A

See ALEPH; ALPHABET.

AALAR

a’-a-lar. See ALTAR.

AARON

ar’-un, sometimes pronounced ar’on (’aharon—Septuagint Aaron, meaning uncertain: Gesenius suggests "mountaineer"; Furst, "enlightened"; others give "rich," "fluent." Cheyne mentions Redslob’s "ingenious conjecture" of ha-’aron—"the ark"—with its mythical, priestly significance, Encyclopedia Biblica under the word):

1. Family:

Probably eldest son of Amram (Ex 6:20), and according to the uniform genealogical lists (Ex 6:16-20; 1Ch 6:1-3), the fourth from Levi. This however is not certainly fixed, since there are frequent omissions from the Hebrew lists of names which are not prominent in the line of descent. For the corresponding period from Levi to Aaron the Judah list has six names (Ru 4:18-20; 1Ch 2). Levi and his family were zealous, even to violence (Ge 34:25; Ex 32:26), for the national honor and religion, and Aaron no doubt inherited his full portion of this spirit. His mother’s name was Jochebed, who was also of the Levitical family (Ex 6:20). Miriam, his sister, was several years older, since she was set to watch the novel cradle of the infant brother Moses, at whose birth Aaron was three years old (Ex 7:7).

2. Becomes Moses’ Assistant:

When Moses fled from Egypt, Aaron remained to share the hardships of his people, and possibly to render them some service; for we are told that Moses entreated of God his brother’s cooperation in his mission to Pharaoh and to Israel, and that Aaron went out to meet his returning brother, as the time of deliverance drew near (Ex 4:27). While Moses, whose great gifts lay along other lines, was slow of speech (Ex 4:10), Aaron was a ready spokesman, and became his brother’s representative, being called his "mouth" (Ex 4:16) and his "prophet" (Ex 7:1). After their meeting in the wilderness the two brothers returned together to Egypt on the hazardous mission to which Yahweh had called them (Ex 4:27-31). At first they appealed to their own nation, recalling the ancient promises and declaring the imminent deliverance, Aaron being the spokesman. But the heart of the people, hopeless by reason of the hard bondage and heavy with the care of material things, did not incline to them. The two brothers then forced the issue by appealing directly to Pharaoh himself, Aaron still speaking for his brother (Ex 6:10-13). He also performed, at Moses’ direction, the miracles which confounded Pharaoh and his magicians.

With Hur, he held up Moses hands, in order that the ‘rod of God might be lifted up,’ during the fight with Amalek (Ex 17:10,12).

3. An Elder:

Aaron next comes into prominence when at Sinai he is one of the elders and representatives of his tribe to approach nearer to the Mount than the people in general were allowed to do, and to see the manifested glory of God (Ex 24:1,9,10). A few days later, when Moses, attended by his "minister" Joshua, went up into the mountain, Aaron exercised some kind of headship over the people in his absence. Despairing of seeing again their leader, who had disappeared into the mystery of communion with the invisible God, they appealed to Aaron to prepare them more tangible gods, and to lead them back to Egypt (Ex 32). Aaron never appears as the strong, heroic character which his brother was; and here at Sinai he revealed his weaker nature, yielding to the demands of the people and permitting the making of the golden bullock. That he must however have yielded reluctantly, is evident from the ready zeal of his tribesmen, whose leader he was, to stay and to avenge the apostasy by rushing to arms and falling mightily upon the idolaters at the call of Moses (Ex 32:26-28).

4. High Priest:

In connection with the planning and erection of the tabernacle ("the Tent"), Aaron and his sons being chosen for the official priesthood, elaborate and symbolical vestments were prepared for them (Ex 28); and after the erection and dedication of the tabernacle, he and his sons were formally inducted into the sacred office (Le 8). It appears that Aaron alone was anointed with the holy oil (Le 8:12), but his sons were included with him in the duty of caring for sacrificial rites and things. They served in receiving and presenting the various offerings, and could enter and serve in the first chamber of the tabernacle; but Aaron alone, the high priest, the Mediator of the Old Covenant, could enter into the Holy of Holies, and that only once a year, on the great Day of Atonement (Le 16:12-14).

5. Rebels Against Moses:

After the departure of Israel from Sinai, Aaron joined his sister Miriam in a protest against the authority of Moses (Nu 12), which they asserted to be self-assumed. For this rebellion Miriam was smitten with leprosy, but was made whole again, when, at the pleading of Aaron, Moses interceded with God for her. The sacred office of Aaron, requiring physical, moral and ceremonial cleanness of the strictest order, seems to have made him immune from this form of punishment. Somewhat later (Nu 16) he himself, along with Moses, became the object of a revolt of his own tribe in conspiracy with leaders of Da and Reuben. This rebellion was subdued and the authority of Moses and Aaron vindicated by the miraculous overthrow of the rebels. As they were being destroyed by the plague, Aaron, at Moses’ command, rushed into their midst with the lighted censer, and the destruction was stayed. The Divine will in choosing Aaron and his family to the priesthood was then fully attested by the miraculous budding of his rod, when, together with rods representing the other tribes, it was placed and left overnight in the sanctuary (Nu 17). See AARON’S ROD.

6. Further History:

After this event Aaron does not come prominently into view until the time of his death, near the close of the Wilderness period. Because of the impatience, or unbelief, of Moses and Aaron at Meribah (Nu 20:12), the two brothers are prohibited from entering Canaan; and shortly after the last camp at Kadesh was broken, as the people journeyed eastward to the plains of Moab, Aaron died on Mount Hor. In three passages this event is recorded: the more detailed account in Nu 20, a second incidental record in the list of stations of the wanderings in the wilderness (Nu 33:38,39), and a third casual reference (De 10:6) in an address of Moses. These are not in the least contradictory or inharmonious. The dramatic scene is fully presented in Nu 20: Moses, Aaron and Eleazar go up to Mount Hor in the people's sight; Aaron is divested of his robes of office, which are formally put upon his eldest living son; Aaron dies before the Lord in the Mount at the age of 123, and is given burial by his two mourning relatives, who then return to the camp without the first and great high priest; when the people understand that he is no more, they show both grief and love by thirty days of mourning. The passage in Nu 33 records the event of his death just after the list of stations in the general vicinity of Mount Hor; while Moses in De 10$ states from which of these stations, namely, Moserah, that remarkable funeral procession made its way to Mount Hor. In the records we find, not contradiction and perplexity, but simplicity and unity. It is not within the view of this article to present modern displacements and rearrangements of the Aaronic history; it is concerned with the records as they are, and as they contain the faith of the Old Testament writers in the origin in Aaron of their priestly order.

7. Priestly Succession:

Aaron married Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, and sister of Nahshon, prince of the tribe of Judah, who bore him four sons: Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar. The sacrilegious act and consequent judicial death of Nadab and Abihu are recorded in Le 10. Eleazar and Ithamar were more pious and reverent; and from them descended the long line of priests to whom was committed the ceremonial law of Israel, the succession changing from one branch to the other with certain crises in the nation. At his death Aaron was succeeded by his oldest living son, Eleazar (Nu 20:28; De 10:6).

Edward Mack

AARON'S ROD

(Nu 17$ and He 9:4): Immediately after the incidents connected with the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram against the leadership of Moses and the priestly primacy of Aaron (Nu 16), it became necessary to indicate and emphasize the Divine appointment of Aaron. Therefore, at the command of Yahweh, Moses directs that twelve almond rods, one for each tribe with the prince's name engraved thereon, be placed within the Tent of the Testimony. When Moses entered the tent the following day, he found that Aaron's rod had budded, blossomed and borne fruit, "the three stages of vegetable life being thus simultaneously visible." When the miraculous sign was seen by the people, they accepted it as final; nor was there ever again any question of Aaron's priestly right. The rod was kept "before the testimony" in

the sanctuary ever after as a token of the Divine will (Nu 17:10). The writer of Hebrews, probably following a later Jewish tradition, mentions the rod as kept in the Holy of Holies within the ark (He 9:4; compare 1Ki 8:9). See PRIEST, III.

Edward Mack

AARONITES

ar'-on-its (le-'aharon, literally, "belonging to Aaron"): A word used in the King James Version, but not in the revised versions, to translate the proper name Aaron in two instances where it. denotes a family and not merely a person (1Ch 12:27; 27:17). It is equivalent to the phrases "sons of Aaron," "house of Aaron," frequently used in the Old Testament. According to the books of Jos and Chronicles the "sons of Aaron," were distinguished from the other Levites from the time of Joshua (e.g. Jos 21:4,10,13; 1Ch 6:54).

AB (1)

('abh, the Hebrew and Aramaic word for "father"): It is a very common word in the Old Testament; this article notes only certain uses of it. It is used both in the singular and in the plural to denote a grandfather or more remote ancestors (e.g. Jer 35:16,15). The father of a people or tribe is its founder, not, as is frequently assumed, its progenitor. In this sense Abraham is father to the Israelites (see, for example, Ge 17:11-14,27), Isaac and Jacob and the heads of families being fathers in the same modified sense. The cases of Ishmael, Moab, etc., are similar. The traditional originator of a craft is the father of those who practice the craft (e.g. Ge 4:20,21,22). Sennacherib uses the term "my fathers" of his predecessors on the throne of Assyria, though these were not his ancestors (2Ki 19:12). The term is used to express worth and affection irrespective of blood relation (e.g. 2Ki 13:14). A ruler or leader is spoken of as a father. God is father. A frequent use of the word is that in the composition of proper names, e.g. Abinadab, "my father is noble." See ABI.

The Aramaic word in its definite form is used three times in the New Testament (Mr 4:6), the phrase being in each case "Abba Father," addressed to God. In this phrase the word "Father" is added, apparently, not as a mere translation, nor to indicate that Abba is thought of as a proper name of Deity, but as a term of pleading and of endearment. See also ABBA.

Willis J. Beecher

AB (2)

('abh): The name of the fifth month in the Hebrew calendar, the month beginning in our July. The name does not appear in the Bible, but Josephus gives it to the month in which Aaron died (Ant., IV, iv, 6; compare Nu 33:38).

ABACUC

ab’-a-kuk (Latin Abacuc): The form given the name of the prophet Habakkuk in 2 Esdras 1:40.

ABADDON

a-bad’-on (’abhaddon, "ruin," "perdition," "destruction"): Though "destruction" is commonly used in translating ‘abhaddon, the stem idea is intransitive rather than passive—the idea of perishing, going to ruin, being in a ruined state, rather than that of being ruined, being destroyed.

The word occurs six times in the Old Testament, always as a place name in the sense in which Sheol is a place name. It denotes, in certain aspects, the world of the dead as constructed in the Hebrew imagination. It is a common mistake to understand such expressions in a too mechanical way. Like ourselves, the men of the earlier ages had to use picture language when they spoke of the conditions that existed after death, however their picturing of the matter may have differed from ours. In three instances Abaddon is parallel with Sheol (Job 26:6; Pr 15:11; 27:20). In one instance it is parallel with death, in one with the grave and in the remaining instance the parallel phrase is "root out all mine increase" (Job 28:22; Ps 88:11; Job 31:12). In this last passage the place idea comes nearer to vanishing in an abstract conception than in the other passages.

Abaddon belongs to the realm of the mysterious. Only God understands it (Job 26:6; Pr 15:11). It is the world of the dead in its utterly dismal, destructive, dreadful aspect, not in those more cheerful aspects in which activities are conceived of as in progress there. In Abaddon there are no declarations of God’s lovingkindness (Ps 88:11).

In a slight degree the Old Testament presentations personalize Abaddon. It is a synonym for insatiableness (Pr 27:20). It has possibilities of information mediate between those of "all living" and those of God (Job 28:22).

In the New Testament the word occurs once (Re 9:11), the personalization becoming sharp. Abaddon is here not the world of the dead, but the angel who reigns over it. The Greek equivalent of his name is given as Apollyon. Under this name Bunyan presents him in the Pilgrim’s Progress, and Christendom has doubtless been more interested in this presentation of the matter than in any other.

In some treatments Abaddon is connected with the evil spirit Asmodeus of Tobit (e.g. 3:8), and with the destroyer mentioned in The Wisdom of Solomon (18:25; compare 22), and through these with a large body of rabbinical folklore; but these efforts are simply groundless. See APOLLYON . Willis J. Beecher

ABADIAS

ab-a-di’-as (Greek Abadias): Mentioned in 1 Esdras 8:35 as the son of Jezelus, of the sons of Joab,

returned with Ezra from the captivity; and in Ezr 8:9 called "Obadiah the son of Jehiel."

ABAGARUS

a-bag’-a-rus. See ABGARUS.

ABAGTHA

a-bag’-tha (’abhaghetha’, perhaps meaning "fortunate one"): One of the seven eunuchs, or "chamberlains," of Xerxes mentioned in Es 1:10. The name is Persian, and is one of the many Persian marks in the Book of Esther.

ABANAH

ab’-a-na, a-ba’-na (’abhanah (Kethibh, Septuagint, Vulgate)), or AMANA a-ma’-na (’amanah (Qere, Peshitta, Targum); the King James Version Abana (American Standard Revised Version, margin Amana), the Revised Version (British and American) ABANAH (Revised Version, margin Amanah)): Mentioned in 2Ki 5:12, along with the PHARPAR (which see), as one of the principal rivers of Damascus. The reading Amana (meaning possibly the "constant," or perennial stream) is on the whole preferable. Both forms of the name may have been in use, as the interchange of an aspirated b (bh = v) and m is not without parallel (compare Evil-merodach = Amilmarduk).

The Abanah is identified with the Chrysorrhoas ("golden stream") of the Greeks, the modern Nahr Barada (the "cold"), which rises in the Anti-Lebanon, one of its sources, the Ain Barada, being near the village of Zebedani, and flows in a southerly and then southeasterly direction toward Damascus. A few miles southeast of Suk Wady Barada (the ancient Abila; see ABILENE) the volume of the stream is more than doubled by a torrent of clear, cold water from the beautifully situated spring ‘Ain Fijeh (Greek pege, "fountain"), after which it flows through a picturesque gorge till it reaches Damascus, whose many fountains and gardens it supplies liberally with water. In the neighborhood of Damascus a number of streams branch off from the parent river, and spread out like an opening fan on the surrounding plain. The Barada, along with the streams which it feeds, loses itself in the marshes of the Meadow Lakes about 18 miles East of the city.

The water of the Barada, though not perfectly wholesome in the city itself, is for the most part clear and cool; its course is picturesque, and its value to Damascus, as the source alike of fertility and of charm, is inestimable.

C. H. Thomson

ABARIM

ab’-a-rim, a-ba’-rim (‘abharim): The stem idea is that of going across a space or a dividing line, or for example a river. It is the same stem that appears in the familiar phrase "beyond Jordan," used to denote the region East of the Jordan, and Hellenized in the name Peraea. This fact affords the most natural explanation of the phrases ‘the mountains of the Abarim’ (Nu 33:47,48); ‘this mountain-country of the Abarim’ (Nu 27:12; De 32:49); Iye-abarim, which means "Heaps of the Abarim," or "Mounds of the Abarim" (Nu 21:11; 33:44). In Nu 33:45 this station is called simply Iyim, "Mounds." It is to be distinguished from the place of the same name in southern Judah (Jos 15:29). The name Abarim, without the article, occurs in Jer (Jer 22:20 the Revised Version (British and American), where the King James Version translates "the passages"), where it seems to be the name of a region, on the same footing with the names Lebanon and Bashan, doubtless the region referred to in Nu and Deuteronomy. There is no reason for changing the vowels in Eze 39:11, in order to make that another occurrence of the same name.

When the people of Abraham lived in Canaan, before they went to Egypt to sojourn, they spoke of the region east of the Jordan as "beyond Jordan." Looking across the Jordan and the Dead Sea they designated the mountain country they saw there as "the Beyond mountains." They continued to use these geographical terms when they came out of Egypt. We have no means of knowing to how extensive a region they applied the name. The passages speak of the mountain country of Abarim where Moses died, including Nebo, as situated back from the river Jordan in its lowest reaches; and of the Mounds of the Abarim as farther to the southeast, so that the Israelites passed them when making their detour around the agricultural parts of Edom, before they crossed the Arnon. Whether the name Abarim should be applied to the parts of the eastern hill country farther to the north is a question on which we lack evidence.

Willis J. Beecher

ABASE

a-bas’:The English rendition of shaphel (Job 40:11; Eze 21:26), and of its derivative shephal (Da 4:37) =" bring down," "debase," "humble"; of ‘anah (Isa 31:4) =" abase self," "afflict," "chasten self," "deal harshly with," etc.; and of tapeinoo =" to depress"; figure "to humiliate" (in condition or heart): "abase," "bring low," "humble self" (Php 4:12). The word is always employed to indicate what should be done to or by him who nurtures a spirit and exhibits a demeanor contrary to the laudable humility which is a natural fruit of religion. Such a person is warned that the most extravagant audacity will not daunt Yahweh nor abate His vengeance (Isa 31:4), and good men are exhorted to employ their powers to bring him low (Job 40:11; Eze 21:26). If men are not able to curb the arrogant, God is (Da 4:37); and He has so constituted the world, that sinful arrogance must fall (Mt 23:12 the King James Version; Lu 14:11 the King James Version; Lu 18:14 the King James Version).

Frank E. Hirsch

ABATE

a-bat’:Used six times in Old Testament for five different Hebrew words, signifying "to diminish," "reduce," "assuage"; of the Flood (Ge 8:8); of strength (De 34:7); of pecuniary value (Le 27:18); of wrath (Jud 8:3); of fire (Nu 11:2).

ABBA

ab’-a (abba, ‘abba’, Hebraic-Chaldaic, "Father"): In Jewish and old-Christian prayers, a name by which God was addressed, then in oriental churches a title of bishops and patriarchs. So Jesus addresses God in prayer (Mt 11:25,26, 26:39,42, Lu 10:21; 22:42; 23:34, Joh 11:41; 12:27; 17:24,25). In Mr 14:36; Ro 8:15, and Ga 4:6 ho pater, is appended even in direct address, in an emphatic sense. Servants were not permitted to use the appellation in addressing the head of the house. See Delitzsch on Ro 8:15; compare G. Dalman, Gram. des jud.-palast. Aramaisch, etc., section 40, c. 3.

J. E. Harry

ABDA

ab’-da (‘abhda’, perhaps, by abbreviation, "servant of Yahweh"):

(1) The father of Adoniram, King Solomon’s superintendent of forced labor (1Ki 4:6).

(2) A Levite mentioned in the statistical note in (Ne 11:17). This "Abda the son of Shammua" is in the partly duplicate passage in (1Ch 9:16) called "Obadiah the son of Shemaiah."

ABDEEL

ab’-de-el (‘abhdeel, "servant of God"): The father of Shelemiah, one of the officers whom King Jehoiakim commanded to arrest Baruch, the scribe, and Jeremiah the prophet (Jer 36:26).

ABDI

ab’-di (‘abhdi, probably by abbreviation "servant of Yahweh"):

(1) A Levite, father of Kishi and grandfather of King David’s singer Ethan (1Ch 6:44; compare 1Ch 15:17). This makes Abdi a contemporary of Saul the king.

(2) A Levite, father of the Kish who was in service at the beginning of the reign of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12). Some mistakenly identify this Abdi with the former.

(3) A man who in Ezra’s time had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:26). Not a Levite, but "of the sons of

Elam."

ABDIAS

ab-di’-as (2 Esdras 1:39 = Obadiah): One of the Minor Prophets. Mentioned with Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and the Minor Prophets who shall be given as leaders to the "nation from the east" which is to overthrow Israel (compare OBADIAH).

ABDIEL

ab’-di-el (‘abhdi’el, "servant of God"): A Gadite who lived in Gilead or in Bashan, and whose name was reckoned in genealogies of the time of Jotham, king of Judah, or of Jeroboam II, king of Israel (1Ch 5:15-17).

ABDON (1)

ab’-don (‘abhdon, perhaps "service"; Abdon):

(1) A judge of Israel for eight years (Jud 12:13-15). The account says that he was the son of Hillel the Pirathonite, and that he was buried in Pirathon in the land of Ephraim. No mention is made of great public services rendered by him, but it is said that he had seventy well-mounted sons and grandsons. So far as we can judge, he was placed in office as a wealthy elderly man, and performed the routine duties acceptably. Very likely his two next predecessors Ibzan and Elon were men of the same type. An effort has been made to identify Abdon with the Bedan mentioned in 1Sa 12:11, but the identification is precarious.

A certain importance attaches to Abdon from the fact that he is the last judge mentioned in the continuous account (Jud 2:6-13:1) in the Book of Jgs. After the account of him follows the statement that Israel was delivered into the hands of the Philistines forty years, and with that statement the continuous account closes and the series of personal stories begins—the stories of Samson, of Micah and his Levite, of the Benjamite civil war, followed in our English Bibles by the stories of Ru and of the childhood of Samuel. With the close of this last story (1Sa 4:18) the narrative of public affairs is resumed, at a point when Israel is making a desperate effort, at the close of the forty years of Eli, to throw off the Philistine yoke. A large part of one’s views of the history of the period of the Judges will depend on the way in which he combines these events. My own view is that the forty years of Jud 13:1 and of 1Sa 4:18 are the same; that at the death of Abdon the Philistines asserted themselves as overlords of Israel; that it was a part of their policy to suppress nationality in Israel; that they abolished the office of judge, and changed the high-priesthood to another family, making Eli high priest; that Eli was sufficiently competent so that many of the functions of national judge drifted into his hands. It should be noted that the regaining of independence was signalized by the reestablishment of the office of judge, with Samuel as incumbent (1Sa 7:6 and context). This view takes into the account that the narrative concerning Samson is detachable, like the narratives that follow, Samson belonging to an earlier period.

See SAMSON.

(2) The son of Jeiel and his wife Maacah (1Ch 8:30; 9:36). Jeiel is described as the "father of Gibeon," perhaps the founder of the Israelirish community there. This Abdon is described as brother to Ner, the grandfather of King Saul.

(3) One of the messengers sent by King Josiah to Huldah the prophetess (2Ch 34:20); called Achbor in 2Ki 22:12.

(4) One of many men of Benjamin mentioned as dwelling in Jerusalem (1Ch 8:23), possibly in Nehemiah's time, though the date is not clear.

Willis J. Beecher

ABDON (2)

ab'-don ('abhdon, perhaps "service"): One of the four Levitical cities in the tribe of Asher (Jos 21:30; 1Ch 6:74). Probably the same with Ebron (in the King James Version "Hebron") in Jos 19:28, where some copies have the reading Abdon. Now called Abdeh, a few miles from the Mediterranean and about fifteen miles south of Tyre.

ABED-NEGO

a-bed'-ne-go (Hebrew and Aramaic 'abhedh neghgo; Da 3:29, 'abhedh negho'): According to many, the nego is an intentional corruption of Nebo, the name of a Babylonian god, arising from the desire of the Hebrew scribes to avoid the giving of a heathen name to a hero of their faith. The name, according to this view, would mean "servant of Nebo." Inasmuch as 'abhedh is a translation of the Babylonian 'arad, it seems ore probable that nego also must be a translation of some Babylonian word. The goddess Ishtar is by the Babylonians called "the morning star" and "the perfect light" (nigittu gitmaltu). The morning star is called by the Arameans nogah, "the shining one," a word derived from the root negah, the equivalent of the Babylonian nagu, "to shine." Abed-nego, according to this interpretation, would be the translation of Arad-Ishtar, a not uncommon name among the Assyrians and Babylonians. Canon Johns gives this as the name of more than thirty Assyrians, who are mentioned on the tablets cited by him in Vol. III of his great work entitled Assyrian Deeds and Documents. It means "servant of Ishtar."

Abed-nego was one of the three companions of Daniel, and was the name imposed upon the Hebrew Azariah by Nebuchadnezzar (Da 1:7). Having refused, along with his friends, to eat the provisions of the king's table, he was fed and flourished upon pulse and water. Having successfully passed his examinations and escaped the death with which the wise men of Babylon were threatened, he was appointed at the request of Daniel along with his companions over the affairs of the province of Babylon (Da 2). Having refused to bow down to the image which Nebuehadnezzar had set up, he was cast into the burning fiery furnace, and after his triumphant delivery he was caused by the king to prosper in the

province of Babylon (Da 3). The three friends are referred to by name in 1 Macc 2:59, and by implication in He 11:33,34.

R. Dick Wilson

ABEL (1)

a’-bel (hebhel; Abel; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Habel; etymology uncertain. Some translation "a breath," "vapor," "transitoriness," which are suggestive of his brief existence and tragic end; others take it to be a variant of Jabal, yabhal, "shepherd" or "herdman," Ge 4:20. Compare Assyrian ablu and Babylonian abil, "son"): The second son of Adam and Eve. The absence of the verb harah (Ge 4:2; compare Ge 4:1) has been taken to imply, perhaps truly, that Cain and Abel were twins.

1. A Shepherd:

"Abel was a keeper of sheep, but Cain was a tiller of the ground," thus representing the two fundamental pursuits of civilized life, the two earliest subdivisions of the human race. On the Hebrew tradition of the superiority of the pastoral over agricultural and city life, see The Expositor T, V, 351 ff. The narrative may possibly bear witness to the primitive idea that pastoral life was more pleasing to Yahweh than husbandry.

2. A Worshipper:

"In process of time," the two brothers came in a solemn manner to sacrifice unto Yahweh, in order to express their gratitude to Him whose tenants they were in the land (Ge 4:3,4. See SACRIFICE).

How Yahweh signified His acceptance of the one offering and rejection of the other, we are not told. That it was due to the difference in the material of the sacrifice or in their manner of offering was probably the belief among the early Israelites, who regarded animal offerings as superior to cereal offerings. Both kinds, however, were fully in accord with Hebrew law and custom. It has been suggested that the Septuagint rendering of Ge 4:7 makes Cain’s offense a ritual one, the offering not being "correctly" made or rightly divided, and hence rejected as irregular. "If thou makest a proper offering, but dost not cut in pieces rightly, art thou not in fault? Be still!" The Septuagint evidently took the rebuke to turn upon Cain’s neglect to prepare his offering according to strict ceremonial requirements. dieles (Septuagint in the place cited.), however, implies nathach (nattach), and would only apply to animal sacrifices. Compare Ex 29:17; Le 8:20; Jud 19:29; 1Ki 18:23; and see COUCH.

3. A Righteous Man:

The true reason for the Divine preference is doubtless to be found in the disposition of the brothers (see CAIN). Well-doing consisted not in the outward offering (Ge 4:7) but in the right state of mind and feeling. The acceptability depends on the inner motives and moral characters of the offerers. "By faith

Abel offered unto God a more excellent (abundant, pleiona) sacrifice than Cain" (Heb 11:4). The "more abundant sacrifice," Westcott thinks, "suggests the deeper gratitude of Abel, and shows a fuller sense of the claims of God" to the best. Cain's "works (the collective expression of his inner life) were evil, and his brother's righteous" (1Joh 3:12). "It would be an outrage if the gods looked to gifts and sacrifices and not to the soul" (Alcibiades II.149E.150A). Cain's heart was no longer pure; it had a criminal propensity, springing from envy and jealousy, which rendered both his offering and person unacceptable. His evil works and hatred of his brother culminated in the act of murder, specifically evoked by the opposite character of Abel's works and the acceptance of his offering. The evil man cannot endure the sight of goodness in another.

4. A Martyr:

Abel ranks as the first martyr (Mt 23:35), whose blood cried for vengeance (Ge 4:10; compare Re 6:9,10) and brought despair (Ge 4:13), whereas that of Jesus appeals to God for forgiveness and speaks peace (Heb 12:24) and is preferred before Abel's.

5. A Type:

The first two brothers in history stand as the types and representatives of the two main and enduring divisions of mankind, and bear witness to the absolute antithesis and eternal enmity between good and evil.

M. O. Evans

ABEL (2)

a'-bel ('abhel, "meadow"): A word used in several compound names of places. It appears by itself as the name of a city concerned in the rebellion of Sheba (2Sa 20:14; compare 1Sa 6:18), though it is there probably an abridgment of the name Abel-beth-maacah. In 1Sa 6:18, where the Hebrew has "the great meadow," and the Greek "the great stone," the King James Version translates "the great stone of Abel."

ABEL-BETH-MAACAH

a'-bel-beth-ma'-a-ka ('abhel beth ma'akhah, "the meadow of the house of Maacah"): The name appears in this form in 1Ki 15:20 and 2Ki 15:29. In 2Sa 20:15 (Hebrew) it is Abel-beth-hammaacah (Maacah with the article). In 20:14 it appears as Beth-maacah, and in 20:14 and 18 as Abel.

In 2Sa it is spoken of as the city, far to the north, where Joab besieged Sheba, the son of Bichri. In 2Ki it is mentioned, along with Ijon and other places, as a city in Naphtali captured by Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria. The capture appears also in the records of Tiglath-pileser. In 1Ki it is mentioned with Ijon and Da and "all the land of Naphtali" as being smitten by Benhadad of Damascus in the time of Baasha. In

the account in Chronicles parallel to this last (2Ch 16:4) the cities mentioned are Ijon, Dan, Abel- maim. Abel-maim is either another name for Abel-beth-maacah, or the name of another place in the same vicinity.

The prevailing identification of Abel-beth-maacah is with Abil, a few miles West of Dan, on a height overlooking the Jordan near its sources. The adjacent region is rich agriculturally, and the scenery and the water supply are especially fine. Abel-maim, "meadow of water," is not an inapt designation for it. Willis J. Beecher

ABEL-CHERAMIM

a'-bel-ker'-a-mim ('abhel keramim, "meadow of vineyards"): A city mentioned in the Revised Version (British and American) in Jud 11:33, along with Aroer, Minnith, and "twenty cities," in summarizing Jephthah's campaign against the Ammonites. The King James Version translates "the plain of the vineyards." The site has not been identified, though Eusebius and Jerome speak of it as in their time a village about seven Roman miles from the Ammonite city of Rabbah.

ABEL-MAIM

a'-bel-ma'-im ('abhel mayim, "meadow of water"). See ABEL-BETH-MAACAH.

ABEL-MEHOLAH

a'-bel-me-ho'-lah ('abhel meholah, "meadow of dancing"): The residence of Elisha the prophet (1Ki 19:16). When Gideon and his 300 broke their pitchers in the camp of Midian, the Midianites in their first panic fled down the valley of Jezreel and the Jordan "toward Zererah" (Jud 7:22). Zererah (Zeredah) is Zarethan (2Ch 4:17; compare 1Ki 7:46), separated from Succoth by the clay ground where Solomon made castings for the temple. The wing of the Midianites whom Gideon pursued crossed the Jordan at Succoth (Jud 8:4 ff). This would indicate that Abel-meholah was thought of as a tract of country with a "border," West of the Jordan, some miles South of Beth-shean, in the territory either of Issachar or West Manasseh.

Abel-meholah is also mentioned in connection with the jurisdiction of Baana, one of Solomon's twelve commissary officers (1Ki 4:12) as below Jezreel, with Beth-shean and Zarethan in the same list. Jerome and Eusebius speak of Abel-meholah as a tract of country and a town in the Jordan valley, about ten Roman miles South of Beth-shean. At just that point the name seems to be perpetuated in that of the Wady Malib, and Abel-meholah is commonly located near where that Wady, or the neighboring Wady Helweh, comes down into the Jordan valley.

Presumably Adriel the Meholathite (1Sa 18:19; 2Sa 21:8) was a resident of Abel-meholah. Willis J. Beecher

ABEL-MIZRAIM

a’-bel-miz’-ra-im (’abhel mitsrayim, "meadow of Egypt"): A name given to "the threshing floor of Atad," East of the Jordan and North of the Dead Sea, because Joseph and his funeral party from Egypt there held their mourning over Jacob (Ge 50:11). The name is a pun. The Canaanite residents saw the ‘ebhel, "the mourning," and therefore that place was called ‘abhel mitsrayim.

It is remarkable that the funeral should have taken this circuitous route, instead of going directly from Egypt to Hebron. Possibly a reason may be found as we obtain additional details in Egyptian history. The explanations which consist in changing the text, or in substituting the North Arabian Mutsri for Mitsrayim, are unsatisfactory. Willis J. Beecher

ABEL-SHITTIM

a’-bel-shit’-tim (’abhel ha-shiTTim, "the meadow of the Acacias"): The name appears only in Nu 33:49; but the name Shittim is used to denote the same locality (Nu 25:1; Jos 2:1; 3:1; Mic 6:5). The name always has the article, and the best expression of it in English would be "the Acacias." ‘The valley of the Acacias’ (Joe 3:18 (4:18)) is, apparently, a different locality.

For many weeks before crossing the Jordan, Israel was encamped in the vicinity of the Jordan valley, North of the Dead Sea, East of the river. The notices in the Bible, supplemented by those in Josephus and Eusebius and Jerome, indicate that the camping region was many miles in extent, the southern limit being Beth-jeshimoth, toward the Dead Sea, while Abel of the Acacias was the northern limit and the headquarters. The headquarters are often spoken of as East of the Jordan at Jericho (e.g. Nu 22:1; 26:3,63). During the stay there occurred the Balaam incident (Nu 22-24), and the harlotry with Moab and Midian (Nu 25) and the war with Midian (Nu 31), in both of which Phinehas distinguished himself. It was from the Acacias that Joshua sent out the spies, and that Israel afterward moved down to the river for the crossing. Micah aptly calls upon Yahweh’s people to remember all that happened to them from the time when they reached the Acacias to the time when Yahweh had brought them safely across the river to Gilgal.

Josephus is correct in saying that Abel of the Acacias is the place from which the Deuteronomic law purports to have been given. In his time the name survived as Abila, a not very important town situated there. He says that it was "sixty furlongs from Abila to the Jordan," that is a little more than seven English miles (Ant., IV, viii, 1 and V, i, 1; BJ, IV, vii, 6). There seems to be a consensus for locating the site at Kefrein, near where the wady of that name comes down into the Jordan valley.

Willis J. Beecher

ABEZ

a’-bez: Used in the King James Version (Jos 19:20) for EBEZ, which see.

ABGAR; ABGARUS; ABAGARUS

ab’-gar, ab-ga’-rus, a-bag’-a-rus (Abgaros): Written also Agbarus and Augarus. A king of Edessa. A name common to several kings (toparchs) of Edessa, Mesopotamia. One of these, Abgar, a son of Uchomo, the seventeenth (14th?) of twenty kings, according to the legend (Historia Ecclesiastica, i.13) sent a letter to Jesus, professing belief in His Messiahship and asking Him to come and heal him from an incurable disease (leprosy?), inviting Him at the same time to take refuge from His enemies in his city, "which is enough for us both." Jesus answering the letter blessed him, because he had believed on Him without having seen Him, and promised to send one of His disciples after He had risen from the dead. The apostle Thomas sent Judas Thaddeus, one of the Seventy, who healed him (Cod. Apocrypha New Testament).

A. L. Breslich

ABHOR

ab-hor’:"To cast away," "reject," "despise," "defy," "contemn," "loathe," etc.

(1) Translated in the Old Testament from the following Hebrew words amongst others: (ba’ash), "to be or to become stinking" (1Sa 27:12; 2Sa 16:21); (ga‘al), "to cast away as unclean," "to loathe"; compare Eze 16:5 the King James Version; (quts), "to loathe," "to fear" (Ex 1:12 m; 1Ki 11:25; Isa 7:16); (shaqats), "to detest" (Ps 22:24); (ta’abh), (ta‘abh), "to contemn" (De 23:7); (dera’on), "an object of contempt," "an abhorring" (Isa 66:24; Da 12:2 margin).

(2) Translated in the New Testament from the following Greek words: bdelussomai, which is derived from bdeo, "to stink" (Ro 2:22); apostugeo, derived from stugeo, "to hate," "to shrink from" (Ro 12:9).

A. L. Breslich

ABI (1)

a’-bi (’abhi): The name of the mother of King Hezekiah, as given in 2Ki 18:2. Most naturally explained as a contraction of Abijah ("Yahweh is a father," or "is my father"), found in the parallel passage in 2Ch 29:1. The spelling in the oldest translations seems to indicate that ‘abhi is not a copyist’s error, but a genuine contracted form. She is spoken of as the daughter of Zechariah, and was of course the wife of Ahaz.

ABI (2)

a’-bi, in the composition of names (’abhi, "father"): The Hebrew words ‘abh, "father," and ‘ach, "brother," are used in the forming of names, both at the beginning and at the end of words, e.g. Abram ("exalted one"), Joah ("Yahweh is brother"), Ahab ("father’s brother"). At the beginning of a word, however, the modified forms ‘abhi and ‘achi are the ones commonly used, e.g. Ahimelech ("king’s brother") and Abimelech (by the same analogy "king’s father").

These forms have characteristics which complicate the question of their use in proper names. Especially since the publication in 1896 of Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, by G. Buchanan Gray, the attention of scholars has been called to this matter, without the reaching of any perfect consensus of opinion.

The word ‘abhi may be a nominative with an archaic ending ("father"), or in the construct state ("father-of"), or the form with the suffix ("my father"). Hence a proper name constructed with it may supposedly be either a clause or a sentence; if it is a sentence, either of the two words may be either subject or predicate. That is to say, the name Abimelech may supposedly mean either "father of a king," or "a king is father," or "a father is king," or "my father is king," or "a king is my father." Further, the clause "father of a king" may have as many variations of meaning as there are varieties of the grammatical genitive. Further still, it is claimed that either the word father or the word king may, in a name, be a designation of a deity. This gives a very large number of supposable meanings from which, in any case, to select the intended meaning.

The older scholarship regarded all these names as construct clauses. For example, Abidan is "father of a judge." It explained different instances as being different varieties of the genitive construction; for instance, Abihail, "father of might," means mighty father. The woman’s name Abigail, "father of exultation," denotes one whose father is exultant. Abishai, "father of Jesse," denotes one to whom Jesse is father, and so with Abihud, "father of Judah," Abiel, "father of God," Abijah, "father of Yahweh." See the cases in detail in Gesenius’ Lexicon.

The more recent scholarship regards most or all of the instances as sentences. In some cases it regards the second element in a name as a verb or adjective instead of a noun; but that is not important, inasmuch as in Hebrew the genitive construction might persist, even with the verb or adjective. But in the five instances last given the explanation, "my father is exultation," "is Jesse," "is Judah," "is God," "is Yahweh," certainly gives the meaning in a more natural way than by explaining these names as construct clauses.

There is sharp conflict over the question whether we ought to regard the suffix pronoun as present in these names—whether the five instances should not rather be translated Yahweh is father, God is father, Judah is father, Jesse is father, exultation is father. The question is raised whether the same rule prevails when the second word is a name or a designation of Deity as prevails in other cases. Should we explain one instance as meaning "my father is Jesse," and another as "God is father"?

A satisfactory discussion of this is possible only under a comprehensive study of Bible names. The argument is more or less complicated by the fact that each scholar looks to see what bearing it may have

on the critical theories he holds. In the Hebrew Lexicon of Dr. Francis Brown the explanations exclude the construct theory; in most of the instances they treat a name as a sentence with "my father" as the subject; when the second part of the name is a designation of Deity they commonly make that the subject, and either exclude the pronoun or give it as an alternative. For most persons the safe method is to remember that the final decision is not yet reached, and to consider each name by itself, counting the explanation of it an open question.

See NAMES, PROPER.

The investigations concerning Semitic proper names, both in and out of the Bible, have interesting theological bearings. It has always been recognized that words for father and brother, when combined in proper names with Yah, Yahu, El, Baal, or other proper names of a Deity, indicated some relation of the person named, or of his tribe, with the Deity. It is now held, though with many differences of opinion, that in the forming of proper names many other words, e.g. the words for king, lord, strength, beauty, and others, are also used as designations of Deity or of some particular Deity; and that the words father, brother, and the like may have the same use. To a certain extent the proper names are so many propositions in theology. It is technically possible to go very far in inferring that the people who formed such names thought of Deity or of some particular Deity as the father, the kinsman, the ruler, the champion, the strength, the glory of the tribe or of the individual. In particular one might infer the existence of a widely diffused doctrine of the fatherhood of God. It is doubtless superfluous to add that at present one ought to be very cautious in drawing or accepting inferences in this part of the field of human study.

Willis J. Beecher

ABI-ALBON

ab-i-al’-bon, abi-al’-bon (’abhi ‘alebhon, meaning not known. Gesenius infers from the Arabic a stem which would give the meaning "father of strength," and this is at worst not quite so groundless as the conjectures which explain ‘alebhon as a textual misreading for ‘el or ba‘al): Abi-albon the Arbathite was one of David’s listed heroes (2Sa 23:31), called Abiel the Arbathite in 1Ch 11:32. Presumably he was from Beth- arabah (Jos 15:6,61, 18:22).

ABIA; ABIAH

a-bi’-a, a-bi’-ah: Variants for ABIJAH; which see.

ABIASAPH

a-bi’-a-saf, ab-i-a’-saf (’abhi-’acaph, "my father has gathered"): A descendant of Kohath the son of Levi (Ex 6:24; 1Ch 6:23,37 (1Ch 8,22); 1Ch 9:19). In Chronicles the name is ‘ebh-yacaph, which seems to be

a mere variant spelling. The Samaritan version has the same form in Exodus. The list in Exodus terminates with Abiasaph, who is to be regarded as the contemporary of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron. The two lists in 1Ch 6 lead up to the prophet Samuel and the singing companies which David is said to have organized. The list in 1Ch 9$ leads up to the Korahite porters of the time of Nehemiah. Apparently all the lists intentionally omit names, just names enough being given in each to indicate the line. Willis J. Beecher

ABIATHAR

a-bi’-a-thar, ab-i-a’-thar (’ebhyathar, "father of super-excellence," or, "the super-excellent one is father." With changed phraseology these are the explanations commonly given, though "a father remains" would be more in accord with the ordinary use of the stem yathar. The pious Abiathar was still conscious that he had a Father, even after the butchery of his human relatives):

1. The Biblical Account:

The Scriptures represent that Abiathar was descended from Phinehas the son of Eli, and through him from Ithamar the son of Aaron; that he was the son of Ahimelech the head priest at Nob who, with his associates, was put to death by King Saul for alleged conspiracy with David; that he had two sons, Ahimelech and Jonathan, the former of whom was, in Abiathar’s lifetime, prominent in the priestly service (1Sa 21:1-9; 22:7 ff; 2Sa 8:17; 15:27 ff; 1Ch 18:16; 24:3,6,31).

See AHIMELECH; AHITUB.

Abiathar escaped from the massacre of the priests at Nob, and fled to David, carrying the ephod with him. This was a great accession to David’s strength. Public feeling in Israel was outraged by the slaughter of the priests, and turned strongly against Saul. The heir of the priesthood, and in his care the holy ephod, were now with David, and the fact gave to his cause prestige, and a certain character of legitimacy. David also felt bitterly his having been the unwilling cause of the death of Abiathar’s relatives, and this made his heart warm toward his friend. Presumably, also, there was a deep religious sympathy between them.

Abiathar seems to have been at once recognized as David’s priest, the medium of consultation with Yahweh through the ephod (1Sa 22:20-23; 23:6,9; 30:7,8). He was at the head of the priesthood, along with Zadok (1Ch 15:11), when David, after his conquests (1Ch 13:5; compare 2Sa 6$), brought the ark to Jerusalem. The two men are mentioned together as high priests eight times in the narrative of the rebellion of Absalom (2Sa 15:24 ff), and are so mentioned in the last list of David’s heads of departments (2Sa 20:25). Abiathar joined with Adonijah in his attempt to seize the throne (1Ki 1:7-42), and was for this deposed from the priesthood, though he was treated with consideration on account of his early comradeship with David (1Ki 2:26,27). Possibly he remained high priest emeritus, as Zadok and Abiathar still appear as priests in the lists of the heads of departments for Solomon’s reign (1Ki 4:4). Particularly apt is the passage in Ps 55:12-14, if one regards it as referring to the relations of David and

Abiathar in the time of Adonijah.

There are two additional facts which, in view of the close relations between David and Abiathar, must be regarded as significant. One is that Zadok, Abiathar's junior, is uniformly mentioned first, in all the many passages in which the two are mentioned together, and is treated as the one who is especially responsible. Turn to the narrative, and see how marked this is. The other similarly significant fact is that in certain especially responsible matters (1Ch 24; 18:16; 2Sa 8:17) the interests of the line of Ithamar are represented, not by Abiathar, but by his son Ahimelech. There must have been something in the character of Abiathar to account for these facts, as well as for his deserting David for Adonijah. To sketch his character might be a work for the imagination rather than for critical inference; but it seems clear that though he was a man worthy of the friendship of David, he yet had weaknesses or misfortunes that partially incapacitated him.

The characteristic priestly function of Abiathar is thus expressed by Solomon: "Because thou barest the ark of the Lord Yahweh before David my father" (1Ki 2:26). By its tense the verb denotes not a habitual act, but the function of ark-bearing, taken as a whole. Zadok and Abiathar, as high priests, had charge of the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:11). We are not told whether it was again moved during the reign of David. Necessarily the priestly superintendence of the ark implies that of the sacrifices and services that were connected with the ark. The details in Kings indicate the existence of much of the ceremonial described in the Pentateuch, while numerous additional Pentateuchal details are mentioned in Ch.

A priestly function much emphasized is that of obtaining answers from God through the ephod (1Sa 23:6,9; 30:7). The word ephod (see 1Sa 2:18; 2Sa 6:14) does not necessarily denote the priestly vestment with the Urim and Thummim (e.g. Le 8:7,8), but if anyone denies that this was the ephod of the priest Abiathar, the burden of proof rests upon him. This is not the place for inquiring as to the method of obtaining divine revelations through the ephod.

Abiathar's landed estate was at Anathoth in Benjamin (1Ki 2:26), one of the cities assigned to the sons of Aaron (Jos 21:18).

Apart from the men who are expressly said to be descendants of Aaron, this part of the narrative mentions priests three times. David's sons were priests (2Sa 8:18). This is of a piece with David's carrying the ark on a new cart (2Sa 6), before he had been taught by the death of Uzza. "And also Ira the Jairite was priest to the king" (2Sa 20:26 the English Revised Version). "And Zabud the son of Nathan was priest, friend of the king" (1Ki 4:5 the English Revised Version). These instances seem to indicate that David and Solomon had each a private chaplain. As to the descent and function of these two "priests" we have not a word of information, and it is illegitimate to imagine details concerning them which bring them into conflict with the rest of the record.

2. Critical Opinions Concerning Abiathar:

No one will dispute that the account thus far given is that of the Bible record as it stands. Critics of certain schools, however, do not accept the facts as thus recorded. If a person is committed to the tradition that the Deuteronomic and the priestly ideas of the Pentateuch first originated some centuries later than Abiathar, and if he makes that tradition the standard by which to test his critical conclusions, he must of course regard the Biblical account of Abiathar as unhistorical. Either the record disproves the tradition or the tradition disproves the record. There is no third alternative. The men who accept the current critical theories understand this, and they have two ways of defending theories against the record. In some instances they use devices for discrediting the record; in other instances they resort to harmonizing hypotheses, changing the record so as to make it agree with theory. Without here discussing these matters, we must barely note some of their bearings in the case of Abiathar.

For example, to get rid of the testimony of Jesus (Mr 2:26) to the effect that Abiathar was high priest and that the sanctuary at Nob was "the house of God," it is affirmed that either Jesus or the evangelist is here mistaken. The proof alleged for this is that Abiathar's service as priest did not begin till at least a few days later than the incident referred to. This is merely finical, though it is an argument that is sometimes used by some scholars.

Men affirm that the statements of the record as to the descent of the line of Eli from Ithamar are untrue; that on the contrary we must conjecture that Abiathar claimed descent from Eleazar, his line being the alleged senior line of that family; that the senior line became extinct at his death, Zadok being of a junior line, if indeed he inherited any of the blood of Aaron. In making such affirmations as these, men deny the Bible statements as resting on insufficient evidence, and substitute for them other statements which, confessedly, rest on no evidence at all.

All such procedure is incorrect. Many are suspicious of statements found in the Books of Chronicles; that gives them no right to use their suspicions as if they were perceptions of fact. Supposably one may think the record unsatisfactory, and may be within his rights in thinking so, but that does not authorize him to change the record except on the basis of evidence of some kind. If we treat the record of the times of Abiathar as fairness demands that a record be treated in a court of justice, or a scientific investigation, or a business proposition, or a medical case, we will accept the facts substantially as they are found in Samuel and Kings and Chronicles and Mk.

Willis J. Beecher

ABIB

a'-bib ('abhibh, young ear of barley or other grain, Ex 9:31; Le 2:14): The first month of the Israelite year, called Nisan in Ne 2:1; Es 3:7, is Abib in Ex 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; compare De 16:1. Abib is not properly a name of a month, but part of a descriptive phrase, "the month of young ears of grain." This may indicate the Israelite way of determining the new year (Ex 12:2), the year beginning with the new moon nearest or next preceding this stage of the growth of the barley. The year thus indicated was practically the same with the old Babylonian year, and presumably came in with Abraham. The

Pentateuchal laws do not introduce it, though they define it, perhaps to distinguish it from the Egyptian wandering year.

See CALENDAR.

Willis J. Beecher

ABIDA

a-bi’-da (’abhidha‘, "father of knowledge," or "my father knows"): A son of Midian and grandson of Abraham and Keturah (Ge 25:4; 1Ch 1:33). Abidah in the King James Version in Gen.

ABIDAH

a-bi’-dah: Used in the King James Version in Ge 25:4 for ABIDA, which see.

ABIDAN

a-bi’-dan (’abhidhan, "father is judge"): Abidan, son of Gideoni, was a "prince" of the children of Benjamin (Nu 2:22; 10:24). He was chosen to represent his tribe at the census in the wilderness of Sinai (Nu 1:11). When, on the erection, anointing and sanctification of the Tabernacle, the heads of Israel offered, Abidan offered on the ninth day (Nu 7:60,65).

ABIDE

a-bid’:Old English word signifying progressively to "await," "remain," "lodge," "sojourn," "dwell," "continue," "endure"; represented richly in Old Testament (King James Version) by 12 Hebrew and in New Testament by as many Greek words. In the Revised Version (British and American) displaced often by words meaning "to sojourn," "dwell," "encamp." The Hebrew and Greek originals in most frequent use are yashabh, "to dwell"; meno, "to remain." "Abide (sit or tarry) ye here" (Ge 22:5); "The earth abide (continueth) forever" (Ec 1:4); "Who can abide (bear or endure) the day?" (Mal 3:2); "Afflictions abide (await) me" (Ac 20:23). The past tense abode, in frequent use, has the same meaning. "His bow abide (remained) in strength" (Ge 49:24); "There he abide" (dwelt) (Joh 10:40).

Abode, as a noun (Greek mone) twice in New Testament: "make our abide with him" (Joh 14:23); "mansions," the Revised Version, margin "abiding-places" (Joh 14:2). The soul of the true disciple and heaven are dwelling-places of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

Dwight M. Pratt

ABIEL

a’-bi-el, ab’-yel, a-bi’-el (’abhi’el, "my father is God," or "God is father"):

(1) A descendant of Benjamin the son of Jacob. Father of Kish the father of King Saul, and also, apparently, the father of Ner the father of Saul’s general, Abner (1Sa 9:1; 14:51).

(2) One of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:32), called ABI-ALBON, which see, in 2Sa 23:31.

ABIEZER

ab-i-e’-zer, a-bi-e’-zer (’abhi‘ezer, "father of help," or "my father is help." Iezer, Iezerite (in the King James Version Jeezer, Jeezerite), is Abiezer with the letter beth omitted):

(1) A descendant of Joseph the son of Jacob, and head of one of the families of Manasseh that settled West of the Jordan (Nu 26:30; Jos 17:1-6; 1Ch 7:14-19). As he was great uncle to Zelophehad’s daughters, who brought a case before Moses (Nu 36), he must have been an old man at the time of the conquest. He was the son of Gilead the son of Machir, in the sense of being a more remote descendant, for Machir had sons before the death of Joseph (Ge 50:23). The Machir that possessed Gilead and Bashan because he was "a man of war" was the Manassite family of Machir, with Jair as its great general (Jos 17:1; 13:30,31, Nu 32:39-41, De 3:12-15). To Abiezer and other sons of Gilead territory was assigned West of the Jordan.

In later generations the name survived as that of the family to which Gideon belonged, and perhaps also of the region which they occupied (Jud 6:34; 8:2). They are also called Abiezrites (Jud 6:11,24, 8:32). The region was West of Shechem, with Ophrah for its principal city.

(2) One of David’s mighty men, "the Anathothite" (2Sa 23:27; 1Ch 11:28), who was also one of David s month-by-month captains, his month being the ninth (1Ch 27:12).

Willis J. Beecher

ABIEZRITE

ab-i-ez’-rit, a-bi-ez’-rit: The Gentile adjective of ABIEZER, which see.

ABIGAIL; ABIGAL

ab’-i-gal, ab’-i-gal (’abhighayil, or ‘abhighal, three times, or ‘abhughayil, once, or ‘abhighayil, once; "father," or "cause of joy"):

(1) The wife of Nabal, a rich shepherd of southern Judea, whose home was Maon (1Sa 25:2,3); shortly

after Nabal's death she became the wife of David. Nabal grazed his flocks in or along the Southern Wilderness, where David and his men protected them from marauding tribes, so that not a sheep was lost. When Nabal was sheep-shearing and feasting at Carmel (in Judea), David sent messengers requesting provisions for himself and men. But Nabal, who was a churlish fellow, answered the messengers insultingly and sent them away empty-handed. David, angered by such mean ingratitude, gathered his 400 warriors and set out to destroy Nabal and all he had (1Sa 25:22). Meanwhile Abigail, a woman "of good understanding, and of a beautiful countenance" (1Sa 25:3), heard of the rebuff given the men of David by her husband; and fearing what vengeance David in his wrath might work, she gathered a considerable present of food (1Sa 25:18), and hastened to meet the approaching soldiers. Her beautiful and prudent words, as also her fair face, so won David that he desisted from his vengeful purpose and accepted her gift (1Sa 25:32-35). When Abigail told Nabal of his narrow escape, he was stricken with fear, and died ten days afterward. Shortly after this David took Abigail to be his wife, although about the same time, probably a little before, he had also taken Ahinoam (1Sa 25:43); and these two were with him in Gath (1Sa 27:3). After David became king in Hebron, Abigail bore him his second son, Chileab (2Sa 3:3) or Daniel, as he is called in 1Ch 3:1.

(2) Sister of David and mother of Amasa, at one time commander of David's army (1Ch 2:16,17; Abigal 2Sa 17:25). In the first passage she is called David's sister, along with Zeruiah; while in the second she is called the "daughter of Nahash." Several explanations of this connection with Nahash have been suggested, any one of which would be sufficient to remove contradiction:

(1) That Nahash was another name of Jesse, as in Isa 14:29, mish-shoresh nachash yetse' (Qimchi);

(2) That Nahash was the wife of Jesse and by him mother of Abigail, which is least probable;

(3) That Nahash, the father of Abigail and Zeruiah, having died, his widow became the wife of Jesse, and bore sons to him;

(4) That the text of 2Sa 17:25 has been corrupted, "daughter of Nahash" having crept into the text. At all events she was the sister of David by the same mother.

Edward Mack

ABIHAIL

ab'-i-hal ('abhichayil; in some manuscripts 'abhihayil, when feminine, but best reading is the former: "father, or cause, of strength"): Five persons in the Old Testament are called by this name:

(1) A Levite and the father of Zuriel, who in the Wilderness was head of the house of Merari, Levi's youngest son (Nu 3:35);

(2) The wife of Abishur, a man of the tribe of Judah, in the line of Hazron and Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:29);

(3) One of the heads of the tribe of Gad, who dwelt in Gilead of Bashan (1Ch 5:14);

(4) Either a wife of Rehoboam, king of Judah, or mother of his wife Mahalath, according to the interpretation of the text (2Ch 11:18); probably the latter view is correct, since there is no conjunction in the text, and since (2Ch 11:19) contemplates only one wife as already mentioned. This being true, she was the wife of Jerimath, a son of David, and daughter of Eliab, David's eldest brother. It is interesting to note this frequent intermarriage in the Davidic house;

(5) Father of Queen Esther, who became wife of Xerxes (Biblical Ahasuerus) king of Persia, after the removal of the former queen, Vashti, (Es 2:15; 9:29). He was uncle of Mordecai.

Edward Mack

ABIHU

a-bi'-hu ('abhihu'," father he is," or "my father he is"): Second son of Aaron, the high priest (Ex 6:23). With his older brother Nadab he "died before Yahweh," when the two "offered strange fire" (Le 10:1,2).

It may be inferred from the emphatic prohibition of wine or strong drink, laid upon the priests immediately after this tragedy, that the two brothers were going to their priestly functions in an intoxicated condition (Le 10:8-11). Their death is mentioned three times in subsequent records (Nu 3:4; 26:61; 1Ch 24:2).

ABIHUD

a-bi'-hud ('abhihudh, "father of majesty," or "my father is majesty," though some regard the second part as the proper name Judah): The son of Bela the oldest son of Benjamin (1Ch 8:3).

ABIJAH

a-bi'-ja ('abhiyah or 'abhiyahu (2Ch 13:20,21), "my father is Yahweh," or "Yahweh is father"): The name of six or more men and two women in the Old Testament.

(1) The seventh son of Becher the son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8).

(2) The second son of the prophet Samuel (1Sa 8:2; 1Ch 6:28 (6:13)).

(3) The eighth among "the holy captains and captains of God" appointed by lot by David in connection with the priestly courses (1Ch 24:10). Compare "Zacharias of the course of Abijah" (Lu 1:5).

(4) A son of Jeroboam I of Israel (1Ki 14:1-18). The narrative describes his sickness and his mother's visit to the prophet Ahijah. He is spoken of as the one member of the house of Jeroboam in whom there was "found some good thing toward Yahweh." With his death the hope of the dynasty perished.

(5) The son and successor of Rehoboam king of Judah (1Ch 3:10; 2Ch 11:20-14:1). As to the variant name Abijam (1Ki 14:31; 15:1,7,8) see ABIJAM.

The statements concerning Abijah's mother afford great opportunity for a person who is interested in finding discrepancies in the Bible narrative. She is said to have been Maacah the daughter of Absalom (1Ki 15:2; 2Ch 11:20,21,22). As more than 50 years elapsed between the adolescence of Absalom and the accession of Rehoboam, the suggestion at once emerges that she may have been Absalom's daughter in the sense of being his granddaughter. But Maacha the daughter of Absalom was the mother of Asa, Abijam's son and successor (1Ki 15:10,13; 2Ch 15:16). Further we are explicitly told that Absalom had three sons and one daughter (2Sa 14:27). It is inferred that the three sons died young, inasmuch as Absalom before his death built him a monument because he had no son (2Sa 18:18). The daughter was distinguished for her beauty, but her name was Tamar, not Maacah. Finally, the narrative tells us that the name of Abijah's mother was "Micaiah the daughter of Uriel of Gibeah" (2Ch 13:2).

It is less difficult to combine all these statements into a consistent account than it would be to combine some pairs of them if taken by themselves. When all put together they make a luminous narrative, needing no help from conjectural theories of discrepant sources or textual errors. It is natural to understand that Tamar the daughter of Absalom married Uriel of Gibeah; that their daughter was Maacah, named for her great-grandmother (2Sa 3:3; 1Ch 3:2); that Micaiah is a variant of Maacah, as Abijah is of Abijam. Maacah married Rehoboam, the parties being second cousins on the father's side; if they had been first cousins perhaps they would not have married. Very likely Solomon, through the marriage, hoped to conciliate an influential party in Israel which still held the name of Absalom in esteem; perhaps also he hoped to supplement the moderate abilities of Rehoboam by the great abilities of his wife. She was a brilliant woman, and Rehoboam's favorite (2Ch 11:21). On Abijah's accession she held at court the influential position of king's mother; and she was so strong that she continued to hold it, when, after a brief reign, Abijah was succeeded by Asa; though it was a position from which Asa had the authority to depose her (1Ki 15:13; 2Ch 15:16).

The account in Chronicles deals mainly with a decisive victory which, it says, Abijah gained over northern Israel (2Ch 13), he having 400,000 men and Jeroboam 800,000, of whom 500,000 were slain. It is clear that these numbers are artificial, and were so intended, whatever may be the key to their meaning. Abijah's speech before the battle presents the same view of the religious situation which is presented in Kings and Amos and Hosea, though with fuller priestly details. The orthodoxy of Abijah on this one occasion is not in conflict with the representation in Kings that he followed mainly the evil ways of his father Rehoboam. In Chronicles coarse luxury and the multiplying of wives are attributed to both father and son.

(6) A priest of Nehemiah's time, who sealed the covenant (Ne 10:7). Conjecturally the same with the

one mentioned in Ne 12:4,17.

(7) The wife of Judah’s grandson Hezron, to whom was traced the origin of Tekoa (1Ch 2:24).

(8) The mother of King Hezekiah (2Ch 29:1), called Abi in 2 Ki. See ABI.

Willis J. Beecher

ABIJAM

a-bi’-jam (’abhiyam, "father of sea," or, "father of west"). The name given in Kings (1Ki 14:31; 15:1,7,8) to the son of Rehoboam who succeeded him as king of Judah. See ABIJAH.

The name has puzzled scholars. Some have proposed, by adding one letter, to change it into "father of his people." Others have observed that the Greek rendering in Kings is Abeiou. Either the Hebrew copy used by the Greek translator read ‘abhiyahu, Abijah, or else the translator substituted the form of the name which was to him more familiar. A few existing copies of the Hebrew have the reading Abijah, and Mt 1:7 presupposes that as the Old Testament reading. So they infer that Abijam in Ki is an erroneous reading for Abijah. This seems at present to be the prevailing view, and it is plausible. It would be more convincing, however, if the name occurred but once in the passage in Kings, instead of occurring five times. It is improbable that a scribe would repeat the same error five times within a few sentences, while a translator, if he changed the name once, would of course change it the other four times.

Exploration has revealed the fact that the whole region near the eastern end of the Mediterranean was known as "the west." "Father of the west" is not an inapt name for Rehoboam to give to the boy who, he expects, will inherit the kingdom of Solomon and David. The effect of the secession of the ten tribes was to make that name a burlesque, and one does not wonder that it was superseded by Abijah, "My father is Yahweh."

Willis J. Beecher

ABILA

ab’-i-la. See ABILENE.

ABILENE

a-bi-le’-ne (Abeilene, Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus; Abilene, Codex Sinaiticus): Mentioned in Lu 3:1 as the tetrarchy of Lysanias at the time when John the Baptist began his ministry. The district derived its name from Abila, its chief town, which was situated, according to the Itinerarium

Antonini, 18 Roman miles from Damascus on the way to Heliopolis (Baalbec). This places it in the neighborhood of the village of Suk Wady Barada (see ABANAH), near which there are considerable ancient remains, with an inscription in Greek stating that a "freedman of Lysanias the tetrarch" made wall and built a temple, and another in Latin recording the repair of the road "at the expense of the Abilenians." The memory of the ancient name probably survives in the Moslem legend which places the tomb of Abel in a neighboring height where there are ruins of a temple. Josephus calls this Abila, he Lusaniou, literally, "the Abilene of Lysanius," thus distinguishing it from other towns of the same name, and as late as the time of Ptolemy (circa 170 AD) the name of Lysanias was associated with it.

The territory of Abilene was part of the Iturean Kingdom, which was broken up when its king, Lysanias, was put to death by M. Antonius, circa 35 BC. The circumstances in which Abilene became distinct tetrarchy are altogether obscure, and nothing further is known of the tetrarch Lysanias (Ant., XIX, v, 1; XX, ii, 1). In 37 AD the tetrarchy, along with other territories, was granted to Agrippa I, after whose death in 44 AD it was administered by procurators until 53 AD, when Claudius conferred it again, along with neighboring territories, upon Agrippa II. On Agrippa’s death, toward the close of the 1st century, his kingdom was incorporated in the province of Syria. See LYSANIAS.

C. H. Thomson

ABILITY

a-bil’-i-ti (dunamis, or ischus): Variously used of resources, material, mental and spiritual; e.g. of wealth, "gave after their ability" (Ezr 2:69); of mental endowment, "ability to stand in the king’s palace" (Da 1:4); of talents and character, "several ability" (Mt 25:15); of spiritual strength, "minister, as of the ability which God giveth" (the King James Version 1Pe 4:11). It thus may signify either possessions, native capacity, or gifts of the Holy Spirit.

ABIMAEL

a-bim’-a-el, ab-i-ma’-el (’abhima’el, "my father is God," or "God is father"): The ninth of the thirteen sons of Joktan, who was descendant of Shem, and son of Eber, and brother of Peleg in whose days the earth was divided (Ge 10:25-29; 1Ch 1:19-23). Like some of the other names in this list, the name is linguistically south Arabian, and the tribes indicated are south Arabians. On the Arabic elements in Hebrew proper names see Halevy, Melanges d’epigraphie et d’archeologie semitiques; ZDMG, especially early in 1883; D. H. Muller, Epigraphie Denkmaler aus Arabien; Glaser, Skizze der Gesch. und Geog. Arabiens; and by index Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition; and Gray, Hebrew Proper Names; and F. Giesebrecht, Die alttestamentliche Schatzung des Gottesnamens.

Willis J. Beecher

ABIMELECH

a-bim’-e-lek (’abhimelekh, "father of a king"): A name borne by five Old Testament persons.

(1) The name of two kings of Philistia; the first was a contemporary of Abraham, the second, probably son of the former, was king in the days of Isaac. It is quite possible that Abimelech was the royal title rather than the personal name, since in the title of Ps 34 we find it applied to the king of Gath, elsewhere known by his personal name, Achish (1Sa 27:2,3). Shortly after the destruction of Sodom Abraham journeyed with his herds and flocks into the extreme Southeast country of Palestine (Ge 20). While sojourning at Gerar, the city of Abimelech, king of the Philistine country, he made believe that Sarah was his sister (Ge 20:2), and Abimelech took her, intending to make her one of his wives. But God rebuked him in a dream, besides sending barrenness on the women of his household (Ge 20:3,17). After Abimelech had reproved Abraham most justly for the deception, he dealt generously with him, loading him with presents and granting him the liberty of the land (Ge 20:14,15). When contention had arisen between the servants of the two men over the wells of water the two men made a covenant at a well, which took its name, Beersheba, from this fact of covenantmaking (Ge 21:31,32).

(2) Nearly a century later than the events connected with the first Abimelech, as outlined above, a second Abimelech, king of the Philistines, is mentioned in relations with Isaac (Ge 26), who in time of grievous famine went down from his home, probably at Hebron, to Gerar. Fearing for his life because of his beautiful wife, Rebekah, he called her his sister, just as Abraham had done with reference to Sarah. Neither Abimelech nor any of his people took Rebekah to wife—quite a variation from the Abrahamic incident; but when the falsehood was detected, he upbraided Isaac for what might have happened, continuing nevertheless to treat him most graciously. Isaac continued to dwell in the vicinity of Gerar, until contention between his herdsmen and those of Abimelech became too violent; then he moved away by stages, reopening the wells digged (dug) by his father (Ge 26:18-22). Finally, a covenant was made between Abimelech and Isaac at Beersheba, just , as had been made between Abraham and the first Abimelech (Ge 26:26-33). The two kings of Philistia were probably father and son.

(3) The title of Ps 34 mentions another Abimelech, who in all probability is the same as Achish king of Gath (1Sa 21:10-22:1); with whom David sought refuge when fleeing from Saul, and with whom he was dwelling at the time of the Philistine invasion of Israel, which cost Saul his kingdom and his life (1Sa 27). It appears from this that Abimelech was the royal title, and not the personal name of the Philistine kings.

(4) A son of Gideon (Jud 9) who aspired to be king after the death of his father, and did rule three years (Jud 9:22). He first won the support of the members of his mother’s family and their recommendation of himself to all Israel (Jud 9:3,4). He then murdered all the sons of his father, seventy in number, at Ophrah, the family home in the tribe of Manasseh, Jotham the youngest son alone escaping (Jud 9:5). After this Abimelech was made ruler by an assembly of the people at Shechem. An insurrection led by Gaal the son of Ebed having broken out in Shechem, Abimelech, although he succeeded in capturing that city, was wounded to death by a mill-stone, which a woman dropped from the wall upon his head, while he was storming the citadel of Thebez, into which the defeated rebels had retreated, after that city also had been taken (Jud 9:50-53). Finding that he was mortally wounded and in order to avoid the

shame of death at a woman’s hand, he required his armor-bearer to kill him with his sword (Jud 9:54). His cruel treatment of the Shechemites (Jud 9:46-49), when they took refuge from him in their strong tower, was a just judgment for their acquiescence in his crimes (Jud 9:20,57); while his own miserable death was retribution for his bloody deeds (Jud 9:56).

(5) A priest in the days of David; a descendant of Ithamar and Eli, and son of Abiathar (1Ch 18:16). In the Septuagint and in 1Ch 24 he is called Ahimelech; but is not to be confused with Ahimelech, the father of Abiathar, and therefore his grandfather. He shared with Zadok, of the line of Ithamar, the priestly office in the reign of David (1Ch 24:31).

Edward Mack

ABINADAB

a-bin’-a-dab (’abhinadhabh, "father of willingness," or, "my father is willing." This is according to the ordinary usage of the second word in the name—"willing" rather than "munificent" or "noble"):

(1) The man in whose house the men of Kiriath-jearim placed the ark, after its return from the land of the Philistines, his house being either in Gibeah of Benjamin or "in the hill" (1Sa 7:1; 2Sa 6:3,4). To account for the ambiguity note that gibh‘ah means hill, and that the place-name Gibeah ordinarily has the definite article. It is natural to think that Abinadab was himself a man of Kiriath-jearim, though the account does not explicitly say so. The record is that the men of Kiriath-jearim were summoned to take charge of the ark at a time when no one else dared to have it (1Sa 6:20,21); and the implication seems to be that they had no option to refuse. Possibly this was due to their being Gibeonites, and hereditary "bondmen" of "the house of my God" (Jos 9:17,23). However this may be, they "sanctified" Abinadab’s son Eleazar to have charge of the ark. According to the Hebrew and some of the Greek copies, the ark was in Gibeah in the middle of the reign of King Saul (1Sa 14:18).

About a century later, according to the Bible numbers, David went with great pomp to Kiriath-jearim, otherwise known as Baalah or Baale-judah, to bring the ark from Kiriath-jearim, out of the house of Abinadab in the hill (or, in Gibeah), and place it in Jerusalem (1Ch 13; 2Sa 6). The new cart was driven by two descendants of Abinadab. There may or may not have been another Abinadab then living, the head of the house.

(2) The second of the eight sons of Jesse, one of the three who were in Saul’s army when Goliath gave his challenge (1Sa 16:8; 17:13; 1Ch 2:13).

(3) One of the sons of King Saul (1Ch 8:33; 9:39; 10:2; 1Sa 31:2). He died in the battle of Gilboa, along with his father and brothers.

(4) In 1Ki 4:11 the King James Version has "the son of Abinadab," where the Revised Version (British and American) has BEN-ABINADAB, which see.

Willis J. Beecher

ABINOAM

a-bin’-o-am, ab-i-no’-am (’abhino‘am, "father of pleasantness," or, "my father is pleasantness"): A man of Kedesh-naphtali, the father of Barak who defeated the army of Jabin and Sisera (Jud 4:6,12; 5:1,12).

ABIRAM

a-bi’-ram (’abhiram, "exalted father," or, "my father is an exalted one"):

(1) The son of Eliab the son of Pallu the son of Reuben (Nu 26:5 ff; De 11:6). In company with his brother Dathan and Korah the Levite and others, he disputed the authority of Moses and Aaron in the wilderness (Nu 16-17; 26; De 11:6; Ps 106:17). Two hundred and fifty followers of Korah perished by fire at the doorway of the tent of meeting. Dathan and Abiram refused to come to the tent of meeting, at the summons of Moses; and the earth opened where their tents were, and swallowed them and their families and their goods. See KORAH.

(2) The firstborn son of Hiel the Bethelite, who rebuilt Jericho in the time of Ahab (1Ki 16:34; compare Jos 6:26). This incident has recently acquired a new interest owing to discoveries made at Gezer and Megiddo concerning foundation sacrifices as in ancient times offered in Palestine. One should not be too positive in making statements concerning this, but the following is a possible interpretation of the record. The curse pronounced by Joshua on the man who should rebuild Jericho was of a piece with the other details, Jericho being treated exceptionally, as a city placed under the ban. The language of Joshua’s curse is capable of being translated: ‘Cursed be the man before Yahweh who shall .... build .... Jericho; (who) shall lay its foundation in his firstborn, and set up its gates in his youngest.’ According to this interpretation the death of the builder’s eldest and youngest sons is not spoken of as the penalty involved in the curse, but as an existing horrible custom, mentioned in order to give solemnity to the diction of the curse. The writer in Kings cites the language of the curse by Joshua. The context in which he mentions the affair suggests that he regards Hiel’s conduct as exceptionally flagrant in its wickedness. Hiel, in defiance of Yahweh, not only built the city, but in building it revived the horrible old Canaanite custom, making his first-born son a foundation sacrifice, and his youngest son a sacrifice at the completion of the work.

Willis J. Beecher

ABIRON

a-bi’-ron (Abeiron):

(1) The Septuagint form (Ecclesiasticus 45:18 the King James Version) of Abiram, one of the sons of Eliab, who, with his brother Dathan, and with one of the same tribe, joined the conspiracy against Moses and Aaron (Nu 16:1,12,24,25,27; 26:9; De 11:6; Ps 106:17).

(2) The eldest son of Hiel, the Bethelite, who died prematurely, thus fulfilling the doom pronounced on the posterity of him who should undertake to rebuild Jericho (1Ki 16:34). See ABIRAM.

ABISEI

ab-i-se’-i. See ABISSEI.

ABISHAG

ab’-i-shag, a-bi’-shag (’abhishagh, apparently, "father of wandering," that is, "cause of wandering," or "my father wanders"): The Shunammite woman who became nurse to King David (1Ki 1-4,15; 2:17,21,22). She was chosen for the service with great care on account of her youth and beauty and physical vigor. She ministered to the king, that is, waited on him as personal attendant and nurse. She also "cherished" him in his feebleness—gave to him through physical contact the advantage of her superabundant vitality. This was a mode of medical treatment recommended by the servants of the king, and it appears to have been not wholly unsuccessful. She had an intimate knowledge of the condition of David, and was present at the interview of Bathsheba with David which resulted in the placing of Solomon on the throne. If that act had been questioned she would have been a most important witness. By reason of this and of her personal charms, she might become a strong helper to any rival of Solomon who should intrigue to supplant him. Adonijah sought Abishag in marriage. On the basis of this and of such other evidence as may supposably have been in his possession, Solomon put Adonijah to death as an intriguer.

Willis J. Beecher

ABISHAI

ab’-i-shi, a-bi’-shi (’abhishai, in Ch ‘abhshai; meaning is doubtful, probably "my father is Jesse," BDB): Son of Zeruiah, David’s sister, and one of the three famous brothers, of whom Joab and Asahel were the other two (2Sa 2:18). He was chief of the second group of three among David’s "mighty men" (2Sa 23:18).

He first appears with David, who was in the Wilderness of Ziph, to escape Saul. When David called for a volunteer to go down into Saul’s camp by night, Abishai responded, and counseled the killing of Saul when they came upon the sleeping king (1Sa 26:6-9). In the skirmish between the men of Ishbosheth and the men of David at Gibeon, in which Asahel was killed by Abner, Abishai was present (2Sa 2:18,24). He was with and aided Joab in the cruel and indefensible murder of Abner, in revenge for their brother

Asahel (2Sa 3:30).

In David's campaign against the allied Ammonites and Syrians, Abishai led the attack upon the Ammonites, while Joab met the Syrians; the battle was a great victory for Israel (2Sa 10:10-14). He was always faithful to David, and remained with him, as he fled from Absalom. When Shimei, of the house of Saul, cursed the fleeing king, Abishai characteristically wished to kill him at once (2Sa 16:8,9); and when the king returned victorious Abishai advised the rejection of Shimei's penitence, and his immediate execution (2Sa 19:21).

In the battle with Absalom's army at Mahanaim Abishai led one division of David's army, Joab and Ittai commanding the other two (2Sa 18:2). With Joab he put down the revolt against David of Sheba, a man of Benjamin (2Sa 20:6,10), at which Joab treacherously slew Amasa his cousin and rival, as he had likewise murdered Abner, Abishai no doubt being party to the crime. In a battle with the Philistines late in his life, David was faint, being now an old man, and was in danger of death at the hands of the Philistine giant Ishbihenob when Abishai came to his rescue and killed the giant (2Sa 21:17). In the list of David's heroes (2Sa 23) Abishai's right to leadership of the "second three" is based upon his overthrowing three hundred men with his spear (2Sa 23:18). He does not appear in the struggle of Adonijah against Solomon, in which Joab was the leader, and therefore is supposed to have died before that time.

He was an impetuous, courageous man, but less cunning than his more famous brother Joab, although just as cruel and relentless toward rival or foe. David understood and feared their hardness and cruelty. Abishai's best trait was his unswerving loyalty to his kinsman, David.

Edward Mack

ABISHALOM

a-bish'-a-lom: Variant of ABSALOM, which see.

ABISHUA

a-bish'-u-a, abi-shoo'-a ('abhishua', uncertain, perhaps "father of wealth," or "my father is wealth"):

(1) A son of Bela the son of Benjamin (1Ch 8:4).

(2) The son of Phinehas, who was grandson to Aaron (1Ch 6:4,5,50, Ezr 7:5).

ABISHUR

a-bi'-shur ('abhishur, "my father is a wall"): Great-grandson of Jerahmeel and Atarah, Jerahmeel being

great-grandson of Judah. Abishur was son of Shammai, and was the husband of Abihail, and the father of sons (1Ch 2:28,29).

ABISSEI a-bis'-e-i (King James Version Abisei): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2) = Abisue (1 Esdras 8:2) and Abishua (1Ch 6:4 ff; Ezr 7:5).

ABISUE

a-bis'-u-e (Codex Vaticanus, Abisai; Codex Alexandrinus, Abisouai; the King James Version Abisum = Abishua (1Ch 6:4 ff; Ezr 7:5) and Abissei (2 Esdras 1:2)): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2).

ABISUM

ab'-i-sum. See ABISUE (Apocrypha).

ABITAL

ab'-i-tal, a-bi'-tal ('abhiTal, "my father is dew"): One of the wives of King David. In the duplicated list (2Sa 3:4; 1Ch 3:3) in which the sons born to David in Hebron are mentioned and numbered, the fifth is said to be Shephatiah the son of Abital.

ABITUB

ab'-i-tub, a-bi'-tub ('abhiTubh, "father of goodness," or, "my father is goodness"): In the King James Version Ahitub. A descendant of Benjamin and son of Shaharaim and Hushim, born in the field of Moab (1Ch 8:11).

ABIUD

a-bi'-ud ('Abioud, perhaps "my father is majesty"; see ABIHUD): Mentioned in the genealogy of Jesus (Mt 1:13 and not elsewhere) as the son of Zerubbabel. See GENEALOGY.

ABJECT

ab'-jekt: Only as a noun, and but once (Ps 35:15) for nekheh, literally, "smitten ones," i.e. "men of the lowest grade" (Hengstenberg, Delitzsch), "the rabble," defined by the succeeding clause as those of such inferior station that they were unknown.

ABLE

a’-b’-l: The Greek dunamai, "to have power," may refer either to inherent strength, or to the absence of in external obstacles, or to what may be allowable or permitted. The Greek ischuo, as in Lu 13:24; Joh 21:6, refers always to the first of the above meanings. The use of the word as an adjective the King James Version of 2Co 3:6, is misleading, and has been properly changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into "sufficient as ministers," i.e. "hath fitted us to be ministers."

ABLUTION

ab-lu’-shun: The rite of ablution for religious purification seems to have been practiced in some form in all lands and at all times. The priests of Egypt punctiliously practiced it (Herodotus ii.37). The Greeks were warned "never with unwashed hands to pour out the black wine at morn to Zeus" (Hesiod, Opera et Dies v.722; compare Homer, Iliad vi.266; Od. iv.759). The Romans also observed it (Virgil, Aeneid ii.217); as did and do Orientals in general (compare Koran, Sura 5:8, etc.). Ablutions for actual or ritual purification form quite a feature of the Jewish life and ceremonial. No one was allowed to enter a holy place or to approach God by prayer or sacrifice without having first performed the rite of ablution, or "sanctification," as it was sometimes called (Ex 19:10; 1Sa 16:5; 2Ch 29:5; compare Josephus, Ant, XIV, xi, 5).

Three kinds of washing are recognized in Biblical and rabbinical law:

(1) washing of the hands,

(2) washing of the hands and feet, and

(3) immersion of the whole body in water. (1 and 2 = Greek nipto; 3 = Greek louo).

Something more than an echo of a universal practice is found in the Scriptures. The rabbis claimed to find support for ceremonial hand-washing in Le 15:11. David’s words, "I will wash my hands in innocency: so will I compass thine altar, O Yahweh" (Ps 26:6; compare Ps 73:13), are regarded by them as warranting the inference that ablution of the hands was prerequisite to any holy act. This is the form of ablution, accordingly, which is most universally and scrupulously practiced by Jews. Before any meal of which bread forms a part, as before prayer, or any act of worship, the hands must be solemnly washed in pure water; as also after any unclean bodily function, or contact with any unclean thing. Such handwashings probably arose naturally from the fact that the ancients ate with their fingers, and so were first for physical cleansing only; but they came to be ceremonial and singularly binding. The Talmud abundantly shows that eating with unwashed hands came to be reckoned a matter of highest importance —"tantamount to committing an act of unchastity, or other gross crime." Akiba, when in prison, went without water given him to quench his thirst, rather than neglect the rite of ablution (‘Er. 216). Only in extreme cases, according to the Mishna, as on a battlefield, might people dispense with it. Simeon, the Essene, "the Saint" (Toseph. Kelim i.6), on entering the holy place without having washed his hands, claiming that he was holier than the high priest because of his ascetic life, was excommunicated, as undermining the authority of the Elders (compare ‘Eduy. 5 6).

Washing of the hands and feet is prescribed by the Law only for those about to perform priestly functions (compare Koran, Sura 5 8, in contrast: "When ye prepare yourselves for prayer, wash your faces and hands up to the elbows, and wipe your heads and your feet to the ankles"; Hughes, Dict. of Islam). For example, whenever Moses or Aaron or any subordinate priest desired to enter the sanctuary (Tabernacle) or approach the altar, he was required to wash his hands and feet from the layer which stood between the Tabernacle and the altar (Ex 30:19; 40:31). The same rule held in the Temple at Jerusalem. The washing of the whole body, however, is the form of ablution most specifically and exactingly required by the Law. The cases in which the immersion of the whole body is commanded, either for purification or consecration, are very numerous. For example, the Law prescribed that no leper or other unclean person of the seed of Aaron should eat of holy flesh until he had washed his whole body in water (Le 22:4-6); that anyone coming in contact with a person having an unclean issue, or with any article used by such a one, should wash his whole body (Le 15:5-10); that a sufferer from an unclean issue (Le 15:16,18); a menstruous woman (2Sa 11:2,4), and anyone who touched a menstruous woman, or anything used by her, should likewise immerse the whole person in water (Le 15:19-27): that the high priest who ministered on the Day of Atonement (Le 16:24-28), the priest who tended the red heifer (Nu 19:7,8,19), and every priest at his installation (Ex 29:4; 40:12) should wash his whole body in water. Compare ‘divers baptisms’ (immersions) in Heb 9:10, and see Broadus on Mt 15:2-20 with footnote. (For another view on bathing see Kennedy in HDB, I, 257 v.)

Bathing in the modern and non-religious sense is rarely mentioned in the Scriptures (Ex 2:5 Pharaoh’s daughter; 2Sa 11:2 the Revised Version (British and American) Bathsheba, and the interesting case 1Ki 22:38). Public baths are first met with in the Greek period—included in the "place of exercise" (1 Macc 1:14), and remains of such buildings from the Roman period are numerous. Recently a remarkable series of bath-chambers have been discovered at Gezer, in Palestine, in connection with a building which is supposed to be the palace built by Simon Maccabeus (Kennedy (illust. in PEFS, 1905, 294 f)). The rite of ablution was observed among early Christians also. Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, X, 4.40) tells of Christian churches being supplied with fountains or basins of water, after the Jewish custom of providing the laver for the use of the priests. The Apostolical Constitutions (VIII.32) have the rule: "Let all the faithful .... when they rise from sleep, before they go to work, pray, after having washed themselves" nipsamenoi.

The attitude of Jesus toward the rabbinical law of ablution is significant. Mr (7:3) prepares the way for his record of it by explaining, ‘The Pharisees and all the Jews eat not except they wash their hands to the wrist (pugme). (See LTJM, II, 11). According to Mt 15:1-20 and Mr 7:1-23 Pharisees and Scribes that had come from Jerusalem (i.e. the strictest) had seen some of Jesus’ disciples eat bread with unwashed hands, and they asked Him: "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread." Jesus’ answer was to the Jews, even to His own disciples, in the highest degree surprising, paradoxical, revolutionary (compare Mt 12:8). They could not but see that it applied not merely to hand-washing, but to the whole matter of clean and unclean food; and this to them was one of the most vital parts of the Law (compare Ac 10:14). Jesus saw that the masses of the Jews, no less than the Pharisees, while scrupulous about ceremonial purity, were careless of inward purity. So here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, and with reference to the Sabbath (Mt 12:1 ff), He would lead

them into the deeper and truer significance of the Law, and thus prepare the way for setting aside not only the traditions of the eiders that made void the commandments of God, but even the prescribed ceremonies of the Law themselves, if need be, that the Law in its higher principles and meanings might be "fulfilled." Here He proclaims a principle that goes to the heart of the whole matter of true religion in saying: "Well did Isaiah prophesy of you hypocrites" (Mr 7:6-13)—you who make great pretense of devotion to God, and insist strenuously on the externals of His service, while at heart you do not love Him, making the word of God of none effect for the sake of your tradition!

LITERATURE.

For list of older authorities see McClintock and Strong, Cyclopedia; Nowack, Biblische Archaeologie, II, 275-99; and Spitzer, Ueber Baden und Bader bei den alten Hebraern, 1884. George B. Eager

ABNER

ab'-ner ('abhner; in 1Sa 14:50 the Hebrew has the fuller form, 'abhiner, Abiner; compare Abiram by the side of Abram; meaning, "my father is a lamp"): Captain of the host under Saul and Ishbosheth (Eshbaal). He was Saul's cousin; Ner the father of Abner and Kish the father of Saul being brothers, the sons of Abiel (1Sa 14:50 f). In 1Ch 8:33; 9:39 the text appears to be faulty; read: And Ner begat Abner, and Kish begat Saul. According to 1Ch 27:21 Abner had a son by the name of Jaasiel. Abner was to Saul what Joab was to David. Despite the many wars waged by Saul, we hear little of Abner during Saul's lifetime. Not even in the account' of the battle of Gilboa is mention made of him. Yet both his high office and his kinship to the king must have brought the two men in close contact. On festive occasions it was the custom of Abner to sit at table by the king's side (1Sa 20:25). It was Abner who introduced the young David fresh from his triumph over Goliath to the king's court (so according to the account in 1Sa 17:57). We find Abner accompanying the king in his pursuit of David (1Sa 26:5 ff). Abner is rebuked by David for his negligence in keeping watch over his master (ibid., 15).

Upon the death of Saul, Abner took up the cause of the young heir to the throne, Ishbosheth, whom he forthwith removed from the neighborhood of David to Mahanaim in the East-Jordanic country. There he proclaimed him king over all Israel. By the pool of Gibeon he and his men met Joab and the servants of David. Twelve men on each side engaged in combat which ended disastrously for Abner who fled. He was pursued by Asahel, Joab's brother, whom Abner slew. Though Joab and his brother Abishai sought to avenge their brother's death on the spot, a truce was effected; Abner was permitted to go his way after three hundred and threescore of his men had fallen. Joab naturally watched his opportunity. Abner and his master soon had a quarrel over Saul's concubine, Rizpah, with whom Abner was intimate. It was certainly an act of treason which Ishbosheth was bound to resent. The disgruntled general made overtures to David; he won over the tribe of Benjamin. With twenty men of them he came to Hebron and arranged with the king of Judah that he would bring over to his side all Israel. He was scarcely gone when Joab learned of the affair; without the knowledge of David he recalled him to Hebron where he slew him, "for the blood of Asahel his brother." David mourned sincerely the death of Abner. "Know ye not," he addressed his servants, "that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?" He

followed the bier in person. Of the royal lament over Abner a fragment is quoted:

"Should Abner die as a fool dieth? Thy hands were not bound, nor thy feet put into fetters: As a man falleth before the children of iniquity, so didst thou fall."

(See 2Sa 3:6-38.) The death of Abner, while it thus cannot in any wise be laid at the door of David, nevertheless served his purposes well. The backbone of the opposition to David was broken, and he was soon proclaimed as king by all Israel.

Max L. Margolis

ABODE

a-bod’. See ABIDE.

ABOLISH

a-bol’-ish (chathath, "to be broken down," "made void," "My righteousness shall not be abolished" (Isa 51:6), i.e. as shown in God’s faithfulness to His promises; machah, "to erase," "blot out," "that your works may be abolished" (Eze 6:6) katargeo, "to render inoperative," "bring to nought," "make of no effect," "when he shall have abolished all rule" (1Co 15:24), every power opposed to God’s kingdom; "having abolished in his flesh the enmity" (Eph 2:15)): By His death, Christ did away with the race separation due to historic ordinances and ceremonial laws (as of circumcision and uncircumcision); through the cross He wrought the reconciliation, and secured that common access to the Father by which the union is maintained.

"Our Saviour Christ Jesus .... abolished death" (2Ti 1:10). Men still die, "it is appointed unto men" (Heb 9:27), but the fear of death as having power to terminate or affect our personal existence and our union with God, as a dreadful stepping out into the unknown and unknowable (into Sheol of the impenetrable gloom), and as introducing us to a final and irreversible judgment, has been removed. Christ has taken out of it its sting (1Co 15:55 f) and all its hurtful power (Heb 2:14); has shown it to be under His control (Re 1:18), brought to light the incorruptible life beyond, and declared the ultimate destruction of death (1Co 15:26; compare Re 20:14). The Greek (katargeitai) indicates that the process of destruction was then going on.

M. O. Evans

ABOMINATION

a-bom-i-na’-shun (piggul, to‘ebhah, sheqets (shiqquts)): Three distinct Hebrew words are rendered in the English Bible by "abomination," or "abominable thing," referring (except in Ge 43:32; 46:34) to

things or practices abhorrent to Yahweh, and opposed to the ritual or moral requirements of His religion. It would be well if these words could be distinguished in translation, as they denote different degrees of abhorrence or loathsomeness.

The word most used for this idea by the Hebrews and indicating the highest degree of abomination is to‘ebhah, meaning primarily that which offends the religious sense of a people. When it is said, for example, "The Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination unto the Egyptians," this is the word used; the significance being that the Hebrews were repugnant to the Egyptians as foreigners, as of an inferior caste, and especially as shepherds (Ge 46:34). The feeling of the Egyptians for the Greeks was likewise one of repugnance. Herodotus (ii.41) says the Egyptians would not kiss a Greek on the mouth, or use his dish, or taste meat cut with the knife of a Greek.

Among the objects described in the Old Testament as "abominations" in this sense are heathen gods, such as Ashtoreth (Astarte), Chemosh, Milcom, the "abominations" of the Zidonians (Phoenicians), Moabites, and Ammonites, respectively (2Ki 23:13), and everything connected with the worship of such gods. When Pharaoh, remonstrating against the departure of the children of Israel, exhorted them to offer sacrifices to their God in Egypt, Moses said: "Shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians (i.e. the animals worshipped by them which were taboo, to‘ebhah, to the Israelites) before their eyes, and will they not stone us?" (Ex 8:26).

It is to be noted that, not only the heathen idol itself, but anything offered to or associated with the idol, all the paraphernalia of the forbidden cult, was called an "abomination," for it "is an abomination to Yahweh thy God" (De 7:25,26). The Deuteronomic writer here adds, in terms quite significant of the point of view and the spirit of the whole law: ‘Neither shalt thou bring an abomination into thy house and thus become a thing set apart (cherem = tabooed) like unto it; thou shalt utterly detest it and utterly abhor it, for it is a thing set apart’ (tabooed). To‘ebhah is even used as synonymous with "idol" or heathen deity, as in Isa 44:19; De 32:16; 2Ki 23:13; and especially Ex 8:22 ff.

Everything akin to magic or divination is likewise an abomination to‘ebhah; as are sexual transgressions (De 22:5; 23:18; 24:4), especially incest and other unnatural offenses: "For all these abominations have the men of the land done, that were before you" (Le 18:27; compare Eze 8:15). It is to be noted, however, that the word takes on in the later usage a higher ethical and spiritual meaning: as where "divers measures, a great and a small," are forbidden (De 25:14-16); and in Proverbs where "lying lips" (Pr 12:22), "the proud in heart" (Pr 16:5), "the way of the wicked" (Pr 15:9), "evil devices" (Pr 15:26), and "he that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the righteous" (Pr 17:15), are said to be an abomination in God’s sight. At last prophet and sage are found to unite in declaring that any sacrifice, however free from physical blemish, if offered without purity of motive, is an abomination: ‘Bring no more an oblation of falsehood—an incense of abomination it is to me’ (Isa 1:13; compare Jer 7:10). "The sacrifice of the wicked" and the prayer of him "that turneth away his ear from hearing the law," are equally an abomination (see Pr 15:8; 21:27; 28:9).

Another word rendered "abomination" in the King James Version is sheqets or shiqquts. It expresses

generally a somewhat less degree of horror or religious aversion than [to‘ebhah], but sometimes seems to stand about on a level with it in meaning. In De 14:3, for example, we have the command, "Thou shalt not eat any abominable thing," as introductory to the laws prohibiting the use of the unclean animals (see CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS), and the word there used is [to‘ebhah]. But in Le 11:10-13,20,23,41,42, Isa 66:17; and in Eze 8:10 sheqets is the word used and likewise applied to the prohibited animals; as also in Le 11:43 sheqets is used when it is commanded, "Ye shall not make yourselves abominable." Then sheqets is often used parallel to or together with to‘ebhah of that which should be held as detestable, as for instance, of idols and idolatrous practices (see especially De 29:17; Ho 9:10; Jer 4:1; 13:27; 16:18; Eze 11:18-21; 20:7,8). It is used exactly as [to‘ebhah] is used as applied to Milcom, the god of the Ammonites, which is spoken of as the detestable thing sheqets of the Ammonites (1Ki 11:5). Still even in such cases to‘ebhah seems to be the stronger word and to express that which is in the highest degree abhorrent.

The other word used to express a somewhat kindred idea of abhorrence and translated "abomination" in the King James Version is piggul; but it is used in the Hebrew Bible only of sacrificial flesh that has become stale, putrid, tainted (see Le 7:18; 19:7; Eze 4:14; Isa 65:4). Driver maintains that it occurs only as a "technical term for such state sacrificial flesh as has not been eaten within the prescribed time," and, accordingly, he would everywhere render it specifically "refuse meat." Compare lechem megho’al, "the loaths ome bread" (from ga’al, "to loathe") Mal 1:7. A chief interest in the subject for Christians grows out of the use of the term in the expression "abomination of desolation" (Mt 24:15 and Mr 13:14), which see.

See also ABHOR.

LITERATURE

Commentators at the place Rabbinical literature in point. Driver; Weiss; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, IV, note 15.

George B. Eager

ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION

des-o-la’-shun: The Hebrew root for abomination is shaqats, "to be filthy," "to loathe," "to abhor," from which is derived shiqquts, "filthy," especially "idolatrous." This word is used to describe specific forms of idolatrous worship that were specially abhorrent, as of the Ammonites (1Ki 11:5,7); of the Moabites (1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 23:13). When Daniel undertook to specify an abomination so surpassingly disgusting to the sense of morality and decency, and so aggressive against everything that was godly as to drive all from its presence and leave its abode desolate, he chose this as the strongest among the several synonyms, adding the qualification "that maketh desolate" (Da 11:31; 12:11), Septuagint bdel-ug-ma er-e-mo-se-os. The same noun, though in the plural, occurs in De 29:17; 2Ki 23:24; Isa 66:3; Jer 4:1; 7:30; 13:27; 32:34; Eze 20:7,8,30; Da 9:27; Ho 9:10; Zec 9:7. The New Testament equivalent of the noun is

bdel-ug-ma =" detestable," i.e. (specially) "idolatrous." Alluding to Daniel, Christ spoke of the "abomination of desolation" (Mt 24:15; Mr 13:14).

1. The Historical Background:

Since the invasion of the Assyrians and Chaldeans, the Jewish people, both of the Northern and of the Southern kingdom, had been without political independence. From the Chaldeans the rulership of Judea had been transferred to the Persians, and from the Persians, after an interval of 200 years, to Alexander the Great. From the beginning of the Persian sovereignty, the Jews had been permitted to organize anew their religious and political commonwealth, thus establishing a state under the rulership of priests, for the high priest was not only the highest functionary of the cult, but also the chief magistrate in so far as these prerogatives were not exercised by the king of the conquering nation. Ezra had given a new significance to the Torah by having it read to the whole congregation of Israel and by his vigorous enforcement of the law of separation from the Gentiles. His emphasis of the law introduced the period of legalism and finical interpretation of the letter which called forth some of the bitterest invectives of our Saviour. Specialists of the law known as "scribes" devoted themselves to its study and subtle interpretation, and the pious beheld the highest moral accomplishment in the extremely conscientious observance of every precept. But in opposition to this class, there were those who, influenced by the Hellenistic culture, introduced by the conquests of Alexander the Great, were inclined to a more "liberal" policy. Thus, two opposing parties were developed: the Hellenistic, and the party of the Pious, or the Chasidim, chacidhim (Hasidaeans, 1 Macc 2:42; 7:13), who held fast to the strict ideal of the scribes. The former gradually came into ascendancy. Judea was rapidly becoming Hellenistic in all phases of its political, social and religious life, and the "Pious" were dwindling to a small minority sect. This was the situation when Antiochus Epiphanes set out to suppress the last vestige of the Jewish cult by the application of brute force.

2. Antiochus Epiphanes:

Antiochus IV, son of Antiochus the Great, became the successor of his brother, Seleucus IV, who had been murdered by his minister, Heliodorus, as king of Syria (175-164 BC). He was by nature a despot; eccentric and unreliable; sometimes a spendthrift in his liberality, fraternizing in an affected manner with those of lower station; sometimes cruel and tyrannical, as witness his aggressions against Judea. Polybius (26 10) tells us that his eccentric ideas caused some to speak of him as a man of pure motive and humble character, while others hinted at insanity. The epithet Epiphanes is an abbreviation of theos epiphanes, which is the designation given himself by Antiochus on his coins, and means "the god who appears or reveals himself." Egyptian writers translate the inscription, "God which comes forth," namely, like the burning sun, Horos, on the horizon, thus identifying the king with the triumphal, appearing god.

When Antiochus Epiphanes arose to the throne, Onias III, as high priest, was the leader of the old orthodox party in Judea; the head of the Hellenists was his own brother Jesus, or, as he preferred to designate himself, Jason, this being the Greek form of his name and indicating the trend of his mind.

Jason promised the king large sums of money for the transfer of the office of high priest from his brother to himself and the privilege of erecting a gymnasium and a temple to Phallus, and for the granting of the privilege "to enroll the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch." Antiochus gladly agreed to everything. Onias was removed, Jason became high priest, and henceforth the process of Hellenizing Judea was pushed energetically. The Jewish cult was not attacked, but the "legal institutions were set aside, and illegal practices were introduced" (2 Macc 4:11). A gymnasium was erected outside the castle; the youth of Jerusalem exercised themselves in the gymnastic art of the Greeks, and even priests left their services at the altar to take part in the contest of the palaestra. The disregard of Jewish custom went so far that many artificially removed the traces of circumcision from their bodies, and with characteristic liberality, Jason even sent a contribution to the sacrifices in honor of Heracles on the occasion of the quadrennial festivities in Tyre.

3. The Suppression of the Jewish Cult:

Under these conditions it is not surprising that Antiochus should have had both the inclination and the courage to undertake the total eradication of the Jewish religion and the establishment of Greek polytheism in its stead. The observance of all Jewish laws, especially those relating to the Sabbath and to circumcision, were forbidden under pain of death. The Jewish cult was set aside, and in all cities of Judea, sacrifices must be brought to the pagan deities. Representatives of the crown everywhere enforced the edict. Once a month a search was instituted, and whoever had secreted a copy of the Law or had observed the rite of circumcision was condemned to death. In Jerusalem on the 15th of Chislev of the year 145 aet Sel, i.e. in December 168 BC, a pagan altar was built on the Great Altar of Burnt Sacrifices, and on the 25th of Chislev, sacrifice was brought on this altar for the first time (1 Macc 1:54,59). This evidently was the "abomination of desolation." The sacrifice, according to 2 Macc was brought to the Olympian Zeus, to whom the temple of Jerusalem had been dedicated. At the feast of Dionysus, the Jews were obliged to march in the Bacchanalian procession, crowned with laurel leaves. Christ applies the phrase to what was to take place at the advance of the Romans against Jerusalem. They who would behold the "abomination of desolation" standing in the holy place, He bids flee to the mountains, which probably refers to the advance of the Roman army into the city and temple, carrying standards which bore images of the Roman gods and were the objects of pagan worship.

Frank E. Hirsch

ABOMINATION, BIRDS OF

Le 11:13-19: "And these ye shall have in abomination among the birds; they shall not be eaten, they are an abomination: the eagle, and the gier-eagle, and the osprey, and the kite, and the falcon after its kind, every raven after its kind, and the ostrich, and the night-hawk, and the sea-mew, and the hawk after its kind, and the little owl, and the cormorant, and the great owl, and the horned owl, and the pelican, and the vulture, and the stork, the heron after its kind, and the hoopoe, and the bat." De 14:12-18 gives the glede in addition.

Each of these birds is treated in order in this work. There are two reasons why Moses pronounced them an abomination for food. Either they had rank, offensive, tough flesh, or they were connected with religious superstition. The eagle, gier-eagle, osprey, kite, glede, falcon, raven, night-hawk, sea-mew, hawk, little owl, cormorant, great owl, horned owl, pelican and vulture were offensive because they were birds of prey or ate carrion or fish until their flesh partook of the odor of their food. Young ostriches have sweet, tender flesh and the eggs are edible also. In putting these birds among the abominations Moses must have been thinking of grown specimens. (Ostriches live to a remarkable age and on account of the distances they cover, and their speed in locomotion, their muscles become almost as hard as bone.)

There is a trace of his early Egyptian training when he placed the stork and the heron on this list. These birds, and the crane as well, abounded in all countries known at that time and were used for food according to the superstitions of different nations. These three were closely related to the ibis which was sacred in Egypt and it is probable that they were protected by Moses for this reason, since they were eaten by other nations at that time and cranes are used for food today by natives of our southeastern coast states and are to be found in the markets of our western coast. The veneration for the stork that exists throughout the civilized world today had its origin in Palestine. Noting the devotion of mated pairs and their tender care for the young the Hebrews named the bird chacidhah, which means kindness. Carried down the history of ages with additions by other nations, this undoubtedly accounts for the story now universal, that the stork delivers newly-born children to their homes; so the bird is loved and protected.

One ancient Roman writer, Cornelius Nepos, recorded that in his time both crane and storks were eaten; storks were liked the better. Later, Pliny wrote that no one would touch a stork, but everyone was fond of crane. In Thessaly it was a capital crime to kill a stork. This change from regarding the stork as a delicacy to its protection by a death penalty merely indicates the hold the characteristics of the bird had taken on people as it became better known, and also the spread of the regard in which it was held throughout Palestine. The hoopoe (which see) was offensive to Moses on account of extremely filthy nesting habits, but was considered a great delicacy when captured in migration by residents of southern Europe.

See also ABOMINATION; BIRDS, UNCLEAN.

Gene Stratton-Porter

ABOUND; ABUNDANCE; ABUNDANT; ABUNDANTLY

a-bound’, a-bun’-dans, a-bun’-dant, a-bun’-dant-li: These words represent in the English Versions of the Bible a considerable variety of different words in the Hebrew and Greek original. In the Old Testament they most frequently stand for some form of the stem rabh, signifying "to cast together," "to increase." In Pr 8:24 the primary idea is "to be heavy" (root: kabhadh); in De 33:19 and Job 22:11 it is "to overflow" shapha‘; in Job 36:31 it is "to plait together," "to augment," "to multiply" (makhbir from ka- bhar); in Isa

47:9 it is "strength" ‘otsmah; in 1Ki 18:41 it is "tumult," "crowd" hamon; in Ec 5:12 it is "to fill to satiety" (Revised Version (British and American) "fulness"); in Isa 15:7 it is "excellence" yithrah and in Isa 66:11 "a full breast" ziz; in Jer 33:6 it is "copiousness" (‘athereth from ‘athar). In several passages (e. g. Eze 16:49; Ps 105:30; Isa 56:12) the Revised Version (British and American) gives other and better renderings than the King James Version. In the New Testament perissos, perisseuo, perisseia, etc., are the usual words for "abundant," "abound," "abundance," etc. (the adjective signifies "exceeding some number or measure"). A slight formal difference of conception may be noted in pleonazo, which suggests that the abundance has resulted from augmentation. In Ro 5:20 the two words stand in the closest connection: ‘Where sin abounded (by its increase) grace abounded more exceedingly (was rich beyond measure).’ In Mr 12:44; Lu 21:4; 2Co 8:20; 12:7; Re 18:3 the Revised Version (British and American) gives improved renderings instead of "abundance," and in Titus 3:6 and 2Pe 1:11 instead of "abundantly."

J. R. Van Pelt

ABOUT

a-bout’:The use of this word as a preposition, in the sense of "around," is confined to the Old Testament. In the New Testament, generally an adverb, for Greek hos or "hosei." The Revised Version (British and American) adopts it in several idiomatic translations of mello, referring to what is about to be, i.e. on the point of occurring, or immediately impending, amending the King James Version, in Ac 5:35; 27:2; Re 12:4, etc.

ABRAHAM

a’-bra-ham:

I. NAME 1. Various Forms 2. Etymology 3. Association II. KINDRED III. CAREER 1. Period of Wandering 2. Period of Residence at Hebron 3. Period of Residence in the Negeb IV. CONDITIONS OF LIFE 1. Economic Conditions 2. Social Conditions 3. Political Conditions 4. Cultural Conditions V. CHARACTER 1. Religious Beliefs 2. Morality 3. Personal Traits VI. SIGNIFICANCE IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION 1. In the Old Testament 2. In the New Testament 3. In Jewish Tradition 4. In the Koran VII. INTERPRETATIONS OF THE STORY OTHER THAN HISTORICAL 1. The Allegorical Interpretation 2. The Personification Theory 3. The Mythical Theory 4. The "Saga" Theory

I. Name.

1. Various Forms:

In the Old Testament, when applied, to the patriarch, the name appears as ‘abhram, up to Ge 17:5; thereafter always as ‘abhraham. Two other persons are named ‘abhiram. The identity of this name with ‘abhram cannot be doubted in view of the variation between ‘abhiner and ‘abhner, ‘abhishalom and

‘abhshalom, etc. Abraham also appears in the list at Karnak of places conquered by Sheshonk I: ‘brm (no. 72) represents ‘abram, with which Spiegelberg (Aegypt. Randglossen zum Altes Testament, 14) proposes to connect the preceding name (so that the whole would read "the field of Abram.") Outside of Palestine this name (Abiramu) has come to light just where from the Biblical tradition we should expect to find it, namely, in Babylonia (e.g. in a contract of the reign of Apil-Sin, second predecessor of Hammurabi; also for the aunt (!) of Esarhaddon 680-669 BC). Ungnad has recently found it, among documents from Dilbat dating from the Hammurabi dynasty, in the forms A-ba-am-ra-ma, A-ba-am-ra-am, as well as A-ba-ra-ma.

2. Etymology:

Until this latest discovery of the apparently full, historical form of the Babylonian equivalent, the best that could be done with the etymology was to make the first constituent "father of" (construct -i rather than suffix -i), and the second constituent "Ram," a proper name or an abbreviation of a name. (Yet observe above its use in Assyria for a woman; compare ABISHAG; ABIGAIL). Some were inclined rather to concede that the second element was a mystery, like the second element in the majority of names beginning with ‘abh and ‘ach, "father" and "brother." But the full cuneiform writing of the name, with the case-ending am, indicates that the noun "father" is in the accusative, governed by the verb which furnishes the second component, and that this verb therefore is probably ramu (= Hebrew racham) "to love," etc.; so that the name would mean something like "he loves the (his) father." (So Ungnad, also Ranke in Gressmann’s article "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzahlungen," ZATW (1910), 3.) Analogy proves that this is in the Babylonian fashion of the period, and that judging from the various writings of this and similar names, its pronunciation was not far from ‘abh-ram.

3. Association:

While the name is thus not "Hebrew" in origin, it made itself thoroughly at home among the Hebrews, and to their ears conveyed associations quite different from its etymological signification. "Popular etymology" here as so often doubtless led the Hebrew to hear in ‘abh-ram, "exalted father," a designation consonant with the patriarch’s national and religious significance. In the form ‘abh-raham his ear caught the echo of some root (perhaps r-h-m; compare Arabic ruham, "multitude") still more suggestive of the patriarch’s extensive progeny, the reason ("for") that accompanies the change of name Ge 17:5 being intended only as a verbal echo of the sense in the sound. This longer and commoner form is possibly a dialectical variation of the shorter form, a variation for which there are analogies in comparative Semitic grammar. It is, however, possible also that the two forms are different names, and that ‘abh-raham is etymologically, and not merely by association of sound, "father of a multitude" (as above). (Another theory, based on South-Arabic orthography, in Hommel, Altisraelitische Ueberlieferung, 177.)

II. Kindred.

Ge 11:27, which introduces Abraham, contains the heading, "These are the generations of Terah." All

the story of Abraham is contained within the section of Genesis so entitled. Through Terah Abraham's ancestry is traced back to Shem, and he is thus related to Mesopotamian and Arabian families that belonged to the "Semitic" race. He is further connected with this race geographically by his birthplace, which is given as 'ur-kasdim (see UR), and by the place of his pre-Canaanitish residence, Haran in the Aramean region. The purely Semitic ancestry of his descendants through Isaac is indicated by his marriage with his own half-sister (Ge 20:12), and still further emphasized by the choice for his daughter-in-law of Rebekah, descended from both of his brothers, Nahor and Haran (Ge 11:29; 22:22 f). Both the beginning and the end of the residence in Haran are left chronologically undetermined, for the new beginning of the narrative at Ge 12:1 is not intended by the writer to indicate chronological sequence, though it has been so understood, e.g. by Stephen (Ac 7:4). All that is definite in point of time is that an Aramean period of residence intervened between the Babylonian origin and the Palestinian career of Abraham. It is left to a comparison of the Biblical data with one another and with the data of archaeology, to fix the opening of Abraham's career in Palestine not far from the middle of the 20th century BC.

III. Career.

Briefiy summed up, that career was as follows.

1. Period of Wandering:

Abraham, endowed with Yahweh's promise of limitless blessing, leaves Haran with Lot his nephew and all their establishment, and enters Canaan. Successive stages of the slow journey southward are indicated by the mention of Shechem, Bethel and the Negeb (South-country). Driven by famine into Egypt, Abraham finds hospitable reception, though at the price of his wife's honor, whom the Pharaoh treats in a manner characteristic of an Egyptian monarch. (Gressmann, op. cit., quotes from Meyer, Geschichte des Alterthums, 12, 142, the passage from a magic formula in the pyramid of Unas, a Pharaoh of the Fifth Dynasty: "Then he (namely, the Pharaoh) takes away the wives from their husbands whither he will if desire seize his heart.") Retracing the path to Canaan with an augmented train, at Bethel Abraham and Lot find it necessary to part company. Lot and his dependents choose for residence the great Jordan Depression; Abraham follows the backbone of the land southward to Hebron, where he settles, not in the city, but before its gates "by the great trees" (Septuagint sing., "oak") of Mamre.

2. Period of Residence at Hebron:

Affiliation between Abraham and the local chieftains is strengthened by a brief campaign, in which all unite their available forces for the rescue of Lot from an Elamite king and his confederates from Babylonia. The pursuit leads them as far as the Lebanon region. On the return they are met by Melchizedek, king of Salem, priest of 'el 'elyon, and blessed by him in his priestly capacity, which Abraham recognizes by presenting him with a tithe of the spoils. Abraham's anxiety for a son to be the bearer of the divine promises conferred upon a "seed" yet unborn should have been relieved by the solemn renewal thereof in a formal covenant, with precise specifications of God's gracious purpose. But

human desire cannot wait upon divine wisdom, and the Egyptian woman Hagar bears to Abraham a son, Ishmael, whose existence from its inception proves a source of moral evil within the patriarchal household. The sign of circumcision and the change of names are given in confirmation of the covenant still unrealized, together with specification of the time and the person that should begin its realization. The theophany that symbolized outwardly this climax of the Divine favor serves also for an intercessory colloquy, in which Abraham is granted the deliverance of Lot in the impending overthrow of Sodom. Lot and his family, saved thus by human fidelity and Divine clemency, exhibit in the moral traits shown in their escape and subsequent life the degeneration naturally to be expected from their corrupt environment. Moabites and Ammonites are traced in their origin to these cousins of Jacob and Esau.

3. Period of Residence in the Negeb:

Removal to the South-country did not mean permanent residence in a single spot, but rather a succession of more or less temporary resting-places. The first of these was in the district of Gerar, with whose king, Abimelech, Abraham and his wife had an experience similar to the earlier one with the Pharaoh. The birth of Isaac was followed by the expulsion of Ishmael and his mother, and the sealing of peaceful relations with the neighbors by covenant at Beersheba. Even the birth of Isaac, however, did not end the discipline of Abraham’s faith in the promise, for a Divine command to sacrifice the life of this son was accepted bona fide, and only the sudden interposition of a Divine prohibition prevented its obedient execution. The death of Sarah became the occasion for Abraham’s acquisition of the first permanent holding of Palestine soil, the nucleus of his promised inheritance, and at the same time suggested the probable approach of his own death. This thought led to immediate provision for a future seed to inherit through Isaac, a provision realized in Isaac’s marriage with Rebekah, grand-daughter of Abraham’s brother Nahor and of Milcah the sister of Lot. But a numerous progeny not associated with the promise grew up in Abraham’s household, children of Keturah, a woman who appears to have had the rank of wife after Sarah’s death, and of other women unnamed, who were his concubines. Though this last period was passed in the Negeb, Abraham was interred at Hebron in his purchased possession, the spot with which Semitic tradition has continued to associate him to this day.

IV. Conditions of Life.

The life of Abraham in its outward features may be considered under the following topics: economic, social, political and cultural conditions.

1. Economic Conditions:

Abraham’s manner of life may best be described by the adjective "semi-nomadic," and illustrated by the somewhat similar conditions prevailing today in those border-communities of the East that fringe the Syrian and Arabian deserts. Residence is in tents, wealth consists of flocks, herds and slaves, and there is no ownership of ground, only at most a proprietorship in well or tomb. All this in common with the nomad. But there is a relative, or rather, intermittent fixity of habitation, unlike the pure Bedouin, a limited amount of agriculture, and finally a sense of divergence from the Ishmael type—all of which

tend to assimilate the seminomadic Abraham to the fixed Canaanitish population about him. As might naturally be expected, such a condition is an unstable equilibrium, which tends, in the family of Abraham as in the history of all border-tribes of the desert, to settle back one way or the other, now into the city- life of Lot, now into the desert-life of Ishmael.

2. Social Conditions:

The head of a family, under these conditions, becomes at the same time the chief of a tribe, that live together under patriarchal rule though they by no means share without exception the tie of kinship. The family relations depicted in Ge conform to and are illuminated by the social features of Code of Hammurabi. (See K. D. Macmillan, article "Marriage among the Early Babylonians and Hebrews," Princeton Theological Review, April, 1908.) There is one legal wife, Sarah, who, because persistently childless, obtains the coveted offspring by giving her own maid to Abraham for that purpose (compare Code of Hammurabi, sections 144, 146). The son thus borne, Ishmael, is Abraham's legal son and heir. When Isaac is later borne by Sarah, the elder son is disinherited by divine command (Ge 21:10-12) against Abraham's wish which represented the prevailing law and custom (Code of Hammurabi, sections 168 f). The "maid-servants" mentioned in the inventories of Abraham's wealth (Ge 12:16; 24:35) doubtless furnished the "concubines" mentioned in Ge 25:6 as having borne sons to him.

Both mothers and children were slaves, but had the right to freedom, though not to inheritance, on the death of the father (Code of Hammurabi, section 171). After Sarah's death another woman seems to have succeeded to the position of legal wife, though if so the sons she bore were disinherited like Ishmael (Ge 25:5). In addition to the children so begotten by Abraham the "men of his house" (Ge 17:27) consisted of two classes, the "home-born" slaves (Ge 14:14; 17:12 f, 23,27) and the "purchased" slaves (ibid.). The extent of the patriarchal tribe may be surmised from the number (318) of men among them capable of bearing arms, near the beginning of Abraham's career, yet after his separation from Lot, and recruited seemingly from the "home-born" class exclusively (Ge 14:14). Over this entire establishment Abraham ruled with a power more, rather than less, absolute than that exhibited in detail in the Code of Hammurabi: more absolute, because Abraham was independent of any permanent superior authority, and so combined in his own person the powers of the Babylonian paterfamilias and of the Canaanite city- king. Social relations outside of the family-tribe may best be considered under the next heading.

3. Political Conditions:

It is natural that the chieftain of so considerable an organism should appear an attractive ally and a formidable foe to any of the smaller political units of his environment. That Canaan was at the time composed of just such inconsiderable units, namely, city-states with petty kings, and scattered fragments of older populations, is abundantly clear from the Biblical tradition and verified from other sources. Egypt was the only great power with which Abraham came into political contact after leaving the East. In the section of Genesis which describes this contact with the Pharaoh Abraham is suitably represented as playing no political role, but as profiting by his stay in Egypt only through an incidental social

relation: when this terminates he is promptly ejected. The role of conqueror of Chedorlaomer, the Elamite invader, would be quite out of keeping with Abraham's political status elsewhere, if we were compelled by the narrative in Ge 14 to suppose a pitched battle between the forces of Abraham and those of the united Babylonian armies. What that chapter requires is in fact no more than a midnight surprise, by Abraham's band (including the forces of confederate chieftains), of a rear-guard or baggage-train of the Babylonians inadequately manned and picketed ("Slaughter" is quite too strong a rendering of the original hakkoth, "smiting," 14:17) Respect shown Abraham by the kings of Salem (14:18), of Sodom (14:21) and of Gerar (Ge 20:14-16) was no more than might be expected from their relative degrees of political importance, although a moral precedence, assumed in the tradition, may well have contributed to this respect.

4. Cultural Conditions:

Recent archaeological research has revolutionized our conception of the degree of culture which Abraham could have possessed and therefore presumably did possess. The high plane which literature had attained in both Babylonia and Egypt by 2000 BC is sufficient witness to the opportunities open to the man of birth and wealth in that day for the interchange of lofty thought. And, without having recourse to Abraham's youth in Babylonia, we may assert even for the scenes of Abraham's maturer life the presence of the same culture, on the basis of a variety of facts, the testimony of which converges in this point, that Canaan in the second millennium BC was at the center of the intellectual life of the East and cannot have failed to afford, to such of its inhabitants as chose to avail themselves of it, every opportunity for enjoying the fruits of others' culture and for recording the substance of their own thoughts, emotions and activities

V. Character.

Abraham's inward life may be considered under the rubrics of religion, ethics and personal traits.

1. Religious Beliefs:

The religion of Abraham centered in his faith in one God, who, because believed by him to be possessor of heaven and earth (Ge 14:22; 24:3), sovereign judge of the nations (Ge 15:14) of all the earth (Ge 18:25), disposer of the forces of Nature (Ge 18:14; 19:24; 20:17 f), exalted (Ge 14:22) and eternal (Ge 21:33), was for Abraham at least the only God. So far as the Biblical tradition goes, Abraham's monotheism was not aggressive (otherwise in later Jewish tradition), and it is theoretically possible to attribute to him a merely "monarchical" or "henotheistic" type of monotheism, which would admit the coexistence with his deity, say, of the "gods which (his) fathers served" (Jos 24:14), or the identity with his deity of the supreme god of some Canaanite neighbor (Ge 14:18). Yet this distinction of types of monotheism does not really belong to the sphere of religion as such, but rather to that of speculative philosophical thought. As religion, monotheism is just monotheism, and it asserts itself in corollaries drawn by the intellect only so far as the scope of the monotheist's intellectual life applies it.

For Abraham Yahweh not only was alone God; He was also his personal God in a closeness of fellowship (Ge 24:40; 48:15) that has made him for three religions the type of the pious man (2Ch 20:7; Isa 41:8, Jas 2:23, note the Arabic name of Hebron El-Khalil, i.e. the friend (viz of God)) To Yahweh Abraham attributed the moral attributes of Justice (Ge 18:25), righteousness (Ge 18:19), faithfulness (Ge 24:27), wisdom (Ge 20:6), goodness (Ge 19:19), mercy (Ge 20:6). These qualities were expected of men, and their contraries in men were punished by Yahweh (Ge 18:19; 20:11). He manifested Himself in dreams (Ge 20:3), visions (Ge 15:1) and theophanies (Ge 18:1), including the voice or apparition of the Divine mal'akh or messenger ("angel") (Ge 16:7; 22:11)

On man's part, in addition to obedience to Yahweh's moral requirements and special commands, the expression of his religious nature was expected in sacrifice. This bringing of offerings to the deity was diligently practiced by Abraham, as indicated by the mention of his erection of an altar at each successive residence. Alongside of this act of sacrifice there is sometimes mention of a "calling upon the name" of Yahweh (compare 1Ki 18:24; Ps 116:13 f). This publication of his faith, doubtless in the presence of Canaanites, had its counterpart also in the public regard in which he was held as a "prophet" or spokesman for God (Ge 20:7). His mediation showed itself also in intercessory prayer (Ge 17:20 for Ishmael; Ge 18:23-32; compare Ge 19:29 for Lot; Ge 20:17 for Abimelech), which was but a phase of his general practice of prayer. The usual accompaniment of sacrifice, a professional priesthood, does not occur in Abraham's family, yet he recognizes priestly prerogative in the person of Melchizedek, priest-king of Salem (Ge 14:20). Religious sanction of course surrounds the taking of oaths (Ge 14:22; 24:3) and the sealing of covenants (Ge 21:23). Other customs associated with religion are circumcision (Ge 17:10-14), given to Abraham as the sign of the perpetual covenant; tithing (Ge 14:20), recognized as the priest's due; and child-sacrifice (Ge 22:2,12), enjoined upon Abraham only to be expressly forbidden, approved for its spirit but interdicted in its practice.

2. Morality:

As already indicated, the ethical attributes of God were regarded by Abraham as the ethical requirement of man. This in theory. In the sphere of applied ethics and casuistry Abraham's practice, at least, fell short of this ideal, even in the few incidents of his life preserved to us. It is clear that these lapses from virtue were offensive to the moral sense of Abraham's biographer, but we are left in the dark as to Abraham's sense of moral obliquity. (The "dust and ashes" of Ge 18:27 has no moral implication.) The demands of candor and honor are not satisfactorily met, certainly not in the matter of Sarah's relationship to him (Ge 12:11-13; 20:2; compare Ge 11-13), perhaps not in the matter of Isaac's intended sacrifice (Ge 22:5,8). To impose our own monogamous standard of marriage upon the patriarch would be unfair, in view of the different standard of his age and land. It is to his credit that no such scandals are recorded in his life and family as blacken the record of Lot (Ge 19:30-38), Reuben (Ge 35:22) and Judah (Ge 38:15-18). Similarly, Abraham's story shows only regard for life and property, both in respecting the rights of others and in expecting the same from them—the antipodes of Ishmael's character (Ge 16:12).

3. Personal Traits:

Outside, the bounds of strictly ethical requirement, Abraham's personality displayed certain characteristics that not only mark him out distinctly among the figures of history, but do him great credit as a singularly symmetrical and attractive character. Of his trust and reverence enough has been said under the head of religion. But this love that is "the fulfilling of the law," manifested in such piety toward God, showed itself toward men in exceptional generosity (Ge 13:9; 14:23; 23:9,13; 24:10; 25:6), fidelity (Ge 14:14,24; 17:18; 18:23-32; 19:27; 21:11; 23:2), hospitality (Ge 18:2-8; 21:8) and compassion (Ge 16:6; 21:14 when rightly understood, Ge 18:23-32). A solid self-respect (Ge 14:23; 16:6; 21:25; 23:9,13,16; 24:4) and real courage (Ge 14:14-16) were, however, marred by the cowardice that sacrificed Sarah to purchase personal safety where he had reason to regard life as insecure (Ge 20:11).

VI. Significance in the History of Religion.

Abraham is a significant figure throughout the Bible, and plays an important role in extra-Biblical Jewish tradition and in the Mohammedan religion.

1. In the Old Testament:

It is naturally as progenitor of the people of Israel, "the seed of Abraham," as they are often termed, that Abraham stands out most prominently in the Old Testament books. Sometimes the contrast between him as an individual and his numerous progeny serves to point a lesson (Isa 51:2; Eze 33:24; perhaps Mal 2:10; compare Mal 2:15). "The God of Abraham" serves as a designation of Yahweh from the time of Isaac to the latest period; it is by this title that Moses identifies the God who has sent him with the ancestral deity of the children of Israel (Ex 3:15). Men remembered in those later times that this God appeared to Abraham in theophany (Ex 6:3), and, when he was still among his people who worshipped other gods (Jos 24:3) chose him (Ne 9:7), led him, redeemed him (Isa 29:22) and made him the recipient of those special blessings (Mic 7:20) which were pledged by covenant and oath (so every larger historical book, also the historical Ps 105:9), notably the inheritance of the land of Canaan (De 6:10) Nor was Abraham's religious personality forgotten by his posterity: he was remembered by them as God's friend (2Ch 20:7; Isa 41:8), His servant, the very recollection of whom by God would offset the horror with which the sins of his descendants inspired Yahweh (De 9:27).

2. In the New Testament:

When we pass to the New Testament we are astonished at the wealth and variety of allusion to Abraham. As in the Old Testament, his position of ancestor lends him much of his significance, not only as ancestor of Israel (Ac 13:26), but specifically as ancestor, now of the Levitical priesthood (Heb 7:5), now of the Messiah (Mt 1:1), now, by the peculiarly Christian doctrine of the unity of believers in Christ, of Christian believers (Ga 3:16,29). All that Abraham the ancestor received through Divine election, by the covenant made with him, is inherited by his seed and passes under the collective names of the promise (Ro 4:13), the blessing (Ga 3:14), mercy (Lu 1:54), the oath (Lu 1:73), the covenant (Ac 3:25). The way in which Abraham responded to this peculiar goodness of God makes him the type of the

Christian believer. Though so far in the past that he was used as a measure of antiquity (Joh 8:58), he is declared to have "seen" Messiah's "day" (Joh 8:56).

It is his faith in the Divine promise, which, just because it was for him peculiarly unsupported by any evidence of the senses, becomes the type of the faith that leads to justification (Ro 4:3), and therefore in this sense again he is the "father" of Christians, as believers (Ro 4:11). For that promise to Abraham was, after all, a "preaching beforehand" of the Christian gospel, in that it embraced "all the families of the earth" (Ga 3:8). Of this exalted honor, James reminds us, Abraham proved himself worthy, not by an inoperative faith, but by "works" that evidenced his righteousness (Jas 2:21; compare Joh 8:39). The obedience that faith wrought in him is what is especially praised by the author of Hebrews (Heb 11:8,17). In accordance with this high estimate of the patriarch's piety, we read of his eternal felicity, not only in the current conceptions of the Jews (parable, Lu 16), but also in the express assertion of our Lord (Mt 8:11; Lu 13:28). Incidental historical allusions to the events of Abraham's life are frequent in the New Testament, but do not add anything to this estimate of his religious significance.

3. In Jewish Tradition:

Outside the Scriptures we have abundant evidence of the way that Abraham was regarded by his posterity in the Jewish nation. The oldest of these witnesses, Ecclesiasticus, contains none of the accretions of the later Abraham-legends. Its praise of Abraham is confined to the same three great facts that appealed to the canonical writers, namely, his glory as Israel's ancestor, his election to be recipient of the covenant, and his piety (including perhaps a tinge of "nomism") even under severe testing (Ecclesiasticus 44:19-21). The Improbable and often unworthy and even grotesque features of Abraham's career and character in the later rabbinical midrashim are of no religious significance, beyond the evidence they afford of the way Abraham's unique position and piety were cherished by the Jews.

4. In the Koran:

To Mohammed Abraham is of importance in several ways. He is mentioned in no less than 188 verses of the Koran, more than any other character except Moses. He is one of the series of prophets sent by God. He is the common ancestor of the Arab and the Jew. He plays the same role of religious reformer over against his idolatrous kinsmen as Mohammed himself played. He builds the first pure temple for God's worship (at Mecca!). As in the Bible so in the Koran Abraham is the recipient of the Divine covenant for himself and for his posterity, and exhibits in his character the appropriate virtues of one so highly favored: faith, righteousness, purity of heart, gratitude, fidelity, compassion. He receives marked tokens of the Divine favor in the shape of deliverance, guidance, visions, angelic messengers (no theophanies for Mohammed!), miracles, assurance of resurrection and entrance into paradise. He is called "Imam of the peoples" (2 118) VII. Interpretations of the Story Other than the Historical.

There are writers in both ancient and modern times who have, from various standpoints, interpreted the person and career of Abraham otherwise than as what it purports to be, namely, the real experiences of a

human person named Abraham. These various views may be classified according to the motive or impulse which they believe to have led to the creation of this story in the mind of its author or authors.

1. The Allegorical Interpretation:

Philo's tract on Abraham bears as alternative titles, "On the Life of the Wise Man Made Perfect by Instruction, or, On the Unwritten Law." Abraham's life is not for him a history that serves to illustrate these things, but an allegory by which these things are embodied. Paul's use of the Sarah-Hagar episode in Ga 4:21-31 belongs to this type of exposition (compare allegoroumena, 4:24), of which there are also a few other instances in his epistles; yet to infer from this that Paul shared Philo's general attitude toward the patriarchal narrative would be unwarranted, since his use of this method is incidental, exceptional, and merely corroborative of points already established by sound reason. "Luther compares it to a painting which decorates a house already built" (Schaff, "Galatians," Excursus).

2. The Personification Theory:

As to Philo Abraham is the personification of a certain type of humanity, so to some modern writers he is the personification of the Hebrew nation or of a tribe belonging to the Hebrew group. This view, which is indeed very widely held with respect to the patriarchal figures in general, furnishes so many more difficulties in its specific application to Abraham than to the others, that it has been rejected in Abraham's case even by some who have adopted it for figures like Isaac, Ishmael and Jacob. Thus Meyer (Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstamme, 250; compare also note on p. 251), speaking of his earlier opinion, acknowledges that, at the time when he "regarded the assertion of Stade as proved that Jacob and Isaac were tribes," even then he "still recognized Abraham as a mythical figure and originally a god." A similar differentiation of Abraham from the rest is true of most of the other adherents of the views about to be mentioned. Hence also Wellhausen says (Prolegomena 6, 317): "Only Abraham is certainly no name of a people, like Isaac and Lot; he is rather ambiguous anyway. We dare not of course on that account hold him in this connection as an historical personage; rather than that he might be a free creation of unconscious fiction. He is probably the youngest figure in this company and appears to have been only at a relatively late date put before his son Isaac."

3. The Mythical Theory:

Urged popularly by Noldeke (Im neuen Reich (1871), I, 508 ff) and taken up by other scholars, especially in the case of Abraham, the view gained general currency among those who denied the historicity of Gen, that the patriarchs were old deities. From this relatively high estate, it was held, they had fallen to the plane of mere mortals (though with remnants of the hero or even demigod here and there visible) on which they appear in Gen. A new phase of this mythical theory has been developed in the elaboration by Winckler and others of their astral-theology of the Babylonian world, in which the worship of Abraham as the moon-god by the Semites of Palestine plays a part. Abraham's traditional origin connects him with Ur and Haran, leading centers of the moon-cult.

Apart from this fact the arguments relied upon to establish this identification of Abraham with Sin may be judged by the following samples: "When further the consort of Abraham bears the name Sarah, and one of the women among his closest relations the name Milcah, this gives food for thought, since these names correspond precisely with the titles of the female deities worshipped at Haran alongside the moongod Sin. Above all, however, the number 318, that appears in Ge 14:14 in connection with the figure of Abraham, is convincing because this number, which surely has no historical value, can only be satisfactorily explained from the circle of ideas of the moon-religion, since in the lunar year of 354 days there are just 318 days on which the moon is visible—deducting 36 days, or three for each of the twelve months, on which the moon is invisible" (Baentsch, Monotheismus, 60 f). In spite of this assurance, however, nothing could exceed the scorn with which these combinations and conjectures of Winckler, A. Jeremias and others of this school are received by those who in fact differ from them with respect to Abraham in little save the answer to the question, what deity was Abraham (see e.g. Meyer, op. cit., 252 f, 256 f).

4. The "Saga" Theory:

Gunkel (Genesis, Introduction), in insisting upon the resemblance of the patriarchal narrative to the "sagas" of other primitive peoples, draws attention both to the human traits of figures like Abraham, and to the very early origin of the material embodied in our present book of Genesis. First as stories orally circulated, then as stories committed to writing, and finally as a number of collections or groups of such stories formed into a cycle, the Abraham-narratives, like the Jacob-narratives and the Joseph-narratives , grew through a long and complex literary history. Gressmann (op. cit, 9-34) amends Gunkel’s results, in applying to them the principles of primitive literary development laid down by Professor Wundt in his Volkerpsychologie. He holds that the kernel of the Abraham-narratives is a series of fairy-stories, of international diffusion and unknown origin, which have been given "a local habitation and a name" by attaching to them the (ex hypothesi) then common name of Abraham (similarly Lot, etc.) and associating them with the country nearest to the wilderness of Judea, the home of their authors, namely, about Hebron and the Dead Sea. A high antiquity (1300-1100 BC) is asserted for these stories, their astonishing accuracy in details wherever they can be tested by extra-Biblical tradition is conceded, as also the probability that, "though many riddles still remain unsolved, yet many other traditions will be cleared up by new discoveries" of archaeology.

J. Oscar Boyd

ABRAHAM’S BOSOM

booz’-um (kolpos Abraam; kolpoi Abraam): Figurative. The expression occurs in Lu 16:22,23, in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, to denote the place of repose to which Lazarus was carried after his death. The figure is suggested by the practice of the guest at a feast reclining on the breast of his neighbor. Thus, John leaned on the breast of Jesus at supper (Joh 21:20). The rabbis divided the state after death (Sheol) into a place for the righteous and a place for the wicked (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; SHEOL); but it is doubtful whether the figure of Jesus quite corresponds

with this idea. "Abraham's bosom" is not spoken of as in "Hades," but rather as distinguished from it (Lu 16:23)—a place of blessedness by itself. There Abraham receives, as at a feast, the truly faithful, and admits them to closest intimacy. It may be regarded as equivalent to the "Paradise" of Lu 23:43. See HADES; PARADISE.

James Orr

ABRAHAM, BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ABRAM

a'-bram. See ABRAHAM.

ABRECH

a'-brek: Transliteration of the Hebrew 'abhrekh, in Ge 41:43 the Revised Version, margin, of which both the origin and meaning are uncertain. It was the salutation which the Egyptians addressed to Joseph, when he was made second to Pharaoh, and appeared in his official chariot.

(1) The explanations based upon Hebrew derivation are unsatisfactory, whether as the King James Version "bow the knee," from barakh (hiphil imperative) or marginal "tender father," or "father of a king" of the Targum. The form as Hiphil Imperative instead of habhrekh, is indefensible, while the other two derivations are fanciful.

(2) The surmises of Egyptologists are almost without number, and none are conclusive. Skinner in his Commentary on Genesis selects "attention!" after Spiegelberg, as best. Speaker's Commentary suggests "rejoice thou" from ab-nek. BDB gives preference to the Coptic a-bor-k, "prostrate thyself."

(3) The most satisfying parallel is the Assyrian abarakku, meaning "grand vizier" or "friend of a king," as suggested by Fried. Delitzsch; for Babylonian laws and customs were dominant in western Asia, and the Hyksos, through whom such titles would have been carried into Egypt, were ruling there at that time.
Edward Mack

ABROAD

a-brod: An idiomatic rendering of aphiketo (literally, "arrived"), "come abroad" is used in Ro 16:19 to indicate a report that has been most widely diffused (literally, "did reach unto all"). Similar idiomatic translations of the King James Version have been replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by those more literal, as in Mr 4:22; Lu 8:17; Mr 6:14; 1Th 1:8. Used also in other idiomatic

renderings, as "spread abroad" diaphemizo, Mr 1:45; "noised abroad" dialaleo, Lu 1:65; "scattered abroad," Joh 11:52; Ac 8:1, etc.; in all these cases for the pervasive meaning of the Greek preposition in composition. In Ge 15:5, chuts means "outside."

H. E. Jacobs

ABROAD, SCATTERED

See DISPERSION.

ABRONAH

a-bro'-na, the King James Version Ebronah ('abhronah): One of the stations of Israel in the wilderness on the march from Sinai to Kadesh—the station next before that at Ezion-geber on the eastern arm of the Red Sea (Nu 33:34,35).

ABSALOM (1)

ab'-sa-lom ('abhshalom, "father is peace," written also Abishalom, 1Ki 15:2,10): David's third son by Maacah, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, a small territory between Hermon and Bashan.

1. A General Favorite:

Absalom was born at Hebron (2Sa 3:3), and moved at an early age, with the transfer of the capital, to Jerusalem, where he spent most of his life. He was a great favorite of his father and of the people as well. His charming manners, his personal beauty, his insinuating ways, together with his love of pomp and royal pretensions, captivated the hearts of the people from the beginning. He lived in great style, drove in a magnificent chariot and had fifty men run before him. Such magnificence produced the desired effect upon the hearts of the young aristocrats of the royal city (2Sa 15:1 ff).

2. In Exile:

When Amnon, his half-brother, ravished his sister Tamar, and David shut his eyes to the grave crime and neglected to administer proper punishment, Absalom became justly enraged, and quietly nourished his anger, but after the lapse of two years carried out a successful plan to avenge his sister's wrongs. He made a great feast for the king's sons at Baalhazor, to which, among others, Amnon came, only to meet his death at the hands of Absalom's servants (2Sa 13:1 ff). To avoid punishment he now fled to the court of his maternal grandfather in Geshur, where he remained three years, or until David, his father, had relented and condoned the murderous act of his impetuous, plotting son. At the end of three years (2Sa 13:38) we find Absalom once more in Jerusalem. It was, however, two years later before he was admitted to the royal presence (2Sa 14:28).

3. Rebels against His Father:

Absalom, again reinstated, lost no opportunity to regain lost prestige, and having his mind made up to succeed his father upon the throne, he forgot the son in the politician. Full of insinuations and rich in promises, especially to the disgruntled and to those having grievances, imaginary or real, it was but natural that he should have a following. His purpose was clear, namely, to alienate as many as possible from the king, and thus neutralize his influence in the selection of a successor, for he fully realized that the court party, under the influence of Bathsheba, was intent upon having Solomon as the next ruler. By much flattery Absalom stole the hearts of many men in Israel (2Sa 15:6). How long a period elapsed between his return from Geshur and his open rebellion against his father David is a question which cannot be answered with any degree of certainty. Most authorities regard the forty years of 2Sa 15:7 as an error and following the Syriac and some editions of the Septuagint, suggest four as the correct text. Whether forty or four, he obtained permission from the king to visit Hebron, the ancient capital, on pretense of paying a vow made by him while at Geshur in case of his safe return to Jerusalem. With two hundred men he repairs to Hebron. Previous to the feast spies had been sent throughout all the tribes of Israel to stir up the discontented and to assemble them under Absalom's flag at Hebron. Very large numbers obeyed the call, among them Ahithophel, one of David's shrewdest counselors (15:7 ff).

4. David's Flight:

Reports of the conspiracy at Hebron soon reached the ears of David, who now became thoroughly frightened and lost no time in leaving Jerusalem. Under the protection of his most loyal bodyguard he fled to Gilead beyond Jordan. David was kindly received at Mahanaim, where he remained till after the death of his disloyal son. Zadok and Abiathar, two leading priests, were intent upon sharing the fortunes of David; they went so far as to carry the Ark of the Covenant with them out of Jerusalem (2Sa 15:24). David, however, forced the priests and Levites to take it back to its place in the city and there remain as its guardians. This was a prudent stroke, for these two great priests in Jerusalem acted as intermediaries, and through their sons and some influential women kept up constant communications with David's army in Gilead (2Sa 15:24 ff). Hushai, too, was sent back to Jerusalem, where he falsely professed allegiance to Absalom, who by thins time had entered the royal city and had assumed control of the government (2Sa 15:32 ff). Hushai, the priests and a few people less conspicuous performed their part well, for the counsel of Ahithophel, who advised immediate action and advance upon the king's forces, while everything was in a panic, was thwarted (2Sa 17:1 ff); nay more, spies were constantly kept in contact with David's headquarters to inform the king of Absalom's plans (2Sa 17:15 ff). This delay was fatal to the rebel son. Had he acted upon the shrewd counsel of Ahithophel, David's army might have been conquered at the outset.

5. Absalom's Death and Burial:

When at length Absalom's forces under the generalship of Amasa (2Sa 17:25) reached Gilead, ample time had been given to David to organize his army, which he divided into three divisions under the efficient command of three veteran generals: Joab, Abishai and Ittai (2Sa 18:1 ff). A great battle was

fought in the forests of Ephraim. Here the rebel army was utterly routed. No fewer than 20,000 were killed outright, and a still greater number becoming entangled in the thick forest, perished that day (2Sa 18:7 ff). Among the latter was Absalom himself, for while riding upon his mule, his head was caught in the boughs of a great oak or terebinth, probably in a forked branch. "He was taken up between heaven and earth; and the mule that was under him went on" (2Sa 18:9). In this position he was found by a soldier who at once ran to inform Joab. The latter without a moment's hesitation, notwithstanding David's positive orders, thrust three darts into the heart of Absalom. To make his death certain and encouraged by the action of their general, ten of Joab's young men "compassed about and smote Absalom, and slew him" (2Sa 18:15). He was buried in a great pit, close to the spot where he was killed. A great pile of stones was heaped over his body (2Sa 18:17), in accordance with the custom of dishonoring rebels and great criminals by burying them under great piles of stone (Jos 7:26; 8:29). Thomson reforms us that Syrian people to this day cast stones upon the graves of murderers and outlaws (LB, II, 61).

6. David's Lament:

The death of Absalom was a source of great grief to the fond and aged father, who forgot the ruler and the king in the tenderhearted parent. His lament at the gate of Mahanaim, though very brief, is a classic, and expresses in tender language the feelings of parents for wayward children in all ages of the world (2Sa 18:33).

Little is known of Absalom's family life, but we read in 2Sa 14:27 that he had three sons and one daughter. From the language of 18:18, it is inferred that the sons died at an early age.

7. Absalom's Tomb:

As Absalom had no son to perpetuate his memory "he reared up for himself a pillar" or a monument in the King's dale, which according to Josephus was two furlongs from Jerusalem (Ant., VII, x, 3). Nothing is known with certainty about this monument. One of the several tombs on the east side of the Kidron passes under the name of Absalom's tomb. This fine piece of masonry with its graceful cupola and Ionic pillars must be of comparatively recent origin, probably not earlier than the Roman period.

W. W. Davies

ABSALOM (2)

(Apocrypha) (Codex Vaticanus, Abessalomos and Abessalom; Codex Alexandrinus, Absalomos, the King James Version Absalon):

(1) Father of Mattathias, a captain of the Jewish army (1 Macc 11:70; Ant, XIII, v, 7).

(2) Father of Jonathan who was sent by Simon Maccabee to take possession of Joppa; perhaps identical

with Absalom (1) (1 Macc 13:11; Ant, XIII, vi, 4).

(3) One of two envoys of the Jews, mentioned in a letter sent by Lysias to the Jewish nation (2 Macc 11:17).

ABSALON

ab’-sa-lon. See ABSALOM (in the Apocrypha).

ABSOLUTION

ab-so-lu’-shun (translation of verbs luo, "loose," etc., and aphiemi, "release," "give up," etc.): Not a Biblical, but an ecclesiastical term, used to designate the official act described in Mt 16:19: "Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven," and Mt 18:18: "What things soever ye shall loose," etc., and interpreted by Joh 20:23: "Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them" (see KEYS, POWER OF THE). The Roman church regards this as the act of a properly ordained priest, by which, in the sacrament of Penance, he frees from sin one who has confessed and made promise of satisfaction. Protestants regard the promise as given not to any order within the church, but to the congregation of believers, exercising its prerogative through the Christian ministry, as its ordinary executive. They differ as to whether the act be only declarative or collative. Luther regarded it as both declarative and collative, since the Word always brings that which it offers. The absolution differs from the general promise of the gospel by individualizing the promise. What the gospel, as read and preached, declares in general, the absolution applies personally. See also FORGIVENESS.

H. E. Jacobs

ABSTINENCE

abs’-ti-nens: Abstinence as a form of asceticism reaches back into remote antiquity, and is found among most ancient peoples. It may be defined as a self-discipline which consists in the habitual renunciation, in whole or in part, of the enjoyments of the flesh, with a view to the cultivation of the life of the spirit. In its most extreme forms, it bids men to stifle and suppress their physical wants, rather than to subordinate them in the interest of a higher end or purpose, the underlying idea being that the body is the foe of the spirit, and that the progressive extirpation of the natural desires and inclinations by means of fasting, celibacy, voluntary poverty, etc., is "the way of perfection."

This article will be concerned chiefly with abstinence from food, as dealt with in the Bible. (For other aspects of the subject, see TEMPERANCE; CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS; MEAT, etc.). Thus limited, abstinence may be either public or private, partial or entire.

1. Public Fasts:

Only one such fast is spoken of as having been instituted and commanded by the Law of Moses, that of the Day of Atonement. This is called "the Fast" in Ac 27:9 (compare Ant, XIV, iv, 3; Philo, Vit Mos, II, 4; Schurer, HJP, I, i, 322).

Four annual fasts were later observed by the Jews in commemoration of the dark days of Jerusalem—the day of the beginning of Nebuchadrezzar's siege in the tenth month, the day of the capture of the city in the fourth month, the day of its destruction in the fifth month and the day of Gedaliah's murder in the seventh month. These are all referred to in Zec 8:19. See FAST.

It might reasonably be thought that such solemn anniversaries, once instituted, would have been kept up with sincerity by the Jews, at least for many years. But Isaiah illustrates how soon even the most outraged feelings of piety or patriotism may grow cold and formal. 'Wherefore have we fasted and thou seest not?' the exiled Jews cry in their captivity. 'We have humbled our souls, and thou takest no notice.' Yahweh's swift answer follows: 'Because your fasting is a mere form! Behold, in the day of your fast ye find your own pleasure and oppress all your laborers' (compare Isa 58:3; Expositor's Bible, at the place). That is to say, so formal has your fasting grown that your ordinary selfish, cruel life goes on just the same. Then Yahweh makes inquest: "Is such the fast that I have chosen? the day for a man to afflict his soul? Is not this the fast that I have chosen: to loose the bonds of wickedness, to undo the bands of the yoke, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? Then shalt thou call, and Yahweh will answer; thou shalt cry, and he will say, Here I am" (Isa 58:5-9). The passage, as George Adam Smith says, fills the earliest, if not the highest place in the glorious succession of Scriptures exalting practical love, to which belong Isa 61; Mt 25; 1Co 13. The high import is that in God's view character grows rich and life joyful, not by fasts or formal observances, but by acts of unselfish service inspired by a heart of love. These fasts later fell into utter disuse, but they were revived after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans.

Occasional public fasts were proclaimed in Israel, as among other peoples, in seasons of drought or public calamity. It appears according to Jewish accounts, that it was customary to hold them on the second and fifth days of the week, for the reason that Moses was believed to have gone up to Mt. Sinai on the fifth day of the week (Thursday) and to have come down on the second (Monday) (compare Didache, 8; Apostolical Constitutions, VIII, 23).

2. Private Fasts:

In addition to these public solemnities, individuals were in the habit of imposing extra fasts upon themselves (e.g. Judith 8:6; Lu 2:37); and there were some among the Pharisees who fasted on the second and fifth days of the week all the year round (Lu 18:12; see Lightfoot, at the place). Tacitus alludes to the "frequent fasts" of the Jews (History, V, 4), and Josephus tells of the spread of fasting among the Gentiles (Against Apion, II, 40; compare Tertullian, ad Nat, i.13). There is abundant evidence that many religious teachers laid down rules concerning fasting for their disciples (compare Mr 2:18; Mt 9:14; Lu 5:33).

3. Degrees of Strictness in Abstinence:

Individuals and sects differ greatly in the degrees of strictness with which they observe fasts. In some fasts among the Jews abstinence from food and drink was observed simply from sunrise to sunset, and washing and anointing were permitted. In others of a stricter sort, the fast lasted from one sunset till the stars appeared after the next, and, not only food and drink, but washing, anointing, and every kind of agreeable activity and even salutations, were prohibited (Schurer, II, ii, 119; Edersheim, Life and Times, I, 663). Such fasting was generally practiced in the most austere and ostentatious manner, and, among the Pharisees, formed a part of their most pretentious externalism. On this point the testimony of Mt 6:16 is confirmed by the Mishna.

4. Abstinence among Different Kinds of Ascetics:

There arose among the Jews various kinds of ascetics and they may be roughly divided into three classes.

(1) The Essenes.

These lived together in colonies, shared all things in common and practiced voluntary poverty. The stricter among them also eschewed marriage. They were indifferent, Philo says, alike to money, pleasure, and worldly position. They ate no animal flesh, drank no wine, and used no oil for anointing. The objects of sense were to them "unholy," and to gratify the natural craving was "sin." They do not seem to come distinctly into view in the New Testament. See ESSENES.

(2) The Hermit Ascetics.

These fled away from human society with its temptations and allurements into the wilderness, and lived there a life of rigid self-discipline. Josephus (Vita, 2) gives us a notable example of this class in Banus, who "lived in the desert, clothed himself with the leaves of trees, ate nothing save the natural produce of the soil, and bathed day and night in cold water for purity’s sake." John the Baptist was a hermit of an entirely different type. He also dwelt in the desert, wore a rough garment of camel’s hair and subsisted on "locusts and wild honey." But his asceticism was rather an incident of his environment and vocation than an end in itself (see "Asceticism," DCG). In the fragments of his sermons which are preserved in the Gospels there is no trace of any exhortation to ascetic exercises, though John’s disciples practiced fasting (Mr 2:18). (3) The Moderate Ascetics.

There were many pious Jews, men and women, who practiced asceticism of a less formal kind. The asceticism of the Pharisees was of a kind which naturally resulted from their legal and ceremonial conception of religion. It expressed itself chiefly, as we have seen, in ostentatious fasting and externalism. But there were not a few humble, devout souls in Israel who, like Anna, the prophetess, served God "with fastings and supplications night and day" (Lu 2:37), seeking by a true self-discipline to

draw near unto God (of Ac 13:2,3; 14:23; 1Ti 5:5).

5. Abstinence as Viewed in the Talmud:

Some of the rabbis roundly condemned abstinence, or asceticism in any form, as a principle of life. "Why must the Nazirite bring a sin offering at the end of his term?" (Nu 6:13,14) asks Eliezer ha-Kappar (Siphra', at the place); and gives answer, "Because he sinned against his own person by his vow of abstaining from wine"; and he concludes, "Whoever undergoes fasting or other penances for no special reason commits a wrong." "Man in the life to come will have to account for every enjoyment offered him that was refused without sufficient cause" (Rabh, in Yer. Kid., 4). In Maimonides (Ha-Yadh ha-

Chazaqah, De'oth 3 1) the monastic principle of abstinence in regard to marriage, eating meat, or drinking wine, or in regard to any other personal enjoyment or comfort, is condemned as "contrary to the spirit of Judaism," and "the golden middle-way of moderation" is advocated.

But, on the other hand, abstinence is often considered by the rabbis meritorious and praiseworthy as a voluntary means of self-discipline. "I partook of a Nazirite meal only once," says Simon the Just, "when I met with a handsome youth from the south who had taken a vow. When I asked the reason he said: 'I saw the Evil Spirit pursue me as I beheld my face reflected in water, and I swore that these long curls shall be cut off and offered as a sacrifice to Yahweh'; whereupon I kissed him upon his forehead and blessed him, saying, May there be many Nazirites like thee in Israel!" (Nazir, 4b). "Be holy" was accordingly interpreted, "Exercise abstinence in order to arrive at purity and holiness" ('Ab. Zarah, 20b; Siphra', Kedhoshim). "Abstain from everything evil and from whatever is like unto it" is a rule found in the Talmud (Chullin, 44b), as also in the Didache (3 1)—a saying evidently based on Job 31:1, "Abstain from the lusts of the flesh and the world." The Mosaic laws concerning diet are all said by Rabh to be "for the purification of Israel" (Le R. 13)—"to train the Jew in self-discipline."

6. The Attitude of Jesus to Fasting:

The question of crowning interest and significance to us is, What attitude did Jesus take toward fasting, or asceticism? The answer is to be sought in the light, first of His practice, and, secondly, of His teaching.

(1) His Practice.

Jesus has even been accounted "the Founder and Example of the ascetic life" (Clem. Alex., Strom, III, 6). By questionable emphasis upon His "forty days'" fast, His abstinence from marriage and His voluntary poverty, some have reached the conclusion that complete renunciation of the things of the present was "the way of perfection according to the Saviour."

A fuller and more appreciative study of Jesus' life and spirit must bring us to a different conclusion. Certainly His mode of life is sharply differentiated in the Gospels, not only from that of the Pharisees,

but also from that of John the Baptist. Indeed, He exhibited nothing of the asceticism of those illustrious Christian saints, Bernard and John of the Cross, or even of Francis, who "of all ascetics approached most nearly to the spirit of the Master." Jesus did not flee from the world, or eschew the amenities of social life. He contributed to the joyousness of a marriage feast, accepted the hospitality of rich and poor, permitted a vase of very precious ointment to be broken and poured upon His feet, welcomed the society of women, showed tender love to children, and clearly enjoyed the domestic life of the home in Bethany. There is no evidence that He imposed upon Himself any unnecessary austerities. The "forty days' " fast (not mentioned in Mk, the oldest authority) is not an exception to this rule, as it was rather a necessity imposed by His situation in the wilderness than a self-imposed observance of a law of fasting (compare Christ's words concerning John the Baptist: "John came neither eating nor drinking", see the article on "Asceticism," DCG). At any rate, He is not here an example of the traditional asceticism. He stands forth throughout the Gospels "as the living type and embodiment of self-denial," yet the marks of the ascetic are not found in Him. His mode of life was, indeed, so non-ascetic as to bring upon Him the reproach of being "a gluttonous man and a winebibber" (Mt 11:19; Lu 7:34).

(2) His Teaching.

Beyond question, it was, from first to last, "instinct with the spirit of self-denial" "If any man will come after me, let him deny himself," is an ever-recurring refrain of His teaching "Seek ye first the kingdom of God," is ever His categorical imperative (Mt 6:33 the King James Version; Lu 12:31). This is to Him the summum bonum—all desires and strivings which have not this as their goal must be suppressed or sacrificed (compare Mt 13:44-46, 19:21, Mr 10:21; Lu 9:59,60, 14:26 with Mt 5:29,30, Mr 9:43-47, Mt 16:24 f; Mr 8:34 f; Lu 9:23 f; and Lu 14:33). In short, if any man find that the gratification of any desire of the higher or lower self will impede or distract him in the performance of his duties as a subject of the Kingdom, he must forego such gratification, if he would be a disciple of Christ. "If it cause thee to stumble," is always the condition, implied or expressed, which justifies abstinence from any particular good.

According to the record, Jesus alluded to fasting only twice in His teaching. In Mt 6:16-18, where voluntary fasting is presupposed as a religious exercise of His disciples, He warns them against making it the occasion of a parade of piety: "Thou, when thou fastest, anoint thy head, and wash thy face; that thou be not seen of men to fast, but of thy Father who is in secret." In short, He sanctions fasting only as a genuine expression of a devout and contrite frame of mind.

In Mt 9:14-17 (parallel Mr 2:18-22; Lu 5:33-39) in reply to the question of the disciples of John and of the Pharisees, Jesus refuses to enjoin fasting. He says fasting, as a recognized sign of mourning, would be inconsistent with the joy which "the sons of the bridechamber" naturally feel while "the bridegroom is with them." But, he adds, suggesting the true reason for fasting, that the days of bereavement will come, and then the outward expression of sorrow will be appropriate. Here, as in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus sanctions fasting, without enjoining it, as a form through which emotion may spontaneously seek expression. His teaching on the subject may be summarized in the one word, subordination (DCG).

To the form of fasting He attaches little importance, as is seen in the succeeding parables of the Old Garment and the Old Wine-skins. It will not do, He says, to graft the new liberty of the gospel on the body of old observances, and, yet more, to try to force the new system of life into the ancient molds. The new piety must manifest itself in new forms of its own making (Mt 9:16,17, Mr 2:21,22, Lu 5:36,38). Yet Jesus shows sympathy with the prejudices of the conservatives who cling to the customs of their fathers: "No man having drunk old vane desireth new; for he saith, The old is good." But to the question, Was Jesus an ascetic? we are bound to reply, No.

"Asceticism," as Harnack says, "has no place in the gospel at all; what it asks is that we should struggle against Mammon, against care, against selfishness; what it demands and disengages is love—the love that serves and is self-sacrificing, and whoever encumbers Jesus' message with any other kind of asceticism fails to understand it" (What is Christianity? 88).

7. The Practice and Teaching of the Apostles:

On the whole, unquestionably, the practice and teachings of the apostles and early Christians were in harmony with the example and teaching of the Master. But a tendency, partly innate, partly transmitted from Jewish legalism, and partly pagan, showed itself among their successors and gave rise to the Vita Religiosa and Dualism which found their fullest expression in Monasticism.

It is worthy of note that the alleged words of Jesus: 'But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting' (Mr 9:29; Mt 17:21 the King James Version), are corruptions of the text. (Compare Tobit 12:8; Sirach 34:26; Lu 2:37). The Oxyrhynchus fragment (disc. 1897) contains a logion with the words legei Iesous, ean me nesteuete ton kosmon, ou me heurete ten basileian tou theou: "Jesus saith, Except ye fast to the world, ye shall in no wise find the Kingdom of God," but the "fasting" here is clearly metaphorical.

LITERATURE.

Bingham, Antiquities, W. Bright, Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life (1898), J. O. Hannay, The Spirit and Origin of Christian Monasticism (1902), and The Wisdom of the Desert (1904); Thomas a Kempis, Imitation of Christ, Migne, Dictionnaire d' Ascetisme, and Encyclopedia Theol., XLV, XLVI, 45, 46; Jewish Encyclopedia, and Bible Dictionaries at the place.

George B. Eager

ABUBUS

a-bu'-bus (Aboubos): The father of Ptolemy, who deceitfully slew Simon Maccabee and his sons at Dok near Jericho (1 Macc 16:11,15).

ABUNDANCE; ABUNDANT

a-bun’-dans, a-bun’-dant. See ABOUND.

ABUSE

a-buz’:"To dishonor," "to make mock of," "to insult," etc.

(1) Translated in the Old Testament from ‘alal, "to do harm," "to defile" (Jud 19:25), "to make mock of" (1Sa 31:4).

(2) Translated in the New Testament from arsenokoites, literally, "one who lies with a male," "a sodomite" (1Co 6:9; 1Ti 1:10; the King James Version "for them that defile themselves with mankind").

(3) In the King James Version 1Co 7:31 "as not abusing it," from katachraomai, "to abuse," i.e. misuse; the Revised Version (British and American) "using it to the full," also 1Co 9:18.

ABYSS

a-bis’,(he abussos): In classical Greek the word is always an adjective, and is used

(1) literally, "very deep," "bottomless";

(2) figuratively, "unfathomable," "boundless." "Abyss" does not occur in the King James Version but the Revised Version (British and American) so transliterates abussos in each case. The the King James Version renders the Greek by "the deep" in two passages (Lu 8:31; Ro 10:7). In Revelation the King James Version renders by "the bottomless pit" (Re 9:1,2,11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1,3). In the Septuagint abussos is the rendering of the Hebrew word tehom. According to primitive Semitic cosmogony the earth was supposed to rest on a vast body of water which was the source of all springs of water and rivers (Ge 1:2; De 8:7; Ps 24:2; 136:6). This subterranean ocean is sometimes described as "the water under the earth" (Ex 20:4; De 5:8). According to Job 41:32 tehom is the home of the leviathan in which he plows his hoary path of foam. The Septuagint never uses abussos as a rendering of sheol (= Sheol = Hades) and probably tehom never meant the "abode of the dead" which was the ordinary meaning of Sheol. In Ps 71:20 tehom is used figuratively, and denotes "many and sore troubles" through which the psalmist has passed (compare Jon 2:5). But in the New Testament the word abussos means the "abode of demons." In Lu 8:31 the King James Version renders "into the deep" (Weymouth and The Twentieth Century New Testament =" into the bottomless pit"). The demons do not wish to be sent to their place of punishment before their destined time. Mark simply says "out of the country" (Lu 5:10). In Ro 10:7 the word is equivalent to Hades, the abode of the dead. In Revelation (where the King James Version renders invariably "the bottomless pit") abussos denotes the abode of evil spirits, but not the place of final punishment; it is therefore to be distinguished from the "lake of fire and brimstone" where the beast

and the false prophet are, and into which the Devil is to be finally cast (Re 19:20; 20:10).

See also ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 7.

Thomas Lewis

ABYSSINIA

ab-i-sin'-i-a. See ETHIOPIA.

ACACIA

a-ka'-sha (shiTTah, the shittah tree of the King James Version, Isa 41:19, and 'atse-shiTTah, acacia wood; shittah wood the King James Version, Ex 25:5,10,13; 26:15,26; 27:1,6; De 10:3.): ShiTTah (= shinTah) is equivalent to the Arabic sant which is now the name of the Acacia Nilotica (NO, Leguminosae), but no doubt the name once included other species of desert acacias. If one particular species is indicated in the Old Testament it is probably the Acacia Seyal—the Arabic Seyyal—which yields the well-known gum- arabic This tree, which has finely leaves ular flowers, grows to a height of twenty feet or more, and its stem may sometimes reach two feet in thickness. The tree often assumes a characteristic umbrella-like form. The wood is close-grained and is not readily attacked by insects. It would be well suited for such purposes as described, the construction of the ark of the covenant, the altar and boarding of the tabernacle. Even today these trees survive in considerable numbers around 'Ain Jidy and in the valleys to the south.

E. W. G. Masterman

ACATAN

ak'-a-tan. See AKATAN (Apocrypha).

ACCABA

ak'-a-ba, ak-a'-ba (B, Akkaba; A, Gaba; the King James Version Agaba) = Hagab (Ezr 2:46); see also HAGABA (Ne 7:48): The descendants of Accaba (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:30).

ACCAD; ACCADIANS

ak'-ad, ak-a'-di-ans. See BABYLONIA.

ACCARON

ak’-a-ron (Akkaron): Mentioned in 1 Macc 10:89 the King James Version; a town of the Philistines, known as Ekron (‘eqron) in Old Testament, which King Alexander gave to Jonathan Maccabeus as a reward for successful military service in western Palestine. It is also mentioned in the days of the Crusades. See EKRON.

ACCEPT; ACCEPTABLE; ACCEPTATION

ak-sept’, ak-sep’-ta-b’-l, ak-sep-ta’-shun: "To receive with favor," "to take pleasure in"; "well-pleasing"; "the act of receiving."

Accept, used

(1) of sacrifice, "accept thy burnt-sacrifice" (dashen, "accept as fat," i.e. receive favorably; Ps 20:3);

(2) of persons, "Yahweh accept Job" (Job 42:9, nasa’," to lift up," "take," "receive");

(3) of works, "a the work of his hands" (De 33:11 ratsah, "to delight in").

In New Testament

(1) of favors, "We accept .... with all thankfulness" (apodechomai, Ac 24:3);

(2) of personal appeal, "He accept our exhortation" (2Co 8:17);

(3) of God’s Impartiality (lambano, "to take," "receive"); "accepteth not man’s person" (Ga 2:6).

Acceptable, used

(1) of justice (bachar, "choose select"), "more accept .... than sacrifice" (Pr 21:3);

(2) of words (chephets, "delight in," "sought .... accept words") (Ec 12:10);

(3) of times (ratson, "delight," "approbation"; dektos, "receivable") "acceptable year of the Lord" (Isa 61:2 (King James Version); Lu 4:19);

(4) of spiritual sacrifice (euprosdektos, "well received"), "acceptable to God" (1Pe 2:5);

(5) of patient endurance (charis, "grace," "favor") "This is acceptable with God" (1Pe 2:20).
Acceptation, used twice to indicate the trustworthiness of the gospel of Christ’s saving grace: "worthy of

all acceptation." (1Ti 1:15; 4:9).

These words are full of the abundant grace of God and are rich in comfort to believers. That which makes man, in word, work and character, acceptable to God; and renders It possible for God to accept him, his service and sacrifice, is the fullness of the Divine mercy and grace and forgiveness. He "chose us" and made us, as adopted sons, the heirs of His grace "which he freely bestowed on us in the Beloved" (Eph 1:6; compare the King James Version).

Dwight M. Pratt

ACCEPTANCE

ak-sep'-tans: A rendering of the Hebrew retson, "delight," found only in Isa 60:7. It pictures God's delight in His redeemed people in the Messianic era, when their gifts, in joyful and profuse abundance, "shall come up with acceptance on mine altar." With "accepted" and other kindred words it implies redeeming grace as the basis of Divine favor. It is the "living, holy sacrifice" that is "acceptable to God" (Ro 12:1; compare Titus 3:4-6).

ACCESS

ak'-ses (prosagoge, "a leading to or toward," "approach"): Thrice used in the New Testament to indicate the acceptable way of approach to God and of admission to His favor. Jesus said, "I am the way" (Joh 14:6). His blood is the "new and living way" (Heb 10:20). Only through Him have we "access by faith into this grace wherein we stand" (Ro 5:2); "Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father" (Eph 2:18 the King James Version); "in whom we have .... access in confidence, through our faith in him" (Eph 3:12).

The goal of redemption is life in God, "unto the Father." The means of redemption is the cross of Christ, "in whom we have our redemption through his blood" (Eph 1:7). The agent in redemption is the Holy Spirit, "by one Spirit," "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph 1:13). The human instrumentality, faith. The whole process of approach to, and abiding fellowship with, God is summed up in this brief sentence Access to the Father, through Christ, by the Spirit, by faith.

Dwight M. Pratt

ACCO

ak'-o ('akko; ['Akcho]; Ake Ptolemais; Modern Arabic 'Akka, English Acre; the King James Version Accho): A town on the Syrian coast a few miles north of Carmel, on a small promontory on the north side of a broad bay that lies between it and the modern town of Haifa. This bay furnishes the best anchorage for ships of any on this coast except that of George, at Beirut, and Alexandretta at the extreme

north. As the situation commanded the approach from the sea to the rich plateau of Esdraelon and also the coast route from the north, the city was regarded in ancient times of great importance and at various periods of history was the scene of severe struggles for its possession. It fell within the bounds assigned to the Israelites, particularly to the tribe of Asher, but they were never able to take it (Jos 19:24-31; Jud 1:31).

It was, like Tyre and Sidon, too strong for them to attack and it became indeed a fortress of unusual strength, so that it many a siege, often baffling its assailants. In the period of the Crusades it was the most famous stronghold on the coast, and in very early times it was a place of importance and appears in the Tell el-Amarna Letters as a possession of the Egyptian kings. Its governor wrote to his suzerain professing loyalty when the northern towns were falling away (Am Tab 17 BM, 95 B). The Egyptian suzerainty over the coast, which was established by Thothmes III about 1480 BC, was apparently lost in the 14th century, as is indicated in Tell el-Amarna Letters, but was regained under Seti I and his more famous son Rameses II in the 13th, to be again lost in the 12th when the Phoenician towns seem to have established their independence. Sidon however surpassed her sisters in power and exercised a sort of hegemony over the Phoenician towns, at least in the south, and Acco was included in it (Rawl. Phoenica, 407-8).

But when Assyria came upon the scene it had to submit to this power, although it revolted whenever Assyria became weak, as appears from the mention of its subjugation by Sennacherib (ib 449), and by Ashurbanipal (ib 458). The latter "quieted" it by a wholesale massacre and then carried into captivity the remaining inhabitants. Upon the downfall of Assyria it passed, together with other Phoenician towns, under the dominion of Babylon and then of Persia, but we have no records of its annals during that period; but it followed the fortunes of the more important cities, Tyre and Sidon. In the Seleucid period (BC 312-65) the town became of importance in the contests between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. The latter occupied it during the struggles that succeeded the death of Alexander and made it their stronghold on the coast and changed the name to PTOLEMAIS, by which it was known in the Greek and Roman period as we see in the accounts of the Greek and Roman writers and in Josephus, as well as in New Testament (1 Macc 5:22; 10:39; 12:48; Ac 21:7).

The old name still continued locally and reasserted itself in later times. The Ptolemies held undisputed possession of the place for about 70 years but it was wrested from them by Antiochus III, of Syria, in 219 BC and went into the permanent possession of the Seleucids after the decisive victory of Antiochus over Scopas in that year, the result of which was the expulsion of the Ptolemies from Syria, Palestine and Phoenicia (Ant., XII, iii, 3). In the dynastic struggles of the Seleucids it fell into the hands of Alexander Bala, who there received the hand of Cleopatra, the daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, as a pledge of alliance between them (ib XIII, iv, 1). Tigranes, king of Armenia, besieged it on his invasion of Syria, but was obliged to relinquish it on the approach of the Romans toward his own dominions (BJ, I, v, 3).

Under the Romans Ptolemais became a colony and a metropolis, as is known from coins, and was of importance, as is attested by Strabo. But the events that followed the conquests of the Saracens, leading to the Crusades, brought it into great prominence. It was captured by the Crusaders in 1110 AD, and

remained in their hands until 1187, when it was taken from them by Saladin and its fortifications so strengthened as to render it almost impregnable. The importance of this fortress as a key to the Holy Land was considered so great by the Crusaders that they put forth every effort during two years to recapture it, but all in vain until the arrival of Richard Coeur de Lion and Philip Augustus with reinforcements, and it was only after the most strenuous efforts on their part that the place fell into their hands, but it cost them 100,000 men. The fortifications were repaired and it was afterward committed to the charge of the knights of John, by whom it was held for 100 years and received the name of Jean d'Acre. It was finally taken by the Saracens in 1291, being the last place held by the Crusaders in Palestine

It declined after this and fell into the hands of the Ottomans under Selim I in 1516, and remained mostly in ruins until the 18th century, when it came into the possession of Jezzar Pasha, who usurped the authority over it and the neighboring district and became practically independent of the Sultan and defied his authority. In 1799 it was attacked by Napoleon but was bravely and successfully defended by the Turks with the help of the English fleet, and Napoleon had to abandon the siege after he had spent two months before it and gained a victory over the Turkish army at Tabor. It enjoyed a considerable degree of prosperity after this until 1831 when it was besieged by Ibrahim Pasha, of Egypt, and taken, but only after a siege of more than five months in which it suffered the destruction of its walls and many of its buildings. It continued in the hands of the Egyptians until 1840 when it was restored to the Ottomans by the English whose fleet nearly reduced it to ruins in the bombardment. It has recovered somewhat since then and is now a town of some 10,000 inhabitants and the seat of a Mutasarrifiyet, or subdivision of the Vilayet of Beirut. It contains one of the state prisons of the Vilayet, where long-term prisoners are incarcerated. Its former commerce has been almost wholly lost to the town of Haifa, on the south side of the bay, since the latter has a fairly good roadstead, while Acre has none, and the former being the terminus of the railway which connects with the interior and the Damascus-Mecca line, it has naturally supplanted Acre as a center of trade.

H. Porter

ACCOMMODATION

a-kom-mo-da'-shun:

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Three Uses of the Term

2. The Importance of the Subject

II. ACCOMMODATED APPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES

1. Interpretation a Science

2. Scientific Accommodation

III. DOUBLE REFERENCE IN SCRIPTURE

1. Allegory in Scripture

2. Hidden Truths of Scripture

3. Prophecy and its Fulfillment

4. Conclusion

IV. ACCOMMODATION IN REVELATION

1. General Principles

2. Accommodation a Feature of Progressive Revelation

3. The Limits of Revelation

4. The Outcome of Revelation

5. The Question as to Christ’s Method

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

1. Three Uses of the Term: The term "accommodation" is used in three senses which demand careful discrimination and are worthy of separate treatment:

(1) the use or application of a Scripture reference in a sense other than the obvious and literal one which lay in the mind and intent of the writer;

(2) theory that a passage, according to its original intent, may have more than one meaning or application;

(3) the general principle of adaptation on the part of God in His self-revelation to man’s mental and spiritual capacity.

2. The Importance of the Subject: Important issues are involved in the discussion of this subject in each of the three divisions thus naturally presented to us in the various uses of the term. These issues culminate in the supremely important principles which underlie the question of God's adaptation of His revelation to men.

II. Accommodated Application of Scripture Passages.

1. Interpretation a Science: It is obvious that the nature of thought and of language is such as to constitute for all human writings, among which the Bible, as a document to be understood, must be placed, a science of interpretation with a definite body of laws which cannot be violated or set aside without confusion and error. This excludes the indeterminate and arbitrary exegesis of any passage It must be interpreted with precision and in accordance with recognized laws of interpretation. The first and most fundamental of these laws is that a passage is to be interpreted in accordance with the intent of the writer in so far as that can be ascertained. The obvious, literal and original meaning always has the right of way. All arbitrary twisting of a passage in order to obtain from it new and remote meanings not justified by the context is unscientific and misleading.

2. Scientific Accommodation: There is, however, a scientific and legitimate use of the principle of accommodation. For example, it is impossible to determine beforehand that a writer's specific application of a general principle is the only one of which it is capable. A bald and literal statement of fact may involve a general principle which is capable of broad and effective application in other spheres than that originally contemplated. It is perfectly legitimate to detach a writer's statement from its context of secondary and incidental detail and give it a harmonious setting of wider application. It will be seen from this that legitimate accommodation involves two things:

(1) the acceptance of the author's primary and literal meaning;

(2) the extension of that meaning through the establishment of a broader context identical in principle with the original one.

In the article on QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT (which see) this use of the term accommodation, here treated in the most general terms, is dealt with in detail. See also INTERPRETATION.

III. Double Reference in Scripture.

The second use of the term accommodation now emerges for discussion. Are we to infer the presence of double reference, or secondary meanings in Scripture? Here again we must distinguish between the legitimate and illegitimate application of a principle. While we wisely deprecate the tendency to look upon Scripture passages as cryptic utterances, we must also recognize that many Scripture references may have more than a single application.

1. Allegory in Scripture:

We must recognize in the Scriptures the use of allegory, the peculiar quality of which, as a form of literature, is the double reference which it contains. To interpret the story of the Bramble-King (Jud 9:7-15) or the Parables of our Lord without reference to the double meanings which they involve would be as false and arbitrary as any extreme of allegorizing. The double meaning is of the essence of the literary expression. This does not mean, of course, that the poetry of the Bible, even that of the Prophets and Apocalyptic writers, is to be looked upon as allegorical. On the contrary, only that writing, whether prose or poetry, is to be interpreted in any other than its natural and obvious sense, in connection with which we have definite indications of its allegorical character. Figures of speech and poetical expressions in general, though not intended to be taken literally because they belong to the poetical form, are not to be taken as having occult references and allegorical meanings. Dr. A. B. Davidson thus characterizes the prophetic style (Old Testament Prophecy, 171; see whole chapter): "Prophecy is poetical, but it is not allegorical. The language of prophecy is real as opposed to allegorical, and poetical as opposed to real. When the prophets speak of natural objects or of lower creatures, they do not mean human things by them, or human beings, but these natural objects or creatures themselves. When Joe speaks of locusts, he means those creatures. When he speaks of the sun and moon and stars, he means those bodies." Allegory, therefore, which contains the double reference, in the sense of speaking of one thing while meaning another, is a definite and recognizable literary form with its own proper laws of interpretation. See ALLEGORY.

2. Hidden Truths of Scripture:

There is progress in the understanding of Scripture. New reaches of truth are continually being brought to light. By legitimate and natural methods hidden meanings are being continually discovered.

(1) It is a well-attested fact that apart from any supernatural factor a writer sometimes speaks more wisely than he knows. He is the partially unconscious agent for the expression of a great truth, not only for his own age, but for all time. It is not often given to such a really great writer or to his age to recognize all the implications of his thought. Depths of meaning hidden both from the original writer and from earlier interpreters may be disclosed by moving historical sidelights. The element of permanent value in great literature is due to the fact that the writer utters a greater truth than can exhaustively be known in any one era. It belongs to all time.

(2) The supernatural factor which has gone to the making of Scripture insures that no one man or group of men, that not all men together, can know it exhaustively. It partakes of the inexhaustibleness of God. It is certain, therefore, that it will keep pace with the general progress of man, exhibiting new phases of meaning as it moves along the stream of history. Improved exegetical apparatus and methods, enlarged apprehensions into widening vistas of thought and knowledge, increased insight under the tutelage of the Spirit in the growing Kingdom of God, will conspire to draw up new meanings from the depths of Scripture. The thought of God in any given expression of truth can only be progressively and approximately known by human beings who begin in ignorance and must be taught what they know.

(3) The supernatural factor in revelation also implies a twofold thought in every important or fundamental statement of Scripture: the thought of God uttered through His Spirit to a man or his generation, and that same thought with reference to the coming ages and to the whole truth which is to be disclosed. Every separate item belonging to an organism of truth would naturally have a twofold reference: first, its significance alone and of itself; second, its significance with reference to the whole of which it is a part. As all great Scriptural truths are thus organically related, it follows that no one of them can be fully known apart from all the others. From which it follows also that in a process of gradual revelation where truths are given successively as men are able to receive them and where each successive truth prepares the way for others which are to follow, every earlier statement will have two ranges of meaning and application—that which is intrinsic and that which flows from its connection with the entire organism of unfolding truth which finally appears.

3. Prophecy and Its Fulfillment: (1) The principles thus far expressed carry us a certain way toward an answer to the most important question which arises under this division of the general topic: the relation between the Old Testament and the New Testament through prophecy and its fulfillment. Four specific points of connection involving the principles of prophetic anticipation and historical realization in the career of Jesus are alleged by New Testament writers. They are of total importance, inasmuch as these four groups of interpretations involve the most important elements of the Old Testament and practically the entire New Testament interpretation of Jesus.

(2) (a) The promise made to Abraham (Ge 12:1-3; compare Ge 13:14-18, 15:1-6, etc.) and repeated in substance at intervals during the history of Israel (see Ex 6:7; Le 26:12; De 26:17-19; 29:12,13; 2Sa 7$; 1Ch 17, etc.) is interpreted as having reference to the distant future and as fulfilled in Christ (see Ga 3$ for example of this interpretation, especially Ga 3:14; also QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT).

(b) The Old Testament system of sacrifices is looked upon as typical and symbolic, hence, predictive and realized in the death of Christ interpreted as atonement for sin (He 10$, etc.).

(c) References in the Old Testament to kings or a king of David’s line whose advent and reign are spoken of are interpreted as definite predictions fulfilled in the advent and career of Jesus the Messiah (Ps 2$, 16$, 22$, 110$; compare Lu 1:69, etc.).

(d) The prophetic conception of the servant of Yahweh (Isa 42:1 f; Isa 44:1 f; Isa 52:13-Isa 53:12; compare Ac 8:32-35) is interpreted as being an anticipatory description of the character and work of Jesus centering in His vicarious sin-bearing death.

(3) With the details of interpretation as involved in the specific use of Old Testament statements we are not concerned here (see QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, etc.) but only with the general principles which underlie all such uses of the Old Testament. The problem is: Can we thus interpret any passage or group of passages in the Old Testament without being guilty of what has been called "pedantic supernaturalism"; that is, of distorting Scripture by interpreting it without regard to its natural

historical connections? Is the interpretation of the Old Testament Messianically legitimate or illegitimate accommodation?

(c) It is a widely accepted canon of modern interpretation that the institutions of Old Testament worship and the various messages of the prophets had an intrinsic contemporary significance.

(b) But this is not to say that its meaning and value are exhausted in that immediate contemporary application. Beyond question the prophet was a man with a message to his own age, but there is nothing incompatible, in that fact, with his having a message, the full significance of which reaches beyond ins own age, even into the far distant future. It would serve to clear the air in this whole region if it were only understood that it is precisely upon its grasp of the future that the leverage of a great message for immediate moral uplift rests. The predictive element is a vital part of the contemporary value.

(c) The material given under the preceding analysis may be dealt with as a whole on the basis of a principle fundamental to the entire Old Testament economy, namely: that each successive age in the history of Israel is dealt with on the basis of truth common to the entire movement of which the history of Israel is but a single phase. It is further to be remembered that relationship between the earlier and later parts of the Bible is one of organic and essential unity, both doctrinal and historical. By virtue of this fact the predictive element is an essential factor in the doctrines and institutions of the earlier dispensation as originally constituted and delivered, hence forming a part of its contemporary significance and value, both pointing to the future and preparing the way for it. In like manner, the element of fulfillment is an essential element of the later dispensation as the completed outcome of the movement begun long ages before. Prediction and fulfillment are essential factors in any unified movement begun, advanced and completed according to a single plan in successive periods of time. We have now but to apply this principle in general to the Old Testament material already in hand to reach definite and satisfactory conclusions.

(4) (a) The promise made to Abraham was a living message addressed directly to him in the immediate circumstances of his life upon which the delivery and acceptance of the promise made a permanent impress; but it was of vaster proportions than could be realized within the compass of a single human life; for it included himself, his posterity, and all mankind in a single circle of promised blessing. So far as the patriarch was concerned the immediate, contemporary value of the promise lay in the fact that it concerned him not alone but in relationship to the future and to mankind. A prediction was thus imbedded in the very heart of the word of God which was the object of his faith—a prediction which served to enclose his life in the plan of God for all mankind and to fasten his ambition to the service of that plan. The promise was predictive in its essence and in its contemporary meaning (see Beecher, Prophets and Promise, 213).

(b) So also it is with the Messianic King. The Kingdom as an institution in Israel is described from the beginning as the perpetual mediatorial reign of God upon earth (see Ex 19:3-6, 2Sa 7:8-16, etc.), and the King in whom the Kingdom centers is God’s Son (2Sa 7:13,15) and earthly representative. In all this there is much that is immediately contemporaneous. The Kingdom and the Kingship are described in

terms of the ideal and that ideal is used in every age as the ground of immediate appeal to loyalty and devotion on the part of the King. None the less the predictive element lies at the center of the representation. The very first recorded expression of the Messianic promise to David involves the prediction of unconditioned perpetuity to his house, and thus grasps the entire future.

More than this, the characteristics, the functions, the dignities of the king are so described (Ps 102$, Isa 9:6,7) as to make it clear that the conditions of the Kingship could be met only by an uniquely endowed person coming forth from God and exercising divine functions in a worldwide spiritual empire. Such a King being described and such a Kingdom being promised, the recipients of it, of necessity, were set to judge the present and scrutinize the future for its realization. The conception is, in its original meaning and expression, essentially predictive.

(c) Very closely allied with this conception of the Messianic King is the prophetic ideal of the Servant of Yahweh. Looked at in its original context we at once discover that it is the ideal delineation of a mediatorial service to men in behalf of Yahweh—which has a certain meaning of fulfillment in any person who exhibits the Divine character by teaching the truth and ministering to human need (for application of the term see Isa 49:5,6,7, 50:10; especially Isa 45:1). But the service is described in such exalted terms, the devotion exacted by it is so high, that, in the application of the ideal as a test to the present and to the nation at large, the mind is inevitably thrown into the future and centered upon a supremely endowed individual to come, who is by preeminence the Servant of Yahweh.

(d) The same principle may be applied with equal effectiveness to the matter of Israel's sacrificial system. In the last two instances this fact emerged: No truth and no institution can exhaustively be known until it has run a course in history. For example, the ideas embodied in the Messianic Kingship and the conception of the Servant of Yahweh could be known only in the light of history. Only in view of the actual struggles and failures of successive kings and successive generations of the people to realize such ideals could their full significance be disclosed. Moreover, only by historic process of preparation could such ideals ultimately be realized. This is preeminently true of the Old Testament sacrifices. It is clear that the New Testament conception of the significance of Old Testament sacrifice in connection with the death of Christ is based upon the belief that the idea embodied in the original institution could be fulfilled only in the voluntary sacrifice of Christ (see He 10:1-14). This view is justified by the facts. Dr. Davidson (op. cit., 239) holds that the predictive element in the Old Testament sacrifices lay in their imperfection. This imperfection, while inherent, could be revealed only in experience. As they gradually deepened a sense of need which they could not satisfy, more and more clearly they pointed away from themselves to that transaction which alone could realize in fact what they express in symbol. A harmony such as obtained between Old Testament sacrifice and the death of Christ could only be the result of design. It is all one movement, one fundamental operation; historically prefigured and prepared for by anticipation, and historically realized. Old Testament sacrifice was instituted both to prefigure and to prepare the way for the sacrifice of Christ in the very process of fulfilling its natural historic function in the economy of Israel.

4. Conclusion: The total outcome of the discussion is this: the interpretation of these representative Old Testament ideas and institutions as referring to Christ and anticipating His advent is no illegitimate use

of the principle of accommodation. The future reference which takes in the entire historical process which culminates in Christ lies within the immediate and original application and constitutes an essential element of its contemporary value. The original statement is in its very nature predictive and is one in doctrinal principle and historic continuity with that which forms its fulfillment.

IV. Accommodation in Revelation.

1. General Principles:

(1) It is evident that God's revelation to men must be conveyed in comprehensible terms and adjusted to the nature of the human understanding. That is clearly not a revelation which does not reveal. A disclosure of God's character and ways to men revolves the use and control of the human spirit in accordance with its constitution and laws. The doctrine of inspiration inseparable from that of revelation implies such a divine control of human faculties as to enable them, still freely working within their own normal sphere, to apprehend and interpret truth otherwise beyond their reach.

(2) The Bible teaches that in the height and depth of His being God is unsearchable. His mind and the human mind are quantitatively incommensurable. Man cannot by searching find out God. His ways are not our ways and His thoughts are not our thoughts.

(3) But, on the other hand, the Bible affirms with equal emphasis the essential qualitative kinship of the divine and the human constitutions God is spirit—man is spirit also. Man is made in the image of God and made to know God. These two principles together affirm the necessity and the possibility of revelation. Revelation, considered as an exceptional order of experience due to acts of God performed with the purpose of making Himself known in personal relationship with man, is necessary because man's finite nature needs guidance. Revelation is possible because man is capable of such guidance. The Bible affirms that God's thoughts are not our thoughts, but that they may become ours because God can utter them so that we can receive them.

(4) These two principles lead to a most important conclusion. In all discussions of the principle of accommodation it is to be remembered that the capacity of the human mind to construct does not measure its capacity to receive and appropriate. The human mind can be taught what it cannot independently discover. No teacher is limited by the capacity of his pupils to deal unaided with a subject of study. He is limited only by their capacity to follow him in his processes of thought and exposition. The determining factor in revelation, which is a true educative process, is the mind of God which stamps itself upon the kindred and plastic mind of man.

2. Accommodation a Feature of Progressive Revelation:

(1) The beginnings of revelation. Since man's experience is organically conditioned he is under the law of growth. His entire mental and spiritual life is related to his part and lot in the kingdom of organisms. The very laws of his mind reveal themselves only upon occasion in experience. While it is true that his

tendencies are innate, so that he is compelled to think and to feel in certain definite ways, yet it is true that he can neither think nor feel at all except as experience presents material for thought and applies stimulus to feeling Man must bye in order to learn. He must, therefore, learn gradually. This fact conditions all revelation. Since it must deal with men it must be progressive, and since it must be progressive it must necessarily involve, in its earlier stages, the principle of accommodation. In order to gain access to man's mind it must take him where he is and link itself with his natural aptitudes and native modes of thought. Since revelation involves the endeavor to form in the mind of man the idea of God in order that a right relationship with Him may be established, it enters both the intellectual and moral life of the human race and must accommodate itself to the humble beginnings of early human experience. The chief problem of revelation seems to have been to bring these crude beginnings within the scope of a movement the aim and end of which is perfection.

The application of the principle of accommodation to early human experience with a view to progress is accomplished by doing what at first thought seems to negate the very principle upon which the mental and moral life of man must permanently rest.

(a) It involves the authoritative revelations of incomplete and merely tentative truths.

(b) It involves also the positive enactment of rudimentary and imperfect morality.

In both these particulars Scripture has accommodated itself to crude early notions and placed the seal of authority upon principles which are outgrown and discarded within the limits of Scripture itself. But in so doing Scripture has saved the very interests it has seemed to imperil by virtue of two features of the human constitution which in themselves lay hold upon perfection and serve to bind together the crude beginnings and the mature achievements of the human race. These two principles are

(c) the idea of truth;

(d) the idea of obligation.

(2) It is mainly due to these two factors of human nature that any progress in truth and conduct is possible to men. What is true or right in matter of specific fact varies in the judgment of different individuals and of different ages. But the august and compelling twin convictions of truth and right, as absolute, eternal, authoritative, are present from the beginning of human history to the end of it. Scripture seizes upon the fact that these great ideas may be enforced through crude human conceptions and at very rudimentary stages of culture, and enforcing them by means of revelation and imperative law brings man to the test of truth and right and fosters his advance to larger conceptions and broader applications of both fundamental principles. Canon Mozley in discussing this principle of accommodation on its moral side, its necessity and its fruitfulness, says: "How can the law properly fulfill its object of correcting and improving the moral standard of men, unless it first maintains in obligation the standard which already exists? Those crudely delineated conceptions, which it tends ultimately to purify and raise, it must first impose" (Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, 183; compare Mt 5:17

with Mt 5:21,27,33).

3. The Limits of Revelation:

Since the chief end of revelation is to form the mind of man with reference to the purpose and will of God to the end that man may enter into fellowship with God, the question arises as to how far revelation will be accommodated by the limitation of its sphere. How far does it seek to form the mind and how far does it leave the mind to its own laws and to historical educative forces? Four foundation principles seem to be sufficiently clear:

(a) Revelation accepts and uses at every stage of its history such materials from the common stock of human ideas as are true and of permanent worth. The superstructure of revelation rests upon a foundation of universal and fundamental human convictions. It appeals continually to the rooted instructs and regulative ideas of the human soul deeply implanted as a preparation for revelation.

(b) Regard is paid in Scripture to man’s nature as free and responsible. He is a rational being who must be taught through persuasion; he is a moral being who must be controlled through his conscience and will. There must be, therefore, throughout the process of revelation an element of free, spontaneous, unforced life in and through which the supernatural factors work.

(c) Revelation must have reference, even in its earliest phases of development, to the organism of truth as a whole. What is actually given at any time must contribute its quota to the ultimate summing up and completion of the entire process. (d) Revelation must guard against injurious errors which trench upon essential and vital matters. In short, the consistency and integrity of the movement through which truth is brought to disclosure must sacredly be guarded; while, at the same time, since it is God and man who are coming to know each other, revelation must be set in a broad environment of human life and entrusted to the processes of history. See REVELATION.

4. The Outcome of Revelation: It is now our task briefly to notice how in Scripture these interests are safeguarded. We must notice (a) the principle of accommodation in general. It has often been pointed out that in every book of the Bible the inimitable physiognomy of the writer and the age is preserved; that the Biblical language with reference to Nature is the language of phenomena; that its doctrines are stated vividly, tropically, concretely and in the forms of speech natural to the age in which they were uttered; that its historical documents are, for the most part, artless annals of the ancient oriental type, that it contains comparatively little information concerning Nature or man which anticipates scientific discovery or emancipates the religious man who accepts it as a guide from going to school to Nature and human experience for such information. All this, of course, without touching upon disputed points or debated questions of fact, involves, from the point of view of the Divine mind to which all things are known, and of the human mind to which certain facts of Nature hidden in antiquity have been disclosed, the principles of accommodation. Over against this we must set certain contrasting facts:

(b) The Scripture shows a constant tendency to transcend itself and to bring the teaching of the truth to a

higher level. The simple, primitive ideas and rites of the patriarchal age are succeeded by the era of organized national life with its ideal of unity and the intensified sense of national calling and destiny under the leadership of God. The national idea of church and kingdom broadens out into the universal conception and world-wide mission of Christianity. The sacrificial symbolism of the Old Testament gives way to the burning ethical realities of the Incarnate Life. The self-limitation of the Incarnation broadens out into the world-wide potencies of the era of the Spirit who uses the letter of Scripture as the instrument of His universal ministry. It is thus seen that by the progressive method through a cumulative process God has gradually transcended the limitation of His instruments while at the same time He has continuously broadened and deepened the Spirit of man to receive His self-disclosure.

(c) More than this, Scripture throughout is marked by a certain distract and unmistakable quality of timelessness. It continually urges and suggests the infinite, the eternal, the unchangeable. It is part of the task of revelation to anticipate so as to guide progress. At every stage it keeps the minds of men on the stretch with a truth that they are not able at that stage easily to apprehend. The inexhaustible vastness and the hidden fullness of truth are everywhere implied. Prophets and Apostles are continually in travail with truths brought to their own ages from afar. The great fundamental verities of Scripture are stated with uncompromising fullness and finality. There is no accommodation to human weakness or error. Its ideals, its standards, its conditions are absolute and inviolate.

Not only has Israel certain fundamental ideas which are peculiar to herself, but there has been an organizing spirit, an "unique spirit of inspiration" which has modified and transformed the materials held by her in common with her Semitic kindred. Even her inherited ideas and Institutions are transformed and infused with new meanings. We note the modification of Semitic customs, as for example in blood revenge, by which savagery has been mitigated and evil associations eliminated. We note the paucity of mythological material. If the stories of Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Samson were originally mythological, they have ceased to be such in the Bible. They have been humanized and stripped of superhuman features. (See Fable, HGHL, 220 ff.)

If we yield to the current hypothesis as to the Babylonian background of the narratives in Gen, we are still more profoundly impressed with that unique assimilative power, working in Israel, which has enabled the Biblical writers to eradicate the deep-seated polytheism of the Babylonian documents and to stamp upon them the inimitable features of their own high monotheism (see BABYLONlA). We note the reserve of Scripture, the constant restraint exercised upon the imagination, the chastened doctrinal sobriety in the Bible references to angels and demons, in its Apocalyptic imagery, in its Messianic promises, in its doctrines of rewards and punishments. In all these particulars the Bible stands unique by contrast, not merely with popular thought, but with the extra-canonical literature of the Jewish people (see DEMON, etc.).

5. The Question as to Christ’s Method:

We come at this point upon a most central and difficult problem. It is, of course, alleged that Christ adopted the attitude of concurrence, which was also one of accommodation, in popular views concerning

angels and demons, etc. It is disputed whether this goes back to the essential accommodation involved in the self-limiting of the Incarnation so that as man He should share the views of His contemporaries, or whether, with wider knowledge, He accommodated Himself for pedagogical purposes to erroneous views of the untaught people about Him (see DCG, article "Accommodation"). The question is complicated by our ignorance of the facts. We cannot say that Jesus accommodated Himself to the ignorance of the populace unless we are ready to pronounce authoritatively upon the truth or falseness of the popular theory. It is not our province in this article to enter upon that discussion (see INCARNATION and KENOSIS). We can only point out that the reserve of the New Testament and the absence of all imaginative extravagance shows that if accommodation has been applied it is most strictly limited in its scope. In this it is in harmony with the entire method of Scripture, where the ignorance of men is regarded in the presentation of God's truth, while at the same time their growing minds are protected against the errors which would lead them astray from the direct path of progress into the whole truth reserved in the Divine counsel.

LITERATURE. (a) For the first division of the subject consult standard works on Science of Interpretation and Homiletics sub loc.

(b) For second division, among others, Dr. A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy; Dr. Willis J. Beecher, Prophets and Promise.

(c) For the third division, the most helpful single work is the one quoted: Mozley, Ruling Ideas in Early Ages, published by Longmans as "Old Testament Lectures."

Louis Matthews Sweet

ACCOMPLISH

a-kom'-plish: Richly represented in the Old Testament by seven Hebrew synonyms and in the New Testament by five Greek (the King James Version); signifying in Hebrew

(1) "to complete" (La 4:11);

(2) "to fulfill" (Da 9:2);

(3) "to execute" (1Ki 5:9);

(4) "to set apart" i.e. "consecrate" (Le 22:21);

(5) "to establish" (Jer 44:25 the King James Version);

(6) "to have pleasure in" (Job 14:6);

(7) "to perfect" (Ps 64:6);

in Greek

(1) "to finish" (Ac 21:5);

(2) "to bring to an end" (Heb 9:6);

(3) "to be fulfilled" (Lu 2:6);

(4) "to fill out" (Lu 9:31);

(5) "to complete" (Lu 12:50).

ACCORD; ACCORDING; ACCORDINGLY

a-kord', a-kord'-ing-li: In Old Testament, peh, "mouth," "to fight with one accord" (Jos 9:2) lephi, "according to the mouth of," "according to their families" (Ge 47:12, "acc. to (the number of) their little ones" the Revised Version, margin). In Isa 59:18 the same Hebrew word, ke'al, is rendered "according to" and "accordingly." In New Testament homothumadon, indicative of harmony of mind or action, Acts, 1:14, 2:46, 7:57, 18:12 and kata, of the same mind .... according to Christ Jesus (Ro 15:5); automatos, "of itself," "without constraint," "opened to them of its own accord" (Ac 12:10), i.e. without human agency (compare Le 25:5 the King James Version; Mr 4:28); authairetos, "of his own free choice" (2Co 8:17). God "will render to every man according to his works" (Ro 2:6), that is, agreeably to the nature of his works (1Co 3:8), but salvation is not according to works (2Ti 1:9; Titus 3:5).

See DEED.

M. O. Evans

ACCOS

ak'-os (Hakchos): The grandfather of Eupolemus, whom Judas Maccabeus sent with others to Rome in 161 BC, to negotiate a "league of amity and confederacy" (1 Macc 8:17). The name occurs In the Old Testament as Hakkoz (haqqots), who was a priest in the reign of David (1Ch 24:10).

ACCOUNT

a-kount'. See ACCOUNTABILITY.

ACCOUNTABILITY

a-koun-ta-bil’-i-ti.

1. Scriptural Principles:

The general teaching of Scripture on this subject is summarized in Ro 14:12: "So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God." But this implies, on the one hand, the existence of a Moral Ruler of the universe, whose will is revealed, and, on the other the possession by the creature of knowledge and free will In Ro 4:15 it is expressly laid down that, ‘where no law is, neither is there transgression’; but, lest this might seem to exclude from accountability those to whom the law of Moses was not given, it is shown that even heathen had the law to some extent revealed in conscience; so that they are "without excuse" (Ro 1:20). "For as many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law" (Ro 2:12). So says Paul in a passage which is one of the profoundest discussions on the subject of accountability, and with his sentiment agrees exactly the word of our Lord on the same subject, in Lu 12:47,48: "And that servant, who knew his lord’s will, and made not ready, nor did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes; but he that knew not, and did things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes And to whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required: and to whom they commit much, of him will they ask the more."

There is a gradual development of accountability accompanying the growth of a human being from infancy to maturity; and there is a similar development in the race, as knowledge grows from less to more. In the full light of the gospel human beings are far more responsible than they were in earlier stages of intellectual and spiritual development, and the doom to which they will be exposed on the day of account will be heavy in proportion to their privileges. This may seem to put too great a premium on ignorance; and a real difficulty arises when we say that, the more of moral sensitiveness there is, the greater is the guilt; because as is well known, moral sensitiveness can be lost through persistent disregard of conscience; from which it might seem to follow that the way to diminish guilt was to silence the voice of conscience. There must, however, be a difference between the responsibility of a conscience that has never been enlightened and that of one which, having once been enlightened, has lost, through neglect or recklessness, the goodness once possessed. In the practice of the law, for example, it is often claimed that a crime committed under the influence of intoxication should be condoned; yet everyone must feel how different this is from innocence, and that, before a higher tribunal, the culprit will be held to be twice guilty—first, of the sin of drunkenness and then of the crime.

2. Connection with Immortality:

Wherever civilization is so advanced that there exists a code of public law, with punishments attached to transgression, there goes on a constant education in the sense of accountability; and even the heathen mind, in classical times, had advanced so far as to believe in a judgment beyond the veil, when the

shades had to appear before the tribunal of Rhadamanthus, Minos and AEacus, to have their station and degree in the underworld decided according to the deeds done in the body. How early the Hebrews had made as much progress has to be discussed in connection with the doctrine of immortality; but it is certain that, before the Old Testament canon closed, they believed not only in a judgment after death but in resurrection, by which the sense of accountability was fastened far more firmly on the popular mind. Long before, however, there was awakened by the sacred literature the sense of a judgment of God going on during the present life and expressing itself in everyone's condition.

The history of the world was the Judgment of the world; prosperity attended the steps of the good man, but retribution sooner or later struck down the wicked. It was from the difficulty of reconciling with this belief the facts of life that the skepticism of Hebrew thought arose; but by the same constraint the pious mind was pushed forward in the direction of the full doctrine of immortality. This came with the advent of Him who brought life and immortality to light by His gospel (2Ti 1:10). In the mind of Jesus not only were resurrection, judgment and immortality unquestionable postulates; but He was brought into a special connection with accountability through His consciousness of being the Judge of mankind, and, in His numerous references to the Last Judgment, He developed the principles upon which the conscience will then be tried, and by which accordingly it ought now to try itself. In this connection the Parable of the Talents is of special significance; but it is by the grandiose picture of the scene itself, which follows in the same chapter of the First Gospel, that the mind of Christendom has been most powerfully influenced. Reference has already been made to the discussions at the commencement of the Epistle to the Romans in which our subject finds a place. By some the apostle John has been supposed to revert to the Old Testament notion of a judgment proceeding now in place of coming at the Last Day; but Weiss (Der johanneische Lehrbegriff, II, 9) has proved that this is a mistake.

3. Joint and Corporate Responsibility:

Up to this point we have spoken of individual accountability, but the subject becomes more complicated when we think of the joint responsibility of several or many persons. From the first the human mind has been haunted by what is called the guilt of Adam's first sin. There is a solidarity in the human race, and the inheritance of evil is too obvious to be denied even by the most optimistic. There is far, however, from being agreement of opinion as to the relation of the individual to this evil legacy; some contending fiercely against the idea that the individual can have any personal responsibility for a sin hidden in a past so distant and shadowy, while others maintain that the misery which has certainly been inherited by all can only be justified in a world governed by a God of justice if the guilt of all precedes the misery. The question enters deeply into the Pauline scheme, although at the most critical point it is much disputed what the Apostle's real position is. While joint responsibility burdens the individual conscience, it may, at the same time, be said to lighten it. Thus, in Eze 18 one of the most weighty ethical discussions to be found in Holy Writ is introduced with the popular proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," which proves to be a way of saying that the responsibility of children is lightened, if not abolished, through their connection with their parents. In the same way, at the present time, the sense of responsibility is enfeebled in many minds through the control over character and destroy ascribed to heredity and environment. Even criminality is excused on the ground that many have never had a chance of virtue, and it is contended that to know everything is to forgive everything.

There can be no doubt that, as the agents of trusts and partnerships, men will allow themselves to do what they would never have thought of in private business; and in a crowd the individual sustains psychological modifications by which he is made to act very differently from his ordinary self. In the actions of nations, such as war, there is a vast and solemn responsibility somewhere; but it is often extremely difficult to locate whether in the ruler, the ministry or the people. So interesting and perplexing are such problems often that a morality for bodies of people, as distinguished from individuals, is felt by many to be the great desideratum of ethics at the present time. On this subject something will be found in most of the works on either philosophical or Christian ethics; see especially Lemme's Christliche Ethik, 242 ff.

James Stalker

ACCOZ

ak'-oz (Akbos; the Revised Version (British and American) AKKOS, which see): 1 Esdras 5:38, head of one of the priestly families, which returned from the Exile, but was unable to prove its descent, when the register was searched. See also Ezr 2:61.

ACCURSED

a-kurs'-ed, a-kurst':In the Book of Jos (Jos 6:17,18; 7:1,11,12,13,15) and 1Ch 2:7 "accursed" (or "accursed thing" or "thing accursed") is the King James Version rendering of the Hebrew word, cherem. The the Revised Version (British and American) consistently uses "devoted" or "devoted thing," which the King James Version also adopts in Le 27:21,28,29 and in Nu 18:14. "Cursed thing" is the rendering in two passages (De 7:26; 13:17); and in one passage (Eze 44:29 the King James Version) "dedicated thing" is used. In four places the King James Version renders the word by "curse" (Jos 6:18, Isa 34:5, 43:28, Mal 3:18, 4:6) whilst in, another passage (Zec 14:11) "utter destruction" is adopted in translation. These various renderings are due to the fact that the word cherem sometimes means the act of devoting or banning or the condition or state resulting therefrom and sometimes the object devoted or banned. We occasionally find periphrastic renderings, e.g. 1Sa 15:21: "the chief of the things which should have been utterly destroyed," the King James Version (literally, "the chief part of the ban"); 1Ki 20:42: "a man whom I appointed to utter destruction," the King James Version (literally, "a man of my ban" (or "banning")). The root-word meant "to separate," "shut off." The Arabic charim denoted the precincts of the temple at Mecca, and also the women's apartment (whence the word "harem").

In Hebrew the word always suggested "separating" or "devoting to God." Just as qadhosh, meant "holy" or "consecrated to the service" of Yahweh, and so not liable to be used for ordinary or secular purposes, so the stem of cherem meant "devoting" to Yahweh anything which would, if spared, corrupt or contaminate the religious life of Israel, with the further idea of destroying (things) or exterminating (persons) as the surest way of avoiding such contamination. Everything that might paganize or affect the unique character of the religion of Israel was banned, e.g. idols (De 7:26); idolatrous persons (Ex 22:20);

idolatrous cities (De 13:13-18). All Canaanite towns—where the cult of Baal flourished—were to be banned (De 20:16-18). The ban did not always apply to the gold and silver of looted cities (Jos 6:24). Such valuable articles were to be placed in the "treasury of the house of Yahweh." This probably indicates a slackening of the rigid custom which involved the total destruction of the spoil. According to Nu 18:14, "everything devoted in Israel" belonged to Aaron, and Eze 44:29 the King James Version ordained that "every dedicated thing" should belong to the priests (compare Ezr 10:8). In the New Testament "accursed" is the King James Version rendering of ANATHEMA (which see).

Thomas Lewis

ACCUSER

a-kuz’-er: This word, not found in the Old Testament, is the rendering of two Greek words:

(1) kategoros, that is, a prosecutor, or plaintiff in a lawsuit, or one who speaks in a derogatory way of another (Ac 23:30,35; 25:16,18; Re 12:10);

(2) diabolos, meaning adversary or enemy. This word is rendered "accuser" in the King James Version and "slanderer" in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version (2Ti 3:3; Titus 2:3). According to the rabbinic teaching Satan, or the devil, was regarded as hostile to God and man, and that it was a part of his work to accuse the latter of disloyalty and sin before the tribunal of the former (see Job 1:6 ff; Zec 3:1 f; Re 12:10).

W. W. Davies

ACELDAMA

a-sel’-da-ma. See AKELDAMA.

ACHAIA

a-ka’-ya (Achaia): The smallest country in the Peloponnesus lying along the southern shore of the Corinthian Gulf, north of Arcadia and east of Elis. The original inhabitants were Ionians, but these were crowded out later by the Acheans, who came from the East. According to Herodotus, the former founded twelve cities, many of which retain their original names to this day. These cities were on the coast and formed a confederation of smaller communities, which in the last century of the independent history of Greece attained to great importance (Achaean League). In Roman times the term Achaia was used to include the whole of Greece, exclusive of Thessaly. Today Achaia forms with Elis one district, and contains a population of nearly a quarter of a million. The old Achean League was renewed in 280 BC, but became more important in 251, when Aratus of Sicyon was chosen commander-in-chief. This great man increased the power of the League and gave it an excellent constitution, which our own great

practical politicians, Hamilton and Madison, consulted, adopting many of its prominent devices, when they set about framing the Constitution of the United States. In 146 BC Corinth was destroyed and the League broken up (see 1 Macc 15:23); and the whole of Greece, under the name of Achaia, was transformed into a Roman province, which was divided into two separate provinces, Macedonia and Achaia, in 27 BC.

In Ac 18:12 we are told that the Jews in Corinth made insurrection against Paul when Gallio was deputy of Achaia, and in 18:27 that Apollos was making preparations to set out for Achaia In Ro 16:5, "Achaia" should read "ASIA" as in the Revised Version (British and American). In Ac 20:2 "Greece" means Achaia, but the oft- mentioned "Macedonia and Achaia" generally means the whole of Greece (Ac 19:21; Ro 15:26; 1Th 1:8). Paul commends the churches of Achaia for their liberality (2Co 9:13).

LITERATURE.

See Gerhard, Ueber den Volksstamm der A. (Berlin, 1854); Klatt, Forschungen zur Geschichte des achaischen Bundes (Berlin, 1877); M. Dubois, Les ligues etolienne et acheenne (Paris, 1855); Capes, History of the Achean League (London, 1888); Mahaffy, Problems, 177-86; Busolt, Greek Staatsalter, 2nd edition (1892), 347 ff; Toeppfer, in Pauly's Realencyclopaedie.

For Aratus see Hermann, Staatsalter, 1885; Krakauer, Abhandlung ueber Aratus (Breslau, 1874); Neumeyer, Aratus aus Sikyon (Leipzig, 1886); Holm, History of Greece.

J. E. Harry

ACHAICUS

a-ka'-i-kus (Achaikos, "belonging to Achaia"): A name honorably conferred upon L. Mummius, conqueror of Corinth and Achaia (compare CORINTH). Achaicus was one of the leaders of the Corinthian church (to be inferred from 1Co 16:15 ff) who, visiting Paul at Ephesus with Stephanas and Fortunatus, greatly relieved the Apostle's anxiety for the Corinthian church (compare 1Co 5:1 ff). Paul admonishes the members of the Cor church to submit to their authority (compare 1Th 5:12) and to acknowledge their work (1Co 16:15 ff).

ACHAN

a'-kan ('akhan (in 1Ch 2:7 Achar, 'akhar, "troubler"): The descendant of Zerah the son of Judah who was put to death, in Joshua's time, for stealing some of the "devoted" spoil of the city of Jericho (Jos 7). The stem 'akhan is not used in Hebrew except in this name. The stem 'akhar has sufficient use to define it. It denotes trouble of the most serious kind—Jacob's trouble when his sons had brought him into blood feud with his Canaanite neighbors, or Jephthah's trouble when his vow required him to sacrifice his daughter (Ge 34:30; Jud 11:35). In Pr 11:17,29; 15:6,27) the word is used with intensity to describe the results of cruelty, disloyalty, greed, wickedness. The record especially speaks of Achan's conduct as

the troubling of Israel (1Ch 2:7; Jos 6:18; 7:24). In an outburst of temper Jonathan speaks of Saul as having troubled the land (1Sa 14:29). Elijah and Ahab accuse each the other of being the troubler of Israel (1Ki 18:17,18). The stem also appears in the two proper names ACHOR and OCHRAN (which see).

The crime of Achan was a serious one. Quite apart from all questions of supposable superstition, or even religion, the cherem concerning Jericho had been proclaimed, and to disobey the proclamation was disobedience to military orders in an army that was facing the enemy. It is commonly held that Achan's family were put to death with him, though they were innocent; but the record is not explicit on these points. One whose habits of thought lead him to expect features of primitive savagery in such a case as this will be sure to find what he expects; a person of different habits will not be sure that the record says that any greater cruelty was practiced on the family of Achan than that of compelling them to be present at the execution. Those who hold that the Deuteronomic legislation comes in any sense from Moses should not be in haste to think that its precepts were violated by Joshua in the case of Achan (see De 24:16). The record says that the execution took place in the arable valley of Achor, up from the Jordan valley. See ACHOR.

Willis J. Beecher

ACHAR

a'-kar: Variant of ACHAN, which see.

ACHAZ

a'-kaz (Achaz), the King James Version (Mt 1:9): Greek form of Ahaz (thus the Revised Version (British and American)). The name of a King of Israel.

ACHBOR

ak'-bor ('akhbor, "mouse"):

(1) The father of Baal-hanan, who was the seventh of the eight kings who reigned in Edom before there were kings in Israel (Ge 36:38,39; 1Ch 1:49).

(2) The son of Micaiah (called in Chronicles Abdon the son of Micah) who went with Hilkiah the priest and other high officials, at the command of King Josiah, to consult Huldah the prophetess concerning the book that had been found (2Ki 22:12,14; 2Ch 34:20).

It may be presumed that this Achbor is also the man mentioned in Jer 26:22; 36:12, as the father of Elnathan, who went to Egypt for King Jehoiakim in order to procure the extradition of Uriah the

prophet, and who protested against the burning of Baruch’s roll.

Willis J. Beecher

ACHIACHARUS

a-ki-ak’-a-rus (Codex Vaticanus Achiacharos; Acheicharos): Governor of Assyria. Achiacharus is the son of Anael, a brother of Tobit (Tobit 1:21). Sarchedonus (Esarhaddon), the king of Assyria, appointed him over all "accounts of his kingdom" and over all "his affairs" (Tobit 1:21 f; compare Da 2:48). At his request Tobit comes to Nineveh (Tobit 1:22). Achiacharus nourishes Tobit, while the latter is afflicted with disease (Tobit 2:10). He attends the wedding-feast of Tobias (Tobit 11:18). Is persecuted by Aman, but saved (Tobit 14:10).

ACHIAS

a-ki’-as: An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2). Omitted in other genealogies.

ACHIM

a’-kim (Acheim): A descendant of Zerubbabel and ancestor of Jesus, mentioned only in Mt 1:14.

ACHIOR

a’-ki-or (Achior): General of the Ammonites, who spoke in behalf of Israel before Holofernes, the Assyrian general (Judith 5:5 ff). Holofernes ordered him bound and delivered at Bethulia to the Israelites (Judith 6), who received him gladly and with honor. Afterward he became a proselyte, was circumcised, and joined to Israel (Judith 14). In Nu 34:27 it is the Septuagint reading for Ahihud, and in the Hebrew would be ‘achi’or, "brother of light."

ACHIPHA

ak’-i-fa; the King James Version Acipha, as’-i-fa (Achipha), in the Apocrypha (1 Esdras 5:31) head of one of the families of the temple-servants, who returned with Zerubbabel, same as the Old Testament HAKUPHA (Ezr 2:51; Ne 7:53), which see.

ACHISH

a’-kish (’akhish): King of the city of Gath in the days of David. His father’s name is given as Maoch (1Sa 27:2), and Maacah (1Ki 2:39). David sought the protection of Achish when he first fled from Saul, and just after his visit to Nob (1Sa 21:10-15). Fearing rough treatment or betrayal by Achish, he feigned

madness. But this made him unwelcome, whereupon he fled to the Cave of Adullam (1Sa 22:1). Later in his fugitive period David returned to Gath to be hospitably received by Achish (1Sa 27:1 ff), who gave him the town of Ziklag for his home. A year later, when the Philistines invaded the land of Israel, in the campaign which ended so disastrously for Saul (1Sa 31), Achish wished David to participate (1Sa 28:1-2), but the lords of the Philistines objected so strenuously, when they found him and his men with the forces of Achish, that Achish was compelled to send them back. Achish must have been a young man at this time, for he was still ruling forty years later at the beginning of Solomon's reign (1Ki 2:39). He is mentioned as Abimelech in the title of Ps 34. See ABIMELECH.

Edward Mack

ACHITOB

ak'-i-tob: Same as Ahitob. Used in 1 Esdras 8:2; compare 2 Esdras 1:1 the King James Version. See AHITUB 3.

ACHMETHA

ak'-me-tha (Ezr 6:2; 'achmetha'; Septuagint Amatha; Peshitta achmathan; in Tiglath Pileser's inscription circa 1100 BC Amadana: in Darius' Behistun Inscr., II, 76-78, Hangmatana =" Place of Assembly"; Agbatana, in Herodotus; Ekbatana, Xenophon, etc.; so 1 Esdras 6:23; Tobit 3:7; 6:5; 7:1; 14:12,14; Judith 1:1,2,14; 2 Macc 9:3; Talmud hamdan; now hamadan).

1. Location:

This, the ancient capital of Media, stood (lat 34 degrees 50' North—long. 48 degrees 32' East) near the modern Hamadan, 160 miles West-Southwest of Tehran, almost 6,000 feet above the sea, circa 1 1/2 miles from the foot of Mt. Orontes (Alvand).

2. History:

It was founded or rebuilt by Deiokes (Dayaukku) about 700 BC on the site of Ellippi an ancient city of the Manda, and captured by Cyrus 549 BC who brought Croesus there as captive (Herodotus i.153). It was the capital of the 10th Nome under Darius I. Cyrus and other Persian kings used to spend the two summer months there yearly, owing to the comparative coolness of the climate. Herodotus describes it as a magnificent city fortified with seven concentric walls (i.98). Its citadel (biretha', Ezr 6:2, wrongly rendered "palace" in the Revised Version (British and American)) is mentioned by Arrian, who says that, when Alexander took the city in 324 BC, he there stored his enormous booty. In it the royal archives were kept. It stood on a hill, where later was built a temple of Mithra. Polybius (x.27) speaks of the great strength of the citadel.

Though the city was unwalled in his time, he can hardly find words to express his admiration for it,

especially for the magnificent royal palace, nearly 7 stadia in circumference, built of precious kinds of wood sheathed in plates of grid and silver. In the city was the shrine of Aine (Nanaea, Anahita?). Alexander is said to have destroyed a temple of AEsculapius (Mithra?) there. Diodorus tells us the city was 250 stadia in circumference. On Mt. Alvand (10,728 feet) there have been found inscriptions of Xerxes. Doubtless Ecbatana was one of the "cities of the Medes" to which Israel was carried captive (2Ki 17:6). It should be noted that Greek writers mention several other Ecbatanas. One of these, afterward called Gazaca (Takhti Sulaiman, a little South of Lake Urmi, lat. 36 degrees 28' North, long. 47 degrees 9' East) was capital of Atropatene. It was almost destroyed by the Mughuls in the 12th century. Sir H. Rawlinson identifies the Ecbatana of Tobit and Herodotus with this northern city. The southern and far more important Ecbatana which we have described is certainly that of 2 Macc 9:3. It was Cyrus' Median capital, and is doubtless that of Ezr 6:2. Classical writers spoke erroneously of Ecbatana (for Ecbatana) as moderns too often do of Hamadan for Hamadan.

3. Present Condition:

Hamadan has perhaps never fully recovered from the fearful massacre made there in 1220 AD by the Mongols, but its population is about 50,000, including a considerable number of descendants of the Israelites of the Dispersion (tracing descent from Asher, Naphtali, etc.). They point to the tombs of Esther and Mordecai in the neighborhood. It is a center for the caravan trade between Baghdad and Tehran. There is an American Presbyterian mission at work. Authorities (besides those quoted above): Ctesias, Curtius, Amm. Marcellinus, Pausanias, Strabo, Diod. Siculus; Ibnu'l Athir, Yaqut, Jahangusha, Jami'u't Tawarikh, and modern travelers.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

ACHO

ak'-o. See ACCO.

ACHOR

a'-kor ('akhor, "trouble," the idea of the word being that of trouble which is serious and extreme. See ACHAN): The place where Achan was executed in the time of Joshua (Jos 7:24,26). In all the five places where it is mentioned it is described as the 'emek, the arable valley of Achor. There is no ground in the record for the current idea that it must have been a locality with horrid and dismal physical features. It was on a higher level than the camp of Israel in the Jordan valley, and on a lower level than Debir—a different Debir from that of Jos 15:15. In a general way, as indicated by the points mentioned in the border of Judah, it was north of Betharabah, and south of Debir (Jos 7:24; 15:7). Many identify it with the Wady Kelt which descends through a deep ravine from the Judean hills and runs between steep banks south of the modern Jericho to Jordan, the stream after rams becoming a foaming torrent. Possibly the name may have been applied to a region of considerable extent. In Isa 65:10 it is a region on the east side of the mountain ridge which is in some sense balanced with Sharon on the west side. By implication

the thing depicted seems to be these rich agricultural localities so far recovered from desolation as to be good grounds for cattle and sheep. Hosea recognizes the comforting aspect of the dreadful affair in the valley of Achor; it was a doorway of hope to pardoned Israel (Ho 2:15 (17)), and he hopes for like acceptance for the Israel of his own day.

Willis J. Beecher

ACHSA

ak’-sa: Used in the King James Version in 1Ch 2:49 for ACHSAH, which see.

ACHSAH

ak’-sa (‘akhchah; in some copies ‘akhca’ in 1Ch 2:49), ("anklet"): The daughter of Caleb whom he gave in marriage to his younger kinsman Othniel the son of Kenaz, as a reward for smiting Kiriath-sepher (Jos 15:16 ff; Jud 1:12 ff). Caleb, the narrative says, established Achsah in the South-country, and in addition, at her asking, gave her certain important springs of water—the "upper basins" and the "nether basins." Professor G. F. Moore identifies these with the groups of springs in Seit ed-Dilbeh (notes on Jud in Polychrome Bible).

Willis J. Beecher

ACHSHAPH

ak’-shaf (’akhshaph, "sorcery," or "fascination"): A city in the northern part of the territory conquered by Joshua. The king of Achshaph was a member of the coalition against Israel under Jabin and Sisera. It is mentioned with Hazor, Megiddo, Taanach, etc., in the list of conquered kings. It is one of the cities marking the boundaries of the tribe of Asher (Jos 11:1; 12:20; 19:25). Several attempts have been made to identify the site of it, but explorers are not agreed as to the identification.

ACHZIB

ak’-zib (’akhzibh, "lying" or "disappointing"): The name of two towns in Palestine:

(1) A town in western Judah in the lowlands, mentioned in connection with Mareshah and Keilah as one of the cities allotted to Judah (Jos 15:44), and in Mic (1:14), where it suggests play upon its meaning, "deceptive" or "failing," possibly the place having received its name from a winter spring or brook, which failed in summer. It is also called Chezib (kezibh (Ge 38:5)), where Judah was at the time of the birth of his son Shelah. In 1Ch 4:22 it is called Cozeba, the King James Version "Chozeba" (kozebha’), clearly seen to be the same as Achzib, from the places with which it is grouped.

(2) It has been identified with the modern ‘Ayin-Kezbeh in the valley of Elah, and north of Adullam.

Edward Mack

(3) Mod Zib Septuagint variously: Jos 19:29, Codex Vaticanus, Echozob, Codex Alexandrinus, Achzeiph; Jud 1:31, Codex Vaticanus, Aschazei, Codex Alexandrinus, Aschendei, Greek Ecdippa: A small town some miles north of Acre on the coast. It is mentioned in Jos 19:29 as falling within the possessions of the tribe of Asher, but they never occupied it, as they did not the neighboring Acre (Acco). The Phoenician inhabitants of the coast were too strongly entrenched to be driven out by a people who had no fleet. The cities on the coast doubtless aided one another, and Sidon had become rich and powerful before this and could succor such a small town in case of attack. Achzib was a coast town, nine miles north of Acco, now known as Ez-Zib. It appears in the Assyrian inscriptions as Aksibi and Sennacherib enumerates it among the Phoenician towns that he took at the same times as Acco (702 BC). It was never important and is now an insignificant village among the sand dunes of the coast. It was the bordertown of Galilee on the west, what lay beyond being unholy ground.

H. Porter

ACIPHA

as’-i-fa. See ACHIPHA.

ACITHO; ACITHOH

as’-i-tho (variant of AHITUB): The name in the King James Version of an ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

ACKNOWLEDGE

ak-nol’-ej (gignosko): To declare that one recognizes the claims of a person or thing fully established. Both in Old Testament and New Testament expressed by various forms of the word "know" (Pr 3:6; Isa 61:9; Col 2:2 the King James Version). The Psalmist (Ps 32:5) "acknowledged" his sin, when he told God that he knew the guilt of what he had done. The Corinthians (2Co 1:14) "acknowledged" Paul and his companions when they formally recognized their claims and authority.

ACQUAINT; ACQUAINTANCE

a-kwant’, a-kwan’-tans (gnostoi): Terms referring to various degrees of knowledge, but implying more or less detailed information; applied to God’s omniscience (Ps 139:3), to the grief of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh (Isa 53:3), and to the knowledge which man should have of God. The noun in the concrete, unless limited by a qualifying term, means more than one who has been known simply in

passing, and implies a degree of intimacy, as may be seen in Lu 2:44; 23:49; 2Ki 12:5.

H. E. Jacobs

ACRA

ak’-ra, a’-kra (1 Macc 1:33 the Revised Version (British and American), "citadel"). See JERUSALEM.

ACRABATTENE

ak-ra-ba-te’-ne. See AKRABATTINE (in the Apocrypha).

ACRABBIM

ak-rab’-im: Incorrect transliteration of ‘aqrabbim, of Jos 15:3 in the King James Version. See AKRABBIM.

ACRE (1)

a’-ker, a’-ker. See ACCO.

ACRE (2)

a’-ker (tsemedh): A term of land-measurement used twice in the English versions of the Bible (Isa 5:10; 1Sa 14:14), and said to be the only term in square measure found in the Old Testament. The English word "acre" originally signified field. Then it came to denote the measure of land that an ox team could plow in a day, and upon the basis of a maximum acre of this kind the standard acre of 160 square rods (with variations in different regions) was fixed. The Hebrew word translated acre denotes a yoke of animals, in the sense of a team, a span, a pair; it is never used to denote the yoke by which the team are coupled together. The phrase ‘ten yokes of vineyard’ (Isa 5:10) may naturally mean vineyard covering as much land as a team would plow in ten days, though other plausible meanings can also be suggested. In 1Sa 14:14 the same word is used in describing the limits of space within which Jonathan and his armor-bearer slew twenty Philistines. The translation of the Revised Version (British and American), "within as it were half a furrow’s length in an acre of land," means, strictly, that they were slain along a line from two to twenty rods in length. The word rendered "furrow," used only here and in Ps 129:3, is in Brown’s Hebrew Lexicon defined as "plowing-ground." This gives the rendering "as it were in half a plowing-stint, a yoke of ground," the last two phrases defining each the other, so that the meaning is substantially that of the paraphrase in the King James Version. There is here an alleged obscurity and uncertainty in the text, but it is not such as to affect either the translation or the nature of the event.

Willis J. Beecher

ACROSTIC

a-kros'-tik: The acrostic, understood as a short poem in which the first letters of the lines form a word, or name, or sentence, has not yet been proved to occur in ancient Hebrew literature. The supposed examples found by some scholars in Ps 2:1-4 and Ps 110:1-4 are not generally recognized. Still less can be said in favor of the suggestion that in Es 1:20 four words read from left to right form by their initials an acrostic on the name YHWH (compare Konig, Einleitung 293). In Byzantine hymn-poetry the term acrostichis with which our word "acrostic" is connected was also used of alphabetical poems, that is poems the lines or groups of lines in which have their initials arranged in the order of the alphabet. Acrostics of this kind are found in pre-Christian Hebrew literature as well as elsewhere in ancient oriental literature. There are twelve clear instances in the Old Testament: Psalms 25; 34; 37; 111 f; 119; 145; Pr 31:10-31, and La 1-4. There is probably an example in Psalms 9 and 10, and possibly another in Nab 1:2-10. Outside the Canon, Sirach 51:13-30 exhibits clear traces of alphabetic arrangement. Each of these fifteen poems must briefly be discussed.

Pss 9 and 10, which are treated as one psalm in Septuagint and Vulg, give fairly clear indications of original alphabetic structure even in the Massoretic Text. The initials of 9:1,3,5 are respectively 'aleph, beth, gimel; of 9:9,11,13,15,17 waw, zayin, cheth, Teth and yodh. Ps 10:1 begins with lamedh and 10:12,14,15,17 with qoph, resh, shin and taw. Four lines seem to have been allotted to each letter in the original form of the poem. In Ps 25 all the letters are represented except waw and qoph. In 25:18 we find resh instead of the latter as well as in its place in 25:19. In 25:2 the alphabetical letter is the initial of the second word. The last verse is again supernumerary. There are mostly two lines to a letter. In Ps 34 all the letters are represented except waw, 34:6 beginning not with it, as was to be expected, but with zayin. The last verse is again a supernumerary. Since here and in 25:22 the first word is a form of padhah it has been suggested that there may have been here a sort of acrostic on the writer's name Pedahel pedhah'el, but there is no evidence that a psalmist so named ever existed. There are two lines to a letter. In Ps 37 all the letters are represented except 'ayin which seems however from Septuagint to have been present in the earliest text. As a rule four lines are assigned to each letter. In Psalms 111 f are found two quite regular examples with a line to each letter. Ps 119 offers another regular example, but with 16 lines to a letter, each alternate line beginning with its letter. Vs 1-8, for instance, each begin with 'aleph. In Ps 145 are found all the letters but nun. As we find in Septuagint between 145:13 and 14, that is where the nun couplet ought to be:

"Faithful is the Lord in his words And holy in his works,"

which may represent a Hebrew couplet beginning with nun, it would seem that a verse has dropped out of the Massoretic Text. Pr 31:10-31 constitutes a regular alphabetical poem with (except in 31:15) two lines to a letter. La 1 is regular, with three lines to a letter La 2; 3; 4, are also regular with a curious exception. In each case pe precedes 'ayin, a phenomenon which has not yet been explained. In La 2 there are three or four lines to a letter except in 2:17, where there seem to be five. In La 3 also there are three lines to a letter and each line begins with that letter. In La 4 there are two lines to a letter except in

4:22 where there are probably four lines. La 5 has twice as many lines as the letters of the alphabet but no alphabetical arrangement. In Nab 1:1-10 ff Delitzsch (following Frohnmeyer) in 1876, Bickell in 1880 and 1894, Gunkel in 1893 and 1895, G. B. Gray in 1898 (Expos, September) and others have pointed out possible traces of original alphabetical structure. In the Massoretic text, however, as generally arranged, it is not distinctly discernible. Sirach 51:13-30: As early as 1882 Bickell reconstructed this hymn on the basis of the Greek and Syriac versions as a Hebrew alphabetical poem. In 1897 Schechter (in the judgment of most scholars) discovered the original text in a collection of fragments from the Genizah of Cairo, and this proved the correctness of Bickell's idea and even the accuracy of some details of his reconstruction. The poem begins with 'aleph and has tav as the initial letter of the last line but one. In 51:21,22,24,25,26,27 the letters mem, nun, 'ayin, pe, tsadhe, qoph and resh can be traced at the beginnings of lines in that order Samekh is absent (compare Schechter-Taylor, The Wisdom of Ben Sira, lxxvi-lxxxvii).

As this rapid survey will have shown, this form of acrostic as employed by Hebrew writers consisted in the use of letters of the alphabet as initials in their order, at regular intervals, the distance between two different letters ranging from one to sixteen lines. Once each letter is thus used three times, in another case eight times. The corruption of the text has in some cases led to considerable interference with the alphabetical arrangement, and textual criticism has endeavored to restore it with varying success.

These alphabetical poems have been unduly depreciated on account of their artificial structure and have also been regarded for the same reason as of comparatively late origin. This latter conclusion is premature with present evidence. The poems in La undoubtedly go back as far as the 6th century BC, and Assyrian testimony takes us back farther still for acrostic poems of some kind. Strictly alphabetical poems are of course out of the question in Assyrian because of the absence of an alphabet, but there are texts from the library of Ashur-bani-pal each verse-line in which begins with the same syllable, and others in which the initial syllables read together compose a word or sentence. Now these texts were written down in the 7th century BC, but may have been copied from far earlier Babylonian originals. There can be little doubt that oriental poets wrote acrostic at an early period, and therefore the use of some form of the acrostic is no clear indication of lateness of date. (For these Assyrian acrostics compare Weber, Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer, 37.)

LITERATURE.

In addition to authorities already cited: Konig, Einl, 58, 66, 74, 76, 399, 404, 419, and Stilistik, etc., 357 ff, Budde, Geschichte der alt-hebraischen Litteratur, 30, 90, 241, 291; article "Acrostic" in HDB (larger and smaller) and Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, and Jewish Encyclopedia; commentaries on Ps, Nah, Pr and Lam; Driver, Parallel Psalter; King, Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews, chapter iv.

William Taylor Smith

ACTS OF PILATE

pi’-lat, pi’-lat. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

ACTS OF SOLOMON

"The book of the acts of Solomon" (1Ki 11:41), probably a history based on the state documents kept by the official recorder. See 1Ki 14:19,29; 15:23,31; 16:5,14,20,27; 22:39,45, etc.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 1-7

a-pos’-ls: I. TITLE II. TEXT III. UNITY OF THE BOOK IV. THE AUTHOR V. CANONICITY VI. DATE VII. SOURCES USED BY LUKE VIII. THE SPEECHES IN THE ACTS IX. RELATION OF ACTS TO THE EPISTLES X. CHRONOLOGY OF ACTS XI. HISTORICAL WORTH OF ACTS XII. PURPOSE OF THE BOOK XIII. ANALYSIS LITERATURE

I. Title.

It is possible, indeed probable, that the book originally had no title. The manuscripts give the title in several forms. Aleph (in the inscription) has merely "Acts" (Praxeis). So Tischendorf, while Origen, Didymus, Eusebius quote from "The Acts." But BD Aleph (in subscription) have "Ac of Apostles" or "The Ac of the Apostles" (Praxeis Apostolon). So Westcott and Hort, Nestle (compare Athanasius and Euthalius). Only slightly different is the title in 31,61, and many other cursives (Praxeis ton Apostolon, "Ac of the Apostles"). So Griesbach, Scholz. Several fathers (Clement of Alex, Origen, Dionysius of Alex, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom) quote it as "The Ac of the Apostles" (Hai Praxeis ton Apostolon). Finally A2 EGH give it in the form "Ac of the Holy Apostles" (Praxeis ton Hagion Apostolon). The Memphitic version has "The Ac of the Holy Apostles." Clearly, then, there was no single title that commanded general acceptance.

II. Text.

(1) The chief documents. These are the Primary Uncials (Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, Codex Bezae), Codex Laudianus (E) which is a bilingual Uncial confined to Acts, later Uncials like Codex Modena, Codex Regius, Codex the Priestly Code (P), the Cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshitta and the Harclean Syriac and quotations from the Fathers. We miss the Curetonian and Syriac Sinaiticus, and have only fragmentary testimony from the Old Latin. (2) The modern editions of Ac present the types of text (Textus Receptus; the Revised Version (British and American); the critical text like that of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek or Nestle or Weiss or von Soden). These three types do not correspond with the four classes of text (Syrian, Western, Alexandrian, Neutral) outlined by Hort in his Introduction to the New Testament in Greek (1882). These four classes are broadly represented in the documents which give us Acts. But no modern editor of the Greek New Testament has given us the Western or the Alexandrian type of text, though Bornemann, as will presently be shown, argues for the originality of the Western type in Acts. But the Textus Receptus

of the New Testament (Stephanus' 3rd edition in 1550) was the basis of the King James Version of 1611. This edition of the Greek New Testament made use of a very few manuscripts, and all of them late, except Codex Bezae, which was considered too eccentric to follow. Practically, then, the King James Version represents the Syriac type of text which may have been edited in Antioch in the 4th century. Various minor errors may have crept in since that date, but substantially the Syriac recension is the text of the King James Version today. Where this text stands alone, it is held by nearly all modern scholars to be in error, though Dean Burgon fought hard for the originality of the Syriac text (The Revision Revised, 1882). The text of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek is practically that of Codex Vaticanus, which is held to be the Neutral type of text. Nestle, von Soden, Weiss do not differ greatly from the text of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, though von Soden and Weiss attack the problem on independent lines. The text of the Revised Version (British and American) is in a sense a compromise between that of the King James Version and the critical text, though coming pretty close to the critical text. Compare Whitney, The Reviser's Greek Text, 1892. For a present-day appreciation of this battle of the texts see J. Rendel Harris, Side Lights on the New Testament, 1908. For a detailed comparison between the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Ac see Rackham, The Ac of the Apostles, xxii.

(3) In Ac the Western type of text has its chief significance. It is the meet of the late Friedrich Blass, the famous classicist of Germany, to have shown that in Luke's writings (Gospel and Acts) the Western class (especially D) has its most marked characteristics. This fact is entirely independent of theory advanced by Blass which will be cussed directly. The chief modern revolt against theories of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek is the new interest felt in the value of the Western type of text. In particular Codex Bezae has come to the front in the Book of Acts. The feeble support that Codex Bezae has in its peculiar readings in Ac (due to absence of Curetonian Syriac and of the Old Latin) makes it difficult always to estimate the value of this document. But certainly these readings deserve careful consideration, and some of them may be correct, whatever view one holds of the Codex Bezae text. The chief variations are, as is usual with the Western text, additions and paraphrases. Some of the prejudice against Codex Bezae has disappeared as a result of modern discussion.

(4) Bornemann in 1848 argued that Codex Bezae in Ac represented the original text. But he has had very few followers.

(5) J. Rendel Harris (1891) sought to show that Codex Bezae (itself a bilingual MS) had been Latinized. He argued that already in 150 AD a bilingual manuscript existed. But this theory has not won a strong following.

(6) Chase (1893) sought to show that the peculiarities were due to translation from the Syriac.

(7) Blass in 1895 created a sensation by arguing in his Commentary on Ac (Acta Apostolorum, 24 ff) that Luke had issued two editions of the Acts, as he later urged about the Gospel of Luke (Philology of the Gospels, 1898). In 1896 Blass published this Roman form of the text of Ac (Acta Apostolorum, secundum Formam quae videtur Romanam). Blass calls this first, rough, unabridged copy of Ac (beta)

and considers that it was issued at Rome. The later edition, abridged and revised, he calls alpha. Curiously enough, in Ac 11:28, Codex Bezae has "when we had gathered together," making Luke present at Antioch. The idea of two editions is not wholly original with Blass. Leclerc, a Dutch philologist, had suggested the notion as early as the beginning of the 18th century. Bishop Lightfoot had also mentioned it (On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament, 29). But Blass worked the matter out and challenged the world of scholarship with his array of arguments. He has not carried his point with all, though he has won a respectable following. Zahn (Einl, II, 338 ff, 1899) had already been working toward the same view (348). He accepts in the main Blass' theory, as do Belser, Nestle, Salmon, Zockler. Blass acknowledges his debt to Corssen (Der cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum, 1892), but Corssen considers the alpha text as the earlier and the beta text as a later revision.

(8) Hilgenfeld (Acta Apostolorum, etc., 1899) accepts the notion of two edd, but denies identity of authorship.

(9) Schmiedel (Encyclopedia Biblica) vigorously and at much length attacks Blass' position, else "the conclusions reached in the foregoing sections would have to be withdrawn." He draws his conclusions and then demolishes Blass! He does find weak spots in Blass' armor as others have done (B. Weiss, Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte, 1897; Page, Class. Rev., 1897; Harnack, The Ac of the Apostles, 1909, 45). See also Knowling, The Ac of the Apostles, 1900, 47, for a sharp indictment of Blass' theory as being too simple and lacking verification.

(10) Harnack (The Ac of the Apostles, 48) doubts if Luke himself formally published the book. He thinks that he probably did not give the book a final revision, and that friends issued two or more editions He considers that the so- called beta recension has a "series of interpolations" and so is later than the alpha text.

(11) Ramsay (The Church in the Roman Empire, 150; Paul the Traveler, 27; The Expositor, 1895) considers the beta text to be a 2nd-century revision by a copyist who has preserved some very valuable 2nd-century testimony to the text.

(12) Headlam (HDB) does not believe that the problem has as yet been scientifically attacked, but that the solution lies in the textual license of scribes of the Western type (compare Hort, Introduction, 122 ff). But Headlam is still shy of "Western" readings. The fact is that the Western readings are sometimes correct as against the Neutral (compare Mt 27:49). It is not necessary in Ac 11:20 to say that Hellenas is in Western authorities (AD, etc.) but is not a Western reading. It is at any rate too soon to say the final word about the text of Acts, though on the whole the alpha text still holds the field as against the beta text. The Syriac text is, of course, later, and out of court.

III. Unity of the Book.

It is not easy to discuss this question, apart from that of authorship. But they are not exactly the same. One may be convinced of the unity of the book and yet not credit it to Luke, or, indeed, to anyone in the

1st century. Of course, if Luke is admitted to be the author of the book, the whole matter is simplified. His hand is in it all whatever sources he used. If Luke is not the author, there may still have been a competent historian at work, or the book may be a mere compilation. The first step, therefore, is to attack the problem of unity. Holtzmann (Einl, 383) holds Luke to be the author of the "we" sections only. Schmiedel denies that the Ac is written by a companion of Paul, though it is by the same author as the Gospel bearing Luke's name. In 1845 Schleiermacher credited the "we" sections to Timothy, not to Luke. For a good sketch of theories of "sources," see Knowling on Acts, 25 ff. Van Manen (1890) resolved the book into two parts, Acta Petri and Acta Pauli, combined by a redactor. Sorof (1890) ascribes one source to Luke, one to Timothy. Spitta also has two sources (a Pauline-Lukan and a Jewish-Christian) worked over by a redactor.

Clemen (1905) has four sources (History of the Hellenists, History of Peter, History of Paul, and a Journey of Paul), all worked over by a series of editors. Hilgenfeld (1895) has three sources (Ac of Peter, Ac of the Seven, Ac of Paul). Jungst (1895) has a Pauline source and a Petrine source J. Weiss (1893) admits sources, but claims that the book has unity and a definite aim. B. Weiss (1902) conceives an early source for the first part of the book. Harnack (The Ac of the Apostles, 1909, 41 f) has small patience with all this blind criticism: "With them the book passes as a comparatively late patchwork compilation, in which the part taken by the editor is insignificant yet in all cases detrimental; the 'we' sections are not the property of the author, but an extract from a source, or even a literary fiction." He charges the critics with "airy conceit and lofty contempt." Harnack has done a very great service in carefully sifting the matter in his Luke the Physician (1907). He gives detailed proof that the "we" sections are in the same style and by the same author as the rest of the book (26-120). Harnack does not claim originality in this line of argument:

"It has been often stated and often proved that the 'we' sections in vocabulary, in syntax, and in style are most intimately bound up with the whole work, and that this work itself including the Gospel, in spite of all diversity in its parts, is distinguished by a grand unity of literary form" (Luke the Physician, 26). He refers to the "splendid demonstration of this unity" by Klostermann (Vindiciae Lucanae, 1866), to B. Weiss, who, in his commentary (1893, 2 Aufl, 1902) "has done the best work in demonstrating the literary unity of the whole work," to "the admirable contributions" of Vogel (Zur Charakteristik des Lukas, etc., 2 Aufl, 1899) to the "yet more careful and minute investigations" of Hawkins (Horae Synopticae, 1899, 2nd edition, 1909), to the work of Hobart (The Medical Language of Luke, 1882), who "has proved only too much" (Luke the Physician, 175), but "the evidence is of overwhelming force" (198). Harnack only claims for himself that he has done the work in more detail and with more minute accuracy without claiming too much (27). But the conversion of Harnack to this view of Ac is extremely significant. It ought not to be necessary any more to refute the partition theories of the book, or to set forth in detail the proofs for the unity of the book.

Perhaps the compilation theory of Ac is nowhere set forth more cogently than in McGiffert's The Apostolic Age (1897). See a powerful refutation of his argument by Ramsay in Pauline and Other Studies (1906, 302-21). "I think his clever argumentation is sophistical" (305). Harnack is fully aware that he has gone over to the rode of "Ramsay, Weiss and Zahn": "The results at which I have arrived not only approach very nearly to, but are often coincident with, the results of their research" (The Ac of the

Apostles, 302). He is afraid that if these scholars failed to get the ear of critics "there is little prospect of claiming the attention of critics and compelling them to reconsider their position." But he has the advantage of coming to this conclusion from the other side. Moreover, if Harnack was won by the force of the facts, others may be. This brief sketch of Harnack's experience may take the place of detailed presentation of the arguments for the unity of the book. Harnack sets forth in great wealth of detail the characteristic idioms of the "we" sections side by side with parallels in other parts of Ac and the Gospel of Luke. The same man wrote the rest of Ac who wrote the "we" sections. This fact should now be acknowledged as proven. This does not mean that the writer, a personal witness in the "we" sections, had no sources for the other parts of Acts. This aspect of the matter will be considered a little later.

IV. The Author.

Assuming the unity of the book, the argument runs as follows: The author was a companion of Paul. The "we" sections prove that (Ac 16:10-17; 20:6-16; 21; 27; 28). These sections have the fullness of detail and vivid description natural to an eye-witness. This companion was with Paul in the second missionary journey at Troas and at Philippi, joined Paul's party again at Philippi on the return to Jerusalem during the third tour, and probably remained with Paul till he went to Rome. Some of Paul's companions came to him at Rome: others are so described in the book as to preclude authorship. Aristarchus, Aquila and Priscilla, Erastus, Gaius, Mark, Silas, Timothy, Trophimus, Tychicus and others more or less insignificant from the point of view of connection with Paul (like Crescens, Demas, Justus, Linus, Pudens, Sopater, etc.) are easily eliminated. Curiously enough Luke and Titus are not mentioned in Ac by name at all. They are distinct persons as is stated in 2Ti 4:10 f. Titus was with Paul in Jerusalem at the conference (Ga 2:1) and was his special envoy to Corinth during the time of trouble there. (2Co 2:1, 12:18.)

He was later with Paul in Crete (Titus 1:5). But the absence of mention of Titus in Ac may be due to the fact that he was a brother of Luke (compare 2Co 8:18; 12:18). So A. Souter in DCG, article "Luke." If Luke is the author, it is easy to understand why his name does not appear. If Titus is his brother, the same explanation occurs. As between Luke and Titus the medical language of Ac argues for Luke. The writer was a physician. This fact Hobart (The Medical Language of Luke, 1882) has demonstrated. Compare Zahn, Einl, 2, 435 ff; Harnack's Luke the Physician, 177 ff. The arguments from the use of medical terms are not all of equal weight. But the style is colored at points by the language of a physician. The writer uses medical terms in a technical sense. This argument involves a minute comparison with the writings of physicians of the time. Thus in Ac 28:3 f kathapto, according to Hobart (288), is used in the sense of poisonous matter invading the body, as in Dioscorides, Animal. Ven. Proem. So Galen, De Typis 4 (VII, 467), uses it "of fever fixing on parts of the body." Compare Harnack, Luke the Physician, 177 f. Harnack agrees also that the terms of the diagnosis in Ac 28:8 "are medically exact and can be vouched for from medical literature" (ibid., 176 f). Hobart has overdone his argument and adduced many examples that are not pertinent, but a real residuum remains, according to Harnack. Then pimprasthai is a technical term for swelling. Let these serve as examples. The interest of the writer in matters of disease is also another indication, compare Lu 8:43. Now Luke was a companion of Paul during his later ministry and was a physician. (Col 4:14). Hence, he fulfils all the requirements of the case. The argument thus far is only probable, it is true; but there is to be added the undoubted fact

that the same writer wrote both Gospel and Ac (Ac 1:1). The direct allusion to the Gospel is reinforced by identity of style and method in the two books.

The external evidence is clear on the matter. Both Gospel and Ac are credited to Luke the physician. The Muratorian canon ascribes Ac to Luke. By the end of the 2nd century the authority of the Ac is as well established as that of the Gospel (Salmon, Introduction to the New Testament, 1885, 366). Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, all call Luke the author of the book. The argument is complete. It is still further strengthened by the fact that the point of view of the book is Pauline and by the absence of references to Paul's epistles. If one not Paul's companion had written Acts, he would certainly have made some use of them. Incidentally, also, this is an argument for the early date of the Acts. The proof that has won Harnack, the leader of the left in Germany, to the acknowledgment of the Lukan authorship of Ac ought to win all to this position.

V. Canonicity.

The use of the Ac does not appear so early or so frequently as is true of the gospels and the Pauline epistles. The reason obvious. The epistles had a special field and the gospels appealed to all. Only gradually would Ac circulate. At first we find literary allusions without the name of book or author. But Holtzmann (Einl, 1892, 406) admits the use of Ac by Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Polycarp. The use of the Gospel according to Luke by Tatian and Marcion really revolves knowledge of the Acts. But in Irenaeus frequently (Adv. Haer., i. 23, 1, etc.) the Ac is credited to Luke and regarded as Scripture. The Canon of Muratori list it as Scripture. Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria attribute the book to Luke and treat it as Scripture. By the times of Eusebius the book is generally acknowledged as part of the canon. Certain of the heretical parties reject it (like the Ebionites, Marcionites, Manicheans). But by this time the Christians had come to lay stress on history (Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament, 1907, 184), and the place of Ac is now secure in the canon.

VI. Date.

1. Luke's relations to Josephus.

The acceptance of the Lukan authorship settles the question of some of the dates presented by critics. Schmiedel places the date of Ac between 105 and 130 AD (Encyclopedia Biblica). He assumes as proven that Luke made use of the writings of Josephus. It has never been possible to take with much seriousness the claim that the Ac shows acquaintance with Josephus. See Keim, Geschichte Jesu, III, 1872, 134, and Krenkel, Josephus und Lucas, 1894, for the arguments in favor of that position. The words quoted to prove it are in the main untechnical words of common use. The only serious matter is the mention of Theudas and Judas the Galilean in Ac 5:36 f and Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 1 f). In Josephus the names occur some twenty lines apart and the resemblance is only slight indeed. The use of peitho in connection with Theudas and apostesai concerning Judas is all that requires notice. Surely, then, two common words for "persuade" and "revolt" are not enough to carry conviction of the writer's use of Josephus. The matter is more than offset by the differences in the two reports of the death of Herod

Agrippa (Ac 12:19-23; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, vi, 7, XIX, viii, 2). The argument about Josephus may be definitely dismissed from the field. With that goes all the ground for a 2nd-century date. Other arguments have been adduced (see Holtzmann, Einl, 1892, 405) such as the use of Paul's epistles, acquaintance with Plutarch, Arrian and Pausanias, because of imitation in method of work (i.e. parallel lives of Peter and Paul, periods of history, etc.), correction of Ga in Ac (for instance, Ga 1:17-24 and Ac 9:26-30; Ga 2:1-10 and Ac 15:1-33). The parallel with Plutarch is fanciful, while the use of Panl's epistles is by no means clear, the absence of such use, indeed, being one of the characteristics of the book. The variation from Galatians is far better explained on the assumption that Luke had not seen the epistles.

2. 80 AD Is the Limit if the Book Is to Be Credited to Luke.

The majority of modern critics who accept the Lukan authorship place it between 70 and 80 AD. So Harnack, Lechler, Meyer, Ramsay, Sanday, Zahn. This opinion rests mainly on the idea that the Gospel according to Luke was written after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD. It is claimed that Lu 21:20 shows that this tragedy had already occurred, as compared with Mr 13:14 and Mt 24:15. But the mention of armies is very general, to be sure. Attention is called also to the absence of the warning in Luke. Harnack (The Ac of the Apostles, 291 f) admits that the arguments in favor of the date 70 to 80 are by no means conclusive. He writes "to warn critics against a too hasty closing of the chronological question." In his new book (Neue Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte, etc., 1911, S. 81) Harnack definitely accepts the date before the destruction of Jerusalem. Lightfoot would give no date to Ac because of the uncertainty about the date of the Gospel.

3. Before 70 AD.

This date is supported by Blass, Headlam, Maclean, Rackham, Salmon. Harhack, indeed, considers that "very weighty considerations" argue for the early date. He, as already stated, now takes his stand for the early date. It obviously the simplest way to understand Luke's close of the Ac to be due to the fact that Paul was still in prison. Harnack contends that the efforts to explain away this situation are not "quite satisfactory or very illuminating." He does not mention Paul's death because he was still alive. The dramatic purpose to bring Paul to Rome is artificial. The supposition of a third book from the use of proton in Ac 1:1 is quite gratuitous, since in the Koine, not to say the earlier Greek, "first was often used when only two were mentioned (compare "our first story" and "second story," "first wife" and "second wife"). The whole tone of the book is that which one would naturally have before 64 AD. After the burning of Rome and the destruction of Jerusalem the attitude maintained in the book toward Romans and Jews would have been very difficult unless the date was a long times afterward Harnack wishes "to help a doubt to its lust dues." That "doubt" of Harnack is destined to become the certainty of the future. (Since this sentence was written Harnack has settled his own doubt.) The book will, I think, be finally credited to the time 63 AD in Rome. The Gospel of Luke will then naturally belong to the period of Paul's imprisonment in Caesarea. The judgment of Moffatt (Historical New Testament, 1901, 416) that "it cannot be earlier than 80 AD is completely upset by the powerful attack of Harnack on his own previous position. See also Moffatt's Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (1911) and Koch's Die Abfassungszeit des lukanischen Geschichtswerkes (1911).

VII. Sources Used by Luke.

If we now assume that Luke is the author of the Acts, the question remains as to the character of the sources used by him. One is at liberty to appeal to Lu 1:1-4 for the general method of the author. He used both oral and written sources. In the Ac the matter is somewhat simplified by the fact that Luke was the companion of Paul for a considerable part of the narrative (the "we" sections, Ac 16:11-17; 20:5; 21:18; 27 and 28). It is more than probable that Luke was with Paul also during his last stay in Jerusalem and during the imprisonment at Caesarea.

There is no reason to think that Luke suddenly left Paul in Jerusalem and returned to Caesarea only when he started to Rome (Ac 27:1). The absence of "we" is natural here, since it is not a narrative of travel, but a sketch of Paul's arrest and series of defenses. The very abundance of material here, as in Ac 20 and 21, argues for the presence of Luke. But at any rate Luke has access to Paul himself for information concerning this period, as was true of the second, from Ac 13 to the end of the book. Luke was either present or he could have learned from Paul the facts used. He may have kept a travel diary, which was drawn upon when necessary. Luke could have taken notes of Paul's addresses in Jerusalem (Ac 22) and Caesarea (Ac 24-26). From these, with Paul's help, he probably composed the account of Paul's conversion (Ac 9:1-30). If, as I think is true, the book was written during Paul's first Roman imprisonment, Luke had the benefit of appeal to Paul at all points. But, if so, he was thoroughly independent in style and assimilated his materials like a true historian. Paul (and also Philip for part of it) was a host witness to the events about Stephen in Ac 6:8-8:1 and a participant of the work in Antioch (11:19-30). Philip, the of Paul's company (21:8) on the last journey to Jerusalem, was probably in Caesarea still during Paul's confinement there. He could have told Luke the events in Ac 6:1-7 and 8:4-40. In Caesarea also the story of Peter's work may have been derived, possibly even from Cornelius himself (9:32-11:18). Whether Luke ever went to Antioch or not we do not know (Codex Bezae has "we" in Ac 11:28), though he may have had access to the Antiochian traditions. But he did go to Jerusalem. However, the narrative in Ac 12 probably rests on the authority of John Mark (Ac 12:12,25), in whose mother's house the disciples were assembled. Luke was apparently thrown with Mark in Rome (Col 4:10), if not before. For Ac 1-5 the matter does not at first seem so clear, but these chapters are not necessarily discredited on that account. It is remarkable, as ancient historians made so little mention of their sources, that we can connect Luke in the Ac with so many probable fountains of evidence. Barnabas (4:36) was able to tell much about the origin of the work in Jerusalem. So could Mnason. Philip also was one of the seven (6:5; 21:8). We do not know that Luke met Peter in Rome, though that is possible. But during the stay in Jerusalem and Caesarea (two years) Luke had abundant opportunity to learn the narrative of the great events told in Ac 1-5. He perhaps used both oral and written sources for this section. One cannot, of course, prove by linguistic or historical arguments the precise nature of Luke's sources in Acts. Only in broad outlines the probable materials may be sketched.

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 13-OUTLINE

XIII. Analysis. 1. The connection between the work of the apostles and that

of Jesus (Ac 1:1-11).

2. The equipment of the early disciples for their task (Ac 1:12-2:47). (a) The disciples obeying Christ's parting command (Ac 1:12-24). (b) The place of Judas filled (Ac 1:15-26). (c) Miraculous manifestations of the presence of the Holy Spirit (Ac 2:1-13). (d) Peter's interpretation of the situation (Ac 2:14-36). (e) The immediate effect of the sermon (Ac 2:37-41). (f) The new spirit in the Christian community (Ac 2:42-47).

3. The development of the work in Jerusalem (Ac 3:1-8:1). (a) An incident in the work of Peter and John with Peter's apologetic (Ac 3). (b) Opposition of the Sadducees aroused by the preaching of the resurrection of Jesus (Ac 4:1-31). (c) An internal difficulty, the problem of poverty (Ac 4:32-5:11). (d) Great progress of the cause in the city (Ac 5:12-16). (e) Renewed hostility of the Sadducees and Gamaliel's retort to the Pharisees (Ac 5:17-42). (f) A crisis in church life and the choice of the seven Hellenists (Ac 6:1-7). (g) Stephen's spiritual interpretation of Christianity stirs the antagonism of the Pharisees and leads to his violent death (Ac 6:8-8:1).

4. The compulsory extension of the gospel to Judea, Samaria and the neighboring regions (Ac 8:1-40). (a) The great persecution, with Saul as leader (Ac 8:1-4). (b) Philip's work as a notable example of the work of the scattered disciples (Ac 8:5-40).

5. The conversion of Saul changes the whole situation for Christianity (Ac 9:1-31). (a) Saul's mission to Damascus (Ac 9:1-3). (b) Saul stopped in his hostile course and turns Christian himself (Ac 9:4-18). (c) Saul becomes a powerful exponent of the gospel in Damascus and Jerusalem (Ac 9:19-30). (d) The church has peace (Ac 9:31).

6. The door opened to the Gentiles, both Roman and Greek (Ac 9:32-11:30). (a) Peter's activity in this time of peace (Ac 9:32-43). (b) The appeal from Cornelius in Caesarea and Peter's response (Ac 10). (c) Peter's arraignment before the Pharisaic element in the church in Jerusalem (Ac 11:1-18). (d) Greeks in Antioch are converted and Barnabas brings Saul to this work (Ac 11:19-26). (e) The Greek Christians send relief to the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem (Ac 11:27-30).

7. Persecution from the civil government (Ac 12). (a) Herod Agrippa I kills James and imprisons Peter (Ac 12:1-19). (b) Herod pays the penalty for his crimes (Ac 12:20-23). (c) Christianity prospers (Ac 12:24 f).

8. The Gentilepropaganda from Antioch under the leadership of Barnabas and Saul (Ac 13-14). (a) The specific call of the Holy Spirit to this work (Ac 13:1-3). (b) The province of Cyprus and the leadership of Paul (Ac 13:4-12). (c) The province of Pamphylia and the desertion of John Mark (Ac 13:13). (d) The province of Galatia (Pisidia and Lycaonia) and the stronghold of the gospel upon the native population (Ac 13:14-14:24). (e) The return and report to Antioch (Ac 14:25-28).

9. The Gentilecampaign challenged by the Judaizers (Ac 15:1-35). (a) They meet Paul and Barnabas at Antioch who decide to appeal to Jerusalem (Ac 15:1-3). (b) The first public meeting in Jerusalem (Ac 15:4 f). (c) The second and more extended discussion with the decision of the conference (Ac 15:6-29). (d) The joyful reception (in Antioch) of the victory of Paul and Barnabas (Ac 15:30-35).

10. The second great campaign extending to Europe (Ac 15:36-18:22). (a) The breach between Paul and Barnabas over John Mark (Ac 15:36-39). (b) From Antioch to Troas with the Macedonian Cry (Ac 15:40-16:10). (c) In Philippi in Macedonia the gospel gains a foothold in Europe, but meets opposition (Ac 16:11-40). (d) Paul is driven also from Thessalonica and Berea (compare Philippi), cities of Macedonia also (Ac 17:1-15). (e) Paul’s experience in Athens (Ac 17:16-34). (f) In Corinth Paul spends nearly two years and the cause of Christ wins legal recognition from the Roman governor (Ac 18:1-17). (g) The return to Antioch by way of Ephesus, Caesarea and probably Jerusalem (Ac 18:18-22).

11. The third great tour, with Ephesus as headquarters (Ac 18:23-20:3). (a) Paul in Galatia and Phrygia again (Ac 18:23). (b) Apollos in Ephesus before Paul comes (Ac 18:24-28). (c) Paul’s three years in Ephesus (Ac 19:1-20:1). (d) The brief visit to Corinth because of the troubles there (Ac 20:1-3).

12. Paul turns to Jerusalem again with plans for Rome (Ac 20:4-21:16). (a) His companions (Ac 20:4). (b) Rejoined by Luke at Philippi (Ac 20:5). (c) The story of Troas (Ac 20:7-12). (d) Coasting

along Asia (Ac 20:13-16). (e) with the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Ac 20:17-38). (f) From Miletus to Tyre (Ac 21:1-6). (g) From Tyre to Caesarea (Ac 21:7-14). (h) From Caesarea to Jerusalem (Ac 21:15 f).

13. The outcome in Jerusalem (Ac 21:15-23:30). (a) Paul's reception by the brethren (Ac 21:15-17). (b) Their proposal of a plan by which Paul could undo the work of the Judaizers concerning him in Jerusalem (Ac 21:18-26). (c) The uproar in the temple courts raised by the Jews from Asia as Paul was carrying out the plan to disarm the Judaizers (Ac 21:27-30). (d) Paul's rescue by the Roman captain and Paul's defense to the Jewish mob (Ac 21:31-22:23). (e) Examination of the chief captain (Ac 22:24-29). (f) Brought before the Sanhedrin (Ac 22:30-23:10). (g) Cheered by the Lord Jesus (Ac 23:11). (h) Paul's escape from the plot of Jewish conspirators (Ac 23:12-30).

14. Paul a prisoner in Caesarea (Ac 23:31-26). (a) The flight to Caesarea and presentation to Felix (Ac 23:31-35). (b) Paul's appearance before Felix (Ac 24). (c) Paul before Festus (Ac 25:1-12). (d) Paul, as a matter of curiosity and courtesy, brought before Herod Agrippa II (Ac 25:13-26:32).

15. Paul going to Rome (Ac 27:1-28:15). (a) From Caesarea to Myra (Ac 27:1-5). (b) From Myra to Fair Havens (Ac 27:6-8). (c) From Fair Havens to Malta (Ac 27:9-28:10). (d) From Malta to Rome (Ac 28:11-15).

16. Paul in Rome at last (Ac 28:16-31). (a) His quarters (Ac 28:16). (b) His first interview with the Jews (Ac 28:17-22). (c) His second interview with the Jews (Ac 28:23-28). (d) Two years afterward still a prisoner, but with freedom to preach the gospel (Ac 28:30 f).

LITERATURE

Besides the works referred to above see Wendt's edition of Meyer's Kommentar (1899); Headlam in HDB; Knowling on Ac in Expositor's Greek Testament (1900); Knowling, Witness of the Epistles (1892), Testimony of Paul to Christ (1905); Moffatt, Historical New Testament (1901).

Here is a selected list of important works:

1. Introduction:

Bacon, Introduction to the New Testament (1900); Bennett and Adeney, Biblical Introduction (1899); Bleek, Einleitung in das New Testament (4 Aufl, 1900); S. Davidson, (3rd edition, 1894); C. R.

Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament (1907), H. J. Holtzmann, Einleitung in das New Testament (3 Aufl, 1892), Jacquies, Histoire des livres du New Testament (1905-8); Julicher, Introduction to the New Testament (translation, 1904); Peaks, Critical Introduction to the New Testament (1909); Reuss, Canon of the Holy Scriptures (translation, 1886); Salmon, Hist Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament (7th edition, 1896), von Soden, The History of Early Christian Lit. (translation, 1906), B. Weiss, A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament (translation, 1889), Westcott, History of the Canon of the New Testament (1869), Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament (translation, 1909), Moffatt, Introduction to the Lit. of the New Testament (1911).

2. Text:

See general works on textual criticism of the New Testament (Gregory, Kenyon, Nestle, Tischendorf, Scrivener, von Soden, B. Weiss, Westcott, etc.). Of special treatises note Blass, Philology of the Gospels (1898). Acta Apostolorum (1895); Bornemann, Acta Apostolorum (1848); Chase, Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae (1893), Corssen, Der cyprianische Text der Acta Apostolorum (1892); Klostermann, Probleme im Apostel Texts (1883), Klostermann, Vindiciae Lucanae (1866); Nestle, Philologia (1896); J. Rendel Harris, Study Codex Bezae (1891).

3. Apostolic History:

For literature on the life of Paul see Robertson, Epochs in the Life of Paul (1909), 321-27, and article PAUL in this encyclopedia. Important general works are the following: Bartlet, The Apostolie Age (1899); Baumgarten, The Apostolic History (translation, 1854); Blunt, Studies in the Apostolic Age (1909); Burton, Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age (1895); Doellinger, The First Age of the Church (translation, 1867); Dobschutz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church (translation, 1904); Ewald, History of the Apostolic Times (translation, Vol VI in History of Israel); Farrar, Early Days of Christianity (1887); Fisher, The Beginnings of Christianity (1877); Gilbert, Christianity in the Apostolic Age (1908); Harnack, The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries (translation, 1904-5); Hausrath, Neut. Zeitgeschichte (Bd. 2, 1872); Heinrici, Das Urchristentum (1902); Holtzmann, Neut. Zeitgeschichte (1895); Hort, Judaistic Christianity (1898); Organization of the Early Christian Churches (1895); Lechler, The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times (translation, 1886); Lightfoot, Dissertations on the Apostolic Age (1892); Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries (1902); McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age (1897); Neander, History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church (1889); Pfleiderer, Christian origins (1906), Pressonse, The Early Years of Christianity (1870); Purves, Christianity in the Apostolic Age (1901), Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire (1893); Ritschl, Die Entstehung der altkath. Kirche (1857); Ropes, The Apostolic Age in the Light of Modern Criticism (1906); Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church (translation, 1894-95); Pictures of the Apostolic Church (1910).

4. Special Treatises on the Acts:

Belser, Beitrage zur Erklarung der Apostelgeschichte (1897); Benson, Addresses on the Ac of the

Apostles (1901); Bethge, Die paulinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte (1887); Blass, Acta Apostolorum secundum Formam quae videtur Romanam (1896); Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Ac of the Apostles (1902); Clemen, Die Apostelgeschichte, im Lichte der neueren Forschungen (1905); Fiene, Eine vorkanonische Nebenlieferung des Lukas in Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte (1891); Harnack, Luke, the Physician (translation, 1907); The Ac of the Apostles (1909); Hilgenfeld, Acta Apostolorum Graece et Latine (1899); Jungst, Die Quellen der Apostelgeschichte (1895); Krenkel, Josephus und Lucas (1894); Luckok, Footprints of the Apostles as Traced by Luke in the Ac (1897); J. Lightfoot, Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations on the Ac of the Apostles (1768); Paley, Horae Paulinae (Birks edition, 1850); Ramsay, Paul the Traveler (1896); Pauline and Other Studies (1906); Cities of Paul (1908), Luke the Physician, and Other Studies (1908); J. Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul (4th edition, 1880); Sorof, Die Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte (1890); Spitta, Die Apostelgeschichte, ihre Quellen und deren geschichtlicher Worth (1891); Stiffler, An Introduction to the Book of Ac (1892); Vogel, Zur Characteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil (1897); J. Weiss, Ueber die Absicht und die literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte (1897); Zeller, The Contents and Origin of the Ac of the Apostles (translation, 1875); Maurice Jones, Paul the Orator (1910).

5. Commentaries:

There are the great standard works. like Bede, Bengel, Calvin, Chrysostom, Grotius. The chief modern commentaries are the following: Alexander (1857), Alloral (6th edition, 1868), Bartlet (1901), Blass (Acta Apostolorum, 1895), Ewald (Apostelgeschichte, 1871), Felten (Apostelgeschichte, 1892), Hackett (1882), Holtzmann (Hand-Commentar, 3 Aufl, 1901), Knabenbauer (Actus Apostol, 1899), Knowling (Expositor's Greek Text, 1900), Luthardt and Zoeckler (Apostelgeschichte, 2nd edition, 1894), McGarvey (1892), Meyer (translation by Gloag and Dickson, 1885), Meyer-Wendt (Apostelgeschichte, 1888). Noesgen (Apostelgeschichte, 1882), Olshausen (1832), Page (1897), Rackham (1901), Rendall, (1897), Stokes (1892), B. Weiss (Apostelgeschichte, 1892, 2nd edition).

A. T. Robertson

ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, 8-12

VIII. The Speeches in Acts.

This matter is important enough to receive separate treatment. Are the numerous speeches reported in Ac free compositions of Luke made to order a la Thucydides? Are they verbatim reports from notes taken at the times and literally copied into the narrative? Are they substantial reports incorporated with more or less freedom with marks of Luke's own style? In the abstract either of these methods was possible. The example of Thucydides, Xenophon, Livy and Josephus shows that ancient historians did not scruple to invent speeches of which no report was available. There are not wanting those who accuse Luke of this very thing in Acts. The matter can only be settled by an appeal to the facts so far as they can be determined. It cannot be denied that to a certain extent the hand of Luke is apparent in the addresses reported by him in Acts. But this fact must not be pressed too far. It is not true that the addresses are all

alike in style.

It is possible to distinguish very clearly the speeches of Peter from those of Paul. Not merely is this true, but we are able to compare the addresses of both Paul and Peter with their epistles. It is not probable that Luke had seen these epistles, as will presently be shown. It is crediting remarkable literary skill to Luke to suppose that he made up "Petrine" speeches and "Pauline" speeches with such success that they harmonize beautifully with the teachings and general style of each of these apostles. The address of Stephen differs also sharply from those of Peter and Paul, though we are not able to compare this report with any original work by Stephen himself. Another thing is true also, particularly of Paul's sermons.

They are wonderfully stated to time, place and audience. They all have a distract Pauline flavor, and yet a difference in local color that corresponds, to some extent, with the variations in the style of Paul's epistles. Professor Percy Gardner (The Speeches of Paul in Acts, in Cambridge Biblical Essays, 1909) recognizes these differences, but seeks to explain them on the ground of varying accuracy in the sources used by Luke, counting the speech at Miletus as the most historic of all. But he admits the use of sources by Luke for these addresses.

The theory of pure invention by Luke is quite discredited by appeal to the facts. On the other hand, in view of the apparent presence of Luke's style to some extent in the speeches, it can hardly be claimed that he has made verbatim reports. Besides, the report of the addresses of Jesus in Luke's Gospel (as in the other gospels) shows the same freedom in giving the substance exact reproduction of the words that is found in Acts. Again, it seems clear that some, if not all, the reports in Ac are condensed, mere outlines in the case of some of Peter's addresses.

The ancients knew how to make shorthand reports of such addresses. The oral tradition was probably active in preserving the early speeches of Peter and even of Stephen, though Paul himself heard Stephen. The speeches of Paul all show the marks of an eyewitness (Bethge, Die paulinischen Reden, etc., 174). For the speeches of Peter, Luke may have had documents, or he may have taken down the current oral tradition while he was in Jerusalem and Caesarea. Peter probably spoke in Greek on the day of Pentecost. His other addresses may have been in Aramaic or in Greek. But the oral tradition would certainly carry them in Greek, if also in Aramaic.

Luke heard Paul speak at Miletus (Ac 20) and may have taken notes at the time. So also he almost certainly heard Paul's address on the steps of the Tower of Antonia (Ac 22) and that before Agrippa (Ac 26). There is no reason to think that he was absent when Paul made his defenses before Felix and Festus (Ac 24-25) He was present on the ship when Paul spoke (Ac 27), and in Rome when he addressed the Jews (Ac 28) Luke was not on hand when Paul delivered his sermon at Antioch in Pisidia (Ac 13), or at Lystra (Ac 14), or at Athens (Ac 17) But these discourses differ so greatly in theme and treatment, and are so essentially Pauline that it is natural to think that Paul himself gave Luke the notes which he used.

The sermon at Antioch in Pisidia is probably given as a sample of Paul's missionary discourses. It contains the heart of Paul's gospel as it appears in his epistles. He accentuates the death and resurrection

of Jesus, remission of sins through Christ, justification by faith. It is sometimes objected that at Athens the address shows a breadth of view and sympathy unknown to Paul, and that there is a curious Attic tone to the Greek style. The sermon does go as far as Paul can (compare 1Co 9:22) toward the standpoint of the Greeks (but compare Col and Eph). However, Paul does not sacrifice his principle of grace in Christ. He called the Athenians to repentance, preached the judgment for sin and announced the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man here taught did not mean that God yanked at sin and could save all men without repentance and forgiveness of sin. Chase (The Credibility of Acts) gives a collection of Paul's missionary addresses. The historical reality and value of the speeches in Ac may be said to be vindicated by modern scholarship. For a sympathetic and scholarly discussion of all of Paul's addresses see Jones, Paul the Orator (1910). The short speech of Tertullus (Ac 24) was made in public, as was the public statement of Festus in Ac 26. The letter of Claudias Lysias to Felix in Ac 23 was a public document. How Luke got hold of the conversation about Paul between Festus and Agrippa in Ac 26 is more difficult to conjecture.

IX. Relation of Ac to the Epistles.

There is no real evidence that Luke made use of any of Paul's epistles. He was with Paul in Rome when Col was written (4:14), and may, indeed, have been Paul's amanuensis for this epistle (and for Eph and Philem). Some similarities to Luke's style have been pointed out. But Ac closes without any narrative of the events in Rome during the years there, so that these epistles exerted no influence on the composition of the book. As to the two preceding groups of Paul's epistles (1 and 2 Thess, 1 and 2 Cor, Gal, Roman) there is no proof that Luke saw any of them. The Epistle to the Romans was probably accessible to into while in Rome, but he does not seem to have used it. Luke evidently preferred to appeal to Paul directly for information rather than to his epistles.

This is all simple enough if he wrote the book or made his data while Paul was alive. But if Ac was written very late, it would be strange for the author not to have made use of some of Paul's epistles. The book has, therefore, the great advantage of covering some of the same ground as that discussed in the earlier epistles, but from a thoroughly independent stand-point. The gaps in our knowledge from the one source are often supplied incidentally, but most satisfactorily, from the other. The coincidences between Ac and Paul's epistles have been well traced by Paley in his Horae Paulinae, still a book of much value. Knowling, in his Witness of the Epistles (1892), has made a more recent study of the same problem. But for the apparent conflict between Ga 2:1-10 and Ac 15 the matter might be dropped at this point.

It is argued by some that Acts, written long after Gal, brushes to one side the account of the Jerusalem conference given by Paul. It is held that Paul is correct in his personal record, and that Ac is therefore unhistorical Others save the credit of Ac by arguing that Paul is referring to an earlier private conference some years before the public discussion recorded in Ac 15. This is, of course, possible in itself, but it is by no means required by the variations between the two reports. The contention of Lightfoot has never been really overturned, that in Ga 2:1-10 Paul gives the personal side of the conference, not a full report of the general meeting. What Paul is doing is to show the Galatians how he is on a par with the Jerusalem apostles, and how his authority and independence were acknowledged by them.

This aspect of the matter came out in the private conference. Paul is not in Ga 2:1-10 setting forth his victory over the Judaizers in behalf of Gentile freedom. But in Ac 15 it is precisely this struggle for Gentile freedom that is under discussion. Paul's relations with the Jerusalem apostles is not the point at all, though it in plain in Ac that they agree. In Galatians also Paul's victory for Gentile freedom comes out. Indeed, in Ac 15 it is twice mentioned that the apostles and elders were gathered together (15:4,6), and twice we are told that Paul and Barnabas addressed them (15:4,12). It is therefore natural to suppose that this private conference narrated by Paul in Galatians came in between 2:5 and 6. Luke may not, indeed, have seen the Epistle to the Galatians, and may not have heard from Paul the story of the private conference, though he knew of the two public meetings. If he did know of the private meeting, he thought it not pertinent to his narration. There is, of course, no contradiction between Paul's going up by revelation and by the appointment of the church in Antioch. In Ga 2:1 we have the second (Ga 1:18) visit to Jerusalem after his conversion mentioned by Paul, while that in Ac 15 is the third in Ac (9:28; 11:29 f; 15:2).

But there was no particular reason for Paul to mention the visit in Ac 11:30, which did not concern his relation to the apostles in Jerusalem. Indeed, only the "elders" are mentioned on this occasion. The same independence between Ac and Ga occurs in Ga 1:17-24, and Ac 9:26-30. In Ac there is no allusion to the visit to Arabia, just as there is no mention of the private conference in Ac 15. So also in Ac 15:35-39 there is no mention of the sharp disagreement between Paul and Peter at Antioch recorded in Ga 2:11 ff. Paul mentions it merely to prove his own authority and independence as an apostle. Luke had no occasion to record the incident, if he was acquainted with the matter. These instances illustrate well how, when the Ac and the epistles vary, they really supplement each other.

X. Chronology of Acts.

Here we confront one of the most perplexing questions in New Testament criticism. In general, ancient writers were not so careful as modern writers are to give precise dates for historical events. Indeed, it was not easy to do so in view of the absence of a uniform method of reckoning times. Luke does, however, relate his narrative to outward events at various points. In his Gospel he had linked the birth of Jesus with the names of Augustus as emperor and of Quirinius as governor of Syria (Lu 2:1 f), and the entrance of John the Baptist upon his ministry with the names of the chief Roman and Jewish rulers of the time (Lu 3:1 f) So also in the Ac he does not leave us without various notes of times. He does not, indeed, give the date of the Ascension or of the Crucifixion, though he places the Ascension forty days after the Resurrection (Ac 1:3), and the great Day of Pentecost would then come ten days later, "not many days hence" (Ac 1:5)

But the other events in the opening chapters of Ac have no clear chronological arrangement. The career of Stephen is merely located "in these days" (6:1). The beginning of the general persecution under Saul is located on the very day of Stephen's death (8:1), but the year is not even hinted at. The conversion of Saul comes probably in its chronological order in Ac 9, but the year again is not given. We have no hint as to the age of Saul at his conversion. So again the relation of Peter's work in Caesarea (10) to the preaching to the Greeks in Antioch (11) is not made clear, though probably in this order. It is only when

we come to Ac 12 that we reach an event whose date is reasonably certain. This is the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 AD. But even so, Luke does not correlate the life of Paul with that incident. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 49) places the persecution and death of James in 44, and the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem in 46. About 44, then, we may consider that Saul came to Antioch from Tarsus.

The "fourteen years" in Ga 2:1 as already shown probably point to the visit in Ac 15 some years later. But Saul had been in Tarsus some years and had spent some three years in Arabia and Damascus after his conversion (Ga 1:18). Beyond this it is not possible to go. We do not know the age of Saul in 44 AD or the year of his conversion. He was probably born not far from 1 AD. But if we locate Paul at Antioch with Barnabas in 44 AD, we can make some headway. Here Paul spent a year (Ac 11:26). The visit to Jerusalem in Ac 11, the first missionary tour in 13 and 14, the conference at Jerusalem in 15, the second missionary tour in 16-18, the third missionary tour and return to Jerusalem in 18- 21, the arrest in Jerusalem and two years in Caesarea in 21-26, all come between 44 AD and the recall of Felix and the coming of Festus. It used to be taken for granted that Festus came in 60 AD.

Wieseler figured it out so from Josephus and was followed by Lightfoot. But Eusebius, in his "Chronicle," placed that event in the second year of Nero. That would be 56, unless Eusebius has a special way of counting those years Mr. C. H Turner (art. "Chronology" in HDB) finds that Eusebius counts an emperor’s regnal year from the September following. If so, the date could be moved forward to 57 (compare Rackham on Acts, lxvi). But Ramsay (chapter xiv, "Pauline Chronology," in Pauline and Other Studies) cuts the Gordian knot by showing an error in Eusebius due to his disregarding an interregnum with the reign of Mugs Ramsay here follows Erbes Todestage Pauli und Pertri in this discovery and is able to fix upon 59 as the date of the coming of Festus. Probably 59 will have to answer as a compromise date. Between 44 AD and 59 AD, therefore, we place the bulk of Paul’s active missionary work.

Luke has divided this period into minor divisions with relative dates. Thus a year and six months are mentioned at Corinth (Ac 18:11), besides "yet many days" (Ac 18:18). In Ephesus we find mention of "three months" (Ac 19:8) and "two years" (Ac 19:10), the whole story summed up as "three years" (Ac 20:31) Then we have the "two years" of delay in Caesarea (Ac 24:27). We thus have about seven of these fifteen years itemized. Much of the remaining eight was spent in the journeys described by Luke. We are told also the times of year when the voyage to Rome was under way (Ac 27:9), the length of the voyage (Ac 27:27), the duration of the stay in Melita (Ac 28:11), and the times spent in Rome at the close of the book, "two whole years" (Ac 28:30). Thus it is possible to fix upon a relative schedule of dates, though not an absolute one. Harnack (The Ac of the Apostles, chapter i, "Chronological Data") has worked out a very careful scheme for the whole of Acts. Knowling has a good critical resume of the present state of our knowledge of the chronology of Ac in his Commentary, 38 ff, compare also Clemen, Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe (1893). It is clear, then, that a rational scheme for events of Paul’s career so far as recorded in the Ac can be found. If 57 AD, for instance, should be taken as the year of Festus coming rather than 59 or 60 AD, the other dates back to 44 AD would, of course, be affected on a sliding scale. Back of 44 AD the dates are largely conjectural.

XI. Historical Worth of Acts.

It was once fashionable to discredit Ac as a book of no real value as history. The Tubingen school regarded Ac as "a late controversial romance, the only historical value of which was to throw light on the thought of the period which produced it" (Chase, The Credibility of Acts, 9). There are not wanting a few writers who still regard Ac as a late eirenicon between the Peter and Paul parties, or as a party pamphlet in the interest of Paul. Somewhat fanciful parallels are found between Luke's treatment of both Peter and Paul "According to Holtzmann, the strongest argument for the critical position is the correspondence between the acts of Peter and the other apostles on the one rode and those of Paul on the other" (Headlam in HDB). But this matter seems rather far fetched. Peter is the leading figure in the early chapters, as Paul is in the latter half of the book, but the correspondences are not remarkably striking.

There exists in some minds a prejudice against the book on the ground of the miracles recorded as genuine events by Luke. But Paul himself claimed to have wrought miracles (2Co 12:12). It is not scientific to rule a book out beforehand because it narrates miracles (Blass, Acta Apostolorum, 8). Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 8) tells his experience in regard to the trustworthiness of Acts: "I began with a mind unfavorable to it, for the ingenuity and apparent completeness of the Tubingen theory had at one time quite convinced me." It was by actual verification of Ac in points where it could be tested by inscriptions, Paul's epistles, or current non-Christian writers, that "it was gradually borne in upon me that in various details the narrative showed marvelous truth." He concludes by "placing this great writer on the high pedestal that belongs to him" (10). McGiffert (The Apostolic Age) had been compelled by the geographical and historical evidence to abandon in part the older criticism. He also admitted that the Ac "is more trustworthy than previous critics allowed" (Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 5). Schmiedel (Encyclopedia Biblica) still argues that the writer of Ac is inaccurate because he was not in possession of full information. But on the whole Ac has had a triumphant vindicatioin in modern criticism. Julicher (Einl, 355) admits "a genuine core overgrown with legendary accretions" (Chase, Credibility, 9). The moral honesty of Luke, his fidelity to truth (Rackham on Acts, 46), is clearly shown in both his Gospel and the Acts.

This, after all, is the chief trait in the true historian (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 4). Luke writes as a man of serious purpose and is the one New Testament writer who mentions his careful use of his materials (Lu 1:1-4). His attitude and spent are those of the historian. He reveals artistic skill, it is true, but not to the discredit of his record. He does not give a bare chronicle, but he writes a real history, an interpretation of the events recorded. He had adequate resources in the way of materials and endowment and has made conscientious and skillful use of his opportunity. It is not necessary here to give in detail all the points in which Luke has been vindicated (see Knowling on Acts, Ramsay's books and Harnack's Luke and Acts). The most obvious are the following: The use of "proconsul" instead of "propraetor" in Ac 13:7 is a striking instance. Curiously enough Cyprus was not a senatorial province very long. An inscription has been found in Cyprus "in the proconsulship of Paulus."

The 'first men' of Antioch in Pisidia is like the (13:50) "First Ten," a title which "was only given (as here) to a board of magistrates in Greek cities of the East" (MacLean in one-vol HDB). The "priest of Jupiter" at Lystra (14:13) is in accord with the known facts of the worship there. So we have Perga in

Pamphylia (13:13), Antioch in Pisidia (13:14), Lystra and Derbe in Lycaonia (14:6), but not Iconium (14:1). In Philippi Luke notes that the magistrates are called strategoi or praetors (Ac 16:20), and are accompanied by lictors or rhabdouchoi (Ac 16:35). In Thessalonica the rulers are "politarchs" (Ac 17:6), a title found nowhere else, but now discovered on an inscription of Thessalonica. He rightly speaks of the Court of the Areopagus at Athens (Ac 17:19) and the proconsul in Achaia (Ac 18:12).

Though Athens was a free city, the Court of the Areopagus at the times were the real rulers. Achaia was sometimes associated with Macedonia, though at this time it was a separate senatorial province. In Ephesus Luke knows of the "Asiarchs" (Ac 19:31), "the presidents of the ‘Common Council’ of the province in cities where there was a temple of Rome and the Emperor; they superintended the worship of the Emperor" (Maclean). Note also the fact that Ephesus is "temple-keeper of the great Diana" (Ac 19:35). Then observe the town clerk (Ac 19:35), and the assembly (Ac 19:39). Note also the title of Felix, "governor" or procurator (Ac 24:1), Agrippa the king (25:13), Julius the centurion and the Augustan band (Ac 27:1). Ac 27 is a marvel of interest and accuracy for all who wish to know details of ancient seafaring. The matter has been worked over in a masterful way by James Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul. The title "First Man of the Island" (Ac 28:7) is now found on a coin of Melita. These are by no means all the matters of interest, but they will suffice. In most of the items given above Luke’s veracity was once challenged, but now he has been triumphantly vindicated.

The force of this vindication is best appreciated when one recalls the incidental nature of the items mentioned. They come from widely scattered districts and are just the points where in strange regions it is so easy to make slips. If space allowed, the matter could be set forth in more detail and with more justice to Luke’s worth as a historian. It is true that in the earlier portions of the Ac we are not able to find so many geographical and historical corroborations. But the nature of the material did not call for the mention of so many places and persons. In the latter part Luke does not hesitate to record miraculous events also. His character as a historian is firmly established by the passages where outside contact has been found. We cannot refuse him a good name in the rest of the book, though the value of the sources used certainly cuts a figure. It has been urged that Luke breaks down as a historian in the double mention of Quirinius in Lu 2:2 and Ac 5:37.

But Ramsay (Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?) has shown how the new knowledge of the census system of Augustus derived from the Egypt papyri is about to clear up this difficulty. Luke’s general accuracy at least calls for suspense of judgment, and in the matter of Theudas and Judas the Galilean (Ac 5) Luke as compared with Josephus outclasses his rival. Harnack (The Ac of the Apostles, 203-29) gives in his usual painstaking way a number of examples of "inaccuracy and discrepancy" But the great bulk of them are merely examples of independence in narration (compare Ac 9 with 22 and 26, where we have three reports of Paul’s conversion). Harnack did not, indeed, once place as high a value on Luke as a historian as he now does. It is all the more significant, therefore, to read the following in Harnack’s The Ac of the Apostles (298 f): "The book has now been restored to the position of credit which is its rightful due. It is not only, taken as a whole, a genuinely historical work, but even in the majority of its details it is trustworthy 6 ..... Judged from almost every possible standpoint of historical criticism it is a solid, respectable, and in many respects an extraordinary work." That is, in my opinion, an understatement of the facts (see Ramsay), but it is a remarkable conclusion concerning the trustworthiness of Luke when

one considers the distance that Harnack has come. At any rate the prejudice against Luke is rapidly disappearing. The judgment of the future is forecast by Ramsay, who ranks Luke as a historian of the first order.

XII. Purpose of the Book.

A great deal of discussion has been given to Luke's aim in the Acts. Baur's theory was that this book was written to give a conciliatory view of the conflict between Peter and Paul, and that a minute parallelism exists in the Ac between these two heroes. This tendency theory once held the critical field, but it does not take into view all the facts, and fails to explain the book as a whole. Peter and Paul are the heroes of the book as they undoubtedly were the two chief personalities in apostolic history (compare Wendt, Apostelgeschichte, 17). There is some parallelism between the careers of the two men (compare the worship offered Peter at Caesarea in Ac 10:25, and that to Paul in 14:11; see also the punishment of Ananias and Sapphira and that of Elymas). But Knowling (Acts, 16) well replies that curiously no use is made of the death of both Peter and Paul in Rome, possibly at the same time. If the Ac was written late, this matter would be open to the knowledge of the writer.

There is in truth no real effort on Luke's part to paint Paul like Peter or Peter like Paul. The few similarities in incident are merely natural historical parallels. Others have seen in the Ac a strong purpose to conciliate Gentile(pagan) opinion in the fact that the Roman governors and military officers are so uniformly presented as favorable to Paul, while the Jews are represented as the real aggressors against Christianity (compare Josephus' attitude toward Rome). Here again the fact is beyond dispute. But the other explanation is the more natural, namely, that Luke brings out this aspect of the matter because it was the truth. Compare B. Weiss, Einl, 569. Luke does have an eye on the world relations of Christianity and rightly reflects Paul's ambition to win the Roman Empire to Christ (see Ro 15), but that is not to say that he has given the book a political bias or colored it so as to deprive it of its historical worth. It is probably true (compare Knowling, Acts, 15; J. Weiss, Ueber die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte) that Luke felt, as did Paul, that Jusaism realized its world destiny in Christianity, that Christianity was the true Judaism, the spiritual and real Israel. If Luke wrote Ac in Rome, while Paul's case was still before Nero, it is easy to understand the somewhat long and minute account of the arrest and trials of Paul in Jerusalem, Caesarea and Rome.

The point would be that the legal aspect of Christianity before Roman laws was involved. Hitherto Christianity had found shelter as a sect of Judaism, and so was passed by Gallio in Corinth as a religio licita. If Paul was condemned as a Christian, the whole aspect of the matter would be altered. Christianity would at once become religio illicita. The last word in the Ac comments on the fact that Paul, though still a prisoner, was permitted to preach unhindered. The importance of this point is clearly seen as one pushes on to the Neronian persecution in 64. After that date Christianity stood apart from Judaism in the eye of Rome. I have already stated my belief that Luke closed the Ac when he did and as he did because the events with Paul had only gone thus far. Numerous scholars hold that Luke had in mind a third book (Ac 1:1), a possible though by no means necessary inference from "first treatise." It was a climax to carry the narrative on to Rome with Paul, but it is rather straining the point to find all this in Ac 1:8. Rome was not "the nethermost part of the earth," Spain more nearly being that. Nor did

Paul take the gospel to Rome.

Besides, to make the arrival of Paul in Rome the goal in the mind of Christ is too narrowing a purpose. The purpose to go to Rome did dominate Paul's mind for several years (Ac 19:21), but Paul cuts no figure in the early part of the book. And Paul wished to push on from Rome to Spain (Ro 15:24). It is probably true that Luke means to announce his purpose in Ac 1:1-8. One needs to keep in mind also Lu 1:1-4. There are various ways of writing history. Luke chooses the biographical method in Acts. Thus he conceives that he can best set forth the tremendous task of interpreting the first thirty years of the apostolic history. It is around persons (compare Harnack, The Ac of the Apostles, 117), two great figures (Peter and Paul), that the narrative is focused. Peter is most prominent in Ac 1-12, Paul in 13-28. Still Paul's conversion is told in Ac 9 and Peter reappears in Ac 15. But these great personages do not stand alone. John the Apostle is certainly with Peter in the opening chapters. The other apostles are mentioned also by name (Ac 1:13) and a number of times in the first twelve chapters (and in Ac 15). But after Ac 15 they drop out of the narrative, for Luke follows the fortunes of Paul.

The other chief secondary figures in Ac are Stephen, Philip, Barnabas, James, Apollos, all Hellenists save James (Harnack, 120). The minor characters are numerous (John, Mark, Silas, Timothy, Aquila and Priscilla, Aristarchus, etc.). In most cases Luke gives a distinct picture of these incidental personages. In particular he brings out sharply such men as Gallio, Claudius, Lysias, Felix, Festus, Herod, Agrippa I and II, Julius. Luke's conception of the apostolic history is that it is the work of Jesus still carried on by the Holy Spirit (Ac 1:1 f). Christ chose the apostles, commanded them to wait for power from on high, filled them with the Holy Spirit and then sent them on the mission of world conquest. In the Ac Luke records the waiting, the coming of the Holy Spirit, the planting of a powerful church in Jerusalem and the expansion of the gospel to Samaria and all over the Roman Empire. He addresses the book to Theophilus as his patron, a Gentile Christian plainly, as he had done with his gospel. The book is designed for the enlightenment of Christians generally concerning the historic origins of Christianity. It is in truth the first church history. It is in reality the Ac of the Holy Spirit as wrought through these men. It is an inspiring narration. Luke had no doubt whatever of the future of a gospel with such a history and with such heroes of faith as Peter and Paul.

ACTS, APOCRYPHAL

a-pok'-ri-fal. See APOCRYPHAL ACTS.

ACUA

ak'-u-a. See ACUD.

ACUB

a'-kub (Codex Vaticanus, Akouph; Codex Alexandrinus, Akoum) = Bakbuk (Ezr 2:51; Ne 7:53): The

descendants of Acub (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:31).

ACUD

a’-kud (Akoud; the King James Version Acua) = AKKUB (Ezr 2:45) which see; omitted in Ne 7: The descendants of Acud (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:30).

ADADAH

a-da’-da (‘adh‘adhah): A city in the southern part of Judah (Jos 15:22). The older copies of the Greek text have Arouel, but that is not a sufficient reason for identifying the name with the Aroer of 1Sa 30:28. Some scholars adopt the change of text, and identify the site with Ararah, about seven miles Southeast of Beer-sheba. Others identify it with Adadah, eight or nine miles Southeast of Arad.

ADADRIMMON

a-dad-rim’-on: Shorter and less accurate name of a place in the Valley of Megiddo, which tradition connected with the death of King Josiah (Zec 12:11; 2Ch 35:22). See HADADRIMMON.

ADAH

a’-da (‘adhah, "adornment"):

(1) One of the two wives of Lamech the descendant of Cain (Ge 4:19,20,23). The narrative in Ge assigns to her two sons, Jabal the "father" of tent-dwelling people, and Jubal the "father" of all such as handle the harp and pipe." Josephus says that Lamech had 77 sons by Ada and Zillah (Ant., I, ii, 2).

(2) According to Ge 36:2,4,10,12,16, the Hittite wife of Esau, daughter of Elon, and mother of Eliphaz. In this chapter Esau’s other wives are Oholibamah, a Hivite, and Basemath the daughter of Ishmael. The names are differently given elsewhere (Ge 26:34; 28:9). Basemath is said to be the daughter of Elon. The daughter of Ishmael is called Mahalath. In place of Oholibamah the Hivite we find Judith the daughter of Beeri the Hittite. Data are lacking for the solution of the problem.

Willis J. Beecher

ADAIAH

a-da’-ya, a-di’-a (‘adhayah, "Yahweh hath adorned"):

(1) Apparently the seventh of the nine sons of Shimei, who is apparently the same with Shema, who is the fifth of the sons of Elpaal, who is the second of the two sons of Shaharaim and Hushim (1Ch 8:21).

Shaharaim and his descendants are listed with the descendants of Benjamin, though his relations to Benjamin are not stated.

(2) A Levite; ancestor to David's singer Asaph, and a descendant of the fifth generation from Gershom (1Ch 6:41).

(3) The father of Maaseiah, who was one of the captains of hundreds associated with Jehoiada the priest in making Joash king (2Ch 23:1).

(4) A resident of Bozkath, and father of Jedidah the mother of King Josiah (2Ki 22:1).

(5) A descendant of Judah through Perez. His great-great-grandson Maaseiah resided in Jerusalem after Nehemiah had rehabilitated the city (Ne 11:5).

(6) One of the men of Israel, not a priest or Levite, but "of the sons of Bani," who promised Ezra that he would part with his foreign wife (Ezr 10:29).

(7) The same man or another, in a different group of the sons of Bani (Ezr 10:39).

(8) One of the priests of the latest Bible times, mentioned with a partial genealogy (Ne 11:12; 1Ch 9:12).

Willis J. Beecher

ADALIA

a-da-li'-a ('adhalya', probably a Persian name, meaning unknown): One of the ten sons of Haman who were put to death by the Jews (Es 9:8).

ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

(Adam): The name of Adam occurs nine times (in five different passages) in the New Testament, though several of these are purely incidental.

I. Gospels.

In Lu 3:38 the ancestry of Jesus Christ is traced up to Adam, "Adam, the son of God," thereby testifying to the acceptance of the Old Testament genealogies of Gen. This is the only place in the Gospels in which Adam is actually named, though there is an allusion to him in Mt 19:4-6 (= Mr 10:6-8), referring to Ge 1:27, 2:24.

II. Epistles.

Adam is used by Paul as the founder of the race and the cause of the introduction of sin in order to point the comparison and contrast with Christ as the Head of the new race and the cause of righteousness.

1. Ro 5:12-21:

The passage is the logical center of the epistle, the central point to which everything that precedes has converged, and out of which everything which follows will flow. The great ideas of Sin, Death, and Judgment are here shown to be involved in the connection of the human race with Adam. But over against this there is the blessed fact of union with Christ, and in this union righteousness and life. The double headship of mankind in Adam and Christ shows the significance of the work of redemption for the entire race. Mankind is ranged under two heads, Adam and Christ. There are two men, two acts and two results. In this teaching we have the spiritual and theological illustration of the great modern principle of solidarity. There is a solidarity of evil and a solidarity of good, but the latter far surpasses the former in the quality of the obedience of Christ as compared with Adam, and the facts of the work of Christ for justification and life. The section is thus no mere episode, or illustration, but that which gives organic life to the entire epistle. Although sin and death are ours in Adam righteousness and life are ours in Christ, and these latter two are infinitely the greater (Ro 5:11); whatever we have lost in Adam we have more than gained in Christ. As all the evils of the race sprang from one man, so all the blessings of redemption come from One Person, and there is such a connection between the Person and the race that all men can possess what the One has done.

In Ro 5:12-19 Paul institutes a series of comparisons and contrasts between Adam and Christ; the two persons, the two works and the two consequences. The fullness of the apostle’s meaning must be carefully observed. Not only does he teach that what we have derived from the first Adam is met by what is derived from Christ, but the transcendence of the work of the latter is regarded as almost infinite in extent. "The full meaning of Paul, however, is not grasped until we perceive that the benefits received from Christ, the Second Adam, are in inverse ratio to the disaster entailed by the first Adam. It is the surplus of this grace that in Paul’s presentation is commonly overlooked" (Mabie, The Divine Reason of the Cross 116).

2. 1Co 15:22:

The contrast instituted here between Adam and Christ refers to death and life, but great difficulty turns on the interpretation of the two "alls." "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive." Dods (Expositor’s Bible, 366) interprets it of Adam as the source of physical life that ends in death, and of Christ as the source of spiritual life that never dies. "All who are by physical derivation truly united to Adam incur the death, which by sinning he introduced into human experience; and similarly, all who by spiritual affinity are in Christ enjoy the new life which triumphs over death, and which he won."

So also Edwards, who does not consider that there is any real unfairness in interpreting the former "all" as more extensive than the latter, "if we bear in mind that the conditions of entrance into the one class

and the other are totally different. They are not stated here. But we have them in Ro 5:5-11, where the apostle seems as if he anticipated this objection to the analogy which he instituted between Adam and Christ. Both alike are heads of humanity, but they are unlike in this (as also in other things, Ro 5:15), that men are in Adam by nature, in Christ by faith" (Corinthians, 412). Godet considers that "perhaps this Interpretation is really that which corresponds best to the apostle's view," and he shows that zoopoieisthai, "to be made alive," is a more limited idea than egeiresthai, "to be raised," the limitation of the subject thus naturally proceeding from the special meaning of the verb itself. "The two pantes (all) embrace those only to whom each of the two powers extends." But Godet favors the view of Meyer and Ellicott that "all" is to be given the same interpretation in each clause, and that the reference is to all who are to rise, whether for life or condemnation, and that this is to be "in Christ": "Christ will quicken all; all will hear His voice and will come forth from the grave, but not all to the true 'resurrection of life':see Joh 5:29" (Ellicott, Corinthians, 301) Godet argues that "there is nothing to prevent the word 'quicken,' taken alone, from being used to denote restoration to the fullness of spiritual and bodily existence, with a view either to perdition or salvation" (Corinthians, 355). There are two serious difficulties to the latter interpretation:

(1) The invariable meaning of "in Christ" is that of spiritual union;

(2) the question whether the resurrection of the wicked really finds any place in the apostle's argument in the entire chapter.

3. 1Co 15:45:

"The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit." The reference to Adam is from Ge 2:7; the reference to Christ is due to the fact of what He had done and was doing in His manifestation as Divine Redeemer. Behind results the apostle proceeds to nature. Adam was simply a living being, Christ a life-giving Being. Thus Christ is called Adam as expressive of His Headship of a race. In this verse He is called the "last" Adam, while in 1Co 15:47 the "second." In the former verse the apostle deals not so much with Christ's relation to the first Adam as to the part He takes in relation to humanity, and His work on its behalf. When precisely Christ became life-giving is a matter of difference of opinion. Ro 1:4 associates power with the resurrection as the time when Christ was constituted Son of God for the purpose of bestowing the force of Divine grace. This gift of power was only made available for His church through the Ascension and the gift of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It is possible that the word "life-giving" may also include a reference to the resurrection of the body hereafter.

4. 1Ti 2:13,14:

Paul uses the creation of man and woman in his argument for the subordination of woman (Ge 2:7-25). This is no mere Jewish reasoning, but an inspired statement of the typical meaning of the passage in Genesis. The argument is a very similar one to that in 1Co 11:8,9. When the apostle states that "Adam was not beguiled," we must apparently understand it as simply based on the text in Genesis to which he refers (Ge 3:13), in which Eve, not Adam, says, "The serpent beguiled me." In Ga 3:16 he reasons

similarly from "seed" in the singular number, just as Heb 7 reasons from the silence of Ge 14 in regard to the parentage of Melchizedek. Paul does not deny that Adam was deceived, but only that he was not directly deceived. His point is that Eve's facility in yielding warrants the rule as to women keeping silence.

5. Jude 1:14:

"And Enoch, the seventh from Adam" (Ge 5). Bigg says that the quotation which follows is a combination of passages from Enoch, though the allusion to Enoch himself is evidently based on the story in Gen.

III. Conclusions.

As we review the use of "Adam" in the New Testament, we cannot fail to observe that Paul assumes that Adam was a historical personality, and that the record in Genesis was a record of facts, that sin and death were introduced into the world and affected the entire race as the penalty of the disobedience of one ancestor. Paul evidently takes it for granted that Adam knew and was responsible for what he was doing. Again, sin and death are regarded as connected, that death obtains its moral quality from sin. Paul clearly believed that physical dissolution was due to sin, and that there is some causal connection between Adam and the human race in regard to physical death. While the reference to death in Ro 5 as coming through sin, is primarily to physical death, yet physical death is the expression and sign of the deeper idea of spiritual death; and even though physical death was in the world before Adam it was only in connection with sin that its moral meaning and estimate became clear. Whether we are to interpret, "for that all sinned," as sinning when Adam sinned, or sinning as the result of an inherited tendency from Adam, the entire passage implies some causal connection between him and them. The need of redemption is thus made by the apostle to rest on facts. We are bound to Adam by birth, and it is open to us to become bound to Christ by faith. If we refuse to exchange our position in Adam for that which is offered to us in Christ we become answerable to God; this is the ground of moral freedom. The New Testament assumption of our common ancestry in Adam is true to the facts of evolutionary science, and the universality of sin predicated is equally true to the facts of human experience. Thus, redemption is grounded on the teaching of Scripture, and confirmed by the uncontradicted facts of history and experience. Whether, therefore, the references to Adam in the New Testament are purely incidental, or elaborated in theological discussion, everything is evidently based on the record in Gen.

W. H. Griffith Thomas

ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

(Evolutionary Interpretation): NOTE: It ought to be superfluous to say that the unfolding or development of the human personality here identified with evolution is something far higher, deeper, and other than anything that can be fathered upon Darwin or Herbert Spencer. Evolution (unfolding) is the great process or movement; natural selection and survival of the fittest name only guesses at some of

its methods. ‘adham, "man," Ge 1:26, or "a man," Ge 2:5; ha-’adham, "the man"; mostly with the article as a generic term, and not used as the proper name of a patriarch until 5:3, after which the name first given to both man and woman (5:2) is used of the man alone: The being in whom is embodied the Scripture idea of the first created man and ancestor of mankind. The account, which belongs mostly to the oldest stratum of the Genesis story (Jahwist) merits careful attention, because evolutionary science, history, and new theology have all quarreled with or rejected it on various grounds, without providing the smallest approach to a satisfactory substitute.

I. What the Writer Meant to Describe.

It is important first of all, if we can, to get at what the author meant to describe, and how it is related, if at all, to literal and factual statement.

1. Derivation and Use of the Name:

Scholars have exercised themselves much, but with little arrival at certainty, over the derivation of the name; a matter which, as it is concerned with one of the commonest words of the language, is of no great moment as compared with the writer’s own understanding of it. The most plausible conjecture, perhaps, is that which connects it with the Assyrian adamu, "to make," or "produce," hence, "the produced one," "the creature." The author of Ge 2:7 seems to associate it, rather by word-play than derivation, with ha-’adhamah, "the ground" or "soil," as the source from which man’s body was taken (compare 3:19,23) The name ‘adhamah itself seems to be closely connected with the name Edom (’edhom, Ge 25:30), meaning "red"; but whether from the redness of the soil, or the ruddiness of the man, or merely the incident recorded in Ge 25:30, is uncertain. Without doubt the writer of Ge 2; 3 had in mind man’s earthly origin, and understood the name accordingly.

2. Outline of the Genesis Narrative:

The account of the creation is twice given, and from two very different points of view. In the first account, Ge 1:26- 31, man is represented as created on the sixth of the day along with the animals, a species Genesis in the animal world; but differing from them in bearing the image and likeness of God, in having dominion over all created things, and in having grains and fruits for food, while they have herbs. The writer’s object in all this seems to be as much to identify man with the animal creation as to differentiate him from it. In the second account, 2:4-3:24, man’s identity with the animals ignored or at least minimized (compare 2:20), while the object is to determine his status in a spiritual individualized realm wherein he has the companionship of God. Yahweh God "forms" or "shapes" him out of the dust of the ground, breathes into his nostrils the breath of life, and with such special distinction he becomes, like other created things, a "living soul" (nephesh chayyah; compare 2:7 with 1:30). He is placed in a garden situated somewhere among the rivers of Babylonia, his primitive occupation being to dress and keep it. In the midst of the garden are two mysterious trees, the tree of life, whose fruit seems to have the potency of conferring immortality (compare 3:22), and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, whose fruit is not to be eaten under penalty of death. Meanwhile, as in naming the animals the man finds

no real companion, Yahweh God "builds" one of the man's ribs into a woman, and the man recognizes her spiritual unity with him, naming her accordingly.

The story goes on to relate, without note of time, how the serpent, the subtlest of beasts, urged on the woman the desirable qualities of the fruit of the forbidden tree, intimating that God had made the prohibition from envy, and roundly denying that death would be the consequence of eating. Accordingly the woman took and ate, and gave to her husband, who also ate; and the immediate consequence was a sense of shame, which caused them to cover their nakedness with girdles of fig leaves, and a sense of guilt (not differentiated by Adam from shame, 3:10), which made the pair reluctant to meet Yahweh God. He obtains the confession of their disobedience, however; and passes prophetic sentence: on the serpent, of perpetual antipathy between its species and the human; on the woman, of sorrows and pains and subservience to the man; and on the man, of hardship and severe labors, until he returns to the dust from which he was taken. As the pair have chosen to eat of the tree of knowledge, lest now they should eat of the tree of life they are expelled from the garden, and the gate is guarded by flaming sword and Cherubim.

3. History or Exposition?:

It is impossible to read this story with the entire detachment that we accord to an ancient myth, or even to a time- and space- conditioned historical tale. It continually suggests intimate relations with the permanent truths of human nature, as if there were a fiber in it truer than fact. And this provokes the inquiry whether the author himself intended the account of the Edenic state and the Fall to be taken as literal history or as exposition. He uniformly makes the name generic by the article (the adam or man), the only exceptions, which are not real exceptions in meaning, being Ge 1:26, 2:5, already noted. It is not until 5:3, where the proper name Adam is as it were officially given, that such history as is conditioned by chronology and genealogy begins. What comes before this, except the somewhat vague location of the Eden region, 2:10-14, reads rather like a description of the primordial manhood nature not in philosophical but in narrative language . It is not fable, it is not a worked-over myth, it is not a didactic parable; it is (to speak technically) exposition by narration. By a descriptive story it traces the elemental movement of manhood in its first spiritual impact on this earthly life. In other words, instead of being concerned to relate a factual series of events from the remote past, the writer's penetrative intuition goes downward and inward to those spiritual movements of being which are germinal in all manhood. It is a spiritual analysis of man's intrinsic nature, and as such must be spiritually discerned. An analogous manner of exposition may be seen in the account of our Lord's temptation in the wilderness, Mt 4:1-11, which account, if authentic, must have come ultimately from our Lord Himself.

II. How the Story Looks Today.

Scarcely any other Scripture story has so suffered from the changes wrought by modern thinking as has this story of Adam. On the one hand it is felt that to refer the fall and inherited guilt of mankind to this experience of Adam as a cause is to impose too great a burden, dogmatic and historic, on this primitive story. Yet on the other hand the story, including this implication of the primal fall, refuses to be

dismissed as an outworn or fantastic myth. It lays hold so vitally on the roots of human nature that our only course is not to reject it but to re-read it with the best light our age affords. And whether best or not, the evolutionary light in which all modern thought is colored cannot be ignored.

1. In the Light of Evolution:

The divergent assumptions of the traditional and the evolutionary view may be roughly stated thus: of the traditional, that in consequence of this Eden lapse man is a ruined nature, needing redemption and reinstatement, and that therefore the subsequent spiritual dealing with him must be essentially pathological and remedial; of the evolutionary, that by the very terms of his creation, which the lapse from obedience did not annul, man is spiritually a child needing growth and education, and that therefore the subsequent dealing with him must foster the development within him of a nature essentially normal and true. It is evident that these two views, thus stated, merely regard two lines of potency in one nature. Without rejecting the traditional, or stopping to inquire how it and the evolutionary may coexist, we may here consider how the story before us responds to the evolutionary view. Only—it must be premised—the evolution whose beginning it describes is not the evolution of the human species; we can leave natural science and history to take care of that; but, beginning where this leaves off, the evolution of the individual, from the first forth-putting of individual initiative and choice toward the far-off adult and complete personality.

This, which in view of its culmination we may call the evolution of personality, is evolution distinctively spiritual, that stage and grade of upward moving being which succeeds to the material and psychical (compare 1Co 15:45,46). On the material stage of evolution, which the human species shares with the beast and the plant, Scripture is silent. Nor is it greatly concerned with the psychical, or cultural development of the human species, except to reveal in a divinely ordered history and literature its essential inadequacy to the highest manhood potencies. Rather its field is the evolution of the spirit in which alone the highest personal values are realized. In the delimitation of this field it has a consistent origin, course and culmination of its own, as it traces the line of spiritual uprising and growth from the first Adam, who as a "living soul" was subject to the determinism of the species, to the last Adam, who as a "life-giving spirit" is identified with the supreme Personality in whom Divine and human met and blended. Of this tremendous evolution the story of Adam, with a clearness which the quaint narrative style of exposition does not impair, reveals the primal and directive factors.

2. The Garden Habitat:

Just as the habitat and the nature of created things answer to each other, so the environment in which man is placed when he comes from his Creator’s hand connotes the kind of life he is fitted to live. He is placed not in wild and refractory Nature but in a garden watered and planted with a new to his receiving care and nurture from above. Nature is kindly and responsive, furnishing, fruits ready to his hand, and requiring only that he "dress and keep" the garden. Of all the trees he may freely eat, including the tree of life; save only the most centrally located of all, the tree of "knowledge of good and evil"

The being fitted to this habitat is a man adult in stature and intelligence, but still like a child; not yet individualized to determinate character, not yet exerting a will of his own apart from the will of his Creator; in other words, as spiritually considered, not yet detached from the spirit of his personal Source. All this reads like the description of a life essentially negative, or rather neutral, with free communication both downward and upward, but neither that of a domesticated animal nor of a captive god; a being balanced, as it were, between the earthly and the Divine, but not yet aware of the possession of that individual will and choice which alone can give spiritual significance to a committal to either.

3. The Organic Factor:

In the first story of man's creation, Ge 1:26-31, describing his creation as a species, the distinction of male and female is explicitly included (Ge 1:27). In the second story (Ge 2-3), wherein man is contemplated rather as an individual, the description of his nature begins before any distinction of sex exists. If the writer meant this latter to portray a condition of man in time or in natural fact, there is thus a discrepancy in accounts. If we regard it, however, as giving a factor in spiritual evolution, it not only becomes full of meaning but lays hold profoundly on the ultimate teleology of creation. The naive story relates that the woman was "built" out of the already-shaped material of the man's body, in order to supply a fellowship which the animals could not; a help "answering to" into (keneghdo; compare Ge 2:18 margin). Then it makes the man recognize this conjugal relation, not at all with reference to sexual passion or the propagation of species but as furnishing man occasion, so to say, for loving and being loved, and making this capacity essential to the integrity of his nature. The value of this for the ultimate creative purpose and revelation is as marvelous as it is profound, it is the organic factor in realizing the far-reaching design of Him who is evolving a being bearing His image and deriving from Him the breath of life.

That God is Spirit (Joh 4:24), that God is love (1Jo 4:8,16) and love creation's "final law," may as an idea be later revelation; but meanwhile from the beginning, in the commonest relation of life, a pulsation of mutual love is implanted, by making man a dual nature, wherein love, which is the antithesis of self-seeking, has the equal and companionable object necessary to its existence. Thus, in the conjugal relation the potency of the highest and broadest spiritual value is made intrinsic. In all the dubious course of his subsequent evolution, this capacity of love, though itself subject to the corruptio optimi pessima, is like a redeeming element at the heart alike of the individual and of society.

4. The Invasion of Subtlety:

Even in this neutral garden existence it is noteworthy that the man's nature evinces its superiority to the animal in the absence of determinism he is not enslaved to an instinct of blind conformity to an external will In other words, he can cooperate intelligently in his own spiritual evolution. He has the power of choice, ministered by the stimulus of an unmotivated prohibition. He can abstain and live, or eat and die (Ge 2:16,17). No reasons are given, no train of spiritual consequences, to one whose spirit is not yet awake; in this pre-spiritual stage rather the beginnings of law and prescription must be arbitrary. Yet

even in so rudimentary a relation we are aware of the essential contrast between animal and spiritual evolution, in that the latter is not a blind and instinctive imposition from without, but a free course submitted to man's intelligence and cooperation. And it is a supremely significant feature of the narrative to make the first self-interested impulse come by the way of subtlety.

"The serpent," the writer premises, "was more subtle than any beast of the field which Yahweh God had made." It points to a trait which he puts on the border-line between the species and the individual, the disposition, not indeed to rebel against a law of being, but to submit it to refinement and accommodation or perhaps from sheer curiosity to try conclusions with it. The suggestion came first from the lower creation, but not from what is animal in it; and it was eagerly responded to by the woman, the finer and more spiritually awake of the pair. Not to press this too far, it is significant that the first impulse toward individual initiative rises through the free play of intellect and reason. It seems to promise a subtler way of being "like God." To differentiate more minutely the respective parts of man and wife in the affair, which are portrayed in the light of sex distinction, would be beyond our present scope. See EVE.

5. The Fateful Venture:

Two trees "in the midst of the garden" (Ge 2:9) are mentioned at the outset; but the tree of life, the permitted one, seems no more to have been thought of until it was no longer accessible (Ge 3:22); indeed, when the woman speaks to the serpent of "the tree which is in the midst of the garden" (Ge 3:3) she has only one tree in mind, and that the prohibited one. The other, as it was counted in with their daily fare and opportunity, seems to have been put by them with those privileges of life which are ignored or postponed, besides, the life it symbolized was the perpetuation of the garden-life they were living, such life as man would live before his spirit was awake to the alternatives of living—a life innocent and blissful, but without the stimulus of spiritual reaction. And it was just this latter that the alternative of the two trees afforded; a reaction fateful for good or evil, needing only the impulse that should set the human spirit in motion. Consider the case. If manhood were ever to rise from a state of childhood, wherein everything was done and prescribed for him, into a life of free choice and self-moved wisdom, it is hard to see how this could have been brought about except by something involving inhibition and prohibition; something that he could not do without incurring a risk.

This is what the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" (Ge 2:17) means. The tree by its very name was alike a test and a lure. In a sense we may say the temptation began with God; but it was not a temptation to evil. Symbolized in the two trees, but actual in the opportunity of spiritual committal, two ways of life stood open before him. On the one hand, it was open to him to fortify his spent in obedience and against the lure of perilous knowledge, thus deepening and seasoning his negative innocence into positive holiness. That such a course was feasible was shown centuries later in the Divine Son of Man, who in perfect loyalty of the child yet in perfect wisdom of adultness fulfilled the primal sinless ideal of the first Adam. On the other hand there was the lure of the forbidden knowledge, to which the serpent gave the false glamor of godlikeness, and which could be had by detaching his individual will from that of God, and incurring the experience of self- seeking, and taking the risk. It was the latter that was chosen, this however not in the spirit of rebellion or temptation, but in the desire for a good beyond what the childlike limitations of Eden afforded (Ge 3:6). This then was the first motivated uprising of the

spirit of manhood, taking the initiative and acting for itself. So far forth, as the self-assertion of the individual, it was as truly a stage of spiritual evolution as if the man had maintained obedience; but there was in it the rupture of his spirit's union with its personal Source; and the hapless committal to self, which is rightly called a Fall. So strangely mingled were the spiritual elements in this primal manhood initiative. See FALL, THE.

6. The Fitted Sequel:

The Scripture does not say, or even imply, that by this forth-putting of initiative the man was committed to a life of sin and depravity. This was the idea of a later time. By the nature of the case, however, he was committed to the fallibility and lack of wisdom of his own untried nature; in other words, to the perils of self-reliance. Naturally, too, the gulf of detachment from his spiritual Support would tend to widen as he trusted himself more exclusively. It lay with him and his species to perfect the individual personality in the freedom which he had chosen. And in this the possibilities both upward toward godlikeness and downward toward the abysms of self were immensely enlarged. Life must henceforth be lived on a broader and profounder scale. But to this end Eden with its tender garden nurture can no longer be its habitat, nor can man's existence be fitly symbolized by a tree from which he has only to take and subsist indefinitely (Ge 3:22). It must encounter hardship and sweat and toil; it must labor to subdue a reluctant soil to its service (Ge 3:17-19); it must return at last to the dust from which man's body was formed (Ge 3:19). Yet there is vouchsafed a dim and distant presage of ultimate victory over the serpent-power, which henceforth is to be man's deadly enemy (Ge 3:15). At this point of the exposition it is that the inchoate manhood is transplanted from the garden to the unsubdued world, to work out its evolution under the conditions of the human species. The pair becomes the family, with its family interests and cares; the family becomes the unit of social and organized life; the members receive individual names (Ge 3:20; 5:2); and chronologically measured history begins.

III. How Adam Is Recognized in the Old Testament.

After the story of Adam is given as far as the birth of Cain and Abel (Ge 4:1,2) and Seth (Ge 4:25), the "book of the generations of Adam" begins at Ge 5:1, and five verses are taken up with a statistical outline of his life, his offspring, and his 930 years of earthly existence.

1. In the Old Testament Canonical Books:

Here at Ge 5:5, in the canonical books of the Old Testament almost all allusion to him ceases, and nothing whatever is made of his fateful relation to the sin and guilt of the race. (See ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.) This latter idea seems to have come to consciousness only when men's sense of sin and a broken law was more ingrained than it seems to have been in canonical times In the case of the few allusions that, occur, moreover, the fact that the name "Adam" is identical with the word for "man" makes the reference more or less uncertain; one does not know whether the patriarch or the race is meant. In the So of Moses (De 32), in the clause De 32:8, "when he separated the children of men" (or "Adam"), the reference, which is to the distribution of races as given in Ge 10, may or may not have

Adam in mind. In like manner Zophar's words (Job 20:4), "Knowest thou not this of old time, since man (or Adam) was placed upon earth?" may or may not be recognition by name of the first created man Job's words (Job 31:33), "if like Adam I have covered my transgressions," sound rather more definite as an allusion to Adam's hiding himself after having taken the fruit. When Isaiah says (Isa 43:27), "Thy first father sinned," It is uncertain whom he means; for in Isa 51:2 he says, "Look unto Abraham your father," and Ezekiel has told his people (Eze 16:3), "The Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was a Hittite." The historical consciousness of the prophets seems to have been confined to the history of the Israelite race.

2. In the Apocrypha:

The references in the Apocryphal books (Sirach, Tobit, 2 Esdras) deal with Adam's origin, his lordship over creation, and in the latest written book with the legacy of sin and misery that the race inherits from him. The passages in Sirach (132 BC) where he is mentioned are 33:10; 40:1, and 49:16. Of these the most striking, 40:1, "Great travail is created for every man, and a heavy yoke is upon the sons of Adam," is hardly to be construed as a reference to our heritage of his sin. In Tobit (2nd century BC) he is mentioned once (8:6), "Thou madest Adam, and gavest him Eve." 2 Esdras, written supposedly some time after 70 AD, is of a somber and desponding tone throughout; and its references to Adam (2 Esdras 3:5,10,21,26, 4:30; 6:54; 7:11,46,48) are almost all in lament over the evil he has implanted in the race of men by his transgression. The first reference (3:5) is rather remarkable for its theory of Adam's nature: "And (thou) commandedst the dust, and it gave thee Adam, a body without a soul, yet it was the workmanship of thine hands," etc. His indictment of Adam culminates (7:48) in the apostrophe: "O thou Adam, what hast thou done? for though it was thou that sinned, the evil is not fallen on thee alone, but upon all of us that come of thee."

John Franklin Genung

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—The promoters of the Encyclopedia are not to be understood as endorsing all the views set forth in Dr. Genung's article. It was thought right, however, that a full and adequate presentation of so suggestive an interpretation should be given.)

ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE APOCRYPHA

ad'-am, ('adham; Septuagint Adam).

1. Usage and Etymology:

The Hebrew word occurs some 560 times in the Old Testament with the meaning "man," "mankind." Outside Ge 1-5 the only case where it is unquestionably a proper name is 1Ch 1:1. Ambiguous are De 32:8, the King James Version "sons of Adam," the Revised Version (British and American) "children of men"; Job 31:33 the King James Version "as" the Revised Version (British and American) "like Adam," but margin "after the manner of men"; Ho 6:7 the King James Version "like men," the Revised Version

(British and American) "like Adam," and vice versa in the margin. In Ge 1 the word occurs only twice, 1:26,27. In Ge 2-4 it is found 26 times, and in 5:1,3,4,5. In the last four cases and in 4:25 it is obviously intended as a proper name; but the versions show considerable uncertainty as to the rendering in the other cases. Most modern interpreters would restore a vowel point to the Hebrew text in 2:20; 3:17,21, thus introducing the definite article, and read uniformly "the man" up to 4:25, where the absence of the article may be taken as an indication that "the man" of the previous narrative is to be identified with "Adam," the head of the genealogy found in 5:1 ff. Several conjectures have been put forth as to the root-meaning of the Hebrew word:

(1) creature;

(2) ruddy one;

(3) earthborn. Less probable are

(4) pleasant—to sight—and

(5) social gregarious.

2. Adam in the Narrative of Genesis:

Many argue from the context that the language of Ge 1:26,27 is general, that it is the creation of the human species, not of any particular individual or individuals, that is in the described. But

(1) the context does not even descend to a species, but arranges created things according to the most general possible classification: light and darkness; firmament and waters; land and seas; plants; sun, moon, stars; swimming and flying creatures; land animals. No possible parallel to this classification remains in the case of mankind.

(2) In the narrative of Ge 1 the recurrence of identical expressions is almost rigidly uniform, but in the case of man the unique statement occurs (verse 27), "Male and female created he them." Although Dillmann is here in the minority among interpreters, it would be difficult to show that he is wrong in interpreting this as referring to one male and one female, the first pair. In this case we have a point of contact and of agreement with the narrative of chapter 2.

Man, created in God’s image, is given dominion over every animal, is allowed every herb and fruit tree for his sustenance, and is bidden multiply and fill the earth. In Ge 2:4-5:5 the first man is made of the dust, becomes a living creature by the breath of God, is placed in the garden of Eden to till it, gives names to the animals, receives as his counterpart and helper a woman formed from part of his own body, and at the woman’s behest eats of the forbidden fruit of "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." With her he is then driven from the garden, under the curse of brief life and heavy labor, since should he eat—or continue to eat?—of the fruit of the "tree of life," not previously forbidden, he might go on

living forever. He becomes the father of Cain and of Abel, and of Seth at a time after the murder of Abel. According to 5:3,5 Adam is aged 130 years at the birth of Seth and lives to the age of 930 years.

3. Teachings of the Narrative:

That man was meant by the Creator to be in a peculiar sense His own "image"; that he is the divinely appointed ruler over all his fellow-creatures on earth; and that he enjoys, together with them, God's blessing upon a creature fit to serve the ends for which it was created—these things lie upon the surface of Ge 1:26-31. In like manner 2-4 tell us that the gift of a blessed immortality was within man's reach; that his Creator ordained that his moral development should come through an inward trial, not as a mere gift; and that the presence of suffering in the world is due to sin, the presence of sin to the machinations of a subtle tempter. The development of the doctrine of the fall belongs to the New Testament. See ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT; FALL, THE.

4. Adam in Apocrypha:

Allusions to the narrative of the creation and the fall of man, covering most points of the narrative of Ge 1-4, are found in 2 Esdras 3:4-7,10,21,26; 4:30; 6:54-56; 7:11,46-48; Tobit 8:6, The Wisdom of Solomon 2:23 f; 9:2 f; 10:1 f, Ecclesiasticus 15:14; 17:1-4; 25:24; 40:1; 49:16. In both 2 Esdras and The Wisdom of Solomon we read that death came upon all men through Adam's sin, while 2 Esdras 4:30 declares that "a grain of evil seed was sown in the heart of Adam from the beginning." Aside from this doctrinal development the Apocrypha offers no additions to the Old Testament narrative.

F. K. Farr

ADAM, BOOKS OF

Books pretending to give the life and deeds of Adam and other Old Testament worthies existed in abundance among the Jews and the early Christians. The Talmud speaks of a Book of Adam, which is now lost, but which probably furnished some of the material which appears in early Christian writings. The Vita Adami was translated from the Ethiopic by Dillmann (1853), and into English by Malan (The Book of Adam and Eve, London, 1882). The Testament of Adam is a portion of the Vita Adami (published by Renan in 1853) and so probably is the Diatheke ton Protoplaston (Fabricius, II, 83). See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; APOCRYPHA.

M. O. Evans

ADAM, CITY OF

('adham, "red" or BDB "made"): A city in the middle of the Jordan valley near ZARETHAN (Jos 3:16), which see. The name probably survives at the Damieh Ford, near the mouth of the Jabbok twenty miles above Jericho. An Arabian historian asserts that about 1265 AD the Jordan was here blocked by a land

slide. The inner gorge of the Jordan is here narrow with high banks which would facilitate such an obstruction as permitted the waters to "pile up" above to Adam and run out below, permitting Joshua's host to cross on dry land (SWP, II, 15; Wright, SCOTH, 130-34).

George Frederick Wright

ADAMAH

ad'-a-ma ('adhamah; Adami): A fortified city in the territory of Naphtali, named between Chinnereth and Ramah (Jos 19:36). It is probably identical with the modern 'Admah, a ruin on the plateau about 10 miles North of Beisan.

ADAMANT

ad'-a-mant (shamir (Eze 3:9; Zec 7:12)): In the passages cited and in Jer 17:1, where it is rendered "diamond" the word shamir evidently refers to a hard stone. The word adamant ("unconquerable") is used in the early Greek writers for a hard metal, perhaps steel, later for a metal-like gold and later for the diamond. The Hebrew shamir, the Greek adamas (from which word "diamond" as well as "adamant" is derived) and the English adamant occur regularly in figurative expressions. All three are equally indefinite. Adamant may therefore be considered a good translation for shamir, though the Septuagint does not use adamas in the passages cited. There is a possible etymological identification of shamir with the Greek smyris (smeris or smiris), emery, a granular form of corundum well known to the ancients and used by them for polishing and engraving precious stones. Corundum in all its forms, including the sapphire and ruby, is in the scale of hardness next to the diamond. In English Versions of the Bible Isa 5:6; 7:23-25; 9:18; 10:17; 27:4; 32:13, shamir is translated "brier". See also STONES, PRECIOUS.

Alfred Ely Day

ADAMI

ad'-a-mi; a-da'-mi: Mentioned in the King James Version as a separate name, where the Revised Version (British and American) has ADAMI-NEKEB, which see (Jos 19:33).

ADAMI-NEKEB

ad'-a-mi ne'-keb 'adhami ha-neqebh, "the ground of the piercing," (that is of the pass, or defile): A place mentioned in indicating the border of Naphtali (Jos 19:33). In the King James Version, Adami and Nekeb are given as separate names, and it is an open question which view of the matter is correct. Most of the Greek texts give the names as two. The Vulgate has "Adami quae est Neceb." The Jerusalem Talmud gives two names, though instead of Hannekeb or Nekeb it has Siyadathah (Meg 1 1, or Neubauer's Geog du Talmud, 225). In the list of places conquered by Thothmes III of Egypt occurs the

name NQBU (Tomkins, Rec of Past, new series, V, 47), which seems to be the same with Neqeb.

The list of names for the border of Naphtali (Jos 19:33,34) has no name in common with the list of cities (Jos 19:35-38) unless Adami and Adamah are the same. The PE Survey maps locate Adamah at Damieh, about seven miles northwest of the exit of the Jordan from the Lake of Galilee, and Adami at Khurbet Adamah, five or six miles south of the exit. Conder, Tomkins and others place Adami at Damieh, and identify Nekeb by its Talmudic name in the neighboring ruin Seiyadeh. Conder says (art. "Nekeb," HDB) that the "pass" implied in the name Nekeb "is probably one leading from the eastern precipices near Tiberias."

Willis J. Beecher

ADAN

a’-dan. See ADDAN.

ADAR (1)

a-’dar (’adhar, meaning uncertain): The Babylonian name of the twelfth month of the year. Used in the Bible only in Ezr 6:15 and eight times in Esther. At first the author in Esther defines Adar as the twelfth month, but afterward omits the numeral. In order to maintain the relation of the year to the seasons it was customary to add a second Adar, as often as was needed, as an intercalary month.

ADAR (2)

a’-dar: In the King James Version (Jos 15:3) for ADDAR, which see.

ADARSA

a-dar’-sa. See ADASA.

ADASA

ad’-a-sa (Adasa; the King James Version Adarsa): A town less than four miles from Beth-horon (30 furlongs Ant, XII, x, 5; 1 Macc 7:40) and a day’s journey from Gazara (1 Macc 7:45), where Judas Maccabee defeated and killed Nicanor, a general of Demetrius (1 Macc 7:40 ff). The ruin of Adaseh near Gibeon (SWP, III, XVII).

ADBEEL

ad’-be-el (’adhbe’el, "God’s discipline," possibly): The third of the twelve sons of Ishmael (Ge 25:13; 1Ch 1:29). The name appears in the Assyrian records as that of a north Arabian tribe residing somewhere Southwest of the Dead Sea.

ADD

(1) epidiatassomai, "to add to," "to arrange in addition": Found only in Ga 3:15, which may thus be paraphrased: "To take a familiar illustration: even a man’s will, when ratified, no third party may annul or supplement" (Dummelow, in the place cited.).

(2) epitithemi, "to put upon," "If any man shall add unto them, God shall add unto him the plagues" (Re 22:18). The book is not to be falsified by addition or excision (see BOOK) by the interpolation of unauthorized doctrines or the neglect of essential ones (compare De 4:2; 12:32).

See also IMPART; SUPPLY.

M. O. Evans

ADDAN

ad’-an (’addan; in Ne ‘addon; connected in some way with the name of the god Addu): A name mentioned in the list of the returning exiles (Ezr 2:59, duplicated in Ne 7:61). It is one of several names of Babylonian localities from which came men who were unable to declare their genealogy as Israelites.

ADDAR

ad’-ar (’addar, "glorious"): See ARD

(1) A grandson of Benjamin, sometimes counted as one of his sons (1Ch 8:3).

(2) A town on the southern border of Judah (Jos 15:3, the King James Version "Adar"). The same as Hazar-addar (Nu 34:4).

ADDER

ad’-er (‘akhshubh (Ps 140:3); pethen (Ps 58:4); tsiph‘oni (Pr 23:32); shephiphon (Ge 49:17); tsepha‘ (King James Version margin; Isa 14:29)): This word is used for several Hebrew originals. In each case a poisonous serpent is clearly indicated by the context. It is impossible to tell in any case just what species is meant, but it must be remembered that the English word adder is used very ambiguously. It is from the Anglo-Saxon noedre, a snake or serpent, and is the common English name for Vipera berus, L, the common viper, which is found throughout Europe and northern Asia, though not in Bible

lands; but the word "adder" is also used for various snakes, both poisonous and non-poisonous, found in different parts of the world. In America, for instance, both the poisonous moccasin (Ancistrodon) and the harmless hog-nosed snakes (Heterodon) are called adders.

See SERPENT.

Alfred Ely Day

ADDI

ad’-i (Addi; Addei): An ancestor of Joseph, the husband of Mary, mother of Jesus; fourth from Zerubbabel in the ascending genealogical series (Lu 3:28).

ADDICT

a-dikt’:Found only in the King James Version of 1Co 16:15, for Greek tasso. The house of Stephanus is said to be "addicted to the ministry of the saints," i.e. they have so "arranged" their affairs as to make of this service a prime object; the Revised Version (British and American) "set themselves to minister."

ADDO

ad’-o (Codex Alexandrinus, Addo; Codex Vaticanus, Eddein) = Iddo (Ezr 5:1; 6:14): The father (Zec 1:1,7 grandfather) of Zechariah the prophet (1 Esdras 6:1).

ADDON

ad’-on.

See ADDAN.

ADDUS

ad’-us (Addous): The descendants of Addus (sons of Solomon’s servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:34). Omitted in Ezr 2 and Ne 7$.

ADER

a’-der: Used in 1Ch 8:15 the King James Version for EDER, which see.

ADIABENE

a-di-a-be’-ne (Adiabene): A state lying on the east of the Tigris, on the greater and lesser rivers Zab, in the territory of ancient Assyria. For the half-century terminating with the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, Adiabene is especially interesting by reason of the careers of its king, Izates, and his mother Helena, who became Jews. They had their part in the Jewish-Roman wars, and in various ways were typical of the existing situation. (See Ant, XX, 2-5; BJ, II, xvi, 4; xix. 2; V, iv, 2; vi. 1; xi. 5; VI, vi, 4.) Somewhat later Adiabene was absorbed into the Roman Empire and became one of the six provinces which formed the larger province of Assyria, though Pliny and Ammianus sometimes call the large province by the name Adiabene.

Willis J. Beecher

ADIDA

ad’-i-da (Adida). A town of the Benjamin tribe near Lod and Ono located upon a hill facing the "plain country" of Judea, rebuilt and fortified by Simon Maccabee (1 Macc 12:38), who later encamped here to meet the army of Tryphon (1 Macc 13:13; Ant, XIII, vi, 5). It was also here that Aretas, king of Arabia, met Alexander Janneus in battle and defeated him (Ant., XIII, xv, 2). Perhaps the El-Haditheh of today located about three miles east of Lydda or Lod. See HADID.

ADIEL

ad’-i-el (‘adhi’el, "ornament of God"):

(1) One of the "princes" of the tribe of Simeon, who, in the days of Hezekiah, smote the aborigines of Gedor and captured the valley (1Ch 4:36 ff).

(2) Father of Maasai, one of the priests who dwelt in Jerusalem after the return from the Exile (1Ch 9:12).

(3) Father of Azmaveth who was over David’s treasures (1Ch 27:25).

ADIN

a’-din (‘adhin, "adorned"): The name of a family, "the sons of Adin" (Ezr 2:15; 8:6; Ne 7:20; 10:16; 1 Esdras 5:14; 8:32), mentioned among the returning exiles. The list in Ezr 2$ is placed in the midst of the narrative concerning Zerubbabel, but its title and Its contents show that it also includes the later Jewish immigrants into Palestine. The list in Ne 7$ is a duplicate of that in Ezr, but with variations; most of the variations are naturally accounted for by supposing that one copy was made later than the other and was brought up to date. In Ezr and 1 Esdras the number of the sons of Adin is said to be 454; in Ne it is 655. The 50 males, led by Ebed the son of Jonathan, who came with Ezr, may or may not have been included

in the numbers just mentioned. Among the names of those who sealed the covenant along with Ne are 44 that are placed under the caption "the chiefs of the people" (Ne 10:14-26), and nearly half of these are the family names of the list in Ezr 2$ and Ne 7$. It is natural to infer that in these cases a family sealed the covenant collectively through some representative. In that case the Adin here mentioned is the same that is mentioned in the other places. See also ADINU.

Willis J. Beecher

ADINA

ad'-i-na, a-di'-na ('adhina'," adorned"). "Adina the son of Shiza the Reubenite, a chief of the Reubenites, and thirty with him" (1Ch 11:42). This is in that part of the list of David's mighty men in which the Chronicler supplements the list given in 2 Samuel.

ADINO

ad'-i-no, a-di'-no ('adhino, "his adorned one"): The senior of David's "mighty men." "Josheb-basshebeth a Tahchemonite, chief of the captains; the same was Adino the Eznite, against eight hundred slain at one time" (2Sa 23:8). This very exact rendering makes it evident even to an English reader that the text is imperfect. Ginsburg offers a corrected form taken substantially from the parallel passage in 1Ch 11:11: "Jashobeam a son of a Hachmonite, chief of the captains; he lifted up his spear." This is plausible, and is very generally accepted, and eliminates the names Adino and Eznite, which do not occur elsewhere in the Bible. Some of the facts are against this. The Septuagint has the names Adino and Eznite. The Latin finds no proper names in the passage, but so translates the words as to presuppose the Hebrew text as we have it. It may be a case for suspended judgment.

The texts concerning David's mighty men are fragmentary both in Samuel and in Chronicles. If they were more complete they would perhaps make it clear that the three seniors were comrades of David at Pas-dammim, Ephes- dammim (1Ch 11:13; 1Sa 17:1); and that we have in them additional details concerning that battle. The record says that on the death of Goliath the Philistines fled and the Israelites pursued (1Sa 17:52 ff), but it is not improbable that during the retreat portions of the Philistine force rallied, so that there was strenuous fighting.

Willis J. Beecher

ADINU; ADIN

ad'-i-nu, ad'-in (Adinou, 1 Esdras 5:14; Adin, 1 Esdras 8:32): Compare Adin (Ezr 2:15; 8:6; Ne 7:20; 10:16). The descendants of Adin (leaders of the nation) returned with their families to Jerusalem: one party being with Zerubbabel (454 members 1 Esdras 5:14), a second party with Ezra (250 members 1 Esdras 8:32).

ADINUS

ad’-i-nus. See IADINUS (Apocrypha).

ADITHAIM

ad-i-tha’-im (‘adhithayim "double ornament, passage, or prey"): A city in "the lowland" (Shephelah, not as the King James Version "valley") of Judah (Jos 15:36). Site unknown, but possibly same as ADIDA (which see).

ADJURATION

ad-ju-ra’-shun: The act of requiring or taking a solemn oath. In a time of military peril Saul adjured the people (’alah, "to take oath") and they took oath by saying "Amen" (1Sa 14:24). When Joshua pronounced a ban on Jericho (Jos 6:26) he completed it with an oath (shabha‘, "to cause to swear"). Often used in the sense of a solemn charge without the administration of an oath (1Ki 22:16; 2Ch 18:15; So 2:7; 5:8,9; 1Th 5:27). With reference to the withholding of testimony, see Le 5:1 and Pr 29:24. The high priest sought to put Jesus under oath (exorkizo, "to force to an oath," Mt 26:63). Adjure also means to solemnly implore (horkizo) as when the man with an unclean spirit appealed to Jesus: "I adjure thee by God, torment me not" (Mr 5:7); or seven sons of Sceva, exorcists, sought in the name of Jesus to expel demons (Ac 19:13).

(1) The exacting of an oath has, from time immemorial, been a customary procedure in conferring civil and ecclesiastical office and in taking legal testimony. Though often allowed to become painfully trivial and a travesty on its inherent solemnity, the taking of an official oath or the swearing of witnesses is still considered essential to the moral integrity of government, secular or spiritual. False sweating, under solemn oath, constitutes the guilt and heinousness of perjury. The universality of oath-taking is humanity’s tribute, whether pagan or Christian, to the sacredness of truth.

(2) Civilized nations administer oaths under three heads: political, ecclesiastical, legal. The sovereign of England receives the crown only as he or she responds affirmatively to the solemn adjuration of the archbishop or bishop: "Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern," etc., closing with the affirmation, "So help me God." A fundamental conviction of civilized nations was expressed by Lycurgus: "An oath is the bond that keeps the state together." It is the most solemn appeal to the inviolability of the human conscience, and the sacredness of a vow as witnessed both by God and men. See also OATH.

Dwight M. Pratt

ADLAI

ad’-la-i, ad’-li (‘adhlay; Septuagint Adli and Adai, "lax, weary"): The father of Shaphat, an overseer of David’s herds in the lowlands (1Ch 27:29).

ADMAH

ad’-ma (’adhmah): From a root signifying red; one of the Cities of the Plain (Ciccar) (Ge 10:19; 14:2,8; De 29:23; Ho 11:8) upon which Abraham and Lot looked from the heights of Bethel; destroyed with Sodom and Gomorrah. Conder tentatively identifies it with the City of Adam referred to in Jos 3:16, and thinks that perhaps the name may be preserved in that of Damieh Ford, near the mouth of the river Jabbok; but that point could not have been in view from Bethel.

See VALE OF SIDDIM.

ADMATHA

ad’-ma-tha, ad-ma’-tha (’adhmatha’): One of "the seven princes of Persia and Media, who saw the king’s face, and sat first in the kingdom" (Es 1:14); compare 2Ki 25:19; Ezr 7:14. The Septuagint gives only three names.

ADMIN

ad’-min. See ARNI.

ADMINISTER; ADMINISTRATION

ad-min’-is-ter ad-min-is-tra’-shun diakoneo, diakonia: Terms used in the King James Version in 1Co 12:5; 2Co 8:19,20; 2Co 9:12 respectively, and replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by "minister" and "ministration." The root idea of both words is "service," hence to supply, or conduct or attend to anything; the performance of official duty, the conduct of affairs, the various forms of spiritual or social service. "Minister," used either of an act or of an office, is the term that best represents the apostolic thought and ideal.

Dwight M. Pratt

ADMIRATION

ad-mi-ra’-shun (thauma, "a marvel" or "wonder"; thaumazo, "to wonder"): A term thrice used in the King James Version in the New Testament, to express a wonder that includes approval, high esteem; replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by three renderings better suited to convey the various kinds of surprise, wonder, admiration, expressed, by this fertile word: namely, in 2Th 1:10, "to be admired," reads in the Revised Version (British and American) "to be marveled at"; in Jude 1:16

"having men’s persons in admiration" is rendered "showing respect of persons"; in Re 17:6 "wondered with great admiration" is replaced by "with a great wonder." The Greek original is used frequently in the New Testament, especially in the Gospels, to express marvel and wonder at the supernatural works of Jesus.

Dwight M. Pratt

ADNA

ad’-na (‘adhna’," pleasure"; Aidaine):

(1) An Israelite in Ezra’s time who, having married a foreign wife, divorced her. He belonged to Pahath-moab (Ezr 10:30).

(2) A priest of the family of Harum, during the high-priesthood of Joiakim son of Jethua (Ne 12:12-15).

ADNAH

ad’-na (‘adhnach, "pleasure"; Edna):

(1) A warrior of the tribe of Manasseh, who deserted Saul and joined David’s forces at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20,21)

(2) An officer of high rank, perhaps the commander-in-chief of Jehoshaphat’s army (2Ch 17:14). Here the spelling in Hebrew is ‘adhnah.

ADO

a-doo’:Found only in Mr 5:39 King James Version: "Why make ye this ado and weep?" Here "make ado" is used to translate the Greek verb thorubeomai (compare Mt 9:23 the King James Version, where it is likewise rendered "making a noise"). "Ado" as a substantive is Old English for "trouble" or "fuss," used only in the sing.; and in the early English versions it combined well with the verb "make," as here, to translate the Greek word rendered elsewhere "causing an uproar," or "tumult," "making a noise," etc. (see Ac 17:5; 20:10). Compare Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, III, 4, "We’ll keep no great ado; —a friend or two."

George B. Eager

ADONAI

a-do’-ni, ad-o-na’-i (’adhonay): A Divine name, translated "Lord," and signifying, from its derivation,

"sovereignty." Its vowels are found in the Massoretic Text with the unpronounceable tetragrammaton YHWH; and when the Hebrew reader came to these letters, he always substituted in pronunciation the word "‘ adhonay." Its vowels combined with the tetragrammaton form the word "Yahweh (Yahweh)."

See GOD, NAMES OF.

ADONI-ZEDEK

a-do-ni-ze’-dek (’adhonitsedheq, "lord of righteousness"): King of Jerusalem at the time of the conquest of Canaan (Jos 10:1). When he heard of the fall of Ai and the submission of the Gibeonites, he entered into a league with four other kings to resist Joshua and Israel, and to punish Gibeon (Jos 10:3,4), but was overthrown by Joshua in a memorable battle (Jos 10:12-14). Adoni-zedek and his four allies were shut up in a cave, while the battle lasted, and afterward were taken out by Joshua’s order, put to death and hanged on trees (Jos 10:22-27). It is noticeable that the name is almost the equivalent of Melchizedek, malkitsedheq, "king of righteousness," who was ruler of Jerusalem in the time of Abraham.

Edward Mack

ADONIBEZEK

a-do-ni-be’-zek (’adhonibhezeq "lord of Bezek"): Lord of a town, Bezek, in southern Palestine, whom the tribes of Judah and Simeon overthrew. Adonibezek fled when his men were defeated, but was captured, and was punished for his cruelty in cutting off the thumbs and great toes of seventy kings by a similar mutilation. Being brought to Jerusalem, he died there (Jud 1:5-7). This not to be confused with Adonizedek, as in the Septuagint. This is quite another name.

ADONIJAH

ad-o-ni’-ja (’adhoniyahu or ‘adhoniyah, "my lord is Yahweh"):

(1) The son of David and Haggith, the forth of David’s sons, born in Hebron after David became king of Judah, principally known for his attempt to become king instead of Solomon (2Sa 3:4; 1Ch 3:2; 1Ki 1$, 2 $). The record gives no details concerning Chileab, the son of David and Abigail. Leaving him out, Adonijah was the oldest living son of David, after the death of Amnon and Absalom.

In treating the record it has been needlessly obscured by neglecting or distorting the time data. It says that the rebellion of Absalom broke out "at an end of forty years" (2Sa 15:7). The natural meaning is not forty years after the last-mentioned preceding date, but at the close of the fortieth calendar year of the reign of David. Since David reigned 40 1/2 years (2Sa 5:4,5), the close of his fortieth calendar year was the beginning of has last year. That the date intended was at the beginning of a vernal year is confirmed by the references to the season (2Sa 17:19,28). Instead of giving this number Josephus says that 4 years

had elapsed since the last preceding date, which is very likely correct.

Many considerations show that the outbreak cannot have occurred much earlier than the fortieth year of David; for Amnon and Absalom were born after David’s reign began, and were men with establishments of their own before Amnon’s offense against Tamar, and after that the record, if we accept the numeral of Josephus, accounts for 2 plus 3 plus 2 plus 4, that is, for 11 years (2Sa 13:23,38; 14:28; Ant, VII, ix, 1). In the year following David’s fortieth year there was ample room for the rebellions of Absalom and of Sheba, the illness of David, the attempt of Adonijah, and the beginning of the reign of Solomon. All things confirm the number forty as giving the date of the outbreak. The common assumption that the forty is to be reduced to four, on the basis of the number in Josephus, is contrary to the evidence.

On this view of the chronology all the events fall into line. David’s idea of making Solomon king was connected with his temple-building idea. This is implied in Kings, and presented somewhat in full in Chronicles. The preparations described in Chronicles (1Ch 22-29) seem to have culminated in David’s fortieth year (1Ch 26:31). David’s policy was not altogether popular with the nation. His assembly (1Ch 28:1) is mostly made up of sarim and other appointed officials, the hereditary Israelite "princes" and "elders" being conspicuous by their absence. The outbreak under Absalom was mainly a matter of skillful manipulation; the hearts of the people were really with David. And yet the party of Absalom was distinctly a legitimist party. It believed in the succession of the eldest son, and it objected to many things in the temple-building policy. Joab and Abiathar and others sympathized with this party, but they remained with David out of personal loyalty to him.

The Absalom campaign began early in the calendar year. There is no reason to think that it lasted more than a few weeks. Later in the year a few weeks are enough time to allow for the campaign against Sheba. Joab must have been more or less alienated from David by David’s appointment of Amasa to supersede him. Then came David’s serious illness. Abishag was brought in, not to "attend upon David during has declining years," but to put her vitality at has disposal during a few weeks. Joab and Abiathar did not believe that David would ever do business again. Their personal loyalty to him no longer restrained them from following their own ideas, even though these were contrary to his wishes.

The narrative does not represent that Nathan and Bathsheba influenced David to interfere in behalf of Solomon; it represents that they succeeded in arousing him from has torpor, so that he carried out his own wishes and intentions. Perhaps resting in bed had done something for him. The treatment by Abishag had not been unsuccessful. And now a supreme appeal to his mind proved sufficient to arouse him. He became himself again, and acted with has usual vigor and wisdom.

Adonijah is described as a handsome and showy man, but his conduct does not give us a high opinion of his capabilities. He had no real command of the respect of the guests who shouted "Live King Adonijah." When they heard that Solomon had been crowned, they "were afraid, and rose up, and went every man his way." Adonijah made has submission, but afterward attempted to engage in intrigues, and was put to death.

(2) One of the Levites sent out by Jehoshaphat, in his third year, with the Book of the Law, to give instruction in Judah (2Ch 17:8).

(3) One of the names given, under the heading "the chiefs of the people," of those who sealed the covenant along with Nehemiah (Ne 10:16).

Willis J. Beecher

ADONIKAM

ad-o-ni'-kam ('adhoniqam, "my lord has risen up"): The name of a family of the returning exiles (Ezr 2:13; Ne 7:18). "The sons of Adonikam," men and women and children, numbered 666 according to the list as given in Ezr, but 667 according to the copy in Neh. Either included among these or in addition to them was the contingent that came with Ezr, "Ehphalet, Jeuel, and Shemaiah, and with them 60 males" (Ezr 8:13).

ADONIRAM

ad-o-ni'-ram ('adhoniram, "my lord is exalted"): An official of Solomon (1Ki 4:6; 5:14). Near the close of the reign of David, and at the opening of the reign of Rehoboam, the same office was held by Adoram (2Sa 20:24; 1Ki 12:18).

The name Adoram seems to be a contraction of Adoniram, and doubtless the same person held the office in all the three reigns. The name also appears as Hadoram (2Ch 10:18). In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) the office is variantly described as "over the tribute," which is misleading, and "over the levy," which is correct, though obscure. In the American Standard Revised Version it is uniformly "over the men subject to taskwork." Adoniram was at the head of the department of forced labor for the government. The record is to the effect that peoples conquered by Israel, except the Canaanites, were to be spared, subject to the obligation to forced labor on the public works (De 20:11); that this law was actually extended to the Canaanites (Jos 16:10; 17:13; Jud 1:28 ff); that David, in his preparations for the temple, organized and handed over to Solomon a service of forced labor (1Ch 22:2,15, etc.); that under Solomon this service was elaborately maintained (1Ki 5:13 ff; 9:15 ff; 2Ch 8:7 ff).

It was not for the temple only, but for all Solomon's numerous building enterprises. In theory men of Israelite blood were free from this burden, but practically they found it a burden and a grievance. At the accession of Rehoboam they protested against it (1Ki 12; 2Ch 10). Nothing in the account is more indicative of Rehoboam's utter lack of good judgment than his sending his veteran superintendent of the forced labor department to confer with the people. The murder of Adoniram, and the ignominious flight of Rehoboam, were natural consequences.

Willis J. Beecher

ADONIS

a-do’-nis: A name for the Babylonian god TAMMUZ, which see. The word occurs only in the English Revised Version, margin of Isa 17:10, where for "pleasant plants" is read "plantings of Adonis." The the American Standard Revised Version rightly omits this marginal suggestion.

ADOPTION

a-dop’-shun (huiothesia, "placing as a son"): I. THE GENERAL LEGAL IDEA

1. In the Old Testament 2. Greek 3. Roman

II. PAUL’S DOCTRINE

1. In Galatians as Liberty 2. In Romans as Deliverance from Debt

III. THE CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE

1. In Relation to Justification 2. In Relation to Sanctification 3. In Relation to Regeneration

IV. AS GOD’S ACT

1. Divine Fatherhood 2. Its Cosmic Range This term appears first in New Testament, and only in the epistles of Paul (Ga 4:5; Ro 8:15,23; 9:4; Eph 1:5) who may have coined it out of a familiar Greek phrase of identical meaning. It indicated generally the legal process by which a man might bring into his family, and endow with the status and privileges of a son, one who was not by nature his son or of his kindred.

I. The General Legal Idea.

The custom prevailed among Greeks, Romans and other ancient peoples, but it does not appear in Jewish law.

1. In the Old Testament:

Three cases of adoption are mentioned: of Moses (Ex 2:10), Genubath (1Ki 11:20) and Esther (Es 2:7,15), but it is remarkable that they all occur outside of Palestine—in Egypt and Persia, where the practice of adoption prevailed. Likewise the idea appears in the New Testament only in the epistles of Paul, which were addressed to churches outside Palestine. The motive and initiative of adoption always

lay with the adoptive father, who thus supplied his lack of natural offspring and satisfied the claims of affection and religion, and the desire to exercise paternal authority or to perpetuate his family. The process and conditions of adoption varied with different peoples. Among oriental nations it was extended to slaves (as Moses) who thereby gained their freedom, but in Greece and Rome it was, with rare exceptions, limited to citizens.

2. Greek:

In Greece a man might during his lifetime, or by will, to take effect after his death, adopt any male citizen into the privileges of his son, but with the invariable condition that the adopted son accepted the legal obligations and religious duties of a real son.

3. Roman:

In Rome the unique nature of paternal authority (patria potestas), by which a son was held in his father's power, almost as a slave was owned by his master, gave a peculiar character to the process of adoption. For the adoption of a person free from paternal authority (sui juris), the process and effect were practically the same in Rome as in Greece (adrogatio). In a more specific sense, adoption proper (adoptio) was the process by which a person was transferred from his natural father's power into that of his adoptive father, and it consisted in a fictitious sale of the son, and his surrender by the natural to the adoptive father.

II. Paul's Doctrine.

As a Roman citizen the apostle would naturally know of the Roman custom, but in the cosmopolitan city of Tarsus, and again on his travels, he would become equally familiar with the corresponding customs of other nations. He employed the idea metaphorically much in the manner of Christ's parables, and, as in their case, there is danger of pressing the analogy too far in its details. It is not clear that he had any specific form of adoption in mind when illustrating his teaching by the general idea. Under this figure he teaches that God, by the manifestation of His grace in Christ, brings men into the relation of sons to Himself, and communicates to them the experience of sonship.

1. In Galatians as Liberty:

In Galatians, Paul emphasizes especially the liberty enjoyed by those who live by faith, in contrast to the bondage under which men are held, who guide their lives by legal ceremonies and ordinances, as the Galatians were prone to do (Ga 5:1). The contrast between law and faith is first set forth on the field of history, as a contrast between both the pre-Christian and the Christian economies (Ga 3:23,24), although in another passage he carries the idea of adoption back into the covenant relation of God with Israel (Ro 9:4). But here the historical antithesis is reproduced in the contrast between men who now choose to live under law and those who live by faith. Three figures seem to commingle in the description of man's condition under legal bondage—that of a slave, that of a minor under guardians appointed by his father's

will, and that of a Roman son under the patria potestas (Ga 4:1-3). The process of liberation is first of all one of redemption or buying out (Greek exagorasei) (Ga 4:5). This term in itself applies equally well to the slave who is redeemed from bondage, and the Roman son whose adoptive father buys him out of the authority of his natural father. But in the latter case the condition of the son is not materially altered by the process: he only exchanges one paternal authority for another. If Paul for a moment thought of the process in terms of ordinary Roman adoption, the resulting condition of the son he conceives in terms of the more free and gracious Greek or Jewish family life. Or he may have thought of the rarer case of adoption from conditions of slavery into the status of sonship. The redemption is only a precondition of adoption, which follows upon faith, and is accompanied by the sending of "the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father," and then all bondage is done away (Ga 4:5-7).

2. In Romans as Deliverance from Debt:

In Ro 8:12-17 the idea of obligation or debt is coupled with that of liberty. Man is thought of as at one time under the authority and power of the flesh (Ro 8:5), but when the Spirit of Christ comes to dwell in him, he is no longer a debtor to the flesh but to the Spirit (Ro 8:12,13), and debt or obligation to the Spirit is itself liberty. As in Galatians, man thus passes from a state of bondage into a state of sonship which is also a state of liberty. "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these (and these only) are sons of God" (Ro 8:14). The spirit of adoption or sonship stands in diametrical opposition to the spirit of bondage (Ro 8:15). And the Spirit to which we are debtors and by which we are led, at once awakens and confirms the experience of sonship within us (Ro 8:16). In both places, Paul conveys under this figure, the idea of man as passing from a state of alienation from God and of bondage under law and sin, into that relation with God of mutual confidence and love, of unity of thought and will, which should characterize the ideal family, and in which all restraint, compulsion and fear have passed away.

III. The Christian Experience.

As a fact of Christian experience, the adoption is the recognition and affirmation by man of his sonship toward God. It follows upon faith in Christ, by which man becomes so united with Christ that his filial spirit enters into him, and takes possession of his consciousness, so that he knows and greets God as Christ does (compare Mr 14:36).

1. In Relation to Justification: It is an aspect of the same experience that Paul describes elsewhere, under another legal metaphor, as justification by faith. According to the latter, God declares the sinner righteous and treats him as such, admits into to the experience of forgiveness, reconciliation and peace (Ro 5:1). In all this the relation of father and son is undoubtedly involved, but in adoption it is emphatically expressed. It is not only that the prodigal son is welcomed home, glad to confess that he is not worthy to be called a son, and willing to be made as one of the hired servants, but he is embraced and restored to be a son as before. The point of each metaphor is, that justification is the act of a merciful Judge setting the prisoner free, but adoption is the act of a generous father, taking a son to his bosom and endowing him with liberty, favor and a heritage.

2. In Relation to Sanctification:

Besides, justification is the beginning of a process which needs for its completion a progressive course of sanctification by the aid of the Holy Spirit, but adoption is coextensive with sanctification. The sons of God are those led by the Spirit of God (Ro 8:14); and the same spirit of God gives the experience of sonship. Sanctification describes the process of general cleansing and growth as an abstract process, but adoption includes it as a concrete relation to God, as loyalty, obedience, and fellowship with an ever-loving Father.

3. In Relation to Regeneration:

Some have identified adoption with regeneration, and therefore many Fathers and Roman Catholic theologians have identified it with baptismal regeneration, thereby excluding the essential fact of conscious sonship. The new birth and adoption are certainly aspects of the same totality of experience, but they belong to different systems of thought, and to identify them is to invite confusion. The new birth defines especially the origin and moral quality of the Christian experience as an abstract fact, but adoption expresses a concrete relation of man to God. Nor does Paul here raise the question of man's natural and original condition. It is pressing the analogy too far to infer from this doctrine of adoption that man is by nature not God's son. It would contradict Paul's teaching elsewhere (e.g. Ac 17:28), and he should not be convicted of inconsistency on the application of a metaphor. He conceives man outside Christ as morally an alien and a stranger from God, and the change wrought by faith in Christ makes him morally a son and conscious of his sonship; but naturally he is always a potential son because God is always a real father.

IV. As God's Act.

Adoption as God's act is an eternal process of His gracious love, for He "fore-ordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will" (Eph 1:5).

1. Divine Fatherhood:

The motive and impulse of Fatherhood which result in adoption were eternally real and active in God. In some sense He had bestowed the adoption upon Israel (Ro 9:4). "Israel is my son, my first-born" (Ex 4:22; compare De 14:1; 32:6; Jer 31:9; Ho 11:1). God could not reveal Himself at all without revealing something of His Fatherhood, but the whole revelation was as yet partial and prophetic. When "God sent forth his Son" to redeem them that were under the law," it became possible for men to receive the adoption; for to those who are willing to receive it, He sent the Spirit of the eternal Son to testify in their hearts that they are sons of God, and to give them confidence and utterance to enable them to call God their Father (Ga 4:5,6; Ro 8:15).

2. Its Cosmic Range:

But this experience also is incomplete, and looks forward to a fuller adoption in the response, not only of man's spirit, but of the whole creation, including man's body, to the Fatherhood of God (Ro 8:23). Every filial spirit now groans, because it finds itself imprisoned in a body subjected to vanity, but it awaits a redemption of the body, perhaps in the resurrection, or in some final consummation, when the whole material creation shall be transformed into a fitting environment for the sons of God, the creation itself delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Ro 8:21). Then will adoption be complete, when man's whole personality shall be in harmony with the spirit of sonship, and the whole universe favorable to its perseverance in a state of blessedness.

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

LITERATURE:

Lightfoot, Galatians; Sanday, Romans; Lidgett, Fatherhood of God; Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation.

T. Rees

ADOR; ADORA

a'-dor, a-do'-ra (Adora): In Idumaea, mentioned in Ant, XIII, ix, 1 as one of the cities captured by Hyrcanus, and referred to in 1 Macc 13:20.

See ADORAIM.

ADORAIM

ad-o-ra'-im ('adhorayim, "a pair of knolls," perhaps): One of several cities in Judah that were fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:9). The name appears in Josephus and in 1 Macc as Adora or Dora or Dor. Its location is indicated in general by that of the other cities which the record in Chronicles groups with it. Common consent identifies it with Dura, about five miles West by South of Hebron.

ADORAM

a-do'-ram. See ADONIRAM.

ADORATION

ad-o-ra'-shun: Though this word never occurs in English Versions, it represents aspects of worship which are very prominent in the Bible.

I. Etymology.

The word is derived from Latin adorare =

(1) "to speak to,"

(2) "to beseech," "entreat,"

(3) "to do homage," "to worship"; from the Latin, os (oris), mouth.

Some have supposed that the root os points to the Roman practice of applying the hand to the mouth, i.e. kissing the hand to (a person or thing), as a token of homage.

II. Meaning.

Adoration is intense admiration culminating in reverence and worship, together with the outward acts and attitudes which accompany such reverence. It thus includes both the subjective sentiments, or feelings of the soul, in the presence of some superior object or person, and the appropriate physical expressions of such sentiments in outward acts of homage or of worship. In its widest sense it includes reverence to beings other than God, especially to monarchs, who in oriental countries were regarded with feelings of awe. But it finds its highest expression in religion. Adoration is perhaps the highest type of worship, involving the reverent and rapt contemplation of the Divine perfections and prerogatives, the acknowledgment of them in words of praise, together with the visible symbols and postures that express the adoring attitude of the creature in the presence of his Creator. It is the expression of the soul’s mystical realization of God’s presence in His transcendent greatness, holiness and lovingkindness. As a form of prayer, adoration is to be distinguished from other forms, such as petition, thanksgiving, confession and intercession.

III. Outward Postures.

In the Old Testament and New Testament, these are similar to those which prevailed in all oriental countries, as amply illustrated by the monuments of Egypt and Assyria, and by the customs still in use among the nations of the East. The chief attitudes referred to in the Bible are the following:

1. Prostration:

Among the Orientals, especially Persians, prostration (i.e. falling upon the knees, then gradually inclining the body, until the forehead touched the ground) was common as an expression of profound reverence and humility before a superior or a benefactor. It was practiced in the worship of Yahweh (Ge 17:3; Nu 16:45; Mt 26:39, Jesus in Gethsemane; Re 1:17), and of idols (2Ki 5:18; Da 3:5,6), but was by no means confined to religious exercises. It was the formal method of supplicating or doing obeisance to a superior (eg 1Sa 25:23 f; 2Ki 4:37; Es 8:3; Mr 5:22; Joh 11:32).

2. Kneeling:

A substitute for prostration was kneeling, a common attitude in worship, frequently mentioned in Old Testament and New Testament (eg 1Ki 8:54; Ezr 9:5; Ps 95:6; Isa 45:23; Lu 22:41, Christ in Gethsemane; Ac 7:60; Eph 3:14). The same attitude was sometimes adopted in paying homage to a fellow-creature, as in 2Ki 1:13. "Sitting" as an attitude of prayer (only 2Sa 7:18 parallel 1Ch 17:16) was probably a form of kneeling, as in Mahometan worship.

3. Standing:

This was the most usual posture in prayer, like that of modern Jews in public worship. Abraham "stood before Yahweh (Yahweh)" when he interceded for Sodom (Ge 18:22). Compare 1Sa 1:26. The Pharisee in the parable "stood and prayed" (Lu 18:11), and the hypocrites are said to "pray standing in the synagogues, and in the corners of the streets" (Mt 6:5 the King James Version).

4. The Hands:

The above postures were accompanied by various attitudes of the hands, which were either lifted up toward heaven (Ps 63:4; 1Ti 2:8), or outspread (Ex 9:29; Ezr 9:5; Isa 1:15), or both (1Ki 8:54).

5. Kiss of Adoration:

The heathen practice of kissing hands to the heavenly bodies as a sign of adoration is referred to in Job 31:27, and of kissing the idol in 1Ki 19:18; Ho 13:2. The kiss of homage is mentioned in Ps 2:12, if the text there be correct. Kissing hands to the object of adoration was customary among the Romans (Pliny xxviii.5). The New Testament word for "worship" (proskuneo) literally means to kiss (the hand) to (one).

See also ATTITUDES.

IV. Objects of Adoration.

The only adequate object of adoration is the Supreme Being. He only who is the sum of all perfections can fully satisfy man’s instincts of reverence, and elicit the complete homage of his soul.

1. Fellow-Creatures:

Yet, as already suggested, the crude beginnings of religious adoration are to be found in the respect paid to created beings regarded as possessing superior claims and powers, especially to kings and rulers. As instances we may mention the woman of Tekoa falling on her face to do obeisance to king David (2Sa

14:4), and the king’s servants bowing down to do reverence to Haman (Es 3:2). Compare Ru 2:10; 1Sa 20:41; 2Sa 1:2; 14:22.

2. Material Objects:

On a higher plane, as involving some recognition of divinity, is the homage paid to august and mysterious objects in Nature, or to phenomena in the physical world which were supposed to have some divine significance. To give reverence to material objects themselves is condemned as idolatry throughout the Old Testament. Such an example is the case with the worship of "the host of heaven" (the heavenly bodies) sometimes practiced by the Hebrews (2Ki 17:16; 21:3,5). So Job protests that he never proved false to God by kissing hands to the sun and moon in token of adoration (Job 31:26-28). We have reference in the Old Testament to acts of homage paid to an idol or an image, such as falling down before it (Isa 44:15,17,19; Da 3:7), or kissing it (1Ki 19:18; Ho 13:2). All such practices are condemned in uncompromising terms. But when material things produce a reverential attitude, not to themselves, but to the Deity whose presence they symbolize, then they are regarded as legitimate aids to devotion; eg. fire as a manifestation of the Divine presence is described as causing the spectator to perform acts of reverence (eg. Ex 3:2,5; Le 9:24; 1Ki 18:38 f). In these instances, it was Yahweh Himself that was worshipped, not the fire which revealed Him. The sacred writers are moved to religious adoration by the contemplation of the glories of Nature. To them, "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." (Compare especially the "nature Psalms" Ps 8; 19; 29; 104.)

3. Angels:

On a still higher plane is the adoration practiced in the presence of supernatural agents of the Divine will. When an angel of God appeared, men fell instinctively before him in reverence and awe (eg. Ge 18:2; 19:1; Nu 22:31; Jud 13:20; Lu 24:4,5). This was not to worship the creature instead of the Creator, for the angel was regarded, not as a distract individual having an existence and character of his own, but as a theophany, a self-manifestation of God.

4. The Deity:

The highest form of adoration is that which is directed immediately to God Himself, His kingly attributes and spiritual excellencies being so apprehended by the soul that it is filled with rapture and praise, and is moved to do Him reverence. A classical instance is the vision that initiated Isaiah into the prophetic office, when he was so possessed with the sovereignty and sublimity of God that he was filled with wonder and self-abasement (Isa 6:1-5). In the Old Testament, the literature of adoration reaches its high-water mark in the Psalms (compare especially the group Psalms 95-100), where the ineffable majesty, power and holiness of God are set forth in lofty strains. In the New Testament, adoration of the Deity finds its most rapturous expression in Rev, where the vision of God calls forth a chorus of praise addressed to the thrice-holy God (4:8-11; 7:11,12), with whom is associated the Redeemer-Lamb.

5. Jesus Christ:

How far is Jesus regarded in the New Testament as an object of adoration, seeing that adoration is befitting only to God? During our Lord's lifetime He was often the object of worship (Mt 2:11; 8:2; 9:18; 14:33; 15:25; 20:20; 28:9,17; Mr 5:6; Joh 9:38). Some ambiguity, however, belongs to the Greek word proskunein, for while it is the usual word for "worshipping" God (eg. Joh 4:24), in some contexts it means no more than paying homage to a person of superior rank by kneeling or prostration, just as the unmerciful servant is said to have 'fallen down and worshipped' his master the king (Mt 18:26), and as Josephus speaks of the Jewish high priests as proskunoumenoi (BJ, IV, v, 2). On the other hand, it certainly implies a consciousness, on the part of those who paid this respect to Jesus, and of Jesus Himself, of a very exceptional superiority in His person, for the same homage was refused by Peter, when offered to him by Cornelius, on the ground that he himself also was a man (Ac 10:25 f), and even by the angel before whom John prostrated himself, on the ground that God alone was to be "worshipped" (Re 22:8,9).

Yet Jesus never repudiated such tokens of respect. But whatever about the "days of His flesh," there is no doubt that after the ascension Christ became to the church the object of adoration as Divine, and the homage paid to Him was indistinguishable in character from that paid to God. This is proved not only by isolated passages, but still more by the whole tone of the Ac and epistles in relation to Him. This adoration reaches its highest expression in Re 5:9-14, where the Redeemer-Lamb who shares the throne of God is the subject of an outburst of adoring praise on the part of the angelic hosts. In Re 4:8-11 the hymn of adoration is addressed to the Lord God Almighty, the Creator; here it is addressed to the Lamb on the ground of His redeeming work. In Re the adoration of Him "who sitteth on the throne" and that of "the Lamb" flow together into one stream of ecstatic praise (compare Re 7:9-11).

D. Miall Edwards

ADORN

a-dorn' (kosmeo): Has as its primary meaning "to arrange," "to put In order," "to decorate." It is used with reference to the manner in which Christian women were urged to dress. This was a vital question in the early church, and both Paul and Peter give advice on the subject (1Ti 2:9; 1Pe 3:3).

See DRESS.

Figurative: In Mt 12:44 the King James Version the word is translated "garnish" and is used in a figurative sense. It describes accurately the condition of the Jewish nation. Even though they have swept out idolatry and have adorned the life with much ceremony and endless religious prescriptions yet the evil spirit can say, "I will return to my house." This same thing has repeatedly been done by individuals and nations when reforms have been instituted, but Christ was not enthroned and the heart or nation was still dominated by evil. It is used also in a figurative sense with reference to the graces of the Christian life. When we remember how very highly Orientals esteem the adornment of the body, its use here becomes very forceful. It is this that makes Ps 45:13 of special significance as to the beauty and glory of the church as she is presented to God. See also Pr 1:9; 4:9; Isa 61:10; 1Pe 3:4,5. Consecration to God,

the indwelling of His Spirit, righteousness, a meek and quiet spirit—these are the true adornments of the life. All these passages carry with them the idea of joy, the satisfaction that should be ours in these possessions.

Jacob W. Kapp

ADRA

a’-dra. See ARAD (city). ADRAMMELECH and ANAMMELECH a-dram’-el-ek and a-nam’-el-ek (’adhrammelekh and ‘anammelekh, apparently, according to Assyrian usage, "Adar is prince," "Anu is prince." By Palestinian usage it would be "Adar is king," "Anu is king"):

(1) The names given by the Israelite narrator to the god or gods imported into the Samaritan land by the men of Sepharvaim whom the king of Assyria had settled there (2Ki 17:31). In the Babylonian pantheon Anu, the god of heaven, is one of the three chief gods, and Adar, otherwise known as Ninib, is a solar god. Concerning the statements in this verse in Kings, archaeologists differ in some important points, and it is a case in which a suspended judgment may be becoming in one who is not an expert. But at least a portion of the alleged difficulties have arisen from failures to get the point of view of the Israelite narrator. He is writing from a time considerably later than the establishment of the institutions of which he speaks—late enough to render the phrase "unto this day" suitable (2Ki 17:34), late enough so that words and usages may have undergone modification. He is describing a mixture of religions which he evidently regards as deserving of contempt and ridicule, even apart from the falsity of the religions included in it. This mixture he describes as containing ingredients of three kinds—first, the imported religions of the imported peoples; second, the local high-place religions (2Ki 17:32, etc.), and third, the Yahweh religion of Northern Israel (not that of Jerusalem). It is not likely that he thought that they practiced any cult in its purity. They contaminated the religion of Yahweh by introducing Canaanitish usages into it, and they are likely to have done the same with the ancestral religions which they brought with them. The proper names may be correct as representing Palestine usage, even if they differ somewhat from the proper Babylonian usage. The writer says that they "burnt their children in the fire to Adrammelech," but this does not necessarily prove that he thought that they brought this practice from Babylonia; his idea may be that they corrupted even their own false cult by introducing into it this horrible Canaanitish rite. In considering the bearings of the evidence of the monuments on the case, considerations of this kind should not be neglected.

(2) The name of a son of Sennacherib king of Assyria—one of the two who slew him and escaped, indirectly leading to the accession of Esar-haddon (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). Mention of the incident is found on the monuments, and traces of the name appear in the writings of Abydenus and Poly-histor.

Willis J. Beecher

ADRAMYTTIUM

ad-ra-mit’-i-um (Adramuttion; for other forms see Thayer’s lexicon): An ancient city of Mysia in the Roman Province of Asia. The only reference in the New Testament to it is in Ac 27:2 which says that Paul, while being taken a prisoner from Caesarea to Rome, embarked upon a ship belonging to Adramyttium.

The city, with a good harbor, stood at the head of the Gulf of Adramyttium facing the island of Lesbos, and at the base of Mt. Ida. Its early history is obscure. While some authors fancy that it was the Pedasus of Homer, others suppose that it was founded by Adramys, the brother of the wealthy Croesus; probably a small Athenian colony existed there long before the time of Adramys. When Pergamus became the capital of Asia, Adramyttium grew to be a city of considerable importance, and the metropolis of the Northwest part of the province. There the assizes were held. The coins which the peasants pick up in the surrounding fields, and which are frequently aids in determining the location and history of the cities of Asia Minor, were struck at Adramyttium as late as the 3rd century AD, and sometimes in connection with Ephesus. Upon them the effigies of Castor and Pollux appear, showing that Adramyttium was the seat of worship of these deities.

The ancient city with its harbor has entirely disappeared, but on a hill, somewhat farther inland, is a village of about one thousand houses bearing the name Edremid, a corruption of the ancient name Adramys. The miserable wooden huts occupied by Greek fishermen and by Turks are surrounded by vineyards and olive trees, hence the chief trade is in olive oil, raisins and timber. In ancient times Adramyttium was noted for a special ointment which was prepared there (Pliny, NH, xiii.2.5).

E. J. Banks

ADRIA

a’-dri-a (Westcott-Hort: ho Hadrias or ho Adrias): In Greek Adrias (Polybios i.2.4), Adriatike Thalassa (Strabo iv.204), and Adriatikon Pelagos (Ptolemy iii.15.2), and in Latin Adriaticum mare (Livy xl.57.7), Adrianum mare (Cicero in Pisonem 38), Adriaticus sinus (Livy x.2.4), and Mare superurn (Cicero ad Att. 9.5.1). The Adriatic Sea is a name derived from the old Etruscan city Atria, situated near the mouth of the Po (Livy v.33.7; Strabo v.214). At first the name Adria was only applied to the most northern part of the sea. But after the development of the Syracusan colonies on the Italian and Illyrian coasts the application of the term was gradually extended southward, so as to reach Mons Garganus (the Abruzzi), and later the Strait of Hydruntum (Ptolemy iii.1.1; Polybios vii.19.2). But finally the name embraced the Ionian Sea as well, and we find it employed to denote the Gulf of Tarentum (Servius Aen xi.540), the Sicilian Sea (Pausanias v. 25), and even the waters between Crete and Malta (Orosius i.2.90). Procopius considers Malta as lying at the western extremity of the Adriatic Sea (i.14). After leaving Crete the vessel in which the apostle Paul was sailing under military escort was "driven to and fro in the sea of Adria" fourteen days (Ac 27:27) before it approached the shore of Malta. We may compare this with the shipwreck of Josephus in "the middle of the Adria" where he was picked up by a ship sailing from Cyrene to Puteoli (Josephus, Vita, 3).

George H. Allen

ADRIEL

a’-dri-el (‘adhri’el, "my help is God"): The son of Barzillai the Meholathite, to whom Merab the daughter of King Saul was married when she should have been given to David (1Sa 18:19; 2Sa 21:8). "Michal" in 2Sa 21:8 is a textual error easily accounted for Adriel and Merab had five sons, whom David handed over to the blood vengeance of the men of Gibeon. The name Adriel seems to be Aramaic, the equivalent of the Hebrew name Azriel.

ADUEL

a-du’-el (Adouel): An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1).

ADULLAM

a-dul’-am (‘adhullam):

(1) A city, with dependencies, and in ancient times having a king, mentioned five times in the Old Testament, each time in a list with other cities (Jos 12:15; 15:35; 2Ch 11:7; Mic 1:15; Ne 11:30). In the list of 31 kings whom Joshua smote, Adullam follows Hormah, Arad, Libnah, and precedes Makkedah. Among the 14 Judahite cities of the first group in "the lowland" Adullam is mentioned between Jarmuth and Socoh. In the list of 15 cities fortified by Rehoboam it appears between Socoh and Gath. Micah gives what may be a list of cities concerned in some Assyrian approach to Jerusalem; it begins with Gath, includes Lachish, and ends with Mareshah and Adullam. And Adullam is still in the same company in the list in Nehemiah of the cities "and their villages" where the men of Judah then dwelt. In the time of the patriarchs it was a place to which men "went down" from the central mountain ridge (Ge 38:1). Judas Maccabeus found it still existing as a city (2 Macc 12:38). Common opinion identifies Adullam with the ruin ‘Aid-el-Ma, 13 miles West-Southwest from Bethlehem (see HGHL, 229 ff). This is in spite of the testimony of the Onomasticon, which, it is alleged, confuses Adullam with Eglon. Presumably the city gave its name to the cave of Adullam, the cave being near the city.

(2) The cave of Adullam, David’s headquarters during a part of the time when he was a fugitive from Saul (1Sa 22:1; 2Sa 23:13; 1Ch 11:15). Sufficient care has not been exercised in reading the Bible statements on this subject. To begin with, Hebrew syntax permits of the use of the word "cave" collectively; it may denote a group or a region of caves; it is not shut up to the meaning that there was one immense cave in which David and his 400 men all found accommodations at once. All reasonings based on this notion are futile.

Further, by the most natural syntax of 2Sa 23:13-17 (duplicated with unimportant variations in 1Ch 11:15-19), that passage describes two different events, and does not connect the cave of Adullam with

the second of these. "And three of the thirty chief men went down, and came to David in the harvest time unto the cave of Adullam; and the troop of the Philistines was encamped in the valley of Rephaim. And David was then in the stronghold; and the garrison of the Philistines was then in Beth-lehem. And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me water," etc. Concerning these three seniors among David's "mighty men" it is narrated, first, that they were David's comrades in a certain battle, a battle which the Chronicler identifies with Pas-dammim, where David slew Goliath; second, that they joined David at the cave of Adullam, presumably during the time when he was hiding from Saul; third, that at a later time, when the Philistines were in the valley of Rephaim (compare 2Sa 5:18), and David was "in the stronghold" (Josephus says "at Jerusalem," Ant, VII, xii, 4), these men broke through the Philistine lines and brought him water from the home well of Bethlehem.

The cave of Adullam, like the city, was "down" from the central ridge (1Sa 22:1; 2Sa 23:13). The city was in Judah; and David and his men were in Judah (1Sa 23:3) at a time when, apparently, the cave was their headquarters. Gad's advice to David to return to Judah (1Sa 22:3,5) was given at a time when he had left the cave of Adullam. If the current identification of 'Aid-el-Ma as Adullam is correct, the cave of Adullam is probably the cave region which has been found in that vicinity.

It has been objected that this location is too far from Bethlehem for David's men to have brought the water from there. To this it is replied that thirteen or fourteen miles is not an excessive distance for three exceptionally vigorous men to go and return; and a yet stronger reply is found in the consideration just mentioned, that the place from which the men went for the water was not the cave of Adullam. The one argument for the tradition to the effect that Chariton's cave, a few miles Southeast of Bethlehem, is Adullam, is the larger size of this cave, as compared with those near 'Aid-el-Ma We have already seen that this has no force.

In our current speech "cave of Adullam" suggests an aggregation of ill-assorted and disreputable men. This is not justified by the Bible record. David's men included his numerous and respectable kinsmen, and the representative of the priesthood, and some of David's military companions, and some men who afterward held high office in Israel. Even those who are described as being in distress and debt and bitter of soul were doubtless, many of them, persons who had suffered at the hands of Saul on account of their friendship for David. Doubtless they included mere adventurers in their number; but the Scriptural details and the circumstances alike indicate that they were mainly homogeneous, and that most of them were worthy citizens.

Willis J. Beecher

ADULLAMITE

a-dul'-am-it: The gentilic adjective of ADULLAM, which see. It is used only of Judah's friend Hirah (Ge 38:1,12,20).

ADULTERY

a-dul’-ter-i: In Scripture designates sexual intercourse of a man, whether married or unmarried, with a married woman.

1. Its Punishment:

It is categorically prohibited in the Decalogue (seventh commandment, Ex 20:14; De 5:18): "Thou shalt not commit adultery." In more specific language we read: "And thou shalt not he carnally with thy neighbor’s wife, to defile thyself with her" (Le 18:20). The penalty is death for both guilty parties: "And the man that committeth adultery with another man’s wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor’s wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death" (Le 20:10). The manner of death is not particularized; according to the rabbis (Siphra’ at the place; Sanhedhrin 52b) it is strangulation. It would seem that in the days of Jesus the manner of death was interpreted to mean stoning ("Now in the law Moses commanded us to stone such," Joh 8:5, said of the woman taken in adultery). Nevertheless, it may be said that in the case in question the woman may have been a virgin betrothed unto a husband, the law (in De 22:23 f) providing that such a person together with her paramour be stoned to death (contrast De 22:22, where a woman married to a husband is spoken of and the manner of death is again left general). Eze 16:40 (compare 23:47) equally mentions stoning as the penalty of the adulteress; but it couples to her sin also that of shedding blood; hence, the rabbinic interpretation is not necessarily disputed by the prophet. Of course it may also be assumed that a difference of custom may have obtained at different times and that the progress was in the line of leniency, strangulation being regarded as a more humane form of execution than stoning.

2. Trial by Ordeal:

The guilty persons become amenable to the death penalty only when taken "in the very act" (Joh 8:4). The difficulty of obtaining direct legal evidence is adverted to by the rabbis (see Makkoth 7a). In the case of a mere suspicion on the part of the husband, not substantiated by legal evidence, the woman is compelled by the law (Nu 5:11-30) to submit to an ordeal, or God’s judgment, which consists in her drinking the water of bitterness, that is, water from the holy basin mingled with dust from the floor of the sanctuary and with the washed-off ink of a writing containing the oath which the woman has been made to repeat. The water is named bitter with reference to its effects in the case of the woman’s guilt; on the other hand, when no ill effects follow, the woman is proved innocent and the husband’s jealousy unsubstantiated. According to the Mishna (SoTah 9) this ordeal of the woman suspected of adultery was abolished by Johanan ben Zaccai (after 70 AD), on the ground that the men of his generation were not above the suspicion of impurity.

See article BITTER, BITTERNESS.

3. A Heinous Crime:

Adultery was regarded as a heinous crime (Job 31:11). The prophets and teachers in Israel repeatedly

upbraid the men and women of their generations for their looseness in morals which did not shrink from adulterous connections. Naturally where luxurious habits of life were indulged in, particularly in the large cities, a tone of levity set in: in the dark of the evening, men, with their features masked, waited at their neighbors' doors (Job 24:15; 31:9; compare Pr 7$), and women forgetful of their God's covenant broke faith with the husbands of their youth (Pr 2:17). The prophet Nathan confronted David after his sin with Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah, with his stern rebuke ("Thou art the man," 2Sa 12:7); the penitential psalm (Ps 51)—"Miserere"—was sung by the royal bard as a prayer for divine pardon. Promiscuous intercourse with their neighbors' wives is laid by Jeremiah at the door of the false prophets of his day (Jer 23:10,14; 29:23).

4. Penal and Moral Distinctions:

While penal law takes only cognizance of adulterous relations, it is needless to say that the moral law discountenances all manner of illicit intercourse and all manner of unchastity in man and woman. While the phrases "harlotry," "commit harlotry," in Scripture denote the breach of wedlock (on the part of a woman), in the rabbinical writings a clear distinction is made on the legal side between adultery and fornication. The latter is condemned morally in no uncertain terms; the seventh commandment is made to include all manner of fornication. The eye and the heart are the two intermediaries of sin (Palestinian Talmud, Berakhoth 6b). A sinful thought is as wicked as a sinful act (Niddah 13b and elsewhere). Job makes a covenant with his eyes lest he look upon a virgin (31:1). And so Jesus who came "not to destroy, but to fulfill" (Mt 5:17), in full agreement with the ethical and religious teaching of Judaism, makes the intent of the seventh commandment explicit when he declares that "every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already In his heart" (Mt 5:28). And in the spirit of Hosea (Hos 4:15) and Johanan ben Zaccai (see above) Jesus has but scorn for those that are ready judicially to condemn though they be themselves not free from sin! "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her" (Joh 8:7). Whereas society is in need of the death penalty to secure the inviolability of the home life, Jesus bids the erring woman go her way and sin no more. How readily His word might be taken by the unspiritual to imply the condoning of woman's peccability is evidenced by the fact that the whole section (Joh 7:53-8:11) is omitted by "most ancient authorities" (see Augustine's remark).

5. A Ground of Divorce:

Adultery as a ground of divorce. —The meaning of the expression "some unseemly thing" (De 24:1) being unclear, there was great variety of opinion among the rabbis as to the grounds upon which a husband may divorce his wife. While the school of Hillel legally at least allowed any trivial reason as a ground for divorce, the stricter interpretation which limited it to adultery alone obtained in the school of Shammai. Jesus coincided with the stricter view (see Mt 5:32; 19:9, and commentaries). From a moral point of view, divorce was discountenanced by the rabbis likewise, save of course for that one ground which indeed makes the continued relations between husband and wife a moral impossibility.

See also CRIMES; DIVORCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT; DIVORCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Max L. Margolis

ADUMMIM

a-dum’-im (’adhummim, perhaps "red spots"): "The ascent of Adummim" is one of the numerous landmarks mentioned in defining the northern border of Judah westward from the mouth of the Jordan to Jerusalem, and in defining the southern border of Benjamin eastward from Jerusalem to the mouth of the Jordan (Jos 15:7; 18:17). It is identified with the gorge part of the road from Jericho up to Jerusalem. Its present name is Tala‘at-ed-Dumm, "ascent of blood." The stone is marked by "curious red streaks," a phenomenon which probably accounts for both the ancient and the modern names, and for other similar names which have been applied to the locality. It is the scene of our Saviour’s story of the Good Samaritan, and tradition of course locates the inn to which the Samaritan brought the wounded man (see HGHL, 265).

Willis J. Beecher

ADVANTAGE

ad-van’-taj (cakhan): In Job 35:3 is interpreted in succeeding clause as "profit." In Ro 3:1 perissos, is likewise interpreted by a paraphrase in the next sentence. the Revised Version (British and American) prefers to render pleonekteo by "take advantage," where the King James Version has "defraud" (2Co 7:2), or "make gain of" (2Co 12:17; compare 2Co 2:11). In Jude 1:16 "advantage" (opheleia) means "profit."

ADVENT

ad’-vent. See INCARNATION; MILLENNIUM; PAROUSIA.

ADVENTURE

ad-ven’-tur: "To risk," "to dare," referring always to an undertaking attended with some peril (Jud 9:17: "My father adventured his life"). Compare De 28:56. So also Ec 5:14: "Riches perish by evil adventure." Only once in New Testament for didomi (Ac 19:31), where Paul’s friends beg him "not to adventure himself (archaic for "venture") into theater."

ADVERSARY

ad’-ver-sa-ri, ad’-ver-sa-ri: This word (in the singular or plural) is used in the Old Testament to render different Hebrew words. In thirty-two cases the word corresponds to the noun tsar, or the verb tsarar. This noun is the ordinary word for "foe" or "adversary." In twelve passages the Hebrew word, of which "adversary" is the translation, is saTan = noun or saTan = verb. This stem means "to oppose," or

"thwart" anyone in his purpose or claims.

The angel of Yahweh was saTan to Balaam (Nu 22:22). The word often denotes a political adversary (1Ki 11:14,23,25). In four cases (namely, Prologue to Job; Zec 3:1,2; 1Ch 21:1; Ps 109:6) the King James Version retains Satan as the rendering. But it is only in 1 Chronicles that the word is used without the article, that is, strictly as a proper name. The Septuagint gives diabolos, as the rendering, and both in Job and Zechariah, Satan is portrayed as the "false accuser." In two cases "adversary" represents two Hebrew expressions which mean the "opponent in a suit" or "controversy" (Job 31:35; Isa 50:8).

In the New Testament "adversary" represents:

(1) antikeimenoi, the participle of a verb which means "to be set over against," "to be opposed" (Lu 13:17; Php 2:8).

(2) antidikos, "opponent in a lawsuit," "prosecutor" (Mt 5:25; Lu 12:58; 18:3; 1Pe 5:8).

According to the last passage the devil is the "accuser" or "prosecutor" of believers, but according to another writer they have an "advocate" or "counselor for the defense" with the Father (1Jo 2:1). In one passage (Heb 10:27) "adversary" represents a Greek word, hupenantios, which means "set over against," "contrary to"—a word used in classical Greek and in the Septuagint.

Thomas Lewis

ADVERSITY

ad-vur'-si-ti: In the Revised Version (British and American) exclusively an Old Testament term, expressing the various forms of distress and evil conveyed by four Hebrew words: tsela', "a halting" or "fall"; tsarah, "straits" "distress," "affliction"; tsar, "straitness," "affliction"; ra', "bad," "evil," "harmful." These words cover the whole range of misfortunes caused by enemies, poverty, sorrow and trouble. "Adversity," which occurs once in the King James Version in New Testament (Heb 13:3: kakouchoumenos, "ill-treated") is displaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by the literal rendering which illustrates or interprets a common phase of adversity.

Dwight M. Pratt

ADVERTISE

ad'-ver-tiz: This word is found twice in the Old Testament: In Nu 24:14 (from Hebrew, ya'ats, "to advise") Balsam advises Balak of the future of Israel and its influence upon his kingdom ("I will advertise thee"). In the King James Version Ru 4:4 (from galah 'ozen, "to uncover the ear," "to reveal") Boaz in speaking to the nearer kinsman of Ruth: "I thought to advertise thee" (the Revised Version,

margin "uncover thine ear").

ADVICE; ADVISE; ADVISEMENT

ad-vis', ad-viz', ad-viz'-ment: Aside from their regular meaning these words are peculiarly employed as follows:

(1) Advice' In 2Sa 19:43 (from, dabhar, "word") the meaning is equal to "request" (the Revised Version, margin "were we not the first to speak of bringing back"). In 1Sa 25:33 the King James Version (from, Ta'am, "taste," "reason") "advice" is equal to "sagacity" (the Revised Version (British and American) "blessed be thy discretion"). In 2Ch 25:17 (from ya'ac, "to give or take counsel") the meaning seems to be "to consult with oneself"; compare also Jud 19:30 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "take counsel").

(2) Advise: In 2Sa 24:13 the King James Version (from yadha, "to know") "to advise" means "to advise oneself," i.e. "to consider" (the Revised Version (British and American) "advise thee") Compare also 1Ch 21:12 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "consider" from, ra'ah, "to see") and Pr 13:10 where "well- advised" is the same as "considerate" (from ya'ac; see 2Ch 25:17).

(3) Advisement (antiquated): Found once in the Old Testament in 1Ch 12:19 (from 'etsah, "counsel"), where "upon advisement" means "upon deliberation." Compare 2Macc 14:20 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "when these proposals had been long considered").

A. L. Breslich

ADVOCATE

ad'-vo-kat (parakletos): Found in 1Joh 2:1, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." The Greek word has several shades of meaning:

(1) a legal advocate;

(2) an intercessor,

(3) a helper generally.

In the passage before us the first and second meanings are included. Christ in heaven intercedes for Christians who sin upon earth. The next verse declares that He is the "propitiation for our sins" and it is His propitiatory work which lies at the basis of His intercession. The margins of the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version give as alternative readings Comforter, Helper, Greek Paraclete. Beyond doubt however, "advocate" is the correct translation in the

passage in the epistle. The same Greek word also occurs in the Gospel of John (Joh 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7) referring not to Christ but to the Holy Spirit, to whom Christ refers as "another comforter" whom He will send from the Father. In the Gospel various functions are ascribed to the Spirit in relation to believers and unbelievers. The word in the Gospel is inadequately translated "Comforter." The Spirit according to these passages, is more than Comforter and more than Advocate.

See PARACLETE; COMFORTER; HOLY SPIRIT.

E. Y. Mullins

ADYTUM

ad’-i-tum (Latin from Greek aduton, adjective adutos, "not to be entered"): Applied to the innermost sanctuary or chambers in ancient temples, and to secret places which were open only to priests: hence, also to the Holy of Holies in the Jewish temple.

See TEMPLE.

AEDIAS

a-e-di’-as (Aedeias). Mentioned in 1 Esdras 9:27, being one of those who agreed to divorce their alien wives. This name is supposed to be a corruption of the Greek Helia, there being no Hebrew equivalent for it, and in Ezr 10:26, the name occurs in the correct form as Elijah (’eliyah =" God is Yahweh").

AELIA

e’-li-a.

See JERUSALEM.

AENEAS

e-ne’-as (’Aineas): A paralytic at Lydda, who, after he "had kept his bed eight years," was miraculously healed by Peter (Ac 9:33,34).

AENON

e’-non (Ainon): The place where John was baptizing "because there was much water there" (Joh 3:23). It was on the west side of the Jordan, the place where John baptized at the first being on the east (Joh 1:28; 3:26; 10:40). We may be sure it was not in Samaritan territory. Eusebius, Onomasticon locates it 8 Roman miles South of Scythopolis (Beisan), this stretch of land on the west of the Jordan being then, not

under Samaria, but under Scythopolis. Its position is defined by nearness to Salim. Various identifications have been suggested, the most probable being the springs near Umm el-‘Amdan, which exactly suit the position indicated by Eusebius, Onomasticon.omforter, Helper, Greek Paraclete. Beyond doubt however, "advocate’is the correct translation in the passage in the epistle. The same Greek word also occurs in the Gospel of John (Joh 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7) referring not to Christ but to the Holy Spirit, to whom Christ refers as "another comforter" whom He will send from the Father. In the Gospel various functions are ascribed to the Spirit in relation to believers and unbelievers. The word in the Gospel is inadequately translated "Comforter." The Spirit according to these passages, is more than Comforter and more than Advocate.

See discussion under SALIM.

W. Ewing

AEON

e’-on: This word originally meant "duration," "dispensation." In the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle the word is aion, from which this word is transliterated. In the Gnostic philosophy it has a special meaning and is there used to solve the problem of the world order. In the infinite separation between God and the world, it was taught, there must of necessity be mediating powers. These powers are the eons and are the successive emanations from God from eternity. They are spiritual, existing as distinct entities. They constituted the Divine fullness or the Divine Pleroma. The name was applied to these beings for two reasons: because they were thought to partake of the eternal existence of God and because they were supposed to govern the various ages. The idea of the eons in various forms may be found in nearly all oriental philosophy that attempted to deal with the problem of the world order. It appears in the writings of Philo, in Shintoism, in the old Zoroastrian religion.

See GNOSTICISM.

Jacob W. Kapp

AESORA

e’-so-ra, the King James Version Esora, e-so’-ra (Aisora): A town in the borders of Samaria, mentioned in connection with Beth-boron and Jericho (Judith 4:4), and from this association we judge that it was in the eastern part of Samaria.

AFFECT; AFFECTION

a-fekt’, a-fek’-shun: The literal meaning of "affect" is to act upon (Latin ad, "to," "upon," facio, "to do"). It has various shades of meaning, and occurs in the following senses in the English Bible:

(1) In its literal sense: La 3:51, "Mine eye affecteth my soul"

(2) In the sense of "to endeavor after," "desire," "court": Ga 4:17, "They zealously affect (the Revised Version (British and American) "seek") you .... that ye may affect (the Revised Version (British and American) "seek") them," i.e. they earnestly court your favor, that you may court theirs. Paul means that the proselytizing zeal of the Judaizers was rooted in personal ambition. The past part. "affected" (the Revised Version (British and American) "sought") has the same meaning in Ga 4:18. The same Greek word (zeloo) is translated "desire earnestly" in the Revised Version (British and American) (1Co 12:31; 14:1,39). "Affect" has a similar meaning in Ecclesiasticus 13:11.

(3) In the passive, it occurs in the sense of "to be disposed," in a neutral sense, with an adverb to characterize the nature of the disposition: Ac 14:2, "evil affected against the brethren" So also 2 Macc 4:21; 13:26.

"Affection" occurs in the following senses:

(1) In the literal sense: the state of having one’s feelings acted upon or affected in some way; bent or disposition of mind, in a neutral sense (the nature of the affection, whether good or bad, needing further description in the context). So Col 3:2, "Set your affection (the Revised Version (British and American) "mind") on things above"; Col 3:5, "inordinate affection" (here "affection" by itself is neutral; the addition of the adjective makes it equivalent to "passion" in an evil sense, as in the Revised Version (British and American)).

(2) In a good sense: tender feeling, warm attachment, good will; the word in itself carrying a good meaning apart from the context. 1Ch 29:3, "because I have set my affection on the house of my God"; Ro 1:31; 2Ti 3:3, "without natural affection", 2Co 6:12 "Ye are straitened in your own affections" (lit. "bowels," regarded as the seat of kindly feelings, compare Eng "heart") So 2Co 7:15.

(3) In an evil sense in the plural = passions. Ga 5:24, the flesh, with the affections (the Revised Version (British and American) "passions") and "lusts"; Ro 1:26, "God gave them unto vile affections" (the Revised Version (British and American) "passions").

"Affectioned" occurs once, in a neutral sense: Ro 12:10, "affectioned (i.e. "disposed") one to another" In 1Th 2:8, we have "affectionately," in a good sense.

D. Miall Edwards

AFFINITY

a-fin’-i-ti (chathan "to join one-self"): This term is used three times in the Old Testament:

(1) in 1Ki 3:1, where we read that "Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh King of Egypt",

(2) in 2Ch 18:1, where it is stated that Jehoshaphat "joined affinity with Ahab," and

(3) in Ezr 9:14, where it is asked "Shall we .... join in affinity with the peoples that do these abominations?" The Hebrew word thus rendered in the above three passages refers in each case to marriage alliances rather than to family or political relationships.

See MARRIAGE; FAMILY.

W. W. Davies

AFFIRM; AFFIRMATIVES

a-fur'-ma-tivs (diischurizomai). The verb "affirm" occurs in several passages of the New Testament in the sense of "assert" Lu 22:59; Ac 12:15; 25:19 pha-sko; Ro 3:8 phemi; 1Ti 17, Titus 3:8 diabebaioomai. The Hebrew does not employ affirmative particles, but gives a positive reply by either repeating the word in question or by substituting the first person in the reply for the second person in the question, or by employing the formula: "Thou hast said" or "Thou hast rightly said." The Saviour used this idiom (su eipas) when answering Judas and Caiaphas (Mt 26:25,64). A peculiar elegance occasionally attaches to the interpretation of the Scriptures because of their use of an affirmative and a negative together, rendering the sense more emphatic; sometimes the negative occurs first, as in Ps 118:17: "I shall not die, but live"; sometimes the affirmative precedes, as in Isa 88:1: "Thou shalt die, and not bye" Joh 1:20 is made peculiarly emphatic because of the negative placed between two affirmatives: "And he confessed, and denied not; and he confessed, I am not the Christ."

Frank E. Hirsch

AFFLICTION

a-flik'-shun: Represents no fewer than 11 Hebrew words in the Old Testament, and 3 Greek words in the New Testament, of which the most common are (oni), (thlipsis). It is used

(1) actively = that which causes or tends to cause bodily pain or mental distress, as "the bread of affliction" (De 16:3; 2Ch 18:26); often in plural, as "Many are the afflictions of the righteous" (Ps 34:19);

(2) passively = the state of being in pain or trouble, as "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction" (Jas 1:27).

The following are the chief forms of affliction referred to:

(1) Individual affliction, especially sickness, poverty, the oppression of the weak by the strong and rich, perverted justice.

(2) National. A great place is given in the Old Testament to affliction as a national experience, due to calamities, such as war, invasion, conquest by foreign peoples, exile. These form the background of much of the prophetic writings, and largely determine their tone and character.

(3) In the New Testament the chief form of affliction is that due to the fierce antagonism manifested to the religion of Jesus, resulting in persecution.

I. The Source of Affliction.

1. God:

The Hebrew mind did not dwell on secondary causes, but attributed everything, even afflictions, directly to the great First Cause and Author of all things: "Shall evil befall a city, and Yahweh hath not done it?" (Am 3:6); "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil (i.e. calamity); I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things" (Isa 45:7) Thus, all things, including calamity, were referred to the Divine operation. The Hebrew when afflicted did not doubt the universal sovereignty of God; yet, while assuming this sovereignty, he was sometimes tempted to accuse Him of indifference, neglect or forgetfulness. Compare Job passim; Isa 40:27; 49:14; Eze 8:12; 9:9.

2. Evil Agents:

Yet there are traces of a dualism which assigns a certain vague limit to God’s absolute sovereignty, by referring affliction to an evil agency acting in quasi-independence of God. There could, however, never be more than a tendency in this direction, for a strict dualism was incompatible with the standpoint of Jewish monotheism. Thus Saul’s mental affliction is attributed to an "evil spirit," which is yet said to be "from Yahweh" (1Sa 16:14; 18:10; 19:9); and the fall of Ahab is said by Micaiah to be due to the "lying spirit" which enticed him to his doom, in obedience to God’s command (1Ki 22:20-22). In the prologue of Job, Job’s calamities are ascribed to the Satan, but even he receives his word of command from God, and is responsible to Him, like the other "sons of God" who surround the heavenly throne. He is thus "included in the Divine will and in the circle of Divine providence" (Schultz). After the prologue, the Satan is left out of account, and Job’s misfortunes are attributed directly to the Divine causality. In later Judaism, the tendency to trace the origin of evil, physical and moral, to wicked spirits became more marked, probably because of the influence of Persian dualism. In New Testament times, physical and mental maladies were thought to be due to the agency of evil spirits called demons, whose prince was Beelzebub or Satan (Mr 1:23 ff; Mr 3:22 f; Mr 5:2 ff; Mt 9:32 f, etc.). Christ gave His assent to this belief (compare the woman under infirmity, "whom Satan hath bound," Lu 13:16). Paul attributed his bodily affliction to an evil angel sent by Satan (2Co 12:7), though he recognized that the evil agent was subordinate to God’s purpose of grace, and was the means of moral discipline (1Co 12:7,9). Thus, while the evil spirits were regarded as malicious authors of physical maladies, they were not, in a strictly

dualistic fashion, thought to act in complete independence; rather, they had a certain place assigned to them in the Divine Providence.

II. Meaning and Purpose of Affliction.

Why did God afflict men? How is suffering to be explained consistently with the goodness and justice of God? This was an acute problem which weighed heavily upon the Hebrew mind, especially in the later, more reflective, period. We can only briefly indicate the chief factors which the Scriptures contribute to the solution of the problem. We begin with the Old Testament.

1. Punitive or Retributive:

The traditional view in early Hebrew theology was that afflictions were the result of the Divine law of retribution, by which sin was invariably followed by adequate punishment. Every misfortune was a proof of sin on the part of the sufferer. Thus Job's "friends" sought to convince him that his great sufferings were due to his sinfulness. This is generally the standpoint of the historians of Israel, who regarded national calamities as a mark of the Divine displeasure on account of the people's sins. But this naive belief, though it contains an important element of truth, could not pass uncontested. The logic of facts would suffice to prove that it was inadequate to cover all cases; eg. Jeremiah's sufferings were due, not to sin, but to his faithfulness to his prophetic vocation. So the "suffering servant" in Isa. Job, too, in spite of his many woes, was firm in the conviction of his own integrity. To prove the inadequacy of the penal view is a main purpose of the Book of Job. A common modification of the traditional view was, that the sorrows of the pious and the prosperity of the wicked were only of brief duration; in the course of time, things would adjust themselves aright (eg. Job 20:5 ff, Ps 73:3-20). But even granting time for the law of retribution to work itself out, experience contradicts the view that a man's fortune or misfortune is an infallible proof of his moral quality.

2. Probational:

The thought is often expressed that afflictions are meant to test the character or faith of the sufferer. This idea is especially prominent in Job. God allowed the Satan to test the reality of Job's piety by over-whelming him with disease and misfortunes (2). Throughout the poem Job maintains that he has stood the test (eg. Job 23:10-12). Compare De 8:2,16; Ps 66:10 f; Ps 17:3; Isa 48:10; Jer 9:7; Pr 17:3.

3. Disciplinary and Purificatory:

For those who are able to stand the test, suffering has a purificatory or disciplinary value.

(1) The thought of affliction as a discipline or form of Divine teaching is found in Job, especially in the speeches of Elihu, who insists that tribulation is intended as a method of instruction to save man from the pride and presumption that issue in destruction (Job 33:14-30; 36:8-10,15 the Revised Version (British and American)). The same conception is found in Ps 94:12; 119:67,71.

(2) The purificatory function of trials is taught in such passages as Isa 1:25; Zec 13:9; Mal 3:2,3, where the process of refining metals in fire and smelting out the dross is the metaphor used.

4. Vicarious and Redemptive:

The above are not fully adequate to explain the mystery of the afflictions of the godly. The profoundest contribution in the Old Testament to a solution of the problem is the idea of the vicarious and redemptive significance of pain and sorrow. The author of Job did not touch this rich vein of thought in dealing with the afflictions of his hero. This was done by the author of the Second Isaiah. The classical passage is Isa 53:1-12, which deals with the woes of the oppressed and afflicted Servant of God with profound spiritual insight. It makes no difference to the meaning of the afflictions whether we understand by the Servant the whole Hebrew nation, or the pious section of it, or an individual member of it, and whether the speakers in Isa 53 are the Jewish nation or the heathen. The significant point here is the value and meaning ascribed to the Servant's sufferings. The speakers had once believed (in accordance with the traditional view) that the Servant suffered because God was angry with him and had stricken him. Now they confess that his sorrows were due, not to his own sin but to theirs (Isa 53:4-6,8). His sufferings were not only vicarious (the punishment of their sin falling upon him), but redemptive in their effect (peace and health coming to them as a result of his chastisement). Moreover, it was not only redemptive, but expiatory ("his soul guilt-offering," Isa 53:10)—a remarkable adumbration of the Christian doctrine of atonement.

5. The New Testament:

So far we have dealt only with Old Testament teaching on the meaning and purpose of affliction. The New Testament makes no new contribution to the solution of the problem, but repeats and greatly deepens the points of view already found in the Old Testament.

(1) There is a recognition throughout the New Testament of the law of retribution (Ga 6:7). Yet Jesus repudiates the popular view of the invariable connection between misfortune and moral evil (Joh 9:2 f). It is clear that He had risen above the conception of God's relation to man as merely retributive (Mt 5:45, sunshine and rain for evil men as well as for the good). His followers would suffer tribulation even more than unbelievers, owing to the hostile reaction of the evil world, similar to that which afflicted Christ Himself (Mt 5:10 f; 10:16-25; Joh 15:18-20; 16:33). Similarly the Ac and the epistles frequently refer to the sufferings of Christians (eg. Ac 14:22; 2Co 4:8-11; Col 1:24; He 10:32; 1Pe 4:13; Re 7:14). Hence afflictions must have some other than a purely punitive purpose.

(2) They are probational, affording a test by which the spurious may be separated from the genuine members of the Christian church (Jas 1:3,12; 1Pe 1:7; 4:17), and

(3) a means of discipline, calculated to purify and train the character (Ro 5:3; 2Co 12:7,9; Jas 1:3).

(4) The idea of vicarious and redemptive suffering gets a far deeper significance in the New Testament than in the Old Testament, and finds concrete realization in a historical person, Jesus Christ. That which is foreshadowed in Second-Isa becomes in the New Testament a central, pervasive and creative thought. A unique place in the Divine purpose is given to the passion of Christ. Yet in a sense, His followers partake of His vicarious sufferings, and "fill up.... that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ" (Col 1:24; compare Php 3:10; 1Pe 4:13). Here, surely is a profound thought which may throw a flood of light on the deep mystery of human affliction. The cross of Christ furnishes the key to the meaning of sorrow as the greatest redemptive force in the universe.

III. Endurance of Affliction.

The Scriptures abound in words of consolation and exhortation adapted to encourage the afflicted. Two main considerations may be mentioned.

(1) The thought of the beneficent sovereignty of God "Yahweh reigneth; let the earth rejoice," even though "clouds and darkness are round about him" (Ps 97:1,2); "All things work together for good to them that love God" (Ro 8:28 the King James Version). Since love is on the throne of the universe, we may rest assured that all things are meant for our good.

(2) The thought that tribulation is of brief duration, in comparison with the Joy that shall follow (Ps 30:5; Isa 54:7 f; Joh 16:22); a thought which culminates in the hope of immortality. This hope is in the Old Testament only beginning to dawn, and gives but a faint and flickering light, except in moments of rare exaltation and insight, when the thought of a perfect future blessedness seemed to offer a solution of the enigmas of life (Job 19:25-27; Psalms 37; 49; 73). But in the New Testament it is a postulate of faith, and by it the Christian is able to fortify himself in affliction, remembering that his affliction is light and momentary compared with the "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" which is to issue out of it (2Co 4:17 the King James Version; compare Mt 5:12; Ro 8:18). Akin to this is the comfort derived from the thought of the near approach of Christ’s second coming (Jas 5:7,8). In view of such truths as these, the Bible encourages the pious in trouble to show the spirit of patience (Ps 37:7; Lu 21:19; Ro 12:12; Jas 1:3,4; 5:7-11; 1Pe 2:20), and even the spirit of positive joy in tribulation (Mt 5:11 f; Ro 5:3; 2Co 12:10; Jas 1:2,12; 1Pe 4:13). In the New Testament emphasis is laid on the example of Jesus in patient endurance in suffering (Joh 16:33; Jas 5:7-11; 1Pe 2:19-23; 3:17 f). Above all, the Scriptures recommend the afflicted to take refuge in the supreme blessedness of fellowship with God, and of trust in His love, by which they may enter into a deep peace that is undisturbed by the trials and problems of life (Ps 73:23-28; Isa 26:3,4; Joh 14:1,27; Php 4:7; et passim).

D. Miall Edwards

AFFRIGHT

a-frit’:Designates a state of terror occasioned by some unexpected and startling occurrence; not as strong as "amazed," which refers more to the stupor resulting from fright. In the New Testament most

frequently for emphobos (Lu 24:37; Ac 10:4; Re 11:13). The Revised Version (British and American) uses it also for pturomenoi of Php 1:28, a word "properly used of scared horses" (Ellicott).

AFOOT

a-foot’ (pezeuo, "to go on foot"): By walking from Troas to Assos Paul avoided the tedious voyage round Cape Lectum (Ac 20:13 the King James Version; compare Mr 6:33).

AFORE

a-for’:Archaic for "before" of time, or "formerly"; frequently occurs as compound, as in "aforetime," "aforehand," etc.; in the New Testament most commonly for the Greek prefix, pro, in compound words (Ro 1:2; 15:4); at other times, for Greek adverb pote, "at some time," "once" (Joh 9:13; 1Pe 3:5; Col 3:7).

AFRESH

a-fresh’:Only in Heb 6:6, "seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh," where it stands for the prefix of the Greek anastaurountas. It has been disputed whether in this word ana has the reiterative force ("again," "anew"). In classical Greek anastauroo has always the simple sense of "to crucify," (ie. "to rinse up on a cross," ana being merely "up"). So some would render it here (eg. Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek). Against this it is argued

(1) that the classical writers had no occasion for the idea of crucifying anew (compare Winer, De verb. Comp., etc., Pt III, 9 ff, Leipzig, 1843);

(2) that in many compounds ana signifies both "up" and "again," as in anablepo, which means "to recover sight" as well as "to look up";

(3) that the rendering "crucify afresh" suits the context;

(4) that the Greek expositors (eg. Chrysostom) take it so without questioning. (So also Bleek, Lunemann, Alford, Westcott; compare the Vulgate’s rursum crucifigentes.)

D. Miall Edwards

AFRICA

af’-ri-ka: The name of this tract, as a continent, does not occur in the Bible, and it was only in later days known as one of the quarters of the world, under the name of Libya—that portion opposite the coast of Greece and West of Egypt.

1. Africa as Known to the Ancients:

Naturally the most considerable part of Africa known to the Hebrews was Egypt itself, but Libya is regarded as being referred to under the names of Lehabim and Lubim (Ludim) (Ge 10:13; 2Ch 12:3)—words indicating, as often with the Semites, not the country itself, but its inhabitants. Other portions of Africa known to the Hebrews were Cush or Ethiopia, and Put, whose inhabitants they regarded as belonging to the Hamitic stock. Canaan, also Cushite and therefore Hamitic, naturally did not belong to the African continent, showing that the divisions of then known world into "quarters" (Europe, Asia, Africa) had not taken place when the Table of the Nations (Ge 10:1 ff) was drawn up—indeed, these division were not apparently thought of until many centuries later. The Casluhim and the Naphtuhim (Ge 10:13,14) were in all probability African peoples, though their position is in general regarded as uncertain. For the Hebrews, to all appearance, the southernmost point of Africa was Cush or Ethiopia, called by the Assyrians and Babylonians Kusu and Meluhha (Meroe), which included the district now known as the Sudan, or Black region. The sons of Cush, and also those of his firstborn, Sheba, were all Arabian tribes, nominally under the domain of Mizraim or Egypt, and on this account classed with the descendants of Ham.

2. The Cushites and the Negroes:

It will thus be seen that the Negro districts were practically unknown to the ancient Hebrews, though men and women of Negro race must have come within their ken. It seems doubtful, therefore, whether there be, in the Bible, any reference to that race, either collectively or individually, the word Cushite standing, not for Negro, but for Ethiopian. This term is applied to Moses' (first) wife (Nu 12:1), and it will probably be generally admitted, that the great Hebrew lawgiver is not likely to have espoused a Negro woman. The Ethiopian eunuch converted by Philip the Evangelist (Ac 8:26 ff) was an official of Meroe, and an educated man, for he could read the Old Testament in the Greek(septuagint) version. Commerce must have revealed to the Hebrews the whereabouts of the various peoples of Africa with whom they came into contact, and they acquired a personal knowledge of Egypt when the 12 tribes were in bondage there. During this period, it may be supposed, they saw from time to time visitors from the South—people who are not mentioned in the sacred books of the Old Testament because the Hebrews, as a nation, never came into contact with them. Apart from Egypt, the history of the portion of Africa known to the Hebrews was a chequered one, as it came successively under Egypt, Phoenicia, Greek and Roman civilization. That it was not overrun, or even influenced, by the barbarous tribes of the South, is due to the fact that the Mediterranean tract is isolated from the central (and southern) portion of that continent by the Sahara.

3. Hebrew Tradition:

In the Talmud it is related that Alexander penetrated Africa on Libyan asses to find a race of women, with whom he had conversation, and from whom, as he afterward confessed, being a fool, he learned wisdom—a legend suggesting some possible tradition of the Amazons of Dahomey. But even in the

Talmud it is mainly the nearer (Northeast) portion of Africa which is referred to, the Africans, who had the reputation of being flat-footed, being associated with the Canaanites.

See also CUSH; ETHIOPIA; MIZRAIM.

T. G. Pinches

AFTER; AFTERWARD

aft’-er, aft’-er-werd: The fundamental thought, in which all shades of meaning unite, is that of succession either in time or place. This succession may be immediate or remote. A very common adaptation of this conception the use of "after" to denote "according to," "after the manner of," or "in the order of," as in Ge 1:26; Eph 4:24; Lu 1:59; Ro 5:14; Heb 4:11 (the Revised Version, margin "unto"), and in many passages where the Greek uses the preposition kata, as Mt 23:3; Ro 8:4; 1Co 1:26, etc. "In proportion to": Ps 28:4; compare Ps 90:15.

It sometimes correctly translates a peculiar Greek idiom of the preposition dia, with the genitive case, indicating time elapsed, as Mr 2:1, literally, "through some days," "after some days had passed"; compare Ac 24:17. While the Greek is expressed by a variety of words, the Hebrew uses ‘achar for both preposition and adverb.

H. E. Jacobs

AFTERNOON

af-ter-noon’ (neToth ha-yom, "the declining of the day"; Jud 19:8 the King James Version): The expression kechom ha-yom, "in the heat of the day" (Ge 18:1) refers to the early afternoon when the sun is a little past its zenith, its rays still being very strong. The phrase le-ruach ha-yom, "in the cool of the day" (Ge 3:8) is in contrast to the last phrase and points to the late afternoon; in the Orient a cooling breeze arises at this period of the day, and it is then that much of the day’s business is transacted.

See DAY.

AGABA

ag’-a-ba: A fortress in Judea. The first of 22 "strong places" which by its commander Galestus was given over to Aristobulus, the son of Alexander Janneus and Alexandra, when he (his mother, the queen, being dangerously ill) attempted to get control of the Judean government (Ant., XIII, xvi, 5).

AGABUS

ag’-a-bus (Agabos): A Christian prophet of Jerusalem, twice mentioned in Acts.

(1) In Ac 11:27 f, we find him at Antioch foretelling "a great famine over all the world," "which," adds the historian, "came to pass in the days of Claudius." This visit of Agabus to Antioch took place in the winter of 43-44 AD, and was the means of urging the Antiochian Christians to send relief to the brethren in Judea by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Two points should be noted.

(a) The gift of prophet’s here takes the form of prediction. The prophet’s chief function was to reveal moral and spiritual truth, to "forth-tell" rather than to "foretell"; but the interpretation of God’s message sometimes took the form of predicting events.

(b) The phrase "over all the world" (practically synonymous with the Roman Empire) must be regarded as a rhetorical exaggeration if strictly interpreted as pointing to a general and simultaneous famine. But there is ample evidence of severe periodical famines in various localities in the reign of Claudius (eg. Suet Claud. 18; Tac. Ann. xii.43), and of a great dearth in Judea under the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, 44-48 AD (Ant., XX, ii, 6; v, 2), which probably reached its climax circa 46 AD.

(2) In Ac 21:10 f we find Agabus at Caesarea warning Paul, by a vivid symbolic action (after the manner of Old Testament prophets; compare Jer 13:1 ff; Eze 3; 4) of the imprisonment and suffering he would undergo if he proceeded to Jerusalem.

(3) In late tradition Agabus is included in lists of the seventy disciples of Christ.

D. Miall Edwards

AGADE

ag’-a-de: Ancient name for Akkad (or ACCAD, which see), one of the chief cities of Babylonia (Ge 10:10), and the capital city of Sargon, who lived and ruled in Babylonia circa 3500 BC. Together with Shunir it formed part of one of the royal titles: "kings of Shunir (Sumer) and Accad."

AGAG

a’-gag (’aghagh, or ‘aghagh, meaning unknown, possibly "violent," BDB): A name, or title, applied to the king of the Amalekites, like Abimelech in Philistia and Pharaoh in Egypt. It is used of two of these kings:

(1) A king of Amalek, mentioned by Balaam (Nu 24:7) in his blessing of Israel;

(2) A later king, in the days of King Saul (1Sa 15). Saul was sent with his army to destroy the

Amalekites, who had so violently opposed Israel in the Wilderness. He disregarded the Divine command, sparing the best of the spoil, and saving Agag the king alive (1Sa 15:8,9). After rebuking Saul, Samuel had Agag put to death for all the atrocities committed by himself and his nation (1Sa 15:32,33).

Edward Mack

AGAGITE

a'-gag-it, ('aghaghi, from, 'aghagh, "a member of the house of Agag"): A title of opprobrium given to Haman (Es 3:1,10; 8:3,5; 9:24). Jewish tradition always assigned the arch-enemies of Israel membership in the house of Amalek, the hereditary foe of the nation. Compare Ant, XI, vi, 5. The word Agag has properly been taken by Delitzsch as related to the Assyrian agagu, "to be powerful," "vehement," "angry." In the Greek parts of Esther, Haman is termed a Macedonian (Es 1:2-6; 1:6-10). The name Haman is probably of Elamitic origin. Oppert's attempt to connect the term "Agagite" with "Agaz," a Median tribe mentioned by Sargon, has found no supporters. See AGAG.

H. J. Wolf

AGAIN

a-gen':Advb. denoting repetition; in New Testament, generally for palin, "back," "once more." Occasionally, it has the force of a connective, synonymous with "moreover," as in Ro 15:10 ff; 1Co 3:20, etc. The expression "born again" of the King James Version, Joh 3:3,7; 1Pe 1:23, translating the Greek "anothen" and "ana" in composition, becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) "anew," i.e. "over again." As these particles mean "from above" and "up," their use as indicating repetition is sometimes disputed, but without further foundation than that "again" does not exhaust the meaning.

AGAIN; BORN

See REGENERATION.

AGAINST

a-genst' (kata; enantion; pros): Preposition expressing contrast. When used of direction, equivalent to "toward" (Mt 10:35; 12:14, etc.); when of position, meaning "opposite," "facing," "in front of" (1Ki 7:5; Ge 15:10, Ro 8:31); when of action, "opposed to" (Mt 5:11; 26:59; 1Co 4:6); "in resistance to" (Heb 12:4); "provision for" (Greek eis, literally, "unto, toward" (1Ti 6:19)). Sometimes also applied to what breaks an established order as "customs" (Ac 28:17), "nature" (Ro 1:26). Peculiar shades of meaning may be traced by careful examination of the variety of prepositions in Hebrew and Greek employed in

the Scriptures, that are translated into English by this one word.

H. E. Jacobs

AGAPE

ag’-a-pe (agape).

1. The Name and the Thing:

The name Agape or "love-feast," as an expression denoting the brotherly common meals of the early church, though of constant use and in the post-canonical literature from the time of Ignatius onward, is found in the New Testament only in Jude 1:12 and in 2Pe 2:13 according to a very doubtful reading. For the existence of the Christian common meal, however, we have abundant New Testament evidence. The"breaking of bread" practiced by the primitive community in Jerusalem according to Ac 2:42,46 must certainly be interpreted in the light of Pauline usage (1Co 10:16; 11:24) as referring to the ceremonial act of the Lord’s Supper. But the added clause in 2:46, "they took there food with gladness and singleness of heart," implies that a social meal was connected in some way with this ceremonial act. Paul’s references to the abuses that had sprung up in the Corinthian church at the meetings for the observance of the Lord’s Supper (1Co 11:20-22,33,34) make it evident that in Corinth as in Jerusalem the celebration of the rite was associated with participation in a meal of a more general character. And in one of the "we" sections of Ac (20:11) where Luke is giving personal testimony as to the manner in which the Lord’s Supper was observed by Paul in a church of his own founding, we find the breaking of bread associated with and yet distinguished from an eating of food, in a manner which makes it natural to conclude that in Troas, as in Jerusalem and Corinth, Christians when they met together on the first day of the week were accustomed to partake of a common meal. The fact that the name Agape or love-feast used in Jude 1:12 (Revised Version) is found early in the 2nd century and often afterward as a technical expression for the religious common meals of the church puts the meaning of Jude’s reference beyond doubt.

2. Origin of the Agape:

So far as the Jerusalem community was concerned, the common meal appears to have sprung out of the koinonia or communion that characterized the first days of the Christian church (compare Ac 1:14; 2:1 etc.). The religious meals familiar to Jews—the Passover being the great type—would make it natural In Jerusalem to give expression by means of table fellowship to the sense of brotherhood, and the community of goods practiced by the infant church (Ac 2:44; 4:32) would readily take the particular form of a common table at which the wants of the poor were supplied out of the abundance of the rich (Ac 6:1 ff). The presence of the Agape in the Greek church of Corinth was no doubt due to the initiative of Paul, who would hand on the observances associated with the Lord’s Supper just as he had received them from the earlier disciples; but participation in a social meal would commend itself very easily to men familiar with the common meals that formed a regular part of the procedure at meetings of those

religious clubs and associations which were so numerous at that time throughout the Greek-Roman world.

3. Relation to the Eucharist:

In the opinion of the great majority of scholars the Agape was a meal at which not only bread and wine but all kinds of viands were used, a meal which had the double purpose of satisfying hunger and thirst and giving expression to the sense of Christian brotherhood. At the end of this feast, bread and wine were taken according to the Lord's command, and after thanksgiving to God were eaten and drunk in remembrance of Christ and as a special means of communion with the Lord Himself and through Him with one another. The Agape was thus related to the Eucharist as Christ's last Passover to the Christian rite which He grafted upon it. It preceded and led up to the Eucharist, and was quite distinct from it. In opposition to this view it has been strongly urged by some modern critical scholars that in the apostolic age the Lord's Supper was not distinguished from the Agape, but that the Agape itself from beginning to end was the Lord's Supper which was held in memory of Jesus. It seems fatal to such an idea, however, that while Paul makes it quite evident that bread and wine were the only elements of the memorial rite instituted by Jesus (1Co 11:23-29), the abuses which had come to prevail at the social gatherings of the Corinthian church would have been impossible in the case of a meal consisting only of bread and wine (compare 1Co 11:21,33 f) Moreover, unless the Eucharist in the apostolic age had been discriminated from the common meal, it would be difficult to explain how at a later period the two could be found diverging from each other so completely.

4. Separation from the Eucharist:

In the Didache (circa 100 AD) there is no sign as yet of any separation. The direction that the second Eucharistic prayer should be offered "after being filled" (x.1) appears to imply that a regular meal had immediately preceded the observance of the sacrament. In the Ignatian Epistles (circa 110 AD) the Lord's Supper and the Agape are still found in combination (Ad Smyrn viii.2). It has sometimes been assumed that Pliny's letter to Trajan (circa 112 AD) proves that the separation had already taken place, for he speaks of two meetings of the Christians in Bithynia, one before the dawn at which they bound themselves by a "sacramentum" or oath to do no kind of crime, and another at a later hour when they partook of food of an ordinary and harmless character (Ep x.96). But as the word "sacramentum" cannot be taken here as necessarily or even probably referring to the Lord's Supper, the evidence of this passage is of little weight. When we come to Justin Martyr (circa 150 AD) we find that in his account of church worship he does not mention the Agape at all, but speaks of the Eucharist as following a service which consisted of the reading of Scripture, prayers and exhortation (Apol, lxvii); so that by his time the separation must have taken place. Tertullian (circa 200 AD) testifies to the continued existence of the Agape (Apol, 39), but shows clearly that in the church of the West the Eucharist was no longer associated with it (De Corona, 3). In the East the connection appears to have been longer maintained (see Bigg, Christian Platonists of Alexandria, 102 ff), but by and by the severance became universal; and though the Agape continued for long to maintain itself as a social function of the church, it gradually passed out of existence or was preserved only as a feast of charity for the poor.

5. Reasons for the Separation:

Various influences appear to have cooperated in this direction. Trajan's enforcement of the old law against clubs may have had something to do with it (compare Pliny as above), but a stronger influence probably came from the rise of a popular suspicion that the evening meals of the church were scenes of licentious revelry and even of crime. The actual abuses which already meet us in the apostolic age (1Co 11:20 ff; Jude 1:12), and which would tend to multiply as the church grew in numbers and came into closer contact with the heathen world, might suggest the advisability of separating the two observances. But the strongest influence of all would come from the growth of the ceremonial and sacerdotal spirit by which Christ's simple institution was slowly turned into a mysterious priestly sacrifice. To Christ Himself it had seemed natural and fitting to institute the Supper at the close of a social meal. But when this memorial Supper had been transformed into a repetition of the sacrifice of Calvary by the action of the ministering priest, the ascetic idea became natural that the Eucharist ought to be received fasting, and that it would be sacrilegious to link it on to the observances of an ordinary social meal.

LITERATURE:

Zahn, art "Agapen" in Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie; Keating, Agape and Eucharist; Schaff, The Oldest Church Manual, chapter xviii; Lambert, Sacraments in the New Testament, Lect viii; Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age, etc., I. 52 ff.

J. C. Lambert

AGAR

a'-gar (Agar). Found once in the Apocrypha in the Greek (Baruch 3:23) probably for the Old Testament Hagar, mother of Ishmael, whose children are mentioned with the merchants of Meran (Midian) and Teman. In 1Ch 5:10 the "Hagarites" the King James Version, are located East of Gilead, and In the days of Saul were at war with the tribe of Reuben. See also 1Ch 5:19,20 and 1Ch 27:31. In Ps 83:6 the name of the same people is Hagarenes.

AGARENES

ag-a-renz':Baruch 3:23 the King James Version. In the Old Testament the word is HAGARENES (which see).

See also AGAR.

AGATE ag'-at.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

AGE

aj: A period of time or a dispensation. In the above sense the word occurs only once in the King James Version, in the sing, as the translation of dor, which means, properly, a "revolution" or "round of time," "a period," "an age" or "generation of man's life"; almost invariable translated "generation," "generations" (Job 8:8), "Inquire, I pray thee, of the former age"); we have the plural as the translation of aion, properly "duration," "the course or flow of time," "an age or period of the world," "the world" (Eph 2:7, "in the ages to come"; Col 1:26, "the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations," the English Revised Version, "from all ages," etc., the American Revised Version, margin, of geneai, "generations" (Eph 3:5 "generations," Eph 3:21, "unto all generations for ever and ever," Greek margin, "all the generations of the age of the ages"). "Ages is given in margin of the King James Version (Ps 145:13; Isa 26:4, "the rock of ages").

We have "age" in the above sense (2 Esdras 3:18; Tobit 14:5; aion) "ages," aion (1 Esdras 4:40 (of Truth) "she is the strength," etc., "of all ages"), genea, the Revised Version (British and American), "generation" (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:27; 1 Macc 2:61); Ecclesiasticus 24:33, eis geneas aionon, "generations of ages"; The Wisdom of Solomon 14:6, "generations' (geneseos).

Revised Version has "age" for "world" (Heb 6:5); "ages" for "worlds" (the Revised Version, margin Heb 1:2; the American Revised Version, margin; compare 1Ti 1:17) (margin, "unto the ages of the ages"), "ages" for "world" (1Co 10:11; Heb 9:26). the English Revised Version has "all ages" for "the beginning of the world "(Eph 3:9, the American Standard Revised Version "for ages"); "king of the ages" for "king of saints" (Re 15:3, corrected text; margin, many ancient authorities read "nations"; Jer 10:7).

See EVERLASTING.

W. L. Walker

AGE; OLD AGE

In individual lives (cheledh; helikia): We have scarcely any word in the Old Testament or New Testament which denotes "age" in the familiar modern sense; the nearest in the Old Testament is perhaps heledh, "life," "lifetime," and in the New Testament helikia, "full age," "manhood," but which is rendered stature in Mt 6:27, etc., the King James Version; cheledh occurs (Job 11:17), "Thine age shall be clearer than the noonday," the Revised Version (British and American) "(thy) life"; Ps 39:5, "Mine age is as nothing before thee," the American Standard Revised Version, "my life-time"); we have helikia (Joh 9:21,23), "He is of age"; Heb 11:11 "past age," Lu 2:52, "Jesus increased in wisdom and age," so the Revised Version, margin, King James Version margin, Eph 4:13); yom, day, (days) is used in the Old Testament to express "age" (Ge 47:28), the whole age of Jacob," the King James Version, "the days of the years of his life"; but it occurs mostly in connection with old age); ben, "son" (Nu 8:25; 1Ch 23:3,24); kelah, "to be complete," is translated "full age" (Job 5:26); teleios, "complete" (Heb 5:14), the

Revised Version (British and American), full-grown men, margin, perfect", dor, a revolution," "a period" is translated "age" Isa 38:12, "Mine age is departed and removed from me as a shepherd's tent," the American Standard Revised Version, "My dwelling is removed, and is carried away from me as a shepherd's tent," the English Revised Version, "mine age," margin, "or habitation"; Delitzsch, "my home"; compare Ps 49:19, 20; 2Co 5:8. In New Testament we have etos, "year" (Mr 5:42), the Revised Version British and American, "old"; Lu 2:37; 3:23, "Jesus .... about 30 years of age". "Old age," "aged," are the translation of various words, zaqen zaqan, "the chin," "the beard", perhaps to have the chin sharp or hanging down, often translated "elders," "old man," etc. 2Sa 19:32, Job 12:20, 32:9, Jer 6:11.

In New Testament we have presbutes, "aged," "advanced in days" (Titus 2:2; Phm 1:9); presbutis, "aged woman" (Titus 2:3); probebekos en hemerais, advanced in days" (Lu 2:36); geras, "old age" (Lu 1:36).

Revised Version has "old" for "the age of" (1Ch 23:3), "own age" for "sort" (Da 1:10); "aged" for "ancients" (Ps 119:100), for "ancient" (Isa 47:6); for "old" (Heb 8:13); "aged men" for "the ancients" (Job 12:12); for "aged" (Job 12:20), "elders."

Regard for Old Age:

(1) Among the Hebrews (and Orientals generally) old age was held in honor, and respect was required for the aged (Le 19:32), "Thou shalt rise up before the hoary head, and honor the face of the old man"; a mark of the low estate of the nation was that "The faces of elders were not honored"; "The elders have ceased from the gate" (La 5:12,14). Compare Job 29:8 (as showing the exceptionally high regard for Job). See also The Wisdom of Solomon 2:10; Ecclesiasticus 8:6.

(2) Old age was greatly desired and its attainment regarded as a Divine blessing (Ge 15:15; Ex 20:12, "that thy days may be long in the land"; Job 5:26; Ps 91:16, "With long life will I satisfy him"; Ps 92:14; compare Isa 65:20; Zec 8:4; 1Sa 2:32).

(3) A Divine assurance is given, "Even to old age I am he, and even to hoar hairs will I carry you" (Isa 46:4); hence it was looked forward to in faith and hope (Ps 71:9,18).

(4) Superior wisdom was believed to belong to the aged (Job 12:20; 15:10; 32:7,9; compare 1Ki 12:8); hence positions of guidance and authority were given to them, as the terms "elders," "presbyters" and (Arabic) "sheik" indicate.

W. L. Walker

AGEE

a'-ge (aghe'," fugitive"): A Hararite, father of Shammah, one of David's "three mighty men" (2Sa 23:11). In 1Ch 11:34 we read of one "Jonathan the son of Shagee the Hararite." The parallel in 2Sa 23:32,33 reads "Jonathan, Shammah the Hararite." If we read "Jonathan (son of) Shammah," then Agee

is the grandfather of Jonathan. Some, however, think 1Ch 11:34 to be correct, and read "Shagee" for "Agee" in 2Sa 23:11, and for "Shammah" in 2Sa 23:33. This makes Jonathan and Shammah brothers.

AGES, ROCK OF

Applied to Yahweh as an encouragement for trust (Isa 26:4 the Revised Version, margin; the King James Version "everlasting strength").

AGGABA

a-ga'-ba (Aggaba, and Agraba; the King James Version, Graba) = Hagabah (Ezr 2:45) and Hagaba (Ne 7:48): The descendants of Abraham (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:29).

See also ACCABA.

AGGAEUS

a-ge'-us (Aggaios; the King James Version Aggeus). Haggai, one of the Minor Prophets. Abraham prophesied in the second year of the reign of Darius (compare Ezr 4:24; 5:1) with Zacharias in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 6:1; 7:3) In 2 Esdras 1:40 he is mentioned as one who with others shall be given as "leader to the nation from the east."

AGIA

a'-gi-a (Agia; the King James Version Hagia) = Hattil (Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59): The descendants of Abraham (sons of the servants of Solomon) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:34).

AGONE

a-gon':In the King James Version of 1Sa 30:13. Old past participle of "to go." the Revised Version (British and American) has "ago," namely, "three days ago," literally, "the third day."

AGONY

ag'-o-ni (agonia; Vulgate agonia):

A word occurring only once in the New Testament (Lu 22:44), and used to describe the climax of the mysterious soul-conflict and unspeakable suffering of our Lord in the garden at Gethsemane. The term is derived from the Greek agon "contest" and this in turn from the Greek ago "to drive or lead," as in a

chariot race. Its root idea is the struggle and pain of the severest athletic contest or conflict. The wrestling of the athlete has its counterpart in the wrestling of the suffering soul of the Saviour in the garden. At the beginning of this struggle He speaks of His soul being exceeding sorrowful even unto death, and this tumult of emotion culminated in the agony. All that can be suggested by the exhausting struggles and sufferings of charioteers, runners, wrestlers and gladiators, in Grecian and Roman amphitheaters, is summed up in the pain and death-struggle of this solitary word "agony." The word was rendered by Wyclif (1382) "maad in agonye" Tyndale (1534) and following translators use an agony." The record of Jesus' suffering in Gethsemane, in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 26:36-46; Mr 14:32-42; Lu 22:39-46, and also in He 5:7,8) indicates that it was threefold:

1. Physical:

The agony of His soul wrought its pain on His body, until "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood falling down upon the ground" (Lu 22:44, omitted by some ancient authorities). He offered His prayers and supplications "with strong crying and tears" (He 5:7). The intensity of His struggle so distressed and weakened Him that Luke says "there appeared unto him an angel from heaven, strengthening him." The threefold record of the evangelists conveys the idea of the intensest physical pain. As the wire carries the electric current, so every nerve in Jesus' physical being felt the anguish of His sensitive soul as He took upon Himself the burden of the world's sin and moral evil.

2. Mental:

The crisis of Jesus' career as Messiah and Redeemer came in Gethsemane. The moral issue of His atoning work was intelligently and voluntarily met here. The Gospels exhaust language in attempting to portray the stress and struggle of this conflict. "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death." "Being in an agony he prayed more earnestly, saying, Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me." The mental clearness of Christ's vision of humanity's moral guilt and the energy of will necessary to meet the issue and take "this cup" of being the world's sin- bearer, indicate the awful sorrow and anguish of His supernatural conflict. It is divinely significant that the word "agony" appears but once in all Scripture. This solitary word records a solitary experience. Only One ever compassed the whole range of the world's sorrow and pain, anguish and agony. The shame of criminal arrest in the garden and of subsequent condemnation and death as a malefactor had to His innocent soul the horror of humanity's entire and ageless guilt. The mental and moral anguish of Jesus in Gethsemane interprets the meaning of Paul's description of the atonement, "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf" (2Co 5:21).

3. Spiritual:

The agony of Jesus was supremely within the realm of His spirit. The effect of sin in separating the human soul from God was fathomed by the suffering Saviour in the fathomless mystery of His supernatural sorrow. Undoubtedly the anguish of Gethsemane surpassed the physical torture of Calvary. The whole conflict was wrought out here. Jesus' filial spirit, under the burden of the world's guilt, felt isolated from the Father. This awful, momentary seclusion from His Father's face constituted the "cup"

which He prayed might pass from Him, and the "agony" of soul, experienced again on the cross, when He felt that God had forsaken Him.

No theory of the atonement can do justice to the threefold anguish of Jesus in Gethsemane and on Calvary, or to the entire trend of Scripture, that does not include the substitutionary element in His voluntary sacrifice, as stated by the prophet: "Yahweh hath laid on him the iniquity of us all," Isa 53:6; and by His apostles "who was delivered up for our trespasses," Ro 4:25; "who his own self bare our sins," 1Pe 2:24.

The word "agony" also occurs in 2 Macc 3:14,16,21 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "distress") in describing the distress of the people at the attempt of Heliodorus to despoil the treasury of the temple in the days of Onias.

Dwight M. Pratt

AGRAPHA

ag'-ra-fa (agrapha).

1. The Term and Its History:

The word agraphos of which agrapha is the neuter plural is met with in classical Greek and in Greek papyri in its primary sense of "unwritten," "unrecorded." In early Christian literature, especially in the writings of Clement of Alexandria, it was used of oral tradition; and in this sense it was revived by Koerner in a Leipzig Program issued in 1776 under the title De sermonibus Christi agraphois. For some time it was restricted to sayings of Christ not recorded in the Gospels and believed to have reached the sources in which they are found by means of oral tradition. As however graphe, the noun with which agrapha is connected, can have not only the general meaning "writing," but the special meaning "Scripture," the, adjective could signify not only "oral" but also uncanonical or "non-canonical"; and it was employed by Resch in the latter sense in the 1st edition of his great work on the subject which appeared in German in 1889 under the title, Agrapha: Extra-canonical Gospel Fragments. The term was now also extended so as to include narratives as well as sayings. In the second edition (also in German) it is further widened so as to embrace all extra-canonical sayings or passages connected with the Bible. The new title runs: Agrapha Extra-canonical Fragments of Scripture; and the volume contains a first collection of Old Testament agrapha. The term is still however used most frequently of non-canonical sayings ascribed to Jesus, and to the consideration of these this article will mainly be devoted.

2. Extent of Material:

Of the 361 agrapha and apocrypha given by Resch about 160 are directly ascribed to Christ. About 30 others can be added from Christian and Jewish sources and about 80 sayings found in Muhammadan literature (Expository Times, V, 59, 107, 177 f, 503 f, 561, etc.). The last-mentioned group, although not

entirely without interest, may largely be disregarded as it is highly improbable that it represents early tradition. The others come from a variety of sources: the New Testament outside of the Gospels, Gospel manuscripts and VSS, Apocryphal Gospels and an early collection of sayings of Jesus, liturgical texts, patristic and medieval literature and the Talmud.

3. Sayings to Be Excluded:

Many of these sayings have no claim to be regarded as independent agrapha. At least five classes come under this category.

(1) Some are mere parallels or variants, for instance: "Pray and be not weary," which is evidently connected with Lu 18:1; and the saying in the Talmud: "I, the Gospel, did not come to take away from the law of Moses but to add to the law of Moses have I come" (Shab 116b) which is clearly a variant of Mt 5:17.

(2) Some sayings are made up of two or more canonical texts. "I chose you before the world was," for example, is a combination of Joh 15:19 and Eph 1:4; and "Abide in my love and I will give you eternal life" of Joh 8:31 and Joh 10:28.

(3) Misquotation or loose quotation accounts for a number of alleged agrapha. "Sodom is justified more than thou" seems to be really from Eze 16:53 and its context. "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath" is of apostolic not evangelic origin (Eph 4:26). "Anger destroys even the prudent" comes from Septuagint of Pr 15:1.

(4) Some sayings must be rejected because they cannot be traced to an early source, for instance, the fine saying: "Be brave in war, and fight with the old serpent, and ye shall receive eternal life," which is first met with in a text of the 12th century

(5) Several sayings are suspicious by reason of their source or their character. The reference to "my mother the Holy Spirit," in one of them, has no warrant in the acknowledged teaching of Christ and comes from a source of uncertain value, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Pantheistic sayings such as "I am thou and thou art I, and wherever thou art I am"; "You are I and I am you"; and perhaps the famous saying: "Raise the stone and thou wilt find me; cleave the wood and there am I," as well as the sayings reported by Epiphanius from the Gospel of the Ebionites seem to breathe an atmosphere different from that of the canonical Gospels.

4. Sayings in New Testament:

When all the sayings belonging to these five classes, and a few others of liturgical origin, have been deducted there remain about thirty-five which are worthy of mention and in some cases of careful consideration. Some are dealt with in the article LOGIA (which see). The others, which are given here, are numbered consecutively to facilitate reference. The best authenticated are of course those found in

the New Testament outside of the Gospels. These are

(1) the great saying cited by Paul at Miletus: "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Ac 20:35);

(2) the words used in the institution of the Eucharist preserved only in 1Co 11:24 f;

(3) the promise of the baptism of the Spirit (Ac 1:5, 11:16); and

(4) the answer to the question: "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" (Ac 1:7 f). Less certain are

(5) the description of the Second Advent, said to be "by the word of the Lord" (1Th 4:15 ff); and

(6) the promise of the crown of life to them that love God (Jas 1:12).

5. Sayings in Manuscripts and Versions:

Of considerable interest are some additions, in manuscripts of the Gospels and versions One of the most remarkable

(7) is the comment of Jesus on a man's working on the Sabbath day inserted after Lu 6:4 in Codex Bezae (D) and the Freer manuscript recently discovered in Egypt: "If thou knowest what thou doest, O man, blessed art thou, but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law." Another

(8) also found in D and in several other authorities is appended to Mt 20:28: "But ye seek ye from little to increase and from greater to be less." In the Curetonian Syriac the latter clause runs: "and not from greater to be less." The new saying is noteworthy but obscure. A third passage

(9) of less value but still of interest is an insertion in the longer ending of Mark, between 16:14 and 16:15, which was referred to by Jerome as present in codices in his day but has now been met with in Greek for the first time in the above-mentioned Freer MS. (For facsimile see American Journal of Archaeology, 1908.) In reply to a complaint of the disciples about the opposition of Satan and their request: "Therefore reveal thy righteousness even now," Jesus is reported to have said: "The limit of the years of the authority of Satan is fulfilled, but other dreadful things are approaching, and in behalf of those who had sinned was I delivered unto death in order that they might return to the truth and might sin no longer, that they might inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness in heaven." This alleged utterance of the risen Lord is most probably of secondary character (compare Gregory, Das Freer Logion; Swete, Two New Gospel Fragments).

6. Sayings from the Fathers, etc.:

Apocryphal and patristic literature supplies some notable sayings. The first place must be given

(10) to the great saying which in its shortest form consists of only three words: "Be ("become," "show yourselves to be") approved money-changers." Resch (Agrapha2, number 87) gives 69 references, at least 19 of which date from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, although they represent only a few authorities, all Egyptian. The saying seems to have circulated widely in the early church and may be genuine. Other early sayings of interest or value, from these sources, must be given without comment.

(11) "The heavenly Father willeth the repentance of the sinner rather than his punishment" (Justin Martyr).

(12) "That which is weak shall be saved by that which is strong" (circa 300 AD).

(13) "Come out from bonds ye who will" (Clement of Alexandria).

(14) "Be thou saved and thy soul" (Theodotus in id).

(15) "Blessed are they who mourn for the perdition of unbelievers" (Didaskalia).

(16) "He who is near me is near the fire; he who is far from me is far from the kingdom" (Origen).

(17) "He who has not been tempted has not been approved" (Didaskalia, etc.).

(18) He who makes sad a brother’s spirit is one of the greatest of criminals" (Ev Heb).

(19) "Never be glad except when ye have seen your brother in love" (same place).

(20) "Let not him who seeks cease .... until he find, and when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall reach the kingdom, and when he has reached the kingdom he shall rest" (Clement of Alexandria and Logia of Oxyrhynchus).

(21) In a fragment of a Gospel found by Grenfell and Hunt at Oxyrhynchus (O Papyri number 655) is the following non-canonical passage in a canonical context: "He Himself will give you clothing. His disciples say unto Him: When wilt thou be manifest to us and when shall we see thee? He saith: When ye shall be stripped and not be ashamed." The saying or apocryphon exhibits considerable likeness to a saying cited by Clement of Alexandria from the Gospel according to the Egyptians, but the difference is great enough to make original identity doubtful. Another fragment found by the same explorers on the same site (O Papyri number 840) preserves two agrapha or apocrypha which though clearly secondary are very curious. The first

(22) is the concluding portion of a saying about the punishment of evil-doers: "Before a man does wrong

he makes all manner of subtle excuses. But give heed lest you also suffer the same things as they for the evil-doers among men receive not their due among the living (Greek zois) only but also await punishment and much torment." Professor Swete (Two New Gospel Fragments), accents zoois as the plural of zoon and thus finds a contrast between the fate of animals and that of human beings. The second saying

(23) is a rather lengthy reply to the complaint of a Pharisaic stickler for outward purity. The most interesting part of it as edited by Swete runs as follows: "Woe to you blind who see not.... But I and my disciples who thou sayest have not been dipped have dipped in the waters of eternal life which come down from God out of heaven." All these texts from Oxyrhynchus probably date from the 2nd century. Other Egypt sources, the so-called Coptic Apocryphal Gospels (Texts and Studies Camb. IV, 2, 1896), contain several sayings which are of interest as coming from the same religious environment. The following three are the most remarkable.

(24) "Repent, for it is better that a man find a cup of water in the age that is coming than all the riches of this world" (130).

(25) "Better is a single footstep in My Father’s house than all the wealth of this world" (130 f).

(26) "Now therefore have faith in the love of My Father; for faith is the end of all things" (176). As in the case of the Logia these sayings are found in association with canonical sayings and parallels. Since the Logan may well have numbered scores, if not hundreds, it is at least possible that these Coptic sayings may have been taken from the missing portions of this collection, or a recension of it, and therefore they are not unworthy of notice as conceivably early agrapha. To these sayings of Christian derivation may be added

(27) one Muhammadan saying, that inscribed in Arabic on the chief gateway of the city Futteypore Sikri built by Akbar: "The world is but a bridge, over which you must pass, but must not linger to build your dwelling" (In the Himalayas by Miss Gordon Cumming, cited by Griffenhoofe, The Unwritten Sayings of Christ, 128).

7. Result:

Although the number of agrapha purporting to be sayings of Jesus which have been collected by scholars seems at first sight imposing, those which have anything like a strong claim to acceptance on the ground of early and reliable source and internal character are disappointingly few. Of those given above numbers 1-4, 7, 8, 10 which have mostly early attestation clearly take precedence of the rest. Numbers 11-20 are early enough and good enough to merit respectful consideration. Still the proportion of genuine, or possibly genuine, material is very small. Ropes is probably not far from the truth when he remarks that "the writers of the Synoptic Gospels did their work so well that only stray bits here and there, and these but of small value, were left for the gleaners." On the other hand it is not necessary to follow Wellhausen in rejecting the agrapha in toto. Recent discoveries have shown that they are the

remains of a considerable body of extra-canonical sayings which circulated more or less in Christian circles, especially in Egypt, in the early centuries, and the possible presence in what we possess of a sentence or two actually spoken by Jesus fully justifies research.

8. Other Agrapha:

The second edition of the work of Resch includes 17 agrapha from manuscripts of Ac and 1 Joh most of which are from Codex Bezae (D), 31 apostolic apocrypha, and 66 agrapha and apocrypha connected with the Old Testament. 19 of the latter are largely taken from pseudepigrapha, a pseudo-Ezekiel for instance These agrapha some of which are really textual variants are of inferior interest and value.

LITERATURE.

The chief authorities are the German book of the American scholar J. H. Ropes, Die Spruche Jesu, die in den kanonischen Evangelien nicht uberliefert sind, and his article "Agrapha in HDB (extra vol); and the often-mentioned work of Resch. The former has great critical value, and the latter, especially in the 2nd edition, is a veritable thesaurus of material. For a full survey of the literature up to 1905 see that work, pp. 14-17. There is much criticism in Bauer's Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, chapter vii. Among smaller works special mention may be made of Prebendary Blomfield's Twenty-Five Agrapha (1900); and the book of Griffenhoofe, the title of which is given above. There are recent articles on the subject in HDB (1909), "Unwritten Sayings," and DCG, "Sayings (Unwritten)"; Am. Journal of Archaeology, XII (1908), 49-55; H. A. Sanders, New manuscripts from Egypt; also ib, XIII (1909), 130.

See LOGIA.

William Taylor Smith

AGRARIAN LAWS

a-gra'-ri-an loz: 1. The Sabbath Year 2. The Jubilee 3. Its Object 4. The Legal Rules 5. Ideas and Circumstances of the Legislation 6. Form of the Legislation 7. Its Operation and Extension 8. Other Laws Affecting the Land The Mosaic provisions on this subject form one of the most characteristic and interesting portions of the legislation. The main institutions are two, namely, the Sabbath year and the jubilee, and they are closely linked together.

1. The Sabbath Year:

In every seventh year the land was to lie fallow "that the poor of thy people may eat: and what they leave the beast of the field shall eat" (Ex 23:10 f; compare Le 25:2-7). 'And the Sabbath of the land shall be for food for you; for thee, and for thy servant, and for thy maid, and for thy hired servant and for thy

stranger that sojourn with thee; but for thy cattle, and for the beasts that are in thy land, shall all the increase thereof be for food' (Le 25:6 f). This has been quoted at length because the rendering of English Versions of the Bible is misleading. "The Sabbath of the land" does not mean that the natural increase thereof is to be eaten by the Israelite peasant. That interpretation is excluded by Le 25:3-5,20-22. What is intended is clearly shown by the latter of these two passages, "I will command my blessing upon you in the sixth year." The principle on which the manna had been provided for Sabbaths was to apply to the harvest of the sixth year, and this is the import of the phrase.

2. The Jubilee:

After "seven sabbaths of years, even forty and tone years" a trumpet was to be blown throughout the land on the tenth day of the seventh month (i.e. the Day of Atonement) and the fiftieth year was to be hallowed and celebrated as a "jubilee." No agricultural work of any kind was to be performed, but "ye may (so correct EVV) eat the increase thereof out of the field" (Le 25:12). God would so bless the land in the sixth year that it would bring forth enough for the Sabbath year, the ensuing jubilee and the subsequent period to the harvest of the ninth year (Le 25:20-22).

3. Its Object:

In addition to being a period in which the land was left fallow, the jubilee was intended to meet the economic evils that befell peasants in ancient societies. Wars or unfavorable seasons would soon reduce a farmer to a condition in which he would have to borrow. But money is rarely to be had without interest and security, and in early communities the rates of interest were very high indeed, while the only security the farmer could offer would consist of his land and the persons of himself and his children. Hence we find insolvency giving rise to the alienation of land and to slavery all over the world—sometimes with the retention of civil rights (as in Rome and Israel), at others in a more unalloyed form. The jubilee aims at both these evils. It is provided that in that year the peasants who had lost their full freedom through insolvency should be free (see Wiener, Studies in Biblical Law, 5 ff) and all lands that had been sold should return to the original owner or his family. "And the land shall not be sold in perpetuity; for the land is mine: for ye are strangers and sojourners with me" (Lev 25:23). To this theory there are parallels elsewhere, e.g. in Togoland (Heinrici, Zeitschrift fur vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, XI, 138).

4. The Legal Rules:

Le 25$ containing the land laws gives effect to this view by enacting that when an Israelite was compelled to part with his land there was to be a "redemption" of land, and that in default of redemption the land should return to its original owner in the jubilee year. This "redemption" covers two ideas—a right of preemption by the next of kin the first instance, and if that were not exercised, a right on the part of the original owner to buy back the land before the jubilee (Le 25:24-28). The theory did not apply to houses in walled cities. Those might be redeemed within a year of sale: in default the property passed for ever and was unaffected by the jubilee (Le 25:29 f). Villages were reckoned as country (Le 25:31). The

Levitical cities were subject to the rules of land, not of walled cities (Le 25:32 f; read with the Vulgate in the American Revised Version, margin, "if they have not been redeemed" in Le 25:32), and their fields were not to be sold (Le 25:34). All sales of lands to which the jubilee applied were to be made on the basis of the number of crops (Le 25:14 ff); in fact, what was sold was not the property itself but the usufruct (i.e. the right of using, reaping, etc.) till the year of the jubilee. Similarly with the laws of Le 27:16-25, where the general principle is that if a field be sanctified the value shall be estimated according to the number of years to the jubilee. Unfortunately the text is corrupt and it is impossible to make out the exact circumstances in which no further redemption was allowed (Le 27:20).

5. Ideas and Circumstances of the Legislation:

"The land laws are the product of many independent ideas and circumstances. .... First such a system as that expounded in the 25th chapter of Le could only be put forward by one who had to work on what is so very rare in history—a clean slate. In other words, the system of land tenure here laid down could only be introduced in this way by men who had no preexisting system to reckon with. Secondly, there is (mutatis mutandis) a marked resemblance between the provisions of Le and the system introduced in Egypt by Joseph (Ge 47$). The land is the Lord’s as it is Pharaoh’s; but the towns which are built on that land are not subject to the same theory or the same rules. Perhaps the explanation is that Joseph’s measures had affected only those who gained their living by agriculture, i.e. the dwellers in the country. Thirdly, the system shows the enormous power that the conception of family solidarity possessed in the Mosaic age. .... And fourthly, the enactment is inspired and illuminated by the humanitarian and religious convictions to which reference has already been made" (Journal of Transactions of the Victoria Institute, XLI, 160). Undoubtedly the most striking feature of the enactment is to be found in these religious convictions with the absolute reliance on constant Divine intervention to secure the working of the law (Ge 47:20 ff).

6. Form of the Legislation:

Le 26$ shows clearly that this legislation was conceived as the terms of a covenant made between God and the children of Israel, and it appears from Le 26:42-45 that this of the covenant was regarded as being connected with the covenants with the patriarchs though it is also a covenant made with the generation that came forth from Egypt. The land was originally promised to Abraham in a covenant (Ge 17$) and it would seem that these laws are regarded as attaching to that covenant which had been renewed with his descendants. Indeed the laws appear to be presented as terms of the sworn agreement (covenant) under which God was about to give Israel the possession of Canaan.

7. Its Operation and Extension:

As respects the operation of these laws we have no information as to the observance of any fallow years before the Exile: 2Ch 36:21 is rather unfavorable, but so obviously echoes Le 26:43 that it scarcely seems to be meant as a historical statement. But traces are to be found of the operation of other parts of the system. Ru 4 shows us the law of redemption working, but with two notable extensions. Widows

have acquired a right of property in their husbands' estates, and when the next of kin refuses to redeem, the right passes to the kinsman who is nearest in succession. Neither of these cases is contemplated by the Pentateuch: both appear to be fresh applications of the Levitical law which, like all other legislations, had to be adapted to meet new sets of facts as they arose. Similarly Jer 32 illustrates the law of preemption, but here a small difficulty arises, for Le 25:34 forbids the sale of the suburbs of the Levitical cities. Probably however this refers only to sale outside the family and not as here to the nearest kinsman and heir presumptive. Similarly Eze twice refers to the jubilee (Eze 7:12 f and Eze 46:17) in terms that seem to show that he knew it as an existing institution (see SBL, 96; Churchman, May, 1906, 292). Historical traces of the Levitical cities are mentioned in the article LEVITICAL CITIES. It should be added that under the monarchy a rule seems to have been introduced that derelict lands fell to the king (see 2Sa 9:9; 1Ki 21:16; 2Ki 8:3,6).

In later times there are several references to the fallow of the Sabbatical year (1 Macc 6:49,53; Ant, XIII, viii, 1, XIV, x, 6, etc.).

8. Other Laws Affecting the Land:

In addition to these laws Moses enacted provisions favoring gleaning, on which see POOR. He also prohibited sowing a field or vineyard with two kinds of seed (Le 19:19; De 22:9) and prescribed that for three years the fruit of trees should not be eaten, while in the fourth it should be holy, and in the fifth it was to be available for ordinary purposes (Le 19:23 ff).

Harold M. Wiener

AGREE

a-gre' (sumphoneo, "to be of the same mind," "to come to a mutual understanding"): This is the sense of the word in Mt 20:2; Joh 9:22, and other passages. In Mr 14:56 the word is isos and has the thought not only that their words did not agree, but also that the testimony was not in agreement with or equal to what the law required in such a case. The thought of being equal occurs also in 1Joh 5:8.

The figurative use of the word in Mt 18:19 makes it of special interest. The word there is sumphoneo, from which comes our word symphony, meaning a harmonious blending. This agreement therefore is complete. Three persons are introduced: two human beings and the Father. They are in perfect agreement on the subject or purpose under consideration. It is therefore an inward unity produced by the Holy Spirit leading the two into such an agreement with the Father. There will follow then, as a matter of course, what is promised in Mt 18:19,20. In Ac 5:9 it sets forth the justice of Peter in dealing in the same manner in both cases. Ananias and Sapphira were in perfect agreement and equally guilty (Lu 5:36; Ac 15:15).

Jacob W. Kapp

AGRICULTURE

ag’-ri-kul-tur, ag’-ri-kul-chur:

I. DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURE

II. CLIMATIC CONDITIONS AND FERTILITY

III. AGRICULTURAL PURSUITS 1. Growing of Grain (1) Plowing and Sowing (2) Reaping (3) Threshing 2. Care of Vineyards 3. Raising of Flocks

I. Development of Agriculture.

One may witness in Syria and Palestine today the various stages of social progress through which the people of Bible times passed in which the development of their agriculture played an important part. To the East the sons of Ishmael still wander in tribes from place to place, depending upon their animals for food and raiment, unless by a raid they can secure the fruits of the soil from the peoples, mostly of their own blood, who have given up wandering and are supporting themselves by tilling the ground. It is only a short step from this frontier life to the more protected territory toward the Mediterranean, where in comparatively peaceful surroundings, the wanderers become stationary. If the land which they have come to possess is barren and waterless, they become impoverished physically and spiritually, but if they have chosen the rarer spots where underground streams burst forth into valleys covered with alluvial deposits (Ex 3:8), they prosper and there springs up the more complicated community life with its servants, hirelings, gardeners, etc. A division of labor ensues. Some leave the soil for the crafts and professions but still depend upon their farmer neighbors for theft sustenance. (1Ki 5:11.) Such was the variety of life of the people among whom Jesus lived, and of their ancestors, and of the inhabitants of the land long before the children of Israel came to take possession of it. Bible history deals with the Hebrews at a period when a large proportion of that people were engaged in agrarian pursuits, hence we find its pages filled with references to agricultural occupations.

II. Climatic Conditions and Fertility.

With climatic conditions and fertility so varied, the mode of cultivation, seedtime and harvest differed even in closely adjacent territory. On the coastal plains and in the low Jordan valley the soil was usually rich and the season was early, whereas the mountainous regions and high interior plains the planting and reaping times were from two weeks to a month later. To make use of the soil on the hillsides, terracing was frequently necessary.

Examples of these old terraces still exist. On the unwatered plains the crops could be grown only In the winter and spring, i.e. during the rainy season. These districts dried up in May or June and remained fallow during the rainless summer. The same was true of the hilly regions and valleys except where water from a stream could be diverted from its channel and spread over the fields. In such districts crops could be grown irrespective of the seasons. See IRRIGATION.

III. Agricultural Pursuits.

To appreciate the many references in the Bible to agricultural pursuits and the frequent allusions of our Lord to the fields and their products, we must remember how different were the surroundings of the farmers of that day from those among which most of us live or with which we are acquainted. What knowledge we have of these pursuits is drawn from such references as disclose methods bearing a close similarity to those of the present day. The strong tendency to resist change which is everywhere manifest throughout the country and the survival of ancient descriptive words in the language of today further confirm our belief that we now witness in this country the identical operations which were used two thousand or more years ago. It would be strange if there were not a variety of ways by which the same object was accomplished when we remember that the Hebrew people benefited by the experience of the Egyptians, of the Babylonians, of the inhabitants of the land of their adoption, as well as of its late European conquerors. For this reason the drawings found on the Egyptian monuments, depicting agricultural scenes, help us to explain the probable methods used in Palestine.

Three branches of agriculture were more prominent than the others; the growing of grain, the care of vineyards (Nu 18:30), and the raising of flocks. Most households owned fields and vineyards and the richer added to these a wealth of flocks. The description of Job's wealth (in Job 1) shows that he was engaged in all these pursuits. Hezekiah's riches as enumerated in 2Ch 32:27,28 suggest activity in each of these branches.

1. Growing of Grain:

In this and following descriptions, present-day methods as far as they correspond to ancient records will be dealt with.

(1) Plowing and sowing.

On the plains, little or no preparation for plowing is needed, but in the hilly regions, the larger stones, which the tilling of the previous season has loosened and which the winter's rains have washed bare, are picked out and piled into heaps on some ledge, or are thrown into the paths, which thus become elevated above the fields which they traverse. (See FIELD.) If grain is to be planted, the seed is scattered broadcast by the sower. If the land has not been used for some time the ground is first plowed, and when the seed has been scattered is plowed again. The sower may keep his supply of seed in a pocket made by pulling up his outer garment through his girdle to a sufficient extent for it to sag down outside his girdle in the form of a loose pouch. He may, on the other hand, carry it in a jar or basket as the sowers are pictured as doing on the Egyptian monuments. As soon as the seed is scattered it is plowed in before the ever-present crows and ravens can gather it up. The path of the plow in the fields of the hilly regions is a tortuous one because of the boulders jutting out here and there (Mt 13:3 ff) or because of the ledges which frequently lie hidden just beneath the surface (the rocky places of Christ's parable).

When the plowman respects the footpaths which the sufferance of the owner has allowed to be trodden across his fields or which mark the boundaries between the lands of different owners, and leaves them unplowed, then the seed which has fallen on these portions becomes the food of the birds. Corners of the field where the plow cannot reach are hoed by hand. Harrowing-in as we know it is not practiced today, except on some of the larger plains, and probably was not used in Palestine in earlier times. See HARROW.

(2) Reaping.

After the plowing is over, the fields are deserted until after the winter rains, unless an unusually severe storm of rain and hail (Ex 9:25) has destroyed the young shoots. Then a second sowing is made. In April, if the hot east winds have not blasted the grain (see BLASTING) the barley begins to ripen. The wheat follows from a week to six weeks later, depending upon the altitude. Toward the end of May or the first week in June, which marks the beginning of the dry season, reaping begins. Whole families move out from their village homes to spend the time in the fields until the harvest is over. Men and women join in the work of cutting the grain. A handful of grain is gathered together by means of a sickle held in the right hand. The stalks thus gathered in a bunch are then grasped by the left hand and at the same time a pull is given which cuts off some of the stalks a few inches above ground (see STUBBLE) and pulls the rest up by the roots. These handfuls are laid behind the reapers and are gathered up by the helpers (see GLEANING), usually the children, and made into piles for transporting to the threshing-floor.

(3) Threshing.

The threshing-floors are constructed in the fields, preferably in an exposed position in order to get the full benefit of the winds. If there is a danger of marauders they are clustered together close to the village. The floor is a level, circular area 25 to 40 ft. in diameter, prepared by first picking out the stones, and then wetting the ground, tamping or rolling it, and finally sweeping it. A border of stones usually surrounds the floor to keep in the grain. The sheaves of grain which have been brought on the backs of men, donkeys, camels, or oxen, are heaped on this area, and the process of tramping out begins. In some localities several animals, commonly oxen or donkeys, are tied abreast and driven round and round the floor. In other places two oxen are yoked together to a drag, the bottom of which is studded with pieces of basaltic stone. This drag, on which the driver, and perhaps his family, sits or stands, is driven in a circular path over the grain. In still other districts an instrument resembling a wheel harrow is used, the antiquity of which is confirmed by the Egyptian records. The supply of unthreshed grain is kept in the center of the floor. Some of this is pulled down from time to time into the path of the animals. All the while the partly threshed grain is being turned over with a fork. The stalks gradually become broken into short pieces and the husks about the grain are torn off. This mixture of chaff and grain must now be winnowed. This is done by tossing it into the air so that the wind may blow away the chaff (see WINNOWING). When the chaff is gone then the grain is tossed in a wooden tray to separate from it the stones and lumps of soil which clung to the roots when the grain was reaped. The difference in weight between the stones and grain makes separation by this process possible (see SIFT). The grain is now poled in heaps and in many localities is also sealed. This process consists in pressing a large wooden

seal against the pile. When the instrument is removed it leaves an impression which would be destroyed should any of the grain be taken away. This allows the government offers to keep account of the tithes and enables the owner to detect any theft of grain. Until the wheat is transferred to bags some one sleeps by the pries on the threshing-floor. If the wheat is to be stored for home consumption it is often first washed with water and spread out on goats' hair mats to dry before it is stored in the wall compartments found in every house (see STOREHOUSES). Formerly the wheat was ground only as needed. This was then a household task which was accomplished with the hand-mill or mortar (see MILL).

2. Care of Vineyards:

No clearer picture to correspond with present-day practice in vine culture (see VINE) in Palestine could be given than that mentioned in Isa 5:1,6. Grapes probably served an important part in the diet of Bible times as they do at present. In the season which begins in July and extends for at least three months, the humblest peasant as well as the richest landlord considers grapes as a necessary part of at least one meal each day. The grapes were not only eaten fresh but were made into wine (see WINE PRESS). No parallel however can be found in the Bible for the molasses which is made by boiling down the fresh grape juice. Some writers believe that this substance was meant in some passages translated by wine or honey, but it is doubtful. The care of the vineyards fitted well into the farmer's routine, as most of the attention required could be given when the other crops demanded no time.

3. Raising of Flocks:

The leaders of ancient Israel reckoned their flocks as a necessary part of their wealth (see SHEEP). When a man's flocks were his sole possession he often lived with them and led them in and out in search of pasturage (Ps 23; Mt 18:12), but a man with other interests delegated this task to his sons (1Sa 16:11) or to hirelings. Human nature has not changed since the time when Christ made the distinction between the true shepherd and the hireling (Joh 10:12). Within a short time of the writing of these words the writer saw a hireling cursing and abusing the stray members of a flock which he was driving, not leading as do good shepherds. The flock furnished both food and raiment. The milk of camels, sheep and goats was eaten fresh or made into curdled milk, butter or cheese. More rarely was the flesh of these animals eaten (see FOOD). The peasant's outer coat is still made of a tawed sheepskin or woven of goats' hair or wool (see WEAVING). The various agricultural operations are treated more fully under their respective names, (which see) . James A. Patch

AGRIPPA

a-grip'-a. See HEROD.

AGUE

a'-gu (qaddachath): In Le 26:16 the King James Version is one of the diseases threatened as a penalty for disobedience to the law. The malady is said to "consume the eyes, and make the soul to pine away."

The word means burning (Vulgate "ardor") and was probably intended to denote the malarial fever so common now both in the Shephelah and in the Jordan valley. In Septuagint the word used (ikteros) means jaundice, which often accompanies this fever. the Revised Version (British and American) translates it "fever." See FEVER.

AGUR

a'-gur ('aghur, seeming, from comparison with Arabic roots, to mean either "hireling," or "collector," "gatherer"): One of the contributors to Proverbs; his words being included in Pr 30. He takes an agnostic attitude toward God and transcendent things, and in general the range of his thought, as compared with that of other authors, is pedestrian. He shows, however, a tender reverence and awe. His most notable utterance, perhaps, is the celebrated Prayer of Agur (Pr 30:7-9), which gives expression to a charming golden mean of practical ideal. His sayings are constructed on a rather artificial plan; having the form of the so-called numerical proverb. See under PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF, II, 6.

John Franklin Genung

AH

In proper names. See AHI.

AH; AHA

a, a-ha':Interjections of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament, representing different Hebrew words and different states of feeling.

(1) 'ahah, expressing complaint and found in the phrase "Ah, Lord Yahweh" (Jer 1:6; 4:10 etc.; Eze 4:14 etc.). Elsewhere the word is translated "alas!" (Joe 1:15).

(2) 'ach, occurs once (Eze 21:15), expressing grief in contemplating Israel's destruction.

(3) he'ach, usually expresses malicious joy over the reverses of an enemy, and is introduced by the verb "to say" (Brown-Driver-Briggs' Lexicon); so in Ps 35:21,25; Eze 25:3; 26:2; 36:2; in the repeated Psalm 40:15; 70:3. It expresses satiety in Isa 44:16; and represents the neighing of a horse in Job 39:25.

(4) hoy, expresses grief or pain, (Isa 1:4; Jer 22:18). In 1Ki 13:30 it is translated "alas!" More frequently it is used to indicate that a threat of judgment is to follow (Isa 10:5; 29:1); or to direct attention to some important announcement (Isa 55:1), where the Hebrew word is translated "Ho."

(5) Greek oua, in Mr 15:29, used by those who mocked Jesus, as He hung upon the cross. All of these words are evidently imitative of the natural sounds, which spontaneously give expression to these

emotions of complaint, grief, pain, exultation, etc.

Edward Mack

AHAB

a’-hab (’ach’abh, Assyrian a-cha-ab-bu; Septuagint Achaab, but Jer 29:21 f, Achiab, which, in analogy with’-h-y- m-l-k, (’)-h-y-’-l, etc., indicates an original ‘achi’abh, meaning "the father is my brother"): The compound probably signifies that "the father," referring to God, has been chosen as a brother.

1. Ahab’s Reign:

Ahab, son of Omri, the seventh king of Israel, who reigned for twenty-two years, from 876 to 854 (1Ki 16:28 ff), was one of the strongest and at the same time one of the weakest kings of Israel. With his kingdom he inherited also the traditional enemies of the kingdom, who were no less ready to make trouble for him than for his predecessors. Occupying a critical position at the best, with foes ever ready to take advantage of any momentary weakness, the kingdom, during the reign of Ahab, was compelled to undergo the blighting effects of misfortune, drought and famine. But Ahab, equal to the occasion, was clever enough to win the admiration and respect of friend and foe, strengthening the kingdom without and within. Many of the evils of his reign, which a stronger nature might have overcome, were incident to the measures that he took for strengthening the kingdom.

2. His Foreign Policy:

In the days of David and Solomon a beneficial commercial intercourse existed between the Hebrews and the Phoenicians. Ahab, recognizing the advantages that would accrue to his kingdom from an alliance with the foremost commercial nation of his time, renewed the old relations with the Phoenicians and cemented them by his marriage with Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre (the Ithobalos, priest of Astarte mentioned by Meander). He next turns his attention to the establishment of peaceful and friendly relations with the kindred and neighboring kingdom of Judah. For the first time since the division of the kingdoms the hereditary internecine quarrels are forgotten, "and Jehoshaphat," the good king of Judah, "made peace with the king of Israel." This alliance, too, was sealed by a marriage relationship, Jehoram, the crown-prince of Judah, being united in marriage with the princess Athaliah, daughter of Ahab.

Perhaps some additional light is thrown upon Ahab’s foreign policy by his treatment of Benhadad, king of Damascus. An opportunity was given to crush to dust the threatening power of Syria. But when Benhadad in the garb of a suppliant was compelled to sue for his life, Ahab received into kindly as his brother, and although denounced by the prophets for his leniency, spared his enemy and allowed him to depart on the condition that he would restore the cities captured from Omri, and concede certain "streets" in Damascus as a quarter for Israelite residents. No doubt Ahab thought that a king won as a friend by kindness might be of greater service to Israel than a hostile nation, made still more hostile, by having its king put to death. Whatever Ahab’s motives may have been, these hereditary foes really

fought side by side against the common enemy, the king of Assyria, in the battle at Karkar on the Orontes in the year 854, as is proved by the inscription on the monolith of Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria.

3. His Religious Policy:

Ahab’s far-sighted foreign policy was the antithesis of his short-sighted religious policy. Through his alliance with Phoenicia he not only set in motion the currents of commerce with Tyre, but invited Phoenician religion as well. The worship of Yahweh by means of the golden calves of Jeroboam appeared antiquated to him. Baal, the god of Tyre, the proud mistress of the seas and the possessor of dazzling wealth, was to have an equal place with Yahweh, the God of Israel. Accordingly he built in Samara a temple to Baal and in it erected an altar to that god, and at the side of the altar a pole to Asherab (1Ki 16:32,33). On the other hand he tried to serve Yahweh by naming his children in his honor —Ahaziah ("Yah holds"), Jehoram ("Yah is high"), and Athaliah ("Yah is strong"). However, Ahab failed to realize that while a coalition of nations might be advantageous, a syncretism of their religions would be disastrous. He failed to apprehend the full meaning of the principle, "Yahweh alone is the God of Israel." In Jezebel, his Phoenician wife, Ahab found a champion of the foreign culture, who was as imperious and able as she was vindictive and unscrupulous. She was the patron of the prophets of Baal and of the devotees of Asherab (1Ki 18:19,20; 19:1,2) At her instigation the altars of Yahweh were torn down. She inaugurated the first great religious persecution of the church, killing off the prophets of Yahweh with the sword. In all this she aimed at more than a syncretism of the two religions; she planned to destroy the religion of Yahweh root and branch and put that of Baal in its place. In this Ahab did not oppose her, but is guilty of conniving at the policy of his unprincipled wife, if not of heartily concurring in it.

4. The Murder of Naboth:

Wrong religious principles have their counterpart in false ethical ideals and immoral civil acts. Ahab, as a worshipper of Baal, not only introduced a false religion, but false social ideals as well. The royal residence was in Jezreel, which had probably risen in importance through his alliance with Phoenicia. Close to the royal palace was a vineyard (1Ki 21:1) owned by Naboth, a native of Jezreel. This piece of ground was coveted by Ahab for a vegetable garden. He demanded therefore that Naboth should sell it to into or exchange it for a better piece of land. Naboth declined the offer. Ahab, a Hebrew, knowing the laws of the land, was stung by the refusal and went home greatly displeased. Jezebel, however, had neither religious scruples nor any regard for the civil laws of the Hebrews. Accordingly she planned a high-handed crime to gratify the whim of Ahab. In the name and by the authority of the king she had Naboth falsely accused of blasphemy against God and the king, and had him stoned to death by the local authorities. The horror created by this judicial murder probably did as much to finally overthrow the house of Omri as did the favor shown to the Tyrian Baal.

5. Ahab and Elijah:

Neither religious rights nor civil liberties can be trampled under foot without Divine retribution. The attempt to do so calls forth an awakened and quickened conscience, imperatively demanding that the right be done. Like an accusing conscience, Elijah appeared before Ahab. His very name ("my God is Yah") inspired awe. "As Yahweh, the God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall not be dew nor rain these years," was the conscience- troubling message left on the mind of Ahab for more than three years. On Elijah's reappearance, Ahab greets into as the troubler of Israel. Elijah calmly reforms him that the king's religious policy has caused the trouble in Israel. The proof for it is to be furnished on Mount Carmel. Ahab does the bidding of Elijah. The people shall know whom to serve. Baal is silent. Yahweh answers with fire. A torrent of rain ends the drought. The victory belongs to Yahweh.

Once more Elijah's indignation flashes against the house of Ahab. The judicial murder of Naboth calls it forth. The civil rights of the nation must be protected. Ahab has sold himself to do evil in the sight of Yahweh. Therefore Ahab's house shall fall. Jezebel's carcass shall be eaten by dogs; the king's posterity shall be cut off; the dogs of the city or the fowls of the air shall eat their bodies (1Ki 21:20-26). Like thunderbolts the words of Elijah strike home. Ahab "fasted, and lay in sackcloth, and went softly." But the die was cast. Yahweh is vindicated. Never again, in the history of Israel can Baal, the inspirer of injustice, claim a place at the side of Yahweh, the God of righteousness.

6. Ahab's Building Operations:

In common with oriental monarchs, Ahab displayed a taste for architecture, stimulated, no doubt, by Phoenician influence. Large building operations were undertaken in Samaria (1Ki 16:32; 2Ki 10:21). Solomon had an ivory throne, but Ahab built for himself, in Jezreel, a palace adorned with woodwork and inlaid with ivory (1Ki 21:1; 22:39). Perhaps Amos, one hundred years later, refers to the work of Ahab when he says, "The houses of ivory shall perish" (Am 3:15). In his day Hiel of Bethel undertook to rebuild Jericho, notwithstanding the curse of Joshua (1Ki 16:33,34). Many cities were built during his reign (1Ki 22:39).

7. Ahab's Military Career:

Ahab was not only a splendor-loving monarch, but a great military leader as well. He no doubt began his military policy by fortifying the cities of Israel (1Ki 16:34; 22:39). Benhadad (the Dadidri of the Assyrian annals; Hadadezer and Barhadad are Hebrew, Aramaic and Arabic forms of the same name), the king of Syria, whose vassals the kings of Israel had been (1Ki 15:19), promptly besieges Samaria, and sends Ahab an insulting message. Ahab replies, "Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off." At the advice of a prophet of Yahweh, Ahab, with 7,000 men under 232 leaders, inflicts a crushing defeat upon Benhadad and his 32 feudal kings, who had resigned themselves to a drunken carousal (1Ki 20-21).

In the following year, the Syrian army, in spite of its overwhelming superiority, meets another defeat at the hands of Ahab in the valley, near Aphek. On condition that Benhadad restore all Israelite territory and grant the Hebrews certain rights in Damascus, Ahab spares his life to the great indignation of the

prophet (1Ki 20:22 f). In the year 854, Ahab with 2,000 chariots and 10,000 men, fights shoulder to shoulder with Benhadad against Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria. At Karkar, on the Orontes, Benhadad, with his allied forces, suffered an overwhelming defeat (COT, II, i, 183 f).

Perhaps Benhadad blamed Ahab for the defeat. At any rate he fails to keep his promise to Ahab (1Ki 22:3; 20:34). Lured by false prophets, but against the dramatic warning of Micaiah, Ahab is led to take up the gauntlet against Syria once more. His friend, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, joins him in the conflict. For the first time since the days of David all Israel and Judah stand united against the common foe.

8. Ahab's Death:

Possibly the warning of Micaiah gave Ahab a premonition that this would be has last fight. He enters the battle in disguise, but in vain. An arrow, shot at random, inflicts a mortal wound. With the fortitude of a hero, in order to avoid a panic, Ahab remains in his chariot all day and dies at sunset. His body is taken to Samaria for burial. A great king had died, and the kingdom declined rapidly after his death. He had failed to comprehend the greatness of Yahweh; he failed to stand for the highest justice, and his sins are visited upon has posterity (1Ki 22:29 f).

9. Ahab and Archaeology:

(1) The Moabite Stone

The Moabite Stone (see MOABITE STONE) bears testimony (lines 7, 8) that Omri and his son (Ahab) ruled over the land of Mehdeba for forty years. When Ahab was occupied with the Syriac wars, Moab rose in insurrection. Mesha informs us in an exaggerated manner that "Israel perished with an everlasting destruction." Mesha recognizes Yahweh as the God of Israel.

(2) The Monolith of Shalmaneser II

The Monolith of Shalmaneser II (Brit Mus; see ASSYRIA) informs us that in 854 Shalmaneser II came in conflict with the kingdom of Hamath, and that Benhadad II with Ahab of Israel and others formed a confederacy to resist the Assyrian advance. The forces of the coalition were defeated at Karkar.

(3) Recent Excavations.

Under the direction of Harvard University, excavations have been carried on in Samaria since 1908. In 1909 remains of a Hebrew palace were found. In this palace two grades of construction have been detected. The explorers suggest that they have found the palace of Omri, enlarged and improved by Ahab. This may be the "ivory house" built by Ahab. In August, 1910, about 75 potsherds were found in a building adjacent to Ahab's palace containing writing. The script is the same as that of the Moabite Stone, the words being divided by ink spots. These ostraca seem to be labels attached to jars kept in a room adjoining Ahab's palace. One of them reads, "In the ninth year. From Shaphtan. For Ba'al-zamar.

A jar of old wine." Another reads, "Wine of the vineyard of the Tell." These readings remind one of Naboth's vineyard. In another room not far from where the ostraca were found, "was found an alabaster vase inscribed with the name of Ahab's contemporary, Osorkon II of Egypt." Many proper names are found on the ostraca, which have their equivalent in the Old Testament. It is claimed that the writing is far greater than all other ancient Hebrew writing yet known. Perhaps with the publication of all these writings we may expect much light upon Ahab's reign. (See OSTRACA; Harvard Theological Review, January, 1909, April, 1910, January, 1911; Sunday School Times, January 7, 1911; The Jewish Chronicle, January 27, 1911.)

S. K. Mosiman

AHAB AND ZEDEKIAH

a'-hab, zed-e-ki'-a ('ach'abh, "uncle"; tsidhqiyahu, "Yahweh is my righteousness"): Ahab, son of Kolaiah, and Zedekiah, son of Maaseiah, were two prophets against whom Jeremiah uttered an oracle for prophesying falsely in the name of Yahweh, and for immoral conduct. They should be delivered over to Nebuchadrezzar and be slain, and the captives of Judah that were in Babylon should take up the curse concerning them. "Yahweh make thee like Zedekiah and like Ahab, whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire" (Jer 29:21 ff).

S. F. Hunter

AHARAH

a'-har-a, a-har'-a ('achrach; A, Aara; B, Iaphael, "brother of Rach," or, a brother's follower, though some regard it as a textual corruption for Ahiram): A son of Benjamin (1Ch 8:1). See AHIRAM.

AHARAHEL

a-har'-hel ('acharchel, "brother of Rachel"; Septuagint adelphou Rechab, "brother of Rechab"): A son of Harum of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:8).

AHASAI

a'-ha-si, a-ha'-si. See AHZAI.

AHASBAI

a-has'-bi ('achacbay, "blooming"): The father of Eliphelet, a Maacathite, a soldier in David's army (2Sa 23:34). He was either a native of Abel-beth-maacah (2Sa 20:14) or, more probably, of Maacah in Syria (2Sa 10:6). The list in 1Ch 11:35,36 gives different names entirely. Here we have Ur and Hepher, which

simply show that the text is corrupt in one or both places.

AHASUERUS or ASSEURUS

a-haz-u-e'-rus, (Septuagint Assoueros, but in Tobit 14:15 Asueros; the Latin form of the Hebrew 'achashwerosh, a name better known in its ordinary Greek form of Xerxes): It was the name of two, or perhaps of three kings mentioned in the canonical, or apocryphal, books of the Old Testament.

1. In Esther:

There seems to be little reasonable doubt, that we should identify the Ahasuerus of Es with the well-known Xerxes, who reigned over Persia from 485 to 465 BC, and who made the great expedition against Greece that culminated in the defeat of the Persian forces at Salamis and Plataea. If Es be taken as equivalent to Ishtar, it may well be the same as the Amestris of Herodotus, which in Babylonian would be Ammi-Ishtar, or Ummi-Ishtar. Amestris is said to have been the daughter of Otanes, a distinguished general of Xerxes, and the grand-daughter of Sisamnes, a notorious judge, who was put to death with great cruelty by the king because of malfeasance in office. Sisamnes may be in Babylonian Shamash-ammanu-(shallim). If he were the brother and Otanes the nephew of Mordecai, we can easily account for the ease with which the latter and has ward Esther, were advanced and confirmed in their Positions at the court, of Xerxes.

2. In Ezra:

An Ahasuerus is mentioned in Ezr 4:6, as one to whom some persons unnamed wrote an accusation against Judah and Jerusalem. Ewald and others have suggested that this Ahasuerus was Cambyses, the son and successor of Cyrus. It seems to be more probable that Xerxes, the son and successor of Darius Hystaspis, is meant: first, because in the following verse Artaxerxes, the son and successor of Xerxes, is mentioned; and secondly, because we have no evidence whatever that Cambyses was ever called Ahasuerus, whereas there is absolute certainty that the Pets Khshayarsha, the Hebrew 'achashwerosh, the Greek Assoueros or Xerxes, and the Latin Ahasuerus, are the exact equivalents of one another.

3. In Tobit:

In the apocryphal book of Tobit (14:15, the King James Version) it is said that before Tobias died he heard of the destruction of Nineveh, which was taken by Nabuchodonosor and Assuerus. This Assuerus can have been no other than Cyaxares, who according to Herodotus (i.196) took Nineveh and reduced the Assyrians into subjection, with the exception of the Babylonian district. As we shall see below, he was probably the same as the Ahasuerus of Da 9:1. The phrase "which was taken by Nabuchodonosor and Assuerus" is not found in the Syriac version of Tobit.

4. In Daniel:

An Ahasuerus is said in Da 9:1 to have been the father of Darius the Mede, and to have been of the seed of the Medes. It is probable that this Ahasuerus is the same as the Uvakhshatara of the Persian recension of the Behistun inscription, which in the Babylonian is Umaku'ishtar, in the Susian Makishtarra, and in Herod Cyaxares. It will be noted that both the Greek Cyaxares and the Hebrew Akhashwerosh omit the preformative uwa- and the "t" of the Persian form Uvakhshatara. That this Median king had sons living in the time of Cyrus is shown by the fact that two rebel aspirants to the throne in the time of Darius Hystaspis claimed to be his sons, to wit: Fravartish, a Median, who lied saying, "I am Khshathrita of the family of Uvakhshatara" (Behistun Inscr, col. II, v); and Citrantakhma, who said, "I am king in Sagartia of the family of Uvakhshatara" (id, II, xiv). If we accept the identification of Gubaru with Darius the Mede, then the latter may well have been another of his sons, at first a sub-king to Astyages the Scythian, as he was later to Cyrus the Persian.

R. Dick Wilson

AHAVA

a-ha'-va ('ahawa'): The river in Babylonia on the banks of which Ezra gathered together the Jews who accompanied him to Jerusalem. At this rendezvous the company encamped for three days to make preparation for the difficult and dangerous journey (Ezr 8:15 ff). On reviewing the people and the priests Ezra found no Levites among them; he therefore sent to Iddo, "the chief at the place Casiphia," a request for ministers for the temple. A number of Levites with 220 Nethinim returned to the rendezvous with the deputation. Ezra had expressed to the king his faith in the protection of God; being, therefore, ashamed to ask for a military escort he proclaimed a fast to seek of God "a straight way." To 12 priests Ezra assigned the care of the offering for the temple in Jerusalem. When all was ready the company "departed from the river Ahava," and journeyed in safety to Jerusalem.

This river, apparently called after a town or district toward which it flowed (Ezr 8:15), remains unidentified, though many conjectures have been made. Rawlinson thinks it is the "Is" of Herodotus (i.79), now called "Hit," which flowed past a town of the same name in the Euphrates basin, 8 days' journey from Babylon. Some identify the district with "Ivvah" (2Ki 18:34, etc.). Most probably, however, this was one of the numerous canals which intersected Babylonia, flowing from the Euphrates toward a town or district "Ahava." If so, identification is impossible.

S. F. Hunter

AHAZ

a'-haz ('achaz, "he has grasped," 2Ki 16; 2Ch 28; Isa 7:10 ff; Achaz).

1. Name:

The name is the same as Jehoahaz; hence appears on Tiglath-pileser's Assyrian inscription of 732 BC as

Ia-u-ha-zi. The sacred historians may have dropped the first part of the name in consequence of the character of the king.

2. The Accession:

Ahaz was the son of Jotham, king of Judah. He succeeded to the throne at the age of 20 years (according to another reading 25). The chronology of his reign is difficult, as his son Hezekiah is stated to have been 25 years of age when he began to reign 16 years after (2Ki 18:2). If the accession of Ahaz be placed as early as 743 BC, his grandfather Uzziah, long unable to perform the functions of his office on account of his leprosy (2Ch 26:21), must still have been alive. (Others date Ahaz later, when Uzziah, for whom Jotham had acted as regent, was already dead.)

3. Early Idolatries:

Although so young, Ahaz seems at once to have struck out an independent course wholly opposed to the religious traditions of his nation. His first steps in this direction were the causing to be made and circulated of molten images of the Baalim, and the revival in the valley of Hinnom, south of the city, of the abominations of the worship of Moloch (2Ch 28:2,3). He is declared to have made his own son "pass through the fire" (2Ki 16:3); the chronicler puts it even more strongly: he "burnt his children in the fire" (2Ch 28:3). Other acts of idolatry were to follow.

4. Peril from Syria and Israel:

The kingdom of Judah was at this time in serious peril. Rezin, king of Damascus, and Pekah, king of Samaria, had already, in the days of Jotham, begun to harass Judah (2Ki 15:37); now a conspiracy was formed to dethrone the young Ahaz, and set upon the throne a certain "son of Tabeel" (Isa 7:6). An advance of the two kings was made against Jerusalem, although without success (2Ki 16:5; Isa 7:1); the Jews were expelled from Elath (2Ki 16:6), and the country was ravaged, and large numbers taken captive (2Ch 28:5 ff). Consternation was universal. The heart of Ahaz "trembled, and the heart of his people, as the trees of the forest tremble with the wind" (Isa 7:2). In his extremity Ahaz appealed to the king of Assyria for help (2Ki 16:7; 2Ch 28:16).

5. Isaiah’s Messages to the King:

Amid the general alarm and perturbation, the one man untouched by it in Jerusalem was the prophet Isaiah. Undismayed, Isaiah set himself, apparently single-handed, to turn the tide of public opinion from the channel in which it was running, the seeking of aid from Assyria. His appeal was to both king and people. By Divine direction, meeting Ahaz "at the end of the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller’s field," he bade him have no fear of "these two tails of smoking firebrands," Rezin and Pekah, for, like dying torches, they would speedily be extinguished (Isa 7:3 ff). If he would not believe this he would not be established (Isa 7:9). Failing to win the young king’s confidence, Isaiah was sent a second time, with the offer from Yahweh of any sign Ahaz chose to ask, "either in the depth, or in the

height above," in attestation of the truth of the Divine word. The frivolous monarch refused the arbitrament on the hypocritical ground, "I will not ask, neither will I tempt Yahweh" (Isa 7:10-12). Possibly his ambassadors were already dispatched to the Assyrian king. Whenever they went, they took with them a large subsidy with which to buy that ruler's favor (2Ki 16:8). It was on this occasion that Isaiah, in reply to Ahaz, gave the reassuring prophecy of Immanuel (Isa 7:13 ff).

6. Isaiah's Tablet:

As respects the people, Isaiah was directed to exhibit on "a great tablet" the words "For Maher-shalal-hash-baz" ("swift the spoil, speedy the prey"). This was attested by two witnesses, one of whom was Urijah, the high priest. It was a solemn testimony that, without any action on the part of Judah, "the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried away before the king of Assyria" (Isa 8:1-4).

7. Fall of Damascus and Its Results:

It was as the prophet had foretold. Damascus fell, Rezin was killed (2Ki 16:9), and Israel was raided (2Ki 15:29). The action brought temporary relief to Judah, but had the effect of placing her under the heel of Assyria. Everyone then living knew that there could be no equal alliance between Judah and Assyria, and that the request for help, accompanied by the message, "I am thy servant" (2Ki 16:7,8) and by "presents" of gold and silver, meant the submission of Judah and the annual payment of a heavy tribute. Had Isaiah's counsel been followed, Tiglath-pileser would probably, in his own interests, have been compelled to crush the coalition, and Judah would have retained her freedom.

8. Sun-Dial of Ahaz:

The political storm having blown over for the present, with the final loss of the important port of Elath on the Red Sea (2Ki 16:6), Ahaz turned his attention to more congenial pursuits. The king was somewhat of a dilettante in matters of art, and he set up a sun-dial, which seems to have consisted of a series of steps arranged round a short pillar, the time being indicated by the position of the shadow on the steps (compare 2Ki 20:9-11; Isa 38:8). As it is regarded as possible for the shadow to return 10 steps, it is clear that each step did not mark an hour of the day, but some smaller period.

9. The Lavers and Brazen Sea:

Another act of the king was to remove from the elaborate ornamental bases on which they had stood (compare 1Ki 7:27-39), the ten layers of Solomon, and also to remove Solomon's molten sea from the 12 brazen bulls which supported it (compare 1Ki 7:23-26), the sea being placed upon a raised platform or pavement (2Ki 16:17). From Jer 52:20, where the prophet sees "the 12 brazen bulls that were under the bases," it has been conjectured that the object of the change may have been to transfer the layers to the backs of the bulls.

10. The Damascus Altar:

To this was added a yet more daring act of impiety. In 732 Ahaz was, with other vassal princes, summoned to Damascus to pay homage to Tiglath-pileser (2Ki 16:10; his name appears in the Assyrian inscription). There he saw a heathen altar of fanciful pattern, which greatly pleased him. A model of this was sent to Urijah the high priest, with instructions to have an enlarged copy of it placed in the temple court. On the king's return to Jerusalem, he sacrificed at the new altar, but, not satisfied with its position, gave orders for a change. The altar had apparently been placed on the east side of the old altar; directions were now given for the brazen altar to be moved to the north, and the Damascus altar to be placed in line with it, in front of the temple giving both equal honor. Orders were further given to Urijah that the customary sacrifices should be offered on the new altar, now called "the great altar," while the king reserved the brazen altar for himself "to inquire by" (2Ki 16:15).

11. Further Impieties:

Even this did not exhaust the royal innovations. We learn from a later notice that the doors of the temple porch were shut, that the golden candlestick was not lighted, that the offering of incense was not made, and other solemnities were suspended (2Ch 29:7). It is not improbable that it was Ahaz who set up 'the horses of the sun' mentioned in 2Ki 23:11, and gave them accommodation in the precincts of the temple. He certainly built the "altars .... on the roof of the upper chamber of Ahaz," perhaps above the porch of the temple, for the adoration of the heavenly bodies (verse 12). Many other idolatries and acts of national apostasy are related regarding him (2Ch 28:22 ff).

12. Recurrence of Hostilities:

In the later years of his unhappy reign there was a recurrence of hostilities with the inhabitants of Philistia and Edom, this time with disaster to Judah (see the list of places lost in 2Ch 28:18,19). New appeal was made to Tiglath-pileser, whose subject Ahaz, now was, and costly presents were sent from the temple, the royal palace, and even the houses of the princes of Judah, but without avail (2Ch 28:19-21). The Assyrian 'distressed' Ahaz, but rendered no assistance. In his trouble the wicked king only "trespassed yet more" (2Ch 28:22).

13. Death of Ahaz:

Ahaz died in 728, after 16 years of misused power. The exultation with which the event was regarded is reflected in Isaiah's little prophecy written "in the year that King Ahaz died" (Isa 14:28-32). The statement in 2Ki 16:20 that Ahaz "was buried with his fathers in the city of David" is to be understood in the light of 2Ch 28:27, that he was buried in Jerusalem, but that his body was not laid in the sepulchers of the kings of Israel. His name appears in the royal genealogies in 1Ch 3:13 and Mt 1:9.

W. Shaw Caldecott

AHAZ, DIAL OF

See DIAL OF AHAZ.

AHAZIAH

a-ha-zi’-a (’achazyah and ‘achazyahu, "Yah holds, or sustains"):

I. Ahaziah.

Son of Ahab and Jezebel, eighth king of Israel (1Ki 22:51-2Ki 1:18).

1. His Reign:

Ahaziah became king over Israel in the seventeenth year of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and he reigned two years, 854-853 BC. There is, here an incongruity between the synchronism and the length of the reigns of the kings. Jehoshaphat began to reign in the fourth year of Ahab (1Ki 22:41), and he reigned 22 years (1Ki 16:29). Accordingly Ahaziah’s first year, in the twenty-second year of Ahab, would fall in the nineteenth year of Jehoshaphat. The chronological statement in 2Ki 1:17 is probably taken from the Syriac, and both are in harmony wrath a method of computation followed by certain Greek manuscripts.

2. His Character:

A good name does not insure a good character. Ahaziah, the "God-sustained," served Baal and worshipped him, and provoked to anger Yahweh, the God of Israel, Just as his father before him had done. He appears to have been weak and unfortunate, and calamities in quick succession pursued him.

3. The Revolt of Moab:

Ahab had sought the good and became an enemy to the best. His house and the nation suffered the consequences. "Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab." Ahaziah appears to have been too weak to offer resistance. The Moabite Stone dates the revolt in the days of Ahab. No doubt it began at the time of Ahab’s last campaign against Syria.

4. His Maritime Alliance:

According to 1Ki 22:48 f Ahaziah attempted to form an alliance with Jehoshaphat of Judah to revive the ancient maritime traffic, but failed. According to 2Ch 20:35-37 the alliance was consummated, in consequence of which the enterprise came to nothing. See JEHOSHAPHAT.

5. His Sickness and Death:

Ahaziah suffered a severe accident by falling through the lattice in his upper apartment in Samaria, and lay sick. As a worthy son of Jezebel and Ahab, he sent messengers to consult Baalzebub, the god of Ekron, regarding his recovery. But Israel belonged to Yahweh. Accordingly the messengers were met by the prophet Elijah who for the last time warns against the corrupting moral influences of the Baal religion. "Thus saith Yahweh, Is it because there is no God in Israel, that thou sendest to inquire of Baal-zebub, the god of Ekron? therefore thou shalt not come down from the bed whither thou art gone up, but shalt surely die" was the message which he sent back to the embassy, and the death of the king speedily followed.

II. Ahaziah.

Sixth king of Judah (2Ki 8:25-29; 9:16 f = 2Ch 22:1-9); also written Jehoahaz (2Ch 21:17; 25:23), which is merely a transposition of the component parts of the compound. The form "Azariah" (2Ch 22:6) is an error, fifteen Hebrew manuscripts and all the versions reading Ahaziah.

1. His Brief Reign:

Ahaziah, youngest son of Jehoram, began to reign in the twelfth year (2Ki 8:25) of Jehoram of Israel. In 2Ki 9:29 it is stated as the eleventh. The former is probably the Hebrew, the latter the Greek method of computation, the Septuagint Luc also reading eleventh in 8:25. He was 22 years old when he began to reign and he reigned one year (2Ki 8:26). The reading "forty two" (2Ch 22:2) is a scribal error, since according to 2Ch 21:5,20 Jehoram the father was only 40 years old at the time of his death. Syriac, Arabic and Luc read 22, Septuagint Codex Vaticanus 20.

See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

2. His Character:

(Compare 2Ki 8:27; 2Ch 22:3,4.) In view of the disaster which befell the royal house (2Ch 21:16,17), the inhabitants of Jerusalem placed Ahaziah the youngest son upon the throne. That "he walked in the way of the house of Ahab" is exemplified by Chronicles to the effect that his mother, the daughter of Jezebel, counseled him in the ways of wickedness and that the house of Ahab led him to his destruction. The influence of Jezebel was at work in Judah. Ahaziah dedicated "hallowed things" to Yahweh (2Ki 12:18), but he did evil in Yahweh’s eyes.

3. His Alliance with Jehoram of Israel:

(Compare 2Ki 8:28,29; 2Ch 22:5,6.) Ahaziah cultivated the relations which had been established between the two kingdoms by Ahab. Accordingly he joined his uncle Jehoram of Israel in an expedition against Hazael, king of Syria. Ramoth-gilead was captured and held for Israel against the king of Syria (2Ki 9:14). However, Jehoram of Israel was wounded and returned to Jezreel to be healed of his

wounds. It appears that the army was left in charge of Jehu at Ramoth-gilead. Ahaziah apparently went to Jerusalem and later went down to Jezreel to visit Jehoram. In the meantime Jehu formed a conspiracy against Jehoram.

4. His Death:

The death of Ahaziah, as told in 2Ki 9:16 f, differs from the account in 2Ch 22:7-9. According to the account in Kings, Ahaziah who is visiting Jehoram, joins him in a separate chariot to meet Jehu. Jehoram suspecting treachery turns to flee, but an arrow from the bow of Jehu pierces his heart and he dies in his chariot. Ahaziah tries to escape, but is overtaken near Ibleam and mortally wounded by one of Jehu's men. He fled to the fortress of Megiddo, where he died. His servants conveyed his body in a chariot to Jerusalem, where he was buried. According to the Chronicler, this account is very much abbreviated (2Ch 22:7 f). His destruction is of God because of his alliance with Jehoram. Jehu, who was executing judgment on the house of Ahab, first slew the kinsmen of Ahaziah. He then sought Ahaziah who was hiding in Samaria. When he was found, he was brought to Jehu and put to death. He was buried, but where and by whom we are not told.

That there were other traditions respecting the death of Ahaziah, is proved by Josephus, who says that when Ahaziah was wounded he left his chariot and fled on horseback to Megiddo, where he was well cared for by his servants until he died (Ant., IX, vi, 3). S. K. Mosiman

AHBAN

a'-ban ('achban, "brother of an intelligent one"(?) Achbar): The son of Abishur of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:29).

AHER

a'-her ('acher, "another"; Aer): A man of Benjamin (1Ch 7:12), apparently a contracted form, perhaps the same as Ahiram (King James Version) (Nu 26:38) or Aharah (1Ch 8:1).

AHI

a'-hi ('achi, "my brother," or perhaps a contraction from AHIJAH, which see): (1) A member of the tribe of Gad (1Ch 5:15). (2) A member of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:34).

AHI OR AH

In proper names ('achi or 'ach "brother"): The usage is practically the same with that of 'abh, 'abhi. See ABI; NAMES, PROPER.

AHIAH

a-hi’-a: A variant in the King James Version (1Sa 14:3,18; 1Ki 4:3; 1Ch 8:7) for AHIJAH, which see. Also in the Revised Version (British and American) (Ne 10:26).

AHIAM

a-hi’-am (’achi’am, "mother’s brother"): One of David’s thirty heroes. He was the son of Sharar (2Sa 23:33) or according to 1Ch 11:35 of Sacar, the Hararite.

AHIAN

a-hi’-an (’achyan, "brotherly"): A son of Shemida of the tribe of Manasseh (1Ch 7:19).

AHIEZER

a-hi-e’-zer (’achi‘ezer, "brother is help"):

(1) A son of Ammishaddai, a Danite prince, who acted as representative of his tribe on several occasions. (See Nu 1:12; 2:25; 7:66,71; 10:25.)

(2) One of the mighty men or warriors, who joined David at Ziklag when a furtive before Saul (1Ch 12:3).

AHIHUD

a-hi’-hud (’achihudh, "brother is majesty"):

(1) One of the chief men of the tribe of Asher. He was selected by Moses to help divide the land west of the Jordan (Nu 34:27).

(2) A son of Ehud of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:6,7). The text here is obscure and probably corrupt.

AHIJAH

a-hi’-ja (’achiyah or ‘achiyahu, "brother of Yahweh," "my brother is Yahweh," "Yah is brother." In the King James Version the name sometimes appears as Ahiah):

(1) One of the sons of Jerahmeel the great-grandson of Judah (1Ch 2:25).

(2) A descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 8:7).

(3) The son of Ahitub, priest in the time of King Saul (1Sa 14:3,18). Either he is the same with Ahimelech, who is mentioned later, or he is the father or brother of Ahimelech. He is introduced to us when Saul has been so long on the throne that his son Jonathan is a man grown and a warrior. He is in attendance upon Saul, evidently as an official priest, "wearing an ephod." When Saul wishes direction from God he asks the priest to bring hither the ark; but then, without waiting for the message, Saul counts the confusion in the Philistine camp a sufficient indication of the will of Providence, and hurries off to the attack. Some copies of the Greek here read "ephod" instead of "ark," but the documentary evidence in favor of that reading is far from decisive. If the Hebrew reading is correct, then the seclusion of the ark, from the time of its return from Philistia to the time of David, was not so absolute as many have supposed. See AHIMELECH, i.

(4) One of David's mighty men, according to the list in 1Ch 11:36. The corresponding name in the list in 2Sa 23:34 is Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite.

(5) A Levite of David's time who had charge of certain treasures connected with the house of God (1Ch 26:20). The Greek copies presuppose the slightly different text which would give in English "and their brethren," instead of Ahijah. This is accepted by many scholars, and it is at least more plausible than most of the proposed corrections of the Hebrew text by the Greek.

(6) Son of Sinsha and brother of Elihoreph (1Ki 4:3). The two brothers were scribes of Solomon. Can the scribes Ahijah and Shemaiah (1Ch 24:6) be identified with the men of the same names who, later, were known as distinguished prophets? Sinsha is probably the same with Shavsha (1Ch 18:16; compare 2Sa 8:17; 20:25), who was scribe under David, the office in this case descending from father to son.

(7) The distinguished prophet of Shiloh, who was interested in Jeroboam I. In Solomon's lifetime Ahijah clothed himself with a new robe, met Jeroboam outside Jerusalem, tore the robe into twelve pieces, and gave him ten, in token that he should become king of the ten tribes (1Ki 11:29-39). Later, when Jeroboam had proved unfaithful to Yahweh, he sent his wife to Ahijah to ask in regard to their sick son. The prophet received her harshly, foretold the death of the son, and threatened the extermination of the house of Jeroboam (1Ki 14). The narrative makes the impression that Ahijah was at this time a very old man (1Ki 14:4). These incidents are differently narrated in the long addition at 1Ki 12:24 found in some of the Greek copies. In that addition the account of the sick boy precedes that of the rent garment, and both are placed between the account of Jeroboam's return from Egypt and that of the secession of the ten tribes, an order in which it is impossible to think that the events occurred. Further, this addition attributes the incident of the rent garment to Shemaiah and not to Ahijah, and says that Ahijah was 60 years old.

Other notices speak of the fulfillment of the threatening prophecies spoken by Ahijah (2Ch 10:15; 1Ki 12:15; 15:29). In 2Ch "the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite" is referred to as a source for the history of Solomon (2Ch 9:29).

(8) The father of Baasha king of Israel (1Ki 15:27,33; 21:22; 2Ki 9:9).

(9) A Levite of Nehemiah’s time, who sealed the covenant (Ne 10:26 the King James Version).

Willis J. Beecher

AHIKAM

a-hi’-kam (’achiqam, "my brother has risen up"): A prominent man of the time of King Josiah and the following decades (2Ki 22:12,14; 25:22; 2Ch 34:20; Jer 26:24; 39:14; 40:5 ff; 41:1 ff; 43:6). He was the son of Shaphan, who very likely is to be identified with Shaphan the scribe, who was at that time so prominent. Ahikam was the father of Gedaliah, whom, on the capture of Jerusalem, Nebuchadnezzar made governor of the land. Ahikam was a member of the deputation sent by Josiah to the prophetess Huldah to consult her concerning the contents of the Book of the Law which had been found. Under Jehoiakim he had sufficient influence to protect Jeremiah from being put to death. On the capture of Jerusalem Nebuchadnezzar committed Jeremiah into the care of Gedaliah. It is clear that both Shaphan and his son, like Jeremiah, belonged to the party which held that the men of Judah were under obligation to keep the oath which they had sworn to the tang of Babylon.

Willis J. Beecher

AHILUD

a-hi’-lud (’achiludh, "child’s brother," perhaps): The father of Jehoshaphat, who is mentioned as "recorder" in both the earlier and the later lists under David, and in the list under Solomon (2Sa 8:16, 1Ch 18:15; 2Sa 20:24; 1Ki 4:3). In the absence of proof we may assume that the father of Baana, one of Solomon’s district superintendents, was the same Ahilud (1Ki 4:12).

AHIMAAZ

a-hi-ma’-az, a-him’-a-az (’achima‘ats, perhaps "my brother is rage," or "brother of rage"):

(1) Father of Ahinoam the wife of King Saul (1Sa 14:50).

(2) The son of Zadok the high priest (1Ch 6:8,9,53). With his father he remained loyal to David in the rebellions both of Absalom and of Adonijah. With Jonathan the son of Abiathar he carried information to Dared when he fled from Absalom (2Sa 15:27,36; 17:17,20). At his own urgent request he carried tidings to David after the death of Absalom (2Sa 18:19 ff). He told the king of the victory, and also, through his reluctance to speak, informed him of Absalom’s death. By his reluctance and his sympathy he softened a little the message, which the Cushite presently repeated more harshly.

That Ahimaaz did not succeed his father as high priest has been inferred from the fact that in the Solomon list of heads of departments (1Ki 4:2) Azariah the son of Zadok is mentioned as priest. It is assumed that this Azariah is the one who appears in the genealogy as the son of Ahimaaz, and that for some reason Ahimaaz was left out of the succession. These inferences are not Justified by the record, though possibly the record does not absolutely disprove them. As the list stands it makes Zadok and Abiathar the high priests. Azariah and Zabud, the son of Nathan (1Ki 4:2,5), are spoken of as holding priestly offices of a different kind. Ahimaaz may have died early, or may have followed some other career, but the simple fact is that we do not know.

(3) Ahimaaz, in Naphtali, was one of Solomon's twelve commissary officers (1Ki 4:15), who married Basemath the daughter of Solomon. It is not impossible that he was Ahimaaz the son of Zadok, though there is no proof to that effect.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIMAN

a-hi'-man ('achiman, perhaps, "brother of fortune," or, "my brother is fortune"):

(1) One of the names given as those of the three "children of the Anak" (Nu 13:22; Jos 15:14; Nu 13:28; 2Sa 21:16,18), or the three "sons of the Anak" (Jos 15:14; Jud 1:20). The three names (Ahiman, Sheshai, Talmai) also occur together in Jud 1:10. The word Anak in the Hebrew Bible has the definite article except in Nu 13:33 and De 9:2. Its use is that of a common noun denoting a certain type of man, rather than as the proper name of a person or a clan, though this need not prevent our thinking of the Anakim as a clan or group of clans, who regarded Arba as their founder. The question is raised whether Ahiman and Sheshai and Talmai are to be thought of as persons or as clans. The most natural understanding of the Bible statements is certainly to the effect that they were personal leaders among the Anakim of Kiriath-arba (Hebron). They were smitten and dispossessed by the tribe of Judah, with Caleb for leader.

(2) A Levite, one of the gatekeepers of the latest Bible times (1Ch 9:17). He is associated with Akkub and Talmon and their brethren: compare Ne 11:19.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIMELECH

a-him'-e-lek ('achimelekh, "brother of a king," or, "my brother is king," or, "king is brother"):

(1) The father of David's high priest Abiathar: son of Ahitub, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eli (1Sa 21:1,2,8; 22:9-20; 23:6; 30:7). Ahijah the son of Ahitub (1Sa 14:3,18) was either the same person under another name, or was Ahimelech's father or brother. See AHIJAH, 3. Ahimelech is an interesting

person, especially because he stands for whatever information we have concerning the priestly office in Israel during the period between Eli and David. Whether the Deuteronomic law for a central sanctuary originated with Moses or not, its provisions were very imperfectly carried out during the times of the Judges. This was particularly the case after the capture of the ark by the Philistines, and the deaths of Eli and his sons. From that time to the middle of the reign of David the ark was in the custody of the men of Kiriath-jearim "in the hill," or "in Gibeah" (1Sa 7:1; 2Sa 6:2,3).

As a general proposition Israel "sought not unto it" (1Ch 13:3), though there is nothing to forbid the idea that it may, on occasion, have been brought out from its seclusion (1Sa 14:18). Before and after the accession of Saul some of the functions of the national sanctuary were transacted, of course very incompletely, at Gilgal (1Sa 10:8; 11:14,15; 13:7; 15:12,21,33). Whether there was a priesthood, with Ahitub the grandson of Eli as high priest, is a matter on which we have no information; but we may remind ourselves that the common assumption that such men as Samuel and Saul performed priestly offices is nothing but an assumption. After Saul has been king for a good many years we find Ahijah in his retinue, acting as priest and wearing priestly vestments. A few years later Ahimelech is at the head of the very considerable priestly establishment at Nob. The scale on which it existed is indicated by the fact that 85 robed priests perished in the massacre (1Sa 22:18).

They had families residing at Nob (1Sa 22:19). They were thought of as priests of Yahweh, and were held in reverence (1Sa 22:17). It was a hereditary priesthood (1Sa 22:11,15). Men deposited votive offerings there, the sword of Goliath, for example (1Sa 21:9). There seems to have been some kind of police authority, whereby a person might be "detained" (1Sa 21:7). It was customary to inquire of Yahweh there (1Sa 22:10,15). A distraction was made between the common and the holy (1Sa 21:4-6). The custom of the shewbread was maintained (1Sa 21:6). In fine, Jesus is critically correct in calling the place "the house of God" (Mr 2:26). The account does not say that the ark was there, or that the burnt-offering of the morning and evening was offered, or that the great festivals were held. The priestly head of the establishment at Nob is represented to have been the man who had the right to the office through his descent from Aaron. It is gratuitous to assume that there were other similar sanctuaries in Israel, though the proposition that there were none might be, like other negative propositions, hard to establish by positive proof.

(2) A son of Abiathar (2Sa 8:17; 1Ch 18:16; 24:6), and grandson of the above. In a list of the heads of departments under David, a list belonging later than the middle of David’s 40 years, and in which David’s sons appear, this Ahimelech, the son of David’s friend, is mentioned as sharing with Zadok a high position in the priesthood. In this capacity, later, he shared with David and Zadok in the apportionment of the priests into 24 ancestral classes, 16 of the house of Eleazar, and 8 of the house of Ithamar (1Ch 24). In this account Ahimelech is mentioned three times, and with some detail. It is alleged as a difficulty that Abiathar was then living, and was high priest along with Zadok (1Ch 15:11; 2Sa 15:29; 19:11; 20:25; 1Ki 2:27,35; 4:4, etc.). But surely there is no improbability in the affirmation that Abiathar had a son named Ahimelech, or that this son performed prominent priestly functions in his father’s lifetime.

Many regard "Ahimelech the son of Abiathar" (Mt gives Ahimelech) as an inadvertent transposition for

"Abiathar the son of Ahimelech." This is rather plausible in the passage in 2Sa 8 and the duplicate of it in 1Ch 18:16, but it has no application in the detailed account in 1Ch 24. One must accept Ahimelech the son of Abiathar as historical unless, indeed, one regards the testimony of Ch to a fact as evidence in disproof of that fact. See ABIATHAR.

(3) A Hittite, a companion and friend of David, when he was hiding from Saul in the wilderness (1Sa 26:6).

Willis J. Beecher

AHIMOTH

a-hi'-moth ('achimoth, "brother of death," or, "my brother is death"): A descendant of Kohath the son of Levi (1Ch 6:25); ancestor of Elkanah the father of Samuel. The name Mahath holds a similar place in the list that follows (1Ch 6:35).

AHINADAB

a-hin'-a-dab ('achinadhabh, "brother of willingness," or, "my brother is willing"): Decidedly the ordinary use of the stem nadhabh is to denote willingness rather than liberality or nobleness One of Solomon's twelve commissary officers (1Ki 4:14). He was the son of Iddo, and his district was Mahanaim.

AHINOAM

a-hi-no'-am, a-hin'-o-am ('achino'am, "my brother is pleasantness"):

(1) Daughter of Ahimaaz, and wife of King Saul (1Sa 14:50).

(2) The woman from Jezreel whom David married after Saul gave Michal to another husband. She and Abigail, the widow of Nabal, seem to have been David's only wives prior to the beginning of his reign in Hebron. His marriage to Abigail is mentioned first, with some details, followed by the statement, easily to be understood in the pluperfect, that he had previously married Ahinoam (1Sa 25:39-44). Three times they are mentioned together, Ahinoam always first (1Sa 27:3; 30:5; 2Sa 2:2), and Ahinoam is the mother of David's first son and Abigail of his second (2Sa 3:2; 1Ch 3:1). Ahinoam's son was Amnon. The record really represents David's polygamy as a series of bids for political influence; the names of Amnon, Absalom, Adonijah suggest that the method was not finally a success.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIO

a-hi’-o (’achyo, variously explained as "his brother," "brotherly," "brother of Yahweh," "my brother is Yah"): Proper names containing a similar form of the name of Yahweh are found on the ostraca recently exhumed at Samaria. The word is always treated as a common noun in the ordinary Greek copies, being rendered either "brother" or "brothers," or "his brother" or "his brothers"; but this is probably to be taken as an instance of the relative inferiority of the Greek text as compared with the Massoretic Text. See OSTRACA.

(1) One of the sons of Beriah, the son of Elpaal, the son of Shaharaim and Hushim, reckoned among the families of Benjamin (1Ch 8:14). Beriah and Shema are described as ‘ancestral heads’ "of the inhabitants of Aijalon, who put to flight the inhabitants of Gath."

(2) A descendant of Jeiel ("the father of Gibeon") and his wife Maacah (1Ch 8:31; 9:37). King Saul apparently came from the same family (1Ch 8:30,33; 9:39).

(3) One of the men who drove the new cart when David first attempted to bring the ark from the house of Abinadab to Jerusalem (2Sa 6:3,4; 1Ch 13:7). In Samuel Uzza and Ahio are called sons of Abinadab. By the most natural understanding of the Biblical data about 100 years had elapsed since the ark was brought to the house; they were sons of that Abinadab in the sense of being his descendants. Whether he had a successor of the same name living in David’s time is a matter of conjecture.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIRA

a-hi’-ra (’achira‘, "brother of evil," or, "my brother is evil"): A man of Naphtali, contemporary with Moses. He is five times mentioned as the son of Enan. He was the representative of his tribe who assisted Moses in the census (Nu 1:15). He was the hereditary "prince" of the tribe; he made the tribal offering (Nu 2:29; 7:78; compare Nu 7:83), and was commander of the tribal host when on the march (Nu 10:27).

AHIRAM

a-hi’-ram (’achiram, "exalted brother," or "my brother is exalted"):

A son of Benjamin. Mentioned third of the five in Nu 26:38,39. In 1Ch 8:1 five sons are likewise mentioned, being explicitly numbered; the third name, Aharah (’achrach), is conjectured to be either a corruption of Ahiram or a different name for the same person. In 1Ch 7:6 ff is a fuller list of Benjamite names, but it is fragmentary and not clear. In it occurs Aher (’acher), which may be either Ahiram or Aharah with the end of the word lost. In Ge 46:21 ten sons of Benjamin are mentioned, some being there counted as sons who, in the other lists, are spoken of as more remote descendants. In this list Ehi (’echi) is perhaps Ahiram shortened. See AHARAH; AHER; EHI.

Willis J. Beecher

AHIRAMITE

a-hi’-ram-it (’achirami, "of the family of Ahiram"; Nu 26:38). See AHIRAM.

AHISAMACH

a-his’-a-mak (’achicamakh, "my brother supports"): A man of the tribe of Dan, father of Oholiab, who was the assistant of Bezalel in the building of the tent of meeting and preparing its furniture (Ex 31:6; 35:34; 38:23).

AHISHAHAR

a-hish’-a-har (’achishachar, "brother of dawn"): One of the sons of Bilhan, the son of Jediael, the son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:10).

AHISHAR

a-hish’-ar (’achishar, "my brother has sung"): Mentioned in Solomon’s list of heads of departments as "over the household" (1Ki 4:6).

AHITHOPHEL

a-hith’-o-fel (’achithophel, "brother of foolishness," perhaps): The real leader of the Absalom rebellion against David. He is described as "the king’s counselor," in a context connected with events some of which are dated in the fortieth year of David (1Ch 27:33,34; compare 1Ch 26:31). Concerning him and his part in the rebellion we have rather full information (2Sa 15:12 ff).

Some hold that he was the grandfather of Bathsheba, and make much of this in forming their estimates of him. Does the evidence sustain this view? In the latter half of the list of David’s mighty men, not among the older veterans with whom the list begins, appears "Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite" (2Sa 23:34), the corresponding name in the other copy of the list being "Ahijah the Pelonite" (1Ch 11:36). It is assumed that this is the same Eliam who was father to Bath-sheba (2Sa 11:3). Apparently the Chronicler testifies (1Ch 3:5) that the mother of Solomon was "Bath-shua the daughter of Ammiel."

Bathshua may easily be a variant of Bathsheba, and the names Eliam and Ammiel are made up of the same parts, only in reversed order. It is not strange that men have inferred that the son of Ahithophel was the father of Bathsheba. But the inference is really not a probable one. The record does not make the

impression that Ahithophel was an older man than David. The recorded events of David's life after his misconduct with Bathsheba cannot have occupied less than about twenty years; that is, he cannot have been at the time older than about fifty years. That Ahithophel had then a married grand-daughter is less probable than that there were in Israel two Eliams. Further, Ahithophel was not the sort of man to conspire against the interests of his grand-daughter and her son, however he may, earlier, have resented the conduct of David toward her. Ahithophel's motive in the rebellion was doubtless ambition for personal power, though he very likely shared with many of his countrymen in the conviction that it was unjust to push aside an older son by elevating a younger son to the throne.

Ahithophel has a reputation for marvelous practical sagacity (2Sa 16:23). He did not show this in joining the conspiracy but it is in evidence in his management of the affair. According to the record the hearts of the people, in spite of the much fault they had to find, were all the time with David. Absalom's only chance of success was by the method of surprise and stampede. There must be a crisis in which everybody would join Absalom because everybody thought that everybody else had done so. Such a state of public sentiment could last only a very few days; but if, in those few days, David could be put out of the way, Absalom might hold the throne in virtue of his personal popularity and in default of a rival. The first part of the program was carried out with wonderful success; when it came to the second part, Ahithophel's practical wisdom was blocked by Hushai's adroit appeal to Absalom's personal vanity. Ahithophel saw with absolute clearness that Absalom had sacrificed his one opportunity, and he committed suicide to avoid participation in the shameful defeat which he saw could not be averted.

Willis J. Beecher

AHITOB

a-hi'-tob (Achitob; the King James Version Achitob): One of the ancestors of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:1). Compare AHITUB, 3 (Ezr 7:2 et al.).

AHITUB

a-hi'-tub ('achiTubh, "brother of goodness," i.e. "good brother," or, "my brother is goodness"):

(1) The brother of Ichabod and son of Phinehas the son of Eli (1Sa 14:3; 22:9,11,12,20), According to 1Ch 24 he and his line were descended from Aaron through Ithamar. The record implies that he was born while his father and grandfather were priests at Shiloh, and it says that he was the father and grandfather of priests; but it is silent as to his own exercise of the priestly office. We have no information concerning the office from the time when the Philistines captured the ark till Saul became king. See AHIJAH; AHIMELECH; ABIATHAR.

(2) A descendant of Aaron through Eleazar: by this fact distinguished from Ahitub, the descendant of Ithamar, though nearly contemporaneous with him. Especially known as the father of Zadok who, at Solomon's accession, became sole high priest (2Sa 8:17; 1Ch 6:8; 18:16). His genealogical line, from

Levi to the Exile, is given in 1Ch 6:1-15. The three successive names, Ahitub and Zadok and Ahimaaz, appear in 2Sa 8:17; 15:27, etc.. The line is paralleled by selected names in Ezr 7:1-5, and relatively late parts of it are paralleled in 1Ch 9:11 and Ne 11:11. The best explanation of certain phenomena in Chronicles is that the record was copied from originals that were more or less fragmentary. In some cases, also, a writer gives only such parts of a genealogy as are needed for his purpose. It is due to these causes that there are many omissions in the genealogical lists, and that they supplement one another. Allowing for these facts there is no reason why we should not regard the genealogies of Ahitub as having distract historical value.

(3) In the genealogies, in the seventh generation from Ahitub, the descendant of Eleazar, appears another Ahitub, the son of another Amariah and the father (or grandfather) of another Zadok (1Ch 6:11; 9:11, Ne 11:11). The list in Ezr 7$ omits a block of names, and the Ahitub there named may be either 2 or 3. He is mentioned in 1 Esdras 8:2 and 2 Esdras 1:1, and the name occurs in Judith 8:1. In these places it appears in the English versions in the various forms: Ahitub, Ahitob, Achitob, Acitho.

Willis J. Beecher

AHLAB

a’-lab (’achlabh, "fat or fruitful"): A town of Asher. It is clear, however, that the Israelites failed to drive away the original inhabitants (Jud 1:31). Some have identified Ahlab with Gush Halab or Geschila, Northwest of the Sea of Galilee.

AHLAI

a’-li (’achlay "O would that!"):

(1) A Son of Sheshan (1Ch 2:31) or according to 1Ch 2:34 a daughter of Sheshan, for here we read: "Now Sheshan had no sons, but daughters."

(2) The father of Zabad, a soldier in David’s army (1Ch 11:41).

AHOAH

a-ho’-a (’achoah, "brotherly"(?)): A son of Bela of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:4).

AHOHITE

a-ho’-hit (’achochi): A patronymic employed in connection with the descendants of AHOAH (which see) such as Doda (2Sa 23:9) or Dodo (1Ch 11:12), Ilai (29) or Zalmon (2Sa 23:28), and also Eleazar, son of Dodo (1Ch 11:12). The family must have been fond of military affairs, for all the above were

officers in David and Solomon’s armies.

AHOLAH

a-ho’-la. See OHOLAH.

AHOLIAB

a-ho-li’-ab. See OHOLIAB.

AHOLIAH

a-ho-li’-a. See OHOLIAH.

AHOLIBAH

a-ho’-li-ba. See OHOLIBAH.

AHOLIBAMAH

a-ho-li-ba’-ma. See OHOLIBAMAH.

AHUMAI

a-hu’-ma-i, a-hu’-mi (’achumay, "brother of water"(?)): A descendant of Shobal of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:2).

AHUZZAM; AHUZAM

a-huz’-am, a-hu’-zam (’achuzzam, "possessor"). A son of Ashahur of the tribe of Judah, his mother’s name was Naarah (1Ch 4:6); written Ahuzam in the King James Version.

AHUZZATH

a-huz’-ath (’achuzzath, "possession"): A "friend" perhaps a minister, of Abimelech, king of Gerar. He together with Phicol, commander of the army, accompanied their sovereign to Beersheba to make a covenant with Isaac (Ge 26:26). The termination "-ath" reminds us of Philistine proper names, such as Gath, Goliath, etc. Compare Genubath (1Ki 11:20).

AHZAI

a’-zi (’achzay, "my protector"): A priest who resided in Jerusalem (Ne 11:13). The the King James Version has Ahasai which is probably the same as Jahzevah of 1Ch 9:12.

AI

a’-i (‘ay, written always with the definite article, ha-‘ay, probably meaning "the ruin," kindred root, ‘awah):

(1) A town of central Palestine, in the tribe of Benjamin, near and just east of Bethel (Ge 12:8). It is identified with the modern Haiyan, just south of the village Der Diwan (Conder in HDB; Delitzsch in Commentary on Ge 12:8) or with a mound, El-Tell, to the north of the modern village (Davis, Dict. Biblical). The name first appears in the earliest journey of Abraham through Palestine (Ge 12:8), where its location is given as east of Bethel, and near the altar which Abraham built between the two places. It is given similar mention as he returns from his sojourn in Egypt (Ge 13:3). In both of these occurrences the King James Version has the form Hai, including the article in transliterating. The most conspicuous mention of Ai is in the narrative of the Conquest. As a consequence of the sin of Achan in appropriating articles from the devoted spoil of Jericho, the Israelites were routed in the attack upon the town; but after confession and expiation, a second assault was successful, the city was taken and burned, and left a heap of ruins, the inhabitants, in number twelve thousand, were put to death, the king captured, hanged and buried under a heap of stones at the gate of the ruined city, only the cattle being kept as spoil by the people (Jos 7; 8). The town had not been rebuilt when Jos was written (Jos 8:28). The fall of Ai gave the Israelites entrance to the heart of Canaan, where at once they became established, Bethel and other towns in the vicinity seeming to have yielded without a struggle. Ai was rebuilt at some later period, and is mentioned by Isa (Isa 10:28) in his vivid description of the approach of the Assyrian army, the feminine form (‘ayyath) being used. Its place in the order of march, as just beyond Michmash from Jerusalem, corresponds with the identification given above. It is mentioned also in post-exilic times by Ezr 2:28 and Ne 7:32, (and in Ne 11:31 as, ‘ayya’), identified in each case by the grouping with Bethel.

(2) The Ai of Jer 49:3 is an Ammonite town, the text probably being a corruption of ‘ar; or ha-‘ir, "the city" (BDB).

Edward Mack

AIAH

a’-ya (’ayyah, "falcon"; once in the King James Version Ajah, Ge 36:24):

(1) A Horite, son of Zibeon, and brother of Anah, who was father of one of Esau’s wives (Ge 36:24; 1Ch 1:40).

(2) Father of Rizpah, a concubine of Saul, about whom Ishbosheth falsely accused Abner (2Sa 3:7), and whose sons were hanged to appease the Gibeonites, whom Saul had wronged (2Sa 21:8-11).

AIATH

a’-yath (‘ayyath): Found in Isa 10:28; feminine form of the city AI (which see).

AID

ad (chazaq, "to strengthen," "to aid"): A military term used only once in Old Testament in the King James Version (Jud 9:24) and displaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by the literal rendering, "who strengthened his hands." The men of Shechem supported Abimelech in his fratricidal crime, with money, enabling him to hire men to murder his brethren. The fundamental idea in the word, as used in the Old Testament, is "abounding strength."

AIJA

a-i’-ja (‘ayya’): A form of name for city Ai, found in Ne 11:31. See AI; AIATH.

AIJALON

a’-ja-lon (’ayyalon, "deerplace"; the King James Version, Ajalon (Jos 10:12)):

(1) The name of a town allotted to the tribe of Da (Jos 19:42), which was also designated a Levitical city (Jos 21:24), which fell to the Sons of Kohath (1Ch 6:69). The first mention of Aijalon is in the narrative of Joshua’s defeat of the five Amorite kings: "thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon" (Jos 10:12). The Danites failed to take it from the Amorites (Jud 1:35), although the men of Ephraim held it in vassalage. Here Saul and Jonathan won a great victory over the Philistines (1Sa 14:31). At one time it was held by the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:13). Rehoboam fortified it against the kingdom of Israel (2Ch 11:10). In the days of King Ahaz it was captured by the Philistines (2Ch 28:18). It has been identified with the modern Yalo; its antiquity goes back to Tell el-Amarna Letters, in which it has mention. It Is situated Northwest of Jerusalem in a valley of the same name, which leads down from the mountains to the sea.

(2) A town in the tribe of Zebulun, site unknown, where Elon the judge was buried (Jud 12:12).

Edward Mack

AIJELETH HASH-SHAHAR

a’-je-leth hash-sha’-har. See PSALMS; SONG.

AIL

al (Anglo-Saxon: eglan, "to pain"): As a verb translation, is "to trouble," "afflict" (obsolete); intrans, "to feel pain, trouble, uneasiness," etc.; it represents Hebrew mah lekha "what to thee" (Ge 21:17, "What aileth thee, Hagar?"; Jud 18:23; 1Sa 11:5; 2Sa 14:5; 2Ki 6:28; Isa 22:1); in Ps 114:5, it is figuratively or poetically applied to the sea, the river Jordan, etc.: "What ailed thee, O thou sea, that thou fleddest?" etc.; the Revised Version (British and American), "What aileth thee, O thou sea that thou fleest?" etc.; in 2 Esdras 9:42; 10:31, "What aileth thee?"

AIM

am: In The Wisdom of Solomon 13:9. Lit. translation by the King James Version of Greek stochasasthai, which commonly means "to shoot at." This is Interpreted and explained by the Revised Version (British and American) as "explore," with a hint as to the nature of the process, and may be paraphrased: "If they be able to conjecture the mysteries of the universe."

AIN (1)

See AYIN.

AIN (2)

a'-in ('ayin, "eye or spring (of water)"):

(1) A town in the extreme Northwest corner of Canaan, so named, most probably, from a noted spring in the vicinity (Nu 34:11). Thomson and after him Robinson make Ain the same as 'Ain el-'Asy, the chief source of the Orontes, some fifteen miles Southwest of Riblah, which, in turn, is about twenty miles Southwest of Emesa (Hums). As Ain is named in connection with Lake Gennesaret, some claim that Riblah of Nu 34:11 must be another place farther South and closer to that lake.

(2) A Levitical city (Jos 21:16) in the Negeb or southern part of Judah. It was first allotted to the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:32) but later to Simeon (Jos 19:7). The fact that it is several times named in immediate connection with Rimmon has lent plausibility to the view that we have here a compound word, and that we should read En-Rimmon, i.e. Ain-Rimmon (see Jos 15:32; 19:7; 1Ch 4:32). See also AYIN.

W. W. Davies

AIR

ar (aer): In the Old Testament "air" is used (with one exception) in the phrase "fowl" or "fowls (birds) of the air." The Hebrew word is usually rendered "heaven" or "heavens." According to ancient Hebrew

cosmogony the sky was a solid dome (firmament) stretching over the earth as a covering. In the above phrase the air means the space between the earth and the firmament. In Job 41:16 "air" renders ruach, "breath," "wind," "spirit." The scales of the leviathan are so closely joined together that no air can penetrate. In the New Testament the phrase "birds (or fowls) of the air," occurs ten times. This simply reproduces the Hebraism noticed above. Apart from this expression "air" in the King James Version represents aer, which denotes the atmosphere which surrounds us. The expression "beating the air" (1Co 9:26) means to "deal blows that do not get home"—that miss the mark. In his conflict with the lower life represented by the body, Paul compares himself to a boxer who aims with unerring accuracy at his opponent. No stroke is lost. Paul also uses the phrase "speaking into the air" (1Co 14:9) in reference to the unintelligible utterances of those who "spake with tongues." In the expression, "prince of the powers of the air" (Eph 2:2 the King James Version) we find an echo of the current belief that the air was the dwelling place of spirits, especially of evil spirits.

Thomas Lewis

AIRUS

a-i’-rus, ar’-us (Iairos): the King James Version, one of the heads of a family of temple servants (1 Esdras 5:31 the Revised Version (British and American) JAIRUS), which returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel; in the Old Testament called Reaiah (Ezr 2:47; Ne 7:50), and classed among the Nethinim.

AJAH

a’-ja. An Edomite tribe (Ge 36:24 the King James Version). See AIAH.

AJALON

aj’-a-lon. See AIJALON.

AKAN

a’-kan (‘aqan, "twisted"): A son of Ezer, a descendant of Esau of Seir (Ge 36:27). He is called Jaakan in 1Ch 1:42. The King James Version margin has Jakan.

AKATAN

ak’-a-tan (Akatan; the King James Version, Acatan = Hakkatan; Ezr 8:12): The father of Joannes who returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:38).

AKELDAMA

a-kel’-da-ma (Akeldama, or, in many manuscripts, Akeldamach; the King James Version, Aceldama): A field said in Ac 1:19 to have been bought by Judas with the "thirty pieces of silver." In Mt 27:6,7 it is narrated that the priests took the silver pieces which Judas had "cast down .... into the sanctuary" and "bought with them the potter’s field, to bury strangers in. Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day." Doubtless it was a supposed connection between this potter’s field and the potter’s house (Jer 18:2) and the Valley of the Son of Hinnom (Jer 19:2) which influenced the selection of the present site which, like the Aramaic h-q-l-d-m-’(Dalman), is today known as haqq-ed-dumm, "field of blood."

Tradition, which appears to go back to the 4th century, points to a level platform on, and some distance up, the southern slope of the Wady er Rababi (Valley of Hinnom) just before it joins the Kidron Valley. Upon this spot there is a very remarkable ruin (78 ft. x 57 ft.) which for many centuries was used as a charnel house. The earth here was reputed to have the property of quickly consuming dead bodies. So great was its reputation that vast quantities of it are said to have been transported in 1215 AD to the Campo Santo at Pisa.

When this building was standing entire, the bodies were lowered into it through five openings in the roof and then left to disintegrate, so that a few years ago there were very many feet of bones all over the floor. These have now been removed. A little Southeast of this ruin is a new Greek monastery erected in recent years over the remains of a large number of cave tombs; many of the bones from "Akeldama" are now buried here.

E. W. G. Masterman

AKKAD; AKKADIANS

ak’-ad, a-ka’-di-ans. See ACCAD; ACCADIANS.

AKKOS

ak’-os (Akbos in 1 Esdras 5:38; the King James Version Accos, which see): The Old Testament equivalent (1Ch 24:10; Ezr 2:61; Ne 3:4,21) is HAKKOZ (haqqots), which also see.

AKKUB

ak’-ub (‘aqqubh, "pursuer"):

(1) A son of Elioenai, a descendant of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:24).

(2) A Levite porter on duty at the east gate of the second Temple (1Ch 9:17).

AKRABATTINE

ak-ra-ba-ti’-ne (Akrabattine; the King James Version, Arabattine): A place in Idumaea where Judas Maccabee defeated the children of Esau (1 Macc 5:3).

AKRABBIM

ak-rab’-im (once in the King James Version, Acrabbim (Jos 15:3); ‘aqrabbim, "scorpions"): Three times found (Nu 34:4; Jos 15:3; Jud 1:36), and always with ma‘aleh, "ascent" or "pass"; and so "Ascent of the Scorpions," an ascent at the Southwest point of the Dead Sea and a part of the boundary line between Judah and Edom. At this pass Judas Maccabeus won a victory over the Edomites (1 Macc 5:3), called in the King James Version, Arabattine.

AL-TASHHETH; AL-TASCHITH

al-tash’-heth, al-tas’-kith. See PSALMS; SONG.

ALABASTER

al’-a-bas-ter (alabastron (Mt 26:7; Mr 14:3; Lu 7:37)): In modern mineralogy alabaster is crystalline gypsum or sulphate of lime. The Greek word alabastron or alabastos meant a stone casket or vase, and alabastites was used for the stone of which the casket was made. This stone was usually crystalline stalagmitic rock or carbonate of lime, now often called oriental alabaster, to distinguish it from gypsum. The word occurs in the Bible only in the three passages of the Synoptic Gospels cited above. See BOX.

ALAMETH

al’-a-meth (‘alameth, "concealment"; 1Ch 7:8 the King James Version): The name of a son of Becher and grandson of Benjamin. His name was preserved as the name of a town near Anathoth (ALLEMETH, 1Ch 6:60 the Revised Version (British and American)). Except for the strong pausal accent in the Hebrew the form of the word would be the same as ALEMETH (which see).

ALAMMELECH

a-lam’-e-lek: the King James Version (Jos 19:26) for ALLAMMELECH (which see).

ALAMOTH

al’-a-moth. See MUSIC.

ALARM

a-larm’ (teru‘ah): This expression is found six times in the Old Testament. The Hebrew word so rendered is derived from a verb meaning "to shout" or "blow a horn," as a signal for breaking up camp, starting on a journey or into battle, or in triumphant shout over the defeat of enemies. In a few instances it is employed of a cry of despair or distress. The noun teru‘ah translated "alarm" in Nu 10:5 f refers to the signal given the people of Israel to start on their journey in the Wilderness. The passages in Jer (4:19; 49:2) both refer to the summons for war. The same is true of Ze 1:16. The law concerning the sounding of the alarm is fully stated in Nu 10:1-10. Here we read that two silver trumpets of beaten work were sounded by the sons of Aaron in case of war and also "in the day of .... gladness" to gather the people together for the various feasts, new moons, sacrifices and offerings.

W. W. Davies

ALBEIT

ol-be’-it (hina me; literally, "lest"): Occurs in a paraphrase rather than as a translation of a clause in Phm 1:19 the King James Version. The thought is: "although" or "albeit" (synonym of "although") "I might say," etc. This the Revised Version (British and American) translates with intense literalness: "that I say not".

ALCIMUS

al’-si-mus (’elyaqum, "God will rise"; Alkimos, "valiant"): A high priest for three years, 163-161 BC, the record of whose career may be found in 1 Macc 7:4-50; 9:1-57; 2 Macc 14; see also Ant, XII, 9-11; XX, 10. He was a descendant of Aaron, but not in the high-priestly line (1 Macc 7:14; also Ant, XX, 10); and being ambitious for the office of high priest, he hastened to Antioch to secure the favor and help of the new king, Demetrius, who had just overthrown Antiochus Eupator and made himself king. Alcimus was of the Grecianizing party, and therefore bitterly opposed by the Maccabees. Demetrius sent a strong army under Bacchides to establish him in the high-priesthood at Jerusalem. The favor with which Alcimus was received by the Jews at Jerusalem on account of his Aaronic descent was soon turned to hate by his cruelties. When Bacchides and his army returned to Antioch, Simon Maccabeus attacked and overcame Alcimus, and drove him also to Syria. There he secured from Demetrius another army, led by Nicanor, who, failing to secure Simon by treachery, joined battle with him, but was defeated and killed. A third and greater army, under Bacchides again, was dispatched to save the falling fortunes of Alcimus. Now Simon was overwhelmed and slain, Alcimus established as high priest and a strong force left in Jerusalem to uphold him. But he did not long enjoy his triumph, since he died soon after from a paralytic stroke.

Edward Mack

ALCOVE

al’-kov (qubbah; the King James Version tent; the American Standard Revised Version pavilion; the American Revised Version, margin alcove): Perhaps a large tent occupied by a prince (Nu 25:8).

ALEMA

al’-e-ma (Alemois): A town in Gilead, mentioned once only (1 Macc 5:26), besieged by the nations under Timotheus, together with Bosor and other cities; and probably relieved along with these cities by Judas Maccabeus, although no mention is made of Alema’s relief. The name occurs the one time as dative plural.

ALEMETH

al’-e-meth (‘alemeth, "concealment"):

(1) the Revised Version (British and American) for Alameth of the King James Version in 1Ch 7:8.

(2) Descendant of Saul and Jonathan, and son of Jehoaddah, 1Ch 8:36, or of Jarah, 1Ch 9:42. The genealogies in the two chapters are identical, and he is the fifth generation after Jonathan.

(3) In some Hebrew texts, Ginsburg and Baer, for ALLEMETH (which see); so in the King James Version.

ALEPH

a’-lef (’): The first letter of the Hebrew alphabet. It is nearly soundless itself and best represented, as in this Encyclopedia, by the smooth breathing (’), but it is the direct ancestor of the Greek, Latin and English "a" as in "father." In either case this beginning of the alphabet happens to be near the very basis of all speech—in one case the simple expiration of breath, in the other the simplest possible vocal action—the actual basis from which all other vowels are evolved. It became also the symbol for the number one (1) and, with the dieresis, 1,000. It is the symbol also for one of the most famous of Greek Biblical manuscripts, the Codex Sinaiticus. For name, written form, etc., see ALPHABET.

E. C. Richardson

ALEPPO

a-lep’-o. See BEREA.

ALEXANDER

al-eg-zan’-der Alexandros, literal meaning "defender of men." This word occurs five times in the New Testament, (Mr 15:21; Ac 4:6; 19:33; 1Ti 1:19,20, 2Ti 4:14): It is not certain whether the third, fourth and fifth of these passages refer to the same man.

1. A Son of Simon of Cyrene:

The first of these Alexanders is referred to in the passage in Mk, where he is said to have been one of the sons of Simon of Cyrene, the man who carried the cross of Christ. Alexander therefore may have been a North African by birth. Matthew, Mark, and Luke all record the fact, with varying detail, that Simon happened to be passing at the time when Christ was being led out of the city, to be crucified on Calvary. Mark alone tells that Simon was the father of Alexander and Rufus. From this statement of the evangelist, it is apparent that at the time the Second Gospel was written, Alexander and Rufus were Christians, and that they were well known in the Christian community. Mark takes it for granted that the first readers of his Gospel will at once understand whom he means.

There is no other mention of Alexander in the New Testament, but it is usually thought that his brother Rufus is the person mentioned by Paul in Ro 16:13, "Salute Rufus the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine." If this identification is correct, then it follows, not only that the sons of Simon were Christians, but that his wife also was a Christian, and that they had all continued faithful to Christ for many years. It would also follow that the households were among the intimate friends of Paul, so much so that the mother of the family is affectionately addressed by him as "Rufus’ mother and mine." The meaning of this is, that in time past this lady had treated Paul with the tender care which a mother feels and shows to her own son.

This mention of Rufus and his mother is in the list of names of Christians resident in Rome. Lightfoot (Comm. on Phil, 176) writes: "There seems no reason to doubt the tradition that Mr wrote especially for the Romans; and if so, it is worth remarking that he alone of the evangelists describes Simon of Cyrene, as ‘the father of Alexander and Rufus.’ A person of this name therefore (Rufus) seems to have held a prominent place among the Roman Christians; and thus there is at least fair ground for identifying the Rufus of Paul with the Rufus of Mark. The inscriptions exhibit several members of the household (of the emperor) bearing the names Rufus and Alexander, but this fact is of no value where both names are so common."

To sum up, Alexander was probably by birth a North African Jew; he became a Christian, and was a well-known member of the church, probably the church in Rome. His chief claim to recollection is that he was a son of the man who carried the cross of the Saviour of the world.

2. A Relative of Annas:

The second Alexander, referred to in Ac 4:6, was a relative of Annas the Jewish high priest. He is

mentioned by Lk, as having been present as a member of the Sanhedrin, before which Peter and John were brought to be examined, for what they had done in the cure of the lame man at the gate of the temple. Nothing more is known of this Alexander than is here given by Luke. It has been conjectured that he may have been the Alexander who was a brother of Philo, and who was also the alabarch or magistrate of the city of Alexandria. But this conjecture is unsupported by any evidence at all.

3. Alexander and the Riot at Ephesus:

The third Alexander is mentioned in Ac 19:33: "And some of the multitude instructed Alexander, the Jews putting him forward. And Alexander beckoned with the hand, and would have made defense unto the people. But when they perceived that he was a Jew, all with one voice," etc., the Revised Version, margin. In the matter of the riot in Ephesus the whole responsibility rested with Demetrius the silversmith. In his anger against the Christians generally, but specially against Paul, because of his successful preaching of the gospel, he called together a meeting of the craftsmen; the trade of the manufacture of idols was in jeopardy. From this meeting there arose the riot, in which the whole city was in commotion. The Jews were wholly innocent in the matter: they had done nothing to cause any disturbance. But the riot had taken place, and no one could tell what would happen. Modern anti-Semitism, in Russia and other European countries, gives an idea of an excited mob stirred on by hatred of the Jews. Instantly recognizing that the fury of the Ephesian people might expend itself in violence and bloodshed, and that in that fury they would be the sufferers, the Jews "put forward" Alexander, so that by his skill as a speaker he might clear them, either of having instigated the riot, or of being in complicity with Paul. "A certain Alexander was put forward by the Jews to address the mob; but this merely increased the clamor and confusion. There was no clear idea among the rioters what they wanted: an anti-Jewish and an anti-Christian demonstration were mixed up, and probably Alexander’s retention was to turn the general feeling away from the Jews. It is possible that he was the worker in bronze, who afterward did Paul much harm" (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, etc., 279).

4. Alexander an Ephesian Heretic:

The fourth of the New Testament Alexanders is one of two heretical teachers at Ephesus—the other being Hymeneus: see article under the word—against whom Paul warns Timothy in 1Ti 1:19,20. The teaching of Hymeneus and Alexander was to the effect that Christian morality was not required—antinomianism. They put away- -"thrust from them," the Revised Version (British and American)—faith and a good conscience; they willfully abandoned the great central facts regarding Christ, and so they "made shipwreck concerning the faith."

5. His Heresy Incipient Gnosticism:

In 2Ti 2:17,18, Hymeneus is associated with Philetus, and further details are there given regarding their false teaching. What they taught is described by Paul as "profane babblings," as leading to more ungodliness, and as eating "as doth a gangrene." Their heresy consisted in saying that the resurrection was past already, and it had been so far successful, that it had overthrown the faith of some. The doctrine

of these three heretical teachers, Hymeneus, Alexander and Philetus, was accordingly one of the early forms of Gnosticism. It held that matter was originally and essentially evil; that for this reason the body was not an essential part of human nature; that the only resurrection was that of each man as he awoke from the death of sin to a righteous life; that thus in the case of everyone who has repented of sin, "the resurrection was past already," and that the body did not participate in the blessedness of the future life, but that salvation consisted in the soul's complete deliverance from all contact with a material world and a material body.

So pernicious were these teachings of incipient Gnosticism in the Christian church, that they quickly spread, eating like a gangrene. The denial of the future resurrection of the body involved also the dental of the bodily resurrection of Christ, and even the fact of the incarnation. The way in which therefore the apostle dealt with those who taught such deadly error, was that he resorted to the same extreme measures as he had employed in the case of the immoral person at Corinth; he delivered Hymeneus and Alexander to Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme. Compare 1Co 5:5.

6. Alexander the Coppersmith:

The fifth and last occurrence of the name Alexander is in 2Ti 4:14,15, "Alexander the coppersmith did me much evil: the Lord will render to him according to his works: of whom do thou also beware (the King James Version "of whom be thou ware also"); for he greatly withstood our words." This Alexander was a worker in copper or iron, a smith. It is quite uncertain whether Alexander number 5 should be identified with Alexander number 4, and even with Alexander number 3. In regard to this, it should be remembered that all three of these Alexanders were resident in Ephesus; and it is specially to be noticed that the fourth and the fifth of that name resided in that city at much the same time; the interval between Paul's references to these two being not more than a year or two, as not more than that time elapsed between his writing 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy. It is therefore quite possible these two Alexanders may be one and the same person.

In any case, what is stud of this last Alexander is that he had shown the evil which was in him by doing many evil deeds to the apostle, evidently on the occasion of a recent visit paid by Paul to Ephesus. These evil deeds had taken the form of personally opposing the apostle's preaching. The personal antagonism of Alexander manifested itself by his greatly withstanding the proclamation of the gospel by Paul. As Timothy was now in Ephesus, in charge of the church there, he is strongly cautioned by the apostle to be on his guard against this opponent.

John Rutherfurd

ALEXANDER BALAS

Alexander ba'-las (Alexandros ho Balas legomenos): He contended against Demetrius I of Syria for the throne and succeeded in obtaining it. He was a youth of mean origin, but he was put forth by the enemies of Demetrius as being Alexander, the son and heir of Antiochus Epiphanes. He received the

support of the Roman Senate and of Ptolemy VI of Egypt, and on account of the tyranny of Demetrius, was favored by many of the Syrians. The country was thrown into civil war and Demetrius was defeated by Alexander II took up the cause of his father and in 147 BC, Alexander fled from his kingdom and was soon after assassinated.

Our chief interest in Alexander is his connection with the Maccabees. Jonathan was the leader of the Maccabean forces and both Alexander and Demetrius sought his aid. Demetrius granted Jonathan the right to raise and maintain an army. Alexander, not to be outdone, appointed Jonathan high priest, and as a token of his new office sent him a purple robe and a diadem (Ant., XIII, ii, 2). This was an important step in the rise of the Maccabean house, for it insured them the support of the Chasidim. In 153 BC, Jonathan officiated as high priest at the altar (1 Macc 10:1-14; Ant, XIII, ii, 1). This made him the legal head of Judea and thus the movement of the Maccabees became closely identified with Judaism. In 1 Macc 10:1, he is called Alexander Epiphanes.

A. W. Fortune

ALEXANDER, THE GREAT

(Alexandros). 1. Parentage and Early Life:

Alexander, of Macedon, commonly called "the Great" (born 356 BC), was the son of Philip, king of Macedon, and of Olympias, daughter of Neoptolemos, an Epeirote king. Although Alexander is not mentioned by name in the canonical Scriptures, in Da he is designated by a transparent symbol (8:5,21). In 1 Macc 1:1 he is expressly named as the overthrower of the Persian empire, and the founder of that of the Greeks. As with Frederick the Great, the career of Alexander would have been impossible had his father been other than he was. Philip had been for some years a hostage in Thebes: while there he had learned to appreciate the changes introduced into military discipline and tactics by Epaminondas. Partly no doubt from the family claim to Heracleid descent, deepened by contact in earlier days with Athenians like Iphicrates, and the personal influence of Epaminondas, Philip seems to have united to his admiration for Greek tactics a tincture of Hellenistic culture, and something like a reverence for Athens, the great center of this culture. In military matters his admiration led him to introduce the Theban discipline to the rough peasant levies of Macedon, and the Macedonian phalanx proved the most formidable military weapon that had yet been devised. The veneer of Greek culture which he had taken on led him, on the one hand, laying stress on his Hellenistic descent, to claim admission to the comity of Hellas, and on the other, to appoint Aristotle to be a tutor to his son. By a combination of force and fraud, favored by circumstances, Philip got himself appointed generalissimo of the Hellenistic states; and further induced them to proclaim war against the "Great King." In all this he was preparing the way for his son, so soon to be his successor.

2. His Preparation for His Career:

He was also preparing his son for his career. Alexander was, partly no doubt from being the pupil of

Aristotle, yet more imbued with Greek feelings and ideas than was Preparation his father. He was early introduced into the cares of government and the practice of war. While Philip was engaged in the siege of Byzantium he sent his son to replace Antipater in the regency; during his occupancy of this post, Alexander, then only a youth of sixteen, had to undertake a campaign against the Illyrians, probably a punitive expedition. Two years later, at the decisive battle of Chaeroneia, which fixed the doom of the Greek autonomous city, Alexander commanded the feudal cavalry of Macedon, the "Companions." He not only saved his father's life, but by his timely and vehement charge materially contributed to the victory.

3. His Accession to the Hegemony of Greece:

When all his plans for the invasion of Persia were complete, and a portion of his troops was already across the Hellespont, Philip was assassinated. Having secured his succession, Alexander proceeded to Corinth, where he was confirmed in his father's position of leader of Hellas against Darius. Before he could cross into Asia he had to secure his northern frontier against possible raids of barbarian tribes. He invaded Thrace with his army and overthrew the Triballi, then crossed the Danube and inflicted a defeat on the Getae. During his absence in these but slightly known regions, the rumor spread that he had been killed, and Thebes began a movement to throw off the Macedonian yoke. On his return to Greece he wreaked terrible vengeance on Thebes, not only as promoter of this revolt, but also as the most powerful of the Greek states.

4. Campaign in Asia Minor:

Having thus secured his rear, Alexander collected his army at Pella to cross the Hellespont, that he might exact the vengeance of Greece on Persia for indignities suffered at the hands of Xerxes, who "by his strength through his riches" had stirred, up "all against the realm of Grecia" (Da 11:2, the King James Version). Steeped as he was in the romance of the Iliad, Alexander, when he came to the site of Troy, honored Achilles, whom he claimed as his ancestor, with games and sacrifices. This may have been the outflow of his own romantic nature, but there was also wise policy in it; the Greeks were more readily reconciled to the loss of their freedom when it was yielded up to one who revived in his own person the heroes of the Iliad. It may be noted how exactly the point of Alexander's invasion is indicated in Daniel's prophecy (Da 8:5). From Troy he advanced southward, and encountered the Persian forces at the Granicus. While in the conflict Alexander exhibited all the reckless bravery of a Homeric hero. He at the same time showed the skill of a consummate general. The Persian army was dispersed with great slaughter.

Before proceeding farther into Persia, by rapid marches and vigorously pressed sieges, he completed the conquest of Asia Minor. Here, too, he showed his knowledge of the sensitiveness of Asiatic peoples to omens, by visiting Gordium, and cutting the knot on which, according to legend, depended the empire of Asia.

5. Battle of Issus and March through Syria to Egypt:

What he had done in symbol he had to make a reality; he had to settle the question of supremacy in Asia by the sword. He learned that Darius had collected an immense army and was coming to meet him. Although the Persian host was estimated at a half-million men, Alexander hastened to encounter it. Rapidity of motion, as symbolized in Da by the "he-goat" that "came from the west .... and touched not the ground" (Da 8:5), was Alexander's great characteristic. The two armies met in the relatively narrow plain of Issus, where the Persians lost, to a great extent, the advantage of their numbers; they were defeated with tremendous slaughter, Darius himself setting the example of flight. Alexander only pursued the defeated army far enough to break it up utterly. He began his march southward along the seacoast of Syria toward Egypt, a country that had always impressed the Greek imagination. Though most of the cities, on his march, opened their gates to the conqueror, Tyre and Gaza only yielded after a prolonged siege.

In the case of the latter of these, enraged at the delay occasioned by the resistance, and emulous of his ancestor, Alexander dragged its gallant defender Batis alive behind his chariot as Achilles had dragged the dead Hector. It ought to be noted that this episode does not appear in Arrian, usually regarded as the most authentic historian of Alexander. Josephus relates that after he had taken Gaza, Alexander went up to Jerusalem, and saw Jaddua the high priest, who showed him the prophecy of Daniel concerning him. The fact that none of the classic historians take any notice of such a detour renders the narrative doubtful: still it contains no element of improbability that the pupil of Aristotle, in the pursuit of knowledge, might, during the prosecution of the siege of Gaza, with a small company press into the hill country of Judea, at once to secure the submission of Jerusalem which occupied a threatening position in regard to his communications, and to see something of that mysterious nation who worshipped one God and had no idols.

6. Founding of Alexandria and Visit to the Shrine of Jupiter Ammon:

When he entered Egypt, the whole country submitted without a struggle. Moved at once by the fact that Pharos is mentioned in the Odyssey, and that he could best rule Egypt from the seacoast, he founded Alexandria on the strip of land opposite Pharos, which separated Lake Mareotis from the Mediterranean. The island Pharos formed a natural breakwater which made possible a spacious double harbor; the lake, communicating with the Nile, opened the way for inland navigation. As usual with Alexander, romance and policy went hand in hand. The city thus founded became the capital of the Ptolemies, and the largest city of the Hellenistic world. He spent his time visiting shrines, in the intervals of arranging for the government of the country. The most memorable event of his stay in Egypt was his expedition to the oracle or Jupiter Ammon (Amen-Ra) where he was declared the son of the god. To the Egyptians this meant no more than that he was regarded a lawful monarch, but he pretended to take this declaration as assigning to him a Divine origin like so many Homeric heroes. Henceforward, there appeared on coins Alexander's head adorned with the ram's horn of Amen-Ra. This impressed the eastern imagination so deeply that Mohammed, a thousand years after, calls him in the Quran Iskander dhu al-qarnain, "Alexander the lord of the two horns." It is impossible to believe that the writer of Da could, in the face of the universal attribution of the two ram's horns to Alexander, represent Persia, the power he overthrew, as a two-horned ram (Da 8:3,20), unless he had written before the expedition into Egypt.

7. The Last Battle with Darius:

Having arranged the affairs of Egypt, Alexander set out for his last encounter with Darius. In vain had Darius sent to Alexander offering to share the empire with him; the "king of Javan" (Revised Version margin) "was moved with anger against him" (Da 8:7) and would have nothing but absolute submission. There was nothing left for Darius but to prepare for the final conflict. He collected a yet huger host than that he had had under him at Issus, and assembled it on the plain east of the Tigris. Alexander hastened to meet him. Although the plain around Gaugamela was much more suitable for the movements of the Persian troops, which consisted largely of cavalry, and gave them better opportunity of making use of their great numerical superiority to outflank the small Greek army, the result was the same as at Issus—overwhelming defeat and immense slaughter. The consequence of this victory was the submission of the greater portion of the Persian empire.

After making some arrangements for the government of the new provinces, Alexander set out in the pursuit of Darius, who had fled in the care or custody of Bessus, satrap of Bactria. Bessus, at last, to gain the favor of Alexander, or, failing that, to maintain a more successful resistance, murdered Darius. Alexander hurried on to the conquest of Bactria and Sogdiana, in the course of his expedition capturing Bessus and putting him to death. In imitation of Bacchus, he proceeded now to invade India. He conquered all before him till he reached the Sutlej; at this point his Macedonian veterans refused to follow him farther.

8. Close of His Life:

Thus compelled to give up hopes of conquests in the farther East, he returned to Babylon, which he purposed to make the supreme capital of his empire, and set himself, with all his superabundant energy, to organize his dominions, and fit Babylon for its new destiny. While engaged in this work he was seized with malaria, which, aggravated by his recklessness in eating and drinking, carried him off in his 33rd year.

9. His Influence:

Alexander is not to be estimated merely as a military conqueror. If he had been only this, he would have left no deeper impress on the world than Tamerlane or Attila. While he conquered Asia, he endeavored also to Hellenize her. He everywhere founded Greek cities that enjoyed at all events a municipal autonomy. With these, Hellenistic thought and the Hellenistic language were spread all over southwestern Asia, so that philosophers from the banks of the Euphrates taught in the schools of Athens. It was through the conquests of Alexander that Greek became the language of literature and commerce from the shores of the Mediterranean to the banks of the Tigris. It is impossible to estimate the effect of this spread of Greek on the promulgation of the gospel.

J. E. H. Thomson

ALEXANDRIA

al-eg-zan’-dri-a (he Alexandreia).

1. History:

In 331 BC, Alexander the Great, on his way to visit the Oracle of Amon seeking divine honors, stopped at the West extremity of the Delta at the isle of Pharos the landing-place of Odysseus (Od. iv.35) His keen eye noted the strategic possibilities of the site occupied by the little Egyptian village of Rhacotis, and his decision was immediate to erect here, where it would command the gateway to the richest domain of his empire, a glorious city to be called by his own name. Deinocrates, greatest living architect, already famous as builder of the Temple of Diana, was given free hand and like a dream the most beautiful city of the ancient or modern world (with the single exception of Rome) arose with straight, parallel streets—one at least 200 feet wide—with fortresses, monuments, palaces, government buildings and parks all erected according to a perfect artistic plan. The city was about fifteen miles in circumference (Pliny), and when looked at from above represented a Macedonian cloak, such as was worn by Alexander’s heroic ancestors. A colossal mole joined the island to the main land and made a double harbor, the best in all Egypt.

Before Alexander died (323 BC) the future of the city as the commercial metropolis of the world was assured and here the golden casket of the conqueror was placed in a fitting mausoleum. Under the protection of the first two Ptolemies and Euergetes Alexandria reached its highest prosperity, receiving through Lake Mareotis the products of Upper Egypt, reaching by the Great Sea all the wealth of the West, while through the Red Sea its merchant vessels brought all the treasures of India and Arabia into the Alexandria docks without once being unladen.

The manufactories of Alexandria were extensive, the greatest industry however being shipbuilding, the largest merchant ships of the world and battleships capable of carrying 1,000 men, which could hurl fire with fearful effect, being constructed here. This position of supremacy was maintained during the Roman domination up to the 5th century during which Alexandria began to decline. Yet even when Alexandria was captured by the Arabs (641) under the caliph Omar, the general could report: "I have taken a city containing 4,000 palaces and 4,000 baths and 400 theaters." They called it a "city of marble" and believed the colossal obelisks, standing on crabs of crystal, and the Pharos, that white stone tower 400 ft. high, "wonder of the world," to be the creation of jinn, not of men. With oriental exaggeration they declared that one amphitheater could easily hold a million spectators and that it was positively painful to go upon the streets at night because of the glare of light reflected from the white palaces. But with the coming of the Arabs Alexandria began to decline. It sank lower when Cairo became the capital (circa 1000 AD), and received its death blow when a sea route to India was discovered by way of the Cape of Good Hope (circa 1500).

Today the ancient Alexandria lies entirely under the sea or beneath some later construction. Only one important relic remains visible, the so-called Pompey’s Pillar which dates from the reign of Diocletian.

Excavations by the English (1895) and Germans (1898-99) have yielded few results, though Dr. G. Botti discovered the Serapeum and some immense catacombs, and only recently (1907) some fine sphinxes. In its most flourishing period the population numbered from 600,000 to 800,000, half of whom were perhaps slaves. At the close of the 18th century. it numbered no more than 7,000. Under the khedives it has recently gained something of its old importance and numbers now 320,000, of whom 46,000 are Europeans, chiefly Greeks (Baedeker, Handbook, 1902; Murray, Handbook, 1907).

2. The Jews in Alexandria:

Among the private papers of Alexander it is said a sketch was found outlining his vast plan of making a Greek empire which should include all races as harmonious units. In accordance with this, Europeans, Asiatics and Africans found in Alexandria a common citizenship. Indeed in several cities, under the Ptolemies, who accepted this policy, foreigners were even given superiority to natives. Egyptians and Greeks were conciliated by the introduction of a syncretic religion in which the greatest Greek god was worshipped as Osiris, Egyptian god of the underworld, whose soul appeared visibly in the form of the Apis bull.

This was the most popular and human form of the Egyptian worship. This new religion obtained phenomenal success. It was in furtherance of this general policy that the Jews in Alexandria were given special privileges, and though probably not possessing full civic rights, yet they "occupied in Alexandria a more Influential position than anywhere else in the ancient world" (Jewish Encyclopedia). To avoid unnecessary friction a separate district was given to the Jews, another to the Greeks and another to the native Egyptians. In the Greek section were situated the palaces of the Ptolemies, the Library and Museum. In the Egyptian district was the temple dedicated to Serapis (Osiris-Apis) which was only excelled in grandeur by the capitol at Rome. The Jews possessed many synagogues in their own district and in Philo’s day these were not confined to any one section of the city. Some synagogues seem to have exercised the right of asylum, the same as heathen temples. One of these was so large that the chazan signaled by a flag when the congregation should give the Amen! Each district had a practically independent political government.

The Jews were at first ruled by a Hebrew ethnarch. By the days of Augustus a Council of Elders (gerusia) had control, presided over by 71 archons. Because of their wealth, education and social position they reached high public office. Under Ptol. VI and Cleopatra the two generals-in-chief of the royal army were Jews. Ptol. I had 30,000 Jewish soldiers, in his army, whose barracks have only recently been discovered. It may have been a good thing that the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (2nd century BC) checked Jewish Hellenization. During the Roman supremacy the rights of the Jews were maintained, except during their persecution for a brief period by the insane Caligula, and the control of the most important industries, including the corn trade, came into their hands.

When Christianity became the state religion of Egypt the Jews at once began to be persecuted. The victory of Heraclius over the Persians (629 AD) was followed by such a massacre of the Jews that the Coptics of Egypt still denominate the first week in Lent as the "Fast of Heraclius." Wisdom and many

other influential writings of the Jews originated in Alexandria. Doubtless numbers of the recently discovered documents from the Cairo genizah came originally from Alexandria. But the epochal importance of Alexandria is found in the teaching which prepared the Hebrew people for the reception of a gospel for the whole world, which was soon to be preached by Hebrews from Hellenized Galilee.

3. Alexandria’s Influence on the Bible:

(1) In Da 11 the Ptolomies of Alexandria and their wives are made a theme of prophecy. Apollos, the "orator," was born in Alexandria (Ac 18:24). Luke twice speaks of himself and Paul sailing in "a ship of Alexandria" (Ac 27:6; 28:11). Stephen ‘disputed’ in Jerusalem in the synagogue of the Alexandrians (Ac 6:9). These direct references are few, but the influence of Alexandria on the Bible was inestimable.

(2) The Septuagint, translated in Alexandria (3rd to 2nd centuries BC), preserves a Hebrew text 1,000 years older than any now known. This translation if not used by Jesus was certainly used by Paul and other New Testament writers, as shown by their quotations. It is Egyptian even in trifles. This Greek Bible not only opened for the first time the "Divine Oracles" to the Gentiles and thus gave to the Old Testament an international influence, but it affected most vitally the Hebrew and Christian development.

(3) The Alexandrinus Codex (4th to 5th centuries) was the first of all the great uncials to come into the hands of modern scholars. It was obtained in Alexandria and sent as a present to the king of England (1628) by Cyrellus Lucaris, the Patriarch of Constantinople. The Sinaiticus and Vaticanus uncials with many other most important Bible manuscripts—Hebrew, Greek, Coptic and Syriac—came from Alexandria.

(4) John and several other New Testament writings have justly been regarded as showing the influence of this philosophic city. Neither the phraseology nor conceptions of the Fourth Gospel could have been grasped in a world which Alexandria had not taught. Pfleiderer’s statement that He "may be termed the most finished treatise of the Alexandria philosophy" may be doubted, but no one can doubt the fact of Alexandrian influence on the New Testament.

4. Influence of Alexandria on Culture:

With the founding of the University of Alexandria began the "third great epoch in the history of civilization" (Max Muller). It was modeled after the great school of Athens, but excelled, being preeminently the "university of progress" (Mahaffy). Here for the first time is seen a school of science and literature, adequately endowed and offering large facilities for definite original research. The famous library which at different eras was reported as possessing from 400,000 to 900,000 books and rolls—the rolls being as precious as the books—was a magnificent edifice connected by marble colonnades with the Museum, the "Temple of the Muses." An observatory, an anatomical laboratory and large botanical and Zoological gardens were available. Celebrated scholars, members of the various faculties, were domiciled within the halls of the Museum and received stipends or salaries from the government.

The study of mathematics, astronomy, poetry and medicine was especially favored (even vivisection upon criminals being common); Alexandrian architects were sought the world over; Alexandrian inventors were almost equally famous; the influence of Alexandrian art can still be marked in Pompeii and an Alexandrian painter was a hated rival of Apelles. Here Euclid wrote his Elements of Geometry; here Archimedes, "that greatest mathematical and inventive genius of antiquity," made his spectacular discoveries in hydrostatics and hydraulics; here Eratosthenes calculated the size of the earth and made his other memorable discoveries; while Ptolemy studied here for 40 years and published an explanation of the stellar universe which was accepted by scientists for 14 centuries, and established mathematical theories which are yet the basis of trigonometry. "Ever since this epoch the conceptions of the sphericity of the earth, its poles, axis, the equator, the arctic and antarctic circles, the equinoctial points, the solstices, the inequality of climate on the earth's surface, have been current notions among scientists. The mechanism of the lunar phases was perfectly understood, and careful though not wholly successful calculations were made of inter-sidereal distances. On the other hand literature and art flourished under the careful protection of the court. Literature and its history, philology and criticism became sciences" (Alexandria Weber).

It may be claimed that in literature no special originality was displayed though the earliest "love storms" and pastoral poetry date from this period (Mahaffy); yet the literature of the Augustan Age cannot be understood "without due appreciation of the character of the Alexandrian school" (EB, 11th ed.), while in editing texts and in copying and translating manuscripts inconceivable patience and erudition were displayed. Our authorized texts of Homer and other classic writers come from Alexandria not from Athens. All famous books brought into Egypt were sent to the library to be copied.

The statement of Josephus that Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247) requested the Jews to translate the Old Testament into Greek is not incredible. It was in accordance with the custom of that era. Ptol. Euergetes is said to have sent to Athens for the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, etc., and when these were transcribed, sent back beautiful copies to Greece and kept the originals! No library in the world except the prophetic library in Jerusalem was ever as valuable as the two Alexandrian libraries. The story that the Arabs burned it in the 7th century is discredited and seemingly disproved (Butler). At any rate, after this period we hear of great private libraries in Alexandria, but the greatest literary wonder of the world has disappeared.

5. Influence on Philosophy:

Though no department of philosophy was established in the Museum, nevertheless from the 3rd century BC to the 6th century AD it was the center of gravity in the philosophic world. Here Neo-Pythagoreanism arose. Here Neo- Platonism, that contemplative and mystical reaction against the materialism of the Stoics, reached its full flower. It is difficult to overestimate the influence of the latter upon religious thought. In it the profoundest Aryan speculations were blended with the sublimest Semitic concepts. Plato was numbered among the prophets. Greece here acknowledged the Divine Unity to which the Old Testament was pledged. Here the Jew acknowledged that Athens as truly as Jerusalem had taught a vision of God. This was the first attempt to form a universal religion.

The Alexandrian philosophy was the Elijah to prepare the way for a Saviour of the world. The thought of both Sadducee and Pharisee was affected by it and much late pre-Christian Jewish literature is saturated with it. Neo- Platonism drew attention to the true relation between matter and spirit, good and evil, finite and infinite; it showed the depth of antagonism between the natural and spiritual, the real and ideal; it proclaimed the necessity of some mystic union between the human and the Divine. It stated but could not solve the problem. Its last word was escape, not reconciliation (Ed. Caird). Neo-Platonism was the "germ out of which Christian theology sprang" (Caird) though later it became an adverse force. Notwithstanding its dangerous teaching concerning evil, it was on the whole favorable to piety, being the forerunner of mysticism and sympathetic with the deepest, purest elements Of a spiritual religion.

6. Christian Church in Alexandria:

According to all tradition, Mark the evangelist, carried the gospel to Alexandria, and his body rested here until removed to Venice, 828 AD. From this city Christianity reached all Egypt and entered Nubia, Ethiopia and Abyssinia. During the 4th century, ten councils were held in Alexandria, it being theological and ecclesiastical center of Christendom. The first serious persecution of Christians by heathen occurred here under Decius (251) and was followed by many others, the one under Diocletian (303-11) being so savage that the native Coptic church still dates its era from it. When the Christians reached political power they used the same methods of controversy, wrecking the Caesarion in 366 and the Serapeum twenty-five years later. Serapis (Osiris-Apis) was the best beloved of all the native deities. His temple was built of most precious marbles and filled with priceless sculptures, while in its cloisters was a library second only to the Great Library of the Museum. When Christianity became the state religion of Egypt the native philosophers, moved by patriotism, rallied to the support of Serapis. But Theodosius (391) prohibited idolatry, and led by the bishop, the Serapeum was seized, and smitten by a soldier’s battle-axe, the image—which probably represented the old heathen religion at its best—was broken to pieces, and dragged through the streets.

That day, as Steindorff well puts it, "Egyp paganism received its death blow; the Egyptian religion fell to pieces" (History of Egypt). Thereafter heathen worship hid itself in the dens and caves of the earth. Even secret allegiance to Serapis brought persecution and sometimes death. The most appalling tragedy of this kind occurred in 415 when Hypatia, the virgin philosopher, celebrated equally for beauty, virtue and learning, was dragged by a mob to the cathedral, stripped, and torn to pieces before the altar. Some of the greatest Christian leaders used all their influence against such atrocities, but the Egyptian Christians were always noted for their excitability. They killed heretics easily, but they would themselves be killed rather than renounce the very slightest and most intangible theological tenet. It only needed the change of a word e.g. in the customary version to raise a riot (Expos, VII, 75).

Some curious relics of the early Egyptian church have very recently come to light. The oldest autographic Christian letter known (3rd century) proves that at that time the church was used as a bank, and its ecclesiastics (who, whether priests or bishops, were called "popes") were expected to help the country merchants in their dealings with the Roman markets. Some sixty letters of the 4th century written to a Christian cavalry officer in the Egyptian army are also preserved, while papyri and ostraca

from circa 600 AD show that at this time no deacon could be ordained without having first learned by heart as much as an entire Gospel or 25 Psalms and two epistles of Paul, while a letter from a bishop of this period is filled with Scripture, as he anathematizes the "oppressor of the poor," who is likened unto him who spat in the face of our Lord on the cross and smote Him on the head (Adolph Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, etc., 1910). Oppression of Jews and heretics was not, however, forbidden and during the 5th and 6th centuries. Egypt was a battle-field in which each sect persecuted every other.

Even when the Arabs under the caliph Omar captured the city on Good Friday (641), Easter Day was spent by the orthodox in torturing supposed heretics! The next morning the city was evacuated and Jews and Coptics received better treatment from the Arabs than they had from the Roman or Greek ecclesiastics. After the Arab conquest the Coptic church, being released from persecution, prospered and gained many converts even from the Mohammedans.

But the Saracenic civilization and religion steadily displaced the old, and the native learning and native religion soon disappeared into the desert. By the 8th century, Arabic had taken the place of Greek and Coptic, not only in public documents but in common speech. Then for 1,000 years the Egyptian church remained without perceptible influence on culture or theology. But its early influence was immeasurable and can still be marked in Christian art, architecture and ritual as well as in philosophy and theology. Perhaps its most visible influence was in the encouragement of image-reverence and asceticism. It is suggestive that the first hermit (Anthony) was a native Egyptian, and the first founder of a convent (Pachomius) was a converted Egyptian (heathen) monk. Today Alexandria has again become a Christian metropolis containing Coptics, Romans, Greeks, Armenians, Maronites, Syrians, Chaldeans and Protestants. The Protestants are represented by the Anglican church, the Scotch Free church, the evangelical church of Germany and the United Presbyterian church of the U.S. (For minute divisions see Catholic Encyclopedia)

7. Catechetical School in Alexandria:

The first theological school of Christendom was founded in Alexandria. It was probably modeled after earlier Gnostic schools established for the study of religious philosophy. It offered a three years' course. There were no fees, the lecturers being supported by gifts from rich students. Pantaenus, a converted Stoic philosopher, was its first head (180). He was followed by Clement (202) and by Origen (232) under whom the school reached its zenith. It always stood for the philosophical vindication of Christianity. Among its greatest writers were Julius Africanus (215), Dionysius (265), Gregory (270), Eusebius (315), Athanasius (373) and Didymus (347), but Origen (185-254) was its chief glory; to him belongs the honor of defeating paganism and Gnosticism with their own weapons; he gave to the church a "scientific consciousness," his threefold interpretation of Scripture affected Biblical exegesis clear down to the last century.

Arius was a catechist in this institution, and Athanasius, the "father of orthodoxy" and "theological center of the Nicene age" (Schaff), though not officially connected with the catechetical school was greatly affected by it, having been bred and trained in Alexandria. The school was closed toward the end

of the 4th century because of theological disturbances in Egypt, but its work was continued from Caesarea and other centers, affecting profoundly Western teachers like Jerome and Ambrose, and completely dominating Eastern thought. From the first there was a mystical and Docetic tendency visible, while its views of inspiration and methods of interpretation, including its constant assumption of a secret doctrine for the qualified initiate, came legitimately from Neo-Platonism. For several centuries after the school disbanded its tenets were combated by the "school of Antioch," but by the 8th century the Alexandrian theology was accepted by the whole Christian world, east and west.

LITERATURE.

Besides works mentioned in the text see especially: Petrie, History of Egypt (1899), V, VI, Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies (1895), Progress of Hellenism (1905); Butler, Arab Conquest of Egypt (1902); Ernst Sieglin, Ausgrabungen in Alexandrien (1908); Harnack, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte (1895-1900), and in New Sch-Herz (1910); Inge, Alexandrian Theology in Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics (1908); Ed. Caird, Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophers (1904); Pfleiderer, Philosophy and Development of Religion (1894); Schaff, History of Christian Church (1884-1910); Zogheb, Etudes sur l’ancienne Alexandrie (1909).

Camden M. Cobern

ALEXANDRIANS

al-eg-zan’-dri-ans (Alexandreis): Jews of Alexandria, who had, with the Libertines and Cyrenians, a synagogue in Jerusalem. They were among those who disputed with Stephen (Ac 6:9).

ALIAH

a-li’-a (‘alyah): One of the dukes, or heads of thousands of Edom (1Ch 1:51). In Ge 36:40 the name is Alvah (‘alwah), the only difference being the change of the weaker w, of Ge to the somewhat stronger, y, of the later Chronicles, a change which is not infrequent in Hebrew. He is not to be confused, as in HDB, with the Alian of the same chapter.

ALIAN

a-li’-an (‘alyan): A descendant of Esau, and son of Shobal (1Ch 1:40). In the corresponding earlier genealogy (Ge 36:23) the same person is given as Alvan (‘alwan), the change of the third consonant being a simple one, common to Hebrew, occurring similarly in Aliah (which see). Alian is not to be identified with Aliah, since the groups of names in which these occur are quite different, and the context in each case is not the same.

ALIEN

al’-yen: Found in the King James Version for ger, (Ex 18:3) =" guest," hence: "foreigner," "sojourner" the Revised Version (British and American); also for nekhar (Isa 61:5) =" foreign," "a foreigner" the Revised Version (British and American) (concrete), "heathendom" (abstract), "alien," "strange" (-er), and for nokhri (De 14:21 the Revised Version (British and American) "foreigner"; compare Job 19:15; Ps 69:8; La 5:2)—"strange," in a variety of degrees and meanings: "foreign," "non-relative," "adulterous," "different," "wonderful," "alien," "outlandish," "strange." In the New Testament we find apellotriomenos (Eph 4:18; Col 1:21) =" being alienated," and allotrios (Heb 11:34) =" another’s," "not one’s own," hence: "foreign," "not akin," "hostile." In the Old Testament the expression was taken in its literal sense, referring to those who were not Israelites—the heathen; in the New Testament it is given a figurative meaning, as indicating those who have not become naturalized in the kingdom of God, hence are outside of Christ and the blessing of the gospel.

Frank E. Hirsch

ALIENATE

al’-yen-at (‘abhar; apallotrioo, "to estrange from"): In Old Testament, for the break between husband and wife caused by unfaithfulness to the marriage vow (Jer 6:8; Eze 23:17); also applied to the diversion of property (Eze 48:14). In New Testament, spiritually, for the turning of the soul from God (Eph 2:12; Col 1:21). The Greek allotrios, which is the root of the verb, is the opposite of id-i-os, "one’s own." The word implies a former state, whence the person or thing has departed, and that, generally, by deterioration.

ALIVE

a-liv’ (chai, "living"; zao, "to live," anazao, "to live again"): These Hebrew and Greek originals are the chief terms for life in both Testaments. They cover all life, including soul and spirit, although primarily referring to physical vitality. Striking examples may be cited: "Is your father yet alive?" (Ge 43:7); "To whom he also showed himself alive" (Ac 1:3). Often used of God: "the living God" (Jos 3:10); also of the resurrection life: "In Christ shall all be made alive" (1Co 15:22); of the soul’s regenerate life: "Reckon .... yourselves .... alive unto God," "as those that are alive from the dead" (Ro 6:11:13 the King James Version). The term is vital with the creative energy of God; the healing, redemptive, resurrection life of Christ; the renewing and recreative power of the Holy Spirit. Dwight M. Pratt

ALL

ol: Used in various combinations, and with different meanings.

(1) All along, "Weeping all along as he went" (Jer 41:6), i.e. throughout the whole way he went, feigning equal concern with the men from Shiloh, etc., for the destruction of the Temple, so as to put them off their guard.

(2) All in all, "That God may be all in all" (1Co 15:28, Greek: panta en pasin, "all things in all (persons and) things"). "The universe, with all it comprises, will wholly answer to God’s will and reflect His mind" (Dummelow).

(3) All one, "It is all one" (Job 9:22), "it makes no difference whether I live or die."

(4) At all, "If thy father miss me at all" (1Sa 20:6), "in any way," "in the least."

(5) All to, "All to brake his skull" (Jud 9:53 the King James Version) an obsolete form signifying "altogether"; "broke his skull in pieces."

(6) Often used indefinitely of a large number or a great part, "All the cattle of Egypt died" (Ex 9:6; compare Ex 9:19,25); "all Judea, and all the region round about" (Mt 3:5); "that all the world should be enrolled" (Lu 2:1); "all Asia and the world" (Ac 19:27); "All (people) verily held John to be a prophet" (Mr 11:32).

M. O. Evans

ALLAMMELECH

a-lam’-e-lek (’allammelekh, "oak of a king"): A town in the tribe of Asher, the location of which is not known (Jos 19:26; the King James Version Alammelech).

ALLAR

al’-ar (the King James Version, Aalar; Aalar): Occurring once (1 Esdras 5:36) and used apparently to indicate a place from which certain Jews came on the return from captivity, who could not prove their lineage, and were excluded for this reason from the privileges of the priesthood. HDB identifies with Immer of Ezr 2:59 and Ne 7:61 (which see), but this is not at all certain.

ALLAY

a-la’ (heniach, "to cause to rest," "soothe": "Gentleness allayeth (lit., "pacifieth") great offenses" (Ec 10:4)): The word is applied to what "excites, disturbs and makes uneasy" (Smith, Synonyms Discriminated, 106).

ALLEGE

a-lej’ ("paratithemi," "to set forth," Ac 17:3): It is not used in the English Bible in its more modern and usual sense, "to assert," but is about equivalent to "to prove."

ALLEGIANCE

a-le’-jans (mishmereth, "a charge," from shamar, "to keep," 1Ch 12:29): the Revised Version, margin gives as literal meaning, "kept the charge of the house of Saul," which revisers consider figurative for "maintaining their loyalty and fidelity," i.e. "allegiance."

ALLEGORY

al’-e-go-ri: The term allegory, being derived from allo agoreuein, signifying to say something different from what the words themselves imply, can etymologically be applied to any figurative form of expression of thought. In actual usage in theology, the term is employed in a restricted sense, being used however in three ways, namely, rhetorically, hermeneutically and homiletically. In the first-mentioned sense it is the ordinary allegory of rhetoric, which is usually defined as an extended or continued metaphor, this extension expanding from two or more statements to a whole volume, like Bunyan’s Pilgrim’s Progress. Allegories of this character abound in the Scriptures, both in Old Testament and in New Testament. Instructive examples of this kind are found in Ps 80:8-19; Ec 12:3-7; Joh 10:1-16; Eph 6:11-17. According to traditional interpretation of both the Jewish exegesis and of the Catholic and Protestant churches the entire book of Canticles is such an allegory. The subject is discussed in full in Terry’s Biblical Hermeneutics, etc., chapter vii, 214-38.

In the history of Biblical exegesis allegory represents a distinct type of interpretation, dating back to pre-Christian times, practiced particularly by the Alexandrian Jews, and adopted by the early Church Fathers and still practiced and defended by the Roman Catholic church. This method insists that the literal sense, particularly of historical passages, does not exhaust the divinely purposed meaning of such passages, but that these latter also include a deeper and higher spiritual and mystical sense. The fourfold sense ascribed to the Scriptures finds its expression in the well-known saying: Littera gesta docet; quid credas, allegorica; moralis, quid agas, quid speres, anagogica ("The letter shows things done; what you are to believe, the allegoric; what you are to do, the moral; what you are to hope, the anagogic"), according to which the allegorical is the hidden dogmatical meaning to be found in every passage.

Cremer, in his Biblico-Theological New Testament Lexicon, shows that this method of finding a hidden thought behind the simple statement of a passage, although practiced so extensively on the Jewish side by Aristobulus and especially Philo, is not of Jewish origin, but was, particularly by the latter, taken from the Alexandrian Greeks (who before this had interpreted Greek mythology as the expression of higher religious conceptions) and applied to a deeper explanation of Old Testament historical data, together with its theophanies, anthropomorphisms, anthropopathies, and the like, which in their plain meaning were regarded as unworthy of a place in the Divine revelation of the Scriptures. Such allegorizing became the common custom of the early Christian church, although not practiced to the same extent in all sections, the Syrian church exhibiting the greatest degree of sobriety in this respect. In this only Jewish precedent was followed; the paraphrases commonly known as the Targum, the Midrash, and later in its most extreme form in the Kabbalah, all showed this mark of eisegesis instead of exegesis.

This whole false hermeneutical principle and its application originated doubtless in an unhistorical conception of what the Scriptures are and how they originated. It is characteristic of the New Testament, and one of the evidences of its inspiration, that in the entire Biblical literature of that age, both Jewish and Christian, it is the only book that does not practice allegorizing but abides by the principle of the literal interpretation. Nor is Paul's exegesis in Ga 4:21-31 an application of false allegorical methods. Here in Ga 4:24 the term allegoroumena need not be taken in the technical sense as expressive of a method of interpretation, but merely as a paraphrase of the preceding thought; or, if taken technically, the whole can be regarded as an argumentum ad hominem, a way of demonstration found also elsewhere in Paul's writings.

The Protestant church, beginning with Luther, has at all times rejected this allegorizing and adhered to the safe and sane principle, practiced by Christ and the entire New Testament, namely, Sensum ne inferas, sed efferas ("Do not carry a meaning into (the Scriptures) but draw it out of (the Scriptures)"). It is true that the older Protestant theology still adheres to a sensus mysticus in the Scriptures, but by this it means those passages in which the sense is conveyed not per verba (through words), but per res verbis descriptas ("through things described by means of words"), as e.g. in the parable and the type.

In homiletics allegorizing is applied to the method which draws spiritual truths from common historical statements, as e.g. when the healing of a leper by Christ is made the basis of an exposition of the healing of the soul by the Saviour. Naturally this is not interpretation in the exegetical sense.

G. H. Schodde

ALLELUIA

al-e-loo'-ya. See HALLELUJAH.

ALLEMETH

al'-e-meth ('allemeth, "concealment"; the King James Version Alemeth, 1Ch 6:60): Name of a town in tribe of Benjamin, near Anathoth, one of the cities given to the sons of Aaron, the same as Almon of Jos 21:18. The the King James Version ALEMETH (which see) is based upon the Hebrew reading 'alemeth. Its site is the modern Almit, a village a short distance Northeast of Anathoth.

ALLIANCE

a-li'-ans. 1. In the Patriarchal Stories:

Frequent references are made to alliances between the patriarchs and foreigners. Abraham is reported to have had "confederates" among the chiefs of the Canaanites (Ge 14:13). He also allied with Abimelech, king of Gerar (Ge 21:22-34). Isaac's alliance with Abimelech (Ge 26:26-34), which is offered as an

explanation of the name Beer-sheba (Ge 26:33), appears to be a variant of the record of alliance between Abraham and Abimelech. Jacob formed an alliance with Laban, the Syrian (Ge 31:44-54), by which Gilead was established as a boundary line between Israel and Aramaic. These treaties refer, in all probability, to the early period of Israel's history, and throw a good deal of light upon the relation between Israel and the Philistines and the Syrians immediately after the conquest of Canaan.

2. In Pre-Canaanitic History:

The only reference to an alliance between Israel and foreign people prior to the conquest of Canaan, that might be regarded as historical, is that made between Israel and the Kenite tribes at the foot of Sinai, the precise nature of which, however, is not very clearly indicated. Such alliances led to intermarriages between the members of the allied tribes. Thus Moses married a Kenite woman (Jud 1:16; 4:11). The patriarchal marriages refer to the existing conditions after the conquest. Possibly one more alliance belonging to that period is that between Israel and Moab (Nu 25:1-3). According to the narrative, Israel became attached to the daughters of Moab, at Shittim, and was led astray after Baal-peor. Its historicity is proven from the prophetic allusions to this event (compare Ho 9:10; Mic 6:5).

3. During the Conquest:

The invading hordes of Israel met with strong opposition on the part of the natives of Palestine (Jud 1:21,27-36). In time, alliances were formed with some of them, which generally led, as might be expected, to considerable trouble. One concrete illustration is preserved in the story of the Gibeonites (Jos 9$). Intermarriages were frequent. The tribe of Judah thus became consolidated through the alliance and the amalgamation with the Kenites and Calebites (Jud 1:10-16). These relations between Israel and the Canaanites threatened the preservation of Yahwism.

4. The Monarchy:

Prohibitory measures were adopted in the legal codes with a view to Jewish separateness and purity (Ex 23:32; 34:12,15; De 7:2; compare Jud 2:2,3; Le 18:3,4; 20:22 f).

But at a very early date in the history of the Jewish kingdom the official heads of the people formed such alliances and intermarried. David became an ally to Achish of Gath (1Sa 27:2-12) and later on with Abner, which led to the consolidation of Judah and Israel into one kingdom (2Sa 3:17-21; 5:1-3). It appears likewise that Toi, king of Hamath, formed an alliance with David (2Sa 9:10) and that Hiram of Tyre was his ally (1Ki 5:12 a). Alliances wrath foreign nations became essential to the progress of trade and commerce during the reign of Solomon. Two of his treaties are recorded: one with Hiram of Tyre (1Ki 5:12-18; 9:11-14) and one with Pharaoh, king of Egypt (1Ki 9:16).

5. The Divided Kingdom:

After the disruption, Shishak of Egypt invaded Judea, and probably also Israel. This meant an abrogation

of the treaty existing between Israel and Egypt during the reign of Solomon. In consequence of the war between the two kingdoms, Asa formed an alliance with Benhadad of Syria (1Ki 15:18-20). Later on Ahab sought an alliance with Ben-hadad (1Ki 20:31-34). Friendly relations ensued between Israel and Judah, during the reign of Jehoshaphat, which continued to the close of the dynasty of Omri (1Ki 22:2-4,50; 2Ki 3:7). With the accession of Jehu, hostilities were resumed. In the Syro-Ephraimitic war, Israel was allied with Syria, and Judah with Assyria (2Ki 16:6-9; Isa 7). This opened the way to the Assyrian power into both kingdoms. Relief against Assyria was sought in Egypt; Hoshea rebelled against Shalmaneser, and allied with So (Sevechus, the Shabaka of the 25th Dynasty) and thus brought about the fall of Samaria.

6. The Kingdom of Judah:

Hezekiah likewise sought an alliance with So, but derived no assistance from him. He is recorded to have formed friendly relations with Berodach-baladan of Babylon (2Ki 20:12-18). These alliances resulted in the introduction of foreign cults into Jerusalem (2Ki 16:10,11). During the reign of Manasseh, Yahwism was seriously threatened by foreign religious practices (2Ki 21:2-9). The protesting spirit against the prevailing conditions found expression in the Deuteronomic code, which emphasizes the national policy. Josiah fought against Pharaoh- necoh as an ally of Assyria (2Ki 23:29). Jehoahaz continued the Assyrian alliance and was dethroned in consequence by Pharaoh-necoh (2Ki 23:33). Jehoiakin was disposed to be friendly with Egypt, and even after his subjection to Nebuchadnezzar, he remained loyal to the Pharaoh (2Ki 23:35). Zedekiah came to the throne as an ally of Babylon. When he broke this alliance, the destruction of Jerusalem resulted (2Ki 25).

7. In Post-exilic Times:

Judas Maccabeus sought an alliance with the Romans (1 Macc 8; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6) which was renewed by Jonathan (1 Macc 12:1; Ant, XIII, v, 8) and by Simon (1 Macc 15:17; Ant, XIII, vii, 3). Treaties were concluded with the Spartans (1 Macc 12:2; 14:20; Ant, XII, iv, 10; XIII, v, 8). The Roman alliance was again renewed by Hyrcanus about 128 BC (Ant., XIII, ix, 2). This alliance proved to be of fatal consequence to the independence of the Jews (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; and xiv, 5). For the rites connected with the formation of the earlier alliances, see COVENANT.

Samuel Cohon

ALLIED

a-lid’ (qarobh, "near," as in Ge 45:10; Ex 13:17, etc.): Ne 13:4 refers either to family ties, as in Ru 2:20, or to intimate association.

ALLOM

al’-om (Allon): the Revised Version (British and American) ALLON (which see): One of the families of

the "servants of Solomon," whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon in the First Return, 537 BC (APC 1Esdras 5:34). The name is not found in the parallel lists of Ezra and Nehemiah, although some have tried to identify with the last name of each list, Ami of Ezr 2:57, and Amon of Ne 7:59. This is not probable.

ALLON

al’-on (’allon, "oak"):

(1) A town in the tribe of Naphtali in northern Palestine (Jos 19:33), according to the King James Version, which follows some Hebrew texts. It is better however to read with the Revised Version (British and American), "oak" (’elon), rather than as proper noun.

(2) A prominent descendant of the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:37).

(3) the Revised Version (British and American) for Allom of the King James Version in 1 Esdras 5:34 (which see).

ALLON-BACUTH

al’-on-ba’-kuth (’allon bakhuth; the King James Version transliterates Allon-bachuth, al-on-bak’uth, "oak of weeping"): The burial place of Deborah, the nurse of Rebekah (Ge 35:8); it appears from the narrative that she made her home with Jacob, who had returned from Paddan-aram, and was sojourning at the time at Bethel, in the vicinity of which was the "oak of weeping," under which she was buried.

ALLOW; ALLOWANCE

a-lou’, a-lou’-ans: The verb "to allow" is used in the King James Version to translate four different Greek words:

(1) suneudokeo, "to approve together" (with others) (the Revised Version (British and American) "consent unto"), Lu 11:48.

(2) prosdechomai, "to receive to oneself," "admit" (the Revised Version (British and American) "look for," margin "accept"); Ac 24:15.

(3) ginosko, "to know," "recognize": "That which I do, I allow not" (the Revised Version (British and American) "I know not"), i.e. "I do not understand what I am doing, my conduct is inexplicable to me" (Grimm-Thayer); Ro 7:15.

(4) dokimazo, "to prove," "approve." "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in the thing which he

alloweth" (the Revised Version (British and American) "approveth," i.e. in practice), i.e. who is not troubled with scruples; Ro 14:22. Thus the Revised Version (British and American) has removed the verb "allow" in each case in which it occurs in the King James Version, it being somewhat ambiguous in meaning (its original sense, as derived from Latin allocare, "to place," "assign," "grant," being influenced by another word, Latin allaudare, "to praise"). The noun "allowance" occurs in the sense of quantity of food allowed, in 2Ki 25:30 (King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) and the parallel passage Jer 52:34 (RV; "diet" in the King James Version).

D. Miall Edwards

ALLOY

a-loi’ (bedhil): In Isa 1:25 the Revised Version, margin; translated "tin" in the text. Elsewhere in both versions bedhil is translated TIN (which see).

ALLURE

a-lur’ (pathah, "to persuade," "woo," "entice"; deleazo, "to entrap," "lay a bait"):

(1) "I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness" (Ho 2:14), with evident reference to the Assyrian invasion and the devastation of the land, followed up by the Exile. Thus would Yahweh entice Israel to repent by gentle punishment; then would follow her restoration and the outpouring of His love (Ho 2:14 ff).

(2) "They allure through the lusts of the flesh" (2Pe 2:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "entice"). Wicked men allure to destruction; God (as above) allures to punishment, repentance and restoration.

M. O. Evans

ALMIGHTY

ol-mit’-i:

(1) (shaddai (Ge 17:1)): Found in the Old Testament forty-eight times, most of these in the Book of Job; it occurs either alone or in combination with ‘el, "God"). The root meaning is uncertain.

(2) (pantokrator), the exclusive translation of this Greek word in the New Testament, found principally in Re (nine times), once besides (2Co 6:18). Its occurrence in the Apocrypha is frequent. See GOD, NAMES OF.

ALMODAD

al-mo’-dad (’almodhadh, "the beloved," or, "God is beloved"): The first mentioned of the thirteen sons of Joktan (Ge 10:25-29; 1Ch 1:19-23). A south Arabian name, and pointing to a south Arabian tribe. See ABIMAEL.

ALMON

al’-mon (‘almon, "hidden"): A Levitical city in the tribe of Benjamin (Jos 21:18), the same as "Allemeth" the Revised Version (British and American), "Alemeth" the King James Version, of 1Ch 6:60 (which see).

ALMON-DIBLATHAIM

al’-mon-dib-la-tha’-im (‘almon dibhlathayim, "Almon of the double cake of figs"): A station in the wilderness journeyings of the Israelites, located in Moab between Diban-gad and the mountains of Abarim (Nu 33:46,47). It was near the end of the forty years’ wanderings. The name was probably given because the location was like two lumps of pressed figs. In both occurrences the word has the accusative ending of direction, and should properly be read: "Almon toward Diblathaim." It was probably the same place as Beth-diblathaim of Jer 48:22, mentioned in the prophet’s oracle against Moab.

ALMOND

a’-mund: (1) shaqedh, Ge 43:11; Nu 17:8, etc. The word shaked comes from a Hebrew root meaning to "watch" or "wait." In Jer 1:11,12 there is a play on the word, "And I said, I see a rod of an almond-tree (shaqedh). Then said Yahweh unto me, Thou hast well seen: for I will watch (shoqedh) over my word to perform it." (2) luz; the King James Version hazel, Ge 30:37; lauz is the modern Arabic name for "almond"—Luz was the old name of BETHEL (which see).

1. Almond Tree:

The almond tree is mentioned in Ec 12:5, where in the description of old age it says "the almond-tree shall blossom." The reference is probably to the white hair of age. An almond tree in full bloom upon a distant hillside has a certain likeness to a head of white hair.

2. A Rod of Almond:

A rod of almond is referred to Ge 30:37, where "Jacob took him rods of fresh poplar, and of the almond (luz) and of the plane-tree; and peeled white streaks in them" as a means of securing "ring-streaked, speckled, and spotted" lambs and goats—a proceeding founded doubtless upon some ancient folklore. Aaron’s rod that budded (Nu 17:2,3) was an almond rod. Also see Jer 1:11 referred to above.

3. The Blossoms:

The blossoms of the almond are mentioned Ex 25:33 f; 37:19 f, etc. "Cups made like almond-blossoms in one branch, a knop (i.e. knob) and a flower," is the description given of parts of the sacred candlesticks. It is doubtful exactly what was intended—the most probable is, as Dillmann has suggested, that the cup was modeled after the calyx of the almond flower. See CANDLESTICK.

4. The Fruit:

Israel directed his sons (Ge 43:11) to carry almonds as part of their present to Joseph in Egypt. Palestine is a land where the almond flourishes, whereas in Egypt it would appear to have been uncommon. Almonds are today esteemed a delicacy; they are eaten salted or beaten into a pulp with sugar like the familiar German Marzipan.

The almond is Amygdalus communis (N.O. Rosaceae), a tree very similar to the peach. The common variety grows to the height of 25 feet and produces an abundant blossom which appears before the leaves; In Palestine this is fully out at the end of January or beginning of February; it is the harbinger of spring. This early blossoming is supposed to be the origin of the name shaqedh which contains the idea of "early." The masses of almond trees in full bloom in some parts of Palestine make a very beautiful and striking sight. The bloom of some varieties is almost pure white, from a little distance, in other parts the delicate pink, always present at the inner part of the petals, is diffused enough to give a pink blush to the whole blossom. The fruit is a drupe with a dry fibrous or woody husk which splits into two halves as the fruit ripens. The common wild variety grows a kernel which is bitter from the presence of a substance called amygdalon, which yields in its turn prussic (hydrocyanic) acid. Young trees are grafted with cuttings from the sweet variety or are budded with apricot, peach or plum.

E. W. G. Masterman

ALMOST

ol’-most (en oligo): In Ac 26:28 the Greek en oligo does not mean "almost," although scholars have for centuries translated the clause "Almost thou persuadest me to become a Christian." The revisers saw clearly the errors of their predecessors, so far as the signification of the first two words is concerned; but their explanation of the sentence is also erroneous; for the Greek cannot mean "With but little persuasion thou wouldst fain make me a Christian." Paul’s reply proves that en oligo must be taken with the last word poiesai, not with peitheis, since he takes up Agrippa’s en oligo, couples it with en megalo and continues with genesthai which is the regular passive of poiesai (compare Lysias xii.71 with 72). And the idea of "Christian" is also taken up and repeated in hopoios kai ego eimi.

An investigation of the usage of en oligo shows that it was never used in the sense of "almost." soil from the peoples, mostly of their own blood, who have given up.

The phrase occurs first in the Hymn to Hermes, 240, and here it is evidently an abbreviated expression for the Homeric oligo eni choro (M 423). Compare K 161, P 394. But it was used for both time and place, with the substantive expressed or understood (Thuc. i.93.1; iii.66.3; iv.26.3; iv.55.3; ii.84.3; ii.86.5; iv.96.3; v.112; vii.67.3; vii.87.1; Pind. Pyth. viii.131; Eur. Suppl. 1126; Hel. 771; Isoc. iv.83; Dem. lviii.60; iii.18). These uses persist from Homer far down into the post-classical literature (Plut. Per. 159 F; Coriol. 217 F; Mar. 427 A; Crass. 547 C; Polyb. x.18; Appian, Mithrad. 330; Themistius xi.143 C; Eustath. II.B, p.339.18). In the New Testament the phrase occurs also in Eph 3:3. Here too the common versions are incorrect. The clause in which the phrase occurs means simply, "as I said a little while ago"—the addition of en oligo merely indicates that the interval indicated by pro is short, an idea which would have been expressed in classical Greek by the simple dative, oligo and the adverb proteron (Ar. Thesm. 578; Aeschin. i. 2, 26, 72, 165; ii. 77, 147). Only a short while before Paul had expressed practically the same thought (Eph 3:3) and in almost identical language.

Consequently, en oligo, in the New Testament, means "a little," and is equivalent to oligos which occurs in 2Pe 2:18. In classical writers the idea would have been expressed by oligon, or kat’ oligon. So en oligo, which originally signified "in a little space" (or time), comes to mean simply "a little (bit)," ein bischen, but is never equivalent to oligou ("within a little") in any period of the language. The King James translators disregarded the real significance of poiesai, or adopted the reading of the inferior manuscripts (genesthai), so as to make the rest of the sentence harmonize with their translation of the first two words; and the revisers force the last two words into an impossible service, since the object of poiesai of which Christianon is the lucrative predicate, must be a third person, but certainly not Agrippa. Some scholars are of the opinion that the thought is: "You are trying to persuade me so as to make me a Christian." This is, indeed, the Spanish version; but examples show that the infinitive after peithein was used in a different sense. The best manuscript reads PITHEIS. This might, of course, stand for peitheis. But mepitheis may point to an original mepipotheis. Compare Jas 4:5 and 2Co 5:2, Plato Leg. 855 E. If these contentions be correct, the verb means simply "earnestly desire," and not "persuade."

Compare Herod. v.93; Plato Protag. 329 D; Aesch. Persian. 542; Soph. Phil. 534; Eur. H.F. 1408; I.T. 542; Cycl. 68; Ion 1432, Ar. Lys. 605, tou dei; ti potheis; Agrippa is asking, "What do you want, Paul? What are you trying to do? Make me a Christian?" The implication in Paul’s reply is that he is very desirous indeed of making him a Christian. And this interpretation harmonizes with the scene. The apostle’s business at this juncture is not to convert heathen to Christianity; for he is in chains before Agrippa, Berenice, Festus and prominent men of Caesarea, meta polles phantasias (Ac 26:23), to answer the charges brought against him by the Jews. But he holds forth at length and with such ardor that the Roman king says (though not necessarily in irony): "You seem to be anxious to make me a Christian in small measure." And Paul responds: "both small and great."

All the manuscripts, except Sinaiticus, have peitheis (Alexandrinus PEITHE). Several read genesthai (instead of poiesai). Wetstenius (Amsterdam 1752) and Knapp (Halle 1829) follow these manuscripts. So most of the old translates: Coverdale (1535), "Thou persuadest me in a parte to become a Christen"; Biblia Sacra (Paris 1745) "In modico suades me C. fieri"; a Latin MS, 14th century, now in Lane Semitic., Cincinnati; Rosenmueller’s Scholia (1829), "Parum abest quin mihi persuadeas ut fiam"; Stier

und Theile’s Polyglotten Bibel (1849), Tregelles (1857- 1879, with Jerome’s version); Edouard Reuss, Histoire apostolique (Paris 1876), "Tu vas me persuader bientot de devenir Chretien." The translation of Queen Elizabeth’s Bible is "Somewhat thou bryngeste me in minde for to become Chryste." Wycliffe renders "In litil thing thou councelist me for to be maad a Christen man." Erasmus takes en oligo in the sense of "a little."

Calvin’s rendering, "Thou writ make me a Christian in a moment," has been adopted in various countries (Wetstenius, Kuinoel, Neander, de Wette, Lange, Robinson, Hackett, Conybeare). The older scholars generally hold to "almost" (Valla, Luther, Beza, Grotius, Castalio, Du Veil, Bengel, Stier). Some interpret the phrase "with little labor" (Oecumenius, Olshausen, Baumgarten, Meyer, Lechler). Neander maintains that if we adopt the readings en megalo in Paul’s answer, Agrippa’s words must be explained "with a few reasons" ("which will not cost you much trouble"). Meyer-Wendt (Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch uber die Apostelgeschichte) translates "mit Weregem imnerredest du mich Christ zu werden." Meyer himself conceives the words to have been spoken sarcastically. Se Classical Review, XXII, 238-41.

J. E. Harry

ALMS; ALMSGIVING

ams, ams-giv’-ing:

The English word "alms" is an abridged form of the Greek word, eleemosune (compare "eleemosynary"), appearing in gradually reduced forms in German Almosen, Wyclif’s Almesse, Scotch Aw’mons, and our alms.

The later Jews often used "righteousness" tsedhaqah as meaning alms, that being in their view the foremost righteousness. (Compare our modern use of "charity" to denote almsgiving.) This use is seen in the Talmud and in the frequent translations of the Hebrew word for "righteousness" (tsedhaqah) by "alms" (eleemosune) in the Septuagint, though nothing warranting this is found in the Hebrew Old Testament, or in the true text of the New Testament. This notion of righteousness as alms being well-nigh universal among Jews in Jesus’ day, and spreading even among Christians, accounts for "alms" in Mt 6:1, where the true text has "righteousness": "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them" (the Revised Version (British and American) with Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae, the Latin versions, etc.). The oriental versions which generally read "alms" may be accounted for on the supposition that "alms" was first written on the margin as explaining the supposed meaning of "righteousness," and then, as according with this accepted oriental idea, was substituted for it in the text by the copyists.

Dikaiosune and eleemosune are both used in the Septuagint to translate chesedh, "kindness," and are also both used to translate tsedhaqah, "justice." Almsgiving was regarded not merely as a plain evidence of righteousness in general but also as an act of justice, a just debt owing to the needy. "No one refuses

directly," Mackie says, hence, possibly, Christ's teaching in Lu 11:41, "Let your righteousness (charity) be from within," "Give your hearts to almsgiving."

In the course of time the impulse and command to give alms in a true human way, out of pity, such as is found expressed in De 15:11 the King James Version, "Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land," gave place to a formal, meritorious" practice, possessing, like sacrifice, as men came to think, the power of atoning for man's sins, and redeeming him from calamity and death. For instance, Pr 11:4 (compare Pr 16:6, 21:3) was expounded: "Water will quench blazing fire; so doth almsgiving make atonement for sins" (Ecclesiasticus 3:30). "Lay up alms in thy storehouse; it shall deliver thee from affliction" (Ecclesiasticus 29:12). The story of Tobit is especially in point: it is simply a lesson on almsgiving and its redeeming powers: "Alms delivers from death and will purge away all sin" (Tobit 1:3,16; 2:14; 4:7-11; 12:8,9. Compare Sirach 29:11 ff). Kindred teaching abounds in the Talmud: "Alms-giving is more excellent than all offerings," is "equal to the whole law," will "deliver from the condemnation of hell," will "make one perfectly righteous," etc. According to Rabbi Assi, "Almsgiving is a powerful paraclete between the Israelites and their Father in heaven, it brings the time of redemption nigh (Babha' Bathra' Talmud 10a).

The Roman Catholics, holding the books of Tobit and Sirach to be canonical, find in them proof-texts for their doctrine of almsgiving, and likewise attach great value to the gifts to the poor as atoning for sins. Protestants, by a natural reaction, have failed to hold always at its true value what was and is an important Christian duty (see Lu 12:33 the King James Version, and, compare Mt 6:19-24: "Sell that ye have and give alms," etc.). It seems to have been so regarded and kept up in the Christian communities until the beginning of the 4th century (Apos Const II 36; Cyprian, De Opera and Eleemos. xiv).

The teaching of Jesus on the subject is important, first, as bearing upon Jewish ideas and practices, and second, as bearing upon present-day Christian ideas and practices.

This teaching appears most conspicuously in the Sermon on the Mount. While showing what is required of the subjects of the Messianic reign, He avowedly sets forth a higher and more spiritual morality than that which was taught and practiced by the scribes and Pharisees: "Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 5:20). There, too, He lays down the general principle embodied in the words of Mt 6:1: "Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them," and illustrates it by applying it to the three exercises most valued among the Jews (commended together in Tobit 12:8), namely, almsgiving (Mt 6:2,4), prayer (Mt 6:5-15), and fasting (Mt 6:16-18). Jewish writers claim that these are "the three cardinal disciplines which the synagogue transmitted to the Christian church and the Mohammedan mosque" (compare Koran, Sura 2 40, 104; 9 54).

Clearly what Jesus here forbids in general is not publicity in performing good deeds, which is often necessary and proper, but ostentatious publicity, for the purpose of attracting attention. (The Greek conveys distinctly this idea of purpose, and the verb for "to be seen" is the one from which comes our word "theater.")

Jewish writers, as also Greek and Roman philosophers, have many notable maxims upon the beauty and importance of being unostentatious in virtue, especially in deeds of benevolence. The Essenes had their treasury in a chamber of their own in the temple that both the giving and the taking should be unobserved (Mishnah, Sheq., v.6). Rabbi Eleazer said, "Alms-giving should be done in secret and not before men, for he who gives before men is a sinner, and God shall bring also the good deed before his judgment" (B.B. 9a; compare Ec 12:14).

In applying this principle to almsgiving Jesus teaches His disciple: "When ... thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do" (Mt 6:2). The conjecture of Calvin, followed by Stier and others, and mentioned as early as Euthymius, that it was a practice among Jews for an ostentatious almsgiver literally to sound a trumpet, or cause a trumpet to be sounded before him, in public places to summon the needy is without foundation (Lightfoot); as is also the notion, made current by the rabbis and accepted by Edersheim (The Temple, etc., 26), that by "sounding a trumpet" Jesus was alluding to the trumpet-like receptacles of brass in the temple treasury.

There is no proof that these were found "in the synagogues," or "in the streets." "Sound a trumpet," according to the Greek commentators, and the best modern authorities, is merely a figurative expression common to many languages, for self-parade—efforts to attract notice and win applause (compare our vulgar English saying about "blowing your own horn"). The contrast with the common practice instituted by Jesus is the significant thing: "But when thou doest alms"—"thou" is emphatic by position in the Greek—"let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth," etc., i.e. "So far from trumpeting your almsgiving before the public, do not even let it be known to yourself." Jesus here, Calvin well says, "silently glances at a kind of folly which prevails everywhere among men, that they think they have lost their pares if there have not been many spectators of their virtues." (The traditional saying of Mohammed, "In almsgiving, the left hand should not know what the right has given," is evidently borrowed from this saying of Jesus.) It is worthy of note that, despite popular practice, to give alms with right motives, and only to those who were worthy to receive, was a matter of special solicitude and instruction with the best among Jews as well as among Christians. The words of the Psalmist, "Blessed is he that considereth the poor," are construed to be an admonition to "take personal interest in him and not simply give him alms" (Lev. R. xxxiv). "When thou wilt do good, know to whom thou doest it. Give unto the good and help not the sinner" (Ecclesiasticus 12:1-6; compare Didache 1:5,6). "He that gives a free offering should give with a well-meaning eye" (Yer. B.D. 4 11). Jesus' words concerning the "single" and the "evil" eye (compare Lu 11:34-36), and Paul's teaching, "God loveth a cheerful giver" (2Co 9:7-9) have their counterparts in Jewish teaching. Rabbi Eleazer, referring to Ho 10:12, taught this high doctrine. "The kindness displayed in the giving of alms decides the final reward" (Suk. 49b). Other kindred teaching in a way anticipated Jesus' supreme lesson, "that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee" (Mt 6:4).

LITERATURE.

Commentaries at the place Rabbinical literature in point. D. Cassel, Die Armenverwaltung des alten Israel, 1887.

George B. Eager

ALMUG or ALGUM

al’-gum, (’algummim (2Ch 2:8; 9:10 f); (’almuggim, 1Ki 10:11 f)): It is generally supposed that these two names refer to one kind of tree, the consonants being transposed as is not uncommon in Semitic words. Solomon sent to Hiram, king of Tyre, saying, "Send me also cedar-trees, fir-trees, and algum-trees, out of Lebanon" (2Ch 2:8). In 1Ki 10:11 it is said that the navy of Hiram "that brought gold from Ophir, brought in from Ophir great plenty of almug-trees and precious stones." In the parallel passage in 2Ch 9:10 it is said that "algum-trees and precious stones" were brought. From this wood "the king made .... pillars for the house of Yahweh, and for the king’s house, harps also and psalteries for the singers: there came no such almug-trees, nor were seen, unto this day" (1Ki 10:12). The wood was evidently very precious and apparently came from East Asia—unless we suppose from 2Ch 2:8 that it actually grew on Lebanon, which is highly improbable; it was evidently a fine, close grained wood, suitable for carving. Tradition says that this was the famous sandal wood, which was in ancient times put to similar uses in India and was all through the ages highly prized for its color, fragrance, durability and texture. It is the wood of a tree, Pterocar pussantalinus (N.D. Santalaceae), which grows to a height of 25 to 30 feet; it is a native of the mountains of Malabar.

E. W. G. Masterman

ALNATHAN

al’-na-than (Alnathan, "God has given," the Revised Version (British and American) ELNATHAN): Apocryphal name of a person (1 Esdras 8:44) corresponding to Elnathan of Ezr 8:16. He was one of the learned men summoned by Ezra, as he was beginning his journey to Jerusalem, and sent to Iddo to ask for ministers for the house of Yahweh.

ALOES; LIGNALOES

al’-oz, lin-al’-oz, lig-nal’-oz (’ahalim, Nu 24:6, translation "lign-aloes" (= lignum aloes, "wood of aloes"), Pr 7:17; ‘ahaloth, Ps 45:8; So 4:14; aloe, Joh 19:39): Mentioned as a substance for perfuming garments (Ps 45:8) and beds (Pr 7:17). In So 4:14, it occurs in a list of the most precious spices. The most memorable use of aloes as a spice is in Joh 19:39: "There came also Nicodemus, he who at the first came to him at night, bringing a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds." This was an immense quantity and if the aloes bore any large proportion to the myrrh the mixture must have been purchased at a very high cost. The most difficult mention of aloes is the earliest where (Nu 24:5,6) Balaam in his blessing on Israel exclaims— `" How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob, Thy tabernacles, O Israel! As valleys are they spread forth, As gardens by the river-side, As lign-aloes which Yahweh hath planted, As cedar-trees beside the waters."` As the aloes in question grow in East Asia it is

difficult to see how Balaam could have come to speak of them as living trees. Post (HDB, I, 69) suggests that they may possibly have been growing at that time in the Jordan valley; this is both improbable and unnecessary. Balaam need have had no actual tree in his mind's eye but may have mentioned the aloe as a tree famous over the Orient for its preciousness. That the reference is poetical rather than literal may be supposed by the expression in the next verse "cedar-trees beside the waters"—a situation very unnatural for the high-mountain-loving cedar. Yet another explanation is that the Hebrew has been altered and that 'elim, "terebinths" instead of 'ahalim, "aloes" stood in the original text. The aloe wood of the Bible is eaglewood—so misnamed by the Portuguese who confused the Malay name for it (agora) with the Latin aquila, "eagle"—a product of certain trees of the Natural Order Aquilariaceae, growing in Southeast Asia The two most valued varieties are Aquilaria malaccensis and Aloes agallocha—both fine spreading trees. The resin, which gives the fragrant quality to the wood, is formed almost entirely in the heart wood; logs are buried, the outer part decays while the inner, saturated with the resin, forms the "eagle wood" or "aloe wood" of commerce; "aloes" being the same wood in a finely powdered condition. To the Arabs this wood is known as 'ud. It shows a beautiful graining and takes a high polish.

These aloes must be clearly distinguished from the well-known medicinal aloes, of ancient fame. This is a resin from Aloes socatrina, and allied species, of the Natural Order Liliaceae, originally from the island of Socotra, but now from Barbados, the Cape of Good Hope and other places. The "American aloe" (Agave americana) which today is cultivated in many parts of Palestine, is also quite distinct from the Biblical plant.

E. W. G. Masterman

ALOFT

a-loft' (epano): Only in 1 Esdras 8:92. Meaning obscure. The statement following a confession of sin means probably that Israel in penitence returning to the Lord, is exultant in the assurance of His forgiveness, and encouraged in efforts at reformation.

ALONG

a-long':Corresponding to two different Hebrew words, Jud 9:25; 1Sa 6:12; Jer 41:6, joined with "come" and "go," vividly describes a course that is taken—it emphasizes its directness and immediateness. In Jud 7:12, "lay along in the valley," probably means "all the length" or "at length."

ALOTH

a'-loth ('aloth): So found in the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin in 1Ki 4:16, where the Revised Version (British and American) has BEALOTH (be'aloth). A town, or district in northern Palestine, together with Asher under Baana, one of Solomon's twelve civil officers. Conder identifies with the ruin 'Alia, near Achzib. There was another Bealoth in southern Palestine (Jos 15:24). The difference in the form of the word in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and

American) is due to interpretation of the initial "b" as the preposition "in" in the former, and as part of the word itself in the latter.

ALPHA AND OMEGA

al’-fa, o’-me-ga, o-me’-ga (Alpha and Omega = A and O): The first and last letters of the Greek alphabet, hence, symbolically, "beginning and end"; in Revelation "The Eternal One" in Re 1:8 of the Father, in Re 21:6 and Re 22:13 of the Son. Compare Theodoret, Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, iv. 8: "We used alpha down to omega, i.e. all." A similar expression is found in Latin (Martial, v.26). Compare Aretas (Cramer’s Catenae Graecae in New Testament) on Re 1:8 and Tertullian (Monog, 5): "So also two Greek letters, the first and last, did the Lord put on Himself, symbols of the beginning and the end meeting in Him, in order that just as alpha rolls on to omega and omega returns again to alpha, so He might show that both the evolution of the beginning to the end is in Him and again the return of the end to the beginning." Cyprian, Testim, ii.1; vi.22, iii.100, Paulinus of Nola Carm. xix.645; xxx.89; Prudentius, Cathem., ix.10-12. In Patristic and later literature the phrase is regularly applied to the Son. God blesses Israel from ‘aleph to taw (Le 26:3-13), but curses from waw to mem (Le 26:14-43). So Abraham observed the whole law from ‘aleph to taw. Consequently, "Alpha and Omega" may be a Greek rendering of the Hebrew phrase, which expressed among the later Jews the whole extent of a thing.

J. E. Harry

ALPHABET

al’-fa-bet.

1. Definition:

An alphabet is a list of the elementary sounds used in any language. More strictly speaking it is that particular series, commonly known as the Phoenician or Canaanite alphabet, which was in use in the region of Palestine about 1000 BC, and which is the ancestor of nearly all modern written alphabets whether Semitic or European. It is the alphabet therefore of Old Testament Hebrew and Aramaic and New Testament Greek, of the superscription of Caesar and the Latin inscription on the cross, as well as of English through the Greek and Latin. It is an interesting fact, with many practical bearings on text and exegesis, that three sets of letters so very unlike in appearance as Hebrew, Greek and modern English should be the same in origin and alike in nature. Although the earliest surviving inscriptions must be a good deal later than the separation between the Greek and Hebrew, the records in each are more like one another than either is like its own modern printed form.

The characteristics of an alphabet are

(1) the analysis of sounds into single letters rather than syllables or images,

(2) the fixed order of succession in the letters,

(3) the signs for the sounds, whether names or written symbols. Of these the analysis into single letters, instead of whole words or syllables, is the characteristic element. The order of the letters may vary, as that of the Sanskrit does from the European, and yet the list remain not only alphabetic but the "same" alphabet, i.e. each sound represented by a similar name or written character. On the face of it, therefore, it might be imagined that the Egyptian and Babylonian, the Cypriote, the Minoan and other forms earlier than the Canaanite which are known or suspected to have had phonetic systems, may have had lists of these forms arranged in a fixed order, but these lists were not alphabetic until the final analysis into individual letters.

2. Name:

The name alphabet comes from the fist two letters of the Greek, alpha beta, just as the old English name for the alphabet, abc or abece, is simply the first three letters of the English alphabet, and thus is merely an abbreviation for the whole alphabet. It appears that the Greeks also used the first and last letters of the alphabet (alpha and omega) as the Jews did the first and last, or the first, middle and last letters of their alphabet, as abbreviation for the whole and in the same sense that in English one says "a to izzard." Alpha and beta are themselves derived from the Semitic names for the same letters (’aleph, beth) and have no meaning in the Greek.

3. Invention:

The question of the invention of this alphabet differs from the question of the origin of the written forms of the letters with which it is often confused, and relates to the recognition of the individual letters. Alphabetical language whether written or spoken, inward or outward, is distinguished from the pictographic, hieroglyphic, and syllabic stages by this analysis into individual sounds or letters. It begins with the picture, passes to the ideogram and syllable, and from the syllable to the letter. This is best seen in writing, but it is equally true in speech. At the letter stage the alphabet begins. It is alleged by some that another stage, a consonantal writing, between syllabic and alphabetic writing, should be recognized. This would deny to the Phoenician the character of a true alphabet since, as in all Semitic languages, the vowels were in ancient times not written at all. Some go so far as to speak of it as syllabic in character, but on the other hand it may be said with equal pertinence that various syllabaries are nearly alphabetic. When a syllabic writing is reduced, as was the case with the Egyptian, the Cypriote and others, to a point where a character represents uniformly a certain consonant and a certain vowel, the vocal analysis has been made and the essential alphabet begun, although it was only later that men discovered that the consonant common to several syllables might be expressed to advantage in writing by one unvarying sign, and later still that the vowels too might be distinguished to advantage.

4. Origin of the Letters:

Few modern questions are changing shape so rapidly as that of the historical predecessor of the Canaanite or Phoenician alphabet. For a long time it was thought that De Rouge had solved the problem by tracing the letters to the Egyptian hieratic. This is the view of most of the popular literature of the present time, but is wholly surrendered by most workers in the field now, in spite of the fact that the latest studies in hieratic show a still greater resemblance in forms (Moller, Hierat. Palaographie, 1909). Winckler and others have claimed derivation from the Cuneiform, Praetorius from the Cypriote, Sayce gets at least three letters from the Hittite, while Evans and others incline to believe that the Minoan was the direct source of the alphabet, introduced from Crete into Palestine by the Philistines who were Cretans, or at least that the two are from a common ancestor, which is also the ancestor of many other of the Mediterranean alphabets.

Some, like Evans and Mosso, even suggest that, perhaps through the Minoan, the letter forms may be traced to the pictographs of the neolithic era in the caves of Europe. There is, in fact, an extraordinary resemblance between some of the letters of the Phoenician alphabet and some of the conventionalized signs of the neolithic age, and it may not be too fantastic to imagine that these early signs are the historic ancestors of the written alphabetical characters, but that they were in any sense alphabetical themselves is impossible if the invention of the alphabet was historical as here supposed, and is unlike from any point of view. If in fact the Paestos disk dates from before 1600 BC, and if Dr. Hempl’s resolution of it into Ionic Greek is sound, we have another possible source or stock of characters from which the inventor of the alphabet may have chosen (Harper’s Magazine, January, 1911).

5. Number of Letters:

The ideal written alphabet contains a separate character for each sound used in any or every language. Practically in most languages the alphabet falls a good deal short of the number of recognized sounds to be expressed in that language and in pronouncing dictionaries they have to be analyzed into say a broad, a short, a open, etc., by adding diacritical marks. "In educated English without regarding finer distinctions" (Edmonds, Comparative Philology, 45) about 50 sounds are commonly used, but Murray distinguishes at least 96, and the number sometimes used or which maybe used is much greater, the possible number of vowel sounds alone being as many as 72. Moreover the individual letters differ in sound in different individuals, and even in the same individual in successive utterances of what would be called the same letter or the same sound. It is alleged that the average sound of the a for example, is never the same in any two languages; the a in "father," even, is never the same in any two individuals, and that the same individual, even, never pronounces it twice so exactly in the same fashion that the difference may not be detected by sound photography.

The written alphabet is always thus less than the number of sounds used. The Phoenician and the Semitic alphabets generally had 22 letters, but they omitted the vowels. English has 26, of which many have two or more sounds.

6. Names of the Letters:

The names of the Greek alphabet are derived from the Semitic names and are meaningless in the Greek, while in the Semitic it has been pretty clearly shown that they signify for the most part some object or idea of which the earliest form of the written letter was a picture, as eg. ‘aleph, the ox. The forms of the letters are apparently derived from pictures of the ox, house, etc., made linear and finally reduced to a purely conventional sign which was itself reduced to the simplest writing motion. All this has been boldly denied by Mr. Pilcher (PSBA, XXVI (1904), 168-73; XXVII (1905), 65-68), and the original forms declared to be geometric; but he does not seem to have made many converts, although he has started up rival claimants to his invention.

The names of the letters at least seem to indicate the Semitic origin of the alphabet, since the majority of them are the Semitic names for the objects which gave name to the letter, and the picture of which gives form to the written letter.

Following is Sayce’s list (PSBA, XXXII (1910), 215-22) with some variants:

(1) ‘aleph = ox;

(2) beth = house (tent);

(3) gimel = camel;

(4) daleth = door;

(5) he = house;

(6) waw = nail (Evans, tent peg);

(7) zayin = weapon;

(8) cheth = fence;

(9) Teth = cake of bread (Lidzbarski, a package);

(10) yodh = hand;

(11) kaph = palm of hand;

(12) lamedh = ox-goad;

(13) mem = water flowing;

(14) nun = fish;

(15) camekh = ?;

(16) ‘ayin = eye;

(17) pe = mouth;

(18) tsadhe = trap (others, hook or nose or steps),

(19) qoph = cage (Evans says picture is an outline head and Lidzbarski, a helmet);

(20) resh = head;

(21) shin = tooth (not teeth);

(22) taw = mark. Not all of these meanings are, however, generally accepted (compare also Noldeke, Beitrage Strassb. (1904), 124-36; Lidzbarski, Ephemeris, II, 125-39).

7. Order of Letters:

The order of the letters differs more or less in different languages, but it is in the main the same in all the Semitic and Western alphabets derived from the Phoenician alphabet and this is roughly the order of the English alphabet. This order is, however, full of minor variations even among the Western alphabets and in the Indian languages the letters are entirely regrouped on a different principle.

The conventional order of the Semitic alphabet may be traced with some certainty in the Biblical books to as early as the 6th century BC, even accepting the dates of a radical higher criticism, for there are more than a dozen passages in the Old Testament composed on the principle of the alphabetical acrostic (Pss 111; 112; 119; Pr 31:10-31; La 1; 2; 3; 4, etc.) and the oldest of these are of this period (see ACROSTIC). The Formello abecedarium, if it is in fact from the 7th century BC, carries the known order back a century farther still and shows it prevailing in Italy as well as Palestine. Moreover, there are those who still consider some of the alphabetical psalms older even than this.

It must be noted, however, that while the order is in general fixed, there are local and temporary differences. In several cases eg. the order of the sixteenth and seventeenth letters of the alphabet is inverted in the alphabetical acrostics, and this would seem to point to a time or place where pe, ‘ayin, was the accepted order. It happens that the inversion occurs in both the passages which are counted earliest by the modern critics (G. B. Gray in HDB2, 8). Mr. Sayce too has recently altered or restored the order by relegating the original camekh to a place after shin, while Mr. Pilcher has quite reconstructed the original order on a geometrical basis, to his own taste at least, as brd; hvg; mnl; szt.

A certain grouping together of signs according to the relationship of the objects which they represent has often been noticed, and Sayce (PSBA, XXXII (1910), 215-22) thinks that he has (after having put camekh in its right place) reduced the whole matter to a sequence of pairs of things which belong together: ox-house, camel-tent door, house-nail, weapon-fence (city wall), bread-hand, open hand-arm with goad, water-fish, eye-mouth, trap-cage, head- tooth, camekh, taw. This arranging he thinks was done by someone who knew that ‘aluph was the West Semitic for "leader" and taw was the Cretan sign for ending—an Amorite therefore in touch with the Philistines. The final word on order seems not yet to have been spoken.

8. The Earliest Texts:

The chief North Semitic texts are

(1) Moabite stone (circa 850 BC);

(2) inscriptions of Zkr, Zenjirli, etc. (circa 800 BC);

(3) Baal-Lebanon inscription (circa 750 BC);

(4) Siloam inscription (circa 700 BC);

(5) Harvard Samaritan ostraca (time of Ahab?);

(6) Gezer tablet;

(7) various weights and seals before 600 BC. The striking fact about the earliest inscriptions is that however remote geographically, there is on the whole so little difference in the forms of the letters. This is particularly true of the North Semitic inscriptions and tends to the inference that the invention was after all not so long before the surviving inscriptions. While the total amount of the earliest Palestine inscriptions is not even yet very large, the recent discovery of the Samaritan ostraca, the Gezer tablet, and various minor inscriptions, is at least pointing to a general use of Semitic writing in Palestine at least as early as the 9th century BC.

9. Changes in Letter Forms:

The tendency of letters to change form in consequence of changed environment is not peculiar to alphabetical writing but is characteristic of the transmission of all sorts of writing. The morphology of alphabetical writing has however its own history. The best source for studying this on the Semitic side is Lidzbarski’s Handbuch (see below), and on the Greek side the best first source is E. S. Roberts, Introduction to Greek Epigraphy (Cambr.). The best synoptical statement of the Semitic is found in the admirable tables in the Jewish Encyclopedia, V, i, 449-53. For the later evolution of both Greek and

Latin alphabets, E. M. Thompson’s Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography, Oxford, 1912, is far the best Introduction. In this he takes account of the great finds of papyri which have so revolutionized the study of the forms of Greek letters around the beginning of the Christian era, since his first Handbook was published. (See articles on the text of Old Testament and New Testament.)

In the Hebrew, the old Phoenician alphabet of the early inscriptions had in the New Testament times given way to the square Aramaic characters of the modern Hebrew which possibly came into use as early as the time of Ezra. The most comprehensive modern brief conspectus covering both Hebrew and Greek is that reproduced in this article from the little manual of Specht. See also WRITING.

LITERATURE.

Isaac Taylor’s Alphabet (2nd ed., 1899) is still useful for orientation, and his article in the HDB likewise, but Edward Clodd’s little Story of the Alphabet (New York, 1907), taken with Faulmann’s Geschichte der Schrift and Buch der Schrift, is better for general purposes. For scientific purposes see the bibliography prefixed to Lidzbarski’s Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik (1898, 2 vols) and his Ephemeris passim to date, Evans’ Scripta minoa, Oxf., 1909, and the literature of the article WRITING in this Encyclopedia. See also C. G. Ball, "Origin of the Phoenician Alphabet," Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, XV, 392-408; E. J. Pilcher, "The Origin of the Alphabet," PSBA, XXVI (1904), 168-73; Franz Praetorius, "The Origin of the Canaanite Alphabet," Smithsonian Rep. (1907), 595-604; S. A. Cook, "The Old Hebrew Alphabet and the Gezer Tablet," PEFS (1909), 284-309. For Bible class work, H. N. Skinner’s Story of the Letters and Figures (Chicago, 1905) is very admirably adapted to the purpose.

E. C. Richardson

ALPHAEUS

al-fe’-us (Alphaios; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Halphaios):

(1) The father of the second James in the list of the apostles (Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13).

(2) The father of Levi, the publican (Mr 2:14). Levi is designated as Matthew in the Gospel of Mt 9:9. There is no other reference to this Alpheus.

Some writers, notably Weiss, identify the father of Levi with the father of the second James. He says that James and Levi were undoubtedly brothers; but that seems improbable. If they were brothers they would quite likely be associated as are James and John, Andrew and Peter. Chrysostom says James and Levi had both been tax- gatherers before they became followers of Jesus. This tradition would not lend much weight as proof that they were brothers, for it might arise through identifying the two names, and the western manuscripts do identify them and read James instead of Levi in Mr 2:14. This, however, is undoubtedly a corruption of the text. If it had been the original it would be difficult to explain the

substitution of an unknown Levi for James who is well known. Many writers identify Alpheus, the father of the second James, with Clopas of Joh 19:25. This had early become a tradition, and Chrysostom believed they were the same person. This identity rests on four suppositions, all of which are doubtful:

(a) That the Mary of Clopas was the same as the Mary who was the mother of the second James. There is a difference of opinion as to whether "Mary of Clopas" should be understood to be the wife of Clopas or the daughter of Clopas, but the former is more probable. We know from Mt 27:56 and Mr 15:40 that there was a James who was the son of Mary, and that this Mary belonged to that little group of women that was near Jesus it the time of the crucifixion. It is quite likely that this Mary is the one referred to in Joh 19:25. That would make James, the son of Mary of Mt 27:56, the son of Mary of Clopas. But Mary was such a common name In the New Testament that this supposition cannot be proven.

(b) That the James, who was the son of Mary, was the same person as the James, the son of Alpheus. Granting the supposition under (a), this would not prove the identity of Clopas and Alpheus unless this supposition can also be proven, but it seems impossible to either prove it or disprove it.

(c) That Alpheus and Clopas are different variations of a common original, and that the variation has arisen from different pronunciations of the first letter ("ch") of the Aramaic original. There are good scholars who both support and deny this theory.

(d) That Clopas had two names as was common at that time; but there is nothing to either substantiate or disprove this theory. See CLOPAS.

It seems impossible to determine absolutely whether or not Alpheus, the father of the second James, and Clopas of Joh 19:25 are the same person, but it is quite probable that they are.

A. W. Fortune

ALSO

ol’-so: In the Greek kai, when it is equivalent to "also" or "even," is always placed before the word or phrase which it is intended to emphasize (e.g. Ac 12:3; 1 Joh 4:21). Mt 6:14 should therefore read, "Your heavenly Father will forgive you also"; Lu 6:13, "Whom also he named apostles"; Heb 8:6, "The mediator of a better covenant also"; and 1Th 4:14, ‘If we believe that Jesus died and rose again, so also (we believe that) those who are fallen asleep in Jesus, God will bring with Him.’

ALTANEUS

al-ta-ne’-us. See MALTANNEUS (Apocrypha).

ALTAR

ol’-ter (mizbeach, literally, "place of slaughter or sacrifice," from zabhach, which is found in both senses; bomos, (only in Ac 17:23), thusiasterion):

I. CLASSIFICATION OF HEBREW ALTARS

Importance of the Distinction

II. LAY ALTARS

1. Pre-Mosaic

2. In the Mosaic Age

3. Dangers of the Custom

4. The Mosaic Provisions

III. HORNED ALTARS OF BURNT OFFERING

1. The Tabernacle Altar

2. The Altar of Jos 22

3. The Altar till Solomon

4. The Horned Altar in Use

5. The Temple of Solomon

6. The Altar of Ahaz

7. Ezekiel

8. The Post-exilic Altar

9. Idolatrous and Unlawful Altars

10. The Horns

IV. ALTARS OF INCENSE

V. RECENT ARCHAEOLOGICAL MATERIALS 1. A Gezer Altar

2. The Taanach Altar of Incense

LITERATURE

A. CRITICAL

I. Classification of Hebrew Altars.

Before considering the Biblical texts attention must be drawn to the fact that these texts know of at least two kinds of altars which were so different in appearance that no contemporary could possibly confuse them. The first was an altar consisting of earth or unhewn stones. It had no fixed shape, but varied with the materials. It might consist of a rock (Jud 13:19) or a single large stone (1Sa 14:33-35) or again a number of stones (1Ki 18:31 f). It could have no horns, nor it would be impossible to give the stone horns without hewing it, nor would a heap of earth lend itself to the formation of horns. It could have no regular pattern for the same reason. On the other hand we meet with a group of passages that refer to altars of quite a different type. We read of horns, of fixed measurements, of a particular pattern, of bronze as the material. To bring home the difference more rapidly illustrations of the two types are given side by side. The first figure represents a cairn altar such as was in use in some other ancient religions. The second is a conjectural restoration of Hebrew altars of burnt offering and incense of the second kind.

Importance of the Distinction:

Both these might be and were called altars, but it is so evident that this common designation could not have caused any eye-witness to confuse the two that in reading the Bible we must carefully examine each text in turn and see to which kind the author is referring. Endless confusion has been caused, even in our own time, by the failure to note this distinction, and the reader can hope to make sense of the Biblical laws and narratives only if he be very careful to picture to himself in every case the exact object to which his text refers. For the sake of clearness different terms will be adopted in this article to denote the two kinds of altars. The first will be termed "lay altars" since, as will be seen, the Law permitted any layman to offer certain sacrifices at an altar of earth or unhewn stone without the assistance of a priest, while the second while be styled "horned altars," owing to their possession of horns which, as already pointed out, could not exist in a lay altar that conformed with the provisions of the law.

II. Lay Altars.

1. Pre-Mosaic:

In Genesis we often read of the erection of altars, e.g. Ge 8:20; 12:7; 13:4. Though no details are given we are able to infer their general character with considerable precision. In reading the accounts it is sometimes evident that we are dealing with some rough improvised structure. For example, when Abraham builds the altar for the sacrifice of Isaac in Ge 22 it cannot be supposed that he used metal or wrought stone. When Jacob makes a covenant with Laban a heap of stones is thrown up "and they did eat there by the heap" (31:46). This heap is not expressly termed an altar, but if this covenant be compared with later covenants it will be seen that in these its place is taken by an altar of the lay type (SBL, chapter 2), and it is reasonable to suppose that this heap was in fact used as an altar (compare Ge 31:54). A further consideration is provided by the fact that the Arabs had a custom of using any stone as an altar for the nonce, and certainly such altars are found in the Mosaic and post- Mosaic history. We may therefore feel sure that the altars of Ge were of the general type represented by Fig. 1 and were totally unlike the altars of Fig. 2.

2. In the Mosaic Age:

Thus Moses found a custom by which the Israelite threw up rude altars of the materials most easily obtained in the field and offered sacrificial worship to God on sundry occasions. That the custom was not peculiar to the Israelites is shown by such instances as that of Balaam (Nu 23:1, etc.). Probably we may take the narrative of Jethro’s sacrifice as a fair example of the occasions on which such altars were used, for it cannot be supposed that Aaron and all the elders of Israel were openly committing an unlawful act when they ate bread with Moses’ father-in-law before God (Ex 18:12). Again, the narrative in which we see Moses building an altar for the purposes of a covenant probably exemplifies a custom that was in use for other covenants that did not fall to be narrated (Ex 24:4 ff).

3. Dangers of the Custom:

But a custom of erecting altars might easily lend itself to abuses. Thus archaeology has shown us one altar—though of a much later date—which is adorned with faces, a practice that was quite contrary to the Mosaic ideas of preserving a perfectly imageless worship. Other possible abuses were suggested by the current practices of the Canaanites or are explained by the terms of the laws.

See HIGH PLACE.

4. The Mosaic Provisions:

Accordingly Moses regulated these lay altars. Leaving the occasion of their erection and use to be determined by custom he promulgated the following laws: "An altar of earth mayest thou make unto me, and mayest sacrifice thereon thy burnt offerings and thy peace offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen; in all the place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee. And if thou make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stones; for if thou lift thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it. Neither mayest thou go up by steps unto mine altar," etc. (Ex 20:24-26; so correct English Versions of the Bible). Several remarks must be made on this law.

It is a law for laymen, not priests. This is proved by the second person singular and also by the reason given for the prohibition of steps—since the priests were differently garbed. It applies "in all the place where I record my name," not, as the ordinary rendering has it, "in every place." This latter is quite unintelligible: it is usually explained as meaning places hallowed by theophanies, but there are plenty of instances in the history of lay sacrifices where no theophany can be postulated; see e.g. Ge 31:54; 1Sa 20:6,29 (EPC, 185 f). "All the place" refers to the territory of Israel for the time being. When Naaman desired to cease sacrificing to any deity save the God of Israel he was confronted by the problem of deciding how he could sacrifice to Him outside this "place." He solved it by asking for two mules' burden of the earth of the "place" (2Ki 5:17). Lastly, as already noticed, this law excludes the possibility of giving the altars horns or causing them to conform to any given pattern, since the stone could not be wrought One other law must be noticed in this connection: De 16:21 f: 'Thou shalt not plant thee an 'asherah of any kind of tree beside the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou shalt make thee. Neither shalt thou set thee up a pillar, which the Lord thy God hateth.' Here again the reference is probably to the lay altars, not to the religious capital which was under the control of the priests.

III. Horned Altars of Burnt Offering.

1. The Tabernacle Altar:

In Ex 27:1-8 (compare Ex 38:1-7) a command is given to construct for the Tabernacle an altar of shittim wood covered with bronze. It was to be five cubits long by five broad and three high. The four corners were to have horns of one piece with it. A network of bronze was to reach halfway up the altar to a ledge. In some way that is defined only by reference to what was shown to Moses in the Mount the altar was to be hollow with planks, and it was to be equipped with rings and staves for facility of transport. The precise construction cannot be determined, and it is useless to speculate where the instructions are so plainly governed by what was seen by Moses in the Mount; but certain features that are important for the elucidation of the Bible texts emerge clearly. The altar is rectangular, presenting at the top a square surface with horns at the four corners. The more important material used is bronze, and the whole construction was as unlike that of the ordinary lay altar as possible. The use of this altar in the ritual of the Tabernacle falls under the heading SACRIFICE. Here we must notice that It was served by priests. Whenever we find references to the horns of an altar or to its pattern we see that the writer is speaking of an altar of this general type. Thus, a criminal seeking asylum fled to an altar of this type, as appears from the horns which are mentioned in the two historical instances and also from such expressions as coming down or going up. See ASYLUM.

2. The Altar of Jos 22:

We read in Jos 22:9 ff that the children of Reuben and the children of Gad built an altar. In 22:28 we find them saying, "Be hold the pattern of the altar," etc. This is decisive as to the meaning, for the lay altar had no pattern. Accordingly in its general shape this altar must have conformed to the type of the Tabernacle altar. It was probably not made of the same materials, for the word "build" is continually used in connection with it, and this word would scarcely be appropriate for working metal: nor again

was it necessarily of the same size, but it was of the same pattern: and it was designed to serve as a witness that the descendants of the men who built it had a portion in the Lord. It seems to follow that the pattern of the Tabernacle altar was distinctive and unlike the heathen altars in general use in Palestine and this appears to be confirmed by modern excavations which have revealed high places with altars quite unlike those contemplated by the Pentateuch. See HIGH PLACE.

3. The Altar till Solomon:

In the subsequent history till the erection of Solomon's Temple attention need only be directed to the fact that a horned altar existed while the Ark was still housed in a tent. This is important for two reasons. It shows a historical period in which a horned altar existed at the religious capital side by side with a number of lay altars all over the country, and it negatives the suggestion of G. A. Smith (Jerusalem, II, 64) that the bare rock ec-Cakhra was used by Solomon as the altar, since the unhewn rock obviously could not provide a horned altar such as we find as early as 1Ki 1:50-53.

4. The Horned Altar in Use:

Note too that we read here of bringing down from the altar, and this expression implies elevation. Further in 1Ki 9:25 we hear that Solomon was in the habit of offering on the altar which he had built, and this again proves that he had built an altar and did not merely use the temple rock. (See also Watson in PEFS (January, 1910), 15 ff, in reply to Smith.)

5. The Temple of Solomon:

For the reasons just given it is certain that Solomon used an altar of the horned type, but we have no account of the construction in Kings. According to a note preserved in the Septuagint but not in the Hebrew, Solomon enlarged the altar erected by David on Araunah's threshing-floor (2Sa 24:25), but this notice is of very doubtful historical value and may be merely a glossator's guess. According to 2Ch 4:1 the altar was made of bronze and was twenty cubits by twenty by ten. The Chronicler's dimensions are doubted by many, but the statement of the material is confirmed by 1Ki 8:64; 2Ki 16:10-15. From the latter passage it appears that an altar of bronze had been in use till the time of Ahaz.

6. The Altar of Ahaz:

This king saw an altar in Damascus of a different pattern and had a great altar made for the temple on its model. As the text contrasts the great altar with the altar of bronze, we may refer that the altar of Ahaz was not made of bronze. Whether either or both of these altars had steps (compare Eze 43:17) or were approached by a slope as in Fig. 2 cannot be determined with certainty. It may be noted that in Isa 27:9 we read of the stones of the altar in a passage the reference of which is uncertain.

7. Ezekiel:

Ezekiel also gives a description of an altar (Eze 43:13-17), but there is nothing to show whether it is purely ideal or represents the altar of Solomon or that of Ahaz, and modern writers take different views. In the vision it stood before the house (Eze 40:47). In addition he describes an altar or table of wood (Eze 41:22). This of course could only be a table, not in any sense an altar. See TABLE.

8. The Post-exilic Altar:

Ezr 3:2 f tells of the setting up of the altar by Zerubbabel and his contemporaries. No information as to its shape, etc., can be extracted from this notice. We read of a defilement of the temple altar in 1 Macc 1:54. This was made of stones (Ex 20:24-26 having at this date been applied to the temple altar contrary to its original intent) and a fresh altar of whole stones was constructed (1 Macc 4:44-49). Presumably this altar had no horns.

9. Idolatrous and Unlawful Altars:

It is clear from the historical and prophetical books that in both kingdoms a number of unlawful altars were in use. The distinction which has been drawn between lay altars and horned altars helps to make these passages easy to understand. Thus when Amos in speaking of Bethel writes, "The horns of the altar shall be cut off," we see that he is not thinking of lay altars which could have no horns (Am 3:14). Again Hosea's "Because Ephraim hath multiplied altars 'to sin,' altars have been to him 'for sin'"(Ho 8:11, compare Ho 10:1-8; 12:11 (12)), is not in contradiction to Ex 20:24-26 because the prophet is not speaking of lay altars. The high places of Jeroboam (1Ki 12:28-33) were clearly unlawful and their altars were unlawful altars of the horned type. Such cases must be clearly distinguished from the lay altars of Saul and others.

10. The Horns:

The origin of the horns is unknown, though there are many theories. Fugitives caught hold of them (1Ki 1:50,51), and victims could be tied to them (Ps 118:27).

IV. Altars of Incense.

Ex 30:1-10 contains the commands for the construction and use of an altar of incense. The material was shittim wood, the dimensions one cubit by one by two, and it also had horns. Its top and sides were overlaid with gold and it was surrounded by a crown or rim of gold. For facility of transport it had golden rings and staves. It stood before the veil in front of the ark.

Solomon also constructed an altar of incense (1Ki 6:20; 7:48; 1Ch 28:18), cedar replacing shittim wood. The altar of incense reappears in 1 Macc 1:21; 4:49.

V. Recent Archaeological Materials.

Recently several altars have been revealed by excavations. They throw light on the Bible chiefly by showing what is forbidden. See especially HIGH PLACE.

1. A Gezer Altar:

Fig. 3 represents an altar found at Gezer built into the foundation of a wall dating about 600 BC. Mr. Macalister describes it in the following words: "It is a four-sided block of limestone, 1 ft. 3 inches high. The top and bottom are approximately 10 1/2 and 9 inches square respectively; but these are only the average dimensions of the sides, which are not regularly cut. The angles are prolonged upward for an additional 1 1/2 inches as rounded knobs—no doubt the 'horns' of the altar. The top is very slightly concave so as to hold perhaps an eighth of a pint of liquid" (PEFS (July, 1907), 196 f). The size suggests an altar of incense rather than an altar of burnt offering, but in view of the general resemblance between the Tabernacle altars of burnt offering and incense, this is a fact of minor importance. On the other hand, the shape, pattern and material are of great interest. That the altar violates in principle the law of Ex 20:25 forbidding the dressing of the stones is obvious, though that passage does not apply in terms to altars of incense, but certainly the appearance of the block does recall in a general way the altars of the other type—the horned altars. Like them it is four-sided with a square top, and like them it has knobs or horns at each corner. Possibly it was formed in general imitation of the Temple altars. Other altars in Canaanite high places exemplify by their appearance the practices prohibited by the Pentateuch. See for illustrations H. Vincent, Canaan d'apres l'exploration recente; R. Kittel, Studien zur hebraischen Archaologie und Religions-Geschichte; S. R. Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible.

2. The Taanach Altar of Incense:

Importance attaches to a terra cotta altar of incense found by Sellin at Taanach, because its height and dimensions at the base recall the altar of Ex. "It was just 3 ft. high, and in shape roughly like a truncated pyramid, the four sides at the bottom being each 18 inches long, and the whole ending at the top in a bowl a foot in diameter. .... The altar is hollow. .... Professor Sellin places the date of the altar at about 700 BC. .... An incense-altar of exactly the same shape .... but of much smaller size .... has been found quite recently at Gezer in debris of about 1000-600 BC" (Driver, Modern Research, etc., 85). These discoveries supply a grim comment on theories of those critics who maintain that incense was not used by the Hebrews before the time of Jeremiah. The form of the altar itself is as contrary to the principles of the Pentateuch law as any thing could be.

On altar furniture see POT; SHOVEL; BASIN; FLESH-HOOK; FIREPAN. On the site, TEMPLE, and generally, ARIEL; SACRIFICE; SANCTUARY; TABERNACLE; HIGH PLACE.

LITERATURE.

R. Kittel, Studien zur hebraischen Archaologie und Religions-Geschichte, I and II; Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics; Murray, Illustrated Bible Dictionary; EB, under the word "Altar"; EPC, chapter 6. The discussions in the ordinary works of reference must be used with caution for the

reason given in I above.

Harold M. Wiener

I. IN WORSHIP: TABERNACLE AND TEMPLES

1. Patriarchal Altars

2. Sacred Sites

3. Pre-Tabernacle Altars

II. THE ALTAR OF BURNT OFFERING; BRAZEN ALTAR

1. Altar before the Tabernacle

2. Its History

3. Altar of Solomon’s Temple

4. Altar of Ezekiel’s Temple

5. Altar of Second Temple

6. Altar of Herod’s Temple

III. THE ALTAR OF INCENSE (GOLDEN ALTAR)

1. In the Tabernacle

2. Mode of Burning Incense

3. In Solomon’s Temple and Later

4. In Herod’s Temple

5. Symbolism of Incense Burning

B. IN WORSHIP

I. In Worship: Tabernacle and Temples.

In the literature of the Bible, sacrifices are prior to altars, and altars prior to sacred buildings. Their first

mention is in the case of the altar built by Noah after the Flood (Ge 8:20).

1. Patriarchal Altars:

The next is the altar built at the place of Shechem, by which Abraham formally took possession, on behalf of his descendants, of the whole land of Canaan (Ge 12:7). A second altar was built between Bethel and Ai (Ge 12:8). To this the patriarch returned on his way from Egypt (Ge 13:4). His next place of sacrifice was Hebron (Ge 13:18); and tradition still professes to show the place where his altar stood. A subsequent altar was built on the top of a mountain in the land of Moriah for the sacrifice of Isaac (Ge 22:9).

2. Sacred Sites:

Each of these four spots was the scene of some special revelation of Yahweh; possibly to the third of them (Hebron) we may attribute the memorable vision and covenant of Ge 15. These sites became, in after years, the most venerated and coveted perquisites of the nation, and fights for their possession largely determined its history. To them Isaac added an altar at Beersheba (Ge 26:25), probably a re-erection, on the same site, of an altar built by Abraham, whose home for many years was at Beersheba. Jacob built no new altars, but again and again repaired those at Shechem and Bethel. On one occasion he offered a sacrifice on one of the mountains of Gilead, but without mention of an altar (Ge 31:54). There were thus four or five spots in Canaan associated at once with the worship of Yahweh, and the name of their great ancestor, which to Hebrews did not lose their sanctity by the passage of time, namely, Shechem, Bethel, Hebron, Moriah and Beersheba.

3. Pre-Tabernacle Altars:

The earliest provision for an altar as a portion of a fixed establishment of religion is found in Ex 20:24-26, immediately after the promulgation of the Decalogue. Altars are commanded to be made of earth or of unhewn stone, yet so as to have, not steps, but only slopes for ascent to the same—the injunction implying that they stood on some elevation (see ALTAR, sec A, above). Before the arrival at Sinai, during the war with Amalek, Moses had built an emergency altar, to which he gave the name Yahweh-Nissi (Ex 17:15). This was probably only a memorial altar (compare the altar ‘Ed in Jos 22:21 ff). At Sinai took place the great crisis in Israel’s national history. It was required that the covenant about to be made with Yahweh should be ratified with sacrificial blood; but before Moses could sprinkle the Book of the Covenant and the people who covenanted (Ex 24:6, ; compare He 9:19), it was necessary that an altar should be built for the sacrificial act. This was done "under the mount," where, beside the altar, were reared twelve pillars, emblematic of the twelve tribes of Israel (Ex 24:4). In connection with the tabernacle and the successive temples there were two altars—the Altar of Burnt Offering (the altar by preeminence, Eze 43:13), and the Altar of Incense. Of these it is now necessary to speak more particularly.

II. The Altar of Burnt Offering (The Brazen Altar)

(mizbach ha-‘olah), (mizbach ha-nechosheth).—(By "brass" throughout understand "bronze.")

1. Altar before the Tabernacle:

The altar which stood before the tabernacle was a portable box constructed of acacia wood and covered on the outside with plates of brass (Ex 27:1 ff). "Hollow with planks," is its definition (Ex 27:8). It was five cubits long, five cubits broad, and three cubits high; on the ordinary reckoning, about 7 1/2 ft. on the horizontal square, and 4 1/2 ft. in height (possibly less; see CUBIT). On the "grating of network of brass" described as around and half-way up the altar (verses 4,5), see GRATING. Into the corners of this grating, on two sides, rings were riveted, into which the staves were inserted by which the Ark was borne (see STAVES). For its corner projections, see HORNS OF THE ALTAR. The prohibition of steps in Ex 20:26 and the analogy of later altars suggest that this small altar before the tabernacle was made to stand on a base or platform, led up to by a slope of earth. The right of sanctuary is mentioned in Ex 21:14. For the utensils connected with the altar, see PAN; SHOVEL; BASIN; FLESH-HOOK; CENSER. All these utensils were made of brass.

2. Its History:

The history of the altar before the tabernacle was that of the tabernacle itself, as the two were not parted during its continuance (see TABERNACLE). Their abolition did not take place till Solomon’s temple was ready for use, when the great high place at Gibeon (1Ki 3:4) was dismantled, and the tabernacle and its holy vessels were brought to the new temple (1Ki 8:4). Another altar had meanwhile been raised by David before the tabernacle he had made on Zion, into which the Ark of the Covenant was moved (1Ch 15:1; 16:1). This would be a duplicate of that at Gibeon, and would share its supersession at the erection of the first temple.

3. Altar of Solomon’s Temple:

In Solomon’s temple the altar was considerably enlarged, as was to be expected from the greater size of the building before which it stood. We are indebted to the Chronicler for its exact dimensions (2Ch 4:1). It formed a square of twenty cubits, with an elevation of ten cubits (30 x 30 x 15 ft.; or somewhat less). It is described as "an altar of brass" (2Ch 4:1), or "brazen altar" (1Ki 8:64; 2Ch 7:7; compare 2Ki 16:14), either as being, like its predecessors, encased in brass, or, as others think, made wholly of brass. It was not meant to be portable, but that the altar itself was movable is shown by the fact of Ahaz having it removed (2Ki 16:14). Further details of its structure are not given. The altar stood in "the middle of the court that was before the house," but proved too small to receive the gifts on the day of the temple’s dedication (1Ki 8:64; 2Ch 7:7). It remained, however, the center of Israelite worship for 2 1/2 centuries, till Ahaz removed it from the forefront of the house, and placed it on the northern side of is Damascene altar (2Ki 16:14). This indignity was repaired by Hezekiah (compare 2Ki 18:22), and the altar assumed its old place in the temple service till its destruction by Nebuchadnezzar in 586 BC.

4. Altar of Ezekiel’s Temple:

The altar of Ezekiel’s ideal temple was, as planned, a most elaborate structure, the cubit used for this purpose being that of "a cubit and an handbreadth" (Eze 43:13), or the large cubit of history (see CUBIT). The paragraph describing it (Eze 43:13-17) is very specific, though uncertainty rests on the meaning of some of the details. The altar consisted of four stages lying one above another, gradually diminishing in size till the hearth was reached upon which the fire was literal. This was a square of twelve cubits (18 ft.), from the corners of which 4 horns projected upward (Eze 43:15). The base or lowest stage was one cubit in height, and had a border round about, half a cubit high (Eze 43:13); the remaining stages were two, four, and four cubits high respectively (Eze 43:14,15); the horns may have measured another cubit (thus, the Septuagint). Each stage was marked by the inlet of one cubit (Eze 43:13,14). The basement was thus, apparently, a square of eighteen cubits or 27 ft. The word "bottom" (literally, "bosom") in Ezekiel’s description is variously interpreted, some regarding it as a "drain" for carrying off the sacrificial blood, others identifying it with the "basement." On its eastern face the altar had steps looking toward the east (Eze 43:17)—a departure from the earlier practice (for the reason of this, compare Perowne’s article "Altar" in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible).

5. Altar of Second Temple:

Of the altar of the second temple no measurements are given. It is told only that it was built prior to the temple, and was set upon its base (Ezr 3:3), presumably on the Cakhra stone—the ancient site.

6. Altar of Herod’s Temple:

In Herod’s temple a difficulty is found in harmonizing the accounts of the Mishna and Josephus as to the size of the altar. The latter gives it as a square of fifty cubits (BJ, V, v, 6). The key to the solution probably lies in distinguishing between the structure of the altar proper (thirty-two cubits square), and a platform of larger area (fifty cubits square = 75 ft.) on which it stood. When it is remembered that the Cakhra stone is 56 ft in length and 42 ft. in width, it is easy to see that it might form a portion of a platform built up above and around it to a level of this size. The altar, like that of Ezekiel’s plan, was built in diminishing stages; in the Mishna, one of one cubit, and three of five cubits in height, the topmost stage measuring twenty-six cubits square, or, with deduction of a cubit for the officiating priests, twenty-four cubits. Josephus, on the other hand, gives the height at fifteen cubits. The altar, as before, had four horns. Both Josephus and the Mishna state that the altar was built of unhewn stones. The ascent, thirty-two cubits long and sixteen broad, likewise of unhewn stone, was on the south side. See further, TEMPLE, HEROD’S. It is of this altar that the words were spoken, "Leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift" (Mt 5:24).

III. The Altar of Incense (Golden Altar)

(mizbach ha-qeToreth), (mizbach ha-zahabh).

1. In the Tabernacle:

This was a diminutive table of acacia overlaid with gold, the upper surface of which was a square of one cubit, and its height two cubits, with an elevated cornice or crown around its top (Ex 30:2 ff). Like the great altar of burnt offering, it was in the category of "most holy" things (Ex 30:10); a distinction which gave it a right to a place in the inner room of the cella or holy of holies. Hence, in 1Ki 6:22, it is said to "belong to the oracle," and in Heb 9:4 that chamber is said to have the "altar of incense." It did not, however, actually stand there, but in the outer chamber, "before the veil" (Ex 40:26). The reason for this departure from the strict rule of temple ritual was that sweet incense was to be burnt daily upon it at the offering of every daily sacrifice, the lamps being then lit and extinguished (compare Nu 28:3 f; Ex 30:7,8), so that a cloud of smoke might fill the inner chamber at the moment when the sacrificial blood was sprinkled (see MERCY-SEAT). To have burnt this incense within the veil would have required repeated entries into the holy of holies, which entries were forbidden (Le 16:2). The altar thus stood immediately without the veil, and the smoke of the incense burnt upon it entered the inner chamber by the openings above the veil. For the material construction which admitted of this, see HOLY PLACE.

For other uses of the altar of incense see HORNS OF THE ALTAR, where it is shown that at the time of the offerings of special sin offerings and on the day of the annual fast its horns were sprinkled with blood. This, with the offering of incense upon it, were its only uses, as neither meal offerings might be laid upon it, nor libations of drink offerings poured thereon (Ex 30:9). The Tamiyd, or standing sacrifice for Israel, was a whole burnt offering of a lamb offered twice daily with its meal offering, accompanied with a service of incense.

2. Mode of Burning Incense:

It is probable that the censers in use at the time of the construction of this altar and after were in shape like a spoon or ladle (see SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF), which, when filled with live coals from the great altar, were carried within the sanctuary and laid upon the altar of incense (Le 16:12). The incense-sticks, broken small, were then placed upon the coals. The narrative of the deaths of Aaron’s sons, Nadab and Abihu, is thus made intelligible, the fire in their censers not having been taken from the great altar.

3. In Solomon’s Temple and Later:

The original small altar made by Moses was superseded by one made by Solomon. This was made of cedar wood, overlaid with gold (1Ki 6:20,22; 7:48; 9:25; 2Ch 4:19); hence, was called the "golden altar." This was among "all the vessels of the house of God, great and small," which Nebuchadnezzar took to Babylon (2Ch 36:18). As a consequence, when Ezekiel drew plans for a new temple, he gave it an incense altar made wholly of wood and of larger dimensions than before (Eze 41:22). It had a height of three cubits and a top of two cubits square. There was an incense altar likewise in the second temple. It was this altar, probably plated with gold, which Antiochus Epiphanes removed (1 Macc 1:21), and which was restored by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:49). (On critical doubts as to the existence of the golden altar in the first and second temples, compare POT, 323.)

4. In Herod’s Temple:

That the Herodian temple also had its altar of incense we know from the incident of Zacharias having a vision there of "an angel .... standing on the right side of the altar of incense" when he went into the temple of the Lord to burn incense (Lu 1:11). No representation of such an altar appears on the arch of Titus, though it is mentioned by Josephus (BJ, V, v, 5). It was probably melted down by John during the course of the siege (V, xiii, 6).

5. Symbolism of Incense Burning:

In the apocalypse of John, no temple was in the restored heaven and earth (Re 21:22), but in the earlier part of the vision was a temple (Re 14:17; 15:6) with an altar and a censer (Re 8:3). It is described as "the golden altar which was before the throne," and, with the smoke of its incense, there went up before God the prayers of the saints. This imagery is in harmony with the statement of Luke that as the priests burnt incense, "the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the hour of incense" (Lu 1:10). Both history and prophecy thus attest the abiding truth that salvation is by sacrificial blood, and is made available to men through the prayers of saints and sinners offered by a great High Priest.

W. Shaw Caldecott

ALTOGETHER

ol-too-geth’-er: Representing five Hebrew and three Greek originals, which variously signify

(1) "together"; i.e. all, e.g. ‘all men, high and low, weighed together in God’s balance are lighter than vanity’ (Ps 62:9); so also Ps 53:3; Jer 10:8.

(2) "all": so the Revised Version (British and American), Isa 10:8: "Are not my princes all of them kings?"

(3) "with one accord have broken the yoke"; so the Revised Version (British and American), Jer 5:5.

(4) "completely," "entirely," "fully": "so as not to destroy him altogether" (2Ch 12:12; compare Ge 18:21; Ex 11:1; Ps 39:5; Jer 30:11 the King James Version; compare the Revised Version (British and American)).

(5) "wholly": "altogether born in sins," Joh 9:34.

(6) In 1Co 5:10 the Revised Version (British and American) rendered "at all"; 1Co 9:10 "assuredly."

(7) A passage of classic difficulty to translators is Ac 26:29, where "altogether" in the Revised Version (British and American) is rendered "with much," Greek en megalo (en pollo). See ALMOST. Many of the instances where "altogether" occurs in the King James Version become "together" in the Revised Version (British and American). Used as an adjective in Ps 39:5 ("altogether vanity").

Dwight M. Pratt

ALUSH

a'-lush ('alush): A desert camp of the Israelites between Dophkah and Rephidim (Nu 33:13,14). The situation is not certainly known. See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

ALVAH

al'-va ('alwah): A chief (the King James Version duke) of Edom (Ge 36:40), called "Aliah" in 1Ch 1:51. Probably the same as Alvan, or Ahan, son of Shobal son of Seir (Ge 36:23; 1Ch 1:40).

ALVAN

al'-van ('alwan, "tall"?): A son of Shobal, the Horite (Ge 36:23). In 1Ch 1:40 the name is written Alian, Septuagint Olam. It is probably the same as Alvah of Ge 36:23, which appears in 1Ch 1:51 as Aliah.

ALWAY; ALWAYS

ol'-way, ol'-waz (archaic and poetic): Properly applied to acts or states perpetually occurring, but not necessarily continuous. In Hebrew, most frequently, tamiydh. In Greek dia pantos, ordinarily expresses continuity. In Mt 28:20 "alway" the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "always," translation Greek pasas tas hemeras, "all the days," corresponding to the Hebrew idiom similarly rendered in De 5:29; 6:24; 11:1; 28:33; 1Ki 11:36, etc. Greek aei in Ac 7:51; 2Co 6:10; 1Pe 3:15, means "at every and any time."

AMAD

a'-mad ('am'adh): A town in northern Palestine, which fell to the tribe of Asher in the division of the land (Jos 19:26). The modern ruin 'Amud near Accho may be the site.

AMADATHA; AMADATHUS

a-mad'-a-tha, a-mad'-a-thus (Additions to Es 12:6). See AMAN; HAMMEDATHA.

AMAIN

a-man’ (translated from the Greek eis phugen hormesan, "they rushed to flight"): The word is composed of the prefix "a" and the word "main," meaning "force." The expression is used by Milton, Parker, et al., but in Biblical literature found only in 2 Macc 12:22 where used to describe the flight of Timotheus and his army after he suffered defeat at the hands of Judas Maccabee ("They fled amain," i.e. violently and suddenly).

AMAL

a’-mal (‘amal, "toiler"): A son of Helem of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:35).

AMALEK

am’-a-lek (‘amaleq): The son, by his concubine Timna, of Eliphaz, the eldest son of Esau. He was one of the chiefs (the King James Version dukes) of Edom (Ge 36:12,16). See AMALEKITE.

AMALEK; AMALEKITE

am’-a-lek, a-mal’-e-kit, am’-a-lek-it (‘amaleq, ‘amaleqi): A tribe dwelling originally in the region south of Judah, the wilderness of et-Tih where the Israelites came into conflict with them. They were nomads as a people dwelling in that tract would naturally be. When they joined the Midianites to invade Israel they came "with their cattle and their tents" (Jud 6:3-5). They are not to be identified with the descendants of Esau (Ge 36:12,16) because they are mentioned earlier, in the account of the invasion of Chedorlaomer (Ge 14:7) and in Balaam’s prophecy (Nu 24:20) Amalek is called "the first of the nations," which seems to refer to an early existence. We are uncertain of their origin, for they do not appear in the list of nations found in Ge 10. They do not seem to have had any relationship with the tribes of Israel, save as, we may surmise, some of the descendants of Esau were incorporated into the tribe. It is probable that they were of Semitic stock though we have no proof of it.

The first contact with Israel was at Rephidim, in the wilderness of Sinai, where they made an unprovoked attack and were defeated after a desperate conflict (Ex 17:8-13; De 25:17,18). On account of this they were placed under the ban and Israel was commanded to exterminate them (De 25:19; 1Sa 15:2,3). The next encounter of the two peoples was when the Israelites attempted to enter Canaan from the west of the Dead Sea. The spies had reported that the Amalekites were to be found in the south, in connection with the Hittites, Jebusites and Amorites (Nu 13:29). The Israelites at first refused to advance, but later determined to do so contrary to the will of God and the command of Moses. They were met by Amalek and the Canaanites and completely defeated (Nu 14:39-45). Amalek is next found among the allies of Moab in their attack upon Israel in the days of Eglon (Jud 3:13). They were also associated with the Midianites in their raids upon Israel (Jud 6:3), and they seemed to have gained a foothold in Ephraim, or at least a branch of them, in the hill country (Jud 5:14; 12:15), but it is evident

that the great body of them still remained in their old habitat, for when Saul made war upon them he drove them toward Shur in the wilderness toward Egypt (1Sa 15:1-9). David also found them in the same region (1Sa 27:8; 30:1). After this they seem to have declined, and we find, in the days of Hezekiah, only a remnant of them who were smitten by the Simeonites at Mount Seir (1Ch 4:41-43). They are once mentioned in Psalms in connection with other inveterate enemies of Israel (Ps 83:7). The hatred Inspired by the Amalekites is reflected in the passages already mentioned which required their utter destruction. Their attack upon them when they were just escaped from Egypt and while they were struggling through the wilderness made a deep impression upon the Israelites which they never forgot, and the wrath of David upon the messenger who brought him news of the death of Saul and Jonathan, declaring himself to be the slayer of Saul, was no doubt accentuated by his being an Amalekite (2Sa 1:1-16).

H. Porter

AMAM

a'-mam ('amam): An unidentified town in southern Palestine, which fell to Judah In the allotment of the land; occurs only in Jos 15:26.

AMAN

a'-man (Aman; Codex Vaticanus reads Adam): Tobit 14:10; Additions to Esther 12:6; 16:10,17, probably in each case for Haman, the arch-enemy of the Jews in the canonical Book of Esther (compare Es 3:1 with Additions to Esther 12:6). In Additions to Esther (16:10) Aman is represented as a Macedonian, in all other points corresponding to the Haman of the Book of Esther.

AMANA

a-ma'-na, ('amanah): A mountain mentioned in So 4:8 along with Lebanon, Senir and Hermon. The name probably means the "firm," or "constant." "From the top of Amana" is mistranslated by the Septuagint apo arches pisteos. The Amana is most naturally sought in the Anti-Lebanon, near the course of the river Abana, or Amana (see ABANAH). Another possible identification is with Mt. Amanus in the extreme north of Syria.

AMARIAH

am-a-ri'-a ('amaryah and 'amaryahu, "the Lord has said"; compare HPN, 180, 285).

(1) A Levite in the line of Aaron-Eleazar; a son of Meraioth and grandfather of Zadok (1Ch 6:7,52) who lived in David's time. Compare Zadok (2Sa 15:27, etc.) also Ant, VIII, i, 3 and X, viii, 6.

(2) A Levite in the line of Kohath-Hebron referred to in 1Ch 23:19 and 24:23 at the time when David divided the Levites into courses.

(3) A Levite in the line of Aaron-Eleazar; a son of Azariah who "executed the priest's office in the house that Solomon built" (1Ch 6:10 f). Compare Ezr 7:3 where in the abbreviated list this Amariah is mentioned as an ancestor of Ezra. See AMARIAS (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:2) and number (4) of this article

(4) Chief priest and judge "in all matters of Yahweh" appointed by Jehoshaphat (2Ch 19:11). Possibly identical with Amariah, number (3).

(5) A descendant of Judah in the line of Perez and an ancestor of Ataiah who lived in Jerusalem after the Babylonian exile (Ne 11:4). Compare Imri (1Ch 9:4) and number (7) of this article, which Amariah seems to be of the same family,

(6) A Levite and an assistant of Kore who was appointed by Hezekiah to distributed the "oblations of Yahweh" to their brethren (2Ch 31:15).

(7) A son of Bani who had married a foreign woman (Ezr 10:42). See number (5) of this article

(8) A priest who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant (Ne 10:3); he had returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:2) and was the father of Jehohanan (compare Hanani, Ezr 10:20), priest at the time of Joiakim (Ne 12:13). Compare Immer (Ezr 2:37; 10:20; Ne 7:40) and also Emmeruth (the King James Version "Meruth," 1 Esdras 5:24).

(9) An ancestor of Zephaniah, the prophet (Ze 1:1).

A. L. Breslich

AMARIAS

am-a-ri'-as (A, Amarias; B, Amartheias) = Amariah number 3: An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:2).

AMARNA, TELL EL-

tel-el-a-mar'-na. See TELL EL-AMARNA.

AMASA

a-ma'-sa ('amasa', or read 'ammishai, i.e. 'am yishai, "people of Jesse"): The form 'amasa', is based

upon a mistaken etymology (from =‘ amac "to burden").

(1) According to 2Sa 17:25, Amasa is the son of Abigail, the sister of Zeruiah and David, and Ithra, an Israelite; but another source, 1Ch 2:17, calls his father Jether the Ishmaelite. He was a nephew of David and a cousin of Absalom, who made him commander of the army of rebellion. When the uprising had been quelled, David, in order to conciliate Amasa, promised him the position held by Joab; the latter had fallen from favor (2Sa 19:13 ff). When a new revolt broke out under Sheba, the son of Bichri (2Sa 20), Amasa was entrusted with the task of assembling the men of Judah. But Joab was eager for revenge upon the man who had obtained the office of command that he coveted. When Amasa met Joab at Gibeon, the latter murdered him while pretending to salute (2Sa 20:8-10; 1Ki 2:5).

(2) Son of Hadlai, of the Bene ‘Ephrayim ("Children of Ephraim"), who, obeying the words of the prophet Oded, refused to consider as captives the Judeans who had been taken from Ahaz, king of Judah, by the victorious Israelites under the leadership of Pekah (2Ch 28:12).

H. J. Wolf

AMASAI

a-ma’-si (‘amasay, perhaps rather to be read ‘ammishay; so Wellhausen, IJG, II, 24, n.2):

(1) A name in the genealogy of Kohath, son of Elkanah, a Levite of the Kohathite family (compare 1Ch 6:25; 2Ch 29:12).

(2) Chief of the captains who met David at Ziklag and tendered him their allegiance. Some have identified him with Amasa and others with Abishai, who is called Abshai in 1Ch 11:20 m (compare 1Ch 18:12). The difficulty is that neither Amasa nor Abishai occupied the rank of the chief of thirty according to the lists in 2Sa 23 and 1Ch 11, the rank to which David is supposed to have appointed into (compare 1Ch 12:18).

(3) One of the trumpet-blowing priests who greeted David when he brought back the Ark of the Covenant (compare 1Ch 15:24).

AMASHSAI

a-mash’-si ‘amashcay, probably a textual error for ‘amashay; the ("s") implies a reading ‘-M-C-Y, based on a mistaken derivation from’-M-C. The original reading may have been ‘ammishay; compare AMASAI): Amashsai is a priestly name in the post-exilic list of inhabitants of Jerusalem (Ne 11:13; Maasai, 1Ch 9:12); the reading in Chronicles is ma‘asay, the King James Version "Maasiai," the Revised Version (British and American) "Maasai."

AMASIAH

am-a-si’-a (‘amacyah, "Yah bears"): One of the captains of Jehoshaphat (compare 2Ch 17:16).

AMATH; AMATHIS

a’-math, am’-a-this (1 Macc 12:25). See HAMATH.

AMATHEIS

am-a-the’-is. See EMATHEIS.

AMAZED

a-mazd’:A term which illustrates the difficulty of expressing in one English word the wide range of startled emotion, wonder, astonishment, awe, covered, in the Old Testament, by four Hebrew words and in the New Testament by as many Greek words. Its Scripture originals range in meaning from amazement accompanied with terror and trembling to an astonishment full of perplexity, wonder, awe and joyous surprise. It is the word especially used to show the effect of Christ’s miracles, teaching, character and Divine personality on those who saw and heard Him, and were made conscious of His supernatural power (Mt 12:23: "All the multitudes were amazed"). The miracles of Pentecost and the Holy Spirit’s bestowal of the gift of tongues produced the same universal wonder (Ac 2:7: "They were all amazed and marveled").

Dwight M. Pratt

AMAZIAH

am-a-zi’-a (’amatsyah, ‘amatsyahu, "Yahweh is mighty"; 2Ki 14:1-20; 2Ch 25). Son of Jehoash, and tenth king of Judah. Amaziah had a peaceable accession at the age of 25. A depleted treasury, a despoiled palace and temple, and a discouraged people were among the consequences of his father’s war with Hazael, king of Syria. When settled on the throne, Amaziah brought to justice the men who had assassinated his father. Amaziah verbal citation of De 24:16 in 2Ki 14:6, forbidding the punishment of children for a father’s offense, shows that the laws of this book were then known, and were recognized as authoritative, and, in theory, as governing the nation. His accession may be dated circa 812 (some put later).

1. The Edomite War:

The young king’s plan for the rehabilitation of his people was the restoration of the kingdom’s military prestige, so severely lowered in his father’s reign. A militia army, composed of all the young men above

20 years of age, was first organized and placed upon a war footing (2Ch 25:5; the number given, 300,000, is not a reliable one). Even this not being considered a large enough force to effect the project, 100 talents of silver were sent to engage mercenary troops for the expedition from Israel. When these came, a man of God strongly dissuaded the king from relying on them (2Ch 25:7 ff). When this was communicated to the soldiers, and they were sent back unemployed, it roused them to "fierce anger" (2Ch 25:10).

2. Its Occasion:

Amaziah's purpose in making these extensive preparations for war, in a time of profound peace, is clear to the Southeast of Judah lay the Edomite state, with its capital at Petra. For many years Edom had been subject to Jehoshaphat, and a Hebrew "deputy" had governed it (1Ki 22:47). In the reign of his son and successor, Jehoram, a confederacy of Philistines, Arabians and Edomites took Libnah and made a raid on Jerusalem. A band of these penetrated the palace, which they plundered, abducted some women, and murdered all the young princes but the youngest (2Ch 21:17; 22:1). The public commotion and distress caused by such an event may be seen reflected in the short oracle of the prophet Obadiah, uttered against Edom, if, with some, Obadiah's date is put thus early

3. The Victory in the Valley of Salt:

From that time "Edom .... made a king over themselves" (2Ch 21:8), and for fifty years following were practically independent. It was this blot on Jerusalem and the good name of Judah that Amaziah determined to wipe out. The army of retaliation went forward, and after a battle in the Valley of Salt, south of the Dead Sea, in which they were the victors, moved on to Petra. This city lies in a hollow, shut in by mountains, and approached only by a narrow ravine, through which a stream of water flows. Amaziah took it "by storm" (such is Ewald's rendering of "by war," in 2Ki 14:7). Great execution was done, many of the captives being thrown from the rock, the face of which is now covered with rock-cut tombs of the Greek-Roman age.

4. Apostasy and Its Punishment:

The campaign was thus entirely successful, but had evil results. Flushed with victory, Amaziah brought back the gods of Edom, and paid them worship. For this act of apostasy, he was warned of approaching destruction (2Ch 25:14-17). Disquieting news soon came relating to the conduct of the troops sent back to Samaria. From Beth-horon in the south to the border of the northern state they had looted the villages and killed some of the country people who had attempted to defend their property (2Ch 25:13). To Amaziah's demand for reparation, Jehoash's answer was the contemptuous one of the well-known parable of the Thistle and the Cedar.

5. Battle of Beth-shemesh:

War was now inevitable. The kings "looked one another in the face," in the valley of Beth-shemesh,

where there is a level space, suitable to the movements of infantry. Judah was utterly routed, and the king himself taken prisoner. There being no treasures in the lately despoiled capital, Jehoash contented himself with taking hostages for future good behavior, and with breaking down 400 cubits of the wall of Jerusalem at the Northwest corner of the defense (2Ki 14:13,14; 2Ch 25:22-24).

6. Closing Years and Tragical End:

Amaziah's career as a soldier was now closed. He outlived Jehoash of Israel "fifteen years" (2Ki 14:17). His later years were spent in seclusion and dread, and had a tragical ending. The reason for his unpopularity is not far to seek. The responsibility for the war with Jehoash is by the inspired writer placed upon the shoulders of Amaziah (2Ki 14:9-11). It was he who "would not hear." The quarrel between the kings was one which it was not beyond the power of diplomacy to remedy, but no brotherly attempt to heal the breach was made by either king. When the results of the war appeared, it could not be but that the author of the war should be called upon to answer for them. So deep was his disgrace and so profound the sense of national humiliation, that a party in the state determined on Amaziah's removal, so soon as there was another to take his place. The age of majority among the Hebrew kings was 16, and when Amaziah's son was of this age, the conspiracy against his life grew so strong and open that he fled to Lachish. Here he was followed and killed; his body being insultingly carried to Jerusalem on horses, and not conveyed in a litter or coffin (2Ki 14:19,20; 2Ch 25:27,28). He was 54 years old and had reigned for 29 years. The Chronicler (2Ch 26:1) hardly conceals the popular rejoicings at the exchange of sovereigns, when Uzziah became king.

In 2Ch 25:28 is a copyist's error by which we read "in the city of Judah," instead of "in the city of David," as in the corresponding passage in Kings. The singular postscript to the record of Amaziah in 2Ki 14:22 is intended to mark the fact that while the port of Elath on the Red Sea fell before the arms, in turn, of Amaziah and of his son Uzziah, it was the latter who restored it to Judah, as a part of its territory. Amaziah is mentioned in the royal genealogy of 1Ch 3:12, but not in that of Mt 1. There is a leap here from Jehoram to Uzziah, Ahaziah, Jehoash and Amaziah being omitted.

W. Shaw Caldecott

AMBASSADOR

am-bas'-a-dor (mal'akh, "messenger"; 'luts, "interpreter"; tsir, "to go"; hence a messenger; presbeuo, "to act as an ambassador," literally, to be older): An ambassador is an official representative of a king or government, as of Pharaoh (Isa 30:4); of the princes of Babylon (2Ch 32:31); of Neco, king of Egypt (2Ch 35:21); of the messengers of peace sent by Hezekiah, king of Judah, to Sennacherib, king of Assyria (Isa 33:7). The same Hebrew term is used of the messengers sent by Jacob to Esau (Ge 32:3); by Moses to the king of Edom (Nu 20:14). For abundant illustration consult "Messenger" (mal'akh) in any concordance. See CONCORDANCE. The inhabitants of Gibeon made themselves pretended ambassadors to Joshua in order to secure by deceit the protection of a treaty ("covenant") (Jos 9:4).

In the New Testament the term is used in a figurative sense. As the imprisoned representative of Christ at Rome Paul calls himself "an ambassador in chains" (Eph 6:20); and in 2Co 5:20 includes, with himself, all ministers of the gospel, as "ambassadors .... on behalf of Christ," commissioned by Him as their sovereign Lord, with the ministry of reconciling the world to God. The Bible contains no finer characterization of the exalted and spiritual nature of the minister's vocation as the representative of Jesus Christ, the King of kings, and Saviour of the world.

Dwight M. Pratt

AMBASSAGE

am'-ba-saj (presbeia, "an embassy," a body of ambassadors on the message entrusted to them): Twice used by Christ

(1) in the parable of the Pounds, of the citizens who hated the nobleman and sent an ambassage, refusing to have him reign over them, thus illustrating those who willfully rejected His own spiritual sovereignty and kingdom (Lu 19:14);

(2) of a weak king who sends to a stronger an ambassage to ask conditions of peace (Lu 14:32). Not used elsewhere in the Bible.

AMBER

am'-ber. See STONES, PRECIOUS.

AMBITIOUS

am-bish'-us (philotimeomai, "to be strongly desirous," "strive earnestly," "make it one's aim"): Given as a marginal reading in Ro 15:20 ("being ambitious to bring good tidings"), 2Co 5:9 ("We are ambitious, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto him"), and 1Th 4:11 ("that ye be ambitious to be quiet").

AMBUSH

am'-boosh ('arabh, "to set an ambush"; ma'arabh, "an ambush"): A military stratagem in which a body of men are placed in concealment to surprise an enemy unawares, or to attack a point when temporarily undefended. This stratagem was employed successfully by Joshua at Ai (Jos 8). Jeremiah calls upon the Medes to "set up a standard against the walls of Babylon, make the watch strong, set the watchmen, prepare the ambushes" (Jer 51:12).

AMBUSHMENT

am’-boosh-ment (as above) has now disappeared in 2Ch 20:22, where the Revised Version (British and American) gives for "ambushment" "liers-in-wait." It still remains in 2Ch 13:13 where both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render the Hebrew noun "ambushment."

AMEN

a-men’ (in ritual speech and in singing a-men’, a’men) (’amen; amen, =" truly," "verily"): Is derived from the reflexive form of a verb meaning "to be firm," or "to prop." It occurs twice as a noun in Isa 65:16, where we have (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) "God of truth." This rendering implies the pointing ‘omen or ‘emun i.e. "truth," or "faithfulness," a reading actually suggested by Cheyne and adopted by others. "Amen" is generally used as an adverb of assent or confirmation—fiat, "so let it be." In Jer 28:6 the prophet endorses with it the words of Hananiah. Amen is employed when an individual or the whole nation confirms a covenant or oath recited in their presence (Nu 5:22; De 27:15 ff; Ne 5:13, etc.). It also occurs at the close of a psalm or book of psalms, or of a prayer.

That "Amen" was appended to the doxology in the early church is evident both from Paul and Rev, and here again it took the form of a response by the hearers. The ritual of the installation of the Lamb (Re 5:6-14) concludes with the Amen of the four beasts, and the four and twenty elders. It is also spoken after "Yea: I come quickly" (Re 22:20). And that Revelation reflects the practice of the church on earth, and not merely of an ideal, ascended community in heaven, may be concluded from 1Co 14:16, whence we gather that the lay brethren were expected to say "Amen" to the address. (See Weizsacker’s The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, English translation, II, 289.)

James Millar

AMERCE

a-murs’:Found in the King James Version only in De 22:19, "And they shall amerce him in an hundred shekels of silver." Amerce is a legal term derived from the French (a =" at"; merci =" mercy," i.e. literally, "at the mercy" (of the court)). Here it is used of the imposing of a fine, according to the Law of Moses, upon the man who has been proven by the Elders to have brought a false charge against the virginity of the maid he has married by saying to the father, "I found not thy daughter a maid."

AMERICAN REVISED VERSION

a-mer’-i-kan re-vizd’ vur’-shun.

1. History:

On July 7, 1870, it was moved in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury that in the work of revision the cooperation of American divines be invited. This resolution was assented to, and on December 7, 1871, the arrangements were completed. Under the general presidency of Dr. Philip Schaff, an Old Testament Company of fifteen scholars was formed, with Dr. W. H. Green as chairman, and a New Testament Company of sixteen members (including Dr. Schaff), with Dr. T. D. Woolsey as chairman. Work was begun on October 4, 1872, and took the form of offering criticisms on the successive portions of the English revision as they were received. These criticisms of the American Companies were duly considered by the English Companies during the second revision and the decisions were again sent to America for criticism. The replies received were once more given consideration and, finally, the unadopted readings for which the American Companies professed deliberate preference were printed as appendices to the two Testaments as published in 1881 and 1885. These lists, however, were not regarded by the American Companies as satisfactory. In the first place, it became evident that the English Companies, on account of their instructions and for other reasons, were not willing to make changes of a certain class. Consequently the American Companies insisted on only such readings as seemed to have a real chance of being accepted. And, in the second place, the English presses hurried the last part of the work and were unwilling to allow enough time for adequate thoroughness in the preparation of the lists. But it was hoped that the first published edition of the English Revised Version would not be considered definitive and that in the future such American proposals as had stood the test of public discussion might be incorporated into the text. This hope was disappointed—the English Companies disbanded as soon as their revision was finished and their work stood as final. As a result the American Companies resolved to continue their organization. They were pledged not to issue or endorse any new revision within fourteen years after the publication of the English Revised Version, and so it was not until 1900 that the American Standard Revised Version New Testament was published. The whole Bible was issued in the following year.

2. Differences from English Revised Version:

As the complete editions of the American Standard Revised Version give a full list of the changes made, only the more prominent need be mentioned here. A few of the readings printed in the appendices to the English Revised Version were abandoned, but many new ones were introduced, including some that had been adopted while the English work was in progress but which had not been pressed. (See above.) Still, in general appearance, the American Standard Revised Version differs but slightly from the English. The most important addition is found in the page-headings. Some changes have been made in shortening the titles of the New Testament books. The printing of poetical passages in poetical form has been carried through more consistently. The paragraphs have been altered in some cases and (especially in the Old Testament) shortened. The punctuation has been simplified, especially by the more frequent use of the semi-colon. The removal of obsolete words ("magnifical," "neesings," etc.) has been effected fairly thoroughly, obsolete constructions ("jealous over," etc.) have been modernized, particularly by the use of "who" or "that" (instead of "which") for persons and "its" (instead of "his") for things. In the Old Testament "Yahweh" has been introduced systematically for the proper Hebrew word, as has "Sheol" ("Hades" in the New Testament). Certain passages too literally rendered in the English Revised Version ("reins," "by the hand of," etc.) are given in modern terms. In the New Testament, the substitution of "Holy Spirit" for "Holy Ghost" was completed throughout (in the English Revised

Version it is made in some twenty places), "demons" substituted for "devils," "Teacher" for "Master," and "try" for "tempt" when there is no direct reference to wrongdoing. And so on.

3. Criticism:

It may be questioned whether the differences between the two Revisions are great enough to counterbalance the annoyance and confusion resulting from the existence of two standard versions in the same language. But, accepting the American Standard Revised Version as an accomplished fact, and acknowledging a few demerits that it has or may be thought to have in comparison with the English Revised Version (a bit of pedantry in Ps 148:12 or renderings of disputed passages such as Ps 24:6), these demerits are altogether outweighed by the superiorities—with one exception. In the Psalter, when used liturgically, the repetition of the word "Yahweh" becomes wearisome and the English Revised Version which retains "The Lord" is much preferable. Most to be regretted in the American Standard Revised Version is its extreme conservatism in the readings of the original texts. In the Old Testament the number of marginal variants was actually reduced. In the New Testament, only trivial changes are made from the so-called Revisers' Greek Text, although this text did not represent the best scholarly opinion even in 1881, while in 1900 it was almost universally abandoned (Today—in 1914—it is obsolete.) It is very unfortunate that the American Revisers did not improve on the example of their English brethren and continue their sessions after the publication of their version, for it is only by the successive revisions of published work that a really satisfactory result can be attained.

4. Apocrypha:

No American Standard Revised Version Apocrypha was attempted, a particularly unfortunate fact, as the necessity for the study of the Apocrypha has become imperative and the English Revised Version Apocrypha is not a particularly good piece of work. However, copies of the American Standard Revised Version can now be obtained with the English Revised Version Apocrypha included. See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

Burton Scott Easton

AMETHYST

am'-e-thist. See STONES, PRECIOUS.

AMI

a'-mi, a'-me ('ami): Ancestor of a family among "Solomon's servants" in the Return (Ezr 2:57); the same as Amon in Ne 7:59.

AMIABLE

a’-mi-a-b’-l (yedhidh, "beloved"): Applied to the tabernacle or tent of meeting "How amiable ("lovely" the Revised Version, margin) are thy tabernacles" (Ps 84:1), the plural having reference to the subdivisions and appurtenances of the sanctuary (compare Ps 68:35). The adjective is rendered "amiable" in the sense of the French amiable, lovely; but the usage of the Hebrew word requires it to be understood as meaning "dear," "beloved." Compare "so amiable a prospect" (Sir T. Herbert), "They keep their churches so cleanly and amiable" (Howell, 1644). "What made the tabernacle of Moses lovely was not the outside, which was very mean, but what was within" (John Gill). See TABERNACLE.

M. O. Evans

AMINADAB

a-min’-a-dab (Aminadab): the King James Version: Greek form of Amminadab (which see). Thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 1:4; Lu 3:33).

AMISS

a-mis’:There are two words translated "amiss" in the New Testament, atopos, referring to that which is improper or harmful (Lu 23:41; Ac 28:6), while kakos, refers to that which is evil in the sense of a disaster, then to that which is wicked, morally wrong. This latter is the use of it in Jas 4:3. The purpose of the prayer is evil, it is therefore amiss and cannot be granted (compare 2Ch 6:37 ff).

AMITTAI

a-mit’-i (’amittay, "faithful"): The father of the prophet Jonah. He was from Gath-hepher in Zebulun (2Ki 14:25; Jon 1:1).

AMMAH

am’-a (’ammah, "mother" or "beginning"): A hill in the territory of Benjamin (2Sa 2:24), where Joab and Abishai halted at nightfall in their pursuit of Abner and his forces after their victory over him in the battle of Gibeon. It "lieth before Giah by the way of the wilderness of Gibeon"; but the exact location has not been identified. The same Hebrew word appears as the second part of Metheg-ammah in 2Sa 8:1 the King James Version, but rendered "mother city" in the Revised Version (British and American), probably however not the same place as in 2Sa 2:24.

AMMI

am’-i (‘ammi, "my people"): A symbolic name given to Israel by Hosea (Ho 2:1; 2:3 in Hebrew text), descriptive of Israel in the state of restoration, and in contrast to sinful and rejected Israel, represented by

Hosea’s son, who was called Lo-ammi, "not my people," when born to the prophet (Ho 1:9,10). This restoration to the Divine favor is more fully described in Ho 2:21,23 in words quoted by Paul (Ro 9:25,26). The use of such figurative and descriptive names is frequent in the Old Testament; compare Isa 62:4,12.

AMMIDIOI; AMMIDOI

a-mid’-i-oi, am’-i-doi (the King James Version Ammidioi, (also with aspirate); occurring only in 1 Esdras 5:20): One of the families returning from the Babylonian Captivity in the First Return, under Zerubbabel, in 537 BC. This name is not found in the corresponding lists of the canonical books, Ezr 2 and Ne 7. Their identity is uncertain.

AMMIEL

am’-i-el (‘ammi’el, "my kinsman is God"; (Ameiel)): A name borne by four men in the Old Testament.

(1) One of the twelve spies sent into Canaan by Moses; son of Gemalli, of the tribe of Da (Nu 13:12).

(2) A Benjamite, the father of Machir, a friend of David, living at Lodebar in Gilead (2Sa 9:4,5; 17:27).

(3) Father of Bathshua (or Bathsheba), one of David’s wives, who was mother of Solomon (1Ch 3:5). In the parallel passage, 2Sa 11:3, by transposition of the two parts of the name, he is called Eliam, meaning "my God is a kinsman."

(4) The sixth son of Obed-edom, a Levite, one of the doorkeepers of the tabernacle of God in David’s life-time (1Ch 26:5).

Edward Mack

AMMIHUD

a-mi’-hud (‘ammihudh, "my kinsman is glorious"; variously in the Septuagint, Emioud or Semioud or Amioud): The name of several Old Testament persons.

(1) Father of Elishama, who in the wilderness was head of the tribe of Ephraim (Nu 1:10; 2:18; 7:48,53; 10:22; 1Ch 7:26).

(2) Father of Shemuel, who was appointed by Moses from the tribe of Simeon to divide the land among the tribes after they should have entered Canaan (Nu 34:20).

(3) Father of Pedahel, who was appointed from the tribe of Naphtali for the same purpose as the

Ammihud of (2) (Nu 34:28).

(4) In the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin for the Ammihur (‘ammichur,"my kinsman is noble"), who was father of Talmai of Geshur, a little Aramaic kingdom East of the Lebanon mountains, to whom Absalom fled after the murder of his brother Amnon. The weight of evidence seems to favor the reading Ammichur (2Sa 13:37).

(5) A descendant of Judah through the line of Perez (1Ch 9:4).

Edward Mack

AMMIHUR

a-mi’-hur (the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin; ‘ammichur, "my kinsman is noble"; Emioud). See AMMIHUD (4).

AMMINADAB

a-min’-a-dab (‘amminadhabh =" my people (or my kinsman) is generous or noble"): Three persons bearing this name are mentioned in the Old Testament.

(1) In Ru 4:19,20 and 1Ch 2:10 Amminadab is referred to as one of David’s ancestors. He was the great-grandson of Perez, a son of Judah (Ge 38:29; 46:12) and the great-grandfather of Boaz, who again was the great- grandfather of David. Aaron’s wife, Elisheba, was a daughter of Amminadab (Ex 6:23), while one of the sons, namely, Nahshon, occupied an important position in the Judah-clan (Nu 1:7; 2:3; 7:12; 10:14).

(2) In the first Book of Chronicles (1Ch 6:22) Amminadab is mentioned as a son of Kohath (and therefore a grandson of Levi) and the father of Korah. But in other genealogical passages (Ex 6:18; Nu 3:19; 1Ch 6:2) the sons of Kohath are Amram, Izhar, Hebron and Uzziel, and in two places (Ex 6:21; 1Ch 6:38) Izhar is mentioned as the father of Korah.

(3) According to 1Ch 15:10,11 Amminadab was the name of a priest who took part in the removal of the ark to Jerusalem. He was the son of Uzziel, and therefore a nephew of Amminadab, son of Kohath (= Izhar).

Thomas Lewis

AMMINADIB

a-min’-a-dib (‘amminadhibh): The name occurs in the King James Version and the Revised Version,

margin only in one passage (So 6:12, "the chariots of Amminadib"). In King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) text, however, it is not regarded as a proper name, and the clause is rendered, "among the chariots of my princely people." Interpretations widely vary (see COMMENTARIES).

AMMISHADDAI

am-i-shad'-i, am-i-shad-a'-i ('ammishadday, "Shaddai is my kinsman"): The father of Ahiezer, a Danite captain or "head of his fathers' house," during the wilderness journey (Nu 1:12; 2:25, etc.).

AMMIZABAD

a-miz'-a-bad ('ammizabhadh, "my kinsman has made a present"): The son of Benaiah, one of David's captains for the third month (1Ch 27:6).

AMMON; AMMONITES

am'-on, am'-on-its ('ammon; 'ammonim):

The Hebrew tradition makes this tribe descendants of Lot and hence related to the Israelites (Ge 19:38). This is reflected in the name usually employed in Old Testament to designate them, Ben 'Ammi, Bene 'Ammon, "son of my people," "children of my people," i.e. relatives. Hence we find that the Israelites are commanded to avoid conflict with them on their march to the Promised Land (De 2:19). Their dwelling-place was on the east of the Dead Sea and the Jordan, between the Arnon and the Jabbok, but, before the advance of the Hebrews, they had been dispossessed of a portion of their land by the Amorites, who founded, along the east side of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, the kingdom of Sihon (Nu 21:21-31).

We know from the records of Egypt, especially Tell el-Amarna Letters, the approximate date of the Amorite invasion (14th and 13th centuries, BC). They were pressed on the north by the Hittites who forced them upon the tribes of the south, and some of them settled east of the Jordan. Thus, Israel helped Ammonites by destroying their old enemies, and this makes their conduct at a later period the more reprehensible. In the days of Jephthah they oppressed the Israelites east of the Jordan, claiming that the latter had deprived them of their territory when they came from Egypt, whereas it was the possessions of the Amorites they took (Jud 11:1-28). They were defeated, but their hostility did not cease, and their conduct toward the Israelites was particularly shameful, as in the days of Saul (1Sa 11) and of David (2Sa 10). This may account for the cruel treatment meted out to them in the war that followed (2Sa 12:26-31).

They seem to have been completely subdued by David and their capital was taken, and we find a better spirit manifested afterward, for Nahash of Rabbah showed kindness to him when a fugitive (2Sa 17:27-

29). Their country came into the possession of Jeroboam, on the division of the kingdom, and when the Syrians of Damascus deprived the kingdom of Israel of their possessions east of the Jordan, the Ammonites became subjects of Benhadad, and we find a contingent of 1,000 of them serving as allies of that king in the great battle of the Syrians with the Assyrians at Qarqar (854 BC) in the reign of Shalmaneser II. They may have regained their old territory when Tiglath-pileser carried off the Israelites East of the Jordan into captivity (2Ki 15:29; 1Ch 5:26). Their hostility to both kingdoms, Judah and Israel, was often manifested. In the days of Jehoshaphat they joined with the Moabites in an attack upon him, but met with disaster (2Ch 20). They paid tribute to Jotham (2Ch 27:5). After submitting to Tiglath-pileser they were generally tributary to Assyria, but we have mention of their joining In the general uprising that took place under Sennacherib; but they submitted and we find them tributary in the reign of Esarhaddon.

Their hostility to Judah is shown in their joining the Chaldeans to destroy it (2Ki 24:2). Their cruelty is denounced by the prophet Am 1:13, and their destruction by Jer 49:1-6, Eze 21:28-32, Ze 2:8,9. Their murder of Gedaliah (2Ki 25:22-26; Jer 40:14) was a dastardly act. Tobiah the Ammonites united with Sanballat to oppose Ne (Ne 4), and their opposition to the Jews did not cease with the establishment of the latter in Judea.

They joined the Syrians in their wars with the Maccabees and were defeated by Judas (1 Mac 5:6). Their religion was a degrading and cruel superstition. Their chief god was Molech, or Moloch, to whom they offered human sacrifices (1Ki 11:7) against which Israel was especially warned (Le 20:2-5). This worship was common to other tribes for we find it mentioned among the Phoenicians.

H. Porter

AMMONITESS

am-on-i'-tes, a-mon'-i-tes ('ammonith): A woman of the Ammonites, Naamah, the mother of Rehoboam (1Ki 14:21,31; 2Ch 12:13; 24:26).

AMNON am'-non ('amnon, "faithful"; compare 'aminon, 2Sa 13:20, which is probably a diminutive. Wellhausen (IJG, II, 24, note 2) resolves 'amiynown into 'immi, and nun, "my mother is the serpent"; compare NUN): (1) The eldest son of David and Ahinoam, the Jezreelites (compare 2Sa 3:2). As the crown prince and heir presumptive to the throne, he was intensely hated by Absalom, who was, therefore, doubly eager to revenge the outrage committed by Amnon upon his sister Tamar (2Sa 3:2; 13:1 ff, 1Ch 3:1). (2) A name in the genealogy of Judah (1Ch 4:20).

AMOK

a'-mok ('amoq, "deep"): A chief priest who came to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:7) and the forefather of Eber, who was priest in the days of Joiakim (Ne 12:20).

AMON

a’-mon (’amon): A name identical with that of the Egyptian local deity of Thebes (No); compare Jer 46:25. The foreign name given to a Hebrew prince is remarkable, as is also the fact that it is one of the two or three royal names of Judah not compounded with the name of Yahweh. See MANASSEH. It seems to reflect the sentiment which his fanatical father sought to make prevail that Yahweh had no longer any more claim to identification with the realm than had other deities.

(1) A king of Judah, son and successor of Manasseh; reigned two years and was assassinated in his own palace by the officials of his household. The story of his reign is told briefly in 2Ki 21:19-26, and still more briefly, though in identical terms, so far as they go, in 2Ch 33:21-25. His short reign was merely incidental in the history of Judah; just long enough to reveal the traits and tendencies which directly or indirectly led to his death. It was merely a weaker continuation of the regime of his idolatrous father, though without the fanaticism which gave the father positive character, and without the touch of piety which, if the Chronicler’s account is correct, tempered the father’s later years.

If the assassination was the initial act of a revolution the latter was immediately suppressed by "the people of the land," who put to death the conspirators and placed Amon’s eight-year-old son Josiah on the throne. In the view of the present writer the motive of the affair was probably connected with the perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty, which, having survived so long according to prophetic prediction (compare 2Sa 7:16; Ps 89:36,37), was an essential guarantee of Yahweh’s favor. Manasseh’s foreign sympathies, however, had loosened the hold of Yahweh on the officials of his court; so that, instead of being the loyal center of devotion to Israel’s religious and national idea, the royal household was but a hotbed of worldly ambitions, and all the more for Manasseh’s prosperous reign, so long immune from any stroke of Divine judgment.

It is natural that, seeing the insignificance of Amon’s administration, some ambitious clique, imitating the policy that had frequently succeeded in the Northern Kingdom, should strike for the throne. They had reckoned, however, without estimating the inbred Davidic loyalty of the body of the people. It was a blow at one of their most cherished tenets, committing the nation both politically and religiously to utter uncertainty. That this impulsive act of the people was in the line of the purer religious movement which was ripening in Israel does not prove that the spiritually-minded "remnant" was minded to violence and conspiracy, it merely shows what a stern and sterling fiber of loyalty still existed, seasoned and confirmed by trial below the corrupting cults and fashions of the ruling classes. In the tragedy of Amon’s reign, in short, we get a glimpse of the basis of sound principle that lay at the common heart of Israel.

(2) A governor of Samaria (1Ki 22:26); the one to whom the prophet Micaiah was committed as a prisoner by King Ahab, after the prophet had disputed the predictions of the court prophets and foretold the king’s death in battle.

(3) The head of the "children of Solomon’s servants" (Ne 7:59) who returned from captivity; reckoned

along with the Nethinim, or temple slaves. Called also Ami (Ezr 2:57).

John Franklin Genung

AMORITES

am’-o-rits; Amorites (’emori, always in the singular like the Babylonian Amurru from which it is taken; Amorraioi):

1. Varying Use of the Name Explained

2. The Amorite Kingdom

3. Sihon’s Conquest

4. Disappearance of the Amorite Kingdom

5. Physical Characteristics of the Amorites

The name Amorite is used in the Old Testament to denote

(1) the inhabitants of Palestine generally,

(2) the population of the hills as opposed to the plain, and

(3) a specific people under a king of their own. Thus

(1) we hear of them on the west shore of the Dead Sea (Ge 14:7), at Hebron (Ge 14:13), and Shechem (Ge 48:22), in Gilead and Bashan (De 3:10) and under Hermon (De 3:8; 4:48). They are named instead of the Canaanites as the inhabitants of Palestine whom the Israelites were required to exterminate (Ge 15:16; De 20:17; Jud 6:10; 1Sa 7:14; 1Ki 21:26; 2Ki 21:11); the older population of Judah is called Amorite in Jos 10:5,6, in conformity with which Eze (16:3) states that Jerusalem had an Amorite father; and the Gibeonites are said to have been "of the remnant of the Amorites" (2Sa 21:2). On the other hand

(2), in Nu 13:29 the Amorites are described as dwelling in the mountains like the Hittites and Jebusites of Jerusalem, while the Amalekites or Bedouins lived in the south and the Canaanites on the seacoast and in the valley of the Jordan. Lastly (3) we hear of Sihon, "king of the Amorites," who had conquered the northern half of Moab (Nu 21:21-31; De 2:26-35).

1. Varying Use of the Name Explained:

Assyriological discovery has explained the varying use of the name. The Hebrew form of it is a transliteration of the Babylonian Amurru, which was both sing. and plural. In the age of Abraham the Amurru were the dominant people in western Asia; hence Syria and Palestine were called by the Babylonians "the land of the Amorites." In the Assyrian period this was replaced by "land of the Hittites," the Hittites in the Mosaic age having made themselves masters of Syria and Canaan. The use of the name "Amorite" in its general sense belongs to the Babylonian period of oriental history.

2. The Amorite Kingdom:

The Amorite kingdom was of great antiquity. About 2500 BC it embraced the larger part of Mesopotamia and Syria, with its capital probably at Harran, and a few centuries later northern Babylonia was occupied by an "Amorite" dynasty of kings who traced theft descent from Samu or Sumu (the Biblical Shem), and made Babylon their capital. To this dynasty belonged Khammu-rabi, the Amraphel of Ge 14:1. In the astrological documents of the period frequent reference is made to "the king of the Amorites." This king of the Amorites was subject to Babylonia in the age of the dynasty of Ur, two or three centuries before the birth of Abraham He claimed suzerainty over a number of "Amorite" kinglets, among whom those of Khana on the Euphrates, near the mouth of the Khabur, may be named, since in the Abrahamic age one of them was called Khammu-rapikh and another Isarlim or Israel. A payment of a cadastral survey made at this time by a Babylonian governor with the Canaanite name of Urimelech is now in the Louvre. Numerous Amorites were settled in Ur and other Babylonian cities, chiefly for the purpose of trade. They seem to have enjoyed the same rights and privileges as the native Babylonians. Some of them were commercial travelers, but we hear also of the heads of the great firms making journeys to the Mediterranean coast.

In an inscription found near Diarbekir and dedicated to Khammu-rabi by Ibirum (= Eber), the governor of the district, the only title given to the Babylonian monarch is "king of the Amorites," where instead of Amurru the Sumerian Martu (Hebrew moreh) is used. The great-grandson of Khammu-rabi still calls himself "king of the widespread land of the Amorites," but two generations later Babylonia was invaded by the Hittites, the Amorite dynasty came to an end, and there was once more a "king of the Amorites" who was not also king of Babylonia.

The Amorite kingdom continued to exist down to the time of the Israelite invasion of Palestine, and mention is made of it in the Egyptian records as well as in the cuneiform Tell el-Amarna Letters, and the Hittite archives recently discovered at Boghaz-keui, the site of the Hittite capital in Cappadocia. The Egyptian conquest of Canaan by the kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty had put an end to the effective government of that country by the Amorite princes, but their rule still extended eastward to the borders of Babylonia, while its southern limits coincided approximately with what was afterward the northern frontier of Naphtali. The Amorite kings, however, became, at all events in name, the vassals of the Egyptian Pharaoh. When the Egyptian empire began to break up, under the "heretic king" Amenhotep IV, at the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty (1400 BC), the Amorite princes naturally turned to their more powerful neighbors in the north. One of the letters in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence is from the Pharaoh to his Amorite vassal Aziru the son of Ebed-Asherah, accusing him of rebellion and threatening him with punishment.

Eventually Aziru found it advisable to go over openly to the Hittites, and pay the Hittite government an annual tribute of 300 shekels of gold. From that time forward the Amorite kingdom was a dependency of the Hittite empire, which, on the strength of this, claimed dominion over Palestine as far as the Egyptian frontier. The second successor of Aziru was Abi-Amurru (or Abi-Hadad), whose successor bore, in addition to a Semitic name, the Mitannian name of Bentesinas. Bente-sinas was dethroned by the Hittite King Muttallis and imprisoned in Cappadocia, where he seems to have met the Hittite prince Khattu-sil, who on the death of his brother Muttallis seized the crown and restored Bente-sinas to his kingdom. Bente-sinas married the daughter of Khattu-sil, while his own daughter was wedded to the son of his Hittite suzerain, and an agreement was made that the succession to the Amorite throne should be confined to her descendants. Two or three generations later the Hittite empire was destroyed by an invasion of "northern barbarians," the Phrygians, probably, of Greek history, who marched southward, through Palestine, against Egypt, carrying with them "the king of the Amorites." The invaders, however, were defeated and practically exterminated by Ramses III of the XXth Egyptian Dynasty (1200 BC). The Amorite king, captured on this occasion by the Egyptians, was probably the immediate predecessor of the Sihon of the Old Testament.

3. Sihon’s Conquest:

Egyptian influence in Canaan had finally ceased with the invasion of Egypt by the Libyans and peoples of the Aegean in the fifth year of Meneptah, the successor of Ramses II, at the time of the Israelite Exodus. Though the invaders were repulsed, the Egyptian garrisons had to be withdrawn from the cities of southern Palestine, where their place was taken by the Philistines who thus blocked the way from Egypt to the north. The Amorites, in the name of their distant Hittite suzerains, were accordingly able to overrun the old Egyptian provinces on the east side of the Jordan; the Amorite chieftain Og possessed himself of Bashan (De 3:8), and Sihon, "king of the Amorites," conquered the northern part of Moab.

The conquest must have been recent at the time of the Israelite invasion, as the Amorite song of triumph is quoted in Nu 21:27-29, and adapted to the overthrow of Sihon himself by the Israelites. ‘Woe unto thee,’ it reads, ‘O Moab; thou art undone, O people of Chemosh! (Chemosh) hath given thy sons who escaped (the battle) and thy daughters into captivity to Sihon king of the Amorites.’ The flame that had thus consumed Heshbon, it is further declared, shall spread southward through Moab, while Heshbon itself is rebuilt and made the capital of the conqueror: "Come to Heshbon, that the city of Sihon (like the city of David, 2Sa 5:9) may be rebuilt and restored. For the fire has spread from Heshbon, the flame from the capital of Sihon, devouring as far as Moab (reading ‘adh with the Septuagint instead of ‘ar), and swallowing up (reading bale‘ah with the Septuagint) the high places of Arnon." The Israelite invasion, however, prevented the expected conquest of southern Moab from taking place.

4. Disappearance of the Amorite Kingdom:

After the fall of Sihon the Amorite kingdom disappears. The Syrians of Zobah, of Hamath and of Damascus take its place, while with the rise of Assyria the "Amorites" cease to be the representatives in

contemporary literature of the inhabitants of western Asia. At one time their power had extended to the Babylonian frontier, and Bente-sinas was summoned to Cappadocia by his Hittite overlord to answer a charge made by the Babylonian ambassadors of his having raided northern Babylonia. The Amorite king urged, however, that the raid was merely an attempt to recover a debt of 30 talents of silver.

5. Physical Characteristics of the Amorites:

In Nu 13:29 the Amorites are described as mountaineers, and in harmony with thins, according to Professor Petrie’s notes, the Egyptian artists represent them with fair complexions, blue eyes and light hair. It would, therefore, seem that they belonged to the Libyan race of northern Africa rather than to the Semitic stock. In western Asia, however, they were mixed with other racial elements derived from the subject populations, and as they spoke a Semitic language one of the most important of these elements would have been the Semites. In its general sense, moreover, the name "Amorite" included in the Babylonian period all the settled and civilized peoples west of the Euphrates to whatever race they might belong.

LITERATURE.

Hugo Winckler, Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft (1907), No. 35, Berlin; Sayce, The Races of the Old Testament, Religious Tract Soc., 1890.

A. H. Sayce

AMOS (1)

a’-mos (‘amoc, "burdensome" or "burden-bearer"; Amos):

I. THE PROPHET

1. Name

2. Native Place

3. Personal History

4. His Preparation

(1) Knowledge of God

(2) Acquaintance with History of His People

(3) Personal Travel

(4) Scenery of His Home

5. His Mission

6. Date

II. THE BOOK

1. Its Divisions

2. Its Outlook

3. Value of the Book

(1) As a Picture of the Social Condition

(2) As Picture of the Religious Condition

(3) Testimony to History

(4) Testimony to the Law

(a) The Ritual

(b) Ethical Teaching

(5) The Prophetic Order

(6) The Prophetic Religion

LITERATURE

I. The Prophet.

1. Name:

Amos is the prophet whose book stands third among the "Twelve" in the Hebrew canon. No other person bearing the same name is mentioned in the Old Testament, the name of the father of the prophet Isaiah being written differently (’amots). There is an Amos mentioned in the genealogical series Lu 3:25, but

he is otherwise unknown, and we do not know how his name would have been written in Hebrew. Of the signification of the prophet's name all that can be said is that a verb with the same root letters, in the sense of to load or to carry a load, is not uncommon in the language.

2. Native Place:

Tekoa, the native place of Amos, was situated at a distance of 5 miles South from Bethlehem, from which it is visible, and 10 miles from Jerusalem, on a hill 2,700 ft. high, overlooking the wilderness of Judah. It was made a "city for defense" by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:6), and may have in fact received its name from its remote and exposed position, for the stem of which the word is a derivative is of frequent occurrence in the sense of sounding an alarm with the trumpet: e. g. "Blow the trumpet in Tekoa, and set up a sign of fire in Beth-haccerem" (Jer 6:1 the King James Version). The same word is also used to signify the setting up of a tent by striking in the tent- pegs; and Jerome states that there was no village beyond Tekoa in his time. The name has survived, and the neighborhood is at the present day the pasture-ground for large flocks of sheep and goats. From the high ground on which the modern village stands one looks down on the bare undulating hills of one of the bleakest districts of Palestine, "the waste howling wilderness," which must have suggested some of the startling imagery of the prophet's addresses. The place may have had—as is not seldom the case with towns or villages—a reputation for a special quality of its inhabitants; for it was from Tekoa that Joab fetched the "wise woman" who by a feigned story effected the reconciliation of David with his banished son Absalom (2Sa 14). There are traces in the Book of Am of a shrewdness and mother-wit which are not so conspicuous in other prophetical books.

3. Personal History:

The particulars of a personal kind which are noted in the book are few but suggestive. Amos was not a prophet or the son of a prophet, he tells us (Am 7:14), i.e. he did not belong to the professional class which frequented the so-called schools of the prophets. He was "among the herdsmen of Tekoa" (1:1), the word here used being found only once in another place (2Ki 3:4) and applied to Mesha, king of Moab. It seems to refer to a special breed of sheep, somewhat ungainly in appearance but producing, an abundant fleece. In Am 7:14 the word rendered "herdman" is different, and denotes an owner of cattle, though some, from the Septuagint rendering, think that the word should be the same as in Am 1:1. He was also "a dresser of sycomore-trees" (Am 7:14). The word rendered "dresser" (Revised Version) or "gatherer" (the King James Version) occurs only here, and from the rendering of the Septuagint (knizon) it is conjectured that there is reference to a squeezing or nipping of the sycamore fig to make it more palatable or to accelerate its ripening, though such a usage is not known in Palestine at the present day.

4. His Preparation:

Nothing is said as to any special preparation of the prophet for his work: "The Lord took me from following the flock, and the Lord said unto me, Go, prophesy unto my people Israel" (Am 7:15, the English Revised Version). In these words he puts himself in line with all the prophets who, in various

modes of expression, claim a direct revelation from God. But the mention of the prophetic call in association with the mention of his worldly calling is significant. There was no period interposed between the one and the other, no cessation of husbandry to prepare for the work of prophesying. The husbandman was prepared for this task, and when God's time came he took it up. What was that preparation? Even if we suppose that the call was a momentary event, the man must have been ready to receive it, equipped for its performance. And, looking at the way in which he accomplished it, as exhibited in his book, we can see that there was a preparation, both internal and external, of a very thorough and effective character.

(1) Knowledge of God.

First of all, he has no doubt or uncertainty as to the character of the God in whose name he is called to speak. The God of Amos is one whose sway is boundless (Am 9:2 ff), whose power is infinite (Am 8:9 f), not only controlling the forces of Nature (Am 4; 5:8 f) but guiding the movements and destinies of nations (Am 6:1 ff, 14; 9:7 ff). Moreover, He is righteous in all His ways, dealing with nations on moral principles (Am 1:3 ff; 2:1 ff); and, though particularly favorable to Israel, yet making that very choice of them as a people a ground for visiting them with sterner retribution for their sins (Am 3:2). In common with all the prophets, Amos gives no explanation of how he came to know God and to form this conception of His character. It was not by searching that they found out God. It is assumed that God is and that He is such a Being; and this knowledge, as it could come only from God, is regarded as undisputed and undisputable. The call to speak in God's name may have come suddenly, but the prophet's conception of the character of the God who called him is no new or sudden revelation but a firm and well-established conviction.

(2) Acquaintance with History of His People.

Then his book shows not only that he was well acquainted with the history and traditions of his nation, which he takes for granted as well known to his hearers, but that he had reflected upon these things and realized their significance. We infer that he had breathed an atmosphere of religion, as there is nothing to indicate that, in his acquaintance with the religious facts of his nation, he differed from those among whom he dwelt, although the call to go forth and enforce them came to him in a special way.

(3) Personal Travel.

It has been conjectured that Amos had acquired by personal travel the accurate acquaintance which he shows in his graphic delineations of contemporary life and conditions; and it may have been the case that, as a wool-merchant or flock-master, he had visited the towns mentioned and frequented the various markets to which the people were attracted.

(4) Scenery of His Home.

Nor must we overlook another factor in his preparation: the scenery in which he had his home and the

occupations of his daily life. The landscape was one to make a solemn impression on a reflective mind: the extensive desert, the shimmering waters of the Dead Sea, the high wall of the distant hills of Moab, over all which were thrown the varying light and shade. The silent life of the desert, as with such scenes ever before him, he tended his flock or defended them from the ravages of wild beasts, would to one whose thoughts were full of God nourish that exalted view of the Divine Majesty which we find in his book, and furnish the imagery in which his thoughts are set (Am 1:2; 3:4 f; 4:13; 5:8; 9:5 f). As he is taken from following the flock, he comes before us using the language and figures of his daily life (Am 3:12), but there runs through all the note of one who has seen God’s working in all Nature and His presence in every phenomenon. Rustic he may be, but there is no rudeness or rusticity in his style, which is one of natural and impassioned eloquence, ordered and regular as coming from a mind which was responsive to the orderly working of God in Nature around him. There is an aroma of the free air of the desert about his words; but the prophet lives in an ampler ether and breathes a purer air; all things in Nature and on the field of history are seen in a Divine light and measured by a Divine standard.

5. His Mission:

Thus, prepared in the solitudes of the extreme south of Judah, he was called to go and prophesy unto the people of Israel, and appears at Bethel the capital of the Northern Kingdom. It may be that, in the prosecution of his worldly calling, he had seen and been impressed by the conditions of life and religion in those parts. No reason is given for his mission to the northern capital, but the reason is not far to seek. It is the manner of the prophets to appear where they are most needed; and the Northern Kingdom about that time had come victorious out of war, and had reached its culmination of wealth and power, with the attendant results of luxury and excess, while the Southern Kingdom had been enjoying a period of outward tranquillity and domestic content.

6. Date:

The date of the prophet Amos can approximately be fixed from the statement in the first verse that his activity fell "in the days of Uzziah king of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash king of Israel, two years before the earthquake." Both these monarchs had long reigns, that of Uzziah extending from 779 to 740 BC and that of Jeroboam II from 783 to 743 BC. If we look at the years when they were concurrently reigning, and bear in mind that, toward the end of Uzziah’s reign, Jotham acted as co-regent, we may safely place the date of Amos at about the year 760 BC. In a country in which earthquakes are not uncommon the one here mentioned must have been of unusual severity, for the memory of it was long preserved (Zec 14:5). How long he exercised his ministry we are not told. In all probability the book is the deposit of a series of addresses delivered from time to time till his plain speaking drew upon him the resentment of the authorities, and he was ordered to leave the country (Am 7:10 ff). We can only conjecture that, some time afterward, he withdrew to his native place and put down in writing a condensed record of the discourses he had delivered.

II. The Book.

We can distinguish with more than ordinary certainty the outlines of the individual addresses, and the arrangement of the book is clear and simple. The text, also, has been on the whole faithfully preserved; and though in a few places critics profess to find the traces of later editorial hands, these conclusions rest mainly on subjective grounds, and will be estimated differently by different minds.

1. Its Divisions:

The book falls naturally into three parts, recognizable by certain recurring formulas and general literary features.

(1) The first section, which is clearly recognizable, embraces Am 1 and 2. Here, after the title and designation of the prophet in Am 1:1, there is a solemn proclamation of Divine authority for the prophet's words. "Yahweh will roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem" (verse 2). This is notable in one who throughout the book recognizes God's power as world-wide and His operation as extensive as creation; and it should be a caution in view, on the one hand, of the assertion that the temple at Jerusalem was not more sacred than any of the numerous "high places" throughout the land, and, on the other hand, the superficial manner in which some writers speak of the Hebrew notion of a Deity whose dwelling-place was restricted to one locality beyond which His influence was not felt. For this God, who has His dwelling-place in Zion, now through the mouth of the prophet denounces in succession the surrounding nations, and this mainly not for offenses committed against the chosen people but for moral offenses against one another and for breaches of a law binding on humanity. It will be observed that the nations denounced are not named in geographical order, and the prophet exhibits remarkable rhetorical skill in the order of selection. The interest and sympathy of the hearers is secured by the fixing of the attention on the enormities of guilt in their neighbors, and curiosity is kept awake by the uncertainty as to where the next stroke of the prophetic whip will fall. Beginning with the more distant and alien peoples of Damascus, Gaza and Tyre, he wheels round to the nearer and kindred peoples of Edom, Ammon and Moab, till he rests for a moment on the brother tribe of Judah, and thus, having relentlessly drawn the net around Israel by the enumeration of seven peoples, he swoops down upon the Northern Kingdom to which his message is to be particularly addressed.

(2) The second section embraces Am 3 to 6, and consists apparently of a series of discourses, each introduced by the formula: "Hear this word" (Am 3:1; 4:1; 5:1), and another introduced by a comprehensive: "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion, and to them that are secure in the mountain of Samaria" (Am 6:1). The divisions here are not so clearly marked. It will be observed e. g. that there is another "Woe" at Am 5:18; and in chapter 4, though the address at the outset is directed to the luxurious women of Samaria, from 4:4 onward the words have a wider reference. Accordingly some would divide this section into a larger number of subsections; and some, indeed, have described the whole book as a collection of ill-arranged fragments. But, while it is not necessary to suppose that the written book is an exact reproduction of the spoken addresses, and while the division into chapters has no authority, yet we must allow for some latitude in the details which an impassioned speaker would introduce into his discourses, and for transitions and connections of thought which may not be apparent on the surface.

(3) The third section has some well-marked characteristics, although it is even less uniform than the preceding. The outstanding feature is the phrase, "Thus the Lord Yahweh showed me" (Am 7:1,4,7; 8:1) varied at Am 9:1 by the words, "I saw the Lord standing beside the altar." We have thus a series of "visions" bearing upon, and interpreted as applying to, the condition of Israel. It is in the course of one of these, when the prophet comes to the words, "I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword" (Am 7:9) that the interposition of Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, is recorded, with the prophet's noble reply as to his Divine call, and his rebuke and denunciation of the priest, ending with a prophetic announcement of the downfall and captivity of Israel (Am 7:14-17).

2. Its Outlook:

If the discourses are put down in chronological order of their delivery, it would appear that Amos did not immediately take his departure, since more visions follow this episode, and there is a special appropriateness in the intervention of Amaziah just at the point where it is recorded. As to the closing passage of this section (Am 9:11-15) which gives a bright prospect of the future, there is a class of critics who are inclined to reject it just on this account as inconsistent with the severe denunciatory tone of the rest of the book. It is quite possible, however, that the prophet himself (and no succeeding later editor) may have added the passage when he came to write down his addresses. There is no reason to believe that any of the prophets—harsh though their words were—believed that the God of Israel would make a full end of His people in captivity: on the contrary, their assurance of God's faithfulness to His promise, and the deep-seated conviction that right would ultimately prevail, lead us to expect even in the sternest or earliest of the prophets the hope of a future glory—that hope which grew brighter and brighter as the nation's outlook grew darker, and attained intensity and clearness in the Messianic hope which sustained them in the darkest days of exile. It is difficult to believe that any of the prophets were prophets of despair, or to conceive how they could have prophesied at all unless they had a firm faith in the ultimate triumph of the good.

3. Value of the Book:

The Book of Amos is particularly valuable from the fact that he is certainly one of the earliest prophets whose writings have come down to us. It is, like the Book of Hosea which belongs to about the same time, a contemporaneous document of a period of great significance in the history of Israel, and not only gives graphic sketches or illuminating hints of the life and religious condition of the people, but furnishes a trustworthy standard for estimating the value of some other books whose dates are not so precisely determined, a definite starting-point for tracing the course of Israel's history.

(1) As a Picture of the Social Condition.

The book is valuable as embodying a contemporary picture of society and the condition of religion. From the abuses which the prophet denounces and the lifelike sketches he draws of the scenes amid which he moved, taken along with what we know otherwise of the historical movements of the period, we are able to form a fairly adequate estimate of the condition of the age and the country. During the

reign of Jeroboam II the kingdom of Israel, after having been greatly reduced during preceding reigns, rose to a degree of extent and influence unexampled since the days of Solomon (2Ki 14:25); and we are not astonished to read in the Book of Am the haughty words which he puts into the mouth of the people of his time when they spoke of Israel as the "chief of the nations" a first-class power in modern language, and boasted of the "horns" by which they had attained that eminence (Am 6:1,13).

But success in war, if it encouraged this boastful spirit, brought also inevitable evils in its train. Victory, as we know from the Assyrian monuments, meant plunder; for king after king recounts how much spoil he had taken, how many prisoners he had carried away; and we must assume that wars among smaller states would be conducted on the same methods. In such wars, success meant an extension of territory and increase of wealth, while defeat entailed the reverse. But it is to be remembered that, in an agricultural country and in a society constituted as that of Israel was, the result of war to one class of the population was to a great extent disastrous, whatever was the issue, and success, when it was achieved, brought evils in its train which even aggravated their condition. The peasant, required to take up arms for offense or defense, was taken away from the labors of the field which, in the best event, were for a time neglected, and, in the worst, were wasted and rendered unproductive. And then, when victory was secured, the spoils were liable to fall into the hands of the nobles and leaders, those "called with a name" (Am 6:1), while the peasant returned to his wasted or neglected fields without much substantial resource with which to begin life again. The wealth secured by the men of strong hand led to the increase of luxury in its possessors, and became actually the means of still further adding to the embarrassment of the poor, who were dependent on the rich for the means of earning their livelihood. The situation would be aggravated under a feeble or corrupt government, such as was certainly that of Jeroboam’s successors. The condition prevails in modern eastern countries, even under comparatively wise and just administration; and that it was the state of matters prevailing in the time of Amos is abundantly clear from his book.

The opening denunciation of Israel for oppression of the poor and for earth-hunger (Am 2:6,7) is re-echoed and amplified in the succeeding chapters (Am 3:9,10; 4:1; 5:11,12; 8:4-6); and the luxury of the rich, who battened on the misfortune of their poorer brethren, is castigated in biting irony in such passages as Am 6:3-6. Specially noticeable in this connection is the contemptuous reference to the luxurious women, the "kine of Bashan" (Am 4:1), whose extravagances are maintained by the oppression of the poor. The situation, in short, was one that has found striking parallels in modern despotic countries in the East, where the people are divided into two classes, the powerful rich, rich because powerful and powerful because rich, and, the poor oppressed, men who have no helper, no "back" in the common eastern phrase, dependent on the rich and influential and tending to greater poverty under greedy patrons.

(2) As a Picture of the Religious Condition.

In such a social atmosphere, which poisoned the elementary virtues, religion of a vital kind could not flourish; and there are plain indications in the words of Amos of the low condition to which it had sunk. There was, indeed, as we gather from ins addresses, no lack of outward attention to the forms of worship; but these forms were of so corrupted a character and associated with so much practical

godlessness and even immorality, that instead of raising the national character it tended to its greater degradation. The people prided themselves in what they regarded the worship of the national God, thinking that so long as they honored Him with costly offerings and a gorgeous ritual, they were pleasing Him and secure in His protection. Bethel, Dan, Gilgal, Beersheba, and we know not how many other places were resorted to in pilgrimage by crowds of worshippers. With all the accompaniments of ceremonious ritual which the newly found wealth put in their power, with offerings more than the legally prescribed or customary (Am 4:4,5) the service of these sanctuaries was maintained; but even these offerings were made at the expense of the poor (Am 5:11), the prevailing luxury forced its way even to the precincts of the altars (Am 2:8), and justice and mercy were conspicuously absent from the religious life. The people seemed to have settled down to a complacent optimism, nourished no doubt by national prosperity, and, though there had not been wanting reminders of the sovereignty of a righteous God, in convulsions of Nature—drought, famine, pestilence and earthquake (Am 4:6-11)—these had been of no avail to awaken the sleeping conscience. They put the evil day far from them (Am 6:3), for Yahweh was their national God and "the day of the Lord," the good time coming (Am 5:18), when God would come to their help, was more in their mind than the imperative duty of returning to Him (Am 4:6,8, etc.).

(3) Testimony to History.

The book is valuable for the confirmation it gives of the historical statements of other books, particularly for the references it contains to the earlier history contained in the Pentateuch. And here we must distinguish between references to, or quotations from, books, and statements or hints or indications of historical events which may or may not have been written in books or accessible to the prophet and his hearers. Opinions differ as to the date of composition of the books which record the earlier history, and the oldest Biblical writers are not in the habit of saying from what sources they drew their information or whether they are quoting from books. We can hardly believe that in the time of Amos copies of existing books or writings would be in the hands of the mass of the people, even if the power to read them was general. In such circumstances, if we find a prophet like Amos in the compass of a small book referring to outstanding events and stages of the past history as matters known to all his hearers and unquestionable, our confidence in the veracity of the books in which these facts are recorded is greatly increased, and it becomes a matter of comparatively less importance at what date these books were composed.

Now it is remarkable how many allusions, more or less precise, to antecedent history are found in the compass of this small book; and the significance of them lies not in the actual number of references, but in the kind of reference and the implications involved in the individual references. That is to say, each reference is not to be taken as an isolated testimony to some single event in question, but involves a great deal more than is expressed, and is intelligible only when other facts or incidents are taken into consideration. Thus e. g. the reference to the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah (Am 4:11) is only intelligible on the supposition that the story of that catastrophe was a matter of common knowledge; and it would be a carping criticism to argue that the destruction of other cities of the plain at the same time and the whole story of Lot were unknown in the days of Amos because they are not mentioned here in detail. So, when we have in one passage a reference to the house of Isaac (Am 7:16), in another to the

house of Jacob (Am 3:13), in another to the house of Joseph (Am 5:6) and in another to the enmity between Jacob and Esau (Am 1:11), we cannot take these as detached notices, but must supply the links which the prophet's words would suggest to his hearers. In other words, such slight notices, just because they are incidental and brief, imply a familiarity with a connected patriarchal history such as is found in the Book of Gen. Again, the prophet's references to the "whole family" of the "children of Israel" whom the Lord "brought up out of the land of Egypt" (Am 3:1), to the Divine leading of the people "forty years in the wilderness, to possess the land of the Amorite" (Am 2:10) are not odds and ends of popular story but links in a chain of national history. It seems to be on the strength of these and similar references in the books of Am and Hos, whose dates are known, that critics have agreed to fix the date of the earliest historical portions of the Pentateuch as they understand them, namely, the parts designated as Jahwist and Elohist, in the 8th and 9th centuries BC, i.e. at or shortly before the time of these prophets. It may be left to the unbiased judgment of the reader to say whether the references look like references to a newly composed document, or whether it is not more probable that, in an age when written documents were necessarily few and not accessible to the multitude, these references are appeals to things well fixed in the national memory, a memory extending back to the things themselves. Or, if the prophet's words are to be taken as sufficient proof of the existence of written sources, the fact that the matters are assumed as well known would rather encourage the conclusion that the written sources in question go back to a much earlier period, since the matters contained in them had by this time become matters of universal knowledge.

(4) Testimony to the Law.

(a) The Ritual.

And what about those other elements of the Pentateuch of a legal and ritual character which bulk so prominently in those books? The question whether the Book of Amos indicates an acquaintance with these or not is important because it is to a great extent on the silence of prophetical and historical writers that critics of a certain school relegate these legalistic portions of the Pentateuch to a late date. Now at the outset it is obvious to ask what we have a reasonable right to expect. We have to bear in mind what was the condition of the people whom Amos addressed, and the purpose and aim of his mission to the Northern Kingdom. It is to be remembered that, as we are told in the Book of Kings (1Ki 12:25 ff), Jeroboam I deliberately sought to make a breach between the worship of Jerusalem and that of his own kingdom, while persuading his people that the worship of Yahweh was being maintained. The schism occurred some 170 years before the time of Amos and it is not probable that the worship and ritual of the Northern Kingdom tended in that interval to greater purity or greater conformity to what had been the authoritative practice of the undivided kingdom at the temple of Jerusalem. When, therefore, Amos, in face of the corrupt worship combined with elaborate ritual which prevailed around him, declares that God hates and despises their feasts and takes no delight in their solemn assemblies (Am 5:21), we are not justified in pressing his words, as is sometimes done, into a sweeping condemnation of all ritual. On the contrary, seeing that, in the very same connection (Am 5:22), he specifies burnt offerings and meal offerings and peace offerings, and, in another passage (Am 4:4,5), daily sacrifices and tithes, sacrifices of thanksgiving and free-will offerings, it is natural to infer that by these terms which are familiar in the Pentateuch he is referring to those statutory observances which were part of the national worship of

united Israel, but had been overlaid with corruption and become destitute of spiritual value as practiced in the Northern Kingdom. So we may take his allusions to the new moon and the Sabbath (Am 8:5) as seasons of special sacredness and universally sanctioned. Having condemned in such scornful and sweeping terms the worship that he saw going on around him, what was Amos to gum by entering into minute ritual prescriptions or defining the precise duties and perquisites of priests and Levites; and having condemned the pilgrimages to the shrines of Bethel, Gilgal, Beersheba, Samaria and Da (Am 4:4; 5:5; 8:14), what was he to gain by quoting the law of Deut as to a central sanctuary? And had one of his hearers, like the woman of Samaria of a later day, attempted to draw him into a discussion of the relative merits of the two temples, we can conceive him answering in the spirit of the great Teacher: "Ye worship ye know not what: we know what we worship" (Joh 4:22 the King James Version). A regulation of the form was of no avail while the whole spirit of the observance was corrupt; the soul of religion was dead, and the prophet had a higher duty than to dress out the carcass.

At the root of the corruption of the religion lay a rottenness of moral sense; and from beginning to end Amos insists on the necessity of a pure and righteous life. In this connection his appeals are in striking agreement with the specially ethical demands of the law books, and in phraseology so much resemble them as to warrant the conclusion that the requirements of the law on these subjects were known and acknowledged. Thus his denunciations of those who oppress the poor (Am 2:7; 4:1; 8:4) are quite in the spirit and style of Ex 22:21,22; 23:9; his references to the perversion of justice and taking bribes (Am 2:6; 5:7,10 ff, 6:12) are rhetorical enforcements of the prohibitions of the law in Ex 23:6-8; when he reproves those that "lay themselves down beside every altar upon clothes taken in pledge" (Am 2:8) we hear an echo of the command: "If thou at all take thy neighbor’s garment to pledge, thou shalt restore it unto him before the sun goeth down" (Ex 22:26); and when he denounces those making "the ephah small, and the shekel great, and dealing falsely with balances of deceit" (Am 8:5) his words are in close agreement with the law, "Ye shall do no unrighteousness in judgment, in mete-yard, in weights, or in measure. Just balances, just weight, a just ephah, and a just hin shall ye have" (Le 19:35,36, the King James Version).

(b) Ethical Teaching.

As a preacher of righteousness, Amos affirms and resists upon those ethical parts of the law which are its vital elements, and which lie at the foundation of all prophecy; and it is remarkable how even in phraseology he agrees with the most ethical book of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy. He does not, indeed, like his contemporary Hosea, dwell on the love of God as De does; but, of sterner mould, in almost the very words of Deuteronomy, emphasizes the keeping of God’s commandments, and denounces those who despise the law (compare Am 2:4 with De 17:19). Among verbal coincidences have been noticed the combinations "oppress" "crush" (Am 4:1; De 28:33), "blasting" and "mildew" (Am 4:9; De 28:22), and "gall" and "wormwood" (Am 6:12; De 29:18).

Compare also Am 9:8 with De 6:15, and note the predilection for the same word to "destroy" common to both books (compare Am 2:9 with De 2:22). In view of all of which it seems an extraordinary statement to make that "the silence of Amos with reference to the centralization of worship, on which De is so explicit, alone seems sufficient to outweigh any linguistic similarity that can be discovered" (H. G.

Mitchell, Amos, an Essay in Exegesis, 185).

(5) The Prophetic Order.

As Amos is without doubt one of the earliest writing prophets, his book is invaluable as an example of what prophecy was in ancient Israel. And one thing cannot fail to impress the reader at the very outset: namely, that he makes no claim to be the first or among the first of the line, or that he is exercising some new and hitherto unheard- of function. He begins by boldly speaking in God's name, assuming that even the people of the Northern Kingdom were familiar with that kind of address. Nay, he goes farther and states in unequivocal terms that "the Lord God will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets" (Am 3:7, the King James Version).

We need not search farther for a definition of the prophet as understood by him and other Old Testament writers: the prophet is one to whom God reveals His will, and who comes forward to declare that will and purpose to man. A great deal has been made of the words of Amaziah the priest of Bethel (Am 7:12), as if they proved that the prophet in those times was regarded as a wandering rhetorician, earning his bread by reciting his speeches; and it has been inferred from the words of Amos himself that the prophets of his day were so disreputable a class that he disdained to be named along with them (Am 7:14). But all this is fanciful. Even if we admit that there were men calling themselves prophets who prophesied for hire (Mic 3:5,11), it cannot be assumed that the expression here to "eat bread" has that meaning; for in other passages it seems simply to signify to lead a quiet or ordinary life, to go about one's daily business (see Ex 24:11; Jer 22:15). In any case we are not to take the estimate of a man like Amaziah or a godless populace in preference to the conception of Amos himself and his account of his call. It was not by man or by any college of prophets but by Yahweh Himself that he was appointed, and by whatever name he might be called, the summons was "Go, prophesy unto my people Israel" (Am 7:15). There is no trace here of the "prophets becoming conscious of a distinction between themselves and the professional nebhi'im, who were apt simply to echo the patriotic and nationalistic sentiments of the people, and in reality differed but little from the soothsayers and diviners of Semitic heathenism" (Ottley, The Religion of Israel, 90). Whoever the "professional nebhi'im" may have been in his day, or whatever he thought of them if they existed, Amos tells us nothing; but he ranges himself with men to whom Yahweh has spoken in truth (Am 3:7,8), and indicates that there had been a succession of such men (Am 2:11), faithful amid the prevailing corruption though tempted to be unfaithful (Am 2:12); in short he gives us to understand that the "prophetic order" goes back to a period long before his day and has its roots in the true and original religion of Israel.

(6) The Prophetic Religion.

Finally, from the Book of Am we may learn what the prophetic religion was. Here again there is no indication of rudimentary crudeness of conception, or of painful struggling upward from the plane of naturalism or belief in a merely tribal God. The God in whose name Amos speaks has control over all the forces of Nature (Am 4:6 ff; 5:8,9), rules the destinies of nations (Am 6:2,14; 9:2-6), searches the thoughts of the heart (Am 4:13), isinflexible in righteousness and deals with nations and with men on

equal justice (Am 1$, 2$ 9:7), andis most severe to the people who have received the highest privileges (Am 3:2). And this is the God by whose name his hearers call themselves, whose claims they cannot deny, whose dealings with them from old time are well known and acknowledged (Am 2:11), whose laws they have broken (Am 2:4; 3:10) and for whose just judgment they are warned to prepare (Am 4:12). All this the prophet enforces faithfully and sternly; not a voice is raised in the circle of his hearers to dispute his words; all that Amaziah the priest can do is to urge the prophet to abstain from unwelcome words in Bethel, because it is the king's sanctuary and a royal house; the only inference is that the people felt the truth and justice of the prophet's words. The "prophetic religion" does not begin with Amos.

LITERATURE.

W. R. Harper, "Amos and Hosea," in the ICC; S. R. Driver, "Joe and Amos" in Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; H. G. Mitchell, Amos, an Essay in Exegesis (Boston); A. B. Davidson, two articles in The Expositor, 3rd ser, V, VI (1887); W. R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel; G. A. Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," in Expositor's Bible; J. J. P. Valeton, Amos und Hosea (1894); C. von Orelli, Die zwolf kleinen Propheten, 3. Aufl. (1908) and ET; Nowack, "Die kleinen Propheten," in Hand-commentar zum Altes Testament; Marti, "Das Dodekapropheton erklart," in Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Altes Testament.

James Robertson

AMOS (2)

a'-mos (Amos): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy, the eighth before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lu 3:25).

AMOZ

a'-moz (amots, "strong"): The father of Isaiah the prophet (2Ki 19:2,20; 20:1; 2Ch 26:22; 32:20,32; Isa 1:1; 2:1; 13:1; 20:2; 37:2,21; 38:1).

AMPHIPOLIS

am-fip'-o-lis (Amphipolis): A town in Macedonia, situated on the eastern bank of the Strymon (modern Struma or Karasu) some three miles from its mouth, near the point where it flows out of Lake Prasias or Cercinitis. It lay on a terraced hill, protected on the North, West and South by the river, on the East by a wall (Thuc. iv.102), while its harbor-town of Eion lay on the coast close to the river's mouth. The name is derived either from its being nearly surrounded by the stream or from its being conspicuous on every side, a fact to which Thucydides draws attention (in the place cited). It was at first called Ennea Hodoi, Nine Ways, a name which suggests its importance both strategically and commercially. It guarded the

main route from Thrace into Macedonia and later became an important station on the Via Egnatia, the great Roman road from Dyrrhachium on the Adriatic to the Hebrus (Maritza), and it was the center of a fertile district producing wine, oil, figs and timber in abundance and enriched by gold and silver mines and considerable manufactures, especially of woolen stuffs. In 497 BC Aristagoras, ex- despot of Miletus, tried to settle there, and a second vain attempt was made in 465-464 by the Athenians, who succeeded in founding a colony there in 437 under the leadership of Hagnon. The population, however, was too mixed to allow of strong Athenian sympathies, and in 424 the town fell away to the Spartan leader Brasidas and defied all the subsequent attempts of the Athenians to recover it. It passed under the protectorate of Perdiccas and Philip of Macedon, and the latter finally made himself master of it in 358. On the Roman partition of Macedonia after the battle of Pydna (168 BC) Amphipolis was made a free city and capital of Macedonia Prima. Paul and Silas passed through it on their way from Philippi to Thessalonica, but the narrative seems to preclude a long stay (Ac 17:1). The place was called Popolia in the Middle Ages, while in modern times the village of Neochori (Turkish, Yenikeui) marks the site (Leake, Northern Greece, III, 181 ff, Cousinery, Macedoine, I, 100 ff, 122 ff; Heuzey et Daumet, Mission archeol. de Macedoine, 165 ff).

Marcus N. Tod

AMPLIAS

am’-pli-as (Textus Receptus Amplias), the King James Version form: a contraction of AMPLIATUS (thus, the Revised Version (British and American); which see).

AMPLIATUS

am-pli-a’-tus (Ampliatos, Codex Sinaiticus, A, B, F, Ampliatus; Amplias, D, E, L, P, the Revised Version (British and American) form; the King James Version Amplias): The name of a member of the Christian community at Rome, to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:8). He is designated "my beloved in the Lord." It is a common name and is found in inscriptions connected with the imperial household. The name is found twice in the cemetery of Domitilla. The earlier inscription is over a cell which belongs to the end of the 1st century or the beginning of the 2nd century. The bearer of this name was probably a member of her household and conspicuous in the early Christian church in Rome.

AMRAM

am’-ram (‘amram, "people exalted"):

(1) Father of Aaron, Moses and Miriam (Ex 6:20; Nu 26:59; 1Ch 6:3; 23:13); and a son of Kohath, the son of Levi (Ex 6:18; Nu 3:19, etc.). It is not certain that he was literally the son of Kohath, but rather his descendant, since there were ten generations from Joseph to Joshua (1Ch 7:20-27), while only four are actually mentioned from Levi to Moses for the corresponding period. Moreover the Kohathites at the time of the Exodus numbered 8,600 (Nu 3:28), which would therefore have been an impossibility if only

two generations had lived. It seems best to regard Amram as a descendant of Kohath, and his wife Jochebed as a "daughter of Levi" in a general sense.

(2) One of the Bani, who in the days of Ezra had taken a foreign wife (Ezr 10:34).

(3) In 1Ch 1:41 (the King James Version) for the properly read HAMRAN of the Revised Version (British and American) (chamran), a Horite, who in Ge 36:26 is called HEMDAN (which see).

Edward Mack

AMRAMITES

am'-ram-its ('amrami): The descendants of Amram, one of the Levitical families mentioned in Nu 3:27 and 1Ch 26:23, who had the charge of the tabernacle proper, guarding the ark, table, candlestick, etc., called in 1Ch 26:22 "the treasures of the house of Yahweh."

AMRAPHEL

am'-ra-fel, am-ra'-fel ('amraphel, or, perhaps better, 'ameraphel).

1. The Expedition Against Sodom and Gomorrah:

This name, which is identified with that of the renowned Babylonian king Hammurabi (which see), is only found in Ge 14:1,9, where he is mentioned as the king of Shinar (Babylonia), who fought against the cities of the plain, in alliance with Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of Nations (the Revised Version (British and American) GOIIM). The narrative which follows is very circumstantial. From it we learn, that Bera king of Sodom, Birsha king of Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, Shemeber king of Zeboiim, and the king of Bela or Zoar, had served Chedorlaomer for 12 years, rebelled in the 13th, and in the 14th year Chedorlaomer, with the kings enumerated, fought with and defeated them in the vale of Siddim, which is described as being the Salt Sea. Previous to this engagement, however, the Elamites and their allies had attacked the Rephaim (Onkelos: "giants") in Ashtaroth-karnaim, the Zuzim (O: "mighty ones," "heroes") in Ham (O: Chamta'), the Emim (O: "terrible ones") in Shaveh-kiriathaim, and the Horites in their Mount Seir, by the Desert. These having been rendered powerless to aid the revolted vassals, they returned and came to Enmishpat, or Kadesh, attacked the country of the Amalekites, and the Amorites dwelling in Hazazontamar (Ge 14:2-7).

2. The Preparation and the Attack:

At this juncture the kings of the cities of the plain came out against them, and opposed them with their battle-array in the vale of Siddim. The result of the fight was, that the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, with their allies, fled, and fell among the bitumen-pits of which the place was full, whilst those who got

away took refuge in the mountain. All the goods and food (the camp-equipment and supplies) of the kings of the plain were captured by Chedorlaomer and his allies, who then continued their march (to their own lands) (Ge 14:8-11).

3. Abraham's Rescue of Lot:

Among the captives, however, was Lot, Abram's nephew, who dwelt in Sodom. A fugitive, having escaped, went and announced the result of the engagement to Abram, who was at that time living by Mamre's oak plantation. The patriarch immediately marched forth with his trained men, and pursued them to Dan, where he divided his forces, attacked the Elamite-Babylonian army by night, and having put them to flight, pursued them again to Hobah, on the left (or North) of Damascus. The result of this sudden onslaught was that he rescued Lot, with the women and people, and recaptured Lot's goods, which the allies of Amraphel had carried off (Ge 14:12-16).

4. Difficulties of the Identification of Amraphel:

There is no doubt that the identification of Amraphel with the Hammurabi of the Babylonian inscriptions is the best that has yet been proposed, and though there are certain difficulties therein, these may turn out to be apparent rather than real, when we know more of Babylonian history. The "l" at the end of Amraphel (which has also "ph" instead of "p" or "b") as well as the fact that the expedition itself has not yet been recognized among the campaigns of Hammurabi, must be acknowledged as two points hard to explain, though they may ultimately be solved by further research.

5. Historical Agreements:

It is noteworthy, however, that in the first verse of Ge 14 Amraphel is mentioned first, which, if he be really the Babylonian Hammurabi, is easily comprehensible, for his renown to all appearance exceeded that of Chedorlaomer, his suzerain. In 14:4 and 5, however, it is Chedorlaomer alone who is referred to, and he heads the list of eastern kings in verse 9, where Tidal comes next (a quite natural order, if Goiim be the Babylonian Gute, i.e. the Medes). Next in order comes Amraphel, king of Babylonia and suzerain of Arioch of Ellasar (Eri-Aku of Larsa), whose name closes the list. It may also be suggested, that Amraphel led a Babylonian force against Sodom, as the ally of Chedorlaomer, before he became king, and was simply crown prince. In that case, like Belshazzar, he was called "king" by anticipation. For further details see ARIOCH and CHEDORLAOMER, and compare ERI-AKU and HAMMURABI; for the history of Babylonia during Hammurabi's period, see that article.

T. G. Pinches

AMULET

am'-u-let (qemia, lechashim, mezuzah, tephillin, tsitsith; phulakterion): Modern scholars are of opinion that our English word amulet comes from the Latin amuletum, used by Pliny (Naturalis Historia, xxviii,

28; xxx, 2, etc.), and other Latin writers; but no etymology for the Latin word has been discovered. The present writer thinks the root exists in the Arabic himlat, "something carried" (see Dozy, Supplement aux Dictionnaires Arabes, I, 327), though there is no known example of the use of the Arabic word in a magical sense. Originally "amulet" denoted any object supposed to have the power of removing or warding noxious influences believed to be due to evil spirits, etc., such as the evil eye, etc. But in the common usage it stands for an object worn on the body, generally hung from the neck, as a remedy or preservative against evil influences of a mystic kind. The word "amulet" occurs once in the Revised Version (British and American) (Isa 3:20) but not at all in the King James Version.

1. Classes of Amulets:

The substances out of which amulets have been made and the forms which they have taken have been various.

(1) The commonest have consisted of Amulets of pieces of stone or metal, strips of parchment with or without inscriptions from sacred writings (Bible, Koran, etc.). The earliest Egyptian amulets known are pieces of green schist of various shapes- -animal, etc. These were placed on the breast of a deceased person in order to secure a safe passage to the under-world. When a piece of stone is selected as an amulet it is always portable and generally of some striking figure or shape (the human face, etc.). The use of such a stone for this purpose is really a survival of animism.

(2) Gems, rings, etc. It has been largely held that all ornaments worn on the person were originally amulets.

(3) Certain herbs and animal preparations; the roots of certain plants have been considered very potent as remedies and preservatives.

The practice of wearing amulets existed in the ancient world among all peoples, but especially among Orientals; and it can be traced among most modern nations, especially among peoples of backward civilization. Nor is it wholly absent from peoples of the most advanced civilization of today, the English, Americans, etc. Though the word charm (see CHARM) has a distinct meaning, it is often inseparably connected with amulets, for it is in many cases the incantation or charm inscribed on the amulet that gives the latter its significance. As distinguished from talisman (see TALISMAN) an amulet is believed to have negative results, as a means of protection: a talisman is thought to be the means of securing for the wearer some positive boon.

2. Amulets in the Bible:

Though there is no word in the Hebrew or Greek Scriptures denoting "amulet," the thing itself is manifestly implied in many parts of the Bible. But it is remarkable that the general teaching of the Bible and especially that of the Old Testament prophets and of the New Testament writers is wholly and strongly opposed to such things.

(1) The Old Testament.

The golden ear-rings, worn by the wives and sons and daughters of the Israelites, out of which the molten calf was made (Ex 32:2 f), were undoubtedly amulets. What other function could they be made to serve in the simple life of the desert? That the women's ornaments condemned in Isa 3:16-26 were of the same character is made exceedingly likely by an examination of some of the terms employed. We read of moonlets and sunlets (verse 18), i.e. moon and sun-shaped amulets.

The former in the shape of crescents are worn by Arab girls of our own time. The "ear-drops," "nose-rings," "arm chains" and "foot chains" were all used as a protection to the part of the body implied, and the strong words with which their employment is condemned are only intelligible if their function as counter charms is borne in mind. In Isa 3:20 we read of lechashim rendered "ear-rings" (the King James Version) and "amulets" (Revised Version (British and American)). The Hebrew word seems to be cognate with the word for "serpent" (nechashim; "l" and "r" often interchange), and meant probably in the first instance an amulet against a serpent bite (see Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbours, by the present writer, 50 f, 81; compare Jer 8:7; Ec 10:11; Ps 58:5). Crescent-shaped amulets were worn by animals as well as human beings, as Jud 8:21,26 shows.

At Bethel, Jacob burned not only the idols ("strange gods") but also the ear-rings, the latter being as much opposed to Yahwism as the former, on account of their heathen origin and import.

In Pr 17:8 the Hebrew words rendered "a precious stone" (Hebrew "a stone conferring favor") mean without question a stone amulet treasured on account of its supposed magical efficacy. It is said in Pr 1:9 that wisdom will be such a defense to the one who has it as the head amulet is to the head and that of the neck to the neck. The words rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "a chaplet of grace unto thy head" mean literally, "something bound to the head conferring favor," the one word for the latter clause being identical with that so rendered above (chen). The Talmudic word for an amulet (qemia‘) denotes something tied or bound (to the person).

We have reference to the custom of wearing amulets in Pr 6:21 where the reader is urged to "bind them (i.e. the admonitions of father and mother) .... upon thy heart" and to "tie them about thy neck"—words implying a condemnation of the practice of trusting to the defense of mere material objects.

Underneath the garments of warriors slain in the Maccabean wars amulets were found in the shape apparently of idols worshipped by their neighbors (2 Macc 12:40). It is strange but true that like other nations of antiquity the Jews attached more importance to amulets obtained from other nations than to those of native growth. It is probable that the signet ring referred to in So 8:6; Jer 22:24; Hag 2:23 was an amulet. It was worn on the heart or on the arm.

(2) The Phylacteries and the Mezuzah.

There is no distract reference to these in the Old Testament. The Hebrew technical term for the former (tephillin) does not occur in Biblical. Hebrew, and although the Hebrew word mezuzah does occur over a dozen times its sense is invariably "door-(or "gate-") post" and not the amulet put on the door-post which in later Hebrew the word denotes.

It is quite certain that the practice of wearing phylacteries has no Biblical support, for a correct exegesis and a proper understanding of the context put it beyond dispute that the words in Ex 13:9,16, De 6:8 f; 11:18-20 have reference to the exhortations in the foregoing verses: "Thou shalt bind them (the commands previously mentioned) for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontiers between thy eyes. And thou shalt write them upon, the door-posts of thy house, and upon thy gates" (De 6:8 f). The only possible sense of these words is that they were to hold the precepts referred to before their minds constantly as if they were inscribed on their arms, held in front of their eyes, and written on the door-posts or gate- posts which they daily passed. That the language in Ex 13:9,16 does not command the use of phylacteries is obvious, and that the same is true of Pr 3:3; 6:21; 7:3 where similar words are used is still more certain. Yet, though none of the passages enjoin the use of phylacteries or of the mezuzah, they may all contain allusions to both practices as if the sense were, "Thou shalt keep constantly before thee my words and look to them for safety and not to the phylacteries worn on head and arm by the heathen." If, however, phylacteries were in use among the Jews thus early, it is strange that there is not in the Old Testament a single instance in which the practice of wearing phylacteries is mentioned. Josephus, however, seems to refer to this practice (Ant., IV, viii, 13), and it is frequently spoken of in the Mishna (Berakhoth, i, etc.). It is a striking and significant fact that the Apocrypha is wholly silent as to the three signs of Judaism, phylacteries, the mezuzah and the tsitsith (or tassel attached to the corner of the prayer garment called Tallith; compare Mt 9:20; 14:36 the King James Version where "hem of the garment" is inaccurate and misleading).

It is quite evident that phylacteries have a magical origin. This is suggested by the Greek name phulakterion (whence the English name) which in the 1st century of our era denoted a counter charm or defense (phulasso, "to protect") against evil influences. No scholar now explains the Greek word as denoting a means of leading people to keep (phulasso) the law. The Hebrew name tephillin (=" prayers") meets us first in post-Bib. Hebrew, and carries with it the later view that phylacteries are used during prayer in harmony with the prayers or other formulas over the amulet to make it effective (see Budge, Egyptian Magic, 27).

See more fully under CHARM.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the literature given in the course of the foregoing article, the following may be mentioned. On the general subject see the great works of Tyler (Early History of Mankind, Primitive Culture) and Frazer, Golden Bough; also the series of articles under "Charms and Amulets" in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics and the excellent article "Amulet" in the corresponding German work, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. See further the article "Amulet" in Jewish

Encyclopedia, and on Egyptian amulets, Budge, Egyptian Magic, 25 ff.

T. Witton Davies

AMZI

am’-zi (‘amtsi, "my strength"):

(1) A Levite of the family of Merari (1Ch 6:46).

(2) A priest of the family of Adaiah in the second temple. His father’s name was Zechariah (Ne 11:12).

ANAB

a’-nab (‘anabh, "grapes"; Codex Vaticanus, Anon or Anob): Mentioned in the list of cities which fell to Judah (Jos 15:50). In the list it follows Debir, from which it was a short distance to the Southwest. It lay about twelve males to the Southwest of Hebron. It was a city of the Anakim, from whom Joshua took it (Jos 11:21). Its site is now known as the rum ‘Anab.

ANAEL

an’-a-el (Anael): A brother of Tobit mentioned once only (APC Tobit 1:21) as the father of Achiacharus, who was an official in Nineveh under Esar-haddon.

ANAH

a’-na (‘anah, meaning uncertain; a Horite clan-name (Ge 36)):

(1) Mother of Aholibamah, one of the wives of Esau and daughter of Zibeon (compare Ge 36:2,14,18,25). The Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the Peshitta read "son," identifying this Anah with number 3 (see below); Ge 36:2, read (ha-chori), for (ha-chiwwi).

(2) Son of Seir, the Horite, and brother of Zibeon; one of the chiefs of the land of Edom (compare Ge 36:20,21 = 1Ch 1:38). Seir is elsewhere the name of the land (compare Ge 14:6; Isa 21:11); but here the country is personified and becomes the mythical ancestor of the tribes inhabiting it.

(3) Son of Zibeon, "This is Anah who found the hot springs in the wilderness" (compare Ge 36:24 = 1Ch 1:40,41)

The word ha-yemim, occurs only in this passage and is probably corrupt. Ball (Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Genesis, critical note 93) suggests that it is a corruption of we-hemam (compare Ge 36:22) in

an earlier verse. Jerome, in his commentary on Ge 36:24, assembles the following definitions of the word gathered from Jewish sources.

(1) "seas" as though yammim;

(2) "hot springs" as though hammim;

(3) a species of ass, yemim;

(4) "mules."

This last explanation was the one most frequently met with in Jewish lit; the tradition ran that Anah was the first to breed the mule, thus bringing into existence an unnatural species. As a punishment, God created the deadly water-snake, through the union of the common viper with the Libyan lizard (compare Ge Rabbah 82 15, Yer. Ber 1 12b; Babylonian Pes 54a, Ginzberg, Monatschrift, XLII, 538-39).

The descent of Anah is thus represented in the three ways pointed out above as the text stands. If, however, we accept the reading ben, for bath, in the first case, Aholibamah will then be an unnamed daughter of the Anah of Ge 36:24, not the Aholibamah, daughter of Anah of 36:25 (for the Anah of this verse is evidently the one of 36:20, not the Anah of 36:24). Another view is that the words, "the daughter of Zibeon," are a gloss, inserted by one who mistakenly identified the Anah of 36:25 with the Anah of 36:24; in this event, Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, will be the one mentioned in 36:25. The difference between (2) and (3) is to be explained on the basis of a twofold tradition. Anah was originally a sub-clan of the clan known as Zibeon, and both were "sons of Seir"—i.e. Horites.

H. J. Wolf

ANAHARATH

a-na’-ha-rath (’ana-charath, meaning unknown): A place which fell to the tribe of Issachar in the division of the land (Jos 19:19). Located in the valley of Jezreel toward the East, the name and site being preserved as the modern en-Na‘-ura. BDB is wrong in assigning it to the tribe of Naphtali.

ANAIAH

an-a-i’-a, a-ni’-a (‘anayah, "Yah has answered"):

(1) a Levite who assisted Ezr in reading the law to the people (Ne 8:4), perhaps the person called Ananias in Esdras 9:43.

(2) One of those who sealed the covenant (Ne 10:22). He may have been the same as Anaiah (1).

ANAK

an’-nak. See ANAKIM.

ANAKIM

an’-a-kim (‘anaqim; Enakim, or Enakeim; also called "sons of Anak" (Nu 13:33), and "sons of the Anakim" (De 1:28)): The spies (Nu 13:33) compared them to the Nephilim or "giants" of Ge 6:4, and according to De 2:11 they were reckoned among the REPHAIM (which see). In Nu 13:22 the chiefs of Hebron are said to be descendants of Anak, while "the father of Anak" is stated in Jos (15:13; 21:11) to be Arba after whom Hebron was called "the city of Arba." Jos "cut off the Anakim .... from Hebron, from Debir, from Anab, ... and from all the hill-country of Israel," remnants of them being left in the Philistine cities of Gaza, Gath and Ashdod (Jos 11:21,22). As compared with the Israelites, they were tall like giants (Nu 13:33), and it would therefore seem that the "giant" Goliath and his family were of their race.

At Hebron, at the time of the Israelite conquest, we may gather that they formed the body-guard of the Amorite king (see Jos 10:5) under their three leaders Sheshai, Ahiman and Talmai (Nu 13:22; Jos 15:14; Jud 1:20). Tell el-Amarna Letters show that the Canaanite princes were accustomed to surround themselves with bodyguards of foreign mercenaries. It appears probable that the Anakim came from the Aegean like the Philistines, to whom they may have been related. The name Anak is a masculine corresponding with a feminine which we meet with in the name of the goddess Onka, who according to the Greek writers, Stephanus of Byzantium and Hesychius, was the "Phoen," i.e. Syrian equivalent of Athena. Anket or Anukit was also the name of the goddess worshipped by the Egyptians at the First Cataract. In the name Ahi-man it is possible that "-man" denotes a non-Semitic deity.

A. H. Sayce

ANAMIM

an’-a-mim (‘anamim): Descendants of Mizraim (Ge 10:13; 1Ch 1:11). See TABLE OF NATIONS.

ANAMMELECH

a-nam’-e-lek (‘anammelekh = Assyrian Anu-malik, "Anu is the prince"): A Babylonian (?) deity worshipped by the Sepharvites in Samaria, after being transported there by Sargon. The worship of Adrammelech (who is mentioned with Anammelech) and Anammelech is accompanied by the sacrifice of children by fire: "The Sepharvites burnt their children in the fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim" (2Ki 17:31). This passage presents two grave difficulties. First, there is no evidence in cuneiform literature that would point to the presence of human sacrifice, by fire or otherwise, as part of the ritual; nor has it been shown that the sculptures or bas-reliefs deny this thesis.

Much depends upon the identification of "Sepharvaim"; if, as some scholars hold, Sepharvaim and Sippar are one and the same cities, the two deities referred to are Babylonian. But there are several strong objections to this theory. It has been suggested that Sepharvaim (Septuagint, seppharin, sepphareimi) is rather identical with "Shabara'in," a city mentioned in the Babylonian Chronicle as having been destroyed by Shalmaneser IV. As Sepharvaim and Arpad and Hamath are grouped together (2Ki 17:24; 18:34) in two passages, it is probable that Sepharvaim is a Syriac city. Sepharvaim may then be another form of "Shabara'in," which, in turn, is the Assyrian form of Sibraim (Eze 47:16), a city in the neighborhood of Damascus (of Halevy, ZA, II, 401 ff). One objection to this last is the necessity for representing "c" by "sh"; this is not necessarily insurmountable, however. Then, the attempt to find an Assyrian etymology for the two god-names falls to the ground. Besides, the custom of sacrifice by fire was prevalent in Syria. Secondly, the god that was worshipped at Sippar was neither Adrammelech nor Anammelech but Samas. It is improbable, as some would urge, that Adrammelech is a secondary title of the tutelary god of Sippar; then it would have to be shown that Anu enjoyed special reverence in this city which was especially consecrated to the worship of the Sun-god. (For "Anu" see ASSYRIA.) It may be that the text is corrupt. See also ADRAMMELECH.

H. J. Wolf

ANAN

a'-nan (‘anan, "cloud"):

(1) One of those who, with Nehemiah, sealed the covenant (Ne 10:26).

(2) A returned exile (1 Esdras 5:30). He is called Hanan in Ezr 2:46 and Ne 7:49.

ANANI

a-na'-ni ‘anani, perhaps a shortened form of Ananiah, "Yah has covered"): A son of Elioenai of the house of David, who lived after the captivity (1Ch 3:24).

ANANIAH

an-a-ni'-a ‘ananyah, ("Yah has covered"):

(1) Grandfather of Azariah. He assisted in repairing the walls of Jerusalem after his return from the exile (Ne 3:23).

(2) A town of Benjamin mentioned in connection with Nob and Hazor (Ne 11:32). It is commonly identified with Beit Hanina, between three and four miles North-Northwest from Jerusalem.

ANANIAS (1)

an-a-ni’-as (Ananias; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Hananias; chananyah, "Yah has been gracious"): The name was common among the Jews. In its Hebrew form it is frequently found in the Old Testament (e.g. 1Ch 25:4; Jer 28:1; Da 1:6).

See HANANIAH.

1. A Disciple at Jerusalem:

Husband of Sapphira (Ac 5:1-10). He and his wife sold their property, and gave to the common fund of the church part of the purchase money, pretending it was the whole. When his hypocrisy was denounced by Peter, Ananias fell down dead; and three hours later his wife met the same doom. The following points are of interest.

(1) The narrative immediately follows the account of the intense brotherliness of the believers resulting in a common fund, to which Barnabas had made a generous contribution (Ac 4:32-37). The sincerity and spontaneity of the gifts of Barnabas and the others set forth in dark relief the calculated deceit of Ananias. The brighter the light, the darker the shadow.

(2) The crime of Ananias consisted, not in his retaining a part, but in his pretending to give the whole. He was under no compulsion to give all, for the communism of the early church was not absolute, but purely voluntary (see especially Ac 5:4) Falsehood and hypocrisy ("lie to the Holy Spirit" Ac 5:3), rather than greed, were the sins for which he was so severely punished.

(3) The severity of the Judgment can be justified by the consideration that the act was "the first open venture of deliberate wickedness" (Meyer) within the church. The punishment was an "awe-inspiring act of Divine church-discipline." The narrative does not, however, imply that Peter consciously willed their death. His words were the occasion of it, but he was not the deliberate agent. Even the words in Ac 5:9 are a prediction rather than a judicial sentence.

2. A Disciple at Damascus:

A disciple in Damascus, to whom the conversion of Saul of Tarsus was made known in a vision, and who was the instrument of his physical and spiritual restoration, and the means of introducing him to the other Christians in Damascus (Ac 9:10-19). Paul makes honorable mention of him in his account of his conversion spoken at Jerusalem (Ac 22:12-16), where we are told that Ananias was held in high respect by all the Jews in Damascus, on account of his strict legal piety. No mention is made of him in Paul’s address before Agrippa in Caesarea (Ac 26). In late tradition, he is placed in the list of the seventy disciples of Jesus, and represented as bishop of Damascus, and as having died a martyr’s death.

3. A High Priest at Jerusalem:

A high priest in Jerusalem from 47-59 AD. From Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 2; vi, 2; ix, 2; BJ, II, xvii, 9) we glean the following facts: He was the son of Nedebaeus (or Nebedaeus) and was nominated to the high-priestly office by Herod of Chalcis. In 52 AD he was sent to Rome by Quadratus, legate of Syria, to answer a charge of oppression brought by the Samaritans, but the emperor Claudius acquitted him. On his return to Jerusalem, he resumed the office of high priest. He was deposed shortly before Felix left the province, but continued to wield great influence, which he used in a lawless and violent way. He was a typical Sadducee, wealthy, haughty, unscrupulous, filling his sacred office for purely selfish and political ends, anti-nationalist in his relation to the Jews, friendly to the Romans. He died an ignominious death, being assassinated by the popular zealots (sicarii) at the beginning of the last Jewish war. In the New Testament he figures in two passages.

(1) Ac 23:1-5, where Paul defends himself before the Sanhedrin. The overbearing conduct of Ananias in commanding Paul to be struck on the mouth was characteristic of the man. Paul's ire was for the moment aroused, and he hurled back the scornful epithet of "whited wall." On being called to account for "reviling God's high priest," he quickly recovered the control of his feelings, and said "I knew not, brethren, that he was high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people." This remark has greatly puzzled the commentators. The high priest could have been easily identified by his position and official seat as president of the Sanhedrin. Some have wrongly supposed that Ananias had lost his office during his trial at Rome, but had afterward usurped it during a vacancy (John Lightfoot, Michaelis, etc.). Others take the words as ironical, "How could I know as high priest one who acts so unworthily of his sacred office?" (so Calvin). Others (e.g. Alford, Plumptre) take it that owing to defective eyesight Paul knew not from whom the insolent words had come. Perhaps the simplest explanation is that Paul meant, "I did not for the moment bear in mind that I was addressing the high priest" (so Bengel, Neander, etc.).

(2) In Ac 24:1 we find Ananias coming down to Caesarea in person, with a deputation from the Sanhedrin, to accuse Paul before Felix.

D. Miall Edwards

ANANIAS (2)

(Apocrypha), an-a-ni'-as:

(1) Ananias, the Revised Version (British and American) Annis, the Revised Version, margin, Annias (1 Esdras 5:16). See ANNIS.

(2) A son of Emmer (1 Esdras 9:21) = Hanani, son of Immer in Ezr 10:20.

(3) A son of Bebai (1 Esdras 9:29) = Hananiah in Ezr 10:28. The two last are mentioned in the list of

priests who were found to have strange wives.

(4) One of those who stood by Esdras while he read the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:43) = Anaiah in Ne 8:4.

(5) One of the Levites who explained the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:48) = Hanan in Ne 8:7.

(6) Ananias the Great, son of Shemaiah the Great; a kinsman of Tobit, whom Raphael the angel, disguised as a man, gave out to be his father (Tobit 5:12 f).

(7) Son of Gideon, mentioned as an ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

(8) Another Ananias is mentioned in The So of the Three Children (Azariah) (verse 66).

D. Miall Edwards

ANANIEL

a-nan’-i-el (Ananiel, "God is gracious"): An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1).

ANATH

a’-nath (‘anath): Father of Shamgar (Jud 3:31; 5:6). This name is connected with the Phoenician and Canaanite goddess ‘Anat, which was also worshipped in Egypt. She is mentioned in monuments of the 18th Dynasty, coupled with the war- goddess Astart (Moore, Judges, 105-896; DB; EB).

ANATHEMA

a-nath’-e-ma (anathema): This word occurs only once in the King James Version, namely, in the phrase "Let him be anathema. Maranatha" (1Co 16:22); elsewhere the King James Version renders anathema by "accursed" (Ro 9:3; 1Co 12:3; Ga 1:8,9), once by "curse" (Ac 23:12). Both words—anathema and anathema—were originally dialectical variations and had the same connotation, namely, offering to the gods. The non-Attic form—anathema—was adopted in the Septuagint as a rendering of the Hebrew cherem (see ACCURSED), and gradually came to have the significance of the Hebrew word—"anything devoted to destruction." Whereas in the Greek Fathers anathema—as cherem in rabbinic Hebrew—came to denote excommunication from society, in the New Testament the word has its full force. In common speech it evidently became a strong expression of execration, and the term connoted more than physical destruction; it invariably implied moral worthlessness. In Ro 9:3 Paul does not simply mean that, for the sake of his fellow-countrymen, he is prepared to face death, but to endure the moral degradation of an outcast from the kingdom of Christ. In 1Co 12:3 the expression, "Jesus is anathema"—with its suggestion of moral unfitness—reaches the lowest depths of depreciation, as the expression, "Jesus is

Lord," reaches the summit of appreciation.

Thomas Lewis

ANATHOTH

an’-a-thoth (‘anathoth; Anathoth): A town which lay between Michmash and Jerusalem (Isa 10:30), in the territory of Benjamin, assigned to the Levites (Jos 21:18). It was the native place of Abiathar (1Ki 2:26), and of the prophet Jer (Jer 1:1; 11:21 ff, etc.). Here lay the field which, under remarkable circumstances, the prophet purchased (Jer 32:7 ff). Two of David’s distinguished soldiers, Abiezer (2Sa 23:27) and Jehu (1Ch 12:3), also hailed from Anathoth. It was again occupied by the Benjamites after the return from the Exile (Ne 11:32, etc.). It is identified with ‘Anata, two and a quarter miles Northeast of Jerusalem, a small village of some fifteen houses with remains of ancient walls. There are quarries in the neighborhood from which stones are still carried to Jerusalem. It commands a spacious outlook over the uplands to the North, and especially to the Southeast, over the Jordan valley toward the Dead Sea and the mountains of Moab. There is nothing to shelter it from the withering power of the winds from the eastern deserts (Jer 4:11; 18:17, etc.).

W. Ewing

ANATHOTHITE

an’-a-thoth-it (ha-‘annethothi): the Revised Version (British and American) form of the King James Version Anethothite, Anetothite, Antothite. An inhabitant of Anathoth, a town of Benjamin assigned to the Levites. The Anathothites are

(1) Abiezer, one of David’s thirty heroes (2Sa 23:27; 1Ch 11:28; 27:12), and

(2) Jehu who came to David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3).

ANCESTORS

an’-ses-ters (ri’shonim, "first ones"): The word ancestor appears in the English Bible only once (Le 26:45). The Hebrew word, the ordinary adjective "first," occurs more than 200 times, and in a few places might fairly be rendered ancestors (e.g. De 19:14; Jer 11:10). In speaking of ancestors the Old Testament ordinarily uses the word for "fathers" (’abhoth).

ANCHOR

an’-ker. See SHIPS AND BOATS.

ANCIENT

an’-shent: This word renders several Hebrew words:

(1) qedhem, which denotes "beforetime," "yore"; generally the remote past (compare De 33:15, "ancient mountains"; Jud 5:21, Kishon, the "ancient river"; Isa 19:11 "ancient kings").

(2) zaqen, "old" in years. Whereas the King James Version generally renders the word by "old" (or "elders" when the plural form is found) in six cases "ancient" is used and "ancients" in nine cases. See ANCIENTS.

(3) ‘olam, which denotes "long duration" —past or future. In regard to the past it suggests remote antiquity. The connotation may be discovered in such expressions as: "the years of ancient times" (Ps 77:5); "ancient land-mark" or "paths" (Pr 22:28; Jer 18:15); "ancient people" or "nation" (Isa 44:7; Jer 5:15); "ancient high places" (Eze 36:2).

(4) ‘attiq. This word—really Aramaic—comes from a stem which means "to advance," i.e. in age; hence old, aged (1Ch 3:22).

(5) yashish, literally, "weak," "impotent," hence decrepit aged; a rare and poetical word, and found only in Job. It is rendered "ancient" only in one instance (Job 12:12 the King James Version).

Thomas Lewis

ANCIENT OF DAYS

(‘attiq yomin, = Aramaic): On ‘attiq, see ANCIENT (4). The expression is used in reference to God in Da 7:9,13,22 and is not intended to suggest the existence of God from eternity. It was the venerable appearance of old age that was uppermost in the writer’s mind. "What Daniel sees is not the eternal God Himself, but an aged man, in whose dignified and impressive form God reveals Himself (compare Eze 1:26)" (Keil).

ANCIENTS

an-shents: This word (except in one instance) renders the Hebrew word zeqenim, (pl of zaqen), which should always be translated "old men" or "elders." The Hebrew word never has the connotation which "ancients" has in modern English. The words "I understand more than the ancients" (Ps 119:100 the King James Version) do not mean that the Psalmist claims greater wisdom than his distant forbears but than his contemporaries with all their age and experience. In the parallel clause "teachers" is the corresponding word. In such phrases as "ancients of the people" (Jer 19:1 the King James Version), "ancients of the house of Israel" (Eze 8:12), "elders" would obviously be the correct rendering, as in the

Revised Version (British and American). Even in Isa 24:23 ("before his ancients gloriously" the English Revised Version) "elders" is the right translation (American Revised Version). The writer probably alludes to the Sinaitic; theophany witnessed by the "seventy .... elders" (Ex 24:9-18) Generally speaking the word suggests the experience, insight and practical acquaintance with life which age ought to bring with it (Ps 119:100; Eze 7:26). In one instance (1Sa 24:13) "ancients" is the right rendering for the Hebrew word qadhmonim, which means "men of former times."

Thomas Lewis

ANCLE

an’-k’-l. See ANKLE.

ANDREW

an’-droo (Andreas, i.e. "manly." The name has also been interpreted as "the mighty one, or conqueror"): Andrew was the first called of the Twelve Apostles.

I. In New Testament.

1. Early History and First Call:

Andrew belonged to Bethsaida of Galilee (compare Joh 1:44). He was the brother of Simon Peter and his father’s name was John (compare Joh 1:42; 21:15,16,17). He occupies a more prominent place in the Gospel of Joh than in the synoptical writings, and this is explicable at least in part from the fact that Andrew was Greek both in language and sympathies (compare infra), and that his subsequent labors were intimately connected with the people for whom Joh was immediately writing. There are three stages in the call of Andrew to the apostleship. The first is described in Joh 1:35-40. Andrew had spent his earlier years as a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee, but on learning of the fame of John the Baptist, he departed along with a band of his countrymen to Bethabara (the Revised Version (British and American) "Bethany") beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing (Joh 1:28). Possibly Jesus was of their number, or had preceded them in their pilgrimage. There Andrew learned for the first time of the greatness of the "Lamb of God" and "followed him" (Joh 1:40). He was the means at this time of bringing his brother Simon Peter also to Christ (Joh 1:41). Andrew was probably a companion of Jesus on his return journey to Galilee, and was thus present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:2), in Capernaum (Joh 2:12), at the Passover in Jerusalem (Joh 2:13), at the baptizing in Judea (Joh 3:22), where he himself may have taken part (compare Joh 4:2), and in Samaria (Joh 4:5).

2. Second Call and Final Ordination:

On his return to Galilee, Andrew resumed for a time his old vocation as fisherman, till he received his second call. This happened after John the Baptist was cast into prison (compare Mr 1:14; Mt 4:12) and is

described in Mr 1:16-18; Mt 4:18,19. The two accounts are practically identical, and tell how Andrew and his brother were now called on definitely to forsake their mundane occupations and become fishers of men (Mr 1:17). The corresponding narrative of Luke varies in part; it does not mention Andrew by name, and gives the additional detail of the miraculous draught of fishes. By some it has been regarded as an amalgamation of Mark's account with Joh 21:1-8 (see JAMES). After a period of companionship with Jesus, during which, in the house of Simon and Andrew, Simon's wife's mother was healed of a fever (Mr 1:29-31; compare Mt 8:14,15; Lu 4:38,39); the call of Andrew was finally consecrated by his election as one of the Twelve Apostles (Mt 10:2; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:14; Ac 1:13).

3. Subsequent History:

Further incidents recorded of Andrew are: At the feeding of the five thousand by the Sea of Galilee, the attention of Jesus was drawn by Andrew to the lad with five sequent barley loaves and two fishes (Joh 6 $ History Joh 8.9). At the feast of the Passover, the Greeks who wished to "see Jesus" inquired of Philip, who turned for advice to Andrew, and the two then told Jesus (Joh 12:20-36). On the Mount of Olives, Andrew along with Peter, James and John, questioned Jesus regarding the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the world (Mr 13:3-23; compare also Mt 24:3-28; Lu 21:5-24).

II. In Apocryphal Literature.

The name of Andrew's mother was traditionally Joanna, and according to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 49) he belonged to the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of his father. A fragment of a Coptic gospel of the 4th or 5th century tells how not only Thomas (Joh 20:27), but also Andrew was compelled, by touching the feet of the risen Saviour, to believe in the bodily resurrection (Hennecke, Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, etc., 38, 39). Various places were assigned as the scene of his subsequent missionary labors. The Syriac Teaching of the Apostles (ed Cureton, 34) mentions Bithynia, Eusebius gives Scythia (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, i, 1), and others Greece (Lipsius, Apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, I, 63). The Muratorian Fragment relates that John wrote his gospel in consequence of a revelation given to Andrew, and this would point to Ephesus (compare Hennecke id, 459). The Contendings of the Twelve Apostles (for historicity, authorship, etc., of this work, compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, Intro; Hennecke, Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 351-58; RE, 664-66) contains several parts dealing with Andrew:

(1) "The Preaching of Andrew and Philemon among the Kurds" (Budge, II 163 ff) narrates the appearance of the risen Christ to His disciples, the sending of Andrew to Lydia and his conversion of the people there.

(2) The "Preaching of Matthias in the City of the Cannibals" (Budge, II, 267 ff; REH, 666) tells of how Matthias, on being imprisoned and blinded by the Cannibals, was released by Andrew, who had been brought to his assistance in a ship by Christ, but the two were afterward again imprisoned. Matthias then caused the city to be inundated, the disciples were set free, and the people converted.

(3) "The Ac of Andrew and Bartholomew" (Budge, II, 183 ff) gives an account of their mission among the Parthians.

(4) According to the "Martyrdom of Andrew" (Budge, II, 215) he was stoned and crucified in Scythia.

According to the surviving fragments of "The Ac of Andrew," a heretical work dating probably from the 2nd century, and referred to by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, ii, 5), the scene of Andrew's death was laid in Achaia. There he was imprisoned and crucified by order of the proconsul Eges (or Aegeates), whose wife had been estranged from him by the preaching of Andrew (compare Hennecke, 459-73; Pick, Apocryphal Acts, 201-21; Lipsius, I, 543-622). A so-called "Gospel of Andrew" mentioned by Innocent I (Ep, I, iii, 7) and Augustine (Contra Advers. Leg. et Prophet., I, 20), but this is probably due to a confusion with the above-mentioned "Ac of Andrew." The relics of Andrew were discovered in Constantinople in the time of Justinian, and part of his cross is now in Peter's, Rome. Andrew is the patron saint of Scotland, whither his arm is said to have been transferred by Regulus. The ascription to him of the decussate cross is of late origin.

III. Character.

There is something significant in Andrew's being the first called of the apostles. The choice was an important one, for upon the lead given by Andrew depended the action of the others. Christ perceived that the soul's unrest, the straining after higher things and a deeper knowledge of God, which had induced Andrew to make the pilgrimage to Bethany, gave promise of a rich spiritual growth, which no doubt influenced Him in His decision. His wisdom and insight were justified of the after event. Along with a keenness of perception regarding spiritual truths was coupled in Andrew a strong sense of personal conviction which enabled him not only to accept Jesus as the Messiah, but to win Peter also as a disciple of Christ. The incident of the Feeding of the Five Thousand displayed Andrew in a fresh aspect: there the practical part which he played formed a striking contrast to the feeble-mindedness of Philip. Both these traits—his missionary spirit, and his decision of character which made others appeal to him when in difficulties—were evinced at the time when the Greeks sought to interview Jesus. Andrew was not one of the greatest of the apostles, yet he is typical of those men of broad sympathies and sound common sense, without whom the success of any great movement cannot be assured.

C. M. Kerr

ANDRONICUS

an-dro-ni'-kus (Andronikos):

(1) A deputy of Antiochus Epiphanes, who, while ruling at Antioch, excited the Jews by the murder of Onias, and, upon their formal complaint, was executed by his superior (2 Macc 4:32-38); generally distinguished from another officer of the same name, also under Antiochus (2 Macc 5:23).

(2) A kinsman of Paul, residing at Rome (Ro 16:7). He had been converted to Christianity before Paul, and, like Paul, had suffered imprisonment, although when and where can only be surmised. When he and Junias, another kinsman of Paul, are referred to as "of note among the apostles," this may be interpreted as either designating the high esteem in which they were held by the Twelve, or as reckoning them in the number of apostles. The latter is the sense, if "apostle" be understood here in the more general meaning, used in Ac 14:14 of Barnabas, in 2Co 8:23 of Titus, in Php 2:25 of Epaphroditus, and in the Didache of "the traveling evangelists or missionaries who preached the gospel from place to place" (Schaff, The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, 67; see also Lightfoot on Philippians, 196). On this assumption, Andronicus was one of the most prominent and successful of the traveling missionaries of the early church.

H. E. Jacobs

ANEM

a'-nem (‘anem, "two springs"; Anam): Anem is mentioned with Ramoth among the cities of Issachar assigned to the priests, the sons of Gershom (1Ch 6:73). In the parallel list (Jos 21:29), there are mentioned Jarmuth and En- gannim, corresponding to Ramoth and Anim, therefore Anim and En-gannim (Jenin) are identical. As the name denotes (Anem =" two springs"; En-gannim =" the spring of gardens"), it was well watered. Anem is identified by Eusebius with Aner, but Conder suggests the village of "Anim," on the hills West of the plain of Esdraelon which represents the Anea of the 4th century AD (Onom under the word "Aniel" and "Bethara"), a city lying 15 Roman miles from Caesarea, which had good baths.

M. O. Evans

ANER (1)

a'-ner (‘aner; Septuagint Aunan; Samaritan Pentateuch, ‘anram, "sprout," "waterfall"): One of the three "confederates" of Abraham in his pursuit after the four kings (Ge 14:13,14). Judging from the meanings of the two other names, Mamre being the name of the sacred grove or tree (Jahwist) and synonymous with Hebron (Priestly Code); and Eschol—a name of a valley (lit. "grape cluster") from which the personal names are derived—it may be expected to explain the name Aner in a similar way. Dillmann suggested the name of a range of mountains in that vicinity (Comm. at the place and Rosen in ZDMG, XII, 479; Skinner, Genesis, 365).

S. Cohon

ANER (2)

a'-ner (‘aner, meaning doubtful): A Levitical town in Manasseh, West of the Jordan (1Ch 6:70).

Gesenius and others identified it with Taanach of Jos 21:25. There is, however, no agreement as to its location.

ANETHOTHITE

an’-e-thoth-it: the King James Version form of Anathothite (thus the Revised Version (British and American) 2Sa 23:27).

ANETOTHITE

an’-e-toth-it: the King James Version form of Anathothite (thus the Revised Version (British and American) 1Ch 27:12).

ANGEL

an’-jel (mal’akh; Septuagint and New Testament, aggelos):

I. DEFINITION AND SCRIPTURE TERMS

II. ANGELS IN OLD TESTAMENT

1. Nature, Appearances and Functions

2. The Angelic Host

3. The Angel of the Theophany

III. ANGELS IN NEW TESTAMENT

1. Appearances

2. The Teaching of Jesus about Angels

3. Other New Testament References

IV. DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

V. THE REALITY OF ANGELS

LITERATURE

I. Definition and Scripture Terms.

The word angel is applied in Scripture to an order of supernatural or heavenly beings whose business it is to act as God’s messengers to men, and as agents who carry out His will. Both in Hebrew and Greek the word is applied to human messengers (1Ki 19:2; Lu 7:24); in Hebrew it is used in the singular to denote a Divine messenger, and in the plural for human messengers, although there are exceptions to both usages. It is applied to the prophet Haggai (Hag 1:13), to the priest (Mal 2:7), and to the messenger who is to prepare the way of the Lord (Mal 3:1). Other Hebrew words and phrases applied to angels are bene ha-’elohim (Ge 6:2,4; Job 1:6; 2:1) and bene ‘elim (Ps 29:1; 89:6), i.e. sons of the ‘elohim or ‘elim; this means, according to a common Hebrew usage, members of the class called ‘elohim or ‘elim, the heavenly powers. It seems doubtful whether the word ‘elohim, standing by itself, is ever used to describe angels, although Septuagint so translates it in a few passages.

The most notable instance is Ps 8:5; where the Revised Version (British and American) gives, "Thou hast made him but little lower than God," with the English Revised Version, margin reading of "the angels" for "God" (compare Heb 2:7,9); qedhoshim "holy ones" (Ps 89:5,7), a name suggesting the fact that they belong to God; ‘ir, ‘irim, "watcher," "watchers" (Da 4:13,17,23). Other expressions are used to designate angels collectively: codh, "council" (Ps 89:7), where the reference may be to an inner group of exalted angels; ‘edhah and qahal, "congregation" (Ps 82:1; 89:5); and finally tsabha’, tsebha’oth, "host," "hosts," as in the familiar phrase "the God of hosts."

In New Testament the word aggelos, when it refers to a Divine messenger, is frequently accompanied by some phrase which makes this meaning clear, e.g. "the angels of heaven" (Mt 24:36). Angels belong to the "heavenly host" (Lu 2:13). In reference to their nature they are called "spirits" (Heb 1:14). Paul evidently referred to the ordered ranks of supra-mundane beings in a group of words that are found in various combinations, namely, archai, "principalities," exousiai, "powers," thronoi, "thrones," kuriotetes, "dominions," and dunameis, also translated "powers." The first four are apparently used in a good sense in Col 1:16, where it is said that all these beings were created through Christ and unto Him; in most of the other passages in which words from this group occur, they seem to represent evil powers. We are told that our wrestling is against them (Eph 6:12), and that Christ triumphs over the principalities and powers (Col 2:15; compare Ro 8:38; 1Co 15:24). In two passages the word archaggelos, "archangel" or chief angel, occurs: "the voice of the archangel" (1Th 4:16), and "Michael the archangel" (Jude 1:9).

II. Angels in Old Testament.

1. Nature, Appearances and Functions:

Everywhere in the Old Testament the existence of angels is assumed. The creation of angels is referred to in Ps 148:2,5 (compare Col 1:16). They were present at the creation of the world, and were so filled with wonder and gladness that they "shouted for joy" (Job 38:7). Of their nature we are told nothing. In general they are simply regarded as embodiments of their mission. Though presumably the holiest of created beings, they are charged by God with folly (Job 4:18), and we are told that "he putteth no trust in

his holy ones" (Job 15:15).

References to the fall of the angels are only found in the obscure and probably corrupt passage Ge 6:1-4, and in the interdependent passages 2Pe 2:4 and Jude 1:6, which draw their inspiration from the Apocryphal book of Enoch. Demons are mentioned (see DEMON); and although Satan appears among the sons of God (Job 1:6; 2:1), there is a growing tendency in later writers to attribute to him a malignity that is all his own (see SATAN).

As to their outward appearance, it is evident that they bore the human form, and could at times be mistaken for men (Eze 9:2; Ge 18:2,16). There is no hint that they ever appeared in female form. The conception of angels as winged beings, so familiar in Christian art, finds no support in Scripture (except, perhaps Da 9:21; Re 14:6, where angels are represented as "flying"). The cherubim and seraphim (see CHERUB; SERAPHIM) are represented as winged (Ex 25:20; Isa 6:2); winged also are the symbolic living creatures of Eze (Eze 1:6; compare Re 4:8).

As above stated, angels are messengers and instruments of the Divine will. As a rule they exercise no influence in the physical sphere. In several instances, however, they are represented as destroying angels: two angels are commissioned to destroy Sodom (Ge 19:13); when David numbers the people, an angel destroys them by pestilence (2Sa 24:16); it is by an angel that the Assyrian army is destroyed (2Ki 19:35); and Ezekiel hears six angels receiving the command to destroy those who were sinful in Jerusalem (Eze 9:1,5,7). In this connection should be noted the expression "angels of evil," i.e. angels that bring evil upon men from God and execute His judgments (Ps 78:49; compare 1Sa 16:14). Angels appear to Jacob in dreams (Ge 28:12; 31:11). The angel who meets Balaam is visible first to the ass, and not to the rider (Nu 22 ff). Angels interpret God’s will, showing man what is right for him (Job 33:23). The idea of angels as caring for men also appears (Ps 91:11 f), although the modern conception of the possession by each man of a special guardian angel is not found in Old Testament.

2. The Angelic Host:

The phrase "the host of heaven" is applied to the stars, which were sometimes worshipped by idolatrous Jews (Jer 33:22; 2Ki 21:3; Ze 1:5); the name is applied to the company of angels because of their countless numbers (compare Da 7:10) and their glory. They are represented as standing on the right and left hand of Yahweh (1Ki 22:19). Hence God, who is over them all, is continually called throughout Old Testament "the God of hosts," "Yahweh of hosts," "Yahweh God of hosts"; and once "the prince of the host" (Da 8:11). One of the principal functions of the heavenly host is to be ever praising the name of the Lord (Ps 103:21; 148:1 f). In this host there are certain figures that stand out prominently, and some of them are named. The angel who appears to Joshua calls himself "prince of the host of Yahweh" (Jos 5:14 f). The glorious angel who interprets to Daniel the vision which he saw in the third year of Cyrus (Da 10:5), like the angel who interprets the vision in the first year of Belshazzar (Da 7:16), is not named; but other visions of the same prophet were explained to him by the angel Gabriel, who is called "the man Gabriel," and is described as speaking with "a man’s voice" (Da 9:21; 8:15 f). In Daniel we find occasional reference made to "princes": "the prince of Persia," "the prince of Greece" (Da 10:20). These

are angels to whom is entrusted the charge of, and possibly the rule over, certain peoples. Most notable among them is Michael, described as "one of the chief princes," "the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people," and, more briefly, "your prince" (Da 10:13; 12:1; 10:21); Michael is therefore regarded as the patron-angel of the Jews. In Apocrypha Raphael, Uriel and Jeremiel are also named. Of Raphael it is said (Tobit 12:15) that he is "one of the seven holy angels who present the prayers of the saints" to God (compare Re 8:2, "the seven angels that stand before God"). It is possible that this group of seven is referred to in the above-quoted phrase, "one of the chief princes". Some (notably Kosters) have maintained that the expressions "the sons of the ‘elohim," God’s "council" and "congregation," refer to the ancient gods of the heathen, now degraded and wholly subordinated to Yahweh. This rather daring speculation has little support in Scripture; but we find traces of a belief that the patron-angels of the nations have failed in establishing righteousness within their allotted sphere on earth, and that they will accordingly be punished by Yahweh their over-Lord (Isa 24:21 f; Ps 82$; compare Ps 58:1 f the Revised Version, margin; compare Jude 1:6).

3. The Angel of the Theophany:

This angel is spoken of as "the angel of Yahweh," and "the angel of the presence (or face) of Yahweh." The following passages contain references to this angel: Ge 16:7 ff—the angel and Hagar; Ge 18—Abraham intercedes with the angel for Sodom; Ge 22:11 ff—the angel interposes to prevent the sacrifice of Isaac; Ge 24:7,40—Abraham sends Eliezer and promises the angel’s protection; Ge 31:11 ff—the angel who appears to Jacob says "I am the God of Beth-el"; Ge 32:24 ff—Jacob wrestles with the angel and says, "I have seen God face to face"; Ge 48:15 f—Jacob speaks of God and the angel as identical; Ex 3 (compare Ac 7:30 ff)—the angel appears to Moses in the burning bush; Ex 13:21; 14:19 (compare Nu 20:16)—God or the angel leads Israel out of Egypt; Ex 23:20 ff—the people are commanded to obey the angel; Ex 32:34-33:17 (compare Isa 63:9)—Moses pleads for the presence of God with His people; Jos 5:13-6:2—the angel appears to Joshua; Jud 2:1-5—the angel speaks to the people; Jud 6:11 ff—the angel appears to Gideon.

A study of these passages shows that while the angel and Yahweh are at times distinguished from each other, they are with equal frequency, and in the same passages, merged into each other. How is this to be explained? It is obvious that these apparitions cannot be the Almighty Himself, whom no man hath seen, or can see. In seeking the explanation, special attention should be paid to two of the passages above cited. In Ex 23:20 ff God promises to send an angel before His people to lead them to the promised land; they are commanded to obey him and not to provoke him "for he will not pardon your transgression: for my name is in him." Thus the angel can forgive sin, which only God can do, because God’s name, i.e. His character and thus His authority, are in the angel. Further, in the passage Ex 32:34-33:17 Moses intercedes for the people after their first breach of the covenant; God responds by promising, "Behold mine angel shall go before thee"; and immediately after God says, "I will not go up in the midst of thee." In answer to further pleading, God says, "My presence shall go with thee, and I will give thee rest." Here a clear distinction is made between an ordinary angel, and the angel who carries with him God’s presence. The conclusion may be summed up in the words of Davidson in his Old Testament Theology: "In particular providences one may trace the presence of Yahweh in influence and operation; in ordinary angelic appearances one may discover Yahweh present on some side of His being, in some attribute of

His character; in the angel of the Lord He is fully present as the covenant God of His people, to redeem them." The question still remains, Who is theophanic angel? To this many answers have been given, of which the following may be mentioned:

(1) This angel is simply an angel with a special commission;

(2) He may be a momentary descent of God into visibility;

(3) He may be the Logos, a kind of temporary preincarnation of the second person of the Trinity. Each has its difficulties, but the last is certainly the most tempting to the mind. Yet it must be remembered that at best these are only conjectures that touch on a great mystery. It is certain that from the beginning God used angels in human form, with human voices, in order to communicate with man; and the appearances of the angel of the Lord, with his special redemptive relation to God's people, show the working of that Divine mode of self-revelation which culminated in the coming of the Saviour, and are thus a fore-shadowing of, and a preparation for, the full revelation of God in Jesus Christ. Further than this, it is not safe to go.

III. Angels in New Testament.

1. Appearances:

Nothing is related of angels in New Testament which is inconsistent with the teaching of Old Testament on the subject. Just as they are specially active in the beginning of Old Testament history, when God's people is being born, so they appear frequently in connection with the birth of Jesus, and again when a new order of things begins with the resurrection. An angel appears three times in dreams to Joseph (Mt 1:20; 2:13,19). The angel Gabriel appears to Zacharias, and then to Mary in the annunciation (Lu 1). An angel announces to the shepherds the birth of Jesus, and is joined by a "multitude of the heavenly host," praising God in celestial song (Lu 2:8 ff). When Jesus is tempted, and again during the agony at Gethsemane, angels appear to Him to strengthen His soul (Mt 4:11; Lu 22:43). The verse which tells how an angel came down to trouble the pool (Joh 5:4) is now omitted from the text as not being genuine. An angel descends to roll away the stone from the tomb of Jesus (Mt 28:2); angels are seen there by certain women (Lu 24:23) and (two) by Mary Magdalene (Joh 20:12). An angel releases the apostles from prison, directs Philip, appears to Peter in a dream, frees him from prison, smites Herod with sickness, appears to Paul in a dream (Ac 5:19; 8:26; 10:3; 12:7 ff; 12:23; 27:23). Once they appear clothed in white; they are so dazzling in appearance as to terrify beholders; hence they begin their message with the words "Fear not" (Mt 28:2-5).

2. The Teaching of Jesus about Angels:

It is quite certain that our Lord accepted the main teachings of Old Testament about angels, as well as the later Jewish belief in good and bad angels. He speaks of the "angels in heaven" (Mt 22:30), and of "the devil and his angels" (Mt 25:41). According to our Lord the angels of God are holy (Mr 8:38); they

have no sex or sensuous desires (Mt 22:30); they have high intelligence, but they know not the time of the Second Coming (Mt 24:36); they carry (in a parable) the soul of Lazarus to Abraham's bosom (Lu 16:22); they could have been summoned to the aid of our Lord, had He so desired (Mt 26:53); they will accompany Him at the Second Coming (Mt 25:31) and separate the righteous from the wicked (Mt 13:41,49). They watch with sympathetic eyes the fortunes of men, rejoicing in the repentance of a sinner (Lu 15:10; compare 1Pe 1:12; Eph 3:10; 1Co 4:9); and they will hear the Son of Man confessing or denying those who have confessed or denied Him before men (Lu 12:8 f). The angels of the presence of God, who do not appear to correspond to our conception of guardian angels, are specially interested in God's little ones (Mt 18:10). Finally, the existence of angels is implied in the Lord's Prayer in the petition, "Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth" (Mt 6:10).

3. Other New Testament References:

Paul refers to the ranks of angels ("principalities, powers" etc.) only in order to emphasize the complete supremacy of Jesus Christ. He teaches that angels will be judged by the saints (1Co 6:3). He attacks the incipient Gnosticism of Asia Minor by forbidding the, worship of angels (Col 2:18). He speaks of God's angels as "elect," because they are included in the counsels of Divine love (1Ti 5:21). When Paul commands the women to keep their heads covered in church because of the angels (1Co 11:10) he probably means that the angels, who watch all human affairs with deep interest, would be pained to see any infraction of the laws of modesty. In Heb 1:14 angels are described as ministering spirits engaged in the service of the saints. Peter also emphasizes the supremacy of our Lord over all angelic beings (1Pe 3:22). The references to angels in 2 Peter and Jude are colored by contact with Apocrypha literature. In Revelation, where the references are obviously symbolic, there is very frequent mention of angels. The angels of the seven churches (Re 1:20) are the guardian angels or the personifications of these churches. The worship of angels is also forbidden (Re 22:8 f). Specially interesting is the mention of elemental angels—"the angel of the waters" (Re 16:5), and the angel "that hath power over fire" (Re 14:18; compare Re 7:1; 19:17). Reference is also made to the "angel of the bottomless pit," who is called ABADDON or APOLLYON (which see), evidently an evil angel (Re 9:11 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "abyss"). In Re 12:7 ff we are told that there was war between Michael with his angels and the dragon with his angels.

IV. Development of the Doctrine.

In the childhood of the race it was easy to believe in God, and He was very near to the soul. In Paradise there is no thought of angels; it is God Himself who walks in the garden. A little later the thought of angels appears, but, God has not gone away, and as "the angel of Yahweh" He appears to His people and redeems them. In these early times the Jews believed that there were multitudes of angels, not yet divided in thought into good and bad; these had no names or personal characteristics, but were simply embodied messages. Till the time of the captivity the Jewish angelology shows little development. During that dark period they came into close contact with a polytheistic people, only to be more deeply confirmed in their monotheism thereby. They also became acquainted with the purer faith of the Persians, and in all probability viewed the tenets of Zoroastrianism with a more favorable eye, because of the great kindness of Cyrus to their nation.

There are few direct traces of Zoroastrianism in the later angelology of the Old Testament. It is not even certain that the number seven as applied to the highest group of angels is Persian in its origin; the number seven was not wholly disregarded by the Jews. One result of the contact was that the idea of a hierarchy of the angels was more fully developed. The conception in Da of angels as "watchers," and the idea of patron-princes or angel-guardians of nations may be set down to Persian influence. It is probable that contact with the Persians helped the Jews to develop ideas already latent in their minds. According to Jewish tradition, the names of the angels came from Babylon. By this time the consciousness of sin had grown more intense in the Jewish mind, and God had receded to an immeasurable distance; the angels helped to fill the gap between God and man. The more elaborate conceptions of Daniel and Zechariah are further developed in Apocrypha, especially in 2 Esdras, Tobit and 2 Macc.

In the New Testament we find that there is little further development; and by the Spirit of God its writers were saved from the absurdly puerile teachings of contemporary Rabbinism. We find that the Sadducees, as contrasted with the Pharisees, did not believe in angels or spirits (Ac 23:8). We may conclude that the Sadducees, with their materialistic standpoint, and denial of the resurrection, regarded angels merely as symbolical expressions of God’s actions. It is noteworthy in this connection that the great priestly document (Priestly Code, P) makes no mention of angels. The Book of Revelation naturally shows a close kinship to the books of Ezekiel and Daniel. Regarding the rabbinical developments of angelology, some beautiful, some extravagant, some grotesque, but all fanciful, it is not necessary here to speak. The Essenes held an esoteric doctrine of angels, in which most scholars find the germ of the Gnostic eons.

V. The Reality of Angels.

A belief in angels, if not indispensable to the faith of a Christian, has its place there. In such a belief there is nothing unnatural or contrary to reason. Indeed, the warm welcome which human nature has always given to this thought, is an argument in its favor. Why should there not be such an order of beings, if God so willed it? For the Christian the whole question turns on the weight to be attached to the words of our Lord. All are agreed that He teaches the existence, reality, and activity of angelic beings. Was He in error because of His human limitations? That is a conclusion which it is very hard for the Christian to draw, and we may set it aside. Did He then adjust His teaching to popular belief, knowing that what He said was not true? This explanation would seem to impute deliberate untruth to our Lord, and must equally be set aside. So we find ourselves restricted to the conclusion that we have the guaranty of Christ’s word for the existence of angels; for most Christians that will settle the question.

The visible activity of angels has come to an end, because their mediating work is done; Christ has founded the kingdom of the Spirit, and God’s Spirit speaks directly to the spirit of man. This new and living way has been opened up to us by Jesus Christ, upon whom faith can yet behold the angels of God ascending and descending. Still they watch the lot of man, and rejoice in his salvation; still they join in the praise and adoration of God, the Lord of hosts, still can they be regarded as "ministering spirits sent forth to do service for the sake of them that shall inherit salvation."

LITERATURE.

All Old Testament and New Testament theologies contain discussions. Among the older books Oehler's Old Testament Theology and Hengstenberg's Christology of Old Testament (for "angel of Yahweh") and among modern ones Davidson's Old Testament Theology are specially valuable. The ablest supporter of theory that the "sons of the Elohim" are degraded gods is Kosters. "Het onstaan der Angelologie onder Israel," TT 1876. See also articles on "Angel" in HDB (by Davidson), EB, DCG, Jew Encyclopedia, RE (by Cremer). Cremer's Biblico- Theological New Testament Lexicon should be consulted under the word "aggelos." For Jewish beliefs see also Edersheim's Life and Times of Jesus, II, Appendix xiii. On the Pauline angelology see Everling, Die paulinische Angelologie. On the general subject see Godet, Biblical Studies; Mozley, The Word, chapter lix, and Latham, A Service of Angels.

John Macartney Wilson

ANGEL OF GOD

See ANGEL.

ANGEL OF YAHWEH

See ANGEL (II, 3).

ANGELS OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES

It is evident from the contexts of the various Biblical passages in which the word "angel" appears, that the word does not always represent the same idea. In such passages as Da 12:1 and Ac 12:15 it would seem that the angel was generally regarded as a superhuman being whose duty it was to guard a nation or an individual, not unlike the jenei of the Arabs. However, in Mal 2:7, 3:1 (Hebrew) the word is clearly used to represent men. In the New Testament also, there are passages, such as Jas 2:25 (Greek), in which the word seems to be applied to men. The seven angels of the seven churches (Re 1:20) received seven letters, figurative letters, and therefore it would seem that the seven angels are also figurative and may refer to the seven bishops who presided over the seven churches of Asia. Or the angels may be regarded as the personifications of the churches.

E. J. Banks

ANGER

an'-ger: In the Old Testament, the translation of several Hebrew words, especially of 'aph (lit. "nostril," "countenance"), which is used some 45 times of human, 177 times of Divine, anger (OHL). The word occurs rarely in the New Testament (Mr 3:5; Eph 4:31; Col 3:8; Re 14:10), its place being taken by the

word "wrath" (see WRATH). As a translation of words denoting God's "anger," the English word is unfortunate so far as it may seem to imply selfish, malicious or vindictive personal feeling. The anger of God is the response of His holiness to outbreaking sin. Particularly when it culminates in action is it rightly called Has "wrath." The Old Testament doctrine of God's anger is contained in many passages in the Pentateuch, Psalms and the Prophets. In Proverbs men are dissuaded from anger (Pr 15:1; 27:4), and the "slow to anger" is commended (Pr 15:18; 16:32; 19:11). Christians axe enjoined to put away the feeling of self-regarding, vindictive anger (Eph 4:31; Col 3:8), and to cherish no desire of personal revenge (Eph 4:26).

F. K. Farr

ANGLE

an'-g'-l: Used in Isa 19:8 for a Hebrew noun that is rendered "hook" in Job 41:1: "The fishers shall lament, and all they that cast angle (hook) into the Nile shall mourn." For a striking figurative use of it see Hab 1:15 where, speaking of the wicked devouring the righteous, "making men as the fishes of the sea," the prophet says: "They take up all of them with the angle, they catch them in their net" (the Revised Version (British and American) uses singular).

ANGLING

an'-gling: Angling, i.e. fishing with a hook or angle, was little known among the ancients. The fish were chiefly taken by casting nets, etc. (see Mt 13:47). Compare e.g. "Then did Deucalion first the art invent of angling" (Davors, Secret of Angling, I). See NET.

ANGLO-SAXON VERSIONS

an-glo-sax'-on vur'-shuns. See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

ANGUISH

an'-gwish: Extreme distress of body, mind or spirit; excruciating pain or suffering of soul, e.g. excessive grief, remorse, despair. Chiefly expressed in Old Testament, by four derivatives of tsuq, "straitened," "pressed," and tsar, and two derivatives signifying "straitness," "narrowness," hence distress; also shabhats, "giddiness," "confusion of mind"; hul "to twist" with pain, "writhe." So in the New Testament, thlipsis, "a pressing together," hence affliction, tribulation, stenochoria, "narrowness of place," hence extreme affliction; sunoche, "a holding together," hence distress. The fundamental idea in these various terms is pressure—being straitened, compressed into a narrow place, or pain through physical or mental torture. Used of the physical agony of child-birth (Jer 4:31; 6:24; 49:24; 50:43; Joh 16:21); of distress of soul as the result of sin and wickedness (Job 15:24; Pr 1:27; Ro 2:9); of anguish of spirit through the cruel bondage of slavery (Ex 6:9) and Assyrian oppression (Isa 8:22); of the anxiety and pain of

Christian love because of the sins of fellow-disciples (2Co 2:4).

Dwight M. Pratt

ANIAM

a-ni’-am (‘ani‘am, "lament of the people"): A son of Shemidah of Manasseh (1Ch 7:19).

ANIM

a’-nim (‘anim, "springs"): One of the cities of the hill country of Judah mentioned immediately after Eshtemoa (Jos 15:50). It is probably represented by the double ruin of el Ghuwein situated South of es Semu‘a. The surface remains are Byzantine—a Christian town called Anem was here in the 4th century, but it is clearly an ancient site of importance (PEF, III, 408, Sh, XXV).

ANIMAL

an’-i-mal: See under the various names and also the general article on ZOOLOGY.

ANISE; DILL

an’-is, or dil; (RVm, anethon): Not the true anise, Pimpinella anisum, as was supposed by the King James Version translators, but Dill, Anethum graveolens. This is an annual or biennial herb of NO Umbelliferae, growing from one to three feet high, with small yellow flowers and brownish, flattened, oval fruits 1/5 inch long. It grows wild in lands bordering on the Mediterranean. The seeds have an aromatic flavor and are used as condiment in cooking, as carminative in medicine. "Dill water" is a favorite domestic remedy. Jesus said (Mt 23:23): "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law," etc. In the tract, Ma‘aseroth (4 5) it is mentioned that this plant (Hebrew shabhath), its stem, leaves and seed, was subject to tithe. See CUT.

E. W. G. Masterman

ANKLE

an’-k’-l (in older editions of the King James Version, ancle): From Hebrew me’aphecayim literally, "water of ankles," i.e. shallow water (Eze 47:3); "anklebones" (Ac 3:7) from sphudron "ankle chains" (the King James Version "chains"), from a Hebrew root meaning "to walk about proudly" (Nu 31:50). The same Hebrew word is translated "bracelet" (2Sa 1:10), but in Isa 3:20 another word from the same root "ankle chains" (the King James Version "ornaments of the legs"). Compare ANKLET (Isa 3:18).

ANKLET; ANKLE-CHAIN

an’-klet, an’-k’-l-chan: "Anklets" is rightly found in Isa 3:18 the Revised Version (British and American), and "ankle-chains" in Nu 31:50 the Revised Version (British and American). A cognate word of essentially the same meaning is used in Isa 3:20, and is rendered by the King James Version "ornaments of the legs." It was these "anklets" that Isaiah represented the ladies of Jerusalem as "rattling" as they walked (Isa 3:16 to end), "making a tinkling with their feet"; and a part of the punishment threatened is, "The Lord will take away the bravery of their tinkling ornaments about their feet" (Isa 3:16 the King James Version).

ANNA

an’-a (Anna (Westcott-Hort, Hanna; see Intro, 408); Hebrew equivalent channah, signifying "grace" 1Sa 1:2):

(1) The wife of Tobit (Tobit 1:9).

(2) A "prophetess," daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher, and thus a Galilean, living in Jerusalem at the time of Jesus’ birth (Lu 2:36-38). "Of a great age," she must have been considerably over 100 years, having been a widow 84 years after a short married life of seven (see the Revised Version (British and American)). Exceptionally devout and gifted in spirit, she worshipped so constantly "with fastings and supplications night and day," that she is said to have "departed not from the temple." Some have mistakenly supposed that this signified permanent residence in the temple. The fact that her lineage is recorded indicates the distraction of her family. Tradition says that the tribe of Asher was noted for the beauty and talent of its women, who for these gifts, were qualified for royal and high-priestly marriage. While the tribe of Asher was not among the tribes that returned from the Babylonian exile to Palestine, many of its chief families must have done so as in the case of the prophetess. The period of war and national oppression, through which Anna’s early life was passed, created in her, as in the aged Simeon, an intense longing for the "redemption" promised through the Messiah. See SIMEON. This hope of national deliverance sustained her through more than four decades of patient waiting. In the birth of Jesus her faith was abundantly rewarded, and she became a grateful and ceaseless witness "to all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem," that the day of their spiritual deliverance had come.

LITERATURE.

See Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, I, 200-201, Gelkie, Life and Words of Christ, I, 133-34.

Dwight M. Pratt

ANNAAS

an’-a-as (Sanaas, 1 Esdras 5:23, the Revised Version (British and American) SANAAS): The Senaah of Ezr 2:35.

ANNAS

an’-as (Annas; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Hannas; Josephus Ananos, the Greek form of Hebrew chanan; "merciful," "gracious"; compare Ne 8:7, etc.):

(1) A high priest of the Jews, the virtual head of the priestly party in Jerusalem in the time of Christ, a man of commanding influence. He was the son of Seth (Josephus: Sethi), and was elevated to the high-priesthood by Quirinius, governor of Syria, 7 AD. At this period the office was filled and vacated at the caprice of the Roman procurators, and Annas was deposed by Valerius Gratus, 15 AD. But though deprived of official status, he continued to wield great power as the dominant member of the hierarchy, using members of his family as his willing instruments. That he was an adroit diplomatist is shown by the fact that five of his sons (Ant., XX, ix, 1) and his son- in-law Caiaphas (Joh 18:13) held the high-priesthood in almost unbroken succession, though he did not survive to see the office filled by his fifth son Annas or Ananus II, who caused Jas the Lord’s brother to be stoned to death (circa 62 AD). Another mark of his continued influence is, that long after he had lost his office he was still called "high priest," and his name appears first wherever the names of the chief members of the sacerdotal faction are given. Ac 4:6, "And Annas the high priest was there, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest." Annas is almost certainly called high priest in Joh 18:19,22, though in Joh 18:13,24 Caiaphas is mentioned as the high priest. Note especially the remarkable phrase in Lu 3:2, "in the high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas," as if they were joint holders of the office. The cases In which Josephus gives the title "high-priest" to persons who no longer held the office afford no real parallel to this. The explanation seems to be that owing to age, ability and force of character Annas was the virtual, though Caiaphas the titular, high priest. He belonged to the Sadducean aristocracy, and, like others of that class, he seems to have been arrogant, astute, ambitious and enormously wealthy. He and his family were proverbial for their rapacity and greed.

The chief source of their wealth seems to have been the sale of requisites for the temple sacrifices, such as sheep, doves, wine and oil, which they carried on in the four famous "booths of the sons of Annas" on the Mount of Olives, with a branch within the precincts of the temple itself. During the great feasts, they were able to extort high monopoly prices for theft goods. Hence, our Lord’s strong denunciation of those who made the house of prayer "a den of robbers" (Mr 11:15-19), and the curse in the Talmud, "Woe to the family of Annas! Woe to the serpent- like hisses" (Pes 57a). As to the part he played in the trial and death of our Lord, although he does not figure very prominently in the gospel narratives, he seems to have been mainly responsible for the course of events. Renan’s emphatic statement is substantially correct, "Annas was the principal actor in the terrible drama, and far more than Caiaphas, far more than Pilate, ought to bear the weight of the maledictions of mankind" (Life of Jesus). Caiaphas, indeed, as actual high priest, was the nominal head of the Sanhedrin which condemned Jesus, but the aged Annas was the ruling spirit. According to Joh 18:12,13, it was to him that the officers who arrested Jesus led Him first. "The reason given for that proceeding ("for he was father-in-law of Caiaphas") lays open alike

the character of the man and the character of the trial" (Westcott, in the place cited). Annas (if he is the high priest of Joh 18:19-23, as seems most likely) questioned Him concerning His disciples and teaching. This trial is not mentioned by the synoptists, probably because it was merely informal and preliminary and of a private nature, meant to gather material for the subsequent trial. Failing to elicit anything to his purpose from Jesus, "Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest" (Joh 18:24 the King James Version is incorrect and misleading) for formal trial before the Sanhedrin, "but as one already stamped with a sign of condemnation" (Westcott). Doubtless Annas was present at the subsequent proceedings, but no further mention is made of him in New Testament, except that he was present at the meeting of the Sanhedrin after Pentecost when Peter and John defended themselves for preaching the gospel of the resurrection (Ac 4:6).

(2) Head of a family who returned with Ezra (1 Esdras 9:32), called "Harim" in Ezr 10:31.

D. Miall Edwards

ANNIS

an’-is (the King James Version Ananias; the Revised Version, margin Annias, Anneis Codex Vaticanus, Annias Codex Alexandrinus): The name of a family in the list of the returning exiles (1 Esdras 5:16). The name is not given in the parallel list in Ezra and Nehemiah.

ANNUL; DISANNUL

a-nul’, dis-a-nul’:God, as the Supreme Ruler, can disannul His covenant for cause (Isa 28:18); man, through willfulness and transgression, as party of the second part, may break the contract and thus release Yahweh, as party of the first part (Job 40:8; Isa 14:27), though there are some purposes and laws which the Almighty will carry out in spite of ungodly rage and ravings (Ga 3:15 the King James Version); or an old law or covenant might be conceived as disannulled by a new one (Ga 3:17), or because of its becoming obsolete and ineffective (Heb 7:18). For the first idea, the Hebrew employs kaphar =" to cover," "to expiate," "condone," "placate," "cancel," "cleanse," "disannul," "purge," "put off" (Isa 28:18); and the Greek (Ga 3:15), atheteo =" to set aside," "disesteem," "neutralize," "violate," "frustrate." One covenant disannulling another by "conflict of laws" is expressed by akuroo, "to invalidate," "disannul," "make of no effect." Atheteo is employed to express also the disannulling through age and disuse (Heb 7:18).

Frank E. Hirsch

ANNUS

an’-us (A, Annous, B, Anniouth; the King James Version Anus = Bani, Ne 8:7): One of the Levites who interpreted the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:48).

ANNUUS

an’-u-us (Announos): Returned with Ezra from Babylon to perform the functions of a priest in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:48). Omitted in Ezr 8:19.

ANOINT; ANOINTED

a-noint’, a-noint’-ed (aleipho, chrio): Refers to a very general practice in the East. It originated from the relief from the effect of the sun that was experienced in rubbing the body with oil or grease. Among rude people the common vegetable or animal fat was used. As society advanced and refinement became a part of civilization, delicately perfumed ointments were used for this purpose. Other reasons soon obtained for this practice than that stated above. Persons were anointed for health (Mr 6:13), because of the widespread belief in the healing power of oil. It was often employed as a mark of hospitality (Lu 7:46); as a mark of special honor (Joh 11:2); in preparation for social occasions (Ru 3:3; 2Sa 14:2; Isa 61:3). The figurative use of this word (chrio) has reference strictly to the coming of the Holy Spirit upon the individual (Lu 4:18; Ac 4:27; 10:38). In this sense it is God who anoints (Heb 1:9; 2Co 1:21). The thought is to appoint, or qualify for a special dignity, function or privilege. It is in this sense that the word is applied to Christ (Joh 1:41 m; Ac 4:27; 10:38; Heb 1:9; compare Ps 2:2; Da 9:25).

See also ANOINTING.

Jacob W. Kapp

ANOINTING

a-noint’-ing: A distinction was made by the ancient Hebrews between anointing with oil in private use, as in making one’s toilet (cukh), and anointing as a religious rite (mashach).

1. Ordinary Use:

(1) As regards its secular or ordinary use, the native olive oil, alone or mixed with perfumes, was commonly used for toilet purposes, the very poor naturally reserving it for special occasions only (Ru 3:3). The fierce protracted heat and biting lime dust of Palestine made the oil very soothing to the skin, and it was applied freely to exposed parts of the body, especially to the face (Ps 104:15).

(2) The practice was in vogue before David’s time, and traces of it may be found throughout the Old Testament (see De 28:40; Ru 3:3; 2Sa 12:20; 14:2; 2 Chron 28:15; Eze 16:9; Mic 6:15; Da 10:3) and in the New Testament (Mt 6:17, etc.). Indeed it seems to have been a part of the daily toilet throughout the East.

(3) To abstain from it was one token of mourning (2Sa 14:2; compare Mt 6:17), and to resume it a sign

that the mourning was ended (2Sa 12:20; 14:2; Da 10:3; Judith 10:3). It often accompanied the bath (Ru 3:3; 2Sa 12:20; Eze 16:9; Susanna 17), and was a customary part of the preparation for a feast (Ec 9:8; Ps 23:5). One way of showing honor to a guest was to anoint his head with oil (Ps 23:5; Lu 7:46); a rarer and more striking way was to anoint his feet (Lu 7:38). In Jas 5:14, we have an instance of anointing with oil for medicinal purposes, for which see OIL.

2. Religious Use:

Anointing as a religious rite was practiced throughout the ancient East in application both to persons and to things.

(1) It was observed in Canaan long before the Hebrew conquest, and, accordingly, Weinel (Stade's Zeutschrift, XVIII, 50 ff) holds that, as the use of oil for general purposes in Israel was an agricultural custom borrowed from the Canaanites, so the anointing with sacred oil was an outgrowth from its regular use for toilet purposes. It seems more in accordance with the known facts of the case and the terms used in description to accept the view set forth by Robertson Smith (Religion of the Semites, 2nd ed., 233, 383 ff; compare Wellhausen, Reste des arabischen Heidenthums, 2nd ed., 125 ff) and to believe that the cukh or use of oil for toilet purposes, was of agricultural and secular origin, and that the use of oil for sacred purposes, mashach, was in origin nomadic and sacrificial. Robertson Smith finds the origin of the sacred anointing in the very ancient custom of smearing the sacred fat on the altar (matstsebhah), and claims, rightly it would seem, that from the first there was a distinct and consistent usage, distinguishing the two terms as above.

(2) The primary meaning of mashach in Hebrew, which is borne out by the Arabic, seems to have been "to daub" or "smear." It is used of painting a ceiling in Jer 22:14, of anointing a shield in Isa 21:5, and is, accordingly, consistently applied to sacred furniture, like the altar, in Ex 29:36 and Da 9:24, and to the sacred pillar in Ge 31:13: "where thou anointedst a pillar."

(3) The most significant uses of mashach, however, are found in its application, not to sacred things, but to certain sacred persons. The oldest and most sacred of these, it would seem, was the anointing of the king, by pouring oil upon his head at his coronation, a ceremony regarded as sacred from the earliest times, and observed religiously not in Israel only, but in Egypt and elsewhere (see Jud 9:8,15; 1Sa 9:16; 10:1; 2Sa 19:10; 1Ki 1:39,45; 2Ki 9:3,6; 11:12). Indeed such anointing appears to have been reserved exclusively for the king in the earliest times, which accounts for the fact that "the Lord's anointed" became a synonym for "king" (see 1Sa 12:3,5; 26:11; 2Sa 1:14; Ps 20:6). It is thought by some that the practice originated in Egypt, and it is known to have been observed as a rite in Canaan at a very early day. Tell el-Amarna Letters 37 records the anointing of a king.

(4) Among the Hebrews it was believed not only that it effected a transference to the anointed one of something of the holiness and virtue of the deity in whose name and by whose representative the rite was performed, but also that it imparted a special endowment of the spirit of Yahweh (compare 1Sa 16:13; Isa 61:1). Hence the profound reverence for the king as a sacred personage, "the

anointed" (Hebrew, meshiach YHWH), which passed over into our language through the Greek Christos, and appears as "Christ".

(5) In what is known today as the Priestly Code, the high priest is spoken of as "anointed" (Ex 29:7; Le 4:3; 8:12), and, in passages regarded by some as later additions to the Priestly Code, other priests also are thus spoken of (Ex 30:30; 40:13-15). Elijah was told to anoint Elisha as a prophet (1Ki 19:16), but seems never to have done so. 1Ki 19:16 gives us the only recorded instance of such a thing as the anointing of a prophet. Isa 61:1 is purely metaphorical (compare Dillmann on Le 8:12-14 with ICC on Nu 3:3; see also Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebraischen Archaologie, II, 124).

LITERATURE.

Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Anointing"; BJ, IV, ix, 10, DB, article "Anointing," etc.

George B. Eager

ANON

a-non’ (eutheos, euthus): In the King James Version of Mr 1:30; Mt 13:20, for "straightway" of the Revised Version (British and American), i.e. "without delay," "immediately."

ANOS

a’-nos (Anos = Vaniah (Ezr 10:36): A son of Bani who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:34).

ANSWER

an’-ser: In our English Bible the word "answer" does not always mean a simple reply to a question.

1. In the Old Testament:

Six different words are translated by answer.

(1) It is frequently used where no question has been asked and in such cases it means a word, a statement.

(2) It also means a response (Job 21:34; 34:36).

(3) It often means a declaration or proclamation from God where no question has been asked. See the many passages that read: "The Lord answered and said."

(4) The other words translated "answer" or "answered" in the Old Testament are unimportant shadings and variations.

2. In the New Testament:

The words translated "answer" are not so varied.

(1) It sometimes means an apology, a defense (1Pe 3:15; Ac 24:10,25).

(2) It may mean simply "to say" (Mr 9:6).

(3) It may mean a revelation from God (Ro 11:4).

(4) It is also used to apply to unspoken thoughts of the heart, especially in the sayings of Jesus; also by Peter to Sapphira (Ac 5:8).

G. H. Gerberding

ANSWERABLE

an’-ser-a-bl: This word is found in the Old Testament only. Moses and Ezekiel alone use it (Ex 38:18; Eze 40:18; 45:7; 48:13,18). It is used in the Old English sense of "corresponding to," "in harmony with." Bunyan uses it in the same sense (Holy War, Clar. Press ed., 92).

ANT

(nemalah = Arabic namalah): The word occurs only twice in the Bible, in the familiar passages in Pr 6:6; 30:25 in both of which this insect is made an example of the wisdom of providing in the summer for the wants of the winter. Not all ants store up seeds for winter use, but among the ants of Palestine there are several species that do so, and their well-marked paths are often seen about Palestinian threshing-floors and in other places where seeds are to be obtained. The path sometimes extends for a great distance from the nest.

Alfred Ely Day

ANTEDILUVIAN PATRIARCHS

an-te-di-lu’-vi-an pa’-tri-arks.

1. The Ten Antediluvian Patriarchs:

Ten patriarchs who lived before the Flood are listed in the genealogical table of Ge 5, together with a statement of the age of each at the birth of his son, the number of years that remained to him till death, and the sum of both periods or the entire length of his life. The first half of the list, from Adam to Mahalalel inclusive, together with Enoch and Noah is the same in the three texts, except that the Septuagint has 100 years more in the first column in each case save that of Noah, and 100 years less in the second column. See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

2. Divergences between the Three Texts:

Divergence exists in the case of Jared, Methuselah and Lamech only. Even here the longevity of Jared and Methuselah is given similarly in the Hebrew and the Septuagint; and probably represents the reading of the source, especially since the different data in the Samaritan text bear evidence of adjustment to a theory. The customary excess of 100 years in the Septuagint over the other texts for the age of the patriarch at the birth of the son, and the variously divergent data for the total age of Jared, Methuselah and Lamech are, therefore, the matters that await explanation.

The general superiority of the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch as a whole to the Samaritan text and the Septuagint is no longer questioned by Biblical scholars. But whether the superiority obtains in this particular passage has given rise to long and earnest discussion. Keil and Delitzsch in their commentaries on Genesis, Preuss (Zeitrechnung der Septuaginta, 1859, 30ff), Noldeke (Untersuchung zur Kritik des Altes Testament, 1869, 112), and Eduard Konig (ZKW, 1883, 281 ff), hold to the originality of the Hebrew data. Bertheau (Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie, XXIII, 657 ff) and Dillmann ascribe prior authority to the Samaritan numbers in Ge 5, but to the Hebrew numbers in Ge 11. Klostermann argues for the originality of the Septuagint (Pentateuch, Neue Folge, 1907, 37- 39).

3. Divergences not Accidental:

It is agreed by all that the divergences between the texts are mainly due, not to accidental corruption, but to systematic alteration. Accordingly, two tasks devolve upon the investigator, namely

(1) the removal of accidental corruptions from the numerical data in the several texts and

(2) the discovery of a principle that underlies and explains the peculiarities in each one or in two of the three sets of data.

4. Different Explanations:

On the interpretation that the names denote individuals and that no links have been omitted in the genealogy, readers of the Septuagint noticed that according to its data Methuselah survived the flood, and in order to avoid this incongruity a scribe changed the 167 years, ascribed to his age at the birth of his son, to 187 years. This reading was early in existence, and was followed by Josephus. Holding the same theory regarding the genealogy, the Samaritans noticed that by their data three men, Jared,

Methuselah, and Lamech, survived the Flood. To correct the apparent mistake, without tampering with the age of these three men at parenthood, their longevity was reduced sufficiently to enable them to die in the year of the Deluge.

If the Hebrew text in its present form is not original, and is to be emended from the Samaritan and Septuagint, the same difficulty inhered in it. To overcome this difficulty, perhaps, 100 years were borrowed from the years that elapsed between parenthood and death and were added to the age of the three men at the time of begetting a son. This relieved the matter as far as Jared was concerned and perhaps in the case of Lamech also, and the borrowing of an additional 20 years set Methuselah right also. If the original number for Lamech was 53 in the Hebrew, as in the Samaritan, then it was necessary to increase the time between Methuselah's birth and the Flood not 20, but 49 years. These 49 years could not be added directly to either Methuselah's or Lamech's age at begetting a son without making this age exceed 200 years, and thus be out of proportion; and accordingly the 49 years were distributed.

The difference of a century in the age assigned to the patriarchs at the son's birth which distinguishes the data of the Hebrew in most cases from the Septuagint, and likewise from the Samaritan in several instances, in Ge 5 and regularly until Nahor in Ge 11:10-26, is commonly explained in the following manner or in a similar way: namely, when any of these long-lived patriarchs was found recorded as having begotten a son at a more youthful age than 150 years, the translators of the Septuagint added 100 years; on the other hand the Samaritan struck off 100 years when necessary in order that no one save Noah might be recorded as reaching 150 years of age before entering upon parenthood, and added 100 years when the record made a patriarch become father of a son before attaining even 50 years. A different explanation is, however, attempted, and the reason for the constant variant is sought in the purpose to construct an artificial chronology; for on interpreting the names as denoting individual persons and the genealogy as proceeding from father to son without break, a method employed as early as the 1st century of the Christian era (Ant., I, iii, 3), the time that elapsed between the creation of man and the Deluge was 1,656 years according to the Hebrew text, 1,307 according to the Samaritan text, and 2,242 according to the Septuagint; and numerous attempts have been made to bring one or other of these totals into arithmetical relation with some conceivable larger chronological scheme. A conspectus of these studies is furnished by Delitzsch (Neuer Commentar uber die Genesis, 136-39), Dillmann (Genesis, 6te Aufl, 111-13), and most recently by Skinner (Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis, 135, 136, 234). The different explanations that are offered naturally vary in plausibility; but all possess the common fault of lacking cogency at critical points and somewhere doing violence to the data.

5. The Relation of the Cainite and Sethite Genealogies:

In Ge 4 there are two distinct genealogies, one proceeding through Cain and the other through Seth. Since Hupfeld, the representative critics who partition Genesis have generally reached the conclusion that both of these genealogies were found in the primary document of J or in an ancient recension of it (Wellhausen, Composition des Hexateuchs 3, 8-14; Delitzsch, Neuer Commentar, etc., 126; Kautzsch und Socin; Dillmann, Genesis 6, 104, 116; Budde, Urgeschichte, 182, 527-31; Driver, Introduction 10, 14, 21; Strack, Genesis 2, 23; Gunkel, Genesis, 49; Skinner, Genesis, 2, 14, 99 (4); Stade on the other

hand regards Ge 4:25,26; 5:29 as the compilation of a redactor, ZATW, XIV, 281). In Ge 5 there is also a genealogy through Seth to Noah.

6. Resemblances and Differences in the Two Lists:

By removing Ge 4:25, 26 from their present position and placing them before 4:1 or, as Guthe does, before 4:17; and by exscinding the word "Eve" from 4:1 and understanding "the man" (ha-'adham) to be Enosh; and by exscinding from 4:25 the words "again," "another," and "instead of Abel, for Cain slew him"; and by introducing the words "and Lamech begat" before "a son" in Ge 5:28,29 and inserting this material in between Ge 4:18 and 4:19 or after 4:24: then the two genealogies of chapter 4 are reduced to one and, so far as the names are concerned, have become almost identical with the Sethite genealogy contained in Ge 5. In fact the resemblances between the six names in 4:17,18 with six in chapter 5 have from the first been the basis of every attempt to identify the two genealogies (Buttmann, Mythologus, 170-72). The procedure is violent (see strictures, Skinner, Genesis, 99). It is a serious objection also that the work of reconstruction has been conducted without thought of the possible bearing of the tribal theory of the genealogies on this problem.

It is important to note that the number of links in the two genealogies may indicate that Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal- Cain, who mark stages of developing culture, lived several generations before Noah. It was ancient Semitic belief that civilization was far advanced before the Flood, and was continued in its various forms by the survivors (Berosus; and inscription 13, col. i. 18 in Lehmann's Shamash-shumukin). However, for the sake of comparison, the six links in the genealogical chain of the Cainites are placed side by side with those of the Sethites so as the better to reveal the resemblances and differences

Of these names two, Enoch and Lamech, occur in each genealogy, though Enoch does not occupy the same place in both lists. Kenan is readily derived from the same root as Kain. Instead of 'Irad the original Hebrew text may have been 'Idad, as was read by the Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus and Lucian. But, accepting 'Irad as original, 'Irad and Jared may conceivably have been distorted in the oral tradition; yet as they stand they are radically different, and one might as well compare Prussia and Russia, Swede and Swiss, Austria and Australia. Methushael is written in the Septuagint exactly as is Methuselah; but both names are fully established by textual evidence and are fine Semitic names. Methushael particularly is of good Babylonian form, meaning "man of God"; archaic in Hebrew or smacking of the northern dialect, but quite intelligible to the Israelite.

7. The Need of Caution:

The resemblance between the six consecutive names in the two lists is indeed striking, but the differences are also great; and the wisdom of caution in pronouncing judgment is suggested and emphasized by a comparison of two lists from the later history of the people of Israel. The twelve kings of Judah compared with their nineteen contemporaries in northern Israel show almost as many resemblances as the ten Cainites to the twelve Sethites, Adam as the common ancestor not being

reckoned. The two series begin with Rehoboam and Jeroboam, names as similar externally as ‘Irad and Jared. Ahaziah of Israel was almost contemporary with Ahaziah of Judah; Jehoram was on the throne of Judah while Jehoram ruled over Israel, the reign of Jehoash of Judah overlapped that of Jehoash of Israel, and Jehoahaz of Israel preceded about half a century Ahaz, or, as his name appears In Assyrian inscriptions, Jehoahaz of Judah. If there can be two contemporary dynasties with these coincidences, surely there could be two antediluvian races with an equal similarity in the names. Then, too, the material differences between the Cainite and Sethite lines are great. Cain is the son of Adam; whereas Kenan is the third remove, being descended through Seth and Enosh. The two Enochs seem to have nothing in common save the name (Ge 4:17,18; 5:22,23). The character of the two Lamechs is quite different, as appears from their speeches (Ge 4:19,23; 5:28,29). The line of Cain terminated in Lamech and his four children, of whom the three sons became of note in the annals of civilization; whereas the line of Seth continued through Noah, the hero of the Flood, and his three sons who were known only as the ancestors of peoples. Moreover, even excluding the section of Genesis assigned to the Priestly Code (P), the two lines were distinguished from each other, and most of the characteristic differences between them were clearly set forth, in the most ancient form of the Hebrew tradition, as it is actually known (Green, Unity of Genesis, 43-49; Delitzsch, Neuer Commentar, etc., 126, 127, 132, 140; Strack, Genesis 2, 22, 23, section III).

The order of narration in the Book of Genesis is also significant. It indicates the writer’s perception of a profound difference between the two races. The narrative regarding Cain and his descendants is completed, according to invariable custom in the Book of Genesis, before the line of Seth, in which eventually Abraham appeared, is taken up and its history recorded (Green, Unity of Genesis, 49; Delitzsch, Neuer Commentar, etc., 126). Thus at each stage of the history the story of the branch line is told before the fortunes are recited of the direct line of promise.

8. The Register of Ge 5 and Berosus’ List of Antediluvian Kings:

Berosus, a priest of Marduk’s temple at Babylon about 300 BC, in the second book of his history tells of the ten kings of the Chaldeans who reigned before the Deluge. He says that the first king was ALOROS of (the city) Babylon, a Chaldean. (He gave out a report about himself that God had appointed him to be shepherd of the people.) He reigned ten sars. (A sar is thirty-six hundred years.)

And afterward ALAPAROS (his son reigned three sars).

And (after him) AMELON (a Chaldean), who was of (the city of) Pautibibla (reigned thirteen sars).

Then AMMENON the Chaldean (of Pautibibla reigned twelve sars).

Then MEGALAROS of the city of Pautibibla, and he reigned eighteen sars.

And after him DAONOS the shepherd of Pautibibla reigned ten sars.

Then EUEDORACHOS of Pautibibla reigned eighteen sars.

Then AMEMPSINOS, a Chaldean of Laraucha, reigned; and he, the eighth, was king ten sars.

Next OTIARTES a Chaldean of Laraucha, reigned; and he (the ninth) was king eight sars.

And (last of all), upon the death of Otiartes, his son Xisouthros reigned eighteen sars. In his time the great deluge occurred. Thus, when summed up, the kings are ten; and the sars are one hundred and twenty (or four hundred and thirty-two thousand years, reaching to the Flood1).

(NOTE: 1Syncellus quoting Alexander Polyhistor. 2Syncellus quoting Apollodorus. 3Syncellus quoting Abydenus. 4Syncellus quoting Abydenus concerning the deluge. 5Eusebius, Armenian Chronicle, quoting Alexander Polyhistor. 6Eusebius, Armenian Chronicle, quoting Abydenus. The royal names have been transmitted with substantial uniformity, except the third, fifth, seventh and ninth. Amelon (2) is given as Amillaros (3) and Almelon (5, 6); Megalaros (2, 3) appears also as Amegalarus (5, 6); Euedorachos (2) as Eudoreschos (3), Edoranchus (5), and Edoreschus (6); and Ardates (1) as Otiartes (2, 5). For texts and readings see Richter, Berosi Chaldaeorum Historiae, 52-56; Migne, Patrologia Graeca, XIX, "Eusebii Chronicorum," Lib. I, cap. i et vi, pp. 106, 121; Schoene, Eusebii Chronicorum, Lib. I, pp. 7, 31.)

The original Babylonian form of seven of these ten names has been determined with a fair degree of certainty. Alaparos is in all probability a misreading by a copyist of the Greek Adaparos (Hommel, PSBA, XV, 243 ff; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), and accordingly represents Adapa, followed perhaps by another element beginning with the letter "r"; Amelon and Ammenon are equivalent to the Babylonian nouns amelu (Delitzsch Wo lag das Paradies? S 149; Hommel, PSBA, XV, 243 ff; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), man, and ummanu (Hommel, PSBA, XV, 243 ff; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), workman; Euedorachos is Enmeduranki (pronounced Evveduranki) (Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff); Amempsinos is probably Amelu-Sin (Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 149; Hommel, PSBA, XV, 243 ff; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), servant of the moon-god; Otiartes, a misreading of the Greek Opartes, is Ubara-Tutu (Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradues? 149; Hommel, PSBA, XV, 243 ff; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), meaning servant of Marduk; and Xisouthros is Chasis-atra (Haupt, KAT2, 503; Zimmern, KAT3, 530 ff), equivalent to Atra-chasis, an epithet given to the hero of the Flood.

Several of these names are well known in Babylonian literature: Adapa was a human being, a wise man, a wizard, who failed to obtain immortality. He was an attendant at the temple of Ea in the town of Eridu, prepared bread and water for the sanctuary and provided it with fish. Perhaps it was his connection with the temple that led to his being called son of Ea, and described as created or built by Ea (Schrader, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, VI, 91-101). Similarly King Esarhaddon calls himself the faithful son, child of Beltis; and Ashurbanipal claims to have been created or built by the gods Ashur and Sin in the womb of his mother (compare Adam, the son of God, Lu 3:38). Enmeduranki, whose name has been interpreted as possibly meaning chief priest of Duranki, the meeting place of sky and earth, was a king of Sippar, a city whose patron deity was the sun-god Shamash. He was a notable wise man who, it

seems, was reputed to have been taken by the gods Shamash and Ramman into their fellowship and made acquainted with the secrets of heaven and earth (KAT3, 530 f). As among the Hebrews the priests were descended from Aaron, so among the Babylonians Enmeduranki was regarded as the ancestor of the wizards and sooth-sayers or the founder of their guild. Amel-Sin is elsewhere mentioned as the wise one of Ur (KAT3, 537). In the Babylonian account of the Flood the hero is addressed as son of Ubara-Tutu. It is worth mention that legends grew up about the hero of the Flood, as they have about other historical personages since; and he even appears like some ancient kings, with the determinative for god before his name. Adapa also, who was classed with the wizards, early came to have a place in story.

9. Correspondences:

The first name in the list of Berosus is Aloros. Professor Hommel would understand the original Babylonian form to have been Aruru, a goddess. The identification is precarious, to say the least; and evidently it was not the conception of the Babylonian priest, for it makes his line of kings begin with a goddess. He should have called Aloros a queen. Professor Hommel regards Adapa also as a deity, contrary to the statements of the tale itself; thus holding that the second Babylonian king like the first was a Divine being. On such an interpretation the Babylonian and Hebrew lists are not identical, for the Hebrew genealogy commences in Adam, human being. With the third name, however, certain remarkable correspondences begin to appear. The third Babylonian king is Amelu, man, and the third patriarch is Enosh, also meaning man; the fourth king is Ummanu, artificer, and the fourth patriarch is Kenan, a name derived from a root meaning to form or fabricate. The seventh king is Enmeduranki, who apparently was reputed to have been summoned by the gods Shamash and Ramman into their fellowship and made acquainted with the secrets of heaven and earth; and the seventh patriarch was Enoch who walked with God (like Noah, Ge 6:9; see KAT3, 540). The tenth king, like the tenth patriarch, was the hero of the Flood. These facts are capable of two interpretations: either the two catalogues are fundamentally different, having been constructed for different purposes, yet as they deal with prominent persons belonging to the same period of history and to the same country, cross each other at various points and culminate in the same individual (as do the genealogies of Mt 1 and Lu 3); or else when the unexplained names of both lists shall have been finally interpreted, the two catalogues will be found to represent the same tradition.

10. Differences:

Differences between the catalogues exist, which in some instances may be more apparent than real.

(1) In the Babylonian hat the descent of the government from father to son is asserted in two instances only, namely, from the first king to the second and from the ninth to the tenth. The Hebrew asserts kinship, however remote, between the successive links. Yet the two records are quite compatible with each other in this respect on theory (see below) that the Hebrew genealogy was shortened by omissions in order to name but ten generations.

(2) Each of the ten patriarchs is assigned a long life; each of the ten kings has a greatly longer reign. The

contrast is twofold: between the number of years in corresponding cases, and between length of life and length of reign. But instead of this difference indicating non-identity of the two lines, it may be found, when the Semitic tradition is fully known, to afford the explanation for the duration of life which is assigned to the patriarchs.

(3) There is no arithmetical ratio between the years connected with the corresponding names of the two lists. And the symmetry of the numbers in the Bah transmission is open to the suspicion of being artificial. The number of kings is ten; the sum of their united reigns is one hundred and twenty sars, a multiple of ten and of the basal number of the Babylonian duodecimal system. There are three reigns of ten sars each, and three successive reigns which taken together, 3 plus 13 plus 12, make ten and eighteen sars. Taking the reigns in the order in which they occur, we have as their duration the series 10, 18 plus 10, 18, 10, 18, 10, 8, and 18 (Davis, Genesis and Semitic Tradition, 96-100; Strack, Genesis 2, 24).

11. The Interpretation of the Genealogy in Ge 5:

Three explanations of the genealogy in Ge 5 may be mentioned.

(1) An interpretation, current at the time of Josephus (Ant., I, iii, 4) and adopted by Archbishop Usher in 1650 in his attempt to fix the dates of the events recorded in the Scriptures, assumes an unbroken descent from father to son, during ten generations, from Adam to Noah. On this theory the time from the creation of man to the Flood is measured by the sum of the years assigned to the patriarchs at the birth of the son and successor, together with Noah’s age when he entered the Ark; so that all the years from the creation of Adam to the Flood were 1,656 years.

The extraordinary longevity of these patriarchs is accounted for by the known physical effects of sin. Sin works disease and death. Man was not as yet far removed from his state of sinlessness. The physical balance between man sinless and man the sinner had not been attained (compare Delitzsch, Genesis 3, 139; see Ant, I, iii, 9). But after all are we really justified in supposing that the Hebrew author of these genealogies designed to construct a chronology of the period? He never puts them to such a use himself. He nowhere sums these numbers. No chronological statement is deduced from them. There is no computation anywhere in Scripture of the time that elapsed from the Creation or from the Deluge, as there is from the descent into Egypt to the Exodus (Ex 12:40), or from the Exodus to the building of the temple (1Ki 6:1; Green, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1890, 296).

(2) A second method of interpretation assumes that links of the genealogy have been intentionally omitted in order that exactly ten may be named. It is based on the phenomena presented by other Hebrew genealogical registers. Matthew, for example, has outlined the lineage of Christ from Abraham.

The history naturally divides into three sections, and to give the tabulation symmetry Matthew names twice seven generations in each division, in one instance omitting three famous kings of Judah and saying "Joram begat Uzziah." As Joram is said to have begotten Uzziah, his grandson’s grandson, so Enoch may be said to have begotten Methuselah, although the latter may have been Enoch’s great-

grandson or remoter descendant.

The book of Genesis is divided by its author into ten sections, each introduced by the same formula (Ge 2:4; 5:1; 6:9, etc.). In the period from the creation of man to the birth of Abraham the crisis of the history was the Flood. Twice ten generations are named in the symmetrical register, ten before the Flood, Adam to Noah, and ten after the Flood, Shem to Abraham; and the latter period in its turn is divided into two equal parts, and five generations are named for the time to, and five for the time after, the birth of Peleg, in whose days ‘the earth was divided’ (Ge 11:10-26; 10:25; compare perhaps Ge 11:1-9).

On this conception of the tables, which is fully justified, there is no basis in the genealogy from Adam to Noah for the calculation of chronology. The table was constructed for a different purpose, and the years are noted for another reason than chronology (Green, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1890, 285-303; Warfield, Princeton Theological Review, 1911, 2-11; compare Dillmann, Genesis 6, 106 "dritte Absicht"). The longevity is explained as it is on Usher’s interpretation of the data (see above).

(3) A third method of interpretation understands the patriarchal name to denote the individual and his family spoken of collectively. The person and tribe form one conception. This method also agrees with the phenomena presented by Hebrew genealogical registers. Thus, Keturah bears to Abraham Jokshan, and Jokshan begat Sheba and Dedan, tribes and the countries they inhabited (Ge 25:1-5). Mizraim, as Egypt was called by the Hebrews, begat the Lydians and other ancient peoples (Ge 10:13); and Canaan begat the town of Sidon and such famous tribes as the Jebusite and the Amorite (Ge 10:15-18). Similarly, countries like Media, Ionia (Javan), Tubal and Meshech, and peoples named by Gentileadjectives in the plural number, like Kittim and Dodanim, are hated as sons of Japheth; and Ethiopia, Egypt, Punt and Canaan, and districts in Arabia like Sheba and Havilah are recorded as descendants of Ham (Ge 10:2-7). Moreover, outside of genealogies, in common parlance Israel denotes a man and the tribe that sprang from him; David, the king of that name and the dynasty he founded (1Ki 12:16; compare Jer 30:9); Nebaioth, a people and its prince (Ge 25:13,16; 28:9).

Sometimes the family takes its name from its progenitor or later leading member; sometimes the name of the tribe or of the country it inhabits is given to its chief representative, as today men are constantly addressed by their family name, and nobles are called by the name of their duchy or county. It is quite in accordance with usage, therefore, that Noah, for example, should denote the hero of the Flood and the family to which he belonged. The longevity is the period during which the family had prominence and leadership; the age at the son’s birth is the date in the family history at which a new family originated that ultimately succeeded to the dominant position. If no links have been omitted in constructing the register, the period from the creation of man to the Flood is measured by the sum of the ages of Adam and his successors to Noah and 600 years of the life of Noah, amounting to 8,225 years. Thus, the family of Seth originated when Adam was 130 years old (Ge 5:3). Adam and his direct line were at the head of affairs for 930 years

(5), when they were superseded by the family of Seth. In Seth, 105 years after it attained headship, the

family of Enosh took Its rise

(6). Seth, after being at the head of affairs for 912 years

(8) was succeeded by the family of Enosh, in the year of the world 1842. And so on.

John D. Davis

ANTEDILUVIANS

an-te-di-lu’-vi-ans.

1. Chronology Uncertain:

According to the ordinary interpretation of the genealogical tables in Ge 5 the lives of the antediluvians were prolonged to an extreme old age, Methuselah attaining that of 969 years. But before accepting these figures as a basis of interpretation it is important to observe that the Hebrew, the Samaritan and the Septuagint texts differ so radically in their sums that probably little confidence can be placed in any of them. The Septuagint adds 100 years to the age of six of the antediluvian patriarchs at the birth of their eldest sons. This, taken with the great uncertainty connected with the transmission of numbers by the Hebrew method of notation, makes it unwise to base important conclusions upon the data accessible. The most probable interpretation of the genealogical table in Ge 5 is that given by the late Professor William Henry Green, who maintains that it is not Intended to give chronology, and does not give it, but only indicates the line of descent, as where (1Ch 26:24) we read that "Shebuel the son of Gershom, the son of Moses, was ruler over the treasures"; whereas, while Gershom was the immediate son of Moses, Shebuel was separated from Gershom by several generations. According to the interpretation of Professor Green all that we can certainly infer from the statement in Hebrew that Adam was 130 years old when he begat Seth, is that at that age the line branched off which culminated in Seth, it being permitted, according to Hebrew usage, to interpolate as many intermediate generations as other evidence may compel.

2. Meaning of Genealogies:

As in the genealogies of Christ in the Gospels, the object of the tables in Genesis is evidently not to give chronology, but the line of descent. This conclusion is supported by the fact that no use is made afterward of the chronology, whereas the line of descent is repeatedly emphasized. This method of interpretation allows all the elasticity to prehistoric chronology that any archaeologist may require. Some will get further relief from the apparent incredibility of the figures by the Interpretation of Professor A. Winchell, and T. P. Crawford (Winchell, Pre-adamites, 449 ff) that the first number gives the age of actual life of the individual while the second gives that of the ascendancy of his family, the name being that of dynasties, like Caesar or Pharaoh.

3. The Nephilim:

The nephilim (giants) and the mighty men born of "the sons of God" and the "daughters of men" (Ge 6:4,5) are according to the best interpretation "giants in wickedness," being the fruit of intermarriage between the descendants of Seth ("sons of God" who called on the name of Yahweh, Ge 4:26), and the "daughters of men." The idea that "sons of God" refers to angels or demigods has no support in Scripture. On this familiar designation of the worshippers of the true God see Ex 4:22; De 1:41; 32, repeatedly; Isa 1:2; 43:6; 45:11; Ho 1:10; 11:1. Intermarriage with depraved races such as is here intimated produced the results which were guarded against in the Mosaic law prohibiting marriages with the surrounding idolatrous nations. The word Nephilim in Ge 6:4 occurs again only in Nu 13:33 (the King James Version "giants"). But the word is more probably a descriptive term than the name of a race. In the older Greek versions it is translated "violent men."

4. The Ice Age:

The antediluvians are, with great probability, identified by some geologists (Sir William Dawson, e.g.) with glacial or paleolithic man, whose implements and remains are found buried beneath the deposits of glacial floods in northern France, southern England, southern Russia, and in the valleys of the Delaware, Ohio and Missouri rivers in America. The remains of "paleolithic" men reveal only conditions of extreme degradation and savagery, in which violence reigned. The sparse population which was spread over the northern hemisphere during the closing floods of the Glacial period lived in caves of the earth, and contended with a strange variety of gigantic animals which became extinct at the same time with their human contemporaries. See DELUGE OF NOAH.

LITERATURE.

Green, "Primeval Chronology," Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1890; Dawson, Modern Science in Bible Lands; B. B. Warfield, "On the Antiquity and the Unity of the Human Race," Princeton Theol. Review, January, 1911; Winchell, Pre-adamites; Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th ed.; Man and the Glacial Period, and Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History.

George Frederick Wright

ANTELOPE

an’-te-lop (RV; the King James Version "wild ox," te’o (De 14:5), and "wild bull," to (Isa 51:20)); orux (The Septuagint in Codex Vaticanus has hos seutlion hemiephthon, literally, "like a half-cooked beet-root"): The dorcas gazelle (Gazella dorcas) is widely distributed in Syria, Palestine and Arabia.

The recently discovered Merrill’s gazelle (Gazella Merrilli) inhabits the hilly country near Jerusalem and is not commonly distinguished from the dorcas gazelle. Probably the only other antelope within this range is the Arabian oryx (Oryx beatrix). Tristram cites two African species (the bubaline antelope,

Bubalis mauretanica, and the addax, Addax nasomaculatus) as existing in the Sinaitic peninsula, southern Palestine and Arabia, but he did not collect specimens of either and was probably misled by statements of the Arabs which in both cases really referred to the oryx. The only naturalist who has ever penetrated into Northwest Arabia is Mr. Douglas Carruthers, who went in 1909 on a collecting expedition for the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut, his object being to obtain the oryx and any other large antelopes which might be found there. Through observation and repeated inquiry he became convinced that neither the addax nor the bubaline antelope is found in Arabia. Tristram says the addax is called maha' and the bubaline antelope baqar-ul-wachsh, both of which names are in fact used by the Arabs for the oryx, which is also according to Doughty called wadichah.

Tsebhi in the list of clean animals in De 14:5 (the King James Version "roebuck"; the Revised Version (British and American) "gazelle") is quite certainly gazelle, Arabic zabi (which see), so it is quite possible that te'o may be the oryx. It is noteworthy that it is rendered oryx (orux) in the Septuagint. It must be borne in mind that re'm or re'em, rendered "unicorn" (which see) in the King James Version and "wild ox" in the Revised Version (British and American), may perhaps also be the oryx. That the oryx should be called by two names in the Bible need not be considered strange, in view of the indefiniteness of Semitic ideas of natural history, which is directly evidenced by the three names now used for this animal by the Arabs.

The slightly different form [to'](the King James Version "wild bull"; the Revised Version (British and American) "antelope") found in Isa 51:20 ("Thy sons have fainted, they lie at the head of all the streets, as an antelope in a net") may quite as well refer to the oryx as to any other animal. According to Gesenius the word is derived from the verb ta'ah, "to outrun," which would be appropriate for this or any antelope.

The accompanying illustration is from a photograph of a well-grown female oryx in the zoological gardens at Cairo, which is 35 inches high at the shoulder and whose horns are 21 inches long. An adult male measures 40 inches at the shoulders, 59 inches from tip of nose to root of tail, and the longest horns known measure 27 1/4 inches. The color is pure white with dark brown or black markings. It is a powerful animal and its horns may inflict dangerous wounds. It inhabits the deserts of Arabia and its remarkably large hoofs seem well adapted to traversing the sands. It feeds upon grasses and upon certain succulent roots, and the Bedouin declare that never drinks. Under its name of maha' it is celebrated in Arabic poetry for the beauty of its eyes. Compare the Homeric "ox-eyed goddess Hera" (Boopis potnia Ere). Baqar-ul-wachsh, the name most commonly used by the Bedouin, means "wild cow" or "wild ox," which is identical with the translation of te'o in the King James Version.

Alfred Ely Day

ANTHEDON

an-the'-don: A city of Palestine, rebuilt along with Samaria, Ashdod, Gaza, and other cities, at Gabinius' command (Josephus, Ant, XIV, v, 3).

ANTHOTHIJAH

an-tho-thi’-ja (‘anthothiyah, "belonging to Anathoth"(?)): A son of Shasak of Benjamin (1Ch 8:24), written in the King James Version Antothijah.

ANTHROPOLOGY

an-thro-pol’-o-ji:

I. TERMS EMPLOYED

II. NATURE OF MAN BIBLICAL CONCEPTION

III. ORIGIN OF MAN FROM SCRIPTURE ACCOUNT: NARRATIVES OF CREATION

IV. UNITY OF THE RACE: VARIOUS THEORIES

V. EVOLUTIONARY THEORY AS TO ORIGIN OF MAN

1. Darwinism

2. Difficulties

3. Objections

4. The New Evolutionism

5. Evolution and Genesis

VI. PRIMITIVE AND PRESENT CONDITIONS OF MAN: ANTIQUITY OF MAN

LITERATURE

Under this heading is grouped whatever the Bible has to say regarding man’s origin, nature, destiny and kindred topics. No systematized doctrine concerning man is found in Scripture; but the great facts about human nature and its elements are presented in the Bible in popular language and not in that of the schools. Delitzsch has well said: "There is a clearly defined psychology essentially proper to Holy Scripture, which underlies all the Biblical writers, and intrinsically differs from that many formed psychology which lies outside the circle of revelation. .... We do not need first of all to force the Biblical teaching: it is one in itself" (Biblical Psychology, 17, 18). What is said of the psychology of Scripture

may with good reason be applied to its anthropology.

I. Terms Employed.

Several words are used in the Old Testament for our word "Man."

1. ‘Adham:

‘adham, either as the name of the first man, (compare Lu 3:38; Ro 5:14; 1Co 15:45); or as an appellative —the man; or, as the generic name of the human race (Septuagint: anthropos; Vulgate: homo). The origin of the name is obscure. In Ge 2:7 Adam is connected with ‘adhamah, from the earthly part of man’s nature (dust out of the ‘adhamah), as the earth-born one. The derivation of Adam from ‘adhamah, however, is disputed—among others by Dillmann: "Sprachlich lasst sich die Ableitung aus Adamah nicht vertheidigen" (Genesis, 53). Delitzsch refers to Josephus (Ant., I, i, 2), who maintained that Adam really meant purrhos ("red as fire"), in reference to the redness of the earth, out of which man was formed. "He means," adds Delitzsch, "the wonderfully fruitful and aromatic red earth of the Hauran chum of mountains, which is esteemed of marvelously strong and healing power, and which is believed to be self-rejuvenescent" (N. Commentary on Gen, 118). The connection with Edom in Ge 25:30 may perhaps point in the same direction. A connection has also been sought with the Assyrian admu ("child"), especially the young of the bird, in the sense of making or producing (Delitzsch; Oxford Dictionary); while Dillmann draws attention to an Ethiopic root adma, "pleasant," "agreeable," "charming"—a derivation, however, which he rejects. Suffice it to say, that no certain derivation has yet been found for the term (thus Dillmann, "ein sicheres Etymon fur Adam ist noch nicht gefunden," Gen, 53). Evidently in the word the earthly side of man’s origin is indicated.

2. Son of Man: The phrase ben-’adham, "son of man" (Nu 23:19; Job 25:6; Eze 2:3) is frequently found to denote man’s frailty and unworthiness in the sight of God. So in the much-disputed passage in Ge 6:2, where the "sons of God" are contrasted with the degenerate "daughters of men" (benoth ha-adham). See also Ps 11:4; 12:1,8; 14:2. On the other hand the dignity of man is sometimes indicated in the word Adam. Thus in Ec 7:28, "One man (’adham) among a thousand have I found: but a woman among all those have I not found."

3. ‘Enosh:

‘enosh (Ps 8:4; 10:18; 90:3; 103:15; frequently in Job and Ps), man in his impotence, frailty, mortality (like the Greek brotos) as against ‘ish, man in his strength and vigor. In Ge 4:26 the word becomes a proper name, applied to the son of Seth. Delitzsch derives it from a root ‘anash (related to the Arabic and Assyrian), signifying "to be or become frail." To intensify this frailty, we have the phrase in Ps 10:18, "‘enosh (man) who is of the earth."

4. ‘Ish:

(’ish), Septuagint aner, Vulg, vir, male as against female, even among lower animals (Ge 7:2); husband as contrasted with wife (’ishshah, Ge 2:23,24); man in his dignity and excellence (Jer 5:1: "seek, ... if ye can find a man"); persons of standing (Pr 8:4, where ‘ish is contrasted with bene ‘adham, "Unto you, O men, I call; and my voice is to the sons of men")—"like the Attic andres and anthropoi, wisdom turning her discourse to high and low, to persons of standing and to the proletariat" (Delitzsch on Prov). Delitzsch maintains, that ‘ish points to a root ‘osh "to be strong," and ‘ishshah to ‘anash, as designating woman in her weakness (compare 1Pe 3:7: "the weaker vessel"). "Thus ‘ishshah and ‘enosh come from a like verbal stem and fundamental notion" (Delitzsch, A New Commentary on Gen, 145). The term ‘ish is sometimes used generally, as the Greek tis, the French on, to express "anyone," as in Ex 21:14; 16:29.

5. Gebher:

gebher, gibbor, man in his strength. The term is applied to men as contrasted with women and children (Job 3:3), "a male child," in opposition to a female (Septuagint: arsen); also in contrast to non-combatants (Ex 10:11) and in New Testament, see Mt 8:9; Joh 1:6, where anthropos is used. Thus we read: "Neither shall a man (gebher) put on a woman’s garment" (De 22:5). Heroes and warriors are specially indicated by the term in such phrases as "mighty man of valor" (Jud 6:12). Sometimes animals are denoted by the term, as in Pr 30:30 ("mightiest among beasts"); sometimes it is applied to God (Isa 10:21) and to the Messiah (Isa 9:6). In combination with ‘ish it gives intensity to the meaning, as in 1Sa 14:52 "any mighty man."

6. Anthropos:

Of the Greek terms anthropos stands for man(kind) generally—a human being (Mt 12:12; Mr 10:27); though it is sometimes used to indicate man in his imperfection and weakness (1Co 3:3,4), in such expressions as "to speak as a man" (Ro 3:5 the King James Version), gospel "after man" (Ga 1:11), "after the manner of men" (1Co 15:32) etc.; or as showing the contrast between the perishable and the imperishable (2Co 4:16, where the "outward man" is represented as slowly dying, while the "inward man" is being renewed from day to day). Thus Paul contrasts the "natural man" (1Co 2:14), the "old man," with the "new" (Ro 6:6; Col 3:9,10).

7. Aner:

Aner, Latin: vir—man in his vigor as contrasted with woman in her weakness (1Co 11:3; 1Pe 3:7): sometimes, however, standing for "men in general" (Mr 6:44: "They that ate the loaves were five thousand men"—andres).

II. The Nature of Man: Biblical Conception:

1. Biblical Terms:

The Biblical idea of man’s nature may be summed up in the words of Paul, "of the earth, earthy" (1Co

15:47), as compared and contrasted with the statement in Ge 1:27: "God created man in his own image." This act of creation is described as the result of special deliberation on the part of God—the Divine Being taking counsel with Himself in the matter (verse 26). Man therefore is a creature, formed, fashioned, shaped out of "earth" and made after the "image of God." More than one word is employed in the Old Testament to express His idea:

(1) bara’," create," a word of uncertain derivation, occurring five times in Ge 1, to indicate the origin of the universe (verse 1), the origin of life in the waters (verse 24), the origin of man (verse 27), and always in connection with God’s creative work, never where "second causes" are introduced. (2) yatsar, "fashion," "form," "knead" (Ge 2:7), "of the dust of the ground."

(3) banah, "build," in special reference to the creation of woman, "built out of the rib" (Ge 2:22). By God’s special interposition man becomes a nephesh chayyah ("a living soul"), where evidently there is a reference to the breath of life, which man shares with the animal world (Ge 1:20,21,24); yet with this distinction, that "God Himself breathed into man’s nostrils the breath of life" (literally, "breath of lives," nishmath chayyim). With a single exception, that of Ge 7:22, the word neshamah, "breath," is confined to man. In Job reference is made to his creative act, where Elihu says: "There is a spirit in man, and the breath (nishmath) of the Almighty (shaddai) giveth them understanding" (Job 32:8); compare also Isa 42:5: "He .... giveth breath (neshamah) unto the people." Man therefore is a being separated from the rest of creation and yet one with it.

2. Image and Likeness:

This distinction becomes more clear in the declaration that man was made in the "image" (tselem, eikon, imago), and after the likeness (demuth, homoiosis, similitudo) of God. The question has been asked whether the two terms differ essentially in meaning; some maintaining that "image" refers to the physical, "likeness" to the ethical side of man’s nature; others holding that "image" is that which is natural to man, was created with him, was therefore as it were stamped upon him (concreata), and "likeness" that which was acquired by him (acquisita); while others again declare that "image" is the concrete and "likeness" the abstract for the same idea. There is very little scriptural ground for these assertions. Nor can we accept the interpretation of the older Socinians and some of the Remonstrants, that God’s image consisted in dominion over all creatures, a reference to which is made in Ge 1:28.

3. Meaning of Terms:

Turning to the narrative itself, it would appear that the two terms do not denote any real distinction. In Ge 1:27 tselem ("image") alone is used to express all that separates man from the brute and links him to his Creator. Hence, the expression "in our image." In 1:26, however, the word demuth ("similitude") is introduced, and we have the phrase "after our likeness," as though to indicate that the creature bearing the impress of God’s "image" truly corresponded in "likeness" to the original, the ectype resembling the archetype. Luther has translated the clause: "An image which is like unto us"—ein Bild das uns gleich sei—and in the new Dutch (Leyden) of the Old Testament by Kuenen, Hooijkaas and others, it is rendered:

"as our image, like unto us"—als ons evenbeeld ons gelijkende.

The two words may therefore be taken as standing to each other in the same relation in which copy or model stands to the original image. "The idea in tselem—says Delitzsch—is more rigid, that of demuth more fluctuating and so to speak more spiritual: in the former the notion of the original image, in the latter that of the ideal predominates." At any rate we have scriptural warrant (see especially, Ge 9:6; Jas 3:9) for the statement, that the image is the inalienable property of the race (Laidlaw), so that offense against a fellow-man is a desecration of the Divine image impressed upon man. Calvin has put it very clearly: Imago Dei est integra naturae humanae praestantia ("The image of God is the complete excellence of human nature").

4. Subsidiary Questions:

Other questions have been asked by early Church Fathers and by Schoolmen of later days, which may here be left out of the discussion. Some, like Tertullian, considered the "image" to be that of the coming Christ (Christi futuri); others have maintained that Adam was created after the image of the Logos (the Word, the second person in the Trinity), which was impressed upon man at his creation. Of all this Scripture knows nothing. There man is represented as made after the image of "Elohim," of the Godhead and not of one person of the Trinity. Paul calls man "the image and glory (eikon kai doxa) of God" (1Co 11:7). We may safely let the matter rest there. The strange theory, that the image of God indicates the sphere or element into which man was created, may be mentioned without further discussion (on this see Bohl, Dogmatik, 154 and Kuijper, De vleeschwording des Woords).

5. Constituents of Image:

In what then does this image or likeness consist? Certainly in what is inalienably human—a body as the temple of the Holy Ghost (the "earthly house" of 2Co 5:1), and the rational, inspiring, inbreathed spirit. Hence man’s personably, linking into to what is above, separating him from what is beneath, constitutes him a being apart—a rational, self-conscious, self-determining creature, intended by his Creator for fellowship with Himself. "The animal feels the Cosmos and adapts himself to it. Man feels the Cosmos, but also thinks it" (G. H. Lewes, Problems of Life and Mind). Light is thrown on the subject by the New Testament, and especially by the two classical texts: Eph 4:24 and Col 3:10, where the "new man" is referred to as "after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth" and "renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him." Knowledge, righteousness and holiness may fully be considered elements in the character of man as originally designed by God. Likeness to God therefore is man’s privilege above all created beings. What was said of the Son of God absolutely, "He is the express image (character) of God," is applied to man relatively the created son is not the only-begotten Son. The created son was "like unto God" (homoiosis; 1 Joh 3:2), and even in his degradation there is the promise of renewal after that image: the eternal, only-begotten Son is God’s equal (Php 2:6,7), though he became a servant and was made in the likeness (homoiomati) of men.

This likeness of man with God is not merely a Scriptural idea. Many ancient nations seem to have

grasped this thought. Man's golden age was placed by them in a far-off past, not in a distant future. Paul quotes a pagan poet in Ac 17:28, "We are also his offspring" (Aratus of Soli, in Cilicia, a countryman of the apostle). This statement also occurs in the beautiful hymn to Jupiter, ascribed to Cleanthes, a Stoic native of Assos in the Troad, and contemporary of Aratus. Psychologically and historically therefore, the Bible view is justified.

III. Origin of Man from Scripture Account: Narratives of Creation.

The Divine origin of man is clearly taught in the early chapters of Gen, as has lust been seen.

1. Scriptural Account:

Two narratives from different sources are supposed to have been combined by an unknown editor to form a not very harmonious whole. It is the purpose of criticism to determine the relationship in which they stand to each other and the dates of their composition. In both accounts man is the crowning glory of creation. The first account (Ge 1:1-2:3) is general, the second particular (Ge 2:4-25); in the first we have an account of man's appearance on a prepared platform—a gradual rise in the scale of organized existence from chaos upward to the climax, which is reached in man. There is recognized order in the whole procedure, represented by the writer as a process which occupied six days, or periods, measured by the appearance and dissipation of darkness. In the first period, chaotic disturbance is succeeded by the separation of light from darkness, which in its turn is followed by the separation of water from dry land, and to this a second period is assigned.

Then gradually in the next four periods we have in orderly sequence the rise of vegetable life, the formation of the creatures of the deep, of the air, of the dry land. When all is prepared man is called into being by a special fiat of the Almighty. Moreover, while other creatures were produced "after their kind," man alone as a unique conception of the Divine Intelligence is made to appear upon the scene, called into existence by direct Divine interposition, after a Divine type, and in distinction of sex; for both man and wife, in a later chapter, are called by the same name: Adam (Ge 5:2). Such is the scope of the first narrative. No wonder, then, that Scripture elsewhere calls the first man "the son of God" (Lu 3:38). It need not be determined here, whether the account is strictly chronological, whether the "days" are interludes between successive periods of darkness and not periods of twenty-four hours regulated by the rising and setting of the sun, or whether the whole narrative is but a prose poem of creation, not strictly accurate, or strictly scientific.

2. The Two Narratives:

In the second narrative (Ge 2:2-25) the order of procedure is different. Man here is not the climax, but the center. He is a creature of the dust, but with the breath of God in his nostrils (Ge 2:7), holding sway over all things, as God's vice-gerent upon earth, creation circling around him and submitting to his authority. To this is added a description of man's early home and of his home-relationships. The second narrative therefore seems on the face of it to be supplementary to the first, not contradictory of it: the

agreements indeed are far greater than the differences. "The first may be called typical, the second, physiological. The former is the generic account of man's creation—of man the race, the ideal; the latter is the production of the actual man, of the historic Adam" (Laidlaw).

3. Contrasts:

The differences between the two narratives have been magnified by supporters of the various documentary hypotheses. They are supposed to differ in style—the first "displaying clear marks of study and deliberation," the second being "fresh spontaneous, primitive" (Driver, Genesis). They differ also in representation, i.e. in detail and order of events—the earth, in the second narrative not emerging from the waters as in the first, but dry and not fitted for the support of vegetation, and man appearing not last but first on the scene, followed by beasts and birds and lastly by woman. The documents are further supposed to differ in their conception of Divine interposition and a consequent choice of words, the first employing words, like "creating," "dividing," "making," "setting," which imply nothing local, or sensible in the Divine nature, the second being strongly anthropomorphic—Yahweh represented as "moulding," "placing," "taking," "building," etc—and moreover locally determined within limits, confined apparently to a garden as His accustomed abode. Without foreclosing the critical question, it may be replied that the first narrative is as anthropomorphic as the second, for God is there represented as "speaking," "setting," (Ge 1:17; 2:17), "delighting in" the work of His hands (Ge 1:31), "addressing" the living creatures (Ge 1:22), and "resting" at the close (Ge 2:2). As to the home of Yahweh in a limited garden, we are expressly told, not that man was admitted to the home of his Maker, but that Yahweh specially "planted a garden" for the abode of man. The order of events may be different; but certainly the scope and the aim are not.

4. Objections:

More serious have been the objections raised on scientific grounds. The cosmogony of Ge has been disputed, and elaborate comparisons have been made between geological theories as to the origin of the world and the Mosaic account. The points at issue are supposed to be the following: geology knows of no "periods" corresponding to the "days" of Genesis; "vegetation" in Ge appears before animal life, geology maintains that they appear simultaneously; "fishes and birds" in Genesis preceded all land animals; in the geological record "birds" succeed "fishes" and are preceded by numerous species of land animals (so Driver, Genesis). To this a twofold reply has been given: (1) The account in Genesis is not scientific, or intended to be so: it is a prelude to the history of human sin and of Divine redemption, and gives a sketch of the world's origin and the earth's preparation for man as his abode, with that one object in view. The starting-point of the narrative is the creation of the universe by God; the culminating point is the creation of man in the image of God. Between these two great events certain other acts of creation in orderly sequence are presented to our view, in so far as they bear upon the great theme of sin and redemption discussed in the record. The aim is practical, not speculative; theological, not scientific.

The whole creation-narrative must be judged from that point of view. See COSMOGONY. (2) What has struck many scientists is not so much the difference or disharmony between the Mosaic and the

geological record, as the wonderful agreements in general outline apart from discrepancies in detail. Geologists like Dana and Dawson have expressed this as clearly as Haeckel. The latter, e.g., has openly given utterance to his "just and sincere admiration of the Jewish lawgiver's grand insight into nature and his simple and natural hypothesis of creation .... which contrasts favorably with the confused mythology of creation current among most of the ancient nations" (History of Creation, I, 37, 38). He draws attention to the agreement between the Mosaic account, which accepts "the direct action of a constructive Creator," and the non-miraculous theory of development, inasmuch as "the idea of separation and differentiation of the originally simple matter and of a progressive development" is to be found in the "Jewish lawgiver's" record.

5. Babylonian Origin:

Latterly it has been maintained that Israel was dependent upon Babylon for its creation-narrative; but even the most serious supporters of this view have had to concede that the first introduction of Babylonian myth into the sacred narrative "must remain a matter of conjecture," and that "it is incredible, that the monotheistic author of Ge 1, at whatever date he lived, could have borrowed any detail, however slight, from the polytheistic epic of Marduk and Tiamat" (Driver, Gen, 31). The statement of Bauer in his Hebraische Mythologie, 1802: "Es ist heut zu Tage ausser allen Zweifel gesetzt, dass die ganze Erzahlung ein Mythus ist" (It is beyond all doubt, that the whole narrative is a myth), can no longer be satisfactorily maintained; much less the assertion that we have here an introduction of post-exilic Babylonian or Persian myth into the Hebrew narrative (compare Van Leeuwen, Anthropologie).

6. Later Critical Views:

Whether the division of the narrative into Elohistic and Jehovistic documents will stand the test of time is a question which exercises a great many minds. Professor Eerdmans of Leyden, the present occupant of Kuenen's chair, has lately maintained that a "thorough application of the critical theories of the school of Graf-Kuenen- Wellhausen leads to highly improbable results," and that "the present Old Testament criticism has to reform itself" (HJ, July, 1909). His own theory is worked out in his Alttestamentliche Studien, to which the reader is referred.

IV. Unity of the Race: Various Theories.

1. Its Solidarity:

The solidarity of the race may be said to be as distinctly a doctrine of science as it is of Scripture. It is implied in the account of the Creation and of the Deluge. It is strongly affirmed by Paul in his address to the Athenians (Ac 17:26), and is the foundation of the Biblical scheme of redemption (Joh 3:16). The human race in the Old Testament is described as "sons of Adam" (De 32:8 the King James Version), as derived from one pair (Ge 1:27; 3:20), as having its origin in one individual (Ge 2:18; 1Co 11:8, where woman is described as derived 'from man'). Hence the term "Adam" is applied to the race as well as to

the individual (Ge 1:26; 2:5,7; 3:22,24; 5:2); while in the New Testament this doctrine is applied to the history of redemption—Christ as the "second Adam" restoring what was lost in the "first Adam" (1Co 15:21,22,47-49).

2. Various Theories:

Outside of Holy Scripture various theories have been held as to the origin, antiquity and primeval condition of the human race. That of polygenism (plurality of origin) has found special favor, partly as co-Adamitism, or descent of different races from different progenitors (Paracelsus and others), partly as pre-adamitism, or descent of dark- colored races from an ancestor who lived before Adam—the progenitor of the Jews and the light-colored races (Zanini and especially de la Peyrere). But no serious attempts have yet been made to divide the human race among a number of separately originated ancestors.

3. Evolutionary View:

The Biblical account, however, has been brought into discredit by modern theories of evolution. Darwinism in itself does not favor polygenism; though many interpreters of the evolutionary hypothesis have given it that application. Darwin distinctly repudiates polygenism. He says: "Those naturalists who admit the principle of evolution will feel no doubt, that all the races of man are descended from a single primitive stock" (Descent of Man, second ed., 176); and on a previous page we read: "Man has been studied more carefully than any other animal, and yet there is the greatest possible diversity amongst capable judges, whether he should be classed as a single species, or race, or as two (Verey), as three (Jacquinot), as four (Kant), five (Blumenbach), six (Buffon), seven (Hunter), eight (Agassiz), eleven (Pickering), fifteen (Bory Vincent), sixteen (Desmoulins), twenty-two (Morton), sixty (Crawford), or as sixty-three, according to Burke" (p. 174).

V. Evolutionary Theory as to Origin of Man.

Modern science generally accepts theory of evolution. Darwin gave to the hypothesis a character it never had before; but since his day its application has been unlimited. "From the organic it is extended to the inorganic world; from our planet and the solar system to the cosmos, from nature to the creations of man’s mind—arts, laws, institutions, religion. We speak in the same breath of the evolution of organic beings and of the steam engine, of the printing-press, of the newspaper, now even of the atom" (Orr, God’s Image in Man, 84). And yet, in spite of this very wide and far-reaching application of theory, the factors that enter into the process, the method or methods by which the great results in this process are obtained, may still be considered as under debate. Its application to the Bible doctrine of man presents serious difficulties.

1. Darwinism:

Darwin’s argument may be presented in the following form. In Nature around us there is to be observed

a struggle for existence, to which every organism is exposed, whereby the weaker ones are eliminated and the stronger or best-fitted ones made to survive. Those so surviving may be said metaphorically to be chosen by Nature for that purpose—hence the term "natural selection," assisted in the higher forms of life by "sexual selection," under the influence of which the best-organized males are preferred by the females, and thus as it were selected for propagation of the species. The properties or characteristics of the organisms so chosen are transmitted to their descendants, so that with indefinite variability "from a few forms or from one, into which life has been originally breathed, endless forms most beautiful and most wonderful have been, or are being evolved" (Origin of Species, 6th ed., 429). Applying this mode of procedure to the origin of man, the strength of the argument is found to lie in the analogies between man and the brute, which may be summed up as follows:

(1) morphological peculiarities in the structure of the bodily organs, in their liability to the same diseases, in their close similarity as regards tissues, blood, etc.;

(2) embryological characteristics, in the development of the human being, like the brute, from an ovule, which does not differ from and passes through the same evolutionary process as that of any other animal;

(3) the existence of rudimentary organs, which are considered to be either absolutely useless, in some cases harmful, often productive of disease, or in any case of very slight service to the human being, pointing back therefore—so it is maintained—to an animal ancestry, in which these organs may have been necessary;

(4) mental peculiarities of the same character, but perhaps not of the same range, in the brute as in man though the differences between the two may be as great as between "a terrier and a Hegel, a Sir William Hamilton, or a Kant";

(5) paleontological agreements, to show that a comparison of fossil remains brings modern civilized man and his primeval, anthropoid ancestor into close correspondence. Latterly Friedenthal’s experiments, in regard to blood- transfusion between man and the ape, have been introduced into the argument by evolutionists.

2. Difficulties:

The difficulties which beset theory are so great that naturalists of repute have subjected it to very severe criticism, which cannot be disregarded. Some, like Du Bois-Reymond, have openly declared that supernaturalism has gained the day "es scheint keine andere Ausnahme ubrig zu sein, als sich dem Supranaturalismus in die Arme zu werfen" (compare Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatik, II, 548). Others, like Virchow, have to the last pronounced against Darwinism as an established hypothesis, and a simian ancestry as an accepted fact "auf dem Wege der Speculation ist man zu der Affen-Theorie gekommen: man hatte eben so gut zu anderen theromorphischen Theorien kommen konnen, z. B. zu einer Elefanten-Theorie, oder zu einer Schaf-Theorie"—i.e. one might as well speak of an elephant-

theory or a sheep-theory or any other animal-theory as of an ape-theory. This was in 1892. When two years later the discovery of the so-called pithecanthropus erectus, supposed to be the "missing link" between man and the lower animals, came under discussion, Virchow held as strongly, that "neither the pithecanthropus nor any other anthropoid ape showed any of the characteristics of primeval man." This was in 1896.

The difference of opinion among scientists on this point seems to be great. While Darwin himself uncompromisingly held to the simian ancestry of man, several of his followers reject that line of descent altogether. This may be seen in the Cambridge volume, dedicated to the memory of the British naturalist. Schwalbe, while instancing Cope, Adloff, Klaatsch and others as advocating a different ancestry for man, acknowledges, though reluctantly, that "the line of descent disappears in the darkness of the ancestry of the mammals," and is inclined to admit that "man has arisen independently" (Darwinism and Modern Science, 134). Two things therefore are clear, namely, that modern science does not endorse the favorite maxim of Darwin, Natura non facit saltum, "Nature does not make a jump," with which according to Huxley he "has unnecessarily hampered himself" (Lay Sermons, 342), and that "man probably arose by a mutation, that is, by a discontinuous variation of considerable magnitude" (J. A. Thomson, Darwinism and Human Life, 123). Granted therefore an ascent In the scale of evolution by "leaps" or "lifts," the words of Otto (Naturalism and Religion, 133) receive a new meaning for those who accept as historic the tradition recorded in the early chapters of Genesis: "There is nothing against the assumption, and there is much to be said in its favor, that the last step, or leap, was such an immense one, that it brought with it a freedom and richness of psychical life incomparable with anything that had gone before."

3. Objections:

The objections raised against the Darwinian theory are in the main threefold:

(1) its denial of teleology, for which it substitutes natural selection;

(2) its assumption, that the evolutionary process is by slow and insensible gradations;

(3) its assertion, that organic advance has been absolutely continuous from the lowest form to the highest (Orr, God’s Image in Man, 108). This may be illustrated a little more fully:

(1) Chance Versus Creation.

The denial of teleology is clear and distinct, though Professor Huxley has spoken of a "wider teleology," by which however he simply meant (Critiques and Addresses, 305) that the teleologist can defy his opponent to prove that certain changes in structure were not intended to be produced. In Darwinism the choice seems to he between chance and creation. Mind, purpose, forethought, intention, Divine guidance and super-intendence are banished from the evolutionary process. Darwin himself, though originally inclined to call in the aid of a creator (Origin of Species, 6th edition, 429), regretted afterward, that he

"had truckled to public opinion and used the pentateuchal term, by which he really meant appearance by some wholly unknown process" (Life and Letters, III, 18).

Admittedly, Darwin attributed too great a power to natural selection. He himself in the Descent of Man considered it "one of the greatest oversights" in his work, that "he had not sufficiently considered the existence of many structures which are neither beneficial nor injurious," and that he had "probably attributed too much to the action of natural selection on the survival of the fittest" (Descent of Man (2nd ed.), 61). Dr. A. R. Wallace, though like Darwin acknowledging the potency of natural selection, considers its operations to be largely negative. Writing to his friend he says: "Nature does not so much select special varieties, as exterminate unfavorable ones" (Darwin's Life and Letters, III, 46). It is this very insistence on a method of advance by slow and imperceptible gradations that has met with strong opposition from the very beginning. "Natural selection" Darwin writes, "acts solely by accumulating slight, successive, favorable variations; it can produce no great or sudden modifications; it can only act by short and slow steps" (Origin of Species (6th ed.), chapter 15). The process therefore according to Darwin is wholly fortuitous. This non-teleological aspect of Darwinism is characteristic of many treatises on evolution.

Weismann states with great clearness and force, that the philosophical significance of theory lies in the fact that "mechanical forces" are substituted for "directive force" to explain the origin of useful structures. Otto speaks of its radical opposition to teleology. And yet an ardent supporter of Darwinism, Professor J. A. Thomson, admits that "there is no logical proof of the doctrine of descent" (Darwinism and Human Life, 22)—a statement which finds its counterpart in Darwin's letters: "We cannot prove that a single species has changed" (Life and Letters, III, 25). Still more clearly, almost epigrammatically this is endorsed by Professor J. A. Thomson: "The fact of evolution forces itself upon us: the factors elude us" (Bible of Nature, 153), and again: "Natural selection explains the survival of the fittest, not the arrival of the fit" (ib 162). Still more extraordinary is the view expressed by Korchinsky that struggle "prevents the establishment of new variations and in reality stands in the way of new development. It is rather an unfavorable than advantageous factor" (Otto, Nature and Religion, 182). We are in fact being slowly led back to the teleology which by Darwin was considered fatal to his theory. Scientists of some repute are fond of speaking of directive purpose. "Wherever we tap organic nature," says Professor J. A. Thomson, "it seems to flow with purpose" (Bible of Nature, 25); and again, "If there is Logos at the end (of the long evolutionary process ending in man) we may be sure it was also at the beginning" (ib 86).

Where there is purpose there must be mind working with purpose and for a definite end; where there is mind there may be creation at the beginning; where creation is granted, an overruling Providence may be accepted. If natural selection "prunes the growing tree"; if it be "a directive, not an originative factor" (J. A. Thomson, Darwinism and Human Life, 193); if it produces nothing, and the evolutionary process is dependent upon forces which work from within and not from without, then surely the Duke of Argyll was right in maintaining (Unity of Nature, 272) that "creation and evolution, when these terms have been cleared from intellectual confusion, are not antagonistic conceptions mutually exclusive. They are harmonious and complementary." The ancient narrative, therefore, which posits God at the beginning, and ascribes the universe to His creative act, is after all not so unscientific as some evolutionists are inclined to make out.

(2) Variability Indefinite.

Indefinite variability, assumed by theory, is not supported by fact. Development there doubtless is, but always within carefully defined limits: at every stage the animal or plant is a complete and symmetrical organism, without any indication of an everlasting progression from the less to the more complex. Reversion to type seems ever to have a development proceeding indefinitely, and the sterility of hybrids seems to be Nature's protest against raising variability into a law of progression. It has been repeatedly pointed out, that variations as they arise in any organ are not of advantage to its possessor: "A very slight enlarged sebaceous follicle, a minute pimple on the nose of a fish, a microscopic point of ossification or consolidation amongst the muscles of any animal could (hardly) give its possessor any superiority over its fellows" (Elam, Winds of Doctrine, 128).

(3) Existing Gaps.

Nor can it be denied that no theory of evolution has been able to bridge the chasms which seem to exist between the various kingdoms in Nature. A gradual transition from the inorganic to the organic, from the vegetable to the animal kingdom, from one species of plant or animal to another species, from the animal to man, is not found in Nature. This is acknowledged by scientists of repute. Du Bois-Reymond has maintained that there are seven great enigmas, indicating a sevenfold limit to investigation, namely,

(a) the existence of matter and force;

(b) the origin of motion;

(c) the origin of life;

(d) the appearance of design in Nature;

(e) the existence of consciousness;

(f) intelligent thought and the origin of speech;

(g) the question of freewill.

Others have found equally serious difficulties in a theory of descent which ignores the existence of such gaps. Thus, Dr. A. R. Wallace—a strong upholder of theory of natural selection—allows that "there are at least three stages in the development of the organic world, when some new cause or power must necessarily have come into action," namely, at the introduction of life, at the introduction of sensation and consciousness and at the introduction of man" (Darwinism, 474-75).

(4) Applied to Man.

When theory is applied to the human species the difficulties are enormously increased. Psychically, man is akin to, yet vastly different from, the brute. Consciousness, thought, language (called by Max Muller "the Rubicon" between the human and the animal world), morality, religion cannot easily be explained under any theory of evolution. The recognition of moral obligations, the freedom of choice between moral alternatives, the categorical imperative of conscience, the feeling of responsibility and the pain of remorse are unaccounted for by the doctrine of descent. Man stands apart, forming psychologically a kingdom by himself, "infinitely divergent from the simian stirps" (Huxley, Man's Place in Nature, 103) —the riddle of the universe, apart from the Biblical narrative. In the very nature of things the conscious and the unconscious he far apart. "The assertion of the difference between them does not rest on our ignorance, but on our knowledge of the perceived distinction between material particles in motion and internal consciousness related to a self" (Orr, Homiletic Review, August, 1907).

There can be no transition from the one to the other. The "gulf" remains in spite of all attempts to bridge it. Strong supporters of Darwinism have acknowledged this. Thus Dr. A. R. Wallace, though vigorously maintaining the "essential identity of man's bodily structure with that of the higher mammals and his descent from some ancestral form common to man and the anthropoid apes," discards theory that "man's entire nature and all his faculties, moral, intellectual, spiritual, have been derived from their rudiments in lower animals"—a theory which he considers unsupported by adequate evidence and directly opposed to many well-ascertained facts (Darwinism, 461; Natural Selection, 322 ff).

(5) Transitional Forms Absent.

The absence of transitional forms is another difficulty which strikes at the very root of Darwinism. Zittel, a paleontologist of repute, endorsed the general opinion, when in 1895 at Zurich he declared, that the extinct transitional links are slowly not forthcoming, except in "a small and ever-diminishing number." The derivation of the modern horse from the "Eohippus," on which great stress is sometimes laid, can hardly be accepted as proved, when it is maintained by scientists of equal repute, that no "Eohippus," but Palaeotherium was the progenitor of the animal whose ancestry is in dispute. And as for man, the discovery by Dr. E. Du Bois, in the island of Java, of the top of a skull, the head of a leg bone, few teeth of an animal supposed to be a man-like mammal, does not convey the absolute proof demanded. From the very first, opinion was strangely divided among naturalists.

Virchow doubted whether the parts belonged to the same individual, and considered Du Bois' drawings of the curves of a skull-outline to prove the gradual transition from the skull of a monkey to that of a man as imaginary. Of twenty-four scientists, who examined the remains when originally presented, ten thought they belonged to an ape, seven to a man, seven to some intermediate form (Otto, Naturalism and Religion, 110). At the Anthropological Congress held at Lindau in September, 1899, "Dr. Bumiller read a paper in which he declared that the supposed 'pithecanthropus erectus' is nothing but a gibbon, as Virchow surmised from the first" (Orr, in The Expositor, July, 1910).

4. The New Evolutionism:

Evolutionism apparently is undergoing a great change. Among others Fleischmann, and Dennert in Germany have submitted Darwinism to a keen and searching criticism. The latter especially, as a scientist, raises a strong protest against the acceptance of the Darwinian theory, He closes his researches with the remarkable words: "The theory of descent is accepted by nearly all naturalists. But in spite of assertions to the contrary, theory has not yet been fully (ganz unzweifelhaft) proved. .... Darwinism on the other hand, i.e. the doctrine of natural selection through struggle for existence, has been forced back all along the line" (vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus, 120). With equal vigor Professor Hugo de Vries, of Amsterdam, has recently taught a "theory of mutation," a term applied by him to "express the process of origination of a new species, or of a new specific character, when this takes place by the discontinuous method at a single step" (Lock, Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, 113). New species, according to De Vries, may arise from old ones by leaps, and this not in long-past geological times, but in the course of a human life and under our very eyes. This theory of "halmatogenesis," or evolution by leaps and not by insensible gradations, was not unknown to scientists.

Lyell, who was a slow convert to Darwinism, in his Antiquity of Man, admitted the possibility of "occasional strides, breaks in an otherwise continuous series of psychical changes, mankind clearing at one bound the space which separated the highest stage of the unprogressive intelligence of inferior animals from the first and lowest form of improvable reason of man." Even Professor Huxley, one of the staunchest supporters of Darwinism, acknowledged that "Nature does make jumps now and then," and that "a recognition of the fact is of no small importance in disposing of many minor objections to the doctrine of transmutation" (Orr, God’s Image in Man, 116). Less conciliatory than either De Vries or Huxley is Eimer, who, while repudiating the "chance" theory of Darwinism, sets against it "definitely directed evolution," and holds that "natural selection is insufficient in the formation of species" (Otto, Naturalism and Religion, 174). Evidently the evolution theory is undergoing modifications, which may have important bearing on the interpretation of the Mosaic narrative of creation and especially on the descent of man. Man may therefore, from a purely scientific point of view, be an entirely new being, not brought about by slow and gradual ascent from a simian ancestry. He may have been introduced at a bound, not as a semi-animal with brute impulses, but as a rational and moral being, "internally harmonious, with possibilities of sinless development, which only his free act annulled." If the new theory of "mutational" evolution be accepted, the scriptural view of man’s origin will certainly not be discredited.

5. Evolution and Genesis:

This much may fairly be granted, that within certain limits Scripture accepts an evolutionary process. In regard to the lower animals the creating (Ge 1:21), or making (Ge 1:28), is not described as an immediate act of Almighty Power, but as a creative impulse given to water and earth, which does not exclude, but rather calls into operation the powers that are in the sea and dry land (Ge 1:11,20,24 the King James Version): "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass .... Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature." It is only in the creation of man that God works immediately: "And God said, Let us make man in our image .... And God created man" (Ge 1:26,27). The stride or jump of

Lyell and Huxley, the "halmatogenesis" of De Vries are names which in the simple narrative disappear before the pregnant sentence: "And God said." Theologians of repute have given a theistic coloring to the evolution theory (compare Flint, Theism, 195 ff), inasmuch as development cannot be purposeless or causeless, and because "Nature is but effect whose cause is God." The deathblow which, according to Professor Huxley, the teleological argument has received from Darwin, may after all not be so serious. At any rate Lord Kelvin (Sir William Thomson) in 1871 before the British Association openly pleaded for "the solid and irrefragable argument so well put forward by Paley .... teaching us, that all living things depended upon an everacting Creator and Ruler." See EVOLUTION.

VI. Primitive and Present Conditions of Man: Antiquity of Man.

1. The Time-Distance of Man's Origin:

The newer anthropology has carried the human race back to a remote antiquity. Ordinary estimates range between 100,000 and 500,000 years. Extraordinary computations go far beyond these numbers. Haeckel, e.g. speaks of "Sirius distances" for the whole evolutionary process; and what this means may easily be conjectured. The sun is 92,700,000 miles away from the earth, and Sirius is a million times as far from us as we are from the sun, so that the time-distance of man from the very lowest organisms, from the first germ or seed or ovule, is according to Haeckel almost incalculable. The human race is thus carried back by evolutionists into an immeasurable distance from the present inhabitants of the earth. Several primeval races are by some declared to have existed, and fossil remains of man are supposed to have been found, bringing him into touch with extinct animals.

The time-computations of evolutionists, however, are not shared by scientists in general. "These millionaires in time have received a rude blow, when another Darwin, Sir G. H. Darwin of Cambridge, demonstrated that the physical conditions were such that geology must limit itself to a period of time inside of 100,000 years" (Orr, God's Image, etc., 176). Professor Tait of Edinburgh limited the range to no more than 10,000,000 years and he strongly advised geologists to "hurry up their calculations." "I dare say," he says, "many of you are acquainted with the speculations of Lyell and others, especially of Darwin, who tells us, that even for a comparatively brief portion of recent geological history, three hundred millions of years will not suffice! We say, so much the worse for geology as at present understood by its chief authorities" (Recent Advances in Physical Science, 168). Recently, however, attention has been drawn to new sources of energy in the universe as the result of radio-activity.

Duncan, in The New Knowledge, contrasts the old conception, according to which God made the universe and started it at a definite time to run its course, with the need, which though it does not distinctly teach, at least is inclined to maintain, that the universe is immortal or eternal, both in the future and the past (p. 245). If this view be correct the Darwinian "eons" of time may be considered restored to the evolutionist. On the other hand it appears that Lord Kelvin seriously doubted the validity of these speculations. Professor Orr writes: "In a personal communication Lord Kelvin states to me that he thinks it 'almost infinitely improbable' that radium had any appreciable effects on the heat and light of the earth or sun, and suggests it as 'more probable that the energy of radium may have come originally in

connection with the excessively high temperatures' produced by gravitational action" (Homiletic Review, August, 1906).

2. Antiquity of Primeval Man:

In regard to primeval man there is no agreement among scientists. Some, like Delaunay, de Mortillet, Quatrefages, believed that man existed in the Tertiary; while others, such as Virchow, Zittel, Prestwich, Dawson, maintain that man appeared on the scene only in the Quaternary. As the limits between these periods are not well defined a decision is by no means easy. Even if man be found to have been a contemporary of extinct animals, such as the mammoth, the inference from this fact would be equally just, not that man is as old as the extinct animal, but that the animal is as young as man and that the period assigned to these fossil remains must be brought considerably nearer to present-day life.

3. Various Calculations:

Calculations based on the gravels of the Somme, on the cone of the Tiniere, on the peat-bogs of France and Denmark, on fossil bones discovered in caves of Germany and France, on delta-formations of great rivers like the Nile and the Mississippi, on the "kitchen middings" of Denmark, and the lake-dwellings of Switzerland, must be carefully scrutinized. Sir J. W. Dawson, a geologist of great repute, has made the deliberate statement, that "possibly none of these reach farther back than six or seven thousand years, which according to Dr. Andrews have elapsed since the close of the boulder-clay in America," and that "the scientific pendulum must swing backward in this direction" (Story of the Earth and Man, 293). The "ice-age," formerly hypothetically calculated, has latterly been brought within calculable distance. G. F. Wright, Winchell and others have arrived at the conclusion that the glacial period in America, and consequently in Europe, does not lie more than some eight or ten thousand years behind us.

If such be the case, the antiquity of man is brought within reasonable limits, and may consequently not be in contradiction to the Biblical statements on this point. If the careful and precise calculations of Dr. Andrews on the raised beaches of Lake Michigan are accepted, then North America must have risen out of the waters of the Glacial period some 5,500 or 7,500 years ago; and if so, the duration of the human period in that continent is fixed and must be considerably reduced (Dawson, Story, etc., 295). One of the latest deliverances on this subject is that of Professor Russell of the University of Michigan (1904), who maintains that "we find no authentic and well- attested evidence of the presence of man in America either previous to or during the Glacial period." He is confident, that "all the geological evidence thus far gathered bearing on the antiquity of man in America points to the conclusion that he came after the Glacial epoch." Where all is vague and experts differ great caution is necessary in the arrangement of dates and periods of time. If moreover a comparatively rapid post-glacial submergence and reelevation is accepted, as some naturalists hold, and man were then on the earth, the question may fairly be asked, whether this subsidence did not "constitute the deluge recorded in that remarkable 'log-book' of Noah preserved to us in Gen" (Dawson, op. cit., 290).

4. Chronology:

The chronology of ancient nations—China, Babylon, Egypt—has been considered as subversive of the scriptural view as to the age of the human race. But it is a well-known fact, that experts differ very seriously upon the point. Their calculations range, for Egypt—starting from the reign of King Menes—from 5,867 (Champollion) to 4,455 (Brugsch), and from 3,892 (Lepsius) to 2,320 (Wilkinson). As to Babylon Bunsen places the starting-point for the historic period in 3,784, Brandis in 2,458, Oppert in 3,540—a difference of thousands of years (compare Bavinck, Geref. Dogmatik, II, 557). Perhaps here, too, future research will bring the scientific and the Biblical view into fuller harmony. At any rate, Hommel's words on all these calculations require careful study: "The chronology for the first thousand years before Christ is fairly fixed: in the second thousand BC some points seem to be fixed: in the third thousand, i.e. before 2000 BC, all is uncertain." In this connection it may be mentioned, that attempts have frequently been made to cast discredit on the chronology of the early chapters of Genesis. Suffice it to say that the calculations are based on the genealogies of the patriarchs and their descendants, and that the generally accepted dates assigned to them by Archbishop Ussher and introduced into the margins of some editions of the Bible are not to be trusted. The Septuagint differs in this respect from the Hebrew text by more than 1,500 years: precise chronological data are not and cannot be given. The basis of calculation is not known. Perhaps we are not far wrong in saying that, "if we allow, say, from 12,000 to 15,000 years since the time of man's first appearance on the earth, we do ample justice to all the available facts" (Orr, God's Image, etc., 180). See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

5. Man's Primitive Condition: That all these discussions have a bearing upon our view of man's primitive conditions can easily be understood. According to Scripture man's destiny was to 'replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over fish, fowl and every living thing' (Ge 1:28), as God's steward (oikonomos, Tit 1:7), as fellow-laborer with God (sunergos, 1Co 3:9). Hence he was placed by God in the garden of Eden (gan be'edhen; Septuagint paradeisos tes trophes; Vulgate paradisus voluptatis, "paradise of delight"). The situation of that garden is carefully described, though the proper site remains unknown (Ge 2:14,15). Some, like Driver, consider this an ideal locality (Genesis, 57); others take a very wide range in fixing upon the true site. Every continent has been chosen as the cradle of the race—Africa, among others, as the home of the gorilla and the chimpanzee—the supposed progenitors of humanity. In America, Greenland and the regions around the North Pole have had their supporters.

Certain parts of Europe have found favor in some quarters. An imaginary island—Lemuria—situated between the African and Australian continents—has been accepted by others. All this, however, lies beyond the scope of science, and beyond the range of Scripture. Somewhere to the east of Palestine, and in or near Babylonia, we must seek for the cradle of humanity. No trace of primeval man has been found, nor has the existence of primeval races been proved. The skulls which have been found (Neanderthal, Engis, Lansing) are of a high type, even Professor Huxley declaring of the first, that "it can in no sense be regarded as the intermediate between Man and the Apes," of the second, that it is "a fair, average skull, which might have belonged to a philosopher, or might have contained the thoughtless brains of a savage" (Man's Place in Nature, 156, 157). Of the Lansing skeleton found in Kansas, in 1902, this may at least be said—apart from the question as to its antiquity—that the skull bears close resemblance to that of the modern Indian. Even the skull of the Cro-Magnon man, supposed to belong to

the paleolithic age, Sir J. W. Dawson considers to have carried a brain of greater size than that of the average modern man (Meeting-Place of Geology and History, 54). Primeval man can hardly be compared to the modern savage; for the savage is a deteriorated representative of a better type, which has slowly degenerated.

History does not know of an unaided emergence from barbarism on the part of any savage tribe; it does know of degradation from a better type. Whatever view we take of the original state of man, the following points must be borne in mind: we need not suppose him to have been a humanized ape, rising into true manhood by a slow and gradual process; nor need we picture him either as a savage of pronounced type, or as in every sense the equal of modern man, "the heir of all the ages." Scripture represents him to us as a moral being, "with possibilities of sinless development, which his own free act annulled." There the matter may rest, and the words of a non-canonical Scripture may fitly be applied to him: "God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of His own eternity" (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:23, the King James Version). See also PSYCHOLOGY.

LITERATURE.

Darwin, Origin of Species, Descent of Man; Lock, Recent Progress in the Study of Variation, etc.; A. R. Wallace, Darwinism, Natural Selection; Sir J. W. Dawson, Story of the Earth and Man, Origin of World according to Revelation and Science, Meeting-Place of Geology and History; R. Otto, Naturalism and Religion; Cambridge Memorial vol, Darwin and Modern Science; J. H. Stirling, Darwinianism; J. Young, Evolution and Design; J. Orr, God’s Image in Man; J. A. Thomson, Bible of Nature, Darwinism and Human Life; Weismann, Essays on Heredity; Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatik; Van Leeuwen. Bijbelsche Anthropologie; Laidlaw, Bible Doctrines of Man; O. Zockler, Vom Urstand des Menschen; A. Fleischmann; Die Darwin’sche Theorie; E. Dennert, Vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus, Bibel und Naturwissenschaft; Huxley, Man’s Place in Nature; Herzog, RE, articles "Geist" and "Seele"; Driver, Genesis; Delitzsch, Genesis; Dillmann, Die Genesis, etc., etc.

J. I. Marais

ANTHROPOMORPHISM

an-thro-po-mor’-fiz’-m:

1. Definition of the Term

2. Old Testament Anthropomorphisms

3. In What Senses an Anthropomorphic Element Is Necessary

4. Anthropomorphism and the Exigencies of Human Thinking

5. Anthropomorphism and Theism

6. Symbolic Forms of Thought

7. Philosophic Pantheism

8. Anthropomorphism and Personalized or Mediated Knowledge

9. From Greek Polytheism to Modern Ethical Monotheism

10. Greek Thought

11. Anthropomorphism of Israel

12. Twofold Nature of the Anthropomorphic Difficulty

13. Need of Rising Higher

14. God in Christ the True Solution

1. Definition of the Term:

By this term is meant, conformably with its etymological signification, i.e. as being in the form or likeness of man, the attribution to God of human form, parts or passions, and the taking of Scripture passages which speak of God as having hands, or eyes, or ears, in a literal sense. This anthropomorphic procedure called forth Divine rebuke so early as Ps 50:21: "Thou thoughtest that I was altogether such a one as thyself."

2. Old Testament Anthropomorphisms:

Fear of the charge of anthropomorphism has had a strangely deterrent effect upon many minds, but very needlessly so. Even that rich storehouse of apparently crude anthropomorphisms, the Old Testament, when it ascribes to Deity physical characters, mental and moral attributes, like those of man, merely means to make the Divine nature and operations intelligible, not to transfer to Him the defects and limitations of human character and life.

3. In What Senses an Anthropomorphic Element Is Necessity:

In all really theistic forms of religion, there is an anthropomorphic element present, for they all presuppose the psychological truth of a certain essential likeness between God and man. Nor, perfect as we may our theistic idea or conception of Deity, can we, in the realm of spirit, ever wholly eliminate the

anthropomorphic element involved in this assumption, without which religion itself were not. It is of the essence of the religious consciousness to recognize the analogy subsisting between God's relations to man, and man's relations to his fellow. We are warned off from speaking of "the Divine will" or "the Divine purpose," as too anthropomorphic—savoring too much of simple humanity and human psychology—and are bidden speak only of "the Divine immanence" or "the Divine ground of our being."

4. Anthropomorphism and the Exigencies of Human Thinking:

But these speculative objections really spring from a shallow interpretation of the primary facts of human consciousness, which, in the deepest realm of inner experience, claims the indefeasible right to speak of the Divine nature in human terms, as may best be possible to our being. The proper duty or function of philosophy is to take due account of such direct and primary facts of our nature: the basal facts of our being cannot be altered to suit her convenience.

5. Anthropomorphism and Theism:

If we were to interpret the impalpable and omni-present Energy, from which all things proceed, in terms of force, then, as Flake said, "there is scarcely less anthropomorphism lurking in the phrase 'Infinite Power,' than in the phrase 'Infinite Person.'" Besides which, the soul of man could never be content with the former phrase, for the soul wants more than dynamics. But if we have ascribed to God certain attributes in keeping with the properties of the one Protean force behind all nature-manifestations, it has been to help purge our conception of God of objectionable anthropomorphic elements. The exigencies of human thinking require us to symbolize the nature of Deity in some psychical way whereby He shall have for us some real meaning; hence those quasi-personal or anthropomorphic forms of expression, which inhere in the most perfected conceptions of Deity, as well as in the crude ideas of unreflective spiritism. And if all anthropomorphism could be dissipated by us, we should in the process have demolished theism—a serious enough issue for religion.

6. Symbolic Forms of Thought:

Even speech has been declared to be a sensuous symbol, which makes knowledge of God impossible. To such an extent have the hyper-critical objections to anthropomorphism been pressed. Symbol of the Divine, speech may, in this sense, be; but it is a symbol whereby we can mark, distinguish or discern the super-sensible. Thus our abstract conceptions are by no means sensuous, however the language may originally have set out from a sensuous significance. Hence, it would be a mistake to suppose that our knowledge of God must remain anthropomorphic in content, and cannot think the Absolute Being or Essence save in symbolic form. It is a developmental law of religion—as of spirit in general—that the spiritual grows always more clearly differentiated from the symbolic and sensuous. The fact that our knowledge of God is susceptible of advance does not make the idea of God a merely relative one. God's likeness to man, in respect of the attributes and elements essential to personal spirit, must be presupposed as a fundamental reality of the universe. In this way or sense, therefore, any true idea of

God must necessarily be anthropomorphic.

7. Philosophic Pantheism:

We cannot prove in any direct manner—either psychological or historical—that man was really made in God's image. But there is no manner of doubt that, on the other hand, man has always made God in his (man's) own image. Man can do no otherwise. Because he has purged his conceptions of Deity after human pattern, and no longer cares much to speak of God as a jealous or repentant or punitive Deity, as the case may be, it yet by no means follows that "the will of God" and "the love of God" have ceased to be of vital interest or primary importance for the religious consciousness. All man's constructive powers —intellectual, aesthetical, ethical, and spiritual—combine in evolving such an ideal, and believing in it as the personal Absolute, the Ideal-Real in the world of reality. Even in the forms of philosophic pantheism, the factors which play in man's personal life have not ceased to project themselves into the pantheistic conceptions of the cosmic processes or the being of the world.

8. Anthropomorphism and Personalized or Mediated Knowledge:

But man's making of God in his (man's) own image takes place just because God has made man in His own image. For the God, whom man makes for himself, is, before all things, real—no mere construction of his intellect, no figure or figment of his imagination, but the prius of all things, the Primal, Originative Reality. Thus we see that any inadequacy springing out of the anthropomorphic character of our religious knowledge or conceptions is not at all so serious as might at first sight be supposed, since it is due merely to the necessarily personalized or mediated character of all our knowledge whatsoever. For all our experience is human experience, and, in that sense, anthropomorphic. Only the most pitiful timidity will be scared by the word "anthropomorphism," which need not have the least deterrent effect upon our minds, since, in the territory of spirit, our conceptions are purged of anthropomorphic taint or hue, the purer our human consciousness becomes.

9. From Greek Polytheism to Modern Ethical Monotheism.

To say, as we have done, that all knowledge is anthropomorphic, is but to recognize its partial, fallible, progressive or developmental character. It is precisely because this is true of our knowledge of God that our improved and perfected conceptions of God are the most significant feature in the religious progress of humanity. Only in course of the long religious march, wherein thought has shot up through the superincumbent weight of Greek polytheism into monotheism, and emerged at last into the severely ethical monotheism of our time, has religion been gradually stripped of its more crude anthropomorphic vestments. It cannot too clearly be understood that the religious ideal, which man has formed in the conception of the Absolute Personality, is one which is rooted in the realm of actuality. Not otherwise than as a metaphysical unity can God be known by us—intelligible only in the light of our own self-conscious experience.

10. Greek Thought:

It is a mere modern—and rather unillumined—abuse of the term anthropomorphic which tries to affix it, as a term of reproach, to every hypothetical endeavor to frame a conception of God. In the days of the Greeks, it was only the ascription to the gods of human or bodily form that led Xenophanes to complain of anthropomorphism. This Xenophanes naturally took to be an illegitimate endeavor to raise one particular kind of being—one form of the finite—into the place of the Infinite. Hence he declared, "There is one God, greatest of all gods and men, who is like to mortal creatures neither in form nor in mind."

11. Anthropomorphism of Israel:

But the progressive anthropomorphism of Greece is seen less in the humanizing of the gods than in the claim that "men are mortal gods," the idea being, as Aristotle said, that men become gods by transcendent merit. In this exaltation of the nature of man, the anthropomorphism of Greece is in complete contrast with the anthropomorphism of Israel, which was prone to fashion its Deity, not after the likeness of anything in the heavens above, but after something in the earth beneath. Certain professors of science have been mainly responsible for the recent and reprehensible use of the term, so familiar to us, for which we owe them no particular gratitude.

12. Twofold Nature of the Anthropomorphic Difficulty:

The anthropomorphic difficulty is a twofold one. Religion, as we have just shown, must remain anthropomorphic in the sense that we cannot get rid of imputing to the universe the forms of our own mind or life, since religion is rooted in our human experience. As we have already hinted, however, religion is in no worse case in that respect than science. For nothing is more idle than the pretension that science is less anthropomorphic than religion—or philosophy either—as if science were not, equally with these, an outcome and manifestation of human thinking! It is surely most obvious that the scientist, in any knowledge of reality he may gain, can, no more than the religionist—or the metaphysician—jump off his own shadow, or make escape from the toils of his own nature and powers. For knowledge of any sort—whether religious or scientific or philosophical—a certain true anthropomorphism is necessary, for it is of the essence of rationality. Nature, of which science professes a knowledge, is really a man- made image, like unto its human maker. Say what science will, this is the objectively real of science—a cognition which, critically viewed, is only subjectively valid. There is no other way by which science can know the being of the world than after the human pattern. It is, however, a serious issue that this human element or factor has often unduly penetrated the realm of the Divine, subordinating it and dragging it down to human aims and conceptions.

13. Need of Rising Higher:

Hence arises the second aspect of the anthropomorphic difficulty, which is, the need of freeing religion from anthropomorphic tendency, since it can be no satisfactory revealer of truth, so long as its more or less unrefined anthropomorphism contracts or subjugates reality to the conditions of a particular kind of being. It is perfectly clear that religion, whose every aim is to raise man beyond the limitations of his

natural being, can never realize its end, so long as it remains wholly within the human sphere, instead of being something universal, transcendent, and independent. This is precisely why religion comes to give man's life the spiritual uplift whereby it rises to a new center of gravity—a true center of immediacy—in the universe, rises, indeed, beyond time and its own finitude to a participation in the universal and transcendent life of the Eternal. It does so without feeling need to yield to the anthropomorphic tendency in our time to attribute a necessity in God for an object to love, as if His egoistic perfection were not capable of realizing love's infinite ideal in itself, and without dependence upon such object.

14. God in Christ the True Solution:

We affirm that God in Christ, in revealing the fact of the likeness of man being eternal in God, disclosed the true anthropomorphism of our knowledge of God—it is with respect to the essential attributes and elements of personal spirit. It is easy to see how the early ascriptions to God of the form and members of the human body, and other non-essential accompaniments of personality, arose. The scriptural representations as to God's hand, eye, and ear, were declared by Calvin to be but adaptations to the slow spiritual progress of men—an infantile mode of talk, as Calvin puts it, like that of nurses to children. But we have got finely clear of essential anthropomorphism, if, with Isa 55:8, we fully recognize that God's "thoughts are not" our "thoughts," nor God's "ways" our "ways." LITERATURE.

E. Caird, Evolution of Religion, 1893; J. Martineau, A Study of Religion, 1889; J. Fiske, The Idea of God, 1901; J. Orr, God's Image in Man, 1905; D. B. Purinton, Christian Theism, 1889; J. Lindsay, Recent Advances in Theistic Philosophy of Religion, 1897; Studies in European Philosophy, 1909.

James Lindsay

ANTI-LIBANUS

an-ti-lib'-a-nus. See LEBANON.

ANTICHRIST

an'-ti-krist (antichristos):

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. The Gospels

2. Pauline Epistles

3. Johannine Epistles

4. Book of Revelation

III. IN APOCALYPTIC WRITINGS

IV. IN PATRISTIC WRITINGS

V. MEDIAEVAL VIEWS

1. Christian

2. Jewish VI. POST-REFORMATION VIEWS

LITERATURE

The word "antichrist" occurs only in 1Joh 2:18,22; 4:3; 2Joh 1:7, but the idea which the word conveys appears frequently in Scripture.

I. In the Old Testament.

Antichrist in the Old Testament:

As in the Old Testament the doctrine concerning Christ was only suggested, not developed, so is it with the doctrine of the Antichrist. That the Messiah should be the divine Logos, the only adequate expression of God, was merely hinted at, not stated: so Antichrist was exhibited as the opponent of God rather than of His anointed. In the historical books of the Old Testament we find "Belial" used as if a personal opponent of Yahweh; thus the scandalously wicked are called in the King James Version "sons of Belial" (Jud 19:22; 20:13), "daughter of Belial" (1Sa 1:16), etc. The the Revised Version (British and American) translates the expression in an abstract sense, "base fellows," "wicked woman." In Da 7:7,8 there is the description of a great heathen empire, represented by a beast with ten horns: its full antagonism to God is expressed in a little eleventh horn which had "a mouth speaking great things" and "made war with the saints" (Da 7:8,21). Him the ‘Ancient of Days’ was to destroy, and his kingdom was to be given to a ‘Son of Man’ (Da 7:9-14). Similar but yet differing in many points is the description of Antiochus Epiphanes in Da 8:9-12,23-25.

II. In the New Testament.

1. The Gospels:

In the Gospels the activity of Satan is regarded as specially directed against Christ. In the Temptation

(Mt 4:1-10; Lu 4:1-13) the Devil claims the right to dispose of "all the kingdoms of the world," and has his claim admitted. The temptation is a struggle between the Christ and the Antichrist. In the parable of the Tares and the Wheat, while He that sowed the good seed is the Son of Man, he that sowed the tares is the Devil, who is thus Antichrist (Mt 13:37-39). our Lord felt it the keenest of insults that His miracles should be attributed to Satanic assistance (Mt 12:24-32). In Joh 14:30 there is reference to the "Prince of the World" who "hath nothing" in Christ.

2. Pauline Epistles:

The Pauline epistles present a more developed form of the doctrine. In the spiritual sphere Paul identifies Antichrist with Belial. "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" (2Co 6:15). 2 Thessalonians, written early, affords evidence of a considerably developed doctrine being commonly accepted among believers. The exposition of 2Th 2:3-9, in which Paul exhibits his teaching on the ‘Man of Sin,’ is very difficult, as may be seen from the number of conflicting attempts at its interpretation. See MAN OF SIN. Here we would only indicate what seems to us the most plausible view of the Pauline doctrine. It had been revealed to the apostle by the Spirit that the church was to be exposed to a more tremendous assault than any it had yet witnessed. Some twelve years before the epistle was penned, the Roman world had seen in Caligula the portent of a mad emperor. Caligula had claimed to be worshipped as a god, and had a temple erected to him in Rome. He went farther, and demanded that his own statue should be set up in the temple at Jerusalem to be worshipped. As similar causes might be expected to produce similar effects, Paul, interpreting "what the Spirit that was in him did signify," may have thought of a youth, one reared in the purple, who, raised to the awful, isolating dignity of emperor, might, like Caligula, be struck with madness, might, like him, demand Divine honors, and might be possessed with a thirst for blood as insatiable as his. The fury of such an enthroned maniac would, with too great probability, be directed against those who, like the Christians, would refuse as obstinately as the Jews to give him Divine honor, but were not numerous enough to make Roman officials pause before proceeding to extremities. So long as Claudius lived, the Antichrist manifestation of this "lawless one" was restrained; when, however, the aged emperor should pass away, or God’s time should appoint, that "lawless one" would be revealed, whom the Lord would "slay with the breath of his mouth" (2Th 2:8).

3. Johannine Epistles:

Although many of the features of the "Man of Sin" were exhibited by Nero, yet the Messianic kingdom did not come, nor did Christ return to His people at Nero’s death. Writing after Nero had fallen, the apostle John, who, as above remarked, alone of the New Testament writers uses the term, presents us with another view of Antichrist (1Joh 2:18,22; 4:3; 2 Joh 1:7). From the first of these passages ("as ye have heard that antichrist cometh"), it is evident that the coming of Antichrist was an event generally anticipated by the Christian community, but it is also clear that the apostle shared to but a limited extent in this popular expectation. He thought the attention of believers needed rather to be directed to the antichristian forces that were at work among and around them ("even now have .... arisen many antichrists"). From 1Joh 2:22; 4:3; 2Joh 1:7 we see that the apostle regards erroneous views of the person of Christ as the real Antichrist. To him the Docetism (i.e. the doctrine that Christ’s body was only a seeming one) which portended Gnosticism, and the elements of Ebionism (Christ was only a man),

were more seriously to be dreaded than persecution.

4. Book of Revelation:

In the Book of Revelation the doctrine of Antichrist receives a further development. If the traditional date of the Apocalypse is to be accepted, it was written when the lull which followed the Neronian persecution had given place to that under Domitian—"the bald Nero." The apostle now feels the whole imperial system to be an incarnation of the spirit of Satan; indeed from the identity of the symbols, seven heads and ten horns, applied both to the dragon (Re 12:3) and to the Beast (Re 13:1), he appears to have regarded the raison d'etre of the Roman Empire to be found in its incarnation of Satan. The ten horns are borrowed from Da 7, but the seven heads point, as seen from Re 17:9, to the "seven hills" on which Rome sat. There is, however, not only the Beast, but also the "image of the beast" to be considered (Re 13:14,15). Possibly this symbolizes the cult of Rome, the city being regarded as a goddess, and worshipped with temples and statues all over the empire.

From the fact that the seer endows the Beast that comes out of the earth with "two horns like unto a lamb" (Re 13:11), the apostle must have had in his mind some system of teaching that resembled Christianity; its relationship to Satan is shown by its speaking "as a dragon" (Re 13:11). The number 666 given to the Beast (Re 13:18), though presumably readily understood by the writer's immediate public, has proved a riddle capable of too many solutions to be now readily soluble at all. The favorite explanation Neron Qecar (Nero Caesar), which suits numerically, becomes absurd when it implies the attribution of seven heads and ten horns. There is no necessity to make the calculation in Hebrew; the corresponding arithmogram in the Sib Or, 1 32830, in which 888 stands for Iesous, is interpreted in Greek. On this hypothesis Lateinos, a suggestion preserved by Irenaeus (V, 30) would suit. If we follow the analogy of Daniel, which has influenced the Apocalyptist so much, the Johannine Antichrist must be regarded as not a person but a kingdom. In this case it must be the Roman Empire that is meant.

III. In Apocalyptic Writings.

Antichrist in the Apocalyptic Writings:

Although from their eschatological bias one would expect that the Jewish Apocalyptic Writings would be full of the subject, mention of the Antichrist occurs only in a few of the apocalypses. The earliest certain notice is found in the Sibylline books (1 167). We are there told that "Beliar shall come and work wonders," and "that he shall spring from the Sebasteni (Augusti)" a statement which, taken with other indications, inclines one to the belief that the mad demands of Caligula, were, when this was written, threatening the Jews. There are references to Beliar in the XII the Priestly Code (P), which, if the date ascribed to them by Dr. Charles, i.e. the reign of John Hyrcanus I, be assumed as correct, are earlier. Personally we doubt the accuracy of this conclusion. Further, as Dr. Charles admits the presence of many interpolations, even though one might assent to his opinions as to the nucleus of the XII the Priestly Code (P), yet these Beliar passages might be due to the interpolator. Only in one passage is "Beliar" antichristos as distinguished from antitheos; Da 5:10,11 (Charles' translation), "And there shall

rise unto you from the tribe of Judah and of Levi the salvation of the Lord, and he shall make war against Beliar, and execute everlasting vengeance on our enemies, and the captivity shall he take from Beliar and turn disobedient hearts unto the Lord." Dr. Charles thinks he finds an echo of this last clause in Lu 1:17; but may the case not be the converse?

The fullest exposition of the ideas associated with the antichrist in the early decades of Christian history is to be found in the Ascension of Isaiah. In this we are told that "Beliar" (Belial) would enter into "the matricide king" (Nero), who would work great wonders, and do much evil. After the termination of 1,332 days during which he has persecuted the plant which the twelve apostles of the Beloved have planted, "the Lord will come with his angels and with armies of his holy ones from the seventh heaven, with the glory of the seventh heaven, and he will drag Beliar into Gehenna and also his armies" (Da 4:3,13, Charles' translation). If the date at which Beliar was supposed to enter into Nero was the night on which the great fire in Rome began, then the space of power given to him is too short by 89 days. From the burning of Rome till Nero's death was 1,421 days. It is to be noted that there are no signs of the writer having been influenced either by Paul or the Apocalypse. As he expected the coming of the Lord to be the immediate cause of the death of Nero, we date the writing some months before that event. It seems thus to afford contemporary and independent evidence of the views entertained by the Christian community as to Antichrist.

IV. In Patristic Writings.

Patristic References to Antichrist:

Of the patristic writers, Polycarp is the only one of the Apostolic Fathers who refers directly to Antichrist. He quotes John's words, "Whosoever doth not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is Antichrist" (7), and regards Docetism as Antichrist in the only practical sense. Barnabas, although not using the term, implies that the fourth empire of Daniel is Antichrist; this he seems to identify with the Roman Empire (4:5). Irenaeus is the first- known writer to occupy himself with the number of the Beast. While looking with some favor on Lateinos, he himself prefers Teitan as the name intended (5:30). His view is interesting as showing the belief that the arithmogram was to be interpreted by the Greek values of the letters. More particulars as to the views prevailing can be gleaned from Hippolytus, who has a special work on the subject, in which he exhibits the points of resemblance between Christ and Antichrist (On Christ and Antichrist, 4.14.15. 19.25). In this work we find the assertion that Antichrist springs from the terms of Jacob's blessing to Dan. Among other references, the idea of Commodian (250 AD) that Nero risen from the dead was to be Antichrist has to be noticed. In the commentary on Revelation attributed to Victorinus of Petau there is, inserted by a later hand, an identification of Genseric with the "Beast" of that book. It is evident that little light is to be gained on the subject from patristic sources.

V. Medieval Views.

Much time need not be spent on the medieval views of Antichrist in either of the two streams in which it

flowed, Christian and Jewish.

1. Christian:

The Christian was mainly occupied in finding methods of transforming the names of those whom monkish writers abhorred into a shape that would admit of their being reckoned 666. The favorite name for this species of torture was naturally Maometis (Mohammed). Gregory IX found no difficulty in accommodating the name of Frederic II so as to enable him to identify his great antagonist with "the beast coming up out of the sea": this identification the emperor retorted on the pope. Rabanus Maurus gives a full account of what Antichrist was to do, but without any attempt to label any contemporary with the title. He was to work miracles and to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem. The view afterward so generally held by Protestants that the papacy was Antichrist had its representatives among the sects denounced by the hierarchy as heretical, as the Kathari. In various periods the rumor was spread that Antichrist had been already born. Sometimes his birthplace was said to be Babylon, sometimes this distinction was accorded to the mystical Babylon, Rome.

2. Jewish:

The Jewish views had little effect on Christian speculation. With the Talmudists Antichrist was named Armilus, a variation of Romulus. Rome is evidently primarily intended, but Antichrist became endowed with personal attributes. He makes war on Messiah, son of Joseph, and slays him, but is in turn destroyed by Messiah, Son of David.

VI. Post-Reformation Views.

Post-Reformation Theories of Antichrist:

In immediately post-Reformation times the divines of the Romish church saw in Luther and the Reformed churches the Antichrist and Beast of Revelation. On the other hand the Protestants identified the papacy and the Roman church with these, and with the Pauline Man of Sin. The latter view had a certain plausibility, not only from the many undeniably antichristian features in the developed Roman system, but from the relation in which the Romish church stood to the city of Rome and to the imperial idea. The fact that the Beast which came out of the earth (Re 13:11) had the horns of a lamb points to some relation to the lamb which had been slain (Re 5:6). Futurist interpreters have sought the Antichrist in historical persons, as Napoleon III. These persons, however, did not live to realize the expectations formed of them. The consensus of critical opinion is that Nero is intended by the Beast of the Apocalypse, but this, on many grounds, as seen before, is not satisfactory. Some future development of evil may more exactly fulfill the conditions of the problem.

LITERATURE.

Bousset, Der Antichrist; "The Antichrist Legend," The Expositor T, contains an admirable vidimus of

ancient authorities in the subject. See articles on subject in Schenkel’s Biblical Lex. (Hausrath); Herzog’s RE, 2nd edition (Kahler), 3rd edition (Sieffert); Encyclopedia Biblica (Bousset); with Commentaries on 2Th and Revelation. A full account of the interpretations of the "Man of Sin" may be seen in Dr. John Eadie’s essay on that subject in his Commentary on Thessalonians.

J. E. H. Thomson

ANTILOGEMENA

an-ti-le-gom’-e-na. See BIBLE; CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; DEUTERO-CANONICAL.

ANTIMONY

an’-ti-mo-ni. See COLOR.

ANTIOCH, IN SYRIA

an’-ti-ok, (Antiocheia).

(2) Antioch in Syria.—In 301 BC, shortly after the battle of Ipsus, which made him master of Syria, Seleucus Nicator rounded the city of Antioch, naming it after his father Antiochus. Guided, it was said, by the flight of an eagle, he fixed its site on the left bank of the Orontes (the El-‘Asi) about 15 miles from the sea. He also rounded and fortified Seleucia to be the port of his new capital.

The city was enlarged and embellished by successive kings of the Seleucid Dynasty, notably by Seleucus Callinicus (246-226 BC), and Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC). In 83 BC, on the collapse of the Seleucid monarchy, Antioch fell into the hands of Tigranes, king of Armenia, who held Syria until his defeat by the Romans fourteen years later. In 64 BC the country was definitely annexed to Rome by Pompey, who granted considerable privileges to Antioch, which now became the capital of the Roman province of Syria. In the civil wars which terminated in the establishment of the Roman principate, Antioch succeeded in attaching itself constantly to the winning side, declaring for Caesar after the fall of Pompey, and for Augustus after the battle of Actium. A Roman element was added to its population, and several of the emperors contributed to its adornment. Already a splendid city under the Seleucids, Antioch was made still more splendid by its Roman patrons and masters. It was the "queen of the East," the third city, after Rome and Alexandria, of the Roman world. About five miles distant from the city was the suburb of Daphne, a spot sacred to Apollo and Artemis.

This suburb, beautified by groves and fountains, and embellished by the Seleucids and the Romans with temples and baths, was the pleasure resort of the city, and "Daphnic morals" became a by-word. From its foundation Antioch was a cosmopolitan city. Though not a seaport, its situation was favorable to commercial development, and it absorbed much of the trade of the Levant. Seleucus Nicator had settled

numbers of Jews in it, granting them equal rights with the Greeks (Ant., XII, iii, 1). Syrians, Greeks, Jews, and in later days, Romans, constituted the main elements of the population. The citizens were a vigorous, turbulent and pushing race, notorious for their commercial aptitude, the licentiousness of their pleasures, and the scurrility of their wit. Literature and the arts, however, were not neglected.

In the early history of Christianity, Antioch occupies a distinguished place. The large and flourishing Jewish colony offered an immediate field for Christian teaching, and the cosmopolitanism of the city tended to widen the outlook of the Christian community, which refused to be confined within the narrow limits of Judaism. Nicolas, a proselyte of Antioch, was one of the first deacons (Ac 6:5). Antioch was the cradle of GentileChristianity and of Christian missionary enterprise. It was at the instance of the church at Antioch that the council at Jerusalem decided to relieve GentileChristians of the burden of the Jewish law (Ac 15). Antioch was Paul’s starting-point in his three missionary journeys (Ac 13:1 ff; 15:36 ff; 18:23), and thither he returned from the first two as to his headquarters (Ac 14:26 ff; 18:22). Here also the term "Christian," doubtless originally a nickname, was first applied to the followers of Jesus (Ac 11:26). The honorable record of the church at Antioch as the mother- church of GentileChristianity gave her a preeminence which she long enjoyed. The most distinguished of her later sons was John Chrysostom. The city suffered severely from earthquakes, but did not lose its importance until the Arab conquest restored Damascus to the first place among Syrian cities. Antioch still bears its ancient name (Antakiyeh), but is now a poor town with a few thousand inhabitants.

C. H. Thomson

ANTIOCH, OF PISIDIA

an’-ti-ok, pi-sid’-i-a (Antiocheia pros Pisidia, or aAntiocheia he Pisidia =" Pisidian").

1. History:

(1) Antioch of Pisidia was so called to distinguish it from the many other cities of the same name founded by Seleucus Nicator (301-280 BC) and called after his father Antiochus. It was situated in a strong position, on a plateau close to the western bank of the river Anthios, which flows down from the Sultan Dagh to the double lake called Limnai (Egerdir Gol). It was planted on the territory of a great estate belonging to the priests of the native religion; the remaining portions of this estate belonged later to the Roman emperors, and many inscriptions connected with the cult of the emperors, who succeeded to the Divine as well as to the temporal rights of the god, have survived. (See Sir W. M. Ramsay’s paper on "The Tekmoreian Guest-Friends" in Studies in the History and Art of the Eastern Roman Provinces, 1906.) The plateau on which Antioch stood commands one of the roads leading from the East to the Meander and Ephesus; the Seleucid kings regularly founded their cities in Asia Minor at important strategical points, to strengthen their hold on the native tribes.

There is no evidence that a Greek city existed on the site of Antioch before the foundation of Seleucus. Ramsay must be right in connecting Strabo’s statement that Antioch was colonized by Greeks from

Magnesia on the Meander with the foundation by Seleucus; for it is extremely unlikely that Greeks could have built and held a city in such a dangerous position so far inland before the conquest of Alexander. Pre-Alexandrian Greek cities are seldom to be found in the interior of Asia Minor, and then only in the open river valleys of the west. But there must have been a Phrygian fortress at or near Antioch when the Phrygian kings were at the height of their power. The natural boundary of Phrygian territory in this district is the Pisidian Mts., and the Phrygians could only have held the rich valley between the Sultan Dagh and Egerdir Lake against the warlike tribes of the Pisidian mountains on condition that they had a strong settlement in the neighborhood. We shall see below that the Phrygians did occupy this side of the Sultan Dagh, controlling the road at a critical point.

The Seleucid colonists were Greeks, Jews and Phrygians, if we may judge by the analogy of similar Seleucid foundations. That there were Jews in Antioch is proved by Ac 13:14,50, and by an inscription of Apollonia, a neighboring city, mentioning a Jewess Deborah, whose ancestors had held office in Antioch (if Ramsay's interpretation of the inscription, The Cities of Paul, 256, is correct). In 189 BC, after the peace with Antiochus the Great, the Romans made Antioch a "free city"; this does not mean that any change was made in its constitution but only that it ceased to pay tribute to the Seleucid kings. Antony gave Antioch to Amyntas of Galatia in 39 BC, and hence it was included in the province Galatia (see GALATIA) formed in 25 BC out of Amyntas' kingdom. Not much before 6 BC, Antioch was made a Roman colony, with the title Caesareia Antiocheia; it was now the capital of southern Galatia and the chief of a series of military colonies founded by Augustus, and connected by a system of roads as yet insufficiently explored, to hold down the wild tribes of Pisidia, Isauria and Pamphylia.

2. Pisidian Antioch:

Much controversy has raged round the question whether Antioch was in Phrygia or in Pisidia at the time of Paul. Strabo defines Antioch as a city of Phrygia toward Pisidia, and the same description is implied in Ac 16:6, and 18:23. Other authorities assign Antioch to Pisidia, and it admittedly belonged to Pisidia after the province of that name was formed in 295 AD. In the Pauline period it was a city of Galatia, in the district of Galatia called Phrygia (to distinguish it from other ethnical divisions of Galatia, e.g. Lycaonia). This view is certain on a study of the historical conditions (see Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 25 f); and is supported by the fact that Phrygian inscriptions (the surest sign of the presence of a Phrygian population, for only Phrygians used the Phrygian language) have been found around Antioch. See PISIDIA. This corner of Phrygia owed its incorporation in the province Galatia to the military situation in 39 BC, when Amyntas was entrusted with the task of quelling the disorderly Pisidian tribes. No scheme of military conquest in the Pisidian mountains could omit this important strategical point on the Northwest. This fact was recognized by Seleucus when he rounded Antioch, by Antony when he gave Antioch to Amyntas, and by Augustus when he made Antioch the chief of his military colonies in Pisidia. A military road, built by Augustus, and called the Royal Road, led from Antioch to the sister colony of Lystra. According to the story preserved in the legend of "Paul and Thekla," it was along this road that Paul and Barnabas passed on their way from Antioch to Iconium (Ac 13:51; compare 2Ti 3:11; see Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 27-36).

3. Language and Religion:

Latin continued to be the official language of Antioch, from its foundation as a Roman colony until the later part of the 2nd century AD. It was more thoroughly Romanized than any other city in the district; but the Greek spirit revived in the 3rd century, and the inscriptions from that date are in Greek. The principal pagan deities were Men and Cybele. Strabo mentions a great temple with large estates and many hierodouloi devoted to the service of the god.

4. Paul at Antioch:

Antioch, as has been shown above, was the military and administrative center for that part of Galatia which comprised the Isaurian, Pisidian and Pamphylian mountains, and the southern part of Lycaonia. It was hence that Roman soldiers, officials, and couriers were dispatched over the whole area, and it was hence, according to Ac 13:49, that Paul's mission radiated over the whole region. (On the technical meaning of "region" here, see PISIDIA.) The "devout and honorable women" (the King James Version) and the "chief men" of the city, to whom the Jews addressed their complaint, were perhaps the Roman colonists. The publicity here given to the action of the women is in accord with all that is known of their social position in Asia Minor, where they were often priestesses and magistrates. The Jews of Antioch continued their persecution of Paul when he was in Lystra (Ac 14:19). Paul passed through Antioch a second time on his way to Perga and Attalia (Ac 14:21). He must have visited Antioch on his second journey (Ac 16:6; Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 74 ff), and on his third (Ac 18:23; ibid., 96).

LITERATURE.

Antioch was identified by Arundel, Discoveries in Asia Minor, I, 281 f, with the ruins north of Yalovadj. A full account of the city in the Greek and Roman periods is given in Ramsay, . The Cities of Paul, 247-314. The inscriptions are published in CIG, 3979-81; LeBas, III, 1189 ff, 1815-25; CIL, III, 289 ff; Sterrett, Epigraphical Journey in Asia Minor, 121 ff; Wolfe Expedition in Asia Minor, 218 ff; Ephem. Epigr., V, 575; Athen. Mirth., XIV, 114. Add to this list (borrowed from Pauly-Wissowa) the inscriptions published in Ramsay's article on "The Tekmoreian Guest-Friends," referred to above. For the Phrygian inscriptions of the Antioch district, see Ramsay's paper in Jahresh. Oest. Arch. Inst., VIII, 85.

W. M. Calder

ANTIOCHIANS

an-ti-o'-ki-ans (Antiocheis, peculiar to the Apocrypha, 2 Macc 4:9,19): Antiochus Epiphanes was on the throne of Syria from 175 to 164 BC. His determined policy was to Hellenize his entire kingdom. The greatest obstacle to his ambition was the fidelity of the Jews to their historic religion. Many worldly Hebrews, however, for material advantage were willing to apostatize, among them, Jason, the brother of the faithful high priest Onias III. With a large sum of money (2 Macc 4:7-10) he bribed Antiochus to

appoint him high priest in his brother’s stead. This office, being, since Ezra’s time, political as well as religious, made him virtually the head of the nation.

He promised, on condition the king would permit him to build a Greek gymnasium at Jerusalem, "to train up the youth of his race in the fashions of the heathen," and to enrol the Hellenized people as Antiochians, i.e. to give all Jews who would adopt Greek customs and the Greek religion the rights and privileges of citizens of Antioch. The granting of this request made Jason the head of the Greek party at Jerusalem. "Such was the height of Greek fashions, and the increase of heathenish manners" under his perverted high-priesthood, that the priests under him lost courage to "serve any more at the altar, but despising the temple and neglecting the sacrifices, hastened" to ally themselves with the Grecians.

When the sacrifice of Hercules was observed in connection with the Grecian games at Tyre "Jason sent special messengers from Jerusalem, who were Antiochians" (2 Macc 4:19) with a large contribution of money. This Hellenizing program was supported by a decree of Antiochus which enjoined uniformity of worship throughout his dominions. He forbade the further observance of Jewish festivals, Sabbath, sacrifices in the temple and the rite of circumcision. His ambition included the like subjugation of Egypt, but being thwarted in his expedition thither by Roman envoys, he returned to Jerusalem to vent his anger on the Jews who refused to deny the faith of their fathers. The persecutions inflicted by the king upon these devout Jews abounded in every atrocity. All sacred books of the law that could be found were burned. This attempt to Hellenize the Jews was pushed to every remote rural village of Palestine. The universal peril led the Samaritans, eager for safety, to repudiate all connection and kinship with the Jews. They sent ambassadors and an epistle asking to be recognized as belonging to the Greek party, and to have their temple on Mt. Gerizim named "The Temple of Jupiter Hellenius." The request was granted. This was evidently the final breach between the two races indicated in Joh 4:9, "For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans."

Among those who refused to be enrolled as Antiochians was Mattathias, an aged priest of the order of Joarib. Mourning the terrible profanation of the holy city and temple he retired with his five sons to his ancestral estates among the mountains Northwest of Jerusalem. The emissaries of Antiochus followed him thither and commanded him to offer sacrifices upon a heathen altar. He was promised special royal favor in case of obedience. The indignant priest not only "had no ear for the temptations of an abhorred Hellenism," but in his fury instantly slew the apostate priest who attempted to comply with the command. He killed also the king’s commissioner and tore down the detested altar.

This act of heroism became the dawn of a new era. The people rallied to Mattathias’ support. The rebellion grew in power. After a year of inspiring leadership "the venerable priest-captain" died, having first committed "the cause of the law" to his sons, henceforth called Maccabees, from Judas Maccabeus, the son to whom he committed his work. Their victorious career brought to an end the Hellenizing process and the Greek party to which the Antiochians belonged. See also ANTIOCHUS IV.

LITERATURE.

Ant, XII, v; Stanley, History of the Jewish Church, III, section 48; Riggs, History of the Jewish People, chapter ii, sections 15-26 (Kent's Hist. Series, IV).

Dwight M. Pratt

ANTIOCHIS

an-ti'-o-kis (Antiochis): A concubine of Antiochus Epiphanes who had presented her with the two Cilician cities, Tarsus and Mallus. Dissatisfied with this the cities made insurrection (2 Macc 4:30).

ANTIOCHUS

an-ti'-o-kus (Antiochos; A, Antimachos (1 Macc 12:16)): The father of Numenius, who in company with Antipater, son of Jason, was sent by Jonathan on an embassy to the Romans and Spartans to renew "the friendship" and "former confederacy" made by Judas (1 Macc 12:16; 14:22; Ant, XIII, vi; 8).

ANTIOCHUS I

an-ti'-o-kus (Antiochos Soter, "savior"): born 323 BC; died 261, son of Seleucus Nicator. He fell in love with his stepmother, Stratonike, and became very ill. His father, when he discovered the cause of his son's illness, gave her to him in 293, and yielded to him the sovereignty over all the countries beyond the Euphrates, as well as the title of king. When Seleucus returned to Macedonia in 281, he was murdered by Ptolemeus Ceraunus. Antiochus thus became ruler of the whole Syrian kingdom. He waged war on Eumenes of Pergamum, but without success. For the victories of his elephant corps over the Gauls, who had settled in Asia Minor, he received the surname of Soter ("Deliverer"). It was in a battle with these inveterate foes of his country that he met his death (261 BC). See also SELEUCIDAE.

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS II

Surnamed Theos (Theos, "god"): Son and successor of Antiochus (261-246 BC). He made a successful war on Ptolemy Philadelphus of Egypt, but was obliged to buy peace in 250 by divorcing his wife, Laodice, and by marrying Ptolemy's daughter, Berenice. After the death of Ptolemy, "the king of the south" (Da 11:6) 248 BC, he recalled Laodice and named her eldest son (Seleucus Kallinikos) as his successor to the throne; but Laodice (probably because she feared a second repudiation) had Berenice, her child, and Antiochus all murdered (246 BC). The Milesians gave him the surname of Theos in gratitude for his liberating them from the tyranny of Timarchus. (See Arrian, I, 17, 10, and 18, 2; Josephus, Ant, XII, iii, 2; Dittenberger, Sylloge Inscr. Graec, 166-71.)

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS III

(Megas, "The Great," mentioned in 1 Macc 1:10; 8:6-8): Son of Seleucus Kallinikos; succeeded to the throne of Syria in 222 BC; put to death his general, Hermeas, and then led an army against Egypt. Theodotus surrendered to him Tyre, Ptolemais and his naval fleet. Rhodes and Cyzicus, as well as Byzantium and Aetolia, desired peace, but Antiochus declined to accept their terms. He renewed the war, but was defeated at Raphia in 217, and was obliged to give up Phoenicia and Coelesyria; Seleucia, however, he retained. He undertook to bring under his sway again all the territory of the Far East. His expedition against Bactria and Parthia gained for him the surname of "The Great." In 209 he carried away the treasure of the goddess Aine in Ecbatana, defeated the Parthians, and in 208 marched against the Bactrians. Later he made a treaty with an Indian rajah, and then returned to the West by way of Arachosia and Carmania, forcing the Gerraean Arabs to furnish him with frankincense, myrrh and silver. Then he took Ephesus, which he made his headquarters. In 196 he had crossed the Hellespont and rebuilt Lysimachia. Hannibal visited Antiochus in Ephesus the next year and became one of the king’s advisers. He sought the friendship also of Eumenes of Pergamum, but without success.

Rome now requested the king not to interfere in Europe, or to recognize the right of the Romans to protect the Greeks in Asia. A war broke out in 192, and Antiochus was persuaded to come to Greece. The Aetolians elected him their general, who asked the Acheans to remain neutral. But the patriotic Philopoemen decided that an alliance with Rome was to be preferred. Antiochus first captured Calchis; then succeeded in gaining a footing in Boeotia, and later made an effort to get possession of Thessaly, but retired on the approach of the Macedonian army. In 191 the Romans made a formal declaration of war on Antiochus, who, being at that time in Acarnania, returned to Calchis, and finally sailed back to Ephesus. The Romans regained possession of Boeotia, Euboea and Sestus; but Polyxenidas defeated the Roman fleet near Samos, which island, together with Cyme and Phocaea, fell into the hands of Antiochus. The victorious Polyxenidas, however, soon sustained a crushing defeat at the hands of the Romans, and Antiochus abandoned Lysimachia, leaving an open road to Asia to the Romans. He was finally defeated at Magnesia and sent word to Scipio, who was at Sardis, that he was willing to make peace; but Scipio ordered him to send envoys to Rome. A decision was reached in 189; the Asiatic monarch was obliged to renounce everything on the Roman side of the Taurus; give up all his ships of war but ten and pay 15,000 talents to Rome, and 500 to Eumenes. Antiochus marched against the revolted Armenians in 187. In order to replenish his exhausted treasury, he attempted to plunder a temple and both he and his soldiers were slain by the Elymeans.

LITERATURE. Polyb. v.40.21; Livy xxxi.14; xxxiii. 19 ff; Josephus, Ant, XII; Heyden, Res ab Ant; Babelon, Rois de Syrie, 77-86; Da 11:10-19; Tetzlaff, De Antiochi III Magni rebus gestis (Munster, 1874).

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS IV; ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES

(Epiphanes, e-pif’-a-naz, "Illustrious"): Son of Antiochus III who became king after his brother, Seleucus IV, had been murdered by Heliodorus. As a boy Antiochus lived at Rome as a hostage. The Pergamene monarchs, Eumenes and Attalus, succeeded in placing upon the throne the brother of Seleucus, although Heliodorus had wished to ascend the throne himself. The young king was even more enterprising than his father. He was called in to settle a quarrel between Onias III and his brother, Jason, the leader of the Hellenizing faction in Jerusalem, and Onias was driven out (2 Macc 4:4-6). Jason became high priest in his stead (2 Macc 4:9-16; 1 Macc 1:10-15; Ant, XII, v, 1). Antiochus himself afterward visited Jerusalem and was signally honored (2 Macc 4:22). On the death of Ptolemy VI in 173, Antiochus laid claim to Coelesyria, Palestine and Phoenicia; whereupon war broke out between Syria and Egypt. In this war Antiochus was victorious. Ptolemy Philometor was taken prisoner, and Antiochus had himself crowned king of Egypt (171-167 BC) at Memphis; whereupon Alexandria revolted and chose Ptolemy’s brother as their king. The Roman ambassador, Popilius Laenas, demanded the surrender of Egypt and the immediate withdrawal of its self-constituted king. Antiochus yielded; gave up Pelusium and withdrew his fleet from Cyprus, but retained Coelesyria, Palestine and Phoenicia.

While Antiochus was on a second campaign in Egypt, he heard of the siege of Jerusalem. He returned immediately, slew many thousands of the inhabitants and robbed the temple of its treasures (1 Macc 1:20-24; 2 Macc 5:11-21). By his prohibition of the Jewish worship and his introduction or substitution of the worship of the Olympian Zeus (1 Macc 1:54; 2 Macc 6:2; Ant, XII, v, 4) he brought about the insurrection of the Jews, under the Maccabees, upon whom he made an unsuccessful war in 167-164 BC. After this war Antiochus retired to the eastern provinces and died, after having failed in an attack on the temple of the Sun in Elymais, in Persia. See also ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION; ANTIOCHIANS.

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS V

(Eupator, "Nobleborn"): Son and successor to Antiochus Epiphanes, ascended the throne as a mere boy (163-161 BC) under the guardianship of Lysias, who led an expedition to the relief of Jerusalem, which had been besieged by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 6:18-30; Ant, XII, ix, 4), who was defeated (1 Macc 6:42). Antiochus then besieged Jerusalem. Peace was finally concluded on the condition that the Jews should not be compelled to change any of their national customs (1 Macc 6:55-60; Ant, XII, ix, 7). Philip, the king’s foster-brother (2 Macc 9:29), was defeated at Antioch, but soon afterward Lysias and Antiochus were themselves defeated by Demetrius Soter, son of Seleucus Philopator (1 Macc 7:4; 2 Macc 14:2; Ant, XII, x, 1; Polyb. xxxi.19; Livy Epit. 46).

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS VI

(Surnamed Theos (Theos), or, according to coins, Dionysus Epiphanes): Was the son of Alexander

Balas, who claimed to be the son of Antiochus Epiphanes. Alexander left the throne to his son in 146 BC. The young king retired to Arabia—perhaps through compulsion. The shrewd diplomatist and skillful general, Tryphon, succeeded first in winning over to his side the two leaders of the Jews, Jonathan and Simon, and then, by force of arms, in making the Syrians recognize his protege. As soon as the monarchy had been firmly established, Tryphon unmasked his projects: he had been ambitious only for himself; Antiochus had been only an instrument in his hands. In 143; after a reign of a little more than three years, Antiochus was assassinated by Tryphon, who ascended the throne himself (1 Macc 13:31; Ant, XIII, vii, 1; Livy Epit. 55).

J. E. Harry

ANTIOCHUS VII

(Surnamed Sidetes, Sidetes, after Sida in Pamphylia, where he was educated): Younger son of Demetrius Soter and brother of Demetrius Nicator, whose wife, Cleopatra, he married when Demetrius was taken prisoner by the Parthians. Antiochus overthrew the usurper, Tryphon, and ascended the throne himself and reigned from 139 to 130 BC. He defeated John Maccabeus and besieged Jerusalem (Ant., XIII, viii, 2), but concluded a favorable peace (Ant., XIII, viii, 3) from fear of Rome. Later he waged war with the Parthians and was slain in battle (1 Macc 15:2-9,28-31).

J. E. Harry

ANTIPAS

an’-ti-pas (Antipas): The name is an abbreviation of Antipater:

(1) A name of Herod "the tetrarch" (in Jos), son of Herod the Great, the brother of Archelaus (Mt 14:1; Lu 3:1; 9:7; Ac 13:1). See HEROD.

(2) A martyr of the church of Pergamum, described as "my witness, my faithful one" (Re 2:13).

ANTIPATER

an-tip’-a-ter (Antipatros): One of two envoys sent by the senate of the Jews to the Romans and Spartans (1 Macc 12:16; 14:22).

ANTIPATRIS

an-tip’-a-tris (Antipatris): Is mentioned in Scripture only once, in connection with the descent of Paul from Jerusalem to Caesarea (Ac 23:31). References will be found in Ant, XIII, xv 1; XVI, v, 2; BJ, I, xxi, 9. It was a town built by Herod the Great, and called after his father Antipater. It is probably

identical with the modern Ras el-‘Ain, "fountain head," a large mound with ruins at the source of Nahr El‘aujeh, in the plain to the Northeast of Jaffa. There are remains of a crusading castle which may be the Mirabel of those times.

W. Ewing

ANTIQUITY an-tik’-wi-ti (qadhmah, from qadham, "to precede in time," "to be old"): In Eze 16:55; 36:11, rendered "former"; in Ps 129:6, "before." Translated "antiquity" only in Isa 23:7 to indicate the primeval age of Tyre, which Strabo terms, "after Sidon," the oldest Phoenician city. Delitzsch renders it "whose origin is from the days of the olden time."

ANTONIA

an-to’-ni-a. See JERUSALEM.

ANTOTHIJAH

an-to-thi’-ja. See ANTHOTHIJAH.

ANTOTHITE

an’-toth-it: the King James Version form of ANATHOTHITE (which see) (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (1Ch 11:28; 12:3).

ANUB

a’-nub (‘anubh, "ripe"): A descendant of Judah and son of Hakkoz (the King James Version Coz) 1Ch 4:8.

ANUS

a’-nus. See ANNUS (Apocrypha).

ANVIL

an’-vil (pa‘am): The word is used only once to mean anvil. The passage (Isa 41:7) refers to the custom still very common of workmen encouraging each other at their work. See CRAFTS. Just how pretentious the anvil of the ancients was we do not know. Most work requiring striking or beating, from the finest wrought jewelry to the largest copper vessels, is now done on an anvil shaped like an inverted letter L which is driven into a block of wood, or into the ground, or into a crack between two of the stone slabs

of the workman’s floor. The only massive anvils seen in the country today are modern and of foreign make.

James A. Patch

APACE

a-pas’ ("at a pace"): With "come," 2Sa 18:25; "flee," Jer 46:5, for "rapidly," "hastily," "fast," corresponding to a Hebrew idiom that adds emphasis or intensity to an idea by repetition of the word or its equivalent.

APAME

a-pa’-me, ap’-a-me (Apame): A concubine of Darius and a daughter of Bartacus the Illustrious, whose behavior to the king is referred to in a speech of Zerubbabel before the king to prove to him the great power of women (1 Esdras 4:29).

See BARTACUS; ILLUSTRIOUS.

APART

a-part’ (badh, "separation," i.e. alone, by oneself; niddah, "uncleanness" i.e. something put away: "an abomination"): In Zec 12:12-14 the former word is used eleven times with powerful effect to indicate the separation of families and the isolation of wives through excessive grief in Jerusalem on account of the slain Messiah. The latter word signifies removal from ceremonial uncleanness (Le 15:19; 18:19; Eze 22:10). In Greek, kat’ idian, "by themselves," of marked significance as expressing Christ’s desire for privacy in prayer, alone or with His disciples; either in a desert (Mt 14:13); a mountain (Mt 14:23); or a high mountain, at the time of the transfiguration (Mt 17:1,19), thus suggestive of the secrecy of prayer and communion with God. Used with reference also to Christ’s disclosures of His purpose and of the purport of His teaching in private to His disciples (Mt 20:17).

Dwight M. Pratt

APE

ap (qoph): The word occurs only in the two parallel passages (1Ki 10:22; 2Ch 9:21) in which the magnificence of Solomon is illustrated by the things which are brought to him from foreign countries. Apes are mentioned with gold, silver, ivory and peacocks. Peacocks are natives of India and Ceylon. Apes and ivory may have been brought from India or Africa. Gold and silver may have come from these or other quarters. An Indian origin may be inferred from the fact that the Hebrew qoph, the Greek kebos and the English "ape" are akin to the Sanskrit "kapi", which is referred to the root kap, kamp, "to

tremble"; but the question of the source of these imports depends upon what is understood by TARSHISH and OPHIR (which see). Canon Cheyne in Encyclopedia Biblica (s.v. "Peacock") proposes a reading which would give "gold, silver, ivory and precious stones" instead of "gold, silver, ivory, apes and peacocks." Assuming, however, that animals are here referred to, the word ape should be understood to mean some kind of monkey. The word "ape" is sometimes used for the tail-less apes or anthropoids such as the gorilla, the chimpanzee and the orangutang, as opposed to the tailed kinds, but this distinction is not strictly held to, and the usage seems formerly to have been freer than now.

Alfred Ely Day

APELLES

a-pel'-ez (Apelles): A Christian at Rome to whom Paul sends greetings (Ro 16:10). He is described by Paul as "the, approved in Christ," i.e. "that approved Christian" (Denney). In some way unknown to us Apelles had been tested and he had proved faithful (compare Jas 1:12; 2Ti 2:15). It is a common name. Many commentators refer to Horace (Satires, i.5.100): "Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego."

APHAEREMA

a-fer'-e-ma (Aphairema and Apherema; the King James Version Apherema). One of three districts taken from Samaria and added to Judea by Demetrius Nicator (1 Macc 11:34). Compare Ant., XIII, iv, 9.

APHARSATHCHITES; APHARSACHITES

af-ar-sath'-kits, a-far'-sak-its ('apharcathkhaye'): A tribe living in Samaria that protested against the rebuilding of the Temple, and brought their complaint to Darius (Ezr 4:9; 5:6; 6:6). The tribe has not yet been recognized with any certainty in the inscriptions. Rawlinson identifies them with the Persians; other scholars deny that any Assyrian king was ever so situated as to have been able to obtain colonists from Persia. Some maintain with Marquardt that the term is not the name of a tribe, but the title of certain officers under Darius. Fred. Delitzsch suggests the inhabitants of one of the two great Medean towns "Partakka" and "Partukka" mentioned in Esarhaddon's inscriptions. Andreas plausibly connects it with the Assyrian suparsak (Muss-Arnolt, Assyrian Dict., 1098), saqu (3) "general"; Scheft takes it from an old Iranian word aparasarka, "lesser ruler."

H. J. Wolf

APHARSITES

a-far'-sits ('apharcaye'): A tribe transferred to Samaria by Asnappar of Assyria (Ezr 4:9). Rawlinson identifies them with the APHARSACHITES (which see), taking Apharsites to be an accidental repetition of the same word. He understands "the Persians" to be meant in both cases. Others identify

them with a Median tribe mentioned in the inscriptions of Sennacherib as dwellers in the district of Parsua.

APHEK

a’-fek (’apheq, "fortress"; Aphek):

(1) In Jos 12:18 we should probably read with the Septuagint "the king of Aphek in Sharon." This may correspond to Aphek in 1Sa 4:1. It was a royal city of the Canaanites whose king was slain by Josh. Probably it is the Aphek mentioned by Josephus as being near to Antipatris (BJ, II, xix, 1). Kakon, a strong position commanding the main entrance to Samaria might suit; but the name has perished.

(2) (Greek Taphek or Apheka): A city in the lot of Asher (Jos 13:4). The inhabitants were not ejected by Asher, nor is it said that they became tributary (Jud 1:31). In this passage it is written ‘aphiq (Hebrew). It may be represented by ‘Afqa on Nahr Ibrahim, although this is probably farther north than we should expect.

(3) To this place the Philistines gathered their hosts, while the Israelites pitched by the fountain which is in Jezreel (1Sa 29:1). It has been generally supposed that these two positions were over against each other, and that therefore Aphek must be sought in the plain of Esdraelon. No place answering this description has been found here. Fuqu‘ah on Mount Gilboa is plainly impossible. If, however, this was only the rallying point of the Philistines from which they went up to Jezreel (1Sa 29:11), it may be identical with the Aphek in the plain of Sharon (compare 1Sa 29:1 above).

(4) A city on the plateau east of the Jordan, where disaster befell Benhadad (1Ki 20:26,30). The same place may be intended in 2Ki 13:17. The modern Fiq or Afiq (for both forms are heard) on the brow of the hill beyond Qal‘at el-Chucn, east of the Sea of Galilee, probably represents this ancient city.

W. Ewing

APHEKAH

a-fe’-ka (’apheqah, "force" or "strength"): An unidentified city in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:53).

APHEREMA

a-fer’-e-ma. See APHAEREMA (Apocrypha).

APHERRA

a-fer’-a (Apherra): Head of a family of children of Solomon’s servants in the post-exilic list, one of eight

listed in 1 Esdras 5:34 after Pochereth-hazzebaim of Ezr 2:57 = Ne 7:59.

APHIAH

a-fi’-a (’aphiach): A Benjaminate and an ancestor of King Saul (1Sa 9:1).

APHIK

a’-fik: Variant of APHEK (which see).

APHRAH

af’-ra: the King James Version form for the Revised Version (British and American) BETH-LEAPHRAH (Mic 1:10).

APHSES

af’-sez: the King James Version form for the Revised Version (British and American) HAPPIZZEZ (1Ch 24:15).

APOCALYPSE

a-pok’-a-lips. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; REVELATION OF JOHN.

APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH

ba’-ruk. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE INTRODUCTION

a-pok-a-lip’-tik lit’-er-a-tur:

INTRODUCTORY

I. BACKGROUND OF APOCALYPTIC

1. Judaism and Hellenism

2. Political Influences

II. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF APOCALYPTIC

1. Differences from Prophecy in Content

2. Differences from Prophecy in Literary Form

III. AUTHORSHIP OF JEWISH APOCALYPTIC WORKS

1. Pseudepigraphic Authors not Known Individually

2. General Resemblance and Mutual Dependence Show Them to be Products of One Sect

3. Three Jewish Sects Comprise Whole Literary Class

4. Not the Product of the Sadducees

5. Nor of the Pharisees

6. Probably Written by the Essenes

WORKS ENTITLED APOCALYPTIC

I. APOCALYPSES PROPER

1. Enoch Books:

(1) History of the Books;

(2) Summary;

(3) Language;

(4) Date;

(5) Internal Chronology: The Book of Noah;

(6) External Chronology;

(7) Slavonic Enoch;

(8) Secrets of Enoch

2. Apocalypse of Baruch:

(1) Summary;

(2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date;

(5) Relation to Other Books;

(6) The Rest of the Words of Baruch

3. The Assumption of Moses:

(1) Summary;

(2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date;

(5) Relation to Other Books

4. The Ascension of Isaiah:

(1) Summary;

(2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date

5. The Fourth Book of Esdras:

(1) Summary; (2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date

II. LEGENDARY WORKS

The Book of Jubilees:

(1) Summary;

(2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date

III. PSALMIC PSEUDEPGRAPHA

1. The Psalter of Solomon:

(1) Summary;

(2) Language;

(3) Date;

(4) Christology

2. The Odes of Solomon:

(1) Relation to Pistis Sophia and Summary;

(2) Date

IV. TESTAMENTS

1. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs:

(1) Summary:

(a) Reuben;

(b) Simeon;

(c) Levi;

(d) Judah;

(e) Issachar;

(f) Zebulun;

(g) Dan;

(h) Naphtali;

(i) Gad;

(j) Asher;

(k) Joseph;

(l) Benjamin;

(2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date and Authorship;

(5) Relation to Other Books

2. Testament of Adam

3. Testament of Abraham

4. Testament of Job:

(1) Summary;

(2) Structure;

(3) Language;

(4) Date and Authorship

V. SIBYLLINE ORACLES

VI. CONCLUSION

LITERATURE

A series of pseudepigraphic works, mainly of Jewish origin, appeared during the period between 210 BC and 200 AD. They have many features in common. The most striking is the resemblance they all bear to the Book of Daniel. Following this model, most of them use "vision" as a literary device by which to introduce their conceptions of the remote future. A side product of this same movement was the composition, mainly in Alexandria, of the Sibylline books. The literary device of "vision" was one used in the Aeneid by Virgil, the classical contemporary of a large number of these works. One peculiarity in regard to the majority of these documents is the fact that while popular among the Christian writers of the first Christian centuries, they disappeared with the advent of the Middle Ages, and remained unknown until the first half of the 19th century was well on in its course.

INTRODUCTORY

I. Background of Apocalyptic.

1. Judaism and Hellenism:

When the Jews came back from Babylon to Palestine, though surrounded by heathen of various creeds, they were strongly monotheistic. The hold the Persians had of the empire of Southwest Asia, and their religion—Zoroastrianism—so closely akin to monotheism, prevented any violent attempts at perverting the Jews. With the advent of the Greek power a new state of things emerged. Certainly at first there does not seem to have been any direct attempt to force them to abandon their religion, but the calm contempt of the Hellene who looked down from the superior height of his artistic culture on all barbarians, and the influence that culture had in the ruling classes tended to seduce the Jews into idolatry. While the governing orders, the priests and the leaders of the Council, those who came in contact with the generals and governors of the Lagids of Egypt, or the Seleucids of Syria, were thus inclined to be seduced into idolatry, there was a large class utterly uninfluenced by Hellenic culture, and no small portion of this class hated fanatically all tampering with idolatry.

When the dominion over Palestine passed out of the hands of the Ptolemies into that of the house of Seleucus, this feeling was intensified, as the Syrian house regarded with less tolerance the religion of

Israel. The opposition to Hellenism and the apprehension of it naturally tended to draw together those who shared the feeling. On the one side was the scribist legal party, who developed into the Pharisaic sect; on the other were the mystics, who felt the personal power of Deity. These afterward became first the Chasidim, then later the Essenes. These latter gradually retired from active participation in national life.

As is natural with mystics their feelings led them to see visions and to dream dreams. Others more intellectual, while they welcomed the enlightenment of the Greeks, retained their faith in the one God. To them it seemed obvious that as their God was the true God, all real enlightenment must have proceeded from Him alone. In such thinkers as Plato and Aristotle they saw many things in harmony with the Mosaic law. They were sure that there must have been links which united these thinkers to the current of Divine revelation, and were led to imagine of what sort these links necessarily were. The names of poets such as Orpheus and Linus, who survived only in their names, suggested the source of these links—these resemblances. Hence, the wholesale forgeries, mainly by Jews, of Greek poems. On the other hand, there was the desire to harmonize Moses and his law with the philosophical ideas of the time. Philo the Alexandrian, the most conspicuous example of this effort, could not have been an isolated phenomenon; he must have had many precursors. This latter movement, although most evident in Egypt, and probably in Asia Minor, had a considerable influence in Judea also.

2. Political Influences:

Political events aided in the advance of both these tendencies. The distinct favor that Antiochus the Great showed to the Greeks and to those barbarians who Hellenized, became with his son Antiochus Epiphanes a direct religious persecution. This emphasized the protest of the Chasidim on the one hand, and excited the imagination of the visionaries to greater vivacity on the other. While the Maccabees and their followers were stirred to deeds of valor, the meditative visionaries saw in God their refuge, and hoped for deliverance at the hand of the Messiah. They pictured to themselves the tyrant smitten down by the direct judgment of Yahweh. After the death of Epiphanes, the Maccabeans had become a power to be reckoned with, and the visionaries had less excitement from external events till the Herodian family found their way into supreme power.

At first the Herodians favored the Pharisaic party as that which supported John Hyrcanus II, the friend of Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, and the Essenes seem to have taken Herod at first into their special favor. However, there was soon a change. In consequence of the compliance with heathen practices, into which their connection with the Romans forced the Herodians, the more religious among the Jews felt themselves compelled to withdraw all favor from the Idumean usurper, and to give up all hope in him. This naturally excited the visionaries to new expectation of Divine intervention. Behind the Herodians was the terrible iron power of Rome. The Romans had intervened in the quarrel between John Hyrcanus and his brother Aristobulus. Pompey had desecrated the temple by intruding into the Holy of Holies. The disastrous overthrow that he suffered at the hands of Caesar and his miserable end on the shores of Egypt seemed to be a judgment on him for his impiety. Later, Nero was the especial mark for the Apocalyptists, who by this time had become mainly Christian. Later Roman emperors impressed the imagination of the Apocalyptists, as the Flavians.

II. General Characteristics of Apocalyptic.

1. Differences from Prophecy in Content:

Both in matter and form apocalyptic literal and the writings associated with it differ from the prophetic writings of the preceding periods. As already mentioned, while the predictive element as present in Apocalypses, as in Prophecy, it is more prominent and relates to longer periods and involves a wider grasp of the state of the world at large. Apocalypse could only have been possible under the domination of the great empires. Alike in Prophecy and in Apocalypse there is reference to the coming of the Messiah, but in the latter not only is the Messianic hope more defined, it has a wider reference. In the Prophets and Psalmists the Messiah had mainly to do with Israel. "He will save his people"; "He will die for them"; "His people shall be all righteous." All this applies to Israel; there is no imperial outlook. In the Apocalypses the imperial outlook is prominent, beginning with Daniel in which we find the Messianic kingdom represented by a "son of man" over against the bestial empires that had preceded (Da 7:13) and reaching the acme of Apocalypse, if not its conclusion, in the Revelation of John: "The kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of his Christ" (Re 11:15). While the prophet was primarily a preacher of righteousness, and used prediction either as a guarantee, by its fulfillment, of his Divine mission, or as an exhibition of the natural result of rebellion against God’s righteous laws, to the Apocalyptist prediction was the thing of most importance, and in the more typical Apocalypse there is no moral exhortation whatever.

2. Differences from Prophecy in Literary Form:

In the literary form employed there are marked differences between Apocalyptic and Prophecy. Both make use of vision, but in Prophecy, in the more restricted sense of the word, these visions are as a rule implied, rather than being described. Although Isaiah calls the greater part of his Prophecy "vision," yet in only one instance does he describe what he sees; as a rule he assumes throughout that has audience knows what is visible to him. The only instance (Isa 6) in which he does describe his vision is not at all predictive; the object is exhortation. In the case of the Apocalypses the vision is the vehicle by which the prediction is conveyed. In Ezekiel there are visions, but only one of these—"the valley of dry bones"—is predictive. In it the symbols used are natural, not, as always in Apocalypses, arbitrary. Compare in Daniel’s vision of the Ram and the He-goat (Da 8).

In Ezekiel the dry bones naturally suggest death, and the process by which they are revivified the reader feels is the natural course such an event would take did it come within the sphere of ordinary experience; while in what is told of the horns on the head of the Greek goat there is no natural reason for the changes that take place, only a symbolical one. This is still more marked in the vision of the Eagle in 4 Esdras 11. What may be regarded as yet more related to the form is the fact that while the Prophets wrote in a style of so elevated prose that it always hovered on the border of poetry—indeed, frequently passed into it and employed the form of verse, as Isa 26:1—the apocalyptists always used pure prose, without the elaborate parrallelism or cadenced diction of Hebrew poetry. The weird, the gorgeous, or the terrible

features of the vision described are thrown into all the higher relief by the baldness of the narrative.

III. Authorship of Jewish Apocalyptic Works.

1. Pseudepigraphic Authors not Known Individually:

In most cases the question of authorship is one that has to be discussed in regard to each work individually. A number of the characteristics of the works render such a procedure impossible in regard to them. If we put to the one side the two Apocalypses that form part of the canon, they are all pseudonymous, as Enoch and Baruch, or anonymous, as the Book of Jubilees. Many of them in addition show traces of interpolation and modification by later hands. If we had a full and clear history of the period during which they were written, and if its literature had to a great extent been preserved to us we might have been in a position to fix on the individual; but as matters stand, this is impossible. At the same time, however, from internal evidence, we may form some idea of the surroundings of those who have written these works.

2. General Resemblance and Mutual Dependence Show Them Products of One Sect:

From the striking resemblance in general style which they exhibit, and from the way in which some of them are related to the others, many of these works seem to have been the product of similar circumstances. Even those most removed from the rest in type and general attitude are nearer them than they are to any other class of work. All affirmative evidence thus points to these works having been composed by authors that were closely associated with each other. The negative evidence for this is the very small traceable influence these works had on later Jewish thought. Many of them axe quoted by the Christian Fathers, some of them by New Testament writers. The whole of these works have been preserved to us through Christian means. A large number have been preserved by being adopted into the Old Testament canon of the Ethiopic church; a considerable number have been unearthed from Ambrosian Library in Milan; most of them have been written in Palestine by Jewish writers; yet no clear indubitable sign of the knowledge of these books can be found in the Talmud.

3. Three Jewish Sects Comprise Whole Literary Class:

The phenomenon here noted is a striking one. Works, the majority of which are written in Hebrew by Jews, are forgotten by the descendants of these Jews, and are retained by GentileChristians, by nations who were ignorant of Hebrew and preserved them in Greek, Latin or Ethiopic translations. A characteristic of the Judaism during the period in which these books were appearing was the power exercised by certain recognized sects. If one takes the most nearly contemporary historian of the Jews, Josephus, as one’s authority, it is found how prominent the three sects, Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, were. To a certain extent this is confirmed by the Gospels and the Acts, with this noticeable exception—the Essenes are never mentioned by name.

4. Not the Product of the Sadducees:

The scribes, the literary class among the Jews, all belonged to one or other of these ruling sects. Consequently these works must have proceeded from members of one of those sects. Their mutual resemblance precludes their authors from belonging some to one sect and some to another. We know pretty exactly from Josephus and the New Testament what the character and tenets of the Sadducees were. They were the priestly sacerdotal class, and were above all, political schemers. They received only the Pentateuch as authoritative, and had no share in the Messianic hopes of which the Prophets were full. They believed neither in angel nor spirit, and had no hope of immortality (Ac 23:8). Josephus compares them with the followers of Epicurus among the Greeks. Nothing could be farther removed from the spirit and doctrines of the Apocalypses than all this. The Messianic hopes bulk largely; angels are prominent, then, hierarchies are described and their names given. The doctrine of immortality is implied, and the places of reward and punishment are described. The Apocalypses cannot therefore be attributed to the Sadducees.

5. Nor of the Pharisees: There is greater plausibility in attributing them to the Pharisees. So far as doctrines are concerned, there is no doubt that the agreement is relatively close. There are, however, difficulties in accepting this view of their origin. With the fall of the Jewish state, the Sadducees disappeared when there was no field for political activity, and when with the destruction of the temple there were no more sacrifices to require the services of Aaronic priests. Nearly contemporaneously the Essenes disappeared in Christianity. The Pharisees alone remained to carry on the traditions of Judaism.

We have in the Talmud the result of Pharisaic literary activity. The Mishna is the only part of this miscellaneous conglomeration which is at all nearly contemporary with the works before us. It has none of the characteristics of the apocalyptic writings. The later Hagadi Midrash have more resemblance to some of these, noticeably to the Book of Jubilees. Still, the almost total want of any references to any of the Apocalypses in the recognized Pharisaic writings, and the fact that no Jewish version of any of these books has been preserved, seems conclusive against the idea that the Apocalypses owed their origin to the Pharisaic schools. The books that form the ordinary Apocrypha are in a different position. The majority, if not the whole of them, were received into the Jewish canon of Alexandria. Some of them are found in Hebrew or Aramaic, as Ecclesiasticus, Tobit and Judith. None of the Apocalypses have been so found. This leads necessarily to the conclusion that the Pharisees did not write these books.

6. Probably Written by the Essenes:

By the method of exclusions we are led thus to adopt the conclusion of Hilgenfeld, that they are the work of the Essenes. We have, however, positive evidence. We know from Josephus that the Essenes had many secret sacred books. Those books before us would suit this description. Further, in one of these books (4 Esdras) we find a story which affords an explanation of the existence of these books. 2 (4) Esdras 14:40-48 tells how to Ezra there was given a cup of water as it were fire to drink, and then he dictated to five men. These men wrote in characters which they did not understand "for forty days" until they had written "four score and fourteen books" (Revised Version (British and American)). He is commanded, "The first that thou hast written publish openly, and let the worthy and unworthy read it: but keep the seventy last that thou mayest deliver them to such as be wise among thy people."

While the twenty-four books of the ordinary canon would be open to all, these other seventy books would only be known by the wise—presumably, the Essenes. This story proceeds on the assumption that all the biblical books had been lost during the Babylonian captivity, but that after he had his memory quickened, Ezra was able to dictate the whole of them; but of these only twenty-four were to be published to all; there were seventy which were to be kept by a society of wise men. This would explain how the Books of Enoch and Noah, and the account of the Assumption of Moses could appear upon the scene at proper times and yet not be known before. In the last-named book there is another device. Moses tells Joshua to embalm (hedriare) the writing which gives an account of what is coming upon Israel.

Books so embalmed would be liable to be found when Divine providence saw the occasion ripe. These works are products of a school of associates which could guard sacred books and had prepared hypotheses to explain at once how they had remained unknown, and how at certain crises they became known. All this suits the Essenes, and especially that branch of them that dwelt as Coenobites beside the Dead Sea. We are thus driven to adopt Hilgenfeld’s hypothesis that the Essenes were the authors of these books. Those of them that formed the Community of Engedi by their very dreamy seclusion would be especially ready to see visions and dream dreams. To them it seem no impossible thing for one of the brotherhood to be so possessed by the spirit of Enoch or of Noah that what he wrote were really the words of the patriarch. It would not be inconceivable, or even improbable, that Moses or Joshua might in a dream open to them books written long before and quicken their memories so that what they had read in the night they could recite in the day-time. As all the Essenes were not dwellers by the shores of the Dead Sea, or "associates with the palms of Engedi," some of the writings of this class as we might expect, betray a greater knowledge of the world, and show more the influence of events than those which proceeded from the Coenobites. As to some extent corroborative of this view, there is the slight importance given to sacrifice in most of these works.

WORKS ENTITLED APOCALYPTIC

Classes of Books:

In the classification of plants and animals in natural science the various orders and genera present the observer with some classes that have all the features that characterize the general Mass prominent and easily observable, while in others these features are so far from prominent that to the casual observer they are invisible. This may be seen in the apocalyptic writings: there are some that present all the marks of Apocalypses, such as the Book of Enoch, the Assumption of Moses and the Apocalypse of Baruch. They all claim to be revelations of the future—a future which begins, however, from the days of some ancient saint—and then, passing over the time of is actual composition, ends with the coming of the Messiah, the setting up of the Messianic kingdom and the end of the world. There are others, like the Book of Jubilees, in which the revelation avowedly looks back, and which thus contain an amount of legendary matter.

One of the books which are usually reckoned in this class, has, unlike most of the Apocalypses, which

are in prose, taken the Book of Psalms as its model—the Psalter of Solomon. A very considerable number of the works before us take the form of farewell counsels on the part of this or that patriarch. The most famous of these is the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. Although the great masonry have been written in Hebrew or Aramaic by Jews resident in Palestine, the Sibylline books, composed to a great extent by Jews of Alexandria, present an exception to this.

We shall in the remainder of the art consider these sub-classes in the order now mentioned:

(1) Typical Apocalypses;

(2) Legendary Testaments;

(3) Psalmic;

(4) Testaments;

(5) Sibylline Oracles.

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, 1

I. Apocalypses Proper.

As above indicated, all these take the Book of Daniel as their model, and imitate it more or less closely. One peculiarity in this connection must be referred to. While we have already said these later Apocalypses were practically unknown by the Jews of a couple of centuries after the Christian era, the Book of Daniel was universally regarded as authoritative alike by Jews and Christians. In considering these works, we shall restrict ourselves to those Apocalypses that, whether Jewish or Christian by religion, are the production of those who were Jews by nation.

1. Enoch Books:

The most important of these is the Book, or rather, Books of Enoch. After having been quoted in Jude and noticed by several of the Fathers, this work disappeared from the knowledge of the Christian church.

(1) History of the Books.

Fairly copious extracts from this collection of books had been made by George Syncellus, the 8th century chronographer. With the exception of those fragments, all the writings attributed to Enoch had disappeared from the ken of European scholars. In the last quarter of the 18th century. Bruce, the Abyssinian traveler, brought to Europe three copies of the Book of Enoch in Ethiopic, which had been regarded as canonical by the Abyssinian church, and had consequently been preserved by them. Of these

three copies, one he retained in Kinnaird House, another he presented to the Bodleian Library In Oxford, the third he gave to the Royal Library in Paris. For more than a quarter of a century these manuscripts remained as unknown as if they had still been in Abyssinia. In the year 1800 Sylvestre de Sacy published an article on Enoch in which he gave a translation of the first sixteen chapters. This was drawn from the Parisian copy.

Twenty-one years after Archbishop Laurence published a translation of the whole work from the manuscript in the Bodleian. Seventeen years after he published the text from the same MS. The expedition to Magdala under Lord Napier brought a number of fresh manuscripts to Europe; the German missionaries, for whose release the advance had been undertaken, brought a number to Germany, while a number came to the British Museum. Some other travelers had brought from the East manuscripts of this precious book. Flemming, the latest editor of the text, claims to have used 26 manuscripts. It needs but a cursory study of the Ethiopic text to see that it is a translation from a Greek original. The quotations in George Syncellus confirmed this, with the exception of a small fragment published by Mai.

Until the last decade of last century. Syncellus' fragments formed the only remains of the Greek text known. In 1892 M. Bouriant published from manuscripts found in Gizeh, Cairo, the Greek of the first 32 chapters. More of the Greek may be discovered in Egypt. Meantime, we have the Greek of chapters 1—32, and from the Vatican fragment a portion of chapter 89. A study of the Greek shows it also to have been a translation from a Hebrew original. Of this Hebrew original, however, no part has come down to us. As we have it, it is very much a conglomeration of fragments of various authorship. It is impossible to say whether the Greek translator was the collector of these fragments or whether, when the mass of material came into his hands, the interpolations had already taken place. However, the probability, judging from the usual practice of translators, is that as he got the book, so he translated it.

(2) Summary.

The first chapter gives an account of the purpose of the book, Enoch 2-5 an account of his survey of the heavens. With Enoch 6 begins the book proper. Chapters 6-19 give an account of the fallen angels and Enoch's relation to them. Chapters 20-36 narrate Enoch's wanderings through the universe, and give an account of the place of punishment, and the secrets of the West and of the center of the earth. This may be regarded as the First Book of Enoch, the Book of the Angels. With chapter 37 begins the Book of Similitudes.

The first Similitude (chapters 37-44) represents the future kingdom of God, the dwelling of the righteous and of the angels; and finally all the secrets of the heavens. This last portion is interesting as revealing the succession of the parts of this conglomeration—the more elaborate the astronomy, the later; the simpler, the earlier. The second Similitude (chapters 46-57) brings in the Son of Man as a superhuman if not also superangelic being, who is to come to earth as the Messiah. The third Similitude occupies chapters 58-71, and gives an account of the glory of the Messiah and of the subjugation of the kings of the earth under Him. There is interpolated a long account of Leviathan and Behemoth. There are also Noachian fragments inserted.

The Book of the Courses of the Luminaries occupies the next eleven chapters, and subjoined to these are two visions (chapters 83-90), in the latter of which is an account of the history of the world to the Maccabean Struggle. Fourteen chapters which follow may be called "The Exhortations of Enoch." The exhortations are emphasized by an exposition of the history of the world in 10 successive weeks. It may be noted here that there is a dislocation. The passage Enoch 91:12 contains the 8, 9, and 10 weeks, while chapter 93 gives an account of the previous 7. After chapter 104 there are series of sections of varying origin which may be regarded as appendices. There are throughout these books many interpolations. The most observable of these are what are known as "Noachian Fragments," portions in which Noah and not Enoch is the hero and spokesman. There are, besides, a number of universally acknowledged interpolations, and some that are held by some to be interpolated, are regarded by others as intimately related to the immediate context. The literary merit of the different portions is various: of none of them can it be called high. The Book of Similitudes, with its revelations of heaven and hell, is probably the finest.

(3) Language.

We have the complete books only in Ethiopic. The Ethiopic, however, is not, as already observed, the original language of the writings. The numerous portions of it which still survive in Greek, prove that at all events our Ethiopic is a translation from the Greek. The question of how far it is the original is easily settled. The angels assemble on Mt. Hermon, we are told (En 6), and bind themselves by an oath or curse: "and they called it Mount Hermon because they had sworn and bound themselves by mutual imprecation upon it." This has a meaning only in Hebrew or Aramaic, not in Greek. A very interesting piece of evidence of the original language is obtained from a blunder. In Enoch 90:38 we are told that "they all became white bullocks, and the first was the Word" (nagara). As for the appearance of this term, from its connection it is obvious that some sort of bullocks is intended. In Hebrew the wild ox is called re’em (Aramaic rima). The Greek translators, having no Greek equivalent available, transliterated as rem or rema. This the translators confused with Tema, "a word." It is impossible to decide with anything like certainty which of the two languages, Hebrew or Aramaic, was the original, though from the sacred character ascribed to Enoch the probability is in favor of its being Hebrew.

(4) Date.

The question of date is twofold. Since Enoch is really made up of a collection of books and fragments of books, the question of the temporal relation of these to each other is the primary one. The common view is that chapters 1-36 and 72-91 are by the same author, and form the nucleus of the whole. Although the weighty authority of Dr. Charles is against assigning these portions to one author, the resemblances are numerous and seem to us by no means so superficial as he would regard them. He, with most critics, would regard the Book of Similitudes as later.

Nevertheless, we venture to differ from this view, for reasons which we shall assign.

(5) Internal Chronology: The Book of Noah.

The fragments of the Book of Noah above alluded to present an intrusive element in the Book of Enoch. These, though fairly numerous, are not so numerous as Dr. Charles would claim. Those that show clear traces not only of being interpolations, but also of being interpolations from this Book of Noah, are found only in those portions of the Book that appear to be written by the author of Enoch 37-71. In them and in the Noachian fragments there are astronomical portions, as there are also in the portion that seems to proceed from another hand, chapters 1-36; 72- 91. When these are compared, the simplest account of the phenomena of the heavens is found in the non-Noachian portions, the first noted chapters 37-71; 92-107; the next in complexity is that found in the Noachian interpolations; the most complex is that contained in chapters 72-91.

This would seem to indicate that the earliest written portion was chapters 37-71; 92-107. Our view of the date of this middle portion of En, the Book of Similitudes, is opposed by Dr. Stanton (Jewish and Christian Messiah, 60-63; 241-44), who maintains that it is post-Christian. For this decision he rests mainly on the use of the title "Son of Man." This title, he says, as applied to the Messiah, is unknown in rabbinic literature. Rabbinic literature is all so late as to be of no value. The Mishna has few traces of Messianic belief, and was not committed to writing till the end of the 2nd century, when the difference between church and synagogue was accentuated. He further states that it was not understood by the Jews who heard our Lord, and brings as proof Joh 12:34, "The Son of Man must be lifted up. Who is this—the Son of Man?" Dr. Stanton (Jewish and Christian Messiah, 241) so translates the passage. To us, the last clause is a mistranslation.

The Greek usage in regard to houtos ho would lead us to translate: "Who is this peculiar kind of Son of Man?" This is the meaning which suits the context. our Lord had not in all the preceding speech used the title "Son of Man" of Himself. This sentence really proves that the multitude regarded the title as equivalent to Messiah or Christ. It might be paraphrased, "The Christ abideth ever; how sayest thou then, the Christ must be lifted up? Who is this Christ?" In fact, our Lord’s adoption of the title is unintelligible unless it were understood by His audience as a claim to being Messiah. It had the advantage that it could not be reported to the Romans as treasonable. There are supplementary portions of Enoch which may be neglected. At first sight 10:1-3 appear to declare themselves as Noacinan, but close inspection shows this to be a misapprehension. If we take the Greek text of Syncellus, Uriel the angel sent to Noah.

The Ethiopic and Gizeh Greek are at this point clearly corrupt. Then the introduction of Raphael implies that the first portion of this chapter and this Raphael section are by the same author. But the Raphael section has to do with the binding of Azazel, a person intimately connected with the earlier history of the Jews. Should it be objected that according to the Massoretic reckoning, as according to that of the Septuagint, Noah and Enoch were not living together, it may be answered that according to the Samaritan they were for 180 years contemporaries. In chapter 68 Noah speaks of Enoch as his grandfather, and assumes him to be a contemporary of himself. Moreover, we must not expect precise accuracy from Apocalyptists.

(6) External chronology.

When the internal chronology of the book is fixed, the way is open for considering the relation of external chronology. Dr. Charles has proved that the Book of Jubilees implies the Noachian portion in the Enoch Books. There are notices of the existence of a Book of Noah (Jub 10:13). There is reference also to a Book of Enoch (Jub 21:10). Dr Charles would date the Book of Jubilees between 135 and 105 BC. If, then, the Book of Noah was already known, and, as we have seen, the Book of Enoch was yet older, it would be impossible to date Enoch earlier than 160 BC. Personally we are not quite convinced of the correctness of Dr. Charles' reasonings as to the date of the Book of Jubilees, as will be shown at more length later.

There appears to us a reference in Enoch 66:5 to the campaign of Antiochus the Great against the Parthians and the Medes. Early in his reign (220 BC) he had made an expedition to the East against the revolted provinces of Media and Persia, which he subdued. This was followed (217 BC) by a campaign in Palestine, which at first successful, ended in the defeat of Raphia. In the year 212 BC he made a second expedition to the East, in which he invaded India, and subdued into alliance the formidable Parthian and Bactrian kingdoms. The expectation was natural that now, having gained such an access of power and reputation, Antiochus would desire to wipe out the dishonor of Raphia. It was to be anticipated that along with the nationalities from which ordinarily the Syriac armies were recruited, the Parthians would be found, and the earlier subdued Medes.

The description of the treading down of the land of the Elect is too mild for a description of the desecration wrought by Epiphanes. If we are right, we may fix on 205 BC, as the probable date of the nucleus. The Book of the Lummaries of the Heavens which we feel inclined to attribute to the same hand as Enoch 1-36 contains a history of Israel that terminates with the Maccabean Struggle still proceeding. Dr. Charles would date this portion at 161 BC. Personally, we should be inclined to place it a few years earlier. He would place chapters 1-36 before the Maccabean Struggle. According to our thinking the genuine Noachian fragments fall between these. The Book of Noah seems to have existed as a separate book in the time when the Book of Jubilees was written. It is dependent on Enoch, and therefore after it. The use of portions taken from it to interpolate in the Enoch Books must have taken place before the Maccabean Struggle. There are other passages that have every appearance of being interpolations, the date of which it is impossible to fix with any definiteness.

(7) Slavonic Enoch.

In the year 1892 the attention of Dr. Charles was directed to the fact that a Book of Enoch was extant in Slavonic. Perusal proved it not to be a version of the book before us, but another and later pseudepigraphic book, taking, as the earlier had done, the name of Enoch. It is totally independent of the Ethiopic Enoch Book, as is seen by the most cursory consideration. It begins by giving an account of Enoch's instruction to his descendants how he had been taken up to the seventh heaven. Another manuscript adds other three heavens. In the third (?) heaven Enoch is shown the place of the punishment of the wicked. In the description of the fourth heaven there is an account of the physical conditions of the universe, in which the year is said to be 365 1/4 days; but the course of the sun is stated as a course of 227 days; which appears to be all that is accounted for. Here the independence of the Slavonic Enoch

is clear, as the Ethiopic Enoch makes the year 364 days.

There are many points of resemblance which show that the writer of the Slavonic Enoch had before him the book which has come down to us in Ethiopic, but the relationship is not by any means so close as to be called dependence. The definite numbering of the heavens into seven or ten is a proof of its later date. It is related to the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, and also to the Ascension of Isaiah. We cannot quite acknowledge the cogency of the proofs that any portion of this Book has been composed in Greek: hence, we cannot agree with Dr. Charles that it was composed in Alexandria. The resemblances to Philo are too few and slight to be convincing. That some of it was originally Hebrew Dr. Charles admits. The date Dr. Charles assigns to it—1-50 AD—seems reasonable, with this qualification, that it seems nearer the later than the earlier of these dates. A double translation, with the certainty of some interpolations and the probability of many more, makes any decided Judgment as to date hazardous, so much has to depend on resemblances between books in cases where it is impossible to decide which is dependent on which. It is at once an interesting and a valuable addition to our knowledge of the mind of the age preceding the publication of the gospel.

(8) Secrets of Enoch.

In imitation of this Book and in some sense in dependence on it was written a rabbinic Book of the Secrets of Enoch. It is attributed to Rabbi Ishmael, who was a prominent figure in the rebellion of Barcochba. Enoch is there noted as Metatron. It follows to some extent the course of the Slavonic Book of Enoch. It is this book that is referred to in the Talmud, not the more important book quoted by Jude.

2. Apocalypse of Baruch:

Though not without its value in estimating the trend of pre-Christian speculation, the Apocalypse of Baruch did not influence thought in the way that the Books of Enoch have done. It is neither quoted nor referred to by any of the Christian Fathers. Irenaeus (V, 33) quotes a saying which he attributes to our Lord on the authority of Papias, who claims to have in this attribution the authority of John behind him. This saying we find in the Apocalypse before us, though considerably expanded. In regard to this, in the first place we have only the Latin version of Irenaeus, not the Greek original. In the next place, even though the Latin may be a faithful translation of the Greek, still it is only a quotation from a lost book, which itself records traditions. The fact that it is in the shortest form in the book before us would seem to indicate that it is the original. If that is so, we may regard it as having a certain vogue among the Essenian school and their sympathizers. In the Syriac Apocrypha published by Lagarde there is a small book entitled "The Epistle of Baruch the Scribe."

This occurs at the end of our Apocalypse of Baruch. In Cyprian’s Test. contra Jud., III, 29 we have a passage of considerable length attributed to Bar, a few words of which agree with a passage in this Apocalypse. Hippolytus quotes an oath used by certain Gnostics which he says is found in the Book of Baruch. There are features in the passage thus quoted which seem to be echoes of the book before us. This was all that was known of the Apocalypse of Baruch until the last half-century, when Ceriani

discovered a Syriac version of it in the Arabroaian Library in Milan, nearly complete.

(1) Summary.

It begins after the model of a prophecy: "The word of the Lord came to Baruch, the son of Neriah, saying." In this he follows the phraseology of Jeremiah. He and Jeremiah are commanded to leave Jerusalem as God is about to pour forth His judgment upon it. Baruch entreats God for his city, and God shows him that the punishment will be temporary. Then the Chaldeans come to fulfill what God has threatened, but Baruch is shown the angel ministers of Divine vengeance saving the sacred vessels by calling upon the earth to swallow them up. Then the angels helped the Chaldeans to overthrow the walls of Jerusalem. Notwithstanding that in the canonical Book of Jeremiah (Jer 43:6,7) and in 2 Kings the prophet goes down to Egypt, Baruch declares that Jeremiah is sent to comfort the captives in Babylon, while he, Baruch, is to remain in Judea. He mourns over Jerusalem and denounces woes in Babylon (chapters 1-12). While he is standing upon Mt. Zion he is called into colloquy with God as to the method of Divine dealing with Judah, and a revelation is promised him (chapters 13-20).

This revelation is introduced by a prayer of Baruch followed by a colloquy with the Almighty. Baruch asks, "Will that tribulation continue a long time?" He is answered that there will be twelve successive different forms of judgment which shall come. Then follows an enigmatic sentence, "Two parts weeks of seven weeks" are "the measure and reckoning of the time" which probably means that each of the parts is a jubilee or half a century. At the termination of this period the Messiah is to appear. Here a description is given of the glories of the Messianic kingdom in the course of which occurs the passage already referred to as quoted by Papias (chapters 21-30). The writer, forgetting what he has already said of the desolation of Jerusalem, makes Baruch assemble the Elders of Jerusalem and announce that he is going to retire into solitude. In his retirement he has a vision of a wooded hill, and at the foot of it is a vine growing and beside the vine a spring of water. This fountain swelled and became tempestuous, sweeping away all the forest on the hill but one great cedar. It, too, falls at length. The interpretation is given The forest is the fourth Empire of Daniel—the Roman—the many magistracies being symbolized by the numerous trees of the forest. The Messiah is the vine and the fountain. It is probable that Pompey is the leader referred to (Baruch 31-40). Then follows a colloquy of Baruch first with God, then with his son and the Elders of the people. A long prayer with God’s answer which includes a description of the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous—the latter is next given with greater fullness (Baruch 41-52). Mother vision is given to Baruch of twelve showers of rain alternately bright and dark and a final torrent blacker than anything else and closed by a bright light. The angel Runnel comes to Baruch to interpret the vision. It represents the history of Israel to the return to Judea under the decree of Cyrus. The last dark waters represent the Maccabean Struggle. It would seem as if the vision carried the conflict on to the fratricidal conflict between John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus (Baruch 53-77). Then follows the epistle to the nine and a half tribes (Baruch 78-87).

(2) Structure.

Preliminary to anything further is the discussion of the state of the book—how far it is one, how far it is

composite or interpolated. That it contains different portions is obvious on the slightest careful study. The first portion that the reader marks off is the "epistle to the nine tribes and a half." As has already been mentioned this portion appears independently and is preserved by Lagarde in his Libri Vet. Test. Apocryphi, in which collection it precedes the ordinary apocryphal Book of Baruch. The last section, which relates how this epistle was sent to the nine tribes and a half by an eagle, is omitted. The last section (chapter 79) has been added, and has been modified in order to introduce this epistle. It is not at all in the spirit of the rest of this Apocalypse that the tribes carried away captive by "Salmanasser, king of Assyria" have any share in the blessings revealed in the vision. The epistle itself merely narrates the capture of the city, and the help of the angels who hid the sacred vessels.

It is to be noted that in the earlier portion of this Apocalypse it is the earth that opens her mouth and swallows down the sacred vessels. Another division reveals itself on further scrutiny. From the beginning to the end of chapter 30 the course of the narrative is fairly continuous. A revelation is promised, and in the end we have a picture of the glory and plenty of the times of the Messiah. The next section begins with an exhortation which has little bearing on what has preceded. Then follows the vision of the forest and the surviving tree. The colloquy and the prayers that follow, to chapter 52, are all connected, though not closely. But close connection is not to be expected from an oriental and an Apocalyptist. Then follow the sections connected with the vision of the twelve showers of rain, and its interpretation. There are thus five independent sections exclusive of interpolations which may be due to different writers.

(3) Language.

In the first place it is clear that the Syriac in which the work has come down to us is itself a translation from Greek. The manuscript of Ceriani states this in its title. This is confirmed by Graecisms filtering through, as ho Manasseh in Baruch 65:1, where ho represents the Greek article. In some cases the readings that are unintelligible can be explained by translation back into Greek, as shown by Dr. Charles. The most convincing is the use made of this book by the writer of the "Rest of the Words of Baruch," who wrote in Greek. Although not a few scholars have followed Langen in maintaining that Greek was the original tongue, careful investigation proves that behind the Greek was Hebrew. The strongest of these proofs is that the echoes of Scriptural texts are almost invariably from the Hebrew as against the Septuagint. Thus, in 6:8, Jeremiah three times addresses the earth and calls upon it to hear the word of the Lord. So it is in the Massoretic Text and in the Vulgate, but not in the Septuagint, where the word "earth" is only given twice. There are several other instances.

Dr. Charles has carefully compared the idiomatic phrases and sees proof that usages of the Massoretic Text have been preserved in the Greek, and thence conveyed to the Syriac. The most interesting of these is the peculiar Hebrew idiom of infinitive with finite verb to emphasize the action narrated. This is rendered in Septuagint sometimes by cognate noun and verb, and sometimes by participle and verb. The examples chosen by Dr. Charles have the disadvantage that none of them show the effect on this idiom of passing through the two languages, Greek and Syriac. In Paulus Tellensis there are examples—e.g. 2Ki 18:33. He is scarcely accurate in saying that this idiom never occurs in the Peshitta unless it is in the Greek. See Lu 1:22; Joh 13:29, etc., as examples to the contrary. The proof seems conclusive that

Hebrew was the original language of this Apocalypse, and that it was first translated into Greek, and from that into Syriac. From this it follows almost necessarily that its place of origin was Palestine. That it has had practically no effect on Jewish literature, and was potent enough among the Christians to lead a Christian about the middle of the 2nd Christian century to compose an addition to it, proves to our thinking its Essenian origin.

(4) Date.

Although the writer assumes the destruction of Jerusalem by the army of the Chaldeans, he evidently has no conception of what such a catastrophe would really mean. He has no conception of the length of time occupied by a siege, the terrors of famine, or the desolation that follows the capture of a city. Josephus tells us (BJ, VII, i, 1) that save a portion of the west wall and three towers, the city was utterly razed to the ground—"there was nothing left to make those who came there believe that ever it had been inhabited." Yet, when endeavoring to realize the similar destruction which had befallen the city under Nebuchadnezzar, he speaks of himself sitting "before the gates of the temple" (Baruch 10:5), when the gates had wholly disappeared. Again, he assembles the people and their elders "after these things" "in the valley of the Kedron." The Apocalypse must be dated at all events considerably before 70 AD. On the other hand, it is subsequent to the first part of En; it assumes it as known (Baruch 56:10-13). But a closer discrimination may be reached. In the vision of the wood and the one tree that survives we have Pompey pointed out clearly. The multitude of trees points to the numerous magistracies of Rome. (Compare description of Senate of Rome in 1 Macc 8:15.)

The seer in his vision sees all these swept away and one remaining. It could not be an emperor, as that title was regarded as equivalent to "king," as Nero in the Ascension of Isaiah is called "the matricide king." The only other besides Pompey likely to be pointed to would be Julius Caesar. But the fall of the great desecrator of the temple, which the seer foresaw, would not have failed to be noted as succeeded by that of Caesar who had conquered him. It is difficult for us to realize the position Pompey occupied in the eyes especially of the eastern world before the outbreak of the civil war. Cicero’s letters and his oration Pro lege Manilia show the way Pompey filled the horizon even in republican Rome, in a society most of the prominent members of which claimed a descent that would have enabled them to look down on Pompey. But in the East he had enjoyed dictatorial powers. His intervention in the contest between the brothers John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus could not fail to impress the Jews, and his desecration of the temple would mark him off for a very special destruction. The date is so far before the death of Pompey (48 BC)—though after the desecration of the temple—that the possibility of anyone entering into conflict with him is not dreamed of. When we turn to the twelve showers, we are led to the time of this struggle also as that which shall immediately precede the coming of the Messiah.

Another note of time is to be found in Baruch 28—"The measure and reckoning of the time are two parts, weeks of seven weeks." This we regard as two jubilees—i.e. approximately a century. The point to be fixed is the time from which this century is to be reckoned. To our idea it must be from some event connected with the temple. Such an event was the dedication of the temple by Judas Maccabeus in the 148th year of the Seleucid era—that is, 163 BC. A century brings us exactly to the year of Pompey’s capture of Jerusalem and desecration of the temple. Thus three different lines converge in pointing to 60

or 59 BC as the date at which this book was written.

(5) Relation to Other Books.

The strange mingling of knowledge of Scripture and ignorance of it is a phenomenon to be observed. The very first clause contains a gross anachronism, whatever explanation may be given of the statement. Taken with what follows, the statement is that Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, "in the 25th year of Jeconiah, king of Judah." This naturally ought to mean the 25th year of the reign of Jeconiah, but he only reigned three months. Whether the date is reckoned from his life or his captivity, it will not suit the date of the capture of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans. Another strange blunder appears in the subjoined "Epistle of Baruch"; the number of northern tribes who rebelled against Rehoboam is confused, with that of the tribes settled on the west of Jordan, and that of the tribes following the House of David with that of those on the east of Jordan. Yet the general course of Biblical history is quite understood. The author seems fairly well acquainted with Jer and Ps, as there are frequent echoes of these books. Most marked is the connection between this Apocalypse and the other books of the same class.

This connection is not so obvious in quotable sentences as in the general atmosphere. This is very marked in regard to the Enoch books, Ethiopic and Slavonic. In the case of the latter, of course, the resemblance is not imitation on the part of the writer of this Apocalypse. One marked distinction, one that precludes any thought of direct imitation, is the elaborate angelology of the Enoch books as compared with the one name which appears in the Apocalypse of Baruch. The book with which the present Apocalypse has closest relation is 2 (4) Esdras. Dr. Charles has given at the end of his translation of the work before us (Apoc of Baruch, 171) a long list of resemblances, not always of equal value. Sometimes the references are inaccurate.

The main thing to be observed is that while 2 Esdras as we have it has on the one hand a markedly Christian coloring, which it seems impossible to attribute to interpolation, and on the other, to have seen the desolation of Jerusalem under the Romans, there is no Christian element in the genuine Baruch, and the desolation is more sentimental as proved by the inability to realize the conditions consequent on the capture of the city by victorious enemies.

(6) The Rest of the Words of Baruch.

One of the evidences of the influence our Apocalypse had in the Christian community is the composition by a Christian of "The Rest of the Words of Baruch" (or Jer). This was found, like so many other treasures, by Ceriani in the Ambrosian Library, Milan. Jer is the principal spokesman in the book. It is revealed to him that Jerusalem is to be given into the hands of the Chaldeans, and he announces this to Baruch. He is desirous to save Abimelech (Ebedmelech), and prays God for him, and Abimelech is sent away out of the city while the angels are overturning it. He goes to the vineyard of Agrippa and falls asleep. His sleep continues sixty years. When, arising from sleep, he enters Jerusalem again he does not recognize it. An angel leads him to Baruch who had made his abode in a tank. Baruch writes to Jeremiah, who has departed to Babylon. His letter is conveyed by an eagle. Jeremiah on receipt of this

epistle collects all the captives and leads them back to Jerusalem. Certain of them would not submit to the law in all its strictness, but, turning aside, founded Samaria. After some time Jeremiah dies, rises again on the third day and preaches Christ as the Son of God, and is stoned by the Jews. A noticeable thing is the relatively accurate account of the date of Christ's appearance after the return from the captivity, 477 years, only it must be calculated from the reign of Artaxerxes and to the resurrection. This, however, would make Jeremiah nearly two hundred years old. Such a thing, however, is not a matter that would disturb a Jewish chronologer. "The Rest of the Words of Baruch" seems to have been written by a Christian Jew in Palestine before the rebellion of Barcochba.

3. The Assumption of Moses:

In the Epistle of Jude is a reference to a conflict between the archangel Michael and Satan, when they "disputed about the body of Moses" Oregon (de Princip, iii.2) attributes this to a book he calls Ascensio Mosis. Clement Alexandrinus gives an account of the burial of Moses quoted from the same book. There are several references to the book up to the 6th century, but thereafter it disappeared till Ceriani found the fragment of it which is published in the Acta Sacra et Profana (Vol I). This fragment is in Latin. It is full of blunders, some due to transcription, proving that the last scribe had but an imperfect knowledge of the tongue in which he wrote. Some of the blunders go farther back and seem to have been due to the scribe who translated it from Greek. Even such a common word as thilpsis ("affliction") he did not know, but attempted, by no means with conspicuous success, to transliterate it as clipsis. So with allophuloi "foreigners," the common Septuagint equivalent of "Philistine," and yet commoner skene ("a tent") and several others. It probably was dictated, as some of the blunders of the copyist may be better explained as mistakes in hearing, as fynicis for Phoenices, and venient for veniet. Some, however, are due to blunders of sight on the part of the translator, as monses for moyses.

From this we may deduce that he read from a manuscript in cursive characters, in which "n" and "u" were alike. This Milan manuscript has been frequently edited. Dr Charles has suggested with great plausibility that there were two works, a Testament of Moses, and an Assumption, and that these have been combined; and, while Jude 1:9 is derived from the Assumption, as also the quotation in Clement of Alexandria, he thinks that Jude 1:16 is derived from separate clauses of the Testament. It may be observed that in the fragment which has been preserved to us, neither the passages in Clement nor that referred to in Jude 1:16 are to be found.

(1) Summary.

Moses, now in the plain of Moab, calls Joshua to him and gives him commands for the people. He had already blessed them tribe by tribe. Now he calls his successor to him and urges him to be of good courage. He tells him that the world has been created for Israel, and that he, Moses, had been ordained from before the foundation of the world to be the mediator of this covenant. These commands are to be written down and preserved in clay jars full of cedar oil. This sentence is added to explain the discovery and publication. A rapid summary of the history of Israel to the fall of the Northern Kingdom follows. The successive reigns are called years—eighteen years before the division of the kingdom, 15 Judges

and Saul, David and Solomon, and nineteen after, the kings from Jeroboam to Hoshea. The Southern Kingdom has twenty years or reigns.

The Southern Kingdom was to fall before Nebuchadnezzar, the king from the East who would cover the land with his cavalry. When they are in captivity one prays for them. Here follows a prayer modeled on Da 9:4-19—almost a version of it. In this connection it may be noted that of the ten tribes it is asserted they will multiply among the Gentiles. There is a sudden leap forward to the time of the Greek domination. Singularly, the period of the Maccabees does not appear in this sketch of history. The times of Judas Maccabeus are not mentioned, but the kings of his house, the descendants of Simon, are referred to as "Kings ruling shall rise from them, who shall be called priests of the Most High God." To them follows Herod, rex petulans, "who will not be of the race of the priests." He will execute judgment on the people like those of Egypt. Herod is to leave children who will reign after him for a short period. The Roman emperor is to put an end to their rule and to burn up Jerusalem. Then comes a mutilated chapter, which, while following in the narrative, may yet be only another aspect of the oppression. The Roman officials figure duly as the source of this, and the Sadducean high-priestly party as their instruments. The resemblance to the terms in which our Lord denounces the Pharisees leads one to think that they, too, are meant by the Essene authors. We have noted above that the Maccabean period is completely omitted.

The persecution under Antiochus appears in Assumption of Moses 8 and 9. With Dr. Charles we are inclined to think they have been displaced. In chapter 9 occurs the reference to the mysterious Taxo with his seven sons. Dr. Charles is quite sure the reference is to the seven sons of the widow who suffered before Antiochus Epiphanes as related in 2 Macc 7 (4 Macc 8-17), but the "mother" is the prominent person in all the forms of the story, while in no form of it is their father mentioned. It is to be noted that if T of this mysterious name, represents taw (t) in the Hebrew (= 400), and xi represents the letter camek (c) (= 60) which occupies the same place in the Hebrew alphabet, and if the O represents waw (w) (= 6), adding those numbers together we have the number 466, which is the sum of the letters of Shimeon. But nothing in the history of the second son of Mattathias resembles the history of the mysterious Taxo. On this subject the reader is recommended to study Charles, Assumption of Moses, 32-34. Taxo recommends his sons, having fasted to retire into a cave, and rather to die than to transgress the commands of God. In this conduct there is a suggestion of the action of several of the pious in the beginning of the Antiochus persecutions. Taxo then breaks into a song of praise to God, in the course of which he describes the final discomfiture of the enemies of God and of His people.

The establishment of the Messianic kingdom is to be 250 times after the Assumption of Moses. The interpretation of this is one of the difficulties in regard to this Apocalypse. Langen takes the times as equivalent to decades, and Dr. Charles as year-weeks. The latter seems a more probable meaning of "time," as more in the line of Jewish thought. It should be noted that Dr. Charles thinks illius adventum refers not to the Messiah’s coming, but to the last judgment. In answer to the declaration of Moses as to his approaching death, Joshua rends his garments and breaks forth into lamentations, wondering who will lead on the people when his master has departed. There is one phrase that seems to imply a tincture of classical culture. Joshua says of Moses, "All the world is thy Sepulchre," which seems to be a reminiscence of Pericles’ funeral oration (Thucyd. ii.4), "The whole earth is the monument of men of

renown." He then casts himself at the feet of Moses. His master encourages him and promises him success. At this point the fragment ends. It is to be expected that shortly after this would occur the passage quoted by Clement of Alexandria, and still later that quoted in Jude.

(2) Structure.

It seems to have been united with one, if not two other books, a "Testament of Moses" and our Book of Jubilees. It would seem that in the present work we have mostly the "Testament." The insertion of the word receptione after morte in Assumption of Moses 10:12 indicates that when this copy was made the two writings were united. As above remarked, there appears to have been a displacement of chapters 8 and 9; they ought to have been placed between chapters 4 and 5.

(3) Language.

As already mentioned, the manuscript found by Ceriani in the Ambrosian Library is in Latin. No one, however, has maintained that this was the language in which it was originally written. It is evidently a translation from the Greek. A number of Greek words are transliterated, some of them common enough. So clearly does the Greek shine through, that Hilgenfeld has reproduced what he imagines the Greek text to have been. That having been settled, a further question rises, Is the Greek the original tongue, or was it, too, a translation from a Sere original? The first alternative is that adopted by Hilgenfeld. His arguments from the alleged impossibility of certain grammatical constructions being found in Hebrew are due to mistake. The presence of such words as Allofile and Deuteronomion simply prove that in translating a book which claimed to be written about Moses, the writer followed the diction used by the Septuagint, just as Archbishop Laurence in translating Enoch used the diction of the King James Version of the Bible These questions have been ably investigated by Dr. Charles in his edition of the Assumption of Moses (42-45). He shows a number of Semitic idioms which have persisted through the Greek—some cases in which the meaning can only be got by reconstructing the Hebrew text.

Again, corruption can only be explained by means of a Semitic text. It might be suggested that a falsarius writing in Greek would naturally employ the diction of the Septuagint as has been done frequently in English; the diction of the King James Version is used to cover the imitation of a sacred book. The fact that style was so little regarded as a means of settling dates and authorship renders this unlikely. The more delicate question of which of the two Sere tongues—Aramaic or Hebrew—is employed, is more difficult to settle. There are, however, one or two cases in which we seem to see traces of the waw conversive—a construction peculiar to Hebrew—e.g. 8:2, "Those who conceal (their circumcision) he will torture and has delivered up to be led to prison." The ignorance of the scribe may, however, be revoked to explain this. On the other hand the change of tense is so violent that even an ignorant scribe would not be likely to make it by mistake. Over and above, a narrative attributed to Joshua and asserted to be written down by him at the dictation of Moses, would necessarily be in Hebrew. From this we would deduce that Hebrew rather than Aramaic has been the Semitic original.

(4) Date.

The identification of the rex petulans with Herod and the statement that he should be succeeded by his sons who should reign a short time, fix the date of the composition of the work before us within narrow limits. It must have been written after the death of Herod and also after the deposition of Archelaus, 6 AD, and before st was seen that Antipas and Philip were secure on their thrones. Thus we cannot date it later than 7 or 8 AD. The intense hatred of the Herodians was a characteristic of this time. Later they came to be admired by the patriotic party.

(5) Relation to Other Books.

The most striking phrase is the name given to Moses—arbiter testamenti, "the mediator of the covenant," which we find repeatedly used in the Epistle to the Hebrews: mesites is the Greek translation of mokhiach in Job 9:33, but in translating the Epistle to the Hebrews into Hebrew Delitzsch uses carcor, a purely rabbinic word. Another rendering is menatseach. There are several echoes in this book of passages in the Old Testament, as the address to Jos (1:1 ff) is parallel with De 31:7 f. The prayer in Assumption of Moses 4, as before observed, is modeled on Da 9:4-19. There are traces of acquaintance with the Psalter of Solomon in Assumption of Moses 5 as compared with Ps 4. In these there appear to be echoes of the present work in our Lord’s description of the Pharisees, when we compare Mt 23 with Assumption of Moses 5.

There is a fragment published by Ceriani entitled "History and Life (diegesis kai politeia) of Adam, Which, Was Revealed by God to Moses, His Servant." It is an account of the life of our first parents after the death of Abel to their own death. It has been composed to all appearance in Greek, and really belongs not to Mosaic literature, but to that connected with Adam. It is to be noted that to Cain and Abel other names are given besides those so well known. They are called Adiaphotos and Amilabes, names of no assignable origin. There are no evidences of Christian influence; from this one would be led to regard it as a Jewish writing; as the middle of it has been lost, any decision is to be made with caution.

4. The Ascension of Isaiah:

The Ascension of Isaiah was often referred to by name in the works of early Christian Fathers, especially by Origen. It is called by him "The Apocryphon of Isaiah." Epiphanes gives it the title by which it is more commonly known. Now that we have the book, we find numerous echoes of it. Indeed, Origen claims that Heb 11:37 contains a reference to it in speaking of saints who were sawn asunder. Justin Martyr speaks of the death of Isaiah in terms that imply an acquaintance with this book. It had disappeared till Archbishop Laurence found a copy of it in Ethiopic on a London book-stall. The capture of Magdala brought home more manuscripts. A portion of it had been printed in Venice from a Latin version.

(1) Summary.

In the 26th year of his reign Hezekiah calls Isaiah before him to deliver certain writings into his hand. Isaiah informs him that the devil Sammael Malkira would take possession of his son Manasseh, and that

he, Isaiah, will be sawn asunder by his hand. On hearing this, Hezekiah would order his son to be killed, but Isaiah tells him that the Chosen One will render his counsel vain. On the death of his father, Manasseh turned his hand to serve Berial Matanbukes. Isaiah retired to Bethlehem, and thence, with certain prophets—Micah, Joe and Habakkuk—and also Hananiah and his own son Joab, he removed to a desert mountain. Balkira, a Samaritan, discovered their hiding- place. They are brought before Manasseh, and Isaiah is accused of impiety because he has said that he has seen God, yet God had declared to Moses, "There shall no flesh see my face." He had also called Jerusalem, Sodom, and its rulers, those of Gomorrah. For Berial (Belial) had great wrath against Isaiah because he had revealed the coming of Christ and the mission of the apostles.

At this point there appears to be a confusion between the first coming of Christ and His second. Lawless elders and shepherds are referred to as appearing, and it is assumed the elders of the church and the pastors are intended, though this is not necessarily so. There certainly was much contention in the churches, as we know, concerning the question of circumcision. The reference, however, may be to the rulers and elders of Israel who crucified our Lord. Then follows the account of the incarnation of Beliar in Nero, "the matricide monarch," and the persecution of the twelve apostles, of whom one will be delivered into his hand—the reference here being probably to the martyrdom of Peter. If it is Paul, then It is a denial of Peter’s martyrdom at Rome altogether; if it is Peter, it means the denial of Paul’s apostleship. The reign of the Antichrist is to be "three years, seven months and twenty-seven days," that is, on the Roman reckoning, 1,335 days. This would seem to be calculated from Nero’s persecution of the Christians. He makes a singular statement: "The greater number of those who have been associated together in order to receive the Beloved he will turn aside after him"—a statement that implies a vastly greater apostasy under the stress of persecution than we have any record of from other sources.

A good deal is to be said for the insertion of 1,000 in the number 332 in 4:14, so as to make it read 1,332. At the end of this period "the Lord will come with His angels and will drag Beliar into Gehenna with his armies." Then follows a reference to the descent of the Beloved into Sheol. The following chapter gives an account of the martyrdom of Isaiah, how he was "sawn in sunder with a wooden saw," and how Balkira mocked him, and strove to get Isaiah to recant. With Ascension of Isaiah 6 begins the Ascension proper. This chapter, however, is merely the introduction. It is in chapter 7 that the account is given of how the prophet is carried up through the firmament and then through heaven after heaven to the seventh. A great angel leads him upward. In the firmament he found the angels of the devil envying one another. Above this is the first heaven where he found a throne in the midst, and angels on the right and the left, the former of whom were the more excellent. So it was in the second, third, fourth and fifth heavens. Each heaven was more glorious than that beneath. In the sixth heaven there was no throne in the midst nor was there any distraction between angels on the right and left; all were equal. Be is then raised to the seventh heaven—the most glorious of all—where he sees not only God the Father, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit. As to the Son we are told that he should descend, and having assumed human form should be crucified through the influence of the Prince of this World. Baring descended into Sheol, he spoiled it, and ascended up on high. In chapter 10 there is a more detailed account of the descent of the Son through the successive heavens, how in each He assumed the aspect of the angels that dwelt therein, so that they did not know Him. In the Firmament, the quarreling and envying appeared at first to hinder Him. In chapter 11 we have a semi-docetic account of the miraculous birth With the

declaration that it was on account of these revelations that he, Isaiah, was sawn in sunder, the Apocalypse ends.

(2) Structure.

Dr. Charles has maintained that three works are incorporated—the Testament of Hezekiah, the Martyrdom of Isaiah and the Vision of Isaiah. The names have been taken from those given to this work in patristic literature, and are not strictly descriptive of the contents, at least of the first. The confused chronology of the work as we have it may to some extent be due to transcription and translation. From the opening paragraph, there appears to have been an Apocryphon attributed to Hezekiah. Manasseh is called into his father's presence in order that here may be delivered into words, of righteousness "which the king himself had seen" "of eternal judgment, the torments of Gehenna and the Prince of this World and his angels and of his principalities and powers"—a phrase which implies a knowledge of the Epistle to the Ephesians on the part of the writer. The contents given thus summarily are not further detailed. The Vision of Isaiah does not give any account of the powers and principalities of Satan's kingdom. It would seem better to regard the present work as composed of two—the Martyrdom of Isaiah and the Vision or Ascension proper. The references backward and forward seem to imply a similarity of authorship in both parts. This would seem to suggest that the editor and author were one and the same person. There is a knowledge of Roman affairs at the time of Nero's fall so much beyond what anyone living in Palestine could attain that Rome would seem to be the place of composition. (3) Language.

The immediate original from which the translation, Ethiopic, Latin and Sclavonic were made appears to have been Greek. It is clear in regard to the Ethiopic where the proper names which end in Hebrew in "h" and in the Greek transcription end in "s", as Bezekias, Isaias, the latter is followed, but Manasseh is Manassa. An interesting case is to be found in Ascension of Isaiah 2:12: Mikayas is called "son of Amida," where "Amida" stands for Imlah. In the Ethiopic transliteration ‘aleph is generally used for the initial yodh as a vowel, as it is in "Israel" (Ethiopic Asreal), hence "Imida" might as correctly represent the name. Then as delta (d) and lambda (l) are like each other the change is explained. Although certainly as said above, Greek has been the immediate original, it is possible if not even probable that behind the Greek there was Hebrew. The structure of the sentences suggests the same thing (see 2:5 Gr). The mysterious name given to Berial, Mattanbukus—which, unfortunately, we have not in Greek—seems to be intelligible only in the idea that it has a Hebrew etymology, mattan buqah, "the gift of emptiness," the latter word being equivalent to "the void," "the abyss." The title given to Sammael, Malkira, seems naturally to mean king of "the watchers"—‘irim, the angels who, as related in Enoch 10:5, did not continue in their first estate, but defiled themselves with women. So Belkira is "Lord of the fort"—ba‘al qir. There thus seems to be a probability that like so many others of this class, the "Ascension" was originally written in Hebrew.

(4) Date.

No one reading the "Ascension" can fail to feel that he has to do with a Christian document, and one belonging to the very beginning of Christian history. There may have been an earlier Jewish Apocalypse

behind, though to our thinking that does not seem necessary. It is made up of two documents, but the Christian element appears to be woven into the structure of both portions. That it is to be dated early in the history of the church may be seen from the expectation of Christ's speedy reappearance in the world in His parousia. The conflict in the church between elders and shepherds gives a picture of the struggle between Judaizers and the Pauline Christians on the other side. The emphasis laid on the twelve, the omission of all reference to Paul, indicates that it was Judaizing. The docetic account of the birth of Jesus, its independence of the canonical Gospels, all speak of an early date The date, however, it seems to us, can be fixed with great certainty.

The reign of Berial, who has come down upon Nero and incarnated himself in him is to be three years, seven months and twenty-seven days, in all 1,335 days (Asc Isa 41:2), the number in the end of Daniel (Da 12:12). This number, it may be noted, is reached by reckoning the years and months according to the Julian Calendar, proving this Apocalypse to have been written in Rome. But the number is singularly near the actual duration of Nero's reign after the persecution had begun. From the burning of Rome (July 19, 64) to the death of Nero (June 9, 68) was 1,421 days—that is, 86 days more. It was at least a month after the conflagration that the persecution began, and longer till the mad orgy of cruelty when Christians wrapt in pitch and set on fire illuminated Nero's gardens. If a Christian in Rome saw the persecution, he might hope for the end of this reign of terror, and fix on the number he found in Daniel. It would seem that already the 1,290 days had been overpassed, so he hopes that the 1,335 days will see the end of the tyrant.

There is a difficulty in the 332 days of Ascension of Isa 41:4. The temptation is great to hold with Lucke, Dillmann and Charles that 1,000 has dropped out, and that the last figure ought to be 5; then we have the same number. In that case, this Apocalypse must have been written after the news of the rebellion of Vindex had reached Rome, but before the death of Nero. If we may adopt this—though the fact that the shorter number is found in all three Ethiopic manuscripts makes this method of adding a figure necessary to an explanation one to be avoided—this would point to the time immediately preceding Nero's death. The difficulty is, where dad the author get the number? If it is correct, it is probably the arithmogram of some name of Satan. Berial gives 322 by gematria. It would seem that another mark of time is given in the martyrdom of Peter, which may be dated 64 AD. Another negative note is the absence of any reference to the fall of Jerusalem. Had it happened, Jew though the writer was, his love for his crucified Master would have led him to see the vengeance of heaven on the city which had put Him to death, and exult in it. It must have been written in the course of the year 68.

5. The Fourth Book of Esdras:

Unlike the books we have been discussing hitherto, 4 Esdras has never disappeared from the knowledge of the church. It has, however, come down to us primarily in a Latin translation of a Greek original. Archbishop Laurence discovered an Ethiopic version of it. Later an Armenian version with Latin translation was published in Venice. An Arabic version is also in existence. It was received into the Apocrypha of the Anglican church, though excluded from that of Germany; by the Council of Trent, 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras of our Apocrypha were excluded from the Roman Catholic canon, and placed after Revelation, along with Pr Man.

(1) Summary.

The first two chapters contain a prophecy after the model of Isaiah. Not a few passages show the influence of the New Testament on it. Compare 2 (4) Esdras 1:30 with Mt 23:37, and 2 (4) Esdras 2:45 with Re 7:13. With 2 (4) Esdras 3 there is a new beginning. This opens with a prayer which occupies the whole chapter. In answer, Uriel is sent from God and reveals to Ezra by various symbols the plan of God in regard to Israel. This goes on to the middle of 2 (4) Esdras 5, and forms the first vision. After fasting seven days, a new communication is made by Uriel to Ezra. It begins as the former did with a prayer. Then follows a series of questions intended to bring out the limited understanding of man. When these are finished, Uriel gives an account of the history of the world from the creation. This vision ends with 2 (4) Esdras 6:35. The third vision is very interesting, as a large section of 70 verses had been lost, and were recovered only comparatively recently. This vision contains an account of Creation as it is in Genesis, only rhetorical expansions occur, and a full description is given of Leviathan and Behemoth. Ezra is shown the heavenly Zion in vision as difficult of access.

The portion recently discovered contains an account of the place of punishment, and there is mention of Paradise. The end of this is a prayer of Ezra, which seems an independent composition (2 (4) Esdras 8:20). The fourth vision begins with 4 Esdras 9:26. In it Ezra is shown a woman weeping, who is interpreted to be Zion. She is transformed into a city (2 (4) Esdras 10:27). The fifth vision is the most important. It begins with an eagle appearing, which has three heads and twelve wings. This is interpreted as referring to the Roman empire. It would seem that this had been added to, as in addition to the twelve wings, eight other wings are spoken of. A lion appears who rebukes and destroys the eagle with the twelve wings. This lion is the Messiah and his kingdom. The sixth vision begins with chapter 13 and contains an account of the coming of Christ. In the seventh we have an account of the re-writing of the books at the dictation of Ezra, and the retention of the seventy secret sacred books. In what has preceded we have followed the scheme of Fritzsche. The last chapter proceeds from the same pen as do the opening chapters, and is combined with them by Fritzsche and called the Fifth Book of Esdras.

(2) Structure.

As has been indicated above, 4 Esdras is marked off into several distinct portions, preceded by Ezra fasting, and introduced by a prayer on the part of the prophet. Kabisch has a more elaborate scheme than Fritzsche. Like him, he recognizes seven visions, and like him he separates off the first chapter and the last 17, 15, 16, as by a different hand from the rest of the book. But in addition, he recognizes additions made by a R throughout the book. To us the scheme appears too elaborate.

(3) Language.

As above mentioned, the immediate source of the Latin text appears to have been Greek. There is very little to enable us to settle the question whether Greek was the language in which this book was composed, or whether even the Greek is a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic. There are many echoes

of the other Scriptures, but no direct quotations, so there is nothing to show whether the author used the Hebrew text or the Septuagint. The proper names do not supply any clue. Although there are so many versions of the Greek, they are all so paraphrastic that the Greek in most cases is not by any means certain. The few verses quoted in Greek by Clemens Alexandrinus do not afford space enough to discover through them if there is any other language behind. It possibly was written in Hebrew, as it seems to have been written in Palestine.

(4) Date.

From the tone of the book there is no doubt that it was written after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Had it been due to the later cataclysm, when the rebellion of Barcochba was overthrown, a Christian Jew would not have manifested such sorrow. The break between the church and the synagogue was complete by that time. Further, had this book been written under Hadrian, the previous disaster would have been referred to. Over and above the distinctly and avowedly Christian passages, there are numerous echoes of the New Testament Scriptures. The fifth vision affords notes of time which would be more unambiguous if there had not been additions made. The eagle with the three heads and twelve wings is declared to be the fourth monarchy of Daniel, and by the context this is shown to be imperial Rome.

The question that has exercised critics is the portion of the Roman history referred to. Lucke regarded the reference to be to rulers prominent in the time of Sulla, and the three heads to be the first triumvirate. This view implies a knowledge of Roman politics not possessed by any Jew of the pre-Christian period. Further, the echoes of New Testament language which occur (compare 2 (4) Esdras 5:1 with Lu 18:8; 2 (4) Esdras 6:5 with Re 7:3, etc.) determine the decision against any idea that it was pre-Christian. The realization of the horrors of the overthrow of Jerusalem is too vivid to be the result merely of imagination. Another theory would see in the three heads the three Septimians, Severus and his sons Caracalla and Geta. This would find a place for the eight under- wings, as that is exactly the number of emperors between Domitian and Severus, if one neglects the short reign of Didius Julianus. The destruction of "the two under wings that thought to have reigned" (2 (4) Esdras 11:31) would be fulfilled in the defeat and death of pescennius Niger and Clodius Albinus.

The fact that it is the right-hand head that devours the head to the left fits the murder of Geta the younger son, by Caracalla, the elder. Against this view is the fact that the book is quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus. Further, the eight under-wings are said to be kings "whose times shall be small, and their years swift" (2 (4) Esdras 12:20). Though might be said of Nerva, it could not be affirmed of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus Plus or Marcus Aurelius. We are thus restricted to the view which maintains that the three heads are the three Flavians. The twelve wings are the first emperors, beginning with Julius Caesar. The reign of Augustus is longer than any of the monarchs that succeeded him, and it is noted that the second wing was to have that distinction (2 (4) Esdras 12:15). The date then may be placed between the death of Titus and that of Domitian—that is, from 81 to 96. The Lion who rebukes the Eagle for his unrighteousness is the Messiah—the Christ—in His second coming, when He shall come in the glory of His kingdom. The Christians had begun to doubt the speedy coming of the Master, hence He is spoken of as "kept unto the end of days" (2 Esdras 12:32). Such are the Apocalypses, strictly speaking.

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, 2

II. Legendary Works.

The Book of Jubilees:

The Book of Jubilees is the only one which survives of this class of composition. The portion of Ascension of Isaiah which contains the account of his martyrdom has much of this character. It, however, has been conjoined to the Apocalyptic "Ascension." It would seem that in some copies the Assumption of Moses was added to this work as a supplement. It is frequently cited as lepto Genesis—sometimes lepto-genesis, and again micro-genesis, "the little Genesis." This title cannot be meant to refer to its actual size, for it is considerably longer than the canonical book. It may either mean that this book is to be less regarded than the canonical Genesis or that it is taken up with lepta- -"minutiae." Another, and possibly more plausible explanation is to be found in the Hebrew or Aramaic. There is a rabbinic book known as Bere'shith Rabba', in which the whole of Genesis is expanded by Midrashic additions, amplifications and explanations, to many times the size of the work before us, which, in comparison, would be Bere'shith ZuTa'—"the small Genesis." The main difficulty is that the Jewish work, B. Rabbah, cannot well be dated earlier than 300 AD. We owe the work before us mainly—in its complete form—like so many others, to its inclusion in the canon of the Ethiopic church. Portions of it in Latin and Syriac have been found in the second main source of apocalyptic literature in recent times, the Ambrosian Library of Milan. There have been several editions of the Ethiopic text.

(1) Summary.

It is difficult to give anything like a summary of the Book of Jubilees in the ordinary sense of the word. Roughly speaking, the canonical Book of Genesis is the summary. The writer has omitted many features and incidents, but these have been more than compensated for by additions and expansions. Most of these omissions have an apologetic aim. The acts of deception of which Abraham was guilty in Egypt and toward Abimelech in regard to Sarah, the similar act of Isaac, would involve matters difficult to palliate. The way Simeon and Levi entrapped the Shechemites into being circumcised and then took advantage of their condition to murder them, is omitted also. Jacob's devices to increase his flocks at Laban's expense are also passed over in silence. The most marked omission is the blessing of Jacob in Ge 49. This is to be explained by the way the writer has praised Simeon and Levi earlier which Jacob's denunciation of them flatly contradicts. Many of the additions have a similar apologetic intention, as the statement that Dinah was twelve years old at the time of the rape, the presents Jacob gave to his parents four times a year, etc. When Jacob deceives his father, he does not say he is Esau, but only "I am thy son." There are longer additions, chiefly ceremonial. Two incidents narrated at length are the warfare of the Amorites against Jacob (34:1-9), and the war of Esau (37 and 38).

(2) Structure.

The most marked characteristic of the book is that from which it has its most common name, "The Book of Jubilee," the dating of events by successive Jubilees. The whole history of the world is set in a framework of Jubilees and every event is dated by the Jubilee of the world's history in which it had occurred, and the year-week of that Jubilee and the year of that week. The writer has carried his septenary principle into the year and made the days in it, as did the writer of one of the Enoch books, a multiple of seven, 364 = 7 x 52 days. It does not seem to have been interpolated.

(3) Language.

Like so many more of the pseudepigrapha, the Ethiopic, from which our modern translations have been made, has been translated from a Greek original, which in turn has had a Semitic source. It is somewhat difficult to form a decision as to which of the two Semitic languages in use in Palestine was that in which it was composed. Certainly some, as Frankel, have maintained that it was written in Greek first of all. This is contrary to ancient evidence, as Jerome refers to the use of rissah, "a stadium," as used in the Book of Jubilees. More can be said for an Aramaic original The use of Mastema for Satan, and the plurals in "in," point in that direction. Dr. Charles' arguments seem to us to settle the matter in favor of Hebrew. Compare the case of Jubilees 47:9, in which bath, "a daughter," is confused with bayith, "a house." One of his arguments is not so conclusive: 2:9 wahaba, "gave," appears where "appointed" is the meaning—a confusion of meanings only possible from the double meaning of nathan, as the Aramaic yahabh has the same double force: "See I have made thee (yehebhethakh) a God to Pharaoh" (compare Peshitta Ex 7:1). These indications are few, but they seem sufficient.

(4) Date.

The formidable authority of Dr. Charles and that of Littmann are in favor of an early date—before the quarrel of John Hyrcanus with the Pharisees. Our reading of the history is different from that of either of these scholars. The Hassidh party had been lukewarm to the Maccabeans from the latter portion of the pontificate of Judas Maccabeus; the insult offered to Hyrcanus at his own table was the enmity reaching its height. If with Dr. Charles we assume the author to be a Pharisee, then the date is impossible. The Pharisaid party were never enthusiastic supporters of the Maccabeans, except when Alexandra threw herself into their arms. Two characteristics of this book strike the reader—its apologetic tone, and its hatred of Edom. During the time of John Hyrcanus the nation did not assume an apologetic attitude. It had thrown off the Syrian-Greek domination and repelled the attempt to Helenize its religion. It would be only Greeks, or those under Greek influences, that would necessitate the apologetic attitude. We are driven to the Herodian period when Romans abounded in the court and Greeks and Graeculi were frequent, when those who, being Jews and knowing Hebrew, yet had imbibed Hellenic culture, and readily saw the points where assault might be made on their faith and its sacred literature. This date would explain the hatred of Edom. We therefore would place it about the death of Herod—from 5 BC to 6 AD. Unlike the other books of this class, much of it has been found in the Talmud; hence, though we still think the author to have been an Essene, we think that he had much sympathy with the Pharisaic school in its latest development.

APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, 3

III. Psalmic Pseudepigrapha.

1. The Psalter of Solomon:

The Psalter of Solomon is the one of all the pseudepigrapha which seems to have hovered most nearly on the border of deutero-canonicity. Even 4 Esdras, since not being found in Greek, scarcely can be counted an exception, as it was never admitted into the canon of Alexandria. The famous Codex Alexandrinus, as its table of contents proves, originally contained the book before us. In several catalogues of books that were acknowledged, by some at least, to be authoritative, it is named—sometimes to be declared uncanonical. Like so many other books—Jewish and Christian—during the Middle Ages, sank into oblivion. A manuscript of it was first noticed by Hoeschel the librarian in the Library at Augsburg, in the beginning of the 17th century, and published by de la Cerda in 1626. This manuscript has since been lost. More recently, four other Greek manuscripts have been brought to light. From these, with the assistance of de la Cerda's text, it has repeatedly been published. The name given to it, "The Psalter of Solomon," seems purely gratuitous; the writer makes no claim, direct or indirect, to be the Son of David.

(1) Summary.

The present collection consists of 18 psalms closely modeled as to line of thought and diction on the canonical Psalms. The first psalm announces the declaration of war, but is occupied with the denunciation of hypocrites. The second describes a siege of Jerusalem and acknowledges that the distresses of the siege have been deserved, but ends by the description of the death of the besieger on the coast of Egypt. The third psalm is one of thanksgiving on the part of the righteous. In the fourth we have the description and denunciation of a hypocrite in terms which suggest strongly our Lord's words against the Pharisees. It is evidently directed against a prominent individual member of the Sanhedrin. On the generally received date, Antipater may be the person denounced. The fifth psalm is a prayer for mercy from God and an appeal to His loving-kindness. The sixth is occupied with a description of the blessedness of the righteous.

The short psalm which follows is a prayer of Israel under chastisement, entreating God not to remove His tabernacle from their midst. The eighth psalm describes the siege of the temple and denounces the sins of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, which had brought the Smiter from afar against them, and a prayer for restoration to favor. Israel, a captive, prays to God for forgiveness in the ninth psalm. In the tenth we have the blessedness of the man who submits to the chastening of the Lord. The theme of the eleventh is the return of the captives. The idea of the following psalm is not unlike the middle stanza of Ps 120 of the canonical Psalter. The next has as its theme the blessedness of the righteous and the evil estate of the wicked. The fourteenth has a similar subject. The next begins with the sentiment so frequent in the canonical Pss: "When I was in trouble I called upon the Lord." The psalm which follows is experimental in the sense of the old Puritans.

The seventeenth psalm is the most important, as it is Messianic, and exhibits the hopes prevalent among the Jews at the time when it was written. The eighteenth gives a description of the blessedness of the return of the Jews to Divine favor. Messrs. Ryle and James would divide this psalm into two, as there seems to be a conclusion at the tenth verse with the sign diapsalma. Moreover, a slightly different theme is introduced at this point, but there is a reference in the Pistis Sophia to the 19th ps, and this is not the one implied. There seems to be some probability that a Latin translation once existed from references, though few, in the Latin Fathers; but no manuscript of it has yet been discovered. A Syriac translation has been discovered by Dr. Rendel Harris, along with a number of other psalms also attributed to Solomon, which he has called "Odes." Of these more will be said below.

(2) Language.

That the Greek of these psalms is a translation from the Hebrew may be proved by what seem to have been errors in translation, as tou eipein, "to say," where sense implies "to destroy," from the double meaning of dabhar, "to say," and later "to destroy"; heos enikese, "till he conquered," where the meaning must be "forever" or "continuously," equivalent to ‘adh, la-netsach, which might be taken as in Aramaic, and translated as in the Greek. Further, the general character, the frequent occurrence of en in senses strained in Greek but suiting thoroughly the Hebrew preposition "b-", the omission of the substantive verb, the general simplicity in the structure of the sentences, serve to confirm this. For fuller elucidation the reader is directed to Ryle and James edition of this book (lxxviii-lxxxiv). Hilgenfeld has urged some arguments in favor of Greek being the original language. These really prove that the translator was very much influenced in making his translation by the Septuagint version of the canonical Psalter.

(3) Date.

While Ewald would place it back in the time of Epiphanes, if not even earlier, and Movers and Delitzsch would place it about the time of Herod, the description of the siege does not suit any siege but that of Pompey. Still more the death of the proud oppressor who besieged the Temple suits down to the minutest detail the death of Pompey, and suits that of no other. This is the opinion of Langen, Hilgenfeld, Drummond, Stanton, Schurer, Ryle and James. The psalms, however, were written at various dates between 64 BC, the year preceding the Pompeian siege, and the death of Pompey 46 BC. The common critical idea is that it is the Psalter of the Pharisees. The singular thing is that though the writer reverences the Temple, he speaks nothing of the sacrifices, and shows no horror at the dishonor of the high priests—the attitude one would expect, not from a Pharisee, but from an Essene.

(4) Christology.

The main interest of this pseudepigraphon is its Christology, which is principally to be seen in the 17th psalm. The Messiah is to be of the seed of David: He is to come on the downfall of the Asmoneans, to overthrow the Romans in turn. He is to gather the dispersed of Israel, and is to subject the Gentiles to Him rule. The cha racter of this rule is to be spiritual, holy, wise and just. All these features indicate a preparation for the coming of Him who fulfilled the expectation of the Jews in a way which they had so

little dreamed of.

2. The Odes of Solomon:

The students of Gnosticism in perusing the Pistis Sophia, one of the few literary remains left us by those bizarre heresies, found repeated quotations from the Psalter of Solomon, not one of which was to be found in the received collection. There was one numbered reference, but it was to the 19th psalm, whereas only eighteen were known to exist. Lactantius has a quotation from the Psalter of Solomon which, like those in Pistis Sophia, has no place in the "eighteen." It was obvious that there were more Solomonic writings that were called Psalms than those ordinarily known. In the beginning of 1909 the learned world was startled by the information that Dr. Rendel Harris had found on his shelves the missing Psalter of Solomon in a Syriac translation. The manuscript was defective both at the beginning and end, but there was, after all, little missing of the whole book. The title and the colophon were of course wanting. It begins with the new Psalms, or, to give them Dr. Harris' title, "Odes," which are followed by those till now known.

(1) Relation to Pistis Sophia and Summary.

This cannot have been the order of the time when Pistis Sophia was published, as the first of these odes is quoted as the 19th. There are forty-two of them. They are the work of a Christian. The doctrine of the Trinity is present; very prominent is the miraculous birth of the Saviour; the descent upon Mary of the Holy Ghost in the form of a dove; the crucifixion, and the descent into Hades; and, though less clearly, the resurrection. One striking thing is the resemblance of the account of the virgin birth to that we find in the Ascension of Isaiah.

(2) Date.

Dr. Rendel Harris dates these Christian odes in the last quarter of the 1st century, and there seems every reason to agree with this. The relation the 19th psalm (Ode 37) bears to the Ascension of Isaiah is not discussed by him, but to our thinking, the Ascension of Isaiah seems the more primitive.

IV. Testaments.

Although, strictly speaking, Jewish law had no place for "testamentary dispositions" by those about to die —"the portion of goods" that fell to each being prescribed—yet the dying exhortations of Jacob addressed to his sons, the farewell song of Moses, David's deathbed counsels to Solomon, were of the nature of spiritual legacies. Under Greek and Roman law testaments were the regularly understood means of arranging heritages; with the thing the name was transferred, as in the Mishna, Babha' Bathra' 15 26 f, dayytike, so also in Syriac. The idea of these pseudepigrapha is clearly not drawn from the "Last Will and Testament," but the dying exhortations above referred to.

1. Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs:

Ge 49 in which Jacob addresses his sons gathered round ins dying bed furnished the model for a number of pseudepigraphic writings. Of these the longest known is Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. In it the writer imagines each of the sons of Jacob following his father's example and assembling his descendants in order that he might give his dying charge. While Jacob addressed each of his sons separately, the sons of none of his sons, save those of Joseph, became at all prominent; so in the case of the sons of Jacob they each address their descendants as a whole. These Testaments are occupied with moral advices mainly. The sin most warned against is incontinence.

(1) Summary.

(a) Reuben:

The first Patriarch whose Testament is given is Reuben. While he bewails the sin that deprived him of his birthright, he gives an account of the various propensities that tend to sin, and accommodates each of these with an evil spirit—spirits of deceit. He gives details of his sin, which, resembling those given in the Book of Jubilees, differs in an apologetic direction. This apologetic effort is carried farther in the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan. In it Reuben is declared to have disordered the bed of Bilhah because it was put beside his mother's, and he was accused of impurity with her; but the Spirit revealed to Jacob that he was not guilty.

(b) Simeon:

The next Testament is that of Simeon. The crime that seems to have most affected Jacob, if we may judge by Ge 49:5-7, was the murder of the Shechemites by Simeon and Levi. That, however, is not touched upon in the Testament; his envy of Joseph is what he most repents of. A stanza, however, is inserted, warning against fornication (Ge 49:3).

(c) Levi:

The Testament of Levi follows. It is mainly apocalyptic. The murder of the Shechemites is regarded as a wholly estimable action, and is commended by God. The treachery of the circumcision is not mentioned at all. He tells how he was admitted in dream to the third heaven. In another vision he is clothed with the garments of the priesthood. After a piece of autobiography followed by general admonitions Levi tells what he had learned from the writing of Enoch. He tells how his descendants will fall away and become corrupt. It is to be noted that fornication becomes very prominent in the picture of the future. The destruction of Jerusalem is foretold, and the captivity of Judah among all nations. This cannot refer to the setting up of the "Abomination of Desolation" by Epiphanes. The Temple was not laid waste, although it was desecrated; and there did not follow on the desecration by Epiphanes the scattering of the Jews unto all nations. It seems necessary to understand by this wasting the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Consequently, the "new priest" of XII P 18 seems to us the priest "after the order of Melchizedek" according to the New Testament interpretation.

(d) Judah:

Judah is the next whose Testament is given. He first declares his own great personal prowess, slaying a lion, a bear, a boar, a leopard and a wild bull. When the Canaanite kings assailed Jacob as related in the Book of Jubilee, he showed his courage. Several warlike exploits, of which we only learn here, he relates. The assault made by the descendants of Esau upon the sons of Jacob and Jacob's victory is related in the manner and nearly in the terms of the account in the Book of Jubilees. He mentions with a number of explanatory and excusatory details his sin in the matter of Tamar. He denounces covetousness, drunkenness and fornication. Then he commands his descendants to look to Levi and reverence him. Then follows a Messianic passage which seems most naturally to bear a Christian interpretation.

(e) Issachar:

The Testament of Issachar is much shorter than either of the two preceding ones. After telling the story of the mandrakes, he dwells on husbandry. As is noted by Dr. Charles, this is at variance with the rabbinic representation of the characteristics of the tribe. He, too, denounces impurity and drunkenness.

(f) Zebulun:

Zebulun's Testament is little longer than that of Issachar. This Testament is greatly occupied with tho history of the sale of Joseph in which Zebulun protests he took only the smallest share and got none of the price.

(g) Dan:

The Testament of Dan also is short. He confesses his rage against Joseph, and so warns against anger. Here also are warnings against whoredom. The Messiah is to spring from Judah and Levi. Dr. Charles thinks the first of these was not in the original, because it would naturally have been "tribes," not "tribe," as it is. This somewhat hasty, as in 1Ki 12:23 (Septuagint) we have the precisely similar construction pros panta oikon Iouda kai Beniamin, a sentence which represents the construction of the Hebrew. In this there is a Messianic passage which describes the Messiah as delivering the captives of Beliar.

(h) Naphtali:

The Testament that follows, that of Naphtali, has apocalyptic elements in it. It opens with the genealogy of Bilhah, his mother, whose father is said to be Rotheus. His vision represents Levi seizing the sun and Judah the moon. The young man with the twelve palm branches seems to be a reference to the Apostles. Joseph seizes a bull and rides on it. He has a further dream in which he sees a storm at sea and the brethren being separated. Again there is a reference to the recurrent theme of sexual relation (XII P 8).

(i) Gad:

The subject of the Testament of Gad is hatred. Gad is associated with Simeon as being most filled with wrath against Joseph.

(j) Asher:

Asher urges whole-hearted obedience to righteousness, as the apostle James does in his epistle.

(k) Joseph:

One of the most important of these Testaments is that of Joseph. The opening is occupied with a prolonged description of the temptation of Joseph by Potiphar's wife. There is in that connection the unhealthy dwelling on sexual matters which is found in monkish writers. There are not a few resemblances to the language of the Gospels (compare XII P 1:6 and Mt 25:36). There is a more important passage (XII P 19:8): "And I saw that from Judah was born a virgin wearing a linen garment, and from her was born a lamb, and on his left hand there was, as it were, a lion: and all the beasts rushed against him, and the lamb overcame them, and destroyed them, and trod them under foot." This to us is clearly Christian. Dr. Charles, without apocalyptic credence to support him, would amend it and change the reading.

(1) Benjamin:

The Testament of Benjamin is very much an appendix to that of Joseph. It opens with the account Joseph gave Benjamin of how he was sold to the Ishmaelites. He exhorts his descendants against deceit, but, as all his brethren, he warns them against fornication. There is a long Christian passage which certainly seems an interpolation, as it is not found in some of the texts, though others have all verses. The text concerning Paul (XII P 11:1,2) appears in varying forms in all versions.

(2) Structure.

That these "Testaments" have been interpolated is proved by the variations in the different texts. Dr. Charles has, however, gone much farther, and wherever there is a Christian clause has declared it an obvious interpolation. For our part, we would admit as a rule those passages to be genuine that are present in all the forms of the text. The Greek text was first in, so to say, recent times edited by Grosseteste, bishop of Lincoln, in the 13th century. Since then other manuscripts have been found, and a Slavonic and an Aramaic version. We are thus able to check the interpolations. In essence the Christian passage in T Josephus is found in all versions.

(3) Language.

Dr. Charles makes a very strong case for Hebrew being the original language. His numerous arguments

are not all of equal value. While some of the alleged Hebraistic constructions may be actually so, not a few may be explained by imitation of the language of the Septuagint. As an example of the first, compare T Jud (XII P 7): ochlos barus = chel kabhedh, "a numerous host." On the other hand T Reub XII P 3:8: "understanding in the Law," is a turn of expression that might quite well be common among Greek-speaking Jews. Of passages that are only explicable by retranslation, as in T Josephus 11:7, "God .... increased him in gold and silver and in work," this last turn is evidently due to the translator's rendering 'abhuddah, "servant," as if it were 'abhodhah, "work." On the whole, we are prepared to amend the decision elsewhere, and admit that the probability is that this book, like so many more of the same class, has been translated from Hebrew.

(4) Date and authorship.

Dr. Charles declares the author to have been a Pharisee who wrote in the early part of the reign of John Hyrcanus I. The initial difficulty with this, as with the other pseudepigrapha in attributing a Pharisaic authorship, is the preservation of the book among the Christian communities, and the ignorance or the ignoring of it among the Jews. The only sect of the Jews that survived the destruction of Jerusalem was that of the Pharisees. The Sadducees, who were more a political than a religious party, disappeared with the cessation of the Jewish state. When Judaism became merely a religion—a church—not a nation, their function was gone.

The third sect, the Essenes, disappeared, but did so into the Christian church. If the writer had been an Essene, as we suppose he was, the preservation of this writing by the Christians is easily explicable. If it were the work of a Pharisee, its disappearance from the literature of the synagogue is as inexplicable as its preservation by the Christians. The constant harping on the sin of fornication—in T Naph XII P 8:8 even marital intercourse is looked at askance—indicates a state of mind suitable to the tenets of the Essenes. The date preferred by Dr. Charles, if the author is a Pharisee, appears to us impossible. The Pharisees had, long before the final break, been out of sympathy with the Maccabeans. The Chasidim deserted Judas Maccabeus at Elasa, not improbably in consequence of the alliance he had made with the heathen Romans, and perhaps also his assumption of the high- priesthood. Further, the temple is laid waste and the people driven into captivity unto all nations (T Levi 15:1). This does not suit the desecration of the temple under Epiphanes.

During that time the temple was not laid waste. The orgies of the worship of Bacchus and of Jupiter Olympius dishonored it, but that is a different thing from its being laid waste. The scattering unto all nations did not take place then. Some were taken captive and enslaved, but this was not general. The description would only apply to destruction of the temple by Titus and the enslaving and captivity of the mass of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The "New Priest" cannot refer to the Maccabeans, for they were Aaronites as much as Alcimus or Onias, though not of the high-priestly family. This change of the priesthood only has point if it refers to the priesthood of Christ as in Heb 7:12. If Dr. Charles is right in maintaining that 2 Macc in its account of Menelaus is to be preferred to Josephus, the change of the priesthood was not unprecedented, for Menelaus was a Benjamite, not a Levite. Yet 1 Macc takes no notice of this enormity.

Further, there are the numerous passages that are directly and indirectly Christian. Dr. Charles certainly marks them all as interpolations, but he gives no reason in most of the cases for doing so. That the omission of such passages does not dislocate the narrative arises from the simpler construction of Semitic narrative, and is therefore not to be regarded as conclusive evidence of interpolation. The reference to Paul in T Ben XII P 11, occurring in all the sources, although with variations, also points to a post-Christian origin. For these reasons, we would venture to differ from Dr. Charles and regard the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs as post-Christian, and to be dated in the first quarter of the 2nd century AD.

(5) Relation to Other Books.

From the decision we have reached in regard to the date of these Testaments, it follows that all the many resemblances which have been noted between them and the books of the New Testament are due to imitation on the part of the Testaments, not the reverse. A case in point is T Josephus XII P 1:6 where the resemblance to Mt 25:31-36 is close; only, whereas in the Gospel the judge approves of the righteous on account of their visiting the sick and the imprisoned, and condemns the wicked because they did not do so, in T Josephus God ministers to His servants. The Testament is really an imitation of the passage in the Gospel. The direct visiting of the afflicted, whatever the form of the affliction, was a thing of everyday occurrence. To think of the Almighty doing so is the result of a bold metaphor. One familiar with the Gospel narrative might not unnaturally think of God’s dealings with the saints in terms drawn from our Lord’s description of the Last Judgment. In T Naph XII P 2:2 the figure of the potter and the clay is, as in Ro 9:21, applied to God’s power over His creatures. The passage in the T Naph is expanded, and has not the close intimate connection with the argument that the Pauline passage has. While none of the other resemblances give one any ground to decide, these instances really carry the others with them. We may thus regard the resemblances to the New Testament in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs as due to the latter’s copying of the former.

2. Testament of Adam:

The Testament of Adam survives merely in a group of fragments published first by Renan in the Journal Asiatique (1853). A Greek fragment was published by M. R. James. A portion of it is apocalyptic, and gives an account of the adoration offered by all the different classes of God’s creatures. More strictly of the nature of a Testament is a Syriac fragment entitled "More of Adam Our Father." It contains a prophecy of the incarnation, and appears to be of late date. It was used by the Sethires.

3. Testament of Abraham:

The Testament of Abraham is a late document. It opens with representing Abraham at his tent door. One recension declares his age then to be 995 years. Michael comes to him. The purpose for which Michael has been sent is to reveal to Abraham that he must die. He hesitates to do this. When, however, the fatal message is revealed, Abraham will not yield up his spirit at first. He is after a while persuaded, and as reward, before his death he has a revelation: there is given to him a vision of the whole world in the

widest sense—the world of spirits as well. Seeing a soul, which, weighed in the balance, is nearly being found wanting, by his intercession the soul is admitted to Paradise.

There are several traces of Christian influence; many of the thoughts and phrases are similar to those to be found in the Gospels. At the same time, although to one who had read John's Gospel the statement of our Lord that Abraham had seen His day "and was glad" (Joh 8:55,56) would inevitably have led a Christian writer to have exhibited Abraham as seeing in vision the day of Christ. The writer's failure to do so seems to show that he was not a Christian. The echoes of the Gospel in the language and the want of that distinctive Christian mark is to be explained if we regard the translator as a Christian, while the original Midrash was the work of a Jew. The language was probably Aramaic. There are two Greek recensions, one longer than the other. There is an Arabic version which appears to be a translation direct from Aramaic. As there is no reference to the coming of Christ, this Testament is probably pre-Christian. The translation may be dated early in the 2nd century, as Origen knew it. In Arabic there is a manuscript of the Testaments of Isaac and Jacob. They are late and Christian. The latter is founded on the last chapter of Genesis.

4. Testament of Job:

More interesting is the Testament of Job published in Anecdota Apocrypha by M. R. James in 1897. It purports to be an account of his sufferings related by Job himself. It appears to be the work of a Jew, translated by a Christian. The position of Satan in the Midrash is not so subordinate as in the drama. Elihu, when not confused with Eliphaz, is regarded as inspired by Satan.

(1) Summary. It begins with Job, "who is called Jobab," summoning his seven sons and three daughters. The list of the sons forms a singular assemblage of names, most probably of Semitic origin. Most of them are certainly Greek words, though not Greek proper names—Choros and Nike, "dance" and "victory," Huon, "of pigs," Phoros, "tribute." The other names are Tersi, Phiphi, Phrouon. He tells his descendants how he had been called in the night and had had it revealed to him that the sacrifices that had been offered previously in the great temple near him were not offered to God, but to Satan. He was ordered to destroy the temple thus devoted to false worship. He did so, but knew that Satan would seek him, to take his revenge. Satan came disguised as a beggar, and Job, recognizing him, ordered his porteress to give him a burned cake of bread, all ashes. Satan reveals himself and threatens Job. With XII P 9 begins an account of Job's wealth and lordly beneficence founded on the canonical book.

It continues to XII P 16. This portion is an expansion of the canonical Job. In some portions there are marked variations. Job is a king, and since this is so, the power of Persia is invoked to overthrow him. After twenty years his friends come to condole with him. They also are kings. Sitis his wife is bemoaning her children. Job declares he sees them crowned with heavenly beauty. On learning this, Sitis dies, and so rejoins her children. The speeches of the friends are much condensed, and scarcely of the same character as those in the canonical book. Lyric passages are introduced. The most singular difference from the canonical book is the role assigned to Elihu. Job says, "Elihu inspired by Satan addressed to me rash words" (XII P 42). God then speaks to Job in the whirlwind and blames Elihu. Job

sacrifices for the three friends, and Eliphaz in a lyric piece congratulates himself and his friends, and declares that the lamp and glory of Elihu will be quenched (XII P 43).

By a second wife we are told Job had the seven sons and three daughters who are summoned to his bedside. Closing his narrative (XII P 44) Job exhorts kindness to the poor. In the end of the book his successive daughters speak. He had divided his property, now double what it had originally been, among his seven sons and had left the daughters unprovided for. He, however, bestows upon them other gifts. Three golden vessels are brought him and given them, three cords besides, and each one has a several endowment. The first daughter, called, as in the Septuagint, Hemera, (Jemima in the canonical Job), had another heart given her, and she spoke in the tongue of the angels. Casia (Keziah), the second daughter, also had a changed heart, and it was given to her to speak in the dialect of the principalities (archon). Then the third daughter girded herself, and with the changed heart it was given her to speak in the language of the Cherubim. This daughter is called Amaltheias Keras, the rather strange translation of Keren Haphukh adopted by the Septuagint. All the names are transferred from that source. A brother of Job named Nereus (or Nereias) is introduced, who records further gifts to these daughters—a lyre to the first, a censer to the second and a drum to the third. This brother is a relative of whose existence we have no hint elsewhere. He is introduced to supply the conclusion to the narrative.

(2) Structure.

It would appear that from XII P 1 to 45 is the original Testament in which Job is the speaker. In XII P 46-51 a new state of matters comes into prominence, in which Nereus is the speaker. The last two chapters seem decidedly to be additions: the new gifts to the daughters seem unexplained. Of course, oriental authors do not look so strictly to the unity of parts as do Occidentals.

(3) Language.

The dependence on the Septuagint would suggest that Greek was the original tongue. One or two phenomena point to a Semitic tongue being behind the Greek. The names of Job’s daughters are taken from the Septuagint; those of the seven sons have been invented. As we have seen, they are not Greek names, but are probably really Hellenized versions of some Semitic appellations. At the same time, they do not seem to be Hebrew, but rather Aramaic. It would seem to have been translated by one familiar with the New Testament.

(4) Date and authorship.

It has no direct references to Christian doctrines or the facts of Christian history. This seems conclusive against its having a Christian origin. The reason that would lead a Christian to compose such a document would be to give a further prophetic evidence for the mission of his Master. He would have no object in making Job out to be a connection of Israel, unless he were so himself. Dr. James thinks the writer to have been a Jewish Christian of the 2nd century resident in Egypt. By the 2nd century few Jews passed from Judaism to the faith of Jesus: the break between church and synagogue had become complete. That

Job is made king of all Egypt (XII P 28) may indicate some relationship to that country, as if the writer had identified Job with Psammeticus, the Egyptian king overthrown by Cambyses. This, however, may have been due to the translator. If the original language were Semitic—Aramaic or Hebrew—the probability is that the author wrote in Palestine. There are no direct signs to indicate the date. There is no appearance of knowledge of Rome. The fire of the opposition to the Seleucids had died down. It may have been written in the reign of Alexander.

V. Sibylline Oracles.

The burning of the Capitol (83 BC) and the destruction of the famous Sibylline books led Sulla to search in Italy and Greece for any Oracles that might replace the contents of the volumes which had been burnt. About half a century later Augustus revived the search for Oracles. Such a demand would naturally produce a supply. It would seem that certain Jews of Alexandria, eager to propagate the faith of their fathers, invented verses in the shape in which these Oracles had been preserved, as we learn from Herodotus—i.e. in hexameter lines and in the epic dialect in which Homer and Hesiod had written. Those in Herodotus are mainly from the Oracle of Delphi. From Pausanias, who quotes several of them, we learn that the Oracles attributed to the various Sibyls were delivered in a similar style. Hence these Jewish forgeries were written in epic hexameters. Later, this industry was pursued with even greater zeal by Christians.

These have been collected into several books—some 15 are named—of which some have been lost. The books are made up of fragments of different ages. The first book begins with the creation, and narrates the history of the race to the flood and the going out of Noah from the ark. Then the history of our Lord is given succinctly, the miracle of the loaves, the crucifixion, and the destruction of Jerusalem. In it Hades is derived from "Adam." Reference is made to the sin of the watchers, as in En, and an arithmograph is given which seems to be fulfilled in Theos Soter. The second book is modeled largely on our Lord’s eschatological discourses, many passages bearing a distinct echo of it. It may be noted that the four archangels of the Book of Enoch—Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel—are introduced. The third is by much the longest, but it is a confused mass of fragments.

There is early reference to the conquest of Egypt by Rome; the building of the tower of Babel, the siege of Troy, the conquest of Alexander and many other events appear. The fourth book is Christian throughout. After praise to the Christians, there is a sketch of the history of the great empires, beginning with the Assyrians and ending with Alexander; then an account of Nero appearing from the East and doing evil fills the end of all things. The fifth book begins with an account of the successive emperors from Julius Caesar to the Antonines. Then a new song begins with Egypt, and wanders off indefinitely, referring to Xerxes crossing the Hellespont, the impurities of Rome, and ending with Egypt and the burning up of all things. The sixth is short—28 lines in praise of the Cross; and the seventh is fragmentary. In the eighth is the arithmogram and acrostic: Iesous christos theou huios soter stauros. The remaining books have similar characteristics. The place of composition is evidently Egypt, as, whatever the immediate context may be, the writer gravitates to Egypt; and the authors are Jews or Jewish Christians. The dates of the various fragments of which this collection is composed fall between the first triumvirate and the age of Diocletian.

VI. Conclusion.

There are many points in which theology of the Apocalyptic prepared the way for that of Christianity. These, however, are more naturally taken up under their special headings. Angelology is much more developed in certain apocalyptic writings than it is in Christianity, if we except the writings published under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite. Most of them are occupied with the coming Messiah. The Christology of these writings is decidedly in advance of that of the Old Testament. That question, however, is discussed under its appropriate heading. Closely connected with this is the doctrine of God, or theology proper. In this, too, there is an approximation to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. With these writers the doctrine of the Last Things is always brought into close relationship to that of the Messiah. His coming is the signal for the end of the world, the last judgment, the punishment of the wicked and the reward of the righteous. What we have just said applies mainly to the strictly Jewish and pre-Christian Apocalypses. In the Christian Jewish Apocalypses the place the incarnation and the miraculous birth hold is worthy of special note. The representation in regard to the latter of these subjects is independent of the gospel narrative. Connected with this independence of the written Scriptures are the variations these writings introduce into history. Many of these are due to apologetic reasons, not a few to the desire to enhance the national glory. The reverence for the letter of Scripture, so markedly characteristic of the rabbinic teachings found in the Talmud, is not found in the apocalyptic writings. Apocalyptic thus presents a stage in the doctrine of Scripture.

LITERATURE.

On Apocalyptic generally: Deane, Pseudepigrapha; Derembourg, Histoire de la Palestine; Drummond. Jewish Messiah; Ewald, History of Israel, translation V; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, III; Hilgenfeld, Messias Judeorum; Judische Apocalyptik; Kautzsch, Die Apocryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Allen Testaments; Langen, Paldstina zur Zeit Christi; Renan, Histoire du Peuple d'Israel; Schurer, Jewish People, translation V; Stanton, Jewish and Christian Messiah; Thomson, Books Which Influenced our Lord. On special books: Enoch (Text, Ethiopic): Laurence, Dillmann, Flemming; (English): Laurence, Schodde, Charles. Slavonic Book of Enoch: Morfill. Baruch (Text, Syriac): Ceriani; (English): Charles, The Assumption of Moses (Text, Latin): Ceriani; (English): Charles, The Ascension of Isaiah (Text, Ethiopic): Laurence, Dillmann; (English): Charles, Fourth Book of Esdras (Text, Latin): Vulgate; (English): Apocrypha the Revised Version (British and American) Book of Jubilees (Text, Ethiopic): Dillmann, Charles; (English): Schodde, Charles, Psalter of Solomon (Text, Greek): Pick, Ryle and James; (English): Whiston, Pick, Ryle and James, Rendel Harris (from Syriac). Odes of Solomon (English): Rendel Harris, Testaments of the XII Patriarchs (Text, Greek): Sinker, Charles; (English): Sinker, Charles, Testaments of Abraham and Job; Texts and Studies; Sibylline Oracles (Text): Alexandre, Rzach.

J. E. H. Thomson

APOCRYPHA

a-pok’-ri-fa:

I. DEFINITION

II. THE NAME APOCRYPHA

1. Original Meanings

(1) Classical

(2) Hellenistic

(3) In the New Testament

(4) Patristic

2. "Esoteric" in Greek Philosophy, etc.

III. USAGE AS TO APOCRYPHA

1. Early Christian Usage

"Apocalyptic" Literature

2. The Eastern Church

(1) "Esoteric" Literature (Clement of Alexandria, etc.)

(2) Change to "Religious" Books (Origen, etc.)

(3) "Spurious" Books (Athanasius, Nicephorus, etc.)

(4) "List of Sixty"

3. The Western Church

(1) The Decretum Gelasii

(2) "Non-Canonical" Books

4. The Reformers

Separation from Canonical Books

5. Heb Words for "Apocrypha"

(1) Do Such Exist?

(2) Views of Zahn, Schurer, Porter, etc. (ganaz, genuzim)

(3) Reasons for Rejection

6. Summary

IV. CONTENTS OF THE APOCRYPHA

1. List of Books

2. Classification of Books

V. ORIGINAL LANGUAGES OF THE APOCRYPHA

VI. DATE OF THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS

LITERATURE

I. Definition.

The word Apocrypha, as usually understood, denotes the collection of religious writings which the Septuagint and Vulgate (with trivial differences) contain in addition to the writings constituting the Jewish and Protestant canon. This is not the original or the correct sense of the word, as will be shown, but it is that which it bears almost exclusively in modern speech. In critical works of the present day it is customary to speak of the collection of writings now in view as "the Old Testament Apocrypha," because many of the books at least were written in Hebrew, the language of the Old Testament, and because all of them are much more closely allied to the Old Testament than to the New Testament. But there is a "New" as well as an "Old" Testament Apocrypha consisting of gospels, epistles, etc. Moreover the adjective "Apocryphal" is also often applied in modern times to what are now generally called "Pseudepigraphical writings," so designated because ascribed in the titles to authors who did not and could not have written them (eg. Enoch, Abraham, Moses, etc.). The persons thus connected with these books are among the most distinguished in the traditions and history of Israel, and there can be no doubt that the object for which such names have been thus used is to add weight and authority to these

writings.

The late Professor E. Kautzsch of Halle edited a German translation of the Old and New Testament Apocrypha, and of the Pseudepigraphical writings, with excellent introductions and valuable notes by the best German scholars. Dr. Edgar Hennecke has edited a similar work on the New Testament Apocrypha. Nothing in the English language can be compared with the works edited by Kautzsch and Hennecke in either scholarship or usefulness. (A similar English work to that edited by Kautzsch is now passing through the (Oxford) press, Dr. R. H. Charles being the editor, the writer of this article being one of the contributors.)

II. The Name Apocrypha.

The investigation which follows will show that when the word "Apocryphal" was first used in ecclesiastical writings it bore a sense virtually identical with "esoteric": so that "apocryphal writings" were such as appealed to an inner circle and could not be understood by outsiders. The present connotation of the term did not get fixed until the Protestant Reformation had set in, limiting the Biblical canon to its present dimensions among Protestant churches.

1. Original Meanings:

(1) Classical.

The Greek adjective apokruphos, denotes strictly "hidden," "concealed," of a material object (Eurip. Here. Fur. 1070). Then it came to signify what is obscure, recondite, hard to understand (Xen. Mem. 3.5, 14). But it never has in classical Greek any other sense.

(2) Hellenistic.

In Hellenistic Greek as represented by the Septuagint and the New Testament there is no essential departure from classical usage. In the Septuagint (or rather Theodotion’s version) of Da 11:43 it stands for "hidden" as applied to gold and silver stores. But the word has also in the same text the meaning "what is hidden away from human knowledge and understanding." So Da 2:20 (Theod.) where the apokrupha or hidden things are the meanings of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream revealed to Daniel though "hidden" from the wise men of Babylon. The word has the same sense in Sirach 14:21; 39:3,7; 42:19; 48:25; 43:32.

(3) In the New Testament.

In the New Testament the word occurs but thrice, namely, Mr 4:22 and the parallel Lu 8:17; Col 2:3. In the last passage Bishop Lightfoot thought we have in the word apokruphoi (treasures of Christ hidden) an allusion to the vaunted esoteric knowledge of the false teachers, as if Paul meant to say that it is in Christ alone we have true wisdom and knowledge and not in the secret books of these teachers.

Assuming this, we have in this verse the first example of apokruphos in the sense "esoteric." But the evidence is against so early a use of the term in this—soon to be its prevailing—sense. Nor does exegesis demand such a meaning here, for no writings of any kind seem intended.

(4) Patristic.

In patristic writings of an early period the adjective apokruphos came to be applied to Jewish and Christian writings containing secret knowledge about the future, etc., intelligible only to the small number of disciples who read them and for whom they were believed to be specially provided. To this class of writings belong in particular those designated Apocalyptic (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE), and it will be seen as thus employed that apokruphos has virtually the meaning of the Greek esoterikos.

2. "Esoteric" in Greek Philosophy, etc.:

A brief statement as to the doctrine in early Greek philosophy will be found helpful at this point. From quite early times the philosophers of ancient Greece distinguished between the doctrines and rites which could be taught to all their pupils, and those which could profitably be communicated only to a select circle called the initiated. The two classes of doctrines and rites—they were mainly the latter—were designated respectively "exoteric" and "esoteric." Lucian (died 312; see Vit. Auct. 26) followed by many others referred the distinction to Aristotle, but as modern scholars agree, wrongly, for the exoterikoi logoi, of that philosopher denote popular treatises. The Pythagoreans recognized and observed these two kinds of doctrines and duties and there is good reason for believing that they created a corresponding double literature though unfortunately no explicit examples of such literature have come down to us.

In the Greek mysteries (Orphic, Dionysiac, Eleusinian, etc.) two classes of hearers and readers are implied all through, though it is a pity that more of the literature bearing on the question has not been preserved. Among the Buddhists the Samga forms a close society open originally to monks or bhikhus admitted only after a most rigid examination; but in later years nuns (bhikshunis) also have been allowed admission, though in their case too after careful testing. The Vinaya Pitaka or "Basket of Discipline" contains the rules for entrance and the regulations to be observed after entrance. But this and kindred literature was and is still held to be caviare to outsiders. See translation in the Sacred Books of the East, XI (Rhys Davids and Oldenberg).

III. Usage as to Apocrypha.

It must be borne in mind that the word apocrypha is really a Greek adjective in the neuter plural, denoting strictly "things hidden." But almost certainly the noun biblia is understood, so that the real implication of the word is "apocryphal books" or "writings." In this article apocrypha will be employed in the sense of this last, and apocryphal as the equivalent of the Greek apokruphos.

1. Early Christian Usage:

"Apocalyptic" literature.

The word apocrypha was first used technically by early Christian writers for the Jewish and Christian writings usually classed under "Apocalyptic" (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE). In this sense it takes the place of the classical Greek word esoterika and bears the same general meaning, namely, writings intended for an inner circle and cap. able of being understood by no others. These writings give intimations regarding the future, the ultimate triumph of the kingdom of God, etc., beyond, it was thought, human discovery and also beyond the intelligence of the uninitiated. In this sense Gregory of Nyssa (died 395; De Ordin., II, 44) and Epiphanius (died 403; Haeres, 51 3) speak of the Apocalypse of John as "apocryphal."

2. The Eastern Church:

Christianity itself has nothing corresponding to the idea of a doctrine for the initiated or a literature for a select few. The gospel was preached in its first days to the poor and ignorant, and the reading and studying of the sacred Scriptures have been urged by the churches (with some exceptions) upon the public at large.

(1) "Esoteric" Literature (Clement of Alexandria, etc.).

The rise of this conception in the eastern church is easily understood. When devotees of Greek philosophy accepted the Christian faith it was natural for them to look at the new religion through the medium of the old philosophy. Many of them read into the canonical writings mystic meanings, and embodied those meanings in special books, these last becoming esoteric literature in themselves: and as in the case of apocalyptic writings, this esoteric literature was more revered than the Bible itself. In a similar way there grew up among the Jews side by side with the written law an oral law containing the teaching of the rabbis and regarded as more sacred and authoritative than the writings they profess to expound. One may find some analogy in the fact that among many Christians the official literature of the denomination to which they belong has more commanding force than the Bible itself. This movement among Greek Christians was greatly aided by Gnostic sects and the esoteric literature to which they gave rise. These Gnostics had been themselves influenced deeply by Babylonian and Persian mysticism and the corresponding literature. Clement of Alexandria (died 220) distinctly mentions esoteric books belonging to the Zoroastrian (Mazdean) religion.

Oriental and especially Greek Christianity tended to give to philosophy the place which the New Testament and western Christianity assign the Old Testament. The preparation for the religion of Jesus was said to be in philosophy much more than in the religion of the Old Testament. It will be remembered that Marcian (died end of 2nd century AD), Thomas Morgan, the Welsh 18th-century deist (died 1743) and Friedrich Schleiermacher (died 1834) taught this very same thing.

Clement of Alexandria (see above) recognized 4 (2) Esdras (to be hereafter called the Apocalypse of

Ezra), the Assumption of Moses, etc., as fully canonical. In addition to this he upheld the authority and value of esoterical books, Jewish, Christian, and even heathen. But he is of most importance for our present purpose because he is probably the earliest Greek writer to use the word apocrypha as the equivalent of esoterika, for he describes the esoteric books of Zoroastrianism as apocryphal.

But the idea of esoteric religious literature existed at an earlier time among the Jews, and was borrowed from them by Christians. It is clearly taught in the Apocalyptic Esdras (2 or 4 Esd) chapter 14, where it is said that Ezra aided by five amanuenses produced under Divine inspiration 94 sacred books, the writings of Moses and the prophets having been lost when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed. Of this large number of sacred books 24 were to be published openly, for the unworthy as well as the worthy, these 24 books representing undoubtedly the books of the Hebrew Old Testament. The remaining 70 were to be kept for the exclusive use of the "wise among the people": i.e. they were of an esoteric character. Perhaps if the Greek original of this book had been preserved the word "apocrypha" would have been found as an epithetic attached to the 70 books. Our English versions are made from a Latin original EZRA or the APOCALYPTIC ESDRAS. Modern scholars agree that in its present form this book arose in the reign of Domitian 81-96 AD. So that the conception of esoteric literature existed among the Jews in the 1st century of our era, and probably still earlier.

It is significant of the original character of the religion of Israel that no one has been able to point to a Hebrew word corresponding to esoteric (see below). When among the Jews there arose a literature of oral tradition it was natural to apply to this last the Greek notion of esoteric, especially as this class of literature was more highly esteemed in many Jewish circles than the Old Testament Scriptures themselves.

(2) Change to "Religious" Books (Origen, etc.).

The next step in the history of the word "apocrypha" is that by which it came to denote religious books inferior in authority and worth to the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament. This change of attitude toward noncanonical writings took place under the influence of two principles: (1) that no writer could be inspired who lived subsequent to the apostolic age; (2) that no writing could be recognized as canonical unless it was accepted as such by the churches in general (in Latin the principle was—quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus). Now it was felt that many if not most of the religious writings which came in the end of the 2nd century to be called "apocryphal" in a disparaging sense had their origin among heretical sects like the Gnostics, and that they had never commanded the approval of the great bulk of the churches. Origen (died 253) held that we ought to discriminate between books called "apocryphal," some such having to be firmly rejected as teaching what is contrary to the Scriptures. More and more from the end of the 2nd century, the word "apocrypha" came to stand for what is spurious and untrustworthy, and especially for writings ascribed to authors who did not write them: i.e. the so-called "Pseudepigraphical books."

Irenaeus (died 202) in opposition to Clement of Alexandria denies that esoteric writings have any claims to credence or even respect, and he uses the Greek word for "apocryphal" to describe all Jewish and

Christian canons. To him, as later to Jerome (died 420), "canonical" and "apocryphal" were antithetic terms. Tertullian (died 230) took the same view: "apocryphal" to him denoted non-canonical. But both Irenaeus and Tertullian meant by apocrypha in particular the apocalyptic writings. During the Nicene period, and even earlier, sacred books were divided by Christian teachers into three classes:

(1) books that could be read in church;

(2) books that could be read privately, but not in public;

(3) books that were not to be read at all. This classification is implied in the writings of Origen, Clement of Alexandria, Athanasius (died 373), and in the Muratorian Fragments (about 200 AD).

(3) "Spurious" Books (Athanasius, Nicephorus, etc.).

Athanasius, however, restricted the word apocrypha to the third class, thus making the corresponding adjective synonymous with "spurious." Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople (806-15 AD) in his chronography (belonging essentially to 500 AD according to Zahn) divides sacred books thus:

(1) the canonical books of the Old Testament and New Testament;

(2) the Antilegomena of both Testaments;

(3) the Apocrypha of both Testaments.

The details of the Apocrypha of the New Testament are thus enumerated:

(1) Enoch;

(2) The 12 Patriarchs;

(3) The Prayer of Joseph;

(4) The Testament of Moses;

(5) The Assumption of Moses;

(6) Abram;

(7) Eldad and Modad;

(8) Elijah the Prophet;

(9) Zephaniah the Prophet;

(10) Zechariah, father of John;

(11) The Pseudepigrapha of Baruch, Habakkuk, Ezekiel and Daniel.

The books of the New Testament Apocrypha are thus given:

(1) The Itinerary of Paul;

(2) The Itinerary of Peter;

(3) The Itinerary of John;

(4) The Itinerary of Thomas;

(5) The Gospel according to Thomas;

(6) The Teaching of the Apostles (the Didache);

(7) and (8) The Two Epistles of Clement;

(9) Epistles of Ignatius, Polycarp and Hermas.

The above lists are repeated in the so-called Synopsis of Athanasius. The authors of these so-called apocryphal books being unknown, it was sought to gain respect for these writers by tacking onto them well-known names, so that, particularly in the western church, "apocryphal" came to be almost synonymous with "pseudepigraphical." Of the Old Testament lists given above numbers 1, 2, 4, 5 are extant wholly or in part. Numbers 3, 7, 8 and 9 are lost though quoted as genuine by Origen and other eastern Fathers. They are all of them apocalypses designated apocrypha in accordance with early usage.

(4) "List of Sixty."

In the anonymous, "List of Sixty," which hails from the 7th century, we have represented probably the attitude of the eastern church. It divides sacred books into three classes:

(1) The sixty canonical books. Since the Protestant canon consists of but 57 books it will be seen that in this list books outside our canon are included.

(2) Books excluded from the 60, yet of superior authority to those mentioned as apocryphal in the next

class. (3) Apocryphal books, the names of which are as follows:

(a) Adam;

(b) Enoch;

(c) Lamech;

(d) The 12 Patriarchs;

(e) The Prayer of Joseph;

(f) Eldad and Modad;

(g) The Testament of Moses;

(h) The Assumption of Moses;

(i) The Psalms of Solomon;

(j) The Apocalypse of Elijah;

(k) The Ascension of Isaiah;

(l) The Apocalypse of Zephaniah (see number 9 of the Old Testament Apocrypha books mentioned in the Chronography of Nicephorus);

(m) The Apocalypse of Zechariah;

(n) The Apocalyptic Ezra;

(o) The History of James;

(p) The Apocalypse of Peter;

(q) The Itinerary and Teaching of the Apostles;

(r) The Epistles of Barnabas;

(s) The Ac of Paul;

(t) Apocalypse of Paul;

(u) Didascalia of Clement;

(v) Didascalia of Ignatius;

(w) Didascalia of Polycarp;

(x) Gospel according to Barnabas;

(y) Gospel according to Matthew.

The greater number of these books come under the designation "apocryphal" in the early sense of "apocalyptic," but by this time the word had taken on a lower meaning, namely, books not good for even private reading. Yet the fact that these books are mentioned at all show that they were more highly esteemed than heathen and than even heretical Christian writings. The eastern churches down to the present day reject the meaning of "apocrypha" current among Protestants (see definition above), and their Bible includes the Old Testament Apocrypha, making no distinction between it and the rest of the Bible.

3. The Western Church:

(1) The Decretum Gelasii.

In the western church the word apocrypha and the corresponding adjective had a somewhat different history. In general it may be said that the western church did not adopt the triple division of sacred books prevalent in the eastern church. Yet the Decretum Gelasii (6th century in its present form) has a triple. list which is almost certainly that of the Roman synod of 382 under Damasus, bishop of Rome, 366 to 384. It is as follows:

(1) the canonical books of both Testaments;

(2) writings of the Fathers approved by the church;

(3) apocryphal books rejected by the church.

Then there is added a list of miscellaneous books condemned as heretical, including even the works of Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Eusebius, these works being all branded as "apocryphal." On the other hand Gregory of Nyssa and Epiphanius, both writing in the 4th century, use the word "apocrypha" in the old sense of apocalyptic, i.e. esoteric.

(2) "Non-Canonical" Books.

Jerome (died 420) in the Prologus Galeatus (so called because it was a defense and so resembled a helmeted warrior) or preface to his Latin version of the Bible uses the word "Apocrypha" in the sense of non-canonical books. His words are: Quidquid extra hos (i.e. the 22 canonical books) inter Apocrypha ponendum: "Anything outside of these must be placed within the Apocrypha" (when among the Fathers and rabbis the Old Testament is made to contain 22 (not 24) books, Ru and Lamentations are joined respectively to Judges and Jeremiah). He was followed in this by Rufinus (died circa 410), in turns Jerome's friend and adversary, as he had been anticipated by Irenaeus. The western church as a whole departed from Jerome's theory by including the antilegomena of both Testaments among the canonical writings: but the general custom of western Christians about this time was to make apocryphal mean non-canonical. Yet Augustine (died 430; De Civitale Dei, XV, 23) explained the "apocrypha" as denoting obscurity of origin or authorship, and this sense of the word became the prevailing one in the West.

4. The Reformers:

Separation from Canonical Books.

But it is to the Reformers that we are indebted for the habit of using Apocrypha for a collection of books appended to the Old Testament and generally up to 1827 appended to every printed English Bible. Bodenstein of Carlstadt, usually called Carlstadt (died 1541), an early Reformer, though Luther's bitter personal opponent, was the first modern scholar to define "Apocrypha" quite clearly as writings excluded from the canon, whether or not the true authors of the books are known, in this, going back to Jerome's position. The adjective "apocryphal" came to have among Protestants more and more a disparaging sense. Protestantism was in its very essence the religion of a book, and Protestants would be sure to see to it that the sacred volume on which they based their religion, including the reforms they introduced, contained no book but those which in their opinion had the strongest claims to be regarded as authoritative.

In the eastern and western churches under the influence of the Greek (Septuagint) and Latin (Vulgate) versions the books of the Apocrypha formed an integral part of the canon and were scattered throughout the Old Testament, they being placed generally near books with which they have affinity. Even Protestant Bibles up to 1827 included the Apocrypha, but as one collection of distinct writings at the end of the Old Testament. It will be seen from what has been said that notwithstanding the favorable attitude toward it of the eastern and western churches, from the earliest times, our Apocrypha was regarded with more or less suspicion, and the suspicion would be strengthened by the general antagonism toward it. In the Middle Ages, under the influence of Reuchlin (died 1532)—great scholar and Reformer—Hebrew came to be studied and the Old Testament read in its original language. The fact that the Apocrypha is absent from the Hebrew canon must have had some influence on the minds of the Reformers.

Moreover in the Apocrypha there are parts inconsistent with Protestant principles, as for example the doctrines of prayers for the dead, the intercession of the saints, etc. The Jews in the early Christian

centuries had really two Bibles: (1) There was the Hebrew Bible which does not include the Apocrypha, and which circulated in Palestine and Babylon; (2) there was the Greek version (Septuagint) used by Greek-speaking Jews everywhere. Until in quite early times, instigated by the use made of it by Christians against themselves, the Jews condemned this version and made the Hebrew canon their Bible, thus rejecting the books of the Apocrypha from their list of canonical writings, and departing from the custom of Christian churches which continued with isolated remonstrances to make the Greek Old Testament canon, with which the Vulgate agrees almost completely, their standard. It is known that the Reformers were careful students of the Bible, and that in Old Testament matters they were the pupils of Jewish scholars—there were no other competent teachers of Hebrew. It might therefore have been expected that the Old Testament canon of the Reformers would agree in extent with that of the Jews and not with that of the Greek and Latin Christians. Notwithstanding the doubt which Ryle (Canon of the Old Testament, 156) casts on the matter, all the evidence goes to show that the Septuagint and therefore the other great Greek versions included the Apocrypha from the first onward.

But how comes it to be that the Greek Old Testament is more extensive than the Hebrew Old Testament? Up to the final destruction of Jerusalem in 71 AD the temple with its priesthood and ritual was the center of the religious thought and life of the nation. But with the destruction of the sanctuary and the disbanding of its officials it was needful to find some fresh binding and directing agency and this was found in the collection of sacred writings known by us as the Old Testament. By a national synod held at Jamnia, near Jaffa, in 90 AD, the Old Testament canon was practically though not finally closed, and from that date one may say that the limits of the Old Testament were once and for all fixed, no writings being included except those written in Hebrew, the latest of these being as old as 100 BC. Now the Jews of the Dispersion spoke and wrote Greek, and they continued to think and write long after their fellow-countrymen of the homeland had ceased to produce any fresh original literature. What they did produce was explanatory of what had been written and practical.

The Greek Bible—the Septuagint—is that of the Jews in Egypt and of those found in other Greek-speaking countries. John Wycliffe (died 1384) puts the Apocrypha together at the end of the Old Testament and the same course was taken by Luther (1546) in his great German and by Miles Coverdale (died 1568) in his English translation.

5. Hebrew Words for "Apocrypha":

Is it quite certain that there is no Hebrew word or expression corresponding exactly to the word "apocrypha" as first used by Christian writers, i.e. in the sense "esoteric"? One may answer this by a decisive negative as regards the Old Testament and the Talmud. But in the Middle Ages qabbalah (literally, "tradition") came to have ‘a closely allied meaning (compare our "kabbalistic").

(1) Do such exist?

Is there in Hebrew a word or expression denoting "non-canonical," i.e. having the secondary sense acquired by "apocrypha"? This question does not allow of so decided an answer, and as matter of fact it

has been answered in different ways.

(2) Views of Zahn, Schurer, Porter, etc. (ganaz, genuzim).

Zahn (Gesch. des neutest. Kanons, I, i, 123 ff); Schurer (RE3, I, 623); Porter (HDB, I) and others maintain that the Greek word "Apocrypha (Biblia)" is a translation of the Hebrew Cepharim genuzim, literally, "books stored away." If this view is the correct one it follows that the distinction of canonical and non-canonical books originated among the Jews, and that the Fathers in using the word apocrypha in this sense were simply copying the Jews substituting Greek words for the Hebrew equivalent. But there are decisive reasons for rejecting this view.

(3) Reasons for Rejection.

(a) The verb ganaz of which the passive part. occurs in the above phrase means "to store away," "to remove from view"—of things in themselves sacred or precious. It never means to exclude as from the canon.

(b) When employed in reference to sacred books it is only of those recognized as canonical. Thus after copies of the Pentateuch or of other parts of the Hebrew Bible had, by age and use, become unfit to be read in the home or in the synagogue they were "buried" in the ground as being too sacred to be burnt or cut up; and the verb denoting this burying is ganaz. But those buried books are without exception canonical.

(c) The Hebrew phrase in question does not once occur in either the Babylonian or the Jerusalem Talmud, but only in rabbinical writings of a much later date. The Greek apocrypha cannot therefore be a rendering of the Hebrew expression. The Hebrew for books definitely excluded from the canon is Cepharim chitsonim =" outside" or "extraneous books." The Mishna (the text of the Gemara, both making up what we call the Talmud) or oral law with its additions came to be divided analogously into

(1) The Mishna proper;

(2) the external (chitsonah) Mishna: in Aramaic called Baraiytha’.

6. Summary:

What has been said may be summarized:

(1) Among the Protestant churches the word "Apocrypha" is used for the books included in the Septuagint and Vulgate, but absent from the Hebrew Bible. This restricted sense of the word cannot be traced farther back than the beginning of the Reformation.

(2) In classical and Hellenistic Greek the adjective apokruphos denotes "hidden" of visible objects, or

obscure, hard to understand (of certain kinds of knowledge).

(3) In early patristic Greek this adjective came into use as a synonym of the classical Greek esoterikos.

(4) In later patristic Greek (Irenaeus, etc.) and in Latin works beginning with Jerome, Greek apokruphos meant non-canonical, implying inferiority in subject-matter to the books in the canon.

(4) By the Protestant Reformers the term "apocrypha" ("apocryphal" "books" being understood) came to stand for what is now called the "Old Testament Apocrypha." But this usage is confined to Protestants, since in the eastern church and in the Roman branch of the western church the Old Testament Apocrypha is as much an integral part of the canon as Genesis or Kings or Psalms or Isaiah.

(5) There are no equivalents in Hebrew for apokruphos in the sense of either "esoteric" or in that of "non- canonical."

IV. Contents of the Apocrypha.

1. List of Books:

The following is a list of the books in the Apocrypha in the order in which they occur in the English versions (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)):

(1) 1 Esdras;

(2) 2 Esdras (to be hereafter called "The Apocalyptic Esdras");

(3) Tobit;

(4) Judith;

(5) The Rest of Esther;

(6) The Wisdom of Solomon;

(7) Ecclesiasticus (to be hereafter called "Sirach");

(8) Baruch, with the Epistle of Jeremiah;

(9) The So of the Three Holy Children; (10) The History of Susanna;

(11) Bel and the Dragon;

(12) The Prayer of Manasses;

(13) 1 Maccabees;

(14) 2 Maccabees.

No. 5 in the above, "Addition to Esther;" as it may be called, consists of the majority (107 out of 270 verses) of the Book of Esther since it occurs in the best manuscripts of the Septuagint and in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) over the text in the Hebrew Bible. These additions are in the Septuagint scattered throughout the book and are intelligible in the context thus given them, but not when brought together as they are in the collected Apocrypha of our English versions and as they are to some extent in Jerome's Latin version and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) (see The Century Bible, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther, 294f). Numbers 9-11 in the above enumeration are additions made in the Greek Septuagint and Vulgate versions of Daniel to the book as found in the Massoretic Text. It will be well to name them "Additions to Daniel." The bringing together of the writings of the Apocrypha into an apart collection was due in a large measure to Jerome, who separated many of the apocryphal additions from their original context because he suspected their genuineness. His version influenced the Vulgate, which follows Jerome's version closely.

Though it is generally true that the Apocrypha is the excess of the Greek (Septuagint) and Latin (Jerome, Vulgate) over the Hebrew Bibles (the Masoretic Text), the statement needs qualification. 2 (4) Ezra, i.e. the Apocalyptic Ezra (Esdras), is absent from the Septuagint, from Jerome's version, and also from Luther's Bible, but it occurs in the Vulgate and in the English and other modern versions of the Apocrypha. On the other hand 3 and 4 Macc occur in the best manuscripts of the Septuagint, but the Vulgate, following Jerome's version, rejects both as do modern versions (English, etc.) of the Apocrypha. Moreover, it has to be pointed out that in the Vulgate proper the Prayer of Manasses and 1 (3) Esdras and the Apocalyptic Esdras are appended to the New Testament as apocryphal.

2. Classification of Books:

(1) Historical.

The books of the Apocrypha proper may be thus classified:

(a) 1 and 2 (i.e. 3) Esdras;

(b) 1 and 2 Maccabees;

(c) Additions to Daniel (nos. 9-11 in the above list);

(d) Additions to Esther;

(e) The Epistle of Jeremy (usually appended to Baruch);

(f) Prayer of Manasses.

(2) Legendary.

(a) Book of Baruch (sometimes classed with prophetic books, sometimes with Apocalypses); (b) Tobit; (c) Judith.

(3) Apocalyptic.

The Apocalyptic Esdras or 2 (4) Esdras.

(4) Didactic.

(a) The Wisdom of Solomon; (b) Sirach (Ecclesiasticus).

R. H. Charles, our greatest living authority on the Apocalyptic and Apocryphal writings, embraces the following under the heading "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," the rest coming under the heading "Palestinian Jewish Literature" (Enc Brit, 11th edition, II, 177):

(1) The Additions to Daniel and Esther

(2) The Epistle of Jeremy;

(3) 2 Macc;

(4) The Wisdom of Solomon.

V. Original Languages of the Apocrypha.

The bulk of the Apocrypha was written originally in the Greek language and existed at the first in that language alone. The following books were however written in Hebrew: Tobit, Judith, Sirach, Baruch (part probably in Greek), and 1 Maccabees. In these cases some prefer regarding Aramaic as the original language in at least parts of the above books. For detailed information see under the several books.

VI. Date of the Apocryphal Writings.

The question of date as it applies to the separate books of the Apocrypha will be discussed in connection with the articles dealing with the several books. But a general statement regarding the extreme limits

between which all the books were completed may safely be made. The oldest apocryphal book is Sirach, which in its original Hebrew form belongs to between 190-170 BC. In its Greek form the best modern scholars agree in fixing it at between 130-120 BC. None of the books can well belong to a date later than 100 AD, though some (2 Esdras, etc.) may be as late as that. The whole of the Apocrypha may with more than average certainty be said to have been written some time between 200 BC and 100 AD. It will be seen that it is an inaccurate assumption that the Apocrypha was in all its parts of later date than the latest parts of the Old Testament. The canonical Book of Daniel and many of the Psalms are of later date than Sirach and 1 Esdras, and there are cogent reasons for giving the canonical Esther a later date than any of the books named and perhaps than Judith as well (see, however, DANIEL; ESTHER). But it is quite certain that by far the greater part of the Apocrypha is of later date than the Old Testament; it is therefore of the utmost importance as reflecting the state of the Jews and the character of their intellectual and religious life at the various periods represented. And in later years much use has been made of it.

LITERATURE.

The Greek text of the Apocrypha is given in the various editions of the Septuagint (except the Apocalyptic Esdras, not extant in Gr). The best editions of the Septuagint are those by Tischendorf revised by E. Nestle (1887); and Swete (1895-99 and later editions). Critical editions of the Apocrypha have been issued by A. Fabricius (Hamburg, 1722-23); Apel (ib 1804) and a very valuable edition by O. T. Fritzsche (Leipzig, 1871) which includes the Latin version of the Apocalyptic Esdras—without the missing fragment. There are several modern translations, far the best being that in German edited by E. Kautzsch, containing Introductions, general and special, and valuable notes by the best German scholars. In English besides the Revised Version (British and American) there is the useful Variorum edition, edited by C. J. Ball. An English critical edition of the Apocrypha edited by R. H. Charles, with introductory notes, is now being printed at Oxford and will be very valuable.

The best commentary is that by O. F. Fritsche and C. L. W. Grimm, Kurzgef. Exeg. Handbuch, 1851-60; but the commentary by Bissell in Lange’s Series of Commentaries and that edited by Wace, in the Speaker’s Bible Series, are meritorious.

Introductory matter will be found in the various Bible Dictionaries under the word: see especially H. E. Ryle in DB (1893), Schurer (RE3), but especially in the valuable Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, by H. B. Swete (1900), Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) (C. F. Porter), and R. H. Charles (Enc Brit11). See also the Einleitungen by Konig, Budde (A. Bertholet has written the part dealing with the Apocrypha), and Schurer, Geschichte, III, 1898 (Eng. translation, II, iii), where much literature is specified. For monographs on the several books of the Apocrypha or discussing special points, see the special articles.

Thomas Witton Davies

APOCRYPHAL ACTS, GENERAL

a-pok’-ri-fal akts:

A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. THE MEANING OF "APOCRYPHAL"

1. Secret

2. False and Heretical

3. Extra-Canonical

II. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Romance

2. The Supernatural

3. Sexual Asceticism

4. Heretical Teaching

5. Religious Feeling

III. ORIGIN

1. Reverence for Apostles

2. Pious Curiosity

3. Apostolic Authority Desired

4. Interests of Local Churches

IV. SOURCES

1. Canonical Acts

2. Traditions

3. Romances of Travel

V. ECCLESIASTICAL TESTIMONY

1. Eastern

2. Western

3. Photius

4. Ecclesiastical Condemnation

VI. AUTHORSHIP

VII. RELATIONSHIP OF DIFFERENT ACTS

VIII. VALUE

1. As History

2. As Records of Early Christianity

IX. INFLUENCE

Literature

B. THE SEPARATE ACTS

I. ACTS OF PAUL

II. ACTS OF PETER

III. ACTS OF JOHN

IV. ACTS OF ANDREW

V. ACTS OF THOMAS

A. GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I. The Meaning of "Apocryphal."

As applied to early-Christian writings the term "apocryphal" has the secondary and conventional sense of "extra- canonical."

1. Secret:

Originally, as the etymology of the word shows (Greek apokrupto =" hide"), it denoted what was "hidden" or "secret." In this sense "apocryphal" was, to begin with, a title of honor, being applied to writings used by the initiated in esoteric circles and highly valued by them as containing truths miraculously revealed and kept secret from the outside world. Just as there were writings of this kind among the Jews, so there were in Christian circles, among Gnostic sects, apocrypha, which claimed to embody the deeper truths of Christianity, committed as a secret tradition by the risen Christ to His apostles.

2. False and Heretical:

When the conception of a catholic church began to take shape, it was inevitable that these secret writings should have been regarded with suspicion and have been ultimately forbidden, not only because they fostered the spirit of division in the church, but because they were favorable to the spread of heretical teaching. By a gradual and intelligible transference of ideas "apocryphal," as applied to secret writings thus discredited by the church, came to have the bad sense of spurious and heretical. In this sense the word is used both by Irenaeus and Tertullian.

3. Extra-Canonical:

Short of being stigmatized as false and heretical many books were regarded as unsuitable for reading in public worship, although they might be used for purposes of private edification. Chiefly under the influence of Jerome the term "apocryphal" received an extension of meaning so as to include writings of this kind, stress now being laid on their non-acceptance as authoritative Scriptures by the church, without any suggestion that the ground of non- acceptance lay in heretical teaching. It is in this wide sense that the word is used when we speak of "Apocryphal Acts." Although the Ac which bear this name had their origin for the most part in circles of heretical tendency, the description of them as "apocryphal" involves no judgment as to the character of their contents, but simply denotes that they are Ac which were excluded from the New Testament canon because their title or claims to recognition as authoritative and normative writings were not admitted by the church. This definition limits the scope of our investigation to those Ac which belong to the 2nd century, the Biblical Ac having secured their place as an authoritative scripture by the end of that century. See further, APOCRYPHA.

II. General Characteristics.

The Apocryphal Ac purport to give the history of the activity of the apostles in fuller detail than the canonical Acts.

1. Romance:

The additions to the New Testament narrative found in them are highly flavored with romance and reveal an extravagant and unhealthy taste for the miraculous. Wonderful tales, the product of an exuberant fancy, often devoid of delicacy of feeling and always out of touch with reality, are freely heaped one upon the other. The apostles are no longer conceived as living on the ordinary levels of humanity; their human frailties, to which the canonical writers are not blind, have almost entirely disappeared; they walk through the world as men conversant with the mysteries of heaven and earth and possessed of powers to which no limit can be set. They have the power to heal, to exorcise demons, to raise the dead; and while marvelous deeds of that nature constantly recur, there are other miracles wrought by the apostles which remind one of the bizarre and non-moral prodigies of the Childhood Gospel of Thomas. A smoked fish is made to swim; a broken statue is made whole by the use of consecrated a wafer; a child of seven months is enabled to talk with a man’s voice; animals receive the power of human speech.

2. The Supernatural:

The romantic character of the Apocryphal Ac is intensified by the frequent introduction of the supernatural. Angelic messengers appear in vision and in dream; heavenly voices are heard; clouds descend to hide the faithful in the hour of danger and lightnings smite their foes; the terrifying forces of Nature, earthquake, wind and fire, strike dismay into the hearts of the ungodly; and martyrs die transfigured in a blaze of unearthly glory. Especially characteristic of these Ac are the appearances of Christ in many forms; now as an old man, now as a comely youth, now as a child; but most frequently in the likeness of this or that apostle. (It is interesting to observe that Origen is familiar with a tradition that Jesus during His earthly life could change His appearance when and how He pleased, and gives that as a reason for the necessity of the traitor’s kiss. Compare also Mr 16:9,12.)

3. Sexual Asceticism:

One must not suppose from the foregoing that the Apocryphal Ac with their profusion of romantic and supernatural details were designed merely to exalt the personality of the apostles and to satisfy the prevalent desire for the marvelous. They had a definite practical end in view. They were intended to confirm and popularize a type of Christianity in strong reaction against the world, in which emphasis was laid on the rigid abstinence from sexual relations as the chief moral requirement. This sexual asceticism is the dominant motif in all the Acts. The "contendings" of the apostles, their trials and their eventual martyrdom are in almost every case due to their preaching the sinfulness of conjugal life and to their success in persuading women to reject the society of their husbands. The Ac are penetrated throughout by the conviction that abstinence from marriage is the supreme condition of entering upon the highest life and of winning heaven. The gospel on its practical side is (to use the succinct expression of the Ac of Paul) "the word of God regarding abstinence and the resurrection."

4. Heretical Teaching:

Besides inculcating an ascetic morality the Apocryphal Ac show traces more or less pronounced of dogmatic heresy. All of them with the exception of the Ac of Paul represent a docetic view of Christ; that is to say, the earthly life of Jesus is regarded merely as an appearance, phantasmal and unreal. This docetic Christology is most prominent in the Ac of John, where we read that when Jesus walked no footprints were discernible; that sometimes when the apostle attempted to lay hold of the body of Jesus his hand passed through it without resistance; that when the crowd gathered round the cross on which to all appearance Jesus hung, the Master Himself had an interview with His disciple John on the Mount of Olives. The crucifixion was simply a symbolical spectacle; it was only in appearance that Christ suffered and died. Allied with the docetic Christology is a naive Modalism, according to which there is no clear distinction between the Father and the Son.

5. Religious Feeling:

In spite of the unfavorable impression created by the flood of miraculous and supernatural details, the pervading atmosphere of sexual asceticism and the presence of dogmatic misconception, it is impossible not to feel in many sections of the Apocryphal Ac the rapture of a great spiritual enthusiasm. Particularly in the Ac of John, Andrew and Thomas there are passages (songs, prayers, homilies), sometimes of genuine poetic beauty, which are characterized by religious warmth, mystic fervor and moral earnestness. The mystical love to Christ, expressed though it frequently is in the strange language of Gnostic thought, served to bring the Saviour near to men as the satisfaction of the deepest yearnings of the soul for deliverance from the dark power of death. The rank superstition and the traces of unconquered heathenism should not blind us to the fact that in the Apocryphal Ac we have an authentic if greatly distorted expression of the Christian faith, and that through them great masses of people were confirmed in their conviction of the spiritual presence and power of Christ the Saviour.

III. Origin.

The Apocryphal Ac had their origin at a time when the canonical Ac of the Apostles were not yet recognized as alone authoritative. Various motives contributed to the appearance of books dealing with the life and activity of the different apostles.

1. Reverence for Apostles:

Behind every variety of motive lay the profound reverence for the apostles as the authoritative depositories of Christian truth. In apostolic times the sole authority in Christian communities, outside Old Testament Scripture, was "the Lord." But as the creative period of Christianity faded into the past, "the apostles" (in the sense of the college of the Twelve, including Paul) were raised to a preeminent position alongside of Christ with the object of securing continuity in the credentials of the faith. The commandments of the Lord had been received through them (2Pe 3:2). In the Ignatian epistles they have a place of acknowledged supremacy by the side of Christ. Only that which had apostolic authority was

normative for the church. The authority of the apostles was universal. They had gone into all the world to preach the gospel. They had, according to the legend referred to at the beginning of the Ac of Thomas, divided among themselves the different regions of the earth as the spheres of their activity. It was an inevitable consequence of the peculiar reverence in which the apostles were held as the securities for Christian truth that a lively interest should everywhere be shown in traditional stories about their work and that writings should be multiplied which purported to give their teaching with fullness of detail.

2. Pious Curiosity:

The canonical Ac were not calculated to satisfy the prevailing desire for a knowledge of the life and teaching of the apostles. For one thing many of the apostles are there ignored, and for another the information given about the chief apostles Peter and Paul is little more than a meager outline of the events of their life. In these circumstances traditions not preserved in the canonical Ac were eagerly accepted, and as the actual history of the individual apostles was largely shrouded in obscurity, legends were freely invented to gratify the insatiable curiosity. The marvelous character of these inventions is a testimony to the supernatural level to which the apostles had been raised in popular esteem.

3. Apostolic Authority Desired:

As in the case of the apocryphal Gospels, the. chief motive in the multiplication of apostolic romances was the desire to set forth with the full weight of apostolic authority conceptions of Christian life and doctrine which prevailed in certain circles.

(1) Alongside the saner and catholic type of Christianity there existed, especially in Asia Minor, a popular Christianity with perverted ideals of life. On its practical side the Christian religion was viewed as an ascetic discipline, involving not only abstinence from animal food and wine but also (and chiefly) abstinence from marriage. Virginity was the Christian ideal. Poverty and fastings were obligatory on all. The Apocryphal Ac are permeated by this spirit, and their evident design is to confirm and spread confidence in this ascetic ideal by representing the apostles as the zealous advocates of it.

(2) The Apocryphal Ac were also intended to serve a dogmatic interest. Heretical sects used them as a means of propagating their peculiar doctrinal views and sought to supplement or supplant the tradition of the growing catholic church by another tradition which claimed to be equally apostolic.

4. Interests of Local Churches:

A subsidiary cause in the fabrication of apostolic legends was the desire of churches to find support for the claims which they put forward for an apostolic foundation or for some connection with apostles. In some cases the tradition of the sphere of an apostle’s activity may have been well based, but in others there is a probability that stories of an apostolic connection were freely invented for the purpose of enhancing the prestige of some local church.

IV. Sources.

In general it may be said that the Apocryphal Ac are full of legendary details. In the invention of these everything was done to inspire confidence in them as historically true.

1. Canonical Acts:

The narratives accordingly abound in clear reminiscences of the canonical Acts. The apostles are cast into prison and are marvelously set at liberty. Converts receive the apostles into their houses. The description of the Lord’s Supper as "the breaking of bread" (Ac 2:42,46) is repeated in the Apocryphal Ac and is strictly apposite to the ritual there set forth in which there is frequently no mention of wine in the celebration of the sacrament. In the Ac of Paul the author evidently used the canonical Ac as the framework of his narrative. This dependence on the canonical Ac and the variety of allusions to details in them served to give an appearance of historical truthfulness to the later inventions and to secure for them a readier acceptance. The fact that the canonical Ac were so used clearly shows that they had a position of exceptional authority at the time when the Apocryphal Ac were written.

2. Traditions:

The legendary character of the Apocryphal Ac does not preclude the possibility of authentic details in the additions made to the canonical history. There must have been many traditions regarding the apostles preserved in Christian communities which had a foundation in actual fact. Some of these would naturally find a place in writings which were designed in part at least to satisfy the popular curiosity for a fuller knowledge of the apostles. It is certain that there is some substratum of historical fact in the episode of Paul’s association with Thecla (Ac of Paul). The description of Paul’s appearance given in the same connection is in all likelihood due to trustworthy historical reminiscence. But it must be confessed that the signs of the presence of reliable traditions are very scanty. The few grains of historical fact are hidden in an overwhelming mass of material whose legendary character is unmistakable.

3. Romances of Travel:

Although a formal connection with the canonical Ac is recognizable and reliable traditions are to a slight extent incorporated in the Apocryphal Acts, it is unquestionable that as a whole they are the creation of the Hellenic spirit which reveled in the miraculous. A noteworthy type of popular literature whose influence is apparent on almost every page of the Apocryphal Ac was that of the travel-romance. The most famous example of this romantic literature is the Life of the neo-Pythagorean preacher, the great wonder-worker Apollonios of Tyana, who died about the end of the 1st century AD. The marvelous deeds reported to have been wrought by him on his travels were freely transferred in a somewhat less striking form to other teachers. It is in the atmosphere of these romances that the Apocryphal Ac had their birth. In particular the Ac of Thomas recall the history of Apollonios. For just as Thomas was a missionary in India, so "Apollonios as a disciple of Pythagoras had traveled, a peaceful Alexander, to

the Indian wonderland and there preached his master’s wisdom" (Geffcken, Christliche Apokryphen, 36).

V. Ecclesiastical Testimony.

From the nature of his reference to the canonical Ac it is probable that the writer of the Muratorian Canon (circa 190 AD) had the existence of other Ac in mind. "The Ac of all the apostles," he says, "are written in a single book. Luke relates them admirably to Theophilus, confining himself to such as fell under his own notice, as he plainly shows by the omission of all reference either to the martyrdom of Peter or to the journey of Paul from Rome to Spain." During the 3rd century there are slight allusions to certain of the Apocryphal Acts, but it is only in the 4th century that distinct references are frequent in writers both of the East and of the West. A few of the more important references may be given here. (For a full account of the ecclesiastical testimony see Harnack, Gesch. der altchr. Lit., I, 116 ff.)

1. Eastern:

Among eastern writers Eusebius (died 340) is the first to make any clear reference to Apocryphal Acts. He speaks of "Ac of Andrew, of John and of the other apostles," which were of such a character that no ecclesiastical writer thought it proper to invoke their testimony. Their style and their teaching showed them to be so plainly of heretical origin that he would not put them even among spurious Scriptures, but absolutely rejected them as absurd and impious (Historia Ecclesiastic, III, 25.6.7). Ephraem (died 373) declares that Ac were written by the Bardesanites to propagate in the name of the apostles the unbelief which the apostles had destroyed. Epiphanius (circa 375) repeatedly refers to individual Ac which were in use among heretical sects. Amphilochius of Iconium, a contemporary of Epiphanius, declares that certain writings emanating from heretical circles were "not Ac of the apostles but accounts of demons." The Second Synod of Nicea (787 AD), in the records of which those words of Amphilochius are preserved, dealt with apocryphal literature and had under special consideration the Ac of John to which the Iconoclasts appealed. In the synod’s finding these Ac were characterized as "this abominable book," and on it the judgment was passed: "Let no one read it; and not only so, but we judge it worthy of being committed to the flames."

2. Western:

In the West from the 4th century onward references are frequent. Philastrius of Brescia (circa 387) testifies to the use of Apocryphal Ac among the Manicheans, and declares that although they are not suitable for general reading they may be read with profit by mature Christians (De Haeres, 88). The reason for this favorable judgment is to be found in the pronounced ascetic tendency of the Acts, which was in line with the moral ideal prevalent at that time in the West. Augustine refers repeatedly to apocryphal Ac in use among the Manicheans and characterizes them as the work of "cobblers of fables" (sutoribus fabularum). The Manicheans accepted them as true and genuine; ú and in respect of this claim Augustine says: "They would in the time of their authors have been counted worthy of being welcomed to the authority of the Holy Church, if saintly and learned men who were then alive and could

examine such things had acknowledged them as speaking the truth" (Contra Faustum, XXII, 79). The Ac of John and the Ac of Thomas are mentioned by Augustine by name. He also refers to Leucius as the author of Apocryphal Acts. Turribius of Astorga (circa 450) speaks of Ac of Andrew, of John, of Thomas, and attributes them to the Manicheans. Of the heretical teaching in the Ac of Thomas, Turribius singles out for special condemnation baptism by oil instead of by water. Leucius is mentioned as the author of the Ac of John. The Ac of Andrew, Thomas, Peter, and Philip are condemned as apocryphal in the Gelasian Decree (496 AD) and in the same condemnation are included "all books written by Leucius, a disciple of the devil."

3. Photius:

The fullest and most important reference to the Apocryphal Ac is found in Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople in the second half of the 9th century. In his Bibliotheca, which contains an account of 280 different books which he had read during his absence on a mission to Bagdad, we learn that among these was a volume, "the so-called Wanderings of the Apostles, in which were included Ac of Peter, John, Andrew, Thomas, Paul. The author of these Acts, as the book itself makes plain, was Leucius Charinus." The language had none of the grace which characterized the evangelic and apostolic writings. The book teemed with follies and contradictions. Its teaching was heretical. In particular it was taught that Christ had never really become man. Not Christ but another in His place had been crucified. After referring to the ascetic doctrine and the absurd miracles of the Ac and to the part which the Ac of John had played in the Iconoclastic Controversy, Photius concludes: "In short this book contains ten thousand things which are childish, incredible, ill-conceived, false, foolish, inconsistent, impious and godless. If anyone were to call it the fountain and mother of all heresy, he would not be far from the truth."

4. Ecclesiastical Condemnation:

There is thus a consensus of ecclesiastical testimony as to the general character of the Apocryphal Acts. They were writings used by a number of heretical sects but regarded by the church as unreliable and harmful. It is probable that the corpus of the Ac in five parts referred to by Photius was formed by the Manicheans of North Africa, who attempted to have them accepted by the church in place of the canonical Ac which they had rejected. These Ac in consequence were stamped by the church with a heretical character. The sharpest condemnation is that pronounced by Leo I (circa 450) who declares that "they should not only be forbidden but should be utterly swept away and burned. For although there are certain things in them which seem to have the appearance of piety, yet they are never free of poison and secretly work through the allurements of fables so that they involve in the snares of every possible error those who are seduced by the narration of marvelous things." The Ac of Paul, which show no trace of dogmatic heresy, were included in the ecclesiastical censure owing to the fact that they had received a place at the end of the corpus. Many teachers in the church, however, made a distinction between the miraculous details and the heretical doctrines of the Acts, and while they rejected the latter they retained the former. Witness the words of an orthodox reviser in regard to his heretical predecessor: "Quaedam de virtutibus quidem et miraculls quae per eos Dominus fecit, vera dixit; de doctrina vero multa mentitus est."

VI. Authorship.

In the notice of Photius (Bibliotheca codex 114) all the five Ac are ascribed to one author, Leucius Charinus. Earlier writers had associated the name of Leucius with certain Acts. In particular he is, on the witness of several writers, declared to be the author of the Ac of John. As these Ac show, the author professes to be a follower and companion of the apostle, and Epiphanius (Haeres., 51 6) mentions one named Leucius as being in the entourage of John. This notice of Epiphanius, however, is of doubtful value, as it probably rested on the association in his mind of the name of Leucius with the Ac of John. Whether or not there is any truth in the ascription of these Ac to a disciple of John must be left undecided, but the probabilities are against there being any. Be that as it may, when the different Ac were collected, the name of the reputed author of the Ac of John was transferred to the whole collection. This probably happened not later than the 4th century. Although all the Ac are certainly not from one hand (the difference of style is sufficient proof of this), there are so many striking similarities between some of them as to suggest a possible common authorship in those cases or at least a relation of literary dependence.

VII. Relationship of Different Acts.

That some connection existed between the different Ac was clearly recognized in early times, and it was doubtless due to this recognition that they were gathered together in a corpus under the name of one author. It is acknowledged that there is a close relationship between the Ac of Peter and the Ac of John, some holding that they are the work of the same author (James, Zahn), others that the former are dependent on the latter (Schmidt, Hennecke), while others again believe that their origin in the same theological school and in the same ecclesiastical atmosphere sufficiently explains all similarities (Ficker). The Ac of Andrew, too, reveal a near kinship to the Ac of Peter. But however the matter may stand in regard to literary dependence, the affinity between the different Ac in a material sense is manifest. All are pervaded by the ascetic spirit; in all Christ appears in the form of the apostle; in all women visit the apostle in prison. In respect of theological doctrine the Ac of Paul stand by themselves as anti-Gnostic in tendency, but the others agree in their docetic view of Christ’s person; while in the Ac of John, Peter and Thomas, there is a similar mystical doctrine of the cross.

VIII. Value.

1. As History:

As a source for information about the life and work of the apostles the Apocryphal Ac are almost entirely worthless. A possible exception in this respect is the section of the Ac of Paul dealing with Paul and Thecla, although even there any historical elements are almost lost in the legendary overgrowth. The spheres of the apostles’ work, so far as they are mentioned only in these Acts, cannot be accepted without question, although they may be derived from reliable tradition. Taken as a whole the picture given in the Apocryphal Ac of the missionary labors of the apostles is a grotesque caricature.

2. As Records of Early Christianity:

The Apocryphal Acts, however, though worthless as history, are of extreme value as throwing light on the period in which they were written. They belong to the 2nd century and are a rich quarry for information about the popular Christianity of that time. They give us a vivid picture of the form which Christianity assumed in contact with the enthusiastic mystery-cults and Gnostic sects which then flourished on the soil of Asia Minor. We see in them the Christian faith deeply tinged with the spirit of contemporary paganism; the faith in Christ the Saviour-God, which satisfied the widespread yearning for redemption from the powers of evil, in association with the as yet unconquered elements of its heathen environment.

(1) The Ac show us popular Christianity under the influence of Gnostic ideas as contrasted with the Gnosticism of the schools which moves in a region of mythological conceptions, cold abstractions and speculative subtleties. At the basis of Gnosticism lay a contempt for material existence; and in the Christianity of the Apocryphal Ac we see the practical working up of the two chief ideas which followed from this fundamental position, a docetic conception of Christ’s person and an ascetic view of life. In this popular religion Christ had few of the features of the historic Jesus; He was the Saviour-God, exalted above principalities and powers, through union with whom the soul was delivered from the dread powers of evil and entered into the true life.

The manhood of Christ was sublimated into mere appearance; and in particular the sufferings of Christ were conceived mystically and symbolically, "sometimes in the form that in the story of His sufferings we see only the symbol of human sufferings in general; sometimes in the form that Christ who is present in His church shares in the martyr-sufferings of Christians; sometimes, again, in the form that the sin, weakness and unfaithfulness of His people inflict upon Him ever-renewed sufferings" (Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 181). The ethical influence of Gnosticism is apparent in the spirit of strict asceticism which is the most characteristic feature of these Acts. It is true that the ascetic ideal obtained not only in Gnostic but also in orthodox church circles, as we gather from the Ac of Paul as well as from other sources.

The prominence of the strict ascetic ideal in early Christianity is intelligible. The chief battle which the Christian faith had to fight with Hellenic heathenism was for sexual purity, and in view of the coarseness and laxity which prevailed in sexual relations it is not surprising that the Christian protest was exaggerated in many cases into a demand for complete continence. This ascetic note in primitive Christianity was emphasized by the spirit of Gnosticism and finds clear expression in the Ac which arose either in Gnostic circles or in an environment tinged with Gnostic ideas. It goes without saying that the influence of these romances which are so largely concerned with sexual morality and occasionally are unspeakably coarse, was to preoccupy the mind with unhealthy thoughts and to sully that purity of spirit which it was their intention to secure. There are, however, other ethical elements in these Ac which are in complete harmony with a true Christian morality.

(2) The Apocryphal Ac are an invaluable source for information about early-Christian forms of worship.

The ritual of the sacraments is fully described in the Ac of Thomas. Some of the prayers found in the Ac are pervaded by a warm religious spirit and are rich in liturgical expression.

(3) The beginnings of Christian hymnology may be traced in the Ac of Thomas, in which occur Gnostic hymns breathing the fantastic oriental spirit. (4) Apparent in the Ac throughout is the excessive love for the supernatural and the religious enthusiasm which flourished in Asia Minor in the 2nd century (compare especially the dance of the disciples round Jesus in the Ac of John: chapter 94 ff).

IX. lnfluence.

The Apocryphal Ac had a remarkable influence in the later history of the church. After the establishment of Christianity under Constantine men turned their eyes to the earlier years of struggle and persecution. A deep interest was awakened in the events of the heroic age of the faith—the age of martyrs and apostles. Ac of martyrs were eagerly read, and in particular the Apocryphal Ac were drawn upon to satisfy the desire for a fuller knowledge of the apostles than was afforded by the canonical books. The heretical teaching with which the apostolic legends were associated in these Ac led to their condemnation by ecclesiastical authority, but the ban of the church was unavailing to eradicate the taste for the vivid colors of apostolic romance. In these circumstances church writers set themselves the task of rewriting the earlier Acts, omitting what was clearly heretical and retaining the miraculous and supernatural elements. And not only so, but the material of the Ac was freely used in the fabrication of lives of other apostles, as we find in the collection of the so-called Abdias in the 6th century.

The result was that from the 4th to the 11th century literature of this kind, dealing with the apostles, grew apace and "formed the favorite reading of Christians, from Ireland to the Abyssinian mountains and from Persia to Spain" (Harnack). Apostolic legends were reproduced in religious poems; they appeared in martyrologies and calendars; they formed the subject of homilies on the feast-days of the apostles, and incidents from them were depicted in Christian article New cycles of legends arose in the Syrian and Coptic churches; and the Coptic legends were translated into Arabic and from Arabic into Ethiopic (Gadla Hawaryat—The Contendings of the Apostles). Literature of this kind was the fruitful mother of every kind of superstition. "Whole generations of Christians (as Harnack says), yes, whole Christian nations were intellectually blinded by the dazzling appearance of these tales. They lost the eye not only for the true light of history but also for the light of truth itself" (Gesch. der altchr. Lit., I, xxvi). It is noteworthy that the apocryphal correspondence with the Corinthians in the Ac of Paul was received as canonical in the Syrian and Armenian churches.

LITERATURE.

The Apocryphal Ac form the subject of a voluminous literature. The earlier editions of the available texts by Fabricius (1703) and Tischendorf (1851) have been completely superseded by Lipsius-Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum apocrypha (1891-1903), which contains texts not only of the earlier but also of many of the later Acts. Translations of earlier Ac with valuable introductions are to be found in Hennecke, New Testament Apokryphen (1904), while critical discussions and elucidation of the text are given in

Hennecke, Handbuch zu den New Testament Apokryphen (1904). These two works are indispensable to the student. English translations of earlier Ac with short introductions in Pick, Apocryphal Ac (1909).

The critical work of Lipsius on these Ac was epoch-making: Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Apostellegenden (1883-90). Full lists of literature may be found in Hennecke and Pick. The following may be mentioned here: Zahn, Geschichte des New Testament Kanons, II, 832 ff (1892); Forschungen zur Gesch. des New Testament Kanons, VI, 14 if, 194 ff (1900); Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, I, 116 ff (1893); II, 493 ff, 541 ff (1897); James, Apocrypha Anecdota (Texts and Studies, V, 1, 1897); Ehrhard, Die altchristliche Litteratur u. i. Erforsch. (1900); C. Schmidt, "Die Alten Petrusakten" (T U, IX, 1, 1903). Useful as setting forth the religious significance of the Ac are Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, III, 170 ff (translation 1910); Liechtenhahn, Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus (1901). The chapter in Salmon's Introduction to the New Testament (325 ff) may be consulted. A short account of the Ac written with full knowledge is given in Geffcken, Christliche Apokryphen (Religionssgeschichtliche Volksbucher, 1908).

APOCRYPHAL ACTS, THE SEPARATE ACTS

B. THE SEPARATE ACTS

The Apocryphal Ac dealt with in this article are the Leucian Ac mentioned by Photius in his Bibliotheca. As we now have them they have undergone revision in the interest of ecclesiastical orthodoxy, but in their original form they belonged to the 2nd century. It is impossible to say how much the Ac in their present form differ from that in which they originally appeared, but it is evident at many points that the orthodox revision which was meant to eliminate heretical elements was not by any means thorough. Passages which are distinctly Gnostic were preserved probably because the reviser did not understand their true meaning.

I. Ac of Paul.

1. Ecclesiastical Testimony:

Origen in two passages of his extant writings quotes the Ac of Paul with approval, and it was possibly due to his influence that these Ac were held in high regard in the East. In the Codex Claromontanus (3rd century), which is of eastern origin, the Ac of Paul are treated as a catholic writing and take rank with the Shepherd of Hermas and the Apocalypse of Peter. Eusebius, who utterly rejects "The Ac of Andrew, John and the rest of the apostles," puts the Ac of Paul in the lower class of debated writings alongside Hermas, Epistle of Barnabas, Didache, the Apocalypse of John, etc. (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25.4). In the West, where Origen was viewed with suspicion, the Ac of Paul were apparently discredited, the only use of them as a reliable source being found in Hippolytus, the friend of Origen, who however does not mention them by name. (The reference by Hippolytus is found in his commentary on Daniel. He argues from Paul's conflict with the wild beasts to the credibility of the story of Daniel in the lions' den.)

2. Contents:

Of the Ac of Paul only fragments remain. Little was known of them until in 1904 a translation from a badly preserved Coptic version was published by C. Schmidt, and the discovery was made that the well-known Ac of Paul and Thecla were in reality a part of the Ac of Paul. From the notes regarding the extent of the Ac given in the Cod. Claromontanus and in the Stichometry of Nicephorus we gather that the fragments amount to about one-fourth of the whole.

(1) Of these fragments the longest and the most important is the section which came to have a separate existence under the name The Ac of Paul and Thecla. When these were separated from the Ac of Paul we cannot tell, but this had happened before the time of the Gelasian Decree (496 AD), which without making mention of the Ac of Paul condemns as apocryphal the Ac of Paul and Thecla.

(a) An outline of the narrative is as follows: At Iconium, Thecla, a betrothed maiden, listened to the preaching of Paul on virginity and was so fascinated that she refused to have anything further to do with her lover. On account of his influence over her, Paul was brought before the proconsul and was cast into prison. There Thecla visited him with the result that both were brought to judgment. Paul was banished from the city and Thecla was condemned to be burned.

Having been miraculously delivered at the pile, Thecla went in search of Paul and when she had found him she accompanied him to Antioch. (There is confusion in the narrative of Antioch of Pisidia and Syrian Antioch.) In Antioch an influential citizen, Alexander by name, became enamored of her and openly embraced her on the street. Thecla, resenting the familiarity, pulled off the crown which Alexander wore and in consequence was condemned to fight with the wild beasts at the games. Until the day of the games Thecla was placed under the care of Queen Tryphaena, then living in Antioch. When Thecla was exposed in the amphitheater a lioness died in defending her against attack. In her peril Thecla cast herself into a tank containing seals and declared: "In the name of Jesus Christ I baptize myself on my last day." (It was with reference partly to this act of self-baptism that Tertullian gave the information about the authorship of these Acts: below 3.) When it was proposed to have Thecla torn asunder by maddened bulls Queen Tryphaena fainted, and through fear of what might happen the authorities released Thecla and handed her over to Tryphaena. Thecla once again sought Paul and having found him was commissioned by him to preach the Word of God.

This she did first at Iconium and then in Seleucia where she died. Various later additions described Thecla’s end, and in one of them it is narrated that she went underground from Seleucia to Rome that she might be near Paul. Finding that Paul was dead she remained in Rome until her death.

(b) Although the Thecla story is a romance designed to secure apostolic authority for the ideal of virginity, it is probable that it had at least a slight foundation in actual fact. The existence of an influential Thecla-cult at Seleucia favors the view that Thecla was a historical person. Traditions regarding her association with Paul which clustered round the temple in Seleucia built in her honor may have provided the materials for the romance. In the story there are clear historical reminiscences.

Tryphaena is a historical character whose existence is established by coins. She was the mother of King Polemon II of Pontus and a relative of the emperor Claudius. There are no grounds for doubting the information given us in the Ac that she was living at Antioch at the time of Paul's first visit. The Ac further reveal striking geographical accuracy in the mention of "the royal road" by which Paul is stated to have traveled from Lystra on his way to Iconium—a statement which is all the more remarkable because, while the road was in use in Paul's time for military reasons, it was given up as a regular route in the last quarter of the 1st century. In the Ac Paul is described as "a man small in stature, bald-headed, bow-legged, of noble demeanor, with meeting eyebrows and a somewhat prominent nose, full of grace. He appeared sometimes like a man, and at other times he had the face of an angel."

This description may quite well rest on reliable tradition. On the ground of the historical features in the story, Ramsay (The Church in the Roman Empire, 375 ff) argued for the existence of a shorter version going back to the 1st century, but this view has not been generally accepted.

(c) The Ac of Paul and Thecla were very widely read and had a remarkable influence owing to the widespread reverence for Thecla, who had a high place among the saints as "the first female martyr." References to the Ac in the Church Fathers are comparatively few, but the romance had an extraordinary vogue among Christians both of the East and of the West. In particular, veneration for Thecla reached its highest point in Gaul, and in a poem entitled "The Banquet" (Caena) written by Cyprian, a poet of South-Gaul in the 5th century, Thecla stands on the same level as the great characters of Biblical history. The later Ac of Xanthippe and Polyxena are entirely derived from the Ac of Paul and Thecla.

(2) Another important fragment of the Ac of Paul is that containing the so-called Third Epistle to the Corinthians. Paul is represented as being in prison at Philippi (not at the time of Ac 16:23 ff, but at some later time). His incarceration was due to his influence over Stratonice, the wife of Apollophanes. The Corinthians who had been disturbed by two teachers of heresy sent a letter to Paul describing their pernicious doctrines, which were to the effect that the prophets had no authority, that God was not almighty, that there was no resurrection of the body, that man had not been made by God, that Christ had not come in the flesh or been born of Mary, and that the world was not the work of God but of angels. Paul was sorely distressed on receipt of this epistle and, "under much affliction," wrote an answer in which the popular Gnostic views of the false teachers are vehemently opposed. This letter which abounds in allusions to several of the Pauline epistles is chiefly remarkable from the fact that it found a place, along with the letter which called it forth, among canonical writings in the Syrian and Armenian churches after the second century. The correspondence was strangely enough believed to be genuine by Rinck who edited it in 1823. The original Greek version has not been preserved, but it exists in Coptic (not quite complete), in Armenian and in two Latin translations (both mutilated), besides being incorporated in Ephraem's commentary (in Armenian translation). The Syriac version has been lost.

(3) Besides the two portions of the Ac of Paul mentioned above there are others of less value, the Healing of a Dropsical Man at Myra by the apostle (a continuation of the Thecla-narrative), Paul's conflict with wild beasts at Ephesus (based on the misunderstanding of 1Co 15:32), two short citations by Origen, and a concluding section describing the apostle's martyrdom under Nero, to whom Paul appeared after his death. Clement of Alexandria quotes a passage (Strom., VI, 5, 42 f)—a fragment from

the mission-preaching of Paul—which may have belonged to the Ac of Paul; and the same origin is possible for the account of Paul's speech in Athens given by John of Salisbury (circa 1156) in the Policraticus, IV, 3.

3. Authorship and Date:

From a passage in Tertullian (De Baptismo, chapter 17) we learn that the author of the Ac of Paul was "a presbyter of Asia, who wrote the book with the intention of increasing the dignity of Paul by additions of his own," and that "he was removed from office when, having been convicted, he confessed that he had done it out of love to Paul." This testimony of Tertullian is supported by the evidence of the writing itself which, as we have seen, shows in several details exact knowledge of the topography and local history of Asia Minor. A large number of the names occurring in these Ac are found in inscriptions of Smyrna, although it would be precarious on that ground to infer that the author belonged to that city. It is possible that he was a native of a town where Thecla enjoyed peculiar reverence and that the tradition of her association with Paul, the preacher of virginity, was the chief motive for his writing the book. Along with this was linked the motive to oppose the views of some Gnostics (the Bardesanites). The date of the Ac of Paul is the latter half of the second century, probably between 160 and 180 AD.

4. Character and Tendency:

The Ac of Paul, though written to enhance the dignity of the apostle, clearly show that both in respect of intellectual equipment and in breadth of moral vision the author, with all his love for Paul, was no kindred spirit. The intellectual level of the Ac is low. There is throughout great poverty in conception; the same motif occurs without variation; and the defects of the author's imagination have their counterpart in a bare and inartistic diction. New Testament passages are frequently and freely quoted. The view which the author presents of Christianity is narrow and one-sided. Within its limits it is orthodox in sentiment; there is nothing to support the opinion of Lipsius that the work is a revision of a Gnostic writing. The frequent occurrence of supernatural events and the strict asceticism which characterize the Ac are no proof of Gnostic influence. The dogmatic is indeed anti-Gnostic, as we see in the correspondence with the Corinthians. "The Lord Jesus Christ was born of Mary, of the Seed of David, the Father having sent the Spirit from heaven into her."

The resurrection of the body is assured by Christ's resurrection from the dead. Resurrection, however, is only for those who believe in it—in this we have the one thought which betrays any originality on the part of the author: "they who say that there is no resurrection shall have no resurrection." With faith in the resurrection is associated the demand for strict sexual abstinence. Only they who are pure (i.e. who live in chastity) shall see God. "Ye have no part in the resurrection unless ye remain chaste and defile not the flesh." The gospel which the apostle preached was "the word regarding self-control and the resurrection." In the author's desire to secure authority for a prevalent form of Christianity, which demanded sexual abstinence as a condition of eternal life, we recognize the chief aim of the book. Paul is represented as the apostle of this popular conception, and his teaching is rendered attractive by the miraculous and supernatural elements which satisfied the crude taste of the time.

LITERATURE.

Books mentioned under "Literature" (p. 188); C. Schmidt, "Die Paulusakten" (Neue Jahrbucher, 217 ff, 1897), Acta Pauli (1904); dealing with Ac of Paul and Thecla Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire (4th edition, 1895); Conybeare, The Apology and Ac of Apollonius ....(1894); Cabrol, La legende de sainte Thecle (1895), Orr, The New Testament Apocrypha Writings (introd. translation, and notes, 1903). For further literature see Hennecke, Handbuch, etc., 358 ff, Pick, Apocrypha Acts, 1, 8 f.

II. Ac of Peter.

1. Contents:

A large portion (almost two-thirds) of the Ac of Peter is preserved in a Latin translation—the Actus Vercellenses, so named from the town of Vercelli in Piedmont, where the manuscript containing them lies in the chapter-library. A Coptic fragment discovered and published (1903) by C. Schmidt contains a narrative with the subscription Praxis Petrou (Act of Peter). Schmidt is of opinion that this fragment formed part of the work to which the Actus Vercellenses also belonged, but this is somewhat doubtful. The fragment deals with an incident in Peter's ministry at Jerusalem, while the Act. Vercell., which probably were meant to be a continuation of the canonical Acts, give an account of Peter's conflict with Simon Magus and of his martyrdom at Rome. References in ecclesiastical writers (Philastrius of Brescia, Isidore of Pelusium and Photius) make it practically certain that the Actus Vercellensus belong to the writing known as the Ac of Peter, which was condemned in the rescript of Innocent I (405 AD) and in the Gelasian Decree (496 AD).

(1) The Coptic Fragment contains the story of Peter's paralytic daughter. One Sunday while Peter was engaged in healing the sick a bystander asked him why he did not make his own daughter whole. To show that God was able to effect the cure through him, Peter made his daughter sound for a short time and then bade her return to her place and become as before. He explained that the affliction had been laid upon her to save her from defilement, as a rich man Ptolemy had been enamored of her and had desired to make her his wife. Ptolemy's grief at not receiving her had been such that he became blind. As the result of a vision he had come to Peter, had received his sight and had been converted, and when he died he had left a piece of land to Peter's daughter. This land Peter had sold and had given the proceeds to the poor. Augustine (Contra Adimantum, 17.5) makes a reference to this story but does not mention Ac of Peter. There are also two references to the incident in the Ac of Philip. In the later Ac of Nereus and Achilleus the story is given with considerable changes, the name of Peter's daughter, which is not mentioned in the fragment, being given as Petronilla.

(2) The contents of the Actus Vercellenses fall into three parts:

(a) The first three chapters which clearly are a continuation of some other narrative and would fitly join on to the canonical Ac tell of Paul's departure to Spain.

(b) The longest section of the Ac (4-32) gives an account of the conflict between Peter and Simon Magus at Rome. Paul had not been gone many days when Simon, who "claimed to be the great power of God," came to Rome and perverted many of the Christians. Christ appeared in a vision to Peter at Jerusalem and bade him sail at once for Italy. Arrived at Rome Peter confirmed the congregation, declaring that he came to establish faith in Christ not by words merely but by miraculous deeds and powers (allusion to 1Co 4:20; 1Th 1:5). On the entreaty of the brethren Peter went to seek out Simon in the house of one named Marcellus, whom the magician had seduced, and when Simon refused to see him, Peter unloosed a dog and bade it go and deliver his challenge. The result of this marvel was the repentance of Marcellus. A section follows describing the mending of a broken statue by sprinkling the pieces with water in the name of Jesus. Meantime the dog had given Simon a lecture and had pronounced on him the doom of unquenchable fire.

After reporting on its errand and speaking words of encouragement to Peter, the dog expired at the apostle’s feet. A smoked fish is next made to swim. The faith of Marcellus waxed strong at the sight of the wonders which Peter wrought, and Simon was driven out of him house with every mark of contempt. Simon, enraged at this treatment, came to challenge Peter. An infant of seven months speaking in a manly voice denounced Simon and made him speechless until the next Sabbath day. Christ appeared in a vision of the night encouraging Peter, who when morning was come narrated to the congregation his triumph over Simon, "the angel of Satan," in Judea. Shortly afterward, in the house of Marcellus which had been "cleansed from every vestige of Simon," Peter unfolded the true understanding of the gospel. The adequacy of Christ to meet every kind of need is shown in a characteristic passage which reveals docetic traits: "He will comfort you that you may love Him, this Great and Small One, this Beautiful and Ugly One, this Youth and Old Man, appearing in time yet utterly invisible in eternity, whom a human hand has not grasped, who yet is now grasped by His servants, whom flesh had not seen and now sees," etc. Next in a wonderful blaze of heavenly light blind widows received their sight and declared the different forms in which Christ had appeared to them.

A vision of Marcellus is described in which the Lord appearing in the likeness of Peter struck down with a sword "the whole power of Simon," which had come in the form of an ugly Ethiopian woman, very black and clad in filthy rags. Then follows the conflict with Simon in the forum in presence of the senators and prefects. Words were first exchanged between the combatants; then from words it came to deeds, in which the power of Peter was signally exhibited as greater than Simon’s in the raising of the dead. Simon was now discredited in Rome, and in a last attempt to recover his influence he declared that he would ascend to God Before the assembled crowd he flew up over the city, but in answer to Peter’s prayer to Christ he fell down and broke his leg in three places. He was removed from Rome and after having his limb amputated died.

(c) The Actus Vercellenses close with an account of Peter’s martyrdom (33-41) Peter had recurred the enmity of several influential citizens by persuading their wives to separate from them. Then follows the well-known "Quo vadis?" story. Peter being warned of the danger he was in fled from Rome; but meeting Christ and leaning that He was going to the city to be crucified again, Peter returned and was condemned to death. At the place of execution Peter expounded the mystery of the cross. He asked to be crucified head downward, and when this was done he explained in words betraying Gnostic influence

why he had so desired it. After a prayer of a mystical nature Peter gave up the ghost. Nero was enraged that Peter should have been put to death without his knowledge, because he had meant to heap punishments upon him. Owing to a vision he was deterred from a rigorous persecution of the Christians. (The account of Peter's martyrdom is also found in the Greek original.)

It is plain from the account given of these Ac that they are entirely legendary in character. They have not the slightest value as records of the activity of Peter.

2. Historical Value:

They are in reality the creation of the ancient spirit which delighted in the marvelous and which conceived that the authority of Christianity rested on the ability of its representatives to surpass all others in their possession of supernatural power. The tradition that Simon Magus exercised a great influence in Rome and that a statue was erected to him (10) may have had some basis in fact. Justin Martyr (Apol, I, 26, 56) states that Simon on account of the wonderful deeds which he wrought in Rome was regarded as a god and had a statue set up in his honor. But grave doubts are thrown on the whole story by the inscription SEMONI SANCO DEO FIDIO SACRUM which was found on a stone pedestal at Rome in 1574. This refers to a Sabine deity Semo Sancus, and the misunderstanding of it may have led to Justin's statement and possibly was the origin of the whole legend of Simon's activity at Rome. The tradition that Peter died a martyr's death at Rome is early, but no reliance can be placed on the account of it given in the Ac of Peter.

3. Authorship and Date:

Nothing can be said with any certainty as to the authorship of the Ac of Peter. James (Apocrypha Anecdota, II) believes them to be from the same hand as the Ac of John, and in this he is supported by Zahn (Gesch. des New Testament Kanons, II, 861). But all that can definitely be said is that both these Ac had their origin in the same religious atmosphere. Both are at home on the soil of Asia Minor. Opinion is not unanimous on the question where the Ac of Peter were written, but a number of small details as well as the general character of the book point to an origin in Asia Minor rather than at Rome. There is no knowledge of Roman conditions, while on the other hand there are probable reminiscences of historical persons who lived in Asia Minor. The date is about the close of the 2nd century.

4. General Character:

The Ac of Peter were used by heretical sects and were subjected to ecclesiastical censure. That however does not necessarily imply a heretical origin. There are traces in them of a spirit which in later times was regarded as heretical, but they probably originated within the church in an environment strongly tinged by Gnostic ideas. We find the principle of Gnosticism in the stress that is laid on understanding the Lord (22). The Gnostic view that the Scripture required to be supplemented by a secret tradition committed to the apostles is reflected in several passages (20 in particular). At the time of their earthly fellowship with Christ the apostles were not able to understand the full revelation of God. Each saw only so far as he was

able to see. Peter professes to communicate what he had received from the Lord "in a mystery." There are slight traces of the docetic heresy. The mystical words of Peter as he hung on the cross are suggestive of Gnostic influence (33 f). In these Ac we find the same negative attitude to creation and the same pronounced ascetic sprat as in the others. "The virgins of the Lord" are held in special honor (22). Water is used instead of wine at the Eucharist. Very characteristic of the Ac of Peter is the emphasis laid on the boundless mercy of God in Christ toward the backsliding (especially 7). This note frequently recurring is a welcome revelation of the presence of the true gospel-message in communities whose faith was allied with the grossest superstition.

LITERATURE.

Books mentioned under "Literature" (p. 188). In addition, Ficker, Die Petrusakten, Beitrage zu ihrem Verstandnis (1903); Harnack, "Patristische Miscellen" (TU, V, 3, 1900).

III. Ac of John.

1. Contents:

According to the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Ac of John in their complete state formed a book about the same length as the Gospel of Matthew. A number of sections which show links of connection with one another are extant- -about two-thirds of the whole. The beginning of the Ac is wanting, the existing narrative commencing at 18. What the contents of the earlier chapters were we cannot surmise. In Bonnet’s reconstruction the first fourteen chapters deal with John’s journey from Ephesus to Rome and his banishment to Patmos, while 15-17 describe John’s return to Ephesus from Patmos. The sections given by Bonnet may contain material which belonged to the original Acts, but it is improbable that they stood at the beginning of the work, as it seems clear that the narrative commencing at 18 describes John’s first visit to Ephesus. The first extant portion of the Ac (18-25) narrates that Lycomedes "the commander-in-chief of the Ephesians" met John as he drew near the city and besought him on behalf of his beautiful wife Cleopatra, who had become paralyzed.

When they came to the house the grief of Lycomedes was so great that he fell down lifeless. After prayer to Christ John made Cleopatra whole and afterward raised Lycomedes to life again. Prevailed upon by their entreaties John took up his abode with them. In 26-29 we have the incident of the picture of John which played so prominent a part in the discussion at the Second Council of Nicea. Lycomedes commissioned a friend to paint a picture of John and when it was completed he put it in bedroom with an altar before it and candlesticks beside it. John discovering why Lycomedes repaired so frequently to his room, taxed him with worshipping a heathen god and learned that the picture was one of himself. This he believed only when a mirror was brought that he might see himself. John charged Lycomedes to paint a picture of his soul and to use as colors faith in God, meekness, love, chastity, etc. As for the picture of his body it was the dead picture of a dead man.

Chapters 30-36 narrate the healing of infirm old women, and in theater where the miracles were wrought

John gave an address on the vanity of all earthly things and on the destroying nature of fleshly passion. In 37-45 we read that in answer to the prayer of John the temple of Artemis fell to the ground, with the result that many people were won to the worship of Christ. The priest of Artemis who had been killed through the fall of the temple was raised to life again and became a Christian (46 f). After the narration of further wonders (one of them the driving of bugs out of a house) follows the longest incident of the Acts, the inexpressibly repulsive story of Drusiana (62-86), which was used as theme of a poem by the nun Hroswitha of Gandersheim (10th century). The following section gives a discourse of John on the life, death and ascension of Jesus (87-105) which is characterized by distinct docetic traits, a long passage dealing with Christ's appearance in many forms and with the peculiar nature of His body. In this section occurs the strange hymn used by the Priscillianists, which purports to be that which Jesus sang after supper in the upper room (Mt 26:30), the disciples dancing round Him in a ring and responding with "Amen." Here too we find the mystic doctrine of the Cross revealed to John by Christ. Chapters 106-15 narrate the end of John. After addressing the brethren and dispensing the sacrament of the Lord's Supper with bread alone, John ordered a grave to be dug; and when this was done, he prayed, giving thanks that he had been delivered from "the filthy madness of the flesh" and asking a safe passage through the darkness and dangers of death. Whereupon he lay down quietly in the grave and gave up the ghost.

2. Historical Value:

The Ac of John, it need hardly be said, have not the slightest historical value. They are a tissue of legendary incidents which by their miraculous character served to insinuate into the popular mind the dogmatic conceptions and the ideal of life which the author entertained. The Ac however are in harmony with the well-founded tradition that Ephesus was the scene of John's later activity. Very remarkable is the account of the destruction of the Artemis-temple by John—a clear proof that the Ac were not written in Ephesus. The Ephesian temple of Artemis was destroyed by the Goths in 262 AD.

3. General Character:

The Ac of John are the most clearly heretical of all the Acts. The docetic traits have already been referred to. The unreality of Christ's bodily existence is shown by the changing forms in which He appeared (88-90), by His ability to do without food (93) and without sleep ("I never at any time saw His eyes closing but only open," 89), by His leaving no footprint when He walked (93), by the varying character of His body when touched, now hard, now soft, now completely immaterial (89, 93) The crucifixion of Jesus, too, was entirely phantasmal (97, 99). The ascension followed immediately on the apparent crucifixion; there was no place for the resurrection of One who had never actually died. Gnostic features are further discernible in the disparagement of the Jewish Law (94), in the view which lays emphasis on a secret tradition committed by Christ to the apostles (96) and in the contempt for those who were not enlightened ("Care not for the many, and them that are outside the mystery despise," 100). The historical incidents of Christ's sufferings are sublimated into something altogether mystical (101); they are simply a symbol of human suffering, and the object of Christ's coming is represented as being to enable men to understand the true meaning of suffering and thus to be delivered from it (96). The real sufferings of Christ are those caused by His grief at the sins of His followers (106 f).

He is also a partaker in the sufferings of His faithful people, and indeed is present with them to be their support in every trial (103). The Ac of John also reveal a strong encratite tendency, although that is not so pronounced as in the Ac of Andrew and of Thomas. Nowhere however do we get a more horrifying glimpse into the depths of corrupt sexualism than in these Acts. The writing and circulation of the story of Drusiana cast a lurid light on the gross sensual elements which survived in early Hellenic Christianity. Apart from this there are passages which reveal a warm and true religious feeling and some of the prayers are marked by glow and unction (112 ff). The Ac show that the author was a man of considerable literary ability; in this respect they form a striking contrast to the Ac of Paul.

4. Authorship and Date:

The author of the Ac of John represents himself as a companion of the apostle. He has participated in the events which he describes, and in consequence the narrative possesses a certain lively quality which gives it the appearance of actual history. The author according to testimony which goes back to the 4th century was Leucius, but nothing can with any certainty be said of him (see above A, VI). It is possible that in some part of the Ac which is lost the author mentioned his name The early date of the Ac is proved by a reference in Clement of Alexandria (circa 200) to the immaterial nature of Christ’s body, the passage plainly indicating that Clement was acquainted with the Ac or had heard another speak of them (Hypotyposeis on 1 Joh 1:1). The probable date is between 150 and 180 and Asia Minor is the place of origin.

5. Influence:

The Ac of John exerted a wide influence. They are in all probability the earliest of the Apocryphal Ac and those written later owe much to them. The Ac of Peter and of Andrew show so close affinities with the Ac of John that some have regarded them as being from the same hand; but if that be not so, there is much to be said for the literary dependence of the former on the latter. We are probably right in stating that the author of the Ac of John was the pioneer in this sphere of apostolic romance and that others eagerly followed in the way which he had opened up. That the Ac of John were read in orthodox circles is clear from the reference in Clement of Alexandria. In later days however they were regarded with suspicion. Augustine quotes part of the hymn (95) which he read in a Priscillianist work sent him by a bishop Ceretius and makes severe animadversions on it and on the claim advanced regarding it that it had been revealed in secret to the apostles. The second Synod of Nicea (787 AD) passed judgment on the Ac of John in words of great severity (see above A, V, 1). The stories found in the Ac had, however, before this time passed into orthodox tradition and had been used by Prochorus (5th century), a supposed disciple of John, in the composition of his travel-romance dealing with the apostle, as well as by Abdias (6th century) whose work contains material from the older Ac which is not otherwise preserved.

LITERATURE.

See under "Literature" (p. 188); also Zahn, Acta Joannis (1880).

IV. Ac of Andrew.

The first mention of these Ac which are referred to frequently by ecclesiastical writers is in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25, 6). They are there, along with other Acts, rejected as absurd and impious. Epiphanius refers to them in several passages (Haeres., 47, 61, 68) as being in use among various heretical sects which practiced a strict ascetic morality. Early writers attribute them to Leucius, the author of the Ac of John.

1. Contents:

Of the Ac of Andrew only small portions remain. A fragment is preserved by Euodius of Uzala (died 424), a contemporary of Augustine, and a longer piece, found in a manuscript of the 10th or 11th century, containing lives of saints for November, was identified by Bonnet as belonging to the Ac of Andrew. The account of the death of Andrew is preserved in many forms; that which has the most appearance of retaining the form of the original Ac being found in a letter of the presbyters and deacons of the churches of Achaia.

(1) The fragment of Euodius gives two short passages describing the relations of Maximilla with her husband Egetes, whose claims she resisted.

(2) The longest section of the Ac deals with Andrew’s imprisonment because he had induced Maximilla to separate from her husband "Aegeates," and to live a life of chastity. ("Aegeates," which occurs as the name of Maximilla’s husband, denotes in reality "a native of Aegae," Aegae being a town in the vicinity of Patrae, where Andrew was described as carrying on his work.) The section opens in the middle of an address spoken to the brethren by Andrew in prison, in which they were enjoined to glory in their fellowship with Christ and in their deliverance from the baser things of earth. Maximilla with her companions frequently visited the apostle in prison. Aegeates expostulated with her and declared that if she did not resume relations with him he would subject Andrew to torture. Andrew counseled her to resist the importunity of Aegeates, and delivered an address on the true nature of man and stated that torture had no terrors for him. If Maximilla should yield, the apostle would suffer on her account. Through her fellowship with his sufferings she would know her true nature and thus escape from affliction. Andrew next comforted Stratocles, the brother of Aegeates, who declared his need of Andrew, the sower in him of the "seed of the word of salvation." Andrew thereafter announced his crucifixion on the following day. Maximilla again visited the apostle in prison, "the Lord going before her in the form of Andrew." To a company of the brethren the apostle delivered an address, in which he discoursed on the deceitfulness of the devil, who first had dealt with men as a friend but now was manifest as an enemy.

(3) When brought to the place of crucifixion Andrew addressed the cross which he joyfully welcomed. After being bound to the cross he hung smiling at the miscarriage of the vengeance of Aegeates, for (as he explained) "a man who belongs to Jesus because he is known of Him is armed against every vengeance." For three days and nights Andrew addressed the people from the cross, and they, moved by

his nobility and eloquence, went to Aegeates, demanding that he should be delivered from death. Aegeates, fearing the wrath of the people, went to take Andrew down from the cross, but the apostle refused deliverance and prayed to Christ to prevent his release. After this he gave up the ghost. He was buried by Maximilla, and Aegeates soon afterward cast himself down from a great height and died.

2. General Character:

The encratite ideal in its most pronounced form is exhibited in the Ac of Andrew. (In view of this, and of Andrew's association elsewhere in ecclesiastical tradition with a strict asceticism, there is a curious irony in the fact that in some parts of Germany Andrew is the patron saint of maidens seeking husbands. In the Harz and in Thuringen St Andrew's Night (November 30) is considered by maidens the most favorable time for the vision of their future husbands.) The Gnostic spirit is revealed in the feeling for the preeminent worth of the spiritual man (6). The true nature of man is pure; the weakness and sin are the work of the "evil enemy who is averse to peace." In seducing men he did not come out openly as an enemy but pretended friendship. When the light of the world appeared the adversary of man was seen in his true colors. Deliverance from sin comes through enlightenment. The mystical view of sufferings (9) reminds us of the similar view in the Ac of John. The addresses of the apostle are characterized by religious earnestness and warmth (words flow from his lips "like a stream of fire" 12), and by a profound sense of the Divine pity for sinful and tempted men.

3. Historical Value:

The only detail in the Ac of Andrew which has a claim to be considered historical is his activity at Patrae on the Corinthian Gulf. (Patrae is not actually mentioned in the fragmentary Acts, but that the scene of the imprisonment and martyrdom of Andrew is laid in that city may be inferred from the name "Aegeates"—see above 1 (2).) Ecclesiastical tradition speaks with great uncertainty of the sphere of Andrew's missionary labors, Scythia, Bithynia and Greece being all mentioned. It may be regarded as probable that Andrew came to Greece and suffered martyrdom at Patrae, although one must reckon with the possibility that the account of his work and crucifixion there was invented for the purpose of representing the church at Patrae as an apostolic foundation. The crucifixion of the apostle on the so-called Andrew's cross is a later tradition.

V. Ac of Thomas.

These Ac exist in a complete state and their great popularity in church circles is shown by the large number of manuscripts which contain them. It is probable that they were written originally in Syriac and that they were later freely translated into Greek and worked over from the Catholic point of view.

1. Contents:

In the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Ac of Thomas are mentioned as containing 1,600 stichoi (lines of about sixteen syllables), one-fifth fewer than the Gospel of Mark. If this notice is correct, the form in

which we have the Ac is very much more extended. In the Greek versions the Ac are divided into thirteen "deeds" followed by the martyrdom of Thomas. Some idea of the contents may be given as follows:

(1) At a meeting of the apostles in Jerusalem, Thomas had India allotted to him as his sphere of service. He was unwilling to go, but at last consented when the Lord sold him to a messenger from King Gundaforus in India. On the journey to India, Thomas came to the city of Andrapolis where the nuptials of the king’s daughter were being celebrated. In these the apostle took part and sang a hymn in praise of the heavenly wedding.

The king asked Thomas to pray for his daughter and after he had done so the Lord appeared in the form of Thomas and won the newly-married pair to a life of sexual abstinence. The king incensed at this sought Thomas, but the apostle had departed.

(2) Arrived in India Thomas undertook to build a palace for king Gundaforus. He received money for this purpose but gave it away in alms. The king discovering this cast Thomas into prison, but afterward released him when he learned from his brother who came back from the dead that Thomas had built a heavenly palace for him. Gundaforus and his brother became Christians.

(3) Traveling farther east Thomas found a youth who had been slain by a dragon because of a woman whom both desired. The dragon at the command of Thomas sucked the poison from the youth’s body and itself died. The young man, restored to life, embraced the ideal of sexual abstinence and was counseled to set his affections on Christ.

(4) The story of a speaking colt.

(5) Thomas delivered a woman from the power of a filthy demon. An account given of the celebration of the Eucharist (with bread alone) which includes a Gnostic prayer.

(6) A youth partaking of the Eucharist was convicted of sin and confessed that he had killed a maiden who refused to live with him in unchaste intercourse. The maiden was raised to life and gave an account of her experience in hell.

(7) Thomas was besought by a commander named Sifor to deliver his wife and daughter from a demon of uncleanness.

(8) While they were on their way to the commander’s house the beast which drew the carriage became exhausted and four wild asses allowed themselves to be quietly yoked. One of the wild asses was instructed by Thomas to exorcise the demons which dwelt in the women.

(9) A woman, Mygdonia, married to Charis, a near relative of King Misdai, listened to a discourse of the apostle and was led to reject the society of her husband. Charis complained to the king about the

magician who had put a spell upon his wife and Thomas was cast into prison. At the request of his fellow-prisoners Thomas prayed for them and recited a hymn (known as "the hymn of the soul") which is entirely Gnostic in character.

(10) Mygdonia received the seal of Jesus Christ, being first anointed with oil, then being baptized, then receiving the Eucharist in bread and water. Thomas was released from prison, and Sifor, his wife and his daughter all received the seal.

(11) Tertia the queen was sent by Misdai to reason with Mygdonia and as a result she herself was won to the new life. Thomas was then brought to the place of judgment.

(12) There Vazan, the king's son, talked with the apostle and was converted. The king gave orders that Thomas should be tortured with hot plates of iron, but when these were brought water gushed forth from the earth and submerged them. Then follow an address and prayer of Thomas in prison.

(13) The apostle was visited in prison by the women and by Vazan and thereafter Vazan along with others was baptized and received the Eucharist, Thomas coming from prison to Vazan's house for this purpose.

(14) Thomas was put to death by the command of the king, being pierced with lances, but afterward he showed himself to his followers. Later a son of Misdai was cured of an unclean spirit by dust taken from the apostle's grave and Misdai himself became a Christian.

2. Character and Tendency:

The Ac of Thomas are in reality a treatise in the form of a travel-romance whose main design was to set forth abstinence from sexual intercourse as the indispensable condition of salvation. In the addresses of Thomas, however, positive Christian virtues are emphasized; and in particular the duty and the recompense of compassion are strikingly exhibited in the story of the building of the heavenly palace. The Ac clearly had their origin in Gnostic circles and were held in high estimation by various encratite sects. The original Ac underwent revision in the interest of orthodoxy. The hymns and dedication-prayers which showed marked Gnostic features were probably retained because their meaning was not understood. As Lipsius says, speaking of "the hymn of the soul": "The preservation of this precious relic of Gnostic poetry we owe to the happy ignorance of the Catholic reviser, who had no idea what heretical serpent lurked beneath the beautiful flowers of this poem."

The hymn, probably written by Bardesanes, the founder of a Gnostic sect, narrates in the form of an allegory the descent of the soul into the world of sense, its forgetfulness of its heavenly origin, its deliverance by the Divine revelation which awoke it to a consciousness of its true dignity, and its return to the heavenly home from which it came. In the opinion of some, however, the hymn is falsely called "the hymn of the soul." As Preuschen says: "It describes rather the descent of the Saviour to the earth, His deliverance of the soul which languishes there in the bondage of evil, and His return to the heavenly

kingdom of light. One may characterize the whole as a Gnostic embellishment and extension of Php 2:5-11" (Hennecke, Handbuch, etc., 587). In whichever way the hymn is to be interpreted, it is a poem of great beauty and rich in oriental imagery. The ascriptions of praise to Christ in the addresses of the apostle are sometimes couched in noble language and always suffused by great warmth of feeling. Throughout the Ac we have miraculous and supernatural elements in abundance. Christ frequently appears in the likeness of Thomas who is represented as his twin-brother. The full name of the apostle is Judas Thomas—Judas the Twin. In 55 ff there is a graphic account of the tortures of the damned, which remind one of the Apocalypse of Peter.

3. Historical Value:

It goes without saying that the Ac of Thomas, which are a romance with a purpose, are in no sense a historical source for information about the apostle. The author however has made use of the names of historical persons. King Gundaforus (Vindafra) is known from other sources as an Indo-Parthian ruler in the 1st century AD. It is very doubtful whether the tradition preserved in the Ac as to the activity of Thomas in India is trustworthy. The earliest tradition with which we are acquainted places the sphere of his missionary labors in Parthia. Syrian tradition states that he died at Edessa, where in the 4th century there was a church dedicated to him. Thomas is also indirectly associated with Edessa in the Abgar Legend, in which we read that Thaddaeus who founded the church at Edessa was sent by Thomas. In the existing form of the Ac of Thomas we have a combination of the traditions regarding India and Edessa; we read (170) that some time after the apostle’s death his bones were carried "into the regions of the West." Early tradition knows nothing of Thomas as a martyr; according to a statement of the Valentinian Heracleon (circa 170) quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Strom, IV, 9) the apostle died quietly in his bed. The name of the apostle is given in the Ac as Judas Thomas, and this we also find in the Doctrine of Addai and elsewhere. The statement in the Ac that the apostle was a twin-brother of Jesus was no doubt suggested by the meaning of the name Thomas (=" twin") and by the desire to enhance the dignity of the apostle. In 110 (in the Hymn of the Soul) there is a reference to the still existing Parthian kingdom, and as that kingdom came to an end in 227 AD, the poem must have been written before that date. The hymn, however, does not seem to have belonged to the original Acts, which probably were in existence before the end of the 2nd century.

LITERATURE.

Besides books mentioned under "Literature" (p. 188) Thilo, Acta Sancti Thomae apostoli (1823); Hoffman, ZNTW (1903, 273-309); Preuschen, Zweignostische Hymnen (1904); Hilgenfeld, ZWT (1904, 229-41). The Syrian Ac of Thomas were edition and translated by W. Wright, Apocryphal Ac of the Apostles (1871); also Bevan, in Texts and Studies, V, 3 (1897). The later Ethiopic version is found in Malan, The Conflicts of the Holy Apostles (1871), and in Budge, The Contendings of the Apostles (2 volumes containing Ethiopic text and translation, 1899-1901).

A. F. Findlay

APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES

a-pok'-ri-fal e-pis'-ls: A few epistles have been attributed to the Virgin Mary, but these are very late and without value. The following epistles fall to be noted as apocryphal:

1. Letter Attributed to our Lord:

The letter attributed to our Lord is given in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, I, 13) who records that in his day a copy of the letter was to be found among the archives of Edessa. Abgarus, king of Osroene, which was a small country in Mesopotamia, writes from Edessa, the capital, to our Lord, asking for healing and offering Him protection. Our Lord sends back a short letter saying that He cannot leave Palestine, but that, after His ascension, a messenger will come and heal Abgarus. The letters are obviously spurious. Osroene was actually Christianized about the beginning of the 3rd century, and the legend took shape and received official sanction in order to show that the country had received the Gospel at a much earlier date. See ABGAR.

2. Letter Attributed to Peter:

The Clementine Homilies is a work of fiction attributed to Clement of Rome; it was actually written about the end of the 2nd century or the beginning of the 3rd. At the beginning of it there is set a letter of Peter to James. In it Peter counsels James not to show the book containing Peter's preaching except to a limited circle, and makes a violent attack upon the apostle Paul. It is thus evidently Ebionitic in tendency, and is, like the homilies to which it is prefixed, spurious.

3. Letters Attributed to Paul:

(1) The Epistle from Laodicea.

The mention of such an epistle in Col 4:16 evidently tempted someone to forge a letter. It is written in Latin, and consists of 20 vs; it is a mere cento of Pauline phrases strung together. It is mentioned in the Muratorian Fragment (170 AD); and by the end of the 4th century. it had a wide circulation. It is now almost universally rejected as spurious. See COLOSSIANS; EPHESIANS; LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

(2) Lost Epistle to the Corinthians.

In 1Co 5:9 a letter to the Corinthians is mentioned which appears to have been lost. In a 5th century Armenian version of the Scriptures there is inserted after 2 Corinthians a short letter from the Corinthians to Paul, and one from Paul to the Corinthians. These are also found in Syriac, and were evidently accepted in many quarters as genuine at the end of the 4th century. They formed a part of the Apocryphal Ac of Paul, and date from about 200 AD. See CORINTHIANS.

(3) An Epistle to the Alexandrines.

This is mentioned only in the Muratorian Fragment, and has not come down to us.

(4) Letters of Paul to Seneca.

This is a correspondence in Latin, six of the letters being attributed to Paul and eight to Seneca. Regarding this correspondence Lightfoot says: "This correspondence was probably forged in the 4th century, either to recommend Seneca to Christian readers, or to recommend Christianity to students of Seneca." It had a wide circulation in the Middle Ages.

LITERATURE.

See article "Apocrypha" in Encyclopedia Biblica and RE. For text of Peter's letter to James, see Roberts' and Donaldson's Ante-Nicene Christian Library, XVII. For the Pauline letters consult Zahn, Geschichte des New Testament Kanons, II. For Paul's Laodicean letter, see Lightfoot's Commentary on Colossians (where the text of the letter is graven); and for the letters to Seneca, Lightfoot's Commentary on Philippians, Dissertation II, with Appendix.

John Macartney Wilson

APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS

a-pok'-ri-fal gos'-pels:

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Early Gospels

2. Canonical Gospels

3. Apocryphal Gospels

4. Gospel according to the Hebrews

II. HERETICAL GOSPELS

1. Gospel of the Ebionites

2. Gospel of the Egyptians

3. Gospel of Marcion

4. Gospel of Peter

5. Gospel of the Twelve Apostles

6. Gospels of Barnabas and Bartholomew

III. SUPPLEMENTARY OR LEGENDARY GOSPELS

1. Gospels of the Nativity

(a) Protevangelium of James

(b) Pseudo-Matthew

(c) The Nativity of Mary

(d) Gospel of Joseph the Carpenter

(e) The Passing of Mary

2. Gospels of the Infancy or Childhood

(a) Gospel of Thomas

(b) Arabic Gospel of the Childhood

3. Gospels of the Passion and Resurrection

(a) Gospel of Peter (as above)

(b) Gospel of Nicodemus

(1) Ac of Pilate

(2) Descent of Jesus into the Lower World

(c) Other Fabrications

LITERATURE

The apocryphal gospels form a branch of the apocryphal literature that attended the formation of the New Testament canon of Scripture. Apocryphal here means non-canonical. Besides gospels, this literature included acts, epistles and apocalypses.

I. Introductory.

1. Early Gospels:

The introduction to the third canonical Gospel shows that in the days of the writer, when the apostles of the Lord were still living, it was a common practice to write and publish accounts of the acts and words of Jesus. It has even been maintained (S. Baring-Gould, Lost and Hostile Gospels, xxiii, London, 1874) that at the close of the 1st century, almost every church had its own gospel with which alone it was acquainted. These were probably derived, or professed to be derived, from the oral reports of those who had seen, heard, and, it may be, conversed with our Lord. It was dissatisfaction with these compositions that moved Luke to write his Gospel. Whether any of these ante-Lukan documents are among those still known to us is hardly longer doubtful. Scholars of repute—Grotius, Grabe, Mill—were in earlier times disposed to place the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Ebionites, and the Gospel of the Egyptians among those alluded to by Luke, some holding the Gospel of the Hebrews to be as early as just after the middle of the 1st century. More recent criticism does not allow so early an appearance for those gospels, though a fairly early date is still postulated for the Gospel of the Hebrews. The Protevangelium of James (noticed below) is still held by some as possibly falling within the 1st century (EB, I, 259).

2. Canonical Gospels:

However this may be, there can be no doubt that by the close of the 1st century and the early part of the 2nd century, opinion was practically unanimous in recognition of the authority of the four Gospels of the canonical Scriptures. Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons (180 AD), recognizes four, and only four Gospels, as "pillars" of the church. The Harmonies of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (168-80 AD), and of Tatian, and the Apology of Justin Martyr carry back the tradition to a much earlier period of the century, and, as Liddon proves at considerable length (Bampton Lectures, 2nd ed., 210-19), "it is scarcely too much to assert that every decade of the 2nd century furnishes its share of proof that the four Gospels as a whole, and John’s in particular, were to the church of that age what they are to the church of the present."

The recent attempt of Professor Bacon of Yale to get rid of the important authority of Irenaeus (The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, New York, 1910) will not succeed; it has been shown to be merely assertive where there is no evidence and agnostic where evidence is apparently demonstrative. During the last century the Gospels, as regards their composition, credibility and historicity, were subjected to the most searching and unsparing criticism which, though intimations of it were previously not wanting, may be said to have begun when Strauss, to use Liddon’s words, "shocked the conscience

of all that was Christian in Europe" by the publication of his first Life of Jesus. The methods pursued in this work consisted largely in the application to the sacred books, and especially to the Gospels, of the principles of criticism that had for forty years previously been used in estimating the structure and composition of some of the literary products of antiquity; and the controversy excited by this criticism can hardly yet be said to have subsided. This is not the place for entering upon an account of the controversy; it may be sufficient here to say that the traditional positions of the church have been ably defended, and in particular, that the claims of the canonical Gospels have been abundantly maintained.

3. Apocryphal Gospels:

Whatever was the fate of the ante-Lukan and other possible 1st-century gospels, it is with the 2nd century and the formation of an authoritative canon that the apocryphal gospels, such as we now have, for the most part begin to appear. In the days of the reproduction of documents by manuscript, of restricted communications between different localities, and when the church was only as yet forming and completing its organization, the formation and spread of such gospels would be much easier than now. The number of such gospels is very considerable, amounting to about fifty. These exist mainly in fragments and scattered notices; though some, as pointed out below, are either entire or nearly so. The apparent number has probably been increased by the use of different names for the same document. Thirty are named by Hofmann with more or less explanation in RE, I, 511; a complete hat is given in Fabricius (Cod. Apocrypha New Testament, I, 355 ff). Ebionistic and Gnostic circles were specially prolific of such gospels. "It would be easy," says Salmon (Intro, 1st ed., 239) "to make a long list of names of gospels said to have been in use in different Gnostic sects; but very little is known as to their contents, and that little is not such as to lead us to attribute to them the very slightest historical value."

Of many indeed no more is known than the names of the authors, such as the gospels of Basilides, of Cerinthus, of Apelles, of Matthias, of Barnabas, of Bartholomew, of Eve, of Philemon and many others. The scholars and authorities of the early church were quite well aware of the existence and aims of these productions. It is noteworthy also that they had no hesitation in characterizing them as they deserved. The Marcosians, according to Irenaeus, adduced "an unspeakable number of apocryphal and spurious writings, which they themselves had forged, to bewilder the minds of the foolish"; and Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25) gives the following list of spurious and disputed books: "That we have it in our power to know both these books (the canonical) and those that are adduced by the heretics under the name of the apostles such, namely, as compose the gospels of Peter, of Thomas, and of Matthew, and certain others beside these or such as contain the Ac of Andrew and John, and of the other apostles, of which no one of those writers in the ecclesiastical succession has condescended to make any mention in his works: and, indeed, the character of the style itself is very different from that of the apostles, and the sentiments, and the purport of these things that are advanced in them, deviating as far as possible from sound orthodoxy, evidently prove they are the fictions of heretical men: whence they are not only to be ranked among the spurious writings but are to be rejected as altogether absurd and impious."

In the appendix to Westcott’s Introduction to the Study of the Gospels will be found, with the exception of those recently discovered in Egypt, a complete list of the non-canonical sayings and deeds ascribed to our Lord as recorded in the patristic writings; and also a list of the quotations from the non-canonical

gospels where these are only known by quotations.

The aim of the apocryphal gospels may be regarded as

(1) heretical or

(2) supplemental or legendary: that is to say, such as either were framed in support of some heresy or such as assume the canonical gospels and try to make additions—largely legendary—to them. Before considering these it may be well to take separate account of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

4. Gospel According to the Hebrews:

The undoubted early date of this gospel, the character of most of its not very numerous quotations, the respect with which it is uniformly mentioned by early writers, and the esteem in which it is at present held by scholars in general, entitle the Gospel according to the Hebrews to special notice. Apart from the tradition, to which it is not necessary to attach too great importance, that represented our Lord as commanding His disciples to remain for twelve years in Jerusalem, it is reasonable to suppose that for the Christian communities resident in Jerusalem and Palestine a written gospel in their own language (Western Aramaic) would soon be a necessity, and such a gospel would naturally be used by Jewish Christians of the Diaspora. Jewish Christians, for example, settled in Alexandria, might use this gospel, while native Christians, as suggested by Harnack, might use the Gospel of the Egyptians, till of course both were superseded by the four Gospels sanctioned by the church.

There is no proof however that the gospel was earlier than the Synoptics, much less that it was among the ante- Lukan gospels. Harnack, indeed, by a filiation of documents for which there seems hardly sufficient warrant, placed it as early as between 65 and 100 AD. Salmon, on the other hand (Intro, Leer X) concludes that "the Nazarene gospel, so far from being the mother, or even the sister of one of our canonical four, can only claim to be a grand- daughter or grand-niece." Jerome (400 AD) knew of the existence of this gospel and says that he translated it into Greek and Lat; quotations from it are found in his works and in those of Clement of Alexandria. Its relation to the Gospel of Matthew, which by almost universal consent is declared to have been originally written in Hebrew (i.e. Aramaic), has given rise to much controversy. The prevalent view among scholars is that it was not the original of which Matthew’s Gospel was a Greek translation, but still that it was a fairly early composition. Some, like Salmon and Harnack, are disposed to regard Jerome’s Hebrew Gospel as to all intents a fifth gospel originally composed for Palestinian Christians, but which became of comparatively insignificant value with the development of Christianity into a world-religion. Besides two references to the baptism of Jesus and a few of his sayings, such as—"Never be joyful except when ye shall look upon your brother in love"; "Just now my Mother, the Holy Spirit, took me by one of my hairs and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor"—it records the appearance of our Lord to James after the resurrection, adduced by Paul (1Co 15:7) as one of the proofs of that event; but of course Paul might have learned this from the lips of James himself as well as from ordinary tradition, and not necessarily from this gospel.

This indeed is the principal detail of importance which the quotations from this gospel add to what we know from the Synoptics. In other divergences from the Synoptics where the same facts are recorded, it is possible that the Gospel according to the Hebrews may relate an earlier and more reliable tradition. On the other hand, the longest quotation, which gives a version of Christ's interview with the Rich Young Ruler, would seem to show, as Westcott suggests, that the Synoptics give the simpler and therefore the earlier form of the common narrative. Many scholars, however, allow that the few surviving quotations of this gospel should be taken into account in constructing the life of Christ. The Ebionites gave the name of Gospel of the Hebrews to a mutilated gospel of Matthew. This brings us to the heretical gospels.

II. Heretical Gospels.

1. Gospel of the Ebionites:

The Ebionites may be described generally as Jewish Christians who aimed at maintaining as far as possible the doctrines and practices of the Old Testament and may be taken as representing originally the extreme conservative section of the Council of Jerusalem mentioned in Ac 15:1-29. They are frequently mentioned in patristic literature from the 2nd to the 4th centuries, and the prolonged Gnostic controversies of those times may well have founded among them different sects or at least parties. Accordingly Jerome, a writer of the 4th century, states (Ep ad August. 122 13) that he found in Palestine Jewish Christians known as Nazarenes and Ebionites. Whether these were separate sects or simply supporters of more liberal or narrower views of the same sect cannot well be determined. Some, such as Harnack and Uhlhorn, have held that the two names are general designations for Jewish Christians; others regard the Ebionites as the most retrograde and the narrowest of Jewish Christians, while the Nazarenes were more tolerant of difference of belief and practice.

The Gospel of the Ebionites or the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, as it was also called, represented along with the Gospel of the Hebrews (noticed above) this Judeo-Christian spirit. Some fragments of the Gospel of the Ebionites are preserved in Epiphanius (d 376). He speaks of the Nazarenes as "having the Gospel according to Matthew in a most complete form, in Hebrew" (i.e. Aramaic), though he immediately adds that he does not know whether "they removed the genealogies from Abraham to Christ," that is to say, whether they accepted or rejected the virgin birth of Christ. In contrast with this statement he says that the Ebionites had a gospel "called the Gospel according to Matthew, not entire and perfectly complete, but falsified and mutilated, which they call the Hebrew gospel." The extant fragments from the gospel are given in Westcott (Intro, 437 f). They "show that its value is quite secondary and that the author has simply compiled it from the canonical, and especially from the Synoptic Gospels, adapting it at the same time to the views and practices of Gnostic Ebionism" (DCG, I, 505).

2. Gospel of the Egyptians:

Three short and somewhat mystic verses are all that are left of what is known as the Gospel of the

Egyptians. They occur in Book III of the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, who devoted that book to a refutation of Encratism, that is, the rejection, as absolutely unlawful, of the use of marriage, of flesh meat and of wine. Already in the Pauline Epistles are met parties with the cry (Col 2:21) "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch," and (1Ti 4:3) "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats." The verses in Clement read as follows: "When Salome asked how long will death prevail? The Lord said, As long as ye women bear children: for I have come to destroy the function of women. And Salome said to him. Did I not well then in not bearing children? And the Lord answered and said, Eat of every herb, but do not eat of that which is bitter. And when Salome asked when the things would be known about which she had inquired, the Lord said, When ye trample on the garment of shame, and when the two shall be one, and the male with the female neither male nor female." The words assuredly vary much from the usual character of those of our Lord. Modern writers vary as to their encratite tendency and as to how far the Gospel of the Egyptians was practical. With so little to go upon, it is not easy to form a conclusion. It may have contained other passages on account of which Origen deemed it heretical. It was used by the Naassenes and Sabellians. The date of the Gospel is between 130 and 150.

3. Gospel of Marcion:

The Gospel of Marcion would seem to have been intended as a direct counteractive to the Aramaic gospels. A native of Pontus and the son of a bishop, Marcion settled at Rome in the first half of the 2nd century and became the founder of the anti-Jewish sect that acknowledged no authoritative writings but those of Paul. This work forms a striking example of what liberties, in days before the final formation of the canon, could be taken with the most authoritative and the most revered documents of the faith, and also as showing the free and practically unlimited nature of the controversy, of which the canon as finally adopted was the result. He rejected the Old Testament entirely, and of the New Testament retained only the Gospel of Luke, as being of Pauline origin, with the omission of sections depending on the Old Testament and ten epistles of Paul, the pastoral epistles being omitted. The principal Church Fathers agree upon this corruption of Luke’s Gospel by Marcion; and the main importance of his gospel is that in modern controversy it was for some time assumed to be the original gospel of which Luke’s Gospel was regarded as merely an expansion. The theory was shown first in Germany and afterward independently in England to be quite untenable. It was lately revived by the author of Supernatural Religion; but Dr. Sanday’s work on The Gospels in the Second Century (chapter viii) may be said to have closed the controversy. (Compare also Salmon’s Intro, Lect XI.)

4. Gospel of Peter:

Until about a quarter of a century ago no more was known of the Gospel of Peter than of the crowd of heretical gospels referred to above. From Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 12, 2) it was known that a Gospel of Peter was in use in the church of Rhossus, a town in the diocese of Antioch at the end of the 2nd century, that controversy had arisen as to its character, and that after a careful examination of it Serapion, bishop of Antioch (190-203), had condemned it as docetic. Origen (died 253 AD), in his commentary on Mt 10:17, refers to the gospel as saying that "there are certain brothers of Jesus, the sons of Joseph by a former wife, who lived with him before Mary." Eusebius further in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 3, 2 knows nothing of the Gospel according to Peter being handed down as a catholic

writing, and in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25, 6 he includes the Gospel of Peter among the forged heretical gospels. Theodoret, one of the Greek ecclesiastical historians (390-459), says that the Nazarenes used a gospel called "according to Peter."

The gospel is also referred to in Jerome (De Viris Illustr., chapter 1) and it is condemned by the Decretum Gelasianum (496?). Salmon (Intro, 231) remarks: "Of the book no extracts have been preserved, and apparently it never had a wide range of circulation." These words were written in 1885. In the following year the French Archaeological Mission, working in upper Egypt, found in a tomb, supposed to be a monk's, at Akhmim (Panopolis), a parchment containing portions of no less than three lost Christian works, the Book of Enoch, the Gospel of Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter. These were published in 1892 and have given rise to much discussion. The gospel has been carefully reproduced in facsimile and edited by competent scholars The fragment is estimated to contain about half of the original gospel. It begins in the middle of the history of the Passion, Just after Pilate has washed his hands from all responsibility and ends in the middle of a sentence when the disciples at the end of the Feast of Unleavened Bread were betaking themselves to their homes "But I (Simon Peter, the ostensible writer) and Andrew my brother took our nets and went to the sea; and there was with us Levi the son of Alpheus whom the Lord. ...." Harnack (Texte und Untersuchungen, IX, 2, 2nd edition, 76) exhibits about thirty new traits contained in the Petrine account of the Passion and burial.

These are given in detail in an additional volume of the Ante-Nicene Library: Recently Discovered manuscripts, etc., Edinburgh, 1897. But Dr. Swete (Gospel of Peter, xv, London, 1893) shows that "even details which seem to be entirely new or which directly contradict the canonical narrative, may have been suggested by it"; and he concludes that notwithstanding the large amount of new matter which it contains, "there is nothing in this portion of the Petrine Gospel which compels us to assume the use of sources other than the canonical gospels." To Professor Orr (NT Apocryphal Writings, xix f) the Gnostic origin of the gospel seems clear in the story given of the Resurrection; and its docetic character—that is, that it proceeded from those who held that Christ had only the semblance of a body—from the statement that on the cross Jesus was silent as one who felt no pain, and from the dying cry from the cross, "My power, my power, thou hast forsaken me," the really Divine Christ having departed before the crucifixion. The date of the gospel has been placed by some in the first quarter, and by others in the third quarter, of the 2nd century. For the other newly discovered "Sayings of Jesus," see LOGIA.

5. Gospel of the Twelve Apostles:

A Gospel of the Twelve is mentioned by Origen (Hom. I, in Luc), and a few fragments of it are preserved by Epiphanius (Haerea, 39 13-16,22). It commenced with the baptism, and was used by the Ebionites. It was written, Zahn thinks, about 170 AD.

6. Gospel of Barnabas and Bartholomew:

A Gospel of Barnabas and Gospel of Bartholomew are condemned in the decree of Pope Gelasius. The latter is mentioned by Jerome (Prooem ad Matt).

III. Supplementary or Legendary Gospels.

In all of the gospels of this class it is noteworthy that considering the desire of the writers of non-canonical gospels to multiply miracles, no notice is taken of the period in the life of Christ that intervened between his twelfth year and his thirtieth. The main reason for the omission probably is that no special dogmatic end was to be served by the narrative of this period of the Saviour's life. Where access cannot be had to these documents in their original languages, it may be useful to point out that a good and full translation of them may be found in Vol XVI of Clark's Ante-Nicene Library, Edinburgh, 1870.

1. Gospels of the Nativity:

(a) The Protevangelium of James.

The earliest of these documents is the Protevangelium of James. James is supposed to be the Lord's brother. The title "Protevangelium" or First Gospel—a catching title which assumes much and suggests more—was given to this document by Postellus, a Frenchman, who first published it in Latin in the year 1552. In the Greek and Syriac manuscripts, it is known by various other titles, such as, The History of James concerning the Birth of the All-Holy and Ever-Virgin Mother of God and of Her Son Jesus Christ. Tischendorf in the notes to chapter i of his Evang. Apocrypha gives a long list of the names descriptive of it in the various manuscripts. In the Gelasian Decree depriving it of canonical authority it is simply styled Evangelium nomine Jacobi minoris apocryphum. In this document the birth of Mary is foretold by angelic announcement to her parents, Joachim and Anna, as was that of Jesus to Mary. It contains in twenty-five chapters the period from this announcement to the Massacre of the Innocents, including accounts of the early training of Mary in the temple, the Lukan narrative of the birth of Christ with some legendary additions, and the death of Zacharias by order of Herod for refusing to give information regarding the place of concealment of Elisabeth and the child John who, in their flight during the massacre, are miraculously saved by the opening of a mountain.

At chapter 18 a change takes place in the narrative from the third to the first person, which has been taken (NT Apocrypha Writings by Professor Orr, D.D., London, 1903) to suggest an Essenian-Ebionitic origin for the document, and at least to argue for it a composite character, which again may account for the great variety of view taken of its date. It has been assigned (EB, I, 259) to the 1st century. Zahn and Kruger place it in the first decade, many scholars in the second half of the 2nd century; while others (e.g. Harnack) place it in its present form as late as the middle of the 4th century. Good scholars (Sanday, The Gospels in the Second Century) admit references to it in Justin Martyr which would imply that possibly in some older form it was known in the first half of the 2nd century. In its latest forms the document indicates the obvious aim of the writer to promote the sanctity and veneration of the Virgin. It has been shown to contain a number of unhistorical statements. It was condemned in the western church by Popes Damasus (382), Innocent I (405) and by the Decretum Gelasianum (496?). It would seem as if the age thus deprived of the Protevangelium demanded some document of the same character to take its place.

(b) Pseudo-Matthew.

A forged correspondence between Jerome and two Italian bishops supplied a substitute in the Gospel of the Pseudo-Matthew, which Jerome was falsely represented to have rendered in Latin from the original Hebrew of Mt. The gospel is known only in Latin and, as already indicated, is not earlier than the 5th century. The Protevangelium is freely used and supplemented from some unknown (probably Gnostic) source, and further miracles especially connected with the sojourn in Egypt have been wrought into it with others added from the Childhood Gospel of Thomas. Some of the miracles recorded of Egypt are represented as fulfillments of Old Testament prophecy, as when (chapter 18) the adoration of the infant Jesus by dragons recalls the fulfillment of what was said by David the prophet: "Praise the Lord from the earth, ye dragons: ye dragons and all ye deeps"; or as when (chapter 19) lions and panthers adored them, showing the company the way in the desert, "bowing their heads and wagging their tails and adoring Him with great reverence," which was regarded as a fulfillment of the prophecy: "Wolves shall feed with lambs and the lions and the ox shall eat straw together." In this gospel, too, appears for the first time the notice of the ox and the ass adoring the child Jesus in the manger, of which much was made in Christian article The gospel is further eked out by the relation of several of the miracles connected with the Gospel of the Childhood.

(c) The Nativity of Mary.

The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary was written in Latin. It goes over much the same ground as the earlier portion of the Pseudo-Matthew, but so differs from it as to indicate a later date and a different author. It includes more of the miraculous element and daily angelic visits to Mary during her residence in the temple. This gospel makes Mary leave the temple in her 14th year; according to the gospel next described, where the narrator is represented as the Son of Mary Himself, she left the temple in her 12th year, having lived in it nine years. It was for long held to be the work of Jerome, and from this gospel was almost entirely formed the "Golden Legend" which largely took the place of the Scriptures in the 13th century. throughout Europe before the invention of printing. It was among the books early printed in some countries where (as in England) it might not be safe to print the Scriptures. Its services to medieval literature and art should not blind us to the fact that it was a forgery deliberately introduced into the service of the church about the 6th century, when the worship of Mary was specially promoted in the church.

(d) Gospel of Joseph the Carpenter.

To the same class of compositions belongs the Gospel of Joseph the Carpenter. Originally written in Coptic, it was translated into Arabic, in which language with a Latin version it was published in 1722. The composition is devoted to the glorification of Joseph, a cult which was specially favored by the monophysite Coptics. It dates from the 4th century. It contains in 22 chapters the whole history of Joseph and relates in the last part the circumstances of his death at the age of 111 years. These are of some importance for the history of dogma.

(e) The Passing of Mary.

Transitus Mariae: although not strictly a gospel of the Nativity notice may here be taken of the account of John the Theologian of the Falling Asleep (koimesis) of the Holy Mother of God or as it is more commonly called "the Passing of Mary" (transitus Mariae). It was originally written in Greek, but appears also in Latin and several other languages. Two years, it seems, after the ascension of Jesus, Mary, who paid frequent visits to the, "Holy tomb of our Lord to burn incense and pray" was persecuted by the Jews and prayed her Son that He would take her from the earth. The archangel Gabriel brings an answer to her prayers and announces that after three days she shall go to the heavenly places to her Son, into true and everlasting life. Apostles from their graves or from their dioceses are summoned to her bedside at Bethlehem and relate how they were occupied when the summons reached them. Miracles of healing are wrought round the dying bed; and after the instantaneous transportation of Mary and the attendant apostles to Jerusalem, on the Lord's Day, amidst visions of angels Christ Himself appears and receives her soul to Himself. Her body is buried in Gethsemane and thereafter translated to Paradise. Judged by its contents which reveal an advanced stage of the worship of the Virgin and also of church ritual, the document cannot have been produced earlier than the end of the 4th or the beginning of the 5th century, and it has a place among the apocryphal documents condemned by the Gelasian Decree. By this time indeed it appears as if the writers of such documents assumed the most unrestricted license in imagining and embellishing the facts and situations regarding the gospel narrative.

2. The Gospels of the Infancy or Childhood:

(a) Gospel of Thomas.

Next to the Protevangelium the oldest and the most widely spread of the apocryphal gospels is the Gospel of Thomas. It is mentioned by Origen and Irenaeus and seems to have been used by a Gnostic sect of the Nachashenes in the middle of the 2nd century. It was docetic as regards the miracles recorded in it and on this account was also acceptable to the Manichees. The author was one of the Marcosians referred to by Irenaeus. Great variations exist in the text, of which there are only late catholic recasts, two in Greek, one in Latin and one in Syriac. One of the Greek versions is considerably longer than the other, while the Latin is somewhat larger than either. They are very largely concerned with a record of miracles wrought by Jesus before He was 12 years of age. They depict Jesus as an extraordinary but by no means a lovable child. Unlike the miracles of the canonical Gospels those recorded in this gospel are mainly of a destructive nature and are whimsical and puerile in character. It rather shocks one to read them as recorded of the Lord Jesus Christ.

The wonder-worker is described by Renan as "un gamin omnipotent et omniscient," wielding the power of the Godhead with a child's waywardness and petulance. Instead of being subject to His parents He is a serious trouble to them; and instead of growing in wisdom He is represented as forward and eager to teach. His instructors, and to be omniscient from the beginning. The parents of one of the children whose death He had caused entreat Joseph, "Take away that Jesus of thine from this place for he cannot dwell with us in this town; or at least teach him to bless and not to curse." Three or four miracles of a

beneficent nature are mentioned; and in the Latin gospel when Jesus was in Egypt and in his third year, it is written (chapter 1), "And seeing boys playing he began to play with them, and he took a dried fish and put it into a basin and ordered it to move about. And it began to move about. And he said again to the fish: ‘Throw out the salt which thou hast, and walk into the water.’ And it so came to pass, and the neighbors seeing what had been done, told it to the widowed woman in whose house Mary his mother lived. And as soon as she heard it she thrust them out of her house with great haste."

As Westcott points out in his Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 444, "In the apocryphal miracles we find no worthy conception of the laws of providential interference; they are wrought to supply present wants or to gratify present feelings, and often are positively immoral; they are arbitrary displays of power, and without any spontaneity on our Lord’s part or on that of the recipient." Possibly the compilers of the 1st-century narratives above mentioned had in many cases deemed it expedient to make the miraculous an essential—even a too prominent—part of their story; and this may be the reason why John in the opening of the Fourth Gospel declared all the reported miracles of the Childhood to be unauthorized by the statement that the first miracle was that performed, after the beginning of the public ministry, at the marriage at Cana of Galilee. "This beginning of his signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested his glory; and his disciples believed on him" (Joh 2:11).

(b) Arabic Gospel of the Childhood.

The Arabic Gospel of the Childhood is a composite production. Though first published in Arabic with a Latin translation in 1697, its Syriac origin may be inferred from the use of the era of Alexander the Great in chapter 2, from the acquaintance of the writer with oriental learning, and from that of the child Jesus, when in Egypt, with astronomy and physics. The popularity of the book among the Arabs and Coptics in Egypt may also be explained by the fact that the most important of its miracles take place during the Sojourn in Egypt. It is noteworthy also that according to this gospel (chapter 7) it was on the ground of a prophecy of Zoroaster regarding the birth of the Messiah that the Magi undertook their journey to Bethlehem. Some of its stories also appear in the Koran and in other Mohammedan writings. Chapters 1-9 are based on the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke and on the Protevangelium of James, while chapters 26 to the end are derived from the Gospel of Thomas. The intermediate portion of the work is thoroughly oriental in character and reads like extracts from the Arabian Nights. It is not easy to treat seriously the proposal to set productions like these on anything approaching equality with the canonical Gospels. The gospel also has much to do with the growth of the veneration of the Virgin.

3. Gospels of the Passion and Resurrection:

(a) Gospel of Peter (as above).

(b) Gospel of Nicodemus.

The principal documents in this connection are the Gospel of Nicodemus and to some extent, as above shown, the Gospel of Peter. The Gospel of Nicodemus is a name given not earlier than the 13th century

to a duplicate composition the two parts of which were

(1) the Acta Pilati or Ac of Pilate and

(2) the Descent of Christ to the Lower World. The document professes to be a translation into Greek from the Hebrew, and to have been made in the 17th year of the emperor Theodosius and the 6th of Valentinian. It exists in six forms, two Greek and one Latin of the Ac of Pilate, and two Latin and one Greek of the Descent to the Lower World. The general consensus of scholars places the composition in the 5th century, though Tischendorf, relying upon references in Justin and Tertullian, places it in the 2nd century, a date by which it is quite possible for the legend to have arisen. Possibly there has been some confusion between the report on the proceedings connected with the trial and crucifixion of Jesus that had to be furnished to the emperor, as required by the rules of the Roman civil service, and the extended record of the proceedings contained in the Gospel of Nicodemus. The writer was obviously a Jewish Christian. He wrote for this class and was anxious to establish his record by evidence from the mouths of the enemies of Jesus and especially of the officials connected with the events before and after the death of Jesus.

(1) Ac of Pilate

Pilate in particular is shown to be favorable to Jesus and—a gap that must have struck many readers of the canonical narratives—several of those on whom miracles of healing had been wrought come forward to give evidence in favor of Jesus—a most natural step for a late narrator to suppose as having taken place in a regular and formal trial, but one which, as may be gathered from the silence of the canonical writers, was omitted in the turbulent proceedings of the priestly conspiracy that ended with the crucifixion. With all the writer’s acquaintance with Jewish institutions "he shows himself in many points ignorant of the topography of Palestine; thinks, e.g. that Jesus was crucified in the garden in which he was seized (chapter 9) and places Mr. Mamilch or Malek (S. of Jerusalem) in Galilee, and confounds it with the Mount of Ascension" (Orr, op. cit., xix).

(2) Descent of Jesus into the Lower World

The second part of the gospel—The Descent of Christ to the Lower World—is an account of an early and widely accepted tradition not mentioned in any canonical Gospel but based upon 1Pe 3:19: "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison." Two saints who were raised at His resurrection relate how they had been confined in Hades when the Conqueror appeared at its entrance, how the gates of brass were broken and the prisoners released, Jesus taking with Him to Paradise the souls of Adam, Isaiah, John the Baptist and other holy men who had died before Him. The document is purely imaginary: its only importance is in showing how this article of the creed was regarded in the 4th century.

(c) Other Fabrications.

Of even less importance are some late fabrications referring to Pilate sometimes in the manuscripts

attached to the Gospel of Nicodemus, such as Pilate's Letter to the emperor Tiberius; Pilate's Official Report, above referred to; the Paradoses of Pilate and the Death of Pilate, who, after condemnation to the most disgraceful death, is represented as dying by his own hand. In the Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea the writer gives a loose rein to his imagination.

The study of the documents above described fully justifies the observation of the editors of the Ante-Nicene Library that while they afford us "curious glimpses of the state of the Christian conscience, and of modes of thought in the first centuries of our era, the predominant impression which they leave on our minds is a profound sense of the immeasurable superiority, the unapproachable simplicity and majesty, of the Canonical Writings."

LITERATURE.

In addition to the books quoted above may be mentioned the following: Fabricius, Codex Apocryphus, 1719; the collections and prolegomena of Thilo (1832); Tischendorf, Gospels, 1853, Ellicott, "On the Apocryphal Gospels" in Cambridge Essays, 1856; Lipsius, article "Gospels (Apocrypha)" in Dict. of Christ. Biog.; Dr. W. Wright in Journal of Sacred Lit. (January and April, 1865) on the Syriac versions of the Protevangelium, The Gospel of Thomas, and the Transitus Mariae: Studia Sinaitica (No. XI, 1902) giving new Syriac texts of the Protevangelium and Transitus Mariae. A. F. Findlay, article "Ac (Apocrypha)," where will be found a very copious body of references to works, British and foreign, dealing with all branches of the subject.

J. Hutchison

APOLLONIA

ap-o-lo'-ni-a (Apollonia): A town in Mygdonia, a district in Macedonia. It was situated a little to the south of Lake Bolbe, on the Via Egnatia, the great Roman road leading from the coast of the Adriatic to the river Hebrus (Maritza), one of the main military and commercial highways of the empire: it lay between Amphipolis and Thessalonica, a day's journey (Livy xlv.28) or about 30 Roman miles from the former and 38 from the latter. The foundation of the town may perhaps be attributed to about 432 BC; in any case, coins are extant which attest its existence in the 4th century BC (Head, Historia Numorum, 181). Paul and Silas passed through the town on their journey from Philippi to Thessalonica, but do not appear to have stayed there (Ac 17:1). The name seems to have survived in the modern Pollina (Leake, Northern Greece, III, 458; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Macedoine, I, 115).

Marcus N. Tod

APOLLONIUS

ap-o-lo'-ni-us (Apollonios): A common name among the Syro-Macedonians. Prideaux (Connexion) interrupts his narrative of the year 148 BC to give an account of the different persons who bore this

name

(1) Son of Thrasaeus (2 Macc 3:5) who was governor of Coele-Syria (Palestine and Phoenicia) under Seleucus Philopator, when Heliodorus came to Jerusalem to rob the temple, and afterward, by his authority in that province, supported Simon the governor of the temple at Jerusalem against Onias the high priest. He was also chief minister of state to King Seleucus. But on the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes, Apollonius, in some way becoming obnoxious to the new king, left Syria and retired to Miletus.

(2) A son of (1) who, while his father resided at Miletus, was brought up at Rome along with Demetrius, son of Seleucus Philopator, and at that time held as a hostage by the Romans. This Apollonius lived in great intimacy with Demetrius, who, on recovering the crown of Syria, made him governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, the same government which his father held under Seleucus Philopator. He seems to have been continued in the same government by Alexander (1 Macc 10:69) but he revolted from him to embrace the interest of Demetrius.

(3) Son of Menestheus, and favorite and chief minister of Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 4:21). He went as ambassador from Antiochus, first to Rome (Livy xlii.6) and afterward to Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt (2 Macc 4:21). This is generally held to be the same who is said to have been over the tribute (1 Macc 1:29; 2 Macc 5:24) and who, on the return of Antiochus from his last expedition into Egypt, was sent with a detachment of 22,000 men to destroy Jerusalem. He attacked the Jews while keeping the Sabbath day holy and slew great multitudes of them (2 Macc 5:24-27).

(4) Governor of Samaria in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He was slain in battle by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 3:10,11; Ant, XII, vii, 10). (5) Son of Gennaeus (2 Macc 12:2); as governor of a toparchy in Palestine under Antiochus Eupator he proved a bitter enemy of the Jews.

J. Hutchison

APOLLOPHANES

ap-o-lof’-a-nez, a-pol-o-fa’-nez (Apollophanes): A Syrian killed by Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 10:37).

APOLLOS

a-pol’-os (Apollos, the short form of Apollonius): Apollos was a Jew of Alexandrian race (Ac 18:24) who reached Ephesus in the summer of 54 AD, while Paul was on his third missionary journey, and there he "spake and taught accurately the things concerning Jesus" (Ac 18:25). That he was eminently fitted for the task is indicated by the fact of his being a "learned man," "mighty in the scriptures," "fervent in spirit," "instructed in the way of the Lord" (Ac 18:24,25). His teaching was however incomplete in that he knew "only the baptism of John" (Ac 18:25), and this has given rise to some controversy. According to Blass, his information was derived from a written gospel which reached

Alexandria, but it was more probably the fruits of what Apollos had heard, either directly or from others, of the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (compare Joh 1:28). Upon receiving further instruction from Priscilla and Aquila (Ac 18:26), Apollos extended his mission to Achaia, being encouraged thereto by the brethren of Ephesus (Ac 18:27).

In Achaia "he helped them much that had believed through grace; for he powerfully confuted the Jews, and that publicly, showing by the scriptures that Jesus was the Christ" (Ac 18:27,28). During Apollos' absences in Achaia, Paul had reached Ephesus and learned of what had been taught by Apollos there. (Ac 19:1). Since Paul was informed that the Ephesians still knew nothing of the baptism of the Spirit (Ac 19:2-4), it is probable that Apollos had not imparted to his hearers the further instruction he had received from Priscilla and Aquila, but had departed for Achaia shortly after receiving it. Paul remained upward of two years among the Ephesians (Ac 19:8,10), and in the spring of 57 AD he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians. By this time Apollos was once more in Ephesus (compare 1Co 16:12). It is incredible that this epistle of Paul could have been prompted by any feelings of jealousy or animosity on his part against Apollos. It was rather the outcome of discussion between the two regarding the critical situation then existing in Corinth.

The mission of Apollos had met with a certain success, but the breeding of faction, which that very success, through the slight discrepancies in his teaching (compare 1Co 1:12; 3:4) with that of Paul or of Cephas, had engendered, was utterly alien to his intentions. The party spirit was as distasteful to Apollos as it was to Paul, and made him reluctant to return to the scene of his former labors even at the desire of Paul himself (1Co 16:12). The epistle voiced the indignation of both. Paul welcomed the cooperation of Apollos (1Co 3:6: "I planted, Apollos watered"). It was not against his fellow-evangelist that he fulminated, but against the petty spirit of those who loved faction more than truth, who saw not that both he and Apollos came among them as "God's fellow-workers" (1Co 3:9), the common servants of the one Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

This view is also borne out by the tenor of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 84-112, especially 105): nor does it conflict with the passages 1Co 12:1-7; 2Co 3:1; 11:16, where Paul seems to allude to Apollos' eloquence, wisdom, and letter of commendation. Paul wrote thus not in order to disparage Apollos but to affirm that, even without these incidental advantages, he would yield to none in the preaching of Christ crucified.

The last mention of Apollos is in the Epistle to Titus, where he is recommended along with Zenas to Titus (Titus 3:13). He was then on a journey through Crete (Titus 3:15), and was probably the bearer of the epistle. The time of this is uncertain, as the writing of the Epistle to Titus, though generally admitted to have been after the release of Paul from imprisonment at Rome, has been variously placed at 64-67 AD. See TITUS, EPISTLE TO.

C. M. Kerr

APOLLYON

a-pol’-i-on (Apolluon; ‘abhaddon, "destroyer"): Present participle of the verb apolluo, "to destroy."

I. Definition.

A proper name, original with the author of the Apocalypse and used by him once (Re 9:11) as a translation of the Hebrew word "Abaddon" (see ABADDON) to designate an angel or prince of the lower world.

II. Old Testament Background.

1. Fundamental Meaning:

The term Abaddon ("destruction") appears solely in the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and in the following narrow range of instances: Job 26:6; 28:22; 31:12; Ps 88:11; Pr 15:11. In all these passages save one (Job 31:12) the word is combined either with Sheol, "death," or "the grave," in such a way as to indicate a purely eschatological term based upon the advanced idea of moral distinctions in the realm of the dead. In the one exceptional passage (Es 8:6 is incorrectly referred to—the word here is different, namely, ‘abhedhan) where the combination does not occur, the emphasis upon the moral element in the "destruction" mentioned is so definite as practically to preclude the possibility of interpreting the term in any general sense (as Charles, HDB, article "Abaddon"; per con., Briggs, ICC, "Psalms" in the place cited.; BDB, sub loc.). The meaning of the word, therefore, is: the place or condition of utter ruin reserved for the wicked in the realm of the dead.

2. Personification:

One other feature of Old Testament usage is worthy of consideration as throwing light upon Re 9:11. Abaddon and the accompanying terms "Death" and Sheol are personified (as in Job 28:22) and represented as living beings who speak and act (compare Re 6:8).

III. New Testament Usage.

1. The Starting-Point:

The starting-point of the Apocalyptist’s use of "Apollyon" is to be found in the fundamental meaning of "Abaddon" as moral destruction in the underworld, together with the occasional personification of kindred terms in the Old Testament. The imagery was in general terms familiar while the New Testament writer felt perfectly free to vary the usage to suit his own particular purposes.

2. Apollyon not Satan but Part of an Ideal Description:

(1) Since Apollyon is a personification he is not to be identified with Satan (compare Re 9:1 where

Satan seems to be clearly indicated) or with any other being to whom historical existence and definite characteristics are ascribed. He is the central figure in an ideal picture of evil forces represented as originating in the world of lost spirits and allowed to operate destructively in human life. They are pictured as locusts, but on an enlarged scale and with the addition of many features inconsistent with the strict application of the figure (see Re 9:7-10). The intention is, by the multiplication of images which the author does not attempt to harmonize, to convey the impression of great power and far-reaching destructiveness.

(2) This interpretation finds additional support in the writer's significant departure from the familiar usage. In the Old Testament the place of destruction is personified—in Re 9:11, personal forces issue from the Abyss, of which the presiding genius is Destruction in person. The seer's picture is equally independent of the tradition represented by the Talmud (Shab f. 55) where Abaddon is personified as jointly with Death president over six destroying angels. These modifications are evidently due to the exigencies of the pictorial form. It is clearly impossible to portray forces proceeding from the place of ruin in the charge of the place itself.

3. Apollyon Necessary to the Picture:

The importance of the conception of Apollyon to the completeness of the picture should not be overlooked. It is intended to represent these forces as having a certain principle of internal unity and as possessors of the power of effective leadership.

4. General Significance of the Description:

As to the specific significance of the vision of the locusts as a whole it is not easy to reach a conclusion. Professor Swete suggests (Commentary on Apocalypse in the place cited.) that "the locusts of the abyss may be the memories of the past brought home at times of divine visitation; they hurt by recalling forgotten sins." It seems to us more probable that it represents an actual historical movement, past or to come, demoniacal in origin and character, human in the mode of its operation and the sphere of its influence, used by God for a scourge upon mankind and kept in restraint by His grace and power. See ABADDON.

Louis Matthew Sweet

APOSTASY; APOSTATE

a-pos'-ta-si, a-pos'-tat (he apostasia, "a standing away from"): I.e. a falling away, a withdrawal, a defection. Not found in the English Versions of the Bible, but used twice in the New Testament, in the Greek original, to express abandonment of the faith. Paul was falsely accused of teaching the Jews apostasy from Moses (Ac 21:21); he predicted the great apostasy from Christianity, foretold by Jesus (Mt 24:10-12) which would precede "the day of the Lord" (2Th 2:2). Apostasy, not in name but in fact, meets scathing rebuke in the Epistle of Jude, e.g. the apostasy of angels (Jude 1:6). Foretold, with

warnings, as sure to abound in the latter days (1Ti 4:1-3; 2Th 2:3; 2Pe 3:17). Causes of: persecution (Mt 24:9,10); false teachers (Mt 24:11); temptation (Lu 8:13); worldliness (2Ti 4:4); defective knowledge of Christ (1 Joh 2:19); moral lapse (Heb 6:4-6); forsaking worship and spiritual living (Heb 10:25-31); unbelief (Heb 3:12). Biblical examples: Saul (1Sa 15:11); Amaziah (2Ch 25:14,27); many disciples (Joh 6:66); Hymeneus and Alexander (1Ti 1:19,20); Demas (2Ti 4:10). For further illustration see De 13:13; Ze 1:4-6; Ga 5:4; 2Pe 2:20,21.

"Forsaking Yahweh" was the characteristic and oft-recurring sin of the chosen people, especially in their contact with idolatrous nations. It constituted their supreme national peril. The tendency appeared in their earliest history, as abundantly seen in the warnings and prohibitions of the laws of Moses (Ex 20:3,4,23; De 6:14; 11:16). The fearful consequences of religious and moral apostasy appear in the curses pronounced against this sin, on Mount Ebal, by the representatives of six of the tribes of Israel, elected by Moses (De 27:13-26; 28:15-68). So wayward was the heart of Israel, even in the years immediately following the national emancipation, in the wilderness, that Joshua found it necessary to re-pledge the entire nation to a new fidelity to Yahweh and to their original covenant before they were permitted to enter the Promised Land (Jos 24:1-28). Infidelity to this covenant blighted the nation’s prospects and growth during the time of the Judges (Jud 2:11-15; 10:6,10,13; 1Sa 12:10). It was the cause of prolific and ever-increasing evil, civic and moral, from Solomon’s day to the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities. Many of the kings of the divided kingdom apostatized, leading the people, as in the case of Rehoboam, into the grossest forms of idolatry and immorality (1Ki 14:22-24; 2Ch 12:1). Conspicuous examples of such royal apostasy are Jeroboam (1Ki 12:28-32); Ahab (1Ki 16:30-33); Ahaziah (1Ki 22:51-53); Jehoram (2Ch 21:6,10,12-15); Ahaz (2Ch 28:1-4); Manasseh (2Ch 33:1-9); Amen (2Ch 33:22). See IDOLATRY.

Prophecy originated as a Divine and imperative protest against this historic tendency to defection from the religion of Yahweh. In classical Greek, apostasy signified revolt from a military commander. In the roman catholic church it denotes abandonment of religious orders; renunciation of ecclesiastical authority; defection from the faith. The persecutions of the early Christian centuries forced many to deny Christian discipleship and to signify their apostasy by offering incense to a heathen deity or blaspheming the name of Christ. The emperor Julian, who probably never vitally embraced the Christian faith, is known in history as "the Apostate," having renounced Christianity for paganism soon after his accession to the throne. An apostate’s defection from the faith may be intellectual, as in the case of Ernst Haeckel, who, because of his materialistic philosophy, publicly and formally renounced Christianity and the church; or it may be moral and spiritual, as with Judas, who for filthy lucre’s sake basely betrayed his Lord. See exhaustive articles on "Apostasy" in the Jewish Encyclopedia.

Dwight M. Pratt

APOSTLE

a-pos’-l ([@ apostolos], literally, "one sent forth," an envoy, missionary): For the meaning of this name as it meets us in the New Testament, reference is sometimes made to classical and Jewish parallels. In

earlier classical Greek there was a distinction between an aggelos or messenger and an apostolos, who was not a mere messenger, but a delegate or representative of the person who sent him. In the later Judaism, again, apostoloi were envoys sent out by the patriarchate in Jerusalem to collect the sacred tribute from the Jews of the Dispersion. It seems unlikely, however, that either of these uses bears upon the Christian origin of a term which, in any case, came to have its own distinctive Christian meaning. To understand the word as we find it in the New Testament it is not necessary to go beyond the New Testament itself. To discover the source of its Christian use it is sufficient to refer to its immediate and natural signification. The term used by Jesus, it must be remembered, would be Aramaic, not Greek, and apostolos would be its literal equivalent.

1. The Twelve:

In the New Testament history we first hear of the term as applied by Jesus to the Twelve in connection with that evangelical mission among the villages on which He dispatched them at an early stage of His public ministry (Mt 10:1 ff; Mr 3:14; 6:30; Lu 6:13; 9:1 ff). From a comparison of the Synoptics it would seem that the name as thus used was not a general designation for the Twelve, but had reference only to this particular mission, which was typical and prophetic, however, of the wider mission that was to come (compare Hort, Christian Ecclesia, 23-29). Luke, it is true, uses the word as a title for the Twelve apart from reference to the mission among the villages. But the explanation probably is, as Dr. Hort suggests, that since the Third Gospel and the Book of Ac formed two sections of what was really one work, the author in the Gospel employs the term in that wider sense which it came to have after the Ascension.

When we pass to Acts, "apostles" has become an ordinary name for the Eleven (Ac 1:2,26), and after the election of Matthias in place of Judas, for the Twelve (2:37,42,43, etc.). But even so it does not denote a particular and restricted office, but rather that function of a world-wide missionary service to which the Twelve were especially called. In His last charge, just before He ascended, Jesus had commissioned them to go forth into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature (Mt 28:19,20; Mr 16:15). He had said that they were to be His witnesses not only in Jerusalem and Judea, but in Samaria (contrast Mt 10:5), and unto the uttermost part of the earth (Ac 1:8). They were apostles, therefore, qua missionaries —not merely because they were the Twelve, but because they were now sent forth by their Lord on a universal mission for the propagation of the gospel.

2. Paul:

The very fact that the name "apostle" means what it does would point to the impossibility of confining it within the limits of the Twelve. (The "twelve apostles" of Re 21:14 is evidently symbolic; compare in 7:3 ff the restriction of God’s sealed servants to the twelve tribes.) Yet there might be a tendency at first to do so, and to restrict it as a badge of honor and privilege peculiar to that inner circle (compare Ac 1:25). If any such tendency existed, Paul effectually broke it down by vindicating for himself the right to the name. His claim appears in his assumption of the apostolic title in the opening words of most of his epistles. And when his right to it was challenged, he defended that right with passion, and especially on

these grounds: that he had seen Jesus, and so was qualified to bear witness to His resurrection (1Co 9:1; compare Ac 22:6 ff); that he had received a call to the work of an apostle (Ro 1:1; 1Co 1:1, etc.; Ga 2:7; compare Ac 13:2 ff; 22:21); but, above all, that he could point to the signs and seals of his apostleship furnished by his missionary labors and their fruits (1Co 9:2; 2Co 12:12; Ga 2:8). It was by this last ground of appeal that Paul convinced the original apostles of the justice of his claim. He had not been a disciple of Jesus in the days of His flesh; his claim to have seen the risen Lord and from Him to have received a personal commission was not one that could be proved to others; but there could be no possibility of doubt as to the seals of his apostleship. It was abundantly clear that "he that wrought for Peter unto the apostleship of the circumcision wrought for (Paul) also unto the Gentiles" (Ga 2:8). And so perceiving the grace that was given unto him, Peter and John, together with James of Jerusalem, recognized Paul as apostle to the Gentiles and gave him the right hand of fellowship (Ga 2:9).

3. The Wider Circle:

It is sometimes said by those who recognize that there were other apostles besides the Twelve and Paul that the latter (to whom some, on the ground of 1Co 15:7; Ga 1:19, would add James the Lord’s brother) were the apostles par excellence, while the other apostles mentioned in the New Testament were apostles in some inferior sense. It is hardly possible, however, to make out such a distinction on the ground of New Testament usage. There were great differences, no doubt, among the apostles of the primitive church, as there were among the Twelve themselves—differences due to natural talents, to personal acquirements and experience, to spiritual gifts. Paul was greater than Barnabas or Silvanus, just as Peter and John were greater than Thaddaeus or Simon the Cananean.

But Thaddaeus and Simon were disciples of Jesus in the very same sense as Peter and John; and the Twelve and Paul were not more truly apostles than others who are mentioned in the New Testament. If apostleship denotes missionary service, and if its reality, as Paul suggests, is to be measured by its seals, it would be difficult to maintain that Matthias was an apostle par excellence, while Barnabas was not. Paul sets Barnabas as an apostle side by side with himself (1Co 9:5 f; Ga 2:9; compare Ac 13:2 f; 14:4,14); he speaks of Andronicus and Junias as "of note among the apostles" (Ro 16:7); he appears to include Apollos along with himself among the apostles who are made a spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men (1Co 4:6,9); the natural inference from a comparison of 1Th 1:1 with 2:6 is that he describes Silvanus and Timothy as "apostles of Christ"; to the Philippians he mentions Epaphroditus as "your apostle" (Php 2:25 the Revised Version, margin), and to the Corinthians commends certain unknown brethren as "the apostles of the churches" and "the glory of Christ" (2Co 8:23 the Revised Version, margin). And the very fact that he found it necessary to denounce certain persons as "false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ" (2Co 11:13) shows that there was no thought in the primitive church of restricting the apostleship to a body of 12 or 13 men. "Had the number been definitely restricted, the claims of these interlopers would have been self-condemned" (Lightfoot, Galatians, 97).

4. Apostles in Didache:

When we come to the Didache, which probably lies beyond the boundary-line of New Testament history, we find the name "apostles" applied to a whole class of nameless missionaries—men who settled in no church, but moved about from place to place as messengers of the gospel (chapter 11). This makes it difficult to accept the view, urged by Lightfoot (op. cit., 98) and Gwatkin (HDB, I, 126) on the ground Of Lu 24:48; Ac 1:8,22; 1Co 9:1, that to have seen the Lord was always the primary qualification of an apostle—a view on the strength of which they reject the apostleship of Apollos and Timothy, as being late converts to Christianity who lived far from the scenes of our Lord's ministry. Gwatkin remarks that we have no reason to suppose that this condition was ever waived unless we throw forward the Didache into the 2nd century. But it seems very unlikely that even toward the end of the 1st century there would be a whole class of men, not only still alive, but still braving in the exercise of their missionary functions all the hardships of a wandering and homeless existence (compare Didache 11:4-6), who were yet able to bear the personal testimony of eye-witnesses to the ministry and resurrection of Jesus. In Lu 24:48 and Ac 18:22 it is the chosen company of the Twelve who are in view. In 1Co 9:1 Paul is meeting his Judaizing opponents on their own ground, and answering their insistence upon personal intercourse with Jesus by a claim to have seen the Lord. But apart from these passages there is no evidence that the apostles of the early church were necessarily men who had known Jesus in the flesh or had been witnesses of His resurrection—much less that this was the primary qualification on which their apostleship was made to rest.

5. The Apostleship:

We are led then to the conclusion that the true differentia of the New Testament apostleship lay in the missionary calling implied in the name, and that all whose lives were devoted to this vocation, and who could prove by the issues of their labors that God's Spirit was working through them for the conversion of Jew or Gentile, were regarded and described as apostles. The apostolate was not a limited circle of officials holding a well-defined position of authority in the church, but a large class of men who discharged one—and that the highest—of the functions of the prophetic ministry (1Co 12:28; Eph 4:11). It was on the foundation of the apostles and prophets that the Christian church was built, with Jesus Christ Himself as the chief corner-stone (Eph 2:20). The distinction between the two classes was that while the prophet was God's spokesman to the believing church (1Co 14:4,22,25,30,31), the apostle was His envoy to the unbelieving world (Ga 2:7,9).

The call of the apostle to his task might come in a variety of ways. The Twelve were called personally by Jesus to an apostolic task at the commencement of His earthly ministry (Mt 10:1 ff parallel), and after His resurrection this call was repeated, made permanent, and given a universal scope (Mt 28:19,20; Ac 1:8). Matthias was called first by the voice of the general body of the brethren and thereafter by the decision of the lot (Ac 1:15,23,26). Paul's call came to him in a heavenly vision (Ac 26:17-19); and though this call was subsequently ratified by the church at Antioch, which sent him forth at the bidding of the Holy Ghost (Ac 13:1 ff), he firmly maintained that he was an apostle not from men neither through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father who raised Him from the dead (Ga 1:1). Barnabas was sent forth (exapostello is the verb used) by the church at Jerusalem (Ac 11:22) and later, along with Paul, by the church at Antioch (Ac 13:1); and soon after this we find the two men described as apostles (Ac 14:4). It was the mission on which they were sent that explains the title. And when this

particular mission was completed and they returned to Antioch to rehearse before the assembled church "all things that God had done with them, and that he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles" (Ac 14:27), they thereby justified their claim to be the apostles not only of the church, but of the Holy Spirit.

The authority of the apostolate was of a spiritual, ethical and personal kind. It was not official, and in the nature of the case could not be transmitted to others. Paul claimed for himself complete independence of the opinion of the whole body of the earlier apostles (Ga 2:6,11), and in seeking to influence his own converts endeavored by manifestation of the truth to commend himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God (2Co 4:2). There is no sign that the apostles collectively exercised a separate and autocratic authority. When the question of the observance of the Mosaic ritual by GentileChristians arose at Antioch and was referred to Jerusalem, it was "the apostles and elders" who met to discuss it (Ac 15:2,6,22), and the letter returned to Antioch was written in the name of "the apostles and the elders, brethren" (Ac 15:23).

In founding a church Paul naturally appointed the first local officials (Ac 14:23), but he does not seem to have interfered with the ordinary administration of affairs in the churches he had planted. In those cases in which he was appealed to or was compelled by some grave scandal to interpose, he rested an authoritative command on some express word of the Lord (1Co 7:10), and when he had no such word to rest on, was careful to distinguish his own judgment and counsel from a Divine commandment (1Co 12:25,30). His appeals in the latter case are grounded upon fundamental principles of morality common to heathen and Christian alike (1Co 5:1), or are addressed to the spiritual judgment (1Co 10:15), or are reinforced by the weight of a personal influence gained by unselfish service and by the fact that he was the spiritual father of his converts as having begotten them in Christ Jesus through the gospel (1Co 4:15 f). It may be added here that the expressly missionary character of the apostleship seems to debar James, the Lord's brother, from any claim to the title. James was a prophet and teacher, but not an apostle. As the head of the church at Jerusalem, he exercised a ministry of a purely local nature. The passages on which it has been sought to establish his right to be included in the apostolate do not furnish any satisfactory evidence. In 1Co 15:7 James is contrasted with "all the apostles" rather than included in their number (compare 1Co 9:5). And in Ga 1:19 the meaning may quite well be that with the exception of Peter, none of the apostles was seen by Paul in Jerusalem, but only James the Lord's brother (compare the Revised Version, margin).

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Galatians, 92-101; Hort, Christian Ecclesia, Lect II; Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age, II, 291-99; Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry, 73-90.

J. C. Lambert

APOSTLES' CREED; THE

kred.

The Oldest Creed:

The Apostles' Creed is the oldest creed, and lies at the basis of most others. Though not, as the long-current legend of its origin affirmed, the direct work of the Apostles, it has its roots in apostolic times, and embodies, with much fidelity, apostolic teaching. It will be seen immediately that it had an important place in the early church, when as yet no creed but itself existed. The oldest usage of the term "Rule of Faith" (regula fidei), now commonly given to the Scriptures, has reference to this creed. It was the creed that could be appealed to as held by the church in all its great branches, and so as forming the test of catholicity. It was as resting on this creed that the church could be called "catholic and apostolic." Of late the creed has been the subject of great controversy, and violent attempts have been made to thrust out some of its chief articles from the Christian faith. This is a special reason for considering the foundations on which these articles of faith rest.

I. Form of the Creed.

In the first place, what is the creed? Here, first of all, it is to be pointed out that the received form of the creed is not its oldest or original form. The creed exists in two forms—a shorter and a longer; the former, known as the Old Roman Form, going back certainly as early as the middle of the 2nd century (about 140 AD), the latter, the enlarged form, in its present shape, of much later date. Its final form was probably given to it in South Gaul not before the middle of the 5th century (in one or two clauses, as late as the 7th). It is desirable, at the outset, to put these two forms of the creed (in translation) clearly before the reader.

1. Old Roman Form:

First, the Old Roman Form is given from the Greek of Marcellus, of Ancyra, 341 AD. It runs thus: "I believe in God the Father Almighty. And in Jesus Christ His only (begotten) Son our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary; crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father, from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost; the holy Church; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; (the life everlasting)."

The last clause is omitted in the Latin form preserved by Rufinus, 390 AD.

2. The Received Form:

The Received Form of the creed reads thus: "I believe in God the Father Almighty; Maker of Heaven and Earth; and in Jesus Christ His only (begotten) Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven; and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the

Holy Ghost; the holy catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen." Such is the form of the creed. Something must now be said of its origin and history.

II. Origin of the Creed.

The legend was that the creed took shape at the dictation of the Twelve Apostles, each of whom contributed a special article. Thus, Peter, it was alleged, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, commenced, "I believe in God the Father Almighty"; Andrew (or according to others, John) continued, "And in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord"; James the elder went on, "Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost," etc. This legend is not older than the 5th or 6th centuries, and is absurd on the face of it.

1. Baptismal Confession:

The real origin of the creed has now been traced with great exactness. The original germ of it is to be sought for in the baptismal confession made by converts in the reception of that rite. The primitive confession may have contained no more than "I believe that Jesus is the Son of God," but we have evidence within the New Testament itself that it soon became enlarged. Paul speaks of the "form of teaching" delivered to converts (Ro 6:17), and reminds Timothy of "the good (beautiful) confession" he had made in sight of many witnesses (1Ti 6:12). Similar language is used of Christ’s confession before Pilate (1Ti 6:13). We may perhaps conjecture from the epistles that Timothy’s confession contained references to God as the author of life, to Jesus Christ and His descent from David, to His witness before Pontius Pilate, to His being raised from the dead, to His coming again to judge the quick and the dead (1Ti 6:13; 2Ti 2:8; 4:1). Early Christian writers, as Ignatius (110 AD), and Aristides the apologist (circa 125 AD), show traces of other clauses.

2. "Rule of Faith":

In any case, the fact is certain that before the middle of the 2nd century the confession at baptism had crystallized into tolerably settled shape in all the greater churches. We have accounts given us of its contents (besides the Old Roman Form) in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Novatian, Origen, etc.; and they show substantial unity with a certain freedom of form in expression. But the form in the Roman church came gradually to be the recognized type. After the middle of the century, the confession rose to new importance as the result of the Gnostic controversies, and assumed more of the character of a formal creed. It came to be known as the "Rule of Truth," or "Rule of Faith," and was employed to check the license of interpretation of Scripture of these fantastic heretical speculators. The creed had originated independently of Scripture—in the early oral teaching and preaching of the apostles; hence its value as a witness to the common faith. But it was not used to supersede Scripture; it was held to corroborate Scripture, where men by their allegorical and other perversions sought to wrest Scripture from its real sense. It was employed as a check on those who sought to allegorize away the Christian faith.

III. History of the Creed.

1. The Roman Creed:

The Old Roman Form of the creed was, as said above, certainly in use by the middle of the 2nd century, in Rome; probably a considerable time before. We have it in both its Greek and Latin forms (the Greek being probably the original). The Latin form is given by Rufinus about 390 AD who compares it with the creed of his own church of Aquileia—a very old church. The Greek form is preserved by Marcellus, of Ancyra, in the 4th century. The old shorter form of the creed long maintained itself. We find it in England, e.g. up to nearly the time of the Norman Conquest (in 8th or 9th century manuscripts in British Museum).

2. The Received Creed:

The Received Form of the creed has a much more obscure history. The additional clauses came in at different times, though in themselves some of them are very old. The addition to the first article, e.g. "Maker of heaven and earth," first appears in this form in Gaul about 650 AD, though similar forms are found in much older creeds. Another addition, "He descended into hell," meets us first in Rufinus as part of the creed of Aquileia, but is probably also old in that church. It is known that the creed had assumed nearly its present shape (perhaps without the above clauses, and that on the communion of saints) by the time of Faustus of Reiz, about 460 AD. Thence it spread, and had reached Ireland apparently before the end of the 7th century. In England it appears a century later, about 850 AD (from the court of Charlemagne?), and from the beginning of the 10th century it largely superseded the older from. The same applies to other countries, so that the Gallican form is now the one in common use. Two significant changes may be noted in the form given to it. In England, whose form we follow, the Reformers substituted for "the resurrection of the flesh" the words, "the resurrection of the body," and in Germany the Lutherans change the word "catholic" to "Christian," in "the holy catholic Church."

IV. Structure of the Creed.

1. Its Trinitarian Form:

The Apostles’ Creed, it will be perceived, has no theological or metaphysical character. It is not only the oldest, but the simplest and least developed of all creeds. It is a simple enumeration, in order, of the great verities which the church was known to have held, and to have handed down from the beginning—which Scripture also taught. Originating from the baptismal confession, it naturally follows the Trinitarian order suggested by the customary formula for baptism. The first article declares belief in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. The second to the seventh articles declare belief in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, and in the great facts embraced in the gospel testimony regarding Him. The eighth article affirms belief in the Holy Ghost, to which are appended the additional clauses, declaring belief in the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh (body), and the life everlasting.

2. Creed of Apelles:

It will help to show the kind of heresies the church of that age had to contend with, and what the earnest struggles of the Fathers of the time (using the Apostles' Creed as a bulwark), if we append here the Creed of Apelles, a 2nd- century Gnostic, as reconstructed by Principal Lindsay (The Church and the Ministry, 222) from Hippolytus: "We believe, that Christ descended from the Power above, from the Good, and that He is the Son of the Good; that He was not born of a virgin, and that when He did appear He was not devoid of flesh. That He formed His Body by taking portions of it from the substance of the universe, i.e. hot and cold, moist and dry; That He received cosmical powers in the Body, and lived for the time He did in the world; That He was crucified by the Jews and died; That being raised again after three days He appeared to His disciples; That He showed them the prints of the nails and (the wound) in His side, being desirous of persuading them that He was no phantom, but was present in the flesh; That after He had shown them His flesh He restored it to the earth; That after He had once more loosed the chains of His Body He gave back heat to what is hot, cold to what is cold, moisture to what is moist, and dryness to what is dry; That in this condition He departed to the Good Father, leaving the Seed of Life in the world for those who through His disciples should believe in Him."

V. Modern Controversies.

It was mentioned that of late the Apostles' Creed has been the subject of many attacks and of keen controversies. In Germany, particularly, quite a fierce controversy broke out in 1892 over the refusal of a Lutheran pastor, named Schrempf, to use the creed in the administration of baptism. He did not believe in its articles about the virgin-birth of Christ, the resurrection of the flesh, etc. The offender was deposed, but a great battle ensued, giving rise to an enormous literature. The conflict has been overruled for good in leading to a more thorough examination than ever before of the history and meaning of the creed, but it has given precision also to the attacks made upon it. A leading part in this controversy was taken by Professor Harnack, of Berlin, whose objections may be regarded as representative. Professor Harnack, and those who think with him, criticize the creed from a twofold point of view:

(1) They deny that in all respects it represents true apostolical doctrine—this not only in its later arts., but even in such an article as that affirming the virgin-birth of Christ:

(2) They deny that the meaning we now put on many of the clauses of ~he creed is its true original meaning, i.e. we use the words, but with a different sense from the original framers.

Harnack's Criticism:

In considering these objections, it is always to be remembered that those who urge them do so from the standpoint of rejection of most that is usually considered essential to Christianity. There is in their view no incarnation, no real Godhead of Christ, no real miracle in His life (only faith-cures), no resurrection from Joseph's tomb. This no doubt takes the bottom from the Apostles' Creed, but it takes the bottom also out of apostolic Christianity. Where Harnack, for instance, objects that "Father" and "Son" in the first and second articles of the creed have no Trinitarian reference, but relate only, the former to God's

relation to creation, the latter, to Christ's historical appearance, the reply can only be the whole evidence in the New Testament for a Trinitarian distinction and for the essential Divinity of Christ. When it is declared that the virgin-birth is no part of the early Christian tradition, one can only appeal to the evidence of the fact in the Gospels, and recall that no section of the Christian church, except a heretical branch of the Ebionites, and some of the Gnostic sects, is known to have rejected it. (See VIRGIN BIRTH.) For detailed replies to Harnack's criticisms, Dr. Swete's book on the Apostles' Creed may be consulted.

LITERATURE.

A list of the voluminous pamphlet literature produced by the German controversy on the Apostles' Creed may be seen in Nippold's Die theologische Einzelschule, II, 232-33. The most important contributions are those of Harnack (Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntniss, also English Translation); Kattenbusch, and Cremer. Compare also Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, I, 14-23; II, 45-55. Special works are: Pearson, Exposition of the Creed (1659); Kattenbusch, Das apostolische Symbolum, 2 volumes (1894-1900); Zahn, Das apostolische Syrnbolum (1893); English translation (1899); H. B. Swete, The Apostles' Creed and Primitive Christianity (1894); A. C. McGiffert, The Apostles' Creed, Its Origin, Its Purpose, and Its Historical Interpretation (1902).

James Orr

APOSTLES, GOSPEL OF THE TWELVE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

APOSTOLIC AGE

ap-os-tol'-ik aj.

1. The Mission:

(1) When the disciples realized that they had seen the risen Christ for the last time and that it had now become their duty to spread His message, they gathered themselves together and restored the number of "witnesses" to the appointed Twelve. Immediately afterward the outpouring of the Holy Spirit gave them the signal to begin work. At first this work was rigidly centered in Jerusalem, and the first journeyings were the result of forcible dispersion and not of planned effort (Ac 11:19). But pilgrims to the feasts had carried away the gospel with them, and in this way Christianity had been spread at least as far as Damascus (Ac 9:2,19). The dispersion itself widened the circle to Cyprus and to Antioch and marked the beginning of the Gentilework (Ac 11:19-20). Here the extreme prominence of Paul's ministry in the New Testament should not obscure the success of the other missionaries.

When the apostles began their journeys we do not know but at the time of Ga 1:19 only Peter

represented the Twelve in Jerusalem. Paul mentions their extended work in 1Co 9:5,6 and it seems certain that Peter was in Rome shortly before his death. The troubles caused Paul by the Judaizers at least give evidence of the missionary zeal of the latter. Barnabas and Mark worked after their separation from Paul (Ac 15:39) and GentileChristianity existed in Rome long before the latter's arrival there (Ro 1:13). By the year 100 it appears that Christianity extended around the Mediterranean from Alexandria to Rome (and doubtless farther, although data are scanty), while Asia Minor was especially pervaded by it.

(2) Many factors cooperated to help the work: Peace was universal and communication was easy. Greek was spoken everywhere. The protection given Judaism sheltered from civil interference. The presence of Judaism insured hospitality and hearers for at least the first efforts to convert. The Jews' own proselytizing zeal (Mt 23:15) had prepared Gentiles to receive Christianity. And not the least element was the break-up of the old religions and the general looking to the East for religious satisfaction.

(3) For the methods, Paul's procedure is probably typical. Avoiding the smaller places, he devoted himself to the cities as the strategic points and traveled in a direct route, without side-journeys. In this way a "line of fire" (Harnack) was traced, and the flame could be trusted to spread of its own accord to each side of the road. So as fruits of Paul's work at Ephesus there appear churches at Colosse and Laodicea some hundred and twenty miles away (Col 2:1; 4:16). The churches founded needed revisiting and confirming, but when the apostle felt that they could shift for themselves, he felt also that his work in the East was over (Ro 15:23).

2. Jerusalem Church:

The members of the earliest Jerusalem church thought of themselves simply as Jews who had a true understanding of the Messiah and so constituting a new "way" or "party" (hardly "sect") in Judaism (Ac 22:4, especially). At first they were suffered to grow unmolested and their right to exist was apparently unquestioned, for the Sadducean actions of Ac 4:1; 5:17 were in the nature of police precautions. And it is significant that the first attack was made on a foreigner, Stephen. He seems to have angered the crowds by preaching the impending destruction of the Temple, although he was martyred for ascribing (practically) Divine honors to Jesus (Ac 7:56). Yet the apostles were not driven from the city (Ac 8:1) and the church was able to continue its development. In 41 AD, the Roman representatives gave way to the Pharisaically inclined Agrippa I and (for reasons that are not clear) persecution broke out in which James was martyred and Peter delivered only by a miracle (Ac 12). With the resumption of Roman rule in 44 AD the persecution ceased.

Some peaceable mode of living was devised, as appears from the absence of further allusions to troubles (compare Ac 21:17-26) and from the accounts of Josephus and Hegesippus of the esteem in which James the Lord's brother was held. His martyrdom (in 62 AD?) was due to the tension that preceded the final revolt against Rome, in which the Christians of Jerusalem took no part. Instead, they retired across the Jordan to Pella (Re 12:13-17), where they formed a close, intensely Jewish body under the rule of the descendants of Christ's brethren according to the flesh. Some mission work was done farther to the

east but in the 2nd century they either were absorbed in normal Christianity or became one of the factors that produced Ebionism.

3. Judaists:

Many members of this body (and, doubtless, other Jewish Christians outside it) showed various degrees of inability to understand the Gentile work. The acceptance of an uncircumcised Christian as "saved" offered fairly slight difficulty (Ga 2:3; Ac 15). But to eat with him was another thing and one that was an offense to many who accepted his salvation (Ga 2:12,13). The rigorous conclusion that the Law bound no Christian was still another thing and one that even James could not accept (Ac 21:21). At the time of Ga 2:9, the "pillars" were as yet not thinking of doing Gentilework. Paul's controversies are familiar and probably the last friction did not end until the fall of Jerusalem. But the difficulties grew gradually less and 1 Peter is evidence that Peter himself finally accepted the full status of Gentiles.

4. Relations with Rome:

From the Roman power Christianity was safe at first, as the distinctions from Judaism were thought too slight to notice (Ac 18:14-16; 25:19). (Troubles such as those of Ac 17:9 were due to disturbance of the peace.) So the government was thought of as a protector (2Th 2:7) and spoken of in the highest terms (Ro 13:1; 1Pe 2:13,14). But, while absolute isolation was not observed (1Co 10:27), yet the Christians tended more and more to draw themselves into bodies with little contact with the world around them (1Pe 4:3-5), so provoking suspicion and hostility from their neighbors. Hence they were a convenient scapegoat for Nero after the burning of Rome. It is uncertain how far his persecution spread or how far persecutions occurred from his time until the end of the reign of Domitian (see PETER, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF), but in Revelation, Rome has become the symbol for all that is hostile to Christ.

5. "Hellenism":

Influence of the "pagan" religions on Christianity is not very perceptible in the 1st century. But syncretism was the fashion of the day and many converts must have attempted to combine the new religion with views that they held already (or that they learned still later). Apparently little attention was paid to this attempt, if restricted to entirely minor details (1Co 15:29), but in Col 2:8-23 a vital matter is touched. The danger is more acute in the Pastorals (1Ti 1:4; 4:3; Titus 3:9) and in Re 2 great harm is being done. And Jude, 2 Peter, and 1 John contain direct polemics against the systems so arising, the beginnings of what in the 2nd century appeared as Gnosticism.

For further details see the separate articles, especially MINISTRY; NEW TESTAMENT CANON; and (for life in the Apostolic Age) SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

LITERATURE.

See the separate articles. Works with the title Apostolic Age are by Gilbert (brief), Bartlet (useful),

Purves (very conservative), Ropes, McGiffert, and Weizsacker. The last three are for critical study.

Burton Scott Easton

APOSTOLIC FATHERS

An appellation usually given to the writers of the 1st century who employed their pens in the cause of Christianity. See SUB-APOSTOLIC LITERATURE.

APOSTOLIC FATHERS, EPISTLES OF

See SUB-APOSTOLIC LITERATURE.

APOSTOLICAL CHURCH ORDINANCES

See DIDACHE.

APOSTOLICAL CONSTITUTIONS

See DIDACHE.

APOSTOLICAL COUNCIL

ap-os-tol’-i-kal koun’-sil: The assembly of the apostles and elders held in Jerusalem (49 AD), an account of which is given in Ac 15$.

APOTHECARY

a-poth’-e-ka-ri: Found in English Versions of the Bible eight times in the Old Testament and Apocrypha for Hebrew word rendered more accurately "perfumer" by the Revised Version (British and American) in Ex 30:25,35; 37:29; Ec 10:1; though inconsistently retained elsewhere (2Ch 16:14 the English Revised Version; Ne 3:8 the English Revised Version (compare the margin); Sirach 38:8; 49:1). See PERFUMER.

APPAIM

ap’-aa-im, ap’-a-im (appayim, "nostrils"): A son of Nadab of the house of Jerahmeel, of Judah (1Ch 2:30 f).

APPAREL

a-par’-el: The English equivalent of six Hebrew and three Greek words, variously signifying all kinds of raiment, chiefly garments costly and beautiful: ornamental (2Sa 1:24); royal, as of Ahasuerus (Es 6:8), of Herod (Ac 12:21, esthes); of kings’ daughters (2Sa 13:18); priestly (Ezr 3:10); also mourning (2Sa 14:2). In 1Sa 17:38,39 "apparel" replaces "armor" of King James Version: "Saul clad David with his apparel," probably some close-fitting garment worn under the armor, or sometimes without it. Severe judgment was pronounced on Jewish princes who clothed themselves with "strange" (the King James Version), i.e. "with foreign apparel" (Ze 1:8; compare Isa 2:6-8). "Modest apparel" as against "costly raiment" is commended as suited to Christians (1Ti 2:9; himatismos, and katastole). Angels are robed in white apparel (Ac 1:10; compare Lu 24:4, "dazzling"). Fig. of the glorious and red (suggestive of the wine-press) apparel of the Messiah (Isa 63:1,2), and of "a meek and quiet spirit" (1Pe 3:4).

Dwight M. Pratt

APPARENTLY

a-par’-ent-li (mar’eh, the Revised Version (British and American) "manifestly," signifying in the only place so translated (Nu 12:8) "in the form of seeing" (Keil and Delitzsch), i.e. "an appearance," "a similitude," a manifestation of the invisible God in human form): This is the Old Testament manner of Divine revelation "in the person and form of the angel of Yahweh": "In the bush I did manifestly reveal myself, and talked with Moses" (2 Esdras 14:3). God talked with Moses openly, without figure, in a direct manner revealing to him His will in the clear distinctness of a spiritual communication: "With him will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches; and the form of Yahweh shall he behold."

M. O. Evans

APPARITION

ap-a-rish’-un (indalma, epiphaneia; phantasma): This word is not found in the Old Testament or New Testament canon, the King James Version or the American Standard Revised Version, but occurs twice in the Revised Version (British and American) and thrice in Apocrypha the King James Version as follows: The Wisdom of Solomon 17:3, Greek indalma, the Revised Version (British and American) "spectral form"; 2 Macc 3:24, Greek epiphaneia, the Revised Version (British and American) "apparition," the Revised Version, margin "manifestation"; 2 Macc 5:4, Greek epiphaneia, the Revised Version (British and American) "vision," the Revised Version, margin "manifestation." New Testament, Revised Version: Mt 14:26; Mr 6:49; Greek phantasma, the American Standard Revised Version "ghost," the King James Version "Spirit."

APPEAL a-pel’:If an appeal be, as it properly is, a petition for the removal of a case that has been decided for rehearing and review and final decision by a higher court, we find no such instance either in the Old Testament or the New Testament.

In the institution of judges by Moses (Ex 18:26), the reference: "The hard cases they brought unto Moses, but every small matter they judged themselves," indicates simply a distribution of cases between two courts, but gives no trace of any provision for the rehearing of any case, by a higher court, that has already been decided by a lower. In De 17:8-13, directions are given that a lower court, under certain conditions, shall ask a higher for instructions as to procedure, and shall strictly follow the order prescribed: nevertheless, the decision itself belongs to the lower court. When its sentence was once given, there was no appeal.

In the New Testament, the provision of the Roman law, for an appeal from a lower to a higher court, is clearly recognized, although the case of Paul in Ac 25 does not strictly fall within its scope. The Roman law originally gave a citizen the right of appeal to the tribune of the people, but, with the establishment of the Empire, the emperor himself assumed this function of the tribune, and became the court of last resort. The case of Paul, however, had not been tried before Festus, nor any verdict rendered, when (Ac 25:10,11) he utters the proper legal formula: "I appeal unto Caesar" (Kaisara epikaloumai). That Roman citizens could insist upon such procedure, as right, is not perfectly certain (HJP, II, 2 279). Paul evidently acted upon the suggestion of the governor himself (Ac 25:9), who seems to have been desirous of avoiding the responsibility of a case involving questions most remote from his ordinary attention. At first sight, Paul’s decision to appeal seems premature. He throws away his chance of acquittal by Festus, and acts upon the assumption that he has been already condemned. Ac 26:32 shows that the possibility of his acquittal had amounted almost to a certainty. His course is explicable only by regarding his appeal the master stroke of a great leader, who was ready to take risks. In the proposition of Festus, he grasps at what had been an object of hope long deferred.

For many years, he had been desiring and praying to get to Rome (Ac 19:21; Ro 1:11,15; 15:23,24). The Lord had just assured him (Ac 23:11), that as he had testified at Jerusalem, "so must thou bear witness also at Rome." With this promise and direction in view, he hastens toward the world’s capital and the center of the world’s influence, in the seemingly precipitate words, "I appeal," which a lower order of prudence would have deferred until he had first been condemned.

H. E. Jacobs

APPEAR

a-per’:Of eight Hebrew originals the chief is ra’ah, "to be seen." Used mainly of God’s self-revelations in person and in dreams and visions: "Yahweh appeared unto Abram" (Ge 12:7); to Moses (Ex 3:2); to Solomon (1Ki 3:5). All originals used of Nature’s processes, of the appearing, i.e. coming of the morning (Ex 14:27); stars (Ne 4:21); flowers, flocks of goats, tender grapes (So 2:12; 4:1 m; So 7:12 margin). So New Testament ophthen, passive of horao, "I see," "to be seen" used especially of angelic revelations and visions: as on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt 17:3); an angel (Lu 1:11); the risen Lord (Lu 24:34); cloven tongues at Pentecost (Ac 2:3); vision to Paul (Ac 16:9); a great wonder in heaven (Re 12:1, the King James Version). opiano, in Ac 1:3, of Christ appearing after his suffering; phainomai, "to

shine," like the above with the added thought of a resplendent, luminous revelation, as of the Bethlehem star (Mt 2:7); the bringing to light of sin (Ro 7:13, the King James Version). Also phaneroo, "to make manifest," used exclusively of the post-resurrection appearances and second coming of Christ and of the disclosures of the great judgment day. See Col 3:4; 2Co 5:10; Re 3:18 and seven other passages the King James Version.

Dwight M. Pratt

APPEARANCE

a-per'-ans (mar'eh; chiefly used of the mystic and supernatural visions of Ezekiel and Daniel): A semblance, as of lightning, wheels, sapphire stone (Eze 1:14,16,26); Gabriel's overpowering revelation (Da 8:15; see also Da 10:6,18). In the New Testament refers exclusively, through three Greek words, prosopon, "sight," "countenance," to "outward appearance" (2Co 10:7 the King James Version); and its possibly deceptive nature: opsis, "Judge not according to appearance." (Joh 7:24); "them that glory in appearance." (2Co 5:12; compare 1Sa 16:7). See also 1Th 2:12, the English Revised Version, margin (eidos =" sight").

APPEARING

a-per'-ing (apokalupsis, "an unveiling"; epiphaneia, "a manifestation"): Exclusively technical, referring in the six passages where found to the return, the millennial advent of Christ (e.g. 1Pe 1:7, the King James Version; 2Ti 1:10; Tit 2:13).

APPEASE

a-pez':"To make one at peace." Esau is appeased, i.e. placated, won over by means of presents (Ge 32:20). One "slow to anger appeaseth strife," i.e. puts an end to it (Pr 15:18). the Revised Version (British and American) changes "appeased" of the King James Version in Ac 19:35 into "quieted" (Greek katastello, "put down," "suppress," "restrain," referring to a popular commotion).

APPERTAIN

ap-er-tan':Only once in English Versions of the Bible, namely, in Jer 10:7, for ya'ah "it becometh," "it is seemly," Vulgate "Tuum est enim decus," "it is Thy honor." Generally in the sense of "to belong to" (Le 6:5, "to whom it appertaineth"); Ne 2:8, "the castle which appertained to the house" (Tobit 6:12; 1 Esdras 8:95; 1 Macc 10:42).

APPETITE

ap'-e-tit (chai, nephesh): This word occurs four times in Old Testament text and once in the King James

Version margin. Once (Job 38:39) it is a translation of chai, "life"; "Canst thou .... satisfy the appetite (life) of the young lions?" Twice (Pr 23:2; Ec 6:7; also Isa 56:11, the King James Version margin) it is a translation of nephesh: Pr 23:2, ba‘al nephesh "a man given to appetite"; Ec 6:7, "the nephesh is not filled." In Isa 56:11, "strong of nephesh" is translated "greedy." Nephesh means originally "breath," hence "the soul," psuche, "the vital principle," "life"; therefore in certain expressions referring to the sustaining of life the nephesh hungers (Pr 10:3), thirsts (Pr 25:25), fasts (Ps 69:10). Nephesh then comes to mean the seat of the senses, affections, emotions, and to it is ascribed love, joy, desire (compare De 12:20; Pr 6:30 the Revised Version, margin; Mic 7:1, where the nephesh "desires"). The idea of desire or appetite of the nephesh may include all forms of longing; e.g. lust (Jer 2:24; "her desire" is literally "the desire of her nephesh"), the appetite for revenge (Ps 41:2, "the will of his enemies" is literally "the nephesh," etc.). The next step is to identify the nephesh with its desire, hence in the cases above nephesh is translated "appetite." In the 4th case (Isa 29:8) "His soul hath appetite" is a free translation of naphsho shoqeqah, literally "His soul runneth to and fro."

S. F. Hunter

APPHIA

af’-i-a, ap’-fi-a (Apphia, dative case of Apphia; in Phm 1:2, though Apphia, Amphia, and Appia, also occur): A Christian of Colosse, probably the wife of Philemon; certainly a member of his household, greeted as "the sister" the Revised Version, margin. In the Greek church, November 22 is sacred to her memory. It has been supposed, since this epistle concerns one household exclusively, that Apphia was Philemon’s wife and the mother or sister of Archippus (which see). She was stoned to death with Philemon, Onesimus, and Archippus in the reign of Nero. (See Lightfoot, Col., 372.)

APPHUS

af’-us, ap’-fus: A name borne by Jonathan, the fifth son of Mattathias (Apphous, 1 Macc 2:5). All the brothers, according to this passage, had double names; John is said to have been called Gaddis; Simon, Thassi; Judas, Maccabeus; Eleazar, Avaran; Jonathan, Apphus (1 Macc 2:2-5). The latter were probably the names which Mattathias gave his sons, while the former were received later when they became "leaders of the people." The common explanation of the word "Apphus" relates it to the Syriac choppus, "the dissembler"; but Torrey (article "Maccabees," Encyclopedia Biblica) points out that we have no means of ascertaining with what guttural consonant the word began, or what Semitic consonant the Greek "s" represents. Both the form and meaning of the name are, therefore, still to be explained.

H. J. Wolf

APPII FORUM

ap’-i-i fo’-rum, transliteration of Lat; APPIUS ap’-i-us, MARKET OF (Revised Version) (Appiou phoron): Appi Forum Cicero ad Att. 2.10; Suetonius Tib. 2: Appii Forum; Vulgate Revised Verson:

Forum Appi; Horace Satires i.5; Pliny, Nat. Hist., iii.64; xiv.61; CIL, X, 6824, or Market of Appius, was a town situated at the forty-third milestone on the Appian Road (39 1/2 English miles from Rome, a single day's journey for energetic travelers) according to the imperial itineraries (Ant., 108; Hierosol. 611; Geog. Rav. 4.34). Its existence probably dates from the time of Appius Claudius Caecus (Suet. Tib. 2; compare Mommsen, Rom. Forsch., I, 308), who laid out the famous highway from Rome to Capua in 312 BC. In the 1st century it had the rank of a municipality (Pliny, iii.64). Its importance as a highway station is due chiefly to the canal which ran by the side of the road from there to within a short distance of Tarracina (at the sixty-second milestone), affording an alternative means of conveyance (Strabo v.3.6). It was customary to cover this section of the journey, passing through the Pontine Marshes, by night in canal boats drawn by mules. Horace (Sat. i.5) offers a lively picture of the discomforts of the trip, mentioning the importunate inn-keepers and intolerable drinking water at Appii Forum, the gnats and frogs which were enemies to repose, and the exasperating procrastination of the muleteer.

The Christian brethren in Rome went out along the Appian Road to welcome the apostle Paul upon hearing of his arrival at Puteoli. One party awaited him at Three Taverns while another proceeded as far as Appii Forum Ac 28:15).

George H. Allen

APPLE, OF THE EYE

ap'-'-l: The eyeball, or globe of the eye, with pupil in center, called "apple" from its round shape. Its great value and careful protection by the eyelids automatically closing when there is the least possibility of danger made it the emblem of that which was most precious and jealously protected. The Hebrew terms for it were, 'ishon, diminutive of 'ish, "man," little man or mannikin, referring perhaps specially to the pupil, probably from "the little image one sees of himself when looking into another's pupil" (Davies' Lexicon). "He kept him (Israel) as the apple of his eye" (De 32:10); "Keep me as the apple of the eye," literally, "as the apple, the daughter of the eye" (Ps 17:8). "Keep my law (the Revised Version, margin "teaching") as the apple of thine eye" (Pr 7:2). Compare Pr 7:9 where it is used to denote what is the center (American Revised Version, "in the middle of the night"; the English Revised Version "in, the blackness of night"; margin "Hebrew pupil (of the eye)"); babhah perhaps an "opening," "gate"; others regard it as a mimetic word akin to Latin pupa, papilla ("He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye," i.e. Yahweh's; Zec 2:8); bath-'ayin, "daughter of the eye"; "Give thyself no respite, let not the apple of thine eye cease" (La 2:18), which means, either "sleep not," or "cease not to weep." kore, "young girl," "pupil of the eye": "He (the Lord) will keep the good deeds (the Revised Version (British and American) "bounty") of a man as the apple of the eye" (Ecclesiasticus 17:22); the Septuagint also has kore in all instances except La 2:18, where it has thugater, "daughter."

W. L. Walker

APPLE; APPLE-TREE

ap’-l ap’-l tre, (tappuach): A fruit tree and fruit mentioned chiefly in Cant, concerning the true nature of which there has been much dispute.

So 2:3 says: "As the apple-tree among the trees of the wood, so is my beloved among the sons. I sat down under his shadow with great delight"; So 8:5: "Under the apple-tree I awakened thee: there thy mother was in travail with thee, there was she in travail that brought thee forth." Of the fruit it is said, So 2:3: "His fruit was sweet to my taste"; So 2:5: "Stay ye me with raisins, refresh me with apples"; So 7:8: "the smell of thy breath (Hebrew "nose") like apples."

In all the above references the true apple, Pyrus malus, suits the conditions satisfactorily. The apple tree affords good shade, the fruit is sweet, the perfume is a very special favorite with the people of the East. Sick persons in Palestine delight to hold an apple in their hands, simply for the smell. (Compare Arabian Nights, "Prince Hassan and the Paribanou.") Further the Arabic for apple tuffah is without doubt identical with the Hebrew tappuach. The apple was well known, too, in ancient times; it was, for example, extensively cultivated by the Romans.

The one serious objection is that apples do not easily reach perfection in Palestine; the climate is too dry and hot; farther north in the Lebanon they flourish. At the same time it is possible to exaggerate this objection, for with careful grafting and cultivation exceedingly good apples may be produced in the mountain regions. Apple trees there need special care and renewal of the grafts, but there is no impossibility that at the time of the writing of Canticles skilled gardeners should have been able to produce sweet and perfumed apples in Palestine. Small but very sweet and fragrant apples are now grown at Gaza. Good apples are now plentiful in the market at Jerusalem, but they are chiefly importations from the North.

On account of the above difficulty three other fruits have been suggested by various writers. Two doubtless have been brought forward with a view to Pr 25:11: "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in network of silver," but the reference would certainly seem to be to some silver filigree work ornamented with gold modeled to look like fruit rather than to any actual fruit. The citron and the apricot (Tristram) have both been suggested as the true tappuach. The former, which is a native of Persia, does not appear to have been introduced into Palestine until well into the Christian era and the apricot, though an attractive substitute for the apple and today one of the most beautiful and productive of fruit trees, can hardly have been established in Palestine at the time of the scriptural references. It is a native of China and is said to have first begun to find its way westward at the time of Alexander the Great.

The third of the fruits is the quince, Cydonia vulgaris (Natural Order Rosaceae), and this had more serious claims. It flourishes in Palestine and has been long indigenous there. Indeed it is probable that even if tappuach was a name for apple, it originally included also the closely allied quince. The greatest difficulty is its harsh and bitter taste. Further the Mishna distinguishes the tappuach from the quince, which is called parish, and from the crab apple or chazor (Kohler in Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 23). The quince along with the apple was sacred to Aphrodite, the goddess of love.

On the whole there does not appear to be any sufficient reason for rejecting the translation of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); the Biblical references suit it; the identity of the Hebrew and Arabic words favor it and there is no insuperable objection on scientific grounds. The word tappuach appears in two place names, BETH-TAPPUAH and TAPPUAH (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

APPLES OF SODOM

sod’-um: Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4) says that "the traces (or shadows) of the five cities (of the plain) are still to be seen, as well as the ashes growing in their fruits, which fruits have a color as if they were fit to be eaten; but if you pluck them with your hands they dissolve into smoke and ashes." What this "Dead Sea fruit" is, is uncertain. The name "Dead Sea apples" is often given to the fruit of the Solanum Sodomaean "a prickly shrub with fruit not unlike a small yellow tomato." Cheyne thinks that the fruits referred to by Josephus (compare Tacitus Hist. v.37) may be either

(1) those of the ‘osher tree (‘usar, Calotropis procera, described by Hasselquist (Travels, 1766)), found in abundance about Jericho and near the Dead Sea, which are filled with dust when they have been attacked by an insect, leaving the skin only entire, and of a beautiful color. Tristram describes the fruit as being "as large as an apple of average size, of a bright yellow color, hanging three or four together close to the stem"; or as suggested by Tristram

(2) those of the wild colocynth; the fruit is fair of aspect with a pulp which dries up into a bitter powder (EB, article "Sodom," col. 4669, note 2). This colocynth is supposed to be the "wild vine" mentioned 2Ki 4:39. The "vine of Sodom" of De 32:32 has been supposed to bear the "Dead Sea fruit"; but most modern writers regard the passage as figurative.

W. L. Walker

APPLY

a-pli’:Purely an Old Testament term representing five Hebrew originals which signify respectively, "to enter," "to incline," "to give," "to go about," "to put or place," in each instance spoken of the heart in its attitude to wisdom (Ps 90:12 the King James Version); instruction (Pr 23:12); understanding (Pr 2:2); knowledge (Pr 22:17).

APPOINT

a-point’:This word is used for the expression of a large variety of ideas and the translation of almost as many words. naqabh =" stipulate" (Ge 30:28). paqadh =" put into office" (Ge 41:34; Nu 1:50; Es 2:3);

"select" (Jer 51:27); "put in charge" (Jer 49:19; 50:44); "assign" (Nu 4:27; Jer 15:3); "send" (Le 26:16); "designate," "select" (Ex 21:13; Nu 4:19; 2Sa 7:10; Isa 61:3); "single out" (1Sa 8:11,12; Ho 1:11). nathan =" designate," "select" (Nu 35:6 the King James Version; Jos 20:2 the King James Version; Eze 45:6); "set aside" (Ex 30:16). shith =" designate," "select" (Job 14:13; Isa 26:1). So also ‘amadh (1Ch 15:16; Ne 7:3); so shalach (1Ki 5:9); qarah (Nu 35:11). tsawah =" choose" (2Sa 6:21). bachar =" select" (2Sa 15:15 the King James Version). ‘amar =" command" (1Ki 5:6 the King James Version). tithemi =" designate," "select" (Mt 24:51; Lu 12:46). A careful reading of the above passages will bring to mind the doctrine that with reference to the world’s work, God Himself calls men into office, selecting them from among the multitude and setting them aside for His special purposes; and that He calls to His assistance not only men but also events and forces of Nature (Le 26:16).

Frank E. Hirsch

APPREHEND

ap-re-hend’:Occurs in the New Testament in two meanings: "to arrest" (piazo; Ac 12:4; 2Co 11:32 the Revised Version (British and American), "take"); and "to seize," "grasp," "take into one’s possession," "attain," "inquire eagerly" (katalambano, the American Standard Revised Version "laid hold on," "laid fast hold of," Php 3:12,13; Eph 3:18). In Joh 1:5, "The darkness apprehended it not," the Revised Version, margin gives "overcame not." See COMPREHEND.

APPROVE

a-proov’:This word, as ordinarily used, means "to entertain a favorable opinion concerning" (Ps 49:13; La 3:36). Its Biblical and archaic use conveys a much stronger meaning and is equivalent to its use in legal formalities of today, "to approve a bill," i.e. by some act, generally a signature, to express approval. In New Testament, a number of times, for Greek dokimazo, "to test, try, make proof of," and its derivative, dokimos, "tested," "tried." The word will, in almost every ease, imply that the proof is victoriously demonstrated, the proved is also approved, just as in English we speak of "tried men" (Trench, Greek Synonyms of New Testament). It is the word most frequently used for the testing of ores. That which does not stand the test is adokimos, "reprobate." Compare Jer 6:30 King James Version: "reprobate silver." That which stands the test is dokimos, "approved." "Salute Apelles the approved in Christ" (Ro 16:10); "they that are approved" (1Co 11:19); "Present thyself approved unto God" (2Ti 2:15); when he hath been "approved" (Jas 1:12). See also Ro 14:18,22; 1Th 2:4.

H. E. Jacobs

APRON

a’-prun: Appears only in Ge 3:7 and Ac 19:12 English Versions. English na-prun, North of England nap-peon, from Low Latin, through French nape, nappe, "napkin." The "n" was dropped owing to false division of the article a from the noun; thus "a napron" became "an apron:" In Ge 3:7 it is used to

translate a Hebrew word rendered "girdles" in Revised Version margin: "And they sewed fig-leaves together and made themselves aprons." In Ac 19:12 simikinthia, stands for semicinctia, which is really a Latin word meaning "half-girdle," i.e. girdles going only half round the body and covering the front of the person: "Unto the sick were carried away from his (Paul's) body handkerchiefs (soudaria, rendered "napkins" Lu 19:20; Joh 11:44; 20:7) or aprons." The word denotes here, probably, a workman's apron, perhaps those of Paul himself; though it seems more natural to suppose that the people brought their own "handkerchiefs" or "aprons" to Paul to secure the miraculous effect desired. The garments, at any rate, were such as could be easily removed and carried back and forth. (See Rich, Dict. of Roman and Greek Ant, under the word, for illust.; also Pope's Lexicon, under the word).

George B. Eager

APT

(Literally, "fitted"): Applied to one distinguished for readiness in meeting demands of some special situation, or emergency. For this, there is no specific Biblical word in either Old Testament or New Testament. It occurs always in the English translations in paraphrases, as "apt for war" (2Ki 24:16), "apt to teach," Greek "didaktikos" (1Ti 3:2; 2Ti 2:24).

AQUEDUCT

ak'-we-dukt. See CISTERN.

AQUILA

ak'-wi-la (Akulas), ("an eagle"): Aquila and his wife Priscilla, the diminutive form of Prisca, are introduced into the narrative of the Ac by their relation to Paul. He meets them first in Corinth (Ac 18:2). Aquila was a native of Pontus, doubtless one of the colony of Jews mentioned in Ac 2:9; 1Pe 1:1. They were refugees from the cruel and unjust edict of Claudius which expelled all Jews from Rome in 52 AD. The decree, it is said by Suetonius, was issued on account of tumults raised by the Jews, and he especially mentions one Chrestus (Suetonius Claud. 25). Since the word Christus could easily be confounded by him to refer to some individual whose name was Chrestus and who was an agitator, resulting in these disorders, it has been concluded that the fanatical Jews were then persecuting their Christian brethren and disturbances resulted. The cause of the trouble did not concern Claudius, and so without making inquiry, all Jews were expelled. The conjecture that Aquila was a freedman and that his master had been Aquila Pontius, the Roman senator, and that from him he received his name is without foundation.

He doubtless had a Hebrew name, but it is not known. It was a common custom for Jews outside of Palestine to take Roman names, and it is just that this man does, and it is by that name we know him. Driven from Rome, Aquila sought refuge in Corinth, where Paul, on his second missionary journey, meets him because they have the same trade: that of making tents of Cilician cloth (Ac 18:3). The

account given of him does not justify the conclusion that he and his wife were already Christians when Paul met them. Had that been the case Lu would almost certainly have said so, especially if it was true that Paul sought them out on that account. Judging from their well-known activity in Christian work they would have gathered a little band of inquirers or possibly converts, even though they had been there for but a short time. It is more in harmony with the account to conclude that Paul met them as fellow-tradespeople, and that he took the opportunity of preaching Christ to them as they toiled.

There can be no doubt that Paul would use these days to lead them into the kingdom and instruct them therein, so that afterward they would be capable of being teachers themselves (Ac 18:26). Not only did they become Christians, but they also became fast and devoted friends of Paul, and he fully reciprocated their affection for him (Ro 16:3,4). They accompanied him when he left Corinth to go to Ephesus and remained there while he went on his journey into Syria. When he , wrote the first letter to the church at Corinth they were still at Ephesus, and their house there was used as a Christian assembly-place (1Co 16:19). The decree of Claudius excluded the Jews from Rome only temporarily, and so afterward Paul is found there, and his need of friends and their affection for him doubtless led them also to go to that city (Ro 16:3). At the time of the writing of Paul's second letter to Tim they have again removed to Ephesus, possibly sent there by Paul to give aid to, and further the work in that city (2Ti 4:19). While nothing more is known of them there can be no doubt that they remained the devoted friends of Paul to the end.

The fact that Priscilla's name is mentioned several times before that of her husband has called forth a number of conjectures. The best explanation seems to be that she was the stronger character. Jacob W. Kapp

AR, AR OF MOAB

ar, mo'-ab ('ar, 'ar-mo'abh; Er; Aroer or Seeir): The city of Ar is named in a snatch of ancient song (Nu 21:15), literally "the site of Ar." It is identical with "Ar of Moab" (Nu 21:28; Isa 15:1). This is probably the place called the City of Moab in Nu 22:36, where the Hebrew is 'ir mo'abh. It is probably also intended by "the city that is in the middle of the valley" (De 2:36; Jos 13:9,16; 2Sa 24:5). It lay "on the border of the Arnon, which is in the utmost part of the border" (Nu 22:36). A possible identification might be the ruin noted by Burckhardt, in the floor of the valley, on a piece of pasture-land below the confluence of the Lejjun and the Mojib. Buhl however thinks that not a city but a Moabite district somewhere in the region south of the Arnon may be intended (GAP, 269).

W. Ewing

ARA

a'-ra ('ara', meaning unknown): A son of Jether of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:38).

ARAB

a’-rab (’arabh, "ambush"): A city in the hill country of Judah, probably the site of the ruins Er-Rabiyeh South of Hebron (Jos 15:52).

ARAB; ARABIANS

ar’-ab, a-ra’-bi-ans. See ARABIA.

ARABAH

ar’-a-ba, a-ra’-ba ha-‘arabhah, ("the Arabah"): This word indicates in general a barren district, but is specifically applied in whole or in part to the depression of the Jordan valley, extending from Mount Hermon to the Gulf of Akabah. In the King James Version it is transliterated only once (Jos 18:18) describing the border of Benjamin. Elsewhere it is rendered "plain." But in the Revised Version (British and American) it is everywhere transliterated. South of the Dead Sea the name is still retained in Wady el-Arabah. In De 1:1; 2:8 (the King James Version "plain") the southern portion is referred to; in De 3:17; 4:49; Jos 3:16; 11:2; 12:3 and 2Ki 14:25 the name is closely connected with the Dead Sea and the Sea of Chinnereth (Gennesaret). The allusions to the Arabah in De 11:30; Jos 8:14; 12:1; 18:18; 2Sa 2:29; 4:7; 2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4; 52:7 indicate that the word was generally used in its most extended sense, while in Jos 11:16, and 12:8 it is represented as one of the great natural divisions of the country.

The southern portion, which still retains the name of Arabah, is included in the wilderness of Zin (Nu 34:3). According to the survey of Lord Kitchener and George Armstrong made in 1883, under the auspices of the Palestine Exploration Fund, its length from the head of the Gulf of Akabah to the Dead Sea is 112 miles. The lowest point of the watershed is 45 miles from Akabah, and 660 feet above tide (1,952 above the Dead Sea). The average width of the valley up to this point is about 6 miles, but here a series of low limestone ridges (called Er Risheh) rising 150 feet above the plain runs obliquely across it for a distance of 10 miles, narrowing it up to a breadth of about one-half mile. North of this point, opposite Mount Hor, the valley widens out to 13 miles and then gradually narrows to 6 miles at the south end of the Dead Sea. At Ain Abu Werideh, 29 miles north of the watershed, the valley is at the sea-level—1,292 feet above that of the Dead Sea. North of the watershed, the main line of drainage is the Wady el-Jeib, which everywhere keeps pretty close to the west side of the valley.

At Ain Abu Werideh it is joined by numerous wadies descending from the Edomite mountains on the east, which altogether water an oasis of considerable extent, covered with a thicket of young palms, tamarisks, willows and reeds. Twenty-four miles farther north the Arabah breaks down suddenly into the valley of the Dead Sea, or the Ghor, as it is technically called. Lord Kitchener’s report is here so vivid as to be worthy of literal reproduction. "The descent to the Ghor was down a sandy slope of 300 feet, and the change of climate was most marked, from the sandy desert to masses of tangled vegetation with streams of water running in all directions, birds fluttering from every tree, the whole country alive with life; nowhere have I seen so great and sudden a contrast" (Mount Seir, 214). The descent here described was on the eastern side of the semicircular line of cliffs formed of sand, gravel, and marl which enclose the Ghor at the south end, and which are probably what are referred to in Jos 15:3 as the "ascent of

Akrabbim." The ordinary route, however, leading to the plain of the Arabah from the Dead Sea is up the trough worn by the Wady el-Jeib along the west side of the valley. But this route would be impracticable during the rainy season after the cloudbursts which occasionally visit this region, when torrents of water pour down it, sufficient to roll boulders of considerable size and to transport an immense amount of coarse sediment.

South of the Dead Sea a muddy plain, known as the Sebkah, extends 6 miles, filling about one-half of the width of the Ghor. During most of the year the mud over this area is so thin and deep that it is impossible to cross it near its northern end. This whole area between the "ascent of Akrabbim" and the Dead Sea has evidently been greatly transformed by the sedimentary deposits which have been brought in by the numerous tributary wadies during the last 4,000 years, the coarser material having encroached upon it from either side, and the fine material having been deposited over the middle portion, furnishing the clay which is so embarrassing to travelers. (For further considerations upon this point see DEAD SEA; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.)

1. Geology of the Region:

The Arabah in its whole extent occupies a portion of the great geological fault or crevasse in the earth’s crust which extends from Antioch near the mouth of the Orontes southward between the Lebanon and the Anti-Lebanon Mountains to the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, and onward to the Gulf of Akabah, whence it can be traced with considerable probability through the Red Sea and the interior lakes of Africa. The most remarkable portion of this phenomenal crevasse is that which extends from the Waters of Merom to the springs of Ain Abu Werideh; for through this entire distance the Arabah is below sea-level, the depression at the Dead Sea being approximately 1,292 feet. See DEAD SEA. Throughout the entire distance from the Waters of Merom to the watershed, 45 miles from Akabah, the western side of the Arabah is bordered by strata of Cretaceous (chalk) limestone rising pretty continuously to a height of from 2,000 to 3,000 feet above sea-level, no older rocks appearing upon that side. But upon the eastern side older sandstones (Nubian and lower Carboniferous) and granitic rocks border the plain, supporting, however, at a height of 2,000 or 3,000 feet Cretaceous limestones corresponding to those which descend to the level of the gorge on the western side.

Throughout this entire distance, therefore, the strata have either slipped down upon the western side or risen upon the eastern side, or there has been a movement in both directions. The origin of this crevasse dates from the latter part of the Cretaceous or the early part of the Tertiary period.

But in post-Tertiary times an expanded lake filled the region, extending from the Waters of Merom to Ain Abu Werideh, a distance of about 200 miles, rising to an elevation of about 1,400 feet above the present level of the Dead Sea, but not sufficiently high to secure connection with the ocean either through the Arabah proper or across the valley of Esdraelon. This body of water was, on the average, 30 miles wide and over the northern part of the Dead Sea had an extreme depth of 2,700 feet. The most distinct evidence of the existence of this enlargement of the lake is to be found at Ain Abu Werideh, where Hull reports "banks of horizontally stratified materials .... sometimes of coarse material, such as

gravel; at other times consisting of fine sand, loam, or white marl, with very even stratification, and containing blanched semi-fossil shells of at least two kinds of univalves, which Professor Haddon has determined to be Melania tuberculata Mull, and Melanopsis Saulcyi, Bourg" (Mount Seir, 99, 100).

These are shells which are now found, according to Tristram, in great numbers in semi-fossil condition in the marl deposits of the Dead Sea, and both of these genera are found in the fluvio-marine beds formed in the brackish or salt water of the Isle of Wight. The existence of the shells indicates the extent to which the saline waters of the Dead Sea were diluted at that time. It should be added, however, that species somewhat similar still exist around the borders of the Dead Sea in lagoons where fresh water is mingled in large quantities with that of the Dead Sea. This is especially true in eddies near the mouth of the Jordan. (See Merrill, East of the Jordan.) Huntington in 1909 confirms the fact that these high-level shore lines are found on both sides of the Dead Sea, though for some reason the have not been traced farther north.

At lower levels, especially at that which is 650 feet above the Dead Sea, there is, however, a very persistent terrace of gravel, sand and clay marking a shore line all the way from the south end of the Dead Sea to Lake Galilee. This can be seen running up into all the wadies on either side, being very prominent opposite their mouths, but much eroded since its deposition. On the shores of the lake between the wadies the line is marked by a slight accumulation of coarse material. Below the 650-foot line there are several other minor strands marking periods when the subsiding waters were for a short time stationary.

This period of enlargement of the waters in the Arabah is now, with abundant reason, correlated with the Glacial epoch whose influence was so generally distributed over the northern hemisphere in early post-Tertiary times. There were, however, no living glaciers within the limits of the Arabah Valley—Mount Hermon not being sufficiently large to support any extensive ice-sheet. The nearest glacier of any extent was on the west side of the Lebanon Mountains, 40 to 50 miles north of Beirut, where according to my own observations one descended from the summit of the mountains (10,000 feet high) 12 miles down the valley of the Kadesha River to a level 5,500 feet above the sea, where it built up an immense terminal moraine several miles across the valley, and 5 miles up it from its front, upon which is now growing the celebrated grove of the Cedars of Lebanon. (See Records of the Past, Am. series, V, 195-204.) The existence of the moraine, however, had been noted by Sir Joseph Hooker forty years before. (See Nat. Hist. Rev., January, 1862.)

But while there were no glaciers in the Arabah Valley itself, there, as elsewhere, semi-glacial conditions extended beyond the glacial limits a considerable distance into the lower latitudes, securing the increased precipitation and the diminished evaporation which would account for the enlargement of the bodies of water occupying enclosed basins within reach of these influences. The basin of Great Salt Lake in Utah presents conditions almost precisely like those of the Arabah, as do the Caspian and Aral seas, and lakes Urumiah, Van, and various others in central Asia. During the Glacial epoch the water level of Great Salt Lake rose more than 1,000 feet higher than now and covered ten times its present area. At the same time the Aral Sea discharged into the Caspian Sea through an outlet as large as Niagara. When the conditions of the Glacial epoch passed away the evaporation again prevailed, until

the water areas of these enclosed basins were reduced to the existing dimensions and the present equilibrium was established between the precipitation and the evaporation.

While it is susceptible of proof that the close of this epoch was geologically recent, probably not more than 10,000 years ago (see Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th edition, chapter xx), the present conditions had become established approximately long before the time of Abraham and the development of civilization in Babylonia and Egypt.

East of the Arabah between the Dead Sea and Akabah numerous mountain peaks rise to the height of more than 4,000 feet above tide level, the highest being Mount Hor, though back of it there is a limestone range reaching 5,000 feet. This mountainous region contains numerous fertile areas and furnishes through its numerous wadies a considerable amount of water to favor vegetation. The limestone floor of the Arabah south of the Dead Sea is deeply covered with sand and gravel, washed in from the granitic areas from the east. This greatly favors the accumulation of sediment at the mouths of the wadies emptying into the south end of the Ghor.

2. History: At present the Egyptian government maintains a fort and harbor at Akabah, but its authority does not extend into the interior. The Arabah has, however, from time immemorial furnished a caravan route between northern Arabia and the Sinaitic Peninsula. It was this which supported the great emporium of Petra. The Israelites traversed its southern portion both on their way from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea and on their return, when the king of Edom refused passage through his land (Nu 20:21; De 2:3). This opposition compelled them to turn up the forbidding Wady el-Ithem, which opens into the Arabah a few miles north of Akabah and leads to the Pilgrim route between Damascus and Mecca. The terrors of this passage are referred to in Nu 21:4, where it is said "the soul of the people was much discouraged because of the way." Around Akabah itself there are still groves of palms, the existence of which, at the time of the Exodus, is indicated by the name Elath (De 2:8), "a grove of trees."

LITERATURE.

Burchkhardt, Travels in Syria and the Holy Land, 1822; De Laborde, Voyage en Orient, 1828; Hull, Mount Seir, Sinai, and Western Palestine, 1889; "The Physical Geol. and Geog. of Arabia Petrea," etc., in PEF, 1886; Lartet, Voyage d’exploration de la Mer Morte, t. 3me, 1880; Robinson, BR, 1855; Stanley, Sinai and Pal5, 1860; Blankenkorn, "Entstehung u. Gesch. des Todten Meeres," in ZDPV, 1896; Ritter, "Comp. Geog. of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula," 1866, translation by Wm. L. Gage; Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation, 1911.

George Frederick Wright

ARABATTINE

ar-a-ba-ti’-ne. See AKRABATTINE (Apocrypha).

ARABIA

a-ra’-bi-a (‘arabh, Arabia):

I. NAME AND SITUATION

1. Name

2. Situation and Configuration

II. PHYSICAL FEATURES

1. The Desert

2. Climate

3. Mountains

4. Rivers

5. Oases and Wells

III. POLITICAL DIVISIONS

1. Ancient Divisions

2. Modern Divisions

3. Political Situation

4. Chief Towns

IV. FLORA AND FAUNA

1. Flora

2. Fauna

V. INHABITANTS

1. Classification

2. Extinct Tribes

3. South Arabian Tribes

4. Migration of Tribes

5. North Arabian Tribes

6. Other Tribes

7. Foreign Elements

VI. RELIGION

1. Monotheism

2. The Ka‘bah, Pilgrimages and Fairs

3. Judaism

4. Christianity

5. Sabianism

6. Seekers after Truth: Islam

LITERATURE

I. Name and Situation.

1. Name:

The Hebrew word ‘arabh always denotes, strictly speaking, not the country, but the people of Arabia taken collectively, and especially the nomadic Arabs. The name of the country does not occur in the Old Testament, but in the New Testament it is used to denote the Syrian desert or the peninsula of Sinai.

2. Situation and Configuration:

Surrounded as it is on three sides by the sea—by the Indian Ocean on the south, and its two branches,

the Red Sea on the west and the Persian Gulf on the east—and on the fourth side by the desert of Syria, the country of Arabia is to all intents and purposes an island; and it is named by its inhabitants and by those who speak their language "the Island of the Arabs." In configuration the country is roughly of the form of a parallelogram, about 1,000 miles in length by 500 or 600 miles broad. This parallelogram is not of uniform altitude, but the generally even surface is tilted to one corner in such a way that the most southerly point contains mountains rising to 10,000 feet in height, whilst the Northeast corner is almost on a level with the sea. The altitudes of the intervening portions are in proportion to their situation with respect to these extremes. Thus the mountains of the Southeast corner have an altitude of from 5,000 to 6,000 feet, those of the Northwest of 4,000 or 5,000, whereas those which are situated near the middle of the West coast rise to 8,000 feet, and the plateau which forms the northern half of the interior of the peninsula is between 3,000 and 4,000 feet above sea-level. In consequence of this configuration the main watershed of the country runs parallel to the West coast at a distance of between 50 and 100 miles from the sea, with a subsidiary watershed running along the south; and the principal outlets for the drainage run in a Northeast direction. The whole of Arabia stretches from about 13 degrees to about 36 degrees north of the equator, and it lies between 33 degrees and 60 degrees east of Greenwich. Its area is about eight times that of the British Isles, or nearly 1,000,000 square miles.

II. Physical Features.

1. The Desert:

Although Arabia is considered by geographers as part of the continent of Asia, it belongs in almost every respect to Africa. The great bulk of the country is desert, of fine sand in the southern part, but consisting of coarse sand (the nefud), gravel and flints in the northern. It is in fact an offshoot from the great African Sahara. Of the southern half little is known, and it has never been crossed by the foot of European. The northern has been traversed in many directions; it has numerous caravan routes, and some important towns are situated in the heart of it. Arabian fancy has peopled the desert with strange creatures not of human kind (compare Isa 13:21; 34:14), and fancy has been justified by the common phenomena of the mirage and the Fata Morgana (Isa 35:7; 49:10). To the keen sight of the nomad the glowing desert heat is visible as a fine gossamer (Isa 18:4). Perhaps this is the meaning of sharabh in Isa 35:7; 49:10 also. It is quite certain, however, that the whole of Arabia and especially the northern borders in the neighborhood of the Sinai peninsula and eastward to the south of Palestine and the country of Edom, were at one time very much better watered than they are at the present day. For centuries a constant process of desiccation has been going on. Indeed, persons now living can remember the existence of wells one or two generations ago, where now there are none. It follows that this district must formerly have supported a very much larger population that it does at present.

2. Climate:

It will be obvious that the climate of Arabia must vary greatly in its different parts, the temperature and rainfall depending not so much upon latitude as upon latitude, so that within a few miles the greatest extremes co-exist. In the southern angle where the mountains are highest there are two rainy seasons,

one in spring the other in autumn, so that this province well deserves its Grecian name of Arabia Felix. In the higher reaches of this province, for example, at its capital San‘a, snow falls in December; while on the coast of the Red Sea at Loheia, scarcely 100 miles distant, thermometer rarely falls below 80 degrees. In the Red Sea 93 degrees is a common reading in the shade in summer, while the heat of the Persian Gulf, owing to its steep shores and great evaporation, is hardly endurable by a European. In the Northwest province, in which are situated the two sacred cities of Mecca and Medina, the rainfall is unreliable and takes the form of heavy thunder showers which occasion frequent floods in the former town, and are, owing to the arborial denudation of the country, of little use for the purpose of agriculture or irrigation. These winter rains may commence as early as September, and by December at latest the new pasture will have covered the ground. Hence the true spring in northern Arabia, or in Syria, falls in our autumn, but there is not the distinction of former and latter rain (compare Ho 6:3) which obtains in Palestine. The climate of the northern central plateau is described by Palgrave as one of the most salubrious in the world.

3. Mountains:

As has been indicated above, the backbone of the peninsula is the mountain range which runs down its western side. In its northern parts this is said to be an extension of the limestone ranges of the Lebanon and Anti-Libanus. In its midmost reaches it attains an elevation of between 8,000 and 9,000 feet, and at its southern extremity it spreads out into the plateau of Arabia Felix, where its highest peaks have an altitude of as much as 11,000 feet. In the Southeast corner of the peninsula the range of Jebel Akhdar runs parallel to that on the West, and is connected with it along the South coast by a range of less elevation. In the interior the northern plateau is intersected by numerous irregular mountain ranges of moderate length, of which the most frequently mentioned are Jebel Aja and Jebel Selma, which face one another in the Shammar country.

4. Rivers:

The course of the rivers is determined by the direction of the mountain ranges. As has been said the drainage is mainly from West to East, but the fact is that Arabia is a land almost without rivers. The only quarter in which perennial streams are found is Arabia Felix, and to some extent they occur along the South coast. The rest of the peninsula is destitute of rivers and lakes. The scour (seyl) from the winter thunder showers cuts out for itself a torrent bed (wadi), which, however, may be filled only once or twice in a generation, and even so dries up as soon as the rain ceases. The most important of these wadis is the West Sirhan, which runs from the Hauran in a Southeast direction to the Jauf (see DUMAH), the West el-Kora to the North of Medina, the West el-Hamth between Medina and Mecca, and the West Duweisir to the South of Mecca. Larger than any of these however is the West er-Rumma, which extends from the neighborhood of Medina to the head of the Persian Gulf. It has never been explored, and is filled with water only at long intervals. 5. Oases and Wells:

In these circumstances the Arabs have to seek their water supply elsewhere than in their rivers. In many places the surface of the country sinks into a depression down to the level of permanent water, thus

forming an oasis, which word is probably none other than the Arabic wadi. The best known of these occur at Kheibar and Teima (see TEMA) to the North of Medina, and also at Tabuk to the Northwest. The West Duweisir is itself practically an oasis of a length of three days' journey. In addition to these natural depressions there are also dotted over all the inhabited parts of Arabia and along the caravan routes numerous wells, these routes following naturally the course of the wadis. These wells are plentiful in the West Sirhan, and a number were sunk by command of Zubeida the wife of Harun al-Rashid, along the Pilgrim way from Persia to Mecca; but the most famous of all is the well of Zemzem in the Holy City itself. It is said that the water in it flows, so that it is probably one of those subterranean rivers which are not uncommon in Arabia. Its water, however, is heavy and brackish and causes indigestion, and the sweetest water obtainable in Mecca for drinking purposes was originally brought by Zubeida from a source some 15 miles distant. The purest water of all is that which collects after rain in the hollows of the numerous outcrops of lava which occur at frequent intervals and in great masses along the western mountain ranges. A spot where lava predominates is called a harrah (from the Arabic verb "to be hot"), and several of these volcanic regions still show signs of activity.

III. Political Divisions.

1. Ancient Divisions:

The peninsula of Arabia was divided by the ancient geographers into three parts: Arabia Petrea, Arabia Deserta and Arabia Felix. The first of these names, which is found in Ptolemy, means, not Arabia the Rocky, but that part of Arabia in which is situated the city of Petra (see SELA), and it also includes the peninsula of Sinai. It is identical with the desert of the Wanderings. Arabia Deserta is a translation from the Greek Arabia eremos of Strabo (circa 24 AD). It denotes the extreme north of the continent of Arabia which is thrust in like a wedge between the fertile lands which drain into the Euphrates on the East and into the Jordan valley on the West. It is thus equivalent to the Syrian Desert. The third term, Arabia Felix, is also a translation from the Greek—Arabia eudaimon—which is again a translation, or rather a mistranslation of the Arabic El-Yemen. This last name denotes the country to the right hand, i.e. the S, just as the Arabic Es-Shem (Syria) means the country to the left hand, or to the North El-Yemen, however, was interpreted as equivalent to El-Eyman, the Fortunate or Happy, a name which the district truly deserves.

2. Modern Divisions:

Since before the time of Mohammed (6th century) Arabia has been divided into seven or eight tribal or political states, the boundaries of which are for the most part clearly defined by intervening deserts or uninhabited tracts. The most important of these from a religious point of view is the Hijaz, which may be described as the northern half of the western coast, stretching from the Red Sea to a distance of between 100 and 200 miles inland. The whole of the coast line, indeed, where the land is low lying is called the Tihama. This may, however, be considered as belonging to the adjacent high land beneath which it lies. Hijaz means "Barrier," and the district is so called because it consists mainly of the mountain ranges which separate the great northern central plateau from the Tihama. This last name is

connected with a root meaning "to be unwholesome." Whether the district gave its origin to the verb, or the verb gave its denomination to the district, the name is equally appropriate. The chief importance of the Hijaz arises from the fact that in it are situated the two holy cities of Mecca and Medina—the cradle and the grave of the Prophet. It is thus the religious center of the Islamic world.

The Yemen forms the southern corner of the peninsula. It is identical with Arabia Felix, and its physical characteristics have been described above. The Hijaz often fell to the sovereign of Egypt, but for the last four centuries it has, like Egypt, been subject to the Turk. It is only within the last fifty years, on the other hand, that the sultan has attempted to enforce his sovereign rights in the Yemen. The southern coast of Arabia is generally designated as Hadramaut, although in strictness that appellation is properly applicable to a section of it only. The eastern corner of Arabia is taken up by Oman, a state which has generally claimed and secured a position of independence. Both it and the southern states are now under the protection of the Indian government. The country adjacent to Oman toward the North formed the province of El-Bahrein ("the Two Seas"), but this name is now restricted to a large island at the western end of it and some smaller islands famous for their pearl fishery. The remaining province of El-Hasa is occupied by practically independent tribes. From many points of view the most interesting province of Arabia is the great northern central plateau called Nejd, that is, "high land." From its situation it is least susceptible to foreign influence. It contains some fairly large towns, but the bulk of its population live, as their fathers have done from time immemorial, the life of the Bedawi. Two small provinces remain to be noticed. Between the Yemen and the Hijaz lies the district of ‘Asir, which largely resembles the first-named province in its physical features. To the East of Nejd lies the district of Yemama, which used to be the territory of an important tribe.

3. Political Situation:

On the whole the political situation in Arabia today bears a considerable resemblance to that which obtained immediately before the mission of Mohammad. At that time (about 600 AD) the Northwest parts of the peninsula were more or less subject to the Byzantine emperor, while the whole East and South coasts were under the sway of Persia. Today the West coast of Arabia is again subject to Constantinople, and the East and South coasts are under the protection of an eastern power—in this case the government of India.

4. Chief Towns:

The principal towns of Arabia and the other centers of population owe their existence to the natural features of the country and have probably remained the same in all ages, just as those of Palestine have, and even their population does not seem to have altered much. Thus Mecca owes its existence to the presence of the famous well Zemzem; Teima, Kheibar and Tabuk to their oases; Mascat, the capital of Oman, to its natural harbor; and so on. An exception is the ancient town of Saba (see SHEBA) or Marib, which probably sprang up as the result of the building in prehistoric times of a gigantic dam for the purposes of irrigation. When the dam burst in the 2nd or 3rd Christian century, the population dispersed. Owing to the absence of a census it is not possible to make accurate statements regarding the population

of an eastern town, and estimates by European travelers always vary greatly. Speaking generally, the cities of Arabia of the first magnitude appear to have some 35,000 inhabitants, though Mascat is said to have as many as 60,000.

IV. Flora and Fauna.

1. Flora:

The peninsula of Arabia belongs, as has been said, in its physical features to Africa, and its flora and fauna are those of that continent. Of all the products of the soil by far the most important is the date palm. It flourishes in every oasis. In the Wadi Duweisir alone it is said one may ride straight on for three days without leaving the shelter of the palm groves. The dates, which are the staff of life of the Arab, differ in quality in each locality, each district producing a variety of its own. In the Yemen, with its varied altitudes, almost every kind of fruit and vegetable known in temperate latitudes is cultivated on the terraced mountain sides. Vines are grown, as Ibn Khaldun remarks, for the sake of the berry, not for the purposes of wine making. The vine is common to Arabia and Palestine, whereas the date palm has almost gone out of cultivation in the latter country. On the other land the olive, which is so important in the northern country is almost unknown in the southern. The olive is constantly referred to in the Bible (Jud 9:8 and often), the date never. From the South coast especially are exported frankincense, balsam, myrrh and other aromatic plants; and cotton is cultivated in the province of Oman. Cereals flourish in the Yemen and tobacco is grown wherever possible in Arabia The coffee of the Yemen is famous; it is exported to Constantinople and named from the port of export Mokha coffee; but the bulk of it is consumed within Arabia itself. Coffee and tobacco are the only two articles of consumption which are used in Arabia today, and which have not been used from time immemorial. Coffee was probably introduced into Arabia from Gallaland on the African mainland two or three centuries ago.

The Arabs are most inveterate coffee drinkers. Tobacco was probably first brought from English ships at Constantinople in the reign of James I. It is cultivated in every oasis, unless in the interior in Nejd, where its use is discouraged on religious grounds. There is only one other point in regard to which the Arabs of today differ from the Arabs of Mohammed’s time—the use of gunpowder. Except in respect of the three commodities just mentioned, everyday life in the desert today goes on exactly as it did 1,600 years ago. Forest trees are extremely rare in Arabia, but a species of tamarisk called ghada which grows in the northern nefud is proverbial for the quality of charcoal it affords and is a favorite food of the camel. An acacia called katad is likewise a by-word on account of its long spines. The wood is used for making camels’ saddles; it grows in the Tihama. As in Palestine and in most countries which have been inhabited for many thousands of years, the larger trees have long been cut down for fuel or for building purposes.

2. Fauna:

Among beasts of prey panthers, wolves, hyenas, jackals and (it is said) even lions are found in Arabia Many of the tribes are named after these and other animals. The wild ox or oryx (see UNICORN) is

rarely seen, but gazelles are plentiful. Apes abound in the Yemen, as they do all along the North of Africa, and are kept as pets (compare 1Ki 10:22). By far the most important domestic animal is the camel. Without it many parts of the country would be uninhabited. It is commonly supposed that the best breed of horses comes from Nejd, but this appears to be an error. In Nejd the camel is the indispensable beast of burden and mount; horses are comparatively useless there. The best Arabian horses are reared in Mesopotamia. Studs are, indeed, kept by the emirs of Nejd, but the horses are small and of little use. The pedigrees of the best horses go back, according to tradition, to the time of Solomon (1Ki 10:28). Dogs are trained to hunt the wild ox, to tend sheep and to watch the camp. All domestic animals—dogs, horses, mules, asses—receive names as with us.

The ostrich is rarely met with, but is found as far north as the Jauf; it no doubt found its way into Arabia from Africa. A common bird is the kata or sand grouse. It is noted for going straight to its watering place. "Better guided than a kata" is a common proverb. Hawks and falcons are found, and falconry among the Arabs was a favorite sport. In Arabia the locust, so far from being a scourge wherever it appears, is a valuable article of food. It is eaten not only by human beings (Mt 3:4), but also by dogs, horses and even beasts of prey. As might be expected in a rocky and sun-scorched land like Arabia, scorpions and various sorts of serpents abound. The chameleon (Le 11:30) is common here. It is used as a simile for fickle people and those who do not fulfill their promises. It may be regarded as a substitute for thermometer, as on very hot days it ascends trees or any high places. Another sign of extreme heat is that the vipers writhe on the ground.

The Persian Gulf, especially the Bahrein archipelago, is famous for its pearls, while the Red Sea is noted for its coral reefs, which have caused many a shipwreck. It is believed that in the interior of Hadramaut there are many mineral deposits including gold.

V. Inhabitants.

1. Classification:

The inhabitants of Arabia are divided into three classes. There are in the first place a number of tribes which became extinct, and which are not connected genealogically with those which survived. The latter are divided into two great stems, the south Arabian and indigenous branch descended from Kahtan, and the north Arabian or immigrant tribes descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham. There is naturally a good deal of inconsistency in the various traditions of the origins of these tribes and their subsequent history.

2. Extinct Tribes:

Of the extinct tribes the most familiar name is that of Amlak or Amlik (Amalek). By the Arabian genealogists he is variously described as a grandson of Shem and as a son of Ham. In Ge 36:12 he is a son of Esau’s son, Eliphaz, by Timna. They are said to be first met with in Chaldea, from which they were expelled on the rise of the Assyrian power under Nimrod. They migrated into Ar, occupying in turn

the Bahrein, Oman, the Yemen, and finally the Hijaz, where they are said to have been the first settlers at Yathrib (Medina) and also to have occupied land round Mecca and Kheibar. In the time of Abraham they were expelled from Mecca on the arrival of two new tribes from the South, those of Jurhum and Katura (Ge 25:1). Later, it is said, David, during the rebellion of Absalom, took up his quarters in Kheibar and ruled over the surrounding districts. According to another tradition Moses sent an expedition against the Amalekites in the Hijaz, on which occasion the Israelites, disobeying his orders, spared their king Arkam (compare Rekem, Nu 31:8; Jos 13:21)—a reminiscence of the incident in the life of Saul (1Sa 15). In any case the Amalekites were supplanted in the northern Hijaz by Jewish tribes, who continued there until the time of Mohammad.

The Amalekites migrated into Egypt and southern Palestine. The Pharaohs of the time of Abraham, Joseph and Moses are represented to have been Amalekites. Finally, broken up by Josh, they fled into northern Africa, where they are said to have grown into the Berber races. The rest of the tribes which became extinct like the Amalekites are of less interest for the present purpose, being unconnected with the Bible narrative. They are mentioned in the Koran, in which book their destruction is attributed to their idolatrous proclivities and to their rejection of the monotheistic prophets. The best known and most important are ‘Ad and Thamud ‘Ad is variously named the son of Amalek and the son of Uz (Ge 10:23).

The tribe dwelt in the deserts behind the Yemen. They became polytheists; the prophet Hud was sent to them; they rejected him, and were destroyed by a hurricane. The remnant grew into a new tribe, whose chief, Lokman, built the great dam at Marib. In the end they were conquered by a tribe of Kahtan. Thamud was closely related to ‘Ad, being a son of Aram the father of Uz. They were driven out of the Yemen and settled in the northern Hijaz; they rejected their prophet Salih and were destroyed by an earthquake accompanied by a loud noise. The rock-cut sepulchral monuments of Medain Salih in the Wadi el-Kora are still pointed out as their dwellings. They were, therefore, considered to have been troglodites like the Horites of the Bible. A second pair were the brother tribes of Tasm and Jadis, grandsons of Aramaic Tasm oppressing Jadis, the latter rose and almost exterminated the former, only to be in turn destroyed by a king of the Yemen. Their home was Yemama.

3. South Arabian Tribes:

The southern Arabs claim to be descended from an ancestor called Kahtan son of ‘Abir, son of Shalikh, son of Arfakhshad, son of Shem, son of Noah. Kahtan is undoubtedly the Biblical Joktan (Ge 10:26), and the names of his descendants reappear as Arabic place names. Indeed the tenth chapter of Ge throws much light on the earliest history of Arabia and the movements of the tribes. Thus the fact that Sheba and Dedan appear as grandsons of Cush, that is, as Abyssinian tribes descended from Ham, in Ge 10:7 and again as descendants of Keturah and Abraham in Ge 25:3 points to the fact that parts of these tribes migrated from the one country to the other. Havilah in Ge 10:7 may similarly be connected with Havilah in Ge 10:29, the intercourse between Southwest Arabia and the opposite coast of Africa being always very close. Among the sons of Joktan are mentioned Almodad, Hazarmaveth, Uzal (Izal), Sheba, Ophir, Havilah. In Almodad we have probably the Arabic El-Mudad, a name which occurs among the descendants of Jurhum, son of Yaktan (Joktan). Hazarmaveth is obviously Hadramaut. Uzal is the ancient name of San‘a, the capital of the Yemen. Sheba is the Arabic Saba or Marib. Ophir and Havilah

were probably in South or East Arabia. In Ge 10:30 it is said that the camping grounds of these tribes stretched from Mesha as you go toward Sephar, the mountain of the East, that is, probably from the North of the Persian Gulf to the center of South Arabia, Sephar being Zafar, the capital of the South Arab kingdom near to the present Mirbat.

4. Migration of Tribes:

Many of the most illustrious tribes are descended from Kahtan, and some of them still survive. A constant stream of migration went on toward the North. Thus the tribe of Jurhum left the Yemen on account of drought and settled in the Hijaz and the Tihama, from which they drove out the Amalekites, and were in turn driven out by Koda‘a, another Kahtanite tribe. After that they disappear from history and are reckoned among the extinct tribes. Koda’a was a descendant of Himyar. The Himyarites founded, about the 1st century BC, a kingdom which lasted for five centuries. The king bore the title of Tubba‘, and the capital was successively Marib (Saba), Zafar and San‘a. One of their monarchs was the queen Bilkis whom the Arabian historians identify with the queen of Sheba who visited Solomon, though she must have lived much later. The story of the meeting is given in the Koran, chapter 38. A chief occasion on which many of the tribes left the district Northeast of the Yemen was the bursting of the great dam, built by Lokman at Marib, about the 2nd century AD. A section of these grew into the Arabian kingdom of Ghassan, whose capital was Damascus and many of whose kings bore the name Al-Harith (Aretas, 2Co 11:32). This kingdom lasted till the time of Mohammad (7th century) and was in alliance with the Roman and Greek empires. On the opposite side of the Syrian desert the Lakhmid kingdom of Al-Hira on the Euphrates (also of Kahtanite origin) was allied to Persia. The two Arabian "buffer-states" were almost constantly at war with one another.

5. North Arabian Tribes:

Among the Arabs Ishmael holds the place occupied by Isaac in the Hebrew tradition. It was to the valley, afterward the site of the town of Mecca, that Abraham conducted Hagar and her son, and that Ishmael grew up and became the father of a great nation. The locality is full of spots connected by tradition with his life history, the ground where Hagar searched for water, the well Zemzem of which Gabriel showed her the place, the mount Thabir where Abraham would have sacrificed his son (Ishmael), and the graves of Hagar and Ishmael. The Jurhum, among whom Ishmael grew up, gave him seven goats: these were the capital with which he began life. He married a woman of Jurhum. He had twelve sons (Ge 25:16) of whom Kaidar and Nabat are the best known, perhaps the Cedrei and Nabataei of Pliny; other sons were Dumah and Tema (which see). The subsequent history of the Ishmaelites is lost for several generations until we come to ‘Adnan, who is said to have been defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, when the latter invaded Arabia. All the Ishmaelite tribes are descended from ‘Adnan. They are the north Arabian tribes, as opposed to the Kahtanite or south Arabian. One of them, Koreish, under their chief, Kosay, became master of Mecca, driving out Koda‘a. Later, as the tribe of the Prophet, they became the rulers of Arabia and the aristocracy of the Muslim empire; and the descendants of Mohammad remain to this day the only hierarchy known to Islam.

6. Other Tribes:

There are one or two other branches which are not included in the above classification: such are the Nabateans (see NEBAIOTH), and the descendants of Esau and Keturah. The Nabateans are not generally reckoned among the Arabian tribes. They were an Aramean stock, the indigenous inhabitants of Mesopotamia, and spoke not Arabic but Aramaic. They founded a kingdom in Arabia of which the capital was Petra (see SELA). This was the most famous of their colonies, and it endured, at first in alliance with the Romans and later in subjection to them, for 500 years—from the 2nd century BC to the 3rd century AD. Petra was an important trading emporium, but, when the trade left the overland routes and was carried by way of the Red Sea, it quickly fell into poverty and oblivion. The descendants of Esau are named in Ge 36:1 ff; they were allied to the Hittites and Ishmaelites. Among the tribes descended from Keturah are Jokshan and Midian, Sheba and Dedan (Ge 25:2 ff).

7. Foreign Elements:

In Arabia there was and still, in spite of religious disabilities, is a large Jewish population. Before the age of Mohammad they lived chiefly in the Northwest, the two best known tribes—An-Nadir and Koreiza—occupying Yathrib (Medina). After the rise of Islam they were expelled from Arabia; but at the present time there are probably some 60,000 Jews in the Yemen alone. There has always been a close connection between the South and West of Arabia and the opposite African coast. Especially in the 6th century there was a large influx of Abyssinians into the Yemen, as there still is into the western districts. A like intermixture of population went on between Zanzibar and Oman.

VI. Religion.

1. Monotheism:

The religion of the greater part of the Arabs before the time of Mohammad consisted of a vague deism combined with a primitive form of stone-worship. This is chiefly true of the Ishmaelite tribes descended from Modan, a great- grandson of ‘Adnan, and among them it is especially true of Koreish. The origin of this stone worship may have been that as each family was forced to hive off from the main stock and quit the sacred territory around Mecca, it carried with it a stone as a monument of the homeland. This stone soon became a fetich. It was worshipped by stroking it with the hand. Before setting out on a journey a man would perform this religious duty, and also immediately on his return, before even visiting his wife and family. The best known idols of the pagan Arabs, from the mention of them in the Koran, are Al-Lat, Al-Ozza and Al-Manat (Kor 53 19.20), worshipped by the Thakif at Taif, by the two tribes of Medina, the Aus and the Khazraj, and by Koreish, in a shrine near Mecca, respectively. Koreish had also a great idol named Hubal in the "house of God" at Mecca, which contained other idols besides.

The deity in each case was probably at first a large boulder of stone, then a portable image was made, apparently in human form. They were regarded as feminine and called the daughters of God. Indeed, Al-Lat is apparently merely the feminine of Allah (God). The deities mentioned in the Koran (71 23),

Yaghuth, Ya‘uk and Nesr, were worshipped in the Yemen. It is certain, however, that the idolatry of the Arabs of "the Ignorance" (Jahiliyah, "roughness," "ignorance"; compare Ac 17:30)—so native writers name the ages before Mohammad (Koran 3 148, etc.)—has been greatly exaggerated by Mohammadan historians. It is remarkable that the words denoting an idol, sanam and wethen, are not Arabic roots, and the practice of idolatry seems also to have been an importation from without. Even the idolatrous Arabs believed in a supreme deity, whose daughters the idol deities were, and with whom they had powers of intercession. They therefore were rather images of saints than of gods. As Renan has said, the desert is monotheistic; it is too empty to give birth to a pantheon, as the fruitful plains of India could do. At the present day the desert Arabs are more strictly monotheistic than the Muslims themselves. Their religion consists in nothing save a vague belief in God.

2. The Ka‘ba, Pilgrimages and Fairs:

Though there were many houses of God in the country, the chief religious resort even before the time of Mohammad was Mecca. The House of God (see BETHEL) here was called the Ka‘ba, which is the English word "cube," the building being so called from its shape. It was believed to have been built by Abraham and Ishmael. The honor of acting as guardians of the House was a subject of rivalry among the tribes. The office was held consecutively by the tribes of Jurhum, Koda‘a and Koreish, and last by the grandfather and uncles of Mohammad. These, therefore, correspond to the tribe of Levi in Israel. It is said to have contained a large number of images, but it is remarkable that the nearer our authorities get to the time of Mohammad the smaller is the number of images mentioned.

The chief of these, Hubal, is not named in the Koran. The worship took the form of circumambulation (tawaf), running or marching round the sanctuary (compare Ps 26:6). An annual visitation was and still is made by those living at a distance, and sacrifices are offered. This is the hajj or pilgrimage; the same name is used for the corresponding rite among the Hebrews (Ex 10:9 and often). These religious assemblies were combined with fairs, at which markets were held and a considerable trade carried on. Before the time of Mohammad the great annual fair was held at Okaz, a place still pointed out about three days’ journey East of Mecca and one day West of Taif. Here were not only all kinds of commercial transactions carried on—auctions, sales, settling of accounts and payment of blood-wit, but an academy was held at which poets recited their odes, and received judgment upon their merits. These fairs were generally held in the sacred months, that is, the first, seventh, eleventh and twelfth months, in which fighting was forbidden. They had therefore a great civilizing and pacifying influence.

3. Judaism:

Before the time of Mohammad Judaism prevailed extensively in Arabia, especially in the Hijaz. It began no doubt with the migration of families due to disturbed political conditions at home. The conquest of Palestine by Nebuchadnezzar, by the Seleucids, by the Romans under Pompey, Vespasian and finally Hadrian, drove many Jews to seek peace and safety in the deserts out of which their forefathers had come. Thither Paul also withdrew after his conversion (Ga 1:17). Two of these emigrant tribes, the Nadir and Koreiza, settled at Medina, first in independence, then as clients of the Aus and Khazraj. In the end

they were harried and destroyed by Mohammad. The Jewish colony at Kheibar met the same fate. Several free Arab tribes also professed the Jewish faith, especially certain branches of Himyar and Kinda, both descendants of Kahtan, the former in southern, the latter in central Arabia. Judaism was introduced into the Yemen by one of the Tubbas, probably in the 3rd century AD, but it was not until the beginning of the 6th century that it made much headway. At that epoch the Tubba Dhu Nuwas became a fierce protagonist of this creed. He seems to have attacked the Aus and Khazraj to whom the Jews of Yathrib (Medina) were subject. He instituted against the Christians of Nejran, a territory lying to the Northeast of the Yemen, a persecution which brought upon him the vengeance of the Byzantine emperor and of the Negus of Abyssinia and involved his kingdom and dynasty in ruin.

4. Christianity:

Judaism did not hold such a large place in Arabia as did Christianity. The apostle Bartholomew is said to have carried the gospel thither. One of the Jurhum kings who may have lived about the beginning of the 2nd century AD is named Abd el-Masih ("Christ's slave"). There is said to have been a representation of the Virgin Mary and her Son in the Ka'ba. The Christian emperor Constans (337-50) sent the Bishop Theophilus into South Arabia in order to obtain toleration for the Christians. The mission was successful. Churches were built at Zafar, at Aden, and on the shore of the Persian Gulf. The emperor's real object was doubtless political—to counteract the influence of Persia in these regions. Most of the Yemenite tribes were at this time pagan: they worshipped the idols mentioned above (Koran 71 23). Some time after we find the Abyssinian sovereign describing himself in the inscriptions at Axum as king of the Himyarites. This supremacy would be favorable to the spread of Christianity. One of the chief seats, however, of the Christian religion, was at the above-mentioned Nejran, the territory of the tribe Harith ibn Ka'b, whom ecclesiastical writers seem to denote by Arethas son of Caleb.

It was this tribe that Dhu Nuwas, Tubba of the Yemen, on his conversion to Judaism, attacked. He threw all the Christians who held by their faith into a trench of fire in which they were burned (Koran 85 4). News of this atrocity was either carried by those who escaped or sent by the Lakhmid, king of Al-Hira, to the emperor Justin I, who, in turn, either directly or through the patriarch of Alexandria, invoked the cooperation of the Axumite king. The result was that the Abyssinians invaded the Yemen and overthrew the Himyarite dynasty. Christianity then became the prevailing religion of South Arabia. The Abyssinians were in their turn, however, expelled by the Persians, under whom all religions—Christianity, Judaism and paganism—were tolerated, until they all disappeared before Islam. Several of the Lakhmid kings of Al-Hira, although they were from circumstances under the influence of the Persian Zoroastrianism, professed Christianity. Nu'man I who reigned at the end of the 4th and beginning of the 5th century, perhaps under the influence of Simon Stylites, retired from the world and became an ascetic. Mundhir II, in the middle of the 6th century, seems to have come temporarily under the influence of the Eutychian heresy. Nu'man V, one of his successors, was also converted to Christianity. But the kingdom in which Christianity flourished most was naturally that in closest contact with the Byzantine empire—the kingdom of the Ghassanids, although it seems not to have been until after the conversion of Constantine that this was the case. From his reign date the monasteries of which the ruins are still visible in the Ghassanid country. The powerful Ishmaelite tribe of Taghlib, whose settlements were in Mesopotamia was also converted to Christianity through similar influences, but not until the end

of the 6th century. Some members of the Kahtanite Koda‘a professed the same religion, as did the Kelb in the Jauf.

5. Sabianism:

In the Koran a third creed is bracketed with those of the Jews and Christians as entitled to toleration—that of the Sabians. These are monotheists who also worshipped the stars or the angels. The name Sabian has no connection with Sabean which is derived from the name of the town of Saba. An account of their religion, taken from Abu’l Faraj (Bar Hebraeus), the Jacobite bishop, who wrote about the middle of the 13th century, will be found in Sale’s Koran, Preliminary Discourse, section I. Sale, however, identified Sabianism with the primitive religion of the Arabs, which Mohammad sought to supplant. This is impossible, however, in view of the fact that Mohammad tolerated the one and proscribed the other. Since the publication of Chwolson’s Ssabier und Ssabismus it has been recognized that under the term Sabians are included two very different groups of people. In the first place the devotees of the old Semitic idolatry which flourished at Harran assumed the name Sabian to enable them to claim the protection afforded by the Koran. It is the tenets of these Harranians of which Chwolson’s work contains an exposition. The true Sabians, however, were a survival of primitive Christian Gnosticism; whence they were also called Mandeans. From their frequent ablutions they received their name derived from the Aramaic tsebha‘, to "baptize," the ‘ayin being softened to ‘aleph, and connected with John the Baptist. The Jews, Christians and Sabians are called in the Koran "the people of the book," that is, those to whom a revelation had been vouchsafed, and who were in consequence of this tolerated. In one passage of the Koran (22 17) a fourth religion is added to these—the Magian, or Zoroastrian, introduced from Persia.

6. Seekers after Truth: Islam:

Shortly before the appearance of Mohammad a number of thinking persons had become dissatisfied with the old Arabian religion of their ancestors, and yet had not joined the Christian or Jewish faith. They gave up the worship of idols, studied the various sacred books, and sought to find out the true way. They are considered in the Koran as having been of the true faith even before Mohammad had appeared. About a dozen are mentioned by the historians, of whom the most important are four—Waraka the cousin of Mohammad’s wife Khadija; Othman who became a Christian; Obeidallah who became a Christian and then a Muslim; Zeid who traveled in pursuit of Truth, but did not at tach himself to any one faith. The Hebrew prophets and those who accepted their doctrines are regarded as belonging to the same class. A person who is a monotheist, and who yet does not attach himself to any particular creed is called in the Koran a Hanif. This pure religion is called the religion of Abraham. Mohammad claimed to restore this primeval religion in Islam. By John of Damascus Mohammad was regarded as the founder of a Christian sect. It is probable that but for his appearance Christianity would have spread over the whole of Arabia.

LITERATURE.

Causinn de Perceval, Essai sur l’histoire des Arabes; Sprenger, Die alte Geographie Arabiens; Hamdani, ed., Muller, Geographic der arabischen Halbinsel; Niebuhr, Travels through Arabia; Burckhardt, Travels in Arabia; Wellsted, Travels in Arabia; Burton, Personal Narrative of a Pilgrimage to El-Medinah and Meccah; Palgrave, Journey through Central and Eastern Arabia; Blunt, A Pilgrimage to Nejd; Hurgronje, Mecca; Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta; Harris, A Journey through the Yemen; Brunnow and Domazewski, Die Provincia Arabia; Musil, Arabia Deserta; Glaser, Skizze der Geschichte und Geographic Arabiens.

Thomas Hunter Weir

ARABIAN

See ARABIA.

ARABIC GOSPEL OF THE INFANCY

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

ARABIC HISTORY OF JOSEPH THE CARPENTER

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

ARABIC LANGUAGE

ar’-a-bik lan’-gwaj: For the student of the Bible the Arabic language is of interest, first, as one of the members of the Semitic group of languages, to which belong the Hebrew and Aramaic tongues of the Bible; secondly, as one of the languages into which the Bible and other church literature were early translated and in which a Christian literature was produced; and thirdly, as the vernacular of Mohammed and his followers, the classical tongue of that religious system which is the offspring of a degenerate Judaism and Christianity.

1. Philological Characterization:

Scholars are generally agreed in grouping the Arabic and Ethiopic together as a South-Sem branch of the Semitic stock. For the geographical and ethnological background of the Arabic language, see ARABIA. A general characteristic of this tongue of the desert is its remarkable retention into a late historical period, of grammatical features obliterated or in process of obliteration in the other Semitic tongues at their earliest emergence in literature; so that in the period since the golden age of its literature, the Arabic has been undergoing changes in some respects analogous to those which its sister-dialects underwent in their pre-literary or earliest literary stage. Thus, for example, the case-endings of nouns, lost in Aramaic and Canaanitish (including Hebrew), all but lost in the Abyssinian dialects, beginning to

be disregarded in even the early (popular) Babylonian, lost also in the dialects of modern Arabic are in full vitality throughout the classical period of Arabic literature.

The Arabic language itself, ancient and modern, divides into a vast number of dialects, many of which have attained the distinction of producing a literature greater or less. But the dialect of the tribe of Koreish, to which Mohammed belonged, is the one that, naturally, by the circumstance of the Koran's composition and diffusion, has become the norm of pure Arabic. Old Arabic poems, some of them produced in "the Ignorance," that is, before the days of Mohammed, are in substantially the same dialect as that of the Koran, for it appears that Bedouin tribes ranging within the limits of the Arabian desert spoke an Arabic little differentiated by tribal or geographical peculiarities. On the other hand the inhabitants of the coast of the Indian Ocean from Yemen to Oman, and of the island of Socotra off that coast, spoke an Arabic differing widely from that of the northern tribes. The various dialects of this "South-Arabic," known partly through their daughter-dialects of today (Mehri, Socotri, etc.), partly from the numerous and important inscriptions ("Minaean" and "Sabaean") found in Yemen by recent travelers, notably Halevy and Glaser, show a closer affinity than do the "North-Arabic" with the Abyssinian dialects (Ge'ez, i.e. "Ethiopic," Tigre, Tigrina, Amharic, etc.), as might indeed be expected from the admitted South Arabian origin of the Habesh-tribes or Abyssinians.

For the interpretation of the Old Testament the Arabic language has been of service in a variety of ways. In the department of lexicography it has thrown light not only on many a word used but once in the Bible or too seldom for usage alone to determine its meaning, but also on words which had seemed clear enough in their Biblical setting, but which have received illustration or correction from their usage in the immense bulk and range of Arabic literature with its enormous vocabulary. For the modern scientific study of Hebrew grammar, with its genetic method, Arabic has been of the greatest value, through the comparison of its cognate forms, where, in the main, the Arabic has the simpler, fuller and more regular morphology, and through the comparison of similar constructions, for which the highly developed Arabic syntax furnishes useful rubrics.

In addition to this the Arabic language plays a prominent part, perhaps the foremost part, in the determination of those laws of the mutation of sounds, which once governed the development and now reveal the mutual relationships of the various Semitic languages.

The script which we know as Arabic script, with its numerous varieties, developed out of the vulgar Aramaic alphabet in North Arabia; diacritical points were added to many of those letters, either to distinguish Arabic sounds for which no letter existed, or to differentiate letters the forms of which had become so similar as to create confusion. In Yemen another script arose early, that of the inscriptions above mentioned, admirably clear and adapted to express probably all the chief varieties of consonantal sounds in actual use, though quite without vowels.

2. Christian Arabic Literature:

For Arabic versions of the Bible, see ARABIC VERSIONS. Outside of the Scriptures themselves there

was most felt by Christian communities living in the Arabic-speaking world (primarily, though not exclusively, in Egypt and Syria) the need of a Christian literature suited to the tastes of the time and region. Apocryphal and legendary material makes up a large part, therefore, of the list of Christian Arabic literature. See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS. But this material was not original. With the small degree of intellectual activity in those circles it is not surprising that most of such material, and indeed of the entire literary output, consists of translations from Syriac, Greek or Coptic, and that original productions are few in number.

Of these last the most noteworthy are the following: theological and apologetic tracts by Theodore, bishop of Haran, the same who held the famous disputation with Mohammedan scholars at the court of Caliph Al-Mamun early in the 9th century; apologetic and polemic writings of Yahya ibn Adi of Tekrit, and of his pupil Abu All Isa ibn Ishaq, both in the 10th century; the Arabic works of Bar Hebraeus, better known for his numerous Syriac compositions, but productive also of both historical and theological works in Arabic (13th century); in Egypt, but belonging to the same Jacobite or Monophysite communion as the above, the polemic and homiletic productions of Bishop Severus of Eshmunain (10th century), and, a generation earlier than Severus and belonging to the opposing or Melkite Egyptian church, the chronicle of Eutychius, patriarch of Alexandria, continued a century later by Yahya ibn Said of Antioch; large compilations of church history, church law and theological miscellany by the Coptic Christians Al-Makin, Abu Ishaq ibn Al-Assal, Abu'l-Barakat and others, the leaders in a general revival of Egyptian Christianity in the 13th century; on the soil of Nestorianism, finally, the ecclesiastical, dogmatic and exegetical writings of Abulfaraj Abdallah ibn At-Tayyib, (11 century), the apologetic compositions of his contemporary, Elias ben Shinaya, the historian, and the Nestorian church chronicle begun in the 12th century by Mari ibn Suleiman and continued two centuries later by Amr ibn Mattai and Saliba bar Johannan. After this date there is no original literature produced by Arabic-speaking Christians until the modern intellectual revival brought about by contact with European Christianity.

3. The Literary Vehicle of Islam:

What Aramaic, Greek and Latin have been successively in the history of Christianity, all this, and more, Arabic has been in the history of Islam. The language of its founder and his "helpers," the language of the Koran "sent down" from God to Mohammed by the angel Gabriel, the language therefore in which it has always been preserved by the faithful, untranslated, whithersoever it has spread in the wide world of Islam, Arabic is identified with Islam in its origin, its history, its literature and its propaganda. All the points of contact between the religion of the Bible and the religion of the Koran, literary, historical, apologetic and missionary, are alike in this, that they demand of the intelligent student of Christianity a sympathetic acquaintance with the genius and the masterpieces of the great Arabic tongue.

J. Oscar Boyd

ARABIC VERSIONS

ar'-a-bik vur'-shuns: Arabic translations of the Bible must have been made at a very early date, for

Christianity and Judaism had penetrated far into Arabia by the 6th century of our era, but the oldest of which a copy has come down to our time is that of Sasdish the Gaon (942 AD). This version was made directly from the Massoretic Text and is said to have covered the whole of the Old Testament, but much of it is no longer extant. It is characterized by an avoidance of anthropomorphisms (e.g. Ge 6:2, "sons of nobles" and "daughters of common people") and by giving modern equivalents, e.g. Turks, Franks, Chinese, for the Hebrew names. Saadiah's Pentateuch was first printed at Constantinople in 1546 and was incorporated into the Paris (1629-45) and London (1657) Polyglots.

When, after the rise of Islam, Arabic became the common language of Syria, Egypt and North Africa, translations were made from the Septuagint, from the Peshitta and from Coptic. In the Polyglots the translation of Joshua is, like the Pentateuch, made from the Massoretic Text, as also portions of Kings and Nehemiah, with interpolations from the Peshitta. Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings (in parts), 1 and 2 Chronicles (?), Nehemiah (in parts) and Job have been translated into Arabic from Syriac. The remaining books (Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs, etc.) are from the Septuagint, and that according to Codex Alexandrinus. In the New Testament the Gospels have been translated from the Vulgate, and the remaining books, although from the Greek, are late. A revised edition of the versions in Walton's Polyglot was published by J. D. Carlyle, professor of Arabic in Cambridge, and printed at Newcastle by Sarah Hodgson in 1811. A very fine translation of the entire Bible in classical Arabic has been issued by the Jesuit Fathers in Beirut, and a simpler version in Arabic which can be understood by the common people, educated and uneducated alike, was made by the late Dr. Cornelius Van Dyck of the Syrian Protestant College and published by the American Press in Beirut. Dr. Van Dyck had the benefit of the help and advice of the Sheikh Nacif al-Yaziji.

A large number of manuscripts of the Bible in Arabic, in whole or in part, are to be found in the British Museum, the Bibliotheque Nationale and the great libraries of the Continent, but none of them are of sufficient age to make them of value for the criticism of the text.

Thomas Hunter Weir

ARABOTH

ar'-a-both. See ARUBBOTH.

ARAD

a'-rad ('aradh; Arad):

(1) A city mentioned four times in the Old Testament. In the King James Version it is twice mistakenly rendered as the name of a king (Nu 21:1; 33:40). Three times it is spoken of as in the South Country, one mention using the phrase 'the wilderness of Judah which is in the South Country of Arad' (Jud 1:16), that is, the part of the wilderness of Judah which is in the South Country near Arad. It was situated near the frontier of Judah and Simeon, being grouped with Debir, Hormah, Makkedah, etc. (Jos 12:14). Arad

and other cities joined in attacking Israel in the fortieth year of the sojourn in the wilderness (Nu 21:1-3), and Israel vowed to "make their cities a devoted thing." In the case of Zephath, one of the cities, this vow was fulfilled after the death of Joshua (Jud 1:17). The Kenite relatives of Moses had their inheritance near Arad (Jud 1:16). In the form a-ru-da the city is mentioned by Shishak of Egypt as among the places which he conquered in Palestine. The identification of the site with Tel Arad, about 17 miles South of Hebron, seems to be generally accepted.

(2) One of the descendants of Elpaal the son of Shaharaim, mentioned among the descendants of Benjamin (1Ch 8:15).

Willis J. Beecher

ARADUS

ar'-a-dus (Arados, 1 Macc 15:23): Greek name of the Old Testament ARVAD (which see), a city on the coast of Phoenicia.

ARAH

a'-ra ('arach, "traveler"?):

(1) The son of Ulla, an Asherite (1Ch 7:39).

(2) The head of a family that returned from the exile with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:5; Ne 7:10). He is sometimes identified with Arah of Ne 6:18 whose grand-daughter became the wife of Tobiah, the Ammonite who tried to thwart Nehemiah in rebuilding Jerusalem.

ARAM

a'-ram ('aram):

(1) A son of Shem (Ge 10:22; 1Ch 1:17). See ARAMEANS; SYRIA.

(2) A grandson of Nahor (Ge 22:21).

(3) A descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:34).

(4) Aram, King James Version: Greek form of Ram (thus the Revised Version (British and American) Mt 13:4; Arni Lu 3:33), grandson of Perez.

ARAM-DAMMESEK

a-ram-dam’-es-ek: Syria of Damascus, conquered by David (2Sa 8:5,6). See SYRIA.

ARAM-MAACAH

a-ram-ma’-a-ka. See SYRIA.

ARAM-NAHARAIM

a-ram-na-ha-ra’-im. See SYRIA.

ARAM-REHOB

a-ram-re’-hob. See SYRIA.

ARAM-ZOBAH

a-ram-zo’-ba. See SYRIA.

ARAMAEANS; ARAMEANS

ar-a-me’-ans: Often in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Syrians. See SYRIA.

ARAMAIC VERSIONS

See TARGUM.

ARAMAIC; ARAMAIC LANGUAGE

ar-a-ma’-ik lan’-gwaj (’aramith; the King James Version Syrian, Syriac; SYRIAN in the Revised Version (British and American)):

1. Early Notices of Aramaic in Scripture

2. Extra-Biblical Evidences of Aramaic

3. The Script of Aramaic Inscriptions

4. Dialects of Aramaic

5. Grammatical Peculiarities

6. Comparison of Aramaic of Sinjirli with That of Bible

7. Comparison of Aramaic of Assouan with That of Daniel

8. Elephantine Papyri

9. Comparison with Aramaic of the Targums

10. Chief Differences in Latter

LITERATURE

The name is given to a form of Semitic speech, most nearly related to Hebrew and Phoenician, but exhibiting marked peculiarities, and subsisting in different dialects. Its original home may have been in Mesopotamia (Aram), but it spread North and West, and, as below shown, became the principal tongue throughout extensive regions. After the return from the Captivity, it displaced Hebrew as the spoken language of the Jews in Palestine. In its eastern form it is known as Syriac. In its occurrence in the Old Testament, it formerly, though incorrectly, generally bore the name Chaldee. The present article deals with it chiefly in its. Old Testament relations.

1. Early Notices of Aramaic in Scripture:

If we neglect two words which occur in Ge 31:47, the earliest notice of the use of this language in Scripture is in the request which the representatives of Hezekiah make to Rabshakeh: "Speak, I pray thee, to thy servants in the Syriac language" (’aramith, 2Ki 18:26; Isa 36:11). The narrative from which we have made this excerpt, even if it stood alone, would prove that Aramaic, "the Syriac language," was so different from Hebrew, "the Jews’ language," that it was not understood by the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Further, it shows that Aramaic was the ordinary language of Assyrian diplomacy. We next meet with Aramaic in Jer 10:11 which appears to be an answer put into the mouths of the Jews as a reply to any attempt to seduce them to the worship of idols. If we assume the traditional date of Daniel to be correct, the six chapters in that book (Da 2:4-7:28), forming the greater part of the whole, are the next and most important occurrence of Aramaic in Scripture. There are, further, passages in Ezr 4:8-6:18; 7:12-26, amounting approximately to three chapters, in which Aramaic is used. In the New Testament several Aramaic words and phrases occur, modified by having passed through Greek

2. Extra-Biblical Evidences of Aramaic:

Formerly our knowledge of Aramaic earlier than the Targums and the Peshitta was restricted to the

above-noticed passages of Scripture. Now, however, discoveries, still comparatively recent, have put us in a different position. In the closing decade of last century extensive inscriptions were discovered in Sibbaldia, in the neighborhood of Aleppo, dated in the reigns of Tiglathpileser and the Sargonid monarchs, and one that seems earlier. More recent has been the discovery of the Assouan papyri; these bear dates which synchronize with Ezra and Nehemiah. Earlier than these in discovery, but between them in date of origin, are weights of the reign of Sargon, with two inscriptions, one, official, in cuneiform, which not only gives the designation of the weight, but relates the name and titles of the king; the other, popular, in Aramaic, which only tells the weight. More striking is the fact that frequently, in regard to contract tablets, while the binding document is in cuneiform character and the Assyrian language, the inscription on the clay envelope which served as a docquet is in Aramaic, language and letter. This affords proof that at all events before the reign of Tiglath-pileser Aramaic was the general speech for commerce and diplomacy all over Southwest Asia.

3. The Script of Aramaic Inscriptions:

When we come in contact with it, Aramaic is a fully formed alphabetical language, and has attained a further stage of development than the Assyrian with its cumbrous cuneiform. To the end, Assyrian was largely ideographic and hieroglyphic. The same group of symbols represented very different sounds according to circumstances, and widely differing meanings were connected with the same sound, with the consequent necessity for determinatives. The alphabet employed in Aramaic is practically that found on the Moabite Stone. It evidently stands at the end of a long process of evolution. It is probable that a hieroglyphic stood behind it; whether it is derived from the Hittite (Conder), or from Egyptian (Rouge), or Assyrian (Delitzsch), or is of independent origin (Gesenius), cannot be determined. Aramaic is, like Hebrew and Assyrian, a North Semitic tongue, standing in a manner between them. It is more regular in its formation than either of the others, a character that may to some extent be due to its use as a lingua franca over so wide a territory. Aramaic was the official language of the extensive Persian empire, as it had been to some extent that of its predecessor, the empire of Assyria. It may be regarded as having been generally understood from Asia Minor on the North, to the Cataracts of the Nile on the South, and from the mountains of Media on the East, to the Mediterranean on the West. Its history has been long; spoken, as we learn by inscriptions, from before the days of Tiglath-pileser, it is still spoken on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates.

4. Dialects of Aramaic:

These extensive limits, geographical and chronological, imply dialectic differences. Means of communication were so ineffective that the distance between the eastern and western limits would require greater time to traverse, than does that which separates America from Europe, or New York from Brazil. The primary dialectic distinction was between eastern Aramaic (Syriac) and western (formerly called Chaldee). The peculiarity which most prominently distinguishes these is the preformative of the imperfect; in the western, as in Hebrew and Arabic, it is yodh (y), while in the eastern it is nun (n) or lamedh (l). Each of these has sub-dialects. In Palestine, besides the Chaldee of the Jewish Targums, there was the Samaritan Pentateuch; in it, besides many foreign elements in the vocabulary, the use of

‘ayin instead of waw in the preterite of ‘ayin-waw verbs is the most striking feature. The sub-dialect of eastern Aramaic is Mandean; it is characterized by the use of the matres lectionis instead of vowel signs. From the inscriptions and the papyri it would seem to follow that the eastern peculiarities are the more recent—changes introduced through passage of time. In eastern Aramaic the script became more cursive than in western, which retained the square character we associate with Hebrew: except the Samaritan, which used a still earlier script, less removed from the angular style of the inscriptions. The script of the Assouan papyri indicated a tendency toward the later square character.

5. Grammatical Peculiarities:

Although an article like the present is not the place to give a full grammar of Aramaic, yet we may advert to some of the more prominent peculiarities, common to all branches of the language, which distinguish it from Hebrew, the best-known of north Semitic tongues. The peculiarity that most strikes the beginner in Aramaic is the want of the article, and the presence instead of the status emphaticus, which follows the syntactic rules of the Hebrew article. The next thing likely to attract attention is the use of the relative pronoun zi or di as if it were a preposition meaning "of." While in Hebrew the passive voice is generally indicated in the derived conjugations by internal vocalic changes, as the pu‘al from the pi‘el; in Aramaic the syllable ‘eth (E) or ‘ith (W) is prefixed (earlier hith). Instead of the Hebrew causative hiph‘il there is the ‘aph‘el earlier haph‘el with its passive ‘ethtaph‘al or ‘ittaph‘al (earlier hoph‘al). The causative had also shaph‘el and taph‘el forms, which occasionally are found. While in the Targums and the Old Testament Peshitta the syllable yath is the sign of the accusative (earlier vath, as in the Sinjirli inscriptions), the letter lamedh serves that purpose in Aramaic which is not a translation from Hebrew. A characteristic of later Aramaic prominent in the Peshitta of the New Testament is the facility with which it adopted words and phrases from Greek which had already largely displaced it as the common language. New Syriac shows a similar facility in regard to Arabic and Persian.

6. Comparison of the Aramaic of Sinjirli with That of the Bible:

A question of very considerable importance to the Biblical student is the relation in which the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra stands to that of the Sinjirli inscriptions and that of the more nearly contemporary Assouan papyri. In making the comparison we must bear in mind that the Hebrew Massoretic Text is the result of transcriptions extending the Bible over 1,500 or 1,200 years, according as we take the traditional or the critical dates for the books in question. This implies probably a score or more of transcriptions each with its quota of variations from the original. While the variations introduced by any one transcription might be few and unimportant, they would all be in the direction of lateness, and cumulatively might easily become very great. The late Hebrew of Ecclesiastes, notwithstanding its ascription to Solomon, shows how little the idea of the chronology of style entered into the thoughts of the scribes of those days, to check this tendency to modernization. It follows that while the presence of late peculiarities proves nothing but the inaccuracy of the copyist, early grammatical forms and modes of spelling are nearly indisputable evidences of antiquity.

The Sinjirli inscriptions, if we neglect the less important, are three, the Panammu inscription, the Hadad

inscription and the Barrekab inscription (Bauenschrift, Sachau). The first and last of these are dated in the reign of Tiglath- pileser, the middle one is placed by Sachau in the preceding century. It ought to be noted that, when first discovered, it was a matter of doubt whether the inscriptions should not be reckoned as Hebrew, rather than Aramaic The close affinity between them and Hebrew is shown in various ways. By a relation among the north Semitic tongues similar to that among the Aryan languages expressed by Grimm's law, where letters with the s- sound appear in Hebrew, in later Aramaic we find corresponding letters with the t-sound. But in the Sinjirli inscriptions we do not find this mark of the later language; thus we have sheqel, not theqel, shelathin instead of telathin, zehabh for dhehabh, etc. That this is not due to the proximity of Hebrew is proved by the fact that on the weights in Sargon's palace we find sheqel. Thus, the Sinjirli inscriptions date from a period when Hebrew and Aramaic had not been completely differentiated. There are other points of likeness. Instead of the 'aph'el and 'ethtaph'al or 'ittaph'al of later Aramaic, there is haph'el and hoph'al; instead of the 'eth or 'ith as the sign of the passive, there is hith. The vocabularies also are nearly identical. In both, the syllable yath or wath, sign of the accusative, is present, as if a survival, only as the support of the oblique case of a pronoun (Da 3:12; Sinjirli, Had 28). The pronouns exhibit a similar resemblance to Hebrew and also to Biblical Aramaic. The 1st person pronoun is 'anokh (once 'anokhi in Pan. 1.19), as in the Phoenician and Moabite dialects of Hebrew; 'anah occurs occasionally as in Daniel. The most marked differences from later Aramaic is "z" instead of "dh" in the demonstrative pronoun; here there is relation to the Hebrew zeh. Another case in frequent evidence is 'arqa' instead of 'ar'a.

7. Comparison of Aramaic of Assouan with That of Daniel:

More nearly contemporary with the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is that of the Assouan papyri. These are carefully dated, and extend from 471 BC to 411 BC; these two dates include the whole reign of Artaxerxes I, the king whose cupbearer Nehemiah was, and who sent him as governor to Jerusalem, and a few years of his predecessor's and successor's reigns. These documents, as written with a reed pen on papyrus, and not cut with a chisel on stone, manifest a very different style of letter; as already said, there is some approximation to the later square character. The resemblance between the grammar and vocabulary of these papyri and those of Biblical Aramaic is closer than that of the latter to the Sinjirli grammar and diction. Where, in the more ancient Aramaic, we have "z," in these papyri we occasionally find the later "dh." It is not improbable that, as in Spain, a lisping pronunciation became prevalent; the "dh" pronounced as "th" in "then" would in that case represent more accurately the sound actually uttered than would "z."

The word already noticed, 'arqa' which generally appears in Biblical Aramaic as 'ar'a, is a similar case. In northern Palestine the Arabic qaf is pronounced much as if it were 'ain, if not even the related sound hemzeh; instances of this spelling also are found in the Assouan papyri. Both of these differences are due to frequent transcription assimilating the spelling to the pronunciation. Another peculiarity is probably due to a different cause. In Biblical Aramaic the preformative of the 3rd person singular and plural of the imperfect of the substantive verb is lamedh. Of this peculiarity Dr. Bevan gives an ingenious explanation. If the yodh preformative were used, the resulting word would have a resemblance to the sacred name: to avoid this, he thinks, the yodh was changed into a lamedh.

Unfortunately this explains too much, therefore explains nothing. Had this been the explanation, the name "Jehu," which consonantally is nearly the same as the 3rd person singular and plural of the substantive verb, would never have been written as it is. Further, if Jewish reverence for the Divine name expressed itself in this way, we should expect to find this preformative in the Targums, which, however, we do not. Hundreds of cases in proof may be found in Onkelos alone. The truth is, it is a Mandean form, which proves that the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is eastern. A further peculiarity is the nun compensative; as tinda‘ (Da 4:23), which regularly would be tidda‘. This also is found in the Mandean; it is, however, also found in papyri of Assouan, an evidence that the Mandean characteristic was a survival from an earlier time.

8. Elephantine Papyri:

Another interesting point of contact between the Aramaic of this period and that of Daniel is exhibited in the Elephantine papyri published by Sachau. These papyri, discovered in the island of Elephantine (opposite Assouan) in 1907, are three in number, and are dated in the 14th year of Darius II (407 BC). In the first, ll. 2, 27, 28, the second, l. 26, and the third ll. 3, 4, we have God called "the God of heaven," the title given to God throughout Da 2. This is also the appellation used in the Aramaic of Ezra (5:11,12; 6:9 etc.) From the passages where it occurs it would seem that during the Babylonian and Persian rule this was the recognized governmental title of the God of the Hebrews.

9. Comparison with Aramaic of the Targums:

As it is frequently asserted that the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is that of the Targums, it is necessary to examine the truth of this statement. In considering this question son with we must have regard to the history of these paraphrases, as only in this way can we estimate truly the chronological value of this "great" resemblance, should it be found to exist. According to Talmudic tradition the Targums were delivered orally, and were not committed to writing till late in the 2nd century of our era. A traditional rendering was handed on from meturgeman (interpreter) to meturgeman. In such circumstances archaic forms, words and idioms, are perpetuated. The sacred always tends to preserve the antique; in illustration we need only refer to the song of the Fratres Arvales, a college of priests dating from primitive Latin times and continuing to the days of the Gordians. This sacred song of theirs preserves to us the most ancient form of the Latin tongue, though the inscriptions, from which we learn of it, date from the classic period. Hence the Aramaic of the Targums may represent the form of the language a couple of centuries before the Christian era.

10. Chief Differences in Latter:

We cannot attempt to give an exhaustive summary of the differences between Biblical and Targumic Aramaic, but indicate only some of the more obvious. Account need not be taken of yath, the sign of the accusative, as it appears only as representing the Hebrew ‘eth. In verbs, reference has already been made to the "L" preformative in the substantive verb, a peculiarity which Biblical Aramaic shares with Mandean in distinction from other forms of the language: also to the fact that the hith of the earlier

verbal forms is replaced by ‘ith in the more recent ‘ithpe‘el and ‘ithpa‘al. This also is the case with ‘aph‘el (in earlier and Biblical Aramaic haph‘el), the passive of which is hoph‘al, not ‘ittaph‘al, as in Targumic. The importance of verbal forms in determining age is readily recognized; thus in English, if the 3rd person singular of the verbs in an English writing is in eth we decide that writing to belong, in fact or feigning, to a period not later than the 17th century. In regard to pronouns, while in Biblical Aramaic, as in Sinjirli and Assouan, the 1st person singular is ‘an’a, in Targumic it is ‘anah: the plural in Biblical Aramaic is ‘anachna’ akin to ‘anachnah in Assouan, whereas in the Targums it is usually ‘anan, though sometimes the Biblical form appears. The 2nd person singular in Biblical Aramaic is ‘ant as in Assouan, with the plural ‘antum (Assouan, ‘antem): in Targumic it is ‘att and ‘attun.

To compare our own language, when we find "thou" and "ye" in a writing, we date it as not later than the 17th century. The ordinary vocabulary, though not without value in this respect, is not very important chronologically. Connective particles, however, are. Everyone acquainted with Hebrew knows how frequently yesh, "is" occurs; as frequent is ‘ith in Targumic. In the Bible, the papyri, the form found is ‘ithi. In the Targums ‘i stands for "if"; in the Bible and papyri it is hen. Cognate with this, the Bible and the papyri have lahen, "therefore": this is not found in the Targums, which have instead ‘al-ken. In our own language the presence of "eke" in serious prose or poetry as a conjunction would prove the antiquity of the composition. The fact that the distinction between "c" and "s" has disappeared in the Targums, but is still preserved in the Bible, is a note of age that cannot be passed over. Other examples might be given, but these will suffice. Professor Bevan lightly dismisses many of these differences as mere matters of orthography; yet in French the presence of "l" for "u" or as strengthening the "u" in such words as alx, eulx, aultres is regarded as a note of old as distinct from modern French; yet probably the pronunciation was not different.

In pursuing this part of the subject the latter portion of Pusey’s first Lecture (Daniel the Prophet) is worthy of study. Pusey had not the advantage of contemporary documents with which to compare Biblical Aramaic; he could only emphasize the nature and amount of the differences which separated the language of Daniel from that of the Targums. The argument can now be supplemented by a yet stronger argument from the resemblance between the former and the contemporary papyri of Assouan, and yet the earlier Sinjirli inscriptions. See further, SYRIAC VERSIONS; LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; and compare the article "Aramaic" in Encyclopedia Biblica.

LITERATURE.

Numerous grammars and dictionaries of the two principal dialects of Aramaic, eastern (Syr) and western (Chaldee) may be seen in any catalogues. There is an excellent compendium of the grammar of Biblical Aramaic in Delitzsch’s introduction to Baer’s Text of Daniel and Ezra. For the Samaritan there is a small grammar by Nicholls, also one in the series "Porta Linguarum Orientalium." Noldeke has published grammars for Mandean and New Syriac

J. E. H. Thomson

ARAMITESS

ar-am-it’-es, ar’-am-it-es, ar’-am-it-es (’arammiyah): The term applied to the concubine-mother of Machir, the father of Gilead (1Ch 7:14); the inhabitants of Gilead were thus in part Arameans (Syrians) by descent.

ARAN

a’-ran (’aran, "wild goat"): A son of Dishan, the Horite (Ge 36:28; 1Ch 1:42). It may possibly be connected with the Yerahmelite Oren (’-ren) (1Ch 2:25; compare Curtis, Chron. at the place; Dillmann, Ge at the place; ZDMG, L, 168); Robertson Smith claims that this name is equivalent to the Samaritan (’-r-n), "wild goat" (Jour. Phil., IX, 90). J. Jacobs translates it by "ass" (Stud. Biblical Arch., 71). This is one of the many totem names in the Bible. More than one-third of the Horites, the descendants of Seir, bear animal names, and those clans of the Edomites connected with the Horites also have animal names. The very name "Self" means a "he-goat," and Dishan, "a gazelle" (Stud. Biblical Arch., 70-72). Gray, however, remarks that "the instance (Aran) is most uncertain" (HPN, 108).

Samuel Cohon

ARARAH

Same as ARARAT (Tobit 1:21).

ARARAT

ar’-a-rat (’araraT): A mountainous plateau in western Asia from which flow in different directions the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Aras and the Choruk rivers. Its general elevation is 6,000 feet above the sea. Lake Van, which like the Dead Sea has no outlet, is nearly in its center. The Babylonian name was Urartu, the consonants being the same in both words. In 2Ki 19:37 and Isa 37:38 the word is translated in the King James Version Armenia, which correctly represents the region designated. It was to Armenia that the sons of Sennacherib fled. In Jer 51:27 Ararat is associated with Minni and Ashkenaz, which according to the Assyrian monuments lay just to the east of Armenia. In Ge 8:4 the ark is said to have rested "upon the mountains of Ararat," i.e. in the mountainous region of Armenia, the plural showing that the mountain peak known as Ararat was not referred to. This peak is of volcanic origin and lies outside the general region, rising from the lowlands of the Araxes (Aras) River to a height of 17,000 feet, supported by another peak seven miles distant, 13,000 feet high. It is only in comparatively modern times that the present name has been given to it. The Armenians still call it Massis, but believe, however, that Noah was buried at Nachitchevan near its base.

The original name of the kingdom occupying Armenia was Bianias, which Ptolemy transliterated Byana. Later the "B" was modified into "V" and we have the modern Van, the present capital of the province.

The "mountains of Ararat" on which the ark rested were probably those of the Kurdish range which separates Armenia from Mesopotamia and Kurdistan. In the Babylonian account the place is called "the mountain of Nizir" which is east of Assyria. Likewise Berosus locates the place "in the mountain of the Kordyaeans" or Kurds (Ant., I, iii, 6), while the Syriac version has Hardu in Gen. 8:4 instead of Ararat. The Kurds still regard Jebel Judi, a mountain on the boundary between Armenia and Kurdistan, as the place where the ark rested.

This elevated plateau of Armenia has still many attractions, and is eminently suited to have been the center from which the human race spread in all directions. Notwithstanding its high elevation the region is fertile, furnishing abundant pasture, and producing good crops of wheat and barley, while the vine is indigenous. Moreover there are unmistakable indications that in early historic times there was a much more abundant rainfall in all that region than there is now, so that the climate was then better adapted to the wants of primitive man. This is shown by the elevated beaches surrounding lakes Van, Urumiah, and, indeed, all the lakes of central Asia. Great quantities of mammoth bones have been found in these bordering lacustrine deposits corresponding to those found in the glacial and postglacial deposits of Europe and America. It should, also, be remembered that the drying up of the waters of the flood is represented to have been very gradual—it being 170 days from the time the waters began to subside before Noah could disembark. It may have been many centuries before the present conditions were established, the climate, meanwhile, being modified to a corresponding degree by the proximity of vast surrounding bodies of water.

Armenia abounds in inscriptions carved on the rocks, altar stones and columns, but they have been only imperfectly translated. The script is cuneiform and each letter has only a single phonetic character attached to it. But there are introduced a good many borrowed ideographs which have assisted in the decipherment. According to Sayce this cuneiform syllabary was introduced from Assyria after the conquest of Shalmaneser II in the 9th century BC.

George Frederick Wright

ARARATH

ar’-a-rath: Same as ARARAT (which see).

ARATHES

a-ra’-thez (the King James Version Araiarthes; Arathes; Ariarathes): King of Cappadocia, 163-130 BC. Educated in Rome, he imbibed Roman ideas and became a faithful ally of the Romans, in conformity with whose wishes he declined a proposal of marriage with the sister of Demetrius Soter. The latter declared war, drove Arathes from his kingdom and set up Holophernes in his stead. He fled to Rome about 158, and through the good offices of the Romans succeeded in obtaining for himself a participation in the government of Cappadocia. Later he again became sole king. In 139 BC, as a result of an embassy sent by Simon Maccabeus, the Romans wrote letters to Arathes (1 Macc 15:22) and other

eastern kings in behalf of the Jews. (See Diodor. XXXI, 19, 28, 32; Justin, XXXV, 1; Polyb. III, 5; XXXII, 20-30; XXXIII, 12).

J. E. Harry

ARAUNAH

a-ro'-na ('arawnah, 2Sa 24:16,20 ff; 'aranyah 2Sa 24:18, and 'ornan, 1Ch 21:15 ff; 2Ch 3:1, all from a Hebrew root meaning "to be strong"): A Jebusite from whom David at the request of the prophet Gad bought a threshing-floor located upon Mt. Moriah, as a site for an altar of the Lord at the time of the great plague (2Sa 24:15 ff; 1Ch 21:15 ff), upon which Solomon later erected the temple (2Ch 3:1).

ARBA

ar'-ba ('arba', "four"): Variously described as "the greatest man among the Anakim" (Jos 14:15), "the father of Anak" (Jos 15:13), "the father of Anok" (Jos 21:11 margin). Thus he seems to have been regarded as the ancestor of the Anakim, and as the most famous hero of that race. He was the reputed founder of the city called after him, on the site of which Hebron was built (Jos 21:11).

ARBA, CITY OF

See KIRIATH-ARBA.

ARBATHITE

ar'-bath-it (ha-'arbhathi): Perhaps "a native of the Arabah." Klostermann suggests "a native of Beth-arabah." The Arbathite is Abi-albon (2Sa 23:31), also named Abiel (1Ch 11:32), one of David's heroes.

ARBATTA

ar-bat'-a, ar-bat'-is the King James Version Arbattis, (en Arbattois (plural)): Apparently a district in the neighborhood of Galilee, from which the Jews who were in danger of attack by the heathen were carried by Simon Maccabeus to Jerusalem (1 Macc 5:21 ff). It cannot be identified with certainty. Ewald (Hist, V, 314, English translation) favors el- BaTeicha, the plain through which the Jordan flows into the Lake of Galilee. Encyclopedia Biblica (s.v.) suggests "the Arabah, or Araboth of Jordan." Possibly however we should look for it in the toparchy of Akrabattis, to the Southeast of Shechem (BJ, III, iii, 4 f).

W. Ewing

ARBELA

ar-be’-la (en Arbelois): This place is mentioned in 1 Macc 9:1 ff, and in Ant, XII, xi, 1, describing the march and encampment of Bacchides. The former says that "Demetrius sent Bacchides and Alcimus into the land of Judea .... who went forth by the way that leadeth to Galgala, and pitched their tents before Masaloth, which is in Arbela, and after they had won it they slew much people." Josephus says that Bacchides "marched out of Antioch and came into Judea and pitched his camp at Arbela, a city of Galilee, and having besieged and taken those that were there in caves (for many people fled into such places) he removed and made all the haste he could to Jerusalem." It was from the caves near the village of Arbela in Galilee that Herod dislodged the robbers (Ant., XIV, xv, 4 f; BJ, I, xvi, 2 ff). Josephus fortified the caves of Arbela in lower Galilee (Vita, 37), "near the lake of Gennesar" (BJ, II, xx, 6). The references in Josephus point plainly to the caves in the cliff forming the south wall of the tremendous gorge of Wady el-Chamam which opens on the plain of Gennesaret, west of the village el-Mejdel. A series of these caves, skillfully adapted to purposes of refuge and defense, is still known as Qal‘at ibn Ma‘an, "fortress of the son of Ma‘an." On the height above stand the ruins of Irbid or Irbil (both forms are heard today), which unquestionably represent the Arbela of Josephus. The army from Antioch may quite well have come this way. No name however in the least resembling Masaloth has been recovered in this district. We may mention Robinson’s suggestion (BR, II, 398, note), that it may stand for the Hebrew mecilloth, "steps, stories, terraces," and may apply to the fortress in the rocks.

On the other hand the writer of 1 Macc is an earlier authority than Josephus. If we accept his guidance, Bacchides must have crossed the plain of Esdraelon and followed the main highway southward through Samaria. Galgala may then be identified with Jiljilia, about 8 miles North of Bethel, and Masaloth with Meselieh, about 3 miles Southeast of Dothan. Onomasticon mentions an Arbela in the great plain, 9 miles from Legio (Lejun), but it is now unknown. The phrase en arbelois might mean that Masaloth was in the district of Arbela; but there is no trace of this name as attaching to any tract in this neighborhood.

One or other of these routes must have been taken. While no certain decision can be reached, special weight attaches to the statement of Josephus, on account of his acquaintance with the localities in the region, and his unquestionable familiarity with the history. See also BETH-ARBEL.

W. Ewing

ARBITE

ar’-bit (ha-’arbi): The Arbite or perhaps an inhabitant of Arabia in southern Judah (Jos 15:52). The epithet is used in connection with one of David’s mighty men in 2Sa 23:35; where Paarai the Arbite occurs. In the parallel list (1Ch 11:37) we have Naarai the son of Ezbai.

ARBONAI

ar-bo’-nai, ar-bo’na-i (Abrona): A torrent mentioned in Judith 2:24. Beyond what is indicated in this passage, it is not possible to determine the location; but from this it appears to have been near Cilicia. Identification with the modern Nahr Ibrahim is rejected on the ground (1) that the ancient name of this

river was Adonis, and (2) that this does not answer to the term "torrent" applied by Judith. A possible misreading of "the high cities that were be‘ebher ha- nahar" ("beyond the river"; Encyclopedia Biblica under the word).

ARCH

arch (’ayil; Septuagint ta ailam, in sense of "posts" or "colonnade"): Referred to repeatedly in Eze 40:16 ff, but translation is an error for "porch" or "portico." the Revised Version (British and American) gives in marg, "or, colonnade. The meaning of the Hebrew word is uncertain." The principle of arch construction was known to the Jews and examples of early Jewish rude arches have been found in Palestine. An arched form need not necessarily be constructed with radiating joints; it can be corbelled as at Mycenae (Treasury of Atreus). This type of construction has been found also in Palestine.

ARCHAEOLOGY OF ASIA MINOR

See ASIA MINOR, ARCHAEOLOGY OF.

ARCHAEOLOGY; ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM

ar-ke-ol’-o-ji, krit’-i-siz’-m: Archaeology, the science of antiquities, is in this article limited to the Biblical field, a field which has been variously delimited (De Wette, 1814, Gesenius), but which properly includes not only all ancient facts bearing upon the Bible which had been lost and have been recovered, but all literary remains of antiquity bearing upon the Bible and, also, as of the first importance, the Bible itself (Hogarth, Authority and Archaeology, vi).

Scope of Article:

Criticism, the art of scrutiny, is here limited mainly, though not exclusively, to the literary criticism of the Bible, now, following Eichhorn, commonly called the Higher Criticism. Thus "Archaeology and Criticism," the title of this article, is meant to designate the bearing of the archaeology of Bible lands upon the criticism, especially the Higher Criticism, of the Bible. The subject as thus defined calls for the discussion of, I. What archaeology can do in the case—the powers, rights and authority, that is to say, the Function of archaeology in criticism; and II. What archaeology has done in the case, the resulting effects of such archaeological evidence, that is to say, the History of the bearing of archaeology upon the criticism of the Bible.

I. Function.

The function of archaeology in criticism has only recently been given much attention and the opinions thereon have varied greatly.

(a) Ignored by Encyclopaedists:

Biblical encyclopaedists generally, until the most recent, have not given this subject a place at all (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Encyclopedia Biblica, Smith, Dictionary of the Bible, Kitto, Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature, Hamburger, See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, Eadie, Biblical Encyclopedia). McClintock and Strong's Encyclopedia Biblical and Ecclesiastical Literature has an article on "Biblical Archeology" consisting entirely of bibliography , also an article of a general character under "Sac. Ant." The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge Encyclopedia has an article, The Catholic Encyclopedia, 1907, has an article under the title "Biblical Antiquities," and the Jewish Encyclopedia, 1902, has an article of five pages on "Biblical Archeology" But on the function of archaeology in criticism there is almost nothing anywhere.

(b) Variously Estimated by Critics:

Critics have varied much in their estimate of the value of archaeology in criticism, according to their individual predilections and their critical theories, but until very recently archaeology has not generally been given a commanding, or even a prominent, place in criticism. Wellhausen seems to declare for the dominance of archaeology in criticism in the beginning of his History of Israel, though he very much ignores it in the pages that follow (History of Israel, 12). Driver (Authority and Archaeology, 143-50), thinks "testimony of archaeology sometimes determines the question decisively," but is "often strangely misunderstood," and the defeats of criticism at the hands of archaeology are often "purely imaginary" (LOT, 1897, 4). Orr thinks "archaeology bids fair before long to control both criticism and history" (POT, 305-435). Eerdmans, successor to Kuenen at Leyden, definitely and absolutely breaks with the Wellhausen school of criticism, chiefly on the ground that archaeology has discredited their viewpoint and the historical atmosphere with which they have surrounded the Old Testament. Wiener, the most prominent of recent Jewish critics, also believes that a proper apprehension of the nature of ancient institutions, customs, documents and codes, i.e. archaeology, and especially the archaeology of the Bible itself, is clearly decisive in its influence on the issue raised by the Wellhausen school (BS, 1908-10).

(c) Urged by Archaeologists:

Archaeologists generally for a long time have been putting forward the superior claims of their science in the critical controversy (Brugsch, Egypt under the Pharaohs; Naville, Recueil de Travaux, IV, N.S.; Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities, chapters i-iv; Researches in Sinai, 188-223; Spiegelberg, Aufenthalt Israels in Aegypten; Steindorf, Explorations in Bible Lands (Hilprecht), 623-90; Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments; Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition, xi; Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients).

The function of archaeology in criticism, as fully brought to light by recent discussion, is as follows:

1. Historical Setting.

Archaeology furnishes the true historical setting of Scripture. In the criticism of a painting, it is of the utmost importance to hang the picture aright before criticism begins. It is not greatly different in the criticism of literature, and especially Biblical literature. The patriarchs and prophets and psalmists are the "old masters" of spirituality and of religious literature; their productions were brought forth under certain social, political, moral and religious conditions, and within certain surroundings of influences, enemies, opportunities, temptations and spiritual privileges. It is only archaeology that can hang their pictures aright, and it is only when thus hung that true criticism is ready to begin. The critic is only then a critic when he has seen how archaeology has hung the picture (BST, 1906, 366).

2. Guidance to Methods.

Archaeology gives guidance to the methods of criticism. This it does; (a) Presuppositions:

With regard to presuppositions. Presuppositions are inevitable from our mental constitutions, and necessary to the consideration of any subject, since all subjects cannot be considered at once. But our presuppositions are naturally, to a large extent, those induced by our own experience and environment, until we are otherwise instructed. As it is only archaeology that is able to instruct us concerning the exact circumstances of certain portions of the Bible it is evident that, in those portions, without the instruction which archaeology can give, we cannot be assured of correct presuppositions in the critic.

(b) Canons:

Archaeology gives guidance concerning the canons of criticism. It is of the utmost importance that a literature should be judged only by the canons followed by its own literati. The innumerable literary remains of Egypt and Babylonia reveal methods and standards very different from each other, and still more different from those of modern western literature, but exhibiting to a marked degree the literary peculiarities of the Old Testament. In Babylonian literature, much attention is paid to epochal chronology. In Egyptian literature, comparatively little attention is given to chronology, and what chronology there is, is seldom epochal, but either synchronistic or merely historianic. In the Old Testament there is a mixture of all these kinds of chronology. Again, in Babylonian literature, there is carefulness and some degree of accuracy; in Egyptian literature, carelessness, slovenliness and inaccuracy are provokingly frequent. The Scriptures of the Old Testament are, in this respect, in striking contrast to these other literatures, ye t nowhere in ancient oriental literature is there the mathematical rigidity of statement demanded in occidental literature today; on the other hand there is frequently a brevity and abruptness of literary method which, to western minds, appears to be fragmentariness of documents. The attempt to elucidate oriental literature in the Bible and out of it by applying thereto the tests and standards of western literature is not less disastrous than would be the attempt to judge western literature by these oriental peculiarities.

(c) Literary Form:

Archaeology gives guidance concerning literary form. Much of the definiteness and unity of modern literature is due to the arts of printing and book-binding. All archaeological literature of Bible lands, lacking, as it does, the influence of these arts, is, in form, indefinite, or fragmentary, or both. These peculiarities in form and the causes of the same, archaeology makes very plain by abundant illustration. It makes clear, also, that fragmentariness and indefiniteness in oriental literature, in so far as it arises from the literary form and not from partial destruction of documents, in no wise militates against integrity.

(d) Interpretation:

Archaeology gives guidance concerning interpretation. Archaeology admonishes us of the truism, too often overlooked, that a language or literature means only what it is understood to mean by those from whom it comes, so that the etymological, syntactical and speculative methods of interpretation employed in criticism, in order to be reliable, must have the support of the historical method. In the absence of this support, more especially if contemporary history as revealed by archaeology be antagonistic, interpretation, though supported by all the other methods of criticism, is very precarious. The interpretation of a rubric by the etymological and analytical methods may be partly or completely overthrown by a single picture or a brief description of the priest at the altar. For instance, it is very disquieting to compare the remarks of commentators on Bible references to the worship at high places with the facts revealed by the recent discovery of high places and the worship there conducted (Macalister, PEFS, 1903, 23-31; Robinson, BW, January, 1901; January, 1908, 219-25, 317-18; Vincent, Canaan, 144). Archaeology must guide in the interpretation of ancient literature, whether that which has just been dug up, as the recent finds of manuscripts and monuments, or that which has never been lost, as in the Bible itself.

3. Facts to Test Theories.

Archaeology supplies facts wherewith to test theories.

Facts and Correct Criticism Agree:

There can be no real antagonism between the facts of archaeology and a correct literary criticism of trustworthy documents. But who or what is to determine when the criticism is correct? If there is conflict between the facts of archaeology and the conclusions of criticism, which must give way? To ask the question is to answer it. Theory must always give way to facts. "Where the testimony of archaeology is direct, it is of the highest possible value, and, as a rule, determines a question decisively; even where it is indirect, if it is sufficiently circumstantial and precise, it may make a settlement highly probable" (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 143). This prerogative of archaeological facts in the testing of critical theories must, then, of necessity be given wide and positive recognition.

(a) Theories Need Attestation:

No theory is to be finally accepted and made applicable to faith and life until tested and attested by facts; if it be a theory in the field of Nature, by the facts of Nature; if in the field of experience, by facts of experience; if in the field of history, byfacts of history. The Master brings even revelation to this test when He says, "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself" (Joh 7:17). Anything in the Bible may be discredited by theory; as everything in heaven and earth may be—indeed, has been—discredited by theory. One might as safely abandon the beaten track for the most alluring but unconfirmed appearance of an eastern desert, as turn one's life aside to a theory unattested by fact. However perfect the appearance, it may, after all, be only the mirage, and the disappointed pilgrim may never get back to the safe road. Let theory first be confirmed by fact; then it may be received into the life.

(b) Success not Attestation:

Even a theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand is not by that fact proved to be true, and therefore to be received into the life. The most alluring danger to which criticism is subject is the contrary assumption that a theory which meets all the known conditions of the case in hand is thereby proved to be true. This is not the case. Such a theory must, in addition, be corroborated by facts independently brought to light, or by mysteries unlocked; and even if mysteries be unlocked, the theory is not necessarily an entirely correct theory—the key that turns the lock must be something like the key that belongs to it, but may after all, be a false key. There must, in any case, whether of mysteries unlocked or of facts otherwise brought to light, be independent, genuine evidence in addition to the adaptability of theory to all the known conditions of the case in hand. And furthermore, a theory must not only be able to meet the test of some additional facts, but the test of all the conditions imposed by any additional facts brought to light, and be able, also, to incorporate these new facts as naturally as those upon which theory was originally constructed.

(1) Theory in Life:

The problem is not to determine one or several of the ways in which an event might have taken place, but the one way in which it did take place. A theory which meets all the conditions of the case in hand may be one of the several ways in which the event might have taken place, but only by independent, genuine, corroborative evidence is any theory to be attested as the way in which the event actually did take place. That this statement of the case is correct in the experiences of life, we have abundant evidence in the proceedings of courts of law. The most careful procedure does not wholly prevent false convictions. The prosecutor presents a theory of the commission of a crime which meets all the conditions of the case as made out by the evidence, convinces twelve jurymen, and secures a conviction. Yet sometimes afterward it is found out that another person committed the crime in an entirely different way. That the dictum under discussion is inapplicable to literature is equally well established. Sir Peter LePage Renouf argued with great acuteness and force that it is possible to assign significations to an unknown script, give meanings to the words thus formed, construct a grammar and translate inscriptions as historical statements and make good sense, though not a single sign, or word, or construction, or thought be correct (Life-work, I, 6, 7). He says of such a method: "It is not difficult to make out the Ten

Commandments, the Psalms of David, the Homeric Poems, or the Irish Melodies, on any ancient or modern monument whatever, and in any language you please."

(2) Theory in Literature:

Actual examples in fulfillment of Renouf's warning thesis are not wanting. The grotesque, yet confident, efforts at the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphs before the discovery of the Rosetta Stone are not forgotten. Dr. Budge says (The Mummy, 124): "In more modern times the first writer at any length on hieroglyphics was Athanasius Kircher, the author of some ponderous works in which he pretended to have found the key to the hieroglyphic inscriptions, and to translate them. Though a man of great learning, it must be plainly said that, judged by scholars of today, he would be considered an impostor." Joseph de Guignes (1770) maintained that China was settled by Egyptians, and the Chinese characters only degenerate Egyptian hieroglyphs. Similar failures in the attempt to decipher the Hittite hieroglyphs and translate the Hittite inscriptions must form painful recollections to distinguished scholars yet living, whose efforts, extending in some cases not only to lists of signs but to syllabaries, vocabularies, grammars and translations, are now, in part, and in some cases, in toto, rejected by the whole learned world. However successful present or future efforts of these scholars may prove to be, they have, in part at least, themselves repudiated their former work. The most plausible theory of a literature, though it seem to embrace every detail, may, after all, be found to be, as in one or two of the instances referred to above, wholly false when tested by the principles of philology and the facts of contemporary history.

(3) Theory in History:

The dangers of unconfirmed theory in life and literature are even greater in history, which, in its present-day form, is but life written down, human experiences given over to all the accidents and conventionalities of literature. The warnings here from Egyptian and classical history and literature are not to be disregarded. Menes and other early kings of Egypt were declared by critics to be mere mythological characters; likewise Minos of Crete; and the stories of Troy and her heroes were said to belong to "cloudland." But the spades of Petrie at Abydos (Royal Tombs), of Evans at Knossos (Quarterly Review, October, 1904, 374-95), and of Schliemann at Troy (Ilios: City and Country of the Trojans), have shown the "cloudland" as solid earth, and the ghostly heroes to be substantial men of flesh and blood. If we are to learn anything from experience, certainly no theory of either sacred or profane history is to be accepted as final until tested and attested by facts.

(c) Source of the Needed Facts:

Only archaeology is bringing forth any new facts on the questions raised by criticism. Criticism produces only theories; it combines facts, but produces none. Exegetes and commentators rarely, if ever, now bring to light new facts any more than present-day philosophers give the world new thoughts. A flood of light is, indeed, pouring across the page of the exegete and the commentator in these latter days which makes their work inestimably more helpful for interpretation, but the source of that light is neither criticism nor exegesis, but archaeology. Archaeology it is which sets alongside the Bible history the

facts of contemporary life and thus illustrates Biblical literature and literary methods by contemporary literature and the methods of contemporary literati, and which makes the purity, sanctity and divinity of the things of revelation stand out in their own glorious light by setting round about them the shadows of contemporary ritual and morality and superstition.

(d) Scope of Function:

Hence, no critical theory of the Bible is to be finally accepted and made a part of our faith until tested and attested by archaeological facts. Even Wellhausen, however far he departs from this principle in the course of his criticism, seems to lay it down as fundamental in the beginning of his History of Israel, when he says: "From the place where the conflagration was first kindled the fire men keep away; I mean the domain of religious antiquities and dominant religious ideas—that whole region as Vatke in his Biblical Theology has marked it out. But only here, where the conflict was kindled, can it be brought to a definite conclusion" (History of Israel, 12). G. A. Smith quotes also with approval these words from Napoleon (Campagnes d'Egypte et de Syrie dictees par Napoleon lui-meme, II): "When camping upon the ruins of the ancient cities, someone read the Bible aloud every evening in the tent of the General-in-Chief. The verisimilitude and the truthfulness of the descriptions were striking. Th ey are still suited to the land after all the ages and the vicissitudes." But Dr. Smith adds, "This is not more than true, yet it does not carry us very far. .... All that geography can do is to show whether or not the situations are possible at the time to which they are assigned; even this is a task often beyond our resources" (HGHL, 108). Thus critics, while here and there acknowledging the proper function of archaeology in criticism, have not heretofore allowed it much scope in the exercise of that function.

II. History.

Limitations of Discussion:

The history of archaeology in criticism to be set forth here has mainly to do with the testing of critical theories by archaeological facts. The contributions of archaeology to the furnishing of the historical setting of the Biblical narratives make up a large part of this and every dictionary of the Bible. The history of the guidance of critical methods by archaeological information is in the making. There can hardly as yet be said to be any to record.

A Wide Field:

The field opened up for the testing of critical theories by the results of archaeological research is so varied and so extended that only an outline can be given here. Extravagant claims concerning the outcome of this testing have been made both by some critics and by some of their opponents; as when Dr. Driver says, after except the points upon which the evidence of archaeology is neutral, "On all other points the facts of archaeology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the position generally adopted by the critics" (Authority and Archaeology, 145); or as when the astronomer, C. Piazzi Smyth, thought that the great pyramid proved the "wisdom of the Egyptians" to have included

some of the abstruse problems of higher mathematics; and Dr. Seiss, in his Miracle in Stone, was confident that the same colossal monument of Egypt definitely portrayed some of the extreme positions of the premillennial theology.

Some of the instances of the testing of critical theories concerning the Scriptures by the facts of archaeology, for which unquestionable historical proofs can be offered, are here presented.

1. Theories Not Affecting Historicity or Integrity.

Many critical theories, notably those not affecting the historicity or the integrity of the Scriptures, i.e. accordant with the face value of Scripture, have been corroborated and others discredited.

(a) Theories corroborated:

(1) Geography and Topography:

The theory of the geographical and topographical trustworthiness of Scripture, i.e. that the peoples, places and events of Scripture are to be found just where the Bible places them. Attempts to belittle the importance of this geographical and topographical corroboration of the trustworthiness of the Scriptures have been made (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 148; also LOT, xi; Smith, HGHL, 108), but such attempts are not satisfying. The theory of the correctness of the Biblical statements has been of well-nigh universal acceptance; archaeologists have fitted out expensive expeditions in accordance with it, exegesis has allowed it to enter into its conclusions, discussion has proceeded upon the assumption of its correctness, the whole body of identifications which make up Biblical geography and topography attest it, and the whole list of sacred geographies, uniform in every essential particular, are in evidence in support of this theory, even the works of those writers who have spoken disparagingly of it.

(2) Story of the Nations:

The theory of the ethnographical correctness of Scripture. That the relation between peoples as indicated in Scripture is correct, has been a working theory for all general purposes and only departed from for special ends. Kautzsch says (Die bleibende Bedeutung des Alttestaments, 17): "The so-called Table of Nations remains, according to all the results of monumental exploration, an ethnographic original document of the first rank, which nothing can replace." The progress of archaeological research has confirmed this general working theory and every year adds new confirmation with regard to particular items which, for some special end, have been represented as against theory. That the general theory of the correctness of the tribal relationships in Scripture has been, and is being, sustained, is indisputable (Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition; Gunkel, Israel und Babylonien, chapter vi; Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine, chapter ii; Winckler, OLZ, December 15, 1906; Budge, History of Egypt, I; Orr, POT, 400-401, 529-30). See TABLE OF NATIONS.

(3) Accuracy of Scripture:

The theory of the accuracy of Scripture in both the originals and the copies. Every theory of inspiration postulates this in greater or less degree, and the most prevalent analytical theory put forth by criticism, with its lists of words indicating, as it is asserted, authorship, demands, for its very life, a degree of accuracy and invariableness in the use of words in both the writing of originals and the transmission of them by copyists greater than that demanded by any the most exacting theory of inspiration. Wherever it has been possible to test the statements of Scripture in its multitudinous historical notices and references, archaeology has found it correct to a remarkable degree, and that in its present form and even in minute peculiarities of statement (Brugsch, Broderick edition, Egypt under the Pharaohs, chapters v-vi; Sayce, Patriarchal Palestine; Naville, Recueil de Travaux, IV, N.S.; Petrie, Tahpanhes; Tompkins, The Age of Abraham; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel).

(4) Bible Imagery:

The theory of the correctness of the imagery of the Bible. This is another of the fundamental and universal working theories of criticism which is, however, sometimes forgotten. Whatever theory of the authorship and the origin of the various books of the Bible, there is always, with only a few special exceptions, the underlying assumption on the part of the critics of the correctness of the imagery reflecting the topography, the flora and the fauna, the seasons and the customs. Indeed, upon the trustworthiness of the imagery, as upon the exactness in the use of words, criticism depends. And this underlying assumption of criticism of every hue has been confirmed indisputably in its general features, and is being corroborated year by year in its minutest details, and even in those very special instances where it has been disputed. To this end testify the whole company of oriental residents, intelligent travelers and scientific investigators (Thomson; Van Lennap; Robinson; Stanley; Palmer, Desert of the Exodus; Trumbull, Kadesh Barnea; Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches; Van Dyke, Out of Doors in the Holy Land).

Besides these theories of a general character, some concerning particulars may be noticed:

(5) Garden of Eden:

The theory of the location of the Garden of Eden somewhere in the Euphrates Valley. This theory has been all but universally held and, while it is not yet definitely of substantiated, is receiving cumulative corroboration along ethnological lines. Wherever it is possible to trace back the lines of emigration of the early nations mentioned in the Bible, it is always found that the ultimate direction is toward a certain comparatively small area in western Asia.

(6) The Flood:

The geological theory concerning the flood of Noah as the last great change in land levels is being most exactly confirmed, not only by investigations into glacial history, but by examination of the records of the cataclysm left upon the mountains and valleys of central and western Asia (Wright, The Ice Age in

North America; and Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, chapters vii-xi). See DELUGE OF NOAH.

(7) Sodom and Gomorrah:

The geological theory of the destruction of the Cities of the Plain has been exactly confirmed by the examination of the strata; a bituminous region, a great stratum of rock-salt capped by sulphur-bearing marls and conglomerates cemented by bitumen, an explosion of pent-up gases, which collect in such geological formations, blowing the burning brimstone high in the air, and the waters of the Jordan coming down to dissolve the salt of the ruptured rock-salt stratum—all this provides for exactly what the Bible describes and for the conditions found there today; the pillar of smoke rising up to heaven, the rain of fire and brimstone falling back from the blowing-off crater, the catching of Lot's wife in the edge of the cataclysm and her encrustation with salt (Wright, Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, 144; Blankenkorn, ZDPV, XIX, 1).

(8) Hyksos and Patriarchs:

It has long been thought that there might be some relationship between the mysterious Hyksos kings of Egypt and the Patriarchs to account for the favorable reception, even royal distinction, given the latter. This theory of relationship has been very fully established by the discoveries of Petrie at Tell el-Yehudiyeh (Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities, 1-16). He has not shown to what race the Hyksos belonged, but he has shown their tribal character, that they were, as their name indicates, "Bedouin princes," leaders of the nomadic or semi-nomadic tribes of Upper and Lower Ruthen, i.e. Syria and Palestine, and northern and western Arabia, as were the Patriarchs, so that the latter were shown by the former the consideration of one "Bedouin prince" for another.

(b) Theories Discredited:

(1) Uncivilized Canaan:

The interesting picture which was wont to be drawn of Abraham leaving all his friends and civilization behind him to become a pioneer in a barbarous land has become dim and dimmer and at last faded out completely in the ever- increasing light of contemporary history revealed by Babylonian and Palestinian discoveries (Vincent, Canaan, chapters i-ii).

(2) Concerning Melchizedek:

Concerning Melchizedek, "without father and without mother" (Heb 7:3), Tell el-Amarna Letters, while not wholly affording the needed information, have put to flight a host of imaginings of old commentators, and pointed toward Melchizedek's place in a line of kings at Jerusalem of unique title disclaiming any hereditary rights in the crown. "It was not my father and it was not my mother who established me in this position, but it was the mighty arm of the king himself who made me master of the

lands and possessions of my father." This title, over the correct translation of which there has been much controversy, occurs not once only, but seems to have been required at every formal mention of the sovereignty of the king (Budge, History of Egypt, IV, 231-35).

(3) Oriental Chronology:

The theory of the chronology of the early portions of the Old Testament, which made it to be so exactly on the principle of the system of chronology in vogue in our western world today, which, indeed, assumed that there could be no other system of chronology, and which was universally held as a working hypothesis by all classes of critics and commentators until very recently, has been greatly modified, if not utterly discredited, by both archaeological and ethnological research. Whatever may have been the system and method of chronology in use in early Biblical history, it certainly was not the same as our epochal chronology based upon exact astronomical time. The early chronologies of the Orient were usually historianic, oftentimes synchronistic, but very seldom epochal. The first, and usually the only, intent of present-day chronology is to chronicle the flight of time; the ancient systems of the East often introduced a moral element; events, rather than time, were chronicled, and the time in which nothing took place and the man who accomplished nothing were apt to be passed over in silence. Sometimes chronicles were arranged symmetrically, and again the visional conception of time found in all prophecy seems sometimes to have prevailed in the writing of history. Certain it is that ancient oriental thought regarded man’s relation to life as of far greater importance than his relation to time—a more deeply moral conception of chronology than our own (Green, BS, April, 1890, 285-303).

2. Theories Affecting the Integrity or Historicity of Scripture.

Many critical theories attacking the integrity or historicity of Scripture, i.e. reconstructive theories, have been utterly discredited by archaeological evidence, and, in some cases, abandoned by those who held them (compare Driver, Genesis, addenda, 7th edition, xx).

(a) Ignorance of Patriarchal Age:

The ignorance of the patriarchal age was once a frontier fortress which threatened away all literary pretensions beyond that limit. This ignorance, though never held by all advocates of a reconstructing criticism, was held by some. Von Bohlen scoffed at the idea of the "undisciplined horde" possessing knowledge of laws (Gen, 29-41; compare Reuss, Gesch des Altes Testament, 96; Dillmann, Nu and Josh, 594). Dr. Driver says, indeed, "It is not denied that the patriarchs possessed the art of writing," but thinks the possession of a literature by them a mere hypothesis, for the truth of which no positive ground can be alleged (Gen, xlii-xliii; also Orr, POT, 375). That this theory is absolutely abandoned by everyone hardly needs to be stated. The discovery of evidence of a postal system in Canaan in the days of Naram Sin (Sayce, Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, 143; Heuzey, Revue d’Assyriologie, 1897, 1-12), the strict conformity of many of the patriarchal customs and events to written law, as revealed by DeMorgan’s discovery of the Code of Hammurabi, Dr. Murch’s discovery of the Tell el-Amarna Letters, revealing as they do the wide diffusion of the art of writing about one hundred and

thirty years before the Exodus, together with the gradual pushing back by epigraphic evidence of the date of the origin of the Hebrew script (Clay, Amurru, 30-32), and the overwhelming evidence, from recent excavations, of the general culture and refinement of patriarchal Palestine, while not yet making known fully the exac t state of the patriarchal civilization, has made any theory of the ignorance of that age impossible.

(b) Religious Ideas in Canaan:

The theory of the nomadic, semi-barbarous condition of Palestine and of the impossibility of high religious ideas among the patriarchs before the Exodus (Kuenen, Rel of Ideas Israel, I, 108-109), though most closely connected with the preceding, demands separate notice. This theory is essential to the current evolutionary view of Israel's history and has been definitely espoused by nearly all holding that view (G. A. Smith, The Expositor, 1908, 254-72; compare POT, 60). This theory, though less important to ot her schools of critics, has in fact been held by nearly all commentators. But the discovery of the earliest wall- and cistern-work at Taanach (Sellin), and the engineering feats on the defenses and the water-works at Gezer (Macalister and Vincent, PEFS), and the 40-ft. city wall pictured in Egyptian illustration of Canaanite war (Petrie, Deshasha, plural IV), as well as the list of richest booty taken by Thothmes III (Sayce, Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, 156-57; Birch, RP, 1st ser, II, 35-52; Leps ius, Denkmaler, Abth. III, bl. 32, 32A, 30A, 30B; Auswahl, III, L. 42-45), which could scarcely be duplicated by all the museums of the world today, testify equally to the luxurious culture and refinement of the times. All this, in addition to the mass of evidence against the ignorance of the patriarchal age (see (a) above), overwhelmingly sustains the opinion of W. Max Muller that "the civilization of Palestine in the patriarchal age was fully equal to that of Egypt."

(c) Evolutionary History:

The theory of the evolution of Israel's history chiefly from a Palestinian origin and environment (Budde, Hist of Israel before the Exile, especially 77; Kuenen, Hist of Israel, 225; Wellhausen, Hist of Israel, 462). Palestine estinian discoveries show a contrast between the unique religion of the Hebrews and the religion of the surrounding peoples of Canaan as marked as it may well be. The evidence is not at all of a purer religion growing up out of the vile culture of Palestine, but of a purer re ligion coming down and overwhelming it (PEFS, 1902-9; G. A. Smith, Mod. Crit. and the Preaching of the Old Testament, chapter iv, especially 142; PEFS, 1905, 287-88).

Descending now to a few of the great mass of particulars, we may mention:

(d) Mythology and Bible:

The theory of the legendary character of the four kings of Ge 14, and of the Hittites; and theory of the generally mythological character of the early portions of the Bible. The four kings have been called "petty sheiks of the desert," and their names "etymological inventions." The historical character of the account of these kings has been utterly discredited by many. Noldeke in his Untersuchungen arrives at

the result that the history (Ge 14) is throughout a "free creation," and the person of Melchizedek a "poetical figure." And Wellhausen thinks Noldeke gave the "death-blow" to the historicity of the story (Wellhausen, Comp. of the Hexateuch, 311- 12). Ed. Meyer is of the same opinion as Noldeke, but expresses himself in a still more unfavorable manner (Gesch, 136). Hitzig, however, goes to the extreme of depreciation when he sees in the expedition of Chedorlaomer only an adumbration of the invasion by Sennacherib (2Ki 19:13). Delitzsch gives a very comprehensive review of those critics who have regarded this narrative of the kings as legend of small or no historical basis (Gen, I, 396- 99; compare Dillmann, Gen, II, 32-33). In addition, the mythological character of the early portions of the Bible generally has had ardent advocates (Stade, Gesch, 129-30; Schultz, Old Testament Theology, I, 31; Wellhausen, Gesch Israels, 317-20).

(1) Chedorlaomer and Allies:

But the four kings have appeared in archaeological discoveries. While there is still some dispute about the identification of certain of them, the confederacy has appeared in Babylonia and also the Babylonian suzerainty over Palestine in the age called for by the narrative, and, indeed, the whole historical setting into which the narrative fits with perfect naturalness (Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients; Hommel, Hebrew Tradition, chapter v; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, chapter vi). But myths do not receive archaeological confirmation such as has not only been given to the narrative of the confederacy of the four kings, but which is rapidly bringing out the features of the whole early Old Testament history (Gunkel, Gen, 263; Ladd, Doct of Sac Scrip, I, 737).

(2) The Hittites:

Then grave doubts in the past have been raised concerning the Hittites. Occasionally it has been boldly said that "no such people ever existed" (compare Newman, Hebrew Monarchy, 184-85; Budge, Hist of Egypt, IV, 136). But in addition to the treaty of Rameses II with the "Kheta," long generally believed to have been the Hittites (RP, 2nd series, IV, 25-32), and the references to the "Hatti" in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, also thought to be the same people, we now have Winckler’s great discovery of the Hittite capital at Boghaz-Koi, and the Hittite copy of the treaty with Rameses II in the cuneiform script. The Hittites are seen to be a great nation, a third with Egypt and Babylonia (OLZ, December 15, 1906). See HITTITES.

(e) The Theory of Anachronisms.

Aside from the general application of this theory by many critics to the traditional view of Scripture and the assertion of the systematic representation of earlier events in the light of much later times (Robertson, Early Religion, 30; Frip, Comp. of Gen), many special instances of anachronisms have been alleged. Edom has been said to be mentioned too early in the narrative (De Wette, Int, II, 71, Parker’s note; also Gunkel, Gen, 61). But an officer of Seti Meremptah II, about the time of the Exodus, in an official report, mentions the people of Edom as desiring to pasture their flocks in Goshen. They had thus early found their way clear across the Sinai peninsula (Muller, Asien und Europa, 135; compare Papyrus

Anastasia). Then Moab, long unidentified, has had doubt cast on its existence at so early a time as its first mention; but it also occurs in an inscription of Rameses II near the time of the Exodus, and the land of Moab is placed in "Ruthen," the Egyptian name for Syria and Palestine and northern and western Arabia (Kyle, "Geographical and Ethnic Lists of Rameses II," Recueil de Travaux, XXX).

3. Theories Now Challenged.

Several critical theories are just now challenged in the name of archaeological discovery; whether or not the challenges will ultimately be sustained remains to be determined. A few only are mentioned here, but they are of such a character as, if ultimately sustained, will have a far-reaching effect upon criticism.

(a) Semitic Origins:

The theory, long established and almost universally held, of the Babylonian origin and westward course of early Semitic culture, especially of religious traditions (Barton, Semitic Origins, chapter i; also "Tiamat," JAOS, XVI, 1- 27; Paton, Early Hist of Palestine and Syria, chapters iii-viii; Driver, Gen, 30-31; Orr, POT, 397). This theory has been mildly questioned for some time and is now boldly challenged. A complete "right-about-face" is proposed by reason of many archaeological considerations, which, it is claimed, make Amurru, Syria and Palestine, the home of the northern Semite, to be, if not the original source of Semitic culture, at least an earlier source than Babylonia, and the course of religious culture among Semites in that early age to be not westward but eastward, as apparently in Ge 11:2 the Revised Version (British and American) (Clay, Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites).

(b) Invasion of Canaan:

The theory of the gradual invasion of Palestine instead of the conquest is now for the first time challenged by evidence other than the record in Joshua. Such Palestinian researches and the collection of such evidence have but begun within a few years, and from the very breadth of the question the process is necessarily slow. So far, however, as the excavations have gone, the evidence is of a decided change in the culture even at such towns as Gezer, without, however, the Canaanite culture coming fully under Israelite influence and succumbing to it; exactly, in fact, as is represented in the Biblical narrative (PEFS, 1903, 49, Macalister; ib, 1908, Macalister, 17; Vincent, 228).

(c) AD Date of Hermetic Writings:

The post-Christian view of the Hermetic Writings. These Egyptian documents in the Greek tongue have been thought to reflect early Christian thought in Egypt, chiefly because of a certain "unholy resemblance" to gospel language found in them. A recent critical examination of these writings has established, it is claimed, by archaeological evidence gathered from the writings themselves, that the "unholy resemblance" to gospel expressions arose not from the reflection of Christian teaching, but from the appropriation by the evangelists of current expressions of Alexandrian Greek in use in pre-Christian theological language. This view of the Hermetic Writings, if finally established, cannot but have a far-

reaching effect upon New Testament study (Petrie, Personal Religion in Egypt before Christianity).

4. Reconstructive Criticism Not Confirmed.

(a) The Claims of Some Critics:

Not a single critical theory still maintained, either generally or by prominent individual critics, which proposes to take Scripture at other than its face value, has been sustained by archaeology. The assertion that is otherwise, that "on all other (controverted) points, the facts of archaeology, so far as they are at present known, harmonize entirely with the positions generally advocated by the critics" (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 145; LOT (1897), Pref, xviii; Gen, addenda to 7th edition, XXXIV-XXXVI), means either that such unsustained theories are not advocated by the person making the assertion and not by him regarded as generally advocated by critics, or, more commonly, that theori es in question have not been positively and definitely contradicted by archaeological evidence. But it is not enough that theories are not definitely contradicted by archaeological evidence; we have seen (compare above) that they must be definitely corroborated before being accepted and allowed to affect one's faith. An instance of the claims of criticism concerning the harmony between its theories and the facts of archaeology, a claim whose importance merits presentation at length, is found in the Addenda to t he 7th edition of Driver's Introduction to Gen, the latest and most positive utterance of criticism on this subject. Driver says (xxxiv): It is stated by Professor Sayce expressly, and by Dr. Orr and Professor A. T. Clay, by implication, that Noldeke's arguments against the historical character of the narrative of Ge 14 have been refuted by archaeology. The statement supplies such an object-lesson of the methods on which the opponents of criticism not infrequently rely, that it may be worth while to explain here the grounds upon which it rests.

Here are Professor Sayce's words (Monumental Facts, 1904, 54; cf, though without Noldeke's name, Monuments, 161 f): "In 1869 the great Semitic scholar, Professor Noldeke, published a treatise on the Unhistorical Character of Ge 14. He declared that 'criticism' had forever disproved its claim to be historical. The political situation presupposed by it was incredible and impossible; at so distant a date Babylonian armies could not have marched to Canaan, much less could Canaan have been a subject province of Babylonia. The whole story, in fact, was a fiction based upon the Assyrian conquest of Palestine in later days. The names of the princes commemorated in it were etymological inventions: eminent Semitic scholars had already explained those of Chedorlaomer and his allies from Sanskrit, and those of the Canaanite princes were derived from the events in which they were supposed to have borne a part." And then he goes on to declare triumphantly (55) how the progress of archaeology has refuted aH these statements. ....

It will probably surprise the reader to be told that, of the series of arguments thus attributed to Professor Noldeke, while the one about the names is attributed to him with partial correctness (though in so far as it is stated correctly, it has not been refuted by archaeology), the other arguments were never used by him at all ....(xxxv). The one grain of truth in Professor Sayce's long indictment is that of the names of the five Canaanite kings, which are given, Bera and Birsha (suggesting the idea o f "evil" and

"wickedness"), and perhaps Shinab and Shemeber as well, are formed artificially; but this (NB) is not asserted of the name of any of the four kings from the East. .... The fact is, Noldeke's arguments on Ge 14 have not been refuted, or even touched, by archaeology. .... Professor Sayce has simply not mentioned Noldeke's real arguments at all. Nor are they mentioned by Dr. Orr or Professor Clay.

.... Archaeology has met the arguments which Noldeke did not use; it has not met the arguments which he did use. Noldeke never questioned, as Professor Sayce declares that he did, the general possibility at this time of an expedition being sent from the far East into Palestine: his argument consisted in pointing out various historical improbabilities attaching to the details of a particular expedition; and archaeology can overthrow this argument only by producing evidence that this expedition, with the details as stated in Ge 14, actually took place. And this up to the present time (June, 1909) archaeology has not done.

(b) Noldeke's Assertions:

Compare with these declarations of Driver, one by one, though in somewhat different order, Noldeke's own words. He says (Untersuchungen, 157-60):

"The chapter begins with an imposing enumeration of kings, in whose time the narrated event is alleged to have occurred. .... Of what use is the dating according to kings, the time of whose reign is perfectly unknown to us? .... so that the dating is wholly superfluous and tells us nothing."

Bern and Birsha are said to be "quite decidedly unhistorical. .... The alliterative pairing also of these names speaks more for their fictitious than for their historical origin. It is striking that for the single historical city of Zoar, no name of the king is given. .... Besides, we are bound to no time, for the event recounted could quite as well have taken place in the year 4000 as 2000; the artificial chronology of Ge is for us no rule. .... Whence the narrator got the names of the hostile kings we cannot say. They may really have been handed down to him, perhaps quite in another connection. However that may be, the utmost we can admit is that he has employed a few correct names intermingled with false or invented ones, and the appearance of historicity thus produced can as little permanently deceive us as the proper names and dates in the book of Esther. .... Concede provisionally the correctness of the names of the kings and test the narrative further."

Here in a long paragraph, Noldeke follows the reductio ad absurdum arguing that, from a historical standpoint, the provisional supposition is incredible and impossible, and concludes (163), "Now this whole expedition is historically improbable to the same extent that it is adapted to the production of a striking effect; the usual sign that it is fictitious. .... Does not the manifest improbability of the narrative lie precisely in the details which give it the appearance of historicity?"

Concerning the story of Abram's pursuit of the kings and the rescue of Lot, he says (165): "If that is possible, then is nothing impossible. It may be replied that the number of Abram's servants was in reality much greater; but everything depends upon it, and the number belongs again to the very things which spread over the narrative the deceptive shimmer of historicity."

Of Melchizedek and the Amorite allies of Abram, he says (168): "So do the proofs pile up, that our narrative has no historical worth. .... Even if the rest of the chapter were historical we would still hold Melchizedek a poetical figure." He sums up the argument in the following words (170-71): "In accordance with what has been said, it is very improbable that the composer in the chief matters rested upon a real tradition of the people, but we must accept as a fact that it is a free creation throughout."

On the same subject, in reply to some of his critics (Zeitschrift fur W. Theol, 1870, 218-19), he says: "I sum up once more the general points:

(1) Of the names mentioned in Ge 14, several are unhistorical (the name of Sodom and Gomorrah, the three Amorites, Melchizedek; in my view, also, Abram and Lot, and probably the four overwhelmed cities).

(2) The expedition of the kings cannot have taken place as narrated .... even through the very clearness of the narrative are we made to know that we have here to do with a romantic expedition, the course of which is determined by aim at sharper effect, and which has for itself no historical probability.

(3) The small number of the host, in whose complete victory over the army of the four kings the story at last comes to a climax, is contrary to sense, while yet it designates about the utmost number which, as his own fighting men, a private citizen could put in the field.

"Whoever now throughout all of this will hold to an historical kernel may do so; he must then admit that at some perfectly uncertain time in great antiquity a king of Elam ruled over the Jordan land and made a warlike expedition thither. But that would be the utmost concession I could make. Everything more precise, as numbers, names, etc., and also exactly that which produces the appearance of careful tradition and trustworthiness is partly false, partly quite unreliable .... more especially, beyond the conquest itself nothing whatever could be known. But to me it still seems much more probable, in view of the consistent, and for the aim of the narrator, exceedingly well ordered, but still, in reality, impossible course of the narrative, out from which there cannot be separated any single things as bare exaggeration of the tradition, that we have here a conscious fiction in which only a few historical names have been used."

(c) The Facts of Archaeology:

Now, recalling to mind the facts of archaeology in this case (compare above) it becomes evident that they are very far from "harmonizing entirely" with the opinion advanced by Noldeke and reiterated by Driver, and the method of advocating such "harmonizing" appears very clearly. Moreover, what is true of this particular theory of Noldeke and Driver is equally true of other radical critical theories at present held. Of the current reconstructive theories of criticism—the patriarchs not individuals but personifications; the rude, nomadic, semi-barbarous condition of Palestine in the patriarchal age; the desert; Egypt; the comparative unimportance of Moses as a lawgiver; the gradual invasion of Palestine; the naturalistic origin of Israel’s religion from astral myths; and the late authorship of the Pentateuch—

not one is being sustained. In fact, however much archaeological evidence there may be that is negative in character or that is not definitely against the reconstructive theories of criticism, no one can point to a single definite particular of archaeological evidence whereby any one of these theories is positively sustained and corroborated.

5. The Present State of the Discussion.

The present stage of progress of the testing of critical theories by archaeological evidence may briefly be stated. The Bible at its face value is being corroborated wherever archaeology immediately and definitely touches it. To illustrate this statement fully would be to cite every definite piece of archaeological evidence in the Biblical field of scientific research during the last one hundred years.

But views of Scripture must finally square with the results of archaeology, i.e. with contemporaneous history, and, just as archaeological research makes that contemporaneous history to appear, critical theories at variance therewith are of necessity giving way; so that, as far as the process has been carried to the present time, archaeology is bringing criticism into harmony with the face value of Scripture, and is not definitely and unequivocally encouraging attempts at literary reconstruction of any portion of the Bible, although sometimes asked to render such service.

LITERATURE.

The bibliography of the discussion has appeared in the references fully given throughout this article. The bibliography on the subject of this article, "Archaeology and Criticism," is, as indicated above, exceedingly meager, since the importance of the subject has but recently come to the front and been generally recognized. The following may be cited: Driver, in Authority and Archaeology (Hogarth), chapter i; Eerdmans, Hibbert Journal, July, 1909; also Alttestamentliche Studien; Orr, T he Problem of the Old Testament, chapter xi; Bennett, Contemporary Review, 1906, 518.

M. G. Kyle

ARCHANGEL

ark-an’-jel. See ANGEL.

ARCHELAUS

ar-ke-la’-us (Archelaos, Mt 2:22): Son of Herod the Great by his wife Malthace. He succeeded on his father’s death to the government of Judea, Samaria and Idumaea, but was deposed by the Romans for misgovernment in 6 AD. See HEROD.

ARCHERY ar’-cher-i:

(1) The art of using the arcus, or bow and arrow for hunting and in battle is of great antiquity. It is mentioned in Ge 21:20, as well as in the Iliad and the Odyssey, and depicted on Egyptian monuments and in Assyrian sculptures. The Philistines excelled in the art, which led David to order that special training in it be given to the Hebrews (2Sa 1:18). It was an important art throughout the world in Biblical times (see Ge 27:3; Isa 22:6; 49:2; Ps 127:4). The Benjamites among the Hebrews were noted as archers (Jud 20), and archers constituted much of the fighting strength, and played no mean part in the victories, of the world-famed Greek and Roman armies.

(2) The bow was common to civil (Ge 21:20) and military life (Zec 9:10), and vies with the spear in importance and antiquity. It was usually made of tough, elastic, seasoned wood, and often mounted with bronze (see Ps 18:34 Revised Version (British and American); compare Job 20:24). But horn, too, was used for bows by the ancients, some with double curves being evidently modeled after the horns of oxen. The bow-string was commonly ox-gut and the arrows were of reed, or light wood tipped with flint, bronze, or iron.

(3) The battle bows, such as are mentioned in Zec 9:10; 10:4, must have been of great size, since they required to be strung by pressing the foot on the lower end, while the upper end was bent down to receive the string into a notch; hence the expression "to tread (= string) the bow," and "bowtreaders," for archers (Jer 50:14,29 Hebrew). The arrows, "the sons of his quiver" (La 3:13 margin, the Revised Version (British and American) "shafts"), were ordinarily, of course, carried in the quiver, which was either placed on the back or slung on the left side, secured by a belt over the right shoulder (HDB). The day of gunpowder and firearms, of course, was not yet.

George B. Eager

ARCHEVITE

ar’-ke-vit (Kethibh, ‘arkawey; Qere, ‘arkewaye’): One of the tribes which Osnappar transplanted to swell the mixed multitudes in the cities of Samaria (Ezr 4:9). The Archevites were the inhabitants of Erech, one of the four cities originally founded by Nimrod in Babylonia. (For its modern site compare Loftus, Travels in Chaldea and Susiana, 162 ff). Marquardt (Fund, 64 ff) emends the text to read di kuthaye’," who are Cuthaeans" (2Ki 17:24).

ARCHI

ar’-ki. See ARCHITES.

ARCHIPPUS

ar-kip’-us (Archippos): Addressed by Paul in his letter to Philem, as "our fellow-soldier"; probably a member of Philem’s family circle, holding some official position in the church (Col 4:17; Phm 1:2). See

APPHIA. The tradition that he was one of the seventy disciples, became bishop of Laodicea and later became a martyr, seems to have little historical foundation.

ARCHITECTURE

ar’-ki-tek-tur:

I. GENERAL HISTORY

1. Plans, Estimates and Measuring

2. Old Testament References

II. TEMPLE AND PALACE OF SOLOMON

1. Construction and Materials

2. Style

3. Facts

4. Phoenician Designers

III. CONCLUSIONS FROM ACTUAL REMAINS

1. Defense Walls

2. Streets

3. Absence of the "Grand Manner"

4. Solomonic Detail

5. Temple of Onias

6. Comparison with Maccabean Work

7. Painted Tombs at Marissa

8. Characteristic Feature

IV. HERODIAN WORK

V. SYNAGOGUES

VI. FINAL

LITERATURE

I. General History.

The words "architect" and "architecture" do not occur in the Old Testament or the New Testament. As the greatness of a nation and its social elevation are reflected in the course of architectural development, so is a nation’s failure to rise to firm establishment, after victory in war, reflected in the absence of such development. The latter condition was that of the Jews in Palestine; they failed so to establish themselves that their character and aims could find true expression in architecture. The country by reason of its geographical position and its broken territorial character, which exaggerat edition the tribal nature of its inhabitants, did not favor political empire (see HGHL, 10). The great difficulty of the Jews was the preservation of their own integrity. There could be no victorious expeditions to foreign lands to inspire monumental evidence of achievement in arms, nor had they the inspiration. of various gods or saints, to whose glory great and separate buildings might be raised. Their dwellings were, by force of circumstances, unpretentious, and their tombs were of the same character.

1. Plans, Estimates and Measuring:

Although in the smaller buildings there is very little evidence of the builder having been governed by a previously drawn plan, there seems no doubt that in larger works a plan was prepared. The Tabernacle was made according to a "pattern" (Ex 25:9) and Solomon’s Temple was also designed and submitted for approval (1Ch 28:11). Estimated cost was also considered (Lu 14:28). The equivalents to a tape line and foot rule can be identified (Eze 40:3,5; 47:3; Re 11:1; 21:15).

The Israelites arrived in tents, and the walled cities, "great and walled up to heaven" (De 1:28 the King James Version) which they took and occupied were well fortified, unlovely shelters, covering areas of anything from 12 acres, as at Taanach and Megiddo, to about 23 acres as at Gezer (Canaan d’apres l’exploration recente). The habitations within the walls were poor structures of mud bricks or rude stone; in many cases they were rock-cut caves. True, the Jews attempted, at the outset of their full pos session, to build in beauty, and made efforts toward greater substantiality, using the best available help; the attempt, however, was doomed to failure. Their most important buildings were their fortifications. The engineering skill displayed in the construction of aqueducts and other water systems was forced out of them by sheer necessity, and proved the existence of a latent constructive power, which they never had sustained opportunity to apply to architecture. In striking contrast is the architecture of the Crusaders. In a comparatively short time of less than 200 years, during the half of which practice in the arts of peace was well-nigh impossible, they stamped their occupation by the erection of an enormous number of

great and beautiful buildings, the ruins of which are among the most imposing landmarks in the country.

2. Old Testament References:

The often-repeated references to building greatness in the Old Testament, indicate a pride out of all scale with actuality. They tell the story of a long desert pilgrimage during which the Jews, as dwellers in tents, were impressed with the walled cities which, with extraordinary fortitude, they stormed and occupied, and which, with pardonable enthusiasm, they consequently exaggerated, to the glory of God. Although references to buildings in the Old Testament are frequent, they are seldom sufficiently de tailed to convey an idea of their character. Cain built a city and named it Enoch (Ge 4:17); his descendant Tubal Cain was "an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron" (Ge 4:22 the Revised Version, margin). The description of the plan of the ark (Ge 6:14 ff) is the first detailed architectural description in the Old Testament. Asshur, a descendant of Ham, built Nineveh and other cities (Ge 10:11). The tower of Babel was built of "brick for stone and slime for mortar" (Ge 11:3). In Ex 27:9-21 plan, dimensions and construction of the Tabernacle are given.

II. Temple and Palace of Solomon.

The most complete architectural reference is the description of the Temple and Palace of Solomon (1Ki 6; 7) and (Eze 40; 41). These buildings are fully dealt with under TEMPLE, but a brief note is here necessary, as they are by far the greatest buildings of which there is mention in the Old Testament. It is clear that Solomon had ambition for architectural greatness, and, following the example of David (2Sa 5:11) he employed Phoenician designers and craftsmen to carry out the work.

1. Construction and Materials:

It is known that the buildings were of stone, that the chambers surrounding the Temple were three stories high, that the Temple was roofed (presumably flat) with cedar. Fergusson’s restoration shows a sloping roof, following the precedent of the sloping roof of the Tabernacle (Temples of the Jews, 26). The walls and ceilings were lined with cedar, so that "there was no stone seen" (1Ki 6:18) within the house. The interior was enriched with carved foliage and cherubim, and in the decorative scheme, gold was freely applied. The description of the exterior is less minutely detailed. Stones were large and, as in the buildings of Egypt, were "sawed with saws" "from foundation to coping" (1Ki 7:9), "foundation to the top of walls" (3 Ki 7:9, the Douay Version). The inference therefore is that the masonry was smooth-faced: "no sign of any hammer" (Ant., VIII, iii, 2). Windows were "narrow" (1Ki 6:4 the King James Version), repeatedly referred to (Eze 40:16,26). In the interior of the palace, cedar beams were carried on rows of cedar columns, and there were three rows of windows, one row to each story, directly opposite each other. Doors and posts were "square in prospect" (1Ki 7:5 the English Revised Version), i. e. square-headed. In Eze 40:21 ff English Versions of the Bible arches are repeatedly mentioned but this is an error of translation. See ARCH.

2. Style:

In the description, there is very little indication of the style of architecture. The rich nature of the pillars of brass and their "chapiters" (1Ki 7:15 ff English Versions) point to some hankering after an ornate trabeated style. There is no indication, however, of such a style in constructive stone. No mention is made of a crowning feature of a distinctive kind, not even an eave, simply a "coping." The use of a coping suggests that the walls were topped by parapets, "battlement" (De 22:8 English Versions), accord ing to the law. Fergusson’s restoration shows both cornice and battlements (Temples of the Jews, Frontispiece).

One can only vaguely conjecture the sources of influence which guided the builders. The description clearly shows that the great columnar architecture of Egypt was not taken as a model, although certain Egyptian characteristics in detail are evident in contemporary work. Probably Phoenician intercourse with the Mediterranean, generally, showed its influence, in which case a comparatively poor result might be inferred.

3. Facts:

There remain these facts, namely, that here is described a group of buildings, of comparatively great scale; internally, at least, richly detailed and disposed in a way which shows considerable appreciation of architectural fitness, inspired by ambition for monumental greatness and dedicated, as was all that is great and spontaneous in architecture, to the glory of God. The one great flaw lay in the complete lack of a national constructive ability to respond to the call.

4. Phoenician Designers:

The Phoenicians who were employed seem to have been indifferent builders. They took 13 years to build Solomon’s house (1Ki 7:1) and 7 1/2 years to build the Temple (1Ki 6:38), and they, in all probability, found such a great work beyond their powers of adequate conception, more especially as the housement of a strange God was uninspiring. "Shalt thou build me an house for me to dwell in?" (2Sa 7:5 English Versions) was a command which they were only hired to fulfill.

III. Conclusions from Actual Remains.

There are only a very few known examples from which a knowledge of Jewish architecture can be obtained. There are none now standing, and what the spade has uncovered proves little more than a mere building craft of an inferior order. Remains of the period of the monarchy have been uncovered on several sites, notably Jerusalem, Lachish, Tel es Safi (Gath?), Gezer, Taanach, Tel es Mutesellim (Megiddo), Jericho, and these give a general idea of the building craft of the period, but give no evidence of an architectural style. It may, with good reason, be argued that there was no style, but it is too much to conclude that the Jews had no architectural instinct. Ideals were not lacking: "Behold, I will set thy stones in fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy pinnacles of rubies, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy border of precious stones" (Isa 54:11,12). Had history been different, Solomon’s great example might have laid a foundation from which a national style would

have been developed. The arts of peace, however, did not even bud, and the bane of internal and external conflict forced building energy to concentrate itself on fortifications.

1. Defence Walls:

Indeed in the great defense walls lies the building history of the Jews. They were hurriedly built and frequently destroyed. Destruction and reparation alternated so consistently, that each successive city within was little more than a temporary housement, at all times subservient to the more important work of defense. Under such conditions nothing flourished, least of all architecture. Building art became a thing of bare temporary utility.

2. Streets:

Streets were laid out without method; narrow, tortuous alleys broken into by projections, founded at the will of each individual builder, served as main thoroughfares (Bible Sidelights, 95; Excavation of Gezer, Vol I, p. 167 ff); compare similarity of conditions with streets of Mediterranean city of Philakopi (Journal RIBA, XI, 531). See CITY. Masonry was usually of rough unhewn stones, unskillfully laid without mortar, and buildings were rarely on the square. Under these conditions the enthusiasm displayed in the description of Solomon’s work can be understood.

3. Absence of the "Grand Manner":

In Jerusalem the Temple area was the center of architectural grandeur, and it is possible that it may have inspired building endeavor of another nature in other cities. Palestine has as yet yielded no such parallel. Free areas, where they are found to have existed, seem to have happened so, and do not always coincide in position in successive superincumbent cities. They lay claim to no particular "lay out" and, in all probability, they served as space for the dump heaps of the town refuse or for the pen ning-up of cattle and sheep (Isa 58:12, "waste places"). Compare the modern city of Es Salt; it gives a fairly good idea of the general appearance of an ancient Jewish city. The use of wooden shafts for porticos and roofs of large covered areas appears to have been prevalent, and these were frequently set in stone sockets which served as bases. Stone columns seem to have been sparingly used; in fact, there is no evidence whatever that a stone columnar style of architecture prevailed in the more important buildings.

4. Solomonic Detail:

At Lachish (Lachish, 23 ff) a number of voluted low-relief slabs were discovered which were originally built into the left reveals of the doorways of a building of considerable importance. These slabs were found in conjunction with a molded lintel of Egyptian character. The discovery disclosed the only authentic examples of the architectural detail of the Solomonic period, and is particularly interesting as furnishing, perhaps, the earliest prototype of the Ionic volute. At its best it is a shoddy uncon structive adaptation of exotic features, and if it is to be taken as a key to the work of the period throughout Palestine, there can be nothing great to record.

5. Temple of Onias:

When Onias fled to Egypt from the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, circa 154 BC, he gained permission from Ptolemy and Cleopatra to build a temple at Leontopolis like to that at Jerusalem (Ant., XIII, iii, 3). The temple was built in fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa and modeled after the temple of Zerubbabel, but "smaller and poorer" and "resembled a tower." Petrie recovered this temple (Hyksos, 19 ff) on an artificial mound resembling the Temple hill at Jerusalem, raised alongside the Hyksos camp, w here an influential Jewish community had established itself. It is the most complete plan of a Jewish building of monumental character yet discovered. A sort of rude Corinthian detail was used, and certain fragments point to a battlemented treatment, suggestive of Babylonian origin, and to some extent confirming the inference drawn from the description of Solomon’s Temple.

6. Comparison with Maccabean Work:

Fragments of contemporary architecture of the Maccabean dynasty throughout Palestine show a Greco-Syrian style of considerable dignity and interest, illustrating a readiness to respond to the Hellenizing influence in the arts, which at that time was characterized, in architecture, by a decadent Greek provincialism. The battlemented details, found at Hyksos, seem to indicate the use of a style antedating the Maccabean work, preserving, to some extent, Babylonian traditions.

7. Painted Tombs at Marissa:

From the 3rd century BC up to the Christian era architecture shows a consistent Greek origin with local character in detail (see Expl. in Palestine, 18, 19) at Tel Sandahannah and Mareshah (Painted Tombs of Marissa). These Marissa tombs show most interesting decorated elevations, with painted architectural detail. The work is Phoenician (93) and the date probably 194 to 119 BC (79). Greek Ionic capitals are used, with wreath enrichments painted on the architrave over the capital, and a deep frieze of painted animals, surmounted by a representation of a "battlement" "coping" (De 22:8; 1Ki 7:9) remarkably like the details found by Petrie at Hyksos. An interesting detail is the pointed head to the intercolumnar opening, a form which seems to have suggested itself universally to the primitive builder, where the handling of large lintel stones presented a difficulty. They call to mind the heads of Anglo-Saxon openings.

A liking for mural decoration existed throughout the whole Jewish period, as is seen from the small fragments of painted plaster discovered in the various excavated cities, but the decoration on the Marissa tombs is the most complete example, and resembles in many ways the mural decoration at Knossos and Phylakopi.

8. Characteristic Feature:

The tomb of Zechariah in the Kedron valley probably belongs to the same date as its neighbor, the tomb

of James, which De Vogue, from the inscription upon it, ascribes to the time of Herod (Le Temple de Jerusalem, 46). The detail of the crowning part of the entablature is an often-recurring feature in Palestine architecture, appearing as early as the Solomonic era at Lachish. It is characteristically Egyptian, and is also seen at Persepolis (Gwilt's Encyclopedia, 22), and although neither might have been bor rowed from the other, they are not many removes from the common parent. (A curious eastern tradition mentioned (BD, "Cities," 610) ascribes the building of Persepolis to Solomon.) It was a feature commonly used by the Phoenicians (Rawlinson, Hist. of Phoenician, 142), and was probably introduced by them from Egypt. It seems to have been in favor up to the time of Herod and was abandoned after the wholesale introduction of the classic entablature which in Hellenistic times was only partially incorporated into the prevailing style. The successive variations of the crowning feature of their design is an important factor in tracing the development of Jewish architecture.

IV. Herodian Work.

The Temple of Siah (described by De Vogue in Recovery of Jerusalem, 419 ff, and Temples of the Jews, 140 ff) is an interesting example of the work of the Herodian period and is more Greek in character than one would expect. Here, local character in carving is strongly marked, foliage and figures being freely used with a certain Assyrian manner which, in spite of loose handling, betrays its origin. In fact this chord of architectural enrichment can be traced through the work of In dia, Assyria, Persia and Syria on to the Byzantine period, when the great cathedral church of Sophia in Constantinople displayed it in the most perfect harmony of all time.

The great building period of Herod need not be detailed. Herod was an Edomite and his architecture partook of the more robust Roman style which dominated Jewish art at a time when the opportunity of national incorporation had passed.

V. Synagogues.

This Roman influence, however, remained in Palestine as can be seen by the important remains of synagogues in Galilee of the 3rd century AD (see Fig. 8 from Kerr Berim; Studies in Galilee, chapter vi; Memoirs of the Survey of Western Palestine, special papers, 294 ff). The many remains investigated shed light upon the plan of these post- exilic places of worship, of which there is little or no mention in the Old Testament. See SYNAGOGUE. The plans vary considerably in proportion. The example at Meiron measures 90 ft. x 44 ft. 8 inches, while that at Irbid measures 57 ft. 3 inches x 53 ft. (SWP, special papers, 299). In general arrangement the plans vary very little, consisting usually of five aisles with a triple entrance, most often facing south. The details are richly carved and "a surprising feature common to all is the use of animal figures, especially lions, or lambs and eagles. .... In some examples human figures, usually intentionally mutilated, are found" (Studies in Galilee, 110).

VI. Final.

It is probable that future researches may add to our knowledge of early Jewish architecture, but it is

doubtful whether there is more to discover than is constituted in the crude and unskilled use of building materials, influenced by limited knowledge of exotic features, which the Jews had neither the time nor the knowledge properly to apply. See CITY; BUILDING; FORTIFICATION; HOUSE; TEMPLE.

LITERATURE.

Conder, Survey of Western Palestine; Warren, Recovery of Jerusalem; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations in Jerusalem, 1894-97; Fergusson, Temple of Jerusalem; Masterman, Studies in Galilee; Bliss and Macalister, Excavations in Palestine; Macalister, Excavations at Gezer; Petrie, Excavations at Hyksos; Rawlinson, History of Phoen; Petrie, Lachish; Sellin, Excavations at Taanach; Schumacher, Excavations at Tell Mutesellim; Macalister, Bible Sidelights; Peters and Thierch, Painted Tombs of Marissa.

Arch. C. Dickie

ARCHITES

ar'-kits (ha-'arki; the King James Version Archi): A clan mentioned in connection with the marking of the southern boundary of Joseph (Jos 16:2). The phrase (gebhul ha-'arki 'aTaroth) offers difficulties, and it has been suggested that the order of the last two words be changed to read "the border of Ataroth-of-the-Archites." See ATAROTH. G. A. Smith identifies Ataroth with the present Atara on the high road from Jerusalem to Bethel, three and one-half miles South of Bethel and six East of th e upper Beth-horon. Hushai, the "friend" of David, was an Arcbite (2Sa 16:16).

H. J. Wolf

ARCHIVES

ar'-kivs (the more correct the Revised Version (British and American) rendition of beth ciphrayya', in Ezr 6:1, "house of the archives" instead of "house of rolls" as in the King James Version): A part of the royal treasure-house (5:17), in which important state documents were kept.

ARCTURUS

ark-tu'-rus: The "Plough" or "Charles's Wain" is intended. See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 13.

ARD

ard ('ard, meaning unknown): Either directly or more remotely a son of Benjamin. Nu 26:38-40 mentions five sons of Benjamin, together with Ard and Naaman, the sons of Bela, Benjamin's oldest son, counting all seven as ancestors of Benjamite families. In 1Ch 8:1-3 Addar and Naaman are mentioned, with others, as sons of Bela, Addar and Ard being apparently the same name with the

consonants transposed. In Ge 46:21 ten sons of Benjamin are counted, including at least the three grandsons, Ard and Naaman and Gera.

ARDAT

ard’-at (the King James Version Ardath; Syriac and Ethiopic have Arphad): A certain field where Ezr communed with God (2 Esdras 9:26).

ARDITES

ar’-dits: Patronymic of ARD, which see.

ARDON

ar’-don (’ardon, meaning unknown): One of the three sons of Caleb and Azubah, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:18).

ARELI

a-re’-li (’ar’eli, apparently the gentilic form of a compound that would mean "God’s lioness," or "God’s hearth"): One of the sons of Gad the son of Jacob (Ge 46:16; Nu 26:17). "Arelites" (which see) is exactly the same word.

ARELITES

a-re’-lits: In Nu 26:17. See ARELI.

AREOPAGITE

ar-e-op’-a-jit. See DIONYSIUS.

AREOPAGUS

ar-e-op’-a-gus (Areios pagos; Ac 17:19,22. Mars’ Hill, 17:22 the King James Version): A sort of spur jutting out from the western end of the Acropolis and separated from it by a very short saddle. Traces of old steps cut in the rock are still to be seen. Underneath are deep grottoes, once the home of the Eumenides (Furies). On the flat surface of the summit are signs still visible of a smoothing of the stone for seats. Directly below to the North was the old Athenian agora, or market-place. To the East, on the descent from the Acropolis, could be seen in antiquity a small semicircular platform—the orchestra—from which rose the precipitous rock of the citadel. Here the booksellers kept their stalls; here the work

of Anaxagoras could be bought for a drachma; from here his physical philosophy was disseminated, then, through Euripides, the poetic associate of Socrates and the sophists, leavened the drama, and finally reached the people of Athens. Then came the Stoics and Epicureans who taught philosophy and religion as a system, not as a faith, and spent their time in searching out some new thing in creed and dogma and opinion. Five centuries earlier Socrates was brought to this very Areopagus to face the charges of his accusers.

To this same spot the apostle Paul came almost five hundred years after 399 BC, when the Attic martyr was executed, with the same earnestness, the same deep-rooted convictions, and with even greater ardor, to meet the philosophers of fashion. The Athenian guides will show you the exact place where the apostle stood, and in what direction he faced when he addressed his audience. No city has ever seen such a forest of statues as studded the market-place, the streets and the sides and summit of the Acropolis of Athens. A large part of this wealth of art was in full view of the speaker, and the apostle naturally made this extraordinary display of votive statues and offerings the starting-point of his address. He finds the Athenians extremely religious. He had found an altar to a god unknown. Then he develops theme of the great and only God, not from the Hebrew, but from the Greek, the Stoic point of view. His audiences consisted, on the one hand, of the advocates of prudence as the means, and pleasure as the end (the Epicureans); on the other, of the advocates of duty, of living in harmony with the intelligence which rules the world for good. He frankly expresses his sympathy with the nobler principles of the Stoic doctrine. But neither Stoic nor Epicurean could believe the declarations of the apostle: the latter believed death to be the end of all things, the former thought that the soul at death was absorbed again into that from which it sprang. Both understood Paul as proclaiming to them in Jesus and Anastasis ("resurrection") some new deities. When they finally ascertained that Jesus was ordained by God to judge the world, and that Anastasis was merely the resurrection of the dead, they were disappointed. Some scoffed, others departed, doubtless with the feeling that they had already given audience too long to such a fanatic.

The Areopagus, or Hill of Ares, was the ancient seat of the court of the same name, the establishment of which leads us far back into the mythical period long before the dawn of history. This court exercised the right of capital punishment. In 594 BC the jurisdiction in criminal cases was given to the archons who had discharged the duties of their office well and honorably, consequently to the noblest, richest and most distinguished citizens of Athens. The Areopagus saw that the laws in force were observed and executed by the properly constituted authorities; it could bring officials to trial for their acts while in office, even raise objections to all resolutions of the Council and of the General Assembly, if the court perceived a danger to the state, or subversion of the constitution. The Areopagus also protected the worship of the gods, the sanctuaries and sacred festivals, and the olive trees of Athens; and it supervised the religious sentiments of the people, the moral conduct of the citizens, as well as the education of the youth.

Without waiting for a formal accusation the Areopagus could summon any citizen to court, examine, convict and punish him. Under unusual circumstances full powers could be granted by the people to this body for the conduct of various affairs of state; when the safety of the city was menaced, the court acted even without waiting for full power to be conferred upon it. The tenure of office was for life, and the

number of members without restriction. The court sat at night at the end of each month and for three nights in succession. The place of meeting was a simple house, built of clay, which was still to be seen in the time of Vitruvius. The Areopagus, hallowed by the sacred traditions of the past, a dignified and august body, was independent of and uninfluenced by the wavering discordant multitude, and was not affected by the ever-changing public opinion. Conservative almost to a fault, it did the state good service by holding in check the too rash and radical younger spirits. When the democratic party came to power, after Cimon's banishment, one of its first acts was to limit the powers of the Areopagus. By the law of Ephialtes in 460 the court lost practically all jurisdiction. The supervision of the government was transferred to the nomophulakes (law-guardians). At the end of the Peloponnesian war, however, in 403 its old rights were restored. The court remained in existence down to the time of the emperors. From Ac 17:19,22 we learn that it existed in the time of Claudius. One of its members was converted to the Christian faith (17:34). It was probably abolished by Vespasian.

As to whether Paul was "forcibly apprehended and formally tried," see Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of Paul, chapter x, and The Expositor, 5th series, II, 209 f, 261 f (Ramsay).

LITERATURE.

P. W. Forchhammer, De Areopago (Kiel, 1828); Philippi, Der A. und die Epheten (Leipzig, 1874); Lange, Die Epheten und der A. vor Solon (Leipzig, 1874).

J. E. Harry

AREOPOLIS

ar-e-op'-o-lis. The Greek name of AR (which see).

ARES

a'-res, ar'-es (Ares = Arah (Ezr 2:5; Ne 7:10)): 756 of the sons of Ares returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:10).

ARETAS

ar'-e-tas (Aretas): The name is a common one among Arabian princes and signifies "virtuous or pleasing."

1. 2 Macc 5:8:

It is mentioned several times in Biblical literature and in Josephus. Here it refers to an Arabian king, who was a contemporary of Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 170 BC), before whom Jason the high priest

was accused.

2. Obodas:

Another Arabian prince of this name, surnamed Obodas (Ant., XIII, xv, 2; xvi, 2; XVI, ix, 4) defeated Antiochus Dionysius and reigned over Coele-Syria and Damascus. He participated with Hyrcanus in the war for the Jewish throne against his brother Aristobulus, but the allies were completely defeated at Papyron, by Aristobulus and Scaurus, the Roman general. The latter carried the war into Arabia and forced Aretas to make an ignominious peace, at the price of three hundred talents of silver. Of that event a memorial denarius still exists, with a Roman chariot in full charge on the one side and a camel on the other, by the side of which an Arab is kneeling, who holds out a branch of frankincense.

3. Aeneas:

The successor of Obodas was apparently surnamed Aeneas and this is the Arabian king who figures in the New Testament (2Co 11:32; compare Ac 9:24). The Aretas, here mentioned, is the father-in-law of Herod Antipas, who divorced his wife to marry Herodins, the wife of his brother Philip (Mt 14:3; Mr 6:17; Lu 3:19). Josephus (Ant., XVIII, v, 1,3) gives us a circumstantial narration of the events leading up to and following the conduct of Antipas. Coupled with a boundary dispute, it occasioned a bitter w ar between the two princes, in which Antipas was completely overwhelmed, who thereupon invoked the aid of the Romans. Tiberius ordered Vitellius, proconsul of Syria, to make war on Aretas and to deliver him dead or alive into the hands of the emperor. On the way, at Jerusalem, Vitellius received intelligence of the death of Tiberius, March 16, 37 AD, and stopped all warlike proceedings (Ant., XVIII, v, 1,3). According to 2Co 11:32, Damascus, which had formerly belonged to the Arabian princes, was again in the hands of Are tas, when Paul escaped from it, not immediately after his conversion, but on a subsequent visit, after his Arabian exile (Ga 1:16,17). It is inconceivable that Aretas should have taken Damascus by force, in the face of the almost omnipotent power of Rome. The picture moreover, which Josephus draws of the Herodian events, points to a passive rather than an active attitude on the part of Aretas. The probability is that Cajus Caligula, the new emperor, wishing to settle the affairs of Syria, freely gave Damascu s to Aretas, inasmuch as it had formerly belonged to his territory. As Tiberius died in 37 AD, and as the Arabian affair was completely settled in 39 AD, it is evident that the date of Paul’s conversion must lie somewhere between 34 and 36 AD. This date is further fixed by a Damascus coin, with the image of King Aretas and the date 101. If that date points to the Pompeian era, it equals 37 AD, making the date of Paul’s conversion 34 AD (Mionnet, Descript. des medailles antiques, V, 284-85).

Henry E. Dosker

ARGOB (1)

ar’-gob (’argobh, "story"): A locality or a person mentioned in the obscure passage 2Ki 15:25. The context deals with Pekah’s conspiracy against Pekahiah; but it is not clear, owing to the state of the text,

whether Argob and his associate Arieh (if these are the names of men) were officers of Pekahiah who were slain with him, or fellow- conspirators with Pekah. The vulg takes them as names of places; they may then be considered glosses that have crept into the text. Rashi holds that Argob was the royal palace. Argob is more likely the name of a place than a person. See ARIEH.

H. J. Wolf

ARGOB (2)

ar'-gob (ha-'argobh; ha-argobh or Argob): A region East of the Jordan which in De 3:4,5 is equivalent to the kingdom of Og in Bashan, and in 3:13 is referred to as "all the region of Argob, even all Bashan." De 3:14 is evidently corrupt. Havvoth-jair lay not in Bashan but in Gilead (Jud 10:4; Nu 32:40 f; 1Ki 4:13). It contained threescore cities. "All these were cities fortified with high walls, gates and bars; besides the unwalled towns a great many." De 3:14 seems to say that it marched with Geshur and Maacah; but we cannot lay stress on this. We may take it that Argob lay in the land of Bashan; beyond this, on available data, we cannot certainly go.

The word chebhel, translated "region," means primarily a line or cord, then "a measuring line," then "the portion measured," e.g. "the part of the children of Judah" (Jos 19:9), the "lot" or "portion" of an inheritance (De 32:9; Jos 17:14, etc.). Chebhel precedes Argob in each of the four cases where it is named. This has led many to think that a district with very clearly marked borders is intended. No region so well meets this condition as el-Leja', a volcanic tract lying about 20 miles South of Damascus, and 30 miles East of the Sea of Galilee. It is roughly triangular in form, with the apex to the North, and is about 25 miles long, with a base of some 20 miles. The lava which has hardened into this confused wilderness of black rock, rent and torn by countless fissures, flowed from the craters whose dark forms are seen on the East.

It rises to an average height of about 20 ft. above the plain, on which it lies like an island on a sea of emerald, the edges being sharply defined. At all points it is difficult of entrance, and might be defended by a few resolute men against an army. To this fact doubtless it owes its name el-Leja'," the refuge." There are many traces of considerable cities in the interior. The present writer collected there the names of no fewer than seventy-one ruined sites. See further TRACHONITIS. This identification is supported by taking 'argobh as the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek trachon, "stony." This is possible only if, as Gesenius assumes, the root raghabh is cognate with ragham, an extremely precarious assumption. "Clod" is the translation of the word reghebh in Job 21:33; 38:38; probably therefore 'argobh should be tendered "a region of clods," i.e. "arable land." This practically rules out el-Leja'.

We have seen above that the term chebhel need have no reference to the clearly marked rocky boundaries. As regards the great cities, all Bashan is studded with the ruins of such. The splendid remains that everywhere meet the traveler's eye were thought by Porter (Giant Cities of Bashan) and others, to be the wreck of the great cities that struck the invading Israelites with wonder. It is now clear that the ruins above ground are not older than the beginning of our era. The Greek and Roman

architecture is easily recognized. Probably, however, excavation will prove that in very many cases the sites have been occupied from very ancient times. Cave dwellings, chambers cut in the rock and covered with stone vaults, and what may be described as subterranean cities, have been found in different parts, the antiquity of which it is impossible to estimate. There is nothing which enables us to identify the region of Argob. The whole country of Bashan., with the exception of el-Leja', is "arable land." The soil is very fertile, composed of lava detritus. In almost every district might have been found the threescore cities. Guthe suggests the western part of el-Chauran, stretching from Edrei (Der'ah) to Nawa. Buhl would locate it in the district of ec-Cuweit, to the Southeast of the low range of ez-Zumleh. This however seems too far to the South. The Southwest slopes of Jebel ed-Druze seem to meet the conditions as well as any. They form quite a wellmarked district; they are very fertile, and the strong cities in the region must have been numerous.

W. Ewing

ARGUE

ar'-gu: Only in the Revised Version (British and American) in Job 40:2. yakhach, which it translates, literally means "to be right," and in the causative form "reason with," "answer back," and is found in the King James Version rendered "reproach."

ARIARATHES

a-ri-a-ra'-thez. See ARATHES.

ARIDAI

ar'-i-di, a-rid'-a-i ('aridhay: a son of Haman (Es 9:9)): The name may be related to the Persian Hari-dayas, "delight of Hari"; the text is very uncertain.

ARIDATHA

ar-i-da'-tha, a-rid'-a-tha ('aridhatha'): A son of Haman (Es 9:8). It may be related to the Persian Hari-data, "given by Hari." The Septuagint reads Pharadatha.

ARIEH

a'-ri-e: "(the) Lion." See ARGOB.

ARIEL

a’-ri-el (’ariy’el or ‘ari’el, "lioness of God"): But the word occurs in Eze 43:15,16, and is there translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "ALTAR HEARTH."

(1) According to the Revised Version (British and American) a man of Moab whose two sons were slain by David’s warrior Benaiah the son of Jehoiada (2Sa 23:20; 1Ch 11:22). Here the King James Version translates "two lionlike men of Moab."

(2) A name applied to Jerusalem (Isa 29:1,2,7). The many explanations of the name are interesting, but mainly conjectural.

(3) One of the members of the delegation sent by Ezra to the place Casiphia, to secure temple ministers for his expedition to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16).

Willis J. Beecher

ARIGHT

a-rit’:"In a right way," "correctly," "going straight to the point," without error or deviation. "Set aright" (Job 11:13; Wiener, Pentateuchal Studies 78 8). Its use in Ps 50:23 is without authority in the Hebrew text; hence in italics.

ARIMATHAEA

ar-i-ma-the’-a (Arimathaia): "A city of the Jews," the home of Joseph in whose sepulchre the body of Jesus was laid. Its identity is the subject of much conjecture. The Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome identifies it with Ramathaim- Zophim in the hill-country of Ephraim (1Sa 11), which is Ramah the birthplace and burial-place of Samuel (1Sa 1:19; 25:1), and places it near Timnah on the borders of Judah and Dan. G. A. Smith thinks it may be the modern Beit Rima, a village on an eminence 2 miles North of Timnah. Others incline to Ramallah, 8 miles North of Jerusalem and 3 miles from Bethel (Mt 27:57; Mr 15:43; Lu 23:51; Joh 19:38).

S. F. Hunter

ARIOCH

ar’-i-ok: (’aryokh):

(1) The name of the vassal king of Ellasar, under Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and Amraphel, king of Shinar (Babylonia), who took part in the expedition against Sodom, Gomorrah and other states (Ge 14:1,9). Assyriologists generally, and probably rightly, identify Arioch with Eri-Aku (which see), king of Larsa, Ellasar being for Al-Larsa (now Sinqara in central Babylonia).

Texts Referring to the Reign of Arioch:

For an account of the expedition see AMRAPHEL, and for the Babylonian texts bearing upon the reign, see ERI-AKU. In Ge 14:1,9, where the names of the allied kings who marched against the Cities of the Plain are given, that of Arioch follows his more immediate suzerain, Amraphel, and not Chedorlaomer, who, however, appears to have been the real overlord (verse 4), which agrees with the indications of the Bah records. No details of the expedition are available from Babylonian sources. Besides Larsa, Eri-Aku's inscriptions inform us that Ur (Muqayyar, Mugheir) was in the principality of which Larsa was the capital.

(2) The Arioch of Da 2:14,25 was captain of the bodyguard of King Nebuchadnezzar. Nothing else is known about him except that it was he who was commanded to slay the "wise men" who failed to repeat to the king his dream and its interpretation; and who communicated to his royal master that Daniel had undertaken the task.

T. G. Pinches

ARISAI

ar'-i-sai, a-ris'-a-i ('aricai): Probably a Persian word of unknown meaning. One of Haman's sons, slain by the Jews (Es 9:9).

ARISTARCHUS

ar-is-tar'-kus (Aristarchos, "best ruler"): He was one of those faithful companions of the apostle Paul who shared with him his labors and sufferings. He is suddenly mentioned along with Gaius as having been seized by the excited Ephesians during the riot stirred up by the silversmiths (Ac 19:29). They are designated "men of Macedonia, Paul's companions in travel." We learn later that he was a native of Thessalonica (Ac 20:4; 27:2). They were probably seized to extract from them information about their leader Paul, but when they could tell nothing, and since they were Greeks, nothing further was done to them.

When Aristarchus attached himself to Paul we do not know, but he seems ever after the Ephesian uproar to have remained in Paul's company. He was one of those who accompanied Paul from Greece via Macedonia (Ac 20:4). Having preceded Paul to Troas, where they waited for him, they traveled with him to Palestine. He is next mentioned as accompanying Paul to Rome (Ac 27:2). There he attended Paul and shared his imprisonment. He is mentioned in two of the letters of the Roman captivity, in the Epistle to the church at Col 4:10, and in the Epistle to Phm (Phm 1:24), in both of which he sends greetings. In the former Paul calls him "my fellow-prisoner." According to tradition he was martyred during the persecution of Nero.

S. F. Hunter

ARISTOBULUS

ar-is-to-bu’-lus (Aristoboulos, "best counselor"):

(1) Son of the Maccabean, John Hyrcanus, who assumed the power and also the title of king after his father’s death (105 BC) and associated with him, as co-regent, his brother Antigonus (Ant., XIII, xi), though by the will of his father the government was entrusted to his mother. Three other brothers and his mother he cast into prison, where they died of starvation. He murdered Antigonus, and died conscience-stricken himself in 104 BC. See MACCABEES.

(2) Aristobulus, nephew of the former, dethroned his mother, Alexandra (69 BC), and forced his brother Hyrcanus to renounce the crown and mitre in his favor. In 64 Pompey came to Palestine and supported the cause of Hyrcanus. See HYRCANUS. Aristobulus was defeated and taken prisoner, and Hyrcanus was appointed ethnarch in 63 BC. Aristobulus and his two daughters were taken to Rome, where he graced the triumph of Pompey. The father escaped later (56 BC) and appeared in Palestine again as a claimant to the throne. Many followers flocked to his standard, but he was finally defeated, severely wounded and taken prisoner a second time and with his son, Antigonus, again taken to Rome. Julius Caesar not only restored him to freedom (49 BC), but also gave him two legions to recover Judea, and to work in his interest against Pompey. But Quintus Metellus Scipio, who had just received Syria as a province, had Aristobulus poisoned as he was on his way to Palestine.CR

(3) Grandson of the preceding, and the last of the Maccabean family. See ASMONEANS.

(4) The Jewish teacher of Ptol. VII (2 Macc 1:10).

(5) An inhabitant of Rome, certain of whose household are saluted by Paul (Ro 16:10). He was probably a grandson of Herod and brother of Herod Agrippa, a man of great wealth, and intimate with the emperor Claudius. Lightfoot (Philippians, 172) suggests that "the household of Aristobulus" were his slaves, and that upon his death they had kept together and had become the property of the emperor either by purchase or as a legacy, in which event, however, they might, still retain the name of their former master. Among these were Christians to whom Paul sends greeting.

M. O. Evans

ARITHMETIC

a-rith’-me-tik. See NUMBER.

ARIUS

a-ri’-us, a’-ri-us (Ares): The reading of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) adopted in the Revised Version (British and American) for the former reading Areus and Areios of Josephus. A king of Sparta (309-265 BC) who wrote the letter to Onias, the high priest, given in 1 Macc 12:7,20-23. There were two Spartan kings named Arius, and three high priests named Onias. Chronology requires the letter mentioned to have been written by Arius I to Onias I, most probably in the interval between 309 and 300 BC. See LACEDAEMONIANS.

ARK

see ARK OF BULRUSHES; ARK OF THE COVENANT; ARK OF NOAH

ARK OF BULRUSHES

ark, bool’-rush-iz (tebhah; Egyptian tebt; Septuagint thibis, "a chest," "a vessel to float").

1. Definitions:

The Hebrew word here translated "ark" is used in the Old Testament only of the ark of Noah (Ge 6:14 ff) and of the ark of bulrushes (Ex 2:3), and always in the secondary meaning, a vessel to float. The Septuagint translates it of Noah’s ark by kibotos, "a casket," and of the ark of bulrushes by thibis, a little basket made of osiers or flags. For the Ark of the Covenant, the Hebrew employed a different word (’aron, "a chest"). Bulrushes (gome’," papyrus"): This species of reed was used by the Egyptians for many different vessels, some of which were intended to float or even to be used as a skiff. Slime (chemar, "bitumen"), pitch (zepheth, "pitch") was probably the sticky mud of the Nile with which to this day so many things in Egypt are plastered. In this case it was mixed with bitumen. Flags (cuph, "sedge") were reeds of every kind and tall grass growing in the shallow water at the edge of the river.

2. History:

Thus the ark of bulrushes was a vessel made of papyrus stalks and rendered fit to float by being covered with a mixture of bitumen and mud. Into this floating vessel the mother of Moses placed the boy when he was three months old, and put the vessel in the water among the sedge along the banks of the Nile at the place where the ladies from the palace were likely to come to bathe. The act was a pathetic imitation of obedience to the king’s command to throw boy babies into the river, a command which she had for three months braved and which now she so obeyed as probably to bring the cruelty of the king to the notice of the royal ladies in such way as to arouse a womanly sympathy, A similar story is related of Sargon I of Babylonia (Records of the Past, 1st series, V, 1-4; Rogers, Hist. Babylonian and Assyrian, I, 362).

The one story in no wise discredits the other. That method of abandoning children, either willingly or by necessity, is as natural along the Nile and the Euphrates, where the river is the great artery of the land

and where the floating basket had been used from time immemorial, as is the custom in our modern cities of placing abandoned infants in the streets or on door-steps where they are likely to be found, and such events probably occurred then as often as now.

M. G. Kyle

ARK OF NOAH

ark, no'-a: A structure built by Noah at the command of God to preserve from the Flood a remnant of the human race and of the animals associated with man. It was constructed of "gopher wood" (Ge 6:14)—very likely the cypress used extensively by the Phoenicians for ship-building. It was divided into rooms or nests, and was three stories high, pitched within and without with bitumen or "asphalt," of which there are extensive deposits at Hit, in the Euphrates valley, a little above Babylon. It was 300 cubits long, 50 cubits broad, 30 cubits high, which according to Petrie's estimate of a cubit as 22.5 inches would make it to be 562 1/2 ft. long, 93 2/3 ft. wide, 56 1/4 ft. deep, which are natural proportions of a ship of that size. The dimensions of the "Great Eastern," built in 1858, were 692 ft. long, 83 ft. broad, 58 ft. deep; those of the "Celtic" built in 1901 are 700 ft. long, 75 ft. wide, 49 1/3 ft. deep. It is extremely improbable that such reasonable dimensions should have been assigned to the Ark except they were based on fact. Unrestrained tradition would have been sure to distort the proportions, as is shown by what actually occurred in other accounts of the Ark. The cuneiform tablets represent it as six stories high, with the length, width, and depth, each as 140 cubits (262 ft.), and having a mast on top of all, and a pilot to guide the impossible craft (see Deluge Tablet, ll.22, 23, 38-41). Berosus, the Greek historian, represents it to have been five stadia (3,000 ft.) long and two stadia (1,200 ft.) broad, while Origen, in order to confound Celsus (Against Celsus 4.41) gave the figures an interpretation which made the Ark 25 miles long and 3/4 of a mile wide.

It is needless to speculate upon the capacity of the Ark for holding absolutely all the species of animals found in the world, together with the food necessary for them, since we are only required to provide for such animals as were native to the area to which the remnants of the human race living at that time were limited, and which (see DELUGE OF NOAH) may not have been large. But calculations show that the structure described contained a space of about 3,500,000 cubic feet, and that after storing food enough to support several thousand pairs of animals, of the average size, on an ocean voyage of a year, there would remain more than 50 cubic feet of space for each pair.

No mention is made in the Bible of a pilot for the Ark, but it seems to have been left to float as a derelict upon the waters. For that purpose its form and dimensions were perfect, as was long ago demonstrated by the celebrated navigator, Sir Walter Raleigh, who notes it had "a flat bottom, and was not raised in form of a ship, with a sharpness forward, to cut the waves for the better speed"—a construction which secured the maximum of storage capacity and made a vessel which would ride steadily upon the water. Numerous vessels after the pattern of the Ark, but of smaller dimensions, have been made in Holland and Denmark and proved admirably adapted for freightage where speed was not of the first importance. They would hold one-third more lading than other vessels, and would require no more hands to work

them. The gradual rise and subsidence of the water, each continuing for six months, and their movement inland, render the survival of such a structure by no means unreasonable. According to Ge 6:3; 1Pe 3:20; 2Pe 2:5, warning of the Flood was given 120 years beforehand, and during that time Noah, while preparing the Ark, became a preacher of righteousness. For evidence that there was a gradual destruction of the race previous to the Flood, see DELUGE OF NOAH.

George Frederick Wright

ARK OF TESTIMONY

test'-i-mo-ni. See ARK OF THE COVENANT.

ARK OF THE COVENANT

kuv'-e-nant ('aron ha-berith):

I. The Statements of the Old Testament Concerning the Ark of the Covenant.

1. Pentateuch:

In Ex 25:10 ff, Moses receives the command to build an ark of acacia wood. Within this ark were to be placed the tables of the law which God was about to give to Moses. Upon the top of the ark, probably not as a lid but above the lid, the kapporeth, in the New Testament to hilasterion (Heb 9:5), is to be placed, which was a golden plate upon which two cherubim, with raised wings and facing each other, covered the ark. From the place between the two cherubim God promises to speak to Moses, as often as He shall give him commands in reference to the Israelites.

The portion of the Pentateuch in which this is recorded is taken from the so-called Priest Codex (P). The reports of the Elohist (E) and the Jahwist (Jahwist) on this subject are wanting; but both of these sources report concerning the important role which the ark played in the entrance of Israel into Canaan, and these documents too must have contained the information that the people had received this ark. It can further with certainty be stated concerning the Elohist, and with some probability concerning the Jahwist, in what part of these documents these accounts were to be found. For Elohist reports in Ex 33:6 that the Israelites, in order to demonstrate their repentance on account of the golden calf, had at God's command laid aside their ornaments. In 33:7-10 there follows a statement concerning the erection of the sacred tent; but this is explained only by the fact that between 33:6 and 7 a report concerning the erection of the ark of the covenant must have been found, which the R of the Pentateuch (since before this he had already made use of the much more exhaustive account of the Priest Codex) was compelled to omit.

But that at this place the Elohist must have reported not only concerning the erection of the sacred tent but also of the construction of the ark of the covenant, is in itself probable, and can too be concluded

from this, that according to the Deuteronomist, the composition of which is also conditioned upon that of the Elohist and the Jahwist, the ark was built on this occasion. We further conclude that it was not so much the tabernacle which could serve as a consolation to the people, something that at that time they needed, but rather the ark, which was to symbolize to them that God was on the march with them. In the Jahwist we do not indeed find at this place any statement concerning this sacred structure, but we do find the statement that the Israelites, out of sorrow because of the bad news brought by Moses, discarded their ornaments.

For Ex 33:4 is taken from the Jahwist, since the Elohist contains the command to discard the ornaments later on, and hence could not have written 33:4. Now it is a justifiable surmise that the Jahwist has also reported what use was made of the ornaments that had been discarded; and as this author, just as is the case with the Elohist, must have at some place contained a report concerning the construction of the ark, he certainly must have given this just at this place. The corresponding account in the Deuteronomist is found in De 10:1-5. Accordingly, then, all the four Pentateuch documents reported that Moses had built the ark at Sinai. The Deuteronomist, like the Priestly Code (P), says, that it was built of acacia wood. In the Elohistic narrative the subject is mentioned again in Nu 10:33 ff, where we read that the ark had preceded the people as they broke camp and marched from Sinai. At this place too the words are found which Moses was accustomed to speak when the ark began to move out and when it arrived at a halting-place.

2. Joshua:

According to the narrative in Jos 3 the ark cooperated at the crossing of the Jordan in such a way that the waters of the river ceased to continue flowing as soon as the feet of the priests who were carrying the ark entered the water, and that it stood still above until these priests, after the people had crossed over, again left the bed of the river with the ark. In the account of the solemn march around Jericho, which according to Jos 6 caused the walls of the city to fall, the carrying of the ark around the city is regarded as an essential feature in 6:4,7,11. In chapter 7 it is narrated that Joshua, after the defeat of the army before Ai, lamented and prayed before the ark. In chapter 8 this is mentioned in connection with Mount Ebal.

3. Other Historical Books:

At the time of Eli the ark stood in the sanctuary at Shiloh (1Sa 3:3). From this place it was taken after Israel had been defeated by the Philistines at Ebenezer, in order to assure the help of Yahweh to the people; but, instead of this, the ark fell into the hands of the Philistines (1Sa 4). But the various misfortunes that now afflicted the Philistines induced these to regard the possession of the ark as a calamity (1Sa 5) and they sent it back to Israel (1Sa 6). It was brought first to Bethshemesh in the tribe of Judah, near the borders of the Philistines, and soon after to Kiriath-jearim, about 7.5 miles Northwest of Jerusalem. There the ark remained for years in the house of a man by the name of Abinadab, whose son was its guardian (1Sa 7:1), until David brought it to Mount Zion, after he had established his camp and court there. He there placed it in a tent prepared for it (2Sa 6; 1Ch 13$; 15$). In David’s time again

the ark was taken along into battle (2Sa 11:11). When David fled from the presence of Absalom, the priests wanted to accompany him with the ark, but he sent it back (2Sa 15:24 f). David had also intended to build a temple, in which the ark was to find its place, since before this it had always found its resting-place in a tent. But God forbade this through Nathan, because He was willing to build a house for David, but was not willing that David should build one for Him (2Sa 7). Solomon then built the temple and placed the ark of the covenant in the Holy of Holies of this temple, where it was placed under the wings of two mighty cherubim images (1Ki 8; 2Ch 5).

4. Prophetical and Poetical Books:

Jeremiah in the passage 3:16, which certainly was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, states that in the future new Jerusalem nobody will any more concern himself about the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, and no one will again build such a one. In the post-exilic Ps 132 (verse 8), Yahweh is petitioned to occupy together with the ark, the symbol of His omnipotent presence, also the sanctuary that has been erected for Him, the poet describing himself and those who sing this psalm as participants in the home-bringing of the ark by David. No further mention is made of the ark of the covenant in the Psalter or the prophetical books.

5. The New Testament:

In the New Testament the ark of the covenant is mentioned only in Heb 9:4 in the description of the Solomonic temple.

II. The Form of the Ark of the Covenant.

According to the statements in the Priestly Code (P), the ark of the covenant was a chest made out of acacia wood, 2 1/2 cubits (about equal to 4 ft.) long, 1 1/2 cubits wide and 1 1/2 high. That it was made out of acacia wood is also stated by the Deuteronomist in De 10:3. According to P it was covered with gold within and without, and was ornamented with a moulding of gold running all around it. At its four feet rings were added, through which the gold- covere d carrying-staves were put. These staves are also mentioned in 1Ki 8:7,8; 2Ch 5:8,9, and mention is often made of those who carried the ark (2Sa 6:13; 15:24). The correctness of these statements cannot be proved, but yet there is no reason to doubt them. Rather we might have reason to hesitate in clinging to the view that on the old ark there was really a golden kapporeth, but only because in olden times the possession of such valuables and their use for such a purpose would be doubtful. But on the basis of such reasons we could at most doubt whether the lid with its cherubim consisted of solid gold. That the cherubim were attached to or above the ark is not at all improbable.

That Solomon placed the ark in the Holy of Holies between two massive cherubim figures (1Ki 6:19,23 ff; 8:6) does not prove that there were no cherubim figures on the ark itself, or even that those cherubim figures, which according to Ex 25:19 were found on the ark, were nothing else than those of Solomon’s days in imagination transferred back to an earlier period (Vatke, Biblische Theologie, 1835, 333;

Popper, Der biblische Bericht uber die Stiftshutte, 1862). In recent times the view has been maintained that the ark in reality was no ark at all but an empty throne. It was Reichel, in his work Vorhellenische Gotterkulte, who first expressed this view, and then Meinhold, Die Lade Jahwes, Tubingen, 1910, and Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1901, 593-617, who developed this view in the following manner. It is claimed that in the days of Moses a throne-like rock at Mount Sinai was regarded as the seat of Yahweh, and when the Israelites departed from Sinai they made for themselves a portable throne, and Yahweh was regarded as sitting visibly enthroned upon this and accompanying His people. In the main the same view was maintained by Martin Dibellius (Die Lade Jahwes, Gottingen, 1906; Hermann Gunkel, Die Lade Jahwes ein Thronsitz, reprinted from the Zeitschrift fur Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft, Heidelberg, 1906).

The occasion for this view was given by the fact that among the Persians and other people there were empty thrones of the gods, which were carried or hauled around in processions. The reasons for finding in the ark of the covenant such an empty throne are found chiefly in this, that the passages in the Old Testament, in which it seems that the presence of God is made conditional on the presence of the ark (compare Nu 14:42-44), can be explained if the ark is regarded as a throne of Yahweh. However, empty thrones of the gods are found only among the Aryan people, and all of the passages of the Old Testament which refer to the ark can be easily explained without such a supposition. This view is to be rejected particularly for this reason, that in the Old Testament the ark is always described as an ark, and never as a throne or a seat; and because it is absolutely impossible to see what reason would have existed at a later period to state that it was an ark if it had originally been a throne. Dibelius and Gunkel appeal also particularly to this, that in several passages, of which 1Sa 4:4; 2Sa 6:2 are the oldest, Yahweh is declared to be enthroned on the cherubim. But this proves nothing, because He is not called "He who is enthroned on the ark," and the cherubim and the ark are two different things, even if there were cherubim on the lid of the ark. Compare the refutation of Meinhold and Dibelius by Budde (ZATW, 1901, 193-200, and Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1906, 489-507).

III. The Contents of the Ark of the Covenant.

According to the Priestly Code the two tables of the law constituted the contents of the ark. In Ex 25:16; 40:20, as also De 10:5, and, too, in 1Ki 8:9, we have the same testimony. The majority of the modern critics regard this as an unhistorical statement first concocted by.the so-called "Deuteronomistic school." Their reasons for this are the following:

(1) The critics deny that the existence of the Mosaic tables of the law is a historical fact;

(2) The critics declare that if these tables had really been in possession of the Israelites, they would not have been so foolish as to put them into a box which it was forbidden to open;

(3) The critics declare that the views entertained in olden times on the importance of the ark cannot be reconciled with the presence of the tables in the ark.

But we reply: (1) that the actual existence of the two tables of the law is denied without sufficient reasons; that the ten principal formulas of the Decalogue, as these are given in Ex 20 and De 5, come from Moses, must be insisted upon, and that according to Ex 34 other ten commandments had been written on these tables is incorrect. The laws in Ex 34:17-26 are not at all declared there to be the ten words which God intended to write upon the tables. But if Moses had prepared the tables for the commandments, then it is

(2) only probable that he caused to be made a suitable chest for their preservation and their transportation through the desert. Now it might be thought that the view that the ark was so holy that it dared not be opened had originated only after the time of Moses. However, it is just as easily possible, that that importance had already been assigned by Moses to the tables in the ark which the sealed and carefully preserved copy of a business agreement would have and which is to be opened only in case of necessity (Jer 32:11-14). Such a case of necessity never afterward materialized, because the Israelites were never in doubt as to what was written on these tables. On a verbatim reading no stress was laid in olden times.

(3) With regard to the importance of the ark according to the estimate placed upon it in the earlier period of Israel, we shall see later that the traditions in reference to the tables harmonize fully with this importance.

Of the modern critics who have rejected this tradition, some have thought that the ark was empty, and that the Israelites thought that Yahweh dwelt in it (Guthe, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 39), or that the empty chest was a kind of fetish (Schwally, Semitische Kriegsaltertumer, 1901, I, 10). As a rule they believe that a stone image of Yahweh or two stones had been placed in the ark, these being possibly meteor stones, in which it was thought that some divine power was dwelling (Stade, Geschichte Israels, I, 458); or possibly stones that in some battle or other had been hurled and through which a victory had been won (Couard, ZATW, XII, 76); or possibly they were the stones which at the alliance of the tribes that dwelt about Mount Sinai were first set up as testimonials of this covenant (Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Alten Testament, 216). Of these views only the one which declares that the ark contained meteor stones deserves any notice, because it could indeed be thought possible that Israel would have taken with them on their journey through the desert such stones which they could have regarded as pledges of the Divine Presence fallen from heaven and could have preserved these in a sacred ark. But it is impossible to show that this view is probable, not to speak of proving it to be correct. The only extant tradition says that the ark contained the tables of the law, and this is the only view that is in harmony with what we must think of the whole work of Moses. Finally we must again remember that it is probable that Elohist and Jahwist, who speak both of the ark and also of the tables of the law, in the portions of these documents which have not been preserved, reported also that the tables were placed in the ark.

IV. The Names of the Ark of the Covenant.

The name "ark of the covenant of Yahweh" was not originally found everywhere where it now stands,

but in many places the words "of the covenant" were added later. However, the expression "ark of the covenant" is found in the oldest source of the Book of Sam (2Sa 15:24), and in 1Ki 3:15 in the old source for the history of Solomon, of which the Deuteronomistic author of the Book of Kings made use; in 1Ki 8:1, a very old account of the building of the temple; and the genuineness of the expression "ark of the covenant" in these passages is not with any good reasons to be called into question. Further the expression is found in the books of Numbers and Joshua, in a number of passages (Nu 10:33; 14:44; Jos 3:3,6,8; 4:9,18; 6:6,8), which in all probability belong to the document of Elohist. It appears that the Elohist designates the ark as the "ark of the covenant of God," or more briefly; as the "ark of the covenant," unless in a connected narrative he writes only " the ark," while in the Jahwist the principal appellation was "ark of Yahweh, the Lord of the whole earth" (compare Lotz, Die Bundeslade, 1901, 30-36).

From this we must conclude that the appellation "ark of the covenant of Yahweh" must go back to very ancient times, and we must reject the view that this term took the place of the term "ark of Yahweh" in consequence of a change of views with reference to the ark, brought about through Deuteronomy. Indeed, since the name "ark of the covenant," as is proved by the Elohist, was nowhere mor e in use than in Ephraim, where they did not possess the ark and accordingly would have had the least occasion to introduce a new name for it, it can be accepted that the name originated in the oldest times, namely those of Moses. The other expression "ark of Yahweh" may be just as old and need not be an abbreviation of the other. It was possible to designate the ark as "ark of Yahweh" because it was a sanctuary belonging to Yahweh; and it was possible to call it also "the ark of the covenant of Yahweh," because it was a monument and evidence of the covenant which Yahweh had made with Israel. It is for this reason not correct to translate the expression ‘aron berith Yahweh by "the ark of the law of Yahweh," as equivalent to "the ark which served as a place for preserving the law of the covenant." For berith does not signify "law," even if it was possible under certain circumstances to call a covenant "law" figuratively and synecdochically the "covenant"; and when 1Ki 8:21 speaks of "the ark wherein is the covenant of Yahweh," the next words, "which he made with our fathers," show that covenant does not here mean "law," but rather the covenant relationship which in a certain sense is embodied in the tables.

In P the ark is also called "the ark of the testimony," and this too does not signify "ark of the law." For not already in P but only in later documents did the word ‘edhuth receive the meaning of "law" (Lotz, Die Bundeslade, 40). P means by "testimony" the Ten Words, through the proclamation of which the true God has given evidence of His real essence. But where this testimony is found engraved in the handwriting of God on the tables of stone, just there also is the place where He too is to be regarded as locally present.

V. The History of the Ark of the Covenant.

According to the tradition contained in the Pentateuch the sacred ark was built at Mount Sinai and was taken by the Israelites along with them to Canaan. This must be accepted as absolutely correct. The supposition is groundless, that it was a shrine that the Israelites had taken over from the Canaanites. This view is refuted by the high estimate in which in Eli’s time the ark was held by all Israel (1Sa 1 ff; 2:22); and especially by the fact that the ark was at that time regarded as the property of that God who had

brought Israel out of Egypt, and accordingly had through this ark caused the Canaanites to be conquered (1Sa 4:8; 6:6; 2Sa 7:6; 1Ki 12:28). The opinion also that the ark was an ancient palladium of the tribe of Ephraim or of the descendants of Joseph and was only at a later period recognized by all Israel (Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, I, 458) is not tenable, for we hear nothing to the effect that the descendants of Joseph concerned themselves more for the ark than the other tribes did. In the time of Eli the ark stood in the sanctuary at Shiloh.

When Israel had been conquered by the Philistines, the ark was taken from Shiloh in order that Yahweh should aid His people. But notwithstanding this the Philistines yet conquered and captured the ark (1Sa 5). But the many misfortunes that overtook them made them think that the possession of the ark was destructive to them and they sent it back (1Sa 6). The ark first came to Bethshemesh, in the tribe of Judah, and then to Kiriath-jearim (or Baale-judah, 2Sa 6:2), about 7.5 miles Northwest of Jerusalem. There the ark remained for many years until David, after he had taken possession of Mount Zion, took it there (2Sa 6) and deposited it in a tent. Solomon brought it into the Holy of Holies in the temple (1Ki 8:3-8), where in all probability it remained until the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar; for Jer 3:16 proves that the Israelites felt that they were in possession of the ark up to this time.

VI. The Significance of the Ark.

According to many investigators the ark was originally a war sanctuary. In favor of this it can be urged that Israel took it into their camp, in order that they might receive the help of Yahweh in the battle with the Philistines (1Sa 4); and further that also in the time of David the ark was again taken along into battle (2Sa 11:11; compare Ps 24); note also the word of Moses, which he spoke when the ark was taken up to be carried: "Rise up, O Yahweh, and let thine enemies be scattered" (Nu 10:35). However, nothing of what we know or presuppose concerning the form and the contents of the ark points to an original military purpose of the same; and in the other statements that are found elsewhere concerning the ark, a much more general significance is assigned to it. The significance which the ark had for the Israelites in connection with their wars is only the outcome of its signification as the symbol of the presence of Yahweh, who was not at all a God of war, but when His people were compelled to fight was their helper in the struggle.

A Symbol of the Divine Presence:

That the ark was designed to be a symbol of the presence of God in the midst of His people is the common teaching of the Old Testament. According to the Elohist the ark was made to serve as a comfort to the people for this, that they were to leave the mountain where God had caused them to realize His presence (Ex 30:6). According to the Priestly Code (P), God purposed to speak with Moses from the place between the cherubim upon the ark. According to Jud 2:1 ff, the angel of Yahweh spoke in Bethel (Bochim) in reproof and exhortation to the people, after the ark of the covenant had been brought to that place; for the comparison of Nu 10:33 ff and Ex 23:20 ff shows that Jud 2:1 is to be understood as speaking of the transfer of the ark to Bethel. When Israel in the time of Eli was overpowered by the Philistines, the Israelites sent for the ark, in order that Yahweh should come into the camp of Israel, and

this was also believed to be the case by the Philistines (1Sa 4:3 ff). After the ark had come to Bethshemesh and a pestilence had broken out there, the people did not want to keep the ark, because no one could live in the presence of Yahweh, this holy God (1Sa 6:20); and Jeremiah says (3:16,17) that an ark of the covenant would not be again made after the restoration of Israel, but then Jerusalem would be called the "throne of Yahweh," i.e. it would so manifestly be the city of God that it would guarantee the presence of God at least just as much as the ark formerly did.

In olden times these things appeared more realistic to the people than they do to us; and when the ark was considered the visible representation of the presence of Yahweh, and as guaranteeing His presence, a close material connection was thought to exist between the ark and Yahweh, by virtue of which Divine powers were also thought to be present in the ark. The people at Bethshemesh were not willing to keep the ark any longer in their midst, because they could not live in its near presence. David's dancing before the ark is regarded by him and by the narrator of the event as a dancing before the Lord (2Sa 6:5,14,21), and in 2Sa 7:5 ff God says, through Nathan, that He had wandered around in a tent since He had led the Israelites out of Egypt. But the view advocated by some of the modern critics, that the Israelites had thought that the ark was the dwelling- place or the throne-seat of Yahweh, is nevertheless not correct. This opinion cannot be harmonized with this fact, that in the sources, dating from the same olden times, mention is made of His dwelling in many places in Canaan and outside of Canaan, so that the idea that His presence or even He Himself is confined to the ark is impossible.

The statement of Moses, "Rise up, O Yahweh, and let thine enemies be scattered" (Nu 10:35), is not the command addressed to those who carry the ark to lift it up and thereby to lift Yahweh up for the journey, but is a demand made upon Yahweh, in accordance with His promise, to go ahead of Israel as the ark does. According to 1Sa 4:3 the Israelites did not say "We want to go and get Yahweh," but "We want to go and get the ark of Yahweh, so that He may come into our midst." They accordingly only wanted to induce Him to come by getting the ark. This, too, the priests and the soothsayers of the Philistines say: "Do not permit the ark of the God of the Israelites to depart without sending a gift along," but they do not speak thus of Yahweh. That Samuel, who slept near the ark, when he was addressed by Yahweh, did not at all at first think that Yahweh was addressing him, proves that at that time the view did not prevail that He was in the ark or had His seat upon it. Ancient Israel was accordingly evidently of the conviction that the ark was closely connected with Yahweh, that something of His power was inherent in the ark; consequently the feeling prevailed that when near the ark they were in a special way in the presence of and near to the Lord.

But this is something altogether different from the opinion that the ark was the seat or the dwelling-place of Yahweh. Even if the old Israelites, on account of the crudeness of antique methods of thought, were not conscious of the greatness of this difference, the fact that this difference was felt is not a matter of doubt. That the ark was built to embody the presence of God among His people is just as clear from the statements of the Elohist, and probably also of the Jahwist, as it is from those of the Priestly Code (P); and if these have accordingly regarded the tables of the law as constituting the contents of the ark, then this is in perfect harmony with their views of this purpose, and we too must cling to these same views. For what would have been better adapted to make the instrument which represents the presence of God more suitable for this than the stone tables with the Ten Words, through which Yahweh had made

known to His people His ethical character? For this very purpose it had to be an ark. The words on these tables were a kind of a spiritual portrait of the God of Israel, who could not be pictured in a bodily form. In this shape nobody in ancient Israel has formulated this thought, but that this thought was present is certain.

Wilhelm Lotz

ARKITE

ark'-it ('arqi): An inhabitant of the town of Arka, situated some ten or twelve miles Northeast of Tripoils, Syria, and about four miles from the shore of the sea. The Arkites are mentioned in Ge 10:17 and 1Ch 1:15 as being the descendants of Canaan, and they were undoubtedly of Phoenician stock. The place was not of much importance, but it is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions, under the name Irkatah and taken by Tiglathpileser III in 738 BC. Not being on the sea its trade was small and it probably belonged to Tripoli or Botrys originally. It was the birthplace of Alexander Severus, hence its Roman name, Caesarea Libani. Its site is marked by a high mound near the foothills of Lebanon.

H. Porter

ARM

arm (zeroa', 'ezroa', dera'; brachion; chotsen, katheph): The usual form is zeroa' from the root zara', "to spread." The arm may be "stretched out." 'Ezroa' is this form with prosthetic 'aleph (Job 31:22; Jer 32:21), and dera' is the Aramaic form. Chotsen is really "bosom," thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Isa 49:22); and katheph is "shoulder," thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Job 31:22). Compare cheir, also, in Ac 11:21.

Figurative: The arm denotes influence, power, means of support or conquest. The arms of Moab (Jer 48:25) and of Pharaoh (Eze 30:21 ff) are broken. The arm of Eli and the arm of his father's house are to be cut off (1Sa 2:31). Because the arm wielded the sword it signified "oppression" (Job 35:9). The arms are the means of support, therefore to refuse to aid the fatherless is to break their arms (Job 22:9).

Applied anthropomorphically to God, the arm denotes also His power, power to deliver, support, conquer. His "outstretched arm" delivered Israel from Egypt (Ex 6:6; De 4:34, etc.). They support: "Underneath are the everlasting arms" (De 33:27). His arm protects (Isa 40:11). Yahweh is sometimes likened to a warrior and smites with His arm (Ps 89:10; Isa 63:5; Jer 21:5). The arm of Yahweh is holy (Ps 98:1; Isa 52:10). Many other passages of Scripture might be quoted showing how the power of God to redeem, judge, protect, punish is expressed by the idea of "the arm of Yahweh."

S. F. Hunter

ARMAGEDDON

ar-ma-ged’-on Armageddon: Re 16:16; the Revised Version (British and American) "HAR-MAGEDON") (which see).

ARMENIA

ar-me’-ni-a:

I. GEOGRAPHY

II. ANCIENT HISTORY

1. Turanian Armenians

Their Religion

2. Aryan Armenians: History to 114 AD

LITERATURE

I. Geography.

‘araraT (Sumerian Ar, "region," plus ar "high," plus Tu, "mountain," plus "high mountainous region"): in Assyrian, UrTu, UrarTu, UrasTu: in AEgyp, Ermenen (=" Region of the Minni") Wiener, Origin of the Pentateuch, Armina, Armaniyqa (Armenia): in Hecataeus of Miletus, circa 520 BC, the people are Armenioi (Ge 8:4; 2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38; Jer 51:27). Throughout the Bible, this is a country, not a mountain. Armenia Major was bounded on the North by the River Cyrus (Kour), Iberia, Colchis, and the Moschici Mts.; on the West by Asia Minor and the Euphrates; on the South by Mesopotamia and Assyria; on the East by the Caspian and Media. (Armenia Minor lay between the Euphrates and the Halys.) Ararat was originally the name of the central district. Most of Armenia is between 8,000 and 3,000 feet above sea-level, and slopes toward Euphrates, Cyrus, and the Gaspian. Mt. Massis (generally called Greater Ararat) is 16,969 ft. and Lesser Ararat, 12,840 ft. Both are of igneous origin, as is Aragds (A‘la Goz), 13,436 ft. Sulphur springs and earthquakes still attest volcanic activity.

The largest rivers are the Euphrates, Tigris and Araxes. The latter, swift and famed for violent floods, joins the Cyrus, which falls into the Caspian. The lakes Van, Urmi and Sevan are veritable inland seas. The many mountain chains, impassable torrents and large streams divide the country into districts far less accessible from one another than from foreign lands. Hence, invasions are easy and national union difficult. This has sadly affected the history of Armenia. Xenophon (Anab. iv.5) describes the people as living in houses partly underground, such as are still found. Each village was ruled by its chief according

to ancient customary laws. He well describes the severity of the winters. In summer the climate in some places is like that of Italy or Spain. Much of Armenia is extremely fertile, producing large herds of horses and cattle, abundant crops of cereals, olives and fruit. It is rich in minerals, and is probably the home of the rose and the vine.

LITERATURE.

Minas Gaphamatzean; Garagashean; Palasanean; Entir Chatouadsner, I; Rawlinson, Seven Anc. Monarchies; Strabo; Xenophon; Petermann, Mittheilungen for 1871; Bryce, Transcaucasia and Ararat.

II. Ancient History.

1. Turanian Armenians:

The country is first mentioned in Ge 8:4 as the land upon (some one of) the mountains of which Noah’s Ark rested. (According to Jewish tradition this was one of the Kurdish mountains.) It is next spoken of by Sargon I of Agade, circa 3800 BC, as among his conquests. In early Babylonian legends Armenia figures as an almost unknown land far to the North, full of high mountains and dense forests, containing the entrance to the Lower World (Mad Nu-ga, "Land of No Return"). On its borders stood Mt. Nisir where the gods dwelt and Cit-napistim’s "ship" stopped. This "Mountain of the World" was the present Jabal Judi, South of Lake Van. Next came Egyptian influence. Thothmes III, in his twenty-third year (circa 1458 BC), after a great victory over the Rutennu or Ludennu (Mesopotamians and Lydians), received the submission of the "chiefs of Ermenen" and others. It is remarkable that the name by which the land is still known to foreigners (Armenians call it Chaiastan) should occur so early. In his thirty-third year, Thothmes III mentions the people of Ermenen as paying tribute when he held his court at Nineveh, and says that in their land "heaven rests upon its four pillars." In Seti I’s Hall of Columns at Karnak we see the people of Ermenen felling trees in order to open a way through their forests for that king’s armies. Rameses II in his twenty-first year, in war with Kheta-sira, king of the Hittites, probably subdued Armenia (compare Tacitus Ann. ii.60). Many places conquered by Rameses III, and mentioned in the Medinet Habu lists, were probably in Armenia.

The Assyrian king Uras-Pal-acur (circa 1190-1170 BC) made a raid into Armenia, and mentions the central district (UrarTu proper, near Lake Van), the land of the Manna (Minni, Jer 51:27), Nahri ("the Rivers"), Ashguza (Ashkenaz, ib), etc. Another invader was Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1110-1090 BC). Asshut-nacir-pal in 883 BC advanced to UrarTu. A little later he mentions as articles of Armenian tribute chariots, horses, mules, silver, gold, plates of copper, oxen, sheep, wine, variegated cloths, linen garments. Again and again he carried fire and sword through the country, but it constantly revolted. Under Shalmaneser II (860-825 BC) and afterward for centuries wars continued. By uniting and forming powerful kingdoms (of which the principal was Biainash around Lake Van) the Armenians resisted. Finally in 606 BC they took part in the destruction of Nineveh, and in that of Babylon later. Shalmaneser II tells of the wickerwork coracles on Lake Van. The Balawat bronzes depict Armenians dressed like the Hittites (to whom they were sometimes subject) in tunics and snow-shoes with turned-up and pointed

ends, wearing helmets, swords, spears and small round shields. Sayce compares their faces in form to the Negro type. Possibly they were Mongolians.

The founder of the kingdom of Biainash was Sardurish I, about 840 BC, who built as his capital Tushpash, now Van. He ruled most of Armenia, defending it against the Assyrians, and apparently, inflicting a check on Shalmaneser II in 833 BC. He introduced the cuneiform characters, and his inscriptions are in Assyrian. His son Ishpuinish adapted the Assyrian syllabary to his own tongue, which bears a slight resemblance to Georgian in some points. The next king, Menuash, has left inscriptions almost all over Armenia, telling of his victories over the Hittites, etc. The kingdom of Biainash reached its acme under the great monarch Argishtish I, who succeeded in defending his country against Shalmaneser III (783-772 BC). But in his son's reign Tiglath-pileser IV (748-727 BC: Pul) crushed the Armenians to the dust in a great battle near Commagene in 743. Pul failed to capture Van in 737, but he ravaged the country far and wide. Rusash I, at the head of an Armenian confederacy, began a great struggle in 716 with Sargon (722-705), who in 714 captured Van with Rusash's family.

After 5 months' wandering Rusash committed suicide. His brother Argishtish II to some degree recovered independence. His successor Erimenash gave an asylum to Adrammelech and Sharezer (Assur-sar-ucur) in 680 (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38) after the murder of their father Sennacherib. Invading Assyria in the same year, they were defeated by Esar-haddon I. Armenia from the Cyrus River to the South of Lake Van was ravaged by the Kimmerians (679-677). Rusash II (circa 660-645) and his son Sandurish III (the latter circa 640 or soon after) submitted to Ashurbanipal (668-626). Nebuchadnezzar (604-561) boasts of reaching Van in his conquests, though the Armenians had probably their share in the destruction of Nineveh in 606. Jer (51:27) mentioned the kingdoms of Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz about 595, and said they would help in the overthrow of Babylon (in 538). Cyrus had therefore probably subdued or won them over after capturing Ekbatana (549). After this the Turanians gradually gave place in Armenia to the Aryan Armenians of later times.

Their Religion.

The supreme god of the Turanian Armenians was Chaldish, who was father of all the rest. They were styled "children of mighty Chaldish." He, with Teishbash, god of the atmosphere, and Ardinish, the Sun-god, formed "the company of the mighty gods." Auish, god of water; Ayash, god of the earth; Shelardish, the Moon-god; Sardish, the Year-god; and 42 other gods are mentioned. Sari was a goddess, probably corresponding to Ishtar. Adoration was offered to the spirits of the dead also. Somewhat strangely, some of the divine names we have mentioned remind one of certain Aryan (Greek and Old Pers) words, however this may be accounted for.

LITERATURE.

Valdemar Schmidt, Assyriens og AEgyptens Gamle Historie; Maspero, Dawn of Civilization; Rawlinson, West. Asiat. Inscrs; Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek (Schrader, editor); Airarat, 1883; Sayce in Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, new series, XIV; Records of the Past; Hastings, End of Religion

and Ethics, I.

2. Aryan Armenians: History to 114 AD:

The ancestors of the present Armenians (who call themselves Chaik'h, i.e. Pati-s, "Lords") may have settled in the country in the 8th century BC, when Sargon mentions a king of part of Armenia who bore the Aryan name Bagadatti (= Theodore). They came from Phrygia (Herod. vii.73), used the Phrygian dress and armor (Dion. of Halicarnassus; Eudoxius; Herod.) and spoke the same language (Herod. i.171). In the Bible they are called the "House of Togarmah" (Ge 10:3; 1Ch 1:6; Eze 27:14; 38:6) and "Ashkenaz" (Ge 10:3; 1Ch 1:6; Jer 51:27; the Assyrian Ashguza), as by their own writers of later times. Xenophon in the Cyropedia mentions a Median conquest of Armenia, Strabo their Median attire; yet Armenian girls could not understand Xenophon's Persian interpreter (Anab. iv.5). Three of the four Armenians mentioned by Darius have Aryan names. The Armenians joined the Median noble Fravartish in his revolt against Darius I (519 BC). Much of the consequent fighting took place in Armenia, which was with difficulty subdued (517). It formed part of Darius' thirteenth Nome, and afterward two satrapies (apparently Armenia Major and Minor). The government (of Armenia Major) was made hereditary in the family of Vidarna (Hydarnes) for helping to put down Fravartish. Xenophon's interesting description of the country and people and the severity of its winters is well known.

Herodotus tells of Armenians in skin and wicker-work coracles bringing wine, etc., to Babylon. Xenophon says they and the Chaldeans traded with India. Strabo mentions their caravan trade across central Asia. The satrap of Armenia had to present 20,000 young horses annually to the king of Persia at the great annual festival of Mithra. A large body of Armenian soldiers served in Xerxes' invasion of Greece. At the battle of Arbela (331 BC), 40,000 of their infantry and 7,000 cavalry took part. Armenia then became a portion of Alexander's empire, and later of that of Seleucus (301 BC), under a native satrap, Artavasdes. Armenia revolted after Antiochus' defeat at Magnesia (190 BC), and the Romans encouraged the two satraps to declare themselves kings. Artaxias, king of Armenia Major, used Hannibal's aid in fortifying his capital Artaxata (189 BC). Artaxias was overthrown by Antiochus Epiphanes in 165, but was restored on swearing allegiance. Civil confusion ensued. The nobles called in the Parthians under Mithridates I (150 BC), who became master of the whole Persian empire. He made his brother Valarsaces king of Armenia. Thus the Arsacide dynasty was established in that country and lasted till the fall of the Parthian empire (226 AD), the Armenian kings very generally recognizing the Parthian monarchs as their suzerains.

The greatest Armenian king was Tigranes I. (96-55 BC), a warrior who raised Armenia for a time to the foremost position in Asia. He humbled the Parthians, joined Mithridates VI in war with Rome, ruled Syria for over 14 years, built near Mardin as his capital Tigranocerta, and assumed the Assyrio-Persian title of "King of Kings." Lucullus defeated Tigranes and destroyed Tigranocerta in 69 BC. Tigranes surrendered to Pompey near Artaxata (66 BC), paid 6,000 talents, and retained only Armenia. Under him Greek art and literature flourished in the country. Armenia as a subjectally of Rome became a "buffer state" between the Roman and Parthian empires. Tigranes' son and successor Artevasdes joined in the Parthian invasion of Syria after Crassus' overthrow at Sinnaca 53 BC. He treacherously caused great loss to Antony's army in 36 BC. Antony carried him in chains to Egypt, where Cleopatra put him to

death in 32 BC. After this, Armenia long remained subject to the Romans whenever not strong enough to join the Parthians, suffering much from intrigues and the jealousy of both powers. There is no proof of the later Armenian story that Armenia was subject to Abgarus, king of Edessa, in our Lord's time, and that the gospel was preached there by Thaddaeus, though the latter point is possible. In 66 AD, Tiridates, elder brother of the Parthian king Vologeses, having defeated the Romans under Paetus and established himself on the throne of Armenia, went by land to Rome and received investiture from Nero. Peace between Rome and Parthia ensued, and Armenia remained closely united to Parthia till Trajan's expedition in 114 AD.

LITERATURE.

Spiegel, Altpers. Keilinschriften; Herodotus; Xenophon; Arrian; Tacitus; Velleius Patroculus; Livy; Polybius; Ammianus Marcellinus.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

ARMENIAN VERSIONS, OF THE BIBLE

ar-me'-ni-an vur'-shuns, bi'-bl.

I. ANCIENT ARMENIAN

1. Circumstances under Which Made

2. The Translators

Apocrypha Omitted

3. Revision

4. Results of Circulation

5. Printed Editions

II. MODERN ARMENIAN VERSIONS

1. Ararat-Armenian

2. Constantinopolitan-Armenian

III. ARMENIAN LANGUAGE

LITERATURE

I. Ancient Armenian.

1. Circumstances under Which Made:

Armenia was in large measure Christianized by Gregory Lousavorich ("the Illuminator": consecrated 302 AD; died 332), but, as Armenian had not been reduced to writing, the Scriptures used to be read in some places in Greek, in others in Syriac, and translated orally to the people. A knowledge of these tongues and the training of teachers were kept up by the schools which Gregory and King Tiridates had established at the capital Vagharshapat and elsewhere. As far as there was any Christianity in Armenia before Gregory's time, it had been almost exclusively under Syrian influence, from Edessa and Samosata. Gregory introduced Greek influence and culture, though maintaining bonds of union with Syria also.

When King Sapor of Persia became master of Armenia (378 AD), he not only persecuted the Christians most cruelly, but also, for political reasons, endeavored to prevent Armenia from all contact with the Byzantine world. Hence his viceroy, the renegade Armenian Merouzhan, closed the schools, proscribed Greek learning, and burnt all Greek books, especially the Scriptures. Syriac books were spared, just as in Persia itself; but in many cases the clergy were unable to interpret them to their people. Persecution had not crushed out Christianity, but there was danger lest it should perish through want of the Word of God. Hence several attempts were made to translate the Bible into Armenian. It is said that Chrysostom, during his exile at Cucusus (404-407 AD), invented an Armenian alphabet and translated the Psalter, but this is doubtful. But when Arcadius ceded almost all Armenia to Sapor about 396 AD, something had to be done. Hence in 397 the celebrated Mesrob Mashtots and Isaac (Sachak) the Catholicos resolved to translate the Bible. Mesrob had been a court secretary, and as such was well acquainted with Pahlavi, Syriac and Greek, in which three languages the royal edicts were then published. Isaac had been born at Constantinople and educated there and at Caesarea. Hence he too was a good Greek scholar, besides being versed in Syriac and Pahlavi, which latter was then the court language in Armenia. But none of these three alphabets was suited to express the sounds of the Armenian tongue, and hence, an alphabet had to be devised for it.

2. The Translators:

A council of the nobility, bishops and leading clergy was held at Vagharshapat in 402, King Vramshapouch being present, and this council requested Isaac to translate the Scriptures into the vernacular. By 406, Mesrob had succeeded in inventing an alphabet—practically the one still in use—principally by modifying the Greek and the Pahlavi characters, though some think the Palmyrene alphabet had influence. He and two of his pupils at Samosata began by translating the Book of Proverbs, and then the New Testament, from the Greek Meanwhile, being unable to find a single Greek manuscript in the country, Isaac translated the church lessons from the Peshitta Syriac, and published

this version in 411. He sent two of his pupils to Constantinople for copies of the Greek Bible. These men were present at the Council of Ephesus, 431 AD. Probably Theodoret (De Cura Graec. Affect., I, 5) learned from them what he says about the existence of the Bible in Armenian. Isaac's messengers brought him copies of the Greek Bible from the Imperial Library at Constantinople—doubtless some of those prepared by Eusebius at Constantine's command. Mesrob Mashtots and Isaac, with their assistants, finished and published the Armenian (ancient) version of the whole Bible in 436. La Croze is justified in styling it Queen of versions Unfortunately the Old Testament was rendered (as we have said) from the Septuagint, not from the Hebrew. But the Apocrypha was not translated, only "the 22 Books" of the Old Testament, as Moses of Khorene informs us. This was due to the influence of the Peshitta Old Testament.

Apocrypha Omitted.

Not till the 8th century was the Apocrypha rendered into Armenian: it was not read in Armenian churches until the 12th. Theodotion's version of Daniel was translated, instead of the very inaccurate Septuagint. The Alexandrine text was generally followed but not always.

3. Revision:

In the 6th century the Armenian version is said to have been revised so as to agree with the Peshitta. Hence, probably in Mt 28:18 the King James Version, the passage, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," is inserted as in the Peshitta, though it occurs also in its proper place (Joh 20:21). It reads "Jesus Barabbas" in Mt 27:16,17—a reading which Origen found "in very ancient manuscripts." It contains Lu 22:43,44. As is well known, in the Etschmiadzin manuscript of 986 AD, over Mr 16:9-20, are inserted the words, "of Ariston the presbyter"; but Nestle (Text. Criticism of the Greek New Testament, Plate IX, etc.) and others omit to notice that these words are by a different and a later hand, and are merely an unauthorized remark of no great value.

4. Results of Circulation:

Mesrob's version was soon widely circulated and became the one great national book. Lazarus Pharpetsi, a contemporary Armenian historian, says he is justified in describing the spiritual results by quoting Isaiah and saying that the whole land of Armenia was thereby "filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." But for it, both church and nation would have perished in the terrible persecutions which have now lasted, with intervals, for more than a millennium and a half.

5. Printed Editions:

This version was first printed somewhat late: the Psalter at Rome in 1565, the Bible by Bishop Oskan of Erivan at Amsterdam in 1666, from a very defective MS; other editions at Constantinople in 1705, Venice in 1733. Dr. Zohrab's edition of the New Testament in 1789 was far better. A critical edition was printed at Venice in 1805, another at Serampore in 1817. The Old Testament (with the readings of the

Hebrew text at the foot of the page) appeared at Constantinople in 1892 ff.

II. Modern Armenian Versions.

There are two great literary dialects of modern Armenian, in which it was necessary to publish the Bible, since the ancient Armenian (called Grapar, or "written") is no longer generally understood. The American missionaries have taken the lead in translating Holy Scripture into both.

1. Ararat-Armenian:

The first version of the New Testament into Ararat Armenian, by Dittrich, was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society at Moscow in 1835; the Psalter in 1844; the rest of the Old Testament much later. There is an excellent edition, published at Constantinople in 1896.

2. Constantinopolitan-Armenian:

A version of the New Testament into Constantinopolitan Armenian, by Dr. Zohrab, was published at Paris in 1825 by the British and Foreign Bible Society. This version was made from the Ancient Armenian. A revised edition, by Adger, appeared at Smyrna in 1842. In 1846 the American missionaries there published a version of the Old Testament. The American Bible Society have since published revised editions of this version.

III. Armenian Language.

The Armenian language is now recognized by philologists to be, not a dialect or subdivision of ancient Persian or Iranian, but a distinct branch of the Aryan or Indo-European family, standing almost midway between the Iranian and the European groups. In some respects, especially in weakening and ultimately dropping "t" and "d" between vowels, it resembles the Keltic tongues (compare Gaelic A (th)air, Arm. Chair = Pater, Father). As early as the 5th century it had lost gender in nouns, though retaining inflections (compare Brugmann, Elements of Comp. Greek of Indo-German Languages).

LITERATURE.

Koriun; Agathangelos; Lazarus Pharpetsi; Moses Khorenatsi (= of Chorene); Faustus Byzantinus; Chhamchheants; Chaikakan Hin Dprouthian Patm; Chaikakan Thargmanouthiunk’h Nak’hneants; The Bible of Every Land; Tisdall, Conversion of Armenia; Nestle, Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); N.Y. Cyclopaedia of Biblical. and Theol. Lit.; Hauck, Real-encyklopadie fur protest. Theol. und Kirche.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

ARMENIAN; ARYAN; RELIGION

ar-me’-ni-an, ar’-i-an. This greatly resembled that of Persia, though Zoroastrianism and its dualistic system were not professed. We are thus enabled to judge how far the religion of the Avesta is due to Zoroaster’s reformation. Aramazd (Ahura Mazda), creator of heaven and earth, was father of all the chief deities. His spouse was probably Spandaramet (Spenta Armaiti), goddess of the earth, who was later held to preside over the underworld (compare Persephone; Hellenistic). Among her assistants as genii of fertility were Horot and Morot (HaurvataT and AmeretaT), tutelary deities of Mt. Massis (now styled Ararat). Aramazd’s worship seems to have fallen very much into the background in favor of that of inferior deities, among the chief of whom was his daughter Anahit (Anahita), who had temples in many places. Her statues were often of the precious metals, and among her many names were "Golden Mother" and "Goddess of the Golden Image."

Hence to the present day the word "Golden" enters into many Armenian names. White heifers and green boughs were offered her as goddess of fruitfulness, nor was religious prostitution in her honor uncommon. Next in popularity came her sister Astghik ("the little star"), i.e. the planet Venus, goddess of beauty, wife of the deified hero Vahagn (Verethraghna). He sprang from heaven, earth, and sea, and overthrew dragons and other evil beings. Another of Anahit’s sisters was Nane (compare Assyrian Nana, Nannaea), afterward identified with Athene. Her brother Mihr (Mithra) had the sun as his symbol in the sky and the sacred fire on earth, both being objects of worship. In his temples a sacred fire was rekindled once a year. Aramazd’s messenger and scribe was Tiur or Tir, who entered men’s deeds in the "Book of Life." He led men after death to Aramazd for judgment. Before birth he wrote men’s fates on their foreheads. The place of punishment was Dzhokhk’h (= Persian Duzakh). To the sun and moon sacrifices were offered on the mountain-tops. Rivers and sacred springs and other natural objects were also adored. Prayer was offered facing eastward. Omens were taken from the rustling of the leaves of the sacred Sonean forest. Armavir was the religious capital.

Among inferior spiritual existences were the Arlezk’h, who licked the wounds of those slain in battle and restored them to life. The Parikk’h were evidently the Pairakas (Peris) of Persia. The Armenian mythology told of huge dragons which sometimes appeared as men, sometimes as worms, or basilisks, elves, sea-bulls, dragon-lions, etc. As in Persia, the demons made darts out of the parings of a man’s nails to injure him with. Therefore these parings, together with teeth and trimmings of hair, must be hidden in some sacred place.

LITERATURE.

Eznik Goghbatzi; Agathangelos; Moses of Khorene; Eghishe; Palasanean; Faustus Byzantinus; Chhamchheantz; Plutarch; Strabo; Tacitus. See my "Conversion of Armenia," R.T.S.; The Expositor T, II, 202 ff.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

ARMHOLE

arm’-hol: The Hebrew word ‘atstsil, is used in Jer 38:12 in the sense of armpits. When the prophet was pulled up out of the pit by ropes, the armpits were protected with rags and old garments. The meaning in Eze 13:18 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "elbows," the Revised Version, margin "joints of the hands") is far from clear. The phrase is used, without doubt, of some ornament or article of dress worn by the false prophetesses and priestesses of Ashtaroth in order to allure the unwary and tempt the simple. The "pillows" were probably "amulets" supposed to have magical virtues, and worn on the arms or wrists.

W. W. Davies

ARMLET

arm’-let: The word translated "bracelet" in 2Sa 1:10 the King James Version, probably denotes an "armlet," or "arm-band," worn on the upper arm. But it is the same word which with a different context is rendered "ankle- chains" (in Nu 31:50 the Revised Version (British and American)). The "bracelet" of Sirach 21:21 the King James Version, worn upon the right arm, was an "armlet," as is seen from the list given of Judith’s ornaments: who "decked herself bravely with her armlets (the Revised Version (British and American) ‘chains’) and her bracelets, and her rings, and her ear-rings, and all her ornaments" (Judith 10:4). The nature of the ornaments given in the Revised Version (British and American) as "armlets," Ex 35:22; Nu 31:50, and in the King James Version as "tablets," is uncertain. For full and distinguishing, descriptions of "arm-lets," "anklets," "bracelets," etc., found in ancient graves, see PEFS, 1905, 318 ff. See also ORNAMENT.

George B. Eager

ARMONI

ar-mo’-ni (’armoni, "belonging to the palace"): One of the two sons of Saul by Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah (2Sa 21:8). David delivered them over to the blood vengeance of the Gibeonites.

ARMOR-BEARER

ar’-mer-bar’-er (nose’ keli; Greek uses a phrase, ho airon ta skeue, literally "the one carrying the armor"): One who carried the large shield and perhaps other weapons for a king (1Sa 31:4), commander-in-chief (2Sa 23:37), captain (1Sa 14:7) or champion (1Sa 17:7). All warriors of distinction had such an attendant. Rather than perish by the hand of a woman, Abimelech called upon his armor-bearer to give him the finishing stroke (Jud 9:54), and when King Saul’s armor-bearer refused to do this office for him that he might not become the prisoner of the Philistines, he took a sword himself and fell upon it (1Sa 31:4). David became Saul’s armor-bearer for a time, and Jonathan’s armor-bearer was a man of resource

and courage (1Sa 14:7). The shield-bearer was a figure well known in the chariots of Egypt and Assyria and the Hittites, his business being to protect his fighting companion during the engagement.

T. Nicol.

ARMOR; ARMS

ar’-mer, arms.

I. ARMOR IN GENERAL—OLD TESTAMENT

II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT; POLYBIUS

III. OFFENSIVE WEAPONS

1. Rod

2. Sling

3. Bow and Arrows

4. Spear—Javelin

5. Sword

IV. DEFENSIVE WEAPONS

1. Shield

2. Helmet

3. Coat of Mail

4. Greaves

5. Girdle

LITERATURE

I. Armor in General—Old Testament.

(maddim; 1Sa 17:38; 1Sa 14:1 the Revised Version (British and American) APPAREL; nesheq, 1Ki 10:25; Job 39:21; kelim; ta hopla): Under this head it may be convenient to notice the weapons of attack and defense in use among the Hebrews, mentioned in Scripture. There are no such descriptions given by the sacred writers as are to be found in Homer, who sets forth in detail the various pieces of armor worn by an Achilles or a Patroclus, and the order of putting them on. There is an account of the armor offensive and defensive of the Philistine Goliath (1Sa 17:5-7); and from a much later time we read of shields and spears and helmets and habergeons, or coats of mail, and bows and slings with which Uzziah provided his soldiers (2Ch 26:14). In Jeremiah's ode of triumph over the defeat of Pharaoh-neco, there is mention of the arms of the Egyptians: "Prepare ye the buckler and shield, and draw near to battle. Harness the horses, and get up, ye horsemen, and stand forth with your helmets; furbish the spears, put on the coats of mail" (Jer 46:3,4). Of the arms of Assyrian, Chaldean, Egyptian and Hittite soldiery there have come down to us sculptured representations from their ancient monuments, which throw light upon the battlepieces of the Hebrew historians and prophets.

II. In the New Testament; Polybius.

In the New Testament, Paul describes the panoply of the Christian soldier, naming the essential pieces of the Roman soldier's armor—the girdle, the breastplate, the footgear, the shield, the helmet, the sword—although it is to be noticed that his most characteristic weapon, the pilum or spear, is omitted (Eph 6:10-17). In a similar context the same apostle speaks of "the armor" of light (Ro 13:12), "of righteousness on the right hand and on the left" (2Co 6:7). Of the equipment of the Roman soldier in detail, the most useful illustration is the account given by Polybius (vi.23): "The Roman panoply consists in the first place of a shield (thureos). .... Along with the shield is a sword (machaira). .... Next come two javelins (hussoi) and a helmet (perikephalaia), and a greave (knemis). ..... Now the majority, when they have further put on a bronze plate, measuring a span every way, which they wear on their breasts and call a heart-guard (kardiophulax), are completely armed, but those citizens who are assessed at more than 10,000 drachmae wear instead, together with the other arms, cuirasses made of chain mail (halusidotous thorakas)."

III. Offensive Weapons.

1. Rod:

The commonest weapon in the hands of the shepherd youth of Palestine today is the rod (shebheT; rhabdos), a stick loaded at one end, which he carries in his hand, or wears attached to his wrist by a loop of string, ready for use. It is of considerable weight and is a formidable weapon whether used in self-defense or in attacking a foe. With such a weapon David may well have overcome the lion and the bear that invaded the fold. This shepherd's rod, while used for guidance, or comfort, or for numbering the flock (Ps 23:4; Le 27:32), was also a weapon with which to strike and punish (Ps 2:9; Isa 10:5,15). In this sense it has for a synonym maTTeh (Isa 9:4; Eze 7:11), and both came to have the derived meaning of spearheads (shebheT, 2Sa 18:14; maTTeh, 1Sa 14:27). They may have been the original of the maul or hammer (mephits, Pr 25:18; Jer 51:20, where Cyrus, as God's battle-axe, is to shatter Babylon and its

inhabitants for the wrongs they have done to His people Israel).

2. Sling:

Scarcely less common and equally homely is the sling (qela‘; sphendone) (1Sa 17:40). It consists of plaited thongs, or of one strip of leather, made broad at the middle to form a hollow or pocket for the stone or other contents, the ends being held firmly in the hand as it is whirled loaded round the head, and one of them being at length let go, so that the stone may take its flight. It is used by the shepherd still to turn the straying sheep, and it can also be used with deadly effect as a weapon of war. The slingers (ha-qalla‘im, 2Ki 3:25) belonged to the light infantry, like the archers. The Benjamites were specially skilled in the use of the sling, which they could use as well with their left hand as the right (Jud 20:16). The sling was a weapon in use in the armies of Egypt and Babylonia, and Jeremiah in a powerful figure makes the Lord say to Jerusalem in a time of impending calamity: "Behold, I will sling out the inhabitants of the land at this time" (Jer 10:18; compare 1Sa 25:29).

3. Bow and Arrows:

A very important offensive weapon in the wars of Israel was the bow (qesheth) and arrows (chitstsim), and the archers whether mounted or on foot formed a powerful element of the fighting forces of the Philistines, Egyptians and Assyrians (s.v. ARCHERY; BOW).

4. Spear—Javelin:

The spear has various words to represent it.

(1) The chanith had a wooden staff or shaft of varying size and length with a head, or blade, of bronze, or, at a later time, of iron (1Sa 17:7). In the King James Version it is sometimes translated "javelin," but in the Revised Version (British and American) "spear" (see 1Sa 13:22; 18:11). Saul’s spear, stuck in the ground, betokened the abode of the king for the time, just as today the spear in front of his tent marks the halting-place of the Bedouin Sheikh (1Sa 22:6; 26:7). Nahum, describing the arms of the Assyrians, joins together the flashing sword and the glittering spear (Na 3:3). The bearers of the chanith belonged to the heavy-armed troops.

(2) The romach, also translated in the King James Version "javelin," was of the character of a lance. It does not appear to have differed much from the chanith—they appear as synonyms in Joe 3:10, where romach is used, and in Isa 2,4 where chanith is used, of spears beaten into pruning hooks. It describes the Egyptian spear in Jer 46:4. The bearers of the romach also belonged to the heavy-armed troops.

(3) The kidhon was lighter than either of the preceding and more of the nature of a javelin (gaison in the Septuagint, Jos 8:18 and Polybius vi.39, 3; Job 41:29; Jer 6:23). (4) In the New Testament the word "spear" occurs only once and is represented by the Greek logche, the equivalent no doubt of chanith as above (Joh 19:34).

5. Sword:

The sword (cherebh) is by far the most frequently mentioned weapon in Scripture, whether offensive or defensive. The blade was of iron (1Sa 13:19; Joe 3:10). It was hung from the girdle on the left side, and was used both to cut and to thrust. Ehud's sword (Jud 3:16) was double-edged and a cubit in length, and, as he was left-handed, was worn on his right thigh under his clothes. The sword was kept in a sheath (1Sa 17:51); to draw the sword was the signal for war (Eze 21:3). Soldiers are "men who draw the sword." It is the flashing sword (Na 3:3); the oppressing sword (Jer 46:16); the devouring sword (2Sa 18:8; Jer 12:12); the sword which drinks its fill of blood (Isa 34:5,6). The sword of the Lord executes God's judgments (Jer 47:6; Eze 21:9,10 ff).

Figurative: In the highly metaphorical language of the prophets it stands for war and its attendant calamities (Jer 50:35-37; Eze 21:28).

In the New Testament machaira is employed for sword in its natural meaning (Mt 26:47,51; Ac 12:2; Heb 11:34,37). Paul calls the Word of God the sword of the Spirit (Eph 6:17); and in the Epistle to Hebrews the Word of God is said to be sharper than any two-edged sword (Heb 4:12). As a synonym the word rhomphaia is used in the Apocrypha alone of the New Testament books, save for Lu 2:35. It was the Thracian sword with large blade, and is classed by the ancients rather as a spear. The word is used frequently in the Septuagint like machaira to translate cherebh. In Re 1:16 the sharp two-edged sword of judgment, rhomphaia is seen in vision proceeding out of the mouth of the glorified Lord (compare Re 19:15). Xiphos is still another word for sword, but it is found only in the Septuagint, and not in the New Testament.

IV. Defensive Weapons.

1. Shield:

The most ancient and universal weapon of defense is the shield. The two chief varieties are

(1) the tsinnah, Latin scutum, the large shield, worn by heavy-armed infantry, adapted to the form of the human body, being made oval or in the shape of a door; hence, its Greek name, thureos, from thura, a door; and

(2) the maghen, Latin clypeus, the light, round hand-buckler, to which pelte is the Greek equivalent. The two are often mentioned together (Eze 23:24; 38:4; Ps 35:2).

The tsinnah was the shield of the heavy-armed (1Ch 12:24); and of Goliath we read that his shield was borne by a man who went before him (1Sa 17:7,41) The maghen could be borne by bowmen, for we read of men of Benjamin in Asa's army that bare shields and drew bows (2Ch 14:8). The ordinary material of which shields were made was wood, or wicker-work overlaid with leather. The wood-work

of the shields and other weapons of Gog’s army were to serve Israel for fuel for seven years (Eze 39:9). The anointing of the shield (2Sa 1:21; Isa 21:5) was either to protect it from the weather, or, more probably, was part of the consecration of the warrior and his weapons for the campaign. Solomon in his pride of wealth had 200 shields (tsinnoth) of beaten gold, and 300 targets (maghinnim) of beaten gold made for himself, and hung in the house of the forest of Lebanon (1Ki 10:16,17). They were only for show, and when Shishak of Egypt came up against Rehoboam and carried them off, Rehoboam replaced them with others of bronze (1Ki 14:27). On the march, the shield was strapped over the shoulder and kept in a cover, which was removed before the battle (Isa 22:6). Both words are used of the mechanical device known to the Romans as the testudo employed by the besiegers of a city against the darts and stones and blazing torches thrown out by the besieged (Isa 37:33; Eze 26:8).

Figurative: Yahweh is spoken of as the Shield and Protector of His people—of Abraham (Ge 15:1); of Israel (De 33:29); of the Psalmist (Ps 18:30; 35:2, and many other passages). In his description of the panoply of the Christian soldier, Paul introduces faith as the thureos, the large Greek-Roman shield, a defense by which he may quench all the fiery darts of the evil one.

2. Helmet:

The helmet, qobha‘ or kobha‘, seems to have been originally in the form of a skull-cap, and it is thus figured in representations of Hittites on the walls of Karnak in Egypt. In the earliest times it is found worn only by outstanding personages like kings and commanders. When King Saul armed David with his own armor he put a helmet of brass upon his head (1Sa 17:38). Uzziah at a later time provided his soldiers with helmets, as part of their equipment (2Ch 26:14). The men of Pharaoh-neco’s army also wore helmets (Jer 46:4), and the mercenaries in the armies of Tyre had both shield and helmet to hang up within her (Eze 27:10). The materials of the helmet were at first of wood, linen, felt, or even of rushes; leather was in use until the Seleucid period when it was supplanted by bronze (1 Macc 6:35); the Greek and Roman helmets both of leather and brass were well known in the Herodian period.

Figurative: Paul has the helmet, perikephalaia, for his Christian soldier (Eph 6:17; 1Th 5:8). In the Septuagint perikephalaia occurs eleven times as the equivalent of the Hebrew term.

3. Coat of Mail:

Body armor for the protection of the person in battle is mentioned in the Old Testament and is well known in representations of Egyptian, Persian and Parthian warriors. The shiryon, translated "habergeon" in the King James Version, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "coat of mail," is part of the armor of Nehemiah’s workers (Ne 4:16), and one of the pieces of armor supplied by King Uzziah to his soldiers. (2Ch 26:14). Goliath was armed with a shiryon, and when Saul clad David in his own armor to meet the Philistine champion he put on him a coat of mail, his shiryon (1Sa 17:5,38). Such a piece of body armor Ahab wore in the fatal battle of Ramoth-gilead (1Ki 22:34). In the battle of Bethsura in the Maccabean struggle the Syrian war-elephants were protected with breastplates, the word for which, thorax, represents the shiryon in the Septuagint (1 Macc 6:43).

Figurative: Isaiah in a striking figure describes Yahweh as putting on righteousness for a coat of mail and salvation as a helmet, where thorax and perikephalaia are the Greek words of the Septuagint to render shiryon and kobha‘. It is from this passage (Isa 59:17) that Paul obtains his "breastplate of righteousness" (Eph 6:14).

4. Greaves:

Greaves (mitschah; knemides) are mentioned once in Scripture as part of the armor of Goliath (1Sa 17:6). They were of brass or leather, fastened by thongs round the leg and above the ankles.

5. Girdle:

The girdle (chaghorah; Greek zone) was of leather studded with nails, and was used for supporting the sword (1Sa 18:4; 2Sa 20:8). See GIRDLE.

Figurative: For figurative uses see under the separate weapons.

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebraische Archaeologie, I, 359-67; Benzinger, Herzog, RE, article "Kriegswesen bei den Hebraern"; McCurdy, HPM, I, II; Woods and Powell, The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers, I, II; G. M. Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs; Browne, Hebrew Antiquities, 40-46; corresponding articles in Kitto, Hastings, and other Bible dictionaries.

T. Nicol.

ARMORY

ar’-mer-i:

(1) (’otsar; thesauros): A storehouse (1Ki 7:51; Ne 10:38), but employed figuratively of the stored-up anger of Yahweh which breaks forth in judgments (Jer 50:25).

(2) (nesheq): Identical with Solomon’s "house of the forest of Lebanon," the arsenal close to the temple (1Ki 10:17; Ne 3:19; Isa 22:8), in which were stored the shields and targets of beaten gold.

(3) (talpiyoth): A puzzling word rendered "armory" in our versions (So 4:4)—"the tower of David builded for an armory, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men." the Revised Version margin renders "builded with turrets."

T. Nicol.

ARMY

ar’-mi (chayil, "army," tsabha’," host," ma‘arakhah, "army in battle array" gedhudh, "troop"):

1. The First Campaign of History

2. In the Wilderness

3. The Times after the Conquest

4. In the Early Monarchy

5. From the Time of Solomon Onward

6. Organization of the Hebrew Army

7. The Army in the Field

8. The Supplies of the Army

9. In the New Testament

The Israelites were not a distinctively warlike people and their glory has been won on other fields than those of war. But Canaan, between the Mediterranean and the desert, was the highway of the East and the battle-ground of nations. The Israelites were, by the necessity of their geographical position, often involved in wars not of their own seeking, and their bravery and endurance even when worsted in their conflicts won for them the admiration and respect of their conquerors.

1. The First Campaign of History:

The first conflict of armed forces recorded in Holy Scripture is that in Ge 14. The kings of the Jordan valley had rebelled against Chedorlaomer, king of Elam—not the first of the kings of the East to reach the Mediterranean with his armies—and joined battle with him and other kings in the Vale of Siddim. In this campaign Abraham distinguished himself by the rescue of his nephew Lot, who had fallen with all that he possessed into the hands of the Elamite king. The force with which Abraham effected the defeat of Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him was his own retainers, 318 in number, whom he had armed and led forth in person in his successful pursuit.

2. In the Wilderness:

When we first make the acquaintance of the Israelites as a nation, they are a horde of fugitives who have escaped from the bitter oppression and hard bondage of Pharaoh. Although there could have been but little of the martial spirit in a people so long and grievously oppressed, their journeyings through the wilderness toward Canaan are from the first described as the marching of a great host. It was according to their "armies" ("hosts" the Revised Version (British and American)) that Aaron and Moses were to bring the Children of Israel from the land of Egypt (Ex 6:26). When they had entered upon the wilderness they went up "harnessed" ("armed" the Revised Version (British and American)) for the journeyings that lay before them—where "harnessed" or "armed" may point not to the weapons they bore but to the order and arrangements of a body of troops marching five deep (hamushshim) or divided into five army corps (Ex 13:18).

On the way through the wilderness they encamped (Ex 13:20; and passim) at their successive halting-places, and the whole army of 600,000 was, after Sinai, marked off into divisions or army corps, each with its own camp and the ensigns of their fathers' houses (Nu 2:2). "From twenty years old and upward, all that are able to go forth to war in Israel," the males of the tribes were numbered and assigned to their place in the camp (Nu 1:3). Naturally, in the wilderness they are footmen (Nu 11:21), and it was not till the period of the monarchy that other arms were added. Bow and sling and spear and sword for attack, and shield and helmet for defense, would be the full equipment of the men called upon to fight in the desert. Although we hear little of gradations of military rank, we do read of captains of thousands and captains of hundreds in the wilderness (Nu 31:14), and Joshua commands the fighting men in the battle against the Amalekites at Rephidim (Ex 17:9 ff). That the Israelites acquired in their journeyings in the wilderness the discipline and martial spirit which would make them a warlike people, may be gathered from their successes against the Midianites, against Og, king of Bashan, toward the close of the forty years, and from the military organization with which they proceeded to the conquest of Canaan.

3. The Times after the Conquest:

In more than one campaign the Israelites under Joshua's leadership established themselves in Canaan. But it was largely through the enterprise of the several tribes after that the conquest was achieved. The progress of the invaders was stubbornly contested, but Joshua encouraged his kinsmen of Ephraim and Manasseh to press on the conquest even against the invincible war-chariots of the Canaanites—"for thou shalt drive out the Canaanites, though they have iron chariots, and though they are strong" (Jos 17:18). As it was in the early history of Rome, where the defense of the state was an obligation resting upon every individual according to his stake in the public welfare, so it was at first in Israel. Tribal jealousies, however, impaired the sentiment of nationality and hindered united action when once the people had been settled in Canaan.

The tribes had to defend their own, and it was only a great emergency that united them in common action. The first notable approach to national unity was seen in the army which Barak assembled to meet the host of Jabin, king of Hazor, under the command of Sisera (Jud 4:5). In Deborah's war-song in commemoration of the notable victory achieved by Barak and herself, the men of the northern tribes, Zebulun, Naphtali, Issachar, along with warriors of Manasseh, Ephraim and Benjamin, are praised for the valor with which they withstood and routed the host—foot, horse and chariots—of Sisera. Once

again the tribes of Israel assembled in force from "Da even to Beersheba, with the land of Gilead" (Jud 20:1) to punish the tribe of Benjamin for condoning a gross outrage. The single tribe was defeated in the battle that ensued, but they were able to put into the field "26,000 men that drew sword," and they had also "700 chosen men left-handed; every one could sling stones at a hair-breadth, and not miss" (Jud 20:15,16).

4. In the Early Monarchy:

Up to this time the fighting forces of the Israelites were more of the character of a militia. The men of the tribes more immediately harassed by enemies were summoned for action by the leader raised up by God, and disbanded when the emergency was past. The monarchy brought changes in military affairs. It was the plea of the leaders of Israel, when they desired to have a king, that he would go out before them and fight their battles (1Sa 8:20). Samuel had warned them that with a monarchy a professional soldiery would be required. "He will take your sons, and appoint them unto him, for his chariots, and to be his horsemen; and they shall run before his chariots; and he will appoint them unto him for captains of thousands, and captains of fifties; and he Will set some to plow his ground, and reap his harvest, and to make his instruments of war, and the instruments of his chariots" (1Sa 8:11,12). That this was the course which military reform took in the period following the establishment of the monarchy may well be. It fell to Saul when he ascended the throne to withstand the invading Philistines and to relieve his people from the yoke which they had already laid heavily upon some parts of the country.

The Philistines were a military people, well disciplined and armed, with 30,000 chariots and 6,000 horsemen at their service when they came up to Michmash (1Sa 13:5). What chance had raw levies of vinedressers and herdsmen from Judah and Benjamin against such a foe? No wonder that the Israelites hid themselves in caves and thickets, and in rocks, and in holes, and in pits (1Sa 13:6). And it is quoted by the historian as the lowest depth of national degradation that the Israelites had to go down to the Philistines "to sharpen every man his share, and his coulter, and his axe, and his mattock" (1Sa 13:20) because the Philistines had carried off their smiths to prevent them from making swords or spears.

It was in this desperate condition that King Saul was called to begin the struggle for freedom and national unity in Israel. The victories at Michmash and Elah and the hotly contested but unsuccessful and fatal struggle at Gilboa evince the growth of the martial spirit and advance alike in discipline and in strategy. After the relief of Jabesh- gilead, instead of disbanding the whole of his levies, Saul retained 3,000 men under arms, and this in all probability became the nucleus of the standing army of Israel (1Sa 13:2). From this time onward "when Saul saw any mighty man, or any valiant man, he took him unto him" (1Sa 14:52). Of the valiant men whom Saul kept round his person, the most notable were Jonathan and David. Jonathan had command of one division of 1,000 men at Gibeah (1Sa 13:2), and David was captain of the king’s bodyguard (1Sa 18:5; compare 1Sa 18:13). When David fell under Saul’s jealousy and betook himself to an outlaw life in the mountain fastnesses of Judah, he gathered round him in the cave of Adullam 400 men (1Sa 22:1,2) who were ere long increased to 600 (1Sa 23:1,3). From the story of Nabal (1Sa 25) we learn how a band like that of David could be maintained in service, and we gather that landholders who benefited by the presence of an armed force were expected to provide the necessary supplies. On David’s accession to the throne this band of warriors remained attached to his

person and became the backbone of his army.

We can identify them with the gibborim—the mighty men of whom Benaiah at a later time became captain (2Sa 23:22,23; 1Ki 1:8) and who are also known by the name of Cherethites and Pelethites (2Sa 8:18). These may have received their name from their foreign origin, the former, in Hebrew kerethi being originally from Crete but akin to the Philistines; and the latter, in Hebrew pelethi being Philistines by birth. That there were foreign soldiers in David's service we know from the examples of Uriah the Hittite and Ittai of Gath. David's gibborim have been compared to the Praetorian Cohort of the Roman emperors, the Janissaries of the sultans, and the Swiss Guards of the French kings. Of David's army Joab was the commander-in-chief, and to the military' genius of this rough and unscrupulous warrior, the king's near kinsman, the dynasty of David was deeply indebted.

5. From the Time of Solomon Onward:

In the reign of Solomon, although peace was its prevailing characteristic, there can have been no diminution of the armed forces of the kingdom, for we read of military expeditions against Edom and Syria and Hamath, and also of fortresses built in every part of the land, which would require troops to garrison them. Hazor, the old Canaanite capital, at the foot of Lebanon; Megiddo commanding the rich plain of Jezreel; Gezer overlooking the Philistine plain; the Bethhorons (Upper and Nether); and Tadmor in the wilderness; not to speak of Jerusalem with Millo and the fortified wall, were fortresses requiring strong garrisons (1Ki 9:15). It is probable that "the levy," which was such a burden upon the people at large, included forced military service as well as forced labor, and helped to create the dissatisfaction which culminated in the revolt of Jeroboam, and eventually in the disruption of the kingdom. Although David had reserved from the spoils of war in his victorious campaign against Hadadezer, king of Zobah, horses for 100 chariots (2Sa 8:4), cavalry and chariots were not an effective branch of the service in his reign. Solomon, however, disregarding the scruples of the stricter Israelites, and the ordinances of the ancient law (De 17:16), added horses and chariots on a large scale to the military equipment of the nation (1Ki 10:26-29). It is believed that it was from Musri, a country of northern Syria occupied by the Hittites, and Kue in Cilicia, that Solomon obtained horses for his cavalry and chariotry (1Ki 10:29; 2Ch 1:16, where the best text gives Mutsri, and not the Hebrew word for Egypt). This branch of the service was not only looked upon with distrust by the stricter Israelites, but was expressly denounced in later times by the prophets (Isa 2:7; Ho 1:7; Mic 5:10). In the prophets, too, more than in the historical books, we are made acquainted with the cavalry and chariotry of Assyria and Babylon which in the days of Sargon, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar had become so formidable. Their lancers and mounted archers, together with their chariots, gave them a sure ascendancy in the field of war (Na 3:2,3; Hab 1:8; Jer 46:4). In comparison with these, the cavalry of the kings of Israel and Judah was insignificant, and to this Rabshakeh contemptuously referred (2Ki 18:23) when he promised to the chiefs of Judah from the king of Assyria 2,000 horses if Hezekiah could put riders upon them.

6. Organization of the Hebrew Army:

As we have seen, every male in Israel at the age of twenty, according to the ancient law, became liable

for military service (Nu 1:3; 26:2; 2Ch 25:5), just as at a later time every male of that age became liable for the half-shekel of Temple dues. Josephus is our authority for believing that no one was called upon to serve after the age of fifty (Ant., III, xii, 4). From military service the Levites were exempt (Nu 2:33). In Deuteronomic law exemption was allowed to persons betrothed but not married, to persons who had built a house but had not dedicated it, or who had planted a vineyard but had not eaten of the fruit of it, and to persons faint-hearted and fearful whose timidity might spread throughout the ranks (De 20:1-9). These exemptions no doubt reach back to a high antiquity and in the Maccabean period they still held good (1 Macc 3:56). The army was divided into bodies of 1,000, 100, 50, and in Maccabean times, 10, each under its own captain (Sar) (Nu 31:14; 1Sa 8:12; 2Ki 1:9; 2Ch 25:5; 1 Macc 3:55). In the army of Uzziah we read of "heads of fathers' houses," mighty men of valor who numbered 2,600 and had under their hand a trained army of 307,500 men (2Ch 26:12,13), where, however, the figures have an appearance of exaggeration.

Over the whole host of Israel, according to the fundamental principle of theocracy, was Yahweh Himself, the Supreme Leader of her armies (1Sa 8:7 ff); it was "the Captain of the Lord's host," to whom Joshua and all serving under him owned allegiance, that appeared before the walls of Jericho to help the gallant leader in his enterprise. In the times of the Judges the chiefs themselves, Barak, Gideon, Jephthah, led their forces in person to battle. Under the monarchy the captain of the host was an office distinct from that of the king, and we have Joab, Abner, Benaiah, named as commanders-in-chief. An armor-bearer attended the captain of the host as well as the king (1Sa 14:6; 31:4,5; 2Sa 23:37). Mention is made of officers who had to do the numbering of the people, the copher, scribe, attached to the captain of the host (2Ki 25:19; compare 2Sa 24:2; 1Ma 5:42), and the shoTer, muster-master, who kept the register of those who were in military service and knew the men who had received authorized leave of absence (De 20:5, Driver's note).

7. The Army in the Field:

Before the army set forth, religious services were held (Joe 3:9), and sacrifices were offered at the opening of a campaign to consecrate the war (Mic 3:5; Jer 6:4; 22:7). Recourse was had in earlier times to the oracle (Jud 1:1; 20:27; 1Sa 14:37; 23:2; 28:6; 30:8), in later times to a prophet (1Ki 22:5 ff; 2Ki 3:13; 19:2; Jer 38:14). Cases are mentioned in which the Ark accompanied the army to the field (1Sa 4:4; 14:18), and before the engagement sacrifices also were offered (1Sa 7:9; 13:9), ordinarily necessitating the presence of a priest (De 20:2). Councils of war were held to settle questions of policy in the course of siege or a campaign (Jer 38:7; 39:3). The signal for the charge or retreat was given by sound of a trumpet (Nu 10:9; 2Sa 2:28; 18:16; 1 Macc 16:8). The order of battle was simple, the heavy-armed spearmen forming the van, slingers and archers bringing up the rear, supported by horses and chariots, which moved to the front as need required (1Sa 31:3; 1Ki 22:31; 2Ch 14:9). Strategy was called into play according to the disposition of the opposing forces or the nature of the ground (Jos 8:3; 11:7; Jud 7:16; 1Sa 15:5; 2Sa 5:23; 2Ki 3:11 ff).

Although David had in his service foreign soldiers like Uriah the Hittite and Ittai of Gath, and although later kings hired aliens for their campaigns, it was not till the Maccabean struggle for independence that mercenaries came to be largely employed in the Jewish army. Mercenaries are spoken of in the prophets

as a source of weakness to the nation that employs them (to Egypt, Jer 46:16,21; to Babylon, Jer 50:16). From the Maccabean time onward the princes of the Hasmonean family employed them, sometimes to hold the troublesome Jews in check, and sometimes to support the arms of Rome. Herod the Great had in his army mercenaries of various nations. When Jewish soldiers, however, took service with Rome, they were prohibited by their law from performing duty on the Sabbath. Early in the Maccabean fight for freedom, a band of Hasideans or Jewish Puritans, allowed themselves to be cut down to the last man rather than take up the sword on the Sabbath (1 Macc 2:34 ff). Cases are even on record where their Gentileadversaries took advantage of their scruples to inflict upon them loss and defeat (Ant., XIII, xii, 4; XIV, iv, 2).

8. The Supplies of the Army:

Before the army had become a profession in Israel, and while the levies were still volunteers like the sons of Jesse, the soldiers not only received no pay, but had to provide their own supplies, or depend upon rich landholders like Nabal and Barzillai (1Sa 25; 2Sa 19:31). In that period and still later, the chief reward of the soldier was his share of the booty gotten in war (Jud 5:30 f; 1Sa 30:22 ff). By the Maccabean period we learn that an army like that of Simon, consisting of professional soldiers, could only be maintained at great expense (1 Macc 14:32).

9. In the New Testament:

Although the first soldiers that we read of in the New Testament were Jewish and not Roman (Lu 3:14; Mr 6:27), and although we read that Herod with his "men of war" joined in mocking Jesus (Lu 23:11), it is for the most part the Roman army that comes before us. The Roman legion, consisting roughly of 6,000 men, was familiar to the Jewish people, and the word had become a term to express a large number (Mt 26:53; Mr 5:9). Centurions figure most honorably alike in the Gospels and the Ac (kenturion, Mr 15:39; hekatontarches, hekatontarchos, Mt 8:5; Lu 23:47; Ac 10:1; 22:25,27). "The Pretorium" is the residence of the Roman procurator at Jerusalem, and in Caesarea (Mt 27:27; Ac 23:35), or the praetorian guard at Rome (Php 1:13). The Augustan band and the Italian band (Ac 10:1; Ac 27:1) are cohorts of Roman soldiers engaged on military duty at Caesarea. In Jerusalem there was one cohort stationed in the time of Paul under the command of a chiliarchos, or military tribune (Ac 22:24). It was out of this regiment that the dexiolaboi (Ac 23:23) were selected, who formed a guard for Paul to Caesarea, spearmen, or rather javelin- throwers.

Figurative: Among the military metaphors employed by Paul, who spent so much of his time in the later years of his life among Roman soldiers, some are taken from the weapons of the Roman soldier (see ARMS), and some also from the discipline and the marching and fighting of an army. Thus, "campaigning" is referred to (2Ti 2:3,4; 2Co 10:3-6); the "order and solid formation of soldiers" drawn up in battle array or on the march (Col 2:5); the "triumphal procession" to the capitol with its train of captives and the smoke of incense (2Co 2:14-16); and "the sounding of the trumpet," when the faithful Christian warriors shall take their place every man in his own order or "division" of the resurrection army of the Lord of Hosts (1Co 15:52,53). (See Dean Howson, Metaphors of Paul—"Roman Soldiers.")

The armies which are in heaven (Re 19:14,19) are the angelic hosts who were at the service of their Incarnate Lord in the days of His flesh and in His exaltation follow Him upon white horses clothed in fine linen white and pure (see Swete's note). See further ARMOR, ARMS.

T. Nicol.

ARMY, ROMAN

ar'-mi, ro'-man; The treatment of this subject will be confined to

(I) a brief description of the organization of the army, and

(II) a consideration of the allusions to the Roman military establishment in the New Testament.

I. Organization.

There were originally no standing forces, but the citizens performed military service like any other civic duty when summoned by the magistrates. The gradual development of a military profession and standing army culminated in the admission of the poorest class to the ranks by Marius (about 107 BC). Henceforth the Roman army was made up of a body of men whose character was essentially that of mercenaries, and whose term of continuous service varied in different divisions from 16 to 26 years.

The forces which composed the Roman army under the Empire may be divided into the following five groups:

(1) the imperial guard and garrison of the capital,

(2) the legions,

(3) the auxilia,

(4) the numeri,

(5) the fleet. We shall discuss their organization in the order mentioned.

1. The Imperial Guard:

The imperial guard consisted of the cohortes praetoriae, which together with the cohortes urbanae and vigiles made up the garrison of Rome. In the military system as established by Augustus there were nine cohorts of the praetorian guard, three of the urban troops, and seven of the vigiles. Each cohort numbered 1,000 men, and was commanded by a tribune of equestrian rank. The praetorian prefects

(praefecti praetorii), of whom there were usually two, were commanders of the entire garrison of the capital, and stood at the highest point of distinction and authority in the equestrian career.

2. The Legions:

There were 25 legions in 23 AD (Tacitus Annals 4, 5), which had been increased to 30 at the time of the reign of Marcus Aurelius, 160-180 AD (CIL, VI, 3492 a-b) and to 33 under Septimius Severus (Dio Cassius, iv. 23-24). Each legion was made up, ordinarily, of 6,000 men, who were divided into 10 cohorts, each cohort containing 3 maniples, and each maniple in turn 2 centuries.

The legatus Augustus pro praetore, or governor of each imperial province, was chief commander of all the troops within the province. An officer of senatorial rank known as legatus Augusti legionis was entrusted with the command of each legion, together with the bodies of auxilia which were associated with it. Besides, there were six tribuni militum, officers of equestrian rank (usually sons of senators who had not yet held the quaestorship) in each legion. The centurions who commanded the centuries belonged to the plebeian class. Between the rank of common soldier and centurion there were a large number of subalterns, called principales, who correspond roughly to the non-commissioned officers and men detailed from the ranks for special duties in modern armies.

3. The "Auxilia":

The auxilia were organized as infantry in cohortes, as cavalry in alae, or as mixed bodies, cohortes equitatae. Some of these divisions contained approximately 1,000 men (cohortes or alae miliariae), but the greater number about 500 (cohortes or alae quingenariae). They were commanded by tribuni and praefecti of equestrian rank. The importance of the auxilia consisted originally in the diversity of their equipment and manner of fighting, since each group adhered to the customs of the nation in whose midst it had been recruited. But with the gradual Romanization of the Empire they were assimilated more and more to the character of the legionaries.

4. The "Numeri":

The numeri developed out of the provincial militia and began to appear in the 2nd century AD. They maintained their local manner of warfare. Some were bodies of infantry, others of cavalry, and they varied in strength from 300 to 90 (Mommsen, Hermes, XIX, 219 f, and XXII, 547 f). Their commanders were praepositi, praefecti or tribuni, all men of equestrian rank.

5. The Fleet:

The fleet was under the command of prefects (praefecti classis), who took rank among the highest officials of the equestrian class. The principal naval stations were at Misenum and Ravenna.

6. Defensive Arrangements:

Augustus established the northern boundary of the Empire at the Rhine and at the Danube, throughout the greater part of its course, and bequeathed to his successors the advice that they should not extend their sovereignty beyond the limits which he had set (Tacitus Annals i.11; Agricola 13); and although this policy was departed from in many instances, such as the annexation of Thrace, Cappadocia, Mauretania, Britain, and Dacia, not to mention the more ephemeral acquisitions of Trajan, yet the military system of the Empire was arranged primarily with the view of providing for the defense of the provinces and not for carrying on aggressive warfare on a large scale. Nearly all the forces, with the exception of the imperial guard, were distributed among the provinces on the border of the Empire, and the essential feature of the disposition of the troops in these provinces was the permanent fortress in which each unit was stationed.

The combination of large camps for the legions with a series of smaller forts for the alae, cohorts, and numeri is the characteristic arrangement on all the frontiers. The immediate protection of the frontier was regularly entrusted to the auxiliary troops, while the legions were usually stationed some distance to the rear of the actual boundary. Thus the army as a whole was so scattered that it was a difficult undertaking to assemble sufficient forces for carrying out any considerable project of foreign conquest, or even to cope at once with a serious invasion, yet the system was generally satisfactory in view of the conditions which prevailed, and secured for the millions of subjects of the Roman Empire the longest period of undisturbed tranquillity known to European history.

7. Recruiting System:

In accordance with the arrangements of Augustus, the cohortes praetoriae and cohortes urbanae were recruited from Latium, Etruria, Umbria, and the older Roman colonies (Tacitus Annals 4, 5), the legions from the remaining portions of Italy, and the auxilia from the subject communities of the Empire (Seeck, Rheinisches Museum, XLVIII, 616).

But in course of time the natives of Italy disappeared, first from the legions, and later from the garrison of the capital. Antoninus Plus established the rule that each body of troops should draw its recruits from the district where it was stationed. Henceforth the previous possession of Roman citizenship was no longer required for enlistment in the legions. The legionary was granted the privilege of citizenship upon entering the service, the auxiliary soldier upon being discharged (Seeck, Untergang der antiken Welt, I, 250).

II. Allusions in the New Testament to the Roman Military Establishment.

Such references relate chiefly to the bodies of troops which were stationed in Judea. Agrippa I left a military establishment of one ala and five cohorts at his death in 44 AD (Josephus, Ant, XIX, ix, 2; BJ, III, iv, 2), which he had doubtless received from the earlier Roman administration. These divisions were composed of local recruits, chiefly Samaritans (Hirschfeld, Verwaltungsbeamte, 395; Mommsen, Hermes, XIX, 217, note 1). The Ala I gemina Sebastenorum was stationed at Caesarea (Josephus, Ant,

XX, 122; BJ, II, xii, 5; CIL, VIII, 9359).

1. Augustan Band:

Julius, the centurion to whom Paul and other prisoners were delivered to be escorted to Rome (Ac 27:1), belonged to one of the five cohorts which was stationed at or near Caesarea. This Speira Sebaste (Westcott-Hort), "Augustus' Band" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Augustan band"; the Revised Version, margin "cohort"), was probably the same body of troops which is mentioned in inscriptions as Cohors I Augusta (CIL, Supp, 6687) and Speira Augouste (Lebas-Waddington 2112). Its official title may have been Cohors Augusta Sebastenorum (GVN). It will be observed that all divisions of the Roman army were divided into companies of about 100 men, each of which, in the infantry, was commanded by a centurion, in the cavalry, by a decurion.

2. Italian Band:

There was another cohort in Caesarea, the "Italian band" (Cohors Italica, Vulgate) of which Cornelius was centurion (Ac 10:1: ek speires tes kaloumenes Italikes). The cohortes Italicae (civium Romanorum) were made up of Roman citizens (Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, II, 467).

3. Praetorian Guard:

One of the five cohorts was stationed in Jerusalem (Mt 27:27; Mr 15:16), the "chief captain" of which was Claudius Lysias. His title, chiliarchos in the Greek (Ac 23:10,15,17,19,22,26; 24:7 the King James Version), meaning "leader of a thousand men" (tribunus, Vulgate), indicates that this body of soldiers was a cohors miliaria. Claudius Lysias sent Paul to Felix at Caesarea under escort of 200 soldiers, 70 horsemen, and 200 spearmen (Ac 23:23). The latter (dexiolaboi, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek) are thought to have been a party of provincial militia. Several centurions of the cohort at Jerusalem appear during the riot and subsequent rescue and arrest of Paul (Ac 21:32; 22:25,26; 23:17,23). The cohortes miliariae (of 1,000 men) contained ten centurions. A centurion, doubtless of the same cohort, was in charge of the execution of the Saviour (Mt 27:54; Mr 15:39,44,45; Lu 23:47). It was customary for centurions to be entrusted with the execution of capital penalties (Tacitus Ann. i.6; xvi.9; xvi.15; Hist. ii.85).

The the King James Version contains the passage in Ac 28:16: "The centurion delivered the prisoners to the captain of the guard" (stratopedarches), which the Revised Version (British and American) omits. It has commonly been held that the expression stratopedarches was equivalent to praetorian prefect (praefectus praetorius), and that the employment of the word in the singular was proof that Paul arrived in Rome within the period 51-62 AD when Sex. Afranius Burrus was sole praetorian prefect. Mommsen (Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie (1895), 491-503) believes that the sentence in question embodies an ancient tradition, but that the term stratopedarches could not mean praefectus praetorius, which is never rendered in this way in Greek. He suggests that it stands for princeps castrorum peregrinorum, who was a centurion in command of the frumentarii at Rome. These were detachments of

legionary soldiers who took rank as principales. They served as military couriers between the capital and provinces, political spies, and an imperial police. It was probably customary, at least when the tradition under discussion arose, for the frumentarii to take charge of persons who were sent to Rome for trial (Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, II, 491-94).

LITERATURE.

Comprehensive discussions of the Roman military system will be found in Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, II, 319-612, and in Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyclopadie, article "Exercitus."

George H. Allen

ARNA

ar'-na (Latin Arna): One of the ancestors of Ezra given in 2 Esdras 1:2, evidently identical with Zerahiah of Ezr 7:4 and Zaraias of 1 Esdras 8:2.

ARNAN

ar'-nan ('arnan, "joyous"): A descendant of David and founder of a family (1Ch 3:21). The Septuagint has Orna.

ARNI

ar'-ni (Arnei, found only in Lu 3:33 the Revised Version (British and American), following Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek): The name of an ancestor of Jesus Christ. But in the King James Version, following Textus Receptus of the New Testament, and in the genealogical list of Mt 13:4 the same person is called Aram (Greek: Aram) in both the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin. In Mt the Revised Version (British and American), however, the form is Ram, which is nearest to the Old Testament name Ram (ram, "high"). Ram was great-grandson of Judah and ancestor of David (Ru 4:19; 1Ch 2:9,10).

ARNON

ar'-non ('arnon; Arnon): Is first mentioned in Nu 21:24 as the border between Moab and the Amorites. "The valleys of Arnon" in the next verse undoubtedly indicate the numerous wadies contributary to the main stream. It formed the southern boundary of the land assigned to Reuben (De 3:12). The city of Aroer stood on the northern edge of the valley (De 2:36; Jud 12:2, etc.). Arnon was claimed by the Ammonites as having marked the southern limit of their territory when Israel invaded the land (Jud 11:13). They, however, had already been driven out by the Amorites, and the region north of Arnon was held by Sihon. From the inscription of Mesha on the Moabite Stone we gather that Moab had established

herself on the north of the Arnon before the time of Omri. Under Omri and Ahab she was confined to the south of the river. A rebellion under Mesha was put down by Jehoram son of Ahab (2Ki 3), and the expedition of Hazael against Israel reached the valley of the Arnon (2Ki 10:33). But according to Mesha he regained for Moab the lost land; and this agrees with Isa 15$, 16$, where cities north of Arnon are located in Moab, e.g. Heshbon.

The modern name of Arnon is Wady el-Mojib, which enters the Dead Sea from the East about 11 miles North of el- Lisan. Some 13 miles East of the Dead Sea two streams, Seil es-Sa‘ideh from the South, and Wady Enkeileh from the East, unite their waters and flow westward in the bottom of an enormous trench. The waters of Wady Welch come in from the Northeast. A wide stretch of country thus drains into the valley by means of a great network of smaller wadies—the "valleys of Arnon." The "fords of the Arnon" (Isa 16:2) were doubtless crossed by Mesha’s highway which he claims to have built in Arnon; and may be marked by the traces of the old Roman road and bridge immediately to the West of where, on the northern edge of the Wady, stands ‘Ara‘ir, the ancient Aroer.

W. Ewing

AROD

a’-rod, ar’-od (’arodh): The sixth son of Gad (Nu 26:17). His descendants are called Arodi or Arodites (Ge 46:16; Nu 26:17).

ARODI

ar’-o-di. See AROD.

ARODITES

a’-rod-its. See AROD.

AROER

a-ro’-er (‘aro’er; Aroer):

(1) A city of the Amorites which stood on the northern edge of the Arnon (De 2:36, etc.). Taken by Israel, it shared the vicissitudes of the country north of the river, and when last named (Jer 48:19) is again in the hands of Moab. It is one of the cities which Mesha claims to have built, i.e. fortified. It was within the territory allotted to Reuben, yet its building (fortification) is attributed to Gad (Nu 32:34). Thus far came the Syrian, Hazael, in his raid upon Israel (2Ki 10:33). The Roman road across the valley lay about an hour to the West of Khirbet ‘Ara‘ir.

(2) A city in Gilead described as "before Rabbah," on the boundary between Gad and the Ammonites (Jos 13:25). No name resembling this has yet been recovered in the district indicated.

(3) A city in the territory of Judah named only in 1Sa 30:28. Probably however in Jos 15:22 we should read ‘ar‘arah instead of ‘adh‘adhah, which may be the same city, and may be identical with ‘Ar‘ara, a site with cisterns and some remains of ancient buildings about 14 miles Southeast of Beersheba.

W. Ewing

AROERITE

a-ro’-er-it (ha-‘aro‘eri): A native of Aroer. The Aroerite was Hotham, father of two of David’s heroes (1Ch 11:44).

AROM

a’-rom (Arom): The sons of Arom returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:16). Omitted in Ezra and Nehemiah. Hashum is found in place of Arom in Ezr 2:19.

ARPACHSHAD

ar-pak’-shad. See ARPHAXAD.

ARPAD; ARPHAD

ar’-pad; ar’-fad (’arpadh, "support"): A city of Syria, captured frequently by the Assyrians, and finally subjugated by Tiglath-pileser III in 740 BC, after a siege of two years. It is now the ruin Tell Erfad, 13 miles Northwest of Aleppo. Arpad is one of the conquered cities mentioned by Rabshakeh, the officer of Sennacherib, in his boast before Jerusalem (2Ki 18:34; 19:13; Isa 36:19; 37:13; the King James Version Arphad). Isaiah puts a boast about its capture in the mouth of the Assyrian king (Isa 10:9), and Jeremiah mentions it as "confounded" because of evil tidings, in the oracle concerning Damascus (Jer 49:23). On every occasion Arpad is mentioned with Hamath.

S. F. Hunter

ARPHAXAD

ar-fak’-sad:

(1) the King James Version form (Ge 10:22,24; 11:12,13; 1Ch 1:17) of the Revised Version (British and American) ARPACHSHAD, which see. See also TABLE OF NATIONS.

(2) In Apocrypha (Judith 1) a king of the Medes, who reigned in Ecbatana. He was defeated and slain by Nebuchadrezzar.

ARRAY

a-ra’:(1) labhesh, ‘aTah; periballo, enduomai, himatismos.

(2) ‘arakh, shith: "Array," composed of prefix "ar-" and "rai," "order," is used in two senses,

(1) in reference to clothing and

(2) in reference to the disposition of an army.

(1) (a) Labhesh is the most common Hebrew word meaning "to clothe," and is used in all cases but one in the Old Testament for "array" (compare Ge 41:42: Pharaoh "arrayed him (Joseph) in vestures of fine linen"; see also 2Ch 28:15; Es 6:9,11; Job 40:10; 2Ch 5:12).

(b) ‘ATah, meaning "to veil," "to cover," is once used. Nebuchadrezzar "shall array himself with the land of Egypt" (Jer 43:12).

(c) Periballo, "to throw around," is used 6 times in the New Testament. It is the word used of Herod’s "arraying" Jesus "in gorgeous apparel" (Lu 23:11; the other references are Mt 6:29; Lu 12:27; Re 7:13; 17:4; 19:8).

(d) Enduomai, middle or passive of enduo, "to enter," means, therefore, "to be entered into" clothing. Once it is used in reference to Herod (Ac 12:21).

(e) Himatismos, "clothing," is translated once "array" = raiment (from same root). This is the only occurrence of "array" in this sense (1Ti 2:9).

(2) (a) ‘Arakh is the common word in the Old Testament, used in reference to the disposition of an army, and is translated "to put in array," "to set in array," the object being "the battle" or the army. The root meaning is that of orderly arrangement, and the verb is used in other senses than the military, e. g. arranging the table of shewbread. In 1Ch 12:33 the Revised Version (British and American) has "order the battle array" for the King James Version "keep rank," translation of Hebrew ‘adhar.

(b) Shith, "to set, to place," used once for battle array: "and the horsemen set themselves in array at the gate" (Isa 22:7).

S. F. Hunter

ARREST, AND TRIAL OF JESUS

a-rest', see JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF.

ARRIVE

a-riv':Originally a nautical term (Latin: ad ripam) for reaching shore, is used in the literal sense in Lu 8:26, and, in the figurative sense for Greek phthano, instead of "attain to," the Revised Version (British and American) in Ro 9:31.

ARROGANCY

ar'-o-gan-si: Excessive pride, leading to boastfulness and insolence (1Sa 2:3; Pr 8:13; Isa 13:11; Jer 48:29).

ARROW

ar'-o. See ARCHERY; ARMOR.

ARROWS, DIVINATION BY

See AUGURY, IV, 1.

ARROWSNAKE

ar'-o-snak: In Isa 34:15 the Hebrew word kippoz, which in the King James Version is rendered "great owl," is in the English Revised Version rendered "arrowsnake," and in the American Standard Revised Version "dart-snake." Gesenius, who translates "arrowsnake," says "so called from the spring with which it propels itself." Others, from the mention of "make her nest, lay, and hatch," think some kind of bird is meant. See OWL; SERPENT.

ARSACES

ar-sa'-sez ar'-sa-sez (Arsakes): The common name assumed by all the Parthian kings, is mentioned in 1 Macc 14:1- 3, and in 15:22 in connection with the history of Demetrius, one of the Greek, or Seleucid, kings of Syria, and successor to Antiochus Epiphanes, the oppressor of the Jews, who caused the uprising against the Syrian domination under the leadership of the Maccabees. This particular Arsaces was the sixth of the line of independent Parthian rulers which had been founded in 250 BC by Arsaces I, who revolted from Antiochus Theos, killed the Syrian satraps, and with his successor Tiridates I firmly established the independence of the Parthian kingdom. About 243 BC, Tiridates added Hyrcania to his

dominions; but it was not till the reign of Arsaces VI, whose pre- regnal name was Mithridates, that Parthia through the conquest of Bactria, Media, Persia, Armenia, Elymais and Babylonia, threatened the very existence of the kingdom of the Seleucids and became a dangerous competitor of Rome itself.

It was this king who about 141 BC was attacked by Demetrius Nicator, king of Syria. According to the account preserved in 1 Macc 14:1-3, Arsaces sent one of his captains, who went and smote the host of Demetrius, and took him alive, and brought him to Arsaces, by whom he was put in ward. At first, the captive king was treated with great severity, being carried in triumph from city to city and exhibited to his enemies. Later, however, Arsaces gave him his daughter in marriage and assigned him a residence in Hyrcania. Some time after the death of Arsaces, Demetrius was sent back to Syria by Phraates, the son of Mithridates, and reigned from 128 to 125 BC. Arsaces VI is mentioned, also, in 1 Macc 15:22, as one of the kings whom the Romans forbade to make war on their Jewish allies.

LITERATURE.

See 1 Macc 14:1-3, and 15:22; Ant, XIII, v, 11; XIV, viii, 5; Appian, Syria, 67; Strabo, XI, 515; XV, 702; Justin, XLI, 5, 6; XXXVI, 1; Orosius, V, 4; Rawlinson's Parthia, in the Story of the Nations series and Die Herrschaft der Parther in Justi's Geschichte des alten Persiens in Oncken's Allgemeine Geschichte, I, 4.

R. Dick Wilson

ARSARETH

ar'-sa-reth. See ARZARETH.

ARSIPHURITH

ar-si-fu'-rith (Arsiphourith; the King James Version Azephurith): 112 of the sons of Arsiphurith returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:16). The name is omitted in Ezra and Nehemiah, but the number corresponds to those mentioned with Jorah (Ezr 2:18) and Hariph (Ne 7:24).

ARTAXERXES

ar-taks-urk'-sez (Artaxerxes): Is the Greek and Latin form of one, and perhaps of two or three kings of Persia mentioned in the Old Testament.

(1) All are agreed that the Artaxerxes at whose court Ezra and Nehemiah were officials is Artaxerxes I, the son of Xerxes, commonly called Longimanus, who reigned from 465 to 424 BC. This Artaxerxes was the third son of Xerxes and was raised to the throne by Artabanus, the murderer of Xerxes. Shortly after his accession, Artaxerxes put his older brother Darius to death; and a little later, Artabanus, who

perhaps aimed to make himself king, was killed. Hystaspes, the second brother, who seems to have been satrap of Bactria at the time of his father's death, rebelled, and after two battles was deprived of his power and probably of his life. The reign of Artaxerxes was further disturbed by the revolt of Egypt in 460 BC, and by that of Syria about 448 BC.

The Egyptians were assisted by the Athenians, and their rebellion, led by Inarus and Amyrtaeus, was suppressed only after five years of strenuous exertions on the part of the Persians under the command of the great general Megabyzus. After the re-conquest of Egypt, Artaxerxes, fearing that the Athenians would make a permanent subjugation of Cyprus, concluded with them the peace of Callias, by which he retained the island of Cyprus; but agreed to grant freedom to all Greek cities of Asia Minor. Shortly after this Megabyzus led a revolt in Syria and compelled his sovereign to make peace with him on his own terms, and afterward lived and died in high favor with his humiliated king. Zopyrus, the son of Megabyzus at a later time, while satrap of Lycia and Caria, led a rebellion in which he was assisted by the Greeks. It is thought by some that the destruction of Jerusalem which is lamented by Nehemiah occurred during the rebellion of Syria under Megabyzus. Artaxerxes I died in 424 BC, and was succeeded by his son Xerxes II, and later by two other sons, Sogdianus and Ochus, the last of whom assumed the regnal name of Darius, whom the Greeks surnamed Nothus.

(2) Ewald and others have thought that the Artaxerxes of Ezr 4:7 was the pseudo-Smerdis. The principal objection against this view is that we have no evidence that either the pseudo-Smerdis, or the real Smerdis, was ever called Artaxerxes. The real Smerdis is said to have been called Tanyoxares, or according to others Oropastes. Ewald would change the latter to Ortosastes, which closely resembles Artaxerxes, and it must be admitted that many of the Persian kings had two or more names. It seems more probable, however, that Artaxerxes I is the king referred to; and there is little doubt that the identification of the Artaxerxes of Ezr 4:7 with the pseudo-Smerdis would never have been thought of had it not been for the difficulty of explaining the reference to him in this place.

(3) The Greek translation of the Septuagint renders the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther by Artaxerxes, and is followed in this rendering by Josephus. There is no doubt that by this Artaxerxes Josephus meant the first of that name; for in the Antiquities, XI, vi, 1 he says that "after the death of Xerxes, the kingdom came to be transferred to his son Cyrus, whom the Greeks called Artaxerxes." He then proceeds to show how he married a Jewish wife, who was herself of the royal family and who is related to have saved the nation of the Jews. In a long chapter, he then gives his account of the story of Vashti, Esther and Mordecai. In spite of this rendering of the Septuagint and Josephus, there is no doubt that the Hebrew achashwerosh is the same as the Greek Xerxes; and there is no evidence that Artaxerxes I was ever called Xerxes by any of his contemporaries. The reason of the confusion of the names by the Septuagint and Josephus will probably remain forever a mystery.

R. Dick Wilson

ARTEMAS

ar’-te-mas (Artemas): One of the seventy disciples and bishop of Lystra, according to Dorotheus (Bibl. Maxima (Lugd. 1677), III, 429). He is mentioned in Titus 3:12 as one of the faithful companions of Paul. The name is probably Greek, a masculine form of Artemis, or, as has been suggested, a short form of Artemidorus, a common name in Asia Minor. These contracted forms were by no means rare in the Greek world. The Athenian orator, Lysias, was doubtless named after his grandfather, Lysanias, and at first may even have been called Lysanias himself.

ARTEMIS

ar’-te-mis. See DIANA.

ARTIFICER

ar-tif’-i-ser. See CRAFTS.

ARTILLERY

ar-til’-er-i (keli): In 1Sa 20:40 (the King James Version) of Jonathan’s bow and arrows, replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by WEAPONS; and in 1 Macc 6:51 (the King James Version) where the Greek words are translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "instruments for casting fire and stones."

ARTISAN

ar’-ti-zan. See CRAFTS.

ARTS

See CRAFTS.

ARUBBOTH; ARUBOTH

a-rub’-oth, ar’-u-both (ha-’arubboth; the King James Version Aruboth): One of the 12 districts from which victuals for Solomon’s household were obtained (1Ki 4:10). With Arubboth are mentioned "Socoh, and all the land of Hepher," and as Socoh lay in the Shephelah (Jos 15:35), Arubboth probably lay in the southern part of the Shephelah.

ARUMAH

a-roo’-ma (arumah, "lofty"): The town in which Abimelech, the son of Jerubbaal (Gideon), dwelt when

driven from Shechem (Jud 9:41). The ruins El-Ormeh, 6 miles Southeast of Shechem, may be on the site, though its position is not known with certainty.

ARVAD; ARVADITES

ar'-vad, ar'-vad-its ('arwadh; Arados; modern Ruad): An island city off the coast of Syria some 30 miles North of Tripolis, and the race inhabiting it. It was a barren rock covered with fortifications and houses several stories in height. The island was about 800 ft. long by 500 wide, surrounded by a massive wall, and an artificial harbor was constructed on the East toward the main land. It developed into a trading city in early times, as did most of the Phoenician cities on this coast. It had a powerful navy, and its ships are mentioned in the monuments of Egypt and Assyria. It seems to have had a sort of hegemony over the northern Phoenician cities, from Mt. Cassius to the northern limits of Lebanon, something like that of Sidon in the South. It had its own local dynasty and coinage, and some of the names of its kings have been recovered. Its inhabitants are mentioned in the early lists of Ge 10:18, and Eze 27:8,11 refers to its seamen and soldiers in the service of Tyre. It brought under its authority some of the neighboring cities on the main land, such as Marathus and Simyra, the former nearly opposite the island and the latter some miles to the South.

Thothmes III, of Egypt, took it in his campaign in north Syria (1472 BC) and it is noticed in the campaigns of Rameses II in the early part of the 13th century BC (Breasted, Ancient Records). It is also mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Lettersas being in league with the Amorites in their attacks upon the Egyptian possessions in Syria (44 and 28, B.M. Tell el-Amarna Letters). About the year 1200, or later, it was sacked by invaders from Asia Minor or the islands, as were most of the cities on the coast (Paton, Syria and Palestine, 145) but it recovered when they were driven back. Its maritime importance is indicated by the inscriptions of the Assyrian kings. Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1020) boasts that he sailed in the ships of Arvad. Asshur-nazir-pal (circa 876) made it tributary, but it revolted and we find 200 men of Arvad mentioned among the allies of Benhadad, of Damascus, at the great battle of Quarqar, when all Syria seems to have been in league against Shalmaneser II (circa 854). At this time the king of Arvad was Mattan Baal.

It was afterward tributary to Tiglath-pileser III and Sennacherib, the king who paid it to the latter being Abd-ilihit (circa 701). Ashurbanipal (circa 664) compelled its king Yakinlu to submit and send one of his daughters to become a member of the royal harem (Rawlinson, Phoenicia, 456-57). Under the Persians Arvad was allowed to unite in a confederation with Sidon and Tyre, with a common council at Tripolis(ib 484). When Alexander the Great invaded Syria in 332 BC Arvad submitted without a struggle under her king Strato, who sent his navy to aid Alexander in the reduction of Tyre. It seems to have received the favor of the Seleucid kings of Syria and enjoyed the right of asylum for political refugees. It is mentioned in a rescript from Rome about 138 BC, in connection with other cities and rulers of the East, to show favor to the Jews. It was after Rome had begun to interfere in the affairs of Judea and Syria, and indicates that Arvad was of considerable importance at that time (see 1 Macc 15:16-23). The town is not mentioned in the New Testament, and in modern times has sunk to a small village, chiefly inhabited by fishermen. See ARADUS.

H. Porter

ARZA

ar’-za (’artsa’): A steward of King Elah, in whose house at Tirzah Zimri murdered the king at a drinking debauch. The text is not quite clear, and Arza might have been a servant of Zimri (1Ki 16:9).

ARZARETH

ar’-za-reth, ar’-sareth (the King James Version, Arsareth): This is the land to which the ten tribes were deported (2 Esdras 13:45). It is described as "another land" lying a year and a half’s journey beyond the river, i.e. the Euphrates. It probably answers to the Hebrew ‘erets ‘achereth (De 29:28). In Josephus’ time the people were still believed to be there in countless numbers (Ant., XI, v, 2).

AS

az: Conj. and adverb (usually Greek hos hosper, kathos), designating:

(1) Likeness: (a) between nouns (Ge 3:5; Jud 6:5; Php 2:8; Heb 11:27,29); (b) between verbs (Lu 6:36; Joh 5:30; 1Co 10:7); (c) between adjectives (1Co 15:48).

(2) Limitation (with respect to a particular aspect or relation) (1Pe 4:15,16).

(3) Time (Lu 8:5; 15:25; Ac 8:36).

(4) Cause (1Co 4:1).

(5) Concession (Joh 7:10; 2Co 11:21).

(6) Illustration, in numerous passages, beginning "as it is written," "as it is said," etc.

ASA

a’-sa (’aca’," healer"; Asa):

(1) A king of Judah, the third one after the separation of Judah and Israel. He was the son of Abijah and grandson of Rehoboam. Maacah, his mother, or rather grandmother, was daughter of Abishalom (Absalom) (1Ki 15:1 ff). The first ten years of his reign were prosperous and peaceful (2Ch 14:1). He introduced many reforms, such as putting away the sodomites or male prostitutes, removing idols from holy places, breaking down altars, pillars and Asherim. He even deposed the "queen mother" because of

her idolatrous practices, and of the image which she had made for Asherah (1Ki 15:12 ff; 2Ch 14:3). Though the king himself, in the main, was a zealous reformer, his subjects did not always keep pace with him (1Ki 15:17). With an army of 580,000 he repelled an attack of Zerah, the Ethiopian, and routed him completely at Mareshah in the lowlands of Judah (2Ch 14:6 ff). Directed and encouraged by Azariah the prophet, he carried on a great revival. Having restored the great altar of burnt offering in the temple, he assembled the people for a renewal of their covenant with Yahweh. On this occasion 700 oxen and 7,000 sheep were offered in sacrifice.

For the next twenty years there was apparently great prosperity and peace throughout his kingdom, but in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, Judah was attacked by Baasha, king of Israel, at all times hostile to Judah (1Ki 15:32). Baasha continued to encroach and finally fortified Ramah as a frontier fortress. Asa, faint-hearted, instead of putting his entire trust in Yahweh, made an alliance with Ben-hadad, of Damascus. The Syrian king, in consideration of a large sum of money and much treasure from the temple at Jerusalem, consented to attack the northern portion of Baasha's territory. It was at this favorable moment that Asa captured Ramah, and with the vast building material collected there by Baasha, he built Geba of Benjamin and Mizpah (1Ki 15:16-22). This lack of faith in Yahweh was severely criticized by Hanani the prophet. Asa, instead of listening patiently to this prophet of God, was greatly offended and enraged and Hanani was put in prison (2Ch 16:1-10). Three years later, Asa was attacked by gout or some disease of the feet. Here again he is accused of lack of faith, for "he sought not to Yahweh, but to the physicians" (2Ch 16:12). Having ruled forty-one years, he died and was buried with great pomp in a tomb erected by himself in the city of David, i.e. Jerusalem. On the whole his reign was very successful, but it is sad to chronicle that as the years rolled on he became less and less faithful to Yahweh and His law.

(2) A son of Elkanah, a Levite, who dwelt in one of the villages of the Netophathites (1Ch 9:16).

W. W. Davies

ASADIAS

as-a-di'-as (Asadias): An ancestor of Baruch (Baruch 1:1).

ASAEL

a'-sa-el, as'-a-el. See ASIEL (Apocrypha).

ASAHEL

as'-a-hel ('asah'el, "God hath made"; Asael):

(1) The brother of Joab and Abishai. The three were sons of Zeruiah, one of David's sisters (1Ch

2:15,16; 2Sa 2:18, etc.). The three brothers seem to have been from the beginning members of David's troop of strangely respectable brigands. Asahel was distinguished for his swift running, and this fact brought misfortune upon him and upon Israel. When Abner and the forces of Ish-bosheth were defeated near Gibeon, Asahel pursued Abner. Abner knew that he could outright Asahel, though he could not outrun him. He also knew that the time had come for making David king, and that a blood feud among the leaders would be a calamity. He expostulated with Asahel, but in vain. It came to a fight, and Abner slew Asahel (2Sa 2:3). As a result the coming of David to the throne of all Israel was delayed; and when at last Abner brought it about, he himself was treacherously killed by Joab in alleged blood revenge for Asahel. Asahel is mentioned as sixth in the list of David's "mighty men" (2Sa 23:24; 1Ch 11:26).

The earlier of the names in this list are evidently arranged in the order of seniority. If it be assumed that the list was not made till after the death of Asahel, still there is no difficulty in the idea that some of the names in the list were placed there posthumously. Asahel is also mentioned as the fourth of David's month-by-month captains (1Ch 27:7). Superficial criticism describes this position as that of "commander of a division of David's army," and regards the statement, "and Zebadiah his son after him," as a note added to explain the otherwise incredible assertion of the text. This criticism is correct in its implication that the fourth captain was, as the text stands, the dead Asahel, in the person of his son Zebadiah. Coming from an annotator, the criticism regards this meaning as intelligible; is it any the less so if we regard it as coming from the author? In fact, the statement is both intelligible and credible. The second of David's month-by-month captains is Dodai, the father of the second of David's "mighty men"; and the fourth is Asahel, with his son Zebadiah. With these two variations the twelve month-by-month captains are twelve out of the nineteen seniors in the list of mighty men, and are mentioned in practically the same order of seniority. The 24,000 men each month were not a fighting army mobilized for war. The position of general for a month, whatever else it may have involved, was an honor held by a distinguished veteran. There is no absurdity in the idea that the honor may in some cases have been posthumous, the deceased being represented by his father or his son or by someone else.

(2) A Levite member of the commission of captains and Levites and priests which Jehoshaphat, in his third year, sent among the cities of Judah, with the book of the law, to spread information among the people (2Ch 17:7-9). (3) One of the keepers of the storechambers in the temple in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:13).

(4) The father of Jonathan who was one of the two men who "stood upon this," at the time when Ezra and the people appointed a court to consider the cases of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:15). The text of the Revised Version (British and American) translates "stood up against this," while the margin has "were appointed over this."

Willis J. Beecher

ASAHIAH

as-a-hi'-a ('asayah, "Yahweh hath made"; the King James Version form; the Revised Version (British

and American) ASAIAH): "The king's servant" sent by Josiah with Hilkiah, the priest, and others to inquire of Yahweh concerning the words of the book found in the temple (2Ki 22:12,14; 2Ch 34:20).

ASAIAH

a-sa'-ya ([‘asayah], "Yahweh has made," written Asahiah twice in the King James Version (2Ki 22:12,14)):

(1) A Levite of the family of Merari, and one of those who helped bring the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (1Ch 6:30; 15:6,11).

(2) A leading man of the tribe of Simeon. He was in the incursion which attacked and dispossessed the MEUNIM (which see), or the shepherd people, in the valley of Gedor (1Ch 4:36).

(3) An officer of Josiah sent to Huldah the prophetess for advice regarding the law book found by Hilkiah (2Ki 22:12,14; see ASAHIAH).

(4) A Shilonite resident of Jerusalem (1Ch 9:5). He is called Maaseiah in Ne 11:5.

W. W. Davis

ASANA

as'-a-na (Asana, Assana) = Asnah (Ezr 2:50); omitted in Nehemiah. The sons of Asana (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:31).

ASAPH

a'-saf (’acaph): Is the name of three men in the Old Testament, of whom one is the reputed author of Psalms 50 and 73-83. He was one of David's three chief musicians, the other two being Heman, and Ethan or Jeduthun, and we first hear of him when the ark was taken to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:16-19). He conducted with cymbals the music performed in the tent where the ark was housed (1Ch 16:4,5,7,37), while his two coadjutors discharged the same office at Gibeon (1Ch 16:41,42). In 1Ch 25:1 ff we are told that four of his sons were appointed to conduct under him detachments of the great chorus, the families of Heman and Jeduthun also furnishing leaders, and all took part at the dedication of the temple (2Ch 5:12). A., H., and J. were called the king's seers (1Ch 25; 2Ch 35:15), no doubt an official title of rank or dignity. The "Sons of Asaph" are mentioned in later times. They formed a guild, and played a prominent part at each revival of the national religion. See MUSIC; PSALMS.

James Millar

ASARA

as’-a-ra (Asara; the King James Version Azara): The sons of Asara (temple-servants) returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31). Omitted in Ezra and Nehemiah.

ASARAMEL

a-sar’-a-mel (Asaramel or Saramel): A name of uncertain origin occurring in 1 Macc 14:28, in the inscription set up in memory of Simon and the Maccabean family. "On the eighteenth day of Elul, in the hundred and seventy and second year, and this is the third year of Simon the high priest, in Asaramel, in a great congregation of priests and people and princes of the nation, and of the elders of the country," etc. The phrase "in Asaramel" has been taken as referring to a place, and as the name of a title of Simon. Ewald and others take it to be the equivalent of ba-chatsar ‘am ‘el, "in the court of the people of God." Another reading is "in Saramel." The majority prefer to take the phrase as a title of Simon; the original phrase is then taken to have been wesar ‘am ‘el, "and prince of the people of God," i.e. ethnarch. If the translator mistook the waw (w) for beth (b) and read ‘en, he might have left the phrase untranslated because he supposed it to be the name of a place. Schurer disposes of the en by taking it as a corruption of segen = ceghen, which is equivalent to the Greek strategos (GVI, I, 197, note 17).

H. J. Wolf

ASAREEL

a-sa’-re-el, a-sar’-e-el. See ASAREL.

ASAREL

as’-ar-el (’asar’el, "God is ruler"; the King James Version Asareel): A descendant of Judah and a son of Jehallelel (1Ch 4:16).

ASARELAH

as-a-re’-la. See ASHARELAH.

ASBACAPHATH

as-bak’-a-fath. See ASBASARETH.

ASBASARETH

as-bas’-a-reth (Septuagint: Asbakaphath, or Asbasareth): The Greek rendering of the Assyrian Asshur-ach-iddina ("Esarhaddon") (1 Esdras 5:69; compare also Ezr 4:2,10). See OSNAPPAR.

ASCALON

as’-ka-lon (Askalon): In Apocrypha, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) (Judith 2:28; 1 Macc 10:86; 11:60; 12:33). See ASHKELON.

ASCEND

a-send’:By derivation the English word implies motion from a lower place to (not merely toward) a higher one; and usage tends to restrict it to cases where the beholder is in the lower, not the higher, position. the King James Version uses it 39 times in all:

(1) of the going up of vapor (Ps 135:7), flame (Jud 20:40), or smoke (Re 8:4);

(2) of travel from one place to another (Ac 25:1) or of the course of a boundary (Jos 15:3);

(3) of coming up from the underworld (1Sa 28:13; Re 11:7; 17:8); and

(4) of the going up (of men, angels, our Lord) from earth to the skies or to heaven (Ge 28:12; Joh 3:13). the Revised Version (British and American) uses the appropriate form of "to go up" in all cases falling under (2) and (3); in those under (4) it retains "ascend" with an occasional change in tense; under (1) it retains "ascend" everywhere in Old Testament (Ex 19:18; Jos 8:20,21; Ps 135:7 parallel Jer 10:13 parallel Jer 51:16) except Jud 20:40, but substitutes "went up," "goeth up," in New Testament (Re 8:4; 14:11).

The like change in the Old Testament passages would make the usage of the Revised Version (British and American) uniform.

F. K. Farr

ASCENSION

a-sen’-shun: Most modern Lives of Christ commence at Bethlehem and end with the Ascension, but Christ’s life began earlier and continued later. The Ascension is not only a great fact of the New Testament, but a great factor in the life of Christ and Christians, and no complete view of Jesus Christ is possible unless the Ascension its consequences are included. It is the consummation of His redemptive work. The Christ of the Gospels is the Christ of history, the Christ of the past, but the full New Testament picture of Christ is that of a living Christ, the Christ of heaven, the Christ of experience, the Christ of the present and the future. The New Testament passages referring to the Ascension need close

study and their teaching careful observation.

I. In the Gospels.

1. Anticipations:

The Ascension is alluded to in several passages in the Gospels in the course of our Lord's earthly ministry (Lu 9:31,51; Joh 6:62; 7:33; 12:32; 14:12,28; 16:5,10,17,28; 20:17). These passages show that the event was constantly in view, and anticipated by our Lord. The Ascension is also clearly implied in the allusions to His coming to earth on clouds of heaven (Mt 24:30; 26:64).

2. Records:

If with most modern scholars we regard Mark's Gospel as ending with 16:8, it will be seen to stop short at the resurrection, though the present ending speaks of Christ being received up into heaven, of His sitting at the right hand of God, and of His working with the disciples as they went preaching the word (Mr 16:19,20). In any case this is a bare summary only. The close of the Third Gospel includes an evident reference to the fact of the Ascension (Lu 24:28-53), even if the last six words of Lu 24:51, "and was carried up into heaven" are not authentic. No difficulty need be felt at the omission of the Fourth Gospel to refer to the fact of the Ascension, though it was universally accepted at the time the apostle wrote (Joh 20:17). As Dr. Hort has pointed out, "The Ascension did not lie within the proper scope of the Gospels .... its true place was at the head of the Ac of the Apostles" (quoted Swete, The Ascended Christ, 2).

II. In the Acts.

1. Record:

The story in Ac 1:6-12 is clear. Jesus Christ was on the Mount of Olives. There had been conversation between Him and His disciples, and in the course of it He was taken up; and a cloud received Him out of their sight (Ac 1:9). His body was uplifted till it disappeared, and while they continued to gaze up they saw two men who assured them that He would come back exactly as He had gone up. The three Greek words rendered "taken up" (eperthe) (Ac 1:9); "went" (poreuomenou) (Ac 1:10); "received up" (analemphtheis) (Ac 1:11); deserve careful notice. This account must either be attributed to invention, or to the testimony of an eye-witness. But Luke's historicity now seems abundantly proved.

2. References:

The Ascension is mentioned or implied in several passages in Ac 2:33 ff; 3:21; 7:55 f; 9:3-5; 22:6-8; 26:13-15. All these passages assert the present life and activity of Jesus Christ in heaven.

III. In the Pauline Epistles.

1. Romans:

In Ro 8:34 the apostle states four facts connected with Christ Jesus: His death; His resurrection; His session at God’s right hand; His intercession. The last two are clearly the culminating points of a series of redemptive acts.

2. Ephesians:

While for its purpose Romans necessarily lays stress on the Resurrection, Ephesians has as part of its special aim an emphasis on the Ascension. In 1:20 God’s work wrought in Christ is shown to have gone much farther than the Resurrection, and to have "made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places," thereby constituting Him the supreme authority over all things, and especially Head of the church (1:20-23). This idea concerning Christ is followed in 2:6 by the association of believers with Christ "in the heavenly places," and the teaching finds its completest expression in 4:8-11, where the Ascension is connected with the gift of the heavenly Christ as the crowning feature of His work. Nothing is more striking than the complementary teaching of Romans and Ephesians respectively in their emphasis on the Resurrection and Ascension.

3. Philippians:

In Php 2:6-11 the exaltation of Christ is shown to follow His deep humiliation. He who humbled Himself is exalted to the place of supreme authority. In 3:20 Christians are taught that their commonwealth is in heaven, "whence also we wait for a Saviour."

4. Thessalonians:

The emphasis placed on the second advent of Christ in 1Th is an assumption of the fact of the Ascension. Christians are waiting for God’s Son from heaven (1:10) who is to "descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God" (4:16).

5. Timothy:

The only allusion to the Ascension in the Pastoral Epistles is found in the closing statement of what seems to be an early Christian song in 1Ti 3:16. He who was "manifested in the flesh .... received up in glory."

IV. In Hebrews.

In Hebrews there is more recorded about the Ascension and its consequences than in any other part of the New Testament. The facts of the Ascension and Session are first of all stated (1:3) with all that this implies of definite position and authority (1:4-13). Christians are regarded as contemplating Jesus as the

Divine Man in heaven (2:9), though the meaning of the phrase, "crowned with glory and honor" is variously interpreted, some thinking that it refers to the result and outcome of His death, others thinking that He was "crowned for death" in the event of the Transfiguration (Matheson in Bruce, Hebrews, 83). Jesus Christ is described as "a great High Priest, who hath passed through the heavens" (4:14), as a Forerunner who is entered within the veil for us, and as a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek (6:20). As such He "abideth for ever," and "ever liveth to make intercession" (7:24,25). The chief point of the epistle itself is said to be "such a high priest, who sat down on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens" (8:1), and His position there implies that He has obtained eternal redemption for His people and is appearing before God on their behalf (9:12,24). This session at God's right hand is also said to be with a view to His return to earth when His enemies will have become His footstool (10:12,13), and one of the last exhortations bids believers to look unto Jesus as the Author and Perfecter of faith who has "sat down at the right hand of the throne of God" (12:2).

V. In the Petrine Epistles.

The only reference to the Ascension is in 1Pe 3:22, where Christ's exaltation after His sufferings is set forth as the pattern and guarantee of Christian glorification after endurance of persecution.

VI. In the Johannine Writings.

1. Epistles:

Nothing is recorded of the actual Ascension, but 1Jo 2:1 says that "we have an Advocate with the Father." The word "Advocate" is the same as "Comforter" in Joh 14:16, where it is used of the Holy Spirit. Christ is the Comforter "in relation to the Father," and the Holy Spirit is the Comforter dwelling in the soul.

2. Apocalypse:

All the references in the Apocalypse either teach or imply the living Christ who is in heaven, as active in His church and as coming again (Re 1:7,13; 5:5-13; 6:9-17; 14:1-5).

VII. Summary of New Testament Teaching.

1. The Fact:

The New Testament calls attention to the fact of Ascension and the fact of the Session at God's right hand. Three words are used in the Greek in connection with the Ascension: anabainein (ascendere), "to go up"; analambanesthai (adsumi), "to be taken up"; poreuesthai "to go." The Session is connected with Ps 110, and this Old Testament passage finds frequent reference or allusion in all parts of the New Testament. But it is used especially in He in connection with Christ's priesthood, and with His position of authority and honor at God's right hand (Swete, The Ascended Christ, 10-15). But the New

Testament emphasizes the fact of Christ's exaltation rather than the mode, the latter being quite secondary. Yet the acceptance of the fact must be carefully noticed, for it is impossible to question that this is the belief of all the New Testament writers. They base their teaching on the fact and do not rest content with the moral or theological aspects of the Ascension apart from the historic reality. The Ascension is regarded as the point of contact between the Christ of the gospels and of the epistles. The gift of the Spirit is said to have come from the ascended Christ. The Ascension is the culminating point of Christ's glorification after His Resurrection, and is regarded as necessary for His heavenly exaltation. The Ascension was proved and demanded by the Resurrection, though there was no need to preach it as part of the evangelistic message. Like the Virgin birth, the Ascension involves doctrine for Christians rather than non-Christians. It is the culmination of the Incarnation, the reward of Christ's redemptive work, and the entrance upon a wider sphere of work in His glorified condition, as the Lord and Priest of His church (Joh 7:39; 16:7).

2. The Message:

We may summarize what the New Testament tells us of our Lord's present life in heaven by observing carefully what is recorded in the various passages of the New Testament. He ascended into heaven (Mr 16:19; Lu 24:51; Ac 1:9); He is seated on the right hand of God (Col 3:1; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12); He bestowed the gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 4:9,33); He added disciples to the church (Ac 2:47); He worked with the disciples as they went forth preaching the gospel (Mr 16:20); He healed the impotent man (Ac 3:16); He stood to receive the first martyr (Ac 7:56); He appeared to Saul of Tarsus (Ac 9:5); He makes intercession for His people (Ro 8:26; Heb 7:25); He is able to succor the tempted (Heb 2:18); He is able to sympathize (Heb 4:15); He is able to save to the uttermost (Heb 7:25); He lives forever (Heb 7:24; Re 1:18); He is our Great High Priest (Heb 7:26; 8:1; 10:21); He possesses an intransmissible or inviolable priesthood (Heb 7:24); He appears in the presence of God for us (Heb 9:24); He is our Advocate with the father (1 Joh 2:1); He is waiting until all opposition to Him is overcome (Heb 10:13). This includes all the teaching of the New Testament concerning our Lord's present life in heaven.

VIII. Problems.

There are two questions usually associated with the Ascension which need our attention.

1. Relation to the Laws of Nature:

There is no greater difficulty in connection with the Ascension than with the Resurrection, or the Incarnation. Of our Lord's resurrection body we know nothing. All we can say is that it was different from the body laid in the tomb and yet essentially the same; the same and yet essentially different. The Ascension was the natural close of Our Lord's earthly life, and as such, is inseparable from the Resurrection. Whatever, therefore, may be said of the Resurrection in regard to the laws of nature applies equally to the Ascension.

2. Localization of the Spiritual World:

The record in Ac is sometimes objected to because it seems to imply the localization of heaven above the earth. But is not this taking the narrative in too absolutely bald and literal a sense? Heaven is at once a place and a state, and as personality necessarily implies locality, some place for our Lord's Divine, yet human person is essential. To speak of heaven as "above" may be only symbolical, but the ideas of fact and locality must be carefully adhered to. And yet it is not merely local, and "we have to think less of a transition from one locality than of a transition from one condition to another. .... the real meaning of the ascension is that .... our Lord withdrew from a world of limitations" to that higher existence where God is (Milligan, Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood, 26). It matters not that our conception today of the physical universe is different from that of New Testament times. We still speak of the sun setting and rising, though strictly these are not true. The details of the Ascension are really unimportant. Christ disappeared from view, and no question need be raised either of distance or direction. We accept the fact without any scientific explanation. It was a change of conditions and mode of existence; the essential fact is that He departed and disappeared. Even Keim admits that "the ascension of Jesus follows from all the facts of His career" (quoted, Milligan, 13), and Weiss is equally clear that the Ascension is as certain as the Resurrection, and stands and fails therewith (Milligan, 14).

IX. Its Relation to Christ Himself.

The Ascension was the exaltation and glory of Jesus Christ after His work was accomplished (Php 2:9). He had a threefold glory:

(1) as the Son of God before the Incarnation (Joh 17:5);

(2) as God manifest in the flesh (Joh 1:14);

(3) as the exalted Son of God after the Resurrection and Ascension (Lu 24:26; 1Pe 1:21).

The Ascension meant very much to Christ Himself, and no study of subject must overlook this aspect of New Testament teaching. His exaltation to the right hand of meant

(1) the proof of victory (Eph 4:8);

(2) the position of honor (Ps 110:1);

(3) the place of power (Ac 2:33);

(4) the place of happiness (Ps 26:11);

(5) the place of rest ("seated");

(6) the place of permanence ("for ever").

X. Its Teaching for Christians.

The importance of the Ascension for Christians lies mainly in the fact that it was the introduction to our Lord’s present life in heaven which means so much in the believer’s life. The spiritual value of the Ascension lies, not in Christ’s physical remoteness, but in His spiritual nearness. He is free from earthly limitations, and His life above is the promise and guarantee of ours. "Because I live ye shall live also."

1. Redemption Accomplished:

The Ascension and Session are regarded as the culminating point of Christ’s redemptive work (Heb 8:1), and at the same time the demonstration of the sufficiency of His righteousness on man’s behalf. For sinful humanity to reach heaven two essential features were necessary:

(a) the removal of sin (negative); and

(b) the presence of righteousness (positive).

The Resurrection demonstrated the sufficiency of the atonement for the former, and the Ascension demonstrated the sufficiency of righteousness for the latter. The Spirit of God was to convict the world of "righteousness" "because I go to the Father" (Joh 16:10). In accord with this we find that in the Epistle to the He every reference to our Lord’s atonement is in the past, implying completeness and perfection, "once for all."

2. High Priesthood:

This is the peculiar and special message of He. Priesthood finds its essential features in the representation of man to God, involving access into the Divine presence (Heb 5:1). It means drawing near and dwelling near to God. In He, Aaron is used as typical of the work, and Melchizedek as typical of the person of the priest; and the two acts mainly emphasized are the offering in death and the entrance into heaven. Christ is both priest and priestly victim. He offered propitiation and then entered into heaven, not "with," but "through" His own blood (Heb 9:12), and as High Priest, at once human and Divine, He is able to sympathize (Heb 4:15); able to succor (Heb 2:18); and able to save (Heb 7:25). See CHRIST AS KING, PRIEST, PROPHET.

3. Lordship:

The Ascension constituted Christ as Head of the church (Eph 1:22; 4:10,15; Col 2:19). This Headship teaches that He is the Lord and Life of the church. He is never spoken of as King in relation to His Body, the Church, only as Head and Lord. The fact that He is at the right hand of God suggests in the

symbolical statement that He is not yet properly King on His own throne, as He will be hereafter as "King of the Jews," and "King of Kings."

4. Intercession:

In several New Testament passages this is regarded as the crowning point of our Lord's work in heaven (Ro 8:33,34). He is the perfect Mediator between God and man (1Ti 2:5; Heb 8:6); our Advocate with the Father (1Jo 2:1). His very presence at God's right hand pleads on behalf of His people. There is no presentation, or representation, or pleading, of Himself, for His intercession is never associated with any such relation to the sacrifice of Calvary. Nor is there any hint in the New Testament of a relation between the Eucharist and His life and work in heaven. This view popularized by the late Dr. William Milligan (The Ascension, etc., 266), and endorsed from other standpoints in certain aspects of Anglican teaching (Swete, The Ascended Christ, 46), does not find any support in the New Testament. As Westcott says, "The modern conception of Christ, pleading in heaven His passion, 'offering His blood,' on behalf of man, has no foundation in this epistle" (Hebrews, 230). And Hort similarly remarks, "The words, 'Still .... His prevailing death He pleads' have no apostolic warrant, and cannot even be reconciled with apostolic doctrine" (Life and Letters, II, 213). our Lord's intercession is He says as in what He is. He pleads by His presence on His Father's throne, and he is able to save to the uttermost through His intercession, because of His perpetual life and His inviolable, undelegated, intransmissible priesthood (Heb 7:24,25).

5. The Gift of the Spirit:

There is an intimate and essential connection between the Ascension of Christ and the descent of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit was given to Christ as the acknowledgment and reward of His work done, and having received this "Promise of the Father" He bestowed Him upon His people (Ac 2:33). By means of the Spirit the twofold work is done, of convincing sinners (Joh 16:9), and of edifying believers (Joh 14:12; see also Joh 14:25,26; 16:14,15).

6. Presence:

It is in connection with the Ascension and our Lord's life in heaven that we understand the force of such a passage as "Lo, I am with you always" (Mt 28:20). "He ever liveth" is the supreme inspiration of the individual Christian and of the whole church. All through the New Testament from the time of the Ascension onward, the one assurance is that Christ is living; and in His life we live, hold fellowship with God, receive grace for daily living and rejoice in victory over sin, sorrow and death.

7. Expectation:

Our Lord's life in heaven looks forward to a consummation. He is "expecting till his enemies be made his footstool" (Heb 10:13 the King James Version). He is described as our Forerunner (Heb 6:18 ff), and His presence above is the assurance that His people will share His life hereafter. But His Ascension is

also associated with His coming again (Php 3:20,21; 1Th 4:16; Heb 9:28). At this coming there will be the resurrection of dead saints, and the transformation of living ones (1Th 4:16,17), to be followed by the Divine tribunal with Christ as Judge (Ro 2:16; 2Ti 4:1,8). To His own people this coming will bring joy, satisfaction and glory (Ac 3:21; Ro 8:19); to His enemies defeat and condemnation (1Co 15:25; Heb 2:8; 10:13).

Reviewing all the teaching of our Lord's present life in heaven, appearing. on our behalf, interceding by His presence, bestowing the Holy Spirit, governing and guiding the church, sympathizing, helping and saving His people, we are called upon to up "lift our hearts," for it is in occupation with the living that we find the secret of peace, the assurance of access, and the guaranty of our permanent relation to God. Indeed, we are clearly taught in He that it is in fellowship with the present life of Christ in heaven that Christians realize the difference between spiritual immaturity and maturity (Heb 6:1; 10:1), and it is the purpose of this epistle to emphasize this truth above all others. Christianity is "the religion of free access to God," and in proportion as we realize, in union with Christ in heaven, this privilege of drawing near and keeping near, we shall find in the attitude of "lift up your hearts" the essential features of a strong, vigorous, growing, joyous Christian life.

LITERATURE.

Milligan, Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord; Swete, The Appearances of the Risen Lord; The Ascended Christ; Lacey, The Historic Christ; Lives of Christ, by Neander, B. Weiss, Edersheim, Farrar, Geikie, Gilbert; Fairbairn, Studies in the Life of Christ; Knowling, Witness of the Epistles; Bernard in The Expositor T, 1900-1901, 152-55; Bruce in The Expositor. Greek Test, I; Swete, Apostles' Creed; Westcott, Historic Faith, chapter vi; Revelation of the Risen Lord, chapters x, xi; Epesians to Hebrews; article "Ascension" in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); Paget, Studies in the Christian Character, sermons xxi, xxii; Findlay, Things Above; article. "Priest" in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) (in New Testament), "Hebrews"; Davidson, Hebrews, special note on "Priesthood of Christ"; Dimock, Our One Priest on High; The Christian Doctrine of Sacerdotium; Perowne, Our High Priest in Heaven; Rotherham, Studies in He; Soames, The Priesthood of the New Covenant; Hubert Brooke, The Great High Priest; H. W. Williams, The Priesthood of Christ; J. S. Candlish, The Christian Salvation (1899), 6; G. Milligan, The Theol. of Ep. to Heb (1899), 111; R. C. Moberly, Ministerial Priesthood (1897); A. S. Peake, "Hebrews" in Century Bible; Beyschlag, New Testament Theol., II, 315; article "Ascension" in Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels; article "Assumption and Ascension" in HDRE; article "Ascension" in JE; Charles, The Book of Enoch; The Slavonic Secrets of En; The Book of Jub; The Apocalypse of Bar; The Ascension Isaiah.; Assumption of Moses; M. R. James, "Testament of Abraham" TS, II, 2, 1892; Martensen, Christian Dogmatics.

W. H. Griffith Thomas

ASCENSION OF ISAIAH

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ASCENT

a-sent’:

(1) The rendering in the King James Version twice, the Revised Version (British and American) 14 times correctly, of Hebrew ma‘aleh, "ascent," "pass," as a geographical term (the King James Version Nu 34:4; 2Sa 15:30; the Revised Version (British and American) Jos 10:10; Jud 8:13, etc.).

(2) The rendering in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of ‘olah in 1Ki 10:5, "his ascent by which he went up unto the house of Yahweh"; but ‘olah everywhere else means "burnt-offering," and all ancient versions support the Revised Version, margin, "his burnt-offering which he offered" (caused to go up), etc.

(3) In 2Ch 9:4 (parallel 1Ki 10:5) a very slight textual correction (supported by Septuagint) gives us the same words as in 1Ki instead of the difficult ‘aliyah, "upper chamber," not "ascent" as the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render it against all usage elsewhere.

(4) In the Revised Version (British and American) Eze 40:31,34,37; Ne 12:37, of a flight of steps, stairs.

(5) In the Revised Version (British and American) (Hebrew ‘aliyah), Ne 3:31,32, margin "upper chamber" is to be preferred to text "ascent."

F. K. Farr

ASCHENAZ

ash’-e-naz. See ASHKENAZ.

ASEAS

a-se’-as (Asaias = Isshijah (Ezr 10:31)) A son of Annas, who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:32).

ASEBEBIAS

a-seb-e-bi’-as, a-seb-e-bi’-a (Asebebias; the King James Version Asebebia): Asebebias his sons and brethren returned with Ezra to perform the functions of priesthood in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:47). Compare Sherebiah (Ezr 8:18).

ASEBIAS

as-e-bi’-as, as-e-bi’-a (Asebias; the King James Version Asebia): Asebias returned with Ezra to perform the function of a priest in Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:48). Compare Hashabiah (Ezr 8:19).

ASENATH

as’-e-nath (Aseneth): The wife of Joseph, daughter of Potiphera, mother of Manasseh and Ephraim (Ge 41:45,50; 46:20). She was evidently an Egyptian woman and bore an Egyptian name. ‘-c-n-t, pointed by the Massoretes as ‘acenath, appears in the Septuagint as aseneth or asenneth. The last two consonants appear to represent the name of the Egyptian goddess Neith. The first part of the name will then represent either ns =" belonging to" (so Brugsch and generally), or ‘ws-n (note the doubled "n" in the Septuagint transcription) =" she belongs to" (so Spiegelberg). It is possible that these four letters represent the Egyptian name Sn-t (so Lieblein and others), though the ‘aleph (’) must then be explained as ‘aleph prostheticum and the taw (t) would be less regular than a he (h) to stand for the Egyptian feminine t.

J. Oscar Boyd

ASER

a’-ser (Aser): the King James Version: Greek form of Asher (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Lu 2:36; Re 7:6).

ASERER

as’-e-rer See SERAR.

ASH (1)

ash (’oren; the Revised Version (British and American) FIR-TREE; the Revised Version, margin Ash): A maker of idols "planteth a fir- tree (margin, "ash"), and the rain doth nourish it" (Isa 44:14). It is a suggestion as old as Luther that the final letter "n", was originally a "z", and that the word should be ‘erez, "cedar"; the chief objection is that cedar occurs just before in the same verse. The word ‘oren seems to be connected with the Assyrian irin, meaning fir or cedar or allied tree. "Fir" has support from the Septuagint and from the rabbis. Post (HDB) suggests as probable the stone pine, Pinus pinea, which has been extensively planted round Beirut and unlike most planted trees flourishes without artificial watering—"the rain doth nourish it."

The translation "ash" was probably suggested by the fanciful resemblance of the Hebrew ‘oren and the Latin ornus, the manna ash of Europe. Three varieties of ash flourish in Syria, Fraxinus ornus, F. excelsior and F. oxycarpa. The last mentioned, which is common in parts of North Palestine, being a

large tree some 30 to 40 ft. high, might suit the context were there anything philological to support the idea.

E. W. G. Masterman

ASH (2)

(Bear). See ASTRONOMY.

ASHAMED

a-shamd’:Almost exclusively moral in significance; confusion or abashment through consciousness of guilt or of its exposure. Often including also a sense of terror or fear because of the disgrace connected with the performance of some action. Capacity for shame indicates that moral sense (conscience) is not extinct. "Ashamed" occurs 96 out of 118 times in the Old Testament. Hebrew bosh, "to feel shame" (Latin, pudere), with derivatives occurs 80 times; kalam, "to shame," including the thought of "disgrace," "reproach"; chapher, "to blush": hence shame because of frustrated plans (uniformly in the Revised Version (British and American) "confounded"); Greek aischunomai, "suffused with shame," passive only and its compounds. Uses:

(1) A few times, of actual embarrassment, as of Hazael before the steadfast look of Elisha (2Ki 8:11; see also 2Sa 10:5; 2Ki 2:17; Ezr 8:22).

(2) Innocence not capable of shame: "both naked .... and .... not ashamed" (Ge 2:25; see SHAME); the redeemed no occasion for (Ps 34:5 the King James Version; 1Joh 2:28); Christ not of "brethren" (Heb 2:11); nor Christian of gospel (Ro 1:16); nor God of men of faith (Heb 11:16); nor they who trust in God (Isa 50:7; 54:4; Joe 2:26).

(3) Sense of guilt: "I am ashamed .... for our iniquities" (Ezr 9:6); "of thy lewd way" (Eze 16:27,61); ascribed to idolaters chagrined at worthlessness of idols (Isa 1:29; 44:9,11; 45:16; Jer 2:26); to enemies (Ps 6:10); to wicked (Ps 31:17); to all who forsake God (Jer 17:13); to those who trust in human help, as Israel of Egypt and Assyria, and Moab of Chemosh (Jer 2:36; 48:13); to a mother of wicked children (Jer 50:12).

(4) Repentance causes shame for sin (Jer 31:19; Ro 6:21).

(5) Calamities also, and judgments (Jer 14:3,4; 15:9; 20:11).

(6) Capacity for shame may be lost through long-continued sin (Jer 6:15; 8:12; compare Jer 3:3), exceptionally striking passages on the deadening power of immorality, suggestive of 1Ti 4:2; Titus 1:15.

(7) The grace of Christ delivers from the shame of moral timidity (Ro 1:1; 2Ti 1:18,12,16; 1Pe 4:16).

(8) At Christ's second coming His followers will "not be ashamed before him" (1Joh 2:28); at the final judgment He will be ashamed of all who have been ashamed of Him (Mr 8:38; Lu 9:26; compare Mt 10:33; Heb 11:16).

(9) The word lends itself to rich poetic use, e.g. Lebanon, with faded and falling foliage, "is ashamed" (the Revised Version (British and American) "confounded") at the desolations of the land under Sennacherib (Isa 33:9); so great is God's glory in the new Jerusalem that "the sun (is) ashamed" in His presence (Isa 24:23), explaining the glorious figure in Re 21:23; 22:5. (The references in this article are from the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) frequently replaces 'ashamed' by 'put to shame.') See SHAME.

Dwight M. Pratt

ASHAN

a'-shan ('ashan): An unknown site in the domain of Judah (Jos 15:42), possessed by Simeon (Jos 19:7), and mentioned among the priests' cities in 1Ch 6:59. (44) = Jos 21:16 ('ayin is a corruption of 'ashan). Chorashan (or Borashan), which was probably the site of some reservoir in the Southwest part of Judah (1Sa 30:30), is the same as Ashan.

ASHARELAH; ASARELAH

ash-a-re'-la ('asar'elah): One of the Asaphites appointed by David to the temple service (1Ch 25:2); in 1Ch 25:14 he is called Jesharelah. The latter element in both forms may be ('el) "God," but the meaning of the former part in the first form is doubtful. Thes. compares 'acar, "to bind," "whom God has bound (by a vow)."

ASHBEA

ash'-be-a, ash-be'-a ('ashbea'): "The house of Ashbea," a family of linen-workers mentioned in 1Ch 4:21. We might render beth 'ashbea' as their dwelling-place; nothing is known of such a place nor is this house of weavers referred to in any other place.

ASHBEL; ASHBELITE

ash'-bel, ash'-bel-it ('ashbel): The gentilic name "Ashbelite" is found in Nu 26:38, second son of Benjamin (Ge 46:21). In 1Ch 7:6-11 (6) "Jediael" ("known to God") is substituted for the heathen-sounding "Ashbel" ("Ishbaal," "man of Baal"). The chronicler, in this case, conforms literally to the principle laid down in Ho 2:17; the title "Baal" ("lord") was applied in early days (e.g. in the days of

Saul) to the national God of Israel, but in later days the prophets objected to it because it was freely applied to heathen gods (compare ISH-BOSHETH). In 1Ch 8:1 the three names Bela, Ashbel, Aharah (= Ahiram) are taken from Nu 26:38, however, without change.

H. J. Wolf

ASHDOD

ash'-dod ('ashdodh; Azotos; modern Esdud): One of the five chief cities of the Philistines. The name means stronghold or fortress, and its strength may be inferred by the fact that Psammetik I, of Egypt, besieged it for many years (Herodotus says 29). Some of the Anakim were found there in the days of Joshua (Jos 11:22), and the inhabitants were too strong for the Israelites at that time. It was among the towns assigned to Judah, but was not occupied by her (Jos 13:3; 15:46,47). It was still independent in the days of Samuel, when, after the defeat of the Israelites, the ark was taken to the house of Dagon in Ashdod (1Sa 5:1,2). We have no account of its being occupied even by David, although he defeated the Philistines many times, and we have no definite knowledge of its coming into the hands of Judah until the time of Uzziah (2Ch 26:6).

Ashdod, like the other Philistine towns, came under the authority of the Assyrian monarchs, and we have mention of it in their records. It revolted against Sargon in 711 BC, and deposed the Assyrian governor, Akhimiti, who had been appointed by him in 720. Sargon at once dispatched a force to subdue the rebels and the city was severely punished. This is referred to by Isaiah (Isa 20:1). Amos had prophesied such a calamity some years before (1:8), and Jeremiah refers to "the remnant of Ashdod" as though it had continued weak until his day (Jer 25:20). Zephaniah (Ze 2:4) refers to the desolation of Ashdod and Zechariah to its degraded condition (Zec 9:6). It continued to be inhabited, however, for we find the Jews intermarried with them after the return from Babylon (Ne 13:23,24). In the Maccabean period we are told that Judas and Jonathan both took it and purified it of idolatry (1 Macc 5:68; 10:84). In these passages it is called Azotus, as it is also in the New Testament (Ac 8:40). In the 4th century AD it became the seat of a bishopric. It had been restored in the time of Herod, by the Roman general Gabinius, and was presented to Salome, the sister of Herod, by the emperor Augustus. It is now a small village about 18 miles Northeast of Gaza.

H. Porter

ASHDODITES

ash'-dod-its, ash'-doth-its: Inhabitants of ASHDOD (which see) (Jos 13:3; the King James Version Ashdothites, Ne 4:7).

ASHDOTH PISGAH

ash’-doth piz’-ga (’ashdoth ha-picgah): Thus the King James Version for the Revised Version (British and American) "The slopes (the Revised Version, margin springs) of Pisgah." The spurs and ravines, or the "shoulders" of Pisgah are meant. ‘Ashedah is "a pouring out," and ‘ashedoth are the slopes of a mountain from which springs gush forth. In Jos 10:40; 12:8, ‘Ashedoth, translated "springs" in the King James Version, is "slopes" in the Revised Version (British and American) (De 3:17; Jos 12:3; 13:20). See PISGAH.

ASHER (1)

ash’-er (’asher; Aser).

1. Biblical Account:

According to the Biblical account Asher was the eighth of Jacob’s sons, the second borne to him by Zilpah the handmaid of Leah. His uterine brother was Gad (Ge 35:26). With four sons and one daughter he went down into Egypt (Ge 46:17). At his birth Leah exclaimed, "Happy am I! for the daughters will call me happy: and she called his name Asher," i.e. Happy (Ge 30:13). This foreshadowing of good fortune for him is repeated in the blessing of Jacob: "His bread shall be fat, and he shall yield royal dainties" (Ge 49:20); and again in that of Moses: "Blessed be Asher with children; let him be acceptable unto his brethren, and let him dip his foot in oil" (De 33:24). His family prospered in Egypt, and at the Exodus the tribe of Asher is numbered at 41,500 adult males (Nu 1:41). At the second census the number is given 53,400 (Nu 26:47). The place of Asher in the desert march was with the standard of the camp of Dan, on the north of the tabernacle, along with Da and Naphtali; the prince of the tribe being Pagiel the son of Ochran (Nu 2:27 ff). Among the spies Asher was represented by Sethur (Nu 13:13). The tribe seems to have taken no important part in the subsequent history. It raised no hero, and gave no deliverer to the nation. In the time of David it was of so little consequence that the name is not found in the list of chief rulers (1Ch 27:16 ff). The rich land assigned to Asher sloped to the Phoenician seaboard, and brought him into touch with the Phoenicians who were already world-famous in trade and commerce. He probably soon became a partner in their profitable enterprises, and lost any desire he may ever have had to eject them from their cities (Jud 1:31). He cared not who ruled over him if he were free to pursue the ends of commerce. Zebulun might jeopard their lives unto the death, and Naphtali upon the high places of the field, to break the power of the foreign oppressor, but Asher "sat still at the haven of the sea, and abode by his creeks" (Jud 5:17 ff). He was probably soon largely absorbed by the people with whose interests his were so closely identified: nevertheless "divers of Asher," moved by the appeal of Hezekiah, "humbled themselves, and came to Jerus" (2Ch 30:11 the King James Version). To this tribe belonged the prophetess Anna (Lu 2:36 ff).

2. Modern Theory:

According to a modern theory, the mention of the slave girl Zilpah as the mother of Asher is meant to indicate that the tribe was of mixed blood, and arose through the mingling of Israelites with the Canaanites. It is suggested that the name may have been taken from that of the Canaanite clan found in

the Tell el-Amarna Letters, Mari abd-Ashirti, "sons of the servant of Asherah." A similar name occurs in the inscriptions of the Egyptian Seti I (14th century BC), ‘Aseru, a state in western Galilee (W. Max Muller, As. und Eur., 236-39). This people it is thought may have associated themselves with the invaders from the wilderness. But while the speculations are interesting, it is impossible to establish any relationship between these ancient tribes and Asher.

3. Territory of Asher:

The boundaries of the territory are given in considerable detail in Jos 19:25 ff (compare Jud 1:31 f; Jos 17:10 f). Only a few of the places named can be identified with certainty. Dor, the modern Tan-Turah, although occupied by Manasseh belonged to Asher. Wady ez-Zerqa, possibly identical with Shihor-libnath, which enters the sea to the South of Dor, would form the southern boundary. The lot of Asher formed a strip of land from 8 to 10 miles wide running northward along the shore to the neighborhood of Sidon, touching Issachar, Zebulun and Naphtali on the East Asher seems to have taken possession of the territory by a process of peaceful penetration, not by conquest, and as we have seen, he never drove out the Phoenicians from their cities. The rich plain of Acre, and the fertile fiats between the mountain and the sea near Tyre and Sidon therefore remained in Phoenician hands. But the valleys breaking down westward and opening on the plains have always yielded fine crops of grain. Remains of an ancient oak forest still stand to the North of Carmel. The vine, the fig, the lemon and the orange flourish. Olive trees abound, and the supplies of olive oil which to this day are exported from the district recall the word of the old-time blessing, "Let him dip his foot in oil."

W. Ewing

ASHER (2)

ash’-er (’asher):

(1) See preceding article.

(2) A town on the southern border of Manasseh (Jos 17:7). The site is unknown.

(3) A place of this name is mentioned in Apocrypha (Tobit 1:2), identified with Hazor, in Naphtali. See HAZOR.

ASHERAH

a-she’-ra, ash’-er-im (’asherah; alsos, mistranslated "grove" in the King James Version, after the Septuagint and Vulgate):

1. References to the Goddess

2. Assyrian Origin of the Goddess

3. Her Symbol

4. The Attributes of the Goddess

Was the name of a goddess whose worship was widely spread throughout Syria and Canaan; plural Asherim.

1. References to the Goddess:

Her "image" is mentioned in the Old Testament (1Ki 15:13; 2Ki 21:7; 2Ch 15:16), as well as her "prophets" (1Ki 18:19) and the vessels used in her service (2Ki 23:4). In Assyria the name appears under the two forms of Asratu and Asirtu; it was to Asratu that a monument found near Diarbekir was dedicated on behalf of Khammu-rabi (Amraphel) "king of the Amorites," and the Amorite king of whom we hear so much in Tell el-Amarna Letters bears the name indifferently of EbedAsrati and Ebed-Asirti.

2. Assyrian Origin of the Goddess:

Like so much else in Canaanite religion, the name and worship of Asherah were borrowed from Assyria. She was the wife of the war- god Asir whose name was identified with that of the city of. Assur with the result that he became the national god of Assyria. Since Asirtu was merely the feminine form of Asir, "the superintendent" or "leader," it is probable that it was originally an epithet of Ishtar (Ashtoreth) of Nineveh. In the West, however, Asherah and Ashtoreth came to be distinguished from one another, Asherah being exclusively the goddess of fertility, whereas Ashtoreth passed into a moon-goddess.

3. Her Symbol:

In Assyrian asirtu, which appears also under the forms asratu, esreti (plural) and asru, had the further signification of "sanctuary." Originally Asirtu, the wife of Asir, and asirtu, "sanctuary," seem to have had no connection with one another, but the identity in the pronunciation of the two words caused them to be identified in signification, and as the tree-trunk or cone of stone which symbolized Asherah was regarded as a Beth-el or "house of the deity," wherein the goddess was immanent, the word Asirtu, Asherah, came to denote the symbol of the goddess. The trunk of the tree was often provided with branches, and assumed the form of the tree of life. It was as a trunk, however, that it was forbidden to be erected by the side of "the altar of Yahweh" (De 16:21; see Jud 6:25,28,30; 2Ki 23:6). Accordingly the symbol made for Asherah by his mother was "cut down" by Asa (1Ki 15:13). So, too, we hear of Asherim or symbols of the goddess being set up on the high places under the shade of a green tree (Jer 17:2; see 2Ki 17:10). Manasseh introduced one into the temple at Jerusalem (2Ki 21:3,7).

4. The Attributes of the Goddess:

Asherah was the goddess of fertility, and thus represented the Babylonian Ishtar in her character as goddess of love and not of war. In one of the cuneiform tablets found at Taanach by Dr. Sellin, and written by one Canaanite sheikh to another shortly before the Israelite invasion of Palestine, reference is made to "the finger of Asherah" from which oracles were derived. The "finger" seems to signify the symbol of the goddess; at any rate it revealed the future by means of a "sign and oracle." The practice is probably alluded to in Ho 4:12. The existence of numerous symbols in each of which the goddess was believed to be immanent led to the creation of numerous forms of the goddess herself, which, after the analogy of the Ashtaroth, were described collectively as the Asherim.

A. H. Sayce

ASHERITES

ash'-er-its (ha-'asheri): The descendants of Asher, Jacob's eighth son (Jud 1:32).

ASHES

ash'-iz: Among the ancient Hebrews and other Orientals, to sprinkle with or sit in ashes was a mark or token of grief, humiliation, or penitence. Ashes on the head was one of the ordinary signs of mourning for the dead, as when "Tamar put ashes on her head .... and went on crying" (2Sa 13:19 the King James Version), and of national humiliation, as when the children of Israel were assembled under Nehemiah "with fasting, and with sackcloth, and earth (ashes) upon them" (Ne 9:1), and when the people of Nineveh repented in sackcloth and ashes at the preaching of Jonah (Jon 3:5,6; compare 1 Macc 3:47). The afflicted or penitent often sat in ashes (compare Job 2:8; 42:6: "I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes"), or even wallowed in ashes, as Jeremiah exhorted sinning Israel to do: "O daughter of my people .... wallow thyself in ashes" (Jer 6:26), or as Ezekiel in his lamentation for Tyre pictures her mariners as doing, crying bitterly and 'casting up dust upon their heads' and 'wallowing themselves in the ashes' (in their weeping for her whose head was lifted up and become corrupted because of her beauty), "in bitterness of soul with bitter mourning" (Eze 27:30,31). However, these and various other modes of expressing grief, repentance, and humiliation among the Hebrews, such as rending the garments, tearing the hair and the like, were not of Divine appointment, but were simply the natural outbursts of the impassioned oriental temperament, and are still customary among eastern peoples.

Figurative: The term "ashes" is often used to signify worthlessness, insignificance or evanescence (Ge 18:27; Job 30:19). "Proverbs of ashes," for instance, in Job 13:12, is Job's equivalent, says one writer, for our modern "rot." For the ritual use of the ashes of the Red Heifer by the priests, see RED HEIFER.

George B. Eager

ASHHUR

ash’-ur (ashchur, the King James Version Ashur): The "father of Tekoa" (1Ch 2:24; 4:5), probably the founder of the village. The original meaning of the name is the "man of Horus," Ashurites (ha-’ashuri). This name occurs in the list of Ish-bosheth’s subjects (2Sa 2:9).

The Syriac, Arabic, and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions read ha-geshuri, "the Geshurites," designating the small kingdom to the South or Southeast of Damascus. This reading, though adopted by Ewald, Thenius and Wellhausen, is untenable, for during the reign of Ish-bosheth Geshur was ruled by its own king Talmai, whose daughter was married to David (2Sa 3:3; 13:37). Furthermore Geshur was too far away from the rest of Ishbosheth’s territory. A more consistent reading is ha- ‘asheri, as given in the Targum of Jonathan and accepted by Kohler, Klost, Kirkpatrick and Budde, "those of the house of Asher" (compare Jud 1:32). The term would, then, denote the country to the West of Jordan above Jezreel.

Samuel Cohon

ASHIMA

a-shi’-ma, ash’-i-ma (’ashima’; Asimath): A deity worshipped at Hamath (2Ki 17:30) of whom nothing further is known. It has been suggested that the name is the same as that of the goddess Simi, the daughter of the supreme god Hadad, who was worshipped at Membij, but there is nothing to support the suggestion.

ASHKELON

ask’-ke-lon, esh’-ka-lon, as’-ke-lon (the King James Version Eshkalon, (Eshkalonites; Jos 13:3); Askelon, (Jud 1:18; 1Sa 6:17; 2Sa 1:20); ‘ashqelon; modern Askelan): A maritime town between Jaffa and Gaza, one of the five chief cities of the Philistines. The Ashkelonites are mentioned by Joshua (Jos 13:3), and the city was taken by the tribe of Judah (Jud 1:18). One of the golden tumors (the King James Version "emerods") sent back with the ark by the Philistines was from Ashkelon (1Sa 6:17).

David couples Ashkelon with Gath in his lament over Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:20) indicating its importance, and it is joined with Gaza, Ashdod and Ekron in the denunciations of Amos (1:7,8). It is referred to in a similar way by Jeremiah (Jer 25:20; 47:5,7). Zephaniah (2:4,7) speaks of the desolation of Ashkelon and Zechariah announces the fear of Ashkelon on the destruction of Tyre (9:5).

The city is mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, and a certain Yitia is referred to as king. It revolted against Rameses II and was subdued, and we have mention of it as being under the rule of Assyria. Tiglath-pileser III names it among his tributaries, and its king, Mitinti, is said to have lost his reason when he heard of the fall of Damascus in 732 BC. It revolted in the reign of Sennacherib and was punished, and remained tributary to Assyria until the decay of that power. In Maccabean times we learn of its capture by Jonathan (1 Macc 10:86; 11:60, the Revised Version (British and American) "Ascalon"). Herod the Great was born there (BJ, III, ii, 1 ff). In the 4th century AD it was the seat of a

bishopric. It became subject to the Moslems in the 7th century and was taken by the Crusaders. It was taken in 1187 by Saladin, who dismantled it in 1191 to make it useless to Richard of England, into whose hands it was expected to fall. Richard restored it the next year but it was again destroyed by Saladin. It was an important fortress because of its vicinity to the trade route between Syria and Egypt.

H. Porter

ASHKELONITES

ash'-ke-lon-its (Jos 13:3): The people of Ashkelon, who were Philistines.

ASHKENAZ

ash'-ke-naz ('ashkenaz): The name occurs in Ge 10:3; 1Ch 16, in the list of the sons of Japheth as a son of Gomer. See TABLE OF NATIONS. It occurs also in Jer 51:27 (the King James Version "Ashchenaz") in connection with the kingdoms of Ararat and Minni, which suggests a location about Armenia.

ASHNAH

ash'-na ('ashnah): Two sites,

(1) Jos 15:33, a site in the lowlands of Judah, probably near Estaol and Zorah. The small ruin Aslin between those two places may retain an echo of the old name;

(2) Jos 15:43 an unknown site farther south.

ASHPENAZ

ash'-pe-naz ('ashpenaz): The master of the eunuchs of Nebuchadnezzar was an officer into whose hands the king entrusted those of the children of Israel, and of the princes, and of the seed of the king of Judah, whom he had carried captive to Babylon, that they might be taught the learning and tongue of the Chaldeans in order to serve in the king's palace. He is mentioned by name in Da 1:3 only. It used to be supposed that the name was Persian; but it now seems more probable that it is Babylonian. We would suggest Ashipu-Anu- Izzu, "the Aship-priest of Ann is mighty," as a possible form of the original.

R. Dick Wilson

ASHRIEL

ash'-re-el. See ASRIEL.

ASHTAROTH

Plural of Ashtoreth. See ASHTORETH.

ASHTAROTH; ASHTEROTH-KARNAIM; BEESHTERAH

ash'-ta-roth, as'-ta-roth ('ashtaroth; the King James Version Astaroth; Astaroth, the city of Og, king of Bashan (De 14$, etc.); 'ashteroth qarnayim, the scene of the defeat of the Rephaim by Chedorlaomer (Ge 14:5): (be'eshterah) a Levitical city in Manasseh East of the Jordan (Jos 21:27)): The name probably means "house" or "temple of Ashtoreth." It is identical with Ashtaroth of 1Ch 6:71. Ashtaroth is the plural of ASHTORETH (which see). The name denotes a place associated with the worship of this goddess. Ashteroth-karnaim is mentioned only once in canonical Scripture unless we accept Gratz's restoration, when Karnaim appears as a city taken by Israel: "Have we not taken to us horns (qarnayim) by our own strength?" (Am 6:13). It is identical with Carnion or Carnaim of 1 and 2 Macc, a city of Gilead with a temple of Atar-gatis. The name Ashtaroth has been identified with Astertu in the lists of Tahutmes III of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty; and with Ashtarti of the Tell el-Amarna Letters. Its claim to antiquity is therefore well established.

As far as the Biblical record is concerned, the names at the head of this article might stand for one and the same city, Ashtaroth being a contraction from Ashteroth-karnaim. But in the days of Eusebius and Jerome, we learn from the Onomasticon, there were two forts of this name 9 miles apart, lying between Adara (Der'ah) and Abila (Abil), while Ashtaroth, the ancient city of Og, king of Bashan, lay 6 miles from Adara. Carnaim Ashtaroth, which is evidently identical with Ashteroth-karnaim, they describe as a large village in the angle of Bashan where tradition places the home of Job. This seems to point to Tell 'Ashtara, a hill which rises about 80 ft. above the plain, 2 miles South of el-Merkez, the seat of the governor of the Chauran. Three-quarters of a mile North of el-Merkez, at the south end of a ridge on which the village of Sheikh Ca'ad is built, stands the weley of the stone of Job, Weley Sakhret 'Ayyub. By the large stone under the dome Job was said to have sat to receive his friends during his affliction.

An Egyptian inscription, found by Schumacher, proves the stone to be a monument of the time of Rameses II. At the foot of the hill is pointed out the bath of Job. In el-Merkez the building known as Deir 'Ayyub, "Monastery of Job," is now part of the barracks. There is also shown the tomb of Job. The stream which flows southward past Tell 'Ashtara, is called Moyet en-Neby 'Ayyub, "stream of the prophet Job," and is said to have risen where the patriarch stamped his foot on his recovery. It is to be noted also that the district lying in the angle formed by Nahr er-Raqqad and the Yarmuk River is called to this day ez-Zawiyet esh-sharqiyeh, "the eastern angle" (i.e. of the Jaulan). The term may in Jerome's time have covered the land east of the 'Allan, although this is now part of the Chauran. At Tell 'Ashtara there are remains pointing to a high antiquity. The site was also occupied during the Middle Ages. Perhaps here we should locate Carnaim Ashtaroth of the Onomasticon. It does not, however, agree with the description of Carnaim in 1 and 2 Macc. The Ashtaroth of the Onomasticon may have been at el-Muzerib, on the great pilgrimage road, about 6 Roman miles from Der'ah—the distance indicated by

Eusebius. The old fortress here was situated on an island in the middle of the lake, Baheiret el-Bajjeh. A full description of the place is given in Schumacher's Across the Jordan, 137 ff. It must have been a position of great strength in antiquity; but the ancient name has not been recovered.

Some would place Ashteroth-karnaim, the Carnaim of the Maccabees, at Tell 'Ash'ari, a site 10 Roman miles North of Der'ah, and 4 1/2 Roman miles S 2 of Tell 'Ashtara. This clearly was "a place hard to besiege, and difficult of access by reason of the narrowness of the approaches on all sides" (2 Macc 12:21). It crowns a promontory which stands out between the deep gorge of the Yarmuk River and a great chasm, at the head of which is a waterfall. It could be approached only by the neck connecting it with the mainland; and here it was guarded by a triple wall, the ruins of which are seen today. The remains of a temple close by the bridge over the Yarmuk may mark the scene of the slaughter by Judas.

The whole question however is obscure. Eusebius is clearly guilty of confusion, with his two Ashtaroth-karnaims and his Carnaim Ashtaroth. All the places we have named lie considerably North of a line drawn from Tell Abel to Der'ah. For light upon the problem of identification we must wait the results of excavation.

W. Ewing

ASHTERATHITE

ash'-te-rath-it, ash-ter'-ath-it (ha-'ashterathi): A native of Ashtaroth: Uzzia, one of David's heroes (1Ch 11:44).

ASHTEROTH-KARNAIM

ash'-te-roth kar-na'-im: I.e. "Ashteroth of the two horns," mentioned in Ge 14:5 as the place of Chedorlaomer's defeat of the Rephaim. See ASHTAROTH. A Carnaim or Carnion in Gilead, with a temple of Atar-gatis attached, was captured by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:43,44; 2 Macc 12:26).

ASHTORETH

ash'-to-reth, ash-to reth ('ashtoreth; plural 'ashtaroth; Astarte):

1. Name and Origin

2. Attributes of the Goddess

3. Ashtoreth as a Moon-Goddess

4. The Local Ashtaroth

1. Name and Origin:

The name of the supreme goddess of Canaan and the female counterpart of Baal.

The name and cult of the goddess were derived from Babylonia, where Ishtar represented the evening and morning stars and was accordingly androgynous in origin. Under Semitic influence, however, she became solely female, but retained a memory of her primitive character by standing, alone among the Assyro-Bab goddesses, on a footing of equality with the male divinities. From Babylonia the worship of the goddess was carried to the Semites of the West, and in most instances the feminine suffix was attached to her name; where this was not the case the deity was regarded as a male. On the Moabite Stone, for example, ‘Ashtar is identified with Chemosh, and in the inscriptions of southern Arabia ‘Athtar is a god. On the other hand, in Atar-gatis or Derketo (2 Macc 12:26), Atar, without the feminine suffix, is identified with the goddess ‘Athah or ‘Athi (Greek Gatis). The cult of the Greek Aphrodite in Cyprus was borrowed from that of Ashtoreth; whether the Greek name also is a modification of Ashtoreth, as has often been maintained, is doubtful.

2. Attributes of the Goddess:

In Babylonia and Assyria Ishtar was the goddess of love and war. An old Babylonian legend related how the descent of Ishtar into Hades in search of her dead husband, Tammuz, was followed by the cessation of marriage and birth in both earth and heaven, while the temples of the goddess at Nineveh and Arbela, around which the two cities afterward grew up, were dedicated to her as the goddess of war. As such she appeared to one of Assur-bani-pal’s seers and encouraged the Assyrian king to march against Elam. The other goddesses of Babylonia, who were little more than reflections of the god, tended to merge into Ishtar who thus became a type of the female divinity, a personification of the productive principle in nature, and more especially the mother and creatress of mankind. The chief seat of the worship of Ishtar in Babylonia was Erech, where prostitution was practiced in her name, and she was served with immoral rites by bands of men and women. In Assyria, where the warlike side of the goddess was predominant, no such rites seem to have been practiced, and, instead, prophetesses were attached to her temples to whom she delivered oracles.

3. Ashtoreth as a Moon-Goddess:

In Canaan, Ashtoreth, as distinguished from the male ‘Ashtar, dropped her warlike attributes, but in contradistinction to Asherah, whose name and cult had also been imported from Assyria, became, on the one hand, the colorless consort of Baal, and on the other hand, a moon-goddess. In Babylonia the moon was a god, but after the rise of the solar theology, when the larger number of the Babylonian gods were resolved into forms of the sun-god, their wives also became solar, Ishtar, "the daughter of Sin" the moon-god, remaining identified with the evening-star. In Canaan, however, when the solar theology had absorbed the older beliefs, Baal, passing into a sun-god and the goddess who stood at his side becoming a representative of the moon—the pale reflection, as it were, of the sun- -Ashtoreth came to be regarded

as the consort of Baal and took the place of the solar goddesses of Babylonia.

4. The Local Ashtaroth:

Hence there were as "many Ashtoreths" or Ashtaroth as Baals. They represented the various forms under which the goddess was worshipped in different localities (Jud 10:6; 1Sa 7:4; 12:10, etc.). Sometimes she was addressed as Naamah, "the delightful one," Greek Astro-noe, the mother of Eshmun and the Cabeiri. The Philistines seem to have adopted her under her warlike form (1Sa 31:10 the King James Version reading "Ashtoreth," as Septuagint), but she was more usually the moon-goddess (Lucian, De Dca Syriac., 4; Herodian, v.6, 10), and was accordingly symbolized by the horns of a cow. See ASHTEROTH-KARNAIM. At Ashkelon, where Herodotus (i.105) places her most ancient temple, she was worshipped under the name of Atar-gatis, as a woman with the tail of a fish, and fish were accordingly sacred to her. Elsewhere the dove was her sacred symbol. The immoral rites with which the worship of Ishtar in Babylonia was accompanied were transferred to Canaan (De 23:18) and formed part of the idolatrous practices which the Israelites were called upon to extirpate.

A. H. Sayce

ASHUR

ash’-ur. See ASHHUR.

ASHURBANIPAL

a-shoor-ba’-ne-pal (Ashur-bani-apal, "Ashur creates a son"): Before setting out on his last campaign to Egypt, Esarhaddon king of Assyria doubtless having had some premonition that his days were numbered, caused his son Ashurbanipal to be acknowledged the crown prince of Assyria (668 BC). At the same time he proclaimed his son Shamash-shum-ukin as the crown prince of Babylonia. At the father’s death the latter, however, was only permitted to become viceroy of Babylonia.

Ashurbanipal is generally believed to be the great and noble Osnappar (Ezr 4:10). See OSNAPPAR. If this identification should not prove correct, the king is not mentioned by name in the Old Testament. In the annals of Ashurbanipal there is a list of twenty tributary kings in which Manasseh (written Minse) of the land of Judah is mentioned. With a few exceptions the list is the same as that given by Esarhaddon, his father. In 2Ch 33:11 ff we learn that the captains of the host of the king of Assyria took Manasseh with hooks and bound him with fetters, and carried him to Babylon. The king to whom reference is made in this passage was either Esarhaddon or Ashurbanipal. If the latter, his restoration of Manasseh was paralleled in the instance of Necho, the vassal king of Memphis and Sais, who also had revolted from Assyria; for he was accorded similar treatment, being sent back to Egypt with special marks of favor, and reinstated upon his throne.

Another reference in the Old Testament, at least to one of the acts of Ashurbanipal, is the prophecy of

Nahum, who in predicting the downfall of Nineveh, said, "Art thou (Nineveh) better than No-amon?" This passage is illustrated by the annals of the king, in which he recounts the destruction of the city. No (meaning "city") is the name of Thebes, while Amon (or Amen) was the chief deity of that city.

Esarhaddon died on his way to Egypt, which he had previously conquered, an insurrection having taken place. Tirhakah, whom Esarhaddon had vanquished, and who had fled to Ethiopia, had returned, and had advanced against the rulers appointed by Assyria. He formed a coalition with Necho and others. Not long after Ashurbanipal came to the throne, he set out for Egypt and defeated the forces. The leaders of the insurrection were carried to Nineveh in fetters. Necho, like Manasseh, as mentioned above, was restored to his rule at Sais. Tirhakah died shortly after. His sister's son Tanut-Amon (Tandami) then took up the cause, and after the departure of the Assyrian army he advanced against the Assyrian vassal governors. The Assyrian army returned and relieved the besieged. Tanut- Amon returned to Thebes, which was conquered and which was spoiled by the rapacious Assyrians, 663 BC. This is what the prophet Nahum referred to (3:8). A few years later Psammetik, the son of Necho, who had remained faithful after his restoration, declared his independence. As the Assyrian army was required elsewhere, Egypt was henceforth free from the yoke of the Assyrian. Ba'al of Tyre, after a long siege, finally submitted. Yakinlu, king of Arvad, paid tribute and sent hostages. Other rebellious subjects, who had become emboldened by the attitude of Tirhakah, were brought into submission. Under Urlaki, the old enemy Elam, which had been at peace with Assyria since the preceding reign, now became aggressive and made inroads into Babylonia. Ashurbanipal marched through the Zagros mountains, and suddenly appeared before Susa. This move brought Teumman, who had in the meanwhile succeeded Urlaki, back to his capital. Elam was humiliated.

In 652 BC the insurrection of Shamash-shumukin, the king's brother, who had been made viceroy of Babylon, broke out. He desired to establish his independence from Assyria. After Ashurbanipal had overcome Babylon, Shamash-shum-ukin took refuge in a palace, set it on fire, and destroyed himself in the flames.

There is much obscurity about the last years of Ashurbanipal's reign. The decadence of Assyria had begun, which resulted not only in the loss to the title of the surrounding countries, but also in its complete annihilation before the century was over. Nineveh was finally razed to the ground by the Umman-Manda hordes, and was never rebuilt.

Ashurbanipal is also distinguished for his building operations, which show remarkable architectural ingenuity. In many of the cities of Assyria and Babylonia he restored, enlarged or embellished the temples or shrines. In Nineveh he reared a beautiful palace, which excelled all other Assyrian structures in the richness of its ornamentations.

During his reign the study of art was greatly encouraged. Some of his exquisite sculptures represent not only the height of Assyrian art, but also belong to the most important aesthetic treasures of the ancient world. The themes of many of the chief sculptures depict the hunt, in which the king took special delight.

Above all else Ashurbanipal is famous for the library he created, because of which he is perhaps to be considered the greatest known patron of literature in the pre-Christian centuries. For Bibliography see ASSYRIA.

A. T. Clay

ASHURITES

ash'-ur-its (ha-'ashuri): According to the Massoretic Text of 2Sa 2:9, a tribe included in the short-lived kingdom of Ish-bosheth, Saul's son. A slight textual correction gives "Asherites," that is, the tribe of Asher; with this the Targum of Jonathan agrees. The tribe of Asher lay where it would naturally fall to Ish-bosheth's kingdom. The reading "Geshurites" (Vulgate and Syriac) is excluded by the known independence Of Geshur at this time (2Sa 3:3; 13:37). For similar reasons we cannot think of Assyria (Hebrew Asshur) nor of the Arabic Asshurim of Ge 25:3.

ASHVATH

ash'-vath ('ashwath): A man of Asher, of the house of Japhlet (1Ch 7:33).

ASIA

a'-shi-a (Asia): A Roman province embracing the greater part of western Asia Minor, including the older countries of Mysia, Lydia, Caria, and a part of Phrygia, also several of the independent coast cities, the Troad, and apparently the islands of Lesbos, Samos, Patmos, Cos and others near the Asia Minor coast (Ac 16:6; 19:10,27). It is exceedingly difficult to determine the exact boundaries of the several countries which later constituted the Roman province, for they seem to have been somewhat vague to the ancients themselves, and were constantly shifting; it is therefore impossible to trace the exact borders of the province of Asia. Its history previous to 133 BC coincides with that of Asia Minor of which it was a part. However, in that year, Attalus III (Philometer), king of Pergamos, bequeathed his kingdom to the Roman Empire. It was not until 129 BC that the province of Asia was really formed by Rome. Its first capital was Pergamos, the old capital of Mysia, but in the time of Augustus, when Asia had become the most wealthy province of the Empire, the seat of the government was transferred to Ephesus. Smyrna was also an important rival of Ephesus. The governor of Asia was a pro-consul, chosen by lot by the Roman senate from among the former consuls who had been out of office for at least five years, and he seldom continued in office for more than a single year. The diet of the province, composed of representatives from its various districts, met each year in the different cities. Over it presided the asiarch, whose duty it was, among other things, to offer sacrifices for the welfare of the emperor and his family.

In 285 AD the province was reduced in size, as Caria, Lydia, Mysia and Phrygia were separated from it, and apart from the cities of the coast little remained. The history of Asia consists almost entirely of the

history of its important cities, which were Adramyttium, Assos, Cnidus, Ephesus, Laodicea, Miletus, Pergamos, Philadelphia, Sardis, Smyrna, Thyatira, Troas, etc.

E. J. Banks

ASIA MINOR

a’-shi-a mi’ner:

Introductory

I. THE COUNTRY

1. Position and Boundaries

2. General Description

3. Mountains

4. Rivers, Lakes and Plains

5. Roads

6. Climate and Products

II. HISTORY

1. The Hittites

2. Phrygian and Bithynian Immigrations

3. Lydians, Greeks and Persians

4. Alexander and his Successors

5. The Galatians

6. The Romans in Asia Minor

III. ASIA MINOR IN THE 1ST CENTURY AD

1. The Population

2. The Native Social System

3. Emperor Worship

4. The Hellenistic System

5. Roman "Coloniae"

IV. CHRISTIANITY IN ASIA MINOR

Christian Inscriptions, etc.

LITERATURE

Introductory:

Technically, it is only on sufferance that an account of "Asia Minor" can find a place in a Biblical encyclopedia, for the country to which this name applies in modern times was never so called in Old Testament or New Testament times. The term first appears in Orosius, a writer of the 5th century AD, and it is now applied in most European languages to the peninsula forming the western part of Asiatic Turkey.

The justification for the inclusion in this work of a summary account of Asia Minor as a whole, its geography, history, and the social and political condition of its people in New Testament times, is to be found in the following sentence of Gibbon: "The rich provinces that extend from the Euphrates to the Ionian Sea were the principal theater on which the Apostle to the Gentiles displayed his zeal and piety"; and no region outside the city of Rome has preserved to modern times so many records of the growth and character of its primitive Christianity.

I. The Country.

1. Position and Boundaries:

Asia Minor (as the country was called to distinguish it from the continent of Asia), or Anatolia, is the name given to the peninsula which reaches out between the Black Sea (Pontus Euxinus) on the North and the Mediterranean on the South, forming an elevated land-bridge between central Asia and southeastern Europe. On the Northwest corner, the peninsula is separated from Europe by the Bosporus, the Sea of Marmora and the hellespont. On the West the peninsula borders on the Aegean Sea, whose numerous islands tempted the timid mariner of ancient times on toward Greece. The West coast, with its

alternation of mountain and river-valley, is deeply indented: there is a total coast line of four times the length of a line drawn from North to South The numerous land-locked bays and harbors of this coast have made it the happy hunting-ground of Mediterranean traders in all ages. On the East it is usual to delimit Asia Minor by a line drawn from Alexandretta to Samsun, but for the purposes of New Testament history it must be remembered that part of Cilicia, Cappadocia and Pontus (Galatia) lie to the East of this line (Longitude 26 degrees to 36 degrees East; latitude 36 degrees to 42 degrees North).

2. General Description:

There are two distinct countries, implying distinct historical development, in the Anatolian peninsula, the country of the coast, and the country of the central plateau. The latter takes its shape from that of the great mountain ranges which bound it on the West, East and North. The high central tableland is tilted down toward the North and West; the mountain ranges on these sides are not so lofty as the Taurus chain on the South and Southeast. This chain, except at its Southeast corner, rises sharply from the South coast, whose undulations it determines. On the North, the mountains of Pontus (no distinctive name), a continuation of the Armenian range, give the coast-line a similar character. On the inhospitable North coast, there is only one good harbor, that of Sinope, and no plain of any extent. The South coast can boast of the plains of Pamphylia and Cilicia, both highly fertile, the harbors of Makri and Marmariki, and the sheltered bays of Adalia and Alexandretta. On the West, the ascent from the littoral to the plateau is more gradual. A distance of over 100 miles separates the Phrygian mountains where the oriental plateau begins, from the West seaboard with its inlets and trading cities. These hundred miles are composed of river valleys, divided off by mountain ranges, and forming the channels of communication between the interior and the coast. While these two regions form part of a single country it is obvious that—in all that gives individuality to a country, their flora, fauna, climate, conditions of life and history—the one region is sharply marked off from the other. For the plateau naturally connects itself with the East In its vegetation and climate, its contrasts of temperature, its dry soil and air, it forms part of the region extending eastward to central Asia. The coast land recalls the scenery and general character of the Greek mainland and islands. It naturally looked to, it influenced and was influenced by, the populations on the other side of the Aegean Sea. At Smyrna, the traveler in all ages recognizes the bright, active life of southern Europe; at Iconium he feels the immobile and lethargic calm of the East. Asia Minor in its geographical structure as well as in its population, has been throughout history the meeting-place, whether for peaceful intermixture or for the clash in war, of the eternally contrasted systems of East and West.

3. Mountains:

The Armenian mountains reach westward, and fork, close to the line we have chosen as the East boundary of Asia Minor, into two ranges, the Taurus Mountains on the South, and the mountains of Pontus on the North Mount Argaeus (over 12,000 ft.) stands in the angle formed by these ranges, nearer to Taurus than to the northern system. Taurus is pierced on the northern side of the Cilician plain by the pass, easy to traverse and still more easy to defend, of the Cilician Gates, while another natural route leads from central Cappadocia to Amisus on the Black Sea. These mountain ranges (average height of Taurus 7,000 to 10,000 ft.; the North range is much lower) enfold the central Galatian and Lycaonian

plains, which are bounded on the West by the Sultan Dagh and the Phrygian mountains. From the latter to the west coast extend three mountain ranges, delimiting the valleys of the Caicus, Hermus and Meander. These valleys lie East and West, naturally conducting traffic in those directions.

4. Rivers, Lakes and Plains:

The great plains of the interior, covering parts of Galatia, Lycaonia and Cappadocia, lie at an altitude of from 3,000 to 4,000 ft. Rivers enter them from the adjoining mountains, to be swallowed up in modern times in salt lakes and swamps. In ancient times much of this water was used for irrigation. Regions which now support only a few wretched villages were covered in the Roman period by numerous large cities, implying a high degree of cultivation of the naturally fertile soil. The remaining rivers cut their way through rocky gorges in the fringe of mountains around the plateau; on the West side of the peninsula their courses open into broad valleys, among which those of the Caieus, Hermus and Meander are among the most fertile in the world. Down those western valleys, and that of the Sangarius on the Northwest, ran the great highways from the interior to the seaboard. In those valleys sprang up the greatest and most prosperous of the Hellenistic and Greek-Roman cities, from which Greek education and Christianity radiated over the whole country. The longest river in Asia Minor is the Halys, which rises in Pontus, and after an enormous bend south-westward flows into the Black Sea. This, and the Iris, East of Amisus, are the only rivers of note on the North coast. The rivers on the South coast, with the exception of the Sarus and the Pyramus which rise in Cappadocia and water the Cilician plain, are mere mountain torrents, flowing immediately into the sea. A remarkable feature of Asia Minor is its duden, rivers disappearing underground in the limestone rock, to reappear as springs and heads of rivers many miles away. Mineral and thermal springs abound all over the country, and are especially numerous in the Meander valley. There are several salt lakes, the largest being Lake Tatta in Lycaonia. Fresh-water lakes, such as Karalis and the Limuae, abound in the mountains in the Southwest.

5. Roads

The road-system of Asia Minor is marked out by Nature, and traffic has followed the same lines since the dawn of history. The traveler from the Euphrates or from Syria enters by way of Melitene and Caesarea, or by the Cilician Gates. From Caesarea he can reach the Black Sea by Zela and Amisus. If he continues westward, he must enter the Aegean area by one of the routes marked out, as indicated above, by the valleys of the Meander, Hermus or Caicus. If his destination is the Bosporus, he travels down the valley of the Sangarius. Other roads lead from the bay of Adalia to Antioch in Pisidia or to Apameia, or to Laodicea on the Lycus and thence down the Meander to Ephesus. The position of the Hittite capital at Pteria fixed the route North of the central plain in general usage for travelers from East to West, and this was the route followed by the Persian Royal Road. Later, traffic from the East took the route passing along the South side of the Axylon, North of Iconium, and Pisidian Antioch to the Lycus, Meander and Ephesus. This route coincides with that from the Cilician Gates, from a point Northeast of Iconium. The need to control the Pisidian tribes in the reign of Augustus led to the building of a series of roads in Pisidia, radiating from Antioch; one of these roads led from Antioch to Lystra, and it was the one traversed by Paul on his journey from Antioch to Iconium (Ac 13:51).

6. Climate and Products:

The winter on the central plateau is long and severe, the summer is short and hot: but a cool breeze from the North (the inbat) tempers the hot afternoons. The south coast in summer is hot and malarious; in winter its climate is mild. Much snow fails in the regions adjacent to the Black Sea. The climate of the west coast resembles that of southern Europe. The country contains vast mineral wealth; many of the mines were worked by the ancients. There are forests of pine, oak and fir in the mountains of the North and South. The central plateau has always been famous for its vast flocks of sheep. King Amyntas of Galatia owned enormous flocks which pastured on the Lycaonian plain. Carpets and rugs and other textile products have always been characteristic of Asia Minor. The wealth of the cities in the province of Asia depended largely on textile and dyeing industries (Re 1-3).

II. History.

It follows from what has been said above that the clue to the history of Asia Minor more almost than in the case of any other country, lies in its geographical position and structure. "Planted like a bridge between Asia and Europe," it has been throughout human history the meeting-place and the battle ground of the peoples of the East and those of the West. From the earliest period to which our records reach, we find it inhabited by an amalgam of races, religions and social systems, none of which has ever quite died out. And throughout history new races, religions and social systems, alike imperishable in many of their features, have poured into the peninsula to find a home there.

1. The Hittites:

At the dawn of history, Asia Minor was ruled by a non-Aryan people, the Hatti or Hittites about which knowledge is at present accumulating so fast that no final account of them can be given. See HITTITES. Asia Minor is now recognized to have been the center of their civilization, as against the older view that they were a Mesopotamian people. Sculptures and hieroglyphs belonging to this people have long been known over the whole country from Smyrna to the Euphrates, and it is almost unanimously assumed that their capital was at Boghaz Keui (across the Halys from Ancyra). This site has been identified with much probability with the Pteria of Herodotus, which Croesus captured when he marched against the Persians, the inference being that the portion of the Hittite land which lay East of the Halys was at that time a satrapy of the Persian Empire. Excavations in the extensive ancient city at Boghaz Keui have recently been carried out by Winckler and Puchstcin, who have discovered remains of the royal archives. These records are written on clay tablets in cuneiform script; they are couched partly in Babylonian, partly (presumably) in the still undeciphered native language. The documents in the Babylonian tongue prove that close political relations existed between the Hatti and the eastern monarchy. In the 14th century BC the Hittites appear to have conquered a large part of Syria, and to have established themselves at Carchemish. Thenceforth, they were in close touch with Mesopotamia. From about the beginning of the first millennium, the Hittites "were in constant relations, hostile or neutral, with the Ninevites, and thenceforward their art shows such marked Assyrian characteristics that it hardly retains its individuality."

2. Phrygian and Bithynian Immigrations:

The date of the Phrygian and Bithynian immigrations. from southeastern Europe cannot be fixed with certainty, but they had taken place by the beginning of the first millennium BC. These immigrations coincide in time with the decline of the Hittite power. After many wanderings, the Phrygians found a home at the western side of the plateau, and no power exercised such an influence on the early development of Asia Minor as the Phrygian, principally in the sphere of religion. The kings of Phrygia "bulked more impressively in the Greek mind than any other non-Gr monarchy; their language was the original language and the speech of the goddess herself; their country was the land of great fortified cities, and their kings were the associates of the gods themselves." The material remains of the "Phrygian country"—the tomb of Midas with the fortified acropolis above it, and the many other rock-tombs around—are the most impressive in Asia Minor Inscriptions in a script like the early Ionian are cut on some of the tombs. The Phrygian language, an Indo-Germanic speech with resemblances to both Greek and the Italian languages, is proved by some seventy inscriptions (a score of them still unpublished) to have been in common use well into the Christian period. Two recently found inscriptions show that it was spoken even in Iconium, "the furthermost city of Phrygia," on the Lycaonian side, until the 3rd century of our era. Those inscriptions mention the names of Ma (Cybele) and Attis, whose cult exercised a profound influence on the religions of Greece and Rome.

3. Lydians, Greeks and Persians:

The next monarchy to rise in Asia Minor is that of Lydia, whose origin is obscure. The Phrygian empire had fallen before an invasion of the Cimmerii in the 9th or 8th century BC; Alyattes of Lydia, which lay between Phrygia and the Aegean, repelled a second invasion of the Cimmerii in 617 BC. Croesus, king of Lydia (both names afterward proverbial for wealth), was lord of all the country to the Halys, as well as of the Greek colonies on the coast. Those colonies—founded from hellas—had reached their zenith by the 8th century, and studded all three coasts of Asia Minor. Their inability to combine in a common cause placed them at the mercy of Croesus, and later of his conquerors, the Persians (546 BC). The Persians divided Asia Minor into satrapies, but the Greek towns were placed under Greek dynasts, who owned the suzerainty of Persia, and several of the inland races continued under the rule of their native princes. The defeat of Xerxes by Hellas set the Greek cities in Asia Minor free, and they continued free during the period of Athenian greatness. In 386 BC they were restored to the king of Persia by the selfish diplomacy of Sparta.

4. Alexander and His Successors:

When Alexander the Great crossed the Hellespont in 334 BC, a new era opened for the Asiatic Greeks. Hitherto the Greek cities in Asia Minor, apart from spasmodic efforts at combination, had been mere trading communities, independent of each other, in competition with each other, and anxious for reasons of self-interest to bring each other to ruin. These colonies had moreover been confined to the coast, and to the open river valleys of the west, The idea of a Greek empire in Asia Minor was originated by Alexander, and materialized by his successors. Henceforward the city rivalries certainly lasted on, and at

a later period excited the scorn of the stolid Romans; but henceforward the Greek cities were members of a Greek empire, and were conscious of an imperial mission. It is to this period that the Hellenization or, as Mommsen would translate the term, the civilization of the interior of Asia Minor belongs. The foundations of Alexander's successors, the Attalids and Seleucids, covered the peninsula; their object was to consolidate the Greek rule over the native races, and, most important of all, to raise those races to the Greek level of civilization and education. The experiment succeeded only partially and temporarily; but such success as it and the later Roman effort in the same direction had, exercised a profound influence on the early growth of Christianity in the country (see below).

5. The Galatians:

In their manner of entering and settling in the country, in the way in which they both came under the influence of the Asiatic environment, and impressed the stamp of their vigorous individuality on the culture and the history of the land, the Galatae, a Celtic nation who crossed from Europe in 278-277 BC, to establish themselves ultimately on the East of ancient Phrygia and on both sides of the Halys, recall the essential features of the Phrygian immigration of a thousand years earlier. "The region of Galatia, at a remote period the chief seat of the oriental rule over anterior Asia, and preserving in the famed rock-sculptures of the modern Boghaz Keui, formerly the royal town of Pteria, reminiscences of an almost forgotten glory, had in the course of centuries become in language and manners a Celtic island amidst the waves of eastern peoples, and remained so in internal organization even under the (Roman) empire."

But these Gauls came under strong oriental influence; they modified to some extent, the organization of the local religion, which they adopted; but they adopted it so completely that only one deity with a Celtic name has so far appeared on the numerous cult- inscriptions of Galatia (Anderson in Journal of Hellenistic Studies, 1910, 163 ff). Nor has a single inscription in the Galatian language been found in the country, although we know that that language was spoken by the lower classes at least as late as the 4th century AD. The Galatian appears to have superseded the Phrygian tongue in the part of Galatia which was formerly Phrygian; no Phrygian inscriptions have been found in Galatia, although they are common in the district bordering on its southern and western boundaries. But Galatian was unable to compete with Greek as the language of the educated classes, and even such among the humbler orders as could write, wrote in Greek, and Greek-Roman city-organization replaced the Celtic tribal system much earlier and much more completely in Galatia than Roman municipal organization did in Gaul. Still, the Galatians stood out in strong contrast both to the Greeks and to the Orientals. Roman diplomacy recognized and encouraged this sense of isolation, and in her struggle against the Orientals and the Greeks under Mithridates, Rome found trusty allies in the Galatians. In the Imperial period, the Galatians were considered the best soldiers in Asia Minor. See GALATIA.

6. The Romans in Asia Minor:

The Romans exercised an effective control over the affairs of Asia Minor after their defeat of Antiochus the Great in 189 BC, but it was only in 133 BC, when Attalus of Pergamus bequeathed his kingdom of "Asia" to the Roman state, that the Roman occupation began. This kingdom formed the province Asia; a

second inheritance which fell to Rome at the death of Nicomedes III in 74 BC became the province Bithynia, to which Pontus was afterward added. Cilicia, the province which gave Paul to the empire and the church, was annexed in 100 BC, and reorganized by Pompey in 66 BC.

These provinces had already been organized; in other words the Roman form of government had been definitely established in them at the foundation of the empire, and, in accordance with the principle that all territory which had been thoroughly "pacified" should remain under the administration of the senate, while the emperor directly governed regions in which soldiers in numbers were still required, the above-mentioned provinces, with the exception of Cilicia, fell to the senate. But all territory subsequently annexed in Asia Minor remained in the emperor's hands. Several territories over which Rome had exercised a protectorate were now organized into provinces, under direct imperial rule. Such were: Galatia, to which under its last king Amyntas, part of Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pisidia and Pamphylia had been added, and which was made a Roman province at his death in 25 BC (the extension of Galatia under Amyntas to include Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe and the consequent incorporation of these cities in the province Galatia, forms the ultimate historical basis of the "South Galatian Theory"); Paphlagonia, annexed in 7 BC; Cappadocia, in 17 AD; Lycia, in 43 AD, and in 63 AD the part of Pontus lying between the Iris and Armenia. This formed the Roman Asia Minor of Paul's time. See ASIA; BITHYNIA, etc.

III. Asia Minor in the First Century AD.

1. The Population:

The partition of Asia Minor into Roman provinces did not correspond to its ethnological divisions, and even those divisions were not always clearly marked. As is clear from the brief historical sketch given above, the population of Asia Minor was composed of many overlying strata of races, which tended in part to lose their individuality and sink into the original Anatolian type. Answering roughly to the above-mentioned separation of Asia Minor into two countries, and to its characterization as the meeting-place of East and West, we can detach from among a medley of races and institutions two main coexistent social systems, which we may call the native system, and the hellenistic system. These systems (especially as the result of Roman government) overlap and blend with each other, but they correspond in a general way to the distinction (observed in the country by Strabo) between city-organization and life on the village system. A deep gulf separated these forms of society.

2. The Native Social System:

Under the Roman Empire, there was a continuous tendency to raise and absorb the Anatolian natives into Greek cities and Roman citizenship. But in the Apostolic Age, this process had not gone far in the interior of the country, and the native social system was still that under which a large section of the population lived. It combined the theocratic form of government with institutions derived from a preexistent matriarchal society. The center of the native community was the temple of the god, with its great corporation of priests living on the temple revenues, and its people, who were the servants of the

god (hierodouloi; compare Paul’s expression, "servant of God"), and worked on the temple estates. The villages in which these workers lived were an inseparable adjunct of the temple, and the priests (or a single priest-dynast) were the absolute rulers of the people. A special class called hieroi performed special functions (probably for a period only) in the temple service. This included, in the ease of women, sometimes a service of chastity, sometimes one of ceremonial prostitution. A woman of Lydia, of good social position (as implied in her Roman name) boasts in an inscription that she comes of ancestors who had served before the god in this manner, and that she has done so herself. Such women afterward married in their own rank, and incurred no disgrace. Many inscriptions prove that the god (through his priests) exercised a close supervision over the whole moral life and over the whole daily routine of his people; he was their Ruler, Judge, helper and healer.

3. Emperor Worship:

Theocratic government received a new direction and a new meaning from the institution of emperor-worship; obedience to the god now coincided with loyalty to the emperor. The Seleucid kings and later the Roman emperors, according to a highly probable view, became heirs to the property of the dispossessed priests (a case is attested at Pisidian Antioch); and it was out of the territory originally belonging to the temples that grants of land to the new Seleucid and Roman foundations were made. On those portions of an estate not gifted to a polis or colonia, theocratic government lasted on; but alongside of the Anatolian god there now appeared the figure of the god-emperor.

In many places the cult of the emperor was established in the most important shrine of the neighborhood; the god-emperor succeeded to or shared the sanctity of the older god, Grecized as Zeus, Apollo, etc.; inscriptions record dedications made to the god and to the emperor jointly. Elsewhere, and especially in the cities, new temples were founded for the worship of the emperor. Asia Minor was the home of emperor-worship, and nowhere did the new institution fit so well into the existing religious system. Inscriptions have recently thrown much light on a society of Xenoi Tekmoreioi ("Guest-Friends of the Secret Sign") who lived on an estate which had belonged to Men Askaenos beside Antioch of Pisidia, and was now in the hands of the Roman emperor. A procurator (who was probably the chief priest of the local temple) managed the estate as the emperor’s representative. This society is typical of many others whose existence in inner Asia Minor has come to light in recent years; it was those societies which fostered the cult of the emperor on its local as distinct from its provincial side (see ASIARCH), and it was chiefly those societies that set the machinery of the Roman law in operation against the Christians in the great persecutions. In the course of time the people on the imperial estates tended to pass into a condition of serfdom; but occasionally an emperor raised the whole or part of an estate to the rank of a city.

4. The Hellenistic System:

Much of inner Asia Minor must originally have been governed on theocratic system; but the Greek city-state gradually encroached on the territory and privileges of the ancient temple. Several of these cities were "founded" by the Seleucids and Attalids; this sometimes meant a new foundation, more often the

establishment of Greek city-government in an older city, with an addition of new inhabitants. These inhabitants were often Jews whom the Seleucids found trusty colonists: the Jews of Antioch in Pisidia (Ac 13:14 ff) probably belong to this class. The conscious aim of those foundations was the Hellenization of the country, and their example influenced the neighboring cities. With the oriental absolutism of the native system, the organization of the Greek and Roman cities was in sharp contrast. In the earlier centuries of the Roman Empire these cities enjoyed a liberal measure of self- government. Magistracies were elective; rich men in the same city vied with each other, and city vied with city, in erecting magnificent public buildings, in founding schools and promoting education, in furthering all that western nations mean by civilization. With the Greek cities came the Greek Pantheon, but the gods of Hellas did little more than add their names to those of the gods of the country. Wherever we have any detailed information concerning a cult in inner Anatolia, we recognize under a Greek (or Roman) disguise the essential features of the old Anatolian god.

The Greeks had always despised the excesses of the Asiatic religion, and the more advanced education of the Anatolian Greeks could not reconcile itself to a degraded cult, which sought to perpetuate the social institutions under which it had arisen, only under their ugliest and most degraded aspects. "In the country generally a higher type of society was maintained; whereas at the great temples the primitive social system was kept up as a religious duty incumbent on the class called Hieroi during their regular periods of service at the temple. .... The chasm that divided the religion from the educated life of the country became steadily wider and deeper. In this state of things Paul entered the country; and wherever education had already been diffused, he found converts ready and eager." This accounts for "the marvelous and electrical effect that is attributed in Ac to the preaching of the Apostle in Galatia" (Ramsay, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, 96).

5. Roman "Coloniae":

Under the Roman Empire, we can trace a gradual evolution in the organization of the Greek cities toward the Roman municipal type. One of the main factors in this process was the foundation over inner Asia Minor of Roman colonies, which were "bits of Rome" set down in the provinces. These colonies were organized entirely on the Roman model, and were usually garrisons of veterans, who kept unruly parts of the country in order. Such in New Testament time were Antioch and Lystra (Iconium, which used to be regarded as a colony of Claudius, is now recognized to have been raised to that rank by Hadrian). In the 1st century Latin was the official language in the colonies; it never ousted Greek in general usage, and Greek soon replaced it in official documents. Education was at its highest level in the Greek towns and in the Roman colonies, and it was to those exclusively that Paul addressed the gospel.

IV. Christianity in Asia Minor.

Already in Paul’s lifetime, Christianity had established itself firmly in many of the greater centers of Greek-Roman culture in Asia and Galatia. The evangelization of Ephesus, the capital of the province Asia, and the terminus of one of the great routes leading along the peninsula, contributed largely to the spread of Christianity in the inland parts of the province, and especially in Phrygia. Christianity, in

accordance with the program of Paul, first took root in the cities, from which it spread over the country districts. Christian Inscriptions, etc.:

The Christian inscriptions begin earliest in Phrygia, where we find many documents dating from the end of the 2nd and beginning of the 3rd centuries AD. The main characteristic of those early inscriptions—a feature which makes them difficult to recognize—is their suppression as a rule of anything that looked overtly Christian, with the object of avoiding the notice of persons who might induce the Roman officials to take measures against their dedicators. The Lycaonian inscriptions begin almost a century later, not, we must suppose, because Christianity spread less rapidly from Iconium, Lystra, etc., than it did from the Asian cities, but because Greek education took longer to permeate the sparsely populated plains of the central plateau than the rich townships of Asia. The new religion is proved by Pliny's correspondence with Trajan (111-13 AD) to have been firmly established in Bithynia early in the 2nd century.

Farther east, where the great temples still had much influence, the expansion of Christianity was slower, but in the 4th century Cappadocia produced such men as Basil and the Gregories. The great persecutions, as is proved by literary evidence and by many inscriptions, raged with especial severity in Asia Minor. The influence of the church on Asia Minor in the early centuries of the Empire may be judged from the fact that scarcely a trace of the Mithraic religion, the principal competitor of Christianity, has been found in the whole country. From the date of the Nicene Council (325 AD) the history of Christianity in Asia Minor was that of the Byzantine Empire. Ruins of churches belonging to the Byzantine period are found all over the peninsula; they are especially numerous in the central and eastern districts. A detailed study of a Byzantine Christian town of Lycaonia, containing an exceptionally large number of churches, has been published by Sir W. M. Ramsay and Miss G. L. Bell: The Thousand and One Churches. Greek- speaking Christian villages in many parts of Asia Minor continue an unbroken connection with the Roman Empire till the present day.

LITERATURE.

Ramsay's numerous works on Asia Minor, especially Paul the Traveler, etc., The Church in the Roman Empire, The Cities of Paul, The Letters to the Seven Churches, and Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia have been freely drawn upon in this account. For a fuller bibliography, see Encyclopedia Biblica (11th edition), article "Asia Minor" (Hogarth and Wilson).

W. M. Calder

ASIA MINOR, ARCHAEOLOGY OF

a'-shi-a mi'-ner, ar'-ke-ol'-o-ji ov: At the present stage of our information it is difficult to write with acceptance on the archaeology of Asia Minor. Views unquestioned only a few years ago are already passing out of date, while the modern archaeologist, enthusiastically excavating old sites, laboriously deciphering worn inscriptions, and patiently collating documentary evidence, has by no means

completed his task. But it is now clear that an archaeological field, worthy to be compared with those in the valleys of the Euphrates and the Nile, invites development in Asia Minor.

1. Earliest Influences from Mesopotamia:

In the Contemporary Review for August, 1907, Professor Sayce reminded his readers that the Greek geographers called Cappadox the son of Ninyas, thereby tracing the origin of Cappadocian culture to Nineveh, and similarly they derived the Merm had Dynasty of Lydia from Ninos the son of Belos, or from Babylonia through Assyria. Actual history is probably at the back of these legends, and the Table of Nations supports this (Ge 10:22), when it calls Lud, or Lydia, a son of Shem and brother of Asshur. This is not to assert, however, that any great number of Semitic people ever made Asia Minor their home. But Professor Winckler and others have shown us that the language, script, ideas and institutions characteristic of the Babylonian civilization were widespread among the nations of western Asia, and from very early times Asia Minor came within their sphere of influence. Strabo records the tradition that Zile, as well as Tyana, was founded upon "the mound of Semiramis," thus connecting these ancient sites with the Mesopotamian culture.

Dr. David Robinson in his Ancient Sinope (145 ff), argues that "the early foundations of Sinope are probably Assyrian," though established history cannot describe in detail what lay back of the Milesian settlement of this the northern point and the best harbor of the peninsula. Neither could Strabo go back of the Milesian colonists for the foundation of Samsoun, the ancient Amisus, an important commercial city east of Sinope, but the accompanying illustration (Fig. 1) seems clearly to show the influence of Assyria. The original is a terra cotta figure of gray clay found recently in Old Samsoun. Mesopotamian religious and cultural influences thus appear to have tinged Asia Minor, at least at certain points, as far as the coast of the Black Sea, and indeed the great peninsula has been what its shape suggests, a friendly hand stretching out from the continent of Asia toward the continent of Europe.

2. Third Millennium BC:

Professor Sayce’s article referred to above was based upon the evidence furnished by cuneiform tablets from Kara Eyuk, the "Black Mound," an ancient site just within the ox-bows of the Halys River near Caesarea Mazaca. These tablets, as deciphered by himself and Professor Pinches, were of the period of Abraham, or of Hammurabi, about 2250 BC, and were written in a dialect of Assyrian. The settlers were soldier colonists from the Assyrian section of the Babylonian empire, engaged in mining and in trade. Silver, copper and perhaps iron were the metals sought. "Time was reckoned as in Assyria by means of officials called limmi, who gave their name to the year." The colonists had a temple with its priests, where financial transactions were carried on under the sanctity of religion. There were roads, mail carriers whose pouches were filled with cuneiform bricks, and commercial travelers who made a speciality of fine clothing. This makes quite natural the finding of a goodly Babylonian mantle by Achan at the pillage of Ai (Jos 7:21). Slavery is a recognized institution; a boy is sent to a barber for circumcision; a house, wife and children are pledged as security for a debt. An oath is taken "on the top of a staff," an interesting fact that sheds its light on the verses describing the oath and blessing of dying

Jacob (Ge 47:31; Heb 11:21). Early Asia Minor is thus lighted up at various points by the culture of Mesopotamia, and transmits some of the scattered rays to the Greek world.

3. Second Millennium BC:

The earliest native inhabitants to be distinguished in Asia Minor are the Hittites (see HITTITES). Ever since 1872, when Dr. Wright suggested that the strange hieroglyphics on four black basalt stones which he had discovered at Hamath were perhaps the work of Hittite art, there has been an ever-growing volume of material for scholars to work upon. There are sculptures of the same general style, representing figures of men, women, gods, lions and other animals, eagles with double heads, sphinxes, musical instruments, winged discs and other symbols, all of which can be understood only in part. These are accompanied by hieroglyphic writing, undeciphered as yet, and the inscriptions read "boustrophedon," that is from right to left and back again, as the oxen go in plowing an oriental field. There have also been discovered great castles with connecting walls and ramparts, gates, tunnels, moats, palaces, temples and other sanctuaries and buildings. More than this, occasional fragments of cuneiform tablets picked up on the surface of the ground led to the belief that written documents of value might be found buried in the soil. Malatia, Marash, Sinjirli, Sakje Geuzi, Gurun, Boghaz-keuy, Eyuk, Karabel, not to mention perhaps a hundred other sites, have offered important Hittite remains. Carchemish and Kedesh on the Orontes were capital cities in northern Syria. The Hittites of the Holy Land, whether in the days of Abraham or in those of David and Solomon, were an offshoot from the main stem of the nation. Asia Minor was the true home of the Hittites.

Boghaz-keuy has become within the last decade the best known Hittite site in Asia Minor, and may be described as typical. It lies in northern Cappadocia, fifty muleteer hours South of Sinope. Yasilikaya, the "written" or "sculptured" rocks, is a suburb, and Eyuk with its sphinx-guarded temple is but 15 miles to the North. It was the good fortune of Professor Hugo Winckler of the University of Berlin to secure the funds, obtain permission from the Turkish government, and, in the summer of 1906 to unearth over 3,000 more or less fragmentary tablets written in the cuneiform character and the Hittite language. This is the first considerable store of the yet undeciphered Hittite literature for scholars to work upon. These tablets are of clay, written on both sides, and baked hard and red. Often the writing is in ruled columns. The cuneiform character, like the Latin alphabet in modern times, was used far from its original home, and that for thousands of years. The language of a few Boghaz-keuy tablets is Babylonian, notably a copy of the treaty between Rameses II of Egypt and Khita-sar, king of the Hittites in central Asia Minor. The scribes adopted not only the Babylonian characters but certain ideographs, and it is these ideographs which have furnished the key to provisional vocabularies of several hundred words which have been published by Professors Pinches and Sayce. When Professor Winckler and his German collaborators publish the tablets they have deposited in the Constantinople museum, we may listen to the voice of some Hittite Homer speaking from amid the dusty bricks written in the period of Moses. Beside Boghaz-keuy the beetling towers of lofty Troy sink to the proportions of a fortified hamlet.

Hittite sculptures show a very marked type of men, with squat figures, slant eyes, prominent noses and Mongoloid features. We suppose they were of Turanian or Mongolian blood; certainly not Semitic and probably not Aryan. As they occupied various important inland centers in Asia Minor before, during and

after the whole of the second millennium BC, it is probable that they occupied much or most of the intervening territory (see Records of the Past for December, 1908). A great capital like Boghaz-keuy, with its heavy fortifications, would require extensive provinces to support it, and would extend its sway so as to leave no enemy within striking distance. The "Amazons" are now generally regarded as the armed Hittite priestesses of a goddess whose cult spread throughout Asia Minor. The "Amazon Mountains," still known locally by the old name, run parallel with the coast of the Black Sea near the Iris River, and tradition current there now holds that the women are stronger than the men, work harder, live longer and are better at a quarrel! A comparative study of the decorated pottery, so abundant on the old sites of the country, makes it more than possible that the artificial mounds, which are so common a feature of the Anatolian landscape, and the many rockhewn tombs, of which the most famous are probably those at Amasia, were the work of Hittite hands.

The Hittite sculptures are strikingly suggestive of religious rather than political or military themes. The people were pagans with many gods and goddesses, of whom one, or one couple, received recognition as at the head of the pantheon. Such titles as Sutekh of Carchemish, Sutekh of Kadesh, Sutekh of the land of the Hittites, show that the chief god was localized in various places, perhaps with varying attributes. A companion goddess was named Antarata. She was the great Mother Goddess of Asia Minor, who came to outrank her male counterpart. She is represented in the sculptures with a youthful male figure, as a consort, probably illustrating the legend of Tammuz for whom the erring Hebrew women wept (Eze 8:14). He was called Attys in later days. He stands for life after death, spring after winter, one generation after another. The chief god worshipped at Boghaz-keuy was Teshub. Another was named Khiba, and the same name appears in the Tell el-Amarna correspondence from Jerusalem. This affords a remarkable illustration of the prophet’s address to Jerusalem, "Your mother was a Hittite" (Eze 16:45).

The worship of the Hittites of the era of the Exodus is still seen pictured on the rocks at Yasilikaya. This spot was the sanctuary of the metropolis. There are two hypaethral rock galleries, the larger of which has a double procession of about 80 figures carved on the natural rock walls, which have been smoothed for the purpose, and meeting at the inmost recess of the gallery. The figures nearest the entrance are about half life-size. As the processions advance the height of the figures increases, until the two persons at the head, the chief priest and priestess or the king and queen, are quite above life-size. These persons advance curious symbols toward each other, each is followed by a retinue of his or her own sex, and each is supported—the priest-king upon the heads of two subjects or captives, and the priestess-queen upon a leopard. The latter figure is followed by her consort son.

The ruins at Eyuk are compact, and consist of a small temple, its sphinx-guarded door, and a double procession of approaching worshippers to the number of about 40. The main room of the sanctuary is only 7 yds. by 8 in measurement. This may be compared with the Holy Place in the tabernacle of the Israelites, which was approximately contemporary. Neither could contain a worshipping congregation, but only the ministering priests. The solemn sphinxes at the door suggest the cherubim that adorned the Israelite temple, and winged eagles with double heads decorate the inner walls of the doorway. Amid the sculptured processions moving on the basalt rocks toward the sanctuary is an altar before which stands a bull on a pedestal, and behind which is a priest who wears a large earring. Close behind the priest a flock of three sheep and a goat approach the sacrificial altar. Compare the description in Ex 32. The Israelites

said to Aaron, "Up, make us gods"; he required their golden earrings, made a calf, "and built an altar before it"; they offered burnt offerings and brought peace offerings; they sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play. Israelite worship was in certain forms similar to the worship of the Hittites, but its spiritual content was wholly different. For musical instruments the Eyuk procession exhibits a lituus, a (silver?) trumpet and a shapely guitar. The animal kingdom is represented by another bull with a chest or ark on its back, a well-executed lion and two hares held in the two talons of an eagle. A spring close by furnished all the water required by the worshippers and for ritual purposes.

Professor Garstang in The Land of the Hittites shows that the power which had been waning after about 1200 BC enjoyed a period of recrudescence in the 10th and 9th centuries. He ascribes to this period the monuments of Sakje Geuzi, which the professor himself excavated, together with other Hittite remains in Asia Minor. The Vannic power known as Urartu, akin to the Hittites but separate, arose in the Northeast; the Phrygians began to dominate in the West; the Assyrians pressed upon the Southeast. The overthrow of the Hittites was completed by the bursting in of the desolating Cimmerian hordes, and after 717, when Carchemish was taken by the Assyrians, the Hittites fade from the archaeological records of their home land. See ASIA MINOR, II, 1.

4. First Millennium BC:

Before the Hittites disappeared from the interior of Asia Minor, sundry Aryan peoples, more or less closely related to the Greeks, were established at various points around the coast. Schliemann, of Trojan fame, was the pioneer archaeologist in this field, and his boundless enthusiasm, optimism and resourcefulness recovered the treasures of Priam’s city, and made real again the story of days when the world was young. Among the most valuable collections in the wonderful Constantinople Museum is that from Troy, which contains bronze axes and lance heads, implements in copper, talents of silver, diadems, earrings and bracelets of gold, bone bodkins and needles, spindle whorls done in baked clay, numbers of idols or votive offerings, and other objects found in the Troad, at the modern Hissarlik. Phrygian, Thracian and subsequently Galatian immigrants from the Northwest had been filtering across the Hellespont, and wedging themselves in among the earlier inhabitants. There were some points in common between the Cretan or Aegean civilization and that of Asia Minor, but Professor Hogarth in his Ionia and the East urges that these resemblances were few. It was otherwise with the Greeks proper. Herodotus gave the names of twelve Aeolian, twelve Ionian and six Dorian cities on the west coast, founded by colonists who came across the Aegean Sea, and who leavened, led and intermarried with the native population they found settled there. One of these Asiatic Greek colonies, Miletus, was sufficiently populous and vigorous to send out from 60 to 80 colonies of its own, the successive swarms of adventurers moving North and East, up the coast of the Aegean, through the Bosphorus and along the south shore of the Black Sea. In due season Xenophon and the Ten Thousand, and then Alexander with his Macedonians, scattered yet more widely the seeds of Hellenic culture upon a soil already prepared for its reception. The inscriptions, sculptures, temples, tombs, palaces, castles, theaters, jewelry, figurines in bronze or terra cotta, coins of silver or copper and other objects remaining from this period exhibit a style of art, culture and religion which may best be named Anatolian, but which are akin to those of Greece proper. The excavations at Ephesus, Pergamus, Sardis and other important sites show the same grafting of Greek scions upon the local stock.

One marked feature survived as a legacy from Hittite days in the worship of a great Mother Goddess. Whether known as Ma, or Cybele, or Anaitis, or Diana, or designated by some other title, it was the female not the male that headed the pantheon of gods. With the Greek culture came also the city-state organization of government. The ruder and earlier native communities were organized on the village plan. Usually each village had its shrine, in charge of priests or perhaps more often priestesses; the land belonged to the god, or goddess; it paid tithes to the shrine; sacrifices and gifts were offered at the sacred center; this was often on a high hill, under a sacred tree, and beside a holy fountain; there was little of education, law or government except as guiding oracles were proclaimed from the temple.

In the early part of this millennium the Phrygians became a power of commanding importance in the western part of the peninsula, and Professor Hogarth says of the region of the Midas Tomb, "There is no region of ancient monument’s which would be better worth examination" by excavators. Then came Lydia, whose capital, Sardis, is now in process of excavation by Professor Butler and his American associates. Sardis was taken and Croesus dethroned by the Persians about 546 BC, and for two centuries, until Alexander, Persian authority overshadowed Asia Minor, but permanent influences were scanty.

5. The Romans in Asia Minor:

By about the year 200 BC the Romans began to become entangled in the politics of the four principal kingdoms that then occupied Asia Minor, namely Bithynia, Pergamus, Pontus and Cappadocia. By slow degrees their influence and their arms advanced under such leaders civil and military as Sulla, Lucullus, Pompey, Cicero and Julius Caesar, while Attalus of Pergamus and Prusias of Bithynia bequeathed their uneasy domains to the steady power arising from the West. In 133 BC the Romans proceeded to organize the province of Asia, taking the name from a Lydian district included in the province. Step by step the Roman frontiers were pushed farther to the East. Mithridates VI, king of Pontus, was called "the most formidable enemy the republic ever had to contend with," but he went down before the conquering arms of Rome. See PONTUS. Caesar chastised the unfortunate Pharnaces at Zile in central Asia Minor, and coolly announced his success in the memorable message of three words, "veni, vidi, vici." Ultimately all of this fair peninsula passed under the iron sway, and the Roman rule lasted more than 500 years, until in 395 AD Theodosius divided the empire between his sons, giving the East to Arcadius and the West to Honorius, and the Roman Empire was cleft in twain. True to their customs elsewhere the Romans built roads well paved with stone between the chief cities of their eastern provinces. The archaeologist or common traveler often comes upon sections of these roads, sometimes in the thickest forests, as sound and as rough as when Roman chariots rumbled over them. Milestones were erected to mark the distances, usually inscribed in both Latin and Greek, and the decipherment of these milestone records contributes to the recovery of the lost history. Bridges over the important streams have been rebuilt and repaired by successive generations of men, but in certain cases the Roman character of the original stands clearly forth. The Romans were a building people, and government houses, aqueducts, baths, theaters, temples and other structures confront the archaeologist or await the labor of the spade. Epigraphical studies such as those of Professor Sterrett indicate what a wealth of inscriptions is yet to be recovered, in Latin as well as in Greek.

It was during the Roman period that Christianity made its advent in the peninsula. Christian disciples as well as Roman legions and governors used the roads, bridges and public buildings. Old church buildings and other religious foundations have their stories to tell. It is very interesting to read on Greek tombstones of the 1st or 2nd century AD such inscriptions as, "Here lies the servant of God, Daniel," "Here lies the handmaid of God, Maria." Our great authority for this period is Sir William M. Ramsay, whose Historical Geography of Asia Minor and other works must be read by anyone who would familiarize himself with this rich field.

6. The Byzantine Period:

By almost imperceptible degrees the Roman era was merged into the Byzantine. We are passing so rapidly now from the sphere of archaeology to that of history proper that we must be brief. For a thousand years after the fall of Rome the Eastern Empire lived on, a Greek body pervaded with lingering Roman influences and with Constantinople as the pulsating heart. The character of the times was nothing if not religious, yet the prevailing Christianity was a syncretistic compound including much from the nature worship of earlier Anatolia. The first great councils of the Christian church convened upon the soil of Asia Minor, the fourth being held at Ephesus in 431, and at this council the phrase "Mother of God" was adopted. We have seen that for fifty generations or more the people of Asia Minor had worshipped a great mother goddess, often with her consort son. It was at Ephesus, the center of the worship of Diana, that ecclesiastics, many of whom had but a slight training in Christianity, adopted this article into their statement of religious faith.

7. The Seljukian Turks:

Again the government of the country, the dominant race, the religion, language and culture, all are changed—this time with the invasions of the Seljukian Turks. This tribe was the precursor of the Ottoman Turks and later became absorbed among them. These Seljukians entered Asia Minor, coming up out of the recesses of central Asia, about the time that the Normans were settling along the coasts of western Europe. Their place in history is measurably clear, but they deserve mention in archaeology by reason of their remarkable architecture. Theirs was a branch of the Saracenic or Moorish architecture, and many examples remain in Asia Minor Mosques, schools, government buildings, khans, fortifications, fountains and other structures remain in great numbers and in a state of more or less satisfactory preservation, and they are buildings remarkably massive, yet ornate in delicacy and variety of tracery. The Ottoman Turks, cousins of the Seljukians, came up out of the central Asian hive later, and took Constantinople by a memorable siege in 1453. With this event the archaeology of Asia Minor may be said to close, and history to cover the field instead.

George E. White

ASIARCH

a’-shi-ark (Asiarches; the English Revised Version "the chief officers of Asia," the King James Version

"the chief of Asia"): The title given to certain men of high honorary rank in the Roman province of Asia. What their exact functions were is not altogether clear. They derived their appellation from the name of the province over which they presided (compare BITHYNIARCH; CARIARCH; SYRIARCH).

Brandis has shown that they were not "high priests of Asia," as some have thought, but delegates of individual cities to the provincial Council (Commune Asioe; see ASIA MINOR) which regulated the worship of Rome and of the emperor. They were probably assembled at Ephesus, among other places, to preside over the public games and the religious rites at the festival, in honor of the gods and the emperor, when they sent word to Paul and gave him a bit of friendly advice, not to present himself at theater (me dounai heauton eis to theatron, Ac 19:31). The title could be held along with any civil office and with the high-priesthood of a particular city. They served for one year, but re-election was possible (the tenure of office, according to Ramsay, was four years). The municipalities must have shown the Asiarchs high honor, as we find the names of many perpetuated on coins and inscriptions. The office could only be held by men of wealth, as the expenses of the provincial games were for the greater part defrayed by the Asiarchs.

LITERATURE.

CI, 2511, 2912; CIL, 296, 297; Brandis, Pauly-Wissowa's Real-Encyclopedia, articles "Archiereus" and "Asiarches"; Strabo, XIV, 649; Eusebius, HE, IV, 15; Hicks, Ancient Greek Inscrs in the British Museum; Ramsay, Classical Review, III, 174 ff; Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, I, 55-58, and II, chapter xi; Guiraud, Les assemblees provinciales de l'Empire Romain; Lightfoot, Ignatius and Polycarp, II, 987 ff.

M. O. Evans

ASIBIAS

as-i-bi'-as (Asibias and Asebias): Asibias put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:26). Compare Malchijah (Ezr 10:25).

ASIDE

a-sid':"Distinct from others," "privately," such is the sense of the word in 2Ki 4:4; Mr 7:33. Also "to withdraw" (Lu 9:10 the King James Version; Ac 23:19: hupochoreo, also anachoreo). One is said to have turned aside when he departs from the path of rectitude (Ps 14:3; Sirach 2:7; 1Ti 1:6). In a figurative sense it is used to express the thought of putting aside, to renounce, every hindrance or impediment to a consecrated earnest Christian life (Heb 12:1: apotithemi).

ASIEL

a’-si-el, as’-i-el (Asiel; the King James Version Asael (Tobit 1:1)):

(1) Grandfather of Jehu, one of the Simeonite "princes" mentioned in 1Ch 4:35 as sharing Judah’s inheritance (see Jos 19:9).

(2) A swift writer engaged by Ezra to transcribe the law (2 Esdras 14:24).

(3) An ancestor of Tobit (Tobit 1:1). Compare Jahzeel or Jahziel (Ge 46:24).

ASIPHA

as’-i-fa (Codex Alexandrinus, Aseipha; Codex Vaticanus, Taseipha) = Hasupha (Ezr 2:43; Ne 7:46). The sons of Asipha (temple- servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:29).

ASK

ask (sha’al "to inquire," "to seek for counsel," "to demand"): It is the word commonly used in the Old Testament and is equivalent to eperotao, "to request," used in the New Testament. It does not imply any inferiority on the part of the person asking (Ps 2:8). It is the Son who is bidden to ask, and therefore the word expresses the request of an equal. It has also the meaning "to inquire": "Wherefore .... ask after my name?" (Ge 32:29) signifying, "Surely you must know who I am." "Ye shall ask me no question" (Joh 16:23), i.e. "about the true meaning of My words, for all will then be clear to you" (Dummelow). aiteo, is the word commonly used with reference to prayer. It means "to ask," "to implore," and presents the petitioner as an inferior asking from a superior (Mt 6:8; 7:7,8; Mr 10:35; Joh 14:13, and in many other places). It is not, however, asking in the sense of the word beg, but rather that of a child making request of its father. The petitioner asks both because of his need and of the assurance that he is welcome. He is assured before he asks that the petition will be granted, if he asks in accordance with God’s will (1 Joh 3:22; 5:15). Moreover the Spirit leads us to such asking in that He reveals our need and the goodness of God to us. See AMISS; PRAYER.

Jacob W. Kapp

ASKELON

as’-ke-lon: the King James Version form in Jud 1:18; 1Sa 6:17; 2Sa 1:20, for ASHKELON (which see).

ASLEEP

a-slep’ (yashen, "sleeping," radham, "deep sleep"; katheudo, "to fall asleep," aphupnoo, "to fall asleep"): A state of repose in sleep, Nature’s release from weariness of body and mind, as of Jonah on shipboard (Jon 1:5); of Christ in the tempest-tossed boat (Mt 8:24); of the exhausted disciples in Gethsemane (Mt

26:43 the King James Version).

Used with beautiful and comforting significance of death (koimaomai, "to put to sleep").

Sleep implies a subsequent waking, and as a symbol of death implies continued and conscious life beyond the grave. In the presence of death no truth has been so sustaining to Christian faith as this. It is the distinct product of Christ's resurrection. Paul speaks of departed believers as having "fallen asleep in Christ" (1Co 15:6,18); as proof of the soul's immortality he terms the risen Christ "the first- fruits of them that are asleep." Lazarus and Stephen, at death, are said to have "fallen asleep" (Joh 11:11; Ac 7:60); so of David and the ancient patriarchs (Ac 13:36; 2Pe 3:4). The most beautiful description of death in human language and literature is Paul's characterization of the dead as "them also which sleep in Jesus" (1Th 4:14 the King James Version). This blessed hope has wrought itself permanently into the life and creed and hymnology of the Christian church, as in the hymn often used with such comforting effect at the burial service of believers: "Asleep in Jesus! blessed sleep!"

Dwight M. Pratt

ASMODAEUS

az-mo-de'-us ('ashmedhai; Asmodaios): An evil spirit first mentioned in Tobit 3:8. Older etymologists derived the name from the Hebrew verb shamadh, "destroy"; but it is now generally held to be associated with Zoroastrianism, with which the Jews became acquainted during the exile, and by which later Jewish views on the spirit-world were greatly influenced. It is now held to be the equivalent of the Persian Aeshma-Deva, the spirit of concupiscence. The spirit is at times reckoned as the equal in power of "Abaddon" (Job 31:12) and of "Apollyon" (Re 9:11), and in Tobit is represented as loving Sara, only daughter of Raguel of Ecbatana, and as causing the death on the bridal night of seven husbands who had in succession married her. His power was broken by the young Tobias acting on the advice of the angel Raphael (Tobit 6:15). He burnt on the "ashes of incense" the heart and liver of a fish which he caught in the Tigris. "But when the devil smelled the smell, he fled into the uppermost parts of Egypt, and the angel bound him" (Tobit 8:3). Milton refers to the incident in Paradise Lost, 4, 168-71, founding on Jewish demonology and the "loves of the angels" (Ge 6:2).

J. Hutchison

ASMONEANS

as-mo-ne'-ans: A remarkable priestly family of Modin, in Judea, also called Hasmoneans or Maccabees. They belonged to that portion of the Jewish nation which under all trials and temptations remained loyal to Yahweh, even when the national life and religion seemed at their lowest ebb, and they succeeded, for a while at least, in restoring the name and fame of Israel. All in all they were an extremely warlike family. But the entire Asmonean history affords abundant proof of the bitter partisanships which, even more than the persecutions of their enemies, sapped the national strength and divided the nation into

bitterly hostile factions.

The Asmoneans never, in all their history, or at any given period in it, had a united people behind their backs. They had to fight disloyalty at home, as well as deadly enmity abroad. A considerable portion of the people was unable to withstand the paganizing influence of the Macedonian and Syrian periods, and in this direction the thousands of Hebrew soldiers, who fought under the Greek banners, must have exerted an inestimable influence. The Asmonean struggle is therefore, in all its phases, a three-sided one, and it makes the ascendancy of the family all the more remarkable. The sources of our knowledge of this period are mainly found in the Books of the Macc, in the Josephus, Antiquities and Josephus, Jewish Wars of Josephus, and in occasional references of Strabo, Livy and other classic historians.

The contents of Josephus, Antiquities plainly prove that Josephus used the Books of the Macc as far as possible, but that besides he was possessed of sources of information now wholly lost. The name "Asmonean" is derived from the Hebrew Chashman, "wealthy." Chashman was a priest of the family Joarib (Ant., XII, vi, 1; 1 Macc 2:1; 1Ch 24:7). The name "Maccabee," from the surname of Judas, the son of Mattathias, may be derived from the Hebrew maqqdbhah, "a hammer"; makhbi, "an extinguisher"; or from the first letters of the Hebrew sentence, Mi Khamokhah Ba-’elim YHWH? "Who among the gods, O Lord, can be likened unto thee," inscribed on the Maccabean banner in the word Makhbiy.

1. The Asmonean Revolt:

Antiochus Epiphanes returned in 169 BC from the Egyptian wars, the fruits of which had been wrested from him by the Roman power, which a year later, in his fourth war, in the person of Pompilius Laenas, was to order him peremptorily to leave Egypt once and for all time. Thus his four campaigns against his hereditary foe were made utterly barren. Grave suspicions had been aroused in the king’s heart against the Jews, and when their wrangling about the high-priesthood afforded him an opportunity, he resolved forever to crush the power of Judaism and to wipe out its detested religion. Thus Apollonius (Josephus tells us, the king himself, BJ, V, ix, 4) in 168 BC appeared before Jerusalem, devastated the city, defiled the temple by the sacrifice of swine on the altar of burnt offering, destroyed all the holy writings that could be obtained, sold numberless Jews and their families into slavery, forbade circumcision on pain of death and inaugurated the dark period spoken of by Da (9:27; 11:31). Thus Antiochus marked his name in blood and tears on the pages of Jewish history. Against this cruel tyranny and this attempt to root out the religion of Israel and their ancient faith, the Maccabean family revolted and thus became the leaders in a desperate struggle for Jewish independence. How far they succeeded in these efforts the following sketch will show.

2. Mattathias:

Mattathias was a priest of the house of Joarib, at the time of the breaking out of the revolt most likely a refugee from Jerusalem, living at Modin, West of the city, in the highlands of Judea, where he may have owned an estate. When compulsion was tried by the Syrians to make him sacrifice to idols, he not only

refused to obey, but slew a Jew, who came forward to the altar, as well as Apelles, the Syrian commander and a portion of his guard (Ant., XII, vi, 2). Overthrowing heathen altars as he went, he was followed into the wilderness by large bands of loyal Jews. And when the refusal to fight on the Sabbath day had led to the slaughter of a thousand of his followers, he gave liberty to the Jews to give battle on that day. In 167 BC, soon after the beginning of the conflict, he sank under the unequal task, leaving the completion of the work to his five sons, John (Gaddis), Simon (Matthes), Judas (Maccabaeus), Eleazar (Auran) and Jonathan (Apphes). On his deathbed he appointed Simon as the counselor and Judas as the military leader of the movement (Ant., XII, vi, 1). These two with Jonathan were to carry the work to completion.

3. Judas Maccabeus, 166-160 BC:

Judas proved himself full worthy of his father’s foresight and trust. His military talent was marvelous, his cunning baffling, his courage leonine, his swiftness that of the eagle. He reminds one strongly of Joshua, the ancient military genius of Israel. Nearly all his battles were fought against impossible odds and his victories inspired the Syrians with awe. In sudden night attacks he surprised the Syrian generals, Apollonius and Seron (1 Macc 3:10,13), and scattered their armies. Antiochus, ready to chastise the countries eastward, who appeared on the point of rebellion, entrusted the conduct of the Judean war to Lysias, his kinsman and favorite, who was charged to wipe Israel and its hated religion off the face of the earth. The latter entrusted the actual conduct of hostilities to a great and well-equipped army, under Ptolemeus, Nicanor and Gorgias.

This army was encamped at Emmaus, South of Modin, while Judas lay with his small force a little to the Southeast. When Gorgias attempted to surprise him by night, Judas himself fell like an avalanche on the rest of the Syrian army and crushed it, then met and defeated the returning Gorgias and gained an immense booty. Equally successful in the campaign of 165 BC Judas captured Jerusalem and purified and rededicated the temple, just five years after its defilement. Thus the Jewish "Festival of Lights" came into existence. The next year was spent in the reduction of Idumaea, the Jordan territory, the Ammonites, and several important strongholds of the enemy, whilst Simon marched northward and brought back the Jewish captives from Galilee and the sources of the Jordan.

Meanwhile Antiochus had died in the eastern campaign and his death inaugurated the collapse of the Syrian empire. Philip was appointed guardian of the infant king, while his uncle Demetrius sought to dethrone him by the aid of the Romans. The siege of the stronghold of Jerusalem, still in the hands of the Syrians, by the Maccabees, led Philip to make a heroic effort to crush Judas and his growing power, and he swiftly marched upon Judea with a large and well-equipped army. The odds were too strong for Judas, his band was frightened by the Syrian war-elephants and in the battle of Bethzacharias the Maccabees were defeated and Eleazar, the youngest brother, was killed. Jerusalem was taken by the Syrians, the temple wall broken down and only the threatening danger of an attack from the king’s southern foes saved the Maccabean cause. Lysias retreated but left a strong garrison in Jerusalem. All seemed lost.

Alcimus, leader of the disloyal Jews and a mortal enemy of Judas, was made high priest and he prayed Demetrius, who had captured the Syrian throne, to come to his aid against the Maccabees in 162 BC. Bacchides was sent with a strong force and sought in vain to obtain possession of the person of Judas by treachery. He made havoc of the Jews, by killing friend and foe alike, and returned to the East to be succeeded by Nicanor, who also failed to dispose of Judas by treachery. In the ensuing battle at Capharsalama he was defeated and compelled to fall back on Jerusalem and thence on Beth-horon, where Judas attacked, again defeated and killed him. In this hour of hope and fear Judas was led to seek a Roman alliance whose consummation he never saw. From that day his fortune changed. A new Syrian army under Bacchides and the false priest Alcimus approached Jerusalem. Judas gave them battle at Elasa, in April, 161 BC. With only 3,000 men he engaged the Syrian forces. He succeeded in defeating the left wing of the Syrians under Bacchides, but was in turn surrounded and defeated by the right wing. All hope of escape being cut off, Judas surrounded himself with his best warriors and fell at last surrounded by heaps of slain foes. Strange to say the Syrians surrendered his body to Simon and Jonathan his brother, who buried him by his father’s side at Modin.

4. Jonathan, 160-143 BC:

The death of Judas for the moment paralyzed the revolutionary movement, while it increased the determination of the Syrians. All previous privileges were revoked, and the Maccabean sympathizers were rigorously persecuted. But all this served only to bind the party closer together, and the chief command was conferred on Jonathan, the youngest brother, as daring as, and perhaps more crafty than, Judas. He plunged into the wilderness, relieved himself of the burden of the women and children, and when the latter under the care of John, his brother, were exterminated by the Amri, he took bloody vengeance on them. Surprised by Bacchides, the Syrian general, he inflicted great losses on the latter and escaped across the Jordan. The death of the traitor Alcimus, in 160 BC, for a while relieved the situation and the strength of the Maccabeans rapidly grew. A second campaign of Bacchides proved fruitless against the daring and cunning of Jonathan and Simon, and they succeeded in making peace with the Syrians (Ant., XIII, i, 5, 6), but the citadel of Jerusalem and other strongholds remained in the hands of the enemy.

The events of the year 153 BC however changed the entire aspect of affairs. Demetrius saw his throne menaced by Alexander Balas, a Roman favorite. Trying to secure the aid of the Maccabees, he greatly extended the former concessions, and when Balas outstripped him in generosity and appointed Jonathan high priest with practically royal powers, the Maccabees craftily played out the one against the other. Since the death of Alcimus the high-priesthood had now been vacant for seven years (Ant., XIII, ii, 3); for which reason the appointment was exceedingly gratifying to the Jews. In his extremity, Demetrius offered the practical equivalent of independence, but the Maccabees had learned the value of these promises by bitter experience. The shrewdness of Jonathan led him to turn a cold shoulder to all the fine promises of Demetrius and to entrust his fortunes to Balas, and not in vain, for the former died in battle with the latter (Ant., XIII, ii, 4).

Jonathan excelled all his brothers in craft and ever embraced the most promising side, as is evident from his relations with Ptolemy Philometer, Balas and Demetrius. When the latter’s cause was embraced in

148 BC by Apollonius, governor of Syria, Jonathan revealed the true Maccabean military genius, by gaining a signal victory over him. Balas now gave the long-coveted permission to break down the old Syrian tower at Jerusalem, which for so long had been a thorn in the sides of the Maccabeans. Alas, during the siege both Balas and Philometer died and Demetrius breathed vengeance against Jonathan. But the latter dexterously won over the king by large presents (Ant., XIII, iv, 9) and accepted the restricted liberties offered. Profiting however by the endless cabals of the Syrian court, he soon sided with Tryphon, the new claimant, and with the aid of his brother Simon extended the Maccabean power over nearly all Palestine. In the next Syrian war he gained an almost miraculous victory over the enemy (Ant., XIII, v, 7; 1 Macc 11:67 ff). Tired of the endless struggle and longing for a strong arm to lean on, like Judas, he sought a renewal of the Roman alliance, but never saw its realization. Tryphon, who feared him, treacherously made him prisoner at Ptolemais; all his followers were immediately killed and he himself subsequently executed at Basca in Coele-Syria (Ant., XIII, vi, 2, 6).

5. Simon, 143-135 BC:

Thus again the Maccabees faced a great crisis. But Simon, the sole survivor of the sons of Mattathias, now stepped in the breach, foiled all the treacherous plans of Tryphon, met strategy with strategy, renewed the alliance with Demetrius and obtained from him the high-priesthood. All the old privileges were renewed, the alliance with Tryphon was condoned by the king, and the Maccabees resolved to count this era as the beginning of their true freedom (1 Macc 13:41). The hated stronghold of Gazara fell and last of all the citadel of Jerusalem was reduced, and even the hill, on which it had stood, was completely leveled in the following three years (Ant., XIII, vi, 7). Simon, favored by the decadence of the Syrian power, brought the rule of the Maccabeans to the zenith of its glory. The only considerable architectural work undertaken in the whole period was the magnificent tomb of the Asmoneans at Modin, built by Simon, which was visible even from the Mediterranean. He was the first of the Maccabees to strike his own coinage, maintained himself, with the aid of his sons, John and Judas, against the new Syrian pretender, Antiochus Sidetes, 139 BC, but fell at last a victim to the treachery of his own son-in-law, Ptolemeus (Ptolemy, 1 Macc 16:11) at a banquet prepared for him (135 BC). His wife and sons, Mattathias and Judas, were made captives at the same time (Ant., XIII, vii, 4; BJ, I, ii, 3).

6. John Hyrcanus, 135-105 BC:

John succeeded his father both as prince and high priest, and his long reign displayed all the characteristics of the true Maccabees. The older sources here are lost sight of, and nearly all we know is derived from Josephus. The reign of John Hyrcanus started amid great difficulties. Hardly was Ptolemeus disposed of before Antiochus appeared before Jerusalem with a strong army and closely invested it. In a truce with the king, Hyrcanus obtained as favorable conditions as possible, paid a ransom and had to permit the razing of the city wall. To obtain money he opened and spoiled the tomb of David (Ant., XIII, viii, 4) and thus obtained a standing army for the defense of the country. With this army he accompanied the king to the Parthian war, in which Antiochus was killed. Hyrcanus now threw off the Syrian yoke and began a war of conquest. In a quick campaign he conquered the trans-Jordanic territory, destroyed Samaria and its temple and devastated the land of Idumaea, whose people were now embodied in the Jewish commonwealth by an enforced circumcision (Ant., XIII, ix, 1).

By an embassy, the third in the Asmonean history, he made an alliance with Rome. Meanwhile a strong partisan spirit had been aroused against him at home, on account of his leaving the party of the Pharisees, to affiliate himself with that of the Sadducees, their bitter enemies. Thus the men who had been the very core of the Maccabean revolt from the beginning now raised a sedition against him. The hagiocratic view of Jewish life, from the start, had been the essence of the Asmonean movement and, as the years rolled on, the chasm between the two great parties in Israel grew ever wider. The break with the Pharisees seemed like a break with all Asmonean antecedents. The core of the trouble lay in the double power of Hyrcanus, who, against the Pharisaic doctrine, combined in one person both the royal and priestly dignities. And as the Pharisees grew in strength they also grew in reverence for the traditions of the fathers, whilst the Sadducees paid attention only to the written testimony, and besides were very liberal in their views in general. Only the immense popularity of Hyrcanus enabled him to weather this storm. After a reign of nearly three decades he died in peace, envied for three things—the possession of the supreme power in Israel, the possession of the high-priesthood and the gift of prophecy (Ant., XIII, x, 7).

7. A Dying House, 105-37 BC:

With John Hyrcanus the glory of the Maccabean house passed away. What remains is only the sad tale of outward and inward decay. The period covered is only six or seven decades. Knowing his family, Hyrcanus had nominated his wife to the supreme power, while Aristobulus, his oldest son, was to take the high-priesthood. But the latter was no sooner installed in this office than he threw off the mask, assumed the royal title, imprisoned and starved to death his mother and incarcerated his three youngest brothers, leaving at liberty only Antigonus, whom he soon after caused to be murdered in a frenzy of jealousy of power (Ant., XIII, xi, 1,2,3). Shortly after this he died of an intestinal disease, little lamented by his people. His childless widow elevated the oldest of the surviving sons of Hyrcanus, Janneus Alexander, to the throne and married him. This man began his reign with the murder of one of his remaining brothers and, following the example of his father, affiliated himself with the party of the Sadducees. Involved in bitter wars, which arose on every hand, he proved that the old military genius of the Maccabees had not wholly perished. When the Pharisees aroused a widespread sedition against him, he crushed the movement in a torrent of blood (Ant., XIII, xiv, 2). In the internecine war that followed, he killed some 50,000 of his own people and was practically an exile from his own city and government. Ruling only by brute force, he made the last years of his reign dark and gloomy. Josephus touches but lightly on the bitter events of this sedition, on both sides marked with great barbarity (Ant., XIII, xiv, 2). Though suffering from an incurable form of quartan fever, he waged war to the last and died during the siege of Ragaba. On his deathbed he advised his queen to cast herself upon the mercy of the Pharisees: a wise counsel as the event proved, for she was permitted to retain the crown and to place her son Hyrcanus in the high-priestly office.

Thus she ruled for nine years (78-69 BC). On her death, her son Aristobulus, whom she had kept from public affairs and who espoused the cause of the Sadducees, aspired to the crown. Another internecine war resulted, in which Aristobulus was victorious. Hyrcanus agreed, for a large financial consideration,

to leave public affairs entirely alone. The Herodian family, which owed everything to the Maccabees (Ant., XIV, i, 3), now appears on the scene. Antipater, a friend of Hyrcanus, induced him to escape to Aretas, king of Arabia, at Petra, with whom he made an alliance. In the ensuing war, Aristobulus was conquered, shut up in Jerusalem and compelled to invoke the aid of the Romans, with whose assistance the Arabs were repelled (Ant., XIV, ii, 3). In this same year Pompey came to Damascus, where he found himself between three fires, for not only the two brothers, but a large hagiocratic party of Pharisees as well clamored for a hearing. This last party refused both Aristobulus and Hyrcanus as rulers. Through the machinations of Antipater, Pompey sided with Hyrcanus, upon which Aristobulus prepared for war. Pompey promptly marched on Jerusalem and the irresolute Aristobulus met him with promises of subjection and presents. When his followers however refused to carry out these promises, Aristobulus was imprisoned and Pompey at once invested Jerusalem, which was taken by assault on the passover of 63 BC, after a siege of three months. Pompey entered the holiest place of the temple, thus forever estranging the Pharisaic party from Rome. But he did not spoil the temple, and appointed Hyrcanus high priest.

This event marks the collapse of the Maccabean power. What follows are only the throes of death. Aristobulus, and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, were taken to Rome as prisoners. On the way Alexander escaped and renewed the fruitless struggle in Judea, only to be at once crushed by the Roman general Gabinius. A little later both Aristobulus and Antigonus also escaped. Returning to the homeland, the former, like his son, fought a brief and valiant but fruitless campaign and was returned captive to Rome, where he died by poison, on the eve of beginning service under the Roman standards, 49 BC. Alexander was executed at Antioch by Pompey. Of all the Maccabean princes thus only Antigonus and Hyrcanus remained. The Idumean power was now about to supplant the Maccabean. Herod the son of Antipater sided, as his father had done, with Hyrcanus against Antigonus. The factional disturbances at Rome and throughout the empire permitted of the enactment of the last stage of the Asmonean drama, in the final contest of Hyrcanus and Antigonus. Herod was in Judea with Hyrcanus, when Antigonus with the Parthian hordes overran the country, caused Herod precipitately to evacuate Palestine, and after capturing Jerusalem in 40 BC, sent his uncle Hyrcanus as a captive to the East, after having cropped off his ears, to incapacitate him forever for the high-priestly office (Ant., XIV, xiii, 10).

Herod now obtained the aid of the Romans and permission to reconquer Judea. In a furious campaign, marked by the most shocking barbarities, he occupied the greater part of the country, and finally in 37 BC succeeded in taking Jerusalem. Antigonus surrendered but was executed at Antioch by Antony, at the instigation of Herod (Ant., XIV, xvi, 4). The fate of the remnants of the Maccabean stem, at the hands of Herod, may be found by consulting the article under MACCABEES.

Henry E. Dosker

ASNAH

as’-na (’acnah, "thornbush"): One of the Nethinim, who returned with Zerubbabel from the exile (Ezr 2:50).

ASNAPPER

as-nap’-er. See OSNAPPAR.

ASOCHIS, PLAIN OF

a-so’-kis. See CANA, OF GALILEE.

ASOM

a’-som (H, Asom) = Hashum (Ezr 10:33): The sons of Asom put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:33).

ASP

(pethen (De 32:33; Job 20:14,16; Isa 11:8); aspis (Ro 3:13)); Any poisonous snake, or even poisonous snakes in general, would satisfy the context in all the passages cited. Pethen is also translated ADDER (which see) in Ps 58:4; 91:13. Most authors have supposed the Egyptian cobra (Naia haje, L.) to be the snake meant, but while this is widely distributed throughout Africa, its occurrence in Southern Palestine seems to rest solely on the authority of Canon Tristram, who did not collect it.

There are Other poisonous snakes in Palestine, any one of which would satisfy the requirements of these passages. See SERPENT. While the aspis of classical Greek literature may well have been the Egyptian cobra, it is to be noted that Vipera aspis, L., is confined to central and western Europe.

Alfred Ely Day

ASPALATHUS

as-pal’-a-thus (aspalathos): An aromatic plant mentioned in Ecclesiasticus 24:15 the King James Version, where "wisdom" says, "I gave a sweet smell like cinnamon and aspalathus," etc. It would appear, from a reference in Pliny, to have been a prickly shrub, the wood of which was scented, but nothing certain is known about it.

ASPATHA

as-pa’-tha (’acpatha’): One of the ten sons of Haman (Es 9:7) (Pers aspadata, "given by a sacred horse," according to Thesaurus, Add. 71, after Pott and Benfey).

ASPHALT

as’-falt. See SLIME.

ASPHAR, THE POOL

as’-far, (lakkos Asphar): When Jonathan and Simon fled from Bacchides they encamped by this pool in the wilderness of Tekoa (1 Macc 9:33; Ant, XIII, i, 2). It is probably identical with Ez-Za‘feraneh, a ruined site with an ancient cistern, to the South of Tekoa, and East of Chalchul. Bir Selhub about 6 miles Southwest of ‘Ain Jidy is favored by some (EB, under the word), the hills around it being known as Cafra, in which there may be a survival of the old name.

ASPHARASUS

as-far’-a-sus (Aspharasos = Mispar (Ezr 2:2; Mispereth, Ne 7:7)): A leader of the captives, who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:8).

ASRIEL

as’-ri-el (’asri’-el, "Vow of God"?): A man of Manasseh (Nu 26:31; Jos 17:2). The form Asrielites, i.e. family of Asriel, occurs in Nu 26:31. According to 1Ch 7:14, Asriel was born to Manasseh by an Aramitess concubine. the King James Version has "Ashnel."

ASS

as (chamowr or chamor, compare Arabic chamar, apparently connected with Arabic root ‘achmar, "red," but referred by some to root hamal, "to carry"; also, but less commonly, both in Hebrew and in Arabic, ‘athon, Arabic ‘atan, used in Arabic only of the females; pereh, or pere’, and ‘aradh, or ‘arodh, Arabic ‘ard, "wild ass," and also ‘ayir, Arabic ‘air, "a young" or "wild ass").

1. Names:

The name ‘arodh (Job 39:5) is rare; onos (Mt 21:2).

2. Meaning:

(1) Chamor is derived from the root which means, in all probability, "to carry a burden" (see Furst, Handworterbuch, ch-m-r ii), or "heap up." While no analogies are contained in the Old Testament this root occurs in New Hebrew. The Aramaic chamer, means "to make a ruin-heap" (from which the noun chamor, "a heap," used in Jud 15:16 in a play of words: "With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, with the jawbone of an ass have I smitten a thousand men"). The root may also mean "to be red." In this case the nominal form chamor may have been derived from the reddish-brown skin of a certain type of

the ass.

(2) ‘Athon, Assyrian ‘atanu and Aramaic ‘atana’, is derived from ‘atha’ "to come," "go," etc. (Furst suggests that it may be derived from ‘athan, Aramaic ‘adhan, "to be slender," "docile," etc.); ‘athonoth tsechoroth, "red-white asses" (Jud 5:10) designates a better breed.

(3) ‘Ayir, Arabic ‘airu ("male ass") used of the young and vigorous animal, is derived from the root ‘-y-r, "to go away," "escape through swiftness" (Hommel, Namen der Saugethiere, 121-23). This name is used as a parallel to beni ‘athono (Ge 49:11) and as a compound of ‘ayir pere’ (Job 11:12), "a wild ass’s colt."

(4) Pere’," wild ass," is derived from the root which means "to run," suggestive of the animal’s swiftness. (5) ‘Arodh, is, in all probability, an Aramaic loan-word for the Hebrew pere’. The Targum uses ‘arodha’ and ‘aradha’.

3. Uses:

From the references to these various names in the Old Testament it is clear that

(1) chamor was used for riding purposes:

(a) by men (2Sa 16:2,23; 19:26; 1Ki 2:40; 13:13,23,24,27);

(b) by women (Ex 4:20; Jos 15:18; Jud 1:14; 1Sa 25:20,23,42; compare 2Ch 28:15). tsemedh chamorim, "a pair of asses" was used for riding as well as for burdens (Jud 19:3,10,19,21, etc.).

(2) It was also used in tillage (Isa 32:20). In this connection the law prohibits the use of an ass in plowing with an ox (De 22:10). The she-ass (’athon) was used as a beast of burden (Ge 45:23) and for riding (Jud 5:10; Nu 22:21,22; 2Ki 4:24). The ‘ayir is also referred to as used in riding (Jud 10:4), carrying (Isa 30:6) and tilling (Isa. 30:24).

4. As a Domestic Animal:

Besides the use of the ass in agriculture and riding it was employed in the caravans of commerce, and sent even upon long expeditions through the desert. The ass is and always has been one of the most common domestic animals. It is a much more important animal in Bible lands than in England and America. The humblest peasant owned his own ass. It is associated throughout the Bible with peaceful pursuits (Ge 42:26 f; 22:3; 1Sa 16:20; 2Sa 19:26; Ne 13:15), whereas the horse is referred to in connection with war and armies. Reference is also made to the use of the flesh of the ass in time of famine (2Ki 6:25). The origin of the ass like that of most domestic animals is lost in antiquity and it cannot be confidently stated from what species of wild ass it was derived. There are three races of wild asses in Asia, one of which is found in Syria, but they may all be referred to one species, Equus

hemionus. The African species is East asinus, and good authorities consider our domestic asses to have descended from this, and to have been introduced at an early period into the entire Orient. The Sulaib Arabs of the Syrian desert, who have no horses, have a famous breed of swift and hardy gray asses which they assert they cross at intervals with the wild asses of the desert. It is not unlikely that domestic asses like dogs are the result of crosses with more than one wild species.

As a domestic animal it preceded the horse, which was first introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos about 1800 BC. See HORSE.

5. Figurative Uses in the Old Testament:

(1) chamorr garem, "an ass of strong bones," is used metaphorically of Issachar (Ge 49:14); besar chamor, "the genital organ of an ass," is used in contempt (Eze 23:20); qebhurath chamor, "the burial of an ass," is applied to ignominious treatment of a corpse (Jer 22:19); chamor is used as a symbol of peace and humility (2Sa 19:26). Zechariah speaks of the future Messiah as "lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass" (Zec 9:9; compare Mt 21:5,7).

(2) Pere’ is used as a symbol of wildness (Ho 8:9), and pere’ ‘adham, ‘a wild ass of man’ (Ge 16:12), referring to Ishmael, designates a free nomad. In Job the name pere’ is applied to the desert dwellers (Job 24:5). Jeremiah employs this name as a symbol of lust. He compares Israel’s love of idolatry to the lust of the wild ass (Jer 2:24).

6. Wider Use in Literature:

The ass (’athon) figures prominently in the Balaam story (Nu 22; 2Pe 2:16. See Gray, ICC, "Numbers," at the place). It is interesting to note that Apion charged the Jews that they "placed an ass’s head in their holy place," affirming that "this was discovered when Antiochus Epiphanes spoiled our temple, and found that ass’s head there made of gold, and worth a great deal of money." Josephus, refuting this absurdity, states that the Roman conquerors of Judea found nothing in the temple "but what was agreeable to the strictest piety." He goes on to say: "Apion ought to have had a regard to these facts. .... As for us Jews, we ascribe no honor or power to asses, as do the Egyptians to crocodiles and asps. .... Asses are the same with us which they are with other wise men; namely, creatures that bear the burdens that we lay upon them" (Apion, II, 7).

LITERATURE.

G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, I, 307 ff; Gesenius’ and Furst’s Lexicons to the Old Testament; articles in Encyclopedia Biblica and HDB.

Samuel Cohon

ASSALIMOTH

a-sal’-i-moth. See SALIMOTH (Apocrypha).

ASSAMIAS

a-sa-mi’-as (Codex Vaticanus, Assamias; Codex Alexandrinus, Asamias; the King James Version Assanias; compare Hashabiah (Ezr 8:24)): Assamias (chief priest) returned with Ezra to Jerusalem. He was one of twelve who had charge of the silver, gold and the temple-vessels (1 Esdras 8:54).

ASSAPHIOTH

a-sa’-fi-oth (Codex Alexandrinus, Asaphphioth; Codex Vaticanus, Assapheioth; the King James Version Azaphion): The head of a family, which returned with Zerubbabel from captivity, called also the servants of Solomon (1 Esdras 5:33). Probably the same as Hassophereth of Ezr 2:55 and Sophereth of Ne 7:57.

ASSARION

as-a’-ri-on. See FARTHING.

ASSASSINATION

a-sas-i-na’-shun.

1. Meaning of the Term:

The language of Scripture distinguishes less clearly than the modern juridical between assassination and murder. "Murderer" = rotseach (Nu 35:16-19,21,30,31; 2Ki 6:32; Job 24:14); horegh, from haragh =" to slay," "kill," the King James Version translation "murderer" in Ho 9:13; but "slayer" in Eze 21:11. Where the Revised Version (British and American) renders "slayers," we find ratsach, in Nu 35:11,25-28; De 4:42; 19:3,4,6; Jos 20:3,5,6; 21:13,21,27,32,38, irrespective of whether willful, deliberate killing is spoken of, or hasty or merely accidental; and nakhah =" to strike," "wound," "kill," "slay," in Nu 35:24. The prohibition against killing is all-inclusive, even to suicide, placing the ban not only on deliberate, purposeful slaying (Ex 21:12,14,18), but on all endangering of life through negligence (De 22:8) or recklessness (Le 19:14) or hatred, anger and revengefulness (Le 19:17 ff).

2. Punishment of the Act:

The Mosaic law presupposes the punishment of all killing of human beings on the ground of Ge 9:6, and repeatedly reiterates it (Ex 21:12,14 ff; Le 24:17,21; Nu 35:33; De 19:11 ff), the reason assigned being that man is made in the image of God; hence to slay a man is paramount to lifting the hand against the

Creator. And while the degrees of guilt are not indicated by the language, they are closely distinguished by the punishments prescribed. Not only notorious enmity against the slain and deliberate lying-in-wait on the part of the murderer (Ex 21:13; Nu 35:20 ff; De 19:4,11), but also the nature of the instrument was taken into account to determine the nature of the crime (Nu 35:16 ff). See CRIMES.

Frank E. Hirsch

ASSASSINS

a-sas'-inz (sicarioi; the King James Version murderers): Josephus (BJ, II, xiii, 3, xvii) relates that "there sprang up in Jerusalem a class of robbers called Sicarii, who slew men in the daytime, and in the midst of the city. This they did chiefly when they mingled with the populace at the festivals, and, hiding short daggers in their garments, stabbed with them those that were their enemies. The first to be assassinated by them was Jonathan the high priest, and after him many were slain daily" (see also Ant, XX, viii, 6, ix). The name is derived from Latin sica, "a dagger." The sicarioi were implacable in their hatred to Rome and to those Jews who were suspected of leaning toward Rome. They took a leading part in the Jewish rebellion and in the disturbance previous to it, and also in the faction quarrels during the war. After the war they continued their nefarious practices in Egypt and Cyrene whither they had fled. Lysias mistook Paul for 'the Egyptian who .... led out into the wilderness the 4,000 men of the sicarioi' (Ac 21:38).

S. F. Hunter

ASSAULT

a-solt' (tsur; horme): The Hebrew verbal form is used of pressing forward a siege (see SIEGE), but also of a hostile attack upon a person then translated "assault" (Es 8:11). The Greek word horme used of an attack upon persons in Ac 14:5 (the King James Version) is rendered "onset" in the Revised Version (British and American). The word "assault" remains in Ac 17:5, of attacking the house of Jason in Thessalonica, where the verb is ephistanai, "to come suddenly upon."

ASSAY

a-sa' (ya'al; nacah; peirdzein; peirasthai; peiran lambanein): The Hebrew and Greek words which are rendered in the King James Version "assay" are so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), and the use of it is extended in the Revised Version (British and American) in two additional cases. The Hebrew word ya'al (1Sa 17:39) is used of David clad in Saul's armor, who "assayed," that is, "tried unsuccessfully," to go and attack Goliath in it, for "he had not proved it," where nacah is the verb. In De 4:34 and Job 4:2 nacah is rendered "assay," in the sense of "attempt," "venture." In Ac 16:7 Paul is said to have "assayed," that is, "attempted" (but was hindered), to go into Bithynia, and now in Ac 24:6 Paul is charged with having "assayed," that is, "having had the audacity," to profane the temple, where peirazein is the verb used in both cases. In Ac 9:26, and now in the Revised Version (British and

American) Ac 26:21, "assay," renders the verb peirasthai, "to attempt," in both cases unsuccessfully. In Heb 11:29 it translates two Greek words peiran lambanein "to make an attempt unsuccessfully."

T. Nicol.

ASSEMBLIES, MASTERS OF

a-sem'-bliz, (ba'ale 'acuppoth, Ec 12:11): the American Revised Version, margin "collectors of sentences," thus Qimchi, Grotius and others. This has been variously interpreted. Tyler translates "editors of collections." Klienert renders "protectors of the treasure- chambers," 'acuppoth being considered equivalent to the 'acuppim of 1Ch 26:15,17; Ne 12:25 (see ASUPPIM). The proverbs are like nails guarding the sacred storehouse, the book closing with this warning against touching the collection (compare Re 22:18,19). Delitzsch translates "like fastened nails which are put together in collections." "As ba'ale berith (Ge 14:13) signifies 'the confederates,' ba'ale shebhu'ah (Ne 6:18) 'the sworn,' and the frequently occurring ba'ale ha-'ir 'the citizens':so ba'ale 'acuppoth means, the possessors of assemblies and of the assembled themselves, or the possessors of collections and of things collected. Thus ba'ale 'acuppoth will be a designation of the 'words of the wise' (as in shalishim, "choice men" = choice proverbs, Pr 22:20, in a certain measure personified), as of those which form or constitute collections and which stand together in order and rank" ("Eccl," English translation, 434).

The Jerusalem Talmud takes 'acuppoth as the Sanhedrin. On the whole it is better to interpret the phrase "persons skilled in collections" of wise sayings, grouped in a compact whole (compare Wright, Eccl, 102).

S. F. Hunter

ASSEMBLY

a-sem'-bli (qahal; ekklesia): The common term for a meeting of the people called together by a crier. It has reference therefore to any gathering of the people called for any purpose whatsoever (Ex 12:6; Ps 22:16 the King James Version; Ps 89:7 the King James Version; Ac 19:32,41). The solemn assemblies of the Jews were their feasts or religious gatherings of any kind (Isa 1:13). The word paneguris, "a general festal assembly" (Heb 12:23), is transferred from the congregation of the people of Israel to the Christian church of which the congregation of Israel was a figure. In the same passage, ekklesia has the sense of calling, summoning. In classical Greek ekklesia was the name for the body of free citizens summoned by a herald. In this sense the church calls all the world to become identified with it. It denotes the whole body of believers, all who are called. Or it may refer to a particular congregation or local church (sunagoge, "synagogue" Jas 2:2 the Revised Version, margin). See CALLING; CHURCH; CONGREGATION.

Jacob W. Kapp

ASSEMBLY, SOLEMN

See CONGREGATION; FEASTS.

ASSENT

a-sent’:Twice used in the King James Version as equivalent to "voice," and to "consent," and displaced in both instances in the Revised Version (British and American) by the literal rendering of the Hebrew peh, "mouth" (2Ch 18:12); and the Greek suntithemi, "agree to," i.e. "affirm" (Ac 24:9).

ASSESSOR

a-ses’-er: Lit. one who sits by another, an assistant; among the ancients especially an assistant to the king (compare "The assessor of his throne," Dryden, Milton’s P.L., Book vi), or to the judge (see Dryden, Virgil’s Aeneid, vi.583). Later it came to mean one who assesses people or property for purposes of taxation.

(1) Royal officials in Israel have the general title sarim, "princes," and this general title included the officer who was "over the tribute," who seems to have had charge of the assessment, as well as the collection of taxes. In the days of the later monarchy "the governor of the royal household," "the royal steward and high chamberlain," seems to have held some such important position (Isa 22:15; 36:3,22).

(2) The early kings do not seem to have subjected the people to heavy taxes, but we find much in the prophets about the injustice and extortion practiced by these officials on the poor of the land (compare Am 2:6,7; Isa 5:8; Jer 5:28; Mic 3:11). Special taxes seem to have been imposed to meet emergencies (compare 2Ki 23:35), but it is not clear that anything of the nature of a regular land tax, or property tax, existed in early times; though something of the kind may be referred to in the reward promised by Saul to the slayer of Goliath (1Sa 17:25) and the tenth mentioned in 1Sa 8:15-17. The kings of Judah, it would seem, made free use of the temple treasures.

(3) Later the Roman government "farmed out" the taxes of the provinces. The publicans, or tax-gatherers of the Gospels, seem to have been agents of the imperial procurator of Judea, instead of direct agents of the great Roman financial companies, who ordinarily let out the business of the collection of the taxes to officers of their own.

During the Empire there was ample imperial machinery provided for the regular collection of the taxes, and the emperor appointed a procurator in each province whose business it was to supervise the collection of revenue. Some Jews found the business profitable, but these were objects of detestation to their countrymen. See PUBLICAN.

George B. Eager

ASSHUR; ASSUR

ash’-oor, as’-oor. See ASSYRIA.

ASSHURIM

a-shoo’-rim (’ashshurim): Mentioned among the sons of Dedan, son of Jokshah, son of Abraham by Keturah (Ge 25:3).

ASSIDAEANS

as-i-de’-ans. See HASIDAEANS (Apocrypha).

ASSIDUOUS

a-sid’-u-us: Occurs only in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:18 the Revised Version (British and American), "In assiduous communing with her is understanding," i.e. "in continued exercise of fellowship." The idea expressed in the adjective is contained in the prepositional prefix, sun of the original suggumnasia, giving the verb intensive force.

ASSIGN

a-sin (nathan, "to give," or "grant," i.e. apportion): Used (Jos 20:8) of Moses setting apart Bezer as one of the three cities of refuge on the East of the Jordan (compare De 4:41-43); also of Joab’s stationing Uriah in a place of mortal peril in battle (2Sa 11:16).

ASSIR

as’-er (accir, "captive"):

(1) A Levite of the family of Korah (Ex 6:24; 1Ch 6:22).

(2) A son of Ebiasaph and grandson of Assir. Samuel was descended from him (1Ch 6:23).

(3) A son of Jeconiah, king of Judah, according to the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin and the American Revised Version, margin. It is a question whether the Assir of this passage (1Ch 3:17) is not a common adjective modifying Jeconiah. The the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render it "the captive." It is to be noticed, however, that there is no definite article in the Hebrew.

ASSOCIATE

a-so’-shi-at: Only in Isa 8:9 the King James Version, where the Hebrew ro‘u, is variously interpreted, according to differences of opinion as to the verb whence it comes. The Revised Version (British and American) "make an uproar"; the Revised Version, margin "break"; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) "Congregamini"; Septuagint gnote ("know ye"); Luther: seid boese ("be wicked").

ASSOS

as’-os (Assos): An ancient city of Mysia in the Roman province of Asia, at which, according to Ac 20:13, Paul and Luke rested while on their way from Troas to Mitylene. Standing upon a conical-shaped rock on the southern coast of the Troad, it occupied one of the finest sites in Asia. The rock is about 700 ft. high; its sides are covered with terraces, both natural and artificial, and so steep is it that Stratoricus wrote of it: "If you wish to hasten your death, try and climb Assos." The view from the summit is extensive and magnificent.

The city, which is very ancient, is said to have been rounded by the Aeolians, and to have always been singularly Greek. As early as the 5th century BC it struck its own coins, and its coinage system continued until 235 AD. One of its early rulers or tyrants was Hermeas, a eunuch, once a slave, who gave his niece in marriage to Aristotle. There the great Greek philosopher lived three years, from 348 to 345 BC. During the time of the kings of Pergamus, the city bore the name of Apollonia. To the Byzantines it was known as Machramion, and at present the town, which has dwindled in importance under Turkish rule, is called Bekhram, a Turkish corruption of the Byzantine name.

The ruins of Assos are among the most imposing in Asia Minor, and yet they have long served as a quarry; from its public buildings the stones for the Constantinople docks were taken. The Turkish sultan Murad II presented the many beautiful bas-reliefs of the Doric temple of Athene to the French government, which are now preserved in the Louvre. The ruins were carefully explored and partially excavated in 1882-83 by Mr. Clarke for the Archaeological Institute of America, and the entire plan of the ancient city is clear. Upon the very summit of the hill stood the temple of Athena which is said to have been erected about 470 BC. Among its ruins Clarke found eight other bas-reliefs which are now in the Boston Museum and which possess a special interest because of their connection between the art of the Orient and of Greece.

Upon the several natural terraces of the hill which have been enlarged by artificial means, stood the many public buildings, as the gymnasium, the public treasury, the baths, the market place and theater, of which but little now remains. The city was surrounded by a double wall which in places is still well preserved. The inner wall of dressed stones laid without mortar, and filled with loose stones, is 8 ft. thick, and the larger outer wall was protected with towers at intervals of 60 ft. The ancient road leading to Troas was well paved. The harbor from which Paul sailed has now been filled up and is covered with gardens, but at its side is the modern harbor protected by an artificial mole, about which are clustered the few houses bearing the name of Bekhram. Upon the summit of the hill, by the ruins of the temple, are

cisterns, a Turkish fortress and a Byzantine church which has been converted into a mosque. Without the city walls is a necropolis. Its many sarcophagi of all ages and sizes and shapes are made of the native trachyte stone which, so the ancients believed, possessed the quality of consuming the bodies buried in it. The stone is the famous "Lapis Assius," or the flesh-eating, hence the word sarcophagus. In former times wheat was raised extensively in the fields about Assos, but now valonia, or acorn cups, form the chief article for export.

E. J. Banks

ASSUAGE

a-swaj’ (the King James Version Asswage) :Lit, ." sweeten," "soften down"; then, "mitigate," "abate"; used of "flood," Ge 8:1 ("subside"); of grief, Job 16:5,6 ("restrain"); also applied to any strong emotion; not used in the New Testament.

ASSUMPTION OF MOSES

a-sump’-shun. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ASSUR

as’-ur. See ASUR.

ASSURANCE

a-shoor’-ans:

A term exceptionally rich in spiritual meaning. It signifies the joyous, unwavering confidence of an intelligent faith; the security of a fearless trust. The original words have to do with the heart of vital religion. baTach, "trust"; ‘aman, "to prop," "to support," hence to confide in, to trust. Jesus repeatedly used this word "amen" to express the trustworthiness and abiding certainty of his sayings. pistis, "faith"; plerophoria, "full assurance." The confidence of faith is based, not on "works of righteousness which we have done" (compare Titus 3:4,5 the King James Version) but on the highpriesthood and atoning sacrifice of Christ.

(Heb 10:21,22; compare He 10:19, "boldness to enter .... by the blood of Jesus," the King James Version). Assurance is the soul’s apprehension of its complete emancipation from the power of evil and from consequent judgment, through the atoning grace of Christ. It is the exact opposite of self-confidence, being a joyous appropriation and experience of the fullness of Christ—a glad sense of security, freedom and eternal life in Him. This doctrine is of immeasurable importance to the life of the church and of the individual believer, as a life of spiritual doubt and uncertainty contradicts the ideal of

liberty in Christ Jesus which is the natural and necessary fruitage of "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit .... shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour." Paul unhesitatingly said, "I know" (2Ti 1:12)—a word which, oft-repeated in 1 Jn, furnishes the groundwork of glad assurance that runs through the entire epistle. For the classic passage on "full assurance" see Col 2:1-10.

Dwight M. Pratt

ASSURBANIPAL

as-ur-ba'-ni-pal. See ASHURBANIPAL.

ASSYRIA

a-sir'-i-a:

I. GEOGRAPHY

II. EARLY HISTORY

III. CLIMATE AND PRODUCTIONS

IV. POPULATION

V. TRADE AND LAW

VI. ART

VII. MECHANICS

VIII. FURNITURE, POTTERY AND EMBROIDERY

IX. LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND SCIENCE

X. GOVERNMENT AND ARMY

XI. RELIGION

XII. EXCAVATIONS

XIII. CHRONOLOGY

XIV. HISTORY

1. Early Period

2. The Older Empire

3. The Second Empire

4. Last Period and Fall of Empire

LITERATURE

Assyria, a Greek name formed from Asshur (’ashshur; ‘Assour; Assyrian Assur): The primitive capital of the country.

I. Geography.

The origin of the city (now Kala’at Shergat), which was built on the western bank of the Tigris between the Upper and Lower Zab, went back to pre-Sem times, and the meaning of the name was forgotten (see Ge 2:14, where the Hiddekel or Tigris is said to flow on the eastern side of Asshur). To the North of the junction of the Tigris and Upper Zab, and opposite the modern Mossul, was a shrine of the goddess Ishtar, around which grew up the town of Nina, Ninua or Nineveh (now Kouyunjik and Nebi Yunus). Another early sanctuary of Ishtar was at Urbillu, Arbailu or Arbela, East of the Upper Zab. North of Nineveh was Dur-Sargina (now Khorsabad) where Sargon built his palace (720 BC). All this district was embraced in the kingdom of Assyria which extended from Babylonia northward to the Kurdish mountains and at times included the country westward to the Euphrates and the Khabur.

II. Early History.

The whole region was known to the early Babylonians as Subartu. Its possession was disputed between Semitic Amurru or AMORITES (which see) and a non-Semitic people from the North called Mitannians. The earlier high priests of Assur known to us bear Mitannian names. About 2500 BC the country was occupied by Babylonian Semites, who brought with them the religion, law, customs, script and Semitic language of Babylonia (Ge 10:11,12, where we should read "He went forth to Asshur"; see Mic 5:6). The foundation of Nineveh, Rehoboth-’Ir (Assyrian Rebit-Ali, "the suburbs of the city"), Calah and Resen (Assyrian Res- eni, "head of the spring") is ascribed to them. The triangle formed by the Tigris and Zab, which enclosed these cities, was in later times included within the fortifications of the "great city" (Ge 10:12; Jon 3:3). Assyria is always distinguished from Babylonia in the Old Testament, and not confounded with it as by Herodotus and other classical writers.

III. Climate and Productions.

Assyria, speaking generally, was a limestone plateau with a temperate climate, cold and wet in winter, but warm during the summer months. On the banks of the rivers there was abundant cultivation, besides pasture-land. The apple of the North grew by the side of the palm-tree of the South. Figs, olives, pomegranates, almonds, mulberries and vines were also cultivated as well as all kinds of grain. Cotton is mentioned by Sennacherib (King, PSBA, December, 1909). The forests were tenanted by lions, and the plains by wild bulls (rimi, Hebrew re'emim), wild asses, wild goats and gazelles. Horses were imported from Cappadocia; ducks were kept, and mastiffs were employed in hunting.

IV. Population.

The dominant type was Semitic, with full lips, somewhat hooked nose, high forehead, black hair and eyes, fresh complexion and abundance of beard. In character the Assyrians were cruel and ferocious in war, keen traders, stern disciplinarians, and where religion was concerned, intense and intolerant. Like the Ottoman Turks they formed a military state, at the head of which was the king, who was both leader in war and chief priest, and which offered a striking contrast to theocratic state of theBabylonians. It seems probable that every male was liable to conscription, and under the Second Empire, if not earlier, there was a large standing army, part of which consisted of mercenaries and recruits from the subject races. One result of this was the necessity for constant war in order to occupy the soldiery and satisfy their demands with captured booty; and the result, as in the Northern Kingdom of Israel, was military revolution, with the seizure of the throne by the successful general. As might be expected, education was confined to the upper classes, more especially to the priests and scribes.

V. Trade and Law.

As far back as the age of Abraham, when Assyria was still a dependency of Babylonia, trade was carried on with Cappadocia and an Assyrian colony of merchants settled at Kara Eyuk near Kaisariyeh. Down the Euphrates came the silver, copper and bronze of Asia Minor, together with horses. Cedar wood was brought from Mount Amanus, and there was already trade, through Syria, with the Mediterranean. Nineveh itself was probably founded in the interests of the trade with the North. In later days commercial reasons had much to do with the efforts of the Assyrian kings to conquer eastern Asia Minor and the Mediterranean coast of Syria and Pal: under the Second Empire no pains were spared to obtain possession of the Phoenician cities and divert their commerce into Assyrian hands. Hence the importance of the capture of the Hittite stronghold, Carchemish, by Sargon in 717 BC, as it commanded the road to Syria and the passage across the Euphrates. Nineveh had at that time already become a great resort of merchants, among whom the Semitic Arameans were the most numerous. Aramaic, accordingly, became the language of trade, and then of diplomacy (compare 2Ki 18:26), and commercial documents written in cuneiform were provided with Aramaic dockets. As in Babylonia, land and houses were leased knd sold, money was lent at interest, and the leading firms employed numerous damgari or commercial agents. Assyrian law was, in general, derived from Babylonia and much of it was connected with trade. The code of Khammu-rabi (Code of Hammurabi) or AMRAPHEL (which see) underlay it,

and the same system of judicial procedure, with pleading before judges, the hearing of witnesses, and an appeal to the king, prevailed in both countries.

VI. Art.

Unlike Babylonia, Assyria abounded in stone; the brick buildings of Babylonia, accordingly, were replaced by stone, and the painted or tiled walls by sculptured slabs. In the bas-reliefs discovered at Nineveh three periods of artistic progress may be traced. Under Assur-nazir-pal the sculpture is bold and vigorous, but the work is immature and the perspective faulty. From the beginning of the Second Empire to the reign of Esar-haddon the bas-reliefs often remind us of embroidery in stone. Attempts are made to imitate the rich detail and delicate finish of the ivory carvings; the background is filled in with a profusion of subjects, and there is a marked realism in the delineation of them. The third period is that of Assur-bani-pal, when the overcrowding is avoided by once more leaving the background bare, while the animal and vegetable forms are distinguished by a certain softness, if not effeminacy of tone. Sculpture in the round, however, lagged far behind that in relief, and the statuary of Assyria is very inferior to that of Babylonia. It is only the human-headed bulls and winged lions that can be called successful: they were set on either side of a gate to prevent the entrance of evil spirits, and their majestic proportions were calculated to strike the observer with awe (compare the description of the four cherubim in Eze 1).

In bronze work the Assyrians excelled, much of the work being cast. But in general it was hammered, and the scenes hammered in relief on the bronze gates discovered by Mr. Rassam at Balawat near Nineveh are among the best examples of ancient oriental metallurgy at present known. Gold and silver were also worked into artistic forms; iron was reserved for more utilitarian purposes. The beautiful ivory carvings found at Nineveh were probably the work of foreign artificers, but gems and seal cylinders were engraved by native artists in imitation of those of Babylonia, and the Babylonian art of painting and glazing tiles was also practiced. The terra-cotta figures which can be assigned to the Assyrian period are poor. Glass was also manufactured.

VII. Mechanics.

The Assyrians were skilled in the transport of large blocks of stone, whether sculptured or otherwise. They understood the use of the lever, the pulley and the roller, and they had invented various engines of war for demolishing or undermining the walls of a city or for protecting the assailants. A crystal lens, turned on the lathe, has been found at Kouyunjik: it must have been useful to the scribes, the cuneiform characters inscribed on the tablets being frequently very minute. Water was raised from the river by means of a shaduf. VIII. Furniture, Pottery and Embroidery.

The furniture even of the palace was scanty, consisting mainly of couches, chairs, stools, tables, rugs and curtains. The chairs and couches were frequently of an artistic shape, and were provided with feet in the form of the legs of an ox. All kinds of vases, bowls and dishes were made of earthenware, but they were rarely decorated. Clothes, curtains and rugs, on the other hand, were richly dyed and embroidered, and were manufactured from wool and flax, and (in the age of the Second Empire) from cotton. The rug, of

which the Persian rug is the modern representative, was a Babylonian invention.

IX. Language, Literature and Science.

The Assyrian language was Semitic, and differed only dialectically from Semitic Babylonian. In course of time, however, differences grew up between the spoken language and the language of literature, which had incorporated many Summerian words, and retained grammatical terminations that the vernacular had lost, though these differences were never very great. Assyrian literature, moreover, was mainly derived from Babylonia. Assur-bani-pal employed agents to ransack the libraries of Babylonia and send their contents to Nineveh, where his library was filled with scribes who busied themselves in copying and editing ancient texts. Commentaries were often written upon these, and grammars, vocabularies and interlinear translations were compiled to enable the student to understand the extinct Sumerian, which had long been the Latin of Semitic Babylonia. The writing material was clay, upon which the cuneiform characters were impressed with a stylus while it was still moist: the tablet was afterward baked in the sun or (in Assyria) in a kiln. The contents of the library of Nineveh were very various; religion, mythology, law, history, geography, zoology, philology, mathematics, astronomy, astrology and the pseudo-science of omens were all represented in it, as well as poetry and legendary romance. See NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.

X. Government and Army.

Assyria was a military kingdom which, like the Northern Kingdom of Israel, had established itself by a successful revolt from Babylonia. In contradistinction to Babylonia, which was a theocratic state, the king being subordinate to the priest, the Assyrian king was supreme. Whereas in Babylonia the temple was the chief public building, in Assyria the royal palace dominated everything, the temple being merely a royal chapel attached to the palace. The king, in fact, was the commander of an army, and this army was the Assyrian people. How far the whole male population was liable to conscription is still uncertain; but the fact that the wars of Assur- bani-pal so exhausted the fighting strength of the nation as to render it unable to resist the invaders from the North shows that the majority of the males must have been soldiers. Hence the constant wars partly to occupy the army and prevent revolts, partly for the sake of booty with which to pay it. Hence too, the military revolutions, which, as in the kingdom of Israel, resulted in changes of dynasty and the seizure of the throne by successful generals. The turtannu or commander-in-chief, who took the place of the king when the latter was unable or unwilling to lead his forces, ranked next to the sovereign. From the reign of Tiglath-pileser IV onward, however, the autocracy was tempered by a centralized bureaucracy, and in the provinces a civil governor was appointed by the side of the military commander. Among the high officials at court were the rab-saki or "vizier," and the rab-sa-risi or "controller," the rabhcaric (RAB-SARIS (which see)) of the Old Testament.

The army consisted of cavalry, infantry, bowmen and slingers, as well as of a corps of charioteers. After the rise of the Second Empire the cavalry were increased at the expense of the chariotry, and were provided with saddles and boots, while the unarmed groom who had run by the side of the horse became

a mounted archer. Sennacherib further clothed the horseman in a coat of mail. The infantry were about ten times as numerous as the calvary, and under Sargon were divided into bowmen and spearmen, the bowmen again being subdivided into heavy-armed and light-armed, the latter being apparently of foreign origin. Sennacherib introduced a corps of slingers, clad in helmet and cuirass, leather drawers and boots. He also deprived the heavy-armed bowmen of the long robes they used to wear, and established a body of pioneers with double-headed axes, helmets and buskins. Shields were also worn by all classes of soldiers, and the army carried with it standards, tents, battering-rams and baggage-carts. The royal sleeping-tent was accompanied by tents for cooking and dining. No pains, in fact, were spared to make the army both in equipment and discipline an irresistible engine of war. The terror it excited in western Asia is therefore easily intelligible (Isa 10:5-14; Na 2:11-13; 3:1-4).

XI. Religion.

The state religion of Assyria was derived from BABYLONIA (which see) and in its main outlines is Babylonian. But it differed from the religion of Babylonia in two important respects:

(1) the king, and not the high priest, was supreme, and

(2) at the head of it was the national god Asur or Assur, whose high priest and representative was the king. Asur was originally Asir, "the leader" in war, who is accordingly depicted as a warrior-god armed with a bow and who in the age when solar worship became general in Babylonia was identified with the sun-god. But the similarity of the name caused him to be also identified with the city of Asur, where he was worshipped, at a time when the cities of northern Babylonia came to be deified, probably under Hittite influence. Later still, the scribes explained his name as a corruption of that of the primeval cosmogonic deity An-sar, the upper firmament, which in the neo-Babylonian age was pronounced Assor. The combination of the attributes of the warrior-god, who was the peculiar god of the commander of the army, with the deified city to which the army belonged, caused Assur to become the national deity of a military nation in a way of which no Babylonian divinity was capable. The army were "the troops of Assur," the enemies were "the enemies of Assur" who required that they should acknowledge his supremacy or be destroyed. Assur was not only supreme over the other gods, he was also, in fact, unlike them, without father or wife. Originally, it is true, his feminine counterpart, Asirtu, the ASHERAH (which see) of the Old Testament, had stood at his side, and later literary pedants endeavored to find a wife for him in Belit, "the Lady," or Ishtar, or some other Babylonian goddess, but the attempts remained purely literary. When Nineveh took the place of Assur as the capital of the kingdom, Ishtar, around whose sanctuary Nineveh had grown up, began to share with him some of the honor of worship, though her position continued to be secondary to the end. This was also the case with the war-god Nin-ip, called Mas in Assyria, whose cult was specially patronized by the Assyrian kings. See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

XII. Excavations.

Rich, who had first visited Mossul in 1811, examined the mounds opposite in 1820 and concluded that

they represented the site of Nineveh. The few antiquities he discovered were contained in a single case in the British Museum, but the results of his researches were not published until 1836. In 1843-45 the Frenchman Botta disinterred the palace of Sargon at Khorsabad, 15 miles North of Nineveh, while at Nimrud (Calah) and Kouyunjik (Nineveh) Layard (1845-51) brought to light the ruins of the great Assyrian palaces and the library of Assur-bani-pal. His work was continued by Rassam (1851-54). Nothing more was done until 1873-75 when George Smith resumed excavations on the site of Assur-bani-pal's library; this was followed in 1877-79 by the excavations of Rassam, who discovered among other things the bronze gates of Balawat. At present a German expedition under Andrae is working at Kala'at Shergat (Assur) where the English excavators had already found the cylinder-inscription of Tiglath-pileser I (see SHERGHAT).

XIII. Chronology.

The Assyrians reckoned time by means of limmi, certain officials appointed every New Year's day, after whom their year of office was named. The lists of limmi or "Eponyms" which have come down to us form the basis of Assyrian chronology. Portions of a "synchronous" history of Assyria and Babylonia have also been discovered, as well as fragments of two "Babylonian Chronicles" written from a Babylonian point of view. The "Eponym" lists carry back an exact dating of time to the beginning of the 10th century BC. Before that period Sennacherib states that Tiglath-pileser I reigned 418 years before himself. Tiglath-pileser, moreover, tells us that Samas-Ramman son of Isme-Dagon had built a temple at Assur 641 years earlier, while Shalmaneser I places Samas-Ramman 580 years before his own reign and Erisu 159 years before Samas-Ramman, though Esar-haddon gives the dates differently. Apart from the native documents, the only trustworthy sources for the chronology (as for the history) of Assyria are the Old Testament records. In return the "Eponym" lists have enabled us to correct the chronology of the Books of Kings (see KINGS, BOOKS OF).

XIV. History.

1. Early Period:

Assyrian history begins with the high priests (patesis) of Assur. The earliest known to us are Auspia and Kikia, who bear Mitannian names. The early Semitic rulers, however, were subject to Babylonia, and under Khammurabi (AMRAPHEL) Assyria was still a Babylonian province. According to Esar-haddon the kingdom was founded by Bel-bani son of Adasi, who first made himself independent; Hadad-nirari, however, ascribes its foundation to Zulili. Assyrian merchants and soldiers had already made their way as far as Cappadocia, from whence copper and silver were brought to Assyria, and an Assyrian colony was established at Kara Eyuk near Kaisariyeh, where the Assyrian mode of reckoning time by means of limmi was in use. In the age of Tell el-Amarna Letters (1400 BC) Assur-uballid was king of Assyria. He corresponded with the Egyptian Pharaoh and married his daughter to the Bah king, thereby providing for himself a pretext for interfering in the affairs of Babylonia. The result was that his son-in-law was murdered, and Assur-uballid sent troops to Babylonia who put the murderers to death and placed the grandson of the Assyrian king on the Babylonian throne.

Babylonia had fallen into decay and been forced to protect herself from the rising power of Assyria by forming an alliance with Mitanni (Mesopotamia) and Egypt, and subsequently, when Mitanni had been absorbed by the Hittites, by practically becoming dependent on the Hittite king. Shalmaneser I (1300 BC), accordingly, devoted himself to crippling the Hittite power and cutting it off from communication with Babylonia. Campaign after campaign was undertaken against the Syrian and more eastern provinces of the Hittite empire, Malatiyeh was destroyed, and Carehemish threatened. Shalmaneser's son and successor Tukulti-Mas entered into the fruits of his father's labors. The Hittites had been rendered powerless by an invasion of the northern barbarians, and the Assyrian king was thus left free to crush Babylonia. Babylon was taken by storm, and for seven years Tukulti-Mas was master of all the lands watered by the Tigris and Euphrates. The image of Merodach was carried to Assur as a sign that the scepter had passed from Babylon to the parvenu Assyria. A successful revolt, however, finally drove the Assyrian conqueror back to his own country, and when he was murdered soon afterward by his own son, the Babylonians saw in the deed a punishment inflicted by the god of Babylon.

2. The Older Empire:

A few years later the Assyrian king Bel-kudur-uzur lost his life in battle against the Babylonians, and a new dynasty appears to have mounted the Assyrian throne. About 1120 BC the Assyrian king was Tiglath-pileser I, whose successful wars extended the Assyrian empire as far westward as Cappadocia. In one of his campaigns he made his way to the Mediterranean, and received presents from the king of Egypt, which included a crocodile. At Assur he planted a botanical garden stocked with trees from the conquered provinces. After his death the Assyrian power declined; Pitru (Pethor, Nu 22:5) fell into the hands of the Arameans and the road to the Mediterranean was blocked.

A revival came under Assur-nazir-pal III (884-860 BC) who rebuilt CALAH (which see) and established the seat of the government at Nineveh, where he erected a palace. Various campaigns were carried on in the direction of Armenia and Comagene, the brutalities executed upon the enemy being described in detail by their conqueror. He then turned westward, and after receiving homage from the Hittite king of Carchemish, laid the Phoenicians under tribute. The road to the West was thus again secured for the merchants of Assyria. Assur-nazir-pal was succeeded by his son Shalmaneser II (859-825 BC), who, instead of contenting himself, like his father, with mere raids for the sake of booty, endeavored to organize and administer the countries which his armies had subdued. The famous bronze gates of Balawat were erected by him in commemoration of his victories.

In his reign the Israelites and Syrians of Damascus first came into direct relation with the Assyrians. In 854 BC he attacked Hamath and at Qarqar defeated an army which included 1,200 chariots, 1,200 cavalry and 20,000 infantry from Ben-hadad of Damascus, 2,000 chariots, and 10,000 infantry from. "Ahab of Israel," besides considerable contingents from Ammon, Arvad, Arabia and elsewhere. In 842 BC Shalmaneser penetrated to Damascus where Hazael, the successor of Ben-hadad, who had already been defeated in the open field, was closely besieged. The surrounding country was ravaged, and "Jehu son of Omri" hastened to offer tribute to the conqueror. The scene is represented on the Black Obelisk found at Nimrud and now in the British Museum. Shalmaneser's campaigns were not confined to the

West. He overran Armenia, where the kingdom of Van had just been established, made his way to Tarsus in Cilicia, took possession of the mines of silver, salt and alabaster in the Taurus mountains among the Tabal or Tubal, and obliged the Babylonian king to acknowledge his supremacy.

In his later days, when too old to take the field himself, his armies were led by the turtannu or commander-in-chief, and a rebellion, headed by his son Assur-danin-pal (Sardanapalus) broke out at home, where Nineveh and Assur were jealous of the preference shown for Calah. Nineveh, however, was captured and the revolt suppressed after two years' duration by another son, Samas-Ramman IV, who shortly afterward, on his father's death, succeeded to the throne (824-812 BC). His chief campaigns were directed against Media. His son Hadad-nirari III (811-783 BC) was the next king, whose mother was Sammu-ramat (Semiramis). He claims to have reduced to subjection the whole of Syria, including Phoenicia, Edom and Philistia, and to have taken Mari'a, king of Damascus, prisoner in his capital city. After this, however, Assyria once more fell into a state of decay, from which it was delivered by the successful revolt of a military officer Pulu (Pul), who put an end to the old line of kings and took the name of Tiglath-pileser IV (745-727 BC).

3. The Second Empire:

Tiglath-pileser founded the second Assyrian empire, and made Assyria the dominant power in western Asia. The army was reorganized and made irresistible, and a new administrative system was introduced, the empire being centralized at Nineveh and governed by a bureaucracy at the head of which was the king. Tiglath-pileser's policy was twofold: to weld western Asia into a single empire, held together by military force and fiscal laws, and to secure the trade of the world for the merchants of Nineveh. These objects were steadily kept in view throughout the reigns of Tiglath-pileser and his successors. For the history of his reign, see TIGLATH-PILESER. In 738 BC Tiglath-pileser put an end to the independent existence of the kingdom of Hamath, Menahem of Samaria becoming his tributary, and in 733 BC he commenced a campaign against Rezin of Damascus which ended in the fall of Damascus, the city being placed under an Assyrian governor. At the same time the land of Naphtali was annexed to Assyria, and Yahu- khazi (Ahaz) of Judah became an Assyrian vassal, while in 731 BC, after the murder of Pekah, Hoshea was appointed king of Israel (compare 2Ki 15-17).

In 728 BC Tiglath-pileser was solemnly crowned at Babylon and the following year he died. His successor was another military adventurer, Shalmaneser IV (727-722 BC), whose original name was Ulula. While engaged in the siege of Samaria Shalmaneser died or was murdered, and the throne was seized by another general who took the name of Sargon (722-705 BC). Sargon, for whose history see SARGON, captured Samaria in 722 BC, carrying 27,290 of its inhabitants into captivity. A large part of his reign was spent in combating a great confederation of the northern nations (Armenia, Manna, etc.) against Assyria. Carchemish, the Hittite capital, was captured in 717 BC, a revolt of the states in southern Palestine was suppressed in 711 BC and Merodach-Baladan, the Chaldean, who had possessed himself of Babylonia in 722 BC, was driven back to the marshlands at the head of the Persian Gulf.

In 705 BC Sargon was murdered, and succeeded by his son SENNACHERIB (which see). Sennacherib

(705-681 BC) had neither the military skill nor the administrative abilities of his father. His campaign against Hezekiah of Judah in 701 BC was a failure; so, also, was his policy in Babylonia which was in a constant state of revolt against his rule, and which ended in his razing the sacred city of Babylon to the ground in 689 BC. Nine years previously his troops had been called upon to suppress a revolt in Cilicia, where a battle was fought with the Greeks.

4. Last Period and Fall of the Empire:

His son Esar-haddon, who succeeded him (681-669 BC) after his murder by two other sons on the 20th Tebet (compare 2Ki 19:37), was as distinguished a general and administrator as his father had been the reverse. For his history see ESARHADDON. Under him the Second Empire reached the acme of its power and prosperity. Babylon was rebuilt and made the second capital of the empire, Palestine became an obedient province, and Egypt was conquered (674 and 671 BC), while an invasion of the Cimmerians (Gomer) was repelled, and campaigns were made into the heart of both Media and Arabia. Esar-haddon died while on his way to repress a revolt in Egypt, and his son Assur-bani-pal succeeded him in the empire (669-626 BC), while another son Samas-sum-ukin was appointed viceroy of Babylonia. Assur-bani-pal was a munificent patron of learning, and the library of Nineveh owed most of its treasures to him, but extravagant luxury had now invaded the court, and the king conducted his wars through his' generals, while he himself remained at home.

The great palace at Kouyunjik (Nineveh) was built by him. Egypt demanded his first attention. Tirhakah the Ethiopian who had headed its revolt was driven back to his own country, and for a time there was peace. Then under Tandamane, Tirhakah's successor, Egypt revolted again. This time the Assyrian punishment was merciless. Thebes—"No-amon" (Na 3:8)—was destroyed, its booty carried away and two obelisks transported to Nineveh as trophies of victory. Meanwhile Tyre, which had rebelled, was forced to sue for peace, and ambassadors arrived from Gyges of Lydia asking for help against the Cimmerians. Elam still remained independent and endeavored to stir up disaffection in Babylonia. Against his will, therefore, Assur-bani-pal was obliged to interfere in the internal affairs of that country, with the result that the Elamites were finally overthrown in a battle on the Eulaeus beneath the walls of Susa, and the conquered land divided between two vassal kings.

Then suddenly a revolt broke out throughout the greater part of the Assyrian empire, headed by Assur-bani-pal's brother, the viceroy of Babylonia. For a time the issue was doubtful. Egypt recovered its independence under Psammetichus, the founder of the XXVIth Dynasty (660 BC) who had received help from Lydia, but Babylonia was reconquered and Babylon after a long siege was starved out, Samas-sum-ukin burning himself in the ruins of his palace. Elam remained to be dealt with, and an Assyrian army made its way to Susa, which was leveled to the ground, the shrines of its gods profaned and the bones of its ancient kings torn from their graves. Then came the turn of northern Arabia, where the rebel sheikhs were compelled to submit. But the struggle had exhausted Assyria; its exchequer was empty, and its fighting population killed. When the Cimmerians descended upon the empire shortly afterward, it was no longer in a condition to resist them. Under Assur-etil-ilani, the son and successor of Assur-bani-pal, Calah was taken and sacked, and two reigns later, Sin-sar-iskun, the last king of Assyria, fell fighting against the Scythians (606 BC). Nineveh was utterly destroyed, never again to be inhabited, and

northern Babylonia passed into the hands of Nabopolassar, the viceroy of Babylon, who had joined the northern invaders. Assur, the old capital of the country, was still standing in the age of Cyrus, but it had become a small provincial town; as for Nineveh and Calah, their very sites were forgotten.

LITERATURE.

See G. Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies of the Eastern World, 1862-67; Perrot and Chipiez, Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquite, II, 1884; Maspero, Struggle of the Nations, and Passing of the Empires, 3 volumes, 1894-1900; Rogers, A History of Babylonia and Assyria, 1900; Johns, Assyrian Deeds and Documents, 1898; Schrader, KAT, English translation by Whitehouse, 1885; Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia, 1902.

A. H. Sayce

ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA, RELIGION OF

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

ASSYRIAN AND BABYLONIAN LIBRARIES

See NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.

ASSYRIANS

a-sir'-i-ans ('ashshur): The inhabitants of Assyria. In Hebrew the name of the people is the same as that of the country. See ASSYRIA.

ASTAD

as'-tad: The reading of the English versions of 1 Esdras 5:13 for the name which appears as Azgad in Ezr 2:12 and Ne 7:17. In the different Greek copies of 1 Esdras the name varies. See AZGAD; ASTATH.

ASTAROTH

as'-ta-roth. See ASHTAROTH.

ASTARTE; ASTORETH as-tar'-te. See ASHTAROTH.

ASTATH

as’-tath (Astath):the form given in 1 Esdras 8:38 to the name which in Ezr 8:12 appears as Azgad. See AZGAD.

ASTONISHED; ASTONIED

as-ton’-isht, as-ton’-id (shamem, "astonished," the root idea being "silent," i.e. struck dumb with amazement; ekplessomai, "to be struck with astonishment," as if by a blow or a shock; existemi, "to amaze," "to throw into wonderment"; thambeomai, "to astonish" to the point of fright): The state of being surprised, startled, stunned by some exceptional wonder, some overwhelming event or miracle, as e.g. Nebuchadnezzar’s amazement at the miracle in the burning fiery furnace (Da 3:24) (tewah, "astonished"); of the passer-by at the desolation of Babylon (Jer 50:13). The personality, teaching and works of Jesus were so wonderful, Divine, supernatural, as to awaken emotions of surprise and awe never before known in the presence of man.

The people "were astonished out of measure" at His doctrine (Mr 10:26 the King James Version); "astonished with a great astonishment" at His raising the dead (Mr 5:42 the King James Version). The gift of the Holy Ghost to the Gentiles was in like manner a source of astonishment to those Jews who believed through the power of Peter’s preaching (Ac 10:45 the King James Version). The miracle of regeneration today, which renews and transforms debased and fallen men into saints, makes the same impression on an observing world.

Dwight M. Pratt

ASTONISHMENT

as-ton’-ish-ment: Amazement; mental surprise, excitement, wonder; often the cause of the startled emotion, as in De 28:37: "Thou shall become an astonishment." The chosen people, visited with calamities for idolatry would become a source of amazement to all nations (Jer 25:9,11,18); Solomon’s’ lofty and beautiful temple would be "an astonishment" (2Ch 7:21 the King James Version). For original terms and fuller study see ASTONISHED.

ASTRAY

a-stra’ (ta‘ah, "to wander," "to err"; planaomai, "to go astray," each carrying the idea of being lost): With one exception (Ex 23:4 "his ass going astray") used metaphorically of moral wandering, going astray in paths of error and sin, like "sheep going astray" (1Pe 2:25 the King James Version; Isa 53:6; Ps 119:176).

This wandering may be due

(1) to inherent evil (Ps 58:3);

(2) to false shepherds (Jer 50:6); contrast the beautiful and classic passage, Mt 18:12,13, the Son of man (verse 12) seeketh that which is gone astray. No word more vividly portrays sin as a straying, a separation from God. To be morally "astray" is to be "lost."

Dwight M. Pratt

ASTROLOGY

as-trol’-o-ji:

I. THE DESIRE TO FORECAST THE FUTURE

1. Methods of Soothsaying

2. Divination

3. Looking in the Liver

4. The Astrologers, or Dividers of the Heavens

5. The Stargazers, or Seers of the Constellations

6. The Monthly Prognosticators, or Men Who Knew the Omens of the New Moon

II. THE WORSHIP OF THE HEAVENLY BODIES THE FORM OF IDOLATRY TO WHICH THE ISRAELITES WERE MOST PRONE

1. Chiun, Certainly the Planet Saturn

2. Saturn or Moloch Worship

3. Mazzaloth, or Planet Worship

4. Gadh and Meni or Star Worship

5. Lucifer, the Shining Star

III. SYSTEMS OF ASTROLOGY

1. Names of the WeekDays, Due to an Astrological System

2. Origin of Modern Astrology

3. "Curious Arts" of Ephesus

LITERATURE

I. The Desire to Forecast the Future.

The desire to penetrate the future and influence its events has shown itself in all lands and ages. But it is clear that a knowledge of the future does not lie within the scope of man's natural powers; "divination" therefore has always been an attempt to gain the help of beings possessing knowledge and power transcending those of man. The answer of the Chaldeans to King Nebuchadnezzar when he demanded that they should tell his dream was a reasonable one: "There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter: .... there is no other that can show it before the king, except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh" (Da 2:10,11). "Divination," therefore, in all its forms is but an aspect of polytheism.

It was for the twofold reason that the arts of divination were abominable in themselves, and gave to their votaries no knowledge of the will of God, that such arts were forbidden in the Law (De 18:9-15). Israel was to be perfect with God and He would reveal to them His will perfectly through that prophet like unto Moses whom He would send. Keil and Delitzsch in commenting on this passage well remark: "Moses groups together all the words which the language contained for the different modes of exploring the future and discovering the will of God, for the purpose of forbidding every description of soothsaying, and places the prohibition of Molochworship at the head, to show the inward connection between soothsaying and idolatry, possibly because februation, or passing children through the fire in the worship of Moloch, was more intimately connected with soothsaying and magic than any other description of idolatry" (Commentary on the Pentateuch, III, 393).

1. Methods of Soothsaying:

The forms of soothsaying mentioned in this catalogue are as follows: "One that practiceth augury" (me'onen) is of uncertain etymology, but the tabbins connect it with 'ayin, "an eye"; literally therefore one who ogles, or who bewitches with the evil eye. "An enchanter" (menachesh), sometimes supposed to be a snakecharmer, is probably one who fascinates like a snake; in other words a mesmerist or hypnotist. The word occurs in connection with Joseph's divining-cup, and such cups were employed both in Babylon and Egypt, and their use was akin to the more modern crystal-gazing, the hypnotic state being induced by prolonged staring, as in the fascination ascribed to serpents. On this account, snakes were sometimes figured upon such cups. Thus in Talmud we read: "If one finds vessels with delineations of the sun, the moon, or of a serpent upon them, let him cast them into the salt sea" ('Abho-dhah-Zarah, fol 42, col. 2). "A sorcerer" (mekhashsheph) is one who mutters incantations or speaks in ventriloquial whispers, as if under the influence of the spirits of the dead. "A charmer" (chobher

chebher), is one who inflicts a spell by weaving magical knots. "A consulter with a familiar spirit" (’obh), denotes one who is possessed of a python or soothsaying demon. Such were the woman of Endor whom Saul consulted on the eve of the battle of Gilboa (1Sa 28) and the pythoness of Philippi out of whom Paul cast the spirit (Ac 16:16-18). The word (’obh) means "bottle" and either indicates that the medium was the receptacle of the spirit or is a relic of the old tradition that genii (jinns) might be enslaved and imprisoned in bottles by means of magical incantations. "A wizard" (yidh‘oni) means a wise man, "a knowing one." The word in Old Testament is always used in connection with ‘obh, and denotes a man who could interpret the ravings of the medium. "A necromancer" (doresh ‘el ha-methim) is one who calls up the spirits of the dead and has intercourse with them. "Consulting the teraphim" (Eze 21:21) may have been a form of consulting the dead, if, as is probable, the teraphim were ancestral images, raised by superstition to the rank of household gods. The manner of consultation we do not know; but as an illustration of the use of the image of a dead person, we may remember that a modern medium will often ask for a portrait of a deceased relative for the alleged purpose of entering into communication with the departed spirit.

It will be seen that these forms of soothsaying are allied to the arts which in modern times bear the names of hypnotism and mediumship. They are more briefly referred to in Isa 8:19, "When they shall say unto you, Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God? on behalf of the living should they seek unto the dead?" Here again mediumship and spiritism are connected with the ventriloquial whispers and mutterings, which are supposed to be characteristic of the utterances of the dead.

2. Divination:

But the first term in the catalogue, "one that useth divination" (qecem) is of wider application. It signifies a "divider" and refers to the practice which men have followed in an infinite variety of ways for trying to get light upon the future by resorting to what seems to them the arbitrament of chance. The results of a battle and of the fall of dice are alike unknown beforehand. But the second can be tested, and men assume that the result of the first will correspond to the second. Any chance will serve; the shuffling of a pack of cards; the flight of birds; the arrangement of dregs in a cup; nothing is too trivial for the purpose. The allotment of a particular interpretation to a particular sign was of course purely arbitrary, but the method could be applied in an infinite number of ways, every one of which could be worked out to an extent only limited by the limits of the misdirected ingenuity of man. Two such forms of "divination," that is of "dividing," are mentioned by Ezekiel in his description of the king of Babylon: "The king of Babylon stood at the parting of the way, at the head of the two ways, to use divination (qecem): he shook the arrows to and fro, he consulted the teraphim, he looked in the liver" (Eze 21:21). The arrows were either marked to represent certain courses of action, and one was drawn out or shaken out, or else they were thrown promiscuously up into the air, and the augury was deduced from the way in which they fell.

3. "Looking in the Liver":

"Looking in the liver" is one of the most venerable forms of divination. Here again it was a question of "division." Each of the various parts of the liver, its lobes, the gall bladder, the ducts and so forth, had a special significance allotted to it, theory, apparently, being that the god to whom the animal was sacrificed revealed his will by the way in which he molded the organ which was supposed to be the seat of the victim's life.

It will be noted that no explicit mention is made of astrology in this catalogue of the modes of soothsaying. But astrology was, as will be shown, closely connected with Moloch-worship, and was most directly a form of "divination," that is of division. Morris Jastrow the Younger indeed considers that astrology rose from hepatoscopy, and points out that, the common designation for "planet" amongst the Babylonians is a compound ideograph, the two elements of which signify "sheep" and "dead." He considers that the sacrificial sheep was offered to the deity specially for the purpose of securing an omen. Hence, when the planets were used as omens, this name of "slain sheep" was naturally applied to them, even as "augury," divination by the flight of birds, came to represent amongst the Romans all kinds of divination. "On the famous bronze model of a liver found near Piacenza and which dating from about the 3rd century BC was used as an object-lesson for instruction in hepatoscopy, precisely as the clay model of a liver dating from the Hammurabi period was used in a Babylonian temple school, we find the edge of the liver divided into sixteen regions with names of the deities inhabiting them corresponding to divisions of the heavens in which the gods have their seats, while on the reverse side there is a line dividing the liver into 'day' and 'night.' Professor Korte, in a study of this remarkable object, summing up the results of many years of research, explains this by showing that the liver was regarded as a microcosm reflecting the macrocosm, or, in other words, the liver of the sacrificial animal from being originally a reflection of the soul or mind of the god to whom the animal was offered, was brought into connection with the observation of the heavenly bodies revealing the intention of the gods acting in concert" (Morris Jastrow, Jr., "Hepatoscopy and Astrology in Babylonia and Assyria," in Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc., 665-66). Three well-marked classes of astrology, that is to say of divination by the heavenly bodies, are mentioned in Isa 47:13, as being practiced in Babylon. "Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee."

4. The Astrologers, or Dividers of the Heavens:

The astrologers are the "dividers of the heavens" (hobhere shamayim); that is to say the significance of any stellar conjunction was made to depend upon the division of the heavens in which it occurred. The earliest of such divisions appears to have been into the four quarters, North, South, East, West, and astrological tablets of this character have been discovered in considerable numbers. Thus tablet W. A. I. III, 56, 1, gives a table of eclipses for each day of the month Tammuz up to the middle of the month, and the significance of the eclipse is connected with the quarter in which it was seen. On the first day the eclipse is associated with the South, on the second with the North, on the third with the East, and on the fourth with the West (Sayce, Astronomy and Astrology of the Babylonians, 222). Tablets of this description are very instructive since they prove that those who drew up such lists of omens had not even a rudimentary knowledge of astronomy. For the Babylonian months were intended to be natural months, yet at this time it was not realized that an eclipse of the sun could only take place when the moon was invisible, that is to say about the 28th or 29th day of the month, if the calendar was correct.

Further, it was not realized that neither sun nor moon can ever be in the North in the latitude of Babylon. Such tables of omens then were not derived, as has sometimes been supposed, from a striking event having occurred near the time of an observed eclipse, but they must have been drawn up on an entirely arbitrary plan.

The same principle of "division" was applied to the moon itself for the purpose of drawing omens from its eclipses. Thus in R. C. Thompson's Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon we read in No. 268, "The omens of all lands. The right of the moon is Akkad, the left Elam, the top Aharru, the bottom Subartu." The constellations of the zodiac also had omens allotted to them in a similar manner.

5. The Star-gazers, or Seers of the Constellations:

The astrologers mentioned in the Book of Daniel (’ashshaphim) were not "dividers of the heavens," but mutterers of incantations. The star-gazers or seers of the stars or constellations (chozim ba-kokhabhim) may be illustrated from two of Thompson's Reports. No. 216, "Saturn has appeared in Leo. When Leo is obscured, for three years lions and jackals .... and kill men"; and No. 239, "When Mars (apin) approaches Scorpio the prince will die by a scorpion's sting and his son after him will take the throne." It may be remarked that as the planet Saturn takes three years to pass through the constellation Leo, the ravages of lions are predicted to last for that time.

At a later date we find a complete system of astrology based upon the constellations of the zodiac which happen to be rising at the moment when the stars were consulted. Examples of this form of divination are found in the works of Zeuchros of Babylon, who flourished about the beginning of our era. By his day the system had received a considerable development. Twelve signs did not give much scope for prediction, so each sign had been divided into three equal portions or "decans"; each decan therefore corresponding nearly to the part of the ecliptic which the sun would pass through in a decade or "week" of 10 days of the Egyptians. A yet further complexity was brought about by associating each one of the 36 decans with one of the 36 extra-zodiacal constellations, and a further variety was obtained by associating each zodiacal constellation with its sunanatellon, or constellation rising with it; that is, at the same time; or with its paranatellon, or constellation rising beside it; that is, a constellation on the same meridian. At what time these particular forms of augury by the constellations came into use we do not know, but the division into the decans is distinctly alluded to in the 5th tablet of the Bah Creation Epic: "4. For the twelve months he (Marduk) fixed three stars."

6. The Monthly Prognosticators, or Men Who Knew the Omens of the New Moon:

The monthly prognosticators were the men who knew the omens of the new moon (modhi‘im le-chodh-ashim). At one time the error of the calendar was made the basis of prediction. This is seen in the great astrological work based on the omens drawn up for Sargon of Agade, and entitled from its opening phrase Enuma anu Bel, "When the heaven god Bel" (the "Illumination of Bel"), as, for instance, "The moon as on the 1st day is seen in its appearance on the 27th day; evil is fixed for the land of Elam"; and

"The moon as on the 1st day is seen on the 28th day: evil is fixed for the land of the Ahurru." Other omens were drawn from the position of the horns of the new moon when first seen; the right horn being assigned to the king and the left to his enemies, as in Thompson's Reports, No. 25: "When at the moon's appearance its right horn is high (literally, "long") and its left horn is low (literally, "short") the king's hand will conquer land other than this." The "monthly prognosticators" had not learned that the righthand horn is always the higher and that the amount of its elevation depends on the time of the year, or they kept the knowledge to themselves.

II. The Worship of the Heavenly Bodies the form of Idolatry to Which the Israelites Were Most Prone.

As we should naturally expect, the earliest astrological tablets relate chiefly to omens dependent upon the two great lights, the sun and moon. There is no evidence at present available to fix the date when the planets were first recognized as distinct from the fixed stars. Probably this discovery was intimately connected with the formation of the constellations; it cannot have been long delayed after it. Certainly planet-worship, and as connected with it, planetary divination, prevailed in the Euphrates valley at a very early period.

1. Chiun, Certainly the Planet Saturn:

One planet is certainly mentioned in Old Testament, and we may safely infer that the other four were known, since this particular planet is the least conspicuous both in brightness and in motion, and was therefore probably the last to be discovered. The reference to Saturn occurs in Am 5:25,26: "Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel? Yea, ye have borne the tabernacle of your king (the King James Version Moloch) and the shrine of (the King James Version Chiun) your images, the star of your god, which ye made to yourselves." This passage was quited from Septuagint by Stephen in his defense, "And they made a calf in those days, and brought a sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their hands. But God turned, and gave them up to serve the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets," `" Did ye offer unto me slain beasts and sacrifices Forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel? And ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, And the star of the god Rephan, The figures which ye made to worship them" (Ac 7:41-43).` The difference between the names Chiun and Rephan, is due either to Rephan being local Egyptian name for the planet Saturn, and therefore used by the Septuagint as its equivalent, or to an actual error of transcription in the text from which they were translating: the initial of the word being taken as resh (r) when it should have been kaph (k), r instead of k. The word should therefore be transliterated Kaivan, which was the name of the planet Saturn amongst the ancient Arabs and Syrians, while kaimanu, "constant" or "regular," was its name with the Assyrians. The English Revised Version in Am 5:26 adopts the reading of the King James Version margin, "Siccuth your king," Moloch meaning king; but the authority of the Septuagint and the parallelism of the text and its general line of thought support the reading given by some of the ancient versions and followed by the King James Version.

2. Saturn or Moloch Worship:

The difficulty of the passage is that both Amos and Stephen appear to represent the worship of the golden calf as identical with the worship of Moloch and of the planet Saturn; yet though Kaivan is only mentioned here, the nature of the reference would imply that this deity was one familiar both to speaker and hearers. The difficulty vanishes at once, if the plain statement of Stephen be accepted, that when God permitted Israel to "go after the stubbornness of their heart, that they might walk in their own counsels" (Ps 81:12) He "gave them up to serve the host of heaven." The worship of the golden calf was star worship; it was the solar bull, the constellation Taurus, in which the sun was at the time of the spring equinox, that was thus represented. The golden calf was therefore analogous to the familiar symbol of the Mithraic cult, the bull slain by Mithra, Sol Invictus, if indeed the latter did not take its origin from this apostasy of Israel.

See CALF, GOLDEN.

And Moloch the king, the idol of the Ammonites and Phoenicians, was intimately connected both with the solar bull and the planet Saturn. According to the rabbins, his statue was of brass, with a human body but the head of an ox. On the Carthaginian worship of Moloch or Saturn, Diodorus (book xx, chapter i) writes: "Among the Carthaginians there was a brazen statue of Saturn putting forth the palms of his hands bending in such a manner toward the earth, as that the boy who was laid upon them, in order to be sacrificed, should slip off, and so fall down headlong into a deep fiery furnace. Hence it is probable that Euripides took what he fabulously relates concerning the sacrifice in Taurus, where he introduces Iphigenia asking Orestes this question: ‘But what sepulchre will me dead receive, shall the gulf of sacred fire me have?’ The ancient fable likewise that is common among all the Grecians, that Saturn devoured his own children, seems to be confirmed by this law among the Carthaginians." The parallelism of the text therefore is very complete. The Israelites professed to be carrying the tabernacle of Yahweh upon which rested the Shekinah glory; but in spirit they were carrying the tabernacle of the cruelest and most malignant of all the deities of the heathen, and the light in which they were rejoicing was the star of the planet assigned to that deity.

Moloch then was the sun as king, and especially the sun as he entered upon what might be considered his peculiar kingdom, the zodiac from Taurus to Serpens and Scorpio, the period of the six summer months. The connection of the sun with Saturn may seem to us somewhat forced, but we have the most direct testimony that such a connection was believed in by the Babylonians. In Thompson’s Reports, obverse of No. 176 reads: "When the sun stands in the place of the moon, the king of the land will be secure on his throne. When the sun stands above or below the moon, the foundation of the throne will be secure." The "sun" in this inscription clearly cannot be the actual sun, and it is explained on the reverse as being "the star of the sun," the planet Saturn. No. 176 rev. reads: "Last night Saturn drew near to the moon. Saturn is the star of the sun. This is the interpretation: it is lucky for the king. The sun is the king’s star." The connection between the sun and Saturn probably arose from both being taken as symbols of Time. The return of the sun to the beginning of the zodiac marked the completion of the year. Saturn, the slowest moving of all the heavenly bodies, accomplished its revolution through the signs of the zodiac in about 30 years, a complete generation of men. Saturn therefore was in a peculiar sense the symbol of Time, and because of Time, of Destiny.

3. Mazzaloth, or Planet Worship:

The connection between the worship of the golden calves, of the heavenly host and of Moloch, and of these with divination and enchantments, is brought out very clearly in the judgment which the writer of the Book of Ki pronounces upon the apostate ten tribes: "They forsook all the commandments of Yahweh their God, and made them molten images, even two calves, and made an Asherah, and worshipped all the host of heaven, and served Baal. And they caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire, and used divination and enchantments" (2Ki 17:16,17). The sin of apostate Judah was akin to the sin of apostate Israel. In the reformation of Josiah, he put down the idolatrous priests that "burned incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets (mazzaloth), and to all the host of heaven" (2Ki 23:5). He also destroyed the ‘asherah and he "defiled Topheth .... that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech" (2Ki 23:10). "Moreover them that had familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the teraphim, and the idols, and all the abominations that were seen in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away" (2Ki 23:24). The idolatries to which the Israelites of both kingdoms were especially prone were those of the heavenly bodies, and inextricably woven with them was the passion for employing those heavenly bodies as omens, and in consequence for every kind of divination and witchcraft.

The word translated "planets" in 2Ki 23:5 is mazzaloth, closely akin to the mazzaroth of Job 38:32. This rendering probably reproduces correctly the meaning of the original. R. C. Thompson in his introduction to the Reports writes (xxvii): "The places where the gods stood in the zodiac were called manzalti, a word which means literally ‘stations,’ and we are probably right in assuming that it is the equivalent of the mazzaloth mentioned in 2Ki 23:5. The use of the word in late Hebrew is, however, somewhat more vague, for mazzal, though literally meaning a constellation of the zodiac, is also applied to any or every star, and in the Ber’shith Rabba’, cx, it is said ‘One mazzal completeth its circuit in thirty days, another completeth it in thirty years.’ " The two bodies referred to are evidently the moon with its lunation of about 30 days, and Saturn with its revolution of about 30 years; these being the two planets with the shortest and longest periods respectively. By a natural metonymy, mazzaloth, the complete circuit of the zodiac, came also to mean mazzaloth, the bodies that performed that circuit, just as in the present day we speak of a railway, which means literally the "permanent way," when we really mean the trains that travel upon it.

4. Gadh and Meni or Star Worship:

The references in Old Testament to the planets other than Saturn are not so clear. In Isa 65:11 two deities are apparently referred to: "Ye that forsake Yahweh, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for Fortune (Gad), and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny (Meni); I will destine you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter." It is clear that Gad and Meni are the titles of two closely associated deities, and Gesenius identifies them with Jupiter and Venus, the Greater and Lesser Good Fortunes of the astrologers; But as I have suggested in the Astronomy of the Bible (133, 217), if any of the heavenly bodies are here intended (which cannot as yet be considered certain), it is more probable that they are the two beautiful starclusters that stand on the head and the shoulder of the Bull at

the old commencement of the zodiac, as if they marked the gateway of the year—the Hyades and Pleiades. Both groups were considered traditionally as composed of seven stars; and the two names Gadh (the Hyades) and Meni (the Pleiades) taken together give the meaning of the "Fortunate Number," i.e. seven. The lectisternia—the spreading the table and mingling the wine to Gadh and Meni—at the beginning of the year to secure good fortune throughout its course, were therefore held about the time of the Passover, as if in parody, if indeed they were not a desecration of it: heathen rites added to one of the most solemn services of Yahweh.

5. Lucifer, the Shining Star:

The planet Venus is more distinctly referred to in Isa 14:12: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" (the King James Version). The word here rendered Lucifer, that is, "light-bearer," is the word helel corresponding to the Assyrian mustelil, "the shining star," an epithet to which the planet Venus has a preeminent claim. Mars and Mercury, the two remaining planets, are not mentioned as such in Old Testament, but the deities connected with them, Nergal = Mars (2Ki 17:30) and Nebo = Mercury (Isa 46:1), both occur.

III. Systems of Astrology.

1. Names of the Week-Days, Due to an Astrological System:

In astrology the planets were regarded as being 7 in number, but the idea that the number 7 derived its sacredness from this fact is an inversion of the true state of the case. It was that 7 being regarded as a sacred number, the number of the planets was artificially made to correspond by including in the same class as the five wandering stars, bodies that differed so widely from them in appearance as the sun and moon. So artificial a classification cannot have been primitive, and it is significant that in Ge 1:14 the sun and moon are presented as being (as indeed they appear to be) of an altogether different order from the rest of the heavenly bodies. Yet there is one feature that they have in common with the five planets: all move among the stars within the band of the zodiac; each of the seven makes the circuit of the mazzaloth.

We owe the names of the days of the week to this astrological conception of the planets as being 7 in number, and some writers (e. g. R. A. Proctor in his Myths and Marvels of Astronomy, 43-47) have supposed that the week of 7 days owed its origin to this astrological conception and that the 7th day—Saturn’s Day—became the Sabbath, the Day of Rest, because Saturn was the planet of ill-omen and it was then unlucky to undertake any work. The way in which the allotment of the planets to the days of the week was arrived at was the following. The Greek astronomers and mathematicians concluded that the planet Saturn was the most distant from the earth and that the others followed in the descending order of Jupiter, Mars, Sun, Venus, Mercury, Moon. In the progress of astrology there came a time when it was found necessary to assign a planet to every hour so as to increase the number of omens it could afford. Starting then with Saturn as presiding over the first hour of the first day, each planet was used three times over on that day, and three planets were used a fourth time. The sun, the fourth planet, took

therefore the first hour of the second day, and gave it its name, so that Sunday followed Saturday. In like manner the third day became the moon's day, and so on with the other planets which followed in the order Mars, Mercury, Jupiter, Venus, and again Saturn. This idea of the relative distances of the planets was that arrived at by the astronomers of Alexandria, and was necessarily subsequent to the reduction of the planetary motions to a mathematical system by Eudoxus and his successors. The division of the day implied was one of 24 hours, not of 12; the Egyptian division, not the Babylonian. But the Egyptian week was one of 10 days, the 7-day week was Semitic, and the week implied in the system is the free week, running on continuously, the Jewish week, not the Babylonian. For the Babylonians, though they paid some attention to the 7th day, began their reckoning afresh at the beginning of each month. This particular astrological system therefore owed its origin to four distinct nationalities. The conception of the influence of the planets was Babylonian; the mathematical working out of the order of the planets was exclusively Gr; the division of the day into 24 hours was Egyptian; the free continuous 7- day week was particularly Jewish. These four influences were brought together in Alexandria not very long before the Christian era. Here therefore and at this time, this particular system of astrology took its origin.

This form of astrology was readily adopted by the Jews in their degenerate days, as we find from references in Talmud. Thus, Rabbi Chanena said to his disciples, "Go and tell Ben Laive, the planetary influence does not depend upon days but hours. He that is born under the influence of the sun (no matter on what day) will have a beaming face"; and so the rabbi went through the whole list of the planets (Shabbath, fol 156, col. 1). The above was spoken as a criticism of Rabbi Shimon Ben Laive who had written, "Whoever is born on the first day of the week will be either a thoroughly good or a thoroughly bad man; because light and darkness was created on that day"; and the rabbi spoke similarly for the other days. We get a relic of this superstition in our nursery rhyme, "Monday's child is full of grace; Tuesday's child is fair of face," etc.; and some present-day astrologers still use the system for their forecasts. It will of course be noted that the system takes no account of the actual positions of the heavenly bodies; . the moon does not shine more or less on Monday than on any other day.

2. Origin of Modern Astrology:

It was from Alexandrian astrology that modern astrology immediately derived its form; but the original source of all astrology in the ancient world lay in the system of planetary idolatry prevalent in the Euphrates valley, and in the fact that this idolatry was practiced chiefly for the purpose of divination. At one time it was supposed that a real astronomy was cultivated at an early time in Babylonia, but Jastrow, Kugler and others have shown that this idea is without basis. The former writes, "The fact however is significant that, with perhaps some exceptions, we have in the library of Ashurbanipal representing to a large extent copies from older originals, no text that can properly be called astronomical ..... It is certainly significant that the astronomical tablets so far found belong to the latest period, and in fact to the age following on the fall of the Babylonian empire. According to Kugler the oldest dated genuinely astronomical tablet belongs to the 7th year of Cambyses, i.e. 522 BC" ("Hepatoscopy and Astrology in Babylonia and Assyria," in Proc. Amer. Phil. Soc., 667).

The conquests of Alexander the Great brought into close connection with each other the Babylonian and Greek systems of thought, and Babylonian astrology was introduced to the Greeks by Berosus the

Chaldean priest. In Greek hands, astrology was changed from its character of an oriental religion into the appearance of a science. In Babylonia the stars had been consulted for the benefit of the king as representing the state; amongst the Greeks, with their strong individualistic tendency, the fortunes of the individual became the most frequent subject of inquiry, and the idea was originated of determining the character and fortune of a man from the position of the stars at his birth—genethlialogy—a phase of astrology which never existed in the Euphrates valley. This extension rendered it necessary to increase greatly the complexities of the omens, and the progress which the Greeks had made in mathematics supplied them with the means of doing so. Thus came into existence that complex and symmetrical system of divination of which we have the earliest complete exposition in the writings of Claudius Ptolemy about 130 AD; a system which, though modified in details, is in effect that in use today.

3. "Curious Arts" of Ephesus:

Since this mathematical astrology did not come into existence until about the commencement of the Christian era, it is clear that there could not be any reference to its particular form in the Old Testament. We may probably see one reference in the New Testament (Ac 19:19). Of the converts at Ephesus it is written, "Not a few of them that practiced magical arts brought their books together and burned them in the sight of all; and they counted the price of them, and found it 50,000 pieces of silver." Books of magical incantations and prescriptions were certainly included, but it is also likely that the almanacs, tables and formulas, essential to the astrologer for the exercise of his art, were also in the number. It was of course impossible then, as now, for the convert to Christianity to consult astrologers or to practice astrological divination. Partly because it was an absurdity, for the divisions of the heavens upon which the predictions are based, are purely imaginary; the "signs" of the zodiac, and the "houses" have nothing whatsoever corresponding to them in Nature; such division is exactly that denounced by the prophets of old as qecem, "divination." Next, and of more importance, it ascribes to mere creatures, the planets or the spirits supposed to preside over them, the powers that belong to God alone; it was and is essentially idolatrous. As one of the chief living astrologers puts it, "The TRUE astrologer believes that the sun is the body of the Loges of this solar system, ‘in Him we live and move and have our being.’ The planets are his angels, being modifications in the consciousness of the Loges" (Knowledge, XXIII, 228). Astrology is indeed referred to in the Old Testament, with other forms of divination, and the idolatry inherent in them, but they are only mentioned in terms of the most utter reprobation. The Jews alone of all the nations of antiquity were taught by their religion neither to resort to such arts nor to be afraid of the omens deduced from them. Isaiah knew the Lord to be He that "frustrateth the signs of the liars, and maketh diviners mad" (Isa 44:25), and Jeremiah declared, "Thus saith Yahweh, Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the nations are dismayed at them" (Jer 10:2). And what held good for the Jews of old holds good for us today. Above all, astrology is an attempt to ascertain the will of God by other means than those which He has appointed—His Son, who is the Way and the Truth and the Life, and His Holy Scriptures in which we learn of Him, and which are able to make us "wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2Ti 3:15).

LITERATURE.

Franz Boll, Sphaera: Neue griechische Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Sternbilder, 1903;

Kugler, Kulturhistorische Bedeutung der babylonischen Astronomie, 1907; Sternkunde und Sterndienst in Babel; E. W. Maunder, Astronomy of the Bible, 1908; The Bible and Astronomy, Annual Address before the Victoria Institute, 1908; E. W. Maunder and A. S. D. Maunder, "Note on the Date of the Passage of the Vernal Equinox from Taurus into Aries," in Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, LXIV, 488-507; also three papers on "The Oldest Astronomy" in Journal of the British Astronomical Association, VIII, 373; IX, 317; XIV, 241; R. A. Proctor, Myths and Marvels of Astronomy; R. C. Thompson, Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon; G. V. Schiaparelli, Astronomy in the Old Testament; also two papers, "I Primordi" and "I Progressi dell’ Astronomia presso i Babilonesi," in Rivista di Scienzia, 1908; C. Virolleaud, L’astrologie chaldeenne. Le livre intitule "Enuma Anu Bel," 1908, 1909.

E. W. Maunder

ASTRONOMY, I

as-tron’-omi:

I. THE HEAVENLY BODIES

1. The Ordinances of Heaven

2. The Sun

(1) The Names for the Sun

(2) The "City of the Sun"

(3) The Greater Light-Giver

(4) The Purpose of the Sun

(5) The Sun as a Type

3. The Moon

(1) The Names for the Moon

(2) The Lesser Light-Giver

(3) Phases of the Moon

4. Signs

(1) Solar and Lunar Eclipses

(2) The Wings of the Morning

5. Seasons

(1) The Meaning of the Word

(2) Natural Seasons for Worship

(3) The Hallowing of the Seventh

(4) The Jubilee a Luni-solar Cycle

(5) The 19-Year Luni-solar Cycle

(6) The Jewish Ritual Preexilic

(7) The Luni-solar Cycles of Daniel

6. The Stars

(1) Their Number

(2) Their Distance

(3) Their Brightness

7. Morning Stars

The Stars as a Dial

8. Falling Stars

(1) Meteorites

(2) The Star "Wormwood"

9. Wandering Stars

(1) Comets as a Spiritual Type

(2) Comets Referred to in Scripture?

II. THE CONSTELLATIONS

1. Nachash, the "Crooked Serpent"

2. Leviathan

3. The Seed of the Woman

4. The Bow Set in the Cloud

5. The Dragon of Eclipse

6. Joseph’s Dream

7. The Standards of the Tribes

8. The Cherubim

9. Balaam’s Prophecy

10. Pleiades

11. Orion

12. Mazzaroth, the Constellations of the Zodiac

13. "Arcturus"

(1) The "Scatterers," or the North

(2) The Ordinances of Heaven Established on the Earth

14. The Date of the Book of Job

III. PHYSIOGRAPHY

1. The Circle of the Earth

(1) The Earth a Sphere

(2) The North Stretched out over Empty Space

(3) The Corners of the Earth

2. The Pillars of the Earth

3. The Firmament

(1) The Hebrew Conception

(2) The Alexandrian Conception

4. The Windows of Heaven

5. Rain

6. Clouds

7. The Deep

(1) Meaning of the Word

(2) The Babylonian Dragon of Chaos

LITERATURE

The keynote of the Hebrew writers respecting the heavenly bodies is sounded in Ps 8: "When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers, The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained; What is man, that thou art mindful of him? And the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him but little lower than God, And crownest him with glory and honor. Thou makest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands; Thou hast put all things under his feet" (Ps 8:3-6). The heavenly bodies were inexpressibly glorious, and they were all the handiwork of Yahweh—without power or vitality of their own—and man, not by any inherent virtue, but by the will and grace of God, was superior to them in importance. Thus there was a great gulf fixed between the superstitions of the heathen who worshipped the sun, moon and stars as gods, and the faith of the pious Hebrew who regarded them as

things made and moved by the will of one only God. And it followed from this difference that the Hebrew, beyond all nations of like antiquity, was filled with a keen delight in natural objects and phenomena, and was attentively observant of them.

I. The Heavenly Bodies.

1. The Ordinances of Heaven:

To the sacred writers, the ordinances of heaven taught the lesson of Order—great, magnificent and immutable. Day by day, the sun rose in the east, "as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber" (Ps 19:5), and pursued unswervingly his appointed path across the sky, to his going down. Night by night, the stars, the "host of heaven," moved in their "highways" or "courses" (mecillah), and the words of Joe (2:7) respecting the Assyrian army might be applied to them. "They march every one on his ways, and they break not their ranks. Neither doth one thrust another; they march every one in his path." Some wheeled in northern circuits that were wholly seen; some swept in long courses from their rising in the East to their setting in the West; some scarcely lifted themselves above the southern horizon. Little wonder that this celestial army on the march, "the host of heaven," suggested to the Hebrews a comparison with the "angels," the unseen messengers of God who in their "thousands of thousands ministered unto him" (Da 7:10).

But, as the year revolved, the dial of stars in the North shifted round; whilst of the other stars, those in the West disappeared into the light of the setting sun, and new stars seemed to spring out of the dawning light. There was thus a yearly procession of the stars as well as a nightly one. And to this "ordinance of the heaven" the Hebrews noted that there was an answer from the earth, for in unfailing correspondence came the succession of seasons, the revival of vegetation, the ripening of harvest and of fruits, the return of winter’s cold. Of them God asked the question: "Knowest thou the ordinances of the heavens? Canst thou establish the dominion thereof in the earth?" (Job 38:33), and they recognized that to this question no answer could be given, for these ordinances of heaven were the sign and evidence of Almighty wisdom, power and unchangeableness. "Thus saith Yahweh, who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night .... Yahweh of hosts is his name" (Jer 31:35).

We have no writings of the early Hebrews other than the books of the Old Testament, and in them there is no record of any research into the mechanical explanation of the movements of the heavenly bodies. Nor should we expect to find in them a record of the research if such were made, since the purpose of Holy Scripture was, not to work out the relation of thing to thing—the inquiry to which modern science is devoted—but to reveal God to man. Therefore the lesson which is drawn from the observed ordinances of heaven is, not that the earth rotates on its axis or revolves round the sun, but that God is faithful to His purpose for mankind. "Thus saith Yahweh: If my covenant of day and night stand not, if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I also cast away the seed of Jacob, and of David my servant" (Jer 33:25,26). And "the glory of God" which "the heavens declare" is not only His almighty power, but the image which the order and perfection of the heavenly movements supply of

the law which He has revealed unto man. The "speech" that they "utter," the "knowledge" that they "show" is: "The law of Yahweh is perfect, restoring the soul" (Ps 19:7).

2. The Sun:

(1) The Names for the Sun.

Four words are translated "sun" in the Old Testament:

(a) Or simply means "light" and is usually rendered thus, but in one instance (Job 31:26), being in antithesis to "moon," it is given as "sun," the great light-giver.

(b) Chammah means "heat" and is used for the sun when this is in association with lebhanah or "snow-white" for the moon, as in Isa 24:23, ‘Then the snow-white (moon) shall be confounded, and the heat (sun) ashamed,’ the antithesis being drawn between the cold light of the silver moon and the fiery radiance, of the glowing sun.

(c) Shemesh, the Samas of the Babylonians, is a primitive word, probably with the root meaning of "ministrant." This is the word most frequently used for the sun, and we find it used topographically as, for instance, in Beth-shemesh, "the house of the sun." Four places of this name are mentioned in the Old Testament: one in Judah, a Levitical city, to which the two milch kine bearing the ark took their straight way from the country of the Philistines; one on the border of Issachar; one in Naphtali, a fenced city; and one in Egypt, supposed to be the same as Heliopolis or On, the city of Asenath, wife of Joseph.

(d) Cherec means "blister" or "burning heat," from a root "to scratch" or "be rough," and is an unusual term for the sun, and its precise rendering is sometimes in doubt. Once it is translated as "itch," when it occurs amongst the evils threatened in the "cursings" that the six tribes uttered from Mount Ebal (De 28:27). Once it is certainly used of the sun itself when Job (9:7) said of God, He "commandeth the sun (cherec or cheres), and it riseth not." Once it is certainly the name of a hill, for Mount Heres was near Aijalon, on the borders of Judah and Dan. In another passage, authorities differ in their rendering, for when Gideon overcame Zebah and Zalmunna (Jud 8:13), he "returned from the battle," according to the King James Version, "before the sun was up," but according to the Revised Version (British and American), "from the ascent of Heres." In yet another passage (Jud 14:18), when the Philistines answered Samson’s riddle, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) translation cherec as sun—"before the sun went down." We moreover get slight variants of the same word, joined with qir ("wall" or "fortress"), in Qir-Chareseth (2Ki 3:25; Isa 16:7) and Qir-Cheres (Isa 16:11; Jer 48:31,36). These are probably to be identified with the modern Kerak of Moab.

(2) The "City of the Sun".

But the most interesting reference is found in Isa 19:18: "In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Yahweh of hosts; one shall be called The city

of destruction." The word here rendered "destruction" is in Hebrew herec, which has that meaning, but Gesenius and other authorities would substitute for the initial letter, he, the letter, cheth, which it so closely resembles, and so read it "The city of the sun." With this reading it was identified with On, that is, Heliopolis (the city of the sun), and on this belief Onias, the son of Onias the high priest, persuaded Ptolemy Philometor to allow him to build a temple to Yahweh in that prefecture, 149 BC (Ant., XIII, iii, 1).

(3) The Greater Light-Giver.

(e) Yet a fifth expression is used to denote the sun, and in one respect it is the most important and significant of all. In the creation narrative it is called the greater light or rather light-giver (ma'or): 'And God made the two great light-givers; the greater light-giver to rule the day, and the lesser light-giver to rule the night: He made the stars also' (Ge 1:16). The extreme simplicity of this passage is most significant. In marked contrast to the Bah creation poem, which by its more complex astronomy reveals its later origin (see post, section II, 12, Mazzaroth), the sun and moon have no distinctive names assigned to them; there is no recognition of the grouping of the stars into constellations, none of any of the planets. The celestial bodies could not be referred to in a more simple manner. And this simplicity is marred by no myth; there is not the faintest trace of the deification of sun or moon or stars; there is no anthropomorphic treatment, no suggestion that they formed the vehicles for spirits. They are described as they were observed when they were first noticed by men, simply as "light-givers" of different brightness. It is the expression of man's earliest observation of the heavenly bodies, but it is real observation, free from any taint of savage fantasies; it marks the very first step in astronomy. No record, oral or written, has been preserved to us of a character more markedly primitive than this.

(4) The Purpose of the Sun.

Two purposes for the great heavenly bodies are indicated in Ge 1:14,15. The sun and moon are appointed to give light and to measure time. These, from the human and practical point of view, are the two main services which they render to us. Their purpose for measuring time by their movements will be taken up under another heading; but here it may be pointed out that when it is stated in the Book of The Wisdom of Solomon (7:18) that King Solomon knew "the alternations of the solstices and the changes of seasons," the reference is to the whole cycle of changes from winter through summer back to winter again. From winter onward the places of sunrise and sunset move northward along the horizon until midsummer when for some days they show no change—the "solstice" is reached; then from midsummer onward the movement "turns" southward until midwinter, when again a "solstice" is reached, after which the places of sunrise and sunset again move northward. This changing place of sunrise is also referred to when God asked Job (38:12-14): Hast thou "caused the dayspring to know its place," and the passage goes on, "It (the earth) is changed as clay under the seal; and all things stand forth as a garment." As the shapeless clay takes form under the pressure of the seal, as the garment, shapeless while folded up, takes form when the wearer puts it on, so the earth, shapeless during the darkness, takes form and relief and color with the impress upon it of the dawning light. In the New Testament when James (1:17) speaks of "the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation (parallage), neither shadow that is cast by turning (trope)" he is using astronomical technical terms for these same apparent movements of the sun.

(5) The Sun as a Type.

But the apparent unchangeability of the sun makes it, as it were, a just measure of eternal duration (Ps 72:5,17). The penetration of its rays renders "under the sun" (Ec 1:9) a fit expression for universality of place, and on the other hand the fierceness of its heat as experienced in Palestine makes it equally suitable as a type of oppression and disaster, so the sun is said, in Scripture, to "smite" those oppressed by its heat (Ps 121:6).

But it was in its light-giving and ministering power that the Hebrew writers used the sun as a type to set forth the power and beneficence of God. Words are the symbols of ideas and it was only by this double symbolism that it was possible to express in intelligible human speech, and to make men partly apprehend some of the attributes of God. So we find in the Ps of pilgrimage (Ps 84:11) "Yahweh God is a sun and a shield"; Malachi (4:2) foretells that "the sun of righteousness shall arise with healing in its wings." But the old Hebrew writers were very guarded and careful in the symbolism they used, whether of word or illustration. Men in those days terribly perverted the benefits which they received through the sun, and made them the occasion and excuse for plunging into all kinds of nature worship and of abominable idolatries. It was not only clear thinking on the part of the sacred writers that made them refer all the benefits that came to them in the natural world direct to the action of God; it was a necessity for clean living. There is no bottom to the abyss in which men plunged when they "worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever" (Ro 1:25).

In New Testament times, though men were no less prone to evil, the fashion of that evil was changing. "The pillars of Beth- shemesh" were broken down (Jer 43:13), idolatry was beginning to fall into disrepute and men were led away rather by "the knowledge (gnosis) which is falsely so called" (1Ti 6:20). The apostles could therefore use symbolism from the natural world more freely, and so we find John speaking of our Lord as "There was the true light, even the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world" (Joh 1:9), and again, "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1Jo 1:5); and again, that the glory of the New Jerusalem shall be that "the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb" (Re 21:23); while the great modern discovery that nearly every form of terrestrial energy is derived ultimately from the energy of the sun’s rays, gives a most striking appropriateness to the imagery of James that ‘Every good gift and perfect boon is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning’ (Jas 1:17 the English Revised Version).

3. The Moon:

(1) The Names for the Moon.

Three words are translated "moon" in the Old Testament, not including cases where "month" has been rendered "moon" for the sake of a more flowing sentence: (a) Lebhanah, "white"; a poetic expression, used in connection with chammah, "heat," for the sun.

(b) Chodhesh, "new moon," meaning "new," "fresh." As the Hebrews reckoned their months from the actual first appearance of the young crescent, chodhesh is most frequently translated "month." Thus "In the six hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month" (Ge 7:11), and in the great majority of cases, the word for month is chodhesh, "new moon." In Isa 66:23, "from one new moon to another," should be literally, "from new moon to new moon." Once it is rendered "monthly" (Isa 47:13), when it is used to denote the astrologers who fixed the omens of the opening month. Chodhesh, therefore, when translated "new moon" is not a designation of the actual heavenly body, but denotes the first day of the month. It is a term directly or indirectly connected with the calendar.

(c) Yareach, probably "wandering," a very appropriate primitive term for the moon, since her motion among the stars from night to night is sufficiently rapid to have caught the attention of very early observers. Its use therefore as the proper name for the "lesser light" indicates that the systematic observation of the heavenly bodies had commenced, and that the motion of the moon, relative to the stars, had been recognized.

Yerach, "month," is twice translated "moon" (De 33:14; Isa 60:20), but without any great reason for the variation in either case.

(2) The Lesser Light-Giver.

The direct references in Scripture to the moon as a light-giver are not numerous, but those that occur are significant of the great importance of moonlight in ancient times, when artificial lights were few, expensive and dim, and the lighting of streets and roads was unthought of. To shepherds, the moon was of especial assistance, and many of the people of Israel maintained the habits of their forefathers and led the shepherd’s life long after the settlement of the nation in Palestine. The return of the moonlit portion of the month was therefore an occasion for rejoicing and for solemn thanks to God, and the "new moon" as well as the Sabbath was a day of special offerings. On the other hand one of the judgments threatened against the enemies of God was that the light of the moon should be withheld. The threat made against Pharaoh is "I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give its light" (Eze 32:7); and in the day of the Lord denounced against Babylon, "The sun shall be darkened in its going forth, and the moon shall not cause its light to shine" (Isa 13:10). But among the glories of the restoration of Israel it is promised that "the light of the moon (lebhanah) shall be as the light of the sun (chammah)" (Isa 30:26).

(3) Phases of the Moon.

There is no direct mention of the phases of the moon in Scripture; a remarkable fact, and one that illustrates the foolishness of attempting to prove the ignorance of the sacred writers by the argument from silence, since it is not conceivable that men at any time were ignorant of the fact that the moon changes her apparent shape and size. So far from the Hebrews being plunged in such a depth of more than savage ignorance, they based their whole calendar on the actual observation of the first appearance of the young crescent. In two passages in the Revised Version (British and American) we find the

expression "at the full moon," keceh (Ps 81:3; Pr 7:20), but though this is what is intended, the literal meaning of the word is doubtful, and may be that given in the King James Version, "at the day appointed." In another passage already quoted, there is a reference to the dark part of the month. "Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon (yerach, "month") withdraw itself"—the "withdrawn" part of the month being the time near new moon when the moon is nearly in conjunction with the sun and therefore invisible.

The periodical changes of the moon are its ordinances (Jer 31:35). It was also appointed for "seasons" (Ps 104:19), that is, for religious assemblies or feasts (mo‘adhim). Two of these were held at the full of the moon, the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles; one at the new moon, the Feast of Trumpets; but the ordinary new moon did not rank among the great "appointed feasts" (mo‘adhim). As light-giver, assisting men in their labors with the flock and in the field and helping them on their journeys; as time-measurer, indicating the progress of the months and the seasons for the great religious festivals, the moon was to the pious Hebrew an evidence of the goodness and wisdom of God.

The "round tires like the moon" worn by the daughters of Zion (Isa 3:18 the King James Version), and those on the camels of Zeba and Zalmunna (Jud 8:21 King James Version, margin), were designated by the same Hebrew word, saharonim, translated in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) as lunulae, and were little round ornaments, probably round like crescents, not discs like the full moon.

Jericho possibly means "the city of the moon," and Jerah, "moon," was the name of one of the sons of Joktan.

4. Signs:

(1) Solar and Lunar Eclipses .

The sun and moon were not only given "for days and years" (Ge 1:14), but also "for signs," and in no way do they better fulfill what was in the old time understood by this word than in their eclipses. Nothing in Nature is more impressive than a total eclipse of the sun; the mysterious darkness, the sudden cold, the shining forth of the weird corona, seen at no other time, affect even those who know its cause, and strike unspeakable terror in those who cannot foresee or understand it. In bygone ages an eclipse of the sun was counted an omen of disaster, indeed as itself the worst of disasters, by all nations except that one to whom the word of the prophet came: "Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the nations are dismayed at them" (Jer 10:2). To the Hebrew prophets, eclipses were "signs" of the power and authority of God who forbade them to be alarmed at portents which distressed the heathen.

The phenomena of both solar and lunar eclipses are briefly but unmistakably described by several of the prophets. Joe refers to them twice (2:10,31), the second time very definitely: "The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood," and this was quoted by Peter on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 2:19,20). John also says that when the sixth seal was opened "the sun became black as sackcloth of hair,

and the whole moon became as blood" (Re 6:12). When the new moon in its revolution or turning comes exactly between the earth and the sun, and its shadow—the "shadow that is cast by turning" of Jas 1:17—falls on the earth, the sun is completely hidden and its glowing discovered is replaced by the dark body of the moon; "the sun is turned into darkness." When the shadow of the earth falls upon the full moon, and the only rays from the sun that reach it have passed through an immense thickness of our atmosphere and are therefore of a dull copper-red color like clotted blood, "the moon is turned into blood."

(2) The Wings of the Morning.

But a solar eclipse is not solely darkness and terror. Scarcely has the dark moon hidden the last thread of sunlight than a beautiful pearly halo, the corona, is seen surrounding the blackness. This corona changes its shape from one eclipse to another, but the simplest form is that of a bright ring with outstretched wings, and is characteristic of times when the sun has but few spots upon it. This form appears to have been the origin of the sacred symbol of the ring or discovered with wings, so frequently figured on Egyptian, Babylonian and Persian monuments. It is possible that these coronal "wings of the sun" may have been in the mind of the prophet Malachi when he wrote, "Unto you that fear my name shall the sun of righteousness arise with healing in its wings" (Mal 4:2). The metaphor "wings of the morning" of Ps 139:9 is however more probably due to the long streamers, the crepuscular rays, seen at dawn when the sun rises behind a low bank of clouds.

Total eclipses of the moon must frequently have been visible in Palestine as in other countries, but only two or three total eclipses of the sun were visible there during Old Testament history; that of 831 BC, August 15, was total in Judea, and that of 824 BC, April 2, very nearly total. It has been suggested that two eclipses of the sun were predicted in the Old Testament—that of Nineveh, 763 BC, June 15, in Am 8:9, and that of Thales, 585 BC, May 28, in Isa 13:10, but the suggestion has little to support it.

5. Seasons:

(1) The Meaning of the Word.

The sun and moon were appointed "to give light upon the earth," and "for signs," and "for days and years." They were also appointed "for seasons" (mo‘adhim), i. e. "appointed assemblies." These seasons were not primarily such seasons as the progress of the year brings forth in the form of changes of weather or of the condition of vegetation; they were seasons for worship. The word mo‘edh occurs some 219 times; in 149, it is translated "congregation," and in about 50 other instances by "solemn assembly" or some equivalent expression. Thus before ever man was created, God had provided for him times to worship and had appointed two great lights of heaven to serve as signals to call to it.

The appointed sacred seasons of the Jews form a most complete and symmetrical series, developing from times indicated by the sun alone to times indicated by the sun and moon together, and completed in times indicated by luni-solar cycles.

(2) Natural Seasons for Worship.

The sun alone indicated the hours for daily worship; at sunrise, when the day began, there was the morning sacrifice; at sunset, when the day closed, there was the evening sacrifice.

The moon indicated the time for monthly worship; when the slender crescent of the new moon was first seen in the western sky, special sacrifices were ordained with the blowing of trumpets over them.

The sun and moon together marked the times for the two great religious festivals of the year. At the beginning of the bright part of the year, when the moon was full in the first month of spring, the Passover, followed by the Feast of Unleavened Bread, was held. At the end of the bright part of the year, when the moon was full in the first month of autumn, the Feast of Tabernacles was held. These may all be termed natural seasons for worship, obviously marked out as appropriate. The beginning and close of the bright part of the day, and of the bright part of the year, and the beginning of the bright part of the month, have been observed by many nations.

(3) The Hallowing of the Seventh.

But that which was distinctive in the system of the Jewish festivals was the hallowing of the seventh: the seventh day, the seventh week, the seventh month, the seventh year were all specially marked out. The sun alone indicated the Sabbath by the application of the sacred number seven to the unit of time given by the day. For the period of seven days, the week was not dependent upon any phase of the moon’s relation to the sun; it was not a quarter month, but a free week, running on independently of the month. The Jewish Sabbath therefore differed from the Babylonian, which was tied to the lunar month. The same principle was applied also to the year; every seventh year was set apart, as a period of rest, the Sabbatic year. Every seventh day, every seventh year, was thus observed. But for the week and month, the principle of hallowing the seventh came into operation only once in each year. The Feast of Pentecost, or as it was also called, the Feast of Weeks, was held at the close of the seventh week from the morrow after the Sabbath of Unleavened Bread; and the new moon of the seventh month was held as a special feast, the Feast of Trumpets, "a holy convocation. Ye shall do no servile work" (Le 23:24,25). The other new moons of the year were not thus distinguished.

The weekly Sabbath, the Passover, Pentecost, and the Feasts of Trumpets and of Tabernacles, with one other day of solemnity, were in an especial sense, the mo‘adhim of the Lord.

The seventh day was especially the day of worship, and to correspond, the seventh month was especially the month of worship; and this, not only because it was ushered in with peculiar solemnity, and included one of the chief great feasts of the year, but because it furnished the culminating ceremony of the entire Jewish system, the great Day of Atonement, held on the tenth day of the month, and therefore on a day not marked directly by any phase of the moon. The Day of Atonement purged away the offenses of the past year, and restored Israel to the full enjoyment of the Divine favor.

(4) The Jubilee a Luni-solar Cycle.

The Jewish month was a natural month, based upon the actual observation of the young crescent. The Jewish year was a natural year, that is, a solar tropical year, based upon actual observation of the ripening of the grain. But there is not an exact number of days in a lunar month, nor is there an exact number of months in a solar year; twelve lunar months falling short of the year, by eleven days; so that in three years the error would amount to more than a complete month, and to restore the balance a thirteenth month would have to be intercalated. As the months were determined from actual observation, and as observation would be interrupted from time to time by unfavorable weather, it was necessary to have some means for determining when intercalation would take place, irrespective of it. And this was provided by carrying the principle of hallowing the seventh, one stage farther. Not only was the seventh of the day, week, month and year distinguished, but the seventh week of years was marked by the blowing of the trumpet of Jubilee on the Day of Atonement. The Day of Atonement meant the restitution of Israel to the Divine favor; the blowing of the trumpet of Jubilee every forty-ninth year meant "the restitution of all things"; every Hebrew in servitude returned to freedom, all land, mortgaged or sold, returned to its original owner.

And this period of 49 solar years was astronomically a period of restitution, for the sun and moon returned nearly to their original positions relative to each other, since 49 solar years are 606 lunar months with an error of only 32 hours. So that though the Jubilee period is not a perfect lunar cycle, it was quite exact enough to guide the Jewish priests in drawing up their calendar in cases where the failure of observation had given rise to some doubt.

The beginning of each month was marked by the blowing of the two silver trumpets (chatsotserah: Nu 10:2,10). The beginning of the civil, that is to say, of the agricultural year, was marked by a special blowing of trumpets (teruʻah), giving the name "Feast of Trumpets" to that new moon (Le 23:24; Nu 29:1). And the beginning of a new cycle of 49 years was marked by the Jubilee, the loud trumpet (shophar: Le 25:9). Thus the cycle of the Jubilee made symmetrical, completed, and welded together all the moʻadhim of the Lord—the two great lights were set "for seasons."

(5) The 19-Year Luni-solar Cycle.

The cycle of the Jubilee was sufficient for the purposes of the religious calendar so long as the nation inhabited its own land, since from its small extent there would be no conflict of time reckoning and it would be easy to notify the appearance of the new moon from one end of the country to the other. But after the captivities, when the people were scattered from Gozan of the Medes to Syene on the Nile, it was necessary to devise some method by which the Jews, however far they had been dispersed, would be able to reckon for themselves as to when the moon was new for Jerusalem. We have lately learned from the discovery of a number of Aramaic papyri at Syene that there was a colony of Jews there who used a calendar constructed, not from observation, but from calculation based upon a very exact luni-solar cycle (E. B. Knobel, "Ancient Jewish Calendar Dates in Aramaic Papyri," Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society, LXVIII, 334). This cycle, known to us by the name of its supposed

discoverer, Meton, is one of 19 years, which is only two hours short of 235 complete months. As this Jewish colony appears to have been founded after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of Jerusalem by some of the refugees who fled into Egypt with Johanan the son of Kareah (Jer 40-44), this acquaintance with the Metonic cycle cannot have been due to Babylonian influence. Nor can it have been due to Egyptian, since the Egyptians did not use or require any such cycle, their year being a solar one of 365 days. Indeed no other nation appears to have been aware of it until, a generation later, Meton, the Athenian, won immortal fame by announcing it. The evidence of these Syene papyri renders it probable that Meton did not himself discover the cycle but learned it from Jewish sources. Many of the Semitic nations used, like the Jews, a natural month in conjunction with the natural year, but the Jews were the most likely to have discovered this cycle, since they alone had their worship centralized at a single shrine which became, in consequence, their standard observatory for their observation of the new moon. These observations, therefore, would all be comparable, and during the 400 years that the Temple stood, it must have been quite clear to them that the 19-year cycle not only gave them seven, the sacred number, of intercalated months, but brought the setting places of the new moons to the same points of the western horizon and in the same order.

It is clear from the evidence of these Syene papyri that the Jews, there, used the 19-year cycle both for fixing the day of the new moon, and in order to determine when a thirteenth month had to be intercalated, an illustration of the futility of "the argument from silence," for so far from there being any notice in Scripture of the use of a cycle for determining intercalation, there is no mention of intercalation at all.

(6) The Jewish Ritual Preexilic.

Ever since this date of the Captivity, the 19-year cycle has been used by the Jews, and it gives to us the "Golden Number" which is employed in fixing the date of Easter in our own ecclesiastical calendar. Since the 19-year cycle has been in use ever since the Captivity, the 49-year cycle, the Jubilee, cannot have been an exilic or post-exilic innovation. In this fact we find the decision of the controversy which has so long divided critics as to whether the ritual legislation of the Jews dated from before or from after their captivity. We may take Kuenen as representing the more recent school: "Even the later prophets and historians, but more especially and emphatically those that lived before the Exile, were unacquainted with any ritual legislation, and specifically with that which has come down to us" (The Hexateuch, 273-74). "In determining its antiquity we must begin by considering its relation to Deuteronomy, to which it is evidently subsequent. .... This comes out most clearly in the legislation concerning the feasts. Other indications though less unequivocal, plead for the same relationship. In the next place the legislation itself gives evidence of the date of its origin, and those data which justify a positive inference point to the Babylonian captivity. .... It would follow that the 'legislation of sanctity' arose in the second half of the Babylonian captivity, presumably shortly before its close; and there is not a single valid objection to this date" (ibid., 276). Kuenen was evidently unaware of the astronomical relations concerned in the ritual legislation, and was unable to anticipate the striking discoveries made from the Syene papyri. More recent knowledge has reversed the verdict which he pronounced so confidently. The traditional view, that the Hebrew ritual preceded the Captivity, was correct. For the Jubilee, with which the Day of Atonement was bound up, was both the culmination and the completion

of the entire ritual, and, since the period of the Jubilee, as a luni- solar cycle, was preexilic, the ritual, as a system, must have been preexilic likewise.

(7) The Luni-solar Cycles of Daniel.

The seasons for which the sun and moon were appointed are mentioned in yet another connection. In the last vision given to Daniel the question was asked, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?" and it was answered, "It shall be for a time, times (dual), and a half; and when they have made an end of breaking in pieces the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished" (Da 12:6,7). From the parallel passage in Da 7:25, where it is said of the fourth beast, "He shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given into his hand until a time (‘iddan) and times (dual) and half a time," it is inferred that mo‘edh in the first instance stands, like ‘iddan in the second, for a year; or the period is equivalent to half a week of years. The parallel passages in Re 11:2,3; 12:6,14; 13:5 have caused these years to be taken as conventional years of 360 days, each year being made up of 12 conventional months of 30 days, and on the year-day principle of interpretation, the entire period indicated would be one of 1,260 tropical years. This again is a luni-solar cycle, since 1,260 years contain 15,584 months correct to the nearest day. To the same prophet Daniel a further chronological vision was given, and a yet more perfect cycle indicated. In answer to the question, "How long shall be the vision concerning the continual burnt-offering, and the transgression that maketh desolate, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?" the answer was returned, "Unto two thousand and three hundred evenings and mornings; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed" (Da 8:13,14). Whatever may be the prophetic significance of the passage its astronomical significance is clear: 840,057 days are precisely 2,300 solar years, or 28,447 lunar months, or 30,487 anomalistic months, the anomalistic month being the period in which the moon travels from perigee to perigee. It is the most perfect lunisolar cycle known, and restores the two great lights exactly to their former relationship. This fullest "season" indicated by the sun and moon is given as that for the cleansing of the sanctuary, for the bringing in, as it were, of the full and perfect Jubilee.

It is not possible at present to decide as to whether the Jews had learnt of this cycle and its significance from their astronomical observations. If so, they must have been far in advance in mathematical science of all other nations of antiquity. If not, then it must have been given to them by Divine revelation, and its astronomical significance has been left for modern science to reveal.

6. The Stars:

As with the sun and moon, the stars are regarded under the two aspects of light-givers and time-measurers; or, in other words, as marking the seasons.

(1) Their Number.

But two other ideas are also strongly dwelt upon; the stars and the heaven of which they form the "host" are used to express the superlatives of number and of height. "Look now toward heaven, and number the

stars, if thou be able to number them" (Ge 15:5); "As the host of heaven cannot be numbered" (Jer 33:22) are a few of the passages in which the stars are used for limitless number. Those separately visible to the naked eye at any one time do not exceed 2,000 in number, but it was just as evident to the Hebrews of old, as it was to Ptolemy, the astronomer of Alexandria, that beside the stars separately visible, there is a background, a patterned curtain of light, which indicates by its granular and mottled appearance that it is made up of countless myriads of stars, too faint to be individually detected, too close to be individually defined. The most striking feature of this curtain is the grand stellar stream that we call the Milky Way, but the mind easily recognizes that the minute points of light, composing its pattern, are as really stars as the great leaders of the constellations. Later astronomy has confirmed the testimony of the prophets that the stars are without number. The earliest star catalogue, that of Hipparchus, contained a little over one thousand stars; the great International Photographic Chart will show the images of more than fifty millions, and there are photographs which show more than a hundred thousand stars on a single plate. The limit that has been reached is due only to the limited power of our telescopes or the limited time of exposure of the photographs, not to any limitation in the number of stars. To us today, as to the Psalmist of old, it is a token of the infinite power and knowledge of God that "He telleth the number of the stars; He giveth them all their names" (Ps 147:4 the King James Version).

(2) Their Distance.

As regards the height, that is to say, the distance of the stars, this is immeasurable except in a very few cases. By using as a base line the enormous diameter of the earth’s orbit—186,000,000 miles—astronomers have been able to get a hint as to the distance of some 40 or 50 stars. Of these the nearest, Alpha Centauri, is distant about twenty-five millions of millions of miles; the brighter stars are on the average quite ten times as far; whilst of the distances of the untold millions of stars beyond, we have no gauge. For us, as for King Solomon, the "heaven" of the stars is "for height" (Pr 25:3), for a height that is beyond measure, giving us therefore the only fitting image for the immensity of God. So Zophar the Naamathite asked, "Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is high as heaven; what canst thou do?" And Eliphaz the Temanite reiterated the same thought, "Is not God in the height of heaven? And behold the height of the stars, how high they are!" (Job 11:7,8; 22:12). And the height of the heaven, that is to say, the distance of the stars, stands as a symbol, not only of God’s infinitude, but of His faithfulness and of His mercy: "Thus saith Yahweh: If heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, then will I also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith Yahweh" (Jer 31:37). And the Psalmist sings, "For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is his mercy toward them that fear him" (Ps 103:11 the King James Version).

(3) Their Brightness.

The stars are not all of equal brightness; a fact alluded to by Paul when he wrote that "one star differeth from another star in glory" (1Co 15:41). The ancient Greek astronomers divided the stars according to their brightness into six classes or magnitudes, to use the modern technical term, the average star in any particular magnitude giving about two and a half times as much light as the average star of the next magnitude.

Just as the number of the stars and their ordered movement led them to be considered as a mighty army, "the host of heaven," and as a type of that other celestial host, the holy angels, so the individual stars are taken as fitly setting forth, by their brightness and exalted position, spiritual powers and intelligences, whether these are the angels of God, as in Job 38:7, or rulers of churches, as in Re 1:20. The same image is naturally applied in a yet higher sense to Christ Himself, who is the "star out of Jacob" (Nu 24:17), and "the bright, the morning star" (Re 22:16; 2Pe 1:19).

7. Morning Stars:

The Stars as a Dial

In ancient times there were two methods by which the progress of the year could be learned from observation of the heavens. The sun was "for seasons," and the change in its place of rising or of setting supplied the first method. The second method was supplied by the stars. For as the Hebrew shepherds, such as Jacob, Moses, David and Amos, kept watch over their flocks by night, they saw the silent procession of the stars through the hours of darkness, and knew without clock or timepiece how they were progressing. They noticed what stars were rising in the East, what stars were culminating in the South, what were setting in the West, and how the northern stars, always visible, like a great dial, were turning. But as the eastern horizon began to brighten toward the dawn, they would specially note what stars were the last to rise before their shining was drowned in the growing light of day. These, the last stars to appear in the East before sunrise, were the "morning stars," the heralds of the sun. As morning followed morning, these morning stars would be seen earlier and earlier, and therefore for a longer time before they disappeared in the dawn, until some morning, other stars, unseen before, would shine out for a few moments, and thus supplant the stars seen earlier as the actual heralds of the sun. Such a first appearance of a star was termed by the Greek astronomers its "heliacal" rising, and the mention in Scripture of "morning stars," or "stars of the twilight" (Job 38:7; 3:9), shows that the Hebrews like the Greeks were familiar with this feature of the ordinances of heaven, and noted the progress of the year by observation of the apparent changes of the celestial host. One star would herald the beginning of spring, another the coming of winter; the time to plow, the time to sow, the time of the rains would all be indicated by successive "morning stars" as they appeared.

8. Falling Stars:

(1) Meteorites.

Meteors are not stars at all in the popular sense of the word, but are quite small bodies drawn into our atmosphere, and rendered luminous for a few moments by the friction of their rush through it. But as they have been shown not to be mere distempers of the air, as they were considered at one time, but bodies of a truly planetary nature, traveling round the sun in orbits as defined as that of the earth itself, the epithet is quite appropriate to them. They are astronomical and not merely terrestrial bodies. Meteors are most striking either when they are seen as solitary aerolites or when they fall in some great shower. The most celebrated shower which seemed to radiate from the constellation Leo—and hence called the

Leonid—gave for centuries a magnificent spectacle every thirty-three years; the last great occasion having been on November 14, 1866. Those who saw that shower could appreciate the vivid description given by John when he wrote, "The stars of the heaven fell unto the earth, as a fig tree casteth her unripe figs when she is shaken of a great wind" (Re 6:13), for the meteors fell like autumn leaves, driven by a great storm, as numerous and as fast. The prophet Isaiah also used a very similar figure (Isa 34:4).

(2) The Star "Wormwood."

Such great meteoric showers are most impressive spectacles, but solitary meteors are sometimes hardly less striking. Bolides or aerolites, as such great solitary meteors are termed, are apparently of great size, and are sometimes so brilliant as to light up the sky even in broad daylight. Such a phenomenon is referred to by John in his description of the star Wormwood: "There fell from heaven a great star, burning as a torch" (Re 8:10). Such aerolites are not entirely consumed in their passage through our atmosphere, but portions of them reach the ground, and in some cases large masses have been found intact. These are generally of a stony nature, but others are either almost pure iron or contain much of that metal. Such a meteoric stone was used as the pedestal of the image of the goddess Diana at Ephesus, and the "townclerk" of the city referred to this circumstance when he reminded the Ephesians that their city was "temple-keeper of the great Diana, and of the image which fell down from Jupiter" (Ac 19:35).

9. Wandering Stars:

It has already been noted that the moon may perhaps have received its Hebrew name from the fact of its being a "wanderer" among the stars, but there is no direct and explicit reference in Scripture to other celestial "wanderers" except in Jude 1:13: "Wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved for ever." These asteres planetai are not our "planets," but either meteors or comets, more probably the latter, as meteors are more appropriately described as "falling stars."

(1) Comets as a Spiritual Type.

But as comets and meteors are intimately connected with each other—meteors being in many cases the debris of comets—the simile applies to either. False professors of religion, unstable or apostate teachers, are utterly unlike the stars which shine forth in heaven for ever, but are fitly represented by comets, which are seen only for a few weeks or days, and then are entirely lost to sight, or by meteors, which flash out for a few moments, and are then totally extinguished.

All the great comets, all the comets that have been conspicuous to the naked eye, with the single exception of that named after Halley, have appeared but once within the period of human records and Halley’s Comet only takes 80 days to traverse that part of its orbit which lies within the orbit of the earth; the rest of its period of revolution—76 years—is passed outside that boundary, and for 38 years at a time it remains outside the orbit of Neptune, more than 2,800,000,000 miles from the sun. The other great comets have only visited our neighborhood once within our experience.

(2) Comets Referred to in Scripture?

The question has been raised whether the appearance of comets is ever referred to in Scripture. Josephus, speaking of the signs which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, says, "Thus there was a star resembling a sword which stood over the city, and a comet that continued a whole year" (BJ, VI, v, 3). The "star resembling a sword" was doubtless the return of Halley's Comet in 66 AD, and the phrase used by Josephus has suggested that it was a stellar phenomenon that is referred to in 1Ch 21:16: "The angel of Yahweh .... between earth and heaven, having a drawn sword in his hand stretched out over Jerusalem." But this, and the corresponding suggestion as to the nature of the flaming sword that kept the way of the tree of life (Ge 3:24), are unsupported conjectures not worthy of attention. The astronomer Pingre thought that the first vision of Jeremiah of the "rod of an almond tree" and of a "boiling caldron" (Jer 1:11,13) had its physical basis in a return of Halley's Comet, and other commentators have thought that cometary appearances were described in the "pillars of smoke" of Joe 2:30; but none of these suggestions appear to have plausibility.

ASTRONOMY, II

II. The Constellations.

The principal achievement of the science of astronomy in the centuries during which the books of the Old Testament were written was the arrangement and naming of the constellations, and there can be no reasonable doubt that the same system was known to the Hebrews as that which has been handed down to us through the Greek astronomers. Paul certainly knew the Greek constellations, for in his sermon on Mars' Hill (Ac 17:28) he quoted from that poetical description of them which Aratus the great poet of Cilicia had written about 270 BC. But these constellations have a much greater antiquity than this, and it is probable that they were well known to Abraham before he left Ur of the Chaldees. It has been frequently shown (The Astronomy of the Bible, 158; Astronomy without a Telescope, 5) that these constellations themselves supply evidence that they were designed about 2700 BC. They thus antedated the time of Abraham by some centuries, and since some of their most characteristic forms are found upon old Babylonian "boundary stones," it is clear that they were known in the country from whence he came out.

1. Nachash, the "Crooked Serpent":

The direct references to these old constellation-forms in Scripture are not numerous. One of the clearest is in Job 26:13, where "formed the crooked serpent" (the King James Version) is used as the correlative of "garnished the heavens"; the great constellation of the writhing Dragon, placed at the crown of the heavens, being used, metaphorically, as an expression for all the constellations of the sky. For by its folds it encircles both the poles, that of the equator and that of the ecliptic.

2. Leviathan:

The term bariach, rendered "crooked" but better as in the Revised Version, margin as "fleeing," is applied by Isaiah to "Leviathan" (liwyathan: Isa 27:1), properly a "wreathed" or writhing animal, twisted in folds, and hence also called by the prophet ‘aqallathon, "crooked," "twisted," or "winding"; a very appropriate designation for Draco, the great polar Dragon. But the latter was not the only "crooked serpent" in the constellations; there were three others, two of which were placed with an astronomical significance not less precise than the coiling of Draco round the poles. Hydra, the Watersnake, marked out the original celestial equator for about one-third of its circumference, and Serpens, the Adder, lay partly along the celestial equator and then was twisted up the autumnal colure, and reached the zenith with its head.

The arrangement of the twelve signs of the zodiac to mark out the apparent yearly path of the sun, and of these three serpent- forms to hold their respective and significant positions in the heavens, shows that a real progress in astronomy had been made before the constellations were designed, and that their places were allotted to these figures on a definite astronomical plan.

3. The Seed of the Woman:

A further purpose is shown by the relation of the three serpents to the neighboring figures, and it is clear that the history preserved in Ge 3 was known to the designers of the constellations, and that they wished to perpetuate its memory by means of the stellar frescoes. For the constellations, Scorpio, Ophiuchus and Serpens, show us a man strangling a snake and standing on a scorpion; the head of the latter he crushes with one foot, but his other foot is wounded by its reverted sting. When these three constellations were due South, that is to say, at midnight in spring-time, Hercules and Draco were due north, and presented the picture of a man kneeling on one knee, and pressing down with his other foot the head of the great northern serpent or dragon. During the winter midnight the zodiacal constellation on the meridian was the Virgin, figured as a woman holding an ear of corn in her hand, while beneath her the immense length of Hydra was stretched out upon its belly in the attitude of a snake when fleeing at full speed. These figures are evidently meant to set forth in picture that which is expressed in word in Ge 3:14,15, "And Yahweh God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: he shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."

4. The Bow Set in the Cloud:

Nor is this the only narrative in Genesis which finds a parallel in the constellations. Among the southern groups we find a ship Argo that has grounded on a rock; and close to it stands a figure, Centaurus, who is apparently slaying an animal, Lupus, beside an Altar. The cloud of smoke arising from the Altar is represented by the Milky Way, and in the midst of the cloud there is set the Bow of the Archer, Sagittarius. Here there seems to be pictured the covenant made with Noah after he offered his sacrifice when he left the ark: "I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth" (Ge 9:13). Thus the constellations, designed several centuries before the time of Abraham,

clearly express a knowledge, and appear designed to preserve a remembrance of the two first promises made by God to mankind as recorded in the early chapters of Gen.

There is no need to assume, as some writers have done, that all the 48 primitive constellations were of Divine origin, or even that any of them were. If some of the early astronomers possessed in one form or another the histories that we have in Ge 3:8, 9, it would not be unnatural for them to attempt to preserve a memorial of them in the heavens by associating these figures with the stars.

It does not follow that all the old constellations have an analogous significance, or that if they have, we should now be able to detect it, and a great deal of ingenuity has been wasted in the attempt to convert the old 48 constellations into a sort of gospel in hieroglyphic. Interpretations of this order were current quite early in Christian times, for they are denounced at considerable length and in detail by Hippolytus in his Refutation of All the Heresies, circa 210 AD. Their revival in recent years is chiefly due to Mazzaroth, a series of papers by the late Miss Frances Rolleston in which fanciful etymologies were given to the Arabic names by which the principal stars are known. These names, for the most part, simply indicate the places which the stars were severally supposed to hold in the figures to which they were assigned, and Miss Rolleston’s derivations for them are quite misleading and unfounded. Nevertheless her results have been blindly accepted by a number of writers.

5. The Dragon of Eclipse:

The peculiar arrangement of the serpent forms in the constellations, and especially the position allotted to Hydra, extended along the equator with its head near the spring equinox and its tail near that of autumn, appears to have given rise to the terms "Dragon’s Head" (omega) and "Dragon’s Tail" (an upside-down omega), for the nodes or points of intersection of the ecliptic (the apparent path of the sun) with the celestial equator, and hence for nodes in general. As eclipses of the sun and moon can only occur when those bodies are near the nodes of the moon’s orbit, that is, near the Dragon’s Head or Tail, the myth seems to have arisen that such eclipses were due to one or other of the two great lights being swallowed by a dragon, and a reference to this myth is found in Job 3:8: "Let them curse it that curse the day, who are ready (the Revised Version, margin: skillful) to rouse up leviathan." The persons referred to are the magicians who pretended to be able by their incantations to cause an eclipse of the sun by bringing up the mythical dragon that was supposed to devour it. Astronomical nomenclature still retains a trace of these old expressions, for the time taken by the moon to pass from one node to the same node again is still called a "draconic month," a "month of the dragon."

6. Joseph’s Dream:

If we realize that the Hebrews were quite familiar with the same constellation figures that we have inherited through the Greeks, several indirect allusions to them gain an added meaning. Thus Joseph dreamed that "the sun and the moon and eleven stars made obeisance" to him (Ge 37:9). The twelve constellations of the zodiac are the twelve among which the sun and moon move, and thus constitute, as it were, their family. Eleven of them therefore represented eleven sons of Jacob, Joseph himself being of

course the twelfth. There is some evidence that the time came when the suggestion of this dream was acted upon to the extent that some of the tribes adopted certain of the constellation figures by way of crest or armorial bearing. In Nu 2 it is stated that each of the four camps into which the host of Israel was divided had its own standard:

7. The Standards of the Tribes:

"Neither the Mosaic law nor the Old Testament generally gives us any intimation as to the form or character of the standard (deghel). According to rabbinical tradition, the standard of Judah bore the figure of a lion, that of Reuben the likeness of a man, or of a man's head, that of Ephraim the figure of an ox, and that of Da the figure of an eagle; so that the four living creatures united in the cherubic forms described by Ezekiel were represented upon these four standards" (Keil and Delitzsch, Commentary on the Pentateuch, III, 17). A variant of this tradition gives as the standard of Reuben, "unstable as water" (Ge 49:4 the King James Version), a Man and a River, and of Dan, "Da shall be a serpent in the way" (Ge 49:17), an Eagle and a Serpent. These four forms are also found in the constellations in the four quarters of the heavens. Aquarius, the man with a stream of water, and Leo were the original zodiacal constellations of the two solstices, Taurus was that of the spring equinox, and Aquila and Serpens were close to the autumnal equinox, the latter being actually upon the colure.

8. The Cherubim:

This distribution of the four cherubic forms in the four quarters of heaven gives a special significance to the invocation used by Hezekiah and the Psalmist, "Thou that dwellest between the cherubims" (Isa 37:16 King James Version: Ps 80:1 the King James Version). The Shekinah glory rested indeed between the golden cherubim over the ark in the Holy of Holies, but "the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands" (Ac 7:48), and the same cherubic forms were pictured on the curtains of the heavens. "Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee" (1Ki 8:27); 'Thou dwellest between the cherubim,' filling the infinite expanse of the stellar universe.

9. Balaam's Prophecy:

When Balaam saw "Israel dwelling according to their tribes; and the Spirit of God came upon him" (Nu 24:2), it was not unnatural that he should allude in his prophecy to the great standards which he would see floating above the camps, and three of the four appear to be indicated: the bull of Joseph—"He hath as it were the strength of the wild-ox"; the lion of Judah—"He lay down as a lion and as a great lion," the King James Version; and Aquarius, the man pouring out a stream of water from a pitcher, the cognizance of Reuben—"Water shall flow from his buckets" (Nu 24:7,8,9).

In a similar way when the prophets refer to the enemies of Israel under the figure of dragons or reptiles, there seems occasionally an indirect reference to the serpents that represent the powers of evil in the pictures that have been associated with the star groups. Thus in Isa 27:1, the English Revised Version, it is prophesied that the Lord "shall punish leviathan the swift serpent, and leviathan the crooked serpent;

and He shall slay the dragon that is in the sea"; the first allusion being appropriate to the attitude of Hydra, the second to Draco, the third to Cetus. Whilst the group of constellations, Andromeda, Cetus and Eridanus, the woman persecuted by a dragon that casts a river out of its mouth, a river which flowing down below the horizon appears to be swallowed up by the earth, would seem to have furnished John with some of the material for the imagery of Re 12 in his great vision.

Besides references direct or indirect to the familiar constellation figures, four special astronomical terms occur in the Hebrew of the Old Testament which have given rise to much discussion. These are Kimah, Kecil, Mazzaroth and ‘Ayish. The tradition of their significance had been lost before the Septuagint translation was made, but it may be taken as practically certain that the renderings given in the Revised Version (British and American) are substantially correct.

10. Pleiades:

The word Kimah occurs in three passages, in each case in conjunction with Kecil (Am 5:8; Job 9:9; 38:31). It apparently means a "heap" or "cluster," and is hence especially applicable to the beautiful little group of the Pleiades, the most conspicuous star cluster visible to the naked eye. There is the less uncertainty about this identification since "kima" is the term generally used in Syriac literature to denote the Pleiades.

Six stars can now easily be seen by any good sight, but very keen-sighted persons can detect more; thus Maestlin, the tutor of Kepler, mapped 11 before the invention of the telescope, and in recent times Carrington and Denning have counted 14 with the naked eye. Still, 6 is the number visible to most persons, though there is a curiously widespread and uniform tradition that they once "were seven who now are six," and seven is the number almost always assigned to them in literature. Hesiod calls them "the seven sisters, the Virgin stars," and Milton, "the seven Atlantic sisters," as representing the daughters of Atlas. Many of the Greek poets, however, regarded them as Peleiades, "rock pigeons," doves, flying from the hunter Orion; but whether they have been considered as representing doves or maidens, seven has still been their traditional number. Possibly one of the group has declined in brightness in the course of the centuries; Alcyone would seem to have increased in brightness, for though now the brightest, it is not one of the four that figure in Ptolemy’s Catalogue, and if one has increased in brightness, others may have diminished. In the telescope many hundreds of stars are visible. The photographic plate has registered thousands and shows the principal stars as enveloped and threaded together by delicate streams of nebulous matter, the stars shining on these filamentous lines of light like pearls upon a string. This, the appearance of the Pleiades on the best modern photographs, would be strikingly appropriate to the rendering of Job 38:31, which has been adopted in the Revised Version (British and American), "Canst thou bind the cluster (m "chain") of the Pleiades?" and the question put to Job would be equivalent to asking him if it were his power that had brought together the Pleiades and bound them in so compact a cluster. This rendering which involves the reading "ma‘anaddoth" is supported by the Septuagint, and all the early versions, and hence by nearly all Orientalists. The reading in Massoretic Text, "ma‘adhannoth," that is to say, "dainties" or "delights," and adopted in the King James Version, where the word is paraphrased as "sweet influences," is however correct, as will be shown below.

The designation of the group as that of the seven stars gives a special significance to one of the details of the vision of John: "I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the candlesticks one like unto a son of man, ... And He had in his right hand seven stars: .... The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks are seven churches" (Re 1:12,13,16,20). The seven stars in a single compact cluster shining as one, furnish an image of the church in its many diversities and its essential unity.

It may be well to correct here a certain widely diffused error. When it was discovered that the sun itself with all its attendant planets was traveling rapidly through space, the German astronomer Madler hazarded the suggestion that the center of the sun's motion, the attracting body that governed it, might lie in the group of the Pleiades, and this suggestion has been quoted in many popular writings as if it were a demonstrated fact. It soon became evident that there was no sufficient ground for the suggestion, and the idea has been entirely abandoned by astronomers.

11. Orion:

The word Kecil as denominating a constellation occurs in the singular number in three passages, and in each it is placed in antithesis to Kimah. In a fourth passage (Isa 13:10) it occurs by itself and is in the plural. There is no doubt as to the significance of the word in its common use. In 70 cases it is translated either "fool" or "foolish." It does not signify a weak- minded person, so much as a violent, impious, self-confident one. As a star name, it is probably rightly considered to refer to the glorious constellation of Orion. According to an old tradition, the name of Nimrod, mentioned in Ge 10:10, as the founder of Babel, Erech, Accad and Calneh, was given by his courtiers to this most brilliant of all the constellations, one that by its form somewhat suggests a gigantic warrior armed for the fight.

Until recently it was not found possible to identify the Nimrod of Scripture with any Babylonian monarch until Dr. T. G. Pinches suggested that "Nimrod" was a deliberate Hebrew transmutation of "Marduk," the name of the great Babylonian national hero, and chief deity of their pantheon. "The change was brought about by making the root triliteral, and the ending uk (ak) in Merodach-Baladan disappearing first, Marduk appeared as Marad. This was connected with the root maradh, 'to be rebellious,' and the word was still further mutilated, or rather deformed, by having a ni attached, assimilating it to a certain extent to the niph'al forms of the Hebrew verbs, and making a change altogether in conformity with the genius of the Hebrew language" (The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia, 129-30). In the very brief reference to Nimrod in Ge 10:8,9, he is three times overemphatically termed gibbor, "a mighty (one)" and this has been the name of this constellation among Syrians, Arabs and Jews for many centuries. Indeed the brightest star of the constellation, the one in the left knee, now generally known as Rigel, is still occasionally called Algebar, a corruption of Al Jabbar, though now one of the fainter stars near it more generally bears that name. The word Kecil as applied to this constellation would parallel closely the etymology suggested for the name "Merodach," by its transformation into "Nimrod" as if it were derived from maradh, "to rebel." He who was to the Babylonians a deified hero, was to the Hebrews a rebel Titan, bound in chains among the

stars that all might behold his punishment, and in this aspect the question, "Canst thou .... loose the bands of Orion?" (Job 38:31) would be equivalent to asking "Canst thou bring down out of their places the stars that make up this figure and so, as it were, set the Titan free?"

In Isa 13:10, kecil occurs in the plural kecilim, "for the stars of heaven and the constellations thereof shall not give their light"; kecilim being translated as "constellations" under the impression that Orion, the brightest of all the constellations, is here put for the constellations in general. This is no doubt correct, but the context shows that the meaning goes farther than this, and that the kecilim who were to be darkened were the proud and arrogant tyrants like Nimrod or Merodach who would, if possible, climb up into heaven itself, even as Orion is represented in our star atlases as if trying to climb up into the zodiac—the home of the sun.

12. Mazzaroth, the Constellations of the Zodiac:

A further astronomical term which occurs in Job 38:32 is left untranslated in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), namely, the word Mazzaroth. It occurs only once in the Old Testament, but the similar word mazzaloth, translated "planets" in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), occurs in 2Ki 23:5. For the latter see ASTROLOGY. In the fifth tablet of the Babylonian Epic of Creation, we read:

1. He (Marduk) made the station for the great gods;

2. The stars, their images, as the stars of the zodiac he fixed.

3. He ordained the year, and into sections (mizrata) he divided it.

4. For the twelve months he fixed three stars.

Here in the third line, mizrata, cognate with the Hebrew mazzaroth, means the sections or divisions of the year, corresponding to the signs of the zodiac mentioned in the second line.

Yet again when Job 9:9 is compared with Job 38:31,32, it is seen that the place of the word mazzaroth in the latter passage is held by the expression "the chambers of the south" (chadhre theman) in the earlier. Mazzaroth therefore is equivalent to "the chambers of the south," and clearly signifies the twelve constellations of the zodiac through which the sun appears to pass in the course of the year, poetically likened to the "inns," the "chambers" or "tabernacles" in which the sun successively rests during the several monthly stages of his annual journey. The same idea was employed by the Arabs in their "mansions of the moon," its "lodging-houses" (menazil), which are 28 in number, since the moon takes 28 days to make the circuit of the heavens, just as the sun takes 12 months.

The word Mazzaroth therefore represents the twelve "signs" or, to speak more correctly, the twelve "constellations" of the zodiac. These two terms are often used indiscriminately, but there is a real

difference between their significations. The constellations of the zodiac are the actual groupings of the stars, lying along the ecliptic, and are quite irregular in form and length. The signs have no connection with the actual stars but are imaginary divisions of the ecliptic, all exactly equal in length, and they are reckoned from that point in the heavens where the sun is at the moment that it is crossing the celestial equator in its northward motion in springtime. As this point, known to astronomers as "the first point of Aries," moves slowly amongst the stars, taking 25,800 years to complete a revolution of the heavens, the signs of the zodiac also move among the stars, and hence, though at one time each sign bore a rough and general correspondence to the constellation of the same name, the signs have gradually drawn away from them. The constellations of the zodiac were designed about 2700 BC, but the signs—the equal divisions of the zodiac named from them—cannot have been adopted earlier than 700 BC, and were probably even later. For since Aries is the first of the signs, it is clear that it was the first of the constellations at the time when the equal division of the zodiac was effected, and 700 BC is the very earliest date that the constellation Aries can have been so regarded. Incidentally it may be remarked that the mention in the Babylonian story of creation of the allotment of three stars to each of the sections (Mizrata) of the year, shows that not only had the division of the zodiac into 12 equal signs been effected, but that a further step had been taken, namely, the division of each sign into 3 equal parts, later known amongst the Greeks as its "decans," corresponding roughly to the 36 decades of the Egyptian calendar. Whatever, therefore, may have been the antiquity of the traditions embodied in it, the actual Babylonian poem quoted above, so far from being an early document, as it was at one time supposed to be, is probably almost as late as the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

13. "Arcturus":

There are three constellations, natural groupings of the stars, the Pleiades and Orion and "Charles's Wain," which have always attracted men's attention, and we accordingly find them referred to in the earliest poems extant. Thus they are the three groups of the stars most frequently mentioned by Homer and Hesiod. The two first groups, the Pleiades and Orion, are, as we have seen, indicated by Kimah and Kecil. We should therefore naturally expect that the third constellation which we find associated with these in the Book of Job should be none other than the seven bright stars in the North, the principal part of the Great Bear. The Hebrew name for this third constellation appears in two slightly different forms. It is 'ash in Job 9:9, and 'ayish in Job 38:32, and in the latter case it is connected with its "sons." The last star of Charles' Wain or the Plough, as the group is often called among ourselves, still bears the name Benetnasch, derived from the Arabic name Benet Na'sh, "the daughters of the Bier," by which the Arabs designated the three stars in the Plough-handle, while they called the four stars in the body of the Plough, Na'sh, "the bier" or "litter." Na'sh and its daughters so closely correspond to "' ayish and its sons," that there can be no reasonable doubt that the same seven bright stars are intended; so that the rendering of the Revised Version (British and American), "Canst thou guide the Bear with her train?" correctly reproduces the original meaning. The Arcturus of the King James Version is derived from Vulgate, where it is probably a mistake for Arctos, that is to say, Ursa Major, the Great Bear.

The antithesis which is presented in Job 38:32 now reveals itself. The Mazzaroth are the twelve constellations of the zodiac, and of these each one rules the night for about a month in its turn; they are each "led forth" in its "season." Each, in its turn, is the "chamber," "tabernacle" or "resting-place" of the

sun, and they are appropriately called "chambers of the south," since it is especially in the southern sky that each is seen. In contrast to these are the northern constellations, those round the pole, of which the Great Bear or Charles' Wain is the brightest and best known At the time of the origin of the constellations, this group was much nearer the pole of the heavens than at present, but now as then these stars are not "led forth," for they are visible at all hours and during every night; but they are "guided"; they move round the pole of the heavens in an unending circle, as if the wain or chariot were being guided by a skillful driver.

(1) The "Scatterers," or the North.

There is some probability that in Job 37:9 the same two regions of the heavens are alluded to: "Out of the chamber of the south cometh the storm, and cold out of the north." It will be observed that the complete expression, "chamber of the south," is not in the original, the translators having supplied "of the south" from analogy with Job 9:9. The sirocco comes then from the region held by the mazzal, the "chamber," or constellation of the zodiac, then on the meridian. But the cold, the blizzard, comes from "the scatterers" (Mezarim). Who or what are the scatterers, and why do they represent the north? The late Professor Schiaparelli suggested that by a slight difference in the pointing, the word might be read as mizrayim, "the two winnowing fans," and that this may well have been a native term for the stars which we now know as the two Bears, Ursa Major and Minor, emphatically the northern constellations; the names being given them from the natural grouping of their chief stars, just as they are known as the two "Dippers" in the United States, or the two "Ladles" in China ("Astronomy in the Old Testament," 67-72).

(2) The Ordinances of Heaven Established on the Earth.

The astronomical antithesis between Mazzaroth, the constellations of the zodiac ("led forth" each "in its season"), and 'Ayish'," the Bear with her train" ("guided" in its unceasing revolution round the pole), is so complete and astronomically appropriate, that there is reason to expect an antithesis as clear and as astronomically significant between the two clauses of the preceding verse. But the rendering of the Revised Version (British and American) does not afford anything of the kind: "Canst thou bind the cluster of the Pleiades, or loose the bands of Orion?" is simply equivalent to the question as to whether Job could fix these stars in their places in the sky; and for an inquiry so perfectly general, one constellation would be no more appropriate than another. The true rendering must certainly bring out some difference or at least distinction between the two constellations or the use that was made of them.

And in the third passage in which Kimah and Kecil are mentioned together an important distinction is hinted at. The order in Am 5:8 suggests that the Pleiades corresponded in some way to daybreak, Orion to nightfall: "That maketh the Pleiades and Orion, and turneth the shadow of death into the morning, and maketh the day dark with night." Sunrise turns "the shadow of death into the morning," and in the progress of the seasons the analogous change on the higher scale is effected when Nature revives from the death of winter in the morning of the year, that is to say, at the return of spring. And at the time of the origin of the constellations the Pleiades were the harbingers of this change at their "cosmical" rising,

that is to say, when they rose with the sun at daybreak they brought back the "delights" of springtime.

Similarly sunset makes "the day dark with night," and in the progress of the seasons the analogous change on the higher scale is effected when the long nights and short days of winter set in the evening of the year, and all nature is bound as by iron bands, in cold and frost. And at the time of the origin of the constellations, the "acronychal" rising of Orion, i. e. its rising at nightfall, was the harbinger of this change; the rigor of winter formed "the bands of Orion."

These regular changes in the appearings and positions of the constellations constitute the ordinances of the heavens, ordinances which Job could neither alter for the worse by holding back the delights of springtime, or for the better by breaking the bonds of winter cold. But these ordinances were not confined in their effects to the heavens; their dominion was established on the earth, which answered by the revival of vegetation when the Pleiades, then nearly in conjunction with the sun, appeared for a short time before sunrise; and by the return of the constraints of cold and frost when Orion, in opposition to the sun, rode the sky the whole night long.

The completeness and beauty of the imagery will now be apparent.

The Pleiades stood for the East, since by their rising just before daybreak, they heralded the morning of the year and the "delights" of springtime.

Orion stood for the West, since his appearing just after nightfall heralded the evening of the year, and the bands of winter cold.

Mazzaroth, the twelve constellations of the zodiac, the "chambers of the south," each "led forth" from the underworld in its own "season," stood for the South.

And the "Bear with her train," "guided" in their unceasing course round the pole, stood for the circumpolar constellations in the North.

And the movements of them all in a perfect obedience to the law of God were the ordinances of heaven; whilst the dominion of them was seen to be established upon the earth in the constant succession of the seasons there in unfailing answer to the changes in the stars above.

These three verses give us a vivid picture of the work of primitive astronomy. The science was then in an early stage of development, but it was a real science, a science of observation, thoroughly sound so far as it had progressed, and showing high intelligence on the part of those who pursued it. We now know that the movement of "the Bear with her train," that is, the apparent rotation of the heavens round the pole, is due to the real rotation of the earth upon its axis; that the bringing out of "the Mazzaroth in their season," apparently due to the revolution of the sun round the earth, is due to the real revolution of the earth round the sun. But this knowledge which has enabled us to see where the actual movements lie has not brought us any nearer penetrating the mystery of those movements. What is the ultimate cause of

the rotation of this vast globe, we know no more than the ancients knew what caused the heavens to rotate; what causes it to fly through space 18 miles in every second of time, we know no more than the ancients knew why the sun appeared to move among the stars. To us, as to them, it is the power of God, and the will of God.

14. The Date of the Book of Job:

It has been supposed by some scholars that the Book of Job was written during the Captivity in Babylon, but this supposition is untenable in view of the statement in Job's Apology that the worship of the heavenly bodies was "an iniquity to be punished by the judges" (Job 31:26-28). This could not have been written by Jews in exile amongst the worshippers of Samas and Sin. But neither can this book have been written after the Return. The meaning of the three terms, ʻAyish, Kimah and Kecil, had been lost before the Septuagint made the rendering of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, for in Am 5:8 they left Kimah and Kecil untranslated, and they rendered ʻAyish and Kecil differently in Job 9:9, and 38:31,32.

Before the Captivity, Kimah and Kecil were plainly in common use, since Amos uses them as if they were familiar to his hearers, and as he himself points out, he was not a man of learning but a simple herdsman. The obvious and sufficient explanation of the later ignorance respecting these three terms lies in the catastrophes of the Assyrian and Bah conquests. Not less significant of their complete loss of the old Hebrew astronomy is the alteration which the Septuagint made in the Hebrew text. The "delights of the Pleiades" had evidently no more meaning for them than they have had for the majority of modern Orientalists, and no doubt it seemed a plausible and legitimate emendation to write maʻanaddoth, "chains," instead of maʻadhannoth, "delights," so as to bring about a fancied parallelism with moshekhoth, the "bands" of Orion. But the alteration transforms a complete, beautiful and symmetrical figure, an epitome of the astronomical observation of the time, into a bald tautology. Those critics are therefore right who assign the Book of Job and the Isa 13 to the period before the Captivities, and the three names come to us as indications, not of a Babylonian science of astronomy, learned by the Jews during their exile, but of a Hebrew astronomy destroyed by the unspeakable disaster of the conquest.

ASTRONOMY, III

III. Physiography.

1. The Circle of the Earth:

It has generally been assumed that the Hebrews considered the earth to be a vast circular plain, arched over by a solid vault—"the firmament"—above which were stored, as if in cisterns, the "treasuries" (Job 38:22) of the rain, snow and hail, and some writers have even attempted to express this supposed conception in diagrammatic form. One of the best of these attempts, reproduced below, is given by Schiaparelli, in his Astronomy in the Old Testament.

But this assumption is in reality based more upon the ideas prevalent in Europe during the Dark Ages

than upon any actual statements in the Old Testament. The same word (chagh) used in the Old Testament to express the roundness of the heavens (Job 22:14) is also used when the circle of the earth is spoken of (Isa 40:22), and it is likewise applied to the deep (Pr 8:27). Now it is obvious that the heavens are spherical in appearance, and to an attentive observer it is clear that the surface of the sea is also rounded. There is therefore no sufficient warrant for the assumption that the Hebrews must have regarded the earth as flat.

(1) The Earth a Sphere.

Certain astronomical relations were recognized very early. The stars appear as if attached to a globe rotating round the earth once in 24 hours, and this appearance was clearly familiar to the author of the Book of Job, and indeed long before the time of Abraham, since the formation of the constellations could not have been effected without such recognition. But the spherical form of the heavens almost involves a similar form for the earth, and their apparent diurnal rotation certainly means that they are not rigidly connected with the earth, but surround it on all sides at some distance from it. The earth therefore must be freely suspended in space, and so the Book of Job describes it: "He stretcheth out the north over empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing" (Job 26:7).

(2) The North Stretched Out over Empty Space.

Here the "north" signifies the northern circumpolar constellations and the writer recognized that they stretch out beyond the utmost confines of the earth; so that he was not under any impression that the heavens rested upon the earth, or were borne up by mountains. The celestial sphere surrounded the earth entirely, but at a distance from it; between the two there was "empty space." Some commentators have indeed claimed that Job 26:10, "He hath described a boundary upon the face of the waters, unto the confines of light and darkness" is equivalent to a statement that the circumference of the terrestrial plain extended to the place where sea and sky met. But no man of intelligence can, at any time, have supposed that the sea horizon marked the dividing line between day and night, and the meaning of the passage is correctly given in the King James Version, "until the day and night come to an end"; in other words, the waters of the sea will be confined to their appointed place never again to overflow the earth so long as the succession of day and night shall continue (compare Ge 8:22; 9:15).

(3) The Corners of the Earth.

See EARTH, CORNERS OF THE.

2. The Pillars of the Earth:

erets, "the earth," is in general the surface of the earth, the dry land inhabited by man and beast. Hence "the pillars" of the earth (Job 9:6) are the rocks that bear up that surface, for as has been shown, it was quite clear to the author of the Book of Job, and to the primitive astronomers, that our world was unsupported in space. For "Vault of the Earth" see EARTH, VAULT OF.

3. The Firmament:

(1) The Hebrew Conception.

Above the, spherical earth was stretched out the "firmament" (raqia‘) made on the second day of creation to "divide the waters from the waters" (Ge 16). To the Hebrews the "firmament" was the apparent void above, in which clouds float and the lights of heaven pursue their appointed paths. The word raqia‘, by its etymology, suggests an expanse, something stretched, spread or beaten out, as when Isaiah (40:22) says that the Lord "stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." But the Greek word stereoma, by which the Septuagint rendered raqia‘, gives the meaning of a firm and solid structure, and our translators have carried out this same idea in their English rendering of "firmament."

(2) The Alexandrian Conception.

In this however the Septuagint simply expressed the astronomical science of their day as accepted in Alexandria, where the doctrine of a succession of solid crystalline spheres, each carrying a planet, held currency. But in order to express the Hebrew idea, raqia‘ should be rendered "expanse" or "space"; it corresponds to the "empty space" of Job 26:7. This "expanse" was appointed to divide "the waters which were under the expanse, from the waters which were above the expanse"; and it has been argued from this that the upper waters must have been regarded as being enclosed in a watertight reservoir, furnished with sluices or floodgates, which could be opened to allow the rain to fall.

4. The Windows of Heaven:

Thus in the account of the Flood, "the windows of heaven" are said to have been opened. But, ‘arubbah, "window," means a network, or lattice, a form which can never have been ascribed to a literal floodgate; and in the other passages where "the windows of heaven" are mentioned the expression is obviously metaphorical (2Ki 7:2,19; Isa 24:18; Mal 3:10).

5. Rain:

Further the numerous other references to rain connect it with the clouds, as "I will also command the clouds that they rain no rain" (Isa 5:6), or in the So of Deborah, "The clouds dropped water" (Jud 5:4; see also Ps 77:17; 147:8; Pr 16:15; Ec 12:2). The fantastic idea of solidly built cisterns in the sky furnished with sluices has no warrant in Scripture. So far from any such crude conception, there is a very clear and complete account of the atmospheric circulation. Elihu describes the process of evaporation, "For he draweth up the drops of water, which distilll in rain from his vapor, which the skies pour down and drop upon man abundantly" (Job 36:27,28).

6. Clouds:

Jeremiah and the Psalmist repeat the description, "He causeth the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth; he maketh lightnings for the rain, and bringeth forth the wind out of his treasuries" (Jer 10:13). By the foreshortening that clouds undergo in the distance they inevitably appear to form chiefly on the horizon, "at the ends of the earth," whence they move upward toward the zenith. Thus God "calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth" (Am 9:6); and thus "All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place whither the rivers go, thither they go again" (Ec 1:7). Other references to the clouds in the Book of Job reveal not merely observation but acute reflection. "Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of him who is perfect in knowledge?" (Job 37:16) indicates a perception that the clouds float, each in its own place, at its own level, each perfectly balanced in the thin air.

7. The Deep:

(1) Meaning of the Word.

Tehom, "the deep," means moving water, and hence the ocean, which is represented as being essentially one, exactly as we now know it to be by actual exploration—"Let the waters Under the heavens be gathered together unto one place" (Ge 1:9). And the earth is stretched out "above the waters" (Ps 136:6; Ps 24:2). That is to say that the water surface lies lower than the land surface; and not only so, but, within the substance of the earth itself, there are subterranean waters which form a kind of ocean underground. This also is called in Eze 31:4 the "deep," tehom; "The waters nourished it, the deep made it to grow." But in general tehom denotes the sea, as when Pharaoh’s chosen captains were drowned in the Red Sea, "The deeps cover them" (Ex 15:5). Indeed the word appears to be onomatopoetic derived from the "moaning" or "humming" of the sea; whilst ‘erets, the "earth," seems intended to represent the "rattle" of shingle, "the scream of a madden’d beach dragged down by the wave."

(2) The Babylonian Dragon of Chaos.

In Ge 1, tehom denotes the primeval waters, and the resemblance of the word to Tiamat, the name of the Babylonian she- dragon of Chaos, has led some commentators to ascribe a Babylonian origin to this chapter. It need hardly be pointed out that if this resemblance proves any connection between the Hebrew and Babylonian accounts of creation, it proves the Hebrew to be the original. The natural object, tehom, the sea, must have preceded the mythological personification of it.

LITERATURE.

Maunder, Astronomy of the Bible; Astronomy without a Telescope; Schiaparelli, Astronomy in the Old Testament; Warren, The Earliest Cosmologies, 1909.

E. W. Maunder

ASTYAGES

as-ti’-a-jes (Astuages; or Astyigas (in Ktesias)), or Istuvigu, son of Cyaxares.

I, king of the Medes 585-550 BC, and predecessor of Cyrus (Bel and the Dragon verse 1): His wife was the daughter of Alyattes, king of Lydia. The daughter of Astyages (Mandane) married a Persian, Cambyses, and a son was born to them who later became Cyrus the Great. Astyages had given orders to expose the babe; but Harpagus, on whom the task had been imposed, gave the child to a herdsman, with instructions to kill him. When the boy, who had been brought up as his own by the herdsman, arrived at the age of twelve, Astyages discovered that he was the son of Mandane. The king in wrath then had the son of Harpagus killed and served to his father as food. The latter concealed his feelings of hatred and resentment, and bided his time; and when the young Cyrus had grown to manhood, he stirred up the grandson in insurrection against Astyages, who was defeated and taken prisoner (Herodotus i.127-30). When Astyages marched against the Persians, the Medes, under the command of Harpagus, deserted their king, and sided with the disappointed Persians; and Cyrus was crowned king. This account of Herodotus is confirmed by the Annalistic Tablet of Cyrus (RP, series ii, 159). The dethroned monarch was treated with kindness by his conqueror. According to Ktesias, a home was provided for him by Cyrus in Hyrcania.

Astyages was the last of the kings of the Manda (Media). An exceedingly shrewd man, Deioces by name, had founded the kingdom 150 years before (699-646). Phraortes was the second in line (646-624), and Cyaxares the third (624-584).

J. E. Harry

ASUNDER

a-sun’-der: This word occurs 22 times in the King James Version, 13 in Old Testament and 9 in the New Testament. It is found in combination with break (twice), burst, cleave (twice), depart, cut (six times), divide (three times), drive, part, pluck, put (twice), rend, saw. These are the translation of 9 Hebrew, and 4 Greek words.

Break asunder

(1) (parpar): Job, in reply to Eliphaz, complains about God, "I was at ease, and he brake me asunder" (Job 16:12).

(2) (nitteq): In Ps 2 the kings and rulers, meditating rebellion against Yahweh and His anointed, say, "Let us break their bonds asunder" (Ps 2:3).

Burst asunder (lasko): This was the fate of Judas (Ac 1:18).

Cleave asunder

(1) (nibhqa'): The same root as of biq'ah, "a valley." "The ground clave asunder" and swallowed up Dathan and Abiram with their households (Nu 16:31).

(2) (pillach): Job complains of God, "He cleaveth my reins asunder" (Job 16:13).

Cut asunder

(1) (qitstsets): The Lord "cut asunder the cords of the wicked" (Ps 129:4). The Hebrew word is used of cutting into wires or strips (Ex 39:3).

(2) (gadha'):" to cut off a branch or cut down a tree." "How is the hammer of the whole earth (Babylon) cut asunder!" (Jer 50:23). Zechariah "cut asunder" the staff "Beauty," signifying the breach of the covenant between Yahweh and His people, and also the staff "Bands," signifying the breach of the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (Zec 11:10,14).

(3) (dichotomeo): The fate of the Unfaithful Steward, literally, "cut in two"; the Revised Version, margin "severely scourge him" (Mt 24:51; Lu 12:46). See PUNISHMENTS.

Depart asunder (apochorizomai): Paul and Barnabas "departed asunder from one another" (Ac 15:39 the King James Version); the Revised Version (British and American) "parted asunder."

Divide asunder

(1) (hibhdil): Usually to separate, to make a division between. Here the reference is to the offering of pigeons or turtledoves (Le 1:17; 5:8).

(2) (merismos): From merizo, "to divide." The noun is abstract, "the act of dividing." The word of God pierces "even to the dividing of soul and spirit" (Heb 4:12).

Drive asunder (hittir): Lit. "to cause to tremble," then "to loosen." God "drove asunder the nations" (Hab 3:6). Part asunder (hiphridh): With a preposition ben, "between," "to separate." The chariot and horses of fire "parted asunder" Elijah and Elisha (2Ki 2:11).

Pluck asunder (diaspao): To bear asunder, to part forcibly. "Chains had been plucked asunder" by the demoniac of the Gerasenes (Mr 5:4 the King James Version); the Revised Version (British and American) "rent asunder."

Put asunder (chorizo): To sever one from another. See the words of Jesus on divorce (Mt 19:6; Mr 10:9).

Rend asunder (nibhqa‘): The same Hebrew word as "cleave asunder."

(1) "And No shall be rent asunder" (Eze 30:16 the King James Version): the Revised Version (British and American) "broken up."

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) for the King James Version "plucked asunder" (Mr 5:4). Saw asunder (prizo or prio): The fate of some on the roll of faith, "They were sawn asunder" (Heb 11:37). See also PUNISHMENTS.

S. F. Hunter

ASUPPIM; HOUSE OF ASUPPIM

a-sup’-im, (beth ha-’acuppim):

King James Version, margin "gatherings"; the Revised Version (British and American) "the storehouses." In Ne 12:25, the King James Version renders the same word Thresholds(king James Version, margin "treasuries, assemblies"). A storehouse most probably at the southern gate of the temple (1Ch 26:15,17; Ne 12:25).

ASUR

as’-ur (Asour): the Revised Version (British and American) for Assur in 1 Esdras 5:31. Same as Harhur of Ezr 2:51.

ASYLUM

a-si’-lum: The custom of fleeing to specially sacred places to obtain the protection of a deity is found all over the world (Post, Grundriss, II, 252 ff). In ancient Israel we meet with it in two forms—the asylum of the altar and the asylum of the cities of refuge. The altar at the House of God was a place to which persons in danger fled for protection (1Ki 1:50; 2:28). It had horns and must not be confused with the altars of earth or stone that were used for lay sacrifices. See ALTAR; SANCTUARY. Ex 21:14 provides that a murderer is to be taken from the altar to be put to death. The law of the cities of refuge proceeds upon a somewhat different principle. Its objects are

(1) to shield a homicide from the avenger of blood until trial, and

(2) to provide a refuge for the manslayer who has not been guilty of murder. There is one reference to the institution in the history of the kingdom (2Sa 14:14). For the legal and geographical information, see CITIES OF REFUGE; HOMICIDE.

Harold M. Wiener

ASYNCRITUS

a-sin’-kri-tus (Asunkritos, "incomparable"): An unknown Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent an affectionate salutation (Ro 16:14).

AT ONE

eis eirenen, "at one," ("at peace"): "Set them at one again" (Ac 7:26), the reconciliation of persons at variance. From this adverb we have the words "atone" and "atonement."

ATAD

a’-tad (’aTadh, "a thorn"). See ABEL-MIZRAIM.

ATAR

at’-ar (Atar; the King James Version Jatal = Ater (Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45)): The sons of Atar (porters) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:28).

ATARAH

at’-a-ra, a-ta’-ra (‘aTarah, "crown"): One of Jerahmeel’s wives and mother of Onam (1Ch 2:26).

ATARGATIS

a-tar’-ga-tis (Atargatis; the Revised Version (British and American) wrongly ATERGATIS):

Is stated in 2 Macc 12:26 to have been worshipped at Karnion, the Ashtaroth-Karnaim of the Old Testament (compare Ant, XII, viii, 4). The name is found on coins of Membij as ‘atar-‘atah, where ‘Atar (i. e. Ashtoreth) is identified with the goddess ‘Atah, whose name is sometimes written ‘Ati. or ‘Atah or ‘Ati was also worshipped at Palmyra, and (according to Melito) in Adiabene.

The compound Atargatis, often corrupted by the Greeks into Derketo, had her chief temples at Membij (Hierapolis) and Ashkelon where she was represented with the body of a woman and the tail of a fish, fish being sacred to her. Herodotus made her the Aphrodite Urania of the Greeks. ‘Ati may have been originally a Hittite goddess with whom the Assyrian Ishtar (‘Atar) came afterward to be identified tory of the kingdom (2Sa 14:14). For the legal and geographical information, see CITIES OF REFUGE; HOMICIDE.

A. H. Sayce

ATAROTH

at’-a-roth, a-ta’-roth (‘aTaroth, "crowns" or "wreaths"; Ataroth):

(1) A city East of the Jordan, apparently in the territory given to Reuben, but built, or fortified, by the children of Gad (Nu 32:3,34). It is named along with Dibon, which is identified with Dhiban. Eight miles Northeast by North of Dibon, on the South of Wady Zerqa Ma‘in, stands Jebel ‘Attarus, in which the ancient name is preserved. The city is doubtless represented by Khirbet ‘Attarus, about 4 miles West of the mountain.

(2) A place on the boundary between Ephraim and Benjamin, toward the West (Jos 16:2). It seems to be the same as Ataroth- addar of Jos 16:5, 18:13. It is probably to be identified with the modern ed-Dariyeh South of nether Bethhoron, and about 12 1/2 miles West of Jerusalem.

(3) A place on the eastern frontier of Ephraim (Jos 16:7). This town has not been identified. Conder thinks it may be identified with et-Truneh in the Jordan valley, or with Khirbet et-Taiyereh.

W. Ewing

ATAROTH-ADDAR

at’-a-roth-ad’-ar (‘aTroth ‘addar, "crowns of Addar"). See ATAROTH (2).

ATER

a’-ter (’aTer, "bound" (?)):

(1) The ancestor of a family of 98 persons who returned from Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:16; Ne 7:21). the King James Version has "Ater of Hezekiah"; the Revised Version (British and American) of 1 Esdras 5:15 has "Ater of Ezekias," margin, "Ater of Hezekiah." the King James Version has "Aterezias."

(2) The head of a family of porters who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45).

ATEREZAIAS

a-ter-e-zi’-as (Ater to Hezekia): Usually found in the abbreviated form Ater. Head of a Jewish family, which returned with Zerubbabel, under the decree of Cyrus. Mentioned (Ezr 2:16) as sprung from

Hezekiah. Their number is given as 98.

Mentioned again as found in the register of the genealogies of the first returned exiles by Nehemiah (Ne 7:21). Again among those who sealed "the sure covenant" (Ne 10:17). Also found in 1 Esdras 5:15, where the name is given variously as Ater or Aterezaias. The number of the family, given by Esdras, is 92.

ATERGATIS

a-ter’-ga-tis. See ATARGATIS.

ATETA

a-te’-ta (the King James Version Teta; Codex Alexandrinus Ateta, Codex Vaticanus, om.): Head of a family of Levites; gate keepers who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:28); called Hitita in Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45.

ATHACH

a’-thak (‘athakh, "lodging-place"): One of the cities of Judah to which David sent from Ziklag the spoil of the Amalekites (1Sa 30:30). Its site is unknown. Driver, Budde, and Wellhausen identify it with Ether (Jos 15:42).

ATHAIAH

a-tha’-ya (’athayah =" Yahweh is helper"; Athea, or Atheai): He is designated (Ne 11:4) as a descendant of Judah and the son of Uzziah. After the return from Babylon, he dwelt in Jerusalem. In 1Ch 9:4 his name is given as Uthai.

ATHALIAH

ath-a-li’-a (‘athalyah; meaning uncertain, perhaps, "whom Yahweh has afflicted"; 2Ki 8:26; 11; 2Ch 22 $, 23$):

1. Relationship:

(1) Daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, grand-daughter of Omri, 6th king of Israel. In her childhood the political relations of the two kingdoms of Judah and Israel had, after many years of strife, become friendly, and she was married to Jehoram, eldest son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (2Ki 8:18). The marriage was one of political expediency, and is a blot on the memory of Jehoshaphat.

2. Athaliah as Queen:

When Jehoram was 32 years of age, he succeeded to the throne, and Athaliah became queen of Judah. She inherited her mother's strength of will, and like her developed a fanatical devotion to the cult of the Zidonian Baal. Elijah's blow at the worship of Baal in Samaria shortly before her accession to power did nothing to mitigate her zeal. It probably intensified it. The first recorded act of Jehoram's reign is the murder of his six younger brothers; some princes of the realm, who were known to be favorable to the ancient faith of the nation, were also destroyed (2Ch 21:4). There can be little doubt that these deeds of blood were supported, and perhaps instigated, by Athaliah, who was a much stronger character than her husband.

3. Murder of Her Grandchildren:

After eight years of royal life, Athaliah became a widow, and her son, Ahaziah, then 22 years of age (2Ki 8:26; not 42 as in 2Ch 22:2), ascended his father's throne. As queen-mother, Athaliah was now supreme in the councils of the nation, as well as in the royal palace. Within a single year, the young king fell (see JEHU), and the only persons who stood between Athaliah and the throne were her grandchildren. It is in such moments that ambition, fired by fanaticism, sees its opportunity, and the massacre of the royal seed was determined on. This was carried out: but one of them, Jehoash, a babe, escaped by the intervention of his aunt, Jehosheba (1Ki 11:2; 2Ch 22:11).

4. Her Usurpation:

The palace being cleared of its royal occupants, Athaliah had herself proclaimed sovereign. No other woman, before or since, sat upon the throne of David, and it is a proof of her energy and ability that, in spite of her sex, she was able to keep it for six years. From 2Ch 24:7 we gather that a portion of the temple of Yahweh was pulled down, and the material used in the structure of a temple of Baal.

5. The Counter-Revolution:

The high priest at this time was Jehoiada, who had married the daughter of Athaliah, Jehosheba (2Ch 22:11). His promotion to the primacy led to the undoing of the usurper, as Jehoiada proved staunchly, if secretly, true to the religion of Yahweh. For six years he and his wife concealed in their apartments, near the temple, the young child of Ahaziah. In the seventh year a counter-revolution was planned. The details are given with unusual fullness in Ki and Chronicles, the writings of which supplement one another. Thus, when the Chronicler wrote, it had become safe to give the names of five captains who led the military rising (2Ch 23:1). With the Book of Ki before him, it was not necessary to do more than extract from the ancient records such particulars as had not hitherto appeared. This it is which has chiefly given rise to the charge of variations in the two narratives. See JEHOASH.

6. Her Death:

At the time of her deposition, Athaliah was resident in the royal palace. When roused to a sense of danger by the acclamations which greeted the coronation ceremony, she made an attempt to stay the revolt by rushing into the temple court, alone; her guards, according to Josephus, having been prevented from following her (Ant., IX, vii, 3). A glance sufficed. It showed her the lad standing on a raised platform before the temple, holding the Book of the Law in his hand, and with the crown upon his brow. Rending her robe and shouting, "Treason! Treason!" she fled. Some were for cutting her down as she did so, but this was objected to as defiling the temple with human blood. She was, therefore, allowed to reach the door of the palace in flight. Here she fell, smitten by the avenging guards.

Athaliah's usurpation lasted for six years (2Ki 11:3; 12:1; 2Ch 22:12). Her 1st year synchronizes with the 1st of Jehu in Israel, and may be placed 846 BC (some put later). See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. The statement of 2Ki 12:1 is here understood in the sense that Jehoash began his public reign in the 7th year of Jehu, and that he reigned 40 years counting from the time of his father's death. A modern parallel is the dating of all official records and legal documents of the time of Charles II of England from the death of Charles I.

The only other reference to Athaliah is that above alluded to in 2Ch 24:7, where she is spoken of as "that wicked woman."

(2) A Benjamite who dwelt in Jerusalem (1Ch 8:26,28).

(3) Father of Jeshaiah, who returned with Ezra (8:7); called Gotholias in Apocrypha (1 Esdras 8:33).

W. Shaw Caldecott

ATHANASIAN; CREED

ath-a-na'-zhan. See CREED.

ATHARIAS

ath-a-ri'-as. See ATTHARIAS.

ATHARIM

ath'-a-rim ('atharim): the Revised Version (British and American) "The way of Atharim"; the King James Version "The way of the spies." the Revised Version (British and American) regards Atharim as a place (so Septuagint). the King James Version follows Syriac and Targum, rendering Atharim as if Tarim = spies. Dillmann translates "the caravan path," connecting it with Arabic athar, "a track or footprint." Here the king of Arad fought against Israel, taking some captives (Nu 21:1).all official records and legal documents of the time of Charles II of England from the death of Charles I. See

HORMAH.

ATHEISM

a’-the-iz’-m (atheos, "without God" (Eph 2:12)): Ordinarily this word is interpreted to mean a denial of the existence of God, a disbelief in God, the opposite of theism. But it seems better that we should consider it under four heads, in order to obtain a clear idea of the different meanings in which it has been used.

(1) The classical.

In this sense it does not mean a denial of the existence of a Divine Being, but the denial of the existence or reality of the god of a particular nation. Thus the Christians were repeatedly charged with atheism, because of their disbelief in the gods of heathenism. It was not charged that they did not believe in any god, but that they denied the existence and reality of the gods worshipped, and before whom the nation hitherto had bowed. This was considered so great a crime, so dangerous a thing to the nation, that it was felt to be a just cause for most cruel and determined persecutions. Socrates’ teaching cast a shadow on the reality of the existence of the gods, and this charge was brought against him by his contemporaries. Cicero also uses the word in this sense in his charge against Diagoras of Athens. Indeed, such use of it is common in all classical literature.

(2) Philosophic.

It is not meant that the various philosophic systems to which this term is applied actually deny the existence of a Divine Being or of a First Cause, but that they are atheistic in their teaching, and tend to unsettle the faith of mankind in the existence of God. There is indeed a belief in a first cause, in force, in motion, in a certain aggregation of materials producing life, but the Divine Being as taught by theism is absolutely denied. This is true of the Idealism of Fichte, of the Ideal Pantheism of Spinoza, the Natural Pantheism of Schelling, and similar forms of thought. In applying the word atheism to the teaching here given, theism does not intend to assail them as wholly without a belief in a Divine Being; but it affirms that God is a person, a self- conscious Being, not merely a first cause or force. To deny this fundamental affirmation of theism is to make the teaching atheistic, a denial of that which is essential to theism (Heb 11:3).

(3) Dogmatic.

It absolutely denies the existence of God. It has often been held that this is, in fact, impossible. Cousin has said, "It is impossible, because the existence of God is implied in every assertion." It is true, however, that in all ages there have been persons who declared themselves absolute atheists. Especially is this true of the 18th century a period of widespread skepticism—when not a few, particularly in France, professed themselves atheists. In many cases, however, it resulted from a loose use of the word, careless definition, and sometimes from the spirit of boastfulness.

(4) Practical atheism.

It has nothing at all to do with belief. Indeed it accepts the affirmations of theism. It has reference wholly to the mode of life. It is to live as though there was no God.

It takes the form often of complete indifference to the claims of the Divine Being or again of outbroken and defiant wickedness (Ps 14:1). That this form of atheism is widely prevalent is well known. It is accompanied in many cases with some form of unbelief or prejudice or false opinion of the church or Christianity. Dogmatic atheism is no longer a menace or even a hindrance to the progress of Christianity, but practical atheism is widespread in its influence and a dangerous element in our modern life (compare Isa 31:1; Jer 2:13,17,18; 18:13-15). Whatever the form, whether it be that of religious agnosticism, denying that we can know that God exists, or critical atheism, denying that the evidence to prove His existence is sufficient, or dogmatic, or practical atheism, it is always a system of negation and as such tears down and destroys. It destroys the faith upon which all human relations are built. Since there is no God, there is no right nor wrong, and human action is neither good nor bad, but convenient or inconvenient. It leaves human society without a basis for order and human government without foundation (Ro 1:10-32). All is hopeless, all is wretchedness, all is tending to the grave and the grave ends all.

Arguments against atheism may be summarized as follows:

(1) It is contrary to reason. History has shown again and again how impossible it is to bring the mind to rest in this doctrine. Although Buddhism is atheistic in its teaching, idolatry is widespread in the lands where it prevails. While the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte was based on a denial of the existence of God, his attempt to found the new religion of humanity with rites and ceremonies of worship reveals how the longing for worship cannot be suppressed. It is a revelation of the fact so often seen in the history of human thought, that the mind cannot rest in the tenets of atheism.

(2) It is contrary to human experience. All history testifies that there are deep religious instincts within the human breast. To regard these as deceptive and unreasonable would itself be utterly unreasonable and unscientific. But the fact of such spiritual longing implies also that there is a Being who is responsive to and can satisfy the cry of the heart (Heb 11:6). In his Bampton Lectures Reville has said on this subject: "It would be irrational in the last degree to lay down the existence of such a need and such a tendency, and yet believe that the need corresponds to nothing, that the tendency has no goal."

(3) It fails to account for the evidence of design in the universe.

See COSMOLOGY.

(4) It fails to account for the existence of man and the world in general. Here is the universe: how did it come to be? Here is man: how is he to be accounted for? To these and like questions, atheism and

atheistic philosophy have no adequate answer to give. See also COSMOLOGY; CREATION; GOD.

Jacob W. Kapp

ATHENIANS

a-the'-ni-ans Athenaioi: Inhabitants of Athens. Luke has a remark on their curiosity and their delight in novelty (Ac 17:21). See ATHENS.

ATHENOBIUS

ath-e-no'-bi-us [Athenobios]: A "friend" of Antiochus VII (Sidetes), who was sent to Jerusalem by the king to protest against the occupation of Joppa and Gazara, and the citadel Jerusalem. A demand was made on Simon Maccabeus to give up all the places he had taken or pay 1,000 talents in silver. Simon declined to pay more than 100 talents, and Athenobius returned to Antiochus from his fruitless mission (1 Macc 15:28-36).

ATHENS

ath'-enz Athenai In antiquity the celebrated metropolis of Attica, now the capital of Greece. Two long walls, 250 ft. apart, connected the city with the harbor (Peiraeus). In Ac 17 we are told what Paul did during his single sojourn in this famous city. He came up from the sea by the new road (North of the ancient) along which were altars of unknown gods, entered the city from the West, and passed by the Ceramicus (burial-ground), which can be seen to this day, the "Theseum," the best preserved of all Greek temples, and on to the Agora (Market-Place), just North of the Acropolis, a steep hill, 200 ft. high, in the center of the city. Cimon began and Pericles completed the work of transforming this citadel into a sanctuary for the patron goddess of the city.

The magnificent gateway (Propylaea), of which the Athenians were justly proud, was built by Mnesicles (437-432 BC). A monumental bronze statue by Phidias stood on the left, as one emerged on the plateau, and the mighty Parthenon a little further on, to the right. In this temple was the famous gold and ivory statue of Athena. The eastern pediment contained sculptures representing the birth of the goddess (Elgin Marbles, now in the British Museum), the western depicting her contest with Poseidon for supremacy over Attica. This, the most celebrated edifice, architecturally, in all history, was partially destroyed by the Venetians in 1687. Other temples on the Acropolis are the Erechtheum and the "Wingless Victory." In the city the streets were exceedingly narrow and crooked. The wider avenues were called plateiai, whence English "place," Spanish "plaza." The roofs of the houses were flat. In and around the Agora were many porticoes stoai. In the Stoa Poecile ("Painted Portico"), whose walls were covered with historical paintings, Paul met with the successors of Zeno, the Stoics, with whom he disputed daily. In this vicinity also was the Senate Chamber for the Council of Five Hundred, and the Court of the Areopagus, whither Socrates came in 399 BC to face his accusers, and where Paul, five centuries later, preached to the Athenians "the unknown God." In this neighborhood also were the Tower of the Winds

and the water-clock, which must have attracted Paul’s attention, as they attract our attention today.

The apostle disputed in the synagogue with the Jews (Ac 17:17), and a slab found at the foot of Mount Hymettus (a range to the East of the city, 3,000 ft. high), with the inscription haute he pule tou kuriou, dikaioi eiseleusontai en aute (Ps 118:20), was once thought to indicate the site, but is now believed to date from the 3rd or 4th century. Slabs bearing Jewish inscriptions have been found in the city itself.

The population of Athens was at least a quarter of a million. The oldest inhabitants were Pelasgians. Cecrops, the first traditional king, came from Egypt in 1556 BC, and by marrying the daughter of Actaeon, obtained the sovereignty. The first king was Erechtheus. Theseus united the twelve communities of Attica and made Athens the capital. After the death of Codrus in 1068 BC, the governing power was entrusted to an archon who held office for life. In 753 BC the term of office was limited to ten years. In 683 BC nine archons were chosen for a term of one year. Draco’s laws, "written in blood," were made in 620 BC. Solon was chosen archon in 594 BC and gave the state a constitution. The tyrant Pisistratus was in control permanently from 541 to 527 BC; his son Hipparchus was assassinated in 514. Clisthenes changed the constitution and introduced the practice of ostracism.

In 490 BC the Athenians defeated the Persians at Marathon, and again in 480 BC at Salamis. In 476 BC Aristides organized the great Athenian Confederacy. After his death Conon became the leader of the conservative party; and when the general Cimon was killed, Pericles became the leader of the people. In 431 BC the Peloponnesian War broke out and continued till 404 BC, when Athens succumbed to Sparta. An oligarchical government was set up with Critias and Theramenes at the head. War broke out again but peace was restored by the pact of Antalcidas (387 BC). In the Sacred War (357-355 BC) Athens exhausted her strength. When Philip of Macedon began to interfere in Greek affairs, Athens could neither resolve on war measures (to which the oratory of Demosthenes incited her), nor make terms with Philip. Finally, she joined Thebes in making armed resistance, but in spite of her heroic efforts at Chaeronea, she suffered defeat (338 BC). Philip was murdered in 336 BC, and Alexander the Great became master.

After the subjugation of Greece by the Romans, Athens was placed under the supervision of the governor of Macedonia, but was granted local independence in recognition of her great history. As the seat of Greek art and science, Athens played an important role even under Roman sway—she became the university city of the Roman world, and from her radiated spiritual light and intellectual energy to Tarsus, Antioch and Alexandria. Philo, the Jew, declares that the Athenians were Hellenon oxuderkestatoi dianoian ("keenest in intellect") and adds that Athens was to Greece what the pupil is to the eye, or reason to the soul. Although the city had lost her real independence, the people retained their old characteristics: they were still interested in art, literature and philosophy.

Paul may possibly have attended theater of Dionysus (under the Southeast cliff of the Acropolis) and witnessed a play of the Greek poets, such as Euripides or Menander. Many gifts were received from foreign monarchs by Athens. Attalus I of Perg amum endowed the Academy, Eumenes added a splendid Stoa to theater and Antiochus Epiphanes began the Olympeium (15 columns of which are still standing),

the massive sub-basement of which had been constructed by Pisistratus. Athens became a favorite residence for foreign writers who cultivated history, geography and literature. Horace, Brutus and Cassius sojourned in the city for some time. Josephus declares that the Athenians were the most god-fearing of the Greeks eusebestatous ton Hellenon. Compare Livy xlv.27.

LITERATURE.

See Wordsworth, Athens and Attica; Butler, Story of Athens; Ernest Gardner, Ancient Athens; Tucker, Life in Ancient Athens; A. Mommsen, Athenae Christianae; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul, chapter x; Gregorovius, Stadt Athen im Mittelalter; Leake, Grote, Thirlwall, Curtius, Wachsmuth, Holm, and Pausanias' Attica, recently edited by Carroll (Ginn and Co.), or in the large work of Frazer.

J. E. Harry

ATHLAI

ath'-la-i 'athlay, ("afflicted?"): A Jew, the son of Bebai, who was influenced by Ezra to put away his wife (Ezr 10:28).

ATIPHA

at'i-fa. See HATIPHA.

ATONEMENT

a-ton'-ment: Translates kaphar; chaTa'; ratsah, the last employed only of human relations (1Sa 29:4); translates the following Greek stems hilas-, simple and compounded with various prepositions; allag- in composition only, but with numerous prepositions and even two at a time, e. g. Mt 5:24; lip- rarely (Da 9:24).

I. Terms Employed.

1. Hebrew and Greek Words:

The root meanings of the Hebrew words, taking them in the order cited above, are, to "cover," hence expiate, condone, cancel, placate; to "offer," or "receive a sin offering," hence, make atonement, appease, propitiate; "effect reconciliation," i. e. by some conduct, or course of action. Of the Greek words the meanings, in order, are "to be," or "cause to be, friendly"; "to render other," hence to restore; "to leave" and with preposition to leave off, i. e. enmity, or evil, etc. ;" to render holy," "to set apart for"; hence, of the Deity, to appropriate or accept for Himself.

2. The English Word:

It is obvious that the English word "atonement" does not correspond etymologically with any Hebrew or Greek word which it translates. Furthermore, the Greek words in both Septuagint and New Testament do not correspond exactly to the Hebrew words; especially is it true that the root idea of the most frequently employed Hebrew word, "cover," is not found in any of the Greek words employed. These remarks apply to both verbs and substantives The English word is derived from the phrase "at one," and signifies, etymologically, harmony of relationship or unity of life, etc. It is a rare instance of an AS theological term; and, like all purely English terms employed in theology, takes its meaning, not from its origin, but from theological content of the thinking of the Continental and Latin-speaking Schoolmen who employed such English terms as seemed most nearly to convey to the hearers and readers their ideas. Not only was no effort made to convey the original Hebrew and Greek meanings by means of English words, but no effort was made toward uniformity in translating of Hebrew and Greek words by their English equivalents.

3. Not to Be Settled by Lexicon Merely:

It is at once clear that no mere word-study can determine the Bible teaching concerning atonement. Even when first employed for expressing Hebrew and Christian thought, these terms, like all other religious terms, already had a content that had grown up with their use, and it is by no means easy to tell how far heathen conceptions might be imported into our theology by a rigidly etymological study of terms employed. In any case such a study could only yield a dictionary of terms, whereas what we seek is a body of teaching, a circle of ideas, whatever words and phrases, or combinations of words and phrases, have been employed to express the teaching.

4. Not Chiefly a Study in Theology:

There is even greater danger of making the study of the Atonement a study in dogmatic theology. The frequent employment of the expression "the Atonement" shows this tendency. The work of Christ in reconciling the world to God has occupied so central a place in Christian dogmatics that the very term atonement has come to have a theological rather than a practical atmosphere, and it is by no means easy for the student, or even for the seeker after the saving relation with God, to pass beyond the accumulated interpretation of the Atonement and learn of atonement.

5. Notes on Use of Terms:

The history of the explanation of the Atonement and the terms of preaching atonement cannot, of course, be ignored. Nor can the original meaning of the terms employed and the manner of their use be neglected. There are significant features in the use of terms, and we have to take account of the history of interpretation. Only we must not bind ourselves nor the word of God in such forms.

(1) The most frequently employed Hebrew word, kaphar, is found in the Prophets only in the priestly section (Eze 45:15,20; Da 9:24) where English Versions of the Bible have "make reconciliation," margin, "purge away." Furthermore, it is not found in Deuteronomy, which is the prophetic book of the Pentateuch (Hexateuch). This indicates that it is an essentially priestly conception. The same term is frequently translated by "reconcile," construed as equivalent to "make atonement" (Le 6:30; 8:15; 16:20; 1Sa 29:4; Eze 45:15,20; Da 9:24). In this latter sense it connects itself with chaTa’. In 2Ch 29:24 both words are used: the priests make a sin offering chaTa’ to effect an atonement kaphar. But the first word is frequently used by metonymy to include, at least suggestively, the end in view, the reconciliation; and, on the other hand, the latter word is so used as to involve, also, doing that by which atonement is realized.

(2) Of the Greek words employed hilaskesthai means "to make propitious" (Heb 2:17; Le 6:30; 16:20; Eze 45:20); allattein, used however only in composition with prepositions, means "to render other," "to restore" to another (former?) condition of harmony (compare Mt 5:24 =" to be reconciled" to a fellow-man as a condition of making an acceptable sacrifice to God).s an essentially priestly conception. The same term is frequently translated by "reconcile," construed as equivalent to "make atonement" (Le 6:30; 8:15; 16:20; 1Sa 29:4; Eze 45:15,20; Da 9:24). In this latter sense it connects itself with chaTa’. In 2Ch 29:24 both words are used: the priests make a sin offering chaTa’ to effect an atonement kaphar. But the first word is frequently used by metonymy to include, at least suggestively, the end in view, the reconciliation; and, on the other hand, the latter word is so used as to involve, also, doing that by which atonement is realized.

(3) In the English New Testament the word "atonement" is found only at Ro 5:11 and the American Standard Revised Version changes this to "reconciliation." While in strict etymology this word need signify only the active or conscious exercise of unity of life or harmony of relations, the causative idea probably belongs to the original use of the term, as it certainly is present in all current Christian use of the term. As employed in Christian theology, both practical and technical, the term includes with more or less distinctness: (a) the fact of union with God, and this always looked upon as (b) a broken union to be restored or an ideal union to be realized, (c) the procuring cause of atonement, variously defined, (d) the crucial act wherein the union is effected, the work of God and the response of the soul in which the union becomes actual. Inasmuch as the reconciliation between man and God is always conceived of as effected through Jesus Christ (2Co 5:18-21) the expression, "the Atonement of Christ," is one of the most frequent in Christian theology. Questions and controversies have turned mainly on the procuring cause of atonement, (c) above, and at this point have arisen the various "theories of the Atonement."

II. Bible Teaching concerning Atonement in General:

The Atonement of Christ must be interpreted in connection with the conception of atonement in general in the Scriptures. This idea of atonement is, moreover, part of the general circle of fundamental ideas of the religion of Yahweh and Jesus. Theories of the Atonement root themselves in conceptions of the nature and character of God, His holiness, love, grace, mercy, etc.; of man, his nature, disposition and capacities; of sin and guilt.

1. Primary Assumption of Unity of God and Man:

The basal conception for the Bible doctrine of atonement is the assumption that God and man are ideally one in life and interests, so far as man's true life and interest may be conceived as corresponding with those of God. Hence, it is everywhere assumed that God and man should be in all respects in harmonious relations, "at-one." Such is the ideal picture of Adam and Eve in Eden. Such is the assumption in the parable of the Prodigal Son; man ought to be at home with God, at peace in the Father's house (Lu 15).

Such also is the ideal of Jesus as seen especially in Joh 14-17; compare particularly 17:21ff; compare also Eph 2:11-22; 1Co 15:28. This is quite possibly the underlying idea of all those offerings in which the priests—God's representatives-and the people joined in eating at a common meal parts of what had been presented to God. The prohibition of the use of blood in food or drink is grounded on the statement that the life is in the blood (Le 17:10 f) or is the blood (Ge 9:4; De 12:23). Blood was used in the consecration of tabernacle, temple, vessels, altars, priests; all things and persons set apart for Yahweh. Then blood was required in offerings made to atone for sin and uncleanness. The reason for all this is not easy to see; but if we seek an explanation that will account for all the facts on a single principle, shall we not find it in the idea that in the life-principle of the blood God's own life was present? Through this life from God all living beings shared God's life. The blood passing out of any living being must therefore return to God and not be consumed. In sprinkling blood, the life-element, or certainly the life-symbol, over persons and things set apart for God they were, so to say, visibly taken up into the life of God, and His life extending over them made them essentially of His own person. Finally the blood of sacrifices was the returning to God of the life of the man for whom the beasts stood. And this blood was not burned with the dead sacrifice but poured out beside the holy altar. The now dead sin offering was burned, but the blood, the life, returned to God. In peace-offerings of various sorts there was the common meal in which the common life was typified.

In the claim of the first-fruits of all crops, of all flocks and of all increase, God emphasized the common life in production; asserted His claim to the total life of His people and their products. God claimed the lives of all as belonging essentially to Himself and a man must recognize this by paying a ransom price (Ex 30:12). This did not purchase for the man a right to his own life in separation from God, for it was in no sense an equivalent in value to the man's time. It the rather committed the man to living the common life with God, without which recognition the man was not fit to live at all. And the use of this recognition-money by the priests in the temple was regarded as placing the man who paid his money in a sort of continuous worshipful service in the tabernacle (or temple) itself (Ex 30:11-16).

2. The Breach in the Unity:

In both Old Testament and New Testament the assumption of unity between God and man stands over against the contrasted fact that there is a radical breach in this unity. This breach is recognized in all God's relations to men; and even when healed it is always subject to new failures which must be provided for, by the daily oblations in the Old Testament, by the continuous intercession of the Christ

(Heb 7:25; 9:24) in the New Testament. Even when there is no conscious breach, man is taught to recognize that it may exist and he must avail himself of the appointed means for its healing, e. g. daily sacrifices. This breach is universally attributed to some behavior on man's part. This may be moral or ceremonial uncleanness on man's part. He may have broken with God fundamentally in character or conduct and so by committing sin have incurred guilt; or he may have neglected the fitting recognition that his life is in common with God and so by his disregard have incurred uncleanness. After the first breach between God and man it is always necessary that man shall approach God on the assumption that this breach needs healing, and so always come with an offering. In human nature the sin breach is rooted and universal (Ro 3:9-19; 5:12-14).

3. Means for Expressing, Restoring and Maintaining:

Numerous and various means were employed for expressing this essential unity of life, for restoring it since it was broken off in sin, and for maintaining it. These means were primarily spiritual and ethical but made extensive use of material substances, physical acts and symbolical ceremonials; and these tended always to obscure and supplant the spiritual and ethical qualities which it was their function to exhibit. The prophet came to the rescue of the spiritual and ethical and reached his highest insight and function in the doctrine of the Suffering Servant of Yahweh through whom God was to be united with a redeemed race (compare among many passages, Isa 49:1-7; 66:18 ff; Ps 22:27 ff).

Atonement is conceived in both Old Testament and New Testament as partly personal and partly social, extending to the universal conception. The acts and attitudes by which it is procured, restored and maintained are partly those of the individual alone (Ps 51), partly those in which the individual secures the assistance of the priest or the priestly body, and partly such as the priest performs for the whole people on his own account. This involves the distinction that in Israel atonement was both personal and social, as also were both sin and uncleanness. Atonement was made for the group by the priest without specific participation by the people although they were, originally at least, to take cognizance of the fact and at the time. At all the great feasts, especially upon the DAY OF ATONEMENT (which see) the whole group was receptively to take conscious part in the work of atonement (Nu 29:7-11).

The various sacrifices and offerings by means of which atonement was effected in the life and worship of Israel will be found to be discussed under the proper words and are to be spoken of here only summarily. The series of offerings, guilt-offerings, burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, peace-offerings, reveal a sense of the breach with God, a conviction of the sin making the breach and an ethical appreciation of the holiness of God entirely unique among religions of ancient or modern times, and this fact must never be overlooked in interpreting the New Testament Christian doctrine of the Atonement. In the Old Testament there are sins and sinful circumstances for which no atonement is possible. Many passages, indeed, almost seem to provide against atonement for any voluntary wrongdoing (e. g. Le 4:2,13,22,27; 5:14 ff). T

his is, no doubt, an extreme interpretation, out of harmony with the general spirit of the Old Testament, but it does show how seriously sin ought to be taken under the Old Testament regime. No atonement for

murder could make possible the residence of the murderer again in that section of the land where the murder was done (Nu 35:33), although the land was not by the murder rendered unfit for occupation by others. When Israel sinned in making the golden calf, God refused to accept any atonement (Ex 32:20 ff) until there had been a great loss of life from among the sinners. No repentance could find atonement for the refusal to follow Yahweh's lead at Kadesh-barnea (Nu 14:20-25), and complete atonement was effected only when all the unbelieving generation had died in the wilderness (Nu 26:65; 32:10 ff); i. e. no atonement was possible, but the people died in that sin, outside the Land of Promise, although the sin was not allowed to cut off finally from Yahweh (Nu 14:29 f).

Permanent uncleanness or confirmed disease of an unclean sort caused permanent separation from the temple and the people of Yahweh (e. g. Le 7:20 f), and every uncleanness must be properly removed (Le 5:2; 17:15; 22:2-8; De 23:10 f). A house in which an unclean disease was found must be cleansed—have atonement made for it (Le 14:53), and in extreme cases must be utterly destroyed (Le 14:43 ff).

After childbirth (Le 12:7 f) and in all cases of hemorrhage (compare Le 15:30) atonement must be effected by prescribed offerings, a loss, diminution, or pollution of blood, wherein is the life, having been suffered. All this elaborate application of the principle of atonement shows the comprehensiveness with which it was sought by the religious teachers to impress the people with the unity of all life in the perfectly holy and majestic God whom they were called upon to serve. Not only must the priests be clean who bear the vessels of the Lord (Isa 52:11), but all the people must be clean also from all defilement of flesh and spirit, seeking perfect holiness in the fear of their God (compare 2Co 7:1).

III. The Atonement of Jesus Christ

1. Preparation for New Testament Doctrine:

All the symbols, doctrine and examples of atonement in the Old Testament among the Hebrews find their counterpart, fulfillment and complete explanation in the new covenant in the blood of Jesus Christ (Mt 26:28; Heb 12:24). By interpreting the inner spirit of the sacrificial system, by insisting on the unity and holiness of God, by passionate pleas for purity in the people, and especially by teaching the principle of vicarious suffering for sin, the Prophets laid the foundation in thought-forms and in religious atmosphere for such a doctrine of atonement as is presented in the life and teaching of Jesus and as is unfolded in the teaching of His apostles.

The personal, parabolic sufferings of Hosea, the remarkable elaboration of the redemption of spiritual Israel through a Suffering Servant of Yahweh and the extension of that redemption to all mankind as presented in Isa 40-66, and the same element in such psalms as Ps 22, constitute a key to the understanding of the work of the Christ that unifies the entire revelation of God's righteousness in passing over human sins (Ro 3:24 f). Yet it is remarkable that such a conception of the way of atonement was as far as possible from the general and average Jewish mind when Jesus came. In no sense can the New Testament doctrine of the Atonement be said to be the product of the thought and spirit of the times.

2. The One Clear Fact:

However much theologians may disagree as to the rationale of the Atonement, there is, as there can be, no question that Jesus and all His interpreters in the New Testament represent the Atonement between God and men as somehow accomplished through Jesus Christ. It is also an agreed fact in exegesis that Jesus and His apostles understood His death to be radically connected with this Atonement.

(1) Jesus Himself teaches that He has come to reveal the Father (Joh 14:9), to recover the lost (Lu 19:10), to give life to men (Joh 6:33; 10:10), to disclose and establish the kingdom of heaven (or of God), gathering a few faithful followers through whom His work will be perpetuated (Joh 17:2 ff; Mt 16:13 ff); that salvation, personal and social, is dependent upon His person (Joh 6:53 ff; 14:6). He cannot give full teaching concerning His death but He does clearly connect His sufferings with the salvation He seeks to give. He shows in Lu 4:16 ff and 22:37 that He understands Isa 52-53 as realized in Himself; He is giving Himself (and His blood) a ransom for men (Mt 20:28; 26:26 ff; compare 1Co 11:23 ff). He was not a mere martyr but gave Himself up willingly, and voluntarily (Joh 10:17 f; Ga 2:20), in accordance with the purpose of God (Ac 2:23), as the Redeemer of the world, and expected that by His lifting up all men would be drawn to Him (Joh 12:31-33). It is possible to explain the attention which the Evangelists give to the death of Jesus only by supposing that they are reflecting the importance which they recall Jesus Himself to have attached to His death.

(2) All the New Testament writers agree in making Jesus the center of their idea of the way of salvation and that His death is an essential element in His saving power. This they do by combining Old Testament teaching with the facts of the life and death of the Lord, confirming their conclusion by appeal to the Resurrection. Paul represents himself as holding the common doctrine of Christianity at the time, and from the beginning, when in 1Co 15:3 f he sums up his teaching that salvation is secured through the death and re surrection of Jesus according to the Scriptures. Elsewhere (Eph 2:16,18; 1Ti 2:5; compare Ac 4:12) in all his writings he emphasizes his belief that Jesus Christ is the one Mediator between God and man, by the blood of His cross (Col 1:20; 1Co 2:2), removing the sin barrier between God and men. Peter, during the life of Jesus so full of the current Jewish notion that God accepted the Jews de facto, in his later ministry makes Jesus in His death the one way to God (Ac 4:12; 1Pe 1:2,18,19; 2:21,24; 3:18).

John has this element so prominent in his Gospel that radical critical opinion questions its authorship partly on that account, while the epistles of John and the Revelation are, on the same ground, attributed to later Greek thought (compare 1Joh 1:7; 2:2; 3:5; 4:10; Re 1:5; 5:9). The Epistle to the Hebrews finds in Jesus the fulfillment and extension of all the sacrificial system of Judaism and holds that the shedding of blood seems essential to the very idea of remission of sins (He 9:22; compare He 2:17; 7:26 f; 9:24-28).

3. How Shall We Understand the Atonement?

When we come to systematize the teaching concerning the Atonement we find, as in all doctrine, that

definite system is not offered us in the New Testament, but all system, if it is to have any value for Christianity, must find its materials and principles in the New Testament. Proceeding in this way some features may be stated positively and finally, while others must be presented interrogatively, recognizing that interpretations may differ.

(1) An initial consideration is that the Atonement originates with God who "was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (2Co 5:19), and whose love gave Jesus to redeem sinful men (Joh 3:16; Ro 5:8, etc.). In all atonement in Old Testament and New Testament the initiative is of God who not only devises and reveals the way to reconciliation, but by means of angels, prophets, priests and ultimately His only begotten Son applies the means of atonement and persuades men to accept the proffered reconciliation. Nothing in the speculation concerning the Atonement can be more false to its true nature than making a breach between God and His Christ in their attitude toward sinful men.

(2) It follows that atonement is fundamental in the nature of God in His relations to men, and that redemption is in the heart of God's dealing in history. The "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Re 13:8 the King James Version and the English Revised Version; compare Re 5:5-7) is the interpreter of the seven-sealed book of God's providence in historyú In Jesus we behold the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world (Joh 1:29).

(3) The question will arise in the analysis of the doctrine: How does the death of Christ save us? No specific answer has ever been generally satisfactory. We have numerous theories of the Atonement. We have already intimated that the answer to this question will depend upon our idea of the nature of God, the nature of sin, the content of salvation, the nature of man, and our idea of Satan and evil spirits. We ought at once to dismiss all merely quantitative and commercial conceptions of exchange of merit. There is no longer any question that the doctrines of imputation, both of Adam's sin and of Christ's righteousness, were overwrought and applied by the early theologians with a fatal exclusiveness, without warrant in the Word of God. On the other hand no theory can hold much weight that presupposes that sin is a thing of light consequence in the nature of man and in the economy of God. Unless one is prepared to resist unto blood striving against sin (Heb 12:2-4), he cannot know the meaning of the Christ. Again, it may be said that the notion that the death of Christ is to be considered apart from His life, eternal and incarnate life, as the atoning work, is far too narrow to express the teaching of the Bible and far too shallow to meet the demands of an ethical conscience.

It would serve clearness if we reminded ourselves that the question of how in the Atonement may involve various elements. We may inquire: (a) for the ground on which God may righteously receive the sinner; (b) for the means by which God places the restoration within the reach of the sinner; (c) for the influence by which the sinner is persuaded to accept the reconciliation; (d) for the attitude or exercise of the sinner toward God in Christ wherein he actually enters the state of restored union with God. The various theories have seemed to be exclusive, or at least mutually antagonistic, largely because they have taken partial views of the whole subject and have emphasized some one feature of the whole content. All serious theories partly express the truth and all together are inadequate fully to declare how the Daystar from on high doth guide our feet into the way of peace (Lu 1:79).

(4) Another question over which theologians have sorely vexed themselves and each other concerns the extent of the Atonement, whether it is available for all men or only for certain particular, elect ones. That controversy may now be passed by. It is no longer possible to read the Bible and suppose that God relates himself sympathetically with only a part of the race. All segregated passages of Scripture formerly employed in support of such a view have now taken their place in the progressive self-interpretation of God to men through Christ who is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 Joh 2:2). No man cometh unto the Father but by Him (Joh 14:6): but whosoever does thus call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved (Joe 2:32; Ac 2:21).

See also ATONEMENT, DAY OF; PROPITIATION; RECONCILIATION; SACRIFICE.

LITERATURE.

In the vast literature on this subject the following is suggested: Articles by Orr in HDB; by Mackenzie in Standard Bible Dictionary; in the Catholic Encyclopedia; in Jewish Encyclopedia; by Simpson in Hastings, DCG; J. McLeod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement; John Champion, The Living Atonement; W. M. Clow, The Cross in Christian Experience; T. J. Crawford, The Doctrine of Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonement; R. W. Dale, The Atonement; J. Denney, The Death of Christ: Its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament, and The Atonement and the Modern Mind; W. P. DuBose, The Soteriology of the New Testament; P. T. Forsyth, The Cruciality of the Cross; J. Scott Lidgett, The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement; Oxenham, The Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement; A. Ritschl, The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, I, II; Riviere, Le dogme de la redemption; D. W. Simon, Reconciliation by Incarnation; W. L. Walker, The Cross and the Kingdom; various writers, The Atonement and Modern Religious Thought.

William Owen Carver

ATONEMENT, DAY OF

a-ton’-ment:

I. THE LEGAL ENACTMENTS

1. Named

2. Leviticus 16

(1) Contents, Structure and Position

(a) Leviticus 16:1-10

(b) Leviticus 16:11-24

(c) Leviticus 16:25-28

(d) Leviticus 16:29-34

Use of Number Four

Place in Leviticus

(2) Modern Attempts to Disprove Unity of Chapter II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

1. The Significance for Israel

2. The Significance from a Christian Standpoint

III. ON THE HISTORY OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT

1. The Long Silence of History

(1) The Facts and the False Conclusions

(2) The Historicity of the Day of Atonement

2. Further Development

I. The Legal Enactments.

1. Named:

In addition to the chief passage, Le 16, which is treated under a separate head, we have the following:

In Ex 30:10 it is mentioned in the directions that are given for the construction of the altar of incense that Aaron, once a year, is to make an atonement on the horns of the altar, with the blood of the sin offering, which is used for the purpose of an atonement for sin.

In Le 23:26-32 mention is made in the list of festivals of the Day of Atonement, on the 10th day of the 7th month. It is ordered that for this day there shall be a holy convocation at the sanctuary, a fast, an offering by fire, and rest from labor from the 9th day of the 7th month in the evening.

According to Le 25:9 the year of jubilee begins with the Day of Atonement.

Nu 18 speaks of the duties and the rights of the priests and the Levites. In contrast with the latter, according to 18:7, Aaron and his sons are to perform the duties of the priesthood in all matters pertaining to the altar and of the service within the veil and shall render this service. We have here doubtless a comprehensive law for the entire priestly order, so that from this alone it cannot be determined that the service within the veil, by which reference is made to the ceremony of the Day of Atonement, has been reserved for the high priest alone, just as in De 10:8; 33:8 ff, everything that pertains to the whole tribe of Levi is found combined, without thereby the division into high priest, priests and Levites, being regarded as excluded (compare EZEKIEL, II, 2, (1), c).

Nu 29:7-11 contains in connection with the laws treating of sacrifices also the enactment, that on the 10th day of the 7th month there shall take place a holy convocation at the sanctuary, fasting and rest from labor. In addition to the sin offering, which is brought for the purpose of atonement for sin, and in addition to the regular burnt offerings and the accompanying meal offerings and drink offerings, burnt offerings also are to be brought, namely, one young bullock, one young ram, seven lambs of the first year (all without blemish); then meal offerings, namely, three-tenths (compare Nu 28:12-14) of fine flour mingled with oil for each bullock; two-tenths for each ram; one-tenth for each lamb; then a sin offering, namely, one he-goat. Ezekiel in his vision of the new temple, of the holy city and the holy country (chapters 40-48), in 45:18 ff, gives a series of enactments for the festivals and the sacrifices. According to these, on the 1st day of the 1st month and on the 7th day of the 1st month (on the 1st day of the 7th month according to the Septuagint), the sanctuary is to be cleansed through a young bullock without blemish, the priest taking some of the blood of the sin offering and putting it on the posts of the temple, on the four corners of the altar and on the posts of the gate of the inner court; and this is to be done for the sake of those who perhaps have sinned through error or ignorance. Further, that sacrifice which is to be brought on the Passover by the princes for themselves and all the people of the land (compare 45:22) appears to present a clear analogy to Le 16. As for the rest, Eze 40-48 cannot without further consideration be put on the same level with the other legal enactments, but are to be regarded as an ideal scheme, the realization of which is conditioned on the entrance of the wonderful future (compare EZEKIEL).

2. Leviticus 16:

(1) Contents, Structure and Position.

Le 16:1-28 contains instructions given by Yahweh to Moses for his brother Aaron (16:1,2).

(a) Leviticus 16:1-10.

Leviticus 16:1-10 contain presuppositions, preparations and summary statements of the ceremonies on the Day of Atonement. According to 16:1,2, Aaron is not allowed to enter the holy place at any time whatever, lest he may die as did his sons with their unseemly fire offering (compare Le 10:1 ff); 16:3-5

tell what is necessary for the ceremony: For himself four things: a young bullock as a sin offering (compare 16:6,11,14,15,27); a ram for burnt offering (compare 16:24); sacred garments, namely, a linen coat, linen breeches, linen girdle, linen mitre (compare 16:23,32); a bath. For the congregation: two he-goats as a sin offering (compare 16:7 ff, 15-22,25,27,28,32,33), a ram as a burnt offering (compare 16:24). The passages in parentheses show how closely the succeeding parts of this account are connected with this introductory part, 16:1-10. In other parts of Le also it is often found that the materials used for the sacrifices are mentioned first, before anything is said in detail of what is to be done with this material. Compare 8:1,2 with 8:6,7 ff, 10,14,18,22,26 and 9:2-4 with 9:7,8 ff, 12 ff, 15-18. In 16:6 Aaron's sin- offering bullock is to be used as an atonement for himself; 16:7-10 refer to the two goats: they are to be placed at the door of the tent of meeting (16:7); lots are to be cast upon them for Yahweh and Azazel (16:8); the first to be prepared as a sin offering for Yahweh (16:9); the second, in accordance with the law, to be sent into the desert (16:10).

(b) Leviticus 16:11-24.

Leviticus 16:11-24 describe the ceremony itself and give fuller directions as to how the different sacrificial materials mentioned under (a) are to be used by Aaron: 16:11-14 speak of the atonement for Aaron and his house; 16:11, of his sin-offering bullock to be killed; 16:12, of burning coal from the altar and two handfuls of sweet incense beaten small to be placed behind the veil; 16:13, of the cloud of incense to be made in the Holy of Holies, so that the top covering is hidden and Aaron is protected from the danger of death; 16:14, of some of the blood to be sprinkled once on the front of the top covering and seven times in front of it. Le 16:15-19 prescribe the ceremony with the first sin-offering goat for the congregation: in 16:15,16, the ceremony described in 16:14 is directed also to be carried out with the goat, as an atonement for the inner sanctuary, cleansing it from blemishes; in 16:16b the same thing is directed to be done in regard to the tabernacle of revelation, i. e. the holy place, in 16:17, no one is permitted to be present even in the holy place when these ceremonies take place; in 16:18,19, the altar too is directed to be cleansed by an atonement, some of the blood of both sin-offering animals being smeared on the horns and sprinkled seven times on the ground.

Le 16:20-22 prescribes the ceremony with the second sin-offering goat for the congregation: 16:20 directs it to be brought there; in 16:21 there takes place the transfer of guilt; Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the goat; shal l confess all guilt over him; shall lay them upon the head of the goat; shall through a man send him into the desert; in 16:22a, the goat carries the guilt into an uninhabited land; in 16:22b, he is not to be let go until he is in the desert.

Le 16:23,24, the concluding act: in 16:23a, Aaron takes off his linen garments in the tent of meeting, and in 16:23b puts them down there; in 16:24a, he bathes in the holy place and again puts on his usual clothing; in 16:24b he brings the burnt offering for himself and his people. (The statement 'for himself and his people' at this place concludes the ritual as such.)

(c) Leviticus 16:25-28.

Leviticus 16:25-28 are explanatory, with three additional directions. In 16:25, the fat of the sin offering is directed to be consumed into smoke on the altar; 16:26, he who has taken away the second goat must wash his clothes and bathe himself, and only then is he permitted to enter the camp; 16:27, the fat, flesh and dung of the sin-offering animal, and then the blood that was brought into the (inner) sanctuary, are to be burned outside of the camp; 16:28, he who has burned these must wash his clothes, and must bathe, and only after this can he enter the camp. (In this case 16:25 and 27 correspond, and also 16:26 and 28; and in addition 16:26,27,28 are united by their reference to the camp.)

(d) Leviticus 16:29-34.

Leviticus 16:29-34: Over against these sections (a)—(c) (16:1-28), which contain the instructions for the high priest, we have a fourth (16:29-34), which already through the address in the second person plural and also by its contents is intended for the congregation. In 16:29-31, the demand is made of the congregation. As in Le 23:26 ff; Nu 29:7 ff, a fast and absolute rest are prescribed for the 10th day of the 7th month as the Day of Atonement; in Le 16:32-34, a number of directions are given in a summary to the congregation on the basis of 16:1 ff, namely, 16:32, how the atonement is to take place: the priest who is anointed; he shall be consecrated; that he perform the service in his father's place; in his linen garments; 16:33 prescribes when and for whom the atonement is to take place: for the holy of holies; for the holy place; for the altar; for the order of priests and all the people; in 16:34, the one Day of Atonement in the year for all sins is declared to be an everlasting statute. The statement that Aaron (16:2), according to Yahweh's command, did as Moses directed aptly closes the whole chapter.

Use of Number Four

The number four appears to occupy a predominating place in this chapter, as the bird's-eye view above already shows, and as this can be traced still further in the details of the accounts. But even if this significance of the number four in the division of the chapter is accidental, although this number appears almost as a matter of course, and in Ex 35:4-40:38, in Ge 12-25, in the story of Abraham, Le 11-15, and De 12-26 naturally fall into four pericopes with four subdivisions, yet this chapter is, as far as contents are concerned, so closely connected, and so well organized as a whole, that all attempts to ascribe it to different sources, concerning which we shall speak immediately, must come to naught in view of this fact.

Place in Leviticus

At this point we first of all draw attention to the fact that Le 16 has its well-established place in the whole of the Book of Le (compare LEVITICUS). The whole book has as its purpose to regulate the dealings of the Israelites with their God, and it does this in such a way that the first part (Le 1-17) removes the hindrances that have been caused by sin. In this the ordinances with reference to the Day of Atonement (Le 16), and with reference to the significance of the blood (Le 17), constitute a natural acme and excellent conclusion, while this prepares for the positive sanctification, which is discussed in Le 18 ff. In 15:31 we find in addition a clear transition to the thoughts of Le 16, for in this passage mention is

made of the uncleanness of the Israelites, which contaminates the dwelling-place of Yahweh that is in their midst.

(2) Modern Attempts to Disprove Unity of Chapter.

A large number of attempts have been made to destroy the unity of this chapter, which has been demonstrated in division (1) above. Thus Stade separates Le 16:3-10 as the original kernel from the explanatory and changing details that were added in 16:11-28. But we have already seen that 16:3-10 are the preparation for all that follows, so that these verses demand 16:11 ff as a necessary complement. Again Oort separates 16:1-4,1 1b, 14, 16, 18a, 19, 23, 24a, 25a, 29a from the rest, by using the purification of the sanctuary and the atonement of the people as the measure for this separation; but above all it is proved by Eze 45:18-20 that just these two thoughts are inseparably united. In recent times it has become the custom, following the leadership of Benzinger, to divide the text into three parts. Baentsch divides as follows:

(a) Le 16:1-4,6,12 f, 34b contain a single pericope, which on the basis of the fate of the sons of Aaron, described in Le 10, determines under what circumstances Aaron alone is permitted to enter the Holy of Holies;

(b) Le 16:29-34 a contain "an older, relatively simpler law in reference to the yearly day of penitence and atonement";

(c) 16:5,7-10,11,14-28 are a "later enlargement of this ritual, with a more complicated blood rite," and above all with "the rite of the sin goat." Of these three pieces only (a) is thought to belong to the original Priest Codex, as proved especially by its reference back to Le 10; (b) is regarded as belonging to the secondary parts, because the day of repentance is not yet mentioned in Ne 8 ff; compare III, 1; at any rate the anointing of all the priests is there not yet presupposed (compare LEVITICUS); (c), however, is declared to be very late and its separate parts are regarded as having originated only after the others (thus recently also Bertholet).

It is impossible here to enter into all the minor parts eliminated by the exegetes; and in the same way we do not intend in our examination to enter into all the incorrect views found in these criticisms. We confine ourselves to the chief matter. The very foundation of the criticism is wrong. What Aaron’s sons experienced according to Le 10 could very easily have furnished a connecting link for that ritual which is introduced in Le 16:2 ff, but could never have furnished the occasion for the composition of the pericope described above (a); for Nadab and Abihu had not entered into the Holy of Holies at all. Just as little justifiable is the conclusion drawn from chapter 10, that chapter 16 originally followed immediately on chapter 10. For who could possibly have conceived the thought of inserting chapters 11-15 in an altogether unsuitable place between chapters 10 and 16 and thus have split asunder a connection so transparent? In general, the different attempts to break the unity of this chapter show how subjective and arbitrary these attempts are. They are a characteristic example of the manner in which the Priest Codex is now being further divided (compare LEVITICUS). In general, sufficient material for the

positive refutation of such attempts has been given above.

II. The Significance of the Day of Atonement.

1. The Significance for Israel:

The significance of the day is expressed in the name "Day of Atonement" Yom ha-kippurim: (Le 23:27 f; 25:9) in the same manner as it is in the fast which was enjoined on the congregation as a sign of sorrow for their sins (this fasting being the only one enjoined by the law: Le 16:29,31; 23:26 ff; Nu 29:7 ff), as also finally and chiefly in the entire ritual (Ex 30:10; Le 23:28; Nu 29:11; Le 16; compare also Eze 18:20,22). Then, too, the atonement takes place for the sanctuary which has been defiled by the contamination of the Israelites (Ex 30:10; Le 16:16-20,33; compare also Eze 45:18-20). In particular, mention is made of the Holy of Holies (Le 16:33, called Miqdash ha-qodhesh; otherwise in Le regularly ha-qodhesh), then of the holy place (16:16b, 20,33), and then of the altar (16:18,20,33). In the last-mentioned case it is a matter of discussion whether the altar of incense is meant, as is claimed by Jewish tradition, on the basis of Ex 30:10, or the altar of burnt offerings, for which reference could be made to the additional statements in Le 16:18, to those of 16:16, and to the conclusion in 16:17. The altar of incense (Ex 30:10) would then be included in the atonement of the tent of meeting. The somewhat remarkable position of 16:17b would then at the same time find its motive in this, that, while 16:6 and 11b mention an atonement only for Aaron and his house, the atonement of the Holy of Holies and of the holy place in 16:17 is for Aaron, his house, and the whole congregation, while the atonement of the burnt-offering altar in the forecourt (16:18) would be intended only for the sins of the congregation. The atonement, however, takes place for all the transgressions of the congregation since the last Day of Atonement (compare 16:21 f, 30,34). In reference to the significance of what is done with the second goat of sin offering, compare 16:8 ff, 20 ff, and AZAZEL, II,

1. In this way Delitzsch has correctly called the Day of Atonement "the Good Friday of the Old Testament." How deeply the consciousness of sin must have been awakened, if the many otherwise commanded private and congregational sacrifices did not make such an institution superfluous, and if even the high priest himself stood before God as a sinner (16:6,11 ff). On this day, with the exception of the mitre, he does not wear the insignia of his high-priestly office, but wears white garments, which in their simplicity correspond to the earnestness of the situation. The repetition of the bath, both in his case and in that of the other persons engaged in the ceremony (16:4,24,26,28), was necessary, because the mere washing of the hands and feet (Ex 30:19 f) would not suffice on this occasion (compare Nu 19:7 ff, 19,21). The flesh of the sin-offering animals was not permitted to be eaten but had to be burned (16:27) because it was sacrificed also for Aaron’s sin, and its blood was carried not only into the holy place but also into the Holy of Holies , compare 16:27 with Le 6:23; 4:11 f, 21; Ex 29:14; Le 8:17; 9:11; 10:19. And in comparison with the consciousness of sin that had been aroused, how great must on the other hand God’s grace appear, when once in each year a general remission of all the sins that had been forgiven was guaranteed.

2. Significance from a Christian Standpoint:

"The Day of Atonement, the good Friday of the Old Testament"—these words express not only the highest significance of the day but also its limitations. As the tabernacle, the sacrificial system, the entire law, thus too the Day of Atonement in particular contained only the shadow of future good things, but not these things themselves (Heb 10:1), and is "like in pattern to the true" (Heb 9:24). Christ Himself entered into the holy place, which was not made with hands, namely, into heaven itself, and has now appeared before God, by once for all giving Himself as a sacrifice for the removal of sin (Heb 9:23 ff). By this act the purpose of the Old Testament sacrificial cult and its highest development, namely, the Day of Atonement, understood in its typical significance, has been fulfilled, and at the same time surpassed and thereby abrogated (compare LEVITICUS). Accordingly, our hope, too, like an anchor—(Heb 6:19), penetrates to the inner part of the veil in the higher sense of the term, i. e. to heaven.

III. On the History of the Day of Atonement.

1. The Long Silence of History:

(1) The Facts and the False Conclusions.

The Day of Atonement is stated to have been instituted in the times of Moses (Le 16:1); the ceremony takes place in the tabernacle (tent of meeting); the people are presupposed to be in the camp (Le 16:26 ff); Aaron is still the high priest. Very remarkably there is but little evidence of the observance of this prominent day in the later history of Israel. Down to the time of the Exile there is found a deep silence on this subject.

The days of atonement in Eze 45:18 ff (compare under I, 1) differ in number and observance from that in Le 16. According to Zec 3:9, God in the Messianic future will take away the guilt of the land in a single day; but this too presents no more than an analogy to the results of the Day of Atonement. On the other hand, there is no reference made to the day where we could expect it. Not only 2Ch 7:7-9 in connection with the consecration of Solomon’s temple, and Ezr 3:1-6, in the account of the reintroduction of the sacrificial services after the return from the Exile, are silent on the subject, which fact could possibly be explained in an easy manner; but also Ne 8 f. According to 8:2 f, Ezra begins on the 1st day of the 7th month in the year 444 BC to read from the law; on the 2nd day of the 7th month remembrance is made of the ordinance treating of the feast of tabernacles, and on the 22nd day of the 7th month (Ne 8:13 ff), this festival is observed; on the 24th day of the 7th month a day of penance is observed (Ne 9:1); but of the Day of Atonement coming in between Ne 8:1 and chapter 9:1, namely, on the 10th day of the 7th month, which would seem to make the day of penance superfluous, nothing is said.

From these facts the Wellhausen school has drawn the conclusion, in accordance with its principles elsewhere observed, that all those legal enactments that have not in the history a sufficient evidence of having been observed, did not exist until the time when they have such historical evidence; that therefore the Day of Atonement did not originate until after the year 444 BC. It is claimed that the day originated in the two days of atonement mentioned in Eze 45:18-20 (compare under I, 1); in the four national fast

days of Zec 7:5, and 8:19, and in the day of penance of 444 BC, just mentioned, on the 24th day of the 7th month, which is said to hav e been repeated on the following New Year's day, the 10th day of the 7th month; and that by the sacred character of its observance it soon crowded the New Year day upon the 1st day of the 7th month (compare Le 23:23 ff; Nu 29:1 ff; contrary to Le 25:9 and Eze 40:1). In this way it is thought that Le 16:29 ff first originated, and that at a still later time the complicated blood ritual had been added (compare under I, 1, 2). But it is to be observed that in still later times there is found no more frequent mention of the Day of Atonement than in the earlier, although it is the custom of modern criticism to place a much larger bulk of Biblical literature into this later period. It is only when we come to Jesus Sirach (Ecclesiasticus 50:5 ff) that the high priest Simon is praised, when he came forth from behind the veil; and this is certainly a reference. to the Day of Atonement, although no further mention is made at this place of the ceremony as such. Then there is a further silence on the subject down to Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews (He 6:19; 9:7,13 ff; 10:1 ff; compare under II, 2). It is probable too that the fasting mentioned in Ac 27:9 is based on the Day of Atonement. We have in this manner a characteristic example to show how carefully we must handle the argument from silence, if we do not want to arrive at uncomfortable results.

(2) The Historicity of the Day of Atonement.

Since Le 16 constitutes only one part of the Levitical legislation, the question as to the original and historical character of the day cannot be fully discussed at this place (see LEVITICUS). At so late a period, naturally all the data that would lead to an explanation of the origin of such a fundamental institution as the Day of Atonement are lacking. It is all the more impossible to separate Le 16 from the other priestly ordinances, because the name of the lid of the ark of covenant hakapporeth: (Ex 25:17 ff; 26:34) stands in the clearest relation to the ceremony that takes place with this ark on the Day of Atonement. The impossibility of splitting up Le 16 as is the manner of critics, or even as much as separating it from Le 11-15, has been sufficiently demonstrated above (compare under I). Against the view which forces the Priest Codex down at least to the Exile and to claim the tabernacle as the product of imagination and as a copy of the temple of Solomon (see EXODUS), we have still the following to add:

If the ark of the covenant was no longer in existence after the Exile and if, according to Jer 3:16, the Israelites no longer expected its restoration, then it would have been absolutely impossible in the ritual of the Day of Atonement to connect the most important ceremony of this ritual with this ark and on this to base the atonement. In the second temple, as is well known, the incense pan was placed on the "foundation stone" in the Holy of Holies, because there was no tabernacle. Against these facts the counter-arguments mentioned above cannot stand. Even those who deny the existence of the Day of Atonement do not lay much stress on 2Ch 7:1-9 and Ezr 3:1-6; but Ne 8 ff also does not deserve mention, since in this place the emphasis lies on the purpose of showing how the congregation was to declare its adherence to the law, and how the Day of Repentance, which had been observed since the beginning of the history of Israel, was instituted to be observed on the 24th day of the 7th month for all sins (9:1 ff), and was not made superfluous by the celebration of the Day of Atonement on the 10th day of the 7th month, on which day only the sins of the last year were taken into consideration. But Ezekiel changed or ignored also other pre-exilic arrangements (compare EZEKIEL), so that he is no authority in

deciding the question as to the earlier existence of the Day of Atonement. Finally, attention must be drawn to the fact that the Passover festival is mentioned in prophetic literature, in addition to the mere reference in Isa 30:29, only in Eze 45:21; the ark of the covenant only in Jer 3:16; the Feast of Tabernacles only in Ho 12:9; Eze 45:25; and that in its historical connection the Feast of Weeks is mentioned incidentally only in 2Ch 8:13, and possibly in 1Ki 9:25, and is not at all found in Eze (compare 45:18 ff), although the existence of these institutions has for a very long time been called into question.

2. Further Development:

The Day of Atonement, in accordance with its purpose in later times, came more and more into the foreground and was called "the great fast" or "the great day," or merely "the day." Its ritual was further enlarged and the special parts mentioned in the law were fully explained, fixed and specialized. Compare especially the tract "Yoma" in the Mish; and for the further elaborations and stories in poetry and prose on the basis of the Talmud, see, e. g. Delitzsch's translation from Maim, Ha-yadh ha-chazaqah, in the supplement to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, 1857. According to these accounts, e. g. the high priest had to be a married man. Already seven days before the beginning of the Day of Atonement he was ordered to leave his house and had to submit to a series of purifications and had to practice for the performance of the different purification ceremonies, some of which were difficult. The last night he was not allowed to sleep and had to spend his time in studying the sacred writings.

On the Day of Atonement he took five baths and ten washings. Four times he enters the Holy of Holies (with the incense), with the blood of both sin offerings, and when he brings out the utensils used with the incense he makes three confessions of sins (for himself, for himself and his house, for Israel); 10 times in all he utters the name of Yahweh; 43 times he sprinkles; in addition he must read certain sections of the Scriptures or repeat them from memory (compare also AZAZEL). When he returns home he celebrates a festival of rejoicing, because he has without harm been able to leave the sanctuary. In addition, he had performed severe physical work, and especially difficult was the manipulation of the incense. The modern estimate put on the Day of Atonement appears from the following citation of Wellhausen: "The rite and the sacrifice through the unfavorable circumstances of the times have disappeared; but it has retained the same sacred character. He who has not yet entirely broken with Judaism observes this day, no matter how indifferent he may be otherwise to old customs and festivals."

Wilhelm Moller

ATROTH-BETH-JOAB

at-roth-beth-jo'-ab 'aTroth beth yo'abh ("crowns of the house of Joab"): the King James Version "Ataroth," the house of Joab. Probably a family in Judah (1Ch 2:54).

ATROTH-SHOPHAN

at’-roth-sho’fan ‘Troth shophan; Septuagint gen sophan: A town built or fortified by the children of Gad East of the Jordan (Nu 32:35), named next to Aroer. If it had been at Khirbet ‘Attarus or Jebel ‘Attarus (HDB and EB, under the word) Aroer would hardly have been named between them. The King James Version reads Atroth, Shophah, understanding that two places are named. No identification is yet possible.

ATTAI

at’-ta-i at’-i ‘attay, ("timely?"):

(1) A son of Jarha, the Egyptian, by a daughter of Sheshan (1Ch 2:35 f).

(2) A Gadite soldier who joined David’s army at Ziklag (1Ch 12:11).

(3) A son of Rehoboam and grandson of Solomon (2Ch 11:20).

ATTAIN

a-tan’:The rendering of qanah =" buy," "get" (Pr 1:5); nasagh=" reach," "a meal-offering .... according as he is able" (Eze 46:7 margin), "not attained unto the days" (Ge 47:9); yakhol or yakhowl =" be able," "overcome," "attain to innocency" (Ho 8:5); bo’ =" come," "follow" (2Sa 23:19,23; 1Ch 11:21,25); katantao=" arrive at" (Ac 27:12 the King James Version; Php 3:11); katalambano =" take eagerly," "seize," "apprehend," "attained to righteousness" (Ro 9:30); phthano =" have arrived at" (Ro 9:31 the King James Version; Php 3:16); lambano -"take," "get a hold of," "catch," the Revised Version (British and American) "already obtained" (Php 3:12); parakoloutheo =" follow," "trace out," "conform to" (1Ti 4:6). Here the Revised Version (British and American) corrects the King James Version.

Frank E. Hirsch

ATTALIA

at-a-li’-a Attalia: A city on the southern coast of Asia Minor in ancient Pamphylia which, according to Ac 14:25, was visited by Paul and Barnabas on the way to Antioch during their first missionary journey. The city was founded by Attalus II Philadelphus (159-138 BC), hence, its name Attalia, which during the Middle Ages was corrupted to Satalia; its modern name is Adalia. Attalia stood on a flat terrace of limestone, about 120 ft. high, near the point where the Catarrhactes River flowed into the sea. The river now, however, has practically disappeared, for the greater part of its water is turned into the fields for irrigation purposes. The early city did not enjoy the ecclesiastical importance of the neighboring city of Perga; but in 1084 when Perga declined, Attalia became a metropolis. In 1148 the troops of Louis IV sailed from there to Syria; in 1214 the Seljuks restored the city walls, and erected several public

buildings. The city continued to be the chief port for ships from Syria and Egypt, and the point of entry to the interior until modern times, when the harbor at Mersine was reopened; it has now become a place of little importance.

The town possesses considerable which is of archaeological interest. The outer harbor was protected by ancient walls and towers now in ruins; its entrance was closed with a chain. The inner harbor was but a recess in the cliff. The city was surrounded by two walls which were constructed at various times from material taken from the ruins of the ancient city; the outer wall was protected by a moat. The modern town, lying partly within and partly without the walls is thus divided into quarters. In the southern quarter live the Christians; in the northern the Moslems. Among other objects of archaeological interest still to be seen may be mentioned the inscribed arched gateway of Hadrian and the aqueduct. Rich gardens now surround the town; the chief exports are grain, cotton, licorice root and valonia or acorn-cups.

E. J. Banks

ATTALUS

at'-a-lus: King of Pergamum, mentioned in 1 Macc 15:22 among the kings to whom was sent an edict (Ant., XIV, viii, 5) from Rome forbidding the persecution of the Jews. See ATTALIA.

ATTEND; ATTENDANCE

a-tend'; a-tend'-ans:

(1) "To incline," "listen," "regard" qashabh; (Ps 17:1 etc.); then, in the King James Version, "observe," but in the Revised Version (British and American), more frequently, "give heed" prosechein noun, as in 1Ti 4:13.

(2) "To be with," "take care of," "wait upon" (Es 4:5; Heb 7:13; Ro 13:6); literally, "give unremitting care to," as in 1Co 7:35 (Luther: "serve the Lord constantly and without hindrance").

ATTENT; ATTENTIVE

a-tent' (archaic; 2Ch 6:40); a-tent'-iv: Expresses the direction of thought and interest toward some one point. Same Hebrew word as "attend," and is used particularly in prayers (Ps 130:2; Ne 1:6). "Very attentive" (Lu 19:48) is a paraphrase for what is literally rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), "the people all hung upon him, listening" exekremeto.

ATTHARATES

a-thar’-a-tez: A title assigned to Nehemiah, probably by a later editor (Ne 8:9). The Septuagint omits the title; the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) gives "Athersatha"; the King James Version reads "Nehemiah, which is the Tirshatha." Tirshatha is the Persian title for a local or provincial governor (Ne 8:9 = 1 Esdras 9:49). See TIRSHATHA.

ATTHARIAS; ATHARIAS

a-tha-ri’as: 1 Esdras 5:40 = Ezr 2:63. See TIRSHATHA.

ATTIRE; DYED ATTIRE

a-tir’:"Can a virgin forget her ornaments, or a bride her attire?" asks the prophet Jeremiah in hot remonstrance against Israel’s unfaithfulness. "Yet," saith Yahweh, "my people have forgotten me" (2:32). "And I saw that she was defiled," cries Ezekiel against Jerusalem; "she saw men ... girded with girdles upon their loins, with flowing turbans [AV exceeding in dyed attire] upon their heads, ... after the likeness of the Babylonians in Chaldea, ... and .... she doted upon them ...."(Eze 23:13-16). "And, behold, there met him," says the author of Pr (Pr 7:10) in his description of the "strange woman," that "lieth in wait at every street corner," "a woman with the attire of a harlot, and wily of heart," whose "house is the way to Sheol" (Pr 7:27). These passages show how diversely and elastically the term "attire" was used among the Hebrews. The numerous synonyms for "dress," "attire," "apparel," "clothes," "raiment," "garment," etc., found in English Versions of the Bible, reflect a similar wealth of nomenclature in the original Hebrew and Greek; but the lack of exactness and consistency in the renderings of translators makes the identification of the various articles of dress referred to very difficult, sometimes impossible. See DRESS.

George B. Eager

ATTITUDES

at’-i-tuds: Customs change slowly in Bible lands. This becomes clear by a comparison of the many references found in the Bible and other literatures of the Orient with existing circumstances and conditions. The same fact is attested by the pictures illustrating daily life upon the monuments of Assyria, Babylonia and Egypt in the countries between the Nile and the Tigris. Many of these, dating back to the second or third millennium before our era, prove conclusively that the same practices and usages as are now common among the inhabitants of those lands were in vogue in the days of Hammurabi and the early rulers of Egypt. This is especially true of matters pertaining to the worship of the gods, and of the attitudes or positions assumed in homage and respect to monarchs and those in authority.

The many references found in the Bible to these same usages prove that the Hebrews too had much in common with the nations around them, not only in creed, but also in the mode of worship, as well as in general everyday etiquette. This is not strange, at least among the Semitic peoples, for there is more or

less agreement, even among all nations, ancient and modern, in the attitude of the worshipper in temple and high place.

The outward tokens of respect and honor shown by Orientals to their superiors, above all to monarchs, may seem exaggerated. But when we consider that the king was God’s vicegerent upon the earth or over a certain country, and in some sense Divine, worthy even of adoration, it is not strange that almost equal homage should be paid him as the gods themselves. The higher the person was in power, the greater the honor and respect shown him. It is natural, therefore, that God, the Lord of Lords, and the King of Kings should be the recipient of the highest reverence and adoration.

There are several Hebrew words used to describe the various attitudes assumed by those who worshipped Yahweh and heathen gods; these same words are constantly employed in speaking of the homage or respect paid to rulers and persons in authority. The most common terms are those rendered "to stand," "to bow," "to kneel" and "prostrate oneself" or "fall on the face." It is not always easy to differentiate between them, for often one passes imperceptibly into the other. No doubt several attitudes were assumed by the worshipper or suppliant while offering a prayer or petition. The intensity, the ardor or earnestness with which such a petition or prayer was presented would naturally have much to do with the words and posture of the petitioner, though the same expression might be employed to designate his posture or attitude. Thus "to fall on the face" might be done in many different ways. The Moslems observe a regular course of nine or more different postures in their worship. These are more or less faithfully observed by the faithful everywhere. It is almost certain that the Hebrews in common with other Orientals observed and went through almost every one of these attitudes as they presented themselves in prayer to Yahweh. We shall call attention to just four postures:

(1) standing,

(2) bowing,

(3) kneeling, and

(4) falling on the face or prostration.

1. Standing:

This was one of the very common postures in prayer to God, especially in public worship. It is still customary to stand either erect or with slightly bowed head while offering the public prayers in the synagogue. This is likewise the common practice of a large number of Christians in this and other lands, and no doubt such a posture is sanctioned by the example of the early church and primitive Christians, who, in turn, adopted the usages of the Jewish church. The same practice was in vogue among the Persians, Egyptians and Babylonians and other ancient people as is evidenced by their sculptures and paintings. The famous stela of Hammurabi shows this great king in a standing position as he receives the famous Code from the sun-god.

There are numerous Babylonian and Assyrian seals on which are pictured a priest in a standing position before the throne of Sin or Shamash. In this attitude with uplifted hands, he is sometimes accompanied by the person in whose behalf prayers are made. A beautiful rock sculpture at Ibriz, Southeast of Eregli in Lycaonia, shows us a king or satrap in a standing position, worshipping a local Baal. E. J. Davies, the discoverer of this Hittite monument, in describing it, makes this remark, which we cannot refrain from inserting, inasmuch as it gives another proof of the unchangeable East. He says: "He (the god) wears boots turned up in front, and bound round the leg above the ankle by thongs and a piece of leather reaching half-way up the shin, exactly as it is worn to this day by the peasants of the plain of Cilicia round Adana." King Solomon, during at least a portion of his prayer at the dedication of the temple, stood before the altar with his hands stretched out toward heaven (1Ki 8:22). Numerous allusions to prayer in the New Testament prove that standing was the common posture (Mt 6:5; Mr 11:25; Lu 18:11).

What has been said about standing while praying to God is true also of the attitude of the petitioner when paying homage or making an entreaty to man. The Assyrian and Babylonian monuments are full of evidence on this point; we shall give only one illustration: One of the sculptures describing the siege of Lachish by Sennacherib represents the monarch as seated upon his throne while the conquered stand or kneel before him. Joseph stood before Pharaoh (Ge 41:46). Solomon’s advisers stood before him (2Ch 10:6) and so did those of Rehoboam (2Ch 10:8). The same attitude was assumed by suppliants in the Persian court (Es 5:2; 8:4). The same is true of Babylonia (Da 1:19; 2:2).

2. Kneeling:

Though standing seems to have been the usual attitude, it is quite certain that kneeling was common at all times. The monuments afford abundant proof for this statement; so too the many references in the Bible. Solomon not only stood before the altar on the occasion of dedicating his famous temple, but he also knelt (1Ki 8:54; 2Ch 6:13). Josephus, describing this ceremony, says that the king at the conclusion of his prayer prostrated himself on the ground and in this posture continued worshipping for a long time. Ezra fell upon his knees as he addressed Yahweh in prayer (Ezr 9:5). Daniel, too, knelt upon his knees and prayed three times a day (Da 6:10). The same practice was observed by the apostles and the early church; for we read that Stephen (Ac 7:60), Peter (Ac 9:40), Paul (Ac 20:36) and others (Ac 21:5) assumed this posture as they prayed.

3. Bowing:

As already stated, it is not always easy to determine the exact posture of those described as kneeling or bowing, for this varied with the temperament of the suppliant and the intensity of his prayer or supplication. Eleazer when sent to select a wife for his master, Isaac, bowed before Yahweh (Ge 24:26). The Hebrews on leaving Egypt were commanded to bow to Yahweh (Ex 11:8; 12:27,28). The injunction of the Psalmist shows the prevalence of this posture in prayer: "O come, let us worship and bow down" (Ps 95:6). Isaiah refers to the same when he says: "Every knee shall bow" to God (Isa 45:23). Paul also bowed his knees to the Father (Eph 3:14). The same practice obtained among the heathen

nations as they worshipped their gods or idols. Naaman bowed before Rimmon, his god. The numerous prohibitions in the Hebrew Scriptures against bowing down at the shrines of the nations around Israel prove the prevalence of this method of adoration. Indeed, one of the ten commandments is directed explicitly against bowing to or worshipping idols (Ex 20:5). The same prohibition was often repeated, as by Joshua (23:7) and the author of 2Ki (17:35). Unfortunately, Israel did transgress in this very thing, for while still in the Wilderness they bowed down to the gods of Moab (Nu 25:2) and again after their settlement in Canaan (Jud 2:12). Amaziah bowed down to the gods of Edom (2Ch 25:14).

Like deference was also shown to angels or supernatural beings. Thus, Abraham bows to the three angels as they appear to him at Mamre (Ge 18:2). And so did Lot at Sodom (Ge 19:1). Joshua fell on his face before the prince of the host of Yahweh (Jos 5:14). This attitude was a common one to Ezekiel as he saw his wonderful visions (Eze 1:28; 3:23, and often). Daniel when he saw Gabriel in a vision was afraid and fell upon his face (Da 8:17). The three disciples had the same experience on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt 17:6).

Monarchs and persons of superior rank were the recipients of like honors and marks of respect. Joseph's brothers bowed as they came into his presence, thinking that he was an Egyptian of high rank (Ge 43:28). Bathsheba bowed to King David when she entered his presence in the interest of their son Solomon (1Ki 1:16,31). But such deference was not shown to monarchs only, for Jacob and his household bowed down seven times to the irate Esau (Ge 33:3 ff). Abigail fell on her face before David as he was marching to avenge himself upon Nabal, her husband (1Sa 25:23). David too when he went to meet Jonathan fell on his face to the ground and bowed himself three times (1Sa 20:41). The Shunammite woman, as she came to entreat Elisha for the life of her boy, bowed before the prophet (2Ki 4:37). The same custom prevailed not only among the Persians, as is evident from the Book of Esther and the monuments at Persepolis, but also in Babylonia, Assyria and other countries.

4. Prostration:

This was but a more intense way of showing one's regard or of emphasizing a petition. It was the token of abject subjection or the deepest reverence. Abraham, when Yahweh appeared to him and promised him a son, with profoundest gratitude and greatest joy fell prostrate on his face (Ge 17:3). Moses and Aaron were often found in this posture (Nu 14:5; 16:4,45; 20:6). Elijah, eccentric in many ways, cast himself upon the earth and placed his face between his knees (compare 1Ki 18:42). Job fell on the ground and worshipped Yahweh (Job 1:20). Such homage was often shown to our Saviour (Mr 5:22; Joh 11:32), not because men realized that He was God in the flesh, but simply as a mark of respect for a great teacher and miracle-worker. It is to be noticed th at our Saviour never refused such homage, but accepted it as pertinent and proper. Did He not realize that honor and worship Divine belonged to Him, He would have refused them just as Peter did when Cornelius fell down at his feet and worshipped him (Ac 10:25) or as the angel in Re 19:10, who said to John, prostrate at his feet, "See thou do it not: I am a fellow servant," etc. See ADORATION, iii.

W. W. Davies

ATTUS

at’-us (1 Esdras 8:29 = Ezr 8:2). See HATTUSH.

AUDIENCE

o’-di-ens: Translated from the Hebrew ‘ozen, "ear." In Ge 23:10 f "in the audience of" is equal to "in the presence of," or "while they listened." Compare Ex 24:7; 1Sa 25:24 (Revised Version (British and American) "in thine ears"); 1Ch 28:8; Ne 13:1. In the New Testament the expression "to give audience" (Ac 22:22; 13:16, the Revised Version (British and American) "hearken"; Ac 15:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "they hearkened") translated from the Greek akouo "to hear" or derivatives, and means "to listen," "to pay attention." In the King James Version Lu 7:1 (Revised Version, "in the ears of") and the King James Version Lu 20:45 (Revised Version, "in the hearing of") the usage is similar to that of the Old Testament.

AUGIA

o’-ji-a Augia: The wife of Jaddus, whose sons were removed from priesthood because their names were not found in the register, their ancestors having "usurped the office of the priesthood" (1 Esdras 5:38). Omitted in Ezr 2 and Ne 7.

AUGUR’S OAK

o’-gurs’ ok: If we translated the Hebrew verb ‘onen, "to practice augury" (see AUGURY) we should in Jud 9:37 for "the oak of Meonemm" render "the augurs’ oak" as in the Revised Version, margin, for the last word is simply the part. of the same verb and means "one who practices augury," though there is some doubt as to the exact connotation of the word. See under DIVINATION.

The English Versions of the Bible make this noun the name of a place; but no such place is known and the derivation and form of the word are clear and certain. We have a similar phrase similarly misunderstood by our translators in Ge 12:6 where the "oak of Moreh" should be "the oak" (or "terebinth?") "of the diviner" or "augur," for moreh is also a part. =" one who teaches" or "directs." Probably the same tree is meant, since in each ease the neighborhood is that of Shechem. The worship of trees, or rather the deity supposed to make them his home, has prevailed very widely. See W. R. Smith, Rel. Semitic. (2), 195; compare Jud 4:5; 2Sa 5:24 and "the oak of Zeus at Dodona. " In Jud 9:6 we read of a "matstsebhah, oak tree": the tree with an altar on which sacrifices were offered. The oak trees of Ge 12:6 and of Jud 9:37, if two distinct trees are meant, would be trees which the Canaanites had been in the habit of consulting: hence, the name.

T. Witton Davies

AUGURY

o’-gu-ri o’-gur-i: This word occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) in Le 19:26; De 18:10,14; 2Ki 21:6, and the parallel in 2Ch 33:6. In all these cases the verb "practice augury" is in the King James Version "to observe times." The verb thus translated is ‘onen, which means probably to utter a low croaking sound as was done in divining. See DIVINATION.

I. Definition.

The derivation of "augur" is doubtful, but that it means strictly to divine from the flight of birds is suggested by its likeliest etymology (avis, gur) and especially from the fact that in early Latin the augur was called auspex (= avi spex). But both words came to be applied to all forms of divining from omens.

II. Augury among the Romans.

The Roman augur was a government official, paid to guide the councils of the nation in times of peace and of war. The principal signs from which these augurs deduced their omens were these:

(1) celestial signs, chiefly lightning and thunder, the direction of the former (right to left a good sign, and vice versa);

(2) signs from the flight, cries and feeding of birds;

(3) signs from the movements and audible sounds of animals, including serpents;

(4) signs from the examination of the entrails of animals;

(5) belomancy, or divination by arrows;

(6) sortilege, or divination by lot. Among the Romans as among other nations (Babylonians, etc.), a sacrifice was offered before omens were taken, so as to propitiate the gods.

III. Augury among the Greeks.

Almost the only kind of divination practiced or even known among the Romans was that by signs or omens, though Cicero (de Div. i.1 f) notices another kind which may be called divining by direct inspiration from the gods. It is this higher and more spiritual mode of divining that obtained most largely among the Greeks, whose chief word for diviner implies this. Yet the lower kind of divination known as augury was to some extent practiced among the Greeks.

IV. Augury among the Hebrews.

In general it may be said that the religion of Israel set itself steadfastly and consistently against augury; a very remarkable fact when one remembers how rife it was among the surrounding peoples—Arabs, Assyrians, Babylonians, Egyptians, etc. Surely there is in this evidence of special Divine guidance, for those ancient Hebrews are not fit to be compared with the Babylonians or Egyptians or Romans for achievements in art and general secular literature. For the attitude of the Old Testament toward augury see the passages enumerated in the opening of this article. Several kinds of augury are mentioned in the Old Testament, and in some eases without explicit condemnation.

1. Belomancy:

Belomancy was a method of divination by arrows, a number of which were marked in certain ways, then mixed and drawn at random. We have a reference to this in Ho 4:12: ‘My people ask counsel from their wood [literally, "tree"] and their staff [i. e. "arrow"] tells them (their oracles)’; and also in Eze 21:21: ‘For the king of Babylon .... used divination, shaking the arrows to and fro.’ The first passage shows that belomancy was practiced by Israelites though the prophet condemned it. The second is interesting as showing how the Babylonian used his arrows. It is to be noticed that the prophet Ezekiel records the incident without making any comment on it, favorable or otherwise. He would, however, had he spoken, almost certainly have condemned it. Mohammed forbade this use of arrows as "an abomination of Satan’s work" (Koran, Sur. 5 92).

2. Hydromancy:

Hydromancy, or divination by water, was practiced by Joseph (Ge 44:3-5) without any censure on the part of the writer. There were among the Romans and other ancient nations, as among modern Arabs, etc., many modes of divining by means of water. Generally a piece of silver or gold or a precious stone was thrown into a vessel containing water: the resulting movements of the water and the figures formed were interpreted according to certain fixed signs. See August., de Civ. Dei, vii.31; Strabo xvi.11.39; Iamblichus, de Myst., iii.4.

3. Sortliege:

Of sortliege, or divination by lot, we have instances in Le 16:8; Mt 27:35; 1Ch 25:8; Jon 1:2 ff; Ac 1:26, etc. The Urim and Thummim was simply a case of sortilege, though in this case, as in the cases enumerated above, God was supposed to control the result. A proper translation of 1Sa 14:41 f, based on a text corrected according to the Septuagint of Lucian, is the following: "And Saul said, O Lord the God of Israel, why hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If the iniquity be in me or in Jonathan my son, give Urim; and if thou sayest thus, The ....." It iniquity is in the people, give Thummim. seems almost certain that these words refer to two balls put into the high priest’s ephod and drawn by him at random, the one divining one answer, and the other the contrary.

4. Other Methods:

We meet with several other signs. The prophet Elisha directs King Joash to throw two arrows through the window in order to find out whether the king will be victorious or not (2Ki 13:14-19). If Gideon's fleece were wet and the ground dry this was to be a sign of coming victory over the Midianites. There is nothing in the narrative disapproving of the course taken (Jud 6:36-40). In 1Sa 14:8 ff Jonathan is represented as deciding whether or not he is to attack the Philistines by the words he will hear them speak. See further Ge 24:12-19; 2Ki 20:9.

5. Dreams:

Dreams are very commonly mentioned in the Bible as a means of forecasting the future. See Ge 20:3,6 f (Abimelech); 31:10-13 (Jacob); 37:5; 40:3 ff (Joseph), and also Jud 7:13; 1Ki 3:5 f; Mt 1:20; 2:12 ff; 27:19, etc. The part of the Pentateuch ascribed by Wellhausen, etc., to Elohist abounds with accounts of such significant dreams.

6. Astrology:

That omens were taken from the heavenly bodies by the Babylonians, and other ancient nations is matter of definite knowledge, but it is never countenanced in the Old Testament. Indeed the only explicit reference to it in the Hebrew Scriptures occurs in Isa 47:13 where the Exilic author mockingly urges Babylon to turn to her astrologers that they may save her from her threatened doom.

Several cuneiform inscriptions give lists of celestial omens by which Babylonian augurs prognosticated the future. In Mt 2 the wise men received their first intimation of the birth of the child Jesus from a bright star which they saw in the East.

V. Higher Character of Hebrew Prophecy.

Though Old Testament prophecy in its lowest forms has features in common with heathen divination, it stands on an infinitely higher level. The prophet speaks under a strong impulse and from a sense of duty. The heathen diviner plied his calling for money. The Greek mantis worked himself into a state of frenzy, thought to imply inspiration, by music and certain drugs. The prophet believed himself directly guided by God. See ASTROLOGY, 1; DIVINATION.

LITERATURE.

T. Witton Davies, Magic. Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews, 1898, 72 ff; articles on "Divination" in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) (Jevons); Encyclopedia Biblica (T. Witton Davies), and on "Augury" in Jewish Encyclopedia (Blau), valuable as giving the rabbinical side as well.

T. Witton Davies

AUGUSTAN; AUGUSTAN BAND

o-gus’-tan o-gus’-tus-izs See ARMY, ROMAN.

AUGUSTUS

o-gus’-tus Augoustos:

(1) The first Roman emperor, and noteworthy in Bible history as the emperor in whose reign the Incarnation took place (Lu 2:1). His original name was Caius Octavius Caepias and he was born in 63 BC, the year of Cicero’s consulship. He was the grand-nephew of Julius Caesar, his mother Atia having been the daughter of Julia, Caesar’s younger sister. He was only 19 years of age when Caesar was murdered in the Senate house (44 BC), but with a true instinct of statesmanship he steered his course through the intrigues and dangers of the closing years of the republic, and after the battle of Actium was left without a rival. Some difficulty was experienced in finding a name that would exactly define the position of the new ruler of the state. He himself declined the names of rex and dictator, and in 27 BC he was by the decree of the Senate styled Augustus. The epithet implied respect and veneration beyond what is bestowed on human things: " Sancta vocant augusta patres: augusta vocantur Templa sacerdotum rite dicata manu." —Ovid Fasti. 609; compare Dion Cass., 5316

The Greeks rendered the word by Sebastos, literally, "reverend’"(Ac 25:21,25). The name was connected by the Romans with augur—"one consecrated by religion"—and also with the verb augere. In this way it came to form one of the German imperial titles "Mehrer des Reichs" (extender of the empire). The length of the reign of Augustus, extending as it did over 44 years from the battle of Actium (31 BC) to his death (14 AD), doubtless contributed much to the settlement and consolidation of the new regime after the troubled times of the civil wars.

It is chiefly through the connection of Judea and Palestine with the Roman Empire that Augustus comes in contact with early Christianity, or rather with the political and religious life of the Jewish people at the time of the birth of Christ: "Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled" (Lu 2:1). During the reign of Herod the Great the government of Palestine was conducted practically without interference from Rome except, of course, as regarded the exaction of the tribute; but on the death of that astute and capable ruler (4 BC) none of his three sons among whom his kingdom was divided showed the capacity of their father.

In the year 6 AD the intervention of Augustus was invited by the Jews themselves to provide a remedy for the incapacity of their ruler, Archelaus, who was deposed by the emperor from the rule of Judea; at the same time, while Caesarea was still the center of the Roman administration, a small Roman garrison was stationed permanently in Jerusalem. The city, however, was left to the control of the Jewish Sanhedrin with complete judicial and executive authority except that the death sentence required confirmation by the Roman procurator. There is no reason to believe that Augustus entertained any

specially favorable appreciation of Judaism, but from policy he showed himself favorable to the Jews in Palestine and did everything to keep them from feeling the pressure of the Roman yoke. To the Jews of the eastern Diaspora he allowed great privileges. It has even been held that his aim was to render them pro-Rom, as a counterpoise in some degree to the pronounced Hellenism of the East; but in the West autonomous bodies of Jews were never allowed (see Mommsen, Provinces of the Roman Empire, chapter 11).

(2) For Augustus in Ac 25:21,25 the King James Version, see EMPEROR.

J. Hutchison

AUL

ol: See AWL.

AUNT

ant dodhah, ("loving"): A father's sister (Ex 6:20); an uncle's wife (Le 18:14; 20:20). See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

AUSTERE

os-ter' austeros, "harsh," ("rough"): Twice used by Christ in the parable of the Pounds (Lu 19:21,22), and of special significance as illustrating the false conception of God cherished by the sinful and disobedient. The fear resident in a guilty conscience sees only sternness and severity in God's perfect righteousness. The word may be made an eminent study in the psychology of an evil heart. Wrongdoing eclipses the soul's vision of God's love and pictures His righteousness as harsh, unfeeling, partial, unjust, forbidding. The awfulness of sin may thus be seen in its power so to pervert the soul as to make goodness seem evil, justice unjust, and even love unlovely. Compare "hard" skleros, "dried up," "harsh" in the parable of the Talents (Mt 25:24).

Dwight M. Pratt

AUTHOR

o'-ther: This word is used to translate two Greek words:

(1) aitios, literally, "cause," hence, "author." Heb 5:9, He "became the author of eternal salvation."

(2) archego = literally, "chief leader," "prince," "captain"; then author, originator. It is rendered "author" in the following passages:

(a) Heb 12:2, "looking unto Jesus, the author [King James Version, Revised Version] and finisher [Revised Version, "perfecter"] of our faith." But here it seems better to take archegos in its primary sense, "leader" (Revised Version margin "captain"), rather than in its secondary sense "author." The meaning is, not that He is the originator of faith in us, but that He Himself is the pioneer in the life of faith. He is first in the company of the faithful (compare references to His "faithfulness," Heb 2:17; 3:2,5,6), far surpassing in His fidelity even the Old Testament saints mentioned in chapter 11; and therefore we are to look to Him as our perfect pattern of faith. Faith has not only Christ for its object, but Christ for its supreme example. So Bengel, Bleek, B. Weiss, Alford, A. B. Davidson, Grimm-Thayer. Others, however, take the word in the sense of "author."

(b) Heb 2:10, "to make the author [King James Version, "captain"] of their salvation perfect through sufferings." Here the idea of Christ as originator or author of our salvation is present (compare the passage Heb 5:9, where however a different word is used; see above). But here again the original meaning of "leader" is not to be lost sight of. He, being the first possessor of salvation, becomes the author of it for others. "The idea that the Son goes before the saved in the same path ought perhaps to be retained" (Davidson). Compare Heb 6:20, where Jesus is said to be our "forerunner."

(c) Ac 3:15, King James Version margin and the Revised Version margin have "author," where text has "prince." Here again it is possible that the two ideas are present.

D. Miall Edwards

AUTHORITY IN RELIGION

o-thor’-i-ti rabhah; toqeph; exousia; exousiazo; katexousiazo; epitage; huperoche; authenteo; dunastes

I. GENERAL IDEA

1. Of Two Kinds

(1) External

(2) Internal

2. Universal Need of Authority

3. Necessity for Infallible Criterion of Truth

4. Ultimate Nature of Authority

5. It Is God

6. Different Ideas of God and Different Views of Authority

7. A Problem of Knowledge for Christians

II. THE BIBLICAL REFERENCES

1. In Old Testament

2. In New Testament

3. Common Elements in their Meaning

III. BIBLICAL TEACHING

1. Old Testament Teaching

(1) Earliest Form Patriarchal

(2) Tribal and Personal Authority

(3) Seers and Priests

(4) Kings and Established Religion

(5) The Great Prophets

(6) The Canon and Rabbinical Tradition

2. New Testament Teaching

(1) Jesus Christ’s Authority (a) His Teaching

(b) His Works

(c) Forgiving and Judging

(d) Life and Salvation

(e) Derived from His Sonship

(f) In His Ascended State

(g) Christ and the Paraclete

(2) The Disciples' Authority

(a) Derived from Christ

(b) Paul's Authority

(c) Authority of All Believers

(d) Authority over the Nations

(3) Church's Authority Moral and Personal

(4) Authority of the Bible

IV. OUTLINE HISTORY OF ECCLESIASTICAL DOCTRINE OF AUTHORITY

1. Appeal to Reason as Logos

2. Orthodox Dogma

3. Scholasticism

4. Ecclesiastical Absolutism

5. Reformation Principles

6. New Scholasticism

7. The Inner Light

8. Back to Experience

9. Distrust of Reason

10. Christian Skepticism

V. CLASSIFICATION OF THEORIES

1. External

(1) Incipient Catholicism

(2) General Councils

(3) Romanism

(4) Papal Infallibility

(5) Inerrancy of Scripture

(6) Anglican Appeal to Antiquity

(7) Limitations of External Authority

(a) Not Infallible (b) Rests on Personal Authority

(c) No Apostolical Tradition Extant

(d) No Consensus of Fathers

(e) Bible Needs Interpretation

(f) Authority Necessarily Spiritual

2. Internal Authority

LITERATURE

I. General Idea.

1. Of Two Kinds:

The term is of manifold and ambiguous meaning. The various ideas of authority fall into two main classes: as external or public tribunal or standard, which therefore in the nature of the case can only apply to the outward expressions of religion; and as immanent principle which governs the most secret movements of the soul’s life.

(1) External.

A characteristic instance of the former idea of authority is found in A. J. Balfour's Foundations of Belief: "Authority as I have been using the term is in all cases contrasted with reason, and stands for that group of non-rational causes, moral, social and educational, which produces its results by psychic processes other than reasoning" (p. 232, 8th edition). The bulk of men's important beliefs are produced and authorized by "custom, education, public opinion, the contagious convictions of countrymen, family, party or church" (p. 226). Authority and reason are "rival claimants" (p. 243). "Authority as such is, from the nature of the case, dumb in the presence of argument" (p. 234).

Newman makes a kindred distinction between authority in revealed religion and conscience in natural religion, although he does not assign as wide a sphere to authority, and he allows to conscience a kind of authority. "The supremacy of conscience is the essence of natural religion, the supremacy of apostle or pope or church or bishop is the essence of revealed; and when such external authority is taken away, the mind falls back again of necessity upon that inward guide which it possessed even before revelation was vouchsafed" (Development of Doctrine, 86, edition 1878). From a very different standpoint the same antithesis appears in the very title of Sabatier's book, The Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit. He knows both kinds of authority. "The authority of material force, of custom, tradition, the co de, more and more yields place to the inward authority of conscience and reason, and in the same measure becomes transformed for the subject into a true autonomy" (p. xxxiii, English Translation).

(2) Internal.

Martineau distinguishes the two types of authority to reject the former and accept the latter. "The mere resort to testimony for information beyond our province does not fill the meaning of 'authority'; which we never acknowledge till that which speaks to us from another and a higher strikes home and wakes the echoes in ourselves, and is thereby instantly transferred from external attestation to self-evidence. And this response it is which makes the moral intuitions, started by outward appeal, reflected back by inward veneration, more than egoistic phenomena, and turning them into correspondency between the universal and the individual mind, invests them with true authority" (Seat of Authority, Preface, edition 1890).

Confusion would disappear if the fact were recognized that for different persons, and even for the same persons at different times, authority means different things. For a child his father's or his teacher's word is a decree of absolute authority. He accepts its truth and recognizes his obligation to allow it to determine his conduct. But when reason awakes in him, he may doubt their knowledge or wisdom, and he will seek other guides or authorities. So it is in religious development. Some repudiate authorities that others acknowledge. But no one has a monopoly of the term or concept, and no one may justly say to Dr. Martineau or anybody else that "he has no right to speak of 'authority' at all."

2. Universal Need of Authority:

All religion involves a certain attitude of thought and will toward God and the Universe. The feeling

element is also present, but that is ignored in theories of external authority. All religion then involves certain ideas or beliefs about God, and conduct corresponding to them, but ideas may be true or false, and conduct right or wrong. Men need to know what is true, that they may do that which is right. They need some test or standard or court of appeal which distinguishes and enforces the truth; forbids the wrong and commands the right. As in all government there is a legislative and an executive function, the one issuing out of the other, so in every kind of religious authority recognized as such, men require that it should tell them what ideas they ought to believe and what deeds to perform.

In this general sense authority is recognized in every realm of life, even beyond that which is usually called religious life. Science builds up its system in conformity with natural phenomena. Art has its ideals of beauty. Politics seeks to realize some idea of the state. Metaphysics reconstructs the universe in conformity with some principle of truth or reality.

3. Necessity for Infallible Criterion of Truth:

"If we are ....to attach any definite intelligible meaning to the distinction between things as they really are, and things as they merely appear to be, we must clearly have some universal criterion or test by which the distinction may be made. This criterion must be in the first place infallible; that is, must be such that we cannot doubt its validity without falling into a contradiction in our thought ..... Freedom from contradiction is a characteristic that belongs to everything that is real .... and we may therefore use it as a test or criterion of reality "(Taylor, Elements of Metaphysics, 18-19). A more skeptical philosopher writes:

"That the truth itself is one and whole and complete, and that all thinking and all experience moves within its recognition, and subject to its manifest authority, this I have never doubted" (Joachim, The Nature of Truth, 178). It is only a thoroughgoing skeptic that could disp ense with authority, a "Pyrrho," who holds suspense of judgment to be the only right attitude of mind, and he, to be logical, must also suspend all action and cease to be. There can be no question, therefore, except in total nescience, as to the fact of authority in general; and the problem to decide is, "What is the authority in religion?"

4. Ultimate Nature of Authority:

It is a problem involved in the difficulties of all ultimate problems, and all argument about it is apt to move in a circle. For the ultimate must bear witness of its own ultimacy, the absolute of its own absoluteness, and authority of its own sovereignty. If there were a court of appeal or a standard of reference to which anything called ultimate, absolute and supreme, could apply for its credentials, it would therefore become relative and subordinate to that other criterion. There is a sense in which Mr. Balfour’s saying is true, "that authority is dumb in the presence of argument." No process of mediate reasoning can establish it, for no premise can be found from which it issues as a conclusion. It judges all things, but is judged of none. It is its own witness and judge. All that reason can say about it is the dictum of Paxmenides: "it is."

5. It Is God:

In this sense, there can be no question again among religious people, that the authority is God. The one idea involves the other. He alone is self-existent and supreme, who is what He is of His own right. If God exists, He is the ultimate criterion and power of truth and reality. All truth inheres in Him and issues from Him. The problem of authority thus becomes one with the proof and definition of God. These questions lie beyond the purpose of the present article; (see GOD). Their solution is assumed in this discussion of authority, although different theories of authority no doubt involve different ideas of God.

6. Different Ideas of God and Different Views of Authority:

External theories generally involve what is called a deistic conception of God. Spiritualistic theories of authority correspond to theistic views of God. If He is immanent as well as transcendent, He speaks directly to men, and has no need of intermediaries. Pantheism results in a naturalistic theory of truth. The mind of God is the law of Nature. But pantheism in practice tends to become polytheism, and then to issue in a crude anarchy which is the denial of all authority and truth. But within Christendom the problem of authority lies between those who agree in believing in one God, who is personal, transcendent and to some extent immanent. The differences on these points are really consequences of differences of views as to His mode of self-communication.

7. A Problem of Knowledge For Christians:

It is, therefore, a problem of epistemology rather than of ontology. The question is, in what way does God make known Himself, His mind and His authority to men generally? The purpose of this article is the exposition of the Biblical teaching of authority, with some attempt to place it in its true position in the life of the church.

II. The Biblical References.

1. In the Old Testament:

Only for

(1) rabhah (Pr 29:2): "to be great" or "many." "When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice." So the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin, but the Revised Version (British and American) "When the righteous are increased" (so BDB). Toy in the place cited remarks, "The Hebrew has: ‘When the righteous increase,’ the suggestion being that they then have control of affairs; the change of a letter gives the reading ‘rule’ which is required by the ‘govern’ of the second line."

(2) toqeph (Es 9:29): "Esther the queen .... wrote with all authority to confirm this second letter of Purim" (Revised Version margin "strength" [so BDB]).

2. In the New Testament:

(1) Most frequently for exousia; exousiazo; and katexousiazo:

(a) of God’s authority (Ac 1:7): as the potter’s over clay (Ro 9:21, right; Jude 1:25, " power"; Re 9$, "power");

(b) of Christ’s teaching and works (Mt 7:29; 21:23,24,27 = Mr 1:22,27; Mr 11:28,29,33 = Lu 4:36; 20:2,8; Joh 5:27, authority to execute judgment. The same Greek word, translated "power" in the King James Version but generally "authority" in the Revised Version (British and American) or the Revised Version, margin, appears also in Mt 9:6,8, to forgive sins: Mt 28:18; Mr 2:10; Lu 4:32; 5:24; Joh 10:18; 17:2; Re 12:10);

(c) of the disciples, as Christ’s representatives and witnesses (Lu 9:1, the twelve; 2Co 10:8, Paul); also of their rights and privileges; (the same Greek word in Mt 10:1; Mr 3:15; 6:7; Lu 10:19 = the Revised Version (British and American) "authority"; Joh 1:12; Ac 8:19; 2Co 13:10; 2Th 3:9; Heb 13:10; Re 2:26; 22:14 = the Revised Version (British and American) "right");

(d) of subordinate heavenly authorities or powers (1Co 15:24; 1Pe 3:22; and the same Greek word in Eph 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10,15; Re 11:6; 14:18; 18:1);

(e) of civil authority, as of king, magistrate or steward (Lu 7:8 = Mt 8:9 [centurion]; Mr 13:34; Lu 19:17; 20:20; 22:25 = Mt 20:25 = Mr 10:42; and Ac 9:14; 26:10,12 [of Saul]; and the same Greek word in Lu 12:11; 23:7; Joh 19:10,11; Ac 5:4; Ro 13:1,2,3; Tit 3:1; Re 17:12,13);

(f) of the powers of evil (Re 13:2, "the beast that came out of the sea"; and the same Greek word in Lu 4:6; 12:5; 22:53; Ac 26:18; Eph 2:2; Col 1:13; Re 6:8; 9:3,10,19; 13:4,5,7,12; 20:6).

(g) of man’s inward power of self-control (the same Greek word in 1Co 7:37; 8:9, "liberty"; 1Co 6:12; 7:4; 9:4,5,6,12,18, the Revised Version (British and American) "right"; 1Co 11:10).

(2) For epitage: commandment, authority to exhort and reprove the church (Tit 2:15).

(3) For huperoche: "for kings and all that are in high place" (Revised Version (British and American) 1Ti 2:2).

(4) For authenteo: "I permit not a woman .... to have dominion over a man" (Revised Version, 1Ti 2:12).

(5) For dunastes: "A eunuch of great authority" (Ac 8:27).

3. Common Elements in Their Meaning:

Of the words translated "authority," exousia, alone expresses the idea of religious authority, whether of God, of Christ or of man. The other uses of this word are here instructive in as bringing out the common element in secular and religious authority.

The control of the state over its subjects, whether as supreme in the person of emperor or king, or as delegated to and exercised by proconsul, magistrate or soldier, and the control of a householder over his family and servants and property, exercised directly or indirectly through stewards, have some characteristics which also pertain to religious authority; and the differences, essential though they are, must be derived from the context and the circumstances of the case. In one passage indeed the civil type of authority is mentioned to be repudiated as something that should not obtain within the religious community (Mt 20:25-27 = Mr 10:42-44 = Lu 22:25,26). But although its principle and power are so entirely different in different realms, the fact of authority as determining religious thought, conduct and relations permeates the whole Bible, and is expressed by many terms and phrases besides those translated "authority."

III. Biblical Teaching.

A summary of the Biblical account of authority is given in Heb 1:1; "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son [RVm]." Behind all persons and institutions stands God, who reveals His mind and exercises His sovereignty in many ways, through many persons and institutions, piecemeal and progressively, until His final revelation of His mind and will culminates in Jesus Christ.

1. Old Testament Teaching:

(1) Earliest Form Patriarchal

The earliest form of authority is patriarchal. The father of the family is at once its prophet, priest and king. The consciousness of individuality was as yet weak. The unit of life was the family, and the father sums up the family in himself before God and stands to it as God. Such is the earliest picture of religious life found in the Bible. For whatever view may be taken of the historicity of Gen, there can be little doubt that the stories of the patriarchs represent an early stage of religious life, before the national or even the tribal consciousness had developed.

(2) Tribal and Personal Authority

When the tribal consciousness emerges, it is clad in a network of customs and traditions which had grown with it, and which governed the greater part of the life of the tribe. The father had now become the elder and judge who exercised authority over the larger family, the tribe. But also, men of commanding personality and influence appear, who change and refashion the tribal customs. They may

be men of practical wisdom like Jethro, great warriors like Joshua, or emergency men like the judges. Moses stands apart, a prophet and reformer who knew that he bore a message from God to reform his people's religion, and gave Israel a knowledge of God and a covenant with God which set them forever apart from all other peoples. Other tribes might have a Jethro, a Joshua and a Jephtha, but Israel alone had its Moses. His authority has remained a large factor in the life of Israel to the present day and should hereafter be assumed as existing side by side with other authorities mentioned.

(3) Seers and Priests

In our earliest glimpses of Hebrew life in Canaan we find bands of seers or prophets associated with religion in Israel, as well as a disorganized priesthood which conducted the public worship of Yahweh. These features were probably common to Israel and neighboring Semitic tribes. Here again the individual person emerges who rises above custom and tradition, and exercises an individual authority direct from God over the lives of the people. Samuel, too, was a prophet, priest and king, but he regarded his function as so entirely ministerial, that God might be said to govern His people directly and personally, though He made known His will through the prophet.

(4) Kings and Established Religion

In the period of the kingship, religious authority became more organized, institutional and external. The occasional cooperation of the tribes developed into nationality, and the sporadic leadership of emergency chieftains gave way to the permanent rule of the king. Priests and prophets became organized and recognized guilds which acted together under the protection and influence of the king, along the lines of traditional morality and religion. The Hebrew church in its middle ages was an established church and thoroughly "Erastian." We know very little of the details of its organization, but it is clear that the religious orders as a rule offered little resistance to the corrupting influences of the court and of the surrounding heathenism.

(5) The Great Prophets

Opposition to corruption and advance to higher levels of religious life invariably originated outside the recognized religious authorities. God raised for Himself prophets such as Elijah, Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah, who spoke out of the consciousness of an immediate vision or message or command from God. In turn they influenced the established religious authorities, as may be seen in the reformations of Hezekiah and Josiah. All that is distinctive in the religion of Israel, all revelation of God in the Old Testament, proceeded from the inner experiences of the irregular prophets.

(6) The Canon and Rabbinical Tradition

In the Judaism of the post-exilic period, the disappearance of the kingship, and the cessation of prophecy produced new conditions which demanded a readaptation of religious authorities. The relative position of the priesthood was greatly enhanced. Its chiefs became princes of Jerusalem, and exercised all the

powers of theocracy that remained under foreign rule. And new developments emerged.

The formation of the canon of the Old Testament set up a body of writings which stood as a permanent and external standard of doctrine and worship. But the necessity was felt to interpret the Scriptures and to apply them to existing conditions. The place of the old prophetic guilds was taken by the new order of rabbis and scribes. Gradually they secured a share with the priests in the administration of the law. "In the last two pre-Christian centuries and throughout the Talmudic times, the scribes tsopherim, also called the wise chakhamim, who claimed to have received the true interpretation of the Law as 'the tradition of the Elders and Fathers' in direct line from Moses, the prophets, and the men of the great synagogue, ... included people from all classes. They formed the court of justice in every town as well as the high court of justice, the Sanhedrin in Jerus" (Kohler in Jew Encyclopedia, II, 337). In the time of Christ, these courts were the recognized authorities in all matters of religion.

2. New Testament Teaching:

(1) Jesus Christ's Authority.

When He began to teach in Palestine, all knowledge of God, and all exercise of His authority were mediated through the priests and scribes, who however claimed the Old Testament as their source. Christ was neither the destroyer nor the creator of institutions. He never discussed the abstract right or capacity of the Jewish orders to be religious teachers. He enjoined obedience to their teaching (Mt 23:2,3). Still less did He question the authority of the Old Testament. He came not to destroy, but to fulfill the law and the prophets (Mt 5:17). But He did two things which involved the assertion of a new and superior authority in Himself. He repudiated the scribes' interpretation of the law (Mt 23:13-16), and He declared that certain of the provisions of the Mosaic law itself were temporary and tentative, and to be replaced or supplemented by His own more adequate teaching (Mt 5:32,34,39,44; 19:8,9).

In doing this, He was really fulfilling a line of thought which permeates the entire Old Testament. All its writers disclaim finality and look forward to a fuller revelation of the mind of God in a day of Yahweh or a new covenant or a Messiah. Jesus Christ regarded these expectations as being realized in Himself, and claimed to complete and fulfill the development which had run through the Old Testament. As such, He claims finality in His teaching of the will of God, and absolute authority in the realm of religion and morals.

(a) His Teaching

His teaching is with authority. His hearers contrast it with that of the scribes, who, with all the prestige of tradition and establishment, in comparison with Him, entirely lacked authority (Mt 7:29; Mr 1:22; Lu 4:32; Joh 7:46).

(b) His Works

His authority as a teacher is closely associated with His works, especially as these revealed His authority over that world of evil spirits whose influence was felt in the mental disorders that afflicted people (Mr 1:27; Lu 4:36).

(c) Forgiving and Judging

In His claim to forgive sins, sanctioned by works of healing, He seemed to exercise a Divine prerogative (Mt 9:6,8; Mr 2:10; Lu 5:24). It implied an infallible moral judgment, a power to dispense with the recognized laws of retribution and to remove guilt, which could only inhere in God. All these powers are asserted in another form in the statement that He is the final judge (Joh 5:27).

(d) Life and Salvation

He therefore possesses authority over life and salvation. The Father gave Him authority over all flesh, "that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life" (Joh 17:2 the American Revised Version, margin). This authority begins in His power over His own life to give it in sacrifice for men (Joh 10:18). By faith in Him and obedience to Him, men obtain salvation (Mt 10:32; 11:28-30). Their relation to Him determines their relation to God and to the kingdom of heaven (Mt 10:40; Lu 12:8).

(e) Derived from His Sonship

When challenged by the chief priests and elders, the established religious authorities, to state by what authority He taught, He gives no categorical reply, but tells them the parable of the Vineyard. All the prophets and teachers that had come from God before Him were servants, but He is the Son (Mt 21:23-27,37; Mr 11:28-33; 12:6; Lu 20:2,8,13). The Fourth Gospel definitely founds His authority upon His sonship (Joh 5:19-27). Paul deduces it from His self-sacrifice (Php 2:5-11).

(f) In His Ascended State

In His ascended state, all authority in heaven and on earth is given unto Him (Mt 28:18). It is not only authority in the church, and in the moral kingdom, but in the universe. God has set Him "far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come" (Eph 1:21; compare Col 2:10; 1Pe 3:22; 1Co 15:24; Re 12:10).

(g) Christ and the Paraclete

His authority in the church as revealer of truth and Lord of spirits is not limited or completed within His earthly life. By His resurrection and exaltation He lives on in the church. "Where two or three are gathered .... in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt 18:20). "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Mt 28:20). Greater works than He did in the flesh will be done in the church, because of His exaltation: (Joh 14:12); and by His sending the Paraclete, "Comforter" (American

Revised Version) (Joh 14:16). The Paraclete, which is the Holy Spirit, will teach the disciples all things, and bring to their remembrance all that He said unto them (Joh 14:26).

He has many things to tell them which in the days of His flesh they cannot receive, but the Spirit of truth shall guide them into all truth (Joh 16:12,13). And the Paraclete is neither separated nor distinct from Him in His exalted and permanent life (Joh 14:18,28). Herein is the authority of Christ made complete and permanent. His teaching, works and character, as facts outside of men, even while He lived, and still more when He was dead, could only partially and imperfectly rule their spirits. "Have I been so long time with you, and dost thou not know me, Philip?" In the day of the Spirit's revelation "ye shall know that I am in my Father" (Joh 14:9,20). Nor, again, did or could He define the truth as it applied to every contingency throughout all time, while He lived under the limitations of time and place.

Such a revelation, if it could have been given, would have been quite useless, for men can only apprehend the truth progressively and in relation to the position they occupy in time and place. But by His permanent spiritual presence in the church, He enters into, inhabits and governs its whole life and determines for it what is true and right at every stage of its development. (See Forrest, Authority of Christ, 202-3.) To ask whence Christ derives or how He possesses the authority above described, is to raise the whole question of His metaphysical existence. Empirically, we see it issuing from two facts which are essentially one—His filial consciousness and His moral perfection. These chiefly are the empirical facts which the church has sought to interpret and express in the metaphysical doctrine of the Incarnation. (See Forrest, op. cit.)

(2) The Disciples' Authority.

The first disciples acknowledged Christ in all things as their Lord and Master; not the teaching they had heard, nor the example they had witnessed, but Christ in His permanent, living presence. They pray to Him to fill Judas' place among the Twelve (Ac 1:24,25). He gave the Spirit at Pentecost (Ac 2:33). In His name they perform their miracles (Ac 3:6; 9:34). With Him Saul meets on the way to Damascus (Ac 9:5; Ga 1:12). From Him they receive the teaching and commands which they deliver to the churches (1Co 11:23).

But they too exercised an authority which is derivative, secondary, and dependent upon Him.

(a) Derived from Christ

While Jesus Christ yet lived He gave the Twelve, and again the Seventy, authority to cast out unclean spirits and to heal all manner of diseases, while they went about preaching (Mt 10:1; Mr 3:15; 6:7; Lu 9:1; 10:19). After His resurrection He gave them commission to bear witness for Him, to baptize and to teach all nations (Mt 28:18-20; Lu 24:48,49). Paul also traced his authority to preach directly to Jesus Christ (Ga 1:1,12). From Him they received their endowment with the Holy Spirit for the work (Ac 1:5; 2:33).

(b) Paul’s Authority

Paul claimed for himself, and by inference, for the other apostles, authority to exercise discipline in the churches, "which the Lord gave for building you up" (2Co 10:8; 13:10). All the church’s ministers exercise oversight and admonition over the churches (1Th 5:12; 2Ti 4:2; 2:2).

(c) Authority of All Believers

The authority of sonship, and of participation in the tree of life belongs to all believers (Joh 1:12; Re 22:14).

(d) Authority over the Nations

And in virtue of their faith they have authority over the nations (Re 2:26; 20:4). Christ makes them to be kings (Revised Version (British and American) a kingdom) and priests (Re 1:6), a royal priesthood (1Pe 2:9).

In all this we are to see the authority of faith, of character, of men who are messengers of Christ because they are in living union with Him. It pertains to no office or institution, and exists only where Christ reigns in men, and therefore, through them.

(3) Church’s Authority Moral and Personal.

It is moral and personal and more concerned with life than with doctrine. Paul was the greatest teacher of the early church, but he claims no infallibility, promulgates no dogma, imposes no standard of orthodoxy beyond faith in Christ. He reasons, argues and persuades men to accept the gospel he had received of the Lord, but he knows no other authority than the truth as it is a living fact in Jesus Christ.

In the Pastoral Epistles we certainly read of a "sound doctrine" which should be taught and believed, but it has not crystallized into a creed, and the only condition of salvation laid down is living faith in Jesus Christ. See DOCTRINE.

The authority of the apostolic church, then, is in the first place that of individual men in whom Jesus Christ lives, a direct personal and individual authority. It is true that the individual can only live the Christian life, and therefore know the Christian truth, in a society, but that does not impair the individual and personal character of his witness. Yet as the church lives a collective life, there is a sense in which it may be said to bear a collective witness. Men are naturally more readily impressed by an idea held by the many. That is right in so far as the probability of the truth of a doctrine increases with the number of minds which approve it.

That is the element of truth in the Catholic dictum quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est ("what is believed everywhere, always, and by all"). But the assent of the many does not

constitute the truth of an idea or fact, nor enhance its authority. And there are levels of truth to which only few minds can attain, so that the assent of the many may be a presumption against the truth of an idea. And in the last resort, men do not accept ideas with mind and heart, because many believe them, but because of their inherent truth, their power to govern their minds. And the essential truth of a doctrine is no greater, whether one or a million accept it.

The apostolic church recognized this principle, for it never claimed for itself greater authority than that of a tutor to bring men to Christ, the one Lord. Peter, Paul, John, each knew Christ in a degree, and each spoke of Him as well as he could, but none of them claims to say all, or demands that his own teaching should absolutely rule men's minds; and the collective authority of the church can never rise higher than that of its best spirits.

(4) Authority of the Bible.

And the authority of the Bible as a whole is of the same nature as that of the church. It is a record of the experiences of men who knew God in various ways and degrees, but among them all there is only one Master. 'No one knows the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.' In varying degrees obedience should be rendered to many men in the church and outside of it, as they satisfy the demands of reason and conscience, but in the last resort every soul by itself must find, choose and obey its own King. For Christians Christ alone is King, as He revealed Himself in His human personality, in the experience and history of the church, and ultimately in the personal experience of every believer. (For a different view see J. H. Leckie, Authority in Religion.)

IV. Outline History of Ecclesiastical Doctrine of Authority.

1. Appeal to Reason as Logos:

Different ideas, drawn from many sources, soon replaced New Testament principles of authority in the life and thought of the church. The Greek apologists and Fathers were generally dominated by the Platonic doctrine of the Logos, and thought of God as dwelling in man and communicating His mind to him by giving him a share of His own mind and reason. While they accepted the Scriptures and the traditions of the church as Divine teaching, they did not regard them as external and sovereign authorities, but rather as copies of the Divine reason which dwelt in every man, but in complete and perfect manner only in Jesus Christ.

2. Orthodox Dogma:

Neo-Platonism followed, and it underlies much of the church teaching from Origen to Augustine. God as pure being could not make known His essence to men, and His Logos in all the forms of its manifestation tended to become a spoken word which God had sent forth from Himself, rather than the living indwelling of God with men. When the Logos ceased to be living, it tended to become external and stereotyped, and upon this basis grew up Greek orthodoxy. Men who knew but little of the living

personal Word felt the need of defining and establishing the central truths of Christianity in fixed and permanent forms which should become the standard of all thinking. The inward witness of the Logos disappears, and the external authority of tradition and dogma as defined by the councils took its place. The bishops preserved the tradition and constituted the councils and thus became the organs of authority. The Scriptures were still venerated in words, but in fact subordinated to the episcopacy.

3. Scholasticism:

Aristotle's philosophy dominated the Middle Ages, or rather the pale ghost of Aristotle's system, the formal logic only. The forms of thought were mistaken for its essence. Truth consisted in logical consistency and systematic coherence. The dogmas of earlier ages were assumed as premises from which to deduce, by syllogistic inference, the whole structure of the church and its organs and sacraments, as the infallible representatives of God on earth.

4. Ecclesiastical Absolutism:

Nominalism emptied the forms of thought of all reality and reared the ecclesiastical system upon negation. All the more necessary was it to affirm the absolute and unquestioned authority of the church, since it rested upon no reason or reality to which appeal could be made to justify its position and teaching. Thus, the growth of absolutism in the church went pari passu with the disappearance of idealism, of any contact of the mind with reality, truth and God. Another way of saying this truth is that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of the living Christ suffered a total eclipse during the Middle Ages, while the authority of the church as the organ of revelation became absolute.

5. Reformation Principles:

The Reformation was not consciously based upon any philosophic principles. It was the product of practical necessities. Men's spiritual needs drove them back to God, and they found Him in two sources, in the Bible, which was the record of His self- revelation through prophet, psalmist, apostle and preeminently through Jesus Christ, and in the accordant testimony of the Holy Spirit in their own hearts. But the underlying principles of this teaching were not articulated in a philosophy of knowledge and revelation for two centuries.

6. New Scholasticism:

Therefore the second and third generations of Reformers, no longer possessed by the visions and convictions of Luther and Calvin, were thrown back upon the old scholastic philosophy which recognized no kinship of mind between God and man, and knew no direct communication between them. Hence, it was necessary to find a new external authority, and this they discovered in the Bible which they made into a law of truth, as defined anew by ecclesiastical councils.

7. The Inner Light:

But the mystical side of the Reformers' teaching was not altogether lost, and a few obscure bodies of Christians continued to hold the doctrine of the inner light. Yet as the scholastic Protestants took only half—the objective half of the Reformers' teaching—the mystics only took the subjective half, and every man's imagination tended to become a law unto himself.

8. Back to Experience:

Kant did for philosophy what Luther had done for religion. He rejected its dogmas and external authorities in order to come back to its realities. He was the first philosopher of the Protestant principle. He sought to discover a direct relation between man's mind and reality. He did not fully succeed. The old dogma of the noumenon as something that lay completely beyond man's ken clung to him, and vitiated his system. But through man's moral nature, he found a way to the heart of reality and to God. His idealistic principles were developed by his successors into the modern idealism, upon which it has been possible to erect a theory of knowledge that brings man's mind into direct contact with God, and therefore, a theory of authority which represents God as directly the sovereign of the soul.

9. Distrust of Reason:

But the other side of Kant's philosophy, too, was developed into a theory of religious skepticism and external authority. Man's reason, he had taught, could not come into contact with reality, with the thing-in-itself, and therefore it could know nothing of God. This distrust of reason was made the basis of two different systems of external authority by Dean Mansol and Cardinal Newman. The skeptical element really descended from Locke and Hume, but men who would have disdained to learn their theology from Hume accepted Hume's principles from Kant, and built upon them, as a house upon sand, one, the authority of Anglicanism, and the other, the authority of Romanism.

10. Christian Skepticism:

Kant's skepticism also allied itself with elements of Luther's teaching and traveled a middle course in the school of Ritschl. While holding that man may have knowledge and experience of Divine things in Jesus Christ, who is of the practical value of God for religious experience, the Ritschlians scruple to affirm that it is a direct and actual knowledge of God as He is essentially. This they will neither deny nor affirm, but the refusal to affirm has for many minds the effect of denial, and it leads to a subjectivism which is not far removed from skepticism and the denial of all authority.

V. Classification of Theories:

The various theories of authority may be now classed as follows:

1. External:

(1) Incipient Catholicism

Incipient Catholicism in the 2nd and 3rd centuries.—All ideas of a living and prosefit revelation were suppressed as in the case of Montanism. Three more or less coordinate authorities were set up which determined for individual Christians what was Christian truth and conduct. The canon of the New Testament was gradually formed to define what writings, in addition to the Old Testament taken over from the Jewish church, were inspired by the Holy Spirit and of Divine authority. The outline of a common creed or rule of faith grew up as the standard interpretation of Scripture. Above all was the episcopacy, which was supposed to preserve in unbroken tradition the unwritten teaching of the apostles. As the only living factor in this system of authority the last easily secured the predominant place. (See Harnack, History of Dogma, II, chapter ii, English translation.)

(2) General Councils.

The authority of the episcopacy was organized into a permanent and general form in the councils, to whose decision obedience was demanded on pain of excommunication. The councils professed and believed that they were only defining the teaching that had always obtained in the church, and therefore invested themselves and their decisions with the authority of Christ.

(3) Romanism.

During the Middle Ages, the church of Rome concentrated in itself, that is, in its episcopacy, all the authority of tradition, bishops, councils and whatever else had held sway over the mind of the church. Scripture was ignored and the Bishop of Rome exercised the plenary authority of God over men’s minds and lives. "Boniface VIII accepted in the Bull Unam sancram (ecclesiam) of November 18, 1302, the Thomist doctrine of the papacy: ‘We declare, say, define and pronounce that it is essential to salvation that every human creature should subject himself to the Roman Pontiff’"(Loofs, Dogmengeschichte, 307).

(4) Papal Infallibility.

This theory culminated in 1870 in the formal declaration of the infallibility of the pope. "The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks ex cathedra .... has that infallibility, with which the Divine Redeemer endowed His church, in defining a doctrine of faith or morals" (Vatican Council, 1870, Session 4, cap. 4). This authority of the pope extends over all questions of knowledge and conduct, of discipline and government in the whole church. The theory is based upon the doctrine of tradition, as laid down in the Council of Chalcedon. "The doctrine of Catholic teaching is, that the body of publicly revealed doctrine has received no objective increase since the days of the apostles," and "it is no change of doctrine when that which has always been held implicitly becomes the subject of an explicit declaration" (Hunter, Outlines of Dogmatic Theology, I, 159, 164).

Newman and recent modernists, however, concede a development in the doctrines of the church, but on

the basis of the traditional teaching derived from the apostles. But once a development is conceded, questions arise as to its principles and conditions, and the whole authority that rests upon them falls to the ground by the mere fact of an appeal from it to the principles that govern its development. The attempt to evade criticism by positing the miraculous preservation of the tradition from error involves a further appeal from the supposed authority to a hypothetical miracle for which there is no tittle of evidence. All the evidence is against it. The history of the church shows that it has been as liable to error, and as readily influenced by natural conditions, as any other human institution.

(5) Inerrancy of Scripture.

When Protestants sought an external authority, they posited the inerrancy and infallibility of the Bible, and the whole Christian faith was founded upon that dogma. "Holy Scripture is the judge, or rather the voice of the supreme and infallible judge, the Holy Spirit, and the norm to which an inferior judge should refer in deciding controversies of faith, and according to which alone he should give sentence" (Quenstedt, quoted in Hutterns Redivivus, 119, 10th edition). Protestants found it necessary to interpret Scripture, and to define doctrines in synods and councils, but their decisions had authority only because they were supposed to be expositions of Scripture, and in that sense, the expression of God’s mind. They differed from the "Catholic" councils in that they claimed no authority of their own and repudiated any authority that might be derived from tradition or the ministerial office.

(6) Anglican Appeal to Antiquity.

In the Anglican church too, the Scriptures as infallible were the ultimate authority, but some kind of a coordinate authority was claimed for the priesthood as standing in the succession of the apostles, and for the church Fathers and councils of the first six centuries. And the tendency has been to lay increasing emphasis on the latter factors, as criticism has undermined the literal and external authority of Scripture.

(7) Limitations of External Authority.

All the above-mentioned theories contain an element of truth, and the authorities they posit have in their turns ruled the minds and lives of men; but none of them can be regarded as adequate and final expressions of the mind of God to man.

(a) Not Infallible

It is superfluous to demonstrate that they are not infallible; in spite of that they might still be all the authority that man can have or need.

(b) Rests on Personal Authority

They all rest on the assumption that God’s self-revelation came to an end with the apostolic age. The Biblical theory admittedly does, and the tradition theories strictly interpreted are in exactly the same

case. An authority resting upon a traditional teaching handed down faithfully from the apostles would differ in no essential respect from one resting upon the written words of the apostles. They would be equally limited, literal, external and mechanical. But problems of mind and conduct have arisen, which the apostles never contemplated, and which their teaching (whether preserved in written or oral tradition matters nothing) could not solve.

(c) No Apostolical Tradition Extant

As a matter of fact no traditional teaching of the apostles supplementing their writings has ever been discovered or can be discovered. What has been put forward as such is in manifest contradiction to their writings.

(d) No Consensus of Fathers

The idea that there is a consensus of opinion among church Fathers is equally illusory. If there were, it would need to be proved that such opinion could have any binding authority in religion.

(e) Bible Needs Interpretation

The Bible is not one body of truth all standing at the same level, and whatever view of its inspiration may be held, some further authority will be needed to discriminate between the lower and the higher in its teaching.

(f) Authority Necessarily Spiritual

Above all, an authority which is merely external and objective is no authority at all to the mature religious life. Blind submission to any external authority, creed, church or book, is the condition of a slave, and in such case "our spiritual intelligence is not quickened and developed by communion with the infinite wisdom, but arrested and quelled. Only then, on the other hand, are we spiritually enfranchised when we receive a revelation as from God, not because we are awed or terrified or allured by our selfish interests into reception of it, but because our own minds and hearts respond to it, because we see and know it to be true" (J. Caird, University Sermons (1898), 204-5).

2. Internal Authority:

Theories of internal authority are in the nature of the case not so easily classified or defined as those of external; nor have they as yet filled so large a place in the public life of the church. But it would be a serious error to suppose that all the men who gave their adherence to systems of external authority lived in mere subjection to them. The history of mysticism in the church is the history of independent thought resting in a direct knowledge of God that transcended all external authority. Montanism and Gnosticism each in its own way appealed to an inner criterion of truth. All heresies involved some independent judgment, and appealed to authorities that were neither objective nor established. The Protestant

Reformation was an open revolt against external authority, and although it resulted for a time in the substitution of another external authority, neither its original motive, nor its permanent force had any kinship with it.

Luther's free criticism of the Bible, and Calvin's appeal to the testimony of the Holy Spirit as the final principle of its interpretation, are well known. No body of Protestants at present founds its faith on the mere letter of Scripture or creed. Inward authority has been conceived in many ways and expressed by many terms, such as the Logos (Greek apologists); the Paraclete (Montanus); ecstasy (Mystics); knowledge as opposed to faith or creed (Gnostics); the personal experience of faith (Luther); the testimony of the Holy Spirit (Calvin); the inner light (Quakers); individual experience (Pietists); practical reason (Kant); religious feeling (Schleiermacher); the historical Christ (Ritschl); conscience (Martineau); the living Christ (R. W. Dale); the consciousness of Christ (A. M. Fairbairn); the Christ of history and of experience (D. W. Forest) and many more. The variety suggests at first the denial rather than the affirmation of authority, but it is only in such a variety that the principles of an adequate authority can be recognized.

The ultimate authority in religion is God as He reigns in men's hearts. But both the experience itself and the expression and interpretation of it vary with each individual. A religious authority to be real and effective must win the response of the human spirit, and in that personal relation of Spirit with spirit lie the conditions of variation. Yet human reason and conscience everywhere tend to acknowledge one standard, to recognize one ideal and to obey one Lord. Nothing can force such a uniformity but the inward fitness of one supreme revelation to the common demands of humanity. No agreement yet exists as to the possibility or reality of such a revelation. But wherever men lend themselves to the spiritual contact of Jesus Christ with their souls, without the intervention of human creeds or institutions, their conscience and reason approve His moral supremacy and their spirits recognize His intimate knowledge of the Father.

LITERATURE:

Besides books already mentioned, Bruce, Chief End of Revelation; Sanday, Inspiration, and Oracles of God; Oman, Vision and Authority, and The Problem of Faith and Freedom; Asia Minor Fairbairn, Catholicism, Roman and Anglican; Sabatier, The Religions of Authority; Watson, The Philosophical Basis of Religion; Kaftan, The Truth of the Christian Religion; Gwatkin, The Knowledge of God; Iverach, article "Authority" in Hastings, Encyclopedia of Theology and Ethics; E. O. Davies, Prolegomena to Systematic Theology, especially for Bibliography.

T. Rees

AUTHORITY; AUTHORITY IN GENERAL

o-thor'-i-ti. See AUTHORITY IN RELIGION, sec. I.

AUTHORIZED VERSION

o’-thor-iz’d. See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

AUTRANITIS

o-ran-i’-tis: Used by Josephus for HAURAN (which see).

AVA

a’-va. See AWA.

AVAIL

a-val’ shawah, ("to be equal," hence "to be enough," "to avail"): Used in the sense of "satisfy" (Es 5:13). Queen Esther’s exceptional favor availed not to satisfy Haman, because of his insane jealousy of his rival Mordecai. ischuo, "to be strong.," translated also "prevail" (Re 12:8); with a negative signifies incompetence, e. g. the impossibility of redemptivc merit or power in an outward ceremony or act (Ga 5:6; 6:15 the King James Version): "neither circumcision availcth anything," contrasted with the efficacy of faith "in Christ Jesus." Used also to express the efficacy of prayer (Jas 5:16).

AVARAN

av’-a-ran: A surname of Eleazar, the third son of Mattathias (1 Macc 2:5). It is doubtfully conjectured that Eleazar received this surname from the episode related in 1 Macc 6:43-46; the word may mean "the piercer," referring to his stabbing of the elephant. Some connect it with chur, "to be white," and connect it with Eleazar’s white complexion. The Syriac reads "Chavran" and the Vulgate’s "Abaron"; the Septuagint in 1 Macc 6:43 gives Sauaran which is an error for Eleazaros auran; Septuagint’s Codex Venetus corrects to auran.

AVEN

a’-ven ‘awen "emptiness," "vanity": Used in Eze 30:17 for On or Heliopolis, in Egypt. See ON. As a term of contempt Hosea calls Beth-el "Beth-aven" (4:15; 10:5). So Amos speaks of some valley near Damascus as "the valley of Aven" (that is, of the idol, 1:5), in which Baalbek (Heliopolis) was situated. The word is rendered "idol" in Isa 66:3.

AVENGE; AVENGER

a-venj’ a-venj’-er: Avenge.—The general idea connected with this word is that of inflicting punishment

upon the wrongdoer. Since emphasis may be placed upon the deed itself, the wrongdoer, or the injured party, the verb is found an intransitive (only Le 19:18; see below), transitive (2Sa 4:8 et al.); and also active (De 32:43), passive (Jer 5:9) and reflexive (Es 8:13). In 1Sa 25:26 ff avenge is translated from yasha‘, "to save" (Revised Version margin, "thine own hand saving thee"), in Ho 1:4 from paqadh, "to visit," and in 2Sa 18:19 ff from shaphaT, "to judge," but the usual Hebrew word is naqam, or derivatives, "to avenge."

The translation in the Revised Version (British and American) differs in some places from King James Version: Nu 31:3 Revised Version (British and American) "execute Yahweh’s vengeance"; (compare 2Sa 22:48; Ps 18:47; Le 26:25); Le 19:18 Revised Version (British and American) "take vengeance"; Jud 5:2 Revised Version (British and American) "for that the leaders took the lead in Israel" from para‘, "to be free, to lead".

In the New Testament avenge is translated from the Greek ekdikeo, "to do justice," "to protect" (Lu 18:3 ff et al.) and the King James Version Re 18:20, krino, "to judge" Revised Version (British and American) "God hath judged your judgment".

Avenger.—That is, the person who inflicts punishment upon the evil-doer for a wrong experienced by himself (from naqam, "to avenge"; Ps 8:2 et al.) or by someone else from ga’al, "to redeem"; (Nu 35:12 ff et al.). In the New Testament avenger occurs only once; "the Lord is an avenger in all things" (1Th 4:6). It was the duty of the nearest relative to execute vengeance upon the murderer of his kin: he became the go’el. With reference to the protective legislation and custom, see \GOEL. Compare BLOOD; REVENGE, REVENGER.

A. L. Breslich

AVERSE

a-vurs’ shabh, "to turn back," ("retreat"): Quiet, peaceful wanderers (Mic 2:8).

AVIM

av’-im. See AVVIM.

AVIMS

av’-imz (De 2:23). See AVVIM.

AVITES

a’-vits. See AVVIM.

AVITH

a’-vith ‘awith: The royal city of Hadad king of Edom (Ge 36:35; 1Ch 1:46). The Septuagint reads Getthaim. There is no clue to its identification.

AVOID

a-void: Archaic use in 1Sa 18:11 for "escaped." In the Revised Version (British and American) of New Testament only in 2Co 8:20 stellomenoi (with negative), literally, "arranging that not," etc., i. e. by anticipation providing that something should not occur. In the King James Version for "turn away from," ekklinete: Ro 16:17; 1Ti 6:20; "refuse," paraitou, 2Ti 2:23; periistaso, Tit 3:9.

AVOUCH

a-vouch’:In English Versions of the Bible only in De 26:17,18, in the sense of "to confess," "avow," "publicly and solemnly declare." The Hebrew form is likewise unique (Hiph. of ‘amar).

AVVIM; AVITES

av’-im a’-vits ‘awwim; Heuaioi, also unaspirated; (also used to represent the name of the Hivites): The early inhabitants of the southern extremity of Canaan afterward occupied by the Philistines (De 2:23; compare Jos 13:3,4, the King James Version "Avim," a’-vim).

The Avvim of Jos 18:23 was a town of Benjamin, not a people. Gesenius supposes the name to mean "dwellers in the desert," but it was more probably the name of some pre-Sem tribe. The Avvim are described as living in Chatserim or "encampments" and extending as far as the outskirts of Gaza.

AWA

av’-a ‘awwa’; the King James Version Ava, a’-va: A province, the people of which Shalmaneser king of Assyria placed in the cities of Samaria in the room of the children of Israel taken into exile by him (2Ki 17:24). It is probably the same as Ivva (2Ki 18:34; 19:13; Isa 37:13), a province conquered by Assyria.

AWAIT

a-wat’:Only in Ac 9:24 the King James Version, in its now obsolete sense as a noun, "ambush": "their laying await was known of Saul." the Revised Version (British and American) "their plot."

AWAKE

a-wak’ yaqats, ("to waken"; ‘ur, "to rouse up" from sleep; egeiro, "to arouse from sleep"): The ordinary terms for awaking from natural slumber: as of Jacob at Bethel (Ge 28:16); of Solomon at Gibeon (1Ki 3:15); of Jesus in the storm-tossed boat (Lu 8:24).

Used figure with striking effect of awaking from mental, moral and spiritual sleep: as when Deborah calls upon herself to awake to the fervor and eloquence of poetry (Jud 5:12); of Zion’s awaking to moral vigor and beauty (Isa 52:1); of waking from spiritual death (Eph 5:14); from the grave in resurrection (Da 12:2). Poetically used of the rising north wind (So 4:16); of music (Ps 108:2); of the sword in battle (Zec 13:7); of a lover’s affection (So 2:7); of God Himself responding to prayer (Ps 59:4). Also used of moral awaking, as from drunkenness: eknepho, "to become sober" (compare Joe 1:5).

Dwight M. Pratt

AWAY WITH

(1) "To endure," "to bear with" (Isa 1:13), "I cannot away with iniquity and the solemn meeting," i e. endure the combination of wickedness and worship. In the Hebrew merely, "I am unable iniquity and the solenm meeting."

(2) To destroy airo. Found in such expressions as Ac 22:22, "Away with such a fellow from the earth."

AWE

o: Fear mingled with reverence and wonder, a state of mind inspired by something terrible or sublime.

In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) it occurs in Ps 4:4: "Stand in awe, and sin not" (where the Revised Version, margin has, "Be ye angry," so Septuagint; compare Eph 4:26); Ps 33:8; 119:161. In the following passages the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "stand in awe" for the King James Version "fear": Ps 22:23 phoboumenoi;

Isa 29:23; 1Sa 18:15; Mal 2:5; and in Heb 12:28 it substitutes "awe" for the King James Version "reverence" (deos here only in New Testament). In all these passages, except 1Sa 18:15 (eulabeito, where it describes Saul’s feeling toward David), the word stands for man’s attitude of reverential fear toward God. This is the characteristic attitude of the pious soul toward God in the Scriptures, especially in the Old Testament. It arises from a consciousness of the infinite power, sublimity and holiness of God, which fills the mind with the "fear of the Lord," and a dread of violating His law. See FEAR.

D. Miall Edwards

AWL

ol martsea‘: "Bore his ear through with an awl" (Ex 21:6; De 15:17). The ear was pierced as being the organ of hearing, thus signifying the servant’s promise of obedience. See BORE.

AX (AXE); AX-HEAD

aks; aks’hed: Nine different Hebrew words have been rendered "ax":

(1) garzen. This unquestionably was one of the larger chopping instruments, as the uses to which it was put would imply (De 19:5; 20:19; 1Ki 6:7; Isa 10:15). The modern ax used by the woodchoppers in Syria has a shape much like the ancient stone and bronze axes, with the exception that it is fastened to the handle by passing the latter through a hole in the ax-head, whereas the Egyptian sculptures show that their ax-heads were held to the handles by means of thongs. The so-called battle-ax found at Tell el-Chesy was probably fastened in this way. Syrian peasants are frequently seen carrying in their belts small hatchets the heads of which are shaped like a battle-ax and which are bound to the handles by thongs.

(2) ma‘atsar, is used in Isa 44:12 (King James Version renders "tongs") and in Jer 10:3.

(3) qardom, is used in Jud 9:48; 1Sa 13:20,21; Ps 74:5; Jer 46:22. The present Arabic word, qudum, which is the name for the native adze, is from the same origin. The adze is the only chopping instrument of the Syrian carpenter. He uses it for many purposes, where a foreigner would use a saw or chisel or plane, and with a skill which the foreigner envies. Many students of Syrian life believe that the adze is a tool which has survived from the early Hebrew times.

(4) barzel (De 19:5; 2Ki 6:5): The interest associated with this word is that it literally means "iron," although the context indicates that it means "ax." If the word iron was not used here to mean "metal," then iron axes were used by the children of Israel. If iron axes existed, however, they have long since disappeared as the result of corrosion, since the only ones discovered have been of stone, copper or bronze. See METALS.

(5) maghzirah (2Sa 12:31) is literally, "a cutting instrument," and might be rendered, "a blade" or sickle.

(6) megherah (1Ch 20:2), translated in this one passage as axes, but better translated "saws."

(7) cherebh (Eze 26:9), rendered ax in this passage only. It is usually translated sword. It could also mean pick-axe.

(8) kashil (Ps 74:6 the King James Version), literally, "a feller," hence, an axe.

(9) mapets (Jer 51:20), literally, "a smiter," hence, a war club or battle-axe. The Greek word used in the New Testament is axine (Mt 3:10; Lu 3:9).

James A. Patch

AXLE-TREE

ak’-sil-tre. See SEA, thE MOLTEN.

AYIN

a’-yen: ‘ayin, "eye" or "fountain": The 16th letter of the Hebrew alphabet, so named, probably, because the original form resembled the eye. ‘Ayin (‘) is usually neglected in pronunciation, and inverted comma (‘) is the sign most commonly employed to represent it in transliteration.

The same sound is found in the Arabic and other Semitic languages. The Arabs have two pronunciations, one a very strong guttural formed at the back of the palate, something like a rattled "r" or "rg," the other similar in quality, only less harsh and guttural. The Septuagint reproduced the ‘ayin (‘) in some cases by the Greek letter gamma (g). The numerical value of this letter is 70. An ‘ayin (‘) begins each verse of the 16th section of Ps 119 in the Hebrew.

W.W. Davies

AZAEL

az’-a-el Azaelos; compare Asahel [Ezr 10:15]: Father of Jonathan, one of two chief investigators of foreign marriages (1 Esdras 9:14).

AZAELUS

az-a-e’-lus (B, Azaelos; A, Azael; omitted in Ezr 10): Azaelus, son of Ezora, put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:34).

AZAL

a’-zal. See AZEL.

AZALIAH

az-a-li’-a atsalyahu, ("Yahweh has set aside"): A son of Meshullam and father of Shaphan the scribe, famous in connection with the discovery of the law in the reign of King Josiah (2Ki 22:3).

AZANIAH

az-a-ni’-a ‘azanyah, ("Yahweh has given ear"): A son of Jeshua, a Levite who signed the covenant (Ne 10:9).

AZAPHION

a-za’-fi-on. See ASSAPHIOTH.

AZARA

az’-a-ra. See ASARA.

AZARAEL

a-za’-ra-el. See AZAREL.

AZARAIAS

az-a-ra’-yas (B, Azaraias; A, Saraias; the King James Version Saraias); compare Seraiah (Ezr 7:1): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:1).

AZAREEL

a-zar’-e-el. See AZAREL.

AZAREL

az’-a-rel ‘azarel, ("God is helper"; the King James Version reads Azareel in numbers 1-5, Azarael in numbers 6):

(1) A Korahite who entered the army of David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:6).

(2) A musician in the temple appointed by lot; son of Heman (1Ch 25:18; compare Uzziel, 1Ch 25:4).

(3) A captain of the tribe of Da in the service of David (1Ch 27:22).

(4) One of those who had "strange wives," a son of Bani (Ezr 10:41).

(5) The father of Amashai, a priest who dwelt in Jerusalem after the Exile (Ne 11:13).

(6) A priest’s son who played the trumpet in the procession when the wall was dedicated (Ne 12:36).

A. L. Breslich

AZARIAH

az-a-ri’-a ‘azaryahu and ‘azaryah, ("Yahweh has helped"):

(1) King of Judah. See UZZIAH.

(2) A Judahite of the house of Ethan the Wise (1Ch 2:8).

(3) The son of Jehu, descended from an Egyptian through the daughter of Sheshan (1Ch 2:38).

(4) A son of Ahimaaz and grandson of Zadok (1Ch 6:9).

(5) A son of Zadok the high priest and an official of Solomon (1Ki 4:2).

(6) A high priest and son of Johanan (1Ch 6:10).

(7) A Levite, ancestor of Samuel, and Heman the singer (1Ch 6:36).

(8) A son of Nathan and captain of Solomon’s tax collectors (1Ki 4:5).

(9) A prophet in the reign of King Asa; his father’s name was Oded (2Ch 15:1-8).

(10 and 11) Two sons of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah (2Ch 21:2).

(12) King of Judah (2Ch 22:6, called Ahaziah in 2Ch 22:1).

(13) A son of Jeroham, who helped to overthrow Athaliah, and place Joash on the throne (2Ch 23:1).

(14) A son of Johanan and a leading man of Ephraim, mentioned in connection with the emancipated captives taken by Pekah (2Ch 28:12).

(15) A Levite of the family of Merari, who took part in cleansing the temple in the days of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12).

(16) A high priest who rebuked King Uzziah for arrogating to himself priestly functions (2Ch 26:16-20).

(17) The father of Seraiah and son of Hilkiah (1Ch 6:13f).

(18) A son of Hoshaiah, and a bitter enemy of Jeremiah (Jer 43:2ff).

(19) One of the royal captives taken to Babylon, whose name was changed to Abed-nego (Da 1:7).

(20) The son of Maaseiah, who helped repair the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 3:23f).

(21) A Levite who assisted Ezra to expound the Law (Ne 8:7).

(22) A priest who sealed the covenant (Ne 10:2).

(23) A prince of Judah mentioned in connection with the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 12:32f).

W. W. Davies

AZARIAS

az-a-ri’as Azarias and Azareias:

(1) Azarias, who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:21); compare Uzziah (Ezr 10:21).

(2) Azarias, who stood at the right side of Ezra when the law was read to the people (1 Esdras 9:43); omitted in Ezr 8:4.

(3) Azarias, who interpreted the law to the people (1 Esdras 9:48); compare Azariah (Ne 8:7).

(4) Azarias, a name assumed by the angel Raphael (Tobit 5:12; 6:6,13; 7:8; 9:2). See RAPHAEL.

(5) Azarias, a general in the service of Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 5:18,56,60).

(6) Azarias, one of the three men thrown into the fiery furnace (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) verses 2,66); compare Azariah (Da 1:6 ff; 2:17), Abed-nego (Da 1:7; 2:49; 3:12ff).

A. L. Breslich

AZARU

az’a-ru B, Azarou; A, Azourou; (the King James Version Azuran): The descendants of Azaru returned

with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:15); omitted in Ezr and Neh; compare however Azzur (Ne 10:17).

AZAZ

a’-zaz ‘azaz, ("powerful"): A descendant of Reuben (1Ch 5:8).

AZAZEL

a-za’-zel (‘aza’zel apopompaios; the King James Version Scapegoat, the Revised Version, margin "removal"):

I. THE MEANING OF THE WORD

1. The Passages to Be Considered

2. The Proposed Interpretations

(1) The Etymology

(2) The Explanation

II. WHAT IS DONE IN CONNECTION WITH AZAZEL

1. The Significance of This Action

2. The Jewish Liturgy

I. The Meaning of the Word

1. The Passages to Be Considered:

This word is found in connection with the ceremony of the Day of Atonement (which see). According to Le 16:8, Aaron is to cast lots upon the two goats which on the part of the congregation are to serve as a sin offering (Le 16:5), "one be lot for Yahweh, and the other lot for Azazel." In Le 16:10, after the first goat has been set apart as a sin offering for Yahweh, we read: "But the goat, on which the lot fell for Azazel, shall be set alive before Yahweh, to make atonement for him, to send him away for Azazel into the wilderness." In Le 16:26 we read: "And he that letteth go the goat for Azazel shall wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in water." Before this, in Le 16:21f mention had been made of what should be done with the goat. After the purification of the (inner) sanctuary, of the tent of meeting, and of the altar, the living goat is to brought, "and Aaron shall lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess

over him all .... their sins; and he shall put them upon the head of the goat, and shall send him away by the hand of a man that is in readiness into the wilderness: and the goat shall bear upon him all their iniquities unto a solitary land: and he shall let go the goat in the wilderness." But in this last mentioned and most important passage the term under consideration is not found.

2. The Proposed Interpretations:

(1) The Etymology.

Some have derived the word from ‘az plus ‘azal (fortis abiens, "passing away in his strength" or from an intentional alteration of ‘el plus ‘azaz, robur Dei, "strength of God"; compare below the angel of the Book of Enoch); while others have regarded the word as a broken plural of a substantive in the Arabic ‘azala, and translated it as "lonesomeness," "desert." Now there is an inclination to regard it as a reduplication from ‘azalzel, derived from the root ‘azal. If we accept this view, although it is without certainty and an exact analogue cannot be found, we could conclude from the way in which this noun has been formed that we have before us not an abstract term (remotio, "removal," or abitus, "departure"), but a concrete noun, or an adjective, longe remotus ("far removed") or porro abiens ("going far away").

(2) The Explanation.

In Le 16:10,22,26, we would have an acceptable sense, if we regarded this word as expressive of a distinct locality in the wilderness. But this interpretation is impossible, since the law in Le 16 was given during the wanderings in the wilderness and accordingly presupposed a constant change in the encampment, even if this should be regarded only as the historical background. By the use of the same preposition le- in connection with Yahweh and Azazel, it seems natural to regard the expressions as entirely II and to think of some personal being. Some interpret this word as referring to a demon of the wilderness (compare Ps 106:37; De 32:17; Le 17:7; 2Ch 11:15; Isa 13:21; 34:14; Mt 12:43ff; Lu 11:24ff; Re 18:2) and explain the term as "one who has separated himself from God," or "he who has separated himself," or "he who misleads others." But a demon of this kind could not possibly be placed in contrast to Yahweh in this way; and as in the Book of Enoch 6:6; 8:1 ff; 9:6; 10:4 ff; 13:1 ff; 69:2 one of the most prominent of the fallen angels who taught mankind the arts of war and luxury, revealed secrets to them, and is now bound in the wilderness, and is there preserved for the final judgment, because he was mainly responsible for the presence of evil in the world, is called Azael (also Azazel, or Azalzel), it is highly probable that this name was taken from Le 16. In later times the word Azazel was by many Jews and also by Christian theologians, such as Origen, regarded as that Satan himself who had fallen away from God. In this interpretation the contrast found in Le 16:8, in case it is to be regarded as a full parallelism, would be perfectly correct. But it must be acknowledged that in Holy Scripture, Satan is nowhere called by the name of Azazel, and just as little is the wilderness regarded as his permanent place of abode. Against these last two interpretations we must also recall that in the most significant passage, namely, Le 16:20 ff, the term Azazel is not found at all. The same is true in the case of the ceremony in connection with the purification of leprous people and houses (Le 14:7 ff, 49ff), which throughout suggests Le 16. In this place we have also the sevenfold sprinkling (compare Le 14:16 with

Le 16:14f); and in addition two animals, in this case birds, are used, of which the one is to be slain for the purpose of sprinkling the blood, but the other, after it has been dipped into the blood of the one that has been slain, is to be allowed to fly away. In this way the essential thought in Le 16 as also in Le 14 seems to be the removal of the animal in either case, and it is accordingly advisable to interpret Azazel adjectively, i.e. to forego finding a complete parallelism in Le 16:8, and to regard the preposition in connection with Yahweh as used differently from its use with Azazel, and to translate as follows: "And Aaron shall cast lots over both goats, the one lot [i.e. for the one goat] for Yahweh, and one lot for the goat that is destined to go far away." On the preposition le- used with the second Azazel in Le 16:10, compare Ex 21:2. With this interpretation a certain hardness yet remains for our linguistic sense, because we cannot find a good translation for the adjective. But in favor of this interpretation and against the personal interpretation we can appeal also to the feeling of the Septuagint translators who translate apopompaios, diestalmenos, and also to that of Aquilos, who translates tragos apoluomenos, apolelumenos, kekrataiomenos, and of Symmachus who translates aperchomenos, aphiemenos. (The general idea expressed by all these words is "removal," "sending away," "releasing" or "dismissal.") It is true that the Septuagint in one place translates eis ten apopompen, which however could be also an abstract circumlocution for a conception that, though used elsewhere, is yet awkward. In the Vulgate, we have caper emissarius and Luther says "der ledige Bock," which are probably based on a wrong etymology, since ‘ez signifies only a goat or perhaps this word "Bock" is here only supplied from the connection, and that quite correctly, so that Luther and the Vulgate can also be cited in favor of our interpretation.

II. What Is Done in Connection with Azazel.

1. The Significance of This Action:

Both goats, according to Le 16:5, are to be regarded as a single sin-sacrifice, even should we interpret Azazel as demon or Satan, and we are accordingly not at all to understand that a sacrifice was brought to these beings. This too is made impossible by the whole tenor of the Old Testament in general, as of Le 16 in particular, so that in 16:8 the two members introduced by the preposition le- would not at all be beings of exactly the same importance. Both goats, so to say, represent two sides of the same thing. The second is necessary to make clear what the first one, which has been slain, can no longer represent, namely, the removal of the sin, and accordingly has quite often aptly been called the hircus redivivus. But what is to be represented finds its expression in the ceremony described in Le 16:20f. Whatever may be the significance of the laying on of hands in other connections, whether the emphasis is placed more on the disposal or on the appropriation of the property, at this place it certainly is only a symbol of the transfer of guilt, which is confessed over the goat and is then carried into the wilderness by the goat upon which it has been laid. In order to make this transfer all the more impressive, both the hands are here brought into action, while e.g. in Le 1:4 only one hand is used. The fact that the goat is accompanied by somebody and that it is to be taken to an uninhabited place is to indicate the absolute impossibility of its return, i.e. the guilt has been absolutely forgiven and erased, a deep thought made objectively evident in a transparent manner and independently of the explanation of Azazel, which is even yet not altogether certain. In the personal interpretation, we could have, in addition to the idea of the removal of the guilt, also a second idea, namely, that Azazel can do no harm to Israel, but must be

content with his claim to a goat which takes Israel’s place.

2. The Jewish Liturgy:

The actions in connection with Azazel, as was also the case with the Day of Atonement, were interpreted more fully by the Talmud and the traditions based on it (compare ATONEMENT, DAY OF, sec. III, 2). The lots could be made of different materials; in later times they were made of gold. The manner of casting the lots was described in full. The goat that was to be sent into the wilderness was designated by a black mark on the head, the other by one on the neck. On the way from Jerusalem to the wilderness, huts were erected. From a distance it was possible to see how the goat was hurled backward from a certain cliff, called Beth-Hadudu (Beth-chadedun, 12 miles East of Jerusalem). By means of signals made with garments, news was at once sent to Jerusalem when the wilderness had been reached.

Wilhelm Moller

AZAZIAH

az-a-zi’-a (‘azazyahu, "Yahweh is strong," or "strengthens"):

(1) A Levite musician who participated in the services held on the return of the ark to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:21). His name is omitted from the list in 1Ch 15:18.

(2) Father of Hoshea, who was the leader of Ephraim at the time that David enumerated the people (1Ch 27:20).

(3) A Levite who had charge of the offerings brought to the temple in the days of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:13).

AZBASARETH

az-bas’-a-reth: The name of an Assyrian king. The King James Version form "Azbasareth" comes from the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.)

See ASBASARETH.

AZBUK

az’-buk ‘azbuk: The father of a certain Nehemiah—not the great governor of the same name, though a contemporary (Ne 3:16).

AZEKAH

a-ze’-ka ‘azekah: A town of some importance in the Shephelah of Judah mentioned (Jos 15:35) next to Socoh. In Jos 10:10 the defeated kings of the Arnorites are described as flying before Joshua "by the way of the ascent of Beth-horon .... to Azekah, and unto Makkedah" and (Jos 10:11) as the host fled "Yahweh cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died." In 1Sa 17:1 it is recorded that before David’s combat with Goliath, the Philistines "gathered together at Socoh, which belongeth to Judah, and encamped between Socoh and Azekah, in Ephes-dammin." In 2Ch 11:9 it is mentioned as one of the frontier cities which Rehoboam fortified and in Jer 34:7 it is one of the two fortified cities remaining to Judah in the Shephelah which Nebuchadnezzar was besieging. "Azekah and the towns (margin, "daughters") thereof" is mentioned among the cities reoccupied by Jews returning after the Exile (Ne 11:30). In all the three last references the place is mentioned along with Lachish.

All the data suit Tell Zaqareyeh on the North side of the Vale of Elah (Wady es-Sunt) and some 3 miles Northwest of Socoh (Kh. Shuweikeh). This site, which was partially excavated by the Palestine Exploration Fund, is one of great natural strength. "The hill stands almost isolated, rising abruptly for almost 350 ft. above the Vale of Elah; .... to the West the fall is also very great, while to the South the tell is joined by a neck of land (about 100 ft. below the summit) to a hill behind." The summit is about 350 yds. by 150 yds., and is much larger than Tell el-Chesy (Lachish) (Bliss). Excavations showed that it was a very ancient site which had been powerfully fortified, and the rock under the city was excavated in a series of very extraordinary underground chambers which could be used as places of refuge. The site suits the narrative of Joshua’s battle every well, as there is a long-used high route running North to South from the neighborhood of Ajalon. Its position as a frontier fortress is comparable with that of Lachish: the name Zakareyeh, seems to be a survival of Azekah. See PEFS, 1899, 10 ff; PEF, III, 441.

E. W. G. Masterman

AZEL

a’-zel (’atsel, "noble"):

(1) A descendant of King Saul, through Jonathan (1Ch 8:37 f; 9:43f).

(2) Azel, a’-zel, the King James Version Azal ‘atsel; Asael; (Zec 14:5): A place not far from Jerusalem. There may be an echo of the name in that of Wady Yasal, to the right of ‘Ain el-Loz, in Wady en-Nar.

AZEM

a’-zem: the King James Version form for Ezem (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Jos 15:29; 19:3).

AZEPHURITH

az-e-fu’-rith. See ARSIPHURITH.

AZETAS

a-ze’-tas (Azetas): The head of a family accompanying Zerubbabel out of captivity (1 Esdras 5:15). Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah gives this name in his list. There may be an echo of the name in that of Wady Yasal, to the right of ‘Ain el-Loz, in Wady en- Nar.

AZGAD

az’-gad (‘azgadh, "strong is Gad"): In the list of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel are mentioned "the children of Azgad" (1,222, Ezr 2:12; 2,322, Ne 7:17). 110 males with their chief returned with Ezra (Ezr 8:12). Azgad was among the leaders who signed the Covenant after Nehemiah (Ne 10:15).

AZIEI

a-zi’-e-i: An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2). Compare Azariah (Ezr 7:3) and Ozias (1 Esdras 8:2; the King James Version Ezias).

AZIEL

a’-zi-el (‘aziel, "God is power"); (compare Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 210, 309): A Levite singer who played the psalteries (1Ch 15:20); compare Jaaziel (1Ch 15:18).

AZIZA

a-zi’-za (‘aziza’ "the powerful"): Aziza had taken a foreign wife (Ezr 10:27): compare Zardeus (1 Esdras 9:28 the Revised Version (British and American)).

AZMAVETH (1)

az-ma’-veth ‘azmaweth:

(1) One of David’s 30 mighty men (2Sa 23:31; 1Ch 11:33).

(2) A descendant of Jonathan, the son of Saul (1Ch 8:36; 9:42).

(3) Father of two warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3).

(4) The name of one set over David’s treasures (1Ch 27:25). Some identify him with (1) and (3).

AZMAVETH (2)

az-ma’-veth (‘azmaweth; Asmoth or Azmoth, "strong one of death"; Ezr 2:24): Is probably identical with el-Chizma, a village a little to the North of ‘Anata (Anathoth). It corresponds to Beth-azmaveth (Ne 7:28).

AZMON

az’-mon (‘atsmon; Asemona, "strong"): On the Southwest border of Israel (Nu 34:4,5; Jos 15:4). Trumbull identifies it with ‘Ain el-Qaseimeh, Northwest of Kadesh Barnea (Kad. Baruch., 117, 289 f).

AZNOTH-TABOR

az’noth-ta’-bor (’aznoth tabhor, "peaks of Tabor"): A place in western Naphtali, evidently in the vicinity of Mt. Tabor (Jos 19:34). The exact locality is not known.

AZOR

a’-zor Azor, "help"(?): An ancestor of Jesus Christ (Mt 1:13f).

AZOTUS

a-zo’-tus. See ASHDOD (1 Macc 9:15; Ac 8:40).

AZRIEL

az’-ri-el (‘azri’el, "God’s help"):

(1) One of the leading men of the half-tribe of Manasseh, East of the Jordan, who with others of his tribe was carried captive by the king of Assyria (1Ch 5:24ff).

(2) The father of Jerimoth of the tribe of Naphtali in the reign of King David (1Ch 27:19).

(3) The father of Seraiah, one of the officers sent by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch (Jer 36:26).

AZRIKAM

az-ri’-kam (‘azriqam, "my help has arisen"):

(1) A descendant of King David through Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:23).

(2) A prince of Judah in the time of Ahaz. He was slain by Zichri, an Ephraimite soldier (2Ch 28:7).

(3) One of Azel’s sons, a Benjamite, descended from King Saul (1Ch 8:38; 9:44).

(4) A Levite of the house of Merari and a resident of Jerusalem (1Ch 9:14; Ne 11:15).

AZUBAH

a-zu’-ba (‘azubhah, "desolation"):

(1) A wife of Caleb, by whom she had three sons (1Ch 2:18f).

(2) The daughter of Shilhi and mother of King Jehoshaphat (1Ki 22:42; 2Ch 20:31).

AZUR

a’-zur. See AZZUR.

AZURAN

az’-u-ran, a-zu’-ran. See AZARU.

AZZAH

az’-a (‘azzah, "strong"): the King James Version form (De 2:23; 1Ki 4:24; Jer 25:20) for the Revised Version (British and American) "Gaza."

AZZAN

az’-an (‘azzan, "strong" or "thorn"): Father of Paltiel of the tribe of Issachar. One of the commissioners selected to divide the land between the tribes (Nu 34:26).

AZZUR

az’-ur (‘azzur, "helpful"):

(1) The father of Hananiah, a false prophet of Gibeon in the days of Zedekiah (Jer 28:1ff).

(2) One of those who, with Nehemiah, sealed the covenant on the return from Babylon (Ne 10:17).

(3) The father of Jaazaniah, "one of" the princes of the people who gave wicked counsel to the city of Jerusalem (Eze 11:1f). the King James Version has "Azur" for (1) and (3), but the Hebrew form of (3) is ‘azur.

BAAL (1)

ba’-al: (ba‘al; or Baal): The Babylonian Belu or Bel, "Lord," was the title of the supreme god among the Canaanites.

I. NAME AND CHARACTER OF BAAL

II. ATTRIBUTES OF BAAL

III. BAAL-WORSHIP

IV. TEMPLES, ETC.

V. USE OF THE NAME

VI. FORMS OF BAAL

1. Baal-berith

2. Baal-gad

3. Baal-hamon

4. Baal-hermon

5. Baal-peor

6. Baal-zebub

I. Name and Character of Baal:

In Babylonia it was the title specially applied to Merodach of Babylon, which in time came to be used in place of his actual name. As the word in Hebrew also means "possessor," it has been supposed to have originally signified, when used in a religious sense, the god of a particular piece of land or soil. Of this, however, there is no proof, and the sense of "possessor" is derived from that of "lord." The Babylonian Bel-Merodach was a Sun-god, and so too was the Can Baal whose full title was Baal-Shemaim, "lord of heaven." The Phoenician writer Sanchuniathon (Philo Byblius, Fragmenta II) accordingly says that the children of the first generation of mankind "in time of drought stretched forth their hands to heaven

toward the sun; for they regarded him as the sole Lord of heaven, and called him Beel-samen, which means ‘Lord of Heaven’ in the Phoenician language and is equivalent to Zeus in Greek" Baal-Shemaim had a temple at Umm el-Awamid between Acre and Tyre, and his name is found in inscriptions from the Phoenician colonies of Sardinia and Carthage.

II. Attributes of Baal:

As the Sun-god, Baal was worshipped under two aspects, beneficent and destructive. On the one hand he gave light and warmth to his worshippers; on the other hand the fierce heats of summer destroyed the vegetation he had himself brought into being. Hence, human victims were sacrificed to him in order to appease his anger in time of plague or other trouble, the victim being usually the first-born of the sacrificer and being burnt alive. In the Old Testament this is euphemistically termed "passing" the victim "through the fire" (2Ki 16:3; 21:6). The forms under which Baal was worshipped were necessarily as numerous as the communities which worshipped him. Each locality had its own Baal or divine "Lord" who frequently took his name from the city or place to which he belonged. Hence, there was a Baal-Zur, "Baal of Tyre"; Baal-hermon, "Baal of Hermon" (Jud 3:3); Baal-Lebanon, "Baal of Lebanon"; Baal-Tarz, "Baal of Tarsus." At other times the title was attached to the name of an individual god; thus we have Bel-Merodach, "the Lord Merodach" (or "Bel is Merodach") at Babylon, Baal-Melkarth at Tyre, Baal-gad (Jos 11:17) in the north of Palestine. Occasionally the second element was noun as in Baal-Shemaim, "lord of heaven," Baalzebub (2Ki 1:2), "Lord of flies," Baal-Hamman, usually interpreted "Lord of heat," but more probably "Lord of the sunpillar," the tutelary deity of Carthage. All these various forms of the Sun-god were collectively known as the Baalim or "Baals" who took their place by the side of the female Ashtaroth and Ashtrim. At Carthage the female consort of Baal was termed Pene-Baal, "the face" or "reflection of Baal."

III. Baal-Worship:

In the earlier days of Hebrew history the title Baal, or "Lord," was applied to the national God of Israel, a usage which was revived in later times, and is familiar to us in the King James Version. Hence both Jonathan and David had sons called Merib-baal (1Ch 8:31; 9:40) and Beeliada (1Ch 14:7). After the time of Ahab, however, the name became associated with the worship and rites of the Phoenician deity introduced into Samaria by Jezebel, and its idolatrous associations accordingly caused it to fall into disrepute. Hosea 2:16 declares that henceforth the God of Israel should no longer be called Baali, "my Baal," and personal names like Esh-baal (1Ch 8:33; 9:39), and Beelinda into which it entered were changed in form, Baal being turned into bosheth which in Heb at any rate conveyed the sense of "shame."

IV. Temples, etc.:

Temples of Baal at Samaria and Jerusalem are mentioned in 1Ki 1:18; where they had been erected at the time when the Ahab dynasty endeavored to fuse Israelites and Jews and Phoenicians into a single people under the same national Phoenician god. Altars on which incense was burned to Baal were set up

in all the streets of Jerusalem according to Jeremiah (11:13), apparently on the flat roofs of the houses (Jer 32:29); and the temple of Baal contained an image of the god in the shape of a pillar or Bethel (2Ki 10:26,27). In the reign of Ahab, Baal was served in Israel by 450 priests (1Ki 18:19), as well as by prophets (2Ki 10:19), and his worshippers wore special vestments when his ritual was performed (2Ki 10:22). The ordinary offering made to the god consisted of incense (Jer 7:9) and burnt sacrifices; on extraordinary occasions the victim was human (Jer 19:5). At times the priests worked themselves into a state of ecstasy, and dancing round the altar slashed themselves with knives (1Ki 18:26,28), like certain dervish orders in modern Islam.

V. Use of the Name.

In accordance with its signification the name of Baal is generally used with the definite art.; in the Septuagint this often takes the feminine form, aischane "shame" being intended to be read. We find the same usage in Ro 11:4. The feminine counterpart of Baal was Baalah or Baalath which is found in a good many of the local names (see Baethgen, Beltrage zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, 1888).

VI. Forms of Baal.

1. Baal-berith:

Baal-berith ba‘al berith; Baalberith, "Covenant Baal," was worshipped at Shechem after the death of Gideon (Jud 8:33; 9:4). In Jud 9:46 the name is replaced by El-berith, "Covenant-god." The covenant was that made by the god with his worshippers, less probably between the Israelites and the native Canaanites.

2. Baal-gad:

Baal-gad ba‘al gadh; Balagada, "Baal [lord] of good luck" (or "Baal is Gad") was the god of a town called after his name in the north of Palestine, which has often been identified with Baalbek. The god is termed simply Gad in Isa 65:11 the Revised Version, margin; where he is associated with Meni, the Assyrian Manu (King James Version "troop" and "number").

3. Baal-hamon:

Baal-hamon ba‘al hamon; Beelamon is known only from the fact that Solomon had a garden at a place of that name (So 8:11). The name is usually explained to mean "Baal of the multitude," but the cuneiform tablets of the Tell el-Amarna age found in Palestine show that the Egyptian god Amon was worshipped in Canaan and identified there with the native Baal. We are therefore justified in reading the name Baal-Amon, a parallel to the Babylonian Bel-Merodach. The name has no connection with that of the Carthaginian deity Baal-hamman.

4. Baal-hermon:

Baal-hermon ba‘al chermon; Balaermon is found in the name of "the mountain of Baal-hermon" (Jud 3:3; compare 1Ch 5:23), which also bore the names of Hermort, Sirion and Shenir (Saniru in the Assyrian inscriptions), the second name being applied to it by the Phoenicians and the third by the Amorites (De 3:9). Baal-hermon will consequently be a formation similar to Baal-Lebanon in an inscription from Cyprus; according to the Phoenician writer Sanchuniathon (Philo Byblius, Fragmenta II) the third generation of men "begat sons of surprising size and stature, whose names were given to the mountains of which they had obtained possession."

5. Baal-peor:

Baal-peor ba‘al pe‘or; Beelphegor was god of the Moabite mountains, who took his name from Mount Peor (Nu 23:28), the modern Fa‘ur, and was probably a form of Chemosh (Jerome, Comm., Isa 15). The sensual rites with which he was worshipped (Nu 25:1-3) indicate his connection with the Phoenician Baal.

6. Baal-zebub:

Baal-zebub ba‘al zebhubh; Baalmuia Theos ("Baal the fly god") was worshipped at Ekron where he had famous oracle (2Ki 1:2,3,16). The name is generally translated "the Lord of flies," the Sun-god being associated with the flies which swarm in Palestine during the earlier summer months. It is met with in Assyrian inscriptions. In the New Testament the name assumes the form of Beelzebul Beelzeboul, in King James Version: BEELZEBUB (which see).

A. H. Sayce

BAAL (2)

ba’-al ba‘al, ("lord," "master," "possessor"):

(1) A descendant of Reuben, Jacob’s first-born son, and the father of Beerah, prince of the Reubenitcs, "whom Tiglath-pileser (1Ch 5:5,6) king of Assyria carried away captive."

(2) The fourth of ten sons of Jeiel (King James Version "Jehiel"), father and founder of Gibeon. His mother was Maacah; his brother Kish father o£ Saul (1Ch 8:29 f; 9:35,36,39; compare 1Sa 14:50f). These passages identify Jeiel and Abiel as the father of Kish and thus of Baal. For study of confusions in the genealogical record, in 1Ch 9:36,39, see KISH; ABIEL; JEIEL.

(3) In composition often the name of a man and not of the heathen god, e.g. Baal-hanan, a king of Edom (Ge 36:38; 1Ch 1:49); also a royal prefect of the same name (1Ch 27:28). Gesenius thinks that Baal in compound words rarely refers to the god by that name. See BAAL (deity).

(4) A city of the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:33). See BAALATH-BEER.

Dwight M. Pratt

BAAL (3)

ba‘al; Baal 1Ch 4:33. See BAALATH-BEER.

BAAL-BERITH

ba-al-be’-rith ba‘al berith =(" Baal of the Covenant"): An idol worshipped by the Shechemites after Gideon’s death (Jud 8:33), as protector and guardian of engagements. His temple is also referred to in Jud 9:4. See BAAL (1).

BAAL-GAD

ba’-al-gad ba‘al gadh; Balagada, Balgad: Joshua in his conquest reached as far north as ‘Baal-gad in the valley’ of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon (Jos 11:17). This definitely locates it in the valley between the Lebanons, to the West or Northwest of Hermon. It must not be confused with Baal-hermon. Conder thinks it may be represented by ‘Ain Jedeideh.

BAAL-HAMON

ba-al-ha’-mon. See BAAL (1).

BAAL-HANAN

ba-al-ha’-nan ba‘al chanan, ("the Lord is gracious"):

(1) A king of Edom (Ge 36:38 f; 1Ch 1:49f).

(2) A gardener in the service of David (1Ch 27:28).

BAAL-HAZOR

ba-al-ha’-zor ba‘al chatsor; Bailasor, Bel-la-sor: A place on the property of Absalom where his sheep-shearers were gathered, beside Ephraim (2Sa 13:23). The sheep-shearing was evidently the occasion of a festival which was attended by Absalom’s brethren. Here he compassed the death of Amnon in revenge for the outrage upon his sister. The place may be identified with Tell ‘Asur, a mountain which rises 3,318 ft. above the sea, 4 miles Northeast of Bethel. rine Kubbet el Baul may retain the old name.

BAAL-HERMON

ba’-al-hur’-mon ba‘al chermon; Baal Ermon: Baalgad under Mount Hermon is described as "toward the sunrising" in Jos 13:5. If Mount Lebanon proper is here intended the reading may be taken as correct. But in Jud 3:3 Baal-gad is replaced by Baal-hermon. One or the other must be due to a scribal error. The Baal-hermon of 1Ch 5:23 lay somewhere East of the Jordan, near to Mount Hermon. It may possibly be identical with Banias.

BAAL-MEON

ba’-al-me’-on ba‘al me‘on; Beelmeon: A town built by the children of Reuben along with Nebo, "their names being changed" (Nu 32:38), identical with Beon of Nu 32:3. As Beth-baal-meon it was given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben (Jos 13:17). Mesha names it as fortified by him (MS, L. 9). It appears in Jer 48:23 as Beth-meon, one of the cities of Moab. Eusebius, Onomasticon speaks of it as a large village near the hot springs, i.e. Callirrhoe, in Wady Zerka Ma‘in, 9 miles from Heshbon. This points to the ruined site of Ma‘in, about 4 miles Southwest of Madeba. The ruins now visible however are not older than Roman times.

W. Ewing

BAAL-PEOR

ba-al-pe’-or. See BAAL. (1).

BAAL-PERAZIM

ba-al-pe-ra’-zim, ba-al-per’-azim ba‘al peratsim; Baal’pharasein, ("the lord of breakings through"): The spot in or near the Valley of Rephaim where David obtained a signal victory over the Philistines; it was higher than Jerusalem for David asked, "Shall I go up against the Philis?" (2Sa 5:20; 1Ch 14:11). The exact site is unknown, but if the Vale of Rephaim is el Beka‘a, the open valley between Jerusalem and Mar Elias, then Baal-perazim would probably be the mountains to the East near what is called the "Mount of Evil Counsel" (see JERUSALEM). The Mount Perazim of Isa 28:21 would appear to be the same spot.

E. W. G. Masterman

BAAL-SHALISHAH

ba-al-shal’-i-sha, ba-al-shale-’sha ba‘al shalishah; Baithsarisa: Whence a man came to Gilgal with first-fruits (2Ki 4:42) was probably not far from the latter place. According to the Talmud (Sanh. 12a) the

fruits of the earth nowhere ripened so quickly. It is called by Eusebius Baithsarith (Jerome "Bethsalisa"), and located 15 miles North of Diospolis (Lydda). Khirbet Sirisia almost exactly fits this description. Gilgal (Jiljulieh) lies in the plain about 4 1/2 miles to the Northwest Khirbet Kefr Thilth, 3 1/2 miles farther north, has also been suggested. The Arabic Thilth exactly corresponds to the Hebrew Shalishah.

W. Ewing

BAAL-TAMAR

ba-al-ta'-mar ba'al tamar; Baal Thamar, ("Baal of the palm tree"): Evidently a seat of heathen worship (Jud 20:33) between Bethel and Gibeah (compare Jud 20:18,31). The place was known to Eusebius (Onomasticon, which see), but trace of the name is now lost. Conder suggests that it may be connected with the palm tree of Deborah (Jud 4:5) which was between Bethel and Ramah (HDB, under the word).

BAAL-ZEPHON

ba-al-ze'-fon ba'al tsephon; Beelsepphon; (Ex 14:2,9; Nu 33:7): The name means "Lord of the North," and the place was opposite the Hebrew camp, which was between Migdol and the sea. It may have been the shrine of a Semitic deity, but the position is unknown (see EXODUS). Goodwin (see Brugsch, Hist. Egt., II, 363) found the name Baali-Zapuna as that of a god mentioned in an Egyptian papyrus in the British Museum.

BAALAH

ba'-a-la ba'alah; ("possessor," "mistress "): Three occurrences of this name:

(1) = KIRIATH-JEARIM (which see) (Jos 15:9,10; 1Ch 13:6).

(2) A city in the Negeb of Judah (Jos 15:29). In Jos 19:3 Balah and in 1Ch 4:29 Bilhah; perhaps also Boaloth of Jos 15:24. The site is unknown; but see PEF, III, 26.

(3) Mount Baalah (Jos 15:11), a mountain ridge between Shikkeron (Ekron) and Jabnoel unless, as seems probable, the suggestion of M. Clermont-Ganneau (Rev. Crit, 1897, 902) is correct that for har (=" mount"), we should read nahar ("river"). In this case the border in question would be the Nahr rubin. Here there is an annual feast held—attended by all classes and famous all over Syria—which appears to be a real survival of "Baal worship."

E. W. G. Masterman

BAALATH

ba’-a-lath ba‘alath; (A, Baalon): between Shikkeron (Ekron) and Jabnoel unless, as seems probable, the suggestion of M. Clermont-Ganneau (Rev. Crit, 1897, 902) is correct that for har (=" mount"), we should read nahar ("river"). In this case the border in question would be the Nahr rubin. Here there is an annual feast held—attended by all classes and famous all over Syria—which appears to be a real survival of "Baal worship."

(1) A town on the border of Da (Jos 19:44) associated with Eltekeh and Gibbethon—possibly Bela‘in.

(2) ("Mistress-ship"): A store city of Solomon, mentioned with Beth-horon (1Ki 9:18; 2Ch 8:6) and possibly the same as (1).

BAALATH-BEER

ba’-a-lath-be’-er ba‘alath be’er "lady (mistress) of the well"; (Jos 19:8 (in 1Ch 4:33, Baal)): In Jos this place is designated "Ramah of the South," i.e. of the Negeb, while in 1Sa 30:27 it is described as Ramoth of the Negeb. It must have been a prominent hill (ramah =" height") in the far south of the Negeb and near a well be’er. The site is unknown though Conder suggests that the shrine Kubbet el Baul may retain the old name.

BAALBEK

bal’-bek, bal-bek’. See AVEN; ON.

BAALE-JUDAH

ba’-al-e-joo’-da. See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

BAALI

ba’-a-li ba‘ali, ("my master"): Baal, a common name for all heathen gods, had in common practice been used also of Yahweh. Hosea (Ho 2:16,17) demands that Yahweh be no longer called Ba‘ali ("my Baal" =" my lord") but ‘Ishi ("my husband"), and we find that later the Israelites abandoned the use of Ba‘al for Yahweh.

BAALIM

ba’-a-lim ha-be‘alim: Plur. of BAAL (which see).

BAALIS

ba’-a-lis ba‘lic, perhaps for Baalim, "gods"; Septuagint Beleisa, Belisa, [Baalis]; Ant, X, ix, 3, Baalimos: King of the children of Ammon, the instigator of the murder of Gedaliah (Jer 40:14). Compare Ant, X, ix, 3.

BAALSAMUS

ba-al’-sa-mus Baalsamos; (the King James Version Balasamus): B. stood at the right side of Ezra, when the law was read to the people (1 Esdras 9:43). Compare Maaseiah (Ne 8:7). the Valley of Rephaim where David obtained a signal victory over the Philistines; it was higher than Jerusalem for David asked, "Shall I go up against the Philis?" (2Sa 5:20; 1Ch 14:11). The exact site is unknown, but if the Vale of Rephaim is el Beka‘a, the open valley between Jerusalem and Mar Elias, then Baal-perazim would probably be the mountains to the East near what is called the "Mount of Evil Counsel" (see JERUSALEM). The Mount Perazim of Isa 28:21 would appear to be the same spot.

BAALZEBUB

ba-al-ze’-bub ba‘al zebhubh =" Lord of flies"; Baal-muian: A deity worshipped by the Philistines at Ekron (2Ki 1:2,3,6,16). All that can be gathered from this one reference to him in ancient literature is that he had some fame as a god that gave oracles. Ahaziah, son of Ahab, and king of Israel, went to consult him whether he should recover of his sickness, and was therefore rebuked by Elijah, who declared that his death would be the result of this insult to Yahweh. Why he was called "lord of flies," or whether his real name has not be en corrupted and lost are matters of conjecture. See BAAL (1).

BAANA

ba’-a-na (Old Testament and Apocrypha; Baana; ba‘ana’ "son of oppression"):

(1, 2) Two commissariat-officers in the service of Solomon (1Ki 4:12; 4:16; the King James Version "Baanah").

(3) Father of Zadok, the builder (Ne 3:4).

(4) A leader who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:8). Compare Bannah (Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7; 10:27).

BAANAH

ba’-a-na ba‘anah, ("son of oppression"):

(1) Captain in the army of Ish-bosheth (2Sa 4:2 ff).

(2) Father of Iteleb, one of David’s mighty men (2Sa 23:29; 1Ch 11:30).

(3) Returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem; a leader and one who sealed the covenant (Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7; 10:27). See BAANA (4).

BAANI

ba’-a-ni (A, Baani; B, Baanei; the King James Version Maani = Bani [Ezr 10:34]): The descendants of Baani put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:34).

BAANIAS

ba-a-ni’as. See BANNEAS (Apocrypha).

BAARA

ba’-a-ra ba‘ara’,(" the burning one"): A wife of the Benjamite Shaharaim (1Ch 8:8).

BAASEIAH

ba-a-si’a, ba-a-se’-ya ba‘aseyah, ("the Lord is bold"): Perhaps for ma‘aseyah, after the Greek Maasai, B, Maasai, "the work of the Lord." Compare Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 293. An ancestor of Asaph, the musician (1Ch 6:40).

BAASHA

ba’-a-sha ba‘sha’,(" boldness"): King of Israel. Baasha, son of Ahijah, and of common birth (1Ki 16:2), usurped the throne of Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, killed Nadab and exterminated the house of Jeroboam. He carried on a long warfare with Asa, the king of Judah (compare Jer 41:9), began to build Ramah, but was prevented from completing this work by Ben- hadad, the king of Syria. He is told by the prophet Jehu that because of his sinful reign the fate of his house would be like that of Jeroboam. Baasha reigned 24 years. His son Elah who succeeded him and all the members of his family were murdered by the usurper Zimri (1Ki 15:16 ff; 16:1 ff; 2Ch 16:1 ff). The fate of his house is referred to in 1Ki 21:22; 2Ki 9:9. Compare ASA; ELAH; ZIMRI.

A. L. Breslich

BABBLER

bab’-ler ba‘al ha-lashon; the King James Version of Ec 10:11 literally, "master of the tongue"; the

Revised Version (British and American) CHARMER; lapistes, the King James Version of Ecclesiasticus 20:7; the Revised Version (British and American) BRAG; spermologos; the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of Ac 17:18: The latter Greek word is used of birds, such as the crow, that live by picking up small seeds (sperma, "20 seed," legein, "to gather"), and of men, for "hangers on" and "parasites" who obtained their living by picking up odds and ends off merchants' carts in harbors and markets. It carries the "suggestion of picking up refuse and scraps, and in the literature of plagiarism without the capacity to use correctly" (Ramsay). The Athenian philosophers in calling Paul a spermologos, or "ignorant plagiarist," meant that he retailed odds and ends of knowledge which he had picked up from others, without possessing himself any system of thought or skill of language—without culture. In fact it was a fairly correct description of the Athenian philosophers themselves in Paul's day.

Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen, 141 ff.

T. Rees

BABBLING

bab'-ling siach; the Revised Version (British and American) COMPLAINING): The consequence of tarrying long at the wine (Pr 23:29 the King James Version); lalia, the Revised Version (British and American) "talk" (Ecclesiasticus 19:6; 20:5 the King James Version); kenophonia, literally, "making an empty sound" (1Ti 6:20; 2Ti 2:16 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American).

BABE

bab:

(1) na'ar; pais of a male infant 3 months old (Ex 2:6) translated elsewhere "boy" or "lad."

(2) 'olel, ta'alulim, in the general sense of "child" (Ps 8:2; 17:14; Isa 3:4).

(3) brephos an unborn or newborn child (King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of Lu 1:41,44; 2:12,16; 1Pe 2:2 and the Revised Version (British and American) of Lu 18:15 [AV "infants"]; Ac 7:19 [King James Version, "young children"] and 2Ti 3:15 [King James Version, "child"]).

(4) nepios =(Latin infans) "a child that cannot speak." (King James and the Revised Version (British and American) of Mt 11:25; 21:16; Lu 10:21; Ro 2:20; 1Co 3:1; Heb 5:13) the same word is translated "child," plural "children" (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of 1Co 13:11; Ga 4:1,3; Eph 4:14) the verb nepiazete is translated in the King James Version "be ye children" and in the Revised Version (British and American) "be ye babes" (1Co 14:20). Nepios is used metaphorically of those who are like children, of simple and single minds, as opposed to the "wise and

understanding" (Mt 11:25 = Lu 10:21; compare 1Co 14:20). "Babes in Christ" are men of little spiritual growth, carnal as opposed to spiritual (1Co 3:1; compare Heb 5:13; Eph 4:14). Nepios is also used of a child as a minor or infant in the eye of the law (Ga 4:1,3).

T. Rees

BABEL, BABYLON (1)

ba'-bel, bab'-i-lon (Topographical): Babylon was the Greek name of the city written in the cuneiform script of the Babylonians, bab-ili, which means in Semitic, "the gate of god." The Hebrews called the country, as well as the city, Babhel. This name they considered came from the' root, balal, "to confound" (Ge 11:9). The name in Sumerian ideographs was written Din-tir, which means "life of the forest," and yet ancient etymologists explained it as meaning "place of the seat of life" (shubat balaTe). Ka-ding'irra, which also means "gate of god," was another form of the name in Sumerian. It was also called Su-anna (which is of uncertain meaning) and Uru-azagga, "the holy city."

Herodotus, the Greek historian, has given us a picture of Babylon in his day. He says that the city was a great square, 42 miles in circuit. Ctesias makes it 56 miles. This, he writes, was surrounded by a moat or rampart 300 ft. high, and 75 ft. broad. The earliest mention of Babylon is in the time of Sargon I, about 2700 BC. That monarch laid the foundations of the temple of Annnit, and also those of the temple of Amal. In the time of Dungi we learn that the place was sacked. The city evidently played a very unimportant part in the political history of Babylonia of the early period, for besides these references it is almost unknown until the time of Hammurabi, when its rise brought about a new epoch in the history of Babylonia. The seat of power was then transferred permanently from the southern states. This resulted in the closing of the political history of the Sumerians. The organization of the empire by Hammurabi, with Babylon as its capital, placed it in a position from which it was never dislodged dur ing the remaining history of Babylonia.

The mounds covering the ancient city have frequently been explored, but systematic excavations of the city were not undertaken until 1899, when Koldewey, the German excavator, began to uncover its ancient ruins in a methodical manner. In spite of what ancient writers say, certain scholars maintain that they grossly exaggerated the size of the city, which was comparatively small, especially when considered in connection with large cities of the present era.

In the northern part of the city there was situated what is called the North Palace on the east side of the Euphrates, which passed through the city. A little distance below this point the Arakhtu canal left the Euphrates, and passing through the southern wall rejoined the river. There was also a Middle and Southern Palace. Near the latter was located the Ishtar gate. The temple E-makh was close to the east side of the gate. Other canals in the city were called Merodach and Libilkhegala. In the southern portion of the city was located the famous temple E-sag-ila. This temple was called by the Greek historian, "the temple of Belus." Marduk or Merodach (as written in the Old Testament), the patron deity of the city, received from Enlil, as Hammurabi informs us, after he had driven the Elamites out of Babylonia, the

title "bel matate," "lord of lands," not the name which Enlil of Nippur had possessed. In the past there has been a confusion. The idcogram Enlil or Ellil had been incorrectly read Bel. This necessitated speaking of the old Bel and the young Bel. Beyond being called bel, "lord," as all other gods were called; Enlil's name was not Bel. Marduk is the Bel of the Old Testament, as well as the god called Bel in the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions.

The temple area included an outer, central and inner court. The shrine of Ishtar and Zamama occupied the central court, and the ziggurrat the inner court. In the temple proper, the shrine Ekua was located, in which stood the golden image of Marduk. This, the ancient writers say, was 40 ft. high. On the topmost stage there was a shrine dedicated to Marduk. It is assumed that it was 50 ft. long by 70 ft. broad and 50 ft. in height. Nabopolassar rebuilt the temple and its tower. Nebuchadrezzar enlarged and embellished the sanctuary. He raised the tower so that "its head was in the heavens," an expression found in the story of the Tower of Babel in Gen, as well as in many of the building inscriptions. See Clay, LOTB, Babel, 121 ff, and the article on BABEL, TOWER OF. One of the chief works of Nebuchadrezzar was the building of Aibursha bu, the famous procession street of the city, which extended from the Ishtar gate to E-sag-ila. It was a great and magnificent causeway, built higher than the houses. Walls lined it on either side, which were decorated with glazed tiles, portraying lions, life size in relief. The pavement was laid with blocks of stone brought from the mountains. This procession street figured prominently on the New Year's festal day, when the procession of the gods took place.

A knowledge of the work Nebuchadrezzar did serves as a fitting commentary to the passage in Da 4:30: "Is not this great Babylon, which I have built?" He had made the city one of the wonders of the world.

The two sieges by Darius Hystaspes and the one by Xerxes destroyed much of the beauty of the city. Alexander desired to make it again a great center and to build an immense fortress in the city; but in the midst of this undertaking he was murdered, while living in the palace of Nebuchadrezzar. The temple, though frequently destroyed, was in existence in the time of the Seleucids, but the city had long since ceased to be of any importance.

See also BABYLONIA.

A. T. Clay

BABEL, BABYLON (2)

@babhel; Assyro-Bab Bab-ili, (Bab-ilani, "gate of god," or "of the gods," rendered in Sumerian as Ka-dingira, "gate of god," regarded as a folk-etymology):

See BABEL, TOWER OF, section 14.

1. Names by Which the City Was Known

2. Probable Date of Its Foundation

3. Its Walls and Gates from Herodotus

4. Its Position, Divisions, Streets and Temple

5. The Works of Semiramis and Nitocris

6. Ctesias' Description—the Palaces and Their Decorated Walls

7. The Temple of Belus and the Hanging Gardens

8. Other Descriptions

9. Nebuchadrezzar's Account

10. Nebuchadrezzar's Architectural Work at Babylon

11. The Royal Palaces

12. Quick Building

13. The Temples Restored by Nebuchadrezzar

14. The Extent of Nebuchadrezzar's Architectural Work

15. Details Concerning the City from Contract-Tablets

16. Details Concerning Babylon from Other Sources

17. Modern Exploration

18. Description of the Ruins—the Eastern Walls

19. The Western Walls

20. The Palaces

21. The Site of Babylon's Great Tower

22. The Central and Southern Ruins

23. A Walk through Babylon

24. The Ishtar-Gate and the Middle Palace

25. The Festival-Street

26. The Chamber of the Fates

27. The Northern Palace and the Gardens

28. Historical References to Babylonian Buildings

LITERATURE

1. Names by Which the City Was Known:

The name of the great capital of ancient Babylonia, the Shinar of Ge 10:10; 14:1, other names of the city being Tin- dir, "seat of life," E (ki), probably an abbreviation of Eridu (ki) "the good city" (= Paradise), Babylonia having seemingly been regarded as the Garden of Eden (PSBA, June 1911, p. 161); and Su-anna, "the high-handed" (meaning, apparently, "high- walled," "hand" and "defense" being interchangeable terms). It is possible that these various names are due to the incorporation of outlying districts as Babylon grew in size.

2. Probable Date of Its Foundation:

According to Ge 10:9, the founder of Babylon was Nimrod, but among the Babylonians, it was Merodach who built the city, together with Erech and Niffer (Calneh) and their renowned temples. The date of its foundation is unknown, but it certainly went back to primitive times, and Babylon may even have equaled Niffer in antiquity (the American explorers of that site have estimated that its lowest strata of habitations go back to 8,000 years BC). Babylon’s late assumption of the position of capital of the country would therefore be due to its rulers not having attained power and influence at an earlier period. Having once acquired that position, however, it retained it to the end, and its great god, Merodach, became the head of the Babylonian pantheon—partly through the influence of Babylon as capital, partly because the city was the center of his worship, and the place of the great Tower of Babel, concerning which many wonderful things were said.

See BABEL, TOWER OF; CONFUSION OF TONGUES.

3. Its Walls and Gates from Herodotus:

According to Herodotus, the city, which lay in a great plain, was square in its plan and measured 120 furlongs (stadia) each way—480 in all. Each side was therefore about 14 miles long, making a circuit of nearly 56 miles, and an area of nearly 196 square miles. As the space enclosed is so great, and traces of the walls would seem to be wanting, these figures may be regarded as open to question. Around the city, Herodotus says, there was a deep and broad moat full of water, and then came a wall 50 royal cubits thick and 200 cubits high, pierced by 100 gateways with brazen gates and lintels. Reckoning the cubit at 18 2/3 inches, this would mean that Babylon's walls were no less than 311 ft. high; and regarding the royal cubit as being equal to 21 inches, their thickness would be something like 87 ft. Notwithstanding that Babylon has been the quarry of the neighboring builders for two millenniums, it is surprising that such extensive masses of brickwork should have disappeared without leaving at least a few recognizable traces.

4. It Position, Divisions, Streets, and Temple:

The city was built on both sides of the Euphrates, and at the point where the wall met the river there was a return-wall running along its banks, forming a rampart. The houses of Babylon were of 3 and 4 stories. The roads which ran through the city were straight, and apparently intersected each other at right angles, like the great cities of America. The river-end of each of the streets leading to the river was guarded by a brazen gate. Within the great outer wall was another, not much weaker, but enclosing a smaller space. Each division of the city contained a great building, the one being the king's palace, strongly fortified around, and the other the temple of Zeus Boles—an erection with brazen gates measuring two furlongs each way. Within this sacred precinct was a solid tower measuring a furlong each way, and surmounted by other towers to the number of eight. An ascent ran around these towers, with a stopping-place about the middle where the visitor might rest. Upou the topmost tower a large cell was built, wherein was a couch and a golden table. No image was placed in the cell, and no one passed the night there, except a woman of the people, chosen by the god. In another cell below was a golden image of Zeus sitting, his seat and footstool being likewise of gold, with, near by, a large golden table. The total weight of the precious metal here was 800 talents. Upon a small golden altar outside the cell young sucklings only were sacrificed, and upon another (not of gold) full-grown animals were offered.

5. The Works of Semiramis and Nitocris:

The hydraulic works of Babylon are attributed by Herodotus to two queens, Semiramis and Nitoeris. The former made banks of earth on the plain which were worth seeing, preventing the river from flooding the plain like a sea. The second, Nitocris, altered the channel of the river in such a way that it flowed three times in its course to the village Andericca, and the traveler by water therefore took three days to pass this spot. She also raised the banks of the river, and dug a great lake above Babylon. The place which was dug out she made into a swamp, the object being to retard the course of the river. The many bends and the swamp were on the shortest route to Media, to prevent the Medes from having dealings with her kingdom and learning of her affairs. Other works were a bridge across the Euphrates, and a tomb for herself over the most frequented gate of the city.

Both Herodotus and Ctesias were eyewitnesses of the glory of Babylon, though only at the period when it had begun to wane. It is exceedingly probable, however, that their accounts will be superseded in the end, by those of the people who best knew the city, namely, the inhabitants of Babylon itself.

6. Ctesias' Description—the Palaces and Their Decorated Walls:

According to Ctesias, the circuit of the city was not 480, but. 360 furlongs—the number of the days in the Babylonian year- -and somewhat under 42 miles. The East and West districts were joined by a bridge 5 furlongs or 1,080 yards long, and 30 ft. broad. At each end of the bridge was a royal palace, that on the eastern bank being the more magnificent of the two. This palace was defended by three walls, the outermost being 60 furlongs or 7 miles in circuit; the second, a circular wall, 40 furlongs (4 1/2 miles), and the third 20 furlongs (2 1/2 miles). The height of the middle wall was 300 ft., and that of its towers 420 ft., but this was exceeded by the height of the inmost wall. Ctesias states that the walls of the second and third enclosures were of colored brick, showing hunting scenes—the chase of the leopard and the lion, with male and female figures, which he regarded as Ninus and Semiramis. The other palace (that on the West bank) was smaller and less ornate, and was enclosed only by a single wall 30 furlongs (3 1/2 miles) in circuit. This also had representations of hunting scenes and bronze statues of Ninus, Semiramis and Jupiter-Belus (Bel-Merodach). Besides the bridge, he states that there was also a tunnel under the river. He seems to speak of the temple of Belus (see BABEL, TOWER OF) as being surmounted by three statues—Bel (Bel-Merodach), 40 ft. high, his mother Rhea (Dawkina, the Dauke of Damascius), and Bel-Merodach's spouse Juno or Beltis (Zer-panitum).

7. The Temple of Belus and the Hanging Gardens:

The celebrated Hanging Gardens he seems to describe as a square of which each side measured 400 ft., rising in terraces, the topmost of which was planted with trees of various kinds. If this was the case, it must have resembled a temple-tower covered with verdure. The Assyrian sculptures, however, indicate something different (see section 27).

8. Other Descriptions:

With regard to the size of the city as given by other authorities, Pliny copies Herodotus, and makes its circuit 480 furlongs (Nat. Hist. vi.26); Strabo (xvi. i. section 5), 385; Q. Curtius (v. i. section 26), 368; Clitarchus (apud Diod. Sic. ii.7), 365. Though the difference between the highest and the lowest is considerable, it is only what might be expected from independent estimates, for it is doubtful whether any of them are based on actual measurements. Diodorus (ii.9, end) states that but a small part of the enclosure was inhabited in his time (he was a contemporary of Caesar and Augustus), but the abandonment of the city must then have been practically completed, and the greater part given over, as he states, to cultivation—even, perhaps, within the space enclosed by the remains of walls today. It is noteworthy that Q. Curtius says (v. i. section 27) that as much as nine-tenths consisted, even during Babylon's most prosperous period, of gardens, parks, paradises, fields and orchards; and this the later contract-tablets confirm. Though there is no confirmation of the height of the walls as given by these

different authorities, the name given to the city, Su-anna, "the high walled" (see above), indicated that it was renowned for the height of its defensive structures.

9. Nebuchadrezzar’s Account:

Among the native accounts of the city, that of Nebuchadrezzar is the best and most instructive. From this record it would seem that there were two principal defensive structures, Imgur-Enlil and Nemitti-Enlil —"Enlil has been gracious" and "Enlil’s foundation" respectively. The construction of these, which protected the inner city only, on the eastern and western sides of the Euphrates, he attributes to his father Nabonidus, as well as the digging of the moat, with the two "strong walls" on its banks, and the embankment of the Arabtu canal. He had also lined the Euphrates with quays or embankments—probably the structures to which the Greek writers refer—but he had not finished the work. Within Babylon itself he made a roadway from Du-azaga, the place where the fates were declared, to Aa-ibur-sabu, Babylon’s festival-street, which lay by the gate of Beltis or Mah, for the great New-Year’s festival of Merodach and the gods.

10. Nebuchadrezzar’s Architectural Work at Babylon:

Nebuchadrezzar, after his accession, completed the two great walls, lined the ditches with brick, and increased the thickness of the two walls which his father had built. He also built a wall, traces of which are apparently extant, on the West side of Babylon (he apparently refers to what may be called the "city," in contradistinction to "greater Babylon"), and raised the level of Aa-ibur-sabu from the "holy gate" to the gate of Nana; together with the gateways (in consequence of the higher level of the pathway) through which it passed. The gates themselves were constructed of cedar overlaid with copper (bronze), most likely in the same manner as the gates of Imgur-Bel (Balawat) in Assyria (reign of Shalmaneser II, circa 850 BC). Probably none of Babylon’s gates were of solid bronze, notwithstanding the statements of Herodotus; but the thresholds were wholly of that metal, stone being very rare, and perhaps less durable. These gates were guarded by images of bulls and giant serpents or composite dragons of the same metal. Nebuchadrezzar also built a wall on the East bank of the river, 4,000 cubits distant, "high like a mountain," to prevent the approach of an enemy. This wall also had cedar gates covered with copper. An additional defense made by him was an enormous lake, "like unto the broad sea to cross," which was kept in by embankments.

11. The Royal Palaces:

The royal palaces next claimed the great king’s attention. The palace in which Nabopolassar had lived, and wherein, in all probability, Nebuchadrezzar had passed his younger days, had suffered from the floods when the river was high. The foundations of this extensive edifice, which extended from the wall called Imgur-Enlil to Libil-hegala, the eastern canal, and from the banks of the Euphrates to Aa-ibur-sabu, the festival-street, were thoroughly repaired with burnt brick and bitumen, and the doorways, which had become too low in consequence of the raising of that street, were raised to a suitable height. He caused the whole to tower aloft, as he has it, "mountainlike" (suggesting a building more than one

story high). The roof of this palace was built of cedar, and the doors were of the same wood covered with bronze. Their thresholds, as in other cases, were bronze, and the interior of the palace was decorated with gold, silver, precious stones and other costly material.

12. Quick Building:

Four hundred and ninety cubits from Nemitti-Enlil lay, as the king says, the principal wall, Imgur-Enlil, and in order to guarantee the former against attack, he built two strong embankments, and an outer wall "like a mountain," with a great building between which served both as a fortress and a palace, and attached to the old palace built by his father. According to Nebuchadrezzar's account, which is confirmed by Berosus (as quoted by Josephus and Eusebius), all this work was completed in 15 days. The decorations were like those of the other palace, and blocks of alabaster, brought, apparently, from Assyria, strengthened the battlements. Other defenses surrounded this stronghold.

13. The Temples Restored by Nebuchadrezzar:

Among the temples which Nebuchadrezzar restored or rebuilt may be mentioned E-kua, the shrine of Merodach within E-sagila (the temple of Belus); the sanctuary called Du-azaga, the place of fate, where, on every New-Year's festival, on the 8th and 9th of Nisan, "the king of the gods of heaven and earth" was placed, and the future of the Babylonian monarch and his people declared. Every whit as important as E-sagila, however, was the restoration of E-temen-an-ki, called "the Tower of Babylon" (see BABEL, TOWER OF), within the city; and connected, as will be seen from the plan, with that structure. Among the numerous temples of Babylon which he rebuilt or restored were E-mah, for the goddess Nin-mah, near the Ishtar-gate; the white limestone temple for Sin, the Moon-god; E-ditur-kalama, "the house of the judge of the land," for Samas, the Sun-god; E-sa-tila for Gula, the goddess of healing; E-hursag-ella, "the house of the holy mountain," etc.

14. The Extent of Nebuchadrezzar's Architectural Work:

The amount of work accomplished by this king, who, when walking on the roof of his palace, lifted up with pride, exclaimed "Is not this great Babylon, which I have built?" (Da 4:30), was, according to his own records and the Greek writers, enormous, and the claim he made fully justified. But if he boasts of the work he did, he is just in attributing much to his father Nabopolassar; though in connection with this it is to be noted that his ascribing the building of the walls of Babylon to his father is not to be taken literally in all probability he only restored them, though he may have added supplementary defenses, as Nebuchadrezzar himself did.

15. Details Concerning the City from Contract-Tablets:

Besides Nebuchadrezzar's inscriptions, various other texts give details concerning the topography of Babylon, among them being the contract-tablets, which mention various districts or quarters of the city, such as Te which is within Babylon; the city of Sula which is within Babylon; the new city which is

within Babylon, upon the new canal. Within the city were also several Hussetu—perhaps "farms," such as Hussetu sa Iddina-Marduk, "Iddina-Marduk's farm," etc. The various gates are also referred to, such as the gate of Samas, the city-gate of Uras, and the gate of Zagaga, which seems to have lain in "the province of Babylon," and had a field in front of it, as had also the gate of Enlil.

16. Details Concerning Babylon from Other Sources:

According to an Assyrian and a Babylonian list of gates, the streets bore names connected with those of the gates to which they led. Thus, the street of the gate of Zagaga, one of the gods of war, was called "the street of Zagaga, who expels his enemies"; that of the gate of Merodach was "the street of Merodach, shepherd of his land"; while the street of Ishtar's gate was "the street of Ishtar, patron of her people." The city-gates named after Enlil, Addu (Hadad or Rimmon), Samas the Sun- god, Sin the Moon-god, etc., had streets similarly indicated. Certain of the streets of Babylon are also referred to on the contract-tablets, and such descriptive indications as "the broad street which is at the southern gate of the temple E-tur- kalama" seem to show that they were not in all cases systematically named. If the streets of Babylon were really, as Herodotus states, straight, and arranged at right angles, this was probably outside the walls of the ancient (inner) city, and most likely due to some wise Babylonian king or ruler. Details of the streets have been obtained at the point called Merkes (sec. 22) and elsewhere, and seem to show that the BabyIonians liked the rooms of their houses to be square. Such streets as slanted were therefore full of rectangles, and must have presented a quite peculiar appearance.

17. Modern Exploration:

It is this inner city which has most attracted the attention of explorers, both English and German, and it is on its site that the latter have carried on their systematic excavations. Indeed, it is probable that the houses of the most numerous class of the people—artisans, merchants, workmen, etc—lay outside the walls to which the Babylonian royal inscriptions refer. It may be supposed that the houses in this district were mainly low buildings of unbaked city (of which, indeed, portions of the temples and palaces were built), and these would naturally disappear more easily than if they had been built of baked brick. Even when baked, however, the brick-built ruins of Babylonia Assyria have a tendency to disappear, owing to the value which bricks, both baked and unbaked, have for the erection of new houses in the neighborhood. Concerning the extent of the exterior city much doubt naturally exists, but it may well have covered the tract attributed to it (see section 3, above). Nineveh, at the time of its prosperity, also had enormous suburbs (see NINEVEH).

18. Description of the Ruins—The Eastern Walls:

The ruins of Babylon lie between 80 and 90 kilometers (50 miles or less) from Bagdad. The first thing seen on approaching them is the broad high ridge of Babil, which marks the site of the ruins of the Northern Palace. After some time, the ruins of the ancient walls are reached. They are still several yards high, and slope down gently to the plain. Starting to the North of Babil, the wall stretches for about 875 yds. due East, and then runs southwards for another 930 yds., taking at that point a course to the

Southeast for about 2 miles 160 yds. (3,300 meters). A wide gap occurs here, after which it runs to the Southwest, and is lost in the open fields at the end of about miles (2 kilometers). "That this is the old citywall," says Weissbach, "there can be no doubt, and the name Sur, ‘city-wall,’ given it by the Arabs, proves that they have fully recognized its nature." At the northern end it exists in its original extent, the plain out of which it rises being the old bed of the Euphrates, which, in the course of the centuries, has become filled up by the desertsand. At the period of Babylon’s glory, the river had a much straighter course than at present, but it reoccupies its old bed about 600 meters (656 yds.) South of Babil, leaving it afterward to make a sharp bend to the West. From the point where the city wall first becomes recognizable on the North to its apparent southernmost extremity is about 3 miles.

19. The Western Walls:

On the West side of the river the traces of the wall are much less, the two angles, with the parts adjoining them, being all that is recognizable. Beginning on the North where the Euphrates has reached its midpoint in its course through the city, it runs westward about 547 yds. (500 meters) West-Southwest, and then, bending almost at a right angle South-Southeast, turns East again toward the Euphrates, but is lost in the plain before reaching the river. The distance of the two angles from each other is about 1 mile, 208 yds. (1,800 meters), and its distance from the Euphrates is at most 5/8 of a mile (1 kilometer). The western portion of the city therefore formed a rectangle with an area of about 1.8 miles, and the eastern quarter, with the projection on the North, 6 1/4 square miles. According to Fried. Delitzsch, the size of Babylon was about the same as Munich or Dresden. This, of course, is an estimate from the extant remains—as has been indicated above, there was probably a large suburban extension beyond the walls, which would account for the enormous size attributed to the city by the ancients.

20. The Palaces:

Among the Arabs, the northern ruin is called Babil, though it is only the remains of a palace. Its present height is 30 meters (98 feet, 5 inches), and its rectangular outline is still easily recognizable. Its sides face the cardinal points, the longest being those of the North and South. This building, which measures 100 meters (109 yds.), was well protected by the city wall on the North and East, the Euphrates protecting it on the West. Continuing to the South, the path at present leads through orchards and palm-groves, beyond which is a rugged tract evidently containing the remains of ancient structures, probably of inconsiderable height. After further palm groves, an enormous ruin is encountered, steep on the East and South, sloping on the North and West. This is the Gasr (Qasr), also called Emjellibeh (Mujellibah), "the overturned," identical with the great palace of Nabopolassar and his son Nebuchadrezzar, referred to so prominently by the latter king in his records. Its longest side skirts the old Euphrates bed, and measures 300 meters (328 yds.). Its surface is very uneven, projections of 15 meters (over 49 ft.) alternating with deep depressions. On the Northwest side enormous walls of exceedingly hard yellow brick still tower to a considerable height. South of this the plain, broken only by a few inconsiderable mounds, extends for a distance of half a kilometer (5/16 mile), and terminates on the South with another enormous ruin-mound, called Ishan Amran ibn ‘Ali. It measures 600 meters (656 yds.) from North to South, and 400 (437 yds.) from East to West, its average height being 25 meters (82 ft.). About the middle, and close to each other, are two Moslem domed tombs, the first called Ibrahim al-Khalil

("Abraham the Friend" (of God)—probably a late addition to the name of another Abraham than the Patriarch), and the other Areran ibn ‘Ali, from which the ruin receives its modern name.

21. The Site of Babylon’s Great Tower:

Near the South termination of the plain on which the village of Jim-jimeh lies, there is a square depression several yards deep, measuring nearly 100 meters (over 100 yds.) each way. In the middle of this depression, the sides of which do not quite face the cardinal points, there rises, to a height of about 13 ft., a platform of sun-dried brick about 60 meters (197 ft.) each way, its sides being parallel with the outer boundary of the depression. This depression, at present called Sahan, "the dish," is partly filled with foundation-water. Centered in its southern side is a rectangular hollowing-out similarly formed, about 50 meters (164 ft.) long, extending toward the ruin called Areran.

22. The Central and Southern Ruins:

East of the Qasr and Emjellibeh are several mounds bearing the name of Ehmereh, so called from the principal mound on the Southeast, named Ishan al-Oheimar, "the red ruin," from the color of its bricks. Close to the Southeast corner of the Qasr lies the ruin called Merkes, "the central-point," and to the South of that again is a long and irregularly shaped mound bearing the name of Ishan al-Aswad, "the black ruin." From this enumeration of the principal remains on the site of Babylon, it will be easily seen that public buildings in this, the most ancient quarter of the city, were exceedingly numerous. Indeed, the district was regarded as being of such importance that the surrounding walls were not thought altogether sufficient to protect it, so another seemingly isolated rampart, on the East, was built, running North and South, as an additional protection. The remains on the western side of the river are insignificant, the changed course of the river being in all probability responsible for the destruction of at least some of the buildings.

23. A Walk through Babylon:

There is much work to be done before a really complete reconstruction of the oldest quarter of Babylon can be attempted; but somc thing may be said about the sights to be seen when taking a walk through the more interesting portion, which, as we know from Herodotus’ narrative, could be visited by strangers, though it is possible that permission had to be obtained beforehand. Entering by the Urash-gate, some distance to the East of the Euphrates, one found oneself in Aa-ibursabu, the Festival-street, which was a continuation of the royal roadway without the inner wall, coming from the South. This street ran alongside the Arahtu canal, on its western bank. After a time, one had the small temple of Ninip on the right (on the other side of the canal), and E-sagila, the great temple of Belus, on the left. This celebrated shrine was dedicated to Merodach and other deities associated with him, notably his spouse Zer-panitum (= Juno), and Nebo, "the teacher," probably as the one who inculcated Merodach’s faith. The shrine of Merodach therein, which was called E-kua, is said by Nebuchadrezzar to have been magnificently decorated, and into the temple itself that king had caused to be brought many costly gifts, acquired by him in the lands over which he had dominion. Connected with E-sagila on the Northwest by a causeway

and probably a staircase, was the great temple-tower E-temen-an-ki, which, as is indicated above, is not now represented by a tower, but by a depression, the bricks having been employed, it is said, to repair the Hindiyeh canal. This great building was a striking monument of the city, and must have been visible for a considerable distance, its height being something over 300 ft. The stages of which it was composed are thought to have been colored like those of the similar tower laid bare by the French excavations at Khorsabad (DurSarru-ukin) in Assyria. Causeways or streets united this building with Aa-ibur-sabu, the festival-street along which the traveler is supposed to be proceeding. Continuing to the North, the visitor crossed a canal at right angles, named Libilhegalli, "may he (the god) bring fertility," and found himself immediately opposite the royal palace—the extensive building now known as the Qasr. According to Weissbach, its area occupied no less than 4 1/2 hectares (rather more than 11 acres) and it was divided, as we know from the inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar, into two parts, connected by a corridor. The building was richly decorated, as the Babylonians understood such things, the interior walls being lined with enameled brick and other material.

Passing along the eastern side of the palace, the visitor came to the Ishtar-gate—a massive doorway faced with enameled brick in Nebuchadrezzar's time, and decorated with colored enameled reliefs of the lion, the bull and the dragon of Babylon. On the right of this gateway was to be seen the temple of the goddess Nin-mah, Merodach's spouse—a temple of sun-dried brick with traces of white coloring. It was a celebrated shrine of the Babylonians, in the usual architectural style with recessed buttresses, but modest from our modern point of view. Nin-mah was the goddess of reproduction, who, under the name of Aruru, had aided Merodach to create mankind, hence the honor in which she was held by the Babylonians.

24. The Ishtar-Gate and the Middle Palace:

The Ishtar-gate was apparently a part of the more ancient fortifications of Babylon, but which portion of the primitive city it enclosed is doubtful. In the time of Nebuchadrezzar it pierced the continuation, as it were, of the wall on the western bank of the river. Passing through this gateway, the visitor saw, on the West, the "middle-palace," an enormous structure, built by Nebuchadrezzar, as he boasts, in 15 days—a statement which seems somewhat of an exaggeration, when we come to consider the massiveness of the walls, some of which have a thickness of several yards. He describes this as having been "a fortress" (duru), "mountainlike" (sadanis), and on its summit he built an abode for himself—a "great palace," which was joined with his father's palace on the South of the intervening wall. It is possibly this latter which was built in 15 days- -not the whole structure, including the fortress. It was raised "high as the forests," and decorated with cedar and all kinds of costly woods, its doors being of palm, cedar, cypress, ebony(?) and ivory, framed in silver and gold, and plated with copper. The thresholds and hinges of its gates were bronze, and the cornice round its top was in (an imitation of) lapis-lazuli. It was a house for men to admire; and it is not improbable that this was the palace upon which he was regarded as having been walking when he referred to "great Babylon," which he had built.

25. The Festival-Street:

But the street Aa-ibur-sabu, along which the visitor is conceived to be walking, was also a highly decorated causeway, fitted for the pathway of the great gods. Its width varied from 11 to 22 yds., and it was paved with regularly hewn and fitted natural stones—limestone and a brownish-red stone with white veins—while its walls were provided with a covering of brick enameled in various colors with representations of lions, some of them in relief. The inscriptions which it bore were white on a rich dark-blue ground, also enameled. There were various other streets in Babylon, but these have still to be identified.

26. The Chamber of the Fates:

At the end of the Procession-street, and at right angle to it, was the Merodach canal, which communicated directly with the Euphrares. At this point also, and forming its end-portion, was the Chamber of Fates (Patak simate), where, yearly, the oracles were asked and declared. In close connection with this was the Temple of Offerings (Bit nike) or festival-house (Bit akiti). Concerning these places more information is needed, but it would seem that, before Nebuchadrezzar's time, the Chamber of Fates was simply decorated with silver—he, however, made it glorious with pure gold. It is at this point that the Procession-street is at its widest. The position of the Temple of Offerings is at present uncertain.

27. The Northern Palace and the Gardens:

What may have lain on the other side of the Arabtu-canal, which here made a bend to the Northwest, and flowed out of the Euphrates somewhat higher up, is uncertain; but in the extreme North of the city was the palace now represented by the ruin called Babil. This was likewise built by Nebuchadrezzar, but it may be doubted whether it was really founded by him. The presence of traces of wells here made Hormuzd Rassam think that this was probably the site of the Hanging Gardens, but further exploration is needed to decide the point, though it may be regarded as not unlikely that this identification is correct. In that case it would represent the palace shown in the Assyrian saloon at the British Museum—a building apparently protected by three walls, and adorned with columns resting on the backs of lions in an attitude of walking. On the adjoining slab is a representation of a small building—also with columns—on a hill. A figure of a king sculptured on a stele is seen on the left, with an altar in front of it, showing that divine honors were paid to him. The hill is thickly wooded with trees which may be olives, poplars, etc., and on the right is a series of arches on which other trees are planted. Irrigation channels stretch in a long stream to the left and in shorter streams to the right. As this belongs to the time of Ashur-bani-apli, about 650 BC, and refers to that king's operations against his brother Samas-sum-ukin, the king of Babylon, it is clear that something similar to the Hanging Gardens existed before the time of Nebuchadrezzar, and therefore, if it was his queen who had them made, before the time of their reputed founder. This would be the point first reached by the Assyrian army when advancing to the attack. Such a park as is represented here with its hills and streams, and thickly planted trees, must have made the palace in the vicinity the pleasantest, in all probability, in all Babylonia, and excited the admiration of every one who visited the sights of the city.

28. Historical References to Babylonian Buildings:

The architectural history of the city of Babylon has still to be written, but something is already known about it, especially its central point of interest, the great temple E-sagila, wherein Merodach was wor shipped. The 5th year of Sumu- la-ila was known as that in which the great fortress of Babylon was built; and his 22nd was that in which a throne of gold and silver was completed and made for Merodach's supreme abode (paramaha). Later on Abil-Sin, in his 17th year, made a throne(?) for Samash of Babylon; and Hammu-rabi, in his 3rd, 12th and 14th years, also made thrones for the gods—Nannar of Babylon (the Moon-god), Zer-panitum, Merodach's consort, and Ishtar of Babylon. Samsuiluna, his son, in his 6th year, placed a "praying statue" in E-sagila before Merodach, followed, in his 8th, by the dedication of some bright-shining object (mace?) of gold and silver, to the god; and on that occasion it is stated that he made E-sagila to shine like the stars of heaven. Passing over many other references to kings who adorned the temples of the city, the work done there by Agukakrime (circa 1480 BC) may be mentioned. This ruler, who belonged to the Kassite dynasty, not only brought back the images of Merodach and Zer-panitum to their temple, but also restored the building and its shrine, and made rich offerings thereto. Later on, after the destruction of the city by Sennacherib, his son Esarhaddon, and his grandsons Samas-sum-ukin, king of Babylon, and Ashurbani-apli, king of Assyria, all took part in the restoration of Babylon's temples and palaces. The work of Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar has already been referred to. In 330 BC (reign of Alexander the Great), an attempt was made, by the tithes of the pious, to clear away the rubbish around E-sangil (E-sagila), but to all appearance no real restorations were made—or, at least, the stage at which they could have been put in hand was not reached. In the year 269 BC Antiochus Soter claims, like Nebuchedrezzar and other Babylonian kings, to have restored the temples E-sagila and E-zida (the latter at Borsippa). Though in late times the temples were more or less dilapidated, the services to all appearance continued to be performed, and may even have gone on until well in the Christian era, Babylonian religion and philosophy being still held in honor as late as the 4th century. The downfall of Babylon as a city began with the founding of Seleucia on the Tigris, in the reign of Seleucus Nicator (after 312 BC). The inhabitants of Babylon soon began to migrate to this new site, and the ruined houses and walls of the old capital ultimately became the haunts of robbers and outlaws. It is said that the walls were demolished by later (Seleucid) kings on that account, and it is not improbable that, with the walls, any houses which may have remained habitable were cleared away. Fortunately, the palaces restored by Nebuchadrezzar were too firmly built to be easily demolished, hence their preservation to the present day.

LITERATURE.

Fried. Delitzsch, Babel and Bible. 1903; French H. Weissbach, Das Stadtbild von Babylon, 1904; R. Koldeway, Die Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa. 1911. T. G. Pinches

BABEL, TOWER OF

This expression does not occur in the Old Testament, but is used popularly for the tower mighdol built by the inhabitants of the world who, traveling in the East, built a city on the Plain of Shinar, with a tower

"whose top may reach unto heaven"—an expression which is regarded as meaning "a very high tower."

1. General Form of Babylonian Temple-Towers:

There was a great difference, however, between a Canaanite mighdol or watchtower, and the great Tower at Babylon. The watchtower was simply a high structure, probably without any special shape or form, which depended upon the will of the architect and the nature of the ground upon which it was erected. The Tower of Babel or Babylon, however, was a structure peculiar to Babylonia and Assyria. According to all accounts, and judging from the ruins of the various erections extant in those countries, Babylonian towers were always rectangular, built in stages, and provided with an inclined ascent continued along each side to the top. As religious ceremonies were performed thereon, they were generally surmounted by a chapel in which sacred objects or images were kept.

2. Their Babylonian Name:

These erections had, with the Babylonians, a special name: ziqquratu, meaning, apparently, "peak," or the highest point of a mountain, this word being applied to the mountain-height upon which Ut-napishtim, the Babylonian Noah, offered sacrifices on coming forth from the ark (or ship) when the waters of the great Flood had sufficiently subsided. It has also been thought that they were used as observatories when the Babylonians studied the starry heavens. This is probable, but as these structures were of no great height, it is possible that, in the clear atmosphere of the Babylonian plains, there was no real necessity to go above the surface of the earth when making their observations.

3. Whereabouts of the Tower of Babel:

There has been much difference of opinion as to the geographical position of the Tower of Babel. Most writers upon the subject, following the tradition handed down by the Jews and Arabs, have identified it with the great Temple of Nebo in the city of Borsippa, now called the Birs-Nimroud (explained as a corruption of Birj Nimroud, "Tower of Nimrod"). This building, however, notwithstanding its importance, was to all appearance never regarded by the Babylonians as the Tower of Babel, for the very good reason that it was not situated in Babylon, but in Borsippa, which, though called, in later times, "the second Babylon," was naturally not the original city of that name. The erection regarded by the Babylonians as the great Tower of their ancient city was E-temen-ana-ki, "the Temple of the foundation of heaven and earth," called by Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar ziqqurat Babili, "the Tower of Babylon"—the world-renowned temple dedicated to Merodach and his consort Zer- panitum, Babylon’s chief deities.

4. Its Position at Babylon:

This structure was situated in the southern portion of the city, not far from the right bank of the Euphrates, and according to Weissbach, is now represented by a depression within which is the original rectangular core of unbaked brick. From its shape, the Arabs have made this site Sahan, "the dish."

These remains of the great temple-tower of Babylon, within the memory of men not so very old, towered, even in its ruined state, high above the surrounding plain. The burnt bricks of the ancient Babylonians, however, who "had brick for stone, and slime (bitumen) for mortar" (Ge 11:3), are still good and have a commercial value, so they were all cleared out, with whatever precious material in the way of antiquities they may have contained, to repair, it is said, the banks of the Hindiyeh Canal. Certain records in the shape of conical "cylinders," however, came into the market, and were acquired by the museums of Europe and America. As these refer to the restoration of the building by Nabopolassar, and the part taken by his sons Nebuchadrezzar and Nabu-sum-lisir in the ceremonies attending the rebuilding, it is very probable that they formed part of the spoils acquired.

5. A Babylonian Description of the Tower:

E-temen-ana-ki, to give the Babylonian (Sumerian) name, consisted of six stages built upon a platform, and provided with a sanctuary at the top. A tablet seemingly giving a detailed description of this building was for a time in the hands of the late George Smith in the year 1876. Unfortunately he had not time to give a translation of the document, or to publish the text, but his detailed account of it (Athenaeum, February 12, 1876) is exceedingly interesting. First there was the outer court called the "grand court," measuring, according to G. Smith’s estimate, 1,156 ft. by 900 ft., and a smaller one, called "the court of Ishtar and Zagaga," 1,056 ft. by 450 ft. Round the court were six gates admitting to the temples:

(1) the grand gate;

(2) the gate of the rising sun (east);

(3) the great gate;

(4) the gate of the colossi;

(5) the gate of the canal; and

(6) the gate of the tower-view.

6. The Platform:

After this came a space or platform apparently walled—a ki-gallu square in form, and measuring 3 ku each way. Its size is doubtful, as the value of the ku is unknown. The sides of this enclosure faced the cardinal points. In its walls were four gates, one on each side, and named from the points toward which they looked. Within this enclosure stood a large building measuring 10 gar (Smith: 200 ft.) each way. Unfortunately, the name of this erection was damaged, so that its nature and use are uncertain.

7. The Chapels and Shrines:

Round the base of the Tower were small temples or chapels dedicated to the various gods of the Babylonians. On the East were 16 shrines, the principal of them being dedicated to Nebo and Tasmetu, his spouse; on thee North were two temples dedicated to Ea. (Ae) and Nusku respectively; on the South was a single temple to the two great gods, Anu and Bel (Enlil?). It was on the West, however, that the principal buildings lay—a double house with a court between the wings 35 cubits (Smith: 58 ft.) wide. These two wings were not alike in dimensions, the erection on one side being 100 cubits by 20 (166 ft. by 34 ft.) and on the other 100 cubits by 65 (166 ft. by 108 ft.). In these western chambers stood the couch of the god, and the golden throne mentioned by Herodotus, with other objects of great value. The couch was stated to have measured 9 cubits by 4 (15 ft. by 6 feet 8 inches).

8. The Tower in Its First Stage:

In the center of these groups of buildings stood the great Tower in stages, called by the Babylonians "the Tower of Babel" (ziqqurat Babili). The stages decreased from the lowest upward, but each was square in plan. The first or foundation-stage was 15 gar each way by 5 1/2 gar high (300 ft. by 110 ft. high), and seems to have been decorated with the usual double recesses which are a characteristic of Assyr-Bab architecture.

9. The Remaining Stages:

The second stage was 13 gar square and 3 gar high (260 ft. by 60 ft.). A term was applied to it which G. Smith did not understand, but he notes that it probably had sloping sides. The stages from the 3rd to the 5th were all of equal height, namely, 1 gar (20 ft.), and were respectively 10 gar (200 ft.), 8 1/3 gar (170 ft.) and 7 gar (140 ft.) square. The dimensions of the 6th stage were omitted, but may be restored in accordance with the others, namely, 5 1/2 gar square (110 ft.) by 1 gar (20 ft.) high.

10. The Chapel at the Top:

On this was raised what Smith calls the 7th stage, namely, the upper temple or sanctuary of the god Bel-Merodach, 4 gar long, 3 1/2 gar broad and 2 1/2 gar high (80 ft., 60 ft., and 50 ft., respectively). He does not mention the statue of the god, but it may be supposed that it was set up in this topmost erection. The total height of the tower above its foundation was therefore 15 gar (300 ft.), the same as the breadth of its base. It cannot be said that it was by any means a beautiful erection, but there was probably some symbolism in its measurements, and in appearance it probably resembled (except the decoration) the temple tower of Calah as restored in the frontispiece to Layard’s Monuments of Nineveh, 1st series, in which a step-pyramid with a similarly highbasement stage is shown.

11. Herodotus’ Description:

With this detailed description, which is quite what would be expected in a Babylonian account of such a celebrated temple, the description in Herodotus (i.181 ff) agrees. He states that it was a temple square in

form, two furlongs (1,213 ft.) each way, in the midst of which was built a solid tower a furlong square (nearly 607 ft.). This, however, must have been the platform, which, with the six stages and the chapel on the top, would make up the total of eight stages of which Herodotus speaks. The ascent by which the top was reached he describes as running "outside round about all the towers"—wording which suggests, though not necessarily, that it was spiral—i.e. one had to walk round the structure 7 times to reach the top. Representations on Babylonian boundary-stones suggest that this view would be correct, though a symmetrical arrangement of inclined paths might have been constructed which would have greatly improved the design. At the middle of the ascent, Herodotus says, there was a stopping-place with seats to rest upon, which rather favors this idea. At the top of the last tower there was a large cell, and in the cell a large couch was laid, well covered; and by it a golden table. There was no image there, nor did any human being spend the night there, except only a woman of the natives of the place chosen by the god, "as say the Chaldeans who are the priests of this god." These men told Herodotus that the god often came to the cell, and rested upon the couch, "but," he adds, "I do not believe them." After mentioning parallels to this at Egyptian Thebes and Patam in Lycia, he goes on to speak of another cell below (that referred to in G. Smith's tablet) wherein was a great image of Zeus (Bel-Merodach) sitting, with a footstool and a large table, all of gold, and weighing no less than 800 talents. Outside of this cell was an altar to the god, made of gold; and also another altar, whereon full-grown animals were sacrificed, the golden altar being for sucklings only. The Chaldeans also told him that there was, in the precincts of the building, a statue 12 cubits high, and of solid gold. Darius Hystaspis desired to take possession of this valuable object, but did not venture. His son Xerxes, however, was not so considerate of the feelings of the people and the priesthood, for he also killed the priest when he forbade him to meddle with it.

12. The Builders of the Tower:

The Bible record does not state who the people were who journeyed in the East and built the city and the Tower. The indefinite "they" might be taken to mean whatever people were there at the time the record was written, and probably presupposes that the reader would certainly know. As the Tower of Babel bears, in the native inscriptions, a Sumero-Akkadian name, it may be supposed that the builders referred to belonged to that race.

13. Traditions Concerning Its Destruction:

It is noteworthy that nothing is said in Ge concerning the stoppage of the erection, though they ceased to build the city. Bochart records a Jewish tradition which makes the tower to have been split through to its foundation by fire which fell from heaven—suggested probably by the condition of the tower at "the second Babylon," i.e. the Birs Nimroud. Another tradition, recorded by Eusebius (Prep. Evang., ix; Chronicon, 13; Syncel. Chron., 44) makes it to have been blown down by the winds; "but when it approached the heavens, the winds assisted the gods, and overturned the work upon its contrivers: and the gods introduced a diversity of tongues among men, who, until that time, had all spoken the same language."

14. The Meaning of "Babel":

The place where they built the Tower was called Babylon, on account of the confusion of languages. Here we have again the statement as in Ge that the meaning of Babel is "confusion." This, as is well known, is based upon the purely Hebrew etymological law, which makes balal, "to confuse," or "mingle," assume a reduplicate form; but as far as the cuneiform inscriptions, which are now very numerous, give us information, Babel, from baldlu, "to mingle" (the root in question), was an impossibility. But on the Babylonian side, that the rendering of the name as Bab-ili (-ilani), "gate of god" ("of the gods") was a folk-etymology, is undoubted, notwithstanding that the Sumero-Akkadian form Ka-dingira, with the same meaning, is far from rare. It is noteworthy, however, that one of the forms used by Nebuchadrezzar is Babilam, with the mimmation or "emming," which is a characteristic of the Babylonian language; moreover, a place-name Babalam also occurs, which may be a still earlier, and perhaps the original, form. Notwithstanding that one would like to see in Babalam, "the place of bringing together," and in Babilam, "the bringer together," the termination -am would seem to be an insurmountable difficulty.

15. The Ultimate Destruction of the Tower:

That the building of the city would have been stopped when the confusion of tongues took place is natural—the departure of the greater part of the inhabitants made this inevitable. When the population increased again, the building of the city was continued, with the result that Babylon ultimately became the greatest city of then known world. The Tower, notwithstanding what had been said as to its destruction, remained, and when, as happened from time to time, its condition became ruinous, some energetic Babylonian king would restore it. Alexander and Philip of Macedon began clearing away the rubbish to rebuild the great temple of Bclus (Bel-Merodach) connected with it and there is hardly any doubt that the Tower would have been restored likewise, but the untimely death of the former, and the deficient mental caliber of the latter for the ruling of a great empire, put an end to the work. The Tower therefore remained unrepaired—"The tower was exceedingly tall. The third part of it sank down into the ground, a second third was burned down, and the remaining third was standing until the time of the destruction of Babylon" (Rabbi Yehanan, Sanhedhrin, 109, 1).

16. No Idea of Reaching Heaven:

Concerning the reputed intention of the builders of the Tower, to carry it as high as the heavens, that, notwithstanding the Talmud and other writings, may be dismissed at once. The intention was to build a very high tower, and that is all that is implied by the words employed. That the Babylonians would have liked their tower to reach heaven may be conceded, and the idea may be taken as symbolical of Babylon’s pride, the more especially as they regarded it as "the house of the foundation of heaven and earth." Though at present brought lower than the other temple-towers of Babylonia, its renown remains as one of the great glories of that renowned capital. Dedicated as it was to the gods whom they worshipped, and chiefly to the glory of Merodach, the representative of Babylonian monotheism, the Babylonians’ descendants, the native Christians, have no reason to remember this erection of their forefathers with shame, but rather with pride. The rallyingpoint of nations, Babylon, while it existed, was always a great commercial center, and many are the languages which have resounded in the

Tower's vicinity. The confusion of tongues led to the Jewish fiction that the air of Babylon and Borsippa caused forgetfulness, and was therefore injurious to students of the Law, causing them to forget it as the builders of the Tower had of old forgotten their speech (Rashi, Sanhedhrin, 109, 1). This, however, did not prevent the rabbis of Babylon from being more celebrated than those of the Holy Land, and even of Jerusalem itself.

See also ASTRONOMY.

T. G. Pinches

BABI

ba'-bi (Codex Alexandrinus, Babi; Codex Vaticanus, Baier = Bebai (Ezr 8:11)). The descendants of Babi returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:37).

BABYLON IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Babylon Babulon, is used in New Testament in at least two different senses:

1. Mesopotamian Babylon:

In Mt 1:11,12,17; Ac 7:43 the old Mesop city is plainly meant. These all refer to the captivity in Babylon and do not demand any further discussion.

2. Symbolic Sense:

All the references to Babylon in Re are evidently symbolic. Some of the most important passages are Rev 14:8; 16:19; 17:5; 18:2,10,21. In Rev 17:5 Babylon is designated as musterion. This undoubtedly in dicates that the name is to be under stood figuratively. A few interpreters have believed that Jerusalem was the city that was designated as Babylon, but most scholars hold that Rome was the city that was meant. That interpretation goes back at least to the time of Tertullian (Adv. Marc., iii. 13). This interpretation was adopted by Jerome and Augustine and has been commonly accepted by the church. There are some striking facts which point to Rome as the city that is designated as Babylon.

(1) The characteristics ascribed to this Babylon apply to Rome rather than to any other city of that age:

(a) as ruling over the kings of the earth (Re 17:18);

(b) as sitting on seven mountains (Re 17:9);

(c) as the center of the world's merchandise (Re 18:3,11-13);

(d) as the corrupter of the nations (Re 17:2; 18:3; 19:2);

(e) as the persecutor of the saints (Re 17:6).

(2) Rome is designated as Babylon in the Sibylline Oracles (5 143), and this is perhaps an early Jewish portion of the book. The comparison of Rome to Babylon is common in Jewish apocalyptic literature (see 2 Esdras and the Apocrypha Baruch).

(3) Rome was regarded by both Jews and Christians as being antagonistic to the kingdom of God, and its downfall was confidently expected, This conception is in accord with the predicted downfall of Babylon (Re 14:8; 18:2,10-21). As Babylon had been the oppressor of Israel, it was natural that this new power, which was oppressing the people of God, should be designated as Babylon.

3. In 1 Peter:

In 1Pe 5:13 Babylon is designated as the place from which 1Pe was written. Down to the time of the Reformation this was generally under stood to mean Rome, and two cursives added "en Roma." Since the Reformation, many scholars have followed Erasmus and Calvin and have urged that the Mesopotamian Babylon is meant. Three theories should be noted:

(1) That the Egyptian Babylon, or Old Cairo; is meant. Strabo (XVII, 807) who wrote as late as 18 AD, says the Egyptian Babylon was a strong fortress founded by certain refugees from the Mesop Babylon. But during the 1st century this was not much more than a military station, and it is quite improbable that Peter would have gone there. There is no tradition that connects Peter’ in any way with Egypt.

(2) That the statement is to be taken literally and that the Mesop Babylon is meant. Many good scholars hold to this view, and among these are Weiss and Thayer, but there is no evidence that Peter was ever in Babylon, or that there was even a church there during the 1st century. Mark and Silvanus are associated with Peter in the letter and there is no tradition that connects either of them with Babylon. According to Josephus (Antiquities, XVIII, ix, 5-9), the Jews at this time had largely been driven out of Babylon and were confined to neighboring towns, and it seems improbable that Peter would have made that his missionary field.

(3) That Rome was the city that was designated as Babylon. The Apocalypse would indicate that the churches would understand the symbolic reference, and it seems to have been so understood until the time of the Reformation. The denial of this position was in line with the effort to refute Peter’s supposed connection with the Roman church. Ancient tradition, however, makes it seem quite probable that Peter did make a visit to Rome (see Lightfoot, Clement, II, 493 ff).

Internal evidence helps to substantiate theory that Rome was the place from which the letter was written. Mark sends greetings (1Pe 5:13), and we know he had been summoned to Rome by the apostle Paul (2Ti

4:11). The whole passage, "She that is in Babylon, elect together with you, saluteth you," seems to be figurative, and that being true, it is natural that Babylon should have been used instead of Rome. The character of the letter as a whole would point to Rome as the place of writing. Ramsay thinks this book is impregnated with Roman thought beyond any other book in the Bible (see The Church in the Roman Empire, 286).

A. W. Fortune

BABYLON IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

See BABEL, BABYLON.

BABYLONIA

bab-i-lo’-ni-a

1. Mounds

2. Explorations

3. Names

4. Semites

5. Sumerians

6. Home of the Semites

7. Immigration

8. Language

9. Script

10. Architecture

11. Art

12. Literature

13. Libraries

14. Personal Names

15. History of Kingdoms

16. Kish

17. Lagash

18. Adab

19. Nippur

20. Erech

21. Larsa

22. Shuruppak

23. Kisurra

24. Umma

25. Accad

26. Opis

27. Basime

28. Drehem

29. Urumma

30. First Dynasty of Babylon

31. Sealand Dynasty

32. Cassite Dynasty

33. Cassite Rule

34. Isin Dynasty

35. Nebuchadrezzar I

36. Sealand Dynasty

37. Bit-Bazi Dynasty

38. Other Rulers

39. Babylonian Dynasty

40. Neo-Babylonian Rulers

41. Persian Rulers of Babylon

LITERATURE

Babylonia is a plain which is made up of the alluvial deposits of the mountainous regions in the North, where the Tigris and Euphrates have their source. The land is bounded on the North by Assyria and Mesopotamia; on the East by Elam, separated by the mountains of Elam; on the South by the sea marshes, and the country Kaldu (Chaldaea); and on the West by the Syrian desert. Some of the cities of the lower country were seaport towns in the early period, but now are far inland. This land- making process continues even at the present time at the rate of about 70 ft. a year.

This plain, in the days when Babylonia flourished, sustained a dense population. It was covered with a network of canals, skillfully planned and regulated, which brought prosperity to the land, because of the wonderful fertility of the soil. The neglect of these canals and doubtless, also, the change of climate, have resulted in altered conditions in the country. It has become a cheerless waste. During some months of the year, when the inundations take place, large portions of the land are partially covered with swamps and marshes. At other times it looks like a desolate plain.

1. Mounds:

Throughout the land there are seen, at the present time, ruin-hills or mounds of accumulation of debris, which mark the site of ancient cities. Some of these cities were destroyed in a very early era, and were never rebuilt. Others were occupied for millenniums, and their history extends far into the Christian era. The antiquities generally found in the upper stratum of the mounds which were occupied up to so late a period, show that they were generally inhabited by the Jews, who lived there after the Babylonians had disappeared.

2. Explorations:

The excavations conducted at various sites have resulted in the discovery, besides antiquities of almost every character, of hundreds of thousands of inscriptions on clay and stone, but principally on the former material. At Tello more than 60,000 tablets were found, belonging largely to the administrative archives of the temple of the third millennium BC. At Nippur about 50,000 inscriptions were found, many of these also belonging to temple archives. But about 20,000 tablets and fragments found in that city came from the library of the school of the priests, which had been written in the third millennium BC. At Sippar, fully 30,000 tablets were found, many being of the same general character, also representing a library. At Delehem and Djokha, temple archives of the same period as those found at Tello have come to light in great numbers, through the illicit diggings of Arabs. Babylon, Borsippa, Kish, Erech and many other cities have yielded to the explorer and the Arab diggers inscribed documents of every period of Babylonian history, and embracing almost every kind of literature, so that the museums and libraries of America and Europe have stored up unread inscriptions numbering hundreds of thousands. Many also are in the possession of private individuals. After the work of excavating Babylonia has been completed and the inscriptions deciphered, many of the pro-Christian centuries in Babylonian history will be better known than some of those of our Christian era. The ancient history of the Babylonians will be reconstructed by the help of these original sources. Lengthy family genealogies will be known, as indeed in some instances is now the case, as well as the Babylonian contemporaries of Ezekiel, Abraham and all the other Biblical characters.

3. Names:

The Greek name of Babylonia which is in use at the present time is derived from the name of the city of Babylon, the capital and chief city of the land from the time of the First Dynasty of Babylon, about 2000 BC (see BABYLON). The name of the land in the very earliest period which is represented by antiquities, and even inscribed objects, is not known. But in a comparatively early age the northern part is called Uri, and the southern part, Engi or En-gira. The second part of the latter name is perhaps the same as in Su-gir, which is thought to be the origin of the Old Testament Shinar. Su-gir and Su- mer are names of the same country. And inasmuch as Mer and Gir were names of the same west Semitic deity, who played an important role in the early history of Babylonia, it is not improbable that the element Su is also to be identified with the ancient name of Mesopotamia. Su is also in Su-bartu, the name of the country to the North. This name is also written Su-Gir.

Subsequent to 2000 BC the ideograms read in Sumerian, Uri and Engi, were pronounced in SemBab, Accad and Sumer. The former received its name from the capital of the kingdom Accad, one of the cities mentioned in Ge 10:10. The title, "king of Accad and Sumer" was used by rulers as late as the 1st millennium BC. The name by which the land is known in the second millennium BC is Kar-Duniash, the exact derivation of which is in doubt. Kar means "garden, land" in Semitic and Sumerian; and Duniash being preceded by the determinative for deity, has been regarded as a name of a Cassite god. A more recently advanced explanation is that Duniash is equivalent to Bel-malati, which means "lord of lands." The meaning of the name, as stated, must be regarded as undetermined.

In the time of the late Assyrian empire a nation in the extreme southern part of the land, called by the Greeks Chaldea, which is derived from the name Kaldu, came into existence. In the Assyrian historical inscriptions the land is usually called Bit-Yakin. This people seems to have issued from Aramaic Under Biblical. Merodach-baladan they ruled Babylonia for a time. The Neo-Bab Dynasty, founded by Nabopolassar, is supposed to be Chaldean in origin, in consequence of which the whole land in the Greek period was called Chaldea.

4. Semites:

Two distinct races are found occupying the land when we obtain the first glimpses of its history. The northern part is occupied by the Semites, who are closely allied to the Amorites, Arameans and Arabs; and the southern part by a non-Sem people called Sumerians. Their cultures had been originally distinct, but when they first become known to us there has taken place such an amalgamation that it is only by the knowledge of other Semitic cultures that it is possible to make even a partial differentiation of what was Sem-Bab and what was Sumerian. The Semites, it would almost seem, entered the land after the Sumerians had established themselves, but this can only be re garded as a conjecture.

5. Sumerians:

Although the earliest Sumerian settlement belongs to a remote period, few traces of the pre-historic Sumerian have been found. The archaeological remains indicate that this non-Sem race is not indigenous to the land, and that when they came into the country they had already attained to a fair degree of culture. But there is no evidence, as yet, in what part of the ancient world the elements of their culture were evolved, although various attempts have been made by scholars to locate their original home.

6. Home of the Semites:

The home of the Semites has been placed in different parts of the ancient world. A number of scholars look to Arabia and others to Africa for their original habitation, although their theories generally are not based upon much archaeological evidence. Unquestionably, the previous, if not the original home of the Semitic Babylonians, is to be found in the land of the Amorites, that is in Syria. In the earliest known period of Babylonian history, which apparently belongs to the age not very far removed from the time when the Semites entered Babylonia, Amurru was an important factor in the affairs of the nations, and it was a land which the world conquerors of Babylonia, both Sumerian and Semitic, endeavored to subjugate. This points to the fact that the culture of Amurru was then already old. Egyptian inscriptions fully substantiate this. We look to the land of the Arnorites as the home of the Semitic Babylonians, because of the important part played by the chief god of that land Amurru or Uru, in the Babylonian religion and nomenclature. In fact nearly all of the original names of the Semitic Babylonian sun-deities are derived from the names and epithets of the great Sun-god of the Amorites and Arameans (see Amurru, 108 ff). These and many other considerations point to Amurru, or the land of the Amorites, as the previous home of the Semites who migrated into Babylonia and who eventually became masters of the land.

7. Immigration:

The original settlements in Babylonia, as stated above, belong to a prehistoric time, but throughout the history of the land fresh Semitic migrations have been recognized. In the Isin and First Dynasty of Babylonia, Amorites or Canaanites seem to flood the country. In the second millennium a foreign people known as Cassites ruled Babylonia for nearly six centuries. The nomenclature of the period shows that many Hittites and Mittanaeans as well as Cassites lived in Babylonia. In the first millennium the thousands of names that appear in the contract literature indicate a veritable Babel of races: Egyptians, Elamites, Persians, Medes, Tabalites, Hittites, Cassites, Ammorites, Edomites, notably Hebrews, are among the peoples that occupied the land. The deportation of the Israelites by the Assyrian kings and of the Jews by the Babylonian kings, find confirmation besides the historical inscriptions in the names of Hebrews living in Babylonia in the corresponding periods.

8. Language:

The languages of Babylonia are Semitic and Sumerian. The latter is an agglutinative tongue like the Turkish, and belongs to that great unclassifiable group of languages, called for the sake of convenience, Turanian. It has not been shown, as yet, to be allied to any other known language. The Semitic language known as the Babylonian, with which the Assyrian is practically identical, is of the common Semitic stock. After the Semites entered the land, their language was greatly influenced by the Sumerian tongue. The Semites being originally dependent upon the Sumerian scribes, with whom the script had originated, considered in connection with the fact that the highly developed culture of the Sumerians greatly influenced that of the Semites, brought about the peculiar amalgamation known as Babylonian. The language is, however, distinctively Semitic, but it has a very large percentage of Sumerian loan-words. Not knowing the cognate tongues of the Sumerian, and having a poor understanding of the pronunciation of that language, it is impossible to ascertain, on the other hand, how much the Sumerian language was influenced by the Semites.

In the late period another Semitic tongue was used extensively in the land. It was not because of the position occupied by the Arameans in the political history of western Asia, that their language became the lingua franca of the first millennium BC. It must have been on account of the widespread migrations of the people. In the time of Sennacherib it seems to have been used as the diplomatic language in Assyria as well as among the Hebrews, as the episode in 2Ki 18:26 would show. Then we recall the story of Belshazzar, and the edicts of the late period referred to in the Old Testament, which were in Aramaic (Ezr 4:7, etc.). In Assyria and Babylonia, many contract tablets have been found with Aramaic reference notes written upon them, showing that this was the language of those who held the documents. The Hebrews after the exile used Aramaic. This would seem to point to Babylonia as the place where they learned the language. The Babylonian language and the cuneiform script continued to be used until the 3rd or 2nd century BC, and perhaps even later, but it seems that the Aramaic had generally supplanted it, except as the literary and legal language. In short the tongue of the common people or the spoken language in all probability in the late period was Aramaic.

9. Script:

The cuneiform writing upon clay was used both by the Sumerians and the Semites. Whether this script had its origin in the land, or in the earlier home of the Sumerians, remains a question. It is now known that the Elamites had their own system of writing as early as that of the earliest found in Babylonia; and perhaps it will be found that other ancient peoples, who are at the present unknown to us, also used the cuneiform script. A writing similar to the Babylonian was in use at an early time in Cappadocia. The Hittites and other peoples of that region also employed it. The origin of the use of clay as a writing material, therefore, is shrouded in mystery, but as stated above, the system used by the Semites in Babylonian ylonia was developed from the Sumerian.

The script is not alphabetic, but ideographic and phonetic, in that respect similar to the Chinese. There are over 500 characters, each one of which has from one to many values. The combination of two or more characters also has many values. The compilation of the values of the different signs used in various periods by both the Sumerians and Assyrians numbers at the present about 25,000, and the number will probably reach 30,000.

10. Architecture:

The architecture of Babylonia is influenced by the fact that the building material, in this alluvial plain, had to be of brick, which was largely sun-dried, although in certain prosperous eras there is much evidence of kiln-dried bricks having been used. The baked brick used in the earliest period was the smallest ever employed, being about the size of the ordinary brick used at the present time. The size of the bricks in the era prior to the third millennium varied from this to about 6 x 10 x 3 inches at Nippur, Sargon and his son Naram-Sin used a brick, the largest found, about 20 inches square, and about 4 inches in thickness. Following the operations of these kings at Nippur is the work of Ur-Engur, who used a brick about 14 inches square and nearly 4 inches in thickness. This size had been used at Tello prior to Sargon’s time, and was thereafter generally employed. It re mained the standard size of brick throughout the succeeding centuries of Babylonian history. Adobes, of which the greater portion of the buildings were constructed, were usually double the thickness of kiln-dried bricks. The pillar made of bricks, as well as the pilaster constructed of the same material, seems to have come into use at a very early age, as is shown by the excavations at Tello.

A large number of Babylonian builders had the brick makers employ brick stamps which gave their names and frequently their titles, besides the name of the temple for which the bricks were intended. These enable the excavator to determine who the builders or restorers were of the buildings uncovered. Naturally, in a building like the temple of Enlil at Nippur, inscribed bricks of many builders covering a period of over 2,000 years were found. These by the help of building inscriptions, which have been found, enable scholars to rewrite considerable of the history of certain Babylonian temples. The walls of the city were also built of clay bricks, principally adobes. The walls usually were of very great thickness.

Clay was also employed extensively in the manufacture of images, weights, drains, playthings, such as

animals, baby rattles, etc., and of inscriptions of every kind. Pottery, with the exception of the blue glaze employed in the late period, was usually plain, although some traces of painted pottery have been found. Although every particle of stone found in Babylonia was carried into the country, either by man or by inundations, still in certain periods it was used freely for statues, steles, votive objects, and in all periods for door sockets, weights and seal cylinders. Building operations in stone are scarcely known in Babylonia until perhaps the time of the greatest of all ancient builders, Nebuchadrezzar II, who laid a pavement in the causeway of Babylon, Aa-ibur-sabu, with blocks of stone from a mountain quarry.

See BABYLON.

11. Art:

The sculpture of the Sumerians, although in most instances the hardest of materials was used, is one of the great achievements of their civilization. Enough examples have been found to trace the development of their art from comparatively rude reliefs of the archaic period to the finished sculpture of Gudea's time, third millennium BC, when it reached a high degree of excellence. The work of the sculpture of this age shows spirit and originality in many respects unique. In the earliest period the Babylonians attempted the round, giving frequently the main figures in full face. The perfection of detail, in their efforts to render true to life, makes their modeling very superior in the history of article The Sumerian seems to have been able to overcome difficulties of technique which later sculptors systematically avoided.

Practically every Babylonian had his own personal seal. He used it as the signature is used at the present time or rather as the little stamp upon which is engraved the name of the individual at the present time, in the Orient, to make an impression upon the letter which was written for him by a public scribe. Thousands of these ancient seals have been found. They were cut out of all kinds of stone and metal. The style in the early period was usually cylindrical, with a hole passing lengthwise through them. In the late period the signet was commonly used. Many of these gems were exquisitely cut by lapidists of rare ability. Some of the very best work of this art belongs to the third millennium BC. The boldness in outline, and the action displayed are often remarkable. The most delicate saws, drills and other tools must have been employed by the early lapidist. Some of his early work is scarcely surpassed in the present age.

The gold and silver smiths of the early age have left us some beautiful examples of their art and skill. A notable one is the silver vase of Entemena of Lagash, mounted on a bronze pedestal, which stands on four feet. There is a votive inscription engraved about its neck. The bowl is divided into two compartments. On the upper are engraved seven heifers, and on the lower four eagles with extended wings, in some respects related to the totem or the coat of arms of Lagash. While attention to detail is too pronounced, yet the whole is well rendered and indicates remarkable skill, no less striking than the well-known work of their Egyptian contemporaries. Bronze was also used extensively for works of art and utensils. Some remarkable specimens of this craft have been found at Tello.

In studying the magnificent remains of their art, one is thoroughly impressed with the skill displayed, and with the fact that there must have been a long period of development prior to the age to which these works belong, before such creations could have been possible. Although much of the craftsman's work is crude, there is considerable in the sculpture and engraving that is well worthy of study. And in studying these remains one is also impressed with the fact that they were produced in an alluvial plain.

12. Literature:

The literature in a narrow sense is almost entirely confined to the epics, which are of a religious character, and the psalms, hymns, incantations, omens, etc. These are the chief remains of their culture.

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

In a general sense almost every kind of literature is found among the hundreds of thousands of clay tablets unearthed in Babylonia. The inscribed votive objects are of all kinds and descriptions. The stone vase taken in booty was dedicated to the deity of the conqueror. The beautiful piece of lapis lazuli, agate, cornelian, etc., obtained, was inscribed and devoted in the same way. Slabs, tablets and cones of all shapes and sizes, were inscribed with the king's name and titles, giving the different cities over which he ruled and referring especially to the work that he had accomplished for his deity. From the decipherment of these votive objects much valuable data are gathered for the reconstruction of the ancient history of the land.

The same is true of what are known as building inscriptions, in which accounts of the operations of the kings in restoring and enlarging temples, shrines, walls and other city works are given. Canal digging and dredging, and such works by which the people benefited, are frequently mentioned in these inscriptions.

Epistolary literature, for example, the royal letters of Hammurabi, the diplomatic correspondence found in Egypt (see TELL EL-AMARNA) or the royal letters from the Library of Ashurbanipal (see ASHURBANIPAL), as well as the private correspondence of the people, furnishes valuable historical and philological data.

The thousands of tablets found in the school libraries of Sippar and Nippur, as well as of the library of Ashurbanipal, among which are all kinds of inscriptions used in the schools of the priests and scribes, have furnished a great deal of material for the Assyrian dictionary, and have thrown much light upon the grammar of the language. The legal literature is of the greatest importance for an understanding of the social conditions of the people. It is also valuable for comparative purposes in studying the codes of other peoples.

See CODE OF HAMMURABI.

The commercial or legal transactions, dated in all periods, from the earliest times until the latest, also

throw important light upon the social conditions of the people. Many thousands of these documents have been found, by the help of which the very life that pulsated in the streets of Babylonian cities is restored.

The administrative documents from the temple archives also have their value, in that they furnish important data as regards the maintenance of the temples and other institutions; and incidentally much light on the nationality and religion of the people, whose names appear in great numbers upon them. The records are receipts of taxes or rents from districts close by the temples, and of commercial transactions conducted with this revenue. A large portion of these archives consists of the salary payments of storehouse officials and priests. There seems to have been a host of tradesmen and functionaries in connection with the temple. Besides the priest, elder, seer, seeress, sorcerer, sorceress, singer, etc., there were the farmer, weaver, miller, carpenter, smith, butcher, baker, porter, overseer, scribe, measurer, watchman, etc. These documents give us an insight into Babylonian system of bookkeeping, and show how carefully the administrative affairs of the temple were conducted. In fact the temple was provided for and maintained along lines quite similar to many of our modern institutions.

13. Libraries:

The discovery of the Library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh speaks volumes for the culture of Assyria, but that culture was largely borrowed from the Babylonians. Much that this library contained had been secured from Babylonian libraries by the scribes employed by Ashurbanipal. In every important center there doubtless existed schools and libraries in connection with the temples. At Nippur, in 1890, Dr. J. P. Peters found such a library, but unfortunately, although he termed it such, his Assyriologists did not recognize that one of the greatest discoveries of antiquity had been made. It remained for Dr. J. H. Haynes, a decade later, to discover another portion of this library, which he regarded as such, because of the large number of tablets which he uncovered. Pere Scheil, prior to Dr. Haynes' discovery, had the good fortune while at Sippar to discover a part of the school and library of that important center. Since Professor Scheil's excavations, Arabs have unearthed many inscriptions of this library, which have found their way to museums and into the hands of private individuals.

The plan of the Nippur Library, unearthed by Dr. Haynes, has been published by Mr. C. Fisher, the architect of the Nippur expedition (see Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, 183). Professor Scheil, in publishing his results, has also given a plan of the school he discovered, and a full description of its arrangements, as well as the pedagogical methods that had been employed in that institution of learning. This has also been attempted by others, but in a less scientific manner. One of the striking features of these libraries is the use of the large reference cylinders, quadrangular, pentagonal and hexagonal in shape. There was a hole cut lengthwise through them for the purpose of mounting them like revolving stands. These libraries, doubtless, contained all the works the Babylonians possessed on law, science, literature and religion. There are lexical lists, paradigm tablets, lists of names, of places, countries, temples, rivers, officers, stones, gods, etc. Sufficient tablets have been deciphered to determine their general character. Also hundreds of exercise tablets have been found, showing the progress made by pupils in writing, in mathematics, in grammar, and in other branches of learning. Some tablets appear to have been written after dictation. Doubtless, the excavators found the waste heaps of the school, where these tablets had been thrown for the purpose of working them over again as

raw material, for new exercises. The school libraries must have been large. Considering for instance that the ideographic and phonetic values of the cuneiform signs in use numbered perhaps 30,000, even the syllabaries which were required to contain these different values must have been many in number, and especially as tablets, unlike books made of paper, have only two sides to them. And when we take into consideration all the different kinds of literature which have been found, we must realize that these libraries were immense, and numbered many thousands of tablets.

14. Personal Names:

In modern times the meaning of names given children is rarely considered; in fact, in many instances the name has suffered so much through changes that it is difficult to ascertain its original meaning. Then also, at present, in order to avoid confusion the child is given two or more names. It was not so with the ancient Babylonian. Originally the giving of a name was connected with some special circumstance, and though this was not always the case throughout the history of Babylonia, the correct form of the name was always preserved.

The name may have been an expression of their religious faith. It may have told of the joy experienced at the birth of an heir. It may even betray the suffering that was involved at the birth of the child, or the life that the parents had lived. In short, the names afford us an intimate glimpse into the everyday life of the people.

The average Babylonian name is theophorous, and indicates one of the deities worshipped by the family, and often the city. For example, it is suggestive that persons with names compounded with Enlil and Ninib hailed from Nippur. Knowing the deities of the surrounding people we have also important evidence in determining the origin of peoples in Babylonia having foreign names. For example, if a name is composed of the Hittite deity Teshup, or the Amorite deity Amurru, or the Aramean god Dagan, or the Egyptian god Esi (Isis), foreign influence is naturally looked for from the countries represented. Quite frequently the names of foreign deities are compounded with Babylonian elements, often resulting from mixed marriages.

Theophorous names are composed of two, three, four and even five elements. Those having two or three elements predominate. Two-element names have a diety plus a verbal form or a subst.; or vice versa: for example, Nabu-na’id (Nabonidus), "Nebo is exalted," or Shulman-asharedu (Shaimaneser), "Shalman is foremost." Many different combinations are found in three-element names which are composed of the name of the deity, a subst., a verbal form, a pronominal suffix, or some other form of speech, in any of the three positions. Explanations of a few of the familiar Biblical. names follow: Sin-akhe-erba (Sennacherib), "Sin has increased the brothers"; Marduk-apal-iddin (Mero-dach-baladan), "Marduk has given a son"; Ashurakh- iddin (Esarhaddon), "Ashur has given a brother"; Ashur-bani-apal, "Ashur is creating a son"; Nabu-kudurri-usur (Nebuchadrezzar), "O Nebo, protect the boundary"; Amel-Marduk (Evil Merodach), "Man of Marrink"; Bel-shar-usur (Belshazzar), "O Bel, protect the king." Some Babylonian names mentioned in the Bible are really of foreign origin, for example, Amraphel and Sargon. Amraphel originally is west Semitic and is written Hammurabi (pronounced Chammu-rabi, the

first letter being the Semitic cheth). Sargon was perhaps originally Aramean, and is composed of the elements shar and the god Gan. When written in cuneiform it was written Shargani, and later Sharrukin, being translated "the true king." Many names in use were not theophorous; for example, such personal names as Ululd, "the month Ulul"; names of animals, as Kalba, "dog," gentilic names, as Akkadai, "the Akkadian," names of crafts, as Pacharu, "potter," etc.

The literature abounds in hypochoristica. One element of a name was used for the sake of shortness, to which usually a hypochoristica suffix was added, like Marduka (Mordecai). That is, the ending a or ai was added to one of the elements of a longer name.

15. History of Kingdoms:

The written history of Babylonia at the present begins from about 4200 BC. But instead of finding things crude and aboriginal in this, the earliest period, the remains discovered show that the people had attained to a high level of culture. Back of that which is known there must lie a long period of development. This is attested in many ways; for instance, the earliest writing found is so far removed from the original hieroglyphs that it is only possible to ascertain what the original pictures were by knowing the values which the signs possessed. The same conclusion is ascertained by a study of the art and literature. Naturally, as mentioned above, it is not impossible that this development took place in a previous home of the inhabitants.

The history of early Babylonia is at present a conflict of the kings and patesis (priest-kings) of the different city- kingdoms, for supremacy over each other, as well as over the surrounding peoples. The principal states that figure in the early history are: Kish, Lagash, Nippur, Akkad, Umma, Erech, Ur and Opis. At the present time more is known of Lagash, because the excavations conducted at that site were more extensive than at others. This makes much of our knowledge of the history of the land center about that city. And yet it should be stated that the hegemony of Lagash lasted for a long period, and the kingdom will ultimately occupy a prominent position when the final history of the land is written. Nippur, where considerable work was also done, was not the seat of rulers, but the sacred city of the god Enlil, to whom the kings of other cities generally did obeisance. Following is a list of known rulers of the different city-kingdoms.

16. Kish:

El-Ohemir, identified as the ancient city of Kish, not far from Babylon, is one of the oldest Semitic centers of the land. No systematic excavations have been conducted at this site, but besides the inscriptions which the Arabs have unearthed, several of the rulers are known to us through votive inscriptions discovered at Nippur and elsewhere. The rulers of Kish are: Utug p. (patesi), circa 4200 BC; Mesilim k. (king), circa 4000 BC; Lugal-tarsi k.; Enbi-Ishtar k.; Manishtusu k., circa 2650 BC; Urnmush k., circa 2600; Manana k.; Sumu-ditana k. and Tanium k.

17. Lagash:

The excavations by the French under De Sarsez and Cross at Tello, the ancient city Lagash, have yielded more inscriptions of ancient Babylonian rulers than those at any other site. Lagash was destroyed about 2000 BC, and only partially rebuilt in the post-Bab period. The known rulers are: Lugal-shag-Engur patesi, circa 4000 BC, contemporary with Mesilim k. of Kish; @@Badu k.; @@En-khegal k.; Ur-Nina k.; Akurgal p.; Eannatum p. and k.; Enannatum I p.; Entemena I; Enannatum IIp.; Enetarzi p.; Enlitarzi p.; Lugal-anda p.; Uru-kagina k., contemporary with Lugal-zaggisi, k. of Uruk; Engilsa p., contemporary with Manishtusu k. of Kish; Lugul-ushumgal p., contemporary with Sargon of Accad; Ur-Babbar p., contemporary with Naram-Sin of Accad; Ur-E p.; Lugal-bur p.; Basha-Kama p.; Ur-Mama p.; Ug-me p.; Ur-Bau p.; Gudea p.; Nammakhini p.; Ur- gar p.; Ka-azag p.; Galu-Bau p.; Galu-Gula p.; Ur-Ninsun p.: Ur-Ningirsu p.; contemporary with Ur-Engur k. of Ur-abba p.; @@Galu-ka zal p.; @@Galuandul p.; @@Ut-Lama I p.; @@Alla, @@Ur-Lama II p.; contemporary with Dungi k. of Ur; Arad-Nannar p. Unfortunately, with the exception of about onethird of these rulers, the exact order is yet to be ascertained. (Note: Asterisk denotes unidentified forms.)

18. Adab:

The mounds of Bismaya which have been identified as Adab were partially excavated by Dr. Edgar J. Banks, for the University of Chicago. Its remains indicate that it is one of the oldest cities discovered. A ruler named Esar, circa 4200 BC, is known from a number of inscriptions, as well as a magnificent statue of the king, discovered by Dr. Banks.

19. Nippur:

The large group of mounds covering an area, the circumference of which is three miles, called in ancient times Nippur, but now Noufar, was excavated as mentioned above by Dr. Peters and Dr. Haynes for the University of Pennsylvania. While a great number of Babylonian kings and patesis are represented by inscriptions discovered at Nippur, practically all had their seats of government at other places, it being the sacred city.

20. Erech:

The mounds at the present called Warka, but representing ancient Erech (Ge 10:10), covering an area whose circumference is 6 miles, have been tentatively examined by Loftus and other explorers. Many inscriptions have also been unearthed by the Arabs at this site. The rulers of this city known to us are: Ilu-(m)a-ilu, Lugal-zaggisi k., contemporary with Uru-kagina of Lagash; Lugal-kigubnidudu k.; Lugal-kisalsi k.; Sin-gashid k., about 2200 BC, and Sin-gamil k.

21. Larsa:

Senkereh known in the Old Testament as Ellasar (Ge 14:1), and in the inscriptions as Larsa, has been explored by Loftus and others. The known rulers of the city are: Gungunu k., contemporary of Ur-Ninib

k. of Isin; Sumu-ilu; Nur-Adad; Sin- iddinam; Eri-Aku (the Biblical "Arioch") circa 2000 BC, son of Kudur-Mabug k. of Elam, and Rim-Sin (or Rim-Aku), his brother.

22. Shuruppak:

The present Fara, which in ancient times was called Shuruppak, was partially excavated by the Germans under Koldewey, Andraea, and Noeldeke. It is also a very ancient city. It yielded little to the spade of the excavator. It is close by Abu- Hatab, and known as the place where the scenes of the Babylonian Deluge story occurred. Two rulers known from the inscriptions found there are Dada and ladda, belonging to a comparatively early period.

23. Kisurra:

The site now known as Abu-Hatab is the ancient Kisurra. It was partially excavated by the Germans. It flourished as a city in the third millennium BC. The two rulers of this city that are known are Idinilu p., and Itur-Shamash p. (?).

24. Umma:

The site now called Jokha lying to the Northwest of Lagash is an ancient Sumerian city known as Umma. The site has been explored by Dr. Peters and others, but more recently surveyed by Andraea and Noeldeke. It proved to be a city destroyed in the early period. Arabs have lately found thousands of documents belonging to the ancient archives of the city. Some of the rulers known are: Ush p., Enakalli and Urlumma p., contemporaries of Enannatum I of Lagash; Ill p., appointed by Entemena p., of Lagash; Kur-Shesh p., time of Manishtusu; @@Galu-Babbar p.; Ur-nesu p., contemporary of Dungi k., of Ur.

25. Accad:

The city mentioned in Ge 10:10 as Accad, one of Nimrod’s cities, has not been explored, but is well known by the inscriptions of Sargon and his son Naram-Sin as well as omen-texts of later eras. Sargon was a usurper. He was born in concealment, and sent adrift in an ark of bulrushes like Moses. He was rescued and brought up by Akki, a farmer. He assumed the title "king of the city" (Shar-ali), or "king of Uri" (Shat Uri). Later he conquered the entire country, and became the "king of Accad and Sumer." In his latter years he extended his conquests to Elam, Amurru and Subartu, and earned for himself the title "king of the Four Quarters," which his son Naram-Sin inherited. The latter followed up the successes of his father and marched into Magan, in the Sinaitic peninsula. Naram-Sin, as well as his father, was a great builder. Evidences of their operations are seen in many cities. Naram-Sin was succeeded by Bingani, who apparently lost the title "king of the Four Quarters," being only called "king of the City, or Uri."

26. Opis:

The exact site of the city of Opis is still in doubt, but the city is represented by the ruler Zuzu k., who was defeated by Eannatum p., of Lagash.

27. Basime:

The city Basime also remains unidentified, but is represented by Ibalum p., a contemporary of Manishtusu k., of Kish, and son of Ilsurabi, apparently another patesi of that city.

28. Drehem:

A site not far from Nippur, called Dolehem or Drehem, which was explored by Dr. Peters, has recently yielded thousands of tablets from the Temple archives dated in the reigns of kings in the Ur Dynasty.

29. Urumma:

The extensive group of mounds lying on the west side of the Euphrates, called Mugayyar, and generally known as Ur of the Chaldees, is the ancient Urumma. It was explored by Taylor and others, and proved to have been an important capital from the middle of the third millennium BC. The dynasty which had made the city its capital is known through inscriptions discovered there and at Tello, Nippur, Drehem and Djokha. Thousands of inscriptions dated in what is commonly called the Ur Dynasty have been published. The dynasty was founded by Ur-Engur, who is conspicuous for his building operations at Nippur and other cities. A dynastic tablet of a much later period, the provenience of which is in doubt, gives the rulers of this dynasty founded about 2400 BC, and the number of years that they reigned.

URUMMA DYNASTY

Ur-Engur, 18 years

Dungi (son), 58 years

Bur-Sin (son), 9 years

Gimil-Sin (son), 7 years

Ibi-Sin (son), 25 years

Five kings, 117 years

The same tablet gives also the following list of the rulers of Isin. Ishbi-Urra, the founder, lived about 2283 BC.

ISIS DYNASTY

Ishbi-Urra, 32 years

Gimil-ilishu (son), 10 years

Idin-Dagan (son), 21 years

Ishme-Dagan (son), 20 years

Libit-Ishtar (son), 11 years

Ur-Ninib, 28 years

Bur-Sin II (son), 28 years

Iter-iqisha (son), 5 years

Urra-imitti (brother), 7 years

Sin-iqisha, 6 months

Enlil-bani, 24 years

Zambia, 3 years

————————, 5 years

Ea————————-, 4 years

Sin-magir, 11 years

Damiq-ilishu (son), 23 years

Sixteen kings, 225 years and 6 months

30. First Dynasty of Babylon:

About the time the Nisin Dynasty came to a close, and while the Larsa Dynasty was ruling, the First Dynasty of Babylon was established. Following is a list of 11 rulers of this dynasty who ruled 300 years:

I. FIRST DYNASTY OF BABYLON

Sumu-abum, 14 years

Sumu-la-el, 36 years

Sabium (son), 14 years

Abil-Sin (son), 18 years

Sin-muballit (son), 20 years

Hammu-rabi (son), 43 years

Samsu-iluna (son), 38 years

Abi-eshuh (son), 28 years

Ammi-Ditana (son), 37 years

Ammi-Zaduga (son), 21 years

Samsu-Ditana (son), 32 years

The First Dynasty of Babylon came into prominence in the reign of Sin-muballit who captured Nisin. Eri-Aku of the Larsa Dynasty shortly afterward took the city. When Hammurabi came to the throne he was subject to Eri-Aku (Bib. Arioch) of Larsa, the son of the Elamitc king, Kudur-Mabug. The latter informs us that he was suzerain of Amurru (Palestine and Syria), which makes intelligible the statement in Ge 14, that the kings of Canaan were subject to the king of Elam, whose name was Chedorlaomer (Kudur-Lagam ar). In his 31st year, Hammurabi, who is the Amraphel of Ge 14:1, succeeded in throwing off the Elamite yoke, and not only established his independence but also became the complete master of Babylonia by driving out the Elamites.

31. Sealand Dynasty:

In the region of the Persian Gulf, south of Babylonia, ruled a dynasty partly contemporaneously with the First Dynasty, extending over the reigns of about five of the last kings, and over several of the Cassite Dynasty, known as the Sealand Dynasty. The historian records for the latter the following list of 11 kings who ruled 368 years:

II. SEALAND DYNASTY

Ilima-ilu, 60 years

Itti-ili-nibi, 55 years

Damqi-ilishu, 36 years

Ishkibal, 15 years

Shushshi (brother), 27 years

Gulkishar, 55 years

Pesh-gal-daramash (son), 50 years

Adara-kalama (son), 28 years

Ekur-ul-anna, 26 years

Melamma-kurkura, 7 years

Ea-gamil, 9 years

32. Cassite Dynasty:

The First Dynasty of Babylon came to an end through an invasion of the Hittites. They plundered Babylon and perhaps ruled that city for a number of years. A new dynasty was then established about 1750 BC by a foreign people known as Cassites. There were 36 kings in this dynasty ruling 576 years and 9 months. Unfortunately the tablet containing the list is fragmentary.

III. CASSITE DYNASTY

Gandash, 16 years

Agum I (s), 22 years

Kashtiliash I, usurper, 22 years; born of Ulamburiash and son of Burna-buriash

Du(?) shi (s), 8 years

Abirattash (b ?)

Tazzigurmash (s)

Agum II (s)

————;————Long gap

@@Kara-indash I, contemporary with Ashur-rimnisheshu, k. of Assyria

@@Kadashman-Enlil I (s ?)

@@Kuri-Galzu I

Burna-buriash II, contemporary of Buzur-Ashur, k. of Assyria

@@Kara-Indash II, son-in-law of Ashur-uballit, k. of Assyria

@@Nazi-Bugash (usurper)

Kuri-Galzu II (s. of Burna-buriash), 23 years; contemporary of Ashur-uballit, and Enlilnirari, kings of Assyria

Nazi-Maruttash (s), 26 years; contemporary of Adad-nirari I, p. of Assyria.

Kadashman-Turgu (s), 17 years

Kadashman-Enlil II, 7 years

Kudur-Enlil (s), 9 years

Shagarakti-Shuriash (s), 13 years

Kashtiliash II (s), 8 years

Enlil-nadin-shum, 1 1/2 years

Kadashman-Kharbe II, 1 1/2 years

Adad-shum-iddin, 6 years

Adad-shum-usur, 30 years

Meli-Shipak (s?), 15 years

Marduk-apil-iddin (s), 13 years

Zamama-shum-iddin, 1 year

Bel-mu—, 3 years

33. Cassite Rule:

The region from which these Cassites came has not yet been determined, although it seems to be the district Northeast of Assyria. Gandash, the first king, seems to have enjoyed the all-embracing title, "King of the Four Quarters of the World." Little is known of the other rulers until Agum II, who claims the rule of the Cassites, Accad, Babel, Padan, Alman and Guti. In his inscriptions he records the conquest of Khani in Asia Minor, and the fact that he brought back to Babylon the statues of Marduk and Zarpanit, which had been carried off by the Hittites. The Cassite rule, while extending over many centuries, was not very prosperous. At Nippur the excavations showed active operations on the part of a few kings in restoring the temple and doing ob eisance to Enlil. The rulers seemed to have conformed to the religion of the land, for few foreign elements have been recognized as having been introduced into it during this era. The many Cassite names found in the inscriptions would indicate an influx from a Cassite quarter of no small proportion. And yet it should be noted that, in the same era, Hittite and Mittanean influence, as is shown by the nomenclature, is as great as the Cassite. It was during this period that Assyria rose to power and influence, and was soon to become the master of the Mesopotamian region.

34. Isin Dynasty:

IV. ISIN OR PASHE DYNASTY

11 Kings; began to rule about 1172 BC

Marduk, 17 years

Wanting, 6 years

Nebuchadrezzar I, contemporary of Ashur-resh-ishi, k. of Assyria

Enlil-nadin-apal

Marduk-nadin-akhi, contemporary of Tiglath-pileser I, k. of Assyria

Marduk-shapik-zer-mati, contemporary of Ashur-bel-kala, k. of Assyria

Adad-apal-iddin, 22 years

Marduk-akh-erba, 1 1/2

Marduk-zer, 12 years

Nabu-shum-libur, 8(?) years

35. Nebuchadrezzar I:

The most famous king of this dynasty, in fact of this era, was Nebuchadrezzar I, who re-established firmly the rule of Babylon. He carried on a successful expedition into Elam as well as into Amurru where he fought against the Hittite. He also conquered the Lulubites. But in contest for supremacy with Assyria Ashur-reshishi triumphed, and he was forced to retreat ingloriously to Babylon. His successors failed to withstand the Assyrians, especially under Tiglath-pileser I, and were allowed to rule only by sufferance. The Babylonians had lost their prestige; the Assyrians had become the dominant people of the land. Few rulers of the dynasty which followed are known except by name. The dynasties with one exception were of short duration.

36. Sealand Dynasty:

V. SEALAND DYNASTY

3 Kings

Simrnash-Shipak, 18 years; about 1042 BC

Ea-mukin-shum, 6 months

Kashshu-nadin-akhi, 3 years

37. Bit-Bazi Dynasty:

VI. BIT-BAZI DYNASTY

3 Kings

Eulmash-shakin-shum, 17 years; about 1020 BC

Ninib-kudur-usur, 3 years

Shilaniln-Shuqamuna, 3 months

38. Other Rulers:

VII. An Elamitic King, whose name is not known

VIII. 13(?) kings who ruled 36 years

IX. A dynasty of 5(?) kings

39. Babylonian Dynasty:

X. BABYLONIAN DYNASTY

Following is a partial list of the 22 kings who ruled until the destruction of Babylon by Sennacherib, when the Assyrian kings assumed direct control. Ashurbanipal, however, introduced a new policy and viceroys were appointed.

Shamash-mudammiq

Nabu-shar-ishkun I

Nabu-apal-iddin

Marduk-nadin-shum

Marduk-balatsu-iqbi

Bau-akh-iddin

Nabu-shum-ishkun II

Nabonassar

Nabu-nadin-zer; 747-734 BC

Nabu-shum-ishkun III; 733-732 BC

Nabu-mukin-zer; 731-729 BC

Pul (Tiglath-pilcser III); 729-727 BC

Ulula (Shalmancsar v); 727-722 BC

Merodach-baladan I; 722-710 BC.

Sargon; 710-705 BC

Sennacherib; 704-702 BC

Marduk-zakir-shum (1 month)

Merodach-baladan II (9 months)

Bel-ibni; 702-700 BC

Ashur-nadin-shum; 700-694 BC

Nergal-ushezib; 694-693 BC

Mushczib-Marduk; 692-689 BC

Sennacherib; 689-681 BC

Esarhaddon; 681-668 BC

Ashurbanipal; 668-626 BC

Shamash-shum-ukin; 668-648 BC

Kandalanu; 648-626 BC

Ashur-etil-ilani-ukin; 626-

Nabopolassar; 626-

During the time of Sennacherib, Merodach-baladan the Chaldean became a great obstacle to Assyria's maintaining its supremacy over Babylonia. Three times he gained possession of Babylon, and twice had himself proclaimed king. For thirty years he plotted against Assyria. What is learned from the

inscriptions concerning him furnishes an interesting commentary on the sending of the embassy, in 704 BC, to Hezekiah (2Ki 20:12; Isa 39:1) in order to induce him to revolt against Assyria, which he knew would help his own cause. Finally Sennacherib, in 690, after he had experienced much trouble by the repeated uprisings of the Babylonians, and the aspirations of Merodach-baladan, endeavored to obliterate Babylon from the map. His son and successor Esarhaddon, however, tried to make Babylon again happy and prosperous. One of his first acts was to send back to Babylon the statue of Bel-Merodach. He rebuilt the city, and also restored other Babylonian temples, for instance, that of Enlil at Nippur. The Babylonians solemnly declared him king. Ashurbanipal, his son and successor, followed his policy. The evidence of his operations at Nippur is everywhere seen in the shape of stamped, kiln-dried bricks.

Before Esarhaddon died, he had planned that Babylonia should become independent and be ruled by his son, Shamash-shum-ukin, while Assyria he handed down to Ashurbanipal. But when the latter came to the throne, Assyria permitted the former only to be appointed viceroy of Babylon. It seems also that even some portions of Babylonia were ruled directly by Ashurbanipal.

After fifteen years Shamash-shum-ukin rebelled and attempted to establish his independence, but Sennacherib besieged Babylon and took it, when Shamash-shum-ukin destroyed himself. Kadalanu was then appointed viceroy, and ruled over part of the country. Nabopolassar was the last viceroy appointed by Assyria. At last the time had arrived for the Babylonians to come again unto their own. Nabopolassar who perhaps was a Chaldean by origin, made an alliance with the Urnman Manda. This he strengthened by the marriage of his son Nebuchadrezzar to the daughter of Astyages, the king. Nineveh finally fell before the Umman Manda hordes, and was razed to the ground. This people took possession of Northern Assyria. The Armenian vassal states, and Southern Assyria, as well as the title to Palestine, Syria and Egypt, fell to Babylonia.

40. Neo-Babylonian Rulers:

RULERS OF NEO-BABYLONIAN EMPIRE

Nabopolassar; 625-604 BC

Nebuchadrezzar II (s); 604-568 BC

Evil-Merodach (s); 561-560 BC

Neriglissar (brother-in-law); 559-556 BC

Labosoarchad (s); 556 BC

Nabonidus; 555-539 BC

Cyrus conquered Babylonia in 539 BC

Nabopolassar having established himself king of Babylon became the founder of the neo-Babylonian empire. He was succeeded by his son, Nebuchadrezzar II, who like Hammurabi and Sargon is among the greatest known characters in Babylonian history. He is the Biblical Nebuchadrezzar who carried the Jews into captivity. There are a number of lengthy records of Nebuchadrezzar concerning the buildings he erected, as well as of other public acts, but unfortunately only a fragment of a historical inscription referring to him has been found. The building inscriptions portray him as the great builder he is represented to be in the Old Testament (see BABYLON). He transformed Babylon into the mistress of the civilized world.

Evil-Merodach, his son and successor, is also mentioned in the Old Testament. Two short reigns followed when the ruling dynasty was overthrown and Nabonidus was placed upon the throne. The king, who delighted in exploring and restoring ancient temples, placed his son at the head of the army. Nabonidus desiring to centralize the religion of Babylonia, brought to Babylon many of the images of deities from other cities. This greatly displeased the people, and excited a strong feeling against him. The priesthood was alienated, and the military party was displeased with him, for in his antiquarian pursuits he left the defense of the empire to others. So when Cyrus, king of Anshan and ruler of Persia, entered the country, he had little difficulty in defeating the Babylonians in a battle at Opis. Sippar immediately surrendered to the invader, and the gates of Babylon were thrown open to his army under Gobryas, his general. Nabonidus was imprisoned. Three months later Cyrus entered Babylon; Belshazzar, who doubtless had set up his throne after his father had been deposed, was slain a week later on the night of the eleventh of Marchesvan. This scene may have occurred in the palace built by Nebuchadrezzar. This event, told by the chronicler, is a remarkable verification of the interesting story related of Belshazzar in Dnl. The title used by the kings who follow the Babylonian Dynasty is "King of Babylon and King of Countries."

41. Persian Rulers of Babylonia:

PERSIAN RULERS OF BABYLONIA

Cyrus; 538-529 BC

Cambyses; 529-522 BC

Barzia

Nebuchadrezzar III

Darius I; 521-485 BC

Xerxes; 485-464 BC

Artaxerxes I; 464-424 BC

Xerxes II; 424-423 BC

Darius II; 423-404 BC

Artaxerxes II; 405-358 BC

Artaxerxes III (Ochos); 358-338 BC

Arses; 338-335 BC

Darius III; 335-331 BC

Alexander the Great conquered Babylonia 331 BC.

Several of the Persian rulers figured prominently in the Old Testament narratives. Cyrus in a cylinder inscription, which is preserved in a fragmentary form, endeavors to justify himself in the eyes of the people. He claims that the god Marduk raised him up to take the place of Nabonidus, and to defend the religion of the people. He tries to show how considerate he was by returning to their respective cities the gods that had been removed from their shrines; and especially by liberating foreign peoples held in bondage. While he does not mention what exiles were allowed to return to their native homes, the Old Testament informs us that the Jews were among those delivered. And the returning of the images to their respective places is also an interesting commentary on Ezr 1:7, in which we are told that the Jews were allowed to take with them their sacred vessels. The spirit manifested in the proclamation for the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 1:1,4) seems also to have been in accordance with his policy on ascending the Babylonian throne. A year before his death he associated with himself Cambyses his son, another character mentioned in the Old Testament. He gave him the title "King of Babylon," but retained for himself "King of Countries." A usurper Smerdis, the Magian, called Barzia in the inscriptions, assumed the throne of Babylonia, but Darius Hystaspes, who was an Aryan and Zoroastrian in religion, finally killed Smerdis and made himself king of Babylon. But before he was acknowledged king he had to reconquer the Babylonians. By so doing the ancient tradition that Bel of Babylon conferred the legitimate right to rule that part of the world ceased to be acknowledged. Under Nidinta-Bel, who assumed the name Nebuchadrezzar III, the Babylonians regained their independence, but it was of short duration, lasting less than a year.

LITERATURE.

History: Rogers, History of Babylonian and Assyrian, 1002; Winckler, History of Babylonian and Assyrian, 1907; King, Sumer and Accad, 1910. Religion: Jastrow, Religion of Babylonian and Assyrian, 1898; Rogers, Religion of Babylonian and Assyrian, Especially in Its Relation to Israel, 1908; Sayce,

The Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonian, 1903. Literature: Assyrian and Babylonian Literature, in "The World's Great Books"; edited by R. F. Harper. Relation to the Old Testament: Price, The Monuments and the Old Testament, 1007; Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Records of Assyrian and Babylonian, 1902; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, 1908; Clay, Amurru, the Home of the Northern Semites, 1909.

See also "Literature" in ASSYRIA.

A. T. Clay

BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF

I. DEFINITION

1. First Period

2. Second Period

3. Third Period

II. THE SOURCES

III. THE HISTORY

IV. THE PANTHEON

1. Enlil, Ellil

2. Anu

3. Ea

4. Sin

5. Shamash

6. Ishtar

7. Marduk (Old Testament Merodach)

8. Nabu (Old Testament Nebo)

9. Nergal, the city god of Kutu (Old Testament Guthah)

10. Ninib

11. Ramman

12. Tammuz

13. Asshur

V. HYMNS AND PRAYERS

VI. MAGIC

1. Maqlu

2. Shurpu

VII. THE LAST THINGS

VIII. MYTHS AND EPICS

IX. THE ASTRAL THEORY OF THE UNIVERSE

X. THE RELATIONS WITH THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

LITERATURE

I. Definition.

The religion of Babylonia and Assyria is that system of belief in higher things with which the peoples of the Tigris and Euphrates valley strove to put themselves into relations, in order to live their lives. The discoveries of the past century have supplied us with a mass of information concerning this faith from which we have been able to secure a greater knowledge of it than of any other ancient oriental religion, except that of Israel. Yet the information which is thus come into our hands is embarrassing because of its very richness, and it will doubtless be a long time before it is possible to speak with certainty concerning many of the problems which now confront us. Progress in the interpretation of the literature is however so rapid that we may now give a much more intelligible account of this religion than could have been secured even so recently as five years ago.

For purposes of convenience, the religion of Babylonia and Assyria may be grouped into three great periods.

1. First Period:

The first of these periods extends from the earliest times, about 3500 BC, down to the union of the Babylonian states under Hammurabi, about 2000 BC.

2. Second Period:

The second period extends to the rise of the Chaldean empire under Nabopolassar, 625 BC, and

3. Third Period:

The third period embraces the brief history of this Chaldean or neo-Babylonian empire under Cyrus, 538 BC.

The Assyrian religion belongs to the second period, though it extends even into the third period, for Nineveh did not fall until 607 BC.

II. The Sources.

The primary sources of our knowledge of this religion are to be found in the distinctively religious texts, such as hymns, prayers, priestly rituals and liturgies, and in the vast mass of magical and incantation literature. The major part of this religious literature which has come down to us dates from the reign of Ashurbanipal (668-625 BC) though much of it is quite clearly either copied from or based upon much older material. If, however, we relied for our picture of the Babylonian and Assyrian religion exclusively upon these religious texts, we should secure a distorted and in some places an indefinite view. We must add to these in order to perfect the picture practically the whole of the literature of these two peoples.

The inscriptions upon which the kings handed down to posterity an account of their great deeds contain lists of gods whom they invoked, and these must be taken into consideration. The laws also have in large measure a religious basis, and the business inscriptions frequently invoke deities at the end. The records of the astronomers, the state dispatches of kings, the reports of general officers from the field, the handbooks of medicine, all these and many other divisions of a vast literature contribute each its share of religious material. Furthermore, as the religion was not only the faith of the king, but also the faith of the state itself, the progress of the commonwealth to greater power oftentimes carried some local god into a new relationship to other gods, or the decadence of the commonwealth deprived a god of some of his powers or attributes, so that even the distinctively political inscriptions have importance in helping us to reconstruct the ancient literature.

III. The History.

The origin of the Babylonian religion is hid from our eyes in those ancient days of which we know little and can never hope to know much. In the earliest documents which have come down to us written in the Sumerian language, there are found Semitic words or constructions or both. It seems now to be definitely determined that a Sumerian people whose origin is unknown inhabited Babylonia before the coming of the Semites, whose original home was in Arabia. Of the Sumerian faith before a union was formed with the Semites, we know very little indeed. But we may perhaps safely say that among that ancient people, beneath the belief in gods there lay deep in their consciousness the belief in animism. They thought that every object, animate or inanimate, had a zi or spirit. The word seems originally to have meant life. Life manifests itself to us as motion; everything which moves has life. The power of motion separates the animate from the inanimate. All that moves possesses life, the motionless is lifeless or dead.

Besides this belief in animism, the early Sumerians seem to have believed in ghosts that were related to the world of the dead as the zi was related to the world of the living. The lil or ghost was a night demon of baleful influence upon men, and only to be cast out by many incantations. The lil was attended by a serving-maid (ardat lili, "maid of night") which in the later Semitic development was transformed into the feminine lilitu. It is most curious and interesting that this ghost demon of the Sumerians lived on through all the history of the Babylonian religion, and is mentioned even in one of the Old Testament prophets (Isa 34:14; Hebrew Lillith, translated "night monster"). The origin of the Semitic religion brought by the ancient Semitic people and united with this Sumerian faith is also lost in the past.

It seems to be quite clear that the gods and the religious ideas which these Semites brought with them from the desert had very little if any importance for the religion which they afterward professed in Babylonia. Some of the names of their gods and images of these they very probably brought with them, but the important thing, it must always be remembered, about the gods is not the names but the attributes which were ascribed to them, and these must have been completely changed during the long history which follows their first contact with the Sumerians. From the Sumerians there flowed a great stream of religious ideas, subject indeed to modifications from time to time down the succeeding centuries. In our study of the pantheon we shall see from time to time how the gods changed their places and how the ideas concerning them were modified by political and other movements. In the very earliest times, besides these ideas of spirits and ghosts, we find also numbers of local gods. Every center of human habitati on had its special patron deity and this deity is always associated with some great natural phenomenon. It was natural that the sun and moon should be made prominent among these gods, but other natural objects and forces were personified and deified, streams, stones and many others.

Our chief source of information concerning the gods of the first period of religious development before the days of Hammurabi is found in the historical inscriptions of the early kings and rulers. Many of these describe offerings of temples and treasures made to the gods, and all of them are religious in tone and filled with ascriptions of praise to the gods. From these early texts Professor Jastrow has extricated the names of the following deities, gods and goddesses. I reproduce his list as the best yet made, but keep in mind that some of the readings are doubtful and some were certainly otherwise read by the Babylonians or Sumerians, though we do not now know how they ought to be read. The progress of Assyrian

research is continually providing corrected readings for words hitherto known to us only in ideograms. It is quite to be expected that many of these strange, not to say grotesque, names will some day prove to be quite simple, and easy to utter: En-lil (Ellil, Bel) Belit, Nin-khar-sag, Nin-gir-su, wh o also appears as Dun-gur, Bau, Ga-tum-dug, Nin-dindug, Ea, Nin-a-gal, Gal- dim-zu-ab, Nin-ki, Damgal-nun-na, Nergal, Shamash, A or Malkatu, the wife of Shamash, Nannar, or Sin, Nin-Urum, Innanna, Nana, Anunit, Nina, Ishtar, Anu, Nindar-a, Gal-alim, Nin-shakh, Dun-shagga, Lugalbanda, with a consort Nin-sun, Dumu-zi-zu- ab, Dumu-zi, Lugal-Erim, Nin-e-gal and Ningal, Nin-gish-zi-da, Dun-pa-uddu, Nin-mar, Pa-sag, Nidaba, Ku(?)-anna, Shid, Nin- agid-kha-du, Ninshul-li, En-gubarra, Im-mi-khu(?), Ur-du-zi, Kadi, Nu-ku-sir-da, Ma-ma, Za-ma-ma, Za-za-ru, Impa-ud-du, Ur- e-nun-ta-ud-du-a, Khi-gir-nunna, Khi-shagga, Gur-mu, Zar-mu, Dagan, Damu, Lama, Nesu, Nun-gal, An-makh, Nin-si-na, Nin-asu. In this list great gods and goddesses and all kinds of minor deities are gathered together, and the list looks and sounds hopeless. But these are local deities, and some of them are mere duplications. Nearly every place in early times would have a sun-god or a moon-god or both, and in the political development of the country the moon-god of the conquering city displaced or absorbed the moon-god of the conquered. When we have eliminated these gods, who have practically disappeared, there remains a comparatively small number of gods who outrank all the others.

In the room of some of these gods that disappeared, others, especially in Assyria, found places. There was, however, a strong tendency to diminish the number of the gods. They are in early days mentioned by the score, but as time goes on many of these vanish away and only the few remain. As Jastrow has pointed out, Shalmaneser II (859-825 BC) had only eleven gods in his pantheon: Ashur, Anu, Bel, Ea, Sin, Shamash, Ninib, Nergal, Nusku, Belit and Ishtar. Sennacherib (704-681 BC) usually mentions only eight; namely, Ashur, Sin, Shamash, Bel (that is, Marduk), Nabu, Nergal, Ishtar of Nineveh and Ishtar of Arbela. But we must not lay much emphasis upon the smallness of this number, for in his building inscriptions at the end he invokes twenty-five deities, and even though some of these are duplicates of other gods, as Jastrow correctly explains, nevertheless the entire list is considerably increased over the eight above mentioned. In the late Babylonian period the worship seems chiefly devoted to Marduk, Nabu, Sin, Shamash and Ishtar. Often there seem little faint indications of a further step forward. Some of the hymns addressed to Shamash seem almost upon the verge of exalting him in such a way as to exclude the other deities, but the step is never taken. The Babylonians, with all their wonderful gifts, were never able to conceive of one god, of one god alone, of one god whose very existence makes logically impossible the existence of any other deity. Monotheism transcends the spiritual grasp of the Babylonian mind.

Amid all this company of gods, amid all these speculations and combinations, we must keep our minds clear, and fasten our eyes upon the one significant fact that stands out above all others. It is that the Babylonians were not able to rise above polytheism; that beyond them, far beyond them, lay that great series of thoughts about God that ascribe to him aloneness, to which we may add the great spiritual ideas which today may roughly be grouped under ethical monotheism. Here and there great thinkers in Babylonia grasped after higher ideas, and were able only to attain to a sort of pantheism of a speculative kind. A personal god, righteous and holy, who loved righteousness. and hated sin, this was not given to them to conceive.

The character of the gods changed indeed as the people who revered them changed. The Babylonians who built vast temples and composed many inscriptions emphasizing the works of peace rather than of war, naturally conceived their deities in a manner different from the Assyrians whose powers were chiefly devoted to conquests in war, but neither the Babylonians nor the Assyrians arose to any such heights as distinguish the Hebrew book of Psalms. As the influence of the Babylonians and Assyrians waned, their go ds declined in power, and none of them survived the onrush of Greek civilization in the period of Alexander.

IV. The Pantheon.

The chief gods of the Babylonian and Assyrian pantheon may now be characterized in turn.

1. Enlil, Ellil:

In the earliest times known to us the greatest of the gods is the god of Nippur whose name in the Sumerian texts is Enlil or Ellil. In the Semitic pantheon of later times he was identified with the god Bel, and it is as Belhe has been chiefly known. During the whole of the first epoch of Babylonian history up to the period of Hammurabi, he is the Lord of the World and the King of the Land. He was originally the hero of the Flood story, but in the form in which it has come down to us Marduk of Babylon has deprived him of these honors. In Nippur was his chief temple, called E-kur or "mountain house." It was built and rebuilt by the kings of Babylonia again and again from the days of Sargon I (3800 BC) onward, and no less than twenty kings are known to us who pride themselves on their work of rebuilding this one temple. He is saluted as "the Great Lord, the command of whose mouth cannot be altered and whose grace is steadfast." He would seem, judging from the name of his temple and from some of his attributes, to have been originally a god of the mountains where he must have had his original dwelling-place.

2. Anu:

The name of the god Anu was interpreted as meaning heaven, corresponding to the Sumerian word ana, "heaven," and he came thus to be regarded as the god of heaven as over against Enlil who was the god of earth, and Ea who was the god of the waters. Anu appears first among the great gods in an inscription of Lugalsaggi, and in somewhat later times he made his way to the top of the earliest triad which consists of Ann, Enlil and Ea. His chief seat of worship was Uruk, but in the Assyrian period he was associated with the god Adad in a temple in the city of Asshur. In the myths and epics he fills an important role as the disposer of all events, but he cannot be thought of as quite equal in rank with Enlil in spite of his position in the heavens. Antu or Anatu is mentioned as the wife of Ann, but hers is a colorless figure, and she may probably be regarded as little else than a grammatical invention owing to the desire of the Semites to associate the feminine with the masculine in their languages.

3. Ea:

The reading of the name of the god Ea still remains uncertain. It may perhaps have been Ae, as the Greek Aos would seem to indicate. His chief city of worship was Eridu, which in the earliest period was situated on the Persian Gulf, near the mouths of the Euphrates and the Tigris. His temple was there called E-absu, which means "house of the deeps," interpreted also as "house of wisdom." He must have been a god of great importance in early times, but was left behind by the growing influence of Ellil and in a later period retained honor chiefly because he was assumed to be the. father of the god Marduk, and so was reverenced by the people of the city of Babylon. As the lord of wisdom he filled a great role in exorcisms down to the very last, and was believed to be the god who was most ready to respond to human need in direful circumstances. Ea's wife is called Damkina.

4. Sin:

Sin was the city god of Urn (Ur of the Chaldeans in the Old Testament). He was originally a local god who came early to a lofty position in the canon because he seems always to have been identified with the moon, and in Babylon the moon was always of more importance than the sun because of its use in the calendar. His temple was called E-kishshirgal, i.e. "house of light." His worship was widespread, for at a very early date he had a shrine at Harran in Mesopotamia. His wife is called Ningal, the Great Lady, the Queen, and his name probably appears in Mt. Sinai. He is addressed in hymns of great beauty and was regarded as a most kindly god.

5. Shamash:

The Sun-god, Shamash, ranks next after Sin in the second or later triad, and there can be no doubt that he was from the beginning associated with the sun in the heavens. His seats of worship were Larsa in southern Babylonia and Sippar in northern Babylonia in both of which his temple was called E-bab-bar, "shining house." He also is honored in magnificent hymns in which he is saluted as the enemy and the avenger of evil, but as the benignant furtherer of all good, especially of that which concerns the races of men. All legislation is ascribed to him as the supreme judge in heaven. To him the Babylonians also ascribe similar powers in war to those which the Egyptians accorded to Re. From some of the texts one might have supposed that he would have come to the top of the triad, but this appears not to have been the case, and his influence extended rather in the direction of influencing minor local deities who were judged to be characterized by attributes similar to those ascribed to him in the greater hymns.

6. Ishtar:

The origin and the meaning of the name of the goddess Ishtar are still disputed, but of her rank there can be no doubt. In the very earliest inscriptions known to us she does not seem to have been associated with the planet Venus as she is in later times. She seems rather to have been a goddess of fruitfulness and of love, and in her temple at Uruk temple- prostitution was a feature. In the mythological literature she occupies a high place as the goddess of war and of the chase. Because of this later identification she became the chief goddess of the warlike Assyrians. Little by little she absorbed all the other goddesses and her name became the general word for goddess. Her chief seats of worhip were Uruk in southern

Babylonia, where she was worshipped in earliest times under the name of Nana, and Akkad in northern Babylonia, where she was called Anunitu, and Nineveh and Arbela in Assyria. Some of the hymns addressed to her are among the noblest products of Babylonian and Assyrian religion and reach a considerable ethical position. This development of a sexual goddess into a goddess who severely judged the sins of men is one of the strangest phenomena in the history of this religion.

7. Marduk:

Marduk (in the Old Testament Merodach) is the city-god of Babylon where his temple was called E-sagila ("lofty house") and its tower E-teme nanki ("house of the foundation of heaven and earth"). His wife is Sarpanitu, and, as we have already seen, his father was Ea, and in later days Nabu was considered his son. The city of Babylon in the earliest period was insignificant in importance compared with Nippur and Eridu, and this city-god could not therefore lay claim to a position comparable with the gods of these cities, but after Hammurabi had made Babylon the chief city of all Babylonia its god rapidly increased in importance until he absorbed the attributes of the earlier gods and displaced them in the great myths. The speculative philosophers of the neo-Babylonian period went so far as to identify all the earlier gods with him, elevating his worship into a sort of henotheism. His proper name in the later periods was gradually displaced by the appellativc Belu "lord," so that finally he was commonly spoken of as Bel, and his consort was called Belit. He shares with Ishtar and Shamash the honor of having some of the finest hymns, which have come down to us, sung to his name.

8. Nabu:

Nabu (in the Old Testament Nebo) was the city-god of Bor-sippa. His name is clearly Semitic, and means "speaker" or "announcer." In earlier times he seems to have been a more important god than Marduk and was worshipped as the god of vegetation. His temple in Borsippa bore the name E-zida ("perpetual house") with the tower E-uriminanki ("house of the seven rulers of heaven and earth"). In later times he was identified with the planet Mercury.

9. Nergal:

Nergal, the city-god of Kutu (in the Old Testament Cuthah), was the god of the underworld and his wife Eresh-kigal was the sovereign lady of the under-world. He was also the god of plague and of fever, and in later days was associated with the planet Mars, though scholars who are attached to the astral theory (see below) think that he was identified at an earlier date with Saturn. For this view no certain proof has yet been produced.

10. Ninib:

Unfortunately the correct pronunciation of the name of the god Ninib has not yet been secured. He seems originally to have been a god of vegetation, but in the later philosophical period was associated with the planet Saturn, called Kaitaann (Kewan, Chiun, Am 5:26 the King James Version, the English

Revised Version). As a god of vegetation he becomes also a god of healing and his wife Gula was the chief patroness of physicians. He comes also to be regarded as a mighty hero in war, and, in this capacity generally, he fills a great role in the Assyrian religion.

11. Ramman:

Ramman is the god of storms and thunder among the Babylonians and in the Assyrian pantheon he is usually called Adad. This form of the name is doubtless connected with the Aramaic god Hadad. In the Sumerian period his name seems to have been Ishkur. His wife is called Shala.

12. Tammuz:

The name Tammuz is derived from the Sumerian Dumuzi-zuab ("real child of the water depths"). He is a god of vegetation which is revived by the rains of the spring. Tammuz never became one of the great gods of the pantheon, but his popularity far exceeded that of the many gods who were regarded as greater than he. His worship is associated with that of Ishtar whose paramour he was, and the beautiful story of the descent of Ishtar to Hades was written to describe Ishtar’s pursuit of him to the depths of the under-world seeking to bring him up again. His disappearance in the under-world is associated with the disappearance of vegetation under the midsummer heat which revives again when the rain comes and the god appears once more on the earth. The cult of Tammuz survived the decay of Babylonian and Assyrian civilization and made its way into the western world. It was similar in some respects to that of Osiris in Egypt, but was not so beautiful or so humane.

13. Asshur:

The supreme god of Assyria, Asshur, was originally the local god of the city which bears the same name. During the whole of Assyrian history his chief role is as the god of war, but the speculative philosophers of Assyria absorbed into him many of the characteristics of Ellil and Marduk, going even so far as to ascribe to him the chief place in the conflict with the sea monster Tiamat in the creation epoch.

V. Hymns and Prayers.

The religious literature of the Babylonians and Assyrians culminated in a great series of hymns to the gods. These have come down to us from almost all periods of the religious history of the people. Some of them go back to the days of the old city- kingdoms and others were composed during the reign of Nabonidus when the fall of Babylon at the hands of Cyrus was imminent. The greatest number of those that have come down to us are dedicated to Shamash, the Sun-god, but many of the finest, as we have already seen, were composed in honor of Sin, the Moon-god. None of these reached monotheism. All are polytheistic, with perhaps tendencies in the direction of pantheism or henotheism. This incapacity to reach monotheism may have been partially due to the influence of the local city whose tendency was always to hold tightly to the honor of the local god. Babylonia might struggle never so hard to lift

Marduk to high and still higher position, but in spite of all its efforts he remains to the very end of the days only one god among many. And even the greatest of the Babylonian kings, Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus, continued to pay honor to Shamash in Sippar, whose temple they continually rebuilt and adorned with ever greater magnificence. Better than any description of the hymns is a specimen adequately to show their quality. Here are some lines taken from an ancient Sumerian hymn to the Moon-god which had been copied and preserved with an Assyrian translation in the library of Ashurbanipal: + O Lord, chief of the gods, who alone art exalted on earth and in heaven, Father Nannar, Lord, Anshar, chief of the gods, Father Nannar, Lord, great Ann, chief of the gods, Father Nannar, Lord, Sin, chief of the gods, Father Nanbar, Lord of Ur, chief of the gods, Father Nannar, Lord of E-gish-shir-gal, chief of the gods, Father Nannar, Lord of the veil, brilliant one, chief of the gods, Father Nannar, whose rule is perfect, chief of the gods, Father Nannar, who does march in great majesty, chief of the gods, O strong, young bull, with strong horns, perfect in muscles, with beard of lapis lazuli color, full of glory and perfection, Self-created, full of developed fruit, beautiful to look upon, in whose being one cannot sufficiently sate himself; Mother womb, begetter of all things, who has taken up his exalted habitation among living creatures; O merciful, gracious father, in whose hand rests the life of the whole world, O Lord, thy divinity is full of awe, like the far-off heaven and the broad ocean. O creator of the land, founder of sanctuaries, proclaimer of their names, O father, begetter of gods and men, who dost build dwellings and establish offerings, Who dost call to lordship, dost bestow the scepter, determinest destinies for far-off days. -Much of this is full of fine religious feeling, and the exaltation of Sin sounds as though the poet could scarcely acknowledge any other god, but the proof that other gods were invoked in the same terms and by the same kings is plentiful.

Some of these hymns are connected with magical and incantation literature, for they serve to introduce passages which are intended to drive away evil demons. A very few of them on the other hand rise to very lofty conceptions in which the god is praised as a judge of righteousness. A few lines from the greatest of all the hymns addressed to Shamash, the Sun-god, will make this plain:

COLUMN II + Who plans evil—his horn thou dost destroy, 40 Whoever in fixing boundaries annuls rights. The unjust judge thou restrainest with force. Whoever accepts a bribe, who does not judge justly —on him thou imposest sin. But he who does not accept a bribe, who has a care for the oppressed, To him Shamash is gracious, his life he prolongs. 45 The judge who renders a just decision Shall end in a palace, the place of princes shall be his dwelling. -COLUMN III + The seed of those who act unjustly shall not flourish. What their mouth declares in thy presence Thou shalt burn it up, what they purpose wilt thou annul. 15 Thou knowest their transgressions: the declaration of the wicked thou dost cast aside. Everyone, wherever he may be, is in thy care. Thou directest their judgments, the imprisoned dost thou liberate. Thou hearest, O Shamash, petition, prayer, and appeal. Humility, prostration, petitioning, and reverence. 20 With loud voice the unfortunate one cries to thee. The weak, the exhausted, the oppressed, the lowly, Mother, wife, maid appeal to thee. He who is removed from his family, he that dwelleth far from his city. -There is in this hymn no suggestion of magic or sorcery. We cannot but feel how close this poet came to an appreciation of the Sun-god as a judge of men on an ethical basis. How near he was to passing through the vale into a larger religious life!

The prayers are on the whole upon a lower plane, though some of them, notably those of

Nebuchadrezzar, reach lofty conceptions. The following may serve as a sufficient example:

O eternal ruler, lord of all being, grant that the name of the king that thou lovest, whose. name thou hast proclaimed. may flourish as seems pleasing to thee. Lead him in the right way. I am the prince that obeys thee, the creature of thy hand. Thou hast created me, and hast entrusted to me dominion over mankind. According to thy mercy, O Lord, which thou bestowest upon all, may thy supreme rule be merciful! The worship of thy divinity implant in my heart! Grant me what seems good to thee, for thou art he that hast fashioned my life.

VI. Magic:

Next in importance to the gods in the Babylonian religion are the demons who had the power to afflict men with manifold diseases of body or mind. A large part of the religion seems to have been given up to an agonized struggle against these demons, and the gods were everywhere approached by prayer to assist men against these demons. An immense mass of incantations, supposed to have the power of driving the demons out, has come down to us. The use of these incantations lay chiefly in the hands of the priests who attached great importance to specific words or sets of words. The test of time was supposed to have shown that certain words were efficacious in certain instances. If in any case the result was not secured, it could only be ascribed to the use of the wrong formula; hence there grew up a great desire to preserve exactly the words which in some cases had brought healing. Later these incantations were gathered into groups or rituals classified according to purpose or use. Of the rituals which have come down to us, the following are the most important:

1. Maqlu:

Maqlu, i.e. "burning," so called because there are in it many symbolic burnings of images or witches. This series is used in the delivering of sufferers from witches or sorcerers.

2. Shurpu:

Shurpu is another word for burning, and this series also deals much in symbolic burnings and for the same purposes as the former. In these incantations we make the acquaintance of a large number of strange demons such as the rabisu, a demon that springs unawares on its victims; the labartu, which attacks women and children; and the lilu and the lilitu, to which reference has been made before, and the utuku, a strong demon.

These incantations are for the most part a wretched jargon without meaning, and a sad commentary on the low position occupied by the religion which has attained such noble heights as that represented in the hymns and prayers. It is strange that the higher forms of religion were not able to drive out the lower, but these incantations continued to be carefully copied and used down to the very end of the Babylonian commonwealth.

VII. The Last Things.

In Babylonia, the great question of all the ages—"If a man die shall he live again?"—was asked and an attempt made to answer it. The answer was usually sad and depressing. After death the souls of men were supposed to continue in existence. It can hardly be called life. The place to which they have gone is called the "land of no return." There they lived in dark rooms amid the dust and the bats covered with a garment of feathers, and under the dominion of Nergal and Ereshkigal. When the soul arrived among the dead he had to pass judgment before the judges of the dead, the Annunaki, but little has been preserved for us concerning the manner of this judgment. There seems to have been at times an idea that it might be possible for the dead to return again to life, for in this underworld there was the water of life, which was used when the god Tammuz returned again to earth. The Babylonians seem not to have attached so much importance to this after-existence as did the Egyptians, but they did practice burial and not cremation, and placed often with the dead articles which might be used in his future existence. In earlier times the dead were buried in their own houses, and among the rich this custom seems to have prevailed until the very latest times. For others the custom of burying in an acropolis was adopted, and near the city of Kutha was an acropolis which was especially famous. In the future world there seem to have been distinctions made among the dead. Those who fell in battle seem to have had special favor. They received fresh water to drink, while those who had no posterity to put offerings at their graves suffered sore and many deprivations. It is to be hoped that later discoveries of religious texts may shed more light upon this phase of the religion which is still obscure.

VIII. Myths and Epics:

In ancient religions the myth fills a very important place, serving many of the functions of dogma in modern religions. These myths have come down to us associated usually with epics, or made a part of ancient stories which belong to the library of Ashurbanipal. Most of them have been copied from earlier Babylonian originals, which go back in origin to the wonderful period of intellectual and political development which began with Hammurabi. The most interesting of those which have been preserved for us are the story of Adapa and the sto ry of Gilgames. This same divine being Adapa, son of Ea, was employed in Ea’s temple at Eridu supplying the ritual bread and water. One day, while fishing in the sea, the south wind swept sharply upon him, overturned his boat, and he fell into the sea, the "house of the fishes." Angered by his misfortune, he broke the wings of the south wind, and for seven days it was unable to bring the comfort of the sea coolness over the hot land. And Anu said: +" Why has the south wind for seven days not blown over the land?" His messenger Ilabrat answered him: "My Lord, Adapa, the son of Ea, hath broken the wing of The south wind." -Then Anu ordered the culprit brought before him, and before he departed to this ordeal Ea gave him instructions. He is to go up to the gatekeepers of heaven, Tammuz and Gish-zida, clad in mourning garb to excite their sympathy. When they ask why he is thus attired he is to tell them that his mourning is for two gods of earth who have disappeared (that is, themselves), and then they will intercede for him. Furthermore, he is cautioned not to eat the food or drink the water that will be set before him, for Ea fears that food and water of death will be set before him to destroy him. But exactly the opposite happened. Tammuz and Gish-zida prevailed in pleading, and Anu said: "Bring for him food of life that he may eat it." They brought him food of life, but he did not eat. They brought him water of life, but he did not drink. They brought him a garment; he put it on.

They brought him oil; he anointed himself with it.

Adapa had obeyed Ea literally, and by so doing had missed the priceless boon of immortality. Some of the motives in this beautiful myth are similar to those found in Gen. Food of life seems to belong to the same category as the tree of life in Gen. The Babylonian doctrine was that man, though of Divine origin, did not share in the Divine attribute of immortality. In the Ge story Adam lost immortality because he desired to become like God. Adapa, on the other hand, was already endowed with knowledge and wisdom and failed of immortality, not because he was disobedient like Adam, but because he was obedient to Ea his creator. The legend would seem to be the Babylonian attempt to explain death.

The greatest of all the Babylonian epics is the story of Gilgames, for in it the greatest of the myths seem to pour into one great stream of epic. It was written upon twelve big tablets in the library of Ashurbanipal, some of which have been badly broken. It was, however, copied from earlier tablets which go back to the First Dynasty of Babylon. The whole story is interesting and important, but its greatest significance lies in the eleventh tablet which contains a description of the great flood and is curiously parallel to the Flood story in the Book of Gen.

IX. The Astral Theory of the Universe:

We have now passed in review the main features of the Babylonian and Assyrian religion. We have come all the way from a primitive animism to a higher organized polytheism with much theological speculation ending in a hope for existence after death, and we must now ask whether there is any great organizing idea which will bring all this religion and speculation into one great comprehensive system. A theory has been propounded which owes its exposition generally to Profes sor Hugo Winckler of the University of Berlin, who in a series of volumes and pamphlets has attempted to prove that the whole of the serious thinking and writing in the realm of religion among both the Babylonians and Assyrians rests down upon a Weltanschauung, a theory of the universe. This theory of Winckler’s has found acceptance and propagation at the hands of Dr. Alfred Jeremias, and portions of it have been accepted by other scholars. The doctrine is extremely complicated and even those who accept it in part decline it in other parts and the exposition of it is difficult. In the form which it takes in the writings of Winckler and Jeremias, it has been still further complicated quite recently by sundry alterations which make it still more difficult. Most of these can only be regarded as efforts to shield theory from criticisms which have been successful in pointing out its weakness.

According to Winckler and Jeremias, the Babylonians conceived of the cosmos as divided primarily into a heavenly and an earthly world, each of which is further subdivided into three parts. The heavenly world consists of

(1) the northern ocean;

(2) the zodiac;

(3) the heavenly ocean;

while the earthly world consists of

(1) the heaven, i.e. the air above the earth;

(2) the earth itself;

(3) the waters beneath the earth.

These great subdivisions were ruled by the gods Anu in the heaven above, Bel in the earth and air, and Ea in the waters beneath. More important than these is the zodiac, the twelve heavenly figures which span the heavens and through which the moon passes every month, the sun once a year, and the five great planets which are visible to the naked eye have their courses. These moving stars serve as the interpreters of the Divine will while the fixed stars, so says Jeremias, are related thereto as the commentary written on the margin of the Book of Rev. The rulers of the zodiac are Sin, Shamash and Ishtar, and according to the law of correspondence, the Divine power manifested in them is identical with the power of Anu, Bel and Ea. The zodiac represents the world-cycle in the year, and also in the world-year, one of these gods may represent the total Divine power which reveals itself in the cycle. By the side of these three, Sin, Shamash and Ishtar, which represent respectively the moon, sun and Venus, there are arranged Marduk which is Jupiter, Nabu which is Mercury, Ninib which is Mars, and Nergal which is Saturn, these being the planets known to the ancients. Now upon these foundations, according to Winckler, and his school, the ancient priests of Babylonia built a closely knit and carefully thought-out world-system of an astral character, and this world-system forms the kernel of the ancient and oriental conception of the universe. This conception of the universe as a double-sided principle is of tremendous importance. First, the heavenly world with its three divisions corresponds exactly to the earthly world with its three divisions. Everything on earth corresponds to its counterpart in heaven. The heavens are a mirror of earth, and in them the gods reveal their will and purpose. Everything which has happened is only an earthly copy of the heavenly original. It is still written in the heavens above and still to be read there. All the myths and all the legends, not only of Babylonia, but of all the rest of the ancient world, are to be interpreted in accordance with this theory; nothing even in history is to be understood otherwise. "An oriental history without consideration of the world era is unthinkable. The stars rule the changes of the times" (Jeremias). The consequences of this theory are so overpowering that it is difficult to deal with it in fairness to its authors and in justice to the enormous labor and knowledge which they have put upon it.

It is impossible within the reasonable limits which are here imposed to discuss theory in detail, and for our purpose it will be sufficient to say that to the great majority of modern scholars who have carefully considered it in its details it seems to lack evidence sufficient to support so enormous a structure. That an astrological structure similar at least to this actually did arise in the Hellenistic period is not here disputed. The sole dispute is as to the antiquity of it. Now it does not appear that Winckler and Jeremias have been able to produce proof, first, that the Babylonians had enough knowledge of astronomy before

the 7th century BC to have constructed such a system; and in the second place, there is no evidence that all the Babylonian gods had an astral character in the earlier period. On the contrary, there seems, as we have already attempted to show in the discussion of the pantheon, to be good reason to believe that many of the deities had no relation whatever to the stars in early times, but were rather gods of vegetation or of water or of other natural forces visible in earthly manifestations. The theory indeed may be said to have broken down by its own weight, for Winckler and Jeremias attempted to show that this theory of the universe spread to Israel, to the Greeks and to the Romans, and that it affords the only satisfactory explanation of the religion and of the history of the entire ancient world. An attempt has been made similar to previous abortive efforts to unlock all the doors of the ancient past with one key (see an interesting example cited in Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 224-25). Instead of gaining adherence in recent times, theory would appear to have lost, and even those who have given a tentative adherence to its claims, cautiously qualify the extent of their submission.

X. The Relations with the Religion of Israel:

No question concerning the religion of Babylonia and Assyria is of so great interest and importance to students of the Bible as the question of the relation between this religion and the faith of Yahweh, as professed by Israel. It seems now to be clearly demonstrated that the religion of Israel has borrowed various literary materials from its more ancient neighbor. The stories of creation and of the flood, both of them, as far as the literary contents are concerned, certainly rest upon Babylonian originals. This dependence has, however, been exaggerated by some scholars into an attempt to demonstrate that Israel took these materials bodily, whereas the close shifting and comparison to which they have been subjected in the past few years would seem to demonstrate beyond peradventure that Israel stamped whatever she borrowed with her own genius and wove an entirely new fabric. Israel used these ancient narratives as a vehicle for a higher and purer religious faith. The material was borrowed, the spirit belonged to Israel, and the spirit was Divine. Words and literary materials were secured from Babylonia, but the religious and spiritual came from Israel and from Israel’s God. The word Sabbath is Babylonian indeed, but the great social and religious institution which it represents in Israel is not Babylonian but distinctively Hebrew. The Divine name Yahweh appears among other peoples, passes over into Babylonia and afterward is used by Israel, but the spiritual God who bears the name in Israel is no Babylonian or Kenite deity. The Babylonians, during all their history and in all their speculations, never conceived a god like unto Him. He belongs to the Hebrews alone.

The gods of Babylonia are connected, as we have seen, with primitive animism or they are merely local deities. The God of Israel, on the other hand, is a God revealed in history. He brought Israel out of Egypt. He is continually made known to His people through the prophets as a God revealed in history. His religion is not developed out of Babylonian polytheism which existed as polytheism in the earliest periods and endured as polytheism unto the end. The religion of Israel, on the other hand, though some of its material origins are humble, moved steadily onward and upward until the great monotheistic idea found universal acceptance in Israel. The religions of Philistia and Phoenicia, Moab, and of Edom, were subject to the same play of influences from Babylonia and Egypt, but no larger faith developed out of them. In Israel alone ethical monotheism arose, and ethical monotheism has no roots in Babylonia. The study of the religion of Babylonia is indeed of the highest importance for the understanding of Israel’s

faith, but it is of less importance than some modern scholars have attempted to demonstrate.

LITERATURE.

L. W. King. Babylonian Religion and Mythology, London. 1899; M. Jastrow. Jr., The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, Boston, 1898 (completely revised by the author and translated into German under the title Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens, Giessen, appearing in parts, and soon to be completed. This is the standard book on the subject); Rogers, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, Especially in Its Relation to Israel, New York, 1908; Hermann Schneider. Kultur und Denken der Babylonier und Juden, Leipzig, 1910; R. P. Dhorme, La religion assyrio-babylonienne, Paris. 1910. Detailed literature on the separate phases of the religion will be found in these books.

Robert W. Rogers

BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY

See CAPTIVITY.

BABYLONIANS

bab-i-lo’-ni-anz: The inhabitants of BABYLONIA (which see). They were among the colonists planted in Samaria by the Assyrians (Ezr 4:9). "The likeness of the Babylonians in Chaldea" (Eze 23:15) refers to the pictures which were common on the walls of Babylonian palaces, and the reports of them being heard in Jerusalem, or copies of them seen there, awakened the nation’s desire for these unknown lovers, which Judah had ample occasion to repent of (Eze 23:17,23; compare 2Ki 24).

BABYLONISH GARMENT

bab-i-lo’-nish gar’ment: In the King James Version, Jos 7:21, for BABYLONISH MANTLE, which see.

BABYLONISH MANTLE

man’-tl (the King James Version Babylonish Garment): One of the articles taken by Achan from the spoil of Jericho (Jos 7:21). In the Hebrew "a mantle of Shinar." Entirely gratuitous is the suggested correction of Shinar to se‘ar, making "a hairy mantle." The Greek has psilen poikilen, which Josephus apparently understood to mean "a royal garment all woven out of gold" (Ant., V, i, 10). The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) calls it a "scarlet pallium," and some of the rabbinical traditions make it a purple robe. Such classical writers as Pliny and Martial speak of the weaving of embroidered stuffs as a famous industry of Babylonia. Many tablets that have been deciphered indicate that the industry was indeed widely extended, that its costly products were of great variety and that some of them were exported to distant markets; in fine, that the account in Joshua is characterized by great

verisimilitude.

Willis J. Beecher

BACA

ba’-ka bakha’:In the King James Version in Ps 84:6, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "the valley of Weeping," with a marginal variant which is best put in the form, "the valley of the balsam-trees." The word is elsewhere used only in the duplicated account of one of David’s battles (2Sa 5:23,24; 1Ch 14:14,15). There the translation is "the mulberry trees," with "the balsam-trees" in the margin in the Revised Version (British and American). Conjecturally the word is, by variant spelling, of the stem which denotes weeping; the tree is called "weeper" from some habit of the trickling of its gum or of the moisture on it; the valley of weeping is not a geographical locality, but a picturesque expression for the experiences of those whose strength is in Yahweh, and who through His grace find their sorrows changed into blessings.

Willis J. Beecher

BACCHIDES

bak-i-dez: Bakchides: Bacchides, ruler over Mesopotamia and a faithful friend of both Antiochus Epiphanes and Demetrius Soter, established at the request of the latter the rulership over Judea for Aleimus, who, desiring to become high priest, had made false accusations against Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 7:8 ff; Ant, XII, x, 2). Bacchides is sent the second time to Judea after the Syrian general Nicanor was killed near Adasa and Judas Maccabee had gained control of the government (1 Macc 9:1 ff; Ant, XII, x). Bacchides after an unsuccessful battle near Bethbasi was forced to make peace with Jonathan, the brother of Judas Maccabee (1 Macc 9:58 ff; Ant, XIII, i). In 1 Macc 10:12 and 2 Macc 8:30 reference is made to the strongholds Bacchides built during his second campaign against Jerusalem (1 Macc 9:50). Compare ALCIMUS; BETHBASI; JONATHAN; JUDAS MACCABAEUS; ADASA; NICANOR. less importance than some modern scholars have attempted to demonstrate.

A. L. Breslich

BACCHURUS

ba-ka’-rus: Bakchouros: One of the "holy singers" who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:24). Omitted in Ezr 10.

BACCHUS

bak’-us Dionusos; later Bakchos, the Feast of Bacchus; Dionusia: The god of wine. His worship had

extended over the whole Greek and Roman world centuries before the Christian era, and had degenerated into an orgy of drunkenness and unnamable immoralities, possibly under the influence of oriental Baal worship, such as the Hebrew prophets condemned. It has been surmised that Dionysus was originally not a Greek, but an oriental deity. His worship had been introduced into Egypt, perhaps by the Ptolemies, and Ptolemy Philopator (222-204 BC) had branded the Jews there with his emblem, the sign of the ivy. When Antiochus Epiphanes made his assault upon Jerusalem in the year 168 BC, he determined to extirpate the worship of Yahweh, which he recognized as the strength of the Jewish resistance, and to replace it by Greek religion. All worship of Yahweh and the observance of Jewish rites, such as the Sabbath and circumcision, were prohibited. Heathen worship was set up all over Judea, and in the temple at Jerusalem on the altar of burnt offering an altar to Jupiter was erected, "the abomination that maketh desolate" (Da 11:31), and a swine was sacrificed upon it (see ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION). The immoral practices associated with heathen worship in those days established themselves in the temple. When this feast of Bacchus (Dionysus) with all its revelry came round, the Jews were compelled to go in procession in honor of Bacchus (Dionysus), wearing wreaths of ivy, the emblem of the god (2 Macc 6:7). Some years later, when the worship of Yahweh had been restored, Nicanor the general of Demetrius I, in conducting the war against Judas Maceabacus, threatened the priests that, unless they delivered Judas up as a prisoner, "he would raze the temple of God even with the ground, break down the altar, and erect there a temple unto Bacchus (Dionysus) for all to see" (2 Macc 14:33).

See DIONYSIA.

LITERATURE.

Cheyne, article "Bacchus," EB; Kent, History of the Jewish People, I, 328-29; Josephus, Ant, XII, v, 4.

T. Rees

BACENOR

ba-se’-nor Bakenor: An officer in the army of Judas Maccabee engaged in war against Gorgias, governor of Idumaea (2 Macc 12:35). Compare Ant, XlI, viii, 6.

BACHRITE

bak’-rit. See BECHER.

BACK, BACK PARTS

(1) ‘achar, ("back side" as in the King James Version): "He led the flock to the back of the wilderness" (Ex 3:1), i.e. "to the pasture-lands on the other side of the desert from the Midianite

encampments."

(2) ‘achor, ("hinder part," "the West"): Used of God in an anthropomorphic sense ("Thou shalt see my back," Ex 33:23) to signify "the after-glow of the Divine radiance," the faint reflection of God’s essential glory. See also Isa 38:17 and compare 1Ki 14:9 and Ne 9:26.

(3) opisthen, ("back side"): "A book written within and on the back" (Re 5:1), "but the back of a book is not the same as the reverse side of a roll. John was struck, not only with the fact that the roll was sealed, but also with the amount of writing it contained" (HDB, I, 231). Compare Eze 2:10.

M. O. Evans

BACKBITE

bak’-bit raghal; doloo: To slander the absent, like a dog biting behind the back, where one cannot see; to go about as a talebearer. "He that backbiteth [Revised Version, slandereth] not with his tongue" (Ps 15:3).

Backbiters bak’-bit-~rz (Greek katalaloi: Men who speak against. Vulgate, "detractors" (Ro 1:30)).

Backbiting bak’-bit-ing: cether: Adj. "a backbiting tongue"; literally, "a tongue of secrecy" (Pr 25:23). katalalia: substantive "a speaking against" (2Co 12:20; Wisdom 1:11); "evil speaking" (1Pe 2:1). glossa trite: "a backbiting tongue" (the King James Version of Ecclesiasticus 28:14,15); more literally translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "a third person’s tongue."

T. Rees

BACKSIDE

bak’sid’:See BACK.

BACKSLIDE

bak’-slid’ (meshubhah; Ho 11:7; 14:4 and often in Ho and Jer, shobhabh; shobhebh, in Jer, 4 times: all meaning "turning back or away," "apostate," "rebellious." carar, in Ho 4:16 =" stubborn," "rebellious"; the Revised Version (British and American) "stubborn"): In all places the word is used of Israel forsaking Yahweh, and with a reference to the covenant relation between Yahweh and the nation, conceived as a marriage tie which Israel had violated. Yahweh was Israel’s husband, and by her idolatries with other gods she had proved unfaithful (Jer 3:8,14; 14:7; Ho 14:4). It may be questioned whether Israel was guilty so much of apostasy and defection, as of failure to grow with the growing revelation of God. The prophets saw that their contemporaries fell far short of their own ideal, but they

did not realize how far their predecessors also had fallen short of the rising prophetic standard in ideal and action. See APOSTASY.

Backslider bak’-slid-er cugh lebh: "The backslider in heart shall be filled with his own ways" (Pr 14:14). But the Revised Version (British and American) "backslider" conveys the wrong impression of an apostate. The Hebrew expression here implies simply non-adherence to the right, "The bad man reaps the fruits of his act" (Toy, Prov, in loc.).

T. Rees

BADGER

baj’er: tachash: The word tachash occurs in the descriptions of the tabernacle in Ex 25; 26; 35; 36; 39, in the directions for moving the tabernacle as given in Nu 4, and in only one other passage, Eze 16:10, where Jerusalem is spoken of as a maiden clothed and adorned by her Lord. In nearly all these passages the word tachash occurs with ‘or, "skin," rendered: the King James Version "badgers’ skins," the Revised Version (British and American) "sealskin," the Revised Version, margin "porpoise-skin," Septuagint dermata huakinthina. In all the passages cited in Ex and Nu these skins are mentioned as being used for coverings of the tabernacle; in Eze 16:10, for shoes or sandals. The Septuagint rendering would mean purple or blue skins, which however is not favored by Talmudic writers or by modern grammarians, who incline to believe that tachash is the name of an animal. The rendering, "badger," is favored by the Talmudic writers and by the possible etymological connection of the word with the Latin taxus and the German Dachs. The main objection seems to be that badgers’ skins would probably not have been easily available to the Israelites. The badger, Meles taxus, while fairly abundant in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, does not seem to occur in Sinai or Egypt.

A seal, Monachus albiventer (Arabic fukmeh), the porpoise, Phocoena comrnunis, and the common dolphin, Delphinus delphis, are all found in the Mediterranean. The dugong, Halicore dugong, inhabits the Indian Ocean and adjoining waters from the Red Sea to Australia. The Arabic tukhas or dukhas is near to tachash and is applied to the dolphin, which is also called delfin. It may be used also for the porpoise or even the seal, and is said by Tristram and others to be applied to the dugong. The statement of Gesenius (Boston, 1850, under the word "tachash") that the Arabs of Sinai wear sandals of dugong skin is confirmed by recent travelers, and is of interest with reference to Eze 16:10, ".... shod thee with badgers’ skin" (King James Version). The dugong is a marine animal from 5 to 9 ft. in length, frequenting the shore and feeding upon seaweed. It belongs to the order Sirenia. While outwardly resembling Cetacea (whales and porpoises), the Sirenia are really more allied to the Ungulata, or hoofed animals. The dugong of the Indian Ocean and the manatee of the Atlantic and of certain rivers of Africa and South America, are the only living representatives of the Sirenia. A third species, the sea-cow of Behring Sea, became extinct in the 18th century. The seal and porpoise of the Revised Version (British and American), the dolphin, and the dugong are all of about the same size and all inhabit the seas bordering on Egypt and Sinai, so that all are possible candidates for identification with the tachash. Of the four, recent opinion seems most to favor the dugong.

Mr. S. M. Perlmann has suggested (Zoologist, set. 4, XII, 256, 1908) that the okapi is the animal indicated by tachash.

Gesenius (Leipzig, 1905) cites Bondi (Aegyptiaca, i. ff) who adduces the Egyptian root t-ch-s and makes the expression ‘or tachash mean "soft-dressed skin." This suits the context in every passage and is very promising explanation.

Alfred Ely-Day

BAEAN

be’-an huioi Baian; the King James Version Bean; 1 Macc 5:4: A tribe mentioned only because of its malignant hatred of the Jews. Its aggressive hostility against their religion and the rebuilding of their sanctuary duplicated the conspiracy of Sanballat and his confederates against the restoration of Jerusalem and the temple in the days of Nehemiah (compare Ne 4:7,8). Utterly exterminated by Judas Maccabeus who burned alive, in towers, many of the imprisoned people. See MAON.

BAG

Bags of various kinds are mentioned in the English Bible, but often in a way to obscure rather than tr the original.

(1) "Bag" is used for a Hebrew word which means a shepherd’s "bag," rendered "wallet" in the Revised Version (British and American). This "bag" of the shepherd or "haversack" of the traveler was of a size sufficient for one or more days’ provisions. It was made of the skin of animals, ordinarily undressed, as most of the other "bags" of ancient times were, and was carried slung across the shoulder. This is the "scrip for the journey" pera mentioned in Mt 10:10 and its parallel (the King James Version). ("Scrip" is Old English, now obsolete.) A unique word appears in 1Sa 17:40,49 which had to be explained even to Hebrew readers by the gloss, "the shepherd’s bag," but which is likewise rendered "wallet" by the American Standard Revised Version.

(2) "Bag" translates also a word ballantion which stands for the more finished leather pouch, or satchel which served as a "purse" (see Christ’s words, Lu 10:4 King James Version: "Carry neither purse, nor scrip," and 12:33 King James Version: "Provide yourselves bags which wax not old"). The word rendered "purse" in Mt 10:9: "Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses"; Mr 6:8: "No money in their purse," is a different word entirely zone, the true rendering of which is "girdle" (Revised Version, margin). The oriental "girdle," though sometimes of crude leather, or woven camel’s hair (see GIRDLE), was often of fine material and elegant workmanship, and was either made hollow so to carry money, or when of silk or cloth, worn in folds, when the money was carried in the folds.

(3) The small "merchant’s bag" often knotted in a handkerchief for carrying the weights, such as is

mentioned in De 25:13: "Thou shalt not have in thy bag divers weights, a great and a small," was another variety. This too was used as "purse," as in the case of the proposed common purse of the wicked mentioned in Pr 1:14: "We will all have one purse," and sometimes carried in the girdle (compare Isa 46:6).

(4) Then there was the "bag" tseror, rendered "bundle" in Ge 42:35 which was the favorite receptacle for valuables, jewels, as well as money, used figuratively with fine effect in 1Sa 25:29: "The soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life"—"life's jewel-case" (see 2Ki 12:10 where the money of the temple was said to be put up "tied up" in bags). This was a "bag" that could be tied with a string: "Behold, every man's bundle of money was in his sack," and with (compare Pr 7:20) "He hath taken a bag of money with him" (compare Hag 1:6: "earneth wages to put it into a bag holes"). A seal was sometimes put on the knot, which occasions the figure of speech used in Job 14:16,17, "Dost thou not watch over my sin? My transgression is sealed up in a bag," i.e. it is securely kept and reckoned against me (compare also 1Sa 9:7; 21:5 where the Hebrew keli, is rendered by "vessels" and stands for receptacles for carrying food, not necessarily bags).

(5) Another Hebrew word chariT; Arabic charitat, is used, on the one hand, for a "bag" large enough to hold a talent of silver (see 2Ki 5:23, "bound two talents of silver in two bags"), and on the other, for a dainty lady's satchel, such as is found in Isa 3:22 (wrongly rendered "crisping pins" in the King James Version). This is the most adequate Hebrew word for a large bag. (6) The "bag" which Judas carried (see Joh 12:6 the King James Version, "He was a thief and had the bag"; compare Joh 13:29) was in reality the small "box" (Revised Version, margin) originally used for holding the mouthpieces of wind instruments (Kennedy, in the 1-volume HDB). The Hebrew 'argaz, (found only here) of 1Sa 6:8, rendered "coffer" in English Versions of the Bible and translated glossokomon, by Josephus, appears to stand for a small "chest" used to hold the gold figures sent by the Philistines as a guilt offering. It is from a word that means "to wag," "to move to and fro"; compare the similar word in Arabic meaning a bag filled with stones hung at the side of the camel to "preserve" equilibrium (Gesenius). But the same word Josephus uses is found in modern Greek and means "purse" or "bag" (Hatch). Later to "carry the bag" came to mean to be treasurer.

George B. Eager

BAGGAGE

bag'aj:

(1) keli, ("the impedimenta of an army"): "David left his baggage in the hand of the keeper of the baggage" (1Sa 17:22); "at Michmash he layeth up his baggage" (Isa 10:28). The American Standard Revised Version gives baggage for "stuff" at 1Sa 10:22; 25:13; 30:24.

(2) aposkeue: "Beside the baggage" (Judith 7:2), "a great ado and much baggage" (1 Macc 9:35,39), "the women and the children and also the baggage" (the King James Version "and other baggage"; 2 Macc

12:21).

(3) aposkeuazomai, ("to make ready for leaving," "to pack up baggage"): "We took up (made ready, Revised Version margin) our baggage" (Ac 21:15, the King James Version "carriages"), i.e. what they could carry—English: "luggage"; but others understand the term of the loading of the baggage animals.

M. O. Evans

BAGO

ba'-go (Codex Alexandrinus, Bago; Codex Alexandrinus, @Banai = Bigvai [Ezr 8:14]): The descendants of Bago returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 8:40).

BAGOAS

ba-go'as Bagoas: The eunuch in charge of the household of Holofernes whom the latter engaged to bring Judith to his palace (Judith 12:11 ff; 13:1,3; 14:14). Compare JUDITH.

BAGOI

bag'-o-i (Codex Alexandrinus, Bagoi; Codex Vaticanus, Bosai = Bigvai [Ezr 2:14; Ne 7:19]): The descendants of B. returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:14).

BAHARUMITE; øBARHUMITE

ba-ha'-rum-it; bar-hu'-mit (1Ch 11:33; 2Sa 23:31): A native of BAHURIM (which see).

BAHURIM

ba-hu'-rim bachurim; (Baoureim usually, but there are variants): A place in the territory of Benjamin which lay on an old road from Jerusalem to Jericho followed by David in his flight from Absalom (2Sa 15:32-16:5 ff). It ran over the Mount of Olives and down the slopes to the East. The Talmud identifies it with Ale, math, the modern Almit, about a mile beyond 'Anata, going from Jerusalem. If this identification is correct, Wady Farah may be the brook of water (2Sa 17:20). Here Paltiel was parted from his wife Miehal by Abner (2Sa 3:16). It was the home of Shimei, who ran along a ridge of the hill cursing and throwing stones at the fugitive king (2Sa 16:5; 1Ki 2:8). In Bahurim Jonathan and Ahimaaz, the native messengers of David, were concealed in a well by a loyal woman (2Sa 17:18 ff). Azmaveth, one of David's heroes, was a of Bahurim. In 2Sa 23:31 we should read, as in 1Ch 11:33,

Barahumite. W. Ewing

BAITERUS

ba-i’-ter-us Baiterous; (the King James Version Meterus): The descendants of Baiterus returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (1 Esdras 5:17). Omitted in Ezr 2 and Ne 7.

BAJITH

ba’-jith.

See BAYITH.

BAKBAKKAR

bak-bak’-ar baqbaqqar, "investigator": A Levite (1Ch 9:15).

BAKBUK

bak’-buk baqbuq, "bottle" perhaps onomatopoetical, referring to the clucking noise created by the pouring out of the contents of a bottle = Acub, (1 Esdras 5:31): The descendants of Bakbuk returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:51; Ne 7:53).

BAKBUKIAH

bak-bu-ki’-a baqbuqyah, ("the Lord pours out"):

(1) A Levite who "dwelt in Jerusalem" after the return from Babylon (Ne 11:17).

(2) A Levite who returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ne 12:9).

(3) A Levite and porter keeping "the watch at the store-houses of the gates" (Ne 12:25).

BAKEMEATS

bak’-mets: Only in Ge 40:17 the King James Version and the English Revised Version. "All manner of baked food for Pharaoh" the American Standard Revised Version. Any kind of meat baked or cooked.

See BREAD; FOOD.

BAKING

bak’-ing.

See BREAD.

BAKING PAN

See BREAD; PAN.

BALAAM

ba’-lam bil‘am, ("devourer"): The son of Beor, from a city in Mesopotamia called Pethor, a man possessing the gift of prophecy, whose remarkable history may be found in Nu 22:2-24:25; compare Num 31:8,16; De 23:4; Jos 13:22; 24:9; Ne 13:2; Mic 6:5; 2Pe 2:15; Jude 1:11; Re 2:14.

1. History:

When the children of Israel pitched their tents in the plains of Moab, the Moabites entered into some sort of an alliance with the Midianites. At the instigation of Balak, at that time king of the Moabites, the elders of the two nations were sent to Balaam to induce him, by means of a bribe, to pronounce a curse on the advancing hosts of the Israelites. But, in compliance with God’s command Balaam, refused to go with the elders. Quite different was the result of a second request enhanced by the higher rank of the messengers and by the more alluring promises on the part of Balak. Not only did God permit Balaam to go with the men, but he actually commanded him to do so, cautioning him, however, to act according to further instructions. While on his way to Balak, this injunction was strongly impressed on the mind of Balaam by the strange behavior of his ass and by his encounter with the Angel of the Lord.

Accompanied by Balak who had gone out to meet the prophet, Balaam came to Kiriath-huzoth. On the next morning he was brought up "into the high places of Baal" commanding a partial view of the camp of the Israelites. But instead of a curse he pronounced a blessing. From there he was taken to the top of Peor, yet this change of places and external views did not alter the tendency of Balaam’s parables; in fact, his spirit even soared to greater heights and from his lips fell glowing words of praise and admiration, of benediction and glorious prophecy. This, of course, fully convinced Balak that all further endeavors to persuade the seer to comply with his wishes would be in vain, and the two parted.

Nothing else is said of Balaam, until we reach Nu 31. Here in 31:8 we are told of his violent death at the hands of the Israelites, and in 31:16 we learn of his shameful counsel which brought disgrace and disaster into the ranks of the chosen people.

2. Problems:

Now, there are a number of interesting problems connected with this remarkable story. We shall try to

solve at least some of the more important ones.

(1) Was Balaam a prophet of Jeh? For an answer we must look to Nu 22-24. Nowhere is he called a prophet. He is introduced as the son of Beor and as a man reputed to be of great personal power (compare Nu 22:6). The cause of this is to be found in the fact that he had intercourse of some kind with God (compare Nu 22:9,20; 22:22-35; 23:4; 23:16). Furthermore, it is interesting to note how Balaam was enabled to deliver his parables. First it is said: "And Yahweh put a word in Balaam's mouth" (Nu 23:5; compare Nu 23:16), a procedure seemingly rather mechanical, while nothing of the kind is mentioned in Nu 24. Instead we meet with the remarkable sentence: "And when Balaam saw that it pleased Yahweh to bless Israel, he went not, as at the other times, to meet with enchantments ...."(Nu 24:1), and then: "the Spirit of God came upon him" (24:2b). All this is very noteworthy and highly instructive, especially if we compare with it 24:3 the Revised Version, margin and Nu 24:4: "The man whose eye is opened saith; he saith, who heareth the words of God, who seeth the vision of the Almighty," etc. The inference is plain enough: Balaam knew the Lord, the Yahweh of the Israelites, but his knowledge was dimmed and corrupted by heathen conceptions. He knew enough of God to obey Him, yet for a long time he hoped to win Him over to his own selfish plan (compare 23:4). Through liberal sacrifices he expected to influence God's actions. Bearing this in mind, we see the import of Nu 24:1. After fruitless efforts to cajole God into an attitude favorable to his hidden purpose, he for a time became a prophet of the Lord, yielding to the ennobling influences of His spirit. Here was a chance for his better nature to assert itself permanently and to triumph over the dark forces of paganism. Did he improve this opportunity? He did not (compare Nu 31:8,16).

(2) Is the Balaam of Nu 22-24 identical with the person of the same name mentioned in Nu 31? Quite a number of scholars deny it, or, to be more accurate, there are according to their theory two accounts of Balaam: the one in Nu 22- 24 being favorable to his character, and the other in Nu 31 being quite the reverse. It is claimed the two accounts could only be made to agree by modifying or eliminating Nu 24:25. Now, we believe that Nu 31:16 actually does modify the report of Balaam's return contained in Nu 24:25. The children of Israel slew Balaam with the sword (Nu 31:8). Why? Because of his counsel of Num 31:16. We maintain that the author of Nu 24:25 had this fact in mind when he wrote Nu 25:1: "And .... the people began to play the harlot," etc. Thus, he closely connects the report of Balaam's return with the narrative contained in Nu 9:5. Therefore, we regard Nu 31:8,16 as supplementary to Nu 22-24. But here is another question:

(3) Is the narrative in Nu 22-24 the result of combining different traditions? In a general way, we may answer this question in the affirmative, and only in a general way we can distinguish between two main sources of tradition. But we maintain that they are not contradictory to each other, but supplementary.

(4) What about the talking of the ass and the marvelous prophecies of Balaam? We would suggest the following explanation. By influencing the soul of Balaam, God caused him to interpret correctly the inarticulate sounds of the animal. God's acting on the soul and through it on the intellect and on the hearts of men—this truth must be also applied to Balaam's wonderful prophetic words. They are called meshaliym or sayings of a prophet, a diviner.

In the first of these "parables" (Nu 23:7-10) he briefly states his reasons for pronouncing a blessing; in the second parable (Nu 23:18-24) he again emphasizes the fact that he cannot do otherwise than bless the Israelites, and then he proceeds to pronounce the blessing at some greater length. In the 3rd (Nu 24:3-9) he describes the glorious state of the people, its development and irresistible power. In the last four parables (Nu 24:15-24) he partly reveals the future of Israel and other nations: they are all to be destroyed, Israel's fate being included in the allusion to Eber. Now, at last, Balaam is back again in his own sphere denouncing others and predicting awful disasters. (On the "star out of Jacob," Nu 24:17, see ASTRONOMY, ii, 9; STAR OF THE MAGI.)

3. Balaam's Character:

This may furnish us a clue to his character. It, indeed, remains "instructively composite." A soothsayer who might have become a prophet of the Lord; a man who loved the wages of unrighteousness, and yet a man who in one supreme moment of his life surrendered himself to God's holy Spirit; a person cumbered with superstition, covetousness and even wickedness, and yet capable of performing the highest service in the kingdom of God: such is the character of Balaam, the remarkable Old Testament type and, in a sense, the prototype of Judas Iscariot.

4. Balaam as a Type:

In 2Pe 2:15 Balaam's example is used as a means to illustrate the pernicious influence of insincere Christian teachers. The author might have alluded to Balaam in the passage immediately preceding 2Pe 2:15 because of his abominable counsel. This is done in Re 2:14. Here, of course, Balaam is the type of a teacher of the church who attempts to advance the cause of God by advocating an unholy alliance with the ungodly and worldly, and so conforming the life of the church to the spirit of the flesh.

LITERATURE.

Butler's Sermons, "Balaam"; ICC, "Numbers."

William Baur

BALAC

ba'-lak.

See BALAK.

BALADAN

bal'-a-dan bal'adhan, "He (i.e. Merodach) has given a son": Baladan is said in 2Ki 20:12 and Isa 39:1 to

have been the father of Berodach (Merodach)-Baladan, king of Babylon. Some have thought that the Biblical. writer was wrong here, inasmuch as it is said in the inscriptions of Sargon (Annals, 228, 315; Pt., 122), that Merodach-Baladan was the son of Yakin. It is evident, however, from the analogy of Jehu, who is called by the Assyrian kings the son of Omri, that Yakin is to be looked upon as the founder of the dynasty or kingdom, rather than as the father of Merodach-Baladan. The Bith Yakin, over which Merodach-Baladan is said to have been king, corresponds exactly to the phrase Bith Khumria, or House of Omri, over which Jehu is said to have ruled. There is no reason, then, for supposing that there is an error in either case. There is, however, good reason for believing that the Merodach-Baladan of the Book of Kings was the son of another king of the same name. That only the latter part of the father's name is here mentioned may be compared with the Shalman of Ho 10:14 for the more fully-written Shalmaneser of 2Ki 17:3; and with the Jareb of Ho 5:13 and Ho 10:6, probably for Sennacherib. Such abbreviation of proper names was usual among the Assyrians and Babylonians. See Tallquist, Namenbuch, xiv- xix.

R. Dick Wilson

BALAH

ba'la balah; Bola: A place, unidentified, in the territory of Simeon (Jos 19:3), called Bilhah in 1Ch 4:29. It may be identical with Baalah in Judah (Jos 15:29).

BALAK

ba'-ak balaq, ("devastator" or "one who lays waste"): Mentioned in connection with the story of Balaam/ Balak (Nu 22-24; compare Jos 24:9; Jud 11:25; Mic 6:5; Re 2:14). He was the king of Moab who hired Balaam to pronounce a curse on the Israelites.

See BALAAM.

BALAMON

bal'-a-mon Balamon; (the King James Version, Balamo): In the field between Balamon and Dothaim Manasses, the husband of Judith, was buried (Judith 8:3). Compare Baal-hamon (So 8:11).

BALANCE

bal'-ans The English word "balance" is from the Latin bilanx =" having two scales" (bi =" two" and lanx =" plate," or "scale"). It is used to render three Hebrew words:

(1) mo'znayim (Le 19:36; Job 6:2; Ps 62:9; Pr 11:1; Isa 40:12,15; Jer 32:10, etc.);

(2) qaneh (Isa 46:6), and

(3) pelec (Pr 16:11).

It is found in the sing., e.g. "a just balance" (Pr 16:11); "a pair of balances" (Re 6:5, etc.), as well as in the plur., e.g. "just balances" (Le 19:36), "weighed in the balances" (Da 5:27, etc.).

1. Balances among the Ancient Hebrews; the Parts, etc.:

(1) The "balances" of the ancient Hebrews differed little, if at all, from those used by the Egyptians (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt (1878), II, 246 f). They consisted, probably, of a horizontal bar, either pivoted on a perpendicular rod (see Erman, Aegypten, I, 615 for similar Egyptian balances), or suspended from a cord and held in the hand, the more primitive form. At the ends of the bar were pans, or hooks, from which the things to be weighed were suspended, sometimes in bags.

A good description of the more developed and final form is this: A beam with its fulcrum in the middle and its arms precisely equal. From the ends of the arms were suspended two scales, the one to receive the object to be weighed, the other the counterpoise, or weight.

(2) The weights were of stone at first and are so named in De 25:13 King James Version, margin. A pair of scales (the King James Version "a pair of balances") is used in Re 6:5 by a figure of speech for the balance as a whole; only once is the beam so used, in Isa 46:6, literally, "weigh silver in the beam." Abraham, we are told (Ge 23:16), "weighed the silver."

2. Probably of Babylonian Origin:

The basis and fountain-head of all systems of weights and measurements is to be traced, it is now thought, to Babylonia; but the primitive instruments and systems were subject to many modifications as they entered other regions and passed into the derivative systems. The Roman "balance" is the same as our steelyard (vulgarly called "stillyards"). Compare the Chinese, Danish, etc.

3. The System of Weighing Liable to Fraud:

Though the "balances" in ancient times were rudely constructed, the weighing could be done quite accurately, as may be seen in the use of equally primitive balances in the East today. But the system was liable to fraud. A "false balance" might be literally one so constructed that the arms were of unequal length, when the longer arm would be intended, of course, for the article to be weighed. The system was liable, however, to various other subtle abuses then as now; hence the importance in God’s sight of "true weights" and a "just balance" is enforced again and again (see Le 19:36; Pr 11:1; 16:11; 20:23; Am 8:5; Mic 6:11, etc.).

4. "Wicked Balances" Condemned:

"A false balance is an abomination to Yahweh" (Pr 11:1; compare Pr 20:23), and "a just balance and scales are Yahweh's" (Pr 16:11). Ho 12:7 condemns "the balances of deceit" in the hand of the wicked; Am 8:5 (the King James Version) cries out upon "falsifying the balances by deceit," and Mic 6:11 denounces "wicked balances." Indeed, the righteousness of a just balance and true weights, and the iniquity of false ones are everywhere emphasized by the lawmakers, prophets and moral teachers of Israel, and the preacher or teacher who would expose and denounce such things in God's name today need be at no loss for texts and precedents.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

LITERATURE.

Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt; Erman, Egypt; Lepsius, Denkmaler; and articles on "Balance." etc., in Smith, DB, EB, Jewish Encyclopedia, HDB, etc.

George B. Eager

BALANCINGS

bal'-ans-ins: "The balancings of the clouds" (Job 37:16), the manner in which they are poised and supported in the air, alike with their mysterious spreadings and motions, challenge the strongest intellect to explain.

BALASAMUS

ba-las'-a-mus.

See BAALSAMUS.

BALD LOCUST

bold lo'kust.

See LOCUST.

BALDNESS

bald'-ness qorchah: The reference in the Bible to baldness is not to the natural loss of hair, but to baldness produced by shaving the head. This was practiced as a mark of mourning for the dead (Le 21:5; Isa 15:2; 22:12); as the result of any disaster (Am 8:10; Mic 1:16). The custom arose from the fact that the hair was regarded as a special ornament. It was the custom of the people of the land, and the

Israelites were strictly forbidden to practice it (Le 21:5; Deut 14:1). These are striking passages with reference to the knowledge the Israelites had concerning the future life. This is saying to them what Paul said to the Thessalonians (1Th 4:13). To call one a "bald head" was an epithet of contempt, and was sometimes applied to persons who were not naturally bald. It was the epithet applied by certain infidel young men to Elisha (2Ki 2:23,24). In a figurative sense it is used to express the barrenness of the country (Jer 47:5).

See HAIR; SHAVING.

Jacob W. Kapp

BALL

bol (dur): A rare Hebrew word used in this sense only in Isa 22:18, and correctly rendered in the American Standard Revised Version "He will surely wind thee round and round, and toss thee like a ball into a large country." De Or, Bottcher, Jastrow, following Talmud, regard the noun as kaddur, but perhaps incorrectly.

See also GAMES.

BALM

bam (tseri, tsori; Septuagint rhetine): The name of an odoriferous resin said to be brought from Gilead by Ishmaelite Arabs on their way to Egypt (Ge 37:25). It is translated "balm" in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but is called "mastic," the Revised Version, margin. In Ge 43:11 it is one of the gifts sent by Jacob to Joseph, and in Eze 27:17 it is named as one of the exports from Judea to Tyre. The prophet Jeremiah refers figuratively to its medicinal properties as an application to wounds and as a sedative (Jer 8:22; 46:11; 51:8). The name is derived from a root signifying "to leak," and is applied to it as being an exudation. There is a sticky, honeylike gum resin prepared at the present day at Jericho, extracted from the Balanites Aegyptiaca grown in the Ghor, and sold to travelers in small tin boxes as "Balm of Gilead," but it is improbable that this is the real tscori and it has no medicinal value. The material to which the classic authors applied the name is that known as Mecca balsam, which is still imported into Egypt from Arabia, as it was in early times. This is the exudation from the Balsamodendron opobalsamum, a native of southern Arabia and Abyssinia. The tree is small, ragged-looking and with a yellowish bark like that of a plane tree, and the exudation is said to be gathered from its smaller branches. At the present day it grows nowhere in Palestine. Dr. Post and other botanists have sought for it on the Ghor and in Gilead, and have not found it, and there is no trace of it in the neighborhood of Jericho, which Pliny says is its only habitat. Strabo describes it as growing by the Sea of Galilee, as well as at Jericho, but both these and other ancient writers give inconsistent and incorrect descriptions of the tree evidently at second hand. We learn from Theophrastus that many of the spices of the farther East reached the Mediterranean shore through Palestine, being brought by Arab caravans which would traverse the indefinitely bounded tract East of Jordan to which the name Gilead is

given, and it was probably thus that the balm received its local name. Mecca balsam is an orange-yellow, treacly fluid, mildly irritating to the skin, possibly a weak local stimulant and antiseptic, but of very little remedial value.

Alex. Macalister

BALM OF GILEAD

The people of Jericho today prepare for the benefit of pilgrims a "Balm of Gilead" from the zaqqum (Balanites Aegyptiaca), but this has no serious claims to be the balm of antiquity. If we are to look beyond the borders of modern Palestine we may credit the tradition which claims that Mecca balsam, a product of Balsamodendron Gileadense and B. opobalsamum, was the true "balm," and Post (HDB, I, 236) produces evidence to show that these plants were once grown in the Jordan valley. Yet another suggestion, made by Lagarde, is that the tsori = sturax, and if so then "balm" would be the inspissated juice of the Storax- tree (Stytax officinalis), a common inhabitant of Gilead.

See also BALM.

E. W. G. Masterman

BALNUUS

bal-nu’-us (Codex Alexandrinus, Balnouos; Codex Vaticanus, Balnous = Binnui (Ezr 10:30)): Balnuus put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:31).

BALSAM bol’-sam (basam, besem; hedusmata; thumiamata): Is usually "spices" but in the Revised Version, margin (So 5:1,13; 6:2) is rendered as "balsam." It was an ingredient in the anointing oil of the priests (Ex 25:6; 35:28). The Queen of Sheba brought it as a present to Solomon (1Ki 10:2) in large quantity (1Ki 10:10) and of a finer quality (2Ch 9:9) than that brought as a regular tribute by other visitors (1Ki 10:25). In the later monarchy Hezekiah had a treasure of this perfume (2Ch 32:27) which he displayed to his Babylonian visitors (Isa 39:2); and after the captivity the priests kept a store of it in the temple (1Ch 9:30). According to Ezekiel the Syrians imported it from Sheba (Eze 27:22). There is a tradition preserved in Josephus (Ant., VIII, vi, 6) that the Queen of Sheba brought roots of the plant to Solomon, who grew them in a garden of spices at Jericho, probably derived from the references to such a garden in So 5:1,13; 6:2. This may be the source of the statements of Strabo, Trogus and Pliny quoted above (see BALM). It was probably the same substance as the BALM described above, but from the reference in Ex 30:7; 35:8, it may have been used as a generic name for fragrant resins. The root from which the word is derived signifies "to be fragrant," and fragrant balsams or resins are known in modern Arabic as bahasan. The trees called in 2Sa 5:23,24 (Revised Version, margin) "balsam-trees" were certainly not those which yielded this substance, for there are none in the Shepehlah but there are both mulberry trees and terebinths in the district between Rephaim and Gezer. When used as a perfume the name basam seems to have been adopted, but as a medicinal remedy it is called tsori.

Alex. Macalister

BALTASAR

bal-ta’-sar (Baltasar; the King James Version Balthasar):

(1) The Greek of Hebrew, belTesha’tstsar, or belTe’shatstsar, perhaps corresponding to BalaT-sar-ucur, "protect the life of the king," the Babylonian cognomen of Daniel. Compare Belteshazzar (Da 1:7; 2:26; 4:8 ff, et al.).

(2) Baltasar is also the Greek of the Hebrew belsha’tstsar, or bel’shatstsar, the name of the last king of Babylon (corresponding to the Babylonian Bel-sar-ucur; Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, III, 396; Syriac Blitshazzar; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) Baltassar). Compare Baruch 1 11 and Belshazzar (Da 5:1 ff; 7:1; 8:1).

(3) The name of one of the Magi who according to the legend visited Jesus at Bethlehem: Melchior from Nubia, Balthasar from Godolia, Caspar from Tharsis.

A. L. Breslich

BAMAH

ba’-ma, ba’-ma (bamah, "high place"): The word appears in Eze 20:29 where reference is made to former "high-place worship," the prophet speaking with contempt of such manner of worship. Ewald suggests a play of words, ba’," come" and mah, "what," "what (mah) is the high place (ba-mah) whereunto ye come (ba’)?" It is possible that reference is made to a prominent high place like the one at Gibeon (compare 1Ki 3:4; 1Ch 16:39; 21:29; 2Ch 13) for which the name "Bamah" was retained after the reform mentioned by the prophet.

BAMOTH; BAMOTH-BAAL

ba’-moth, ba’-moth-ba’-al (bamoth-ba’al, "high places of Baal"): Bamoth is referred to in Nu 21:19,20, as a station in the journeyings of Israel North of the Arnon. It is probably the same place as the Bamoth-baal of Nu 22:41 (Revised Version margin), whither Balak, king of Moab, conducted Balaam to view and to curse Israel. Bamoth-baal is named in Jos 13:17 as one of the cities given to Reuben. Mesha, on the Moabite Stone, speaks of having "rebuilt" Beth-bamoth.

BAN

(A, Ban; B, Bainan; 1 Esdras 5:37 = Tobiah (Ezr 2:60; Ne 7:62); some manuscripts of the Septuagint

read Boua): The descendants of Ban were not able to trace their ancestry to show "how they were of Israel."

BANAIAS

ban-a-i’-as (Banaias; 1 Esdras 9:35 = Benaiah (Ezr 10:43)): Banaias put away his "strange wife."

BAND

The English word has two generic meanings, each shading off into several specific meanings:

(1) that which holds together, binds or encircles: a bond;

(2) a company of men. The second sense may philologically and logically have been derived from the first, men being held together by social ties. Both meanings appear in Old Testament and New Testament representing various Hebrew and Greek words.

(1) A band

(a) (’ecur): a flaxen rope (Jud 15:14); a band of iron and brass (Da 4:15,23); metaphorically used of a false woman’s hands (Ec 7:26).

(b) (chebhel): "The bands of the wicked have robbed me" (the King James Version of Ps 119:61), where "bands" =" troops" by mistr; the Revised Version (British and American) "The cords of the wicked have wrapped me round"; plural chobhlim =" bands" = the name of the prophet’s symbolic staff representing the brotherhood between Judah and Israel (Zec 11:7,14).

(c) (‘abhoth): "I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love" (Ho 11:4; compare Eze 3:25; 4:8; Job 39:10).

(d) (saphah): the edge of the round opening in the robe of the ephod with a band (the Revised Version (British and American) "binding") round about the hole of it (only in Ex 39:23).

(e) (chartsubboth): bands (the Revised Version (British and American) "bonds") of wickedness (Isa 58:6); bands (= pains) in death (Ps 73:4); the Revised Version, margin ("pangs," Cheyne, "torments").

(f) (moTah): the cross bar of oxen’s yoke, holding them together (Le 26:13; Eze 34:27 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "bars").

(g) (mocer): a fetter: "Who hath loosed the bonds of the swift ass?" (Job 39:5; Ps 2:3; 107:14; Isa 28:22; 52:2; Jer 2:20; all in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). The

same Hebrew word (in Ps 116:16; Jer 5:5; 27:2; 30:8; Na 1:13) is translated "bonds " in the King James Version, and in the English Revised Version of Ps 116:16, and Na 1:13, but "bands" in the English Revised Version of Jer 5:5; 27:2; 30:8; the American Standard Revised Version has "bonds" throughout. See BOND.

(h) (moshekhoth): "Canst thou .... loose the bands of Orion?" (only in Job 38:31).

(i) (desmos, sundesmos): a fetter: that which binds together: of the chains of a lunatic or prisoner (Lu 8:29; Ac 16:26; 22:30 the King James Version), metaphorically of the mystic union of Christ and the church (Col 2:19). These words are often translated by "bond" in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American).

(j) (zeukteria): the rudder’s bands (only in Ac 27:40).

(2) A company of men

(a) (gedhudh): a band of soldiers (2Sa 4:2; 1Ki 11:24, the King James Version; 2Ki 6:23; 13:20,21; 24:2; 1Ch 7:4; 12:18,21; 2Ch 22:1). So the Revised Version (British and American) (except in 1Ki 11:24, "troop").

(b) (ro’sh): "head" =" division": "The Chaldeans made three bands" (Job 1:17); 1Ch 12:23 the Revised Version (British and American) translates "heads."

(c) (chayil): "a band of men" the Revised Version (British and American) the "host" (only in 1Sa 10:26).

(d) (’aghappim): "the wings of an army," only in Ezekiel, armies of the King of Judah (12:14; 17:21); of Gomer and of Togarmah (38:6); of Gog (the Revised Version (British and American) "hordes") (38:9,22; 39:4).

(e) (machaneh): "camp": only in Ge 32:7,10; the Revised Version (British and American) "companies."

(f) (chotsets): of locusts dividing into companies or swarms (Pr 30:27).

(g) (speira): usually a "cohort" (see the Revised Version, margin) of Roman soldiers; the tenth part of a legion, about 600 men: (Mt 27:27; Mr 15:16; Ac 10:1; 21:31; 27:1). A smaller detachment of soldiers (Joh 18:3,12; compare 2 Macc 8:23; Judith 1:4:11).

(h) (poiein sustrophen): "to make a conspiracy": "The Jews banded together" (Ac 23:12).

T. Rees

(3) The Augustan Band (speira Sebaste) to which Julius, the Roman centurion who had charge of Paul as a prisoner on his voyage to Rome, belonged, was a cohort apparently stationed at Caesarea at the time (Ac 27:1). Schurer (GJV, I3, 461 f) is of opinion that it was one of five cohorts mentioned by Josephus, recruited in Samaria and called Sebastenes from the Greek name of the city of Samaria (Sebaste). This particular cohort had in all likelihood for its full name Cohors Augusta Sebastenorum, Augusta being an honorific title of which examples are found in the case of auxiliary troops. Sir William Ramsay, following Mommsen (Paul the Traveler, 315, 348), thinks it denotes a body of legionary centurions, selected from legions serving abroad, who were employed by the emperor on confidential business between the provinces and Rome, the title Augustan being conferred upon them as a mark of favor and distinction. The grounds on which the views of Mommsen and Ramsay rest are questioned by Professor Zahn (Introduction to the New Testament, I, 551 ff), and more evidence is needed to establish them.

See ARMY (ROMAN).

(4) The Italian Band (speira Italike) was a cohort composed of volunteer Roman citizens born in Italy and stationed at Caesarea at this time (Ac 10:1). Schurer maintains that there could have been no Roman cohort there at this time, although he accepts the testimony of inscriptions to the presence of an Italian cohort at a later time. He accordingly rejects the story of Cornelius, holding that the author of the Ac has given in this narrative conditions belonging to a later time (GJV, I3, 462 f). In reply to Schurer, Blass asks why one of the five cohorts mentioned by Josephus may not have been composed of Roman citizens living at Caesarea or Sebaste, and bearing this name (Blass, Acta Apostolorum, 124). From a recently discovered inscription, Sir W. M. Ramsay has ascertained that there was an Italian cohort stationed in Syria in 69 AD, which heightens the probability of one actually being found in Caesarea at 41-44 AD, and he shows that even if his cohort was at the time on duty elsewhere a centurion like Cornelius might well have been at Caesarea at the time mentioned (Expositor, 5th series, IV, V, with Schurer’s rejoinder). The subject of detached service in the provinces of the Roman Empire is admittedly obscure, but nothing emerges in this discussion to cast doubt upon the historical character of Luke’s narrative.

See ARMY (ROMAN).

T. Nicol.

BANDS OF RUDDER

See RUDDER.

BANDS, BEAUTY AND

See BEAUTY AND BANDS.

BANI

ba’-ni (bani, "posterity"):

(1) A Gadite, one of David’s mighty men (2Sa 23:36).

(2) A Levite whose son was appointed for service in the tabernacle at David’s time (1Ch 6:46).

(3) A Judahite whose son lived in Jerusalem after the captivity (1Ch 9:4).

(4) The descendants of Bani (called Binnui, Ne 7:15) returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:10) and had taken "strange wives" (Ezr 10:29).

(5) Bani who had taken a "strange wife" (Ezr 10:38) mentioned with his brothers, the sons of Bani who also had taken "strange wives" (Ezr 10:34).

(6) Son of Bani, a Levite and builder (Ne 3:17).

(7) Bani, who instructed the people at Ezra’s time (Ne 8:7).

(8) Three Levites mentioned in connection with the temple worship at Ezra’s time (Ne 9:4,5).

(9) A Levite who sealed the covenant with Ne (Ne 10:13).

(10) A leader of the people who also signed the covenant (Ne 10:14).

(11) One whose son Uzzi was overseer of the Levites at Jerusalem (Ne 11:22).

See BINNUI.

A. L. Breslich

BANIAS (1)

ba-ni’-as (B, Banias; A, Bani; the King James Version Banid (1 Esdras 8:36)): An ancestor of Salimoth. The descendants of Banias returned with Ezra to Jerusalem. The name is omitted (Ezr 8:10), perhaps due to the oversight of a copyist or a mistaken reading of bene, "sons of," for bani.

BANIAS (2)

See CAESAREA, PHILIPPI.

BANID

ba’-nid (1 Esdras 8:36): In the Revised Version (British and American) BANIAS, which see.

BANISHMENT

ban’-ish-ment.

See PUNISHMENTS.

BANK

bank:

(1) (saphah, "lip," "edge"): "By the bank of the Jordan" (2Ki 2:13); "Upon the bank of the river were very many trees" (Eze 47:7,12).

(2) (gadhah, "cuttings"): Always of banks overflowed (Jos 3:15; 4:18; Isa 8:7), as also

(3) (gidhyah, 1Ch 12:15). (4) (solelah, "mound," "rampart"): "Cast up a bank against the city" (2Sa 20:15, the English Revised Version "mount," the American Standard Revised Version "mound"; compare 2Ki 19:32; Isa 37:33). "Banks of sweet herbs" (So 5:13); "the marginal rendering is the right one, ‘towers of perfumes,’ i.e. plants with fragrant leaves and flowers trained on trellis-work" (Speaker’s Commentary in the place cited.).

(5) (charax, "a stake," "entrenchment"): "Thine enemies shall cast up a bank about thee" (Lu 19:43 the King James Version "trench"). It is probably a military term and stands for a "palisade" (so the Revised Version, margin), i.e. probably an embankment of stakes strengthened with branches and earth, with a ditch behind it, used by the besiegers as a protection against arrows or attacking parties (Latin vallum), such, no doubt, as was employed by Titus in the siege of Jerusalem, 70 AD (Josephus, BJ, V, vi, 2).

(6) BANK; BANKING (which see).

M. O. Evans

BANK; BANKING

1. Introductory:

"Banking" in the full modern sense, of taking money on deposit and lending it out on interest, is of

comparatively recent origin. A few "banks of deposit" were founded in Italy in the Middle Ages, but the earliest "banks of issue," of the modern sort, were those of Amsterdam (1609) and Hamburg (1619), beginning in the 17th century. The law of Moses forbade Israelites to charge each other interest (Ex 22:25; Le 25:35,37; De 23:19), but let them lend on interest to Gentiles (De 23:20), though this law was often evaded or disregarded (Ne 5:10,12). Banks and banking, however, are found in operation in the Greek cities; "moneychangers ," sitting at their tables (trapezai) in the market place, both changed coins and took money on deposit, giving high interest; and banking of a sort, in its incipient stages, existed among the ancient Hebrews. But the Phoenicians are now thought to have been the inventors of the money-changing, money-lending system which is found in more or less modified and developed forms among ancient peoples and in full development and operation in the palmy days of the Roman Empire. In the Greek-Roman period, without doubt, bankers both received money on deposit, paying interest, and let it out at a higher rate, or employed it in trade, as the publicani at Rome did, in farming the revenues of a province (Plumptre).

2. Banking among the Ancient Hebrews:

(1) The Hebrew money-changer, like his modern Syrian counterpart, the saraf (see PEFS, 1904, 49 ff, where the complexity of exchange in Palestine today is graphically described), changed the large coins current into those of smaller denominations, e.g. giving denarii for tetradrachms, or silver for gold, or copper for silver.

(2) But no mean part of his business was the exchanging of foreign money, and even the money of the country of a non- Phoenician standard, for shekels and half-shekels on this standard, the latter being accepted only in payment of the temple dues (see MONEY). The "money-changers" of Mt 21:12, as the Greek signifies, were men who made small change. Such men may be seen in Jerusalem now with various coins pried in slender pillars on a table (compare epi trapezan, Lu 19:23), ready to be used in changing money for a premium into such forms, or denominations, as would be more current or more convenient for immediate use.

(3) "Usury" in English Versions of the Bible is simply Old English for what we today call "interest," i.e. the sum paid for the use of money, Latin usura; and "interest" should take the place of it in all passages in the Old Testament and New Testament, where it has such significance.

3. Banking in New Testament Times:

The Greek word rendered (tokos), "usury" in the New Testament (see Lu 19:23 f) means literally, "what is born of money," "what money brings forth or produces." "Usury" has come to mean "exorbitant interest," but did not mean this at the time of the King James Version, 1611.

(1) In Christ’s time, and immediately following, there was great need for money-changers and money-changing, especially on the part of foreign Jews whom custom forbade to put any but Jewish coins into the temple treasury (see Mr 12:41). It was mainly for the convenience of these Jews of the Dispersion,

and because it was in order to a sacred use, that the people thought it proper to allow the money-changers to set up their tables in the outer court of the temple (see Mt 21:12 ff).

(2) The language of Mt 25:27, ‘Thou oughtest to have put my money to the bankers,’ etc., would seem to indicate the recognition by Christ of the custom and propriety of lending out money on interest (compare 19:23). The "exchangers" here are "bankers" (compare Mt 25:27). The Greek (trapezitai) is from a word for "bank" or "bench" (trapeza), i.e. the "table" or "counter" on which the money used to be received and paid out. These "bankers" were clearly of a higher class than the "small-change men" of Mt 21:12, etc. (compare "changers of money," Joh 2:14, and "changers," Joh 2:15, English Versions). Christ upbraids the "slothful servant" because he had not given his pound to "the bank" (or "banker," epi trapezan, literally, "on a banker’s table"), who, it is implied, would have kept it safe and paid interest for it (Lu 19:23 f). It is noteworthy that the "tenminae" of Lu 19:24 are those acquired by "the good servant" from the "one" which was first lent him. So these wealthier bankers even then in a way received money on deposit for investment and paid interest on it, after the fashion of the Greeks.

4. Interpretations, Figurative Uses, etc.:

(1) In Christ’s parable (Lu 19:23 ff) "the bank" (literally, "a bank," "table") is taken by some to mean "the synagogue," by others to mean "the church" (Lange, LJ, II, 1, 414); i.e. it is thought that Christ meant to teach that the organized body, "synagogue" or "church," might use the gifts or powers of an adherent or disciple, when he himself could not exercise them (compare DCG, article "Bank").

(2) Then some have thought that Christ was here pointing to prayer as a substitute for good works, when the disciple was unable to do such. Such views seem far-fetched and unnecessary (compare Bruce, Parabolic Teaching of Christ, 209 f).

(3) The "money-changers," then as now, had ever to be on guard against false money, which gives point to the oft-quoted extra-scriptural saying (agraphon) of Jesus to His disciples: "Be ye expert money-changers" (Greek ginesthai trapezitai dokimoi; see Origen, in Joam, XIX), which was taken (Clem., Hom., . III, 61) to mean, "Be skillful in distinguishing true doctrine from false" (HDB, 1-vol).

George B. Eager

BANNAIA

ba-na’-ya.

See SABANNEUS.

BANNAS

ban’-as (Bannos; the King James Version, Banuas): A name occurring in the list of those who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:26). Bannas and Sudias are represented by Hoodaviah in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

BANNEAS

ban-e’-as (Bannaias; the King James Version Baanias (1 Esdras 9:26) = Benaiah (Ezr 10:25)): Banneas put away his "strange wife."

BANNER

ban’-er (ENSIGN, STANDARDS): The English word "banner" is from banderia, Low Latin, meaning a banner (compare bandum, Latin, which meant first a "band," an organized military troop, and then a "flag"). It has come to mean a flag, or standard, carried at the head of a military band or body, to indicate the line of march, or the rallying point, and it is now applied, in its more extended significance, to royal, national, or ecclesiastical "banners" also. We find it applied sometimes to a streamer on the end of a lance, such as is used by the Arab sheik today. "Banner" occurs in the following significant Old Testament passages:

(1) in the singular, "Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain" (Isa 13:2 the King James Version); "a banner to them that fear thee" (Ps 60:4); and

(2) in the plur., "In the name of our God we will set up our banner" (Ps 20:5); "terrible as an army with banner" (So 6:4).

1. Military Ensigns among the Hebrews:

The Hebrews, it would seem, like the Assyrians, the Egyptians, and other ancient nations, had military ensigns. As bearing upon this question, a very significant passage is that found in Nu 2:2: "The children of Israel shall encamp every man by his own standard, with the ensigns of their fathers’ houses." "Standard-bearer" in Isa 10:18 the King James Version, "They shall be as when a standard-bearer fainteth," is not a case in point, but is to be rendered as in the Revised Version, margin, "as when a si ck man pineth away."

In this noted passage a distinction seems intentionally made (another view is held by some) between "the ensigns of their fathers’ houses" (literally, "signs"; compare Ps 74:4, where the reference is thought by some today to be to the standards of Antiochus’ army), and "the standards" of the four great divisions of the Hebrew tribes in the wilderness (compare the "banner" of So 2:4 and So 6:4,10).

2. A Distinction with a Difference:

The relation of these to the "standard" of Nu 21:8 f (Hebrew nec, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "standard") is by no means clear. The word nec, here translated "standard," seems to have meant at first a pole set up on an eminence as a signal for mustering troops (compare "mast" Isa 30:17 the English Revised Version, margin). But it occurs frequently in the prophets both in this literal and original sense, and in the figurative or derived sense of a rallying point for God's people (see Isa 5:26; 11:10; Jer 4:21 and elsewhere). Here the rendering in English Versions of the Bible alternates between "ensign" and "banner" (see HDB, 1-vol, article "Banner").

George B. Eager

BANNUS

ban'-us (Bannous (1 Esdras 9:34) = Bani or Binnui (Ezr 10:29,30)): The sons of Bannus put away their "strange wives."

BANQUET

ban'-kwet.

1. The Ancient Hebrew Customs:

(1) "Banquet" and "banqueting" in the King James Version always include and stand for wine-drinking, not simply "feast" or "feasting" in our sense. Thus (So 2:4), "He brought me to the banqueting-house" is literally, "the house of wine," and Es 7:2 has in the Hebrew "a banquet of wine." In the New Testament we see a reflection of the same fact in 1Pe 4:3 the King James Version, "We walked in .... excess of wine, banquetings" (Greek "drinkings"; the Revised Version (British and American) "carousings"). Compare Amos 6:7 the King James Version, "The banquet of them that stretched themselves," where the reference seems to be to reclining at wine-drinkings.

See MEALS.

The Hebrew of Job 1:4, "make a banquet," may refer to a social feast of a less objectionable sort (compare Job 41:6 the King James Version), though the Hebrew for "to drink" yayin "wine," was used as synonymous with "banquet."

See SYMPOSIUM.

Music, dancing and merriment usually attended all such festivities. Certainly the ancient Hebrews, like other peoples of the ancient East, were very fond of social feasting, and in Christ's day had acquired, from contact with Greeks and Romans, luxurious and bibulous habits, that often carried them to excess in their social feasts.

2. In Christ’s Teaching and Practice:

Among the Greeks the word for "feast" (doche) is from dechomai "to receive" (compare our English usage, "to receive" and "reception"). This word doche is used with poiein "to make," to signify "to make" or "give a feast." Compare Lu 5:29 where Levi "made a feast."

(1) In view of existing customs and abuses, Christ taught His followers when they gave a banquet to invite the poor, etc. (Lu 14:13), rather than, as the fashion of the day called for, to bid the rich and influential. Much in the New Testament that has to do with banquets and banquetings will be obscure to us of the West if we do not keep in mind the many marked differences of custom between the East and the West.

(2) "Banquets" were usually given in the house of the host to specially invited guests (Lu 14:15; Joh 2:2), but much more freedom was accorded to the uninvited than we of the West are accustomed to, as one finds to be true everywhere in the East today. The custom of reclining at meals (see MEALS; TRICLINIUM, etc.) was everywhere in vogue among the well-to-do in Christ’s day, even in the case of the ordinary meals, the guest leaning upon the left arm and eating with the aid of the right (compare Mt 26:20 m "reclining," and 1Co 11:20, "the Lord’s supper").

(3) "Banquets" were considered normal parts of weddings as they are now throughout the East. Jesus and His disciples were bidden to one at Cana in Galilee, and accepted the invitation (Joh 2:2 ff), and wine-drinking was a part of the feast. The "banquet" Levi gave was in Christ’s honor (Lu 5:29). There were numbers present and marked gradations in the places at table (Mt 23:6; Mr 12:39; Lu 14:7; 20:46). Guests were invited in advance, and then, as time-pieces were scarce, specially notified when the feast was ready, which helps to explain Christ’s words (Mt 22:4), "All things are ready: come to the marriage" (compare Lu 14:17; Es 5:8; 6:14).

(4) Matthew tells us (Mt 23:6) that the Pharisees "love the chief place ("uppermost rooms" the King James Version) at feasts."

In Mt 22:3,4 "made a marriage feast," is rendered by some simply "a feast," because Greek gamos, "marriage," was used by Septuagint to translate the Hebrew for "feast" in Es 1:5. But, as this is the only known example of such a use compare gamos, it is better to take it here in the literal sense of "marriage feast," as would seem to be required by the words "for his son" (Messiah). The Greek is plural (gamous) to indicate the several parts or stages of the feast (Button, 23; compare English "nuptials").

wine was provided, superintend the drinking, etc. (compare Lu 22:27).

3. A Distinction Giving Rise to a Question:

(1) In Mt 22:4, "I have made ready my dinner," "dinner" in Greek is ariston (compare Lu 11:38). "Supper" (Greek deipnon) is found in Mt 23:6 and often in the New Testament. Both words are found in

Lu 14:12. The question arises, What was the distinction? Thus much may be said in answer: The ariston (English Versions "dinner") was a meal usually taken about the middle of the forenoon, with variations of earlier or later; the deipnon (English Versions "supper"), the one taken at the close of the day, often after dark. In Ant, V, iv, 2 Josephus supposes Eglon's guards (Jud 3:24) were negligent about noon, "both because of the heat and because their attention was turned to dinner" (ariston). So the "dinner" (ariston) was sometimes as late as noon. Yet Joh 21:12,15 shows, on the other hand, that the ariston was on some occasions taken shortly after dawn.

(2) Another question raised is this, Were the ancient Jews accustomed to have two or three meals a day? Vambery, quoted by Morison, gives a saying of the Turks that is in point: "There are only two meals a day, the smaller at 10 or 11 o'clock in the morning, the second and larger after sunset." There seems no evidence to sustain the view, maintained by Grimm and entertained by others, that the Jews of Christ's day were accustomed to take a separate and slight meal on rising, as the later Greeks and some of the later Romans did. There is certainly no clear evidence that the Jews of that day had more than two meals a day (see DB, article "Meals").

(3) The marriage feast of Mt 22:3 f was an ariston, somewhat like an English "wedding-breakfast"; but that in Lu 14:16 f was a deipnon, which was as usual delayed till after dark (Lu 14:17). Perhaps the ariston in this case was preliminary, while the marriage with its accompanying deipnon was after dark; such things are not unheard of today (compare Mt 26:20 and 1Co 11:20, "the Lord's deipnon").

George B. Eager

BANUAS

ban'-u-as (1 Esdras 5:26): A misprint for BANNAS (Revised Version), which see.

BAPTISM (LUTHERAN DOCTRINE)

I. THE TERM

1. The Derivation

2. The Meaning

3. The Application

4. Equivalent Terms

II. THE ORDINANCE

1. The Teaching of Scripture

(1) An Authoritative Command

(2) A Clear Declaration of the Object in View

(3) A Definite Promise

(4) A Plain Indication of the Scope

(5) A Prescribed Formula for Administering the Ordinance

2. The Biblical History of the Ordinance

3. Types of Baptism

III. DIFFICULTIES

1. Are Matthew 28:18-20 and Mark 16:15,16 Genuine?

2. Was the Trinitarian Formula Used in New Testament Times?

3. Was Christian Baptism Really a New Ordinance?

4. Should Infants Be Baptized?

5. Why Did Paul not Baptize?

6. What Is the Baptism for the Dead?

I. The Term.

1. The Derivation:

The word "baptism" is the Anglicized form of the Greek baptisma, or baptismos. These Greek words are verbal nouns derived from baptizo, which, again, is the intensive form of the verb bapto. "Baptismos denotes the action of baptizein (the baptizing), baptisma the result of the action (the baptism)" (Cremer). This distinction differs from, but is not necessarily contrary to, that of Plummer, who infers from Mr 7:4 and Heb 9:10 that baptismos usually means lustrations or ceremonial washings, and from Ro 6:4; Eph 4:1; 1Pe 3:21 that baptisma denotes baptism proper (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)).

2. The Meaning:

The Greek words from which our English "baptism" has been formed are used by Greek writers, in classical antiquity, in the Septuagint and in the New Testament, with a great latitude of meaning. It is not possible to exhaust their meaning by any single English term. The action which the Greek words express may be performed by plunging, drenching, staining, dipping, sprinkling. The nouns baptisma and baptismos do not occur in the Septuagint; the verb baptizo occurs only in four places, and in two of them in a figurative sense (2Ki 5:14; Judith 12:7; Isa 21:4; Ecclesiasticus @@31 (34): 25). Wherever these words occur in the New Testament, the context or, in the case of quotations, a comparison with the Old Testament will in many instances suggest which of the various renderings noted above should be adopted (compare Mr 7:4; Heb 9:10 with Nu 19:18,19; 8:7; Ex 24:4-6; Ac 2:16,17,41 with Joe 2:28). But there are passages in which the particular form of the act of baptizing remains in doubt. "The assertion that the command to baptize is a command to immerse is utterly unauthorized" (Hodge).

3. The Application:

In the majority of Biblical instances the verbs and nouns denoting baptism are used in a lit sense, and signify the application of water to an object or a person for a certain purpose. The ceremonial washings of the Jews, the baptism of proselytes to the Jewish faith, common in the days of Christ, the baptism of John and of the disciples of Christ prior to the Day of Pentecost, and the Christian sacrament of baptism, are literal baptisms (baptismus fluminis, "baptism of the river," i.e. water). But Scripture speaks also of figurative baptisms, without water (Mt 20:22; Mr 10:38; Lu 12:50 = the sufferings which overwhelmed Christ and His followers, especially the martyrs—baptismus sanguinis, "baptism of blood"; Mt 3:11; Mr 1:8; Lu 3:16; Ac 1:5; 11:16 = the outpouring of the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost, which was a characteristic phenomenon of primitive Christianity—baptismus flaminis, "baptism of wind, breeze," i.e. "spirit"). Some even take Mt 21:25; Mr 11:30; Ac 18:25; 1Co 10:2 in a synecdochical sense, for doctrine of faith, baptism being a prominent feature of that doctrine (baptismus luminis, "baptism of light").

4. Equivalent Terms:

Scripture occasionally alludes to Christian baptism without employing the regular term. Thus in Tit 3:5, and Eph 5:26 we have the term loutron, "washing," instead lent terms of baptisma. From this term the Latin church derived its lavacrum (English "layer") as a designation of baptism. In Heb 10:22 we have the verbs rhantizo and louo, "sprinkle" and "wash"; in Eph 5:26 the verb katharizo, "cleanse"; in 1Co 6:11 the verb apolouo, "wash" are evidently synonyms of baptizo, and the act has been so denominated from its prime effect.

II. The Ordinance.

1. The Teaching of Scripture:

Christian baptism, as now practiced, is a sacred ordinance of evangelical grace, solemnly appointed by

the risen Christ, prior to His entering into the state of glory by His ascension, and designed to be a means, until His second coming, for admitting men to discipleship with Him. Mt 28:18-20 and its parallel Mr 16:15,16 are the principal texts of Scripture on which the church in all ages has based every essential point of her teaching regarding this ordinance. The host of other baptismal texts of Scripture expand and illustrate the contents of these two texts. We have in these texts:

(1) An Authoritative Command

An authoritative (Mt 28:19) command, issued in plain terms: "Make disciples .... baptizing." This command declares (a) speciem actus, i.e. it indicates with sufficient clearness, by the use of the term "baptize," the external element to be employed, namely, water, and the form of the action to be performed by means of water, namely, any dipping, or pouring, or sprinkling, since the word "baptize" signifies any of these modes. On the strength of this command Luther held: "Baptism is not simple water only, but it is the water comprehended in God’s command"; and the Westminster Shorter Catechism (Ques. 94) calls baptism "a washing with water." Water is distinctly mentioned as the baptismal element in Ac 8:38; 10:47; Eph 5:26; Heb 10:22. "There is no mention of any other element" (Plummer). The phraseology of Eph 5:26, "the washing of water with the word," shows that not the external element alone, nor the physical action of applying the water, constitutes baptism; but "the word" must be added to the element and the action, in order that there may be a baptism. (Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua nisi aqua? Accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum, "Remove the word and what is water but water? The word is added to the element and it becomes a sacrament" Augustine). "Without the Word of God the water is simple water, and no baptism" (Luther). The command prescribes (b) exercitium actus, i.e. it enjoins a continued exercise of this function of the messengers of Christ for all time.

(2) A Clear Declaration of the Object in View.

The participle "baptizing" qualifies the imperative "make disciples," and expresses that, what the imperative states as the end, is to be attained by what the participle names as a means to that end. The participle "baptizing," again, is qualified by "teaching" (Mt 28:20). The second participle is not connected by "and" with the first, hence, is subordinate to the first (Meyer). Discipleship is to be obtained by baptizing-teaching. There is no rigid law regarding the order and sequence of these actions laid down in these words; they merely state that Christ desires His disciples to be both baptized and fully informed as to His teaching.

(3) A Definite Promise:

Salvation (Mr 16:16), i.e. complete and final deliverance from all evil, the securing of "the end of faith" (1Pe 1:9). This is a comprehensive statement, as in 1Pe 3:21, of the blessing of baptism. Scripture also states, in detail, particular baptismal blessings:

(a) Regeneration, Tit 3:5; Joh 3:3,5. Despite Calvin and others, the overwhelming consensus of interpreters still agrees with the ancient church and with Luther in explaining both these texts of

baptism.

(b) Remission of sins, or justification (Ac 2:38; 22:16; 1Co 6:11; Eph 5:26; Heb 10:22). This blessing, no doubt, is also intended in 1Pe 3:21, where eperotema has been rendered "answer" by the King James Version while the Revised Version (British and American) renders "interrogation." The word denotes a legal claim, which a person has a right to set up (See Cremer under the word and Ro 8:1).

(c) The establishment of a spiritual union with Christ, and a new relationship with God (Ga 3:26,27; Ro 6:3,4; Col 2:12). In this connection the prepositions with which baptizein in the New Testament connects may be noted. Baptizein eis, "to baptize into," always denotes the relation into which the party baptized is placed. The only exception is Mr 1:9. Baptizein en, or baptizein epi, "to baptize in" (Ac 10:48; 2:38), denotes the basis on which the new relation into which the baptized enters, is made to rest (Cremer).

(d) The sanctifying gifts of the Holy Spirit (1Co 12:13; Tit 3:5). All these blessings Scripture declares to be effects of baptism (Wirkung der Taufe, Riehm, Handworterb.). "Baptism is called ‘washing of regeneration,’ not merely because it symbolizes it, or pledges a man to it, but also, and chiefly, because it effects it" (Holtzmann, Huther, Pfleiderer, Weiss). "Regeneration, or being begotten of God, does not mean merely a new capacity for change in the direction of goodness, but an actual change. The legal washings were actual external purifications. Baptism is actual internal purification" (Plummer). To these modern authorities Luther can be added. He says: "Baptism worketh forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives eternal salvation to all who believe, as the words and promises of God declare" (Smaller Catech.). In Tit 3:5 the King James Version the force of the preposition dia, "by," deserves to be noted: it declares baptism to be the regenerating, renewing, justifying, glorying medium to the heirs of eternal life. The baptismal promise is supported, not only in a general way, by the veracity and sincerity of the Speaker, who is the Divine Truth incarnate, but also in a special way, by the Author’s appeal to His sovereign majesty (Mt 28:18), and by the significant assurance of His personal ("I" = ego, is emphatic: Meyer) presence with the disciples in their afore-mentioned activity (Mt 28:20; compare Mr 16:20).

(4) A Plain Indication of the Scope:

"All nations," "the whole creation" (pase te ktisei to be understood as in Col 1:23 =" all men"). Baptism is of universal application; it is a cosmopolitan ordinance before which differences such as of nationality, race, age, sex, social or civil status, are leveled (compare Col 3:11 with 1Co 12:13). Accordingly, Christ orders baptism to be practiced "alway" (literally, "all days"), "even unto the end of the world," i.e. unto the consummation of the present age, until the Second Advent of the Lord. For, throughout this period Christ promises His cooperative presence with the efforts of His disciples to make disciples.

(5) A Prescribed Formula for Administering the Ordinance:

"Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." The belief in the Trinity is fundamental to Christianity; accordingly, the sacred rite by which men are initiated into the Christian religion justly emphasizes this belief. The three Persons are mentioned as distinct from one another, but the baptismal command is issued upon their joint and coequal authority ("in the name," not "names"), thus indicating the Unity in Trinity. This ancient baptismal formula represents "the Father as the Originator, the Son as the Mediator, the Holy Ghost as the Realization, and the vital and vitalizing blessing of the promise and fulfillment," which is extended to men in this ordinance (Cremer).

2. The Biblical History of the Ordinance:

After the Lord had entered into His glory, we find that in the era of the apostles and in the primitive Christian church baptism is the established and universally acknowledged rite by which persons are admitted to communion with the church (Ac 2:38,41; 8:12 f, 36,38; 9:18; 10:47 f; 16:15,33; 18:8; Ro 6:3; 1Co 12:13; Ga 3:27). Even in cases where an outpouring of the special gifts of the Holy Spirit had already taken place, baptism is still administered (Ac 10:44 ff; 11:15 f). "Thus, baptism occupied among the Gentile converts to Christianity, and later among all Christians, the same position as circumcision in the Old Covenant (Col 2:11 f; Ga 5:2). It is, essentially, part of the foundation on which the unity of the Christian society rested from the beginning (Eph 4:5; 1Co 12:13; Ga 3:27 f)" (Riehm, Handworterb.). 3. Types of Baptism:

In 1Co 10:1,2 the apostle states that the Israelites "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." Farrar attempts the following solution of this type: "The passing under the cloud (Ex 14:19) and through the sea, constituting as it did their deliverance from bondage into freedom, their death to Egypt, and their birth to a new covenant, was a general type or dim shadow of Christian baptism (compare our collect, ‘figuring thereby Thy holy baptism’). But the typology is quite incidental; it is the moral lesson which is paramount. ‘Unto Moses’; rather, into. By this ‘baptism’ they accepted Moses as their Heavensent guide and teacher" (Pulpit Comm.). In 1Pe 3:21 the apostle calls baptism the antitupon of the Deluge. Delitzsch (on Heb 9:24) suggests that tupos and antitupon in Greek represent the original figure and a copy made therefrom, or a prophetic foretype and its later accomplishment. The point of comparison is the saving power of water in either instance. Water saved Noah and his family by floating the ark which sheltered them, and by removing from them the disobedient generation which had sorely tried their faith, as it had tried God’s patience. In like manner the water of baptism bears up the ark of the Christian church and saves its believing members, by separating them from their filthy and doomed fellow-men.

III. Difficulties.

1. Are Matthew 28:18-20 and Mark 16:15,16 Genuine?:

Feine (PER3, XIX, 396 f) and Kattenbusch (Sch-Herz, I, 435 f) argue that the Trinitarian formula in Mt 28:19 is spurious, and that the text in Mr belongs to a section which was added to this Gospel at a later time. The former claim had first been advanced by Conybeare, but later research by Riggenbach has

established the genuineness of the Trinitarian formula in Mt. Feine still maintains his doubts, however, on subjective grounds. As to the concluding section in Mr (16:9- 20), Jerome is the first to call attention to its omission in most Greek manuscripts to which he had access. But Jerome himself acknowledged Mr 16:14 as genuine. Gregory of Nyssa reports that, while this section is missing in some manuscripts, in the more accurate ones many manuscripts contain it. No doctrinal scruple can arise on account of this section; for it contains nothing that is contrary to the doctrine of Scripture in other places on the same subject; and it has always been treated as genuine by the Christian church. The question is a purely historical one (see Bengel, Apparatus Criticus, 170 f).

2. Was the Trinitarian Formula Used in New Testament Times?:

No record of such use can be discovered in the Ac or the epistles of the apostles. The baptisms recorded in the New Testament after the Day of Pentecost are administered "in the name of Jesus Christ" (Ac 2:38), "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Ac 8:16), "into Christ" (Ro 6:3; Ga 3:27). This difficulty was considered by the Fathers; Ambrose says: Quod verbo tacitum fuerat, expressum est fide, "What had not been expressed in word, was expressed by faith." On close inspection the difficulty is found to rest on the assumption that the above are records of baptismal formulas used on those occasions. The fact is that these records contain no baptismal formula at all, but "merely state that such persons were baptized as acknowledged Jesus to be the Lord and the Christ" (Plummer). The same can be said of any person baptized in our day with the Trinitarian formula. That this formula was the established usage in the Christian church is proven by records of baptisms in Justin (Apol., I, 61) and Tertullian (Adv. Prax., XXVI). 3. Was Christian Baptism Really a New Ordinance?:

Baptism was practiced among the Jews prior to the solemn inauguration of this ordinance by the risen Christ. The ceremonial washings of the Jews are classed with the transient forms of the Levitical worship (Heb 9:9,10), which had not been intended to endure except "until a time of reformation." They were removed when Christian baptism was erected into an abiding ordinance of the church of God (Col 2:11-13). It is erroneous to say that those ancient washings developed into Christian baptism. A shadow does not develop into a substance. Nor do we find the origin of Christian baptism in the baptism of proselytes, which seems to have been a Jewish church custom in the days of Christ. Though the rite of baptism was not by unknown to the Jews, still the baptism of John startled them (Joh 1:25). Such passages as Isa 4:4 (1:16); Eze 36:25; 37:23; Zec 13:1 had, no doubt, led them to expect a rite of purification in the days of the Messiah, which would supersede their Levitical purification. The delegation which they sent to John was to determine the Messianic character of John and his preaching and baptizing. Johannic baptism has been a fruitful theme of debate. The question does not affect the personal faith of any Christian at the present time; for there is no person living who has received Johannic baptism (Chemnitz). The entire subject and certain features of it, as the incident recorded Ac 19:1-7, will continue to be debated. It is best to fix in our minds a few essential facts, which will enable us to put the Scriptural estimate on the baptism of John. John had received a Divine commission to preach and baptize (Lu 3:2; Joh 1:33; Mt 21:25). He baptized with water (Joh 3:23). His baptism was honored by a wonderful manifestation of the holy Trinity (Mt 3:16,17), and the Redeemer, in His capacity as the Representative of sinful mankind, the sin-bearing Lamb of God, accepting baptism at John’s hand (Mt 3:13 ff; Joh 1:29 ff). It was of the necessity of receiving John’s baptism that Christ

spoke to Nicodemus (Joh 3:3 ff). The Pharisees invited their eternal ruin by refusing John's baptism (Lu 7:30); for John's baptism was to shield them from the wrath to come (Mt 3:7); it was for the remission of sin (Mr 1:4); it was a washing of regeneration (Joh 3:5). When Jesus began His public ministry, He took up the preaching and baptism of John, and His disciples practiced it with such success that John rejoiced (Joh 3:22,25-36; 4:1,2). All this evidence fairly compels the belief that there was no essential difference between the baptism of John and the baptism instituted by Christ; that what the risen Christ did in Mt 28:18-20 was merely to elevate a rite that had previously been adopted by an order "from above" to a permanent institution of His church, and to proclaim its universal application. The contrast which John himself declares between his baptism and that of Christ is not a contrast between two baptisms with water. The baptism of Christ, which John foretells, is a baptism with the Holy Ghost and with fire, the Pentecostal baptism. But for the general purpose of begetting men unto a new life, sanctifying and saving them, the Spirit was also bestowed through John's baptism (Joh 3:5). 4. Should Infants Be Baptized?:

The command in Mt 28:19; Mr 16:16 is all-embracing; so is the statement concerning the necessity of baptism in Joh 3:5. After reading these statements, one feels inclined, not to ask, Should infants be baptized? but Why should they not be baptized? The onus probandi rests on those who reject infant baptism. The desire to have their infants baptized must have been manifested on the day when the first three thousand were baptized at Jerusalem, assuming that they were all adults. The old covenant had provided for their children; was the new to be inferior to the old in this respect? (See Plummer in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes).) The baptism of entire households is presumptive evidence that children and infants were baptized in apostolic times (Ac 16:15,33; 18:8; 1Co 1:16). The arguments against infant baptism imply defective views on the subject of original sin and the efficacy of baptism. Infant faith—for, faith is as necessary to the infant as to the adult—may baffle our attempts at explanation and definition; but God who extends His promises also to children (Ac 2:39), who established His covenant even with beasts (Ge 9:16,17); Christ who blessed also little children (Mr 10:13 ff), and spoke of them as believers (Mt 18:6), certainly does not consider the regeneration of a child or infant a greater task than that of an adult (compare Mt 18:3,4).

5. Why Did Paul not Baptize?:

Paul did baptize Crispus, Gaius and Stephanas with his household. These baptisms he performed at Corinth alone; we have no record of his baptisms at other places. What Paul declares in 1Co 1:14-17 is, that by his baptizing he could not have become the cause of the divisions in the Corinthian congregation, because he had baptized only a few persons at Corinth, and, moreover, he had not baptized in his own name, hence had attached no one to his person. The statement, "Christ sent me not to baptize," is made after the Semitic idiom, and means: "not so much to baptize as to preach" (Farrar in Pulpit Commentary). If they are taken in any other sense, it is impossible to protect Paul against the charge that he did something that he was not authorized to do, when he baptized Crispus, etc.

6. What Is the Baptism for the Dead?:

1Co 15:29 is sometimes taken to mean that the early Christians practiced baptism by proxy. After they had been converted to Christianity, it is held, they desired to convey the benefits of their faith to their departed friends who had died in paganism, by having themselves baptized "in their behalf," perhaps on their graves. We have no evidence from history that such a practice prevailed in the early Christian churches. Nor does the text suggest it. The Greek preposition huper expresses also the motive that may prompt a person to a certain action. In this case the motive was suggested by the dead, namely, by the dead in so far as they shall rise. The context shows this to be the meaning: If a person has sought baptism in view of the fact that the dead are to rise to be judged, his baptism is valueless, if the dead do not rise.

See BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

W. H. T. Dau

BAPTISM (NON-IMMERSIONIST VIEW)

I. THE SCRIPTURAL NAMES FOR THE RITE

II. PRE-CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

1. Baptism of Proselytes

2. Baptism of John

3. Baptism in the Pagan Mysteries

III. CHRISTIAN BAPTISM

1. The administration of the Rite

2. The Mode of Using the Water

(1) Immersion

(2) Affusion

(3) Aspersion

3. Who May Perform Baptism

4. Who May Receive Baptism

(1) Baptism of Infants

(2) Baptism for the Dead

IV. THE FORMULA OF BAPTISM

V. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM

The Doctrine of Infant Baptism

LITERATURE

Baptism (baptisma, baptismos, baptizein) has been from the earliest times the initiatory rite signifying the recognition of entrance into or of presence within the Christian church. We find the earliest mention of the ceremony in the Epistle to the Galatians (Ga 3:27), written about 20 years after the death of Jesus. There and in 1 Corinthians (1Co 1:13; 12:13) Paul takes for granted that everyone who becomes a Christian (himself included) must be baptized. The rite seems also to have existed among the discipleship of Jesus before His death. We are told (Joh 4:1,2) that, although Jesus Himself did not baptize, His disciples did, and that their baptisms were more numerous than those of John.

I. The Scriptural Names for the Rite.

The words commonly used in the New Testament to denote the rite are the verb baptizo, and the nouns baptisma and baptismos; but none are employed in this sense alone. The verb is used to denote the ceremonial purification of the Jews before eating, by pouring water on the hands (Lu 11:38; Mr 7:4); to signify the sufferings of Christ (Mr 10:38,39; Lu 12:50); and to indicate the sacrament of baptism. It is the intensive form of baptein, "to dip," and takes a wider meaning. The passages Lu 11:38 and Mr 7:4 show conclusively that the word does not invariably signify to immerse the whole body. Some have held that baptismos invariably means ceremonial purification, and that baptisma is reserved for the Christian rite; but the distinction can hardly be maintained. The former certainly means ceremonial purification in Mr 7:4, and in Mr 7:8 (the King James Version); but it probably means the rite of baptism in Heb 6:2. Exegetes find other terms applied to Christian baptism. It is called ‘the Water’ in Ac 10:47: "Can any man forbid ‘the Water,’ that these should not be baptized?"; the layer of the water in Eph 5:26 the Revised Version, margin (where baptism is compared to the bridal bath taken by the bride before she was handed over to the bridegroom); and perhaps the laver of regeneration in Tit 3:5 the Revised Version, margin (compare 1Co 6:11), and illumination in Heb 6:4; 10:32.

II. Pre-Christian Baptism.

1. Baptism of Proselytes:

Converts in the early centuries, whether Jews or Gentiles, could not have found this initiatory rite, in which they expressed their new-born faith, utterly unfamiliar. Water is the element naturally used for cleansing the body and its symbolical use entered into almost every cult; and into none more completely than the Jewish, whose ceremonial washings were proverbial. Besides those the Jew had what would seem to the convert a counterpart of the Christian rite in the baptism of proselytes by which Gentiles entered the circle of Judaism. For the Jews required three things of strangers who declared themselves to be converts to the Law of Moses: circumcision, baptism, and to offer sacrifice if they were men: the two latter if they were women. It is somewhat singular that no baptism of proselytes is forthcoming until about the beginning of the 3rd century; and yet no competent scholar doubts its existence. Schurer is full of contempt for those who insist on the argument from silence. Its presence enables us to see both how Jews accepted readily the baptism of John and to understand the point of objectors who questioned his right to insist that all Jews had to be purified ere they could be ready for the Messianic kingdom, although he was neither the Messiah nor a special prophet (Joh 1:19-23).

2. Baptism of John:

The baptism of John stood midway between the Jewish baptism of proselytes and Christian baptism. It differed from the former because it was more than a symbol of ceremonial purification; it was a baptism of repentance, a confession of sin, and of the need of moral cleansing, and was a symbol of forgiveness and of moral purity. All men, Jews who were ceremonially pure and Gentiles who were not, had to submit to this baptism of repentance and pardon. It differed from the latter because it only symbolized preparation to receive the salvation, the kingdom of God which John heralded, and did not imply entrance into that kingdom itself. Those who had received it, as well as those who had not, had to enter the Christian community by the door of Christian baptism (Ac 19:3-6). The Jewish custom of baptizing, whether displayed in their frequent ceremonial washings, in the baptism of proselytes or in the baptism of John, made Christian baptism a familiar and even expected rite to Jewish converts in the 1st century.

3. Baptism in the Pagan Mysteries:

Baptism, as an initiatory rite, was no less familiar to Gentileconverts who had no acquaintance with the Jewish religion. The ceremonial washings of the priests of pagan in the religions have been often adduced as something which might familiarize Gentileconverts with the rite which introduced them into the Christian community, but they were not initiations. A more exact parallel is easily found. It is often forgotten that in the earlier centuries when Christianity was slowly making its way in the pagan world pagan piety had deserted the official religions and taken refuge within the Mysteries, and that these Mysteries represented the popular pagan religions of the times. They were all private cults into which men and women were received one by one, and that by rites of initiation which each had to pass through personally. When admitted the converts became members of coteries, large or small, of like-minded persons, who had become initiated because their souls craved something which they believed they would receive in and through the rites of the cult. These initiations were secret, jealously guarded from the knowledge of all outsiders; still enough is known about them for us to be sure that among them baptism took an important place (Apuleius Metamorphoses xi). The rite was therefore as familiar to pagan as to Jewish converts, and it was no unexpected requirement for the convert to know that baptism was the

doorway into the church of Christ. These heathen baptisms, like the baptism of proselytes, were for the most part simply ceremonial purifications; for while it is true that both in the cult of the Mysteries and beyond it a mode of purifying after great crimes was baptizing in flowing water (Eurip. Iph. in Tauri 167) or in the sea, yet it would appear that only ceremonial purification was thought of. Nor were ceremonial rites involving the use of water confined to the paganism of the early centuries. Such a ceremony denoted the reception of the newly-born child into pagan Scandinavian households. The father decided whether the infant was to be reared or exposed to perish. If he resolved to preserve the babe, water was poured over it and a name was given to it.

III. Christian Baptism.

1. The Administration of the Rite:

In the administration of the rite of Christian baptism three things have to be looked at: the act of baptizing; those who are entitled to perform it; and the recipients or those entitled to receive it. A complete act of baptizing involves three things: what has been called the materia sacramenti; the method of its use; and the forma sacramenti, the baptismal formula or form of words accompanying the use of the water. The materia sacramenti is water and for this reason baptism is called the Water Sacrament. The oldest ecclesiastical manual of discipline which has descended to us, the Didache, says that the water to be preferred is "living," i.e. running water, water in a stream or river, or fresh flowing from a fountain; "But if thou hast not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm" (c. 7). In those directions the prescriptions of the ceremonial for the Jewish baptism of proselytes are closely followed. The earlier canons of the church permit any kind of water, fresh or salt, provided only it be true and natural water (aqua vera et naturalis).

2. The Mode of Using the Water:

(1) Immersion.

The use of the water is called ablutio. According to the rules of by far the largest portion of the Christian church the water may be used in any one of three ways: Immersion, where the recipient enters bodily into the water, and where, during the action, the head is plunged either once or three times beneath the surface; affusion, where water was poured upon the head of the recipient who stood either in water or on dry ground; and aspersion where water was sprinkled on the head or on the face. It has frequently been argued that the word baptizein invariably means "to dip" or immerse, and that therefore Christian baptism must have been performed originally by immersion only, and that the two other forms of affusion and aspersion or sprinkling are invalid—that there can be no real baptism unless the method of immersion be used. But the word which invariably means "to dip" is not baptizein but baptein. Baptizein has a wider signification; and its use to denote the Jewish ceremonial of pouring water on the hands (Lu 11:38; Mr 7:4), as has already been said, proves conclusively that it is impossible to conclude from the word itself that immersion is the only valid method of performing the rite. It may be admitted at once that immersion, where the whole body including the head is plunged into a pool of pure water, gives a

more vivid picture of the cleansing of the soul from sin; and that complete surrounding with water suits better the metaphors of burial in Roman 6:4 and Col 2:12, and of being surrounded by cloud in 1Co 10:2.

(2) Affusion.

On the other hand affusion is certainly a more vivid picture of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit which is equally symbolized in baptism. No definite information is given of the mode in which baptism was administered in apostolic times. Such phrases as "coming up out of the water," "went down into the water" (Mr 1:10; Ac 8:38) are as applicable to affusion as to immersion. The earliest account of the mode of baptizing occurs in the Didache (c. 7), where it is said: "Now concerning Baptism, thus baptize ye: having first uttered all these things, baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, in living water. But if thou hast not living water, baptize in other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm. But if thou hast neither, pour water upon the head thrice in the name of Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost." This seems to say that to baptize by immersion was the practice recommended for general use, but that the mode of affusion was also valid and enjoined on occasions. What is here prescribed in the Didache seems to have been the practice usually followed in the early centuries of the Christian church. Immersion was in common use: but affusion was also widely practiced: and both were esteemed usual and valid forms of baptizing. When immersion was used then the head of the recipient was plunged thrice beneath the surface at the mention of each name of the Trinity; when the mode was by affusion the same reference to the Trinity was kept by pouring water thrice upon the head. The two usages which were recognized and prescribed by the beginning of the 2nd century may have been in use throughout the apostolic period although definite information is lacking. When we remember the various pools in Jerusalem, and their use for ceremonial washings it is not impossible to suppose that the 3,000 who were baptized on the day of Pentecost may have been immersed, but, when the furnishing and conditions of Palestinian houses and of oriental jails are taken into account, it is difficult to conceive that at the baptisms of Cornelius and of the jailer, the ceremony was performed otherwise than by affusion. It is a somewhat curious fact that if the evidence from written texts, whether ancient canons or writings of the earlier Fathers, be studied by themselves, the natural conclusion would seem to be that immersion was the almost universal form of administering the rite; but if the witness of the earliest pictorial representation be collected, then we must infer that affusion was the usual method and that immersion was exceptional; for the pictorial representations, almost without exception, display baptism performed by affusion, i.e. the recipient is seen standing in water while the minister pours water on the head. It may therefore be inferred that evidence for the almost universal practice of immersion, drawn from the fact that baptisms took place in river pools (it is more than probable that when we find the names of local saints given to pools in rivers, those places were their favorite places of administering the rite), or from the large size of almost all early medieval baptisteries, is by no means so conclusive as many have supposed, such places being equally applicable to affusion. It is also interesting to remember that when most of the Anabaptists of the 16th century insisted on adult baptism (re-baptism was their name for it) immersion was not the method practiced by them. During the great baptismal scene in the market-place of the city of Munster the ordinance was performed by the ministers pouring three cans of water on the heads of the recipients. They baptized by affusion and not by immersion. This was also the practice among the Mennonites or earliest Baptists. This double mode of administering the sacrament—by

immersion or by affusion—prevailed in the churches of the first twelve centuries, and it was not until the 13th that the practice of aspersio or sprinkling was almost universally employed.

(3) Aspersion.

The third method of administering baptism, namely, by aspersio or sprinkling, has a different history from the other two. It was in the early centuries exclusively reserved for sick and infirm persons too weak to be submitted to immersion or affusion. There is evidence to show that those who received the rite in this form were somewhat despised; for the nicknames clinici and grabatorii were, unworthily Cyprian declares, bestowed on them by neighbors. The question was even raised in the middle of the 3rd century, whether baptism by aspersio was a valid baptism and Cyprian was asked for his opinion on the matter. His answer is contained in his lxxvth epistle (lxix Hartel's ed.). There he contends that the ordinance administered this way is perfectly valid, and quotes in support of his opinion various Old Testament texts which assert the purifying effects of water sprinkled (Eze 36:25,26; Nu 8:5-7; 19:8,9,12,13). It is not the amount of the water or the method of its application which can cleanse from sin: "Whence it appears that the sprinkling also of water prevails equally with the washing of salvation .... and that where the faith of the giver and receiver is sound, all things hold and may be consummated and perfected by the majesty of God and by the truth of faith." His opinion prevailed. Aspersio was recognized as a valid, though exceptional, form of baptism. But it was long of commending itself to ministers and people, and did not attain to almost general use until the 13th century.

The idea that baptism is valid when practiced in the one method only of immersion can scarcely be looked on as anything else than a ritualistic idea.

3. Who May Perform Baptism:

The Scripture nowhere describes or limits the qualifications of those who are entitled to perform the rite of baptism. We find apostles, wandering preachers (Ac 8:38), a private member of a small and persecuted community (Ac 9:18) performing the rite. So in the sub-apostolic church we find the same liberty of practice. Clement of Alexandria tells us that the services of Christian women were necessary for the work of Christian missions, for they alone could have access to the gynaeceum and carry the message of the gospel there (Strom., III, 6). Such women missionaries did not hesitate to baptize. Whatever credit may be given to the Ac of Paul and Theckla, it is at least historical that Theckla did exist, that she was converted by Paul, that she worked as a missionary and that she baptized her converts. Speaking generally it may be said that as a sacrament has always been looked upon as the recognition of presence within the Christian church, it is an act of the church and not of the individual believer; and therefore no one is entitled to perform the act who is not in some way a representative of the Christian community—the representative character ought to be maintained somehow. As soon as the community had taken regular and organized form the act of baptism was suitably performed by those who, as office-bearers, naturally represented the community. It was recognized that the pastor or bishop (for these terms were synonymous until the 4th century at least) ought to preside at the administration of

the sacrament; but in the early church the power of delegation was recognized and practiced, and elders and deacons presided at this and even at the Eucharist. What has been called lay-baptism is not forbidden in the New Testament and has the sanction of the early church. When superstitious views of baptism entered largely into the church and it was held that no unbaptized child could be saved, the practice arose of encouraging the baptism of all weakling infants by nurses. The Reformed church protested against this and was at pains to repudiate the superstitious thought of any mechanical efficacy in the rite by deprecating its exercise by any save approved and ordained ministers of the church. Still, while condemning lay-baptism as irregular, it may be questioned whether they would assert any administration of the rite to be invalid, provided only it had been performed with devout faith on the part of giver and receiver.

4. Who May Receive Baptism:

The recipients of Christian baptism are all those who make a presumably sincere profession of repentance of sin and of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour; together with the children of such believing parents. The requirements are set forth in the accounts given us of the performance of the rite in the New Testament, in which we see how the apostles obeyed the commands of their Master. Jesus had ordered them to "make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28:19)—to "preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned" (Mr 16:15,16). The apostle Peter said to the inquirers on the Day of Pentecost, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit"; and 3,000 were added to the church through the initiatory rite of baptism. The Samaritans, who believed on Jesus through the preaching of Philip, were admitted to the Christian community through baptism; though in this case one of the baptized, Simon Magus, after his reception, was found to be still in "the bond of iniquity" (Ac 8:12,23). The jailer and all his, Lydia and her household, at Philippi, were baptized by Paul on his and her profession of faith on Jesus, the Saviour. There is no evidence in any of the accounts we have of apostolic baptisms that any prolonged course of instruction was thought to be necessary; nothing of classes for catechumens such as we find in the early church by the close of the 2nd century, or in modern missionary enterprise. We find no mention of baptismal creeds, declarative or interrogative, in the New Testament accounts of baptisms. The profession of faith in the Lord Jesus, the Saviour, made by the head of the family appears, so far as the New Testament records afford us information, to have been sufficient to secure the baptism of the "household"—a word which in these days included both servants and children.

(1) Baptism of Infants.

This brings us to the much-debated question whether infants are to be recognized as lawful recipients of Christian baptism. The New Testament Scriptures do not in so many words either forbid or command the baptism of children. The question is in this respect on all fours with the change of the holy day from the seventh to the first day of the week. No positive command authorizes the universal usage with regard to the Christian Sabbath day; that the change is authorized must be settled by a weighing of evidence. So it is with the case of infant baptism. It is neither commanded nor forbidden in so many words; and the

question cannot be decided on such a basis. The strongest argument against the baptizing of infants lies in the thought that the conditions of the rite are repentance and faith; that these must be exercised by individuals, each one for himself and for herself; and that infants are incapable either of repentance or of faith of this kind. The argument seems weak in its second statement; it is more dogmatic than historical; and will be referred to later when the doctrine lying at the basis of the rite is examined. On the other hand a great deal of evidence supports the view that the baptism of infants, if not commanded, was at least permitted and practiced within the apostolic church. Paul connects baptism with circumcision and implies that under the gospel the former takes the place of the latter (Col 2:12); and as children were circumcised on the 8th day after birth, the inference follows naturally that children were also to be baptized. In the Old Testament, promises to parents included their children. In his sermon on the Day of Pentecost Peter declares to his hearers that the gospel promise is "to you and to your children" and connects this with the invitation to baptism (Ac 2:38,39). It is also noteworthy that children shared in the Jewish baptism of proselytes. Then we find in the New Testament narratives of baptisms that "households" were baptized—of Lydia (Ac 16:15), of the jailer at Philippi (Ac 16:32), of Stephanas (1Co 1:16). It is never said that the children of the household were exempted from the sacred rite. One has only to remember the position of the head of the household in that ancient world, to recollect how the household was thought to be embodied in its head, to see how the repentance and faith of the head of the household was looked upon as including those of all the members, not merely children but servants, to feel that had the children been excluded from sharing in the rite the exclusion would have seemed such an unusual thing that it would have at least been mentioned and explained. our Lord expressly made very young children the types of those who entered into His kingdom (Mr 10:14-16); and Paul so unites parents with children in the faith of Christ that he does not hesitate to call the children of the believing husband or wife "holy," and to imply that the children had passed from a state of "uncleanness" to a state of "holiness" through the faith of a parent. All these things seem to point to the fact that the rite which was the door of entance into the visible community of the followers of Jesus was shared in by the children of believing parents. Besides evidence for the baptism of children goes back to the earliest times of the sub-apostolic church. Irenaeus was the disciple of Polycarp, who had been the disciple of John, and it is difficult to draw any other conclusion from his statements than that he believed that the baptism of infants had been an established practice in the church long before his days (Adv. Haer., II, 22; compare 39). The witness of Tertullian is specially interesting; for he himself plainly thinks that adult baptism is to be preferred to the baptism of infants. He makes it plain that the custom of baptizing infants existed in his days, and we may be sure from the character and the learning of the man, that had he been able to affirm that infant-baptism had been a recent innovation and had not been a long-established usage descending from apostolic times, he would certainly have had no hesitation in using what would have seemed to him a very convincing way of dealing with his opponents. Tertullian’s testimony comes from the end of the 2nd century or the beginning of the 3rd century. Origen, the most learned Christian writer during the first three centuries and who comes a little later than Tertullian, in his 14th Homily on Luke bears witness to the fact that the baptism of infants was usual. He argues that original sin belongs to children because the church baptizes them. At the same time it is plain from a variety of evidence too long to cite that the baptism of infants was not a universal practice in the early church. The church of the early centuries was a mission church. It drew large numbers of its members from heathendom. In every mission church the baptism of adults will naturally take the foremost place and be most in evidence. But is is clear that many Christians were of the opinion of Tertullian and

believed that baptism ought not to be administered to children but should be confined to adults. Nor was this a theory only; it was a continuous practice handed down from one generation to another in some Christian families. In the 4th century, few Christian leaders took a more important place than Basil the Great and his brother Gregory of Nyssa. They belonged to a family who had been Christians for some generations; yet neither of the brothers was baptized until after his personal conversion, which does not appear to have come until they had attained the years of manhood. The whole evidence seems to show that in the early church, down to the end of the 4th century at least, infant and adult baptism were open questions and that the two practices existed side by side with each other without disturbing the unity of the churches. In the later Pelagian controversy it became evident that theory and practice of infant baptism had been able to assert itself and that the ordinance was always administered to children of members of the church.

(2) Baptism for the Dead.

Paul refers to a custom of "baptizing for the dead" (1Co 15:29). What this "vicarious baptism" or "baptism for the dead" was it is impossible to say, even whether it was practiced within the primitive Christian church. The passage is a it very difficult one and has called forth a very large number of explanations, which are mere guesses. Paul neither commends nor disapproves of it; he simply mentions its existence and uses the fact as an argument for the resurrection. See BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

IV. The Formula of Baptism.

The Formula of Christian baptism, in the mode which prevailed, is given in Mt 28:19: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." But it is curious that the words are not given in any description of Christian baptism until the time of Justin Martyr: and there they are not repeated exactly but in a slightly extended and explanatory form. He says that Christians "receive the washing with water in the name of God, the Ruler and Father of the universe, and of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit" (1 Apol., 61). In every account of the performance of the rite in apostolic times a much shorter formula is in use. The 3,000 believers were baptized on the Day of Pentecost "in the name of Jesus" (Ac 2:38); and the same formula was used at the baptism of Cornelius and those that were with him (Ac 10:48). Indeed it would appear to have been the usual one, from Paul’s question to the Corinthians: "Were ye baptized into the name of Paul?" (1Co 1:13). The Samaritans were baptized "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Ac 8:16); and the same formula (a common one in acts of devotion) was used in the case of the disciples at Ephesus. In some instances it is recorded that before baptism the converts were asked to make some confession of their faith, which took the form of declaring that Jesus was the Lord or that Jesus Christ was the Son of God. It may be inferred from a phrase in 1Pe 3:21 that a formal interrogation was made, and that the answer was an acknowledgment that Jesus Christ was Lord. Scholars have exercised a great deal of ingenuity in trying to explain how, with what appear to be the very words of Jesus given in the Gospel of Mt, another and much shorter formula seems to have been used throughout the apostolic church. Some have imagined that the shorter formula was that used in baptizing disciples during the lifetime of our Lord (Joh 4:1,2), and that the apostles having become accustomed to it continued to use it during their lives. Others declare that the phrases "in the name of Jesus Christ" or "of the Lord Jesus" are not meant to give the formula of baptism, but simply to denote

that the rite was Christian. Others think that the full formula was always used and that the narratives in the Book of Ac and in the Pauline Epistles are merely brief summaries of what took place—an idea rather difficult to believe in the absence of any single reference to the longer formula. Others, again, insist that baptism in the name of one of the persons of the Trinity implies baptism in the name of the Three. While others declare that Matthew does not give the very words of Jesus but puts in His mouth what was the common formula used at the date and in the district where the First Gospel was written. Whatever explanation be given it is plain that the longer formula became universal or almost universal in the sub-apostolic church. Justin Martyr has been already. quoted. Tertullian, nearly half a century later, declares expressly that the "law of baptism has been imposed and the formula prescribed" in Mt 28:19 (De Bapt., 13); and he adds in his Adversus Praxean (c. 26): "And it is not once only, but thrice, that we are immersed into the Three Persons, at each several mention of Their names." The evidence to show that the formula given by Matthew became the established usage is overwhelming; but it is more than likely that the use of the shorter formula did not altogether die out, or, if it did, that it was revived. The historian Socrates informs us that some of the more extreme Arians "corrupted" baptism by using the name of Christ only in the formula; while injunctions to use the longer formula and punishments, including deposition, threatened to those who presumed to employ the shorter which meet us in collections of ecclesiastical canons (Apos. Canons, 43, 50), prove that the practice of using the shorter formula existed in the 5th and 6th centuries, at all events in the East.

V. The Doctrine of Baptism.

The sacraments, and baptism as one of them, are always described to be

(1) signs representing as in a picture or figure spiritual benefits (1Pe 3:21), and also

(2) as seals or personal tokens and attestations corroborative of solemn promises of spiritual benefits.

Hence, the sacrament is said to have two parts: "the one an outward and sensible sign, used according to Christ’s appointment; the other an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified." It is held, moreover, that when the rite of baptism has been duly and devoutly performed with faith on the part of both giver and receiver, the spiritual benefits do follow the performance of the rite. The question therefore arises: What are the spiritual and evangelical blessings portrayed and solemnly promised in baptism? In the New Testament we find that baptism is intimately connected with the following: with remission of sins, as in Ac 22:16 ("Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins"), and in Heb 10:22; with regeneration or the new birth, as in Tit 3:6 and Joh 3:5 (this idea also entered into the baptism of proselytes and even into the thought of baptism in the Mysteries; neophytes were taught that in the water they died to their old life and began a new one (Apuleius Meta. xi)); with engrafting into Christ, with union with Him, as in Ga 3:27—and union in definite ways, in His death, His burial and His resurrection, as in Ro 6:3-6; with entering into a new relationship with God, that of sonship, as in Ga 3:26,27; with the bestowal of the Holy 16:16; Spirit, as in 1Co 12:13; with belonging to the church, as in Ac 2:41; with the gift of salvation, as in Joh 3:5. From these and similar passages theologians conclude that baptism is a sign and seal of our engrafting into Christ and of our union with Him, of remission of sins, regeneration, adoption

and life eternal; that the water in baptism represents and signifies both the blood of Christ, which takes away all our sins, and also the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit against the dominion of sin and the corruption of our human nature; and that baptizing with water signifies the cleansing from sin by the blood and for the merit of Christ, together with the mortification of sin and rising from sin to newness of life by virtue of the death and resurrection of Christ. Or to put it more simply: Baptism teaches that all who are out of Christ are unclean by reason of sin and need to be cleansed. It signifies that just as washing with water cleanses the body so God in Christ cleanses the soul from sin by the Holy Spirit and that we are to see in this cleansing not merely pardon but also an actual freeing of the soul from the pollution and power of sin and therefore the beginnings of a new life. The sacrament also shows us that the cleansing is reached only through connection with the death of Christ, and further that through the new life begun in us we become in a special way united to Christ and enter into a new and filial relationship with God. Probably all Christians, reformed and unreformed, will agree in the above statement of the doctrinal meaning in the rite of baptism; and also that when the sacrament is rightly used the inward and spiritual grace promised is present along with the outward and visible signs. But Romanists and Protestants differ about what is meant by the right use of the sacrament. They separate on the question of its efficacy. The former understand by the right use simply the correct performance of the rite and the placing no obstacle in the way of the flow of efficacy. The latter insist that there can be no right use of the sacrament unless the recipient exercises faith, that without faith the sacrament is not efficacious and the inward and spiritual blessings do not accompany the external and visible signs. Whatever minor differences divide Protestant evangelical churches on this sacrament they are all agreed upon this, that where there is no faith there can be no regeneration. Here emerges doctrinally the difference between those who give and who refuse to give the sacrament to infants.

The Doctrine of Infant Baptism:

The latter taking their stand on the fundamental doctrine of all evangelical Christians that faith is necessary to make any sacrament efficacious, and assuming that the effect of an ordinance is always tied to the precise time of its administration, insist that only adults can perform such a conscious, intelligent, and individually independent act of faith, as they believe all Protestants insist on scriptural grounds to be necessary in the right use of a sacrament. Therefore they refuse to baptize infants and young children.

The great majority of evangelical Protestants practice infant baptism and do not think, due explanations being given, that it in any way conflicts with the idea that faith is necessary to the efficacy of the sacrament. The Baptist position appears to them to conflict with much of the teaching of the New Testament. It implies that all who are brought up in the faith of Christ and within the Christian family still lack, when they come to years of discretion, that great change of heart and life which is symbolized in baptism, and can only receive it by a conscious, intelligent and thoroughly independent act of faith. This seems in accordance neither with Scripture nor with human nature. We are told that a child may be full of the Holy Ghost from his mother’s womb (Lu 1:15); that little children are in the kingdom of Christ (Mt 19:14); that children of believing parents are holy (1Co 7:14). Is there nothing in the fact that in the New Testament as in the Old Testament the promise is "to you and your children"? Besides, the argument of those who oppose the baptism of infants, if logically carried out, leads to consequences which few of them would accept. Faith is as essential to salvation, on all evangelical theology, as it is for

the right use of the sacrament; and every one of the arguments brought against the baptism of infants is equally applicable to the denial of their salvation. Nor can the Baptist position be said to be true to the facts of ordinary human nature. Faith, in its evangelical sense of fiducia or trust, is not such an abrupt thing as they make it. Their demand for such a conscious, intelligent, strictly individualist act of faith sets aside some of the deepest facts of human nature. No one, young or old, is entirely self-dependent; nor are our thoughts and trust always or even frequently entirely independent and free from the unconscious influences of others. We are interwoven together in society; and what is true generally reveals itself still more strongly in the intimate relations of the family. Is it possible in all cases to trace the creative effects of the subtle imperceptible influences which surround children, or to say when the slowly dawning intelligence is first able to apprehend enough to trust in half-conscious ways? It is but a shallow view of human nature which sets all such considerations on the one side and insists on regarding nothing but isolated acts of knowledge or of faith. With all those thoughts in their minds, the great majority of evangelical churches admit and enjoin the baptism of infants. They believe that the children of believing parents are "born within the church and have interest in the covenant of grace and a right to its seal." They explain that the efficacy of a sacrament is not rigidly tied to the exact time of administration, and can be appropriated whenever faith is kindled and is able to rest on the external sign, and that the spiritual blessings signified in the rite can be appropriated again and again with each fresh kindling of faith. They declare that no one can tell how soon the dawning intelligence may awaken to the act of appropriation. Therefore these churches instruct their ministers in dispensing the sacrament to lay vows on parents that they will train up the infants baptized "in the knowledge and fear of the Lord," and will teach them the great blessings promised to them in and through the sacrament and teach them to appropriate these blessings for themselves. They further enjoin their ministers to admonish all who may witness a baptismal service to look back on their own baptism in order that their faith may be stirred afresh to appropriate for themselves the blessings which accompany the proper use of the rite.

LITERATURE.

The literature on the subject of baptism is very extensive. It may be sufficient to select the following: J. S. Candlish, The Sacraments, 10th thousand, 1900; J. C. W. Augusti, Denkwurdigkeiten aus d. christ. Archaologie, V, 1820; Hofling, Das Sakrament der Taufe, 1846-48; J. B. Mozley, Review of the Baptismal Controversy, 2nd edition, 1895; W. Goode, The Doctrine of the Church of England as to the Effects of Baptism in the Case of Infants, 1849; W. Wall, History of Infant Baptism, 1705; E. B. Underhill, Confessions of Faith .... of Baptist Churches of England (Hanserd Knollys Soc., IX), 1854.

T. M. Lindsay

BAPTISM (THE BAPTIST INTERPRETATION) bap’-tiz-m:

I. MEANING OF BAPTISM

1. Terminology

2. Proselyte Baptism

3. Greek Usage

4. New Testament Usage

5. The Didache

6. Baptismal Regeneration

II. THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM

III. THE PRESENT OBLIGATION

LITERATURE

This article is not a discussion of the whole subject, but is merely a presentation of the Baptist interpretation of the ordinance. The origin and history of the ordinance, as a whole, do not come within the range of the present treatment.

I. Meaning of Baptism.

1. Terminology:

The verb used in the New Testament is (baptizo). The substantives baptisma and baptismos occur, though the latter is not used in the New Testament of the ordinance of baptism except by implication (Heb 6:2, "the teaching of baptisms") where the reference is to the distinction between the Christian ordinance and the Jewish ceremonial ablutions. Some documents have it also in Col 2:12 (compare Heb 9:10, "divers washings") for a reference purely to the Jewish purifications (compare the dispute about purifying in Joh 3:25). The verb baptizo appears in this sense in Lu 11:38 (margin) where the Pharisee marveled that Jesus "had not first bathed himself before breakfast" (noon-day meal). The Mosaic regulations required the bath of the whole body (Le 15:16) for certain uncleannesses. Tertullian (de Baptismo, XV) says that the Jew required almost daily washing. Herodotus (ii.47) says that if an Egyptian "touches a swine in passing with his clothes, he goes to the river and dips himself (bapto) from it" (quoted by Broadus in Commentary on Matthew, 333). See also the Jewish scrupulosity illustrated in Sirach 34:25 and Judith 12:7 where baptizo occurs. The same thing appears in the correct text in Mr 7:4, "And when they come from the market-place, except they bathemselves, they eat not." Here baptizo is the true text. The use of rhantizo ("sprinkle") is due to the difficulty felt by copyists not familiar with Jewish customs. See also the omission of "couches" in the same verse. The couches were "pallets" and could easily be dipped into water. It is noteworthy that here rhantizo is used in contrast with baptizo, showing that baptizo did not mean sprinkle. The term baptismos occurs in Josephus (Ant., XVIII, v, 2) in connection with John’s baptism (compare also Irenaeus 686 B about Christ’s baptism). In general,

however, baptisma is the substantive found for the ordinance. The verb baptizo is in reality a frequentative or intensive of bapto ("dip"). Examples occur where that idea is still appropriate, as in 2Ki 5:14 (Septuagint) where Naaman is said to have "dipped himself seven times in the Jordan" (ebaptisato). The notion of repetition may occur also in Josephus (Ant., XV, iii, 3) in connection with the death of Aristobulus, brother of Mariamne, for Herod's friends "dipped him as he was swimming, and plunged him under water, in the dark of the evening." But in general the term baptizo, as is common with such forms in the late Greek, is simply equivalent to bapto (compare Lu 16:24) and means "dip," "immerse," just as rhantizo, like rhaino, means simply "sprinkle."

If baptizo never occurred in connection with a disputed ordinance, there would be no controversy on the meaning of the word. There are, indeed, figurative or metaphorical uses of the word as of other words, but the figurative is that of immersion, like our "immersed in cares," "plunged in grief," etc. It remains to consider whether the use of the word for a ceremony or ordinance has changed its significance in the New Testament as compared with ancient Greek

It may be remarked that no Baptist has written a lexicon of the Greek language, and yet the standard lexicons, like that of Liddell and Scott, uniformly give the meaning of baptizo as "dip," "immerse." They do not give "pour" or "sprinkle," nor has anyone ever adduced an instance where this verb means "pour" or "sprinkle." The presumption is therefore in favor of "dip" in the New Testament.

2. Proselyte Baptism:

Before we turn directly to the discussion of the ceremonial usage, a word is called for in regard to Jewish proselyte baptism. It is still a matter of dispute whether this initiatory rite was in existence at the time of John the Baptist or not. Schurer argues ably, if not conclusively, for the idea that this proselyte baptism was in use long before the first mention of it in the 2nd century. (Compare The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div ii, II, 319 ff; also Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, appendix, xii, Baptism of Proselytes). It matters nothing at all to the Baptist contention what is true in this regard. It would not be strange if a bath was required for a Gentile who became a Jew, when the Jews themselves required such frequent ceremonial ablutions. But what was the Jewish initiatory rite called proselyte baptism? Lightfoot (Horae Hebraicae, Mt 3:7) gives the law for the baptism of proselytes: "As soon as he grows whole of the wound of circumcision, they bring him to Baptism, and being placed in the water they again instruct him in some weightier and in some lighter commands of the Law. Which being heard, he plunges himself and comes up, and, behold, he is an Israelite in all things." To this quotation Marcus Dods (Presbyterian) HDB adds: "To use Pauline language, his old man is dead and buried in the water, and he rises from this cleansing grave a new man. The full significance of the rite would have been lost had immersion not been practiced." Lightfoot says further: "Every person baptized must dip his whole body, now stripped and made naked, at one dipping. And wheresoever in the Law washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else than the washing of the whole body." Edersheim (op. cit.) says: "Women were attended by those of their own sex, the rabbis standing at the door outside." Jewish proselyte baptism, an initiatory ceremonial rite, harmonizes exactly with the current meaning of baptizo already seen. There was no peculiar "sacred" sense that changed "dip" to "sprinkle."

3. Greek Usage:

The Greek language has had a continuous history, and baptizo is used today in Greece for baptism. As is well known, not only in Greece, but all over Russia, wherever the Greek church prevails, immersion is the unbroken and universal practice. The Greeks may surely be credited with knowledge of the meaning of their own language. The substitution of pouring or sprinkling for immersion, as the Christian ordinance of baptism, was late and gradual and finally triumphed in the West because of the decree of the Council of Trent. But the Baptist position is that this substitution was unwarranted and subverts the real significance of the ordinance. The Greek church does practice trine immersion, one immersion for each person of the Trinity, an old practice (compare ter mergitamur, Tertullian ii.79 A), but not the Scriptural usage. A word will be needed later concerning the method by which pouring crept in beside immersion in the 2nd and later centuries. Before we turn directly to the New Testament use of bapti zo it is well to quote from the Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods by Professor E. A. Sophocles, himself a native Greek. He says (p. 297): "There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks." We expect therefore to find in the New Testament "dip," as the meaning of this word in the ceremonial sense of an initiatory Christian rite. Thayer's Lexicon likewise defines the word in this ceremonial Christian use to mean "an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin."

Baptists could very well afford to rest the matter right here. There is no need to call for the testimony of a single Baptist scholar on this subject. The world of scholarship has rendered its decision with impartiality and force on the side of the Baptists in this matter. A few recent deliverances will suffice. Dr. Alfred Plummer (Church of England) in his new Commentary on Matthew (p. 28) says that the office of John the Baptist was "to bind them to a new life, symbolized by immersion in water." Swete (Church of England) in his Commentary on Mark (p. 7) speaks of "the added thought of immersion, which gives vividness to the scene." The early Greek ecclesiastical writers show that immersion was employed (compare Barnabas, XI, 11): "We go down into the water full of sins and filth, and we come up bearing fruit in the heart." For numerous ecclesiastical examples see Sophocles' Lexicon.

4. New Testament Usage:

But the New Testament itself makes the whole matter perfectly plain. The uniform meaning of "dip" for baptizo and the use of the river Jordan as the place for baptizing by John the Baptist makes inevitable the notion of immersion unless there is some direct contradictory testimony. It is a matter that should be lifted above verbal quibbling or any effort to disprove the obvious facts. The simple narrative in Mt 3:6 is that "they were baptized of him in the river Jordan." In Mr 1:9,10 the baptism is sharpened a bit in the use of eis and ek. Jesus "was baptized of John in (eis) the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of (ek) the water, he saw." So in Ac 8:38 we read: "They both went down into (eis) the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came up out of (ek) the water, the Spirit .... caught away Philip." If one could still be in doubt about the matter, Paul sets it at rest by the symbolism used in Ro 6:4, "We were buried therefore with him through bapti sm into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." The

submergence and emergence of immersion thus, according to Paul, symbolize the death and burial to sin on the one hand and the resurrection to the new life in Christ on the other. Sanday and Headlam (Church of England) put it thus in their Commentary on Romans (p. 153): "It expresses symbolically a series of acts corresponding to the redeeming acts of Christ. Immersion = Death. Submersion = Burial (the ratification of death). Emergence = Resurrection." In Col 2:12 Paul again says: "having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." The same image is here presented. Lightfoot (Church of England) on Colossians (p. 182) says: "Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and new life."

There is nothing in the New Testament to offset this obvious and inevitable interpretation. There are some things which are brought up, but they vanish on examination. The use of "with" after baptize in the English translation is appealed to as disproving immersion. It is enough to reply that the Committee of the American Standard Revision, which had no Baptist member at the final revision, substituted "in" for "with." Thus: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance" (Mt 3:11; compare also Mr 1:8). The use of both "with" and "in" in Lu 3:16 is a needless stickling for the use of the Greek en with the locative case. In Mr 1:8 en is absent in the best manuscripts, and yet the American Revisers correctly render "in." In Ac 1:5 they seek to draw the distinction between the mere locative and en and the locative. As a matter of fact the locative case alone is amply sufficient in Greek without en for the notion of "in." Thus in Joh 21:8 the translation is: "But the other disciples came in the little boat." There is no en in the Greek, but "the boat" is simply in the locative case. If it be argued that we have the instrumental case (compare the instrumental case of en as in Re 6:8, "kill with sword"), the answer is that the way to use water as an instrument in dipping is to put the subject in the water, as the natural way to use the boat (Joh 21:8) as an instrument is to get into it. The presence or absence of en with baptizo is wholly immaterial. In either case "dip" is the meaning of the verb The objection that three thousand people could not have been immersed in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost is superficial. Jerusalem was abundantly supplied with pools. There were 120 disciples on hand, most of whom were probably men (compare the 70 sent out before by Jesus). It is not at all necessary to suppose that the 12 (Matthias was now one of them) apostles did all the baptizing. But even so, that would be only 250 apiece. I myself have baptized 42 candidates in a half-hour in a creek where there would be no delay. It would at most be only a matter of four or five hours for each of the twelve. Among the Telugus this record has been far exceeded. It is sometimes objected that Paul could not have immersed the jailer in the prison; but the answer is that Luke does not say so. Indeed Luke implies just the opposite: "And he took (took along in the Greek, para) them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized." He took Paul and Silas along with him and found a place for the baptism, probably, somewhere on the prison grounds. There is absolutely nothing in the New Testament to dispute the unvarying significance of baptizo.

5. The Didache:

Appeal has been made to the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, which may belong to the first half of the 2nd century. Here for the first time pouring is distinctly admitted as an ordinance in place of immersion.

Because of this remarkable passage it is argued by some that, though immersion was the normal and regular baptism, yet alongside of it, pouring was allowed, and that in reality it was a matter of indifference which was used even in the 1st century. But that is not the true interpretation of the facts in the case. The passage deserves to be quoted in full and is here given in the translation of Philip Schaff (Presbyterian) in his edition of the Didache (pp. 184 ff): "Now concerning baptism, baptize thus: Having first taught all these things, baptize ye into (eis) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, in living water. And if thou hast not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, then in warm (water). But if thou hast neither, pour water thrice upon the head in (eis) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." There is thus no doubt that early in the 2nd century some Christians felt that baptism was so important that, when the real baptism (immersion) could not be performed because of lack of water, pouring might be used in its place. This is absolutely all that can be deduced from this passage. It is to be noted that for pouring another word (ekcheo) is used, clearly showing that baptizo does not mean "to po ur." The very exception filed proves the Baptist contention concerning baptizo. Now in the New Testament baptizo is the word used for baptism. Ekcheo is never so used. Harnack in a letter to C. E. W. Dobbs, Madison, Ind. (published in The Independent for February 9, 1885), under date of January 16, 1885 says:

(1) Baptizein undoubtedly signifies immersion (eintauchen).

(2) No proof can be found that it signifies anything else in the New Testament and in the most ancient Christian literature. The suggestion regarding ‘a sacred sense’ is out of the question.

This is the whole point of the Baptists admirably stated by Adolph Harnack. There is no thought of denying that pouring early in the 2nd century came to be used in place of immersion in certain extreme cases. The meaning of baptizo is not affected a particle by this fact. The question remains as to why this use of pouring in extreme cases grew up. The answer is that it was due to a mistaken and exaggerated estimate put upon the value of baptism as essential to salvation. Those who died without baptism were felt by some to be lost. Thus arose "clinic" baptisms.

6. Baptismal Regeneration:

(For the doctrine of baptismal regeneration see Justin Martyr, First Apology, 61.) Out of this perversion of the symbolism of baptism grew both pouring as an ordinance and infant baptism. If baptism is necessary to salvation or the means of regeneration, then the sick, the dying, infants, must be baptized, or at any rate something must be done for them if the real baptism (immersion) cannot be performed because of extreme illness or want of water. The Baptist contention is to protest against the perversion of the significance of baptism as the ruin of the symbol. Baptism, as taught in the New Testament, is the picture of death and burial to sin and resurrection to new life, a picture of what has already taken place in the heart, not the means by which spiritual change is wrought. It is a privilege and duty, not a necessity. It is a picture that is lost when something else is substituted in its place.

See BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

II. The Subjects of Baptism.

It is significant that even the Teaching of the Twelve apostles with its exaggerated notion of the importance of baptism does not allow baptism of infants. It says: "Having first taught all these things." Instruction precedes baptism. That is a distinct denial of infant baptism. The uniform practice in the New Testament is that baptism follows confession. The people "confessing their sins" were baptized by John (Mt 3:6). It is frankly admitted by Paedobaptist scholars that the New Testament gives no warrant for infant baptism. Thus Jacobus (Congregationalist) in the Standard Bible Dictionary says: "We have no record in the New Testament of the baptism of infants." Scott (Presbyterian) in the 1-vol HDB says: "The New Testament contains no explicit reference to the baptism of infants or young children." Plummer (Church of England), HDB, says: "The recipients of Christian baptism were required to repent and believe." Marcus Dods (Presbyterian), DCG, says: "A rite wherein by immersion in water the participant symbolizes and signalizes his transition from an impure to a pure life, his death to a past he abandons, and his new birth to a future he desires." It would be hard to state the Baptist interpretation in better terms. Thus no room is found in the New Testament for infant baptism which would symbolize what the infant did not experience or would be understood to cause the regeneration in the child, a form of sacramentalism repugnant to the New Testament teaching as understood by Baptists. The dominant Baptist note is the soul's personal relation to God apart from ordinance, church or priest. The infant who dies unbaptized is saved without baptism. The baptized individual, child (for children are often baptized by Baptists, children who show signs of conversion) or man, is converted before his baptism. The baptism is the symbol of the change already wrought. So clear is this to the Baptist that he bears continual protest against that perversion of this beautiful ordinance by those who treat it as a means of salvation or who make it meaningless when performed before conversion. Baptism is a preacher of the spiritual life. The Baptist contention is for a regenerated church membership, placing the kingdom before the local church. Membership in the kingdom precedes membership in the church. The passages quoted from the New Testament in support of the notion of infant baptism are wholly irrelevant, as, for instance, in Ac 2:39 where there is no such idea as baptism of infants. So in 1Co 7:14, where note husband and wife. The point is that the marriage relation is sanctified and the children are legitimate, though husband or wife be heathen. The marriage relation is to be maintained. It is begging the question to assume the presence of infants in the various household baptisms in Acts. In the case of the family of Cornelius they all spake with tongues and magnified God (Ac 10:46). The jailer's household "rejoiced greatly" (Ac 16:34). We do not even know that Lydia was married. Her household may have been merely her employes in her business. The New Testament presents no exceptions in this matter.

III. The Present Obligation.

The Baptists make one more point concerning baptism. It is that, since Jesus himself submitted to it and enjoined it upon His disciples, the ordinance is of perpetual obligation. The arguments for the late ecclesiastical origin of Mt 28:19 are not convincing. If it seem strange that Jesus should mention the three persons of the Trinity in connection with the command to baptize, one should remember that the Father and the Spirit were both manifested to Him at His baptism. It was not a mere ceremonial ablution like the Jewish rites. It was the public and formal avowal of fealty to God, and the names of the Trinity

properly occur. The new heart is wrought by the Holy Spirit. Reconciliation with the Father is wrought on the basis of the work of the Son, who has manifested the Father's love in His life and death for sin. The fact that in the acts in the examples of baptism only the name of Jesus occurs does not show that this was the exact formula used. It may be a mere historical summary of the essential fact. The name of Jesus stood for the other two persons of the Trinity. On the other hand the command of Jesus may not have been regarded as a formula for baptism; while in no sense sacramental or redemptive, it is yet obligatory and of perpetual significance. It is not to be dropped as one of the Jewish excrescences on Christianity. The form itself is necessary to the significance of the rite. Hence, Baptists hold that immersion alone is to be practiced, sinc e immersion alone was commanded by Jesus and practiced in the New Testament times. Immersion alone sets forth the death to sin, and burial in the grave the resurrection to new life in Christ. Baptism as taught in the New Testament is "a mould of doctrine," a preacher of the heart of the gospel. Baptists deny the right of disciples of Jesus to break that mould. The point of a symbol is the form in which it is cast. To change the form radically is to destroy the symbolism. Baptists insist on the maintenan ce of primitive New Testament baptism because it alone is baptism, it alone proclaims the death and resurrection of Jesus, the spiritual death and resurrection of the believer, the ultimate resurrection of the believer from the grave. The disciple is not above his Lord, and has no right to destroy this rich and powerful picture for the sake of personal convenience, nor because he is willing to do something else which Jesus did not enjoin and which has no association with Him. The long years of perversion do not justify this wrong to the memory of Jesus, but all the more call upon modern disciples to follow the example of Jesus who himself fulfilled righteousness by going into the waters of the Jordan and receiving immersion at the hands of John the Baptist.

LITERATURE.

The Greek Lexicons, like Suicer, Liddell and Scott, Sophocles, Thayer, Preuschen; the Biblical Dictionaries; the Critical Commentaries on the New Testament; books of antiquities like Smith's Dictionary of Christian Antiquities; the new Sch-Herz; Binghara's Antiquities of the Christian Church; Schaff's Creeds of Christendom; Neale's History of the Holy Eastern Church; Lives of Christ, like Edersheim's LTJM, or a survey of the customs of the Jews like Schurer's HJP; books on John the Baptist like Reynolds' John the Baptist, Feather's Last of the Prophets, Robertson's John the Loyal; special treatises on Baptism like Wall's History of Infant Baptism, Stanley's Christian Institutions, Dargan's Ecclesiology, Conant's Baptizein, Mozley's Review of the Baptismal Controversy, Christian's Immersion, Broadus' Immersion, Frost's The Moral Dignity of Baptism, Whitsitt's a Question in Baptist History, Lofton's The Baptist Reformation, Lambert's The Sacraments of the New Testament, Dale's Classic Baptism and Christian and Patristic Baptism, Kirtley's Design of Baptism, Forester's The Baptist Position, Frost's Baptist Why and Why Not, Ford's Studies in Baptism.

A. T. Robertson

BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD

(baptizomai huper ton nekron).

_1. Paul’s Argument:

Some of the Corinthian Christians denied the resurrection of the dead, and Paul advances three arguments to convince them that the dead will be raised:

(1) "If there is no resurrection of the dead, neither hath Christ been raised," but Christ is raised (1Co 15:13,20).

(2) If the dead are not raised, why are men being baptized for the dead (1Co 15:29)?

(3) Why should the apostle himself wage his spiritual warfare (1Co 15:30)? The first argument rests upon the central fact of Christianity, and the other two are appeals to the consistency of the Corinthians, and of Paul himself. Whatever "baptism for the dead" meant, it was, in Paul’s opinion, as real, valid and legitimate a premise from which to conclude that the dead would rise as his own sufferings. The natural meaning of the words is obvious. Men in Corinth, and possibly elsewhere, were being continually baptized on behalf of others who were at the time dead, with a view to benefiting them in the resurrection, but if there be no resurrection, what shall they thus accomplish, and why do they do it? "The only legitimate reference is to a practice .... of survivors allowing themselves to be baptized on behalf of (believing?) friends who had died without baptism" (Alford in the place cited.).

2. Patristic Evidence:

Tertullian believed that Paul referred to a custom of vicarious baptism (Res., 48c; Adv. Marc., 5.10). There is evidence that the early church knew such a practice. Epiphanius mentions a tradition that the custom obtained among the Cerinthians (Haer., 28 6). And Chrysostom states that it prevailed among the Marcionites.

3. Modern Views:

But commentators have offered between thirty and forty other interpretations, more or less strained, of the passage. (For a summary of different views see T. C. Edwards and Stanley, Comms., at the place) Two of the most reasonable views from recent commentators are: "What shall they do who receive baptism on account of the dead? i.e. with a view to the resurrection of the dead?" and therefore to sharing in it themselves (Canon Evans, Speaker’s Comm., at the place); "that the death of Christians led to the conversion of survivors, who in the first instance ‘for the sake of the dead’ (their beloved dead), and in the hope of reunion, turn to Christ" (Findlay, Expositor’s Greek Test., at the place). Both ideas may be true, but they are simply imported into this passage, and the latter also is quite irrelevant to the argument and makes Paul identify conversion with baptism.

4. The Difficulty:

But why is all this ingenuity expended to evade the natural meaning? Because

(1) such a custom would be a superstition involving the principle of opus operarum; and

(2) Paul could not share or even tolerate a contemporary idea which is now regarded as superstition.

To reply (with Alford) that Paul does not approve the custom will not serve the purpose, for he would scarcely base so great an argument, even as an argumentum ad hominem, on a practice which he regarded as wholly false and superstitious. The retort of those who denied the resurrection would be too obvious. But why should it be necessary to suppose that Paul rose above all the limitations of his age? The idea that symbolic acts had a vicarious significance had sunk deeply into the Jewish mind, and it would not be surprising if it took more than twenty years for the leaven of the gospel to work all the Jew out of Paul. At least it serves the apostle's credit ill to make his argument meaningless or absurd in order to save him from sharing at all in the inadequate conceptions of his age. He made for himself no claim of infallibility.

T. Rees

BAPTISM OF FIRE

(en pneumati hagio kai puri): This expression is used in Mt 3:11. The copulative kai requires that the baptism "in the Holy Ghost and in fire," should be regarded as one and the same thing. It does violence to the construction, therefore, to make this statement refer to the fire Of judgment. The difficulty has always been in associating fire with the person of the Holy Ghost. But in the connection of fire with the work or influence of the Holy Ghost the difficulty disappears. The thought of John is that the Saviour would give them the Divine Sanctifier as purifying water to wash away their sins and as a refining fire to consume their dross; to kindle in their hearts the holy flame of Divine love and zeal; to illuminate their souls with heavenly wisdom. The statement, therefore, in this verse indicates the manner in which Christ will admit them to discipleship and prepare them for His service.

See BAPTISM; FIRE.

Jacob W. Kapp

BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

1. The Biblical Material:

The expression "baptism of the Holy Spirit" is based on a number of predictions found in our four Gospels and in connection with these the record of their fulfillment in the Book of Acts. The passages in the Gospels are as follows: Mt 3:11: "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance: but he that cometh

after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire." The last clause is autos humas baptisei en pneumati hagio kai puri. In Mr 1:8 and Lu 3:16 we have the declaration in a slightly modified form; and in Joh 1:33 John the Baptist declares that the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at the baptism of the latter marked out Jesus as "he that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit." Again in Joh 7:37,38 we read: "Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water." Then the evangelist adds in Joh 7:39: "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." These are the specific references in the four Gospels to the baptisms of the Holy Spirit. In Ac we find direct reference by Luke to the promised baptism in the Holy Spirit. In Ac 1:5 Jesus, just before the ascension, contrasts John's baptism in water with the baptism in the Holy Spirit which the disciples are to receive "not many days hence," and in Ac 1:8 power in witnessing for Jesus is predicted as the result of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. On the evening of the resurrection day Jesus appeared to the disciples and "he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit" (Joh 20:22). This was probably not a wholly symbolic act but an actual communication to the disciples, in some measure, of the gift of the Spirit, preliminary to the later complete bestowal.

We observe next the fulfillment of these predictions as recorded in Acts. The gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost and the miraculous manifestations which followed are clearly the chief historical fulfillment of the prediction of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Among the manifestations of the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost were first those which were physical, such as "a sound as of the rushing of a mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting" (Ac 2:2), and the appearance of "tongues parting asunder, like as of fire; and it sat upon each one of them" (Ac 2:3). Secondly, there were spiritual results: "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance" (Ac 2:4). In Ac 2:16 ff Peter declares that this bestowment of the Holy Spirit is in fulfillment of the prediction made by the prophet Joe and he cites the words in Ac 2:28 ff of Joel's prophecy.

There is one other important passage in Acts in which reference is made to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. While Peter was speaking to Cornelius (Ac 10:44) the Holy Spirit fell on all that heard the word and they of the circumcision who were with Peter "were amazed" "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit." When giving the brethren at Jerusalem an account of his visit to Cornelius, Peter declares that this event which he had witnessed was a baptism of the Holy Spirit (Ac 11:16): "And I remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit."

2. Significance of Baptism of the Holy Spirit:

We consider next the significance of the baptism of the Holy Spirit from various points of view.

(1) From the Point of View of Old Testament Teaching as to the Gift of the Spirit.

The prophecy of Joe quoted by Peter indicates something extraordinary in the gift of the Spirit at Pentecost. The Spirit now comes in new forms of manifestation and with new power. The various classes mentioned as receiving the Spirit indicate the wide diffusion of the new power. In the Old Testament usually the Spirit was bestowed upon individuals; here the gift is to the group of disciples, the church. Here the gift is permanently bestowed, while in the Old Testament it was usually transient and for a special purpose. Here again the Spirit comes in fullness as contrasted with the partial bestowment in Old Testament times.

(2) From the Point of View of the Ascended Christ.

In Lu 24:49 Jesus commands the disciples to tarry in the city "until ye be clothed with power from on high," and in Joh 15:26 He speaks of the Comforter "whom I will send unto you from the Father," "he shall bear witness of me"; and in Joh 16:13 Jesus declares that the Spirit when He comes shall guide the disciples into all truth, and He shall show them things to come. In this verse the Spirit is called the Spirit of truth. It was fitting that the Spirit who was to interpret truth and guide into all truth should come in fullness after, rather than before, the completion of the life-task of the Messiah. The historical manifestation of Divine truth as thus completed made necessary the gift of the Spirit in fullness. Christ Himself was the giver of the Spirit. The Spirit now takes the place of the ascended Christ, or rather takes the things of Christ and shows them to the disciples. The baptism of the Spirit at Pentecost thus becomes the great historic event signalizing the beginning of a new era in the kingdom of God in which the whole movement is lifted to the spiritual plane, and the task of evangelizing the world is formally begun.

(3) The Significance of the Baptism of the Spirit from the Point of View of the Disciples.

It can scarcely be said with truth that Pentecost was the birthday of the church. Jesus had spoken of His church during His earthly ministry. The spiritual relation to Christ which constitutes the basis of the church existed prior to the baptism of the Holy Spirit. But that baptism established the church in several ways. First in unity. The external bond of unity now gives place to an inner spiritual bond of profound significance. Secondly, the church now becomes conscious of a spiritual mission, and theocratic ideals of the kingdom disappear. Thirdly, the church is now endued with power for its work. Among the gifts bestowed were the gift of prophecy in the large sense of speaking for God, and the gift of tongues which enabled disciples to speak in foreign tongues. The account in the second chapter of Ac admits of no other construction. There was also bestowed power in witnessing for Christ. This was indeed one of the most prominent blessings named in connection with the promise of the baptism of the Spirit. The power of working miracles was also bestowed (Ac 3:4 ff; 5:12 ff). Later in the epistles of Paul much emphasis is given to the Spirit as the sanctifying agency in the hearts of believers. In Ac the word of the Spirit is chiefly Messianic, that is, the Spirit’s activity is all seen in relation to the extension of the Messianic kingdom. The occasion for the outpouring of the Spirit is Pentecost when men from all nations are assembled in Jerusalem. The symbolic representation of tongues of fire is suggestive of preaching, and the glossolalia, or speaking with tongues which followed, so that men of various nations heard the gospel in their own languages, indicates that the baptism of the Spirit had a very special relation to the task of world-wide evangelization for the bringing in of the kingdom of God.

3. Finality of the Baptism of the Holy Spirit:

The question is often raised whether or not the baptism of the Holy Spirit occurred once for all or is repeated in subsequent baptisms. The evidence seems to point to the former view to the extent at least of being limited to outpourings which took place in connection with events recorded in the early chapters of the Book of Acts. The following considerations favor this view:

(1) In the first chapter of Ac Jesus predicts, according to Luke's account, that the baptism of the Holy Spirit would take place, "not many days hence" (Ac 1:5). This would seem to point to a definite and specific event rather than to a continuous process.

(2) Again, Peter's citation in Ac 2:17-21 of Joel's prophecy shows that in Peter's mind the event which his hearers were then witnessing was the definite fulfillment of the words of Joel.

(3) Notice in the third place that only one other event in the New Testament is described as the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and for special reasons this may be regarded as the completion of the Pentecostal baptism. The passage is that contained in Ac 10:1-11:18 in which the record is given of the following events:

(a) miraculous vision given to Peter on the housetop (Ac 10:11-16) indicating that the things about to occur are of unique importance;

(b) the speaking with tongues (Ac 10:45,46);

(c) Peter declares to the brethren at Jerusalem that the Holy Ghost fell on the Gentiles in this instance of Cornelius and his household "as on us at the beginning" (Ac 11:15);

(d) Peter also declares that this was a fulfillment of the promise of the baptism of the Holy Spirit (Ac 11:16,17);

(e) the Jewish Christians who heard Peter's account of the matter acknowledged this as proof that God had also extended the privileges of the gospel to the Gentiles (Ac 11:18). The baptism of the Holy Spirit bestowed upon Cornelius and his household is thus directly linked with the first outpouring at Pentecost, and as the event which signalized the opening of the door of the gospel formally to Gentiles it is in complete harmony with the missionary significance of the first great Pentecostal outpouring. It was a turning point or crisis in the Messianic kingdom and seems designed to complete the Pentecostal gift by showing that Gentiles as well as Jews are to be embraced in all the privileges of the new dispensation.

(4) We observe again that nowhere in the epistles do we find a repetition of the baptism of the Spirit. This would be remarkable if it had been understood by the writers of the epistles that the baptism of the Spirit was frequently to be repeated. There is no evidence outside the Book of Ac that the baptism of the

Spirit ever occurred in the later New Testament times. In 1Co 12:13 Paul says, "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, ... and were all made to drink of one Spirit." But here the reference is not to the baptism of the Spirit, but rather to a baptism into the church which is the body of Christ. We conclude, therefore, that the Pentecostal baptism taken in conjunction with the baptism of the Spirit in the case of Cornelius completes the baptism of the Holy Spirit according to the New Testament teaching. The baptism of the Spirit as thus bestowed was, however, the definite gift of the Spirit in His fullness for every form of spiritual blessing necessary in the progress of the kingdom and as the permanent and abiding gift of God to His people. In all subsequent New Testament writings there is the assumption of this presence of the Spirit and of His availability for all believers. The various commands and exhortations of the epistles are based on the assumption that the baptism of the Spirit has already taken place, and that, according to the prediction of Jesus to the disciples, the Spirit was to abide with them forever (Joh 14:16). We should not therefore confound other forms of expression found in the New Testament with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When Christians are enjoined to "walk by the Spirit" (Ga 5:16) and "be filled with the Spirit" (Eph 5:18), or when the Spirit is described as an anointing (chrisma) as in 1Jo 2:20-27, and as the "earnest of our inheritance" (arrabon). as in Eph 1:14, and when various other similar expressions are employed in the epistles of the New Testament, we are not to understand the baptism of the Holy Spirit. These expressions indicate aspects of the Spirit's work in believers or of the believer's appropriation of the gifts and blessings of the Spirit rather than the historical baptism of the Spirit.

4. Relation of Baptism of the Spirit to Other Baptisms:

Three final points require brief attention, namely, the relation of the baptism of the Spirit to the baptism in water, and to the baptism in fire, and to the laying on of hands.

(1) We note that the baptism in fire is coupled with the baptism in the Spirit in Mt 3:11 and in Lu 3:16. These passages give the word of John the Baptist. John speaks of the coming One who "shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire" (Lu 3:16). This baptism in fire is often taken as being parallel and synonymous with the baptism in the Spirit. The context however in both Matthew and Luke seems to favor another meaning. Jesus' Messianic work will be both cleansing and destructive. The "you" addressed by John included the people generally and might naturally embrace both classes, those whose attitude to Jesus would be believing and those who would refuse to believe. His action as Messiah would affect all men. Some He would regenerate and purify through the Holy Ghost. Others He would destroy through the fire of punishment. This view is favored by the context in both gospels. In both the destructive energy of Christ is coupled with His saving power in other terms which admit of no doubt. The wheat He gathers into the garner and the chaff He burns with unquenchable fire.

(2) The baptism of the Holy Spirit was not meant to supersede water baptism. This is clear from the whole of the history in the Book of Acts, where water baptism is uniformly administered to converts after the Pentecostal baptism of the Spirit, as well as from the numerous references to water baptisms in the epistles. The evidence here is so abundant that it is unnecessary to develop it in detail. See Ro 6:3; 1Co 1:14-17; 10:2; 12:13; 15:29; Ga 3:27; Eph 4:5; Col 2:12; 1Pe 3:21.

(3) In Ac 8:17 and 19:6 the Holy Spirit is bestowed in connection with the laying on of the hands of apostles, but these are not to be regarded as instances of the baptism of the Spirit in the strict sense, but rather as instances of the reception by believers of the Spirit which had already been bestowed in fullness at Pentecost.

LITERATURE.

Arts. on Holy Spirit in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) and Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels; article on "Spiritual Gifts" in Encyclopedia Biblica; Moule, Veni Creator; Smeaton, The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; Kuyper, The Work of the Holy Spirit.

See also HOLY SPIRIT.

E. Y. Mullins

BAPTISM, INFANT

See BAPTISM (I), II; (II), III, 3, v; (III), III, 3.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION

bap-tiz'-mal re-jen-er-a'-shun: As indicated in the general articles on BAPTISM and SACRAMENTS, the doctrine ordinarily held by Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, and also by Low-Church Episcopalians, differs from that of the Roman and Greek churches, and of High-Church Anglicans, in its rejection of the idea that baptism is the instrumental cause of regeneration, and that the grace of regeneration is effectually conveyed through the administration of that rite wherever duly performed. The teaching of Scripture on this subject is held to be that salvation is immediately dependent on faith, which, as a fruit of the operation of the Spirit of God in the soul, already, in its reception of Christ, implies the regenerating action of that Spirit, and is itself one evidence of it. To faith in Christ is attached the promise of forgiveness, and of all other blessings. Baptism is administered to those who already possess (at least profess) this faith, and symbolizes the dying to sin and rising to righteousness implicit in the act of faith (Ro 6). It is the symbol of a cleansing from sin and renewal by God's Spirit, but not the agency effecting that renewal, even instrumentally. Baptism is not, indeed, to be regarded as a bare symbol. It may be expected that its believing reception will be accompanied by fresh measures of grace, strengthening and fitting for the new life. This, however, as the life is already there, has nothing to do with the idea of baptism as an opus operatum, working a spiritual change in virtue of its mere administration. In Scripture the agency with which regeneration is specially connected is the Divine "word" (compare 1Pe 1:23). Without living faith, in those capable of its exercise, the outward rite can avail nothing. The supposed "regeneration" may be received—in multitudes of instances is received—without the least apparent change in heart or life.

The above, naturally, applies to adults; the case of children, born and growing up within the Christian community, is on a different footing. Those who recognize the right of such to baptism hold that in the normal Christian development children of believing parents should be the subjects of Divine grace from the commencement (Eph 6:4); they therefore properly receive the initiatory rite of the Christian church. The faith of the parent, in presenting his child for baptism, lays hold on God's promise to be a God to him and to his children; and he is entitled to hope for that which baptism pledges to him. But this, again, has no relation to the idea of regeneration through baptism.

James Orr

ANGLICAN (HIGH-CHURCH) DOCTRINE

Regeneration, the initial gift of life in Christ, is, in the church's normal system, associated with the sacrament of baptism. The basis for this teaching and practice of the church is found primarily in our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus (Joh 3:1-8) wherein the new birth is associated not only with the quickening Spirit but with the element of water. The Saviour's words, literally translated, are as follows: "Except one be born (out) of water and Spirit (ex hudatos kai pneumatos gennaomai), he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (That it is the impersonal aspect of the Divine Spirit, i.e. as equivalent to "spiritual life" which is here presented, is indicated by the absence of the article in the Greek of Joh 3:5.) Entrance into the kingdom of God implies entrance into the church as the outward and visible embodiment of that kingdom. our Lord, in the passage above cited, does not limit the possibility or the need of "new birth" to those who have arrived at adult age, or "years of discretion," but uses the general pronoun tis, "anyone." The Anglican church does not, however, teach that baptism is unconditionally necessary, but only that it is "generally" necessary to salvation (compare the language of the Church Catechism with the qualification mentioned in the Prayer-Book "Office for the Baptism of Those of Riper Years," "Whereby ye may perceive the great necessity of this Sacrament, where it may be had"). It is not taught that the grace of God is absolutely or unconditionally bound to the external means, but only that these sacramental agencies are the ordinary and normal channels of Divine grace.

The typical form of baptism is that appropriate to the initiation of adults into the Christian body. Justin Martyr in his First Apology (chapter lxi) no doubt testifies to what was the general view of Christians in the 2nd century (circa 150 AD): "As many as are persuaded and believe that the things taught and said by us are true, and, moreover, take upon them to live accordingly, are taught to pray and ask of God with fasting for forgiveness of their former sins; .... and then they are brought to a place of water, and there regenerated after the same manner with ourselves; for they are washed in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit." For the due administration of this sacrament, personal faith and repentance on the part of the candidate are prerequisite conditions. However, "the baptism of young children" (i.e. of infants) "is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable to the institution of Christ" (XXXIX Articles, Art. XXVII, sub fin.). In the service "For the Baptism of Infants," repentance and faith are promised for the children by their "sureties" (ordinarily known as "sponsors" or "godparents"), "which promise, when they come to age (the children) themselves are bound to perform."

The person, whether adult or infant, receives in his baptism a real forgiveness; a washing away of all sins, whether original or actual. He also receives, at least in germ, the beginnings of new life in Christ; which life, however, must be developed and brought to perfection through his personal cooperation with the grace of God. But regeneration, as such, is not conversion; it is not even faith or love, strictly speaking. These latter, while they are conditions, or effects, or evidences of regeneration, are not regeneration itself, which is purely the work of God, operating by His creative power, through the Holy Ghost. The moral test of the existence of spiritual life is the presence in heart and conduct of the love of God and of obedience to His commandments (see 1 Joh passim).

It may be added that the bestowment of the gifts of spiritual strength—of the manifold graces and of the fullness of the Holy Spirit—is primarily associated with the laying on of hands (confirmation) rather than with baptism proper; the rite of confirmation was, however, originally connected with the baptismal service, as an adjunct to it. The newly-made Christian is not to rest content with the initial gift of life; he is bound to strive forward unto perfection. Confirmation is, in a sense, the completion of baptism. "The doctrine of laying on of hands" is accordingly connected with "the doctrine of baptisms," and both are reckoned by the author of the Epistle to the He as among "the first principles of Christ" (Heb 6:1,2 the King James Version).

LITERATURE.

For the Anglican doctrine on the subject of regeneration in baptism the following authorities may be consulted: Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity, V, lix, lx; Waterland, The Doct. Use of Christian Sacraments; Regeneration; Wall, Infant Baptism; R. I. Wilberforce, The Doctrine of Holy Baptism; Darwell Stone, Holy Baptism, in "The Oxford Library of Practical Theology"; A. J. Mason, The Faith of the Gospel. For patristic teaching on this subject, compare Tertullian, De Baptismo.

William Samuel Bishop

LUTHERAN DOCTRINE

1. Definition of Terms:

Regeneration is here taken in its strict meaning to denote that internal spiritual change, not of the substance, but of the qualities, of the intellect and will of natural man, by which blindness, darkness in regard to spiritual matters, especially the gospel, is removed from the former, and spiritual bondage, impotency, death from the latter (2Co 3:5; Ac 26:18; Php 2:13), and the heart of the sinner is made to savingly know and appropriate the Lord Jesus Christ and the merits of His of atoning sacrifice, as its only hope for a God-pleasing life here in time and a life in glory hereafter. Regeneration in the strict sense signifies the first spiritual movements and impulses in man, the beginning of his thinking Divine thoughts, cherishing holy desires and willing God-like volitions. But it does not signify the radical extinction of sin in man; for evil concupiscence remains also in the regenerate as a hostile element to the new life (Ro 7:23-25; Ga 5:16,17). Peccatum tollitur in baptismo, non ut non sit, sed ut non obsit—

Augustine. "Sin is removed in baptism, not that it may not be, but that it may not hurt." Reduced to its lowest terms, regeneration in the strict sense may be defined as the kindling saving faith in the heart of the sinner; for according to 1 Joh 5:1, "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God." Such terms as new creation (2Co 5:17; Ga 6:15 margin), spiritual quickening, or vivification (Eph 2:5; Ro 6:11), spiritual resurrection (Eph 2:6; Col 3:1), are true synonyms of regeneration in the strict sense. In the point of time justification coincides with regeneration in the strict sense; for it is by faith, too, that the sinner is justified. But these two spiritual events must not be confounded; for justification affects, not the internal conditions of the sinner's heart, but his legal standing with God the righteous Judge. Regeneration is called baptismal regeneration in so far as it occurs in the event and as an effect of the application of the Christian baptism.

See BAPTISM (I), I, 6.

2. Scriptural Basis of This Doctrine:

The two leading texts of Scripture which declare in plain terms that baptism is a means for effecting regeneration in the strict sense are Joh 3:5 and Tit 3:5. But this doctrine is implied in Ac 2:38; Eph 5:26; Ga 3:27; 1Pe 3:21. In Joh 3:7 it is immaterial whether anothen gennethenai is rendered "to be born from above" or "to be born a second time." For the second birth is never of the flesh (Joh 1:13; 3:4,5); hence, is always of divine origin, "from above." It is ascribed to the agency of the entire Trinity: the Father (Jas 1:18; 1Pe 1:3); the Son (Joh 1:12); and the Spirit (Tit 3:5). But by appropriation it is generally attributed to the Spirit alone, whose particular function is that of Quickener (see Cremer, Bibl.-theol. Worterb., 9th edition, under the word "pneuma," 894 f). Baptism is an instrument by which the Holy Spirit effects regeneration. "Water and the Spirit" (Joh 3:5) is a paraphrastic description of baptism: "water," inasmuch as the man is baptized therewith (1 Joh 5:7,8; Eph 5:26) for the forgiveness of sin (Ac 2:33; 22:16; 1Co 6:11), and "Spirit," inasmuch as the Holy Ghost is given to the person baptized in order to his spiritual renewal and sanctification; "both together—the former as causa medians, the latter as causa efficiens—constitute the objective and causative element out of which (compare Joh 1:13) the birth from above is produced (ek)" (Meyer). In Tit 3:5 "the expression to loutrou palingenesias, literally, 'bath of regeneration,' has been very arbitrarily interpreted by some expositors, some taking loutron as a figurative name for the regeneration itself, or for the praedicario evangelii, 'preaching of the gospel' or for the Holy Spirit, or for the abundant imparting of the Spirit. From Eph 5:26 it is clear that it can mean nothing else than baptism; compare too, Heb 10:22; 1Co 6:11; Ac 22:16." Of this laver of regeneration Paul says that through it (dia), i.e. by its instrumentality, men are saved. Meyer is right when, correcting a former view of his, he states: "According to the context, Paul calls baptism the bath of the new birth, not meaning that it pledges us to the new birth ('to complete the process of moral purification, of expiation and sanctification,' Matthies), nor that it is a visible image of the new birth (Wette), for neither in the one sense nor in the other could it be regarded as a means of saving. Paul uses that name for it as the bath by means of which God actually brings about the new birth." The application of baptism and the operation of the Spirit must be viewed as one undivided action. Thus the offense of Spurgeon, Weiss and others at "regeneration by water-baptism" can be removed.

3. Faith in Baptism:

Baptism does not produce salutary effects ex opere operato, i.e. by the mere external performance of the baptismal action. No instrument with which Divine grace works does. Even the preaching of the gospel is void of saving results if not "mixed with faith" (Heb 4:2 the King James Version). Luther correctly describes the working of baptism thus: "How can water do such great things? It is not the water indeed that does them, but the Word of God which is in and with the water (God's giving hand), and faith which trusts such word of God in the water (man's receiving hand)." But this faith, which is required for a salutary use of the gospel and baptism, is wrought by these as instruments which the Holy Spirit employs to produce faith; not by imparting to them a magical power but by uniting His Divine power with them (Ro 10:17; 2Co 4:6; Eph 5:26).

4. Infants and Adults:

The comprehensive statements in Joh 3:6; Eph 2:3 ("by nature") show that infants are in need of being regenerated, and Mt 18:3,6, that they are capable of faith. It is not more difficult for the Holy Spirit to work faith in infants by baptism, than in adults by the preaching of the gospel. And infant faith, though it may baffle our attempts at exact definition, is nevertheless honored in Scripture with the word which denotes genuine faith, pisteuein, i.e. trustfully relying on Christ (Mt 18:6; compare 2Ti 3:15; 1:5). In the case of adults who have received faith through hearing and reading the gospel (Jas 1:18; 1Pe 1:23; 1Co 4:15), baptism is still "the washing of regeneration," because it is a seal to them of the righteousness which these people have previously obtained by believing the gospel (Ro 4:11-13; Ga 3:7); and it reminds them of, and enables them to discharge, their daily duty of putting away the old and putting on the new man (Eph 4:22,24), just as the Word is still the regenerating word of truth (Jas 1:18) though it be preached to persons who are regenerated a long time ago. Accordingly, Luther rightly extends the regenerating and renewing influences of baptism throughout the life of a Christian, when he says "Baptizing with water signifies that the old Adam in us should, by daily contrition and repentance, be drowned and die, with all sins and evil lusts; and, again, a new man should come forth and arise, who shall live before God in righteousness and purity forever" (Smaller Catechism).

W. H. T. Dau

BAPTIST

bap'-tist.

See JOHN THE BAPTIST.

BAR (1)

bar (prefix): Aramaic for the Hebrew ben, "son." Compare Aramaic sections of Ezra and Daniel. In the Old Testament the word is found three times in Pr 31:2 and once in Syriac Ps 2:12 (Hier. translates "pure"). In the New Testament "Bar" is frequently employed as prefix to names of persons. Compare

Barabbas; Bar-Jesus; Bar-Jonah; Barnabas; Barsabbas; Bartholomew; Bartimeus.

See BEN.

BAR (2)

bar (substantive):

(1) beriach =" a bolt" (Ex 26:26-29; 35:11; 36:31-34; 39:33; 40:18; Nu 3:36; 4:31; De 3:5; Jud 16:3; 1Sa 23:7; 1Ki 4:13; 2Ch 8:5; 14:7; Ne 3:3,6,13-15; Job 38:10 "bars and doors" for the sea (the bank or shore of the sea); Ps 107:16; 147:13 "the bars of thy gates": the walls of the city were now rebuilt and its gates only closed and barred by night (see Ne 7:3); Pr 18:19, "bars of a castle"; Isa 45:2; Jer 49:31; 51:30; La 2:9; Eze 38:11): meaning "a rock in the sea" (Jon 2:6).

(2) moT =" a staff," "stick," "pole" (Nu 4:10,12 margin); "strong fortification and great impediment" (Isa 45:2; Am 1:5, "the bolt of Damascus": no need here to render prince, as some do (G. A. Smith in the place cited.)).

(3) badh =" staff," "part of body," "strength" (Job 17:16, "bars of Sheol": the gates of the world of the dead; compare Isa 38:10; some read, "Will the bars of Sheol fall?").

(4) meTil =" something hammered out, a (forged) bar" (Job 40:18).

See DOOR; GATE; HOUSE.

Frank E. Hirsch

BAR-JESUS

bar-je'-zus (Bariesous): "A certain sorcerer (Greek magos), a false prophet, a Jew" whom Paul and Silas found at Paphos in Cyprus in the train of Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul (Ac 13:6 ff). The proconsul was "a man of understanding" (literally, a prudent or sagacious man), of an inquiring mind, interested in the thought and magic of his times. This characteristic explains the presence of a magos among his staff and his desire to hear Barnabas and Saul. Bar-Jesus was the magician's Jewish name. Elymas is said to be the interpretation of his name (Ac 13:8). It is the Greek transliteration of an Aramaic or Arabic word equivalent to Greek magos. From Arabic 'alama, "to know" is derived 'alim, "a wise" or "learned man." In Koran, Sur note 106, Moses is called Sachir 'alim, "wise magician." Elymas therefore means "sorcerer" (compare Simon "Magus").

The East was flooding the Roman Empire with its new and wonderful religious systems, which, culminating in neo-Platonism, were the great rivals of Christianity both in their cruder and in their more

strictly religious forms. Superstition was extremely prevalent, and wonder-workers of all kinds, whether imposters or honest exponents of some new faith, found their task easy through the credulity of the public. Babylonia was the home of magic, for charms are found on the oldest tablets. "Magos" was originally applied to the priests of the Persians who overran Babylonia, but the title degenerated when it was assumed by baser persons for baser articles Juvenal (vi.562, etc.), Horace (Sat. i.2.1) and other Latin authors mention Chaldean astrologers and impostors, probably Babylonian Jews. Many of the Magians, however, were the scientists of their day, the heirs of the science of Babylon and the lore of Persia, and not merely pretenders or conjurers (see MAGIC). It may have been as the representative of some oriental system, a compound of "science" and religion, that Bar-Jesus was attached to the train of Sergius Paulus.

Both Sergius and Elymas had heard about the teaching of the apostles, and this aroused the curiosity of Sergius and the fear of Elymas. When the apostles came, obedient to the command of the proconsul, their doctrine visibly produced on him a considerable impression. Fearing lest his position of influence and gain would be taken by the new teachers, Elymas "withstood them, seeking to turn aside the proconsul from the faith" (Ac 13:8). Paul, inspired by the Holy Spirit, worked a wonder on the wonder-worker by striking him blind with his word, thus revealing to the proconsul that behind him was Divine power. Sergius Paulus believed, "being astonished at the teaching of the Lord" (Ac 13:12).

S. F. Hunter

BAR-JONAH

bar-jo’-na (Bar-ionas): Simon Peter’s patronymic (Mt 16:17). Bar is Aramaic for "son" (compare Bar-timaeus, Bartholomew, etc.), and corresponds to Hebrew ben. Thus we are to understand that Peter’s father’s name was Jonah. But in Joh 1:42; 21:15-17, according to the best reading, his name is given as John (so the Revised Version (British and American), instead of the King James Version Jona, Jonas). There are two hypotheses to account for this difference:

(1) Ionas (Jonah) in Mt 16:17 may be simply a contraction of Ioanes (John);

(2) Peter’s father may have been known by two names, Jonah and John.

D. Miall Edwards

BARABBAS

ba-rab’-as (Barabbas): For Aramaic Bar-abba = literally, "son of the father," i.e. of the master or teacher. Abba in the time of Jesus was perhaps a title of honor (Mt 23:9), but became later a proper name. The variant Barrabban found in the 19- Harclean Syriac would mean "son of the rabbi or teacher." Origen knew and does not absolutely condemn a reading of Mt 27:16,17, which gave the name "Jesus Barabbas," but although it is also found in a few cursives and in the Aramaic and the Jerusalem Syriac

versions in this place only, it is probably due to a scribe’s error in transcription (Westcott-Hort, App., 20). If the name was simply Barabbas or Barrabban, it may still have meant that the man was a rabbi’s son, or it may have been a purely conventional proper name, signifying nothing. He was the criminal chosen by the Jerusalem mob, at the instigation of the priests, in preference to Jesus Christ, for Pilate to release on the feast of Passover (Mr 15:15; Mt 27:20,21; Lu 23:18; Joh 18:40). Matthew calls him "a notable (i.e. notorious) prisoner" (Mt 27:16). Mr says that he was "bound with them that had made insurrection, men who in the insurrection had committed murder" (Mt 15:7). Luke states that he was cast into prison "for a certain insurrection made in the city, and for murder" (Lu 23:19; compare Ac 3:14). John calls him a "robber" or "brigand" (Joh 18:40). Nothing further is known of him, nor of the insurrection in which he took part. Luke’s statement that he was a murderer is probably a deduction from Mark’s more circumstantial statement, that he was only one of a gang, who in a rising had committed murder. Whether robbery was the motive of his crime, as Joh suggests, or whether he was "a man who had raised a revolt against the Roman power" (Gould) cannot be decided. But it seems equally improbable that the priests (the pro-Roman party) would urge the release of a political prisoner and that Pilate would grant it, especially when the former were urging, and the latter could not resist, the execution of Jesus on a political charge (Lu 23:2). The insurrection may have been a notorious case of brigandage. To say that the Jews would not be interested in the release of such a prisoner, is to forget the history of mobs. The custom referred to of releasing a prisoner on the Passover is otherwise unknown. "What Matthew (and John) represents as brought about by Pilate, Mark makes to appear as if it were suggested by the people themselves. An unessential variation" (Meyer). For a view of the incident as semi-legendary growth, see Schmiedel in Encyclopedia Biblica. See also Allen, Matthew, and Gould, Mark, at the place, and article "Barabbas" by Plummer in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes).

T. Rees

BARACHEL

bar’-a-kel (barakh’el, "God blesses"): Barachel, the Buzite, of the family of Ram, was the father of Elihu, who was the last one to reason with Job (Job 32:2,6). Compare BUZ; RAM.

BARACHIAH

bar-a-ki’-a (Barachias; the King James Version Barachias; Mt 23:35): Father of Zachariah who was murdered between the sanctuary and the altar. It is possible that reference is made to Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2Ch 24:20 ff), whom Matthew by mistake calls "Z., the son of Barachiah." Lu 11:51 omits the name of the father of Z. (compare Zahn’s Kommentar, 649, note).

BARACHIAS

bar-a-ki’-as.

See BARACHIAH.

BARAK

ba’-rak (baraq, "lightning flash"): The name occurs in Sabeanbarqac, in Palmyrene baraq, and in Punic Barcas, as surname of Hamilcar; and as Divine name in Assyrian Ramman-Birqu and Gibil-Birqu (Del. Assyrian, HWB, 187). Barak was the son of Abinoam of Kedesh, a refuge city in Mt. Naphtali. He was summoned by the prophetess Deborah to lead his countrymen to war against the Canaanites under the leadership of Sisera. From the celebrated ode of Deborah we gather that Israel suffered at the hand of the enemy; the caravan roads were in danger, traffic almost ceased; the cultivated country was plundered (Jud 5:6,7). The fighting men in Israel were disarmed, a shield was not to be seen nor a spear among forty thousand men (Jud 5:8). The prophetess raised the signal of struggle for independence. Soon Barak came to her aid. With an army of 10,000 men—according to Jud 4:10 they were all drawn from Zebulun and Naphtali, whereas Jud 5:13-18 adds Benjamin, Machir and Issachar to the list of faithful tribes—Barak, accompanied by Deborah, rushed to the summit of Mt. Tabor. This location was very favorable to the rudely armed Israelites in warding off the danger of the well-armed enemy. The wooded slopes protected them against the chariots of the Canaanites. In addition they were within striking distance should the enemy expose himself on the march. Under the heavy rainfall the alluvial plain became a morass, in which the heavy-armed troops found it impossible to move. Soon the little stream Kishon was filled with chariots, horses and Canaanites. Sisera abandoned his chariot and fled on foot. Barak pursued him and found him murdered by Jael in her tent. This completed the victory. See BEDAN; Moore, "Judges," at the place.

Samuel Cohon

BARBARIAN; BARBAROUS

bar-ba’-ri-an, bar’-ba-rus (barbaros): A word probably formed by imitation of the unintelligible sounds of foreign speech, and hence, in the mouth of a Greek it meant anything that was not Greek, language, people or customs. With the spread of Greek language and culture, it came to be used generally for all that was non-Greek. Philo and Josephus sometimes called their own nation "barbarians," and so did Roman writers up to the Augustan age, when they adopted Greek culture, and reckoned themselves with the Greeks as the only cultured people in the world. Therefore Greek and barbarian meant the whole human race (Ro 1:14).

In Col 3:11, "barbarian, Scythian" is not a classification or antithesis but a "climax" (Abbott) =" barbarians, even Scythians, the lowest type of barbarians." In Christ, all racial distinctions, even the most pronounced, disappear.

In 1Co 14:11 Paul uses the term in its more primitive sense of one speaking a foreign, and therefore, an unintelligible language: "If then I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh will be a barbarian unto me." The speaking with tongues would not be a

means of communication. The excited inarticulate ejaculations of the Corinthian revivalists were worse than useless unless someone had the gift of articulating in intelligible language the force of feeling that produced them (dunamis tes phones, literally, "the power of the sound").

In Ac 28:2,4 (in the King James Version of Ac 28:2 "barbarous people" = barbarians) the writer, perhaps from the Greek-Roman standpoint, calls the inhabitants of Melita barbarians, as being descendants of the old Phoenician settlers, or possibly in the more general sense of "strangers." For the later sense of "brutal," "cruel," "savage," see 2 Macc 2:21; 4:25; 15:2.

T. Rees

BARBER

bar'-ber:

(1) The English word "barber" is from Latin barba, "beard" = a man who shaves the beard. Dressing and trimming the hair came to be added to his work. "Barber" is found only once English Versions of the Bible, in Eze 5:1, "Take thee a sharp sword; as a barber's razor shalt thou take it unto thee, and shalt cause it to pass upon thy head and upon thy beard" (compare Chaghigha' 4b, Shab, section 6).

(2) In Ge 41:14 we probably have a case of conformity to Egyptian, rather than Palestinian custom, where Joseph "shaved himself, and changed his raiment, and came in unto Pharaoh." It is known that Egyptians of the higher classes shaved the beard regularly and completely (as the Hittites, Elamites and early Babylonians seem to have done), except that fashion allowed, as an exception to the rule, a small tuft, or "goatee," under the chin.

(3) We learn from various Scriptural allusions, as well as from other sources (compare W. Max Muller, Asien und Europa, 296 ff), that the business of the oriental barber included, besides ceremonial shaving, the trimming and polling of the hair and the beard. Compare 2Sa 19:24 where it appears that the moustache (Hebrew sapham; the King James Version "beard") received regular trimming; and 1Sa 21:14, where the neglect of the beard is set down as a sign of madness.

That men wore wigs and false beards in ancient days, the latter showing the rank of the wearer, appears from Herodotus ii.36; iii.12; and Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, II, 324, etc. Josephus, Vita, II, gives one case where false hair appears to have been used as an intentional disguise. See also Polyb. iii.78.

(4) The business of the barber (see Eze 5:1, "as a barber's razor shalt thou take it unto thee, and shalt cause it to pass upon thy head and upon thy beard"), outside of ceremonial shaving, may have consisted in trimming and polling the beard and the hair of the head. Of other nations with whom Israel of old came in contact, the Hittites and Elamites, it is now known, shaved the beard completely, as the earliest Babylonians also seem to have done.

(5) The prohibition enjoined in the Mosaic law upon "the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok" (Eze 44:15,20) forbidding either "shaving the head," or "suffering their locks to grow long," or shaving off the corners of their beard (Le 21:5), was clearly, in a sense peculiar to the priests, etc.: "They (the priests) shall only cut off," i.e. trim, not shave, "the hair of their heads" (Eze 44:20). But in the Apostolical Constitutions, I, 3, insistence is laid upon the Biblical prohibition as applicable to all as regards the removal of the beard (compare Clement of Alexandria, Paed., III, edition Migne, I, 580 f). Jerome on Eze 44:20 and some of the Jewish sages find the basis of this prohibition in the fact that God gave a beard to man to distinguish him from the woman—so, they reasoned, it is wrong thus to go against Nature (compare Bahya, on Le 19:27).

(6) In the Palestine of the Greek period, say in the 3rd century BC, when there was a large infusion of Hellenic population and influence, clipping of the beard prevailed in some circles, being omitted only in times of mourning, etc. The common people, however, seem to have seen little distinction between clipping the beard and shaving. But see pictures of captive Jews with clipped beard in the British Museum.

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, heb. Arch., 110; Nowack, Lehrbuch der Heb. Arch., 134; W. Max Muller, Asien und Europa, 296 ff.

George B. Eager

BARCHUS

bar’-kus (Codex Vaticanus, Bachous; Codex Alexandrinus, Barchoue; the King James Version Charchus, from Aldine edition, Charkous; 1 Esdras 5:32 = Barkos (Ezr 2:53; Ne 7:55)): The descendants of Barchus (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BAREFOOT

bar’-foot.

1. Introductory:

The word is found in the following passages: English Versions of the Bible, "He went barefoot" (2Sa 15:30); "(Isaiah) did so, walking .... barefoot" (Isa 20:2); and like the Egyptians, "naked and barefoot" (Isa 20:3,4). It seems that David in his flight before Absalom "went barefoot," not to facilitate his flight, but to show his grief (2Sa 15:30), and that Micah (Mi 1:8) makes "going barefoot" a sign of mourning (Septuagint: "to be barefoot"; the King James Version "stripped"). The nakedness and bare feet of the prophet Isaiah (20:2) may have been intended to symbolize and express sympathy for the

forlorn condition of captives (compare Job 12:17,19, where the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "spoiled," but some authorities give as the true translation "barefoot").

Jastrow, in article on "Tearing the Garments" (Jour. of the Am. Oriental Soc., XXI, 23-39) presents a view worth considering of going barefoot as a sign of mourning and then of grief in general (compare also Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Barefoot"). All these passages seem to imply the discomfort or going barefoot on long journeys, over stony roads or hot sands; but then, as now, in the Orient sandals seem to have been little worn ordinarily in and around the house.

See SHOE.

2. An Ancient Oriental Custom:

The "shoes" of the ancients, as we know from many sources, were "sandals," i.e. simply soles, for the most part of rawhide, tied to the feet to protect them against the gravel, stones or thorns of the road. Shoes of the modern sort, as well as socks and stockings, were unknown. In ancient times it was certainly a common custom in Bible lands to go about in and around one’s house without sandals. The peasantry, indeed, like the fellaheen of today, being hardened to it, often went afield barefoot. But for a king, or a prophet, a priest or a worshipper, to go barefoot, was another matter, as it was also for a mourner, for one in great distress, to be found walking the streets of a city, or going any distance in bare feet. Here we come again to customs peculiar to the Orient, and of various significance. For instance, it was considered then, as it is now in the Moslem world, profane and shocking, nothing short of a desecration, to enter a sanctuary, or walk on "holy ground," with dust-covered shoes, or unwashed feet. Moses and Joshua were commanded to take off their shoes when on "holy ground" (Ex 3:5; Jos 5:15). "No one was allowed to walk on the temple ground with shoes on, or with dust on his feet" (Ber., IX, 5; compare Jamblichus, Pythagoras, section 105). No one in the East today is allowed to enter any mosque with shoes on, or without first putting slippers furnished for the purpose over his shoes. As a rule, too, the feet must be cleansed by ablution in every such case, as well as hands and feet before each meal.

3. Priests on Duty Went Barefoot:

The priests of Israel, as would seem true of the priests in general among the ancients, wore no shoes when ministering (see Silius Italicus, III, 28; compare Theodoret on Ex 3, questio 7; and Yer. Shet., 5, 48d). In ancient times, certainly the priests of Israel, when going upon the platform to serve before the ark, in Tabernacle or temple, as later in the synagogue to bless the congregation, went barefoot; though today strange to say, such ministering priests among the Jews wear stockings, and are not supposed to be barefoot (CoTah, 40a; RH, 316; Shulchan ‘Arukh, ‘Orach Chayyim, 128, 5; see Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Barefoot").

4. Reasons for the Ancient Custom:

The reason or reasons for the removal of the shoes in such cases as the above, we are not at a loss to divine; but when it comes to the removal of the shoes in times of mourning, etc., opinions differ. Some see in such customs a trace of ancestor- worship; others find simply a reversion or return to primitive modes of life; while others still, in agreement with a widely prevalent Jewish view, suggest that it was adopted as a perfectly natural symbol of humility and simplicity of life, appropriate to occasions of grief, distress and deep solemnity of feeling.

The shoes are set aside now by many modern Jews on the Day of Atonement and on the Ninth of Ab.

LITERATURE.

Winer, Robinson, Biblical Researches, under the word "Priester und Schuhe"; Riehm, Handworterbuch des bib. Alt., under the word "Schuhe."

George B. Eager

BARHUMITE

bar-hu’-mit.

See BAHARUMITE.

BARIAH

ba-ri’-ah (bariach, "fugitive"): Bariah was a descendant of David in the line of Solomon (1Ch 3:22).

BARKOS

bar’-kos (barqoc, "party-colored" (?) compare Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 68, note 2): The descendants of Barkos returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:53; Ne 7:55). Compare Barchus (1 Esdras 5:32).

BARLEY

bar’-li (se‘orah):

(1) In the Bible, as in modern times, barley was a characteristic product of Palestine—"a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees," etc. (De 8:8), the failure of whose crop was a national disaster (Joe 1:11). It was, and is, grown chiefly as provender for horses and asses (1Ki 4:28), oats being practically unknown, but it was, as it now is, to some extent, the food of the poor in country districts (Ru 2:17; 2Ki 4:42; Joh 6:9,13). Probably this is the meaning of the dream of the Midianite concerning Gideon:

"Behold, I dreamed a dream; and, lo, a cake of barley bread tumbled into the camp of Midian, and came unto the tent, and smote it so that it fell, and turned it upside down, so that the tent lay flat. And his fellow answered and said, This is nothing else save the sword of Gideon, the son of Joash, a man of Israel" (Jud 7:13 f). Here the barley loaf is type of the peasant origin of Gideon's army and perhaps, too, of his own lowly condition.

Barley was (Eze 4:9) one of the ingredients from which the prophet was to make bread and "eat it as barley cakes" after having baked it under repulsive conditions (Eze 4:12), as a sign to the people. The false prophetesses (Eze 13:19) are said to have profaned God among the people for "handfuls of barley and for pieces of bread."

Barley was also used in the ORDEAL OF JEALOUSY (s. v.). It was with five barley loaves and two fishes that our Lord fed the five thousand (Joh 6:9,10).

(2) Several varieties of barley are grown in Palestine The Hordeum distichum or two-rowed barley is probably the nearest to the original stock, but Hordeum tetrastichum, with grains in four rows, and Hordeum hexastichum, with six rows, are also common and ancient; the last is found depicted upon Egyptian monuments.

Barley is always sown in the autumn, after the "early rains," and the barley harvest, which for any given locality precedes the wheat harvest (Ex 9:31 f), begins near Jericho in April—or even March—but in the hill country of Palestine is not concluded until the end of May or beginning of June.

The barley harvest was a well-marked season of the year (see TIME) and the barley-corn was a well-known measure of length.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

E. W. G. Masterman

BARN

barn (meghurah, "a granary," "fear," Hag 2:19; acam, "a storehouse," Pr 3:10; mammeghurah, "a repository," Joe 1:17; apotheke, Mt 6:26; 13:30; Lu 12:18,24): A place for the storing of grain, usually a dry cistern in the ground, covered over with a thick layer of earth. "Grain is not stored in the East until it is threshed and winnowed. The apotheke in Roman times was probably a building of some kind. But the immemorial usage of the East has been to conceal the grain, in carefully prepared pits or caves, which, being perfectly dry, will preserve it for years. It thus escaped, as far as possible, the attentions of the tax-gatherer as well as of the robber—not always easily distinguished in the East; compare Jer 41:8" (Temple Dictionary, 215).

Figurative of heaven (Mt 13:30).

See AGRICULTURE; GARNER.

M. O. Evans

BARNABAS

bar’-na-bas (Barnabas, "son of exhortation," or possibly "son of Nebo"): This name was applied to the associate of Paul, who was originally called Joses or Joseph (Ac 4:36), as a testimony to his eloquence. Its literal meaning is "son of prophecy" (bar, "son"; nebhu’ah, "prophecy"). Compare word for prophet in Ge 20:7; De 18:15,18, etc. This is interpreted in Ac 4:36 as "son of exhortation" the Revised Version (British and American), or "son of consolation" the King James Version, expressing two sides of the Greek paraklesis, that are not exclusive. The office of a prophet being more than to foretell, all these interpretations are admissible in estimating Barnabas as a preacher. Deismann (Bibelstudien, 175-78) considers Barnabas the Jewish Grecized form of Barnebous, a personal Semitic name recently discovered in Asia Minor inscriptions, and meaning "son of Nebo" (Standard Bible Dictionary in the place cited.).

He was a Levite from the island of Cyprus, and cousin, not "nephew" (the King James Version), of the evangelist Mark, the word anepsios (Col 4:10), being used in Nu 36:11, for "father’s brothers’ sons." When we first learn of him, he had removed to Jerusalem, and acquired property there. He sold "a field," and contributed its price to the support of the poorer members of the church (Ac 4:36 ff). In Ac 11:24 he is described as "a good man and full of the Holy Spirit" (compare Isa 11:2; 1Co 12:8,11) "and of faith," traits that gave him influence and leadership. Possibly on the ground of former acquaintanceship, interceding as Paul’s sponsor and surety, he removed the distrust of the disciples at Jerusalem and secured the admission of the former persecutor into their fellowship. When the preaching of some of the countrymen of Barnabas had begun a movement toward Christianity among the Greeks at Antioch, Barnabas was sent from Jerusalem to give it encouragement and direction, and, after a personal visit, recognizing its importance and needs, sought out Paul at Tarsus, and brought him back as his associate. At the close of a year’s successful work, Barnabas and Paul were sent to Jerusalem with contributions from the infant church for the famine sufferers in the older congregation (Ac 11:30). Ordained as missionaries on their return (Ac 13:3), and accompanied by John Mark, they proceeded upon what is ordinarily known as the "First Missionary Journey" of Paul (Ac 13:4,5). Its history belongs to Paul’s life. Barnabas as well as Paul is designated "an apostle" (Ac 14:14). Up to Ac 13:43, the precedency is constantly ascribed to Barnabas; from that point, except in 14:14 and 15:12,25, we read "Paul and Barnabas," instead of "Barnabas and Saul." The latter becomes the chief spokesman. The people at Lystra named Paul, because of his fervid oratory, Mercurius, while the quiet dignity and reserved strength of Barnabas gave him the title of Jupiter (Ac 14:12). Barnabas escaped the violence which Paul suffered at Iconium (Ac 14:19).

Upon their return from this first missionary tour, they were sent, with other representatives of the church at Antioch, to confer with the apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem concerning the obligation of

circumcision and the ceremonial law in general under the New Testament—the synod of Jerusalem. A separation from Paul seems to begin with a temporary yielding of Barnabas in favor of the inconsistent course of Peter (Ga 2:13). This was followed by a more serious rupture concerning Mark. On the second journey, Paul proceeded alone, while Barnabas and Mark went to Cyprus. Luther and Calvin regard 2Co 8:18,19 as meaning Barnabas by "the brother whose praise is spread through all the churches," and indicating, therefore, subsequent joint work. The incidental allusions in 1Co 9:6 and Ga 2:13 ("even Barnabas") show at any rate Paul's continued appreciation of his former associate. Like Paul, he accepted no support from those to whom he ministered.

Tertullian, followed in recent years by Grau and Zahn, regard him as the author of the Epistle to the He. The document published among patristic writings as the Epistle of Barnabas, and found in full in the Codex Sinaiticus, is universally assigned today to a later period. "The writer nowhere claims to be the apostle Barnabas; possibly its author was some unknown namesake of 'the son of consolation' "(Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, 239 f).

H. E. Jacobs

BARNABAS, EPISTLE OF

See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES.

BARNABAS, GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

BARODIS

ba-ro'-dis (Barodeis, 1 Esdras 5:34): The descendants of Barodis (sons of the servants of Solomon) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem. Omitted in Ezr 2 and Ne 7.

BARREL

bar'-el: The word "barrel" in the King James Version (see 1Ki 17:12,14,16; 18:33: "The barrel of meal," "fill four barrels with water," etc.) stands for the large earthenware jar (so the American Standard Revised Version) used in the East for carrying water from the spring or well, and for storing grain, etc., according to a custom that still persists. It is elsewhere (EV) more fitly rendered "pitcher."

See HOUSE; PITCHER, etc.

BARREN; BARRENNESS

bar’-en, (bar’-en-nes tsiyah; melehah; shakhol; ‘aqar; steiros; argos):

(1) Of land that bears no crop, either

(a) because it is naturally poor and sterile: tsiyah "dry" (Joe 2:20), melechah, "salt" (Job 39:6 the King James Version), shakhol, "miscarrying" (2Ki 2:19,21), or

(b) because it is, under God’s curse, turned into a melechah or salt desert, for the wickedness of the people that dwell therein (Ps 107:34 the King James Version; compare Ge 3:17,18).

(2) Of females that bear no issue: ‘aqar: Sarah (Ge 11:30); Rebekah (Ge 25:21); Rachel (Ge 29:31); Manoah’s wife (Jud 13:2,3); Hannah (1Sa 2:5); steiros: Elisabeth (Lu 1:7,36).

In Israel and among oriental peoples generally barrenness was a woman’s and a family’s greatest misfortune. The highest sanctions of religion and patriotism blessed the fruitful woman, because children were necessary for the perpetuation of the tribe and its religion. It is significant that the mothers of the Hebrew race, Sarah, Rebekah and Rachel, were by nature sterile, and therefore God’s special intervention shows His particular favor to Israel. Fruitfulness was God’s special blessing to His people (Ex 23:26; De 7:14; Ps 113:9). A complete family is an emblem of beauty (So 4:2; 6:6). Metaphorically, Israel, in her days of adversity, when her children were exiled, was barren, but in her restoration she shall rejoice in many children (Isa 54:1; Ga 4:27). The utter despair and terror of the destruction of Jerusalem could go no farther than that the barren should be called blessed (Lu 23:29).

(3) Argos is translated in the King James Version "barren," but in the Revised Version (British and American) more accurately "idle" (2Pe 1:8).

T. Rees

BARSABAS; BARSABBAS

bar’-sa-bas, bar-sab’-as.

See JOSEPH BARSABBAS; JUDAS BARSABBAS.

BARTACUS

bar’-ta-kus (Bartakos; Josephus Rhabezdkes; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) Bezazes (1 Esdras 4:29)): The father of Apame. He is called "the illustrious," probably because of rank and merits. The family seems to be of Persian origin since the name Bartacus (Syriac,) in the form of Artachaeas is mentioned by Herodotus (vii.22.117) as a person of rank in the Persian army of Xerxes and the name of his daughter Apame is identical with that of a Persian princess who married Seleucus I, Nicator, and

became the mother of Antiochus I. Apamea, a city in Asia Minor founded by Seleucus I, is named in honor of his wife Apame. Compare APAME; ILLUSTRIOUS.

BARTHOLOMEW

bar-thol’-o-mu (Bartholomaios, i.e. "son of Tolmai or Tolmai"): One of the Twelve Apostles (Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:14; Ac 1:13). There is no further reference to him in the New Testament. According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50) "Bartholomew was of the house of Naphtali. Now his name was formerly John, but our Lord changed it because of John the son of Zebedee, His beloved." A "Gospel of Bartholomew" is mentioned by Hieronymus (Comm. Proem ad Matth.), and Gelasius gives the tradition that Bartholomew brought the Hebrew gospel of Matthew to India. In the "Preaching of Bartholomew in the Oasis" (compare Budge, II, 90) he is referred to as preaching probably in the oasis of Al Bahnasa, and according to the "Preaching of Andrew and Bartholomew" he labored among the Parthians (Budge, II, 183). The "Martyrdom of Bartholomew" states that he was placed in a sack and cast into the sea.

From the 9th century onward, Bartholomew has generally been identified with Nathanael, but this view has not been conclusively established.

See NATHANAEL.

C. M. Kerr

BARTHOLOMEW, GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; BARTHOLOMEW.

BARTIMAEUS

bar-ti-me’-us (Bartimaios): A hybrid word from Aramaic bar =" son," and Greek timaios =" honorable." For the improbability of the derivation from bar-tim’ai =" son of the unclean," and of the allegorical meaning = the Gentiles or spiritually blind, see Schmiedel in Encyclopedia Biblica. In Mr (Mr 10:46-52) Bartimeus is given as the name of a blind beggar, whose eyes Jesus Christ opened as He went out from Jericho on His last journey to Jerusalem. An almost identical account is given by Lu (Lu 18:35-43), except that the incident occurred "as he drew nigh unto Jericho," and the name of the blind man is not given. Again, according to Mt (Mt 20:29-34), "as they went out from Jericho" (like Mk) two blind men (unlike Mr and Lk) receive their sight. It is not absolutely impossible that two or even three events are recorded, but so close is the similarity of the three accounts that it is highly improbable. Regarding them as referring to the same event, it is easy to understand how the discrepancies arose in the passage of the story from mouth to mouth. The main incident is clear enough, and on purely historical grounds, the miracle cannot be denied. The discrepancies themselves are evidence of the wide currency of the story

before our Gospels assumed their present form. It is only a most mechanical theory of inspiration that would demand their harmonization.

T. Rees

BARUCH

ba’-ruk, bar’-uk (baruk; Barouch, "blessed"):

(1) Son of Neriah and brother of Seraiah, King Zedekiah’s chamberlain (Jer 51:59). He was the devoted friend (Jer 32:12), the amanuensis (36:4 ff, 32) and faithful attendant (36:10 ff; Josephus, Ant, X, vi, 2) of the prophet Jeremiah. He seems to have been of noble family (see Ant, X, ix, 1; compare Jer 51:59; Baruch 1:1). He was also according to Josephus a man of unusual acquirements (Ant., X, ix, 1). He might have risen to a high position and seemed conscious of this, but under Jeremiah’s influence (see Jer 45:5) he repressed his ambition, being content to throw in his lot with the great prophet whose secretary and companion he became. Jeremiah dictated his prophecies to Baruch, who read them to the people (Jer 36). The king (Jehoiakim) was greatly angered at these prophecies and had Baruch arrested and the roll burnt. Baruch however rewrote the prophet’s oracles. In the final siege of Jerusalem Baruch stood by his master, witnessing the purchase by the latter of his ancestral estate in Anathoth (Jer 32). According to Josephus (Ant., X, ix, 1) he continued to reside with Jeremiah at Mizpah after the fall of Jerusalem. Subsequent to the murder of Gedaliah, he was accused of having unduly influenced Jeremiah when the latter urged the people to remain in Judah—a fact which shows how great was the influence which Baruch was believed to have had over his master (Jer 43:3). He was carried with Jeremiah to Egypt (Jer 43:6; Ant, X, ix, 6), and thereafter our knowledge of him is merely legendary. According to a tradition preserved by Jerome (on Isa 30:6 f) he died in Egypt soon after reaching that country. Two other traditions say that he went, or by Nebuchadnezzar was carried, to Babylon after this king conquered Egypt. The high character of Baruch and the important part he played in the life and work of Jeremiah induced later generations still further to enhance his reputation, and a large number of spurious writings passed under his name, among them the following:

(a) The APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH (which see);

(b) the Book of Baruch;

(c) the Rest of the Words of Baruch;

(d) the Gnostic Book of Baruch;

(e) the Latin Book of Baruch, composed originally in Latin;

(f) a Greek Apocalypse of Baruch belonging to the 2nd century of our era;

(g) another Book of Baruch belonging to the 4th or 5th century.

(2) A son of Zabbai who aided Nehemiah in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 3:20).

(3) One of the priests who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:6).

(4) The son of Colhozeh, a descendant of Perez, the son of Judah (Ne 11:5).

T. Witton Davies

BARUCH, APOCALYPSE OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

BARUCH, BOOK OF

One of the Apocryphal or Deutero-canonical books, standing between Jeremiah and Lamentations in the Septuagint, but in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) after these two books.

I. Name.

See under BARUCH for the meaning of the word and for the history of the best-known Biblical. personage bearing the name. Though Jewish traditions link this book with Jeremiah’s amanuensis and loyal friend as author, it is quite certain that it was not written or compiled for hundreds of years after the death of this Baruch. According to Jer 45:1 it was in the 4th year (604 BC) of the reign of Jehoiakim (608-597 BC) that Baruch wrote down Jeremiah’s words in a book and read them in the ears of the nobles (English Versions, "princes," but king’s sons are not necessarily meant; Jer 36). The Book of Baruch belongs in its present form to the latter half of the 1st century of our era; yet some modern Roman Catholic scholars vigorously maintain that it is the work of Jeremiah’s friend and secretary.

II. Contents.

This book and also the Epistle of Jeremy have closer affinities with the canonical Book of Jer than any other part of the Apocrypha. It is probably to this fact that they owe their name and also their position in the Septuagint and in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) The book is apparently made up of four separate parts by independent writers, brought together by an editor, owing it is very likely to a mere accident—each being too small to occupy the space on one roll they were all four written on one and the same roll. The following is a brief analysis of the four portions of the book:

1. Historical Introduction:

Historical Introduction, giving an account of the origin and purpose of the book (Baruch 1:1-14). Baruch 1:1 f tell us that Baruch wrote this book at Babylon "in the fifth month (not "year" as the Septuagint) in the seventh day of the month, what time as the Chaldeans took Jerusalem, and burnt it with fire" (see 2Ki 25:8 ff). Fritzsche and others read: "In the fifth year, in the month Sivan (see 1:8), in the seventh day of the month," etc. Um gives the date of the feast Pentecost, and the supposition is that the party who made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem did so in order to observe that feast. According to 1:3-14, Baruch read his book to King Jehoiachin and his court by the (unidentified) river Sud. King and people on hearing the book fell to weeping, fasting and praying. As a result money was collected and sent, together with Baruch's book, to the high priest Jehoiakim, (NOTE: So spelled in the canonical books; but it is Joacim or Joachim in Apocrypha the King James Version, and in the Apocrypha the Revised Version (British and American) it is invariably Joakim.) to the priests and to the people at Jerusalem. The money is to be used in order to make it possible to carry on the services of the temple, and in particular that prayers may be offered in the temple for the king and his family and also for the superior lord King Nebuchadnezzar and his son Baltasar (= the Belshazzar of Da 5).

2. Confession and Prayer:

Confession and prayer (Baruch 1:15-3:8) (1) of the Palestinian remnant (Baruch 1:15-2:15). The speakers are resident in Judah not in Babylon (Baruch 1:15; compare 2:4), as J. T. Marshall and R. H. Charles rightly hold. This section follows throughout the arrangement and phraseology of a prayer contained in Da 9:7-15. It is quite impossible to think of Daniel as being based on Baruch, for the writer of the former is far more original than the author or authors of Baruch. But in the present section the original passage in Da is altered in a very significant way. Thus in Da 9:7 the writer describes those for whom he wrote as 'the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem and all Israel(ites): those near and those far off, in all the lands (countries) whither thou hast driven them on account of their unfaithfulness toward thee.' The italicized words are omitted from Baruch 1:15, though the remaining part of Da 9:7 is added. Why this difference? It is evident, as Marshall has ably pointed out, that the editor of the section intends to put the confession and prayer of Baruch 1:15-2:5 into the mouths of Jews who had not been removed into exile. Ewald (History, V, 208, 6) holds that Da 9:7-9 is dependent on Baruch 1:15-2:17. The section may thus be analyzed:

(a) Baruch 1:15-22: Confession of the sins of the nation from the days of Moses down to the exile. The principle of solidarity (see Century Bible, "Psalms," II, 21, 195, 215) so governed the thoughts of the ancient Israelites that the iniquities of their forefathers were in effect their own.

(b) Baruch 2:1-5: God's righteous judgment on the nation in humbling and scattering them.

Confession and prayer (2) of the exiles in Babylon Baruch 2:16-3:8. That the words in this section are supposed to be uttered by Babylonian exiles appears from 2:13 f; 3:7 f and from the general character of the whole. This portion of the book is almost as dependent on older Scriptures as the foregoing. Three sources seem in particular to have been used.

(a) The Book of Jeremiah has been freely drawn upon.

(b) Deuteronomic phrases occur frequently, especially in the beginning and end. These are perhaps taken second-hand from Jeremiah, a book well known to the author of these verses and deeply loved by him.

(c) Solomon’s prayer as recorded in 1Ki 8 is another quarry from which our author appears to have dug. This section may be thus divided:

(i.) Baruch 2:6-12: Confession, opening as the former (see 1:15) with words extracted from Da 9:7.

(ii.) Baruch 2:13-3:8: Prayer for restoration. Baruch 3:1-8 shows more independence than the rest, for the author at this point makes use of language not borrowed from any original known to us. As such these verses are important as a clue to the writer’s position, views and character.

In Baruch 3:4 we have the petition: "Hear now the prayer of the dead Israelites," etc., words which as they stand involve the doctrine that the dead (Solomon, Daniel, etc.) are still alive and make intercession to Goal on behalf of the living. But this teaching is in opposition to 2:17 which occurs in the same context. Without making any change in the Hebrew consonants we can and should read for "dead (methe) Israelites" "the men of (methe) Israel." The Septuagint confuses the same words in Isa 5:13.

3. The Praise of Wisdom:

The praise of "Wisdom," for neglecting which Israel is now in a strange land. God alone is the author of wisdom, and He bestows it not upon the great and mighty of this world, but upon His own chosen people, who however have spurned the Divine gift and therefore lost it (Baruch 3:9-4:4).

The passage, Baruch 3:10-13 (Israel’s rejection of "Wisdom" the cause of her exile), goes badly with the context and looks much like an interpolation. The dominant idea in the section is that God has made Israel superior to all other nations by the gift of "wisdom," which is highly extolled. Besides standing apart from the context these four verses lack the rhythm which characterize the other verses. What is so cordially commended is described in three ways, each showing up a different facet, as do the eight synonyms for the Divine word in each of the 22 strophes in Ps 119 (see Century Bible, "Psalms," II, 254).

(1) It is called most frequently "Wisdom."

(2) In Baruch 4:1 it is described as the Commandments of God and as the Law or more correctly as authoritative instruction. The Hebrew word for this last (torah) bears in this connection, it is probable, the technical meaning of the Pentateuch, a sense which it never has in the Old Testament. Compare De 4:6, where the keeping of the commandments is said to be "wisdom" and understanding.

4. The Dependence of This Wisdom Section:

(1) The line of thought here resembles closely that pursued in Job 28, which modern scholars rightly regard as a later interpolation. Wisdom, the most valuable of possessions, is beyond the unaided reach of man. God only can give it—that is what is taught in these parts of both Baruch and Job with the question "Where shall wisdom be found?" (Job 28:12; compare Baruch 3:14 f, where a similar question forms the basis of the greater portion of the section of Job 38 f). Wisdom is not here as in Proverbs hypostatized, and the same is true of Job 28. This in itself is a sign of early date, for the personifying of "wisdom" is a later development (compare Philo, John 1).

(2) The language in this section is modeled largely on that of Deuteronomy, perhaps however through Jeremiah, which is also especially after chapter 10 Deuteronomic in thought and phraseology. See ante II, 2 (2 1b).

The most original part of this division of the book is where the writer enumerates the various classes of the world's great ones to whom God had not given "wisdom": princes of the heathen, wealthy men, silversmiths, merchants, theologians, philosophers, etc. (Baruch 3:16 ff).

See WISDOM.

5. Words of Cheer to Israel:

The general thought that pervades the section, Baruch 4:5-5:9, is words of cheer to Israel (i.e. Judah) in exile, but we have here really, according to Rothstein, a compilation edited so skillfully as to give it the appearance of a unity which is not real. Earlier Biblical writings have throughout been largely drawn upon. Rothstein (Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen, etc., 213-15) divides the section in the following manner:

(1) Baruch 4:5-9a: Introductory section, giving the whole its keynote—"Be of good cheer," etc.; 4:7 f follows De 32:15-18.

(2) Baruch 4:9b-29: A song, divisible into two parts.

(a) Personified Jerusalem deplores the calamities of Israel in exile (Baruch 4:9b-16).

(b) She urges her unfortunate children to give themselves to hope and prayer, amending their ways so that God may bring about their deliverance (Baruch 4:17-29).

(c) Baruch 4:30-5:9: A second song, beginning as the first with the words, "Be of good cheer," and having the same general aim, to comfort exiled and oppressed Israel.

In all three parts earlier Scriptures have been largely used, and in particular Deutero-Isaiah has had much influence upon the author. But there do not seem to the present writer reasons cogent enough for concluding, with Rothstein, that these three portions are by as many different writers. There is

throughout the same recurring thought "Be of good cheer," and there is nothing in the style to suggest divergent authorship.

(3) The Relation between Baruch 4:36-5:9 and Psalter of Solomon 11. It was perhaps Ewald (Geschichte, IV, 498) who first pointed out the similarity of language and viewpoint between Baruch 4:36-5:9 and Psalter of Solomon 11, especially 11:3-8. The only possible explanation is that which makes Baruch 4:36 ff an imitation of Psalter of Solomon 11. So Ewald (op. cit.); Ryle and James (Ps 70:2 ff).

Ps Sol were written originally in Hebrew, and references to Pompey (died 48 BC) and to the capture of Jerusalem (63 BC) show that this pseudepigraphical Psalter must have been written in the first half of the 1st century BC. Bar, as will be shown, is of much later date than this. Besides it is now almost certain that the part of Baruch under discussion was written in Greek (see below, IV) and that it never had a Hebrew original. Now it is exceedingly unlikely that a writer of a Hebrew psalm would copy a Greek original, though the contrary supposition is a very likely one.

On the other hand A. Geiger (Psalt. Sol., XI, 137-39, 1811), followed by W. B. Stevenson (Temple Bible), and many others argue for the priority of Baruch, using this as a reason for giving Baruch an earlier date than is usually done. It is possible, of course, that the Pseudo-Solomon and the Pseudo-Baruch have been digging in the same quarry; and that the real original used by both is lost.

III. Language.

For our present purpose the book must be divided into two principal parts:

(1) Baruch 1-3:8;

(2) 3:9-5:9.

There is general agreement among the best recent scholars from Ewald downward that the first portion of the book at least was written originally in Hebrew.

(1) In the Syro-Hex. text there are margin notes to 1:17 and 2:3 to the effect that these verses are lacking in the Hebrew, i.e. in the original Hebrew text.

(2) There are many linguistic features in this first part which are best explained on the supposition that the Greek text is from a Hebrew original. In Baruch 2:25 the Septuagint English Versions of the Bible apostole at the end of the verse means "a sending of." The English Versions of the Bible ("pestilence") renders a Hebrew word which, without the vowel signs (introduced late) is written alike for both meanings (d-b-r). The mistake can be explained only on the assumption of a Hebrew original. Similarly the reading "dead Israelites" for "men of Israel" (= Israelites) in 3:4 arose through reading wrong vowels with the same consonants, which last were alone written until the 7th and 8th centuries of our era. off, in

all the lands (countries) whither thou hast driven them on account of their unfaithfulness toward thee.’ The italicized words are omitted from Baruch 1:15, though the remaining part of Da 9:7 is added. Why this difference? It is evident, as Marshall has ably pointed out, that the editor of the section intends to put the confession and prayer of Baruch 1:15-2:5 into the mouths of Jews who had not been removed into exile. Ewald (History, V, 208, 6) holds that Da 9:7-9 is dependent on Baruch 1:15-2:17. The section may thus be analyzed:

Frequently, as in Hebrew, sentences begin with Greek kai (=" and") which, without somewhat slavish copying of the Hebrew, would not be found. The construction called parataxis characterizes Hebrew; in good Greek we meet with hypotaxis.

The Hebrew way of expressing "where" is put literally into the Greek of this book (Baruch 2:4,13,29; 3:8). Many other Hebrew idioms, due, it is probable, to the translator’s imitations of his original, occur: in "to speak in the ears of" (Baruch 1:3); the word "man" (anthropos) in the sense "everyone" (Baruch 2:3); "spoken by thy servants the prophets" is in Greek by "the hand of the servants," which is good Hebrew but bad Greek Many other such examples could be added.

There is much less agreement among scholars as to the original language or languages of the second part of the book (Baruch 3:9-5:9). That this part too was written in Hebrew, so that in that case the whole book appeared first in that language, is the position held and defended by Ewald (op. cit.), Kneucker (op. cit.), Konig (Ein), Rothstein (op. cit.) and Bissell (Lange). It is said by these writers that this second part of Baruch equally with the first carries with it marks of being a translation from the Hebrew. But one may safely deny this statement. It must be admitted by anyone who has examined the text of the book that the most striking Hebraisms and the largest number of them occur in the first part of the book. Bissell writes quite fully and warmly in defense of the view that the whole book was at first written in Hebrew, but the Hebraisms which he cites are all with one solitary exception taken from the first part of the book. This one exception is in Baruch 4:15 where the Greek conjunction holi is used for the relative ho, the Hebrew ‘asher having the meaning of both. There seems to be a Hebraism in 4:21: "He shall deliver thee from .... the hand of your enemies," and there are probably others. But there are Hebraisms in Hellenistic Greek always—the present writer designates them "Hebraisms" or "Semiticisms" notwithstanding what Deismann, Thumb and Moulton say. In the first part of this book it is their overwhelming number and their striking character that tell so powerfully in favor of a Hebrew original.

(3) The following writers maintain that the second part of the book was written first of all in Greek: Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, Schurer, Gifford, Cornill and R. H. Charles, though they agree that the first part had a Hebrew original. This is probably the likeliest view, though much may be written in favor of a Hebrew original for the whole book and there is nothing quite decisively against it. J. Turner Marshall (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, I, 253) tries to prove that Baruch 3:9-4:4 was written first in Aramaic, the rest of the book (4:5-5:9) in Greek But though he defends his case with great ability he does not appear to the present writer to have proved his thesis. Ewald (op. cit.), Hitzig (Psalmen2, II, 119), Dillmann, Ruetschi, Fritzsche and Bissell were so greatly impressed by the close likeness between the Greek of Baruch and that of the Septuagint of Jeremiah, that they came to the conclusion that both books were translated by the same person. Subsequently Hitzig decided that Baruch was not written until after

70 AD, and therefore abandoned his earlier opinion in favor of this one—that the translator of Baruch was well acquainted with the Septuagint of Jeremiah and was strongly influenced by it.

IV. Date or Dates.

It is important to distinguish between the date of the completion of the entire book in its present form and the dates of the several parts which in some or all cases may be much older than that of the whole as such.

1. The Historical Introduction:

Baruch 1:1-14 was written after the completion of the book expressly to form a prologue or historical explanation of the circumstances under which the rest of the book came to be written. To superficial readers it could easily appear that the whole book was written by one man, but a careful examination shows that the book is a compilation. One may conclude that the introduction was the last part of the book to be composed and that therefore its date is that of the completion of the book. Reasons will be given (see below) for believing that 4:5-5:9 belongs to a time subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in 70 AD. This is still more true of this introduction intended as a foreword to the whole book.

2. Confession and Prayer:

The following points bear on the date of the section Baruch 1:15-3:8, assuming it to have one date:

(1) The generation of Israelites to which the writer belonged were suffering for the sins of their ancestors; see especially Baruch 3:1-8.

(2) The second temple was in existence in the writer’s day. Baruch 2:26 must (with the best scholars) be translated as follows: "And thou hast made the house over which thy name is called as it is this day," i.e. the temple—still in being—is shorn of its former glory. Moreover though Da 9:7-14 is largely quoted in Baruch 1:15-2:12, the prayer for the sanctuary and for Jerusalem in Da 9:16 is omitted, because the temple is not now in ruins.

(3) Though it is implied (see above II, 2, (1)) that there are Jews in Judah who have never left their land there are a large number in foreign lands, and nothing is said that they were servants of the Babylonian king.

(4) The dependence of Baruch 2:13-3:8 on Deuteronomy, Jer and 1Ki 8 (Solomon’s prayer) shows that this part of the book is later than these writings, i.e. later than say 550 BC. Compare Baruch 2:13 with De 28:62 and Jer 42:2.

(5) The fact that Da 9:7-14 has influenced Baruch 1:15-2:12 proves that a date later than Daniel must be

assumed for at least this portion of Baruch. The temple is still standing, so that the book belongs somewhere between 165 BC, when Daniel was written, and 71 AD, when the temple was finally destroyed.

Ewald, Gifford and Marshall think that this section belongs to the period following the conquest of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I (320 BC). According to Ewald the author of Baruch 1:1-3:8 (regarded as by one hand) was a Jew living in Babylon or Persia. But Daniel had not in 320 BC been written. Fritzsche, Schrader, Keil, Toy and Charles assign the section to the Maccabean age—a quite likely date. On the other hand Hitzig, Kneucker and Schurer prefer a date subsequent to 70 AD. The last writer argues for the unity of this section, though he admits that the middle of chapter 1 comports ill with its context.

3. The Wisdom Section Baruch 3:9-4:4:

It has been pointed out (see above, II, 3) that Baruch 3:10-13 does not belong to this section, being manifestly a later interpolation. The dependence of this Wisdom portion on Job 28 and on Deuteronomy implies a post-exilic date. The identification of Wisdom with the Torah which is evidently a synonym for the Pentateuch, argues a date at any rate not earlier than 300 BC. But how much later we have no means of ascertaining. The reasons adduced by Kneucker and Marshall for a date immediately before or soon af ter the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD have not convinced the present writer.

4. Words of Cheer Baruch 4:5-5:9:

The situation implied in these words may be thus set forth:

(1) A great calamity has happened to Jerusalem (Baruch 4:9 f). Nothing is said proving that the whole land has shared the calamity, unless indeed this is implied in Baruch 4:5 f.

(2) A large number of Jerusalemites have been transported (Baruch 4:10).

(3) The nation that has sacked Jerusalem and carried away many of its inhabitants is "shameless," having "a strange language, neither reverencing old men nor pitying children" (Baruch 4:15).

(4) The present home of the Jerusalemites is a great city (Baruch 4:32-35), not the country. Now the above details do not answer to any dates in the history of the nation except these two:

(a) 586 BC, when the temple was destroyed by the Babylonians;

(b) 71 AD, when the temple was finally destroyed by the Romans.

But the date 586 BC is out of the question, and no modern scholar pleads for it. We must therefore assume for this portion of the book a date soon after 70 AD. In the time of Pompey, to which Graetz

assigns the book, neither Jerusalem nor the temple was destroyed. Nor was there any destruction of either during the Maccabean war. In favor of this date is the dependence of Baruch 4:36 ff on Psalter of Solomon 11 (see above, II, 5, (3)).

Rothstein (in Kautzsch) says that in this section there are at least three parts by as many different writers. Marshall argues for four independent parts. But if either of these views is correct the editor has done his work exceedingly well, for the whole harmonizes well together.

Kneucker, author of the fullest Commentary, endeavors to prove that the original book consisted of Baruch 1:1 f plus 3a (the heading) plus 3:9-5:9, and that it belongs to the reign of Domitian (81-96 AD). The confession and prayer in 1:15-3:8 were written, he says, somewhat earlier and certainly before 71 AD, and as a separate work, being inserted in the book by the scribe who wrote 1:4-14.

V. Versions.

The most important versions are the following. It is assumed in the article that the Greek text of the book up to Baruch 3:8 is itself a translation from a Hebrew text now lost. The same remark may be true of the rest of the book or of a portion of it (see above, III).

1. Latin:

There are two versions in this language:

(1) The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) which is really the Old Latin, since Jerome’s revision was confined to the Hebrew Scriptures, the Apocrypha being therefore omitted in this revision. This version is a very literal one based on the Greek It is therefore for that reason the more valuable as a witness to the Greek text.

(2) There is a later Latin translation, apparently a revision of the former, for its Latinity is better; in some cases it adopts different readings and in a general way it has been edited so as to bring it into harmony with the Vatican uncial (B). This Latin version was published in Rome by J. Maria Caro (died circa 1688) and was reprinted by Sabatier in parallel columns with the pre-Jeromian version noticed above (see Bibliotheca Casinensis, I, 1873).

2. Syriac:

There are also in this language two extant versions:

(1) The Peshitta, a very literal translation, can be seen in the London (Walton’s) Polyglot and most conveniently in Lagarde’s Libr. Apocrypha. Syriac., the last being a more accurate reproduction.

(2) The Hexapla Syriac translation made by Paul, bishop of Telle, near the beginning of the 7th century

AD. It has been published by Ceriani with critical apparatus in his beautiful photograph-lithographed edition of the Hexapla Syriac Bible.

3. Arabic:

There is a very literal translation to be found in the London Polyglot, referred to above.

LITERATURE.

For editions of the Greek text see under APOCRYPHA. Of commentaries the fullest and best is that by Kneucker, Das Buch Baruch (1879), who gives an original German rendering based on a restored Hebrew original. Other valuable commentaries are those by Fritzsche (1851); Ewald, Die Propheten2, etc. (1868), III, 251-82 (Eng. translation); The Prophets of the Old Testament, V, 108-37, by Reusch (1855); Zockler (1891) and Rothstein (op. cit.); and in English, Bissell (in Lange's series edited by D. S. Schaff, 1880); and Gifford (Speaker's Comm., 1888). The S. P. C. K. has a handy and serviceable volume published in the series of popular commentaries on the Old Testament. But this commentary, though published quite recently (my copy belongs to 1894, "nineteenth thousand"), needs strengthening on the side of its scholarship.

Arts. dealing with introduction occur in the various Bible Dictionaries (Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Westcott and Ryle; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), J. T. Marshall, able and original; Encyclopedia Biblica, Bevan, rather slight). To these must be added excellent articles in Jewish Encyclopedia (G. F. Moore), and Encyclopedia Biblica (R. H. Charles).

T. Witton Davies

BARZILLAI

bar-zil'-a-i, bar-zil'-i (barzillay; Berzelli, "man of iron" (BDB, but compare Cheyne, Encyclopedia Biblica)):

(1) A Gileadite of Rogelim who brought provisions to David and his army to Mahanaim, in their flight from Absalom (2Sa 17:27-29). When David was returning to Jerusalem after Absalom's defeat, Barzillai conducted him over Jordan, but being an old man of 80 years of age, he declined David's invitation to come to live in the capital, and sent instead his son Chimham (2Sa 19:31-39). David before his death charged Solomon to "show kindness unto the sons of Barzillai." (1Ki 2:7). Cheyne in Encyclopedia Biblica, without giving any reason, differentiates this Barzillai from Barzillai the Gileadite (Ezr 2:61 = Ne 7:63). See (2) below.

(2) The father of a family of priests who in Ezra's time, after the return of the exiles, could not trace their genealogy. "Therefore were they deemed polluted and put from the priesthood." This Barzillai had taken "a wife of the daughters of Barzillai the Gileadite," and had adopted his wife's family name (Ezr

2:61,62 = Ne 7:63,64). His original name is given as Jaddus (the King James Version Addus) (1 Esdras 5:38). (See ZORZELLEUS; the Revised Version, margin "Phaezeldaeus.")

(3) Barzillai the Meholathite, whose son Adriel was married to Saul's daughter, either Michal (2Sa 21:8) or Merab (1Sa 18:19).

T. Rees

BASALOTH

bas'-a-loth (A, Baaloth; B, Basalem; 1 Esdras 5:31 = Bazluth (Ezr 2:52) and Bazlith (Ne 7:54)): The descendants of Basaloth (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BASCAMA

bas'-ka-ma (Baskama (1 Macc 13:23)): A town located in the country of Gilead, where Tryphon slew Jonathan, the son of Absalom. Compare JONATHAN (Apocrypha).

BASE bas:

(1) Substantive from Latin basis, Greek basis, a foundation.

(a) (mekhonah): the fixed resting-place on which the lavers in Solomon's temple were set (1Ki 7:27-43; 2Ki 16:17; 25:13,16; 2Ch 4:14; Jer 27:19; 52:17,20; compare Ezr 3:3; Zec 5:11 the American Revised Version, margin).

(b) (ken): pedestal in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) (1Ki 7:29,31) and in the Revised Version (British and American) only (Ex 30:18,28; 31:9; 35:16; 38:8; 39:39; 40:11; Le 8:11) of the base of the laver of the tabernacle (the King James Version "foot").

(c) (yarekh): "base of candlestick" (the Revised Version (British and American) of Ex 25:31; 37:17) the King James Version "shaft."

(d) (yecodh): the Revised Version (British and American) "base of altar"; the King James Version "bottom" (Ex 29:12; 38:8; Le 4:7,18,25,30,34; 5:9; 8:15; 9:9).

(e) (gabh): the Revised Version (British and American) "elevation," i.e. basement of altar; the King James Version "higher place" (Eze 43:13).

(2) Adjective from French bas—low, or Welsh bas—"shallow": of lowly birth or station, of voluntary humility and of moral depravity.

(a) (shaphal, shephal): of David’s self-humiliation (2Sa 6:22): "a modest unambitious kingdom" (Eze 17:14; 29:14,15 (BDB); Da 4:17 (the American Standard Revised Version "lowest")): compare shephelah =" lowland."

(b) (qalah): men of humble birth and station as opposed to the nobles (Isa 3:5).

(c) (beli-shem): "nameless," "of no account": "children of fools, yea, children of base men" (Job 30:8).

(d) the King James Version men, sons, daughters, children of Belial; literally "worthless persons"; in the American Standard Revised Version "base," except 1Sa 1:16 "wicked woman"; also the English Revised Version of De 13:13, "base," which elsewhere retains the King James Version rendering.

(e) (tapeinos): "lowly," "humble or abject" (2Co 10:1); the Revised Version (British and American), "lowly"; so Paul’s enemies said he appeared when present in the church at Corinth.

(f) (agenes): "of low birth," "of no account" (1Co 1:28): "base things of the world."

(g) (agoraios): " belonging to the market-place," loafers, worthless characters (Ac 17:5): "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort"; the Revised Version (British and American) "certain vile fellows of the rabble."

T. Rees

BASEMATH; BASHEMATH; BASMATH

bas’-e-math, bash’-e-math, bas’-math (basemath, "fragrant"):

(1) Basemath, one of the wives of Esau, a daughter of Elon, the Hittite (Ge 26:34; the King James Version Bashemath), probably identical with or a sister of Adah whom he also married (Ge 36:2). Compare ADAH.

(2) Basemath (the King James Version Bashemath), another wife of Esau, a daughter of Ishmael and a sister of Nebaioth (Ge 36:3,4,10,13,17). This wife is also called Mahalath (Ge 28:9), and is of the house of Abraham. Esau married her because his father was not pleased with his other wives who were daughters of Canaan. Compare MAHALATH.

(3) Basemath (the King James Version Basmath), the daughter of Solomon, and wife of Ahimaaz, a commissariat-officer in the service of Solomon (1Ki 4:15).

A. L. Breslich

BASHAN

ba’-shan (ha-bashan, "the Bashan"; Basan): This name is probably the same in meaning as the cognate Arabic bathneh, "soft, fertile land," or bathaniyeh (batanaea), "this land sown with wheat" ("wheatland").

1. Boundaries:

It often occurs with the article, "the Bashan," to describe the kingdom of Og, the most northerly part of the land East of the Jordan. It stretched from the border of Gilead in the South to the slopes of Hermen in the North. Hermon itself is never definitely included in Bashan, although Og is said to have ruled in that mountain (Jos 12:5; 13:11). In De 3:10 Salecah and Edrei seem to indicate the East and West limits respectively. This would agree with Jos 12:5; 13:11, which seem to make Geshur and Maacath the western boundary of Bashan. If this were so, then these unconquered peoples literally "dwelt in the midst of Israel." On the other hand De 4:47 may mean that the Jordan formed the western boundary; while De 33:22 makes Bashan extend to the springs of the Jordan. If Golan lay in the district in which its name is still preserved (el Jaulan), this also brings it to the lip of the Jordan valley (De 4:43). "A mountain of summits," or "protuberances" (Ps 68:15,16: Hebrew), might describe the highlands of the Jaulan, with its many volcanic hills as seen from the West. "A mountain of God" however does not so well apply to this region. Perhaps we should, with Wetzstein (Das batanaische Giebelgebirge) take these phrases as descriptive of Jebel Chauran, now usually called Jebel ed-Druze, with its many striking summits. This range protected the province from encroachment by the sands of the wilderness from the East. On the South Bashan marched with the desert steppe, el-Chamad, and Gilead. Of the western boundary as we have seen there can be no certainty. It is equally impossible to draw any definite line in the North.

2. Characteristics:

Bashan thus included the fertile, wooded slopes of Jebel ed-Druze, the extraordinarily rich plain of el-Chauran (en-Nuqrah—see HAURAN), the rocky tract of el-Leja’, the region now known as el-Jedur, resembling the Chauran in character, but less cultivated; and, perhaps, the breezy uplands of el-Jaulan, with its splendid reaches of pasture land. It was a land rich in great cities, as existing ruins sufficiently testify. It can hardly be doubted that many of these occupy sites of great antiquity. We may specially note Ashtaroth and Edrei, the cities of Og; Golan, the city of refuge, the site of which is still in doubt; and Salecah (Calkhad), the fortress on the ridge of the mountain, marking the extreme eastern limit of Israel’s possessions.

The famous oaks of Bashan (Isa 2:13; Eze 27:6) have their modern representatives on the mountain slopes. It seems strange that in Scripture there is no notice of the wheat crops for which the country is in such repute today. Along with Carmel it stood for the fruitfulness of the land (Isa 33:9 etc.); and their languishing was an evident mark of God’s displeasure (Na 1:4). The "bulls of Bashan" represent blatant and brutal strength (Ps 22:12, etc.). It is long since the lion deserted the plateau (De 33:22); but the

leopard is still not unknown among the mountains (So 4:8).

3. History:

In pre-Israelite days Bashan was ruled by Og the Amorite. His defeat at Edrei marked the end of his kingdom (Nu 21:33 ff; Jos 13:11), and the land was given to the half tribe of Manasseh (Jos 13:30, etc.). In the Syrian wars Bashan was lost to Israel (1Ki 22:3 ff; 2Ki 8:28; 10:32 f), but it was regained by Jeroboam II (2Ki 14:25). It was incorporated in the Assyrian empire by Tiglath-pileser III (2Ki 15:29). In the 2nd century BC it was in the hands of the Nabateans. It formed part of the kingdom of Herod the Great, and then belonged to that of Philip and Agrippa II.

W. Ewing

BASHAN-HAVVOTH-JAIR

ba’-shan-hav’-oth-ja’-ir (bashan chawwoth ya’ir).

See HAVVOTH-JAIR.

BASHEMATH

bash’-e-math.

See BASEMATH.

BASILISK

baz’-i-lisk (tsepha‘, tsiph‘oni, from obsolete root tsapha‘, "to hiss": Isa 11:8; 14:29; 59:5; Jer 8:17; Pr 23:32 m. In Pr 23:32, the King James Version has "adder," margin "cockatrice"; in the other passages cited the King James Version has "cockatrice," margin "adder" (except Jer 8:17, no margin)): The word is from basiliskos, "kinglet," from basileus, "king," and signifies a mythical reptile hatched by a serpent from a cock’s egg. Its hissing drove away other serpents. Its look, and especially its breath, was fatal. According to Pliny, it was named from a crown-like spot on its head. It has been identified with the equally mythical COCKATRICE (which see). In all the passages cited, it denotes a venomous serpent (see ADDER; SERPENT), but it is impossible to tell what, if any, particular species is referred to. It must be borne in mind that while there are poisonous snakes in Palestine, there are more which are not poisonous, and most of the latter, as well as some harmless lizards, are commonly regarded as deadly. Several of the harmless snakes have crownlike markings on their heads, and it is quite conceivable that the basilisk myth may have been founded upon one of these.

Alfred Ely Day

BASIN; BASON

ba’-s’-n.

1. The Terms Used and Their Meaning:

The American Standard Revised Version has "basin," the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "bason," the preferred spelling of the English revisers. In the Appendix to the Revised Old Testament the American Revisers (section viii) say, "The modern spelling is preferred for the following words"; then follow among others "basin" for "bason"; but no similar statement appears in the Appendix to the Revised New Testament. The Hebrew word so rendered in English Versions of the Bible is chiefly used for the large bowl of bronze (the King James Version "brass") employed by the priests to receive the blood of the sacrificial victims (Ex 27:3; compare Ex 29:16; 1Ki 7:45, etc.). It is found only once in secular use (Am 6:6, "drink wine in bowls"), if the text there is correct; the Septuagint has it otherwise. See BOWL. The "basins" of Ex 12:22; 2Sa 17:28 were probably of earthenware.

2. Of Various Materials and Forms:

While the priests’ bowls were of bronze, similar bowls or basins of silver were presented by the princes of the congregation, according to Nu 7:13 ff; and those spoken of in 1Ki 7:50 as destined for Solomon’s temple were of gold (compare 1Ch 28:17).

3. The Typical Ewer of the East:

(1) The well-known eastern mode of washing the hands was and is by pouring water on the hands, not by dipping them in water, an act, of course, calling for the aid of an attendant. Elisha "poured water on the hands of Elijah" (2Ki 3:11; see Kitto’s note in Pictorial Bible 2, II, 330). A disciple came to be known as "one who poured water on the hands of another." Such was beyond question the prevailing custom among the ancient Hebrews, as it was, and is, among eastern peoples in general. They incline to look with disgust, if not with horror, upon our western practice of washing face and hands in water retained in a basin.

(2) The typical vessel of the East used in such ablutions has a long spout, not unlike our large coffee-pot (see Kitto, Pict. Biblical, II, 331, note). While the English Versions of the Bible unfortunately often suggests nothing like such pouring, the Hebrew expresses it, e.g. in 1Sa 25:41, where we have the Qal of rachats compare Kennedy in 1-vol HDB, and HDB, articles "Bath," "Bathing." Kennedy shows that "affusion," "pouring on" of water, was meant in many cases where we read "bathe" or "wash" in Enoch glish Versions. Lane (Mod. Egypt, chapter v) says: "A servant brings him a basin and ewer (called Tsisht and ibreek) of tinned copper or brass. The first has a cover with holes, with a raised receptacle for the soap; and the water is poured upon the hands and passes through the ewer into the space below; so

that when the basin is brought to a second person the water with which the former has washed is not seen."

4. A Basin of a Unique Sort:

(1) A wash-basin of a special sort was used by Jesus for washing the disciples' feet (see Joh 13:5). The Greek is nipter eita ballei hudor eis ton niptera, translated the Revised Version (British and American), "then he poureth water into the basin." This word nipter is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, nor in the Septuagint, nor, indeed, in Greek profane literature. But fortunately the general sense is here made plain by the context and by comparison of the cognate verbs niptein and n izein. It evidently denotes an article, not necessarily a vessel, specifically suited to the use of washing a part of the body, e. g. the hands or the feet, and hence is used with the article, "the basin," the Revised Version (British and American). It is doubtful, therefore, if "basin," or "bason," conveys a true idea of either the oriental article here meant or the scene portrayed. The fact that, according to the custom of the day, the position of the disciples here was reclining, precludes the possibility of the use of a "basin" of our sort, in the way we are accustom edition to, i.e. for immersing the feet in the water, in whole or in part.

(2) So it is likely that the nipter was a jug, or ewer, with a dish, saucer, or basin placed under it and combined with it to catch the dripping water. We know from other sources that such a vessel was kept in the Jewish house regularly for ordinary handwashings, etc. (see Mt 15:2; Mr 7:3), and for ceremonial ablutions. Hence, it would naturally be ready here in the upper room as a normal part of the preparation of the "goodman of the house" for his guests (the King James Version Mr 14:14; Lu 22:12), and so it is distinguished by the Greek article ton. Jesus Himself used the nipter, standing, doubtless, to impress upon His disciples the lessons of humility, self-abasement and loving service which He ever sought to impart and illustrate.

(3) Our conclusion, we may say with George Farmer in DCG, article "Bason," is that nipter was not simply one large basin, but the set of ewer and basin combined, such a set as was commonly kept in the Jewish house for the purpose of cleansing either the hands or the feet by means of affusion. The Arabic Tisht, authorities tell us, is the exact rendering of nipter, and it comes from a root which means "to pour," or "rain slightly." (See Anton Tien, reviser of the Arabic prayer-book, author of Arabic an d Mod. Greek Grammars, etc., quoted in DCG, article "Bason.")

George B. Eager

BASKET

bas'-ket: Four kinds of "baskets" come to view in the Old Testament under the Hebrew names, dudh, Tene', cal and kelubh. There is little, however, in these names, or in the narratives where they are found, to indicate definitely what the differences of size and shape and use were. The Mishna renders us some help in our uncertainty, giving numerous names and descriptions of "baskets" in use among the ancient Hebrews (see Kreugel, Dasse Hausgerat in der Mishna, 39-45). They were variously m ade of willow,

rush, palm-leaf, etc., and were used for various purposes, domestic and agricultural, for instance, in gathering and serving fruit, collecting alms in kind for the poor, etc. Some had handles, others lids, some both, others neither.

1. Meaning of Old Testament Terms:

(1) Dudh was probably a generic term for various kinds of baskets. It was probably the "basket" in which the Israelites in Egypt carried the clay for bricks (compare Ps 81:6, where it is used as a symbol of Egyptian bondage), and such as the Egyptians themselves used for that purpose (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, I, 379), probably a large, shallow basket, made of wicker-work. It stood for a basket that was used in fruit-gathering (see Jer 24:1), but how it differed from Amos' "basket of summer fruit" (Am 8:1) we do not know. Dudh is used for the "pot" in which meat was boiled (1Sa 2:14), showing probably that a pot-shaped "basket" was known by this name. Then it seems to have stood for a basket tapering toward the bottom like the calathus of the Romans. So we seem forced to conclude that the term was generic, not specific.

(2) The commonest basket in use in Old Testament times was the cal. It was the "basket" in which the court-baker of Egypt carried about his confectionery on his head (Ge 40:16). It was made in later times at least of peeled willows, or palm leaves, and was sometimes at least large and flat like the canistrum of the Romans, and, like it, was used for carrying bread and other articles of food (Ge 40:16; Jud 6:19). Meat for the meat offerings and the unleavened bread, were placed in it (Ex 29:3; Le 8:2; Nu 6:15). It is expressly required that the unleavened cakes be placed and offered in such a "basket." While a "basket," it was dish-shaped, larger or smaller in size, it would seem, according to demand, and perhaps of finer texture than the dudh.

(3) The Tene' was a large, deep basket, in which grain and other products of garden or field were carried home, and kept (De 28:5,17), in which the first-fruits were preserved (De 26:2), and the tithes transported to the sanctuary (De 26:2 f). It has been thought probable that the chabya, the basket of clay and straw of the Palestine peasantry of today, is a sort of survival or counterpart of it. It has the general shape of a jar, and is used for storing and keeping wheat, barley, oats, etc. At the top is the mouth into which the grain is poured, and at the bottom is an orifice through which it can be taken out as needed, when the opening is again closed with a rag. The Septuagint translates Tene' by kartallos, which denotes a basket of the shape of an inverted cone.

(4) The term kelubh, found in Am 8:1 for a "fruit-basket," is used in Jer 5:27 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "cage") for a bird-cage. But it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that a coarsely woven basket with a cover would be used by a fowler to carry home his feathered captives.

2. Meaning of New Testament Terms:

In the New Testament interest centers in two kinds of "basket," distinguished by the evangelists in their

accounts of the feeding of the 5,000 and of the 4,000, called in Greek kophinos and spuris (Westcott-Hort sphuris).

(1) The kophinos (Mt 14:20; Mr 6:43; Lu 9:17; Joh 6:13) may be confidently identified with the kuphta' of the Mishna which was provided with a cord for a handle by means of which it could be carried on the back with such provisions as the disciples on the occasions under consideration would naturally have with them (of Kreugel, and Broadus, Commentary in the place cited.). The Jews of Juvenal's day carried such a specific "provision-basket" with them on their journeys regularly, and the Latin for it is a transliteration of this Greek word, cophinus (compare Juvenal iii.14, and Jastrow, Dictionary, article "Basket"). Some idea of its size may be drawn from the fact that in CIG, 1625, 46, the word denotes a Beotian measure of about two gallons.

(2) The sphuris or spuris (Mt 15:37; Mr 8:8) we may be sure, from its being used in letting Paul down from the wall at Damascus (Ac 9:25, etc.), was considerably larger than the kophinos and quite different in shape and uses. It might for distinction fitly be rendered "hamper," as Professor Kennedy suggests. Certainly neither the Greek nor ancient usage justifies any confusion.

(3) The sargane (2Co 11:33) means anything plaited, or sometimes more specifically a fish-basket.

George B. Eager

BASMATH

bas'-math.

See BASEMATH.

BASON

ba'-s'-n.

See BASIN.

BASSA

bas'-a.

See BASSAI.

BASSAI

bas’-a-i, bas’-i (Bassai, Bassa; the King James Version Bassa; 1 Esdras 5:16; Bezai (Ezr 2:17; Ne 7:23)): The sons of Bassai returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BASTAI

bas’-ta-i.

See BASTHAI.

BASTARD

bas’-tard (mamzer; nothos): In De 23:2 probably the offspring of an incestuous union, or of a marriage within the prohibited degrees of affinity (Le 18:6-20; 20:10-21). He and his descendants to the tenth generation are excluded from the assembly of the Lord. (See Driver, at the place). Zechariah (Zec 9:6), after prophesying the overthrow of three Philistine cities, declares of the fourth: "And a bastard (the Revised Version, margin "a bastard race") shall dwell in Ashdod," meaning probably that a "mixed population" (BDB) of aliens shall invade and settle in the capital of the Philistines. In Heb (He 12:8) in its proper sense of "born out of wedlock," and therefore not admitted to the privileges of paternal care and responsibility as a legitimate son.

T. Ress

BASTHAI

bas’-tha-i, bas’-thi (Basthai; the King James Version Bastai; 1 Esdras 5:31 = Besai (Ezr 2:49; Ne 7:52)): The descendants of Basthai (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BAT

(‘aTaleph; Le 11:19; De 14:18; Isa 2:20): Bats are the most widely distributed of mammals, reaching even the oceanic islands, and modern science has revealed the existence of an astonishing number of species, nearly twenty being recorded from Palestine. These include both fruit-eating and insect-eating bats, the latter being the smaller. It has not always been realized that they are mammals, and so it is not surprising that they should be mentioned at the end of the list of unclean birds in Le 11:19 and De 14:18. It may, however, be significant that they are at the end of the list and not in the middle of it. The fruit bats are a pest to horticulturists and often strip apricot and other trees before the fruit has ripened enough to be picked. On this account the fruit is often enclosed in bags, or the whole tree may be surrounded with a great sheet or net. They commonly pick the fruit and eat it on some distant perch beneath which the seeds and the ordure of these animals are scattered. The insect bats, as in other countries, flit about at dusk and through the night catching mosquitoes and larger insects, and so are distinctly beneficial.

The reference in Isa 2:20, "cast .... idols .... to the moles and to the bats" refers of course to these animals as inhabitants of dark and deserted places. As in the case of many animal names the etymology of ‘aTaleph is doubtful. Various derivations have been proposed but none can be regarded as satisfactory. The Arabic name, waTwaT, throws no light on the question.

Alfred Ely Day

BATANAEA

bat-a-ne’-a: The name used in Greek times for BASHAN (which see), Josephus, Life, II; Ant, XV, x, 1; XVII, ii, 1, "toparchy of Butanea."

BATH

(bath): A liquid measure equal to about 9 gallons, English measure. It seems to have been regarded as a standard for liquid measures (Eze 45:10), as in the case of the molten sea and the lavers in Solomon’s temple (1Ki 7:26,38), and for measuring oil and wine (2Ch 2:10; Ezr 7:22; Isa 5:10; Eze 45:14). Its relation to the homer is given in Eze 45:11,14.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

BATH KOL

bath’-kol, bath kol (bath qol, "the daughter of the voice"): Originally signifying no more than "sound," "tone," "call" (e.g. water in pouring gives forth a "sound," bath qol, while oil does not), sometimes also "echo." The expression acquired among the rabbis a special use, signifying the Divine voice, audible to man and unaccompanied by a visible Divine manifestation. Thus conceived, bath qol is to be distinguished from God’s speaking to Moses and the prophets; for at Sinai the voice of God was part of a larger theophany, while for the prophets it was the resultant inward demonstration of the Divine will, by whatever means effected, given to them to declare (see VOICE). It is further to be distinguished from all natural sounds and voices, even where these were interpreted as conveying Divine instruction. The conception appears for the first time in Da 4:28 (English Versions 31)—it is in the Aramaic portion—where, however, qal = qol, "voice" stands without berath = bath, "daughter": "A voice fell from heaven." Josephus (Ant., XIII, x, 3) relates that John Hyrcanus (135- 104 BC) heard a voice while offering a burnt sacrifice in the temple, which Josephus expressly interprets as the voice of God (compare Babylonian SoTah 33a and Jerusalem SoTah 24b, where it is called bath qol). In the New Testament mention of "a voice from heaven" occurs in the following passages: Mt 3:17; Mr 1:11; Lu 3:22 (at the baptism of Jesus); Mt 17:5; Mr 9:7; Lu 9:35 (at His transfiguration); Joh 12:28 (shortly before His passion); Ac 9:4; 22:7; 26:14 (conversion of Paul), and Ac 10:13,15 (instruction of Peter concerning clean and unclean). In the period of the Tannaim (circa 100 BC- 200 AD) the term bath qol was in very frequent us and was understood to signify not the direct voice of God, which was held to be supersensible, but the echo of the voice (the bath being somewhat arbitrarily taken to express the distinction). The rabbis held that bath qol

had been an occasional means of Divine communication throughout the whole history of Israel and that since the cessation of the prophetic gift it was the sole means of Divine revelation. It is noteworthy that the rabbinical conception of bath qol sprang up in the period of the decline of Old Testament prophecy and flourished in the period of extreme traditionalism. Where the gift of prophecy was clearly lacking—perhaps even because of this lack—there grew up an inordinate desire for special Divine manifestations. Often a voice from heaven was looked for to clear up matters of do ubt and even to decide between conflicting interpretations of the law. So strong had this tendency become that Rabbi Joshua (circa 100 AD) felt it to be necessary to oppose it and to insist upon the supremacy and the sufficiency of the written law. It is clear that we have here to do with a conception of the nature and means of Divine revelation that is distinctly inferior to the Biblical view. For even in the Biblical passages where mention is made of the voice from heaven, all that is really essential to the revelation is already present, at least in principle, without the audible voice.

LITERATURE.

F. Weber, System der altsynagogalen palastinischen Theologie, 2nd edition, 1897, 194 ff; J. Hamburger, Real-Enc des Judentums, II, 1896; W. Bacher, Agada der Tannaiten and Agada der palast. Amoraer (see Index); Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 588 ff; "Bath Kol" in TSBA, IX, 18; P. Fiebig, Rel. in Gesch. und Gegenwart, I, under the word

J. R. Van Pelt

BATH-RABBIM, THE GATE OF bath-rab’-im, (sha‘ar bath-rabbim; Septuagint en pulais thugatros pollon, literally "in the gates of the daughter of the many.") The gate of Heshbon near which were the pools compared to the Shulammite’s eyes (So 7:4). Guthe would translate "by the gate of the populous city." Cheyne would amend the passage and read `" Thine eyes are like Solomon’s pools, By the wood of Beth-cerem,"` and transfer the scene to the pools of Solomon, S. of Bethlehem (EB, under the word). But this is surely very violent. One of the pools of Heshbon still survives, measuring 191 ft. X 139 ft., and is 10 ft. deep. The walls however have been rent by earthquakes, and now no longer retain the water.

W. Ewing

BATH-SHEBA

bath-she’-ba, bath’-she-ba (bath-shebha‘, "the seventh daughter," or "the daughter of an oath," also called Bathshua bath- shua‘, "the daughter of opulence" (1Ch 3:5); the Septuagint however reads Bersabee everywhere; compare BATHSHUA; HPN, 65, 67, 77, 206 for Bath-sheba, and 67, 69, note 3, for Bathshua): Bath-sheba was the daughter of Eliam (2Sa 11:3) or Ammiel (1Ch 3:5); both names have the same meaning. She was the beautiful wife of Uriah the Hittite, and because of her beauty was forced by David to commit adultery (2Sa 11:2 ff; Ps 51). Her husband Uriah was treacherously killed by the order of David (2Sa 11:6 ff). After the death of her husband David made her his wife and she lived with

him in the palace (2Sa 11:27). Four sons sprang from this marriage (2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 3:5), after the first child, the adulterine, had died (2Sa 12:14 ff). With the help of the prophet Nathan she renders futile the usurpation of Adonijah and craftily secures the throne for her son Solomon (1Ki 1:11 ff). Later Adonijah succeeds in deceiving Bath-sheba, but his plan is frustrated by the king (1Ki 2:13 ff). According to Jewish tradition, Pr 31 is written by Solomon in memory of his mother. In the genealogy of Jesus (Mt 16) Bath-sheba is mentioned as the former wife of Uriah and the mother of Solomon by David.

See ADONIJAH; AMMIEL; BATHSHUA; DAVID; ELIAM; NATHAN; SOLOMON.

A. L. Breslich

BATH-ZACHARIAS

bath-zak-a-ri’-as.

See BETH-ZACHARIAS.

BATH; BATHING

bath, bath’-ing.

1. Ordinary Bathing:

Bathing in the ordinary, non-religious sense, public or private, is rarely met with in the Scriptures. We find, however, three exceptional and interesting cases:

(1) that of Pharaoh’s daughter, resorting to the Nile (Ex 2:5);

(2) that of Bath-sheba, bathing on the house-top (2Sa 11:2 the Revised Version (British and American));

(3) the curious case mentioned in 1Ki 22:38. (To wash with royal blood was supposed to be beneficial to the complexion.)

The dusty, limestone soil of Palestine and the open foot-gear of the Orient on stockingless feet, called for frequent washing of the feet (Ge 24:32; 43:24; Jud 19:24; 1Sa 25:41; 2Sa 11:8; So 5:3, etc.), and bathing of the body for refreshment; but the chief concern of the writers of Scripture was with bathing of another sort. Indeed, something of the religious sense and aspect of bathing, in addition to that of bodily refreshment, seems to have entered into the ordinary use of water, as in the washing of the hands before meals, etc. (see Ge 18:4; 19:2; Lu 7:44).

2. Bathing Resorts:

The streams and ponds, when available, were the usual resorts for bathing (Ex 2:5; 2Ki 5:10, etc.), but the water- supply of large cities, stored up in great pools or large cisterns, was certainly available at times to some degree for bathing (2Sa 11:2); though, as Benzinger says, no traces of bathrooms have been found in old Hebrew houses, even in royal palaces. In Babylon, it would seem from Susanna 15, there were bathing pools in gardens, though this passage may refer simply to bathing in the open air. Certainly public baths as now known, or plunge-baths of the Greek type, were unknown among the Hebrews until they were brought in contact with the Greek civilization. Such baths first come into view during the Greek-Roman period, when they are found to be regularly included in the gymnasia, or "places of exercise" (1 Macc 1:14). Remains of them, of varying degrees of richness and architectural completeness, may be seen today in various parts of the East, those left of the cities of the Decapolis, especially at Gerash and Amman, being excellent examples (compare also those at Pompeii). A remarkable series of bath-chambers has recently been discovered by Mr. R. A. S. Macalister at Gezer in Palestine, in connection with a building supposed to be the palace built by Simon Maccabeus. For an interesting account of it see PEFS, 1905, 294 f.

3. Greek versus Semitic Ideas:

When we consider that in Palestine six months of the year are rainless, and how scarce and pricelessly valuable water is during most of the year, and in many places all the year round; and when we recall how the Bedouin of today looks on the use of water for cleansing in such times and places of scarcity, viewing it as a wanton waste (see Benzinger, Hebrew. Arch., 108, note), the rigid requirement of it for so many ritual purposes by the Mosaic law is, to say the least, remarkable (see ABLUTION; CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS, etc.). Certainly there was a marked contrast between the Greek idea of bathing and that of the Hebrews and Asiatics in general, when they came in contact. But when Greek culture invaded Palestine under Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 168 BC), it brought Greek ideas and Greek bathing establishments with it; and under Herod (40-44 BC) it was given the right of way and prevailed to no mean degree (see Anecdote of Gamaliel II in Schurer, HJP, II, i, 18, 53).

4. Ceremonial Purification:

But "bathing" in the Bible stands chiefly for ritual acts—purification from ceremonial uncleanness, from contact with the dead, with defiled persons or things, with "holy things," i.e. things "devoted," or "under the ban," etc. (see CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS, etc.). The Hebrew of the Old Testament does not sharply distinguish between bathing and partial washing—both are expressed by rahats, and the Revised Version (British and American) rightly renders "wash" instead of "bathe" in some cases. Talmudic usage simply codified custom which had been long in vogue, according to Schurer. But Kennedy grants that the "bath" at last became, even for the laity, "an important factor in the religious life of Israel." We read of daily bathing by the Essenes (Josephus, BJ, II, viii, 5). Then later we find John, the Baptizer, immersing, as the record clearly shows the apostles of Christ did also (Ac 8:38; Ro 6:3 f); compare Lu 11:38 where baptizo, in passive =" washed."

5. Bathing for Health:

In Joh 5:2-7 we have an example of bathing for health. There are remains of ancient baths at Gadara and at Callirrhoe, East of the Jordan, baths which were once celebrated as resorts for health-seekers. There are hot baths in full operation today, near Tiberias, on the southwestern shore of the Lake of Galilee, which have been a health resort from time immemorial. It is probably true, however, as some one has said, that in Old Testament times and in New Testament times, the masses of the people had neither privacy nor inclination for bathing.

George B. Eager

BATHSHUA

bath'-shu-a (bath-shua', "the daughter of opulence" or "the daughter of Shua"; compare BATH-SHEBA; for derivation see HPN, 67, 69, note 3):

(1) In Ge 38:2 and 1Ch 2:3, where the name is translated "Shua's daughter," the wife of Judah.

(2) In 1Ch 3:5, the daughter of Ammiel and wife of David.

See BATH-SHEBA.

BATTERING-RAM

bat'-er-ing-ram.

See SIEGE.

BATTLE

See WAR.

BATTLE-AXE

bat'-'-l-ax.

See ARMOR, ARMS, III, 1; AX (AXE).

BATTLE-BOW

bat'-'-l-bo: Found in the striking Messianic prophecy: "The battle bow shall be cut off" (Zec 9:10). The

prophet is predicting the peace that shall prevail when Zion’s king cometh, "just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass." The words convey their full significance only when read in the light of the context: "I will cut off the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem; and the battle bow shall be cut off; and he shall speak peace unto the nations" (compare Zec 10:4). The battle-bow was sometimes made of tough wood, sometimes of two straight horns joined together (Hom. II. iv.105-11), and sometimes of bronze. In Ps 18:34 the Revised Version (British and American) we find "bow of brass," but it probably should be of "bronze" (nechosheth), a metal very different from our brass, which is a mixture of copper and zinc. The point of the passage in this connection ("He teacheth my hands to war; so that mine arms do bend a bow of bronze"), as well as of that in 2Ki 9:24 ("And Jehu drew his bow with his full strength") is that it required great strength to bend the battle-bow.

See ARCHERY; ARMOR.

George B. Eager

BATTLEMENT

bat’-’-l-ment.

See FORTIFICATION; HOUSE.

BAVAI

bav’-a-i.

See BAVVAI.

BAVVAI

bav’-a-i (bawway; Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus, Benei; Codex Vaticanus, Bedei; the King James Version Bavai, "wisher" (?)(Ne 3:18)): Perhaps identical with or a brother of Binnui (Ne 3:24). See BINNUI. Bavvai, "the son of Henadad, the ruler of half the district of Keilah," was of a Levitical family. He is mentioned as one of those who repaired the wall of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Ne 3:17 f).

BAY (1)

ba.

See COLORS.

BAY (2)

ba (lashon, literally "tongue"; kolpos): The word occurs in the sense of inlet of the sea in the Old Testament only in Jos 15:2,5; 18:19, and in New Testament only in Ac 27:39 (of Malta, the King James Version "creek").

BAY TREE

ba'-tre' (the King James Version only; Ps 37:35; 'ezrach): The word means "native," "indigenous," and the Revised Version (British and American) translations "a green tree in its native soil."

BAYITH

ba'-yith (bayith; the King James Version Bajith, "house" (Isa 15:2)): A town in the country of Moab. The reading of the Revised Version, margin, "Bayith and Dibon are gone up to the high places to weep," seems to be the proper rendering of this passage. Duhm et al., by changing the text, read either "house of" or "daughter of." The construct of this word beth is frequently used in compound words.

See BETH.

BAZLITH; BAZLUTH

baz'-lith, baz'-luth (batslith, Ne 7:54; batsluth, Ezr 2:52; Basaloth, 1 Esdras 5:31, "asking"): The descendants of Bazlith (temple-servants) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem.

BDELLIUM

del'-i-um (bedholach): The word occurs twice in the Pentateuch:

(1) in Ge 2:12, in conjunction with gold and onyx, as a product of the land of HAVILAH (which see), and

(2) in Nu 11:7, where the manna is likened to this substance in appearance: "The appearance thereof as the appearance of bdellium." The latter comparison excludes the idea of bedholach being a precious stone, and points to the identification of it with the fragrant resinous gum known to the Greeks as bdellion, several kinds being mentioned by Dioscorides and Pliny. It was a product of Arabia, India, Afghanistan, etc.

James Orr

BEACH

bech (aigialos): The part of the shore washed by the tide on which the waves dash (Mt 13:2,48; Joh 21:4; Ac 21:5; 27:39,40).

BEACON

be’-k’-n. The translation of the Hebrew toren, which usually means "mast" (compare Isa 33:23; Eze 27:5), but in Isa 30:17 being used in parallelism with "ensign" the meaning may be "signal-staff" (Isa 30:17 the American Revised Version, margin "pole").

BEALIAH

be-a-li’-a (be‘alyah, "Yahweh is Lord," compare HPN, 144, 287): Bealiah, formerly a friend of Saul, joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5).

BEALOTH

be’-a-loth (be‘aloth; Baloth): An unidentified city of Judah in the Negeb (Jos 15:24).

BEAM

bem: The word is used to translate various Old Testament terms:

(1) gebh (1Ki 6:9), tsela‘, "a rib" (1Ki 7:3), qurah (2Ch 3:7; 34:11; So 1:17), all refer to constructional beams used in buildings for roofing and upper floors, main beams being carried on pillars generally of wood. The last term is used in 2Ki 6:2,5 ("as one was felling a beam") of trees which were being cut into logs. A related form is qarah (used of the Creator, Ps 104:3; of building, Ne 2:8; 3:3,6). Yet another term, kaphim, is used in Hab 2:11: "The stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it"—a protest against sin made by inanimate things. The Douay version, in translating, "the timber that is between the joints of the building," suggests the use of bond timbers in buildings, similar to that used at one time in English brickwork. It probably refers to its use in mud brick buildings, although bond timbers might also be used in badly built stone walls. The Arabs of the present day use steel joints to strengthen angles of buildings.

(2) Beam, in weaving, represents two words, ‘eregh (Jud 16:14, the beam of a loom to which Samson’s hair was fastened; used in Job 7:6 of a weaver’s shuttle), and manor (1Sa 17:7; 2Sa 21:19; 1Ch 11:23; 20:5), of a spear-staff.

(3) In the New Testament Jesus uses the word dokos, "a rafter," in bidding the censorious person first cast the "beam" out of his own eye before attempting to remove the "mote" from another’s eye (Mt 7:3;

Lu 6:41,42).

See ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE.

Arch. C. Dickie

BEAN

be’-an.

See BAEAN.

BEANS

benz (pol; Arabic ful): A very common product of Palestine; a valuable and very ancient article of diet. The Bible references are probably to the Faba vulgaris (N. D. Leguminosae) or horsebean. This is sown in the autumn; is in full flower—filling the air with sweet perfume—in the early spring; and is harvested just after the barley and wheat. The bundles of black bean stalks, plucked up by the roots and piled up beside the newly winnowed barley, form a characteristic feature on many village threshing-floors. Beans are threshed and winnowed like the cereals. Beans are eaten entire, with the pod, in the unripe state, but to a greater extent the hard beans are cooked with oil and meat.

In Eze 4:9, beans are mentioned with other articles as an unusual source of bread and in 2Sa 17:28 David receives from certain staunch friends of his at Mahanaim a present, which included "beans, and lentils, and parched pulse."

E. W. G. Masterman

BEAR

bar (dobh; compare Arabic dubb): In 1Sa 17:34-37, David tells Saul how as a shepherd boy he had overcome a lion and a bear. In 2Ki 2:24 it is related that two she bears came out of the wood and tore forty-two of the children who had been mocking Elisha. All the other references to bears are figurative; compare 2Sa 17:8; Pr 17:12; 28:15; Isa 11:7; 59:11; La 3:10; Da 7:5; Ho 13:8; Am 5:19; Re 13:2. The Syrian bear, sometimes named as a distinct species, Ursus Syriacus, is better to be regarded as merely a local variety of the European and Asiatic brown bear, Ursus arctos. It still exists in small numbers in Lebanon and is fairly common in Anti-Lebanon and Hermon. It does not seem to occur now in Palestine proper, but may well have done so in Bible times. It inhabits caves in the high and rugged mountains and issues mainly at night to feed on roots and vegetables. It is fond of the chummuc or chick-pea which is sometimes planted in the upland meadows, and the fields have to be well guarded. The figurative re ferences to the bear take account of its ferocious nature, especially in the case of the she bear robbed of

her whelps (2Sa 17:8; Pr 17:12; Ho 13:8). It is with this character of the bear in mind that Isaiah says (Is 11:7), "And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together."

Alfred Y. Day

BEAR, THE (ARCTURUS)

bar. A great northern constellation.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 13.

BEAR; BORN

bar, born (vb.), (yaladh): Occurs frequently in its literal sense, alluding to motherhood (Ge 16:11; 17:17,19,21; 18:13; 22:23; 30:3; Le 12:5; Jud 13:3; 5:7; Ru 1:12; 1Ki 3:21; Jer 29:6); in the New Testament gennao, in the same sense (Lu 1:13).

Figurative: It is often used with reference to the beginning of the spiritual life or regeneration (Joh 1:13; 3:3-8; 1Jo 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1,4,18 the King James Version).

See REGENERATION.

BEAR; BORNE

bar, born (nasa’; lambano, anaphero, bastazo): In English Versions of the Bible the physical sense is familiar, of supporting or carrying any weight or burden. The translation of the Revised Version (British and American) is to be preferred in Ps 75:3 ("have set up"); La 3:28 ("hath laid it upon him"); Ze 1:11 ("were laden with silver"); Lu 18:7 ("he is longsuffering over them"); Joh 12:6 ("took away what was put therein"); Ac 27:15 ("could not face the wind").

Figurative: The words are used in the figurative sense of enduring or taking the consequences of, be it for oneself or as representative for others: one’s own iniquity (Le 5:17 and often); chastisement (Job 34:31); reproach (Ps 69:7; 89:50); or the sins of others (Isa 53:4,11,12; Mt 8:17; Heb 9:28; 1Pe 2:24). In Isa 46:1-7 a striking contrast is presented between the idols of Babylon whom their worshippers had carried (borne) about and which would be borne away by the conquerors, and Yahweh who had ca rried (borne) Israel from the beginning. "Jacob and Israel .... borne by me from their birth .... and I will bear; yea, I will carry." "They bear it upon the shoulder," etc.

M. O. Evans

BEARD

berd:

(1) Western Semites in general, according to the monuments, wore full round beards, to which they evidently devoted great care. The nomads of the desert, in distinction from the settled Semites, wore a clipped and pointed beard (see Jer 9:26: "all that have the corners of their hair cut off, that dwell in the wilderness"; and compare 25:23; 49:32, etc.).

(2) Long beards are found on Assyrian and Babylonian monuments and sculptures as a mark of the highest aristocracy (compare Egyptian monuments, especially representations by W. Max Muller, Asien und Europa, 140). It is not clear that it was ever so with the Jews. Yet it is significant that the Hebrew "elder" (zaqen) seems to have received his name from his long beard (compare bene barbatus).

(3) The view of some that it was customary among the Hebrews to shave the upper lip is considered by the best authorities as without foundation. The mustache (Hebrew sapham, "beard"), according to 2Sa 19:24, received regular "trimming" (thus English Versions of the Bible after the Vulgate, but the Hebrew is generic, not specific: "He had neither dressed his feet, nor trimmed his beard").

(4) In one case (1Sa 21:13,14) the neglect of the beard is set down as a sign of madness: "(He) let his spittle fall down upon his beard. Then said Achish, ... Lo, ye see the man is mad."

(5) It was common. Semitic custom to cut both hair and beard as a token of grief or distress. Isa 15:2, describing the heathen who have "gone up to the high places to weep," says "Moab waileth over Nebo, and over Medeba; on all their heads is baldness, every beard is cut off." Jeremiah (Je 41:5), describing the grief of the men of Samaria for their slain governor, Gedaliah, says, "There came men from .... Samaria (his sorrowing subjects) even four score men, having their beards shaven and their clothes rent," etc. And Amos, in his prophecy of the vision of the "basket of summer fruit" (Am 8:1 ff), makes Yahweh say to His people: "I will turn your feasts into mourning; .... I will bring sackcloth upon all loins, and baldness upon every head" (Am 8:10). On the other hand it was even more significant of great distress or fear to leave the beard untrimmed, as did Mephibosheth, the son of Saul, when he went to meet King David, in the crisis of his guilty failure to go up with the king according to his expectation: "He had neither dressed his feet, nor trimmed his beard, nor washed his clothes, from the day the king departed until the day he came home in peace." (Compare 1Sa 21:13,14; 2Sa 19:24.)

(6) Absalom’s hair was cut only once a year, it would seem (2Sa 14:26; compare rules for priests, Levites, etc., Eze 44:20). But men then generally wore their hair longer than is customary or seemly with us (of So 5:2,11, "His locks are bushy, and black as a raven"). Later, in New Testament times, it was a disgrace for a man to wear long hair (1Co 11:6-15). To mutilate the beard of another was considered a great indignity (see 2Sa 10:4; compare Isa 50:6, "plucked off the hair"). The shaving of the head of a captive slave-girl who was to be married to her captor marked her change of condition and prospects (De 21:12; W. R. Smith, Kinship, 209).

LITERATURE.

Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, II, 324, 349; Herod. i.195; ii.36; iii.12; Josephus, Antiquities, VIII, viii, 3; XVI, viii, 1; W. R. Smith, Kinship, 209; RS, 324; Wellhausen, Skizzen, III, 167,

George B. Eager

BEAST

best: This word occurs often in both Old and New Testaments and denotes generally a mammal (though sometimes a reptile) in distinction to a man, a bird, or a fish. In this distinction the English is fairly in accord with the Hebrew and Greek originals. The commonest Hebrew words behemah and chai have their counterpart in the Arabic as do three others less often used, be‘ir (Ge 45:17; Ex 22:5; Nu 20:8 the King James Version), nephesh (Le 24:18), and Tebhach (Pr 9:2). Behemah and A rabic bahimah are from a root signifying vagueness or dumbness and so denote primarily a dumb beast. Chai and Arabic chaiwan are from the root chayah (Arabic chaya), "to live," and denote primarily living creatures. Be‘ir, "cattle," and its root-verb, ba‘ar, "to graze," are identical with the Arabic ba‘ir and ba‘ara, but with a curious difference in meaning. Ba‘ir is a common word for camel among the Bedouin and the root-verb, ba‘ara, means "to drop dung," ba‘rah being a common word for the dung of camels, goats, and sheep. Nephesh corresponds in every way with the Arabic nephs, "breath," "soul" or "self" Tebhach from Tabhach, "to slaughter," is equivalent to the Arabic dhibch from dhabacha, with the same meaning. Both therion ("wild beast"), and zoon ("living thing"), occur often in the Apocalypse. They are found also in a few other places, as mammals (Heb 13:11) or figuratively (Tit 1:12). Therion is used also of the viper which fastened on Paul’s hand, and this has parallels in classic al Greek. Beasts of burden and beasts used for food were and are an important form of property, hence, ktenos ("possession"), the word used for the good Samaritan’s beast (Lu 10:34) and for the beasts with which Lysias provided Paul for his journey to Caesarea (Ac 23:24).

For "swift beast," kirkaroth, "dromedary" (Isa 66:20 the King James Version), see CAMEL. For "swift beast," rekhesh, see HORSE (Mic 1:13 the King James Version; 1Ki 4:28 the King James Version, margin; compare Es 8:10,14).

See also WILD BEAST.

Alfred Ely Day

BEAST-FIGHT

best’-fit.

See GAMES.

BEATEN GOLD

See GOLD (BEATEN).

BEATEN OIL

See OIL (BEATEN).

BEATING

bet’-ing.

See PUNISHMENTS.

BEATITUDES

be-at’-i-tudes:

1. The Name:

The word "beatitude" is not found in the English Bible, but the Latin beatitudo, from which it is derived, occurs in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) version of Ro 4:6 where, with reference to Ps 32:1,2, David is said to pronounce the "beatitude" of the man whose transgressions are forgiven. In the Latin church beatitudo was used not only as an abstract term denoting blessedness, but in the secondary, concrete sense of a particular declaration of blessedness and especially of such a declaration coming from the lips of Jesus Christ. Beatitudes in this derivative meaning of the word occur frequently in the Old Testament, particularly in the Psalms (Ps 32:1,2; 41:1; 65:4, etc.), and Jesus on various occasions threw His utterances into this form (Mt 11:6; 13:16; 16:17; 24:46, with the Lukan parallels; Joh 13:17; 20:29). But apart from individual sayings of this type the name Beatitudes, ever since the days of Ambrose, has been attached specifically to those words of blessing with which, according to both Matthew and Luke, Jesus began that great discourse which is known as the Sermon on the Mount.

2. The Two Groups:

When we compare these Beatitudes as we find them in Mt 5:3-12 and Lu 6:20-23 (24-26), we are immediately struck by the resemblances and differences between them. To the ordinary reader, most familiar with Matthew’s version, it is the differences that first present themselves; and he will be apt to account for the discrepancy of the two reports, as Augustine did, by assigning them to two distinct occasions in the Lord’s ministry. A careful comparative study of the two narratives, however, with some attention to the introductory circumstances in each case, to the whole progress of the discourses themselves, and to the parabolic sayings with which they conclude, makes this view improbable, and

points rather to the conclusion that what we have to do with is two varying versions given by the Evangelists of the material drawn from an underlying source consisting of Logia of Jesus. The differences, it must be admitted, are very marked.

(a) Matthew has 8 Beatitudes; Luke has 4, with 4 following Woes.

(b) In Matthew the sayings, except the last, are in the 3rd person; in Luke they are in the 2nd.

(c) In Matthew the blessings, except the last, are attached to spiritual qualities; in Luke to external conditions of poverty and suffering.

Assuming that both Evangelists derived their reports from some common Logian source, the question arises as to which of them has adhered more closely to the original. The question is difficult, and still gives rise to quite contrary opinions. One set of scholars decides in favor of Matt hew, and accounts for Luke's deviation from the Matthean version by ascribing to him, on very insufficient grounds, an ascetic bias by which he was led to impart a materialistic tone to the utterances of Jesus. Another set inclines to theory that Luke's version is the more literal of the two, while Matthew's partakes of the nature of a paraphrase. In support of this second view it may be pointed out that Luke is usually more careful than Matthew to place the sayings of Jesus in their original setting and to preserve them in their primitive form, and further that owing to the natural tendency of the sacred writers to expand and interpret rather than to abbreviate an inspired utterance, the shorter form of a saying is more likely to be the original one. It may be noted, further, that in Mt 5:11,12 the Beatitude takes the direct form, which suggests that this may have been the form Matthew found in his source in the case of the others also. On the whole, then, probabilities appear to favor the view that Luke's version is the more literal one. It does not follow, however, that the difference between the two reports amounts to any real inconsistency. In Luke emphasis is laid on the fact that Jesus is addressing His disciples (Lu 6:20), so that it was not the poor as such whom He blessed, but His own disciples although they were poor. It was not poverty, hunger, sorrow or suffering in themselves to which He promised great rewards, but those experiences as coming to spiritual men and thus transformed into springs of spiritual blessing. And so when Matthew, setting down the Lord's words with a view to their universal application rather than with reference to the particular circumstances in which they were uttered, changes "the poor" into "the poor in spirit," and those that "hunger" into those that "hunger and thirst after righteousness," he is giving the real purport of the words of Jesus and recording them in the form in which by all men and through all coming time they may be read without any chance of misunderstanding.

As regards the Beatitudes of the meek, the merciful, the pure in heart, the peacemakers, which are given by Matthew only, they may have been spoken by Jesus at the same time as the rest and have been intended by Him in their association with the other four to fill out a conception of the ideal character of the members of the Kingdom of God. In view, however, of their omission from Luke's list, it is impossible to affirm this with certainty. That they are all authentic utterances of Jesus Himself there is no reason to doubt. But they may have been originally scattered through the discourse itself, each in its own proper place. Thus the Beatitude of the meek would go fitly with Lu 6:38 ff, that of the merciful

with Lu 6:43 ff, that of the pure in heart with Lu 6:27 ff, that of the peacemakers with Lu 6:23 ff. Or they may even have been uttered on other occasions than that of the Sermon on the Mount and have been gathered together by Matthew and placed at the head of the Sermon as forming along with the other four a suitable introduction to our Lord's great discourse on the laws and principles of the Kingdom of God.

3. Number, Arrangement, Structure:

With regard to the number of the Beatitudes in Matthew's fuller version, some have counted 7 only, making the list end with Mt 5:9. But though the blessing pronounced on the persecuted in Mt 5:10-12 differs from the preceding Beatitudes, both in departing from the aphoristic form and in attaching the blessing to an outward condition and not to a disposition of the heart, the parallel in Lu (Lu 6:22 f) justifies the view that this also is to be added to the list, thus making 8 Beatitudes in all. On the arrangement of the group much has been written, most of it fanciful and unconvincing. The first four have been described as negative and passive, the second four as positive and active. The first four, again, have been represented as pertaining to the desire for salvation, the second four as relating to its actual possession. Some writers have endeavored to trace in the group as a whole the steadily ascending stages in the development of the Christian character. The truth in this last suggestion lies in the reminder it brings that the Beatitudes are not to be thought of as setting forth separate types of Christian character, but as enumerating qualities and experiences that are combined in the ideal character as conceived by Christ—and as exemplified, it may be added, in His own life and person.

In respect of their structure, the Beatitudes are all alike in associating the blessing with a promise—a promise which is sometimes represented as having an immediate realization (Mt 5:3,10), but in most cases has a future or even (compare Mt 5:12) an eschatological outlook. The declaration of blessedness, therefore, is based not only on the possession of the quality or experience described, but on the present or future rewards in which it issues. The poor in spirit are called blessed not merely because they are poor in spirit, but because the kingdom of heaven is theirs; the mourners because they shall be comforted; those that hunger and thirst after righteousness because they shall be filled; those who are persecuted because a great reward is laid up for them in heaven. The Beatitudes have often been criticized as holding up an ideal of which limitation, privation and self-renunciation are the essence, and which lacks those positive elements that are indispensable to any complete conception of blessedness. But when it is recognized that the blessing in every case rests on the associated promise, the criticism falls to the ground. Christ does demand of His followers a renunciation of many things that seem desirable to the natural heart, and a readiness to endure many other things from which men naturally shrink. But just as in His own case the great self-emptying was followed by the glorious exaltation (Php 2:6 ff), so in the case of His disciples spiritual poverty and the bearing of the cross carry with them the inheritance of the earth and a great reward in heaven.

LITERATURE.

Votaw in HDB, V, 14 ff; Adeney in Expositor, 5th series, II, 365 ff; Stanton, The Gospels as Historical

Documents, II, 106 ff, 327 f; Gore, Sermon on the Mount, 15 ff; Dykes, Manifesto of the King, 25-200.

J. C. Lambert

BEAUTIFUL GATE

bu’-ti-fool, gat.

See TEMPLE.

BEAUTY

bu’-ti: The space allotted to this topic allows liberty only for the statement of two problems to students of the Bible. They should give distinct attention to the interblending of aesthetics with ethics in the Scripture. They should observe the extent and meaning of aesthetics in Nature.

1. Aesthetics in Scripture:

That the Bible is an ethical book is evident. Righteousness in all the relations of man as a moral being is the key to its inspiration, the guiding light to correct understanding of its utterance. But it is everywhere inspired and writ in an atmosphere of aesthetics. Study will bring out this fact from Genesis to Revelation. The first pair make their appearance in a garden where grew "every tree that is pleasant to the sight" (Ge 2:9), and the last vision for the race is an abode in a city whose gates are of pearl and streets of gold (Re 21:21). Such is the imagery that from beginning to end is pictured as the home of ethics—at first in its untried innocence and at last in its stalwart righteousness. The problem will be to observe the intermingling of these two elements—the beautiful and the good—in the whole Scripture range. A few texts will set before us this kinship and then the Bible student can detect it as he reads. "One thing have I asked of Yahweh, that will I seek after: That I may dwell in the house of Yahweh all the days of my life, To behold the beauty of Yahweh, And to inquire in his temple" (Ps 27:4).

"For all the gods of the peoples are idols; But Yahweh made the heavens. Honor and majesty are before him: Strength and beauty are in his sanctuary" (Ps 96:5,6). If we catch the spirit set forth in such and similar Psalms, we can use it as a magnetic needle to detect its like wherever we shall read: and we shall find that like in abundance. It is only necessary to turn to the directions given for making the Ark of the Covenant and its encircling tabernacle, and the decorations of the priests that were to minister in the worship of Yahweh in the ceremonies described, as given in Ex 25 ff, to see that every resource of Israel was brought to bear to render ark and tabernacle and their service beautiful. One will find in a concordance half a column of references under the word "Ark" and a column and a half under the word "Tabernacle." By looking up these references one can realize how much care was spent to give and preserve to these aids to worship the attractiveness of beauty.

In 1Ch 15 and 16 we have an account of David's bringing in the Ark of the Covenant into his own city to rest in a tent he had provided for it. On this occasion a demonstration was made with all the aesthetics of which the music of that day was capable. "And David spake to the chief of the Levites to appoint their brethren the singers, with instruments of music, psalteries and harps and cymbals, sounding aloud and lifting up the voice with joy." And David himself gave to the celebration the aesthetics of one of the noblest of his psalms (1Ch 16:8-36).

It is almost idle to refer to Solomon and his temple (1Ki 6 ff; 2Ch 3 ff). It is a common understanding that the civilization of Solomon's day was drawn upon to its utmost in every department of aesthetics, in the building of that house for Yahweh and in the appointments for the worship there to be conducted. Beauty of form and color and harmony of sound were then and there integrated—made one—with worship in holiness. The propriety of that association has been seen and felt through the ages.

There is beauty in speech. It is a fact that the supreme classics in the literature of the tongues of two of the dominant nations of the earth, the English and the German, are translations of the Bible. There is no explanation of such fact except that the original justified the translations. You can read indifferently from one translation to the other and catch the same aesthetic gleam. Nobility and poetry of thought lay in what was to be translated. Here is proof that cannot be gainsaid that the Scripture authors sought the aid of aesthetics as garb for the ethics they taught. So they wrote in poetry. So they used allegory, illustration, figure, metaphor that would charm and hold. The parables of Jesus are examples of this method of clothing thought. They do their ethical work because they have swept into it figure and imagery from familiar aesthetic perceptions. "The sower went forth to sow" (Mt 13:3). That is a glad sight—always has been and always will be. That is why a picture of "The Sower" hangs on the walls of a Christian home. Just the painting—and every beholder remembers the parable and cannot forget its ethics. The intensity of thought concentrated upon ethics in the New Testament has drawn away attention from the partnership between these two principles in religion. But it is there, and we shall see it when once we look for it.

It is something to which we do not wake up till late in life—to wit, the measurelessness of the provision in Nature for beauty. Common consent awards beauty to the rainbow.

2. Aesthetics in Nature:

Reflect that every drop of water in the ocean, or in the hydrated rocks, or in the vapor floating over Saturn, has in it the possibility of rainbow coloring. In fact all matter has color of which the rainbow is only specimen. Any element incandescent has a spectrum partially coincident with that of water and ranging above and below it in the infinite capacity it has to start ether undulations. As apparently the larger part of the matter of the universe is incandescent, we can see that the field for expression in color is infinite. No one but the infinite God can see it all.

If we come down to this plain, plodding earth, cultivation of aesthetic sense will bring out beauty

everywhere, from the grandeur of mountain scenery to aesthetic curves and colors revealed only by the microscope. We say the butterfly is finish beautiful. But the larva from which it is derived often carries as much beauty in mottling of color and of the fineness of of spine and mandible. Looking across the scale in this way the evidence of theism from beauty itself becomes convincing. Beauty becomes a messenger of and from God—as Iris was to the Greek and the rainbow to the Hebrew (Ec 3:11).

This from Amiel's Journal Intime, I, 233, sets forth the radical, inexpugnable position of beauty in Nature and in philosophy thereof correctly interpretative: "To the materialist philosopher the beautiful is a mere accident, and therefore rare. To the spiritualist philosopher the beautiful is the rule, the law, the universal foundation of things, to which every form returns as soon as the force of accident is withdrawn."

As we accustom ourselves to make larger and larger synthesis in the department of aesthetics, what diapason of theistic message may we not hear? Beauty wherever and however expressed is a medium of revelation. It is a bush ever burning, never consumed. Before it "put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." That beauty should be—to that intent, for that end, from everlasting hath wrought the Ancient of Days.

C. Caverno

BEAUTY AND BANDS

bu'-ti, bandz (no'am, and chobhelim): The names given in Zec 11:7,14 to two symbolical staves, the first signifying Yahweh's covenant of grace with the peoples, and the second representing the brotherhood of Judah and Israel. The breaking of the two staves is symbolic of the breaking of Yahweh's covenant and of the union between Judah and Israel.

BEBAI

be'-ba-i, beb'-a-i (bebhay; Septuagint Bebai, "fatherly"):

(1) Descendants of B: returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:11 called Babi; 1 Esdras 8:37); one of these is Zechariah, the son of Bebai (Ezr 8:11, Zaeharias; 1 Esdras 8:37). 623 returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:11; 1 Esdras 5:13; Ne 7:16 gives the number 628); some of these had married "strange wives" (Ezr 10:28; 1 Esdras 9:29).

(2) A chief of the people who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:15).

(3) An unknown town (Judith 15:4). Omitted in Codex Vaticanus and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.)

BECAUSE

be-kos’ (hina, "in order that"): "The multitude rebuked them, because (AV; the Revised Version (British and American) "that") they should hold their peace" (Mt 20:31).

BECHER

be’-ker (bekher, "the firstborn"; compare HPN, 88):

(1) Son of Benjamin (Ge 46:21; 1Ch 7:6,8).

(2) Son of Ephraim whose family is called Becherites (the King James Version "Bachrites"), Nu 26:35 (1Ch 7:20 called Bered). Compare BERED.

BECHORATH

be-kor’-ath.

See BECORATH.

BECK; BECKON

bek, bek’-’-n (neuma): This word from neuo, "to nod," "beckon," "make a sign" by moving the head or eyes (Lu 5:7; Joh 13:24; Ac 21:40; 24:10), occurs only in 2 Macc 8:18, "Almighty God who at a beck can cast down both them that come against us, and also all the world," the Revised Version (British and American), "able at a beck." So Shak, "troops of soldiers at their beck"; "nod" is now generally used.

BECOME

be-kum’:

(1) Greek ginomai, used in New Testament for a change of state, corresponding to Hebrew hayah of Old Testament. Compare Mt 18:3 with De 27:9.

(2) For what is fitting, suitable, proper, in New Testament: "prepei" (Mt 3:15; Eph 5:3; 1Ti 2:10); in Old Testament, na’awah, na’ah, Ps 93:5: "Holiness becometh thy house." in this sense, the adverb "becomingly" must be interpreted: "Walk becomingly toward them that are without" (1Th 4:12), i.e. in a way that is consistent with your profession.

BECORATH

be-ko’-rath (bekhorath, "the first birth"; the King James Version Bechorath): A forefather of Saul of the

tribe of Benjamin (1Sa 9:1).

BECTILETH

bek’-ti-leth (to pedion Baikteilaith): A plain which is defined as "near the mountain which is at the left hand of the upper Cilicia" (Judith 2:21). The name in Syriac is Beth QeTilath, "house of slaughter." So far there is no clue to its identification.

BED; BEDCHAMBER; BEDSTEAD

For the very poor of the East, in ancient times as now, the "bed" was and is, as a rule, the bare ground; and the bedclothes, the gown, simlah, or "outer garment," worn during the day ("For that is his only covering, it is his garment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep?" (Ex 22:27); compare De 24:13, "Thou shalt surely restore to him the pledge when the sun goeth down, that he may sleep in his garment").

When one was on a journey, or watching his flock by night as a shepherd, such a "bed" was the most natural, and often a stone would serve as a pillow. (See Ge 28:11, where Jacob "took one of the stones of the place, and put it under his head, and lay down in that place to sleep.")

An advance on this custom, which came in due course of time, or under change of circumstances, was the use of a mat on the floor as a bed, with or without covering. At first it was literally laid on the floor, which was generally of one common level, in some convenient place near the wall; but later it was put on an elevation, either a raised part of the floor on one side, or a bedstead, which gave rise to the expression "going up to the bed" (compare Ge 49:33 English Versions of the Bible, "He gathered up his feet into the bed," and Ps 132:3, "go up into my bed").

1. Old Testament Terms for Bed, and Sleeping Customs of the Hebrews:

With a later development and civilization, "beds" came to be built upon supports and constructed in different forms, which fact is reflected in the variety of names given the "bed" in the Hebrew and related languages.

(1) The following Hebrew words are used in the Bible for "bed," and, though it is impossible at this remove of time and place and custom to differentiate them sharply, they will repay study: miTTah (Ge 48:2, "And Israel strengthened himself and sat upon the bed"; Ex 8:3, "frogs .... shall come into thy bedchamber, and upon thy bed"); mishkabh, compare (Ge 49:4, Jacob to Reuben: "Because thou wentest up to thy father’s bed; then defiledst thou it"); ‘eres (Pr 7:16, the "strange woman" says: " I have spread my couch with carpets of tapestry"; compare Ps 41:3, "Thou makest all his bed in his sickness"); matstsa‘ (once only, Isa 28:20, "For the bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it"); and yetsua‘ (Job 17:13, "I have spread my couch in the darkness"; 1Ch 5:1, "He defiled his father’s couch"; compare Ge 49:4 where the same "father’s bed" is mishkabh; Ps 63:6, "when I remember thee upon my bed"; Ps 132:3, "nor go up into my bed").

(2) It is a far cry from the simple sleeping customs of De 24:13 to the luxurious arts and customs of the post-exilic days, when beds of fine wood and ivory are found in use among the Hebrews, as well as pillows of the most costly materials elaborately embroidered (see Judith 10:21; Es 1:6; compare So 3:10); but it all came about as a natural, as well as artificial development, with changed conditions and contacts and increasing civilization and luxury. As marking the several stages of that development, we find pictures of the poor, first sleeping upon the ground without mat or mattress, then in a single sleeping-room for the whole family, often without a separate bed, then with "beds" that were simply wadded quilts, or thin mattresses, and mats for keeping them off the ground; then with still better "beds" laid upon light portable, wooden frames, or upon more elevated bedsteads (compare Ps 132:3 and Mr 4:21 the Revised Version (British and American) "under the bed"). The degree of richness depended, of course, upon time and place, in a measure, but more upon the wealth and station of the family and the style of the house or tent in which they lived, as it does even with the Bedouin of today. The prophet Amos gives a vivid and significant picture of the luxury of certain children of Israel, "that sit in Samaria in the corner of a couch, and on the silken cushions of a bed" (Am 3:12); and of certain children of luxury "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon their couches, and eat the lambs out of the flock .... that drink wine in bowls, and anoint themselves with the chief oils; but they are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph" (Am 6:4-6; compare Re 18:10-13).

(3) We find that the poor, while sleeping for the most part in their ordinary clothing, often, in cold weather, made their beds of the skins of animals, old cloaks, or rugs, as they do still in the East. The "beds" and "bedding" now in ordinary use among Orientals are much the same, we may be sure, as they were in olden times. "Bedsteads" of any pretention were and are rare among the common people; but the richness of "beds" and "bedsteads" among Asiatics of wealth and rank was quite equal to that of the Greeks and Romans (compare Pr 7:16,17, "I have spread my couch with carpets of tapestry, with striped cloths of the yarn of Egypt. I have perfumed my bed with myrrh, aloes, and cinnamon"); So 1:16,17: "The beams of our house are cedars, and our rafters are firs .... also our couch is green." Compare the "palanquin" of Solomon, "of the wood of Lebanon," "the pillars thereof of silver," "the bottom of gold," and "the seat of purple" (So 3:9,10).

(4) As soon as any family could afford it, a special bedroom would be set apart, and the whole family would sleep in it (see Lu 11:5-8, "My children are with me in bed"). When the house had two stories the upper story was used for sleeping, or, during very hot weather, preferably the roof, or the room on the roof. See HOUSE. When morning came the "bed," a wadded quilt or mattress, used with or without covering according to the season, was rolled up, aired and sunned, and then put aside on the raised platform, or packed away in a chest or closet.

The words mishkabh and miTTah came to have a figurative meaning signifying the final resting-place; and ‘eres used of the "bedstead" of the King of Og (De 3:11) is thought by some to mean his sarcophagus (Benzinger, Hebrew Arch., 123; Nowack, I, 143). Ge 47:31, "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed’s head" is not rightly rendered (see STAFF, and Crit. Commentary in the place cited.).

2. New Testament Terms for Bed, Their Meaning, etc.:

(1) We find several Greek words, kline, krabbatos, and koitte, used in the New Testament somewhat indiscriminately and rendered English Versions of the Bible by "bed," "couch," etc.; but, as with the Hebrew words noted, there is little to indicate just exactly what they severally stand for, or how they are related to the Hebrew terms rendered "bed" or "couch" in the Old Testament. Of one thing we can be sure, reasoning from what we know of "the unchanging East," the "beds" and sleeping customs of the Hebrews in Christ's time were in the main about what they were in later Old Testament times.

(2) An interesting case for study is that of the man "sick of the palsy" whom they brought to Jesus "lying on a bed," and who when healed "took up the bed, and went forth before them all" (Mt 9:2,6; Mr 2:4,12; Lu 5:18,19; compare Joh 5:8- 12). Here the "bed" on which the sick of the palsy lay was let down from the housetop "through the tiles with his couch into the midst before Jesus" (Lu 5:18,19); and when the man was healed Jesus commanded him, as Luke says, to "take up (his) couch and go unto (his) house ," and he "took up that whereon he lay, and departed to his house, glorifying God" (Lu 5:24,25). It seems, therefore, that this "bed" was a "pallet" and "couch" combined, a thin mattress upon a light portable frame, such as we have already seen was in use among the ancients. Another kindred case was that of the sick man at the pool of Bethesda (Joh 5:2 ff) whom Jesus healed and commanded to "take up his bed and walk," and he "took up his bed and walked"; only in this case the "bed" is a "pallet" without the frame, it would seem.

(3) Jesus in His teaching (Mr 4:21; compare Lu 8:16) asks, in language which is significant in this connection: "Is the lamp brought to be put under .... the bed?" (Lu 8:16: "No man, when he hath lighted a lamp, covereth it with a vessel, or putteth it under a bed"). Here, clearly, "the bed" is the "bedstead," bedclothes, draperies and all, under which "the lamp" would be obscured and hindered in its function of "giving light to all in the room." Again (Lu 17:34) Jesus says, "In that night there shall be two men on one bed," which is incidental evidence that the "beds" of that day were not all "pallets" or "couches" for one only (compare Lu 11:7, "My children are with me in bed"; So 1:16; 3:10; Pr 7:16,18).

(4) For figurative use in the prophets (e.g. Eze 23:17) and in the New Testament (e.g. "Let the bed be undefiled," Heb 13:4), see commentaries in the place cited

George B. Eager

BEDAD

be'-dad (bedhadh, "alone"): Father of Hadad, king of Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Ge 36:35; 1Ch 1:46).

BEDAN

be'-dan (bedhan, "son of judgment" (?)):

(1) One of the leaders in Israel who with Jerubbaal, Jephthah and Samuel is mentioned as a deliverer of the nation (1Sa 12:11). The text is questioned because the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic read "Barak" instead.

(2) A son of Ulam of the house of Manasseh (1Ch 7:17).

BEDCHAMBER

bed'-cham-ber.

See BED.

BEDEIAH

be-de'-ya (bedheydh, "servant of Yah"): A son of Bani who had married a "strange wife" (Ezr 10:35).

BEDSTEAD

bed'-stead.

See BED.

BEE

be (debhorah; compare Arabic dabr, "a swarm of bees," also Arabic debbur, "a wasp," said to be a corruption of zunbur, "a wasp"; all are apparently from the Hebrew dabhar, "to speak," "arrange," "lead," "follow," or from Arabic dabara, "follow" (compare Arabic dabbara, "arrange"), though the connection in meaning is not apparent): Honey is mentioned many times in the Bible, especially in the Old Testament, but the word "bee" occurs only four times, and only one of the four times in connection with honey in the story of Samson (Jud 14:8). Both wild and domesticated bees are found today in Palestine, but it is not clear that bees were kept in Bible times, although it would seem very probable. The frequently recurring phrase, "a land flowing with milk and honey," certainly suggests that the honey as well as the milk is a domestic product. The hives now in use are very primitive and wasteful as compared with hives that are made in Europe and America. Sometimes a large water jar is used. More frequently a cylinder about 3 or 4 ft. long and 6 inches in diameter is constructed of mulberry withes plaited together and plastered with mud or cow dung. A number of these cylinders are placed horizontally, being piled up together under some rude structure which serves as a protection from the direct rays of the sun. In the passage already cited it is related that Samson found a swarm of bees and honey in the carcass of the lion which he had killed on his previous visit. We are not told how much time had intervened, but it does not take long in the dry climate of Palestine for scavenging beasts and

insects to strip the flesh from the bones and make the skeleton a possible home for a swarm of bees. The other three passages refer to the offensive power of bees. In De 1:44, in the speech of Moses he says, "The Amorites chased you, as bees do"; in Ps 118:12, the psalmist says, "They compassed me about like bees"; in Isa 7:18, the bee is the type of the chastisement that the Lord will bring from the land of Assyria.

Alfred Ely Day

BEEF

bef.

See CATTLE.

BEELIADA

be-e-li'-a-da (be'elyadha', "the Lord knows"; ELIADA, which see; compare HPN, 144, 192, note 1, 202): A son of David (1Ch 14:7).

BEELSARUS

be-el'-sa-rus, be-el-sa'-rus (Beelsaros): One who accompanied Zerubbabel in the return from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:8), called Bilshan in Ezr 2:2 and Ne 7:7.

BEELTETHMUS

be-el-teth'-mus (Beeltethmos; Balthemus): One of the officers of King Artaxerxes in Palestine (1 Esdras 2:16,25). According to Professor Sayce, the name by etymology means "lord of official intelligence" or "postmaster." Rendered "chancellor" in Ezr 4:8 and "story-writer" in 1 Esdras 2:17.

BEELZEBUB

be-el'-ze-bub (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) is an error (after the Vulgate) for Beelzebul (Revised Version margin) Beelzeboul; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Beezeboul): In the time of Christ this was the current name for the chief or prince of demons, and was identified with SATAN (which see) and the DEVIL (which see). The Jews committed the unpardonable sin of ascribing Christ's work of casting out demons to Beelzebul, thus ascribing to the worst source the supreme manifestation of goodness (Mt 10:25; 12:24,27; Mr 3:22; Lu 11:15,18,19). There can be little doubt that it is the same name as BAALZEBUB (which see). It is a well-known phenomenon in the history of religions that the gods of one nation become the devils of its neighbors and enemies. When the Aryans divided into Indians and Iranians, the Devas remained gods

for the Indians, but became devils (daevas) for the Iranians, while the Ahuras remained gods for the Iranians and became devils (asuras) for the Indians. Why Baalzebub became Beelzebul, why the b changed into l, is a matter of conjecture. It may have been an accident of popular pronunciation, or a conscious perversion (Beelzebul in Syriac =" lord of dung"), or Old Testament zebhubh may have been a perversion, accidental or intentional of zebhul (=" house"), so that Baalzebul meant "lord of the house." These are the chief theories offered (Cheyne in EB; Barton in Hastings, ERE).

T. Rees

BEER

be'-er (be'er; phrear; Latin puteus =" well"):

(1) A station on the march of the Israelites to the North of the Arnon (Nu 21:16). Here it was that they sang round the well this song: ‘ Spring up O well; greet it with song, Well, that the princes have dug, The nobles of the people have bored, With the scepter—with their staves’ (Nu 21:16 ff). The place is not identified.

(2) The town to which Jotham fled from his brother Abimelech after declaring his parable from Mt. Gerizim (Jud 9:21). This may be identical with BEEROTH, which see.

BEER-ELIM

be-er-e'-lim (be'er ‘elim; phrear tou Aileim, literally "well of Elim"): Probably lay to the North of Moab, answering to Eglaim in the South (Isa 15:8). It may possibly be identical with BEER (1); but there is no certainty.

BEER-LAHAI-ROI

be-er-la-hi'-roi, be-er-la-hi-ro'-i (be'er lachai ro'i, "well of the Living One that seeth me"): "A fountain of water in the wilderness," "the fountain in the way to Shur" (Ge 16:7-14). It was the scene of Hagar's theophany, and here Isaac dwelt for some time (Ge 16:7 f; 24:62; 25:11). The site is in The Negeb between Kadesh and Bered (Ge 16:14). Rowland identifies the well with the modern ‘Ain Moilaihhi, circa 50 miles South of Beersheba and 12 miles West of ‘Ain Kadis. Cheyne thinks that Hagar's native country, to which she was fleeing and from which she took a wife for Ishmael, was not Egypt (mitsrayim), but a north Arabian district called by the Assyrians Mucri (Encyclopedia Biblica).

S. F. Hunter

BEERA be-e'-ra, be'-er-a (be'era'," expounder"): A descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:37).

BEERAH

be-e’-ra, be’-er-a (be’erah; "expounder"): A prince of the house of Reuben whom Tiglath-pileser carried away captive (1Ch 5:6). Compare 2Ki 15:29; 16:7.

BEERI

be-e’-ri (be’eri, "expounder"):

(1) Father of Judith, one of Esau’s wives (Ge 26:34).

(2) The father of the prophet Hosea (Ho 1:1).

BEEROTH

be-e’-roth, be’-er-oth (be’eroth; Beroth): One of the cities of the Canaanites whose inhabitants succeeded in deceiving Israel, and in making a covenant with them (Jos 9:3 ff). Apparently they were Hivites (Jos 9:7). The occasion on which the Beerothites fled to Gittaim where they preserved their communal identity is not indicated. The town was reckoned to Benjamin (2Sa 4:2 f). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it under Gibeon, 7 Roman miles from Jerusalem on the way to Nicopolis (Amwas). If we follow the old road by way of Gibeon (el-Jib) and Bethhoron, Beeroth would lie probably to the Northwest of el-Jib. The traditional identification is with el-Bireh, about 8 miles from Jerusalem on the great north road. If the order in which the towns are mentioned (Jos 9:17; 18:25) is any guide as to position, el-Bireh is too far to the Northwest. The identification is precarious. To Beeroth belonged the murderers of Ish-bosheth (2Sa 4:2), and Naharai, Joab’s armor- bearer (2Sa 23:37; 1Ch 11:39). It was reoccupied after the Exile (Ezr 2:25; Ne 7:29).

W. Ewing

BEEROTH BENE-JAAKAN

ben’-e-ja’-a-kan (be’eroth bene ya‘aqan; the Revised Version, margin "the wells of the children of Jaakan"): A desert camp of the Israelites mentioned before Moserah (De 10:6). In Nu 33:31,32 the name is given simply "Bene-jaakan," and the situation after Moseroth.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

BEEROTHITE; BEROTHITE

be-e’-roth-it, be’-er-oth-it (be’erothi; 2Sa 4:5,9; 2Sa 23:37; shortened form, 1Ch 11:39).

See BEEROTH.

BEERSHEBA

be-er-she’-ba (be’er shebha‘; Bersabee): Allotted originally to Simeon (Jos 19:2), one of "the uttermost cities of the tribe of the children of Judah" (Jos 15:28).

1. The Meaning of the Name:

The most probable meaning of Beersheba is the "well of seven." "Seven wells" is improbable on etymological grounds; the numeral should in that case be first. In Ge 21:31 Abraham and Abimelech took an oath of witness that the former had dug the well and seven ewe lambs were offered in sacrifice, "Wherefore he called that place Beer-sheba; because there they sware both of them." Here the name is ascribed to the Hebrew root shabha‘, "to swear," but this same root is connected with the idea of seven, seven victims being offered and to take an oath, meaning "to come under the influence of seven."

Another account is given (Ge 26:23-33), where Isaac takes an oath and just afterward, "the same day Isaac’s servants came, and told him concerning the well which they had digged (dug), and said unto him, We have found water. And he called it Shibah: therefore the name of the city is Beer-sheba unto this day."

2. A Sacred Shrine: Beersheba was a sacred shrine. "Abraham planted a tamarisk tree in Beer-sheba, and called there on the name of Yahweh, the Everlasting God" Ge (Ge 21:33). Theophanies occurred there to Hagar (Ge 21:17), to Isaac (Ge 26:24), to Jacob (Ge 46:2), and to Elijah (1Ki 19:5). By Amos (Am 5:5) it is classed with Bethel and Gilgal as one of the rival shrines to the pure worship of Yahweh, and in another place (Am 8:14) he writes "They shall fall, and never rise up again," who sware, "As the way (i. e. cult) of Beersheba liveth." The two unworthy sons of Samuel were Judges in Beersheba (1Sa 8:2) and Zibiah, mother of King Jehoash, was born there (2Ki 12:1; 2Ch 24:1).

3. Its Position:

Geographically Beersheba marked the southern limit of Judah, though theoretically this extended to the "river of Egypt" (Ge 15:18)—the modern Wady El‘avish—60 miles farther south. It was the extreme border of the cultivated land. From Da to Beersheba (2Sa 17:11, etc.) or from Beersheba to Da (1Ch 21:2; 2Ch 30:5) were the proverbial expressions, though necessarily altered through the changed conditions in later years to "from Geba to Beer-sheba" (2Ki 23:8) or "from Beer-sheba to the hill-country of Ephraim" (2Ch 19:4).

4. Modern Beersheba:

Today Beersheba is Bir es-Seba‘ in the Wady es Seba‘, 28 miles Southwest of Hebron on "the southern border of a vast rolling plain broken by the torrent beds of Wady Khalil and Wady Seba" (Robinson).

The plain is treeless but is covered by verdure in the spring; it is dry and monotonous most of the year. Within the last few years this long-deserted spot—a wide stretch of shapeless ruins, the haunt of the lawless Bedouin—has been re-occupied; the Turks have stationed there an enlightened Kaimerkhan (subgovernor); government offices and shops have been built; wells have been cleared, and there is now an abundant water supply pumped even to the separate houses. Robinson (BW, XVII, 247 ff) has described how he found seven ancient wells there—probably still more will yet be found. The whole neighborhood is strewn with the ruins of the Byzantine city which once flourished there; it was an episcopal see. It is probable that the city of Old Testament times stood where Tell es Seba' now is, some 2 1/2 miles to the East; from the summit a commanding view can be obtained (PEF, III, 394, Sheet XXIV).

E. W. G. Masterman

BEESHTERAH

be-esh'-te-ra (Jos 21:27).

See ASHTAROTH.

BEETLE

be'-t'-l (the Revised Version (British and American) CRICKET; chargol; See LOCUST): This name occurs only in Le 11:22 as one of four winged Jumping insects (sherets ha-'oph) which may be eaten. It certainly is not a beetle and is probably not a cricket. Probably all four are names of locusts, of which more than 30 species have been described from Syria and Palestine, and for which there are at least 8 Arabic names in use, though with little distinction of species. Closely allied to chargol are the Arabic charjalet, a troop of horses or a flight of locusts, from charjal, "to gallop," and harjawan, "a wingless locust."

Alfred Ely Day

BEEVES

bevs (Le 22:21 the King James Version).

See CATTLE.

BEFORE

be-for':The translation of a great variety of Hebrew and Greek words. "Haran died before (the English Revised Version "in the presence of," literally "before the face of") his father Terah" (Ge 11:28). To be

"before" God is to enjoy His favor (Ps 31:22). "The Syrians before" (Isa 9:12 the Revised Version, margin "on the east," as "behind," owing to the position of Canaan, relative to Syria, implies the west).

BEG; BEGGAR; BEGGING

1. No Law Concerning Beggars or Begging in Israel:

It is significant that the Mosaic law contains no enactment concerning beggars, or begging, though it makes ample provision for the relief and care of "the poor in the land." Biblical Hebrew seems to have no term for professional begging, the nearest approach to it being the expressions "to ask (or seek) bread" and "to wander." This omission certainly is not accidental; it comports with the very nature of the Mosaic law, the spirit of which is breathed in this, among other kindred provisions, that a poor Hebrew who even sold himself for debt to his wealthy brother was allowed to serve him only until the Jubilee (See JUBILEE), and his master was forbidden to treat him as a sl ave (Le 25:39). These laws, as far as actually practiced, have always virtually done away with beggars and begging among the Jews.

2. Begging Not Unknown to the Ancient Jews:

Begging, however, came to be known to the Jews in the course of time with the development of the larger cities, either as occurring among themselves, or among neighboring or intermingling peoples, as may be inferred from Ps 59:15; compare Ps 109:10, where Yahweh is besought that the children of the wicked may be cursed with beggary, in contra-distinction to the children of the righteous, who have never had to ask bread (Ps 37:25, "I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed asking (English Versions, "begging") bread.") For the Hebrew expression not corresponding to "begging" see Ps 59:15, "They shall wander up and down for food"; and compare Ps 119:10, "Let me wander," etc.

3. Begging and Alms-taking Denounced in Jewish Literature:

The first clear denunciation of beggary and almstaking in Jewish literature is found in Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 40:28-30, where the Hebrew for "begging" is to "wander," ete, as in Ps 59:15, according to the edition of Cowley and Neubauer; Oxford, 1897. There as well as in Tobit, and in the New Testament, where beggars are specifically mentioned, the word eleemosune has assumed the special sense of alms given to the begging poor (compare Tobit 4:7,16,17; 12:8-11; Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 3:14,30; 7:10; 16:14; Mt 6:2-4; 20:30-34; Mr 10:46-52; Lu 11:41; 12:33; Joh 9:1-41; Ac 9:36; 10:2,4,31; 24:17).

4. Professional Beggars a Despised Class: As to professional beggars, originally, certainly, and for a long time, they were a despised class among the Hebrews; and the Jewish communities are forbidden to support them from the general charity fund (BB, 9a; Yoreh De‘ah, 250, 3). But the spirit of the law is evinced again in that it is likewise forbidden to drive a beggar away without an alms (ha-Yadh ha-Chazaqah, in the place cited 7 7).

5. In the Gospel Age:

Begging was well known and beggars formed a considerable class in the gospel age. Proof of this is found in the references to almsgiving in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7 and parallels), and in the accounts of beggars in connection with public places, e.g. the entrance to Jericho. (Mt 20:30 and parallels), which was a gateway to pilgrims going up to Jerusalem to the great festivals and in the neighborhood of rich men's houses (Lu 16:20), and especially the gates of the Temple at Jerusalem (Ac 3:2). This prevalence of begging was due largely to the want of any adequate system of ministering relief, to the lack of any true medical science and the resulting ignorance of remedies for common diseases like ophthalmia, for instance, and to the impoverishment of the land under the excessive taxation of the Roman government (Hausrath, History of New Testament Times, I, 188 (Eng. translation Williams and Norgate), compare Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, II, 178). That begging was looked down upon is incidentally evidenced by the remark of the unjust steward, "To beg I am ashamed" (Lu 16:3); and that, when associated with indolence, it was strongly condemned by public opinion appears from Sirach (40:28-30).

The words used for "beg," "beggar" of English Versions of the Bible in the New Testament differ radically in idea: in those formed from aiteo (Mr 10:46; Lu 16:3; 18:35; Joh 9:8 the Revised Version (British and American)) the root idea is that of "asking," while ptochos (Lu 16:20,22) suggests the cringing or crouching of a beggar. But see Mt 5:3 where the word for "humble" is ptochos.

6. A Change in Modern Times:

A marked change has come over Jewish life in modern times, in this as well as in other respect. Since the 17th century the Jewish poor in many parts of the world have made it a practice, especially on Fridays and on the eves of certain festivals, to go systematically from house to house asking alms. In parts of Europe today it is a full-grown abuse: crowds of Jewish beggars push their way and ply their trade about the synagogue doors (Abrahams, EB, article "Alms," 310). So the Jewish beggar, in spite of the spirit of the law and ancient Jewish custom, has, under modern conditions too well known to require explanation here, become a troublesome figure and problem in modern Jewish society. For such beggars and begging, see Jew Encyclopedia, articles "Schnorrers," "Alms," etc., and for another kind of begging among modern Jews, and collections for poverty-stricken Jewish settlers in Palestine, see the articles "Chalukah," "Charity," etc.

LITERATURE.

Saalschiutz, Arch. der Hebraer, II, chapter xviii (Konigsberg, 1855-56); Riehm Handworterbuch zu den Buchern des A T, under the word "Almosen "; compare Jew Encyclopedia, HDB, and Encyclopedia B, arts, "Alms"; and Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, chapters xvii, xviii (Philadelphia, 1896); Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs; Day, The Social Life of the Hebrews.

George B. Eager

BEGGARLY

beg’-er-li (ptochos): The word has the thought of "to crouch" or "cringe," such as is common with professional beggars. It is used in Mt 5:3 and Ga 4:9, and in both cases means complete spiritual destitution. As used in Galatians it expresses the contrast between their present condition and the former estate, toward which he says they are again tending. Paul has in mind both the Jewish and heathen systems of religion with all their outward show. He therefore here emphasizes to the immeasurable superiority of the riches and liberty in Christ. He further expresses this same thought of the law in Ro 8:3 and Heb 7:18. In view of the wretchedness of the condition indicated by the word "beggarly," he states his astonishment that they should so little appreciate the liberty and riches which they now enjoy as even to think of going back the former condition.

Jacob W. Kapp

BEGIN

be-gin’:To make the first movement toward a given end (chalal; archomai). Those who interpret it in many passages pleonastically mean by this, that in such passages as "began to teach" or "began to speak," nothing more is intended than to express vividly and graphically the thought of the dependent infinitive. Mt 4:17; Lu 3:23; Ac 1:1 are so understood. For contrary opinion, see Thayer’s Lexicon and Winer’s Grammar of New Testament Greek.

The noun, arche, "beginning," in the writings of John, is used sometimes in an abstract sense, to designate a previous stage (Joh 1:1,2; 8:25; 1Jo 1:1; 3:8) and, sometimes, the Source or First Cause (Re 3:14; 21:6; 22:13). Often used also, not for the absolute beginning, but, relatively, for the starting-point of some important movement (1Jo 2:7,24; Ac 11:15; Php 4:15).

H. E. Jacobs

BEGINNING

be-gin’-ing (re’-shith; arche): The natural meaning of the word is with reference to time. The primitive Greek root means "to be long," "to draw out." Thus, it is used to refer to some point of time long drawn out, or long past (Ge 1:1). It is used also to express the inauguration of a particular event (Ex 12:2). The principal interest in the word centers in the use of it in Joh 1:1. It must be interpreted here by that which follows in the statement as to the relation of the Logos to the Eternal God and the use of the word "was." It is true that the word arche cannot be separated from the idea of time, but when time began He already was, and therefore He was from eternity.

See TIME; ETERNITY.

Figurative: in a figurative sense it is used of that which is most excellent, the chief part (Pr 1:7); of the most eminent person (Col 1:18); the author (Re 3:14).

Jacob W. Kapp

BEGOTTEN

be-got’-’-n (yaladh; "to bear," "bring forth," "beget"; denotes the physical relation of either parent to a child, Ge 3:16; 4:18): Used metaphorically of God’s relation to Israel (De 32:18) and to the Messianic king (Ps 2:7); (gennao, "to beget," or "bear"): generally used of a father (Mt 1:1-16); more rarely of a mother (Lu 1:13,57); used metaphorically of causing or engendering moral and spiritual relations and states (1Co 4:15; Phm 1:10); of the new birth the Holy Spirit (Joh 3:3 ff). Men who obey and love God as sons are begotten of Him (Joh 1:13; 1Jo 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1,4,18; compare 1Pe 1:23). Used especially of God’s act in making Christ His Son: "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee" (Ps 2:7) quoted in Ac 13:33 in reference to His resurrection (compare Ro 1:4). The same passage is cited (Heb 1:5) as proving Christ’s filial dignity, transcending the angels in that "he hath inherited a more excellent name than they," i.e. the name of son; and again (Heb 5:5) of God conferring upon Christ the glory of the priestly office.

Commentators differ as to whether the act of begetting the Son in these two passages is

(a) the eternal generation, or

(b) the incarnation in time, or

(c) the resurrection and ascension.

The immediate context of Heb 1:5 (see Heb 1:3) seems to favor the last view (Westcott). The first view would not be foreign to the author’s thought: with Heb 5:5 compare Heb 6:20, "a high priest forever" (Alford). The author of Heb thinks of the eternal and essential sonship of Christ as realized in history in His ascension to the "right hand of the Majesty" (Heb 1:3). And what is emphatic is the fact and status of sonship, rather than the time of begetting.

T. Rees

BEGUILE

be-gil’:In 2Pe 2:14 the King James Version (compare Jas 1:14) the word deleazo, is translated "beguile," and means particularly to "entice," "catch by bait." Doubtless Peter got this idea from his old business of fishing, baiting the hook to beguile the fish. In Ro 7:11; 16:18; 1Co 3:18 the word is exapatao, and means "to cheat" or "to thoroughly deceive." The thought is to be so completely deceived as to accept

falsehood for the truth, believing it to be the truth. In Col 2:4,18 the King James Version; Jas 1:22 the word is paralogizomai, and means "to miscalculate," "to be imposed upon." It refers particularly to being beguiled by mere probability.

See DECEIT; DELUSION.

Jacob W. Kapp

BEHALF

be-haf’:"On the part of" (Ex 27:21, i.e. so far as it affects them); "on the side of" (Job 36:2). For huper, "over," in the sense of furnishing assistance, as in 2Co 5:20, "in the interest of Christ" (2Co 5:21); "for our good," "in his cause" (Php 1:29); also, often in 2 Cor, in general sense of "concerning" (2Co 5:12; 7:4; 8:24; 9:2; 12:5). Huper does not of itself indicate substitution, although one who shelters ("is over") another, suffers "in his stead" (the King James Version 2Co 5:20), as well as "in his behalf."

BEHAVIOR

be-hav’-yer (Ta‘am, "taste," "flavor," hence, "intellectual taste," i.e. judgment, reason, understanding): Of significance as referring to David’s feigning madness before Aehish, king of Gath, being "sore afraid." Gesenius renders it "changed his understanding," i.e. his mental behavior and outward manner (1Sa 21:13, and title to Ps 34).

Twice used in the New Testament (the King James Version) of the well-ordered life of the Christian (kosmios, "well-arranged," "modest," i.e. living with decorum: 1Ti 3:2), defining the blameless life expected of a minister (overseer), "A bishop must be. .... of good behavior," the Revised Version (British and American) "orderly" (katastema, "demeanor," "deportment"), including, according to Dean Alford, "gesture and habit" as the outward expression of a reverent spirit (1Pe 3:1,2). "Aged women .... in behavior as becometh holiness" (Tit 2:3; the Revised Version (British and American) "reverent in demeanor").

Dwight M. Pratt

BEHEADING

be-hed’-ing.

See PUNISHMENTS.

BEHEMOTH

be’-he-moth, be-he’-moth (behemoth: Job 40:15): Apparently the plural of behemah, "a beast," used of domestic or wild animals. The same form, behemoth, occurs in other passages, e.g. De 28:26; 32:24; Isa 18:6; Hab 2:17, where it is not rendered "behemoth" but "beasts." According to some, the word behemoth, occurring in Job 40:15, is not a Hebrew word, the plural of behemah, but a word of Egyptian origin signifying "water ox." This etymology is denied by Cheyne and others. The word has by various writers been understood to mean rhinoceros and elephant, but the description (Job 40:15-24) applies on the whole very well to the hippopotamus (Hippopotamus arnphibius) which inhabits the Nile and other rivers of Africa. Especially applicable are the references to its great size, its eating grass, the difficulty with which weapons penetrate its hide, and its frequenting of streams. " He lieth under the lotus-trees, In the covert of the reed, and the fen. The lotus-trees cover him with their shade; The willows of the brook compass him about." The remains of a fossil hippopotamus of apparently the same species are found over most of Europe, so that it may have inhabited Palestine in early historical times, although we have no record of it. There is a smaller living species in west Africa, and there are several other fossil species in Europe and India. The remains of Hippopotamus minutus have been found in enormous quantities in caves in Malta and Sicily.

For an elaborate explanation of behemoth and leviathan (which see) as mythical creatures, see Cheyne, EB, under the word

Alfred Ely Day

BEHOLDING

be-hold’-ing: Many Hebrew and Greek words are so rendered in English Versions of the Bible, but epopteusantes, "your good works, which they behold" (1Pe 2:12); "beholding your chaste behavior" (1Pe 3:2), and epoptai, "We were eyewitnesses of his majesty" (2Pe 1:16) are peculiar to Peter. The fact that this word is used only by Peter and is used in both epistles is an argument for identity of authorship. The word epoptes denotes one who had been initiated into the innermost secrets of his faith and who enjoyed the highest religious privileges; but now in contradiction to the secrecy of all pagan "mysteries" (Eleusinian, etc.) the apostles would share with all the faithful every spiritual vision which they enjoyed ("we made known unto you").

In 2Co 3:18, for katoptrizomenoi, the English Revised Version gives "reflecting (as a mirror) the glory of the Lord," the American Standard Revised Version "beholding (as in mirror," etc.). Katoptron was a mirror of polished metal. We cannot clearly and fully behold the outshining of spiritual grandeur in Christ Jesus, but in the gospel God accommodates and adjusts the vision as we are able to bear it, and the glory beheld becomes glory imparted to (and reflected by) the beholder.

John’s Gospel gives us theaomai ("to look closely at"), and theoreo ("to discern"). "We beheld (etheasametha) his glory" (Joh 1:14), "that they may behold (theorosin) my glory" (Joh 17:24). In classic literature, the former word is closely associated with theatrical spectacles, and the latter with athletic

games, and they both convey the idea of unceasing interest, deepening in this connection into love and joy.

M. O. Evans

BEHOOVE

be-hoov’:Used in the New Testament for two Greek words dei (Lu 24:26; Ac 17:3) and opheilo (Heb 2:17); the former referring to a physical, and the latter to a moral, necessity (Bengelon, 1Co 11:10). The former means "must," that is, it is required by the order which God has ordained; the latter, "ought," that is, it is required as a debt.

BEIRUT

ba’-root’.

See BERYTUS.

BEKA

be’-ka (beqa‘, "half"): Half a shekel, the amount contributed by each male of the Israelites for the use of the Sanctuary (Ex 38:26). Its value varied according to the standard used, but on the ordinary, or Phoenician, standard it would represent about 122 grams.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

BEL

bel, bal (bel): Appellative name of a Bah god (compare BAAL), in the Old Testament and Apocrypha identified with Marduk or Merodach, the tutelary deity of Babylon (compare Isa 46:1; Jer 51:44; Baruch 6:41).

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

BEL AND THE DRAGON

See DANIEL, BOOK OF, sec. X.

BEL, AND THE DRAGON

bel, bal, drag’-un (Greek words: drakon, "dragon," "serpent"; ektos, "except"; horasis "vision," "prophecy"; ophis, "serpent"; sphragisamenos, "having sealed"; choris, "except," Hebrew or Aramaic words: chatham, "to seal"; zepha’," pitch"; za‘apha’," storm," "wind"; nachash, "snake"; tannin, "serpent," "sea monster"):

I. INTRODUCTORY

II. NAME OF BEL AND THE DRAGON

III. CONTENTS

1. The Bel Story: the God of Bel

2. The Dragon Story; Meaning of "Dragon"; Serpent-Worship in Babylon

IV. TEXTUAL AUTHORITIES

1. Manuscripts

(1) Greek

(2) Syriac

2. Recensions or Versions

(1) Greek

(2) Syriac

(3) Latin

(4) Aramaic

V. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE: PRINCIPAL OPINIONS

VI. TEACHING Little in this work that is distinctly Jewish. God is great, absolute and ever-living; angels intervene for special ends; the absurdity of idol-worship

VII. AUTHOR, PLACE AND DATE OF COMPOSITION

Probably not in Babylon; perhaps the Hebrew text originated in Palestine about 146 BC or later. The Septuagint version produced in Egypt about 100 BC, which may be the date and language of the Book. Theta (Theodotion's version) was produced probably at Ephesus about 180 AD

VIII. CANONICITY AND AUTHENTICITY

Accepted as canonical by the Jews of Egypt but rejected by the Jews of Palestine Accepted as part of the Bible by Greek and Latin church Fathers, by the Council of Trent and therefore by the Roman church; denied by Protestants to be canonical

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

Bel and the Dragon is the third of the three Apocryphal additions to Daniel, The SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN and SUSANNA (which see) being the other two. In the Greek and Latin versions (see below, "IV. Textual Authorities") these "additions" form an integral part of the canonical Book of Daniel, and they are recognized as such and therefore as themselves canonical by the Council of Trent. But the So of the Three Children is the only piece having a necessary connection with the Hebrew canonical Book of Daniel; in the Greek and Latin texts it follows Da 3:24. The other two are appended and appear to have an origin independent of the book to which they are appended and also of each other, though in all three as also in the Hebrew Book of Daniel the name and fame of Daniel stand out prominently.

II. Name of Bel and the Dragon.

Since in the Greek and Latin recensions or versions Bel and the Dragon forms a portion of the Book of Da it does not bear a special name. But in the only two known manuscripts of the Septuagint in Syro-Hexaplar (see below, "IV. Textual Authorities") these words stand at the head of the "addition" now under consideration: "From (or "a part of") the prophecy of Habakkuk son of Joshua of the tribe of Levi." That the Biblical writing prophet of that name is meant is beyond question. In Theta (Theodotian) this fact is distinctly stated (see Bel and the Dragon verse 33); and it is equally beyond question that these tales could never have come from the prophet so called (see below "VIII. Canonicity and Authenticity").

In codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus of Theodotian (Theta) the title is: Horasis 12, i.e. Da 12, canonical Daniel being comprised in 11 chapters. In the Vulgate, Bel and the Dragon forms chapter 14, but, as in the case of the earlier chapters, it has no heading.

In the Syriac Peshitta (W) the story of Bel and the Dragon is preceded by "Bel the idol," and that of the Dragon by "Then follows the Dragon." Bel and the Dragon is the title in all Protestant versions of the

Apocrypha, which rigidly keep the latter separate from the books of the Hebrew canon.

III. Contents.

The stories of Bel and of the Dragon have a separate origin and existed apart: they are brought together because they both agree in holding up idolatry to ridicule and in encouraging Jewish believers to be true to their religion. The glorification of Daniel is also another point in which both agree, though while the Daniel of the Bel and the Dragon story appears as a shrewd Judge corresponding to the etymology of that name, he of the Dragon story is but a fearless puritan who will die rather than be faithless to his religion.

It is evident, however that the editor of the "additions" has fused both stories into one, making the Dragon story depend on that which precedes (See Bel and of the Dragon verses 23 f). It seems very likely that, in a Nestorian list mentioned by Churton (Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures, 391), Bel and the Dragon is comprised under the title, The Little Daniel.

The two stories as told in common by Septuagint and Theodotion may be thus summarized:

1. The Story of Bel: the God of Bel:

There is in Babylon an image of Bel which Daniel refuses to worship, though no form of worship is mentioned except that of supplying the god with food. The king (Cyrus according to Theodotion) remonstrates with the delinquent Hebrew, pointing Out to him the immense amount of food consumed daily by Bel, who thus proves himself to be a living god. Daniel, doubting the king’s statement as to the food, asks to be allowed to test the alleged fact. His request being granted, he is shown by expressed desire th e lectisternia, the sacred tables being covered by food which the god is to consume during the night. The doors are all sealed by arrangement, and after the priests have departed Daniel has the temple floor strewn with light ashes. When the morning breaks it is found that the doors are still sealed, but the food has disappeared. Upon examination the tracks of bare feet are found on the ash-strewn floor, showing that the priests have entered the temple by a secret way and removed the food. Angered by the trick played on him the king has the priests put to death and the image destroyed.

The word Bel, a short form of Baal, occurs in the Old Testament in Isa 46:1; Jer 50:2; 51:44, where it stands for Merodach or Marduk, chief of the Babylonian deities. Originally however it denotes any one of the Babylonian local deities, and especially the principal deity worshipped at Nippur (for similar use of the Hebrew "Baal" see the article on this word). In Theodotion Cyrus appears as an abettor of Bel-worship, which is quite in accordance with the practice of the early Persian kings to show favor to the worship of the countries they conquered. See Century Bible, "Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther," 40.

2. The Dragon Story; Meaning of "Dragon"; Serpent-Worship in Babylon:

There is in Babylon a great live dragon worshipped by a large number of the inhabitants, who lavishly

feed it. In the present case the god is or is represented by a living creature which can be fed, and, indeed, needs feeding. Daniel refuses to bow down before the dragon and makes an offer to the king to kill it. Believing the god well able to care for himself, the king accepts Daniel's challenge. Daniel makes a mixture of which pitch forms the principal ingredient and thrusts it down the dragon's throat, so that "it bursts asunder and dies." The people are infuriated at the death of their god and demand that the king shall have the god-murderer put to death, a demand to which the royal master yields by having Daniel cast into a den of lions, as was done to other culprits found guilty of capital charges. But though the prophet remained in the company of 7 lions for 6 days he suffered no injury. On the last day when Daniel, without food, was naturally hungry, a miracle was performed by way of supplying him with food. Habakkuk (see above, "II. Name"), when cooking food for his reapers, heard an angel's voice commanding him to carry the food he had prepared to Daniel in the lions' den in Babylon. Upon his replying that he did not know where the den, or even Babylon, was, the angel laid hold of his hair and by it carried the prophet to the very part of the den where Daniel was. Having handed the latter the meal intended for the reapers, he was safely brought back by the angel to his own home. It would seem that Habakkuk was protected from the lions as well as Daniel. Seeing all this the king worshipped God, set Daniel free, and in his stead east his accusers into the lions' den, where they were instantly devoured,

Zockler in his commentary (p. 215) speaks of the "fluidity" of the Dragon myth, and he has been followed by Marshall and Daubney. But what in reality does the Greek word drakon, rendered "dragon," mean? In the Septuagint the word is used generally (15 times) to translate the Hebrew tannin which denotes a serpent or sea monster. It is this word (tannin) which in the Aramaic version of the Dragon story translates the Greek drakon. Now in Ex 4:3 and Ex 7:9 the Hebrew tannin and nachash ("serpent") seem identified as are the Greek drakon and ophis in Re 12:9. We may therefore take drakon in the present story to stand for a serpent. We know that in Babylon the god Nina was worshipped in the form of a serpent (see Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, 281 f), and it is more probable that it is the worship of this god or of some other serpent deity that is here meant, than that there is any allusion to the Babylonian story according to which Marduk the supreme deity of Babylon engaged in a conflict with Tiamat the monster —foe to light and order.

(1) The dragon of the present story is a god and not as Tiamat, a kind of devil, and a male, not a female.

(2) The dragon in the present story is a serpent, which is not true of Tiamat.

(3) Apsu (male) and Tiamat (female) are Babylonian deities who give birth to the gods of heaven; these gods subsequently led by their mother Tiamat engaged in a fierce contest with Marduk.

Since Gunkel published his book, Schopfung und Chaos (1895), it has been the fashion to see reflections of the Marduk-Tiamat conflict throughout the Old Testament. But recent investigations tend to show that Babylonian mythology has not dominated Hebrew thought to the extent that was formerly thought, and with this statement Gunkel himself now agrees, as the last edition of his commentary on Genesis proves.

IV. Textual Authorities.

1. Manuscripts:

(1) Greek.

There exist in Greek two forms of the text (see below).

(a) The Septuagint text has been preserved in but one original MS, the codex Christianus (from the Chigi family who owned it, published in Rome in 1772). This belongs to about the 9th century. This text has been printed also in Cozza's Sacrorum Bibliorum vestustissima fragmenta Graeca et Latina, part iii, Romae, 1877, and in Swete's edition of the Septuagint side by side with Theodotion. In Tischendorf's Septuagint it occurs at the close of the ordinary text of the Septuagint.

(b) Of Theta (the text of Theodotion) we have the following important manuscripts: Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Q (codex Marchalianus), Gamma (verses 1,2-4 only) and Delta (from verse 21 to verse 41).

(2) Syriac.

There exists in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, a manuscript of the 8th century of the Syro-Hexaplar version made by Paul of Tella in 617 AD at Alexandria from col vi (Septuagint) of Origen's Hexapla. This most valuable manuscript has been edited and published by Ceriani.

2. Recensions or Versions:

(1) Greek.

(a) The Septuagint:

Of this we have but one manuscript (see above under "Manuscripts") and until its publication at Rome in 1772 what is now known as Theta was believed to be the real Septuagint version, notwithstanding hints to the contrary by early Christian writers.

(b) Theta, or the Version of Theodotion:

This version appears to be a revision of the Septuagint, with the help, perhaps, as in the case of the canonical Daniel, of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) original, now lost. It is much less pedantic than Aquila's Greek translation which preceded it, and its Greek is better. It is also a better translation than the Septuagint; yet it has many transliterations of Hebrew words instead of translations. This version of Daniel displaced that of the Septuagint at a very early time, for though Origen gave place to the Septuagint in his Hexapla, in his writings he almost always cites from Theta. In his preface to Daniel Jerome points to the fact that in his own time the church had rejected the Septuagint in favor of

Theodotion, mentioning the defectiveness of the former as the ground. Even Irenaeus (died 202) and Porphyry (died 305) preferred Theodotion to the Septuagint. Field was the first to point out that it is the work of Theodotion (not the Septuagint) that we have in 1 Esdras, etc.

(2) Syriac.

In addition to the Syro-Hexaplar version (see above, under "Manuscript") the Peshitta version must be noted. It follows Theodotion closely, and is printed in Walton's Polyglot (in one recension only of Bel and the Dragon) and in a revised text edited by Lagarde in 1861; not as R. H. Charles (Enc Brit, VII, 807) erroneously says in The Book of Tobit by Neubauer.

(3) Latin.

(a) The old Latin version, which rests on Theodotion, fragments of which occur in Sabatier's work, Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae (1743, etc., II).

(b) The Vulgate, which follows Jerome's translation, is also based on Theodotion, and follows it closely.

(4) Aramaic.

For the Aramaic version published by M. Caster and claimed to be the text of the book as first written, see below, "V. Original Language." **V. The Original Language: Principal Opinions.**

It has been until recent years most generally maintained that Bel and the Dragon was composed and first edited in the Greek language. So Eichhorn, de Wette, Schrader, Fritzsche, Schurer and Konig. In favor of this the following reasons have been given:

(1) No Semitic original with reasonable claims has been discovered. Origen, Eusebius and Jerome distinctly say that no Hebrew (or Aramaic) form of this tract existed or was known in their time.

(2) The Hebraisms with which this work undoubtedly abounds are no more numerous or more crucial than can be found in works by Jewish authors which are known to have been composed in the Greek language, such as the continual recurrence of kai (=" and"), kai eipe ("and he said"), etc.

On the other hand, the opinion has been growing among recent scholars that this work was written first of all either in Hebrew or Aramaic Some of the grounds are the following:

(1) It is known that Theodotion in making his translation of other parts of the Old Testament (Daniel) endeavored to correct the Septuagint with the aid of the Massoretic Text. A comparison of the Septuagint and of Theodotion of Bel and the Dragon reveal differences of a similar character. How can we account for them unless we assume that Theodotion had before him a Semitic original? A very weak

argument, however, for the translator might have corrected on a priori principles, using his own Judgment; or there might well have been in his time different recensions of the Septuagint. Westcott (DB, I, 397a; 2nd edition, 714a) holds that some of Theodotion's changes are due to a desire to give consistency to the facts.

(2) Much has been made of the Semiticisms in the work, and it must be admitted that they are numerous and striking. But are these Hebraisms or Aramaisms? The commonest and most undoubted Semiticism is the repeated use of kai and kai egeneto with the force of the waw-consecutive and only to be explained and understood in the light of that construction. But the waw- consecutive exists only in classical Hebrew; Aramaic and post-Biblical. Hebrew, including late parts of the Old Testament (parts of Ecclesiastes, etc.), know nothing of it. It must be assumed then that if the Semiticisms of this work imply a Semitic original, that original was Hebrew, not Aramaic

The following Hebraisms found in the Septuagint and in Theodotion may briefly be noted:

(1) The use of the Greek kai with all the varied meanings of the waw-consecutive. (see below, under "VI. Teaching"). The beginning of a sentence with kai en ("and there was") Bel and the Dragon (verses 1,3 in the Septuagint; 2 f, etc., in Theodotion) agrees with the Hebrew waw-consecutive construction, but makes poor Greek. In verse 15 kai egeneto can be understood only in the light of the Hebrew for which it stands.

(2) The syntactical feature called parataxy (coordination) presents itself throughout the Greek of this piece, and it has been reproduced in the English translations (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) as any English reader can see. In the classical languages it is hypotaxy that prevails. If, as seems likely, those responsible for Septuagint and Theodotion followed a Hebrew original, they failed to make sufficient allowance for the peculiar force of the waw-consecutive idiom, for this does not involve hypotaxy to an y considerable extent.

(3) The constant occurrence of Kurios ("Lord") without the article implies the Hebrew Yahweh; and the phrase the "Lord God" is also Hebrew.

(4) There are difficulties and differences best explained by assuming a Hebrew origin. The Greek word sphragisamenos has no sense in verse 14 (Septuagint) for, retaining it, we should read of a sealing of the temple (of Bel) and also of a sealing with signet rings of the doors. The Hebrew word "shut" (catham) is written much like that for "seal" (chatham), and was probably, as Marshal suggests, mistaken for the latter. The temple was "shut" and the doors "sealed." In verse 10 the Septuagint (choris) and Theodotion (ektos) have 2 words of similar sense, which are best explained as independent renderings of one Hebrew word.

Marshall, identifying this dragon story with the Babylonian creation-myth of Marduk and Tiamat, thinks that instead of "pitch" used in making the obolus with which Daniel destroyed the dragon, the original Aramaic document has "storm wind," the two words being in Aramaic written much alike (za'apha' ="

storm wind," and zepha’ = pitch). But the fact is quite overlooked that the obolus contained not only pitch, but also "fat" and "hair" (see Bel and the Dragon, verse 27). Besides, in the Aramaic version, published by Gaster, to which Marshall attaches great importance as at least a real source, we have four ingredients, namely, pitch (zepetha’), fat, flax (kittan) and hair. Dr. Marshall’s suggestion involves therefore not only the confusion of two words spelled differently in Aramaic, but the substitution of 3 or 4 terms for one in the original draft. Moreover, in Bel and the Dragon the several ingredients are made up into a cake with which the dragon was gorged. Dr. Marshall’s view assumes also an Aramaic original which is a gainst the evidence. But the suggestion would not have been made but for a desire to assimilate the dragon story to the Babylonian creation-myth, though in motive and details both differ so essentially.

In favor of a Semitic original many writers have cited the fact that forms of the story have been found in Hebrew and Aramaic in the 13th century. Raymund Martini in his Pugio Fidei (written against the Jews) quotes Bel and the Dragon from a Hebrew Midrash on Genesis which Neubauer discovered and which is almost verbatim identical with the unique manuscript containing Midrash Rabba de Rabba (see Neubauer, Tobit, viii, and Franz Delitzsch, de Habacuci, 82). Still other Hebrew forms of these stories have been found. All the "additions" to Daniel "occur in Hebrew in the remains of Yosippon," the "Hebrew Josephus," as he has been called. He wrote in the 10th century.

But most important of all is the discovery by Dr. M. Gaster of the dragon story in Aramaic, imbedded in the Chronicles of Yerahmeel, a work of the 10th century. Dr. Gaster maintains that in this Aramaic fragment we have a portion of the original Bel and the Dragon (see PSBA, 1894, 280 ff (Introduction), 312 (Text) and 1895 (for notes and translation)). The present writer does not think Dr. Gaster has made out his case.

(1) If such an Aramaic original did really exist at any time we should have learned something definite about it from early writers, Jewish and Christian.

(2) Dr. Gaster has discovered an Aramaic form of only two of the three "additions," those of the So of the Three Children and of the dragon story. What of the rest of the Aramaic document?

(3) It has already been pointed out that the waw-consecutive constructions implied in the Greek texts go back to a Hebrew, not an Aramaic original.

(4) The Aramaic text of the Dragon story not seldom differs both from the Septuagint and Theodotion as in the following and many other cases: The two Greek versions have in Bel and the Dragon, verse 24 "The king (said)," which the Aramaic omits: in verse 35 the Aramaic after "And Habakkuk said" adds "to the angel," which the Septuagint and Theodotion are without.

(5) The compiler of the Yerahmeel Chronicle says distinctly that he had taken the So of the Three Children and the dragon story from the writings of Theodotion (see PSBA, 1895, 283), he having, it is quite evident, himself put them into Aramaic. Dr. Gaster lays stress on the words of the compiler, that

what he gives in Aramaic is that which "Theodotion found" (loc. cit.). But the reference can be only to the Septuagint which this translator made the basis of his own version; it is far too much to assume that the Chronicler means an Aramaic form of the stories.

VI. Teaching.

The two stories teach the doctrine of the oneness and absoluteness of Yahwe, called throughout Kurios ("Lord"), a literal rendering of the Hebrew word ‘adhonai ("Lord") which the Jews substituted for Yahwe in reading the Hebrew as do now-a-day Jews. In the Greek and Latin versions it is the word read (the Qere perpetuum, not that written Kethibh), which is translated. It would have been more consonant with universal practice if the proper name Yahweh had been transliterated as proper names usually are.

But very little is said of the character of Yahweh. He is great and the only (true) God in Bel and the Dragon (verse 41), the living God in contrast with Bel (verse 57). Of the nature of His demands on His worshippers, ritualistic and ethical, nothing is said. There is no reference to any distinctly Jewish beliefs or practices; nothing about the torah or about any Divine revelation to men, about sacrifice or the temple or even a priesthood, except that in the Septuagint (not in Theodotion) Daniel the prophet is spoken of as a priest—strong evidence of the low place assigned by the writer to the external side of the religion he professed. We do however find mention of an angel, a sort of deus ex machina in the Dragon story (verses 34 ff); compare Da 6:22.

The incident of the transportation of Habakkuk to Babylon shows that the writer had strong faith in supernatural intervention on behalf of the pious. Apart from this incident the two stories steer fairly clear of anything that is supernatural. But Bel and the Dragon verses 33-39 are a late interpolation.

VII. Author, Place and Date of Composition.

Nothing whatever is known of the author of the book and nothing definite or certain of the place or date of composition. It has been commonly felt, as by Bissell, etc., that it reflects a Babylonian origin. Clay (see Bel and the Dragon, verse 7) abounded in Babylon (but surely not only in Babylon); bronze (Bel and the Dragon, verse 7) was often used in that country for the manufacturing of images, and the lion, it is known, was native to the country (but that was the case also in Palestine in Biblical, and even post-Biblical times). None of the arguments for a Babylonian origin have much weight, and there are contrary arguments of considerable force.

The anachronisms and inconsistencies are more easily explained on the assumption of a non-Babylonian origin. Besides, the Judaism of Babylon was of a very strict and regulation kind, great attention being given to the law and to matters of ritual. There is nothing in Bel and the Dragon regarding these points (see above under "Teaching").

If we assume a Hebrew original, as there are good grounds for doing, it is quite possible that these legends were written in Palestine at a time when the Jewish religion was severely persecuted: perhaps

when Antiochus VII (Sidetes, 139-128 BC) reconquered Judah for Syria and sorely oppressed the subject people. Yet nothing very dogmatic can be said as to this. We cannot infer much from the style of the Hebrew (or Aramaic?), since no Semitic original has come down to us. It is quite clear that these "additions" imply the existence of the canonical Book of Da and belong to a subsequent date, for they contain later developments of traditions respecting Daniel. The canonical Book of Daniel is dated by modern scholars about 160 BC, so that a date about 136 BC (see above) could not be far amiss.

If, on the other hand, we take for granted that the Septuagint is the original text of the book, the date of that recension is the date of the work itself. It seems probable that this recension of Daniel was made in Egypt about 150 BC (see 1 Macc 1:54; 2:59), and we have evidence that up to that date the "three additions" formed no part of the book, though they exist in all Greek and Syriac manuscripts of Daniel, which have come down to us. Probably the "additions" existed as separate compositions for some time before they were joined to Daniel proper, but it is hardly too much to assume that they were united no later than 100 BC. Yet the data for reaching a conclusion are very slight. It may be added that the Greek of the Septuagint is distinctly Alexandrian in its character, as Westcott, Bissell and others have pointed out. Theodotion’s version is supposed to have been made at Ephesus toward the end of the 2nd century AD.

VIII. Canonicity and Authenticity.

The Alexandrian Jews, recognizing the Septuagint as their Bible, accepted the whole of the Apocrypha as canonical. The Palestine Jews, on the other hand, limited their canonical Scriptures to the Hebrew Old Testament. There is, of course, some uncertainty (largely no doubt because it was originally a translation from the Hebrew) as to whether the Septuagint at the first included the Apocrypha in its whole extent or not, but all the evidence points to the fact that it did, though individual books like Da existed apart before they formed a portion of the Greek or Egyptian canon.

In the early Christian church all the three "additions" are quoted as integral parts of Da by Greek and by Latin Fathers, as e.g. by Irenaeus (IV, 5, 2 f); Tertullian (De idololatria c.18); Cyprian (Ad fortunatum, c.11).

By a decree of the Council of Trent these "additions" were for the Roman church made as much a part of the Bible canon as the Hebrew Book of Daniel. Protestant churches have as a rule excluded the whole of the Apocrypha from their Bibles, regarding its books as either "Deutero-canonical" or "non-canonical." In consequence of this attitude among Protestants the Apocrypha has until lately been greatly neglected by Protestant writers. But a great change is setting in, and some of the best commentaries by Protestant scholars produced in recent years deal with the Apocrypha and its teaching.

Julius Africanus (flourished about first half of 3rd century AD) was the first to impugn the truth of the stories embodied in the "additions" to Daniel. This he did in a letter to Origen to which the recipient vigorously replied.

The improbabilities and contradictions of these three pieces have often been pointed out from the time of Julius Africanus down to the present day. The following points may be set down as specimens:

(1) Daniel is called a priest in the Septuagint (Bel and the Dragon, verse 1), and yet he is identified with the prophet of that name.

(2) Habakkuk the prophet (he is so called in Theodotion (see Bel and the Dragon, verse 33), and no other can be intended) is made to be a contemporary of Daniel and also of the Persian king Cyrus (see Bel and the Dragon, verses 1 and 33 in the English Bible). Now Cyrus conquered Babylon in 538 BC, the principal Jews in Babylon returning to Palestine the following year. The events narrated in Bel and the Dragon could not have occurred during the time Cyrus was king of Babylon, but the Septuagint speaks of "the king" without naming him.

(3) It was not Cyrus but Xerxes who destroyed the image of Bel, this being in 475 BC (see Herodotus i.183; Strabo xvi.1; Arrian, Exped. Alex., vii.1).

(4) It is further objected that dragon-worship in Babylon, such as is implied in the dragon story, is contrary to fact. Star-worship, it has been said, did exist, but not animal-worship. So Eichhorn and Fritzsche. But there is every reason for believing that the worship of living animals as representing deity, and especially of the living serpent, existed in Babylon as among other nations of antiquity, including the Greeks and Romans (see Herzog, 1st edition, article "Drache zu Babylon," by J. G. Muller). It has already been pointed out (see list of meanings) that the word "dragon" denotes a serpent.

LITERATURE.

Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apoc. Schriften des Alten Testaments (1795), 431 ff (remarkable for its time: compares the Septuagint and Theodotion); W. H. Daubney, The Three Additions to Daniel (Cambridge, 1906; contains much matter though rather uncritically treated); the commentaries of Fritzsche (Vol I: still very rich in material; it forms part of the Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch); Bissell (in Lange's series, but not a translation); Ball Speaker's Commentary (this is the best English commentary on the Apocrypha). See also Schurer, Geschichte3, III, 333, and his article in RE3, I, 639; and the articles by Kamphausen in EB, I, 1014; Toy, in Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 650; R. H. Charles, Encyclopedia Brittanica, VII, 807, and especially that by J. Turner Marshall in HDB, I, 267. Fritzsche Libri Veteris Testamenti Graece (1871), and Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, III, 1894, and later editions, give the Septuagint and Theodotion on parallel pages. In the edition of the Septuagint edited by Tischendorf, the Septuagint is given in the text and Theodotion in an appendix.

T. Witton Davies

BELA

be'-la.

See ZOAR.

BELA; BELAH

be’-la (bela‘, "destruction"; the King James Version Belah, Ge 46:21):

(1) Bela, the son of Beor, was the first king of Edom previous to the kingdom of Israel and reigned in the city of Dinhabah (Ge 36:32 f; 1Ch 1:43 f). Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus, Balak.

(2) Bela, the firstborn son of Benjamin (Ge 46:21; 1Ch 7:6 f; 1Ch 8:1). He was the head of the family of the Belaites (Nu 26:38), the father of Addar (called Ard, Nu 26:40), Gera, Abihud, Abishua, Naaman, Ahoah, Gera, Shephuphan (compare Shephupham, Nu 26:39), Huram (1Ch 8:3-5; Nu 26:40).

(3) Bela, a son of Azaz, of the tribe of Reuben, was a man of great power and wealth. His possessions reached from Nebo to the Euphrates (1Ch 5:8 ff).

A. L. Breslich

BELAITES

be’-la-its (bal‘i, "belonging to Bela"): The descendants of Bela (Nu 26:38). Compare BELA (2).

BELCH

belsh: The primary idea of this word is "to gush forth" as a fountain. As used in Ps 59:7 the thought is that these enemies had so cherished these evil thoughts and bitter wrath that now the heart is a very fountain of evil, and has taught the tongue how to give utterance thereto. But the previous verse shows that the Psalmist also had in mind the howling and barking of the dogs about the city. The imprecations of his enemies are like the snarling, howling, barking of dogs which in an eastern city makes the night hideous with the noise, and is continued until the daybreak.

Jacob W. Kapp

BELEMUS

bel’-e-mus (Belemos; Balsamus): An officer of King Artaxerxes in Palestine associated with Beeltethmus in hindering the rebuilding of the temple (1 Esdras 2:16): called Bishlam in Ezr 4:7.

BELIAL

be’-li-al, bel’-yal (beliya‘al; Beliar): This name, occurring very frequently in the Old Testament, has the sense of "worthlessness" (compare 2Sa 23:6 margin); accordingly in such phrases as "sons of Belial" (Jud 20:13; 1Sa 10:27, etc.), "men of Belial" (1Sa 30:22; 1Ki 21:13, etc.), which the English Revised Version usually retains, the American Standard Revised Version more correctly renders, "base fellows" (so "daughter of Belial" 1Sa 1:16, "wicked woman"). There is here no suggestion a proper name. Afterward, however, "Belial" became a proper name for Satan, or for Antichrist (thus frequently in the Jewish Apocalyptic writings, e.g. in XII the Priestly Code (P), Book Jubilees, Asc Isa, Sib Or). In this sense Paul used the word in 2Co 6:15, "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" (Beliar). Bousset thinks that Paul’s "man of sin" in 2Th 2:3, where some authorities read "man of lawlessness," is a translation of this term. The sense at least is similar.

See ANTICHRIST; MAN OF SIN.

James Orr

BELIE

be-li’:Is the translation of kachash, "to be untrue" (Jer 5:12), "They have belied the Lord" (the American Standard Revised Version "denied Yahweh"), here used as synonym of "give the lie to."

In The Wisdom of Solomon 1:11 "belle" translates katapseudomai (the kata prefix referring to the kata in katalalia in the same verse), "A mouth that belieth destroyeth a soul."

BELIEF

be-lef’.

See FAITH.

BELIEVERS

be-lev’-ers (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of Ac 5:14, for posteuontes, the Revised Version, margin "believing"; in the King James Version of 1Ti 4:12 for hoi pistoi, the Revised Version (British and American) "them that believe"): Equivalent phrases, they (he, she) that believe (for hoi pepisteukotes; hoi, pisteuontes; (adj.), pistos, etc.) occur frequently as a regular description of those who professed their faith in Christ, and attached themselves to the Christian church. The one essential condition of admission into the Christian community was, that men should believe in Jesus Christ (Ac 16:31). The actual experiences of the men thus denoted varied with all the possible degrees and modifications of FAITH (which see). Believers are nowhere in the New Testament distinguished as a subordinate class from the "Christians who know" as in the Gnostic antithesis of pistikoi and gnostikoi, "believers" and "knowers."

T. Rees

BELL

(metsilloth, pa‘amon): The former of these terms occurs only once (Zec 14:20) where it is thus translated. It is derived from a verb meaning "to tingle" or "dirl" (1Sa 3:11), and there is, therefore, no objection etymologically to rendering the noun by "bells." But the little bell attached to the harness of horses would hardly be a suitable place for a fairly long inscription, and as buckles shaped exactly like cymbals (see MUSIC) were used as ornaments for horses, "cymbals" is probably a better rendering.

The other Hebrew word for bell is found only in Ex 28:33 f; 39:25,26, where "bells of gold" are directed to be attached to the hem of Aaron’s official robe, that the people may hear him when he enters and quits the sanctuary. Bells were not employed by the Hebrews to summon the congregation to worship, nor do Mohammedans so use them at the present day. The church bell is a peculiarly Christian institution, said to have been introduced by Bishop Paulinus of Nola in Campania, who lived about the end of the 4th century. Little bells, however, like those attached to the hem of Aaron’s robe, frequently form part of the harness of horses, or are fastened to the necks of the he-goats or wethers that lead the flock in eastern lands.

James Millar

BELLOWS

bel’-oz, bel’-us: The word occurs once only in English Versions of the Bible, in Jer 6:29, where the prophet is predicting the coming of the destroyer (verse 26), "a great nation" from "the north country" (verse 22), down upon Israel, because "all of them deal corruptly" (verse 28). "The bellows blow fiercely; the leads is of the fire." Here the imagery is drawn from the refiner’s art, and the "bellows" are those used to make the refiner’s fires burn fiercely.

See CRAFTS, II, 10.

BELLY

bel’-i: gachon =" the external abdomen" (Ge 3:14; Le 11:42). qobhah =" the abdominal cavity" (Nu 25:8 the American Standard Revised Version "body"). beTen =" the internal abdomen," "the womb" (1Ki 7:20; Job 15:2,35 the King James Version; Job 20:15,23; 40:16; Ps 17,14; Pr 13:25; 18:20; Jer 1:5; Eze 3:3); also figuratively "the internal regions," "the body of anything" (Jon 2:2). me‘eh =" intestines," "abdomen" (Da 2:32; Jon 1:17; 2:1,2). In the New Testament koilia =" a cavity," espec ially the abdominal (Mt 12:40; 15:17; Mr 7:19); the seat of appetite and of the carnal affections (Ro 16:18; 1Co 6:13; Php 3:19; Re 10:9,10); the innermost of the soul (the American Revised Version, margin Joh 7:38).

Frank E. Hirsch

BELMAIM

bel’-ma-im, the King James Version Belmen (Belmaim, Judith 7:3; Bailmain, 4:4): A place in the neighborhood of Dothan (Judith 7:3), to which warning was sent to prepare for the invasion of Holofernes (Judith 4:4). It probably answers to the modern Bir Bil‘ameh (Ibleam), a ruined site about half a mile South of Jenin.

BELMEN; BELMON

bel’-men, bel’-mon.

See BELMAIM.

BELOMANCY

bel’-o-man-si.

See AUGURY, IV, 2.

BELOVED

be-luv’-ed, be-luv’-d’ (agapetos): A term of affectionate endearment common to both Testaments; in the Old Testament found, 26 out of 42 times, in Solomon’s So of Love. Limited chiefly to two Heb words and their derivatives: ‘ahebh, "to breathe" or "long for," hence, to love, corresponding to the New Testament, agapao, "to prefer," i.e. a love based on respect and benevolent regard; dodh, "love," chiefly love between the sexes, based on sense and emotion, akin to phileo (Latin amare). Used occasionally, in their nobler sense, interchangeably, e.g. the former of a husband’s love for his wife (De 21:15,16); twice of a lover (So 1:14,16), thus lifting the affection of the So of Solomon out of mere amorousness into the realm of the spiritual and possibly Messianic. Both words used of God’s love for His chosen: e.g. Solomon, "beloved of his God" (Ne 13:26); Benjamin "beloved of Yahweh" (De 33:12); so even of wayward Israel (Jer 11:15).

In the New Testament "beloved" used exclusively of Divine and Christian love, an affection begotten in the community of the new spiritual life in Christ, e.g. "beloved in the Lord" (Ro 16:8). The beauty, unity, endearment of this love is historically unique, being peculiarly Christian. "Brethren" in Christ are "beloved" (1Th 1:4; 1Co 15:58; Jas 1:16; 2:5). Many individuals are specified by name: Timothy (2Ti 1:2); Philemon (Phm 1:1); Amplias, Urbane, Stachys, Persis (Ro 16:8,9,12), etc. The aged John is the conspicuous New Testament illustration of the depth and tenderness of Christian love. In his epistles

alone he addresses his disciples 12 times as "beloved." Paul terms "God's elect" "holy and beloved" (Col 3:12).

The term rises to still Diviner significance as an epithet of Christ, whom Paul, grateful for His "freely bestowed" grace, terms "the Beloved." This is the word used repeatedly to express God the Father's infinite affection for Jesus His "beloved Son" (Mt 3:17; 12:18; 17:5; Mr 1:11; 9:7; Lu 3:22; 20:13).

Agapetos rendered as above 47 times is 9 times "dearly beloved" (the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly omits "dearly") and 3 times "well beloved" (the Revised Version (British and American) omits "well"). The former rendering found only once in the Old Testament (yedhidhuth, "something beloved"), portraying God's tender love for His people: "dearly beloved of my soul" (Jer 12:7). Thrice is Daniel spoken of as "greatly beloved" of Gabriel and of God (hamudhoth, "precious," i. e. delight = beloved; Da 9:23; 10:11,19). Through the apostles the word has become familiar in pastoral and sermonic address. Few New Testament words better illustrate the power and impress of the Christian spirit on succeeding centuries than this.

Dwight M. Pratt

BELSHAZZAR

bel-shaz'-ar (belsha'tstsar; Baltasar, Babylonian Bel-shar-usur): According to Da 5:30, he was the Chaldean king under whom Babylon was taken by Darius the Mede. The Babylonian monuments speak a number of times of a Bel-shar-usur who was the "firstborn son, the offspring of the heart of" Nabunaid, the last king of the Babylonian empire, that had been founded by Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, at the time of the death of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, in 626 BC. There is no doubt that this Belshazzar is the same as the Belshazzar of Dnl. It is not necessary to suppose that Belshazzar was at any time king of the Babylonian empire in the sense that Nebuchadnezzar and Nabunaid were. It is probable, as M. Pognon argues, that a son of Nabunaid, called Nabunaid after his father, was king of Babylon, or Babylonian king, in Harran (Haran), while his father was overlord in Babylon. This second Nabunaid is called "the son of the offspring of the heart" of Nabunaid his father. It is possible that this second Nabundid was the king who was killed by Cyrus, when he crossed the Tigris above Arbela in the 9th year of Nabunaid his father, and put to death the king of the country (see the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle col. ii, 17); since according to the Eshki-Harran inscription, Nabunaid the Second died in the 9th year of Nabunaid the First. Belshazzar may have been the son of the king who is said in the same chronicle to have commanded the Babylonian army in Accad from the 6th to the 11th year of Nabunaid I; or, possibly longer, for the annals before the 6th and after the 11th year are broken and for the most part illegible. This same son of the king is most probably mentioned again in the same chronicle as having died in the night in which Babylon was captured by Gobryas of Gutium. As Nabunaid II, though reigning at Hatran under the overlordship of his father, is called king of Babylon on the same inscription on which his father is called by the same title; so Belshazzar may have been called king of Babylon, although he was only crown prince. It is probable also, that as Nabunaid I had made one of his sons king of Harran, so he had made another king of Chaldea. This would account for Belshazzar's being called in

Da 5:30 the Chaldean king, although, to be sure, this word Chaldean may describe his race rather than his kingdom. The 3rd year of Belshazzar spoken of in Da 8:1, would then refer to his 3rd year as subking of the Chaldeans under his father Nabunaid, king of Babylon, just as Cambyses was later subking of Babylon, while his fathe r Cyrus was king of the lands. From the Book of Daniel we might infer that this subkingdom embraced Chaldea and Susiana, and possibly the province of Babylon; and from the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle that it extended over Accad as well. That the city of Babylon alone was sometimes at least governed by an official called king is highly probable, since the father of Nergal-har-ucur is certainly, and the father of Nabunaid I is probably, called king of Babylon, in both of which cases, the city, or at most the province, of Babylon must have been meant, since we know to a certainty all of the kings who had been ruling over the empire of Babylon since 626 BC, when Nabopolassar became king, and the names of neither of these fathers of kings is found among them.

In addition to Nabunaid II, Belshazzar seems to have had another brother named Nebuchadnezzar, since the two Babylonian rebels against Darius Hystaspis both assumed the name of Nebuchadnezzar the son of Nabunaid (see the Behistun Inscription, I, 85, 89, 95). He had a sister also named Ina-esagilaremat, and a second named probably Ukabu'shai'-na.

Belshazzar had his own house in Babylon, where he seems to have been engaged in the woolen or clothing trade. He owned also estates from which he made large gifts to the gods. His father joins his name with his own in some of his prayers to the gods, and apparently appointed him commander of the army of Accad, whose especial duty it was to defend the city of Babylon against the attacks of the armies of Media and Persia.

It would appear from the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle, that Belshazzar was de facto king of the Babylonian empire, all that was left of it, from the 4th to the 8th month of the 17th year of the reign of his father Nabunaid, and that he died on the night in which Babylon was taken by Gobryas of Gutium (that is, probably, Darius the Mede (see DARIUS)).

The objection to the historical character of the narrative of Daniel, based upon the fact that Belshazzar in 5:11,18 is said to have been the son of Nebuchadnezzar whereas the monuments state that he was the son of Nabunaid, is fully met by supposing that one of them was his real and the other his adoptive father; or by supposing that the queen-mother and Daniel referred to the greatest of his predecessors as his father, just as Omri is called by the Assyrians the father of Jehu, and as the claimants to the Medo-Pers throne are called on the Behistun Inscription the sons of Cyaxares, and as at present the reigning sheikhs of northern Arabia are all called the sons of Rashid, although in reality they are not his sons.

LITERATURE.

The best sources of information as to the life and times of Belshazzar for English readers are: The Records of the Past; Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia; Sayce. The Higher Criticism and the Monuments; and W. W. Wright's two great works, Daniel and His Prophecies and Daniel and His Critics.

R. Dick Wilson

BELT

See ARMOR; DRESS.

BELTESHAZZAR

bel-te-shaz’-ar (belTsha’tstsar Babylonian BalaT-sharucur "protect his life"; Da 4:8): The Bah name given to Daniel (Da 1:7; 2:26; 5:12). Not to be confounded with Belshazzar.

BELUS, TEMPLE OF

be’-lus.

See BABEL.

BEN

ben (ben, "son"): A Levite appointed to assist as musician in the temple service (1Ch 15:18). The text seems to be doubtful, since the name is omitted in 1Ch 15:20 and not mentioned at all in the Septuagint.

BEN-

Ben (prefix) (singular ben, "son of"; plural bene, "sons of" = Aramaic bar): This word is used in the singular or plural to express relationship of almost any kind:

(1) to a person; as such it is found as part of many compound names like Benjamin, Benhur, etc. (compare Bar);

(2) to a clan; in this connection it is found in the plural only: "children of Israel," "children of Ammon," etc.;

(3) to a town; perhaps as place of birth ("son of Jabesh"; 2Ki 15:10 ff);

(4) to occupation, state of life, age, character, quality even of things;

(5) peculiarly employed in the sense of "scholar disciple" ("son of prophet"), or in phrases like "son of death," etc.;

(6) in poetry, "sons of flame" for "sparks" (Job 5:7 margin), etc. The frequent metaphorical use of the word indicates that it was rarely used to express the relation of father to son like the Arabic Ibn. Compare HPN, 64 ff.

A. L. Breslich

BEN-ABINADAB

ben-a-bin'-a-dab, ben-ab-i-na'-dab (ben 'abhinadhabh, "son of Abinadab"): One of the "captains" of Solomon who provided for the king and his household, each for a month in the year (1Ki 4:11). His district was the region of Dor. In the King James Version he is called "the son of Abinadab." His wife was Tappath, the daughter of Solomon.

BEN-AMMI

ben-am'-i (ben 'ammi, "son of my kinsman," Ge 19:38): The progenitor of the Ammonites was a son of Lot's younger daughter, born after the destruction of Sodom. The account of his birth as well as that of Moab was commonly regarded as an expression of Israel's intense hatred and contempt toward these two nations. However, this idea is rather unwarranted, in view of the fact that the origin of the tribe of Judah (which is held in especial honor by J) is accounted for in a similiar way (Ge 38). Gunkel (Schopfung und Chaos, 190) suggests that the narrative (Ge 19:30-38) was originally a Moabitic account tracing the common origin of Moab and Ammon to Lot. It presupposes a universal catastrophe—such as the conflagration of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim suggests—in which all the human race, save Lot and his two daughters, perished. In order to avert the extinction of the race, his daughters resorted to incestuous practices. In this case we have here a Moabite parallel to the Deluge story (Skinner, Genesis, 313-14). While the common origin of the two brother tribes is undoubtedly a fact (Jud 10:6; 11:15,18,25; De 2:19; 2Ch 20, etc.), the folk-etymology of their names is rather suspicious. The name Ben-Ammi is probably derived from the deity "Emu," which is the name for Nergal among the shuchites on the West of the Euphrates a land which corresponds to the position of the Bene-'Ammo, "children of his people" (Nu 22:5). The chief god of the Kataban Arabs was called Ammi (Hom., ZDMG, V, 95, 525, note 1). In cuneiform inscriptions this name appears as part of the title of the Ammonite rulers (HDB). Neubauer (Studia Biblica, 1-26) suggests that the name Balaam is a compound of Bel plus Am, that is, "Am is Lord." For other compounds with Ammi see Gray, HPN, 41-60.

S. Cohon

BEN-DEKER

ben-de'-ker (ben-deqer, "son of Deker," the King James Version "son of Dekar"): The word is derived from a Hebrew root meaning "to pierce." Compare HPN, 69. One of the 12 officers who provided victuals for King Solomon and his household (1Ki 4:9).

BEN-GEBER

ben-ge’-ber (ben-gebher, "son of Geber"; the King James Version son of Geber; the word is derived from a Hebrew root meaning "to be strong." Compare HPN, 66, 69): One of the twelve commissariat officers in the service of Solomon (1Ki 4:13).

BEN-HAIL

ben-ha’-il (ben-chayil, "son of strength"; compare HPN, 65, 231): One of the princes who was sent by Jehoshaphat "to teach in the cities of Judah" (2Ch 17:7).

BEN-HANAN

ben-ha’-nan (ben-chanan, "son of grace"): A son of Shimon of the house of Judah (1Ch 4:20).

BEN-HESED

ben-he’-sed (ben-checedh, "son of Hesed"; the King James Version son of Hesed; the word is derived from a Hebrew root meaning "to be kind"): A commissariat officer in the service of Solomon (1Ki 4:10).

BEN-HUR

ben-hur’ (ben-chur, "son of Hur"; the King James Version son of Hur; from a Hebrew root meaning "to be white." Compare HPN, 69, note 3): One of the twelve commissariat officers in the service of Solomon (1Ki 4:8).

BEN-JAAKAN

ben-ja’-a-kan.

See BENE-JAAKAN.

BEN-ONI

ben-o’-ni (ben-’oni; huios odunes mou, "son of my sorrow"): The name given by the dying Rachel to her new-born son; changed by his father Jacob to BENJAMIN (Ge 35:18) which see.

BEN-ZOHETH

ben-zo’-heth (ben-zoheth, "son of Zoheth," from a Hebrew root meaning "to be strong(?)"): A son of

Ishi of the house of Judah (1Ch 4:20).

BENAIAH

be-na’-ya, be-ni’-a (benayah, benayahu, "Yahweh has built." Compare HPN, 182, 265, 268):

(1) Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada of Kabzeel (compare Jos 15:21), was a man of "mighty deeds" and was more honorable than any of the mighty men of David except the three chiefs. Therefore David made him his chief counselor (2Sa 23:23 m; month compare 1Ch 27:34 where the order of names seems to be reversed) and set him over the Cherethites (compare Carites, 2Ki 11:4 ff and margin) and Pelethites and he was made the 3rd captain of the host and chief over the course of the 3rd (1Ch 27:5 f; 2Sa 8:18; 20:23; 1Ch 18:17; 2Sa 23:20 ff; 11:22 ff). Being a true friend of David (compare 2Sa 15:18) he did not take part in the usurpation of Adonijah (1Ki 1:8,10,26), and was therefore with others chosen by the king to proclaim Solomon king over Israel (1Ki 1:32 ff) and later by Solomon to execute Adonijah (1Ki 2:25), Joab (1Ki 2:29 ff), and Shimei (1Ki 2:46). In recognition of his services Solomon appointed him over the host in Joab’s place (1Ki 2:35; 4:4).

(2) Benaiah, a Pirathonite (compare Jud 12:13,15), was one of David’s 30 mighty men (2Sa 23:30; 1Ch 11:31). He was captain over the course of the 11th month numbering 24,000 (1Ch 27:14).

(3) A ruler of the house of Simeon (1Ch 4:36).

(4) A Levite of second degree appointed as singer (1Ch 15:18) with "psalteries Set to Alamoth" (1Ch 15:20; 16:5).

(5) A priest appointed "to blow the trumpet before the ark of God" (1Ch 15:24; 16:6).

(6) The father of Jehoiada (1Ch 27:34), but see (1) above.

(7) An ancestor of Jahaziel of the house of Asaph (2Ch 20:14).

(8) An overseer in the service of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:13).

(9, 10, 11, 12) Four different men of Israel who had taken "strange wives" (Ezr 10:25,30,35,43).

(13) The father of Pelatiah who was seen by Ezekiel in his vision (Eze 11:1,13).

A. L. Breslich

BENCH

(qeresh): Found only in English Versions of the Bible in Eze 27:6, in the prophet’s "lamentation over Tyre": "They have made thy benches of ivory inlaid in boxwood, from the isles of Kittim," where the word evidently stands for the "benches" of the boat whose "mast" (verse 5) and "oars" (verse 6) have just been described, in the vivid figs. of speech in which the city itself is pictured as a merchantship. Compare verse 8, "Thy wise men, O Tyre, were in thee, they were thy pilots."

See SEAT.

BENE-BERAK

ben-e-be’-rak (bene beraq; Banebarak): A town in the territory of Da (Jos 19:45), represented by the modern village Ibn Ibraq, about an hour Southeast of Jaffa.

BENE-JAAKAN

ben-e-ja’-a-kan, be-ne-ja’-a-kan (bene ya‘aqan: Nu 33:31,32).

See BEEROTH BENE-JAAKAN.

BENEATH

be-neth’:The adverb for "under" (kato). In Joh 8:23, the words "ye are from beneath," suggest hell in contrast to heaven. But the succeeding clause, "ye are of this world," gives the key for the interpretation. Earth, not hell, is expressed, although "that more awful meaning surely is not excluded" (Alford).

BENEDICTION

ben-e-dik’-shun: From the earliest times the records bear testimony that pronouncing the benediction or giving the blessing was a common practice. In the temple service, this duty was assigned to the Aaronites and was made an impressive part of the service. The form of the benediction used is given in Nu 6:22-27. References to this practice may be found in Le 9:22; De 10:8; 2Ch 30:27. After a time, minute directions were given concerning it and careful preparation was made for this part of the service. All Aaronites, of proper age, were entitled to perform this service, except those who by previous conduct or on account of physical defect were disqualified. One who had killed another, whether intentionally or otherwise, who had violated the marriage vows, had given himself excessively to wine drinking or other excesses, or indeed had been guilty of unrighteous conduct or life, was not only prohibited from pronouncing the blessing, but was required to withdraw before this part of the service was performed. If one was blind even of one eye, or had a defect in his hands or speech, or was a hunchback, he was also excluded. Before the priest could engage in this service he was required to wash his hands. Then, with uplifted hands, while the people stood, he uttered the words of blessing. The main idea was that thus the name of Yahweh was put on the people. Later it came to be regarded as having some special blessing in

and of itself, a result against which the more spiritual of the priests protested.

It was common not only to pronounce the benediction in the public worship but also in the family. We have such instances in Ge 9:26,27; 27:27-30. This practice prevailed also on many other occasions not only in Israel, but among the heathen as well. We may readily see, therefore, that from the very beginning of the Christian church the use of the benediction was common. In the course of time an extensive liturgy developed on this subject and it may be said that there are now three distinct ideas in the church as to the benediction. That section of the church which regards the minister as clothed with sacerdotal powers, holds that the blessings pronounced are actually conferred in the act of the utterance of the words, because of the powers conferred upon him when he was set aside for the sacred office. On the other hand it is held that it is merely a prayer that God may bestow certain blessings on the people. From this position others dissent, and teach that it is the declaration of the special privileges and relations in which those stand who have entered into covenant fellowship with Christ; that the blessings now declared are theirs by fight of that relation, and are conferred upon them by the Holy Spirit. The Greek and Roman Catholic churches take the first portion, and therefore we find among them much of detail and minutiae as to the manner in which it should be pronounced. In the Greek church the priest raises his hand with the thumb touching the third finger, signifying the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone; or according to others to form the sacred name IHS. In the Roman church the form is, the thumb, first and second fingers are to be open, to symbolize the Trinity. In this church too, the benediction is pronounced in a multitude of cases and in each case the thing so blessed by the priest is made sacred. Crosses, church vessels, houses, paschal eggs, churchyards, are thus blessed. Every parish has a collection of these forms of blessing in what is known as the "Benedictionale." The authority for this is based on some documents claiming to reach back to early church history, but as they belong to the forged decretal class, the position of the Roman church on this subject is untenable.

Apostolic benedictions, as we find them in the epistles, present considerable variety. One of the striking features is that in a number of cases there is the omission of the Holy Ghost. The best explanation seems to be that the Father and the Son effect the redemption of the world and the Holy Ghost applies the blessing so wrought out. "Grace, mercy and peace" may then be said to be sent from the Father and the Son through the Holy Ghost to be the possession of all who have come into the kingdom. The third person of the Trinity, being thus in the act of applying the blessing, is not mentioned. The fact that in other cases Father, Son and Holy Ghost are mentioned, proves that the writers knew the character and office of the Holy Ghost. The most common form used today is that in 2Co 13:14. Occasionally some changes are introduced by ministers, but it would seem best to adhere strictly to the Scriptural forms.

See BLESSING; SALUTATION.

Jacob W. Kapp

BENEFACTOR

ben-e-fak’-ter (Greek euergetes, Lu 22:25): There is here a probable allusion to two kings of Egypt

(Ptolemy III and VII), who had the surname "Euergetes," of whom the period of the first was 247-242 BC, and of the second, 147-117 BC. Jesus draws the contrast between worldly kingdoms, in which the title "benefactor" is given those who rule with all the splendor of earthly display and luxury, and His kingdom, in which it belongs only to those whose work is that of humble, obscure and often menial service.

BENEFIT

ben'-e-fit (gemul =" a deed," 2Ch 32:25); yaTabh =(causat.) "to make well," "to do good" (Jer 18:10). The plural of gemul, is found is found in Ps 103:2. Ps 68:19 (the King James Version) should be translated "Blessed be the Lord. Day by day he sustains us; God is our salvation." charis =" gift"; "grace" (2Co 1:15, "a second benefit": that is, two visits in the same journey). euergesia =" good deed done" (1Ti 6:2: "because they that partake of the benefit (of their service) are believing and beloved"); agathos =" good" (Philemon 1:14, the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "goodness").

Frank E. Hirsch

BENEVOLENCE

be-nev'-o-lens: the King James Version translation of phrase in Textus Receptus of the New Testament of 1Co 7:3, rejected by the Revised Version (British and American) which following Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek translates Greek opheile, "due." This reference to the marriage relation is explained in 7:4. Compare Ex 21:10.

BENHADAD

ben-ha'-dad (ben-hadhadh; Septuagint huios Hader):

The Name

I. BENHADAD I

1. The Kingdom of Syria Founded

2. Syria and Judah

3. Shortsightedness of Asa

II. BENHADAD II

1. Hadad-’idri of the Monuments

2. Expeditions against Israel

3. Alliance with Ahab

4. Biblical History Confirmed by the Monuments

5. Alliance Broken off

6. Benhadad and Elisha

7. Panic of Syrians at Samaria

8. Murder of Benhadad

III. BENHADAD III

1. His Contemporaries

2. The Assyrians in the West

3. Downfall of Damascus before Ramman-Nirari III

4. Breathing Space for Israel

The Name:

The name of three kings of Syria mentioned in the historical books. Hadad is the Syrian god of storms, and is apparently identical with Rimmon (2Ki 5:18), the Assyrian Rammanu, "the Thunderer," whose temple was in Damascus. The name Benhadad, "son of Hadad," accords with the custom which obtained in Semitic mythology of calling a king or a nation the son of the national god, as we have Mesha‘, son of Chemosh, and the Moabites, children of Chemosh. Benhadad seems to have become a general designation for the kings of Syria (Am 1:4; Jer 49:27).

I. Benhadad I

1. The Kingdom of Syria Founded:

Benhadad I was the son of Tabrimmon, who is called (1Ki 15:18) "the son of Hezion, king of Syria, that

dwelt at Damascus." Hezion has been with some plausibility identified with Rezon (1Ki 11:23,25) who founded the kingdom of Damascus and imparted to Syria that temper of hostility to Israel which became hereditary. Meanwhile the Arameans had shaken themselves free from the rule of the Hittites, and with Damascus for a center had planted strong settlements in the plains westward from the Euphrates. By the time that Benhadad entered into this succession, Syria was the strongest power in this region of Western Asia, and ready to take advantage of every opportunity of increasing her dominions.

2. Syria and Judah:

Such an opportunity presented itself in the appeal of Asa, king of Judah, for help against Baasha king of Israel. The two Hebrew kingdoms had been at feud ever since their disruption. Baasha had pushed his frontier southward to Ramah, within 5 miles of Jerusalem, and this commanding eminence he proceeded to fortify. The danger of a hostile fortress overlooking his capital, and the humiliation of his rival's presence so near, were more than Asa could bear. It was at this juncture that he bethought him of Benhadad. Taking all the silver and the gold that were left in the treasury of the house of the Lord, and the treasury of the king's house, he sent them to Benhadad with a request for an alliance begging him at the same time to break off the league he had with Baasha and thus enable Asa to dislodge his enemy. Benhadad saw an opening for the aggrandizement of his kingdom and broke off the alliance he had had with Jeroboam and Baasha. By an invasion of Northern Israel he obliged Baasha to withdraw from Ramah and confine himself to the neighborhood of his own capital (1Ki 15:16 ff). Judah obtained relief, but the price paid for it was too great. Asa had surrendered his treasures, and very likely some of his independence.

3. Shortsightedness of Asa:

For his shortsightedness in laying himself under obligation to Benhadad and relying upon the help of Syria rather than upon the Lord his God, Asa was rebuked by the prophet Hanani (2Ch 16:1 ff). Benhadad had extended his territories by the transaction and seems to have exercised henceforward some sort of sovereignty over both the Hebrew kingdoms.

LITERATURE.

McCurdy HPM, I, 256; H. P. Smith, Old Testament History, 186.

II. Benhadad II

1. Hadad-'idri of the Monuments:

Benhadad II was in all probability the son of Benhadad I. He is the Hadad-ezer, or Hadad-'idri, of the monuments. He comes first upon the scene of the Biblical history invading the land of Israel with a large host, in which were 32 tributary kings, and horses and chariots. He had penetrated as far as Samaria, the newly built city of Omri, now the capital of his son Ahab. Benhadad and his Syrian host had laid siege

to Samaria and Ahab had been summoned to surrender. Ahab was disposed to come to terms, but the intolerable proposals made by Benhadad drove him to resistance. Encouraged by the elders of the people, and acting on the counsel of a prophet, Ahab made a sortie and falling upon the carousing Syrians put them so completely to rout that Benhadad himself only escaped on a horse with the horsemen.

2. Expeditions against Israel:

Next year the Syrians resolved to retrieve their defeat saying of the Israelites, "Their God is a god of the hills; therefore they were stronger than we: but let us fight against them in the plain, and surely we shall be stronger than they." Ahab had been warned to expect the return of the Syrians and was prepared for the fresh attack. For seven days the two armies faced each other, the Israelites "like two little flocks of kids" before a host that filled the country. On the seventh day they joined battle near to Aphek, and the Syrians met again an overwhelming defeat. Yahweh was proved to be God both of the plains and of the hills. Benhadad was taken prisoner, and appealing to the clemency of the victor, he persuaded Ahab to spare his life.

3. Alliance with Ahab:

A treaty was agreed upon between the two monarchs under which Ahab’s people were to have bazaars of their own in Damascus, as it would appear Benhadad I had had for his subjects before in Samaria (1Ki 20:1-34). The treaty was denounced by a prophet, and Ahab was warned that this man whom God had devoted to destruction would be the destruction of himself and his people. Under the treaty, however, there were three years without war between Syria and Israel.

4. Biblical History Confirmed by the Monuments:

The treaty and the resulting period of peace receive striking confirmation from the monuments. From the monolith inscription of Shalmaneser II we learn that this Assyrian king in the 6th year of his reign (854 BC) had crossed the Tigris and made his way across the Euphrates on boats of sheepskin into Syria to Chalman (Aleppo). At Karkar he encountered the combined forces of Damascus, Hamath, Israel and the states which had united to oppose his progress westward. Achabbu Sir-’lai, Ahab of Israel Damascus are Dad’idri Hadadezer (Benhadad II) of Damascus are named in the inscription with chariots, horsemen and infantry, making common cause against Shalmaneser and fighting on the same side. It was Benhadad, as we gather, that bore the brunt of the assault, but the result of the battle was the complete rout of the allies with the loss of 14,000 men. That the assistance of Israel on the occasion was the outcome of the treaty between Ahab and Benhadad, and that the combination against Shalmaneser took place dur ing the three years of peace, are in the highest degree probable.

5. Alliance Broken Off:

The disaster to the allies, however, seems to have broken up the confederacy. When the king of Syria is

next mentioned in Biblical history, it is defending the city of Ramoth-Gilead against the attack made upon it by Ahab, who is found now in alliance with Jehoshaphat, the king of Judah, attempting unsuccessfully and with fatal results to himself, to recover this city of Israel from the weakened power of Damascus. At Ramoth-Gilead Benhadad is not said to have 32 tributary kings in his train, but 32 military commanders who have taken their place (1Ki 22:2,29-31).

6. Benhadad and Elisha:

The peace between Israel and Syria having been broken, there was frequent, if not continuous, war between the kingdoms, in which the prophet Elisha is a prominent figure. He healed of his leprosy Naaman, Benhadad's commander-in-chief. He disclosed to the king of Israel the places wherever Benhadad pitched his camp. He smote with blindness a great host whom Benhadad had sent with horses and chariots to seize him at Dothan, and led them into Samaria where he saw them treated kindly and sent back to their master (2Ki 6:8-23).

7. Panic of Syrians at Samaria:

Some time after Benhadad again assembled all his host and laid siege to Samaria. So great was the famine that women ate their own children. The king of Israel sent one of his men to put Elisha to death, but Elisha closed his house against him and announced that on the morrow there would be great plenty in the city. And so it happened. Certain lepers, despairing of relief, had gone into the Syrian camp and learned that the Syrians had abandoned their camp in a panic, believing that the king of Israel had hired the kings of the Mucri and the northern Hittites to raise the siege (2Ki 6:24-7:20; compare Burney's note, 2Ki 7:6).

8. Murder of Benhadad:

Still another notice of Benhadad II is found in the Annals of Shalmaneser, who records that in the 11th year of his reign he defeated a combination of 12 kings of the Hittites with Benhadad at their head, and slew 10,000 men. Of this. there is no record in Biblical history, but it must have been shortly before the tragedy which ended the career of the Syrian king. Benhadad had fallen sick and sent his commander-in-chief, Hazael, to inquire as to the issue of his sickness of the prophet Elisha, who was visiting Damascus. Elisha foretold the king's death, and wept as he read to Hazael the cruel purpose which the Syrian commander was even then maturing. Hazael professed to be incredulous, but he departed from Elisha and the very next day in cold blood put his master to death and ascended the throne (2Ki 8:7-15). Thus ingloriously ended the reign of one of the most powerful of the Syrian kings.

LITERATURE.

McCurdy, HPM, I, 267 ff; Schrader, COT, I, 179 if; Winckler, Geschichte Israels, Theil I, 133-55.

III. Benhadad III

1. His Contemporaries:

Benhadad III was the son of the usurper Hazael, and though not in the dynastic succesion, assumed on the dent h of his father the dynastic name. He was contemporary with Amaziah, king of Judah; Jehoahaz, the son of Jehu, king of Israel; and Ramman-Nirari III, king of Assyria. The fortunes of Israel had fallen low in the days of Jehoahaz, and Hazael and Benhadad III were the instruments of Yahweh's displeasure with the nation. At this time Jehoahaz had no more than 53 horsemen and 10 chariots and 10,000 footmen; for the king of Syria had destroyed them and made them like the dust in threshing (2Ki 13:7). It was when the fortunes of Israel were at the lowest ebb by reason of the oppression of the king of Syria—by this time Benhadad—that help came to them and Yahweh gave Israel a savior, so that Israel went out from under the hands of the Syrians, "and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents (in their homes) as beforetime" (2Ki 13:5).

2. The Assyrians in the West:

The "saviour" of the Biblical narrative is the one allusion in Scripture to the king of Assyria of that day, Ramman-Nirari III, whose inscriptions record his victorious expedition to the West. "From the Euphrates to the land of the Hittites," runs an inscription, "the west country in its entire compass, Tyre, Zidon, the land Omri, Edom, Philistia as far as the Great Sea of the sunsetting, I subjected to my yoke; payment of tribute I imposed upon them. Against Syria of Damascus I marched; Mari, the king of Syria, in Damascus his royal city I besieged." He then proceeds to tell of the subjugation of the monarch and of the spoils obtained from his capital. That Mari which means in Aramaic "lord," is Benhadad III, the son of Hazael, is now generally believed.

3. Downfall of Damascus before Ramman-Nirari III:

With the capture of Damascus and the collapse of the Syrian power under Marl (Benhadad III), an era of recuperation and prosperity became possible to Israel and Judah. So it came to pass that "Jehoash the son of Jehoahaz took again out of the hand of Benhadad the son of Hazael the cities which he had taken out of the hand of Jehoahaz by war. Three times did Joash smite him, and recovered the cities of Israel" (2Ki 13:25). 4. Breathing Space for Israel:

Israel was able to breathe freely for a time and Jeroboam II restored the Northern Kingdom to its former extent and glory. But the flame of war which had been sent into the house of Hazael and which devoured the palaces of Benhadad (Am 1:4 ff) was only waiting the time when the Assyrians would be free to renew their expeditions to the West and carry Samaria and Israel "into captivity beyond Damascus" (Am 5:27).

LITERATURE.

McCurdy, HPM, I, 291 ff; Schrader, COT, I, 202-ff.

T. Nicol.

BENINU

be-ni’-nu (beninu, "our son"): A Levite who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant (Ne 10:13).

BENJAMIN

ben’-ja-min (binyamin, or binyamin; Beniaein, Beniamin):

1. The Patriarch:

The youngest of Jacob’s sons. His mother Rachel died in giving him birth. As she felt death approaching she called him Benoni, "son of my sorrow." Fearing, probably, that this might bode evil for the child—for names have always preserved a peculiar significance in the East—Jacob called him Benjamin, "son of the fight hand" (Ge 35:17 ff). He alone of Jacob’s sons was born in Palestine, between Bethel and Ephrath. Later in the chapter, in the general enumeration of the children born in Paddan-ar am, the writer fails to except Benjamin (Ge 35:24). Joseph was his full brother. In the history where Benjamin appears as an object of solicitude to his father and brothers, we must not forget that he was already a grown man. At the time of the descent of Israel to Egypt Joseph was about 40 years of age. Benjamin was not much younger, and was himself the father of a family. The phrase in Ge 44:20, "a little one," only describes in oriental fashion one much younger than the speaker. And as the youngest of the family no doubt he was made much of. Remorse over their heartless treatment of his brother Joseph may have made the other brothers especially tender toward Benjamin. The conduct of his brethren all through the trying experiences in Egypt places them in a more attractive light than we should have expected; and it must have been a gratification to their father (Ge 42 ff). Ten sons of Benjamin are named at the time of their settlement in Egypt (Ge 46:21).

2. The Tribe:

At the Exodus the number of men of war in the tribe is given as 35,400. At the second census it is 45,600 (Nu 1:37; 26:41). Their place in the host was with the standard of the camp of Ephraim on the west of the tabernacle, their prince being Abidan the son of Gideoni (Nu 2:22 f). Benjamin was represented among the spies by Palti the son of Raphu; and at the division of the land the prince of Benjamin was Elidad the son of Chislon (Nu 13:9; 34:21).

3. Territory:\

The boundaries of the lot that fell to Benjamin are pretty clearly indicated (Jos 18:11 ff). It lay between Ephraim on the North and Judah on the South. The northern frontier started from the Jordan over against Jericho, and ran to the north of that town up through the mountain westward past Bethaven, taking in

Bethel. It then went down by Ataroth-addar to Beth- horon the nether. From this point the western frontier ran southward to Kiriath-jearim. The southern boundary ran from Kiriath-jearim eas tward to the fountain of the waters of Netophah, swept round by the south of Jerrus and passed down through the wilderness northern by shore of the Dead Sea at the mouth of the Jordan. The river formed the eastern boundary. The lot was comparatively small. This, according to Josephus, was owing to "the goodness of the land" (Ant., V, i, 22); a description that would apply mainly to the plans of Jericho. The uplands are stony, mountainous, and poor in water; but there is much good land on the western slopes.

4. Importance of Position:

It will be seen from the above that Benjamin held the main avenues of approach to the highlands from both East and West: that by which Joshua led Israel past Ai from Gilgal, and the longer and easier ascents from the West, notably that along which the tides of battle so often rolled, the Valley of Aijalon, by way of the Beth-horons. Benjamin also sat astride the great highway connecting North and South, which ran along the ridge of the western range, in the district where it was easiest of defense. It was a position calling for occupation by a brave and warlike tribe such as Benjamin proved to be. His warriors were skillful archers and slingers, and they seem to have cultivated the use of both hands, which gave them a great advantage in battle (Jud 20:16; 1Ch 8:40; 12:2, etc.). These characteristics are reflected in the Blessing of Jacob (Ge 49:27). The second deliverer of Israel in the period of the Judges was Ehud, the left-handed Benjamite (Jud 3:15).

5. History:

The Benjamites fought against Sisera under Deborah and Barak (Jud 5:14). The story told in Jud 20:21 presents many difficulties which cannot be discussed here. It is valuable as preserving certain features of life in these lawless times when there was no details in Israel. Whatever may be said of the details, it certainly reflects the memory of some atrocity in which the Benjamites were involved and for which they suffered terrible punishment. The election of Saul as first king over united Israel naturally lent a certain prestige to the tribe. After the death of Saul they formed the backbone of Ish- bosheth’s party, and most unwillingly conceded precedence to Judah in the person of David (2Sa 2:15,25; 3:17 ff). It was a Benjamite who heaped curses upon David in the hour of his deep humiliation (2Sa 16:5); and the jealousy of Benjamin led to the revolt on David’s return, which was so effectually stamped out by Joab (2Sa 19 f). Part of the tribe, probably the larger part, went against Judah at the disruption of the kingdom, taking Bethel with them. 1Ki 12:20 says that none followed the house of David but the house of Judah only. But the next verse tells us that Rehoboam gathered the men of Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam. It seems probable that as Jerusalem had now become the royal city of the house of David, the adjoining parts of Benjamin proved loyal, while the more distant joined the Northern Kingdom. After the downfall of Samaria Judah assumed control of practically the whole territory of Benjamin (2Ki 23:15,19, etc.). Nehemiah gives the Valley of Hinnom as the south boundary of Benjamin in his time (Ne 11:30), while westward it extended to include Lod and Ono. Saul of Tarsus was a member of this tribe (Php 3:5).

(4) A great-grandson of Benjamin, son of Jacob (1Ch 7:10).

(5) One of those who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:32, and probably also Ne 3:23; 12:34).

W. Ewing

BENJAMIN, GATE OF

See JERUSALEM.

BENJAMITE

ben’-ja-mit: One belonging to the tribe of Benjamin, such as Ehud (Jud 3:15), Saul (1Sa 9:1,2), Sheba (2Sa 20:1), Shimei (1Ki 2:8), etc.

BENO

be’-no (beno, "his son"): The son of Jaaziah of the house of Levi (1Ch 24:26,27).

BEON

be’-on (Nu 32:3).

See BAAL-MEON.

BEOR

be’-or (be‘or, "destroyer"(?)):

(1) Father of Bela, the first king of Edom (Ge 36:32; 1Ch 1:43).

(2) The father of the seer Balaam (Nu 22:5; 24:3,15; 31:8; De 23:4; Jos 13:22; 24:9, omitted in Septuagint; Mic 6:5; 2Pe 2:15, the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin "Bosor").

BERA

be’-ra (bera‘, "gift"(?); compare HPN, 74 note): King of Sodom (Ge 14:2) who in the battle of Siddim was subdued by Chedorlaomer.

BERACAH

be-ra’-ka (berakhah, "blessing," the King James Version Berachah): A Benjamite who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3).

BERACAH, VALLEY OF

be-ra’-ka, ber’-a-ka (the King James Version Berachah; ‘emeq berkhah; koilas eulogias): After the victory of Jehoshaphat and his people over Moab and Ammon, "On the fourth day they assembled themselves in the valley of Beracah; for there they blessed Yahweh: therefore the name of that place was called The valley of Beracah (i.e. of blessing) unto this day" (2Ch 20:26). In the Wady ‘Arrub there is a ruin called Breikut and the valley in its proximity receives the same name. This is on the main road from Hebron to Jerusalem and not far from Tekoa; it suits the narrative well (see PEF, III, 352).

E. W. G. Masterman

BERACHIAH

ber-a-ki’-a.

See BERECHIAH.

BERAIAH

be-ri’-a (bera’yah, "Yah hath created"): A son of Shimei of the house of Benjamin (1Ch 8:21).

BEREA

be-re’-a.

See BEROEA.

BEREAVE; BEREAVER; BEREFT

be-rev’, be-rev’-er, be-reft’:Bereave is frequently used in the Old Testament in the (now almost obsolete) meaning of "to deprive," "to take away," especially with reference to loss of children. The Hebrew word used here is shakhol, "to be childless," or in the Piel "to make childless" (compare Ge 42:36 et al.). In the King James Version Ec 4:8 (from the Hebrew chacer, "to lack") we read "and bereave my soul of good" (the Revised Version (British and American) "deprive"), and in Eze 36:14 (from Hebrew kashal, "to stumble"), "neither bereave thy nations any more" (the Revised Version, margin "cause to stumble").

Bereaver, otherwise very rare, is found the Revised Version (British and American) Eze 36:13 (from Hebrew shakhol "to be childless"), "a bereaver of thy nation" (the King James Version "hast bereaved").

Bereft is found in 1Ti 6:5 (from the Greek apostereo, "to rob") "bereft of the truth" (the King James Version "destitute"). The expression bereavement (the Revised Version (British and American) Isa 49:20) in the phrase "the children of thy bereft" means "the children born to thee in the time when God had afflicted thee."

A. L. Breslich

BERECHIAH

ber-e-ki’-a (berekhyah, berekhyahu, "Yahweh blesses," HPN, 216, 287):

(1) A descendant of David (1Ch 3:20).

(2) The father of Asaph, the singer (1Ch 6:39 the King James Version "Berachiah"; 1Ch 15:17).

(3) A former inhabitant of Jerusalem, a Levee (1Ch 9:16).

(4) A doorkeeper ‘for the ark at David’s time (1Ch 15:23).

(5) One of the heads of the children of Ephraim (2Ch 28:12).

(6) The father of Meshullam the builder (Ne 3:4,30; 6:18).

(7) The father of the prophet Zechariah (Zec 11:7).

A. L. Breslich

BERED (1)

be’-red (beredh, "hail," from a Hebrew root meaning "to be cold"): The son of Shuthelah of the house of Ephraim (1Ch 7:20). Compare BECHER.

BERED (2)

be’-red (beredh; Barad): A place in the Negeb mentioned in the story of Hagar (Ge 16:14). The well Beer-lahai-roi was "between Kadesh and Bered." The Onkelos Targum renders it Chaghra’, which is the usual equivalent of Shur, while the Jerusalem Targum renders it Chalutsah, which is also Shur (Ex

15:22). Chalutsah is clearly the city of Elusu mentioned by Ptolemy and from the 4th to the 7th centuries by various ecclesiastical writers. It was an important town on the road from Palestine to Kadesh and Mount Sinai. This is without doubt the very large and important ruin Kh. Khalasa, some 70 miles South of Jerusalem on the road from Beersheba and Rehoboth. "These ruins cover an area of 15 to 20 acres, throughout which the foundations and enclosures of houses are distinctly to be traced. .... We judged that here there must have been a city with room enough for a population of 15,000 to 20,000 souls" (Robinson, BR, I, 201).

E. W. G. Masterman

BERENICE

ber’-e-nes.

See BERNICE.

BERI

be’-ri (beri, "wisdom"): A descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:36).

BERIAH; BERIITES

be-ri’-a, be-ri’-its (beri‘ah, "in shouting," probably derived from a Hebrew root meaning "to make noise," or "in evil," from another Hebrew root):

(1) A son of Asher and father of Heber and Malchiel (Ge 46:17; 1Ch 7:30,31; the head of the family of the Beriites, Nu 26:44 ff).

(2) A son of Ephraim, called Beriah by his father because "it went evil with his house" (1Ch 7:23).

(3) A descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 8:13,16).

(4) A Levite in the line of Gershon (1Ch 23:10 f).

BERITES

be’-rits (berim; according to Klostermann and others, bikhrim): The word is found only once in the Old Testament (2Sa 20:14). The passage seems to be doubtful. The suggestion of Klostermann does not improve matters any; the other proposed reading, bachrim (Vulgate, viri electi), "choice young men," is to be preferred.

BERITH

be’-rith (berith, "covenant").

See BAAL-BERITH.

BERNICE ber-ni’-se (Bernike "victorious"): One of the shameless women of the Bible, mentioned in Ac 25:13,23; 26:30. She was the eldest daughter of Herod Agrippa I (Ac 12:1,6,11,21) who ruled from 38-45 AD. Her whole life from the Jewish standpoint was incestuous. Its story is told by Josephus (Ant XIX, v, 1; XX, vii, 1-3), also by Juvenal (6, 156). Her first husband was her own uncle, Herod of Calchis. After his death she consorted with her own brother Agrippa II, with whom she listened to the impassioned defense of Paul at Caesarea before Felix. For a while she was married to King Ptolemy or Polemo of Sicily, who for her sake embraced Judaism, by the rite of circumcision. But she left him soon to return to Agrippa. Later on she figures shamefully in the lives of Vespasian and Titus, father and son. If heredity stands for anything, its lessons are forcibly taught in the history of the Herodian family.

Henry E. Dosker

BERODACH-BALADAN

be-ro’-dak-bal’-a-dan.

See MERODACH-BALADAN.

BEROEA

be-re’-a (Beroia or Berroia):

(1) A town of southwestern Macedonia, in the district of Emathia. It lay at the foot of Mt. Bermius, on a tributary of the Haliacmon, and seems to have been an ancient town, though the date of its foundation is uncertain. A passage in Thucydides (i.61) relating to the year 432 BC probably refers to another place of the same name, but an inscription (Inscr Graec, II, 5, 296i) proves its existence at the end of the 4th century BC, and it is twice mentioned by Polybius (xxvii.8; xxviii.8). After the battle of Pydba in 168 BC Berea was the first city to surrender to Rome and fell in the third of the four regions into which Macedonia was divided (Livy xliv.45; xlv.29). Paul and Silas came to Berea from Thessalonica which they had been forced by an uproar to leave, and preached in the synagogue to the Jews, many of whom believed after a candid examination of the apostolic message in the light of their Scriptures (Ac 17:10,11). A number of "Gr women of honorable estate and of men" also believed, but the advent of a body of hostile Jews from Thessalonica created a disturbance in consequence of which Paul had to leave the city, though Silas and Timothy stayed there for a few days longer (Ac 17:12-15). Perhaps the Sopater of Berea who accompanied Paul to Asia on his last journey to Jerusalem was one of his converts on this

visit (Ac 20:4). Berea, which was one of the most populous cities of Macedonia early became a bishopric under the metropolitan of Thessalonica and was itself made a metropolis by Andronicus II (1283-1328): there is a tradition that the first bishop of the church was Onesimus. It played a prominent part in the struggles between the Greeks and the Bulgarians and Serbs, and was finally conquered by the Turks in 1373-74. The town, which still bears among the Greeks its ancient name (pronounced Verria) though called by the Turks Karaferia, possesses but few remains of antiquity with the exception of numerous inscriptions (Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, III, 290 if; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Macedoine, I, 57 ff; Dimitsas, Makedonia in Greek, 57 ff).

Marcus N. Tod

(2) The place where Menelaus the ex-high priest was executed by order of Antiochus Eupator, the victim, according to local custom, being cast from a tower 50 cubits high into a bed of ashes (2 Macc 13:3 ff). It was the ancient city of Chalab, lying about midway between Antioch and Hierapolis. Seleucus Nicator gave it the name Berea. It was a city of importance under the Moslems in the Middle Ages, when the old name again asserted itself, and remains to the present time.

The name "Aleppo" came to us through the Venetian traders in the days before the great overland route to India via Aleppo lost its importance through the discovery of the passage round the Cape. Aleppo is now a city of nearly 130,000 inhabitants. The governor exercises authority over a wide district extending from the Euphrates to the Mediterranean.

(3) (Berea); A place mentioned in 1 Macc 9:4. It may be identical with BEEROTH (which see) in Benjamin, a Hivite town, 8 miles North of Jerusalem, or with the modern Birez-Zait, 1 1/2 miles Northwest of Jifneh.

W. Ewing

BEROTH

be’-roth (1 Esdras 5:19). See BEEROTH.

BEROTHAH

be-ro’-tha (Eze 47:16: berothah; Septuagint Codex Vaticanus, Abthera; or BEROTHAH 2Sa 8:8; berothai, where for mibberothai Septuagint reads ek ton eklekton poleon, "from the select cities"): Probably two forms of the same name. Eze 47:16 places it on the ideal northern frontier of Israel, between Damascus and Hamath. According to 2Sa 8:8 it was a city of Hadadezer, king of Zobah. In the parallel passage (1Ch 18:8) Cun is given in place of Berothai. Its site is unknown. Ewald connected it with Beirut (so also apparently H. P. Smith, ICC, "Samuel," 307), but Ezekiel’s description excludes this view. Others have sought it in the Wady Brissa, in the East slope of Lebanon, North of Baalbec. A more plausible conjecture identifies it with Bereitan (Brithen), a village somewhat South of Baalbec

(Baedeker, Pal3, 369). Possibly, however, the ideal northern frontier line should be drawn farther south. See HETHLON; ZEDAD; ZOBAH.

C. H. Thomson

BEROTHITE

be’-roth-it.

See BEEROTHITE.

BERRIES

ber’-is: Occurs in Jas 3:12 (the King James Version) in the phrase "olive berries" (elaiai). The Revised Version (British and American) reads simply "olives."

BERYL

ber’-il.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

BERYTUS

ber’-i-tus, be-ri’-tus (Berutos; Arabic: modern Beirut, Beyrout, Beyrouth): An ancient Phoenician city situated on the North side of a promontory jutting out from the base of Lebanon to the West into the Mediterranean and forming a bay on the North connected with the fable of George and the Dragon, and hence called George’s Bay. The city is about 25 miles North of Sidon and about 12 South of the famous Lycus or Dog River, at the mouth of which are found the sculptured rocks bearing the monuments of the ancient kings of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria.

The city has been thought by some to be the Berothai of 2Sa 8:8 or the Berothah of Eze 47:16, but the connection in which these cities are mentioned seems to preclude the identification. The town is, however, an ancient one, for it occurs in Tell el-Amarna Letters as Beruti where it is closely connected with Gebal of which it may have been a dependency.

Though not mentioned in Old Testament or New Testament it appears in the history of Herod the Great as an important town where was assembled a court of 150 judges, presided over by Saturninus, a former Roman consul, to try the case which Herod brought against his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, who were condemned there by the Roman court (Ant., XVI, xi, 2). Beirut was a Roman colony at this time where many veterans settled and it afterward became the seat of a great Roman law school which

was attended, in the days of Justinian, by thousands of students. It was utterly destroyed by an earthquake in 551 AD, and for a time was abandoned. Many remains of temples and public buildings of the Roman period remain. It rose to some importance during the Crusades and is at present the chief seaport of Syria, and has the only harbor on the coast. It is a town of about 125,000 inhabitants.

H. Porter

BERZELUS

ber-ze’-lus.

See ZORZELLEUS.

BESAI

be’-si (becay, "downtrodden"): The descendants of Besai (Nethinim) returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:49; Ne 7:52 = Basthai, 1 Esdras 5:31).

BESET

be-set’ (euperistatos): The most common sense of this word is "to surround." This is the thought in Ps 139:5, and teaches the omnipresence of God. Often wicked men find that the things which they have done so envelope them that they cannot escape ruin (Ho 7:2). The reference in Heb 12:1 is first of all against the sin of apostasy against which repeated warning is given in this book. But the warning is also against any sin that is especially dangerous to us. It, again and again, surrounds us like a besieging army. To surrender would be traitorous and disgraceful, since the Captain of the Lord’s host is with us.

Jacob W. Kapp

BESIDE

be-sid’:Near to, or close to (Ps 23:2). It is often used to refer to the mental state, to the derangement of the mind (existemi, Mr 3:21; Ac 26:24 the King James Version). Or it may refer to the condition of being out of the ordinary course of the life. A life consecrated to God and spent in the interest of humanity is so designated (2Co 5:13). It has the sense also of a state of being out of one’s usual mind, but not of mental derangement, occasioned by something that causes amazement or ast onishment (Mr 5:42). Or it may refer to a state in which one is not conscious of present conditions, but is rapt in vision (Ac 10:10).

Besides is used in the sense of in addition to or that which is over and above what has been said or is possessed (Lu 16:26; see the American Revised Version, margin "in"; Philemon 1:19).

Jacob W. Kapp

BESIEGE

be-sej’.

See SIEGE.

BESODEIAH

bes-o-de’-ya, bes-o-di’-a (becodheyah, "in the confidence or counsel of Yah"; compare Jer 23:18,22; and HPN, 207, 221, 286): Father of Meshullam, the builder (Ne 3:6).

BESOM

be’-zum: Occurs only once in Scripture: "I will sweep it with the besom of destruction" (Isa 14:23). Refers to what was in store for Babylon. The Hebrew word maT’ate’, rendered "besom," is close of kin to the one (ti’te’thiha) rendered "sweep." In early English "besom" was synonymous with "broom," and is still so used in some parts of England.

BESOR, THE BROOK

be’-sor, (nachal besor; Codex Alexandrinus, Bechor, Codex Vaticanus, Beana; 1Sa 30:9,20,21; Josephus, Ant, VI, xiv, 6): A torrent-bed (nachal) mentioned in the account of David’s pursuit of the Amalekites. Thought to be Wady Ghazza, which enters the sea Southwest of Gaza.

BEST

Of five Hebrew originals the chief is Tobh, "good," expressing quality, character. Variously used of objects pleasing to the senses, feelings, mind, moral sense, e.g. "best of the land" (Ge 47:6); "of sheep" (1Sa 15:9); of persons "married to whom they think best" (Nu 36:6); of abode, "where it liketh (the Revised Version (British and American) "pleaseth") him best" (De 23:16).

In Nu 18:12 the revenues of the priests were to be "holy gifts," e.g. the "best of the oil," etc. (chelebh, "fat"); also 18:29,30,32, the gifts of the heave-offering were to be "of all the best," indicating that the richest elements of life were to go into the support and service of the sanctuary. So "the choice (best) fruits" (zimrah, literally, "the song of the land"), a beautifully poetic expression for the most celebrated fruits (Ge 43:11); equally choice is pazaz, "separate," "the finest (best) gold," hence "purified" (1Ki 10:18).

Used but twice in the New Testament:

(1) of spiritual gifts ((kreitton, "better" the Revised Version (British and American) "greater"); 1Co 12:31);

(2) of raiment (protos, "first"), "best robe" (Lu 15:22), of special significance as expressing the Father’s lavish love for the repentant and returning sinner.

Dwight M. Pratt

BESTEAD

be-sted’ (niqsheh, "caught in a snare," "entrapped"; as Judah hard pressed in their own land by the Assyrians (Isa 8:21 the King James Version)): Found only here. Old English word steden meaning "place," hence, "set," "beset"; usually with "ill," "sorely bested." In the Revised Version (British and American) rendered "sore distressed."

BESTIALITY

bes-ti-al’-i-ti.

See CRIMES.

BESTOW

be-sto’:The seven Hebrew words rendered by this term variously mean "to put" or "place," "to give"; "do," "deposit," as e.g. to locate chariots and horsemen in cities (1Ki 10:26); or give a blessing (Ex 32:29). Four Greek words so translated signify "to give," "to labor," "to feed," "to place around"; as sunago, "to stow away goods" (Lu 12:17); or psomizo, "give away" (1Co 13:3). The term has richest significance in expressing God’s abundant gift of grace and love, didomi (2Co 8:1 the King James Version; 1Jo 3:1).

BETAH

be’-ta (2Sa 8:8).

See TIBHATH.

BETANE

bet’-a-ne (Baitane): A place named in Judith 1:9, among those to which the messengers of Nebuchadnezzar were sent. From the order in which they are named we should seek for it South of Jerusalem. It may be identical with Beit ‘Ainun, about 3 miles North of Hebron.

BETEN

be’-ten (beTen; Batne): A city of Asher mentioned between Hall and Achshaph (Jos 19:25). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 8 Roman miles East of Ptolemais, giving it the name Bethseten. It may be identical with the modern village el-B‘aneh, but no certainty is possible.

BETH (1)

bath (b): The second letter of the Hebrew alphabet. With the daghesh it is transliterated in this dictionary as "b," and, without the daghesth, as "bh" (=" v"). It came also to be used for the number two (2) and with the dieresis for 2,000. For name, etc., see ALPHABET; BAYITH.

BETH (2)

beth (in proper names; Greek transliteration in Septuagint, beth, baith, or beth): This is the English transliteration for the Hebrew beth, meaning "house," "tent," "place." It occurs in many compound proper names formed similarly to the method of compounding words in the German language, as shown in the articles immediately following. Thus we have beth ‘anath or ‘anoth =" house of replies" (Jos 19:38; Jud 1:33); beth’el =" house of God" (Ge 12:8; 13:3), etc. We also find the word in hybrid formations, e.g. Bethphage = Bethphage =" fig house" (Mt 21:1).

Frank E. Hirsch

BETH-ANATH

beth-a’-nath (beth‘anath; Bainathath): A city in the territory of Naphtali, named with Horem and Bethshemesh (Jos 19:38; Jud 1:33). It is represented by the modern village Ainatha, about 12 miles Northwest of Cafed. The name signifies the "house" or "temple" of Anath, a goddess of the Canaanites.

BETH-ANOTH

beth-a’-noth (beth‘anoth; Baithanam, probably "House of Anath"—a god; Jos 15:59): The ruin of Beit ‘Ainun, 1 1/2 miles Southeast of Halhul, in the neighborhood also of Bethzur and Gedor—places mentioned in association with it as towns in the hill country of Judah—appears to be a probable site. The present surface ruins belong to later ages.

BETH-ARABAH

beth-ar’-a-ba (beth ha-‘arabhah; Baitharaba, "place of the Arabah"):

(1) One of the 6 cities of Judah "in the wilderness" (Jos 15:61), on the borders of Benjamin and Judah (Jos 15:6; 18:18 Septuagint). "The wilderness of Judah" is the barren land West of the Dead Sea. Beth-arabah is not yet identified.

(2) One of the cities of Benjamin (Jos 18:22). Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus) reads Baithabara, and this may be correct. The names are early confounded.

See BETHABARA.

BETH-ARBEL

beth-ar’-bel (beth ‘arbe’l): The scene of a terrific disaster inflicted on the inhabitants by Shalman (Ho 10:14). If the place intended was in Palestine, and was not the famous city of that name on the Euphrates, then probably it should be identified either with Irbid (or Irbil) in Galilee, or with Irbid, which corresponds to Arbela of the Eusebius, Onomasticon, East of the Jordan, about 12 miles Southeast of Gadara. If, as Schrader thinks (COT, II, 140), Shalman stands for the Moabite king, Shalamanu, a tributary of Tiglath-pileser, the eastern town would be the more natural identification. Possibly however the reference is to Shalmaneser III or IV. For the Galilean site, see ARBELA; see also DB, under the word

W. Ewing

BETH-AVEN

beth-a’-ven (beth ‘awen; Baithon, Baithaun): A place on the northern boundary of the territory of Benjamin (Jos 18:12) East of Bethel, near Ai (Jos 7:2), West of Michmash (1Sa 13:5; 14:23). Beth-aven, "house of vanity," i.e. "idolatry," may possibly represent an original beth-’on, "house of wealth." Wilson (PEFS, 1869, 126) suggests Khirbet An, West of Michmash. The name is used in mockery for Bethel by Hosea (4:15; 10:5,8, etc.; compare Am 5:5).

BETH-AZMAVETH

beth-az-ma’-veth (Ne 7:28).

See AZMAVETH.

BETH-BAAL-MEON

beth-ba-al-me’-on (Jos 13:17).

See BAAL-MEON.

BETH-BARAH

beth-ba’-ra (beth barah; Baithera): Perhaps Beth-‘abharu, the guttural being lost in copying. It is a ford which the Midianites were expected to pass in fleeing from Gideon. Messengers were therefore sent by Gideon to the Ephraimites bidding them "take before them the waters, as far as Beth-barah, even (the Revised Version, margin "and also") the Jordan" (Jud 7:24). "The waters" were the streams emptying themselves into the Jordan: "even the Jordan" is a gloss on "the waters." Between the Jordan and the modern Wady Fari‘ah an enemy could be entrapped; it is therefore probable that Beth-barah was on that stream near its entrance into the Jordan.

See BETHABARA.

S. F. Hunter

BETH-BIRI

beth-bir’-i (the King James Version Beth-birei, beth-bir’-e-i) beth bir’i; oikos Braoumseoreim; 1Ch 4:31 (called in Jos 19:6, Beth-lebaoth, "abode of lions"): A site belonging to Simeon in the Negeb—unidentified.

BETH-CAR

beth’-kar (beth-kar; Baithchor, Belchor): "And the men of Israel went out of Mizpah, and pursued the Philistines, and smote them, Until they came under Beth-car" (1Sa 7:11). ‘Ain Karem has been suggested; if Mizpah is nebi Samwil then this identification is probable, as the pursuit would be along the deep Wady beit Hannineh—a natural line of retreat for the Philistines to take.

See BETH-HACCHEREM.

BETH-DAGON

beth-da’-gon (bethdaghon; Bethdagon):

(1) A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Gederoth, Naamah, and Makkedah (Jos 15:41). It may be represented by the modern Beit Dijan, about 6 miles Southeast of Jaffa. This however is a modern site, and not in the Shephelah. Nearly 2 miles to the south is Khirbet Dajan, a Roman site. The connection in which it occurs leads us to expect a position farther Southeast

(2) A city on the border of Asher (Jos 19:27) which Conder would identify with Tell D'auk, near the mouth of the Belus, in the plan of Acre.

The name seems to have been of frequent occurrence. There is a Beit Dejan about 6 miles East of Nablus, and Josephus speaks of a fortress called Dagon above Jericho (Ant., XII, viii, 1; BJ, I, ii, 3). This would seem to indicate a widespread worship of Dagon. But the name may mean "house of corn."

W. Ewing

BETH-DIBLATHAIM

beth-dib-la-tha'-im (beth dibhlathayim; oikos Deblaithaim, literally, "house of Diblathaim"): A town in Moab mentioned with Dibon and Nebo (Jer 48:22). It is probably identical with Almondiblathaim (Nu 33:46 f). Mesha claims to have fortified it along with Mehedeba and Ba'al-me'on (see MOABITE STONE). The place is not yet identified.

BETH-EDEN

beth-e'-den (Am 1:5 King James Version, margin; English Versions of the Bible "house of Eden").

See CHILDREN OF EDEN.

BETH-EMEK

beth-e'-mek (beth ha-'emeq; Bethaemek, "house of the valley"): A town in the territory of Zebulun (Jos 19:27). It has not been identified, but must be sought somewhere East of Acre, not far from Kabul, the ancient Cabul.

BETH-EZEL

beth-e'-zel (beth ha-'etsel; oikos echomenous autes; literally, "adjoining house"): A place named along with other cities in the Philistine plain (Mic 1:11). The site has not been identified. By some it is thought to be the same as Azel of Zec 14:5; but see AZEL.

BETH-GADER

beth-ga'-der (bethgadher; Baithgedor, or (Codex Vaticanus) Baithgaidon): The name occurs between those of Bethlehem and Kiriath-jearim in 1Ch 2:51. It is possibly identical with Geder of Jos 12:13.

BETH-GAMUL

beth-ga’-mul (beth gamul; oikos Gaimol; Codex Sinaiticus, Gamola): A city in Moab named with Dibon, Kiriathaim and Beth-meon (Jer 48:23). Conder places it at Umm el-Jamal, toward East of the plateau, S. of Medeba (HDB, under the word). Others (Guthe, Kurz. bib. Worterbuch, under the word; Buhl, GAP, 268, etc.) favor Jemeil, a site 6 miles East of Dhiban. Since the town is not mentioned among the cities of Israel Buhl doubts if it should be sought North of the Arnon.

BETH-GILGAL

beth-gil’-gal (beth ha-gilgal; Bethaggalgal; the King James Version house of Gilgal): The Gilgal which lay in the plain East of Jericho (Ne 12:29).

See GILGAL.

BETH-HACCHEREM

beth-ha-ke’-rem, beth-hak’-e-rem (the King James Version Beth-haccerem; beth ha-kerem; Bethachcharma (see DB), "place of the vineyard"): A district (in Ne 3:14) ruled over by one, Malchijah; mentioned in Jer 6:1 as a suitable signal station. From its association with Tekoa (Jer 6:1) and from the statement by Jerome that it was a village which he could see daily from Bethlehem, the Frank mountain (Herodium) has been suggested. It certainly would be a unique place for a beacon. More suitable is the fertile vineyard country around ‘Ain Karem (the "spring of the vineyard"). On the top of Jebel ‘Ali, above this village, are some remarkable cairns which, whatever their other uses, would appear to have been once beacons. ‘Ain Karem appears as Carem in the Septuagint (Jos 15:59).

See BETH-CAR.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-HAGGAN

beth-hag’-an (beth-ha-gan, "house of the garden"). The place where Ahaziah was slain by Jehu (2Ki 9:27). The words are rendered in English Versions of the Bible "the garden house," but some take them to be a proper name. The location is doubtful.

BETH-HANAN; ELON-BETH-HANAN

beth-ha’-nan (1Ki 4:9).

See ELON.

BETH-HARAM

beth-ha’-ram (beth haram; Baitharan; Codex Alexandrinus, Baitharra; the King James Version wrongly, Beth-Aram): An Amorite city taken and fortified by the Gadites (Jos 13:27; Nu 32:36; in the latter passage the name appears as Beth-haran, probably the original form). It corresponds to Bethramphtha of Josephus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1), which, according to Eusebius, was the name used by the Syrians. Here was a palace of Herod (Ant., XVII, x, 6; BJ, II, iv, 2). Eusebius, Onomasticon says it was called Livias. Josephus says it was fortified by Herod Antipas, who called it Julias for the wife of Augustus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1). The name would be changed to Julias when Livia, by the will of the emperor, was received into the Gens Julia. It is represented by Tell er-Rameh in Wady Chesban, about 6 miles East of Jordan.

W. Ewing

BETH-HARAN

beth-ha’-ran (beth haran): A fenced city East of the Jordan (Nu 32:36) identical with BETH-HARAM, which see.

BETH-HOGLAH

beth-hog’-la (beth-choghlah; Septuagint Baithaglaam, "house of partridge"): Mentioned in Jos 15:6; 18:19, identified with Ain Haijab ("partridge spring") lying between Jericho and the Jordan, where in 1874 there was still a ruined Greek monastery called Kasr Hajlah, dating from the 12th century. The ruins are now destroyed. In Jos 15:5; 18:19 it is said to be at the mouth of the Jordan on a Tongue (Lisan) of the Salt Sea. But it is now several miles inland, probably because the Jordan has silt edition up a delta to that extent.

See DEAD SEA.

George Frederick Wright

BETH-HORON

beth-ho’-ron (beth-choron (other Hebrew forms occur); Bethoron, probably the "place of the hollow"; compare Hauran, "the hollow"):

1. The Ancient Towns:

The name of two towns, Beth-horon the Upper (Jos 16:5) and Beth-horon the Lower (Jos 16:3), said to

have been built (1Ch 7:24) by Sheerah, the daughter of Beriah. The border line between Benjamin and Ephraim passed by the Beth- horons (Jos 16:5; 21:22), the cities belonging to the latter tribe and therefore, later on, to the Northern Kingdom. Solomon "built Beth-horon the upper, and Beth-horon the nether, fortified cities, with walls, gates, and bars" (2Ch 8:5; 1Ki 9:17).

From Egyptian sources (Muller, As. und Europa, etc.) it appears that Beth-horon was one of the places conquered by Shishak of Egypt from Rehoboam. Again, many centuries later, Bacchides repaired Beth-horon, "with high walls, with gates and with bars and in them he set a garrison, that they might work malice upon ("vex") Israel" (1 Macc 9:50,51), and at another time the Jews fortified it against Holofernes (Judith 4:4,5).

2. The Modern Beit Ur el foqa and el tachta:

These two towns are now known as Beit Ur el foqa (i.e. "the upper") and Beit Ur el tachta (i.e. "the lower"), two villages crowning hill tops, less than 2 miles apart; the former is some 800 ft. higher than the latter. Today these villages are sunk into insignificance and are off any important lines of communication, but for many centuries the towns occupying their sites dominated one of the most historic roads in history.

3. The Pass of the Beth-horons:

When (Jos 10:10) Joshua discomfited the kings of the Amorites "he slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon, and chased them by the way of the ‘Ascent of Beth-horon.’ " When the Philistines were opposing King Saul at Michmash they sent a company of their men to hold "the way of Beth-horon."

This pass ascends from the plain of Ajalon (now Yalo) and climbs in about 3/4 hr. to Beit Ur el tachta (1,210 ft.); it then ascends along the ridge, with valleys lying to north and south, and reaches Beit Ur el foqa (2,022 ft.), and pursuing the same ridge arrives in another 4 1/2 miles at the plateau to the North of el Jib (Gibeon). At intervals along this historic route traces of the ancient Roman paving are visible. It was the great highroad into the heart of the land from the earliest times until about three or four centuries ago. Along this route came Canaanites, Israelites, Philistines, Egyptians, Syrians, Romans, Saracens and Crusaders. Since the days of Joshua (Jos 10:10) it has frequently been the scene of a rout. Here the Syrian general Seron was defeated by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 3:13-24), and six years later Nicanor, retreating from Jerusalem, was here defeated and slain (1 Macc 7:39 ff; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 5). Along this pass in 66 AD the Roman general Cestius Gallus was driven in headlong flight before the Jews.

Now the changed direction of the highroad to Jerusalem has left the route forsaken and almost forgotten. See PEF, III, 86, Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF

1. The Political Situation

2. Joshua’s Strategy

3. Joshua’s Command to the Sun and Moon

4. The Astronomical Relations of the Sun and Moon

5. The "Silence" of the Sun

6. "Yahweh Fought for Israel"

7. The Afternoon’s March

8. The Chronicle and the Poem Independent Witnesses

9. Date of the Events

10. The Records Are ntemporaneous with the Events

1. The Political Situation:

The battle which gave to the Israelites under Joshua the command of southern Palestine has always excited interest because of the astronomical marvel which is recorded to have then taken place.

In invading Palestine the Israelites were not attacking a single coherent state, but a country occupied by different races and divided, like Greece at a later period, into a number of communities, each consisting practically of but a single city and the cultivated country around it. Thus Joshua destroyed the two cities of Jericho and Ai without any interference from the other Amorites. The destruction of Jericho gave him full possession of the fertile valley of the Jordan; the taking of Ai opened his way up to the ridge which forms the backbone of the country, and he was able to lead the people unopposed to the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim for the solemn reading of the Law. But when the Israelites returned from this ceremony a significant division showed itself amongst their enemies. Close to Ai, Joshua’s most recent conquest, was Beeroth, a small town inhabited by Hivites; and no doubt because in the natural order of events Beeroth might look to be next attacked, the Hivites determined to make terms with Israel. An embassy was therefore sent from Gibeon, their chief city, and Joshua and the Israelites, believing that it came from a distant land not under the Ban, entered into the proposed alliance.

The effect on the political situation was immediate. The Hivites formed a considerable state, relatively speaking; their cities were well placed on the southern highland, and Gibeon, their capital, was one of

the most important fortresses of that district, and only 6 miles distant from Jerusalem, the chief Amorite stronghold. The Amorites recognized at once that, in view of this important defection, it was imperative for them to crush the Gibeonites before the Israelites could unite with them, and this they endeavored to do. The Gibeonites, seeing themselves attacked, sent an urgent message to Joshua, and he at the head of his picked men made a night march up from Gilgal and fell upon the Amorites at Gibeon the next day and put them to flight.

2. Joshua's Strategy:

We are not told by which route he marched, but it is significant that the Amorites fled by the way of Beth-horon; that is to say, not toward their own cities, but away from them. A glance at the map shows that this means that Joshua had succeeded in cutting their line of retreat to Jerusalem. He had probably therefore advanced upon Gibeon from the south, instead of by the obvious route past Ai which he had destroyed and Beeroth with which he was in alliance. But, coming up from Gilgal by the ravines in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, he was exposed to a great danger, for the Amorites might have caught him before he had gained a footing on the plateau, and have taken him at a complete disadvantage. It was thus that the eleven tribes suffered such terrible loss at the hands of the Benjamites in this very region during the first inter-tribal war, and probably the military significance of the first repulse from Ai was of the same character; the forces holding the high ground being able to overwhelm their opponent s without any fear of reprisals.

It would seem possible, therefore, that Joshua may have repeated, on a larger scale, the tactics he employed in his successful attack upon Ai. He may have sent one force to draw the Amorites away from Gibeon, and when this was safely done, may have led the rest of his army to seize the road to Jerusalem, and to break up the forces besieging Gibeon. If so, his strategy was successful up to a certain point. He evidently led the Israelites without loss up to Gibeon, crushed the Amorites there, and cut off their retreat toward Jerusalem. He failed in one thing. In spite of the prodigious efforts which he and his men had made, the greater part of the Amorite army succeeded in escaping him and gained a long start in their flight, toward the northwest, through the two Beth-horons.

3. Joshua's Command to the Sun and Moon:

It was at this point that the incident occurred upon which attention has been chiefly fixed. The Book of Jashar (which seems to have been a collection of war songs and other ballads) ascribes to Joshua the command: +' Sun, be thou silent upon (be) Gibeon (compare Revised Version margin); And thou, Moon, in (be) the valley of Aijalon. And the Sun was silent, And the Moon stayed, Until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies' (Jos 10:12,23). -And the prose narrative continues, "The sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day."

4. The Astronomical Relations of the Sun and Moon:

In these two, the ballad and the prose chronicle, we have several distinct astronomical relations

indicated. The sun to Joshua was associated with Gibeon, and the sun can naturally be associated with a locality in either of two positions: it may be overhead to the observer, in which case he would consider it as being above the place where he himself was standing; or on the other hand, he might see the locality on the skyline and the sun rising or setting just behind it. In the present instance there is no ambiguity, for the chronicle distinctly states that the sun was in "the midst of heaven"; literally, in the halving of the heaven, that is to say overhead. This is very important because it assures us that Joshua must have been at Gibeon when he spoke, and that it must have been noonday of summer when the sun in southern Palestine is only about 8 degrees or 12 degrees from the exact zenith. Next, the moon appeared to be associated with the valley of Aijalon; that is, it must have been low down on the horizon in that direction, and since Aijalon is Northwest of Gibeon it must have been about to set, which would imply that it was about half full, in its "third quarter," the sun being, as we have seen, on the meridian. Thirdly, "the sun hasted not to go down," that is to say, it had already attained the meridian, its culmination; and henceforward its motion was downward. The statement that it was noonday is here implicitly repeated, but a further detail is added. The going down of the sun appeared to be slow. This is the work of the afternoon, that is of half the day, but on this occasion the half-day appeared equal in length to an ordinary whole day. There is therefore no question at all of the sun becoming stationary in the sky: the statement does not admit of that, but only of its slower progress.

5. The "Silence" of the Sun:

The idea that the sun was fixed in the sky, in other words, that the earth ceased for a time to rotate on its axis, has arisen from the unfortunate rendering of the Hebrew verb dum, "be silent," by "stand thou still." It is our own word "dumb," both being onomatopoetic words from the sound made when a man firmly closes his lips upon his speech. The primary meaning of the word therefore is "to be silent," but its secondary meaning is "to desist," "to cease," and therefore in some cases "to stand still. "

From what was it then that Joshua wished the sun to cease: from its moving or from its shining? It is not possible to suppose that, engaged as he was in a desperate battle, he was even so much as thinking of the sun’s motion at all. But its shining, its scorching heat, must have been most seriously felt by him. At noon, in high summer, the highland of southern Palestine is one of the hottest countries of the world. It is impossible to suppose that Joshua wished the sun to be fixed overhead, where it must have been distressing his men who had already been 17 hours on foot. A very arduous pursuit lay before them and the enemy not only had a long start but must have been fresher than the Israelites. The sun’s heat therefore must have been a serious hindrance, and Joshua must have desired it to be tempered. And the Lord hearkened to his voice and gave him this and much more. A great hailstorm swept up from the west, bringing with it a sudden lowering of temperature, and no doubt hiding the sun and putting it to "silence."

6. "Yahweh Fought for Israel":

And "Yahweh fought for Israel," for the storm burst with such violence upon the Amorites as they fled down the steep descent between the Beth-horons, that "they were more who died with the hailstones

than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword" (Jos 10:11). This was the culminating incident of the day, the one which so greatly impressed the sacred historian. "There was no day like that before it or after it, that Yahweh hearkened unto the voice of a man" (Jos 10:14). It was not the hailstorm in itself nor the veiling of the sun that made the day so remarkable. It was that Joshua had spoken, not in prayer or supplication, but in command, as if all Nature was at his disposal; and the Lord had hearkened and had, as it were, obeyed a human voice: an anticipation of the time when a greater Joshua should command even the winds and the sea, and they should obey Him (Mt 8:23-27).

7. The Afternoon's March:

The explanation of the statement that the sun "hasted not to go down about a whole day" is found in Jos 10:10, in which it is stated that the Lord discomfited the Amorites before Israel, "and he slew them with a great slaughter at Gibeon, and chased them by the way of the ascent of Beth-horon, and smote them to Azekah, and unto Makkedah." The Israelites had of course no time-keepers, no clocks or watches, and the only mode of measuring time available to them was the number of miles they marched. Now from Gibeon to Makkedah by the route indicated is some 30 miles, a full day's march for an army. It is possible that, at the end of the campaign, the Israelites on their return found the march from Makkedah to Gibeon heavy work for an entire day. Measured by the only means available to them, that afternoon seemed to be double the ordinary length. The sun had "hasted not to go down about a whole day."

8. The Chronicle and the Poem Independent Witnesses:

Joshua's reference to the moon in connection with the Valley of Aijalon appears at first sight irrelevant, and has frequently been assumed to be merely inserted to complete the parallelism of the poem. But when examined astronomically it becomes clear that it cannot have been inserted haphazard. Joshua must have mentioned the moon because he actually saw it at the moment of speaking. Given that the sun was "in the midst of heaven," above Gibeon, there was only a very restricted arc of the horizon in which the moon could appear as associated with some terrestrial object; and from Gibeon, the Valley of Aijalon does lie within that narrow arc. It follows therefore that unless the position assigned to the moon had been obtained from actual observation at the moment, it would in all probability have been an impossible one. The next point is especially interesting. The ballad does not expressly state whether the sun was upon Gibeon in the sense of being upon it low down on the distant horizon, or upon it, in the sense of being overhead both to Joshua and to that city. But the moon being above the Valley of Aijalon, it becomes clear that the latter is the only possible solution. The sun and moon cannot both have been setting—though this is the idea that has been generally held, it being supposed that the day was far spent and that Joshua desired it to be prolonged—for then sun and moon would have been close together, and the moon would be invisible. The sun cannot have been setting, and the moon rising; for Aijalon is West of Gibeon. Nor can the sun have been rising, and the moon setting, since this would imply that the time of year was either about October 30 of our present calendar, or about February 12. The month of February was already past, since the Israelites had kept the Feast of the Passover. October cannot have come; for, since Beeroth, Gibeon and Jerusalem were so close together, it is certain that the events between the return of the Israelites to Gilgal and the battle of Beth-horon cannot h ave been spread over several months, but must have occupied only a few days. The poem therefore contains implicitly the

same fact that is explicitly stated in the prose narrative—that the sun was overhead—but the one statement cannot, in those days, have been inferred from the other.

9. Date of the Events:

A third point of interest is that the position of the moon gives an indication of the time of the year. The Valley of Aijalon is 17 degrees North of West of from Gibeon, of which the latitude is 31 degrees 51 minutes North. With these details, and assuming the time to be nearly noon, the date must have been about the 21st day of the 4th month of the Jewish calendar, corresponding to July 22 of our present calendar, with a possible uncertainty of one or two days on either side. The sun's declination would then be about 21 degrees North, so that at noon it was within 11 degrees of the zenith. It had risen almost exactly at 5 AM and would set almost exactly at 7 PM. The moon was now about her third quarter, and in North latitude. about 5 degrees. It had risen about 11 o'clock the previous night, and was now at an altitude of under 7 degrees, and within about half an hour of setting. The conditions are not sufficient to fix the year, since from the nature of the luni-solar cycle there will always be one or two years in each cycle of 19 that will satisfy the conditions of the case, and the date of the Hebrew invasion of Palestine is not known with sufficient certainty to limit the inquiry to any particular cycle.

10. The Records Are Contemporaneous with the Events:

It will be seen however that the astronomical conditions introduced by the mention of the moon are much more stringent than might have been expected. They supply therefore proof of a high order that the astronomical details, both of the poem and prose chronicle, were derived from actual observation at the time and have been preserved to us unaltered. Each, therefore, supplies a strictly contemporaneous and independent record.

This great occurrence appears to be referred to in one other passage of Scripture—the Prayer of Habakkuk. Here again the rendering of the English versions is unfortunate, and the passage should stand: +' The sun and moon ceased (to shine) in their habitation; At the light of Thine arrows they vanished, And at the shining of Thy glittering spear. Thou didst march through the land in indignation, Thou didst thresh the nations in anger' (Hab 3:11,12). -E. W. Maunder

BETH-JESHIMOTH

beth-jesh'-i-moth (beth ha-yeshimoth; Codex Vaticanus, Haisimoth; Codex Alexandrinus, Asimoth, and other variants (see DB, under the word)): Mentioned as the point in the south from which the camp of Israel stretched to Abel-shittim in the plains of Moab (Nu 33:49). In Jos 12:3 the way to Beth-jeshimoth is described as South of the Arabah, near the Dead Sea. It was in the lot assigned to Reuben (Jos 13:20), At what times and how long it was actually held by Israel we do not know; but it appears in Eze 25:9 as belonging to Moab. It may be identical with Khirbet es-Suweimeh, where there are some ruins and a well, about 3 miles East of the mouth of the Jordan.

W. Ewing

BETH-LEAPHRAH

beth-le-af’-ra (beth le‘aphrah; Septuagint ex oikou kata gelota, "house of dust"): The name of a place found only in Mic 1:10. From the connection in which it is used it was probably in the Philistine plain. There seems to be a play upon the name in the sentence, "at Beth le-‘apharah have I rolled myself in the dust," ‘aphrah meaning "dust," and possibly another on Philistine in rolled, hith-palldshithi (see G. A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, called Minor, in the place cited.).

BETH-LEBAOTH

beth-le-ba’-oth, beth-leb’-aoth (beth lebha’oth; Baithalbath, "house of lionesses"): A town in the territory of Simeon (Jos 19:6). In 1Ch 4:31 the name is given as Beth-birei: the Revised Version (British and American) BETH-BIRI (which see).

BETH-LEHEMITE

beth’-le-hem-it (beth ha-lachmi): An inhabitant of Bethlehem, a town in Judah, 5 miles South of Jerusalem. Jesse is so named in 1Sa 16:18; 17:58, and Elhanan in 2Sa 21:19. The children of Bethlehem are referred to in Ezr 2:21; Ne 7:26; 1 Esdras 5:17.

BETH-LOMON

beth-lo’-mon (Baithlomon; Codex Vaticanus, Rhagethlomon): The inhabitants of this city are mentioned as returning with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:17). It is the city of Bethlehem in Judah, the modern Beit Lachm (Ezr 2:21).

BETH-MAACAH

beth-ma’-a-ka.

See ABEL-BETH-MAACAH.

BETH-MARCABOTH

beth-mar’-ka-both (beth ha-markabhoth; Baithmachereb, "the house of chariots"): Mentioned along with Hazar-susah, "the station of horses" (Jos 19:5; 1Ch 4:31) as cities in the Negeb near Ziklag. It is tempting to connect these stations with "the cities for his chariots, and the cities for his horsemen" which Solomon built (1Ki 9:19; compare 1Ki 10:26). The site of Beth-marcaboth has not been identified, but

Guerin (La Terre Sainte. Jerusalem et le Nord de la Judee, II, 230) suggests Khan Yunas , Southwest of Gaza, as a suitable chariot city.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-MEON

beth-me’-on: A city of Moab (Jer 48:23), identical with BAAL-MEON (which see).

BETH-MERHAK

beth-mer’-hak (beth ha-merchaq; en oiko to makran, literally "a place (house) that was far off" (2Sa 15:17 the Revised Version, margin "the Far House")): A place mentioned in the account of David’s flight from Absalom. No town of this name is known on the route which he followed. Some scholars think the name denotes simply the outermost of the houses of the city.

BETH-MILLO

beth-mil’-o.

See JERUSALEM.

BETH-NIMRAH

beth-nim’-ra (beth nimrah, "house of leopard," Nu 32:36, but in verse Nu 32:3 it is simply Nimrah): In Jos 13:27 the full name appears. In Isa 15:6 the name appears as Nimrim, identified as Tell Nimrim, between Jericho and the mountains on the east, where there is a fountain of large size. The city was assigned to Gad. In the 4th century AD it was located as five Roman miles North of Livias. Eusebius calls it Bethamnaram (SEP, I, Tell Nimrin).

BETH-PALET

beth-pa’-let.

See BETH-PELET.

BETH-PAZZEZ

beth-paz’-ez (beth patstsets; Bersaphes, Baithphrasee): A town in the territory of Issachar, named with En-gannim and En- haddah (Jos 19:21). The site has not been discovered; it probably lay near the

modern Jenin.

BETH-PELET

beth-pe’-let (beth-peleT; Baithphaleth, "house of escape"; the King James Version Beth-palet; Jos 15:27, Beth-phelet, the King James Version Ne 11:26): One of "the uttermost cities of the tribe of the children of Judah toward the border of Edom in the (Negeb) South" (Jos 15:21,27). Site unknown.

BETH-PEOR

beth-pe’-or (beth pe‘or; oikos Phogor; in Joshua (Vaticanus), Baithphogor, or beth-):" Over against Beth-peor" the Israelites were encamped, "beyond the Jordan, in the valley," when Moses uttered the speeches recorded in De (De 3:29; 4:46). "In the valley in the land of Moab over against Beth-peor" Moses was buried (De 34:6). Beth-peor and the slopes of Pisgah (the King James Version "Ashdoth-pisgah") are mentioned in close connection in Jos 13:20. According to Eusebius, Onomasticon, Beth-peor was situated near Mt. Peor (Fogor) opposite Jericho, 6 miles above Livias. Mt. Peor is the "top" or "head" of Peor (Nu 23:28). Some height commanding a view of the plain East of the river in the lower Jordan valley is clearly intended, but thus far no identification is possible. "The slopes of Pisgah" are probably the lower slopes of the mountain toward Wady ‘Ayun Musa. Somewhere North of this the summit we are in search of may be found. Conder suggested the cliff at Minyeh, South of Wady Jedeideh, and of Pisgah; and would locate Beth-peor at el-Mareighat, "the smeared things," evidently an ancient place of worship, with a stone circle and standing stones, about 4 miles East, on the same ridge. This seems, however, too far South, and more difficult to reach from Shittim than we should gather from Nu 25:1 ff.

W. Ewing

BETH-PHELET

beth-fe’-let.

See BETH-PELET.

BETH-RAPHA

beth-ra’-fa (beth rapha’; B, ho Bathraia, Bathrepha): The name occurs only in the genealogical list in 1Ch 4:12. It does not seem possible now to associate it with any particular place or clan.

BETH-REHOB

beth-re’-hob (beth-rechobh; ho oikos Rhaab) :An Aramean town and district which, along with Zobah and Maacah, assisted Ammon against David (2Sa 10:6,8, Rehob). It is probably identical with Rehob

(Nu 13:21), the northern limit of the spies' journey. Laish-Da (probably Tell el-Kadi) was situated near it (Jud 18:28). The site of the town is unknown. It has been conjecturally identified with Hunin, West of Banias, and, more plausibly, with Banias itself (Thomson, The Land and the Book (2), 218; Buhl, Geog., 240; Moore, ICC, Jgs, 399).

C. H. Thomson

BETH-SHEAN; BETH-SHAN

beth-she'-an, beth'-shan (beth-shan, or [beth-she'an]; in Apocrypha Baithsan or Bethsa): A city in the territory of Issachar assigned to Manasseh, out of which the Canaanites were not driven (Jos 17:11; Jud 1:27); in the days of Israel's strength they were put to taskwork (Jud 1:28). They doubtless were in league with the Philistines who after Israel's defeat on Gilboa exposed the bodies of Saul and his sons on the wall of the city (1Sa 31:7 ff), whence they were rescued by the men of Jabesh , who remembered the earlier kindness of the king (1Sa 31:7 ff; 2Sa 21:12). In 1Ki 4:12 the name applies to the district in which the city stands. It was called Scythopolis by the Greeks. This may be connected with the invasion of Palestine by the Scythians who, according to George Syncellus, "overran Palestine and took possession of Beisan." This may be the invasion noticed by Herodotus, circa 600 BC (i.104-6). Here Tryphon failed in his first attempt to take Jonathan by treachery (1 Macc 12:40). It fell to John Hyrcanus, but was taken from the Jews by Pompey. It was rebuilt by Gabinius (Ant., XIV, v, 3), and became an important member of the league of the "ten cities" (BJ, III, ix, 7). The impiousness of the inhabitants is painted in dark colors by Josephus (Vita, 6; BJ, II, xviii, 3); and the Mishna speaks of it as a center of idol worship ('Abhodhah Zarah, i.4). Later it was the seat of a bishop.

It is represented by the modern Beisan, in the throat of the Vale of Jezreel where it falls into the Jordan valley, on the southern side of the stream from 'Ain Jalud. The ruins of the ancient city are found on the plain, and on the great mound where probably stood the citadel. Between the town and the stretch of marsh land to the South runs the old road from East to West up the Vale of Jezreel, uniting in Esdraelon with the great caravan road from North to South.

W. Ewing

BETH-SHEMESH

beth-she'-mesh, beth'-shemesh (beth-shemesh; Baithsamus, "house of the sun"): This name for a place doubtless arose in every instance from the presence of a sanctuary of the sun there. In accordance with the meaning and origin of the word, it is quite to be expected that there should be several places of this name in Bible lands, and the expectation is not disappointed. Analysis and comparison of the passages in the Bible where a Beth-shemesh is mentioned show four places of this name.

1. Beth-shemesh of Judah:

The first mention of a place by this name is in the description of the border of the territory of Judah (Jos 15:10) which "went down to Beth-Shemesh." This topographical indication "down" puts the place toward the lowlands on the East or West side of Palestine, but does not indicate which. This point is clearly determined by the account of the return of the ark by the Philistine lords from Ekron (1Sa 6:9-19). They returned the ark to Beth-shemesh, the location of which they indicated by the remark that if their affliction was from Yahweh, the kine would bear the ark "by the way of its own border." The Philistines lay along the western border of Judah and the location of Beth-Shemesh of Judah is thus clearly fixed near the western lowland, close to the border between the territory of Judah and that claimed by the Philistines. This is confirmed by the account of the twelve officers of the commissariat of King Solomon. One of these, the son of Dekar, had a Beth-shemesh in his territory. By excluding the territory assigned to the other eleven officers, the territory of this son of Dekar is found to be in Judah and to lie along the Philistine border (1Ki 4:9). A Philistine attack upon the border- land of Judah testifies to the same effect (2Ch 28:18). Finally, the battle between Amaziah of Judah and Jehoash of Israel, who "looked one another in the face" at Beth-shemesh, puts Beth-Shemesh most probably near the border between Judah and Israel, which would locate it near the northern part of the western border of Judah’s territo ry. In the assignment of cities to the Levites, Judah gave Beth-shemesh with its suburbs (Jos 21:16). It has been identified with a good degree of certainty with the modern ‘Ain Shems.

It may be that Ir-shemesh, "city of the sun," and Har-cherec, "mount of the sun," refer to Beth-shemesh of Judah (Jos 15:10; 19:41-43; 1Ki 4:9; Jud 1:33,35). But the worship of the sun was so common and cities of this name so many in number that it would be hazardous to conclude with any assurance that because these three names refer to the same region they therefore refer to the same place.

2. Beth-shemesh of Issachar:

In the description of the tribal limits, it is said of Issachar (Jos 19:22), "And the border reached to Tabor, and Shahazumah, and Beth-shemesh; and the goings out of their border were at the Jordan." The description indicates that Beth- shemesh was in the eastern part of Issachar’s territory. The exact location of the city is not known.

3. Beth-shemesh of Naphtali:

A Beth-shemesh is mentioned together with Beth-anath as cities of Naphtali (Jos 19:38). There is no clear indication of the location of this city. Its association with Beth-anath may indicate that they were near each other in the central part of the tribal allotment. As at Gezer, another of the cities of the Levites the Canaanites were not driven out from Beth- shemesh.

4. Beth-shemesh "that is in the Land of Egypt":

A doom is pronounced upon "Beth-shemesh, that is in the land of Egypt" (Jer 43:13). The Seventy identify it with Heliopolis. There is some uncertainty about this identification. If Beth-shemesh, "house of the sun," is here a description of Heliopolis, why does it not have the article? If it is a proper name,

how does it come that a sanctuary in Egypt is called by a Hebrew name? It may be that the large number of Jews in Egypt with Jeremiah gave this Hebrew name to Heliopolis for use among themselves, Beth-shemesh. being a translation of Egyptian Perra as suggested by Griffith. Otherwise, Beth- shemesh. cannot have been Heliopolis, but must have been some other, at present unknown, place of Semitic worship. This latter view seems to be favored by Jeremiah's double threat: "He shall also break the pillars of Beth-shemesh, that is in the land of Egypt; and the houses of the gods of Egypt shall he burn with fire" (save place). If Beth-shemesh were the "house of the sun," then the balancing of the state ment would be only between "pillars" and "houses," but it seems more naturally to be between Beth-shemesh, a Semitic place of worship "that is in the land of Egypt" on the one hand, and the Egyptian place of worship, "the houses of the gods of Egypt," on the other.

But the Seventy lived in Egypt and in their interpretation of this passage were probably guided by accurate knowledge of facts unknown now, such as surviving names, tradition and even written history. Until there is further light on the subject, it is better to accept their interpretation and identify this Beth-shemesh with Heliopolis.

See ON.

M. G. Kyle

BETH-SHEMITE

beth-she'-mit beth-shimshi (1Sa 6:14,20): An inhabitant of Beth-shemesh in Judah (compare BETH-SHEMESH 1).

BETH-SHITTAH

beth-shit'-a (beth ha-shiTTah, "house of the acacia"): A place on the route followed by the Midianites in their flight before Gideon (Jud 7:22). It is probably identical with the modern ShuTTa, a village in the Vale of Jezreel, about 6 miles Northwest of Beisan.

BETH-TAPPUAH

beth-tap'-u-a (beth-tappuach; Beththapphoue, "place of apples" (see however APPLE)); A town in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:53), probably near Hebron (el Tappuah, 1Ch 2:43), possibly the same as Tephon (1 Macc 9:50). The village of Tuffuch, 3 1/2 miles Northwest of Hebron, is the probable site; it stands on the edge of a high ridge, surrounded by very fruitful gardens; an ancient highroad runs through the village, and there are many old cisterns and caves. (See PEF, III, 310, 379, Sh XXI.)

E. W. G. Masterman

BETH-ZACHARIAS

beth-zak-a-ri’-as (Baith-zacharia): Here Judas Maccabeus failed in battle with Antiochus Eupator, and his brother Eleazar fell in conflict with an elephant (1 Macc 6:32 ff; the King James Version "Bathzacharias"). It was a position of great strength, crowning a promontory which juts out between two deep valleys. It still bears the ancient name with little change, Beit Zakaria. It lies about 4 miles Southwest of Bethlehem (BR, III, 283 ff; Ant, XII, ix, 4).

BETH-ZUR

beth’-zur (beth-tsur; Baith-sour, "house of rock"; less probably "house of the god Zur"):

(1) Mentioned (Jos 15:58) as near Halhul and Gedor in the hill country of Judah; fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:7). In Ne 3:16 mention is made of "Nehemiah the son of Azbuk, the ruler of half the district of Beth-zur." During the Maccabean wars it (Bethsura) came into great importance (1 Macc 4:29,61; 6:7,26,31,49,50; 9:52; 10:14; 11:65; 14:7,33). Josephus describes it as the strongest place in all Judea (Ant., XIII, v, 6). It was inhabited in the days of Eusebius and Jerome.

(2) It is the ruined site Belt Cur, near the main road from Jerusalem to Hebron, and some 4 miles North of the latter. Its importance lay in its natural strength, on a hilltop dominating the highroad, and also in its guarding the one southerly approach for a hostile army by the Vale of Elah to the Judean plateau. The site today is conspicuous from a distance through the presence of a ruined medieval tower. (See PEF, III, 311, Sh XXI).

E. W. G. Masterman

BETHABARA

beth-ab’-a-ra beth‘abharah; (Bethabara, "house of the ford"): According to the King James Version (following Textus Receptus of the New Testament) the place where John baptized (Joh 1:28). the Revised Version (British and American) (with Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek following Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Ephraemi) reads BETHANY. It is distinguished from the Bethany of Lazarus and his sisters as being "beyond the Jordan." The reading "Bethabara" became current owing to the advocacy of Origen. Various suggestions have been made to explain the readings. G. A. Smith (HGHL) suggests that Bethany ("house of the ship") and Bethabara ("house of the ford") are names for the same place. Bethabara has also been identified with Bethbarah, which, however, was probably not on the Jordan but among the streams flowing into it (Jud 7:24). It is interesting to note that LXXB reads Baithabara for Massoretic Text Beth-‘arabhah, one of the cities of Benjamin (Jos 18:22). If this be correct, the site is in Judea.

Another solution is sought in the idea of a corruption of the original name into Bethany and Bethabara,

the name having the consonants n, b and r after Beth. In Jos 13:27 (Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus) we find Baithanabra for Bethnimrah (Massoretic Text), and Sir George Grove in DB (arts. "Bethabara" and "Beth-nimrah") identifies Bethabara and Beth-nimrah. The site of the latter was a few miles above Jericho (see BETH-NIMRAH), "immediately accessible to Jerusalem and all Judea" (compare Mt 3:5; Mr 1:5, and see article "Bethany" in EB). This view has much in its favor.

Then, again, as Dr. G. Frederick Wright observes: "The traditional site is at the ford east of Jericho; but as according to Joh 1:29,35,43 it was only one day's journey from Cana of Galilee, while according to Joh 10:40; 11:3,6,27 it was two or three days from Bethany, it must have been well up the river toward Galilee. Conder discovered a well-known ford near Beisan called Abarah, near the mouth of the valley of Jezreel. This is 20 miles from Cana and 60 miles from Bethany, and all the conditions of the place fit in with the history."

See also BETHANY (2).

S. F. Hunter

BETHANY

beth'-a-ni (Bethania):

(1) A village, 15 furlongs from Jerusalem (Joh 11:18), on the road to Jericho, at the Mount of Olives (Mr 11:1; Lu 19:29), where lived "Simon the leper" (Mr 14:3) and Mary, Martha and Lazarus (Joh 11:18 f). This village may justifiably be called the Judean home of Jesus, as He appears to have preferred to lodge there rather than in Jerusalem itself (Mt 21:17; Mr 11:11). Here occurred the incident of the raising of Lazarus (Joh 11) and the feast at the house of Simon (Mt 26:1-13; Mr 14:3-9; Lu 7:36-50; Joh 1:2:1-8). The Ascension as recorded in Lu 24:50-51 is thus described: "He led them out until they were over against Bethany: and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven."

Bethany is today el 'Azareyeh ("the place of Lazarus"—the L being displaced to form the article). It is a miserably untidy and tumble-down village facing East on the Southeast slope of the Mount of Olives, upon the carriage road to Jericho. A fair number of fig, almond and olive trees surround the houses. The traditional tomb of Lazarus is shown and there are some remains of medieval buildings, besides rock-cut tombs of much earlier date (PEF, III, 27, Sheet XVII).

(2) "Bethany beyond the Jordan" (Joh 1:28; the King James Version Bethabara; Bethabara, a reading against the majority of the manuscripts, supported by Origen on geographical grounds): No such place is known. Grove suggested that the place intended is BETH-NIMRAH (which see), the modern Tell nimrin, a singularly suitable place, but hard to fit in with Joh 1:28; compare Joh 2:1. The traditional site is the ford East of Jericho.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETHARAM

beth-a’-ram (beth haram).

See BETH-HARAM.

BETHASMOTH

beth-az’-moth (the King James Version Bethsamos; Baithasmoth (1 Esdras 5:18); corresponds to Beth-azmaveth in Ne 7:28): A town in the territory of Benjamin, and may be identified with the modern el-Hizmeh.

See AZMAVETH.

BETHBASI

beth-ba’-si (Baithbasi): The name may mean "place of marshes" = Hebrew beth-betsi. According to G. A. Smith there is a Wady el-Bassah East of Tekoa in the wilderness of Judea. The name means "marsh," which Dr. Smith thinks impossible, and really "an echo of an ancient name." Jonathan and Simon repaired the ruins of the fortified place "in the desert" (1 Macc 9:62,64). Josephus reads Bethalaga, i.e. Beth-hoglah (Ant., XIII, i, 5). Peshitta version reads Beth-Yashan (see JESHANAH), which Dr. Cheyne thinks is probably correct. Thus the origin of the name and the site of the town are merely conjectural.

S. F. Hunter

BETHEL

beth’-el (beth-’el; Baithel and oikos theou, literally, "house of God"):

(1) A town near the place where Abraham halted and offered sacrifice on his way south from Shechem.

1. Identification and Description:

It lay West of Ai (Ge 12:8). It is named as on the northern border of Benjamin (the southern of Ephraim, Jos 16:2), at the top of the ascent from the Jordan valley by way of Ai (Jos 18:13). It lay South of Shiloh (Jud 21:19). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 12 Roman miles from Jerusalem, on the road to Neapolis. It is represented by the modern Beitin, a village of some 400 inhabitants, which stands on a knoll East of the road to Nablus. There are four springs which yield supplies of good water. In ancient times these were supplemented by a reservoir hewn in the rock South of the town. The surrounding country is bleak

and barren, the hills being marked by a succession of stony terraces, which may have suggested the form of the ladder in Jacob's famous dream.

2. The Sanctuary:

The town was originally called Luz (Ge 28:19, etc.). When Jacob came hither on his way to Paddan-aram we are told that he lighted upon "the place" (Ge 28:11. Hebrew). The Hebrew maqom, like the cognate Arabic maqam, denotes a sacred place or sanctuary. The maqom was doubtless that at which Abraham had sacrificed, East of the town. In the morning Jacob set up "for a pillar" the stone which had served as his pillow (Ge 28:18; see PILLAR, matstsebhah), poured oil upon it and called the name of the place Bethel, "house of God"; that is, of God whose epiphany was for him associated with the pillar. This spot became a center of great interest, lending growing importance to the town. In process of time the name Luz disappeared, giving place to that of the adjoining sanctuary, town and sanctuary being identified. Jacob revisited the place on his return from Paddan-aram; here Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, died and was buried under "the oak" (Ge 35:6 f). Probably on rising ground East of Bethel Abraham and Lot stood to view the uninviting highlands and the rich lands of the Jordan valley (Ge 13:9 ff).

3. History:

Bethel was a royal city of the Canaanites (Jos 12:16). It appears to have been captured by Joshua (8:7), and it was allotted to Benjamin (Jos 18:22). In Jud 1:22 ff it is represented as held by Canaanites, from whom the house of Joseph took it by treachery (compare 1Ch 7:28). Hither the ark was brought from Gilgal (Jud 2:1, Septuagint). Israel came to Bethel to consult the Divine oracle (Jud 20:18), and it became an important center of worship (1Sa 10:3). The home of the prophetess Deborah was not far off (Jud 4:5). Samuel visited Bethel on circuit, judging Israel (1Sa 7:16).

With the disruption of the kingdom came Bethel's greatest period of splendor and significance. To counteract the influence of Jerusalem as the national religious center Jeroboam embarked on the policy which won for him the unenviable reputation of having "made Israel to sin." Here he erected a temple, set up an image, the golden calf, and established an imposing ritual. It became the royal sanctuary and the religious center of his kingdom (1Ki 12:29 ff; Am 7:13). He placed in Bethel the priests of the high places which he had made (1Ki 12:32). To Bethel came the man of God from Judah who pronounced doom against Jeroboam (1Ki 13), and who, having been seduced from duty by an aged prophet in Bethel, was slain by a lion. According to the prophets Amos and Hosea the splendid idolatries of Bethel were accompanied by terrible moral and religious degradation. Against the place they launched the most scathing denunciations, declaring the vengeance such things must entail (Am 3:14; 4:4; 5:11 m; Am 9:1; Ho 4:15; 5:8; 10:5,8,15). With the latter the name Bethel gives place in mockery to Beth-aven. Bethel shared in the downfall of Samaria wrought by the Assyrians; and according to an old tradition, Shalmaneser possessed himself of the golden calf (compare Jer 48:13). The priest, sent by the Assyrians to teach the people whom they had settled in the land how to serve Yahweh, dwelt in Bethel (2Ki 17:28). King Josiah completed the demolition of the sanctuary at Bethel, destroying all the instruments of idolatry, and harr ying the tombs of the idolaters. The monument of the man of God from Judah he

allowed to stand (2Ki 23:4,25). The men of Bethel were among those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:28; Ne 7:32), and it is mentioned as reoccupied by the Benjamites (Ne 11:31). Zechariah (Zec 7:2) records the sending of certain men from Jerusalem in the 4th year of King Darius to inquire regarding particular religious practices. Bethel was one of the towns fortified by Bacchides in the time of the Maccabees (1 Macc 9:50; Ant, XIII, i, 3). It is named again as a small town which, along with Ephraim, was taken by Vespasian as he approached Jerusalem (BJ, IV, ix, 9).

(2) A city in Judah which in 1Sa 30:27 is called Bethel; in Jos 19:4 Bethul; and in 1Ch 4:30 Bethuel. The site has not been identified. In Jos 15:30 Septuagint gives Baithel in Judah, where the Hebrew has Kecil—probably a scribal error.

W. Ewing

BETHEL, MOUNT

(har beth-’el; Baithel louza (1Sa 13:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "the mount of Bethel"; Jos 16:1)): The hill which stretches from the North of the town to Tell ‘Acur. The road to Shechem lies along the ridge. An army in possession of these heights easily commanded the route from north to south.

BETHELITE

beth’-el-it: The term applied to a man who in the days of Ahab rebuilt Jericho (1Ki 16:34).

See HIEL.

BETHER

be’-ther (bether): In So 2:17 mention is made of "the mountains of Bether." It is doubtful if a proper name is intended. The Revised Version, margin has, "perhaps, the spice malobathron." A Bether is prominent in late Jewish history as the place where the Jews resisted Hadrian under Bar Cochba in 135 AD. Its identity with Bittir, 7 miles Southwest of Jerusalem, is attested by an inscription.

BETHESDA

be-thez’-da (Bethesda; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Joh 5:2 (probably beth chicda’," house of mercy"); other forms occur as Bethzatha and Bethsaida):

1. The Conditions of the Narrative: Joh 5:2:

The only data we have is the statement in Joh 5:2-4: "Now there is in Jerusalem by the sheep gate a pool,

which is called in Hebrew Bethesda, having five porches. In these lay a multitude of them that were sick, blind, halt, withered." Many ancient authorities add (as in the Revised Version, margin) "waiting for the moving of the water: for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and troubled the water," etc.

The name does not help as to the site, no such name occurs elsewhere in Jerusalem; the mention of the sheep gate is of little assistance because the word "gate" is supplied, and even were it there, its site is uncertain. Sheep "pool" or "place" is at least as probable; the tradition about the "troubling of the water" (which may be true even if the angelic visitant may be of the nature of folk-lore) can receive no rational explanation except by the well-known phenomenon, by no means uncommon in Syria and always considered the work of a supernatural being, of an intermittent spring. The arrangement of the five porches is similar to that demonstrated by Dr. F. Bliss as having existed in Roman times as the Pool of Siloam; the story implies that the incident occurred outside the city walls, as to carry a bed on the Sabbath would not have been forbidden by Jewish traditional law.

2. The Traditional Site:

Tradition has varied concerning the site. In the 4th century, and probably down to the Crusades, a pool was pointed out as the true site, a little to the Northwest of the present Stephen’s Gate; it was part of a twin pool and over it were erected at two successive periods two Christian churches. Later on this site was entirely lost and from the 13th century the great Birket Israel, just North of the Temple area, was pointed out as the site.

Within the last quarter of a century, however, the older traditional site, now close to the Church of Anne, has been rediscovered, excavated and popularly accepted. This pool is a rock-cut, rain-filled cistern, 55 ft. long X 12 ft. broad, and is approached by a steep and winding flight of steps. The floor of the rediscovered early Christian church roofs over the pool, being supported upon five arches in commemoration of the five porches. At the western end of the church, where probably the font was situated, there was a fresco, now much defaced and fast fading, representing the angel troubling the waters.

3. A More Probable Site:

Although public opinion supports this site, there is much to be said for the proposal, promulgated by Robinson and supported by Conder and other good authorities, that the pool was at the "Virgin’s Fount" (see GIHON), which is today an intermittent spring whose "troubled" waters are still visited by Jews for purposes of cure. As the only source of "living water" near Jerusalem, it is a likely spot for there to have been a "sheep pool" or "sheep place" for the vast flocks of sheep coming to Jerusalem in connection with the temple ritual. See Biblical World, XXV, 80 ff.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETHINK

be-think’ (heshibh ‘el lebh, "to lay to heart," hence, "recall to mind"): Anglo-Saxon word used only in seventh petition of Solomon’s prayer at the dedication of the Temple. If the people, carried into captivity, because of sin, should "take it to heart," then God (he prayed) would hear and forgive (1Ki 8:47; 2Ch 6:37). A choice illustration of the mental and heart process in reflection, repentance and conversion.

BETHLEHEM

beth’-le-hem (bethlechem; Baithleem, or Bethleem, "house of David," or possibly "the house of Lakhmu," an Assyrian deity):

I. Bethlehem Judah:

Bethlehem Judah, or EPHRATH or EPHRATHAH (which see) is now Beit Lahm (Arabic =" house of meat"), a town of upward of 10,000 inhabitants, 5 miles South of Jerusalem and 2,350 ft. above sea level. It occupies an outstanding position upon a spur running East from the watershed with deep valleys to the Northeast and South It is just off the main road to Hebron and the south, but upon the highroad to Tekoa and En-gedi. The position is one of natural strength; it was occupied by a garrison of the Philistines in the days of David (2Sa 23:14; 1Ch 11:16) and was fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:6). The surrounding country is fertile, cornfields, fig and olive yards and vineyards abound. Bethlehem is not naturally well supplied with water, the nearest spring is 800 yds. to the Southeast, but for many centuries the "low level aqueduct" from "Solomon’s Pools" in the ArTas valley, which has here been tunneled through the hill, has been tapped by the inhabitants; there are also many rock-cut cisterns.

1. Early History:

In 1Ch 2:51 Salma, the son of Caleb, is described as the "father of Bethlehem." In Ge 35:19; 48:7 it is recorded that Rachel "was buried in the way to Ephrath (the same is Beth-lehem)." Tradition points out the site of Rachel’s tomb near where the road to Bethlehem leaves the main road. The Levites of the events of Jud 17; Jud 19 were Bethlehemites. In the list of the towns of Judah the name Bethlehem occurs, in the Septuagint version only in Jos 15:57.

2. David the Bethlehemite:

Ruth, famous chiefly as the ancestress of David, and of the Messiah, settled in Bethlehem with her second husband Boaz, and it is noticeable that from her new home she could view the mountains of Moab, her native land. David himself "was the son of that Ephrathite of Bethlehem-judah, whose name was Jesse" (1Sa 17:12). To Bethlehem came Samuel to anoint a successor to unworthy Saul (1Sa 16:4): "David went to and fro from Saul to feed his father’s sheep at Bethlehem" (1Sa 17:15). David’s "three mighty men" "brake through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Beth- lehem,

that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David" (2Sa 23:14,16). Tradition still points out the well. From this town came those famous "sons of Zeruiah," David's nephews, whose loyalty and whose ruthless cruelty became at once a protection and a menace to their royal relative: in 2Sa 2:32 it is mentioned that one of them, Asahel, was buried "in the sepulchre of his father, which was in Bethlehem."

3. Later Bible History:

After the time of David, Bethlehem would appear to have sunk into insignificance. But its future fame is pointed at by Micah (Mi 5:2): "But thou, Beth-lehem Ephrathah, which art little to be among the thousands of Judah, out of thee shall one come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting."

In the return of the Jews captive Bethlehemites re-inhabited the place (Ezr 2:21; Ne 7:26 "men"; 1 Esdras 5:17 "sons").

4. The Christian Era:

In the New Testament Bethlehem is mentioned as the birthplace of the Messiah Jesus (Mt 2:1,5; Lu 2:4,25) in consequence of which event occurred Herod's "massacre of the innocents" (Mt 2:8,16). Inasmuch as Hadrian devastated Bethlehem and set up there a sacred grove to Adonis (Jerome, Ep. ad Paul, lviii.3) it is clear that veneration of this spot as the site of the Nativity must go back before 132 AD. Constantine (circa 330) founded a basilica over the cave-stable which tradition pointed out as the scene of the birth, and his church, unchanged in general structure though enlarged by Justinian and frequently adorned, repaired and damaged, remains today the chief attraction of the town. During the Crusades, Bethlehem became of great importance and prosperity; it remained in Christian hands after the overthrow of the Latin kingdom, and at the present day it is in material things one of the most prosperous Christian centers in the Holy Land.

II. Bethlehem of Zebulun:

Bethlehem of Zebulun (Jos 19:15) was probably the home of Ibzan (Jud 12:8) though Jewish tradition is in support of (1). See Josephus, Ant, V, vii, 13. This is now the small village of Beit Lahm, some 7 miles Northwest of Nazareth on the edge of the oak forest. Some antiquities have been found here recently, showing that in earlier days it was a place of some importance. It is now the site of a small German colony. See PEF, I, 270, Sh V.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETHLEHEM, STAR OF

See STAR OF THE MAGI.

BETHPHAGE

beth’-fa-je, beth’-faj (from beth paghah; Bethphage, or Bethphage; in Aramaic "place of young figs"): Near the Mount of Olives and to the road from Jerusalem to Jericho; mentioned together with Bethany (Mt 21:1; Mr 11:1; Lu 19:29). The place occurs in several Talmudic passages where it may be inferred that it was near but outside Jerusalem; it was at the Sabbatical distance limit East of Jerusalem, and was surrounded by some kind of wall. The medieval Bethphage was between the summit and Bethany. The site is now enclosed by the Roman Catholics. As regards the Bethphage of the New Testament, the most probable suggestion was that it occupied the summit itself where Kefr et Tur stands today. This village certainly occupies an ancient site and no other name is known. This is much more probable than the suggestion that the modern Abu Dis is on the site of Bethphage.

E. W. G. Masterman

BETHSAIDA

beth-sa’-i-da (Bethsaida, "house of fishing"):

(1) A city East of the Jordan, in a "desert place" (that is, uncultivated ground used for grazing) at which Jesus miraculously fed the multitude with five loaves and two fishes (Mr 6:32 ff; Lu 9:10). This is doubtless to be identified with the village of Bethsaida in Lower Gaulonitis which the Tetrarch Philip raised to the rank of a city, and called Julias, in honor of Julia, the daughter of Augustus. It lay near the place where the Jordan enters the Sea of Gennesaret (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1; III, x, 7; Vita, 72). This city may be located at et-Tell, a ruined site on the East side of the Jordan on rising ground, fully a mile from the sea. As this is too far from the sea for a fishing village, Schumacher (The Jaulan, 246) suggests that el-‘Araj, "a large, completely destroyed site close to the lake," connected in ancient times with et-Tell "by the beautiful roads still visible," may have been the fishing village, and et- Tell the princely residence. He is however inclined to favor el-Mes‘adiyeh , a ruin and winter village of Arab et-Tellawiyeh, which stands on an artificial mound, about a mile and a half from the mouth of the Jordan. It should be noted, however, that the name is in origin radically different from Bethsaida. The substitution of sin for cad is easy: but the insertion of the guttural ‘ain is impossible. No trace of the name Bethsaida has been found in the district; but any one of the sites named would meet the requirements.

To this neighborhood Jesus retired by boat with His disciples to rest awhile. The multitude following on foot along the northern shore of the lake would cross the Jordan by the ford at its mouth which is used by foot travelers to this day. The "desert" of the narrative is just the barriyeh of the Arabs where the animals are driven out for pasture. The "green grass" of Mr 6:39, and the "much grass" of Joh 6:10, point to some place in the plain of el-BaTeichah, on the rich soil of which the grass is green and plentiful compared with the scanty herbage on the higher slopes.

(2) Bethsaida of Galilee, where dwelt Philip, Andrew, Peter (Joh 1:44; 12:21), and perhaps also James

and John. The house of Andrew and Peter seems to have been not far from the synagogue in Capernaum (Mt 8:14; Mr 1:29, etc.). Unless they had moved their residence from Bethsaida to Capernaum, of which there is no record, and which for fishermen was unlikely, Bethsaida must have lain close to Capernaum. It may have been the fishing town adjoining the larger city. As in the case of the other Bethsaida, no name has been recovered to guide us to the site. On the rocky promontory, however, East of Khan Minyeh we find Sheikh ‘Aly ec-Caiyadin, "Sheikh Aly of the Fishermen," as the name of a ruined weley, in which the second element in the name Bethsaida is represented. Near by is the site at ‘Ain et-Tabigha, which many have identified with Bethsaida of Galilee. The warm water from copious springs runs into a little bay of the sea in which fishes congregate in great numbers. This has therefore always been a favorite haunt of fishermen. If Capernaum were at Khan Minyeh, then the two lay close together. The names of many ancient places have been lost, and others have strayed from their original localities. The absence of any name resembling Bethsaida need not concern us.

Were There Two Bethsaidas?:

Many scholars maintain that all the New Testament references to Bethsaida apply to one place, namely, Bethsaida Julias. The arguments for and against this view may be summarized as follows:

(a) Galilee ran right round the lake, including most of the level coastland on the East. Thus Gamala, on the eastern shore, was within the jurisdiction of Josephus, who commanded in Galilee (BJ, II, xx, 4). Judas of Gamala (Ant., XVIII, i, l) is also called Judas of Galilee (ibid., i, 6). If Gamala, far down the eastern shore of the sea, were in Galilee, a fortiori Bethsaida, a town which lay on the very edge of the Jordan, may be described as in Galilee.

But Josephus makes it plain that Gamala, while added to his jurisdiction, was not in Galilee, but in Gaulonitis (BJ, II, xx, 6). Even if Judas were born in Gamala, and so might properly be called a Gaulonite, he may, like others, have come to be known as belonging to the province in which his active life was spent. "Jesus of Nazareth" was born in Bethlehem. Then Josephus explicitly says that Bethsaida was in Lower Gaulonitis (BJ, II, ix, 1). Further, Luke places the country of the Gerasenes on the other side of the sea from Galilee (Lu 8:26)—antipera tes Galilaias ("over against Galilee").

(b) To go to the other side—eis to peran (Mr 6:45)—does not of necessity imply passing from the East to the West coast of the lake, since Josephus uses the verb diaperaioo of a passage from Tiberias to Tarichea (Vita, 59). But (i) this involved a passage from a point on the West to a point on the South shore, "crossing over" two considerable bays; whereas if the boat started from any point in el-BaTeichah, to which we seem to be limited by the "much grass," and by the definition of the district as belonging to Bethsaida, to sail to et-Tell, it was a matter of coasting not more than a couple of miles, with no bay to cross. (ii) No case can be cited where the phrase eis to peran certainly means anything else than "to the other side." (iii) Mark says that the boat started to go unto the other side to Bethsaida, while John, gives the direction "over the sea unto Capernaum" (Mr 6:17). The two towns were therefore practically in the same line. Now there is no question that Capernaum was on "the other side," nor is there any suggestion that the boat was driven out of its course; and it is quite obvious that, sailing toward

Capernaum, whether at Tell Chum or at Khan Minyeh, it would never reach Bethsaida Julius. (iv) The present writer is familiar with these waters in both storm and calm. If the boat was taken from any point in el-BaTeichah towards et-Tell, no east wind would have distressed the rowers, protected as that part is by the mountains. Therefore it was no contrary wind that carried them toward Capernaum and the "land of Gennesaret." On the other hand, with a wind from the West, such as is often experienced, eight or nine hours might easily be occupied in covering the four or five miles from el-BaTeichah to the neighborhood of Capernaum.

(c) The words of Mark (Mr 6:45), it is suggested (Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 42), have been too strictly interpreted: as the Gospel was written probably at Rome, its author being a native, not of Galilee, but of Jerusalem. Want of precision on topographical points, therefore, need not surprise us. But as we have seen above, the "want of precision" must also be attributed to the writer of Joh 6:17. The agreement of these two favors the strict interpretation. Further, if the Gospel of Mark embodies the recollections of Peter, it would be difficult to find a more reliable authority for topographical details connected with the sea on which his fisher life was spent.

(d) In support of the single-city theory it is further argued that

(i) Jesus withdrew to Bethsaida as being in the jurisdiction of Philip, when he heard of the murder of John by Antipas, and would not have sought again the territories of the latter so soon after leaving them.

(ii) Medieval works of travel notice only one Bethsaida.

(iii) The East coast of the sea was definitely attached to Galilee in AD 84, and Ptolemy (circa 140) places Julius in Galilee. It is therefore significant that only the Fourth Gospel speaks of "Bethsaida of Galilee."

(iv) There could hardly have been two Bethsaidas so close together.

But:

(i) It is not said that Jesus came hither that he might leave the territory of Antipas for that of Philip; and in view of Mr 6:30 ff, and Lu 9:10 ff, the inference from Mt 14:13 that he did so, is not warranted.

(ii) The Bethsaida of medieval writers was evidently on the West of the Jordan. If it lay on the East it is inconceivable that none of them should have mentioned the river in this connection.

(iii) If the 4th Gospel was not written until well into the 2nd century, then the apostle was not the author; but this is a very precarious assumption. John, writing after 84 AD, would hardly have used the phrase "Bethsaida of Galilee" of a place only recently attached to that province, writing, as he was, at a distance from the scene, and recalling the former familiar conditions.

(iv) In view of the frequent repetition of names in Palestine the nearness of the two Bethsaidas raises no difficulty. The abundance of fish at each place furnished a good reason for the recurrence of the name.

W. Ewing

BETHSAMOS

beth-sa’-mos.

See BETHASMOTH.

BETHSURA; BETHSURON

beth-su’-ra (Baithsoura (1 Macc 4:29, etc.)), (2 Macc 11:5 the Revised Version (British and American)): The Greek form of the name BETH-ZUR (which see).

BETHUEL (1)

be-thu’-el (bethu’el; "dweller in God"): A son of Nahor and Milcah, Abraham’s nephew, father of Laban and Rebekah (Ge 22:23; 24:15,24,47,50; 25:20; 28:2,5). In the last-named passage, he is surnamed "the Syrian." The only place where he appears as a leading character in the narrative is in connection with Rebekah’s betrothal to Isaac; and even here, his son Laban stands out more prominently than he—a fact explainable on the ground of the custom which recognized the right of the brother to take a special interest in the welfare of the sister (compare Ge 34:5,21,25; 2Sa 13:20,22). Ant, I, xvi, 2 states that Bethuel was dead at this time.

Frank E. Hirsch

BETHUEL (2)

be-thu’-el, beth’-u-el (bethu’el, "destroyed of God"): A town of Simeon (1Ch 4:30), the same as Bethul (Jos 19:4), and, probably, as the Beth-el of 1Sa 30:27.

BETHUL

beth’-ul, be’-thul (bethul):

See BETHUEL; CHESIL.

BETHULIA

be-thu’-li-a (Baithouloua): A town named only in the Book of Judith (4:6; 6:10 ff; 7:1 ff; 8:3; 10:6; 12:7; 15:3,6; 16:21 ff). From these references we gather that it stood beside a valley, on a rock, at the foot of which was a spring, not far from Jenin; and that it guarded the passes by which an army might march to the South. The site most fully meeting these conditions is that of Sanur. The rock on the summit of which it stands rises sheer from the edge of Merj el-Ghariq, on the main highway, some 7 miles South of Jenin. Other identifications are suggested: Conder favoring Mithiliyeh, a little farther north; while the writer of the article "Bethulia" in Encyclopedia Biblica argues for identification with Jerusalem.

W. Ewing

BETIMES

be-timz’:In the sense of "early" is the translation of two Hebrew words:

(1) shakham, a root meaning "to incline the shoulder to a load," hence "to load up," "start early": in Ge 26:31 "they rose up betimes in the morning," also in 2Ch 36:15 (the American Standard Revised Version "early");

(2) of shachar, a root meaning "to dawn" in Job 8:5; 24:5, the American Standard Revised Version "diligently," and in Pro 13:24, "chasteneth him betimes."

In the Apocrypha (Sirach 6:36) "betimes" is the translation of orthizo, literally, "to rise early in the morning," while in Bel and the Dragon verse 16 the same word is translated "betime."

In other cases the King James Version "betimes" appears as "before the time" (Sirach 51:30); "early" (1 Macc 4:52; 11:67); "the mourning" (1 Macc 5:30).

Arthur J. Kinsella

BETOLION

be-to’-li-on (Betolio (Codex Alexandrinus), or (Codex Vaticanus) Betolio; the King James Version Betolius, be-to’-li-us): A town the people of which to the number of 52 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:21). It corresponds to Bethel in Ezr 2:28.

BETOMESTHAIM; BETOMASTHAIM

be-to-mes’-tha-im, be-to-mes’-tham the King James Version Betomestham, (Betomesthaim (Judith 4:6)): the King James Version Betomasthem (Baitornasthaim (Judith 15:4)): The place is said to have been "over against Jezreel, in the face of (i. e eastward of) the plain that is near Dothan" It can hardly be Deir Massin, which lies West of the plain. The district is clearly indicated, but no identification is yet

possible.

BETONIM

bet’-o-nim, be-to’-nim (beTonim; Botanei or Botanin): A town East of the Jordan in the territory of Gad (Jos 13:26). It may be identical with BaTneh, about 3 miles Southwest of es-SalT.

BETRAY

be-tra’ (ramah; paradidomi): In the Old Testament only once (1Ch 12:17). David warns those who had deserted to him from Saul: "If ye be come to betray me to mine adversaries .... the God of our fathers look thereon." The same Hebrew word is elsewhere translated "beguile" (Ge 29:25; Jos 9:22), "deceive" (1Sa 19:17; 28:12; 2Sa 19:26; Pr 26:19; La 1:19).

In the New Testament, for paradidomi: 36 times, of the betrayal of Jesus Christ, and only 3 times besides (Mt 24:10; Mr 13:12; Lu 21:16) of kinsmen delivering up one another to prosecution. In these three places the Revised Version (British and American) translates according to the more general meaning, "to deliver up," and also (in Mt 17:22; 20:18; 26:16; Mr 14:10,21; Lu 22:4,6) where it refers to the delivering up of Jesus. The Revisers’ idea was perhaps to retain "betray" only in direct references to Judas’ act, but they have not strictly followed that rule. Judas’ act was more than that of giving a person up to the authorities; he did it under circumstances of treachery which modified its character:

(a) he took advantage of his intimate relation with Jesus Christ as a disciple to put Him in the hands of His enemies;

(b) he did it stealthily by night, and

(c) by a kiss, an act which professed affection and friendliness;

(d) he did it for money, and

(e) he knew that Jesus Christ was innocent of any crime (Mt 27:4).

T. Rees

BETRAYERS

be-tra’-ers (prodotai, "betrayers," "traitors"): Stephen charged the Jews with being betrayers of the Righteous One (Ac 7:52) i.e. as having made Judas’ act their own; compare Lu 6:16: "Judas Iscariot, who became a traitor;" 2Ti 3:4, "traitors."

BETROTH

be-troth', be-troth' ('dras): On betrothal as a social custom see MARRIAGE. Hosea, in his great parable of the prodigal wife, surpassed only by a greater Teacher's parable of the Prodigal Son, uses betrothal as the symbol of Yahweh's pledge of His love and favor to penitent Israel (Ho 2:19,20). In Ex 21:8,9 the Revised Version (British and American) renders "espouse" for the "betroth" of the King James Version, the context implying the actual marriage relation.

BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS

I. THE PERIOD IN GENERAL

II. A GLANCE ALTES TESTAMENT CONTEMPORANEOUS HISTORY

1. The Egyptian Empire

2. Greece

3. Rome

4. Asia

III. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS

1. The Persian Period

2. The Alexandrian Period

3. The Egyptian Period

4. The Syrian Period

5. The Maccabean Period

6. The Roman Period

IV. INTERNAL DEVELOPMENTS IN THIS PERIOD

1. Literary Activity

(a) The Apocrypha

(b) Pseudepigrapha

(c) The Septuagint

2. Spiritual Conditions

3. Parties

4. Preparation for Christianity

As the title indicates, the historical period in the life of Israel extends from the cessation of Old Testament prophecy to the beginning of the Christian era.

I. The Period in General.

The Exile left its ineffaceable stamp on Judaism as well as on the Jews. Their return to the land of their fathers was marked by the last rays of the declining sun of prophecy. With Malachi it set. Modern historical criticism has projected some of the canonical books of the Bible far into this post-exilic period. Thus Kent (HJP, 1899), following the lead of the Wellhausen-Kuenen hypothesis, with all its later leaders, has charted the period between 600 BC, the date of the first captivity, to 160 BC, the beginning of the Hasmonean period of Jewish history, in comparative contemporaneous blocks of double decades. Following the path of Koster, the historical position of Ezra and Nehemiah is inverted, and the former is placed in the period 400-380 BC, contemporaneously with Artaxerxes II; Joe is assigned to the same period; portions of Isa (chapters 63-66; 24-27) are placed about 350 BC; Zec is assigned to the period 260-240, and Da is shot way down the line into the re ign of the Seleucids, between 200 and 160 BC. Now all this is very striking and no doubt very critical, but the ground of this historical readjustment is wholly subjective, and has the weight only of a hypothetical conjecture. Whatever may be our attitude to the critical hypothesis of the late origin of some of the Old Testament literally, it seems improbable that any portion of it could have reached far into the post-exilic period. The interval between the Old and the New Testaments is the dark period in the hist ory of Israel. It stretches itself out over about four centuries, during which there was neither prophet nor inspired writer in Israel. All we know of it we owe to Josephus, to some of the apocryphal books, and to scattered references in Greek and Latin historians. The seat of empire passed over from the East to the West, from Asia to Europe. The Persian Empire collapsed, under the fierce attacks of the Macedonians, and the Greek Empire in turn gave way to the Roman rule.

II. A Glance at Contemporaneous History.

For the better understanding of this period in the history of Israel, it may be well to pause for a moment to glance at the wider field of the history of the world in the centuries under contemplation, for the

words "fullness of time" deal with the all-embracing history of mankind, for whose salvation Christ appeared, and whose every movement led to its realization.

1. The Egyptian Empire:

In the four centuries preceding Christ, The Egyptian empire, the oldest and in many respects the most perfectly developed civilization of antiquity, was tottering to its ruins. The 29th or Mendesian Dynasty, made place, in 384 BC, for the 30th or Sebennitic Dynasty, which was swallowed up, half a century later, by the Persian Dynasty. The Macedonian or 32nd replaced this in 332 BC, only to give way, a decade later, to the last or 33rd, the Ptolemaic Dynasty. The whole history of Egypt in this period was therefore one of endless and swiftly succeeding changes. In the Ptolemaic Dynasty there was a faint revival of the old glory of the past, but the star of empire had set for Egypt, and the mailed hand of Rome finally smote down a civilization whose beginnings are lost in the dim twilight of history. The Caesarian conquest of 47 BC was followed, 17 years later, by the annexation of Egypt to the new world-power, as a Roman province. Manetho's history is the one great literary monument of Egyptian history in this period. Her priests had been famous for their wisdom, to which Lycurgus and Solon, the Greek legislators, had been attracted, as well as Pythagoras and Plato, the world's greatest philosophers.

2. Greece:

In Greece also the old glory was passing away. Endless wars sapped the strength of the national life. The strength of Athens and Sparta, of Corinth and Thebes had departed, and when about the beginning of our period, in 337 BC, the congress of Greek states had elected Philip of Macedon to the hegemony of united Greece, the knell of doom sounded for all Greek liberty. First Philip and after him Alexander wiped out the last remnants of this liberty, and Greece became a fighting machine for the conquest of the world in the meteoric career of Alexander the Great. But what a galaxy of illustrious names adorn the pages of Greek history, in this period, so dark for Israel! Think of Aristophanes and Hippocrates, of Xenophon and Democritus, of Plato and Apelies, of Aeschines and Demosthenes, of Aristotle and Praxiteles and Archimedes, all figuring, amid the decay of Greek liberty, in the 4th and 3rd centuries before Christ! Surely if the political glory of Greece had left its mark on the ages, its intellectual brilliancy is their pride.

3. Rome:

Rome meanwhile was strengthening herself, by interminable wars, for the great task of world-conquest that lay before her. By the Latin and Samnite and Punic wars she trained her sons in the art of war, extended her territorial power and made her name dreaded everywhere. Italy and north Africa, Greece and Asia Minor and the northern barbarians were conquered in turn. Her intellectual brilliancy was developed only when the lust of conquest was sated after a fashion, but in the century immediately preceding the Christian era we find such names as Lucretius and Hortentius, Cato and Cicero, Sallust and Diodorus Siculus, Virgil and Horace. At the close of the period between the Testaments, Rome had become the mistress of the world and every road led to her capital.

4. Asia:

In Asia the Persian empire, heir to the civilization and traditions of the great Assyrian-Babylonian world-power, was fast collapsing and was ultimately utterly wiped out by the younger Greek empire and civilization. In far-away India the old ethnic religion of Brahma a century or more before the beginning of our period passed through the reformatory crisis inaugurated by Gatama Buddha or Sakya Mouni, and thus Buddhism, one of the great ethnic religions, was born. Another reformer of the Tauistic faith was Confucius, the sage of China, a contemporary of Buddha, while Zoroaster in Persia laid the foundations of his dualistic world-view. In every sense and in every direction, the period between the Testaments was therefore one of political and intellectual ferment.

III. Historical Developments.

As regards Jewish history, the period between the Testaments may be divided as follows:

(1) the Persian period;

(2) the Alexandrian period;

(3) the Egyptian period;

(4) the Syrian period;

(5) the Maccabean period;

(6) the Roman period.

1. The Persian Period:

The Persian period extends from the cessation of prophecy to 334 BC. It was in the main uneventful in the history of the Jews, a breathing spell between great national crises, and comparatively little is known of it. The land of Palestine was a portion of the Syrian satrapy, while the true government of the Jewish people was semi-theocratic, or rather sacerdotal, under the rule of the high priests, who were responsible to the satrap. As a matter of course, the high-priestly office became the object of all Jewish ambition and it aroused the darkest passions. Thus John, the son of Judas, son of Eliashib, through the lust of power, killed his brother Jesus, who was a favorite of Bagoses, a general of Artaxerxes in command of the district. The guilt of the fratricide was enhanced, because the crime was committed in the temple itself, and before the very altar. A storm of wrath, the only notable one of this period, thereupon swept over Judea. The Persians occupied Jerusalem, the temple was defiled, the city laid waste in part, a heavy fine was imposed on the people and a general persecution followed, which lasted for many years (Ant., XI, 7; Kent, HJP, 231). Then as later on, in the many persecutions which followed, the Samaritans, ever pliable

and willing to obey the tyrant of the day, went practically scot free.

2. The Alexandrian Period:

The Alexandrian period was very brief, 334-323 BC. It simply covers the period of the Asiatic rule of Alexander the Great. In Greece things had been moving swiftly. The Spartan hegemony, which had been unbroken since the fall of Athens, was now by destroyed by the Thebans under Epaminondas, in the great battles of Leuctra and Mantinea. But the new power was soon crushed Philip of Macedon, who was thereupon chosen general leader by the unwilling Greeks. Persia was the object of Philip's ambition and vengeance, but the dagger of Pausanias (Ant., XI, viii, 1) forestalled the execution of his plans. His son Alexander, a youth of 20 years, succeeded him, and thus the "great he-goat," of which Daniel had spoken (Da 8:8; 10:20), appeared on the scene. In the twelve years of his reign (335-323 BC) he revolutionized the world. Swift as an eagle he moved. All Greece was laid at his feet. Thence he moved to Asia, where he defeated Darius in the memorable battles of Granicus and Issus. Passing southward, he conquered the Mediterranean coast and Egypt and then moved eastward again, for the complete subjugation of Asia, when he was struck down in the height of his power, at Babylon, in the 33rd year of his age. In the Syrian campaign he had come in contact with the Jews. Unwilling to leave any stronghold at his back, he reduced Tyre after a siege of several months, and advancing southward demanded the surrender of Jerusalem. But the Jews, taught by bitter experience, desired to remain loyal to Persia. As Alexander approached the city, Jaddua the high priest, with a train of priests in their official dress, went out to meet him, to supplicate mercy. A previous dream of this occurrence is said to have foreshadowed this event, and Alexander spared the city, sacrificed to Yahweh, had the prophecies of Daniel concerning him rehearsed in his hearing, and showed the Jews many favors (Ant., XI, viii, 5) From that day on they became his favorites; he employed them in his army and gave them equal rights w ith the Greeks, as first citizens of Alexandria, and other cities, which he founded. Thus the strong Hellenistic spirit of the Jews was created, which marked so large a portion of the nation, in the subsequent periods of their history.

3. The Egyptian Period:

The Egyptian period (324-264 BC). The death of Alexander temporarily turned everything into chaos. The empire, welded Thrace together by his towering genius, fell apart under four of his generals—Ptolemy, Lysimachus, Cassander, and Selenus (Da 8:21,22). Egypt fell to the share of Ptolemy Soter and Judea was made part of it. At first Ptolemy was harsh in his treatment of the Jews, but later on he learned to respect them and became their patron as Alexander had been. Hecataeus of is at this time said to have studied the Jews, through information received from Hezekiah, an Egyptian Jewish immigrant, and to have written a Jewish history from the time of Abraham till his own day. This book, quoted by Josephus and Origen, is totally lost. Soter was succeeded by Ptolemy Philadelphus, an enlightened ruler, famous through the erection of the lighthouse of Pharos, and especially through the founding of the celebrated Alexandrian library. Like his father he was very friendly to the Jews, and in his reign the celebrated Greek translation of the Old Testament Scriptures, the Septuagint, was made, according to tradition (Ant., . XII, ii). As however the power of the Syrian princes, the Seleucids, grew, Palestine increasingly became the battle ground between them and the Ptolemies. In the decisive battle between Ptolemy Philopator and Antiochus the Great, at Raphia near Gaza, the latter was crushed and during Philopator's

reign Judea remained an Egyptian province. And yet this battle formed the turning-point of the history of the Jews in their relation to Egypt. For when Ptolemy, drunk with victory, came to Jerusalem, he endeavored to enter the holy of holies of the temple, although he retreated, in confusion, from the holy place. But he wreaked his vengeance on the Jews, for opposing his plan, by a cruel persecution. He was succeeded by his son Ptolemy Epiphanes, a child of 5 years. The long-planned vengeance of Antiochus now took form in an invasion of Egypt. Coele-Syria and Judea were occupied by the Syrians and passed over into the possession of the Seleucids.

4. The Syrian Period:

The Syrian period (204-165 BC). Israel now entered into the valley of the shadow of death. This entire period was an almost uninterrupted martyrdom. Antiochus was succeeded by Seleucis Philopator. But harsh as was their attitude to the Jews, neither of these two was notorious for his cruelty to them. Their high priests, as in former periods, were still their nominal rulers. But the aspect of everything changed when Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC) came to the throne. He may fitly be called the Nero of Jewish history. The nationalists among the Jews were at that time wrangling with the Hellenists for the control of affairs. Onias III, a faithful high priest, was expelled from office through the machinations of his brother Jesus or Jason (2 Macc 4:7-10). Onias went to Egypt, where at Heliopolis he built a temple and officiated as high priest. Meanwhile Jason in turn was turned out of the holy office by the bribes of still another brother, Menelaus, worse by far than Jason, a Jew-hater and an avowed defender of Greek life and morals. The wrangle between the brothers gave Antiochus the opportunity he craved to wreak his bitter hatred on the Jews, in the spoliation of Jerusalem, in the wanton and total defilement of the temple, and in a most horrible persecution of the Jews (1 Macc 1:16-28; 2 Macc 5:11-23; Da 11:28; Ant, XII, v, 3.4). Thousands were slain, women and children were sold into captivity, the city wall was torn down, all sacrifices ceased, and in the temple on the altar of burnt off ering a statue was erected to Jupiter Olympius (1 Macc 1:43; 2 Macc 6:1-2). Circumcision was forbidden, on pain of death, and all the people of Israel were to be forcibly paganized. As in the Persian persecution, the Samaritans again played into the hands of the Syrians and implicitly obeyed the will of the Seleucids. But the very rigor of the persecution caused it to fail of its purpose and Israel proved to be made of sterner stuff than Antiochus imagined. A priestly family dwelling at Modin, west of Jerusalem , named Hasmonean, after one of its ancestors, consisting of Mattathias and his five sons, raised the standard of revolt, which proved successful after a severe struggle.

See ASMONEANS.

5. The Maccabean Period:

The Maccabean period (165-63 BC). The slaying of an idolatrous Jew at the very altar was the signal of revolt. The land of Judea is specially adapted to guerilla tactics, and Judas Maccabeus, who succeeded his father, as leader of the Jewish patriots, Was a past master in this kind of warfare. All efforts of Antiochus to quell the rebellion failed most miserably, in three Syrian campaigns. The king died of a loathsome disease and peace was at last concluded with the Jews. Though still nominally under Syrian

control, Judas became governor of Palestine. His first act was the purification and rededication of the temple, from which the Jews date their festival of purification (see PURIFICATION). When the Syrians renewed the war, Judas applied for aid to the Romans, whose power began to be felt in Asia, but he died in battle before the promised aid could reach him (Ant., XII, xi, 2). He was buried by his father's side at Modin and was succeeded by his brother Jonathan. From that time the Maccabean history becomes one of endless cabals. Jonathan was acknowledged by the Syrians as meridarch of Judea, but was assassinated soon afterward. Simon succeeded him, and by the help of the Romans was made hereditary ruler of Palestine. He in turn was followed by John Hyrcanus. The people were torn by bitter partisan controversies and a civil war was waged, a generation later, by two grandsons of John Hyrcanus, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. In this internecine struggle the Roman general Pompey participated by siding with Hyrcanus, while Aristobulus defied Rome and defended Jerusalem. Pompey took the city, after a siege of three months, and entered the holy of holies, thereby forever estranging from Rome every loyal Jewish heart.

6. The Roman Period:

The Roman period (63-4 BC). Judea now became a Roman province. Hyrcanus, stripped of the hereditary royal power, retained only the high-priestly office. Rome exacted an annual tribute, and Aristobulus was sent as a captive to the capital. He contrived however to escape and renewed the unequal struggle, in which he was succeeded by his sons Alexander and Antigonus. In the war between Pompey and Caesar, Judea was temporarily forgotten, but after Caesar's death, under the triumvirate of Octavius, Antony and Lepidus, Antony, the eastern triumvir, favored Herod the Great, whose intrigues secured for him at last the crown of Judea and enabled him completely to extinguish the old Maccabean line of Judean princes.

IV. Internal Developments in This Period.

One thing remains, and that is a review of the developments within the bosom of Judaism itself in the period under consideration. It is self-evident that the core of the Jewish people, which remained loyal to the national traditions and to the national faith, must have been radically affected by the terrible cataclysms which mark their history, during the four centuries before Christ. What, if any, was the literary activity of the Jews in this period? What was their spiritual condition? What was the result of the manifest difference of opinion within the Jewish economy? What preparation does this period afford for the "fullness of time"? These and other questions present themselves, as we study this period of the history of the Jews.

1. Literary Activity:

The voice of prophecy was utterly hushed in this period, but the old literary instinct of the nation asserted itself; it was part and parcel of the Jewish traditions and would not be denied. Thus in this period many writings were produced, which of although they lack canonical authority, among Protestants at least, still are extremely helpful for a correct understanding the life of Israel in the dark

ages before Christ.

(a) The Apocrypha.

First of all among the fruits of this literary activity stand the apocryphal books of the Old Testament. It is enough here to mention them. They are fourteen in number: 1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, Judith, 2 Esther, Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus, in Baruch, So of the Three Holy Children, History of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, Prayer of Manasses, 1 and 2 Maccabees. As 3 and 4 Maccabees fall presumably within the Christian era, they are not here enumerated. All these apocryphal writings are of the utmost importance for a correct understanding of the Jewish problem in the day which they were written. For fuller information, see APOCRYPHA.

(b) Pseudepigrapha.

Thus named from the spurious character of the authors' names they bear. Two of these writings very probably belong to our of period, while a host of them evidently belong to a later date. In this class of writings there is a mute confession of the conscious poverty of the day. First of all, we have the Psalter of Solomon, originally written in Hebrew and translated into Greek—a collection of songs for worship, touching in their spirit, and evincing the fact that true faith never died in the heart of the true believer. The second is the Book of Enoch, a production of an apocalyptic nature, named after Enoch the patriarch, and widely known about the beginning the Christian era. This book is quoted in the New Testament (Jude 1:14). It was originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic and translated into Greek as there is no trace of a Christian influence in the book, the presumption is that the greater part of it was written at an earlier period. Both Jude and the author of Revelation must have known it, as a comparative study of both books will show. The question of these quotations or allusions is a veritable crux interpretum: how to reconcile the inspiration of these books with these quotations?

(c) The Septuagint.

The tradition of the Septuagint is told by Josephus (Ant., XII, ii, 13). Aristeas and Aristobulus, a Jewish priest in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (2 Macc 1:10), are also quoted in support of it by Clement of Alexandria and by Eusebius. See SEPTUAGINT. The truth of the matter is most probably that this great translation of the Old Testament Scriptures was begun at the instance of Ptolemy Philadelphus 285-247 BC, under the direction of Demetrius Phalereus, and was completed somewhere about the middle of the 2nd century BC. Internal evidence abounds that the translation was made by different hands and at different times. If the translation was in any way literal, the text of the Septuagint raises various interesting questions in regard to the Hebrew text that was used in the translation, as compared with the one we now possess. The Septuagint was of the utmost missionary value and contributed perhaps more than any other thing to prepare the world for the "fullness of time."

2. Spiritual Conditions:

The return from Babylon marked a turning point in the spiritual history of the Jews. From that time onward, the lust of idolatry, which had marked their whole previous history, utterly disappears. In the place of it came an almost intolerable spirit of exclusiveness, a striving after legal holiness, these two in combination forming the very heart and core of the later Pharisaism. The holy books, but especially the law, became an object of almost idolatrous reverence; the spirit was utterly lost in the form. And as their own tongue, the classic Hebrew, gradually gave way to the common Aramaic, the rabbis and their schools strove ever more earnestly to keep the ancient tongue pure, worship and life each demanding a separate language. Thus, the Jews became in a sense bilingual, the Hebrew tongue being used in their synagogues, the Aramaic in their daily life, and later on, in part at least, the Greek tongue of the conqueror, the lingua franca of the period. A spiritual aristocracy very largely replaced the former rule of their princes and nobles. As the core of their religion died, the bark of the tree flourished. Thus, tithes were zealously paid by the believer (compare Mt 23:23), the Sabbath became a positive burden of sanctity, the simple laws of God were replaced by cumbersome human inventions, which in later times were to form the bulk of the Talmud, and which crushed down all spiritual liberty in the days of Christ (Mt 11:28; 23:4,23). The substitution of the names "Elohim" and "Adonai" for the old glorious historic name "Yahweh" is an eloquent commentary on all that has been said before and on the spiritual condition of Israel in this period (Ewald, History of Israel, V, 198), in which the change was inaugurated. The old centripetal force, the old ideal of centralization, gave way to an almost haughty indifference to the land of promise. The Jews became, as they are today, a nation without a country. For, for every Jew that came back to the old national home, a thousand remained in the land of their adopti on. And yet scattered far and wide, in all sorts of environments, they remained Jews, and the national consciousness was never extinguished. It was God’s mark on them now as then. And thus they became world-wide missionaries of the knowledge of the true God, of a gospel of hope for a world that was hopeless, a gospel which wholly against their own will directed the eyes of the world to the fullness of time and which prepared the fallow soil of human hearts for the rapid spread of Christianity when it ultimately appeared.

3. Parties:

During the Greek period the more conservative and zealous of the Jews were all the time confronted with a tendency of a very considerable portion of the people, especially the younger and wealthier set, to adopt the manners of life and thought and speech of their masters, the Greeks. Thus the Hellenistic party was born, which was bitterly hated by all true blooded Jews, but which left its mark on their history, till the date of the final dispersion 70 AD. From the day of Mattathias, the Chasids or Haside ans (1 Macc 2:42) were the true Jewish patriots. Thus the party of the Pharisees came into existence (Ant., XIII, x, 5; XVIII, i, 2; BJ, I, v, 2). See PHARISEES. They were opposed by the more secular-minded Sadducees (Ant., XIII, x, 6; XVIII, i, 3; BJ, II, viii, 14), wealthy, of fine social standing, wholly free from the restraints of tradition, utterly oblivious of the future life and closely akin to the Greek Epicureans. See SADDUCEES. These parties bitterly opposed each other till the very end of the national existence of the Jews in Palestine, and incessantly fought for the mastery, through the high-priestly office. Common hatred for Christ, for a while, afforded them a community of interests. 4. Preparation for Christianity:

Throughout this entire dark period of Israel’s history, God was working out His own Divine plan with

them. Their Scriptures were translated into Greek, after the conquest of Alexander the Great the common language in the East. Thus the world was prepared for the word of God, even as the latter in turn prepared the world for the reception of the gift of God, in the gospel of His Son. The Septuagint thus is a distinct forward movement in the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise (Ge 12:3; 18:18). As the sacrificial part of Jewish worship declined, through their wide separation from the temple, the eyes of Israel were more firmly fixed on their Scriptures, read every Sabbath in their synagogues, and, as we have seen, these Scriptures, through the rendering of the Septuagint, had become the property of the entire world. Thus, the synagogue everywhere became the great missionary institute, imparting to the world Israel's exalted Messianic hopes. On the other hand, the Jews themselves, embittered by long-continued martyrdoms and suffering, utterly carnalized this Messianic expectation in an increasing ratio as the yoke of the oppressor grew heavier and the hope of deliverance grew fainter. And thus when their Messiah came, Israel recognized Him not, while the heart-hungry heathen, who through the Septuagint had become familiar with the promise, humbly received Him (Joh 1:9-14). The eyes of Israel were blinded for a season, 'till the fullness of the Gentiles shall be gathered in' (Ro 9:32; 11:25).

Henry E. Dosker

BEULAH

bu'-la (be'ulah "married"): A name symbolically applied to Israel: "Thy land (shall be called) Beulah .... thy land shall be married. .... so shall thy sons marry thee" (Isa 62:4 f). In this figure, frequently used since Hosea, the prophet wishes to express the future prosperity of Israel. The land once desolate shall again be populated.

BEWAIL

be-wal' (kopto): In the middle voice, this word has the thought of striking on the breast and of loud lamentation, so common among oriental people in time of great sorrow. It is used to express the most intense grief, a sorrow that compels outward demonstration (Lu 8:52; 23:27). A striking instance of this grief is that of the daughter of Jephthah (Jud 11:37; Le 10:6).

See BURIAL, IV, 4, 5, 6; GRIEF.

BEWITCH

be-wich' (existemi): There are two Greek words in the New Testament translated "bewitch." The one given above (Ac 8:9,21 the King James Version "bewitched," the Revised Version (British and American) "amazed") has reference to the work of Simon Magus. It means "to be out of one's mind," "to astonish," "to overwhelm with wonder." The other word, baskaino (Ga 3:1), means "to fascinate by false representation." It is by this means the apostle complains they have been led to accept a teaching wholly contrary to the gospel of Christ. Both these words reveal to us something of the difficulty the early teachers had to eradicate the idea so widely held by the Jews and Egyptians especially, that there were

certain powers, dark and mysterious, which by certain occult forces they could control. For a long time this had to be contended with as one of the corrupt practices brought into the church by the converts, both from Judaism and heathenism. These words have a reference to the evil eye which for centuries was, and even today is, an important factor in the life of the people of the East. 1Ti 6:20 is a reference to this thought and explains the word "science" (the King James Version) as there used.

See DIVINATION; EVIL EYE; SORCERY; SUPERSTITION.

Jacob W. Kapp

BEWRAY; BEWRAYER

be-ra’, be-ra’-er: In its derivation is entirely different from betray (Latin, tradere), and meant originally "to disclose," "reveal" (compare Shakspere, Titus Andronicus, II, iv, 3: "Write down thy mind, bewray thy meaning so"); but has been affected by the former word and is used almost synonymously. It is the translation of three Hebrew words:

(1) qara’, meaning "to call out" (Pr 27:16), "the ointment of his right hand which bewrayeth itself" (the American Standard Revised Version "his right hand encountereth oil," the American Revised Version, margin "the oil of his right hand betrayeth itself");

(2) naghadh meaning "to front," "to announce" (by word of mouth): Pr 29:24, "heareth cursing and bewrayeth it not" (the American Standard Revised Version "heareth the adjuration and uttereth nothing");

(3) galah, "to denude," figuratively, "to reveal" (Isa 16:3), "bewray not him that wandereth" (the American Standard Revised Version "betray not the fugitive").

In Sirach 27:17 "bewray (the Revised Version (British and American) "reveal") his secrets" is the translation of apokalupto, literally "to uncover"; so also in Sirach 27:21 (the Revised Version (British and American) "revealeth"). Bewrayer of 2 Macc 4:1 ("bewrayer of. the money and of his country," the Revised Version (British and American) "had given information of the money and had betrayed his country") is the translation of endeiktes, literally, "one who shows."

In the New Testament "bewrayeth" is the King James Version of Mt 26:73; "thy speech bewrayeth thee" is the translation of the phrase delon poiein, which the American Standard Revised Version renders "maketh thee known."

Arthur J. Kinsella

BEYOND

be-yond’:Found in the Hebrew only in its application to space and time, and for these ideas three words are employed: hale’ah (Ge 35:21) =" to the distance"; ‘abhar =" to go beyond" "to cross" derivative ‘ebher (Chald. ‘abhar) =" across," "beyond" (De 30:13; Jos 18:7; Jud 3:26; 1Sa 20:36; 2Ch 20:2; Ezr 4:17,20; Jer 25:22); and ‘al (Le 15:25) =" beyond the time." In the New Testament peran, is used to express "beyond" in the spatial sense (Mt 4:15), while other words and phrases are employed for adverbial ideas of degree: huperperissos (Mr 7:37); huper (2Co 8:3; 10:16); kathuperbolen (Ga 1:13). In the King James Version be‘eher, is occasionally translated "beyond," and when this word is joined to ha-yarden, "Jordan," as it usually is, it becomes critically important. In the American Standard Revised Version, be‘ebher ha- yarden is translated "beyond the Jordan," in Ge 50:10,21; De 3:20,25; Jos 9:10; Jud 5:17; "on this side Jordan" in De 1:1,5; Jos 1:14,15; "on the other side Jordan" in De 11:30; Jos 12:1; 22:4; 24:2,8 (compare the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), Jos 24:14,25; see RIVER, THE), Jud 10:8; 1Sa 31:7; and "on the side of Jordan" in Jos 5:1. the American Standard Revised Version gives "beyond the Jordan" throughout. me‘ebher, is used with ha-yarden in Nu 34:15; 35:14; Jos 13:32; Jud 7:25; and ‘ebher, alone in De 4:49 (the King James Version "on this side"); Jos 13:27 (the King James Version "on the other side"). It is clear that the phrase may be translate d "across Jordan"; that it is used of either side of the Jordan (De 3:8 speaks of the eastern, De 3:20,25 of the western); that "beyond Jordan" may be used of the side of the Jordan on which the writer stands (Jos 5:1; 9:1; 12:7); but from the fact that De 1:1,5; 4:41,46,47,49, where statements are made about Moses, the reference is to the country East of the Jordan, while in De 3:20,25; 11:30, where Moses is represented as speaking, the West is indicated, critics have concluded that the author (at least of Deuteronomy) must have lived after Moses, being careful to distinguish between himself and the prophet.

Frank E. Hirsch

BEZAANANNIM

be-za-an-an’-im (Jos 19:33 the Revised Version, margin).

See ZAANANNIM.

BEZAI

be’-za-i (betsay, "shining"(?)):

(1) A chief who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant (Ne 10:18).

(2) The descendants of Bezai returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (323, Ezr 2:17; 324, Ne 7:23 = Bassai, 1 Esdras 5:16).

BEZALEL

bez’-a-lel (betsal’el, "in the shadow (protection) of ‘El (God)"; Beseleel; the King James Version Bezaleel):

(1) A master workman under Moses; son of Uri, son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah. Yahweh gave him especial wisdom and skill for his task, which was, with the aid of Oholiab of the tribe of Dan, to superintend the making of the tabernacle and its furniture (Ex 31:2; 35:30; 36:1,2, 8; 37:1; 38:22; 1Ch 2:20; 2Ch 1:5).

(2) An Israelite of the time of Ezra who put away a foreign wife (Ezr 10:30).

F. K. Farr

BEZEK

be’-zek (bezeq; Bezek, Codex Vaticanus, Abiezek):

(1) The city of Adoni-bezek taken by Judah and Simeon (Jud 1:4 f), in the territory allotted to Judah. It is somewhat doubtfully identified with Bezqah, about 3 miles Northeast of Gezer.

(2) The place where Saul marshaled his army before marching to the relief of Jabesh-gilead (1Sa 11:8). Eusebius, Onomasticon speaks of two villages of this name 17 Roman miles from Shechem, on the way to Scythopolis. No doubt Khirbet Ibziq is intended. Here, or on the neighboring height, Ras Ibziq, a mountain 2,404 ft. above sea level, the army probably assembled.

W. Ewing

BEZER

be’-zer (betser; Bosor, "strong"):

(1) A city of refuge, set apart by Moses for the Reubenites and located in the "plain country" (or table-land, Mishor) East of the Jordan, later assigned to this tribe by Joshua (De 4:43; Jos 20:8). The same city was assigned by lot as place of residence to the children of Merari of the Levite tribe (Jos 21:36; 1Ch 6:63,78). Driver, HDB, suggests the identity of Bezer with Bozrah (Septuagint, Bosor) (Jer 48:24). Besheir has been suggested as the present site. According to the manuscript it was forti fied by Mesha.

(2) A son of Zophah of the house of Asher (1Ch 7:37).

A. L. Breslich

BEZETH

be’-zeth (Bezeth): A place in the neighborhood of Jerusalem to which Bacchides withdrew and where he slew several deserters (1 Macc 7:19). Possibly the same as Bezetha (see JERUSALEM).

BEZETHA

be-ze’-tha: Also called by Josephus the "New City" (BJ, V, iv, 2), certain suburbs of Jerusalem, North of the Temple, which were outside the second but included within the third wall. BEZETH (which see) may be the same place.

See JERUSALEM.

BIATAS

bi’-a-tas (Phalias; Codex Alexandrinus, Phiathas): the Revised Version (British and American) "Phalias," one of the Levites (1 Esdras 9:48) who "taught (the people) the law of the Lord, making them withal to understand it." Called Pelaiah in Ne 8:7.

BIBLE, THE, I-III INTRODUCTION

bi’-b’-l, (biblia):

I. THE NAMES

1. Bible

2. Other Designations—Scriptures, etc.

3. Old Testament and New Testament

II. LANGUAGES

III. COMPASS AND DIVISIONS

1. The Jewish Bible

Josephus, etc.

2. The Septuagint

The Apocrypha

3. The Vulgate (Old Testament)

4. The New Testament

(1) Acknowledged Books

(2) Disputed Books

IV. LITERARY GROWTH AND ORIGIN—CANONICITY

1. The Old Testament

(1) Indications of Old Testament Itself

(a) Patriarchal Age

(b) Mosaic Age

(c) Judges

(d) Monarchy

(e) Wisdom Literature—History

(f) Prophecy

(aa) Assyrian Age

(bb) Chaldean Age

(g) Josiah’s Reformation

(h) Exilian and Post-Exilian

(i) Daniel, etc.

(j) Pre-exilic Bible

(2) Critical Views

(a) The Pentateuch

(b) Histories

(c) Psalms and Prophets

(3) Formation of Canon

(a) Critical Theory

(b) More Positive View

(c) Close of Canon

2. The New Testament

(1) Historical Books

(a) The Synoptics

(b) Fourth Gospel

(c) Acts

(2) The Epistles

(a) Pauline

(b) Epistle to Hebrews

(c) Catholic Epistles

(3) Prophecy

Book of Revelation

(4) New Testament Canon

V. UNITY AND SPIRITUAL PURPOSE—INSPIRATION

1. Scripture a Unity

2. The Purpose of Grace

3. Inspiration

4. Historical Influence

VI. ADDENDA

1. Chapters and Verses

2. The King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)

3. Helps to Study

LITERATURE

General Designation:

This word designates the collection of the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament recognized and in use in the Christian churches. Different religions (such as the Zoroastrian, Hindu, Buddhist, Mohammedan) have their collections of sacred writings, sometimes spoken of as their "Bibles." The Jews acknowledge only the Scriptures of the Old Testament. Christians add the writings contained in the New Testament. The present article deals with the origin, character, contents and purpose of the Christian Scriptures, regarded as the depository and authoritative record of God’s revelations of Himself and of His will to the fathers by the prophets, and through His Son to the church of a later age (Heb 1:1,2). Reference is made throughout to the articles in which the several topics are more fully treated.

I. The Names.

1. Bible:

The word "Bible" is the equivalent of the Greek word biblia (diminutive from biblos, the inner bark of the papyrus), meaning originally "books." The phrase "the books" (ta biblia) occurs in Da 9:2 (Septuagint) for prophetic writings. In the Prologue to Sirach ("the rest of the books") it designates generally the Old Testament Scriptures; similarly in 1 Macc 12:9 ("the holy books"). The usage passed into the Christian church for Old Testament (2 Clem 14:2), and by and by (circa 5th century) was

extended to the whole Scriptures. Jerome's name for the Bible (4th century) was "the Divine Library" (Bibliotheca Divina). Afterward came an important change from plural to singular meaning. "In process of time this name, with many others of Greek origin, passed into the vocabulary of the western church; and in the 13th century, by a happy solecism, the neuter plural came to be regarded as a feminine singular, and 'The Books' became by common consent 'The Book' (biblia, singular), in which form the word was passed into the languages of modern Europe" (Westcott, Bible in the Church, 5). Its earliest occurrences in English are in Piers Plowman, Chaucer and Wycliffe.

2. Other Designations—Scriptures, etc.:

There is naturally no name in the New Testament for the complete body of Scripture; the only Scriptures then known being is those of the Old Testament. In 2Pe 3:16, however, Paul's epistles seem brought under this category. The common designations for the Old Testament books by our Lord and His apostles were "the scriptures" (writings) (Mt 21:42; Mr 14:49; Lu 24:32; Joh 5:39; Ac 18:24; Ro 15:4, etc.), "the holy, scriptures" (Ro 1:2); once "the sacred writings" (2Ti 3:15). The Jewish technical division (see below) into "the law," the "prophets," and the "(holy) writings" is recognized in the expression "in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms" (Lu 24:44). More briefly the whole summed up under "the law and the prophets" (Mt 5:17; , 11:13; Ac 13:15). Occasionally even the term "law" is extended to include the other divisions (Joh 10:34; 12:34; 15:25; 1Co 14:21). Paul uses the phrase "the oracles of God" as a name for the Old Testament Scriptures (Ro 3:2; compare Ac 7:38; Heb 5:12; 1Pe 4:11).

3. Old Testament and New Testament:

Special interest attaches to the names "Old" and "New Testament," now and since the close of the 2nd century in common use to distinguish the Jewish and the Christian Scriptures. "Testament" (literally "a will") is used in the New Testament (the King James Version) to represent the Greek word diatheke, in classical usage also "a will," but in the Septuagint and New Testament employed to translate the Hebrew word berith, "a covenant." In the Revised Version (British and American), accordingly, "testament" is, with two exceptions (Heb 9:16,27), changed to "covenant" (Mt 26:28; 2Co 3:6; Ga 3:15; Heb 7:22; 9:15, etc.). Applied to the Scriptures, therefore, "Old" and "New Testament" mean, strictly, "Old" and "New Covenant," though the older usage is now too firmly fixed to be altered. The name is a continuation of the Old Testament designation for the law, "the book of the covenant" (2Ki 23:2). In this sense Paul applies it (2Co 3:14) to the Old Testament law; "the reading of the old testament" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Covenant"). When, after the middle of the 2nd century, a def inite collection began to be made of the Christian writings, these were named "the New Testament," and were placed as of equal authority alongside the "Old." The name Novum Testamentum (also Instrumentum) occurs first in Tertullian (190-220 AD), and soon came into general use. The idea of a Christian Bible may be then said to be complete.

II. Languages.

The Old Testament, it is well known, is written mostly in Hebrew; the New Testament is written wholly in Greek, the parts of the Old Testament not in Hebrew, namely, Ezr 4:8-6:18; 7:12-26; Jer 10:11; Da 2:4-7:28, are in Aramaic (the so-called Chaldee), a related dialect, which, after the Exile, gradually displaced Hebrew as the spoken language of the Jews (see ARAMAIC; LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). The ancient Hebrew text was "unpointed," i.e. without the vowel-marks now in use. These are due to the labors of the Massoretic scholars (after 6th century AD).

The Greek of the New Testament, on which so much light has recently been thrown by the labors of Deissmann and others from the Egyptian papyri, showing it to be a form of the "common" (Hellenistic) speech of the time (see LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT), still remains, from its penetration by Hebrew ideas, the influence of the Septuagint, peculiarities of training and culture in the writers, above all, the vitalizing and transforming power of Christian conceptions in vocabulary and expression, a study by itself. "We speak," the apostle says, "not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth" (1Co 2:13). This is not always remembered in the search for parallels in the papyri. (For translations into other languages, see VERSIONS.)

III. Compass and Divisions.

The story of the origin, collection, and final stamping with canonical authority of the books which compose our present Bible involves many points still keenly in dispute. Before touching on these debatable matters, certain more external facts fall to be noticed relating to the general structure and compass of the Bible, and the main divisions of its contents.

1. Jewish Bible

Josephus, etc.:

A first step is to ascertain the character and contents of the Jewish Bible—the Bible in use by Christ and His apostles. Apart from references in the New Testament itself, an important aid is here afforded by a passage in Josephus (Apion, I, 8), which may be taken to represent the current belief of the Jews in the 1st century AD. After speaking of the prophets as writing their histories "through the inspiration of God," Josephus says: "For we have not myriads of discordant and conflicting books, but 22 only, comprising the record of all time, and justly accredited as Divine. Of these, 5 are books of Moses, which embrace the laws and the traditions of mankind until his own death, a period of almost 3,000 years. From the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes, the successor of Xerxes, king of Persia, the prophets who followed Moses narrated the events of their time in 13 books. The remaining 4 books consist of hymns to God, and maxims of conduct for men. From Artaxerxes to our own age, the history has been written in detail, but it is not esteemed worthy of the same credit, on account of the exact succession of the prophets having been no longer maintained." He goes on to declare that, in this long interval, "no one has dared either to add anything to (the writings), or to take anything from them, or to alter anything," and speaks of them as "the decrees (dogmata) of God," for which the Jews would willingly die. Philo (20 BC-circa 50 AD) uses similar strong language about the law of Moses (in

Eusebius, Pr. Ev., VIII, 6).

In this enumeration of Josephus, it will be seen that the Jewish sacred books—39 in our Bible—are reckoned as 22 (after the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet), namely, 5 of the law, 13 of the prophets and 4 remaining books. These last are Ps, Prov, So and Eccl. The middle class includes all the historical and prophetical books, likewise Job, and the reduction in the number from 30 to 13 is explained by Jgs-Ruth, 1 and 2 S, 1 and 2 K, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezr-Neh, Jer-La and the 12 minor prophets, each being counted as one book. In his 22 books, therefore, Josephus includes all those in the present Hebrew canon, and none besides—not the books known as the APOCRYPHA, though he was acquainted with and used some of these.

Other Lists and Divisions.

The statement of Josephus as to the 22 books acknowledged by the Jews is confirmed, with some variation of enumeration, by the lists preserved by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, vi.26) from Melito of Sardis (circa 172 AD) and Origen (186-254 AD), and by Jerome (Pref to Old Testament, circa 400)—all following Jewish authorities. Jerome knew also of a rabbinical of division into 24 books. The celebrated passage from the Talmud (Babha' Bathra', 14b: see CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; compare Westcott, Bible in Church, 35; Driver, LOT, vi) counts also 24. This number is obtained by separating Ru from Judges and Lamentations from Jeremiah. The threefold division of the books, into Law, Prophets, and other sacred Writings (Hagiographa), is old. It is already implied in the Prologue to Sirach (circa 130 BC), "the law, the prophets, and the rest the books"; is glanced at in a work ascribed to Philo (De vita contempl., 3); is indicated, as formerly seen, in Lu 24:44. It really reflects stages in the formation of the Hebrew canon (see below). The rabbinical division, however, differed materially from that of Josephus in reckoning only 8 books of the prophets, and relegating 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezr- Neh, Esther, Job and Da to the Hagiographa, thus enlarging that group to 9 (Westcott, op. cit., 28; DB, I, "Canon"). When Ru and La were separated, they were added to the list, raising the number to 11. Some, however, take this to be the original arrangement. In printed Hebrew Bibles the books in all the divisions are separate. The Jewish schools further divided the "Prophets" into "the former prophets" (the historical books—Josh, Jgs, Sam and Ki), and "the latter prophets" (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets as one book).

New Testament References.

It may be concluded that the above lists, excluding the Apocrypha, represent the Hebrew Bible as it existed in the time of our Lord (the opinion, held by some, that the Sadducees received only the 5 books of the law rests on no sufficient evidence). This result is borne out by the evidence of quotations in Josephus and Philo (compare Westcott, op. cit.). Still more is it confirmed by an examination of Old Testament quotations and references in the New Testament. It was seen above that the main divisions of the Old Testament are recognized in the New Testament, and that, under the name "Scriptures," a Divine authority is ascribed to them. It is therefore highly significant that, although the writers of the New Testament were familiar with the Septuagint, which contained the Apocrypha (see below), no quotation

from any book of the Apocrypha occurs in their pages, One or two allusions, at most, suggest acquaintance with the Book of Wisdom (e.g. The Wisdom of Solomon 5:18-21 parallel Eph 6:13-17). On the other hand, "every book in the Hebrew Bible is distinctly quoted in the New Testament with the exception of Josh, Jgs, Chronicles, Cant, Eccl, Ezr, Neh, Esther, Ob, Ze and Nah" (Westcott). Enumerations differ, but about 178 direct quotations may be reckoned in the Gospels, Ac and Epistles; if references are included, the number is raised to about 700 (see QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT). In four or five places (Lu 11:49- 51; Jas 4:5; 1Co 2:9; Eph 5:14; Joh 7:38) apparent references occur to sources other than the Old Testament; it is doubtful whether most of them are really so (compare Westcott, op. cit., 46-48; Eph 5:14 may be from a Christian hymn). An undeniable influence of Apocalyptic literature is seen in Jude, where Jude 1:14,25 are a direct quotation from the Book of Enoch. It does not follow that Jude regarded this book as a proper part of Scripture.

2. The Septuagint:

Hitherto we have been dealing with the Hebrew Old Testament; marked changes are apparent when we turn to the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Septuagint current in the Greek-speaking world at the commencement of the Christian era. The importance of this version lies in the fact that it was practically the Old Testament of the early church. It was used by the apostles and their converts, and is freely quoted in the New Testament, sometimes even when its renderings vary considerably from the Hebrew. Its influence was necessarily, therefore, very great.

Origin.

The special problems connected with origin, text and literary relations of the Septuagint are dealt with elsewhere (see SEPTUAGINT). The version took its rise, under one of the early Ptolemies, from the needs of the Jews in Egypt, before the middle of the 2nd century BC; was gradually executed, and completed hardly later than circa 100 BC; thereafter spread into all parts. Its renderings reveal frequent divergence in manuscripts from the present Massoretic Text, but show also that the translators permitted themselves considerable liberties in enlarging, abbreviating, transposing and otherwise modifying the texts they had, and in the insertion of materials borrowed from other sources.

The Apocrypha.

The most noteworthy differences are in the departure from Jewish tradition in the arrangement of the books (this varies greatly; compare Swete, Introduction to Old Testament in Greek, II, chapter i), and in the inclusion in the list of the other books, unknown to the Hebrew canon, now grouped as the Apocrypha. These form an extensive addition. They include the whole of the existing Apocrypha, with the exception of 2 Esdras and Pr Man. All are of late date, and are in Greek, though Sirach had a Hebrew original which has been partly recovered. They are not collected, but are interspersed among the Old Testament books in what are taken to be their appropriate places. The Greek fragments of Esther, e.g. are incorporated in that book; Susanna and Bel and the Dragon form part of Daniel; Baruch is joined with Jeremiah, etc. The most important books are Wisdom, Sirach and 1 Maccabees (circa 100 BC). The

fact that Sirach, originally in Hebrew (circa 200 BC), and of high repute, was not included in the Hebrew canon, has a weighty bearing on the period of the closing of the latter.

Ecclesiastical Use.

It is, as already remarked, singular that, notwithstanding this extensive enlargement of the canon by the Septuagint, the books just named obtained no Scriptural recognition from the writers of the New Testament. The more scholarly of the Fathers, likewise (Melito, Origen, Athanasius, Cyprian, Jerome, etc.), adhere to the Hebrew list, and most draw a sharp distinction between the canonical books, and the Greek additions, the reading of which is, however, admitted for edification (compare Westcott, op. cit., 135-36, 168, 180, 182-83). Where slight divergencies occur (e.g. Es is omitted by Melito and placed by Athanasius among the Apocrypha; Origen and Athanasius add Baruch to Jer), these are readily explained by doubts as to canonicity or by imperfect knowledge. On the other hand, familiarity with the Septuagint in writers ignorant of Hebrew could not but tend to break down the limits of the Jewish canon, and to lend a Scriptural sanction to the additions to that canon. This was aided in the West by the fact that the Old Latin versions (2nd century) based on the Septuagint, included these additions (the Syriac Peshitta followed the Hebrew). In many quarters, therefore, the distinction is found broken down, and ecclesiastical writers (Clement, Barnabas, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, etc.) quote freely from books like Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, Tobit, 2 Esdras, as from parts of the Old Testament.

3. The Vulgate (Old Testament):

An important landmark is reached in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) or Latin version of Jerome. Jerome, on grounds explained in his Preface, recognized only the Hebrew Scriptures as canonical; under pressure he executed later a hasty translation of Tobit and Judith. Feeling ran strong, however, in favor of the other books, and ere long these were added to Jerome’s version from the Old Latin (see VULGATE). It is this enlarged Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) which received official recognition, under anathema, at the Council of Trent (1543), and, with revision, from Clement VIII (1592), though, earlier, leading Romish scholars (Ximenes, Erasmus, Cajetan) had made plain the true state of the facts. The Greek church vacillated in its decisions, sometimes approving the limited, sometimes the extended, canon (compare Westcott, op. cit., 217-29). The churches of the Reformation (Lutheran, Swiss), as was to be expected, went back to the Hebrew canon, giving only a qualified sanction to the reading and ecclesiastical use of the Apocrypha. The early English versions (Tyndale, Coverdale, etc.) include, but separate, the apocryphal books (see ENGLISH VERSIONS). The Anglican Articles express the general estimate of these books: "And the other books (as Jerome saith) the Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners; yet doth it not apply them to establish any doctrine" (Art. VIII). Modern Protestant Bibles usually exclude the Apocrypha altogether.

4. The New Testament:

From this survey of the course of opinion on the compass of the Old Testament, we come to the New

Testament. This admits of being more briefly treated. It has been seen that a Christian New Testament did not, in the strict sense, arise till after the middle of the 2nd century. Gospels and Epistles had long existed, collections had begun to be made, the Gospels, at least, were weekly read in the assemblies of the Christians (Justin, 1 Apol., 67), before the attempt was made to bring together, and take formal account of, all the books which enjoyed apostolic authority (see CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). The needs of the church, however, and very specially controversy with Gnostic opponents, made it necessary that this work should be done; collections also had to be formed for purposes of translation into other tongues. Genuine gospels had to be distinguished from spurious; apostolic writings from those of later date, or falsely bearing apostolic names. When this task was undertaken, a distinction soon revealed itself between two classes of books, setting aside those recognized on all hands as spurious: (1) books universally acknowledged—those named afterward by Eusebius the homologoumena; and (2) books only partially acknowledged, or on which some doubt rested—the Eusebian antilegomena (Historia Ecclesiastica, iii.25). It is on this distinction that differences as to the precise extent of the New Testament turned.

(1) Acknowledged Books.

The "acknowledged" books present little difficulty. They are enumerated by Eusebius, whose statements are confirmed by early lists (e.g. that of Muratori, circa 170 AD), quotations, versions and patristic use. At the head stand the Four Gospels and the Acts, then come the 13 epistles of Paul, then 1 Peter and 1 John. These, Westcott says, toward the close of the 2nd century, "were universally received in every church, without doubt or limitation, as part of the written rule of Christian faith, equal in authority with the Old Scriptures, and ratified (as it seemed) by a tradition reaching back to the date of their composition" (op. cit., 133). With them may almost be placed Revelation (as by Eusebius) and He, the doubts regarding the latter relating more to Pauline authority than to genuineness (e.g. Origen).

(2) Disputed Books.

The "disputed" books were the epistles of James, Jude, 2 John and 3 John and 2 Peter. These, however, do not all stand in the same rank as regards authentication. A chief difficulty is the silence of the western Fathers regarding James, 2 Peter and 3 John. On the other hand, James is known to Origen and is included in the Syriac Peshitta; the Muratorian Fragment attests Jude and 2 John as "held in the Catholic church" (Jude also in Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen); none of the books are treated as spurious. The weakest in attestation is 2 Pet, which is not distinctly traceable before the 3rd century (See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; articles under the word) It is to be added that, in a few instances, as in the case of the Old Testament Apocrypha, early Fathers cite as Scripture books not generally accepted as canonical (e.g. Barnabas, Hermas, Apocrypha of Peter).

The complete acceptance of all the books in our present New Testament canon may be dated from the Councils of Laodicea (circa 363 AD) and of Carthage (397 AD), confirming the lists of Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome and Augustine.

BIBLE, THE, IV CANONICITY

IV. Literary Growth and Origin—Canonicity.

Thus far the books of the Old Testament and New Testament have been taken simply as given, and no attempt has been made to inquire how or when they were written or compiled, or how they came to acquire the dignity and authority implied in their reception into a sacred canon. The field here entered is one bristling with controversy, and it is necessary to choose one's steps with caution to find a safe way through it. Details in the survey are left, as before, to the special articles.

1. The Old Testament:

Attention here is naturally directed, first, to the Old Testament. This, it is obvious, and is on all sides admitted, has a long literary history prior to its final settlement in a canon. As to the course of that history traditional and modern critical views very widely differ. It may possibly turn out that the truth lies somewhere midway between them.

(1) Indications of Old Testament Itself.

If the indications furnished by the Old Testament itself be accepted, the results are something like the following:

(a) Patriarchal Age:

No mention is made of writing in the patriarchal age, though it is now known that a high literary culture then prevailed in Babylonia, Egypt and Palestine, and it is not improbable, indeed seems likely, that records in some form came down from that age, and are, in parts, incorporated in the early history of the Bible.

(b) Mosaic Age:

In Mosaic times writing was in use, and Moses himself was trained in the learning of the Egyptians (Ex 2:10; Ac 7:22). In no place is the composition of the whole Pentateuch (as traditionally believed) ascribed to Moses, but no inconsiderable amount of written matter is directly attributed to him, creating the presumption that there was more, even when the fact is not stated. Moses wrote "all the words of Yahweh" in the "book of the covenant" (Ex 21,22,23; 24:4,7). He wrote "the words of this law" of Deuteronomy at Moab, "in a book, until they were finished" (De 31:9,24,26). This was given to the priests to be put by the side of the ark for preservation (De 31:25,26). Other notices occur of the writing of Moses (Ex 17:14; Nu 33:2; De 31:19,22; compare Nu 11:26). The song of Miriam, and the snatches of song in Nu 21, the first (perhaps all) quoted from the "book of the Wars of Yahweh" (Nu 21:14 ff), plainly belong to Mosaic times. In this connection it should be noticed that the discourses and law of De imply the history and legislation of the critical JE histories (see below). The priestly laws (Leviticus,

Numbers) bear so entirely the stamp of the wilderness that they can hardly have originated anywhere else, and were probably then, or soon after, written down. Joshua, too, is presumed to be familiar with writing (Jos 8:30-35; compare De 27:8), and is stated to have written his farewell address "in the book of the law of God" (Jos 24:26; compare Jos 1:7,8). These statements already imply the beginning of a sacred literature.

(c) Judges:

The song of Deborah (Jud 5) is an indubitably authentic monument of the age of the Judges, and the older parts of Jgs, at least, must have been nearly contemporary with the events which they record. A knowledge of writing among the common people seems implied in Jud 8:14 (American Revised Version, margin). Samuel, like Joshua, wrote "in a book" (1Sa 10:25), and laid it up, evidently among other writings, "before Yahweh."

(d) Monarchy:

The age of David and Solomon was one of high development in poetical and historical composition: witness the elegies of David (2Sa 1:17 ff; 3:33,34), and the finely-finished narrative of David's reign (2Sa 9-20), the so-called "Jerusalem-Source," admitted to date "from a period very little later than that of the events related" (Driver, LOT, 183). There were court scribes and chroniclers. David and the Monarchy: David, as befits his piety and poetical and musical gifts (compare on this POT, 440 ff), is credited with laying the foundations of a sacred psalmody (2Sa 23:1 ff; see PSALMS), and a whole collection of psalms (Pss 1-72, with exclusion of the distinct collection, (Psalm 42-50)), once forming a separate book (compare Ps 72:20), are, with others, ascribed to him by their titles (Psalms 1, 2, 10 are untitled). It is hardly credible that a tradition like this can be wholly wrong, and a Davidic basis of the Psalter may safely be Assumed. Numerous psalms, by their mention of the "king" (as Psalms 2; 18; 20; 21; 28; 33; 45; 61; 63; 72; 101; 110), are naturally referred to the period of the monarchy (some, as Ps 18 certainly, Davidic). Other groups of psalms are referred to the temple guilds (Sons of Korah, Asaph).

(e) Wisdom Literature—History:

Solomon is renowned as founder of the Wisdom literature and the author of Proverbs (1Ki 4:32; Pr 1:1; 10:1; Ec 12:9; Ec itself appears to be late), and of the So (So 1:1). The "men of Hezekiah" are said to have copied put a collection of his proverbs (Pr 25:1; see PROVERBS). Here also may be placed the Book of Job. Hezekiah's reign appears to have been one of literary activity: to it, probably, are to be referred certain of the Psalms (e.g. Psalms 46, 48; compare Perowne, Delitzsch). In history, during the monarchy, the prophets would seem to have acted as the "sacred historiographers" of the nation. From their memoirs of the successive reigns, as the later books testify (1Ch 29:29; 2Ch 9:29; 12:15, etc.), are compiled most of the narratives in our canonical writings (hence the name "former prophets"). The latest date in 2Ki is 562 BC, and the body of the book is probably earlier.

(f) Prophecy:

(i) Assyrian Age:

With the rise of written prophecy a new form of literature enters, called forth by, and vividly mirroring, the religious and political conditions of the closing periods of the monarchy in Israel and Judah (see PROPHECY). On the older view, Obadiah and Joe stood at the head of the series in the pre-Assyrian period (9th century), and this seems the preferable view still. On the newer view, these prophets are late, and written prophecy begins in the Assyrian period with Amos (Jeroboam II, circa 750 BC) and Hosea (circa 745-735). When the latter prophet wrote, Samaria was tottering to its fall (721 BC). A little later, in Judah, come Isaiah (circa 740-690) and Micah (circa 720-708). Isaiah, in the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, is the greatest of the prophets in the Assyrian age, and his ministry reaches its climax in the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib (2Ki 18; 19; Isa 36; Isa 37). It is a question whether some oracles of an Isaianic school are not mingled with the prophet's ow n writings, and most scholars now regard the 2nd part of the book (Isa 40-66) as exilian or (in part) post-exilian in date. The standpoint of much in these chapters is certainly in the Exile; whether the composition of the whole can be placed there is extremely doubtful (see ISAIAH). Nahum, who prophesies against Nineveh, belongs to the very close of this period (circa 660).

(ii) Chaldean Age:

The prophets Zephaniah (under Josiah, circa 630 BC) and Habakkuk (circa 606) may be regarded as forming the transition to the next—the Chaldean—period. The Chaldeans (unnamed in Zephaniah) are advancing but are not yet come (Hab 1:6). The great prophetic figure here, however, is Jeremiah, whose sorrowful ministry, beginning in the 13th year of Josiah (626 BC), extended through the succeeding reigns till after the fall of Jerusalem (586 BC). The prophet elected to remain with the remnant in the land, and shortly after, troubles having arisen, was forcibly carried into Egypt (Jer 43). Here also he prophesied (Jer 43; Jer 44). From the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah consistently declared the success of the Chaldean arms, and foretold the 70 years' captivity (Jer 25:12-14). Baruch acted as his secretary in writing out and editing his prophecies (Jer 36; Jer 45).

(g) Josiah's Reformation:

A highly important event in this period was Josiah's reformation in his 18th year (621 BC), and the discovery, during repairs of the temple, of "the book of the law," called also "the book of the covenant" and "the law of Moses" (2Ki 22:8; 23:2,24,25). The finding of this book, identified by most authorities with the Book of Deuteronomy, produced an extraordinary sensation. On no side was there the least question that it was a genuine ancient work. Jeremiah, strangely, makes no allusion to this discovery, but his prophecies are deeply saturated with the ideas and style of Deuteronomy.

(h) Exilian and Post-Exilian:

The bulk of Isa 40-66 belongs, at least in spirit, to the Exile, but the one prophet of the Exile known to

us by name is the priestly Ezekiel. Carried captive under Jehoiachin (597 BC), Ezekiel labored among his fellow-exiles for at least 22 years (Eze 1:2; 29:17). A man of the strongest moral courage, his symbolic visions on the banks of the Chebar alternated with the most direct expostulation, exhortation, warning and promise. In the description of an ideal temple and its worship with which his book closes (chapters 40-48), critics think they discern the suggestion of the Levitical code.

(i) Daniel, etc.:

After Ezekiel the voice of prophecy is silent till it revives in Daniel, in Babylon, under Nebuchadnezzar and his successors. Deported in 605 BC, Daniel rose to power, and "continued" until the 1st year of Cyrus (536 BC; Da 1:21). Criticism will have it that his prophecies are product of the Maccabean age, but powerful considerations on the other side are ignored (see DANIEL). Jonah may have been written about this time, though the prophet's mission itself was pre- Assyrian (9th century). The rebuilding of the temple after the return, under Zerubbabel, furnished the occasion for the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah (520 BC). Scholars are disposed to regard only Zec 1-8 as belonging to this period—the remainder being placed earlier or later. Malachi, nearly century after (circa 430), brings up the rear of prophecy, rebuking unfaithfulness, and predicting the advent of the "messenger of the covenant" (Mal 3:1,2). To this period, or later, belong, besides post-exilian psalms (e.g. Psalms 124; 126), the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronciles, Esther and apparently Ecclesiastes.

(j) Preexilic Bible:

If, in this rapid sketch, the facts are correctly represented, it will be apparent that, in opposition to prevalent views, large body of sacred literature existed (laws, histories, psalms, wisdom-books, prophecies), and was recognized long before the Exile. God's ancient people had "Scriptures"—had a Bible—if not yet in collected form. This is strikingly borne out by the numerous Old Testament passages referring to what appears to be a code of sacred writings in the hands of the pious in Israel. Such are the references to, and praises of, the "law" and "word" of God in many of the Psalms (e.g. Psalm 1; 19; 119; 12:6; 17:4; 18:21,22), with the references to God's known "words," "ways," "commandments," "statutes," in other books of the Old Testament (Job 8:8; Ho 8:12; Da 9:2). In brief, Scriptures, which must have contained records of God's dealings with His people, a knowledge of which is constantly presupposed, "laws" of God for the regulation of the heart and conduct, "statutes," "ordinances, "" words" of God, are postulate of a great part of the Old Testament.

(2) Critical views.

The account of the origin and growth of the Old Testament above presented is in marked contrast with that given in the textbooks of the newer critical schools. The main features of these critical views are sketched in the article CRITICISM (which see); here a brief indication will suffice. Generally, the books of the Old Testament are brought down to late dates; are regarded as highly composite; the earlier books, from their distance from the events recorded, are deprived of historical worth. Neither histories nor laws in the Pentateuch belong to the Mosaic age: Joshua is a "romance"; Judges may embody ancient

fragments, but in bulk is unhistorical. The earliest fragments of Israelite literature are lyric pieces like those preserved in Ge 4:23,24; 9:25-27; Nu 21; the So of Deborah (Jud 5) is probably genuine. Historical writing begins about the age of David or soon thereafter. The folklore of the Hebrews and traditions of the Mosaic age began to be reduced to writing about the 9th century BC.

(a) The Pentateuch:

Our present Pentateuch (enlarged to a "Hexateuch," including Josh) consists of 4 main strands (themselves composite), the oldest of which (called Jahwist (Jahwist), from its use of the name Yahweh) goes back to about 850 BC. This was Judean. A parallel history book (called E, from its use of the name Elohim, God) was produced in the Northern kingdom about a century later (circa 750). Later still these two were united (JE). These histories, "prophetic" in spirit, were originally attributed to individual authors, distinguished by minute criteria of style: the more recent fashion is to regard them as the work of "schools." Hitherto the only laws known were those of the (post-Mosaic) Book of the Covenant (Ex 20-23). Later, in Josiah’s reign, the desire for centralization of worship led to the composition of the Book of Deuteronomy. This, secreted in the temple, was found by Hilkiah (2Ki 22), and brought about the reformation of Josiah formerly mentioned. Deuteronomy (D), thus produced, is the third stra nd in the Pentateuchal compilation. With the destruction of the city and temple, under the impulse of Ezekiel, began a new period of law-construction, now priestly in spirit. Old laws and usages were codified; new laws were invented; the history of institutions was recast; finally, the extensive complex of Levitical legislation was brought into being, clothed with a wilderness dress, and ascribed to Moses. This elaborate Priestly Code (PC), with its accompanying history, was brought from Babylon by Ezra, and, united with the already existing JE and D, was given forth by him to the restored community at Jerusalem (444 BC; Ne 8) as "the law of Moses." Their acceptance of it was the inauguration of "Judaism."

(b) Histories:

In its theory of the Pentateuch the newer criticism lays down the determinative positions for its criticism of all the remaining books of the Old Testament. The historical books show but a continuation of the processes of literary construction exemplified in the books ascribed to Moses. The Deuteronomic element, e.g. in Josh, Jgs, 1, 2 Sam, 1, 2 Ki, proves them, in these parts, to be later than Josiah, and historically untrustworthy. The Levitical element in 1, 2Ch demonstrates its pictures of David and his successors to be distorted and false. The same canon applies to the prophets. Joel, e.g. must be post-exilian, because it presupposes the priestly law. The patriarchal and Mosaic histories being subverted, it is not permitted to assume any high religious ideas in early Israel. David, therefore, could not have written the Psalms. Most, if not practically all, of these are post-exilian.

(c) Psalms and Prophets:

Monotheism came in—at least first obtained recognition—through Amos and Hosea. The prophets could not have the foresight and far-reaching hopes seen in their writings: these passages, therefore, must be

removed. Generally the tendency is to put dates as low as possible and very many books, regarded before as preexilian, are carried down in whole or part, to exilian, post-exilian, and even late Greek times (Priestly Code, Psalter, Job, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Second Isaiah, Joel, Lamentations). Daniel is Maccabean and unhistorical (circa 168-167 BC).

It is not proposed here to discuss this theory, which is not accepted in the present article, and is considered elsewhere (see CRITICISM; PENTATEUCH). The few points calling for remark relate to canonical acceptance.

(3) Formation of the Canon.

The general lines of the completed Jewish canon have already been sketched, and some light has now been thrown on the process by which the several books obtained a sacred authority. As to the actual stages in the formation of the canon opinions again widely diverge (see CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT).

(a) Critical Theory:

On theory at present in favor, no collections of sacred books were made prior to the return from Babylon. The only books that had authority before the Exile were, perhaps, the old Book of the Covenant, and, from Josiah's time, the Book of Deuteronomy. Both, after the return, were, on this theory, embodied, with the JE histories, and the Priestly Code, in Ezra's completed Book of the Law (with Joshua(?)), in which, accordingly, the foundation of a canon was laid. The fivefold division of the law was later. Subsequently, answering to the 2nd division of the Jewish canon, a collection was made of the prophetic writings. As this includes books which, on the critical view, go down to Greek times (Jon; Zec 9-14), its completion cannot be earlier than well down in the 3rd century BC. Latest of all came the collection of the "Hagiographa"—a division of the canon, on theory, kept open to receive additions certainly till the 2nd century, some think after. Into it were received such late writings as Ecclesiastes, the Maccabean Psalms, Daniel. Even then one or two books (Ecclesiastes, Esther) remained subjects of dispute.

(b) More Positive View:

It will appear from the foregoing that this theory is not here accepted without considerable modification. If the question be asked, What constituted a right to a place in the canon? the answer can hardly be other than that suggested by Josephus in the passage formerly quoted—a real or supposed inspiration in the author of the book. Books were received if men had the prophetic spirit (in higher or lower degree: that, e.g. of wisdom); they ceased to be received when the succession of prophets was thought to fail (after Malachi). In any case the writings of truly inspired men (Moses, the prophets, psalmists) were accepted as of authority. It was sought, however, to be shown above, that such books, many of them, already existed from Moses down, long before the Exile (the law, collections of psalms, of proverbs, written prophecies: to what end did the prophets write, if they did not mean their prophecies to be circulated and

preserved?); and such writings, to the godly who knew and used them, had the full value of Scripture. A canon began with the first laying up of the "book of the law" before Yahweh (De 31:25,26; Jos 24:26). The age of Ezra and Nehemiah, therefore, is not that of the beginning, but, as Jewish tradition rightly held (Josephus; 2 Macc 2:13; Talmud), rather that of the completion, systematic delimitation, acknowledgment and formal close of the canon. The divisions of "law, prophets, and holy writings" would thus have their place from the beginning, and be nearly contemporaneous. The Samaritans accepted only the 5 books of the law, with apparently Joshua (see SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH).

(c) Close of Canon:

There is no need for dogmatism as to an absolute date for the close of the canon. If inspired voices continued to be heard, their utterances were entitled to recognition. Books duly authenticated might be added, but the non-inclusion of such as a book as Sirach (Ecclesiasticus: in Hebrew, circa 200 BC) shows that the limits of the canon were jealously guarded, and the onus of proof rests on those who affirm that there were such books. Calvin, e.g. held that there were Maccabean Psalms. Many modern scholars do the same, but it is doubtful if they are right. Ecclesiastes is thought on linguistic grounds to be late, but it and other books need not be so late as critics make them. Daniel is confidently declared to be Maccabean, but there are weighty reasons for maintaining a Persian date (see DANIEL). As formerly noticed, the threefold division into "the law, the prophets, and the rest (ta loipa, a definite number) of the books" is already attested in the Prologue to Sirach.

2. The New Testament:

Critical controversy, long occupied with the Old Testament, has again keenly attached itself to the New Testament, with similar disturbing results (see CRITICISM). Extremer opinions may be here neglected, and account be taken only of those that can claim reasonable support. The New Testament writings are conveniently grouped into the historical books (Gospels and Acts); Epistles (Pauline and other); and a Prophetic book (Rev). In order of writing, the Epistles, generally, are earlier than the Gospels, but in order of subject, the Gospels naturally claim attention first.

(1) Historical Books:

The main facts about the origin of the Gospels can perhaps be distinguished from the complicated literary theories which scholars are still discussing (see GOSPELS). The first three Gospels, known as the Synoptics, evidently embody a common tradition, and draw from common sources. The Fourth Gospel—that of John—presents problems by itself.

(a) The Synoptics:

The former—the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke)—fall in date well within the apostolic age, and are, in the 2nd century, uniformly connected with the authors whose names they bear, Mark is spoken of as "the interpreter of Peter" (Papias, in HE iii.39); Luke is the well-known companion of Paul.

A difficulty arises about Matthew, whose Gospel is stated to have been written in Aramaic (Papias, ut supra, etc.), while the gospel bearing his name is in Greek. The Greek gospel seems at least to have been sufficiently identified with the apostle to admit of the early church always treating it as his.

The older theory of origin assumed an oral basis for all 3 Gospels. The tendency in recent criticism is to distinguish two main sources:

(1) Mk, the earliest gospel, a record of the preaching of Peter;

(2) a collection of the sayings and discourses of Jesus, attributed to Matthew (the Eusebian Logia, now called Q); with

(3) a source used by Luke in the sections peculiar to himself—the result of his own investigations (Lu 1:1-4).

Mt and Lu are supposed to be based on Mr and the Logia (Q); in Luke's case with the addition of his special material. Oral tradition furnished what remains. A simpler theory may be to substitute for (1) a Petrine tradition already firmly fixed while yet the apostles were working together in Jerusalem. Peter, as foremost spokesman, would naturally stamp his own type upon the oral narratives of Christ's sayings and doings (the Mark type), while Matthew's stories, in part written, would be the chief source for the longer discourses. The instruction imparted by the apostles and those taught by them would everywhere be made the basis of careful catechetical teaching, and records of all this, more or less fragmentary, would be early in circulation (Lu 1:1-4). This would explain the Petrine type of narrative, and the seeming dependence of Matthew and Luke, without the necessity of supposing a direct use of Mark. So important a gospel could hardly be included in the "attempts" of Lu 1:1.

(b) Fourth Gospel:

The Fourth Gospel (Jn), the genuineness of which is assumed (see JOHN, GOSPEL OF), differs entirely in character and style. It is less a narrative than a didactic work, written to convince its readers that Jesus is "the Son of God" (Joh 20:31). The gospel may be presumed to have been composed at Ephesus, in the last years of the apostle's residence there. With this its character corresponds. The other gospels had long been known; John does not therefore traverse the ground already covered by them. He confines himself chiefly to matters drawn from his personal recollections: the Judean ministry, the visits of Christ to Jerusalem, His last private discourses to His disciples. John had so often retold, and so long brooded over, the thoughts and words of Jesus, that they had become, in a manner, part of his own thought, and, in reproducing them, he necessarily did so with a subjective tinge, and in a partially paraphrastic and interpretative manner. Yet it is truly the words, thoughts and deeds of his beloved Lord that he narrates. His gospel is the needful complement to the others—the "spiritual" gospel.

(c) Acts:

The Ac narrates the origin and early fortunes of the church, with, as its special motive (compare Ac 1:8), the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles through the labors of Paul. Its author is Luke, Paul's companion, whose gospel it continues (Ac 1:1). Certain sections—the so-called "we-sections" (Ac 16:10-17; 20:5-15; 21:1-18; 27:1-28:16)—are transcribed directly from Luke's journal of Paul's travels. The book closes abruptly with Paul's 2 years' imprisonment at Rome (Ac 28:30,31; 60-61 AD), and not a hint is given of the issue of the imprisonment—trial, liberation or death. Does this mean that a 3rd "treatise" was contemplated? Or that the book was written while the imprisonment still continued? (thus now Harnack). If the latter, the Third Gospel must be very early.

(2) The Epistles.

(a) Pauline:

Doubt never rested in the early church on the 13 epistles of Paul. Following upon the rejection by the "Tubingen" school of all the epistles but 4 (Rom, 1, 2 Cor, Gal), the tide of opinion has again turned strongly in favor of their genuineness. An exception is the Pastoral epistles (1, 2 Tim, Tit), still questioned by some on insufficient grounds (see PASTORAL EPISTLES). The epistles, called forth by actual needs of the churches, are a living outpouring of the thoughts and feelings of the mind and heart of the apostle in relation to his converts. Most are letters to churches he himself had founded (1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians(?), Philippians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonains): two are to churches he had not himself visited, but with which he stood in affectionate relations (Romans, Colossians); one is purely personal (Philemon); three are addressed to individuals, but with official responsibilities (1 Timonty, 2 Timothy, Titus). The larger number were written during his missionary labors, and reflect his personal situation, anxieties and companionships at the places of their composition; four are epistles of the 1st Roman imprisonment (Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon): 2 Timothy is a voice from the dungeon, in his 2nd imprisonment, shortly before his martyrdom. Doctrine, counsel, rebuke, admonition, tender solicitude, ethical instruction, prayer, thanksgiving, blend in living fusion in their contents. So marvelous a collection of letters, on such magnificent themes, was never before given to the world.

The earliest epistles, in point of date, are generally held to be those to the Thessalonians, written from Corinth (52, 53 AD). The church, newly-founded, had passed through much affliction (1Th 1:6; 2:14; 3:3,4, etc.), and Paul writes to comfort and exhort it. His words about the Second Coming (1Th 4:13 ff) led to mistaken expectations and some disorders. His second epistle was written to correct these problems (2Th 2:1-3; 3:6, etc.).

Corinth itself received the next epistles—the 1st called forth by reports received at Ephesus of grave divisions and irregularities 1Co (1Co 1:11; 3:3; 11:18 ff, etc.), joined with pride of knowledge, doctrinal heresy (1Co 15:12 ff), and at least one case of gross immorality (chapter 5) in the church; the 2nd, written at Philippi, expressing joy at the repentance of the offender, and removing the severe sentence that had been passed upon him (2Co 2:1-10; compare 1Co 5:3,4), likewise vindicating Paul's own apostleship 2Co (chapters 10-13). The date of both is 57 AD. 1Co contains the beautiful hymn on love

(chapter 13), and the noble chapter on resurrection (chapter 15).

In the following year (58 BC) Paul penned from Corinth the Epistle to the Romans—the greatest of his doctrinal epistles. In it he develops his great theme of the impossibility of justification before God through works of law (Ro 1-3), and of the Divine provision for human salvation in a "righteousness of God" in Christ Jesus, received through faith. He exhibits first the objective side of this redemption in the deliverance from condemnation effected through Christ's reconciling death (Ro 3-5); then the subjective side, in the new life imparted by the spirit, giving deliverance from the power of sin (Ro 6-8). A discussion follows of the Divine sovereignty in God's dealings with Israel, and of the end of these dealings (Ro 9-11), and the epistle concludes with practical exhortations, counsels to forbearance and greetings (Ro 12-16).

Closely connected with the Epistle to the Romans is that to the Galatians, in which the same truths are handled, but now with a polemical intent in expostulation and reproach. The Galatian churches had apostatized from the gospel of faith to Jewish legalism, and the apostle, sorely grieved, writes this powerful letter to rebuke their faithlessness, and recall them to their allegiance to the truth. It is reasonable to suppose that the two epistles are nearly related in place and time. The question is complicated, however, by the dispute which has arisen as to whether the churches intended are those of Northern Galatia (the older view; compare Conybeare and Howson, Lightfoot) or those of Southern Galatia (Sir Wm. Ramsay), i.e. the churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, in Paul's time embraced in the Roman province of Galatia (see GALATIA; GALATIANS). If the latter view is adopted, date and place are uncertain; if the former, the epistle may have been written from Ephesus (circa 57 AD).

The 4 epistles of the imprisonment all fall within the years 60, 61 AD. That to the Philipplans, warmly praising the church, and exhorting to unity, possibly the latest of the group, was sent by the hand of Epaphroditus, who had come to Rome with a present from the Philippian church, and had there been overtaken by a serious illness (Php 2:25-30; 4:15-18). The remaining 3 epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon) were written at one time, and were carried to their destinations by Epaphras. Ephesians and Colossians are twin epistles, similar in thought and style, extolling the preeminence of Christ, but it is doubtful whether the former was not really a "circular" epistle, or even, perhaps, the lost Epistle to the Laodiceans (Col 4:16; see LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE). The Colossian epistle has in view an early form of Gnostic heresy (compare Lightfoot, Gal). Philemon is a personal letter to a friend of the apostle's at Colosse, whose runaway slave, Onesimus, now a Christian, is being sent back to him with warm commendation s.

See CAPTIVITY EPISTLES.

Latest from Paul's pen are the Pastoral Epistles (1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus), implying his liberation from his first imprisonment, and a new period of missionary labor in Ephesus, Macedonia and Crete (see PASTORAL EPISTLES). Timothy was left at Ephesus (1Ti 1:3), Titus at Crete (Tit 1:5), for the regulation and superintendence of the churches. The epistles, the altered style of which shows the deep

impress of advancing years and changed conditions, contain admonitions to pastoral duty, with warnings as to perils that had arisen or would arise. 1 Timothy and Titus were written while the apostle was still at liberty (63 AD); 2 Timothy is from his Roman prison, when his case had been partly heard, and the end was impending (2Ti 4:6,7).

(b) Epistle to the Hebrews:

These are the Pauline Epistles proper. The Epistle to the Hebrews, though ascribed to Paul in the title of the King James Version, is not really his. It is an early writing (probably before the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD) of some friend of the apostle's (in Italy, Heb 13:23,24), designed, by a reasoned exhibition of the superiority of Jesus to Moses and the Levitical priesthood, and of the fulfillment of Old Testament types and institutions in His person and sacrifice, to remove the difficulties of Jewish Christians, who clung with natural affection to their temple and divinely appointed ritual. It was included by Eusebius, with others in the East (not, however, by Origen), among the epistles of Paul: in the West the Pauline authorship was not admitted. Many, nevertheless, with Origen, upheld a connection with Paul ("the thoughts are Paul's"). Ideas and style suggest an Alexandrian training: hence Luther's conjecture of Apollos as the writer. There can be no certainty on the subject. The value of the Epistle is unimpaired, whoever was the author.

(c) Catholic Epistles:

Of the seven so-called "Catholic" Epistles, James and Jude are by "brethren" of the Lord (James, "the Lord's brother," was head of the church at Jerusalem, Ac 15:13; 21:18; Ga 1:19, etc.); Peter and John, to whom the others were ascribed, were apostles. James and 1 Peter are addressed to the Jews of the Dispersion (1Pe 1:1; Jas 1:1). The doubts respecting certain of these writings have already been mentioned. The early date and acceptance of Jas is attested by numerous allusions (Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Didache). Many regard it as the earliest of the epistles—before Paul's. Its tone is throughout practical. The seeming conflict with Paul on faith and works, which led Luther to speak slightingly of it, is only verbal. Paul, too, held that a dead faith avails nothing (1Co 13:2; Ga 5:6). 1 John, like 1 Peter, was undisputed (if the Fourth Gospel is genuine, 1 John is), and, on internal grounds, the shorter epistles (2 John, 3 John) need not be doubted (see JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF). Jude, rugged in style, with allusions to Jewish Apocalypses (1:9,24), is well attested, and 2 Peter seems to found on it. The last-named epistle must rely for acceptance on its own claim (2Pe 1:1,8), and on internal evidence of sincerity. It is to be observed that, though late in being noticed, it never appears to have been treated as spurious. The style certainly differs from 1 Peter; this may be due to the use of an amanuensis. If accepted, it must be placed late in Peter's life (before 65 AD). 1 Peter and Jude, in that case, must be earlier (see CATHOLIC EPISTLES).

(3) Prophecy.

The Book of Revelation:

The one prophetic book of the New Testament—the apocalyptic counterpart of Daniel in the Old Testament—is the Book of Revelation. The external evidence for the Johannine authorship is strong (see APOCALYPSE). Tradition and internal evidence ascribe it to the reign of Domitian (circa 95 AD). Its contents were given in vision in the isle of Patmos (Re 1:9). The theory which connects it with the reign of Nero through the supposed fitness of this name to express the mystic number 666 is entirely precarious (compare Salmon, Introduction to New Testament, 245-54). The main intent is to exhibit in symbolic form the approaching conflicts of Christ and His church with anti-Christian powers—with secular world-power (Beast), with intellectual anti-Christianism (False Prophet), with ecclesiastical anti-Christianism (Woman)—these conflicts issuing in victory and a period of triumph, preluding, after a sharp, final struggle, the last scenes (resurrection, judgment), and the eternal state. When the visions are taken, not as poetic imaginings, but as true apocalyptic unveilings, the change in style from the gospel, which may be regarded as already written, can readily be understood. These mighty revelations in Patmos brought about, as by volcanic force, a tremendous upheaval in the seer's soul, breaking through all previous strata of thought and feeling, and throwing everything into a new perspective. On the resultant high keynote: "Amen: Come, Lord Jesus" (Re 22:20), the New Testament closes.

(4) New Testament Canon.

The principal steps by which the books now enumerated were gradually formed into a New Testament "Canon," have been indicated in previous sections. The test of canonicity here, as in the Old Testament, is the presence of inspiration. Some would prefer the word "apostolic," which comes to the same thing. All the writings above reckoned were held to be the works of apostles or of apostolic men, and on this ground were admitted into the list of books having authority in the church. Barnabas (circa 100-120 AD) already quotes Mt 20:16 with the formula "it is written." Paul quotes as "scripture" (1Ti 5:18) a passage found only in Lu (Lu 10:7). Paul's Epistles are classed with "other scriptures" in 2Pe 3:16. Post-apostolic Fathers draw a clear distinction between their own writings and those of apostles like Paul and Peter (Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas). The Fathers of the close of the 2nd century treat the New Testament writings as in the fullest degree inspired (compare Westcott, Introduction to Study of Gospels, Appendix B). An important impulse to the formation of a definite canon came from the Gnostic Marcion (circa 140 AD), who made a canon for himself in 2 parts, "Gospel" and "Apostolicon," consisting of one gospel (a mutilated Lk) and 10 epistles of Paul (excluding Pastorals). A challenge of this kind had to be taken up, and lists of New Testament writings began to be made (Melito, Muratorian Fragment, etc.), with the results previously described. By the commencement of the 4th century unanimity had practically been attained as regards even the Antilegomena. At the Council of Nicea (325 AD), Westcott says, "the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were silently admitted on all sides to have a final authority" (Bible in Church, 155).

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BIBLE, THE, V INSPIRATION V. Unity and Spiritual Purpose—Inspiration.

1. Scripture a Unity:

Holy Scripture is not simply a collection of religious books: still less does it consist of mere fragments of Jewish and Christian literature. It belongs to the conception of Scripture that, though originating "by divers portions and in divers manners" (Heb 1:1), it should yet, in its completeness, constitute a unity, evincing, in the spirit and purpose that bind its parts together, the Divine source from which its revelation comes. The Bible is the record of God's revelations of Himself to men in successive ages and dispensations (Eph 1:8-10; 3:5-9; Col 1:25,26), till the revelation culminates in the advent and work of the Son, and the mission of the Spirit. It is this aspect of the Bible which constitutes its grand distinction from all collections of sacred writings—the so-called "Bibles" of heathen religions—in the world. These, as the slightest inspection of them shows, have no unity. They are accumulations of heterogeneous materials, presenting, in their collocation, no order, progress, or plan. The reason is, that they embody no historical revelation working out a purpose in consecutive stages from germinal beginnings to perfect close. The Bible, by contrast, is a single book because it embodies such a revelation, and exhibits such a purpose. The unity of the book, made up of so many parts, is the attestation of the reality of the revelation it contains.

2. The Purpose of Grace:

This feature of spiritual purpose in the Bible is one of the most obvious things about it (compare POT, 30 ff). It gives to the Bible what is sometimes termed its "organic unity." The Bible has a beginning, middle and end. The opening chapters of Ge have their counterpart in the "new heaven and new earth" and paradise restored of the closing chapters of Revelation (21; 22). Man's sin is made the starting-point for disclosures of God's grace. The patriarchal history, with its covenants and promises, is continued in the story of the Exodus and the events that follow, in fulfillment of these promises. De recapitulates the lawgiving at Sinai. Jos sees the people put in possession of the promised land. Backsliding, rebellion, failure, do not defeat God's purpose, but are overruled to carry it on to a surer completion. The monarchy is made the occasion of new promises to the house of David (2Sa 7). The prophets root themselves in the past, but, at the very hour when the nation seems sinking in ruin; hold out bright hopes of a greater future in the extension of God's kingdom to the Gentiles, under Messiah's rule. A critical writer, Kautzsch, has justly said: "The abiding value of the Old Testament lies above all in this, that it guarantees to us with absolute certainty the fact and the process of a Divine plan and way of salvation, which found its conclusion and fulfillment in the new covenant, in the person and work of Jesus Christ" (Bleibende Bedeutung des Altes Testament, 22, 24, 28-29, 30-31).

Fulfilment in Christ.

How truly all that was imperfect, transitional, temporary, in the Old Testament was brought to realization and completion in the redemption and spiritual kingdom of Christ need not here be dwelt upon. Christ is the prophet, priest and king of the New Covenant. His perfect sacrifice, "once for all," supersedes and abolishes the typical sacrifices of the old economy (Heb 9-10). His gift of the Spirit realizes what the prophets had foretold of God's law being written in men's hearts (Jer 31:31-34; 32:39,40; Eze 11:19,20, etc.). His kingdom is established on moveless foundations, and can have no end (Php 2:9-11; Heb 12:28; Re 5:13, etc.). In tracing the lines of this redeeming purpose of God, brought to

light in Christ, we gain the key which unlocks the inmost meaning of the whole Bible. It is the revelation of a "gospel."

3. Inspiration:

"Inspiration" is a word round which many debates have gathered. If, however, what has been said is true of the Bible as the record of a progressive revelation, of its contents as the discovery of the will of God for man's salvation, of the prophetic and apostolic standing of its writers, of the unity of spirit and purpose that pervades it, it will be difficult to deny that a quite peculiar presence, operation, and guidance of the Spirit of God are manifest in its production. The belief in inspiration, it has been seen, is implied in the formation of these books into a sacred canon. The full discussion of the subject belongs to a special article. (see INSPIRATION). Biblical Claim.

Here it need only be said that the claim for inspiration in the Bible is one made in fullest measure by the Bible itself. It is not denied by any that Jesus and His apostles regarded the Old Testament Scriptures as in the fullest sense inspired. The appeal of Jesus was always to the Scriptures, and the word of Scripture was final with Him. "Have ye not read?" (Mt 19:4). "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God" (Mt 22:29). This because "God" speaks in them (Mt 19:4). Prophecies and psalms were fulfilled in Him (Lu 18:31; 22:37; 24:27,44). Paul esteemed the Scriptures "the oracles of God" (Ro 3:2). They are "God-inspired" (2Ti 3:16). That New Testament prophets and apostles were not placed on any lower level than those of the Old Testament is manifest from Paul's explicit words regarding himself and his fellow-apostles. Paul never faltered in his claim to be "an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God" (Eph 1:1, etc.)—"separated unto the gospel of God "(Ro 1:1)—who had received his message, not from man, but by "revelation" from heaven (Ga 1:11,22). The "mystery of Christ" had "now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit," in consequence of which the church is declared to be "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph 2:20; 3:5).

Marks of Inspiration.

It might be shown that these claims made by New Testament writers for the Old Testament and for themselves are borne out by what the Old Testament itself teaches of prophetic inspiration, of wisdom as the gift of God's spirit, and of the light, holiness, saving virtue and sanctifying power continually ascribed to God's "law," "words," "statutes," "commandments," "judgments" (see above). This is the ultimate test of "inspiration"—that to which Paul likewise appeals—its power to "make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus" (2Ti 3:15)—its profitableness "for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness" (2Ti 3:16)—all to the end "that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work" (2Ti 3:17). Nothing is here determined as to "inerrancy" in minor historical, geographical, chronological details, in which some would wrongly put the essence of inspiration; but it seems implied that at least there is no error which can interfere with or nullify the utility of Scripture for the ends specified. Who that brings Scripture to its own tests of inspiration, will deny that, judged as a whole, it fulfils them?

4. Historical Influence of the Bible:

The claim of the Bible to a Divine origin is justified by its historical influence. Regarded even as literature, the Bible has an unexampled place in history. Ten or fifteen manuscripts are thought a goodly number for an ancient classic; the manuscripts of whole or parts of the New Testament are reckoned by thousands, the oldest going back to the 4th or 5th century. Another test is translation. The books of the New Testament had hardly begun to be put together before we find translations being made of them in Latin, Syriac, Egyptian, later into Gothic and other barbarous tongues (see VERSIONS). In the Middle Ages, before the invention of printing, translations were made into the vernacular of most of the countries of Europe. Today there is not a language in the civilized world, hardly a language among uncivilized tribes, wherever missions have gone, into which this word of God has not been rendered. Thanks to the labors of Bible Societies, the circulation of the Bible in the different countries of the world in recent years outstrips all previous records. No book has ever been so minutely studied, has had so many books written on it, has founded so vast a literature of hymns, liturgies, devotional writings, sermons, has been so keenly assailed, has evoked such splendid defenses, as the Bible. Its spiritual influence cannot be estimated. To tell all the Bible has been and done for the world would be to rewrite in large part the history of modern civilization. Without it, in heathen lands, the arm and tongue of the missionary would be paralyzed. With it, even in the absence of the missionary, wondrous results are often effected. In national life the Bible is the source of our highest social and national aspirations. Professor Huxley, though an agnostic, argued for the reading of the Bible in the schools on this very ground. "By the study of what other book," he asked, "could children be so much humanized, and made to feel that each figure in that vast historical procession fills, like themselves, but a momentary space in the interval between two eternities, and earns the blessings or the curses of all times, according to its effort to do good and to hate evil, even as they are also earning their payment for their work?" (Critiques and Addresses, 61).

VI. Addenda.

A few notes may be added, in closing, on special points not touched in the preceding sections.

1. Chapters and Verses:

Already in pre-Talmudic times, for purposes of reading in the synagogues, the Jews had larger divisions of the law into sections called Para-shahs, and of the prophets into similar sections called HaphTarahs. They had also smaller divisions into Pecuqim, corresponding nearly with our verses. The division into chapters is much later (13th century). It is ascribed to Cardinal Hugo de St Caro (died 1248); by others to Stephen Langton, archbishop of Canterbury (died 1227). It was adopted into the Vulgate, and from this was transferred by R. Nathan (circa 1440) to the Hebrew Bible (Bleek, Keil). Verses are marked in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) as early as 1558. They first appear in the New Testament in Robert Stephens’ edition of the Greek Testament in 1551. Henry Stephens, Robert’s son, reports that they were devised by his father during a journey on horseback from Paris to Lyons.

2. The King James Version and Revised Version:

The King James Version of 1611, based in part on earlier English Versions, especially Tyndale's, justly holds rank as one of the noblest monuments of the English language of its own, or any, age. Necessarily, however, the Greek text used by the translators ("Textus Receptus"), resting on a few late manuscripts, was very imperfect. With the discovery of more ancient manuscripts, and multiplication of appliances for criticism, the need and call for a revised text and translation became urgent. Finally, at the instance of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, the task of revision was undertaken by Committees representing the best English and American scholarship. Their labors resulted in the publication, in 1881, of the Revised New Testament, and in 1885, of the Revised Old Testament (a revised edition of the Apocrypha was published in 1896). The preferencest of the American Revisers were printed in an appendix, a pledge being given that no further changes should be made for 14 years. The English Companies were disbanded shortly after 1885, but the American Committee, adhering to its own renderings, and believing that further improvements on the English the Revised Version (British and American) were possible, continued its organization and work. This issued, in 1901, in the production of the American Standard Revised Version, which aims at greater consistency and accuracy in a number of important respects, and is supplied, also, with carefully selected marginal references (see AMERICAN REVISED VERSION). Little could be done, in either the English Revised V ersion or the American Standard Revised Version, in the absence of reliable data for comparison, with the text of the Old Testament, but certain obvious corrections have been made, or noted in the margin.

3. Helps to Study:

In recent years abundant helps have been furnished, apart from Commentaries and Dictionaries, for the intelligent study of the English Bible. Among such works may be mentioned the Oxford Helps to the Study of the Bible; the valuable Aids to Bible Students (Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1898); Dr. Angus' Bible Handbook (revised by Green); A. S. Peake's Guide to Biblical Study (1897); W. F. Adeney's How to Read the Bible (1896); R. C. Moulton's The Modern Reader's Bible (1907); The Sunday School Teachers' Bible (1875); The Variorum Reference Bible and Variorum Teachers' Bible (1880); Weymouth's New Testament in Modern Speech (1909); The Twentieth Century New Testament (Westcott and Hort's text, 1904); S. Lloyd's The Corrected English New Testament (Bagster, 1905).

LITERATURE.

Compare articles in the Bible Dicts., specially Sanday on "Bible," and Dobschutz on "The Bible in the Church," in Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, II; Westcott, The Bible in the Church (1875); W. H. Bennett, A Primer of the Bible (1897); A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Divine Library of the Old Testament (1896); J. Eadie, The English Bible; works on Introduction (Driver, etc.); books mentioned above under "Helps"; B. B. Warfield in Princeton Theological Review (October, 1910); C. A. Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture (Scribners, 1899); W. H. Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament (Scribners, 1899); E. C. Bissell, The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure (Scribners, 1885); Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament.

James Orr

BIBLICAL CRITICISM

See CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

BIBLICAL DISCREPANCIES

bib’-li-kal diskrep’-an-siz.

See DISCREPANCIES, BIBLICAL.

BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

bib’-li-kal the-ol’-o-ji:

I. BIBLICAL THEOLOGY AS A SCIENCE

1. Definition

2. Relation to Dogmatics

3. Place and Method of Biblical Theology

4. Relation to Scientific Exegesis

II. HISTORY OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

1. Its Rise in Scientific Form

2. Patristic and Scholastic Periods

3. Biblical Efforts in 17th and 18th Centuries

4. Old Testament Theology in First Half of 19th Century

5. New Testament Theology in the 19th Century

6. Old Testament Theology in Second Half of 19th Century

7. Bearings of Criticism on Old Testament Theology

III. DIVISIONS OF BIBLICAL THEOLOGY

1. Divergent Views of Old Testament Divisions

2. Law and Prophecy

3. Primal Prophetism and Final Judaism

4. Place of Mosaism

5. Nature of Israel’s Religious Development

LITERATURE

I. Biblical Theology As a Science.

1. Definition:

Biblical theology seems best defined as the doctrine of Biblical religion. As such it works up the material contained in the Old Testament and the New Testament as the product of exegetical study. This is the modern technical sense of the term, whereby it signifies a systematic representation of Biblical religion in its primitive form.

Biblical theology has sometimes been taken to signify not alone this science of the doctrinal declarations of the Scriptures, but the whole group of sciences Concerned with the interpretation and exposition of the Scriptures. In that wider view of Biblical theology, the term exegetical theology has been used to define and include the group of sciences already referred to. But the whole weight of preference seems, in our view, to belong to the narrower use of the term Biblical theology, as more strictly scientific.

2. Relation to Dogmatics:

This is not to confound the science of Biblical theology with that of dogmatics, for their characters are sharply distinguished. The science of dogmatics is a historico-philosophical one; that of Biblical theology is purely historic. Dogmatics declares what, for religious faith, must be regarded as truth; Biblical theology only discovers what the writers of the Old Testament and the New Testament adduce as truth. This latter merely ascertains the contents of the ideas put forward by the sacred writers, but is not concerned with their correctness or verification. It is the what of truth, in these documentary authorities, Biblical theology seeks to attain. The why, or with what right, it is so put forward as truth, belongs to the other science, that of dogmatics.

3. Place and Method of Biblical Theology:

Biblical theology is thus the more objective science; it has no need of dogmatics; dogmatics, on the other hand, cannot be without the aid of Biblical theology. The Biblical theologian should be a Christian philosopher, an exegete, and, above all, a historian. For it is in a manner purely historical that Biblical theology seeks to investigate the teaching, in whole, of each of the sacred writers. Each writing it studies in itself, in its relation to the others, and in its place in history taken as a whole. Its method is historical-genetic. The proper place of Biblical theology is at the head of historical theology, where it shines as a center of light. Its ideal as a science is to present a clear, complete and comprehensive survey of the Biblical teachings.

4. Relation to Scientific Exegesis:

In pursuance of this end, Biblical theology is served by scientific exegesis, whose results it presents in ordered form so as to exhibit the organic unity and completeness of Biblical religion. The importance of Biblical theology lies in the way it directs, corrects and fructifies all moral and dogmatic theology by bringing it to the original founts of truth. Its spirit is one of impartial historical inquiry.

II. History of Biblical Theology.

1. Its Rise in Scientific Form:

Biblical theology, in any truly scientific form, dates only from the 18th century. Offspring as it was of German rationalism, it has yet been found deserving of cultivation and scientific study by the most orthodox theology. Indeed, Pietism, too, urged its claims as Biblical dogma, over against the too scholastic dogma of orthodoxy.

2. Patristic and Scholastic Periods:

The Patristic theology, no doubt, was Biblical, and the Alexandrian School deserves special praise. The scholastic theology of the Middle Ages leaned on the Fathers rather than on the Bible. Biblical theology, in spirit, though not in form, found a revival at the Reformation. But this was early followed by a 17th century type of scholasticism, polemical and confessional.

3. Biblical Efforts in 17th and 18th Centuries:

Even in that century, however, efforts of a more purely Biblical character were not wanting, as witness those of Schmidt, Witsius and Vitringa. But throughout the entire 18th century there were manifest endeavors to throw off the scholastic yoke and return to Biblical simplicity. Haymann (1708), Busching (1756), Zachariae (1772) and Storr (1793), are examples of the efforts referred to. But it was from the rationalistic side that the first vindication of Biblical theology as a science of independent rank was

made. This merit belonged to Gabler (1787), who urged a purely historical treatment of the Bible, and was, later, shared by his colleague, G. L. Bauer, who issued a Biblical Theology of the New Testament (Ger) in four parts (1800-1802). More independent still was the standpoint assumed by C. F. Ammon in his Biblische Theologie (2nd edition, 1801- 2). Ammon does not fail to apprehend the historical character of our science, saying that Biblical theology should deal only with the "materials, fundamental ideas, and results of Biblical teaching, without troubling itself about the connection of the same, or weaving them into an artificial system."

4. Old Testament Theology in First Half of 19th Century:

The influence of Schleiermacher was hardly a fortunate one, the Old Testament being sundered from the New Testament, and attention centered on the latter. Kayser (1813) and, still more, DeWette, who died in 1850, pursued the perfecting of our science, particularly in matters of method. Continuators of the work were Baumgarten-Crusius (1828), Cramer (1830) and Colln, whose work was posthumously presented by D. Schulz in 1836. It was in the second quarter of the 19th century that the Biblical theology of the Old Testament began to receive the full attention it deserved. It has been declared the merit of Hegel’s philosophy to have taught men to see, in the various Biblical systems of doctrine, a complete development, and Hegel did, no doubt, exert a fertilizing influence on historical inquiry. But it must also be said that the Hegelian philosophy affected Biblical theology in a prejudicial manner, as may be seen in Vatke’s a priori construction of history and doctrine in his work, Die bib. Theologie (1835), and in Bruno Bauer’s Die Religion des AT (1838-39), which disputed but did not improve upon Vatke. Steudel (1840), Oehler (1845) and Havernick (1848) are worthy of particularly honorable mention in this Old Testament connection. In his Theology of the Old Testament (3rd edition, 1891; American edition, 1883) G. F. Oehler excellently maintained the close connection between the Old Testament and the New Testament, which Hengstenberg had already emphasized in 1829.

5. New Testament Theology in the 19th Century:

The Biblical theology of the New Testament was furthered by the memorable Neander. In 1832, he first issued his Planting and Training of the Christian Church, while his Life of Jesus first appeared in 1837. In this latter work, he summarized the doctrine of the Redeemer, while the former presented the doctrinal teaching of the apostolic writers in such wise as to show the different shades of thought peculiar to each of them, pointing out, at the same time, "how, notwithstanding all difference, there was an essential unity beneath, unless one is deceived by the form, and how the form in its diversity is easily explained." C. F. Schmid improved in some respects upon Neander’s work in his excellent Biblical Theology of the New Testament, issued (1853) after his death by Weizsacker (new edition, 1864). In Schmid’s work, the Biblical theology of the New Testament is presented with objectivity, clearness and penetrating sympathy.

Hahn’s Theology of the New Testament (1854) came short of doing justice to the diverse types of doctrinal development in the New Testament. The work of G. V. Lechler on the apostolic and post-apostolic age, was, in its improved form of 1857, much more important. E. Reuss, in 1852, issued his

valuable History of the Christian Theology of the Apostolic Age, a complete and critical work, but not sufficiently objective in its treatment. The Prelections on New Testament Theology of F. C. Baur, head of the Tubingen school, exemplify both the merits and the defects of the school. They are critical, independent and suggestive, but lacking in impartiality. They were published by his son after his death (1864). A new edition of these lectures on New Testament theology was issued by Pfleiderer in 1893.

Having first dealt with the teachings of Jesus, Baur then set out the materials of the New Testament theology in three periods, making Paul well-nigh the founder of Christianity. For him only four epistles of Paul were genuine products of the apostolic age, namely, Romans, the two Corinthians, Galatians, together with the Revelation. To the growth and history of the New Testament Baur applied the method of the Hegelian dialectic, and, though powerful and profound, displayed a lack of sane, well-balanced judgment. Yet so conservative a scholar as Weiss gave Baur the credit of having "first made it the problem of criticism to assign to each book of the New Testament its place in the history of the development of primitive Christianity, to determine the relations to which it owes its origin, the object at which it aims, and the views it represents." Among Baur's followers may be noted Pfleiderer, in his Paulinism (1873).

The Theology of the New Testament, by J. J. Van Oosterzee (English edition, 1870), is a serviceable book for students, and the New Testament Theology of A. Immer (1878), already famous for his hermeneutical studies, is noteworthy. Chief among subsequent cultivators of the Biblical theology of the New Testament must be reckoned B. Weiss, whose work in two volumes (English edition, 1882-83) constitutes a most critical and complete, thorough and accurate treatment of the subject in all its details: W. Beyschlag, whose New Testament Theology (English edition, in 2 volumes, 1895) is also valuable; H. Holtzmann, whose treatise on New Testament Theology (1897) dealt in a critical fashion with the doctrinal contents of the New Testament. Holtzmann's learning and ability are great, but his work is marred by naturalistic presuppositions. The French work on Theology of the New Testament, by J. Boron (2 volumes, 1893-94) is marked by great independence, skill and fairness. The Theology of the New Testament, by W. F. Adeney (1894), and the yet more recent, and very attractively written, work with the same title, by G. B. Stevens (1899), bring us pretty well up to the present state of our science in respect of the New Testament.

6. Old Testament Theology in Second Half of the 19th Century:

Coming back to the Biblical theology of the Old Testament in the second half of the 19th century, we find A. Klostermann's Investigations into the Old Testament Theology, which appeared in 1868. The Old Testament theology, no less than that of the New Testament, was set forth by that great scholar, H. Ewald, in four volumes (1871-75; English edition (first part), 1888). His interest in New Testament theology was due to his strong feeling that the New Testament is really the second part of the record of Israel's revelation. A. Kuenen dealt with the Religion of Israel in two volumes (English edition, 1874-75), writing nobly but with defective insight into, and comprehension of, the higher religious ideas of Israel. F. Hitzig's Prelections (1880) deal with theology of the Old Testament, as part of their contents. H. Schultz treated of the Old Testament Theology in two volumes (1st edition, 1869; 5th edition, 1896; English edition, 1892), in a careful, mainly just, and, by comparison, well-balanced handling of the

development of its religious ideas.

We have not touched upon writers like Smend, for example, in his History of Old Testament Religion (1893), and J. Robertson, in his Early Religion of Israel (2nd edition, 1892), who treat of the Biblical theology of the Old Testament only in a way subsidiary to the consideration of the historico-critical problems. The Conception of Revelation in the Old Testament was dealt with by F. E. Konig in 1882 in a careful and comprehensive manner, and with regard to the order and relation of the documents, revelation in Israel being taken by him in a supranaturalistic sense. Significant also for the progress of Old Testament Biblical theology was The Theological and the Historical View of the Old Testament, by C. Siegfried (1890), who insisted on the development of the higher religion of Israel being studied from the elder prophets as starting-point, instead of the law.

Mention should be made of Biblical Study: Its Principles, Methods and History, by C. A. Briggs (1883; 4th edition, 1891); of the important Compendium of the Biblical Theology of the Old and the New Testament by K. Schlottmann (1889); of E. Riehm's valuable Old Testament Theology (1889); and of G. Dalman's Studies in Biblical Theology—the Divine name and its history—in 1889. Also, of the Old Testament Theology of A. Duff (1891); A. Dillmann's Handbook of Old Testament Theology, edited by Kittel (189:5); and of Marti's edition of the Theology of the Old Testament of A. Kayser (3rd edition, 1897).

Of Theology of the Old Testament, by A. B. Davidson (1904), it may be said that it does full justice to the idea of a progressive development of doctrine in the Old Testament, and is certainly divergent from the view of those who, like Cheyne, treat the Old Testament writings as so many fragments, from which no theology can be extracted. Biblical Theology of the Old Testament, by B. Stade (1905), is the work of a distinguished representative of the modern critical views, already famous for his work on the history of Israel (1887). The Theology of the Old Testament by W. H. Bennett (1906) is a clear and useful compendium of the subject.

7. Bearings of Criticism on Old Testament Theology:

Recent works like The Problem of the Old Testament by James Orr (1905), Old Testament Critics by Thomas Whitelaw (1903), and Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, by Harold M. Wiener (1909), deal with the critical questions, and do not concern us here, save to remark that they are not without bearing, in their results, upon theology of the Old Testament. Such results are, e.g. the insistences, in Orr's work, on the unity of the Old Testament, the higher than naturalistic view of Israel's religious development, the discriminate use of Divine names like Elohim and Yahweh, and so forth; and the express contention in Whitelaw's work, that the critical hypotheses are not such as can yield "a philosophically reasonable theology" (p. 346). Indeed, it must not be supposed that even works, like that of S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament (first issued in 1891), axe without resultant influence on Biblical theology.

So far from that, the truth is that there is probably no result of the readjustment of the history and

literature of the Old Testament so important as its bearings on the Biblical theology of the Old Testament. For the order and the method of revelation are most surely involved in the order and relation of the books or documents, and the course of the history. The progress of the revelation ran parallel with the work of God in Nature and in the growth of human society. Hence, the reconstruction of the historical theology of the Old Testament will take much time and study, that the full value of the Old Testament may be brought out as that of an independent and permanent revelation, with characteristic truths of its own. Meantime, the reality of that revelation, and the teleological character of the Old Testament, have been brought out, in the most signal manner, by theological scholars like Dorner, Dillmann, Kittel, Kautsch, Schultz and others, who feel the inadequacy of natural development or "human reflection" to account for Old Testament th eology, and the immediacy of God's contact with man in Old Testament times to be alone sufficient to account for a revelation so weighty, organically connected, dynamically bound together, monotheistic and progressive.

III. Divisions of Biblical Theology.

1. Divergent Views of Old Testament Divisions:

The divisions of Old Testament theology are matters of grave difficulty. For the newer criticism has practically transformed that mode of representing the process of Israel's religious development, which had been customary or traditional. On this latter view, the Patriarchal Age was succeeded by the Mosaic Age, with its law-giving under Moses, followed, after an intercalated period of Judges and monarchy, by the splendid Age of Prophecy. Then there was the Exile preparing the way, after the Return, for the new theocracy, wherein the Law of Moses was sought with more persistent endeavor, though not without darkly legalistic result. Such were the historic bases for Old Testament theology, but the modifications proposed by the new criticism are sufficiently serious. These it will be necessary to indicate, without going beyond the scope of this article and attempting criticism of either the one view or the other. It is the more necessary to do so, that finality has not been reached by criticism. We are only concerned with the difference which these divergent views make for Old Testament Biblical theology, whose reconstruction is very far from perfected.

2. Law and Prophecy:

That they do mean serious difference has been indicated in the historical part of this article. Most obtrusive of these differences is the proposal to invert the order of law and prophecy, and speak rather of the Prophets and the Law. For the Law is, on the newer view, taken to belong to the post-prophetic period—in short, to the period of the return from the Exile, whereas, in the traditional scheme of the order of revelation, the Law was found in full force both at the Exodus and the Return, with a dead-letter period between. The garment of legalism, the newer criticism asserts, could not have suited the Israelite nation in its early and undeveloped stage, as it does after the teachings of the prophets and the discipline of the Exile. Against this, the older scheme prefers the objection that an external and legalistic system is made the outcome of the lofty spiritual teaching of the prophets; the letter appears super-imposed upon the spirit. Criticism, however, postulates for the ritual codes of the Pentateuch an influence parallel in

time with that of prophetism.

3. Primal Prophetism and Final Judaism:

Besides the adjustments of prophecy and law just referred to, the critical views postulate a primal period in which the religion of the prophets, with their view of Israel's vocation, was inculcated; also, a final period of Judaism, intercalated between the Return and the Maccabees, in which are seen at work the Levitical law, and various anti-legal tendencies. It must be obvious that attempts to integrate the Old Testament theology amid the prevailing uncertainties of criticism must be far from easy or final, even if the need and importance be felt of keeping the religious interest before even the historical in Old Testament study. For the Old Testament writers, religion was primary, history secondary and incidental, we may well believe.

4. Place of Mosaism:

We must be content to know less of the remote beginnings and initial stages of Israel's religious development, for, as A. B. Davidson remarked, "in matters like this we never can get at the beginning." J. Robertson deems criticism wrong in not allowing "a sufficient starting-point for the development," by which he means that pure prophetic religion needs "a pure pre-prophetic religion" to explain its more than "germinal or elementary character." It may be noted, too, how much greater place and importance are attached to Mosaism or Moses by critics like Reuss, Schultz, Bredenkamp and Strack, than by Wellhausen, who yet allows a certain substratum of actual and historical fact.

5. Nature of Israel's Religious Development:

It may be observed, further, that no one is under any compulsion to account for such a transformation, as even Wellhausen allows, in the slow growth from very low beginnings of the idea of Yahweh up to pure and perfect monotheism—among a non- metaphysical people—by the simple supposition of naturalistic theory. Evolutionary the critical hypothesis of the religious development of Israel may be, but that development was clearly not so exclusively controlled by human elements or factors as to exclude the presence of supernatural energy or power of revelation. It had God within it—had, in Dorner's phrase, "teleology as its soul." Thus, as even Gunkel declares, "Israel is, and remains, the people of revelation." This is why Israel was able to make—despite all retrograde tendencies—rectilinear progress toward a predestined goal—the goal of being what Ewald styled a "purely immortal and spiritual Israel." Old Testament theology does not seem to have sufficiently realized that the Old Testament really presents us with theologies rather than a theology—with the progressive development of a religion rather than with theological ideas resting on one historic plane.

LITERATURE.

I. Old Testament Literature:

B. Stade, Biblische Theologie des A T, 1905; H. Schultz, A T Theologie, 5th edition, 1896; English edition, 1892; H. Ewald, Revelation: Its Nature and Record, English edition, 1884; G F. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, English edition, 1874; A. Kuenen, The Religion of Israel to the Fall of the Jewish State, English edition, 1875; E. Riehm, AT Theologie, 1889; S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 1st edition, 1891, A. B. Davidson, Theology the Old Testament, 1904; J. Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, 1905; A. Duff, Old Testament Theology, 1891; J. Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 2nd edition, 1892; W. R. Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, new edition, 1892; W. H. Bennett; The Theology of the Old Testament, 1896; T. K. Cheyne, Founders of Old Testament Criticism, 1893; T. Whitelaw, Old Testament Critics, 1903; W. G. Jordan, Biblical Criticism and Modern Thought, 1909; H. M. Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Crit icism, 1909; E. C. Bissell, The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure, 1885; D. K. V. Orelli, The Old Testament Prophecy, Amer. edition, 1885, English edition, 1893; B. Duhm, Die Theologogie der Propheten, 1875; E. Richre, Messianic Prophecy, 2nd English edition, 1891; C. I. Bredenkamp, Gesetz und Propheten, 1881; W. R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel, 1882; D. K. Schlottmann, Kompendium der biblischen Theologie des A. u. N. Testaments, 1889; A. T. Kirkpatrick, The Divine Library of the Old Testament, 1891; J. Lindsay, The Significance of the Old Testament for Modern Theology, 1896; R. Kittel, Scientific Study of the Old Testament, English edition, 1910.

II. New Testament Literature:

W. Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, 2nd edition, 1896; English edition, 1895; H. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der N T Theologie, 1897; B. Weiss, Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des New Testament, 7th edition, 1903; English edition, 1883; J. J. V. Oosterzee, Die Theologie des New Testament, 2nd edition, 1886; English edition, 1870; J. Boron, Theologie du Nouveau Testament, 1893-94; C. F. Schmid, Biblische Theologie des New Testament, new edition, 1864; G. B. Stevens, The Theology of the New Testament, 1899; F. C. Baur, Vorlesungen uber New Testament Theologie, 1864; W. F. Adeney, The Theology of the New Testament, 1894; A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 1897; E. Reuss, History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age, English edition, 1872; H. H. Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, English edition, 1892; A. B. Bruce, The Kingdom of God, 1890; J. Moorhouse, The Teaching of Christ, 1891; O. Pfleiderer, Der Paulinismus, 2nd edition, 1890; 2nd English edition, 1891; A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, English edition, 1891; G. B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology, 2nd edition, 1897; G. Matheso n, The Spiritual Development of Paul, 1890; E. Riehm, Der Lehrbegriff des Hebraerbriefs, 1867; B. Weiss, Der petrinische Lehrbegriff, 1855; G. B. Stevens, The Johannine Theology, 1894; B. Weiss, Der johanneische Lehrbegriff in seinen Grundzugen untersucht, 1862.

James Lindsay

BICHRI

bik’-ri (bikhri, "first born"; compare HPN, 88, 102): Father of Sheba who rebelled against David. Bichri is of the house of Benjamin and the word probably means a "descendant of Becher" (2Sa 20:1 ff).

Compare BECHER 1.

BID

Variously signifying, according to six Hebrew and as many Greek originals:

(1) "to command" (Nu 14:10; Mt 1:24 the King James Version, prostasso);

(2) "to prescribe" or "order" (Joh 2:2);

(3) "to consecrate," and so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (Ze 1:7; compare 1Sa 16:5);

(4) eipon, "to say" or "tell" (Mt 16:12);

(5) "to call" i.e. "invite" (kaleo), conspicuously used in this sense in Christ's parables of the Marriage Feast (Mt 22:3- 9) and of the Great Supper (Lu 14:7-24);

(6) "to take leave of," appotasso (Lu 9:61).

BIDDEN

bid'-n: "Called," "invited" (1Sa 9:13).

BIDE

bid: A variant of "abide" (which see); is the rendering of perimeno, in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:12 (the Revised Version (British and American) "they shall wait for me"). In Ac 1:4 the same word is translated "wait for."

BIDKAR

bid'-kar (bidhqar; "son of Deker" (?); compare HPN, 69): A captain in the service of Jehu, formerly his fellow-officer (2Ki 9:25).

BIER

ber:

(1) Found in the Old Testament only in 2Sa 3:31, "and king David followed the bier"; and in the New

Testament in Lu 7:14, "and he (Jesus) came nigh and touched the bier." The Hebrew word rendered "bier" (miTTah) and its Greek equivalent (soros) mean strictly "coffin." The so-called "bier" among the ancient Hebrews was simply an open coffin or a flat wooden frame, on which the body of the dead was carried from the house to the grave.

(2) Closed coffins, so universal now in the West, were unknown to common usage among the Hebrews of olden times, though not unknown to Egyptians, Greeks and Romans.

At the burial of Abner the people were commanded to "rend their clothes" and "gird themselves with sackcloth," and the king himself in token of his grief and royal regard, "followed the bier" in the procession to the grave (2Sa 3:31).

(3) Of Jesus, when He met the procession that went out of the gate of the city of Nain, bearing to the grave the only son of the widowed mother, Luke says, "When the Lord saw her, he had compassion on her .... and he came nigh and touched the bier," and commanded the young man to arise, etc. We should recall that contact with a dead body was forbidden by the law as a source of defilement (Nu 19:11 f); so Jesus here "came nigh" and "touched the bier" only in raising the young man, thus avoiding any criticism for infraction of the law. In Joh 11:35, as here, we have a miracle of Jesus which clearly pointed to a higher law—the eternal law of compassion which received its first full expression in the life of Jesus and forms one of the distinctive features of the gospel.

George B. Eager

BIGTHA

big'-tha (bighetha'; Septuagint Barazi; Codex Vaticanus, Boraze; Codex Alexandrinus, Oareboa): One of the seven eunuchs or chamberlains having charge of the harem of King Xerxes ("Ahasuerus") and commanded to bring Vashti to the king's banquet (Es 1:10).

BIGTHAN; BIGTHANA

big'-than big-tha'-na (bighethan, bighethana'; Septuagint omits name): One of the two chamberlains or eunuchs of Xerxes on ("Ahasuerus") who conspired against the king's life, the conspiracy being detected by Mordecai and the culprits hanged (Es 2:21). Possibly these men had been partially superseded by the degradation of Vashti and were thus prompted to take revenge Xerxes.

BIGVAI

big'-va-i (bighway; Baogei, Bagoua):

(1) The head of one of the families who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7),

having a large number of his retainers (2,056, according to Ezr 2:14; 2,067, according to Ne 7:19), besides 72 males later under Ezra (Ezr 8:14).

(2) One of those who subscribed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:16).

BIKATH-AVEN

bik-ath-a'-ven (biq'ath 'awen, "valley of vanity" (Am 1:5 King James Version, margin)).

See AVEN; BETH-EDEN.

BILDAD

bil'-dad (bildadh, "Bel has loved"): The second of the three friends of Job who, coming from distant regions, make an appointment together to condole with and comfort him in his affliction (Job 2:11). He is from Shuah, an unknown place somewhere in the countries East and Southeast of Palestine (or the designation Shuhite may be intended to refer to his ancestor Shuah, one of Abraham's sons by Keturah, Ge 25:2), and from his name (compounded with Bel, the name of a Babylonian deity) would seem to represent the wisdom of the distant East. His three speeches are contained in Job 8; 18; For substance they are largely an echo of what Eliphaz has maintained, but charged with somewhat increased vehemence (compare Job 8:2; 18:3,4) because he deems Job's words so impious and wrathful. He is the first to attribute Job's calamity to actual wickedness; but he gets at it indirectly by accusing his children (who were destroyed, Job 1:19) of sin to warrant their punishment (Job 8:4). For his contribution to the discussion he appeals to tradition (Job 8:8-10), and taking Eliphaz' cue of cause and effect (Job 8:11) he gives, evidently from the literary stores of wisdom, a description of the precarious state of the wicked, to which he contrasts, with whatever implication it involves, the felicitous state of the righteous (Job 8:11-22). His second speech is an intensified description of the wicked man's woes, made as if to match Job's description of his own desperate case (compare Job 18:5-21 with Job 16:6-22), thus tacitly identifying Job with the reprobate wicked. His third speech (Job 25), which is the last utterance of the friends, is brief, subdued in tone, and for substance is a kind of Parthian shot, reiterating Eliphaz' depravity idea, the doctrine that dies hardest. This speech marks the final silencing of the friends.

John Franklin Genung

BILEAM

bil'-e-am (bil'am; Iblaam): A town in the territory of Manasseh assigned to the Kohathite Levites (1Ch 6:70), probably the same as Ibleam (Jos 17:11, etc.), and identical with the modern Bel'ameh, half a mile South of Jenin.

BILGAH; BILGAI

bil’-ga bil’-ga-i (bilgah; bilgay, "cheerfulness"): A priest or priestly family in the time of the Return (Ne 12:5), and (under the form of "Bilgai," Ne 10:8) in the time of Nehemiah. According to 1Ch 24:14, Bilgah is the 15th of the 24 divisions of the priests who officiated in the Temple. In the Septuagint, the names read Belgai, Belga and Balgas. The traditional explanation of the name is "rejuvenation"; modern exegetes explain it as "cheerfulness."

BILHAH (1)

bil’-ha (person) (bilhah; Balla): A slave girl whom Laban gave to Rachel (Ge 29:29), and whom the latter gave to Jacob as a concubine (Ge 30:3,4); the mother of Da and Naphtali (Ge 30:4,7; 35:25; 46:25; 1Ch 7:13); guilty of incest with Reuben (Ge 35:22).

BILHAH (2)

bil’-ha (place) (bilhah; Codex Alexandrinus, Balaa; Codex Vaticanus, Abella): A city in Simeon (1Ch 4:29) = Baalah (Jos 15:29), Balah (Jos 19:3), and Baalath (Jos 19:44). Unidentified.

BILHAN (3)

bil’-han (bilhan; Balaan) :

(1) A Horite chief, son of Ezer (Ge 36:27; 1Ch 1:42).

(2) A descendant of Benjamin, son of Jediael, father of seven sons who were heads of houses in their tribes (1Ch 7:10).

BILL, BOND, etc.

(1) In the parable of the Unjust Steward (Lu 16:6 f) "bill," the King James Version, better "bond," the Revised Version (British and American), is used to translate the Greek grammata, which is the equivalent of the contemporary Hebrew legal term sheTar, "writing." This "writing," in the usage of the times, was an acknowledgment of the taking over or receiving of goods or money that had to be written and signed by the debtor himself. (See Babha’ Bathra’ Lu 10:8.) Edersheim’s averment that the Greek word was adopted into the Hebrew (Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 272), is based, according to competent textual critics, upon a false reading. The Greek, according to Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, is ta grammata, not to gramma (Textus Receptus of the New Testament). The word is indefinite, literally "the letter," and determines nothing involved in controversy.

(2) A question much discussed is, Was "the bond" (the Revised Version (British and American)) merely an acknowledgment of debt, or was it an obligation to pay a fixed annual rental from the produce of a

farm? Edersheim, for instance, holds the former view, Lightfoot the latter. That the obligation is stated in the parable in kind—wheat and oil—and not in money—seems to bear against the simple debt theory. Edersheim sets down the remissions spoken of as authorized by the steward as amounting in money value to only about 5 British pounds and 25 British pounds respectively, and thinks they represented not a single but an annual payment (compare Kennedy, 1-vol HDB, and Fraser, DCG, article "Bill").

(3) Still another question has arisen: Was the old "bond" simply altered, or was a new one substituted for it? Here again Lightfoot and Edersheim are in the controversy and on opposite sides. The alteration of the old bond is suggested though not demanded by the language here, and, moreover, would be, Edersheim thinks, in accordance with the probabilities of the case. Such bonds were usually written, not on vellum or papyrus, but on wax-covered tablets, and so could be easily erased or altered by the stylus with its fiat, thick "eraser" (mocheq).

(4) It is probably safe to conclude:

(a) that the "bill" or "bond" had to be written and signed by the person assuming the obligation;

(b) that it was the only formal or legal evidence of the debt incurred; and

(c) that the supervision of the whole transaction belonged of right to "the steward." Should "the steward" conspire with the debtor against the master, the latter, it would appear, would have no check against the fraud.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrew, edition L. and T., II, 268-73; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 272 ff; crit. commentary in the place cited.

George B. Eager

BILL OF DIVORCEMENT

di-vors’-ment.

See DIVORCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BILLOW

bil’-o (gal, "a great rolling wave"): Figuratively, of trouble, "All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me" (Ps 42:7; compare Jon 2:3).

BILSHAN

bil’-shan (bilshan): An Israelite who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2 = Ne 7:7). The name may be explained as the "inquirer" (new Hebrew and Aramaic), balash, the ("b" being an abbreviation of ben, as in bidhqar, and bimhal. Bilshan would then be a compound of ben, and lashon. J. Halevy (Revue etudes juives, X, 3)) translates the name "pere de la langue," ‘abh lashon. In 1 Esdras 5:8, he is called "Beelsarus," which is akin to the form "Belshar" =" Belshar-uccur" or "O Bel, protect king." Bilshan points to "Belsun," "his lord." The rabbis take Bilshan as a surname to the preceding

Mordecai. H. J. Wolf

BIMHAL

bim’-hal (bimhal): A descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:33).

BIND; BOUND

bind (deo): There are a number of Hebrew words used to express this word in its various meanings, ‘alam (Ge 37:7), ‘acar (Ge 42:24), qashar (De 6:8). It sometimes means "to attach," "to fasten" (Ex 28:28; De 14:25). It was used also with reference to an agreement in a judicial sense (Nu 30:2,3), or to make one a prisoner (Jud 16:10; Ps 149:8). It means also "to control" (Job 38:31).

Figurative: In a figurative sense, to bind heavy and burdensome (extra) so-called religious duties on men (Mt 23:4). This figurative use of the word in Mt 16:19 and 18:18 has given special interest to it. Necessarily certain powers for administration must be conferred on this company of men to carry out the purpose of Christ. That this power was not conferred on Peter alone is evident from the fact that in Mt 18:18 it is conferred on all the apostles. The use of the word in the New Testament is to declare a thing to be binding or obligatory (Joh 20:23). In this sense this authority is used by some denominations in the service in preparation for the Lord’s Supper, in which after the confession of sin by the people the ministers say, "I declare to you who have sincerely repented of your sins and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ the entire forgiveness of your sins." This statement is followed by the further declaration that if any have not so repented God will not forgive them, but will retain them and call them to account. The claim of the church of Rome that these statements of our Lord confer on the priests and bishops, or primarily on the pope, the power to retain or forgive sins, is without historical validity and does violence to the Scriptures.

See AUTHORITY; FORGIVENESS; PETER.

Jacob W. Kapp

BINEA

bin’-e-a (bin‘ah): A name in the genealogy of Benjamin (1Ch 8:37: = 1Ch 9:43).

BINNUI

bin’-u-i (binnuy, a proper name, "a building up"):

(1) A Levite, living in the time of Ezra (Ezr 8:33; Ne 10:9; 12:8).

(2) One of the bene Pachath-mo’abh who had taken foreign wives (Ezr 10:30—Balnuus of 1 Esdras 9:31) and one of the bene Bani (Ezr 10:38) who had also intermarried.

(3) The son of Henadad, who built part of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:24), and sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:9). In all probability he is identical with "Bavvai, the son of Henadad" mentioned in Ne 3:18. "Bavvai" is either a corruption of "Binnui," or is the name of the Levitical house of which Bavvai was the chief representative. Binnui is mentioned in Ne 10:9 as a leading Levite, and, besides, the names in these verses are obviously those of priests and Levites; so the former theory is probably correct. (4) Head of a family who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 7:15; Ezr 2:10).

H. J. Wolf

BIRD-CATCHER

burd’-kach-er

See FOWLER.

BIRDS

burds (‘ayiT; Greek variously ta peteina (Mt 13:4) ta ornea tou ouranou (Re 19:17) ornis (Mt 23:37; Lu 13:34) Latin, avis; Old English "brid"):

I. Meaning of the Word.

All authorities agree that the exact origin of the word bird, as we apply it to feathered creatures, is unknown.

1. In Early Hebrew:

The Hebrew ‘ayiT means to "tear and scratch the face," and in its original form undoubtedly applied to birds of prey. It is probable that no spot of equal size on the face of the globe ever collected such

numbers of vultures, eagles and hawks as ancient Palestine. The land was so luxuriant that flocks and herds fed from the face of Nature. In cities, villages, and among tent-dwellers incessant slaughter went on for food, while the heavens must almost have been obscured by the ascending smoke from the burning of sacrificed animals and birds, required by law of every man and woman. From all these slain creatures the offal was thrown to the birds. There were no guns; the arrows of bowmen or "throw sticks" were the only protection against them, and these arms made no noise to frighten feathered creatures, and did small damage. So it easily can be seen that the birds would increase in large numbers and become so bold that men were often in actual conflict with them, and no doubt their faces and hands were torn and scratched.

2. In Later Usage:

Later, as birds of song and those useful for food came into their lives, the word was stretched to cover all feathered creatures. In the King James Version ‘ayiT is translated "fowl," and occurs several times: "And when the fowls came down upon the carcasses, Abram drove them away" (Ge 15:11). "They shall be left together unto the fowls of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth; and the fowls shall summer upon them, and all the beasts of the earth shall winter upon them" (Isa 18:6). "There is a path which no fowl knoweth, and which the vulture’s eye hath not seen" (Job 28:7). The American Standard Revised Version changes these and all other references to feathered creatures to "birds," making a long list. The Hebrew ‘ayiT in its final acceptance was used in Palestine as "bird" is with us.

3. In Old English:

Our earliest known form of the word is the Old English "brid," but they applied the term to the young of any creature. Later its meaning was narrowed to young produced from eggs, and the form changed to "bird."

II. Natural History of Birds.

The first known traces of birds appear in the formation of the Triassic period, and are found in the shape of footprints on the red sandstone of the Connecticut valley.

1. Earliest Traces and Specimens:

This must have been an ancient sea bed over which stalked large birds, leaving deeply imprinted impressions of their feet. These impressions baked in the sun, and were drifted full of fine wind-driven sand before the return of the tide. Thus were preserved to us the traces of 33 species of birds all of which are proven by their footprints to have been much larger than our birds of today. The largest impressions ever found measured 15 inches in length by 10 in width, and were set from 4 to 6 ft. apart. This evidence would form the basis for an estimate of a bird at least four times as large as an ostrich. That a bird of this size ever existed was not given credence until the finding of the remains of the dinornis in New Zealand. The largest specimen of this bird stood 10 1/2 ft. in height. The first complete skeleton of a bird was

found in the limestone of the Jurassic period in Solenhofen, Bavaria. This bird had 13 teeth above and 3 below, each set in a separate socket, wings ending in three-fingered claws much longer than the claws of the feet, and a tail of 20 vertebrae, as long as the body, having a row of long feathers down each side of it, the specimen close to the size of a crow. The first preserved likeness of a bird was found frescoed on the inside of a tomb of Maydoon, and is supposed to antedate the time of Moses 3,000 years. It is now carefully preserved in the museum of Cairo. The painting represents six geese, four of which can be recognized readily as the ancestors of two species known today. Scientists now admit that Moses was right in assigning the origin of birds to the water, as their structure is closer reptilian than mammalian, and they reproduce by eggs. To us it seems a long stretch between the reptile with a frame most nearly bird-like and a feathered creature, but there is a possibility that forms making closer connection yet will be found.

2. Structural Formation:

The trunk of a bird is compact and in almost all instances boat-shaped. Without doubt prehistoric man conceived his idea of navigation and fashioned his vessel from the body of a water bird, and then noticed that a soaring bird steered its course with its tail and so added the rudder. The structural formation of a bird is so arranged as to give powerful flight and perfect respiration. In the case of a few birds that do not fly, the wings are beaten to assist in attaining speed in running, as the ostrich, or to help in swimming under the water, as the auk. The skull of a young bird is made up of parts, as is that of man or animal; but with age these parts join so evenly that they appear in a seamless formation. The jaws extend beyond the face, forming a bill that varies in length and shape with species, and it is used in securing food, in defense, feather dressing, nest building—in fact it is a combination of the mouth and hand of man. The spine is practically immovable, because of the ribs attached to the upper half and the bony structure supporting the pelvic joints of the lower. In sharp contrast with this the neck is formed of from 10 to 23 vertebrae, and is so flexible that a bird can turn its head completely around, a thing impossible to man or beast. The breast bone is large, strong, and provided with a ridge in the middle, largest in birds of strong flight, smallest in swimmers, and lacking only in birds that do not fly, as the ostrich. The wings correspond to the arms of man, and are now used in flight and swimming only. Such skeletons as the Archeopteryx prove that the bones now combined in the tip of the wing were once claws. This shows that as birds spread over land and developed wing power in searching longer distances for food or when driven by varying conditions of climate, the wings were used more in flight, and the claws gradually joined in a tip and were given covering that grew feathers, while the bill became the instrument for taking food and for defense. At the same time the long tail proving an encumbrance, it gradually wore away and contracted to the present form. Studied in detail of bony structure, muscle, and complicated arrangement of feathers of differing sizes, the wing of a bird proves one of Nature’s marvels. The legs are used in walking or swimming, the thigh joint being so enveloped in the body that the true leg is often mistaken for it. This makes the knee of a man correspond to the heel of a bird, and in young birds of prey especially, the shank or tarsus is used in walking, until the bones harden and the birds are enabled to bear their weight on the feet and straighten the shank. The toes vary with species. Pliny classified birds by them: "The first and principal difference and distinction in birds is taken from their feet; for they have either hooked talons, as Hawkes, or long round claws as Hens, or else they be broad, flat and whole- footed as Geese." Flight is only possible to a bird when both wings are so nearly full-feathered

that it balances perfectly. In sleep almost every bird places its head under its wing and stands on one foot. The arrangement by which this is accomplished, without tiring the bird in the least, is little short of miraculous and can be the result only of slow ages of evolution. In the most finished degree this provision for the comfort of the bird is found among cranes and other long- legged water birds. The bone of one part of the leg fits into the bone of the part above, so that it is practically locked into place with no exertion on the part of the bird. At the same time the muscles that work the claws, cross the joints of the leg so that they are stretched by the weight of the bird, and with no effort, it stands on earth or perches on a branch. This explains the question so frequently asked as to why the feet of a perching bird do not become so cramped and tired that it falls.

3. Birds' Food, Blood, etc.:

Birds feed according to their nature, some on prey taken alive, some on the carrion of dead bodies, some on fish and vegetable products of the water, some on fruit seed, insects and worms of the land. Almost every bird indulges in a combination of differing foods. Their blood is from 12 degrees to 16 degrees warmer than that of the rest of the animal kingdom, and they exhibit a corresponding exhilaration of spirits. Some indulge in hours of sailing and soaring, some in bubbling notes of song, while others dart near earth in playful dashes of flight. Birds are supposed to be rather deficient in the senses of taste and touch, and to have unusually keen vision. They reproduce by eggs that they deposit in a previously selected and prepared spot, and brood for a length of time varying with the species. The young of birds of prey, song birds, and some water birds, remain in the nests for differing lengths of time and are fed by the old birds; while others of the water birds and most of the game birds leave the nest as soon as the down is dry, and find food as they are taught by their elders, being sheltered at night so long as needful.

III. Birds of the Bible.

The birds of the Bible were the same species and form as exist in Palestine today. Because of their wonderful coloring, powerful flight, joyous song, and their similarity to humanity in home-making and the business of raising their young, birds have been given much attention, and have held conspicuous place since the dawn of history. When the brain of man was young and more credulous than today he saw omens, signs and miracles in the characteristic acts of birds, and attributed to them various marvelous powers: some were considered of good omen and a blessing, and some were bad and a curse.

1. Earliest Mention:

The historians of the Bible frequently used birds in comparison, simile, and metaphor. They are first mentioned in Ge 7:14,15, "They, and every beast after its kind, and all the cattle after their kind, and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and every bird after its kind, every bird of every sort." This is the enumeration of the feathered creatures taken into the ark to be preserved for the perpetuation of species after the flood abated. They are next found in the description of the sacrifice of Abram, where it was specified that he was to use, with the animals slaughtered, a turtle dove and a young pigeon, the birds not to be divided. It is also recorded that the birds of prey were attracted by the

carcasses as described in Ge 15:9-11, "And he said unto him, Take me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon. And he took him all these, and divided them in the midst, and laid each half over against the other: but the birds divided he not. And the birds of prey came down upon the carcasses, and Abram drove them away." Palestine abounded in several varieties of "doves" (which see) and their devotion to each other, and tender, gentle characteristics had marked them as a loved possession of the land; while the clay cotes of pigeons were reckoned in establishing an estimate of a man’s wealth.

2. Used in Sacrifice:

In an abandon of gratitude to God these people offered of their best-loved and most prized possessions as sacrifice; and so it is not surprising to find the history of burnt offerings frequently mentioning these birds which were loved and prized above all others. Their use is first commanded in Le 1:14-17, "And if his oblation to Yahweh be a burnt-offering of birds, then he shall offer his oblation of turtle-doves, or of young pigeons. And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off its head , and burn it on the altar; and the blood thereof shall be drained out on the side of the altar; and he shall take away its crop with the filth thereof, and cast it beside the altar on the east part, in the place of the ashes." Again in Le 5:7-10, we read: "And if his means suffice not for a lamb, then he shall bring his trespass- offering for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, unto Yahweh; one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering." Throughout the Bible these birds figure in the history of sacrifice (Le 12:8; 14:4-8; Nu 6:10, etc.).

3. Other References:

The custom of weaving cages of willow wands, in which to confine birds for pets, seems to be referred to when Job asks (Job 41:5): +" Wilt thou play with him as with a bird? Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?" -See Job 12:7: +" But ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; And the birds of the heavens, and they shall tell thee." David was thinking of the swift homeward flight of an eagle when he wrote: "In Yahweh do I take refuge: How say ye to my soul, Flee as a bird to your mountain?" (Ps 11:1).

His early days guarding the flocks of his father no doubt suggested to him the statement found in Ps 50:11: "I know all the birds of the mountains; And the wild beasts of the field are mine" (the Revised Version margin, "in my mind"). In describing Lebanon, the Psalmist wrote of its waters: "By them the birds of the heavens have their habitation; They sing among the branches" (Ps 104:12). -He mentioned its trees: +" Where the birds make their nests: As for the stork, the fir-trees are her house" (Ps 104:17). -See also Ps 78:27; 148:10.

The origin of the oft-quoted phrase, "A little bird told me," can be found in Ec 10:20: "Revile not the king, no, not in thy thought; and revile not the rich in thy bedchamber: for a bird of the heavens shall carry the voice, and that which hath wings shall tell the matter." In a poetical description of spring in the So of Solomon, we read: +" The flowers appear on the earth; The time of the singing of birds is come, And the voice of the turtle-dove is heard in our land" (So 2:12). -In his prophecy concerning Ethiopia,

Isaiah wrote, "They shall be left together unto the ravenous birds of the mountains, and to the beasts of the earth; and the ravenous birds shall summer upon them, and all the beasts of the earth shall winter upon them" (Isa 18:6). In foretelling God's judgment upon Babylon, Isaiah (Isa 46:11) refers to Cyrus as "a ravenous bird (called) from the east, the man of my counsel from a far country"; "probably in allusion to the fact that the griffon was the emblem of Persia; and embroidered on its standard" (HDB, I, 632); (see EAGLE). Jer 4:25 describes the habit of birds, which invariably seek shelter before an approaching storm. In His denunciation of Israel, Yahweh questions, in Jer 12:9, "Is my heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey? are the birds of prey against her round about?" When Jeremiah threatened the destruction of Jerusalem, he wrote that Yahweh would "cause them to fall by the sword before their enemies, and by the hand of them that seek their life: and their dead bodies will I give to be food for the birds of the heavens" (Jer 19:7): that is, He would leave them for the carrion eaters. Ezekiel threatens the same fate to the inhabitants of Gog (Eze 39:4,17). Hosea (Ho 9:11) prophesies of Ephraim, "Their glory shall fly away like a bird." In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus mentions the birds, as recorded by Mt 6:26: "Behold the birds of the heaven, that they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; and your heavenly Father feedeth them. Are not ye of much more value than they?" In the sermon from the boat where He spoke the parable of the Sower He again mentioned the birds: "As he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the birds came and devoured them" (Mt 13:4). Mark describes the same sermon in Mr 4:4, and Mr 4:32 quotes the parable of the Mustard Seed: "Yet when it is sown, (it) groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches; so that the birds of the heaven can lodge under the shadow thereof." In Lu 8:5, Luke gives his version of the parable of the Sower, and in Lu 13:19 of the Mustard Seed. See also Re 19:17,21. These constitute all the important references to birds in the Bible, with the exception of a few that seem to belong properly under such subjects as TRAP; NET; CAGE, etc..

Gene Stratton-Porter

BIRDS OF ABOMINATION

See ABOMINATION, BIRDS OF.

BIRDS OF PREY

pra: They were undoubtedly the first birds noticed by the compilers of Biblical records. They were camp followers, swarmed over villages and perched on the walls of cities. They were offensive in manner and odor, and of a boldness unknown to us in birds. They flocked in untold numbers, there was small defense against them, and the largest and strongest not only carried away meat prepared for food and sacrifice, but also preyed upon the much-prized house pigeons, newly born of the smaller animals, and even at times attacked young children. See Ge 15:11, "And the birds of prey came down upon the carcasses, and Abram drove them away." Because they were attracted from above the clouds by anything suitable for food, people recognized that these were birds of unusual vision. When Job wanted to tell how perfectly the path to the gold mine was concealed, he wrote, "That path no bird of prey knoweth" (Job 28:7). The inference is, that, if it were so perfectly concealed that it escaped the piercing

eyes of these birds, it was not probable that man would find it. These birds were so strong, fierce and impudent that everyone feared them, and when the prophets gave warning that people would be left for birds of prey to ravage, they fully understood what was meant, and they were afraid (Isa 18:6). In His complaint against His heritage, Yahweh questions, "Is my heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey? are the birds of prey against her round about?" (Jer 12:9). And when he prophesied the destruction of Jerusalem, Jeremiah painted a dreadful picture, but one no doubt often seen in that land of pillage and warfare: "Their dead bodies will I give to be food for the birds of the heavens, and for the beasts of the earth" (Jer 19:7).

Gene Stratton-Porter

BIRDS, UNCLEAN

un-klen’:The lists of birds forbidden as food are given in Le 11:13-19 and De 14:12-18. The names are almost identical, Deuteronomy containing one more than Leviticus and varying the order slightly. In De 14:13 the first name, ha-ra’ah, is almost certainly a corruption of ha-da’-ah, the first name in Le 11:14. In the American Standard Revised Version it is translated "kite" in Leviticus, while in Deuteronomy it is translated "glede." The additional one in Deuteronomy is ha-dayyah, and is translated "kite." Doubtless the three words, ha-da’ah, ha-’ayyah and ha-dayyah, are generic and refer to different birds of the kite or perhaps falcon family, so it is impossible to give specific meanings to them. There are twenty-one names in all, counting the extra one in Deuteronomy. The translation of many of these words is disputed. The American Standard Revised Version gives them as follows: eagle, gier eagle, osprey, kite, falcon, glede, every raven, ostrich, night-hawk, sea-mew, hawk, little owl, cormorant, great owl, horned owl, pelican, vulture, stork, h eron, hoopoe and bat. It will be observed that all of them are either carrion-eaters, birds of prey, or water fowl. The names of those birds which may be eaten are not given, the principle of classification is that of elimination. No principle of separation is given as is the case with the animals. The reason for the prohibition doubtless lies in the unsanitary and repulsive nature of the flesh of these birds, the Divine command endorsing the instincts which were repelled by such food. For particulars, see separate articles on each of these birds.

See also ABOMINATION, BIRDS OF.

James Josiah Reeve

BIRSHA

bur’-sha (birsha‘): King of Gomorrah (Ge 14:2), who joined the league against Chedorlaomer. The name is probably corrupt; some have tried to explain it as beresha‘, "with wickedness," a name purposely used by the writer in referring to this king.

BIRTH

burth (genesis):

(1) It was said by the angel beforehand of John the Baptist, "Many shall rejoice at his birth"; and when he was born Elisabeth said, "Thus hath the Lord done unto me .... to take away my reproach among men" (Lu 1:14,25). Among the ancient Hebrews barrenness was a "reproach" and the birth of a child, of a son especially, an occasion for rejoicing.

(2) This, no doubt, was due in part to the Messianic hope inspired and sustained by prophecy (see Ge 3:15, where it was foretold that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head; and subsequent prophecies too numerous to mention). Cases in point worth studying are found in Ge 4:1, where Eve rejoices over the birth of her firstborn and cries, "I have gotten a man with the help of Yahweh"; and 1Sa 1:20, where Hannah exults over her firstborn, calling his name "Samuel," "because," she says, "I have asked him of Yahweh."

(3) The marvelous passage in Isa 7:14, "Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," must have intensified the longing and hope of every devout Jewish maiden to be a mother, if mayhap, under God, she might be the mother of Messiah—Immanuel! (Compare Mt 1:22,23; Lu 1:13 f.)

See JESUS CHRIST; VIRGIN BIRTH.

George B. Eager

BIRTH, NEW

See REGENERATION.

BIRTH, VIRGIN

See VIRGIN BIRTH.

BIRTH-STOOL

burth'-stool: Found only in Ex 1:16, in connection with Hebrew women in Egypt when oppressed by Pharaoh. The Hebrew (’obhnayim) here rendered "birth-stool" is used in Jer 18:3, and is there rendered "potter's wheel." The word is used in both places in the dual form, which points, no doubt, to the fact that the potter's wheel was composed of two discs, and suggests that the birth-stool was similarly double.

See STOOL.

BIRTHDAY

burth’-da:

(1) The custom of observing birthdays of great men, especially of kings, was widespread in ancient times (see Ge 40:20 f, "the third day, which was Pharaoh’s birthday," etc.; compare 2 Macc 6:7; and Herod. ix.110; in the New Testament, Mt 14:6; Mr 6:21, "Herod on his birthday made a supper to his lords," etc., i.e. Herod Antipas). Here we see the ancient custom reflected in two conspicuous instances centuries apart:

(a) Pharaoh, on his birthday "made a feast unto all his servants," etc., and

(b) Herod o n his birthday "made a supper to his lords, and the high captains," etc.

The King James Version (Mt 14:6) has it "when Herod’s birthday was kept," etc. The correct text here (Tischendorf, Westcott-Hort) has a very peculiar construction, but without material difference of meaning. The locative case gives the time of the principal action, "danced on Herod’s birthday, when it occurred." The construction is not unexampled (see Jelf, section 699). This need not be called "a case absolute," though it corresponds to the Latin ablative (locative) absolute; and the Greek genitive absolute is itself not really "absolute," i.e. it is not cut loose from the rest of the construction, but gives some event to which the principal action is referred, for the indication of its circumstances.

(2) The term "birthday" (ta genesia) was applied also to the anniversary of a king’s accession to the throne (Edersheim); but Wieseler’s argument that such is the case here is not conclusive. It is easy to suppose that when Herod’s birthday approached he was sojourning at the castle of Macherus, accompanied by leading military and civil officials of his dominions (Mr 6:21). Petty ruler as he was, not properly "king" at all, he affected kingly ways (compare Es 5:3,6; 7:2).

(3) Genesia, which in Attic Greek means the commemoration of the dead, in later Greek is interchangeable with genethlia =" birthday celebrations"; and there is no good reason why the rendering of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) here, "birthday," should not be right (See Swete on Mr 6:21, and HDB, under the word) For date of Christ’s birth, etc., see JESUS CHRIST; CALENDAR, etc.

George B. Eager

BIRTHRIGHT

burth’-rit (bekhorah, from bekhor, "firstborn"; prototokia): Birthright is the right which naturally belonged to the firstborn son. Where there were more wives than one, the firstborn was the son who in point of time was born before the others, apparently whether his mother was a wife or a concubine. Sarah protests against Ishmael being heir along with Isaac, but it is possible that the bestowal of the

rights of the firstborn on Isaac was not due to any law, but rather to the influence of a favorite wife (Ge 21:10). The birthright of the firstborn consisted in the first place of a double portion of what his father had to leave. This probably means that he had a double share of such property as could be divided. We have no certain knowledge of the manner in which property was inherited in the patriarchal age, but it seems probable that the lands and flocks which were the possession of the family as a whole, remained so after the death of the father. The firstborn became head of the family and thus succeeded to the charge of the family property, becoming responsible for the maintenance of the younger sons, the widow or widows, and the unmarried daughters. He also, as head, succeeded to a considerable amount of authority over the other members. Further, he generally received the blessing, which placed him in close and favored covenant-relationship with Yahweh. According to the accounts which have come down to us, all these gifts and privileges could be diverted from the firstborn son. This could happen with his own consent, as in the case of Esau, who sold his birthright to Jacob (Ge 25:29-34), or by the decision of the father, as in the case of Reuben (Ge 48:22; 49:3,4; 1Ch 5:1,2) and of Shimri (1Ch 26:10). In the Deuteronomic version of the law, a provision is made, prohibiting the father from making the younger son the possessor of the birthright, just because his mother was specially beloved (De 21:15-17). The blessing also could be diverted from the eldest son. This was done when Jacob blessed the children of Joseph, and deliberately put the younger before the elder (Ge 48:13,14,17-19); even when the blessing was obtained by the younger son in a fraudulent manner, it could not be recalled (Ge 27). Jacob does not appear to have inherited any of the property of his father, although he had obtained both the birthright and the blessing.

In the New Testament "birthright," prototokia, is mentioned only once (Heb 12:16), where the reference is to Esau. In various passages where our Lord is spoken of as the firstborn, as in Col 1:15-19; Heb 1:2, the association of ideas with the Old Testament conception of birthright is easy to trace.

See also FIRSTBORN; FAMILY; HEIR; INHERITANCE; LAW.

J. Macartney Wilson

BIRZAITH

bur-za’-ith, bur-za’-vith the King James Version Birzavith, (birzawith or birzayith; Bezaith, or Berzaie): The name of a town in Asher founded by Malchiel (1Ch 7:31). It probably corresponds to the modern Bir ez-Zait, "well of olive oil," near Tyre.

BISHLAM

bish’-lam (bishlam, "peaceful" (?)): One of three foreign colonists who wrote a letter of complaint against the Jews to Artaxerxes (Ezr 4:7 = 1 Esdras 2:16). In 1 Esdras the reading is "Belemus." "And in the days of Artaxerxes wrote Bishlam, Mithredath, Tabeel, and the rest of his companions, unto Artaxerxes, king of Persia," etc. (Ezr 4:7). The Septuagint renders Bishlam as en eirene, "in peace," as though it were a phrase rather than a proper name; this is clearly an error.

BISHOP

bish’-up: The word is evidently an abbreviation of the Greek episkopos; Latin, episcopus.

GENERAL

1. Use in the Septuagint and Classic Greek:

The Septuagint gives it the generic meaning of "superintendency, oversight, searching" (Nu 4:16; 31:14) in matters pertaining to the church, the state, and the army (Jud 9:28; 2Ki 12:11; 2Ch 34:12,17; 1 Macc 1:54; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:6). Nor is it unknown to classical Greek. Thus Homer in the Iliad applied it to the gods (xxii.255), also Plutarch, Cam., 5. In Athens the governors of conquered states were called by this name.

2. New Testament Use:

The word is once applied to Christ himself, "unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (1Pe 2:25). It abounds in as Pauline literature, and is used as an alternative for presbuteros or elder (Tit 1:5,7; 1Ti 3:1; 4:14; 5:17,19). The earliest ecclesiastical offices instituted in the church were those of elders and deacons, or rather the reverse, inasmuch the latter office grew almost immediately out of the needs of the Christian community at Jerusalem (Ac 6:1-6). The presbyteral constitution of Jerusalem must have been very old (Ac 11:30) and was distinct from the apostolate (Ac 15:2,4,6,22,23; 16:4). As early as 50 AD Paul appointed "elders" in every church, with prayer and fasting (Ac 14:23), referring to the Asiatic churches before established. But in writing to the Philippians (Php 1:1) he speaks of "bishops" and "deacons." In the GentileChristian churches this title evidently had been adopted; and it is only in the Pastoral Epistles that we find the name "presbyters" applied. The name "presbyter" or "elder," familiar to the Jews, signifies their age and place in the church; while the other term "bishop" refers rather to their office. But both evidently have reference to the same persons. Their office is defined as "ruling" (Ro 12:8), "overseeing" (Ac 20:17,28; 1Pe 5:2), caring for the flock of God (Ac 20:28). But the word archein, "to rule," in the hierarchical sense, is never used. Moreover, each church had a college of presbyter-bishops (Ac 20:17,28; Php 1:1; 1Ti 4:14). During Paul’s lifetime the church was evidently still unaware of the distinction between presbyters and bishops.

Of a formal ordination, in the later hierarchical sense, there is no trace as yet. The word "ordained" used in the King James Version (Ac 1:22) is an unwarrantable interpolation, rightly emended in the Revised Version (British and American). Neither the word cheirotonesantes (Ac 14:23, translated "appointed" the American Standard Revised Version) nor katasteses (Tit 1:5, translated "appoint" the American Standard Revised Version) is capable of this translation. In rendering these words invaria bly by "ordain" the King James Version shows a vitium originis. No one doubts that the idea of ordination is extremely old in the history of the church, but the laying on of hands, mentioned in the New Testament (Ac 13:3; 1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6; compare Ac 14:26; 15:40) points to the communication of a spiritual gift or to its invocation,

rather than to the imparting of an official status.

3. Later Development of the Idea:

According to Rome, as finally expressed by the Council of Trent, and to the episcopal idea in general, the hierarchical organization, which originated in the 3rd century, existed from the beginning in the New Testament church. But besides the New Testament as above quoted, the early testimony of the church maintains the identity of "presbyters" and "bishops." Thus, Clement of Rome (Ep. 1, chapters 42, 44, 57), the Didache, chapter 15; perhaps the Constitutions, II, 33, 34, in the use of the plural form; Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., iii.2, 3), Ambrosiaster (on 1Ti 3:10; Eph 4:11), Chrysostom (Hom 9 in Ep. ad Tim), in an unequivocal statement, the "presbyters of old were called bishops .... and the bishops presbyters," equally unequivocally Jerome (Ad Tit, 1, 7), "the same is the presbyter, who is also the bishop." Augustine and other Fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries hold this view, and even Peter Lombard, who preceded Aquinas as the great teacher of the church of the Middle Ages. Hatch of Oxford and Harnack of Berlin, in the face of all t his testimony, maintain a distinction between the presbyters, as having charge of the law and discipline of the church, and the bishops, as being charged with the pastoral care of the church, preaching and worship. This theory is built upon the argument of prevailing social conditions and institutions, as adopted and imitated by the church, rather than on sound textual proof. The distinction between presbyters and bishops can only be maintained by a forced exegesis of the Scriptures. The later and rapid growth of the hierarchical idea arose from the accession of the Ebionite Christian view of the church, as a necessary continuation of the Old Testament dispensation, which has so largely influenced the history of the inner development of the church in the first six centuries of her existence.

Henry E. Dosker

ANGLICAN VIEW

I. Episcopacy Defined.

Episcopacy is the government in the Christian church by bishops. The rule of the Orthodox churches in the East, of the Roman Catholics, and of the Anglicans is that the consecration of other bishops, and the ordination of priests and deacons can only be by a bishop; and with them, a bishop is one who claims historic descent from apostolic or sub-apostolic times.

II. Offices in the Early Church.

In the New Testament, the office of bishop is not clearly defined. Indeed there appear to have been many degrees of ministry in the infant church: apostles, prophets, evangelists, teachers, presbyters or elders, bishops or overseers, and deacons.

Due allowance is not generally made for the mental attitude of the apostles and early Christians. They

were looking for the speedy return of Christ, and consequently did not organize the church in its infancy, as it was afterward found necessary to do. For this reason, while the different persons who composed the body of Christian ministers did not overlap or infringe on each other's work, yet the relative rank or priority of each minister was not clearly defined.

1. Apostles:

The apostles were undoubtedly first, and in them rested the whole authority, and they were the depository of the power committed unto them by Christ.

2. Prophets:

Next to the apostles in rank, and first in point of mention (Ac 11:27), came the prophets. So important were these officers in the early church that they were sent from Jerusalem to warn the rapidly growing church at Antioch of an impending famine. Then it appears that there were resident prophets at Antioch, men of considerable importance since their names are recorded, Barnabas, Symeon, Lucius, Manaen and Saul (Ac 13:1). These men received a command from the Holy Spirit to "separate me Barnabas and Saul," on whom they laid their hands and sent them forth on their work. The election is conducted on the same lines as the election by the eleven apostles of Matthias, and Barnabas and Paul are hereafter called apostles. It is an ordination to the highest order in the Christian ministry by "prophets and teachers." Whether "prophets and teachers" refers to two distinct ministries, or whether they are terms used for the same one is uncertain. It may be that of the five men mentioned, some were prophets, and others teachers.

In Ac 15:32 we have given us the names of two other prophets, Judas and Silas. Paul tells the Corinthians (1Co 12:28) that God hath set some in his church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, and writing to the Ephesians he places the prophets in the same rank. "He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry" (Eph 4:11,12 the King James Version). And again, he says that the mystery of Christ is now "revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" (Eph 3:5). The same apostle in that wonderful imagery of Christians being built up for a habitation of God, says they are "being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone" (Eph 2:20).

In the case of the ordination of Timothy, which Paul says distinctly was by his own laying on of hands and that of the presbytery, it is of great consequence to note that Paul says to Timothy that his ordination was "according to the prophecies which went before on thee" (1Ti 1:18 the King James Version). From this it would appear that the prophets, as in the case of Paul himself, guided by the Holy Ghost, chose Timothy for the overseership or bishopric, or it may be, which is just as likely, that Timothy was set apart by the laying on of hands by some prophets, to the rank of elder or presbyter which did not carry with it the "overseership." It is at any rate evident that in the selection of Timothy, Paul is insistent on pointing out that it was through the prophets (compare 1Ti 1:18; 4:14; 2Ti 1:6).

In Revelation, the term prophet constantly occurs as a term denoting rank equivalent to that of apostle: "ye saints, and ye apostles, and ye prophets" (Re 18:20); "blood of prophets and of saints" (Re 16:6; 18:24). The angel calls himself "thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren the prophets" (Re 22:9 the King James Version). The words prophesy and prophesying are used in a general sense, and it does not mean that they were in every case the formal utterances of prophets.

3. Elders or Presbyters:

The ministry of the elders of the Christian church was modeled after that of the synagogue in which there were elders and teachers. The Christian elders or presbyters were most likely a council of advice in each local Christian ekklesia. They appear to act conjointly and not separately (Ac 15:4,6,22; 16:4; 20:17; Jas 5:14).

4. Teachers:

Teachers were the equivalent of those teachers or catechists of the synagogue before whom our Lord was found in the temple.

5. Evangelists:

Evangelists were persons who probably had the gift of oratory and whose function it was to preach the glad tidings. Philip was one of them (Ac 21:8). In the instructions to Timothy he is bidden to do the work of an evangelist, that is to say, to preach the gospel. This was to be part of his work in the ministry.

In writing to Timothy, Paul twice says that he himself was ordained preacher, and apostle and teacher. This does not mean that he held three grades of the ministry, but that his duties as an apostle were to preach and to teach. The fact that the apostles called themselves elders does not thereby confirm the view that the bishops mentioned by them were not superior to elders, any more than the fact that the apostles called themselves teachers, or preachers, makes for the view that teachers, or preachers, were the equals of apostles.

6. Bishops:

Bishops or overseers were probably certain elders chosen out of the body of local elders. Under the Jewish dispensation, the elders stayed at home, that is, they did no ministerial visiting, but it was soon found necessary as the Christian church grew to have someone to attend to outside work to win over by persuasion and exposition of the Scriptures those inclined to embrace Christianity. This necessitated visiting families in their own homes. Then, it became necessary to shepherd the sheep. Someone had to oversee or superintend the general work. The Jewish elders always had a head and in a large synagogue the conditions laid down for its head, or legatus, were almost identical with those laid down by Paul to Timothy. He was to be a father of a family, not rich or engaged in business, possessing a good voice, apt

to teach, etc.

The term episkopos was one with which the Hellenistic Jews and Gentiles were well acquainted; and it became thus a fitting term by which to designate the men called out of the body of elders to this special work of oversight. Then, again, the term episkopos was endeared to the early Christians as the one applied to our Lord—"the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls" (1Pe 2:25). The duties of elders, or presbyters, are not clearly defined in the New Testament.

In the Acts, the term is found only twice, one in reference to Judas, "his bishopric (or overseership) let another take" (Ac 1:20 the King James Version), and in Paul's address to the elders of Ephesus, he warns them to feed the church over which they have been made overseers or bishops (Ac 20:28). It is impossible to say whether this "overseership" refers to all the elders addressed, or to such of those elders as had been made "overseers," or "bishops."

In the epistles, we find the church more clearly organized, and in these writings we find more definite allusions to bishops and their duties (Php 1:1; 1Ti 3:1,2; Tit 1:7; 1Pe 2:25).

Paul tells Timothy, "If a man desire the office of a bishop (or overseer) he desireth a good work." "A bishop (or overseer) must be blameless" (1Ti 3:1,2 the King James Version). He tells Titus that "he is to ordain elders in every city" and that a "bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God" (Tit 1:5,7 the King James Version).

On the other hand, there are numerous texts where elders and their duties are mentioned and where there is no reference whatever to bishopric or oversight. The epistles show that of necessity there had grown to be a more distinct organization of the ministry, and that following the custom of the synagogue to some of the elders had been committed a bishopric or oversight. At the same time the rank of a bishop, or overseer, was not yet one of the highest. Paul does not enumerate it in the order of ministry which he gives to the Ephesians—apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers.

That Timothy had an oversight over the elders or presbyters is evident from the fact that Paul enjoins him to rebuke those that sin: "Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two or three witnesses. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all" (1Ti 5:19,20). This, of course, refers to a formal trial by one in authority of persons inferior to him in rank.

It has been asserted that the terms elder and bishop in the New Testament were equivalent and denoted the same office or grade in the ministry. This assertion seems unwarranted. They do not naturally denote the same grade any more than do apostle and teacher, or angel and prophet.

7. Deacons:

The deacons were the seven appointed to take charge of the temporal affairs of the church. Their appointment was perhaps suggested by the alms-collectors of the synagogue. In the New Testament they

do not appear as deacons to have had any part in the sacred ministry, except, in the case of Philip the evangelist, if it be assumed that he was a deacon, which is uncertain. Nowhere is it recorded that they laid hands on anyone, or were considered as capable of bestowing any grace. In the epistles they are mentioned with the bishops—"bishops and deacons" (Php 1:1), thus showing the nature of their influence as the helpers of the "bishops" in the management of the growing funds, or properties of the church.

III. Episcopacy according to the New Testament.

The passages where the Greek word occurs which has been translated either as bishops, or overseers, are so few that they are enumerated: Ac 20:17,28: the Ephesian elders are stated to be bishops (or overseers) to feed the church; Php 1:1 the salutation of Paul and Timothy to bishops (or overseers) and deacons at Philippi; 1Ti 3:1,2 and Tit 1:7 give the exhortation to Timothy and Titus as holding the office of a bishop; 1Pe 2:25, where the apostle referring to Christ says, "unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

IV. The "Didache."

Passing out of the New Testament, we come to the early Christian writing, the so-called Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. Setting aside the question for what class of Christians this document was intended, the clear fact stands out that at the date of its writing the two highest grades in the Christian ministry were still called apostles and prophets. Various dates have been assigned to this document ranging from 80 to 160 AD.

At the end of chapter 10, which deals with the thanksgiving or eucharist, the remark is made, "But permit the prophets to make thanksgiving as much as they desire." Chapters 11 and 13 deal with apostles and prophets. They were to be treated "according to the ordinance of the gospel." An apostle was not to be allowed to stay more than a couple of days at the utmost, and in no case was he to receive any money, else he was to be considered "a false prophet." A prophet could beg on behalf of others, but not for himself; but a prophet could settle among a congregation, and in that case he was to receive the same first-fruits "of money and raiment and of every possession" as the chief priest did under the old dispensation. It is to be noted that in reality the prophets, though placed second in order, were to be treated with the greater respect. If the prophet settles down, he becomes the man of the first rank in that Christian community.

Chapter 15 deals with bishops and deacons, and we are told that if appointed they rendered the ministry of prophets and teachers, but the warning is given, "Despise them not, therefore, for they are your honored ones, together with the prophets and teachers." This shows that bishops were localized; and that while they could be appointed over a community, they were not considered as of equal rank with the prophets.

V. Clement of Rome.

Clement of Rome in his Epistle to the Corinthians says that the apostles preaching through countries and cities appointed the first-fruits of their labors to be bishops and deacons (chapter 42). It is usually said that Clement meant elders by the term "bishops," but it is much more likely that he meant what he said; that according to the tradition received by him, the apostles appointed bishops, that is, appointed bishops out of the elders—mentioned in the Acts. In chapter 44 Clement warns against the sin of ejecting from the episcopate those who have presented the offerings, and says, "Blessed are those presbyters who have finished their course."

The reason why the terms apostles and prophets fell into desuetude was, as regards the first, not so much out of respect to the original apostles, but because the apostles in the sub-apostolic age became apparently only wandering evangelists of little standing; while the prophets lowered their great office by descending to be soothsayers, as the Shepherd of Hermas plainly intimates. With the fall of the apostles and the prophets, there rose into prominence the bishops and deacons.

VI. Bishops and Deacons.

The deacons acted as secretaries and treasurers to the bishops. They were their right-hand men, representing them in all secular matters. As the numbers of Christians increased, it was found absolutely necessary for the bishops to delegate some of their spiritual authority to a second order.

VII. Bishops and Presbyters (Priests).

Thus very slowly emerged out of the body of elders the official presbyters or priests. To them the bishop delegated the power to teach, to preach, to baptize, to celebrate the Holy Eucharist; but how slowly is evidenced by the fact that so late as 755 AD the Council of Vern forbade priests to baptize, except by distinct permission of their bishop.

VIII. Ignatian Epistles on the Three Orders.

When we come to the Ignatian epistles written between 110-17 AD, we find a distinct threefold order. We have given us the names of Damas, for bishop, Bassus and Apollonius for presbyters, Zotion for deacon. Throughout these epistles there is no question that the bishop is supreme. Apostles and prophets are not even mentioned. The bishop succeeds to all the powers the apostles and prophets had. On the other hand, as with the Jewish elders, so with the Christian presbyters, they form a council with the bishop. Here we see in clear day what we had all along suspected to be the case in apostolic times: a council of presbyters with a ruler at their head and deacons to attend to money matters.

It is quite immaterial as to whether a bishop had ten or a hundred presbyter-elders under him, whether he was bishop in a small town or in a large city. The question of numbers under him would not affect his authority as has been claimed. The greatness of the city in which he exercised this rule would add dignity to his position, but nothing to his inherent authority.

From this time on it is admitted by all that bishops, priests and deacons have been continuously in existence. Their powers and duties have varied, have been curtailed as one order has encroached on the power of the other, but still there the three orders have been. Gradually the presbyters or priests encroached on the power of the bishop, till now, according to Anglican usage, only the power of ordaining, confirming and consecrating churches is left to them.

IX. Views of Reformers.

At the time of the Reformation there was a great outcry against bishops. This was caused by the fact that under feudalism the bishops had come to be great temporal lords immersed in schemes of political and material aggrandizement, and often actually leading their armies in times of war. Many of the bishops were proud and arrogant, forgetful that their duties as fathers of the children of Christ were to look after those committed to them with fatherly kindness and charity or that as pastors they had to tend the erring sheep with Divine patience and infinite love.

The bulk of the adherents to the Reformed religion, looking upon the bishops as they were and as their fathers had known them, recoiled from retaining the office, although their principal men, like Calvin, deplored the loss of bishops, and hoped that bishops of the primitive order would some day be restored. The present modern Anglican bishop seems to sum up in his person and office the requirements laid down by Calvin.

Conclusion:

Thus the claim put forth by the Anglicans in the preface to the Ordinal may be considered as sound: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

LITERATURE.

Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; Clement of Rome; Shepherd of Hermas; Ignatian epistles; Muratorian Fragment; Works of John Lightfoot; Duchesne, Origines du Culte Chretien; Pellicia, Polity of the Christian Church; Bishop MacLean, Ancient Church Orders; Cheetham, Hist of the Christian Church during the First Six Centuries; Salmon, Introduction to New Testament; Elwin, The Minister of Baptism; Cruttwell, Literary History of Early Christianity; Potter, Church Government; Lowndes, Vindication of Anglican Orders; E. Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Churches; C. Gore, The Church and the Ministry; Thompson, Historic Episcopate (Presbyterian); Baird, Huguenots.

Arthur Lowndes

CONGREGATIONAL VIEW:

1. The New Testament Church a Spiritual Democracy:

As a spiritual and social democracy, Congregationaliam finds no warrant or precedent in the New Testament for the episcopal conception of the words "bishop," "presbyter," and "elder." It interprets episkopos, literally as overseer—not an ecclesiastical dignitary but a spiritual minister. It finds the Romanist view of Peter's primacy, founded alone on Mt 16:18, contradicted by the entire trend of Christ's teaching, as e.g. when referring to the Gentiles exercising lordship and authority Christ says, "Not so shall it be among you" (Mt 20:26 ff). He set the precedent of official greatness when He said "the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister," and that "whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister (servant)." Paul's testimony confirms this in suggesting no primacy among the apostles and prophets, but making "Christ .... himself .... the chief corner stone" (Eph 2:20). The organization and history of the early Christian church establish this view of its simplicity and democracy. In Ac 1:20 the Revised Version (British and American) corrects the rendering "bishopric" (given by the King James translators, who were officers in the Episcopal church) to "office," thus, relieving the verse of possible ecclesiastical pretensions.

The church formed on the day of Pentecost was the spontaneous coming together of the original 120 disciples and the 3,000 Christian converts, for fellowship, worship and work, under the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Its only creed was belief in the risen Christ and the renewing power of the Holy Spirit; its only condition of membership, repentance and baptism.

2. Election of Officers by Popular Vote:

The apostles naturally took leadership but, abrogating all authority, committed to the church as a whole the choice of its officers and the conduct of its temporal and spiritual affairs. Judas' place in the apostolate was not filled by succession or episcopal appointment (Ac 1:23-26). The seven deacons were elected by popular vote (Ac 6:1-6). One of the seven—Philip—preached and, without protest, administered the rite of baptism (Ac 8:12,13).

The churches in the apostolic era were independent and self-governing, and the absence of anything like a centralized ecclesiastical authority is seen by the fact that the council at Jerusalem, called to consider whether the church at Antioch should receive the uncircumcised into membership, was a delegated body, composed in part of lay members, and having only advisory power (Ac 15:1-29).

3. The Epistles not Official Documents:

The apostolic letters, forming so large a part of the New Testament, are not official documents but letters of loving pastoral instruction and counsel. The terms bishops, elders, pastors and teachers are used synonymously and interchangeably, thus limiting the officers of the early church to two orders: pastors and deacons.

See also CHURCH GOVERNMENT; DIDACHE.

4. Restoration of Primitive Ideals:

Under the spiritual tyrannies of the Church of England, during the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, "bloody" Mary and ‘Queen Elizabeth, the Dissenting bodies, chiefly the Congregationalists, returned to the simplicity and spiritual freedom of the primitive church. The issue was forced by two arbitrary acts of Parliament under Elizabeth: the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity. Emancipation from the intellectual and religious tyranny of these acts was won at the cost of many martyrdoms. These struggles and persecutions wrought into the successors of Robert Browne, the father of modern Congregationalism, a deep-seated and permanent resentment against all forms of autocratic power in church and state. They challenged, at the cost of life, both the Divine Right of kings, and of bishops. They believed that in Christ Jesus all believers are literally and inalienably made "kings and priests unto God" (Re 1:6 the King James Version), actual spiritual sovereigns, independent of all human dictation an d control in matters of belief and worship. The Pilgrims expatriated themselves to secure this spiritual liberty; and to their inherent antagonism to inherited and self-perpetuated power, whether civil or ecclesiastical, must be credited the religious freedom and civil democracy of America.

LITERATURE.

For further study see Henry M. Dexter, Congregationalism, chapter ii; Dunning’s Congregationalists in America, chapters i, ii: Rainy, The Ancient Catholic Church.

Dwight M. Pratt

BISHOPRICK

bish’-up-rik (episkope; Ac 1:20 the King James Version, quoted from Ps 109:8): the Revised Version (British and American) "office," margin, "overseership."

See BISHOP.

BISHOPS’ BIBLE

See ENGLISH VERSIONS.

BIT AND BRIDLE

bri’-d’-l (methegh wa-recen): The two words occur in conjunction (Ps 32:9 the King James Version, "Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding; whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee"; the Revised Version (British and American)) "else they will not come near unto thee," margin, "that they come not near." Methegh, translated "bit" above, is

properly a bridle or halter in which the bit was a loop passed round the under jaw of the animal; recen has a similar meaning. The counsel in the verse is that men should render a willing obedience to God and not be like the animals that man has to bridle and curb in order to get them to do his will. Compare Jas 3:3, where we have "bit" as translation of chalinos, "a bit" or "curb," "We put bits (the Revised Version (British and American) "bridles") in the horses' mouths that they may obey us." "Bridle" occurs separately as translation of methegh (2Sa 8:1), "David took Metheg-ammah," King James Version margin "the bridle of Ammah," the Revised Version (British and American) "the bridle of the mother city," margin, as the King James Version; the meaning may be that he took the control or dominion of it; "I will put .... my bridle in thy lips" (2Ki 19:28; Isa 37:29); "a bridle for the ass" (Pr 26:3); of recen (Job 30:11), "They have also let loose the bridle before me," the Revised Version (British and American) "and they have cast off the bridle before me" (acted in an unbridled (unrestrained) manner); Job 41:13, said of "leviathan" (the Revised Version (British and American) "the hippopotamus"), "Who can come to him his double bridle?" the American Standard Revised Version "within his jaws?" the English Revised Version "within his double bridle," others, "into the double row of his teeth"; Isa 30:28, "a bridle in the jaws of the people causing them to err," the Revised Version (British and American) "a bridle that causeth to err"; of machcom, which means "a muzzle" (Ps 39:1), "I will keep my mouth with a bridle," King James Version margins "Hebrew, a bridle, or muzzle for my mouth"; so the Revised Version, margin.

To "bridle" occurs (Jas 1:26, "bridleth not his tongue"; Jas 3:2 "able to bridle the whole body"; chalinagogeo, "to lead" or "guide with a bit"). In 1 Esdras 3:6, and 2 Macc 10:29, we have "bridles of gold" (chrusochalinos).

W. L. Walker

BITHIAH

bi-thi'-a (bithyah; Beththia; Codex Vaticanus, Gelia, "daughter of Yah"): The daughter of a Pharaoh who married Mered, a descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:18). Whether this Pharaoh was an Egyptian king, or whether it was in this case a Hebrew name, it is difficult to say. The name Bithiah seems to designate one who had become converted to the worship of Yahweh, and this would favor the first supposition. If, as the Revised Version (British and American) reads, the other wife of Mered is distinguished as "the Jewess" (instead of the King James Version "Jehudijah"), this supposition would receive further support.

Frank E. Hirsch

BITHRON

bith'-ron (ha-bithron; holen ten parateinousan, literally "the entire (land) extending"; 2Sa 2:29, "the Bithron," i.e. the gorge or groove): Does not seem to be a proper name; rather it indicates the gorge by which Abner approached Mahanaim. Buhl (GAP, 121) favors identification with Wady 'Ajlun, along which in later times a Ro road connected 'Ajlun and Mahanaim. Others (Guthe, Kurz. bib. Worterbuch,

under the word) incline to Wady esh Sha‘ib.

BITHYNIA

bi-thin’-i-a (Bithunia): A coast province in northwestern Asia Minor on the Propontis and the Euxine. Its narrowest compass included the districts on both sides of the Sangarius, its one large river, but in prosperous times its boundaries reached from the Rhyndacus on the west to and beyond the Parthenius on the east. The Mysian Olympus rose in grandeur to a height of 6,400 ft. in the southwest, and in general the face of Nature was wrinkled with rugged mountains and seamed with fertile valleys sloping toward the Black Sea.

Hittites may have occupied Bithynia in the remote past, for Priam of Troy found some of his stoutest enemies among the Amazons on the upper Sangarius in Phrygia, and these may have been Hittite, and may easily have settled along the river to its mouth. The earliest discernible Bithynians, however, were Thracian immigrants from the European side of the Reliespont. The country was overcome by Croesus, and passed with Lydia under Persian control, 546 BC. After Alexander the Great, Bithynia became independent, and Nicomedes I, Prusias I and II, and Nicomedes II and III, ruled from 278 to 74 BC. The last king, weary of the incessant strife among the peoples of Asia Minor, especially as provoked by the aggressive Mithridates, bequeathed his country to Rome. Nicomedia and Prusa, or Brousa, were founded by kings whose names they bear; the other chief cities, Nicea and Chalcedon, had been built by Greek enterprise earlier. There were highways leading from Nicomedia and Nicea to Dorylaeum and to Angora (see Ramsay , Historical Geography of Asia Minor, and The Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170). Under Rome the Black Sea littoral as far as Amisus was more or less closely joined with Bithynia in administration.

Paul and Silas essayed to go into Bithynia, but the Spirit suffered them not (Ac 16:7). Other evangelists, however, must have labored there early and with marked success. Bithynia is one of the provinces addressed in 1Pe 1:1.

Internal difficulties and disorders led to the sending of Pliny, the lawyer and literary man, as governor, 111 to 113 AD. He found Christians under his jurisdiction in such numbers that the heathen temples were almost deserted, and the trade in sacrificial animals languished. A memorable correspondence followed between the Roman governor and the emperor Trajan, in which the moral character of the Christians was completely vindicated, and the repressive measures required of officials were interpreted with leniency (see E. G. Hardy, Pliny’s Correspondence with Trajan, and Christianity and the Roman Government). Under this Roman policy Christianity was confirmed in strength and in public position. Subsequently the first Ecumenical Council of the church was held in Nicea, and two later councils convened in Chalcedon, a suburb of what is now Constantinople. The emperor Diocletian had fixed his residence and the seat of government for the eastern Roman Empire in Nicomedia.

Bithynia was for a thousand years part of the Byzantine Empire, and shared the fortunes and misfortunes of that state. On the advent of the Turks its territory was quickly overrun, and Orchan, sultan in 1326,

selected Brousa as his capital, since which time this has been one .of the chief Ottoman cities.

G. E. White

BITTER HERBS

hurbs, or urbs (merorim): Originally in the primitive Passover (Ex 12:8; Nu 9:11) these were probably merely salads, the simplest and quickest prepared form of vegetable accompaniment to the roasted lamb. Such salads have always been favorites in the Orient. Cucumbers, lettuce, water-cress, parsley and endive are some of those commonly used. Later on the Passover ritual (as it does today) laid emphasis on the idea of "bitterness" as symbolical of Israel's lot in Egypt. In modern Palestine the Jews use chiefly lettuce and endive for the "bitter herbs" of their Passover. In La 3:15 the same word is used: "He hath filled me with bitterness merorim, he hath sated me with wormwood." Here the parallelism with "wormwood" suggests some plant more distinctly bitter than the mild salads mentioned above, such, for example, as the colocynth (Citrullus colocynthus) or the violently irritating squirting cucumber (Ecballium elaterium).

E. W. G. Masterman

BITTER WATER

See ADULTERY (2); MARAH.

BITTER; BITTERNESS

bit'-er, bit'-er-nes (mar, or marah =" bitter" (literally or figuratively); also (noun) "bitterness" or (adverb) "bitterly"; "angry," "chafed," "discontented," "heavy" (Ge 27:34; Ex 15:23; Nu 5:18,19,23,24,27; Es 4:1; Job 3:20; Ps 64:3; Pr 5:4; 27:7; Ec 7:26; Isa 5:20; Jer 2:19; 4:18; Eze 27:31; Am 8:10; Hab 1:6); the derivatives marar, meror, and merorah, used with the same significance according to the context, are found in Ex 1:14; 12:8; Nu 9:11; Job 13:26; Isa 24:9. The derivati ves meri and meriri occur in De 32:24; Job 23:2 (margin); and tamrur, is found in Jer 6:26; 31:15. In the New Testament the verb pikraino =" to embitter"; the adjective pikros =" bitter," and the noun pikria, "bitterness," supply the same ideas in Col 3:19; Jas 3:11,14; Re 8:11; 10:9,10): It will be noted that the word is employed with three principal spheres of application:

(1) the physical sense of taste;

(2) a figurative meaning in the objective sense of cruel, biting words; intense misery resulting from forsaking God, from a life of sin and impurity; the misery of servitude; the misfortunes of bereavement;

(3) more subjectively, bitter and bitterness describe emotions of sympathy;' the sorrow of childlessness

and of penitence, of disappointment; the feeling of misery and wretchedness, giving rise to the expression "bitter tears";

(4) the ethical sense, characterizing untruth and immorality as the bitter thing in opposition to the sweetness of truth and the gospel;

(5) Nu 5:18 the Revised Version (British and American) speaks of "the water of bitterness that causeth the curse." Here it is employed as a technical term.

Frank E. Hirsch

BITTERN

bit'-ern (qippodh; Latin Botaurus stellaris; Greek echinos): A nocturnal member of the heron family, frequenting swamps and marshy places. Its Hebrew name means a creature of waste and desert places. The bittern is the most individual branch of the heron (ardeidae) family on account of being partially a bird of night. There are observable differences from the heron in proportion, and it differs widely in coloration. It is one of the birds of most ancient history, and as far back as records extend is known to have inhabited Europe, Asia, Africa, Australia and America. The African bird that Bible historians were familiar with was 2 1/2 ft. in length. It had a 4-inch bill, bright eyes and plumage of buff and chestnut, mottled with black. It lived around swamps and marshes, hunting mostly at night, and its food was much the same as that of all members of the heron family, frogs being its staple article of diet. Its meat has not the fishy taste of most members of the heron family, and in former times wa s considered a great delicacy of food. In the days of falconry it was protected in England because of the sport afforded in hunting it. Aristotle mentions that previous to his time the bittern was called oknos, which name indicates "an idle disposition." It was probably bestowed by people who found the bird hiding in swamps during the daytime, and saw that it would almost allow itself to be stepped upon before it would fly. They did not understand that it fed and mated at night. Pliny wrote of it as a bird that "bellowed like oxen," for which reason it was called Taurus. Other medieval writers called it botaurus, from which our term "bittern" is derived. There seems to be much confusion as to the early form of the name; but all authorities agree that it was bestowed on the bird on account of its voice. Turner states that in 1544 the British called it "miredromble," and "botley bump," from its voice. Rolland says the French called it, Boeuf d'eau. In later days "bog-bull," "stake-driver" and "thunder-pumper" have attached themselves to it as terms fitly descriptive of its voice. Nuttall says its cry is "like the interrupted bellowing of a bull, but hollower and louder, and is heard at a mile's distance, as if issuing from some formidable being that resided at the bottom of the waters." Tristram says, "Its strange booming note, disturbing the stillness of night, gives an idea of desolation which nothing but the wail of a hyena can equal." Thoreau thought its voice like the stroke of an ax on the head of a deeply driven stake. In ancient times it was believed the bird thrust its sharp beak into a reed to produce this sound. Later it was supposed to be made by pushing the bill into muck and water while it cried. Now the membrane by which the sound is produced has been located in the lungs of the bird. In all time it has been the voice that attracted attention to the bittern, and it was solely upon the ground of its vocal attainments that it entered the Bible. There are three

references, all of which originated in its cry. Isaiah in prophesying the destruction of Babylon (Isa 14:23 in the King James Version) wrote: "I will also make it a possession for the bittern, and pools of water"; in other words he would make of it a desolate and lonely swamp. Again in Isa 34:11 in the King James Version, in pronouncing judgment against Idumaea, he wrote, "But the cormorant and the bittern shall possess it." In the Revised Version (British and American), "cormorant" and "bittern" are changed to "pelican" and "porcupine." The change from the cormorant to pelican makes less difference, as both are water birds, and the Hebrew shalakh, which means "a plunging bird," would apply equally to either of them. If they were used to bear out the idea that they would fill the ruins with terrifying sound, then it is well to remember that the cormorant had something of a voice, while the pelican is notoriously the most silent of birds. The change from bittern to porcupine is one with which no ornithologist would agree. About 620 BC, the prophet Zephaniah (Zep 2:14) clearly indicates this bird: "And herds shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations: both the pelican and the porcupine shall lodge in the capitals thereof; their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds: for he hath laid bare the cedar work." This should forever settle the question raised by some modern commentators as to whether a bird or beast is intended by the word qippodh. In some instances it seems to have been confounded with qunfudh, the hedgehog or porcupine. No natural historian ever would agree to this, because these animals are not at home in the conditions that were known to exist here. Even granting that Nineveh was to be made dry, it must be remembered that the marshes of the Tigris lay very close, and the bird is of night, with a voice easily carrying over a mile. Also it was to "sing" and to "lodge" on the "upper lintels" which were the top timbers of the doors and windows. These formed just the location a bittern would probably perch upon when it left its marshy home and went booming through the night in search of a mate. It was without doubt the love song of the bittern that Isaiah and Zephaniah used in completing prophecies of desolation and horror, because with the exception of mating time it is a very quiet bird. For these reasons the change from bittern to porcupine in the Revised Version (British and American), of the paragraph quoted, is a great mistake, as is also that of cormorant to pelican.

Gene Stratton-Porter

BITTERNESS

bit’-er-ness.

See BITTER.

BITTERNESS, WATER OF

See ADULTERY (2).

BITUMEN

bi-tu’-men.

See SLIME.

BIZIOTHIAH

biz-yo-thi’-a, biz-joth’-ja (bizyotheyah; Septuagint hai komai auton, literally "their villages"; the King James Version Bizjothjah, "place of Jah’s olives" (Young), or "contempt of Jah" (Strong)): According to Massoretic Text, a town in the south of Judah, near Beersheba (Jos 15:28). Septuagint reads "and her daughters," only one consonant of Massoretic Text being read differently; and so We, Hollenberg, Di and others The Septuagint has probably preserved the original text (compare Ne 11:27).

BIZTHA

biz’-tha (Septuagint Mazan; also Bazan and Bazea): One of the seven eunuchs or chamberlains of King Ahasuerus (Xerxes). It is possible that the name is derived from the Persian besteh, "bound," hence, "eunuch" (Es 1:10).

BLACK

See COLORS.

BLACKNESS

(kimririm, "obscurations"; qadhruth, "darkness"; gnophos, "darkness" zophos "blackness"): Terms rarely used but of special significance in picturing the fearful gloom and blackness of moral darkness and calamity. Job, cursing, the day of his birth, wishes that it, a dies ater ("dead black day"), might be swallowed up in darkness (Job 3:5). Because of Israel’s spiritual infidelity Yahweh clothes the heavens with the blackness of sackcloth (Isa 50:3), the figure being that of the inky blackness of ominous, terrifying thunder clouds. The fearful judgment against sin under the old dispensation is illustrated by the appalling blackness that enveloped smoking, burning, quaking Sinai at the giving of the law (Heb 12:18; compare Ex 19:16-19; 20:18). The horror of darkness culminates in the impenetrable blackness of the under-world, the eternal abode of fallen angels and riotously immoral and ungodly men (Jude 1:13; see also Jude 1:6 and 2Pe 2:4,17). Human language is here too feeble to picture the m oral gloom and rayless night of the lost: "Pits (the King James Version "chains") of darkness" (compare the ninth plague of Egypt, "darkness which may be felt" (Ex 10:21)). Wicked men are "wandering stars," comets that disappear in "blackness of darkness .... reserved for ever." In art this figurative language has found majestic and awe-inspiring expression in Dore’s illustrations of Dante’s Purgatory and Milton’s Paradise Lost.

Dwight M. Pratt

BLAINS

blanz (abha‘bu‘ah: only in Ex 9:9,10): Pustules containing fluid around a boil or inflamed sore. It is an Old English word "bleyen," used sometimes as a synonym for boil. Wyclif (1382) uses the expression "stinkende bleyne" for Job’s sores. The Hebrew word is from a root which means that which bubbles up.

See BOIL.

BLASPHEMY

blas’-fe-mi (blasphemia): In classical Greek meant primarily "defamation" or "evil-speaking" in general; "a word of evil omen," hence, "impious, and irreverent speech against God."

(1) In the Old Testament as substantive and vb.:

(a) (barakh) "Naboth did blaspheme God and the king" (1Ki 21:10,13 the King James Version);

(b) (gadhaph) of Senna-cherib defying Yahweh (2Ki 19:6,22 = Isa 37:6,23; also Ps 44:16; Eze 20:27; compare Nu 15:30), "But the soul that doeth aught with a high hand (i.e. knowingly and defiantly), ... the same blasphemeth (so the Revised Version (British and American), but the King James Version "reproacheth") Yahweh; and that soul shall be cut off from among his people." Blasphemy is always in word or deed, injury, dishonor and defiance offered to God, and its penalty is death by stoning;

(c) (charaph) of idolatry as blasphemy against Yahweh (Isa 65:7);

(d) (naqabh) "And he that blasphemeth the name of Yahweh, he shall surely be put to death" (Le 24:11,16);

(e) (na’ats) David’s sin is an occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme (2Sa 12:14; also Ps 74:10,18; Isa 52:5; compare Eze 35:12; 2Ki 19:3 the King James Version; Isa 37:3).

(2) In the New Testament blasphemy, substantive and vb., may be

(a) of evil-speaking generally, (Ac 13:45; 18:6); The Jews contradicted Paul "and blasphemed," the Revised Version, margin "railed." (So in the King James Version of Mt 15:19 = Mr 7:22; Col 3:8, but in the Revised Version (British and American) "railings"; Re 2:9 the Revised Version, margin "reviling"; so perhaps in 1Ti 1:20; or Hymeneus and Alexander may have blasphemed Christ by professing faith and living unworthily of it.)

(b) Speaking against a heathen goddess: the town clerk of Ephesus repels the charge that Paul and his companions were blasphemers of Diana (Ac 19:37).

(c) Against God: (i) uttering impious words (Re 13:1,5,6; 16:9,11,21; 17:3); (ii) unworthy conduct of Jews (Ro 2:24) and Christians (1Ti 6:1; Tit 2:5, and perhaps 1Ti 1:20); (iii) of Jesus Christ, alleged to be usurping the authority of God (Mt 9:3 = Mr 2:7 = Lu 5:21), claiming to be the Messiah, the son of God (Mt 26:65 = Mr 14:64), or making Himself God (Joh 10:33,36).

(d) Against Jesus Christ: Saul strove to make the Christians he persecuted blaspheme their Lord (Ac 26:11). So was he himself a blasphemer (1Ti 1:13; compare Jas 2:7).

The Unpardonable Sin:

(3) Blasphemy against the Holy Spirit:

"Every sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Spirit shall not be forgiven. And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy of Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come" (Mt 12:31,32 = Mr 3:28,29; Lu 12:10). As in the Old Testament "to sin with a high hand" and to blaspheme the name of God incurred the death penalty, so the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit remains the one unpardonable sin. These passages at least imply beyond cavil the personality of the Holy Spirit, for sin and blasphemy can only be committed against persons. In Mt and Mr a particular case of this blasphemy is the allegation of the Pharisees that Jesus Christ casts out devils by Beelzebub. The general idea is that to attribute to an evil source acts which are clearly those of the Holy Spirit, to call good evil, is blasphemy against the Spirit, and sin that will not be pardoned. "A distinction is made between Christ’s other acts and those which manifestly reveal the Holy Spirit in Him, and between slander directed against Him personally as He appears in His ordinary acts, and that which is aimed at those acts in which the Spirit is manifest" (Gould, Mark at the place). Luke does not refer to any particular instance, and seems to connect it with the denial of Christ, although he, too, gives the saying that "who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven." But which of Christ’s acts are not acts the Holy Spirit, and how therefore is a word spoken against Him not also blasphemy against the Holy Spirit? John identifies the Holy Spirit with the exalted Christ (Joh 14:16-18,26,28). The solution generally offered of this most difficult problem is concisely put by Plummer (Luke ad loc.): "Constant and consummate opposition to the influence of the Holy Spirit, because of a deliberate preference of darkness to light, render repentance and therefore forgiveness morally impossible." A similar idea is taught in Heb 6:4-6, and 1Jo 5:16: "A sin unto death." But the natural meaning of Christ’s words implies an inability or unwillingness to forgive on the Divine side rather than inability to repent in man. Anyhow the abandonment of man to eternal condemnation involves the inability and defeat of God. The only alternative seems to be to call the kenotic theory into service, and to put this idea among the human limitations which Christ assumed when He became flesh. It is less difficult to ascribe a limit to Jesus Christ’s knowledge than to God’s saving grace (Mr 13:32; compare Joh 16:12,13). It is also noteworthy that in other respects, at least, Christ acquiesced in the view of the Holy Spirit which He found among His contemporaries.

See HOLY SPIRIT.

T. Ress

BLAST

(neshamah, ruach):

(1) The blowing of the breath of Yahweh, expressive of the manifestation of God’s power in Nature and Providence. "With the blast of thy nostrils the waters were piled up" (Ex 15:8), referring to the east wind (Ex 14:21; compare 2Sa 22:16 and Ps 18:15). "I will send a blast upon him" (2Ki 19:7 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "put a spirit in him," i.e. "an impulse of fear" (Dummelow in the place cited.); compare Isa 37:7). "By the blast of his anger are they consumed" (Job 4:9; compare Isa 37:36).

(2) The word ruach is used with reference to the tyranny and violence of the wicked (Isa 25:4).

(3) The blowing of a wind instrument: "When they make a long blast with the ram’s horn" (Jos 6:5).

M. O. Evans

BLAST; BLASTING

blast’-ing (shiddaphon—root, shadhaph, literally "scorching"): This is the effect produced upon grain or other plants by the hot east winds which blow from the desert of Arabia. They usually continue to blow for two or three days at a time. If they occur in the spring near ripening time, the grain is often turned yellow and does not properly mature. The farmers dread this wind. In some localities, if they suspect that the east wind is coming, they set up a great shouting and beating of pans, hoping to drive it off. Sometimes this wind is a double pestilence, when it brings with it a cloud of locusts (2Ch 6:28). The writer, while journeying in the northern part of the Arabian desert, the source of these winds, witnessed such a cloud of locusts on their way toward habitable regions. It did not call for a very vivid imagination on the part of the children of Israel to realize the meaning of the curses and all manner of evil which would befall those who would not hearken to the voice of Yahweh. De 28:22-24 could easily be considered a poetic description of the east winds (Arabic howa sharki’yeh) which visit Palestine and Syria at irregular intervals today. The heat is fiery: it dries up the vegetation and blasts the grain; the sky is hazy and there is a glare as if the sun were reflected from a huge brass tray. Woodwork cracks and warps; the covers of books curl up. Instead of rain, the wind brings dust and sand which penetrate into the innermost corners of the dwellings. This dust fills the eyes and inflames them. The skin becomes hot and dry. To one first experiencing this storm it seems as though some volcano must be belching forth heat and ashes. No other condition of the weather can cause such depression. Such a pestilence, only prolonged beyond endurance, was to be the fate of the disobedient. This word should not be confused with mildew. Since the words blasting and mildew occur together it may be inferred that mildew (literally "a paleness") must mean the sickly color which plants assu me for other causes than the

blasting of the east wind, such, as for instance, fungus diseases or parasites (1Ki 8:37; Am 4:9; Hag 2:17).

James A. Patch

BLASTUS

blas’-tus (Blastos, "shoot"): The chamberlain of Herod Agrippa I, whose services as an intermediary between them and the king were gained by the people of Tyre and Sidon. These cities were dependent on Palestine for corn and other provisions, and when Herod, on the occasion of some commercial dispute, forbade the export of foodstuffs to Tyre and Sidon, they were at his mercy and were compelled to ask for peace. "Having made Blastus the king’s chamberlain their friend," probably by means of a bribe, the Phoenician embassy was given an opportunity of setting their case before Herod (Ac 12:20 ff).

S. F. Hunter

BLAZE

blaz ("to publish"): Found only in the King James Version of Mr 1:45, for Greek diaphemizein, translated by the Revised Version (British and American) "spread abroad," as in Mt 9:31; 28:15.

BLEMISH

blem’-ish:

(1) mum, me’um; momos: This word signifies no particular skin disease, as has been supposed; but is used generally for any and all disfiguring affections of the skin, such as eczema, herpes, scabies, etc., even for scratches and scars, as in Le 24:19,20; and thence for moral defects, as in Eph 5:27. The existence of a blemish in a person of priestly descent prevented him from the execution of the priestly office; similarly an animal fit for sacrifice was to be without blemish. In the New Testament Christ is presented as the antitype of a pure and ritually acceptable sacrifice "as a lamb without blemish and without spot" (Heb 9:14; 1Pe 1:19), and the disciples are admonished to be blameless, "without blemish" (Eph 5:27). Rarely the word is used to designate a reprobate person (2Pe 2:13).

(2) Blemish in the eye, tebhallul (from a root balal, "to overflow"; Arabic balla, balal, "to moisten"), cataract, white spots in the eye (Le 21:20).

H. L. E. Luering

BLESS

(barakh): This word is found more frequently in the Old Testament than in the New Testament, and is used in different relations.

(1) It is first met in Ge 1:22 at the introduction of animal life upon the earth, where it is written, "And God blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply," etc. The context furnishes the key to its meaning, which is the bestowal of good, and in this particular place the pleasure and power of increase in kind. Thus it is generally employed in both Testaments, the context always determining the character of the bestowal; for instance (where man is the recipient), whether the good is temporal or spiritual, or both.

Occasionally, however, a different turn is given to it as in Ge 2:3 the King James Version, where it is written, "And God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it." Here the good consists in the setting apart and consecrating of that day for His use.

(2) In the foregoing instances the Creator is regarded as the source of blessing and the creature the recipient, but the order is sometimes reversed, and the creature (man) is the source and the Creator the recipient. In Ge 24:48, for example, Abraham's servant says, "I bowed my head, and worshipped Yahweh, and blessed Yahweh, the God of my master Abraham," where the word evidently means to worship God, to exalt and praise Him.

(3) There is a third use where men only are considered. In Ge 24:60, her relatives "blessed Rebekah, and said unto her, Our sister, be thou the mother of thousands of ten thousands" (the King James Version "millions"), where the word expresses the wish or hope for the bestowal of the good designated. There are also instances where such a blessing of man by man may be taken in the prophetic sense, as when Isaac blessed Jacob (Ge 27:4,27), putting himself as it were in God's place, and with a sense of the Divine concurrence, pronouncing the good named. Here the word becomes in part a prayer for, and in part a prediction of, the good intended. Balaam's utterances are simply prophetic of Israel's destiny (Nu 23:9,10,11,23 margin, Nu 23:24).

Although these illustrations are from the Old Testament the word is used scarcely differently in the New Testament; "The blessing of bread, of which we read in the Gospels, is equivalent to giving thanks for it, the thought being that good received gratefully comes as a blessing"; compare Mt 14:19 and Mt 15:36 with 1Co 11:24 (Adeney, HDB, I, 307).

See also BENEDICTION.

James M. Gray

BLESSED

bles'-ed (barukh): Where God is referred to, this word has the sense of "praise," as in 1Sa 25:32, "Blessed be Yahweh, the God of Israel." But where man is in mind it is used in the sense of "happy" or "favored," and most frequently so in the Psalms and the Gospels, as for example, "Blessed is the man

that walketh not in the counsel of the wicked" (Ps 1:1); "Blessed art thou among women" (Lu 1:42); "Blessed are the poor in spirit" (Mt 5:3).

See BEATITUDES.

BLESSEDNESS

bles'-ed-nes: This translation of makarismos (a word signifying "beatification" or "the ascription of blessing"), is used but three times, in Ro 4:6,9, and Ga 4:15, in the King James Version only. In the first two instances it refers to the happy state or condition of a man to whom Christ's righteousness is imputed by faith, and in the last to a man's experience of that condition.

See HAPPINESS.

BLESSING

(berakhah; eulogia): Sometimes means the form of words used in invoking the bestowal of good, as in De 33:1; Jos 8:34; and Jas 3:10. Sometimes it means the good or the benefit itself which has been conferred, as in Ge 27:36, "Hast thou not reserved a blessing for me?" and Pr 10:22, "The blessing of Yahweh, it maketh rich." "The cup of blessing" (to poterion tes eulogias, a special use of the word in 1Co 10:16), means the cup for which we bless God, or which represents to us so much blessin g from God.

James M. Gray

BLESSING, CUP OF

(to poterion tes eulogias, "the consecrated cup," 1Co 10:16): A technical term from the Jewish liturgy transferred to the Lord's Supper, and signifying the cup of wine upon which a blessing was pronounced. The suggestion that it carries with it a higher significance, as a cup that brings blessing, is not without force. The succeeding words, "we bless," are equivalent to "for which we give thanks." It was consecrated by thanksgiving and prayer.

See also CUP.

BLESSING, VALLEY OF

See BERACAH.

BLINDFOLD

blind’-fold (perikalupto): A sport common among the children of ancient times, in which the blindfolded were struck on the cheek, then asked who had struck them, and not let go until they had correctly guessed. This treatment was accorded Christ by his persecutors (Lu 22:64).

BLINDING

blind’-ing.

See PUNISHMENTS.

BLINDNESS

blind’-ness (‘awar, and variants; tuphlos): The word blind is used as a verb, as Joh 12:40, usually in the sense of obscuring spiritual perception. In reference to physical blindness it is used as a noun frequently or else as an adjective with the noun man. There are 54 references to this condition, and there is no reason to believe, as has been surmised, that blindness was any less rife in ancient times than it is now, when defective eyes and bleared, inflamed lids are among the commonest and most disgusting sights in a Palestine crowd. In the Papyrus Ebers (1500 BC) there are enumerated a number of diseases of the eye and a hundred prescriptions are given for their treatment. That the disease occurred in children and caused destruction and atrophy of the eyeball is testified to by the occurrence of a considerable number of mummy heads, in which there is marked diminution in size of one orbit. The commonest disease is a purulent ophthalmia, a highly infectious condition propagated largely by the flies which can be seen infesting the crusts of dried secretion undisturbed even on the eyes of infants. (In Egypt there is a superstition that it is unlucky to disturb them.) This almost always leaves the eyes damaged with bleared lids, opacities of the cornea, and sometimes extensive internal injury as well. Like other plagues, this disease was thought to be a Divine infliction (Ex 4:11). Minor forms of the disease destroy the eyelashes and produce the unsightly tender-eyes (in Ge 29:17 the word rakh may mean simply "weak").

Blindness from birth is the result of a form of this disease known as ophthalmia neonatorum which sets in a few days after birth. I have seen cases of this disease in Palestine. Sometimes ophthalmia accompanies malarial fever (Le 26:16). All these diseases are aggravated by sand, and the sun glare, to which the unprotected inflamed eyes are exposed. Most of the extreme cases which one sees are beyond remedy—and hence, the giving of sight to the blind is generally put in the front of the mighty works of healing by our Lord. The methods used by Him in these miracles varied probably according to the degree of faith in the blind man; all were merely tokens, not intended as remedies. The case of the man in Mr 8:22 whose healing seemed gradual is an instance of the phenomenon met with in cases where, by operation, sight has been given to one congenitally blind, where it takes some time before he can interpret his new sensations.

The blindness of old age, probably from senile cataract, is described in the cases of Eli at 98 years of age (1Sa 3:2; 4:15), Ahijah (1Ki 14:4), and Isaac (Ge 27:1). The smiting of Elymas (Ac 13:11) and the Syrian soldiers (2Ki 6:18) was either a miraculous intervention or more probably a temporary

hypnotism; that of Paul (Ac 9:8) was doubtless a temporary paralysis of the retinal cells from the bright light. The "scales" mentioned were not material but in the restoration of his sight it seemed as if scales had fallen from his eyes. It probably left behind a weakness of the eyes (see thORN IN THE FLESH). That blindness of Tobit (Tobit 2:10), from the irritation of sparrows' dung, may have been some form of conjunctivitis, and the cure by the gall of the fish is paralleled by the account given in Pliny (xxxii.24) where the gall of the fish Callionymus Lyra is recommended as an application in some cases of blindness. The hypothesis that the gall was used as a pigment to obscure the whiteness of an opaque cornea (for which Indian ink tattooing has been recommended, not as a cure but to remove the unsightliness of a white spot) has nothing in its favor for thereby the sight would not be restored. The only other reference to medicaments is the figurative mention of eyesalve in Re 3:18.

Blindness unfitted a man for the priesthood (Le 21:18); but care of the blind was specially enjoined in the Law (Le 19:14), and offenses against them are regarded as breaches of Law (De 27:18).

Figuratively, blindness is used to represent want of mental perception, want of prevision, recklessness, and incapacity to perceive moral distinctions (Isa 42:16,18,19; Mt 23:16 ff; Joh 9:39 ff).

Alex. Macalister

BLINDNESS, JUDICIAL

ju-dish'-al, joo-dish'-al: Among the ancient Israelites in the pre-Canaanite period disputes within the family or clan or tribe would be settled by the natural head of the family or clan or tribe. According to Ex 18 Moses, as the leader of the tribes, settled all disputes. But he was compelled to appoint a body of magistrates—heads of families—to act in conjunction with himself, and under his judicial oversight. These magistrates settled ordinary disputes while he reserved for himself the more difficult cases. After the conquest of Canaan, the conditions of life became so complex, and questions of a difficult nature so constantly arose, that steps were taken

(1) to appoint official judges—elders of the city (Jos 8:33; Jud 8:3; 1Ki 21:8);

(2) to codify ancient custom, and

(3) to place the administration of justice on an organized basis.

It is significant that in one of the oldest documents in the Pentateuch—namely, in the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:20- 23:33)—the miscarriage of justice was of such frequent occurrence as to require special mention (23:1-3,6-8). In fact the Old Testament abounds with allusions to the corruption and venality of the magisterial bench (De 16:19; Le 19:15; Am 5:12; Mic 3:11; 7:3; Isa 1:23; 5:23; Ze 3:3; Ps 15:5; Pr 17:23). According to the Book of the Covenant (Ex 23:8) 'a bribe blindeth the eyes of the open-eyed.' This descriptive phrase indicates a prolific cause of the miscarriage of justice—an exceedingly common thing in the East, in the present no less than in the past. The prohibition in Ex 23:3,

"Neither shalt thou favor a poor man in his cause," is rather remarkable and many scholars are of opinion that "a great man" should be read for "a poor man" as, according to 23:6 the King James Version, the common fault was "wresting the judgment of the poor." The rich alone could offer a satisfactory bribe. But it should be pointed out that Le 19:15 legislates in view of both tendencies —"respecting the person of the poor:" and "honoring the person of the mighty." Sympathy with the poor no less than a bribe from the well-to-do might affect the judgment of the bench. De 16:19 reproduces the words of the Book of the Covenant with a slight alteration—namely, "eyes of the wise" for "eyes of the open-eyed" ("them that have sight"). Both phrases vividly bring out the baneful effect of bribery—a magistrate otherwise upright and honest—open-eyed and wise—may be unconsciously yet effectively influenced in his judicial decisions by a gift sufficiently large. A similar phrase is found in the story of Abraham's life (Ge 20:16). A gift of a thousand shekels to Abraham was intended to be a "covering of the eyes" for Sarah, i.e. compensation or reparation for the wrong which had been done. For a gift of such magnitude she ought to wink at the injury. Job 9:24 declares in his bitterness that God "covereth the faces of the judges"—inflicts judicial blindness on them so that justice in this world is out of the question. Judicial corruption was the burden of the prophets' preaching—"judges loved bribes, and followed after rewards," with the result that "the fatherless" and "the widow" were helpless to have their grievances redressed (Isa 1:23). A satisfactory reward would always secure the acquittal of the offender (Isa 5:23). Micah combines judges, priests and prophets under a similar charge; they are all guilty of gross venality (Isa 3:11). Pr 17:23 defines the wicked person as one who is always prepared to take a "bribe out of the bosom, to pervert the ways of justice"; on the other hand the good man is he who will not take a reward against the innocent (Ps 15:5) or "shaketh his hands from taking a bribe" (Isa 33:15). In regard to Yahweh alone is absolute incorruptibility affirmed—he "regardeth not persons, nor taketh reward" (De 10:17).

T. Lewis

BLOOD

blud (dam, probably from ‘adham "to be red"; haima): Used in the Old Testament to designate the life principle in either animal or vegetable, as the blood of man or the juice of the grape (Le 17:11, et al.); in the New Testament for the blood of an animal, the atoning blood of Christ, and in both Old Testament and New Testament in a figurative sense for bloodshed or murder (Ge 37:26; Ho 4:2; Re 16:6).

1. Primitive Ideas:

Although the real function of the blood in the human system was not fully known until the fact of its circulation was established by William Harvey in 1615, nevertheless from the earliest times a singular mystery has been attached to it by all peoples. Blood rites, blood ceremonies and blood feuds are common among primitive tribes. It came to be recognized as the life principle long before it was scientifically proved to be. Naturally a feeling of fear, awe and reverence would be attached to the shedding of blood. With many uncivilized peoples scarification of the body until blood flows is practiced. Blood brotherhood or blood friendship is established by African tribes by the mutual shedding

of blood and either drinking it or rubbing it on one another's bodies. Thus and by the inter-transfusion of blood by other means it was thought that a community of life and interest could be established.

2. Hebrew and Old Testament Customs:

Notwithstanding the ignorance and superstition surrounding this suggestively beautiful idea, it grew to have more than a merely human significance and application. For this crude practice of inter-transference of human blood there came to be a symbolic substitution of animal blood in sprinkling or anointing. The first reference in the Old Testament to blood (Ge 4:10) is figurative, but highly illustrative of the reverential fear manifested upon the shedding of blood and the first teaching regarding it.

The rite of circumcision is an Old Testament form of blood ceremony. Apart from the probable sanitary importance of the act is the deeper meaning in the establishment of a bond of friendship between the one upon whom the act is performed and Yahweh Himself. In order that Abraham might become "the friend of God" he was commanded that he should be circumcised as a token of the covenant between him and God (Ge 17:10-11; see CIRCUMCISION).

It is significant that the eating of blood was prohibited in earliest Bible times (Ge 9:4). The custom probably prevailed among heathen nations as a religious rite (compare Ps 16:4). This and its unhygienic influence together doubtless led to its becoming taboo. The same prohibition was made under the Mosaic code (Le 7:26; see SACRIFICE).

Blood was commanded to be used also for purification or for ceremonial cleansing (Le 14:5-7,51,52; Nu 19:4), provided, however, that it be taken from a clean animal (see PURIFICATION).

In all probability there is no trace of the superstitious use of blood in the Old Testament, unless perchance in 1Ki 22:38 (see BATHING); but everywhere it is vested with cleansing, expiatory, and reverently symbolic qualities.

3. New Testament Teachings:

As in the transition from ancient to Hebrew practice, so from the Old Testament to the New Testament we see an exaltation of the conception of blood and blood ceremonies. In Abraham's covenant his own blood had to be shed. Later an expiatory animal was to shed blood (Le 5:6; see ATONEMENT), but there must always be a shedding of blood. "Apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb 9:22). The exaltation and dignifying of this idea finds its highest development then in the vicarious shedding of blood by Christ Himself (1Jo 1:7). As in the Old Testament "blood" was also used to signify the juice of grapes, the most natural substitute for the drinking of blood would be the use of wine. Jesus takes advantage of this, and introduces the beautiful and significant custom (Mt 26:28) of drinking wine and eating bread as symbolic of the primitive intertransfusion of blood and flesh in a pledge of eternal friendship (compare Ex 24:6,7; Joh 6:53-56). This is the climactic observance of blood rites recorded in

the Bible.

LITERATURE.

Trumbull, The Blood Covenant and The Threshold Covenant; Westermarck, The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas; Robertson Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites.

Walter G. Clippinger

BLOOD AND WATER

(haima kai hudor): The remarkable passage (Joh 19:34) from which this expression is taken refers to the piercing of the Savior’s side by the soldier. The evangelist notes here what he, as an eyewitness of the crucifixion, had seen as a surprising fact. Whereon this surprise was founded cannot now be more than guessed at. Nor is it necessary here to discuss the reason or reasons why the apostle mentions the fact at all in his report, whether merely for historical accuracy and completeness, or as a possible proof of the actual death of Christ, which at an early date became a subject of doubt among certain Christian sects, or whether by it he wished to refer to the mystical relation of baptismal cleansing ("water") and the atonement ("blood") as signified thereby. Let it suffice to state that a reference often made to 1Jo 5:6,8 is here quite out of place. This passage, though used by certain Fathers of the church as a proof of the last-named doctrine, does not indeed refer to this wonderful incident of the crucifixion story. The argument of 1Jo 5:8 concerns the Messiahship of Jesus, which is proved by a threefold witness, for He is the one whom at the baptism of John ("water") God attested as the Messiah by the heavenly voice, "This is my beloved Son," who at the crucifixion ("blood") had the testimony that the Father had accepted His atoning sacrifice, and whose promise of sending the Comforter fulfilled on Pentecost ("spirit") presented us with the final proof of the completed Messianic task. The same expression in 1Jo 5:6 refers probably to the same argument with the implied meaning that Jesus came not only by the merely ceremonial water of baptism, but also by the more important, because vivifying, blood of atonement.

The physiological aspect of this incident of the crucifixion has been first discussed by Gruner (Commentatio de morte Jesu Christi vera, Halle, 1805), who has shown that the blood released by the spear-thrust of the soldier must have been extravasated before the opening of the side took place, for only so could it have been poured forth in the described manner. While a number of commentators have opposed this view as a fanciful explanation, and have preferred to give the statement of the evangelist a symbolical meaning in the sense of the doctrines of baptism and eucharist (so Baur, Strauss, Reuss and others), some modern physiologists are convinced that in this passage a wonderful phenomenon is reported to us, which, inexplicable to the sacred historian, contains for us an almost certain clue to the real cause of the Savior’s death. Dr. Stroud (On the Physiological Cause of the Death of Christ, London, 1847) basing his remarks on numerous postmortems, pronounced the opinion that here we had a proof of the death of Christ being due not to the effects of crucifixion but to "laceration or rupture of the heart" as a consequence of supreme mental agony and sorrow. It is well attested that usually the suffering on the cross was very prolonged. It often lasted two or three days, when death would supervene from

exhaustion. There were no physical reasons why Christ should not have lived very much longer on the cross than He did. On the other hand, death caused by laceration of the heart in consequence of great mental suffering would be almost instantaneous. In such a case the phrase "of a broken heart," becomes literally true. The life blood flowing through the aperture or laceration into the pericardium or caul of the heart, being extravasated, soon coagulates into the red clot (blood) and the limpid serum (water). This accumulation in the heart-sac was released by the spear-thrust of the soldier (which here takes providentially the place of a postmorten without which it would have been impossible to determine the real cause of death), and from the gaping wound there flow the two component parts of blood distinctly visible.

Several distinguished physicians have accepted Dr. Stroud's argument, and some have strengthened it by the observation of additional symptoms. We may mention Dr. James Begbie, fellow and late president of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, Sir J. Y. Simpson, professor at the University of Edinburgh, and others (see Dr. Hanna, Our Lord's Life on Earth, Appendix I). The latter refers to the loud cry, mentioned by the Synoptists (Mt 27:50; Mr 15:37; Lu 23:46), which preceded the actual death of Jesus, as a symptom characteristic of cases of "broken heart." He adds that Dr. Walshe, professor of medicine in University College, London, one of the greatest authorities on the diseases of the heart, says that a "piercing shriek" is always uttered in such cases immediately before the end.

While we may never reach a state of absolute certainty on this subject, there is no valid reason to deny the probability of this view of the death of Christ. It certainly gives a more solemn insight into Christ's spiritual anguish, "the travail of his soul" on our behalf, which weighed upon Him so heavily that long before the usual term of bodily and therefore endurable suffering of crucified persons Christ's loving heart broke, achieving the great atoning sacrifice for all mankind.

H. L. E. Luering

BLOOD, AVENGER OF

See AVENGER.

BLOOD, ISSUE OF

ish'-u.

See BLOODY FLUX.

BLOOD-REVENGE

blud-re-venj':

See AVENGER.

BLOODGUILTINESS

blud-gilt’-i-nes: Found in the King James Version only in Ps 51:14. The Revised Version (British and American) adds Ex 22:2,3; 1Sa 25:26,33. Eze 18:13 seems to indicate that the phrase does not necessarily signify bloodshed, but any grievous sin which, if it remains, will block God’s favor to His land and people (compare De 21:8; Isa 1:15). Ps 51 is to be interpreted in this light.

BLOODSHEDDING

blud’-shed-ing (haimatekchusia, Heb 9:22): In this passage the indispensability of expiating sacrifice is positively set forth.

BLOODTHIRSTY

blud’-thurs-ti (’anshe damim, "men of blood"): This occurs in the King James Version only in Pr 29:10; in the Revised Version (British and American), Ps 5:6; 55:23; 59:2; 139:19.

See BLOODY.

BLOODY

blud’-i (dam =" blood" of man or an animal; and where the King James translators have rendered with the adjective "bloody," the Hebrew employs the noun in the construct case, "of blood"): "A bridegroom of blood" (Ex 4:25,26, the King James Version bloody husband). Zipporah, not being an Israelite, probably objected to the circumcision of infants, if not to the rite altogether; apprehending, however, that her husband’s life was imperiled possibly through some grievous sickness (Ex 4:24) because of their disobedience in this particular, she performed the ceremony herself upon her son, saying, "A bridegroom of blood art thou to me."

In the Revised Version (British and American) the expression (the King James Version "bloody") is variously rendered, "man of blood" (2Sa 16:7,8); "men of blood" (Ps 26:9); "bloodthirsty" (Ps 5:6; 59:2; 139:19). In 2Sa 21:1, "It is for Saul, and for his bloody house," might be rendered "Upon Saul and his house rests bloodshed."

Ezekiel calls Jerusalem "the bloody city" (Eze 22:2; 24:6; compare Eze 7:23), referring to those unjustly put to death by the wicked rulers of Jerusalem. Nineveh also is called "the bloody city" (Na 3:1). The capital here virtually stands for the kingdom, and history bears witness to the enormous cruelties perpetrated by the Assyrian rulers. It is siege on siege, pools of blood everywhere, the flaying of men alive, "great baskets stuffed with the salted heads of their foes." For two hundred years it is th e story of

brute force and ruthless cruelty. "The prey departeth not." And now every cruelty which they have visited upon others is to be turned upon themselves (Na 3:19).

M. O. Evans

BLOODY FLUX

fluks (puretos kai dusenteria, literally "fever and dysentery"): The disease by which the father of Publius was afflicted in Malta (Ac 28:8). the Revised Version (British and American) calls it "dysentery"; a common and dangerous disease which in Malta is often fatal to soldiers of the garrison even at the present day (Aitken, Pract. of Medicine, II, 841). It is also prevalent in Palestine at certain seasons, and in Egypt its mortality was formerly about 36 percent. Its older name was due to the d ischarge of blood from the intestine. Sometimes portions of the bowel become gangrenous and slough, the condition described as affecting Jehoram (2Ch 21:19). There seems to have been an epidemic of the disease at the time of his seizure (2Ch 21:14,15), and in the case of the king it left behind it a chronic ulcerated condition, ending in gangrene. Somewhat similar conditions of chronic intestinal ulceration following epidemic dysentery I have seen in persons who had suffered from this disease in India.

Alex. Macalister

BLOODY SWEAT

(swet hosei thromboi haimatos): Described in Lu 22:44 as a physical accompaniment of our Lord’s agony at Gethsemane (on the passage, which is absent in some manuscripts, see Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek). Many old writers take this to mean that the perspiration dropped in the same manner as clots of blood drop from a wound, regarding the Greek word prefixed as expressing merely a comparison as in Mt 28:3, where leukon hos chion means "white as snow." Cases of actual exudation of blood are described in several of the medieval accounts of stigmatization, and Lefebvre describes the occurrence of something similar in his account of Louise Lateau in 1870. For references to these cases see the article "Stigmatization" in Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), XXII, 550. It is perhaps in favor of the older interpretation that the word used by Aeschylus for drops of blood is stagon (Agam. 1122) and by Euripides stalagmos, not thromboi. None of the instances given by Tissot (Traite des nerfs, 279), or Schenck (Observ. med., III, 45:5), can be said to be unimpeachable; but as the agony of our Lord was unexampled in human experience, it is conceivable that it may have been attended with physical conditions of a unique nature.

Alex. Macalister

BLOOM; BLOSSOM

bloom, blos’-um.

See FLOWERS.

BLOT

blot (mum, contracted from me'um, "spot"): Occurs in the sense of scorn (Pr 9:7). In Job 31:7 (the King James Version) it is used figuratively of a moral defect; the Revised Version (British and American) has "spot." Blot out (machah, "to wipe out," exaleipho, "to smear out"), to obliterate or destroy: "That a tribe be not blotted out" (the King James Version "destroyed," Jud 21:17). To blot men out of God's book is to cut them off by an untimely death (Ex 32:32).

Figuratively: "To blot out sin" is to forgive sin fully (Ps 51:1,9; Ac 3:19; Col 2:14). Not to blot out sin is to reserve for punishment (Ne 4:5). The names of those who inherit eternal life are not blotted out of the "book of life" (Re 3:5).

See BOOK OF LIFE; BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE; FORGIVENESS.

L. Kaiser

BLOW

blo (nashaph): Used with reference to the wind (Ex 15:10; Ps 78:26; 147:18; pneo, "to breathe," Lu 12:55; Joh 3:8; Re 7:1); taqa', with reference to trumpet sound (Nu 10:3-10; 31:6 the King James Version; Jud 7:18,20; 1Ki 1:34; 1Ch 15:24; Ps 81:3; Eze 33:3,6; Ho 5:8; Joe 2:1,15); puach, with reference to the strong expulsion of the breath (Eze 21:31; 22:20,21; Hag 1:9; Isa 40:7; 54:16; Job 20:26); nashaph, with reference to a forcible slap or stroke with hand or an instrument (Ps 39:10; Isa 40:24; Jer 14:17 the King James Version).

Frank E. Hirsch

BLUE

bloo.

See COLORS.

BOANERGES

bo-a-nur'-jez (Boanerges; bene reghesh, "sons of thunder"): The surname bestowed by Jesus upon James and John, the sons of Zebedee, when they were ordained to the apostleship (Mr 3:17). See JAMES. It has also been regarded as an equivalent of the "Heavenly Twins," the Sons of Zeus or Thunder.

According to this interpretation, the name Boanerges would represent the Dioscuri in some form or other of their varied presentation in the cults of the Mediterranean (compare Professor J. Rendel Harris in The Expositor, series vii, III, 146).

C. M. Kerr

BOAR

bor (chazir): In lamenting the troubled state of the Jewish nation the Psalmist (Ps 80:13) says: "The boar out of the wood doth ravage it, and the wild beasts of the field feed on it," with evident reference to Israel's enemies, the Assyrians, etc. The wild boar is abundant in certain parts of Palestine and Syria, especially in the thickets which border the lakes and rivers, as about the Chuleh, the sea of Galilee, the Jordan, and in the deltas of streams flowing into the Dead Sea, as Ghaur-us-Cafiyeh. Several fountains in Lebanon bear the name, 'Ain-ul-Chazir, though chazir is not an Arabic word, khanzir being the Arabic for "swine."

See SWINE.

Alfred Ely Day

BOARD

bord (qeresh, "a slab or plank," "deck of a ship," "bench," "board"): This word is found in Ex 26:16-21; 36:21 ff; its plural occurs in Ex 26:15,17-29; 35:11; 36:20-34; 39:33; 40:18; Nu 3:36; 4:31. This word also is used in translation of luach (Ex 27:8; 38:7; So 8:9; Eze 27:5 the King James Version) =" a tablet" (of stone, wood or metal), "board," "plate," "table"; also of tsla' =" rib," hence, a "side," "timber," "plank" (1Ki 6:15 f). In 1Ki 6:9, sedherah =" a rank," "a row," hence, "a range" or "board" is used. In the New Testament we find the expression "on board" in Ac 27:44 the King James Version, in translation of epi sanisin =" planks."

Frank E. Hirsch

BOAST

bost (halal, "to praise"; kauchaomai, "to vaunt oneself," used both in a good and a bad sense): To praise God: "In God have we made our boast all the day long" (Ps 44:8); to praise oneself, to vaunt (Ps 10:3). In the New Testament the Revised Version (British and American) frequently translates "glory," where the King James Version has "boast," in a good sense (2Co 7:14). In the sense of self-righteousness (Eph 2:9; Ro 2:17,23). Boaster (alazon, "a braggart") occurs in the King James Version (Ro 1:30; 2Ti 3:2); the Revised Version (British and American) has "boastful."

BOAT

bot.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

BOAZ

bo’-az (bo‘az; Booz; "quickness" (?) Ru 2-4; 1Ch 2:11,12; Mt 1:5; Lu 3:32):

(1) A resident of Bethlehem and kinsman of Elimelech, Naomi’s husband. In Ru 2:1 he is described as a gibbor chayil, a phrase which can mean either "a mighty man of valor" or else "a man of position and wealth." The latter is probably the sense in which the phrase is applied to Boaz (compare 1Sa 9:1). He had fields outside the town, and to them Ru went to glean. Boaz noticed her and extended special kindness and protection to her, bidding her remain with his female workers, and charging the men not to illtreat her, and also giving her of the reapers’ food at mealtime. Boaz awoke one night and found Ru lying at his feet. He praised her virtue, and promised to take charge of her if her dead husband’s next-of-kin failed to do so. He laid her case before the next-of-kin, and finally redeemed the family property himself and bought as well the right to take Ru in marriage. The son of Boaz and Ru was Obed, father of Jesse, and grandfather of David. 1Ch 2:11,12 makes Boaz a descendant of Hezron, and so probably a chief of the Hezronite clan in Bethlehem. Jewish tradition identifies Boaz with Ibzan (Jud 12:8-10).

Boaz "is set before us as a model of piety, generosity and chastity" (H. P. Smith, Old Testament History, 398). He found virtue and rewarded it. HPM, sections 501-8, gives a picture of the life of "a well-to-do landed proprietor of central Palestine," much of which could aptly be taken as a description of Boaz.

(2) The name of one of the two bronze pillars erected in front of Solomon’s temple, the other being Jachin (1Ki 7:21; 2Ch 3:17).

See JACHIN AND BOAZ; TEMPLE.

David Francis Roberts

BOCCAS

bok’-as (Bokkas): A priest in the line of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2) called Bukki in Ezr 7:4 and Borith in 2 Esdras 1:2.

BOCHERU

bo’-ke-roo (bokheru): A son of Azrikam, Saul’s descendant (1Ch 8:38 = 1Ch 9:34). For the ending ("-

u"), compare the forms gashmu (Ne 6:1,6) and melikhu (Ne 12:14 the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin).

BOCHIM

bo’-kim (ha-bokhim): A place on the mountain West of Gilgal said to have been so named (literally "the weepers") because Israel wept there at the remonstrance of the angel (Jud 2:1,5). No name resembling this has been discovered. Given on the occasion mentioned, it may not have endured. Many, following Septuagint, identify it with Bethel.

BODY

bod’-i:

I. PHILOLOGICAL:

Generally speaking, the Old Testament language employs no fixed term for the human body as an entire organism in exact opposition to "soul" or "spirit." Various terms were employed, each of which denotes only one part or element of the physical nature, such as "trunk," "bones," "belly," "bowels," "reins," "flesh," these parts being used, by synecdoche, for the whole: etsem =" bone," or "skeleton," hence, "body," is found in Ex 24:10 the King James Version; La 4:7; nephesh =" living organism" (Le 21:11; Nu 6:6,7,11; 19:11,13,16; Hag 2:13); nebhelah =" a flabby thing," "carcass" (De 21:23; Isa 26:19; Jer 26:23; 36:30); beTen =" womb" (De 28:4,11,18,53; 30:9; Job 19:17 the King James Version; Ps 132:11; Mic 6:7); yarekh =" thigh," "generative parts," "body" (Jud 8:30); gewiyah =" a body, whether alive or dead" (1Sa 31:10,12; 2Ki 8:5 the King James Version; Da 10:6); me‘im, "body" (So 5:14); guphah =" corpse" (1Ch 10:12); gewah =" the back," i.e. (by extension) "person" (Job 20:25); she’er =" flesh, as living or for food," "body" (Eze 10:12); geshem =" a hard shower of rain" hence, "a body" (Da 4:33; 5:21; 7:11); nidhneh =" a sheath," hence, the receptacle of the soul, "body" (Da 7:15).

The Greek word which is used almost exclusively for "body" in the New Testament is soma, Latin corpus (Mt 5:29,30; 6:22,23,25; 26:26; Joh 2:21; Ac 9:40; 1Co 15:35,37,38,44; Eph 1:23; 2:16; 4:4,12,16; 5:23,30). chros, signifying primarily the "surface" or "skin," occurs in Ac 19:12. A compound word with soma, as its base, sussomos =" a member of the same body," occurs in Eph 3:6. From the above, it appears that the New Testament places the body as a whole into opposition to the spirit or the invisible nature. Paul, of course, employs the term also to designate the sublimated substance with which we are to be clothed after the resurrection when he speaks of the "spiritual body" (1Co 15:44).

Frank E. Hirsch

II. GENERAL:

1. In the Old Testament:

soma, Latin corpus: The term "body" is not found in the Hebrew of the Old Testament in the sense in which it occurs in the Greek "The Hebrew word for ‘body’ is gewiyah, which is sometimes used for the ‘living’ body (Eze 1:11), ‘bodies of the cherubim’ (Ge 47:18; Ne 9:37), but usually for the dead body or carcass. Properly speaking the Hebrew has no term for ‘body.’ The Hebrew term around which questions relating to the body must gather is flesh" (Davidson, Old Testament Theology, 188). Various terms are used in the Old Testament to indicate certain elements or component parts of the body, such as "flesh," "bones," "bowels," "belly," etc., some of which have received a new meaning in the New Testament. Thus the Old Testament "belly" (Hebrew beTen, Greek koilia), "Our soul is bowed down to the dust; our belly cleaveth unto the earth" (Ps 44:25 the King James Version)—as the seat of carnal appetite—has its counterpart in the New Testament: "They serve .... their own belly" (Ro 16:18). So also the word translated "bowels" (meim, rachamim) in the sense of compassion, as in Jer 31:20, King James Version: "Therefore my bowels are troubled for him," is found in more than one place in the New Testament. Thus in Php 1:8 the King James Version, "I long after you all in the bowels (splagchna) of Christ," and again, "if there be any bowels (splagchna) and mercies" (Php 2:1 the King James Version).

2. In the New Testament:

"Body" in the New Testament is largely used in a figurative sense, either as indicating the "whole man" (Ro 6:12; Heb 10:5), or as that which is morally corrupt—"the body of this death" (Ro 6:6; 7:24). Hence, the expression, "buffet my body" (1Co 9:27, hupopiazo, a word adopted from the prize-ring, palaestra), the body being considered as the lurking-place and instrument of evil. (Compare Ro 8:13 the King James Version "Mortify the deeds of the body.")

3. Other Meanings:

Between these two the various other meanings seem to range. On the one hand we find the church called "the body of Christ" (Eph 4:16; 1Co 12:13), with diversity of gifts, enjoying the "unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." On the other we read of a spiritual, incorruptible body, a resurrection-body as opposed to the natural body, which is doomed to corruption in death (1Co 15:44). Not only do we find these meanings in the word itself, but also in some of its combinations. On the one hand we read in Eph 3:6 of the Gentiles as "partakers of the promise in Christ" as "fellow- heirs," and "of the same body" (sussoma) in corporate union with all who put their trust in the Redeemer of mankind; on the other, we read of mere "bodily (somatic) exercises," which are not profitable. (1Ti 4:8)—where "body" evidently is contrasted with "spirit." And again, we read of the Holy Ghost descending in "bodily" (somatic) shape upon the "Son of God" (Lu 3:22), in whom dwelt the "fullness of the Godhead bodily" (somatically) (Col 2:9). So, too, the "body" is called a temple of the Holy Ghost: "Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit?" (1Co 6:19).

4. The Body and Sin:

From all this it is apparent that the body in itself is not necessarily evil, a doctrine which is taught in

Greek philosophy, but nowhere in the Old Testament and New Testament. The rigid and harsh dualism met with in Plato is absent from Paul's writings, and is utterly foreign to the whole of Scripture. Here we are distinctly taught, on the one hand, that the body is subordinated to the soul, but on the other, with equal clearness, that the human body has a dignity, originally conferred upon it by the Creator, who shaped it out of earth, and glorified it by the incarnation of Christ, the sinless One, though born of a woman. Julius Muller has well said: "Paul denies the presence of evil in Christ, who was partaker of our fleshly nature (Ga 4:4), and he recognizes it in spirits who are not partakers thereof (Eph 6:12 the King James Version, 'spiritual wickedness in high places'). Is it not therefore in the highest degree probable that according to him evil does not necessarily pertain to man's sensuous nature, and that sarx (say body) denotes something different from this?" (The Christian Doctrine of Sin, I, 321, English edition). He further shows that the derivation of sin from sense is utterly irreconcilable with the central principle of the apostle's doctrine as to the perfect holiness of the Redeemer, and that "the doctrine of the future resurrection—even taking into account the distinction between the soma psuchikon and the soma pneumatikon (1Co 15:44)—is clearly at variance with the doctrine that sin springs from the corporal nature as its source" (318).

5. The First Sin:

The very first sin was spiritual in its origin—an act of rebellion against God—the will of the creature in opposition to the will of the Creator (Ge 3). It was conceived in doubt—"Hath God said?"; it was born in desire—"The tree was good for food"; it was stimulated by a rebellious hankering after equality with God: "Ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil"; it was introduced from without, from the spiritual world, through the agency of a mysterious, supernatural being, employing "a beast of the field more subtle than any which Yahweh God had made." That the serpent in the Old Testament is not identified with Satan, and that the clearest utterance in pre-Christian times on the subject is to be found in the Book of The Wisdom of Solomon 2:24 ("by the envy of the devil death entered into the world"), may be true. That the narrative of the Fall is figurative or symbolical may also be granted. But the whole tendency of the early narrative is to connect the first human sin with a superhuman being, employing an agent known to man, and making that agent its representative in the "subtlety" of the great temptation as a prelude to the mighty fall. The New Testament is clear on this point (Joh 8:44; 16:11; 2Co 11:3; 1Ti 2:14; Heb 2:14; Re 12:9). Great historic truths are imbedded in that narrative, whatever we may think of the form which that narrative has assumed. There can be no doubt that the oldest and truest traditions of the human race are to be found there. It is not denied that sin has desecrated the temple of the liv ing God, which is the body. That body indeed has become defiled and polluted by sin. Paul recognizes "an abnormal development of the sensuous in fallen man, and regards sin as having in a special manner entrenched itself in the body, which becomes liable to death on this very account (Ro 6:23; 7:24)" (Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I, 761). But we may safely say that theory which connects sin with the physical body, and gives it a purely sensuous origin, is alien to the whole spirit and letter of revelation.

J. I. Marais

III. FIGURATIVE:

In the New Testament (soma, "the body" both of men and animals) the word has a rich figurative and spiritual use:

(1) the temporary home of the soul (2Co 5:6);

(2) "the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1Co 6:19);

(3) "temple" (Joh 2:21);

(4) "the old man," the flesh as the servant of sin or the sphere in which moral evil comes to outward expression (Ro 6:6; 7:7; compare Paul's use of sarx, "flesh");

(5) the "church" as Christ's body, the organism through which He manifests His life and in which H is spirit dwells (Eph 1:23; Col 1:24);

(6) the spiritual "unity" of believers, one redeemed society or organism (Eph 2:16; a corpus mysticum, Eph 4:4);

(7) "substance" (spiritual reality or life in Christ) versus "shadow" (Col 2:17);

(8) the ascended and glorified body of Jesus (Php 3:21);

(9) the resurrection or "spiritual" (v. natural) body of the redeemed in heaven (1Co 15:44);

(10) the whole personality, e.g. the spiritual presence, power and sacrificial work of Christ, the mystical meaning of "the body and the blood" symbolized in the bread and cup of the sacrament (1Co 11:27).

The term body is exceptionally rich in connection with the selfgiving, sacrificial, atoning work of Christ. It was the outward sphere or manifestation of His suffering. Through the physical He revealed the extent of His redeeming and sacrificial love. He "bare our sins in his body upon the tree" (1Pe 2:24), thus forever displacing all the ceaseless and costly sacrifices of the old dispensation (Heb 9:24-28). Special terms, "body of his flesh" (Col 1:22); "body of sin" (Ro 6:6); "body of this death" (Ro 7:24); "body of his glory" (Php 3:21).

ptoma, used only of fallen, i.e. dead bodies (Re 11:8,9).

Dwight M. Pratt

BODY OF DEATH

deth (soma tou thanatou): These words are found in Paul’s impassioned argument on the reign of the law, which dooms man to continuous disappointment and convinces him of the terrible power of indwelling sin. "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" (Ro 7:24 the King James Version). It is the "picture of the still unredeemed man in his relation to the law" (Meyer). The translation, "this body of death," though grammatically possible, is logically impermissible. The picture here before the mind of the apostle is not physical but ethical. Death points to the dominion of sin, to the reign of the law, as revealed in his physical life, from which he is delivered only through regeneration, by faith in Christ. It points to the "I must" and to the "I cannot." It is therefore the bondage under the law of sin, the body as the seat of this conscious and bitter struggle, that the figure points at. And yet the ethical may have a physical background. There may be a distant reference here to the dreadful punishment of the ancients of chaining the living body to a corpse, that the constant corruption of death might extinguish the life of the victim of this exquisite torture.

Henry E. Dosker

BODY OF HEAVEN

The King James Version translates the Hebrew idiom, etsem ha-shamayim, by "the body of heaven" (Ex 24:10). A more correct rendering is given in the Revised Version (British and American), "the very heaven," taking the word ‘etsem in its idiomatic use as an intensive, which is derived from its literal meaning, "bone," as "strength," "substance," and then as "self" (compare Job 21:23); the substance of the blue, unclouded sky, hence, the clear sky itself.

BODY, SPIRITUAL

spir’-it-u-al: Paul describes the body after the resurrection as a spiritual body (soma psuchikon) and contrasts it with the natural (psychical body, soma pneumatikon, 1Co 15:44). Our present natural body has for its life-principle the soul (psuche) but the resurrection body is adapted and subordinated to the spirit (pneuma). See PSYCHOLOGY. The apostle does not argue for a literal and material identity of that future body with the present one, but thinks of it as the counterpart of the present animal organism so conditioned as to be adapted to a state of existence which lies wholly within the sphere of the spirit. Against his Corinthian readers he argues that the resurrection cannot be succeeded by a state of non-existence, nor is he willing to admit a mere etherealized state. There must be a body, but between it and our present body there is a similar difference to that between the first and second Adam. The present body and the first Adam were alike dominated by the soul (psuche); but as the second Adam became a life-giving spirit, so will the resurrection body be a spiritual one. Christ became a life-giving spirit through the resurrection (Meyer on 1Co 15:45); and since we are to bear His image (1Co 15:49), it becomes evident that Christ’s resurrection-body is the nearest possible approach to a sensible representation of the spiritual body. For this Paul argues more directly when he affirms that our resurrection-body shall be transformed according to the body of His glory (Php 3:21; compare 1Jo 3:2). The body of Christ after the resurrection was conformed in many respects to the body of His earthly life, yet with some marked differences. He ate (Lu 24:42,43); He breathed (Joh 20:22); possessed flesh and

bones (Lu 24:39), and could be apprehended by the bodily senses (Lu 24:40; Joh 20:27). His body possessed characteristics which differentiated it entirely from the popular fancy of ghosts or apparitions (Lu 24:36-43). Yet His body was superior to the usual barriers which restrict human movements. Barred doors and distances did not impede His going (Joh 20:19-26; Lu 24:31-36). The context shows that the purpose of His eating was to convince the disciples that it was really He (Lu 24:41-43), and not to sustain life which His body was probably capable of maintaining in other ways. John speaks of His appearances after His resurrection as "manifestations" (Joh 21:1- 21). A change in His person and appearance had certainly taken place, for those who knew Him best did not at once recognize Him (Lu 24:16; Joh 20:14). It is evident therefore that the post-resurrection-body of Jesus was one that had the power of materializing itself to natural senses, or withdrawing itself at will. It was this same body which was taken into the heavens at the ascension, and which remains in heaven (Ac 1:11; 3:21). There is no hint that it underwent any change in its removal from earth. Hence, the spiritual body of which Paul speaks is not to be unlike the body which Jesus possessed after His resurrection. There is to be an absence of the desires and passions which belong naturally to the present bodily existence (Mt 22:30; Lu 20:35,36).

William Charles Morro

BODY-GUARD

bod’-i-gard: The expression occurs in Apocrypha (1 Esdras 3:4), "the body-guard that kept the king’s person."

BOHAN

bo’-han (bohan, "thumb," "stumpy"): A son of Reuben according to Jos 15:6; 18:17. No mention is made of Bohan in the genealogies of Reuben. "The stone of Bohan" (’ebhen bohan) was a boundary mark on the Northeast frontier of Judah, separating it from Benjamin. Site unidentified.

BOIL (1)

(noun) (shechin; helkos): A localized inflamed swelling. The Hebrew word is derived from a root probably meaning "to burn," and is used as a generic term for the sores in the sixth plague of Egypt (Ex 9:9-11); for a sore which might be confounded with leprosy (Le 13:18-23); for Job’s malady (Job 2:7) and Hezekiah’s disease (2Ki 20:1; Isa 38:21). Our English word is derived from the verb "to beal," i.e. to suppurate, now obsolete except as a dialect word in Scotland and Ireland. Wyclif uses the name f or Lazarus’ sores (Lu 16:20), "houndis lickeden his bylis." The Egyptian word schn is the name of an abscess, and occurs in the reduplicated form chnchnt in Papyr. Ebers, CV. The plague of boils in Egypt came without warning immediately after the insect plagues of kinnim (sandflies) and that of ‘arobh or flies, and followed the epizootic murrain, which is suggestive in the light of the transmission of toxic germs by insects. It has been supposed by some to be elephantiasis, as Pliny says that this di sease was peculiar to Egypt (xxvi.5). A stronger case has been made out for its identity with confluent smallpox;

but as it is not described as being a fatal disease, it may more probably have been an aggravated form of the ordinary gregarious furuncles or boils, due to the microbe streptococcus pyogenes.

Job's body is said to have been covered with itchy, irritating sores which made his face unrecognizable, Job 2:12, caused continual burning pain (Job 3:24; 6:4), and which were infested with maggots (Job 7:5) and exhaled a nauseous fetor (Job 19:17). His sleep was destroyed and his nervous system enfeebled (Job 3:26) so that he required assistance to move, as he sat in the ashes (Job 2:8). Various diagnoses have been made of his malady, but it is most probable that it was a form of the disease known as "oriental sore," or "Bagdad boil," called in Algeria "Biskra batton," in which the intensely itchy sores are often multiple, affecting the face, hands, and other exposed parts. The cases which I have seen have been very intractable and disfiguring.

Hezekiah's boil was apparently more localized, and the indefinite description would accord with that of a carbuncle. It seems to have rendered him unclean (Isa 38:22), though the reference may be to the practice referred to in Le 13:18 f. The "botch" of Egypt (De 28:27,35 the King James Version) is translation of the same word, as is "boil" in the Revised Version (British and American). Botch is an old English name for boil and occurs in Piers Plowman, and the adjective "botchy" is used in Troilus and Cressida (II, 1, 6). The word is cognate to the old French boche or poche, a form of our later word "pock." The sores of Lazarus (Lu 16:20) were probably old varicose ulcers, such as are as common on the legs of the old and poor in the East as they are in the West.

Alex. Macalister

BOIL (2)

(verb) (bashal, rathach): "Boil" is the translation of bashal, "to bubble up," "to boil," "to be cooked," Piel, "to cause to boil," "to cook" (Le 8:31; 1Ki 19:21; 2Ki 6:29; Eze 46:20,24 bis); of rathach, "to be hot," "to boil," "to be made to boil," "to be greatly moved" under strong emotion (the bowels), Hiphil "to cause to boil" (Job 30:27 the King James Version "My bowels boiled, and rested not," the English Revised Version "My bowels boil." the American Standard Revised Version "My heart is troubled"; Job 41:31, "He maketh the deep to boil like a pot"; Eze 24:5, "make it boil well"); of ba'ah, "to bubble" or "well up" (Isa 64:2 (1, in Hebrew) "The fire causeth the waters to boil"); in King James Version, margin of Ps 45:1 ("My heart is inditing a good matter") we have Hebrew "boileth" or "bubbleth up" (rachash, "to boil" or "bubble up," the Revised Version (British and American) text, "My heart overfloweth with a goodly matter").

"Boiling-places," occurs in Eze 46:23 as the translation of mebhashsheloth, "hearths," "boiling-places." The American Standard Revised Version has "boiling-houses" for "places of them that boil" (Eze 46:24), "boil well" for "consume" (Eze 24:10). the American Standard Revised Version has "boiling over" for "unstable" (Ge 49:4; the English Revised Version, margin "bubbling over").

W. L. Walker

BOLDNESS

bold’-nes (parresia, "confidence," "fearlessness," "freedom of speech"): This was one of the results of discipleship (Ac 4:13,29,31; Eph 3:12; Php 1:20; 1Ti 3:13; 1Jo 4:17). It was a necessary qualification for the work assigned them. They were not only subject to violent persecutions, but also were the constant subject of ridicule and contempt. Paul uses the word in the sense of plainness in 2Co 3:12. In Heb 10:19; 1Jo 2:28; 4:17, it has the sense of freeness resulting from confidence. In Phm 1:8, the reference is to the authority which Paul claims in this case.

Jacob W. Kapp

BOLLED

bold (gibh‘ol, "the calyx of flowers"): Hence, "in bloom," and so rendered, in the Revised Version (British and American), of flowering flax (Ex 9:31).

BOLSTER

bol’-ster: Found in the King James Version only in 1Sa 19:13,16, "Behold, the teraphim was in the bed, with the pillow of goat’s hair at the head thereof" (the King James Version "for his bolster"), and 1Sa 26:7,11,12,16, "Saul lay sleeping .... with his spear stuck in the ground at his head." "Bolster" in these passages in the King James Version was used to translate a Hebrew word whose true significance is "the place of the head," or "the head-place." It will be noted that it has disappeared from the Revised Version (British and American), which rightly has throughout "head," instead of "bolster."

See CUSHION.

BOLT

bolt (na‘al, "to bind up"): The ancient Hebrews had fastenings of wood or iron for the doors of houses (2Sa 13:17,18; So 5:5), city gates (Ne 3:3,6,13-15), prison doors, etc. (Isa 45:2), which were in the form of bolts. These were sometimes pushed back from within; but there were others which, by means of a key, could be unfastened and pushed back from without (Jud 3:23 ff). These were almost the only form of locks known.

See BAR; LOCKS.

In Hab 3:5, resheph (a poetic word for "flame") is rendered "fiery bolts" (the King James Version "burning coals"). It seems to denote "the fiery bolts, by which Yahweh was imagined to produce pestilence or fever" (Driver, Deuteronomy, 367).

M. O. Evans

BOND

See BAND; BILL; CHAIN.

BONDAGE

bon’-daj: Used in two senses in Scripture, a literal and a metaphorical sense.

(1) In the former sense it refers

(a) to the condition of the Hebrews (’abhodhah) in Egypt (Ex 1:14 the King James Version; Ex 2:23 and often) which is frequently called "the house of bondage" ("slaves," ‘abhadhim), Ex 13:3,14; 20:2; De 5:6 and often. It also refers to the condition of the Hebrews in Babylonia (Isa 14:3, the King James Version) and in Persia (Ezr 9:8 f), where a slightly different form of the same root (‘abhedhuth) is used in the original. In both these cases the bondage was not so much personal as national. As a rule individuals were not subject to individuals, but the whole Hebrew people were subject to the Egyptian, Babylonian and the Persian states. They were forced to labor on public works, and otherwise, and were denied their own freedom when the exigencies of state seemed to demand it. The former word ‘abhodhah is also used in Ne 5:18 as descriptive of the subject and depressed conditions of the Hebrews in Palestine during the earlier years after their return from captivity, when they were still living under Persian suzerainty.

(b) The word bondage (‘abhadhim) is also used to describe the slavery into which the poor Jews were being forced by their more prosperous brethren in the earlier years under the Persians in Palestine (Ne 5:5). Here true personal, though temporary, slavery is meant.

(c) Marriage is once referred to as a bondage (1Co 7:15) (verb douloo).

(2) It is used in the metaphorical sense only in New Testament. he douleia, "bondage," is the power of physical corruption as against the freedom of life (Ro 8:21), the power of fear as over against the confidence of Christian faith (Ro 8:15; Heb 2:15), and especially is it the bondage of the letter, of the elements, of a ceremonial and institutional salvation which must be scrupulously and painfully observed, as contrasted with the freedom of the sons of God, emancipated by faith in Jesus Christ. This bondage is a peculiarly Pauline idea since he was fighting for Christian freedom (Ga 2:4; 4:3,9,24,25; 5:1). In 2Pe 2:19 the idea is essentially different. Libertinism, masquerading under the name of freedom, is branded as bondage, in contrast with the true freedom of righteous living.

See SLAVERY.

William Joseph McGlothlin

BONDMAID

bond'-mad: Occurs but three times in the King James Version (Le 19:20; 25:44; Ga 4:22 (the Revised Version (British and American) "handmaid")). The first instance is that of Hebrew girl who has by birth, purchase or otherwise come into temporary slavery. The word here is shiphchah. It occurs often in the Old Testament, but is elsewhere translated "maid," "handmaid," "woman servant," "maidservant," etc. The other instance (Le 25:44) refers to foreign slave girls and has different word, 'amah, which also occurs number of times, but is elsewhere translated "handmaid," etc. The New Testament instance (Ga 4:22) refers to Hagar, Abraham's Egyptian slave girl. The original word paidiske, occurs several other times, but in the King James Version is elsewhere translated "maid," "damsel," etc. It means a slave girl.

See SLAVERY.

William Joseph McGlothlin

BONDMAN

bond'-man: One of the translations of the word 'ebhedh, very common in the Old Testament. It refers to the ordinary slave, either foreign (Ge 43:18; 44:9,33; Le 25:44,46) or Hebrew (Le 25:42; 2Ki 4:1). Hebrews were forbidden to enslave Hebrews, but did it nevertheless. It also refers to the Israelites in the bondage of Egypt (De 15:15, and often), and in the exile of Babylonia (Ezr 9:9). The intended treatment of the men of Judah in Samaria (2Ch 28:10) was apparently to sell them into ordinary slavery or bondage. The word is used once in the New Testament (Re 6:15) to translate doulos, where it evidently means a slave in contrast with a freeman.

See SLAVERY.

William Joseph McGlothlin

BONDSERVANT

bond'-sur-vant: Appears only once in the King James Version (Le 25:39) where it translates 'ebhedh, "a slave": "Thou shalt not cause him to render the service of a bondservant" or slave. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently uses bondservant (doulos) instead of the word "servant" of the King James Version (Joh 8:34,35; 1Co 7:21; Ga 4:7).

See SLAVERY.

BONE; BONES

bon (‘etsem, ‘otsem; Aramaic gerem, by extension used for "bony frame," "body," "strength," Ps 35:10; "the whole man"; Lu 24:39, "flesh and bones" = the solid and tangible framework of the body; figuratively the substance, the idea of a thing, the thing, per se): Figurative: Very often we find the use of these words in metaphorical phrases, in which a disease or a discomfort of the body denotes certain emotions or mental attitudes. Thus the expression "rottenness of the bones" (Pr 12:4; 14:30) signifies the feelings of a man whose wife causes him shame and confusion, or is equivalent to "envy," "jealousy." The translation of the Septuagint in these passages by skolex, "worm," and ses, "maggot," "moth," is incorrect. The same phrase is used in Hab 3:16 for utter dejectedness through the anticipation of approaching evil. Similarly the "shaking of the bones" (Job 4:14) is expressive of fear, and denotes dejection and sadness in Jer 23:9. The "burning of the bones" is found as a symptom of J ob’s disease (Job 30:30), and stands for grief, depression of spirits in Ps 102:3 and La 1:13, and also for the feeling of Jeremiah, when he attempted to hold back the Divine message (Jer 20:9), while "dryness of bones" (Pr 17:22) is the opposite of "good health." Other similar expressions of mental distress are the "piercing of the bones" (Job 30:17), the bones are "troubled" (Ps 6:2), "out of joint" (Ps 22:14), "consumed" (Ps 31:10 the King James Version), "wasted away" or "waxed old" (Ps 32:3), "broken" (Ps 51:8; La 3:4), "ill at rest" (Ps 38:3), "bone of my bones," etc. (Ge 2:23), having the same nature, and the nearest relation (2Sa 5:1) and affection (Eph 5:30). In the last-mentioned passage, the Revised Version (British and American) omits "of his flesh, and of his bones" as an interpolation from Ge 2:23. The figs. in Mic 3:2,3 are expressive of the most cruel oppression and murder.

H. L. E. Luering

BONNET

bon’-et: In the King James Version the designation of the special headdress of the rank and file of the priesthood, the Revised Version (British and American) "head-tire" (Ex 28:40). It consisted of a long swath of fine white linen wound around the head in oriental fashion. The Hebrew word found in Ex 29:9 the Revised Version (British and American), "to bind head-tires," literally "to wind head-tires," means, in the light of usage, "to form an egg-shaped turban." Compare Josephus, Ant, III, vii, 3; and see Rich, Dict. Roman and Greek Ant, under the word pileus, for illustration of the egg- shaped cap of Ulysses, with which Jerome compared the priestly turban.

See DRESS; MITRE, etc.

BOOK

book (cepher; he biblos):

1. Definition

2. Inward Books

3. Publication

(1) Mechanical Copies

(2) Personal Copies

4. Oral Transmission

5. Manuscripts

(1) Epigraphy

(2) Sphragistics

(3) Numismatics

(4) Diplomatics

(5) Paleography

6. Printed Books

7. Variations

8. Textual Criticism

9. Higher Criticism

10. Literary Criticism

11. Origin of New Forms

12. Survival

13. Book Collections

14. Early History of Books in Bible Lands

LITERATURE

A book is any record of thought in words. It consists of a fixed form of words embodied in some kind of substance.

1. Definition:

The form of words is the main factor, but it has no existence without the record. The kind of record is indifferent; it may be carved on stone, stamped on clay, written or printed on vellum, papyrus or paper, or only stamped on the mind of author or hearer, if so be it keeps the words in fixed form. Looked on as a form of words the book is called a work, and looked on as a record it is called a volume, document, inscription, etc., as the case may be; but neither volume nor work has any real existence as book save as united.

The Biblical words for book, both Greek and Hebrew, oscillate in meaning (as they do in all languages) between the two elements, the form of words and the material form. The common words for book in the New Testament, from which too the word "Bible" comes, refer back to the papyrus plant or the material on which the book is written, just as the English word "book" was long supposed to be derived from the beech tree, on whose bark the book was written. The usual word in the Hebrew of the Old Testament (cepher) may possibly refer to the act of writing, just as the Greek word grammata and the English "writings" do, but more likely, as its other meanings of "numbering" and "narration" or even "missive" indicate, it refers neither to the material nor to the writing process but to the literary work itself. It suggests at least the fact that the earliest books were, indeed, books of tallies. The knot-books and various notchbook tallies are true books. In the King James' version the "word" (dabhar) is sometimes translated book, and, althoug h changed in these places in the Revised Version (British and American) to "acts" or "deeds," it was nevertheless quite properly translated a book, just as the "word" in Greek is used for book, and indeed in English when the Bible is called the Word. Besides these terms commonly translated book in the English Versions of the Bible, various book forms are referred to in the Bible as roll or volume (which is the same in origin), tablet, and perhaps rock inscription (Job 19:23,24).

The fact that the Bible is a book, or indeed a library of many kinds of books, makes necessary that to approach its study one should have some systematic idea of the nature of the book; the origin of new forms and their survival, oral and manuscript transmission, the nature of the inward book and the various kinds of inward books. Apart from the matter of general archaeological use for historical interpretation, the questions of inspiration, the incarnate, creative, and indwelling word and many other doctrines are wholly bound up with this question of the nature of the book, and many phrases, such as the Book of Life, can hardly be understood without knowing with some degree of clearness what a book is.

The archaeology, text criticism and higher criticism of the past few years have revolutionized book history and theory in their respective fields. Above all the young science of experimental psychology has, in its short life, contributed more even than the others to an understanding of the book and The Book, the word of God and the Word of God, the Bible and Jesus Christ.

2. Inward Books:

Modern experimental psychology by its study of inward images, inward speech, inward writings and other kinds of inward book forms has, in particular, thrown on Biblical inspiration, higher criticism and text criticism and the various aspects of the doctrine of the word, an unexpected light. Inward books, it appears, are not only real, but of many kinds, visual and auditory, oral and written, sensory and motor, and these different kinds have perhaps a material basis and local habitation in different parts of the brain. At least they have real existence; they are real records which preserve a fixed form of words, to be brought out of the recesses of the mind from time to time for re-shaping, re-study or utterance. (See Dittrich, Sprachpsychologie, 1903; LeRoy, Le langage, Paris, 1905; Van Ginneken, Principes de linguistique psychol., 1907; A. Marty, Untersuch. Sprachphilosophie, 1908; Macnamara, Human Speech, 1909; the classical work is Wundt, Volkerpsychologie: Die Sprache, Leipzig, 1900.)

Inward books may be originals or copies. Every book is, to begin with, inward. Men sometimes speak of an autograph as the "original," but it is in fact only a first-hand copy of the original, which is inward, and never by any chance becomes or can become outward. Besides these originals there are also inward copies of the books of others. The fact that a book may be memorized is no new thing, but the analysis of the process is. It seems that a book may be inwardly copied through eye or ear or touch or any sense from some outward book; or again it may be copied back and forth within, from sense copy to motor copy, from visual to oral, auditory to inward writing. In reading aloud the visual image is copied over into oral; in taking dictation the auditory image is copied over into inward writing. Many men, even in reading from print, cannot understand unless they translate as they go into oral images or even move their lips. Many others either hearing or reading a French book, e.g. have to translate inwardly into English and have in the end two memory copies, one French and one English, both of which may be recalled. In whatever way they are recorded, these memory impressions are real copies of outward books, and in the case of tribal medicine men, Vedic priests, the ancient minstrels, village gossips, and professional story-tellers of all kinds, the inward collection of books may become a veritable library.

3. Publication:

The end for which a book is created is in general to reach another mind. This means the utterance or copying into some outward material and the re-copying by another into memory. The commonest modes of utterance are oral speech and writing; but there are many others, some appealing to eye, some to ear, some to touch: e.g. gesture language of the Indian and the deaf mute, pressure signs for the blind and deaf, signal codes, drum language, the telegraph click, etc. If the persons to be reached are few, a single oral speech or manuscript may be enough to supply all needs of publication, but if there are very many the speech or writing must somehow be multiplied. This may be done by the author himself. Blind Homer, it is alleged, repeated the Iliad in many cities; and the modern political orator may repeat the same speech several times in the same evening to different audiences. So too the author may, as many Latin writers did, copy out several autographs. If the audience is still too great to be reached by authors' utterances, the aid of heralds, minstrels, scribes and the printing- press must be called in to copy from the autographs or other author's utterances; and in case of need more help yet is called in, copies made

from these copies, and copies again, and so on to perhaps hundreds of copyings. This process may be represented as x plus x1 plus x2 plus x2 plus x3 plus xn where x = an original, x1 a first-hand copy of author's utterance, x2 a second-hand copy, x3 a third-hand, etc.

Books may thus be divided into originals, first-hand or authors' copies and re-copies. Re-copies in turn whether at second-, third-, fourth- or nth-hand, may be either mechanical or personal, according as the copy is direct from outward material to outward material or from the outward material to a human memory.

(1) Mechanical Copies:

Mechanical copies include photographic copies of manuscripts, or of the lips in speaking, or of gesture, or any other form of utterance which may be photographed. They include also phonographic records, telegraph records, and any other mechanical records of sound or other forms of utterance. Besides photographic and phonographic processes, mechanical copies include founding, stamping by seal or die, stereographic, electrotype, stencil, gelatine pad and printing-press processes, any processes, in short, which do not pass via the human mind, but direct from copy to copy by material means. They do not include composition in movable types or by type-setting machines, typewriting machines and the like, which, like writing, require the interposition of a human mind. These mechanical copies are subject to defects of material, but are free from psychological defects and error, and defect of material is practically negligible.

(2) Personal Copies:

Personal copies include inward copies, or memory books, and the re-uttered copies from these copies, to which latter class belong all copied manuscripts. The memory copy may be by eye from writing, or from the lips of a speaker in the case of the deaf. Or it may be by ear from oral speech, telegraph key, drum or other sound utterances. Or it may be again from touch, as in the case of finger-tip lip-reading or the reading of raised characters by the blind. Each of these kinds may perhaps be located in a different part of the mind or brain, and its molecular substratum may be as different from other kinds of inward record as a wave of light is different from a wave of sound, or a photograph from the wax roll of a phonograph; but whatever the form or nature, it somehow records a certain fixed form of words which is substantially equivalent to the original. This memory copy, unlike the mechanical copy, is liable to substantial error. This may arise from defects of sense or of the inward processes of record and it is nearly always present. Why this need be so is one of the mysteries of human nature, but that it is, is one of the obvious facts; and when memory copies are reuttered there is still another crop of errors, "slips of tongue and pen," equally mysterious but equally inevitable. It comes to pass, therefore, that where oral or manuscript transmission exists, there is sure to be a double crop of errors between the successive outward copies. When thus a form of words is frequently re-copied or reprinted via the human mind the resulting book becomes more and more unlike the original as to its form of words, until in the late manuscript copies of early works there may often be thousands of variations from the original. Even an inspired revelation would thus be subject to at least one and perhaps two or three sets of errors from copying before it

reached even the autograph stage.

4. Oral Transmission:

Before the knowledge of handwriting became general, oral publication was usual, and it is still not uncommon. The king's laws and proclamations, the works of poets and historians, and the sacred books were in ancient times published orally by heralds and minstrels and prophets; and these primitive publishers are survived still by town criers, actors, reciters, and Scripture readers.

Up to the point of the first impression on another mind, oral publication has many advantages. The impression is generally more vivid, and the voice conveys many nice shades of feeling through inflection, stress, and the delicate variations in tone quality which cannot be expressed in writing. When it comes to transmission, however, oral tradition tends to rapid deterioration with each re-copy. It is true that such transmission may be quite exact with enough painstaking and repetition; thus the modern stage affords many examples of actors with large and exact repertories, and the Vedas were, it is alleged, handed down for centuries by a rigidly trained body of memorizers. The memorizing of Confucian books by Chinese students and of the Koran by Moslem students is very exact. Nevertheless, exact transmission orally is rare, and exists only under strictly artificial conditions. Ear impressions, to begin with, tend to be less exact than eye impressions, in any event, because they depend on a brief sense impression, while in reading the eye lingers until the matter is understood. Moreover, the memory copy is not fixed and tends to fade away rapidly; unless very rigidly guarded and frequently repeated it soon breaks up its verbal form. This is readily seen by the great variety in the related legends of closely related tribes; and in modern times in the tales of village gossips and after-dinner stories, which soon lose their fixed verbal form, save as to the main point.

There is great difference of opinion as to the part which oral transmission played in the composition of the Old Testament. The prevailing theory of the higher critics of the 19th century made this the prime factor of transmission to at earliest the 8th century BC, but the recent remarkable revelations of archaeology regarding the use of written documents in Palestine at the time of the Exodus and before has changed the situation somewhat. The still more recent developments as to the Semitic character of Palestine before the invasion of the Israelites, together with the growing evidence of the prevailing use of handwriting all over Palestine by not later than the 9th century, point in the same direction. It is now even asserted (Clay, Amorites) that the Semitic wave was from the north rather than the south, in which case the only possible ground for ascribing illiteracy to the Hebrews at the time of the conquest, and therefore exclusive oral tradition, would be removed.

Whatever may be the facts, it may be said with some definiteness that theory which implies two sets of traditions, handed down for several centuries and retaining a considerable amount of verbal likeness, implies written tradition, not oral, for no popular tradition keeps identical verbal forms for so long a time, and there is little ground for supposing artificial transmission by professional memorizers. The schools of the prophets might, indeed, have served as such, but there is no evidence that they did; and it would have been curious if, writing being within easy reach, this should have been done. As in almost

all literatures, it is far more likely that the popular traditions are derived from and refreshed by literary sources, than that literature was compiled from traditions with long oral transmission.

Biblical references to oral publication are found in the references to heralds (see under the word), to Solomon’s wisdom as "spoken" (1Ki 4:32-34), proclamations and edicts, the public reading of the law in the Old Testament, and the reading in the synagogue in the New Testament. All the oracles, "thus saith the Lord" and "the word of Yahweh," to Moses, etc., and all allusions to preaching the word, belong to this class of oral publication and transmission. A direct allusion to oral transmission is found in Ps 44:1, "We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us."

5. Manuscripts:

The distinction of handwriting as against oral utterance lies first in the permanence of the record, but it has also a curious psychological advantage over speech. The latter reaches the mind through hearing one letter at a time as uttered. With writing, on the other hand, the eye grasps three to six letters at a time, and takes in words as wholes instead of spelling them out. The ear always lags, therefore, the eye anticipates, although it may also linger if it needs to. While therefore impressions from hearing may perhaps be deeper, one may gather many more in the same time from reading.

When it comes to transmission, the advantage of handwriting is obvious. In the first place, even the poorest ink hardly fades as rapidly as memory. Then at best few men reach a hundred years, and therefore no memory, copy, while on the other hand the limit to the life of writing has never been reached. We have writings that have lasted 6,000 years, at least; while if the Palermo stone, e.g. had been orally transmitted it must needs have passed through some 200 copyists at least, each producing two sets of errors. The advantage of manuscript transmission over oral tradition in its permanence is thus very great. It is true, of course, that in the case of fragile material like papyrus, paper, or even leather, transmission ordinarily implies many re-copyings and corresponding corruption, but even at worst these will be very much better than the best popular oral tradition.

In the broad sense manuscripts include all kinds of written books without regard to material, form or instruments used. In the narrowest sense they are limited to rolls and codices, i.e. to literary manuscripts. Inscriptions are properly written matter engraved or inscribed on hard material. Documents, whether private letters or official records, are characteristically folded in pliable material. Literary works again are usually rolls or else codices, which latter is the usual form of the printed books as well. These three classes of written books have their corresponding sciences in epigraphy, diplomatics and paleography.

(1) Epigraphy:

Epigraphy has to do primarily with inscriptions set up for record in public places. These include published laws, inscriptions, biographical memorials like the modern gravestone inscriptions and those on memorial statues, battle monuments and the like. It includes also votive inscriptions, inscriptions on gems, jewels, weights and measures, weapons, utensils, etc. Seals and coins from all points of view

belong here and form another division under printing. These have their own sciences in numismatics and sphragistics. The chief Biblical reference is to the "tables of stone" (Ex 24:12).

See TABLE; ALPHABET; WEIGHT; WRITING; etc.

(See Lidzbarski, Handb. nordsemit. Epigr., 1898-.)

(2) Sphragistics:

Sphragistics is the science of seals. Scripture references to the seal or signet (Ge 38:18; Job 38:14; Re 5:1; etc.) are many.

See SEAL; SIGNET.

(3) Numismatics:

Numismatics has to do with inscriptions on coins and medals, and is becoming one of the greatest sources of our knowledge of ancient history, especially on account of the aid derived from coins in the matter of dating, and because of the vast quantity of them discovered.

See MONEY.

(4) Diplomatics:

Diplomatics, or the science of documents, has to do with contracts of sale and purchase (Jer 3:8; 32:14), bills of divorce (De 24:1) and certificates of all sorts of the nature of those registered in the modern public records. These may be on clay tablets, as in Babylonia and the neighboring regions, or on ostraca as found especially in Egypt, but everywhere in the ancient Mediterranean world, and notably for Biblical history, in Samaria, as discovered by the Harvard expedition. Multitudes of the Egyptian papyri discovered in modern times are of this character as well as the Italian papyri until papyrus was succeeded by vellum. Many are also found on wax, gold, silver, brass, lead tablets, etc.

See LETTERS; OSTRACA; PAPYRUS.

(5) Paleography:

Paleography has to do with volumes or books of considerable bulk, chiefly. It has, therefore, to do mainly with literary works of all sorts, but it shades into diplomatics when official documents, such as collections of laws (e.g. Deuteronomy), treatises, such as the famous treaty between the Hittites and Egypt, and modern leases are of such bulk as to be best transmitted in volume form. It has to do chiefly with the clay tablets, papyrus, leather, vellum and paper volumes. The clay tablet is mentioned in the

Old Testament at various points (see TABLET), the roll in both Old Testament and New Testament (see ROLL). The leather roll is the traditional form for the Hebrew Scriptures up to the present day, although the codex or modern volume form had been invented before the conclusion of the New Testament, and the earliest extant copies are in this form. The books of the Old Testament and New Testament were all probably first written on rolls. For the different methods of producing these var ious forms—graving, casting, pressing, pen and ink, etc., see WRITING.

6. Printed Books:

Printing differs from writing chiefly in being executed in two dimensions. In writing, a chisel or brush or pen follows a continuous or interrupted line, while printing stamps, a letter or a part of a letter, a line, a page, or many pages at a stroke. The die, the wedge for clay tablets, seals, molds, xylographic plates, as well as the typewriter, movable type or electrotype plates, etc., belong properly to printing rather than writing. The wedge stamp, or single-letter die, the typewriter, the matrix and movable type form, however, a sort of transition between the pen point and the printing-press in that they follow letter after letter. Coins and seals, on the other hand, differ little from true printing save in the lengths of the writings; Babylonian seals and the rotary press are one in principle. Sphragistics, or the science of seals, and numismatics, or the science of coins, medals, etc., belong thus with printing from this point of view, but are more commonly and conveniently classed with epigrap hy, on the principle that they depend on the light and shade of incision or relief in one color as distinguished from the color contrasts of ink or paint. Printed books include the xylographic process of Chinese and early European printing, page and form printing from movable type, and all electrotype, stencil, gelatine pad, etc., processes.

The advantage of printing over writing is in the more rapid multiplication of copies, and still more in the accuracy of the copies. The first setting in movable type is as liable to error as any written copy, but all impressions from this are wholly without textual variations. For printed editions of the Bible see TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; VERSIONS, etc.

7. Variations:

In the natural process of transmission all reprints in movable type, manuscripts or oral repetitions accumulate variations with each re-copying. These are, in general, errors, and the process is one of degeneration. In oral transmission the average error with each generation is very great, and it is only with incredible pains that the best copies are made equal to even the average manuscript, which in turn at its best only equals the first type-set copy. The same expenditure of care on this type-set copy produces thousands of copies in printing where it produces one in manuscript. The phonograph, the typewriter, type-bar composition, photographic and electrotype methods have reduced the average error in modern books to a very low point. But even after incredible pains on the part of the authors and professional proofreaders, the offered reward of a guinea for each detected error in the Oxford revised version of the Bible brought several errors to light. This version is however about as nearly free from textual error as any large book ever made, and millions of copies of it are now printed wholly without

textual variation.

But textual errors are not the only variations. It often happens that the author or someone else undertakes to correct the errors and makes substitutions or additions of one sort or another. The result is a revised edition, which is, in general, an improvement, or evolution upward. Variations are thus of two kinds: involuntary and intentional, corresponding pretty well with the words "copies" and "editions" of a work.

Strictly speaking, every book with intentional changes is a new work, but colloquially it is counted the "same work" until the changes become so great that the resemblance of the form of words to the original is hard to recognize. It is a common thing for a work to be edited and reedited under a certain author's name (Herzog), then become known by the joint name of the author and editor (Herzog-Plitt or Schaff-Herzog), and finally become known under the name of the latest editor (Hauck). In this case it is often described for a time on a title-page as "founded" on its predecessor, but generally the original author's name is dropped from the title-page altogether when no great portions retain the original verbal form. All editions of a work are recognized in common use in some sense as new works; and in the bookshop or library a man is careful to specify the latest edition of Smith, or Brown's edition of Smith, to avoid getting the older and outdated original work.

Sometimes the original work and the additions, corrections, explanations, etc., are kept quite separate and distinct—additional matter being given in manuscripts in the margins, or between lines, and in printed books as footnotes or in brackets or parentheses. This is commonly the case with the text-and-comment editions of Biblical books and great writers. Sometimes, as often in ancient manuscripts, it happens in copying that what were marginal and interlinear notes become run in as an undistinguished part of the text and, still more often, what was indicated as quotation in an original work loses its indications and becomes an undistinguished part of the work. In the case of the paraphrase the comment is intentionally run in with the words of the text; and most editors of scientific works likewise make no attempt to distinguish between the original matter and additions by another hand, the whole responsibility being thrown forward on the editor. Sometimes the original work itself to begin with is largely made up of quotation, or is a mere compilation or collection of works in which the "originality" is confined to title-page or preface or even a mere title, as in the case of the Old Testament, the New Testament, and the Bible, and the order of arrangement of parts.

Almost all books are thus composite. Even in a manuscript copy of a manuscript, or an oral repetition of an oral tale, two human minds have contributed to the net result, and the work of each may perhaps be distinguished from that of the other. In the case of a new edition by the same author, the result is still composite—a new work composed of old and new material. With all new editions by other authors the compositeness increases until, e.g. an edition of the Bible with textual variants and select comments from various writers becomes the combined work of thousands of writers, each distinguished as to his work from all the rest by his name or some symbol.

The work proper or work unchanged, save for involuntary error, includes thus copies, translates, abridgments, selections and quotations; the revised work or work with voluntary changes includes

editions and paraphrases (which are simply texts with commentary run into the text), digests, redactions, etc., and perhaps compilations.

These two kinds of variations give rise to the two sciences of text-criticism and higher or historical criticism. The former distinguishes all accidental errors of transmission, the latter all the voluntary changes; the former aims to reconstruct the original, the latter to separate in any given book between the work of the original and each editor.

In this connection it must not be forgotten that the original itself may be a composite work—containing long quotations, made up wholly of selections or even made up of whole works bound together by a mere title. In these cases textual criticism restores not the original of each, but the original text of the whole, while higher criticism takes up the task of separating out the elements first of later editions and redactions of this original, then of the original itself.

8. Textual Criticism:

The involuntary variations of manuscripts or oral tradition give rise to the science of text-criticism. The point of the science is to reconstruct exactly the original form of words or text. Formerly the method for this was a mere balancing of probabilities, but since Tregelles it has become a rigid logical process which traces copies to their near ancestors, and these in turn farther back, until a genealogical tree has been formed of actual descent. The law of this is in effect that "like variations point to a common ancestor," the biological law of "homology," and if the groupings reveal as many as three independent lines of copies from the original, the correct text can be constructed with mathematical precision, since the readings of two lines will always be right against the third—granting a very small margin of error in the psychological tendency of habit in a scribe to repeat the same error. The method proceeds

(1) to describe all variations of each manuscript (or equally of each oral or printed copy) from the standard text;

(2) to group the manuscripts which have the most pronounced variations;

(3) to unite these groups on the principle of homology into larger and larger groups until authors' utterances have been reached and through these the inward original. The results are expressed in a text and variants—the text being a corrected copy of the original, and the variants showing the exact contribution of each copyist to the manuscripts which he produced.

It is carefully to be remembered that text-criticism proper has only to do with a particular form of words. Every translation or edition is a separate problem complete in itself when the very words used by translator and the editor have been reconstructed. These may in turn be useful in reconstructing the original, but care must be had not to amend, translate or edition from the original, and the original in turn, when it contains quotations from other writers, must not be amended from the originals of these writers. The task of textual criticism is to set forth each man's words—each original author, each

copyist, each translator, each editor, just as his words were—no more and no less.

See TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

9. Higher Criticism:

Higher criticism has to do with voluntary variations or variations in subject-matter. Like text-criticism it has to do with distinguishing the share of each of several cooperators in a composite work; and like it higher criticism traces the contributions of various authors each to its source. It differs, however, in dealing with original matter. While the variations by officious scribes, or intelligent scribes who correct spelling, grammar, wrong dates and the like, come pretty closely into the region of editing, and on the other hand the redactor is sometimes little more than an officious copyist, still the line of involuntary and voluntary change holds good, whether it be the grafting into an original work by the author of many quotations, or the grafting onto the work by others of the work of themselves or of other authors. It is not the business of the textual critic to separate out either of these (it is expressly his business not to), although his work may greatly help and even furnish results which can be used automatically. The whole of this double field of composite authorship belongs to higher criticism.

In the case of most modern works the task of the higher critic is a simple one. Quotation marks, a growing ethical feeling against plagiarism, the mechanical conveniences of typographical display, and the like, all contribute to a careful separation of the work of each contributor. Nevertheless, in many cases as, for example, in the editing of textbooks and newspapers, this is not regarded. While the signed article in the encyclopedia is now nearly universal, the signed review more and more common, the signed editorial is still rare, and the others by no means universal. It is still a matter of interest to many to pick out by his "style" the author of an unsigned article, review or editorial—which is higher criticism.

In ancient literature, where there were few such mechanical conveniences in discriminating, and little or no conscience had been developed about incorporating anything which suited the purpose of the writer in part or as a whole, the result was often a complete patchwork of verbal forms of many writers. The task of higher criticism is to sort out the original and each of its literary variants, and to trace these variants to their originals. The net result in the case of any work does not differ much from an ordinary modern work with quotation marks and footnotes referring to the sources of the quotations. It restores, so to speak, the punctuation and footnotes which the author omitted or later copyists lost. It includes many nice questions of discrimination through style and the historical connection of the fragments with the works from which they were taken; and after these have been analyzed out, many nice questions also of tracing their authorship or at least the time, place and environment of their composition. It includes thus the questions of superhuman authorship and inspiration.

10. Literary Criticism:

Literary criticism has to do with originals as originals, or, in composite works, the original parts of

originals. An original work may include quotations from others or be mainly quotations, and its "originality" consists in part in the way these quotations are introduced and used. By "original," however, is meant in the main new verbal forms. The original work must not plagiarize nor even use stereotyped phrases, although it may introduce proverbs or idiomatic phrases. In general, however, originality means that literary food has been digested—reduced to its chemical elements of word or briefest phrase and rebuilt into a wholly new structure in the mind. The building in of old doorways and ornaments may be a part of the literary architect's originality, but they themselves were not "original" with him.

The literary critic has thus to do with a man's originality—the contribution that he has made to the subject, the peculiar quality of this in its fitness to influence other minds which is effected by the "reaction of the whole personality," all his learning and emotional experience, on every part of his material—what in short we call style. This involves a judgment or comparison with all other works on the same subject as to its contribution of new matter and its readability.

11. Origin of New Forms:

The chief problems of book science may be described in the words of biological science as

(1) the origin of new forms,

(2) survival.

The question of the origin of a new literary work and its survival is so like that of the origin of a new species and its survival that it may be regarded less as analogy than as falling under the same laws of variations, multiplication, heredity and natural selection. The origin of variant forms of the same original through involuntary and voluntary changes has been traced above up to the point where editorial variants overwhelm the original and a new author's name takes the place of the old. After this step has been taken it is a new work, and at bottom the origin of all new works is much the same. The process is most clearly seen in treatises of some branch of science, say physics. A general treatise, say on Heat, is published, giving the state of knowledge on the subject at that time. Then monographs begin to be produced. The monograph may and generally does include, in bibliographical or historical outline, the substance of previous works, and in every event it implies the previous total. The point of the monograph itself is, however, not the summary of common knowledge but the contribution that it makes, or, in the language of natural science, the "useful variant" of the subject which it produces. After some accumulation of these monographs, or useful variants of previous treatises, some author gathers them together and unites them with previous treatises into a new general treatise or textbook, which is in effect the latest previous treatise with all variants developed in the meantime.

In either case a permanent new form has been produced—the old common knowledge with a difference, and the process goes on again: the new work is multiplied by publication into many like individuals; these like individuals develop each its variations; the variations in the same direction unite in some new

accepted fact, idea or law, expressed in a monograph; common knowledge with this new variation forms a new general work which again is multiplied, and so on.

And what is true of scientific monographs is just as true in substance of literature, of oral tradition and of the whole history of ideas. It is the perpetual putting together of variations experienced two or more times by one individual or one or more times each by two or more individuals, with the common body of our ideas, and producing thus a new fixed form. Popular proverbs, for example, and all poetry, fiction and the like, come thus to sum up a long human experience.

And carrying the matter still farther back, what is true of the scientific book and of poetry and of folk-literature, is true also of the inward evolution of every thought, even those phrased for conversation or indeed for self-communion—it is the result of a series of variations and integrations. The workings of the scientist's mind in producing a contribution and the workings of the farmer's mind in evolving a shrewd maxim, are alike the result of a long series of these observations, variations and integrations. Repeated observations and the union of observations which vary in the same direction is the history of the thought process all the way along from the simplest perception of the infant, up through the ordinary thinking of the average man, to the most complex concept of the philosopher.

Through all the processes of inward thought and outward expression thus the same process of evolution in the production of a new form holds good: it is the synthesis of all works on a given subject (i.e. any more or less narrow field of reality), the multiplication of this synthetic work, the development of new variations in it and the reunion again of all these variations in a more comprehensive work.

12. Survival:

When it comes to the matter of the survival of a new work when it has been produced, the problem is a double one:

(1) the survival of the individual book, and

(2) the survival of the work, i.e. any copy of the original whose text does not vary so far that it may not be recognized as the "same" work.

The original book is in a man's mind and survives only so long as its author survives. In the same sense that the author dies, the individual book dies. No new book, therefore, survives its author. If, however, by survival is meant the existence of any copy, or copy of a copy of this original, containing much (but never quite) the same form of words, then the book survives in this world, in the same sense that the author survives, i.e. in its descendants; it is the difference between personal immortality and race immortality. At the same time, however, the survival of species depends on the individual. A work or a species is no metaphysical reality, but a sum total of individuals with, of course, their relations to one another.

On the average, the chance of long survival for any individual copy of a book is small. Every new book enters into a struggle for existence; wind and weather, wear and tear conspire to destroy it. On the whole they succeed sooner or later. Some books live longer than others, but however durable the material, and however carefully treated they may be, an autograph rarely lasts a thousand years. If survival depended on permanence of the individual, there would be no Bible and no classics.

The average chance of an individual book for long life depends

(1) on the intrinsic durability of its material, or its ability to resist hostile environment,

(2) on isolation.

The enemies to which books are exposed are various: wind, fire, moisture, mold, human negligence and vandalism, and human use. Some materials are naturally more durable than others. Stone and metal inscriptions survive better than wood or clay, vellum than papyrus or paper.

On the other hand, however, if isolated or protected from hostile environment, very fragile material may outlast more substantial. Papyrus has survived in the mounds of Egypt, and unbaked clay tablets in the mounds of Babylonia, while millions of stone and metal inscriptions written thousands of years later have already perished. Here the factor of isolation comes in. Fire and pillage, moth and rust and the bookworm destroy for the most part without respect of persons. It is only those books which are out of the way of destructive agencies which survive. An unbaked tablet which has survived 5,000 years under rubbish may crumble to dust in 5 years after it has been dug up and exposed to the air. This isolation may be accidental or "natural," as when tablets and papyri are preserved under ruins, but it may also be artificial and the result of human care. A third factor of survival is therefore the ability of a work to procure for itself human protection, or artificial isolation. In brief this ability is the "value" of a book to its owner. This value may lie in the material, artistic excellence, association or rarity. Any variation in the direction of value which may be expressed financially tends to preserve. In fire or shipwreck, these are the ones saved, in pillage the ones spared. They are the ones for whom fireproof buildings and special guardians are provided. An exception to this rule is when the material is more valuable for other than book purposes. In times of war the book engraved on gold or lead or paper may be melted down for coin or bullets or torn up for cartridges, while stone and vellum books are spared. The general law is, however, that value tends to preserve, and it has been remarked that all the oldest codices which have survived in free environment are sumptuous copies.

Literary value on the other hand is, on the whole, a factor of destruction for the individual rather than of survival. The better a book is the more it is read, and the more it is read, the faster it wears out. The worthless book on the top shelf outlasts all the rest. In cases of fire or shipwreck an owner will save books which cannot be replaced and the books most easily replaced are those with literary value. A man will sometimes save his favorite books, and does treat them often with a certain reverent care, which tends to preservation but, on the whole, literary value tends to destruction.

When it comes to the survival of the work or race survival, matters are reversed. Literary value is the prime factor. It is the ability of a book to get itself multiplied or re-copied which counts—the quality, whatever it may be, which tends to make a man wish to replace his copy when it is worn out, and to make many men wish to read the work.

This literary interest operates first to produce a large number of copies in order to meet the demand, each of which copies has its chance of survival. It operates also by inducing men to use the very best material, paper, ink, binding, etc., which results in giving each individual book a longer time to produce a new copy.

The modern newspaper published in a million copies is ephemeral, in the first place, because it is printed upon paper which cannot last, save in very favorable conditions of isolation, for more than forty or fifty years. In the second place, it is very rarely reprinted save for an occasional memorial copy. Books like the Bible or Virgil, Dante or Shakespeare, on the other hand, are reprinted in multitudes of editions and in many instances in the most permanent material that art can devise.

It often happens that a book is popular for a short time, but will not survive a changed environment. The newspaper is popular for a few hours, but the time environment changes and interest is gone. It sometimes happens that a book is very popular in one country and wholly fails to interest in another. Millions of copies of Uncle Tom’s Cabin and Ben Hur were required to fill the demand of one generation where a few hundreds may suffice for the next.

All the time popular taste, which is only another name for average human experience, is judging a book. A book survives because it is popular—not necessarily because it is popular with the uneducated majority, but because it appeals continually to the average human experience of some considerable class, good or bad. Survival is, therefore, natural. Skilled critics help popular judgment, and select lists aid, but in the long run the test is simply of its correspondence with human experience; in short, it is because men "like" it that a book survives.

There is thus going on all the time a process of struggle and "natural selection" which in the end is a survival of the fittest in the true evolutionary sense, i.e. books survive because fitted to their environment of human experience or taste. There grows up, therefore, continually in every country a certain class of books which are counted classics. These are those which have survived their tests, and are being still further tested. Some have been tested from remote antiquity, and it is the books which survive the test of many periods of time, many kinds of geographical environment, and many varieties of intellectual environment, i.e. which appeal to many classes of readers, which are the true classics and which, on the other hand, show that they do correspond with the fundamental facts of human experience, simply because they have survived. In general it is the religious books which have survived in all nations, and the only books which have been tested in all lands and ages and appeal to Oriental and Western, ancient and modern alike, are those of the Christian Bible.

13. Book Collections:

It has been noticed above that the process of forming a new work is the bringing together of all works on the same subject in order to unite all their variations in the new work. It is for this purpose that every student brings together the working library on his specialty; it is what the librarian does when he brings together all the books on a subject for the use of students. Every man who reads up on a subject is performing the same task for himself, and likewise every man who does general reading.

There are few libraries, however, which attempt to get together all the books on a subject. Most libraries are select libraries containing the best books on the subject: by this is meant all books which have anything new or in short have a useful variation. This is an artificial process of the critical human mind, but in humanity in general it is going on all the time as a natural process. Men are perpetually at work choosing their "five-foot shelves," the collections of the very "best of best books." The reason for this lies in the fact that the average human mind can read and hold only a limited number of books; an unconscious process is all the time going on tending to pick out the small number of books which on the whole contain the greatest amount of human experience to the average page. The mass of world's books, however enormous, is thus boiled down by a natural selection to a few books, which contain the essence of all the rest. The process tends to go on in every country and every language. The most universal example is the Bible, which represents a long process of natural selection through many periods of time and considerable variety of geographical influence. It unites the quintessence of Semitic ideas with the corresponding quintessence of Indo-European ideas, each embodied in a correspondingly perfect language—for language itself is in the last analysis the quintessence of the experience of any people in its likeness and unlikeness to other peoples. It is therefore by the mere fact o f "survival" and "natural selection" proved to be the "fittest" to survive, i.e. that which corresponds most nearly to universal human experience. Councils do not form the canon of Scripture: they simply set a seal upon a natural process. The Bible is thus the climax of evolution among books as man is among animals. It is as unique among books as man is unique among all living things.

See LIBRARIES.

14. Early History of Books in Bible Lands:

The history of books begins at least with the history of writing. Some of the pictures on the cave walls of the neolithic age (Dechelette, Man: Archaeol., Prehist. (1908), 201-37) seem to have the essential characteristics of books and certainly the earliest clay tablets and inscriptions do. These seem to carry back with certainty to at least 4,200 years BC. By a thousand years later, tablet books and inscriptions were common and papyrus books seem to have been well begun. Another thousand years, or some time before Hammurabi, books of many sorts were numerous. At the time of Abraham, books were common all over Egypt, Babylonia, Palestine, and the eastern Mediterranean as far at least as Crete and Asia Minor. In the time of Moses, whenever that may have been, the alphabet had perhaps been invented, books were common among all priestly and official classes, not only in Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt, but at least in two or three scores of places in Palestine, north Syria and Cyprus. In the time of D avid not only was historical, official and religious literature common in Egypt and Assyria, but poetry and fiction had been a good deal developed in the countries round about Palestine; and very soon after, if not

long before, as the Moabitic, Siloam, Zkr, Zenjirli, Baal-Lebanon, Gezer and Samaritan inscriptions show, Semitic writing was common all over Palestine and its neighborhood.

LITERATURE.

Articles by Dziatzko on "Buch" and "Bibliotheken," in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-encyclopedia d. class. Altertumsw., V, 5, and his Antikes Buchwesen, Leipzig, 1900, are mines of material, and the bibliographical reference thorough. The rapid developments in the history of most ancient books may be followed in Hortzschansky's admirable annual volume, Bibliographie des Bibliotheks und Buchwesens, Leipzig, 1904 ff. For a first orientation the little book of O, Wiese, Schrift und Buchwesen in alter u. neuer Zeit (3rd edition, Leipzig, 1910), or in English, the respective articles in the Encyclopedia Britannica, are perhaps best. On the scientific side the best introductions are Vol I of Iwan Muller's Handb. d. klass. Altertumsw. and T. Birt's D. antike Buchwesen (Berlin, 1882). For Biblical aspects of the Book, the best of all, and very adequate indeed, is the long article of E. von Dobschutz on the "Bible in the Church" in the Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion, II, 579-615, and especially on ac count of the bibliographical apparatus at the end of each section. These little bibliographies give a complete apparatus on many of the above subjects. Paragraphs with bibliographies on others of above topics will be found in the W. Sanday article on "Bible," just preceding.

E. C. Richardson

BOOK OF ABRAHAM

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

BOOK OF ENOCH

See ENOCH, BOOK OF.

BOOK OF JUBILEES

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; APOCRYPHA.

BOOK OF LIFE

(cepher chayyim; he biblos tes zoes, "book of life"): The phrase is derived from the custom of the ancients of keeping genealogical records (Ne 7:5,64; 12:22,23) and of enrolling citizens for various purposes (Jer 22:30; Eze 13:9). So, God is represented as having a record of all who are under His special care and guardianship. To be blotted out of the Book of Life is to be cut off from God's favor, to suffer an untimely death, as when Moses pleads that he be blotted out of God's book—that he might die, rather than that Israel should be destroyed (Ex 32:32; Ps 69:28). In the New Testament it is the record of

the righteous who are to inherit eternal life (Php 4:3; Re 3:5; 13:8; 17:8; 21:27). In the apocalyptic writings there is the conception of a book or of books, that are in God's keeping, and upon which the final judgment is to be based (Da 7:10; 12:1; Re 20:12,15; compare Book Jubilees 39:6; 19:9).

See APOCALYPSE; BLOT; BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE; JUDGMENT, LAST.

L. Kaiser

BOOK OF NOAH

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

BOOK OF REMEMBRANCE

re-mem'-brans (cepher zikkdron, "book of record"): Is related in meaning to the "Book of Life." It refers to a list of the righteous, recorded in a book that lies before God (Mal 3:16; compare Da 7:10).

See BOOK OF LIFE.

BOOKS OF ADAM

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; ADAM, BOOKS OF.

BOOT

boot (ce'on; the King James Version battle; the American Standard Revised Version "armor"; the American Revised Version, margin "boot"): The word ce'on, found only in Isa 9:5 (Hebrew 9:4), is probably a loanword from the Assyrian senu, meaning "shoe," "sandal." The root has the same meaning in Aramaic and Ethiopic. The passage should be translated "every boot of the booted warrior."

BOOTH

booth, booth: The Hebrew word cukkah (rendered in the King James Version "booth" or "booths," eleven times; "tabernacle" or "tabernacles," ten times; "pavilion" or "pavilions," five times; "cottage" once) means a hut made of wattled twigs or branches (Le 23:42; Ne 8:15). In countries where trees are abundant such wattled structures are common as temporary buildings as they can be constructed in a very short time. Cattle were probably housed in them (Ge 33:17). Such hurriedly-made huts were use d by soldiers (2Sa 11:11; 1Ki 20:12) and by harvesters—hence, the name feast of "booths" or "tabernacles" (see TABERNACLES, FEAST OF). Job 27:18 uses booth (parallel moth's house) as a symbol of impermanence. Similar huts were erected in vineyards, etc., to protect them from robbers and beasts of prey. The isolated condition of Jerusalem in the time of the prophet Isaiah is compared to a

"booth in a vineyard" (Isa 18).

T. Lewis

BOOTHS, FEAST OF

See FEASTS AND FASTS, I, 2.

BOOTY

boot’-i (baz and baz): "Booty" is the translation of baz or baz, usually rendered "prey" and "spoil" (Jer 49:32); of malqoach, "prey," "booty" (Nu 31:32, "the booty—the rest of the prey," the Revised Version (British and American) "the prey, over and above the booty," baz); of meshiccah, "spoil" (Hab 2:7; Ze 1:13; the Revised Version (British and American) "spoil"); of opheleia, "gain" (2 Macc 8:20). "Booty respects what is of personal service to the captor; spoils whatever serves to designate his triumph; prey includes whatever gratifies the appetite and is to be consumed" (Crabb, English Synonymes). Persons (for slaves, etc.) might be part of the booty. See also SPOIL.

W. L. Walker

BOOZ

bo’-oz (TR, Booz; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Boes): the King James Version, Greek form of Boaz (thus, the Revised Version (British and American)) (Mt 1:5; Lu 3:32).

BOR-ASHAN

bor-ash’-an: A correction of the Massoretic Text in the American Standard Revised Version in 1Sa 30:30 for the King James Version "Chor-ashan" and the English Revised Version "Cor-ashan." Probably the same as ASHAN (Jos 15:42; 1Ch 4:32; 6:59), which see.

BORDER; BORDERS

bor’-der: Indicating in both singular and plural the outlines or territory of a country. In the sense of "limits," "boundaries" or "territory," it occurs as a translation of gebhul (and its feminine gebhulah, in Ps 74:17) in numerous passages in Old Testament, especially in Josh. yerekhdh =" the flank," "the side," "the coast," hence, "the border" occurs in Ge 49:13; qatseh =" an extremity" "brim," "brink," "edge" (Ex 16:35; 19:12; Jos 4:19); micgereth = something enclosing, i.e. "a margin" (Ex 37:12,14; 1Ki 7:28 f, 31 f, 35 f the King James Version; 2Ki 16:17 the King James Version); saphah or sepheth =" the lip" (as a natural boundary) hence, "a margin" "brim," "brink," "edge" (Ex 28:26; 39:19 the King James Version); qets =" an extremity" "end" (2Ki 19:23 the King James Version); totsa’ah =" exit," hence,

"boundary" (1Ch 5:16); tor =" a succession" "a string" "row," hence, "border" (So 1:11 the King James Version); yadh =" hand," used in a great variety of applications, both literally and figuratively, proximate and remote; but how it should be translated with "border" in 1Ch 7:29 is not clear; better would be: "in the hands of the children of Manasseh." Three Greek words occur for the idea: kraspedon =" a margin," "fringe" (Mt 23:5; Mr 6:56; Lu 8:44); horion =" a limit," "a boundary line" (Mt 4:13); methorios =" contiguous" (neuter plural as noun, "frontier," "border" in Mr 7:24).

Frank E. Hirsch

BORDERER

bor'-der-er (parakeimenous): One who dwells on the borders or confines of a country. Only in 2 Macc 9:25, "The princes that are borderers and neighbors unto my kingdom."

BORE

bor: According to the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:20-23:33) a slave whom his master had purchased was to be released after six years. Should he choose to remain in his master's service a religious ceremony was necessary to ratify his decision. "Then his master shall bring him unto God" (better than "unto the judges" of the King James Version), "and shall bring him to the door, or unto the doorpost; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl" (Ex 21:6). It is highly improbable that "unto God" means "to a sanctuary"; for there was no special reason for performing this ceremony near the door of a sanctuary. On the other hand the entrance to a private house was a sacred spot. According to primitive thinking near the door dwelt the household gods whose function it was to guard the house and its occupants, e.g. against the entry of disease. It was natural that the ceremony of attaching the slave permanently to the master's household should be performed in the presence of the household gods. "The boring of the ear of slaves was a common practice in antiquity, possibly to symbolize the duty of obedience, as the ear was the organ of hearing" (Bennett). The Deuteronomist (De 15:17) rejects the religious aspect of the ceremony—probably as a relic of Canaanite religion—and looks upon it as a secular and symbolical operation. According to his view, the awl was thrust through the ear of the slave to the door. The slave in question was permanently attached to the household.

T. Lewis

BORITH

bo'-rith: Mentioned in the genealogical table which traces the descent of Esdras (Ezra) from Aaron (2 Esdras 1:2). In 1 Esdras 8:2, his name appears as BOCCAS (which see), and in 1Ch 6:5,51; Ezr 7:4, BUKKI (which see).

BORN

See BORN.

BORN AGAIN

See REGENERATION.

BORNE

See BORN.

BORROWING

bor’-o-ing:

(1) In the Old Testament period loans were not of a commercial nature, i.e. they were not granted to enable a man to start or run a business. They were really a form of charity, and were made by the lender only to meet the pressure of poverty. To the borrower they were esteemed a form of misfortune (De 28:12 f), and by the lender a form of beneficence. Hence, the tone of the Mosaic legislation on the subject.

(2) Laying interest upon the poor of Israel was forbidden in all the codes (see Ex 22:25 (JE); De 23:19; Le 25:36 H), because it was looked upon as making unwarranted profit out of a brother’s distress: "If thou lend money to any of my people with thee that is poor, thou shalt not be to him as a creditor; neither shall ye lay upon him interest .... and it shall come to pass, when he crieth unto me, that I will hear; for I am gracious."

(3) The Law, however, allowed interest to be taken of a foreigner, or non-Jew (De 23:20: "Unto a foreigner thou mayest lend upon interest"; compare De 15:3); and even among Jews pledges were allowed under limitations, or taken against the law (De 24:10; compare Job 24:2,3 "There are that remove the landmarks .... they take the widow’s ox for a pledge"). In De 15:1 ff there is a remarkable law providing a "release" by the creditor every "seven years," a "letting drop of loans" (see Driver in the place cited.). In Ex 3:22, the King James Version "shall borrow" is rendered "shall ask" in the Revised Version (British and American).

George B. Eager

BOSCATH

bos’-kath.

See BOZKATH.

BOSOM

booz’-um: In the ordinary signification of the anterior upper portion of the trunk of the body, choq or cheq, "inlet", "lap" (Ex 4:6,7; Nu 11:12; De 13:6; 28:54,56; Ru 4:16; Ps 74:11; Isa 65:6,7; La 2:12). "A present in the bosom" (Pr 21:14): bribes carried ready for use in the fold of the robe. chetsen =" bosom" (with special reference to that portion of the body which is between the arms), occurs in Ps 129:7; chobh =" a cherisher," hence, "the bosom" (Job 31:33); tsallachath = something advanced or deep, "a bowl"; figurative "the bosom" (Pr 19:24 the King James Version; Pr 26:15 the King James Version). The Greek employs kolpos (Lu 6:38; Joh 13:23). For Abraham’s bosom, see separate article.

Figurative: In a figurative sense it denotes intimacy and unrestrained intercourse (Ge 16:5; 2Sa 12:8); tender care and watchfulness (Isa 40:11); closest intimacy and most perfect knowledge (Joh 1:18); "into their bosom" (Ps 79:12) indicates the bosom as the seat of thought and reflection.

F. E. Hirsch

BOSOM, ABRAHAM’S

See ABRAHAM’S BOSOM.

BOSOR

bo’-sor (Bosor):

(1) A city named among those taken by Judas Maccabeus "in the land of Gilead" (1 Macc 5:26,36). From the towns named it is evident that this phrase is elastic, covering territory beyond what is usually called the land of Gilead. Possibly therefore Bosor may be identical with Bucr el-Chariri, in the Luchf, Southeast of el-Leja’.

(2) In 2Pe 2:15 the King James Version, the Greek form of BEOR (which see).

BOSORA

bos’-o-ra (Bosora): One of the strong cities of Gilead taken by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:26,28). It is identical with the Roman Bostra, the city whose extensive ruins lie on the Southeast border of the Hauran, on the old Roman road that runs between Der‘ah and Calkhad. The modern name is Bosra eski-Sham. It cannot be identified with BOZRAH either (1) or (2), as it lies much too far north. It appears for the first time in history in the passage noted above. The ruins show it to have been a pla ce of great strength and importance. In the time of Herod the Great it was in the hands of the Nabateans. When

Aulus Cornelius Palma conquered these regions, Bostra was made capital of the province under the name of Nova Trajana Bostra, in honor of the emperor Trajan. This was in 105 AD, from which year the Bostrian era was reckoned. It was taken by the Moslems under Khalid—"the sword of God." It resisted the attack of Baldwin III. Later it fell on evil days. Now, if it be true, as the proverb says, that "the prosperity of Bocra is the prosperity of the Chauran," the case of the latter is sad indeed.

W. Ewing

BOSS

bos: Occurs only in the plural as a translation of gabh =" arch," or "protuberance," referring to the curved ornaments of a shield (Job 15:26), the central knob of the buckler.

BOTANY

bot’-a-ni.

1. General Characteristics of Palestinian Flora:

On account of the great diversity in the climatic and topographical conditions Palestine is peculiarly rich in the variety of its flora—the best authority, Post, distinguishes 3,500 species. The land as a whole belongs to the botanical area known as the "Mediterranean region," a region characterized climatically by very dry, hot summers and fairly mild winters. Plants here grow in spring, rest in the hot, dry season and grow again in autumn; the long-continued, scorching sunlight and the absence of water for five or six months at a time, lead to the destruction of vast quantities of seeds and young plants imported by various natural means and by human agency. Among these xerophile or drought-resisting plants, some of the most characteristic features are a thick, leathery rind admitting of little transpiration, e.g. cactus, stonecrops, etc., and the presence of bulbs, rigid stalks, or fleshy leaves, of which the flora of Palestine abounds with examples. Equally characteristic are dry, much-branched spiny trees or shrubs with scanty foliage and small leaves, such as the acacias and the thorny burnet. In connection with this last, it may be mentioned that, next to the strong sunlight and drought, the great enemy of vegetation over a great part of the "Mediterranean region"—emphatically so in Palestine—is the goat. He is one of the most destructive of animals, and as he has for long ages been allowed to graze freely all over the hillsides, it is not wonderful that in many spots it is only plants like the thorny burnet with its powerful spines which have survived.

The common plants of Palestine will be referred to in order shortly, but among those especially characteristic of the whole region are the olive and the fig, the ilex oak and the bay laurel, the arbutus and the sumach.

2. Plants Introduced Since Bible Times:

A number of trees and shrubs which have been imported into this region within comparatively recent times have become so acclimatized as to be today among the most noticeable plants. Prominent among these is the well-known opuntia or prickly pear, an introduction from the continent of America; so characteristic is this of modern Palestine scenery that it is a common feature in pictures by artists who have painted Scripture scenes in the Holy Land. The common variety, Opuntia ficus- Indica with its innumera ble sharp prickles makes impenetrable hedges round many of the village gardens, while the Opuntia cochinillifera, cultivated specially round Nablus and introduced from tropical America with the cochineal insect, is almost unarmed. The American aloe (Argave Americana)—quite a different plant be it noted from either the ALOES (which see) of the Bible or the well-known medicinal aloes—has established itself in many parts as a garden ornament and will doubtless in time become thoroughly indigenous. More important and more recent of introduction is the group of eucalypti or gum trees, of which some half-dozen varieties have been imported. As is well known, they all come from Australia, where they flourish in climatic conditions somewhat similar to those of the Mediterranean region. Seeds of eucalypti were first introduced into Europe in 1854, having been sent from Melbourne to Paris, and from that center they have found their way to all parts. The most common variety is the Eucalyptus globulus which is now to be found everywhere in the Mediterranean region. It was introduced into Palestine through the late Baron E. de Rothschild of Paris, and great plantations of it have been made specially in the neighborhood of the Jewish colonies. In the marshy plains between Sammarin and Caesarea over a million have been planted, and here, and also on the marshy shores of Lake Huleh, this tree has attained magnificent proportions. Many specimens will be found with trunks two or three feet in circumference and of a height of upward of 100 feet. This size is nothing for a eucalyptus, many of these trees attaining in their native habitat a height of 300, or even 400 ft., but time is required, and it may be that eventually many of the eucalypti of the Holy Land will also acquire giant proportions. That this group of trees has come to stay is evident. Not only in small forests such as those mentioned, but also in isolated groups all over the land they may be found. Their quick growth, fresh, evergreen foliage and their reputed health-giving properties account for their wide cultivation. Concerning this last it may be said that the virtues of the eucalyptus as a prophylactic against malaria have been much exaggerated. The most malignant cases of malaria may sometimes be found in houses shaded by eucalyptus boughs, and the Anopheles, or malarial-bearing mosquito, in such situations will be found swarming among its leaves. Probably the beneficial action of the eucalyptus is simply one of drying up marshy lands by absorbing great quantities of water into its deep-running roots.

Other trees which have been recently introduced but now flourish even better than the indigenous trees are the locust tree (Robinia pseudo-acacia), from America, the "Pride of India" (Melia Azedaracht) called in Arabic zinzilukt, a stranger from India, very extensively grown, the so-called "Spanish pepper tree" (Schinus molle), the Casuarina stricta from Australia, the very common ailanthus (A. glandulosus), a native of China, and many others. Of fruit trees the apricot, mulberry, orange, citron, lemon an d prickly pear have all been introduced into Syria within historic times; as have almost all the best varieties of the indigenous fruits.

3. Fertility and Climate in Modern and Ancient Palestine:

A question of great interest to Bible students is, How far has the fertility of the land altered in historic

times? Two facts are important in answering this:

(1) The general features of the climate have been the same since the days of the patriarchs, probably since the dawn of history. We may gather this from the many Biblical references to the seasonal rain (Le 26:4)—the "early" and the "latter" (e.g. De 11:14; Jer 5:24; Ho 6:3); to the frequent droughts (e.g. 1Ki 17; Am 4:6,7); to the grateful mention of the "dew" (De 32:2; 2Sa 1:21; 17:12; Mic 5:7, etc.); to the repeated mention of the most characteristic products of modern Palestine—the olive and fig, the vine and almond, the oak and the terebinth. It is further confirmed by the presence everywhere of the ruins of ancient terraces on the hillsides and of the "broken cisterns" which are found at every site where once cultivation flourished.

(2) It is undeniable that the destruction of forest and thicket all over the land has been immense during the past fifty years. The increasing demands for fires by resident Europeans and the development of steam mills, the result of European enterprise, are largely responsible. The firewood brought to Jerusalem comes from ever-increasing distances, as the wood in the neighborhood is consumed, and the destruction has been increasingly ruthless. First the branches are cut, then the trunks are leveled, and finally the very roots are dug out of the soil. At a greater distance, as for example in the once extensive forests East of the Jordan, a terrible destruction is being wrought by the charcoal burners. Thousands of sacks of charcoal arrive in Jerusalem during the autumn months, chiefly in the care of Circassian settlers in the East Jordan lands; but a similar work is pursued by other charcoal burners in the northern parts of upper Galilee. All the tree trunks are soon destroyed and then the rising branches are cut as soon as they reach any size, so that miles of country which, within the memory of many now living, were forest are now either entirely treeless or covered with nothing but brushwood. This last consists of dwarf oak, carob, terebinth, arbutus, wild olive and hawthorn—all capable of development into noble trees. The process having been commenced by the hand of man is assisted by the goats who crop the tender leaves and shoots, and thus keep stunted many of the bushes. Older inhabitants can remember that between Bethlehem and Hebron, where today scarcely a twig is visible, there were trees and brushwood all the way, and in the 7th century the pilgrim Arculphus writes of a pine wood as existing South of Bethlehem. This destruction is common all over the land. The only trees which have any chance of surviving are those which from their near proximity to some sacred Wely or grave, or in some case from their own traditional sanctity, have been left uninjured from motives of superstition. Such " holy" trees occur all over the land, sometimes singly, at others in groves; they may be any species of tree. Commonly they are oaks, terebinths, carob, meis (nettle tree), sidr (zizyphus) or hawthorn.

Besides the willful destruction of trees for firewood or charcoal another agent has in places been in operation. It is a common thing for the fellahin to clear a large area for plowing by burning all the vegetation; such fires sometimes extend far beyond the area intended (compare Ps 83:14). There is a large and almost entirely sterile district, chiefly of bare rock, between Cafed and Jebel Jermuk in Galilee which was swept a few years ago by a raging fire which eyewitnesses state blazed for a week. The destruction of all this vegetation has led to the washing away of almost all the soil, so that now great labor would be required to make this area productive. The removal of the natural vegetation produces sterility in two ways. Firstly, whereas the deep roots of trees and shrubs support the soil even on hillsides of considerable slope, and slowly but surely cause the disintegration of the underlying rocks,

while their stems and branches by accumulating decaying leaves and twigs ever make more and richer soil, so the destruction of these plants leads to the washing away of the soil by the torrential winter's rain, until the bare rock—never on the hillslopes very far from the surface—is laid open to the sky. Secondly, the rainfall, which was once largely absorbed by this soil, now rapidly rushes off the denuded rocks and flows away to the valleys. The consequent result of this—combined with the destruction of many miles of the artificial soil-surfaces of terraces—is that a large proportion of the rainfall which once found its way slowly through the soil to the sources of the springs—never very deep in Palestine—now rapidly runs down the valley bottoms to the lower grounds. The whole mountain region thus suffers from drought. It is a common saying that "trees bring rain." Probably the truth is simply that vegetation modifies the climate almost entirely by retaining moisture in the soil, and in the surface air near the soil; by preventing rapid evaporation for the surface through the shade they afford, and by increasing the output of the springs in the way described above. Remove the vegetation, and the soil gradually leaves the hillsides and the rainfall is largely wasted. This is what has happened over large districts in the Holy Land, and the consequent diminution of some of the springs even within half a century has been scientifically noted.

While therefore, from the permanent climatic conditions, Palestine could never have been a land of verdure such, for example, as England, yet we know with certainty that its native vegetation has much diminished within the memory of many now living. But besides this, we have abundant historical evidence that at several periods it was much more productive. This is shown, for example, abundantly in the writings of Josephus, and, for later periods, in the accounts of many pilgrims. But indeed the mere fact that for many centuries Palestine had a population far greater than today is in itself a proof; for as things are, modern Palestine is not able to support a much greater population than at present. Great expenditure of capital and labor on the restoring of ancient terraces, the construction of dams and systems of irrigation and the planting of trees is one essential preparation for any considerable development of the land. For any of these things to be possible a radical change in the attitude of the Turkish gover nment is an essential preliminary.

With regard to Bible evidence it is clear from very many references in the historical books of the Old Testament that "forest" or "woodland" was very plentiful in those days. In a large proportion where the word ya‘ar (translated "forest") occurs it is definitely associated with trees. (For references see FOREST.) Whether these references are always to tall trees or also to the brushwood such as is plentiful in parts of Galilee today, is immaterial, as the latter consists of the same elements as the former, only stunted through the interference of man. It would certainly appear probable that at the time of the arrival of the Hebrews there were considerable forests of trees—oaks, terebinths, pines, etc.—over a great part of the higher mountains. In Jos 17:14-18 we have reference to Joshua's twice-repeated command to the people to cut down the "forest," as the inhabited areas were too narrow for them. In later ages, e.g. in New Testament times, the cultivation of the land must have been so thorough that, to the West of the Jordan especially, the area left for forest trees must necessarily have been much circumscribed; but the land then with its millions of olive trees and countless vineyards in the mountains and its great palm groves at Jericho and the coast, not to mention all kinds of imported fruit trees, must have presented a very different appearance from its present comparative barrenness. As a single example we may compare the glowing description by Josephus of the extraordinary fertility of Gennesaret with its present

condition (Josephus, BJ, III, x, 8). Two periods in history stand out preeminent in the history of Palestine as times of prosperity and fertility: that about and immediately succeeding the rise of Christianity and that of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (see Conder, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 239-41: "The present culture of Palestine does not, perhaps, attain to a tenth of that which enriched the Latins in the 1st century of their rule"). In both these periods the land was highly cultivated and the population large, in the former more so than the latter. That the blight of the Ottoman Turks is largely responsible for the decay of agriculture and progressive deforestation in recent centuries is undoubted, but it is more than possible that at one if not at both these periods another factor was at work. It is difficult to believe that in the days when Palmyra was a vast city and Petra a great emporium, the home of a highly developed civilization, these sites were not better supplied by springs than at present; at those times great tracts of country East of the Jordan, now swallowed up by the desert, were sites of flourishing cities whose melancholy and lonely ruins are the wonder of all. No afforestation and no increased cultivation will account for the supplies of water which must have sustained such a development; and it is only reasonable to suppose, and there is much to support such a view, that there must have been then a rainfall somewhat greater or more prolonged than today. It must be remembered the increased rainfall of, say, only one inch per annum over a long series of years, or a sustained extension of the rainfall to two or three inches later in the season, or even a few degrees of greater cold producing heavy snow instead of rain, would, any of them, greatly improve the fertility of the soil and the output of the springs. All the evidence seems to confirm theory that there have been cycles of greater and of lesser rainfall extending over centuries, and that the periods we have mentioned, certainly the Roman period, coincided with one of the former cycles. At the present time there is some evidence that the rainfall has, on the whole, been increasing during the last 50 years and the cultivated area of the land, as contrasted with the natural "forest" land, is also slowly extending.

4. Plant Zones in the Holy Land:

In dealing briefly with some of the more characteristic and remarkable of the plants of the Holy Land we must recognize at least four distinct plant zones:

(1) The coast plains and the western mountains, with a distinctly "Mediterranean flora";

(2) The Jordan valley or Ghor, with a very peculiar semi-tropical flora in which a considerable number of African forms occur;

(3) The steppe or desert zones, specially those East of the Jordan and to the south. The higher western slopes to the East of the Jordan also have a very similar flora;

(4) The Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon above 4,000 ft. in which Alpine forms occur, and in the higher regions of which there is a flora entirely distinct from the three other zones.

These divisions are necessarily somewhat artificial. Everywhere the western slopes are more fertile than the eastern, so that the land to the East of the water parting in western Palestine partakes more of the

desert flora than that opposite to it on the east. Vegetation in all parts is more abundant on t he hill slopes with a northern aspect, as it gets more shade; this is particularly noticeable in the drier areas.

(1) The Coast-Plains and Western Mountains.

(a) In the maritime plain there is a rich red alluvial soil with abundance of water deep under the surface. The annual mean temperature is 70 degrees F.; frost is extremely rare, and the atmosphere is distinctly humid, though the rainfall is less than in the higher hills. Citrons, oranges and lemons here flourish, palms grow in places on the coast, melons and pomegranates reach perfection. Vines have been extensively planted by Jewish colonists in the neighborhood of Jaffa. Cereals—wheat, barley and Egyptian maize (Sorghum annuum)—are extensively grown. The wild flora is similar to that of the mountains. The sycamore fig (Arabic jummeiz) flourishes around Jaffa—it is a tree which requires a warm climate; it was in Talmudic writings one of the distinctions between "lower" and "upper" Galilee that the sycamore fig flourished in the former and not in the latter. It is evident it was far more plentiful in olden times (see SYCAMORE). A closely allied tree, the mulberry, is common everywhere, though not really indigenous. Two varieties occur, the Morus nigra (Arabic tut-shami) a native of central Asia, cultivated for its delicious fruit, and the M. alba (Arabic tut beledi) a native of China introduced as food for silk worms. See SYCAMINE. Another tree which reaches perfection only in the warmer regions of the plain—and that too in the Jordan valley—is the tamarisk (Arabic athl) of which Post recognizes 9 species. It is characterized by its brittle feathery branches covered by minute scale-like leaves; a bedraggled, wind-torn tamarisk half buried in sea-sand is a characteristic sight all along the Syrian coast. Under favorable conditions some species attain considerable size.

See TAMARISK.

(b) In the higher mountain regions there is an average temperature of 62 degrees F. and extreme variations between a maximum of 100 degrees or 80 degrees in the shade in the summer and a few degrees of frost in the winter. Here the fig, vine and olive do admirably, their late fruiting corresponding with the "dew"—or clouds of fine mist—which settle over the mountains after sunset, particularly in the north. Apricots, mulberries, quince, apples and pears (chiefly from imported grafts), peaches and plums, almonds and walnuts do well in sheltered spots. Wheat and barley are grown on hill slopes or in valley bottoms all over the mountain region.

In the valleys where there is running water the oleander (Nerium oleander; Arabic difleh) abounds—a plant beautiful in foliage and flower but poisonous and not uncommonly imparting its poison to the water in which it grows. In similar situations occurs the Vitex (V. Agnus Castris), a variety of verbena whose lilac or purple flowers are, wherever they occur, a sure sign of the presence of water on or near the surface.

In similar situations flourishes the oriental plane (Platanus orientalis; Arabic dilb), a tree which often attains great size (see PLANE TREE), and also the alder (Alnus orientalis; Arabic naght), a tree of humbler growth. There are some 8 varieties of willow (Arabic sifsaf), a tree very common along the

water courses (see WILLOW TREE). Poplars (Arabic chaur) are plentiful in places, especially near water. Three native varieties are known, but the cylindrical Lombardy poplar, an imported variety, is most widely cultivated (see POPLAR). The southern hackberry or nettle tree (Celtis australis; Arabic mais) a member of the Urticaceae closely allied to the elm, is an indigenous tree which is widely planted; it is not uncommonly seen beside Moslem shrines. It grows to a height of 20 to 30 ft., and yields a close-grained timber taking a high polish. The walnut (Juglans regia; Arabic jauz) is a valuable timber tree and grows to noble proportions. It flourishes around Damascus, being a water-loving tree: some of the most magnificent specimens occur at Sheba‘, a village in the lower slopes of Hermon. The walnut is really an imported tree, its native home being Persia and the Himalayas, but it has been long naturalized.

The carob (Ceratonia siliqua; Arabic kharrub) is a handsome evergreen tree whose dense, dark glistening foliage renders it everywhere conspicuous. It is widely distributed, especially in the lower mountain regions. Its pods are the HUSKS (which see) of Lu 15:16. Oaks are among the most important and characteristic of all the trees and shrubs of Pal: the evergreen oak which forms, it is estimated, two-thirds of all the shrubby vegetation of Carmel and attains noble proportions at some of the Moslem shrines, the Valonica oak, plentiful on the hills East of Nazareth, and the ilex or holm oak, commonest near the coast, are among the more important. The recent destruction of timber in the Holy Land has especially fallen upon the oaks, which afford the best of all fuel; as their growth is very slow and there is no attempt to plant young trees this is most regrettable. (For fuller account see OAK.) Closely allied to the oak both in the Old Testament and with the modern inhabitant—though botanically very distinct—is the terebinth or turpentine tree (Pistacia terebinthus; Arabic butm), one of the finest trees in Palestine, although from a distance superficially like an oak, the foliage is very different. In many spots in Palestine where terebinths are for various reasons regarded as "sacred" they have obtained splendid proportions.

See TEREBINTH. Pines, although they flourish on the coast and lower mountain slopes, are, together with cypresses, junipers and cedars, reserved to the discussion of the flora of the fourth division of the country—the Alpine regions.

The hawthorn (Crataegus; Arabic za‘rur), of which there are 4 varieties, occurs as a shrub or small tree everywhere, its sweet-scented white or pink blossom being much in evidence in the spring.

Among the more important shrubs which make up the thickets over the limestone hills the following may be briefly enumerated:

The sumach (Rhus conaria), usually a shrub but occasionally a small tree, grows in considerable quantities in fertile spots in the mountains; from its fruit an acid drink is concocted and the fruit, bark and young leaves are used in tanning.

A plant closely allied to this, and also to the terebinth, is the lentesk (Pistacia lentiscus; Arabic serres), a common shrub in the lower mountain region, e.g. on Carmel, which yields mastich, a white gum, thought by many to be the BALM of the Old Testament (which see).

The bay laurel (Laurus nobilis; Arabic el ghar) occurs in clumps in many places. It is the Daphne of the Greeks and was sacred to Apollo. From its large, leathery, shining leaves were made the laurel crowns of victory in classical times. This, it may be mentioned in passing, is quite a distinct plant from our familiar "cherry laurel," which is allied to the cherry.

The butchers' broom (Ruscus aculeatus) is very plentiful. It is a plant peculiar in having its leaf petioles flattened out like a leaf (phillodia), so that the flower and berry appear to arise from the middle of the midrib of the leaf.

The myrtle (Myrtus communis; Arabic rihan or aas) is exceedingly common, especially in northern Palestine, and when it grows near water it attains a good size.

See MYRTLE.

A showy shrub, which sometimes attains to the dimensions of a tree 20 or 30 ft. high, is the arbutus (Arabic qoTlib) or strawberry tree. Two kinds occur, the less common Arbutus unedo or true "strawberry tree" which has a rough, warty fruit of a scarlet color, and Arbutus andrachne with a smooth, red bark, which when peeled off leaves a reddish inner surface. It has small orange-colored, non-edible berries. The red stems of this arbutus may be seen conspicuous in thickets all over the land, but very few are allowed to come to full growth.

Among some of the more showy shrubs we may mention the oleaster (Eleagnus hortensis; Arabic zaizafan) with its beautiful silvery leaves and white blossom (see OIL TREE).; the styrax (Styrax officinale; Arabic haz or 'abhar), a shrub or small tree, with beautiful white flowers, somewhat resembling orange blossoms, the dried juice from whose bark is the officinal STORAX (which see); the Judas tree (Cercis siliquaestrum; Arabic zemzariq), a straggling shrub or tree with very showy pink flowers, and the caper (Capparis spinosa; Arabic el acaf), which is very common on old walls and about ruins (see CAPERBERRY). The beautiful rockrose or Cistus (Arabic ghibrah) is found on many shrubby hillsides, even on the bare mountain tops. The C. villosus has pink and the C. salviaefolus white blossoms, the petals being curiously crumpled. and falling off almost at once when the flower is picked. From the Cistus is obtained the gum called Ladanum (Arabic ladhanun; Hebrew loT) for which see MYRRH. Many of the hill tops near the watershed, which should be clothed by forests of oaks and pines, are now almost bare and support upon the dry and scanty soil nothing but low bushes of thorny burnet, mingled with wild thyme and mint, with, in places, small bushes of the Cistus. This thorny burner (Poterium Spinosum; Arabic ballan) is almost ubiquitous; its long thorns and tiny leaves enable it to survive the goats. It is of considerable economic importance, as from masses of this plant the fellahin fire almost all the limekilns in the land; and they use it extensively too for their ovens. It is a common sight in the late summer, after the harvest is gathered in, to see companies of peasants gathering this plant into clumps all over the hillsides, and conveying it on the women's heads in huge masses to the kilns. They pile around the kilns enormous heaps, enough to keep the furnace continually burning for several days. They may well be the "thorns under the pot" of Ec 7:6.

See thORNS.

Of the myriad spring flowers which make such a brilliant annual display it is impossible here to write in any detail. Earliest after the rains appear the crocuses and the cyclamen, then the narcissi, anemones—scarlet, white and purple—the scarlet ranunculi, gladioli, irises, dwarf orchids, pink and yellow flax, mountain lilies, borage and bugloss, the primrose- colored Palestine scabious, and vast numbers of small Composites all appear in quick succession. When these fade many brilliant thistles continue to add some color to the otherwise dry roadsides, and last of all, in the late summer, numbers of tall stalks of squill, shot from the now leafless bulbs, remain scattered in groups over the dry and leafless ground as last survivors of the season's display. The varieties of flowers are enormous, but those mentioned are almost universally present.

Of cultivated vegetables-mention may be made of CUCUMBER (which see), lettuce, onions, GARLIC (which see), MELONS (which see), cauliflower and cabbage, potatoes (a fairly recent introduction), sweet potatoes, the egg plant (Melongena badinjan), artichokes (which also grow wild) and the bamieh (Hibiscus esculentus).

(2) The Jordan Valley.

The flora of this region is of a very special kind, and has affinities to Africa. Several trees and shrubs are of great interest. Firstly, mention may be made of the group of true acacias. One variety, the ‘anbar (Acacia Farnesiana), is by no means peculiar to the Ghor, but is used for making hedges in many parts of the land; its little yellow, fluffy, scented flowers are a great favorite with the natives; it is usually a shrub rather than a tree. The remaining acacias are desert inhabitants and in many places are the only trees. The seyyal, which includes A. tortilis and A. seyal, flourishes on the west shores of the Dead Sea, at ‘Ain Jidy and southward; from it is obtained the gum arabic of commerce; it probably yielded the wood known in the Old Testament as SHITTIM WOOD (which see).

The semitropical Ghor is the home of many other thorny trees. Extremely characteristic of the whole region are the jujube trees of which the nabk or sidr tree (Zizyphus spina-Christi), is the most common. It has rounded yellowish fruit; under favorable conditions it develops into a tall and handsome tree. Somewhat less common is the ‘ennabh (Z. vulgaris) which bears an edible fruit of the shape and size of an olive. A third kind, the dom (Z. lotus), is merely a shrub and has small pea-sized fruit. These various kinds of jujube trees are found in every part of the Jordan depression and of the valleys approaching it. Closely allied botanically to these thorny shrubs is the samur (Paliurus aculeatus) or "Christ thorn," widely used for the making of hedges (see BRIER). Another common shrub, or small tree, in the hotter parts of the Ghor near Jericho and the Dead Sea, is the zaqqum (Balanites AEgyptiaca) from whose oval berries the monks of Jericho extract a resinous substance which they term "Balm of Gilead."

The dibk (Cordia myxa), a giant borage, which grows to a tree of 7 or 8 ft. high is widely cultivated but grows in the Ghor spontaneously. The fruit, which is edible, is used principally for making bird lime.

A very striking tree near Jericho and the Dead Sea is the ‘oshr (Calotropis procera), a member of the Natural Order Asclepiadeae. It has large obovate leaves, cabbage-like in consistence—a great contrast to the small, dry, dull-colored leaves of most of its neighbors. The trunk has a cork-like bark and white, milky juice and the fruit consists of queer apple-like follicles which, though solid looking, are only inflated with air and contain but silk threads and seeds. These have been supposed to be the apples of Sodom of Josephus, which he describes as looking like tempting fruit but which on examination prove to contain but dust. A much more likely theory is that he refers to the equally common colocynth (Citrullus colocynthus).

See GOURD, WILD.

Another abundant herb is the Solanum coagulans (Arabic khadak), whose apple-like fruit has also received (without serious claim) the name of "apple of Sodom."

Then there are in the immediate neighborhood of the Dead Sea a whole group of salt-loving plants which grow in the saline marshes such, for example, as the samphire or glasswort (Salicornia fructosa and S. herbacea). The latter of these is called the kali plant, because it is burnt in order to obtain potash (el kali). Another group is included under the name of sea blite or sueda (Arabic suweid) of which there are several varieties.

Along the banks of the Jordan willows (Silex safsaf) and tamarisks (especially Tamarix Jordanis) abound.

At various parts of the Jordan valley, but particularly to the north of Lake Huleh, flourishes the papyrus reed (Cyperus papyrus), known in Arabic as babir, the source of the earliest paper.

Of cultivated plants, palms, as we know from history, grow here well, though their cultivation has been neglected; sterile wild palms still occur in some of the warmer valleys, especially to the East of the Dead Sea. Many dead palm-tree trunks lie scattered along the shores of the Dead Sea.

In situations well supplied with water, bananas flourish—they are cultivated both near Jericho and near the Lake of Galilee. Oranges, lemons and citrons also grow well. All kinds of ordinary vegetables are grown in various parts of this region. Wheat and barley yield an early and an abundant crop in irrigated regions on both sides of the Jordan; rice and Indian maize are cultivated in irrigated fields North of Lake Huleh, and cotton at several spots. With scientific irrigation this region might be one of the most productive upon earth.

(3) The Steppe or "Desert" Zones:

The Steppe or "Desert" Zones are chiefly noticeable for the absence of trees and the stunted condition of the small shrubs and herbs which grow there. Thorny plants like Poterium, Astragalus (the most characteristic order) and Cousinea thistles flourish. With the early rains a rapid growth of dwarf flowers

appears which dries up soon after the rainy season ends. Botanically the region stands somewhat distinct by the occurrence of Persian and Indian plant-forms. This region includes the great corn land of the Hauran and Nukra—some of the richest of their kind.

(4) The Flora of the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon:

The flora of the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon consists, in the lower slopes, of similar plants to those mentioned under (1). The Conifera are specially characteristic of this northern region, the destruction of these trees in Palestine proper being in many parts complete. Of the indigenous cypress (Arabic Saru) we have one species, the Cypressus sempervirens, a handsomer tree than the cylindrical kind—a cultivated variety—planted so frequently in Turkish cemeteries (see CYPRESS). There are 6 varieties of juniper known, and one species of yew. Of pines the two important kinds are—the Aleppo pine (Pinus Halepensis), which grows with considerable rapidity and is widely planted, and the handsomer stone pine (Pinus pinia the true snobar of the Arabs), probably more truly the native tree (see PINE TREE). The most important and characteristic member of this order of trees is the cedar which still flourishes in a very few spots (see CEDAR). On the Lebanon occurs a single species of rhododendron (R. Ponticum) and one of heather (Erica verticillata). Above the height of 7,000 ft. trees and shrubs disappear and vegetation is chiefly represented by low, rounded, thorny bushes, chiefly varieties of Astragalus; by clumps of Acantholimon Lebanoticum; by small procumbent bushes of Cerasus prostata—a member of the cherry family—and the Coloneaster nummularia with scarlet berries. Even on the summit of Hermon it is astonishing how many tiny flowers are in bloom in the late summer after the snow has melted. The most curious feature of this region is the almost complete absence of Arctic forms such as are found in the Alps and even in the Himalayas.

LITERATURE.

Prof. Ellsworth Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation; J. Glaisher (PEF); Meteorological Observations at Jerusalem; G. E. Post, M. D., Flora of Syria, Palestine and Sinai; Mrs. Hannah Zeller, Wild Flowers of the Holy Land; Augusta A. Temple, Flowers and Trees of Palestine; Tristram, The Fauna and Flora of Palestine (PEF Memoirs); also articles in recent Bible Dictionaries, particularly those by Dr. Post in HDB, and by Sir W. T. Thiselton Dyer, director of Kew Gardens, in EB.

E. W. G. Masterman

BOTCH

See BOIL.

BOTRYS

bot’-ris (Botrus; modern Batrun): A town of Phoenicia on the coast some miles North of Gebal (Byblus) on the southern side of the bold promontory called in classic times Theoprosopon. It is said to have been

founded by Ithobal (Ethbaal), king of Tyre, whose daughter married Ahab (Josephus, Ant, VIII, xiii, 2). The town is not mentioned in Scripture.

BOTTLE

bot’-’-l (chemeth, no’-dh, nebhel, baqbuq, ‘obh; askos): The most literal rendering of all the words for bottle in English Versions of the Bible is "skin," or "wine-skin," the Revised Version (British and American). The primitive bottle among eastern peoples was really a bag made from skins, tanned or untanned, of kid, goat, cow, camel or buffalo—in most cases drawn off of the animal entire, after the legs and head were cut off, and, when filled, grotesquely retaining the shape of the animal. The skins in common use today, as in ancient times no doubt, for holding water milk, butter and cheese, have the hair left on and are far from cleanly-looking. Those used for wine and oil are tanned by means of oak bark and seasoning in smoke, a process that gives a peculiar astringency of flavor to the wine kept in them, and gave rise to the parable of Jesus about putting new wine into old wine-skins (Mt 9:17; Mr 2:22; Lu 5:37). The fact that the leather underwent distension once and only once under fermentation, and the further fact that the wine-skins became dried and liable to crack from the smoke and dry heat of the tents and houses, gave point to the parable: "No man putteth new wine into old wine-skins; else the wine will burst the skins, and the wine perisheth, and the skins: but they put new wine into fresh wine-skins." All such "bottles" today are liable to crack and become worthless.

Pliny Fisk used fresh goat-skins to carry water, but he says this gave the water a reddish color and an exceedingly loathsome taste. Harmer tells of carrying liquids in smoked skin-bottles, which when rent "were mended by putting in a new piece, or by gathering up the piece, or by inserting a flat bit of wood." Burckhardt says he saw Arabs keeping water for their horses on journeys in "large bags made of tanned camel-skin." They would sew the skins up well on four sides, but would leave two openings, one to admit the air, one to let out the water. Two such bags made a good load for a camel. Edwin Wilbur Rice says the leather or skin-bottles are of different sizes and kinds, usually made from the skin of the goat, rarely ever from that of the sheep, as it is not considered strong enough. But sometimes they are made from the skin of the camel, or the ox, which is then prepared by tanning. When leather bags are sewed up the joinings are smeared with grease, as the skin-bottles of all sorts are, as they grow older, lest the water, or other liquid, ooze through.

Such bottles, being more portable and less breakable than earthenware, were peculiarly well suited to the use of primitive and nomad peoples, as they are to the roving Bedouin of today. The mention of them, however, in such various accounts and connections as those for instance of the story of Hagar (Ge 21:19), of the Gibeonites (Jos 9:4), and of David (1Sa 25:18) shows that they were in common use among ancient Orientals, pastoral and peasant alike. Tourists still find that they are admirably suited to travelers in waterless districts, or districts where the water is brackish and bad. One of the characteristic figures even in oriental centers like Damascus today is the waterman who sells from his dripping goat-skin water cooled with the snow of Hermon, flavored with lemon, rose, or licorice, temptingly offered up and down the streets by his clapping his brass cups and crying in the most pleading but pleasing tones, "Drink, drink, thirsty. one" (compare Isa 55:1). But, as Dr. Mackie, of Beirut, says, "While the

bottle is thus highly prized, and the water thus kept in it is a grateful necessity, the luxury of the East belongs to the spring itself, to the draught from the fountain of living waters." Hence, the comparison Jesus made at Jacob's well (Joh 4:14), and the one blessed terminus of all, the Shepherd's leading (Re 7:17). See HDB, under the word.

Of course in the settled life of the Orient water, milk, wine and other liquids are often kept in earthen jars or other receptacles. For such "bottles" see PITCHER; VESSEL. Glass bottles are not mentioned in the Bible; but those now found in tombs, for keeping perfume in, may have been known in Old Testament times.

Figurative:

(1) For the clouds (Job 38:37).

(2) For intoxication, through which, because of their headstrong continuance in sin, Israel shall be helpless to resist the enemy's attack (Jer 13:12).

(3) For sorrow: "Put thou my tears into thy bottle" (Ps 56:8). "The Psalmist's sorrows were so many that they would need a great wine-skin to hold them all. There is no allusion to the little lachrymatories of fashionable and fanciful Romans: it is a robuster metaphor by far; such floods of tears had the Psalmist wept that a leathern bottle would scarce hold them" (Treasury of David, III, 39). "God treasures His servants' tears as if they were water or wine." Bernard says, "The tears of penitents are the wine of angels" (Dummelow's Comm., 351).

George B. Eager

BOTTOM

bot'-um: Rendered by several Hebrew words:

(1) sheresh, "root"; Chaldaic, shoresh (Job 36:30, "the bottom of the sea").

(2) qarqa'," soil," "pavement of tesserae" (Am 9:3).

(3) qetsebh, "cutting," "chop," "extremity" (Jon 2:6, "the bottoms of the mountains").

(4) rephidhah, "railing," "couch" (So 3:10, "the bottom thereof of gold").

(5) cheq, "bosom," "lap" (Eze 43:13,14,17, the Revised Version, margin "hollow").

(6) metsullah, "to be dark," "shadowy place," from primitive root tsalal, "to tumble down," i.e. "settle";

hence, the idea of a valley ("the myrtle-trees that were in the bottom," Zec 1:8 the Revised Version, margin "shady place"). The prophet may have been wont to frequent the myrtle grove in the glen or bottoms, in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, for meditation and prayer (BTP, II, 283).

M. O. Evans

BOTTOMLESS, PIT

bot'-um-les, (to phrear tes abussou, "the pit of the abyss," Re 9:1,2 the King James Version): In the Revised Version (British and American), he abussos (always an adjective in classical authors =" bottomless") is uniformly rendered "the ABYSS" (which see) (Lu 8:31; Ro 10:7; Re 9:11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1,3).

BOUGH

bou.

See BRANCH.

BOUGHT (1)

bout (tawekh, "bisection," "middle"): The best part of a sling that contains the stone, "in the midst of the bought of a sling" (1Sa 25:29 King James Version, margin, the King James Version "out of the middle," the Revised Version (British and American) "from the hollow").

BOUGHT (2)

bot (adj. and vb.).

See BUYING.

BOUND

See BIND.

BOUNDS

boundz: gabhal =" to twist" (as a rope), "to make an enclosure" (as by a line) occurs in Ex 19:12,23; Ps 104:9; gebhul =" a cord," hence, "a boundary," "territory" (Ex 23:31 the King James Version), with its feminine form gebhulah (De 32:8; Isa 10:13); choq =" enactment," "appointment" (of time, space,

quantity, labor, or usage), hence, "commandment," "decree," "ordinance" (Job 14:5; 26:10 the King James Version); in the Greek, horothesia, in the sense of "a limit," "boundary line," occurs in Ac 17:26.

BOUNTIFULNESS; BOUNTY

boun’-ti-fool-nes, boun’-ti (haplotes, "singleness," "benevolence," 2Co 9:11 the King James Version; Tobh, "to be good" (Pr 22:9); eulogia, "good speech," "blessing" (2Co 9:6); gamal, "to treat well" (Ps 119:17); shoa‘, "to be liberal" (Isa 32:5); yadh, "hand," "power"): Paul speaks of the church at Corinth "being enriched in everything unto all liberality" (the King James Version "bountifulness," 2Co 9:11). The offering of the church at Corinth for the Christians of Judea is termed a "bounty," a blessing, liberally given: "and not of extortion" (the King James Version "of covetousness," 2Co 9:5,6). The word occurs also in 1Ki 10:13: "Besides that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty," literally "according to the hand of King Solomon."

L. Kaiser

BOW

bo.

See ARCHERY.

BOW, IN THE CLOUD

bo: Reference to the promise made to Noah (Ge 9:13) preserved in the Constellation figures.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 4.

BOW; BOWING

bou, bou’-ing.

See ADORATION; ATTITUDES.

BOWELS

bou’-elz (me‘ah, plural me‘im, rechem, plural rachamim; splagchnion):

(1) Literal: The literal meaning of these words is intestines, then the abdomen, the womb (matrix and uterus). As will be seen there is not much definiteness in the use of these expressions from the

standpoint of physiology; but not less so than in modern oriental languages and even in many occidental languages, as popularly used. The remarkable phrases used in 2Ch 21:18,19, "Yahweh smote him in his bowels" and "His bowels fell out by reason of his sickness," refer to a severe and fatal case of hemorrh oids.

(2) Figurative: In figurative language these words denote deep emotions of various kinds. As in physiology we speak of the "nervus sympathicus," the ancients expressed by these terms "affection," "sympathy" and "mercy," feelings of distress and sorrow, as in Job 30:27 the King James Version; La 1:20 the King James Version; La 2:11 the King James Version. In one passage we have to translate me‘im by "heart," being the seat of affection and devotion (Ps 71:6): "Thy law is within my heart" (Ps 40:8). In the New Testament (Revised Version) the word is only given in Ac 1:18.

H. L. E. Luering

BOWING

bou’-ing (naTah, "to incline," "bulge"): The Psalmist’s assailants expected that he would be "like a leaning (the King James Version "bowing") wall" (Ps 62:3) before their united attack, as when an ill-built, bulging wall gives way under a sudden and heavy fall of rain (compare Eze 13:11; 38:22).

BOWL

bol:

(1) The primitive Hebrews, like the wandering Bedouin of today, probably used bowls of wood, as less breakable than earthenware. Some hollow dish of the sort would be indispensable, even in the lowest stage of nomad life, to receive the milk of the flock, and as the common dish in which to serve the family meal. We have abundant proof, however, that vessels of earthenware of various sorts were in use by the settled peoples of Canaan in the earliest times. Many interesting specimens, characteristic of different peoples and ages, have been found by excavators of the PEF, especially recently by Flinders Petrie and Fred. Bliss at Tell el-Hesy (see Tell el-Hesy (Lachish), by Petrie, and A Mound of Many Cities, by Bliss) and by Macalister and others at Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo, etc. (see PEFS).

It was probably in some such dish—"a bowl fit for lords" (English Versions, "a lordly dish")—that Jael offered. Sisera a draught of sour milk (Jud 5:25; compare Arabic leben), and the bowl into which Gideon wrung the water from his fleece (Jud 6:38) is denoted by the same word (cephel; Septuagint lekane), though this may have been of earthenware instead of wood. Certainly the cephel was a dish of goodly size.

(2) Another word rendered sometimes "bowl" and sometimes "basin" is mizraq. It is used of the large silver bowls presented by "the princes of the congregation" (Nu 7:13 f). See BASIN. It is also applied by Amos 6:6 to the costly bowls used by the nobles of Samaria in their debaucheries.

(3) A still larger bowl is mentioned by Jer 35:5, the King James Version "pot" (gabhia‘). This same word is used of Joseph’s cup (Ge 44:2 f): "Put my cup, the silver cup, in the sack’s mouth." As used at banquets it corresponds to the crater, from which the drinking cups (kocoth) were replenished. The material seems to have been uniformly silver. But see (4).

(4) Bowl is used in the King James Version to translation gabhia‘, "the bowls made like almonds" (Ex 25:33 the King James Version), as applied to the "cups" (Revised Version), or calyxes, used to ornament the golden candlestick (see TABERNACLE). It seems to have been an elastic term.

(5) The bowl of Zec 4:3 (gullah, found also in 5:2 correct text), is represented as the receptacle for oil in the candlestick of the prophet’s vision. It is likewise used of "the lamp of life" (Ec 12:6) and to designate the bowl- shaped capitals of Jachin and Boaz (1Ki 7:41,42; 2Ch 4:12,13).

(6) Bowl is found in Isa 51:17,22 the Revised Version (British and American), "bowl of the cup" (the King James Version "dregs of the cup"). Some think the second word here (qubba‘ath koc) is a gloss to explain the unusual preceding word.

(7) In Re where the King James Version has "vial" (phiale) the Revised Version (British and American) has "bowl."

See BASIN.

George B. Eager

BOWMAN

bo’-man: Israel seems not to have been equal to the surrounding peoples in the use of the bow. The battle of Gilboa was clearly lost through the superior skill of the Philistine bowmen. This seems to have moved David to encourage archery practice in Judah (2Sa 1:18; compare Driver in the place cited.). It is thought probable that the revival of Israel’s military power under Jeroboam, son of Joash, was due to improvement in archery. Hosea, a contemporary, speaks of the bow as the national weapon of Israel (2Sa 1:5,7) . The most skilled bowmen of antiquity were the Assyrians (compare Isa 5:28; 37:33). From Assyrian reliefs it seems that it was their practice to overwhelm their enemies with the bow, and to use sword and spear only when the foe had been demoralized and put to flight.

See ARCHERY.

George B. Eager

BOWSHOT

bo’-shot: Found only in Ge 21:16 in the account of Hagar and her child: "And she went, and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bowshot," literally "stretchings of a bow," a typical oriental way of indicating distance.

BOX

The passages in which this word occurs are 2Ki 9:1,3 (Hebrew pakh, "cruet," "flask," the Revised Version (British and American) vial) and the synoptic passages Mt 26:7 the King James Version; Mr 14:3 the King James Version; Lu 7:37 the King James Version (Greek alabastron). "Perfume-boxes" are mentioned in Isa 3:20; in the New Testament passages the Revised Version (British and American) renders "alabaster cruse." "Alabaster" was a white stone much used in ornamentation; and out of it small vessels we re made for holding precious ointment. "She brake the cruse" (Mr 14:3), i.e. the seal, not the vessel.

In Isa 41:19 and Isa 60:13, "box" is found in connection with "tree," as "box-tree" (which see).

BOX-TREE

box’-tre (te’ashshur; Isa 41:19; 60:13, "boxwood" Eze 27:6): A tree of uncertain identity, which must once have been common in the forests of Lebanon. According to Post (HDB, I, 313), "The only species of box found in Bible lands is Buxus longifolia, which is a shrub from 2 to 3 ft. high. It does not grow South of Mt. Cassius and it is unlikely that it did in historical times."

As an alternative to the box the cypress, Cupressus sempervirens—known in Arabic as Sherbin—has been suggested. It is a fine tree and was probably once plentiful, but as it seems to answer to the berosh (see FIR), it cannot well be the te’ashshur. There is nothing certain to go upon.

E. W. G. Masterman

BOXING

See GAMES.

BOY

(yeledh, "child," naʻar, "lad," "youth"; ho pais and he pais): Refers to a child of any age, and is sometimes used of either sex: Joe 3:3; Zec 8:5; Mt 17:18; Lu 2:43; 8:51,54 fem.; Lu 9:42. In the East the word applies also to an adult who is a servant (Mt 8:6 the Revised Version, margin). The boy occupied a place of special importance in the family life of all ancient people. In Syria the father even was called by the name of his son. He was known as the father of Joseph, or whatever the n ame might be. As is true

among all oriental people, while the father had absolute control in his case as well as in the case of the rest of the household, yet the boy received a consideration and advantages not accorded to the daughter. In the Jewish family his religious life began at the fourth year. He was expected to learn the Scriptures at five, the Mishna at ten, and to fulfill the whole law at thirteen. At twelve years he was expected to learn a trade, and attained to something of independence at that age, though he did not come into full rights as a citizen until he was twenty. Among many nations there was special rejoicing at the birth of the boy, and sometimes a feast. One of the most ancient customs was the planting of a cedar tree on this occasion.

See CHILD; FAMILY; SON.

Jacob W. Kapp

BOZCATH

boz’-kath (botsqath).

See BOZKATH.

BOZEZ

bo’-zez (botsets; Bazes, probably from an obsolete root batsats, corresponding to the Arabic batstsa, "to shine" or "to ooze"): The name of the northern of the two cliffs that stand one on each side of the gorge of Michmash (1Sa 14:4). It catches the sun during most of the day, while the southern cliff is in the shade. To this circumstance it may owe its name, "shining." "The contrast is surprising and picturesque between the dark coal color of the south side, and the ruddy or tawny tints of the northern cliff, crowned with the gleaming white of the upper chalky strata. The picture is unchanged since the day when Jonathan looked over to the white camping ground of the Philistines, and Bozez must have then shone as brightly as it does now, in the full light of an eastern sun" (Conder, Tent Work, 256).

W. Ewing

BOZKATH

boz’-kath (botsqath, "stony"; Septuagint Basedoth): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named between Lachish and Eglon (Jos 15:39). It was the birthplace of Adaiah the mother of King Josiah (2Ki 22:1; the King James Version "Boscath"). The site is not identified.

BOZRAH

boz’-ra (botsrah, "sheepfold"; Bosorrha, Bosor):

(1) The capital of Edom, a city of great antiquity (Ge 36:33; 1Ch 1:44; Isa 34:6; 63:1; Jer 49:13; Am 1:12). It may be identical with Buceirah, which lies about 7 miles Southwest of Tufileh, on the main road to Petra.

(2) A city in Moab mentioned in Jer 48:24. It is probably identical with Bezer, the city of refuge. It may be represented today by Qusur Bashair, which towers lie some 15 miles Southeast of Dibon. In this case Beth-gamul would be identical with Jemail, 8 miles East of Dibon, and Beth-meon with Ma‘in, Southwest of Medebah.

W. Ewing

BRACELET

bras’-let (’ets‘adhah, chach, tsamidh, pathil, sheroth): Used to translate a number of Hebrew words, only one of which means a band for the arm (’ets‘adhah), as in 2Sa 1:10, "the bracelet that was on his arm." In Ex 35:22, where both men and women are said to have brought as offerings among other "jewels of gold" "bracelets" (the Revised Version (British and American) "brooches"), another word (chach) is used, meaning most likely nose-rings (see RING). The bracelet asked of Judah by Tamar as a pledge ("Thy signet, and thy b., and thy staff that is in thy hand," Ge 38:18,25 the King James Version) was probably the cord of softly-twisted wool for the shepherd’s headdress (pathil; the Revised Version (British and American) "cord"). The bracelets ("two bracelets for her hands of ten shekels weight of gold") which Abraham’s servant gave to Rebekah stand for still another word (tsamidh). These "bracelets" are always spoken of as "bracelets for the hands," or as "put upon the hands" (Ge 24:47, compare Eze 16:11; 23:42). Isaiah, predicting the day when Yahweh will smite the haughty daughters of Zion, who "walk with outstretched necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet," says, "In that day the Lord will take away the beauty of their anklets .... the bracelets" (Eze 3:19, sheroth) etc., where some translate "twisted ornaments," leaving it uncertain as to just what is specifically meantú In 2Sa 1:10 the bracelet appears with the crown as one of the royal insignia. In 2Ki 11:12, according to Wellhausen, W. R. Smith (OTJC2, 311n.) and oth ers, we should read, "Then he brought out the king’s son, and put the crown upon him and gave him bracelets" ... for "testimony" ... See DB.

Today, as of old, the bracelet is multiform and a favorite ornament in the East. It is made of gold, silver, copper, brass, glass and even enameled earthenware, and in many designs: flat band, plain ring, interlinked rings, as well as of twisted wires, connected squares, solid or perforated, with or without pendants (Mackie).

When owned by women, bracelets had the special the commendation, along with other jewelry, of being inalienable—not to be taken by the husband in case of divorce, nor seized and sold for his debts. "Even now," says Rice (Orientalisms, etc., 41), "in Moslem lands a woman may be divorced without legal process, at the freak of her husband, but she can carry away undisputed any amount of gold, silver,

jewels, precious stones, or apparel that she has loaded on her person; so she usually wears all her treasures on her person, not knowing when the fateful word may be spoken."

George B. Eager

BRAG

(megalaucheo, "proud brags"): Occurs only in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 15:32), not being sufficiently dignified to be given a place in the canonical Scriptures by the King James translators (compare Judith 16:5).

BRAIDED; BRAIDING

brad'-ed, brad'-ing (to plegama, "that which is plaited," 1Ti 2:9; he emploke, "a plaiting," 1Pe 3:3): Used with reference to Christian women in two passages where the apostles emphasized the superiority of good works and spiritual grace over outward adornment.

See EMBROIDERY.

BRAMBLE

bram'-b'-l.

See thORNS.

BRAN

(ta pitura): The women of Babylon are described as burning "bran for incense" in their unchaste idolatrous worship (Baruch 6:43).

BRANCH ; BOUGH

bransh: Represented by very many words in the Hebrew.

(1) zemorah used especially of a vine branch. The spies "cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes" (Nu 13:23). See also Eze 15:2; Na 2:2. "They put the branch to their nose" (Eze 8:17), refers to some unknown idolatrous practice, as does also Isa 17:10, "thou plantest pleasant plants, and settest it with strange slips," or "vine slips of a strange (god)" the Revised Version, margin.

(2) yoneqeth, literally "a sucker." "The tender branch thereof will not cease" (Job 14:7). Used

figuratively of Israel, Ps 80:11 (the Revised Version (British and American) "shoots"); Eze 17:22 the King James Version; Ho 14:6, and of the wicked, Job 8:16 (the Revised Version (British and American) "shoots"), 15:30.

(3) kippah, Job 15:32. Isa 9:14; 19:15, the Revised Version (British and American) has "palm-branch," "Therefore Yahweh will cut off from Israel head and tail, palm-branch and rush, in one day" (9:14).

(4) netser (of the same Hebrew root, according to many commentators, as Nazareth), literally "a little shoot springing from the root" ("out of a shoot from her roots," Da 11:7), which may be planted out to grow (Isa 11:1; 60:21), or may be rooted out and thrown away (Isa 14:19).

(5) tsemach. The "branch" of Messianic prophecy. See PROPHECY. "In that day shall the branch (m "shoot" or "sprout") of Yahweh be beautiful and glorious" (Isa 4:2); "a shoot out of the stock of Jesse" (Isa 11:1); "a righteous branch" (Jer 23:5; 33:15): "my servant the Branch" (Zec 3:8); "the man whose name is the Branch" (Zec 6:12).

(6) qanah, is used for the "branches" of the golden candlesticks (Ex 25:32; 37:18 ff). Literally, qanah means a "reed." There are a number of words, less frequently used, meaning "branch":

(7) baddim (plural only used; Eze 17:6; 19:14).

(8) dalith (plural only used; Jer 11:16).

(9) maTTeh (Eze 19:11).

(10) ca‘iph (Isa 18:5; ce‘appah (plural) (Eze 31:6); car‘appah (Eze 31:5)).

(11) ‘anaph (Mal 4:1; Ps 80:11); ‘anaph (Da 4:14,21); ‘eneph (Eze 36:8).

(12) pu’rah, "a bough" (Isa 10:33); po’roth (pl. only) (Eze 31:5,8).

(13) tsammereth, "foliage" or "boughs of trees," literally "locks" or "fleece" of trees (Eze 17:3; 31:3).

(14) qatsir (collective) (Job 14:9), "boughs" (Ps 80:11), "branches."

(15) shibbeleth, the two olive branches of Zec 4:12.

(16) soqch, root meaning "to interweave" (Jud 9:49); sokhah (Jud 9:48), "boughs."

(17) sarigh (pl. only, sarighim), "branches" (of the vine) (Ge 40:10; Joe 1:7). Represented in Greek in the New Testament:

(1) baion (Joh 12:13), "a palm branch."

(2) klados (Mt 13:32; 21:8; 24:32; Mr 4:32; 13:28; Lu 13:19; Ro 11:16,17,18,19,21).

(3) klema, a slip or cutting of the vine, especially one cut off to be grafted into another plant (Joh 15:2,4,5,6).

(4) stibos (= stoibas), a "twig" or "bough" (Mr 11:8).

E. W. G. Masterman

BRAND

In the double signification of an object on fire and of objects used to feed a fire. The first meaning is expressed by ‘udh, "a bent stick" for stirring fire (Am 4:11; Zec 3:2; compare Isa 7:4); the second by lappidh, in Jud 15:4,5. A third meaning is found in ziqah, indicating the brand as a spreader of fire (Pr 26:18).

BRANDING

See PUNISHMENTS.

BRASEN

bra’-z’-n.

See BRASS.

BRASS; BRAZEN

bras (nechosheth): The use of the word brass has always been more or less indefinite in its application. At the present time the term brass is applied to an alloy of copper and zinc or of copper, zinc and tin. The word translated "brass" in the King James Version would be more correctly rendered bronze, since the alloy used was copper and tin (Ex 27:4). In some passages however copper is meant (De 8:9), as bronze is an artificial product. This alloy was known in Egypt in at least 1600 BC. It was probably known in Europe still earlier (2000 BC), which helps to answer the question as to the source of the tin. Bronze was probably of European origin and was carried to Egypt. At a later period the Egyptians made the alloy themselves, bringing their copper from Sinai, Cyprus or northern Syria (see COPPER), and their tin from the Balkan regions or from Spain or the British Isles (see TIN). When the Children of Israel came into the promised land, they found the Canaanites already skilled in the making and use of

bronze instruments. This period marked the transition from the bronze age to the iron age in Palestine Museums possessing antiquities from Bible lands have among their collections many and varied bronze objects. Among the most common are nails, lamps, hand mirrors, locks, cutting instruments, etc. Within comparatively recent times brass, meaning an alloy of copper and zinc, has been introduced into Syria. The alloy is made by the native workmen (see CRAFTS). Sheet brass is now being extensively imported for the making of bowls, vases, etc. Bronze is practically unknown in the modern native articles

Figurative: "Brass," naturally, is used in Scripture as the symbol of what is firm, strong, lasting; hence, "gates of brass" (Ps 107:16), "hoofs of brass" (Mic 4:13), "walls of brass" (Jeremiah is made as a "brazen wall," Jer 1:18; 15:20), "mountains of brass" (Da 2:35, the Macedonian empire; the arms of ancient times were mostly of bronze). It becomes a symbol, therefore, of hardness, obstinacy, insensibility, in sin, as "brow of brass" (Isa 48:4); "they are brass and iron" (Jer 6:28, of the wicked); "all of them are brass" (Eze 22:18, of Israel).

James A. Patch

BRAVERY

brav'-er-i: tiph'arah or 'tiph'ereth =" beauty," "glory," "honor" and "majesty," hence, "splendor of bravery." "The bravery of their tinkling ornaments" (Isa 3:18 the King James Version), "the beauty of their anklets" (American Standard Revised Version). Compare bravado, bravura.

BRAWLER

brol'-er (Qere midhyanim; Kethibh midhwanim, "quarrelsomeness"; amachos, "not fighting"): Spoken of the quarrelsome woman; "a contentious (the King James Version "brawling") woman" (Pr 21:9). He who seeks the office of a bishop should be "no brawler" (paroinos the King James Version "given to wine," Tit 1:7); "not contentious" (the King James Version "not a brawler," 1Ti 3:3; Tit 3:2).

BRAY

bra (nahaq, "to bray," of the ass; kathash, "to pound in a mortar"): This word occurs with two distinct meanings:

(a) The harsh cry of the ass (Job 6:5). Job argued that as the sounds instinctively uttered by animals denote their wants, even so his Words were but the natural expression of his longing for some adequate explanation of his sufferings, or, failing this, for death itself. Used figuratively of Job's mockers (Job 30:7).

(b) "To beat small in a mortar," "to chastise." Pr 27:22 refers to a more elaborate process than threshing for separating grain (the English Revised Version "corn") from its husk and impurities; used figuratively

of a thorough but useless course of discipline; or still more probably with reference to the Syrian custom of braying meat and bruised corn together in a mortar with a pestle, "till the meat and grain become a uniform indistinguishable pulp" (see The Expositor Times, VIII, 521).

M. O. Evans

BRAZEN

bra’-z’-n.

See BRASS.

BRAZEN SEA

See SEA, THE MOLTEN.

BRAZEN SERPENT

See NEHUSHTAN.

BREACH

brech: Represented by

(1) perets =" a tear," "a rending asunder," "a break," hence, figuratively "enmity," "disruption," "strife" (Ge 38:29; Jud 21:15; 2Sa 5:20; 1Ch 15:13; Ne 6:1; Job 16:14; Ps 106:23; Isa 30:13; 58:12);

(2) shebher =" fracture," "affliction," "bruise," "destruction" (Le 24:20; Jer 14:17; La 2:13; Ps 60:2);

(3) bedheq =" a gap" or "leak" (in a building or ship) occurring in 2Ki 12:5-8,12; 22:5;

(4) tenu’ah =" alienation," "breach of promise" (Nu 14:34 the King James Version);

(5) miphrats =" a break" (in the shore), and hence, "a haven" (Jud 5:17, the Revised Version (British and American) "creeks").

Frank E. Hirsch

BREACH OF COVENANT

brech, kuv’-e-nant, kuv’-e-nant.

See CRIMES.

BREACH OF RITUAL

rit’-u-al.

See CRIMES.

BREACH OF TRUST

See CRIMES.

BREAD

bred (lechem; artos):

I. DIETARY PREEMINENCE

II. MATERIALS

1. Barley

2. Wheat

3. Three Kinds of Flour

III. BREAD-MAKING

1. Grinding

2. Kneading

3. Baking

(1) Hot Stones

(2) Baking Pans

4. Ovens

(1) The Bowl-Oven

(2) The Jar-Oven

(3) The Pit-Oven

5. Forms of Baked Bread

6. Work for Women

IV. SANCTITY AND SYMBOLISM OF BREAD

1. Sanctity

2. Symbolism

LITERATURE

The art of bread-making is very ancient. It was even known to the Egyptians at a very early day (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians), to the Hebrews of the Exodus (Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebr. Archaologie) and, of course, to the Greeks and Romans of a later day. Bread played a large part in the vocabulary and in the life of the ancient Hebrews.

I. Dietary Preeminence.

(1) In the East bread is primary, other articles of food merely accessory; while in the West meat and other things chiefly constitute the meal, and bread is merely secondary. Accordingly "bread" in the Old Testament, from Ge 3:19 onward, stands for food in general.

(2) Moreover in ancient times, as now, most probably, when the peasant, carpenter, blacksmith or mason left home for the day’s work, or when the muleteer or messenger set out on a journey, he wrapped other articles of food, if there were any, in the thin loaves of bread, and thus kept them ready for his use as needed.

(3) Often the thin, glutinous loaf, puffed out with air, is seen today, opened on one side and used so as to form a natural pouch, in which meat, cheese, raisins and olives are enclosed to be eaten with the bread (see Mackie in DCG, article "Bread"). The loaf of bread is thus made to include everything and, for this reason also, it may fitly be spoken of as synonymous with food in general. To the disciples of Jesus, no doubt, "Give us this day our daily bread" would naturally be a petition for all needed food, and in the

case of the miraculous feeding of the multitude it was enough to provide them with "bread" (Mt 14:15 ff).

II. Materials.

1. Barley:

Barley was in early times, as it is today, the main bread-stuff of the Palestine peasantry (see Jud 7:13; where "the cake of barley bread" is said to be "the sword of Gideon"), and of the poorer classes of the East in general (see Joh 6:13, where the multitude were fed on the miraculous increase of the "five barley loaves," and compare Josephus, BJ, V, x, 2).

2. Wheat:

But wheat, also, was widely used as a breadstuff then, as it is now, the wheat of the Syrian plains and uplands being remarkable for its nutritious and keeping qualities.

3. Three Kinds of Flour:

Three kinds, or qualities, of flour, are distinguished, according to the way of making:

(1) a coarser sort, rudely made by the use of pestle and mortar, the "beaten corn" of Le 2:14,16 (the Revised Version (British and American) "bruised");

(2) the "flour" or "meal" of ordinary use (Ex 29:2; Le 2:2; 6:15), and

(3) the "fine meal" for honored guests (see Ge 18:6, where Abraham commands Sarah to "make ready .... three measures of fine meal") with which we may compare the "fine flour" for the king’s kitchen (1Ki 4:22) and the "fine flour" required for the ritual meal offering, as in Le 2:1; 5:11; 7:12; 14:10; 23:13; 24:5; etc.

III. Bread-Making.

1. Grinding:

After thoroughly sifting and cleaning the grain, the first step in the process was to reduce it to "meal" or "flour" by rubbing, pounding, or grinding. (In Nu 11:8 it is said of the manna "The people went about, and gathered it, and ground it in mills, or beat it in mortars.") It has been shown that by a process, which is not yet extinct in Egypt, it was customary to rub the grain between two the "corn-rubbers" or "corn grinders," of which many specimens have been found by Petrie, Bliss, Macalister and others, at Lachish, Gezer and elsewhere (PEFS, 1902, 326; 1903, 118; compare Erman, Egypt, 180, for illustrations of

actual use). For detailed descriptions of the other processes, see MORTAR; MILL.

2. Kneading:

The "flour" was then ordinarily mixed simply with water, kneaded in a wooden basin or kneading-trough (Ex 8:3) and, in case of urgency, at once made into "cakes" and baked. (See Ex 12:34, "And the people took their dough before it was leavened.") The Hebrews called such cakes matstsoth, and they were the only kind allowed for use on the altar during Passover, and immediately following the Feast of Unleavened Bread (also called Matstsoth). Commonly however the process was as follows: a lump of leavened dough of yesterday's baking, preserved for the purpose, was broken up and mixed with the day's "batch," and the whole was then set aside and left standing until it was thoroughly leavened (see LEAVEN).

3. Baking:

We find in the Old Testament, as in the practice of the East today, three modes of firing or baking bread:

(1) Hot Stones:

That represented by Elijah's cake baked on the hot stones (1Ki 19:6 the Revised Version, margin; compare "the cakes upon the hearth," Ge 18:6 the King James Version, and see Robinson, Researches, II, 406). The stones were laid together and a fire was lighted upon them. When the stones were well heated the cinders were raked off, and the cakes laid on the stones and covered with ashes. After a while the ashes were again removed and the cake was turned (see Ho 7:8) and once more covered with the glowing ashes. It was thus cooked on both sides evenly and made ready for eating (compare the Vulgate, Panis subcineraris, and DeLagarde, Symmicta, II, 188, where egkouthia, is referred to as "the hiding" of the cakes under the ashes). Out of these primitive usages of the pastoral tribes and peasants grew other improved forms of baking.

(2) Baking Pans:

An ancient method of baking, prevalent still among the Bedouin of Syria and Arabia, is to employ a heated convex iron plate, or griddle, what we would call a frying pan, in lieu of the heated sand or stones. The Hebrew "baking-pan" (machabhath, Le 2:5; 7:9; compare Eze 4:3) must have been of this species of "griddle." The reference in 1Ch 9:31 is probably to bread baked in this way. There it is said that one of the sons of the priests "had the office of trust over the things that were baked in pans."

4. Ovens:

tannur (compare Arabic), no doubt were used by the Hebrews, when they settled in Palestine, as they were used by the settled populations of the Orient in general, more and more as they approached civilized conditions. These "ovens" were of various kinds:

(1) The Bowl-Oven:

The simplest used by the ancients were hardly more primitive than the kind quite commonly used in Palestine today. It may be called the "bowl-oven." It consists of a large clay-bowl, which is provided with a movable lid. This bowl is placed inverted upon small stones and then heated with a fuel distinctly oriental, consisting of dried dung heaped over and around it. The bread is baked on the stones, then covered by the inverted oven, which is heated by the firing of the fuel of dung on the outside of the cover.

(2) The Jar-Oven:

The jar-oven is another form of oven found in use there today. This is a large earthen-ware jar that is heated by fuel of grass (Mt 6:30), stubble (Mal 4:1), dry twigs or thorns (1Ki 17:12) and the like, which are placed within the jar for firing. When the jar is thus heated the cakes are stuck upon the hot inside walls.

(3) The Pit-Oven:

The pit-oven was doubtless a development from this type. It was formed partly in the ground and partly built up of clay and plastered throughout, narrowing toward the top. The ancient Egyptians, as the monuments and mural paintings show, laid the cakes upon the outside of the oven (Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians); but in Palestine, in general, if the customs of today are conclusive, the fire was kindled in the inside of the pit-oven. Great numbers of such ovens have been unearthed in recent excavations, and we may well believe them to be exact counterparts of the oven of the professional bakers in the street named after them in Jerusalem "the bakers' street" (Jer 37:21). The largest and most developed form of oven is still the public oven of the town or city of this sort; but the primitive rural types still survive, and the fuel of thorns, and of the grass, "which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven," are still in evidence.

5. Forms of Baked Bread:

(1) The large pone or thick, light loaf of the West is unknown in the East. The common oriental cake or loaf is proverbially thin. The thin home-made bread is really named both in Hebrew and Arabic from its thinness as is reflected in the translation "wafer" in Ex 16:31; 29:23; Le 8:26; Nu 6:19; 1Ch 23:29. Such bread was called in Hebrew raqiq (raqiq; compare modern Arabic warkuk, from warak =" foliage," "paper").

(2) It is still significantly customary at a Syrian meal to take a piece of such bread and, with the ease and skill of long habit, to fold it over at the end held in the hand so as to make a sort of spoon of it, which then is eaten along with whatever is lifted by it out of the common dish (compare Mt 26:23). But this "dipping in the common dish" is so accomplished as not to allow the contents of the dish to be touched

by the fingers, or by anything that has been in contact with the lips of those who sit at meat (compare Mackie, DCG, article "Bread").

(3) Such "loaves" are generally today about 7 inches in diameter and from half an inch to an inch thick. Such, probably, were the lad's "barley loaves" brought to Christ at the time of the feeding of the 5,000 (Joh 6:9,13). Even thinner cakes, of both leavened and unleavened bread, are sometimes made now, as of old, especially at times of religious festivals. Often they are coated on the upper surface with olive oil and take on a glossy brown color in cooking; and sometimes they are sprinkled over with aromatic seeds, which adhere and impart a spicy flavor. They may well recall to us the "oiled bread" of Le 8:26 and "the wafers anointed with oil" of Ex 29:2 and Le 2:4.

(4) Sometimes large discs of dough about 1 inch thick and 8 inches in diameter are prepared and laid in rows on long, thin boards like canoe paddles, and thus inserted into the oven; then, by a quick, deft jerk of the hand, they are slipped off upon the hot pavement and baked. These are so made and baked that when done they are soft and flexible, and for this reason are preferred by many to the thinner cakes which are cooked stiff and brown.

(5) The precise nature of the cracknels of 1Ki 14:3 (the American Standard Revised Version "cakes") is not known. A variety of bakemeats (Ge 40:17, literally "food, the work of the baker") are met with in the Old Testament, but only in a few cases is it possible or important to identify their nature or forms (see Encyclopedia Bibl, coll. 460 f). A cake used for ritual purposes (Ex 29:2 and often) seems, from its name, to have been pierced with holes, like the modern Passover cakes (compare Kennedy, 1-vol HDB, article " Bread").

6. Work for Women:

(a) Every oriental household of importance seems to have had its own oven, and bread-making for the most part was in the hands of the women. Even when and where baking, as under advancing civilization, became a recognized public industry, and men were the professional bakers, a large part of the baker's work, as is true today, was to fire the bread prepared and in a sense pre-baked by the women at home.

(b) The women of the East are often now seen taking a hand in sowing, harvesting and winnowing the grain, as well as in the processes of "grinding" (Ec 12:3; Mt 24:41; Lu 17:35), "kneading" (Ge 18:6; 1Sa 28:24; 2Sa 13:8; Jer 7:18) and "baking" (1Sa 8:13), and doubtless it was so in ancient times to an equal extent.

IV. Sanctity and Symbolism of Bread.

1. Sanctity:

It would seem that the sanctity of bread remains as unchanged in the Orient as the sanctity of shrines and graves (compare Mackie, DCG, article "Bread," and Robinson's Researches). As in Egypt everything

depended for life on the Nile, and as the Nile was considered "sacred," so in Palestine, as everything depended upon the wheat and barley harvest, "bread" was in a peculiar sense "sacred." The psychology of the matter seems to be about this: all life was seen to be dependent upon the grain harvest, this in turn depended upon rain in its season, and so bread, the product at bottom of these Divine processes, was regarded as peculiarly "a gift of God," a daily reminder of his continual and often undeserved care (Mt 5:45 ff; consider in this connection the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," Mt 6:11; compare Lu 11:11). Travelers generally note as a special characteristic of the Oriental of today that, seeing a scrap of bread on the roadside, he will pick it up and throw it to a street dog, or place it in a crevice of the wall, or on a tree-branch where the birds may get it. One thing is settled with him, it must not be trodden under foot in the common dust, for, in the estimat ion of all, it has in it an element of mystery and sacredness as coming from the Giver of all good.

2. Symbolism:

(a) In partaking of the hospitality of the primitive peasants of Palestine today, east and west of the Jordan, one sees what a sign and symbol of hospitality and friendship the giving and receiving of bread is. Among the Arabs, indeed, it has become a proverb, which may be put into English thus: "Eat salt together, be friends forever." Once let the Arab break bread with you and you are safe. You may find the bread the poorest barley loaf, still marked by the indentations of the pebbles, with small patches of the gray ash of the hearth, and here and there an inlaid bit of singed grass or charred thorn, the result of their primitive process of baking; but it is bread, the best that the poor man can give you, "a gift of God," indeed, and it is offered by the wildest Arab, with some sense of its sacredness and with somewhat of the gladness and dignity of the high duty of hospitality. No wonder, therefore, that it is considered the height of discourtesy, yea, a violation of the sacred law of hospitality, to decline it or to set it aside as unfit for use.

(b) Christ must have been influenced by His knowledge of some such feeling and law as this when, on sending forth His disciples, He charged them to "take no bread with them" (Mr 6:8). Not to have expected such hospitality, and not to have used what would thus be freely offered to them by the people, would have been a rudeness, not to say an offense, on the part of the disciples, which would have hindered the reception of the good tidings of the Kingdom.

(c) It has well been pointed out that God's gift of natural food to His people enters in for the praises of the Magnificat (Lu 1:53), and that when Christ called Himself "the bread of life" (Joh 6:35) He really appealed to all these endeared and indissoluble associations connected in the eastern mind with the meaning and use of bread. Most naturally and appropriately in the inauguration of the New Covenant Christ adopted as His memorial, not a monument of stone or brass, but this humble yet sacred article of food, familiar and accessible to all, to become, with the "wine" of common use, in the Lord's Supper, the perpetual symbol among His disciples of the communion of saints.

LITERATURE.

Wilkinson. Ancient Egypt, 1878, II, 34; Erman, Aegypten und aegyptisches Leben, 1885, 191 ff; Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebr. Archaologie, 1894; Maimonides, Yadh, Temidhin U-Mucaphin, v, 6-8; Bacher, Monats-schrift, 1901, 299; Mishna B. M., II, 1, 2; Robinson, Biblical Researches in Palestine, II, 416; Doughty, Travels in Arabia Deserta, I, 131; Josephus, BJ; and Bible Dicts. on "Bread," "Dietary Laws": "Matstsoth," "Challah," etc.

George B. Eager

BREADTH

bredth (rochabh, the root idea being to make wide, spacious): A term of expanse or measurement used of the ark (Ge 6:15); of the tabernacle (Ex 27:13); of Solomon’s temple (1Ki 6:2). platos, "breadth," as of the celestial city (Re 21:16). Figuratively, of the comprehensiveness of God’s law (Ps 119:96); of the heart (1Ki 4:29, rendered "largeness of heart" English Versions); of God’s immeasurable love (Eph 3:18).

BREAK

brak: shabhar =" break" (down, off, in pieces, up), "destroy," "quench" (Isa 14:25; Jer 19:10,11; Eze 4:16; Am 1:5); paraq =" to break off" or "craunch"; figuratively "to deliver" (Ge 27:40 the King James Version); ‘araph =" to break the neck," hence, "to destroy" (Ex 13:13); harac =" to break through" (Ex 19:21,24); parats =" to break" (forth, away), occurs in Ex 19:22,24; 1Sa 25:10; "breaking faith," Ho 4:2; parach =" to break forth as a bud" (Le 13:12); nathats or nathaq =" destroy" (Eze 23:34 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "gnaw"; see BREAST); chalal =" profane," "defile," "stain" (Nu 30:2; Ps 89:31,34); baqa =" rip open" (2Ki 3:26; Isa 58:8); ra‘a‘ =" to spoil by breaking to pieces," "to make good for nothing" (Job 34:24; Ps 2:9; Jer 15:12, the King James Version "Shall iron break northern iron?"); patsach =" to break out" (in joyful sound), "break forth," "make a noise" (Isa 14:7, the nations rejoice in the peace which follows the fall of the oppressor); nir =" to glisten," "gleam" (as of a fresh furrow) (Jer 4:3; Ho 10:12); pathach =" to open wide," "loosen," "have vent" (Jer 1:14); naphats =" to dash to pieces or scatter," "overspread," "scatter" (Jer 48:12, the work usually done carefully shall be done roughly; Jer 51:20-23, descriptive of the terrible fate appointed for Babylon); na’aph =" to break wedlock" (Eze 16:38); tsalach or tsaleach =" break out," "come mightily" (Am 5:6). The New Testament employs luo =" to loosen," "dissolve" (Mt 5:19); diorusso =" to penetrate burglariously," "break through" (Mt 6:19,20, Greek "dig through"); rhegnumi or rhesso =" to disrupt," "burst," "to utter with a loud voice" (Ga 4:27); klao =" to break" (Ac 20:7, "to break bread," i.e. to celebrate the Lord’s Supper; 1Co 10:16).

See also BREACH.

Frank E. Hirsch

BREAK OF DAY

‘or, "to be light," "the light breaks" (2Sa 2:32); auge, "bright light," "radiance" (Ac 20:11).

See DAWN.

BREAST

brest: Signifying the front view of the bust in humans and the corresponding portion of the body in animals. chazeh, occurs in Ex 29:26,27; Le 7:30,31,34; 8:29; 10:14,15; Nu 6:20; 18:18; and chadhi, in Da 2:32. shadh or shodh =" breast" in the sense of pap of a woman or animal (Job 24:9; So 8:1,8,10; Isa 60:16; La 4:3). Only one word occurs with this signification in the New Testament: stethos =" bosom," "chest" (Lu 18:13; 23:48; Joh 13:25; 21:20).

See WAVE OFFERING.

Figurative: "The breasts of virginity," pressed and bruised (Eze 23:3,8 the King James Version), indicative of Ezekiel’s belief that Israel practiced idolatry in Egypt (compare Eze 20:8). "To tear (pluck off) thy breasts" (Eze 23:34) denotes the anguish of the people in parting with their beloved sin (compare Ho 2:2). "Its breast of silver" (Da 2:32) is possibly expressive of the humanity and wealth of the Medo-Persian empire.

Frank E. Hirsch

BREASTPLATE

brest’-plat.

See ARMOR.

BREASTPLATE OF THE HIGH PRIEST

prest: The Hebrew word choshen, rendered in the King James Version "breastplate," means really a "pouch" or "bag." The references to it are found exclusively in the Priestly Code (Ex 25:7; 28; 29:5; 35:9,27; Le 8:8). The descriptions of its composition and particularly the directions with regard to wearing it are exceedingly obscure. According to Ezr 2:63 and Ne 7:65 the Urim and Thummim, which were called in the priestly pouch, were lost during the Babylonian exile. The actual pouch was a "span in length and a span in breadth," i.e. about 9 inch square. It was made, like the ephod, of "gold, of blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen" (Ex 28:15 f). In it were twelve precious stones, in rows of four, representing the twelve tribes of Israel. Apparently the pouch had two rings (perhaps four) through which passed two gold chains by which it was fastened to the ephod supplied for the purpose with ouches or clasps. The pouch was worn by the high priest over his heart when he entered the "holy place"

"for a memorial before Yahweh." The presence of the high priest, the representative of the people, with the names of the separate tribes on his person, brought each tribe before the notice of Yahweh and thereby directed His attention to them. The full designation was choshen mishpaT, "pouch of judgment" or "decision." It was the distinctive symbol of the priest in his capacity as the giver of oracles. As already suggested the priestly pouch contained the Urim and Thummim which were probably precious stones used as lots in giving decisions. In all probability the restored text of 1Sa 14:41 preserves the true custom. On one side stood Saul and Jonathan, and the people on the other side. If the result was Urim, Saul and Jonathan would be the guilty parties. If the result was Thummim, the guilt would fasten on the people.

T. Lewis

BREATH; BREATHE; BREATHING

breth, breth, breath'-ing: In the English Versions of the Bible of the Old Testament "breath" is the rendering of neshamah, and of ruach. These words differ but slightly in meaning, both signifying primarily "wind," then "breath," though the former suggests a gentler blowing, the latter often a blast. As applied to persons there is no very clear distinction between the words. Yet in general one may say that of the two neshamah is employed preferably of breath regarded physiologically: "vital breath," hence, the vital principle, "Soul (animal) life" (compare Ge 2:7; 7:22; Job 27:3, where both words occur; Da 5:23); while ruach (though it, too, sometimes signifies "vital breath") is the word generally employed where the breath is regarded physically—breath or blast as an act or force—and so is related to the will or the emotions, whence the meaning "spirit," also sometimes "thought," "purpose" (compare Job 4:9; 9:18; Ps 18:15; 146:4; Eze 37:5,6,8,9,10). The examples cited, however, and other passages reveal a lack of uniformity of usage. Yet generally ruach is the expression, neshamah, the principle, of life. Yet when employed of God they of course signify the principle, not of His own life, but of that imparted to His creatures. "Breathe" in English Versions of the Bible of the Old Testament requires no remark except at Ps 27:12 ("such as breathe out cruelty"), from yaphach, "to breathe hard," "to snort" (compare Ac 9:1). In the New Testament "breath" (pnoe) occurs once Ac 17:25 in the plain sense of vital principle, the gift of God. "Breathed" is employed in Joh 20:22 of our Lord's concrete symbolism of the giving of the Spirit. In Ac 9:1 Saul's "breathing threatening and slaughter" is literally "snorting," etc., and the nouns are partitive genitives, being the element of which he breathed.

See also SPIRIT.

J. R. Van Pelt

BREECHES

brich'-iz, brech'-iz: A garment, extending from the waist to or just below the knee or to the ankle, and covering each leg separately. Breeches are not listed among the garments of an ordinary wardrobe, but the priests in later times (Ex 20:26) wore a garment resembling modern trousers. These priestly linen

breeches, mikhnece bhadh, were worn along with the linen coat, the linen girdle and the linen turban by Aaron on the Day of Atonement, when he entered the "holy place." (The word mikhnece is derived from a root, kanac = ganaz, "to cover up," "hide.") Ordinary priests also wore them on sacrificial occasions (Ex 28:42; 39:28; Le 6:10; Eze 44:18). Apart from the breeches just referred to, the only reference to a similar garment among the Israelites is found in Da 3:21, where the carbal, the Revised Version (British and American) "hosen," is mentioned. (The King James Version translates "coats.") The rendering of the King James Version is the more likely, though the meaning of the Aramaic sarbal is obscure (compare the thorough discussion in Ges., Thesaurus). In Targum and Talmud (compare Levy, NHWB, under the word), and is so taken by the rabbinical commentators. Still, Aquila and Theodotion (sarabara), Septuagint in Da 3:27, Symmachus (anaxurides), Peshitta, express the meaning "trousers" (of a looser kind than those worn by us), a garment known (from Herodotus and other sources) to have been worn by the ancient Scythians and Persians, and to have been called by them sarabara. The word, with the same connotation, was brought into the Arabic in the form sirwal. In both these senses the word may be originally Persian: in that of mantle, meaning properly (according to Andreas) a "head-covering" (sarabara), for which in Persia the peasants often use their mantle; in that of "trousers," corresponding to the modern Persian shalwar, "under-breeches." Cook has pointed out that "mantles, long-flowing robes, and therefore extremely liable to catch the flames," are more likely to be especially mentioned in this chapter than trousers, or (Revised Version) "hosen."

The word paTish (Da 3:21), is also uncertain. The Septuagint and Theodotion render tiarai, "turbans"; Peshitta has the same word, which is variously taken by Syrian lexicographers as "tunic," "trousers," or a kind of "gaiter" (Payne Smith, Thes. Syriac., col. 3098). (For further discussion of these words, compare commentaries on Da of Jour. Phil., XXVI, 307 if.)

In general, we must remember that a thorough discussion of Israelite "dress" is impossible, because of the limitations of our sources.

H. J. Wolf

BREED

bred: Found in the past tense in Ex 16:20 as a translation of rum =" to bring up," "to rise." In this verse, the manna is said to have arisen, i.e. "become alive" (with worms), to indicate that God’s gifts are spoiled by selfish and miserly hoarding. The pres. act. occurs in Ge 8:17 for sharats =" to wriggle," "swarm," "abound," hence, "breed abundantly"; and in De 32:14 for ben =" son," "descendant," "child," "colt," "calf," "breed." The present participle is found in Ze 2:9 the King James Version for mimshaq, a derivative of mesheq =" possession," "territory," "field." The passage in question should therefore be translated "field of nettles" (the Revised Version (British and American) "possession of nettles").

Frank E. Hirsch

BRETHREN

breth’-ren.

See BROTHER.

BRETHREN OF THE LORD

In Mt 12:46 ff; Mr 3:31 ff; Lu 8:19 ff, while Jesus was in the midst of an earnest argument with scribes and Pharisees, His mother and brothers sent a message evidently intended to end the discussion. In order to indicate that no ties of the flesh should interfere with the discharge of the duties of His Messianic office, He stretched His hands toward His disciples, and said: "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister, and mother." In Mt 13:54 ff; Mr 6:2 ff, while He was teaching in His own town, Nazareth, His neighbors, who, since they had watched His natural growth among them, could not comprehend the extraordinary claims that He was making, declare in an interrogative form, that they know all about the entire family, mother, brothers and sisters. They name the brothers. Bengel suggests that there is a tone of contempt in the omission of the names of the sisters, as though not worth mentioning. In Joh 2:12, they are said to have accompanied Jesus and His mother and disciples from the wedding at Cana. In Joh 7:3 ff, they are described as unbelieving, and ridiculing His claims with bitter sarcasm. This attitude of hostility has disappeared, when, at Jerusalem, after the resurrection and ascension (Ac 1:14), in the company of Mary and the Eleven, and the faithful group of women, they "continued steadfastly in prayer," awaiting the promise of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Their subsequent participation in the missionary activity of the apostolic church appea rs in 1Co 9:5: "Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" In Ga 1:19, James, bishop of the church at Jerusalem, is designated "the Lord’s brother," thus harmonizing with Mt 13:55, where their names are recorded as James, Joseph, Simon and Judas. When, then, "Jude, ... brother of James" is mentioned (Jude 1:1), the immediate inference is that Jude is another brother of the Lord. In reading these passages, the natural inference is that these "brethren" were the sons of Joseph and Mary, born after Jesus, living with Mary and her daughters, in the home at Nazareth, accompanying the mother on her journeys, and called the "brethren" of the Lord in a sense similar to that in which Joseph was called His father. They were brethren because of their common relationship to Mary. This impression is strengthened by the fact that Jesus is called her prototokos, "first-born son" (Lu 2:7), as well as by the very decided implication of Mt 1:25. Even though each particular, taken separately, might, with some difficulty, be explained otherwise, the force of the argument is cumulative. There are too many items to be explained away, in order to establish any other inference. This view is not the most ancient. It has been traced to Tertullian, and has been more fully developed by Belvidius, an obscure writer of the 4th century

Two other views have been advocated with much learning and earnestness. The earlier, which seems to have been prevalent in the first three centuries and is supported by Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa and Ambrose, Epiphanius being its chief advocate, regards these "brethren" as the children of Joseph by a former marriage, and Mary as his second wife. Joseph disappears from sight when Jesus is twelve years old. We know nothing of him after the narrative of the child Jesus in the temple. That there is no allusion to him in the account of the family in Mr 6:3 indicates that Mary had been a widow long before

she stood by the Cross without the support of any member of her immediate family. In the Apocryphal Gospels, the attempt is made to supply what the canonical Gospels omit. They report that Joseph was over eighty years of age at his second marriage, and the names of both sons and daughters by his first marriage are given. As Lightfoot (commentary on Galatians) has remarked, "they are pure fabrications." Theophylact even advanced theory that they were the children of Joseph by a levirate marriage, with the widow of his brother, Clopas. Others regard them as the nephews of Joseph whom, after the death of his brother Clopas, he had taken into his own home, and who thus became members of his family, and were accounted as though they were the children of Joseph and Mary. According to this view, Mary excepted, the whole family at Nazareth were no blood relatives of Jesus. It is a Docetic conception in the interest of the dogma of the perpetual virginity of Mary. All its details, even that of the advanced age and decrepitude of Joseph, start from that premise. Another view, first propounded by Jerome when a very young man, in antagonizing Belvidius, but afterward qualified by its author, was followed by Augustine, the Roman Catholic writers generally, and carried over into Protestantism at the Reformation, and accepted, even though not urged, by Luther, Chemnitz, Bengel, etc., understands the word "brother" in the general sense of "kinsman," and interprets it here as equivalent to "cousin." According to this, these brethren were actually blood-relatives of Jesus, and not of Joseph. They were the children of Alpheus, otherwise known as Clopas (Joh 19:25), and the sister of Mary. This Mary, in Mt 27:56, is described as "the mother of James and Joses," and in Mr 15:40, "the mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome." This theory as completely developed points to the three names, James, Judas and Simon found both in the list of the apostles and of the "brethren," and argues that it would be a remarkable coincidence if they referred to different persons, and the two sisters, both named Mary, had found the very same names for their sons. The advocates of this theory argue also that the expression "James the less" shows that there were only two persons of the name James in the circle of those who were most closely connected with Jesus. They say, further, that, after the death of Joseph, Mary became an inmate of the home of her sister, and the families being combined, the presence and attendance of her nephews and nieces upon her can be explained without much difficulty, and the words of the people at Nazareth be understood. But this complicated theory labors under many difficulties. The identity of Clopas and Alpheus cannot be established, resting, as it does, upon obscure philological resemblances of the Aramaic form of the two names (see ALPHAEUS). The most that such argument affords is a mere possibility. Nor is the identity of "Mary the wife of Clopas" with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, established beyond a doubt. Joh 19:25, upon which it rests, can with equal correctness be interpreted as teaching that four women stood by the cross, of whom "Mary of Clopas" was one, and His mother’s sister was another. The decision depends upon the question as to whether "Mary" be in apposition to "sister." If the verse be read so as to present two pairs, it would not be a construction without precedent in the New Testament, and would avoid the difficulty of finding two sisters with the same name—a difficulty greater yet than that of thre e cousins with the same name. Nor is the identity of "James the less" with the son of Alpheus beyond a doubt. Any argument concerning the comparative "less," as above explained, fails when it is found that in the Greek there is no comparative, but only "James the little," the implication being probably that of his stature as considerably below the average, so as to occasion remark. Nor is the difficulty less when it is proposed to identify three of these brethren of Jesus with apostles of the same name. For the "brethren" and the apostles are repeatedly distinguished. In Mt 12:49, while the former stood without, the latter are gathered around Jesus. In Joh 2:12, we read: "his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples." In Ac 1:13 the Eleven, including James the son of Alpheus,

and Simon, and Judas of James, and then it is said that they were accompanied by "his brethren." But the crowning difficulty of this hypothesis of Jerome is the record of the unbelief of the brethren and of their derision of His claims in Joh 7:3-5.

On the other hand, the arguments against regarding them as sons of Mary and Joseph are not formidable. When it is urged that their attempts to interfere with Jesus indicate a superiority which, according to Jewish custom, is inconsistent with the position of younger brothers, it may be answered that those who pursue an unjustifiable course are not models of consistency. When an argument is sought from the fact that Jesus on the cross commended His mother to John, the implication is immediate that she had no sons of her own to whom to turn in her grief and desolation; the answer need not be restricted to the consideration that unknown domestic circumstances may explain the omission of her sons. A more patent explanation is that as they did not understand their brother, they could not understand their mother, whose whole life and interests were bound up in her firstborn. But, on the other hand, no one of the disciples understood Jesus and appreciated His work and treasured up His words as did John. A bond of fellowship had thus been established between John and Mary that was closer than her nearer blood relationship with her own sons, who, up to this time, had regarded the course of Jesus with disapproval, and had no sympathy with His mission. In the home of John she would find consolation for her loss, as the memories of the wonderful life of her son would be recalled, and she would converse with him who had rested on the bosom of Jesus and whom Jesus loved. Even with the conversion of these brethren within a few days into faithful confessors, before the view of Jesus, provision was made for her deeper spiritual communion with her risen and ascended Son through the testimony of Jesus which John treasured in his deeply contemplative spirit. There was much that was alike in the characters of Mary and John. This may have had its ground in relationship, as many regard Salome his mother, the sister of the mother of Jesus mentioned in Joh 19:25.

Underneath both the stepbrother (Epiphanian) and the cousin (Hieronymian) theories, which coincide in denying that Mary was the actual mother of these brethren, lies the idea of the perpetual virginity of Mary. This theory which has as its watchword the stereotyped expression in liturgy and hymn, "Maria semper Virgo," although without any support from Holy Scripture, pervades theology and the worship of the ancient and the medieval churches. From the Greek and Roman churches it has passed into Protestantism in a modified form. Its plea is that it is repugnant to Christian feeling to think of the womb of Mary, in which the Word, made flesh, had dwelt in a peculiar way, as the habitation of other babes. In this idea there lies the further thought, most prominent in medieval theology, of a sinfulness of the act in itself whereby new human lives come into existence, and of the inclination implanted from the creation, upon which all family ties depend. 1Ti 4:3,4; Heb 13:4 are sufficient answer. The taint of sin lies not in marriage, and the use of that which is included in its institution, and which God has blessed (compare Ac 10:15), but in its perversion and abuse. It is by an inconsistency that Protestants have conceded this much to theory of Rome, that celibacy is a holier estate than matrimony, and that virginity in marriage is better than marriage itself. The theory also is connected with the removal of Mary from the sphere of ordinary life and duties as too commonplace for one who i s to be surrounded with the halo of a demi-god, and to be idealized in order to be worshipped. The interpretation that they are the Lord’s real brethren ennobles and glorifies family life in all its relations and duties, and sanctifies motherhood with all its cares and trials as holier than a selfish isolation from the world, in order to evade the annoyances

and humiliations inseparable from fidelity to our callings. Not only Mary, but Jesus with her, knew what it was to grieve over a house divided concerning religion (Mt 10:35 ff). But that this unbelief and indifference gave way before the clearer light of the resurrection of Jesus is shown by the presence of these brethren in the company of the disciples in Jerusalem (Ac 1:14). The reference to His post-resurrection appearance to James (1Co 15:7) is probably connected with this change in their attitude. 1Co 9:5 shows that at least two of these brothers were active as missionaries, undoubtedly within the Holy Land, and to Jews, according to the agreeme nt into which James entered in Ga 2, and his well-known attitude on questions pertaining to the Gentiles. Zahn regards James as an ascetic and celibate not included in 1Co 9:5, which is limited then to Jude and Simon. Their marriage indicates "the absence in the Holy Family of that pseudo-asceticism which has so much confused the tradition concerning them" (Alford).

See also JAMES; JUDE.

For fuller discussions, see the extensive arguments of Eadie and Lightfoot, in their commentaries on Gal, the former in favor of the Helvidian, and the latter, with his exhaustive scholarship, of the Epiphanian views; also, on the side of the former, Mayor, The Epistle of James; Alford, Greek Test.; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity; Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament.

H. E. Jacobs

BRIBERY

brib'-er-i (shochadh, "a gift," in a corrupt sense, "a bribe"): The Hebrew law condemns everything that would tend to impair the impartial administration of justice, particularly the giving and receiving of gifts or bribes, in order to pervert judgment (Ex 23:8). Allusions are frequent to the prevailing corruption of oriental judges and rulers. "And fire shall consume the tents of bribery" (Job 15:34; 1Sa 8:3; Ps 26:10; Isa 1:23; 33:15; Eze 22:12). Samuel speaks of a "ransom" in the sense of a bribe: "Of whose hand have I taken a ransom (kopher, "covering," the King James Version "bribe") to blind mine eyes therewith?" (1Sa 12:3; Am 5:12; compare Am 2:6).

See CRIMES; JUSTICE; PUNISHMENTS.

L. Kaiser

BRICK

(lebhenah): The ancient Egyptian word appears in the modern Egyptian Arabic toob. In Syria the sun-baked bricks are commonly called libn or lebin, from the same Semitic root as the Hebrew word.

Bricks are mentioned only a few times in the Bible. The story of how the Children of Israel, while in bondage in Egypt, had their task of brick-making made more irksome by being required to collect their

own straw is one of the most familiar of Bible narratives (Ex 1:14; 5:7,10-19).

Modern excavations at Pithom in Egypt (Ex 1:11) show that most of the bricks of which that store-city was built were made of mud and straw baked in the sun. These ruins are chosen as an example from among the many ancient brick structures because they probably represent the work of the very Hebrew slaves who complained so bitterly of their royal taskmaster. In some of the upper courses rushes had been substituted for straw, and still other bricks had no fibrous material. These variations could be explained by a scarcity of straw at that time, since, when there was a shortage in the crops, all the straw (Arabic, tibn) was needed for feeding the animals. It may be that when the order came for the workmen to provide their own straw they found it impossible to gather sufficient and still furnish the required number of bricks (Ex 5:8). However, the quality of clay of which some of the bricks were made was such that no straw was needed.

Brickmaking in early Egyptian history was a government monopoly. The fact that the government pressed into service her Asiatic captives, among whom were the Children of Israel, made it impossible for independent makers to compete. The early bricks usually bore the government, stamp or the stamp of some temple authorized to use the captives for brick manufacture. The methods employed by the ancient Egyptians differ in no respect from the modern procedure in that country. The Nile mud is thoroughly slipped or mixed and then rendered more cohesive by the addition of chopped straw or stubble. The pasty mass is next worked into a mould made in the shape of a box without a bottom. If the sides of the mould have been dusted with dry earth it will easily slip off and the brick is allowed to dry in the sun until it becomes so hard that the blow of a hammer is often necessary to break it.

When the children of Israel emigrated to their new country they found the same methods of brickmaking employed by the inhabitants, methods which are still in vogue throughout the greater part of Palestine and Syria. In the interior of the country, especially where the building stone is scarce or of poor quality, the houses are made of sun-baked brick (libn). Frequently the west and south walls, which are exposed most to the winter storms, are made of hewn stone and the rest of the structure of bricks. When the brick-laying is finished the house is plastered inside and outside with the same material of which the bricks are made and finally whitewashed or painted with grey- or yellow-colored earth. The outer coating of plaster must be renewed from year to year. In some of the villages of northern Syria the brick houses are dome-shaped, looking much like beehives. In the defiant assertion of Isa 9:10 the superiority of hewn stone over bricks implied a greater difference in cost and stability than exists between a frame house and a stone house in western lands today.

In the buildings of ancient Babylonia burnt bricks were used. These have been found by modern excavators, which confirms the description of Ge 11:3. Burnt bricks were rarely used in Egypt before the Roman period and in Palestine their use for building purposes was unknown. Specimens of partially burnt, glazed bricks have been found in Babylonia and recently in one of the Hittite mounds of northern Syria. These were probably used for decorative purposes only. If burnt bricks had been generally used in Palestine, races of them would have been found with the pottery which is so abundant in the ruins (see POTTERY).

The fact that unburnt bricks were so commonly used explains how the sites of such cities as ancient Jericho could have become lost for so many centuries. When the houses and walls fell they formed a heap of earth not distinguishable from the surrounding soil. The wood rotted and the iron rusted away, leaving for the excavator a few bronze and stone implements and the fragments of pottery which are so precious as a means of identification. The "tels" or mounds of Palestine and Syria often represent the ruins of several such cities one above the other.

LITERATURE.

H. A. Harper, The Bible and Modern Discoveries; Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians; Erman, Life in Ancient Egypt; Hilprecht, Recent Research in Bible Lands.

James A. Patch

BRICK-KILN

brik'-kil, -kiln (malben): The Hebrew word is better translated by "brickmould." In Syria the brickmould is still called milben. In Jer 43:9 the American Standard Revised Version rendering is "brickwork" and the American Revised Version, margin "pavement." 2Sa 12:31 becomes much clearer if the American Revised Version, margin is incorporated. Being put to work at the brickmould was considered the task of those taken as slaves. The ancestors of the new taskmasters had themselves been put to similar toil.

BRIDE

brid.

See MARRIAGE.

BRIDE-CHAMBER

brid'-cham-ber (numphon): The room in which the marriage ceremonies were held (Mt 9:15; Mr 2:19; Lu 5:34; compare Mt 22:10).

See CHAMBER; MARRIAGE.

BRIDE-CHAMBER, SONS (CHILDREN) OF THE

(hoi huioi tou numphonos): These were friends or companions of the bridegroom and were usually very numerous (Mt 9:15; Mr 2:19; Lu 5:34). Any wedding guest might be included in the expression, or anyone who took part in the bridal procession and remained for the wedding-feast (see MARRIAGE). In

the above passages "the sons of the bride-chamber" are the disciples of Christ.

BRIDEGROOM; BRIDEGROOM, FRIEND OF

brid’-groom;

See MARRIAGE.

BRIDGE

brij (gephura, 2 Macc 12:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) GEPHYRUN): Does not occur in the canonical Scriptures, unless it be indirectly in the proper name Geshur (geshur, 2Sa 3:3; 13:37; 15:8; 1Ch 2:23, and others). The so-called Jacob’s bridge is said to mark the site where Jacob crossed the upper Jordan on his return from Paddan-aram, but, of course, does not date from the time of the patriarch. There are traces of ancient bridges across the Jordan in the vicinity of the Lake of Gennesaret, over the Arnon and over other rivers which enter the Jordan from the east; but none of them seem to date farther back than the Roman period. Na 2:6, in which the Chaldaic paraphrase renders "bridges," evidently refers to dikes or weirs. Judas Maccabeus is said to have planted a bridge in order to besiege the town of Casphor (2 Macc 12:13). Josephus (Ant., V, i, 3) tells us that the Jordan, before the passage of the Israelites, had never been bridged, evidently implying that in his own time bridges had been constructed over it, which was the case, under the Romans. The bridge connecting the temple with the upper part of the city of which Josephus speaks (War, VI, vi, 2; Ant, XV, xi, 5) probably was a viaduct.

Frank E. Hirsch

BRIDLE

bri’-d’-l.

See BIT AND BRIDLE.

BRIER

bri’-er.

See thORNS.

BRIGANDINE

brig’-an-den.

See ARMS (Defensive, 5); COAT OF MAIL.

BRIGHTNESS

brit’-nes: Used by the King James Version in Heb 1:3 for "effulgence of his glory," as in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version. The Greek apaugasma may mean either "reflection" or "radiation." Patristic usage favors the latter; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 7:26; also the Nicene Creed: "Light of Light," i.e. the Son not only manifests the Father, but is of the same substance. "What emanates from light, must have the nature of light" (Delitzsch).

BRIM

qatseh or qetseh =" an extremity" (in a variety of applications and idioms), "border," "edge," "side," "shore" (Jos 3:15 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "brink"); also saphah or sepheth =" edge," "lip" (1Ki 7:23,24,26; 2Ch 4:2,5). In Joh 2:7, the adverb ano, is used to emphasize the verb egemisan =" to fill," thus giving the idea of "filling to the top."

BRIMSTONE

brim’-ston, brim’-stun (gophrith; to theion): The word translated "brimstone" probably referred originally to the pitch of trees, like the cypress. By analogy it has been rendered "brimstone" because of the inflammability of both substances. Sulphur existed in Palestine in early times and was known by most of the ancient nations as a combustible substance. In the vicinity of the Dead Sea, even at the present time, deposits of sulphur are being formed. Blanckenhorn (ZDPV, 1896) believes that this formation is due to the action of bituminous matter upon gypsum, as these two substances are found associated with each other in this district. Travelers going from Jericho to the Dead Sea may pick up lumps of sulphur, which are usually encrusted with crystals of gypsum. De 29:23 well describes the present aspect of this region. That the inhabitants of the land had experienced the terrors of burning sulphur is very probable. Once one of these deposits took fire it would melt and run in burning streams down the ravines spreading everywhere suffocating fumes such as come from the ordinary brimstone match. No more realistic figure could be chosen to depict terrible suffering and destruction. It is not at all unlikely that during some of the disastrous earthquakes which took place in this part of the world, the hot lava sent forth ignited not only the sulphur, but also the bitumen, and added to the horrors of the earthquake the destruction caused by burning pitch and brimstone.

The figurative use of the word brimstone to denote punishment and destruction is illustrated by such passages as De 29:23; Job 18:15; Ps 11:6; Isa 30:33; Eze 38:22; Lu 17:29; Re 9:17.

James A. Patch

BRING

dasha’ =" to sprout," "spring" (Ge 1:11 the King James Version); sharats =" to wriggle," "swarm" (Ge 1:20 f; 9:7; Ex 8:3); yaladh =" to bear," "beget" (Ge 3:16; 2Ki 19:3; Job 15:35; 39:1,2; "what a day may bring forth," Pr 27:1; "before the decree bring forth," Ze 2:2); ‘anan =" to cloud over," "to darken" (Ge 9:14); shalach =" to send on," "to escort" (Ge 18:16); shubh =" to turn back," "bring" (again, back, home again), "fetch," "establish" (Ge 24:5,6,8; Job 10:9; Ps 68:22; "bring him back to see," Ec 3:22; Zec 10:6,10); naghash =" present," "adduce" (an argument) (1Sa 13:9; 15:32; 23:9; 30:7; "bring forth your strong reasons," Isa 41:21,22); ‘asah =" to do," "cause to be," "accomplish" (Ps 37:5); ‘alah =" to carry up," "exalt," "restore" (Ge 46:4; Ex 3:8,17; 33:12; Ps 71:20; Ho 12:13); nagha‘ =" to touch," "lay hand upon," "reach to" (Le 5:7); kabhadh, or kabhedh =" to be heavy" (causative "to make weighty"), "to be glorious" (Pr 4:8); kana‘ =" to bend the knee," hence "humiliate," "bring" (down, into subjection, under), "subdue" (De 9:3; Isa 25:5); zakhar =" to mark," "call to, put (put in) remembrance" (Ps 38 title; Ps 70 title); yabhal =" to flow," "bring" (especially with pomp) (Ps 60:9; 68:29; 76:11; Ze 3:10); chul, or chil =" to writhe in pain," "to be in travail" (Isa 66:8); tsa‘adh =" to step regularly," "march," "hurl" (Job 18:14); halakh =" to walk," "get" (Ho 2:14); gadhal =" bring up," "increase" (Ho 9:12).

The New Testament employs telesphoreo =" to bring to maturity," "to ripen" (Lu 8:14); hupomimnesko =" to bring to mind," "suggest," "bring to remembrance" (Joh 14:26); douloo =" to enslave" (Ac 7:6); suntrophos =" brought up with" (Ac 13:1 the Revised Version (British and American), "the foster-brother of"): diasozo =" to save," "to care," "rescue" (Ac 23:24); atheteo =" to set aside" "cast off," "bring to naught" (1Co 1:19); katargeo =" to abolish," "destroy," "do away," "put away," "make void" (1Co 1:28); propempo =" to send forward," "bring forward" (1Co 16:6 the King James Version; Tit 3:13 the King James Version; 3 Joh 1:6 the King James Version); ektrepho =" to rear up to maturity," "to cherish," "nourish" (Eph 6:4 the King James Version).

Frank E. Hirsch

BRINK

brink: saphah, or sepheth =" the lip," "margin," "bank," "edge" (Ge 41:3; Ex 2:3; 7:15); qatseh, or qetseh =" an extremity," "border," "brim" (Jos 3:8,15; Isa 19:7; Da 12:5).

See BRIM.

BROAD

brod (rochabh, "width"; rechobh, "a broadway," "street," "court"; eurchoros, "spacious"): Occurs frequently as a term of dimension (Ex 27:1; 1Ki 6:6; Eze 40:6,43 the Revised Version (British and American), "handbreadth long") and as indicative of strength (Ne 3:8; Jer 51:58). The centers of communal life are called the "broad places," often rendered "streets" (Jer 5:1; So 3:2; Na 2:4). A court before the temple: "the broad place on the east" (the King James Version "the east street," 2Ch 29:4);

"broad plates" (Nu 16:38,39, the Revised Version (British and American) "beaten").

Figurative: Relief from distress: "Yea, he would have allured thee out of (Hebrew "the mouth of") distress into a broad place" (Job 36:16); the liberty of obedience or liberty within the law (Ps 119:96, "broad," "roomy," "at liberty"); the all-sufficiency of God for His people (Isa 33:21). Jerusalem could not boast of a river or navy—Yahweh's presence with and within her would more than supply these deficiencies; the road to destruction: "Broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction" (Mt 7:13); the ostentatious piety of the Pharisees: "They make broad (platuno, "widen") their phylacteries" (Mt 23:5).

See CITY; GATE.

L. Kaiser

BROAD PLACE

See CITY.

BROIDERED

broid'-erd:

(1) riqmah, "variegation of color" (Eze 16:10,13,18; 26:16; 27:7,16,24);

(2) tashbets, "checkered stuff" (as reticulated). The high priest's garments consisted of "a breastplate, and an ephod, and a robe, and a broidered coat (Ex 28:4 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "a coat of checker work"), a miter, and a girdle";

(3) plegma, "twined or plaited work" (1Ti 2:9 the King James Version).

See BRAIDED; EMBROIDERY.

BROKEN

bro'-k'-n: Occurs both as past participle of the verb translated "to break" and as an adjective, the former use will be dealt with here only so far as verbs occur which are thus translated but do not present the non-participial forms. Such are: meroach =" bruised," "emasculated" (Le 21:20); chathath =" to frustrate," hence, "to break down" either by violence or by confusion and fear (1Sa 2:10; Jer 48:20,39); dakhah =" to collapse" (Ps 44:19; 51:8); ratsats =" to crack in pieces" "crush" (Ec 12:6); kathath =" to bruise or violently strike," "break in pieces" (Isa 30:14); Jer 2:16 should evidently be rendered: "have grazed on the crown of thy head," instead of the King James Version "have broken," etc., for ra'ah =" to tend a flock," "pasture," "graze," but gives no hint of the meaning "to break"; 'alah =" to arise," "depart" (Jer

37:11); sunthlao =" to dash together," "shatter" (Mt 21:44); exorusso =" to dig through," "to extract," "remove" (Mr 2:4).

See BREAK.

Frank E. Hirsch

BROKENFOOTED

bro'-k'-n-foot-ed (shebher reghel): In Le 21:19, one of the blemishes which prevented a man of priestly descent from the execution of the priestly office.

BROKENHANDED

bro'-k'-n-hand-ed (shebher yadh): In Le 21:19 one of the blemishes which prevented a man of priestly descent from the execution of the priestly office.

BROKENHEARTED

bro'-k'-n-har-ted (shabhar lebh; suntetrimmenoi ten kardian; Ps 69:20,21; Isa 61:1; Lu 4:18 the King James Version; "of a broken heart," Ps 34:18; "broken in heart," Ps 147:3): People who feel their spiritual bankruptcy and helplessness, and who long for the help and salvation of God. Such people are in the right condition to be met and blessed by God. Compare "of contrite spirit" (Ps 31:18; Isa 66:2).

BROOCH

broch (chach): Used in plural by the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "bracelets") for a class of "jewels of gold" brought as offerings by both men and women of Israel (Ex 35:22). "Brooches," as Mackie says, is unoriental. The Hebrew word means most likely nose-rings.

See BRACELET; RING.

BROOK

brook (nachal, 'aphiq, ye'or, mikhal; cheimarrhos): In Palestine there are few large streams. Of the smaller ones many flow only during the winter, or after a heavy rain. The commonest Hebrew word for brook is nachal, which is also used for river and for valley, and it is not always clear whether the valley or the stream in the valley is meant (Nu 13:23; De 2:13; 2Sa 15:23). The Arabic wady, which is sometimes referred to in this connection, is not an exact parallel, for while it may be used of a dry valley or of a valley containing a stream, it means the valley and not the stream. 'Aphiq and ye'or are translated both "brook" and "river," ye'or being generally used of the Nile (Ex 1:22, etc.), though in Da 12:5-7, of

the Tigris. Cheirnarrhos, "winter-flowing," is applied in Joh 18:1 to the Kidron. Many of the streams of Palestine which are commonly called rivers would in other countries be called brooks, but in such a dry country any perennial stream assumes a peculiar importance.

Alfred Ely Day

BROOK OF EGYPT, THE

(nachal =" a flowing stream," "a valley"; best translated by the oriental word wady, which means, as the Hebrew word does, both a stream and its valley).

1. Name:

The Brook of Egypt is mentioned six times in the Old Testament (Nu 34:5; Jos 15:4,47; 1Ki 8:65; Isa 27:12); once, Ge 15:18, by another word, nahar. The Brook of Egypt was not an Egyptian stream at all, but a little desert stream near the borderland of Egypt a wady of the desert, and, perhaps, the dividing line between Canaan and Egypt. It is usually identified with the Wady el ‘Arish of modern geography.

2. Description:

The Brook of Egypt comes down from the plateau et Tih in the Sinai peninsula and falls into the Mediterranean Sea at latitude 31 5 North, longitude 33 42 East. Its source is at the foot of the central mountain group of the peninsula. The upper portion of the wady is some 400 ft. above the sea. Its course, with one sharp bend to the West in the upper part, runs nearly due North along the western slope of the plateau. Its whole course of 140 miles lies through the desert. These streams in the Sinai peninsula are usually dry water-courses, which at times become raging rivers, but are very seldom babbling "brooks." The floods are apt to come with little or no warning when cloudbursts occur in the mountain region drained.

3. Archaeology:

The use of the Hebrew word nachal for this wady points to a curious and most interesting and important piece of archaeological evidence on the critical question of the origin of the Pentateuch. In the Pentateuch, the streams of Egypt are designated by an Egyptian word (ye’or) which belongs to Egypt, as the word bayou does to the lower Mississippi valley, while every other stream mentioned, not except this desert stream, "the Brook of Egypt," is designated by one or other of two Hebrew words, na chal and nahar. Each of these words occurs 13 times in the Pentateuch, but never of the streams of Egypt. The use of nahar in Ex 7:19 in the account of the plagues is not really an exception for the word is then used generically in contrast with ye’or to distinguish between the "flowing streams," neharoth, and the sluggish irrigation branches of the Nile, ye’orim, "canals" (compare CANALS) (Isa 19:6; 33:21), while ye’or occurs 30 times but never of any other than the streams of Egypt. There is thus a most exa ct discrimination in the use of these various words, a discrimination which is found alike in the Priestly

Code (P), Jahwist (Jahwist), and Elohim (E) of the documentary theory, and also where the editor is supposed to have altered the documents. Such discrimination is scarcely credible on the hypothesis that the Pentateuch is by more than one author, in later than Mosaic times, or that it is by any author without Egyptian training. The documentary theory which requires these instances of the use of these various words for "river" to have been recorded by several different authors or redactors, in different ages and all several centuries after the Exodus, far away from Egypt and opportunities for accurate knowledge of its language, seems utterly incompatible with such discriminating use of these words. And even if the elimination of all mistakes be attributed to one person, a final editor, the difficulty is scarcely lessened. For as no purpose is served by this discriminating use of words, it is evidently a natural phenomenon. In every instance of the use of ye'or, one or other of the usual Hebrew words, nachal or nahar would have served the purpose of the author, just as any foreign religious writer might with propriety speak of the "streams of Louisiana," though a Louisianian would certainly call them "bayous." How does the author come to use ye'or even where his native Hebrew words might have been used appropriately? Why never, where its appropriateness is even doubtful, not even saying ye'or for nachal of the "Brook of Egypt"? It is not art, but experience, in the use of a language which gives such skill as to attend to so small a thing in so extensive use without a single mistake. The only time and place at which such experience in the use of Egyptian words is to be expected in Israel is among the people of the Exodus not long subsequent to that event.

M. G. Kyle

BROOM

broom: Occurs in 1Ki 19:4 m ("broomtree"); Job 30:4, and Ps 120:4 m as the translation of the Hebrew rothem, where the King James Version employed "juniper" which is retained in the Revised Version (British and American) text in 1Ki 19:4 and Job 30:4. Juniper is certainly incorrect and broom is not a particularly happy rendering. The rothem was doubtless the shrub called by the Arabs ratam, a shrub which casts so little shadow that it would be used for shade only when there was no other refuge from the desert sun, and would be eaten only in case of the direst necessity, but which could be burned and used for the making of charcoal.

See JUNIPER.

David Foster Estes

BROTH

broth (maraq): Equivalent to our "soup." When Gideon (Jud 6:19) made ready a kid, "the flesh he put in a basket," but, it is added, "he put the broth in a pot"; and he is told by the angel to "pour out the broth" (Jud 6:20). Isaiah 65:4 makes Yahweh speak of rebellious Israel as "a people that provoke me to my face continually sacrificing in gardens," and adds in description "that eat swine's flesh, and broth of abominable things is in their vessels" (maraq, paraq).

See FOOD.

BROTHER

bruth'-er ('ach; adelphos = kin by birth, from the same parents or parent): Used extensively in both Old Testament and New Testament of other relations and relationships, and expanding under Christ's teaching to include the universal brotherhood of man. Chiefly employed in the natural sense, as of Cain and Abel (Ge 4:8); of Joseph and his brethren (Ge 42:3); of Peter and Andrew, of James and John (Mt 10:2). Of other relationships:

(1) Abram's nephew, Lot, is termed "brother" (Ge 14:14);

(2) Moses' fellow-countrymen are "brethren" (Ex 2:11; Ac 3:22; compare Heb 7:5);

(3) a member of the same tribe (2Sa 19:12);

(4) an ally (Am 1:9), or an allied or cognate people (Nu 20:14);

(5) used of common discipleship or the kinship of humanity (Mt 23:8);

(6) of moral likeness or kinship (Pr 18:9);

(7) of friends (Job 6:15);

(8) an equal in rank or office (1Ki 9:13);

(9) one of the same faith (Ac 11:29; 1Co 5:11);

(10) a favorite oriental metaphor used to express likeness or similarity (Job 30:29, "I am a brother to jackals");

(11) a fellow-priest or office-bearer (Ezr 3:2); Paul called Sosthenes "brother" (1Co 1:1) and Timothy his spiritual son and associate (2Co 1:1);

(12) a brother-man, any member of the human family (Mt 7:3-5; Heb 2:17; 8:11; 1 Joh 2:9; 4:20);

(13) signifies spiritual kinship (Mat 12:50);

(14) a term adopted by the early disciples and Christians to express their fraternal love for each other in Christ, and universally adopted as the language of love and brotherhood in His kingdom in all

subsequent time (2Pe 3:15; Col 4:7,9,15).

The growing conception of mankind as a brotherhood is the outcome of this Christian view of believers as a household, a family (Eph 2:19; 3:15; compare Ac 17:26). Jesus has made "neighbor" equivalent to "brother," and the sense of fraternal affection and obligation essential to vital Christianity, and coextensive with the world. The rabbis distinguished between "brother" and "neighbor," applying "brother" to Israelites by blood, "neighbor" to proselytes, but allowing neither title to the Gentiles. Christ and the apostles gave the name "brother" to all Christians, and "neighbor" to all the world (1Co 5:11; Lu 10:29 ff). The missionary passion and aggressiveness of the Christian church is the natural product of this Christian conception of man’s true relation to man.

See also FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS.

Dwight M. Pratt

BROTHER’S WIFE

(yebhemeth =" a sister-in-law," "brother’s wife" (De 25:7,9); ‘ishshah =" a woman," "wife"; ‘esheth ‘ach =" brother’s wife" (Ge 38:8,9; Le 18:16; 20:21); he gune tou adelphou =" the brother’s wife" (Mr 6:18)): A brother’s wife occupies a unique position in Hebrew custom and law, by virtue of the institution of the Levirate. The widow had no hereditary rights in her husband’s property, but was considered a part of the estate, and the surviving brother of the deceased was considered the natural heir. The right to inherit the widow soon became a duty to marry her if the deceased had left no sons, and in case there was no brother-in-law, the duty of marriage devolved on the father-in-law or the agnate who inherited, whoever this might be. The first son of the Levirate marriage was regarded as the son of the deceased. This institution is found chiefly among people who hold to ancestral worship (Indians, Persians, Afghans, etc.), from which circumstances Benzinger (New Sch-Herz, IV, 276) derives th e explanation of this institution in Israel. The Levirate marriage undoubtedly existed as a custom before the Israelite settlement in Canaan, but after this received special significance because of the succession to the property of the first son of the marriage, since he was reckoned to the deceased, inherited from his putative, not from his real father, thus preventing the disintegration of property and its acquirement by strangers, at the same time perpetuating the family to which it belonged. While the law limited the matrimonial duty to the brother and permitted him to decline to marry the widow, such a course was attended by public disgrace (De 25:5 ff). By the law of Nu 27:8, daughters were given the right to inherit, in order that the family estate might be preserved, and the Levirate became limited to cases where the deceased had left no children at all.

Frank E. Hirsch

BROTHER-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

BROTHERHOOD

bruth’-er-hood: The rare occurrence of the term (only Zec 11:14 and 1Pe 2:17) in contrast with the abundant use of "brother," "brethren," seems to indicate that the sense of the vital relation naturally called for the most concrete expression: "the brethren." But in 1Pe 2:17 the abstract is used for the concrete. In the Old Testament the brotherhood of all Israelites was emphasized; but in the New Testament the brotherhood in Christ is a relation so much deeper and stronger as to eclipse the other.

See also BROTHER; BRETHREN.

BROTHERLY

bruth’-er-li (’ach, "brother"; philadelphia, "brotherly love"): Like a brother in all the large human relationships indicated above; e.g. the early friendly and fraternal alliance between Tyre and Israel as illustrated by "brotherly covenant" between David and Solomon, and Hiram, king of Tyre (2Sa 5:11; 1Ki 5:12), and repudiated in a later generation by the treachery of Tyre (Am 1:9).

See BROTHERLY KINDNESS (LOVE).

BROTHERLY KINDNESS; BROTHERLY LOVE

kind’-nes (the King James Version 2Pe 1:7), or LOVE (the King James Version Ro 12:10; 1Th 4:9; Heb 13:1; philadelphia):

1. As Moral Ideal:

In the Revised Version (British and American), "love of the brethren" in all places, and so in the King James Version of 1Pe 1:22, thus defining the disposition as love, and its objects as brethren. Since God is Father and men are His sons, they are therefore brethren of one another. As sonship is the most essential factor in man’s right relation to God, so is brotherhood in his relation to his fellow-man. Brotherhood is first known as the relation between sons of the same parent, a relation of tender affection and benevolence. It becomes gradually extended to kindred, and to members of the same tribe or nation. And the Christian ideal of society is that a similar relation should exist between all men without limit or distinction. Agape, "love" (see CHARITY), is the word in the New Testament that generally denotes this ideal. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" is the whole law of conduct as between man and man (Mt 22:39,40); and neighbor includes every man within one’s reach (Lu 10:29 ff), even enemies (Mt 5:44; Lu 6:35). Without the love of man, the love of God is impossible, but "he that abideth in love abideth in God" (1Jo 4:16,20).

2. As Actual Between Christians:

But man’s sonship to God may be potential or actual. He may not respond to God’s love or know His Fatherhood. Likewise love to man may not be reciprocated, and therefore may be incomplete. Yet it is the Christian’s duty, like God, to maintain his disposition of love and benevolence to those that hate and curse him (Lu 6:27,28). But within the Christian community, love should respond to love, and find its fulfillment, for there all men are, or should be, God’s sons actually, "because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts, through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us" (Ro 5:5). And this mutual love within the Christian brotherhood (1Pe 5:9) is called philadelphia.

3. Stoic Teaching:

This twofold ideal of social morality as universal benevolence and mutual affection had been foreshadowed by the STOICS (which see). Men as citizens of the world should adopt an attitude of justice and mercy toward all men, even slaves; but within the community of the "wise" there should be the mutual affection of friendship.

4. Christian Advance on Heathen Thought:

Christianity succeeded in organizing and realizing in intense and practical fellowship the ideal that remained vague and abstract in the Greek schools: "See how these Christians love one another." It was their Master’s example followed, and His commandment and promise fulfilled: "Love one another .... as I have loved you ....; by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples" (Joh 13:14,34,35). Paul in his earliest epistle bears witness that the Thessalonians practice love "toward all the brethren that are in all Macedonia," even as they had been taught of God, but urges them to "abound more and more" (1Th 4:9,10). For the healing of differences, and to build up the church in order and unity, he urges the Romans "in love of the brethren (to) be tenderly affectioned one to another" (Ro 12:10). Christians must even "forbear one another in love" (Eph 4:2) and "walk in love, even as Christ also loved you" (Eph 5:2; Php 2:1,2). It involves some suffering and sacrifice. The author of the Epistle to the He recognizes the presence of "love of the brethren" and urges that it may continue (Heb 13:1). It is the direct result of regeneration, of purity and obedience to the truth (1Pe 1:22,23). It proceeds from godliness and issues in love (2Pe 1:7). "Love of the brethren" (agape) is the one practical topic of John’s epistles. It is the message heard from the beginning, "that we should love one another" 1Jo 3:11,23. It is the test of light and darkness (1Jo 2:10); life and death (1Jo 3:14); children of God or children of the devil (1Jo 3:10; 4:7-12). Without it there can be no knowledge or love of God (1Jo 4:20), but when men love God and obey Him, they necessarily love His children (1Jo 5:2). No man can be of God’s family, unless his love extends to all its members.

T. Rees

BROW

brou: Is found in Isa 48:4, "thy brow brass" as the translation of metsch, meaning "to be clear," i.e. conspicuous. In Lu 4:29 "led him unto the brow of the hill" is the rendering of ophras, literally "the

eyebrow," but used throughout Greek literature as any prominent point or projection of land (compare use of supercilium in Verg. Georg. i.108).

BROWN

See COLORS.

BRUISE; BRUISED

brooz, broozd: The noun occurs in Isa 1:6 the King James Version, "bruises and putrifying sores," as the translation of chabbarah. The verb translations a number of Hebrew words, the principal ones being:

(1) shuph (Ge 3:15 (twice));

(2) daqaq (Isa 28:28 (twice) (the American Standard Revised Version "ground," "and though the wheel of his cart and his horses scatter it, he doth not grind it" for the King James Version "nor break it with the wheels of his cart, nor bruise it with his horsemen"));

(3) dakha', in the classical passage, Isa 53:5, "He was bruised for our iniquities," Isa 53:10, "Yet it pleased Yahweh to bruise him";

(4) ratsats, "A bruised reed shall he not break," Isa 42:3 (quoted in Mt 12:20).

In the New Testament bruise is the translation of sparasso, "to rend" (the American Standard Revised Version "bruising him sorely") Lu 9:39; of suntribo, "to break to pieces" (Mt 12:20); "shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly" (Ro 16:20); of thrauo in Lu 4:18 in the quotation from Isa 58:6, "to set at liberty them that are bruised" (WH omits the verse).

Arthur J. Kinsella

BRUIT

broot (shema'): A word no longer in common use (marked "archaic" and "obsolete" by Murray), signifying a rumor or report. The word occurs in the King James Version Jer 10:22 (the Revised Version (British and American) "rumour"; the American Standard Revised Version "tidings") and the King James Version Na 3:19 (the Revised Version (British and American) "bruit," appendix. "report"; the American Standard Revised Version "report").

BRUTE; BRUTISH

broot, brootish (ba'ar, "stupid"; alogos, "without speech," hence, irrational, unreasonable (Ac 25:27; 2Pe

2:12; Jude 1:10 the King James Version)): The man who denies God acts in an irrational way. Such persons are described as brutish (Ps 49:10; 92:6; 94:8; Jer 10:14,21; 51:17). These are stupid, unteachable. This is a graphic description of the atheist. The proverb, "No fool like the learned fool," is especially true of the ignorance of the unbelievers of the Scriptures. Their obj ections to the Bible, as a rule, are utterly ridiculous. The word is occasionally used in the sense of thoughtless ignorance. Brutish counsel is counsel that is foolish, unreasonable (Isa 19:11). The term is used by Agur (Pr 30:2) to express the low estimate he has of himself and his conscious lack of knowledge.

Jacob W. Kapp

BUBASTIS

bu-bas’-tis.

See PI-BESETH.

BUCKET

buk’-et (deli): The word is found only in Isa 40:15; Nu 24:7, in the latter passage in a figurative use. The bucket was doubtless a waterskin with two cross-pieces at the top to fit it for use in drawing water, like those now in use in Palestine. The ordinary word for water-skin is a different one (no’dh).

BUCKLE

buk’-’-l (porpe): As a mark of favor Jonathan Maccabeus was presented by Alexander Balas with a buckle of gold (1 Macc 10:89), the wearing of which was restricted to the blood royal. The buckle was used for fastening the mantle or outer robe on the shoulder or chest.

BUCKLER

buk’-ler: God is called a "buckler" (the Revised Version (British and American) "shield") to them that trust Him (Ps 18:2,30; 2Sa 22:31; Pr 2:7).

See ARMOR.

BUD

See FLOWERS.

BUFFALO

buf’-a-lo.

See CATTLE.

BUFFET

buf’-et (kolaphizo, "to beat with the fist"): Refers to bodily maltreatment and violence: "Then did they spit in his face and buffet him" (Mt 26:67; Mr 14:65; 1Co 4:11; 1Pe 2:20). Paul speaks of "a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me" (2Co 12:7). Used figuratively of self-control: "I buffet (the King James Version keep under, the Revised Version, margin "bruise") my body, and bring it into bondage" (1Co 9:27). The Greek in this passage reads hupopiazo, literally "to give a blow beneath the eye." In Lu 18:5 the same word is rendered "wear out": "Lest she wear roe out by her continual coming" (the King James Version "weary me" the Revised Version, margin "bruise me") (see Pape’s Lexicon, under the word).

L. Kaiser

BUGEAN

bu-je’-an, ba’-je-an (Bougaios): An epithet given to Haman in Apocrypha, Additions to Esther 12:6, the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version has "Agagite".

BUILD; BUILDING

bild, bild’-ing (banah, binyah, once (Eze 41:13); oikodomeo).

1. Building Conditions:

The building conditions existing at the time of the Hebrew conquest were rude and untutored, and, with the exception of the work of the Solomonic period, there was still little or no effort made to introduce a higher state, until the time when Greek influence began to be felt (circa 3rd century BC). In localities where stone was not available, mud bricks were used, and their perishable nature being realized, stone slab facing came into use. These slabs were a protection against the weather and had no constructive value. Probably the hand of the "jerry" builder can be seen in an attempt to make such bad construction appear to be solid stone.

2. Masonry:

In stone localities buildings were of stone, but the class of building was only that of the rude stone waller. Random rubble masonry, unskillfully laid, was the prevailing characteristic. Occasionally a piece of carefully dressed masonry is found, but it is the exception and is often a re-use of an earlier type akin

to "sawed stone" (1Ki 7:9). The remains of Jewish walls of the period of the early kings in Jerusalem show skill which does not appear to have existed elsewhere. The boss and margin stones, with wide mud joint, were, in part, the actual masonry of the early fortifications, and were re-used and imitated over and over again. The type crops up in feeble imitation at different sites throughout the country, but hammer-picked and rough hammer-dressed stones are also common. The fine comb pick and marginal dressing of the walls of the Temple area belong to the Herodian period (see Bliss and Dickie, "Excavations at Jerusalem," 273 ff, PEFS, 1898). The absence of lime is a striking characteristic. There is no distinctive type which can be named exclusively Jewish, although there is good reason for believing that the boss and margin type has a Jewish origin. Wilson (Golgotha, 124) points out that the projecting bosses had a defensive value, in breaking the force of the battering-ram, and here again the necessity of defense shows its vitality in the existence of such a well-engineered detail. The absence of the finer qualities of building craft can be traced to the same source.

3. Foundations:

Foundations of fortifications were usually on rock which was sometimes squared for a bed, but more often leveled up with small stones. A portion of the South wall of Jerusalem, certainly late (5th century AD), was laid on a foundation of small rubble resting on debris, accumulated over an earlier wall. (See Plate IV, Excavations at Jerusalem, p. 29.) In smaller buildings, the foundations were usually laid on the debris of earlier structures. At Lachish mud brick walls were laid on a foundation of stone . A peculiar method of spreading a layer of sand under the foundations was also noted (see A Mound of Many Cities, 125-26).

4. Modern Methods:

The native wall of today is less rudely built and is bedded in lime mortar. It is a broad wall usually about 3 ft. thick, with inner and outer faces of large stones, filled in between with small rubble without proper bond, somewhat in the manner of ancient building. To make up for the want of bond, it is a common habit to insert a piece of steel joint across the return angle (see BEAM). The building and hewing methods, in all probability, are the same as they were in early Jewish times. Hewers sit at their work, with the plane of the stone on which they operate, lying obliquely from them. Stones are conveyed from the quarry, if at a distance from the building site, on donkeys, thence on men’s backs to the top of the wall, by rude gangways. Every man digs his "own cistern" (Isa 36:16), which is sunk in the rock under the site of the house, and used as a quarry from which stones for the building are supplied. If water is scarce, the cistern is sunk first, and the winter rains are allowed to collect and provide the necessary water for the building.

5. Figurative:

To build up is often used in the sense of giving increase and prosperity, or of stablishing and strengthening. Thus in Job 22:23; Ps 69:35; Jer 18:9. A kindred sense is to restore what was decayed, as in Isa 58:12. To "build an house" for a person is to grant him children or a numerous posterity (Ru 4:11;

of David, 2Sa 7:27; 1Ch 17:10). Spiritually, the word is used of one's work in life, or of the formation of character and habits. The main thing here is the foundation. Those who build on Christ's word build on rock; those who reject this word build on sand (Mt 7:24-27). Christ is the sole true foundation; the work which a man builds on this will be tried by fire (1Co 3:9-15). The church is compared to a building (1Co 3:9; 1Pe 2:4-6) reared on the foundation of apostles and prophets (their truths or teaching), Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone (Eph 2:20-22). Believers are "builded up" in Christ (Col 2:7), and are exhorted to build themselves up on their most holy faith (Jude 1:20).

See ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE; FORTIFICATION.

A. C. Dickie

BUILDER

bild'-er (banah; oikodomeo, technites): "To build," "builder," ete, are in the Old Testament commonly the translation of banah, "to build," occurring very frequently; see BUILD, BUILDING. The literal significance leads also to several figurative applications, especially to God as Divine Builder:

(1) as establishing, e.g. the nation (Ps 69:35; 102:16; Jer 12:16), the throne of David (Ps 89:4), Jerusalem (Ps 147:2);

(2) in restoration—rebuilding (Isa 58:12; 61:4; 65:21; Jer 31:4,28; 42:10; Eze 36:36; Am 9:11; compare Ac 15:16);

(3) as establishing in prosperity (Job 22:23; 1Sa 2:35; Jer 24:6; compare Ge 16:2 the Revised Version, margin, Hebrew, "be builded by her");

(4) the firm establishment of the Divine attributes (Ps 89:2);

(5) Divine opposition (La 3:5, "He hath builded against me"); compare Job 19:8;

(6) the choosing of a corner-stone which the builders rejected (Ps 118:22,23; quoted by Christ (Mt 21:42; Mr 12:10; Lu 20:17); by Peter (Ac 4:11; 1Pe 2:7)).

In the New Testament Christians are represented as being:

(1) built by God (1Co 3:9,16) on Christ as the one foundation (Mt 16:18, on Jesus as the Christ; 1Pe 2:5 f; Ac 9:31 the Revised Version, margin; Ro 15:20; 1Co 3:10,12,14 (epoikodomo); Eph 2:20);

(2) as being continuously and progressively built up in their faith and life (Ac 20:32; 1Co 8:1 the Revised Version, margin, "buildeth up"; Ac 10:23 margin, Greek "build up"; Ac 14:4,17 m; 1Th 5:11;

compare Jude 1:20);

(3) they are "builded togethe r" (sunoikodomeo) in Christ (Eph 2:22; Col 2:7 (epoikodomeo); compare 1Co 3:9);

(4) "builded up" is used in a bad sense (1Co 8:10 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "emboldened," the Revised Version, margin "be builded up");

(6) in Heb 3:4 God is represented as the Builder (establisher) of all things, the Revised Version, margin "established," and in 11:10 as the Builder (technites), of the New Jerusalem; in Heb 9:11 for "building" the Revised Version (British and American) has "creation" (ktisis);

(7) in 1Co 3:10-14; Ga 2:18, building represents constructing a system of teaching; Paul speaks of himself as "a wise master-builder" (sophos architekton).

W. L. Walker

BUKKI

buk’-i (buqqi, "mouth of Jah"):

(1) A Danite, son of the tribal prince Jogli (Nu 34:22); he was one of the representative chiefs who assisted in the division of the land.

(2) Son of Abishua and father of Izzi, a priest, fourth in descent from Aaron, in the line of Eleazar (1Ch 6:5,51), and ancestor of Ezra (Ezr 7:4). In 2 Esdras 1:2 the name appears as Borith, and in 1 Esdras 8:2 as Boccas.

BUKKIAH

buk-i’-a (buqqiyahu, "proved of God"): A Levite, son of Heman (1Ch 25:4,13).

See BAKBUKIAH.

BUL

bul (bul): Name of the 8th month of the Jewish year (1Ki 6:38). It is of Phoenician origin and signifies the month of rain, the beginning of the rainy season.

See CALENDAR.

BULL, WILD

See ANTELOPE; CATTLE.

BULL; BULLOCK

bool, bool’-ok.

See CATTLE.

BULLS, JEROBOAM’S

See CALF (GOLDEN).

BULRUSH

bool’-rush.

See REED.

BULRUSHES, ARK OF

See ARK OF BULRUSHES.

BULWARK

bool’-wark: The word represents several Hebrew terms (chel, Isa 26:1; chelah, Ps 48:13; matsodh, Ec 9:14; matsor, De 20:20). In 2Ch 26:15 the word is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "battlements."

See FORTIFICATION.

BUNAH

bu’-na (bunah); A son of Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:25).

BUNCH

bunsh: Is used of

(1) a "bunch of hyssop" (Ex 12:22, ‘aghuddah);

(2) a "cluster of raisins" (2Sa 16:1 the King James Version; 1Ch 12:40 the King James Version tsimmuq =" something dried or shriveled");

(3) a "camel’s hump" (Isa 30:6 the King James Version dabbesheth): of obscure etymology.

BUNDLE

bun’-d’-l: Represents in English Versions of the Bible the words tseror, from a verb meaning "cramp" "bind," etc. (Ge 42:35; 1Sa 25:29; So 1:13); tsebheth, from a verb probably meaning "to grasp" (Ru 2:16); and deseme, from deo, "to tie up," "bind," hence, literally "bundle," just as the English word is derived from "bind" (Mt 13:30); and plethos, properly "multitude." The custom of binding up precious things in bundles (compare So 1:13) is the basis of the very interesting metaphor in 1Sa 25:29: "The soul of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life with Yahweh thy God," or perhaps better, "in the bundle of the living in the care of Yahweh"—an assurance of perfect safety.

J. R. Van Pelt

BUNNI

bun’-i (bunni, buni, bunni; compare BANI):

(1) A Levite (Ne 9:4). The repetition of Bani’s name in this passage is probably a scribal error. The Syriac version for the second "Bani" reads "Binnui"; but as, in Ne 10:9 and Ne 12:8, Binnui’s name comes, as here, between those of Jeshua and Kadmiel, we should substitute Binnui here for the first Bani. The Septuagint renders all three names as if the Hebrew in each case had been bene, "sons of," reducing the proper names in the verse to five. The names probably stand for chief Levitical houses rather than individuals.

(2) Another Levite, one of the overseers of the temple, father of Hashabiah, according to Ne 11:15; but, according to 1Ch 9:14, Hashabiah is "of the sons of Merari" The reading in Nehemiah is a corruption of the one in Ch.

H. J. Wolf

BURDEN

bur’-dn.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament more than one word is rendered "burden."

(1) massa', from a root nasa' "he lifted up." Thus literally any load is called massa' (Ex 23:5; Nu 4:15,24,27 ff; 2Ki 5:17; 8:9). Figuratively, people are a burden (Nu 11:11,17; De 1:12; 2Sa 15:33; 19:35). A man may be a burden to himself (Job 7:20). Iniquities are a burden (Ps 38:4). Taxes may be a burden (Ho 8:10).

(2) In both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) massa' is translated "burden," as applied to certain prophetic utterances; but both the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin have "oracle." Examples are Isa 13:1; 14:28, and often; Jer 23:33,36,38, no marginal reading; Eze 12:10; Na 1:1; Hab 1:1; Zec 9:1; 12:1; Mal 1:1. As was natural under the circumstances, such oracles usually denounced judgment upon place or people. Hence, probably the translation "burden." But some of these prophetic utterances do not contain denunciation or threat (Zec 12). The passage in Jer, moreover, implies that the prophet used the term in the sense of "oraele," for scoffers are reproved for perverting the word and giving it the meaning "burden." Massa', therefore, means something taken up with solemnity upon the lips, whether threatening or not, and the rendering, "burden," ought most likely to be given up.

The word mas'-eth, of the same derivation as massa', is applied to foolish oracles (La 2:14 the King James Version, oracles the American Standard Revised Version, burdens the American Revised Version, margin, burdens the Revised Version (British and American), oracles the Revised Version, margin; Am 5:11, burdens the King James Version, exactions the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American)).

Massa' is used also in Pr 30:1 and Pr 31:1, and is variously rendered prophecy (the King James Version), oracle (American Revised Version), burden, or the name of the speaker's country (Revised Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin), oracle (Revised Version). The reading is doubtful, but probably the reference is to the speaker's country- -"Jakeh, of Massa" (compare Ge 25:14), "Lemuel king of Massa."

Other words translated "burden" are from the root cabhal, "to bear a load" (Ne 4:17; Ps 81:6; 1Ki 11:28; King James Version margin, charge the King James Version, labor the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American), burden the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin, Ex 5:4,5; 6:6,7; Isa 10:27; Isa 14:25).

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament several Greek words mean "burden."

(1) baros, "something heavy." Burdens of the day (Mt 20:12), the burden of duty to be borne, a difficult requirement (Ac 15:28; Re 2:24). The burden of one's moral infirmities (Ga 6:2).

(2) phortion, "something to be borne." The obligation which Christ imposes (Mt 11:30); the legal ordinances of the Pharisees (Lu 11:46); a man’s individual responsibility (Ga 6:5). Whether any clear and consistent distinction can be made between these two words is doubtful. Probably, however, phortion refers to the load as something to be borne, whether heavy or light, whilst baros may be an oppressive load. According to Lightfoot baros may suggest a load of which a man may rightly rid himself should occasion serve, but phortion a burden which he is expected to bear, as every soldier carries his own pack. But most likely too much weight should not be given to these distinctions.

(3) There is also the word gomos, "the freight" of a ship (Ac 21:3); compare ogkos, weight or encumbrance which impedes the runner’s progress to the goal (Heb 12:1), with particular reference to the superfluous flesh which an athlete seeks to get rid of in training (compare 1Co 9:24-27), and figuratively whatever hinders the full development of Christian manhood.

George Henry Trever

BURGLARY

bur’-gla-ri.

See CRIMES.

BURIAL

ber’-i-al (qebhurah; compare New Testament to entaphidsai):

I. IMMEDIATE BURIAL CONSIDERED URGENT

1. Reasons for This

2. The Burial of Jesus

3. The Usual Time

4. Duties of Next of Kin

II. PREPARATIONS FOR BURIAL

1. Often Informal and Hasty

2. Usually with More Ceremony

3. Contrasts between Jewish Customs and Other Peoples’

(1) Cremation

(2) Embalming

III. ON THE WAY TO THE GRAVE

1. Coffins Unknown

2. Professional Mourners

IV. AT THE GRAVE

1. Graves Dug in the Earth

2. Family Tombs. Later Customs

3. Sealed Stones

4. Stated Times of Mourning

5. Excessive Mourning

6. Dirge-Songs

V. FAILURE TO RECEIVE BURIAL A CALAMITY OR JUDGMENT

VI. PLACES OF BURIAL: HOW MARKED

LITERATURE

It is well to recall at the outset that there are points of likeness and of marked contrast between oriental and occidental burial customs in general, as well as between the burial customs of ancient Israel and those of other ancient peoples. These will be brought out, or suggested later in this article. **I. Immediate Burial Considered Urgent.**

1. Reasons for This:

The burial of the dead in the East in general was and is often effected in such a way as to suggest to the westerner indecent haste. Dr. Post says that burial among the people of Syria today seldom takes place later than ten hours after death, often earlier; but, he adds, "the rapidity of decomposition, the excessive violence of grief, the reluctance of Orientals to allow the dead to remain long in the houses of the living, explain what seems to us the indecency of haste." This still requires the survivors, as in the case of Abraham on the death of Sarah, to bury their dead out of their sight (Ge 23:1-4); and it in part explains the quickness with which the bodies of Nadab and Abihu were Carried out of the camp (Le 10:4), and those of Ananias and Sapphira were hastened off to burial (Ac 5:1-11). Then, of course, the defilement to which contact with a dead body gave occasion, and the judgment that might come upon a house for harboring the body of one dying under a Divine judgment, further explain such urgency and haste.

2. The Burial of Jesus:

It was in strict accordance with such customs and the provision of the Mosaic law (De 21:23; compare Ga 3:13), as well as in compliance with the impulses of true humanity, that Joseph of Arimathea went to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus for burial on the very day of the crucifixion (Mt 27:39 ff).

3. The Usual Time:

The dead are often in their graves, according to present custom, within two or three hours after death. Among oriental Jews burial takes place, if possible, within twenty-four hours after death, and frequently on the day of death. Likewise Mohammedans bury their dead on the day of death, if death takes place in the morning; but if in the afternoon or at night, not until the following day.

4. Duties of Next of Kin:

As soon as the breath is gone the oldest son, or failing him, the nearest of kin present, closes the eyes of the dead (compare Ge 46:4, "and Joseph shall put his hand upon thine eyes"). The mouth, too, is closed and the jaws are bound up (compare Joh 11:44, "and his face was bound about with a napkin"). The death is announced, as it was of old, by a tumult of lamentation preceded by a shrill cry, and the weeping and wailing of professional mourners (compare Mr 5:38 ff).

See MOURNING.

II. Preparations for Burial.

1. Often Informal and Hasty:

These are often informal and hasty. Under the tyranny of such customs as those noted, it is often impossible to make them elaborate. Canon Tristram says: "As interments take place at latest on the evening of the day of death, and frequently at night, there can be no elaborate preparations. The corpse, dressed in such clothes as were worn in life, is stretched on a bier with a cloth thrown over it, until

carried forth for burial" (Eastern Customs, 94). In Ac 5:6 we read of Ananias, "The young men .... wrapped him round, and they carried him out and buried him." "What they did," as Dr. Nicol says, "was likely this: they unfastened his girdle, and then taking the loose under-garment and the wide cloak which was worn above it, used them as a winding-sheet to cover the corpse from head to foot." In other words, there was little ceremony and much haste.

2. Usually with More Ceremony:

Usually, however, there was more ceremony and more time taken. Missionaries and natives of Syria tell us that it is still customary to wash the body (compare Ac 9:37), anoint it with aromatic ointments (compare Joh 12:7; 19:39; Mr 16:1; Lu 24:1), swathe hands and feet in grave-bands, usually of linen (Joh 11:44), and cover the face or bind it about with a napkin or handkerchief (Joh 11:44). It is still common to place in the wrappings of the body aromatic spices and other preparations to retard decomposition. Thus the friends at Bethany prepared the body of Lazarus, and he came forth wrapped in grave-bands and with a napkin bound about his face. And, we are further told that after the burial of Jesus, Nicodemus brought "a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds," and that they "took the body of Jesus, and bound it in linen cloths with the spices, as the custom of the Jews is to bury," and that Mary Magdalene and two other women brought spices for the same purpose (Joh 19:39,40; Mr 16:1; Lu 24:1). That this was a very old custom is witnessed by such passages as 2Ch 16:14, where it is said that Asa, the king, was laid "in the bed which was filled with sweet odors and divers kinds of spices prepared by the perfumers' art" (compare Joh 12:3,7; Sirach 38:16). From Ac 5:6; 8:2 it appears that there was in later times a confraternity of young men whose business it was to attend to these proprieties and preparations on behalf of the dead; but it was probably only in exceptional cases that they were called upon to act. Certainly such ministries ordinarily devolved, as they do now, upon loving relatives and friends, and mostly women, among the Jews as well as among the Greeks. The practice among the Greeks, both by similarity and contrast, affords an interesting illustration. The following instance is aptly cited in D B (art. "Burial"): Electra believing Orestes to be dead and his ashes placed in the sepulchral urn (Soph. Electra 1136-52), addresses him thus: "Woe is me! These loving hands have not washed or decked thy corpse, nor taken, as was meet, their sad burden from the flaming pyre. At the hands of strangers, hapless one, thou hast had those rites, and so art come to us, a little dust in a narrow urn."

3. Contrasts between Jewish Customs and Other Peoples':

This brings us to note two marked contrasts between customs in Israel and among other peoples.

(1) Cremation:

With the Greeks it was customary to cremate the dead (see CREMATION); but there was nothing in Jewish practice exactly corresponding to this. Tacitus (Hist. v.5) expressly says, in noting the contrast with Roman custom, that it was a matter of piety with the Jews "to bury rather than to burn dead bodies." The burning of the bodies of Saul and his sons by the men of Jabesh-Gilead (1Sa 31:11-13) seems to have been rather a case of emergency, than of conformity to any such custom, as the charred bones were

buried by the same men under the tamarisk at Jabesh, and later, by David's order, removed and laid to rest in the sepulcher of Kish (2Sa 21:12-14). According to the Mosaic law burning was reserved, either for the living who had been found guilty of unnatural sins (Le 20:4; 21:9), or for those who died under a curse, as in the case of Achan and his family, who after they had been stoned to death were, with all their belongings, burned with fire (Jos 7:25).

(2) Embalming:

As the burning practiced by the Greeks found no place in Jewish law and custom, so embalming, as practiced by the Egyptians, was unknown in Israel, the cases of Jacob and Joseph being clearly special, and in conformity to Egyptian custom under justifying circumstances. When Jacob died it was Joseph, the Egyptian official, who "commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father" (Ge 50:2), and it was conventionally the fit thing that when Joseph himself died his body was embalmed and "put in a coffin (sarcophagus) in Egypt" (Ge 50:26).

III. On the Way to the Grave:

When the preparations were made and the time came, the corpse was carried to the grave on a bier, or litter (miTTah). 1. Coffins Unknown:

Coffins were unknown in ancient Israel, as they are among the Jews of the East to this day. The only one mentioned in the Bible is the sarcophagus in which the embalmed body of Joseph was preserved, unless Asa's bed (2Ch 16:14) be another, as some think. Moslems, like eastern Jews, never use coffins. The bier sometimes has a pole at each corner by means of which it is carried on the shoulders to the tomb.

See BIER.

2. Professional Mourners:

The procession of mourners is made up largely, of course, of relatives and friends of the deceased, but is led by professional mourning women, who make the air resound with their shrieks and lamentations (compare Ec 12:5; Jer 9:17; Am 5:16). See MOURNING. Am 5:16 alludes to this custom in describing the mourning that shall be over the desolations of Israel: "Wailing shall be in all the broad ways; and they shall say in all the streets, Alas! alas! and they shall call the husbandman to mourning, and such as are skillful in lamentation to wailing." (Jer 9:17,18) breaks out: "Call for the mourning women, that they may come; .... and let them make haste, and take up a wailing for us, that our eyes may run down with tears, and our eyelids gush out with waters." Dr. Fred. Bliss tells of a mourning delegation at the mahal, or mourning house, of a great man. "No matter how gaily they may be chatting they approach, when they reach the house they rush forward, handkerchiefs to face, sobbing, weeping, with utmost demonstrations of grief, going through them time after time as occasion requires." Amelia B. Edwards gives a vivid account of her first experience with such mourning: "It rose like the far-off wavering sound of many owls. It shrilled, swelled, wavered, dropped, and then died away, like the moaning of the wind

at sea. We never heard anything so wild and plaintive." Among some Jews of today, it is said, the funeral procession moves swiftly, because there are supposed to be innumerable evil spirits (shedhim) hovering about, desirous to attack the soul, which is thought to be in the body until interment takes place and the corpse is actually covered (see DB, article "Burial").

IV. At the Grave.

When the grave, or place of entombment, is reached ceremonies more or less characteristic and peculiar to the Orient take place.

1. Graves Dug in the Earth:

When the body is let down into the ground, the bier, of course, is set aside, and at first a heap of stones only is piled over the shallow grave—to preserve the dead from the dreaded depredations of hyenas, jackals or thieves. Beyond question graves among ancient Jews were often simply dug in the earth, as they are with us, and as they are with Jews at Jerusalem and elsewhere in the East today. 2. Family Tombs. Later Customs:

But originally, it would seem to have been customary for each family to have a family tomb: either a natural cave, prepared with stone shelves to receive the bodies, or else hewn out of rock in the hillside, each tomb, or sepulcher, having many niches or loculi, in each one of which a body could be placed (see Ge 25:10; 49:31; 50:13; 35:19; Jos 24:32). As Dr. Nicol says, "All among the Israelites who possessed any land, or who could afford it, had their family tombs, hewn out of the rock, each sepulchre containing many niches. Many generations of a family could thus be placed in the ancestral tomb." Countless numbers of such tombs are to be found all over Palestine, but Machpelah, of course, is the chief example (Ge 23). Compare the cases of Joshua buried in his inheritance at Timnath-serah (Jos 24:30), Samuel in his house at Ramah (1Sa 25:1), Joab in his house in the wilderness (1Ki 2:34), Manasseh in the garden of his house (2Ki 21:18), Josiah in the same tomb, it would seem, as his fath er and grandfather (2Ki 23:30), and Asa, singled out for special mention (2Ch 16:14). According to custom, too, the Jew was not to sell his burying-place, if it was possible for him to hold it. Today in the Orient it is quite different—burying-places of Moslem, Jewish and Christian peoples, while distinct from each other, are community rather than family burying-places.

3. Sealed Stones:

When the tomb was a cave, or was dug out from some rock, the entrance was often closed with a large circular stone set up on its edge or rim and rolled in its groove to the front of the mouth of the tomb, so as to close it securely. This stone was then often further secured by a strap, or by sealing. In such case it could easily be seen or known if the tomb had been disturbed. Pilate, it will be recalled, directed that the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea, in which the body of Jesus was laid, should be carefully sealed and made as secure as the officials could make it. "So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them" (Mt 27:66).

4. Stated Times of Mourning:

In Syria, as elsewhere in the East, it is customary to have stated times after the burial for mourning at the tomb—for example on the third, seventh, and fortieth days, and again on the anniversary of the burial. The relatives or friends then go to the tomb without ornaments, often with hair disheveled; sometimes with head covered and faces blackened with soot, or ashes, or earth, in their oldest and poorest clothing, which is sometimes violently rent, and, sitting or moving in a circle around or near to the tomb, they break out in spells into weird, dirge-like singing or wailing.

5. Excessive Mourning:

The violence of grief at times leads to lacerations of the body and the shedding of blood. Morier (Second Journey through Persia), describing a celebration which takes place annually to commemorate the death of the grandson of Mohammed, says: "I have seen the most violent of them, as they vociferated Ya Hosein! walk the streets with their bodies streaming with blood by the voluntary cuts they had given themselves". Such cutting of the flesh in mourning for the dead was specifically forbidden by the Mosaic law (Le 19:28; 21:5; De 14:1). But excessive mourning for the dead is often alluded to in Scripture (see 2Sa 1:11,12; Ps 6:6; 119:136; La 1:16; 3:48; Jer 9:1).

6. Dirge-Songs:

The custom of dirge-songs seems to be alluded to (Mt 9:23; Mr 5:38) in the narrative of the healing of the ruler’s daughter: "Jesus came into the ruler’s house, and saw the flute-players, and the crowd making a tumult." A characteristic oriental funeral procession and burial are vividly pictured in the narrative of the burial of Jacob (Ge 50:6-13).

V. Failure to Receive Burial Counted a Calamity or a Judgment.

Any lack of proper burial is still regarded in the East, as it was in ancient times, as a great indignity or a judgment from God. It is esteemed the greatest calamity that can befall a person. It gives men still untold distress to think they shall not receive suitable burial, according to the customs of their respective race, or family, or religion—a fact or sentiment that is often alluded or appealed to by way of illustration in the Scriptures. For a corpse to remain unburied and become food for beasts of prey was the climax of indignity or judgment (2Sa 21:10,11; 1Ki 13:22; 14:11; 16:4; 21:24; 2Ki 9:37; Jer 7:33; 8:1; Eze 29:5; Ps 79:3; Re 11:9), and uncovered blood cried for vengeance (Eze 24:6 f; 39:11-16), the idea being the same as among other oriental peoples, that the unburied dead would not only inflict trouble upon his family, but bring defilement also and a curse upon the whole land. It was, therefore, an obligation resting upon all to bury even the dead found by the way (Tobit 1:18; 2:8). Even malefactors were to be allowed burial (De 21:22,23), and the exceptional denial of it to the sons of Rizpah gave occasion for the touching story of her self-denying care of the dead found in 2Sa 21:10,11.

VI. Places of Burial: How Marked.

Ordinary graves were marked by the heaping of crude stones, but hewn stones and sometimes costly pillars were set up as memorials of the dead (Eze 39:15; 2Ki 23:17 the Revised Version (British and American), "What monument is that which I see?" the reference being to a sepulchral pillar). Jacob set up a pillar over Rachel's grave (Ge 35:20), and her tomb is marked by a monument to this day. Absalom's grave in the wood of Ephraim had a heap of stones raised over it (2Sa 18:17), but in this case, as in the case of Achan, it was not for honor but for dishonor. In New Testament times the place of burial was uniformly outside the cities and villages (see Lu 7:12; Joh 11:30). There was public provision made for the burial of strangers (Mt 27:7), as in the closing days of the monarchy there was a public burying-ground at Jerusalem (Jer 26:23), probably where it is to this day between the city wall and the Kidron Valley. Thousands of Jewish graves on the sloping sides of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, where the Jews have come from all lands to be buried, bear witness today to the belief that associates the coming of Messiah with a blessed resurrection. Many Jews hold that Messiah, when He comes, will descend upon the Mount of Olives, and will pass through these resting-places of the dead as He enters the Holy City in glory.

LITERATURE.

HDB, article "Burial"; Keil, Biblical Arch., II, 199 f; Nowack, Heb Arch., I, 187 ff; "Burial" and "Tombs" in Kitto, Cycl.; Thomson, LB (see "Funerals" in Index); Tristram, Eastern Customs in Bible Lands; Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs.

George B. Eager

BURIER

ber'-i-er (kabhar): "Set up a sign by it, till the buriers have buried it" (Eze 39:15). "When the searchers found any human remains as they passed through the land, they were to set up a mark to attract the attention of the buriers, who followed them" (Dummelow's Commentary, in the place cited.).

See BURIAL.

BURN; BURNING

burn, burn'-ing: Figurative: In addition to the ordinary meaning, burn is used metaphorically in the following passages of the New Testament:

(1) kaio (Lu 24:32), "Was not our heart burning within us," i.e. greatly moved.

(2) puroo, used twice, once in the sense of inflamed with sexual desire (1Co 7:9), "For it is better to

marry than to burn" and in 2Co 11:29 of the heat of the passions, here of grief, or anger, "Who is offended (the American Standard Revised Version "caused to stumble") and I burn not?"

See also PUNISHMENTS.

BURNT OFFERING See SACRIFICE.

BURNT SACRIFICE

See SACRIFICE.

BUSH boosh:

(1) (ceneh, Ex 3:2-4; De 33:16; batos, Mr 12:26; Lu 6:44, "bramble bush"; 20:37; Ac 7:30,35. All the Old Testament references and the New Testament references, except Lu 6:44, are to the same "bush," namely, Moses' "burning bush"). From its etymology ceneh clearly denotes a "thorny" plant, as does the corresponding batos in the Septuagint and New Testament. In the Latin versions rubus, i.e. "bramble," is used as equivalent. Several varieties of bramble flourish in Palestine, of which the most common is Rubus discolor, but this is not an indigenous plant in Sinai. It is stated by Post that a bush of this plant has been planted by the monks of the Convent of Catherine at Sinai to the rear of the "Chapel of the Burning Bush." In spite of tradition there is but little doubt that Moses' "burning bush" must actually have been a shrub of one of the various thorny acacias, or allied plants, indigenous in the Sinaitic peninsula.

(2) (siach "plant," Ge 2:5; "shrub," Ge 21:15; "bush," Job 30:4,7). In the first reference any kind of plant may be meant, but in the other passages the reference is to the low bushes or scrub, such as are found in the desert.

(3) (nahalolim, the King James Version bushes, the Revised Version (British and American) PASTURE, margin "bushes," Isa 7:19). The meaning appears to be rather a place for watering flocks, the corresponding Arabic root nahal, having the meaning "to quench one's thirst," and the corresponding noun of place, manhal, meaning a watering-place in the desert.

E. W. G. Masterman

BUSH, BURNING

burn'-ing.

1. Meaning and Use:

The scene at the burning bush (ceneh, "a bush," Septuagint batos, "blackberry bush") reveals God to the world in one of theophanies with fire, of which there are four mentioned in the Bible (Ex 3:2; 13:21; 19:18; also 2Th 1:8 the King James Version, yet to be fulfilled). Many other Divine manifestations were associated with fire. The Burning Bush is mentioned elsewhere in De 33:16; Mr 12:26; Lu 20:37; Ac 7:30,31.

2. Identification:

Exact identification of the particular kind of bush in which God appeared to Moses is impossible. Attempts have been made to identify it with the blackberry bush, as by the Septuagint and also by the monks of the Convent of Catharine on Mount Sinai who grow the blackberry there in token of their tradition. The cassia has also been suggested. Both identifications are failures, the former because the blackberry does not grow in that region unless imported and tended, the latter for philological reasons. Nothing in the language used gives any clue to the species of the bush. The generally accepted view that it was some kind of thorn bush is an assumption with scarcely other ground than that there are so many thorny bushes in that region. This fact does, however, give to the assumption much probability.

3. Interpretation:

The old Jewish commentators have many things to say in explanation of this theophany (compare Jewish Encyclopedia). That one thing which will meet with much response from the Christian heart is that the unconsumed bush with the fire in the midst of it indicated that the Israelites would not be consumed by the afflictions in Egypt. The application of this view to God’s people under affliction in all ages is often made by Christian homilists. But this cannot have been the primary meaning of theophany. Of the many theophanies and other Divine manifestations with fire, the specific signification must be learned from a careful study of the circumstances in each case. The fire does not seem to have any one fundamental meaning running through them all. In addition to the references already given, compare Ps 18:8-12; 50:3; Eze 1:4; Mic 1:1-4; Hab 3:3-6; Heb 12:29.

The exact meaning of the Burning Bush as a method or medium of revelation may appear as follows:

(1) The flame in this bush was not the flame of persecution by God’s enemies without, but the flame of God’s presence or the presence of His angel within.

(2) The idea of burning and yet not being consumed is brought into the narrative by Moses’ wonderment in the moment of his ignorance, before he knew that God was in the bush.

(3) The real significance of the flame in this case seems to be light and glory and preservation where God manifests Himself graciously. This is the universal idea of revealed religion.

The prevailing idea of God in the religions round about was that God dwelt in darkness. The approach to the gods in Egyptian temples was through ever-deepening gloom. It was thought that God was very

dangerous and apt to be a destroyer, so that a priest must always intervene. God as a gracious Saviour was the new idea revelation was bringing to the world. This was now first clearly announced, but was not to be fully revealed throughout the time of the long line of priests until the Great High Priest should come and make a "way of approach" that we may come "with boldness unto the throne of grace."

M. G. Kyle

BUSHEL

boosh'-el (modios): A dry measure containing about a peck, but as it is used in the New Testament (Mt 5:15; Mr 4:21; Lu 11:33) it does not refer to capacity but is used only to indicate a covering to conceal the light.

BUSHY

boosh'-i: Found in So 5:11 as the translation of taltal, meaning trailing, pendulous (Septuagint elatai, literally "ductile"); the Revised Version, margin reads "curly."

BUSINESS

biz'-nes: Is the rendering of four Hebrew words:

(1) mela'khah, in Ge 39:11 (the American Standard Revised Version "work"); 1Ch 26:29,30; 2Ch 13:10 (the American Standard Revised Version "in their work"); 17:13 (the American Standard Revised Version "many works"); Ne 11:16,22; 13:30 (the American Standard Revised Version "in his work"); Es 3:9; Ps 107:23; Pr 22:29; Da 8:27.

(2) dabhar, literally "a word," is so translated in De 24:5; Jos 2:14,20; Jud 18:7 (the American Standard Revised Version "dealings"); Jud 18:28 (the American Standard Revised Version "dealings"); 1Sa 21:2,8.

(3) ma'aseh, "an action" (1Sa 20:19).

(4) 'inyan, "employment" (Ec 5:3; 8:16).

In the New Testament "business" in Lu 2:49 is the rendering of the phrase en, tois, tou patros mou, literally "in the things of my Father," which the American Standard Revised Version renders "in my Father's house," with "about my Father's business" as the marginal reading. "Business" is also used in the translation of chreia, literally "need," of Ac 6:3; as the translation of spoude, literally "haste" of Ro 12:11 (the American Standard Revised Version "diligence"); of pragma, literally "thing done," of Ro 16:2 (the American Standard Revised Version "matter"); of prassein ta idia, literally "tend to one's own

business," of 1Th 4:11. In Ac 19:24,25 in Paul's account of the riot in Ephesus, ergasia, literally "working," "performing," is translated "little business" in Ac 19:24 (the King James Version "small gain"), and "by this business" in Ac 19:25 (the King James Version "by this craft").

Arthur J. Kinsella

BUSYBODY

biz'-i-bod-i (periergos, allotrioepiskopos): The word is found twice in Paulinic literature.: 1Ti 5:13, "not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies," and 2Th 3:11, "work not at all, but are busybodies." It is also found in 1Pe 4:15 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "meddler") "or as a busybody in other men's matters." If these passages be coupled with such others as Jas 3:2-10; 4:11; Eph 4:29,31; Tit 3:2, it becomes evident that sins against the eighth commandment were as common in the apostolic church as they are today. To this day backbiting is a common trait of oriental peoples. And it is this sin which is so repeatedly warned against by the apostles, as in direct conflict with the ethics of Christianity, and in violation of that spirit of brotherly love and mutual trust which Christ has enjoined on His followers, and which is the very marrow of the outward revelation of the Christian faith (1Co 13).

Henry E. Dosker

BUTLER

but'-ler: An officer in households of kings, or other dignitaries, having charge of wines and other potables. mashqeh, "one who gives drink" (Ge 40:1-23; 41:9), rendered "cupbearer" in 1Ki 10:5; 2Ch 9:4; Ne 1:11. The office was one of consider ble importance in oriental courts, because of the danger to the king's life through plots of poison, etc. Nehemiah held this position to King Artaxerxes. Wealthy courts, as that of Solomon, usually had more than one (1Ki 10:5); over these cupbearers or butlers was the sar ha-mash-qim, or chief butler (Ge 40:9).

Edward Bagby Pollard

BUTTER

See FOOD.

BUYING

bi'-ing (karah, laqach, qena', qanah, shabhar; agorazo, oneomai, emporeuomai):

I. IN THE EARLIEST PERIODS AND AMONG NOMADS 1. The Primitive Stage (the

"Shop")

2. In Old Testament Times

3. In New Testament Times

II. ORIENTAL BUYING A TEDIOUS PROCESS

III. SHOPS AND BAZAARS

1. Oriental Shops

2. The Market-Place

IV. BUYING ON CREDIT PAYING CASH (MONEY)

V. OPEN-AIR MARKETS AND FAIRS

I. In the Earliest Periods and among Nomads.

1. The Primitive Stage; (the "Shop"):

Among primitive races and nomads there can be, of course, no organized commerce. Yet they buy and sell, by barter and exchange, in rude and simple ways. When tribes become settled and live in villages the "shop" is established—usually at first the simple "stall" of the grocer (bakkal) where one can buy bread; cheese, salt and dried fish, olives, oil, bundles of wood or charcoal, and even earthenware vessels for the passing traveler. At a later stage the village will have also, according to demand, other shops, as, for instance, those of the baker, the blacksmith, the cobbler, and, today, will be found in many obscure places in the East the butcher’s shop, and the coffee house.

2. In Old Testament Times:

These gradations and the gradual rise to the more organized commerce of the Greek-Roman period are indicated in a way by the succession of words for "buying" used in the Bible and the conditions and circumstances pictured and implied in the various accounts of buying and selling. Even as early as Abraham’s time, however, there were buying and weighing of silver in exchange. "Hear me," pleads Abraham with the children of Heth, "and entreat for me to Ephron the son of Zohar, that he may give me the cave of Machpelah .... which is in the end of his field; for the full price let him give it to me." And Ephron said, "Nay, my lord, hear me: the field give I thee, and the cave that is therein." But Abraham said, "If thou wilt .... I will give the price of the field; take it of me, and I will bury my dead there. And Ephron answered .... My lord, hearken unto me: a piece of land worth four hundred shekels of silver,

what is that betwixt me and thee? bury therefore thy dead ..... And Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver .... four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant. So .... the field, and the cave, and all the trees that were in the field, ... were made sure unto Abraham for a possession" (Ge 23:8-18). Other examples of primitive buying are found in Jos 24:32 ("the parcel of ground which Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor the father of Shechem for a hundred pieces of money"); in Ru 4:5-9, where Boaz is represented as buying "the parcel of land which was Elimelech's .... of the hand of Naomi .... and of Ru the Moabitess, the wife of the dead .... all that was Elimelech's"; and in 2Sa 24:21-24, where David is said to have "bought the threshing-floor" of Araunah at "a price." Such cases, however, are in a sense exceptional; trade in general at that time was by barter and exchange, without intermediary or market-place.

3. In New Testament Times:

In New Testament times things have so changed that the word most commonly used for buying (agorazo) means "to use the market-place," and another (emporeuomai) points to a class of traders or merchants who go on, from city to city—"continue" here or there "and buy and sell" (Jas 4:13 the King James Version).

II. Oriental Buying a Tedious Process.

Something of this is seen even in the fine examples given above. Doubtless, however, eastern buyers and sellers of old haggled over prices with controversy and heat, even as such buyers do today. Every where you find them now keen for bargains, but "striking a bargain" is a tedious process. They grow warm and then cool off; they are swept into a frenzy by some new turn of the strife and then calm down; but soon the haggling and arguing begin over again, becoming more heated and seemingly more hopeless than ever, and often they become so excited as to threaten to come to blows. But they don't mean it all, and at last they find a common basis; the sale is made with flattering compliments to one another, and, if we may believe appearances, to the rapturous delight of both parties to the bargain.

The native Oriental clearly takes pleasure in such exercise, and sees great possibilities before him. He graciously assures you at the outset that the bargain shall be "just as you like it—just as you like it!" Is he not a servant of God? What cares he for money? What he most wants is your happiness and good will—that is the sweetest thing in life—the love and favor of brothers. After a while you offer a price. He says, "What is such a trifle between us? Take it for nothing!" But he is far from meaning it, and so the haggling begins and the fire and heat of controversy follow—perhaps for hours.

III. Shops and Bazaars.

1. Oriental Shops:

Oriental shops are all of a pattern—the workshop and the place to store and sell goods is one and the same. It is on the street, of course, and a platform, usually about 2 ft. high, extends along the whole

front. A small door opens to a room back, which, as far as such a thing is possible in the Orient, is private. The goods, particularly the best articles, are displayed in front, somewhat as they are in the windows of our department stores. In the center of the platform is a sejadeh, a rug or mat. Upon this the keeper sits in true oriental fashion—cross-legged. He is never too busy with his accounts to let the passerby escape his keen eye. He will give up his nargileh any time to hail the stranger, display his goods, and coaxingly invite him to look at the special beauty and quality of his articles.

2. The Market-Place:

All the shops or storerooms of the oriental village line the "market," which as a rule, is in the center of the village, or on the chief street. This the Arabs call suk, sookh (compare Mt 20:3). Here the peasant is found with his donkeys or camels laden with food-stuffs and country produce. The gardener is there with his small fruits, and the fisherman with his latest "catch." All the shopkeepers, too, are on or near to this street or market center. "The sookh in a country village," says J. Carrow Duncan, "is one of the most interesting sights of modern Egypt. Formerly the cattle and dry-goods markets were uniformly held in an open space in the center of each village. Now the government compels them to go to a fenced enclosure outside of the town. At Belbeys the ordinary market is still held in the center of the town, but the cattle market is a mile away, across the canal. As in a bazaar, such as the traveler sees in Cairo, the merchants of the various trades dispose themselves here in lanes, all easily accessible from the main street, which is thus left clear. On the left are the dealers in copper utensils, busily plying their trade; next to them the makers of sieves and riddles; then comes a large space filled with pottery ware, and, close by, the vegetable yentiers. There, jammed in between the pottery space and the coppersmiths, is a lane of gold- and silversmiths—the greatest sharks in the market, their chief prey being the women. On the other side of the main street are the shoemakers' lane, the drapers' lane, the grocers, the seed men, the sweetmeat-sellers, fruit-merchants, dealers in glass and carnelian jewelry and, lastly, the butchers' stalls, all arranged in lanes, and all equally ready to trade or to enjoy a joke at each other's expense. There is apparently little eagerness to trade—except when a tourist appears." To one who is ignorant of the value of his wares, the oriental dealer has no fixed price. This is really regulated by the supposed ignorance of the purchaser. If you choose, you may give him what he asks, and be laughed at all round the sookh. If you are wise, you will offer something near to the real value and firmly refuse to vary or haggle, and he will come to terms.

Professor Elihu Grant tells of a shop in a Syrian village—"a small room, 6 to 12 ft. square, with a door, but no window, a counter or bench, and shelves and bins along the sides, where sugar, flour, oil, matches, candies, spice, starch, coffee, rice, dried figs, etc., were found, but no wrapping-paper. The buyer must bring his own dish for liquids; other things he carries away in the ample folds of his skirt or in a handkerchief." "Every considerable Turkish town," says Van Lennep, "has a bazaar, bezesten, or 'arcade':a stone structure, open at both ends, a narrow alley or street running through it, covered with an arched roof, the sides pierced with openings or windows. This covered street is lined on both sides with shops, narrow and shallow. Dealers in similar goods and articles flock together here, as do the artisans of like trades in all oriental cities." Such shops can yet be seen in quite characteristic form in Damascus, Bagdad, Cairo and Constantinople, as in ancient days they were found in Babylon, Jerusalem and Noph (see Eze 27:13-24).

IV. Buying on Credit.

The shop-keeper does not always get cash from the native buyer. Dr. Post found that debt was well-nigh universal in Syria. The peasant sows "borrowed" seed, in "borrowed" soil, plants and reaps with "borrowed" tools, and lives in a "borrowed" house. Even in case of an abundant harvest the proportion of the crop left by the landlord and the tax-gatherer leaves the man and his family but the barest living at best; at times he can barely pay the debt accumulated in making and gathering in the crop, and sometimes fails in doing this.

Paying Cash (Money):

In the rare cases when the buyer pays cash for his purchases, he makes payment, after a true oriental fashion, in coin of the most various or varying values, or in rings of copper, silver or gold, such as are now common in the market-places of China. This throws light upon some Scriptural passages, as, for example, Ge 43:21,22, where the language implies that the "rings" or "strings of money" were weighed: "Behold, every man's money was in the mouth of his sack, our money in fill weight .... and other money have we brought down in our hand to buy food." In Ezr 2:69, three kinds of currency are mentioned, "darics of gold," "pounds of silver," and "priests' garments," as having been given into the treasury for the house of God. The term rendered "darics of gold," 'adharkonim, stands for Persian coins, which were similar to the Greek "darics." The Persians are said to have got the idea of coining from Lydia, at the capture of Sardis, 564 BC. Early Lydian coins were of electrum, but Croesus changed this to coins of gold and silver, probably about 568 BC. Examples of these ancient coins are now known (Rice, Orientalisms in Bible Lands, 234).

V. Open-Air Markets and Fairs.

In inland towns and cities, markets and market-places are often found in the open air, as well as under cover. Great fairs are held thus on certain days of the week. Several towns will agree upon different days as market days and will offer in turn whatever they have for sale: lambs, sheep, cattle, horses, mules, chickens, eggs, butter, cheese, vegetables, fruits, and even jewelry and garments. In such a case it is as if the whole town for the day was turned into a market or exhibition, where everything is for sale. On such days peasants and townspeople come together in much larger numbers than is ordinary, and mingle freely together. The day thus chosen now, as in olden times, is often a holy day—Friday, which is the Moslem Sabbath, or the Christian Sunday, where Christians abound. Such instances form a side-light on such passages as Ne 13:15- 22: "In those days saw I in Judah some men treading winepresses on the sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses therewith; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the sabbath day: and I testified against them." Morier testifies that he attended similar fairs in Persia, where were gathered sellers of all sorts of goods in temporary shops or tents, such as sellers of barley and flour, as it was at the gate of Samaria after the famine (2Ki 7). Layard also speaks of having seen at the gate of the modern town of Mosul, opposite the site of ancient Nineveh shops for the sale of wheat, barley, bread-stuffs, and drinks for the thirsty. It will

be recalled that it was "at the gate" that Boaz (Ru 4:1-3) called the elders and people to witness that he had bought all that was Elimelech’s. For similar allusions see Job 5:4; Pr 31:23; Ps 127:5; La 5:14.

See MONEY; TRADE, etc.; also DB, DCG, etc.

George B. Eager

BUZ; BUZI; BUZITE

buz, bu’-zi, buz’-it (buz):

(1) Second son of Nahor (Ge 22:21). The word occurs again in Jer 25:23, by the side of Dedan (Ge 10:7) and Tema (Ge 25:15), and is probably, therefore, the name of a people living in the neighborhood of Edom. Buz and Hazo (Ge 22:22) are probably the countries of Bazu and Chazu (the former described as full of snakes and scorpions), which Esarhaddon invaded (KB, II, 131).

(2) A Gadite ((1Ch 5:14) (buzi), "an inhabitant of Buz"), a title given to Elihu, the fourth speaker in the Book of Job (Job 32:2).

Horace J. Wolf

BY

In the sense of "against" which survives only in dialectal English (compare Wright, Dialect Dict., I, 470, for examples) is the King James Version rendering of the dative emauto of 1Co 4:4 (the American Standard Revised Version renders this "against"). In classical Greek the same idiom sunoida with dative =" be conscious" or "be cognizant of" a thing.

BY AND BY

In the sense of "immediately" is the King James Version translation of exautes, of Mr 6:25 (the American Standard Revised Version "forthwith"); of euthus, Mt 13:21 (the American Standard Revised Version "straightway"); of eutheos, Lu 17:7 (the American Standard Revised Version "straightway"); Lu 21:9 (the American Standard Revised Version "immediately"). In English literally this meaning is obsolete (compare: "After you have dyned and supte, laboure not by and by after, but make a pause—the space of an howre or more with some pastyme") (Babees Book, EETS, 247).

BYBLUS

bib’-lus.

See GEBAL.

BYPATHS

bi’-pathz.

See BYWAY.

BYSSUS

bis’-us.

See LINEN.

BYWAY

bi’-wa (nethibhoth): Only in Jud 5:6. Compare Jer 18:15; the King James Version "paths" (the Revised Version (British and American) "by-paths").

BYWORD

bi’-wurd: shammah =" consternation," "astonishment," "waste," "wonderful language," "object of remark" (De 28:37; 1Ki 9:7; 2Ch 7:20); mashal, or meshol =" a satire," "byword" (Job 17:6; Ps 44:14); millah, or milleh =" a topic," "object of talk," "byword" (Job 30:9).

CAB

See KAB.

CABBON

kab’-on (kabbon; Chabra): An unidentified place in the Shephelah of Judah near Eglon (Jos 15:40). It is possibly the same as MACHBENA, which see.

CABIN

kab’-in (chanuyyoth, "vaults"; Jer 37:16 the Revised Version (British and American), "cells"): In the East the prison often consisted of a pit (compare "dungeon-house" the Revised Version (British and American) and "house of the pit" the Revised Version, margin) with vaulted cells around it for the confinement of prisoners. The word is probably a gloss. The phrase "and into the cells" seems superfluous after "into the dungeonhouse."

CABUL

ka’-bul (kabhul; Codex Vaticanus, Chobamasomel; Codex Alexandrinus, Chabol apo aristeron):

(1) A city on the boundary between Asher and Zebulun (Jos 19:27). It corresponds to the Chabolo of Josephus (Vita, 43, etc.), and is represented by the modern village Kabul, about nine miles Southeast of Acre.

(2) A district probably connected with (1), containing 20 cities, given by Solomon to Hiram king of Tyre (1Ki 9:10 ff).

CADDIS

kad’-is.

See GADDIS.

CADES

ka’-dez.

See KEDESH (Apocrypha).

CADES-BARNE

ka’-dez bar’-ne.

See KADESH-BARNEA (Apocrypha).

CAESAR

se’-zar (Kaisar): Originally the surname of the Julian gens (thus, Caius Julius Caesar); afterward a name borne by the Roman emperors. In the New Testament the name is definitely applied to Augustus (Lu 2:1, "Caesar Augustus"), to whom it belonged by adoption, and to Tiberius (Lu 3:1, "Tiberius Caesar"; compare Mt 22:17,21). The "Caesar" to whom Paul appealed (Ac 25:11,12,21) was Nero. The form is perpetuated in "Kaiser" and "Czar."

CAESAR’S HOUSEHOLD

hous’-hold (hoi ek tes Kaisaros oikias, "they that are of Caesar’s household," Php 4:22): These words occur in the epistle which Paul wrote from Rome near the end of his first imprisonment there, probably in the end of 61 AD, to the church in Philippi. They give us most interesting information in regard to the progress made in the propagation of the gospel in Rome.

It is necessary to ask, in the first place, What is meant by the words "Caesar’s household"? and when the meaning of that phrase is known, then it is needful to discuss the question which rises at once, In what way did the gospel enter Caesar’s household? How is it that the gospel, which at the first chiefly advanced among the poorer classes in the Empire, made its way at a bound into the very palace of the Caesars?

1. What Exactly Was Caesar’s Household?:

"Caesar’s household" meant the whole of the persons, slaves and freemen alike, composing the establishment of the emperor in his palace on the Palatine Hill at Rome. The slaves of the imperial household formed a host in themselves. At a time when many a private citizen in Rome owned several hundreds of slaves, it need not surprise anyone to know that there was a vastly larger number of such persons in the palace of the emperor. This was a period when the city of Rome and the court of the Caesars swarmed with Asiatics, many of whom were Jews, and many of them would be in slavery, or in employment, in the imperial court. It cannot be forgotten that Poppea, Nero’s shameless consort, was a proselyte to Judaism and that she continued to advocate successfully the cause of the Jews before the emperor as occasion arose.

These persons in the emperor’s palace would be employed in every conceivable capacity as household servants, cooks, bathmen, gardeners, grooms, kennel-keepers, porters, doorkeepers, messengers,

secretaries, amanuenses, teachers, librarians, architects, carpenters, shoemakers, and in all other forms of service. Of course they were not all slaves: there was a very large number of freemen. The domus or familia Caesaris (represented by the Greek oikia Kaisaros) included the whole of the imperial household, the meanest slaves as well as the most powerful courtiers. On the character and constitution of this household we happen to possess more information than perhaps on any other department of social life in Rome. "In Rome itself, if we may judge by these inscriptions, the domus Augusta must have formed no inconsiderable fraction of the whole population; but it comprised likewise all persons in the emperor's service, whether slaves or freemen, in Italy and even in the provinces" (Lightfoot, Commentary on Phil, 171). In the list of offices filled by members of the imperial household were also such functions as those of keepers of the wardrobe or of the plate-chest; even the "tasters" formed a separate class of servants under a chief of their own. To belong to Caesar's household would secure even to the lowest grade of slaves substantial privileges and immunities, and would give a certain social importance, which made this position a valued one. An office in the emperor's household, however mean, was thought of so highly, that in the monumental inscriptions such a fact is recorded with scrupulous care.

2. How Did the Gospel Enter into Caesar's Household?:

The next inquiry is, How did the gospel win its way into Caesar's household? And, first, there is no need at all to suppose that the gospel was unknown, even in the palace, previous to the arrival of Paul in Rome.

3. The Gospel Known There before Paul's Arrival:

For in that numerous household of the emperor there would be Jews, perhaps many of them; and all the Jews were at that time filled with Messianic hopes, and thus were ready to listen to the gospel. As soon therefore as the gospel entered Rome, as soon as it was proclaimed in the many synagogues there, these members of Caesar's household could not fail, equally with the other members of the synagogue, to hear the story of Jesus Christ and of His cross and resurrection. A fact such as this, that the gospel was known in Rome previous to Paul's arrival there, is quite sufficient to account for the other fact, that the gospel was known in Caesar's palace.

4. The Gospel Advances in the Palace:

But the propagation of the gospel received a great impetus and help forward, when Paul arrived in the city. For although he was a "bound prisoner," his wrist fastened by an iron chain, day and night, to the soldier who guarded him, he was able to "preach the kingdom of God and to teach those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ, with all confidence, no man forbidding him" (Ac 28:31 the King James Version). And in this way the gospel would again reach members of the emperor's household. Immediately after his arrival in Rome, Paul had put himself in communication with "the chief of the Jews"—probably the rulers of the synagogues in Rome—and many of them came to him in his lodging and conferred with him. Those chief men of the Jews expressed their great desire to hear from him what his thoughts were in regard to the hope of Israel (Ac 28:22); and naturally all the Jews in Rome would

be equally desirous to gain this information from a man of the outstanding position and character of Paul. The Jewish community in Rome had for years past been permeated with the hope of the coming of the Messiah; indeed successive rumors of false Christs had kept them in a fever of excitement, which, on one occasion at least, had broken out in tumult, so strong was their hope of His speedy appearing. Thus it would come about, as a matter of course, that the gospel would reach all the Jews in Rome, and from this knowledge of Jesus, whom Paul proclaimed, the Jews who were in the service of the emperor could not possibly be excluded.

5. The Gospel Carried by Paul's Soldier-Guard:

But besides this, the fact that Paul was in daily contact and intercourse with the soldiers who guarded him could not fail to lead to the introduction of the gospel into Gospel the regiment. And as part of the Praetorian Guard was quartered in buildings on the Palatine Hill, attached to the emperor's palace there, there was thus one other channel through which the gospel would be made known to some of those who resided in the palace of Caesar. It is thus seen that there is nothing at all surprising in the fact that there were Christians in Caesar's household.

6. Lightfoot's Conjecture:

Some of Lightfoot's suggestions and conjectures on this subject are exceedingly interesting. He reviews the names of the persons to whom Paul sends greeting in Ro 16 and compares them with the names of persons who lived at that time, and which have been found in monumental inscriptions on the columbaria or places of sepulture exhumed on the Appian Way. Many of the occupants of those columbaria were freedmen or slaves of the emperors, and were contemporaries of Paul. The result of Lightfoot's review of the names is that he claims to have established a fair presumption that among the salutations in Ro 16 some members at least of the imperial household are included (Phil, 177).

In the household of the emperor there were necessarily many persons of high rank. Perhaps we may find a hint that the gospel had been embraced by some in the higher grades of society, in such strange facts as the execution of Titus Flavius Clemens, a man of consular rank and cousin to the emperor, and also in the fact that Flavia Domitilla, the wife of Flavius Clemens, was banished by Domitian, notwithstanding her near relationship to him, for she was the emperor's niece. Her daughter Portia also shared in the same punishment of exile. The charges brought against all three were atheism and inclination to Jewish customs: surely such charges were sufficiently vague and even self-contradictory. The opinion has been suggested that probably these three persons in the inner circle of the emperor's kinsmen were Christians.

7. Aristobulus and Narcissus:

Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, etc., 353), speaking of Lightfoot's conjectures, already referred to, writes, "In all probability he is right in thinking that all the slaves of Aristobulus (son of Herod the Great) and of Narcissus (Claudius' favorite freedman) had passed into the imperial household, and that members of their two families are saluted as Christians by Paul (Ro 16:10 ff)."

The fact of greatest interest in the whole subject is, that in society so profligate and corrupt as the court of Nero, there were "saints," Christian men whose garments were clean and who kept themselves unspotted from the world amid surroundings so dreadful and in temptation so unceasing; that the gospel was known and obeyed and loved, and that hearts and lives were loyal to Christ even in the palace of Nero Caesar.

John Rutherfurd

CAESAREA

ses-a-re'-a, se-za-re'-a (Kaisareia):

(1) Caesarea Palestina (pal-es-ti'na).

The ancient name in the Arabic form Qaisariyeh still clings to the ruins on the sea shore, about 30 miles North of Jaffa. It was built by Herod the Great on the site of Strato's Tower (Ant., XIII, xi, 2; XV, ix, 6), and the name Caesarea Sebaste was given it in honor of Augustus (ibid., XVI, v, 1). With his usual magnificence Herod lavished adornments on the city. He erected sumptuous palaces and public buildings, a theater, and amphitheater with prospect to the sea; while a spacious system of sewers under the city secured cleanliness and health. But "the greatest and most laborious work of all" was a magnificent harbor "always free from the waves of the sea," which Josephus says was not less than the Piraeus: this however is an exaggeration. It was of excellent workmanship, and all the more remarkable because the place itself was not suitable for such noble structures. The whole coast line, indeed, is singularly ill-fitted for the formation of harbors. The mighty breakwater was constructed by letting down stones 50 x 18 x 9 ft. in size into twenty fathoms deep. The mole was 200 ft. wide. Part was surmounted by a wall and towers. A promenade and dwellings for mariners were also provided. The work was done in ten or twelve years. It became the residence of the Roman procurator. It passed into the hands of Agrippa I; and here he miserably died (Ac 12:19,23). Here dwelt Philip the Evangelist (Ac 8:40; 21:8). To Caesarea Peter was sent to minister to the Roman centurion Cornelius (Ac 10). Thrice Paul passed through Caesarea (Ac 9:30; 18:22; 21:8); hither he was sent under guard from Jerusalem to escape danger from the Jews (Ac 23:23); and here he was imprisoned till his final departure for Rome.

Riots between Gentiles and Jews in Caesarea gave rise to the war (BJ, II, xiii, 7; . xiv, 4 f). Terrible cruelties were practiced on the Jews under Felix and Florus. Here Vespasian was hailed emperor by his soldiers. Titus here celebrated the birthday of his brother Domitian by setting 2,500 Jews to fight with beasts in the amphitheater. Eusebius was bishop of Caesarea (313-40 AD). In 548 AD a massacre of the Christians was organized and carried out by the Jews and Samaritans. The city passed into Moslem hands in 638. In the time of the Crusades it fell, now to the Christians and now to the Moslems; and was finally overthrown by Sultan Bibars in 1265 AD.

The cathedral stood on the site of a temple built by Herod, where the ruins are seen today; as are also

those of two aqueducts which conveyed water from Nahr ez-Zerqa. The landward wall of the Roman city was nearly 3 miles in length.

(2) Caesarea Philippi (fi-lip'-i) (Kaisareia he Philippou).

At the Southwest base of Mt. Hermon, on a rocky terrace, 1,150 ft. above sea-level, between Wady Khashabeh and Wady Za'areh, lie the ruins of the ancient city. It was a center for the worship of Pan: whence the name Paneas, applied not only to the city, but to the whole district (Ant., XV, x, 3). It is possible that this may have been the site of ancient Baal-hermon; while Principal G. A. Smith would place Da here (HGHL, 480). The district was given by Augustus to Herod the Great 20 BC, by whom a temple of white marble was built in honor of the emperor. Paneas formed part of the tetrarchy of Philip. He rebuilt and beautified the town, calling it Caesarea as a compliment to Augustus, and adding his own name to distinguish it from Caesarea on the coast of Sharon (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 1). From Bethsaida Jesus and His disciples came hither, and on the way Peter made his famous confession, after which Jesus began to tell them of His coming passion (Mt 16:13 ff; Mr 8:27 ff). Some think that on a height near Caesarea Philippi Jesus was transfigured. See TRANSFIGURATION, MOUNT OF. Agrippa II renamed the town Neronias (Ant., XX, ix, 4). The ancient name however outlived both Caesare a and Neronias, and survives in the Arabic form Banias. The modern village, built among the ruins, contains 350 inhabitants. The walls and towers of which the remains are seen date from Crusading times. The castle, ec-Cubeibeh, crowns the hill behind the town, and must have been a place of strength from the earliest times. Its possession must always have been essential to the holding of the valley to the west. Immediately to the north of the town, at the foot of a steep crag, the fountain of the Jordan rises. Formerly the waters issued from a cave, Magharet ras en-Neba', "cave of the fountain head," now filled up with debris. Two niches cut in the face of the rock recall the idolatries practiced here in olden times. A shrine of el-Khudr stands on the west of the spring. With the rich soil and plentiful supplies of water, in a comparatively temperate climate, average industry might turn the whole district into a garden. As it is, the surroundings are wonderfully beautiful.

W. Ewing

CAGE

kaj (kelubh; phulake): The earliest known form of cage made to confine a bird, for the pleasure of its song or the beauty of its coloring, was a crude affair of willows or other pliable twigs. Later cages were made of pottery, and now they are mostly made of wire. References in the Bible make it very clear that people were accustomed to confine in cages such birds as they especially prized for pets, or to detain them for market purposes. James indicated that cages were common when he wrote (Jam 3:7): "For every kind of beasts and birds .... is tamed, and hath been tamed by mankind." In Job (Job 41:5) we find these lines `" Wilt thou play with him as with a bird? Or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?"` The only way to play with a bird is to confine it so that it grows accustomed to you and thus loses fear. Jeremiah compared the civil state of Judah to a "cage (crate) full of birds" (Jer 5:27), "the houses of the rich being stuffed with craftily-obtained wealth and articles of

luxury" (HDB). The sale of sparrows as an article of food still continues in the eastern markets. Jesus referred to this (Mt 10:29) and it was He who entered the temple and overthrew "the seats of them that sold the doves" (Mt 21:12). In Re 18:2 we find a reference to "a hold (the King James Version "cage") of every unclean and hateful bird." See also Ecclesiasticus 11:30.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CAIAPHAS

ka'-a-fas, ki'-a-fas (Kaiaphas; Caiaphas = Kephas (compare Dods in Expositor's Greek Test, I, 803), and has also been interpreted as meaning "depression"): Caiaphas was the surname of Joseph, a son-in-law of Annas (compare Joh 18:13), who filled th e post of high priest from about 18-36 AD, when he was deposed by Vitellius (compare Josephus, Ant, XVIII, ii, 2; iv, 3). He is mentioned by Luke as holding office at the time of John the Baptist's preaching in the wilderness (Lu 3:2).

Caiaphas took a leading part in the trial and condemnation of Jesus. It was in his court or palace that the chief priests (Sadducees) and Pharisees, who together constituted the Sanhedrin, assembled "that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him" (compare Mt 26:3,4; Joh 11:49). The regal claims of the new Messiah and the growing fame of His works had made them to dread both the vengeance of imperial Rome upon their nation, and the loss of their own personal authority and prestige (compare Joh 11:48). But Caiaphas pointed a way out of their dilemma: let them bide their time till the momentary enthusiasm of the populace was spent (compare Mt 26:5), and then by the single sacrifice of Jesus they could at once get rid of a dangerous rival and propitiate the frowns of Rome (compare Joh 11:49,50; 18:14). The commentary of John upon this (Joh 11:51,52) indicates how the death of Jesus was indeed to prove a blessing not only for Israel but also for all the children of God; but not in the manner which the cold-blooded statecraft of Caiaphas intended. The advice of the high priest was accepted by the Sanhedrin (Joh 11:53), and they succeeded in arresting Jesus. After being led "to Annas first" (Joh 18:13), Jesus was conducted thence in bonds to Caiaphas (Joh 18:24), According to Mt He was led immediately upon His arrest to Caiaphas (Mt 26:57). Mr and Lu do not refer to Caiaphas by name. His conduct at this preliminary trial of Jesus (Mt 26:57-68), its time and its procedure, were almost entirely illegal from the standpoint of then existing Jewish law (compare JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF; and A. Taylor Innes, The Trial of Jesus Christ). False witnesses were first called, and when Jesus refused to reply to their charges, Caiaphas asked of Him if He were "the Christ, the Son of God "(Mt 26:63). Upon our Lord's answering "Thou hast said" (Mt 26:64), Caiaphas "rent his garments, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy" (Mt 26:65). Upon this charge was Jesus found "worthy of death" (Mt 26:66). Caiaphas is also mentioned in Ac 4:6 as being among those who presided over the trial of Peter and John.

C. M. Kerr

CAIN

kan (qayin, "spear" or "smith," resembling in sound the root qanah, "get," "acquire," Ge 4:1 the Revised Version, margin, but not necessarily derived from that root; Septuagint Kain):

1. The Scripture Narrative:

(1) In Ge 4:1-24 Cain is the first son of Adam and Eve. His birth is hailed as a manifestation of Yahweh's help. He becomes "a tiller of the ground," and brings to Yahweh an offering of the produce of the soil, his brother Abel, the shepherd, bringing at the same time the fat of the first-born of his own flock. From Cain and from his offering Yahweh withholds the sign of acceptance which he grants to Abel. That the ground of this difference of treatment is to be found (so Heb 11:4) in Cain's lack of right disposition toward Yahweh is shown by his behavior (see ABEL). Instead of humbling himself he gives signs of strong indignation at Yahweh's refusal to favor him. Under the just rebuke of Yahweh he hardens his heart and is further confirmed in impenitence. His jealousy of Abel, unrepented of, increases until it culminates in deliberate murder. Deliberate, for in Ge 4:8 we must restore a clause to the Hebrew text, all the ancient versions bearing witness, and read "And Cain said unto Abel his brother, Let us go into the field," etc. In the vain attempt to conceal his crime Cain adds falsehood to his other sins. He is cursed "from," i.e. away from, that soil upon which he poured out his brother's blood, and must become a fugitive and a wanderer, far from the immediate presence of Yahweh. Although his remonstrance against the severity of his sentence displays no genuine contrition, still Yahweh in pity appoints a "sign" for his protection. Cain takes up his abode in the land of Nod ("wandering"), and there builds a city and becomes the ancestor of a line which includes Jabal, forefather of tent-dwelling cattle-keepers; Jubal, forefather of musicians; Tubal-cain, forefather of smiths; and Lamech, like Cain, a man of violence. In Cain's character we see "a terrible outburst of selfwill, pride, and jealousy, leading to a total and relentless renunciation of all human ties and affection." "Among the lessons or truths which the narrative teaches may be instanced: the nature of temptation, and the manner in which it should be resisted; the consequences to which an unsubdued temper may lead a man; the gradual steps by which in the end a deadly crime may be committed; the need of sincerity of purpose lest our offering should be rejected; God's care for the guilty sinner after he has been punished; the interdependence upon one another of members of the human race; and the duties and obligations which we all owe to each other" (Driver). In Heb 11:4 Cain's spiritual deficiency is pointed out; 1Jo 3:12 observes his envy and jealousy, as "of the wicked one," and Jude 1:11 makes him a very type of the ungodly.

2. Difficulties:

With few and bold strokes the story of Cain as it stands paints for us the character of the first of murderers and the scene of his detection and condemnation. To the religious purpose of the narrative all other things are made tributary. But if we can not refrain from putting the familiar question, Who was Cain's wife? it is also impossible upon close study of Ge 4, as it stands, to avoid asking what was the nature of the sign of Yahweh's acceptance (Gen 4:4), or of the "sign" appointed for Cain (Gen 4:15); or what we are to think of the introduction in the midst of the narrative, without explanation, of such important institutions as sacrifice (Gen 4:3,4) and blood-revenge (Gen 4:14); who were the persons of whom Cain stood in fear (Gen 4:14); who inhabited the city he built (Gen 4:17); how the wanderer and fugitive could become the city-builder; and why the shepherd life should be represented as beginning

with Abel (Gen 4:2) and again with Jabal (Gen 4:20); also whether the narrator means that not only the collection of men in cities (Gen 4:17), but also animal husbandry, music and metal-working (Gen 4:20-22) are to be looked upon with disfavor as having sprung from Cain or from his descendants? Most of these questions find their answers in one consideration: the narrative is not exhaustively complete and is not intended to be so. That a large body of racial traditions existed, from which, with the severest condensation, the author of Ge selected his material, is the conclusion forced by close examination the Ge narrative and comparison of it with the most ancient extant traditions. "In Ge 4 these old stories are not told for their own sakes. The incompleteness and the difficulties left unsolved do not allow this assumption to be made. They form simply the material foundation, to which higher ideas and doctrines are attached" (Dillmann).

3. Critical Theories:

Without going outside the Scripture text we may find strong evidence that the narrative under consideration is founded in part upon ancient sources. Let the line of Cain (Ge 4:17-24) be compared with that of Seth (Ge 5:1-29):

The Hebrew forms of the names show even more clearly that Cain = Kenan, Irad = Jared, Methushael = Methuselah; a single transposition, that of the first and third names after Cain, brings the two Enochs together, and likewise the similar names Mehujael and Mahalalel. Thus we have six names nearly or quite identical; seven ancestors in one list and ten in the other, ending in both cases with a branching into three important characters. Resemblances equally certain, though not by any means so obvious, exist between the names in this double list and the names of the ten kings of Babylonia who reigned before the Flood, as the latter are given by Berosus, the Babylonian historian of the 3rd century BC (see Skinner, Driver, Sayce as below). Thus one source of which the author in Ge 4 made use appears to have been an ancient list in genealogical form, by which the first of mankind was linked with the beginnings of civilized institutions and articles Another part of his material was the story of a brother's murder of a brother (Gen 4:1-16). Many maintain at this point that the narrative must be based upon the doings of tribes, rather than of individuals. It is true that not seldom in the Old Testament tribal history is related under individual names (compare Ge 49; , Jud 1, and the tables of tribes in Ge 25:1-4); yet the tribe referred to can hardly be the Kenites of the Old Testament, who appear as the close allies of Israel, not especially bloodthirsty or revengeful, and haunted by no shadow of early crime against a brother tribe (see KENITES). The indications in Ge 4:1-16 of a developed state of society and a considerable population may go to show that the narrative of the murder was not originally associated with the sons of the first man. Thus there is room to suppose that in the process of condensation and arrangement Cain, son of Adam; Cain, the murderer; and Cain, city-builder and head of a line of patriarchs, have been made one. The critical conclusions here epitomized are indeed reached by a delicate and difficult process; but it is asserted in their favor that they make possible the removal of difficulties which could be explained in no other manner. The question which will arise with many, What theory of inspiration can be held consistently with the application of such critical processes? is dealt with at length by most modern commentators (see CRITICISM; INSPIRATION).

LITERATURE.

A. Dillmann, Genesis (English translation); S. R. Driver, Genesis ("Westminster Commentaries"); H. E. Ryle, Early Narratives of Genesis; J. Skinner, Genesis (ICC); A. H. Sayce, "Archaeology of the Book of Genesis," The Expositor T, August, 1910, June, 1911. (2) In Jos 15:57, the Revised Version (British and American) KAIN, which see.

See also KENITES.

F. K. Farr

CAINAN

ka’-nan, ka-i’-nan (Kainan):

(1) Greek form of Kenan (Lu 3:37): also the King James Version form in Old Testament (except 1Ch 1:2).

(2) A son of Arphaxad (Lu 3:36), omitted in Ge 10:24; 11:12.

CAKE

See BREAD.

CALAH

ka’-la (kalach; Chalach, also Chalak or Kalach; in Assyrian Kalhu, Kalha, Kalhi, Kalah): The name of one of the great cities of Nimrod (Ge 10:11), or rather, Asshur (text), which formed, with Nineveh, Resen between Calah and Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir (probably lying more to the North), Asshur’s great fourfold capital. The meaning of the name is unknown, but if a Sumerian etymology be accepted, some such signification as "Holy Gate" (Ka-lah) or the like—a parallel to Ka-dingira = Bab-ili, "Gate of God" (see BABEL, BABYLON)—might be regarded as possible.

1. Date of the City’s Foundation:

As Nineveh is mentioned by Hammurabi, who reigned about 2000 BC, it is clear that that city was already, in his time, an important place; and the passage in Ge 10:11 implies, though it does not actually prove, that Calah was of about the same period.

2. Early References to the City:

The Assyrian king Assur-nacir-apli (circa 885 BC) states that Calah was made (probably = founded) by

Shalmaneser (I) circa 1300 BC, but this is possibly simply an indication that he rebuilt it. Later on, the site seems to have become neglected, for Assur-nacir-apli states that, the city having fallen into ruin, he rebuilt it, and it thereafter became practically the capital of the country, for he not only reerected or restored its shrines and temples—the temple of Ninip, with the god's image; the temple of "the Lady of the Land," and the temples of Sin, Gula, and Enlil—but he also received tribute there. Among his other works may be mentioned the water-channel Pati-chengala, and the plantations, whose fruits, apparently, he offered to the god Assur (Asshur), and the temples of the city. It also became a favorite place of residence for the later kings of Assyria,' who built palaces, and restored the city's temples from time to time.

3. Its Position:

Calah occupied the roughly triangular tract formed by the junction of the Greater Zab with the Tigris, which latter stream in ancient times flowed rather closer to the western wall than it does now, and would seem to have separated the small town represented by Selamiyeh from the extensive ruins of Calah, which now bear the name of Nimroud. The main ruins are situated on a large, rectangular platform on the bank of the old bed of the Tigris.

4. The Temple-Tower:

The most prominent edifice was the great Temple-tower at the Northwest corner—a step-pyramid (ziq-qurat) like the Bah towers, constructed of brick faced with stone, and rising, in stages, to a height of circa 126 ft., probably with a sanctuary at the top (see BABEL, TOWER OF). A long vault occupies the basement-stage of this structure, and caused Sir A. H. Layard, its discoverer, to regard it as the probable traditional tomb of Ninus, under whose shadow the tragedy of Pyramis and Thisbe took place. Ovid (Metam. iv.98) describes the tomb of Ninus as having been situated "at the entrance of Nineveh," and, if this be correct, Calah must have been regarded as the southern portion of that great city, which, on a preaching journey, may well have taken three days (Jon 3:3) to traverse, provided Khorsabad was in reality its northern extremity.

5. The Temples and Palaces:

The platform upon which the temple-tower of Calah was situated measures circa 700 x 400 yds., and the portion not occupied by that erection afforded space for temples and palaces. In the center of the East side of this platform lie the remains of the palace of Assur-nacir-apli, the chambers and halls of which were paneled with sculptured and inscribed slabs, the principal doorways being flanked with finely carved winged and human-headed lions and bulls. In the Southeast corner are the remains of the palace of Esarhaddon, built, at least in part, with material taken from the palace of Tiglath-pileser IV, which was situated in the South portion of the platform. The remains of this last are, as a result of this spoliation, exceedingly meager. The Southwest corner of the platform contains the remains of the last palace built on the site—a very inferior erection constructed for Assur-etil-ilani (circa 626 BC).

6. The Temple of Ninip:

One of the temples on this platform was that dedicated to Ninip, situated at the Southwest corner of the temple-tower. The left-hand entrance was flanked by man-headed lions, while the sides of the right-hand entrance were decorated with slabs showing the expulsion of the evil spirit from the temple—a spirited sculpture now in the Nimroud Gallery of the British Museum. On the right-hand side of the entrance was an arch-headed slab with a representation of King Assur-nacir-apli in low relief, standing in the usual conventional attitude. Before it stood a stone tripod altar, implying that Divine honors were paid to this king. (Both these are now in the British Museum.) The remains of another temple were found to the East of this, and there are traces of further buildings at other points of the platform.

7. The Sculptures of Assur-nacir-apli:

The slabs from Assur-nacir-apli’s palace show this king’s warlike expeditions, but as descriptive lettering is wanting, the campaigns cannot be identified. Notwithstanding this disadvantage, however, they are of considerable importance, showing, as they do, incidents of his various campaigns—the crossing of rivers, the march of his armies, the besieging of cities, the reception of tribute, the life of the camp and hunting the lion and the wild bull. The reliefs from the temples, which are much larger and finer, show the king engaged in various religious ceremonies and ritual acts, and are among the most striking examples of Assyrian of sculpture. When looking at these works of art, the student’s thoughts go back with thankfulness to those Assyrians who, through the generations, cared for and preserved these monuments, though the vandalism of Esarhaddon in dressing off the slabs of Tiglath-pileser IV to carve his own bas-reliefs thereon will ever be regretted.

8. The City Walls:

The site is described as being 14 miles South of Kouyunjik (Nineveh) and consists of an enclosure formed of narrow mounds still having the appearance of walls. Traces of no less than 108 towers, the city’s ancient defenses, are said to be visible even now on the North and East, where the walls were further protected by moats. The area which the walls enclose—about 2,331 x 2,095 yards—would contain about 1,000 acres.

Layard, Nineveh and Its Remains, and Nineveh and Babylon, still remain the standard works upon the subject, and his Monuments of Nineveh gives the most complete collection of the sculptures found. See also George Smith, Assyrian Discoveries, and Rassam, Asshur and the Land of Nimrod.

T. G. Pinches

CALAMITY

ka-lam’-i-ti (’edh, "a load" or "burden" under which one is crushed, hence, "misfortune"; hayyah, hawwah, "fall," "ruin," the latter word used only in the plural; ra‘, "evil in essence" hence, "adversity,"

once only, Ps 141:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "wickedness"): Purely an Old Testament term, signifying adversities—natural, but more often those that result from wickedness or moral evil. Various kinds:

(1) folly, "a foolish son" (Pr 19:13);

(2) disease, poverty, bereavement, as in Job’s experience (Job 6:2; 30:13);

(3) persecution (2Sa 22:19; Ps 18:18);

(4) Divine retribution and judgment (De 32:35); compare ruin of the wicked (Pr 1:26, also Pr 1:27 the Revised Version (British and American) for "destruction" the King James Version);

(5) the devastation of war (Jer 46:21);

(6) adversities of any kind (Pr 27:10).

Dwight M. Pratt

CALAMOLALUS

kal-a-mol’-a-lus, -mol-a’-lus (Codex Alexandrinus, Kalamolalos, Codex Vaticanus, Kalamokalos): This name is corrupt (1 Esdras 5:22). It has evidently arisen through combining the two names Lod and Hadid, in the lists of Ezr 2:33 and Ne 7:37.

CALAMUS

kal’-a-mus. See REED.

CALCOL; CHALKOL

kal’-kol, kal’-kol (kalkol): Mentioned in 1Ki 4:31 as one of the wise men with whom Solomon was compared. The better orthography is Calcol which the King James Version gives for the same name in 1Ch 2:6. In the former passage, Calcol is the son of Mahol, while in the latter he is called the son of Zerah of the tribe of Judah, and a brother of Heman and Ethan.

CALDRON

kol’-drun (the rendering of qallachath, cir, dudh ‘aghmon) :Qallachath is found only in 1Sa 2:14; Mic 3:3. It is a pot for cooking, of undefined size and characteristics, in the former passage for sanctuary use, in the latter for domestic. Cir is translated caldron in Jer 1:13 (Revised Versions); Jer 52:18 f(the King

James Version); Eze 11:3,7,11. It was distinctly a large pot, employed both for domestic use and in the sanctuary. Dudh is translated caldron only in 2Ch 35:13. It was also a pot for cooking. ‘Aghmon is translated caldron by the King James Version in Job 41:20, but it is a mistranslation; the Revised Version (British and American) correctly has "rushes."

George Ricker Berry

CALEB

ka’-leb (kalebh; in the light of the cognate Syriac and Arabic words, the meaning is not "dog," which is kelebh, in Hebrew, but "raging with canine madness"; Chaleb): As a person, Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, occurs in the story of the spies (Nu 13 ff). He represents the tribe of Judah as its prince (Nu 13:6; compare Nu 13:2). While the majority of the men sent out by Moses bring back evil report, Caleb and Hoshea, or Joshua, the son of Nun, are the only ones to counsel the invasion of the promised land (Nu 13:30; 14:6 ff). Accordingly, these two alone are permitted to survive (Nu 14:38; 32:12). Upon the conquest and distribution of the land by Joshua, Caleb reminds the leader of the promise made by God through Moses, and so he receives Hebron as an inheritance for himself and his descendants (Jos 14:6-15), after driving out from thence the Anakim who were in possession of the city (Jos 15:14). In the parallel account in Jud 1:8 ff, the dispossession of the Canaanite inhabitants of Hebron is ascribed to Judah (Jud 1:10). Both accounts agree in mentioning Othniel, a younger brother of Caleb, as the conqueror of Kiriath-sepher or Debir; as his reward he receives the hand of Achsah, Caleb’s daughter. Achsah is given by her father a portion of the Southland; but, upon request, she obtains a more fruitful locality with upper and nether springs (Jos 15:15-19; Jud 1:12-15).

In 1Sa 30:14 Caleb is undoubtedly the name of a clan which is, moreover, differentiated from Judah. Modern scholars therefore assume that Caleb was originally an independent clan which in historical times merged with Judah. As Caleb is called the son f Kenaz (Jud 1:13) or the Kenizzite (Nu 32:12), it is further believed that the Calebites were originally associated with an Edomite clan named Kenaz (Ge 36:11), and that they entered their future homes in the southern part of Palestine from the south. Their migration up north would then be reflected in the story of the spies.

In the genealogical tables (1Ch 2), Caleb is made a descendant of Judah through his father Hezron. He is the brother of Jerahmeel, and the "father" of Hebron and of other towns in Judah. (Chelubai, 1Ch 9:9, is apparently identical with Caleb.)

Nabal, with whom David had an encounter, is called a Calebite, i.e. one belonging to the house of Caleb (1Sa 25:3).

Max. L. Margolis

CALEB-EPHRATHAH

ka’-leb ef’-ra-tha, -ef’-ra-ta (the King James Version Caleb-ephratah, kalebh ‘ephrathah): The place where Hezron died (1Ch 2:24). Many scholars, however, read with the Septuagint "after the death of Hezron, Caleb came unto Ephrath, the wife of Hezron, his father." The name does not occur elsewhere, and none resembling it has been recovered.

CALENDAR

kal’-en-dar (Latin calendarium, "an account book," from calendae, "day on which accounts were due"): The Hebrew or Jewish calendar had three stages of development: the preexilic, or Biblical; the postexilic, or Talmudic; and the post-Talmudic. The first rested on observation merely, the second on observation coupled with calculation, and the third on calculation only. In the first period the priests determined the beginning of each month by the appearance of the new moon and the recurrence of the prescribed feasts from the vernal and autumnal equinoxes. Thus, the month Abib (’abhibh), the first month of the year according to the Levitical law, in which the Passover was to be celebrated, was determined by observation (Ex 12:2; De 16). After the exile more accurate methods of determining the months and seasons came into vogue, and calculation was employed to supplement and correct observations and the calendar was regulated according to the Babylonian system, as is evidenced by the names of the months which are derived from it. In later times the calendar was fixed by mathematical methods (see the article "Calendar" in the Jewish Encyclopedia). The difficulty of ascertaining the first day of the new moon by observation, in the early period, led to the celebration of two days, as seems to be indicated in 1Sa 20:27. We have only four names of months belonging to the pre-exilic period, and they are Phoenician. Of these Abib (’abhibh) was the first month, as already indicated, and it corresponded to Nis (nican) in the later calendar. It was the month in which the Exodus occurred and the month of the Passover (Ex 13:4; 23:15; 34:18; De 16:1).

The 2nd month of this calendar was Ziv (ziw) (1Ki 6:1,37); Ethanim (’ethanim) was the 7th (1Ki 8:2), corresponding to Tishri of the later calendar, and Bul (bul) the 8th, corresponded to Marchesvan (marcheshwan) (1Ki 6:38). There were course other month names in this old calendar, but they have not come down to us. These names refer to the aspects of the seasons: thus Abib (’abhibh) means grain in the ear, just ripening (Le 2:14; Ex 9:31); Ziv (ziw) refers to the beauty and splendor of the flowers in the spring; Ethanim (’ethanim) means perennial, probably referring to living fountains; and Bul (bul) means rain or showers, being the month when the rainy season commenced. The full calendar of months used in the postexilic period is given in a table accompanying this article. The names given in the table are not all found in the Bible, as the months are usually referred to by number, but we find Nican in Ne 2:1 and Es 3:7; Siwan in Es 8:9; Tammuz in Eze 8:4, although the term as here used refers to a Phoenician god after whom the month was named; ‘Elul occurs in Ne 6:15; Kiclew (the American Standard Revised Version "chislev") in Ne 1:1 and Zec 7:1; Tebheth in Es 2:16; ShebhaT in Zec 1:7 and ‘Adhar in Ezr 6:15 and several times in Est. These months were lunar and began with the new moon, but their position in regard to the seasons varied somewhat because of the intercalary month about every three years.

The year (shanah) originally began in the autumn, as appears from Ex 23:16 and Ex 34:22, where it is stated that the feast of Ingathering should be at the end of the year; the Sabbatic year began, also, in the

7th month of the calendar year (Le 25:8-10), indicating that this had been the beginning of the year. This seems to have been a reckoning for civil purposes, while the year beginning with Nican was for ritual and sacred purposes. This resulted from the fact that the great feast of the Passover occurred in this month and the other feasts were regulated by this, as we see from such passages as Ex 23:14-16 and De 16:1-17. Josephus (Ant., I, iii, 3) says: "Moses appointed that Nican, which is the same with Xanthicus, should be the first month of their festivals, because he brought them out of Egypt in that month; so that this month began the year as to all solemnities they observed to the honor of God, although he preserved the original order of the months as to selling and buying and other ordinary affairs." A similar custom is still followed in Turkey, where the Mohammedan year is observed for feasts, the pilgrimage to Mecca and other sacred purposes, while the civil year begins in March O. S.

The year was composed of 12 or 13 months according as to whether it was ordinary or leap year. Intercalation is not mentioned in Scripture, but it was employed to make the lunar correspond approximately to the solar year, a month being added whenever the discrepancy of the seasons rendered it necessary. This was regulated by the priests, who had to see that the feasts were duly observed at the proper season. The intercalary month was added after the month of ‘Adhar and was called the second ‘Adhar (sheni, wa-’adhar, "and Adar"), and, as already indicated, was added about once in 3 years. More exactly, 4 years out of every 11 were leap years of 13 months (Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Calendar"), this being derived from the Babylonian calendar. If, on the 16th of the month Nican, the sun had not reached the vernal equinox, that month was declared to be the second ‘Adhar and the following one Nican. This method, of course, was not exact and about the 4th century of our era the mathematical method was adopted. The number of days in each month was fixed, seven having 30 days, and the rest 29. When the intercalary month was added, the first ‘Adhar had 30 and the second 29 days.

H. Porter

CALF

kaf (‘eghel; par, or par, often rendered "bullock"): The etymology of both words is uncertain, but the former has a close parallel in the Arabic ‘ijl, "calf." Par is generally used of animals for sacrifice, ‘eghel, in that and other senses. ‘Eghel is used of the golden calves and frequently in the expression, ‘eghel marbeq, "fatted calf," or "calf of the stall," the latter being the literal meaning (1Sa 28:24; Jer 46:21; Am 6:4; Mal 4:2).

At the present day beef is not highly esteemed by the people of the country, but mutton is much prized. In the houses of the peasantry it is common to see a young ram being literally stuffed with food, mulberry or other leaves being forced into its mouth by one of the women, who then works the sheep’s jaw with one hand. The animal has a daily bath of cold water. The result is deliciously fat and tender mutton. Such an animal is called a ma‘luf. From the same root we have ma‘laf, "manger," suggestive of the Hebrew marbeq, "stall."

The calf for sacrifice was usually a male of a year old. Other references to calves are: "to skip like a

calf" (Ps 29:6); "the calf and the young lion and the fatling together" (Isa 11:6); "a habitation deserted .... there shall the calf feed, and there shall he lie down, and consume the branches thereof" (Isa 27:10).

See CATTLE.

Alfred Ely Day

CALF IMAGE

See IMAGES.

CALF, GOLDEN

kaf, gol'-d'-n:

I. THE NAME

II. ANCIENT CALF WORSHIP

1. Narrative of Aaron's Golden Calf

2. Jeroboam's Golden Calves

III. ATTITUDE OF ELIJAH TO THE BULL SYMBOLS

IV. ATTITUDE OF AMOS AND HOSEA TO THE BULL SYMBOLS

LITERATURE

I. The Name.

The term 'eghel, is the ordinary Hebrew name for a male calf and is as flexible as the English name, applying to any animal from one a year old (Mic 6:6) or perhaps younger (Le 9:3; 12:6) to one three years old (Ge 15:9; compare Jer 34:18,19). It has been thought that the habitual use of this diminutive term for the golden bulls which Aaron and Jeroboam set up—especially as it is twice made feminine (Ho 10:5; 13:2)—was intended to indicate their small size and thus to express contempt for them. This however, though plausible, is by no means certain. It was not their size which made these bulls contemptible in the eyes of the prophets, and besides there were no life-size bulls of molten gold in any surrounding countries so far as known. The reference to female calves that were kissed (Ho 13:2), presumably at Bethel, may refer not to the worship of the bulls, but to their female counterparts, since in

all other countries such female deities invariably accompanied the bull gods. Bethel may be especially mentioned because it was the "king's sanctuary" (Am 7:13) or because of the multitude of altars and high places found there (Ho 10:8; compare Ho 8:11; Am 5:26). False worship is also mentioned in connection with Jeroboam's apostasy, at Gilgal and Gilead (Ho 4:15; 12:11; Am 4:4; 5:5), Samaria (Ho 8:6; 10:5; 13:2,16); and Beersheba (Am 5:5; 8:14) where no bulls had been set up by Jeroboam so far as stated. That these places receive more condemnation than Dan—which is explicitly mentioned in only one passage (Am 8:14) though it was a chief center of the bull worship (1Ki 12:30)—may be due to the fact that the worship of the female deity was the more popular. This was certainly true in neighboring countries and also in other cities in Palestine, as has recently been proved by the excavations (see below).

II. Ancient Calf Worship.

The origin of animal worship is hidden in obscurity, but reverence for the bull and cow is found widespread among the most ancient historic cults. Even in the prehistoric age the influence of the bull symbol was so powerful that it gave its name to one of the most important signs of the Zodiac, and from early historic times the horns of the bull were the familiar emblem of the rays of the sun, and solar gods were very commonly represented as bull-gods (Jensen, Kosmologie, 62-90; Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, 1901-5, passim; Jeremias, Das Alter der bah. Astronomie, 1909, passim). The Egyptians, close neighbors of the Hebrews, in all eras from that of the Exodus onward, worshipped living bulls at Memphis (not Mendes, as EB) and Hellopolls as incarnations of Ptah and Ra, while one of the most elaborate rituals was connected with the life-size image of the Hathor-cow (Naville, Deir el Bahari, Part I (1907), 163-67), while the sun was revered as the "valiant bull" and the reigning Pharaoh as "Bull of Bulls." But far more important in this connection is the fact that "calf" worship was almost if not quite universal among all the ancient Semitic peoples. If the immediate ancestors of Abraham did not revere this deity, they were certainly quite unlike their relatives, the Babylonians, among whom, according to all tradition, they lived before they migrated to Palestine (Ge 11:28,30; Josephus, Ant, I, vi, 5), for the Babylonians revered the bull as the symbol of their greatest gods, Ann and Sin and Marduk—the ideograph of a young bullock forming a part of the latter's name—while Hadadrimmon, an important Amorite deity, whose attributes remarkably resemble those of Yahweh (see Ward, AJSL, XXV, 175-85; Clay, Amurru (1909), 87-89), is pictured standing on the back of a bull. In Phoenicia also the bull was a sacred animal, as well as in northern Syria where it ranked as one of the chief Hittite deities its images receiving devout worship (see further, Sayce, Encyclopedia of Rel. and Ethics, under the word "Bull"). Among all these peoples the cow goddess was given at least equal honor. In Babylonia the goddess Ishtar has the cow for her symbol on very ancient seal cylinders, and when this nude or half-nude goddess appears in Palestine she often stands on a bull or cow (see William Hayes Ward, Cylinders and Other Ancient Oriental Seals), and under slightly different forms this same goddess is revered in Arabia, Moab, Phoenicia, Syria and elsewhere, while among the Semitic Canaanites the bull was the symbol of Baal, and the cow of Astarte (see particularly Barton, Hebraica, IX, 133-63; X, 1-74, and Semitic Origins, chapter vii; Driver, "Astarte" in DB). Recent excavations in Palestine have shown that during all eras no heathen worship was as popular as that of Astarte in her various forms (see S. A. Cook, Rel. of Ancient Palestine, 1909). That she once is found wearing ram's horns (PEFS (1903), 227) only reveals her nature more clearly as the goddess of fertility. Her relation to the sacred fish at Carnion in

Gilead and to the doves of Ascalon, as well as to female prostitution and to Nature’s "resurrection" and fruitage, had been previously well known, as also her relation to the moon which governs the seasons. Is there any rational motif which can account for this widespread "calf" worship? Is it conceivable that this cult could so powerfully influence such intelligent and rather spiritually-minded nations as the Egyptians and Babylonians if it were wholly irrational and contained no spiritual content? And is there no rational explanation behind this constant fusion of the deity which controls the breeding of cattle with the deity which controls vegetation? How did the bull come to represent the "corn spirit," so that the running of a bull through the corn (the most destructive act) came to presage good crops; and how did the rending of a bull, spilling his life blood on the soil, increase fertility? (See Fraser, Golden Bough, II, 291-93, 344.) The one real controlling motif of all these various representations and functions of the "calf" god may be found in the ancient awe, especially among the Semites, for the Mystery of Life. This seems to offer a sufficient reason why the bull, which is a most conspicuous example of life-giving power, should be so closely connected with the reproductive processes of the animal and vegetable kingdoms and also with the sun, which from earliest historic times was considered as preeminently the "giver of life." Bull worship was not always an exhibition of gross animalism, but, certainly in Bible times, often represented a concept which was the product of reflection upon one of the deepest mysteries of Nature. Few hymns in Egypt or Babylon express higher spiritual knowledge and aspiration than those addressed to the bull gods or to others honored with this title, e. g. this one to the god Sin of Ur, the "heifer of Anu," "Strong young bull; with strong horns, ... with beard of lapislazuli color .... self-created, full of developed fruit .... Mother-womb who has taken up his abode, begetter of all things, exalted habitation among living creatures; O merciful gracious father, in whose hand rests the life of the whole world; O Lord, thy divinity is full of awe like the far-off heaven and the broad ocean!" (Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (1908), 164). Many modern scholars believe that the primitive Egyptians and Babylonians really thought of their earthly and heavenly gods as animals (see especially Maspero, Bulletin critique, 1886; Revue de l’histoiredes religions, 1888), but it seems certain that at least as early as the date of the Exodus these stars and beasts were not regarded by all as being themselves deities, but rather as symbols or representations of deity (Davis and Cobern, Ancient Egypt, 281-89; Brugsch, Die Aegyptologie, I, 135; Chwolsohn, Die Ssabier u. der Ssabismus, II, 134).

1. Narrative of Aaron’s Golden Calf:

The text of Ex 32 is certainly composite (see e. g. Bacon’s "Exodus" in the place cited and DB), and some words and phrases are a verbal dupli care of the narrative of Jeroboam’s calf worship (compare Ex 32:4 with 1Ki 12:28, and see parallel columns in Driver’s Deteronomy). Some Bible critics so analyze the text as to make the entire calf story a later element, without ancient basis, added to some short original statement like Ex 32:7-11, for the sake of satirizing Jeroboam’s bull worship and its non-Levitical priesthood (see e. g. Kuenen, Hexateuch). Most recent critics have however accepted the incident as an ancient memory or historic fact attested by the oldest sources, and used thus by the Deuteronomist (De 9), though the verbal form may have been affected by the later editor’s scorn of the northern apostasy. It seems clearly unreasonable to suppose that a Hebrew writer at any era would so fiercely abuse his own ancestors, without any traditional basis for his statements, merely for the sake of adding a little more which cast reproach upon his northern neighbors, and it seems equally unlikely that any such baseless charges would have been accepted as true by the slandered nation. The old expositors,

accepting the essential historicity of the account, generally followed Philo and the early Fathers in supposing this calf of gold was an image of the Apis or Mnevis bulls of Egypt, and this is occasionally yet advocated by some Egyptologists (e. g. Steindorf, Ancient Egypt (1903), 167; compare also Jeremias, Old Testament in Light of Ancient East (1911), II, 138). The objections made to this view by the skeptics of the 18th century, based on the supposed impossibility of such chemical and mechanical skill being possessed at that era, have mostly been made obsolete by recent discovery. The common modern objection that this could not have been Apis worship because the Apis was a living bull, is by no means conclusive, since images of Apis are not uncommon and were probably worshipped in the temple itself. It may be added that a renaissance of this worship occurred at this very era. So Erman, Handbook of Egyptian Rel. (1907), 23-79. Modern Bible scholars, however, are practically unanimous in the opinion that the Golden Calf, if worshipped at all, must have been a representation of a Semitic, not an Egyptian, deity. In favor of this it may be suggested:

(1) It was an era when each deity was considered as the god of a particular country and it would seem impossible that a native Egyptian god should be thought of as joining with Egypt’s enemies and assisting them to reach a land over which he had no control.

(2) The Israelite religion shows little influence from Egypt, but was immensely influenced from Canaan and Babylon, Apis only being mentioned once (Jer 46:20 (translated "heifer"); compare Eze 20:7,8, and see Brugsch, Steininschrift und Bibelwort, passim, and Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 217).

(3) The bull and cow are now known to have been ordinary symbols for the most popular deities which were worshipped by all the race-relatives of the Hebrews and nowhere more devoutly than in Canaan and in the adjoining districts (see above).

(4) Some of the chief gods of the pasture land of Goshen, where the Hebrews had resided for centuries (Ge 47:6; 50:8), were Semitic gods which were worshipped not only by the Edomitic Bedouin and other foreigners living there by the "pools of Pithom" (compare Ex 1:11) but by the native Egyptians, Ramses II even naming a daughter after one of these. The special god of this district had as its symbol a bull calf, and one inscription actually speaks of the statue of a "golden calf of 600 pounds weight" which it was the custom to dedicate annually to one of these Semitic gods, while another inscription mentions a statue of gold "a cubit in height" (Breasted, Ancient Records of Egypt (1905), III, 630-38; Naville, Goshen, Store City of Pithom; Erman, Handbook; 173-74; Brugsch, op. cit.).

(5) The chief proof, however, is the statement of the text that the feast in connection with this worship was a "feast to Yahweh" (Ex 32:5). When Moses disappeared for forty days in the Mount, it was not unnatural that the people should turn back to the visible symbols worshipped by their ancestors, and should give to them the new name or new attributes which had been attached to deity by Moses. The worship was condemned for much the same reason as that of Jeroboam’s calves (see next section).

2. Jeroboam’s Golden Calves:

Though this passage (1Ki 12:26-33; compare 2Ch 10:14,15) may have been reedited later, "there is no reason to infer that any detail of fact is underived from the olden time" (Burney, Hebrew Text of Kings (1902), and DB). These calves which Jeroboam set up were doubtless bulls (1Ki 12:28, Hebrew) but at least as early as Hosea's time it seems probable (see above) that the more licentious worship of the feminine principle had been added to the official worship (Ho 10:5; 13:2, Hebrew). This which else here naturally and universally accompanied the bull worship could most truly be called "the sin of Samaria" (Am 8:14) and be classed as the "sin of Jeroboam" (1Ki 14:9,16; 16:26; 2Ki 10:29). There is no sufficient reason for explaining the term "molten" in any other an its most natural and usual sense (Ex 32:8,24; 2Ki 17:16; De 9:16), for molded metal idols were common in all eras in Palestine and the surrounding countries, though the core of the image might be molten or graven of some inferior metal overlaid with gold (Isa 30:22; 40:19, Hebrew; De 7:25; Ex 32:4). These bull images were undoubtedly intended to represent Yahweh (yet compare Robertson, op. cit., and Orr, Problem of Old Testament (1906), 145). The text explicitly identifies these images with Aaron's calf (1Ki 12:28), so that nearly all the reasons given above to prove that Aaron's image represented not an Egyptian but an ancient Semitic deity are equally valid here. To these various other arguments may be added:

(1) The text itself states that it is Yahweh who brought them from Egypt (Ho 2:15; 12:13; 13:4), whom they call "My lord," and to whom they swear (Ho 2:16, King James Version margin; Ho 4:15); and to whom they present their wine offerings, sacrifices and feasts (Ho 8:13; 9:4,5, Hebrew; compare Am 5:8).

(2) Jehu, though he destroyed all Baal idols, never touched these bulls (2Ki 10:28,29).

(3) The ritual, though freer, was essentially that of the Jerusalem temple (1Ki 12:32; Ho 5:6; Am 4:5; 5:22,23; see, Oettli, Greifswalder Studien (1895), quoted in DB, I, 342).

(4) Even the southern prophets recognized that it was Yahweh who had given Jeroboam the kingdom (1Ki 11:31; 12:15,24) and only Yahweh worship could have realized Jeroboam's purpose of attaching to the throne by this cult such devout citizens as would otherwise be drawn to Jerusalem to worship. It was to guard against this appeal which the national sanctuary made to devout souls that this counter worship had been established. As Budde says, "A foreign cult would only have driven the devout Ephraimites the more surely over to Jerusalem" (Rel. of Israel (1899), 113). Jeroboam was not attempting to shock the conscience of his religious adherents by making heathenism the state religion, but rather to win these pious worshippers of Yahweh to his cause.

(5) The places selected for the bull worship were places already sacred to Yahweh. This was preeminently true of Bethel which, centuries before Jerusalem had been captured from the Jebusites, had been identified with special revelations of Yahweh's presence (Ge 13:3,4; 28:19; 31:13; 35:15; 1Sa 7:16; Ho 12:4).

(6) The story shows that the allegiance of his most pious subjects was retained (1Ki 12:20) and that not even Elijah fled to the Southern, supposing that the Northern Kingdom had accepted the worship of

heathen gods as its state religion. Instead of this, Elijah, though the boldest opponent of the worship of Baal, is never reported as uttering one word against the bull worship at Da and Bethel.

III. Attitude of Elijah to the Bull Symbols.

This surprising silence is variously explained. A few scholars, though without any historic or textual evidence for the charge, are sure that the Bible narratives (though written by southern men) are fundamentally defective at this point, otherwise they would report Elijah's antagonism to this cult. Other few, equally without evidence, are comfortably sure that he fully approved the ancient ancestral calf cult. Others, with more probability, explain his position on the ground that, though he may not have favored the bull symbol—which was never used by the Patriarchs so far as known, and certainly was not used as a symbol of Yahweh in the Southern Kingdom, or Hosea the northern prophet would have spoken of it—yet being himself a northern man of old ideals and simple habits, Elijah may have believed that, even with this handicap, the freer and more democratic worship carried on al the ancient holy places in the North was less dangerous than the elaborate and luxurious ritual of the aristocratic and exclusive priesthood of the South, which insisted upon political and religious centralization, and was dependent upon such enormous revenues for its support (compare 1Ki 12:10,14). At any rate it is self-evident that if Elijah had turned against Jeroboam and the state religion, it would have divided seriously the forces which needed to unite, in order to oppose with all energy the much fouler worship of Baal which just at this crisis, as never before or afterward, threatened completely to overwhelm the worship of Yahweh.

IV. Attitude of Amos and Hosea to the Bull Symbols.

It is easy to see why Hosea might fiercely condemn a ritual which Elijah might rightly tolerate.

(1) This calf worship may have deteriorated. Elijah lived closer to the time when the new state ritual was inaugurated and would naturally be at its best. Hosea lived at an era when he could trace the history of this experiment for nearly two cents, and could see clearly that these images had not helped but greatly hindered the development of the ethical and spiritual religion of Yahweh. Even if at first recognized as symbols, these images had become common idols (Ho 12:11; 13:2, and passim). "This tiring became a sin" (1Ki 12:30; 13:34). The history of religion shows many such instances wher the visible or verbal symbol which in one era had been a real aid to devotion at a later time became positively antagonistic to it (see IMAGES). As Baal was also worshipped under the form of a calf and as Yahweh himself was at times called "Baal" (Isa 54:5; Jer 31:32; Ho 2:16 Hebrew) this unethical tendency would be accelerated, as also by the political antagonism between Judah and Ephraim and the bitter hatred between the two rival priesthoods (compare 2Ch 11:15; 13:9). Certain it is that by the middle of the 8th century the worship at Da and Bethel had extended itself to many other points and had become so closely affiliated with the heathen worship as to be practically indistinguishable—at least when viewed from the later prophetic standpoint. But

(2) it cannot be doubted that the prophetic standpoint had changed in 200 years. As the influence of the

northern worship had tended toward heathenism, so the influence of the southern worship of an imageless god had tended toward higher spiritual ideals. Elijah could not have recognized the epoch-making importance of an imageless temple. The constant pressure of this idea—God is Spirit—had developed a new spiritual conscience, which by the 8th century was so keen that the worship of Yahweh under the form of an image was not improperly considered as almost if not quite as bad as out-and-out heathenism, just as the Reformers of the 16th century regarded the Roman Catholic images as little better than idols (Ho 8:5,6; 11:2; 13:2; compare 2Ki 17:16,17). The ifluence of this new conscience is also seen in the fact that it is not simply or perhaps chiefly the "calves" which are condemned, but the spirit of ungodliness and unkindness which also made the orthodox worship in Jerusalem little if any better than that at Bethel (Ho 6:4; 5:12,14). The influence of this theology—God is Spirit—had so filled the souls of these prophets that even the sacrifices had lost their importance when unaccompanied by kindness and spiritual knowledge (Ho 6:6; 7:1), and it is the absence of this essential spirit, rather than the form of worship, which Amos and Hosea condemn in the Northern Kingdom (Am 2:6-8; 3:10; 4:1; 5:7,12-15,21-24; 6:12; 8:4-6; Ho 4:2,3; 9:1; 10:12-14). These later prophets could also see, as Elijah could not possibly have seen, that unity of worship was imperatively needed, and that sacrifices in the old sacred "high places" must be discontinued. Only thus could superstitious fanaticism and religious disintegration be avoided. A miscellaneous and unregulated Yahweh cult might become almost as bad as heathenism. Indeed it might be worse if it gave the Baal spirit and interpretation to Yahweh worship.

See also ASTROLOGY, sec. II, 2.

LITERATURE.

Besides references above, see especially commentaries of Dillmann and Driver on Exodus; Kuenen, Religion of Israel; W. R. Smith, Religion of Semites, 93-113 and index; Konig, Hauptprobleme der altisraelitischen Religionsgeschichte; Baeth gen, Beitr. zur semit. Religionsgeschichte; Kittel, History of Hebrews; "Baal" and "Ashtoreth" in Encyclopedia of Rel. and Ethics (full lit.); "Golden Calf" in Jewish Encyclopedia for Rabbinical and Mohammedan lit.

Camden M. Cobern

CALITAS

kal’-i-tas (Kalitas, or Kaleitais): One of the Levites who put away their foreign wives at the request of Esdras (Ezra), 1 Esdras 9:23, "Colius, who was called Calitas." It is the Greek form of Hebrew Kelita (compare parallel passage, Ezr 10:23, elaiah, the same is "Kelita"). He is also named with those who explained the law when read to the people by Esdras (1 Esdras 9:48; compare Ne 8:7). It is not certain whether he is to be identified with the Kelita of Ne 10:10 (one of the Levites who signed the covenant made by Nehemiah). The word probably means "dwarf."

D. Miall Edwards

CALKER

kok’-er.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

CALLING

kol’-ing (klesis, from kaleo, "I call"): Is a New Testament expression. The word is used chiefly by Paul, though the idea and term are found also elsewhere. It has a definite, technical sense, the invitation given to men by God to accept salvation in His kingdom through Jesus Christ. This invitation is given outwardly by the preaching of the gospel, inwardly by the work of the Holy Spirit. With reference to Israel, it is on the part of God irrevocable, not repented of. Having in His eternal counsel called this people, He entrusted them with great gifts, and because He did thus enrich them, He also, in the course of time, summoned them to fulfill the task of initiating the world into the way of salvation, and of preparing salvation for the world. Therefore, He will not desert His people, for He Will not revoke that call (Ro 11:29). This calling is high or upward, in Christ, that is, made in heaven by God on account of Christ and calling man to heaven (Php 3:14). Similarly it is a heavenly calling (Heb 3:1); also a holy calling, holy in aim, means, and end (2Ti 1:9). Christians are urged to walk worthy of this calling (Eph 4:1) (the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but the King James Version has "vocation"). In it there is hope; it is the inspirer of hope, and furnishes for hope its supreme object (Eph 4:4). Men are exhorted so to live that God will count them worthy of their calling (2Th 1:11). They are also urged to make their calling and election sure (2Pe 1:10). See ELECTION. There is a somewhat peculiar use of the word in 1Co 1:26 and 1Co 7:20, namely, that condition of life in which men were when God called them, not many of them wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, some circumcised, some uncircumcised, some bond, some free, some male, some female, some married, some unmarried.

George Henry Trever

CALLISTHENES

ka-lis’-the-nez (Kallisthenes): An officer of Nicanor who was charged with the burning of the sacred portals of the temple at the time of the desecration under Antiochus Epiphanes (168 BC). After the decisive defeat of Nicanor’s army at Emmaus (165 BC) the Jews celebrated the victory in the city of their fathers and burned C. who had fled into an outhouse with others who had set the sacred gates on fire, "the meet reward of their impiety" (2 Macc 8:33).

CALNEH

kal’-ne (kalneh; Chalanne): The name of the fourth city of Nimrod’s kingdom (Ge 10:10), the three

preceding it being Babel, Erech, and Accad, i.e. the capital of the realm of Babylonia and the chief cities of three of the principal states. The meaning of the name is unknown, and many regard the identification as uncertain athers and burned C. who had fled into an outhouse with others who had set the sacred gates on fire, "the meet reward of their impiety" (2 Macc 8:33).

1. Identified with Nippur:

G. Rawlinson thought it to be the modern Niffer (or Noufar), comparing the Talmudic (compare Yoma') Nopher, which is said to be the same as Calneh. What place-name Calneh corresponds with in cuneiform is doubtful. Fried. Delitzsch (Wo lag das Paradies?) compared it with Kul-unu, but as we are told to pronounce this group as Kullaba, it seems unlikely that there is any connection between the two. The identification proposed by G. Rawlinson, however, may be regarded as being supported by the bilingual Creation-legend, in which Merodach (= Nimrod) is made the founder of Babylon, Erech and Nippur, which would in that case be three of the four cities mentioned in Ge 10:10.

2. Nippur's Importance:

The inscriptions reveal to us Nippur as a city with a glorious past. Sargon of Agade, Sur-Engur, Dungi and all the more prominent kings of Babylonia in its larger sense interested themselves in the rebuilding and restoration of its renowned temples, so as to gain the favor of their great divinities.

3. Its Deities and Their Legends:

The city's earlier divine patrons were Enlil and Ninlil, the older Bel and Beltis, whose shrines were at the great temple-tower called E-kura, "the house of the land," and a poetical legend in Sumerian (dialectical) recording their visit to the city, and enumerating its sacred places, still exists (PSBA, March, 1911, 85 ff). Later, the chief deities of the city seem to have been Ninip, the son of Enlil, and his spouse Nin-Nipri, "the lady of Nippur." These two divine beings likewise evoked the muse of the city-scribes, who dealt with the glories of the god in a composition extending over several tablets, in which his favor to his spouse Nin-Nipri is extolled; and to whom a career very similar to that of Merodach, the head of the Babylonian pantheon, is attributed (PSBA, December, 1906, 270 ff).

4. Its Ruins Today:

The great temple-tower of Niffer, which was dedicated to the god Enlil, was a very striking object among the buildings and temples of the city, and the lower stages are still in an extremely perfect condition. Most interesting, also, are the remains of streets and houses which enable the general conditions of life in ancient Babylonia to be estimated, and suggest that they are similar to those subsisting even at the present day. Our knowledge of the city is almost entirely due to the American excavations at Niffer, inaugurated by J. P. Peters, which have been most fruitful and have shed quite a new light on the city's history. See Peters' Nippur (2 volumes, 1887); the many volumes written or edited by Professor H. V. Hilprecht under the general title The Babylonian Expedition of the University

of Pennsylvania; and Professor A. T. Clay’s Light on the Old Testament from Babel (Philadelphia, 1907).

T. G. Pinches

CALNEH; CALNO

kal’-ne, kal’-no (kalneh (Am 6:2), kalno (Isa 10:9)): "Probably the Kulnia (Kullani) associated with Arpad and Hadrach, Syrian cities, in the Assyrian ‘tribute’ list (Western Asiatic Inscriptions, II, 53, number 3); Kullanhu about six miles from Arpad" (HDB, I, 344, and 1-vol HDB, 109).

CALPHI

kal’-fi

See CHALPHI.

CALVARY

kal’-va-ri.

See GOLGOTHA.

CALVES, OF THE LIPS

kavz, (Septuagint: karpon cheileon): This is the King James Version rendering of a dubious Hebrew text in Ho 14:2 (parim sephathenu). The Revised Version (British and American) runs "So will we render as bullocks the offering of our lips." Strange as the text is, it may be retained, and it admits of at least a possible explanation. The prophet calls on his contemporaries to return in penitence to Yahweh. Their worship should consist not of meaningless dumb ritual, but of "words"—hymns and prayers, expressive of real gratitude and of actual needs—or perhaps pledges of repentance and reform. The people respond and undertake that their worship shall consist of "calves or bullocks of lips," i.e. not of animal offerings, but of promises of reform or vows of obedience. But this explanation is forced and most modern commentators follow the Septuagint, which presupposes a slightly different Hebrew text, and renders peri sephathenu, "fruit of our lips," i.e. adoring gratitude or, as the author of the Epistle to the He, who quotes this verse from the Septuagint, explains it, "sacrifice of praise" (Heb 13:15). The same phrase occurs in Isa 57:19, where it signifies gladsome gratitude.

T. Lewis

CAMBYSES

kam-bi'-sez (Aram., c-n-b-n-z-y; Persian, Kambujiya; Assyrian, Kambuzia; Egyptian, Kambythet; Susian, Kanpuziya): The older son of Cyrus, king of Persia. Some have thought that he is the Ahasuerus of Ezr 4:6. This seems to be most improbable, inasmuch as the Hebrew form of Ahasuerus is the exact equivalent of the Old Persian form of Xerxes, and we have no evidence that Cambyses was ever called Xerxes.

Ancient authorities differ as to who was the mother of Cambyses. It is variously said that she was Cassandane, a Persian princess, Amytis, a Median princess, or Nititis, a daughter of Apries king of Egypt. He had one brother, Bardes or Smerdes, whom he put to death secretly shortly after his accession, probably because of an attempted rebellion. Cambyses organized an expedition for the conquest of Egypt, which was rendered successful by internal treachery and by the aid of the Phoenician, Cyprian and Greek fleets. During this campaign Cambyses seems to have acted with good generalship and with clemency toward the conquered. After the subjugation of Egypt, Cyrene and Barca, the modern Tripoli, submitted to his sway. He then desired to undertake the conquest of Carthage, but was compelled to give it up, because his Phoenician allies, without whose ships it was impossible for him to conduct his army in safety, refused to join in an attack upon a country that had been colonized by them. He is said to have sent an army of 50,000 men against the oasis of Jupiter Ammon. This army is said to have perished in the sands. A little less unsuccessful expedition was made against Ethiopia. After some initial successes, Cambyses was forced to return to Egypt with the shattered remains of his army. He found that the Egyptians were in revolt, led by their king Psammetichus III, whose life he had formerly spared. This revolt was put down with great harshness, the Egyptian king being taken and executed, and many of the temples being destroyed. Shortly after this, Cambyses heard that a certain Magian, who claimed to be his brother Smerdes whom he had secretly put to death, had set himself up as king of Persia, and that almost the whole of his Asiatic dominions had acknowledged him as king. With the fragments of his army he started toward Persia to attack the usurper, but on the way was killed by a wound inflicted by himself, it is uncertain whether by accident or with intention. His general and cousin, Darius Hystaspis, soon put down the false Smerdis and reigned in his stead.

For two or more years Cambyses was king of Babylon, while his father was king of the lands. The son was a drunkard and subject to fits of unbridled passion, but seems to have been of good capacity as a general and as an administrator. Many of the tales that have been told against him were doubtless invented by his enemies, and he has left us no records of his own. That he married his own sisters is probable; but it must be remembered that this was the custom of the Egyptian kings of that time and may have been of the Persian kings as well. As to his conduct in Egypt, the only contemporary Egyptian authority says that he worshipped before the holiness of Neit as all the pious kings had done, that he ordered that the temple of Neit should be purified, and that its revenues should be restored as they had been before they had been confiscated by Akhmes for his Greek troops. He adds also that not merely were the strangers who had taken up their abode in the temple of Neit ejected from her sanctuary, but that their goods were taken away and their houses destroyed. Darius Hystaspis, the only other contemporary source of information, says of him simply that he was the son of Cyrus, of the same father and mother as Bardes, whom he slew secretly at some time before he set out on his Egyptian campaign; and that he died by suicide shortly after he had heard of the rebellion of Persia, Media and the other

provinces against him, and of the establishment of Gaumata the Magian as king under the claim that he was "Barzia, the son of Cyrus and brother of Cambyses."

The name of Cambyses is found in three of the Elephantine papyri recently published (September, 1911) by Professor Sachau of Berlin. The fragment numbered 59 1 is so broken that it is impossible to make out the connection or the sense. In papyrus I, we are told that when Cambyses came to Egypt he found in the fortress of Yeb (Elephantine) a temple or synagogue (’agora’), which had been built in the days of the Egyptian kings; and that although he had torn down the temples of the Egyptian gods, he had allowed no harm to be done to that of Yahweh. The third papyrus is so interesting, because of its mention of Bagoas, the Persian governor of Jerusalem in 407 BC, who had hitherto been known only from Josephus, and of Dalayah the son of the Sanballat who opposed the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem in the time of Ezra-Nehemiah, that we shall now give a translation of it in full: "A memorial of that which Bagoas and Dalayah said to me: Thou shalt say in Egypt unto Arsames with regard to the house of the altar of the God of heaven that was built in the fortress of Yeb before the time of Cambyses and which the accursed(?) Waidrang destroyed in the 14th year of Darius the king, that it shall be built again upon its place as it was before, and that meal-offerings and incense-offerings shall be offered upon that altar as they used to be."

LITERATURE.

For further information as to the history of Cambyses see Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies; Prasek, Geschichte der Meder und Perser; the Behistun inscription in the editions of the various recensions by Bezold, Spiegel, Weisbach, Thomson, and King; Herodotus; Josephus; the Sachau papyri; and Petrie, History of Egypt, III.

R. Dick Wilson

CAMEL

kam’-el (gamal; kamelos; bekher, and bikhrah (Isa 60:6; Jer 2:23 "dromedary," the American Revised Version, margin "young camel"), rekhesh (1Ki 4:28; see HORSE), kirkaroth (Isa 66:20, "swift beasts," the American Standard Revised ersion. "dromedaries"); bene ha-rammakhim (Es 8:10, "young dromedaries," the American Standard Revised Version "bred of the stud"); achashteranim (Es 8:10,14, the King James Version "camels," the American Standard Revised Version "that were used in the king’s service")): There are two species of camel, the Arabian or one-humped camel or dromedary, Camelus dromedarius, and the Bactrian or two-humped camel, Camelus bactrianus. The latter inhabits the temperate and cold parts of central Asia and is not likely to have been known to Biblical writers. The Arabian camel inhabits southwestern Asia and northern Africa and has recently been introduced into parts of America and Australia. Its hoofs are not typical of ungulates but are rather like great claws. The toes are not completely separated and the main part of the foot which is applied to the ground is a large pad which underlies the proximal joints of the digits. It may be that this incomplete separation of the two toes is a sufficient explanation of the words "parteth not the hoof," in Le 11:4 and De 14:7. Otherwise

these words present a difficulty, because the hoofs are completely separated though the toes are not. The camel is a ruminant and chews the cud like a sheep or ox, but the stomach possesses only three compartments instead of four, as in other ruminants. The first two compartments contain in their walls small pouches, each of which can be closed by a sphincter muscle. The fluid retained in these pouches may account in part for the power of the camel to go for a relatively long time without drinking.

The Arabian camel is often compared with justice to the reindeer of the Esquimaux. It furnishes hair for spinning and weaving, milk, flesh and leather, as well as being an of invaluable means of transportation in the arid desert. There are many Arabic names for the camel, the commonest of which is jamal (in Egypt gamal), the root being common to Arabic, Hebrew and other Semitic languages. From it the names in Latin, Greek, English and various European languages are derived. There are various breeds camels, as there are of horses. The riding camels or dromedaries, commonly called hajin, can go, even at a walk, much faster than the pack camels. The males are mostly used for carrying burdens, the females being kept with the herds. Camels are used to a surprising extent on the rough roads of the mountains, and one finds in the possession of fellachin in the mountains and on the littoral plain larger and stronger pack camels than are often found among the Bedouin. Camels were apparently not much used by the Israelites after the time of the patriarchs. They were taken as spoil of war from the Amalekites and other tribes, but nearly the only reference to their use by the later Israelites was when David was made king over all Israel at Hebron, when camels are mentioned among the animals used for bringing food for the celebration (1Ch 12:40). David had a herd of camels, but the herdsman was Obil, an Ishmaelite (1Ch 27:30). Nearly all the other Biblical references to camels are to those possessed by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Ishmaelites, Amalekites, Midianites, Hagrites and the "children of the East" (see EAST). Two references to camels (Ge 12:16; Ex 9:3) are regarded as puzzling because the testimony of the Egyptian monuments is said to be against the presence of camels in ancient Egypt. For this reason, Ge 12-16, in connection with Abram’s visit to Egypt, is turned to account by Canon Cheyne to substantiate his theory that the Israelites were not in Egypt but in a north Arabian land of Mucri (Encyclopaedia Biblica under the word "Camel," 4). While the flesh of the camel was forbidden to the Israelites, it is freely eaten by the Arabs. There are three references to the camel in New Testament:

(1) to John’s raiment of camel’s hair (Mt 3:4; Mr 1:6);

(2) the words of Jesus that "it is easier for a camel to go through a needle’s eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Mt 19:24; Mr 10:25; Lu 18:25);

(3) the proverb applied to the Pharisees as blind guides, "that strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel" (Mt 23:24). Some manuscripts read ho kamilos, "a cable," in Mt 19:24 and Lu 18:25.

There are a few unusual words which have been translated "camel" in text or margin of one or the other version. (See list of words at beginning of the article) Bekher and bikhrah clearly mean a young animal, and the Arabic root word and derivatives are used similarly to the Hebrew. Rakhash, the root of rekhesh, is compared with the Arabic rakad, "to run," and, in the Revised Version (British and American), rekhesh is translated "swift steeds." Kirkaroth, rammakhim and ‘achashteranim must be admitted to be

of doubtful etymology and uncertain meaning.

Alfred Ely Day

CAMEL’S HAIR

(triches kamelou): In Mt 3:4 and Mr 1:6 the description of John’s raiment is explicit to the extent of telling the kind of hair of which his raiment was made. It is probable that his garment was made of a tawed camel skin, for the more expensive woven camel’s hair garment would not be in keeping with the rest of the description. It is still common among the poor in some parts of Syria, when a camel or other animal dies, to remove its skin and, after treating the inner surface to stop decomposition, to make it up into various domestic articles. The writer once saw a peasant dragging a skin along the road which proved to be that of a donkey which had just died on the route. His intention was probably to make it up into a cloak. Some believe that Elijah’s mantle was of camel’s hair (2Ki 1:8; compare Zec 13:4). Of that we cannot be sure, for in the East today the hairy garment is usually goat’s hair or wool either woven or still clinging to the skin. It was much more likely to have been one of these latter. See SHEEP. Camel’s hair, when woven into fabrics, as in rugs, makes an article of even softer and more glossy texture than wool.

See WEAVING.

James A. Patch

CAMON

ka’-mon (qamon, "standing-place," Jud 10:5 the King James Version).

See KAMON.

CAMP

See WAR.

CAMPHIRE

kam’-fir.

See HENNA.

CANA, OF GALILEE

ka’-na, (Kana tes Galilaias): This was the scene of Christ’s earliest miracle, when, at the marriage feast, He turned water into wine (Joh 2:1 ff). It was the home of Nathaniel (Joh 21:2). From Cana, after the marriage, Jesus "went down" to Capernaum (Joh 2:12), and returned at the request of the centurion (Joh 4:46,51). These are the only notices of Cana in Scripture, and from them we learn merely that it was in Galilee, and in the uplands West of the lake. Other villages of the same name are mentioned by Josephus, but probably this one is intended by the Cana where for a time he dwelt (Vita, 16) which he locates in the plain of Asochis (ibid., 41). The Greek kana probably transliterates an old Hebrew qanah, "place of reeds." This ancient name survives in Khirbet Qana, a ruined site with rockhewn tombs, cisterns and a pool, on the northern edge of Sahl el-Battauf, the plain of Asochis. Near by are marshy stretches where reeds still abound: the name therefore is entirely appropriate. The name Qana el-Jelil , the exact Arabic equivalent of Kana tes Galilaias, is also heard among the natives. This, however, may have arisen from the suggested identification with Cana of the Gospel. The position agrees well enough with the Gospel data.

Kefr Kennah, a thriving village about 3 3/4 miles from Nazareth, on the southern edge of Sahl Tor‘an, the plain South of the range of that name, through which the road from Nazareth to Tiberias passes, has also many advocates. This identification is accepted by the Greek and Latin churches, which have both built extensively in the village; the Greeks showing stone jars said to have been used in the miracle, and the traditional house of Nathaniel being pointed out. A copious spring of excellent water rises West of the village; and the pomegranates grown here are greatly prized. The change of name, however, from Qana to Kennah—(note the doubled n), is not easy; and there are no reeds in the neighborhood to give the name any appropriateness.

Onom locates Cana in the tribe of Asher toward Great Sidon, probably thinking of Kana, a village about 8 miles South of Tyre. The pilgrims of the Middle Ages seem to be fairly divided as to the two sites. Saewulf (1102), Brocardius (1183), Marinus Sanutus (1321), Breydenbach (1483) and Anselm (1507) favor the northern site; while on the side of Kefr Kennah may be reckoned Paula (383), Willibald (720), Isaac Chelo (1334) and Quaresimus (1616). It seems pretty certain that the Crusaders adopted the identification with Khirbet Kana (Conder, Tent Work, 69 f). While no absolute decision is possible, on the available evidence probability points to the northern site.

Col. Conder puts in a claim for a third site, that of ‘Ain Kana on the road from er-Reineh (a village about 1 1/2 mile from Nazareth on the Tiberias road) to Tabor (Tent Work, 81).

W. Ewing

CANAAN; CANAANITES

ka’-nan, ka’-nan-its (kena‘an; Chanaan):

1. Geography

2. Meaning of the Name

3. The Results of Recent Excavations

4. History

(1) Stone Age

(2) Bronze Age

(3) A Babylonian Province

(4) Jerusalem Founded

(5) The Hyksos

(6) Egyptian Conquest

(7) Tell el-Amarna Tablets

5. The Israelitsh Invasion

6. Culture

7. Art

8. Commerce

9. Art of Writing

LITERATURE

Canaan is stated in Ge 10:6 to have been a son of Ham and brother of Mizraim, or Egypt. This indicates the Mosaic period when the conquerors of the XVIIIth and XIXth Egyptian Dynasties made Canaan for a time a province of the Egyptian empire. Under the Pharaoh Meneptah, at the time of the Exodus, it ceased to be connected with Egypt, and the Egyptian garrisons in the South of the country were expelled by the Philistines, who probably made themselves masters of the larger portion of it, thus causing the name of Philistia or Palestine to become synonymous with that of Canaan (see Ze 2:5). In the Tell el-Amarna Letters, Canaan is written Kinakhna and Kinakhkhi. The latter form corresponds with the Greek (Chna), a name given to Phoenicia (Hecat. Fragments 254; Eusebius, praep. Ev., i.10; ix.17).

1. Geography:

In Nu 13:29 the Canaanites are described as dwelling "by the sea, and along by the side of the Jordan," i. e. in the lowlands of Palestine. The name was confined to the country West of the Jordan (Nu 33:51; Jos 22:9), and was especially applied to Phoenicia (Isa 23:11; compare Mt 15:22). Hence, Sidon is called the "firstborn" of Canaan (Ge 10:15, though compare Jud 3:3), and the Septuagint translates "Canaanites" by "Phoenicians" and "Canaan" by the "land of the Phoenicians" (Ex 16:35; Jos 5:12). Kinakhkhi is used in the same restricted sense in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, but it is also extended so as to include Palestine generally. On the other hand, on the Egyptian monuments Seti I calls a town in the extreme South of Palestine "the city of Pa-Kana'na" or "the Canaan," which Conder identifies with the modern Khurbet Kenan near Hebron. As in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, so in the Old Testament, Canaan is used in an extended sense to denote the whole of Palestine West of the Jordan (Ge 12:5; 23:2,19; 28:1; 31:18; 35:6; 36:2; 37:1; 48:7; Ex 15:15; Nu 13:2; Jos 14:1; 21:2; Ps 135:11). Thus, Jerusalem which had Amorite and Hittite founders is stated to be of "the land of the Canaanite" (Eze 16:3), and Isa 19:18 terms Hebrew, which was shared by the Israelites with the Phoenicians and, apparently, also the Amorites, "the language of Caaan." Jabin is called "the king of Canaan" in Jud 4:2,23,24; but whether the name is employed here in a restricted or extended sense is uncertain.

2. Meaning of the Name:

As the Phoenicians were famous as traders, it has been supposed that the name "Canaanite" is a synonym of "merchant" in certain passages of the Old Testament. The pursuit of trade, however, was characteristic only of the maritime cities of Phoenicia, not of the Canaanitish towns conquered the Israelites. In Isa 23:11 we should translate "Canaan" (as the Septuagint) instead of "merchant city" (the King James Version); in Ho 12:7 (8), "as, for Canaan" (Septuagint), instead of "he is a merchant" (the King James Version); in Ze 1:11, "people of Canaan" (Septuagint), instead of "merchant people" (the King James Version); on the other hand, "Canaanite" seems to have acquired the sense of "merchant," as "Chaldean" did of "astrologer," in Isa 23:8, and Pr 3:1:24, though probably not in Zec 14:21, and Job 41:6 (Hebrew 40:30).

3. The Results of Recent Excavation:

Much light has been thrown upon the history of Canaan prior to the Israelite occupation by recent excavation, supplemented by the monuments of Babylonia and Egypt. The Palestine Exploration led the way by its excavations in 1890-92 at Tell el-Hesy, which turned out to be the site of Lachish, first under Professor Flinders Petrie and then under Dr. Bliss. Professor Petrie laid the foundations of Palestine archaeology by fixing the chronological sequence of the Lachish pottery, and tracing the remains of six successive cities, the fourth of which was that founded by the Israelites. Between it and the preceding city was a layer of ashes, marking the period when the town lay desolate and uninhabited. The excavations at Lachish were followed by others at Tell es-Safi, the supposed site of Gath; at Tell Sandahanna, the ancient Marissa, a mile South of Bet Jibrin, where interesting relics of the Greek period

were found, and at Jerusalem, where an attempt was made to trace the city walls. Next to Lachish, the most fruitful excavations have been at Gezer, which has been explored by Mr. Macalister with scientific thoroughness and skill, and where a large necropolis has been discovered as well as the remains of seven successive settlements, the last of which comes down to the Seleucid era, the third corresponding with the first settlement at Lachish. The two first settlements go back to the neolithic age. With the third the Semitic or "Amorite" period of Canaan begins; bronze makes its appearance; high-places formed of monoliths are erected, and inhumation of the dead is introduced, while the cities are surrounded with great walls of stone. While Mr. Macalister has been working at Gezer, German and Austrian expeditions under Dr. Schumacher have been excavating at Tell em-Mutesellim, the site of Megiddo, and under Dr. Sellin first at Tell Taanak, the ancient Taanach, and then at Jericho. At Taanach cuneiform tablets of the Mosaic age were found in the house of the governor of the town; at Samaria and Gezer cuneiform tablets have also been found, but they belong to the late Assyrian and Babylonian periods. At Jericho, on the fiat roof of a house adjoining the wall of the Canaanitish city, destroyed by the Israelites, a number of clay tablets were discovered laid out to dry before being inscribed with cuneiform characters. Before the letters were written and dispatched, however, the town, it seems, was captured and burnt. An American expedition, under Dr. Reisner, is now exploring Sebastiyeh (Samaria), where the ruins of Ahab’s palace, with early Hebrew inscriptions, have been brought to light, as well as a great city wall built in the age of Nebuchadrezzar.

4. History:

(1) Stone Age.

The history of Canaan begins with the paleolithic age, paleolithic implements having been found in the lowlands. Our first knowledge of its population dates from the neolithic period. The neolithic inhabitants of Gezer were of short stature (about 5 ft. 4 inches in height), and lived in caves—at least in the time of the first prehistoric settlement—and burned their dead. Their sacred place was a double cave with which cup-marks in the rock were connected, and their pottery was rude; some of it was ornamented with streaks of red or black on a yellow or red wash. In the time of the second settlement a rude stone wall was built around the town. The debris of the two neolithic settlements is as much as 12 ft. in depth, implying a long period of accumulation.

(2) Bronze Age.

The neolithic population was succeeded by one of Semitic type, which introduced the use of metal, and buried its dead. The name of Amorite has been given to it, this being the name under which the Semitic population of Canaan was known to the Babylonians. Gezer was surrounded by a great wall of stone intersected by brick towers; at Lachish the Amorite wall was of crude brick, nearly 29 ft. in thickness (compare De 1:28). A "high-place" was erected at Gezer consisting of 9 monoliths, running from North to South, and surrounded by a platform of large stones. The second monolith has been polished by the kisses of the worshippers; the seventh was brought from a distance. Under the pavement of the sanctuary lay the bones of children, more rarely of adults, who had been sacrificed and sometimes burnt, and the

remains deposited in jars. Similar evidences of human sacrifice were met with under the walls of houses both here and at Taanach and Megiddo. In the Israelite strata the food-bowl and lamp for lighting the dead in the other world are retained, but all trace of human sacrifice is gone. At Lachish in Israelite times the bowl and lamp were filled with sand. The second "Amorite" city at Gezer had a long existence. The high-place was enlarged, and an Egyptian of the age of the XIIth Dynasty was buried within its precincts. Egyptian scarabs of the XIIth and XIIIth Dynasties are now met with; these give place to scarabs of the Hyksos period, and finally to those of the XVIIIth Dynasty (1600 BC). Hittite painted pottery of Cappadocian type is also found in the later debris of the city as well as seal-cylinders of the Babylonian pattern.

(3) A Babylonian Province.

Meanwhile Canaan had for a time formed part of the Babylonian empire. Gudea, viceroy of Lagas under the kings of the Dynasty of Ur (2500 BC), had brought "limestone" from the "land of the Amorites," alabaster from Mt. Lebanon, cedar-beams from Amanus, and golddust from the desert between Palestine and Egypt. A cadastral survey was drawn up about the same time by Uru-malik, "the governor of the land of the Amorites," the name by which Syria and Canaan were known to the Babylonians, and colonies of "Amorites" engaged in trade were settled in the cities of Babylonia. After the fall of the Dynasty of Ur, Babylonia was itself conquered by the Amorites who founded the dynasty to which Khammurabi, the Amraphel of Ge 14:1, belonged (see HAMMURABI). In an inscription found near Diarbekir the only title given to Khammu-rabi is "king of the land of the Amorites." Babylonian now became the official, literary and commercial language of Canaan, and schools were established there in which the cuneiform script was taught. Canaanitish culture became wholly Babylonian; even its theology and gods were derived from Babylonia. The famous legal code of Khammu-rabi (see HAMMURABI, CODE OF) was enforced in Canaan as in other parts of the empire, and traces of its provisions are found in Gen. Abram’s adoption of his slave Eliezer, Sarai’s conduct to Hagar, and Rebekah’s receipt of a dowry from the father of the bridegroom are examples of this. So, too, the sale of the cave of Machpelah was in accordance with the Babylonian legal forms of the Khammu-rabi age. The petty kings of Canaan paid tribute to their Babylonian suzerain, and Babylonian officials and "commerical travelers" (damgari) frequented the country.

(4) Jerusalem Founded.

We must ascribe to this period the foundation of Jerusalem, which bears a Babylonian name (Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim"), and commanded the road to the naphtha springs of the Dead-Sea. Bitumen was one of the most important articles of Babylonian trade on account of its employment for building and lighting purposes, and seems to have been a government monopoly. Hence, the rebellion of the Canaanitish princes in the naphtha district (Ge 14) was sufficiently serious to require a considerable force for its suppression.

(5) The Hyksos.

The Amorite dynasty in Babylonia was overthrown by a Hittite invasion, and Babylonian authority in Canaan came to an end, though the influence of Babylonian culture continued undiminished. In the North the Hittites were dominant; in the South, where Egyptian influence had been powerful since the age of the XIIth Dynasty, the Hyksos conquest of Egypt united Palestine with the Delta. The Hyksos kings bear Canaanitish names, and their invasion of Egypt probably formed part of that general movement which led to the establishment of an "Amorite" dynasty in Babylonia. Egypt now became an appanage of Canaan, with its capital, accordingly, near its Asiatic frontier. One of the Hyksos kings bears the characteristically Canaanitish name of Jacob-el, written in the same way as on Babylonian tablets of the age of Khammu-rabi, and a place of the same name is mentioned by Thothmes III as existing in southern Palestine

(6) Egyptian Conquest.

The Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty expelled the Hyksos and conquered Palestine and Syria. For about 200 years Canaan was an Egyptian province. With the Egyptian conquest the history of the second Amorite city at Gezer comes to an end. The old wall was partially destroyed, doubtless by Thothmes III (about 1480 BC). A third Amorite city now grew up, with a larger and stronger wall, 14 ft. thick. The houses built on the site of the towers of the first wall were filled with scarabs and other relics of the reign of Amon-hotep III (1440 BC). At Lachish the ruins of the third city were full of similar remains, and among them was a cuneiform tablet referring to a governor of Lachish mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. At Taanach cuneiform tablets of the same age have been discovered, written by Canaanites to one another but all in the Babylonian script and language.

(7) Tell el-Amarna Tablets.

In the Tell el-Amarna Letters we have a picture of Canaan at the moment when the Asiatic empire of Egypt was breaking up through the religious and social troubles that marked the reign of Amon-hotep IV. The Hittites were attacking it in the North; in the South of Canaan the Khabiri or "confederate" bands of free-lances were acquiring principalities for themselves. The petty kings and governors had foreign troops in their pay with which they fought one against the other; and their mercenaries readily transferred their allegiance from one paymaster to another, or seized the city they were engaged to defend. Hittites, Mitannians from Mesopotamia, and other foreigners appear as governors of the towns; the Egyptian government was too weak to depose them and was content if they professed themselves loyal. At times the Canaanitish princes intrigued with the Assyrians against their Egyptian masters; at other times with the Mitannians of "Aram-Naharaim" or the Hittites of Cappadocia. The troops sent by the Egyptian Pharaoh were insufficient to suppress the rebellion, and the authority of the Egyptian commissioners grew less and less. Eventually the king of the Amorites was compelled to pass openly over to the Hittite king, and Canaan was lost to the Pharaohs.

5. The Israelite Invasion:

Gaza and the neighboring towns, however, still remained in their hands, and with the recovery of

Egyptian power under the XIXth Dynasty allowed Seti I to march once more into Canaan and reduce it again to subjection. In spite of Hittite attacks the country on both sides of the Jordan acknowledged the rule of Seti and his son Ramses II, and in the 21st year of the latter Pharaoh the long war with the Hittites came to an end, a treaty being made which fixed the Egyptian frontier pretty much where the Israelite frontier afterward ran. A work, known as The Travels of the Mohar, which satirizes the misadventures of a tourist in Canaan, gives a picture of Canaan in the days of Ramses II. With the death of Ramses II Egyptian rule in Palestine came finally to an end. The Philistines drove the Egyptian garrisons from the cities which commanded the military road through Canaan, and the long war with the Hittites exhausted the inland towns, so that they made but a feeble resistance to the Israelites who assailed them shortly afterward. The Egyptians, however, never relinquished their claim to be masters of Canaan, and when the Philistines power had been overthrown by David we find the Egyptian king again marching northward and capturing Gezer (1Ki 9:16). Meanwhile the counry had become to a large extent Israelite. In the earlier days of the Israelite invasion the Canaanitish towns had been destroyed and the people massacred; later the two peoples intermarried, and a mixed race was the result. The portraits accompanying the names of the places taken by Shishak in southern Palestine have Amorite features, and the modern fellahin of Palestine are Canaanite rather than Jewish in type.

6. Culture:

Canaanitish culture was based on that of Babylonia, and begins with the introduction of the use of copper and bronze. When Canaan became a Babylonian province, it naturally shared in the civilization of the ruling power. The religious beliefs and deities of Babylonia were superimposed upon those of the primitive Canaanite. The local Baal or "lord" of the soil made way for the "lord of heaven," the Sun-god of the Babylonians. The "high-place" gradually became a temple built after a Babylonian fashion. The sacred stone, once the supreme object of Canaanitish worship, was transformed into a Beth-el or shrine of an indwelling god. The gods and goddesses of Babylonia migrated to Canaan; places received their names from Nebo or Nin-ip; Hadad became Amurru "the Amorite god"; Ishtar passed into Ashtoreth, and Asirtu, the female counterpart of Asir, the national god of Assyria, became Asherah, while her sanctuary, which in Assyria was a temple, was identified in Canaan with the old fetish of an upright stone or log. But human sacrifice, and more especially the sacrifice of the firstborn son, of which we find few traces in Babylonia, continued to be practiced with undiminished frequency until, as we learn from the excavations, the Israelite conquest brought about its suppression. The human victim is also absent from the later sacrificial tariffs of Carthage and Marseilles, its place being taken in them by the ram. According to these tariffs the sacrifices and offerings were of two kinds, the zau‘at or sin offering and the shelem or thank-offering. The sin offering was given wholly to the god; part of the thank-offering would be taken by the offerer. Birds which were not allowed as a sin offering might constitute a thank-offering. Besides the sacrifices, there were also offerings of corn, wine, fruit and oil.

7. Art:

What primitive Canaanitish art was like may be seen from the rude sculptures in the Wadi el-Kana near Tyre. Under Babylonian influence it rapidly developed. Among the Canaanite spoil captured by

Thothmes III were tables, chairs and staves of cedar and ebony inlaid with gold or simply gilded, richly embroidered robes, chariots chased with silver, iron tent poles studded with precious stones, "bowls with goats' heads on them, and one with a lion's head, the workmanship of the land of Zahi" (the Phoenician coast), iron armor with gold inlay, and rings of gold and silver that were used as money. At Taanach, gold and silver ornaments have been found of high artistic merit. To the Israelites, fresh from the desert, the life of the wealthy Canaanite would have appeared luxurious in the extreme.

8. Commerce:

The position of Canaan made it the meeting-place of the commercial routes of the ancient world. The fleets of the Phoenician cities are celebrated in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, and it is probable that they were already engaged in the purple trade. The inland towns of Canaan depended not only on agriculture but also on a carrying trade: caravans as well as "commercial travelers" (damgari) came to them from Cappadocia, Babylonia and Egypt. Bronze, silver, lead, and painted ware were brought from Asia Minor, together with horses; naphtha was exported to Babylonia in return for embroidered stuffs; copper came from Cyprus, richly chased vessels of the precious metals from Crete and corn from Egypt. Baltic amber has been found at Lachish, where a furnace with iron slag, discovered in the third Amorite city, shows that the native iron was worked before the age of the Israelite conquest. The manufacture of glass goes back to the same epoch. As far back as 2500 BC, alabaster and limestone had been sent to Babylonia from the quarries of the Lebanon.

9. Art of Writing:

Long before the age of Abraham the Babylonian seal-cylinder had become known and been imitated in Syria and Canaan. But it was not until Canaan had been made a Babylonian province under the Khammu-rabi dynasty that the cuneiform system of writing was introduced together with the Babylonian language and literature. Henceforward, schools were established and libraries or archive-chambers formed where the foreign language and its complicated syllabary could be taught and stored. In the Mosaic age the Taanach tablets show that the inhabitants of a small country town could correspond with one another on local matters in the foreign language and script, and two of the Tell el-Amarna letters are from a Canaanitish lady. The official notices of the name by which each year was known in Babylonia were sent to Canaan as to other provinces of the Babylonian empire in the cuneiform script; one of these, dated in the reign of Khammurabi's successor, has been found in the Lebanon.

LITERATURE.

H. Vincent, Canaan d'apres l'exploration recente, 1907; G. A. Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 1894; Publications of the Palestine Exploration Fund; E. Sellin, Tell Ta'annek and Eine Nachlese auf dem Tell Ta'annek, 1904-5; Schumacher, Tell Mutesellim, 1909; Thiersch, Die neueren Ausgrabungen in Palestina, 1908.

See, further, ARKITE; ARVADITES; BAAL; GIRGASHITE; HITTITES; HIVITE; JEBUSITE;

KADMONITE; KENIZZITE; PALESTINE; PERIZZITE; REPHAIM; SINITES; TEMAN.

A. H. Sayce

CANAANITESS

ka’-nan-it-es.

See SHUA; BATHSHUA.

CANALS

ka-nalz’ (ye’orim): The word "canals" occurs in several places in the Revised Version, margin (Ex 7:19; 8:5; Isa 19:6; Na 3:8). ye’or is an Egyptian word, the designation of the Nile (Brugsch, Geogr, I, 8, 78). The proper name of the Nile as a god was Hapi. There were several common designations of the Nile, but the usual one was ye’or, Hebrew plural ye’orim. The primary meaning of ye’or in Egyptian is not certain, but its significance in use for the Nile is plain enough. All the waters in Egypt were of the Nile and this word ye’or was used to denote all of them, the Nile and all its ramifications through the whole irrigating system. Thus ye’orim, Niles, came to be used. As only the main channels of the Nile had much current, the ye’orim came naturally to convey the idea of sluggishness. In the account of the plagues (Ex 7:19), names are used descriptively to designate the different waters of Egypt: neharoth, "flowing streams," for the main channels of the river, and ye’orim for other streams, which by contrast must mean, as it should according to its use by the Egyptians, "the sluggish streams," i.e. "canals," as it is rendered by the Revisers. This meaning of the word being thus clearly established, it is appropriately used in the Revised Version, margin in the other instances of its occurrence in like circumstances.

M. G. Kyle

CANANAEAN; CANAANITE

ka-na-ne’-an, ka’-nan-it.

See SIMON; CANANAEAN.

CANDACE

kan’-da-se (Kandake): Queen of the Ethiopians (Ac 8:27). Pliny states that the name Candace had already been borne for many years by the queens of Ethiopia (vi, 29). See ETHIOPIA. Her treasurer, "a eunuch of great authority," was baptized by Philip the Evangelist on his return from worshipping in Jerusalem.

CANDLE; CANDLESTICK

kan’-d’-l, kan’-d’-l-stik (ner; luchnos; menorah; luchnia):

(1) "Candle" is found in the Old Testament, the King James Version, as the rendering of ner, and in the New Testament for luchnos. In all places except Jer 25:10 and Ze 1:12 (see margin) the Revised Version (British and American) gives the more exact rendering "lamp." See LAMP. Candle, in our sense of the term, was unknown to antiquity.

(2) "Candlestick" stands for what was a common and indispensable article of ancient house furniture, a lamp-stand (menorah). Accordingly we find it mentioned in a case thoroughly representative of the furnishings of an oriental room of the plainer sort, in the account of "the prophet’s chamber" given in 2Ki 4:10. Here we find that the furniture consisted of a "bed," a "table," a "seat," and a "candlestick," or lamp-stand. The excavations of Petrie and Bliss at Lachish (Tell el-Hesy, 104), not to mention others, help to make it clear that a lamp-stand is meant in passages where the Hebrew word, menorah, or its Greek equivalent luchnia, is used. Accordingly throughout the New Testament, the Revised Version (British and American) has consistently rendered luchnia by "stand" (Mt 5:15; Mr 4:21; Lu 8:16; 11:33).

(3) The "candlestick" of Da 5:5 is rather the candelabrum (nebhrashta’) of Belshazzar’s banqueting-hall. The "golden candlestick" of the tabernacle and the temple requires special treatment.

See CANDLESTICK, THE GOLDEN; TABERNACLE.

(4) Certain figurative uses of "candle" and "candlestick" in the Bible demand attention. The ancient and still common custom of the East of keeping a house lamp burning night and day gave rise to the figure of speech so universally found in oriental languages by which the continued prosperity of the individual or the family is set forth by the perennially burning lamp (see Job 29:3; "when his lamp shined upon my head"; Ps 18:28 "Thou wilt light my lamp"). The converse in usage is seen in many passages—(see Job 18:6; "His lamp above him shall be put out"; 21:17: "How oft is it that the lamp of the wicked is put out"; Pr 24:20; "The lamp of the wicked shall be put out"; Jer 25:10; "Take from them .... the light of the lamp"). The same metaphor is used in Re 2:5 to indicate the judgment with candlestick out of its place." "The seven golden candlesticks" (Re 1:20) which John saw were "the seven churches," the appointed light-bearers and dispensers of the religion of the risen Christ. Hence, the significance of such a threat. George B. Eager which the church of Ephesus was threatened: "I will move thy

CANDLESTICK, THE GOLDEN

kan’-d’-l-stik, gold’-’-n (menorah, literally "lamp-stand"): An important part of the furniture of the tabernacle and temples.

See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE; LAMP.

1. The Tabernacle:

The candlestick is first met with in the descriptions of the tabernacle (Ex 25:31-39; 37:17-24). It was, with the utensils connected with it (snuffers, snuff dishes), to be made of pure beaten gold, of one piece, a talent in weight (Ex 25:39). It consisted of a pedestal or base, of a central stem (the name "candlestick" is specially given to this), of six curving branches—three on each side—and of seven lamps resting on the tops of the branches and stem. Stem and branches were ornamented with cups like almond-blossoms, knops and flowers—four of this series on the stem, and three on each of the branches. Some, however, understand the "cup" to embrace the "knop" and "flower" (calyx and corolla). The shape of the pedestal is uncertain. Jewish tradition suggests three small feet; the representation of the candlestick on the Arch of Titus has a solid, hexagonal base. The position of the candlestick was on the South side of the holy place (Ex 40:24).

2. Temple of Solomon:

In Solomon's temple the single golden candlestick was multiplied to ten, and the position was altered. The candlesticks were now placed in front of the Holy of Holies, five on one side, five on the other (1Ki 7:49; 2Ch 4:7). Further details are not given in the texts, from which it may be presumed that the model of the tabernacle candlestick was followed.

3. Temple of Zerubbabel:

The second temple reverted to the single golden candlestick. When the temple was plundered by Antiochus Epiphanes, the candlestick was taken away (1 Macc 1:21); after the cleansing, a new one was made by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:49,50).

4. Temple of Herod:

The same arrangement of a single golden candlestick, placed on the South side of the holy place, was continued in Herod's Temple (Josephus, BJ, V, v, 5). It was this which, carried away by Titus, was represented on his Arch at Rome.

5. Use and Symbolism:

The immediate object of the candlestick was to give light in the holy place. The lamps were lighted in the evening and burned till the morning (Ex 30:7,8; Le 24:3; 1Sa 3:3; 2Ch 13:11), light being admitted into the temple during the day by the upper windows. Josephus in his Cosmical speculations (BJ, V, v, 5) takes the seven lamps to signify the seven planets. In Zechariah's vision of the golden candlestick (Zec 4:2 ff), the seven lamps are fed by two olive trees which are interpreted to be "the two anointed ones," Zerubbabel and Joshua—the civil and spiritual representatives of theocracy. The candlestick here, like the seven candlesticks in Re 1:20; 2:1, symbolizes the church of God, then in its Old Testament form, the idea conveyed being that God's church is set to be a lightgiver in the world. Compare Christ's

words (Mt 5:14,16; Lu 12:35), and Paul’s (Php 2:15).

The oldest known representation of the seven-branched candlestick is on a coin of Antigonus, circa 40 BC (see Madden’s Coins of the Jews, 102). For literature see TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

James Orr

CANE

kan.

See REED.

CANKER

kan’-ker.

See GANGRENE.

CANKER-WORM

kan’-ker-wurm (yeleq, (Joe 1:4; 2:25; Na 3:15,16)): The name given to a larval stage of the LOCUST (which see).

See also CATERPILLAR.

CANKERED

kan’-kerd (Jas 5:3 the Revised Version (British and American), "rusted").

CANNEH

kan’-e (kanneh; Chanaa): Mentioned in Eze 27:23 in connection with Haran and Eden as one of the places with which Tyre had commercial relations. This is the only reference to the place and the site is unknown. Gesenius and others think it is probably the same as Calneh of Am 6:2 or of Ge 10:10, and Calno of Isa 10:9. According to the Targums, Eusebius, and Jerome, this place is identical with Ctesiphon, which was situated on the Tigris. One codex of De Rossi has made this identification in the passage in Eze 27:23. Cornill thinks Canneh is the Calneh of Am 6:2, but Cheyne thinks the name is really non-existent. He says the words rendered "and Canneh and Eden" should rather be "and the sons of Eden."

A. W. Fortune

CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

kan’-un

I. TWO PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

1. Early Christians Had the Old Testament

2. No Intention of Writing the New Testament

II. THREE STAGES OF THE PROCESS

1. From the Apostles to 170 AD

(1) Clement of Rome; Ignatius; Polycarp

(2) Forces Increasing Value of Writings

(a) Apologists, Justin Martyr

(b) Gnostics, Marcion

2. From 170 AD to 220 AD

(1) Irenaeus

(2) Muratorian Fragment

3. 3rd and 4th Centuries

(1) Origen

(2) Dionysius

(3) Cyprian

(4) Eusebins

(5) Athanasius

(6) Council of Carthage; Jerome; Augustine

LITERATURE

I. Two Preliminary Considerations.

The canon is the collection of 27 books which the church (generally) receives as its New Testament Scriptures. The history of the canon is the history of the process by which these books were brought together and their value as sacred Scriptures officially recognized. That process was gradual, furthered by definite needs, and, though unquestionably continuous, is in its earlier stages difficult to trace. It is always well in turning to the study of it to have in mind two considerations which bear upon the earliest phases of the whole movement. These are:

1. Early Christians Had the Old Testament:

The early Christians had in their hands what was a Bible to them, namely, the Old Testament Scriptures. These were used to a surprising extent in Christian instruction. For a whole century after the death of Jesus this was the case. These Scriptures were read in the churches, and there could be at first no idea of placing beside them new books which could for a moment rank with them in honor and authority. It has been once and again discussed whether Christianity from the first was a "book-religion." The decision of the matter depends upon what is referred to by the word "book." Christianity certainly did have from the very beginning a book which it reverenced—the Old Testament—but years passed before it had even the beginnings of a book of its own. What has been called "the wealth of living canonical material," namely, prophets and teachers, made written words of subordinate value. In this very teaching, however, with its oral traditions lay the beginnings of that movement which was ultimately to issue in a canon of writings.

2. No Intention of Writing the New Testament:

When the actual work of writing began no one who sent forth an epistle or framed a gospel had before him the definite purpose of contributing toward the formation of what we call "the Bible." All the New Testament writers looked for "the end" as near. Their words, therefore, were to meet definite needs in the lives of those with whom they were associated. They had no thought of creating a new sacred literature. And yet these incidental occasional writings have come to be our choicest Scripture. The circumstances and influences which brought about this result are here briefly set forth.

II. Three Stages of the Process.

For convenience of arrangement and definiteness of impression the whole process may be marked off in three stages:

(1) that from the time of the apostles until about 170 AD;

(2) that of the closing years of the 2nd century and the opening of the 3rd (170-220 AD);

(3) that of the 3rd and 4th centuries. In the first we seek for the evidences of the growth in appreciation of the peculiar value of the New Testament writings; in the second we discover the clear, full recognition of a large part of these writings as sacred and authoritative; in the third the acceptance of the complete canon in the East and in the West.

1. From the Apostles to 170 AD:

(1) Clement of Rome; Ignarius; Polycarp:

The first period extending to 170 AD.—It does not lie within the scope of this article to recount the origin of the several books of the New Testament. This belongs properly to New Testament Introduction (which see). By the end of the 1st century all of the books of the New Testament were in existence. They were, as treasures of given churches, widely separated and honored as containing the word of Jesus or the teaching of the apostles. From the very first the authority of Jesus had full recognition in all the Christian world. The whole work of the apostles was in interpreting Him to the growing church. His sayings and His life were in part for the illumination of the Old Testament; wholly for the understanding of life and its issues. In every assembly of Christians from the earliest days He was taught as well as the Old Testament. In each church to which an epistle was written that epistle was likewise read. Paul asked that his letters be read in this way (1Th 5:27; Col 4:16). In this attentive listening to the exposition of some event in the life of Jesus or to the reading of the epistle of an apostle began the "authorization" of the traditions concerning Jesus and the apostolic writings. The widening of the area of the church and the departure of the apostles from earth emphasized increasingly the value of that which the writers of the New Testament left behind them. Quite early the desire to have the benefit of all possible instruction led to the interchange of Christian writings. Polycarp (110 AD ?) writes to the Philippians, "I have received letters from you and from Ignatius. You recommend me to send on yours to Syria; I shall do so either personally or by some other means. In return I send you the letter of Ignatius as well as others which I have in my hands and for which you made request. I add them to the present one; they will serve to edify your faith and perseverance" (Epistle to Phil, XIII). This is an illustration of what must have happened toward furthering a knowledge of the writings of the apostles. Just when and to what extent "collections" of our New Testament books began to be made it is impossible to say, but it is fair to infer that a collection of the Pauline epistles existed at the time Polycarp wrote to the Php and when Ignatius wrote his seven letters to the churches of Asia Minor, i.e. about 115 AD. There is good reason to think also that the four Gospels were brought together in some places as early as this. A clear distinction, however, is to be kept in mind between "collections" and such recognition as we imply in the word "canonical." The gathering of books was one of the steps preliminary to this. Examination of the testimony to the New Testament in this early time indicates also that it is given with no intention of framing the canonicity of New Testament books. In numerous instances only "echoes" of the thought of the epistles appear; again quotations are incomplete; both showing that Scripture words are used as the

natural expression of Christian thought. In the same way the Apostolic Fathers refer to the teachings and deeds of Jesus. They witness "to the substance and not to the authenticity of the Gospels." That this all may be more evident let us note in more detail the witness of the subapostolic age.

Clement of Rome, in 95 AD, wrote a letter in the name of the Christians of Rome to those in Corinth. In this letter he uses material found in Mt, Lk, giving it a free rendering (see chapters 46 and 13); he has been much influenced by the Epistle to the Hebrews (see chapters 9, 10, 17, 19, 36). He knows Romans, Corinthians, and there are found echoes of 1 Timothy, Titus, 1 Peter and Ephesians.

The Epistles of Ignatius (115 AD) have correspondences with our gospels in several places (Eph 5; Ro 6; 7) and incorporate language from nearly all of the Pauline epistles. The Epistle to Polycarp makes large use of Phil, and besides this cites nine of the other Pauline epistles. Ignatius quotes from Matthew, apparently from memory; also from 1 Peter and 1 John. In regard to all these three writers—Clement, Polycarp, Ignatius—it is not enough to say that they bring us reminiscences or quotations from this or that book. Their thought is tinctured all through with New Testament truth. As we move a little farther down the years we come to "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (circa 120 AD in its present form; see DIDACHE); the Epistle of Barnabas (circa 130 AD) and the Shepherd of Hermas (circa 130 AD). These exhibit the same phenomena as appear in the writings of Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp as far as references to the New Testament are concerned. Some books are quoted, and the thought of the three writings echoes again and again the teachings of the New Testament. They bear distinct witness to the value of "the gospel" and the doctrine of the apostles, so much so as to place these clearly above their own words. It is in the Epistle of Barnabas that we first come upon the phrase "it is written," referring to a New Testament book (Matthew) (see Epis., iv.14). In this deepening sense of value was enfolded the feeling of authoritativeness, which slowly was to find expression. It is well to add that what we have so far discovered was true in widely separated parts of the Christian world as e. g. Rome and Asia Minor.

(2) Forces Increasing Value of Writings:

(a) Apologists, Justin Martyr:

The literature of the period we are examining was not, however, wholly of the kind of which we have been speaking. Two forces were calling out other expressions of the singular value of the writings of the apostles, whether gospels or epistles. These were

(a) the attention of the civil government in view of the rapid growth of the Christian church and

(b) heresy.

The first brought to the defense or commendation of Christianity the Apologists, among whom were Justin Martyr, Aristides, Melito of Sardis and Theophilus of Antioch. By far the most important of these was Justin Martyr, and his work may be taken as representative. He was born about 100 AD at Shechem, and died as a martyr at Rome in 165 AD. His two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho are the

sources for the study of his testimony. He speaks of the "Memoirs of the Apostles called Gospels" (Ap., i.66) which were read on Sunday interchangeably with the prophets (i.67). Here emerges that equivalence in value of these "Gospels" with the Old Testament Scriptures which may really mark the beginning of canonization. That these Gospels were our four Gospels as we now have them is yet a disputed question; but the evidence is weighty that they were. (See Purves, Testimony of Justin Martyr to Early Christianity, Lect V.) The fact that Tatian, his pupil, made a harmony of the Gospels, i.e. of our four Gospels, also bears upon our interpretation of Justin's "Memoirs." (See Hemphill, The Diatessaron of Tatian.) The only other New Testament book which Justin mentions is the Apocalypse; but he appears to have known the Acts, six epistles of Paul, Hebrew and 1 John, and echoes of still other epistles are perceptible. When he speaks of the apostles it is after this fashion: "By the power of God they proclaimed to every race of men that they were sent by Christ to teach to all the Word of God" (Ap., i.39). It is debatable, however, whether this refers to more than the actual preaching of the apostles. The beginning of the formation of the canon is in the position and authority given to the Gospels.

(b) Gnostics, Marcion:

While the Apologists were busy commending or defending Christianity, heresy in the form of Gnosticism was also compelling attention to the matter of the writings of the apostles. From the beginning Gnostic teachers claimed that Jesus had favored chosen ones of His apostles with a body of esoteric truth which had been handed down by secret tradition. This the church denied, and in the controversy that went on through years the question of what were authoritative writings became more and more pronounced. Basilides e. g., who taught in Alexandria during the reign of Hadrian (AD 117-38), had for his secret authority the secret tradition of the apostle Matthias and of Glaucias, an alleged interpreter of Peter, but he bears witness to Matthew, Luke, John, Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians in the effort to recommend his doctrines, and, what is more, gives them the value of Scripture in order to support more securely his teachings. (See Philosophoumena of Hippolytus, VII, 17). Valentinus, tracing his authority through Theodas to Paul, makes the same general use of New Testament books, and Tertullian tells us that he appeared to use the whole New Testament as then known.

The most noted of the Gnostics was Marcion, a native of Pontus. He went to Rome (circa 140 AD), there broke with the church and became a dangerous heretic. In support of his peculiar views, he formed a canon of his own which consisted of Luke's Gospel and ten of the Pauline epistles. He rejected the Pastoral Epistles, Hebrews, Matthew, Mark, John, the Acts, the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse, and made a recension of both the gospel of Luke and the Pauline epistles which he accepted. His importance, for us, however, is in the fact that he gives us the first clear evidence of the canonization of the Pauline epistles. Such use of the Scriptures inevitably called forth both criticism and a clearer marking off of those books which were to be used in the churches opposed to heresy, and so "in the struggle with Gnosticism the canon was made." We are thus brought to the end of the first period in which we have marked the collection of New Testament books in greater or smaller compass, the increasing valuation of them as depositions of the truth of Jesus and His apostles, and finally the movement toward the claim of their authoritativeness as over against perverted teaching. No sharp line as to a given year can be drawn between the first stage of the process and the second. Forces working in

the first go on into the second, but results are accomplished in the second which give it its right to separate consideration.

2. From 170 AD to 220 AD:

The period from 170 AD to 220 AD.—This is the age of a voluminous theological literature busy with the great issues of church canon and creed. It is the period of the great names of Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, representing respectively Asia Minor, Egypt and North Africa. In passing into it we come into the clear light of Christian history. There is no longer any question as to a New Testament canon; the only difference of judgment is as to its extent. What has been slowly but surely shaping itself in the consciousness of the church now comes to clear expression.

(1) Irenaeus.

That expression we may study in Irenaeus as representative of the period. He was born in Asia Minor, lived and taught in Rome and became afterward bishop of Lyons. He had, therefore, a wide acquaintance with the churches, and was peculiarly competent to speak concerning the general judgment of the Christian world. As a pupil of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John, he is connected with the apostles themselves. An earnest defender of the truth, he makes the New Testament in great part his authority, and often appeals to it. The four Gospels, the Acts, the epistles of Paul, several of the Catholic epistles and the Apocalypse are to him Scripture in the fullest sense. They are genuine and authoritative, as much so as the Old Testament ever was. He dwells upon the fact that there are four gospels, the very number being prefigured in the four winds and the four quarters of the earth. Every attempt to increase or diminish the number is heresy. Tertullian takes virtually the same position (Adv. Marc., iv. 2), while Clement of Alexandria quotes all four gospels as "Scripture." By the end of the 2nd century the canon of the gospels was settled. The same is true also of the Pauline epistles. Irenaeus makes more than two hundred citations from Paul, and looks upon his epistles as Scripture (Adv. Haer., iii.12, 12). Indeed, at this time it may be said that the new canon was known under the designation "The Gospel and the Apostles" in contradistinction to the old as "the Law and the Prophets." The title "New Testament" appears to have been first used by an unknown writer against Montanism (circa 193 AD). It occurs frequently after this in Origen and later writers. In considering all this testimony two facts should have emphasis:

(1) its wide extent: Clement and Irenaeus represent parts of Christendom which are widely separated;

(2) the relation of these men to those who have gone before them. Their lives together with those before them spanned nearly the whole time from the apostles.

They but voiced the judgment which silently, gradually had been selecting the "Scripture" which they freely and fully acknowledged and to which they made appeal.

(2) The Muratorian Fragment.

Just here we come upon the Muratorian Fragment, so called because discovered in 1740 by the librarian of Milan, Muratori. It dates from some time near the end of the 2nd century, is of vital interest in the study of the history of the canon, since it gives us a list of New Testament books and is concerned with the question of the canon itself. The document comes from Rome, and Lightfoot assigns it to Hippolytus. Its list contains the Gospels (the first line of the fragment is incomplete, beginning with Mark, but Matthew is clearly implied), the Acts, the Pauline epistles, the Apocalypse, 1 and 2 John (perhaps by implication the third) and Jude. It does not mention Hebrew, 1 and 2 Peter, James. In this list we have virtually the real position of the canon at the close of the 2nd century. Complete unanimity had not been attained in reference to all the books which are now between the covers of our New Testament. Seven books had not yet found a secure place beside the gospel and Paul in all parts of the church. The Palestinian and Syrian churches for a long time rejected the Apocalypse, while some of the Catholic epistles were in Egypt considered doubtful. The history of the final acceptance of these belongs to the third period.

3. 3rd and 4th Centuries:

(1) Origen:

The period included by the 3rd and 4th centuries—It has been said that "the question of the canon did not make much progress in the course of the 3rd century" (Reuss, History of the Canon of Holy Scripture, 125). We have the testimony of a few notable teachers mostly from one center, Alexandria. Their consideration of the question of the disputed book serves just here one purpose. By far the most distinguished name of the 3rd century is Origen. He was born in Alexandria about 185 AD, and before he was seventeen became an instructor in the school for catechumens. In 203 he was appointed bishop, experienced various fortunes, and died in 254. His fame rests upon his ability as an exegete, though he worked laboriously and successfully in other fields. His testimony is of high value, not simply because of his own studies, but also because of his wide knowledge of what was thought in other Christian centers in the world of his time. Space permits us only to give in summary form his conclusions, especially in regard to the books still in doubt. The Gospels, the Pauline epistles, the Acts, he accepts without question. He discusses at some length the authorship of He, believes that "God alone knows who wrote it," and accepts it as Scripture. His testimony to the Apocalypse is given in the sentence, "Therefore John the son of Zebedee says in the Revelation." He also gives sure witness to Jude, but wavers in regard to James, 2 Peter, 2 John, and 3 John.

(2) Dionysius:

Another noted name of this century is Dionysius of Alexandria, a pupil of Origen (died 265). His most interesting discussion is regarding the Apocalypse, which he attributes to an unknown John, but he does not dispute its inspiration. It is a singular fact that the western church accepted this book from the first, while its position in the East was variable. Conversely the Epistle to the He was more insecure in the West than in the East. In regard to the Catholic epistles Dionysius supports James, 2 John, and 3 John, but not 2 Peter or Jude.

(3) Cyprian:

In the West the name of Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (248-58 AD), was most influential. He was much engaged in controversy, but a man of great personal force. The Apocalypse he highly honored, but he was silent about the Epistle to the Hebrews. He refers to only two of the Catholic epistles, 1 Peter and 1 John.

These testimonies confirm what was said above, namely, that the end of the 3rd century leaves the question of the full canon about where it was at the beginning. 1 Peter and 1 John seem to have been everywhere known and accepted. In the West the five Catholic epistles gained recognition more slowly than in the East.

(4) Eusebius:

In the early part of the 4th century Eusebius (270-340 AD), bishop of Caesarea before 315, sets before us in his Church History (III, chapters iii-xxv) his estimate of the canon in his time. He does not of course use the word canon, but he "conducts an historical inquiry into the belief and practice of earlier generations." He lived through the last great persecution in the early part of the 4th century, when not only places of worship were razed to the ground, but also the sacred Scriptures were in the public market-places consigned to the flames (Historia Ecclesiastica, VIII, 2). It was, therefore, no idle question what book a loyal Christian must stand for as his Scripture. The question of the canon had an earnest, practical significance. Despite some obscurity and apparent contradictions, his classification of the New Testament books was as follows:

(1) The acknowledged books. His criteria for each of these was authenticity and apostolicity and he placed in this list the Gospels, Acts, and Paul’s epistles, including He.

(2) The disputed books, i.e. those which had obtained only partial recognition, to which he assigned Jas, Jude, 2Pe and 2 Jn. About the Apocalypse also he was not sure. In this testimony there is not much advance over that of the 3rd century. It is virtually the canon of Origen.

All this makes evident the fact that as yet no official decision nor uniformity of usage in the church gave a completed canon. The time, however, was drawing on when various forces at work were to bring much nearer this unanimity and enlarge the list of acknowledged books. In the second half of the 4th century repeated efforts were made to put an end to uncertainty.

(5) Athanasius:

Athanasius in one of his pastoral letters in connection with the publishing of the ecclesiastical calendar gives a list of the books comprising Scripture, and in the New Testament portion are included all the 27 books which we now recognize. "These are the wells of salvation," he writes, "so that he who thirsts

may be satisfied with the sayings in these. Let no one add to these. Let nothing be taken away." Gregory of Nazianzen (died 390 AD) also published a list omitting Revelation, as did Cyril of Jerusalem (died 386), and quite at the end of the century (4th) Isidore of Pelusium speaks of the "canon of truth, the Divine Scriptures." For a considerable time the Apocalypse was not accepted in the Palestinian or Syrian churches. Athanasius helped toward its acceptance in the church of Alexandria. Some differences of opinion, however, continued. The Syrian church did not accept all of the Catholic epistles until much later.

(6) Council of Carthage, Jerome; Augustine:

The Council of Carthage in 397, in connection with its decree "that aside from the canonical Scriptures nothing is to be read in church under the name of Divine Scriptures," gives a list of the books of the New Testament. After this fashion there was an endeavor to secure unanimity, while at the same time differences of judgment and practice continued. The books which had varied treatment through these early centuries were He, the Apocalypse and the five minor Catholic epistles. The advance of Christianity under Constantine had much to do with the reception of the whole group of books in the East. The task which the emperor gave to Eusebius to prepare "fifty copies of the Divine Scriptures" established a standard which in time gave recognition to all doubtful books. In the West, Jerome and Augustine were the controlling factors in its settlement of the canon. The publication of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) virtually determined the matter.

In conclusion let it be noted how much the human element was involved in the whole process of forming our New Testament. No one would wish to dispute a providential overruling of it all. Also it is well to bear in mind that all the books have not the same clear title to their places in the canon as far as the history of their attestation is concerned. Clear and full and unanimous, however, has been the judgment from the beginning upon the Gospels, the Acts, the Pauline epistles, 1 Peter and 1 John.

LITERATURE. Reuss, History of the Canon of Holy Scriptures; E. C. Moore, The New Testament in the Christian Church; Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament; Introductions to New Testament of Julicher, Weiss, Reuss; Zahn, Geschichte des Neutest. Kanons; Harnack, Das New Testament um das Jahr 200; Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur; Westcott, The Canon of the New Testament; Zahn, Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutest. Kanons.

J. S. Riggs

CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, I

kan’-un:

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. The Christian Term "Canon"

2. The Corresponding Hebrew Expression

3. The "Hidden Books" of the Jews

4. The Determining Principle in the Formation of the Canon

5. The Tripartite Division of the Old Testament

6. How Account for the Tripartite Division?

II. EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES

1. The Old Testament’s Witness to Itself (circa 1450-444 BC)

2. The Samaritan Pentateuch (circa 432 BC)

3. The Septuagint Version (circa 250-150 BC)

4. Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach (circa 170 BC)

5. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (circa 132 BC)

6. 1 and 2 Maccabees (between 125 and 70 BC)

7. Philo (circa 20 BC-50 AD)

8. The New Testament as a Witness (circa 50-100 AD)

9. 4 Esdras (circa 81-96 AD)

10. Josephus’ "Contra Apionem" (circa 100 AD)

11. The Councils of Jamnia (90 and 118 AD)

12. The Talmud (200-500 AD)

13. Jewish Doubts in the 2nd Century AD

14. Summary and Conclusion

III. THE CANON IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

1. In the Eastern or Oriental Church

2. In the Western Church

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

The problem of how we came by 39 books known as Old Testament "Scripture" is a purely historical investigation. The question involved is, not who wrote the several books, but who made them into a collection, not their origin or contents, but their history; not God’s part, but man’s. Our present aim, accordingly, must be to trace the process by which the various writings became "Scripture."

1. The Christian Term "Canon":

The word "canon" is of Christian origin, from the Greek word kanon, which in turn is probably borrowed from the Hebrew word, qaneh, meaning a reed or measuring rod, hence, norm or rule. Later it came to mean a rule of faith, and eventually a catalogue or list. In present usage it signifies a collection of religious writings Divinely inspired and hence, authoritative, normative, sacred and binding. The term occurs in Ga 6:16; 2Co 10:13-16; but it is first employed of the books of Scripture in the technical sense of a standard collection or body of sacred writings, by the church Fathers of the 4th century; e. g. in the 59th canon of the Council of Laodicea (363 AD); in the Festal Epistle of Athanasius (365 AD); and by Amphilochius, archbishop of Iconium (395 AD).

2. The Corresponding Hebrew Expression:

How the ancient Hebrews expressed the conception of canonicity is not known; but it is safe to say that the idea, as an idea, existed long before there was any special phrase invented to express it. In the New Testament the word "Scriptures" conveys unquestionably the notion of sacredness (Mt 21:42; Joh 5:39; Ac 18:24). From the 1st century AD and following, however, according to the Talmud, the Jews employed the phrase "defile the hands." Writings which were suitable to be read in the synagogue were designated as books which "defile the hands." What this very peculiar oriental expression may have originally signified no one definitely knows. Probably Le 16:24 gives a hint of the true interpretation. According to this passage the high priest on the great Day of Atonement washed not only when he put on the holy garments of his office, but also when he put them off. Quite possibly, therefore, the expression "defile the hands" signified that the hands which had touched the sacred writings must first be washed before touching aught else. The idea expressed, accordingly, was one akin to that of taboo. That is to say, just as certain garments worn by worshippers in encircling the sacred Kaaba at Mecca are taboo to the Mohammedans of today, i.e. cannot be worn outside the mosque, but must be left at the

door as the worshippers quit the sanctuary, so the Hebrew writings which were fit to be read in the synagogue rendered the hands of those who touched them taboo, defiling their hands, as they were wont to say, so that they must first be washed before engaging in any secular business. This seems to be the best explanation of this enigmatical phrase. Various other and somewhat fanciful explanations of it, however, have been given: for example, to prevent profane uses of worn-out synagogue rolls (Buhl); or to prevent placing consecrated grain alongside of the sacred rolls in the synagogues that it might become holy, as the grain would attract the mice and the mice would gnaw the rolls (Strack, Wildeboer and others); or to prevent the sacred, worn-out parchments from being used as coverings for animals (Graetz); or to "declare the hands to be unclean unless previously washed" (Furst, Green). But no one of these explanations satisfies. The idea of taboo is more likely imbedded in the phrase.

3. The "Hidden Books" of the Jews:

The rabbins invented a special phrase to designate rolls that were worn- out or disputed. These they called genuzim, meaning "hidden away." Cemeteries filled with Hebrew manuscripts which have long been buried are frequently found today in Egypt in connection with Jewish synagogues. Such rolls might first be placed in the genizah or rubbish chamber of the sanctuary. They were not, however, apocryphal or uncanonical in the sense of being extraneous or outside the regular collection. For such the Jews had a special term cepharim chitsonim, "books that are outside." These could not be read in the synagogues. "Hidden books" were rather worn-out parchments, or canonical rolls which might by some be temporarily disputed.

See APOCRYPHA.

4. The Determining Principle in the Formation of the Canon:

Who had the right to declare a writing canonical? To this question widely divergent answers have been given. According to a certain class of theologians the several books of the Old Testament were composed by authors who were conscious not only of their inspiration but also that their writings were destined to be handed down to the church of future generations as sacred. In other words each writer canonized, as it were, his own writings. For example, Dr. W. H. Green (Canon, 35 f, 106, 110) says: "No formal declaration of their canonicity was needed to give them sanction. They were from the first not only eagerly read by the devout but believed to be Divinely obligatory .... Each individual book of an acknowledged prophet of Yahweh, or of anyone accredited as inspired by Him to make known His will, was accepted as the word of God immediately upon its appearance. .... Those books and those only were accepted as the Divine standards of their faith and regulative of their conduct which were written for this definite purpose by those whom they believed to be inspired of God. It was this which made them canonical. The spiritual profit found in them corresponded with and confirmed the belief in their heavenly origin. And the public official action which further attested, though it did not initiate, their canonicity, followed in the wake of the popular recognition of their Divine authority. .... The writings of the prophets, delivered to the people as a declaration of the Divine will, possessed canonical authority from the moment of their appearance. .... The canon does not derive its authority from the church,

whether Jewish or Christian; the office of the church is merely that of a custodian and a witness." So likewise Dr. J. D. Davis (Pres. and Ref. Review, April, 1902, 182).

On the contrary, Dillmann (Jahrb. fur deutsche Theol., III, 420) more scientifically claims that "history knows nothing of the individual books having been designed to be sacred from their origin. .... These books bore indeed in themselves from the first those characteristics on account of which they were subsequently admitted into the sacred collection, but yet always had first to pass through a shorter or longer period of verification, and make trial of the Divine power resident within them upon the hearts of the church before they were outwardly and formally acknowledged by it as Divine books." As a matter of fact, the books of the Old Testament are still on trial, and ever will be. So far as is known, the great majority of the writers of Holy Scripture did not arbitrarily hand over their productions to the church and expect them to be regarded as canon Scripture. Two parties are involved in the making of canonical Scripture—the original authors and the church—both of whom were inspired by the same Spirit. The authors wrote inspired by the Divine Spirit, and the church ever since—Jewish and Christian alike—has been inspired to recognize the authoritative character of their writings. And so it will be to the end of time. "We cannot be certain that anything comes from God unless it bring us personally something evidently Divine" (Briggs, The Study of Holy Scripture, 162).

5. The Tripartite Division of the Old Testament:

The Jews early divided the Old Testament writings into three classes:

(1) the Torah, or Law; (2) the Nebhi’im, or Prophets; and

(3) the Kethubhim, or Writings, called in Greek the Hagiographa.

The Torah included the 5 books of the Pentateuch (Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy), which were called "the Five-fifths of the Law." The Nebhi’im embraced

(a) the four so-called Former Prophets, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, counted as one book, 1 and 2 Kings, also counted as one book; and

(b) the four so-called Latter Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve Minor Prophets, counted as one book; a total of 8 books.

The Kethubhim, or Writings, were 11 in all, including Psalms, Proverbs, and Job, the five Meghilloth or Rolls (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Ezra-Nehemiah, counted as one book, and 1 and 2 Chronicles, also counted as one book; in all 24 books, exactly the same as those of the Protestant canon. This was the original count of the Jews as far as we can trace it back. Later certain Jewish authorities appended Ru to Judges, and Lamentations to Jer, and thereby obtained the number 22, which corresponded to the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet; but this manner of counting was secondary and fanciful. Still later others divided Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah and

Jeremiah-Lamentations into two books each respectively and thereby obtained 27, which they fancifully regarded as equivalent to the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet plus 5, the number of letters having a peculiar final form when standing at the end of a word. Jerome states that 22 is the correct reckoning, but he adds, "Some count both Ru and Lamentations among the Hagiographa, and so get 24." 4 Esdras, which is the oldest (85-96 AD) witness to the number of books in the Old Testament, gives 24.

6. How Account for the Tripartite Division?:

The answer to the question of how to account for the tripartite division involves the most careful investigation of the whole process by which the canon actually took shape. If the entire canon of the Old Testament were formed, as some allege, by one man, or by one set of men, in a single age, then it is obvious that the books must have been separated into three groups on the basis of some material differences in their contents. If, on the other hand; the process of canonization was gradual and extended over several generations, then the various books were separated from one another probably because one section of the canon was closed before certain other books of similar character were written. At any rate it is difficult to see why Kings and Chronicles are not included in the same division, and especially strange that Daniel does not stand among the prophets. To explain this mystery, medieval Jews were wont to say that "the Prophets were inspired by the spirit of prophecy, whereas the Writings by the Holy Spirit," implying different degrees of inspiration. But this is a distinction without a difference, the Holy Spirit and the spirit of prophecy are one and the same. Modern Protestants distinguish between the donum propheticum and the munus propheticum, i.e. between the gift and the office of prophecy. They allow that Daniel possessed the gift of prophecy, but they deny that he was Divinely appointed to the office of prophet. But compare Mt 24:15, which speaks of "Daniel the prophet," and on the other hand, Am 7:14, in which Amos resents being considered a prophet. Oehler modifies this explanation, claiming that the threefold division of the canon corresponds to the three stages of development in the religion of Israel, namely, Mosaism, Prophetism, and Hebraism. According to Oehler, the Law was the foundation of the entire canon. From it there were two lines of development, one objective, the Prophets, the other subjective, the Writings. But Oehler’s theory does not satisfactorily account for Ezra and Nehemiah and Chronicles, being in the third division; for in what sense can they be said to be more subjective than Judges, Samuel, and Kings? The Septuagint version (250-150 BC) takes no notice of the tripartite division. The true solution probably is that the process was gradual. When all the witnesses have been examined, we shall probably discover that the Law was canonized first, the Prophets considerably later, and the Writings last of all. And it may further become evident that the two last divisions were collected synchronously, and hence, that the tripartite divisions of the canon are due to material differences in their contents as well as to chronology.

CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, II

II. Examination of the Witnesses.

1. The Old Testament’s Witness to Itself (circa 1450-444 BC):

Though the Old Testament does not tell us anything about the processes of its own canonization, it does furnish valuable hints as to how the ancient Hebrews preserved their writings. Thus in Ex 40:20 it is stated that the "testimony," by which is meant the two tables of the Law containing the Ten Commandments, was put into the Ark of the Covenant for safe-keeping. In De 31:9,24-26, the laws of Deuteronomy are said to have been delivered to the sons of Levi, and by them deposited "by the side of the ark .... that it may be there for a witness against thee." Such language indicates that the new lawbook is regarded "as a standard of faith and action" (Driver, Deuteronomy, 343). According to 1Ki 8:9, when Solomon brought the Ark up from the city of David to the Temple, the two tables were still its only contents, which continued to be carefully preserved. According to 2Ki 11:12, when Joash was crowned king, Jehoiada the high priest is said to have given (literally "put upon") him "the testimony," which doubtless contained "the substance of the fundamental laws of the covenant," and was regarded as "the fundamental charter of the constitution" (compare H. E. Ryle, Canon of the Old Testament 45). Likewise in Pr 25:1, it is stated that a large number of proverbs were copied out by Hezekiah's men. Now all these, and still other passages which might be summoned, witness to the preservation of certain portions of the Old Testament. But preservation is not synonymous with canonization. A writing might easily be preserved without being made a standard of faith and conduct. Nevertheless the two ideas are closely related; for, when religious writings are sedulously preserved it is but natural to infer that their intrinsic value was regarded as correspondingly precious.

Two other passages of paramount importance remain to be considered. The first is 2Ki 22:8 ff, describing the finding of the "Book of the Law," and how Josiah the king on the basis of it instituted a religious reformation and bound the people to obey it precepts. Here is an instance in which the Law, or some portion of it (how much no one can say), is regarded as of normative and authoritative character. The king and his coadjutators recognize at once that it is ancient and that it contains the words of Yahweh (2Ki 22:13,18,19). Its authority is undisputed. Yet nothing is said of its "canonicity," or that it would "defile the hands"; consequently there is no real ground for speaking of it as "the beginnings of the canon," for in the same historic sense the beginnings of the canon are to be found in Ex 24:7. The other passage of paramount importance is Ne 8:8 f, according to which Ezra is said to have "read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly." Not only did Ezra read the Law; he accompanied it with an interpretation. This seems to imply, almost beyond question, that in Ezra's time (444 BC) the Law, i.e. the Pentateuch, was regarded as canonical Scripture. This is practically all that the Old Testament says about itself, though other passages, such as Zec 7:12 and Da 9:2 might be brought forward to show the deep regard which the later prophets had for the writings of their predecessors. The former of these is the locus classicus in the Old Testament, teaching the inspiration of the Prophets; it is the Old Testament parallel to 2Ti 3:16.

2. The Samaritan Pentateuch (circa 432 BC):

Chronologically the Old Testament is of course our most ancient witness. It brings us down to 444 BC. The next in order is the Samaritan Pentateuch, the history of which is as follows: About 432 BC, as we know from Ne 13:28 and Josephus (Ant., XI, vii, 2 through viii, 4), Nehemiah expelled from the Jewish colony in Jerusalem Manasseh, the polygamous grandson of Eliashib the high priest and son-in-law of Sanballat. Manasseh founded the schismatic community of the Samaritans, and instituted on Mt.

Gerizim a rival temple worship to that at Jerusalem. Of the Samaritans there still survive today some 170 souls; they reside in Shechem and are known as "the smallest religious sect in the world." It is true that Josephus, speaking of this event, confuses chronology somewhat, making Nehemiah and Alexander the Great contemporaries, whereas a century separated them, but the time element is of little moment. The bearing of the whole matter upon the history of the formation of the canon is this: the Samaritans possess the Pentateuch only; hence, it is inferred that at the time of Manasseh's expulsion the Jewish canon included the Pentateuch and the Pentateuch only. Budde (Encyclopaedia Biblica col. 659) says: "If alongside of the Law there had been other sacred writings, it would be inexplicable why these last also did not pass into currency with the Samaritans." Such a conclusion, however, is not fully warranted. It is an argument from silence. There are patent reasons on the other hand why the Samaritans should have rejected the Prophets, even though the y were already canonized. For the Samaritans would hardly adopt into their canon books that glorified the temple at Jerusalem. It cannot, accordingly, be inferred with certainty from the fact that the Samaritans accept the Pentateuch only, that therefore the Pentateuch at the time of Manasseh's expulsion was alone canonical, though it may be considered a reasonable presumption.

3. The Septuagint Version (circa 250-150 BC):

The Septuagint version in Greek is the first translation of the Old Testament ever made; indeed the Old Testament is the first book of any note in all literature to receive the honor of being translated into another tongue. This fact in itself is indicative of the esteem in which it was held at the time. The work of translation was inaugurated by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 BC) and probably continued for well-nigh a century (circa 250-150 BC). Aristeas, a distinguished officer of Ptolemy, records how it came about. It appears that Ptolemy was exceedingly fond of books, and set his heart on adding to his famous collection in Alexandria a translation of the Hebrew Pentateuch In order to obtain it, so the story goes, the king set free 198,000 Jewish slaves, and sent them with presents to Jerusalem to ask Eleazar the high priest for their Law and Jewish scholars capable of translating it. Six learned rabbis from each tribe (6 X 12 = 72) were sent. They were royally feasted; 70 questions were asked them to test their wisdom, and after 72 days of cooperation and conference they gave the world the Old Testament in the Greek language, which is known as the Septuagint version. To this fabulous story, Christian tradition adds that the rabbis did the work of translating in 72 (some say 36) separate cells on the island of Pharos, all working independently of each other, and that it was found at the expiration of their seclusion that each had produced a translation exactly word for word alike, hence, supernaturally inspired. Justin Martyr of the 2nd century AD says that he was actually shown by his Alexandrian guide the ruins of these Septuagint cells. The story is obviously a fable. The kernel of real truth at the bottom of it is probably that Ptolemy Philadelphus about the middle of the 3rd century BC succeeded in obtaining a translation of the Law. The other books were translated subsequently, perhaps for private use. The lack of unity of plan in the books outside the Law indicates that probably many different hands at different times were engaged upon them. There is a subscription, moreover, at the close of the translation of Es which states that Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy in Jerusalem, translated it. But the whole was apparently completed before Jesus ben Sirach the younger wrote his Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (circa 132 BC).

Now the Septuagint version, which was the Bible of our Lord and His apostles, is supposed to have

included originally many of the Apocryphal books. Furthermore, in our present Septuagint, the canonical and Apocryphal books stand intermingled and in an order which shows that the translators knew nothing of the tripartite division of later Judaism, or if they did they quite ignored it. The order of the books in our English Old Testament is of course derived from the Septuagint through the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) of Jerome. The books in the Septuagint are arranged as follows: Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, 1 and 2 Esdras, Nehemiah, Tobit, Judith, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zepheniah, Hagai, Zechariah, Malachi, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Ep. Jer., Ezekiel, Daniel, 1, 2 and 3 Maccabees. On the basis of the Septuagint, Catholics advocate what is known as the "larger" canon of the Jews in Alexandria; Protestants, on the other hand, deny the existence of an independent canon in Alexandria in view of the "smaller" canon of the Jews in Palestine The actual difference between the Catholic and Protestant Old Testaments is a matter of 7 complete books and portions of two others: namely, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Maccabees, together with certain additions to Esther (Es 10:4-16:24) and to Daniel (Da 3:24-90; The So of the Three Holy Children (Azariah); Susanna verse 13 and Bel and the Dragon verse 14). These Protestants reject as apocryphal because there is no sufficient evidence that they were ever reckoned as canonical by the Jews anywhere. The fact that the present Septuagint includes them is far from conclusive that the original Septuagint did, for the following reasons:

(1) The design of the Septuagint was purely literary; Ptolemy and the Alexandrians were interested in building up a library.

(2) All the extant manuscripts of the Septuagint are of Christian not Jewish origin. Between the actual translation of the Septuagint (circa 250-150 BC) and the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint extant (circa 350 AD) there is a chasm of fully 500 years, during which it is highly possible that the so-called Apocryphal books crept in.

(3) In the various extant manuscripts of the Septuagint, the Apocryphal books vary in number and name. For example, the great Vatican MS, which is probably "the truest representative which remains of the Alexandrian Bible," and which comes down to us from the 4th century AD, contains no Book of Maccabees whatever, but does include 1 Esdras, which Jerome and Catholics generally treat as apocryphal. On the other hand, the Alexandrian MS, another of the great manuscripts of the Septuagint, dating from the 5th century AD, contains not only the extra-canonical book of 1 Esdras, but 3 and 4 Maccabees, and in the New Testament the 1st and 2nd Epistles of Clement, none of which, however, is considered canonical by Rome. Likewise the great Sinaiticus MS, hardly less important than the Vatican as a witness to the Septuagint and like it dating from the 4th century AD, omits Baruch (which Catholics consider canonical), but includes 4 Macc, and in the New Testament the Epistle of Barnabas and the Shepherd of Hermas; all of which are excluded from the canon by Catholics. In other manuscripts, 3 Maccabees, 3 Esdras and The Prayer of Manasseh are occasionally included. The problem as to how many books the original Septuagint version actually included is a very complicated one. The probability is that it included no one of these variants.

(4) Still another reason for thinking that there never existed in Egypt a separate or "larger" canon is the

fact that during the 2nd century AD, the Alexandrian Jews adopted Aquila's Greek version of the Old Testament in lieu of their own, and it is known that Aquila's text excluded all Apocryphal books. Add to all this the fact that Philo, who lived in Alexandria from circa 20 BC till 50 AD, never quotes from One of these Apocryphal books though he often does from the canonical, and that Origen, who also resided in Alexandria (circa 200 AD), never set his imprimatur upon them, and it becomes reasonably convincing that there was no "larger" canon in Alexandria. The value of the evidence derived from the Septuagint, accordingly, is largely negative. It only indicates that when the translation of the Old Testament into Greek was made in Alexandria, the process of canonization was still incomplete. For had it been actually complete, it is reasonable to suppose that the work of translation would have proceeded according to some well-defined plan, and would have been executed with greater accuracy. As it is, the translators seem to have taken all sorts of liberties with the text, adding to the books of Es and Da and omitting fully one-eighth of the text of Jer. Such work also indicates that they were not executing a public or ecclesiastical trust, but rather a private enterprise. Our necessary conclusion, therefore, is that the work of canonization was probably going on in Palestine while the work of translation was proceeding in Alexandria.

4. Ecclesiasticus, or the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach (circa 170 BC):

Our next witness is Jesus ben Sirach who (circa 170 BC) wrote a formidable work entitled Ecclesiasticus, otherwise known as Sir. The author lived in Jerusalem and wrote in Hebrew. His book is a book of Wisdom resembling Proverbs; some of his precepts approach the high level of the Gospel. In many respects Ecclesiasticus is the most important of all the Apocryphal books; theologically it is the chief monument of primitive Sadduceeism. In chapters 44-50, the author sings a "hymn to the Fathers," eulogizing the mighty heroes of Israel from Enoch to Nehemiah, in fact from Adam to Simon, including the most famous men described in the Old Testament, and making explicit mention of the Twelve Prophets. These facts would indicate that the whole or, at least, the most of the Old Testament was known to him, and that already in his day (180 BC) the so-called Minor Prophets were regarded as a special group of writings by themselves. What the value of Ecclesiasticus is as a witness, however, depends upon the interpretation one places on 24:33, which reads: "I will yet pour out doctrine as prophecy and leave it unto generations of ages." From this it is inferred by some that he feels himself inspired and capable of adding to the canon already in existence, and that, though he knew the full prophetic canon, he did not draw any very definite line of demarcation between his own work and the inspired writings of the prophets. For example, he passes over from the patriarchs and prophets of Israel to Simon the son of Onias, who was probably the high priest in his own time, making no distinction between them. But this may have been partly due to personal conceit; compare 39:12, "Yet more will I utter, which I have thought upon; and I am filled as the moon at the full." Yet, perhaps, in his day still only the Law and the Prophets were actually canonized, but alongside of these a body of literature was being gathered and gradually augmented of a nature not foreign to his own writings, and therefore not clearly marked off from literary compositions like his own. Yet to Sirach the Law is everything. He identifies it with the highest Wisdom; indeed, all wisdom in his judgment is derived from a study of the Law (compare Sirach 19:20-24; 15:1-18; 24:23; 2:16; 39:1).

5. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus (circa 132 BC):

The Prologue or Preface to Ecclesiasticus is our next witness to the formation of the canon. It was written by the grandson of Jesus ben Sirach, who bore his grandfather's name (circa 132 BC). Jesus ben Sirach the younger translated in Egypt his grandfather's proverbs into Greek, and in doing so added a Preface or Prologue of his own. In this Prologue, he thrice refers to the tripartite division of the Old Testament. In fact the Prologue to Ecclesiasticus is the oldest witness we have to the threefold division of the Old Testament books. He says: "Whereas many and great things have been delivered unto us by the Law and the Prophets, and by others, ... my grandfather, Jesus, when he had given himself to the reading of the Law, and the Prophets, and other books of our Fathers, and had gotten therein good judgment (the Revised Version (British and American) "having gained great familiarity therein"), was drawn on also himself to write something pertaining to learning and wisdom. .... For the same things uttered in Hebrew and translated into another tongue, have not the same force in them; and not only these things, but the Law itself, and the Prophets, and the rest of the books, have no small difference, when they are spoken in their own language." These are explicit and definite allusions to the threefold division of the Old Testament writings, yet only the titles of the first and second divisions are the technical names usually employed; the third is especially vague because of his use of the terms, "the other books of the Fathers," and "the rest of the books." However, he evidently refers to writings with religious contents; and, by "the other books of the Fathers," he can hardly be supposed to have meant an indefinite number, though he has not told us which they were or what was their number. From his further statement that his grandfather, having immersed himself in the Law and the Prophets, and other books of the Fathers, felt drawn on also himself to write something for the profit of others, it may be inferred that in his time there was as yet no definite gulf fixed between canonical writings and those of other men, and that the sifting process was still going on (compare W. R. Smith, OTJC2, 178- 79).

6. 1 and 2 Maccabee (between 125 and 70 BC):

1 Maccabee was written originally in Hebrew; 2 Maccabee in Greek, somewhere between 125 and 70 BC. The author of 1 Maccabee is acquainted, on the one hand, with the deeds of John Hyrcanus (135 to 105 BC), and knows nothing on the other of the conquest of Palestine by Pompey (63 BC). The value of this book as a witness to the history of the canon centers about his allusions to Daniel and the Psalms. In 1 Macc 1:54, he tells how Antiochus Epiphanes "set up the abomination of desolation" upon the altar at Jerusalem, referring most likely to Da 9:24-27; and in 1 Macc 2:59,60 he speaks of Ananias, Azarias and Misael, who by believing were saved from the fiery furnace, and of Daniel, who was delivered from the mouths of the lions (compare Da 1:7; 3:26; 6:23). From these allusions, it would seem as though the Book of Daniel was at that time regarded as normative or canonical. This is confirmed by 1 Macc 7:16,17, which introduces a quotation from Ps 79:2, with the solemn formula, "According to the words which he wrote"; which would suggest that the Ps also were already canonical.

2 Maccabee, written circa 124 BC, also contains a couple of passages of considerable importance to us in this investigation. Both, however, are found in a spurious letter purporting to have been sent by the inhabitants of Judea to their fellow-countrymen residing in Egypt. The first passage (2 Macc 2:13) tells how Nehemiah, "founding a library, gathered together the acts of the kings, and the prophets, and of David, and the epistles of the kings concerning holy gifts." These words throw no special light upon the

formation of the canon, but they do connect with the name of Nehemiah the preservation of public documents and historical records of national interest, and how he, as a lover of books, founded a library. This is in perfect agreement with what we know of Nehemiah's character, for he compiled the genealogy of Ne 7; besides, collection precedes selection. The other passage (2 Macc 2:14) reads: "In like manner also Judas gathered together all things that were lost by reason of the war we had, and they remain with us." Though found in a letter, supposed to be spurious, there is every reason for believing this statement to be true. For when Antiochus, the arch enemy of the nation, sought to stamp out the religion of the Jews by destroying their books (compare 1 Macc 1:56,57), what would have been more natural for a true patriot like Judas than to attempt to re-collect their sacred writings? "This statement, therefore," as Wildeboer says, "may well be worthy of credence" (The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament, 40). Though it yields nothing definite as to the number of the books recovered, it is obvious that the books collected were the most precious documents which the nation possessed. They were doubtless religious, as was the age.

7. Philo (circa 20 BC-50 AD):

Philo is our next witness. He flourished in Alexandria between circa 20 BC and 50 AD, leaving behind him a voluminous literature. Unfortunately, he does not yield us much of positive value for our present purpose. His evidence is largely negative. True, he nowhere mentions the tripartite division of the Old Testament, which is known to have existed in his day. Nor does he quote from Ezekiel, the Five Megilloth (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Chronicles, or from the Twelve Minor Prophets, except Hosea, Jonah, and Zechariah. Moreover he held a loose view of inspiration. According to Philo, inspiration was by no means confined to the sacred Scriptures; all truly wise and virtuous men are inspired and capable of expressing the hidden things of God. But as Dr. Green (Canon, 130) right fully contends, "Philo's loose views of inspiration cannot be declared irreconcilable with the acceptance of a fixed canon, unless it is first shown that he places others whom he thinks inspired on a level with the writers of Scripture. This he never does." Philo's reverence for the "Law" was unbounded. In this respect he is the type of other Alexandrians. He quotes predominatingly from the Law. Moses was to him the source of all wisdom, even the wisdom of the Gentiles. Concerning the laws of Moses, he is reported by Eusebius as saying: "They have not changed so much as a single word in them. They would rather die a thousand deaths than detract anything from these laws and statutes." On the other hand, Philo never quotes any of the Apocryphal books. Hence, it may safely be assumed that his canon was essentially ours.

8. The New Testament as a Witness (circa 50-100 AD):

The evidence furnished by the New Testament is of the highest importance. When summed up, it gives the unmistakable impression that when the New Testament was written (circa 50-100 AD) there was a definite and fixed canon of Old Testament Scripture, to which authoritative appeal could be made. And first, too much importance can scarcely be attached to the names or titles ascribed to the Old Testament writings by the authors of the New Testament: thus, "the scripture" (Joh 10:35; 19:36; 2Pe 1:20), "the scripture s" (Mt 22:29; Ac 18:24), "holy scriptures" (Ro 1:2), "sacred writings" (2Ti 3:15), "the law" (Joh 10:34; 12:34; 15:25; 1Co 14:21), "law and prophets" (Mt 5:17; 7:12; 22:40; Lu 16:16; 24:44;

Ac 13:15; 28:23). Such names or titles, though they do not define the limits of the canon, certainly assume the existence of a complete and sacred collection of Jewish writings which are already marked off from all other literature as separate and fixed. One passage (Joh 10:35) in which the term "scripture," is employed seems to refer to the Old Testament canon as a whole; "and the scripture cannot be broken." In like manner the expression "law and prophets" is often used in a generic sense, referring to much more than merely the 1st and 2nd divisions of the Old Testament; it seems rather to refer to the old dispensation as a whole; but the term "the law" is the most general of all. It is frequently applied to the entire Old Testament, and apparently held in Christ's time among the Jews a place akin to that which the term "the Bible" does with us. For example, in Joh 10:34; 11:34; 15:25, texts from the prophets or even from the Ps are quoted as part of "the Law"; in 1Co 14:21 also, Paul speaks of Isa 28:11 as a part of "the law." These names and titles, accordingly, are exceedingly important; they are never applied by New Testament writers to the Apocrypha.

One passage (Lu 24:44) furnishes clear evidence of the threefold division of the canon. But here again, as in the Prologue of Sirach, there is great uncertainty as to the limits of the 3rd division. Instead of saying "the law, the prophets and the writings," Luke says, "the law, the prophets and the psalms." But it is obvious enough why the Psalms should have been adduced by Jesus in support of His resurrection. It is because they especially testify of Christ: they were, therefore, the most important part of the 3rd division for His immediate purpose, and it may be that they are meant to stand a potiori for the whole of the 3rd division (compare Budde, Encyclopedia Biblica, col. 669).

Another passage (Mt 23:35; compare Lu 11:51) seems to point to the final order and arrangement of the books in the Old Testament canon. It reads: "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar." Now, in order to grasp the bearing of this verse upon the matter in hand, it must be remembered that in the modern arrangement of the Old Testament books in Hebrew, Chronicles stands last; and that the murder of Zachariah is the last recorded instance in this arrangement, being found in 2Ch 24:20,21. But this murder took place under Joash king of Judah, in the 9th century BC. There is another which is chronologically later, namely, that of Uriah son of Shemaiah who was murdered in Jehoiakim's reign in the 7th century BC (Jer 26:23). Accordingly, the argument is this, unless Ch already stood last in Christ's Old Testament, why did He not say, "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Uriah"? He would then have been speaking chronologically and would have included all the martyrs whose martyrdom is recorded in the Old Testament. But He rather says, "from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah," as though He were including the whole range of Old Testament Scripture, just as we would say "from Genesis to Malachi." Hence, it is inferred, with some degree of justification also, that Chronicles stood in Christ's time, as it does today in the Hebrew Bible of the Massorets, the last book of an already closed canon. Of course, in answer to this, there is the possible objection that in those early days the Scriptures were still written by the Jews on separate rolls.

Another ground for thinking that the Old Testament canon was closed before the New Testament was written is the numerous citations made in the New Testament from the Old Testament. Every book is quoted except Esther, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Obadiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah. But these exceptions are not serious. The Twelve Minor Prophets were always treated by the Jews en bloc as

one canonical work; hence, if one of the twelve were quoted all were recognized. And the fact that 2Ch 24:20,21 is quoted in Mt 23:35 and Lu 11:51 presupposes also the canonicity of Ezra-Nehemiah, as originally these books were one with Chronicles, though they may possibly have already been divided in Jesus' day. As for Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, it is easy to see why they are not quoted: they probably failed to furnish New Testament writers material for quotation. The New Testament writers simply had no occasion to make citations from them. What is much more noteworthy, they never quote from the Apocryphal books, though they show an acquaintance with them. Professor Gigot, one of the greatest of Roman Catholic authorities, frankly admits this. In his General Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures, 43, he says: "They never quote them explicitly, it is true, but time and again they borrow expressions and ideas from them." As a matter of fact, New Testament writers felt free to quote from any source; for example, Paul on Mars' Hill cites to the learned Athenians an astronomical work of the Stoic Aratus of Cilicia, or perhaps from a Hymn to Jupiter by Cleanthes of Lycia, when he says, "For we are also his off-spring" (Ac 17:28). And Jude 1:14,15 almost undeniably quotes from Enoch (1:9; 60:8) —a work which is not recognized as canonical by any except the church of Abyssinia. But in any case, the mere quoting of a book does not canonize it; nor, on the other hand, does failure to quote a book exclude it. Quotation does not necessarily imply sanction; no more than reference to contemporary literature is incompatible with strict views of the canon. Everything depends upon the manner in which the quotation is made. In no case is an Apocryphal book cited by New Testament authors as "Scripture," or as the work of the Holy Spirit. And the force of this statement is not weakened by the fact that the authors of New Testament writings cited the Septuagint instead of the original Hebrew; for, "they are responsible only for the inherent truthfulness of each passage in the form which they actually adopt" (Green, Canon, 145). As a witness, therefore, the New Testament is of paramount importance. For, though it nowhere tells us the exact number of books contained in the Old Testament canon, it gives abundant evidence of the existence already in the 1st century AD of a definite and fixed canon.

9. 4 Esdras (circa 81-96 AD):

4 Esdras in Latin (2 Esdras in English) is a Jewish apocalypse which was written originally in Greek toward the close of the 1st century (circa 81-96 AD). The passage of special interest to us is 2 Esdras 14:19-48 which relates in most fabulous style how Ezra is given spiritual illumination to reproduce the Law which had been burned, and how, at the Divine command, he secludes himself for a period of 40 days, after which he betakes himself with five skilled scribes to the open country. There, a cup of water is offered him; he drinks, and then dictates to his five amanuenses continuously for 40 days and nights, producing 94 books of which 70 are kept secret and 24 published. The section of supreme importance reads as follows: "And it came to pass, when the forty days were fulfilled, that the Most High spake, saying, 'The first that thou hast written, publish openly, that the worthy may read it; but keep the seventy last, that thou mayest deliver them only to such as be wise among the people; for in them is the spring of understanding, the fountain of wisdom, and the stream of knowledge.' And I did so" (4 Esdras 14:45-48). The story is obviously pure fiction. No wonder that a new version of it arose in the 16th century, according to which the canon was completed, not by Ezra alone, but by a company of men known as the Great Synagogue. From the legend of 4 Esdras it is commonly inferred that the 24 books which remain after subtracting 70 from 94 are the canonical books of the Old Testament. If so, then this legend is the first witness we have to the number of books contained in the Old Testament canon. This number

corresponds exactly with the usual number of sacred books according to Jewish count, as we saw in section 5 above. The legend, accordingly, is not without value. Even as legend it witnesses to a tradition which existed as early as the 1st Christian century, to the effect that the Jews possessed 24 specially sacred books. It also points to Ezra as the chief factor in the making of Scripture and intimates that the Old Testament canon has long since been virtually closed.

10. Josephus' "Contra Apionem" (circa 100 AD):

Flavius Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born 37 AD. He was a priest and a Pharisee. About 100 AD, he wrote a controversial treatise, known as Contra Apionem, in defense of the Jews against their assailants, of whom Apion is taken as a leading representative, Now Apion was a famous grammarian, who in his life had been hostile to the Jews. He had died some 50 years before Contra Apionem was written. Josephus wrote in Greek to Greeks. The important passage in his treatise (I, 8) reads as follows: "For it is not the case with us to have vast numbers of books disagreeing and conflicting with one another. We have but twenty-two, containing the history of all time, books that are justly believed in. And of these, five are the books of Moses, which comprise the laws and the earliest traditions from the creation of mankind down to the time of his (Moses') death. This period falls short but by a little of three thousand years. From the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, king of Persia, the successor of Xerxes, the prophets who succeeded Moses wrote the history of the events that occurred in their own time; in thirteen books. The remaining four documents comprise hymns to God and practical precepts to men. From the days of Artaxerxes to our own time every event has indeed been recorded. But these recent records have not been deemed worthy of equal credit with those which preceded them, because the exact succession of the prophets ceased. But what faith we have placed in our own writings is evident by our conduct; for though so great an interval of time (i.e. since they were written) has now passed, not a soul has ventured either to add, or to remove, or to alter a syllable. But it is instinctive in all Jews at once from their very birth to regard them as commands of God, and to abide by them, and, if need be, willingly to die for them."

The value of this remarkable passage for our study is obviously very great. In the first place Josephus fixes the number of Jewish writings which are recognized as sacred at 22, joining probably Ru to Jud and La to Jer. He also classifies them according to a threefold division, which is quite peculiar to himself: 5 of Moses, 13 of the prophets, and 4 hymns and maxims for human life. The 5 of Moses were of course the Pentateuch; the 13 of the prophets probably included the 8 regular Nebhi'im plus Daniel, Job, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther; the "4 hymns and maxims" would most naturally consist of Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles and Ecclesiastes. There is little doubt that his 22 books are those of our present Hebrew canon.

Another very remarkable fact about Josephus' statement is the standard he gives of canonicity, namely, antiquity; because, as he says, since Artaxerxes' age the succession of prophets had ceased. It was the uniform tradition of Josephus' time that prophetic inspiration had ceased with Malachi (circa 445-432 BC). Hence, according to him, the canon was closed in the reign of Artaxerxes (465-425 BC). He does not pause to give any account of the closing of the canon; he simply assumes it, treating it as unnecessary. Prophecy had ceased, and the canon was accordingly closed; the fact did not require to be

officially proclaimed. As remarked above. the value of Josephus as a witness is very great. But just here an important question arises: How literally must we interpret his language? Was the Old Testament canon actually closed before 425 BC? Were not there books and parts of books composed and added to the canon subsequent to his reign? Dr. Green seems to take Josephus literally (Canon, 40, 78). But Josephus is not always reliable in his chronology. For example, in his Antiquities (XI, vi, 13) he dates the story of Esther as occurring in the reign of Artaxerxes I (whereas it belongs to Xerxes' reign), while in the same work (XI, v, 1) he puts Ezra and Nehemiah under Xerxes (whereas they belong to the time of Artaxerxes). On the whole, it seems safer on internal grounds to regard Josephus' statements concerning the antiquity of the Jewish canon as the language not of a careful historian, but of a partisan in debate. Instead of expressing absolute fact in this case, he was reflecting the popular belief of his age. Reduced to its lowest terms, the element of real truth in what he says was simply this, that he voiced a tradition which was at that time universal and undisputed; one, however, which had required a long period, perhaps hundreds of years, to develop. Hence, we conclude that the complete Old Testament canon, numbering 22 books, was no new thing 100 AD.

11. The Councils of Jamnia (90 and 118 AD):

According to the traditions preserved in the Mishna, two councils of Jewish rabbis were held (90 and 118 AD respectively) at Jabne, or Jamnia, not far South of Joppa, on the Mediterranean coast, at which the books of the Old Testament, notably Ecclesiastes and Canticles, were discussed and their canonicity ratified. Rabbi Gamaliel II probably presided. Rabbi Akiba was the chief spirit of the council. What was actually determined by these synods has not been preserved to us accurately, but by many authorities it is thought that the great controversy which had been going on for over a century between the rival Jewish schools of Hillel and Shammai was now brought to a close, and that the canon was formally restricted to our 39 books. Perhaps it is within reason to say that at Jamnia the limits of the Hebrew canon were officially and finally determined by Jewish authority. Not that official sanction created public opinion, however, but rather confirmed it.

12. The Talmud (200-500 AD):

The Talmud consists of two parts:

(1) The Mishna (compiled circa 200 AD), a collection of systematized tradition; and

(2) the Gemara, Gemara (completed about 500 AD), a "vast and desultory commentary on the Mishna" A Baraitha', or unauthorized gloss, known as the Babha' Bathra' 14 b, a Talmudic tractate, relates the "order" of the various books of the Old Testament and who "wrote" or edited them. But it says nothing of the formation of the canon.

To write is not the same as to canonize; though to the later Jews the two ideas were closely akin. As a witness, therefore, this tractate is of little value, except that it confirms the tripartite division and is a good specimen of rabbinic speculation. For the full text of the passage, see Ryle, Canon of the Old

Testament, 273 ff.

13. Jewish Doubts in the 2nd Century AD:

During the 2nd century AD, doubts arose in Jewish minds concerning four books, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, and Esther. In a certain Talmudic tractate it is related that an attempt was made to withdraw (ganaz, "conceal," "hide") the Book of Pr on account of contradictions which were found in it (compare Pr 26:4,5), but on deeper investigation it was not withdrawn. In another section of the Talmud, Rabbi Akiba is represented as saying concerning Canticles: "God forbid that any man of Israel should deny that the So of Songs defileth the hands, for the whole world is not equal to the day in which the So of Songs was given to Israel. For all Scriptures are holy, but the So of Songs is the holiest of the holy." Such extravagant language inclines one to feel that real doubt must have existed in the minds of some concerning the book. But the protestations were much stronger against Ecclesiates. In one tractate it is stated: "The wise men desired to hide it because its language was often self-contradictory (compare Ec 7:3 and Ec 2:2; 4:2; 9:4), but they did not hide it because the beginning and the end of it consist of words from the Torah (compare Ec 1:3; 12:13,14)." Likewise Es was vigorously disputed by both the Jerusalem and Babylonian Gemaras, because the name of God was not found in it; but a Rabbi Simeon ben Lakkish (circa 300 AD) defended its canonicity, putting Esther on an equality with the Law and above the Prophets and the other Writings. Other books, for example, Ezekiel and Jonah, were discussed in post-Talmudic writings, but no serious objections were ever raised by the Jews against either. Jonah was really never doubted till the 12th century AD. In the case of no one of these disputed books were there serious doubts; nor did scholastic controversies affect public opinion.

14. Summary and Conclusion:

This brings us to the end of our examination of the witnesses. In our survey we have discovered

(1) that the Old Testament says nothing about its canonization, but does emphasize the manner in which the Law was preserved and recognized as authoritative;

(2) that to conclude that the Jews possessed the Law only, when the renegade Manasseh was expelled by Nehemiah from Jerusalem, because the Samaritans admit of the Law alone as the true canon, is unwarrantable;

(3) that the Septuagint version as we know it from the Christian manuscripts extant is by no means a sufficient proof that the Alexandrians possessed a "larger" canon which included the Apocrpha;

(4) that Jesus ben Sirach is a witness to the fact that the Prophets in his day (180 BC) were not yet acknowledged as canonical;

(5) that his grandson in his Prologue is the first witness to the customary tripartite division of Old Testament writings, but does not speak of the 3rd division as though it were already closed;

(6) that the Books of Maccabees seem to indicate that Psalms and Daniel are already included in the canon of the Jews;

(7) that Philo's testimony is negative, in that he witnesses against the Apocryphal books as an integral part of Holy Scripture;

(8) that the New Testament is the most explicit witness of the series, because of the names and titles it ascribes to the Old Testament books which it quotes;

(9) that 4 Esdras is the first witness to the number of books in the Old Testament canon—24;

(10) that Josephus also fixes the number of books, but in arguing for the antiquity of the canon speaks as an advocate, voicing popular tradition, rather than as a scientific historian;

(11) that the Councils of Jamnia may, with some ground, be considered the official occasion on which the Jews pronounced upon the limits of their canon; but that

(12) doubts existed in the 2nd century concerning certain books; which books, however, were not seriously questioned.

From all this we conclude, that the Law was canonized, or as we would better say, was recognized as authoritative, first, circa 444 BC; that the Prophets were set on an even footing with the Law considerably later, circa 200 BC; and that the Writings received authoritative sanction still later, circa 100 BC. There probably never were three separate canons, but there were three separate classes of writings, which between 450 and 100 BC doubtless stood on different bases, and only gradually became authoritative. There is, therefore, ground for thinking, as suggested above (section 6), that the tripartite division of the Old Testament canon is due to material differences in the contents as well as to chronology.

III. The Canon in the Christian Church.

1. In the Eastern or Oriental Church:

In making the transition from the Jewish to the Christian church, we find the same canon cherished by all. Christians of all sects have always been disposed to accept without question the canon of the Jews. For centuries all branches of the Christian church were practically agreed on the limits set by the Jews, but eventually the western church became divided, some alleging that Christ sanctioned the "larger" canon of Alexandria, including the Apocrypha, while others adhered, as the Jews have always done, to the canon of the Jews in Palestine taking the eastern or oriental church first, the evidence they furnish is as follows: The Peshitta, or Syriac version, dating from circa 150 AD, omits Chronicles; Justin Martyr (164 AD) held to a canon identical with that of the Jews; the Canon of Melito, bishop of Sardis, who

(circa 170 AD) made a journey to Palestine in order carefully to investigate the matter, omits Est. His list, which is the first Christian list we have, has been preserved to us by Eusebius in his Eccl. Hist., IV, 26; Origen (died 254 AD), who was educated in Alexandria, and was one of the most learned of the Greek Fathers, also set himself the task of knowing the "Hebrew verity" of the Old Testament text, and gives us a list (also preserved to us by Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., VI, 5) in which he reckons the number of books as 22 (thus agreeing with Josephus). Inadvertently he omits the Twelve Minor Prophets, but this is manifestly an oversight on the part of either a scribe or of Eusebius, as he states the number of books is 22 and then names but 21. The so-called Canon of Laodicea (circa 363 AD) included the canonical books only, rejecting the Apocrypha. Athanasius (died 365 AD) gives a list in which Esther is classed as among the non-canonical books, but he elsewhere admits that "Esther is considered canonical by the Hebrews." However, he included Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah with Jeremiah. Amphilochius, bishop of Iconium (circa 380 AD), speaks of Esther as received by some only. Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (died 386 AD), gives a list corresponding with the Hebrew canon, except that he includes Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah. Gregory of Nazianzus in Cappadocia (died 390 AD) omits Esther. But Anastasius, patriarch of Antioch (560 AD), and Leontius of Byzantium (580 AD) both held to the strict Jewish canon of 22 books. The Nestorians generally doubted Esther. This was due doubtless to the influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia (circa 390-457 AD) who disputed the authority of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and Job. The oriental churches as a whole, however, never canonized the Apocrypha.

2. In the Western Church:

Between 100 and 400 AD, the New Testament writings became canonical, occupying in the Christian church a place of authority and sacredness equal to those of the Old Testament. The tendency of the period was to receive everything which had been traditionally read in the churches. But the transference of this principle to the Old Testament writings produced great confusion. Usage and theory were often in conflict. A church Father might declare that the Apocryphal books were uninspired and yet quote them as "Scripture," and even introduce them with the accepted formula, "As the Holy Ghost saith." Theologically, they held to a strict canon, homiletically they used a larger one. But even usage was not uniform. 3 and 4 Esdras and the Book of Enoch are sometimes quoted as "Holy Writ," yet the western church never received these books as canonical. The criterion of usage, therefore, is too broad. The theory of the Fathers was gradually forgotten, and the prevalent use of the Septuagint and other versions led to the obliteration of the distinction between the undisputed books of the Hebrew canon and the most popular Apocryphal books; and being often publicly read in the churches they finally received a quasi-canonization.

Tertullian of Carthage (circa 150-230 AD) is the first of the Latin Fathers whose writings have been preserved. He gives the number of Old Testament books as 24, the same as in the Talmud Hilary, bishop of Poitiers in France (350-368 AD), gives a catalogue in which he speaks of "Jeremiah and his epistle," yet his list numbers only 22. Rufinus of Aquileia in Italy (died 410 AD) likewise gives a complete list of 22 books. Jerome also, the learned monk of Bethlehem (died 420 AD), gives the number of canonical books as 22, corresponding to the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and explains that the five double books (1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Jeremiah-Lamentations)

correspond to the five final letters of the Hebrew alphabet. In his famous Prologus Galeatus or "Helmed Preface" to the books of Samuel and Kings, he declares himself for the strict canon of the Jews; rejecting the authority of the deutero-canonical books in the most outspoken manner, even distinguishing carefully the apocryphal additions to Esther and to Daniel. As the celebrated Catholic writer, Dr. Gigot, very frankly allows, "Time and again this illustrious doctor (Jerome) of the Latin church rejects the authority of the deutero-canonical books in the most explicit manner" (General Intro, 56).

Contemporaneous with Jerome in Bethlehem lived Augustine in North Africa (353-430 AD). He was the bishop of Hippo; renowned as thinker, theologian and saint. In the three great Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397 and 419 AD), of which he was the leading spirit, he closed, as it were, the great debate of the previous generations on the subject of how large shall be the Bible. In his essay on Christian Doctrine, he catalogues the books of Scripture, which had been transmitted by the Fathers for public reading in the church, giving their number as 44, with which he says "the authority of the Old Testament is ended." These probably correspond with the present canon of Catholics. But it is not to be supposed that Augustine made no distinction between the proto-canonical and deutero-canonical books. On the contrary, he limited the term "canonical" in its strict sense to the books which are inspired and received by the Jews, and denied that in the support of doctrine the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were of unquestioned authority, though long custom had entitled them to respect. And when a passage from 2 Maccabees was urged by his opponents in defense of suicide, he rejected their proof by showing that the book was not received into the Hebrew canon to which Christ was witness. At the third Council of Carthage (397 AD), however, a decree was ratified, most probably with his approval, which in effect placed all the canonical and deutero-canonical books on the same level, and in the course of time they actually became considered by some as of equal authority (see DEUTERO-CANONICAL). A few years later, another council at Carthage (419 AD) took the additional step of voting that their own decision concerning the canon should be confirmed by Boniface, the bishop of Rome; accordingly, thereafter, the question of how large the Bible should be became a matter to be settled by authority rather than by criticism.

From the 4th to the 16th century AD the process of gradually widening the limits of the canon continued. Pope Gelasius (492-496 AD) issued a decretal or list in which he included the Old Testament apocrypha. Yet even after this official act of the papacy the sentiment in the western church was divided. Some followed the strict canon of Jerome, while others favored the larger canon of Augustine, without noting his cautions and the distinctions he made between inspired and uninspired writings. Cassiodorus (556 AD) and Isidore of Seville (636 AD) place the lists of Jerome and Augustine side by side without deciding between them. Two bishops of North Africa, Primasius and Junilius (circa 550 AD) reckon 24 books as strictly canonical and explicitly state that the others are not of the same grade. Popular usage, however, was indiscriminate. Outside the Jews there was no sound Hebrew tradition. Accordingly, at the Council of Florence (1442 AD), "Eugenius IV, with the approval of the Fathers of that assembly, declared all the books found in the Latin Bibles then in use to be inspired by the same Holy Spirit, without distinguishing them into two classes or categories" (compare Gigot, General Introduction, 71). Though this bull of Eugenius IV did not deal with the canonicity of the Apocryphal books, it did proclaim their inspiration. Nevertheless, down to the Council of Trent (1546 AD), the Apocryphal books possessed only inferior authority; and when men spoke of canonical Scripture in the strict sense, these

were not included.

Luther, the great Saxon Reformer of the 16th century, marks an epoch in the history of the Christian Old Testament canon. In translating the Scriptures into German, he gave the deutero-canonical books an intermediate position between the Old Testament and the New Testament. The Lutheran church, also, while it does not expressly define the limits of the canon, yet places the Apocryphal writings by themselves as distinct and separate from Holy Scripture. This indeed was the attitude of all the early Reformers. In the Zurich Bible of 1529, as in the Genevan version in English of 1560, the Apocryphal books were placed apart with special headings by themselves. Thus the early Reformers did not entirely reject the Apocryphal writings, for it was not an easy task to do so in view of the usage and traditions of centuries.

Rome had vacillated long enough. She realized that something must be done. The Reformers had sided with those who stood by Jerome. She therefore resolved to settle the matter in an ecclesiastical and dogmatic manner. Accordingly the Council of Trent decreed at their fourth sitting (April 8, 1546), that the Apocryphal books were equal in authority and canonical value to the other books of sacred Scripture; and to make this decree effective they added: "If, however, anyone receive not as sacred and canonical the said books entire with all their facts, and as they have been used to be read in the Catholic church, and as they are contained in the Old Latin Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) edition .... let him be anathema." The decree was the logical outcome of the ever-accumulating snowball tendency in the western church. The historical effect of it upon the church is obvious. It closed forever the field of Biblical study against all free research. Naturally, therefore, the Vatican Council of 1870 not only reiterated the decree but found it easy to take still another step and canonize tradition.

Repeated endeavors were made during the 16th and 17th centuries to have the Apocryphal books removed from the Scriptures. The Synod of Dort (1618-19), Gomarus, Deodatus and others, sought to accomplish it, but failed. The only success achieved was in getting them separated from the truly canonical writings and grouped by themselves, as in the Gallican Confession of 1559, the Anglican Confession of 1562, and the Second Helvetic Confession of 1566. The Puritan Confession went farther, and declared that they were of a purely secular character. The various continental and English versions of the Bible then being made likewise placed them by themselves, apart from the acknowledged books, as a kind of appendix. For example, the Zurich Bible of 1529, the French Bible of 1535, Coverdale's English translation of 1536, Matthew's of 1537, the second edition of the Great Bible, 1540, the Bishops' of 1568, and the King James Version of 1611. The first English version to omit them altogether was an edition of King James' Version published in 1629; but the custom of printing them by themselves, between the Old Testament and the New Testament, continued until 1825, when the Edinburgh Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society protested that the Society should no longer translate these Apocryphal writings and send them to the heathen. The Society finally yielded and decided to exclude them (May 3, 1827). Since then, Protestants in Great Britain and America have given up the practice of publishing the Apocrypha as a part of sacred Scripture. In Europe, also, since 1850, the tendency has been in the same direction. The Church of England, however, and the American Episcopal church, do not wholly exclude them; certain "readings" being selected from Wisdom, Ecclesiastes and Baruch, and read on week days between October 27 and November 17. Yet, when the

English Revised Version appeared in 1885, though it was a special product of the Church of England, there was not so much as a reference to the Apocryphal writings. The Irish church likewise removed them; and the American Standard Revised Version ignores them altogether.

LITERATURE.

G. Wildeboer, The Origin of the Canon of the Old Testament, translated by B. W. Bacon, London, Luzac and Co., 1895; H. E. Ryle, The Canon of the Old Testament, London and New York, Macmillan, 1892; F. Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament, translated by John MacPherson, Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1892; W. H. Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament, The Canon, New York, Scribner, 1898; W. Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 2nd edition, London, A. and C. Black, 1895; F. E. Gigot, General Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, 3rd edition, New York, Cincinnati and Chicago, Benziger Bros., 1903; B. F. Westcott, The Bible in the Christian Church, London and New York, Macmillan, 1901; C. A. Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, New York, Scribner, 1899; A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Divine Library of the Old Testament, London and New York, Macmillan, 1892; Hastings, DB, III, 1900, article "Old Testament Canon" by F. H. Woods; Cheney and Black’s EB, I, 1899, article "Canon" by K. Budde; The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, II, 1908, article "Canon of Scripture" by H. L. Struck; Jour. of Biblical Lit., 1896, 118-28, article "The Alleged Triple Canon of the Old Testament," by W. J. Beecher; Abbe A. Loisy, Histoire du canon de l’ancien testament, Paris, 1890; J. Furst, Der Kanon des Altes Testament, Leipzig, 1868; E. Reuss, Histoire du canon des saintes ecritures dans l’eglise chretienne, Strassburg, 1864, English translation, Edinburgh, 1891.

George L. Robinson

CANOPY

kan’-o-pi (chuppah, from a root meaning "to enclose" or "cover"): Isa 4:5 the King James Version has "defence," the English Revised Version "canopy," the American Standard Revised Version "covering," the last being best, though "canopy" has much in its favor. In Ps 19:5 (Hebrew 19:6) chuppah is used of the bridegroom’s chamber and in Joe 2:16 of the bride’s. Among the Hebrews the chuppah was originally the chamber in which the bride awaited the groom for the marital union. In Judith 10:21; 13:9,15; 16:19 the word canopy occurs as the English equivalent of the Greek konopeion, which was primarily a mosquito-net and then a canopy over a bed, whether for useful or for decorative purposes.

John Richard Sampey

CANTICLES

kan’-ti-k’-lz.

See SONG OF SONGS.

CAPERBERRY

ka’-per-ber-i (’abhiyonah; kapparis; Ec 12:5 the Revised Version, margin): The translation "the caperberry shall fail" (the Revised Version (British and American) "burst") instead of "desire shall fail" (the King James Version) has the support of the Septuagint and of some Talmudic writers (see G. F. Moore, JBL, X, 55-64), but it is doubtful.

The caperberry is the fruit of the thorny caper, Capparis spinosa (Natural Order Capparidaceae), a common Palestine plant with pretty white flowers and brightly colored stamens. Largely on account of its habit of growing out of crevasses in old walls it has been identified by some with the HYSSOP (which see). The familiar "capers" of commerce are the young buds, but the berries were the parts most used in ancient times; their repute as excitants of sexual desire is ancient and widespread. Various parts of this plant are still used for medical purposes by the modern peasants of Palestine.

E. W. G. Masterman

CAPERNAUM

ka-per’-na-um (Kapernaoum (Textus Receptus), Kapharnaoum (Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Bezae; etc.)): The woe spoken by the Master against this great city has been fulfilled to the uttermost (Mt 11:23; Lu 10:15). So completely has it perished that the very site is a matter of dispute today. In Scripture Capernaum is not mentioned outside the Gospels. When Jesus finally departed from Nazareth, He dwelt in Capernaum (Mt 4:13) and made it the main center of His activity during a large part of His public ministry. Near by He called the fishermen to follow Him (Mr 1:16), and the publican from the receipt of custom (Mt 9:9, etc.). It was the scene of many "mighty works" (Mt 11:23; Mr 1:34). Here Jesus healed the centurion’s son (Mt 8:5, etc.), the nobleman’s son (Joh 4:46), Simon Peter’s mother-in-law (Mr 1:31, etc.), and the paralytic (Mt 9:1, etc.); cast out the unclean spirit (Mr 1:23, etc.); and here also, probably, He raised Jairus’ daughter to life (Mr 5:22, etc.). In Capernaum the little child was used to teach the disciples humility, while in the synagogue Jesus delivered His ever-memorable discourse on the bread of life (Joh 6). From the notices in the Gospels we gather that Capernaum was a city of considerable importance. Some think that the words "shalt thou be exalted," etc. (Mt 11:23; Lu 10:15), mean that it stood on an elevated site. Perhaps more naturally they refer to the excessive pride of the inhabitants in their city. It was a customs station, and the residence of a high officer of the king (Mt 9:9; Joh 4:46, etc.). It was occupied by a detachment of Roman soldiers, whose commander thought the good will of the people worth securing at the expense of building for them a synagogue (Mt 8:5; Lu 7:5). It stood by the sea (Mt 4:13) and from Joh 6:17 ff (compare Mt 14:34; Mr 6:53), we see that it was either in or near the plain of Gennesaret.

Josephus twice mentions Capernaum. It played no great part in the history of his time, and seems to have declined in importance, as he refers to it as a "village." In battle in el-BaTeichah his horse fell into a quagmire, and he suffered injury which disabled him for further fighting. His soldiers carried him to the

village of Capernaum (this reference is however doubtful; the name as it stands is Kepharnomon which Niese corrects to Kepharnokon), whence he was removed to Tarichea (Vita, 72). Again he eulogizes the plain of Gennesaret for its wonderful fruits, and says it is watered by a most fertile fountain which the people of the country call Capharnaum. In the water of this fountain the Coracinus is found (BJ, III, x, 8). Josephus therefore corroborates the Biblical data, and adds the information as to the fountain and the Coracinus fish. The fish however is found in other fountains near the lake, and is therefore no help toward identification.

The two chief rivals for the honor of representing Capernaum are Tell Chum, a ruined site on the lake shore, nearly 2 1/2 miles West of the mouth of the Jordan; and Khan Minyeh fully 2 1/2 miles farther west, at the Northeast corner of the plain of Gennesaret. Dr. Tristram suggested ‘Ain El-Madowwerah, a large spring enclosed by a circular wall, on the western edge of the plain. But it stands about a mile from the sea; there are no ruins to indicate that any considerable village ever stood here; and the water is available for only a small part of the plain.

In favor of Tell Chum is Eusebius, Onomasticon, Which places Chorazin 2 miles from Capernaum. If Kerazeh is Chorazin, this suits Tell Chum better than Khan Minyeh. To this may be added the testimony of Theodosius (circa 530), Antoninus Martyr (600), and John of Wurtzburg (1100). Jewish tradition speaks of Tankhum, in which are the graves of Nahum and Rabbi Tankhum. Identifying Kerr Nahum with Tankhum, and then deriving Tell Chum from Tankhum, some have sought to vindicate the claims of this site. But every link in that chain of argument is extremely precarious. A highway ran through Tell Chum along which passed the caravans to and from the East; but the place was not in touch with the great north-and-south traffic.

There is also no fountain near Tell Chum answering the description of Josephus. Of recent advocates of Tell Chum, it is sufficient to name Schurer (HJP, IV, 71) and Buhl (GAP, 224 f). In this connection it may be interesting to note that the present writer, when visiting the place recently (1911), drew his boatman’s attention to a bit of ruined wall rising above the greenery West of the lagoon, and asked what it was called. Kaniset el Kufry, was the reply, which may be freely rendered, "church of the infidels." This is just the Arabic equivalent of the Jewish "church of the minim."

For Khan Minyeh it may be noted that Gennesaret corresponds to el-Ghuweir, the plain lying on the Northwest shore, and that Khan Minyeh stands at the Northeast extremity of the plain; thus answering, as Tell Chum cannot do, the description of the Gospels. The copious fountains at eT-Tabigha, half a mile to the East, supplied water which was conducted round the face of the rock toward Khan Minyeh at a height which made it possible to water a large portion of the plain. If it be said that Josephus must have been carried to Tell Chum as being nearer the scene of his accident—see however, the comment above—it does not at all follow that he was taken to the nearest place. Arculf (1670) described Capernaum as on a "narrow piece of ground between the mountain and the lake." This does not apply to Tell Chum; but it accurately fits Khan Minyeh. Isaac Chelo (1334) says that Capernaum, then in ruins, had been inhabited by Minim, that is, Jewish converts to Christianity. The name Minyeh may have been derived from them. Quaresimus (1620-26) notes a Khan called Menieh which stood by the site of Capernaum. Between the ruined Khan and the sea there are traces of ancient buildings. Here the road from the East united with

that which came down from the North by way of Khan Jubb Yusif, so that this must have been an important center, alike from the military point of view, and for customs. This is the site favored by, among others, G. A. Smith (HGHL, 456 f; EB, under the word) and Conder. Sanday argued in favor of Khan Minyeh in his book, The Sacred Sites of the Gospel, but later, owing to what the present writer thinks a mistaken view of the relation between Tell Chum and the fountain at eT-Tabigha, changed his mind (Expository Times, XV, 100 ff). There is no instance of a fountain 2 miles distant being called by the name of a town. Tell Chum, standing on the sea shore, was independent of this fountain, whose strength also was spent in a westward direction, away from Tell Chum.

The balance of evidence was therefore heavily in favor of Khan Minyeh until Professor R. A. S. Macalister published the results of his researches. He seems to be wrong in rejecting the name Tell Chum in favor of Talchum; and he falls into a curious error regarding the use of the word tell. No one who speaks Arabic, he says, "would ever think of applying the word Tell, ‘mound,’ to this flat widespread ruin." In Egyptian Arabic, however, tell means "ruin"; and Asad Mansur, a man of education whose native language is Arabic, writes: "I do not understand what the objectors mean by the word ‘tell.’ In Arabic ‘tell’ is used for any heap of ruins, or mound. So that the ruins of Tell Chum themselves are today a ‘tell’ "(Expos, April, 1907, 370). Professor Macalister is on surer ground in discussing the pottery found on the rival sites. At Khan Minyeh he found nothing older than the Arabian period, while at Tell Chum pottery of the Roman period abounds—"exactly the period of the glory of Capernaum" (PEFS, April and July, 1907). If this be confirmed by further examination, it disposes of the claim of Khan Minyeh. Important Roman remains have now been found between the ruined Khan and the sea. It is no longer open to doubt that this was the site of a great Roman city. The Roman period however covers a long space. The buildings at Tell Chum are by many assigned to the days of the Antonines. Is it possible from the remains of pottery to make certain that the city flourished in the time of the Herods? If the city at Tell Chum had not yet arisen in the days of Christ, those who dispute its claim to be Capernaum are under no obligation to show which city the ruins represent. They are not the only extensive ruins in the country of whose history we are in ignorance.

W. Ewing

CAPH

See KAPH.

CAPHARSALAMA

kaf-ar-sal’-a-ma, kaf-ar-sala’-ma (Chapharsalama): The site of an indecisive skirmish between Judas Maccabeus and Nicanor, an officer of the king of Syria and governor of Judea. The situation cannot be precisely fixed but it must have been in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, for Nicanor, after losing 5,000 men, retired with the remainder to "the city of David" (1 Macc 7:26-32). The first part of the word, "Caphar," means village or hamlet; the last part has been identified with Siloam and also with Khirbet Deir Sellam, about 12 1/2 miles West of Jerusalem.

CAPHENATHA

ka-fen’-a-tha.

See CHAPHENATHA.

CAPHIRA

ka-fi’-ra (Codex Alexandrinus, Kaphira, Codex Vaticanus, Peira): A town whose inhabitants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:19). It corresponds to CHEPHIRAH (Ezr 2:25), which see.

CAPHTHORIM

kaf’-tho-rim (kaphtorim).

See CAPHTORIM.

CAPHTOR; CAPHTORIM

kaf’-tor, kaf’-tor-im (kaphtor, kaphtorim; Kappadokia, Gaphtorieim, Kaphtoriem).

1. First Theory: Crete:

The country and people whence came the Philistines (Ge 10:14 = 1Ch 1:12 (here the clause "whence went forth the Philistines" should, probably come after Caphtorim); De 2:23; Jer 47:4; Am 9:7). Jer (loc. cit.) calls it an "island"; there is evidence of ancient connection between Crete and Philistia; and the Philistines are called Cherethites, which may mean Cretans (see CHERETHITES). These considerations have led many to identify Caphtor with the important island of Crete. It should be noted, however, that the word ‘i, used by Jeremiah, denotes not only "isle," but also "coastland."

2. Second Theory: Phoenicia:

Ebers (Aegypten und die Bucher Moses, 130 ff) thought that Caphtor represented the Egyptian Kaft-ur, holding that Kaft was the Egyptian name for the colonies of Phoenicians in the Delta, extended to cover the Phoenicians in the north and their colonies. Kaft-ur, therefore, would mean "Greater Phoenicia." But the discovery of Kaptar among the names of countries conquered by Ptolemy Auletes in an inscription on the Temple of Kom Ombo is fatal to this theory.

3. Third Theory: Cilicia:

A third theory would identify Caphtor with the Kafto of the Egyptian inscriptions. As early as the time of Thotmes III the inhabitants of this land, the Kafti, are mentioned in the records. In the trilingual inscription of Canopus the name is rendered in Greek by Phoinike, "Phoenicia." This seems to be an error, as the Kafti portrayed on the monuments have no features in common with the Semites. They certainly represent a western type. It is held that the Egyptian Kafto is a district in Asia Minor, probably Cilicia. The sea- pirates, the purasati, whom Rameses III subdued (circa 1200 BC), entered Syria from the north. The "R" in the name is the Egyptian equivalent of the Semitic "L". Therefore Purasati = Pilishti, "Philistines." And so it is proposed to identify Caphtor with Cilicia. A serious objection to this theory is the absence of the final "r" in Kafto. McCurdy's suggestion (HDB) that it represents a Hebrew waw, written as a vowel-letter in an original Kafto, does not carry conviction.

It is impossible to give a certain decision; but the balance of probability seems still inclined to the first theory.

W. Ewing

CAPPADOCIA

kap-a-do'-shi-a (he Kappadokia): An extensive province in eastern Asia Minor, bounded by the Taurus mountains on the South, the Anti-Taurus and the Euphrates on the East, and, less definitely, by Pontus and Galatia on the North and West. Highest mountain, Argaeus, over 13,000 ft. above sea-level; chief rivers, the Pyramus now Jihan, Sarus now Sihon, and Halys now the Kuzul; most important cities, Caesarea Mazaca, Comana, Miletene now Malatia, and Tyana now Bor. At Malatia the country unrolls itself as a fertile plain; elsewhere the province is for the most part composed of billowy and rather barren uplands, and bleak mountain peaks and pastures.

The Greek geographers called Cappodax the son of Ninyas, thereby tracing the origin of Cappadocian culture to Assyria. Cuneiform tablets from Kul Tepe (Kara Eyuk), deciphered by Professors Pinches and Sayce, show that in the era of Khammurabi (see HAMMURABI) this extensive ruin on the ox-bow of the Halys and near Caesarea Mazaca, was an outpost of the Assyr-Bah Empire. A Hittite civilization followed, from about 2000 BC onward. Malatia, Gurun, Tyana and other old sites contain important and undoubted Hittite remains, while sporadic examples of Hittite art, architecture and inscriptions are found in many places, and the number is being steadily increased by fresh discovery. After the Hittites fade from sight, following the fall of Carchemish, about 718 BC, Cappadocia emerges as a satrapy of Persia. At the time of Alexander the Great it received a top-dressing of Greek culture, and a line of native kings established an independent throne, which lasted until Cappadocia was incorporated in the Roman Empire, 17 AD. Nine rulers bore the name of Ariarathes (the Revised Version (British and American) Arathes) the founder of the dynasty, and two were named Ariobarzanes. One of these kings is referred to in 1 Macc 15:22. The history of this Cappadocian kingdom is involved, obscure and bloody.

Pagan religion had a deep hold upon the population prior to the advent of Christianity. Comana was famous for its worship of the great goddess Ma, who was served, according to Strabo, by 6,000

priestesses, and only second to this was the worship paid to Zeus at Venasa.

Representatives from Cappadocia were present at Pentecost (Ac 2:9), and Peter includes the converts in this province in the address of his letter (1Pe 1:1). Caesarea became one of the most important early centers of Christianity. Here the Armenian youth of noble blood, Krikore, or Gregory the Illuminator, was instructed in the faith to which he afterward won the formal assent of his whole nation. Here Basil governed the churches of his wide diocese and organized monasticism. His brother, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, lived and labored not far away. Cappadocia passed with the rest of Asia Minor into the Byzantine Empire, but from its exposed position early fell under the domination of the Turks, having been conquered by the Seljukians in 1074.

G. E. White

CAPTAIN

kap’-tin: In the King James Version there are no fewer than 13 Hebrew words, and 4 different Greek words, which are rendered by this one English word. In the Revised Version (British and American) some of these are rendered by other English words, and so we find for "captain": "marshal" (Jer 27; Na 3:17), "prince" (1Sa 9:16), "governor" (Jer 51:23,18), while in the case of one of these Hebrew words a different construction is found altogether (Jer 13:21).

1. In the Old Testament:

Of Hebrew words in the Old Testament rendered by "captain"

(1) the most frequent is sar, which denotes "a military commander," whether of thousands or hundreds or fifties (Nu 31:48; 1Sa 8:12 and many other places). Sar is the chief officer of any department, civil and religious, as well as military—captain of the guard the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), chief of the executioners the Revised Version, margin (Ge 37:36); chief butler (Ge 40:9); chief baker (Ge 40:16); chief of a district (Ne 3:15); chiefs of tribes (Naphtali; Zebulun, Ps 68:27); chiefs over gangs of slaves (Ex 1:11); chiefs of the priests and the Levites (Ezr 8:29).

(2) rabh, later Hebrew for chief of the executioners or captain of the guard, a title always given to Nebuzar-adan (2Ki 25:8 ff; Jer 39:9 ff) and to Arioch (Da 2:14). Compare also Rab-mag, chief of the magicians (Jer 39:13), and Ashpenaz, chief of the eunuchs (Da 1:3).

(3) ro’sh, "head" over a host (Israel in the wilderness, Nu 14:4), over tribes (De 29:10, where the Revised Version (British and American) renders "heads"), over thousands (1Ch 12:20). Abijah, king of Judah, before joining battle against Jeroboam, claimed "God himself is with us for our captain" the King James Version, "with us at our head" the Revised Version (British and American) (2Ch 13:12).

(4) shalish, originally the third man in the chariot, who, when the chief occupant was the king, or

commander-in-chief, was of the rank of captain (2Ki 7:2; 9:25), the term "third man" being generalized to mean "a captain" in 2Ki 10:25; 2Ch 8:9, where "chief of his captains" combines (1) and (4).

(5) naghidh, leader by Divine appointment: of Saul (1Sa 9:16, "captain," the King James Version, "prince" the Revised Version (British and American) 1Sa 10:1); of David (2Sa 5:2); of Hezekiah (2Ki 20:5); with a charge in connection with the temple (2Ch 31:13). It is the word used of Messiah "the prince" (Da 9:25), who is also Prince of the Covenant (Da 11:22).

(6) nasi', rendered "captain" in the King James Version Nu 2:3,5,7 only, there in the Revised Version (British and American) and in other places, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), rendered "prince." In 1Ch 7:40 "chief of the princes" combines (3) and (6).

(7) pechah, is found almost entirely in a foreign title denoting "governor," and belongs to the later history of Israel (Ne 2:7,9; Ezr 8:36; Hag 1:1), rendered "captain" in exclusively foreign associations (1Ki 20:24; 2Ki 18:24; Da 3:27 f).

(8) qatsin (from root of qadi, Arabic for "judge"), denotes "dictator," almost "usurper," and is found in "rulers of Sodom" the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "judges of Sodom" the Revised Version, margin (Isa 1:10), used of Jephthah in sense of "captain" the King James Version, "chief" the Revised Version (British and American) (Jud 11:6), found combined with (3), "head and captain" (King James Version, "head and chief" the Revised Version (British and American) Jud 11:11). In Jos 10:24 it denotes commanders of troops, the King James Version "captains of the men of war," the Revised Version (British and American) "chiefs of the men of war."

(9) kar, in Eze 21:22 "to set captains" the King James Version, is translated "to set battering rams" the Revised Version (British and American).

(10) ba'al, only once in "captain of the ward" (Jer 37:13).

(11) Tiphcar, a dignitary belonging to an oriental court, in the King James Version rendered "captain," in the Revised Version (British and American) "marshal" (Na 3:17; Jer 51:27).

(12) shalliT, in Da 2:15 of Arioch, the king's captain; in Ec 8:8 "having power over," and in Ec 7:19 used of "mighty men" (the Revised Version (British and American) "rulers").

2. In the New Testament:

Of Greek words rendered by "captain" in New Testament there are the following:

(1) archegos, rendered "captain" in Hebrews 2:10 the King James Version but relegated to the margin in the Revised Version (British and American), where "author" (of their salvation) is preferred, this being

the rendering of Hebrews 12:2 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "author" (and finisher of our faith), "captain" being still retained in the Revised Version, margin. Compare Ac 3:15 and Ac 5:31, where the same Greek word is rendered "Prince," the Revised Version, margin of the former passage giving "Author." In the Risen and Ascended Christ the various conceptions thus expressed are found to blend.

(2) chiliarchos, the Latin tribunus militum of which there were six to a legion, commanding the six cohorts of which it was composed. In its lit. acceptation it would be "commander of a thousand," and it is so used in Ac 22:28 where it designates the commander of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem, consisting of a cohort, and is rendered "chief captain" (Joh 18:12; Ac 21:31; 22:24; 24:22). It is used more vaguely in the sense of "military officer" in Mr 6:21; Re 6:15; 19:18.

(3) strategos, used only by Luke in the New Testament, and almost exclusively of

(a) officials in charge of the Temple (Lu 22:4,52; Ac 4:1; 5:24,26). The captain of the Temple had the superintendence of the Levites and priests who were on guard in and around the Temple, and under him were strategoi, who were also captains of the Temple police, although they took their instruction from him as their head. He was not only a priest, but second in dignity only to the high priest himself;

(b) the exception to Luke’s general usage is where the word is used of the chief authorities in civil affairs at Philippi; where "the magistrates," as the word is rendered (Ac 16:20 f), called themselves "praetors" (strategoi). In the case of Paul and Silas they placed themselves in peril of removal from their office by ordering them to be beaten, being Romans and uncondemned.

(4) stratopedarches, the captain of the guard to whom Julius of the Augustan band (according to the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Ac 28:16) delivered Paul and his fellow-prisoners. The word has disappeared from the Revised Version (British and American), but the passage in which it occurs has attestation which satisfies Blass, Sir William Ramsay, and other scholars. It was supposed that this was the captain of the Praetorian guard, but Mommsen and Ramsay believe him to be the princeps peregrinorum castrorum.

See AUGUSTAN BAND; ARMY, ROMAN.

T. Nicol.

CAPTIVE

kap’-tiv (shebhi, galah; aichmalotos and its derivatives): The frequent references in the Old Testament to captives as men forcibly deported (from the Hebrew root shabhah) or inhabiting a land foreign to them (from Hebrew galah) reflect the universal practice of the ancient world. The treatment of captives was sometimes barbarous (2Sa 8:2) but not always so (2Ki 6:21,22).

See further under ASSIR and WAR.

Figurative: Except in Job 42:10 the figurative use of the idea is confined to the New Testament, where reference is made to the triumphal reign of the Lord Jesus (Lu 4:18; Eph 4:8), or, on the other hand, to the power of the devil (2Ti 2:26), or of false teachers (2Ti 3:6); compare also Ro 7:23; 2Co 10:5.

See CAPTIVITY.

F. K. Farr

CAPTIVITY

kap-tiv'-i-ti (galah, galuth, shebhuth, shibhyah; metoikesia):

I. OF THE NORTHERN KINGDOM (THE WORK OF ASSYRIA)

1. Western Campaigns of Shalmaneser II, 860-825 BC

2. Of Rimmon-nirari III, 810-781 BC

3. Of Tiglath-pileser III, 745-727 BC

4. Of Shalmaneser IV, 727-722 BC—Siege of Samaria

5. Samaria Captured by Sargon, 722 BC

6. Depopulation and Repopulation of Samaria

7. The Ten Tribes in Captivity

II. OF JUDAH (THE WORK OF THE CHALDAEAN POWER)

Southern Kingdom and House of David

1. Break-up of Assyria

2. Downfall of Nineveh, 606 BC

3. Pharaoh Necoh's Revolt

4. Defeat at Carchemish, 604 BC

5. The New Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadrezzar, 604-562 BC

The Mission of Jeremiah, 626-580 BC

6. Revolt and Punishment of Jehoiakim, 608-597 BC

7. Siege and Surrender of Jerusalem under Jehoiachin, 597 BC

8. First Deportation, 597 BC

The Baskets of Figs

9. The Ministry of Ezekiel, 592-570 BC

10. Jeremiah’s Ministry in Jerusalem, 597-588 BC

11. Zedekiah’s Rebellion and Siege of Jerusalem, 588-586 BC

Jeremiah "Falling Away to the Chaldeans"

12. Destruction of Jerusalem, 586 BC

Flight, Capture, and Punishment of Zedekiah

13. Second Deportation of Inhabitants, 586 BC

14. Third Deportation, 581 BC

(1) Number and Quality of Exiles

(2) The Residue Left

15. Gedaliah, Governor of Judah

(1) Jeremiah and the Flight to Egypt

(2) Descendants of the Fugitives, 471-411 BC

16. The Exiles in Babylon: Their Social Condition, 464-405 BC

17. The Rise and Development of Judaism

18. The Return by Permission of Cyrus, 538 BC

19. Rebuilding of the Temple, 536 BC

Completed 515 BC

20. Reforms and Labors of Ezra and Nehemiah, 445 BC

21. Modern Theories of the Return

22. Importance of the Period of Ezra-Nehemiah

LITERATURE

I. Of the Northern Kingdom (The Work of Assyria).

1. Western Campaigns of Shalmaneser II, 860-825 BC:

The captivity of the Northern Kingdom was the work of the great Assyrian power having its seat at Nineveh on the Tigris. The empire of Assyria, rounded nearly 2000 BC, had a long history behind it when its annals begin to take notice of the kingdom of Israel and Judah. The reign of Shalmaneser II (860-825 BC) marks the first contact between these powers. This is not the Shalmaneser mentioned in 2Ki 17 and 18, who is the fourth of the name and flourished more than a century later. Shalmaneser II was contemporary during his long reign with Jehoshaphat, Jehoram, Ahaziah and Joash, kings of Judah; with Ahab, Ahaziah, Jehoram and Jehu, kings of Israel; with Hazael and Benhadad II, kings of Syria at Damascus, and with Mesha, king of Moab. The Assyrian authorities for his reign are an inscription engraved by himself on the rocks of Armenia; the Black Obelisk brought by Layard from Nimroud, now in the British Museum; and the texts engraved on the bronze gates of Balawat, discovered by Hormuzd Rassam in 1878, and recognized as the swinging gates of Shalmaneser’s palace. From these authorities we learn that in his 6th year he encountered the combined forces of Damascus, Hamath, Israel, and other states which had united to oppose his progress westward, and completely routed them in the battle of Karkar (854 BC). The danger which threatened the western states in common had brought Syria and Israel together; and this is in accord with the Scripture narrative which tells of a covenant, denounced by God’s prophet, between Ahab and Benhadad (1Ki 20:34 ff), and mentions a period of three years when there was no war between Syria and Israel. The defeat of the allies seems, however, to have broken up the confederacy, for, soon after, Ahab is found, with the aid of Jehoshaphat of Judah, attempting unsuccessfully, and with fatal result to himself, to recover from the weakened power of Syria the city of Ramoth-gilead (1Ki 22). In another campaign to the West, which likewise finds no record in Scripture,

Shalmaneser received the tribute of Tyre and Sidon, and of "Yahua of Khumri," that is, of Jehu, of the land of Omri, as Israel is called on the monuments.

2. Of Rimmon-nirari III, 810-781 BC:

The next Assyrian monarch who turned his arms against the West was Rimmon-nirari III (810-781 BC), grandson of Shalmaneser II. Although he is not mentioned by name in Scripture, his presence and activity had their influence upon contemporary events recorded in 2 Ki. He caused Syria to let go her hold of Israel; and although he brought Israel into subjection, the people of the Northern Kingdom would rather have a ruler exercising a nominal sovereignty over them in distant Nineveh than a king oppressing them in Damascus. Hence, Rimmon-nirari has been taken for the saviour whom God gave to Israel, "so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians" (2Ki 13:5; compare 2Ki 13:23).

With the death of Rimmon-nirari in 781 BC, the power of Assyria received a temporary check, and on the other hand the kingdom of Judah under Uzziah and the kingdom of Israel under Jeroboam II reached the zenith of their political prosperity. In 745 BC, however, a usurper, Pul, or Pulu, ascended the throne of Assyria, and reigned as Tiglath- pileser III. It is by the former name that he is first mentioned in the Scripture narrative (2Ki 15:19; 1Ch 5:26), and by the latter that he is mentioned on the monuments. That the two names belong to one man is now held to be certain (Schrader, COT, I, 230 f).

3. Of Tiglath-pileser III, 745-727 BC:

Tiglath-pileser was one of the greatest monarchs of antiquity. He was the first to attempt to consolidate an empire in the manner to which the world has become accustomed since Roman times. He was not content to receive tribute from the kings and rulers of the states which he conquered. The countries which he conquered became subject provinces of his empire, governed by Assyrian satraps and contributing to the imperial treasury. Not long after he had seated himself on the throne, Tiglath-pileser, like his predecessors, turned his attention to the West. After the siege of Arpad, northward of Aleppo, the Assyrian forces made their way into Syria, and putting into operation the Assyrian method of deportation and repopulation, the conqueror annexed Hamath which had sought the alliance and assistance of Azariah, that is Uzziah, king of Judah. Whether he then refrained from molesting Judah, or whether her prestige was broken by this campaign of the Assyrian king, it is not easy to say. In another campaign he certainly subjected Menahem of Israel with other kings to tribute. What is stated in a word or two in the Annals of Tiglath-pileser is recorded at length in the Bible history (2Ki 15:19 ff): "There came against the land Pul the king of Assyria; and Menahem gave Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. And Menahem exacted the money of Israel, even of all the mighty men of wealth, of each man 50 shekels of silver, to give to the king of Assyria. So the king of Assyria tamed back, and stayed not there in the land." In the reign of Pekah, under his proper name of Tiglath-pileser, he is recorded to have raided the northern parts of Israel, and carried the inhabitants away into the land of Assyria (2Ki 15:29). We next hear of Ahaz, king of Judah, appealing to the Assyrians for help against "these two tails of smoking firebrands," Rezin of Syria and Pekah, the son of Remaliah (Isa 7:4). To secure this help he took the silver and gold of the house of the

Lord, and sent it as a present to the king of Assyria (2Ki 16:8). Meanwhile Tiglath-pileser was setting out on a new campaign to the West. He carried fire and sword through Syria and the neighboring lands as far as Gaza, and on his return he captured Samaria, without, however, razing it to the ground. Pekah having been slain by his own people, the Assyrian monarch left Hoshea, the leader of the conspiracy, on the throne of Israel as the vassal of Assyria.

4. Of Shalmaneser IV, 727-722 BC—Seige of Samaria:

In 727 BC Tiglath-pileser III died and was succeeded by Shalmaneser IV. His reign was short and no annals of it have come to light. In 2Ki 17 and 18, however, we read that Hoshea, relying upon help from the king of Egypt, thought the death of Tiglath-pileser a good opportunity for striking a blow for independence. It was a vain endeavor, for the end of the kingdom of Israel was at hand. The people were grievously given over to oppression and wickedness, which the prophets Amos and Hosea vigorously denounced. Hosea, in particular, was "the prophet of Israel's decline and fall." Prophesying at this very time he says: "As for Samaria, her king is cut off, as foam upon the water. The high places also of Aven, the sin of Israel, shall be destroyed: the thorn and the thistle shall come up on their altars; and they shall say to the mountains, Cover us; and to the hills, Fall on us" (Ho 10:7,8; compare Ho 10:14,15). No less stern are the predictions by Isaiah and Micah of the doom that is to overtake Samaria: "Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim, and to the fading flower of his glorious beauty, which is on the head of the fat valley of them that are overcome with wine" (Isa 28:1). "For the transgression of Jacob is all this, and for the sins of the house of Israel. What is the transgression of Jacob? is it not Samaria? .... Therefore I will make Samaria as a heap of the field, and as places for planting vineyards" (Mic 1:5,6). No help came from Egypt. With the unaided and enfeebled resources of his kingdom Hoshea had to face the chastising forces of his sovereign. He was made prisoner outside Samaria and was most likely carried away to Nineveh. Meanwhile the land was over-run and the capital doomed to destruction, as the prophets had declared.

5. Samaria Captured by Sargon, 722 BC:

Not without a stubborn resistance on the part of her defenders did "the fortress cease from Ephraim" (Isa 17:3). It was only after a three years' siege that the Assyrians captured the city (2Ki 17:5). If we had only the record of the Hebrew historian we should suppose that Shalmaneser was the monarch to whom fell the rewards and honors of the capture. Before the surrender of the city Shalmaneser had abdicated or died, and Sargon, only once mentioned in Scripture (Isa 20:1), but one of the greatest of Assyrian monarchs, had ascended the throne. From his numerous inscriptions, recovered from the ruins of Khorsabad, we learn that he, and not Shalmaneser, was the king who completed the conquest of the revolted kingdom and deported the inhabitants to Assyria. "In the beginning (of my reign)," says Sargon in his Annals, "the city Samaria (I took) with the help of Shamash, who secures victory to me (.... 27,290 people inhabiters of it) I took away captive; 50 chariots the property of my royalty, which were in it I appropriated. (.... the city) I restored, and more than before I caused it to be inhabited; people of the lands conquered by my hand in it (I caused to dwell. My governor over them I appointed, and tribute) and imposts just as upon the Assyrians I laid upon them." The Assyrian Annals and the Scripture history support and supplement each other at this point. The sacred historian describes the deportation as

follows: "The king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and on the Habor, the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes .... because they obeyed not the voice of Yahweh their God, but transgressed his covenant, even all that Moses, the servant of Yahweh, commanded, and would not hear it, nor do it" (2Ki 17:6,7; 18:11,12).

6. Depopulation and Repopulation of Samaria:

The repopulation of the conquered territory is also described by the sacred historian: "And the king of Assyria brought men from Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Avva, and from Hamath and Sepharvaim, and placed them in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel; and they possessed Samaria, and dwelt in the cities thereof" (2Ki 17:24). The fact that Sargon introduced foreign settlers taken in war into Samaria is attested by inscriptions. That there were various episodes of deportation and repopulation in connection with the captivity of the Northern Kingdom appears to be certain. We have seen already that Tiglath-pileser III deported the population of the northern tribes to Assyria and placed over the depopulated country governors of his own. And at a time considerably later, we learn that Sargon's grandson Esarhaddon, and his great-grandson Ashur-bani-pal, "the great and noble Osnappar," imported to the region of Samaria settlers of nations conquered by them in the East (Ezr 4:2,10). Of the original settlers, whom a priest, carried away by the king of Assyria but brought back to Bethel, taught "the law of the god of the land," it is said that "they feared Yahweh, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations from among whom they had been carried away" (2Ki 17:33). The hybrid stock descended from those settlers is known to us in later history and in the Gospels as the Samaritans.

7. The Ten Tribes in Captivity:

We must not suppose that a clean sweep was made Of the inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom. No doubt, as in the Babylonian captivity, "the poorest of the land were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen" (2Ki 25:12). The numbers actually deported were but a moiety of the whole population. But the kingdom of the Ten Tribes was now at an end. Israel had become an Assyrian province, with a governor established in Samaria. As regards the Golah—the captives of Israel in the cities of the Medes —it must not be supposed that they became wholly absorbed in the population among whom they were settled. We can well believe that they preserved their Israelite traditions and usages with sufficient clearness and tenacity, and that they became part of the Jewish dispersion so widespread throughout the East. It is quite possible that at length they blended with the exiles of Judah carried off by Nebuchadrezzar, and that then Judah and Ephraim became one nation as never before. The name Jew, therefore, naturally came to include members of what had earlier been the Northern Confederacy of Israel as well as those of the Southern Kingdom to which it properly belonged, so that in the post-exilic period, Jehudi, or Jew, means an adherent of Judaism without regard to local nationality.

II. Of Judah (The Work of the Chaldean Power).

Southern Kingdom and House of David

The captivity of Judah was the work of the great Chaldean power seated at Babylon on the Euphrates. While the Northern Kingdom had new dynasties to rule it in quick succession, Judah and Jerusalem remained true to the House of David to the end. The Southern Kingdom rested on a firmer foundation, and Jerusalem with its temple and priesthood secured the throne against the enemies who overthrew Samaria for nearly a century and a half longer.

1. Break-up of Assyria:

Sargon, who captured Samaria in 722 BC, was followed by monarchs with a great name as conquerors and builders and patrons of literature, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal. When Ashurbanipal died in 625 BC, the dissolution of the Assyrian Empire was not far off. Its hold over the West had greatly slackened, and the tributary peoples were breaking out into revolt. Bands of Scythians, a nomad Aryan race, from the region between the Caucasus and the Caspian, were sweeping through the Assyrian Empire as far as Palestine and Egypt, and the prophecies of Jeremiah and Zephaniah reflect their methods of warfare and fierce characteristics. They were driven back, however, at the frontier of Egypt, and appear to have returned to the North without invading Judah.

2. Downfall of Nineveh, 606 BC:

From the North these hordes were closing in upon Nineveh, and on all sides the Assyrian power was being weakened. In the "Burden of Nineveh," the prophet Nahum foreshadows the joy of the kingdom of Judah at the tidings of its approaching downfall: "Behold, upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace! Keep thy feasts, O Judah, perform thy vows; for the wicked one shall no more pass through thee; he is utterly cut off" (Na 1:15; compare Na 3:8-11). The Medes regained their independence and under their king, Cyaxares, formed an alliance with the Chaldeans, who soon afterward revolted under the leadership of Nabopolassar, viceroy of Babylon. Rallying these various elements to his standard Nabopolassar laid siege to the Assyrian capital, and in 606 BC, Nineveh, which had been the capital city of great conquerors, and had "multiplied (her) merchants above the stars of heaven" (Na 3:16), fell before the combined forces of the Medes and Chaldeans, fell suddenly and finally, to rise no more. Of the new Babylonian Empire upon which the Chaldeans now entered, Nebuchadrezzar, whose father Nabopolassar had associated him with him on the throne, was the first and most eminent ruler.

3. Pharaoh Necoh’s Revolt:

That the people of Judah should exult in the overthrow of Nineveh and the empire for which it stood we can well understand. Jerusalem herself had by God’s mercy remained unconquered when Sennacherib nearly a century before had carried off from the surrounding country 200,150 people and had devastated the towns and fortresses near. But the hateful Assyrian yoke had rested upon Judah to the end, and not upon Judah only but even upon Egypt and the valley of the Nile. In 608 BC Pharaoh Necoh revolted from his Assyrian suzerain and resolved upon an eastern campaign. He had no desire to quarrel with Josiah of Judah, through whose territory he must pass; but in loyalty to his Assyrian suzerain Josiah

threw himself across the path of the Egyptian invader and perished in the battle of Megiddo. The Pharaoh seems to have returned to Egypt, taking Jehoahaz the son of Josiah with him, and to have appointed his brother Jehoiakim king of Judah, and to have exacted a heavy tribute from the land.

4. Defeat at Carchemish, 604 BC:

But he did not desist from his purpose to win an eastern empire. Accordingly he pressed forward till he reached the Euphrates, where he was completely routed by the Babylonian army under Nebuchadrezzar in the decisive battle of Carchemish, 604 BC. The battle left the Chaldeans undisputed masters of Western Asia, and Judah exchanged the yoke of Assyria for that of Babylon.

5. The New Babylonian Empire under Nebuchadrezzar, 604-562 BC:

So far as cruelty was concerned, there was little to choose between the new tyrants and the old oppressors. Of the Chaldeans Habakkuk, who flourished at the commencement of the new Empire, says: "They are terrible and dreadful. .... Their horses also are swifter than leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves; and their horsemen spread themselves: yea, their horsemen come from far; they fly as an eagle that hasteth to devour" (Hab 1:7,8 the American Revised Version, margin). Over Western Asia, including Judah, Nebuchadrezzar since the battle of Carchemish was supreme. It was vain for Judah to coquet with Egypt when Nebuchadrezzar had a long and powerful arm with which to inflict chastisement upon his disloyal subjects.

The Mission of Jeremiah, 626-580 BC.

The mission of Jeremiah the prophet in this crisis of the history of Judah was to preach obedience and loyalty to the king of Babylon, and moral reformation as the only means of escaping the Divine vengeance impending upon land and people. He tells them in the name of God of the great judgment that was to come at the hand of the Chaldeans on Jerusalem and surrounding peoples. He even predicts the period of their subjection to Chaldean domination: "And this whole land shall be a desolation, and an astonishment; and these nations shall serve the king of Babylon seventy years" (Jer 25:11). This preaching was unpalatable to the partisans of Egypt and to those who believed in the inviolability of Jerusalem. But with stern rebuke and with symbolic action he proclaims the doom of Jerusalem, and in the face of persecution and at the risk of his life, the prophet fulfills his ministry.

6. Revolt and Punishment of Jehoiakim, 608-597 BC:

Jehoiakim, who was first the vassal of Pharaoh Necoh, and then of Nebuchadrezzar, was in corruption and wickedness too faithful a representative of the people. Jeremiah charges him with covetousness, the shedding of innocent blood, oppression and violence (Jer 22:13-19). The fourth year of Jehoiakim was the first year of Nebuchadrezzar, who, fresh from the victory of Carchemish, was making his sovereignty felt in the western world. The despicable king of Judah became Nebuchadrezzar’s vassal and continued in his allegiance three years, after which he turned and rebelled against him. But he

received neither encouragement nor help from the neighboring peoples. "Yahweh sent against him bands of the Chaldeans, and bands of the Syrians, and bands of the Moabites, and bands of the children of Ammon, and sent them against Judah to destroy it, according to the word of Yahweh, which he spake by his servants the prophets" (2Ki 24:2). The history of the latter part of Jehoiakim's reign is obscure. The Hebrew historian says that after a reign of eleven years he slept with his fathers, from which we infer that he died a natural death. From Daniel we learn that in the third year of Jehoiakim, Nebuchadrezzar came up against Jerusalem and besieged it, and carried off, along with vessels of the house of God, members of the seed royal, and of the nobility of Judah, among whom was Daniel the prophet. That Jehoiakim was included in what seems to be a first installment of the captivity of Judah is expressly affirmed by the Chronicler who says: "Against him (Jehoiakim) came up Nebuchadnezzar .... and bound him in fetters, to carry him to Babylon" (2Ch 36:6). However the facts really stand, the historian adds to the record of the death of Jehoiakim and of the succession of Jehoiachin the significant comment: "And the king of Egypt came not again any more out of this land; for the king of Babylon had taken, from the brook of Egypt unto the river Euphrates, all that pertained to the king of Egypt" (2Ki 24:7).

7. Siege and Surrender of Jerusalem under Jehoiachin, 597 BC:

Jehoiachin who succeeded Jehoiakim reigned only three months, the same length of time as his unfortunate predecessor Jehoahaz (2Ki 23:31). The captivity of Jehoahaz in Egypt and the captivity of Jehoiachin in Babylon are lamented in a striking elegy by Ezekiel, who compares them to young lions, the offspring of the mother lioness Israel, which learned to catch and their prey and devoured men, but were taken in the pit of the nations and put in rings, so that their roar was no more heard in the mountains of Israel (Eze 19:1-9). Nebuchadrezzar came in person while his servants were besieging Jerusalem, and Jehoiachin surrendered at discretion. So the king and his mother and his servants and his princes and his officers were carried off with the mighty men of valor, even ten thousand captives. 'None remained, save the poorest sort of the people of the land. He carried out thence all the treasures of the house of Yahweh, and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold, which Solomon king of Israel had made in the temple of Yahweh, as Yahweh had said.

8. First Deportation, 597 BC:

And all the men of might, even seven thousand, and the craftsmen and the smiths a thousand, all of them strong and apt for war, even them the king of Babylon brought captive to Babylon. And the king of Babylon made Mattaniah, Jehoiachin's father's brother, king in his stead, and changed his name to Zedekiah' (2Ki 24:10-17). From Jehoiachin dates the carrying away into Babylon, the year being 597 BC. The unfortunate monarch lived in exile in Babylon 38 years, and seems to have retained the respect and loyalty of the exiles among whom he dwelt.

The Baskets of Figs:

It was with reference to the deportation of the princes and craftsmen and smiths that Jeremiah had his vision of the baskets of figs—one containing figs very good, like the first ripe figs; the other very bad, so

bad they could not be eaten (Jer 24:1-3). The good figs were the captives of Judah carried away into the land of the Chaldeans for good; the bad figs were the king Zedekiah and his princes and the residue of Jerusalem, upon whom severe judgments were yet to fall till they were consumed from off the land (Jer 24:4-10).

9. The Ministry of Ezekiel, 592-570 BC:

Among the captives thus carried to Babylon and placed on the banks of the Chebar was the priest-prophet Ezekiel. Five years after the captivity he began to have his wonderful "visions" of God, and to declare their import to the exiles by the rivers of Babylon. To the desponding captives who were engrossed with thoughts of the kingdom of Judah, not yet dissolved, and of the Holy City, not yet burned up with fire, Ezekiel could only proclaim by symbol and allegory the destruction of city and nation, till the day when the distressing tidings reached them of its complete overthrow. Then to the crushed and despairing captives he utters no lamentations like those of Jeremiah, but rather joyful predictions of a rebuilt city, of a reconstituted kingdom, and of a renovated and glorious temple.

10. Jeremiah’s Ministry in Jerusalem, 597-588 BC:

Although the flower of the population had been carried away into Babylon and the Temple had been despoiled of its treasures, Jerusalem and the Temple still stood. To the inhabitants who were left behind, and to the captives in Babylon, Jeremiah had a message. To the latter he offered counsels of submission and contentment, assured that the hateful and repulsive idolatries around them would throw them back upon the law of their God, and thus promote the work of moral and spiritual regeneration within them. ‘Thus saith Yahweh, I will give them a heart to know me, that I am Yahweh: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return unto me with their whole heart’ (Jer 24:5,7). To "the residue of Jerus" his counsels and predictions were distasteful, and exposed him to the suspicion of disloyalty to his people and his God. None of his warnings was more impressive than that symbolically proclaimed by the bands and bars which the prophet was to put upon his neck to send to the kings of Edom and Moab and Ammon and Tyre and Sidon, who seem to have had ideas of forming an alliance against Nebuchadrezzar. Zedekiah was also urged to submit, but still entertained hopes that the king of Babylon would allow the captives of Judah to return. He even himself went to Babylon, perhaps summoned thither by his suzerain (Jer 51:59). With an Egyptian party in Jerusalem urging an alliance with Egypt, and with a young and warlike Pharaoh on the throne, Hophra (Apries), Zedekiah deemed the opportunity favorable for achieving independence, and entered into an intrigue with the Egyptian king. So Zedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon (2Ki 24:20).

11. Zedekiah’s Rebellion and the Siege of Jerusalem, 588-586 BC:

It was a bold throw, but Nebuchadrezzar would brook no such disloyalty from his vassals. He marched at once to the West, and committed to Nebuzaradan the task of capturing Jerusalem, while he himself established his headquarters at Riblah, in Syria, on the Orontes. Meanwhile the Pharaoh with his army crossed the frontier to the help of his allies, and compelled the Chaldeans to raise the siege of Jerusalem

and meet him in the field (Jer 37:5). But here his courage failed him, and he retired in haste without offering battle. Nebuzaradan now led back his army and the siege became closer than before.

Jeremiah "Falling Away to the Chaldeans"

During the breathing-space afforded by the withdrawal of the Chaldeans, Jeremiah was going out of the city to his native Anathoth, some 4 miles to the Northeast across the ridge, on family business (Jer 37:11-15). His departure was observed, and he was charged with falling away to the Chaldeans, and cast into an improvised dungeon in the house of Jonathan the scribe. While there the king sent for him and asked, "Is there any word from Yahweh?" And Jeremiah answered fearlessly, "There is. Thou shalt be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon." For a time Jeremiah, by the favor of Zedekiah, enjoyed after this a greater measure of freedom; but as he continued to urge in hearing of all the people the duty of surrender, his enemies vowed that he should be put to death, and had him cast into a foul empty cistern, where he ran the risk of being choked or starved to death. Once again the king sought an interview with the prophet, giving him private assurance that he would not put him to death nor allow his enemies to do so. Again the prophet counseled surrender, and again he was allowed a measure of freedom.

12. Destruction of Jerusalem, 586 BC:

Flight, Capture, and Punishment of Zedekiah

But the end of the doomed city was at hand. In the 11th year of Zedekiah, 586 BC, in the 4th month, the 9th day of the month, a breach was made in the city (Jer 39:1,2), and the final assault completed the work that had been done by months of famine and want. Zedekiah and his men of war do not seem to have waited for the delivery of the last assault. They fled from the city by night "by the way of the king’s garden, through the gate betwixt the two walls," and made eastward for the Arabah. But the army of the Chaldeans pursued them, and overtook Zedekiah in the plains of Jericho. They took him prisoner and brought him to Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah, where the king of Babylon first slew the son of Zedekiah, and then put out his eyes. With the sons of the captured monarch were slain all the nobles of Judah. This time neither city nor temple nor palace was spared. Nebuzaradan "burnt the house of Yahweh, and the king’s house; and all the houses of Jerusalem, even every great house, burnt he with fire" (2Ki 25:9). His soldiers, too, broke down the walls of Jerusalem round about. The treasure and the costly furnishings of the Temple, in so far as they had escaped the former spoliation, were carried away to Babylon. The ruin of Jerusalem was complete. The Book of Lamentations utters the grief and shame and penitence of an eyewitness of the captures and desolation of the Holy City: "Yahweh hath accomplished his wrath, he hath poured out his fierce anger; and he hath kindled a fire in Zion, which hath devoured the foundations thereof. The kings of the earth believed not, neither all the inhabitants of the world, that the adversary and the enemy would enter into the gates of Jerusalem. Woe unto us! for we have sinned. For this our heart is faint; for these things our eyes are dim; for the mountain of Zion, which is desolate: the foxes walk upon it" (La 4:11,12; 5:16,18). 13. Second Deportation of Inhabitants, 586 BC:

"So Judah," says the prophet who had been through the siege and the capture (if not rather the editor of

his prophecies), "was carried away captive out of his land" (Jer 52:27). The statements of the numbers carried away are, however, conflicting. In Jer 52:28-30 we read of three deportations: that of 597 BC when 3,023 Jews were carried off; that of 586 BC when Nebuchadrezzar carried off 832 persons; and one later than both in 581 BC, when Nebuzaradan carried away captive of the Jews 745 persons—a total of 4,600.

14. Third Deportation, 581 BC:

(1) Number and Quality of Exiles:

In 2Ki 24:15,16 it is said that in 597 Nebuchadrezzar carried to Babylon 8,000 men. Dr. George Adam Smith taking all the data together estimates that the very highest figures possible are 62,000 or 70,000 men, women and children, less than half of the whole nation (Jerusalem, II, 268-70). In 597 BC, Nebuchadrezzar carried off the princes and nobles and craftsmen and smiths, leaving behind the poorest sort of the people of the land (2Ki 24:14).

(2) The Residue Left:

In 586 BC Nebuzaradan carried off the residue of the people that were left in the city, but he "left of the poorest of the land to be vinedressers and husbandmen" (2Ki 25:12). "They were, as the Biblical narratives testify, the poorest of the land, from whom every man of substance and energy had been sifted; mere groups of peasants, without a leader and without a center; disorganized and depressed; bitten by hunger and compassed by enemies; uneducated and an easy prey to the heathenism by which they were surrounded. We can appreciate the silence which reigns in the Bible regarding them, and which has misled us as to their numbers. They were a negligible quantity in the religious future of Israel: without initiative or any influence except that of a dead weight upon the efforts of the rebuilders of the nation, when these at last returned from Babylonia" (Jerusalem, II, 269-70).

15. Gedaliah, Governor of Judah:

Over those who were left behind, Gedaliah was appointed governor, with his residence at Mizpah, where also a Babylonian contingent remained on guard. Jeremiah had the choice of being taken to Babylon or of remaining in Judah. He preferred to remain with the residue of the people under the care of Gedaliah. With the murder of Gedaliah by Ishmael, a traitorous scion of the royal house, who in turn had to flee and made good his escape, it looked as if the last trace of the former kingdom of Judah was wiped out.

(1) Jeremiah and the Flight to Egypt:

Against the counsel of Jeremiah, the remnant, led by Johanan the son of Kareah, resolved to take refuge in Egypt and insisted that Jeremiah and his friend Baruch should accompany them. It is in Egypt, amid disappointment and misrepresentation which he had to endure, that we have our last glimpse of the prophet of the downfall of Judah.

(2) Descendants of the Fugitives, 471-411 BC:

Of the descendants of those settlers in Egypt remarkable remains have been discovered within the last few years. They consist of Aramaic papyri which were found at Assouan, the ancient Syene, and which belong to a time not more than a century after the death of Jeremiah. The documents are accounts and contracts and deeds of various kinds, from which we gather that in the 5th century BC there were Jews keeping themselves apart as they do still, worshipping Yahweh, and no other God, and even having a temple and an altar of sacrifice to which they brought offerings as their fathers did at Jerusalem before the destruction of the Temple. These papyri give us valuable glimpses of the social condition and religious interest of the settlers.

See DISPERSION.

16. The Exiles in Babylon: Their Social Condition, 464-405 BC:

Of the Jewish captives carried off by Nebuchadrezzar and settled by the rivers of Babylon, we learn something from the prophecies of Daniel which are now generally believed to belong to the Maccabean period, and much from the prophecies of Ezekiel, from the Psalms of the Captivity, and from the Second Isaiah, whose glowing messages of encouragement and comfort were inspired by the thought of the Return. From Haggai and Zechariah we see how the work of rebuilding the Temple was conceived and carried out. Of the social condition of the Exiles an interesting revelation is given by the excavations at Nippur. From cuneiform tablets, now in the Imperial Ottoman Museum at Constantinople, preserved among the business archives of the wealthy firm of Murashu, sons of Nippur, in the reign of Artaxerxes I and Darius II (464- 405 BC), there can be read quite a number of Jewish names. And the remarkable thing is that many of the names are those known to us from the genealogical and other lists of the Books of Ki and Ch and Ezr and Neh. Professor Hilprecht (The Babylonian Expedition, IX, 13 ff) infers from an examination of these that a considerable number of the Jewish exiles, carried away by Nebuchadrezzar after the destruction of Jerusalem, were settled in Nippur and its neighborhood. Of this fact there are various proofs. The Talmudic tradition which identifies Nippur with Calneh (Ge 10:10) gains new force in the light of these facts. And "the river Khebar in the land of the Chaldeans," by which Ezekiel saw his vision, is now known from inscriptions to be a large navigable canal not far from Nippur (ibid., 27,28).

17. The Rise and Development of Judaism:

The influence of the Captivity as a factor in the development of Judaism can hardly be overestimated. "The captivity of Judah," says Dr. Foakes-Jackson (Biblical History of the Hebrews, 316) "is one of the greatest events in the history of religion. .... With the captivity the history of Israel ends, and the history of the Jews commences." Placed in the midst of heathen and idolatrous surroundings the Golah recoiled from the abominations of their neighbors and clung to the faith of their fathers in the God of Abraham. Exposed to the taunts and the scorn of nations that despised them, they formed an inner circle of their

own, and cultivated that exclusiveness which has marked them ever since. Being without a country, without a ritual system, without any material basis for their life as a people, they learned as never before to prize those spiritual possessions which had come down to them from the past. They built up their nationality in their new surroundings upon the foundation of their religion. Their prophets, Jeremiah and Ezekiel, had encouraged and stimulated them with the assurance of spiritual blessings, and the promise of restoration. For their whole social and domestic and spiritual life there was needed some steady and continuous regulative principle or scheme. The need of this threw their leaders and thinkers back upon the Law of Moses. The rabbi and the scribe took the place of the sacrificing priest. The synagogue and the Sabbath came to occupy a new place in the religious practice of the people. These and other institutions of Judaism only attained to maturity after the Return, but the Captivity and the Exile created the needs they were meant to supply. While the prophets were clear and explicit in setting forth the Captivity, they were not less so in predicting the Return. Isaiah with his doctrine of the Remnant, Micah, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and others gifted with the vision of God, cheered the nation, each in their day, with the hope of restoration and return, not for Judah only but for Israel as well. Vineyards were to be planted again upon the mountains of Samaria as well as in the valleys of Judah. Jeremiah had even predicted the length of the period of the Exile, when he declared that the inhabitants of the land should serve the king of Babylon for seventy years (Jer 25:12; 29:10).

18. The Return by Permission of Cyrus, 538 BC:

It was in Cyrus, who brought about the fall of Babylon and ended the New Babylonian Empire in 539 BC, that the hopes of the exiles came to be centered. He was "the battle- axe" with which Yahweh was to shatter Babylon (Jer 51:20), and as he proceeded on his path of victory the unknown Seer whom we call the Second Isaiah welcomed him as the liberator of his people. "Thus saith Yahweh .... of Jerusalem, She shall be inhabited; and of the cities of Judah, They shall be built, and I will raise up the waste places thereof; that saith to the deep, Be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers; that saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built; and of the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isa 44:26-28).

19. Rebuilding of the Temple, 536 BC:

Within a year of the entry of Cyrus into Babylon an edict was issued (2Ch 36:22,23; Ezr 1:1 ff), granting permission to the exiles to return and build a house for the Lord in Jerusalem. He also brought forth the vessels of the Temple which Nebuchadrezzar had carried away and handed them over to Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah; and Sheshbazzar brought them with him when they of the Captivity were brought up from Babylon unto Jerusalem.

Particulars of the Return are given in the Books of Ezr and Neh, and in the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. Of the exiles 42,360 returned under Sheshbazzar, besides slaves; and under Jeshua the son of Jozadak the priest, and Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, first an altar was built and then the foundations of the Temple were laid. In consequence of the opposition of the Samaritans, who were refused any share in the restoration of the Temple, the work of rebuilding was greatly hindered, and came to a stop.

It was then that Haggai and Zechariah urged the resumption of the work and partly by denouncing the niggardliness of the people and partly by foreshadowing the glorious future in store for the Temple, hastened forward the enterprise.

Completed 515 BC:

At length in the month Adar, in the 6th year of Darius (515 BC) the work was completed and the Passover celebrated within the courts of the restored Sanctuary (Ezr 6:15- 18).

20. Reforms and Labors of Ezra and Nehemiah, 445 BC:

For some decades the history is silent, and it was in 458 BC that Ezra set out for Jerusalem taking 1,800 Jews along with him. He found that the returned Jews had become allied in marriage with the people of the land and were in danger of losing their racial characteristics by absorption among the heathen (Ezr 9). It was due no doubt to his efforts and those of Nehemiah, supported by the searching and powerful utterances of Malachi, that this peril was averted. Thirteen years later (445 BC) Nehemiah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes, having heard of the desolate condition of the Holy City, the place of his fathers' sepulchers, obtained leave of his master to visit Jerusalem. With letters to the governors on the route and to the keeper of the king's forest, he set out, and came safely to Jerusalem. Having himself inspected the walls he called the people to the work of repairing the ruins, and despite the taunts and calumny and active hostility of the Samaritan opposition he had the satisfaction of seeing the work completed, the gates set up and the city repopulated. Nehemiah and Ezra then gathered the people together to hear the words of the Law, and at a solemn convocation the Law was read and explained to the assembly. Thereafter a covenant was entered into by the people that they would observe the Law of Moses and not intermarry with the heathen nor traffic on the Sabbath, but would pay a third of a shekel annually for the services of the Temple and would bring first-fruits and tithes (Ne 10:28 ff).

21. Modern Theories of the Return:

The course of the history as here set forth has been disputed by some modern scholars, who hold that there was no return of the exiles under Cyrus and that the rebuilding of the Temple was the work of the Jews who remained behind in Judah and Jerusalem (EB, article "Ezra-Nehemiah"). This view, held by the late Professor Kosters of Leyden and supported by Professor H. P. Smith and other scholars, proceeds largely upon the rejection of the historical character of the Book of Ezra-Nehemiah. The historical difficulties which are found in the book are by no means such as to warrant us in denying the fact of the Return and the work of Ezra in connection with Nehemiah. As regards the Return, the course of the narrative is too well supported by documents which bear upon them the stamp of historical truth to be rashly disputed. Moreover, it seems highly improbable that an enterprise requiring such energy and skill and faith should have been undertaken, without stimulus from without, by the residue of the people. We have already seen how little initiative was to be expected of the poorest of the people; and the silence of Haggai, on the subject of the Return, is no argument against it. That the Judaism of Palestine required invigoration by an infusion of the zeal and enthusiasm which grew up in the Judaism of

Babylonian, is manifest from the story of the Captivity.

22. Importance of the Period Ezra-Nehemiah:

From the age of Nehemiah and the period immediately preceding it came influences of the utmost moment for the future. "Within these hundred years," says the late Dr. P. Hay Hunter in After the Exile (I, xvi), "the teaching of Moses was established as the basis of the national life, the first steps were taken toward the formation of a canon of Scripture. Jewish society was moulded into a shape which succeeding centuries modified, but did not essentially change. During this period the Judea of the days of our Lord came into being. Within this period the forces which opposed Christ, the forces which rallied to His side, had their origin. This century saw the rise of parties, which afterward became sects under the names of Pharisees and Sadducees. It laid the foundation of Rabbinism. It fixed the attitude of the Jews toward the Gentiles. It put the priesthood in the way to supreme authority. It gave birth to the Samaritan schism."

Figurative uses.

See CAPTIVE.

LITERATURE.

Schrader, COT, I; McCurdy, HPM, I, 281 ff, II, 249 ff, III; C. F. Barney, Notes on Heb Text of Bks of Kings; Foakes-Jackson, Biblical Hist of the Hebrews, 260-412; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 223-349; Cambridge Biblical Essays, 93-135; P. Hay Hunter, The Story of Daniel and After the Exile; EB, article "Ezra-Nehemiah"; Nicol, Recent Archaeology and the Bible, 239-78; H. P. Smith, Old Testament Hist, 219-412; Kittel, History of the Hebrews, II, 329 ff.

T. Nicol.

CAPTIVITY EPISTLES

See PHILEMON.

CAR

See PALANQUIN.

CARABASION

kar-a-ba’-zi-on (Rhabasion, Karabasion; Marimoth): One of the sons of Baani (1 Esdras 9:34) who had married foreign wives, during the captivity. The name is allowed to be corrupt; it seems to be

represented by Meremoth in the list of Ezr 10:36.

CARAVAN

kar’-a-van, kar-a-van’ (’orach): This word is not found in the King James Version, but the Revised Version (British and American) employs it three times, namely, in Job 6:18,19 (’orchoth), where the King James Version renders "paths" (Job 6:18) and "troops" (Job 6:19); in Isa 21:13 (’orechoth), where the King James Version and English Versions of the Bible give "travelling companies," and in Eze 27:25 (sharoth), where the King James Version gives a totally different translation. The Hebrew text in Ezekiel is dubious, but in Isaiah and Job "caravan" is undoubtedly a correct rendering of the Hebrew (compare also Ge 37:25). The inhabitants of Palestine were familiar with the caravans—the goods trains of the Semitic world—which traveled between BabyIon and Syria on the one hand to Arabia and on the other to Egypt. The main routes between these countries passed through Canaan. Isaiah refers to "caravans of Jedanites"—a trading Arabic tribe who conveyed their wares to Babylon. Job compares his would-be friends to a deceitful brook, full in the rainy season, but dry in summer, which entices caravans to turn aside from the main route in the hope of a plentiful supply of water, but which fails the thirsty travelers when they need it most.

T. Lewis

CARAVANSARY

kar-a-van’-sa-ri.

See INN.

CARBUNCLE

kar’-bun-k’-l.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CARCAS

kar’-kas (karkac): One of seven chamberlains, ordered to summon Queen Vashti before King Ahasuerus (Es 1:10). The Targum allegorizes the first five of the names.

CARCASS; CARCASE

kar’-kas: The dead body of a beast; used sometimes in a contemptuous way of the dead body of a human being. The use of the word as applied to a living body is not found in either Old Testament or New

Testament.

(1) It occurs as a translation of the Hebrew pegher, in Ge 15:11; this Hebrew word is also translated "dead body" in Nu 14:29; 1Sa 17:46; Isa 34:3; 66:24; Eze 6:5; 43:7:9, and "corpse" in Na 3:3.

(2) The Hebrew nebhelah, is also translated "carcass" in Le 5:2; 11:8,11; Jer 16:18, but as "dead body" in De 28:26 ("body," Jos 8:29; 1Ki 13:22,29; 2Ki 9:37); Isa 5:25; Jer 7:33; 16:4; 19:7.

(3) In Jud 14:8 the word mappelah, from naphal, "to incline" or "fall," is also translated "carcass."

(4) In Mt 24:28 the word "carcase" (not "carcass") is used to render the Greek ptoma, the reference probably being here to the dead body of an animal For the body of a human being the Greek is translated "corpse" (Mt 14:12; Mr 6:29; 15:45), and "dead bodies" (Re 11:8,9).

W. N. Stearns

CARCHEMISH

kar'-ke-mish (karkemish; Charmeis, Karchameis) :An exceedingly ancient Hittite city on the banks of the Euphrates, identified with Jerablus (Hierapolis) about 23 hours from Aleppo, between Birejik and Membij. The Assyrian form of the name is Kargamis or Gargamis, but its meaning is doubtful, the interpretation "Fort of the god Chemosh" having been suggested before it was known that the Assyrian-Babylon form of Chemosh was not Kamish or Gamish, but Kammusu (Kammosu). Systematic excavations on the site have apparently only just been made, those undertaken by Consul J. Henderson, after the death of G. Smith the Assyriologist, having been mainly devoted to the excavation of sculptures, etc. The site has vast walls and palace-mounds about. 8,000 ft. in circumference.

1. Evidence of the City's Early Existence:

The earliest occurrence of the name is in an adjectival form, namely, Karkarnisu, "Carchemishite," applied to a vase or measure of 200 qa, in a list of property at Sippar in the reign of Ammi-caduga (circa 1900 BC). Later on, the Egyptian poet known as Pentaur refers to the people of Carchemish (Qarqamesa) as forming, with the men of Arvad, Aleppo and Gozan, part of "the host of the miserable king of the Hittites" (Hattu-sil), who fought against Rameses II at the battle of Kadesh. The first Assyrian king to mention Carchemish is Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1268 BC), who states that he plundered "from the neighborhood of the land of Suhu (the Shuhites) as far as Carchemish of the land of Hattu" in one day.

2. Its Later History:

Later, the city attracted the attention of the Assyrian king Assur-nacir-apli, who started on the 8th of Iyyar, about the year 870 BC, to the conquest of the district, and received tribute from the son of Bit-

Bahiani; and, a little later, from Sangara of Carchemish, who is described as king of the Hittites. This tribute consisted of 20 talents of silver, various objects of gold, 100 talents of copper, 250 talents of iron, furniture, chariots and horses—an enormous treasure. Shalmaneser II, son of Assur-nacir-apli, also took tribute from the king of Carchemish here referred to. On the first occasion when the two monarchs met, Sangara was in alliance with the Sam'alians, Patinians, and Til- Bursip. After the capture of Sazabe (858 BC), a strong city of Sangara of Carchemish, all the opposing princes submitted. The tribute paid by the Hittite king on this occasion is depicted on strip F of the bronze coverings of the gates of Balawat, which has four representations of the place—two in the upper and two in the lower row of reliefs. The Kurkh monolith states that the tribute consisted of "2 talents of gold, 70 talents of silver, 80 talents of bronze, 100 talents of iron, 30 talents of purple stuff, 500 weapons, his daughter with a dowry, and 100 daughters of his great men, 500 oxen, and 5,000 sheep." A yearly tax was also imposed. The reliefs show two long trains of tribute-bearers, that in the lower row escorting the princess, who, apparently accompanied by her father, goes to meet the Assyrian king. Samsi-Adad, Shalmaneser II's son, merely mentions Carchemish as being on the western limits of his empire.

3. Tiglath-pileser IV Receives Its Tribute, and Sargon of Assyria Incorporates It:

In the time of Tiglath-pileser IV, the city was ruled by King Pisiri(s), who paid tribute as an Assyrian vassal. On the accession of Sargon of Assyria, however, Pisiris tried to throw off the Assyrian yoke, and made alliance with Meta of Moschi (Mesech) and other rulers, but was taken prisoner in the operations which followed. In the subsequent plundering of the city, those who suffered most were the inhabitants of the city who had been most active against Assyria. These were carried captive, and their places filled, as was the custom, by Assyrian settlers. The city's importance under Assyrian rule continued, the "mana of Carchemish" being one of the standard weights in use at Nineveh. After incorporation into the Assyrian empire it was ruled by Assyrian governors, one of whom, Bel-emuranni, was eponym for. the year 691 BC (reign of Sennacherib). The Old Testament gives later details. In the time of Josiah, Pharaoh Necoh marched to fight against the city, and the Jewish king went out to meet him, but lost his life at Megiddo (2Ch 35:20 ff). Four years later (605 BC), the Egyptian king was himself defeated by Nebuchadrezzar under the walls of the city (Jer 46:2) in the battle which decided the fate of Western Asia.

4. Sculpture and Inscriptions Found at Carchemish:

The art of Carchemish was that of the Hittite nation to which the city belonged, but it was strongly influenced by the style of the Assyrians, and exhibits a mannerism if anything more pronounced. The Inscriptions found on the site are in the usual Hittite style—boldly carved natural objects and implements in relief arranged in boustrophedonbands between division-lines. It is not improbable, however, that cuneiform was also used, and texts in Phoenician characters may, by chance, be found. The patron-deity of the city was the Asiatic goddess Atargatis, whose worship, when the place lost its importance, was removed to the new Hierapolis now represented by the ruins of Membij.

T. G. Pinches

CARE; CAREFULNESS; CAREFUL

kar, kar’-fool-ness, kar’-fool: The English word "care" has such a variety of meanings, and so many Hebrew and Greek words in the Bible are translated by this English expression and its compounds, that it is difficult to organize them into a single brief article. We may do so, however, by remembering that into our word are really woven two strands, one Teutonic and one Latin. The former element implies a measure of trouble or sorrow, as the pain from a blow, a throb, a distress in the mind; the latter, from Latin cura, implies a stretching forward, attention to some person or thing. We can often discern these two senses side by side in the Bible, and sometimes they almost run into one another. This is so especially in the King James Version. We can treat the subject best by keeping separate, as far as possible, these two senses.

I. In the Sense of Anxiety, Solicitude.

1. Substantives:

In the Old Testament several words are translated "care" in this sense. "Thy father hath left off caring for the asses," concern about them literally, "matters of the asses" (dibhre, 1Sa 10:2). "They shall eat bread by weight, and with care" (de’-aghah, "carefulness" the Revised Version (British and American); "fearfulness" the American Standard Revised Version, Eze 4:16). The same word is rendered carefulness (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); "fearfulness," the American Standard Revised Version, Eze 12:18-19); and "fear" (King James Version; "carefulness," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, Jos 22:24). Again, "heaviness" (the Kings James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version), but "care" (the Revised Version, margin and the American Revised Version, margin, Pr 12:25). Once more, "sorrow" (the King James Version, the Revised with Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version), but "care" (the Revised Version, margin and the American Revised Version, margin, Jer 49:23). There is also the word charadhah "trembling," "fear," "anxiety." It is rendered "trembling" (Ge 27:33 the King James Version). But "thou hast been careful for us all this care" ("showed us all this reverence," the Revised Version, margin, the American Revised Version, margin, 2Ki 4:13). In the New Testament, "care," in the sense of anxiety, is the meaning given to merimna, the condition of being drawn mentally in different directions, distraction of mind. "Care of the world" (Mt 13:22; Mr 4:19; Lu 8:14, "cares of this life," Lu 21:34); "care of all the churches" (2Co 11:28) ("anxiety," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version); "casting all your care upon him" ("anxiety," the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, 1Pe 5:7). Also in the Apocrypha, "My heart faileth for care" (1 Macc 6:10); "Care bringeth old age before the time" (Sirach 30:24). To these may be added the adjective amerimnos, "I would have you without carefulness" (King James Version; "free from cares," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, 1Co 7:32).

2. Verbs:

In the Old Testament (da'agh, "to have concern or anxiety for"). "Not be careful in the year of drought" (Jer 17:8). (sum lebh, "to set the heart upon"), "If we flee away, they will not care for us" ("set their heart upon us" King James Version, margin, 2Sa 18:3).

In the New Testament (memrinao), "Thou art careful and troubled" ("anxious" the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, Lu 10:41). "He that is unmarried careth for things that belong to the Lord" ("is careful for," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, 1Co 7:32-34). "Members should have the same care one for another" (1Co 12:25). "Who will naturally care (the American Standard Revised Version "care truly") for your state" (Php 2:20). "Be careful for nothing" ("in nothing be anxious," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, Php 4:6). The Apocrypha has "careful" (Baruch 3:18) and the Revised Version (British and American) has "be not careful overmuch," where a distinction is plainly made between care in the sense of anxiety and of attention, for a person cannot be too attentive, but he may be too anxious (2 Esdras 2:27).

The impersonal verb (melei), though not quite so strong as merimnao, always implies a degree of concern higher than is felt in mere attention. "Carest thou not that we perish?" (Mr 4:38). "Carest not for anyone" (the King James Version "no man," Mt 22:16; Mr 12:14). "Dost thou not care that my sister did leave me to serve alone?" (Lu 10:40). "Careth not for the sheep" (Joh 10:13). "Cared for the poor" (Joh 12:6). "Gallio cared for none of these things" (Ac 18:17). "Care not for it" (1Co 7:21). "He careth for you" (1Pe 5:7). "Doth God care for oxen?" (better, "Is it for the oxen that God careth?" the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, 1Co 9:9).

II. In the Sense of Attention.

1. Substantives:

In the sense of attention, with the flavor of earnestness added from the original Teutonic meaning of the word care, we have the translation of spoude, "speed," "earnest care." "What carefulness it wrought in you" ("earnest care," the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, 2Co 7:11). "Our care for you in the sight of God" ("earnest care," the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, 2Co 7:12). "Put the same care into the heart of Titus" ("earnest care," the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, 2Co 8:16). We have also phronein, the infin. used as a substantive "Your care for me hath flourished" ("thought," the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Php 4:10). Also phrontis, "thought" ("care" the American Standard Revised Version, The Wisdom of Solomon 6:17; 7:4).

2. Verbs:

"A land which Yahweh thy God careth for" darash, "seek after" ("seeketh after," the Revised Version, margin, the American Revised Version, margin, De 11:12). "No man careth for my soul" ("sought" King

James Versions margin, Ps 142:4; chashach). "We are not careful to answer" (King James Version, also compare the margin, the American Revised Version, margin; "We have no need to answer," the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Da 3:16). In the New Testament epimeleomai, "Take care of him" (Lu 10:34,35). "How shall he take care of the church of God?" (1Ti 3:5). phrontizo, "to be thoughtful or mindful of," "may be careful to maintain good works" (Ti 3:8).

G. H. Trever

CAREAH

ka-re’-a.

See KAREAH.

CAREFUL; CAREFULNESS

See CARE.

CAREFULLY

kar’-fool-i: The same two strands of anxiety and of attention appear in this word as in care. Several words in the Hebrew and Greek are thus rendered in the English versions "Anxiously" is the thought in "The inhabitants of Maroth waited carefully for good" (chalah, "to be in pain," "was grieved" King James Version margin, "waiteth anxiously" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, "is in travail" the Revised Version, margin, the American Revised Version, margin, Mic 1:12).

In the sense of attentively, the Hebrew emphatic expression, the infinite absolute with the finite verb is rendered "carefully" in, "Thou shalt carefully hearken" (literally "hearing, thou shalt hear," "diligently hearken" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, De 15:5). The same Hebrew is rendered "diligently hearken" the King James Version; "hearken diligently" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version (De 11:13; 28:1).

In the New Testament spoudaioteros, "I sent him the more carefully" ("diligently" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Php 2:28)). The verb (ekzeteo, "I seek out," is translated "seek carefully": "though he sought it carefully with tears" ("diligently" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Hebrews 12:17).

The Revised Version (British and American) adds others (akriboo, "I ascertain exactly"), "learned of them carefully" the Revised Version (British and American) ("diligently" the King James Version;

"exactly" the American Standard Revised Version, Mt 2:7,16). The adverb akribos, "search out carefully" the Revised Version (British and American) ("diligently" the King James Version; "exactly" the American Standard Revised Version, Mt 2:8). "Taught carefully" the Revised Version (British and American) ("diligently" the King James Version; "accurately" the American Standard Revised Version, Ac 18:25). "More carefully" the Revised Version (British and American) ("more perfectly" the King James Version, "more accurately" the American Standard Revised Version, Ac 18:26). episkopeo, "I oversee," is rendered "look carefully" (Revised Version, the American Standard Revised Version, "look diligently" the King James Version, Hebrews 12:15).

In the Apocrypha merimao is translated "carefully," as "We should carefully think of thy goodness" ("ponder" the Revised Version (British and American), The Wisdom of Solomon 12:22).

G. H. Trever

CARELESS; CARELESSLY

kar'-les, kar'-les-li: These words always mean, "without anxiety," the confidence springing from a sense of security. There is both the verb baTach, "he trusted," and the noun beTach, "Ye careless daughters" (the Revised Version, margin "confident") (Isa 32:9-11). People dwelt careless ("in security" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Jud 18:7); "careless Ethiopians" (Eze 30:9). "Thou that dwellest carelessly" ("sittest securely" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Isa 47:8). "Thou that dwellest carelessly" ("securely" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, "confidently" King James Version, margin, Eze 39:6). "The city that dwelt carelessly" (Ze 2:15). the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American) add bazah, "he despised," using the participle in "He that is careless of his ways shall die," "despiseth" the King James Version, the American Revised Version, margin, the Revised Version, margin (Pr 19:16).

G. H. Trever

CAREM

ka'-rem (Karem): A city of Judah interpolated by the Septuagint (Jos 15:59). Probably BETH-HACCHEREM (which see).

CARIA

ka'-ri-a (Karia): A country in the Southwest of Asia Minor which extended on the North to Lydia, on the East to Phrygia, on the South to Lycia, and the West to the Aegean Sea. Its borders, however, like those of most of the ancient countries of Asia Minor, were never definitely fixed; hence, the difficulty presented by the study of the political divisions. The general surface of the country is rugged, consisting

of mountainous ridges running across it, and terminating as promontories jutting into the sea. Its history consists chiefly of that of its practically independent cities of which Miletus (Ac 20:15-20) and Cnidus (Ac 27:7) are the chief. For some time previous to 168 BC it had lost its independence, and belonged to the island of Rhodes, but in that year Rome made it again free. According to 1 Macc 15:23, Caria was one of several places to which the Roman senate in 139-138 BC sent letters in favor of the Jews, a fact showing that its population was mixed. Its coast cities, however, were peopled chiefly by Greeks. In 129 BC Caria became a part of the Roman province of Asia, and from that date its history coincides with that of the province. Though Paul and others of the apostles traversed Caria in their missionary journeys, only its cities are mentioned by name in that connection.

E. J. Banks

CARITES

kar'-i-tez (kari) ,(" one ready," "life-guardsman"): A body of troops mentioned in 2Ki 11:4,19 (the King James Version "captains"). Instead of CHERETHITES (which see), the Kethibh of 2Sa 20:23 offers the reading Carites.

CARMANIANS

kar-ma'-ni-anz.

See CARMONIANS.

CARME kar'-me.

See CHARME.

CARMEL kar'-mel (karmel, or, with article, ha-karmel, "fruit garden"; Josephus, ho Karmelos, Karmelion oros):

(1) A beautifully wooded mountain range running for about 13 miles in a south-easterly direction from the promontory which drops on the shore of the Mediterranean near Haifa, at the southern extremity of the plain of Acre, to the height of el-Machraqah which overlooks the plain of Esdraelon. On the top of the promontory, at a height of 500 ft. the monastery of Elias stands. From this point there is a gradual ascent until the greatest height is reached at Esfiyeh (1,742 ft.), the peak at el-Machraqah being only some 55 ft. lower. The mountain—usually named with the article, "the Carmel"—still justifies its name, "the garden with fruit trees." The steep slopes on the North and East, indeed, afford little scope for cultivation, although trees and brushwood grow abundantly. But to the South and West the mountain falls away to the sea and the plain in a series of long, fertile valleys, where the "excellency" of Carmel finds full illustration today. There are a few springs of good water; but the main supply is furnished by

the winter rains, which are caught and stored in great cisterns. The villages on the slopes have a look of prosperity not too often seen in Syria, the rich soil amply rewarding the toil of the husbandmen. Oak and pine, myrtle and honeysuckle, box and laurel flourish; the sheen of fruitful olives fills many a hollow; and in the time of flowers Carmel is beautiful in a garment of many colors. Evidences of the ancient husbandry which made it famous are found in the cisterns, and the oil and wine presses cut in the surface of the rock. There is probably a reference to the vine culture here in 2Ch 26:10. In the figurative language of Scripture it appears as the symbol of beauty (So 7:5), of fruitfulness (Isa 35:2), of majesty (Jer 46:18), of prosperous and happy life (Jer 50:19). The languishing of Carmel betokens the vengeance of God upon the land (Na 1:4); and her decay, utter desolation (Am 1:2; Isa 33:9).

Asylum and Sanctuary:

Roughly triangular in form, with plains stretching from its base on each of the three sides, the mountain, with its majestic form and massive bulk, is visible from afar. Its position deprived it of any great value for military purposes. It commanded none of the great highways followed by armies: the passes between Esdraelon and Sharon, to the East of Carmel, furnishing the most convenient paths. But the mountain beckoned the fugitive from afar, and in all ages has offered asylum to the hunted in its caves and wooded glens. Also its remote heights with their spacious outlook over land and sea; its sheltered nooks and embowering groves have been scenes of worship from old time. Here stood an ancient altar of Yahweh (1Ki 18:30). We may assume that there was also a sanctuary of Baal, since the worshippers of these deities chose the place as common ground for the great trim (1Ki 18). The scene is traditionally located at el-Machraqah, "the place of burnt sacrifice," which is still held sacred by the Druzes. A Latin chapel stands near, with a great cistern. A good spring is found lower down the slope. Just below, on the North bank of the Kishon stands the mound ca11ed Tell el-qissis, "mound of the priest." From the crest of Carmel Elijah descried the coming storm, and, descending the mountain, ran before the chariot of Ahab to the gate of Jezreel (1Ki 18:42 ff). Under the monastery on the western promontory is a cave, said to be that of Elijah. An older tradition locates the cave of the prophet at ed-Deir, near ‘Ain es-Sih. It may have been the scene of the events narrated in 2Ki 1:9 ff. Elisha also was a familiar visitor to Mt. Carmel. It was within the territory allotted to Asher; in later times it passed into the hands of Tyre (BJ, III, iii, 1).

(2) A city of Judah, in the uplands near Hebron, named with Maon and Ziph (Jos 15:55). Here Saul for some reason not stated set up a monument or trophy (1Sa 15:12; literally "hand"). It was the home of Nabal the churlish and drunken flockmaster, whose widow Abigail David married (1Sa 25); and also of Hezro, one of David’s mighty men (2Sa 23:35; 1Ch 11:37). It is represented by the modern el-Karmil, about 10 miles to the Southeast of Hebron. Karmil is the pronunciation given me by several natives this spring. There are considerable ruins, the most outstanding feature being square tower dating from the 12th century, now going swiftly to ruin. There are also caves, tombs and a large reservoir.

W. Ewing

CARMELITE

kar’-mel-it (karmeli; Karmelios, Karmelites): A native of the Judean Carmel. Those who are thus named are Nabal, the husband of Abigail (1Sa 30:5, etc.), and Hezro (the King James Version Hezrai), one of David’s mighty men (2Sa 23:35). In 2Sa 3:3 Septuagint reads tes Abigaias tes Karmelias, "of Abigail the Carmelitess" (1Sa 27:3; 1Ch 3:1).

See following article, CARMELITESS.

CARMELITESS

kar’-mel-it-es, kar-mel-i’-tes (karmelith; Karmelia): A name applied only to Abigail, the wife of Nabal, and subsequently of David, a native of Carmel in Judah (1Sa 27:3; 1Ch 3:1).

CARMI kar’-mi (karmi, "fruitful," "noble"):

(1) A son of Reuben who came to Egypt with Jacob (Ge 46:9; Ex 6:14; 1Ch 5:3). Also the name of a family of which Carmi was the head (Nu 26:6).

(2) A Judahite (1Ch 2:7), son of Zabdi, according to Jos 7:1, and father of Achan, who is given the name of "Achar" in 1Ch 2:7. This last form "Achar" is preferred to the usual "Achan" in order to bring out the play on the Hebrew word for "troubler." The Hebrew runs ‘akhar ‘okher yisra’el, "Achar, the troubler of Israel." As regards the phrase "the sons of Carmi" (1Ch 2:7), Carmi is probably to be taken as the son of Zimri (= Zabdi, Jos 7:1). The Targum, however, has "Carmi who is Zimri." The Septuagint identifies Zimri and Zabdi.

(3) In 1Ch 4:1, Carmi, elsewhere called son of Zabdi or Zimri, is made son of Judah; but Wellhausen correctly changes "Carmi" to "Chelubai" (compare 1Ch 2:9).

Horace J. Wolf

CARMONIANS

kar-mo’-ni-anz; the King James Version Carmanians: A people mentioned in one of the visions—"an horrible vision" (2 Esdras 15:30 ff)—of the "Apocalypse of Esdras." Their country, Carmania, was an extensive province of Asia lying between Parthia and Ariana and the North side of the Persian Gulf, and extending to Drangiana and Gedrosia on the East and to the river Bagradas and Persis on the West. It is frequently mentioned by the ancient writers, among others by Strabo and Arrian, who describe the inhabitants as closely resembling the Medians and Persians in manners and customs. In the passage cited they are intended to denote a fierce and warlike people, being described as "raging in wrath as wild boars of the wood" and associated with the "dragons of Arabia."

J. Hutchison

CARNAIM

kar-na’-im, kar’-na-im (Karnein, 1 Macc 5:26, Karnain, verses 43 f, to Karnion, 2 Macc 12:21,26): One of the strong cities besieged and captured by Judas Maccabeus in his campaign East of the Jordan (1 Macc 5:26,43 f). In the temple of Atargatis, which was situated here, those who fled from the city were put to death. It is apparently identical with Ashteroth Karnaim. It is called Camion in 2 Macc 12:21.

CARNAL

kar’-nal: In the Old Testament there is an expression which indicates sexual intercourse shikhebhath zera‘, "lying of seed," (Le 18:20; 19:20; Nu 5:13). In the New Testament the words rendered "carnal" are derived from sarks, "flesh." This refers to the flesh as opposed to the pneuma, "spirit," and denotes, in an ethical sense, mere human nature, the lower side of man as apart from the Divine influence, and therefore estranged from God and prone to sin; whatever in the soul is weak and tends toward ungodliness (see FLESH). Thus one may be carnal (sarkinos), sold under sin (Ro 7:14). Christians may be carnal (sarkinos, 1Co 3:1; sarkikos, 1Co 3:3); the lower side of their being is dominant and not the spirit, hence, they fall into sins of envy and strife. The weapons of the Christian warfare are not carnal, not merely human (of the flesh the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version), but spiritual (2Co 10:4); "not after the law of a carnal commandment" (Hebrews 7:16); "The carnal mind is enmity against God" ("mind of the flesh" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Ro 8:7). So, "to be carnally minded is death" ("mind of the flesh" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, Ro 8:6). There are "carnal ordinances," in contrast to the spiritual ones of the gospel (Hebrews 9:10); "Minister unto them in carnal things," those that pertain to the body in contrast to spiritual things (Ro 15:27; 1Co 9:11). The same expressions are elsewhere rendered "fleshly" (2Co 1:12; 3:3 the Revised Version (British and American) "hearts of flesh"; 1Pe 2:11).

Is there any difference between sarkinos and sarkikos? The former more definitely denotes the material of which an object is made. It may express with emphasis the idea of sarkikos, the spiritual given up as it were to the flesh.

See MAN (THE NATURAL).

G. H. Trever

CARNION

kar’-ni-on.

See CARNAIM.

CAROUSINGS

ka-rouz’-ingz (potois, dative plural of potos): This word is found only in the American Standard Revised Version and once only (1Pe 4:3). The King James Version translates it "banquetings." It is one of the Gentileexcesses of fleshly indulgence against which the Christians are warned by Peter.

CARPENTER

kar’-pen-ter (charash; tekton): This word, which is a general word for graver or craftsman, is translated "carpenter" in 2Ki 22:6; 2Ch 24:12; Ezr 3:7; Isa 41:7. The same word is rendered "craftsman" in the American Standard Revised Version of Jer 24:1 and Jer 29:2 and "smith" in the American Standard Revised Version of Zec 1:20. In 2Sa 5:11; 2Ki 12:11; 1Ch 14:1; and Isa 44:13, charash occurs with ‘ets (wood), and is more exactly translated "carpenter" or "worker in wood." Tekton, the corresponding Greek word for artificer, is translated "carpenter" in Mt 13:55 and Mr 6:3.

See CARVING; CRAFTS.

CARPUS

kar’-pus (Karpos): A name but once mentioned in the New Testament (2Ti 4:13), "the cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus." These words were written from the dungeons, where Paul was confined during his second imprisonment. The name, common enough in Paul’s day, signifies "fruit" (Young) or "wrist" (Davis). The words indicate that Paul must have been very well acquainted with the family of Carpus. He was presumably one of his converts; and the apostle must have lodged with him and also have had considerable confidence in him, since he committed to his care not only the comparatively valueless "cloak," but especially the priceless "books and parchments." It is idle to attempt to find out the identity of Carpus, but one cannot help wondering what were the contents of these books and parchments for which the apostle longed in his bitter second imprisonment.

Henry E. Dosken

CARRIAGE

kar’-ij (keli, kebhuddah, nesu’ah; episkeuasamenoi; the Revised Version (British and American) "We took up our baggage"; the American Revised Version, margin "made ready"): One or the other of the above words occurs in six different places and all have been translated in the King James Version by "carriage" in its obsolete meaning (Jud 18:21; 1Sa 17:22 (twice); Isa 10:28; 46:1; Ac 21:15). In the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version these are translated by the more modern expressions "goods," "baggage," or "the things that you carried." In 1Sa 17:20 the King James Version margin "place of the carriage" occurs as the equivalent of "trench." The Hebrew ma’galah may mean "the place of wagons" as translated in the Revised Version (British and

American), as it is not at all improbable that the encampment was surrounded by the baggage train.

James A. Patch

CARRY

kar'-i (nasa', nahagh): The English Versions of the Bible rendering of a number of Hebrew and Greek words, and it has several shades of meaning, of which the following are the most important:

(1) "To take up," "to bear," "to transport from one place to another," as, "to carry away handkerchiefs" (Ac 19:12), "to carry a corpse" (Ge 50:13), and "to be carried away by the wind" (Da 2:35).

(2) "To cause to go" or "come," "to lead," "to drive" as, "to be carried away to Babylon" (2Ki 20:17), "to be carried away to Pilate" (Mr 15:1), "to carry away cattle" (Ge 31:18), and "to carry daughters" (Ge 31:26).

(3) "To uphold," or "sustain," "and even to hoar hairs will I carry you" (Isa 46:4).

(4) "To bear," or "endure," as, "to carry sorrows" (Isa 53:4).

(5) "To overwhelm," "to bear away," "to destroy," as, "to carry away as with a flood" (Ps 90:5).

(6) "To influence," "to move," as, "to carry away with dissimulation" (Ga 2:13), "to carry away with error" (2Pe 3:17), "to be carried away by strange teachings" (Hebrew 13:9).

A. W. Fortune

CARSHENA

kar'-she-na, kar-she'-na (karshena'): The first named among the "seven princes of Persia and Media" under Ahasuerus (Es 1:14).

See PRINCES, THE SEVEN.

CART

kart ('aghalah): The Hebrew word has been translated in some passages "cart," and in others "wagon." In one verse only has it been translated "chariot." The context of the various passages indicates that a distinction was made between vehicles which were used for carrying baggage or produce and those used for carrying riders (chariots), although in their primitive form of construction they were much the same

(compare English "cart" and "carriage").

Carts, like "chariots" (which see), were of Assyrian origin. They were early carried to Egypt where the flat nature of the country readily led to their adoption. From Egypt they gradually found their way among the people of the Palestinian plains. In the hills of Judea and Central Palestine, except where highways were built (1Sa 6:12), the nature of the country prevented the use of wheeled vehicles. 1Sa 6:7,8,10,11,14 show that the people of the plains used carts. The men of Kiriath-jearim found it easier to carry the ark (1Sa 7:1). Their attempt to use a cart later (2Sa 6:3,1; 1Ch 13:7) proved disastrous and they abandoned it for a safer way (2Sa 6:13).

That carts were used at a very early date is indicated by Nu 7:3,7,8. That these vehicles were not the common mode of conveyance in Palestine is shown in Ge 45. Pharaoh commanded that Joseph's brethren should return to their father with their beasts of burden (Gen 45:21) and take with them Egyptian wagons (Gen 45:19,21; 46:6) for bringing back their father and their families. The very unusual sight of the wagons was proof to Jacob of Joseph's existence (Gen 45:27).

Bible descriptions and ancient Babylonian and Egyptian pictures indicate that the cart was usually two-wheeled and drawn by two oxen.

With the Arabian conquests and subsequent ruin of the roads wheeled vehicles disappeared from Syria and Palestine. History is again repeating itself. The Circassians, whom the Turkish government has settled near Caesarea, Jerash (Gerasa) and Amman (Philadelphia), have introduced a crude cart which must be similar to that used in Old Testament times. The two wheels are of solid wood. A straight shaft is joined to the wooden axle, and to this a yoke of oxen is attached. On the Philistian plains may be seen carts of present-day Egyptian origin but of a pattern many centuries old. With the establishment of government roads during the last 50 years, European vehicles of all descriptions are fast coming into the country.

One figurative reference is made to the cart (Isa 5:18), but its meaning is obscure.

James A. Patch

CARVING

karv'-ing: Carving, or engraving, was extensively used among the peoples of Bible lands. There were no materials used in the arts which were not subjected to the graver's skill. Carved objects of wood, stone, ivory, clay, bronze, gold, silver and glass discovered today show how skillful the ancient carvers were. Carving was principally done in bas- relief, although Ex 28:11 shows that incised lines were also used. The signets and scarabs are examples of this class of carving. Several Hebrew words have been translated "carved" in the King James Version. Pecel or pecil is found in Jud 18:18; 2Ch 33:7,22; 34:3,1; chaqah in 1Ki 6:35. The translation "graven" appears in the Revised Version (British and American) of all these passages. In 1Ki 6:29,32,35, qala appears; in 1Ki 6:18,32, miqla'ath; in 1Ki 6:29 and Ps 74:6,

pittuach; in Ex 31:5; 35:33, charosheth (see CARPENTER); chaTubhah in Pr 7:16 is better translated "striped" as in the Revised Version (British and American). For further notes on carving, see CRAFTS.

James A. Patch

CASDIM

kaz’-dim

See CHESED.

CASE

kas: Ordinarily to describe the circumstances or condition of things; sometimes, juridically (aitia, Mt 19:10; Ac 25:14), as that for which a reckoning has to be given, as frequently the Latin res. In Ex 5:19, "they were in evil case," is interpreted by the Revised Version (British and American) as "were set on mischief."

CASEMENT

kas’-ment.

See HOUSE.

CASIPHIA

ka-sif’-i-a, ka-sif-e’-a (kaciphya’): An unidentified place in North Babylonia, near the river Ahava, to which Ezra sent for "ministers for the house of our God" (Ezr 8:17). Some have thought the name to be connected with keceph, "silver" or "money." Septuagint renders argurio tou topou, as in 1 Esdras 8:45, "the place of the treasury."

CASLUHIM

kas’-lu-him, kas-lu-him (kacluchim; Chasmonieim): The name of a people mentioned in Ge 10:14; 1Ch 1:12 as descended from Mizraim. The parenthesis should probably follow Caphtorim. From them, it is said, sprang the PHILISTINES, which see.

CASPHON

kas’-fon.

See CASPHOR.

CASPHOR

kas’-for (the King James Version Casphon; Kasphor, 1 Macc 5:26; Chasphon, Chasphoth, 5:36; Kaspein, 2 Macc 12:13): A city East of the Jordan captured by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:36). It is probably identical with Caspis of 2 Macc 12:13. It was a fortress of great strength, with a lake near it. This has led some to think it may be represented by el-Muzerib, an important station on the pilgrim route to Mecca. The ancient name of this city, however, has not been discovered.

See ASHTAROTH

CASPIN; CASPIS

kas’-pin, kas’-pis.

See CASPHOR.

CASSIA

kash’-a: Two Hebrew words,

(1) qiddah, which is mentioned, along with myrrh, cinnamon, calamus and olive oil, as one of the ingredients of the "holy anointing oil" (Ex 30:24); it was, too, one of the wares in which Vedan and Javan traded with Tyre (Eze 27:19); it is identified in the Peshitta and the Targum with (2).

(2) qetsi‘oth (plural only, probably referring to the strips of bark), a word from which is derived the Greek kasia, and hence, cassia (Ps 45:8).

It is probable that both (1) and (2) refer to Cassia lignea, the inner bark of Cinnamomum cassia, a plant growing in eastern Asia closely allied to that which yields the cinnamon of commerce. It is a fragrant, aromatic bark and was probably used in a powdered form. Both as an ingredient in unguents and as one of the perfumes at funerals, cassia, like cinnamon, was much used by the Romans. The cassia of Scripture must be clearly distinguished from the entirely distinct Cassia lanceolata and C. obovata which yield the familiar senna. The proper name KEZIAH (which see) is the singular form of ketsi‘oth.

E. W. G. Masterman

CAST

In general "to throw," with various degrees of violence; usually, with force, but not so necessarily, as e. g. in "cast a net," "cast lots." When applied to molten metal, as in English, first, "to let run. into molds," with reference to their descent by gravity, and, then, "to form," as in Ex 25:12, etc. Usually in the New Testament for ballo, but not always. Thus, in Lu 1:29 "cast in her mind" means "considered" (dielogizeto); "cast reproach" for Greek oneidizon, "reproached" (Mt 27:44); "casting down" for kathaireo, "demolishing" (2Co 10:4); "casting all anxiety upon" (1Pe 5:7), a still stronger term, as in Lu 17:2 the King James Version; Ac 27:19. As a fundamental Greek word, it is compounded with many prepositions, "about," "away," "down," "forth," "in," "into," "off," "out," "up," "upon." "Cast down" in 2Co 4:9 the King James Version is used in a military sense of one prostrated, but not killed in battle. Compare Ps 42:5 with the Revised Version, margin. "Castaway" of the King James Version in 1Co 9:27, is in the Revised Version (British and American) "rejected" (compare Hebrews 6:8), adokimos, i.e. what the application of a test shows to be counterfeit, or unfit; translated "reprobate" in Ro 1:28; 2Co 13:5,6,7, etc.

H. E. Jacobs

CASTANETS

kas’-ta-nets, kas-ta-nets’ (mena‘an‘im): Are mentioned in 2Sa 6:5 among the musical instruments upon which David and the house of Israel played at the time of the bringing up of the ark out of the house of Abinadab. This word is incorrectly translated "cornets" in the King James Version. The castanet was probably about the same kind of instrument as the Egyptian sistrum, and the Revised Version (British and American) has "sistra" in the margin of 2Sa 6:5. The sialrum was a loop-shaped metal frame through which were passed loose rods at the ends of which were rings. The instrument was held by a long handle and was rattled during songs and dances. It was used in Egypt in religious worship or to scare away evil influences. There is only the one reference to this instrument in the Bible.

A. W. Fortune

CASTAWAY

kast’-a-wa (adokimos, from dokimazo, "I test," "I approve after testing," hence, approved after being tested): This word is rendered "castaway" only in the King James Version: "I myself should be a castaway" ("rejected" the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, 1Co 9:27). But the same word occurs a number of times usually translated "reprobate" (Ro 1:28; 2Co 13:5-7; 2Ti 3:8; Tit 1:16); "rejected" (Hebrews 6:8).

CASTLE

kas’-’-l.

See FORTIFICATION.

CASTOR AND POLLUX

kas’-ter, pol’-uks.

See DIOSCURI; ASTRONOMY.

CAT

(ailouros): The only mention of this animal is in Baruch 6:22. It is not mentioned in the canonical Scriptures, though Bochart (Hieroz., 862) gives "wild cats" as the equivalent of tsyim in Isa 13:21; 34:14; Jer 50:39; Ps 74:19, where English Versions of the Bible gives "wild beasts of the desert." Mention is, however, made of cats, cathod, in the Welsh Bible (Isa 34:14). The only mention of the catta in classical Latin writers is in Martial xiii.69. How the cat was regarded in Egypt is described in Herod. ii.66 and Rawlinson’s notes. In Baruch 6:22 cats are mentioned with "bats, swallows and birds" as sitting with impunity on the images of the heathen gods which are unable to drive them off.

See also ZOOLOGY.

J. Hutchison

CATECHIST; CATECHUMEN

kat’-e-kist, kate-ku’-men (katechizein "to resound," "to teach," "to instruct"): A catechist is a teacher who instructs his pupils in the elements of his own religion. In the Old Testament he teaches them the rudiments of Old Testament truth; in the New Testament he teaches the principles of the Christian faith. A catechumen, one whom the catechist instructs or catechizes, in preparation for the ceremony of baptism.

The words are derived from katechein, meaning "to give a sound," "to answer," "to echo." Classically it was used of the sounding down of rushing water, of the falling of music from a ship to the sea. Then it came to signify the sounding down of words of command or instruction. The preposition kata strengthens the meaning, bringing out more emphatically the back or return sound, the echo, the answer. So it came to mean familiar verbal instruction, a free informal discussion between teacher and pupil. Luke informs Theophilus (Lu 1:4) that he intends to give him a succinct and orderly account of those things which he had previously received by word of mouth (peri hon katechethes). See also the Greek in Ac 18:25 and Ac 21:21; Ro 2:18; 1Co 14:19; Ga 6:6. In all these passages the Greek verb is "catechised."

We do not find in the New Testament an organized catechumenate, such as we find in the 3rd and 4th

centuries. The apostles preached mainly to synagogue-instructed Jews who were familiar with the law and the prophets and the Psalms, or to Gentiles who had, learned from the Jews and had become "proselytes" (which see). The first apostolic preaching and teaching was to convince the hearers that Jesus was the promised Messiah, the Saviour of the world. As believers multiplied, the contrast between them and those who rejected the teaching became more and more marked. Opposition, scorn and persecution became more bold and bitter. The Christians were compelled to set forth and defend their beliefs more clearly. They had to meet and answer keen and persistent objections. And so the necessity for clear, systematic and organized teaching grew more and more into the form of an ordered catechumenate. The Apostolic Constitutions, from the latter part of the 3rd century, show the institution in a fair state of development. A Jew, pagan, or heretic of good moral standing, upon application to the deacon, presbyter, or bishop, was admitted into the state of catechumen by the sign of the cross and the imposition of hands (Schaff-Herzog, under the word).

The basis for the Christian catechumenate we find in the great commission (Mt 28:19,20). The aim of this commission was to make disciples, i.e. believing followers. The means for this discipling are baptizing and teaching. The result of using the means is that those who have become disciples are to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded.

Jesus Himself at twelve years of age had become a child of the law, a catechumen. He increased in wisdom and learned obedience. He became the great Catechist instructing His disciples, other private individuals and the multitudes. See an example of His catechizing in Mt 16:13 ff.

Paul was a master in method. See examples of use of the modern pedagogical method of apperception in Ac 14:14ff; 17:16ff; 19:8,9. The cathechetical method is frequently found in the epistles (see 1Co 3:1,2; Heb 5:11,14; 6:1,2; 1Pe 2:2; 1Jo 2:13), and so the idea of religious nurture and instruction is found all through the New Testament. The catechist and the catechumen are there. It was not something new in the New Testament. Its roots lie back and run through the Old Testament. The narrative of God’s first communication with man, inside the gates of Eden, concerning commandment, law, sin, its consequences, its remedy, takes a catechetical form. The importance of systematic instruction, both public and private, is emphasized throughout the Old Testament and New Testament, although it might not always take the form of catechizing in the modern pedagogical sense. In the patriarchal age the father was the prophet, the teacher, the catechist, in his house, which often included several families with their servants (see Ge 18:19). Matthew Henry explains thus: "Abraham not only took care of his children, but his whole household, including his servants, were catechized" (see also Ex 12:26; De 6:1-9; Jos 4:6,7; 24:15; Ps 34:11). Priests and Levites in addition to their sacerdotal functions were catechists (instructors) among the people (Le 10:11; De 33:10; 2Ch 15:3; Eze 44:23). In later times the synagogues had regular instruction in the law and the prophets.

See EDUCATION; INSTRUCTION; TEACHER.

G. H. Gerberding

CATERPILLAR

kat’-er-pil-er (chacil (Ps 78:46; Joe 1:4, etc.); yeleq (Ps 105:34 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "grasshopper"; Jer 51:14,27 the King James Version; elsewhere "canker-worm")): A name given to a larval stage of the LOCUST (which see).

CATHOLIC EPISTLES

kath’-o-lik (epistolai katholikai): In distinction from the apostolic or Pauline epistles which were addressed to individual churches or persons, the term "catholic," in the sense of universal or general, was applied by Origen and the other church Fathers to the seven epistles written by James, Peter, John and Jude. As early as the 3rd century it came to be used in the sense of "encyclical," "since," as Theodoret says, "they are not addressed to single churches, but generally (katholou) to the faithful, whether to the Jews of the Dispersion, as Peter writes, or even to all who are living as Christians under the same faith." Three other explanations of the term have been given, namely,

(1) that it was intended to indicate a common apostolic authorship (only a few support this view);

(2) that it signifies that the seven epistles were universally received as genuine;

(3) that it refers to the catholicity of their doctrine, i.e. orthodox and authoritative versus heretical epistles whose teachings were in harmony with Christian truth. By some misconception of the word "catholic" the Western Church interpreted it as signifying "canonical" and sometimes called these epistles epistolae canonicae. That it was originally used in the sense of "general" epistles is now commonly received.

This is evident from their form of address. James wrote to all Jews, "of the Dispersion," who had embraced the Christian faith. In his first epistle Peter addressed the same Christians, including also Gentileconverts, resident in five provinces of Asia Minor: "elect who axe sojourners of the Dispersion." His second epistle is to all Christians everywhere. John’s first letter was evidently written to a cycle of churches and intended for universal use. Jude also had in mind all Christians when he said "to them that are called beloved in God," etc. The seeming exceptions are 2 and 3 Jn, addressed to individuals, but included with the catholic epistles as properly belonging with John’s first epistle and of value to the general reader. The character and contents of these seven epistles are treated under their various heads. The letters of James and Jude belong to the Judaic school of Christianity; those of Peter to a broad and non-partisan type of faith that both includes and mediates between the Judaists and Paulinists. John’s letters were written after the internal doctrinal controversies of the church had ceased, and the pressure of opposition and error from without tended to unite his "little children" in a new community of love and spiritual life.

Dwight M. Pratt

CATHUA

ka-thu’-a (Kathoua; Codex Vaticanus, Koua): Head of a family of temple-servants who returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:30); corresponds to Giddel in Ezr 2:47.

CATTLE

kat’-’-l (behemah, "a dumb beast"; miqneh, "a possession" from qanah, "to acquire" (compare Arabic qana’," to acquire," and Greek kienos, "beast," and plural ktenea, "flocks," from ktaomai, "to acquire," flocks being both with the Homeric peoples and with the patriarchs an important form of property; compare English "fee"); tso’n "small cattle," "sheep" or goats (compare Arabic da’n, "sheep"); seh, a single sheep or goat (compare Arabic shah); mela’khah, "property," from la’akh, "to minister" (compare Arabic malakah and mulk, "property," from malak, "to possess"); meri’ "fatling" (1Ki 19); thremma (Joh 4:12), "cattle," i.e. "that which is nourished," from trepho, "to nourish"; baqar, "kine," "oxen" (compare Arabic baqar, "cattle"); shor, tor (Da 4:25), tauros (Mt 22:4), "ox" or "bull"; bous, "ox" (Lu 13:15); ‘eleph, only in the plural, ‘alaphim, "oxen" (Ps 8:7)): From the foregoing and by examination of the many references to "cattle," "kine" or "oxen" it is apparent that there are important points of contact in derivation and usage in the Hebrew, Greek and English terms. It is evident that neat cattle were possessed in abundance by the patriarchs and later Israelites, which is fax from being the case in Palestine at the present day. The Bedouin usually have no cattle. The fellachin in most parts of the country keep them in small numbers, mostly for plowing, and but little for milk or for slaughtering. Travelers in the Holy Land realize that goat’s milk is in most places easier to obtain than cow’s milk. The commonest cattle of the fellachin are a small black breed. In the vicinity of Damascus are many large, fine milch cattle which furnish the delicious milk and cream of the Damascus bazaars. For some reason, probably because they are not confined and highly fed, the bulls of Palestine are meek creatures as compared with their European or American fellows.

In English Versions of the Bible the word "cattle" is more often used in a wide sense to include sheep and goats than to denote merely neat cattle. In fact, baqar, which distinctively denotes neat cattle, is often rendered "herds," as tso’n, literally "sheep," is in a large number of instances translated "flocks." A good illustration is found in Ge 32:7: "Then Jacob .... divided the, people (‘am) that were with him, and the flocks (tso’n), and the herds (baqar), and the camels (gemallim), into two companies (machanoth)." For the last word the King James Version has "drove" in Ge 33:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "company." Next to tso’n, the word most commonly rendered "flock" in English Versions of the Bible is ‘edher, from root "to arrange," "to set in order." ‘Edher is rendered "herd" in Pr 27:23, and in Joe 1:18 it occurs twice, being rendered "herds of cattle," ‘edhre baqar, and "flocks of sheep," ‘edhre ha-tso’n. Miqneh is rendered "flock" in Nu 32:26, "herd" in Ge 47:18, and "cattle" in a large number of passages. Other words rendered "flock" are: mar‘ith (r. ra‘ah (Arabic ra‘a), "to pasture"), once in Jer 10:21; ‘ashteroth tso’n, "flocks of thy sheep," the Revised Version (British and American) "young of thy flock," in De 7:13, etc., ‘ashiaroth being plural of ‘ashtoreth, or Ashtoreth; chasiph, once in 1Ki 20:27: "The Children of Israel encamped before them (the Syrians) like two little flocks of kids," chasiph signifying "something stripped off or separated," from root chasaph, "to strip" or "to peel," like the

Arabic qaTi‘, "flock," from root qaTa‘, "to cut off"; poimne (Mt 26:31): "The sheep of the flock shall be scattered," and (Lu 2:8): "keeping watch by night over their flock"; poimnion (Lu 12:32): "Fear not, little flock," and (1Pe 5:2): "Tend the flock of God which is among you." Figurative: Not only poimne and poimnion but also ‘edher and tso’n are used figuratively of God’s people; e.g. Isa 40:11: "He will feed his flock (‘edher) like a shepherd"; Zec 10:3: "Yahweh of hosts hath visited his flock ([‘edher]), the house of Judah"; Isa 65:10: "And Sharon shall be a fold of flocks" (tso’n); Jer 23:2: "Ye have scattered my flock" (tso’n); Eze 34:22: "Therefore will I save my flock" (tso’n); Mic 7:14: "Feed .... the flock (tso’n) of thy heritage."

The wild ox or wild bull, the Revised Version (British and American) "antelope" (te’o or to’ of De 14:5 and Isa 51:20), is considered by the writer to be probably the Arabian oryx, and in this he is in agreement with Tristram (NHB). Tristram however thinks that the unicorn (rem or re’em), the Revised Version (British and American) "wild ox," was the aurochs, while the present writer believes that this also may well have been the oryx, which at the present day has at least three names in Arabic, one of which, baqar-ul-wachsh, means "wild ox."

See ANTELOPE.

Our domestic cattle are believed by some of the best authorities to be of the same species as the ancient European wild ox or aurochs, Bos taurus, which is by others counted as a distinct species under the title of Bos primigeniusú The aurochs was widely spread over Europe in Roman times, but is now extinct. Some degenerate wild cattle are preserved in some British parks, but these according to Lydekker in the Royal Natural History are probably feral descendants of early domestic breeds. Tristram cites the occurrence in the Dog River bone breccia of teeth which may be those of the aurochs, but this is a deposit accumulated by prehistoric man of an unknown antiquity to be variously estimated according to the predilections of the geologist at a few thousands or a few score of thousands of years, and is far from proving that this animal existed in Palestine in Bible times or at any time.

The European bison (Bos or Bison bonassus) is thought by some to be the wild ox of the Bible. This is a forest-dwelling species and is now confined to the forests of Lithuania and the Caucasus. It was formerly more widely distributed, but there is no certain evidence that it ever lived as far South as Palestine, and there have probably never existed in Palestine forests suitable to be the haunts of this animal.

About the Sea of Tiberias and the Jordan valley and in the plain of Coele-Syria there exist today Indian buffaloes (Bos bubalus) some feral and some in a state of domestication, which are believed to have been introduced in comparatively recent times.

See BEAST; CALF.

Alfred Ely Day

CAUDA

ko’-da (Kauda; also called Klauda; the King James Version Clauda; the modern Greek name Gaudho supports the form Cauda): An island 23 miles West of Cape Matala. It is a small island, and can never have supported a large population, or have been of any importance. Its elevation to the rank of a bishopric in Byzantine times must have been due to its association with the voyage of Paul. The ship with Paul on board was driven under the lee of Cauda (Ac 27:16); in the calm water south of the island the crew succeeded in hauling in the boat, undergirding the ship and slackening sail.

W. M. Calder

CAUL

kol:

(1) yothereth (Ex 29:13), the large lobe or flap of the liver, which is usually mentioned together with the kidneys and the fat as the special portions set aside for the burnt offering (Le 3:4,10,15; 4:9; 7:4; 8:16,25; 9:10,19).

(2) ceghor (from the root caghar, "to enclose," "shut up"), Ho 13:8, literally the enclosure or covering of the heart, the caul or pericardium, or perhaps the chest as surrounding the heart. It must not be forgotten, however, that the expression may be taken in the sense of "mailcoat of the heart," i.e. hardened heart, which is shut to the influence of God’s grace. So Luther and many modern translators and commentators.

H. L. E. Luering

CAUSE

kos: In both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "for this cause" (the King James Version "cause") occurs in Ex 9:16 as the rendering of ba‘abhur zo’th =" in order that"; "to the end that"; so also in Da 2:12 for kol-qebhel denah, and in 2Ch 32:20 the King James Version for ‘al-zo’th, where RVS read "because of." In the New Testament the word is used adverbially in the translation of several Greek phrases: heneka toutou (Mt 19:5; Mr 10:7); dia touto, Joh 12:27; Ro 1:26; 13:6; 15:9 (the Revised Version (British and American) "therefore"); 1Co 11:30; 1Th 2:13; 2Th 2:11; 1Ti 1:16; Hebrews 9:15; eis touto, Joh 18:37 (where the King James Version varying the phraseology reads "to this end" "for this cause"); 1Pe 4:6 the King James Version; toutou charin, Eph 3:14. Unusual renderings occur, as "for his cause" (=" because of"), 2Co 7:12; as =" affair," "thing," obsolete in the King James Version 1Ki 12:15; 2Ch 10:15, where the word occurs as a paraphrase of necibbah (=" turn of affairs"). In 1Sa 25:31 (King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American)) "causeless" (= without cause the American Standard Revised Version) occurs arbitrarily in adverb sense.

W. N. Stearns

CAUSEWAY; CAUSEY

koz'-wa, ko'-zi (more correctly): This word occurs in 1Ch 26:16,18 for the Hebrew mecillah; Septuagint pastophorion tes anabaseos. In 2Ch 9:11 the word is translated "terraces" (Septuagint anabaseis). Compare BDB, under the word, where mecilloth, is an error for mic'adhoth (1Ki 10:12). In all the above passages reference is made to a series or flight of steps leading up into the temple. The word also signifies a prepared, traveled road, as in Nu 20:19; Jud 20:31 f, 45; 1Sa 6:12; 2Sa 20:12 f; 2Ki 18:17 (Isa 36:2); Isa 7:3; 11:16; 19:23; 33:8; 40:3; 49:11; Jer 31:21.

Figurative: In Isa 59:7 the word (mecillah) occurs in a figurative sense, so also in Jud 5:20; Pr 16:17.

W. N. Stearns

CAVE

kav ([me'arah] (compare Arabic magharah), chor (Job 30:6 the King James Version), mechilloth (Isa 2:19); ope (Hebrews 11:38), spelaion (Joh 11:38); chor, more often rendered "hole," is akin to Arabic khaur, "gulf" or "inlet," but is also related to me'arah (compare also Arabic ghaur "low-land," especially of the Jordan valley and Dead Sea). Mechilloth (root, chalal, "to pierce" (compare Arabic khall, "to pierce")) occurs only in Isa 2:19, where the King James Version has "caves" and translates me'aroth in the same verse by "holes." In the Revised Version (British and American) these words are very properly changed about. Spelaion is a common Greek word for "cave"; ope means rather "hole"): In Palestine as in other limestone countries, caves are of frequent occurrence, and not a few of large size are known. Water from the rain and snow, seeping down through cracks, enlarges the passages through which it goes by dissolving away the substance of the rock. Just as upon the surface of the land the trickling streams unite to form brooks and rivers, so many subterranean streams may come together in a spacious channel, and may issue upon the surface as a bold spring. The cave of the Dog River near Beirut and that of 'Afqa (perhaps Aphek (Jos 13:4)) in Lebanon are excellent examples of this. Not infrequently after forming a cave the stream of water may find some lower outlet by a different route, leaving its former course dry. In some cases the hinder part of the roof of the cave may fall in, leaving the front part standing as a natural bridge. Numerous shallow caves, especially in the faces of cliffs, are formed not by seeping water, but by atmospheric erosion, a portion of a relatively soft stratum of rock being hollowed out, while harder strata above and below it are but little worn away. Many of the hermits' caves originated in this way and were artificially enlarged and walled up at the mouth. The principal caves mentioned in the Bible are those of MACHPELAH, MAKKEDAH and ADULLAM (which see).

See DEN.

Alfred Ely Day

CEASE

ses: A remarkable array of 20 Hebrew and 6 Greek words is so translated. In the King James Version 15 of the former and 3 of the latter are used only once with this rendering. The originals most frequently in use are chadhal, "to leave off"; shabhath "to rest from" (labor); pauomai, "to make to cease." Few words illustrate better the fertility of the Hebrew in expressing limitless shades of meaning, impoverished by the use of one English word. This extensive variety is, however, well expressed by "cease": i.e. stop, come to an end, e.g. ceasing of tears (Jer 14:17); work (Ezr 4:24); grinders (Ec 12:3); thunder (Ex 9:29); the wicked (Job 3:17); anger (Ps 37:8). The significance of shabhath lies in its being the Hebrew for Sabbath, implying complete cessation: as of manna (Jos 5:12); strife and ignominy (Pr 22:10); occurs with negative to show the ceaseless Providence of God in Nature: "summer and winter .... shall not c." (Ge 8:22). In the New Testament it illustrates Christ's power over Nature; wind and raging sea ceased (Lu 8:24); over a sinner's heart: "not ceased to kiss my feet" (dialeipo) (Lu 7:45); devotion of the early disciples, "ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus as the Christ" (Ac 5:42); the eternity and blessedness of the believer's sabbatic rest (apoleipo) (Hebrews 4:10 the King James Version).

Dwight M. Pratt

CEDAR

se'-dar, se'-der ('erez, from Hebrew root meaning "to be firm"; kedros): The 'erez was in almost all the Old Testament references the true cedar, Cedrus libani, but the name may have been applied in a loose way to allied trees, such as junipers and pines. In Nu 24:6—"as cedar-trees beside the waters"—the reference must, as is most probable, be purely poetical (see ALOES) or the 'arazim must signify some other kind of tree which flourishes beside water.

1. Cedar for Ritual Cleansing:

Cedar is twice mentioned as a substance for ritual cleansing. In Le 14:4 the cleansed leper was sprinkled with the blood of a "clean bird" into which had been put "cedar- wood, and scarlet, and hyssop." In Nu 19:6 "cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet" were to be cast into the holocaust of the red heifer. (For the symbolical meaning see CLEAN.) Here it is very generally considered that the cedar could not have been the wood of Cedrus libani, which so far as we know never grew in the wilderness, but that of some species of juniper—according to Post, Juniperis phoenicea, which may still be found in the wilderness of Edom.

2. Cedar Trees in the Old Testament:

Cedar trees are everywhere mentioned with admiration in the Old Testament. Solomon made the cedar the first of trees (1Ki 4:33). They are the "glory of Lebanon" (Isa 35:2; 60:13). The most boastful threat of Sennacherib was that he would cut down the tall cedars of Lebanon (Isa 37:24). They were strong, as is implied in— " The voice of Yahweh is powerful; .... The voice of Yahweh

breaketh the cedars; Yea, Yahweh breaketh in pieces the cedars of Lebanon" (Ps 29:4,5). The cedars are tall—"whose height was like the height of the cedars"—(Am 2:9; 2Ki 19:23); majestic (2Ki 14:9), and excellent (So 5:15). The Assyrian power is compared to—"a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches, and with a forest-like shade, an high stature; and its top was among the thick boughs .... its stature was exalted above all the trees of the field; and its boughs were multiplied, and its branches became long" (Eze 31:3-5). They are in particular God's trees—" The trees of Yahweh are filled with moisture, The cedars of Lebanon, which he hath planted" (Ps 104:16). Doubtless as a reminiscence of this the Syrians today call the cedar 'ars er rubb, "the cedar of the Lord." The growth of the cedar is typical of that of the righteous man (Ps 92:12).

That cedars were once very abundant in the Lebanon is evident (1Ki 6:9-18; 10:27). What they contributed to the glory and beauty of that district may be seen in Zec 11:1-2: " Open thy doors, O Lebanon, that the fire may devour thy cedars. Wail, O fir-tree, for the cedar is fallen, because the glorious (Revised Version margin) ones are destroyed: Wail, O ye oaks of Bashan, for the strong forest is come down." 3. Cedar Timber:

The wood of the cedar has always been highly prized—much more so than the sycamore (1Ki 10:27; Isa 9:10). David had a house of cedar built for him by Hiram, king of Tyre (2Sa 5:11), and he prepared "cedar-trees without number" for the temple which his son was to build (1Ch 22:4). Cedar timber was very much used in the construction of Solomon's temple and palace, the trees being cut in the Lebanon by Sidonians by orders of the king of Tyre—"Hiram gave Solomon timber of cedar and timber of fir according to all his desire" (1Ki 5:6-10). One of Solomon's most important buildings was known as "the house of the forest of Lebanon" (1Ki 7:2; 10:17; 2Ch 9:16), on account of the source of its materials. While cedar was well adapted for beams (1Ki 6:9; So 1:17), boards (So 8:9), pillars (1Ki 7:2) and ceilings (Jer 22:14), it was suited as well for carved work, such as idols (Isa 44:14,15). It was also used for ships' masts (Eze 27:5).

4. Cedars in Modern Syria:

The Cedrus libani still survives in the mountains of Syria and flourishes in much greater numbers in the Taurus mountains. "There are groves of cedars above el-Ma'acir, Baruk, 'Ain Zehaltah, Hadith, Besherri, and Sir" (Post, Flora, 751). Of these the grove at Besherri is of world-wide renown. It consists of a group of about 400 trees, among them some magnificent old patriarchs, which lies on the bare slopes of the Lebanon some 6,000 ft. above the sea. Doubtless they are survivors of a forest which here once covered the mountain slopes for miles. The half a dozen highest specimens reach a height of between 70 and 80 ft., and have trunks of a circumference of 40 ft. or more. It is impossible to estimate with any certainty their age, but they may be as much as 800, or even 1,000, years old. Though magnificent, these are by no means the largest of their kind. Some of the cedars of Amanus are quite 100 ft. high and the Himalayan cedar, Cedrus deodara, a variety of Cedrus libani, reaches a height of 150 ft. The impressiveness of the cedar lies, however, not so much in its height and massive trunk, as in the wonderful lateral spread of its branches, which often exceeds its height. The branches grow out

horizontally in successive tiers, each horizontal plane presenting, when looked at from above, the appearance of a green sward. The leaves are about an inch long, arranged in clusters; at first they are bright green, but they change with age to a deeper tint with a glaucous hue; the foliage is evergreen, the successive annual growths of leaves each lasting two years. The cones, 4 to 6 inches long, are oval or oblong-ovate, with a depression at times at the apex; they require two years to reach maturity and then, unlike other conifers, they remain attached to the tree, dropping out their scales bearing the seeds.

The wood of the cedar, specially grown under the conditions of its natural habitat, is hard, close grained, and takes a high polish. It is full of resin (Ps 92:14) which preserves it from rot and from worms. Cedar oil, a kind of turpentine extracted from the wood, was used in ancient times as a preservative for parchments and garments.

E. W. G. Masterman

CEDRON

se’-dron.

See KIDRON.

CEILAN

se’-lan.

See KILAN.

CEILED; CEILING

seld, sel’-ing (the King James Version and the English Revised Version Cieled, Cieling; the Hebrew words for "ceiled" are chippah, caphan, sachiph; for "ceiling," cippun): Ceiling occurs only in 1Ki 6:15. It comes from the root caphan, meaning "to cover." It has its common meaning of the upper surface of a room; there is, however, some doubt of the textual Ceiled is found in 2Ch 3:5 ((chippah); Jer 22:14; Hag 1:4 (caphan in both); Eze 41:16 (sachiph)), the text of the last passage being doubtful. In none of these cases does "ceiled" refer to the upper surface of a room, but to the covering or paneling of the inner walls of a house with cedar or other costly wood. This is in accordance with a common early use of the English word, no longer frequent.

George Ricker Berry

CELEBRATE

sel’-e-brat: Of the three Hebrew words so rendered halal, "to praise" is preeminently significant. It is an onomatopoetic word meaning "to give a clear sharp sound," as word in vocal rejoicing, celebration. Its equivalent in Ethiopic is ellell, German hallen, English halloo, and appears in the great choral word Hallelujah of the Hebrew religion. Passing into Christian use it has become the term most expressive of majestic praise. Psalms 113-118 and 136 are called Hallel psalms. Found in Hezekiah’s psalm of praise for his miraculous recovery: "Death cannot celebrate thee" (Isa 38:18). chaghagh, root meaning "to move in a circle" hence, "to keep a festival" by sacred leaping and dancing; "celebrate (the Revised Version (British and American) "keep") a feast" (Le 23:41); shabhath, "to rest," i.e. keep or observe a holy day; "celebrate (the Revised Version (British and American) "keep") your sabbath" (Le 23:32).

Dwight M. Pratt

CELESTIAL

se-les’-chal (epouranios, "above the sky," "heavenly"): Peculiar to Paul’s majestic argument on the resurrection: celestial verses terrestrial bodies (1Co 15:40) with reference possibly to sun and moon, etc., but more probably to the bodies of angels in distinction from those of beasts and mortal men (compare Christ’s words, Mt 22:30; Lu 20:36); including also doubtless in the apostle’s thought the resurrection-body of Jesus and of the saints already taken-into glory. Light is thrown on its meaning by the rendering of the same Greek original as "heavenly places" (Eph 1:3,20; 2:6; 3:10); "heavenly" (1Co 15:48). Hence, "celestial" as used by Paul indicates the soul’s continued life beyond the grave, the spiritual body of the redeemed in heaven, who, in Christ, have put on immortality.

Dwight M. Pratt

CELLAR

sel’-er, sel’-ar (krupte; ‘otsar): Krupte is found only in Lu 11:33, and is rendered "cellar" in the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version has "secret place." In this passage it doubtless means a cellar beneath a house. Etymologically the Greek word means "a covered place," and in classical Greek its usage includes vaults and crypts as well as cellars. It seems evident that it was only the larger houses in Palestine in which cellars were used with any frequency. It is shown by the excavations that in rebuilding a town which was in ruins the old houses were sometimes utilized as cellars for the new. ‘otsar, is rendered cellar only in 1Ch 27:27 f. It is an erroneous rendering, the correct meaning being stores, or supplies, of wine and oil.

George Ricker Berry

CELOSYRIA

se-lo-sir’-i-a.

See COELE-SYRIA.

CENCHREAE

sen’-kre-e (Kegchreai, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Kenchreai; the King James Version incorrectly Cenchrea): A seaport of Corinth on the eastern side of the isthmus (see CORINTH). Here according to Ac 18:18, Paul had his hair shorn before sailing for Syria, since he had a vow. A local church must have been established there by Paul, since Phoebe, the deaconess of Cenchrea, was entrusted with the Epistle to the Romans, and was commended to them in the highest terms by the apostle, who charged them to "assist her in whatsoever matter she may have need" (Ro 16:1,2).

CENDEBAEUS

sen-de-be’-us (Kendebaios; the King James Version Cendebeus): A general of Antiochus VII who was appointed "captain of the seacoast" of Palestine (1 Macc 15:38 ff) after the defeat of Tryphon by Antiochus 138 BC. He fortified Kedron and harassed the Jews in various ways. As Simon Maccabeus was too old to attack Cendebaeus in person he sent his two eldest sons, Judas and John, who defeated him with great loss at Modin (1 Macc 16:1-10).

CENSER

sen’-ser: In the King James Version censer is used as a translation of two Hebrew words, namely, machtah, and miqTereth. The former word is generally rendered "censer," sometimes "firepan," and in three cases (Ex 25:38; 37:23; Nu 4:9) "snuffdish" It denoted a bowl-shaped vessel used for different purposes, namely,

(1) a censer, in which incense was burnt (Le 10:1);

(2) a firepan, made of bronze, used in connection with the altar of burnt offering (Ex 27:3);

(3) a snuffdish, i.e. a receptacle to hold pieces of burnt lamp-wick removed by the tongs or snuffers (Ex 25:38).

Probably in all these cases the same kind of vessel was meant, namely, a bowl-shaped utensil with a handle, not unlike a saucepan. The other Hebrew word (derived from the same root as the word for "incense") denoted a vessel for conveying incense (Eze 8:11; 2Ch 26:19). The Greek word thumiaterion, by which the Septuagint rendered miqTereth, is used also in Hebrews 9:4, where the King James Version gives "censer," but the American Standard Revised Version is probably more correct, namely, "altar of incense" (see Commentaries under the word). Compare also Re 8:3,1, where libanotos, properly the adjective of "frankincense," is translated "censer."

T. Lewis

CENSUS

sen’-sus.

See DAVID; QUIRINIUS.

CENTURION

sen-tu’-ri-un: As the name implies, hekatontarches or hekatontarchos, kenturion, Latin centurio, was the commander of a hundred men, more or less, in a Roman legion. Matthew and Luke use the Greek word while Mark prefers the Latin form, as he does in the case of other words, seeing that he wrote primarily for Roman readers. The number of centurions in a legion was 60, that being at all epochs the number of centuries, although the number varied in the cohort or speira. The ordinary duties of the centurion were to drill his men, inspect their arms, food and clothing, and to command them in the camp and in the field. Centurions were sometimes employed on detached service the conditions of which in the provinces are somewhat obscure. Men like Cornelius and Julius (Ac 10:1; 27:1) may have been separated from the legion to which they properly belonged for the discharge of special duties. They and other centurions mentioned in the Gospels and the Ac (Mt 8:5; Mr 15:39,44,45; Lu 23:47) are represented by the sacred writers in a favorable light.

See AUGUSTAN BAND.

T. Nicol.

CEPHAS

se’-fas.

See PETER (SIMON).

CERAS

se’-ras (Keras; the Revised Version (British and American) KERAS (which see)).

CERTAIN; CERTAINLY; CERTAINTY

ser’-tin, ser’-tin-li, ser’tin-ti: The rendering of some Hebrew words and forms expressive of what is definitely settled or determined.

(1) Translation of the Hebrew nakhon, "to be established" or "fixed," as in De 13:14 (Hebrew 15); De 17:4; 1Sa 23:23 (of Ex 16:4, "a certain rate every day" the King James Version). In the New Testament it is the rendering of asphales, asphaleia, from "a" privative and sphallein, "to shake" or "move"; as in Lu 1:4, "the certainty of those things" = actual circumstances; Ac 21:34; 22:30; 25:26.

(2) The word "certain" is also employed in the Old Testament to bring out the force of the absolute infinitive form used with the finite verb to express emphasis or to strengthen the idea of the main verb (Kautzsch-Gesenius, Hebrew Grammar, translation Collins-Cowley, 357, 3). Such usage occurs in Ge 18:10; Jos 9:24; Le 5:19; 24:16; 1Sa 20:3 the King James Version; 1Ki 2:37; Jer 26:15; 36:29; 42:19,22; 44:17.

(3) The word "certain" is also made auxiliary to bring out the force of such expressions as the Hebrew yatsabh, "to be firm," as in Da 2:8; also in the New Testament, of the verb astatein as in 1Co 4:11, "have no certain dwelling-place."

(4) Mention might be made also of "certain" as the rendering of sundry words, as ‘akh, in La 2:16; ki, in Ex 3:12; and ontos, in Lu 23:47, all being expressions for what is sure, beyond doubt.

W. N. Stearns

CERTIFY

ser’-ti-fi: Occurs in

(1) 2Sa 15:28 (haggidh, "to show," "announce," from naghadh);

(2) Ezr 4:14,16; 5:10; 7:24 (hodha‘, "to make known," from yedha’; Aramaic for yadha‘);

(3) Es 2:22 the King James Version (’amar, "to say," "tell," so the Revised Version (British and American)); and

(4) Ga 1:11 the King James Version gnorizo, "to make to know," so the Revised Version (British and American).

In the English Versions of the Bible, accordingly, the word has not the strong, specific sense of "to make certain," but only the broader sense of "to make to know." Compare Ps 39:5 (Prayer Book version), "that I may be certified how long I have to live."

CETAB

se’-tab.

See KETAB.

CHABRIS

ka’-bris (Abris, Chabreis): Son of Gothoniel, one of the three rulers of Bethulia in the time of Judith (Judith 6:15; 8:10; 10:6).

CHADIAS, THEY OF; CHADIASAI

ka’-di-as, ka’-di-a-si; (the Revised Version (British and American) Codex Alexandrinus, Chadasai; Codex Vaticanus, hoi Chadiasai): The inhabitants of the city here referred to returned with Zerubbabel, along with the Ammidioi (1Es 5:20). The name is not found in Ezra and Nehemiah. The Chadiasai have been taken for the people of Kadesh and the Ammidioi for the people of Humtah (Jos 15:54). Possibly the place is identical with Kedesh of Jos 15:23.

CHAEREAS

ke’-re-as (Chaireas; the King James Version Chereas): Brother of Timotheus, the Ammonite leader against Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:6). He held the fortress of Gazara (the "Jazer" of 1 Macc 5:8) to which Timotheus fled from Judas. The latter pursued him and captured the fortress after a vigorous siege. In the slaughter which followed the two brothers, Chaereas and Timotheus, were killed (2 Macc 10:32,37).

CHAFE

chaf (mar, "bitter"; hence, bitter of soul, deadly, destructive, ferocious, "as a bear robbed of her whelps"): Occurs only in 2Sa 17:8; used by Hushai to characterize David’s supposedly fierce mood at the time of Absalom’s armed rebellion.

CHAFF

chaf: Four different words have been translated "chaff" in the Old Testament:

(1) mots, is found in Job 21:18; Ps 1:4; 35:5; Isa 17:13; 29:5; 41:15; Ho 13:3; Ze 2:2.

(2) chashash, occurs in two verses (Isa 5:24; 33:11). Compare "chashish," an Arabic word which, as commonly used, denotes grass either standing or cut, green or dry, although, strictly speaking, dry or cut grass alone. In the Revised Version (British and American) Isa 5:24 the translation is "dry grass."

(3) tebhen, is translated "chaff" in the King James Version (Jer 23:28). The same word is rendered

"straw" in the Revised Version (British and American) (compare Arabic tibn).

(4) ‘ur, a Chaldaic word, occurs in Da 2:35.

In the New Testament achuron, is found in Mt 3:12 and Lu 3:17.

In the process of winnowing, as it has been carried on in the East for thousands of years, the grain is tossed into the air so that the wind may cause a separation of chaff and straw. The light husks from the wheat and fine particles of straw are dispersed by the wind in the form of a fine dust; the heavier straw which has been broken into short pieces by the threshing process falls near at hand on the edge of the threshing-floor, while the grain falls back upon the pile. In Syria and Palestine, that which falls near at hand as cut straw is called tibn. This word occurs in the Arabic translation of Mt 3:12 and Lu 3:17. This straw is ordinarily saved and fed as "roughage" to the animals. It could easily be gathered and burned, as indicated in the above-mentioned verses, while the chaff is blown away beyond recovery, a strong figure to depict complete annihilation (Job 21:18; Isa 29:5; 41:16; Ho 13:3, Da 2:35).

See AGRICULTURE; STRAW; WINNOWING.

JAMES A. Patch

CHAIN; CHAINS

chan, chanz: Chains were used by the Hebrews:

(1) As ornaments: ‘ets‘adhah, neTiphah, ‘anaq, rabhidh, sharsherah, rattoq. As ornaments for the person they were worn about the ankles (Nu 31:50; Isa 3:20) and about the neck (So 4:9; Eze 16:11). They were used as ornaments for the ephod and breastplate of the high priest (Ex 28:14; 39:15). These chains were of pure gold. Solomon placed chains before the oracle in the temple (1Ki 6:21), and these were also of pure gold. They were used as ornaments for graven images (Isa 40:19) and around the necks of prized animals. This was true of the camels taken from the Midianites by Gideon (Jud 8:21,26).

(2) As marks of distinction: rabhidh, hamunekh (hamnikh): That seems to be true of the chain which Pharaoh placed about the neck of Joseph (Ge 41:42), and of the one which the king of Babylon promised to the wise men (Da 5:7).

(3) As means of confining prisoners: nechosheth; halusis: A number of passages that were translated "chains" in the King James Version are translated "fetters" in the Revised Version (British and American) (see Jud 16:21; 2Sa 3:34). Among the Romans the prisoner was chained to one or two guards (Ac 12:6,7; 21:33; Eph 6:20; 2Ti 1:16). These chains were perhaps made of copper or an alloy of copper and tin.

(4) As a figurative expression: ‘anaq. The Psalmist likens pride to a chain about the neck (Ps 73:6), and

in Pr it is stated that the young man who hears the instruction of his father and forsakes not the law of his mother shall find that they are chains about his neck (Pr 1:9). In Re 20:1 the angel is described as descending with a great chain in his hand. According to the King James Version Peter speaks of the fallen angels as having been delivered into "chains of darkness" (2Pe 2:4), seira, and Jude speaks of them as being reserved in "everlasting chains" (Jude 1:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "bonds"), desmos.

See also PUNISHMENTS.

A. W. Fortune

CHAIR

char.

See SEAT; SEATS, CHIEF.

CHALCEDONY

kal-sed’-o-ni, kal’-se-do-ni.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CHALCOL

kal’-kol.

See CALCOL.

CHALDEA; CHALDEANS

kal-de’-a, kal-de’-anz (kasdim, ‘erets kasdim; Chaldaia, Chaldaioi):

1. Geographical Position

Seats of the Chaldeans

2. Originally Sumero-Akkadian

3. History of the Chaldean Tribes

4. Merodach-baladan and Sargon of Assyria

5. Suzubu

6. Musezib-Marduk

7. Merodach-baladan’s Son

8. Na’id-Marduk

9. Palia

10. Nabu-bel-sumati and Others

His Tragic End

11. The Chaldeans Forge Ahead

12. Nabopolassar’s Revolt against Assyria

13. The Chaldeans as Learned Men

"Kasdim," "land of Kasdim" or "the Chaldeans," is the usual designation, in the Old Testament, for the land and the people (Jer 50:10; 51:24; 24:5; 25:12). The corresponding Greek form with l for s follows the Assyr-Bab Kaldu, mat Kaldi, "Chaldean, land of the Chaldeans." Kasdim is possibly connected with the name of Kesed (Kesedh), nephew of Abraham (Ge 22:22), and may be derived from the Assyr-Bab root kasadu, "to capture," suggesting that the Chaldeans were originally tribes of nomadic plunderers (compare Job 1:17).

1. Geographical Position:

Seats of the Chaldeans:

In its widest acceptation, Chaldea is the name of the whole of Babylonia, owing to the fact that the Chaldeans had given more than one king to the country. In the strict sense, however, their domain was the tract at the Northwest end of the Persian Gulf, which was often called by the Assyro-Babylonians mat Tamtim, "the Land of the Sea," a province of unknown extent. When these tribes migrated into Babylonia is uncertain, as is also their original home; but as they are closely related to the Arameans, it is possible that their first settlements lay in the neighborhood of the Aramean states bordering on the Holy Land. Tiglath-pileser IV (742 BC) speaks of the ra’asani or chiefs of the Kaldu, and the mention of numerous Aramean tribes in Babylonia itself shows that their example of settling there soon found

imitators, as did the Anglo-Saxons when they invaded Britain. Among the Chaldean tribes in Babylonia may be mentioned Bit Amukkani, whose capital was Sapia; Bit Yakin which furnished the dynasty to which Merodach-baladan II belonged; and probably also Bit Dakkuri, as all three lay near the Persian Gulf. Sargon of Assyria excludes Bit-Amukkani and Bit-Dakkuri, and speaks of "the whole of the land of Chaldea, as much as there is; the land of Bit-Yakini, on the shore of the Salt River (the Persian Gulf), to the border of Tilmun" (the island of Bahrein and the adjacent mainland) (Pavement Inscr., IV, ll. 82, 83, 85, 86). It was probably the influence of theBabylonians among whom they settled which changed these nomads into city-dwellers. Sennacherib refers to 75 (var. 89) strong cities and fortresses of Chaldea, and 420 (var. 800) smaller towns which were around them; and there were also Chaldeans (and Arameans) in Erech, Nippur (Calneh), Kis, Hursag-kalama, Cuthah, and probably Babylon.

2. Originally Sumero-Akkadian:

The "land of the sea" (mat Tamtim)is mentioned in the chronicle of the early Babylonian kings (rev. 14) as being governed by Ea-gamil, contemporary of Samsu-Titana (circa 1900 BC), but at that period it was apparently one of the original Sumero-Akkadian states of Babylonia. It is doubtful whether, at that early date, the Chaldeans had entered Babylonia and founded settlements there, though the record mentions Arameans somewhat later on.

3. History of the Chaldean Tribes:

One of the earliest references to the Chaldeans is that of Shalmaneser II of Assyria, who, on invading Babylonia in the eponymy of Belbunaya (851 BC), captured the city Baqani, which belonged to Adini of the Chaldean tribe of Dakuri. After plundering and destroying the place, Shalmaneser attacked Enzudi, the capital, whereupon Adini submitted and paid tribute. On this occasion Yakini of "the Land of the Sea," also paid tribute, as did Musallim-Marduk, son of Amukkani (the Bit-Amukkani mentioned above). The next Assyrian ruler to mention the country is Adadnirari III (810 BC), who speaks of all the kings of the Chaldeans, which evidently refers to the various states into which the Chaldean tribes were divided. Later on, Sargon of Assyria, in his 12th year, decided to break the power of Merodach-baladan, who had made himself master of Babylon. To effect this, he first defeated the Gambulians, who were the Chaldean king’s supporters, and the Elamites, his allies over the border. The Chaldean, however, did not await the Assyrian king’s attack, but escaped to Yatburu in Elam, leaving considerable spoil behind him.

4. Merodach-baladan and Sargon of Assyria:

Though extensive operations were carried out, and much booty taken, the end of the campaign seems only to have come two years later, when Dur-Yakin was destroyed by fire and reduced to ruins. In the "Annals of Hall XIV" Sargon claims to have taken Merodach-baladan prisoner, but this seems doubtful. Merodach-baladan fled, but returned and mounted the throne again on Sargon’s death in 705 BC. Six months later Sennacherib, in his turn, attacked him, and he again sought safety in flight.

5. Suzubu:

A Chaldean chief named Suzubu, however, now came forward, and proclaimed himself king of Babylon, but being defeated, he likewise fled. Later on, Sennacherib attacked the Chaldeans at Nagitu and other settlements in Elamite-territory which Merodach-baladan and his followers had founded.

6. Musezib-Marduk:

After the death of Merodach-baladan, yet another Chaldean, whom Sennacherib calls likewise Suzubu, but whose full name was Musezib-Marduk, mounted the Babylonian throne. This ruler applied for help against Sennacherib of Assyria to Umman-menanu, the king of Elam, who, taking the bribe which was offered, supported him with an armed force, and a battle was fought at Chalule on the Tigris, in which Sennacherib claims the victory—probably rightly. Musezib-Marduk reigned 4 years, and was taken prisoner by his whilom ally, Umman-menanu, who sent him to Assyria.

7. Merodach-baladan's Son:

In the reign of Esarhaddon, Nabu-zer-napistilisir, one of the sons of Merodach-baladan, gathered an army at Larsa, but was defeated by the Assyrians, and fled to Elam. The king of that country, however, wishing to be on friendly terms with Esarhaddon, captured him and put him to death.

8. Na'id-Marduk:

This prince had a brother named Na'id-Marduk, who, not feeling himself safe in the country which had acted treacherously toward his house, fled, and made submission to Esarhaddon, who received him favorably, and restored to him the dominion of the "Land of the Sea." This moderation secured the fidelity of the Chaldeans, and when the Elamite Urtaku sent inviting them to revolt against their suzerain, they answered to the effect that Na'id-Marduk was their lord, and they were the servants of the king of Assyria. This took place probably about 650 BC, in the reign of Esarhaddon's son Assur-bani-apli (see OSNAPPAR).

9. Palia:

Hostility to Assyria, however, continued to exist in the tribe, Palia, grandson of Merodach-baladan, being one of the prisoners taken by Assur-bani-apli's troops in their operations against the Gambulians (a Babylonian, and perhaps a Chaldean tribe) later on. It was only during the struggle of Samas-sumukin (Saosduchimos), king of Babylon, Assur-banl-apli's brother, however, that they took sides against Assyria as a nationality. This change was due to the invitation of the Babylonian king—who may have been regarded, rather than Assur-bani-apli, as their overlord.

10. Nabu-bel-sumati:

The chief of the Chaldeans was at that time another grandson of Merodach-baladan, Nabu-bel-sumati,

who seized the Assyrians in his domain, and placed them in bonds. The Chaldeans suffered, with the rest, in the great defeat of the Babylonian and allied forces, when Babylon and the chief cities of the land fell. Mannu-ki-Babili of the Dakkurians, Ea-sum-ikisa of Bit-Amukkani, with other Chaldean states, were punished for their complicity in Samas-sum-ukin's revolt, while Nabu-bel-sumati fled and found refuge at the court of Indabigas, king of Elam. Assur-bani-apli at once demanded his surrender, but civil war in Elam broke out, in which Indabigas was slain, and Ummanaldas mounted the throne.

His Tragic End:

This demand was now renewed, and Nabu-bel-sumati, fearing that he would be surrendered, decided to end his life. He therefore directed his armor-bearer to dispatch him, and each ran the other through with his sword. The prince's corpse, with the head of his armor-bearer, were then sent, with some of the Chaldean fugitives, to Assyria, and presented to the king. Thus ended, for a time, Chaldean ambition in Babylonia and in the domain of eastern politics.

11. The Chaldeans Forge Ahead:

With the death of Assur-bani-apli, which took place about 626 BC, the power of Assyria fell, his successors being probably far less capable men than he. This gave occasion for many plots against the Assyrian empire, and the Chaldeans probably took part in the general movement. In the time of Saracus (Sin-sarra-iskun of Assyria, circa 620 BC) Busalossor would seem to have been appointed general of the forces in Babylonia in consequence of an apprehended invasion of barbarians from the sea (the Persian Gulf) (Eusebius, Chronicon, book i).

12. Nabopolassar's Revolt against Assyria:

The new general, however, revolted against the Assyrians, and made himself master of Babylonia. As, in other cases, the Assyrians seem to have been exceedingly faithful to their king, it has been thought possible that this general, who was none other than Nabopolassar, the father of Nebuchadpolassar's rezzar, was not really an Assyrian, but a Babylonian, and probably a Chaldean. This theory; if correct, would explain how Babylonia, in its fullest sense, obtained the name of Chaldea, and was no longer known as the land of Shinar (Ge 10:10). The reputation of Merodach-baladan, the contemporary of Hezekiah, may have been partly responsible for the change of name.

13. The Chaldeans as Learned Men:

It was not in the restricted sense, but as a synonym of Babylonian, that the name Chaldean obtained the signification of "wise man." That the Chaldeans in the restricted and correct sense were more learned than, or even as learned as, the Babylonians in general, is unlikely. Moreover, the native inscriptions give no indication that this was the case. The Babylonians in general, on the other hand, were enthusiastic students from very early times. From their inscriptions, it is certain that among their centers of learning may be classed Sippar and Larsa, the chief seats of sun-worship; Nippur, identified with the

Calneh of Ge 10:10; Babylon, the capital; Borsippa in the neighborhood of Babylon; Ur of the Chaldees; and Erech. There is, also, every probability that this list could be extended, and will be extended, when we know more; for wherever an important temple existed, there was to be found also a priestly school. "The learning of the Chaldeans" (Da 1:4; 2:2; 4:7; 5:7,11) comprised the old languages of Babylonia (the two dialects of Sumerian, with a certain knowledge of Kassite, which seems to have been allied to the Hittite; and other languages of the immediate neighborhood); some knowledge of astronomy and astrology; mathematics, which their sexagesimal system of numeration seems to have facilitated; and a certain amount of natural history. To this must be added a store of mythological learning, including legends of the Creation, the Flood (closely resembling in all its main points the account in the Bible), and apparently also the Temptation and the Fall. They had likewise a good knowledge of agriculture, and were no mean architects, as the many celebrated buildings of Babylonia show—compare not only the descriptions of the Temple of Belus (see BABEL, TOWER OF) and the Hanging Gardens, but also the remains of Gudea's great palace at Lagas (Tel-loh), where that ruler, who lived about 2500 BC, is twice represented as an architect, with plan and with rule and measure. (These statues are now in the Louvre.) That their architecture never attained the elegance which characterized that of the West, is probably due to the absence of stone, necessitating the employment of brick as a substitute (Ge 11:3).

See BABYLONIA; SHINAR.

T. G. Pinches

CHALKSTONE

chok'-ston ('abhneghir (compare Eben-ezer, 'ebhen ha-'ezer, "stone of the help," 1Sa 7:12)): In Isa 27:9 we have: "Therefore by this shall the iniquity of Jacob be forgiven, and this is all the fruit of taking away his sin: that he maketh all the stones of the altar as chalkstones that are beaten in sunder, so that the Asherim and the sun- images shall rise no more." 'Abhne-ghir is compounded of 'ebhen, "stone," which occurs in many passages, and gir or gir, "lime" (compare Arabic jir ," gypsum" or "quicklime"), which occurs only here and in Da 5:5: "wrote .... upon the plaster (gir) of the wall of the king's palace." Nearly all the rock of Palestine is limestone. When limestone is burned, it is converted into lime, which is easily broken into pieces, and, if allowed to remain open to the air, becomes slaked by the moisture of the atmosphere and crumbles into dust. The reference is to the destruction of the altar. It may mean that the altar will be burned so that the stones will become lime, or, more probably, that the stones of the altar will be broken as chalkstones (i.e. lumps of quicklime) are broken. There is no doubt that lime was known to the Egyptians, Assyrians and Hebrews, though clay, with or without straw, was more commonly used in building. Even bitumen ("slime") appears to have been used for mortar.

See CLAY; LIME; SLIME.

Alfred Ely Day

CHALLENGE

chal’-enj: Only in Ex 22:9, where the King James Version has taken Hebrew ‘amar, "say," in the sense of "claim." the Revised Version (British and American) "whereof one saith, This is it," points more definitely to the idea of identification of the stolen personal property.

CHALPHI

kal’-fi (Chalphi; the King James Version Calphi): Father of Judas, who, along with Mattathias, steadily supported Jonathan at the battle of Gennesar when the hosts of Demetrius’ princes were routed (1 Macc 11:70).

CHAMBER

cham’-ber (the translation of the following Hebrew words: chedher, chuppah, yatsia‘, yatsua‘, lishkah, nishkah, ‘aliyah, tsela‘, and the Aramaic word ‘illith): For the most part the word chamber is the expression of an idea which would be adequately expressed by the English word "room," in accordance with an earlier use of the word, now little employed. For the arrangement of rooms in a Hebrew house, see HOUSE. Chedher is a word of frequent occurrence, and designates a private room. Chuppah is translated "chamber" only in Ps 19:5, where it is used in connection with "bridegroom," and means a bridal chamber. The same Hebrew word used of the bride in Joe 2:16 is rendered "closet." Yatsia‘ and yatsua‘ are found only in 1Ki 6:5,6,10 (the King James Version only in all the passages), yatsua‘ being the reading of Kethibh and yatsia‘ of Kere in each ease. Here the meaning is really "story," as given in the Revised Version (British and American), except in 1Ki 6:6, where doubtless the text should be changed to read ha-tsela‘, "the side-chamber." Lishkah, a frequent word, and the equivalent nishkah, infrequent, are used ordinarily of a room in the temple utilized for sacred purposes, occasionally of a room in the palace. ‘Aliyah and the equivalent Aramaic ‘illith signify "a roof chamber," i.e. a chamber built on the flat roof of a house. Tsela‘, when used of a chamber, designates a side-chamber of the temple. It is usually rendered "side-chamber," but "chamber" in 1Ki 6:5,8 (the King James Version), where the Revised Version (British and American) has "side-chamber."

George Ricker Berry

CHAMBER, ROOF

See CHAMBER.

CHAMBERING

cham’-ber-ing: Illicit intercourse; the rendering in English Versions of the Bible since Tyndale of koitias (literally "beds," Ro 13:13). The Greek usage is paralleled in classic authors and the Septuagint; like the English participle, it denotes repeated or habitual acts. The word is not recorded elsewhere in English

literature as verb or participle in this sense; in Othello, iii, 3, a chamberer is an intriguer, male wanton, in Byron, Werner, IV, 1, 404, a gallant or carpet knight, and in Chaucer, Clerk's Tale, 766, a concubine.

CHAMBERLAIN

cham'-ber-lin: In the Old Testament the word rendered chamberlain, caric, is more properly "eunuch," an officer which oriental monarchs placed over their harems (Es 1:10,12,15; 2:3,14,21; 4:4 f; 6:2,14; 7:9; 2Ki 23:11). This officer seems also to have had other duties. See under EUNUCH. In the New Testament:

(1) oikonomos, literally manager of the household, apparently the "treasurer" as in the Revised Version (British and American) "Erastus the treasurer of the city saluteth you" (Ro 16:23). Compare adapted use as applied to Christian apostles and teachers, bishops, and even to individual members; in which cases, rendered "stewards" (1Co 4:1; Tit 1:7; 1Pe 4:10).

(2) In Ac 12:20, "Blastus the king's chamberlain" (ho epi toa koitonos tou basileos, "he who is over the king's bed-chamber"), not treasure-chamber, as above; here praefectus cubiculo, or chief valet de chambre to the royal person, a position involving much honor and intimacy.

Edward Bagby Pollard

CHAMBERS IN THE HEAVENS

See ASTRONOMY; DIAL OF AHAZ.

CHAMBERS IN THE SOUTH

See ASTRONOMY; SOUTH, CHAMBERS OF THE.

CHAMBERS OF IMAGERY

im'-aj-ri, im'-a-jer-i (maskith): The reference (Eze 8:12) is to chambers in the temple where the elders of Israel were wont to assemble and practice rites of an idolatrous character. What the imagery consisted of, we may gather from 8:10: symbolic representations of beasts and reptiles and "detestable things." It is thought that these symbols were of a zodiacal character. The worship of the planets was in vogue at the time of the prophet among the degenerate Israelites.

CHAMELEON

ka-me'-le-un (koach, the Revised Version (British and American) LAND CROCODILE (Le 11:30); tinshemeth, the King James Version mole, the Revised Version (British and American) CHAMELEON

(Le 11:30)):

Koach, which in the King James Version is rendered "chameleon" and in the Revised Version (British and American) "land crocodile," means also "strength" or "power," as in Ge 4:12; 1Sa 2:9; Ps 22:15; Isa 40:29, and many other passages. The Septuagint has chamaileon, but on account of the ordinary meaning of the word, koach, it has been thought that some large lizard should be understood here. The desert monitor, Varanus griseus, one of the largest of lizards, sometime attaining the length of 4 ft., is common in Palestine and may be the animal here referred to. The name "monitor" is a translation of the German warnen, "to warn," with which has been confused the Arabic name of this animal, waran or waral, a word of uncertain etymology.

The word tinshemeth in the same verse is rendered in the King James Version "mole" and in the Revised Version (British and American) "chameleon." The Septuagint has aspalax (= spalax, "mole"). Tinshemeth also occurs in the lists of unclean birds in Le 11:18 and De 14:16, where it is rendered: the King James Version "swan"; the Revised Version (British and American) "horned owl"; Septuagint porphurion (i.e. "coot" or, according to some, "heron"); Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) cygnus, "swan." It appears to come from the root nasham, "to breathe"; compare neshamah, "breath" (Ge 2:7; Job 27:3 the King James Version, etc.). It has therefore in Le 11:30 been referred to the chameleon on account of the chameleon's habit of puffing up its body with air and hissing, and in the other passages to the pelican, on account of the pelican's great pouched bill.

The common chameleon is abundant in Palestine, being found also in North Africa and in Spain. The other species of chameleons are found principally in Africa and Madagascar. It is not only a harmless but a decidedly useful creature, since it feeds upon insects, especially flies. Its mode of capturing its prey is most interesting. It slowly and cautiously advances until its head is from 4 to 6 inches from the insect, which it then secures by darting out its tongue with great rapidity. The pigment cel ls in its skin enable it to change its color from pale yellow to bright green, dark green and almost black, so that it can harmonize very perfectly with its surroundings. Its peculiar toes and prehensile tail help to fit it for its life in the trees. Its prominent eyes with circular lids, like iris diaphragms can be moved independently of each other, and add to its striking appearance.

See LAND-CROCODILE; MOLE; SWAN; OWL; PELICAN.

Alfred Ely Day

CHAMOIS

sham'-i, sha-mwa', sha-moi' (zemer; kamelopdrdalis): Occurs only once in the Bible, i.e. in the list of clean animals in De 14:5. Gesenius refers to the verb zamar, "to sing," and suggests the association of dancing or leaping, indicating thereby an active animal. M'Lean in Encyclopedia Biblica cites the rendering of the Targums dica', or "wild goat." Now there are two wild goats in Palestine. The better known is the ibex of the South, which may well be the ya'el (English Versions, "wild goat"; Job 39:1; Ps

104:18; 1Sa 24:2), as well as the ‘aqqo (English Version, "wild goat," De 14:5). The other is the pasang or Persian wild goat which ranges from the Northeast of Palestine and the Syrian desert to Persia, and which may be the zemer (English Versions "chamois"). The accompanying illustration, which is taken from the Royal Natural History, shows the male and female and young. The male is distinguished by its larger horns and goatee. The horns are in size and curvature very similar to those of the ibex (see GOAT, section 2) , but the front edge is like a nicked blade instead of being thick and knotty as in the ibex. Like the ibex it is at home among the rocks, and climbs apparently impossible cliffs with marvelous ease.

Tristram (NHB) who is followed by Post (HDB) suggests that zemer may be the Barbary sheep (Ovis tragelaphus), though the latter is only known to inhabit the Atlas Mountains, from the Atlantic to Tunis. Tristram supports his view by reference to a kebsh ("ram") which the Arabs say lives in the mountains of Sinai, though they have apparently neither horns nor skins to show as trophies, and it is admitted that no European has seen it. The true chamois (Rupicapra tragus) inhabits the high mountains from t he Pyrenees to the Caucasus, and there is no reason to suppose that it was ever found in Syria or Palestine.

Alfred Ely Day

CHAMPAIGN

sham-pan’, sham’-pan (‘arabhah, biq‘ah): A champaign is a flat open country, and the word occurs in De 11:30 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "the Arabah") as a translation of ‘arabhah, for which the King James Version has in most places "the plain," and the Revised Version (British and American) "the Arabah," when it is used with the article and denotes a definite region, i.e. the valley of the Jordan from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea (De 2:8; 3:17; 4:4:9; Jos 3:16; 8:14; 11:16; 12:1,3,1; 2Sa 2:29; 4:7; 2Ki 14:25; 25:4; Jer 39:4; 52:7), and also the valley running southward from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah (De 1:1). Eze 47:8 has for ha-‘arabhah "the desert," the King James Version margin "plain," the Revised Version (British and American) "the Arabah." The plural is used in Jos 5:10; 2Ki 25:5, "the plains of Jericho," and in Nu 22:1; 26:3, "the plains of Moab." Elsewhere ‘arabhah is rendered in English Versions of the Bible "desert" or "wilderness" (Job 24:5; 39:6; Isa 33:9; 35:1,6; 40:3; 41:19; 51:3; Jer 2:6; 17:6; 50:12). At the present day, the Jordan va lley is called the Ghaur (compare Hebrew ‘ur, "to dig," me‘arah, "cave," and Arabic magharah, "cave"). This name is also applied to the deltas of streams flowing into the Dead Sea from the East, which are clothed with thickets of thorny trees and shrubs, i.e. Ghaur-ul-Mezra‘ah, at the mouths of Wadi-Kerak and Wadi-Beni-Chammad, Ghaur-uc-Cafiyeh, at the mouth of Wadi-ul-Hisa. The name "Arabah" (Arabic al-‘Arabah) is now confined to the valley running southward from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah, separating the mountains of Edom from Sinai and the plateau of at-Tih.

See ARABAH.

Eze 37:2 the King James Version margin has "champaign" for biq‘ah, which is elsewhere rendered "vale" or "valley." Biq‘ah seems to be applied to wide, open valleys, as: "the valley of Jericho" (De 34:3), "the valley of Megiddo" (2Ch 35:22; Zec 12:11), "the valley of Lebanon" (Jos 11:17). If Baal-Gad

be Ba‘albeq and "the valley of Lebanon" be Coele-syria, the present name of Coele-syria, al-Biqa‘ (plural of buq‘ah, "a low, wet place or meadow"), may be regarded as a survival of the Hebre w biq‘ah.

Alfred Ely Day

CHAMPION

cham’-pi-un (’ish habenayim): In 1Sa 17:4,23 this unusual expression occurs in the description of Goliath. It means literally "the man of the two spaces," "spaces," or "space between," and is perhaps to be explained by the fact that there was a brook flowing through the valley separating the two armies. In 1Sa 17:51 the word champion is the rendering of the Hebrew gibbor, "mighty man."

CHANAAN; CHANAANITE

ka’-nan, ka’-na-an, ka’-nan-it (Chanaan), the King James Version in the Apocrypha (Judith 5:3,16) and New Testament (Ac 7:11; 13:19) for the Revised Version (British and American) CANAAN, CANAANITE (which see).

CHANCE

chans: The idea of chance in the sense of something wholly fortuitous was utterly foreign to the Hebrew creed. Throughout the whole course of Israel’s history, to the Hebrew mind, law, not chance, ruled the universe, and that law was not something blindly mechanical, but the expression of the personal Yahweh. Israel’s belief upon this subject may be summed up in the couplet, " The lot is cast into the lap; But the whole disposing thereof is of Yahweh" (Pr 16:33). A number of Hebrew and Greek expressions have been translated "chance," or something nearly equivalent, but it is noteworthy that of the classical words for chance, suntuchia, and tuche, the former never occurs in the Bible and the latter only twice in the Septuagint.

The closest approach to the idea of chance is found in the statement of the Philistines that if their device for ascertaining the cause of their calamities turned out a certain way they would call them a chance, that is, bad luck (miqreh, 1Sa 6:9). But note that it was a heathen people who said this. We have the same Hebrew noun and the verb, from which the noun is taken, a number of times, but variously rendered into English: Uncleanness that "chanceth him by night" (De 23:10). "Her hap was to ligh t on the portion of the field" (Ru 2:3). "Something hath befallen him" (1Sa 20:26). "One event happeneth to them all" (Ec 2:14,15); "that which befalleth the sons of men" ("sons of men are a chance," the English Revised Version, margin) (Ec 3:19). "There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked" (Ec 9:2,3). Here the idea certainly is not something independent of the will of God, but something unexpected by man.

There is also qara’," If a bird’s nest chance to be before thee in the way" (De 22:6). Both the above

Hebrew words are combined in the statement "As I happened by chance upon Mount Gilboa" (2Sa 1:6). "And Absalom chanced to meet the servants of David" ("met the servants," 2Sa 18:9, the King James Version). "And there happened to be there a base fellow" (2Sa 20:1).

We have also pegha‘, "Time and chance happeneth to them all," meaning simply occurrence (Ec 9:11). "Neither adversary, nor evil occurrence" (1Ki 5:4).

In the New Testament we have sugkuria, "coincidence," a meeting apparently accidental, a coincidence. "By chance a certain priest was going down that way" (Lu 10:31). Also ei tuchoi. "It may chance of wheat, or of some other kind," i.e. we cannot tell which (1Co 15:37). "It may be" (1Co 14:10).

If we look at the Septuagint we find tuche used twice. "And Leah said, (En tuche) With fortune" ("a troop cometh," the King James Version; "fortunate," the Revised Version (British and American); "with fortune," the Revised Version, margin, Ge 30:11). Note, it was no Israelite, but who said this. "That prepare a table for Fortune, and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny" ("fate," Isa 65:11). In this passage tuche stands or the Hebrew meni, the god of destiny, and Fortune is for Gad, the old Semitic name for the god of fortune found in inscriptions, private names, etc. Note here, however, also, that the prophet was rebuking idolatrous ones for apostasy to heathen divinities.

We have also in the Apocrypha, "these things which have chanced," the Revised Version (British and American) "to be opened unto thee" (2 Esdras 10:49).

See also GAD; MENI.

George Henry Trever

CHANCELLOR

chan’-sel-er: The rendering in Ezr 4:8,9,17 of the Hebrew be‘el Te‘em; Septuagint Baal (4:9), Balgam (4:17), the latter being an incorrect translation of Hebrew ‘ayin. In 1 Esdras 2:16,25, Beeltethmos (compare Ezr 4:8) occurs as a corruption, doubtless of be‘el Te‘em. The term in question designates an Assyrian office, namely, that of the "master or lord of official intelligence," or "postmaster" (Sayce).

CHANGE

chanj: A word which seeks to express the many shades of meaning contained in 13 variations of 9 Hebrew words and 5 Greek. These signify, in turn, "to change" "to exchange," "to turn," "to put or place," "to make other" i.e. "alter," "to disguise oneself." chalaph, and its derivatives, occuring often, indicates "to pass away," hence, alter, renew, e.g.:

(1) "changes of raiment" (Ge 45:22; Jud 14:12,13,19);

(2) "changed my wages ten times" (Ge 31:7,41);

(3) heavens changed "as a vesture" (Ps 102:26);

(4) "changes and warfare" (Job 10:17), i.e. relays of soldiers as illustrated in 1Ki 5:14 (the Revised Version, margin "host after host is against me");

(5) "till my change come" (the Revised Version (British and American) "release"), i.e. death (Job 14:14);

(6) "changed the ordinances" (the American Standard Revised Version "violated the statutes"), i.e. disregarded law (Isa 24:5);

(7) change of mind (Hab 1:11 the King James Version). Used also of change of character, haphakh:

(1) of leprosy, "changed unto white" (Le 13:16);

(2) figuratively of the moral life, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" (Jer 13:23); so also mur, and derivatives, "changed their gods" and "their glory," etc. (Ps 106:20; Jer 2:11; Ho 4:7).

Other words used to indicate change of name (2Ki 24:17); of day and night (Job 17:12); of times and seasons (Da 2:21); of countenance. (Da 7:28); of behavior (1Sa 21:13); God’s unchangeableness, "I, Yahweh, change not" (Mal 3:6).

In the New Testament the word has to do chiefly with spiritual realities:

(1) metatithemi, of the necessary change of the priesthood and law under Christ (Heb 7:12);

(2) allatto, of His changing the customs of Moses (Ac 6:14);

(3) of moral change, e.g. debasement (Ro 1:23,25,26);

(4) of bodily change at the resurrection (1Co 15:51,52; metaschematizo, Php 3:21 the King James Version);

(5) metaballo, of change of mind in presence of a miracle (Ac 28:6);

(6) of the change to come over the heavens at the great day of the Lord (Heb 1:12; compare 2Pe 3:10,12).

Figurative uses indicated separately in the course of the article.

Dwight M. Pratt

CHANGE OF RAIMENT

ra’-ment.

See DRESS.

CHANGER

chan’-jer (kollubistes, "money-changer," and so rendered Mt 21:12; Mr 11:15): A banker or other person who changes money at a fixed rate. Indignant at the profane traffic in the temple Jesus "poured out the changers’ money" (Joh 2:15). So used only here. For fuller treatment see BANK; MONEY-CHANGERS.

CHANNEL

chan’-el (’aphiq (root ‘aphaq, "to hold or contain," "to be strong"; compare Arabic ‘afaq "to overcome" and ‘afiq, "preeminent"); shibboleth (shabhal, "to go," "to go up or grow," "to flow"; compare Arabic ‘asbal, "to flow," "to rain," "to put forth ears"; sabalat, "an ear of grain"; sabil, "a road," "a public fountain")): In Job 12:21; 40:18; 41:15 we have ‘aphiq in the sense of "strong" (but compare 40:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "tubes" (of brass)). Elsewhere it is translated "river," "brook," "stream," "channel" or "watercourse." Shibboleth (in the dialect of Ephraim cibboleth (Jud 12:6)) means "an ear of grain" (Ge 41:5 ff; Ru 2:2; Isa 17:5) or "a flood of water" (Ps 69:2,15; Isa 27:12). In 2Sa 22:16 (compare Ps 18:15) we have: `" Then the channels of the sea appeared, The foundations of the world were laid bare, By the rebuke of Yahweh, At the blast of the breath of his nostrils."` This is reminiscent of "fountains of the deep" (Ge 7:11; 8:2; Pr 8:28). It is a question how far we should attribute to these ancient writers a share in modern notions of oceanography, but the idea seems to be that of a withdrawal of the water of the ocean, and the laying bare of submarine declivities and channels such as we know to exist as the result of erosion during a previous period of elevation, when the given portion of ocean floor was dry land.

The fact that many streams of Palestine flow only during the rainy season seems to be referred to in Job 6:15; and perhaps also in Ps 126:4.

See BROOK; RIVER.

Alfred Ely Day

CHANT

(paraT): Occurs only once in the King James Version in Am 6:5, and the meaning of the Hebrew is uncertain. ParaT corresponds to an Arabic root meaning to anticipate. It may therefore signify to improvise, to sing without care or preparation. the Revised Version (British and American) "to sing idle songs" suits the context. See Driver, Joe and Amos.

CHANUNEUS

ka-nun'-e-us (Chanounaios; the King James Version Channuneus): A Levite in the list of 1 Esdras 8:48, probably corresponding to "Merari" in Ezr 8:19.

CHAPEL

chap'-el (miqdash, "a holy place"; the Revised Version (British and American) SANCTUARY, which see): "It is the king's chapel" (Am 7:13 the King James Version), an expression indicative of the dependence of this sanctuary on the court.

CHAPHENATHA

ka-fen'-a-tha (Chaphenatha; the King James Version Caphenatha): A name apparently given to part of the eastern wall of Jerusalem or a fort in that neighborhood which is said (1 Macc 12:37) to have been repaired by Jonathan Maccabeus. The place cannot now be identified. Various speculations have been made as to the origin of the name, but they can hardly be said to throw any light on the passage cited.

CHAPITER

chap'-i-ter.

See ARCHITECTURE; JACHIN AND BOAZ; TEMPLE, II, 4.

CHAPMAN

chap'-man (plural 'anshe ha-tarim): Word used only once in the King James Version (2Ch 9:14, the American Standard Revised Version "the traders"; compare also 1Ki 10:15 the Revised Version (British and American), where the Hebrew uses the same expression). The English word means "merchant"; compare the verb "to chaffer," and the German Kaufmann. The Hebrew means "those who go about" as merchants.

CHAPT

(chathath): The Hebrew term chathath means "broken," "terrified" or "dismayed." This term as it occurs

in Jer 14:4 is rendered "chapt" in English Versions of the Bible, "cracked" in the American Standard Revised Version, and "dismayed" in the Revised Version, margin. Inasmuch as the Hebrew term means "broken," it is not incorrectly rendered "chapt" or "chapped," which means to be cracked Open.

CHARAATHALAN

kar-a-ath'-a-lan (Charaathalan; the King James Version Charaathalar (1 Esdras 5:36)): Most probably a corruption of the text. The names "Cherub, Addan, and Immer" in the lists of Ezr 2:59 and Ne 7:61 are presented in the text cited as "Charaathalan leading them, and Allar."

CHARACA

kar'-a-ka.

See CHARAX.

CHARASHIM

kar'-a-shim (charashim, "craftsmen").

See GE-HARASHIM.

CHARAX; CHARACA

kar'-ax, kar'-a-ka; (eis ton Charaka; the King James Version Charax): A place mentioned only in 2 Macc 12:17. It lay East of the Jordan and is said to be 750 stadia from Caspis, and to be inhabited by Jews called Tubieni, that is, of Tobie (Tob) in Gilead (1 Macc 5:9,13; 2 Macc 12:17). There is no clue as to the direction in which Ch. lay from Caspis. Possibly Kerak (Kir-moab), in post-Biblical times called Charamoba and Moboucharax, may represent the place. It lay about 100 miles South of el-Mezerib, Southeast of the Dead Sea.

CHARCHEMISH

kar'-ke-mish.

See CARCHEMISH.

CHARCHUS

kar'-kus.

See BARCHUS.

CHAREA

kar’-re-a (Charea): Head of a family of temple-servants (1 Esdras 5:32); called "Harsha" in Ezr 2:52; Ne 7:54.

CHARGE; CHARGEABLE

charj, char’-ja-b’-l (from Latin carrus, "a wagon," hence, "to lay or put a load on or in," "to burden, or be a burden"):

Figurative:

(1) of a special duty mishmereth, ("thing to be watched"), "the charge of Yahweh" (Le 8:35), the injunctions given in Ex 29; "the charge of the tabernacle" (Nu 1:53); "the charge of the sons of Getshon" (Nu 3:25);

(2) of the burden of expense (kabhedh, "to be, or make heavy"; adapanos, "without expense"), "lest we be chargeable unto thee" (2Sa 13:25 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "burdensome"); "The former governors .... were charge unto the people" (Ne 5:15 margin "laid burdens upon"); "that .... I may make the gospel without charge" (1Co 9:18; see CHARGES);

(3) of oversight, care, custody, "Who gave him a charge over the earth?" (Job 34:13); "to have the charge of the gate" (2Ki 7:17); "charge of the vessels of service" (1Ch 9:28); "cause ye them that have charge (pequddoth, "inspectors") over the city" (Eze 9:1); "who had the charge of all her treasure" (Ac 8:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "was over");

(4) of a command, injunction, requirement, "He gave him a charge" (Ge 28:6); "His father charged the people with the oath" (1Sa 14:27); "Jesus strictly (m "sternly") charged them" (Mt 9:30); "I charge you by the Lord" (1Th 5:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "adjure"); "having received such a charge" (Ac 16:24, paraggelia, "private or extra message"); "This charge I commit unto thee" (1Ti 1:18);

(5) of blame, responsibility, reckoning, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge" (Ac 7:60); "nothing laid to his charge" (Ac 23:29); "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s elect?" (Ro 8:33).

M. O. Evans

CHARGER

char’-jer (the American Standard Revised Version "platter"): A word which meant in the older English speech a flat dish or platter. It is used in the Bible as the translation:

(1) of qe‘arah, which in Nu 7:19 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "platter") and repeatedly in that chapter denotes one of the gifts made by the several princes at the dedication of the tabernacle;

(2) of ‘agharTal, a word of uncertain derivation used in Ezr 1:9 (the King James Version) twice to designate certain temple vessels which might better be called "libation bowls";

(3) of pinax, used Mt 14:8,11; Mr 6:25,28 (EV) for the dish in which the head of John the Baptist was presented.

David Foster Estes

CHARGES

char’-jiz (dapanao, "to spend"): "Be at charges for them" (Ac 21:24, the King James Version "with them"), i.e. pay the sacrificial expenses of these poorer Nazirites (compare Josephus, Ant, XIX, xvi, 1).

CHARIOT

char’-i-ot (merkabh, merkabhah, "riding-chariot," rekhebh, "war-chariot"; harma):

1. Chariots of Egypt

2. Chariots of the Canaanites

3. Chariots of Solomon and Later Kings

4. Chariots of the Assyrians

5. Chariots of Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks

6. In the New Testament

7. Figurative Use

LITERATURE

1. Chariots of Egypt:

It is to the chariots of ancient Egypt that reference is first made in Scripture. Joseph was honored by being made to ride in the second chariot of King Pharaoh (Ge 41:43). Joseph paid honor to his father on his arrival in Goshen by meeting him in his chariot (Ge 46:29). In the state ceremonial with which the remains of Jacob were escorted to Canaan, chariots and horsemen were conspicuous (Ge 50:9). In the narrative of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt and of Pharaoh's futile attempts to detain them the chariots and horsemen of Pharaoh figure largely (Ex 14:17,18,23,15; 15:4,19). It was with the Hyksos invasion, some centuries before the Exodus, that the horse, and subsequently the chariot, were introduced for purposes of war into Egypt; and it may have been the possession of chariots that enabled those hated shepherd warriors to overpower the native Egyptians. The Egyptian chariot was distinguished by its lightness of build. It was so reduced in weight that it was possible for a man to carry his chariot on his shoulders without fatigue. The ordinary chariot was made of wood and leather, and had only two occupants, the fighting man and his shield-bearer. The royal chariots were ornamented with gold and silver, and in the battle of Megiddo Thothmes III is represented as standing in his chariot of electrum like the god of war, brandishing his lance. In the battle the victorious Egyptians captured 2,041 horses and 924 chariots from the Syrian allies.

2. Chariots of the Canaanites:

The Canaanites had long been possessed of horses and chariots when Joshua houghed their horses and burnt their chariots with fire at the waters of Merom (Jos 11:6,9). The chariots of iron which the Canaanites could maneuvere in the plains and valleys proved a formidable obstacle to the Complete conquest of the land (Jud 1:19). Jabin had 900 chariots of iron, and with them he was able to oppress the children of Israel twenty years (Jud 4:3). The Philistines of the low country and the maritime plain, of whom we read in Judges and Samuel, were a warlike people, were disciplined and well armed and their possession of chariots gave them a great advantage over the Israelites. In the war of Michmash they put into the field the incredible number of 30,000 chariots and 6,000 horsemen, only in the end to suffer a grievous defeat (1Sa 13:5; 14:20). In the battle of Gilboa, however, the chariots and horsemen of the Philistines bore down all opposition, and proved the destruction of Saul and his house. Of these chariots there have come down to us no detailed description and no representation. But we cannot be far wrong in turning to the chariot of the Hittites as a type of the Canaanite and Philistine chariot. It is not from the monuments of the Hittites themselves, however, but from the representations of the Kheta of the Egyptian monuments, that we know what their chariots were like. Their chariotry was their chief arm of offense. The Hittite chariot was used, too, for hunting; but a heavier car with paneled sides was employed for war. The Egyptian monuments represent three Hittites in each car, a practice which differed from that of Egypt and attracted attention. Of the three, one guided the chariot, another did the fighting with sword and lance, and the third was the shield-bearer.

3. Chariots of Solomon and Later Kings:

The Israelites living in a mountainous country were tardy in adopting the chariot for purposes of war.

David houghed all the chariot horses of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and "reserved of them for a hundred chariots" (2Sa 8:4), and Adonijah prepared for himself chariots and horsemen with a view to contest the throne of his father (1Ki 1:5). But Solomon was the first in Israel to acquire chariots and horses on a national scale, and to build cities for their accommodation (1Ki 9:19). In Massoretic Text of the Old Testament we read that Solomon had agents who received droves of horses from Egypt, and it is added: "And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for 600 shekels of silver, and a horse for 150; and so for all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria, did they bring them out by their means" (1Ki 10:29). On the strength of a warrantable emendation of the text it is now proposed to read the preceding (1Ki 10:28): "And Solomon's import of horses was from Mucri and from Kue; the king's traders received them from Kue at a price"—where Mucri and Kue are North Syria and Cilicia. No doubt it was Egypt out of which the nation was forbidden by the Deuteronomic law to multiply horses (De 17:16), but on the other hand the statement of Eze (27:14) that Israel derived horses, chargers and mules not from Egypt but from Togarmah—North Syria and Asia Minor—agrees with the new rendering (Burney, Notes on Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings, in the place cited.). From Solomon's time onward chariots were in use in both kingdoms. Zimri, who slew Elah, son of Baasha, king of Israel, was captain of half his chariots (1Ki 16:9). It was when sitting in his chariot in disguise beside the driver that Ahab received his fatal wound at Ramoth-gilead (1Ki 22:34). The floor of the royal chariot was a pool of blood, and "they washed the chariot by the pool of Samaria" (1Ki 22:35,38). It was in his war-chariot that his servants carried Josiah dead from the fatal field of Megiddo (2Ki 23:30). The chief pieces of the Hebrew chariot were

(1) the pole to which the two horses were yoked,

(2) the axle—resting upon two wheels with six or eight spokes (1Ki 7:33)—into which the pole was fixed,

(3) a frame or body open behind, standing upon the axle and fitted by a leather band to the pole.

The chariots of iron of which we read (Jud 4:3) were of wood strengthened or studded with iron. Like that of the Hittite, the Hebrew chariot probably carried three men, although in the chariot of Ahab (1Ki 22:34) and in that of Jehu (2Ki 9:24 f) we read of only two.

4. Chariots of the Assyrians:

In the later days when the Assyrians overran the lands of the West, the Israelites had to face the chariots and the hosts of Sennacherib and of the kings (2Ki 19:23). And they faced them with chariots of their own. An inscription of Shalmaneser II of Assyria tells how in the battle of Karkar (854 BC) Ahab of the land of Israel had put into the field 2,000 chariots and 10,000 soldiers. But the Assyrian chariotry was too numerous and powerful for Israel. The Assyrian chariot was larger and heavier than the Egyptian or the Hebrew: it had usually three and sometimes four occupants (Maspero, Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria, 322). When we read in Nahum's prophecy of "chariots flashing with steel," "rushing to and fro in the broad ways" (Na 2:3,4), it is of the Assyrian chariots that we are to think being hastily got together

for the defense of Nineveh.

5. Chariots of Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks:

In early Babylonian inscriptions of the 3rd millennium before Christ there is evidence of the use of the war-chariots, and Nebuchadrezzar in his campaigns to the West had chariots as part of his victorious host (Jer 47:3). It was the Persians who first employed scythed chariots in war; and we find Antiochus Eupator in the Seleucid period equipping a Greek force against Judea which had 300 chariots armed with scythes (2 Macc 13:2).

6. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament the chariot is only twice mentioned. Besides the chariot in which the Ethiopian eunuch was traveling when Philip the evangelist made up to him (Ac 8:28,29,38), there is only the mention of the din of war-chariots to which the onrush of locusts in Apocalyptic vision is compared (Re 9:9).

7. Figurative Use:

In the figurative language of Scripture, the chariot has a place. It is a tribute to the powerful influence of Elijah and Elisha when they are separately called "the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof" (2Ki 2:12; 13:14). The angelic hosts are declared to be God’s chariots, twice ten thousand, thousands upon thousands (Ps 68:17). But chariots and horses themselves are a poor substitute for the might of God (Ps 20:7). God Himself is represented as riding upon His chariots of salvation for the defense of His people (Hab 3:8). In the Book of Zec, the four chariots with their horses of various colors have an apocalyptic significance (Zec 6). In the worship of the host of heaven which prevailed in the later days of the kingdom of Judah, "the chariots of the sun" (see article) were symbols which led the people into gross idolatry and King Josiah burnt them with fire (2Ki 23:11).

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebrew Archaeology, I, 366 f; Garstang, Land of the Hittites, 363 f; Maspero, Struggle of the Nations and Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria; Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, II, 1-21.

T. Nicol.

CHARIOTS OF THE SUN

(markebhoth ha-shemesh): These, together with "horses of the sun," are mentioned in 2Ki 23:11. They are said to have stood in the temple, a gift of the kings of Judah. Josiah removed the horses from the precincts of the temple and burned the chariots. Among the Greeks, Helios was endowed with horses and chariots. Thus the course of the sun as he sped across the skies was understood by the mythological

mind of antiquity. The Babylonian god Shamash (= Hebrew Shemesh) likewise had his chariot and horses as well as his charioteer. The cult of the sun and other heavenly bodies which was particularly in vogue during the latter days of the Judean monarchy (compare 2Ki 23:5; Eze 8:16 f; De 17:3; Jer 8:2) seems to have constituted an element of the Canaanitish religion (compare the names of localities like Beth-shemesh and the like). The chariots of the sun are also referred to in Enoch 72:5,37; 75:4, and Greek Apocrypha of Baruch 6.

Max L. Margolis

CHARITABLY

char'-i-ta-bli (kata agapen): The Revised Version (British and American), which substitutes "love" for "charity" regularly, removing the latter word from the vocabulary of Scripture, makes a like change in Ro 14:15, the only occurrence of "charitably" in the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "in love."

See CHARITY.

CHARITY

char'-i-ti (agape):

1. A New Word

2. A New Ideal

3. An Apostolic Term

4. Latin Equivalents

5. English Translation

6. Inward Motive

7. Character

8. Ultimate Ideal 9. Almsgiving

10. Tolerance

In the King James Version in 26 places from 1Co 8:1 onward. The same Greek word, which appears in

the New Testament 115 times, is elsewhere translated by "love."

1. A New Word:

The substantive agape is mainly, if not exclusively, a Biblical and ecclesiastical word (see Deissmann, Bible Studies, 198 ff), not found in profane writings, although the verb agapan, from which it is derived, is used in classical Greek in the sense of "love, founded in admiration, veneration, esteem, like the Latin diligere" (Grimm-Thayer), rather than natural emotion (Latin, amare).

2. A New Ideal:

It is a significant evidence of the sense of a new ideal and principle of life that permeated the Christian consciousness of the earliest communities, that they should have made current a new word to express it, and that they should derive that word, not from the current or philosophical language of Greek morality, but from the Septuagint.

3. An Apostolic Term:

In the New Testament the word is apostolic, and appears first and predominantly in the Pauline writings. It is found only twice in the Synoptics (Mt 24:12; Lu 11:42), and although it is in both places put in the mouth of the Saviour, it can easily be understood how the language of a later time may have been used by the narrator, when it is considered that these gospels were compiled and reduced to writing many years after the spread of the Pauline epistles. The word is not found in James, Mark or Acts, but it appears in Paul 75 times, in John 30 times, in Peter 4 times, in Jude twice and in Hebrews twice. Jesus Christ gave the thing and the spirit in the church, and the apostles (probably Paul) invented the term to express it.

4. Latin Equivalents:

When Jerome came to translate the Greek Testament into Latin, he found in that language no word to represent agape. Amor was too gross, and he fell back on dilectio and caritas, words which, however, in their original meanings were too weak and colorless to represent agape adequately. No principle seems to have guided him in the choice of the one word or the other in particular places.

5. English Translation:

Caritas in English became "charity," and was taken over by the English translators from the Vulg, though not with any regularity, nor as far as can be judged, according to any definite principle, except that it is used of agape only in man, never as it denotes a quality or action of God, which is always translated by "love." When agape is translated by "charity" it means either

(1) a disposition in man which may qualify his own character (1Co 8:1) and be ready to go forth to God

(1Co 8:3) or to men; or

(2) an active and actual relation with other men, generally within the church (Col 3:14; 1Th 3:6; 2Th 1:3; 1Ti 1:5; 4:12; 1Pe 4:8; 5:14), but also absolutely and universally (1Co 13). In the earlier epistles it stands first and unique as the supreme principle of the Christian life (1Co 13), but in the later writings, it is enumerated as one among the Christian virtues (1Ti 2:15; 2Ti 2:22; 3:10; Tit 2:2; 2Pe 1:7; Re 2:19).

6. Inward Motive:

In Paul’s psalm of love (1Co 13) it is set forth as an innermost principle contrasted with prophecy and knowledge, faith and works, as the motive that determines the quality of the whole inner life, and gives value to all its activities. If a man should have all gifts of miracles and intellect, and perform all the works of goodness and devotion, "and have not love, it profiteth nothing," for they would be purely external and legal, and lacking in the quality of moral choice and personal relation which give life its value (1Co 13:1-3). Love itself defines men’s relation to men as generous, tolerant and forgiving.

7. Character:

"Love suffereth long, and is kind; love envieth not" (1Co 13:4). It determines and defines a man’s own character and personality. It is not boastful and arrogant, but dignified, pure, holy, courageous and serene. Evil cannot provoke it nor wrong delight it. It bears cheerfully all adversity and follows its course in confident hope (1Co 13:4- 7). It is final virtue, the ultimate ideal of life. Many of life’s activities cease or change, but "love never faileth."

8. Ultimate Ideal:

To it all other graces and virtues are subordinated. "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love" (1Co 13:8-13). In one passage only in the New Testament (3Jo 1:6) agape seems to have a meaning that comes near to the later, ecclesiastical meaning of charity as almsgiving.

9. Almsgiving:

With the growing legalism of the church and the prevalence of monastic ideals of morality, caritas came to mean the very opposite of Paul’s agape—just "the giving of goods to feed the poor," which "without love profiteth nothing." At present, the word means either liberality to the poor, or tolerance in judging the actions of others, both qualities of love, but very inadequate to express its totality.

10. Tolerance:

The Revisers have therefore accurately dropped the word and substituted "love" for it in all passages. It is interesting to note that in Welsh the reverse process has occurred: cariad (from Latin caritas) was used throughout to translate agape, with the result that, in both religious and ordinary speech, the word has

established itself so firmly as almost to oust the native word "serch."

T. Rees

CHARM

charm: Definition.—The word charm is derived from the Latin carmen, "a song," and denotes strictly what is sung; then it comes to mean a magical formula chanted or recited with a view to certain desired results. Charm is distinguished from amulet in this, that the latter is a material object having as such a magical potency, though it is frequently an inscribed formula on it that gives this object its power (see AMULET). The word charm stands primarily for the incantation, though it is often applied to an inscribed amulet.

A charm may be regarded as having a positive or a negative effect. In the first case it is supposed to secure some desired object or result (see AMULET). In the second, it is conceived as having the power of warding off evils, as the evil eye, the inflictions of evil spirits and the like. In the last, its negative meaning, the word "countercharm" (German, Gegenzauber) is commonly used.

Charms are divisible into two general classes according as they are written (or printed) or merely spoken:

(1) Written charms—Of these we have examples in the phylacteries and the mezuzah noticed in the article AMULET. In Ac 19:13-20 we read of written charms used by the Ephesians, such as are elsewhere called (ephesia grammata). Such magical formulas were written generally on leather, though sometimes on papyrus, on lead, and even on gold. Those mentioned in the above passage must have been inscribed on some very valuable material, gold perhaps, or they could not have cost 2,000 British pounds (= 50,000 drachmas). Charms of the kind have been dug up from the ruins of Ephesus. In modern Egypt drinking-bowls are used, inscribed with passages from the Koran, and it is considered very lucky to drink from such a "lucky bowl," as it is called. Parts of the Koran and often complete miniature copies are worn by Egyptians and especially by Egyptian soldiers during war. These are buried with the dead bodies, just as the ancient Egyptians interred with their dead portions of the Book of the Dead or even the whole book, and as the early Abyssinians buried with dead bodies certain magical texts. Josephus (Ant., VIII, ii, 5) says that Solomon composed incantations by which demons were exorcised and diseases healed.

(2) Spoken charms are at least as widespread as those inscribed. Much importance was attached by the ancients (Egyptians, Babylonians, etc.) to the manner in which the incantations were recited, as well as to the substance of the formulas. If beautifully uttered, and with sufficient frequency, such incantations possessed unlimited power. The stress laid on the mode of reciting magical charms necessitated the existence of a priestly class and did much to increase the power of such a class. The binding force of the uttered word is implied in many parts of the Old Testament (see Jos 9:20). Though the princes of Israel had promised under false pretenses to make a covenant on behalf of Israel with the Gibeonites, they

refused to break their promise because the word had been given. The words of blessing and curse were believed to have in themselves the power of self-realization. A curse was a means of destruction, not a mere realization (see Nu 22-24, Balaam's curses; Jud 5:23; Job 31). In a similar way the word of blessing was believed to insure its own realization. In Ge 48:8-22 the greatness of Ephraim and Manasseh is ascribed to the blessing of Jacob upon them (see further Ex 12:32; Jud 17:2; 2Sa 21:3). It is no doubt to be understood that the witch of Endor raised Samuel from the dead by the recitation of some magical formula (1Sa 28:7 ff).

The uttering of the tetragrammaton (~YHWH) was at a very early time (at latest 300 BC) believed to be magically potent, and hence, its ordinary use was forbidden, so that instead of Yahweh, the Jews of the time, when the earliest part of the Septuagint was translated, used for this Divine name the appellative 'adhonai =" Lord." In a similar way among the Jews of post-Biblical and perhaps of even Biblical times, the pronunciation of the Aaronic blessing (Nu 6:24-26) was supposed to possess great efficacy and to be a means of certain good to the person or persons involved. Evil spirits were exorcised by Jews of Paul's day through the use of the name of the Lord Jesus (Ac 19:13). In the Talmud (Pecachim 110a) it is an instruction that if a man meets a witch he should say, "May a pot of boiling dung be stuffed into your mouth, you ugly witch," and her power is gone.

For literature see AMULET.

T. Witton Davies

CHARME

kar'-me (so the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version Carme; Charme): A Greek transliteration of Hebrew charim. The name of a priestly family in the list of those who returned from the Exile (1 Esdras 5:25 = Harim in Ezr 2:39 = Ne 7:42).

CHARMIS

kar'-mis (Charmeis, Charmeis, A, Chalmeis): The son of Melchiel, one of the three elders or rulers of the town of Bethulia (Judith 6:15; 8:10; 10:6).

CHARRAN

kar'-an (Charrhan): Greek form of HARAN (which see) (Ac 7:2,4).

CHASE

chas.

See HUNTING.

CHASEBA

kas’-e-ba (Chaseba): The name of a family of temple-servants in the list of those who returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:31). The name is not given in the parallel passages in Ezra and Nehemiah.

CHASTE; CHASTITY

chast, chas’-ti-ti.

See CRIMES; MARRIAGE.

CHASTENING; CHASTISEMENT

chas’-’-n-ing, chas’-tiz-ment: These two words corresponding to Hebrew mucar, and Greek paideia, are distinguished in English use, in that "chastisement" is applied to the infliction of pain, either as a punishment or for recalling to duty, while "chastening," is a wider term, indicating the discipline or training to which one is subjected, without, as in the other term, referring to the means employed to this end. The narrower term occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) but once in the New Testament and then in its verbal form, Lu 23:16: "I will therefore chastise him." the King James Version uses it also in Heb 12:8.

The meaning of the word paideia grows with the progress of revelation. Its full significance is unfolded in the New Testament, when reconciliation through Christ has brought into prominence the true fatherhood of God (Heb 12:5,10). In the Old Testament, where it occurs about 40 times, the radical meaning is that simply of training, as in De 8:5: "As a man chasteneth his son, so Yahweh thy God chasteneth thee." But, as in a dispensation where the distinguishing feature is that of the strictest justice, retributive punishment becomes not only an important, but a controlling factor. in the training, as in Le 26:28: "I will chastise you seven times for your sins." In this sense, it is used of chastisements inflicted by man even unjustly: "My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (1Ki 12:11). As, therefore, the thought of the suffering inflicted, or that of the end toward which it is directed, preponderates, the Psalmist can pray: "Neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure" (Ps 6:1), and take comfort in the words: "Blessed is the man whom thou chastenest" (Ps 94:12). Hence, it is common in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) to find the Hebrew mucar, and Greek paideia translated as "instruction." Illustrations are most numerous in Prov.

In the New Testament the Greek paideia is used with a variety similar to its corresponding Hebrew in the Old Testament. Examples of the fundamental idea, namely, that of "training," are found in such passages as Ac 7:22; 22:3, where Moses and Paul are said to have been "instructed," and 2Ti 3:16, where Scripture is said to be "profitable .... for instruction" (compare 1Ti 1:20; 2Ti 2:25; Tit 2:12; Ro

2:20). A similar, but not identical, thought, is found in Eph 6:4: "Nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord." But when paideia is described as bringing pain, the mystery of suffering, which in the Old Testament is most fully treated in the Book of Job, at last finds its explanation. The child of God realizes that he cannot be beneath God's wrath, and hence, that the chastening which he endures is not destructive, but corrective (1Co 10:13; 11:32; 2Co 6:9; Re 3:19). In Heb 12:5-11, such consolation is afforded, not, as in the above passages, by incidental allusions, but by a full argument upon the basis of Pr 3:11 f, an Old Testament text that has depth and richness that can be understood and appropriated only by those who through Christ have learned to recognize the Omnipotent Ruler of heaven and earth, as their loving and considerate Father. On the basis of this passage, a distinction is often drawn between punishment and chastisement; the former, as an act of justice, revealing wrath, and the latter, as an act of mercy, love. Since to them that are in Christ Jesus, there is no condemnation (Ro 8:1) they can suffer no punishment, but only chastisement. Where there is guilt, there is punishment; but where guilt has been removed, there can be no punishment. There being no degrees of justification, no one can be forgiven in part, with a partial guilt still set to his account for which he must yet give a reckoning, either here or hereafter. If, then, all the righteousness of Christ belongs to him, and no sin whatever remains to be forgiven, either in whole or in part, all life's sorrows are remedial agencies against danger and to train for the kingdom of heaven.

H. E. Jacobs

CHATTER

chat'-er (tsaphaph): This word, which means to "peep," "twitter" or "chirp," as small birds do, is translated "chatter" only in Isa 38:14, "Like a swallow or a crane, so did I chatter."

See CHIRP.

CHAVAH

ka'-va (Septuagint Zoe): A transliteration of the Hebrew chawwah or chavvah, which means "life giver" "living" and appears in our English versions as Eve (Ge 3:20, see the King James Version margin).

CHEBAR

ke'-bar (kebhar, "joining" (Young), "length" (Strong); Chobar): The river by the side of which his first vision was vouchsafed to Ezekiel (Ez 1:1). It is described as in "the land of the Chaldeans," and is not, therefore, to be sought in northern Mesopotamia. This rules out the Habor, the modern Chabour, with which it is often identified. The two names are radically distinct: chabhor could not be derived from kebhar. One of the great Babylonian canals is doubtless intended. Hilprecht found mention made of (naru) kabaru, one of these canals large enough to be navigable, to the East of Nippur, "in the land of the Chaldeans." This "great canal" he identifies with the rood. shaTT en-Nil, in which probably we should recognize the ancient Chebar.

W. Ewing

CHECK

(mucar): Occurs in Job 20:3 the King James Version, "I have heard the check of my reproach" (the Revised Version (British and American) "the reproof which putteth me to shame"), i.e. a check or reproof, such as that which closes the last speech of Job (chapter 19), and intended to put Zophar to shame.

CHECKER-WORK; (NETWORK)

chek’-er-wurk (sebhakhah): This was a kind of ornamentation used on the tops of the pillars of Jachin and Boaz before the porch of the Temple (1Ki 7:17). Its exact form is not known. See TEMPLE. For "a broidered coat" (Ex 28:4 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) gives "a coat of checker work."

See BROIDERED; EMBROIDERY.

CHEDORLAOMER

ked-or-la-o’-mer, ked-or-la’-omer (kedhorla‘omer; Chodollogomor):

1. was He the Elamite King Kudur-lahgumal?

2. Kudur-lahgumal and the Babylonians

3. The Son of Eri-Ekua

4. Durmah-ilani, Tudhul(a) and Kudur-lahmal

5. The Fate of Sinful Rulers

6. The Poetical Legend

7. Kudur-lahgumal’s Misdeeds

8. The Importance of the Series

The name of the Elamite overlord with whom Amraphel, Arioch and Tidal marched against Sodom and

Gomorrah, and the other cities of the plain (Ge 14:1 ff). The Greek (Septuagint) form of the name is Chodollogomor, implying a different vocalization, the assimilation of "R "with "L", and the pronunciation of "‘o" as "gho" (Codorlaghomer). This suggests that the Elamite form, in cuneiform, would be Kudur-lagamar, the second element being the name of a god, and the whole therefore meaning "servant of La‘omer" (Lagamar), or the like. A Babylonian deity worshippeal at Dilmu, Lagamal, may be the same as the Elamite Lagamar. This name is not found in the cuneiform inscriptions, unless it be, as is possible, the fancifully-written Kudur-lah(gu)mal (or Kodorlahgomal) of three late Babylonian legends, one of which is in poetical form. Besides this Elamite ruler, two of these tablets mention also a certain Eri-Aku or Eri-Akua, son of Durmah-ilani, and one of them refers to Tudhul(a) or Tidal.

See ERI-AKU, 4.

1. Was He the Elamite King Kudur-lahgumal?:

Objections have been made to the identification of Chedorlaomer with the Kudur-lah(gu)mal of these texts, some Assyriologists having flatly denied the possibility, while others expressed the opinion that, though these names were respectively those with which they have been identified, they were not the personages referred to in Ge 14, and many have refrained from expressing an opinion at all. The main reason for the identification of Kudur-lah(gu)mal(?) with Chedorlaomer is its association with the names Eri-Eaku and Tudgul(a) found on two of the documents. No clear references to the expedition against the Cities of the Plain, however, have been found in these texts.

2. Kudur-lahgumal and the Babylonians:

The longer of the two prose compositions (Brit. Mus., Sp. II, 987) refers to the bond of heaven (extended?) to the four regions, and the fame which he (Merodach?) set for (the Elamites) in Babylon, the city of (his) glory. So (?the gods), in their faithful (or everlasting) counsel, decreed to Kudur-lahgumal, king of Elam (their favor?). He came down, and (performed) what was good to them, and exercised dominion in Babylon, the city of Kar-Dunias (Babylonia). When in power, however, he acted in a way which did not please the Babylonians, for he loved the winged fowl, and favored the dog which crunched the bone. "What(?) king of Elam was there who had (ever) (shown favor to?) the shrine of E-saggil?" (E-sagila, the great temple of Belus at Babylon).

3. The Son of Eri-Ekua:

A letter from Durmah-ilani son of Eri-Ekua (?Arioch) is at this point quoted, and possibly forms the justification for the sentences which had preceded, giving, as they do, reasons for the intervention of the native ruler. The mutilation of the inscription, however, makes the sense and sequence very difficult to follow.

4. Durmah-ilani, Tudhul(a) and Kudur-lahmal:

The less perfect fragment (Sp. III, 2) contains, near the beginning, the word hammu, and if this be, as Professor F. Hommel has suggested, part of the name Hammurabi (Amraphel), it would in all probability place the identification of Kudur-lahgumal(?) with Chedorlaomer beyond a doubt. This inscription states, that Merodach, in the faithfulness of his heart, caused the ruler not supporting (the temples of Babylonia) to be slain with the sword. The name of Durmah-ilani then occurs, and it seems to be stated of him that he carried off spoil, and Babylon and the temple E-saggil were inundated. He, however, was apparently murdered by his son, and old and young (were slain) with the sword. Then came Tudhul(a) or Tidal, son of Gazza(ni?), who also carried off spoil, and again the waters devastated Babylon and E-saggil. But to all appearance Tudhul(a), in his turn, was overtaken by his fate, for "his son shattered his head with the weapon of his hands." At this point there is a reference to Elam, to the city Ahhea(?), and to the land of Rabbatum, which he (? the king of Elam) had spoiled. Whether this refers to some expedition to Palestine or not is uncertain, and probably unlikely, as the next phrase speaks of devastation inflicted in Babylonia.

5. The Fate of Sinful Rulers:

But an untoward fate overtook this ruler likewise, for Kudur-lahmal (= lahgumal), his son, pierced his heart with the steel sword of his girdle. All these references to violent deaths are apparently cited to show the dreadful end of certain kings, "lords of sin," with whom Merodach, the king of the gods, was angry.

6. The Poetical Legend:

The third text is of a poetical nature, and refers several times to "the enemy, the Elamite"—apparently Kudur-lahgu(mal). In this noteworthy inscription, which, even in its present imperfect state, contains 78 lines of wedge-written text, the destruction wrought by him is related in detail. He cast down the door (of the temple) of Istar; entered Du- mah, the place where the fates were declared (see BABEL, BABYLON), and told his warriors to take the spoil and the goods of the temple.

7. Kudur-lahgumal’s Misdeeds:

He was afraid, however, to proceed to extremities, as the god of the place "flashed like lightning, and shook the (holy) places." The last two paragraphs state that he set his face to go down to Tiamtu (the seacoast; see CHALDEA), whither Ibi-Tutu, apparently the king of that district, had hastened, and founded a pseudo-capital. But the Elamite seems afterward to have taken his way north again, and after visiting Borsippa near Babylon, traversed "the road of darkness—the road to Mesku" (?Mesech). He destroyed the palace, subdued the princes, carried off the spoil of all the temples and took the goods (of the people) to Elam. At this point the text breaks off.

8. The Importance of the Series:

Where these remarkable inscriptions came from there ought to be more of the same nature, and if these

be found, the mystery of Chedorlaomer and Kudur-lahgumal will probably be solved. At present it can only be said, that the names all point to the early period of the Elamite rulers called Kudurides, before the land of Tiamtu or Tamdu was settled by the Chaldeans. Evidently it was one of the heroic periods of Babylonian history, and some scribe of about 350 BC had collected together a number of texts referring to it. All three tablets were purchased (not excavated) by the British Museum, and reached that institution through the same channel. See the Journal of the Victoria Institute, 1895-96, and Professor Sayce in Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology (1906), 193 ff, 241 ff; (1907), 7 ff.

T. G. Pinches

CHEEK TEETH

(methalle‘ah, transposed from malta‘ah (only in Ps 58:6), literally "the biter," "crusher," "molar," "jaw-teeth," "great teeth" (Job 29:17 m; Joe 1:6)).

Figurative: The word is used as a synonym of reckless strength and cruelty.

CHEEK; CHEEKBONE

chek, chek’-bon:

(1) lechi; siagon, "the jaw," "jaw-bone," "side of the face." The Hebrew word denotes originally freshness and rounded softness of the cheek, a sign of beauty in youth and maiden (So 1:10; 5:13). The oriental guards with jealous care his cheek from touch or defilement, therefore a stroke on the cheek was, and is to this day, regarded as an act of extreme rudeness of behavior, a deadly affront. Our Saviour, however, teaches us in Mt 5:39 and Lu 6:29 that even this insult is to be ignored and pardoned.

Jawbones of animals have been frequently used as tools and weapons among primitive people. We see this sufficiently proven from cave deposits in many parts of the world, and from recent ethnological researches, especially in Australia. In the light of this evidence it is interesting to note that Samson used a jawbone of an ass with success against his enemies the Philistines (Jud 15:15).

(2) malqoach (Ps 22:15), is a dual form indicative of the two jaws, to which a parched tongue seems to cleave.

(3) methalle‘ah (Job 29:17), better "cheek teeth" (which see).

H. L. E. Luering

CHEER; CHEERFULNESS

cher, cher’-fool-nes: The English word "cheer" meant:

(1) originally face, countenance (Greek kara, "head," through Old French, chere, "face"),

(2) then the expression on the face, especially

(3) the expression of good spirits, and finally

(4) good spirits, without any reference to the facial expression.

The noun "cheer" in English Versions of the Bible is only found with adjective "good" (except 1 Esdras 9:54, "great cheer"), the word not having quite lost its earlier neutral character (any face expression, whether joyous or otherwise). In Old Testament, Tobh, is translated "cheer," "let thy heart cheer thee" (see GOOD); sameach, "to rejoice" is so translated in De 24:5, "shall cheer his wife" (the King James Version "cheer up his wife"), and Jud 9:13, "wine, which cheereth God (’elohim) and man." The phrase "of good cheer" occurs in Old Testament in Job 9:27 (the King James Version "comfort"); in Apocrypha, 1 Esdras 9:54; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:6; Baruch 4:5,30; Sirach 18:32 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "luxury"); in New Testament for Greek euthumeo, euthumos, in Ac 27:22,25,36, and for tharseo in Mt 9:2,22. (the King James Version "comfort"); Mt 14:27; Mr 6:50; 10:49 (RV; "comfort" in the King James Version); Joh 16:33; Ac 23:11. "Cheer" as verb transitive occurs in Ec 11:9; Deu 24:5; Jud 9:13.

Cheerful occurs in Pr 15:13,15 (the King James Version "merry"); Zec 8:19; 9:17 the King James Version; Sirach 30:25; 2Co 9:7.

Cheerfully, Ac 24:10.

Cheerfulness, Ro 12:8.

D. Miall Edwards

CHEESE

chez.

See FOOD; MILK.

CHELAL

ke’-lal (kelal, "perfection"): One of the bene Pachath-Mo’abh who took "strange wives" (Ezr 10:30).

CHELCIAS

kel’-si-as.

See HELKIAS; HILKIAH.

CHELLIANS

kel’-i-anz: The people of "Chellus" (Judith 2:23) (which see).

CHELLUH

kel’-u.

See CHELUHI.

CHELLUS

kel’-us (Chellous), a place named (Judith 1:9) among those West of the Jordan to which Nebuchadnezzar sent his summons. It is mentioned along with "Kades," and as it lay North of the "children of Ishmael" it may with some probability be taken as lying Southwest of Jerusalem. It has been conjectured that it may be Chalutzah (Reland, Palestine, 717), a place under the form Elusa well known to the ancient geographers.

CHELOD

ke’-lod (Cheleoud, Cheleoul): In Judith 1:6 it is said that "many nations of the sons of Chelod assembled themselves to the battle." They are mentioned as obeying the summons of Nebuchadnezzar to his war against Arphaxad. No very probable suggestion has been made as to the meaning of Chelod.

CHELUB

ke’-lub:

(1) kelubh, father of Mehir (1Ch 4:11); the name is probably a variation of Caleb. Wellhausen (De gentibus et familiis Judaeis) reads kalebh ben chezron.

(2) Father of Ezri (1Ch 27:26), one of the officers of David.

See GENEALOGY.

CHELUBAI

ke-loo’-bi (kelubhay): Another form of Caleb used in 1Ch 2:9; compare 1Ch 2:18,42. Caleb is here described as the brother of Jerahmeel, and son of Hezron, a remote ancestor, instead of as the son of Jephunneh.

See CALEB.

CHELUHI

kel’-oo-hi (keluhi, Kt.; keluhu, Qere; the Revised Version, margin Cheluhu; the King James Version Chelluh): Mentioned in the list of persons with foreign wives (Ezr 10:35 = 1 Esdras 9:34).

CHEMARIM

kem’-a-rim (kemarim, a plural whose singular komer is not found in the Old Testament): Occurs only once in the text of English Versions of the Bible (Ze 1:4, the King James Version Chemarims), though the Hebrew word is found also in 2Ki 23:5 (English Versions "idolatrous priests") and Ho 10:5 (English Versions "priests," English Versions margins, however, having "Chemarim" in both places). Some regard the word as an interpolation in Ze 1:4, since the Septuagint omits it and its presence disturbs the parallelism. The word, which is of Aramaic origin (kumra, priest), is used in the Old Testament only in an unfavorable sense, its origin and associations naturally suggesting Syriac affinities. In the Syriac, however, no such connotation is involved. In the Peshitta version of the Old Testament it is used indifferently of idolatrous priests and of priests of Yahweh, while in the same version of the New Testament it is used of the Levitical priests and of our Lord (e.g. Heb 2:17; 3:1; 4:14,15, and often) and in Ac 19:35 it is the rendering of neokoros (the Revised Version (British and American) "temple-keeper," the King James Version "worshipper"). The question of the root idea of the word remains unsettled. The traditional supposition, which finds some support even among modern scholars, is that the verbal form means "to be black," the priests being supposed to have been clad in black. But it is doubtful whether the root had this meaning. Another conjecture takes the root to mean "to be sad," the priest being a man of a sad countenance, an ascetic. Cheyne would relate the word to the Assyrian kummaru, having the sense of "a clean vesture." It is at all events probable that the priests, both in Israel and in the surrounding nations, employed white vestments, rather than black, when in the performance of their official functions. According to the Mishna, Middoth, verse 4, a Levitical priest who had become disqualified for service put on black garments and departed, while the others put on white garments and went in and ministered. The reference to the Baal worship in 2Ki 10:22 seems more congruous with this view; hence, probably blackrobed priests (Chemarim) of Baal and the unfaithful priests of Yahweh shall be cut off together. G. A. Smith (BTP, II, 56) reads "the priestlings with the priests."

J. R. Van Pelt

CHEMOSH

ke’-mosh (kemosh; Chamos):

1. Moabites, the People of Chemosh

2. Solomon and Chemosh Worship

3. Josiah Putting Down Chemosh Worship

4. Chemosh and Ammonites

5. Moabite Stone

6. Mesha’s Inscription and the Old Testament

7. Chemosh in the Inscription

8. Parallels between Inscription and Old Testament Record

9. Ethical Contrast

LITERATURE

1. Moabites, the People of Chemosh:

The national God of the Moabites, as Baal of the Zidonians, or Milcom (Moloch, Malcam) of the Ammonites. The Moabites are apostrophized in an old Hebrew song as the "people of Chemosh" (Nu 21:29). Jeremiah in his oracle of doom upon Moab has recourse to the same old song and calls the people "the people of Chemosh." The impotence of the god to deliver his people is described by the prophet in figures representing him as going into captivity with them, his priests and princes together, and Moab is to be ashamed of him as Israel was of the Golden Calf of Bethel, which did not avail to save the Northern Kingdom from the conquering Assyrian power (Jer 48:7,13,16).

2. Solomon and Chemosh Worship:

For Chemosh, "the abomination of Moab," as for Moloch, "the abomination of the children of Ammon," Solomon, under the influence of his idolatrous wives, built a high place in the mount before Jerusalem (1Ki 11:7). It was natural that they should desire to worship still after the manner of the gods of their native land, but although the effect of all this was seen in the moral and spiritual deterioration of Solomon himself there is no indication that the immoralities and cruelties associated with such worship

were then practiced in Jerusalem. In the days of Ahaz and Manasseh, even as early as the days of Abijam of Judah, they were (1Ki 15:12,13).

3. Josiah Putting Down Chemosh Worship:

Josiah found these abominations of alien worship, which had been introduced by Solomon and added to by Ahaz and Manasseh, flourishing when he came to the throne. Moved by the prohibitions of the Book of the Law (De 12:29-31; 18:10), Josiah pulled down and defiled the high places and the altars, and in order to make a clean sweep of the idolatrous figures, "he brake in pieces the pillars," or obelisks, "and cut down the Asherim," or sacred poles, "and filled their places with the bones of men" (2Ki 23:1- 20).

4. Chemosh and Ammonites:

There is one passage where Chemosh is designated the god of the Ammonites (Jud 11:24). Jephthah is disputing the right of the Ammonites to invade territory which belongs to Israel because Yahweh has given it to them by conquest. And he asks: ‘Shouldst thou not possess the territory of those whom Chemosh, thy god, dispossesses, and we the territory of all whom Yahweh, our god, dispossesses?’ It may be that he is called here the god of the Ammonites by a mere oversight of the historian; or that Moab and Ammon being kindred nations descended from a common ancestor, Lot, Chemosh may in a sense belong to both. We notice, however, that Jephthah’s argument in meeting the claim preferred by the king of Ammon passes on to Israel’s relation to the Moabites and makes mention only of well-known Moabite cities. Chemosh is accordingly named because of his association with Moab, the cities of which are being spoken of, although strictly and literally Milcom should have been named in an appeal addressed as a whole to the Ammonites (Jud 11:12-28; compare Moore at the place).

5. Moabite Stone:

The discovery of the Moabite Stone in 1868 at Dibon has thrown light upon Chemosh and the relations of Moab to its national god. The monument, which is now one of the most precious treasures of the Louvre in Paris, bears an inscription which is the oldest specimen of Semitic alphabetic writing extant, commemorating the successful effort made about 860 or 850 BC by Mesha, king of Moab, to throw off the yoke of Israel. We know from the Old Testament record that Moab had been reduced to subjection by David (2Sa 8:2); that it paid a heavy tribute to Ahab, king of Israel (2Ki 3:4); and that, on the death of Ahab, Mesha its king rebelled against Israelite rule (2Ki 3:5). Not till the reign of Jehoram was any effort made to recover the lost dominion. The king of Israel then allied himself with the kings of Judah and Edom, and marching against Moab by the way of the Red Sea, inflicted upon Mesha a defeat so decisive that the wrath of his god, Chemosh, could be appeased only by the sacrifice of his son (2Ki 3:6 ff).

6. Mesha’s Inscription and the Old Testament:

The historical situation described in the Old Testament narrative is fully confirmed by Mesha’s

inscription. There are, however, divergences in detail. In the Book of Kings the revolt of Mesha is said to have taken place after the death of Ahab. The inscription implies that it must have taken place by the middle of Ahab's reign. The inscription implies that the subjection of Moab to Israel had not been continuous from the time of David, and says that 'Omri, the father of Ahab, had reasserted the power of Israel and had occupied at least a part of the land.

7. Chemosh in the Inscription:

It is with what the inscription says of Chemosh that we are chiefly concerned. On the monument the name appears twelve times. Mesha is himself the son of Chemosh, and it was for Chemosh that he built the high place upon which the monument was found. He built it because among other reasons Chemosh had made him to see his desire upon them that hated him. It was because Chemosh was angry with his land that 'Omri afflicted Moab many days. 'Omri had taken possession of the land of Medeba and Israel dwelt in it his days and half his son's days, but Chemosh restored it in Mesha's days. Mesha took 'Ataroth which the king of Israel had built for himself, slew all the people of the city, and made them a gazing-stock to Chemosh and to Moab. Mesha brought thence the altar-hearth of Dodo, and dragged it before Chemosh in Kerioth. By command of Chemosh, Mesha attacked Nebo and fought against Israel, and after a fierce struggle he took the place, slaying the inhabitants en masse, 7,000 men and women and maidservants, devoting the city to 'Ashtor-Chemosh and dragging the altar vessels of Yahweh before Chemosh. Out of Jahaz, too, which the king of Israel had built, Chemosh drove him before Mesha. At the instigation of Chemosh, Mesha fought against Horonaim, and, although the text is defective in the closing paragraph, we may surmise that Chemosh did not fail him but restored it to his dominions.

8. Parallels between Inscription and Old Testament Record:

Naturally enough there is considerable obscurity in local and personal allusions. Dodo may have been a local god worshipped by the Israelites East of the Jordan. Ashtor- Chemosh may be a compound divinity of a kind not unknown to Semitic mythology, Ashtor representing possibly the Phoenician Ashtoreth. What is of importance is the recurrence of so many phrases and expressions applied to Chemosh which are used of Yahweh in the Old Testament narratives. The religious conceptions of the Moabites reflected in the inscription are so strikingly like those of the Israelites that if only the name of Yahweh were substituted for that of Chemosh we might think we were reading a chapter of the Books of Kings. It is not in the inscriptions, however, but in the Old Testament narrative that we find a reference to the demand of Chemosh for human sacrifice. "He took his eldest son," says the Hebrew historian, "that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall. And there was great wrath against Israel: and they departed from him, and returned to their own land" (2Ki 3:27). This appears to indicate that the Israelites had to give up their purpose to fasten the yoke of bondage again upon Mesha and that they returned empty-handed to their own land. But this fortunate result for Moab was due to the favor of Chemosh, and in particular to the human sacrifice by which he was propitiated.

9. Ethical Contrast:

If we find in these representations of Chemosh in the Old Testament narrative and in Mesha's inscription a striking similarity to the Hebrew conception of Yahweh, we cannot fail to notice the lack of the higher moral and spiritual elements supplied to the religion of Israel by the prophets and indeed from Moses and Abraham downward. "Chemosh," says W. Baudissin, "is indeed the ruler of his people whom he protects as Yahweh the Israelites, whom he chastises in his indignation, and from whom he accepts horrible propitiatory gifts. But of a God of grace whose long-suffering leads back even the erring to Himself, of a Holy God to whom the offering of a pure and obedient heart is more acceptable than bloody sacrifices, of such a God as is depicted in Israel's prophets and sweet singers there is no trace in the Moabite picture of Chemosh. While Mesha is represented as offering up his own son in accordance with the stern requirements of his religion, Old Testament law-givers and prophets from the beginning condemned human sacrifice" (RE3, article "Kemosh").

LITERATURE.

RE3, article "Kemosh"; Cooke, Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions, "Moabite Stone," 1-14; W. Robertson Smith, Prophets of Israel, 49 ff; Sayce, Sayce, Higher Criticism and the Monuments, 364 ff.

T. Nicol.

CHENAANAH

ke-na'-a-na (kena'anah, feminine form of "Canaan," though others explain it as "toward Canaan"): The name of two men:

(1) The fourth-named of the seven sons of Bilham, son of Jediael, of the tribe of Benjamin, a leading warrior in the time of David (1Ch 7:10).

(2) Father of the false prophet Zedekiah, who encouraged Ahab against Micaiah (1Ki 22:11,24; 2Ch 18:10,23).

CHENANI

ke-na'-ni (kenani, "planted"): One of the names mentioned in Ne 9:4, in connection with the constitution of "congregation." If the names represent houses or families, eight Levitical houses probably sang some well-known psalm on this occasion. If they are names of individual representatives, they were probably deputed to recite or chant some special prayer in order to lead the worship of the people.

CHENANIAH

ken-a-ni'-a (kenanyahu, and kenanyah, literally "established by God"): Chief of the Levites who was over "the songs," or "the carrying" (namely, "of the ark") from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem

(1Ch 15:22,27; 26:29).

CHEPHAR-AMMONI

ke-far-am’-o-ni (the King James Version Chephar-haammoni; kephar ha‘ammoni; Codex Vaticanus, Kepheira kai Monei; A, Kapherammin, "village of the Ammonites"): A place in the territory of Benjamin (Jos 18:24). It may be identical with Kefr ‘Ana, a ruined site about two miles to the Northeast of Bethel.

CHEPHAR-HAAMONI

ke-far-ha-am’-o-ni.

See CHEPHAR-AMMONI.

CHEPHIRAH

ke-fi’-ra (ha-kephirah; Codex Vaticanus, Kapheira (Jos 9); Codex Alexandrinus has Chepheira, Codex Vaticanus has kai Pheira (Jos 18)): One of the cities of the Hivites who by guile made alliance with Israel (Jos 9:17). It was in the lot of Benjamin (Jos 18:26), and was reoccupied after the return from Babylon (Ezr 2:25; Ne 7:29). It is represented by the modern Kefireh, to the Southwest of Gibeon, and North of Karyat el-‘Anab. It stands on high ground, with many ancient remains.

CHERAN

ke’-ran (keran): A Horite clan-name, occurring in the genealogy of Seir, the Horite (Ge 36:26), and in the parallel list in 1Ch 1:41. Dillmann derives it from kar, "a lamb."

CHERETHITES

ker’-e-thits (kerethim, ha-kerethi; Chelethi "executioners," "life-guardsmen"): A people in South Palestine whose territory bordered upon that of Judah (1Sa 30:14). In 1Sa 30:16 this land is apparently identical with that of the Philistines. In Eze 25:16 the Philistines and the Cherethites are threatened together; while in Zep 2:5 the Cherethites are evidently the dwellers in "the land of the Philistines," "the inhabitants of the seacoast." Septuagint in both Ezekiel and Zephaniah renders the name "Cretans." The translators may have been "guided only by the sound." But Zeus Cretagenes in Gaza suggests a connection with the island of Crete. See, however, CAPHTOR. It may be taken as certain that the Cherethites were a Philistine clan. In conjunction with the Pelethites they are frequently named as forming the guard of David (2Sa 8:18, etc.). It was the custom of many ancient monarchs to have a guard of foreign mercenaries.

W. Ewing

CHERISH

cher’-ish (cakhan; thalpo): Cakhan, "to act the friend," "to be useful," is translated "cherish" (1Ki 1:2,4); thalpo, "to warm," "to make warm," "to foster" (Eph 5:29), said of the regard the husband should have for his wife, even as his own flesh which he "nourisheth and cherisheth, even as Christ also the church," and in 1Th 2:7, of Paul amongst his converts, "as when a nurse cherisheth her own children."

CHERITH, THE BROOK

ke’-rith (nachal kerith; Cheimarrhous Chorrhath): The place where Elijah hid and was miraculously fed, after announcing the drought to Ahab (1Ki 17:3). It is described as being "before," that is "east," of Jordan. It cannot therefore be identified with Wady el-Kelt, to the West of Jericho. The retreat must be sought in some recess of the Gilead uplands with which doubtless Elijah had been familiar in his earlier days.

CHERUB

ke’-rub (kerubh, Cheroub, Charoub): A place in Babylonia from which people whose genealogies had fallen into confusion went up at the return from exile (Ezr 2:59; Ne 7:61); unidentified. In 1 Esdras 5:36 we read "Charaathalan leading them, and Allar," a phrase that seems to have arisen through confusion of the names in the passages cited above.

CHERUBIC, FORMS IN THE CONSTELLATIONS

che-roo’-bik.

See ASTRONOMY.

CHERUBIM (1)

cher’-u-bim, cher’-oo-bim (kerubhim, plural of cherub, kerubh): Through the influence of the Septuagint, "cherubim" was used in the earlier English versions, also as a singular, hence, the plural was made to sound "cherubims." The etymology of the word cannot be ascertained.

1. As Guardians of Paradise:

In Ge 3:24 the cherubim are placed by God, after the expulsion of Adam from the garden of Eden, at the east thereof, together with the flaming sword "to keep the way of the tree of life." In their function as guardians of Paradise the cherubim bear an analogy to the winged bulls and lions of Babylonia and

Assyria, colossal figures with human faces standing guard at the entrance of temples (and palaces), just as in Egypt the approaches to the sanctuaries are guarded by sphinxes. But the Babylonian colossi go by the name of lamassu, or shedu; no designation at all approaching the Hebrew kerubh has so far been found in the Assyrian language. Nor are thus named the winged figures, half human and half animal, which in Babylonian and Persian art are found on both sides of the "sacred tree." Thus, a Babylonian origin of the Hebrew cherubim is neither proved nor disproved. If we look for further analogies which, of course, do not indicate a borrowing on the part of the Hebrews, we may mention the fabulous griffins (grupes), usually represented as having the heads and wings of an eagle and the body and hind quarters of a lion; they were believed by the Greeks to inhabit Scythia, and to keep jealous watch over the gold of that country.

2. The Garden as the Abode of the Gods:

If we read between the lines of the Paradise account in Ge (compare Ge 3:8), the garden of Eden, the primeval abode of man, reveals itself as more than that: it was apparently the dwelling-place of God. In the polytheistic story of the creation of the world and early life of man, which, while in several respects analogous (compare Ge 3:22), is devoid of the more spiritual notions of Hebraism, the garden was the abode of the gods who alone had access to the tree of life from the fruit of which they derived their immortality. Adam, before the fall, is conceived as a superhuman being; for while he is forbidden to taste of the fruit of the tree of knowledge, the way to immortality is open to him; for it is only after transgressing the Divine command that he merits death and becomes mortal. The choice of immortal innocence and mortal knowledge lay before him; he elected death with knowledge.

3. The Cherubim as Attendants of the Deity:

The mythical elements of the Paradise story are still more patent in Eze 28:13 ff, where the fall of the king of Tyre is likened to that of primeval man. The garden is situated on a holy mountain of Elohim(= God to Ezekiel, but gods in the primitive source), the ‘mountain of assembly’ of Isa 14:13, high above the stars in the recesses of the North. It is a wonderful place, adorned with all manner of precious stones. There man, perfect from the day he was created, resplendent with beauty, excelling in wisdom, walks among the fiery stones, like a cherub with outstretched wings. The cherubs are apparently the attendants of the Deity, beauteous angels, of whom man was to be one: but he fell from glory and was hurled from the sanctuary which he had polluted. Some of the angelic attendants of the Deity within are placed in Genesis without, to do service as guardians of the unapproachable holy garden.

4. As Bearers of the Throne:

As attendants of God, they bear the throne upon which He descends from His high abode. Thus in the description of a theophany in Ps 18, we read: " He bowed the heavens also, and came down; And thick darkness was under his feet. And he rode upon a cherub and did fly; Yea, he soared upon the wings of the wind." (Ps 18:9,10) Hence, the Lord, or, as the fuller title goes, the Lord of Hosts, is repeatedly styled "He that

sitteth (throned) above the cherubim" (Ps 80:1; 99:1; 1Sa 4:4, and elsewhere). There is certainly no trace here of bull figures: bulls do not fly. The underlying conception is, it seems, rather that of the storm cloud. Compare Ps 104:3: " Who maketh the clouds his chariot; Who walketh upon the wings of the wind." The Hebrew for "chariot" is rekhubh, a sort of inverted kerubh. 5. In the Vision of Ezekiel:

But the function of the cherubim as bearers and movers of the Divine throne is brought out most clearly in the vision of Ezekiel (Eze 1, with which compare Eze 10). In chapter 1 the prophet designates them as "living creatures" (chayyoth); but upon hearing God's words addressed to the "man clothed in linen" (Eze 10:2) he perceives that the living creatures which he saw in the first vision were cherubim (Eze 10:20); hence, in Eze 9:3 the chariot or throne, from which the glory of God went up, is spoken of as a cherub. The following is a description in detail of the cherubim as seen by Ezekiel. They are represented as four living creatures, each with four faces, man, lion, ox (replaced in the parallel chapter by cherub), and eagle (Eze 1:10; 10:14), having the figure and hands of men (Eze 1:5,8), and the feet of calves (Eze 1:7). Each has four wings, two of which are stretched upward (Eze 1:11), meeting above and sustaining the "firmament," that is, the bottom of the Divine throne (Eze 1:22; 10:1), while two are stretched downward, conformable the one to the other, so as to cover their bodies (Eze 1:11,23). In appearance, the living creatures resemble coals of fire (compare Eze 10:2,6 f, where the "man clothed in linen" is bidden fill both his hands with coals of fire from between the cherubim), burning like torches, the fire flashing up and down among the creatures, a bright fire out of which lightning goes forth (Eze 1:13). Thus the creatures run and vanish as the appearance of a flash of lightning (Eze 1:14). The cherubim do not turn as they change direction, but always go straight forward (Eze 1:9,17; 10:11), as do the wheels of the cherubic chariot with rings full of eyes round about (Eze 1:18; 10:12). The cherubim represent the spirit, or will, in the wheels: at the direction of the spirit, the wheels are lifted up from the bottom and the chariot moves upward (Eze 1:19 f; 10:16 f). The cherubim are thus the moving force of the vehicle.

6. Relation to Seraphim and Other Angels:

Ezekiel's cherubim are clearly related to the seraphim in Isaiah's inaugural vision (Isa 6). Like the cherubim, the seraphim are the attendants on God as He is seated upon a throne high and exalted; they are also winged creatures: with twain they cover their faces, and with twain they cover their feet, and with twain they fly. Like the Levites in the sanctuary below, they sing a hymn of adoration: "Holy, holy, holy, is Yahweh of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." In the Book of Enoch, the cherubim, seraphim, and ophannim (wheels), and all the angels of power constitute the "host of God," the guardians of His throne, the singers of praise ascribing blessedness to "the Lord of Spirits," with the archangel Gabriel at their head (see Isa 61:10 f;). And so in the Jewish daily liturgy the seraphim, ophannim, and "living creatures" constitute the heavenly choir who, the elect ministers of the Living God, ready to do the will of their maker with trembling, intone in sweet harmony the Thrice-holy. In the Talmud, the cherubim are represented as having the likeness of youths (with a fanciful etymology, ke plus rubh, "like a youth"; Cukk 5b; Chag 13b), while, according to the Midrash, they have no definite shape, but appear indifferently as men or women, or as spirits and angelic beings (Ge rabba' 21).

7. In Revelation 4:

The "four living creatures" of Re 4:6 ff are clearly modeled upon Ezekiel, with supplementary touches from Isaiah. Full of eyes before and behind, they are in the midst of the throne, and round about it. One resembles a lion, the other a calf, and the third a man, and the fourth a flying eagle. Each of the creatures has six wings. "They have no rest day and night, saying, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God, the Almighty, who was and who is and who is to come."

8. Ornamental Cherubim in the Temple of Solomon:

In the temple of Solomon, two gigantic cherubic images of olive-wood plated with gold, ten cubits high, stood in the innermost sanctuary (the debhir) facing the door, whose wings, five cubits each, extended, two of them meeting in the middle of the room to constitute the throne, while two extended to the walls (1Ki 6:23-28; 8:6,7; 2Ch 3:10-13; 5:7,8). The Chronicler represents them as the chariot of the Lord (1Ch 28:18). There were also images of the cherubim carved on the gold-plated cedar planks which constituted the inner walls of the temple, and upon the olive-wood doors (1Ki 6:29,35; 2Ch 3:7); also on the bases of the portable lavers, interchanging with lions and oxen (1Ki 7:29-36). According to the Chronicler, they were also woven in the veil of the Holy of Holies (2Ch 3:14).

9. In the Temple of Ezekiel:

Ezekiel represents the inner walls of the temple as carved with alternating palm trees and cherubim, each with two faces, the lion looking on one side, the man on the other (Eze 41:18-25).

10. In the Tabernacle:

In the Tabernacle, there were two cherubim of solid gold upon the golden slab of the "lid," or "mercy-seat," facing each other, with wings outstretched above, so as to constitute a throne on which the glory of the Lord appeared, and from which He spake (Ex 25:18-22; 37:7-9; Nu 7:89; Heb 9:5). There were also cherubim woven into the texture of the inner curtain of the Tabernacle and the veil (Ex 26:1,31; 36:8,35). There were no cherubim in the temple of Herod, but the walls were painted with figures of them (see Talmud Yoma' 54a). In the times of Josephus no one knew what the Scriptural cherubim looked like (Ant., VIII, iii, 3).

LITERATURE.

Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, under the word; KAT3, 529 f, and references; commentaries on Genesis and Ezekiel.

Max L. Margolis

CHERUBIM (2)

The cherubic forms in the constellation figures.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 8.

CHESALON

kes’-a-lon (kecalon; Chaslon, Chasalon): One of the cities on the Northern boundary of Judah (Jos 15:10). In the 4th century it was a "very large village." It is now Kesla, 2,087 ft. above sea-level, a small village perched on a mountain ridge to the South of Wady el Humar. See Palestine Exploration Fund, III, 25, 26; Sh XVII.

CHESED

ke’-sed, kes’-ed (kasdim; Chaszad): One of the sons of Nahor and Milcah (Ge 22:22); was probably the father of the Casdim. The early Babylonian form Kasdu appears in Assyrian as Kaldu or Kaldu. English Versions of the Bible follows the Assyrian and Greek style of writing the name and uses Chaldees or Chaldeans instead of Casdim. The Chaldeans dwelt in the lower valley of the Euphrates, at the head of the Persian Gulf. Abram came from Ur of the Chaldees (Ge 11:28,31; 15:7; Ne 9:7). In Job 1:17 the Casdim are described as invading the land of Uz, the eldest brother of Chesed (Ge 22:21,22). In the days of Nebuchadrezzar the Casdim overran Syria and Palestine and carried the people of Judah in successive deportations into captivity (2Ki 24:1-10; 25:1 ff). In Da 2:2,5 the Casdim are named with the magicians and astrologers as a learned class, skilled in interpretations. Casdim is sometimes used in Hebrew for the land of Chaldea (Eze 23:15 f; 11:24).

John Richard Sampey

CHESIL

ke’-sil, kes’-il (kecil; A, Chaseir): A town in the extreme South of Judah named with Eltolad, Hormah and Ziklag (Jos 15:30). The name does not occur again. In Jos 19:4 it is replaced by Bethul (Septuagint Baithel), and in 1Ch 4:30 by Bethuel. "Chesil" may have arisen from a misreading of the text.

CHESNUT

ches’-nut.

See CHESTNUT.

CHEST

chest (’aron, genazim; kibotos):

(1) The ark of the covenant in Old Testament is invariably denoted by the word ‘aron, elsewhere rendered the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "chest."

See ARK.

(2) ‘Aron is also the word rendered "coffin" (Ge 50:26: "and he was put in a coffin in E.").

See COFFIN.

(3) In Kings and Chronicles (2Ki 12:9,10; 2Ch 24:8,10,11) ‘aron stands uniformly for a money chest. It is the "chest" that Jehoiada, the priest, placed in the court "beside the altar" and "bored a hole in the lid of" that the priests might "put therein all the money that was brought into the house of Yahweh" (2Ki 12:9); and "the chest" that King Joash commanded to be made and set "without at the gate of the house of Yahweh" to receive "the tax that Moses the servant of God laid upon Israel" (2Ch 24:8,10,11). One feature is common to the thing meant in all these applications—the c. was rectangular in shape, and, most probably in every instance, made of wood.

(4) Josephus (Ant., VI, 1,2) uses the equivalent of the word to denote the "coffer" (1Sa 6:8 ff English Versions), or small chest, in which the princes of Philistia deposited the gold mice.

(5) In New Testament times the "chests" that were provided in the court of the women, in the temple of Herod, to receive the various kinds of money gifts had the exceptional shape of a trumpet (if Sheqalim, vi.5 may be trusted)—wide at the bottom and gradually narrowing toward the top, hence, called shopharoth. It was into these that the Master was watching the multitude casting in their money when He saw the poor widow cast in her two mites (Mr 12:41,42).

(6) In Eze 27:24, where the prophet is giving an inventory of the merchandise of Tyre, another word entirely is used (genazim), and it is rendered in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "chests" ("chests of rich apparel, bound with cords and made of cedar"). According to Cornill, Davidson, Smend and others this rendering is without sufficient support (see Smith, Dictionary of the Bible and commentary in the place cited.).

George B. Eager

CHESTNUT, TREE

ches’-nut.

See PLANE TREE.

CHESULLOTH

ke-sul’-oth (ha-keculloth; B, Chasaloth, A, Achesaloth): A town on the border of Zebulun (Jos 19:18), the same as Chisloth-tabor (Jos 19:12). It is represented by the modern village Iksal on the northern edge of Esdraelon, circa 3 miles West of Mt. Tabor.

CHETH khath.

See CHETH.

CHETTIIM

ket’-i-im, ket-i’-im (kittim).

See KITTIM.

CHEW; CUD

choo, chu, (ma‘aleh gerah, literally "bringing up" (American Revised Versions margin), i.e. "chewing the cud," from garar, "to roll," "ruminate"): One of the marks of cleanliness, in the sense of fitness for food, of a quadruped, given in Le 11:3 and De 14:6, is the chewing of the cud. Among the animals considered clean are therefore included the ox, the sheep, the goat, the hart, the gazelle, the roebuck, the wild goat, the pygarg, the antelope and the chamois. Several of the forbidden animals are expressly named in the passages, e.g. the camel, the rock-badger, the hare and the swine. In addition to the distinctions between clean and unclean animals mentioned in the Bible, the Talmud points out that the clean animals have no upper teeth, that their horns are either forked, or if not forked they are clear of splinters, notched with scales and round, and that certain portions of the meat of clean animals tear lengthwise as well as across. Many theories have been advanced as to the reasons for the distinctions with regard to the chewing of the cud and the cloven hoof. See the Jewish Encyclopedia under the word "Clean." The most obvious is that ruminating animals and animals without claws were apparently cleaner-feeding animals than the others.

Nathan Isaacs

CHEZIB

ke’-zib.

See ACHZIB (1).

CHICKEN

chik’-’-n, chik’-in (Anglo-Saxon, cicen or cycen; Latin, Gallus ferrugineus; alektruon, masculine and fem.): A barnyard fowl of any age. The record is to be found in the books of the disciples, but Jesus is responsible for the only direct mention of chickens in the Bible. Mt 23:37, contains this: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, that killeth the prophets, and stoneth them that are sent unto her! how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" Luke’s version of the same scene says: "Even as a hen gathereth her own brood under her wings" (Lu 13:34). There is no reference to chickens in the Old Testament sufficiently clear to specify our common domestic bird. The many references to "fatted fowl" in these older records, in accordance with the text and the history of the other nations, were pigeons, guineas, ducks, geese and swans. The importation of peafowl by Solomon is mentioned. The cock and hen are distinctive birds and would have been equally a marvel worth recording had they been introduced at that time. From the history of the bird in other countries it is a safe estimate to place their entrance into Palestine between five and six hundred years BC. That would allow sufficient time for them to increase and spread until they would be well known and common enough to be used effectively in the ministry of Jesus Christ. Every historical fact and indication points to the capture and domestication of the red jungle fowl in Burma. The Chinese records prove that they first secured imported fowl from the West in 1400 BC. Their use for food dated from 1200 to 800 BC, in the Book of Manu, but it was specified that only those that ran wild were to be eaten. From these countries they were imported to Greece and Italy, and from there carried south into Palestine Homer ([?] 10; compare also alektruon, P 602) names a man Cock, alektor, which seems to indicate that he knew the bird. Pindar gives them slight mention; Aristophanes wrote of them as "Persian birds," which indicates that they worked their way westward by importation. I cannot find them in the records of Aristotle, but Aristophanes advanced the idea that not the gods, but the birds were rulers of men in ancient times, and compared the comb of the cock with the crown of a king, and pointed out that when he "merely crows at dawn all jump up to their work" (Aves, 489-90). They were common in Italy in the days of Pliny, who was ten years old at the time of the crucifixion of Christ. Pliny gave many rules for raising chickens, proving that much was known of their habits in his time. Yet so credulous was he and so saturated with superstition, that, mixed with his instructions for preserving eggs, brooding and raising chickens, is the statement that on account of the fighting power of the cocks the lions feared them. He wrote that a man named Galerius in the time of the consuls, Lepidus and Catulus, owned a barnyard fowl that spoke. He names Lenius Strabo as the first man to devise a "coupe" to keep fowl in and "cram" them to fatness. He gave the laws governing the use of fowl at table and recorded that in Egypt eggs were hatched in manure beds, which is conclusive proof that birds had been carried across the Mediterranean several centuries previous. The records of Babylon, 600 BC, contain figures undoubtedly intended for cocks, and they were reproduced in marble in Lycia at that time, In all these reproductions the birds have the drooping tail of the wild, and there is no record of the date at which they erected the tail, lifted the head and assumed the upright bearing of today.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CHIDE

chid: Only in the Old Testament, translating Hebrew ribh, a word which is more frequently rendered "strive." Since in Ge 31:36; Jud 8:1; Ps 103:9, the strife is one of words, it means in these passages, "scold," or "sharply censure," and is applied either to mutinous protests and reproaches of inferiors to a superior, or, as in the last of these passages, to rebukes administered by a superior to inferiors.

CHIDON, THE THRESHING-FLOOR OF

ki’-don, (goren kidhon; Septuagint B, omits; A has Cheilo): The place where Uzza perished because he touched the ark (1Ch 13:9). In 2Sa 6:6 it is called the threshing- floor of Nachon. No name resembling either of these has been discovered.

CHIEF

chef: The English word is in the King James Version of Old Testament the translation of some 17 different Hebrew words, most frequently of ro’sh, "head," sar, "prince," and re’shith, "beginning." The principal changes made by the Revised Version (British and American) are:

(1) Hebrew beth’abh, "house of a father," being recognized as a technical term denoting a subdivision of a tribe, ro’sh is rendered literally "head," when it occurs in connection with this phrase, so that "chief fathers" (Num 31:26) and "chief of the fathers" (Ezr 1:5) become "heads of fathers’ houses";

(2) Hebrew naghidh and nasi’ are more accurately translated "prince" in such passages as 1Ch 5:2; Nu 3:32;

(3) the misinterpretations which brought about the translation "chief" for ‘atsilim, "corners," Isa 41:9, and for ma‘aleh, "ascent," in 2Ch 32:33, are corrected.

In the New Testament "chief" is in most of its appearances the translation of Greek protos, "first"; the Revised Version (British and American) reads "first" for the King James Version "chief," "chiefest," in Mt 20:27; Mr 10:44; Ac 16:12. The reading in the latter passage is a difficult one, but the King James Version "Philippi, which is the chief city of that part of Macedonia," seems to imply a political authority which Philippi did not possess; the Revised Version (British and American) "a city of Macedonia, the first of the district." Greek archon, "prince," "ruler," is rendered by the King James Version "chief," by the Revised Version (British and American) "prince," in Lu 11:15; the King James Version "chief Pharisees," the Revised Version (British and American) "rulers of the Pharisees," in Lu 14:1.

The original meaning of "chief" having been weakened, the comparative and superlative were admitted into English, the latter only appearing in the King James Version or the Revised Version: 1Sa 2:29; So 5:10; 2Co 11:5, etc. On "chief of Asia" (Ac 19:31 the King James Version) see ASIARCH.

F. K. Farr

CHIEF FRIENDS; GOOD MEN

See CHIEF FRIENDS; GOOD, CHIEF; CHIEF.

CHIEF MUSICIAN

mu-zish’-an.

See ASAPH.

CHIEF SEATS

chef sets (protokathedria): It was one of the reproaches urged by our Lord against the scribes and Pharisees that they loved the chief seats in the synagogues (Mt 23:6; Mr 12:39; Lu 11:43; 20:46). These were special seats set in front of the ark containing the Scriptures and of the reader’s platform, and facing the congregation. They were specially reserved for those who were held in the highest honor in the congregation. There were seventy-one such seats in the great synagogue of Alexandria, which were occupied by the members of the great Council in that city (see SYNAGOGUE).

J. Macartney Wilson

CHILD-BEARING

child’-bar-ing: Only in 1Ti 2:15: "She shall be saved through her (m "the") child-bearing" (dia tes teknogonias). The reference is to the calling of woman as wife and mother, as her ordinary lot in life, and to the anxieties, pains and perils of maternity, as the culmination and representation of the penalties woman has incurred because of the Fall (Ge 3:16). "She shall be saved by keeping faithfully and simply to her allotted sphere as wife and mother" (Dummelow). The preposition dia is not used here instrumentally, as though child-bearing were a means of her salvation, but locally, as in 1Co 3:15, "saved so as through fire," where life is saved by rushing through the flames. The explanation by reference to the incarnation, with an appeal to Ga 4:4, favored by Ellicott and others, seems very mechanical.

H. E. Jacobs

CHILD; CHILDREN

child, chil’-dren (ben, "son," yeledh, "child" na‘ar, "lad"; teknon, paidion): The Hebrews regarded the

presence of children in the family as a mark of Divine favor and greatly to be desired (Ge 15:2; 30:1; 1Sa 1:11,20; Ps 127:3; Lu 1:7,28). The birth of a male child was especially a cause for rejoicing (Ps 128:3, Hebrew); more men, more defenders for the tribe. If there were no sons born to a household, that family or branch became lost. If the wife proved childless, other wife or wives might be added to the family (Ge 16 f). Further, each Jewish mother, at least in later times, hoped that her son might prove to be the Messiah. The custom of Levirate marriage, which was not limited to the Hebrew people, rested on the principle that if a man died childless his brother should marry his widow, the children of such union being considered as belonging to the brother whose name and line were thus preserved from extinction (De 25:5; Ge 38:26; Mt 22:24).

Children were sometimes dedicated to God, even before their birth (1Sa 1:11). Names often were significant: Moses (Ex 2:10); Samuel (1Sa 1:20); Ichabod (1Sa 4:21; compare Ge 30) (see PROPER NAMES). The firstborn son belonged to God (Nu 3:44 ff). The ceremony of redeeming the firstborn occurred on the thirtieth day. Friends of the family were invited to a feast, the rabbi also being present. The child was placed in the hands of the priest. The father carried some gold or silver in a cup or vessel. The priest asked the mother whether this was her firstborn, and, on being answered in the affirmative, claimed the child as Yahweh's. The father offered the redemption money, which was accepted in exchange for the child (compare 1Pe 1:18). See FIRSTBORN. Other stages in the life of the child were celebrated with fitting ceremonies. In the fourth year, in Palestine, on the second day of the Passover occurred the ceremony of the first cutting of the boy's hair, the friends sharing the privilege. Sometimes, as in the case of the wealthy, the weight of the child in currency was given as a donation to the poor. In common with the custom of other eastern peoples, male children were circumcised (Ge 17:12), the rite being performed on the eighth day.

Early education was cared for in the home, the children growing up more or less with the mother (Pr 6:20; 31:1; 2Ti 1:5; 3:14,15), and the girl continuing with her mother until her marriage. In wealthier families tutors were employed (1Ch 27:32). Schools for children are first mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XV, x, 5). According to the Talmud the first school for children was established about 100 BC, but in the time of Jesus such schools were common. Children were taught to read and to write even in families of moderate means, these arts being widely diffused as early as 600 BC, if not earlier (Isa 8:1; 10:19). Great stress was laid on the Torah, i.e. the law of Moses. Boys were trained also in farming, the tending of cattle, and in the trades. The religious training of the boy began in his fourth year, as soon as he could speak distinctly. The religious life of the girl also began early. In later times at least children took part in the Sabbath and Passover festivals and boys attended synagogue and school regularly.

Children were subject to the father (Ne 5:5 marks the extreme), who in turn was bound to protect them, though he himself had the power of life and death (Le 18:21; 20:2 ff). Respect for and obedience to parents were stoutly upheld by public opinion (Ex 20:12; De 5:16; compare Pr 6:20; Mic 7:6; De 21:18-21; Ex 21:15).

Both the Old Testament and New Testament afford abundant evidence of the strength of the bond that bound the Hebrew family together (Ge 21:16; 2Sa 18:33; 1Ki 3:23 ff; 2Ki 4:19; Isa 8:4; Job 29:5; Mt 19:13; 20:20; Mr 9:24; Lu 2:48; Joh 4:47; Heb 2:13; 11:23). The gift of a son from Yahweh was the

height of joy; the loss of a child marked the depth of woe. A hint occurs in the custom of naming a man as the father of his firstborn son (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, I, 382), or even the use of the father's name as a surname (Bar-jonah, Bartimeus) and such continues in Syria at the present day. This idea is further instanced in the use, in both Old Testament and New Testament, of the terms to express the relation between God and men (Ex 4:22; De 14:1; 32:6; Jer 3:4; Zec 12:10; Mal 1:6).

See also FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS; SONS.

LITERATURE. Benzinger, Hebraische Archaologie, 2nd edition, 1907, 112-23; for rabbinical lore, Friedenberg in Jewish Encyclopedia, IV, 27 f.

W. N. Stearns

Figurative: Child is the English Versions of the Bible rendering of the Greek teknon. The corresponding Hebrew words (ben, and yeledh), are usually translated "son," but they have practically the same significance in the figurative use of the term. Child is used figuratively to describe:

(1) An affectionate greeting. Jesus addressed the sick of the palsy as "child" (Mr 2:5 the Revised Version, margin).

(2) The disciples, or followers, of a teacher. Jesus addressed His disciples as children (Mr 10:24). Paul referred to Timothy as his child (1Ti 1:2), and also to Onesimus (Phm 1:10). John also designated the disciples to whom he was writing as his children (2Jo 1:4). The same use of "children" or "sons" is common in the Old Testament (see 1Ki 20:35; 2Ki 2:3,5,7; 4:38). As a term of special endearment, disciples are sometimes called "little children" (teknia). Jesus thus addressed His disciples when He was speaking about His departure (Joh 13:33). Paul thus addressed the Galatians (Ga 4:19), and that was a favorite expression with John (see 1Jo 2:1; 4:4; 5:21). A term that was even more endearing was paidia, which means "little ones" or "babes." Jesus used this term once in addressing His disciples after His resurrection (Joh 21:5), and John also used this term occasionally in saluting those to whom he was writing (1Jo 2:18).

(3) Those who belong to God. Children of God is a common expression in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. It is based on the relation between parents and children, and in general describes God's affection for His own, and their dependence upon Him, and moral likeness to Him. The term is sometimes used of those who are disloyal to God, and they are designated as "rebellious children" (see Isa 30:1).

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

(4) Those who belong to the devil. Those who are like the devil in thought and action are designated as "children of the devil" (1Jo 3:10).

(5) One’s relation to something to which he belongs, or by which he is dominated in his affection for it. Thus we have:

(a) the children of a city or country (see Jer 2:16; Mt 23:37), and this designates those who belong to that particular city or country;

(b) children of wisdom (Mt 11:19 the King James Version; Lu 7:35), and these are the ones whose lives are dominated by wisdom. Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek adopted ergon for teknon in Mt 11:19, but this seems to be without any good reason;

(c) children of obedience (1Pe 1:14), and these are the ones who are eager to obey;

(d) children of light (Eph 5:8), and this designates those whose souls are illumined by the light.

(6) Those who are liable to some particular fate. Thus, we have

(a) children of cursing, or those who are exposed to cursing (2Pe 2:14), and

(b) children of wrath or those who are exposed to wrath (Eph 2:3).

(7) Moral likeness or spiritual kinship (Ga 3:7 the King James Version; compare Joh 8:39; "the children of Abraham"). See secs. (3), (4).

A. W. Fortune

CHILDHOOD, GOSPELS OF THE

child’-hood.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

CHILDREN OF EDEN

e’-d’-n (bene ‘edhen): In 2Ki 19:12; Isa 37:12 "the children of Eden that were in Telassar" are mentioned in connection with "Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph" as having been destroyed by the Assyrians who were before the time of Sennacherib. The expression, "the children of Eden that were in Telassar," undoubtedly referred to a tribe which inhabited a region of which Telassar was the center. Telassar means "the hill of Asshur" and, according to Schrader, it was a name that might have been given to any place where a temple had been built to Asshur. Inasmuch as Gozan, and Haran, and Rezeph were in Mesopotamia it would seem probable that "the children of Eden that were in Telassar" belonged to the same locality. The "children of Eden" is quite probably to be identified with the Bit ‘Adini of the

inscriptions and this referred to a district on the middle Euphrates. According to the inscriptions Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, and Bit ‘Adini were destroyed by Sennacherib’s forefathers, and this is in accord with the account in 2 Kings and Isaiah.

The "Eden" of Eze 27:23 is usually taken as the name of a place in Mesopotamia with which Tyre had commercial relations, and probably belongs to the region of "the chilrden of Eden," discussed above.

Some writers think the "Beth-eden" of Am 1:5 the Revised Version, margin (the American Standard Revised Version "Aven") is to be identified with the Bit ‘Adini of the inscriptions and hence, with "the children of Eden," but this is doubtful. This was perhaps in Syria in the neighborhood of Damascus.

A. W. Fortune

CHILDREN OF GOD

Introduction: Meaning of Terms

I. OLD TESTAMENT TEACHING

1. Mythological Survivals

2. Created Sonship

3. Israel’s Collective Covenant Sonship

4. Individual and Personal Relation

5. Universalizing the Idea

II. NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING

1. Physical and Limited Sonship Disappears

2. As Religious Experience, or Psychological Fact

(1) Filial Consciousness of Jesus

(2) Communicated to Men

3. As Moral Condition, or Ethical Fact

4. As State of Being, or Ontological Fact

(1) Essence of Christ’s Sonship

(2) Men’s Sonship

5. As Relation to God, or Theological Fact

(1) Eternal Generation

(2) The Work of Grace

Introduction: Meaning of Terms:

Children (Sons and Daughters) of God (bene and benoth ‘elohim, literally "sons and daughters of God"; tekna theou, and huioi theou): so the King James Version; but the Revised Version (British and American) translates the latter Greek phrase more accurately "sons of God." Tekna contains the idea of origin or descent, but also that of personal relation, and is often used metaphorically of "that intimate and reciprocal relationship formed between men by the bonds of love, friendship, trust, just as between parents and children" (Grimm-Thayer). Huioi, too, conveys the ideas of origin, and of personal relation, but the latter in the fuller form in which it appears in mature age. "The difference between huios and teknon appears to be that whereas teknon denotes the natural relationship of child to parent, huios implies in addition to this the recognized status and legal privileges reserved for sons" (Sanday and Headlam, on Ro 8:14). This difference obtains, however, only in a very general sense.

The above phrases denote the relation in which men are conceived to stand to God, either as deriving their being from Him and depending upon Him, or as standing in that personal relation of intimate trust and love toward Him which constitutes the psychological fact of sonship. The exact significance of the expression depends upon the conception of God, and particularly of His Fatherhood, to which it corresponds. It therefore attains to its full significance only in the New Testament, and its meaning in the Old Testament differs considerably, even though it marks stages of development up to the New Testament idea.

I. Old Testament Teaching.

The most primitive form of the idea appears in Ge 6:1-4, where the sons of God by marrying the fair daughters of men become the fathers of the giants.

1. Mythological Survivals:

These were a subordinate order of Divine beings or demi-gods, and the title here may mean no more,

although it was probably a survival of an earlier idea of the actual descent of these gods from a higher God. The idea of a heavenly court where the sons of God come to present themselves before Yahweh is found in quite late literature (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Ps 29:1; 89:6). In all these cases the phrase implies a certain kinship with God and dependence upon Him on the part of the Divine society around Him. But there is no evidence to show whether the idea of descent of gods from God survived to any extent, nor is there any indication of a very close personal relationship. Satan is unsympathetic, if not hostile. In one obviously polytheistic reference, the term implies a similarity of appearance (Da 3:25). In a secondary sense the titles "gods," and "sons of the Most High" are given to magistrates, as exercising God's authority (Ps 82:6).

2. Created Sonship:

The idea of creation has taken the place of that of procreation in the Old Testament, but without losing the sense of sonship. "Saith Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel, and his Maker: Ask me .... concerning my sons, and concerning the work of my hands" (Isa 45:11). Israel acknowledges the absolute sovereignty of God as her Father and Maker (Isa 64:8). Israel's Maker is also her Husband, and by inference the Father of her children (Isa 54:5). Since all Israel has one Father, and one God created her, the tribes owe brotherly conduct to one another (Mal 2:10). Yahweh upbraids His sons and daughters whom He as their Father bought, made and established. "He forsook God who made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation. .... Of the Rock that begat thee thou art unmindful, and hast forgotten God that gave thee birth" (De 32:6,15,18 ff). These passages reveal the transition from the idea of original creation to that of making and establishing Israel as a nation. All things might be described as children of God if creation alone brought it to pass, but Israel stands in a unique relation to God.

3. Israel's Collective Covenant Sonship:

The covenant relation of God with Israel as a nation is the chief form in which man's sonship and God's fatherhood appear in the Old Testament. "Israel is my son, my firstborn" (Ex 4:22); "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt" (Ho 11:1). And to be children of God involves the obligation to be a holy people (De 14:1,2). But Israel has proved unworthy of her status: "I .... have brought up children, and they have rebelled against me" (Isa 1:2,4; 30:1,9). Yet He will have pity upon them: "for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn" (Jer 31:9,20). Israel's unworthiness does not abolish the relation on God's side; she can therefore return to Him again and submit to His will (Isa 63:16; 64:8); and His pity exceeds a mother's love (Isa 49:15). The filial relation of Israel to God is summed up and symbolized in a special way in the Davidic king: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son" (2Sa 7:14 = 1Ch 17:13; compare 1Ch 22:10; 28:6; Ps 2:7).

4. Individual and Personal Relation:

God's fatherhood to collective Israel necessarily tends to develop into a personal relation of father and son between Him and individual members of the nation. The children of Israel, whatever their number, shall be called "the sons of the living God" (Ho 1:10). Yahweh's marriage relation with Israel as a nation

made individual Israelites His children (Ho 2:19,20; Jer 3:14,22; compare Isa 50:1; Eze 16:20,21; 23:37), and God's ownership of His children, the individual members of the nation, is asserted (compare Ps 127:3). Chastisement and pity alike God deals forth as Father to His children (De 1:31; 8:5; Ps 103:13), and these are intimate personal relations which can only obtain between individuals.

5. Universalizing the Idea:

In another direction the idea of God as the father of Israel tends to be modified by the inclusion of the Gentiles. The word "first-born" (in Ex 4:22 and Jer 31:9,20) may be only an emphatic form of expressing sonship, or it may already suggest the possibility of the adoption of the Gentiles. If that idea is not present in words, it is an easy and legitimate inference from several passages, that Gentiles would be admitted some day into this among the rest of Israel's privileges (Isa 19:25; 65:1; Zec 14:16).

II. New Testament Teaching.

1. Physical and Limited Sonship Disappears:

As the doctrine of Divine fatherhood attains its full spiritual and moral significance in the New Testament, so does the experience and idea of sonship. All traces of physical descent have disappeared. Paul's quotation from a heathen poet: "For we are also his offspring" (Ac 17:28), whatever its original significance, is introduced by the apostle for the purpose of enforcing the idea of the spiritual kinship of God and men. The phrase "Son of God" applied to Christ by the Roman centurion (Mt 27:54; Mr 15:39) may or may not, in his mind, have involved the idea of physical descent, but its utterance was the effect of an impression of similarity to the gods, produced by the exhibition of power attending His death. The idea of creation is assumed in the New Testament, but generally it is not prominent in the idea of sonship. The virgin birth of Jesus, however, may be understood as implying either the creative activity of the Holy Spirit, or the communication of a preexistent Divine being to form a new human personality, but the latter idea also would involve creative activity in the physical realm (compare Lu 3:38: "Adam (son) of God"). The limitations of the Old Testament conception of sonship as national and collective disappear altogether in the New Testament; God is father of all men, and of every man. In potentiality at least every man and all men are sons of God. The essence of sonship consists in a personal experience and moral likeness which places man in the most intimate union and communion with God.

2. As Religious Experience, or Psychological Fact:

(1) Filial Conciousness of Jesus.

Divine sonship was first realized and made manifest in the consciousness of Jesus (Mt 11:27). For Him it meant unbroken personal knowledge of God and communion with Him, and the sense of His love for Him and of His satisfaction and delight in Him (Mt 3:17; 17:5; Mr 1:11; 9:7; Lu 3:22; 9:35). Whether the "voice out of the heavens saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" was objective or not, its message always dwelt in the filial consciousness of Jesus. The Father's love was to Him a

source of knowledge and power (Joh 5:20), the reward of His self-sacrifice (Joh 10:17) and the inspiration of His love for men (Joh 15:9).

Sonship meant for Him His Messianic mission (Mt 16:16,17). It involved His dependence on the Father and His obedience to Him (Joh 5:19,30; 8:29), and a resulting confidence in His mission (Joh 5:36; 10:36,37). It filled Him with a sense of dignity, power and glory which the Father gave Him, and would yet give in larger measure (Mt 26:63,14; 16:27; Joh 17:5).

(2) Communicated to Men.

Jesus communicated His own experience of God to men (Joh 14:9) that they also might know the Father's love and dwell in it (Joh 17:26). Through Him and through Him alone can they become children of God in fact and in experience (Joh 1:12; 14:6; Mt 11:27). It is therefore a distinctively Christian experience and always involves a relation of faith in Christ and moral harmony with Him. It differs from His experience in one essential fact, at least in most men. It involves an inner change, a change of feeling and motive, of ideal and attitude, that may be compared to a new birth (Joh 3:3). Man must turn and return from disobedience and alienation through repentance to childlike submission (Lu 15:18-20). It is not the submission of slaves, but the submission of sons, in which they have liberty and confidence before God (Ga 4:6), and a heritage from Him for their possession (Ga 4:6,7; Ro 8:17). It is the liberty of self-realization. As sons they recognize their kinship with God, and share his mind and purpose, so that His commands become their pleasure: "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments: and his commandments are not grievous" (1Jo 5:3). They have boldness and access to God (Eph 2:18; 3:12). With this free union of love with God there comes a sense of power, of independence of circumstances, of mastery over the world, and of the possession of all things necessary which become the heirs of God (Mt 6:26,32; 7:11). "For whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world" (1Jo 5:4). They learn that the whole course and destiny of creation is for the "revealing of the sons of God" (Ro 8:19,21).

3. As Moral Condition, or Ethical Fact:

Christ's sonship involved His moral harmony with the Father: "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love" (Joh 15:10; 8:53). He accomplished the work which the Father gave Him to do (Joh 17:4; 5:19), "becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Php 2:8). And sonship makes the same demand upon men. The peacemakers and those who forgive like God are His children (Mt 5:9,45; Lu 6:35). "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these (and these only) are sons of God" (Ro 8:14). God will be Father to the holy (2Co 6:18). The test and mark of the children of God is that they do righteousness and love the brethren (1Jo 3:10). They are blameless and harmless, without blemish, in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation (Php 2:15). Therefore their ideal of life is to be "imitators of God" and to walk in love even as Christ did (Eph 5:1). Sonship grows to its consummation as the life grows in the likeness of Christ, and the final destiny of all sons is to be ever like Him (1Jo 3:2).

4. As State of Being, or Ontological Fact:

Sonship is properly and primarily a relation, but it may so dominate and transform the whole of a man's life, thought and conduct as to become his essential being, the most comprehensive category under which all that he is may be summed up.

(1) Essence of Christ's Sonship.

It is so that the New Testament comprehends the person of Christ. Everything that He did, He did as God's son, so that He is the Son, always and ever Son. In the beginning, in the bosom of the Father, He is the ONLY BEGOTTEN (which see) Son (Joh 1:1,18). He is born a Son of God (Lu 1:35). He begins life in the things of His Father (Lu 2:49). His whole life is that of the beloved Son (Mt 3:17; 17:5). As Son of God He dies (Mt 26:63; Lu 22:70; Mt 27:40,43; compare Joh 5:18). In His resurrection He was declared to be the Son of God with power (Ro 1:4); as Jesus the Son of God He is our great high priest in heaven (Heb 4:14), and in the glory of His father He will come to judge in the last day (Mt 16:27).

(2) Men's Sonship.

Unlike Him, men's moral sonship is neither eternal nor universal. Are they therefore sons in any sense always and everywhere? All children are heirs of the kingdom of God and objects of the Father's care (Lu 18:16; Mt 18:10). But men may turn away from the Father and become unworthy to be called His sons (Lu 15:13,19). They may become children of the devil (1Jo 3:10; Joh 8:44), and children of wrath (Eph 2:3). Then they lose the actuality, but not the potentiality, of sonship. They have not the experience or character of sons, but they are still moral and rational beings made in the image of God, open to the appeal and influence of His love, and able to "rise and go to their Father." They are objects of God's love (Joh 15:13; Ro 5:8) and of His gracious search and seeking (Lu 15:4; Joh 11:52). But they are actual sons only when they are led by the Spirit of God (Ro 8:14); and even so their sonship will only be consummated in the resurrection (Ro 8:23; Lu 20:36).

5. As Relation to God, or Theological Fact:

In the relation of father and son, fatherhood is original and creative. That does not necessarily mean priority in time.

(1) Eternal Generation.

Origen's doctrine of the eternal generation of Christ, by which is meant that God and Christ always stood in the relation of Father and Son to one another, is a just interpretation of the New Testament idea that the Son "was in the beginning with God" (pros ton Theon). But Jesus was conscious of His dependence upon the Father and that His sonship was derived from Him (Joh 5:19,36). Still more manifest is it that men derive their sonship from God. He made them for Himself, and whatever in human nature qualifies men to become sons of God is the free gift of God. But men in their sin and

disobedience could not come to a knowledge of the Father, had He not "sent forth his Son .... that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Ga 4:4,5): "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called children of God" (1Jo 3:1); "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son" (which see) who gave men "the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name" (Joh 3:16; 1:12). It is not the children of the flesh but the children of the promise who are children of God (Ro 9:4). The mere act of birth does not constitute men into children of God, but His covenant of free grace must be added. God being essentially Father made men and the universe, sent His Son and His Spirit, "for the revealing of the sons of God." But they can only know the Father, and realize their sonship when they respond to His manifestation of fatherly love, by faith in God and obedience to Him.

(2) The Work of Grace.

The question whether sonship is natural and universal or conditional upon grace working through faith, does not admit of a categorical answer. The alternatives are not strict antitheses. God does all things as Father. To endow man with rational and moral nature capable of his becoming a son was an act of love and grace, but its whole purpose can be communicated only in response to faith in Christ. But a natural sonship which is not actual is meaningless. A man's moral condition and his attitude toward God are the most essential elements of his nature, for a man's nature is just the sum total of his thoughts, acts and states. If these are hostile or indifferent to God, there is nothing left that can have the reality or bear the name of son. For if the word son be used of mere creaturehood and potentiality, that is to give it a meaning entirely different from New Testament usage. All men by nature are potential sons, because God has made them for sonship and does all things to win them into their heritage. Men may be sons of God in a very imperfect and elementary manner. The sharp transitions of Pauline and Johannine theology are rather abstract distinctions for thought than actual descriptions of spiritual processes. But Paul and John also contemplate a growth in sonship, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full- grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ" (Eph 4:13).

See SONS OF GOD.

For lit. and further discussion, see special articles on ADOPTION; GOD; JESUS CHRIST.

T. Rees

CHILDREN OF ISRAEL

iz'-ra-el (bene yisra'el): A very common term in both the Old Testament and the New Testament, and it refers to the Israelites as the descendants of a common ancestor, Jacob, whose name was changed to Israel (see Ge 32:24-32). It was customary to designate the members of the various tribes as the children of the one from whom the tribe originated (see Nu 1:20-43; Ezr 2:3-61), and it was natural that the people who boasted of Israel as their ancestor should be designated as his children. The first reference to

the descendants of Jacob is found in the account of the changing of Jacob's name to Israel, and the purpose is to connect them with the experience in Jacob's life which led to the change in his name: "Therefore the children of Israel eat not the sinew of the hip, which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day: because he touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew of the hip." At the time when this was written "the children of Israel" was a phrase that was commonly applied to the Israelites. In 2Ki 17:34 they are called "the children of Jacob," and this occurs in connection with the account of the changing of Jacob's name to Israel and is intended to connect them closely with their father Jacob, who was favored of God.

After a time, it is quite likely that the phrase "children of Israel" lost its peculiar significance and was simply one of the popular terms designating the inhabitants of Palestine, but at first it was intended to connect these people with their ancestor Jacob whose name was changed to Israel. The Jews of the New Testament times connected themselves with Abraham rather than with Jacob (see Joh 8:39; Ro 9:7; Ga 3:7, tekna, or, huioi Abraam).

A. W. Fortune

CHILDREN OF THE BRIDECHAMBER

See BRIDE-CHAMBER, SONS.

CHILDREN OF THE EAST

est (bene qedhem): A term which in a general way designated the inhabitants of the country East of Palestine The Hebrews thought of their own country as occupying the central place, and of the other parts of the world in relation to this. They spoke of the "queen of the south" (Mt 12:42), and of the "king of the south" (Da 11:5,6). They spoke of people coming from "the east and the west" and sitting down with the patriarchs (Mt 8:11).

The term "children of the east" seems to have been applied to the inhabitants of any part of the country East of Palestine It is stated that Jacob, when he fled from Esau, "came to the land of the children of the east" (Ge 29:1), and the place to which he came was Haran in Mesopotamia. In Jer 49:28 the inhabitants of Kedar are called "the children of the east," and in later Jewish literature, Kedar is identified with the Arabs (see KEDAR). Job was designated as "the greatest of all the children of the east" (Job 1:3), and the land of Uz was mentioned as his home (Job 1:1). While it is impossible absolutely to locate the land of Uz, it must have been on the edge of the desert which was East of Palestine. The children of the east seem to have been famous for their wisdom. It is said that "Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east" (1Ki 4:30), and "Wise-men from the east" came to Jerusalem seeking the one that was born king of the Jews (Mt 2:1).

Many of the inhabitants of the east country were regarded as descending from Abraham (see Ge 25:6), and hence, they were related to Israel.

A. W. Fortune

CHILEAB

kil’-e-ab (kil’abh; Dalouia, "restraint of father"): A son of David, born to him at Hebron. His mother was Abigail, whom David married after the death of her husband Nabal, the Carmelite (2Sa 3:3). In the corresponding account (1Ch 3:1) he is called "Daniel," the meaning of which name ("God is my judge") points to its having been given in order to commemorate God’s judgment upon Nabal (1Sa 25:39; compare Ge 30:6). Some suppose that he bore both names, but the Septuagint reading here Dalouia (Ch Damniel), and the identity of the last three letters of the Hebrew word "Chileab" with the first three of the following word, seems to indicate that the text of Samuel is corrupt.

Horace J. Wolf

CHILION

kil’-i-on (kilyon, "pining," "wasting away"): One of the two sons of Elimelech and Naomi, "Mahlon and Chilion, Ephrathites of Bethlehem-judah" (Ru 1:2). With his mother and brother he came into Moab and there both married Moabite women, Orpah being the name of Chilion’s wife and Ru that of the wife of Mahlon (Ru 4:9,10). Both died early and Orpah remained in Moab while Ru accompanied Naomi back to Bethlehem. When Boaz married Ru he "bought all that was Elimelech’s, and all that was Chilion’s, and Mahlon’s, of the hand of Naomi" (Ru 4:9).

W. L. Walker

CHILMAD

kil’-mad (kilmadh; Charman): A city or district mentioned after Sheba and Asshur as supplying merchandise to Tyre (Eze 27:23). By changing "m" into "w" (common in Assytoprian-Babylonian) this has been compared with Kalwadha near Bagdad (G. Smith, Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, I, 61; Delitzsch, Paradies, 206), but the identification seems improbable. Though regarded as the name of a country in the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) (Charman; Chelmad), there is some doubt whether this view of the word is correct. The Targum substitutes Madhai, "Media," and on this account Mez (Stadt Harran, 24) amends to Kol Madhai, "all Media." The absence of the copula "and" has caused others to further modify the vocalization, and by reading kelimmudh instead of Chilmad, the sense "Asshur was as the apprentice of thy trading" (Qimchi, Hitzig, Cornill) is obtained, but is not satisfactory. Probably both text and translation are susceptible of improvement.

T. G. Pinches

CHIMHAM

kim’-ham (kimham (2Sa 19:37,38) or kimhan (2Sa 19:40) or kemohem (Jer 41:17 Kt.); this reading, however, may probably be safely ignored): One of the sons of Barzillai the Gileadite, who supported David while the latter was in exile in Mahanaim (2Sa 19:37). After the death of Absalom, Barzillai was invited to spend the remainder of his life with the king; but he refused, and sent his son Chimham in his stead. From the mention of "the habitation of Chimham, which is by Beth-lehem" (Jer 41:17 the King James Version), it has been inferred that Chimham received a grant of land from David’s patrimony at Bethlehem, which retained his name for at least four centuries. It has been suggested that his name was probably Ahinoam (’achino‘am).

Horace J. Wolf

CHIMNEY chim’-ni.

See HOUSE; CHINNERETH or CHINNEROTH

kin’-e-reth, kin’-e-roth (kinnereth (De 3:17; Jos 19:35, etc.)), (kinaroth; Codex Vaticanus, Kenereth, Codex Alexandrinus, Cheneroth (Jos 11:2)): Taking the order in which the towns are mentioned, this city seems to have lain North of Rakkath (?Tiberias). It may have occupied the site of el-Mejdel, at the Southwest corner of the plain of Gennesaret. From this city the sea took its Old Testament name (Nu 34:11, etc.).

CHIOS

ke’-os, ki’-os (Chios): An island belonging to Turkey in the Aegean Sea, South of Lesbos, and very near the mainland of Asia Minor. Paul’s vessel passed it on his last voyage to Jerusalem (Ac 20:15). The channel here is very picturesque. From Luke’s expression, "we came the following day over against Chios," it has been conjectured that they were becalmed; more probably it simply means that, because of the dark moon, they lay at anchor for the night on the Asian coast opposite the island (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, under the word). Herod, when on his way to Agrippa at the Bosphorus, "continued many days at Chios" and conferred many royal benefactions upon the inhabitants (Josephus, Ant, XVI, ii, 2).

The soil is sterile (though well cultivated), the climate mild. Earthquakes are frequent. In the mountains (highest 4,000 ft.) beautiful blue marble with white veins, and excellent potter’s clay, were quarried in antiquity. In modern times large quantities of ochre are mined. The chief industry is the culture of the silkworm, the cocoons being sent to Lyons. Oranges, lemons, almonds, brandy, anise, mastich and leather are also exported. The inhabitants, who are almost entirely Greeks, number about 60,000. The capital, Castro, has a population of 15,000. The place where Homer is said to have collected his pupils around him is still pointed out to the traveler at the foot of Mt. Epos, near the coast. It is in reality

(probably) a very old sanctuary of Cybele, the Mother of the Gods. The tragic poet Ion, the historian Theopompus and the sophist Theocritus were natives of Chios. The Chians were especially famous for their skill in telling stories, and for their levity. A familiar proverb says that "it is easier to find a green horse than a sober- minded Sciot" (Conybeare and Howson, XX, 549).

The oldest inhabitants of the island were Leleges, Cretans and Carians, who were conquered by the Ionians. The latter made Chios one of the most flourishing states in Ionia. When the Persians overran Asia Minor and oppressed the Greek colonies, the Chians showed a Pan-Hellenic spirit. They surrendered, however, to Cyrus in 546 BC. Nevertheless, 46 years later they joined in the rebellion of Aristagoras against the Persians. In the naval engagement off the island Lade they fought with 100 ships and displayed great bravery. Again they fell into the power of Persia; but after the battle of Mycale (479) the Chians joined the Athenian confederacy. In 412 they sided with the Peloponnesians, in the 19th year of the war which Athens had been waging against Sparta and her allies. For this act of treason the Athenians devastated the island. At the end of the war the Chians revolted from Sparta and, after the battle of Naxos (376), became an ally of Athens once more. Oppressed now by Athens, as she had been by Sparta, Chios made an alliance with Thebes in 363 and defended herself successfully against the Athenian general, Chares; and in 355 Athens was forced to recognize the island’s independence. Later the Chians became friends of the Romans and in the war with Mithridates were obliged to surrender their ships to the Pontic king and in addition pay him 2,000 talents.

In 1307 AD Turkish pirates subjugated and laid waste the island. The Turks themselves became masters of Chios in 1566. In the war of the Greek revolution the Chians joined the Greeks (February 1821) but were overpowered by the Turks. The Pasha decreed that the island should be utterly devastated; 23,000 Chians were massacred and 47,000 sold into slavery. Only 5,000 escaped. A second attempt to regain their freedom was made in 1827, but met with failure. When the kingdom of Greece was established two years later, Chios was not included. On April 3, 1881, the island was visited by a terrible earthquake, the city of Castro being almost entirely destroyed.

LITERATURE.

Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles of Paul; W. M. Ramsay, Paul the Traveler; G. H. Gilbert, The Student’s Life of Paul (chiefly concerned with the chronology and order of events in Paul’s life); Eckenbrecher, Die Insel Chios (1845); Pauli, same person (in the Mitteilungen der Geogr. Gesellschaft in Hamburg, 1880-81).

J. E. Harry

CHIRP

cherp (tsaphaph): "Chirp" occurs in the King James Version marginand the Revised Version, margin of Isa 29:4, "Thy voice shall be as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper (margin, "chirp") out of the dust." The reference is to "the sounds made by wizards and

ventriloquists, who imitated the chirping of the bats which was supposed to proceed from the Iower world"; hence, for "peep" of the King James Version in Isa 8:19 we have "chirp"—"wizards, that chirp and that mutter."

Figurative: We have also in Isa 10:14 the Revised Version (British and American), in a figurative allusion to young birds, "chirped" instead of "peeped."

See CHATTER.

W. L. Walker

CHISLEU; CHISLEV

kis’-lu, kis’-lev.

See KISLEV.

CHISLON

kis’-lon, kiz’-lon (kiclon, "strength"): A prince of Benjamin, the father of Elidad (Nu 34:21).

CHISLOTH-TABOR

kis-loth-ta’-bor, kiz’-loth.

See CHESULLOTH.

CHITLISH

kit’-lish (kithlish, "separation"; the King James Version Kithlish, the English Revised Version "Chithlish," kith’lish): An unidentified town named with Lahman and Gederoth in the Shephelah of Judah (Jos 15:40).

CHITTIM

kit’-im.

See KITTIM.

CHIUN (1)

ki’-un: Thus Hebrew kiyun, is transliterated in Am 5:26 the King James Version. The vowels represent an assimilation to some such word as shiqquts, "detestable thing," or gillul, "idol" (properly "a filthy thing"), in consonance with the well-known habit of the punctuators (compare molekh, Molech with the vowels of bosheth, "shame"). The Syriac version has preserved the correct vocalization; apparently also the Septuagint, albeit the consonants have suffered corruption (so particularly in the Greek manuscripts of Ac 7:43). There can be no doubt that we should vocalize kewan = the Assyrian Kai(a)-wanu = Kaiamanu by which at least in late Babylonian Saturn was indicated. The passage in Amos refers to the Saturn worship which appears to have been in vogue in the prophet’s days. The Israelites shall carry with them into exile the images of their gods (render with the margin of the Revised Version (British and American): "Yea, ye shall take up," etc.). The received vocalization is as old as Aquila and Symmachus. Max L. Margolis

CHIUN (2)

ki’-un (Am 5:26 the King James Version): Called in Ac 7:43 "Rephan" (Rhemphan) the planet Saturn.

See ASTROLOGY.

CHLOE

klo’-e (Chloe, "a tender shoot"): A woman, presumably a Christian, mentioned only in 1Co 1:11. She was a resident either of Corinth or of Ephesus. Paul had been informed by some of her household, probably Christian slaves, of the dissensions in the church at Corinth. Nothing more is known of her.

CHOBA; CHOBAI

ko’-ba, ko’-ba-i (Choba, Judith 4:4; Chobai, 15:4 f): A place named along with Jericho, Asora, and the valley of Salem (Judith 4:4; 15:4 f). Reland’s (Pal, 721) suggestion of Choabis, which the Peutinger Tables give as 12 Roman miles from Scythopolis, seems probable. It may be identical with el-Mekhubby, about 11 miles from Beisan (Scythepolis), and 3 miles from Tubas.

CHOENIX

ke’-niks (choinix): A Greek dry measure, almost equal to one quart. Mentioned in the New Testament only in Re 6:6, where the Revised Version, margin would read "choenix" instead of the indefinite translation "measure." The verse is then obviously a threat of famine.

CHOICE

chois.

See CHOOSE; WILL.

CHOKE

chok (pnigo, and its compounds): Is used in its primary sense of "to strangle," or "to suffocate," in describing the fate of the swine (Lu 8:33 the King James Version). The Revised Version (British and American) has "drowned," but "choked" is the correct rendering of the Greek word.

Figurative: It is used in the sense of "to strangle" "smother," "suffocate," as if by depriving of breath, in describing the fate of the young grain growing in the midst of thorns (Mt 13:7). The figurative is carried a little farther still in describing the way the word, planted in the heart, is overcome by the care of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches (Mt 13:22).

A. W. Fortune

CHOLA

ko'-la (Chola; the King James Version, Cola): This names occurs only with that of Chobai (see CHOBA) in Judith 15:4. It may be identical with the modern Ka'un, between el- Mekhubby and Beisan.

CHOLER

kol'-er: Lit. "bile," is used in the sense of a disease (cholera) (Sirach 31:20; 37:30), and in the sense of bitter anger (marar) (Da 8:7; 11:11 English Versions of the Bible, the American Standard Revised Version "anger").

CHOOSE; CHOSEN

chooz, cho'-z'-n (bachar, qabhal, bara', barah; ek-lego):

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Human Choice

2. God Chooses King of Israel

3. God Chooses Jerusalem

4. Election of Israel

5. Yahweh’s Grace

(1) An Act of Sovereignty

(2) For Mankind’s Sake

II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Various Meanings

2. Of God’s Free Grace

3. Ultimate Antinomies

4. Election Corresponds to Experience

The words denote an act of comparison of two or more objects or persons, the preference and selection of one, or of a few out of a larger number for a certain purpose, function, position or privilege.

I. In the Old Testament.

1. Human Choice:

For bachar and its derivatives: men choosing wives (Ge 6:2); Lot choosing the cities of the Plain (Ge 13:11); often of kings and generals choosing soldiers for their prowess (e.g. Ex 17:9; Jos 8:3; 1Sa 13:2; 2Sa 10:9; 17:1). The word bachar is often used for "young men," as being choice, in the prime of manhood. The most important uses of bachar are these: of Israel choosing a king (1Sa 8:18; 12:13); of moral and religious choice: choosing Yahweh as God (Jos 24:15,22), or other gods (Jud 5:8; 10:14); the way of truth (Ps 119:30); to refuse the evil and choose the good (Isa 7:15,16); compare David’s choice of evils (2Sa 24:12).

2. God Chooses King of Israel:

A leading idea is that of God choosing Moses as leader (Nu 16:5,7; 17:5); the Levites to the priesthood (1Sa 2:28; 2Ch 29:11); Saul as king (1Sa 10:24), David (2Sa 6:21; 1Ki 11:34), Solomon (1Ch 28:5). All this follows from theocratic idea that God rules personally over Israel as His chosen people.

3. God Chooses Jerusalem:

A more important, but still subsidiary, idea is that of Yahweh choosing Jerusalem as the place of His habitation and worship (De 12:5; 20 other times, Jos 9:27; 1Ki 8:44,48; Ps 132:13; Zec 1:17; 2:12; 3:2).

This was the ruling idea of Josiah's reformation which was instrumental in putting down polytheistic ideas and idolatrous practices in Israel, and was therefore an important factor in the development of Hebrew monotheism; but it was an idea that Hebrew monotheism had to transcend and reject to attain its full growth. "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father" (Joh 4:21).

4. Election of Israel:

But the fundamental idea of choosing, which governs all others in the Old Testament, is that of God choosing Israel to be His peculiar people. He chose Abraham, and made a covenant with him, to give him the land of Canaan (Ne 9:7 ff): "For thou art a holy people unto Yahweh thy God: Yahweh thy God hath chosen thee to be a people for his own possession, above all peoples that are upon the face of the earth .... because Yahweh loveth you, and because he would keep the oath which he sware unto your fathers" (De 7:6-8). Historically this idea originated in the old conception of Yahweh as the tribal God of Israel, bound to her by natural and indissoluble ties (see GOD). But as their conception of Yahweh became more moral, and the idea of His righteousness predominated, it was recognized that there was no natural and necessary relation and harmony between Israel and Yahweh that accounted for the favor of a righteous God toward her, for Israel was no better than her neighbors (Am 1; 2). Why then was Yahweh Israel's God, and Israel His people?

5. Yahweh's Grace:

It was by an act of free choice and sovereign grace on God's part. "You only have I known of all the families of the earth" (Am 3:2). In Ho the relation is described under the figure of a marriage tie. Yahweh is Israel's husband: and to realize the force of the figure, it is necessary to recall what ancient and oriental marriage customs were. Choice and favor were almost entirely made by the husband. The idea of the covenant which Yahweh out of His free grace made with Israel comes to the forefront in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Because He loved her, and for no other reason, He has chosen Israel to be His peculiar people. In Isa 40-66 the idea is carried farther in two directions:

(1) An Act of Sovereignty:

Yahweh's gracious choice of Israel rests ultimately on His absolute sovereignty: "O Jacob my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen: thus saith Yahweh that made thee, and formed thee from the womb" (Isa 44:1,2; compare Isa 29:16; Jer 18:6; Isa 64:8). For Israel's deliverance Cyrus and his world-empire are in Yahweh's hands as clay in the potter's hands (Isa 45:9,10).

(2) For Mankind's Sake:

"Israel is elect for the sake of mankind." This is the moral interpretation of a choice that otherwise appears arbitrary and irrational. God's purpose and call of salvation are unto all mankind. "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else" (Isa 45:22). And

Israel is His servant, chosen, the messenger He sends, "to bring forth justice to the Gentiles" (Isa 42:1,19; 43:10,12). The idea is further developed in the conception of the SERVANT OF JEHOVAH (which see) as the faithful few (or one) formed "from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him," "for a light to the Gentiles," God's "salvation unto the end of the earth" (Isa 49:1-6; 52:13-53:12) (compare Isaiah's doctrine of the Remnant: Shearjashub; also, the righteous, the godly, the meek, in Pss; and see Skinner, Isaiah, II, xxx ff). As the conception of personality and of individual relation and responsibility to God developed from Eze onward, together with the resulting doctrine of personal immortality, the conditions were prepared for the application of the idea of election to individuals (compare Ps 65:4).

Coordinate with the idea of God choosing Israel runs the complementary idea that Israel should prove faithful to the covenant, and worthy of the choice. God has chosen her, not for any merit in her, but of His free grace, and according to His purpose of salvation, but if Israel fails to respond by faithful conduct, fitting her to be His servant and messenger, He may and will cast her off, or such portion of her as proves unworthy. See Oehler, Old Testament Theology, I, 256 ff, 287 f.

Three other Hebrew words expressing choice in minor matters are: qabhal, for David's choice of evils (1Ch 21:11); bara', to mark out a place (Eze 21:19), to select singers and porters for the temple (1Ch 9:22; 16:41); barah, to choose a man to represent Israel against Goliath (1Sa 17:8).

II. In the New Testament.

1. Various Meanings:

The whole conception of God, of His relation to Israel, and of His action in history indicated above, constituted the religious heritage of Jesus Christ and His disciples. The national conciousness had to a considerable extent given place to that of the individual; and salvation extended beyond the present life into a state of blessedness in a future world. But the central ideas remain, and are only modified in the New Testament in so far as Jesus Christ becomes the Mediator and Agent of God's sovereign grace. Eklego and its derivatives are the words that generally express the idea in the New Testament. They are used

(1) of the general idea of selecting one out of many (Lu 14:7);

(2) of choosing men for a particular purpose, e.g. of the church choosing the seven (Ac 6:5); of the choice of delegates from the Council of Jerusalem (Ac 15:22,25; compare 2Co 8:19), cheirotoneo; choose by vote (the Revised Version (British and American) "appoint") (compare Ac 10:41), procheirotoneo;

(3) of moral choice (Mr 13:20): "Mary hath chosen the good part" (Lu 10:42);

(4) of Christ as the chosen Messiah of God (Lu 23:35; 1Pe 2:4 the King James Version);

(5) of Christ choosing His apostles (Lu 6:13; Joh 6:70; 13:18; 15:16,19; Ac 1:2,24); Paul (Ac 9:15; compare Ac 22:14 the King James Version), procheirizomai; Rufus (Ro 16:13); and Paul chose Silas (Ac 15:40), epilego;

(6) of God

(a) choosing Israel (Ac 13:17; compare Ro 9:11),

(b) choosing the Christian church as the new Israel (1Pe 2:9 the King James Version),

(c) choosing the members of the church from among the poor (Jas 2:5), the foolish, weak and despised (1Co 1:27-28),

(d) choosing into His favor and salvation a few out of many: "Many are called, but few are chosen"‘ (Mt 20:16 (omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)); Mt 22:14); God shortens the days of the destruction of Jerusalem "for the elect’s sake, whom he chose" (Mr 13:20).

2. Of God’s Free Grace:

In Eph 1:4-6 every phrase tells a different phase of the conception:

(1) God chose (and foreordained) the saints in Christ before the foundation of the world;

(2) according to the good pleasure of His will;

(3) unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto Himself;

(4) to be holy and without blemish before Him in love;

(5) to the praise of the glory of His grace;

(6) which He freely bestowed on them in the Beloved. And in Re 17:14, the triumphant church in heaven is described as "called and chosen and faithful." God’s sovereign choice governs the experience and testing of the saints at every point from beginning to end.

Thus in the New Testament as in the Old Testament

(1) God’s covenant of grace is free and unconditional. It is unto all men, now as individuals rather than nations, and without distinction of race or class. It is no less free and sovereign, because it is a father’s grace.

(2) Israel is still a chosen race for a special purpose.

(3) The church and the saints that constitute it are chosen to the full experience and privileges of sonship.

(4) God’s purpose of grace is fully revealed and realized through Jesus Christ.

3. Ultimate Antinomies:

This doctrine raises certain theological and metaphysical difficulties that have never yet been satisfactorily solved.

(1) How can God be free if all His acts are preordained from eternity? This is an antinomy which indeed lies at the root of all personality. It is of the essence of the idea of personality that a person should freely determine himself and yet act in conformity with his own character. Every person in practice and experience solves this antinomy continually, though he may have no intellectual category that can coordinate these two apparently contradictory principles in all personality.

(2) How can God be just, if a few are chosen and many are left? And

(3) How can man be free if his moral character proceeds out of God’s sovereign grace? It is certain that if God chose all or left all He would be neither just nor gracious, nor would man have any vestige of freedom.

4. Election Corresponds to Experience:

The doctrine describes accurately (a) the moral fact, that some accept salvation and others reject it; (b) the religious fact that God’s sovereign and unconditional love is the beginning and cause of salvation. The meeting-point of the action of grace, and of man’s liberty as a moral and responsible being, it does not define. Nor has the category as yet been discovered wherewith to construe and coordinate these two facts of religious experience together, although it is a fact known in every Christian experience that where God is most sovereign, man is most free.

For other passages, and the whole idea in the New Testament, see ELECTION.

T. Rees

CHOP

(paras):

Figurative: This word, meaning "to cut in pieces," "to distribute," often translated "spread," is rendered "chop" in Mic 3:3, they "chop them in pieces, as for the pot," figuratively for the destruction of God’s people through the cruel exactions of their rulers.

CHORASHAN

kor-ash’-an, ko-ra’-shan.

See COR-ASHAN.

CHORAZIN

ko-ra’-zin (Chorazin, Mt 11:21; Chorazin, Lu 10:13; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Chorazein): A city whose name appears only in the woe pronounced against it by Christ (Mt 11:21; Lu 10:13). Its appearance there, however, shows that it must have been a place of some importance, and highly privileged by the ministry of Jesus. It was already deserted in the time of Eusebius, who places it 2 miles from Capernaum (Onomasticon, under the word). We can hardly doubt that it is represented by the extensive ruins of Kerazeh, on the heights to the north of Tell Chum. It is utterly desolate: a few carved stones being seen among the heaps. There are traces of a Roman road which connected the ancient city with the great highway between north and south which touched the lake shore at Khan Minyeh. W. Ewing

CHORBE kor’-be (Chorbe; the King James Version Corbe): Head of a family which returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:12). The name apparently corresponds to Zaccai in Ezr 2:9 and Ne 7:14.

CHOSAMAEUS

kos-a-me’-us (A, Simon Chosamaios; B, Chosamaos): Occurs in 1 Esdras 9:32 as the name of one of the sons of Annas. But in the parallel passage (Ezr 10:31) the name is simply Shimeon followed by "Benjamin, Malluch, Shemariah," which are omitted in 1 Esdras. The Septuagint of Ezr 10:31 has Semeon, followed by the three omitted names. The difference may have arisen from a mistake of a copyist, or from the use of an imperfect MS.

CHOSEN

cho’-z’-n.

See CHOOSE.

CHOZEBA

ko-ze’-ba (kozebha’," deceitful"): Same as ACHZIB and CHEZIB (which see).

CHRIST AS KING, PRIEST, PROPHET

See under several titles; also CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

CHRIST, HUMANITY OF

See CHRIST, HUMANITY OF.

CHRIST, INTERCESSION OF

See INTERCESSION OF CHRIST.

CHRIST, JESUS

See JESUS CHRIST.

CHRIST, OFFICES OF

of’-is-is.

General Titles of our Lord

I. CHRIST’S MEDIATION EXPRESSED IN THE SPECIFIC OFFICES

Historical Review of the Theory

II. THE THREEFOLD OFFICE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Failure of the Offices to Secure Their Desired Ends

III. THE PROPHET

The Forecast of the True Prophet

IV. CHRIST THE PROPHET

1. Christ’s Manner of Teaching

2. Christ as Prophet in His Church

V. THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

1. Judaic Priesthood

2. Sacrificial Relations of Christ in the Gospels

3. Christ’s Ethical Teaching Affected by Sacrificial Ideas

4. Mutual Confirmations of the Synoptics

5. The Dual Outgrowth of Sacrifice, the Victim and Sacrificer

6. Christ’s Priesthood in the Apostolic Ministry and Epistles

7. The Crowning Testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews

8. Christ’s Relation to Sin Expressed in Sacrificial Terms

VI. CHRIST’S KINGLY OFFICE

The Breakdown of the Secular Monarchy

VII. THE MESSIANIC BASIS OF THE THREEFOLD OFFICE OF THE LORD

LITERATURE

General Titles of our Lord:

This term has been used by theologians to describe the various characters of our Lord’s redemptive work. Many appellative and metaphorical titles are found in Scripture for Christ, designative of His Divine and human natures and His work: God (Joh 20:28); Lord (Mt 22:43,14); Word (Joh 1:1,14); Son of God (Mt 3:17; Lu 1:35; Col 1:15; 1 Joh 5:20); Firstborn from the dead (Col 1:18); Beginning of the Creation of God (Re 3:14); Image of God (2Co 4:4); Express Image of His Person (Heb 1:3 the King James Version); Alpha and Omega (Re 1:8; 22:13); Son of Man (Mt 8:20; Joh 1:51; Ac 7:56); Son of David (Mt 9:27; 21:9); Last Adam (1Co 15:45,47); Captain of Salvation (Heb 2:10 margin) ; Saviour (Lu 2:11; Joh 4:42; Ac 5:31); Redeemer (Isa 59:20; Tit 2:14); Author and Perfecter of Faith (Heb 12:2); Light of the World (Joh 8:12); Lamb of God (Joh 1:29,36); Creator of all things (Joh 1:3,10); Mediator (1Ti 2:5); Prophet (De 18:15; Lu 24:19); Great High Priest (Heb 4:14); King (Lu 1:33; Re 17:14; 19:16);

Way, Truth and Life (Joh 14:6). These and many others express the mediatorial office of the Lord. As mediator, He stands between God and Man, revealing the Father to man, and expressing the true relation of man to God. The term (Greek mesites), moreover, signifies messenger, interpreter, advocate, surety or pledge in Ga 3:19,20, where a covenant is declared to be assured by the hand of one who intervenes. Thus the covenant is confirmed and fulfilled by Him who secures that its stipulations should be carried out, and harmony is restored where before there had been difference and separation (1Ti 2:5; Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24). Thus is expressed the purpose of God to redeem mankind by mediation.

I. Christ's Mediation Expressed in the Specific Offices.

In presenting a systematic idea of this Redemptive Work of Christ by Mediation, Christian thought gave to it a harmonious character by choosing the most general and familiar titles of the Lord as the most inclusive categories expressive of the mode of Redemption. These were prophetic, priestly and regal.

Historical Review of the Theory:

The first trace of this division is found in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, I, 3, and his Demonstratio Evangelica, IV, 15. It was accepted very largely in the Greek church, and continues to be used by Russian ecclesiastical writers. The Roman church has not so generally followed it, though it is found in the writings of many Roman theologians. The earlier reformers, especially Lutheran, ignored it. But Gerhard employed it and the Lutheran theologians followed his example, although some of these repudiated it, as Ernesti, Doderlein and Knapp. Calvin employed the division in his Institutes, II, 15. It was incorporated in the Heidelberg Catechism and has been adopted by most theologians of the Reformed church and by English and American divines. In Germany most theological writers, such as De Wette, Schleiermacher, Tholuck, Nitzsch, Ebrard, adopt it, affirming it as expressive of the essential quality of the work of redemption, and the most complete presentment of its contents. The justification of this position is found in the important place occupied in the progress of revelation by those to whom were entrusted the duties of teaching and leading men in relation to God in the offices of priest, prophet and king. Even the modern development of Christian thought which extends the view of Divine dealing with man over the entire race and its religious history, not excluding those who would find in the most recent conditions of the world's life the outworking of the will of God in the purposes of human salvation, cannot discover any better form of expressing Christ's relation to man than in terms of the prophetic, the priestly and the governmental offices. The prophet is the instrument of teaching: the priest expresses the ethical relation of man to God; while the king furnishes the typical form of that exercise of sovereign authority and Providential direction which concerns the practical life of the race.

II. The Threefold Office in the Old Testament.

From the close relation which Jesus in both His person and work bore to the Old Testament dispensation, it is natural to turn to the preparatory history of the early Scriptures for the first notes of these mediatorial offices. That the development of the Jewish people and system ever moved toward Christ as an end and fulfillment is universally acknowledged. The vague and indeterminate conditions of

both the religious and national life of Israel manifest a definite movement toward a clearer apprehension of man's relationship to God. Nothing is more clear in Israel's history than the gradual evolution of official service both of church and state, as expressed in the persons and duties of the prophet, the priest and the king. The early patriarch contained in himself the threefold dignity, and discharged the threefold duty. As the family became tribal, and the tribe national, these duties were divided. The order of the household was lost for a while in the chaos of the larger and less homogeneous society. The domestic altar was multiplied in many "high places." Professional interpreters of more or less religious value began to be seers, and here and there, prophets. The leadership of the people was occasional, ephemeral and uncertain. But the men of Divine calling appeared from time to time; the foundation work of Moses was built on; the regular order of the worship of Yahweh, notwithstanding many lapses, steadily prevailed. Samuel gave dignity to his post as judge, and he again beheld the open vision of the Lord; he offered the appointed sacrifices; he established the kingly office; and although he was not permitted to see the family of David on the throne, like Moses he beheld afar off the promised land of a Divinely appointed kingdom. With the accession of the Davidic house, the three orders of God's service were completely developed. The king was seated on the throne, the priest was ministering at the one altar of the nation, the prophet with the Divine message was ever at hand to teach, to guide and to rebuke.

The Failure of the Offices to Secure Their Desired Ends:

Notwithstanding this growth of the special institutions—prophet, priest and king—the religious and national condition was by no means satisfactory. The kingdom was divided; external foes threatened the existence of the nation; idolatry was not extinguished, and the prophets who were true to Yahweh were compelled to warn and rebuke the sins of the rulers and the people, and even to testify against the priests for their unfaithfulness to the truth and purity of the religion which they professed. The best hopes of Israel and the Divine promises seem thus to be contradicted by the constant failure of the people to realize their best ideals. Hence, slowly arose a vague expectation of reform. The idea of the better condition which was coming grew ever more distinct, and settled down at length to Israel's Messianic hope, expressed in various forms, finally converging to the looking for of one who should in some mysterious way gather into himself the ideas which belonged especially to the three great offices.

III. The Prophet.

In this article we are concerned only with the offices as they tend to their fulfillment in Christ. For the more general treatment of each office, reference must be made to the special articles.

The Forecast of the True Prophet:

The first appearance of the idea of the special prophet of Yahweh is in De 18:15. Moses had been sent by the people to hear the Lord's words on their behalf (Ex 20:19; De 5:27); and this incident in the later passage of De 18:15-22 is connected with the promise of a prophet, while at the same time reference is made to the general fact of prophecy and the conditions of its validity and acceptance. Here we find the germ of the expectation of the Prophet, which occupied so large a place in the mind of Israel. In the act

of the people sending Moses to receive the word, and Yahweh's promise to send a prophet whom they would accept, we see also the suggestion of a distinction between the first dispensation and the latter. The Divine promise was to the effect that what was given by Moses God would consummate in a prophetic revelation through a person. The conception of this personality is found in the second part of Isa (40-66). Isaiah's mission was vain, Isa 49:4, but the coming one shall prevail, 49-53 (passim). But the success of this servant of Yahweh was not to be only as a prophet, but by taking on himself the penalty of sin (Isa 53:5), and by being made an offering for sin; and as Mighty Victor triumphing over all foes (Isa 53:10-12), the dignities of whose kingship are set forth in various parts of the prophetic writings. Thus the general effect of the course of the earlier revelation may be summed up in this prophetic ministry with which has been combined a priestly and a royal character. It was an ever-advancing manifestation of the nature and will of God, delivered by inspired men who spake at sundry times and in divers manners, but whose message was perfected and extended by Jesus Christ (Heb 1:1), who thus became the Prophet of the Lord.

IV. Christ the Prophet.

Christ's ministry illustrates the prophetic office in the most extensive and exalted sense of the term. He was designed and appointed by the Father (Isa 61:1,2; compare Lu 4:16-21; Mt 17:5). In 1Co 1:30, Christ is declared to be made to us wisdom. His intimate knowledge of God (Joh 1:18; Mt 11:27; Joh 16:15), the qualities of His teaching dependent upon His nature, both Divine and human (Joh 3:34); His authority (Joh 1:9,17,18; Lu 4:18-21); His knowledge of God (Mr 12:29; Joh 4:24; Mt 11:25; Joh 17:11,25; Mt 18:35)—these all peculiarly fitted Christ to be the Revealer of God. Besides His doctrine of God, His ministry included the truth concerning Himself, His nature, claims, mission, the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the religious life of man. He taught as none other the foundation of religion, the facts on which it was based, the essence of Divine service, the nature of sin, the grace of God, the means of atonement, the laws of the kingdom of God and the future state. By the acknowledgment of even those who have denied His Divine nature and redemptive work, He has been recognized as the Supreme Moral Teacher of the world. His claim to be the Prophet is seen in that He is the source of the ever-extending revelation of the eternal. His own words and works He declared were only part of the fuller knowledge which would be furnished by the system which He established (Lu 9:45; 18:34; Joh 12:16; 14:26; 15:26; 16:12,13,14).

1. Christ's Manner of Teaching:

How remarkable was His method of teaching! Parable, proverb, absolute affirmation, suggestion, allusion to simple objects, practical life—these all made His teaching powerful, easily understood, living; sometimes His action was His word—and all with a commanding dignity and gracious winsomeness, that was felt by His hearers and has ever been recognized (Mt 7:29). So perfect and exalted was the teaching of Jesus that many have supposed that revelation ceased with Him, and the immediate followers whom He especially inspired to be His witnesses and interpreters. Certainly in Him the prophetic ministry culminated.

2. Christ as Prophet in His Church:

An important aspect of Christ's prophetic office is that of His relation to the church as the source, through the instrumentality of His Spirit, of ever-enlarging knowledge of Divine truth which it has been able to gain. This is the real significance of the claim which some churches make to be the custodians and interpreters of the tradition of faith, with which has also gone theory of development—not as a human act but as a ministration of the Lord through His Spirit, which is granted to the church. Even those who hold that all Divine truth is to be found in the sacred Scriptures have yet maintained that God has much truth still to bring out of His word by the leading and direction of the Spirit of Jesus. The Scripture itself declares that Christ was the light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world (Joh 1:9). He Himself promised that the Spirit which He would give would guide His followers into all truth (Joh 16:13). The apostles claimed to receive their teaching and direction of the church from the Lord (1Co 11:23). The testimony of Jesus is definitely declared to be the spirit of prophecy (Re 19:10). Indeed, all the apostolic writings in almost every line affirm that what they teach is received from the Spirit, who is the Spirit of the Lord.

V. The Priesthood of Christ.

1. Judaic Priesthood:

For the history of the development of the priesthood of Israel on which our Lord's High-Priesthood is ideally based, reference must be made to the article especially dealing of with that subject. The bearings of that institution upon the work of Jesus as Redeemer alone fall under this section. Judaism like all religions developed an extensive system priestly service. As the moral sense of the people enlarged and became more distinct, the original simplicity of sacrifice, especially as a commensal act, in which the unity of the celebrants with each other and with God was expressed, was expanded into acts regularly performed by officials, in which worship, thanksgiving, covenant and priestly expiation and atonement were clearly and definitely expressed. The progress of sacrifice may be seen in the history of the Old Testament from Cain and Abel's (Ge 4:3,4), Noah's (Ge 8:20), Abraham's covenant (Ge 15:9-18), etc., to the elaborate services of the Mosaic ritual set forth in Lev, the full development of which is found only in the later days of Israel. When Christ appeared, the entire sacerdotal system had become incorporated in the mind, customs and language of the people. They had learned more or less distinctly the truth of man's relation to God in its natural character, and especially in that aspect where man by his sin had separated himself from God and laid himself open to the penalty of law. The conception of priesthood had thus grown in the consciousness of Israel, as the necessary instrument of mediation between man and God. Priestly acts were performed on behalf of the worshipper. The priest was to secure for man the Divine favor. This could only be gained by an act of expiation. Something must be done in order to set forth the sin of man, his acknowledgment of guilt, the satisfaction of the law, and the assurance of the Divine forgiveness, the restored favor of God and finally the unity of man and God.

2. Sacrificial Relations of Christ in the Gospels:

That the work of Christ partook of the nature of priestly service is already indicated by references in the Gospels themselves. He was called "Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (Mt 1:21). Salvation from sin, in the habit of thought at which the Jew had arrived, must have expressed itself most clearly in the symbolic signification of the sacrifices in the temple. Thus in the very name which our Lord received His priesthood is suggested. The frankincense of the Magi's offering is not without its mystical meaning (Mt 2:11). Some may find in the Baptist's words, "baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire" (Mt 3:11), a suggestion of priestly action, for the understanding of John's declaration must be found in the conventional ideas of the Jewish thought of the period, determined as they undoubtedly were by the history of priestly service in the past and the fully developed ritual of the temple. The baptizing of the proselyte was not necessarily a priestly act, as indeed we cannot be certain that the baptism was always necessary at the introduction of a proselyte into the Jewish church. But the association of circumcision with the initiation of the proselyte certainly introduced the priest, and the sprinkling of the congregation by the priest was a familiar part of his official duties. It is quite probable therefore that John's use of the expression carried with it something of the sacerdotal idea.

3. Christ's Ethical Teaching Affected by Sacrificial Ideas:

The spirit of our Lord's teaching, as seen in the Sermon on the Mount, etc., as it reflects the thought of the Galilean ministry, may be regarded as prophetic rather than priestly. Still the end of the teaching was righteousness, and it was impossible for a Jew to conceive of the securing of righteousness without some reference to priestly administration and influence. The contrast of the effect of Christ's teaching with that of the scribes (Mt 7:29) keeps us in the vicinity of the law as applied through the sacerdotal service of which the scribes were the interpreters and teachers, and surely therefore a hint of our Lord's relation to priesthood may have found its way into the minds of His immediate hearers. He was careful to recognize the authority of the priest (Mt 8:4). The doctrine of sacrifice emerges somewhat more distinctly in the reference to the cross, which our Lord associates with the thought of finding life by losing it (Mt 16:24,25), and when the taking up the cross is interpreted by following Christ, and this hint is soon followed by Christ's distinct reference to His coming sufferings (Mt 17:9,12), more definitely referred to in Mt 17:22,23. Now the object of the work of the Lord takes clearer form. The Son of Man is come to save that which was lost (Mt 18:11 the American Revised Version, margin). As the time of the catastrophe drew nearer, the Lord became still more distinct in His references to His coming death (Mt 20:18,19), and at length declares that "the Son of man came .... to give his life a ransom for many" (Mt 20:28). our Lord's quotations (Mt 21:42; 23:39) concerning the rejected "corner stone," and the Blessed One "that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Ps 118:22,26), are drawn from a psalm filled with the spirit of the priestly service of the temple, and in their reference to Himself again illustrate the ever-increasing recognition of His priesthood. He also uses the official term "Christ" (Messiah, the anointed one) more frequently (Mt 24:5,23,14). On the eve of the betrayal and trial the crucifixion is clearly foretold (Mt 26:2); and the death (Mt 26:12). The full significance of the death is asserted at the institution of the Lord's Supper. The bread is "my body," the wine is "my blood of the new covenant," and it is declared to be "poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:26-28 margin).

4. Mutual Confirmations of the Synoptics:

A similar succession of ideas of our Lord's priestly work may be found in the other gospels (see Mr 1:8,44; 8:29; see below on the significance of the term Christ; Mr 8:31,34; 9:9,10). The inability of the disciples to understand the life that was to follow death here is indicated—the truth of the gospel of death and resurrection so closely bound up with the conception of sacrifice, where the blood is the life which given becomes the condition of the new union with God, being thus revealed by Christ as the initial doctrine to be continuously enlarged (Mr 9:31; 10:21,33,14,45; 11:9; 12:10; 13:21,22; 14:8,22-25,61,62). In Luke the priestly "atmosphere" is introduced in the earliest part of the narrative, the history of Zacharias and Elisabeth giving emphasis to the setting of John's own mission (Lu 1). The name Jesus (Lu 1:31); the special relation of the new kingdom to sin, necessarily connected with sacrifice in the mind of a priest, found in Zacharias' psalm (Lu 1:77,78); the subtle suggestion of the Suffering One in the "also" of Lu 2:35 the King James Version (the American Standard Revised Version omits) shows that the third Gospel is quite in line with the two other Synoptics (see also Lu 3:3; 5:14). The claim to forgive sins must have suggested the sacrificial symbol of remission (Lu 5:24; 9:23; 13:35; 14:27; 18:31; 20:14; 22:19,20; 24:7,26,46,47). In the Fourth Gospel, we have the word of the Baptist, "Behold, the Lamb of God" (Joh 1:29,36), where Christ's relation to sin is distinctly expressed (see LAMB OF GOD)—the baptism in the Spirit (Joh 1:33). It is highly probable that the apostle John was the "other" of the two disciples, (Joh 1:40) and, having heard the Baptist's words, is the only evangelist who records them, thus introducing from his personal knowledge the sacrificial idea earlier into his history than the Synoptics. Christ declares that He will give His life for the life of the world (Joh 6:51). The entire passage (Joh 6:47-65) is suffused with the conception of "life for life," one of the elements constituting the conception of the sacrificial act. In Joh 8:28 (compare Joh 3:14; 12:32) Christ predicts His crucifixion. The Good Shepherd gives His life for the sheep (Joh 10:15). In Joh 10:17,18, Christ claims the power to lay down His life and to take it again. He is the sacrifice and the Sacrificer.

5. The Dual Outgrowth of Sacrifice, the Victim and Sacrificer:

Here appears for the first time the double relation of Christ to the sacrificial idea, worked out in the later thought of the church into the full significance of our Lord's priestly office. In Joh 11:25,26 Christ is the source of life, and life after death. It is hardly possible that this conception should not have, even if remotely suggested, some reference to the significance of sacrifice; for in the sacrifices the Divine claim for the blood, as specially to be set apart as the Divine portion, was ever present. God ever claimed the blood as His; for to Him the life was forfeited by sin. And moreover He alone possesses life and gives it. Of that forfeit and that Divine sovereignty of life, sacrifice is the expression. This is fully realized and made actual in Christ's life and death for man, in which man shares by His unity with Christ. Man at once receives the penalty of sin in dying with Christ, and rises again into the new life which our Lord opened, and of which He is the ceaseless energy and power through the spirit of God. The emergence of this idea is illustrated by the evangelist in the sayings of Caiaphas, where as the high priest of the nation he gives, though unconsciously, a significant expression to the truth that it was "expedient" that Jesus 'should die for the nation and for the children of God everywhere scattered' (Joh 11:47-52). Here the symbolic significance of sacrifice is practically realized: death in the place of another and the giving of life to those for whom the sacrifice was offered. The vitalizing power of Christ's death is asserted in the discourse following the visit of the Greeks (Joh 12:24-33). The idea of life from the dying seed is associated with the conception of the power of attraction and union by the cross. The natural law of life

through death is thus in harmony with the gift of life through sacrifice involving death. That sacrifice may be found much more widely than merely in death, is shown by the law of service illustrated in the washing of the disciples' feet (13:14-17); and this is declared to spring out of love (Joh 15:13). For the priestly ideas of our Lord's prayer (Joh 17) see INTERCESSION; INTERCESSION OF CHRIST; PRAYERS OF CHRIST.

6. Christ's Priesthood in the Apostolic Ministry and Epistles:

Christ's priestly office finds illustration in the Ac of the Apostles, in the apostolic declaration of Christ's Messianic office, not only Lord, but also Christ the Anointed One (Ac 2:36). Peter's reference to the stone which completed the temple, the service of which was essentially sacrificial, as the Symbol of Christ, the Crown of that Spiritual Temple (Ac 4:11); Philip's application of the passage in Isa of the sheep led to the slaughter (Isa 53:7,8) to our Lord (Ac 8:32,35); Peter's discourse to Cornelius, culminating in the remission of sins through Christ (Ac 10:43)—all indicates the steady growth in the apostolic ministry of the conception of our Lord's priestly office. The idea takes its most distinct form in Paul's sermon at Antioch (Ac 13:38,39). The necessity of Christ's death and resurrection was the essence of Paul's message (Ac 17:3). And in the address to the elders, the church is declared to have been purchased by God with His own blood (Ac 20:28).

As the epistles express the more elaborated thought of the apostolic ministry, the sacrifice of our Lord naturally finds more definite exposition, and inasmuch as He was both active and passive in the offering of Himself, the conception of sacrifice branches into the twofold division, the object offered, and the person offering. It must never be forgotten, however, that the thought of Christ's sacrifice even when thus separated into its two great divisions necessarily involves in each conception the suggestion of the other: God setting Him forth as a propitiation through faith in His blood (Ro 3:25). He was delivered for our offenses and raised for our justification (Ro 4:25). Through Him we have access to the conditions of justification and peace (Ro 5:2). Christ died for the ungodly, and we are justified by His blood (Ro 5:8,9). The conception of life both as forfeit from man and gift by God, expressed by sacrifice, runs through the reasoning of Ro 8 (see especially Ro 8:11,32-34, where Christ who died for man rises from the dead, and becomes the intercessor; the victim and the High Priest are thus united in the Lord, and thus He becomes full expression and supplier of the love of God which is the perfect life). In 1Co 1:23 Paul affirms the preaching of the cross as the center of his message. The subject of his teaching was not merely Christ, but Christ and Him crucified (1Co 2:2). In 1Co 5:7 Christ is declared to be the Passover, and sacrificed for us (1Co 10:16-18). The manifestation of the death of the Lord by the bread and wine is given in the account of the institution of the Supper (1Co 11:26). In 1Co 15:3 Christ is said expressly to have died for our sins. Christ's sacrifice lies at the basis of all the thought of the Galatian epistle (Gal 1:4; 2:20; 3:13). In Eph we have the definite statement of redemption through the blood of Christ (Eph 1:7). Christ's humiliation to the cross is given in Php 2:8; community with Christ's death, one of the important elements of sacrifice, in Php 3:10,11. Forgiveness, the essence of redemption, is declared to be through the blood of Christ (Col 1:14). Peace is secured through the blood of the cross, and reconciliation (Col 1:20); the presentation of us in Christ's flesh through death, holy and unblamable and unreprovable to God (Col 1:22). The community of sacrifice sets forth the oneness of believers with Christ (Col 3:1-4). Christ is declared to be the one Mediator between God and man, who gave Himself a

ransom for all (1Ti 2:5,6).

7. The Crowning Testimony of the Epistle to the Hebrews:

The chief source of the priestly conception of our Lord is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Christ is declared to have by Himself purged our sins (Heb 1:3); to taste of death for every man (Heb 2:9); that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest to make reconciliation for the sins of the people (Heb 2:17; compare Heb 3:1); the community of sacrifice (Heb 3:14); our great High Priest has passed into the heavens (Heb 4:14); His pitifulness (Heb 4:15); the authority and power of Christ's priesthood fully set forth (Heb 5). Christ was made a High Priest after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 5:6). The priesthood of Christ being of the order of Melchizedek is more excellent than the Aaronic priesthood (Heb 7). Christ's priesthood being eternal, that of the Aaronic is abolished (Heb 8). Christ's high-priesthood is made effectual by His own blood; and He entered once for all into the holy place, and has become the Mediator of a New Covenant (Heb 9:11-15). Christ is forever the representative of man in heaven (Heb 9:24-28). Christ by the sacrifice of Himself forever takes away sin, and has consecrated the new and living way to God (Heb 10). He is the Mediator of the New Covenant (Heb 12:24). The entire Epistle is steeped in the conception of Christ's priesthood.

In 1Pe 1:2 the sacrificial element appears in the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The sufferings of the Lord were prophesied, the spirit of the Anointed One signifying what the prophets desired to know (1Pe 1:11); the redemption by the precious blood of Christ is of "a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1Pe 1:19); the priesthood of believers was through Christ (1Pe 2:5), who carried up our sins in his body to the tree (1Pe 2:24 the Revised Version, margin).

In the Johannine writings we have the cleansing from sin by the blood of Jesus Christ (1Jo 1:7). Christ is said to have laid down His life for us (1Jo 3:16). The sacrifice as well as the teaching of Christ is insisted on in the coming by blood as well as by water (1Jo 5:6).

The appearance of Christ in Re 1:13 is high-priestly; His robe is the talar, the high-priestly garment. The sacrificial place of Christ is indicated by "a Lamb .... as though it had been slain" (Re 5:6,9,12). The repeated title of Christ throughout the Apocalypse is The Lamb.

8. Christ's Relation to Sin Expressed in Sacrificial Terms:

This review of the Scripture teaching on priesthood clearly indicates the development of thought which led to the affirmation of our Lord's priestly office. He came to put away sin. The doctrine of sin was intimately associated with the priestly service of the temple. The sacrifices were in some cases sin offerings, and in these there ever appeared, by the function of the blood which is the life, the fatal loss of life by sin, the punishment of which was the withdrawal of the Divine gift of life. The life was always in the sacrifice reserved for God. It was natural therefore when Christ appeared that His work in taking away sin should have been interpreted in the light of sacrificial thought. We find the idea steadily developed in the New Testament. He was the sacrifice, the Lamb of God. The question as to who offered

the sacrifice was answered—Himself. Then He became in the conception of apostolic teaching, especially emphasized in the Epistle to the He, the priest as well as the sacrifice. This was at length completely defined in theology of the church, and has generally been accepted as setting forth an important aspect of our Lord's redemptive work.

VI. Christ's Kingly Office.

The Breakdown of the Secular Monarchy:

The association of rule with the redemption of mankind was early found in Divine revelation. It is in the Protevangelium of Ge 3:15; the covenant with Abraham contains it (Ge 22:17,18); the blessing of Jacob reflects it (Ge 49:10). After the successive attempts to establish a visible and earthly monarchy, its settlement in the family of David was associated with Divine premonitions of continued and gracious royalty (2Sa 7:18-29; 23:1-7; Psalms 2; 45; 72; 110). The failure of the earthly monarchy and the fatal experiences of the kingdom turned the thought of the devout, especially guided by prophetic testimony, to a coming king who should restore the glory of the Davidic house and the people of Israel. Here and there the conception appears of the more extended reign of the Coming One, and the royal authority finds a growing place in the prophetic Scriptures (Isa 2:1-4; 9:6,7; 11:1-10; 42:1-4; 52:13-15; 53:12; 60:1ff; Jer 23:5,6; 30:18-24; Da 2:44; 7:9-14,27; Mic 5:1-4; Zec 3). The postexilic conception of the king became one of the supreme and most active ideas in the Jewish mind. The reign of the Messiah was to be earthly, and all nations were to be subject to the Jew. The Jews of Palestine seem to have retained the more patriotic and the more material form of the idea (see 1 Macc 14:41), while the Egyptian and dispersed Jews began to regard the more spiritual character of the coming Messiah. References to the future blessedness of Israel under the restored royalty do not appear so largely in the Apocrypha writings which it must be remembered reflect chiefly their Egyptian-Jewish sources. Still there are some passages of interest (Baruch 4:21-5; Tobit 13; Ecclesiasticus 35:18,19; 36:11-16; 47:11,22). In the New Testament we have references to the strong ex pectation of the restored royalty and kingdom (Joh 1:49; 6:15; 12:12-15; Ac 1:6). Christ's kingship was speedily recognized by those who saw His works of power, and acknowledged His authority. He Himself clearly claimed this authority (Mt 22:43-45; Joh 18:36,37). It was however not a kingdom based upon material and external power and rule, but on the foundation of truth and righteousness. The Kingdom of Heaven or of God is familiar to every reader of the words of Jesus. It was thus He described the new order which He had come to establish, of which He was to be the Lord and Administrator; not an earthly dominion after the fashion of this world's kingdoms; it was to be the rule of mind and of spirit. It was to be extended by ethical forces, and the principle of its authority was centered in Christ Himself. It was to be developed on earth but perfected in the future and eternal life. Some divines have distinguished Christ's regal power as that of nature, that of grace, that of glory. Many believe that there is to be a personal visible reign of Christ upon the earth. Some hold that this will be produced by His advent prior to an age of millennial glory. Other views regard the advent as the close of earthly conditions and the final judgment.

VII. The Messianic Basis of the Threefold Office of the Lord.

That the developments of Jewish thought centered round what may conveniently be called the idea of the Messiah is plain to any student of the Old Testament and other Jewish writings. They sprang from the ethical and theological ideas of this people, interpreted by and expressed in their political and religious forms, and continually nurtured by their experiences in the varied course of their national life. The essence of Messianic belief was a personal deliverer. Jewish history had always been marked by the appearance and the exploits of a great man. The capacity of the production of exceptional and creative individuals has been the characteristic of the race in all its ages. A judge, a lawgiver, a teacher, a seer, a king—each had helped, or even saved the people in some critical period. Each had added to the knowledge of God, whether received or rejected by the people. The issues of such service had remained, enshrined in a growing liturgy, or made permanent in a finally centralized and unified ritual, recorded in chronicle and lyric. The hope of Israel at one time did not take the completely personal form; indeed, it is probably easy to exaggerate the Messianic element as we look back from the perfect realization of it, in the Christian revelation and history. Much that has been called Messianic has been the result of reading into the Old Testament what has been derived from Christian thought and experience. Zephaniah has been described as a picture of Israel's restoration and triumph. Yet apparently it has no reference to the personal element. Still the "Messiah" begins to appear in the prophetic writings (see above), especially in the royal elements of His office. It is at this point that the meaning of the term is to be considered. "Yahweh's anointed" is found as applied to a king, and is familiar in this use in the Old Testament. But anointing belonged to the priesthood and to the prophetic order, if not actually, at least metaphorically, as sett ing apart (see 1Ki 19:16; Ps 105:15; Isa 61:1). And the word Messiah (Christ) the Anointed, came to be used for that conception of a person, perhaps first employed definitely (Da 9:24-26), who should be the Deliverer of the Jews and even still more widely, a Redeemer. In the age immediately preceding the Christian, the idea had taken possession not only of the Jews, but also of the Samaritans (Joh 4:25); and was not altogether unknown in Gentilethought; e.g. Sib Or, iii.97; Virgil Ecl. iv. It involves certainly the prophetic and royal offices and, in the idea of a Suffering Servant, was closely allied to the objects of the sacrificial order.

The claim of Jesus to be the Christ, and the recognition of this claim by His followers and apostles, gave a new meaning to the teaching of the Old Testament, and the writings lying outside the canon, but which were familiar to the people. Especially was the suffering and death of the Lord and its relation to sin the occasion of a new Understanding of the Mosaic and later-developed sacrificial system. Jesus as the Offerer of Himself perfected the function of the priest, as He became the Lamb of God who t aketh away the sins of the world. He thus completed the threefold ministry of the Messiah as the Prophet who reveals, the Priest who offers and intercedes, the King who rules. In Him the offices are commingled. He rules by His sacrifice and His teaching; He reveals by His Kingship and His offering. The offices spring from both His person and His work, and are united in the final issue of the salvation of the world.

See also EXALTATION OF CHRIST; INTERCESSION OF CHRIST.

LITERATURE.

Euseb., HE, I, 3; Aug., De civ. Dei, x. 6; Catech. Council of Trent; Calvin, Instit., II, 15; Heidelb. Catech. Ans. 31 and Reformed Liturg; Thanksgiving aft. Inft. Bapt.; J. Gerhard, Loci Theolog; Spener,

Catechism.; Ernesti, De officio Christi triplici; Knapp, Theology, section 107; Ebrard, Herzog Realencyc., under the word Further discussion is found in the standard theologies, as Pye Smith, First Lines, and Scrip. Teatim. to the Messiah; Hodge, Shedd, Weiss, Biblical Theol. of the New Testament, Van Oosterzee, Christian Dogmatics. See also Higginson, Ecce Messias; Moule's brief but suggestive statement in Outlines of Christian Doctrine; Ritschl, A Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, especially Introduction; Dorner, The Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ.

L. D. Bevan

CHRIST, PERSON OF

See PERSON OF CHRIST.

CHRIST, TEMPTATION OF

See TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

CHRIST, THE EXALTATION OF

egz-ol-ta'-shun:

I. THE RESURRECTION

1. Its Glorification of Christ

2. Resurrection Body—Identity, Change, Present Locality

3. The Agent of the Resurrection

II. ASCENSION OF OUR LORD

1. Its Actuality

2. General Doctrine of the Church

3. Lutheran Doctrine

4. Theory of Laying Aside the Existence-Form of God

5. Necessity

III. EXALTATION TO THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD

1. Its Significance

2. Its Essential Necessity

V. THE SECOND ADVENT

1. Reality

2. Judgment

This term is given to that condition of blessedness, glory and dominion into which our Lord entered after the completion of His earthly career of humiliation and suffering, and which is to be regarded as the reward of His meritorious obedience, and the issue of His victorious struggle, and at the same time the means of His prosecution and completion of His work as Redeemer and Saviour of the world. The classic passage of Scripture, rich in suggestion, and the source of much controversy in the development of Christian theology, is Php 2:5-11. The word "exalted" of Php 2:9, huperupsoo, occurs only in this place in the New Testament and, like its Latin representative, is limited to ecclesiastical use. Compare Ro 14:9; Eph 1:19-23; 1Pe 3:21,22.

Christ’s Exaltation includes His Resurrection, Ascension, Session at the right hand of God, and Advent as Judge and Consummator of the world’s redemption.

I. The Resurrection.

1. Its Glorification of Christ:

The historic place and validity of this event will be found under other heads; our concern is with the event as it relates to the glorification of our Lord.

(1) It revealed His power over death.

(2) It confirms all His claims to Divine Sonship.

(3) It attests His acceptance and that of His work by God.

(4) It crowns the process of the redemption of the world.

(5) It forms the beginning of that new creation which is life eternal, and over which death can have no power.

(6) It is the entrance of the Son of God into the power and glory of the New Kingdom, or the restored Kingdom of the Sovereign Ruler of the Universe.

The following Scriptures among many others may be consulted: Re 1:18; Ac 2:24; Ro 1:4; 1Co 15:20; Joh 5:25; Ro 4:25; Ro 6:4,5; Col 2:12; Php 3:10; Ro 6:9.

2. Resurrection Body—Identity, Change, Present Locality:

An interesting and important question arises in connection with Christ's exaltation, relating to the nature of the body of the risen Lord. It was clearly identical with that of His natural life. It was recognized by the marks which were upon it: Lu 24:39,40; Joh 20:24-29. It received food: Lu 24:43 (compare Lu 24:30; Joh 21:12,13; Ac 10:41). Nevertheless it was changed. After the resurrection, it was not at once recognized: Joh 20:15; 21:7; Lu 24:31. It appeared under apparently new conditions of relation to material substance: Joh 20:19; Lu 24:36. It suddenly became visible, and as suddenly vanished. These facts suggest what reverently may be surmised as to its exalted condition. The apostle's declaration as to the resurrection-body of the redeemed furnishes some hints: 1Co 15:35-49; compare Php 3:21. We may cautiously, from the history of the resurrection and the Pauline doctrine, conclude, that our Lord still possesses a human body. It is of material substance, with new properties. It occupies space. It was seen by Paul, by Stephen, by the seer of the Apocalypse. It is glorious, incorruptible, spiritual.

3. The Agent of the Resurrection:

By whom was the resurrection effected? It is referred by some Scriptures to God. See Ps 16:10 (compare Ac 2:27,31); and the distinct affirmation by Peter (Ac 2:32). Paul declares that Christ was "raised .... through the glory of the Father" (Ro 6:4). In Eph 1:19,20, it was the mighty power of God which was wrought in Christ "when he raised him from the dead." Elsewhere it is ascribed to Christ Himself. He declared: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Joh 2:19). In Joh 10:17,18, our Lord declares: "I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." The efficient agent is said, according to the generally received reading of Ro 8:2, to have been the Spirit of God, and thus the resurrection is referred to each person of the Godhead. The doctrine of the Lutheran church refers the act to the human power of the Lord Himself, which by incarnation had been endowed with attributes of Deity. This view consists with their teaching of the omnipresence of the body of Jesus (see below on the section "Ascension").

II. The Ascension of our Lord.

1. Its Actuality:

The exaltation of Christ consisted further in His ascension. Some have held that the resurrection and ascension of Jesus ought to be regarded as aspects of the same event. But Mary saw the risen Lord, though she was forbidden to touch Him, for "I am not yet ascended unto the Father: but go unto my brethren, and say to them, I ascend," etc. (Joh 20:17). This, compared with the invitation to Thomas to touch Him, eight days later, suggests something in the ascension added to that which the resurrection implied, and the general thought of the church has consistently regarded the latter as a further step in the exaltation of the Lord.

2. General Doctrine of the Church:

The fact of ascension is recorded in Mr 16:19, and Lu 24:50,51, and with greater detail in Ac 1:9-11. According to these accounts, the ascension was seen by the disciples, and this suggests that heaven is a locality, where are the angels, who are not ubiquitous, and where Christ's disciples will find the place which He declared He was going to prepare for them (Joh 14:2). Heaven is also undoubtedly referred to as a state (Eph 2:6; Php 3:20), but Christ's body must be in some place, and where He is, there is Heaven.

3. Lutheran Doctrine:

This is certainly the doctrine of the church in general, and seems to be consistent with the Scriptural teaching. But the Lutherans have maintained that the ascension of the Lord merely involved a change of state in the human nature of Christ. He possessed during His life on earth the Divine attributes of omnipresence, omnipotence and omniscience, but He voluntarily abstained from their exercise. But at His ascension He returned to the full use of these powers. The ascension is Christ's return to immensity. The community of natures gave these Divine qualities to the humanity of Jesus, which Luther declared involved its ubiquity, and that as He was at the right hand of God, and God was everywhere, so Christ in His human personality was in no specific place but everywhere. This omnipresence is not of the infinite extension of the body of the Lord, but He is present as God is everywhere present in knowledge and power.

4. Theory of Laying Aside the Existence-Form of God:

Another theory of the ascended humanity-of the Lord depends upon the conception of the Son of God laying aside at incarnation the "existence-form of God," and while affirming that Christ's body is now in a definite place, it proceeds to hold that at the ascension the accidental and variable qualities of humanity were laid aside, and that He dwells in heaven as a glorified man. Ebrard says: "He has laid aside forever the existence form of God, and assumed that of man in perpetuity, in which form by His Spirit He governs the church and the world. He is thus dynamically present to all His people." This form of doctrine seems to involve as the result of the incarnation of the Son of God His complete and sole humanity. He is no more than a man. The Logos is no longer God, and as the ascension did not involve the reassumption of the "existence-form of God," Christ in glory is only a glorified man.

5. Necessity:

The ascension was necessary, in conformity with the spiritual character of the kingdom which Christ founded. Its life is that of faith, not sight. A perpetual life of even the resurrected Christ on earth would have been wholly inconsistent with the spiritual nature of the new order. The return of Christ to the special presence of God was also part of His high-priestly service (see CHRIST, OFFICES OF) and His corporal absence from His people was the condition of that gift of the Spirit by which salvation was to be secured to each believer and promulgated throughout the world, as declared by Himself (Joh 16:7). Finally, the ascension was that physical departure of the Lord to the place which He was to prepare for His people (Joh 14:2,3). The resurrection was this completion of the objective conditions of redemption. The ascension was the initial step in the carrying out of redemptive work in the final salvation of mankind.

III. Exaltation Completed at the Right Hand of God.

1. Its Significance:

The term "the right hand of God" is Scriptural (Ac 7:55,56; Ro 8:34; Eph 1:20; Heb 1:3; 10:12; 12:2; 1Pe 3:22) and expresses the final step in the Lord’s exaltation. Care must be taken in the use of the expression. It is a figure to express the association of Christ with God in glory and power. It must not be employed as by Luther to denote the relation of the body of Christ to space, neither must it be limited to the Divine nature of the Logos reinstated in the conditions laid aside in incarnation. Christ thus glorified is the God-man, theanthropic person, Divine and human.

2. Its Essential Necessity:

This exaltation is based upon the essential glory of the Son of God, who "being the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person .... sat down on the right hand" (Heb 1:3 the King James Version). It is the claim which the Lord makes for Himself in His prayer (Joh 17:4,5), and is thus specifically declared in Php 2:6-11: "God highly exalted Him." But in His glory Christ received the power universal and Divine. In Eph 1:20-22 His supreme dignity and power are affirmed "far above .... every name," "all things .... under His feet" (compare Heb 2:8; 1Co 15:27; 1Pe 3:22). Christ at the "right hand of God" is the highly suggestive picture of His universal dominion asserted by Himself (Mt 28:18): "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." It is vain to speculate upon the relation of Christ’s nature in this exalted state. We cannot distinguish between the human and Divine. We can only believe in, and trust and submit to the One Glorified Person who thus administers the kingdom in perfect harmony with its Divine laws in all the ages, and His own revelation of the will of God, as given to man in His own earthly career: pitiful, tender, serving, helping, restoring, saving, triumphant. The exaltation is for His mediatorial and finally saving work. He is the Head of His church; He is the Lord of angels and men; He is the Master of the ages.

IV. The Second Advent.

The exaltation of Christ is to be completed by His coming again at the close of the dispensation, to complete His redemptive work and judge the world, and so to establish the final Kingdom of God. This belief has found a place in all the ecumenical symbols. Theology has ever included it in its eschatology. It is clear that the apostles and the early church expected the second coming of the Lord as an immediate event, the significance of which, and especially the effect of the nonfulfillment of which expectation, does not fall within the province of this article to consider. The various theories of the Parousia, the different ideas as to the time and the form of the second Advent, do not concern its relation to the exaltation of the Lord. Whenever and however He may return; whether He is ever coming to the church and to the world, His visible or His spiritual presence, do not affect the fact that He has been exalted to the position of ultimate Lord and final judge of men. We may therefore define this crowning condition of exaltation as:

1. Reality:

An advent, real, personal and visible. We must guard against the extremes of limiting this advent on the one side to a final particular event, on the other to those critical and catastrophic movements in world history which have led to the extension of God’s kingdom and a virtual judgment of men. The Lord is ever coming, and also He will return. See Ac 1:11; Lu 17:24; Mt 24:30; 25:31; Lu 19:12; Mt 13:40,41,49; Lu 18:8; Joh 5:28,29; 6:40,54; 21:22; Ac 3:20; 2Th 1:10; Heb 9:28; Jas 5:8; Jude 1:14; 1Jo 2:28; Re 1:7. The reality and visibility of the advent depend upon the personal and abiding relation of the Lord to the world-redemption. Christianity is not merely a spiritual dynamic drawn from a series of past events. It is the living relation of the complete humanity of the redeemed to the God man, and must therefore be consummated in a spiritual and material form. The ultimate of Christianity is no more docetic than was its original. A reverent faith will be satisfied with the fact of the glory whenever it shall arrive. The form and time are unrevealed. Preparation and readiness are better than speculation and imaginary description.

2. Judgment:

The Judgment is clearly taught by Scripture. our Lord declares that He is appointed Judge. (Joh 5:22; 9:39). Paul teaches that we must "all stand before the judgment- seat of God" (Ro 14:10). Here again there is the suggestion of the judgment which is ever being made by the Lord in His office as Sovereign and Administrator of the kingdom; but there is also the expectation of a definite and final act of separation and discernment. Whatever may be the form of this judgment (and here again a wise and reverent silence as to the unrevealed is a becoming attitude for the believer), we are sure that He who will make it, is the glorified Word incarnate, and it will be the judgment of a wisdom and justice and love that will be the complete glory of the Christ.

See also ASCENSION; JUDGMENT; PAROUSIA; RESURRECTION.

L. D. Bevan

CHRISTIAN

kris’-chan, kris’-ti-an (Christianos):

1. Historicity of Ac 11:26

2. Of Pagan Origin

3. The Christian Attitude to the Name

4. Was "Christian" the Original Form?

5. The Christians and the Empire

6. Social Standing of the Early Christians

7. Christian Self-Designations

LITERATURE

1. Historicity of Ac 11:26:

The word Christian occurs only three times in the New Testament (Ac 11:26; 26:28; and 1Pe 4:16). The first passage, Ac 11:26, gives the origin of the term, "The disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." The older generation of critical scholars disputed the historicity of this statement. It was argued that, had the term originated so early, it must have been found far more frequently in the records of early Christianity; sometimes also that the termination -ianus points to a Latin origin. But there is general agreement now that these objections are groundless. The historicity of the Lukan account is upheld not only by Harnack, but by the more radical Knopf in Die Schriften des New Testament, edited by Johannes Weiss. In early imperial times, the adjectival termination -ianos was widely diffused throughout the whole empire. Originally applied to the slaves belonging to the great households, it had passed into regular use to denote the adherents of an individual or a party. A Christian is thus simply an adherent of Christ. The name belongs, as Ramsay says, to the popular slang, as indeed sect and party names generally do. It is only after a considerable interval, and very often under protest, that such names are accepted as self-designations.

2. Of Pagan Origin:

The name, then, did not originate with the Christians themselves. Nor would the Jews have applied it to the followers of Jesus, whose claim to be the Christ they opposed so passionately. They spoke of the Christians as "the sect of the Nazarenes" (Ac 24:5); perhaps also as "Galileans," a term which the

emperor Julian attempted later vainly to revive. The word must have been coined by the heathen population of Antioch, as the church emerged from the synagogue, and a Christianity predominantly Gentiletook its place among the religions of the world.

3. The Christian Attitude to the Name:

Perhaps the earliest occurrence of Christian as a self-designation is in Didache 12:4. In the Apologists and Ignatius on the other hand the word is in regular use. 1Pe simply takes it over from the anti-Christian judicial procedure of the law courts, without in any way implying that the Christians used it among themselves. There is every probability, however, that it was the danger which thus began at an early date to attach to the name which commended it to the Christians themselves as a title of honor . Deissmann (Licht vom Osten, 286) suggests that Christian means slave of Christ, as Caesarian means slave of Caesar. But the word can scarcely have had that fullness of meaning till the Christians themselves had come to be proud of it.

According to tradition, Luke himself belonged to Antioch. In Ac 11:27,28 Codex Bezae (D) reads "There was much rejoicing, and when we had assembled, there stood up," etc. In view of the greater authority now so frequently accorded to the so-called Western text, we cannot summarily dispose of such a reading as an interpolation. If the historian was not only an Antiochene, but a member of the original GentileChristian church, we have the explanation alike of his interest in the origin of the name Chris tian, and of the detailed precision of his information.

4. Was "Christian" the Original Form?:

In all three New Testament passages the uncorrected Codex Sinaiticus reads "Chrestian." We know from many sources that this variant was widely current in the 2nd century. Blass in his edition of Ac not only consistently reads "Chrestian," but conjectures that "Chrestian" is the correct reading in Tacitus (Annals, xv.44), the earliest extra- Biblical testimony to the word. The Tacitus manuscript has since been published in facsimile. This has shown, according to Harnack (Mission and Expansion (English translation), I, 413, 414), that "Chrestian" actually was the original reading, though the name "Christ" is correctly given. Harnack accordingly thinks that the Latin historian intended to correct the popular appellation of circa 64 AD, in the light of his own more accurate knowledge. "The common people used to call them ‘Chrestians,’ but the real name of their founder was Christ." Be this as it may, a confusion between "Christos" (Christos) and the familiar Greek slave name "Chrestos" (chrestos is more intelligible at an early date than late r, when Christianity was better known). There must have been a strong tendency to conform the earlier witnesses to the later, familiar, and etymologically correct, usage. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that the original scribe of Codex Sinaiticus retains "Chrestian." On the whole it seems probable that this designation, though bestowed in error, was the original one.

5. The Christians and the Empire:

The fuller discussion of this subject more appropriately falls under the articles dealing with the relation

of the church and empire. Suffice it here to say that Paul apparently hoped that by his acquittal the legal position of Christianity as a religio licita would be established throughout the empire, and that 1 Peter belongs to a time when the mere profession of Christianity was a crime in the eyes of the state, but that in all probability this was a new position of affairs.

6. Social Standing of the Early Christians:

That early Christianity was essentially a movement among the lower non-literary classes has been rightly emphasized—above all by Deissmann. This is a circumstance of the utmost importance for the correct understanding of the early history of our faith, though probably Deissmann in some degree exaggerates and misplaces the significance. Is it correct to say, for example, that "primitive Christianity was relatively indifferent to politics, not as Christianity, but as a movement of the humbler folks, whose lot on the whole had certainly been lightened by the Empire" (Licht vom Osten, 254)? Very probably however the difficulties of the Pauline Gentilemission were appreciably increased by the fact that he touched a lower social stratum than that of the original Jewish Christianity of Palestine. No class more resents being associated in any way with the "submerged masses" than the self-respecting peasant or artisan, who seems to have formed the backbone of the Palestine church. The apostle had conseq uently to fight against social, no less than racial and religious, prejudices.

7. Christian Self-Designations:

The Christians originally called themselves "Disciples," a term afterward restricted to personal hearers of the Lord, and regarded as a title of high distinction. The ordinary self-designations of the apostolic age are "believers" (Ac 5:14; 1Ti 4:12), "saints" (Ac 9:13,12,41; Ro 1:7), "brethren" (Ac 6:3; 10:23, etc.), "the elect" (Col 3:12; 2Ti 2:10), "the church of God" (Ac 20:28 margin), "servants (slaves) to God" (Ro 6:22; 1Pe 2:16). The apostolic authors refer to themselves as "servants (slaves) of Christ Jesus" (Php 1:1). Other expressions are occasionally met with, of which perhaps the most significant is: Those "that call upon the name of the Lord" (Ac 9:14; Ro 10:12,13; 1Co 1:2). Compare Pliny’s report to Trajan (Epistles, X, 97): "They affirmed that .... they had been wont to assemble and address a hymn to Christ as to a god."

LITERATURE.

The most recent discussion of the names of Christian believers, including "Christian," is in Harnack’s Mission and Expansion of Christianity, English translation (2nd edition, 1908), I, 399 ff. See also EB, HDB, DCG, with the lit. there cited. On the social status of the early Christians, compare Orr’s Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity; on the religious significance of the name, see CHRISTIANITY.

John Dickie

CHRISTIANITY

kris-chan’-i-ti, kris-chi-an’-i-ti, kris-ti-an’-i-ti (Christianismos):

I. IN PRINCIPLE AND ESSENCE

1. Early Use of Term

2. New Testament Implications:

Messiahship—Resurrection—Redemption

Pauline Summaries

3. Did Jesus Claim to Be Christ?

4. The Resurrection

Its Evidence

5. Two Contrasted Estimates of our Lord’s Person

(1) The Non-Believing Estimate—not Truly Historical

(2) The Believing Estimate—Relation to Experience

6. Christianity an Experience of Salvation

7. Jesus and the Gospel

8. New Testament Types of Doctrines

9. Naturalistic Interpretations—the Religio-Historic School

II. HISTORICAL AND DOCTRINAL

1. "Religion of Christ" and "The Christian Religion"

(1) The Historical Jesus Is Supernatural

(2) Essence of Christianity in Redemption

2. Modern Definitions

(1) Schleiermacher

(2) Ritschl

3. Place in Historical Religions

(1) This Place Unique

(2) Universality of Christianity

(3) The Absolute Religion

(4) Religion of Redemption

4. Development and Influence

(1) Expansion of Christianity (a) Apostolic Age

(b) Succeeding Period

(c) Modern Missions

(2) Doctrinal Shaping

(a) Gnosticism

(b) Monarchianism

(c) Arianism

(d) Sin and Grace

(e) Person of Christ

(f) The Atonement

(g) The Reformation

(h) Lutheran and Reformed

(3) Its Influence

(a) The Ancient World

(b) The Modern World

(c) Testimony of Professor Huxley

LITERATURE

I. In Principle and Essence.

1. Early Use of Term:

Unlike "Christian" (the King James Version), the term "Christianity," so far as is known, was first used by the Christians themselves, but does not occur in the New Testament. It is exactly parallel to Judaism ("the Jews' religion"), found not only in Ga 1:13,14, but in 2 Macc 2:21, etc. Our earliest authority for the word "Christianism" is Ignatius of Antioch. Christian is now a title of honor, and the Christian's glory is "to live according to Christianism" (Ignatius, Ad magnes, 10).

2. New Testament Implications: Messiahship—Resurrection—Redemption: While, however, the name is foreign to the New Testament, the New Testament is by universal consent our most important source of information regarding the thing. Christianity arose out of the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth, who claimed to be "the Christ." During Jesus' lifetime this claim was admitted by a circle of adherents, in whose view, afterwards, it was triumphantly vindicated by His resurrection from the dead. By resurrection He "was declared to be the Son of God with power" (Ro 1:4). With this was united from the first the recognition of Christ as the God-sent Redeemer, through whom has come to the world forgiveness, reconciliation with God and Divine spiritual power.

Pauline Summaries.

One of the oldest summaries of Christianity is that of Paul in 1Co 15:3,1: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; .... and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures." Of similar purport are the apostle's words in 2Co 5:18,19: "God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." From this reconciliation springs the new life of believers (Ro 6; 2Co 5:14-17).

3. Did Jesus Claim to Be Christ?:

More recently some have denied that Jesus advanced any such claim to Messiahship, but always upon purely arbitrary and subjective grounds. On the one hand these writers have been profoundly impressed by the grandeur of Jesus' character; on the other they have looked upon the claim to stand in such a unique relation to God and man as unfounded or meaningless. They have sought, accordingly, to escape the difficulty by denying that Jesus regarded Himself as the Anointed of the Lord (thus, e.g. Wrede). Sometimes they have gone the length even of affirming that Jesus was not so regarded by His personal disciples. Divine honors were accorded Him only gradually, as the memory of what He actually was faded away, and an idealization begotten of Christian faith took its place. The notion of Messiah is merely a piece of Jewish folklore. This position in its distinctively modern form has been answered, it seems to us, with absolute conclusiveness, by Professor James Denney in his Jesus and the Gospel. In a historical point of view, nothing in Jesus' life is more certain than that He regarded Himself as the Christ, the culmination and fulfillment of the Divine revelation given to Israel. This conviction of His is the point round which His whole message revolves. The most recent New Testament theology, that, e.g. of Dr. Paul Feine (1910), rightly starts from Jesus' Messianic consciousness, and seeks to understand His whole teaching in the light of it. Doubtless, like everything else which Jesus touched, the concept of Messiahship becomes transmuted and glorified in His hands. our Lord was in no way dependent upon current beliefs and expectations for the content of His Messianic consciousness. But is it likely that His followers, without His authority, would have attributed Messiahship to one so utterly unlike the Messiah of popular fancy?

4. The Resurrection:

The New Testament proves not only that the Christians from the very outset were fully persuaded, on what they regarded as adequate grounds in history and experience, that their Lord had risen from the dead, but also that this conviction mastered them, giving direction and purpose to their whole lives. Historical Christianity was erected on the foundation of a Risen Lord.

Its Evidence.

On this point Professor Denney says (Jesus and the Gospel, 111): "The real historical evidence for the resurrection is the fact that it was believed, preached, propagated, and produced its fruit and effect in the new phenomenon of the Christian church, long before any of our gospels were written. .... Faith in the resurrection was not only prevalent but immensely powerful before any of our New Testament books were written. Not one of them would ever have been written but for that faith. It is not this or that in the New Testament—it is not the story of the empty tomb, or of the appearing of Jesus in Jerusalem or in Galilee—which is the primary evidence for the resurrection: it is the New Testament itself. The life that throbs in it from beginning to end, the life that always fills us again with wonder, as it beats upon us from its pages, is the life which the Risen Saviour has quickened in Christian souls. The evidence for the resurrection of Jesus is the existence of the church in that extraordinary spiritual vitality which confronts us in the New Testament. This is its own explanation of its being."

5. Two Contrasted Estimates of our Lord's Person:

The best Christian thought of our day has no more difficulty than had the apostles in holding and establishing what Principal Forsyth fitly calls "the superhistoric finality of Christ." In the very nature of the case, wherever the problem of our Lord's person has been seriously faced, there have always been two distinct estimates of His value, that of assured faith, based upon personal experience of His redemptive power, and that of mere externalism.

(1) The Non-Believing Estimate—not Truly Historical:

The latter or non-believing estimate has no more right now to call itself "historical" or "scientific," than it had, nearly nineteen hundred years ago, to crucify the Lord of glory. The priests doubtless thought that they understood Jesus better than the ignorant, deluded Galileans. Yet the boldest champion of "the religio-historic method" would scarcely claim that theirs was the correct judgment. As a matter of fact, the so-called critical school are no more free from presuppositions than is the most thoroughgoing traditionalist. Nor have they a monopoly either of historical knowledge or of critical acumen. No truths are accessible to them which are not equally available for the Christian believer. No proof exists, beyond their own unsupported assertions, that they are better interpreters of the common truth. On the other hand, that whole range of experience and conviction intop which the Christian believer finds the supreme assurance of the truth of his religion is to them a sealed book. Surel y, then, it is the height of absurdity to maintain that the external, non-believing, estimate of our Lord's person is likely to be the more correct one. From the standpoint of Christian faith, such an external estimate is necessarily inadequate, whether it finds expression in a mechanical acceptance of the whole ecclesiastical Christology, or in the denial that such a person as Jesus of Nazareth ever lived.

(2) The Believing Estimate—Relation to Experience:

The believing estimate of our Lord's person is the essence of Christianity as a historical religion. But according to the New Testament this estimate is itself Divinely- inwrought and Divinely attested (Mt 16:17; 1Co 12:3; 1Jo 4:2,3). It presupposes the perfect objective self-manifestation of God in Jesus Christ on the one hand, and the subjective appropriation of this revelation by faith on the other. No argument against the reality of the revelation can be built upon the fact, generally acknowle dged by Christian theologians nowadays, that the Deity of our Lord and the supernatural origin of our religion can neither be proved nor disproved independently of one's personal attitude to Christianity. This follows necessarily from the nature of the apprehension of Divine truth. Spiritual things are spiritually discerned. There can be no impersonal knowledge of religious, any more than of ethical and aesthetic, truth. In these realms another's knowledge has no real meaning for anyone till he has felt its power and tested it in his own experience. Evangelical Christians do not accept the Deity of the Lord as the cardinal article of their religious faith on any merely external authority whether of Scripture or of tradition, or even of His own recorded words apart from experience of Christ. They accept it precisely as they accept the authority of Scripture itself, because of the witness of the Spirit with their spirits. The combined testimony of Scripture and tradition is confirmed in their religious life, when by receiving Jesus as our Lord and Saviour they experience the Christian power. This power is the great experienced reality in the light of which alone the other realities become intelligible. "One thing I know, that, whereas I was blind,

now I see" (Joh 9:25). "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life" (Joh 6:68).

6. Christianity an Experience of Salvation:

The true church of Christ consists of all who have experienced the power of Christ, delivering them from the guilt, the stain, and the dominion of sin and bringing the peace of God into their souls. Nothing less than this is either the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, or the historic faith of Christendom, or a religion adequate to human need. The Christian doctrine is partly the assertion of the reality of this power, partly its interpretation. Facts of history and theological propositions are vital to our faith, just in proportion as they are vitally related to this power. The Christian essentials are those elements, historical and dogmatic, without which Christianity would lose in whole or in part its living power to reconcile sinful man to the all-righteous, loving God.

7. Jesus and the Gospel:

Thus Jesus Himself belongs to His gospel. He is the heart and core of it. Christianity is both a rule of life and a doctrine. But in its inmost nature and being it is neither an ethic, nor a theology, but a religion—a new relation to God and man, Divinely mediated through Jesus Christ in His life, death and resurrection. As many as receive Him, to them gives He the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on His name, who are born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God (Joh 1:12). He brings man to God by bringing God to man, and the power of God into man’s sin-stained life.

8. New Testament Types of Doctrines:

It can scarcely be claimed that New Testament Christianity was in a theological point of view absolutely homogeneous. Various types can be distinguished with more or less clearness; even the ordinary reader feels a difference of theological atmosphere between e.g. Romans and James. This is inevitable, and need occasion no perplexity to Christian faith. All theology is partly interpretation—the relation of universal and eternal reality to personal thought. Hofmann rightly says that genuine Christian faith is one and the same for all, but that everyone must have his own theology, if he is to have any at all. In all genuine serious thought there is a personal element not precisely the same for any two individuals. It is possible to find in the New Testament foreshadowings of all the great distinctive types of historic Christianity. But the essential purpose of the New Testament is to make Christ real to us, to proclaim reconciliation to God through Him, and to convey the Christian power to our lives. The New Testa ment everywhere exhibits the same Christ, and bears witness to the same redeeming, life-transforming power.

9. Naturalistic Interpretations—the Religio-Historic School:

The attempt has often been made to explain Christianity as the natural product of contemporary forces intellectual and religious—most recently by the so-called "religio- historic school." But at most they have only shown that the form in which the religious concepts of primitive Christianity found articulate

expression was to some extent influenced ab extra, and that the earliest Christians were in their general intellectual outlook the children of their own time. They have not proved that the distinctive content of Christianity was derived from any external source. They have not even realized what they have to prove, in order to make good their contention. They have done nothing to account for the Christian power on their principles.

LITERATURE.

See the New Testament Theologies, especially that of Feine (1910); Seeberg, Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion (English translation very incorrect, 1908); Seeberg's Lehrbuch d. Dogmengeschichte, 2nd edition I, 1908; Brown, Essence of Christianity, New York, 1902; W. N. Clarke, What Shall We Think of Christianity? New York, 1899; above all Denney, Jesus and the Gospel (1909), and Forsyth, Person and Place of Jesus Christ (1909).

John Dickie

II. Historical and Doctrinal.

In its historical and doctrinal relations, developments, and influence, and its connection with the successive phases of human thought, Christianity presents many points of interest, only the more prominent of which can here briefly be touched upon.

1. "Religion of Christ" and "The Christian Religion":

A convenient starting-point is the well-known distinction of Lessing (Fragment in Works, XI, 242 ff) between "the religion of Christ" and "the Christian religion"—a distinction which still exactly marks the attitude to Christianity of the modern so-called "historical" school. By "the religion of Christ" is meant the religion which Christ Himself acknowledged and practiced as man; by "the Christian religion" is meant the view which regards Christ as more than man, and exalts Him as an object of worship. From this standpoint the problem for the historian is to show how the religion of Christ came to develop into the Christian religion—in modern speech, how the "Jesus of history" became the "Christ of faith."

(1) The Historical Jesus Is Supernatural.

It has already been pointed out (under I above) that the view of Jesus on which the assumed contrast rests is not one truly historical. The fallacy lies in regarding the Jesus of history as simply a man among men—holier, diviner in insight, but not essentially distinguished from the race of which He was a member. This is not the Christ of apostolic faith, but as little is it the picture of the historical Jesus as the Gospels actually present it. There, in His relations alike to God and to man, in His sinlessness, in His origin, claims, relation to Old Testament revelation, judgeship of the world, in His resurrection, exaltation, and sending of the Spirit, Jesus appears in a light which it is impossible to confine within natural or purely human limits. He is the Saviour who stands over against the race He came to save. It is

the same fallacy which under-lies the contrast frequently sought to be drawn between the religious standpoints of Christ and Paul. Pau l never for an instant dreamed of putting himself on the same plane with Christ. Paul was sinner; Christ was Saviour. Paul was disciple; Christ was Lord. Paul was weak, struggling man; Christ was Son of God. Jesus achieved redemption; Paul appropriated it. These things involved the widest contrasts in attitude and speech.

(2) Essence of Christianity in Redemption.

Though, therefore, Christ, in His relations of love and trust to the Father, and perfection of holy character, necessarily ever remains the Great Exemplar to whose image His people are to be conformed (Ro 8:29), in whose steps they are to follow (1Pe 2:21), it is not correct to describe Christianity simply as the religion which Christ practiced. Christianity takes into account also the work which Christ came to do, the redemption He achieved, the blessings which, through Him, are bestowed on those who accept Him as their Saviour, and acknowledge Him as their Lord. Essentially Christianity is a religion of redemption; not, therefore, a religion practiced by Jesus for Himself, but one based on a work He has accomplished for others. Experimentally, it may be described as consisting, above all, in the joyful consciousness of redemption from sin and reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ, and in the possession of a new life of sonship and holiness through Christ's Spirit. Everything in the way of holy obedience is included here. This, at least, reduced to its simplest terms, is undeniably what Christianity meant for its first preachers and teachers, and what historically it has meant for the church ever since.

2. Modern Definitions:

Definitions of Christianity are as numerous as the writers who treat of the subject; but one or two definitions may be glanced at as illustrative of the positions above assumed. As modern types, Schleiermacher and Ritschl may be selected in preference to writers of more conspicuous orthodoxy.

(1) Schleiermacher:

Schleiermacher, in his Der Christliche Glaube, has an interesting definition of Christianity. Christianity he speaks of as "a form of monotheistic faith, of the teleological order of religion (i.e. in which the natural is subordinated to the moral), the peculiarity of which, in distinction from other religions of this type, essentially is, that in it everything is referred to the redemption accomplished through Jesus of Nazareth" (section 11). As, in general, Schleiermacher's merit is recognized to lie in his bringing back, in a time of religious decay, the person of Christ to a central place in His religion, so here his true religious feeling is manifested in his fixing on the reference to redemption by Christ as the distinctive thing in Christianity.

(2) Ritschl:

Ritschl's definition is more complicated, and need not here be cited in full (compare his Justif. and Recon., III; English translation, 13). The important point is that, like Schleiermacher, Ritschl gives,

together with the idea of the kingdom of God, an essential place to the idea of redemption in the conception of Christianity. "Christianity," he says, "so to speak, resembles not a circle described from a single center, but an ellipse which is determined by two foci" (Jb., 11). The idea of the kingdom of God furnishes the teleological, the idea of redemption the religious, element in Christianity. There is truth in this; only it is to be remembered that the kingdom of God, as representing the end, can only, in a world of sin, be into existence through a redemption. Redemption, therefore, still remains the basal conception.

3. Place in Historical Religions:

In the enlarged view of modern knowledge, Christianity can be no longer regarded in isolation, but is seen to take its place in the long series of historical religions. It appears, like these other religions, in a historical context; has, like some of them, a personal founder; claims, as they also do, or did, the allegiance of multitudes of the population of the world; presents in externals (e.g. the possession of Scriptures), sometimes in ideas, analogies to features in these religions. For this reason, an influential modern school is disposed to treat Christianity, as before it, the religion of Israel, as simply one of these historical religions—"nothing less, but also nothing more"—explaining it from the inherent laws of religious development, and rejecting the idea of any special, authoritative revelation. Sacred books are pitted against sacred books; moral codes against moral codes; Jesus against founders of other religions; gospel stories against legends of the Buddha; ideas like those of the virgin birth, the incarnation, the resurrection, against seeming parallels on other soils. For examination of the principal of these alleged resemblances, see COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

(1) This Place Unique.

Here it is desirable to look at the place of Christianity in the series of historical religions in certain of its wider aspects. The uniqueness of Christ’s religion, and justification of its claim to a special, Divine origin, will only appear the more clearly from the comparison. In general, it need only be remarked that no other religion in the world has ever even professed to present a plain, historically developed, progressive revelation, advancing through successive stages in the unfolding of a Divine purpose of grace, till it culminates in the appearance of a person, life, character and work, like that of Jesus Christ; not in one single instance.

(2) Universality of Christianity.

A distinction is commonly made between national and universal religions, and Christianity is classed as one of the three universal religions—the other two being Buddhism and Mohammedanism (compare e.g. Kuenen’s Hibbert Lectures on National Religions and Universal Religions). There is certainly agreement in the fact that the two religions named with Christianity are not "national" religions; that they are "universal," in the sense in which Christianity is, may be denied. Neither Buddhism nor Mohammedanism has any fitness to become a religion for the world, nor, with all their remarkable extension, have they succeeded in establishing themselves, as Christianity has done, in East and West, in Old World and in New. Mohammed boasted that he would plant his religion wherever the palm tree

grew (Palgrave), and this still marks very nearly the range of its conquests. It is not a revivifying influence, but a blight on all higher civilization. It degrades woman, perpetuates slavery, fosters intolerance, and brings no real healing for the spiritual woes of mankind. Buddhism, again, notwithstanding its wide spread in China and neighboring lands, has in it no real spring of moral progress, and is today withering up at the root. Its system of "salvation"—attainment of Nirvana—is not for the many but the few. It has not a message for all men alike. Buddha does not profess that all can accept his method, or ought to be asked to do so. For the multitude it is impossible of attainment. In practice, therefore, instead of one, he has three codes of duty—one for the laity, who continue to live in the world; one for the monks, who do not aspire to Arahatship or sainthood: and one for those who would reach the goal of Nirvana. These last are very few; only two cases are specified, besides Buddha himself, of success in this endeavor. In contrast with these Christianity approves itself as a strictly universal religion—the only religion of its kind in the world. In its doctrines of the one God and Father, and of the brotherhood of all mankind; its teaching on universal need through sin, and universal provision for salvation in Christ; its gospel of reconciliation addressed to all; its pure spirituality in worship and morality; its elevating and emancipating tendency in all the relations of human life, it approves itself as a religion for all sections and races of mankind, for all grades of civilization and stages of culture, appealing to that which is deepest in man, capable of being understood and received by all, and renewing and blessing each one who accepts and obeys it. The history of missions, even among the most degraded races, in all parts of the globe, is the demonstration of this truth. (On the universalism of Christianity, compare Baur, Church History of the First Three Centuries, I, Pt 1.)

(3) The Absolute Religion.

It is the custom, even in circles where the full supernatural claims of Christianity are not admitted, to speak of Christ’s religion as, in comparison with others, "the absolute religion," meaning by this that in Christianity the true idea of religion, which in other faiths is only striven after, attains to complete and final expression. Hegel, e.g. speaks of Christianity as the "Absolute or Revealed Religion" in the sense that in it the idea is discovered of the essential unity of God and man (thus also T. H. Green, E. Caird, etc.); others (e.g. Pfleiderer) in the meaning that it expresses the absolute "principle" of religion—a Divine sonship. Christianity also claims for itself, though in a more positive way, to be the absolute religion. It is the final and perfect revelation of God for which not only revelation in Israel, but the whole providential history of the race, was a Divinely ordained preparation (Ga 4:4). It is absolute in the sense that a larger and fulle r revelation than Christ has given is not needed, and is not to be looked for. Not only in this religion is all truth of Nature about God’s being, attributes and character, with all truth of Old Testament revelation, purely gathered up and preserved, but in the person and work of the incarnate Son a higher and more complete disclosure is made of God’s Fatherly love and gracious purposes to mankind, and a redemption is presented as actually accomplished adequate to all the needs of a sinful world. Mankind can never hope to attain to a higher idea of God, a truer idea of man, a profounder conception of the end of life, of sin, of duty, a Diviner provision for salvation, a more perfect satisfaction in fellowship with God, a grander hope of eternal life, than is opened to it in the gospel. In this respect again, Christianity stands alone (compare W. Douglas Mackenzie, The Final Faith, a Statement of the Nature and Authority of Christianity as the Religion of the World).

(4) Religion of Redemption.

A third aspect in which Christianity as a historical religion is sometimes regarded is as a religion of redemption. In this light a comparison is frequently instituted between it and Buddhism, which also in some sort is a religion of redemption. But the comparison brings out only the more conspicuously the unique and original character of the Christian system. Buddhism starts from the conception of the inherent evil and misery of existence, and the salvation it promises as the result of indefinitely prolonged striving through many successive lives is the eternal rest and peace of non-being; Christianity, on the other hand, starts from the conception that everything in its original nature and in the intent of its Creator is good, and that the evil of the world is the result of wrong and perverted development—holds, therefore, that redemption from it is possible by use of appropriate means. And redemption here includes, not merely deliverance from existing evils, but restoration of the Divine likeness which has been lost by man, and ultimate blessedness of the life everlasting. Dr. Boyd Carpenter sums up the contrast thus: "In Buddhism redemption comes from below; in Christianity it is from above; in Buddhism it comes from man; in Christianity it comes from God" (Permanent Elements in Religion, Introduction, 34).

4. Development and Influence:

Christianity, as an external magnitude, has a long and chequered history, into the details of which it is not the purpose of this article to enter. Ecclesiastical developments are left untouched. But a little may be said of its outward expansion, of the influences that helped to mould its doctrinal forms, and of the influence which it in turn has exercised on the thought and life of the peoples into whose midst it came.

(1) Expansion of Christianity.

From the first Christianity aimed at being a world-conquering principle. The task it set before itself was stupendous. Its message was not one likely to commend it to either Jew or Greek (1Co 1:23). It renounced temporal weapons (in this a contrast with Mohammedanism); had nothing to rely on but the naked truth. Yet from the beginning (Ac 2) it had a remarkable reception. Its universal principle was still partially veiled in the Jewish-Christian communities, but with Paul it freed itself from all limitations, and entered on a period of rapid and wide diffusion.

(a) Apostolic Age:

It is the peculiarity of the Pauline mission, as Professor W. M. Ramsay points out, that it followed the great lines of Roman communication, and aimed at establishing itself in the large cities—the centers of civilization (Church in Roman Empire, 147, etc.). The Book of Ac and the Epistles show how striking were the results. Churches were planted in all the great cities of Asia Minor and Macedonia. In Rome Tacitus testifies that by the time of Nero’s persecution (64 AD) the Christians were a "great multitude" ("ingens multitudo" (Annals xv.44)).

(b) Succeeding Period:

Our materials for estimating the progress of Christianity in the post-apostolic age are scanty, but they suffice to show us the church pursuing its way, and casting its spell alike on East and West, in centers of civilization and dim regions of barbarism. In the last quarter of the 2nd century great churches like those of Carthage and Alexandria burst into visibility, and reveal how firm a hold the new religion was taking of the empire. Deadly persecution could not stop this march of the church to victory. From the middle of the 3rd century there is no question that it was progressing by leaps and bounds. This is the period in which Harnack puts its great expansion (Expansion, II, 455, English Translation). On the back of the most relentless persecution it had yet endured, the Diocletian, it suddenly found itself raised by the arms of Constantine to a position of acknowledged supremacy. By this time it had penetrated into all ranks of society, and reckoned among its adherents many of noblest birth.

(c) Modern Missions:

It is unnecessary to trace the subsequent course of Christianity in its conquest of the northern nations. For a time the zeal for expansion slumbered, but, with the revival of the missionary spirit at the close of the 18th century, a new forward movement began, the effects of which in the various regions of the heathen world are only now beginning to be realized. It is impossible to read without a thrill what was accomplished by the pioneers of Christian missions in the South Seas a nd other early fields; now the tidings of what is being done in India, China, Japan, Korea, Africa and elsewhere, by Christian preaching and education, awaken even more astonishment. Countries long closed against the gospel are now opened, and the standard of the cross is being carried into all. The church is arousing to its missionary obligations as never before. Still, with all this progress, immense obstacles remain to be overcome. Including all the populations of nominally Christian lands, the adherents of the Christian religion are reckoned to amount only to some 560,000,000, out of a total of over 1,600,000,000 of the population of the world (Hickmann). This looks discouraging, but it is to be remembered that it is the Christian peoples that represent the really progressive portion of the human race.

(2) Doctrinal Shaping:

The doctrinal shaping of Christianity has taken place largely as the result of conflict with opposing errors. First, as was inevitable, its conflict was waged with that narrowest section of the Jewish-Christian community—the Ebionites of early church history—who, cleaving to circumcision, disowned Paul, and insisted that the Gentiles should observe the law (Ga 5:13,14; see EBIONITES). These, as a party of reaction, were soon left behind, and themselves fell under heretical (Essenian) influences.

(a) Gnosticism:

A more formidable conflict was that with Gnosticism—the distinctive heresy of the 2nd century, though its beginnings are already within the apostolic age (compare Lightfoot, Colossians). This strange compound of oriental theosophy and ideas borrowed from Christianity (see GNOSTICISM) would have

dissolved Christ's religion into a tissue of fantasies, and all the strength and learning of the Church were needed to combat its influence. Its opposition was overruled for good in leading t o a fixing of the earliest creed (see APOSTLES' CREED), the formation of an authoritative New Testament canon (see BIBLE; CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT), and the firm assertion of the reality of Christ's humanity.

(b) Monarchianism:

Christianity had now entered the world of Greek thought, and ere long had contests to sustain within its own borders. First came assaults (3rd century) on the idea of the Trinity in what are known as the Monarchian heresies—the assertion that the Father Himself was incarnate and suffered in Christ (Patripassianism), or that the Trinity consisted only in "modes" of the Divine self-revelation (Sabellianism).

(c) Arianism:

These were hardly repelled when a yet greater danger overtook the church in the outbreak (318 AD) of the violent Arian controversy, the Son Himself being now declared to be a creature, exalted, before all worlds, but not truly of the nature of God. The commotion produced by this controversy led to the summoning of the first ecumenical council- -that of Nicea (325 AD), and the framing of the Nicene Creed, affirming the full deity of the Son. A like controversy about the Spirit (the Macedonian, 4th century), led to the confirming of this creed, and adoption of additional clauses, at the Council of Constantinople (381 AD).

(d) Sin and Grace:

The doctrine of the Trinity was now settled, but new controversies speedily sprang up—in the West on sin and grace (Pelagius and Augustine) (411-18 AD), and in the East in the long series of controversies known as the Christological, bearing on the right apprehension of the person of Christ (4th to 7th centuries): as against Pelagius, who denied original sin, and affirmed man's natural ability to keep the whole law of God, Augustine vindicated the complete dependence of man on the grace of God for his salvation.

(e) Person of Christ:

And as against errors successively denying the reality of a human soul in Jesus (Appollinarianism), dissolving the unity of His person (Nestorianism, condemned at Ephesus, 431 AD), or conversely, fusing together the Divine and human into one nature (Eutychianism, Monophysitism), the church maintained, and embodied in a Creed at Chalcedon (451 AD), the integrity of the two natures, Divine and human, in the one Divine person of the Lord. These decisions are upheld by all branches of the church—Greek, Latin, Protestant.

(f) The Atonement:

The medieval scholastic period made one great advance in the attempt of Anselm in his Cur Deus Homo (1089) to lay deep the foundations of a doctrine of atonement in the idea of the necessity of a satisfaction for human sin: Abelard, on the other hand, denied the need of satisfaction, and became the representative of what are known as moral theories of the atonement. It was reserved for the Protestant Reformers, however, to bring this doctrine to its true bearing, as furnishing the ground for man's free justification before God in his union with Christ, who had made full satisfaction for his guilt. There have been many theories of atonement, but the idea that Christ has "satisfied Divine justice" is too firmly imbedded in all the Reformation creeds, and has too profound a Scriptural support, to be removed.

(g) The Reformation:

The 16th century Reformation, on its outward side, was a revolt against the errors and corruptions of the papacy, but in its positive aspect it may be described as the reassertion of the sole mediatorship of Christ (as against priestly intervention), the sole authority of Scripture (as against tradition), and justification by faith alone (as against salvation by works of merit). The schism meant a separation of the great Protestant communities and nations from the church of Rome, which, by its claim o f papal supremacy, had already separated from itself the great Greek communion.

(h) Lutheran and Reformed:

Within Protestantism itself a difference of genius between the Swiss and German Reformers, with divergences of view on the sacraments, led to the formation of two main types—the Lutheran (German) and the Reformed (Swiss)—and between these two, as respects theology and church order, later Protestantism has mostly been divided. Luther represented the one; Calvin for long was the chief name in the other. With the rise of Arminianism and other forms of dissent from the peculiarities of Calvinism, the aspect of Protestantism became more variegated. Of the later divisions, producing the numerous modern sects which yet own allegiance to the common head (Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, etc.), it is not necessary here to speak. The unity of spirit revealed in creed, worship and combined endeavors in Christ's service goes deeper than all outward differences.

(3) Its Influence.

Christianity preaches a kingdom of God, or supremacy of God's will in human hearts and human affairs, by which is meant, on its earthly side, nothing less than a complete reconstruction of society on the two great bases of love to God and love to man—"Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth" (Mt 6:10). The influence of Christianity is paramount in all the great advances that have been made in the moral and social amelioration of the state of mankind.

(a) The Ancient World:

It was so undoubtedly in the ancient world. The world into which Christianity came was one fast sinking into dissolution through the weight of its own corruptions. Into that world Christianity brought a totally new idea of man as being of infinite dignity and immortal worth. It restored the well-nigh lost sense of responsibility and accountability to God; breathed into the world a new spirit of love and charity, and created that wealth of charitable and beneficent institutions with which Christian lands are now full (Lecky speaks of it as "covering the globe with countless institutions of mercy, absolutely unknown in the whole pagan world," History of Morals, II, 91); set up a new moral ideal and standard of integrity which has acted as an elevating force on moral conceptions till the present hour; restored woman to her rightful place as man's helpmeet and equal; created the Christian home; gave the slave an equal place with his master in the kingdom of God, and struck at the foundations of slavery by its doctrines of the natural brotherhood and dignity of man; created self-respect, and a sense of duty in the use of one's powers for self-support and the benefit of others; urged to honest labors; and in a myriad other ways, by direct teaching, by the protest of holy lives, and by its general spirit, struck at the evils, the malpractices, the cruelties of the time.

(b) The Modern World:

Despite many failures, and gross backslidings in the church itself, these ideas, implanted in the world, and liberating other forces, have operated ever since in advancing the progress of the race. They exist and operate far beyond the limits of the church. They have been taken up and contended for by men outside the church—by unbelievers even—when the church itself had become unfaithful to them. None the less they are of Christian parentage. They lie at the basis of our modern assertion of equal rights, of justice to the individual in social and state arrangements, of the desire for brotherhood, peace and amity among classes and nations. It is Christian love which is sustaining the best, purest and most self-sacrificing efforts for the raising of the fallen, the rescue of the drunkard, the promotion of enlightenment, virtues, social order and happiness. It is proving itself the grand civilizing agency in other regions of the world. Christian missions, with their benign effects in the spread of education, the checking of social evils and barbarities, the creation of trade and industry, the change in the status of women, the advance in social and civilized life, generally, is the demonstration of it (see Dennis, Christian Missions and Social Progress).

(c) Testimony of Professor Huxley:

Professor Huxley will not be regarded as a biased witness on behalf of Christianity. Yet this is what he writes on the influence of the Christian Scriptures, and his words may be a fitting close to this article: "Throughout the history of the western world," he says, "the Scriptures, Jewish, and Christian, have been the great instigators of revolt against the worst forms of clerical and political despotism. The Bible has been the Magna Charta of the poor, and of the oppressed; down to modern times no state has had a constitution in which the interests of the people are so largely taken into account, in which the duties, so much more than the privileges, of rulers are insisted upon, as that drawn up for Israel in De and Lev; nowhere is the fundamental truth that the welfare of the State, in the long run, depends upon the uprightness of the citizen so strongly laid down. Assuredly the Bible talks no trash about the rights of man; but it insists upon the equality of duties, on the liberty to bring about that righteousness which is

somewhat different from struggling for ‘rights’; on the fraternity of taking thought for one’s neighbor as for one’s self."

LITERATURE.

See works cited in Part I above; also Kuenen, Hibbert Lectures for 1882, National Religions and Universal Religions; W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire; M. Dods, Mohammed, Buddha, and Christ; on early expansion of Christianity, Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity, and Orr, Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity; on the essence of Christianity, W. Douglas Mackenzie, The Final Faith; on the influence of Christianity, C. L. Brace, Gesta Christi; Uhlhorn, Christian Charity in the Ancient Church; C. Schmidt, Social Results of Early Christianity; Lecky, History of European Morals; Dennis, Christian Missions and Social Progress; Reports of World Miss. Conference, 1910.

James Orr

CHRISTOLOGY kris-tol’-o-ji.

See PERSON OF CHRIST.

CHRISTS

krists.

See CHRISTS, FALSE; MESSIAH.

CHRISTS, FALSE

fols (pseudo-christoi).

1. Christ’s Warnings:

In His discourse on the last things, uttered by Him on the Tuesday of the week of His Passion, Jesus solemnly forewarned His disciples that many would come in His name, saying "I am the Christ," who would deceive many; that there would arise false Christs and false prophets, who would show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect; that, therefore, if any man said to them, "Lo, here is the Christ," or "Lo, there," they were not to believe it (Mt 24:5,11,23-25; Mr 13:6,21-23; Lu 21:8).

2. Early Notices:

The warning was needed. De Wette, Meyer, and others have, indeed, pointed out that there is no historical record of anyone expressly claiming to be the Christ prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. This, however, is probably only in appearance (compare Lange, Commentary on Mt 24:3). Edersheim remarks: "Though in the multitude of impostors, who, in the troubled time between the rule of Pilate and the destruction of Jerusalem, promised Messianic deliverance to Israel, few names and claims of this kind have be en specially recorded, yet the hints in the New Testament, and the references, however guarded, in the Jewish historian, imply the appearance of many such seducers" (Jesus the Messiah, V, chapter vi; in 1906 edition, II, 446). The revolts in this period were generally connected with religious pretensions in the leaders (Josephus, BJ, II, xiii, 4—"deceived and deluded the people under pretense of Divine inspiration"), and, in the fevered state of Messianic expectation, can hardly have lacked, in some instances, a Mes sianic character. Judas of Galilee (Ac 5:37; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, i, 1, 6; BJ, II, viii, 1) founded a numerous sect (the Gaulonites) by many of whom, according to Origen (Hom on Lk, 25), he was regarded as the Messiah (compare DB, under the word). The Theudas of Ac 5:36, "giving himself out to be somebody," may or may not be the same as the Theudas of Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 1), but the latter, at least, made prophetic claims and deluded many. He promised to divide the river Jordan by a word. Another instance is the "Egyptian" for whom Paul was mistaken, who had made an "uproar" (Ac 21:38; the Revised Version (British and American) "sedition")—one of a multitude of "impostors and deceivers," Josephus tells us, who persuaded multitudes to follow them into the wilderness, pretending that they would exhibit wonders and signs (Ant., XX, viii, 6). This Egyptian was to show them that, at his command, the walls of Jerusalem would fall down (BJ, II, xiii, 5). Of another class was the Samaritan Dositheus, with whom Simon Magus was said to be connected (see refs to Eusebius, Origen, Hippolytus, Clementine writings, etc., in DB, under the word). He is alleged to have been regarded as "the prophet like unto Moses," whom God was to raise up.

3. Bar-Cochba:

The most celebrated case of a false Christ is that of Bar-Cochba (to give the name its usual form), the leader of the great insurrection under Hadrian in 132 AD (Eus., HE, IV, 6; for Jewish and other authorities, see the full account in Schurer, HJP, I, 2, pp. 297 ff, English Translation). The insurrection was on a scale which it required the whole force of the Roman empire to put down (compare Schurer). The leader’s own name was Simon, but the title, "Bar-Cochba" ("son of a star"), was given him with reference to the pr ophecy in Nu 24:17 of the star that should come out of Jacob. Rabbi Akiba, the most celebrated doctor of his time, applied this prophecy, with that in Hag 2:6,7, to Simon, and announced him as the Messiah. He is commonly known in Jewish literature as Barcosiba, probably from his birthplace. Immense multitudes flocked to his standard, and the Christians in Palestine were severely persecuted. Coins were issued in his name. After tremendous efforts the rebellion was crushed, and Jerusalem was converted into a Roman colony (Aelia Capitolina), which Jews were forbidden to enter.

4. Jewish Pseudo-Messiahs:

Among the Jews themselves, in later times, many pseudo-Messiahs have arisen. An interesting account of some of these is given by Mr. Elkan Adler in his Introduction to the volume, Aspects of the Hebrew Genius (London, Routledge, 1910). "Such there had been," this writer says, "from time to time ever

since the destruction of the Temple." In the 16th and 17th centuries, however, the belief in pseudo-Messiahs took new and remarkable shapes. Among the names mentioned is that of David Reubeni, or David of the tribe of Reuben (1524), who ultimately fell a sacrifice to the Inquisition. Under his influence a Portuguese royal secretary, Diego Pires, adopted the Jewish faith, changed his name to Solomon Molko, and finally proclaimed himself the Messiah. In 1529 he published some of his addresses under the title of The Book of Wonder. He was burned at the stake at Mantua. "Other Kabbalists, such as Isaac Luria and Chajim Vital and Abraham Shalom, proclaimed themselves to be Messiahs or forerunners of the Messiah, and their works and manuscripts are still piously studied by many oriental Jews." The chief of all these false Messiahs was Sabbatai Zevi, born at Smyrna in 1626. "His adventures," it is said, "created a tremendous stir in western Europe." He ultimately became an apostate to Islam; notwithstanding which fact he had a line of successors, in whom the sect of Donmeh, in Salonica, continue to believe. Another mentioned is Jacob Frank, of Podolia, who revealed himself in 1755 as the Holy Lord, in whom there dwelt the same Messiah-soul that had dwelt in David, Elijah, Jesus, Mohammed, Sabbatai Zevi, and his followers. Jewish literature in the 18th century is full of controversial writing connected with Sabbatianism. As a special source of information on modern false Messiahs among the Jews, Lange mentions the serial Dibhre ‘emeth, or Words of Truth (Breslau, 1853-54).

James Orr

CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF

kron’-i-k’-ls (dibhere ha-yamim), "The Words of the Days"; Septuagint paraleipomenon:

1. The Name

2. The Position of Chronicles in the Old Testament

3. Two Books, or One?

4. The Contents

5. Sources Biblical and Extra-Biblical

6. Nehemiah’s Library

7. The Way of Using the Biblical Sources

8. Additions by the Chronicler

9. Omissions by the Chronicler

10. The Extra-Biblical Sources

11. The Object in Writing the Books of Chronicles

12. The Text

13. Critical Estimates

14. Date and Authorship

15. Evidence as to Date and Authorship

Arguments for a Later Date

16. Truthfulness and Historicity

(1) Alleged Proofs of Untruthfulness

(2) Truthfulness in the Various Parts

17. The Values of the Chronicles

LITERATURE

1. The Name:

The analogy of this title to such English words as diary, journal, chronicle, is obvious. The title is one which frequently appears in the Hebrew of the Old Testament. It is used to denote the records of the Medo-Persian monarchy (Es 2:23; 6:1; 10:2), and to denote public records, either Persian or Jewish, made in late postexilian times (Ne 12:23), and to denote public records of King David (1Ch 27:24). But its most common use is to denote the Judahite and Israelite records referred to in the Books o f Kings as sources (1Ki 14:19; 15:7 and about 30 other places). The references in Kings are not to our present Books of Chronicles, for a large proportion of them are to matters not mentioned in these. Either directly or indirectly they refer the reader to public archives.

As applied to our present Books of Chronicles this title was certainly not intended to indicate that they are strictly copies of public documents, though it may indicate that they have a certain official character distinguishing them from other contemporary or future writings. The Greek title is Paraleipomenon, "Of

Things that have been Left Untold." Some copies add "concerning the kings of Judah," and this is perhaps the original form of the title. That is, the Greek translators thought of Chronicles as a supplement to the other narrative Scriptural books. Jerome accepted the Greek title, but suggested that the Hebrew title would be better represented by a derivative from the Greek word chronos, and that this would fit the character of the book, which is a chronicle of the whole sacred history. Jerome's suggestion is followed in the title given to the book in the English and other languages.

2. The Position of Chronicles in the Old Testament:

In most of the VSS, as in the English, the Books of Chronicles are placed after the Books of Kings, as being a later account of the matters narrated in Kings; and Ezra and Nehemiah follow Chronicles as being continuations of the narrative. In the Hebrew Bibles the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah and 1 and 2 Chronicles are placed last. By common opinion, based on proof that is entirely sufficient, the three books constitute a single literary work or group of works, by one author or school of authors. It is co nvenient to use the term "the Chronicler" to designate the author, or the authors if there were more than one.

3. Two Books, or One?:

It is the regulation thing to say that 1 and 2 Chronicles were originally one book, which has been divided into two. The fact is that Chronicles is counted as one book in the count which regards the Old Testament as 22 or 24 books, and as two books in the count which regards the whole number of books as 39; and that both ways of counting have been in use as far back as the matter can be traced. Both ways of counting appear in the earliest Christian lists, those of Origen and Melito, for example. 1 Chronicles closes with a summary which may naturally be regarded as the closing of a book.

4. The Contents:

With respect to their contents the Books of Chronicles are naturally divided into three parts. The first part is preliminary, consisting mostly of genealogical matters with accompanying facts and incidents (1Ch 1-9). The second part is an account of the accession and reign of David (1Ch 10-29). The third part is an account of the events under David's successors in the dynasty (2 Ch).

The genealogies begin with Adam (1Ch 1:1) and extend to the latest Old Testament times (1Ch 9; compare Ne 11, and the latest names in the genealogical lines, e. g. 1Ch 3:19 ff). The events incidentally mentioned in connection with them are more numerous and of more importance than the casual reader would imagine. They are some dozens in number. Some of them are repeated from the parts of the Old Testament from which the Chronicler draws as sources—for example, such statements as that Nimrod was a mighty one, or that in the time of Peleg the earth was divided, or the details concerning the kings of Edom (1Ch 1:10,19,43 ff; compare Ge 10:8,25; 36:31 ff). Others are instances which the Chronicler has taken from other sources than the Old Testament—for instance, the story of Jabez, or the accounts of the Simeonite conquests of the Meunim and of Amalek (1Ch 4:9,10,38-43).

The account in Chronicles of the reign of David divides itself into three parts. The first part (1Ch 10-21) is a series of sections giving a general view, including the death of Saul, the crowning of David over the twelve tribes, his associates, his wars, the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, the great Davidic promise, the plague that led to the purchase of the threshing-floor of Ornan the Jebusite. The second part (1Ch 22-29:22) deals with one particular event and the preparations for it. The event is the making Solomon king, at a great public assembly (1Ch 23:1; 28:1 ff). The preparations for it include arrangements for the site and materials and labor for the temple that is to be built, and the organizing of Levites, priests, singers, doorkeepers, captains, for the service of the temple and the kingdom. The third part (1Ch 29:22-30) is a brief account of Solomon's being made king "a second time" (compare 1Ki 1), with a summary and references for the reign of David.

The history of the successors of David, as given in 2 Chronicles, need not here be commented upon.

5. Sources Biblical and Extra-Biblical:

The sources of the Books of Chronicles classify themselves as Biblical and extra-Biblical. Considerably more than half the contents come from the other Old Testament books, especially from Sam and Ki. Other sources mentioned in the Books of Chronicles are the following:

(1) The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel (2Ch 16:11; 25:26; 28:26; 32:32).

(2) The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah (2Ch 27:7; 35:27; 36:8).

(3) The Book of the Kings of Israel (2Ch 20:34).

(4) The Book of the Kings (2Ch 24:27).

It is possible that these may be four variant forms of the same title. It is also possible that they may be references to our present Books of Ki, though in that case we must regard the formulas of reference as conventional rather than exact.

(5) The Book of the Kings of Israel (1Ch 9:1), a genealogical work.

(6) The Midrash of the Book of the Kings (2Ch 24:27).

(7) The Words of the Kings of Israel (2Ch 33:18), referred to for details concerning Manasseh.

Observe that these seven are books of Kings, and that the contents of the last three do not at all correspond with those of our Biblical books. In the seventh title and in several of the titles that are yet to be mentioned it is commonly understood that "Words" is the equivalent of "acts" or "history"; but it is

here preferred to retain the form "Words," as lending itself better than the others to the syntactical adjustments.

(8) The Words of Samuel the Man of Vision and the Words of Nathan the Prophet and the Words of Gad the Seer (1Ch 29:29) are perhaps to be counted as one work, and identified with our Books of Judges and Samuel.

(9) The Words of Nathan the Prophet (2Ch 9:29; compare 1Ki 11:41-43). Source concerning Solomon.

(10) The Prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite (2Ch 9:29; compare 1Ki 11:29 ff; 14:2 ff, etc.). Solomon.

(11) The Visions of Jedo the Seer (2Ch 9:29; compare 1Ki 13). Solomon.

(12) The Words of Shemaiah the Prophet (2Ch 12:15; compare 1Ki 12:22 ff). Rehoboam.

(13) "Shemaiah wrote" (1Ch 24:6). David.

(14) Iddo the Seer in Reckoning Genealogies (2Ch 12:15). Rehoboam.

(15) "The Words (The History) of Jehu the son of Hanani, which is inserted in the Book of the Kings of Israel" (2Ch 20:34; compare 1Ki 16:1,7,12). Jehoshaphat.

(16) "The rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the Prophet, the son of Amoz, write" (2Ch 26:22; compare Isa 1:1; 6).

(17) "The Vision of Isaiah .... in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel" (2Ch 32:32; compare 2Ki 18-20; Isa 36-39, etc.). Hezekiah.

(18) The Words of the Seers (2Ch 33:19 margin). Manasseh.

(19) References to "Lamentations," and to "Jeremiah" etc. (2Ch 35:25). Josiah.

(20) The Midrash of the Prophet Iddo (2Ch 13:22). Abijah. These numbers, from 12 to 20, are referred to as works of prophets. At first thought there is plausibility in the idea that the references may be to the sections in Samuel and Kings where these several prophets are mentioned; but in nearly all the cases this explanation fades out on examination. The Chronicler had access to prophetic writings not now known to be in existence.

(21) Liturgical writings of David and Solomon (2Ch 35:4; compare Ezr 3:10). Josiah.

(22) Commandments of David and Gad and Nathan (2Ch 29:25). Hezekiah.

(23) The Commandment of David and Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun (2Ch 35:15). Josiah.

(24) Chronicles of King David (1Ch 27:24).

(25) Last Words of David (1Ch 23:27).

Add to these many mentions of genealogical works, connected with particular times, those for example of David, Jotham, Jeroboam II (1Ch 9:22; 5:17), and mentions of matters that imply record-keeping, from Samuel and onward (e.g. 1Ch 26:26-28). Add also the fact that the Chronicler had a habit, exhibited in Ezra and Nehemiah, of using and quoting what he represents to be public documents, for example, letters to and from Cyrus and Artaxerxes and Darius and Artaxerxes Longimanus (Ezr 1:1; 6:3; 4:7,17; 5:6 ; 6:6; 7:11; Ne 2:7). It is no exaggeration to say that the Chronicler claims to have had a considerable library at his command.

6. Nehemiah’s Library:

If such a library as this existed we should perhaps expect to find some mention of it somewhere. Such a mention I think there is in the much discussed passage in 2 Macc 2:13-15. It occurs in what purports to be a letter written after 164 BC by the Maccabean leaders in Jerusalem to Aristobulus in Egypt. The letter has a good deal to say concerning Nehemiah, and among other things this: "And how he, founding a library, gathered together the books about the kings and prophets, and the (books) of David, and letters of kings about sacred gifts." It says that these writings have been scattered by reason of the war, but that Judas has now gathered them again, and that they may be at the service of Aristobulus and his friends.

This alleged letter contains statements that seem fabulous to most modern readers, though they may not have seemed so to Judas and his compatriots. Leaving out of view, however, the intrinsic credibility of the witness, the fitting of the statement into certain other traditions and into the phenomena presented in Chronicles is a thing too remarkable to neglect. In the past, men have cited this passage as an account of the framing of a canon of Scripture—the canon of the Prophets, or of the Prophets and the Hagiographa. But it purports to be an account of a library, not of a body of Scripture; and its list of contents does not appear to be that of either the Prophets or the Hagiographa or both. But it is an exact list of the sources to which the author (or authors) of Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah claim to have access—"books about the kings" (see above, Numbers 1-7), "and prophets" (Numbers 8-20), "and of David" (Numbers 21-25 ff), "and letters of kings about sacred gifts" (those cited in Ezra and Nehemiah). The library attributed to Nehemiah corresponds to the one which the Chronicler claims to have used; and the two independent pieces of evidence strongly confirm each the other.

7. The Way of Using the Biblical Sources:

The method in which the Biblical sources are used in Chronicles presents certain remarkable features. As a typical instance study 1Ch 10 in comparison with 1Sa 31. 1Ch 10:1-12 is just a transcription, with

slight changes, of the passage in Samuel. A large part of Chronicles is thus made up of passages transcribed from Samuel and Kings. The alternative is that the Chronicler transcribed from sources which had earlier been transcribed in Samuel and Kings, and this alternative may in some cases be the true one.

This phenomenon is interesting for many reasons. It has its bearings on the trustworthiness of the information given; a copy of an ancient document is of higher character as evidence than a mere report of the contents of the document. It has a bearing on questions concerning the text; are the texts in Kings and Chronicles to be regarded as two recensions? It is especially interesting as illustrating the literary processes in use among the writers of our Scriptures.

It is sometimes said that they used their sources not by restating the contents as a modern compiler would do, but by just copying. It would be more correct to say that they do this part of the time. In 1Ch 10 the copying process ceases with 1Ch 10:12. In 1Ch 10:13,14 the Chronicler condenses into a sentence a large part of the contents of 1 Samuel; one clause in particular is a condensation of 1Sa 28. So it is with other parts. 1Ch 1:1-4 is abridged from Ge 5 at the rate of a name for a section; so is 1Ch 1:24-27 from Ge 11:10-26. In the various parts of Chronicles we find all the methods that are used by any compiler; the differentiating fact is simply that the method of transcribing is more used than it would be by a modern compiler.

In the transcribed passages, almost without exception, there has been a systematic editorial revision. Words and clauses have been pruned out, and grammatical roughness smoothed away. Regularly the text in Chronicles is somewhat briefer, and is more fluent than in Samuel or Kings. If we give the matter careful attention we will be sure that this revisional process took place, and that it accounts for most of the textual differences between Chronicles and the earlier writings, not leaving many to be accounted for as corruptions.

8. Additions by the Chronicler:

Of course the most significant changes made by the Chronicler are those which consist in additions and omissions. It is a familiar fact that the added passages in Chronicles which bulk largest are those which deal with the temple and its Worship and its attendants—its priests, Levites, musicians, singers, doorkeepers. Witness for example the added matter in connection with the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem, the preparations for the temple, the priests' joining Rehoboam, the war between Abijah and Jeroboam, the reforms under Asa and Jehoshaphat, details concerning Uzziah, Hezekiah's passover, the reform of Manasseh, the passover of Josiah (1Ch 15-16; 22- 29; 2Ch 11:13-17; 13; 14; 15; 17; 19; 20; 26:16-21; 29-31; 33:10-20; 35). It has been less noticed than it should be that while the Chronicler in these passages magnifies the ceremonial laws of Moses, he magnifies those of David yet more.

Next in bulk comes the added genealogical and statistical matter, for example, the larger part of the preliminary genealogies, details as to David's followers, Rehoboam's fortified cities and family affairs with details concerning the Shishak invasion, Asa's military preparations and the invasion by Zerah,

with numbers and dates, Jehoshaphat's military arrangements, with numbers, Jehoram's brothers and other details concerning him, Uzziah's army and his business enterprises (1Ch 2-9; 12; 27; 2Ch 11:5-12,18-23; 12:3-9; 14:3-15; 17:1-5,10-19; 26:6-15).

The Chronicler is sometimes spoken of as interested in priestly affairs, and not in the prophets. That is a mistake. He takes particular pains to magnify the prophets (e.g. 2Ch 20:20; 36:12,16). He uses the word "prophet" 30 times, and the two words for "seer" (chozeh and ro'eh) respectively 5 and 11 times. He gives us additional information concerning many of the prophets—for example, Samuel, Gad, Nathan, Ahijah, Shemaiah, Hanani, Jehu, Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah. He has taken pains to preserve for us a record of many prophets concerning whom we should otherwise be ignorant—Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun, Jedo (2Ch 9:29), Iddo, the Oded of Asa's time, Jahaziel the son of Zechariah, Eliezer the son of Dodavah, two Zechariahs (2Ch 24:20; 26:5), unnamed prophets of the time of Amaziah (2Ch 25:5-10,15,16), Oded of the time of Ahaz (2Ch 28:9).

In addition, however, to the materials that can be thus classified, it is the method of the Chronicler to preserve interesting incidents of all kinds by working them into his narrative. When he reaches Jair in his genealogical list, he finds himself in possession of a bit of information not contained in the older writings, and he inserts it (1Ch 2:21 ff). He is interested to keep alive the memory of the "families of scribes which dwelt at Jabez" (1Ch 2:55). He has found items concerning craftsmen, and concerning a linen industry, and a potters' industry, and he connects these with names in his list (1Ch 4:14,21,23). He has come across a bit of a hymn in the name of Jabez, and he attaches the hymn to his list of names as an annotation (1Ch 4:9,10). There are matters concerning the sickness and the burial of Asa, and concerning the bad conduct of Joash after the death of Jehoiada, and concerning constructions by Hezekiah (2Ch 16:12,13; 24:15-27; 32:27-30), that seem to the Chronicler worth preserving, though they are not recorded in the earlier writings. The fruits of the habit appear, in many scores of instances, in all parts of the Books of Chronicles.

9. Omissions by the Chronicler:

As the Books of Chronicles thus add matters not found in the older books, so they leave out much that is contained in the Books of Samuel and Kings. Here, however, the question should rather be as to what the Chronicler has retained from his sources than as to what he has omitted. He writes for readers whom he assumes to be familiar with the earlier books, and he retains so much of the older narrative as seems to him necessary for defining the relations of his new statements of fact to that narrative. From the point where the history of David begins he has omitted everything that is not strictly connected with David or his dynasty—the history of northern Israel as such, the long narratives concerning the prophets, such distressing affairs as those of Amnon and Absalom and Adonijah and the faithlessness of Solomon, and a multitude of minor particulars. We have already noticed his systematic shortening of the passages which he transcribes.

10. The Extra-Biblical Sources:

There are two marked phenomena in the parts of Chronicles which were not taken from the other canonical books. They are written in later Hebrew of a pretty uniform type; many parts of them are fragmentary. The Hebrew of the parts that were copied from Samuel and Kings is of course the classical Hebrew of those books, generally made more classical by the revision to which it has been subjected. The Hebrew of the other parts is presumably that of the Chronicler himself. The difference is unmistakable. An obvious way of accounting for it is by supposing that the Chronicler treated his Scriptural sources with especial respect, and his other sources with more freedom. We will presently consider whether this is the true account.

There are indications that some of the non-Biblical sources were in a mutilated or otherwise fragmentary condition when the Chronicler used them. Broken sentences and passages and constructions abound. In the translations these are largely concealed, the translators having guessed the meanings into shape, but the roughnesses are palpable in the Hebrew. They appear less in the long narratives than in the genealogies and descriptive passages. They are sometimes spoken of as if they were characteristic of the later Hebrew, but there is no sense in that.

For example, most of the genealogies are incomplete. The priestly genealogies omit some of the names that are most distinguished in the history, such names as those of Jehoiada and two Azariahs (2Ki 11:9, etc.; 2Ch 26:17; 31:10). Many of the genealogies are given more than once, and in variant forms, but with their incompleteness still palpable. There are many breaks in the lists. We read the names of one group, and we suddenly find ourselves in the midst of names that belong to another group, and with nothing to call attention to the transition. The same phenomena appear in the sections in 1Ch 23:2-27. These contain a succession of matters arranged in absolutely systematic order in classes and subclasses, while many of the statements thus arranged are so fragmentary as to be hardly intelligible. The most natural explanation of these phenomena assumes that the writer had a quantity of fragments in writing—clay tablets, perhaps, or pottery or papyrus, or what not, more or less mutilated, and that he copied them as best he could, one after another. A modern writer, doing such work, would indicate the lacunae by dots or dashes or other devices. The ancient copyist simply wrote the bits of text one after another, without such indications. In regard to many of the supposable lacunae in Chronicles scholars would differ, but there are a large number in regard to which all would agree. If someone would print a text of Chronicles in which these should be indicated, he would make an important contribution to the intelligibility of the books.

11. The Object in Writing the Books of Chronicles:

On the basis of these phenomena what judgment can we form as to the purposes for which the books of Chronicles were written? There are those who find the answer to this question a very simple one. They say that the interests of the writer were those of the temple priesthood, that it seemed to him that the older histories did not emphasize these interests as they ought, and that he therefore wrote a new history, putting into it the views and facts which he thought should be there. If this statement were modified so as not to impugn the good faith of the Chronicler, it would be nearly correct as a statement of part of his purpose. His purpose was to preserve what he regarded as historical materials that were in danger of

being lost, materials concerning the temple-worship, but also concerning a large variety of other matters. He had the historian’s instinct for laying hold of all sorts of details, and putting them into permanent form. His respiration from God (we do not here discuss the nature of that inspiration) led him this way. He wanted to save for the future that which he regarded as historical fact. The contents of the book, determined in part by his enthusiasm for the temple, were also determined in part by the nature of the materials that were providentially at his disposal. There seems also to have been present in his consciousness the idea of bringing to completion the body of sacred writings which had then been accumulating for centuries.

As we have seen, the Greek translators gave to the Books of Chronicles a title which expressed the idea they had of the work. They regarded it as the presentation of matters which had been omitted in the earlier Scriptures, as written not to supersede the older books, but to supplement them, as being, along with Ezra and Nehemiah, a work that brought the Scriptures up to date, and made them complete.

12. The Text:

The text of the Books of Chronicles has been less carefully preserved than that of some other parts of the Old Testament. Witness for example the numbers 42 and 8 for the ages of Ahaziah and Jehoiachin (2Ch 22:2; compare 2Ki 8:26; 2Ch 36:9; compare 2Ki 24:8). There is no proof, however, of important textual corruption. As we have seen, the fragmentary character of certain parts is probably in the main due to exactness in following fragmentary sources, and not to bad text; and the differences between Samuel or Kings and Chronicles, in the transcribed passages, are mostly due to intended revision rather than to text variations.

13. Critical Estimates:

In critical discussions less semblance of fair play has been accorded to Chronicles than even to most of the other Scriptures. It is not unusual to assume that the Chronicler’s reference to sources is mere make-believe, that he "has cited sources simply to produce the impression that he is writing with authority." Others hurry to the generalization that the Books of Kings mentioned in Chronicles (see Numbers 1-7 above) are all one work, which must therefore have been an extensive Midrash (commentary, exe getical and anecdotal) on the canonical Books of Kings; and that the references to prophetic writings are to sections in this Midrash; so that practically the Chronicler had only two sources, the canonical books and this midrashic history of Israel; and that "it is impossible to determine" whether he gathered any bits of information from any other sources.

Into the critical theories concerning Chronicles enters a hypothesis of an earlier Book of Ki that was more extensive than our present canonical books. And in recent publications of such men as Buchler, Benzinger and Kittel are theories of an analysis of Chronicles into documents—for example, an earlier writing that made no distinction between priests and Levites, or an earlier writing which dealt freely with the canonical books; and the later writing of the Chronicler proper.

What we know in the matter is that three sets of authors combined in producing the Books of Chronicles —first, the men who produced the canonical sources, second, the men who produced the other sources, and third, the man or men who directly or indirectly put the contents of these sources together into the book which we have. We have no means of knowing what most of the intermediate processes were, and it is superlatively useless to guess. It is gratuitous to say that the mention of sources in Chronicl es is not made in good faith. It is probable that among the sources were Midrashim that were nearly contemporaneous. It is exceedingly improbable that none of the sources mentioned were genuine and ancient. All probabilities agree to the effect that the returned exiles and their near descendants were likely to study the ancient history of their race, and to gather materials for that purpose. As we have seen, the phenomena of the book indicate the presence of an antiquarian motive which was sure to be interested in genuine items of evidence from the remote past.

14. Date and Authorship:

The current opinion sixty years ago was that the Books of Chronicles and the whole Old Testament were completed about 404 BC, near the time when Artaxerxes Mnemon succeeded Darius Nothus. The statement now fashionable is that the Books of Chronicles were completed not later than about 250 BC, and this constantly degenerates into the statement that they were written about 250 BC or later. In fact, they were completed within the lifetime of Nehemiah, not later or not much later than 400 BC.

In discussing this we cannot ignore the fact that Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah are one work, or, if you prefer, one series. The closing verses of 2 Chronicles duplicate the opening verses of Ezr. This is not, probably, an inadvertent repetition. The Books of Chronicles were written later than the other parts of the series. The closing verses are the Chronicler’s notification to his readers that he has brought up the earlier history to the point at which he had previously begun the narrative in Ezr. The testimony concerning Ezra and the "men of the Great Synagogue" and Nehemiah and their work on the Scriptures does not deserve the contempt with which some persons treat it. We know nothing concerning the Great Synagogue as an organization, but we know much concerning the succession of men, from Daniel to Simon the Just, who are called the men of the Great Synagogue. The old traditions do not say that Ezra was the founder of the succession, but they make him the typical person in it. Two bits of tradition are not necessarily inconsistent if one attributes work to Ezra which the other attributes to the men of the Great Synagogue. The regulation remark that tradition attributes Biblical work to Ezra and not to Nehemiah is untrue. Nehemiah was one of the men of the Great Synagogue, and prominent as such. He is introduced to us as a handsome boy, a king’s favorite, coming to Jerusalem in 444 BC. In 433 BC he returned to the king. After an unknown interval of time he came back to Judea, and presumably spent the remainder of his long life there, dying some years or sortie decades after 400 BC.

15. Evidence as to Date and Authorship:

The placing of the work of the Chronicles at the close of the Hebrew Scriptures is in itself of the nature of testimony. The men who placed it there testify thereby to their belief that these are the latest writings of the Old Testament aggregate. We are familiar with the testimony of Babha’ Bathra’ to the effect that

most of the later books of the Old Testament were due to the men of the Great Synagogue and to Ezra, but that Nehemiah completed the Books of Chronicles. We cannot avoid including the Chronicles among the 22 books which Josephus says were written before the death of Artaxerxes Longimanus (Apion, I, 8). Of course the limit of time here really intended by Josephus is not the death of Artaxerxes, but the lifetime of men who were contemporary with him—that of Nehemiah, for example. We have already noted the testimony concerning Nehemiah's library (2 Macc 2:13-15). The time when the library was being gathered was the most likely time for it to be used as the Chronicler has used it. Add the recapitulation in Ecclesiasticus (44-49), which m entions Nehemiah latest in its list of Old Testament worthies.

Internal marks, also, justify the conclusion that the work of the Chronicler was complete before Nehemiah died. The abundant presence of Persian words and facts, with the absence of Greek words and facts, seems conclusive to the effect that the work was done before the conquests of Alexander rendered the Greek influence paramount. In some of the sections (e.g. Ezr 7:28 ff; Nehemiah passim) Ezra and Nehemiah speak in the first person. The whole work makes the impression of being written up to date. The latest situation in Chronicles is the same with that in Ne (1Ch 9; compare Ne 11:3-12:26). The latest event mentioned is the differentiating of the Samaritan schism. A certain enrollment was made (Ne 12:22-26) in the reign of Darius, up to the high-priesthood of Johanan (elsewhere called Jonathan and John), but including Jaddua the son of Johanan in the high-priestly succession. Ezra and Nehemiah were still in office (Ne 12:26). This enrollment naturally connects itself with the expulsion of Jaddua's bro ther Manasseh for marrying into the family of Sanballat (Ne 13:28; Josephus, Ant, XI, 7-8). Jaddua belongs to the fifth generation from Jeshua, who was high priest 538 BC. Josephus says that Sanballat held a commission from Darius. He mentions a certain Bagoas, "general of another Artaxerxes' army," as in relations with the high priest John.

Arguments for a Later Date.

Josephus, however, apparently regards the Darius who commissioned Sanballat as the last of the kings of that name, and says that Jaddua was contemporary with Alexander the Great, thus dating the Samaritan schism a little before 331 BC. All scholars reject these statements when they are used for dating the Samaritan schism, but some scholars eagerly accept them for the purpose of proving the late date of the last books of the Hebrew Bible. The argument never was valid, and it is completely exploded by the Aramaic papyri recently discovered in Egypt, which show that Bagoas and the high priest Johanan and the sons of Sanballat were contemporaries in 407 BC, the 17th year of Darius Nothus, and for some years earlier.

Dr. Driver (LOT, edition 1897, 518) expresses an opinion very commonly held concerning the Chronicles: "The only positive clue which the book contains as to the date at which it was composed is the genealogy in 1Ch 3:17-24, ... carried down to the sixth generation after Zerubbabel. This would imply a date not earlier than about 350 BC." Turn to the passage and do your own arithmetic on it. Jeconiah was born 614 BC (2Ki 24:8). If as an average each of the sons in the succession was born when his fat her was about 25 years old, that would bring the first birth in the 6th generation from Zerubbabel to about 414 BC, and not 350 BC. This is not an improbable showing.

Dr. Driver suggests, however, that in 1Ch 3:21 we should follow the Greek reading instead of the Hebrew. This would give us: "And the sons of Hananiah: Pelatiah, and Jeshaiah his son, Rephaiah his son, Arnan his son, Obadiah his son, Shecaniah his son." The meaning here is ambiguous. It may be understood to be that each of the six men named after Hananiah was the son of the man named before him (compare 1Ch 3:10-14, or 1Ch 6:20-30,50-53); or as counting the six as the sons of Hananiah (compare 1Ch 3:16; 7:20,21, etc.). Understanding it in the first of these two ways the number of generations after Zerubbabel would be increased to eleven. So many generations before the early decades of the 4th century BC would be exceptional, though not impossible. But the statement that there were 11 generations is weak, being based on a conjectural interpretation of an unproved text emendation, and standing unconfirmed in opposition to credible proof.

16. Truthfulness and Historicity:

"The Books of Chronicles are a tendency writing of little historical value"; "a distorted picture in the interest of the later institutions of postexilic Judaism"; "some ancient facts, having trickled down through oral or written tradition, are doubtless preserved. .... They are few indeed compared with the products of the imagination, and must be sifted like kernels of wheat from a mass of chaff." These statements, taken at random from the book that happens to be handiest, fairly represent the opinion held by many. They regard the Chronicles as a fabrication made in the interest of a religious party, a fabrication in which the history has been intentionally falsified.

A principal motive for this opinion is to discredit the testimony of Chronicles against certain critical theories, the said testimony being more full and detailed than that in Samuel and Kings and the prophets. But on the whole question the testimony of Chronicles is to the same effect with that of the other books. The testimony of the other books supports that of the Chronicles. The discrediting of Chronicles is part of a theory which denies the historical trustworthiness of practically all parts of the Old Testament and New Testament.

(1) Alleged Proofs of Untruthfulness.

Against the Chronicles it is alleged that they sometimes contradict the older books; but nearly all the instances are capable of satisfactory solution. The large numerals in Chronicles, for example those concerning the armies of David, Abijah, Jeroboam, Asa, Zerah, Jehoshaphat, Amaziah, Uzziah, are adduced as extravagant and incredible. Most of the difficulty in connection with such numbers, whether in Chronicles or Exodus or Numbers or Judges or Samuel, disappears when we observe that they clearly belong to an artificial way of counting. These numbers are given in even thousands or even hundreds (even fifties or tens in a very few instances), which would not be the case if the hundreds and thousands were merely numerical. It is alleged that the Chronicler views the glories of the past as on a larger scale than that in which they are presented in the earlier books, but this is not uniformly the case. On the basis of these allegations the Chronicler is charged with an extravagance that is inconsistent with sober truthfulness, but this charge follows the fate of the others. It is said that the Chronicler lacked

trustworthy sources, but that is a thing to be proved, not taken for granted, and we have seen that it is improbable. It is alleged that the text is in such bad shape as to render the contents unreliable. This may be balanced against the counter conjecture that, since the Books of Chronicles have not been so often copied as the Books of Ki, their text is in the transcribed passages to be preferred to that of Ki. In fine, the reasons alleged against the historicity of Chronicles dwindle on examination, though there remain some problems that cannot be so easily disposed of.

(2) Truthfulness in the Various Parts.

Different parts of the Chronicles have their own separate problems of historicity. Take the genealogies, for example. If anyone had fabricated them, he would not have put them into their present fragmentary form, in which they have no story interest, and are of no direct use to anybody. On the other hand it is reasonable to account for their present form by the hypothesis that the writer used such materials as he had. This hypothesis is not derogatory to the inspiration of the writer. Deity saw fit to have these materials placed in the Scriptures, and to this end He influenced men of different generations through providential leadings and through impulses of the Spirit. No one thinks that the Spirit-guided man who put the genealogies in their final form received them as miraculous revelations. He received them as the product of effort in study—his own efforts and those of his predecessors. He is entitled to be counted as truthful if he used good judgment and fidelity in selecting and recording his materials.

Similar statements would be true in regard to the other statistical matter, and in regard to the many incidents that are mentioned in connection with the genealogies and other matters. To think of them as inventions by the Chronicler is not congruous with human experience. They are too brief and broken to have interest by themselves as stories. You can assign no possible reason that one could have for inventing them. They bear the marks of being genuine antiquarian discoveries. The final writer believed that he had come across facts which would be of interest if put into connection with the history as currently narrated. These matters are much more reasonably accounted for as facts than as inventions. And furthermore, a good many of them, first and last, have been corroborated by exploration. Take, for example, Manasseh’s being carried to Babylon by the captains of the king of Assyria, or the account of Uzziah’s military greatness (2Ch 33:11; 26:6 ff), or the references to industries in 1Ch 4:14-23 (compare PEFS, 1905, 243, 328; or Bible Sidelights from Gezer, 150 ff).

Possibly on a different footing is such a passage as the account of Abijah and Jeroboam (2Ch 13:3-18). It says that Abijah had 400,000 men and Jeroboam 800,000, of whom 500,000 were slain in the battle. One might plausibly argue that these numbers were intended as a notice to the reader that he is to understand the story, not as fact, but as a work of the imagination, a religious parable, a midrashic narrative sermon, taken from the Midrash of Iddo (verse 22). Whether or no one finds this argument convincing, anyone can see that it does not accuse the Books of Chronicles of being untruthful. If the passage is a parable it is true in the sense in which it was intended to be understood. A similar case is the account of Jehoshaphat’s peril from the invading nations and his wonderful rescue (2Ch 20).

On still a different footing are such narratives as those concerning the bringing up of the ark, the first

making of Solomon king, the reforms under Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, Josiah. These are sober narratives, with nothing in them to suggest flights of the imagination. Probably no one doubts that the Chronicler intended them to be understood as historical fact. If one is under bondage to the modern tradition which dates De from the time of Josiah and the priestly laws from after the exile, he must needs count these parts of Chronicles as falsified history; but if he is free from that bondage he will see no strong reason for counting them so.

17. The Values of the Chronicles:

In fine men are correct when they say that the greatest values of the Books of Chronicles lie in their availability for vividly illustrating the great truths of religion. They are correct when they assign great value to these books as depicting the ideas of the time when they were written. But they are none the less of great value as repeating from the other Scriptures the outline of the history of the religion of Yahweh, and presenting additional material for the filling in of that outline.

LITERATURE.

Among the older commentaries on Chronicles see that of Keil in the Keil-Delitzsch series, published in English in 1872; that of Zockler in the Lange series, 1876; that of Barker in the Pulpit Commentary, after 1880. Among more recent works, from the point of view which denies the historicity of Chronicles, see R. Kittel in the Polychrome Bible, 1895, and Curtis and Masden in the International Critical Commentary, 1910. A brilliant characterization from that point of view is that by Torrey, "The Chronicler as Editor and as Independent Narrator" in AJSL, January, 1909, and subsequent numbers. On the other side see Beecher, Reasonable Biblical Criticism, 1911, chapters xviii and xxii; "Is the Chronicler a Veracious Historian?" in Bible Student (October, 1899 and subsequent numbers), is a defense of the historicity. All works on Old Testament Introduction discuss the questions concerning Chronicles. In view of the many proper names in Chronicles, such a book as Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, has its uses. For the chronological facts, especially in connection with the closing of the Old Testament history, see Beecher, Dated Events of the Old Testament, 1907. For the Egyptian papyri see Drei Aramaische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine, Sachau, Berlin, 1907, or the Appendix to Toffteen, Historic Exodus. Also Sprengling’s article in AJSL, April, 1911. As to light on the Chronicles from explorations, see "The Excavations of Gezer, 1902-5, and 1907-9," PEF; or Bible Sidelights from the Mounds of Gezer, 1906. For other books see the lists in Encyclopedia Biblica and HDB.

Willis J. Beecher

CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

1. Birth of Jesus

(1) Death of Herod

(2) Census of Quirinius

(3) Star of the Magi

(4) Course of Abijah

(5) Day and Month

(6) Summary

2. Baptism of Jesus

3. First Passover

4. Death of John the Baptist

5. Length of Jesus’ Ministry

6. Death of Jesus

7. Summary of Dates

LITERATURE

II. CHRONOLOGY OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE

1. Paul’s Conversion

2. Death of Herod Agrippa I

3. Famine under Claudius

4. Sergius Paulus

5. Edict of Claudius

6. Gallio

7. Festus

8. Relative Chronology of Acts

9. Pauline Epistles

10. Release and Death of Paul

11. Death of Peter

12. Death of James the Just

13. The Synoptic Gospels, etc.

14. Death of John

15. Summary of Dates

LITERATURE

The current Christian era is reckoned from the birth of Jesus and is based upon the calculations of Dionysius (6th century). Subsequent investigation has shown that the Dionysian date is at least four years too late. Several eras were in use in the time of Jesus; but of these only the Varronian will be used coordinately with the Dionysian in the discussion of the chronology of the life of Jesus, 753 A. U. C. being synchronous with 1 BC and 754 A. U. C. with 1 A. D.

I. Chronology of the Life of Jesus.

1. Birth of Jesus:

Jesus was born before the death of Herod the Great (Mt 2:1 ff) at the time of a census or enrollment made in the territory of Herod in accordance with a decree of Augustus when Quirinius (Revised Version; Cyrenius, the King James Version) was exercising authority in the Roman province of Syria (Lu 2:1 f). At the time of Jesus' birth a star led the Magi of the East to seek in Jerusalem the infant whom they subsequently found in Bethlehem (Mt 2:1 ff). John the Baptist was six months older than Jesus (Lu 1:36) and he was born in the days of Herod (Lu 1:5; compare Lu 2:1) after his father, Zacharias, of the priestly course of Abijah, had been performing the functions of his office in the temple.

(1) Death of Herod.

The death of Herod the Great occurred in the spring of 750/4. (NOTE: The alternative numbers are BC

or AD, i. e, 750 A. U. C. = 4 BC, etc.) He ruled from his appointment in Rome 714/40 (Ant., XIV, xiv, 4-5, in the consulship of Caius Domitius Calvinus and Caius Asinius Pollio) 37 years, and from his accession in Jerusalem after the capture of the city 717/37 (Ant., . XIV, xvi, 1-3; BJ, I, xvii, 9; I, xviii, 1-3; Dio Cassius xlix.22; compare Schurer, GJV3, I, 358, note 11) 34 years (Ant , XVII, xviii, 1; BJ, I, xxxiii, 7-8; compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 415, note 167 where it is shown that Josephus reckons a year too much, probably counting from Nisan 1 and including partial years). Just before Herod's death there was an eclipse of the moon (Ant., XVII, vi, 4). According to astronomical calculations an eclipse was visible in Palestine on March 23 and September 15, 749/5, March 12, 750/4 and January 9, 753/1. Of these the most probable is that of March 12, 750/4. Soon after the eclipse Herod put to death his son Antipater and died five days later (Ant., XVII, vii; BJ, I, xxxiii, 7). Shortly after Herod's death the Passover was near at hand. (Ant., XVII, vi, 4 through ix, 3). In this year Passover (Nisan 15) fell on April 11; and as Archelaus had observed seven days of mourning for his father before this, Herod's death would fall between March 17 and April 4. But as the 37th (34th) year of his reign was probably reckoned from Nisan 1 or March 28, his death may be dated between March 28 and April 4, 750/4.

This date for Herod's death is confirmed by the evidence for the duration of the reigns of his three sons. Archelaus was deposed in 759/6 (Dio Cassius lv.27 in the consulship of Aemilius Lepidus and Lucius Arruntius) in the 10th year of his reign (Ant., XVII, xiii, 2; compare BJ, II, vii, 3 which gives the year as the 9th). Antipas was deposed most probably in the summer of 792/39 (Ant., XVIII, vii, 1-2; compare XVIII, vi, 11; XIX, viii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 6; Schurer, op. cit., I, 448, note 46 and 416, note 167). There are coins of Antipas from his 43rd year (Madden, Coins of the Jews, 121 ff). The genuineness of a coin from the 44th year is questioned by Schurer but accepted by Madden. The coin from the 45th year is most probably spurious (Schurer, op. cit., I, 417, note 167). Philip died after reigning 37 years, in the 20th year of Tiberius—August 19, 786/33-787/34 (Ant., XVIII, iv, 6). There is also a coin of Philip from his 37th year (Madden, op. cit., 126). Thus Archelaus, Antipas and Philip began to reign in 750/4.

(2) Census of Quirinius.

The census or enrollment, which, according to Lu 2:1 f, was the occasion of the journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem where Jesus was born, is connected with a decree of Augustus embracing the Greek-Roman world. This decree must have been carried out in Palestine by Herod and probably in accordance with the Jewish method—each going to his own city—rather than the Roman (Dig. 15, 4, 2; Zumpt, Das Geburtsjahr Christi, 195; Kenyon, Greek Papyri in the British Museum, III, 124 f; Schurer, Theol. Ztg, 1907, 683 f; and on the other hand, Ramsay, Expositor, 1908, I, 19, note). Certainly there is no intimation of an insurrection such as characterized a later census (Ac 5:37; Ant, XVIII, i, 1; BJ, II, xvii, 7; compare Tac. Ann. vi.41; Livy Epit. cxxxvi, cxxxvii; Dessau, Inscrip. lat. Sel. number 212, col. ii, 36) and this may have been due in no small measure to a difference in method. Both Josephus and Luke mention the later census which was made by Quirinius on the deposition of A rchelaus, together with the insurrection of Judas which accompanied it. But while Josephus does not mention the Herodian census—although there may be some intimation of it in Ant, XVI, ix, 3; XVII, ii, 4; compare Sanclemente, De vulg. aerae emend., 438 f; Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Beth.1, 178 ff—Luke carefully distinguishes the two, characterizing the census at the time of Jesus' birth as "first," i.e. first in a series of enrollments connected either with Quirinius or with the imperial policy inaugurated by t he decree of Augustus. The

Greek- Roman writers of the time do not mention this decree and later writers (Cassiodor, Isidor and Suidas) cannot be relied upon with certainty as independent witnesses (Zumpt, Geburtsjahr, 148 ff). Yet the geographical work of Agrippa and the preparation of a breviarium totius imperil by Augustus (Tac. Ann. i.11; Suet. Aug. 28 and 101; Dio Cassius liii.30; lvi.33; compare Mommsen, Staatsrecht, II, 1025, note 3), together with the interest of the emperor in the organization and finances of the empire and the attention which he gave to the provinces (Marquardt, Rom. Staatsverwaltung, II, 211 f; compare 217), are indirectly corroborative of Luke's statement. Augustus himself conducted a census in Italy in 726/28, 746/8, 767/14 (Mommsen, Res Ges., 34 ff) and in Gaul in 727/27 (Dio Cassius liii.22, 5; Livy Epit. cxxxiv) and had a census taken in other provinces (Pauly-Wissowa, Realencyc., under the word "Census," 1918 f; Marquardt, op. cit., II, 213). For Egypt there is evidence of a regular p eriodic census every 14 years extending back to 773/20 (Ramsay, op. cit., 131 if; Grenfell and Hunt, Oxy. Papyri, II, 207 ff; Wilcken, Griech. Ostraka, I, 444 ff) and it is not improbable that this procedure was introduced by Augustus (Schurer, op. cit., I, 515). The inference from Egyptian to similar conditions in other provinces must indeed be made cautiously (Wilcken, op. cit., 449; Marquardt, op. cit., 441); yet in Syria the regular tributum capitis seems to imply some such preliminary work (Dig, 1. 15, 3; Appian, Syriac., 50; Marquardt, op. cit., II, 200, note 2; Pauly-Wissowa, op. cit., 1921; Ramsay, op. cit., 154). The time of the decree is stated only in general terms by Luke, and it may have been as early as 727/27 (Zumpt, op. cit., 159; Marquardt, op. cit., II, 212) or later in 746-8 (Huschke, Census, 34; Ramsay, op. cit., 158 ff), its execution in different provinces and subject kingdoms being carried out at different times. Hence, Luke dates the census in the kingdom of Herod specifically by connecting it with the administrative functions of Quirinius in Syria. But as P. Quintilius Varus was the legate of Syria just before and after the death of Herod from 748/6-750/4 (Ant., XVII, v, 2; XVII, ix., 3; XVII, x, 1 and 9; XVII, xi, 1; Tac. Hist. v.9; and coins in Eckhel, Doctr. num. vet., III, 275) and his predecessor Was C. Sentius Saturninus from 745/9-748/6 (Ant; XVI, ix, 1; x, 8; xi, 3; XVII, i, 1; ii, 1; iii, 2), there seems to be no place for Quirinius during the closing years of Herod's reign. Tertullian indeed speaks of Saturninus as legate at the time of Jesus' birth (Adv. Marc., iv.9). The interpretation of Luke's statement as indicating a date for the census before Quirinius was legate (Wieseler, Chron. Syn., 116; Lagrange, Revue Biblique, 1911, 80 ff) is inadmissible. It is possible that the connection of the census with Quirinius may be due to his having brought to completion what was begun by one of his predecessors; or Quirinius may have been commissioned especially by the emperor as legatus ad census accipiendos to conduct a census in Syria and this commission may have been connected temporally with his campaign against the Homonadenses in Cilicia (Tac. Ann. iii.48; compare Noris, Cenotaph. Pis., 320 ff; Sanclemente, op. cit., 426 passim; Ramsay, op. cit., 238). It has also been suggested by Bour (L'Inscription de Quirinius, 48 ff) that Quirinius may have been an imperial procurator specially charged with authority in the matter of the Herodian census. The titulus Tiburtinus (CIL, XIV, 3613; Dessau, Inscr. Latin Sel., 918)—if rightly assigned to him—and there seems to be no sufficient reason for questioning the conclusiveness of Mommsen's defense of this attribution (compare Liebenam, Verwaltungsgesch., 365)—proves that he was twice legate of Syria, and the titulus Venetus (CIL, III, 6687; Dessau, op. cit., 2683) gives evidence of a census conducted by him in Syria. His administration is dated by Ramsay (op. cit., 243) in 747/7; by Mommsen in the end of 750/4 or the beginning of 751/3 (op. cit., 172 ff). Zahn (Neue kirch. Zeitschr., 1893, IV, 633 ff), followed by Spitta (Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss., 1906, VII, 293 ff), rejects the historicity of the later census connected by Josephus with the deposition of Archelaus, basing his view on internal grounds, and assigns the Lucan census to a time shortly after the death of Herod. This view

however is rendered improbable by the evidence upon which the birth of Jesus is assigned to a time before the death of Herod (Mt 2:1 ff; Lu 1:5; 2:1 f); by the differentiation of the census in Lu 2:1 f and Ac 5:37; by the definite connection of the census in Josephus with Syria and the territory of Archelaus (compare also the tit. Venet.); and by the general imperial policy in the formation of a new province (Marquardt, op. cit., II, 213). Moreover there seems to be no adequate ground for identifying the Sabinus of Josephus with Quirinius as urged by Weber, who regards the two accounts (Ant., XVII, viii, 1 ff and XVII, iv, 5; XVIII, i, 2; ii, 1 ff) as due to the separation by Josephus of parallel accounts of the same events in his sources (Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss., 1909, X, 307 ff)—the census of Sabinus-Quirinius being assigned to 4 BC, just after the death of Herod the Great. The synchronism of the second census of Quirinius with the periodic year of the Egyptian census is probably only a coincidence, for it was occasioned by the deposition of Archelaus; but its extension to Syria may be indicative of its connection with the imperial policy inaugurated by Augustus (Tac. Ann. vi.41; Ramsay, op. cit., 161 f).

(3) Star of the Magi.

The identification of the star of the Magi (Mt 2:2; compare Mt 2:7,9,16; Macrobius, Sat., II, 4; Sanclemente, op. cit., 456; Ramsay, op. cit., 215 ff) and the determination of the time of its appearance cannot be made with certainty, although it has been associated with a conjunction in 747/7 and 748/6 of Saturn and Jupiter in the sign of Pisces- -a constellation which was thought to stand in close relation with the Jewish nation (Ideler, Handbuch d. math. u. tech. Chron., II, 400 ff). When the Magi came to Jerusalem, however, Herod was present in the city; and this must have been at least several months before his death, for during that time he was sick and absent from Jerusalem (Ant., XVII, vi, 1 ff; BJ, I, xxxiii, 1 ff).

(4) Course of Abijah.

The chronological calculations of the time of the service of the priestly course of Abijah in the temple, which are made by reckoning back from the time of the course of Jehoiarib which, according to Jewish tradition, was serving at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, are uncertain (Schurer, op. cit., II, 337, note 3; compare Lewin, Fasti Sacri, 836).

(5) Day and month.

The day and month of Jesus' birth are also uncertain. December 25 was celebrated by the church in the West as early as the 2nd century—if the date in Hippolytus on Dan., IV, 23, be genuine (compare Ehrhardt, Altchr. Lit., 1880-1900, 383); but January 6 was celebrated in the East as the anniversary both of the birth and of the baptism. The fact that shepherds were feeding their flocks at night when Jesus was born (Lu 2:8) makes it improbable that the season of the year was winte r.

(6) Summary.

The birth of Jesus may therefore be assigned to the period 747/7 to 751/5, before the death of Herod, at

the time of a census made by Herod in accordance with a decree of Augustus and when Quirinius was exercising extraordinary authority in Syria—Varus being the regular legate of the province, i.e. probably in 748/6.

See JESUS CHRIST.

2. Baptism of Jesus:

The Synoptic Gospels begin their description of the public ministry of Jesus with an account of the ministry of John the Baptist (Mt 3:1 ff; Mr 1:1 ff; Lu 3:1 ff; compare of in Joh 1:19 ff; Joh 4:24; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iii, 3) and Luke definitely dates the baptism of Jesus by John in the 15th year of Tiberius. Luke also designates this event as the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and by stating Jesus' age approximately brings it into connection with the date of His birth. If Luke reckoned the reign of Tiberius fro m the death Augustus, August 19, 767/14, the 15th year would extend from August 19, 781/28 to August 18, 782/29; and if Jesus was about thirty years old at this time, His birth would fall 751/3 to 752/2—or sometime after the death of Herod, which is inconsistent with Luke's own and Matthew's representation. This indeed was one of the common modes of reckoning the imperial reigns. The mode of reckoning from the assumption of the tribunician power or from the designation as imperator is altogether unlikely in Luke's case and intrinsically improbable, since for Tiberius the one began in 748/6 and the other in 743/11 (Dio Cassius Iv.9; liv.33; Vell. ii.99; Suet. Tib. ix.11). But if, as seems likely, the method of reckoning by imperial years rather than by the yearly consuls was not definitely fixed when Luke wrote, it is possible that he may have counted the years of Tiberius from his appointment in 764/11 or 765/12 to equal authority with Augustus in the provinces (Veil. ii 121; Suet. Tib. xx.21; Tac. Ann. i.3). This method seems not to have been employed elsewhere (Lewin, op. cit., 1143 f; compare Ramsay, op. cit., 202 f). The coins of Antioch in which it is found are regarded as spurious (Eckhel, op. cit., III, 276), the genuine coins reckoning the reign of Tiberins from the death of Augustus (ibid., III, 278). If Luke reckoned the reign of Tiberins from 764/11 or 765/12, the 15th year would fall in 778/25 or 779/26, probably the latter, and Jesus' birth about thirty years earlier, i.e. about 748/6 or 749/5.

3. First Passover:

At the time of the first Passover in Jesus' ministry the Herodian temple had been building 46 years (Joh 2:20). Herod began the temple in the 18th year of his reign (Ant., XV, xi, 1, which probably corrects the statement in BJ, I, xxi, I that it was the 15th year; compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 369 f, note 12). As Josephus reckons from the accession of Herod in 717/37, the 18th year would be 734/20 to 735/21 and 46 years later would be 780/27 to 781/28. The interval implied in John between this Passover an d the beginning of Jesus' ministry agrees well with the Lucan dating of the baptism in 779/26.

4. Death of John the Baptist:

The imprisonment of John the Baptist, which preceded the beginning of Jesus' Galilean work, was continued for a time (Mt 11:2-19; Lu 7:18-35) but was finally terminated by beheading at the order of

Herod Antipas. Announcement of the death was made to Jesus while in the midst of His Galilean ministry (Mt 14:3-12; Mr 6:14-29; Lu 9:7-9). Josephus reports that the defeat of Antipas by Aretas, in the summer of 789/36, was popularly regarded as a Divine punishment for the murder of John (Ant., XVIII, v, 2); But although Josephus mentions the divorce of Aretas daughter by Antipas as one of the causes of hostilities, no inference can be drawn from this or from the popular interpretation of Antipas' defeat, by which the int erval between John s death and this defeat can be fixed (Schurer, op. cit., I, 443 f).

5. Length of Jesus' Ministry:

The Synoptic Gospels mention the Passion Passover at which Jesus' ministry was terminated, but they contain no data by which the interval between the imprisonment of John the Baptist and this Passover can be fixed with certainty. Yet indications are not wanting that the interval consisted of at least two years. The Sabbath controversy broke out in Galilee when the grain was still standing in the fields (Mt 12:1; Mr 2:23; Lu 6:1) and the condition of the grass when the Five Thousand were fed (Mt 14:15; Mr 6:39; Lu 9:12) points to the springtime, the Passion Passover marking the return of still another springtime (compare also Lu 13:7; Mt 23:37). But the Gospel of John mentions explicitly three Passovers (Joh 2:23; 6:4; 11:55) and probably implies a fourth (Joh 5:1), thus necessitating a ministry of at least two years and making probable a ministry of three years after the first Passover. The Passover of 6:4 cannot be eliminated on textual grounds, for the documentary evidence is conclusive in its favor and the argument against it based on the statements of certain patristic writers is unconvincing (compare Turner, HDB, I, 407 f; Zahn, Kom., IV, 708 ff). The indications of time from Joh 6:4—the Passover when the Five Thousand were fed in Galilee—to Joh 11:55—the Passion Passover—are definite and clear (Joh 7:2; 10:22). But the interval between the first Passover (Joh 2:23) and the Galilean Passover (Joh 6:4) must have been one and may have been two years. The following considerations favor the latter view: Jesus was present in Jerusalem at a feast (Joh 5:1) which is not named but is called simply "a" or "the" feast of the Jews. The best authorities for the text are divided, some supporting the insertion, others the omission of the definite article before "feast." If the article formed part of the original text, the feast may have been either Tabernacles—from the Jewish point of view—or Passover—from the Christian point of view. If the article was wanting in the original text, the identification of the feast must be made on contextual and other grounds. But the note of time in Joh 4:35 indicates the lapse of about nine months since the Passover of Joh 2:23 and it is not likely that the Galilean ministry which preceded the feeding of the Five Thousand lasted only about three months. In fact this is rendered impossible by the condition of the grain in the fields at the time of the Sabbath controversy. The identification of the feast of Joh 5:1 with Purim, even if the article be not genuine, is extremely improbable; and if so, a Passover must have intervened between Joh 2:23 and Joh 6:4, making the ministry of Jesus extend over a period of three years and the months which preceded the Passover of Joh 2:23. While the identification cannot be made with certainty, if the feast was Passover the subject of the controversy with the Jews in Jerusalem as well as the season of the year would harmonize with the Synoptic account of the Sabbath controversy in Galilee which probably followed this Passover (compare the variant reading in Lu 6:1).

6. Death of Jesus:

Jesus was put to death in Jerusalem at the time of the Passover when Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea (Mt 27:2 ff; Mr 15:1 ff; Lu 23:1 ff; Joh 18:29 ff; Joh 19:1 ff; Ac 3:13; 4:27; 13:28; 1Ti 6:13; Tac. Ann. xv.44), Caiaphas being the high priest (Mt 26:3,17; Joh 11:49; 18:13 ff) and Herod Antipas the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea (Lu 23:7 ff). Pilate was procurator from 779/26 to 789/36 (Ant., XVIII, iv, 3; v, 3; compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 487, note 141); Caiaphas was high priest from 771/18 to 789/36 (Ant., XVIII, ii, 2; iv, 3; compare Schurer, op. cit., II, 271) and Antipas was tetrarch from 750/4 to 792/39. If the first Passover of Jesus' ministry was in 780/27, the fourth would fall in 783/30. The gospels name Friday as the day of the crucifixion (Mt 27:62; Mr 15:42; Lu 23:54; Joh 19:14,31,42) and the Synoptic Gospels represent this Friday as Nisan 15—the day following (or according to Jewish reckoning from sunset to sunset, the same day as) the day on which the paschal supper was eaten (Mt 26:17 ff; Mr 14:12 ff; Lu 22:7 ff). But the Fourth Gospel is thought by many to represent the paschal meal as still uneaten when Jesus suffered (Joh 18:28; compare Joh 13:29); and it is held that the Synoptic Gospels also contain traces of this view (Mt 26:5; Mr 14:2; 15:21; Lu 23:26). Astronomical calculations show that Friday could have fallen on Nisan 14 or 15 in 783/30 according to different methods of reckoning (von Soden, EB, I, 806; compare Bacon, Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVIII, 2, 1910, 130 ff; Fotheringham, Jour. of Theol. Studies, October, 1910, 120 ff), but the empirical character of the Jewish calendar renders the result of such calculations uncertain (Schurer, op. cit., I, 749 f). In the year 783/30 Friday, Nican 15, would fall on April 7. There is an early patristic tradition which dates the death of Jesus in the year 782/29, in the consulship of the Gemini (Turner, HDB, I, 413 f), but its origin and trustworthy character are problematical.

7. Summary of Dates:

1. Birth of Jesus, 748/6.

2. Death of Herod the Great, 750/4.

3. Baptism of Jesus, 779/26.

4. First Passover of Jesus' ministry, 780/27.

5. Death of Jesus, 783/30.

LITERATURE.

Schurer, Geschichte des Judischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 3. und 4. Aufl., 1901-9, 3 volumes, English translation of the 2nd edition, in 5 volumes, 1885-94; Ideler, Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie, 1825-26, 2 volumes; Wieseler, Chronologische Synopse der Evangelien, 1843, English translation; Lewin, Fasti Sacri, 1865; Turner, article "Chronology of the NT" in HDB, 1900, I. 403-25; von Soden, article "Chronology" in Cheyne and Black, EB, 1899, I, 799-819; Ramsay, Wa s Christ Born at Bethlehem? 1898; F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, article "Dates" in Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels; Mommsen, Res Gestae Divi Augusti2.

II. Chronology of the Apostolic Age.

The chronology of the apostolic age must be based on the data in Ac and the epistolary literature of the New Testament which afford contacts with persons or events of the Greek-Roman world. From the fixed points thus secured a general outline of the relative chronology may be established with reasonable probability.

1. Paul’s Conversion:

Paul was converted near Damascus (Ac 9:3 ff; Ac 22:5 ff; Ac 26:12 ff; Ga 1:17). After a brief stay in that city (Ac 9:19 ff) he went to Arabia and then came again to Damascus (Ga 1:17). When he left Damascus the second time, he returned to Jerusalem after an absence of three years (Ga 1:18). The flight of Paul from Damascus (Ac 9:24) probably terminated his second visit to the city. At that time the ethnarch of Aretas, the king of the Nabateans, acting with the resident Jews (Ac 9:23 f), guarded t he city to seize him (2Co 11:32). Aretas IV succeeded Obodas about 9 BC, and reigned until about 40 AD Damascus was taken by the Romans in 62 BC and probably continued under their control until the death of Tiberius (March 37 AD). Roman coins of Damascus exist from the time of Augustus, Tiberius and Nero, but there are no such coins from the time of Caligula and Claudius (Schurer, op. cit., I, 737; II, 153). Moreover the relations of Aretas to Augustus and Tiberius make it extremely improbable that he held Damascus during their reign as part of his kingdom or acquired it by conquest. The statement of Paul however seems to imply Nabatean control of the city, and this is best explained on the supposition that Damascus was given to Aretas by Caligula, the change in the imperial attitude being due perhaps to the influence primarily of Agrippa and possibly also of Vitellius (Steinmann, Aretas IV, 1909, 34 ff). But if Paul’s escape from Damascus was not earlier than 37 AD, his conversion cannot be placed earlier than 34 or 35 AD, and the journey to Jerusalem 14 years later (Ga 2:1) not earlier than 50 or 51 AD.

2. Death of Herod Agrippa I:

Herod Agrippa I died in Caesarea shortly after a Passover season (Ac 12:23; compare Ac 12:3,19). Caligula had given him the tetrarchy of Philip and of Lysanias in 37 AD—the latter either at this time or later—with the title of king (Ant., XVIII, vi, 10; BJ, II, ix, 6) and this was increased in 40 AD by the tetrarchy of Antipas (Ant., XVIII, vii, 1 f; BJ, II, ix, 6). Claudius gave him also Judea and Samaria (Ant., XIX, v, 1; BJ, II, xi, 5) thus making his territory even more extensive than that of his grandfather, Herod the Great. Agrippa reigned over "all Judea" for three years under Claudius (Ant., XIX, viii, 2; BJ, II, xi, 6), his death falling in the spring of 44 AD, in the 7th year of his reign. The games mentioned by Josephus in this connection are probably those that were celebrated in honor of the return of Claudius from Britain in 44 AD. There are coins of Agrippa from his 6th year, but the attribution to him of coins from other years is questioned (Schurer, op. cit., 560, note 40; Madden, op . cit., 132).

3. Famine under Claudius:

The prophecy of a famine and its fulfillment under Claudius (Ac 11:28) are associated in Ac with the death of Herod Agrippa I (Ac 11:30; 12:23). Famines in Rome during the reign of Claudius are mentioned by Suetonius (Claud. xviii), Dio Cassius (lx.11), Tacitus (Annals xii.43), and Orosius (vii.6). Josephus narrates in the time of Fadus the generosity of Helena during a famine in Palestine (Ant., XX, ii, 5), but subsequently dates the famine generally in the time of Fadus and Alexander. The famine in P alestine would fall therefore at some time between 44 and 48 (Schurer, op. cit., I, 567, note 8).

4. Sergius Paulus:

When Paul visited Cyprus with Barnabas the island was administered by Sergius Paulus (Ac 13:7 ff), a proprietor with the title proconsul (Marquardt, op. cit., I, 391). There is an inscription from Cyprus (Cagnat, Inscr. graec. ad res rom. pertin., III; 930) dating from the 1st century, and probably from the year 53 (Zahn, Neue kirch. Zeitschr., 1904, XV, 194) in which an incident in the career of a certain Apollonius is dated in the proconsulship of Paulus (epi Palilou (anth)upatou). From another inscription (CIG, 2632), dated in the 12th year of Claudius, it appears that L. Annins Bassus was proconsul in 52. If the Julius Cordus mentioned by Bassus was his immediate predecessor, the proconsulship of Sergius Paulus may be dated at some time before 51.

5. Edict of Claudius:

When Paul came to Corinth for the first time he met Aquila and Priscilla, who had left Rome because of an edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from the city (Ac 18:2). Suetonius mentions an expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Claudius but gives no date (Claud. xxv; compare Dio Cassius lx.6). Orosius however dates the edict in the 9th year of Claudius or 49 AD (Hist. vii.6, 15); and though Josephus, from whom he quotes, does not mention this edict. but records the favor shown by Claudius to the Jews and to Herod Agrippa I (Ant., XIX, v, 1-3; compare Dio Cassius lx.6, 6, 9, 10; 8, 2), it is not improbable that the date is approximately accurate (Schurer, op. cit., III, 62, note 92).

6. Gallio:

During Paul’s first sojourn in Corinth the apostle was brought before the proconsul Gallio (Ac 18:12). This could not have been earlier than the year 44 when Claudius gave Achaia back to the Senate and the province was administered by a proprietor with the title of proconsul (Dio Cassius lx.24; Marquardt, op. cit., I, 331 f; Ramsay, The Expositor., 1897, I, 207). Moreover the career of Seneca makes it improbable that his brother would be advanced to this position before 49 or 50 (Harnack, Chron., I, 237; Wieseler, Chron. d. apos. Zeitalters, 119). There is a fragmentary inscription from Delphi containing a letter from the emperor Claudius in which mention is made of Gallio. The inscription is dated by the title of the emperor which contains the number 26. This is referred naturally to the acclammatio as "imperator" and dated in the year 52 before August, after which time the number 27 occurs in the title of Claudian inscriptions. Gallio may therefore have been proconsul from the spring or summer of the year 51-52 or 52-53. The latter seems the more probable time (compare Aem. Bourguet, De rebus Delphicis, 1905, 63 f; Ramsay, The Expositor., 1909, I, 467 f; Princeton Theological Review, 1911, 290 f; 1912, 139 f;

Deissmann, Paulus, 1911, 159-177; Lietzmann, Zeitschrift fur wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1911, 345-54).

7. Festus:

When Paul had been for two years a prisoner in Caesarea Felix was succeeded by Festus as procurator of Judea (Ac 24:27). The accession of Festus, which is placed by Eusebius in the Church History in the reign of Nero (Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 22, 1), is dated in the Chronicle in the version of Jerome in the 2nd year of Nero, 56 AD, and in the Armenian version in the 14th year of Claudius, 54 AD. The excerpts from the Chronicle in Syncellus apparently follow the text underlying the version of Jerome, but state simply that Festus was sent as successor of Felix by Nero (ed. Schoene, II, 154). After his removal from office Felix was tried in Rome, but escaped punishment through the influence of his brother Pallas, who, according to Josephus, was in favor with Nero at that time (Ant., XX, viii, 9). Pallas was removed from office before February 13, 55 AD (Tac. Ann. xiii.14, 1; compare 15, 1), but apparently continued to have influence with the emperor; for he fixed the terms of his removal and was permitted to enjoy his fortune for several years (Tac. Ann. xiii.14, 1 f; 23, 1-3). His death occurred in 62 AD (Tac. Ann. xiv.65, 1). The trial of Felix must therefore have occurred before 62; but it is impossible to place it before the removal of Pallas, for this would necessitate the removal of Felix in 54 AD, and this is excluded by the fact that the first summer of Nero's reign fell in 55 AD. But if Eusebius reckoned the imperial years from September 1st after the accession (Turner, Jour. of Theol. Studies, 1902, 120 f; HDB, I, 418 f), the summer of the second year of Nero would fall in 57. In any event the removal and trial of Felix must have fallen after the removal of Pallas. The date of the Eusebian Chronicle is thus without support from Tacitus or Josephus, and its value depends on the character of the source from which it was obtained—if there was such a source, for it is at least possible that the definite date owes its origin solely to the necessities imposed on Eusebius by the form of the Chronicle. It is not unlike ly that the error of 5 years made by Eusebius in the reign of Agrippa II may be the source of a similar error in regard to Festus in spite of the fact that the framework of the Chronicle is generally furnished not by the years of the Jewish kings but by the imperial years (Erbes in Gebhardt u. Harnack, Texte und Untersuchungen, N. F., IV, 1, 1899; Die Todestage d. Apos. Paulus u. Petrus; Turner, Jour. of Theol. Studies, 1902, III, 120 f; Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, 1906, 350 ff). There is evidence however in Ac 21:38 that Paul's arrest could not have been earlier than the spring of 55 AD. For Paul was supposed by the chief captain to be the Egyptian who had led an insurrection that had been suppressed by Felix during the reign of Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 6; BJ, II, 13, 5). Thus the accession of Festus, two years later (Ac 24:27), could not have been earlier than 57 AD.

But if the summer of 57 AD is the earliest date possible for the accession of Festus, the summer of 60 AD is the latest date that is possible. Albinus, the successor of Festus, was present in Jerusalem in October, 62 AD (Ant., XX, ix, 1 ff), and while the administration of Festus was probably shorter than that of Felix (compare Ant, XX, viii, 9-11; BJ, II, xiv, 1 with Ant, XX, vii, 1-8, 8; BJ, II, 12-13), it is not likely that it lasted less than two years. But as between 57 AD and 60 AD, probability favo rs the latter. For greater justice is thus done to the words of Paul to Felix: "Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation," etc. (Ac 24:10). Felix was appointed by Claudius in 52 AD (Tac. Ann. xii. 54; Ant, XX, v, 2) and was continued in office by Nero. Most of the events of his

administration are narrated by Josephus under Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 5 ff); and although Tacitus mentions an administration of Felix in Samaria when Cumanus was administering Galilee (Ann. xii.54) , the omission of any direct reference to Judea, the unusual character of such a double administration and the explicit statement of Josephus that Claudius sent Felix as successor of Cumanus, make it unlikely that Paul's statement is to be understood of an administration beginning earlier than 52 AD. If Festus succeeded in the summer of 60 AD, Paul's arrest would fall in 58 and the "many years" of Felix' administration would cover a period of 6 years, from 52 AD to 58 AD (compare Schurer, op. cit., I, 577 f, note 38). Ramsay argues in favor of 57 AD as the year of Paul's arrest and 59 AD as the year of the accession of Festus (Pauline and Other Studies, 1906, 345 ff).

8. Relative Chronology of Acts:

If Festus succeeded Felix in the summer of 60 AD, Paul would reach Rome in the spring of 61 AD, and the narrative in Ac would terminate in 63 AD (Ac 28:30). Paul's arrest in Jerusalem 2 years before the accession of Festus (Ac 24:27) would fall in the spring of 58 AD. Previous to this Paul had spent 3 months in Corinth (Ac 20:3) and 3 years in Ephesus (Ac 20:31; compare Ac 19:10), which would make the beginning of the third missionary journey fall about 54 AD. There was an interval between the second and the third journeys (Ac 18:23), and as Paul spent 18 months at Corinth (Ac 18:11) the beginning of the second journey would fall about 51 AD. The Apostolic Council preceded the second journey and may be dated about 50 AD—14 years subsequent to Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (37 AD) in the third year after his conversion in 35 AD. The first missionary journey was made after the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem with the alms from the church at Antioch (Ac 11:30; 12:25), about the time of the death of Herod Agrippa I, and would fall between 44 AD and 50 AD. The growth of the early church in Jerusalem previous to Paul's conversion would thus extend over a period of about 5 years from 30 AD to 35 AD.

9. Pauline Epistles:

Ten of the thirteen Pauline epistles were written during a period of about ten years between Paul's arrival in Corinth and the close of his first Roman imprisonment. These epistles fall into three groups, each possessing certain distinctive characteristics; and although each reflects the difference in time and occasion of its production, they all reveal an essential continuity of thought and a similarity of style which evidences unity of authorship. The earliest group consists of the Thessalonian epistles, both of which were written from Corinth on the second missionary journey about 52 or 53 AD, while Silas (Silvanus) was still in Paul's company and shortly after Paul's visit to Athens (1Th 1:1; 3:1,2,6; 2Th 1:1). The major epistles belong to the third missionary journey. 1 Corinthians was written from Ephesus about 55 AD; Galatians probably from Ephesus, either before or after 1 Corinthians, for Paul had been twice in Galatia (Ga 4:13); 2 Corinthians from Macedonia about 57 AD; and Romans from Cor inth about 57 or 58 AD. The imprisonment epistles were written from Rome: Colossians, Ephesians and Philemon about 62 AD, and Philippians about 63 AD.

10. Release and Death of Paul:

When Paul wrote to Philemon (Phm 1:22) and to the Philippians (Php 2:24; compare Php 1:25), he expected a favorable issue of his trial in Rome and was looking forward to another visit to the East. Before his arrest he had planned a journey to Spain by way of Rome (Ro 15:28), and when he bade farewell to the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Ac 20:25) he must have had in mind not only the dangers of his journey to Jerusalem, but also his determination to enter another field of labor. 1 Clement 5, the Muratori Canon and the Apocryphal Ac of Peter (Zahn, Einltg.3, I, 444 f) witness to the Spanish journey, and the Pastoral Epistles to a journey to the East and to another imprisonment in Rome. The two lines of evidence for Paul's release are independent and neither can be explained as derived merely from the statement of Paul's intention in Romans and in Philemon and Philippians. The historical situation implied in the Pastoral Epistles can be charged with artificiality only on the hypothesis that Paul was not released from his first Roman imprisonment. The data of these epistles cannot be fitted into any period of Paul's life previous to his imprisonment. But these data are embodied in just those parts of the Pastoral Epistles which are admitted to be Pauline by those who regard the epistles as containing only genuine fragments from Paul but assign the epistles in their present form to a later writer. On any hypothesis of authorship, however, the tradition which these epistles contain cannot be much later than the first quarter of the 2nd century. It is highly probable therefore that Paul was released from his first Roman imprisonment; that he visited Spain and the East; and that he was imprisoned a second time in Rome where he met his death in the closing years of Nero's reign, i.e. in 67 or 68 AD. According to early tradition Paul suffered martyrdom by beheading with the sword (Tert., De praescr. haer., xxxvi), but there is nothing to connect his death with the persecution of the Christians in Rome by Nero in 64 AD.

Little is known of Peter beside what is recorded of him in the New Testament. The tradition of his bishopric of 20 or 25 years in Rome (compare Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Lit., II; Die Chronologie, I, 243 f) accords neither with the implications of Ac and Galatians nor with Paul's silence in Rom.

11. Death of Peter:

But 1Pe was probably written from Rome (1Pe 5:13; compare Euseb., HE, ii.15, 2) and the testimony to Peter's martyrdom (implied in Joh 21:18 f) under Nero in Rome by crucifixion (Tert., De praes. haer., xxxvi; compare 1 Clem 5:1 ff) is early and probably trustworthy. Tradition also associates Peter and Paul in their Roman labors and martyrdom (Dionysius in Euseb., HE, ii. 25, 8; Iren., Adv. haer., iii.1, 2; iii. 3, 1). The mention of the Vatican as the place of Peter's interment (Caius in Euseb., HE, ii. 25, 6 f) may indicate a connection of his martyrdom with the Neronian persecution in 64 AD; but this is not certain. Peter's death may therefore be dated with some probability in Rome between 64 and 67 AD. His two epistles were written at some time before his death, probably the First about 64 and the Second at some time afterward and subsequent to the Epistle of Jude which it apparently uses. (The arguments against the Roman sojourn and martyrdom of Peter are stated fully by Schmiedel in the Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Simon Peter," especially col. 458 ff; on the other hand compare Zahn, Einleitung3, II, 17 ff, English translation, II, 158 ff.)

12. Death of James the Just:

James the Just, the brother of the Lord, was prominent in the church of Jerusalem at the time of the Apostolic Council (Ac 15:13 ff; Ga 2:9; compare Ga 1:19; 2:12) and later when Paul was arrested he seems still to have occupied this position (Ac 21:18 ff), laboring with impressive devotion for the Jewish people until his martyrdom about the year 66 AD (Ant., XX, ix, 1; Euseb., HE, ii.23, 3 ff; HRE3, VIII, 581; Zahn, Einltg.3, I, 76). The Epistle of Jas contains numerous indications of its early origin a nd equally clear evidence that it was not written during the period when the questions which are discussed in the major epistles of Paul were agitating the church. It is probably the earliest book of the New Testament, written before the Apostolic Council.

13. The Synoptic Gospels, etc.:

In the decade just preceding the fall of Jerusalem, the tradition of the life and teaching of Jesus was committed to writing in the Synoptic Gospels. Early tradition dates the composition of Matthew's Gospel in the lifetime of Peter and Paul (Iren., Adv. haer., ill. l, 1; Eusebius, HE, v.8, 2 ff), and that of the Gospel of Mark either just before or after Peter's death (Clement in Euseb., HE, vi.14, 7; compare ii.15; and Irenaeus, Adv. haer., iii.11, 1; Presbyter of Papias in Euseb., HE, iii. 39, 15; compare also 2Pe 1:15). The Lucan writings—both the Gospel and Acts—probably fall also in this period, for the Gospel contains no intimation that Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem had been fulfilled (compare Lu 21:21; Ac 11:28), and the silence of Ac about the issue of Paul's trial is best explained on the hypothesis of an early date (Jerome, De vir. illustr., vii; Harnack, Neue Untersuch. zur Apostelgesch., 1911; compare also Lu 10:7; 1Ti 5:18). To this period belong also the Epistle of Jude and the Epistle to the He (if addressed to Jewish Christians of Palestine; but later, about 80 AD, if addressed to Jewish Christians of Rome (Zahn, Einltg.3, II, 152)), the former being used in 2 Peter and the latter in 1 Clement.

14. Death of John:

Early tradition connects John with Ephesus and mentions his continuing in life until the time of Trajan (Irenaeus, Adv. haer., ii.22, 5 (Eusebius, HE, v.24); iii. l, 1; v.30, 3; v.33, 4; Clement in Eusebius, HE, iii.23, 5-19; Polycrates in Eusebius, HE, iii.31, 3; v.24, 3; Justin, Dialogue, lxxxi; compare Re 1:1,4,9; 22:8; Joh 21:22,23,14; 19:35). He died probably about the end of the 1st century. There is another but less well-attested tradition of martyrdom based chiefly on the De Boor fragment of Papias (Texte u. Unters., 1888), a Syriac Martyrology of the 4th century (Wright, Jour. of Sacred Lit., 1865-66, VIII, 56 ff, 423 ff), the Codex Coislinianus 305 of Georgius Hamartolus. This tradition, it is thought, finds confirmation in Mr 10:35-40; Mt 20:20-23 (compare Bousset, Theologische Rundschau, . 1905, 225 ff, 277 ff). During the closing years of his life John wrote the Revelation, the Fourth Gospel and the three Epistles.

15. Summary of Dates:

LITERATURE.

In addition to the literature mentioned in section 8: Anger, De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione. 1833; Wieseler, Chronologie des apos. Zeitalters, 1848: Hoennicke, Die Chronologie des Lebens des Apostels Paulus, 1903; Harnack, Gesch. d. altchr. Lit. bis Euseb., II, 1, Die Chronologie bis Iren., 1897; Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 1893; Zahn, Einleitung, II, 1907 (Eng. translation, 1909).

W. P. Armstrong

CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

kro-nol’-o-ji:

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Difficulties of the Subject

2. Plan of Treatment

3. Bible to be Regarded as Highest Authority

II. THE AGES BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS

III. PERSIAN PERIOD

IV. BABYLONIAN PERIOD

V. ASSYRIAN PERIOD AND JUDAH AFTER FALL OF SAMARIA

VI. PERIOD OF DIVIDED KINGDOM

1. Causes of Variation in Systems

2. Some Important and Pivotal Dates

3. Difficulties to Be Removed

4. Overlappings

VII. FROM THE DISRUPTION TO THE EXODUS

Indications of Overlapping

VIII. FROM THE EXODUS TO BIRTH OF ABRAHAM

Main Points at Issue

IX. FROM ABRAHAM TO THE CREATION

A Suggested Interpretation

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

1. Difficulties of the Subject:

For evident reasons the student of Biblical chronology must meet many difficulties, and must always be severely handicapped. First of all, the Old Testament is not purely nor intentionally a book of history. Nor does it present a formulated system of chronology, its many numbers and dates being used principally with a view to the spiritual facts and truths with which the authors were concerned. We are not, therefore, to expect to find a perfectly arranged order of periods and dates, though happily for us in our investigation we shall indeed find many accurately dated events, frequent consecutions of events, and orderly success ions of officials; as, for example, the numerous genealogical tables, the succession of judges and the lists of kings.

Furthermore, there is not to be found in the Old Testament one particular and definitely fixed era, from which all of its events are dated, as is the case in Christian history. The points of departure, or reckoning, are found to vary in different periods of the advancing history; being at one stage the Creation, at another the migration of Abraham, or the Exodus, or again the disruption of the kingdom. Ordinarily dates and all time-allusions are comparative, i.e. they are related to the reign of some contemporary monarch, as the vision of Isaiah "in the year that king Uzziah died" (Isa 6:1), or to some unusual occurrence, historical or natural, as the great earthquake (Am 1:1; Zec 14:5). Only occasional reference is found to some event, which marks an era-beginning; such as the Exodus (Jud 11:16,26; 1Ki 6:1).

The general lack of uniformity among writers on Biblical chronology contributes further toward increase of the already perplexing confusion. It is almost possible to say that no two writers agree; and proposed harmonies are with each other most inharmonious. The two articles on Old Testament chronology in a recent work (Murray, Illus. Bible Dictionary, 1908), for example, are several hundred years apart at certain points. Wide diversity of opinion exists about the most prominent events, such as the call of Abraham and the age of his famous contemporary Hammurabi, the year of the Exodus, and the beginning of Solomon’s temple. Naturally there is less variance of opinion about later dates, some of which, e.g. the fall of Samaria and the destruction of Jerusalem, may be considered as fixed. A like wide

range of opinion prevails among archaeologists with regard to events in contemporaneous history, the difference between Goodspeed and Hommel in the dates of early Babylonian history being five hundred years, and the beginning and extent of the Hyksos period in Egypt varying in different "authorities" by hundreds of years. Nor should the difference in the various and total numbers of the Hebrew, Samaritan and Septuagint texts of the pre-Abrahamic ages be left out of sight in any statement of the difficulties attending the discussion of this subject.

2. Plan of Treatment:

These difficulties, and others as serious, have determined the plan of this article. The usual method of development has been to begin with the sources of Old Testament history, and to follow its course downward. While such a system may have its advantages, there is, however, this serious disadvantage connected with it: that the least certain dates are confessedly those at the beginning of the records, and the use of them at the foundation renders the whole structure of the discussion more or less uncertain. Archaeology and comparative history have done much to fix dates from the Exodus downward, bringing these later centuries by discovery and translation almost into the position of attested history. But the ages before the Exodus, and particularly before Abraham, still lie from the very nature of the ease in great obscurity. And thus any system beginning with the indistinct early past, with its compacted numbers and their uncertain interpretation, is much like a chain hung on thin air. The writer purposes, therefore, beginning with certain familiar, important and pivotal dates, to gather around and relate to these the events and persons of the Old Testament. Such accepted dates are: the completion of the Second Temple in 516, the fall of Jerusalem in 586, the fall of Samaria in 721, tribute to Shalmaneser II from Jehu in 842, and from a member of Omri’s dynasty in 854. Such Old Testament events as mark the beginning of eras are the Disruption, Solomon’s temple, the Exodus and Abraham’s Call. The material and the plan, then, almost necessarily require that we begin at the end of the history and work logically backward to the earlier stages, at which we may hope to arrive with firm ground under our feet for the disposition of the more uncertain problems. It is hoped that on this plan the system of chronology will not be mere speculation, nor a personal theory, but of some certainty and affording some assurance in days of wild assertion and free manipulation.

3. Bible to be Regarded as Highest Authority:

It should be remembered that this is a study of Bible chronology, and therefore full value will be given to the explicit and positive statements of the Bible. Surely the time has come, when all fair-minded men should recognize that a clear and straightforward declaration of the Sacred Scriptures is not to be summarily rejected because of its apparent contradiction by some unknown and irresponsible person, who could stamp clay or chisel stone. It has been all too common that archaeological and critical adventurers have doubted and required accurate proof of every Bible statement, but have been ready enough to give credence to any statement from ancient pagan sources. We assume, as we have every reason to do, the trustworthiness of the Bible records, which have been corroborated in countless instances; and we shall follow their guidance in preference to any other. The help of contemporaneous history and the witness of archaeology can be used to advantage, but should not be substituted for the plain facts of the Scriptures, which are full worthy of our trust and regard. The province of a chronology

of the Bible is properly to present in system the dates therein given, with an honest effort to harmonize the difficulties, using the external helps, but ever regardful of Scripture authority and rights.

II. The Ages between the Testaments.

Between the coming of Christ and the end of Old Testament history there lie in round numbers four hundred years. But while these were extra-Biblical ages, they were neither barren nor uneventful years; for in them will be found much of the highest value in the development of Jewish life, and in the preparation for the Messiah. And thus they have their proper place in Bible chronology (see BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS). The birth of Jesus could not have been later than 4 BC, since Herod the Great died in April of that year. Herod became king of Judea in 37 BC. Palestine had been conquered and Jerusalem entered by the Romans under Pompey in 56 BC, the Jews coming in this way under the power of Rome. The Roman age was preceded by the government of priest-kings, with which the Idumean Antipater became identified by marriage, so that Herod, whom Rome made king, was both Jew and alien.

The period of the Maccabees, which ended in 39 BC with the removal of Antigonus by the Romans in favor of Herod, began 168 BC with Judas. Antipater, who had been appointed procurator of Judea in 47, was assassinated in 43 BC. The period of the Seleucids stretches from its close with the regency of Antiochus VII in 128 back to its founder, Seleucus, 312 BC. The most notable of these monarchs from the Jewish point of view was Antiochus Epiphanes, who reigned from 175 to 164, and in 168 gave occasion to the rise of the Maccabees by his many acts of impiety and oppression, particularly the desecration of the Jerusalem temple. In 203 BC Antiochus the Great, who had become king of Syria in 223, took Jerusalem, and later, in 198, annexed Judea to Syria. Previous to this Judea had been an Egyptian dependency, as after the death of Alexander the Great, 323 BC, and the division of his empire, it had been annexed by Ptolemy Soter to Egypt. Ptolemy Philadelphus, becoming king 280 BC, encouraged the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, the result being the Septuagint version, and all it meant by way of preparation for the spread of Christianity. Alexander’s defeat of Darius III, or Codomannus, at Arbela in 331 brought the Persian empire to an end, fulfilling the long-cherished ambition of the Greeks for mastery of Asia. The long reign of the Biblical king of Persia, Artaxerxes Longimanus, extended from 465 to 424 BC, and in reaching his reign we find ourselves in the region of the Old Testament history. Reversing the order of this brief review and setting out from Old Testament point of view, we have the following table for the centuries between the Testaments:

III. Persian Period.

Entering now the last period of Old Testament history, which may be called the Persian period, we find that the activities of Ezra, Nehemiah and other Jewish leaders are dated by the regnal years of the kings of Persia (e.g. Hag 1:1; Zec 1:1; Ezr 1:1; Ne 2:1); and consequently the difficulties in the chronology of this period are not great. Recently a fanciful effort has been made to place the events narrated in Esther, Ezra and Nehemiah in the time of the Babylonian Captivity, claiming Scripture warrant from the occurrence of these names, with Mordecai, in Ezr 2:2 and Ne 7:7; but altogether without success (see

Prince of Judah, or Days of Nehemiah Redated). These names were doubtless of common occurrence, and their appearance among those returning with Zerubbabel is not sufficient to affect the historical evidence for the accepted dates of Ezra and Nehemiah. The attempt to move back these dates into the 6th century, to associate Nehemiah with Daniel and Mordecai and to place his work before Zerubbabel may be dismissed as pure fancy and impossible of reconciliation with the Old Testament narrative.

Artaxerxes I began his reign, which gives date to Ezra and Nehemiah, in 465 BC. In his 7th year, 458, Ezra went from Babylon to Jerusalem by the king's decree (Ezr 7:7), taking back with him the vessels of the Temple and much besides for the worship at Jerusalem, accompanied also by a great company of returning Jews. Nehemiah followed from Shushan in the 20th year of the king (Ne 1:1), having heard of and being distressed by the partial failure of Ezra's efforts. Under his wise and courageous leadershi p, the city walls were speedily restored, and many reforms accomplished. He returned after twelve years (433) to the service of the king in Shushan (Ne 13:6), but in a short time, hearing evil tidings from Jerusalem, went back to complete his reforms, and apparently spent the rest of his life in that work. Although the Bible is silent, such is the testimony of Josephus. The Book of Mal, reflecting the difficulties and evils of this time, is evidently to be placed here, but not with exactness, as it might hav e been written as early as 460 or as late as 420.

The period from the return under Ezra (458) back to the completion of the Temple in the reign of Darius I (516) is, with the exception of incidental references and the assignment of undated books and incidents, practically a blank. Here belong, we believe, the Book of Esther, possibly Mal, some of the Psalms, and those social and religious tendencies among the returned exiles, which made the vigorous reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah so necessary. But the Old Testament does not draw the curtain from the mystery of that half-century, that we may know the happenings and watch the development. Beyond this blank we come again to explicit dates. The second temple, begun with the Return under Zerubbabel, was completed in the 6th year of Darius, i.e. 516. The building of it, which had been early abandoned for selfish reasons, was resumed in the 2nd year of Darius under the exhortation of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah (Hag 1:1; Zec 1:1). Darius the Great began his reign in 521. Cambyses succeeded Cyrus in 527. Babyl on was taken by the Persians in 538, and shortly after the Jews, under the edict of Cyrus, began their return to Jerusalem, reaching their destination by 536 at the latest. Cyrus overthrew Lydia in 545, the Medes five years earlier, and must have come to the Persian throne not later than 555. His conquest of Asia Minor opened the contest between Persia and Greece for supremacy, to be continued by Darius and. Xerxes, resulting finally at Arbela (331) in Greek triumph under Alexander, and the inauguration of a new age.

The table for the Persian period of Old Testament history, following the stream upward, is therefore as follows:

IV. Babylonian Period.

Just preceding the Persian is the Babylonian period of Old Testament chronology, overlapping, of course, the former, and finally superseded by it in Cyrus' conquest of Babylonia. This period may

properly be said to begin with the death in 626 BC of Ashurbanipal, the last great ruler of Assyria. At this time Nabopolassar had been made governor of Babylonia, subject to the supremacy of Assyria. With Ashurbanipal's death Nabopolassar became independent sovereign of Babylonia , and shortly entered into league with the Medes to overthrow the rule of Assyria, and then to divide its empire between them. This was accomplished in the fall of Nineveh (606) which brought the end of the mighty Assyrian empire, the last king being Sinsharishkun (the historic Saracus), a son of Ashurbanipal. Some years before his death in 604 Nabopolassar associated with him on the throne of Babylonia his son Nebuchadnezzar, most illustrious ruler of the new Babylonian empire, and intimately connected with the history of Judah in the last years of that kingdom. His long reign came to an end in 562.

While the conflict, which brought Assyria to its end, and the attendant confusion, were absorbing the attention of Mesopotamian countries, Egypt under a new and virile dynasty was reviving her ambitions and intrigues for dominion in Asia. Pharaoh-necoh II taking advantage of the confusion and helplessness of Assyria invaded Palestine in 609, intending to march on through Palestine to attack Mesopotamia. King Josiah in loyalty to his Assyrian overlord opposed him, but was defeated and slain at the battle of Megiddo, after a reign of 31 years; apparently an unnecessary and foolish opposition on Josiah's part, as the plan of Necoh's march shows that Judah was not directly affected. After the victory at Megiddo, Necoh continued his march north-eastward, subduing Syria and hoping to have a hand in Mesopotamian affairs. But in 606 or 607 BC he was defeated at Carchemish and driven back to Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, fresh from victory over Nineveh. In the same year Nebuchadnezzar marched against Egypt, receiving the submission of Jerusalem as he passed through Palestine, and sending noble hostages back to Babylon, among whom were Daniel and his three friends. The death of his father and his endangered succession recalled Nebuchadnezzar suddenly to Babylon, where he became sole ruler in 604. It appears that Necoh must have returned to Egypt after Megiddo and before the battle of Carchemish, as he made Jehoiakim, king in place of Jehoahaz, whom he carried captive to Egypt. Nebuchadnezzar's victory at Carchemish and his march southward brought Judah in close relations with Babylon, and opened up the dramatic chapter of Jerusalem's fall and exile. These historic events fix the dates of the last kings and the closing incidents of the kingdom of Judah, as shown in the following table:

V. Assyrian Period and Judah after Fall of Samaria.

This section, which may for convenience be treated as a division, is the chronology of Judah under Assyria after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 721. As the Scripture time-references are frequent and explicit, and the contemporaneous Assyrian records are full, and explicit also, the problems of this period are neither many nor insoluble. One difficulty is found in the fact that the aggregate years of the reigns of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon and Josiah fall one or two years short of the period between Hezekiah's accession in 726 and Josiah's death in 609. But there is evidence of anarchical conditions at the close of Amon's reign (2Ki 21:23,14), and it is probable that at least a year should be counted for the interregnum. The chief difficulty is with the invasions of Sennacherib in Hezekiah's reign. The confusion is caused by the apparent dating of Sennacherib's famous and disastrous invasion of 701 in the 14th year of Hezekiah's reign (2Ki 18:13). Various attempts reconciliation have been made; one attempt has been to place the beginning of Hezekiah's reign in 715, which is out of the question entirely,

as it disregards the exact terms in which the beginning of his reign is placed before the fall of Samaria (2Ki 18:10). Another suggestion has been that "24th" be read instead of "14th"; but this is pure conjecture. There is a simple and satisfactory solution: in the chapters which contain the record (2Ki 18 and Isa 36) it is evident that two invasions are described. Frequently in the Scriptures records are topical rather than chronological, and just so in this instance the topic is Sennacherib's menace of Judah, and the ultimate deliverance by Yahweh. The story includes two invasions: the first in the 14th year of Hezekiah (713) when Sennacherib led the armies of his father Sargon, the end of which, so far as Jerusalem was concerned, was the payment of tribute by Hezekiah, as is accurately stated in 2Ki 18:16. The second invasion, the description of which begins with the following verse (2Ki 18:17), was the more serious, and is probably identified as that of 701, when Sennacherib had become king. The necessary insertion of a paragraph indicator between 2Ki 18:16 and 2Ki 18:17 satisfies every demand for harmony.

From 609 BC, the year of Josiah's death, we count back 31 years to the beginning Of his reign in 639; he attained his majority in the 8th year (632; 2Ch 34:3); the reformation in his 12th year, at the time of the Scythian irruption, would fall in 628 (2Ch 34:3); in the following year Jeremiah began to prophecy; and in Josiah's 18th year (621) the temple was cleansed and the Book of the Law found (2Ch 34:8). Allowing a year of confusion, Amon began his short reign in 642, and Manasseh his long reign of 55 years in 697, Hezekiah's reign of 29 years dating back to 726. Some fixed important dates of contemporaneous history are: death of Ashurbanipal, Assyria's last great king, in 626, with the consequent independence of Babylon and beginning of the 2nd Babylonian empire. Ashurbanipal's long reign began in 668 on the death of his father Esarhaddon; who succeeded his father Sennacherib in 681. Sargon usurped the Assyrian throne in 722, and died in 705. Shalmaneser IV, successor of Tiglath-pileser III, r eigned for the brief space between 727 and 722. In Egypt the XXVth, or Ethiopian Dynasty, was in power from circa 720 to 667, two of its kings, So and Tirhakah, having mention in the Old Testament (2Ki 17:4; 19:9; Isa 37:9), and after this the XXVIth (a native) Dynasty appeared, Pharaoh-necoh being one of its kings. The dates of this period we may summarize in the following table:

VI. Period of Divided Kingdom.

The most complex, but most interesting, problems of Old Testament chronology are found in the period of the Divided Kingdom. In the literature of this period are found larger number of dates and historical references than in that of any other. We have the assistance of several important sources and factors in arranging these dates:

(1) The parallel records of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah serve as checks to each other, since the accession and death of the kings in each nation are fixed by reference to reigns of those of the other. Many other events are similarly related.

(2) The history of the two kingdoms, or parts of it, at least, is given in three parallel authorities: the Books of Kings, of Chronicles, and of the Prophets.

(3) The Assyrian records are fullest and are practically continuous in this period, the limu lists extending

unbroken from 893 to 650 BC.

1. Causes of Variation in Systems:

But while this apparently should be the most satisfactory field for the chronologist, it has been found impossible to arrive at anything approaching certainty, and consequently there is considerable divergence among individuals and schools. One cause of variation is the difference between the Assyrian royal lists and the total of the Old Testament numbers for this period, the Old Testament aggregate being 51 years greater then the Assyrian lists. Two common methods of harmonizing this difference have bee n adopted:

(1) to accept the Old Testament aggregate as correct and to assume that the 51 years have been omitted from the Assyrian lists (see W. J. Beecher, Dated Events of Old Testament, 18, 19);

(2) to harmonize the Old Testament numbers with the Assyrian lists by taking into account the overlapping of reigns of kings who were, for brief periods, associated on the throne.

Instances of such overlapping are the co-regency of Uzziah and Jotham in Judah (2Ki 15:5), and possibly the reign of Pekah contemporaneously with Menahem and Pekahiah in Israel (2Ki 23-28). The latter method yields the most satisfactory results, and will be adopted in this article. The chief point of difference will be the age of Solomon and the foundation-laying of the Temple. This may be found according to the former method by adding 51 years to the dates as given below. That the method of following the aggregate of the Old Testament numbers must assume arbitrarily that there have been omissions from the Assyrian lists, and that it also must resort to some overlapping and justment of the numb ers as they are given in the text, are sufficient reasons against its adoption. And in meeting the difficulties of this period it should always be borne in mind that the Old Testament is not a book of annals merely, and that dates are given not for any special interest in them, but to correlate and emphasize events. Ordinarily dates are given with reference to local situations and contemporary persons, and not as fixed by some great epoch-marking event; e.g. Uzziah’s reign is fixed not with reference to the Disrupti on nor the Temple building, but by relation to his Israelite contemporary, Jeroboam II.

2. Some Important and Pivotal Dates:

However, there are some fixed dates, which are so by reason of their international significance, and upon these we may rest with reasonable assurance. Such are the fall of Samaria (721 BC); the accession of Tiglath-pileser III (745); tribute paid to Shalmaneser II by Jehu in 842, and by Ahab, or one of his dynasty, in 854; and the invasion of Judah by Pharaoh-shishak in the fifth year of Rehoboam (1Ki 14:25). There are also certain coincident dates, fixed with fair accuracy, in the parallel history of the two kingdoms, which serve both as starting-points and as checks upon each other. The most prominent of these are: the beginning of Hezekiah’s reign, 5 years before the fall of Samaria (2Ki 18:10); the synchronism of the reigns of Jeroboam II and Jotham (1Ch 5:17), Jotham’s accession being used as a

basis of calculation for the reigns of Israelite kings (2Ki 15:30); the coincidence of the end of the Omri Dynasty and the death of Ahaziah, king of Judah (2Ki 9), Jehu and Athaliah therefore beginning their reigns at the same time; and, primarily, the division of the kingdom and the synchronous beginning of the reigns of Jeroboam I and Rehoboam. Using these fixed dates and coincidences, we must find the summaries of the reigns of Israelite and Jewish kings between 721, the 9th year of Hoshea and the 6th of Hezekiah, and 843, the beginning of the reigns of Jehu add Athaliah, to be 122 years each; and likewise the summaries from 843 back to the Disruption to be the same.

3. Difficulties to Be Removed:

The most serious difficulties are found near the end of the period, when conditions in the Northern Kingdom were becoming anarchical, and, also evident co-regencies, the extent of which is not evident, occurred in the Southern Kingdom. Pekah is said to have reigned 20 years (2Ki 15:27); and yet Menahem paid tribute to Assyria in 738, and he was succeeded for two years by his son Pekahiah, from whom Pekah seized the kingdom. This would allow Pekah only 6 years of sovereignty. The explanation lies in the context: in the confusion which followed the death of Jeroboam, Pekah established his authority over the section East of the Jordan, and to that year the numbers in 2Ki 15:27,32; 2Ki 16:1 refer. Uzziah was leprous the last 16 years of his life, and Jotham his son was over the kingdom (2Ki 15:5). The length of Jotham’s reign was just 16 years, not additional to the 16 of the co-regency, as this would result in the absurdity of making him co-regent at the age of 9 years (2Ki 15:33). Therefore nearly his whole reign is included in the 52 years of his father. For some reason Ahaz was associated with his father Jotham before the death of the latter, since the 16 years of his reign plus the 5 of Hezekiah before the fall of Samaria bring his accession before the death of Uzziah and Jotham, i.e. in 741. So that for approximately 6 years the three reigns were contemporaneous. That these 6 years may not be accounted for by a co-regency with Hezekiah at the other end of Ahaz’ reign is evident from the age of Hezekiah at his accession (2Ki 18:2), and from the radical difference in the policy of the two kings. 2Ki 7:1 may suggest that Uzziah and Jotham died about the same time, and that Ahaz was regarded as succeeding both directly.

Another difficulty is found at the beginning of Uzziah’s reign, where he is said to have succeeded his father Amaziah at the age of 16, but is also said to have accomplished certain notable things after his father’s death (2Ki 14:21,22). Evidently, then, he became king before the death of Amaziah. When did this co-regency begin? No better time is suggested than Amaziah’s ignominious defeat by Jehoash of Israel in the 15th year of his reign, after which the people arose and put Uzziah in his place, Amaziah living on for 15 years (2Ki 14:17), so that 15 of Amaziah’s 29 years were contemporaneous with Uzziah. Further, in the last years of Joash of Judah there may have been a co-regency, since he was "very sick" in those years (2Ch 24:25). Thus the totals of 146 years for the reigns of the kings of Israel and of 165 for the reigns of the kings of Judah between 721 and 842 are reduced to the actual 121 by the overlappings, which are suggested in the narrative itself.

4. Overlappings:

For the first division of this period, from the rise of Jehu, circa 843, to the division of the kingdom, the totals of the reigns of the kings of Israel is 98 years, and of the kings of Judah is 95. But there must be some overlappings. The interval between Ahab and Jehu, as shown by mention of them in the Assyrian records, is 12 years; but the two sons of Ahab reigned 14 years, Ahaziah 2 and Jehoram 12. Evidently the last year of Ahab, in which came the defeat at Karkar, was the 1st of Ahaziah, and the 2nd of Ahaziah, who suffered in that year serious accident (2Ki 1:2), was the first of Jehoram. It is probable that the long reign of Asa closed with Jehoshaphat as co-regent (1Ki 15:23), so the above totals of both kingdoms must be reduced to some extent, probably to 90 years, and the disruption of the kingdom placed about 933 BC. Shishak, founder of the XXIId Dynasty, invaded Palestine in the 5th year of Rehoboam (1Ki 14:25), and in, or shortly before, the 21st year of his own reign, so that he must have bec ome sovereign of Egypt about 950 BC. Jeroboam fled to Egypt after Solomon had reigned more than 20 years, as is shown by the connection of Jeroboam with the building of Millo; and so Jeroboam's flight must have been about the beginning of Shishak's reign. This is in accord with the Old Testament records, since the hostile Shishak Dynasty must have arisen in the reign of Solomon, the dynasty which was ruling at the beginning of his reign having been in alliance with him. So we place the accession of Shishak about 950, his invasion of Judah in 929, and the Disruption in 933 BC.

An interesting instance of co-regency in this period is that of Jehoshaphat and Jehoram, for while Ahaziah of Israel began to reign in the 17th year of Jehoshaphat (1Ki 22:51) and died in the 2nd year of Jehoram (2Ki 1:17), the year of his death was also the 18th of Jehoshaphat, so that the father and son reigned together about 5 years. It is evident also that Jehoshaphat ruled before his father's death, as the total of his reign is counted from the co-regency's beginning (1Ki 22:41), but certain events are dated from his sole reign on the death of Asa (1Ki 22:51; 2Ki 3:1). It is probable that the 6 years of Athaliah were included in the 40 years of the reign of Joash, the legitimate king. The age of his son, Amaziah, at his accession (2Ch 25:1) does not operate against this probability, since the precocious Jewish sovereigns attained their majority at 15 years of age (compare 2Ch 34:3). The co-regency for 2 years of Joash and Amaziah (2Ch 24:25) brings the aggregate years of the reigns of the kings of both kingdoms down to the accession of Jeroboam II, three years before Uzziah's accession, into exact accord. Finally, the difference of three years in the totals of reigns in the two kingdoms from Jehu' to the Disruption is explained by the fact that in Israel the first year of a king was coincident with the last of his predecessor, whereas in Judah, certainly at the beginning of this period, the first year of a king followed the death of his predecessor; e.g. while Asa began to reign in the 20th year of Jeroboam (1Ki 15:9), Jeroboam, who reigned 22 years, died three years later in the second year of Asa (1Ki 15:25). Observation of this principle in the accessions of the first three kings after Jeroboam removes the difference, the long numbers of the reign of Asa being found to corroborate. The preceding table will illustrate these facts of the records, as harmonizing the dates of the two contemporaneous kingdoms.

VII. From the Disruption to the Exodus.

The period now to be considered extends from the disruption of the kingdom back to the Exodus. The reasons for combining the Biblical events within these widely separated dates into one period of such length are evident, namely,

(1) the regular sequence of the history;

(2) the occurrence of comprehensive numbers for the period as a whole, e.g. Jud 11:26 and 1Ki 6:1; the chronological data of the Book of Judges, which lead directly up to the developments in the time of the united kingdom, e.g. the narrative of Ru preparing the way for the reign of David. Characteristic of this period is the frequent occurrence of the general numbers 80, 40 and 20, which are not necessarily to be taken always as exact, but possibly at times indicating a round, or generation, number.

In order to get the time limits of this period, it is necessary to count back 37 years from the end of Solomon's reign in 933 BC, and this brings us to that epoch-marking event, the laying of the foundations of the Temple in 969 or 970, the 4th year of his reign (1Ki 6:1); and from this event we are brought by the addition of the comprehensive number 479, given in the same verse, back to the year of the Exodus, approximately 1448 BC, making the total length of the period about 516 years.

Indications of Overlapping:

But the addition of the numbers given for the various reigns and administrations of the period yields a total which is much greater than 516, and therefore one must seek in the text indications of overlapping, which will bring the narrative into harmony with itself. The reigns of Solomon (1Ki 11:42), David (1Ki 2:11) and Saul (Ac 13:21), are given as 40 years each; and here there may be some overlapping, Solomon, e.g. becoming king before David's death (1Ki 1:43-48). We are rather surprised to find that there is no statement of the length of Samuel's ministry, such as its important place in the national life would lead us to expect. The probable reason for this is that his life was paralleled largely by the reign of Saul and the administration of Eli. A period of 40 years is assigned to Eli (1Sa 4:18); the aggregate of numbers given for the Judges is 410 years; Joshua ruled for 40 years (Jud 2:8); and finally the wilderness wanderings covered another 40-year period. The sum total of all these numbers is 670—far beyond the comprehensive reckonings of Jud 11:26; 1Ki 6:1, and Ac 13:19. It is evident from Jud 10:7,8; 13:1 that the periods of Ammonite and Philistine oppression were either contemporaneous or very near together, and therefore that the comprehensive number, 300 years, of Jud 11:26, reaches from the entrance into Canaan under Joshua down to the age of Samson, as well as of Jephthah. The administrations of Ibzan, Elon and Abdon (Jud 12:8-13) should then be regarded as practically synchronous with Jephthah and Samson, and the number of their years should, in part at least, be left out of account. The numbers from Samson and Eli to Solomon are approximately fixed, 20 to Samson, 40 to Eli, 40 to Saul and 40 to David; and their total accords with the 300 before Jephthah, and the 40 of wilderness wanderings in making up the grand total (1Ki 6:1) from Solomon to the Exodus. This proportion before and after Jephthah, or Samson, and the Philistine oppression, approximately 330 and 150 yea rs, is in agreement with the genealogies of Ru 4:18-22; 1Sa 14:3; 22:9; 1Ch 2; 6; 24. The shortening therefore of the excessive aggregate of 670 years must be sought in the records from Samson back to Joshua. Assuming that the oppressions may be synchronous with the administrations of preceding or succeeding judges, that Abimelech's abortive attempt to become king (Jud 9) should be included in Gideon's 40 years, and that parallelings are possible in the three judges just after Jephthah (Jud 12:8-13) and the two just before (Jud 10:1-5), it is possible to bring the detailed time-references of

the Books of Jud into satisfactory agreement with the comprehensive numbers. That the period of the Judges is shorter than the aggregate of the numbers assigned to each is further indicated by the manner in which the brief narratives at the end of the book—the migration of the Danites, the sin and punishment of Benjamin—and the Book of Ruth, bring the earlier generations into close touch with the later; compare the genealogy of David (Ru 4:18-22).

The preceding table (p. 641) shows the dates of events according to the longer reckoning, and also according to the suggested shortening by taking into account the possible synchronisms. It should be remembered that these figures are not indisputable, but merely tentative and suggestive.

VIII. From the Exodus to Birth of Abraham.

The period of Old Testament chronology now to receive our attention is that which extends from the Exodus in circa 1448 BC back to the call and migration of Abraham. This may be called the period of the patriarchal wanderings, the formative or infancy period of the nation, and therefore of the highest interest historically and religiously. But it is not possible to fix its dates with indisputable accuracy, since, with rare exceptions, the events of the Old Testament record are not related in their narration to eras or definite persons of the contemporary nations; and since also the chronology of these nations is much in dispute among historians and archaeologists, with variations of hundreds of years.

Main Points at Issue:

The chief points at issue here for determination of the chronological problems are the time of the Exodus, the duration of Israel’s sojourn in Egypt and the date of Hammurabi. Considering these in their order:

(1) As to the Exodus, opinions have been divided among the XVIIIth, XIXth and XXth dynasties as the time of the Oppression and Exodus of Israel, and there are plausible arguments for, and serious objections to, each of these periods. When all things have been considered it seems best to fix upon the XVIIIth Dynasty as the age of the Oppression and Exodus, Thothmes III as the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and the years immediately following his death as the time of the Exodus, for the following reasons:

(a) This is in harmony with the time-reckoning from the Temple of Solomon back to the Exodus (1Ki 6:1), and fully satisfies the Biblical numbers for the intervening period, as shown above; while either later dynastic period would necessitate either unnatural cramping or ruthless rejection of the Biblical numbers. To place the Exodus so late as Ramses III, after 1200 BC, is in the light of the Biblical reckoning an evident absurdity.

(b) In the XVIIIth Dynasty we can look best for the Pharaoh "that knew not Joseph," as it was the leader of this dynasty, Ahmes I, who conquered and drove out the Hyksos, and left to his followers as a legacy cordial hatred of the Asiatics.

(c) Thothmes III was a great builder, and the heavy tasks of the Hebrews would fit well into his reign. He was also the champion of Amon, the god of Thebes, having been a priest of that god; therefore the religious significance of the Exodus and the struggle preceding it were most natural in his age.

(d) An inscription of Menephthah, son of Ramses II, indicates that Israel was in Palestine in his time, therefore he could not have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, nor his father the oppressor.

(e) The objection that Pharaohs of the XIXth and XXth dynasties invaded and claimed sovereignty over Palestine is of little consequence, since these invasions usually involved only the sea-plain, and any city or district might secure immunity and maintain its status quo by payment of tribute. In later centuries many foreign invasions swept through Israel without disturbing the national integrity. As for the objection that the cities Ramses and Pithom indicate the age of Ramses II, it is altogether probable that they were built long before his time, and only restored by him. For these reasons the earlier date is assigned to the Exodus.

(2) Whether the duration of the sojourn in Egypt was 430 or 215 years will depend upon the interpretation of the comprehensive 430, or roundly 400, which is of frequent occurrence in the Bible as indicating the extent of the period of the Hebrews' wanderings among, and oppression by, the nations (Ge 15:13; Ex 12:40; Ac 7:6; Ga 3:17). These passages have been, and may properly be, interpreted as indicating the time of the actual sojourn in Egypt, or the time from the entrance of Abraham into Canaan to the Exodus. Modern archaeological discoveries and the logical conclusions from them, our better knowledge of the history and conditions of contemporaneous Egypt, the shortening of the Hyksos period, as by Meyer, Mahler and Breasted, and the acceptance of a later date for Hammurabi, all seem to favor the shorter, or 215-year, view of the sojourn. The remaining 215 years cover the period from Jacob's descent into Egypt back to the migration of Abraham. The shorter period is adopted here for the reasons alread y given; but by the addition of 215 the dates from the death of Joseph backward may be conformed to theory of the longer period.

(3) Accepting the almost universal and well-grounded judgment that the Amraphel of Ge 14 is the famous Hammurabi of the 1st Babylonian Dynasty, we should have assistance in determining the date of his Biblical contemporary Abraham, if the opinions of scholars about the age of Hammurabi were not so divergent. Goodspeed (Hist Babylonian and Assyrian.) places his reign at 22:97-2254 BC; Hommel (art. on "Babylonia," HDB) fixes the probable date at 1772-1717, an astonishing divergence of 500 years, and suggestive of the spend-thrift manner in which chronologists are accustomed to dispose of the past ages of man. The difference in this instance is caused by the disposition of the IId Babylonian Dynasty, Goodspeed making its more than 360 years follow the Hammurabi Dynasty, and adding the years of the two; Hommel on the other hand regarding the IId, or Southern, Dynasty as contemporaneous with the Ist, or Northern. But it is more probable that the truth lies between these extremes, since the IId Dynasty must have had some independent standing, and must have ruled alone for a time, in order to secure consideration as a dynasty. This moderate reckoning is now commonly adopted, Breasted placing Hammurabi at 1900 BC, Davis (in DB) about 1975, and Pinches (in Murray's Illus. B. Dict.) later than 2000 BC. It is in accord with the Bible numbers, as the following table shows, and does not vary

materially from the reckoning of Ussher, which was based upon those numbers. Therefore the age of Hammurabi and Abraham may be considered as about 1900 BC, or 2100, if one estimates the sojourn in Egypt at 430 years. The former is more reasonable. The Tell el- Amarna Letters, preserving correspondence of the 14th and 15th centuries between the Pharaohs of the XVIIIth Dynasty and Palestine and Babylon, by showing the contemporary sovereigns of the empires of the Nile and the Euphrates, contribute confirmation to the Biblical reckoning. It is possible that increased knowledge of the Hittite empire and its dealings with Egypt, Palestine and Babylonian may in the near future contribute further confirmation. The foregoing conclusions may be summarized in the following table:

IX. From Abraham to the Creation.

One other general period of Old Testament chronology remains for consideration: from the age of Abraham back to the creation of the world, about which in the nature of the case there can be no absolute certainty, and in which there is neither reason nor need for inflexible accuracy. The system, or succession, of numbers in the early chapters of Ge (Ge 5 and Ge 11:10-26) has given rise, in the effort to explain these numbers, to several theories.

(1) The literal interpretation, the best known advocate of which was Archbishop Ussher (died 1656), whose literal arrangement was introduced into the margin of the King James Version after his death. This theory takes the birth- and death-numbers just as they are, and by addition of the time intervals between the birth of the various patriarchs, together with Adam's age at the birth of Seth, shows that 1,656 years elapsed from the Creation to the Flood, and 290 years from the Flood to Abraham's birth, accor ding to the Massoretic Text. But it must be apparent at the very outset, that, on the most liberal arrangement of the numbers and the most conservative geological and anthropological estimate, this reckoning is not sufficiently long to satisfy the known facts of the age of the earth, of the life of man upon the earth, and of established historic dates. Even the conservative system of Professor Breasted (Ancient Egypt) places the first certain date of Egyptian history, namely, the introduction of the Sothic calendar, as early as 4241 BC, which is more than two centuries beyond Ussher's beginning of the world. Moreover, at that time an astronomical basis of reckoning time was in existence, implying an age of culture already gone before. This difficulty was appreciated by the earliest interpreters, as indicated by the variations of the Sam and Septuagint texts, the latter increasing the total of the age about 1,500 years and inserting a new name into the genealogical list of Ge 11. An interesting commentary on the literal method is that it make s Noah live until Abraham was seventy years old, and prolongs the life of Shem to within the lifetime of Jacob.

(2) A second theory is the dynastic: that the long number of a patriarch's lifetime indicates the era during which his house or dynasty prevailed, to be followed by the long number of the next dynasty; e.g. the 930 years of Adam were followed by the 912 of Seth, and so on until the period is stretched to cover thousands of years. But there are evident objections to this view: it does not account for the invariable origin of each succeeding dynasty so near the beginning of its predecessor, and it disregards the manifest plan of the inspired author to narrate the descent of the human race through families and not by eras or empires.

(3) By others it has been conjectured that the units of time have been different in the ancient ages of man; that originally the time-unit was the lunar cycle, by which the 969 lunar cycles of Methuselah's life really should be reduced to a little more than 80 years of more recent times; and that in the days of Abraham a year measured from equinox to equinox had superseded the lunar time-measurement. It is possible that the Septuagint variations were based upon this idea, since it increased the age at which every father begat a son to at least 162 in the generations before the Flood. But even this expedient would not remove all difficulties from the physical side; nor have we the slightest indication of the points at which these radical changes of the time-units were made. On the contrary the decrease of man's years seems to have come by somewhat gradual process, and not by sharp and tremendous breaks.

(4) Others have thought to meet the difficulties by suggesting the omission of links in the chain of descent, in accordance with Hebrew custom of omitting inconsequential names from a genealogical list. The omission by Matthew of certain names from his genealogy of Jesus Christ, in order to preserve his symmetrical scheme of fourteens (Mt 1:8), is an illustration in point. As corroborative of this it might be urged that the Septuagint does insert a name between Arpachshad and Shelah (Ge 11:12). It may be said confidently that whatever theory of the genealogies before Abraham one may adopt, it is altogether reasonable to suppose that one name, or many, may have been omitted from the line of descent.

The dates resulting from the literal and exact interpretation of the genealogical lists of Ge 5 and Ge 11 may be tabulated as follows:

If the 130 years of Kainan, whom the Septuagint inserts between Shelah and Arpachshad, be added, the date for Adam's creation is increased to 4031 BC. The exhibit of this table is most interesting and suggestive. Noah, Shem, Arpachshad, Shelah, Eber, Peleg were contemporaries of Abraham. Shem, Shelah and Eber were living after Jacob's birth. Adam, Enoch, Methuselah and Lamech were contemporary; and Methuselah's long life came to an end in the year of the Flood.

A Suggested Interpretation:

These genealogical lists of the early chapters of Ge appear therefore not to have been given as an exact and exclusive system of chronology; but it is more probable that they were written to present a general, compact, or mere outline statement of the origin, early experience and apostasy of the human race, given without the purpose of recording every possible link in the chain of descent, or every incident in the early racial experience. There are many indications, or suggestions at least, that this is the sensible and Divinely intended interpretation, some of which have been stated: the variant items and summaries of the Massoretic Text, Septuagint and Sam; the frequent omission in Hebrew genealogies of one or more generations, the third, or later, descendant being truly regarded as a son; the age of the world; the comparative antiquity of man; and the more ancient dates disclosed by archaeology. It should be noticed further that the inspired writer gives ten generations from Adam to the Flood, and ten also from the Flood to Abraham, as if by the use of the decimal, or representatively human, number he would indicate to us that he is dealing with comprehensively complete numbers and not with those that are minutely complete, arranging in symbolic form the account of man's descent.

See ANTEDILUVIAN PATRIARCHS.

But while the age of man may be greater than the mechanical and exact sum of the Genesis numbers, we should not be deluded into the belief that it is so great as some anthropologists and geologists, who are prodigal of their numbers, would have us think. The numbers of Ge are much nearer the facts than these dreary stretches and wastes of time. The formation of the Nile and the Euphrates valleys, which furnished historic man's first home, is quite recent, possibly not antedating 7000 BC; the account of the Flood is the record of a great cataclysm which came upon historic man within these millenniums; we have the records of the presence of intelligent man in these fertile and recently formed centers without traces of his origin and development in, and movement from, other homes. Archaeology and ancient history bring civilized man upon us with somewhat of suddenness, well established in homelands of recent formation. Whence came these peoples whose great works and thoughts are found near the beginning of an era so clearly limited by history and geography? If they came from elsewhere and developed tediously, why have they left no trail of their movement and no trace of the evolution? So late as the 3rd millennium BC Mesopotamia was sparsely settled, and Palestine in the first half of the 2nd millennium was still thinly settled. It is a legitimate conclusion, then, that intelligent man's life on the earth does not extend far beyond the total of the Bible numbers (see ANTEDILUVIANS; DELUGE OF NOAH). At the same t ime it is far from necessary to force a literal and exact interpretation on these numbers, which were given rather to trace lineage, keep relationships, show development under the Divine purpose, and fix responsibility, than to mark particular years.

LITERATURE.

Ussher, Chronologia Sacra; G. Smith, Assyrian Eponym Canon; Maspero, The Dawn of Civilization; The Struggle of the Nations; The Passing of the Empires; Goodspeed, A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians; Breasted, Ancient Egypt; History of Egypt, Mesopotamia and Israel in Hist of World; Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition; L. W. King, Chronology of the Babylonian Kings; Beecher, Dated Events of Old Testament; Auchinloss, Chronology of the Holy Bible; various commentaries; Driver, Book of Genesis; Skinner, Genesis; Moore, Commentary on Judges; G. A. Smith, "Isaiah" in Expositor's Bible, etc. Magazines: James Orr, "Assyrian and Hebrew Chronology" in Presbyterian Review, 1889; "Israel and the Exodus" in Expositor, 1897; J. D. Davis. "Chronology of the Divided Kingdom" in Presbyterian and Reformed Review, 1891. Bible Dictionaries: J. D. Davis in Dict. of the Bible, Westminster Press; Hommel, articles on "Assyria" and "Babylonia" in HDB. Of interest also, Franke Parker, Chronology, 1858.

Edward Mack

CHRYSOLITE kris'o-lit.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CHRYSOPRASE; CHRYSOPRASUS

kris’-o-praz, kri-sop’ra-sus.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

CHUB

chub (kubh).

See CUB.

CHUN

chun (kun, "founding").

See CUN.

CHURCH

church:

I. PRE-CHRISTIAN HISTORY OF THE TERM

II. ITS ADOPTION BY JESUS

III. ITS USE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. In the Gospels

2. In Acts

3. In the Pauline Epistles

IV. THE NOTES OF THE CHURCH

1. Faith

2. Fellowship

3. Unity

4. Consecration

5. Power

V. ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH

1. The General and Prophetic Ministry

2. The Local and Practical Ministry

LITERATURE

The word "church," which is derived from kuriakos, "of or belonging to the Lord," represents in the English Versions of the Bible of the New Testament the Greek word ekklesia; Latin, ecclesia. It is with the signification of this word ekklesia as it meets us in the New Testament, and with the nature of the society which the word is there used to describe, that the present article is concerned.

I. Pre-Christian History of the Term.

Although ekklesia soon became a distinctively Christian word, it has its own pre-Christian history; and to those, whether Jews or Greeks, who first heard it applied to the Christian society it would come with suggestions of familiar things. Throughout the Greek world and right down to New Testament times (compare Ac 19:39), ekklesia was the designation of the regular assembly of the whole body of citizens in a free city-state, "called out" (Greek ek, "out," and kalein, "to call") by the herald for the discussion and decision of public business. The Septuagint translators, again, had used the word to render the Hebrew qahal, which in the Old Testament denotes the "congregation" or community of Israel, especially in its religious aspect as the people of God. In this Old Testament sense we find ekklesia employed by Stephen in the Book of Acts, where he describes Moses as "he that was in the church (the Revised Version, margin "congregation") in the wilderness" (Ac 7:38). The word thus came into Christian history with associations alike for the Greek and the Jew. To the Greek it would suggest a self-governing democratic society; to the Jew a theocratic society whose members were the subjects of the Heavenly King. The pre-Christian history of the word had a direct bearing upon its Christian meaning, for the ekklesia of the New Testament is a "theocratic democracy" (Lindsay, Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries, 4), a society of those who are free, but are always conscious that their freedom springs from obedience to their King.

II. Its Adoption by Jesus.

According to Mt 16:18 the name ekklesia was first applied to the Christian society by Jesus Himself, the

occasion being that of His benediction of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. The authenticity of the utterance has been called in question by certain critics, but on grounds that have no textual support and are made up of quite arbitrary presuppositions as to the composition of the First Gospel. It is true that Jesus had hitherto described the society He came to found as the "kingdom of God" or the "kingdom of heaven," a designation which had its roots in Old Testament teaching and which the Messianic expectations of Israel had already made familiar. But now when it was clear that He was to be rejected by the Jewish people (compare Mt 16:21), and that His society must move on independent lines of its own, it was natural that He should employ a new name for this new body which He was about to create, and thus should say to Peter, on the ground of the apostle's believing confession, "Upon this rock I will build my church." The adoption of this name, however, did not imply any abandonment of the ideas suggested by the conception of the kingdom. In this very passage (Mt 16:19) "the kingdom of heaven" is employed in a manner which, if it does not make the two expressions church and kingdom perfectly synonymous, at least compels us to regard them as closely correlative and as capable of translation into each other's terms. And the comparative disuse by the apostolic writers of the name "kingdom," together with their emphasis on the church, so far from showing that Christ's disciples had failed to understand His doctrine of the kingdom, and had substituted for it the more formal notion of the church, only shows that they had followed their Master's guidance in substituting for a name and a conception that were peculiarly Jewish, another name whose associations would enable them to commend their message more readily to the world at large.

III. Its Use in the New Testament.

1. In the Gospels:

Apart from the passage just referred to, the word ekklesia occurs in the Gospels on one other occasion only (Mt 18:17). Here, moreover, it may be questioned whether Our Lord is referring to the Christian church, or to Jewish congregations commonly known as synagogues (see the Revised Version, margin) The latter view is more in keeping with the situation, but the promise immediately given to the disciples of a power to bind and loose (Mt 18:18) and the assurance "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt 18:20) are evidently meant for the people of Christ. If, as is probable, the ekklesia of Mt 18:17 is the Christian ekklesia of which Christ had already spoken to Peter, the words show that He conceived of the church as a society possessing powers of self-government, in which questions of discipline were to be decided by the collective judgment of the members.

2. In Acts:

In Ac the ekklesia has come to be the regular designation for the society of Christian believers, but is employed in two distinct senses. First in a local sense, to denote the body of Christians in a particular place or district, as in Jerusalem (Ac 5:11; 8:1), in Antioch (Ac 13:1; 15:22), in Caesarea (Ac 18:22)—a usage which reappears in the Apocalypse in the letters to the Seven Churches. Then in a wider and what may be called a universal sense, to denote the sum total of existing local churches (Ac 9:31 the Revised

Version (British and American)), which are thus regarded as forming one body.

3. In the Pauline Epistles:

In the Pauline Epistles both of these usages are frequent. Thus the apostle writes of "the church of the Thessalonians" (1Th 1:1), "the church of God which is at Corinth" (1Co 1:2; 2Co 1:1). Indeed he localizes and particularizes the word yet further by applying it to a single Christian household or to little groups of believers who were accustomed to assemble in private houses for worship and fellowship (Ro 16:5; 1Co 16:19; Col 4:15; Phm 1:2)—an employment of the word which recalls the saying of Jesus in Mt 18:20. The universal use, again, may be illustrated by the contrast he draws between Jews and Greeks on the one hand and the church of God on the other (1Co 10:32), and by the declaration that God has set in the church apostles, prophets, and teachers (1Co 12:28).

But Paul in his later epistles has another use of ekklesia peculiar to himself, which may be described as the ideal use. The church, now, is the body of which Christ is the head (Eph 1:22 f; Col 1:18,24). It is the medium through which God’s manifold wisdom and eternal purpose are to be made known not only to all men, but to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places (Eph 3:9-11). It is the bride of whom He is the heavenly Bridegroom, the bride for whom in His love He gave Himself up, that He might cleanse and sanctify her and might present her to Himself a glorious church, a church without blemish, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing (Eph 5:25 ff). This church clearly is not the actual church as we know it on earth, with its divisions, its blemishes, its shortcomings in faith and love and obedience. It is the holy and catholic church that is to be when the Bridegroom has completed the process of lustration, having fully "cleansed it by the washing of water with the word." It is the ideal which the actual church must keep before it and strive after, the ideal up to which it shall finally be guided by that Divine in-working power which is able to conform the body to the head, to make the bride worthy of the Bridegroom, so that God may receive in the church the glory that is His (Eph 3:21).

IV. The Notes of the Church.

1. Faith:

Although a systematic doctrine of the church is neither to be found nor to be looked for in the New Testament, certain characteristic notes or features of the Christian society are brought before us from which we can form some conception as to its nature. The fundamental note is faith. It was to Peter confessing his faith in Christ that the promise came, "Upon this rock I will build my church" (Mt 16:18). Until Jesus found a man full of faith He could not begin to build His church; and unless Peter had been the prototype of others whose faith was like his own, the walls of the church would never have risen into the air. Primarily the church is a society not of thinkers or workers or even of worshippers, but of believers. Hence, we find that "believers" or "they that believed" is constantly used as a synonym for the members of the Christian society (e.g. Ac 2:44; 4:32; 5:14; 1Ti 4:12). Hence, too, the rite of baptism, which from the first was the condition of entrance into the apostolic church and the seal of membership in it, was recognized as preeminently the sacrament of faith and of confession (Ac 2:41; 8:12,36; Ro 6:4;

1Co 12:13). This church-founding and church-building faith, of which baptism was the seal, was much more than an act of intellectual assent. It was a personal laying hold of the personal Saviour, the bond of a vital union between Christ and the believer which resulted in nothing less than a new creation (Ro 6:4; 8:1,2; 2Co 5:17).

2. Fellowship:

If faith in Christ is the fundamental note of the Christian society, the next is fellowship among the members. This follows from the very nature of faith as just described; for if each believer is vitally joined to Christ, all believers must stand in a living relation to one another. In Paul's favorite figure, Christians are members one of another because they are members in particular of the body of Christ (Ro 12:5; 1Co 12:27). That the Christian society was recognized from the first as a fellowship appears from the name "the brethren," which is so commonly applied to those who belong to it. In Ac the name is of very frequent occurrence (Ac 9:30, etc.), and it is employed by Paul in the epistles of every period of his career (1Th 4:10, etc.). Similar testimony lies in the fact that "the koinonia" (English Versions "fellowship") takes its place in the earliest meetings of the church side by side with the apostles' teaching and the breaking of bread and prayers (Ac 2:42). See COMMUNION. The koinonia at first carried with it a community of goods (Ac 2:44; 4:32), but afterward found expression in the fellowship of ministration (2Co 8:4) and in such acts of Christian charity as are inspired by Christian faith (Heb 13:16). In the Lord's Supper, the other sacrament of the primitive church, the fellowship of Christians received its most striking and most sacred expression. For if baptism was especially the sacrament of faith, the Supper was distinctively the sacrament of love and fellowship—a communion or common participation in Christ's death and its fruits which carried with it a communion of hearts and spirits between the participants themselves.

3. Unity:

Although local congregations sprang up wherever the gospel was preached, and each of these enjoyed an independent life of its own, the unity of the church was clearly recognized from the first. The intercourse between Jerusalem and Antioch (Ac 11:22; 15:2), the conference held in the former city (Ac 15:6 ff), the right hand of fellowship given by the elder apostles to Paul and Barnabas (Ga 2:9), the untiring efforts made by Paul himself to forge strong links of love and mutual service between Gentileand Jewish Christians (2Co 8)—all these things serve to show how fully it was realized that though there were many churches, there was but one church. This truth comes to its complete expression in the epistles of Paul's imprisonment, with their vision of the church as a body of which Christ is the head, a body animated by one spirit, and having one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all (Eph 4:4 ff; Col 1:18; 3:11). And this unity, it is to be noticed, is conceived of as a visible unity. Jesus Himself evidently conceived it so when He prayed for His disciples that they all might be one, so that the world might believe (Joh 17:21). And the unity of which Paul writes and for which he strove is a unity that finds visible expression. Not, it is true, in any uniformity of outward polity, but through the manifestation of a common faith in acts of mutual love (Eph 4:3,13; 2Co 9).

4. Consecration:

Another dominant note of the New Testament church lay in the consecration of its members. "Saints" is one of the most frequently recurring designations for them that we find. As thus employed, the word has in the first place an objective meaning; the sainthood of the Christian society consisted in its separation from the world by God's electing grace; in this respect it has succeeded to the prerogatives of Israel under the old covenant. The members of the church, as Peter said, are "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (1Pe 2:9). But side by side with this sense of an outward and priestly consecration, the flame "saints" carried within it the thought of an ethical holiness—a holiness consisting, not merely in a status determined by relation to Christ, but in an actual and practical saintliness, a consecration to God that finds expression in character and conduct. No doubt the members of the church are called saints even when the living evidences of sainthood are sadly lacking. Writing to the Corinthian church in which he found so much to blame, Paul addresses its members by this title (1Co 1:2; compare 1Co 6:11). But he does so for other than formal reasons—not only because consecration to God is their outward calling and status as believers; but also because he is assured that a work of real sanctification is going on, and must continue to go on, in their bodies and their spirits which are His. For those who are in Christ are a new creation (2Co 5:17), and those to whom has come the separating and consecrating call (2Co 6:17) must cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God (2Co 7:1). Paul looks upon the members of the church, just as he looks upon the church itself, with a prophetic eye; he sees them not as they are, but as they are to be. And in his view it is "by the washing of water with the word," in other words by the progressive sanctification of its members, that the church itself is to be sanctified and cleansed, until Christ can present it to Himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing (Eph 5:26,27).

5. Power:

Yet another note of the church was spiritual power. When the name ekklesia was given by Jesus to the society He came to found, His promise to Peter included the bestowal of the gift of power (Mt 16:18,19). The apostle was to receive the "power of the keys," i.e. he was to exercise the privilege of opening the doors of the kingdom of heaven to the Jew (Ac 2:41) and to the Gentile (Ac 10:34-38; 15:7). He was further to have the power of binding and loosing, i.e. of forbidding and permitting; in other words he was to possess the functions of a legislator within the spiritual sphere of the church. The legislative powers then bestowed upon Peter personally as the reward of his believing confession were afterward conferred upon the disciples generally (Mt 18:18; compare Mt 18:1 and also Mt 18:19,20), and at the conference in Jerusalem were exercised by the church as a whole (Ac 15:4,22). The power to open the gates of the kingdom of heaven was expanded into the great missionary commission, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations" (Mt 28:19)—a commission that was understood by the apostolic church to be addressed not to the eleven apostles only, but to all Christ's followers without distinction (Ac 8:4, etc.). To the Christian society there thus belonged the double power of legislating for its own members and of opening the kingdom of heaven to all believers. But these double functions of teaching and government were clearly recognized as delegated gifts. The church taught the nations because Christ had bid her go and do it. She laid down laws for her own members because He had conferred upon her authority to bind and to loose. But in every exercise of her authority she relied upon Him from whom

she derived it. She believed that Christ was with her alway, even unto the end of the world (Mt 28:20), and that the power with which she was endued was power from on high (Lu 24:49).

V. Organization of the Church.

It seems evident from the New Testament that Jesus gave His disciples no formal prescriptions for the organization of the church. In the first days after Pentecost they had no thought of separating themselves from the religious life of Israel, and would not realize the need of any distinct organization of their own. The temple-worship was still adhered to (Ac 2:46; 3:1), though it was supplemented by apostolic teaching, by prayer and fellowship, and by the breaking of bread (Ac 2:42,46). Organization was a thing of gradual growth suggested by emerging needs, and the differentiation of function among those who were drawn into the service of the church was due to the difference in the gifts bestowed by God upon the church members (1Co 12:28). At first the Twelve themselves, as the immediate companions of Jesus throughout His ministry and the prime witnesses of the Christian facts and especially of the resurrection (compare Ac 1:21,22), were the natural leaders and teachers of the community. Apart from this, the earliest evidence of anything like organization is found in the distinction drawn by the Twelve themselves between the ministry of the word and the ministry of tables (Ac 6:2,4)—a distinction which was fully recognized by Paul (Ro 12:6,8; 1Co 1:17; 9:14; 12:28), though he enlarged the latter type of ministry so as to include much more than the care of the poor. The two kinds of ministry, as they meet us at the first, may broadly be distinguished as the general and prophetic on the one hand, the local and practical on the other.

1. The General and Prophetic Ministry:

From Ac 6:1 ff we see that the Twelve recognized that they were Divinely called as apostles to proclaim the gospel; and Paul repeatedly makes the same claim for himself (1Co 1:17; 9:16; 2Co 3:6; 4:1; Col 1:23). But apostle ship was by no means confined to the Twelve (Ac 14:14; Ro 16:7; compare Didache 11 4 ff); and an itinerant ministry of the word was exercised in differing ways by prophets, evangelists, and teachers, as well as by apostles (1Co 12:28,29; Eph 4:11). The fact that Paul himself is variously described as an apostle, a prophet, a teacher (Ac 13:1; 14:14; 1Ti 2:7; 2Ti 1:11) appears to show that the prophetic ministry was not a ministry of stated office, but one of special gifts and functions. The apostle carried the good tidings of salvation to the ignorant and unbelieving (Ga 2:7,8), the prophet (in the more specific sense of the word) was a messenger to the church (1Co 14:4,22); and while the teacher explained and applied truth that was already possessed (Heb 5:12), the prophet was recognized by those who had spiritual discernment (1Co 2:15; 14:29; 1Jo 4:1) as the Divinely employed medium of fresh revelations (1Co 14:25,30,31; Eph 3:5; compare Didache 4 1).

2. The Local and Practical Ministry:

The earliest examples of this are the Seven of Jerusalem who were entrusted with the care of the "daily ministration" (Ac 6:1 ff). With the growth of the church, however, other needs arose, and the local ministry is seen developing in two distinct directions. First there is the presbyter or elder, otherwise

known as the bishop or overseer, whose duties, while still local, are chiefly of a spiritual kind (Ac 20:17,28,35; 1Ti 3:2,5; Jas 5:14; 1Pe 5:2). See BISHOP. Next there are the deacon and the deaconess (Php 1:1; 1Ti 3:8-13), whose work appears to have lain largely in house to house visitation and a practical ministry to the poor and needy (1Ti 5:8-11). The necessities of government, of discipline, and of regular and stated instruction had thus brought it to pass that within New Testament times some of the functions of the general ministry of apostles and prophets were discharged by a local ministry. The general ministry, however, was still recognized to be the higher of the two. Paul addresses the presbyter-bishops of Ephesus in a tone of lofty spiritual authority (Ac 20:17ff). And according to the Didache, a true prophet when he visits a church is to take precedence over the resident bishops and deacons (Didache 10 7; 13 3).

See CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

LITERATURE.

Hort, The Christian Ecclesia; Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Cents., lects I-V; Hatch, Bampton Lectures; Gwatkin, Early Church History to AD 313; Kostlin, article "Kirche" in See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche; Armitage Robinson, article "Church" in Encyclopedia Biblica; Fairbairn Christ in Modern Theology, 513-34; Dargan, Ecclesiology; Denney, Studies in Theology, Ch viii.

J. C. Lambert

CHURCH GOVERNMENT

guv’-ern-ment:

I. APPROACH TO SUBJECT

1. The General Sense

2. The Local Sense

II. INTERNAL ORDER

1. Subjects of Admission

2. Definite Organizations

3. Ministers

(1) General

(2) Local

4. Ecclesiastical Functions

(1) Control of Membership

(2) Selection of Officers, etc.

(3) Observations of Ordinances

5. Independent (Autonomous) Organizations

III. EXTERNAL AUTHORITY

IV. COOPERATIVE RELATIONS

LITERATURE

The object here sought is to discover what kind of church government is mirrored in the New Testament. To do this with perfect definiteness is, no doubt, quite impossible. Certain general features, however, may clearly be seen.

I. Approach to the Subject.

The subject is best approached through the Greek word ekklesia, translated "church." Passing by the history of this word, and its connection with the Hebrew words ‘edhah and qahal (which the Septuagint sometimes renders by ekklesia), we come at once to the New Testament usage. Two perfectly distinct senses are found, namely, a general and a local.

1. The General Sense:

Christ is "head over all things to the church, which is his body ...."(Eph 1:22); "the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven" (Heb 12:23). Here we have "church" in the broadest sense, including all the redeemed in earth and heaven, and in all ages (see also Eph 1:22; 3:10; 5:22-27; Col 1:24; Heb 12:23).

2. The Local Sense:

Here the Scripture passages are very numerous. In some cases, the word is used in the singular, and in

others the plural; in some it is used with reference to a specified church, and in others without such specification. In all cases the sense is local.

In Ac 11:26, it is said that Paul and Barnabas were "gathered together with the church," where the church at Antioch is meant. In Ac 14:23, Paul and Barnabas are said to have "appointed elders in every church," that is, churches which they had planted. In Re 2 and Re 3 the seven churches of Asia Minor are addressed. In Ac 16:5 we are told that the churches "were strengthened in the faith." On the local sense see, further, Ac 8:1; 15:4; 16:5; 20:17; Ro 16:4; 1Co 12; 6:4; 11:16; Ga 1:2,22, and many other places.

There are a few passages that do not seem exactly to fit into either of the above categories. Such, for example, are Mt 18:17 and 1Co 12:28, where it seems best to understand a generic sense. Such, also, are passages like Ac 9:31, and 1Co 10:32, where a collective sense best suits the cases.

Church government in the New Testament applies only to the local bodies.

II. Internal Order.

With respect to the constitution and life of these New Testament churches, several points may be made out beyond reasonable doubt.

1. Subjects of Admission:

They were composed of persons who professed faith in Christ, and who were believed to have been regenerated, and who had been baptized. See Ac 2:41,44,47 (the Revised Version (British and American) "added to them"); Ac 8:12; Ro 1:8; 6:4; 10:9,10; 1Co 1:2; Col 1:2,4; 1Ti 6:12, and others, where they are called "saints," "sons of God," "faithful brethren," "sanctified in Christ Jesus."

2. Definite Organizations:

They are definitely and permanently organized bodies, and not temporary and loose aggregations of individuals. It is quite impossible, for example, to regard the church at Antioch as a loose aggregation of people for a passing purpose. The letters of Paul to the churches at Rome, Corinth, Philippi, Thessalonica, cannot be regarded as addressed to other than permanent and definitely organized bodies.

3. Ministers:

They were served by two classes of ministers—one general, the other local.

(1) General.

At the head of these is the "apostle" (1Co 12:28; Eph 4:11). His official relation to the churches was general. He did not necessarily belong to the group of the original Eleven. Besides Matthias (Ac 1:26), Paul and Barnabas (1Co 9:5,6), James, the Lord's brother (Ga 1:19), Andronicus and Junias (Ro 16:7) are reckoned as "apostles." The one invariable and necessary qualification of an apostle was that he should have seen the Lord after the Resurrection (Ac 1:22; 1Co 9:1). Another qualification was to have wrought "the signs of an apostle" (2Co 12:12; compare 1Co 9:2). He was to bear witness to what he had seen and heard, to preach the gospel of the kingdom (Ac 1:8; 1Co 1:17), to found churches and have a general care of them (2Co 11:28). From the nature of his chief qualification, his office was temporary.

Next comes the "prophet." His relation to the churches, also, was general. It was not necessary that he should have seen the Lord, but it appertained to his spiritual function that he should have revelations (Eph 3:5). There is no indication that his office was in any sense administrative.

After the "prophet" come the "evangelist" and "teacher," the first, a traveling preacher, the second, one who had special aptitude for giving instruction.

After the "teacher" and "evangelist" follow a group of special gifts of "healing," "helps," "governments," "tongues." It may be that "helps" and "governments" are to be identified with "deacons" and "bishops," to be spoken of later. The other items in this part of Paul's list seem to refer to special charismata.

(2) Local.

There were two clearly distinct offices of a local and permanent kind in the New Testament churches. Paul (Php 1:1) addresses "all the saints in Christ Jesus that are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons."

See BISHOP; DEACON.

The most common designation of the first of these officers is "elder" (presbuteros). In one passage (Eph 4:11) he is called "pastor" (poimen). In Ac 20:17-28, it becomes clear that the office of elder, bishop, and pastor was one; for there the apostle charges the elders of the church at Ephesus to feed (pastor) the church in which the Holy Spirit has made them bishops (compare Titus 1:5,7; 1Pe 5:1,2).

The function of the elders was, in general, spiritual, but involved an oversight of all the affairs of the church (1Ti 3:2; 5:17).

As to the second of the local church officers, it has to be said that little is given us in the New Testament. That the office of deacon originated with the appointment of the Seven in Ac 6 is not certain. If we compare the qualifications there given by the apostles with those given by Paul in 1Ti 3:8-13, it seems quite probable that the necessity which arose at Jerusalem, and which led to the appointment of the Seven was really the occasion for originating the office of deacon in the churches. The work assigned the Seven was secular, that is to say, the "service of tables." They were to relieve the apostles

of that part of the work. A similar relation to the work of the elders seems to have been borne by that of the deacons.

Again, they exercised the highest ecclesiastical functions.

4. Ecclesiastical Functions:

(1) Control of Membership.

In Mt 18:17, our Lord, by anticipation, lodges final action, in the sphere of church discipline, with the church. When the church has taken action, the matter is ended. There is no direction to take it to a higher court. In the church at Corinth, there was a man who was guilty of an infamous offense against purity. With regard to the case, Paul urged the most summary discipline (1Co 5:5). If the church should act upon the judgment which he communicated to them, they would act when "gathered together"; that is to say, action would be taken in conference of the church. In 2Co 2, a reference to the case shows that they had acted upon his advice, and that the action was taken by the majority ("the many," the more, 2Co 2:6). In 2Co 2 he counsels restoration of this excluded member now repentant. Exclusion and restoration of members were to be effected by a church. This, of course, carried with it the reception of members in the first instance.

(2) Selection of Officers, etc.

This was true in case of the Seven (Ac 6:3-13; see other cases in Ac 15:22; 1Co 16:3; 2Co 8:1 ff; Php 2:25). Ac 14:23 and Titus 1:5 seem, at first, to offset the passages just given. In one of these, Paul and Barnabas are said to have "appointed" (cheirotonesantes) elders in the churches which they had planted. But scholars of first quality, though themselves adhering to Presbyterial or Episcopal forms of church government, maintain that Paul and Barnabas ordained the elders whom the churches selected—that they "appointed" them in the usual way, by the suffrages of the members of the churches concerned. The word rendered "appoint" in Tit 1:5 (katasteses) is more easily understood as referring to ordination instead of selection.

(3) Observation of Ordinances.

Paul gives direction (1Co 11:20-34) to the church at Corinth about the observance of the Lord’s Supper. These directions are given, not to any officer or set of officers, but to the church. Ecclesiastically, of course, the two ordinances are on the same level; and, if one of them had been committed to the custody, so to say, of the churches, so must the other.

5. Independent (Autonomous) Organizations:

The management of their business was in their own hands. Paul wrote the church at Corinth: "Let all things be done decently and in order" (1Co 14:40). In that comprehensive injunction, given to a church,

is implied control of its affairs by the church.

III. External Authority.

The investigation up to this point places us in position to see that there is in the New Testament no warrant for ecclesiastical grades in the ministry of the churches, by which there may be created an ascending series of rulers who shall govern the churches merged into one vast ecclesiastical organization called "the church." So, also, we are in position to see that there is no warrant for an ascending series of courts which may review any "case" that originates in a local church. We may see, on the contrary, that to each local church has been committed by Christ the management of its own affairs; and that He had endowed every such church with ecclesiastical competency to perform every function that any ecclesiastical body has a right to perform.

As the churches are not to be dominated by any external ecclesiastical authority, so they are not to be interfered with, in their church life, by civil government. Jesus taught that Christians should be good citizens (Mt 22:15-22); so did the apostles (Ro 13:1-7; 1Pe 2:13-16). Jesus also taught the spirituality of His Kingdom: "My kingdom is not of this world" (Joh 18:36). It follows that only where the life of a church touched the civic life of the community has the civil authority any right to interfere.

IV. Cooperative Relations.

While each local church, according to the New Testament, is independent of every other in the sense that no other has jurisdiction over it, yet cooperative relations were entered into by New Testament churches. Examples and indications of that may be found in Ro 15:26,27; 2Co 8; 9; Ga 2:10; Ro 15:1; 3 Joh 1:8. The principle of cooperation effective in those cases is susceptible of indefinite expansion. Churches may properly cooperate in matters of discipline, by seeking and giving counsel, and by respecting each other’s disciplinary measures. In the great, paramount business of evangelizing and teaching the nations, they may cooperate in a multitude of ways. There is no sphere of general Christian activity in which the churches may not voluntarily and freely cooperate for the betterment of the world, the salvation of humanity.

For other standpoints see BISHOP; GOVERNMENT; MINISTRY, etc.

LITERATURE.

Hort, The Christian Ecclesia; Hatch, Organization of the Early Christian Churches; Whitley, Church, Ministry and Sacraments in the New Testament; Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Cents.; French, Synonyms of New Testament; Vitringa, De Synagoga Vetere; Holzinger, ZAW; Schurer, Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II; Driver, Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament; Thayer, New Testament Lexicon, and Cremer, Biblical Theol. Lexicon, under the word, "ekklesia" and "sunagoge"; Neumann, Rom. Staat und die all-gemeine Kirche; Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire.; Lightfoot, "The Christian Ministry," in Commentary on Philippians;

Harvey, The Church; Dagg, Church Order; Hovey, Religion and the State; Owen, Church Government; Ladd, Principles of Church Polity; Dexter, Congregationalism; Hodge, Discussions in Church Polity; Abbey, Ecclesiastical Constitutions; Hooker, Ecclesiastical Polity; Jacob, Ecclesiastical Polity; Bore, The Church and Its Ministry; Dollinger, The Church and The Churches; Stanley, Lectures on the Eastern Church; Dargan, Ecclesiology.

E. J. Forrester

CHURCHES, ROBBERS OF

church'-iz.

See ROBBERS OF TEMPLES.

CHURCHES, SEVEN

See ANGELS OF THE SEVEN CHURCHES.

CHURL

churl (kilay or kelay): The Hebrew word occurs only in Isa 32:5,7, in the latter verse in a form slightly modified so as to produce a pleasing assonance with the word immediately following. The word probably means "crafty" or "miserly," both ideas being suitable to the context, though "miserly" accords with the setting in Isa somewhat better.

In 1Sa 25:3 the Hebrew qasheh which means "hard," "severe," "rough," is rendered "churlish." In Saxon, churl, as the name for the lowest order of freemen, came to be used of persons boorish in manner. The rough and ill-mannered Nabal is aptly described as churlish.

John Richard Sampey

CHUSHAN-RISHATHAIM

ku-shan-rish-a-tha'-im.

See CUSHAN-RISHATHAIM.

CHUSI

ku'-si, (Chous): A place only named in Judith 7:18, as near Ekrebel on the brook Mochmur. It was in

central Palestine, and has with some probability been identified with Quzah, a village 5 1/2 miles South of Nablus and 5 miles West of Agrabeh (Ekrebel).

CHUZAS

ku’-zas, chu’-zas (Chouzas; the King James Version Chuza): The steward of Herod Antipas. In Lu 8:3 we read that his wife Joanna, "and Susanna, and many others," ministered to Christ and His disciples.

See JOANNA (Lu 24:10).

CICCAR

sik’-ar (kikkar, "circle"): Used of the circle of the Jordan (Ge 13:10, Hebrew).

See PLAIN; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

CIELED; CIELING

seld, sel’-ing.

See CEILED; CEILING.

CILICIA

si-lish’-i-a (he Kilikia): An important province at the Southeast angle of Asia Minor, corresponding nearly with the modern Turkish vilayet of Adana; enfolded between the Taurus mountains and the Mediterranean Sea, with the Amanus range on the East and Pamphylia on the West; chief rivers, the Pyramus, Sarus, Cydnus and Calycadnus. The character of Cilician history has been largely determined by the physical features of the province. It is divided by nature into a mountainous part to the West, called Tracheia, and a broad, alluvial plain, hot and fertile, toward the East, termed Campestris or Pedias. Cilicia has always been isolated from its neighbors by land by its encircling mountains, save for its two famous mountain passes, the "Syrian Gates," which offer an easy road to Antioch and the South, and the wonderful "Cilician Gates," which open a road to central and western Asia Minor. Through these passes the armies and the pilgrims, the trade and the travel of the centuries have made their way. Alexander was one of the most renowned leaders of such expeditions, and at Issus he met and shattered the power of the Persian empire.

The early settlers of Cilicia are held to have been Semitic Syrians and Phoenicians, but in the still earlier days the inhabitants must have been Hittites. While few Hittite remains have been brought to light in Cilicia proper, the province was so surrounded by Hittites, and such important works of Hittite art and industry remain on the outskirts of the province, as at Ivriz, Marash, Sinjirli and Sakche Geuzi, that the

intervening territory could hardly fail to be overspread with the same civilization and imperial power. See Professor John Garstang's The Land of the Hittites.

Cilicia appears as independent under Syennesis, a contemporary of Alyattes of Lydia, 610 BC. Later it passed under the Persian sway, but retained its separate line of kings. After Alexander the Seleucid rulers governed Cilicia from Antioch. The disturbances of the times enabled the pirates so to multiply and establish themselves in their home base, in Cilicia, Tracheia, that they became the scourge of the Mediterranean until their power was broken by Pompey (67-66 BC). Cilicia was by degrees incorporated in the Roman administration, and Cicero, the orator, was governor (51-50 BC).

The foremost citizen of the province was Saul of Tarsus (Ac 21:39; 22:3; 23:34). Students or pilgrims from Cilicia like himself disputed with Stephen (Ac 6:9). Some of the earliest labors of the great apostle were near his home, in Syria and Cilicia (Ga 1:21; Ac 15:23,11). On his voyage to Rome he sailed across the sea which is off Cilicia (Ac 27:5). Constantinople and Antioch may be regarded as the front and back door of Asia Minor, and as the former was not founded till the 4th century, Asia Minor may be regarded as fronting during apostolic days on Antioch. Cilicia was intimately connected with its neighbor province on the South. The first Christian apostles and evangelists followed the great highways, through the famous mountain passes, and carried the religion of Jesus to Asia Minor from Antioch as a base.

Armenians migrating from the North founded kingdom in Cilicia under Roupen which was terminated by the overthrow of King Levon, or Leo, by the conquering Turks in 1393. A remnant of this kingdom survives in the separate Armenian catholicate of Sis, which has jurisdiction over few bishoprics, and Armenians are among the most virile of the present inhabitants of the province.

G. E. White

CINNAMON

sin'-a-mun (qinnamon; kinnamomon): Mentioned, like cassia, as a perfume. In Ex 30:23 it is one of the ingredients of the "holy anointing oil"; in Pr 7:17 it is, along with myrrh and aloes, a perfume for a bed; in So 4:14 it is a very precious spice. Cinnamon is (Re 18:13) part of the merchandise of "Babylon the great."

Cinnamon is the product of Cinnamomum zeylanicum, a laurel-like plant widely cultivated in Ceylon and Java. It has a profuse white blossom, succeeded by a nut from which the fragrant oil is obtained. The wood is the inner bark from branches which have reached a diameter of from 2 to 3 inches; the epidermis and pulpy matter are carefully scraped off before drying. In commerce the cheaper Cassia ligra of China is sometimes substituted for true cinnamon, and it is thought by some authorities that this was the true cinnamon of the ancients.

See, however, CASSIA.

E. W. G. Masterman

CINNEROTH

sin’-e-roth (kinneroth).

See CHINNERETH.

CIRAMA

si-ra’-ma, sir’-a-ma.

See KIRAMA.

CIRCLE

sur’-k’-l: Is used with reference to the vault of the heavens (hugh) in Isa 40:22, and in a similar sense in The Wisdom of Solomon 13:2 (Revised Version margin), "circle of stars" (kuklos astron). It is also used in the sense of surrounding territory, as in the expression "circle of Jordan" (Ge 13:10 the Revised Version, margin).

See also CICCAR; ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 1.

CIRCUIT

sur’-kit, "a going around": Used to represent several Hebrew words in several senses, e.g. the sun’s orbit (tequphah), Ps 19:6; the vault of the heavens (chugh), Job 22:14 the King James Version; the circuit of the winds (cabhibh), Ec 1:6 (see ASTRONOMY); Samuel’s visiting of communities (cabhabh), 1Sa 7:16. In the Revised Version (British and American) the idea of encircling or "fetching a compass" (the King James Version) is expressed by the phrase "to make a circuit" (hacebh), 2Sa 5:23; 2Ki 3:9; and in the Revised Version, margin it indicates a plain (ha-kikkar), Ne 3:22. The Greek perielthontes is translated in the same way (Ac 28:13), but the Revised Version, margin reads "cast loose," following the Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek reading perielontes.

Nathan Isaacs

CIRCUMCISION

sur-kum-sizh’-un (mul, muloth; peritome): The removal of the foreskin is a custom that has prevailed, and prevails, among many races in different parts of the world—in America, Africa and Australia. It was

in vogue among the western Semites—Hebrews, Arabians, Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Egyptians, but was unknown among the Semites of the Euphrates. In Canaan the Philistines were an exception, for the term "uncircumcised" is constantly used in connection with them. Generally speaking, the rite of circumcision was a precondition of the enjoyment of certain political and religious privileges (Ex 12:48; Eze 44:9); and in view of the fact that in the ancient world religion played such an important role in life, it may be assumed that circumcision, like many other strange customs whose original significance is no longer known, originated in connection with religion. Before enumerating the different theories which have been advanced with regard to the origin and original significance of circumcision, it may be of advantage to consider some of the principal references to the rite in the Old Testament.

1. Circumcision in the Old Testament:

In the account of the institution of the covenant between Yahweh and Abraham which Priestly Code (P) gives (Ge 17), circumcision is looked upon as the ratification of the agreement. Yahweh undertook to be the God of Abraham and of his descendants. Abraham was to be the father of a multitude of nations and the founder of a line of kings. He and his descendants were to inherit Canaan. The agreement thus formed was permanent; Abraham’s posterity should come within the scope of it. But it was necessary to inclusion in the covenant that every male child should be circumcised on the 8th day. A foreigner who had attached himself as a slave to a Hebrew household had to undergo the rite—the punishment for its non-fulfilment being death or perhaps excommunication. According to Ex 12:48 (also P) no stranger could take part in the celebration of the Passover unless he had been circumcised. In the Book of Jos (Jos 5:2-9) we read that the Israelites were circumcised at Gilgal ("Rolling"), and thus the "reproach of Egypt" was "rolled away." Apparently circumcision in the case of the Hebrews was prohibited during the Egyptian period—circumcision being a distinctive mark of the ruling race. It is noticeable that flint knives were used for the purpose. This use of an obsolete instrument is one of many proofs of conservatism in religion. According to the strange and obscure account of the circumcision by Zipporah of her eldest son (Ex 4:25) the performance of the rite in the case of the son apparently possesses a vicarious value, for thereby Moses becomes a "bridegroom of blood." The marriage bond is ratified by the rite of blood (see 4 below). But it is possible that the author’s meaning is that owing to the fact that Moses had not been circumcised (the "reproach of Egypt") he was not fit to enter the matrimonial estate (see 3 below).

2. Theories of Origin:

The different theories with regard to the origin of circumcision may be arranged under four heads:

(1) Herodotus (ii.37), in dealing with circumcision among the Egyptians, suggests that it was a sanitary operation. But all suggestions of a secular, i.e. non-religious, origin to the rite, fail to do justice to the place and importance of religion in the life of primitive man.

(2) It was a tribal mark. Tattooed marks frequently answered the purpose, although they may have been originally charms. The tribal mark enabled one member of the tribe to recognize another and thus avoid

injuring or slaying a fellow-tribesman. It also enabled the tribal deity to recognize a member of the tribe which was under his special protection. A mark was placed on Cain to indicate that he was under the special protection of Yahweh (Ge 4:15). It has been suggested, in the light of Isa 44:5 the Revised Version, margin, that the employer's mark was engraved (tattooed) on the slave's hand. The prophet represents Jews as inscribing on their hands that they belong to Yahweh. The walls of Jerusalem are engraved on Yahweh's palms (Isa 49:16). On the other hand "cuttings in the flesh" are prohibited in Le 19:28 because they were common in the case of the non-Jewish religions. Such tattooed marks might be made in conspicuous places when it was necessary that they should be easily seen, but there might be reason for secrecy so that the marks might be known only to the members of the tribe in question.

(3) It was a rite which celebrated the coming of age of the person. It signified the attainment of puberty and of the right to marry and to enjoy full civic privileges.

(4) As human sacrifices began to be done away with, the sacrifice of the most easily removed portion of the anatomy provided a vicarious offering.

(5) It was a sacramental operation. "The shedding of blood" was necessary to the validity of any covenant between tribes or individuals. The rite of blood signifies the exchange of blood on the part of the contracting parties, and therefore the establishment of physical affinity between them. An alliance based on blood-relationship was inviolable. In the same way the tribal god was supposed to share in the blood of the sacrificed animal, and a sacred bond was established between him and the tribe. It is not quite obvious why circumcision should be necessary in connection with such a ceremony. But it may be pointed out that the process of generation excited the wonder and awe of primitive man. The prosperity of the tribe depended on the successful issue of the marriage bond, and a part of the body which had so much to do with the continuation and numerical strength of the tribe would naturally be fixed upon in connection with the covenant of blood. In confirmation of the last explanation it is urged that in the case of the covenant between Yahweh and Abraham circumcision was the rite that ratified the agreement. In opposition to (3) it has been urged that among the Hebrews circumcision was performed in infancy—when the child was 8 days old. But this might have been an innovation among the Hebrews, due to ignorance of the original significance of the rite. If circumcision conferred upon the person circumcised the right to the enjoyment of the blessings connected with membership in the tribe it was natural that parents should be anxious that such an initiatory act should be performed early in life. The question of adult and infant baptism is capable of similar explanation. When we examine explanations (2), (3), (4), (5), we find that they are really different forms of the same theory. There can be no doubt that circumcision was originally a religions act. Membership in the tribe, entrance upon the rights of citizenship, participation in the religious practices of the tribe—these privileges are interdependent. Anyone who had experienced the rite of blood stood within the scope of the covenant which existed between the tribe and the tribal god, and enjoyed all the privileges of tribal society. It is easily understood why the historian carefully relates the circumcision of the Israelites by Joshua on their arrival in Canaan. It was necessary, in view of the possible intermingling of the conquerors and the conquered, that the distinctive marks of the Abrahamic covenant should be preserved (Jos 5:3).

3. Spiritual Significance:

In Jer 9:25 and De 30:6 we find the spiritual significance of circumcision. A prophet like Jeremiah was not likely to attach much importance to an external act like circumcision. He bluntly tells his countrymen that they are no better than Egyptians, Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites. They are uncircumcised in heart. Paul uses the term concision for this outward circumcision unaccompanied by any spiritual change (Php 3:2). The question of circumcision occasioned a protracted strife among the early Christians. Judaizing Christians argued for the necessity of circumcision. It was a reminiscence of the unrelenting particularism which had sprung up during the prolonged oppression of the Greek and Roman period. According to their view salvation was of the Jews and for the Jews. It was necessary to become a Jew in order to become a Christian. Paul consented to circumcision in the case of Timothy "because of the Jews" (Ac 16:3). But he saw that a principle was at stake and in most of his epistles he points out the sheer futility of the contention of the Judaizers. (See commentaries on Romans and Galatians.)

4. Figurative Uses:

In a few suggestive passages we find a figurative application of the term. For three years after the settlement in Canaan the "fruit of the land" was to be considered as "uncircumcised" (Le 19:23), i.e. it was the property of the Baalim, the gods of Palestine The fruit of the fourth year belonged to Yahweh. Moses with characteristic humility describes himself as a man of "uncircumcised lips" (Ex 6:30). Jeremiah charges his contemporaries with having their ear uncircumcised (Jer 6:10) and their heart (Jer 9:26). "An uncircumcised heart" is one which is, as it were, closed in, and so impervious to good influences and good impressions, just as an uncircumcised ear (Jer 6:10) is an ear which, from the same cause, hears imperfectly; and uncircumcised lips (compare Ex 6:12,30) are lips which open and speak with difficulty (Driver on De 10:16).

T. Lewis

CIS

sis (Keis): The form given in Ac 13:21 the King James Version for Kish, the father of Saul the first king of Israel (1Sa 9:1 f).

CISAI

si’-sa-i.

See KISEUS.

CISTERN; WELL; POOL; AQUEDUCT

sis’-tern:

Use of Terms

1. General

2. Wells or Cylindrical Cisterns

3. Private Cisterns

4. Public Cisterns

5. Pools and Aqueducts

6. Figurative Uses

LITERATURE

Several words are rendered by "cistern," "well," "pool," the relations of which in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) are as follows:

Use of Terms:

"Cistern," bo’r (Jer 2:13, etc.), or bor (2Ki 18:31). The latter word is frequently in the King James Version translated "well." the Revised Version (British and American) in these cases changes to "cistern" in text (De 6:11; 2Ch 26:10; Ne 9:25) margin (Jer 14:3), rendered "pit" in the King James Version are changed to "cistern" the Revised Version (British and American) (the latter in the American Standard Revised Version only).

The proper Hebrew word for "well" is be’er (seen in Beer-sheba, "well of the oath," Ge 21:31), but other terms are thus rendered in the King James Version, as ‘ayin (Ge 24:13,16, etc., and frequently), ma‘yan (Jos 18:15), maqor (Pr 10:11). ally changes to "fountain"; in Ex 15:27, however, it renders ‘ayin by "springs," and in Ps 84:6, ma‘yan by, "place of springs." "Pool," ‘agham (Isa 14:23, etc.; in the King James Version, Ex 7:19; 8:5, rendered "ponds"); more frequently berekhah (2Sa 2:13; 4:12, etc.). In Ps 84:6 the cognate berakhah, is changed to "blessing."

In the New Testament "well" represents the two words: pege (Joh 4:6,14; in the Revised Version, margin "spring"; 2Pe 2:17; the Revised Version (British and American) renders "springs"), and phrear (Joh 4:11,12). "Pool" is kolumbethra, in Joh 5:2,4,7; 9:7,11.

1. General:

The efforts made to supplement the natural water supply, both in agricultural and in populated areas, before as well as after the Conquest, are clearly seen in the innumerable cisterns, wells and pools which abound throughout Palestine The rainy season, upon which the various storage systems depend, commences at the end of October and ends in the beginning of May. In Jerusalem, the mean rainfall in 41 years up to 1901 was 25,81 inches, falling in a mean number of 56 days (see Glaisher, Meteorological Observations, 24). Toward the end of summer, springs and wells, where they have not actually dried up, diminish very considerably, and cisterns and open reservoirs become at times the only sources of supply. Cisterns are fed from surface and roof drainage. Except in the rare instances where springs occur, wells depend upon percolation. The' great open reservoirs or pools are fed from surface drainage and, in some cases, by aqueducts from springs or from more distant collecting pools. In the case of private cisterns, it is the custom of the country today to close up the inlets during the early days of the rain, so as to permit of a general wash down of gathering surfaces, before admitting the water. Cisterns, belonging to the common natives, are rarely cleansed, and the inevitable scum which collects is dispersed by plunging the pitcher several times before drawing water. When the water is considered to be bad, a somewhat primitive cure is applied by dropping earth into the cistern, so as to sink all impurities with it, to the bottom. The accumulation often found in ancient cisterns probably owes some of its presence to this same habit.

2. Wells or Cylindrical Cisterns:

It is necessary to include wells under the head of cisterns, as there appears to be some confusion in the use of the two terms. Wells, so called, were more often deep cylindrical reservoirs, the lower part of which was sunk in the rock and cemented, the upper part being built with open joints, to receive the surface percolation. They were often of great depth. Job's well at Jerusalem, which is certainly of great antiquity, is 125 ft. deep (see Palestine Exploration Fund, "Jerus," 371).

The discovery of "living water" when digging a well, recorded in Ge 26:19 margin, appears to have been an unusual incident. Uzziah hewed out many cisterns in the valley for his cattle (2Ch 26:9,10 the Revised Version (British and American)), and he built towers, presumably to keep watch over both cattle and cisterns. Isaac "digged again the wells" which had been filled in by the Philistines (Ge 26:18). Wells were frequently dug in the plain, far from villages, for flocks and herds, and rude stone troughs were provided nearby. The well was usually covered with a stone, through which a hole was pierced sufficiently large to allow of free access for the pitchers. A stone was placed over this hole (Ge 29:10) when the well was not in use. The great amount of pottery found in ancient cisterns suggests that clay pots were used for drawing water (see Bible Sidelights, 88). Josephus (Ant., IV, viii, 37) elucidates the passage in Ex 21:33 requiring the mouth of a "pit" or "well" to be covered with planks against accidents. This would seem to apply to wide-mouthed wells which had not been narrowed over to receive a stone cover. It may have been a well or cistern similar to these into which Joseph was cast (Ge 37:24). In fact, dry-wells and cisterns formed such effective dungeons, that it is very probable they were often used for purposes of detention. From earliest times, wells have been the cause of much strife. The covenant between Abimelech and Abraham at Beersheba (Ge 32) was a necessity, no less pressing then than it is now. The well, today, is a center of life in the East. Women gather around it in pursuit of their daily

duties, and travelers, man and beast, divert their course thereto, if needs be, for refreshment; and news of the outer world is carried to and from the well. It is, in fact, an all-important center, and daily presents a series of characteristic Bible scenes. The scene between Rebekah and the servant of Abraham (Ge 24:11 ff) is one with frequent parallels. The well lies usually at some little distance from the village or city. Abraham's servant made his "camels to kneel down without the city by the well of water at the time of the evening, the time that women go out to draw water." Saul and his servant found young maidens going out of the city to draw water (1Sa 9:11). Moses helped the daughters of the priest of Midian at the well, which was evidently at some distance from habitation (Ex 2:16 ff).

3. Private Cisterns:

Private cisterns must be distinguished from public cisterns or wells. They were smaller and were sunk in the rocks within private boundaries, each owner having his own cistern (2Ki 18:31; Pr 5:15). Ancient sites are honeycombed with these cisterns. A common type in Jerusalem seems to have been bottle-shaped in section, the extended bottom part being in the softer rock, and the narrow neck in the hard upper stratum. Many irregularly shaped cisterns occur with rock vaults supported by rock or masonry piers. Macalister tells of the discovery at Gezer of a small silt catchpit attached to a private cistern, and provided with an overflow channel leading to the cistern. It is an early instance of a now well-known method of purification. The universal use of cement rendering to the walls of the cisterns was most necessary to seal up the fissures of the rock. The "broken cisterns" (Jer 2:13) probably refer to insufficiently sealed cisterns.

4. Public Cisterns:

Besides private cisterns there were huge public rock-cut cisterns within the city walls. The great water caverns under the Temple area at Jerusalem show a most extensive system of water storage (see Recovery of Jerusalem, chapter vii). There are 37 of these described in Palestine Exploration Fund, "Jerus," 217 ff, and the greatest is an immense rock-cut cavern the roof of which is partly rock and partly stone, supported by rock piers (see Fig. 1, Palestine Exploration Fund). It is 43 ft. deep with a storage capacity of over two million gallons and there are numerous access manholes. This cistern is fed by an aqueduct from Solomon's Pools about 10 miles distant by road, and is locally known as Bahar el Kebir, the "Great Sea." One of the most recent and one of the most interesting rock-cut reservoirs yet discovered is that at Gezer. (See Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1908, 96 ff.) In this example, the pool of spring water is reached by a great rock-tunnel staircase which descends 94 ft. 6 inches from the surface. The staircase diminishes in size as it descends, and at its greatest, it is 23 ft. high and 12 ft. 10 inches wide. These proportions may seem unnecessarily large, but may be accounted for by the necessity for providing light at the water level. As a matter of fact, the brink of the pool receives the light from above. The work dates back to pre-Israelite times.

5. Pools and Aqueducts:

Open pools were common in every city. They were cut out of the rock and were built and cemented at

points where occasion demanded. They were often of great size. The pool outside Jerusalem known as Birket es Sultan measures 555 ft. x 220 ft. x 36 ft. deep, and the so-called Hezekiah's Pool within the walls, is 240 ft. x 144 ft. x about 20 ft. deep. The latter probably owes its origin to the rock-cut fosse of early Jewish date. The Birket es Sultan, on the other hand, probably dates from the time of the Turkish occupation. They may, however, be taken as examples, which, if somewhat larger, are still in accord with the pool system of earlier history. Pools were usually fed by surface drainage, and in some cases by aqueducts from springs at some distance away. They seem to have been at the public service, freely accessible to both man and beast. Pools situated outside the city walls were sometimes connected by aqueducts with pools within the city, so that the water could be drawn within the walls in time of siege. The so-called Pools of Solomon, three in number (see Fig. 3), situated about 10 miles by road from Jerusalem, are of large proportions and are fed by surface water and by aqueducts from springs. The water from these pools is conveyed in a wonderfully engineered course, known as the lower-level aqueduct, which searches the winding contours of the Judean hills for a distance of about 15 miles, before reaching its destination in "the great sea" under the Temple area. This aqueduct is still in use, but its date is uncertain (see G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, 131, where the author finds reason for ascribing it to the period of Herod). The course and destination of another aqueduct known as the high-level aqueduct is less definite. These aqueducts are of varying dimensions. The low-level aqueduct at a point just before it enters the Temple area was found to measure 3 ft. high x 2 ft. 3 inches wide, partly rock-cut and partly built, and rendered in smooth-troweled cement, with well-squared stone covers (see Palestine Exploration Fund, Excavations at Jerusalem, 53 ff). There are many remains of rock-cut aqueducts throughout Palestine (see Fig. 4) which seem to indicate their use in early Hebrew times, but the lack of Old Testament references to these works is difficult to account for, unless it is argued that in some cases they date back to pre-Israelite times. The great tunnel and pool at Gezer lends a measure of support to this hypothesis. On the other hand, a plea for a Hebrew origin is also in a measure strengthened by the very slight reference in the Old Testament to such a great engineering feat as the cutting of the Siloam tunnel, which is doubtless the work of Hezekiah. The pool of Siloam was originally a simple rock-cut reservoir within the walls, and was constructed by Hezekiah (2Ch 32:30). It measures 75 ft. x 71 ft. It is the upper pool of Isa 7:3. A lower overflow pool existed immediately beyond, contained by the city wall across the Tyropoeon valley. The aqueduct which supplies the upper pool takes a tortuous course of about 1,700 ft. through the solid rock from the Virgin's fountain, an intermittent spring on the East slope of the hill. The water reaches the pool on the Southwest of the spur of Ophel, and it was in the rock walls of this aqueduct that the famous Siloam inscription recording the completion of the work was discovered.

Herod embellished the upper pool, lining it with stone and building arches around its four sides (see Palestine Exploration Fund, Excavations at Jerusalem, 154 ff), and the pool was most likely in this condition in the time of Christ (Joh 9:6,7). There are numerous other pools, cisterns and aqueducts in and around Jerusalem, which provide abundant evidence of the continual struggle after water, made by its occupants of all times (see G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, chapter v, volume I).

See also PIT; WELL, etc.

6. Figurative Uses:

Good wives are described as cisterns (Pr 5:15 ff). "The left ventricle of the heart, which retains the blood till it be redispersed through the body, is called a cistern" (Ec 12:6). Idols, armies and material objects in which Israel trusted were "broken cisterns" (Jer 2:13, see above) "soon emptied of all the aid and comfort which they possess, and cannot fill themselves again."

LITERATURE.

G. A. Smith, Jerusalem; Palestine Exploration Fund Memoirs, Jerusalem vol; Wilson, The Recovery of Jerusalem; Macalister, Bible Sidelights; Palestine Exploration Fund Statement; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations at Jerusalem; Josephus.

Arch. C. Dickie

CITADEL

sit'-a-del (1 Macc 1:33; 3:45).

See FORTIFICATION.

CITHERN

sith'-ern (kithara; 1 Macc 4:54 the King James Version, kitharais kai kinurais is translated "citherns and harps"; the Revised Version (British and American) "harps and lutes"; compare guitar, zither): As 1 Macc was originally written in Hebrew, it is natural to suppose that these two Greek words stand for Hebrew nebhalim and kinnoroth; but to this it may be objected that kithara and kinura are not used elsewhere together to represent two different instruments. On the contrary we have either kinura kai nabla or kithara kai psalterion. The most probable explanation of the unusual collocation of these two words in 1 Maccabees is that kithara was a gloss meant to explain the obsolescent kinura.

See MUSIC.

James Millar

CITIES OF REFUGE

See REFUGE, CITIES OF.

CITIES OF THE PLAIN; CICCAR

sit'-iz, plan, (kikkar ha-yarden): Included Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim and Zoar. The locality is

first referred to in Ge 13:10, where it is said that Lot "lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the Plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before Yahweh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of Yahweh, like the land of Egypt, as thou goest unto Zoar." The word translated plain is kikkar, "circle." In this ver, and in the 11th, as well as in 1Ki 7:46 and Mt 3:5, we have the full phrase "circle of the Jordan." Elsewhere (Ge 13:12; 19:17,29; De 34:3; 2Sa 18:23) the word for "circle" is used alone with the article. Until recently the traditional view that this circle of the Jordan was at the south end of the Dead Sea was universally maintained. The arguments in favor of this view are:

(1) The name of Sodom is preserved in Jebel Usdum—Usdum having the same consonants with Sodom; moreover, the name is known to have referred to a place in that region as early as the days of Galen (De Simpl. medic. Facult., 4,19) who describes certain "salts of Sodom" from the mountains surrounding the lake which are called Sodom.

(2) Zoar seems to have been represented in the Middle Ages by a place which the Crusaders called Segore, and Arabic writers Zoghar. Under the name Zughar or Sughar the place is often referred to by medieval Arabian geographers as situated 1ø South of Jericho "at the end of the Dead Sea" and as a station on the route between the Gulf of Akabah and Jericho, two days' journey from Jericho. Ptolemy (v.17,5) reckons Zoar as belonging to Arabia Petrea. Eusebius (Onom., 261) describes the Dead Sea as lying between Jericho and Zoar. Josephus (Ant., I, xi, 4) makes the Dead Sea extend 580 stadia "as far as Zoar of Arabia" (Wars, IV, viii, 4). These references would locate Zoar at the base of the mountains just Southeast of the Dead Sea, and, as it was within easy reach of Sodom, from which Lot fled, would fix the Cities of the Plain in that locality. Jerome (Comm. on Isa 15:5) says that Zoar was in the borders of Moab.

On the other hand, it is maintained that the "kikkar of the Jordan" lay North of the Dead Sea for the following reasons:

(1) That is the region which is visible from the heights of Bethel whence Abraham and Lot looked down upon it (Ge 13:10), while the south end of the lake is not visible. But it may be answered that the phrase need not be limited to the actual region in sight, but may have included the whole known extension of the valley.

(2) Zoar was said to be in range of Moses' vision from the top of Pisgah (De 34:1-3) whereas the south end of the Dead Sea is invisible from that point, on account of intervening mountains. But this description in De evidently is not intended to be limited to the points which are actually visible, but should be understood as describing the extreme limits of the land some points of which are visible in their near vicinity. Certainly the vision did not comprehend all portions of Da or Judah "unto the hinder sea." The phrase from Jericho to. Zoar is like "from Da to Beersheba." The mountain heights overlooking Zoar were certainly visible.

(3) In Ge 14 the four kings coming up from Kadesh attacked the Amorites "that dwelt in Hazezon-tamar" before reaching Sodom, and Hazezon-tamar is to be identified with Engedi. On the other hand, it

is possible that it is to be identified with the Tamar of Eze 47:19; 48:28, and that this place lay Southwest of the Dead Sea. Or, if that explanation is not accepted, it is proper to note that the course of this expedition led at first a considerable distance South of the Dead Sea through Mt. Seir to El-paran, when "they smote all the country of the Amalekites, and also the Amorites." In accomplishing this they would naturally be led along the highland to Hebron from which they could easily descend to Engedi, whence they could proceed without difficulty to the south end of the end Sea. Besides, it is by no means certain that there was not an easy passage along the whole western shore of the Dead Sea at that time. See DEAD SEA.

(4) It is argued that the region at the south end of the Dead Sea could not be described "as the garden of the Lord," etc. Neither, for that matter, could the region around the north end be so described in its present condition. But, on the other hand, the region South of the sea is by no means as devoid of vegetation as is sometimes represented, while there are convincing arguments to prove that formerly it was much more extensive and fertile than now. To the fertility of this area there is no more capable witness than Professor Hull, though he is an ardent advocate of the location of these cities at the north end of the lake. This appears both in his original diary, and in his more mature and condensed account contained in his article on the Dead Sea in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), where he writes, "When, in December, 1883. the writer found himself standing on the edge of the terrace overlooking the Ghor, he beheld at his feet a wide plain stretching away northward toward the margin of the Dead Sea, and to a large extent green with vegetation and thickets of small trees. To the right in an open space were seen several large Bedouin camps, from which the shouts of wild men, the barking of dogs, and the bellowing of camels ascended. Numerous flocks of black goats and white sheep were being tended by women in long blue cloaks; and on the party of travelers being observed, groups of merry children came tripping up toward the path accompanied by a few of the elders, and, ranging themselves in a line, courteously returned salutations. Here the Arabs remain enjoying the warmth, of the plain till the increasing heat of the summer’s sun calls them away to their high pasture grounds on the table-land of Edom and Moab. At a short distance farther toward the shore of the lake is the village of Es-Safieh, inhabited by a tribe of fellahin called the Ghawarneh, who by means of irrigation from the Wady el-Hessi cultivate with success fields of wheat, maize, dhurah, indigo and cotton, while they rear herds of camels and flocks of sheep and goats. On the produce of these fields the Arabs largely depend for their supplies of food and raiment, which they obtain by a kind of rude, often compulsory, barter."

LITERATURE.

Authorities favoring the south end of the Dead Sea: Dillmann, Genesis, 111 f; Robinson, BRP2, II, 187: ff; G. A. Smith, Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 505 ff; Baedeker-Socin, Palestine, III, 146; Buhl, Buhl, Geographic des alten Palastina, 117, 271, 274; see also especially Samuel Wolcott, "Site of Sodom," Bibliotheca Sacra, XXV, 112-51. Favoring the north end: Sir George Grove in various articles in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible; Canon Tristram, Land of Moab, 330 ff; Selah Merrill, East of the Jordan, 232-39; W. M. Thomson, The Land and the Book.

George Frederick Wright

CITIES, LEVITICAL

See LEVITICAL CITIES; CITY.

CITIES, STORE

stor.

See CITY.

CITIMS

sit’-imz.

See CHITTIM (1 Macc 8:5 the King James Version).

CITIZENSHIP

sit’-i-zen-ship: All the words in use connected with this subject are derived from polis, "city."

1. Philological:

These words, with the meanings which they have in the Bible, are the nouns, polites, "citizen"; politeia, "citizenship"; politeuma, "commonwealth"; sumpolites, "fellow-citizen"; and the verb, politeuo, "to behave as a citizen." Each will be considered more fully in its proper place.

2. Civil:

(1) The word for citizen is sometimes used to indicate little if anything more than the inhabitant of a city or country. "The citizens of that country" (Lu 15:15); "His citizens hated him" (Lu 19:14). Also the quotation from the Septuagint, "They shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen" (Heb 8:11; compare Jer 31:34). So also in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 4:50; 5:6; 9:19).

(2) Roman citizenship.—This is of especial interest to the Bible student because of the apostle Paul’s relation to it. It was one of his qualifications as the apostle to the Gentiles. Luke shows him in Ac as a Roman citizen, who, though a Jew and Christian receives, for the most part, justice and courtesy from the Roman officials, and more than once successfully claims its privileges. He himself declares that he was a citizen of Tarsus (Ac 21:39). He was not only born in that city but had a citizen’s rights in it.

See PAUL; TARSUS.

But this citizenship in Tarsus did not of itself confer upon Paul the higher dignity of Roman citizenship. Had it done so, Claudius Lysias would not have ordered him to be scourged, as he did, after having learned that he was a citizen of Tarsus (Ac 21:39; compare Ac 22:25). So, over and above this Tarsian citizenship, was the Roman one, which availed for him not in one city only, but throughout the Roman world and secured for him everywhere certain great immunities and rights. Precisely what all of these were we are not certain, but we know that, by the Valerian and Porcian laws, exemption from shameful punishments, such as scourging with rods or whips, and especially crucifixion, was secured to every Roman citizen; also the right of appeal to the emperor with certain limitations. This sanctity of person had become almost a part of their religion, so that any violation was esteemed a sacrilege. Cicero's oration against Verres indicates the almost fanatical extreme to which this feeling had been carried. Yet Paul had been thrice beaten with rods, and five times received from the Jews forty stripes save one (2Co 11:24,25). Perhaps it was as at Philippi before he made known his citizenship (Ac 16:22,23), or the Jews had the right to whip those who came before their own tribunals. Roman citizenship included also the right of appeal to the emperor in all cases, after sentence had been passed, and no needless impediment must be interposed against a trial. Furthermore, the citizen had the right to be sent to Rome for trial before the emperor himself, when charged with capital offenses (Ac 16:37; 22:25-29; 25:11).

How then had Paul, a Jew, acquired this valued dignity? He himself tells us. In contrast to the parvenu citizenship of the chief captain, who seems to have thought that Paul also must have purchased it, though apparently too poor, Paul quietly, says, "But I was free born" (King James Versions; "a Roman born" the Revised Version (British and American), Ac 22:28). Thus either Paul's father or some other ancestor had acquired the right and had transmitted it to the son.

3. Metaphorical and Spiritual:

What more natural than that Paul should sometimes use this civic privilege to illustrate spiritual truths? He does so a number of times. Before the Sanhedrin he says, in the words of our English Versions, "I have lived before God in all good conscience" (Ac 23:1). But this translation does not bring out the sense. Paul uses a noticeable word, politeuo, "to live as a citizen." He adds, "to God" (to Theo). That is to say, he had lived conscientiously as God's citizen, as a member of God's commonwealth. The day before, by appealing to his Roman citizenship, he had saved himself from ignominious whipping, and now what more natural than that he should declare that he had been true to his citizenship in a higher state? What was this higher commonwealth in which he has enjoyed the rights and performed the duties of a citizen? What but theocracy of his fathers, the ancient church, of which the Sanhedrin was still the ostensible representative, but which was really continued in the kingdom of Christ without the national restrictions of the older one? Thus Paul does not mean to say simply, "I have lived conscientiously before God," but "I have lived as a citizen to God, of the body of which He is the immediate Sovereign." He had lived theocratically as a faithful member of the Jewish church, from which his enemies claimed he was an apostate. Thus Paul's conception was a kind of blending of two ideas or feelings, one of which came from the old theocracy, and the other from his Roman citizenship.

Later, writing from Rome itself to the Philippians, who were proud of their own citizenship as members

of a colonia, a reproduction on a small scale of the parent commonwealth, where he had once successfully maintained his own Roman rights, Paul forcibly brings out the idea that Christians are citizens of a heavenly commonwealth, urging them to live worthy of such honor (Php 1:27 margin).

A similar thought is brought out when he says, "For our commonwealth (politeuma) is in heaven" (Php 3:20 margin). The state to which we belong is heaven. Though absent in body from the heavenly commonwealth, as was Paul from Rome when he asserted his rights, believers still enjoy its civic privileges and protections; sojourners upon earth, citizens of heaven. The Old Testament conception, as in Isa 60-62, would easily lend itself to this idea, which appears in Heb 11:10,16; 12:22-24; 13:14; Ga 4:26, and possibly in Re 21.

See also ROME.

G. H. Trever

CITRON

sit'-run.

See APPLE.

CITY

sit'-i ('ir, qiryah; polis):

I. THE CANAANITE CITY

1. Origin

2. Extent

3. Villages

4. Sites

5. External Appearance

6. General

II. THE CITY OF THE JEWISH OCCUPATION

1. Tower or Stronghold

2. High Place

3. Broad Place

4. Streets

5. General Characteristics

III. STORE CITIES

IV. LEVITICAL CITIES

LITERATURE

I. The Canaanite City.

1. Origin:

The development of the Canaanite city has been traced by Macalister in his report on the excavation at Gezer (Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1904, 108 ff). It originated on the slopes of a bare rocky spur, in which the Neolithic Troglodytes quarried their habitations out of the solid rock, the stones therefrom being used to form a casing to the earthen ramparts, with which the site was afterwards surrounded and which served as a protection against the intrusion of enemies. Later Semitic intruders occupied the site, stone houses were built, and high stone defense walls were substituted for the earthen stone-cased ramparts. These later walls were much higher and stronger than those of the Neilithic occupation and were the walls seen by the Israelites when they viewed the country of their promise.

2. Extent:

"The people that dwell in the land are strong, and the cities are fortified, and very great" (Nu 13:28) was the report of the spies sent by Moses to spy out the land of Canaan, to see "what cities they are that they dwell in, whether in camps, or in strongholds" (Nu 13:19,20). The difficulties of the task set before the advancing Israelites and their appreciation of the strength of the cities, is here recorded, and also in De 1:28: "The people are greater and taller than we; the cities are great and fortified up to heaven; and moreover we have seen the sons of the Anakim there." This assessment of greatness was based upon comparative ignorance of such fortifications and the want of war experience and the necessary implements of assault. It need not, therefore, be supposed that the cities were "great" except by comparison in the eyes of a tent- dwelling and pastoral people. On the contrary, most recent exploration has proved that they were small (see Pere Vincent, Canaan, 27, note 3, and Pl. I, where comparative

measurements of the areas of ancient cities show that, in nine cities compared, Tell Sandahannah (barely 6 acres) is the smallest). Gezer measures approximately 22 1/4 acres and Tell el-Hesy somewhat greater. By way of illustration, it is interesting to note that the Acropolis at Athens, roughly computed, measures 7:1/4 acres, while the Castle Rock at Edinburgh is about 6 acres, or the same as the whole Seleucidan city of Tell Sandahannah. The Acropolis at Tell Zakariya measures about 2 acres or nearly one-fourth of the area of the whole city (about 8 1/2 acres). It is unlikely that Jebus (Jerusalem) itself was an exception, although in Solomonic and later times it extended to a far greater area.

3. Villages:

Besides the walled cities there were "unwalled (country) towns a great many" (De 3:5), "villages," unfortified suburbs, lying near to and under the protection of the walled cities and occupied by the surplus population. The almost incredible number of cities and their villages mentioned in the Old Testament, while proving the clannishness of their occupants, proves, at the same time, their comparatively small scale.

4. Sites:

Traces of similar populations that rise and fall are seen in China and Japan today. As a little poem says of Karakura: " Where were palaces and merchants and the blades of warriors, Now are only the cicadas and waving blades of grass. " Cities that stood on their mounds" (Jos 11:13; Jer 30:18) as at Lachish and Taanach are distinguished from those built on natural hills or spurs of hills, such as Jebus, Gezer, Tell es Sail (Gath?), Bethshemesh (see Vincent, Canaan, 26 ff). The Arabic name "Tell" is applied to all mounds of ancient cities, whether situated on a natural eminence or on a plain, and the word is common in the geographical nomenclature of Palestine Sites were chosen near a water supply, which was ever the most essential qualification. For purposes of defense, the nearest knoll or spur was selected. Sometimes these knolls were of no great height and their subsequent elevation is accounted for by the gradual accumulation of debris from town refuse and from frequent demolitions; restoration being effected after a levelng up of the ruins of the razed city (see Fig. 2: Tell el-Hesy, Palestine Exploration Fund, which shows a section of the Tell from which the levels of the successive cities in distinct stratification were recovered). Closely packed houses, in narrow alleys, with low, rude mud, brick, or stone and mud walls, with timber and mud roofs, burned readily and were easily razed to the ground (Jos 8:1 ff; Jos 11:11).

It would seem that, viewed from the outside, these cities had the appearance of isolated forts, the surrounding walls being strengthened at frequent intervals, with towers. The gates were approached by narrow roads, which mounted the slopes of the mound at the meeting-point of the meandering paths on the plain below.

5. External Appearance:

The walls of Tell ej-Judeideh were strengthened by towers in the inside, and presented an unbroken

circuit of wall to the outside view (see Fig. 4, PEF). Houses on the wall (Jos 2:15; 2Co 11:33) may have been seen from the outside; but it is unlikely that any building within the walls was visible, except possibly the inner tower or stronghold. The whole of the interior of the early Jerusalem (Jebus) was visible from the hills to the East, but this peculiarity of position is uncommon. Strong and high walls, garrisoned by men-at-arms seen only through the battlements, showed no weakness, and the gates, with their narrow and steep approaches and projecting defense towers, looked uninviting traps. The mystery of these unseen interiors could therefore be easily conjured into an exaggeration of strength.

6. General:

The inhabitants of the villages (banoth, "daughters," Nu 32:42 margin) held feudal occupation and gave service to their lord of the city (’em, "mother," 2Sa 20:19), in defense of their own or in attacks on their neighbor’s property. Such were the cities of the truculent, marauding kings of Canaan, whose broken territories lent themselves to the upkeep of a condition, of the weakness of which, the Israelites, in their solid advance, took ready advantage.

II. The City of the Jewish Occupation.

After the conquest, and the abandonment of the pastoral life for that of agriculture and general trade, the condition of the cities varied but little, except that they were, from time to time, enlarged and strengthened. Solomon’s work at Jerusalem was a step forward, but there is little evidence that, in the other cities which he is credited with having put his hands to, there was any embellishment. Megiddo and Gezer at least show nothing worthy of the name. Greek influence brought with it the first real improvements in city building; and the later work of Herod raised cities to a grandeur which was previously undreamed of among the Jews. Within the walls, the main points considered in the "layout" were, the Tower or Stronghold, the High Place, the Broad Place by the Gate, and the Market-Place.

1. Tower or Stronghold:

The Tower or Stronghold was an inner fort which held a garrison and commander, and was provisioned with "victuals, and oil and wine" (2Ch 11:11), to which the defenders of the city when hard pressed betook themselves, as a last resource. The men of the tower of Shechem held out against Abimelech (Jud 9:49) who was afterward killed by a stone thrown by a woman from the Tower of Thebez "within the city" (Jud 9:51,53). David took the stronghold of Zion, "the same is the city of David" (2Sa 5:7), which name (Zion) was afterward applied to the whole city. It is not unlikely that the king’s house was included in the stronghold. Macalister (Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1907, 192 ff) reports the discovery of a Canaanite castle with enormously thick walls abutting against the inside of the city wall. The strongholds at Taanach and Tell el-Hesy are similarly placed; and the Acropolis at Tell Zakariya lies close to, but independent of, the city wall.

2. High Place:

The High Place was an important feature in all Canaanite cities and retained its importance long after the conquest (1Sa 9:12 ff; 1Ki 3:2; Am 7:9). It was a sanctuary, where sacrifices were offered and feasts were held, and men did "eat before Yahweh" (De 14:26). The priests, as was their custom, received their portion of the flesh (1Sa 2:12 ff). The High Place discovered at Gezer (Bible Sidelights, chapter iii) is at a lower level than the city surrounding it, and lies North and South. It is about 100 ft. in length, and when complete consisted of a row of ten rude undressed standing stones, of which eight are still remaining, the largest being 10 ft. 6 inches high, and the others varying to much smaller sizes.

See HIGH PLACE.

3. Broad Place:

The Broad Place (Ne 8:1,3,16; Jer 5:1) seems to have been, usually, immediately inside the city gate. It was not, in early Jewish cities, an extensive open area, but simply a widening of the street, and was designated "broad" by comparison with the neighboring alleys, dignified by the name of street. It took the place of a general exchange. Justice was dispensed (Ru 4:2) and punishment was administered. Jeremiah was put in "the stocks that were in the upper gate of Benjamin" (Jer 20:2), proclamations were read, business was transacted, and the news and gossip of the day were exchanged. It was a place for all classes to congregate (Job 29:7; Pr 31:23), and was also a market-place (2Ki 7:1). In later times, the market-place became more typically a market square of the Greek agora plan, with an open area surrounded by covered shelters. The present market-place at Haifa resembles this. Probably it was this type of market-place referred to in Mt 11:16; 20:3 and Lu 7:32; 11:43. The street inside the Damascus gate of Jerusalem today is, in many ways, similar to the Broad Place, and retains many of its ancient uses. Here, Bedouin and Fellahin meet from the outlying districts to barter, to arbitrate, to find debtors and to learn the news of the day. Lying as it did immediately inside the gate, the Broad Place had a defensive value, in that it admitted of concentration against the forcing of the gate. There does not seem to have been any plan of either a Canaanite or early Jewish city, in which this question of defense did not predominate. Open areas within the city were "waste places" (Isa 58:12) and were not an integral part of the plan.

4. Streets:

The streets serving these quarters were not laid out on any fixed plan. They were, in fact, narrow, unpaved alleys, all seeming of equal importance, gathering themselves crookedly to the various centers. Having fixed the positions of the City Gates, the Stronghold and the High Place, the inhabitants appear to have been allowed to situate themselves the best way they could, without restriction of line or frontage. Houses were of modest proportions and were poorly built; planned, most often, in utter disregard of the square, and presenting to the street more or less dead walls, which were either topped by parapets or covered with projecting wood and mud roofs (see ARCHITECTURE, fig. 1; HOUSE).

The streets, as in the present day in Palestine, were allocated to separate trades: "bakers' street" (Jer 37:21), place "of the merchants" (Ne 3:31,32 the King James Version), "goldsmiths," etc. The Valley of

the Cheesemakers was a street in the Tyropceon Valley at Jerusalem.

For a discussion of the subject of "cisterns" , see the separate article under the word

5. General Characteristics:

The people pursued the industries consequent upon their own self-establishment. Agriculture claimed first place, and was their most highly esteemed occupation. The king’s lands were farmed by his subjects for his own benefit, and considerable tracts of lands belonged to the aristocracy. The most of the lands, however, belonged to the cities and villages, and were allotted among the free husbandmen. Various cereals were raised, wheat and barley being most commonly cultivated. The soil was tilled and the crops reaped and threshed in much the same manner and with much the same implements as are now used in Syria. Cities lying in main trade routes developed various industries more quickly than those whose positions were out of touch with foreign traffic. Crafts and trades, unknown to the early Jews, were at first monopolized by foreigners who, as a matter of course, were elbowed out as time progressed. Cities on the seaboard of Phoenicia depended chiefly on maritime trade. Money, in the form of ingots and bars of precious metals, "weighed out" (2Ki 12:11), was current in preexilic times, and continued in use after foreign coinage had been introduced. The first native coinage dates from the Maccabean period (see Madden, Jewish Coinage, chapter iv). Slavery was freely trafficked in, and a certain number of slaves were attached to the households of the more wealthy. Although they were the absolute property of their masters, they enjoyed certain religious privileges not extended to the "sojourners" or "strangers" who sought the protection of the cities, often in considerable numbers.

The king’s private property, from which he drew full revenue, lay partly within the city, but to a greater extent beyond it (1Sa 8:15,16). In addition to his private property, he received tithes of fields and flocks, "the tenth part of your seed." He also drew a tax in the shape of certain "king’s mowings" (Am 7:1). Vassal kings, paid tribute; Mesha, king of Moab, rendered wool unto the king of Israel (2Ki 3:4).

See G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, I, chapters v-x, for detailed account of the conditions of Jewish city life. For details of government, see ELDER; JUDGES; SANHEDRIN.

III. Store Cities.

These were selected by Solomon and set aside for stores of victuals, chariots, horsemen, etc. (1Ki 9:19). Jehoshaphat "built in Judah castles and cities of store" (2Ch 17:12). Twelve officers were appointed by Solomon to provision his household, each officer being responsible for the supply in one month in the year (1Ki 4:7). There were also "storehouses in the fields, in the cities, and in the villages" (1Ch 27:25 the King James Version).

IV. Levitical Cities.

These were apportioned 13 to the children of Aaron, 10 to Kohath, 13 to Gershon, 12 to Merari, 48 cities

in all (Jos 21:13 ff), 6 of which were cities of Refuge (Nu 35:6); see REFUGE, CITIES OF. For further details see ARCHITECTURE; HOUSE.

LITERATURE.

PEFS; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations at Jerusalem; Macalister, Excavation at Gezer; Bliss and Macalister, Excavations in Palestine; Sellin, Excavation at Taanach; Schumacher, Excavation at Tell Mutesellim; Macalister, Bible Sidelights; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem; Historical Geography of the Holy Land; Bliss, Mounds of Many Cities; Vincent, Canaan.

Arch. C. Dickie

CITY OF CONFUSION

kon-fu'-zhun (qiryath-tohu): A name applied to Jerusalem (Isa 24:10 the King James Version).

CITY OF DAVID

See ZION.

CITY OF DESTRUCTION

de-struk'-shun 'ir ha-herec; (Septuagint Base-dek): In his prediction of the future return of Egypt to Yahweh, Isaiah declares, "In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Yahweh of hosts; one shall be called The city of destruction" (Isa 19:18). The name 'ir ha-herec, "the city of overthrow," is evidently a play upon 'ir ha-cherec, "city of the sun," a designation of Heliopolis (same meaning; compare the name for this city, Beth-shemesh, Jer 43:13), in Egyptian, On (Ge 41:45), which last name Ezekiel, by a similar play on sound, changes into Aven. See ON. Some codices, however, as the Revised Version, margin notes, read here 'ir ha-cherec, the actual name of the city.

James Orr

CITY OF PALM TREES

pam'-trez ('ir ha-temarim).

See JERICHO (De 34:3; Jud 1:16; 3:13; 2Ch 28:15).

CITY OF SALT

See SALT, CITY OF.

CITY OF WATERS

See RABBAH.

CITY, GOLDEN

See GOLDEN CITY.

CITY, ROYAL

See RABBAH.

CITY, RULERS OF

rool’-erz: The English Versions of the Bible rendering of the politarchai, of Thessalonica, before whom Jason and the other Christians were dragged by the mob (Ac 17:6,8). The term distinguishes the magistrates of a free Greek city from the ordinary Roman officials. It primarily denotes "rulers of the citizens," and hence, was used only of magistrates of free cities. The term seems to have been confined largely to Macedonia, although there have been found a few inscriptions elsewhere in which it is used. The use of this term well illustrates the accuracy of the author of the Book of Acts, for while politarchai is not used by classical authors, this form is attested by a number of Macedonian inscriptions. Much work has been done in this field in recent years and the results throw light on the reference in Acts. Of the inscriptions that have been found at least five belong to Thessalonica (see article by Professor Burton, in the American Journal of Theology of 1898, "The Politarchs").

"The rulers" of Philippi, before whom Paul and Silas were brought is the English Versions of the Bible rendering of archonies, which is commonly used in the New Testament (Ac 16:19). This is the ordinary term for "rulers" and is not the same as "rulers of the city."

A. W. Fortune

CLAP

An emphatic expression of joy, "They clapped their hands (nakhah), and said, Long live (the King James Version "God save") the king" (2Ki 11:12); "Oh clap your hands (taqa‘), all ye peoples" (Ps 47:1); or exultation (caphaq, La 2:15; macha’, Eze 25:6; taqa‘, Na 3:19); or repudiation (caphaq, Job 27:23; 34:37).

Figurative: To denote Nature’s "sympathy" with God’s people. "Let the floods clap (macha’) their hands" (Ps 98:8); "All the trees of the field shall clap their hands" (Isa 55:12; compare Jud 5:20).

CLASPS

klasps (qerec): The word occurs nine times in Ex 26; 36, 39; which record the specifications for the erection of the tabernacle and their subsequent carrying out. In each of these passages the King James Version renders "taches"—an early English word of French origin now embodied in our "attachment." 50 clasps or taches of gold were ordered to be used in connecting together the two sets of inner tapestry curtains (10 in number) of the tabernacle (Ex 26:6), and 50 clasps of brass (bronze) were similarly to be used in joining the two sets of goats’ hair curtains (11 in number) which formed the outer covering (Ex 26:11). See TABERNACLE. As to the nature of the clasp itself, it seems to have belonged to a double set of loops, opposite to each other, to one of which in each set, required to be of blue cord, a gold or brass button or pin was attached, which, being inserted into the loop opposite, kept the curtain in position (Ex 26:4-6).

A difficulty arises from the direction in Ex 26:33 that the veil which divided the "dwelling" into two parts—the holy place and the most holy—was to be suspended "under the clasps." If the clasps are supposed to be midway in the total length of the tabernacle, this would make the two holy places to be of equal size, contrary to the usual assumption that the outer was twice the length of the inner. The term "under" must therefore be used with some latitude, or the ordinary conception of the arrangement of the curtains, or of the size of the holy places will have to be revised (the dimensions are not actually given in the description).

W. Shaw Caldecott

CLAUDA klo’-da.

See CAUDA.

CLAUDIA

klo’-di-a (Klaudia): A member of the Christian congregation at Rome, who, with other members of that church, sends her greetings, through Paul, to Timothy (2Ti 4:21). More than this concerning her cannot be said with certainty. The Apostolical Constitutions (VII, 21) name her as the mother of Linus, mentioned subsequently by Irenaeus and Eusebius as bishop of Rome. An ingenious theory has been proposed, upon the basis of the mention of Claudia and Pudens as husband and wife in an epigram of Martial, that they are identical with the persons of the same name here mentioned. A passage in the Agricola of Tacitus and an inscription found in Chichester, England, have been used in favor of the further statement that this Claudia was a daughter of a British king, Cogidubnus. See argument by Alford in the Prolegomena to 2Ti in his Greek Testament. It is an example of how a very few data may be used to construct a plausible theory. If it be true, the contrast between their two friends, the apostle

Paul, on the one hand, and the licentious poet, Martial, on the other, is certainly unusual. If in 2Ti 4:21, Pudens and Claudia be husband and wife, it is difficult to explain how Linus occurs between them. See argument against this in Lightfoot, The Apostolic Fathers.

H. E. Jacobs

CLAUDIUS

klo’-di-us (Klaudios): Fourth Roman emperor. He reigned for over 13 years (41-54 AD), having succeeded Caius (Caligula) who had seriously altered the conciliatory policy of his predecessors regarding the Jews and, considering himself a real and corporeal god, had deeply offended the Jews by ordering a statue of himself to be placed in the temple of Jerusalem, as Antiochus Epiphanes had done with the statue of Zeus in the days of the Maccabees (2 Macc 6:2). Claudius reverted to the policy of Augustus and Tiberius and marked the opening year of his reign by issuing edicts in favor of the Jews (Ant., XIX, 5), who were permitted in all parts of the empire to observe their laws and customs in a free and peaceable manner, special consideration being given to the Jews of Alexandria who were to enjoy without molestation all their ancient rights and privileges. The Jews of Rome, however, who had become very numerous, were not allowed to hold assemblages there (Dio LX, vi, 6), an enactment in full correspondence with the general policy of Augustus regarding Judaism in the West. The edicts mentioned were largely due to the intimacy of Claudius with Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, who had been living in Rome and had been in some measure instrumental in securing the succession for Claudius. As a reward for this service, the Holy Land had a king once more. Judea was added to the tetrarchies of Philip and Antipas; and Herod Agrippa I was made ruler over the wide territory which had been governed by his grandfather. The Jews’ own troubles during the reign of Caligula had given "rest" (the American Standard Revised Version "peace") to the churches "throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria" (Ac 9:31). But after the settlement of these troubles, "Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the church" (Ac 12:1). He slew one apostle and "when he saw that it pleased the Jews, he proceeded to seize" another (Ac 12:3). His miserable death is recorded in Ac 12:20-23, and in Ant, XIX, 8. This event which took place in the year 44 AD is held to have been coincident with one of the visits of Paul to Jerusalem. It has proved one of the chronological pivots of the apostolic history.

Whatever concessions to the Jews Claudius may have been induced out of friendship for Herod Agrippa to make at the beginning of his reign, Suetonius records (Claud. chapter 25) "Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit," an event assigned by some to the year 50 AD, though others suppose it to have taken place somewhat later. Among the Jews thus banished from Rome were Aquila and Priscilla with whom Paul became associated at Corinth (Ac 18:2). With the reign of Claudius is also associated the famine which was foretold by Agabus (Ac 11:28). Classical writers also report that the reign of Claudius was, from bad harvest or other causes, a period of general distress and scarcity over the whole world (Dio LX, 11; Suet. Claud. xviii; Tac. Ann. xi. 4; xiii.43; see Mommsen, Provinces of the Roman Empire, chapter ix; and Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul, I).

J. Hutchison

CLAUDIUS LYSIAS

klo’-di-us lis’-i-as (Klaudios Lysias): A chief captain who intervened when the Jews sought to do violence to Paul at Jerusalem (Ac 21:31; 24:22). Lysias, who was probably a Greek by birth (compare Ac 21:37), and who had probably assumed the Roman forename Claudius (Ac 23:26) when he purchased the citizenship (Ac 22:28), was a military tribune or chiliarch (i.e. leader of 1,000 men) in command of the garrison stationed in the castle overlooking the temple at Jerusalem. Upon learning of the riot instigated by the Asiatic Jews, he hastened down with his soldiers, and succeeded in rescuing Paul from the hands of the mob. As Paul was the apparent malefactor, Lysias bound him with two chains, and demanded to know who he was, and what was the cause of the disturbance. Failing amid the general tumult to get any satisfactory reply, he conducted Paul to the castle, and there questioned him as to whether he was the "Egyptian," an postor that had lately been defeated by Felix (Josephus, BJ, II, xiii, 5; Ant, XX, viii, 6). Upon receiving the answer of Paul that he was a "Jew of Tarsus," he gave him permission to address the people from the stairs which connected the castle and the temple. As the speech of Paul had no pacifying effect, Lysias purposed examining him by scourging; but on learning that his prisoner was a Roman citizen, he desisted from the attempt and released him from his bonds. The meeting of the Sanhedrin which Lysias then summoned also ended in an uproar, and having rescued Paul with difficulty he conducted him back to the castle. The news of the plot against the life of one whom he now knew to be a Roman citizen decided for Lysias that he could not hope to cope alone with so grave a situation. He therefore dispatched Paul under the protection of a bodyguard to Felix at Caesarea, along with a letter explaining the circumstances (Ac 23:26-30. The genuineness of this letter has been questioned by some, but without sufficient reason.) In this letter he took care to safeguard his own conduct, and to shield his hastiness in binding Paul. There is evidence (compare Ac 24:22) that Lysias was also summoned to Caesarea at a later date to give his testimony, but no mention is made of his arrival there. It is probable, however, that he was among the chief captains who attended the trial of Paul before King Agrippa and Festus (compare Ac 25:22). For the reference to him in the speech of Tertullus (see Ac 24:7 the Revised Version, margin), see TERTULLUS.

C. M. Kerr

CLAW

klo (parcah, literally, "hoof"): One of the marks of a "clean" animal is stated thus: "Every beast that parteth the hoof, and cleaveth the cleft into two claws, ye shall eat" (De 14:6 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "hath the hoof cloven in two"). See CHEW; CUD. the King James Version uses the word "claws" where the Revised Version (British and American) supplies "hoofs" in Zec 11:16, "and will tear their hoofs in pieces," as the sheep are being overdriven. In the only other passage containing the word (Da 4:33) there is no Hebrew equivalent in the original—"his nails like birds’ (claws)."

CLAY

kla (chomer, chacaph, TiT, meleT, ‘abhi, ma‘abheh, abhTiT; pelos, "wet clay," "mud"): True clay, which is a highly aluminous soil, is found in certain localities in Palestine, and is used in making pottery. The Hebrew and Greek words, as well as the English "clay," are, however, used loosely for any sticky mud. In making mud bricks, true clay is not always used, but ordinary soil is worked up with water and mixed with straw, molded and left to dry in the sun. Chomer (compare chmar, "slime" or "bitumen") is rendered both "clay" and "mortar." TiT is rendered "clay" or "mire." In Isa 41:25 we have: "He shall come upon rulers as upon mortar (chomer), and as the potter treadeth clay" (TiT). In Na 3:14, "Go into the clay (TiT), and tread the mortar (chomer); make strong the brickkiln" (i.e. make the walls ready to withstand a siege). Chacaph is the clay of the image in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream (Da 2:33 ff). MeleT occurs only in Jer 43:9, where we find: the King James Version, "Take great stones .... and hide them in the clay in the brickkiln"; the Revised Version (British and American), "hide them in mortar in the brickwork"; the Revised Version, margin, "lay them with mortar in the pavement." In Hab 2:6, ‘abhTiT (found only here) is rendered in the King James Version "thick clay," as if from ‘abhi and TiT, but the Revised Version (British and American) has "pledges," referring the word to the root ‘abhaT, "to give a pledge." In 1Ki 7:46, ma‘abheh ha-’adhamah (compare 2Ch 4:17, ‘abhi ha-’adhamah) is the compact or clayey soil in the plain of Jordan between Succoth and Zarethan, in which Hiram cast the vessels of brass for Solomon’s temple. In Joh 9:6,11,14, Thayer gives "made mud of the spittle"; in Ro 9:21, "wet clay."

Alfred Ely Day

CLEAN

klen (Anglo-Saxon cloene, "clear," "pure"): Rendering four Hebrew roots: bar, etc., "purify," "select," "make shining"; zakh, etc., "bright," "clean" "pure"; naqi, "free from," "exempt"; Taher, "clean," "pure," "empty," "bright" (?) the principal root, rendered "clean" 80 times (the King James Version); occurring in all its forms in various renderings about 200 times; also one Greek root, katharos, etc., akin to castus, "chaste," "free from admixture or adhesion of anything that soils, adulterates, corrupts" (Thayer’s Lexicon). The physical, ritual, ethical, spiritual, figurative uses continually overlap, especially the last four.

1. Physical:

The physical use is infrequent: "Wash .... with snow water, and make my hands never so clean" (zakhakh, Job 9:30; figurative also); "clean provender" (hamits, the Revised Version (British and American) "savory"; the Revised Version, margin "salted"); "Cleanse .... inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also" (katharos, Mt 23:26); "arrayed in fine linen, clean (katharon) and white" (Re 19:8; the American Standard Revised Version "bright and pure").

2. Ceremonial:

The principal use was the ceremonial; applied to persons, places or things, "undefiled," "not causing defilement," or "from which defilement has just been removed"; Taher, almost exclusively ceremonial, being the chief Hebrew root. Katharos (New Testament), or derivatives, has this use clearly in Mr 1:44; Lu 5:14: "Offer for thy cleansing the things which Moses," etc.; Heb 9:13,12,23: "the cleanness of the flesh," etc. "Clean" is applied to animals and birds: "of every clean beast" (Ge 7:2); "of all clean birds" (De 14:11); (for list of unclean creatures see Le 14-20); to places: "Carry forth .... unto a clean place" (Le 4:12); to buildings: "Make atonement for the house; and it shall be clean" (Le 14:53); to persons: "A clean person shall take hyssop" (Nu 19:18); to clothing: "garment .... washed the second time, and shall be clean" (Le 13:58); and to objects of all sorts, free or freed from defilement.

3. Ethical or Spiritual:

The ethical or spiritual meaning, either directly or figuratively, is found in the Old Testament chiefly in Job, Psalms, the Prophets, whose interest is ethico-religious, rather than ritual, but the predominant uses are found in the New Testament: "Cleanse yourselves (barar) ye that bear the vessels of Yahweh" (Isa 52:11); "How can he be clean (zakhah) that is born of a woman?" (Job 25:4) (principally moral, perhaps with allusion to the ceremonial defilement of childbirth); "The fear of Yahweh is clean" (Ps 19:9), that is, the religion of Yahweh is morally undefiled, in contrast to heathen religions; "He that hath clean (naqi) hands, and a pure heart" (Ps 24:4); "Purify me with hyssop, and I shall be clean" (Taher, Ps 51:7); "Therefore said he, Ye are not all clean" (katharos, Joh 13:11). Here, as in Ps 51:7 and many others, the ritual furnishes a figure for the spiritual, illustrating the Divine purpose in the ritual, to impress, prefigure and prepare for the spiritual. A somewhat similar figurative moral use is found in Ac 18:6: "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean" (katharos, "guiltless," "unstained").

See also UNCLEANNESS; PURIFICATION; DEFILEMENT.

Clean.—Adverb (in one case adjective): "utterly," "wholly"; usually rendering an intensive use of the Hebrew verb as Joe 1:7: "He hath made it clean bare" (lit. "stripping he will strip"); Zec 11:17: "Arm .... clean dried up"; Isa 24:19 the King James Version :"Earth is clean dissolved." Twice it renders a principal verb: Jos 3:17: "Passed clean over the Jordan" (literally, "finished with regard to J."); Le 23:22 King James Version: "Shall not make a clean riddance" (literally, "shall not finish the corners"; the American Standard Revised Version "shalt not wholly reap"). Once it renders a noun: Ps 77:8: "Is his lovingkindness clean gone for ever?" ("end," he-'aphec, "has his lovingkindness come to an end?"); and once an adverb "clean (ontos, "actually," "really") escaped" (2Pe 2:18); but the American Standard Revised Version, following the reading "oligos," "a little," "scarcely," renders "just escaping."

Philip Wendell Crannell

CLEANSE

klenz: "Make clean," "purify" being a frequent rendering of the original. It is found often (American

Revised Version) instead of "purge," "purify" (the King James Version), renders nearly the same roots, and has the same overlapping phases, as "clean."

1. Physical:

Physical cleansing, often figuratively used: "Stripes that wound cleanse away (tamriq) evil" (Pr 20:30); "A hot wind .... not to winnow, nor to cleanse" (barar, Jer 4:11); "Straightway his leprosy was cleansed" (katharizo, Mt 8:3).

2. Ceremonial:

In the ceremonial sense:

(1) With a very strong religious aspect: to purify from sin by making atonement (chaTe); e.g. the altar, by the sin offering (Ex 29:36); the leprous house (Le 14:48-53); the people, by the offering of the Day of Atonement (Le 16:30); the sanctuary, by the blood of the sin offering (Eze 45:18 ff).

(2) To expiate (kaphar, "cover," "hide"); sin (in this case blood-guiltiness): "The land cannot be cleansed of the blood" (the King James Version Nu 35:33; the American Standard Revised Version "no expiation can be made for the land").

(3) To remove ceremonial defilement, the principal use, for which the chief root is Taher: "Take the Levites .... and cleanse them" (Nu 8:6); "and she shall be cleansed (after childbirth) from the fountain of her blood" (Le 12:7); "Cleanse it, and hallow it (the altar) from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel" (Le 16:19), etc. This use is infrequent in the New Testament, except figuratively. Clear instances are Mr 1:44: "Offer for thy cleansing (katharismos) .... for a testimony unto them" (also Lu 5:14); Heb 9:22,23: "necessary therefore that the copies of the things in the heavens should be cleansed with these." Physical, ritual, and figurative uses are combined in Mt 23:25: "Ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter." Ac 10:15: "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common" uses the figure of the ritual to declare the complete abolition of ceremonial defilement and hence, of ceremonial cleansing. For the elaborate system of ceremonial cleansing see especially Le 12-17, also articles UNCLEANNESS; PURIFICATION. Its principal agencies were water, alone, as in minor or indirect defilements, like those produced by contact with the unclean (Le 15:5-18, etc.); or combined with a sin offering and burnt offering, as with a woman after childbirth (Le 12:6-8); fire, as with Gentile booty (Nu 31:23; by water, when it would not endure the fire\); the ashes of a red heifer without spot, mingled with running water, for those defiled by contact with the dead (Nu 19:2 ff). For the complex ceremonial in cases of leprosy, combining water, cedar, hyssop, crimson thread, the blood and flight of birds, the trespass offering, sin offering, burnt offering, see Le 14. Blood, the vehicle and emblem of life, plays a large part in the major cleansings, in which propitiation for sin, as well as the removal of ceremonial defilement, is prominent, as of the temple, altar, etc.: "According to the law, I may almost say, all things are cleansed with blood" (Heb 9:22).

3. Ethical and Spiritual:

In the ethical and spiritual sense, using the symbolism chiefly of 2. This embodies two phases: (1) the actual removal of sin by the person's own activity, "Wherewith shall a young man cleanse (zakhah) his way?" (Ps 119:9); "Cleanse your hands, ye sinners" (Jas 4:8); "Let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement" (2Co 7:1);

(2) God's removal of the guilt and power of sin, as, by discipline or punishment: "He cleanseth it" (Joh 15:2, the King James Version "purgeth"); "I have cleansed thee" (Eze 24:13); or in forgiveness, justification, sanctification. In these latter cases the exculpatory idea is sometimes the prominent, although the other is not absent: "I will cleanse (Taher) them from all their iniquity, whereby they have sinned against me; and I will pardon aH their iniquities" (Jer 33:8); "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse (Taher, "declare me clean") me from my sin" (Ps 51:2). "Cleanse (naqqeh; the American Standard Revised Version "clear") thou me from hidden faults" (Ps 19:12), while formally to be understood "hold innocent," really connotes forgiveness. In Eph 5:26, it is hard to determine whether pardon or God-given holiness is predominant: "That he might sanctify it (the church), having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word." In 1Jo 1:7, the sanctificatory meaning seems almost wholly to absorb the other: "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us ("is purifying, sanctifying") from all sin"; but in 1Jo 1:9 it is again hard to determine the predominance: "He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sin, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." The uncertainty lies in that the second clause may not, as in our speech, add a distinct idea, but may be Hebrew synonymous parallelism. Perhaps it is not wise to seek too curiously to disentangle the two ideas, since they cannot be separated. God never "clears" where he has not begun to "cleanse," and never "cleanses" by the Spirit without "clearing" through the blood.

Philip Wendell Crannell

CLEAR; CLEARNESS

kler, kler'-nes (bar; diablepo): Equivalent of several Hebrew and Greek words for bright, unclouded, shining without obstruction, distinct, brilliant; "clearer than the noon-day" (Job 11:17): "clear as the sun" (So 6:10); "clear shining after rain" (2Sa 23:4); "clear heat in sunshine" (Isa 18:4); "clear as crystal" (Re 21:11). Adverb, "clearly," for distinctly (Mt 7:5; Mr 8:25; Ro 1:20). Noun, "clearness," for brilliancy, in Ex 24:10, "as the very heaven for clearness."

From this physical, it is applied, in a moral sense, to character, as spotless and free from guilt, or charge, or obligation "from oath" (Ge 24:8); "from transgression" (Ps 19:13). Hence, the verb "to clear" means juridically to declare or prove innocent, to vindicate (Ge 44:16; Ex 34:7; Nu 14:18; compare hagnos, 2Co 7:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "pure") "Be clear when thou judgest" (Ps 51:4) refers to the proof and vindication of the righteousness of God.

H. E. Jacobs

CLEAVE

klev: Is used in the Bible in two different senses:

(1) baqa‘ "to split," or "to rend." We are told that Abraham "clave the wood for the burnt-offering" (Ge 22:3), and that "they clave the wood of the cart" (1Sa 6:14). The Psalmist speaks of Yahweh cleaving fountain and flood (Ps 74:15), and the plowman cleaving the earth (Ps 141:7). For other examples see Jud 15:19; Ec 10:9; Ps 78:15; Hab 3:9.

(2) dabhaq; kollao, "to adhere to," or "to join one’s self to." This meaning is the reverse of the preceding. The Psalmist speaks of his tongue cleaving to the roof of his mouth (Ps 137:6). We are told that a man should cleave unto his wife (Ge 2:24; Mt 19:5). It is said that Ru clave unto her mother-in-law (Ru 1:14), and that certain men clave unto Paul (Ac 17:34; compare Ac 4:23; 11:23 margin).

"Cleave" is also used in this sense to describe one’s adherence to principles. Paul admonished the Romans to cleave to that which is good (Ro 12:9).

A. W. Fortune

CLEFT; CLIFF; CLIFT

kleft, klif, klift: The first of these words, from cleave, "to split," is a crevice or narrow opening, as "of the ragged rocks" (Isa 2:21); "under the clefts of the rocks" (Isa 57:5). "Clift" is an obsolete form of cleft, found in the King James Version Ex 33:22; Isa 57:5, but not in the Revised Version (British and American). "Cliff," an abrupt, precipitous, towering rock, is not in the Revised Version (British and American), but is found in the King James Version 2Ch 20:16, the Revised Version (British and American) "ascent," Job 30:6.

CLEMENCY

klem’-en-si (epietkeia, "fairness," "sweet reasonableness," Ac 24:4): The Greek word is rendered elsewhere "gentleness," 2Co 10:1; Tit 3:2, "meekhess"; Jas 3:17; 1Pe 2:18.

CLEMENT

klem’-ent (Klemes, "mild"): A fellow-worker with Paul at Philippi, mentioned with especial commendation in Php 4:3. The name being common, no inference can be drawn from this statement as to any identity with the author of the Epistle to the Corinthians published under this name, who was also the third bishop of Rome. The truth of this supposition ("it cannot be called a tradition," Donaldson, The Apostolical Fathers, 120), although found in Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius and Jerome, can neither be

proved nor disproved. Even Roman Catholic authorities dispute it (article "Clement," Catholic Cyclopaedia, IV, 13). The remoteness between the two in time and place is against it; "a wholly uncritical view" (Cruttwell, Literary History of Early Christianity, 31).

H. E. Jacobs

CLEOPAS

kle’-o-pas (Kleopas, "renowned father"): One of the two disciples whom Jesus met on the way to Emmaus (Lu 24:18). The name is a contraction of Cleopatros, not identical with Clopas of Joh 19:25.

See also ALPHAEUS; CLOPAS.

CLEOPATRA

kle-o-pa’-tra (Kleopatra, "from a famous father"): A daughter of Ptolemy VI (Philometor) and of Queen Cleopatra, who was married first to Alexander Balas 150 BC (1 Macc 10:58; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iv, 1) and was afterward taken from him by her father and given to Demetrius Nicator on the invasion of Syria by the latter (1 Macc 11:12; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iv, 7). Alexander was killed in battle against the joint forces of Ptolemy and Demetrius while Demetrius was in captivity in Parthia. Cleopatra married his brother Antiochus VII (Sidetes), who in the absence of Demetrius had gained possession of the Syrian throne (137 BC). She was probably privy (Appian, Syriac., 68) to the murder of Demetrius on his return to Syria 125 BC, but Josephus (Ant., XIII, ix, 3) gives a different account of his death. She afterward murdered Seleucus, her eldest son by Nicator, who on his father’s death had taken possession of the government without her consent. She attempted unsuccessfully to poison her second son by Nicator, Antiochus VIII (Grypus), for whom she had secured the succession, because he was unwilling to concede to her what she considered her due Share of power. She was herself poisoned (120 BC) by the draught which she had prepared for their son (Justin 39). She had also a son by Antiochus VII (Sidetes Antiochus Cyzicenus), who took his name from the place in which he was educated. He was killed in battle 95 BC. The name Cleopatra was borne by many Egyptian princesses, the first of whom was daughter of Antiochus III and was married to Ptolemy V (Epiphanes) 193 BC.

J. Hutchison

CLEOPHAS

kle’-o-fas.

See CLOPAS.

CLERK

See TOWN CLERK.

CLIFF; CLIFT

See CLEFT.

CLOAK; CLOKE

klok, (me‘il, simlah, etc.; himation, stole, etc.): "Cloke" is retained in the English Revised Version, as in the King James Version, instead of modern "cloak" (American Revised Version). In the Old Testament, me’il (compare New Testament himation) uniformly stands for the ordinary upper garment worn over the coat (kethoneth). In Mt 5:40 both "cloak" and "coat" are mentioned together; compare Lu 6:29. In size and material the "cloak" differed according to age and sex, class and occupation, but in shape it was like our mantle or shawl. It might be sewed up to have the surplice form of the robe of the Ephod (Ex 39:23), or be worn loose and open like a Roman toga, the Arabic Abaa, or the Geneva gown. This is the "garment" referred to in Ge 39:12; Ex 22:26; De 24:13; "the robe" that Jonathan "stripped himself of" and gave to David (1Sa 18:4); "the robe" of Saul, "the robe" in which it is said the "old man" (Samuel) was "covered" (1Sa 28:14); and in the New Testament "the best robe" put on the returning prodigal (Lu 15:22). Paul’s "cloak" that he left at Troas (2Ti 4:13; phailones, Latin, paenula, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek phelones), it has been suggested, "may have been a light mantle like a cashmere dust-cloak, in which the books and parchment were wrapped"

(HDB, under the word).

Figuratively: The word lent itself easily and naturally to figurative uses. We find Paul (1Th 2:5) disclaiming using "a cloak of covetousness" (compare 1Pe 2:16) and Jesus (Joh 15:22) saying, "Now they have no excuse ("cloak") for their sin." Some such usage seems common to all languages; compare English "palliate."

See DRESS.

George B. Eager

CLOD

In Job 7:5 (gish, gush, "a mass of earth"), "clods of dust," the crust of his sores, formed by the dry, swollen skin—a symptom of leprosy, though not peculiar to it. In Job 21:33; 38:38 (reghebh, "a soft clod," "lump of clay"), "The clods of the valley shall be sweet unto him," "The clods cleave fast together." In Joe 1:17 (meghraphah, "a furrow," "something thrown off" (by the spade)), "The seeds rot (m "shrivel") under their clods."

Figurative: "Jacob shall break his clods" (Ho 10:11), i.e. "must harrow for himself," used figuratively of spiritual discipline (compare Isa 28:24 the King James Version).

M. O. Evans

CLOPAS; CLEOPHAS

klo’-pas (Klopas): The former in the Revised Version (British and American), the latter in the King James Version, of Joh 19:25, for the name of the husband of one of the women who stood by the cross of Christ. Upon the philological ground of a variety in pronunciation of the Hebrew root, sometimes identified with Alpheus, the father of James the Less. Said by tradition to have been the brother of Joseph, the husband of Mary; see BRETHREN OF THE LORD. Distinguished from Cleopas, a Greek word, while Clopas is Aramaic

CLOSE

kloz, klos verb, adjective and adverb, (kacah, caghar; kammuo): Other words are charah, "to burn"; "Shalt thou reign, because thou closest thyself in cedar?" (Jer 22:15 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) "strivest to excel in cedar," margin "viest with the cedar"; atsam, "to harden"; "Yahweh has closed your eyes" (Isa 29:10); gadhar, "to hedge" or "wall up" (Am 9:11); ‘atsar, "to restrain" (Ge 20:18). In Lu 4:20, ptusso, "to fold up." the Revised Version (British and American) has "was closed," margin "is opened," for "are open" (Nu 24:3,15), "closed" for "narrow" or "covered" (Eze 40:16; 41:16,26). To "keep close," sigao (Lu 9:36), the Revised Version (British and American) "held their peace." We have also "kept close" (the Revised Version (British and American) Nu 5:13; Hebrew cathar, "to hide"); also Job 28:21; "kept himself close," the Revised Version, margin "shut up" (1Ch 12:1); "close places," micgereth (2Sa 22:46; Ps 18:45 =" castles or holds shut in with high walls").

W. L. Walker

CLOSET

kloz’-et: Is the rendering in the King James Version of

(1) chuppah, and

(2) tameion, also tamieion.

Chuppah, derived from chaphah, "to cover," was probably originally the name of the tent specially set apart for the bride, and later (Joe 2:16) used for the bride’s chamber. The word tameion, originally storeroom (compare Lu 12:24, the King James Version "storehouse"; the Revised Version (British and

American) "storechamber"), but since for safety it was the inner rooms of the Hebrew house which were used for storage purposes, the word came to mean inner room, as in Mt 6:6; Lu 12:3, in both the King James Version "closet" (compare Mt 24:26, the King James Version "secret chamber"). In all cases the Revised Version (British and American) uses "inner chamber."

See also HOUSE.

David Foster Estes

CLOTH; CLOTHING

kloth, kloth'-ing.

See DRESS.

CLOTHED UPON

klothd, (ependuo, "to put on over" another garment): Used only in 2Co 5:2,4. In 5:4 in contrast with unclothed, compare 1Co 15:53 f, in which the idea of putting on, as a garment, is expressed of incorruption and immortality. The meaning here is very subtle and difficult of interpretation. In all probability Paul thinks of a certain envelopment of his physical mortal body even in this life ("in this we groan," i.e. in this present body), hence, the force of the prefixed preposition. The body itself was regarded by the philosophers of his day as a covering of the soul, and hence, it was to be clothed upon and at the same time transformed by the superimposed heavenly body. Ependutes, an outer garment, is used several times in Septuagint for me'il, an upper garment or robe (compare Joh 21:7).

Walter G. Clippinger

CLOTHES, RENDING OF

klothz, (keri'ath beghadhim): This term is used to describe an ordinary tear made in a garment. Samuel's skirt was rent when Saul laid hold upon it (1Sa 15:27). Jesus spoke about a rent being made in a garment (Mt 9:16). The term is also used to describe a Hebrew custom which indicated deep sorrow. Upon the death of a relative or important personage, or when there was a great calamity, it was customary for the Hebrews to tear their garments. Reuben rent his clothes when he found that Joseph had been taken from the pit (Ge 37:29). The sons of Jacob rent their clothes when the cup was found in Benjamin's sack (Ge 44:13). A messenger came to Eli with his clothes rent to tell of the taking of the ark of God and of the death of his two sons (1Sa 4:12). David rent his garments when he heard that Absalom had slain his brothers (2Sa 13:31). See also 2Sa 15:32; 2Ki 18:37; Isa 36:22; Jer 41:5. Rending of clothes was also an expression of indignation. The high priest rent his garment when Jesus spoke what he thought was blasphemy (Mt 26:65).

See also MOURNING.

A. W. Fortune

CLOUD

kloud (‘anan, ‘abh; nephele, nephos):

I. Clouds in Palestine.

In the Bible few references are found of particular clouds or of clouds in connection with the phenomena of the weather conditions. The weather in Palestine is more even and has less variety than that in other lands. It is a long, narrow country with sea on the West and desert on the East. The wind coming from the West is always moist and brings clouds with it. If the temperature over the land is low enough the clouds will be condensed and rain will fall, but if the temperature is high, as in the five months of summer, there can be no rain even though clouds are seen. As a whole the winter is cloudy and the summer clear.

1. Rain Clouds:

In the autumn rain storms often arise suddenly from the sea, and what seems to be a mere haze, "as small as a man’s hand," such as Gehazi saw (1Ki 18:44) over the sea, within a few hours becomes the black storm cloud pouring down torrents of rain (1Ki 18:45). Fog is almost unknown and there is very seldom an overcast, gloomy day. The west and southwest winds bring rain (Lu 12:54).

2. Disagreeable Clouds:

In the months of April, May and September a hot east wind sometimes rises from the desert and brings with it a cloud of dust which fills the air and penetrates everything. In the summer afternoons, especially in the month of August, on the seacoast there is apt to blow up from the South a considerable number of low cirro-stratus clouds which seem to fill the air with dampness, making more oppressive the dead heat of summer. These are doubtless the detested "clouds without water" mentioned in Jude 1:12, and "heat by the shade of a cloud" (Isa 25:5).

II. Figurative Uses.

1. Yahweh’s Presence and Glory:

The metaphoric and symbolic uses of clouds are many, and furnish some of the most powerful figures of Scripture. In the Old Testament, Yahweh’s presence is made manifest and His glory shown forth in a cloud. The cloud is usually spoken of as bright and shining, and it could not be fathomed by man: "Thou

hast covered thyself with a cloud, so that no prayer can pass through" (La 3:44). Yahweh Himself was present in the cloud (Ex 19:9; 24:16; 34:5) and His glory filled the places where the cloud was (Ex 16:10; 40:38; Nu 10:34); "The cloud filled the house of Yahweh" (1Ki 8:10). In the New Testament we often have "the Son of man coming on" or "with clouds" (Mt 24:30; 26:64; Mr 13:26; 14:62; Lu 21:27) and received up by clouds (Ac 1:9). The glory of the second coming is indicated in Re 1:7 for "he cometh with the clouds" and "we that are alive .... shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord" and dwell with Him (1Th 4:17).

2. Pillar of Cloud:

The pillar of cloud was a symbol of God's guidance and presence to the children of Israel in their journeys to the promised land. The Lord appeared in a pillar of cloud and forsook them not (Ne 9:19). They followed the guidance of this cloud (Ex 40:36; Ps 78:14).

3. Bow in Cloud:

The clouds are spoken of in the Old Testament as the symbol of God's presence and care over His people; and so the "bow in the cloud" (Ge 9:13) is a sign of God's protection.

4. Clouds Blot Out:

As the black cloud covers the sky and blots out the sun from sight, so Yahweh promises "to blot out the sins" of Israel (Isa 44:22); Egypt also shall be conquered, "As for her, a cloud shall cover her" (Eze 30:18; compare La 2:1).

5. Transitory:

There is usually a wide difference in temperature between day and night in Palestine. The days axe warm and clouds coming from the sea are often completely dissolved in the warm atmosphere over the land. As the temperature falls, the moisture again condenses into dew and mist over the hills and valleys. As the sun rises the "morning cloud" (Ho 6:4) is quickly dispelled and disappears entirely. Job compares the passing of his prosperity to the passing clouds (Job 30:15).

6. God's Omnipotence and Man's Ignorance:

God "bindeth up the waters in his thick clouds" (Job 26:8) and the "clouds are the dust of his feet" (Na 1:3). Yahweh "commands the clouds that they rain no rain" (Isa 5:6), but as for man, "who can number the clouds?" (Job 38:37); "Can any understand the spreadings of the clouds?" (Job 36:29); "Dost thou know the balancings of the clouds, the wondrous works of him who is perfect in knowledge?" (Job 37:16). See BALANCINGS. "He that regardeth the clouds shall not reap" (Ec 11:4), for it is God who controls the clouds and man cannot fathom His wisdom. "Thick clouds are a covering to him" (Job 22:14).

7. Visions:

Clouds are the central figure in many visions. Ezekiel beheld "a stormy wind .... out of the north, a great cloud" (Eze 1:4), and John saw "a white cloud; and on the cloud one sitting" (Re 14:14). See also Da 7:13; Re 10:1; 11:12.

8. The Terrible and Unpleasant:

The cloud is also the symbol of the terrible and of destruction. The day of Yahweh's reckoning is called the "day of clouds" (Eze 30:3) and a day of "clouds and thick darkness" (Zec 1:15). The invader is expected to "come up as clouds" (Jer 4:13). Joe 2:2 foretells the coming of locusts as "a day of clouds and thick darkness" which is both literal and figurative. Misfortune and old age are compared to "the cloudy and dark day" (Eze 34:12) and "the clouds returning after rain" (Ec 12:2).

9. Various Other Figures:

Clouds are used in connection with various other figures. Rapidity of motion, "these that fly as a cloud" (Isa 60:8). As swaddling clothes of the newborn earth (Job 38:9); indicating great height (Job 20:6) and figurative in Isa 14:14, "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds," portraying the self-esteem of Babylon. "A morning without clouds" is the symbol of righteousness and justice (2Sa 23:4); partial knowledge and hidden glory (Le 16:2; Ac 1:9; Re 1:7).

Alfred H. Joy

CLOUD, PILLAR OF

See CLOUD, II, 2; PILLAR OF CLOUD.

CLOUT

klout: As substantive (ha-cechabhoth) a patch or piece of cloth, leather, or the like, a rag, a shred, or fragment. Old "cast clouts and old rotten rags" (Jer 38:11,12 the King James Version). As verb (Tala')" to bandage," "patch," or mend with a clout. "Old shoes and clouted (the American Standard Revised Version "patched") upon their feet" (Jos 9:5); compare Shakespeare, Cym., IV, 2: "I thought he slept, And put my clouted brogues from off my feet"; Milton, Comus: "And the dull swain treads on it daily with his clouted shoon."

CLOVEN

klo'-v'-n: In the Old Testament, represented by a participle from shaca, "to split," and applied to beasts

that divide the hoof (Le 11:3; De 14:7). Beasts with hoofs completely divided into two parts, that were also ruminant, were allowed the Israelites as food; see CUD; HOOF. In the New Testament, for diamerizomenai, in Ac 2:3 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "tongues parting asunder," i.e. "bifurcated flames." Another explanation found in the Revised Version, margin applies the word, not to tongues, but to the multitude, "parting among them," or "distributing themselves among them," settling upon the head of each disciple.

H. E. Jacobs

CLUB

klub.

See ARMOR, III, 1; SHEPHERD; STAFF.

CLUSTER

klus’-ter:

(1) ‘eshkol; compare proper name VALE OF ESHCOL. (which see), from root meaning "to bind together." A cluster or bunch of grapes (Ge 40:10; Nu 13:23; Isa 65:8; So 7:8; Mic 7:1, etc.); a cluster of henna flowers (So 1:14); a cluster of dates (So 7:7). "Their grapes are grapes of gall, their clusters are bitter." (De 32:32).

(2) botrus, "gather the clusters of the vine of the earth" (Re 14:18).

The "cluster of raisins" (tsimmuqim) of 1Sa 25:18; 30:12, should rather be "raisin cakes" or "dried raisins."

E. W. G. Masterman

CNIDUS

ni’-dus, kni’-dus (Knidos, "age"): A city of Caria in the Roman province of Asia, past which, according to Ac 27:7, Paul sailed. At the Southwest corner of Asia Minor there projects for 90 miles into the sea a long, narrow peninsula, practically dividing the Aegean from the Mediterranean. It now bears the name of Cape Crio. Ships sailing along the southern coast of Asia Minor here turn northward as they round the point. Upon the very end of the peninsula, and also upon a small island off its point was the city of Cnidus. The island which in ancient times was connected with the mainland by a causeway is now joined to it by a sandy bar. Thus were formed two harbors, one of which could be closed by a chain. Though Cnidus was in Caria, it held the rank of a free city. There were Jews here as early as the 2nd

century BC.

The ruins of Cnidus are the only objects of interest on the long peninsula, and as they may be reached by land only with great difficulty, few travelers have visited them; they may, however, be reached more easily by boat. The nearest modern village is Yazi Keui, 6 miles away. The ruins of Cnidus are unusually interesting, for the entire plan of the city may easily be traced. The sea-walls and piers remain. The acropolis was upon the hill in the western portion of the town; upon the terraces below stood the public buildings, among which were two theaters and the odeum still well preserved. The city was especially noted for its shrine of Venus and for the statue of that goddess by Praxiteles. Here in 1875-78 Sir C. Newton discovered the statue of Demeter, now in the British Museum. See also the Aphrodite of Cnidus in the South Kensington Museum, one of the loveliest statues in the world. From here also came the huge Cnidian lion. The vast necropolis West of the ruins contains tombs of every size and shape, and from various ages.

E. J. Banks

COAL

kol (pecham, "charcoal"; compare Arabic fachm, "charcoal"; gacheleth, "burning coal" or "hot ember"; compare Arabic jacham, "to kindle"; shechor, "a black coal" (La 4:8); compare Arabic shachchar, "soot" or "dark-colored sandstone"; retseph (1Ki 19:6), and ritspah (= Rizpah) (Isa 6:6), margin "a hot stone"; compare resheph, "a flame" (So 8:6; Hab 3:5); anthrax, "a live coal" (Ro 12:20) (= gacheleth in Pr 25:22); anthrakia, "a live coal" (Joh 18:18; 21:9)): There is no reference to mineral coal in the Bible. Coal, or more properly lignite, of inferior quality, is found in thin beds (not exceeding 3 ft.) in the sandstone formation (see GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE, under Nubian Sandstone), but there is no evidence of its use in ancient times. Charcoal is manufactured in a primitive fashion which does not permit the conservation of any by-products. A flat, circular place (Arabic beidar, same name as for a threshing-floor) 10 or 15 ft. in diameter is prepared in or conveniently near to the forest. On this the wood, to be converted into charcoal, is carefully stacked in a dome-shaped structure, leaving an open space in the middle for fine kindlings. All except the center is first covered with leaves, and then with earth. The kindlings in the center are then fired and afterward covered in the same manner as the rest. While it is burning or smoldering it is carefully watched, and earth is immediately placed upon any holes that may be formed in the covering by the burning of the wood below. In several days, more or less, according to the size of the pile, the wood is converted into charcoal and the heap is opened. The charcoal floor is also called in Arabic mashcharah, from shachchar, "soot"; compare Hebrew shechor. The characteristic odor of the mashcharah clings for months to the spot.

In Ps 120:4, there is mention of "coals of juniper," the Revised Version, margin "broom," rothem. This is doubtless the Arabic retem, Retama roetam, Forsk., a kind of broom which is abundant in Judea and Moab. Charcoal from oak wood, especially Quercus coccifera, L., Arabic sindyan, is much preferred to other kinds, and fetches a higher price.

In most of the passages where English versions have "coal," the reference is not necessarily to charcoal, but may be to coals of burning wood. Pecham in Pr 26:21, however, seems to stand for charcoal: " As coals are to hot embers, and wood to fire, So is a contentious man to inflame strife." The same may be true of pecham in Isa 44:12 and Isa 54:16; also of shechor in La 4:8.

Alfred Ely Day

COAST

kost (gebhul, etc., "boundary"; compare gebhal, "mountain" and Arabic jebel, "mountain"; chebhel, literally, "a rope"; compare Arabic chabl (Jos 19:29 the King James Version; Zec 2:5,6,7); choph, literally, "that which is washed"; compare Arabic chaffet (Jos 9:1 the King James Version; Eze 25:16); paralios, literally, "by the sea" (Lu 6:17)): "Coast" (from Latin costa, "rib" or "side") in the sense of "seacoast," occurs but a few times in the Bible. In nearly all the many passages where the King James Version has "coast," the Revised Version (British and American) correctly has "border," i.e. "boundary," translating gebhul, etc.; in Ac 27:2 the American Standard Revised Version, "coast" is the translation of topos, literally, "place." That the seacoast is but seldom mentioned arises naturally from the fact that, while the promised land extended to the sea, the coast was never effectively occupied by the Israelites. RVm in a number of places renders ‘i English Versions of the Bible "isle" or "island" (which see), by "coastland," e.g. Isa 11:11; 23:6; 24:15; 59:18; Jer 25:22; Eze 39:6; Da 11:18; Ze 2:11. In Isa 20:6, the King James Version has "isle," the King James Version margin "country," and the Revised Version (British and American) "coast-land." In Jer 47:4, the King James Version has "country," the King James Version marginand the Revised Version (British and American) "isle," and the Revised Version, margin "sea-coast."

See ISLE.

Alfred Ely Day

COAT

kot.

See CLOAK; DRESS, etc.

COAT OF MAIL

mal.

See ARMOR, ARMS; BRIGANDINE.

COCK

kok (alektor; Latin gallus): There is no reference in the Old Testament to domesticated poultry, which was probably first introduced into Judea after the Roman conquest. See CHICKEN. The cock is several times mentioned in the New Testament and always with reference to its habit of crowing in eastern countries with such regularity as to be almost clocklike. The first full salute comes almost to the minute at half-past eleven, the second at half-past one, and the third at dawn. So uniformly do the cocks keep time and proclaim these three periods of night that we find cock-crowing mentioned as a regular division of time: "Watch therefore: for ye know not when the lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrowing, or in the morning" (Mr 13:35). Jesus had these same periods of night in mind when he warned Peter that he would betray Him. Mt 26:34; Lu 22:34; Joh 13:38, give almost identical wording of the warning. But in all his writing Mark was more explicit, more given to exact detail. Remembering the divisions of night as the cocks kept them, his record reads: "And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say into thee, that thou today, even this night, before the cock crow twice, shalt deny me thrice" (Mr 14:30). See CHICKEN. It is hardly necessary to add that the cocks crow at irregular intervals as well as at the times indicated, according to the time of the year and the phase of the moon (being more liable to crow during the night if the moon is at the full), or if a storm threatens, or there is any disturbance in their neighborhood.

Gene Stratton-Porter

COCK-CROWING

kok'-kro-ing (alektorophonia): An indefinite hour of the night between midnight and morning (Mr 13:35), referred to by all the evangelists in their account of Peter's denial (Mt 26:34,74; Mr 14:30; Lu 22:34; Joh 13:38). It is derived from the habit of the cock to crow especially toward morning.

See COCK.

COCKATRICE kok'-a-tris, kok'-a-tris (tsepha'; tsph'oni; Septuagint, basiliskos, "basilisk" (which see), and aspis, "asp" (see ADDER; ASP; SERPENT)): A fabulous, deadly, monster. The name "cockatrice" appears to be a corruption of Latin calcatrix, from calcare, "to tread," calcatrix being in turn a translation of the Greek ichneumon, from ichnos, "track" or "footstep." Herpestes ichneumon, the ichneumon, Pharaoh's rat, or mongoose, a weasel-like animal, is a native of northern Africa and southern Spain. There are also other species, including the Indian mongoose. It preys on rats and snakes, and does not despise poultry and eggs.

Pliny (see Oxford Dictionary, under the word "Cockatrice") relates that the ichneumon darts down the open mouth of the crocodile, and destroys it by gnawing through its belly. In the course of time, as the story underwent changes, the animal was metamorphosed into a water snake, and was confused with the crocodile itself, and also with the basilisk. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, the

cockatrice was believed as late as the 17th century to be produced from a cock's egg and hatched by a serpent, and "to possess the most deadly powers, plants withering at its touch, and men and animals being poisoned by its look. It stood in awe however of the cock, the sound of whose crowing killed it. .... The weasel alone among animals was unaffected by the glance of its evil eye, and attacked it at all times successfully; for when wounded by the monster's teeth it found a ready remedy in rue, the only plant which the cockatrice could not wither." The real ichneumon does kill the most deadly snakes, and has been supposed to resort to a vegetable antidote when bitten. It actually dies however when bitten by a deadly snake, and does not possess a knowledge of herbs, but its extraordinary agility enables it ordinarily to escape injury. It is interesting to see how the changing tale of this creature with its marvelous powers has made a hodge-podge of ichneumon, weasel, crocodile, and serpent.

The Biblical references (the King James Version Isa 11:8; 59:5; Jer 8:17) are doubtless to a serpent, the word "cockatrice," with its medieval implications, having been introduced by the translators of the King James Version.

See SERPENT.

Alfred Ely Day

COCKER

kok'-er (titheneo, "to nurse," "coddle," "pamper"): Occurs only in Ecclesiasticus 30:9 with the meaning "to pamper": "Cocker thy child, and he shall make thee afraid"; so Shakespeare, "a cockered silken wanton"; now seldom used; Jean Ingelow, "Poor folks cannot afford to cocker themselves."

COCKLE

kok'-'-l (King James Version margin "stinking weeds," the Revised Version, margin "noisome weeds"; bo'shah, from Hebrew root ba'ash, "to stink"; batos): "Let thistles grow instead of wheat, and cockle instead of barley" (Job 31:40). On account of the meaning of the Hebrew root we should expect that the reference was rather to repulsive, offensive weeds than to the pretty corn cockle. It is very possible that no particular plant is here intended, though the common Palestinian "stinking" arums have been suggested by Hooker.

CODE OF HAMMURABI

See HAMMURABI, CODE OF.

COELE-SYRIA

se-le-sir'-i-a (the King James Version Celosyria; Koile Suria, "hollow Syria"): So the Greeks after the

time of Alexander the Great named the valley lying between the two mountain ranges, Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. It is referred to in the Old Testament as Biq‘ath ha-Lebhanon, "the valley of Lebanon" (Jos 11:17), a name the echo of which is still heard in el-Buqa‘, the designation applied today to the southern part of the valley. This hollow, which extends about 100 miles in length, is the continuation northward of the Jordan valley. The main physical features are described under LEBANON (which see). The name, however, did not always indicate the same tract of territory. In Strabo (xvi.2) and Ptolemy (v.15), it covers the fertile land between Jebel esh-Sharqy and the desert presided over by Damascus. In 1 Esdras 2:17; 2 Macc 3:8, etc., it indicates the country South and East of Mt. Lebanon, and along with Phoenicia it contributed the whole of the Seleucid dominions which lay South of the river Eleutherus. Josephus includes in Coele-Syria the country East of the Jordan, along with Scythopolis (Beisan) which lay on the West, separated by the river from the other members of the Decapolis (Ant., XIII, xiii, 2, etc.). In XIV, iv, 5, he says that "Pompey committed Coele-Syria as far as the river Euphrates and Egypt to Scaurus." The term is therefore one of some elasticity.

W. Ewing

COFFER

kof’-er (’argaz): A small box such as that in which the Philistines placed their golden mice and other offerings in returning the Ark (1Sa 6:8,11,15).

COFFIN

kof’-in.

See CHEST; BURIAL.

COGITATION

koj-i-ta’-shun, ra‘yon, "the act of thinking or reflecting," as in Da 7:28, "my cogitations much troubled me" (the Revised Version (British and American) "my thoughts").

COHORT

ko’-hort: In the Revised Version, margin of Mt 27:27; Mr 15:16; Joh 18:3,12; Ac 10:1; 21:31; 27:1, the translation of speira (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "band"); the tenth part of a legion; ordinarily about 600 men. In Joh 18 the word seems to be used loosely of a smaller body of soldiers, a detachment, detail.

See ARMY; BAND.

COINS

koinz: There were no coins in use in Palestine until after the Captivity. It is not quite certain whether gold and silver were before that time divided into pieces of a certain weight for use as money or not, but there can be no question of coinage proper until the Persian period. Darius I is credited with introducing a coinage system into his empire, and his were the first coins that came into use among the Jews, though it seems probable that coins were struck in Lydia in the time of Croesus, the contemporary of Cyrus the Great, and these coins were doubtless the model upon which Darius based his system, and they may have circulated to some extent in Babylonia before the return of the Jews. The only coins mentioned in the Old Testament are the Darics (see DARIC), and these only in the Revised Version (British and American), the word "dram" being used in the King James Version (Ezr 2:69; 8:27; Ne 7:70-72). The Jews had no native coins until the time of the Maccabees, who struck coins after gaining their independence about 143-141 BC. These kings struck silver and copper, or the latter, at least (see MONEY), in denominations of shekels and fractions of the shekel, until the dynasty was overthrown by the Romans. Other coins were certainly in circulation during the same period, especially those of Alexander and his successors the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Seleucids of Syria, both of whom bore sway over Palestine before the rise of the Maccabees. Besides these coins there were the issues of some of the Phoenician towns, which were allowed to strike coins by the Persians and the Seleucids. The coins of Tyre and Sidon, both silver and copper, must have circulated largely in Palestine on account of the intimate commercial relations between the Jews and Phoenicians (for examples, see under MONEY). After the advent of the Romans the local coinage was restricted chiefly to the series of copper coins, such as the mites mentioned in the New Testament, the silver denarii being struck mostly at Rome, but circulating wherever the Romans went. The coins of the Herods and the Procurators are abundant, but all of copper, since the Romans did not allow the Jewish rulers to strike either silver or gold coins. At the time of the first revolt (66-70 AD) the Jewish leader, Simon, struck shekels again, or, as some numismatists think, he was the first to do so. But this series was a brief one, lasting between 3 and 4 years only, as Jerusalem was taken by Titus in 70 AD, and this put an end to the existence of the Jewish state. There was another short period of Jewish coinage during the second revolt, in the reign of Hadrian, when Simon Barcochba struck coins with Hebrew legends which indicate his independence of Roman rule. They were of both silver and copper, and constitute the last series of strictly Jewish coins (see MONEY). After this the coins struck in Judea were Roman, as Jerusalem was made a Roman colony.

H. Porter

COL-HOZEH

kol-ho’-ze (kol-chozeh, "all seeing"; Septuagint omits): A man whose son Shallum rebuilt the fountain gate of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemiah (Ne 3:15). The Col-hozeh of Ne 11:5 is probably another man.

COLA

ko’-la.

See CHOLA.

COLD

kold (qor; psuchros (adj.), psuchos (noun)): Palestine is essentially a land of sunshine and warmth.

1. Temperature in Palestine:

The extreme cold of northern latitudes is unknown. January is the coldest month; but the degree of cold in a particular place depends largely on the altitude above the sea. On the seacoast and plain the snow never falls; and the temperature reaches freezing-point, perhaps once in thirty years. In Jerusalem at 2,500 ft. above the sea the mean temperature in January is about 45 degrees F., but the minimum may be as low as 25 degrees F. Snow occasionally falls, but lasts only a short time. On Mt. Hermon and on the Lebanons snow may be found the whole year, and the cold is most intense, even in the summer. In Jericho and around the Dead Sea, 1,292 ft. below sea-level, it is correspondingly hotter, and cold is not known.

2. Provision against Cold:

Cold is of such short duration that no adequate provision is made by the people to protect themselves against the cold. The sun is always bright and warm, and nearly always shines for part of the day, even in winter. After sunset the people wrap themselves up and go to sleep. They prefer to wrap up their heads rather than their feet in order to keep warm. The only means of heating the houses is the charcoal brazier around which as many as possible gather for a little warmth. It is merely a bed of coals in an iron vessel. Peter was glad to avail himself of the little heat of the coals as late as the beginning of April, when the nights are often chilly in Jerusalem: "Having made a fire of coals; for it was cold: .... and Peter also was with them, standing and warming himself" (Joh 18:18). There is no attempt made to heat the whole house. In the cold winter months the people of the mountains almost hibernate. They wrap up their heads in shawls and coverings and only the most energetic venture out: "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the winter" (Pr 20:4, the King James Version "cold"). The peasants and more primitive people of the desert often make a fire in the open or in partial shelter, as in Melita where Paul was cast ashore after shipwreck: "The barbarians .... kindled a fire .... because of the cold" (Ac 28:2).

3. Dread of Cold:

The cold is greatly dreaded because it causes so much actual suffering: "Who can stand before his cold?" (Ps 147:17). The last degree of degradation is to have "no covering in the cold" (Job 24:7).

4. Cold Grateful in Summer:

In the heat of the long summer, the shadow of a rock or the cool of evening is most grateful, and the appreciation of a cup of cold water can easily be understood by anyone who has experienced the burning heat of the Syrian sun: "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country" (Pr 25:25); "cold of snow in the time of harvest" (Pr 25:13), probably with reference to the use of snow (shaved ice) in the East to cool a beverage.

Figurative uses: "The love of the many shall wax cold" (Mt 24:12); "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot" (Re 3:15).

Alfred H. Joy

COLIUS

ko'-li-us (Kolios, 1 Esdras 9:23).

See CALITAS.

COLLAR

kol'-ar, kol'-er:

(1) (neTphah, plural neTphoth, literally, "drops," from naTaph, "to drop"). Jud 8:26 includes neTphoth among the spoils taken from the Midianites and Ishmaelites; the Revised Version (British and American) "pendants," the King James Version "collars." Qimchi at the place suggests "perfume-dropper."

(2) (peh, literally, "mouth"). In Job 30:18 the word is used to indicate the collar band, or hole of a robe, through which the head was inserted. Job, in describing his suffering and writhing, mentions the disfiguring of his garment, and suggests that the whole thing feels as narrow or close-fitting as the neckband, or perhaps that in his fever and pains he feels as if the neckband itself is choking him.

(3) (tsinoq, Jer 29:26, "stocks"; the Revised Version (British and American) "shackles," which see; the Revised Version, margin "collar"). An instrument of torture or punishment.

Nathan Isaacs

COLLECTION

ko-lek'-shun:

(1) In the Old Testament (mas'eth, "something taken up"), used in 2Ch 24:6,9 the King James Version

with reference to the tax prescribed in Ex, 30:12,16; the Revised Version (British and American) "tax."

(2) In the New Testament "collection" is the translation given to logia, found only twice (classical, sulloge). It is used with reference to the collection which Paul took up in the Gentilechurches for the poor Christians in Jerusalem, as, for some reason, perhaps more severe persecutions, that church was especially needy (1Co 16:1,2; verse 2 the King James Version "gatherings"). Other words, such as bounty, contribution, blessing, alms, ministration, are used to indicate this same ministry. Paul seems to have ascribed to it great importance. Therefore, he planned it carefully long in advance; urged systematic, weekly savings for it; had delegates carefully chosen to take it to Jerusalem; and, in spite of dangers, determined himself to accompany them. Evidently he thought it the crowning act of his work in the provinces of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Achaia, for as soon as it was finished he purposed to go to Rome and the West (Ac 24:17; Ro 15:25,26; 2Co 8; 9).

See also COMMUNION. G. H. Trever

COLLEGE

kol'-ej: This is the rendering of the King James Version for Hebrew Mishneh (mishneh, 2Ki 22:14 = 2Ch 34:22; compare Ze 1:10). It is found in the Targum of Jonathan on 2Ki 22:14 and rests on a faulty combination with Mishna, the well-known code of laws of the 2nd century AD. the Revised Version (British and American) renders "second quarter" (of the city); 2Ch 34:22 the King James Version margin, "the school."

COLLOP

kol'-up (pimah): A slice of meat or "fat," the King James Version in Job 15:27, "maketh collops of fat (thick folds of flesh) on his flanks," said of the "wicked man." the American Standard Revised Version reads "(hath) gathered fat upon his loins."

COLONY

kol'-o-ni (kolonia, Greek transliteration of Latin colonia, from the root, col, "cultivate"): The word occurs but once (Ac 16:12) in reference to Philippi in Macedonia. Roman colonies were of three kinds and of three periods:

(1) Those of the early republic, in which the colonists, established in conquered towns to serve the state as guardians of the frontier, were exempt from ordinary military service. They were distinguished as

(a) c. civium Romanorum, wherein the colonists retained Roman citizenship, also called c. maritumae, because situated on the coast, and

(b) c. Latinae, situated inland among the allies (socii), wherein the colonists possessed the ius Latinum, entitling them to invoke the Roman law of property (commercium), but not that of the family (connubium), and received Roman citizenship only when elected to magistracies.

(2) The colonies of the Gracchan period, established in pursuance of the scheme of agrarian reforms, to provide land for the poorer citizens.

(3) After the time of Sulla colonies were founded in Italy by the Republic as a device for granting lands to retiring veterans, who of course retained citizenship. This privilege was appropriated by Caesar and the emperors, who employed it to establish military colonies, chiefly in the provinces, with various rights and internal organizations. To this class belonged Philippi. Partly organized after the great battle of 42 BC, fought in the neighboring plain by Brutus and Cassius, the champions of the fated Republic, and Antonius and Octavian, it was fully established as a colony by Octavian (afterward styled Augustus) after the battle of Actium (31 BC), under the name Colonia Aug. Iul. Philippi or Philippensis. It received the ius Italicum, whereby provincial cities acquired the same status as Italian cities, which possessed municipal self-government and exemption from poll and land taxes.

See CITIZENSHIP; PHILIPPI; ROMAN.

William Arthur Heidel

COLOR; COLORS

kul’-er, kul’-erz: The word translated "color" in the King James Version is ‘ayin, which literally means "eye" or "appearance," and has been so translated in the Revised Version (British and American). In the New Testament the Greek prophasis, has the meaning of pretense or show (Ac 27:30; compare Re 17:4 the King James Version). The references to Joseph’s coat of many colors (Ge 37:3,13,12) and "garments of divers colors" (2Sa 13:18,19) probably do not mean the color of the garment at all, but the form, as suggested in the American Revised Version, margin, "a long garment with sleeves." In Jud 5:30 the word for "dip" or "dye" appears in the original and has been so translated in the American Standard Revised Version. (see DYE). In 1Ch 29:2 riqmah, meaning "variegated," hence, "varicolored," is found. In Isa 54:11, pukh is used. This name was applied to the sulfide of antimony (Arabic kochl) used for painting the eyes. Hence, the American Revised Version, margin rendering "antimony" instead of "fair colors" (see PAINT). In Eze 16:16 Tala’, is found, meaning "covered with pieces" or "spotted," hence, by implication "divers colors."

Although the ancient Hebrews had no specific words for "color," "paint" or "painter," still, as we know, they constantly met with displays of the art of coloring among the Babylonians (Eze 23:14) and Egyptians and the inhabitants of Palestine Pottery, glazed bricks, glassware, tomb walls, sarcophagi, wood and fabrics were submitted to the skill of the colorist. This skill probably consisted in bringing out striking effects by the use of a few primary colors, rather than in any attempt at the blending of shades which characterizes modern coloring. That the gaudy show of their heathen neighbors attracted the

children of Israel is shown by such passages as Jud 8:27; Eze 23:12,16.

Two reasons may be given for the indefiniteness of many of the Biblical references to color.

(1) The origin of the Hebrew people: They had been wandering tribes or slaves with no occasion to develop a color language.

(2) Their religious laws: These forbade expression in color or form (Ex 20:4). Yielding to the attractions of gorgeous display was discouraged by such prophets as Ezekiel, who had sickened of the abominations of the Chaldeans (Eze 23:14,15,16); "And I said unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes" (Eze 20:7).

Indefiniteness of color language is common to oriental literature, ancient and modern. This does not indicate a want of appreciation of color but a failure to analyze and define color effects. The inhabitants of Syria and Palestine today delight in brilliant colors. Bright yellow, crimson, magenta and green are used for adornment with no evident sense of fitness, according to the foreigners' eyes, other than their correspondence with the glaring brightness of the eastern skies. A soapmaker once told the writer that in order to make his wares attractive to the Arabs he colored them a brilliant crimson or yellow. A peasant chooses without hesitation a flaring magenta or yellow or green zun-nar (girdle), rather than one of somber hues. The oriental student in the chemical or physical laboratory often finds his inability to distinguish or classify color a real obstacle. His closest definition of a color is usually "lightish" or "darkish." This is not due to color blindness but to a lack of education, and extends to lines other than color distinctions. The colloquial language of Palestine today is poor in words denoting color, and an attempt to secure from a native a satisfactory description of some simple color scheme is usually disappointing. The harmonious color effects which have come to us from the Orient have been, in the past, more the result of accident (see DYE) than of deliberate purpose, as witness the clashing of colors where modern artificial dyes have been introduced.

This inability of the peoples of Bible lands to define colors is an inheritance from past ages, a consideration which helps us to appreciate the vagueness of many of the Biblical references.

The following color words occur in the King James Version or Revised Version:

(1) bay,

(2) black,

(3) blue,

(4) brown,

(5) crimson,

(6) green,

(7) grey,

(8) hoar,

(9) purple,

(10) red,

(11) scarlet,

(12) sorrel,

(13) vermilion,

(14) white,

(15) yellow.

In addition there are indefinite words indicating mixtures of light and dark:

(a) grisled (grizzled),

(b) ringstraked (ringstreaked),

(c) speckled,

(d) spotted.

(1) Bay or Red:

Bay or red is more properly translated "strong" in the Revised Version (British and American).

(2) Black (Blackish):

Eight different words have been translated "black." They indicate various meanings such as "dusky like the early dawn," "ashen," "swarthy," "moved with passion." Black is applied to hair (Le 13:31; So 5:11; Mt 5:36); to marble or pavement (Es 1:6); to mourning (Job 30:28,30; Jer 14:2); to passion (Jer 8:21 the King James Version; La 5:10); to horses (Zec 6:2,6; Re 6:5); to the heavens (1Ki 18:45; Job 3:5; Pr 7:9

the King James Version; Jer 4:28; Mic 3:6); to the sun (Re 6:12); to the skin (racial) (So 1:5,6); to flocks (Ge 30:32,33,15,40); to brooks because of ice (Job 6:16).

(3) Blue:

Blue (tekheleth, a color from the cerulean mussel): This word was applied only to fabrics dyed with a special blue dye obtained from a shellfish. See DYE. shesh in one passage of the King James Version is translated "blue" (Es 1:6). It is properly translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "white cloth." "Blueness of a wound" (Pr 20:30) is correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "stripes that wound." Blue is applied to the fringes, veil, vestments, embroideries, etc., in the description of the ark and tabernacle (Ex 25 ff; Nu 4:6 f; 15:38); to workers in blue (2Ch 2:7,14; 3:14); to palace adornments (Es 1:6); to royal apparel (Es 8:15; Jer 10:9; Eze 23:6; 27:7,24).

(4) Brown:

The Hebrew word meaning "sunburnt" or "swarthy" is translated "black" in the Revised Version (British and American) (Ge 30:32 ff).

(5) Crimson:

Crimson (karmil): This word is probably of Persian origin and applies to the brilliant dye obtained from a bug. A second word tola‘ath, is also found. Its meaning is the same. See DYE. Crimson is applied to raiment (2Ch 2:7,14; 3:14; Jer 4:30 the King James Version); to sins (Isa 1:18).

(6) Green (Greenish):

This word in the translation refers almost without exception to vegetation. The Hebrew yaraq, literally, "pale," is considered one of the three definite color words used in the Old Testament (see WHITE; RED). The Greek equivalent is chloros; compare English "chlorine." This word occurs in the following vs: Ge 1:30; 9:3; Ex 10:15; Le 2:14 (the King James Version); 23:14 (the King James Version); 2Ki 19:26; Ps 37:2; Isa 15:6; 37:27; Job 39:8; chloros, Mr 6:39; Re 8:7; 9:4. ra‘anan, closely allied in meaning to yaraq, is used to describe trees in the following passages: De 12:2; 1Ki 14:23; 2Ki 16:4; 17:10; 19:26; 2Ch 28:4; Job 15:32; Ps 37:35; 52:8; So 1:16; Isa 57:5; Jer 2:20; 3:6; 11:16; 17:2,8; Eze 6:13; Ho 14:8. In the remaining verses the Hebrew equivalents do not denote color, but the condition of being full of sap, fresh or unripe (compare similar uses in English) (Ge 30:37 (the King James Version); Jud 16:7,8; Ps 23:2; So 2:13; Job 8:16; Eze 17:24; 20:47; Lu 23:31). In Es 1:6 the Hebrew word refers to a fiber, probably cotton, as is indicated by the American Revised Version, margin. Greenish is used to describe leprous spots in Le 13:49; 14:37. The same word is translated "yellow" in Ps 68:13.

(7) Gray:

The Hebrew sebhah, means old age, hence, refers also to the color of the hair in old age (Ge 42:38;

44:29; 44:31; De 32:25; Ps 71:18; Ho 7:9). See Hoar, next paragraph.

(8) Hoar (Hoary):

The same word which in other verses is translated "gray" is rendered "hoar" or "hoary," applying to the hair in 1Ki 2:6,9; Isa 46:4; Le 19:32; Job 41:32; Pr 16:31. Another Hebrew word is translated "hoar" or "hoary," describing "frost" in Ex 16:14; Job 38:29; Ps 147:16.

(9) Purple:

The Hebrew equivalent is ‘argaman; Greek porphura. The latter word refers to the source of the dye, namely, a shell-fish found on the shores of the Mediterranean. See DYE. This color, which varied widely according to the kind of shellfish used and the method of dyeing, was utilized in connection with the adornment of the tabernacle (Ex 25; 26; 27; 28; 35; 36; 38; 39; Nu 4:13). There were workers in purple called to assist in beautifying the temple (2Ch 2:7,14; 3:14). Purple was much used for royal raiment and furnishings (Jud 8:26; Es 1:6; 8:15; So 3:10; Mr 15:17,20; Joh 19:2,5). Purple was typical of gorgeous apparel (Pr 31:22; Jer 10:9; So 7:5; Eze 27:7,16; Lu 16:19; Ac 16:14; Re 17:4; 18:12,16).

(10) Red:

The Hebrew ‘adhom, is from dam, "blood," hence, "bloodlike." This is one of the three distinctive color words mentioned in the Old Testament (see GREEN; WHITE), and is found in most of the references to red. Four other words are used:

(a) chakhlili, probably "darkened" or "clouded" (Ge 49:12; Pr 23:29);

(b) chamar, "to ferment" (Ps 75:8 margin; Isa 27:2 the King James Version);

(c) bahaT, probably "to glisten" (Es 1:6);

(d) purros "firelike" (Mt 16:2,3; Re 6:4; 12:3). Red is applied to dyed skins (Ex 25:5; 26:14; 35:7,23; 36:19; 39: 34); to the color of animals (Nu 19:2; Zec 1:8; 6:2; Re 6:4; 12:3); to the human skin (Ge 25:25; ruddy, 1Sa 16:12; 17:42; So 5:10; La 4:7); to the eyes (Ge 49:12; Pr 23:29); to sores (Le 13); to wine (Ps 75:8 m; Pr 23:31; Isa 27:2 the King James Version); to water (2Ki 3:22); to pavement (Es 1:6); to pottage (Ge 25:30); to apparel (Isa 63:2); to the sky (Mt 16:2,3); to sins (Isa 1:18); to a shield (Na 2:3).

(11) Scarlet:

Scarlet and crimson colors were probably from the same source (see CRIMSON; DYE). tola‘ath, or derivatives have been translated by both "scarlet" and "crimson" (Greek kokkinos). A Chaldaic word for purple has thrice been translated "scarlet" in the King James Version (Da 5:7,16,29). Scarlet is applied to

fabrics or yarn used

(a) in the equipment of the tabernacle (Ex 25 ff; Nu 4:8);

(b) in rites in cleansing lepers (Le 14); in ceremony of purification (Nu 19:6); to royal or gorgeous apparel (2Sa 1:24; Pr 31:21; La 4:5; "purple"; Na 2:3; Mt 27:28; Re 17:4; 18:12,16); to marking thread (Ge 38:28,30; Jos 2:18,21); to lips (So 4:3); to sins (Isa 1:18); to (Re 17:3); to wool (Heb 9:19).

(12) Sorrel:

This word occurs once in the Revised Version (British and American) (Zec 1:8).

(13) Vermilion:

This word, shashar, occurs in two passages (Jer 22:14; Eze 23:14). Vermilion of modern arts is a sulfide of mercury. It is not at all improbable that the paint referred to was an oxide of iron. This oxide is still taken from the ground in Syria and Palestine and used for decorative outlining.

(14) White:

The principal word for denoting whiteness in the Hebrew was labhan, a distinctive color word. Some of the objects to which it was applied show that it Da was used as we use the word "white" (Ge 49:12). Mt. Lebanon was probably named because of its snow-tipped peaks (Jer 18:14). White is applied to goats (Ge 30:35); to rods (Ge 30:37); to teeth (Ge 49:12); to leprous hairs and spots (Le 13; Nu 12:10); to garments (Ec 9:8; 7:9); as symbol of purity (Da 11:35; 12:10; Isa 1:18); to horses (Zec 1:8; 6:3,1); to tree branches (Joe 1:7); to coriander seed (Ex 16:31). The corresponding Greek word, leukos, is used in New Testament. It is applied to hair (Mt 5:36; Re 1:14); to raiment (Mt 17:2; 28:3; Mr 9:3; 16:5; Lu 9:29; Joh 20:12; Ac 1:10; Re 3:4,5,18; 6:11; 7:9,13,14; 19:14); to horses (Re 6:2; 19:11,14); to a throne (Re 20:11); to stone (Re 2:17); to a cloud (Re 14:14). Besides labhan, four other Hebrew words have been translated "white":

(a) chori, or chur, meaning "bleached," applied to bread (Ge 40:16); to linen (Es 1:6; 8:15);

(b) tsach, or tsachor, literally, "dazzling," is applied to asses (Jud 5:10); to human appearance (So 5:10); to wool (Eze 27:18);

(c) dar, probably mother of pearl or alabaster (Es 1:6);

(d) rir, literally, "saliva," and, from resemblance, "white of egg" (Job 6:6).

(15) Yellow:

This word occurs in Es 1:6 to describe pavement; in Le 13 to describe leprous hair; in Ps 68:13 to describe gold.

Mixtures of colors:

(a) grizzled (grisled), literally, "spotted as with hail," applied to goats (Ge 31:10,12); to horses (Zec 6:3,1);

(b) ringstreaked (ringstraked), literally, "striped with bands," applied to animals (Ge 30:35 ff; 31:8 ff);

(c) speckled, literally, "dotted or spotted," applied to cattle and goats (Ge 30:32 ff; 31:8 ff); to a bird (Jer 12:9); to horses (Zec 1:8 the King James Version);

(d) spotted, literally, "covered with patches," applied to cattle and goats (Ge 30:32 ff). In Jude 1:23 "spotted" means "defiled."

Figurative: For figurative uses, see under separate colors.

LITERATURE.

Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in Ancient Egypt, History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria, History of Art in Phoenicia and its Dependencies; Wilkinson, The Ancient Egyptians; Jewish Encyclopedia; EB; Delitzsch, Iris.

James A. Patch

COLOSSAE

ko-los’-e (Kolossai, "punishment"; the King James Version Colosse): A city of Phrygia on the Lycus River, one of the branches of the Meander, and 3 miles from Mt. Cadmus, 8,013 ft. high. It stood at the head of a gorge where the two streams unite, and on the great highway traversing the country from Ephesus to the Euphrates valley, 13 miles from Hierapolis and 10 from Laodicea. Its history is chiefly associated with that of these two cities. Early, according to both Herodotus and Xenophon, it was a place of great importance. There Xerxes stopped 481 BC (Herodotus vii.30) and Cyrus the Younger marched 401 BC (Xen. Anab. i.2,6). From Col 2:1 it is not likely that Paul visited the place in person; but its Christianization was due to the efforts of Epaphras and Timothy (Col 1:1,7), and it was the home of Philemon and Epaphras. That a church was established there early is evident from Col 4:12,13; Re 1:11; 3:14. As the neighboring cities, Hierapolis and Laodicea, increased in importance, Colosse declined. There were many Jews living there, and a chief article of commerce, for which the place was renowned, was the collossinus, a peculiar wool, probably of a purple color. In religion the people were specially lax, worshipping angels. Of them, Michael was the chief, and the protecting saint of the city. It is said

that once he appeared to the people, saving the city in time of a flood. It was this belief in angels which called forth Paul's epistle (Col 2:18). During the 7th and 8th centuries the place was overrun by the Saracens; in the 12th century the church was destroyed by the Turks and the city disappeared. Its site was explored by Mr. Hamilton. The ruins of the church, the stone foundation of a large theater, and a necropolis with stones of a peculiar shape are still to be seen. During the Middle Ages the place bore the name of Chonae; it is now called Chonas.

E. J. Banks

COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE

ko-losh'-ans, ko-los'-i-anz: This is one of the group of Paul's epistles known as the Captivity Epistles (see PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO, for a discussion of these as a group).

I. Authenticity.

1. External Evidence:

The external evidence for the Epistle to the Colossians, prior to the middle of the 2nd century, is rather indeterminate. In Ignatius and in Polycarp we have here and there phrases and terminology that suggest an acquaintance with Colossians but not much more (Ignat., Ephes., x.3, and Polyc. x.1; compare with Col 1:23). The phrase in Ep Barnabas, xii, "in him are all things and unto him are all things," may be due to Col 1:16, but it is quite as possibly a liturgical formula. The references in Justin Martyr's Dialogue to Christ as the firstborn (prototokos) are very probably suggested by Col 1:15, "the firstborn of all creation" (Dial., 84, 85, 138). The first definite witness is Marcion, who included this epistle in his collection of those written by Paul (Tert., Adv. Marc., v. 19). A little later the Muratorian Fragment mentions Colossians among the Epistles of Paul (10b, l. 21, Colosensis). Irenaeus quotes it frequently and by name (Adv. haer., iii.14, 1). It is familiar to the writers of the following centuries (e.g. Tert., De praescrip., 7; Clement of Alexandria, Strom., I, 1; Orig., Contra Celsum, v. 8).

2. Internal Evidence:

The authenticity was not questioned until the second quarter of the 19th century when Mayerhoff claimed on the ground of style, vocabulary, and thought that it was not by the apostle. The Tubingen school claimed, on the basis of a supposed Gnosticism, that the epistle was the work of the 2nd century and so not Pauline. This position has been thoroughly answered by showing that the teaching is essentially different from the Gnosticism of the 2nd century, especially in the conception of Christ as prior to and greater than all things created (see V below). The attack in later years has been chiefly on the ground of vocabulary and style, the doctrinal position, especially the Christology and the teaching about angels, and the relation to the Ephesian epistle. The objection on the ground of vocabulary and style is based, as is so often the case, on the assumption that a man, no matter what he writes about, must use the same words and style. There are thirty-four words in Colossians which are not in any other New

Testament book. When one removes those that are due to the difference in subject-matter, the total is no greater than that of some of the acknowledged epistles. The omission of familiar Pauline particles, the use of genitives, of "all" (pas), and of synonyms, find parallels in other epistles, or are due to a difference of subject, or perhaps to the influence on the language of the apostle of his life in Rome (von Soden). The doctrinal position is not at heart contradictory to Paul's earlier teaching (compare Godet, Introduction to the New Testament; Paul's Epistles, 440 f). The Christology is in entire harmony with Php (which see) which is generally admitted as Pauline, and is only a development of the teaching in 1Co (8:6; 15:24-28), especially in respect of the emphasis laid on "the cosmical activity of the preincarnate Christ." Finally, the form in which Paul puts the Christology is that best calculated to meet the false teaching of the Colossian heretics (compare V below). In recent years H. Holtzmann has advocated that this epistle is an interpolated form of an original Pauline epistle to the Colossians, and the work of the author of the Epistle to the Ephesians (which see). A modification of this theory of interpolation has recently been suggested by J. Weiss (Theologische Literaturzeitung, September 29, 1900). Both these theories are too complicated to stand, and even von Soden, who at first followed Holtzmann, has abandoned the position (von Soden, Einleitung., 12); while Sanday (DB2) has shown how utterly untenable it is. Sober criticism today has come to realize that it is impossible to deny the Pauline authorship of this epistle. This position is strengthened by the close relationship between Colossians and Philemon, of which Renan says: "Paul alone, so it would seem, could have written this little masterpiece" (Abbott, International Critical Commentary, lviii). If Philemon (which see) stands as Pauline, as it must, then the authenticity of Colossians is established beyond controversy.

II. Place and Date.

The Pauline authorship being established, it becomes evident at once that the apostle wrote Colossians along with the other Captivity Epistles, and that it is best dated from Rome (see PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO), and during the first captivity. This would be about 58 or, if the later chronology is preferred, 63 or 64.

III. Destination.

The epistle was written, on the face of it, to the church at COLOSSAE (which see), a town in the Lycus valley where the gospel had been preached most probably by Epaphras (Col 1:7; 4:12), and where Paul was, himself, unknown personally (Col 1:4,8,9; 2:1,5). From the epistle it is evident that the Colossian Christians were Gentiles (Col 1:27) for whom, as such, the apostle feels a responsibility (Col 2:1 ff). He sends to them Tychicus (Col 4:7), who is accompanied by Onesimus, one of their own community (Col 4:9), and urges them to be sure to read another letter which will reach them from Laodicea (Col 4:16).

IV. Relation to Other New Testament Writings.

Beyond the connection with Ephesians (which see) we need notice only the relation between Colossians and Rev. In the letter to Laodicea (Re 3:14- 21) we have two expressions: "the beginning of the creation of God," and "I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne," in which we have an echo of

Colossians which "suggests an acquaintance with and recognition of the earlier apostle's teaching on the part of John" (Lightfoot, Colossians, 42, note 5).

V. The Purpose.

The occasion of the epistle was, we may be sure, the information brought by Epaphras that the church in Colosse was subject to the assault of a body of Judaistic Christians who were seeking to overthrow the faith of the Colossians and weaken their regard for Paul (Zahn). This "heresy," as it is commonly called, has had many explanations. The Tubingen school taught that it was gnostic, and sought to find in the terms the apostle used evidence for the 2nd century composition of the epistle. Pleroma and gnosis ("fullness" and "knowledge") not only do not require this interpretation, but will not admit it. The very heart of Gnosticism, i.e. theory of emanation and the dualistic conception which regards matter as evil, finds no place in Colossians. The use of pleroma in this and the sister epistle, Eph, does not imply Gnostic views, whether held by the apostle or by the readers of the letters. The significance in Colossians of this and the other words adopted by Gnosticism in later years is quite distinct from that later meaning. The underlying teaching is equally distinct. The Christ of the Colossians is not the aeon Christ of Gnosticism. In Essenism, on the other hand, Lightfoot and certain Germans seek the origin of this heresy. Essenism has certain affinities with Gnosticism on the one side and Judaism on the other. Two objections are raised against this explanation of the origin of the Colossian heresy. In the first place Essenism, as we know it, is found in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, and there is no evidence for its establishment in the Lycus valley. In the second place, no references are found in Colossians to certain distinct Essene teachings, e.g. those about marriage, washings, communism, Sabbath rules, etc.

The Colossian heresy is due to Judaistic influences on the one hand and to native beliefs and superstitions on the other. The Judaistic elements in this teaching are patent, circumcision (Col 2:11), the Law (Col 2:14,15), and special seasons (Col 2:16). But there is more than Judaism in this false teaching. Its teachers look to intermediary spirits, angels whom they worship; and insist on a very strict asceticism. To seek the origin of angel worship in Judaism, as is commonly done, is, as A. L. Williams has shown, to miss the real significance of the attitude of the Jews to angels and to magnify the bitter jeers of Celsus. Apart from phrases used in exorcism and magic he shows us that there is no evidence that the Jew ever worshipped angels (JTS, X, 413 f). This element in the Colossian heresy was local, finding its antecedent in the worship of the river spirits, and in later years the same tendency gave the impulse to the worship of Michael as the patron saint of Colosse (so too Ramsay, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), under the word "Colossae"). The danger of and the falsehood in this teaching were twofold. In the first place it brought the gospel under the bands of the Law once more, not now with the formality of the Galatian opponents, but none the less surely. But as the apostle's readers are Gentiles (Col 1:27) Paul is not interested in showing the preparatory aspect of the Law. He simply insists to them that they are quite free from all obligations of the Law because Christ, in whom they have been baptized (Col 2:12), has blotted out all the Law (Col 2:14). The second danger is that their belief in and worship of the heavenly powers, false ideas about Christ and the material world, would develop even further than it had. They, because of their union with Him, need fear no angelic being. Christ has triumphed over them all, leading them as it were captives in His train (Col 2:15), as He conquered on the cross. The spiritual powers cease to have any authority over the Christians. It is to set Christ forward, in

this way, as Head over all creation as very God, and out of His relation to the church and to the universe to develop the Christian life, that the apostle writes.

VI. Argument.

The argument of the Epistle is as follows:

Colossians 1:1,2:

Salutation.

Colossians 1:3-8:

Thanksgiving for their faith in Christ, their love for the saints, their hope laid up in heaven, which they had in and through the gospel and of which he had heard from Epaphras.

Colossians 1:9-13:

Prayer that they might be filled with the full knowledge of God's will so as to walk worthy of the Lord and to be fruitful in good works, thankful for their inheritance of the kingdom of His Son.

Colossians 1:14-23:

Statement of the Son's position, from whom we have redemption. He is the very image of God, Creator, pre-existent, the Head of the church, preeminent over all, in whom all the fullness (pleroma) dwells, the Reconciler of all things, as also of the Colossians, through His death, provided they are faithful to the hope of the gospel.

Colossians 1:24-2:5:

By his suffering he is filling up the sufferings of Christ, of whom he is a minister, even to reveal the great mystery of the ages, that Christ is in them, the Gentiles, the hope of glory, the object of the apostle's preaching everywhere. This explains Paul's interest in them, and his care for them, that their hearts may be strengthened in the love and knowledge of Christ.

Colossians 2:6-3:4:

He then passes to exhortation against those who are leading them astray, these false teachers of a vain, deceiving philosophy based on worldly wisdom, who ignore the truth of Christ's position, as One in whom all the Divine pleroma dwells, and their relation to Him, united by baptism; raised through the faith; quickened and forgiven; who teach the obligation of the observance of various legal practices,

strict asceticisms and angel worship. This exhortation is closed with the appeal that as Christ's they will not submit to these regulations of men which are useless, especially in comparison with Christ's power through the Resurrection.

Colossians 3:5-17:

Practical exhortations follow to real mortification of the flesh with its characteristics, and the substitution of a new life of fellowship, love and peace.

Colossians 3:18-4:1:

Exhortation to fulfill social obligations, as wives, husbands, children, parents, slaves and masters.

Colossians 4:2-6:

Exhortation to devout and watchful prayer.

Colossians 4:7-18:

Salutations and greeting.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon; Abbott, Ephesians and Colossians, International Critical Commentary; Peake, Colossians, Expositor's Greek Testament; Maclaren, Colossians, Expositor's Bible; Alexander, Colossians and Ephesians, Bible for Home and School; Moule, Colossians, Cambridge Bible; Haupt, Meyer's Krit. u. Exeg. Kom.; von Soden, Hand-Kom. zum New Testament.

C. S. Lewis

COLT; FOAL

kolt (‘ayir, ben; polos, huios, with some word such as hupozugiou, understood; huios alone =" son"): The English words "colt" and "foal" are used in the Bible of the ass everywhere except in Ge 32:15, where the word "colt" is used of the camel in the list of animals destined by Jacob as presents for Esau. In most cases ‘ayir (compare Arabic ‘air, "ass") means "ass's colt," but it may be joined with ben, "son," as in Zec 9:9, where we have: ‘al-chamor we‘al-‘ayir ben-’athonoth, literally, "on an epi onon kai epi polon huion hupozugiou", "upon an ass, and upon a colt ass, and on an ass's colt, the son of the she-asses"; compare Mt 21:5 epi onon kai epi polon huion hupozugiou, "upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass." In Joh 12:15 we have epi polon onou, and in the previous verse the diminutive, onarion.

The commonest New Testament word for "colt" is polos, akin to which is German Fohle and English "foal" and "filly." The Latin pullus signifies either "foal" or "chicken," and in the latter sense gives rise to French poulet and English "pullet."

In view of the fact that horses are but little mehtioned in the Bible, and that only in connection with royal equipages and armies, it is not surprising that "colt" does not occur in its ordinary English sense.

Alfred Ely Day

COME

kum: The translation of many Hebrew and Greek words. In the phrase "The Spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon him" (Jud 14:6,19; 15:14; 1Sa 10:10; 11:6; 16:13), the word is tsaleah; Jud 14:6; 15:14 "came mightily," which is the uniform translation of the Revised Version (British and American) (compare Jud 13:25 "to move," i.e. to disturb or stir up). In Jud 6:34; 1Ch 12:18; 2Ch 24:20, it is labhesh, "to clothe"; the Revised Version, margin "The Spirit .... clothed itself with Gideon" and ...." with Zechariah," "The Spirit clothed Amasai."

Among its many changes, the Revised Version (British and American) has "come forth" for "come" (Mt 2:6); "gone up" for "come" (Mt 14:32, a different text); "come all the way" for "come" (Joh 4:15); "got out upon the" for "come to" (Joh 21:9); "draw near" for "come" (Heb 4:16); "come" for "come and see" (Re 6:1); "secure" for "come by" (Ac 27:16); "attain unto" for "come in" (Eph 4:13); and "I come" for "I come again" (Joh 14:28).

W. L. Walker

COMELINESS; COMELY

kum’-li-nes, kum’-li: Cognate with "becoming," namely, what is suitable, graceful, handsome. The servant of Yahweh in Isa 53:2 is without "comeliness" (hadhar, "honor"), i.e. there is in his appearance nothing attractive, while he is bowed beneath man’s sin. "Praise is comely" (na’wah, f. of na’weh; Ps 33:1; 147:1), i.e. suitable or befitting "for the righteous," and, therefore, an honor and glory; "uncomely parts," aschemona (1Co 12:23), namely, less honorable. See also 1Sa 16:18, "a comely person"; So 6:4, "comely as Jerusalem." etc.

COMFORT

kum’-fert (nacham; parakaleo): The New Testament word is variously translated, as "comfort," "exhort," "beseech," the exact translation to be determined by the context. Etymologically, it is "to call alongside of," i.e. to summon for assistance. To comfort is to cheer and encourage. It has a positive force wanting in its synonym "console," as it indicates the dispelling of grief by the impartation of strength. the

Revised Version (British and American) has correctly changed the translation of paramutheomai from the King James Version "comfort," to "consolation." So in the Old Testament, "Comfort ye my people" (Isa 40:1) is much stronger than "console," which affords only the power of calm endurance of affliction, while the brightest hopes of the future and the highest incentives to present activity are the gifts of the Divine grace that is here bestowed.

H. E. Jacobs

COMFORTABLY

kum'-fer-ta-bli ('al lebh, "to the heart"): "To speak to the heart," i.e. to speak kindly, to console, to comfort, is the ordinary Hebrew expression for wooing: e.g. Boaz spake "to the heart" of Ru (Ru 2:13 margin; the King James Version "friendly," the Revised Version (British and American) "kindly"). The beauty of the Hebrew term is illustrated in Ge 50:21 where Joseph "spake kindly" unto his brethren, winning them from fear to confidence. Rendered "comfortably" in five passages: thrice of human speaking, and twice of the tenderness of God's address to His people. David was urged to win back the hearts of the people by kind words: "speak comfortably" (2Sa 19:7). Hezekiah in like manner comforted the Levites (2Ch 30:22) and encouraged his captains (2Ch 32:6). The term has exceptional wealth of meaning in connection with God's message of grace and forgiveness to His redeemed people. The compassionate love that has atoned for their sins speaks to the heart ("comfortably") of Jerusalem, saying "that her iniquity is pardoned" (Isa 40:2). The same promise of forgiveness is given to the penitent nation by the prophet Hosea (Ho 2:14); "comfortable words" (Zec 1:13), i.e. words affording comfort.

Dwight M. Pratt

COMFORTER

kum'-fer-ter: This is translation of the word patakletos, in the Johannine writings. In the Gospel it occurs in Joh 14:16,26; 15:26; 16:7, and refers to the Holy Spirit. The word means literally, "called to one's side" for help. The translation "Comforter" covers only a small part of the meaning as shown in the context. The word "Helper" would be a more adequate translation. The Spirit does a great deal for disciples besides comforting them, although to comfort was a part of His work for them. The Spirit guides into truth; indeed, He is called the Spirit of truth. He teaches and quickens the memory of disciples and glorifies Christ in them. He also has a work to do in the hearts of unbelievers, convicting the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment (Joh 14-16). The Comforter remains permanently with disciples after He comes in response to the prayers of Christ. The word parakletos does not occur elsewhere in the Scriptures except in 1Jo 2:1. In Job 16:2 the active form of the word (parakletos is passive) is found in the plural, where Job calls his friends "miserable comforters." The word "Comforter" being an inadequate, and the word "Helper" a too indefinite, translation of the word in the Gospel of John, it would probably be best to transfer the Greek word into English in so far as it relates to the Holy Spirit (see PARACLETE).

In 1 Joh 2:1 the word parakletos refers to Christ: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous." Here the translation Advocate is quite correct. As the next verse shows the writer has in mind the intercession of Christ for Christians on the basis of His mediatorial work: "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (1Jo 2:2).

See ADVOCATE; HOLY SPIRIT; PARACLETE.

E. Y. Mullins

COMFORTLESS

kum'-fert-les (orphanous, "orphans"): The Greek original is found but twice in the New Testament; rendered "comfortless" in Joh 14:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "desolate"; "fatherless" in Jas 1:27 (compare Ps 68:5). The term signifies bereft of a father, parents, guardian, teacher, guide, and indicates what must be the permanent ministry of the Holy Spirit to the disciples of Jesus, in comforting their hearts. In harmony with these parting words Jesus had called the chosen twelve "little children" (Joh 13:33); without Him they would be "orphans," comfortless, desolate. The coming of the Holy Spirit would make Christ and the Father forever real to them, an abiding spiritual presence.

Dwight M. Pratt

COMING OF CHRIST See ADVENT; PAROUSIA.

COMING, SECOND

See PAROUSIA.

COMMANDMENT, THE NEW

nu (entole kaine): The word "commandment" is used in the English versions of the Old Testament to translate several Hebrew words, more especially those meaning "word" (dabhar) as the ten words of God (Ex 34:28) or king's "command" (Es 1:12); "precept" (mitswah) of God (De 4:2), of a king (2Ki 18:36); "mouth" or "speech" (peh) of God (Ex 17:1), of Pharaoh (2Ki 23:35). They express theocratic idea of morality wherein the will or law of God is imposed upon men as their law of conduct (2Ki 17:37).

1. Christ and the Old Commandment:

This idea is not repudiated in the New Testament, but supplemented or modified from within by making love the essence of the command. Jesus Christ, as reported in the Synoptics, came not "to destroy the

law or the prophets .... but to fulfill" (Mt 5:17). He taught that "whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 5:19). He condemned the Pharisees for rejecting the commandments of God as given by Moses (Mr 7:8-13). There is a sense in which it is true that Christ propounded no new commandment, but the new thing in His teaching was the emphasis laid on the old commandment of love, and the extent and intent of its application. The great commandment is "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, ...(and) thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets" (Mt 22:34-40; Mr 12:28-34; compare De 6:5; Le 19:18).

2. Principle instead of Law:

Whey the law realizes itself as love for God and man in men’s hearts, it ceases to bear the aspect of a command. The force of authority and the active resistance or inertia of the subject disappear; the law becomes a principle, a motive, a joyous harmony of man’s will with the will of God; and in becoming internal, it becomes universal and transcends all distinctions of race or class. Even this was not an altogether new idea (compare Jer 31:31-34; Ps 51); nor did Christ’s contemporaries and disciples think it was.

3. Christ’s Love Fulfilled in Death Becomes the Law of the Church:

The revolutionary factor was the death of Christ wherein the love of God was exemplified and made manifest as the basis and principle of all spiritual life (Joh 13:34). Paul therefore generalizes all pre-Christian morality as a system of law and commandments, standing in antithesis to the grace and love which are through Jesus Christ (Ro 5-7). Believers in Christ felt their experience and inward life to be so changed and new, that it needed a new term (agape =" love") to express their ideal of conduct (see CHARITY). Another change that grew upon the Christian consciousness, following from the resurrection and ascension of Christ, was the idea that He was the permanent source of the principle of life. "Jesus is Lord" (1Co 12:3). Hence, in the Johannine writings the principle described by the new term agape is associated with Christ’s lordship and solemnly described as His "new commandment." "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another" (Joh 13:34). To the Christians of the end of the 1st century it was already an old commandment which they had from the beginning of the Christian teaching (1Jo 2:7; 2Jo 5); but it was also a new commandment which ever came with new force to men who were passing from the darkness of hatred to the light of love (1Jo 2:8-11).

4. The New Revelation:

The term in the Gospel we may owe to the evangelist, but it brings into relief an element in the consciousness of Jesus which the author of the Fourth Gospel had appreciated more fully than the Synoptists. Jesus was aware that He was the bearer of a special message from the Father (Joh 12:49; Mt 11:27), that He fulfilled His mission in His death of love and self-sacrifice (Joh 10:18), and that the mission fulfilled gave Him authority over the lives of men, "even as I have loved you, that ye also love

one another." The full meaning of Christ's teaching was only realized when men had experienced and recognized the significance of His death as the cause and principle of right conduct. The Synoptists saw Christ's teaching as the development of the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament. Paul and John felt that the love of God in Christ was a new thing:

(a) new as a revelation of God in Christ,

(b) new as a principle of life in the church, and

(c) new as a union of believers with Christ. While it is love, it is also a commandment of Christ, calling forth the joyous obedience of believers.

See also BROTHERLY LOVE.

T. Rees

COMMANDMENT; COMMANDMENTS

ko-mand'-ment (mitswah; entole): The commandments are, first of all, prescriptions, or directions of God, concerning particular matters, which He wanted observed with reference to circumstances as they arose, in a period when He spake immediately and with greater frequency than afterward. They were numerous, minute, and regarded as coordinate and independent of each other. In the Ten Commandments, or, more properly, Ten Words, EVm (debharim), they are reduced to a few all-comprehensive precepts of permanent validity, upon which every duty required of man is based. Certain prescriptions of temporary force, as those of the ceremonial and forensic laws, are applications of these "Words" to transient circumstances, and, for the time for which they were enacted, demanded perfect and unconditional obedience. The Psalms, and especially Ps 119, show that even under the Old Testament, there was a deep spiritual appreciation of these commandments, and the extent to which obedience was deemed a privilege rather than a mere matter of constrained external compliance with duty. In the New Testament, Jesus shows in Mt 22:37,40; Mr 12:29,31; Lu 10:27 (compare Ro 13:8,10) their organic unity. The "Ten" are reduced to two, and these two to one principle, that of love. In love, obedience begins, and works from within outward. Under the New Testament the commandments are kept when they are written upon the heart (Heb 10:16). While in the Synoptics they are referred to in a more abstract and distant way, in both the Gospel and the Epistles of John their relation to Jesus is most prominent. They are "my commandments" (Joh 14:15,21; 15:10,12); "my Father's" (Joh 10:18; 15:10); or, many times throughout the epp., "his (i.e. Christ's) commandments." The new life in Christ enkindles love, and not only makes the commandments the rule of life, but the life itself the free expression of the commandments and of the nature of God, in which the commandments are grounded. Occasionally the word is used in the singular collectively (Ex 24:12; Ps 119:96; 1Co 14:37).

See TEN COMMANDMENTS, THE.

H. E. Jacobs

COMMANDMENTS, THE TEN

See COMMANDMENT; TEN COMMANDMENTS.

COMMEND

ko-mend’:

(1) For paratithemi (Lu 23:46), translating the Hebrew paqadh (Ps 31:5), in the dying words of Jesus: "Into thy hands I commend my Spirit." the King James Version in Psalms has the more general word "commit." The use of the Greek word in the sense of "deposit what belongs to one into the hands of another" is not uncommon in the classics. So also the derivatives paratheke (2Ti 1:12) and parakatatheke (1Ti 6:20; 2Ti 1:14). See DEPOSIT. This sense of the English, while slightly archaic, corresponds to the first meaning of the Latin, whence it comes, "to commit for preservation," especially of the dying; to commend children, parents, etc., to the care of others (for examples, see Harper’s Latin Dictionary).

(2) For sunistiemi, "to stand together," and then, by standing together, to establish, prove, exhibit, as "righteousness" and "love of God" (Ro 3:5; 5:8), and thus to attest (2Co 3:1; 4:2), and, finally, to certify or to recommend a stranger (Ro 16:1; 2Co 6:4). The use of paristemi in 1Co 8:8 is equivalent.

(3) "To praise," epaineo (Lu 16:8), and sunistemi in 2Co 10:12,18; for the Old Testament, Hebrew hillel, in Ge 12:15 the King James Version; Pr 12:8.

H. E. Jacobs

COMMENTARIES

kom’-en-ta-riz:

I. THE WORD—GENERAL SCOPE

II. DIFFERENCES IN CHARACTER OF COMMENTARIES

III. RANGE OF COMMENTARIES

1. Early Commentaries

(1) Origen, etc.

(2) Chrysostom, etc.

2. Scholastic Period

Nicolas de Lyra

3. Reformation and Post-Reformation Periods

(1) Luther and Calvin

(2) Beza, Grotius, etc.

(3) Later Writers

4. 18th Century

(1) Calmer, M. Henry, etc.

(2) Patrick, Lowth, Scott

(3) Gill, Doddridge

(4) Bengel

5. The Modern Period—Its Characteristics

(1) Germany

(a) The Liberal School

(b) Believing Tendency

(i) Conservative

(ii) Critical

(iii) Mediating

(iv) Confessional

(v) Godet (Swiss)

(2) Britain and America

(a) Alford, Eadie

(b) Ellicott and Lightfoot

(c) Westcott

(d) Critical Influences—Broad Church

Stanley and Jowett

(e) General Commentaries (Series)

6. Recent Period

(1) Germany

(2) Britain and America

LITERATURE

I. The Word—General Scope.

Etymologically, a commentary (from Latin commentor) denotes jottings, annotations, memoranda, on a given subject, or perhaps on a series of events; hence, its use in the plural as a designation for a narrative or history, as the Commentaries of Caesar. In its application to Scripture, the word designates a work devoted to the explanation, elucidation, illustration, sometimes the homiletic expansion and edifying utilization, of the text of some book or portion of Scripture. The primary function of a good commentary is to furnish an exact interpretation of the meaning of the passage under consideration; it belongs to it also to show the connection of ideas, the steps of argument, the scope and design of the whole, in the writing in question. This can only be successfully accomplished by the help of a knowledge of the original language of the writing, and of the historical setting of the particular passage; by careful study of the context, and of the author’s general usages of thought and speech; and by comparison of parallel or related texts. Aid may also be obtained from external sources, as a knowledge of the history, archaeology, topography, chronology, manners and customs, of the lands, peoples and times referred to; or, as in Deissmann’s recent discoveries, from the light thrown on peculiarities of language by papyri or other ancient remains (see his Light from the Ancient East).

II. Differences in Character of Commentaries.

It is obvious that commentaries will vary greatly in character and value according as they are more scholarly, technical, and critical, entering, e.g. into philological discussions, and tabulating and remarking upon the various views held as to the meaning; or again, more popular, aiming only at bringing out the general sense, and conveying it to the mind of the reader in attractive and edifying form. When the practical motive predominates, and the treatment is greatly enlarged by illustration, application, and the enforcement of lessons, the work loses the character of commentary proper, and partakes more of the character of homily or discourse.

III. Range of Commentaries.

No book in the world has been made the subject of so much commenting and exposition as the Bible. Theological libraries are full of commentaries of all descriptions and all grades of worth. Some are commentaries on the original Hebrew or Greek texts; some on the English or other versions Modern commentaries are usually accompanied with some measure of introduction to the books commented upon; the more learned works have commonly also some indication of the data for the determination of the textual readings (see TEXTUAL CRITICISM). Few writers are equal to the task of commenting with profit on the Bible as a whole, and, with the growth of knowledge, this task is now seldom attempted. Frequently, however, one writer contributes many valuable works, and sometimes, by cooperation of like-minded scholars, commentaries on the whole Bible are produced. It is manifestly a very slight survey that can be taken in a brief article of the work of commenting, and of the literature to which it has given rise; the attempt can only be made to follow the lines most helpful to those seeking aid from this class of books. On the use and abuse of commentaries by the preacher, C. H. Spurgeon’s racy remarks in his Commenting and Commentaries may be consulted.

1. Early Commentaries:

Rabbinical interpretations and paraphrases of the Old Testament may here be left out of account (see next article; also TARGUM; TALMUD; F. W. Farrar’s History of Interpretation, Lect II). Commentaries on the New Testament could not begin till the New Testament books themselves were written, and had acquired some degree of authority as sacred writings (see BIBLE). The earliest commentaries we hear of are from the heretical circles of the Gnostics. Heracleon, a Valentinian (circa 175 AD), wrote a commentary on the Gospel of John (fragments in Origen), and on parts at least of the Gospel of Luke. Tatian, a disciple of Justin Martyr, about the same time, compiled his Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Four Gospels, on which, at a later time, commentaries were written. Ephraem Syrus (4th century) wrote such a commentary, of which an Armenian translation has now been recovered. The Church Father Hippolytus (beginning of 3rd century), wrote several commentaries on the Old Testament (Exodus, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, Zechariah, etc.), and on Matthew, Luke and Revelation.

(1) Origen, etc.

The strongest impulse, however, to the work of commenting and exposition of Holy Scripture undoubtedly proceeded from the school of Alexandria—especially from Origen (203-254 AD). Clement, Origen's predecessor, had written a treatise called Hupotuposeis, or "Outlines," a survey of the contents of Holy Scripture. Origen himself wrote commentaries on all the books of the Old Testament, Ruth, Es and Ec alone excepted, and on most of the books of the New Testament (Mark, 1 and 2 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, James, Jude, Revelation excepted). He furnished besides, scholia, or notes on difficult passages, and delivered Homilies, or discourses, the records of which fill three folio volumes. "By his Tetrapla and Hexapla," says Farrar, "he became the founder of all textual criticism; by his Homilies he fixed the type of a popular exposition; his scholia were the earliest specimens of marginal explanations; his commentaries furnished the church with her first continuous exegesis" (op. cit., 188). Unfortunately, the Alexandrian school adopted a principle of allegorical interpretation which led it frequently into the most extravagant fancies. Assuming a threefold sense in Scripture—a literal, a moral, and a spiritual—it gave reins to caprice in foisting imaginary meanings on the simplest historical statements (Farrar, op. cit., 189 ff). Some of Origen's commentaries, however, are much freer from allegory than others, and all possess high value (compare Lightfoot, Galatians, 217). The later teachers of the Alexandrian school continued the exegetical works of Origen. Pamphilus of Caesarea, the friend of Eusebius, is said to have written Old Testament commentaries.

(2) Chrysostom, etc.

At the opposite pole from the allegorizing Alexandrian school of interpretation was the Antiochinn, marked by a sober, literal and grammatical style of exegesis. Its reputed founder was Lucian (martyred 311 AD); but its real heads were Diodorus of Tarsus(379-94 AD) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (393-428 AD); and its most distinguished representative was John Chrysostom (347-407 AD). Chrysostom wrote continuous commentaries on Isaiah (only Isa 1-8:10 remaining) and on Galatians; but his chief contributions were his Homilies, covering almost the whole of the Old Testament and New Testament. Of these over 600 remain, chiefly on the New Testament. They are unequal in character, those on Ac being reputed the feeblest; others, as those on Matthew, Romans and Corinthians, are splendid examples of expository teaching. Schaff speaks of Chrysostom as "the prince of commentators among the Fathers" (History, Ante-Nicene Per., 816). Thomas Aquinas is reported to have said that he would rather possess Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew than be master of all Paris. In the West, Ambrose of Milan (340-97 AD) wrote expositions of Old Testament histories and of Luke (allegorical and typical), and Jerome (346-420 AD) wrote numerous commentaries on Old Testament and New Testament books, largely, however, compilations from others.

2. Scholastic Period:

The medieval and scholastic period offers little for our purpose. There was diligence in copying manuscripts, and producing catenae of the opinions of the Fathers; in the case of the schoolmen, in building up elaborate systems of theology; but the Scriptures were thrown into the background.

Nicolas de Lyra.

The 14th century, however, produced one commentator of real eminence—Nicolas de Lyra (1270-1340). Nicolas was a Franciscan monk, well versed in Hebrew and rabbinical learning. While recognizing the usual distinctions of the various senses of Scripture, he practically builds on the literal, and exhibits great sobriety and skill in his interpretations. His work, which bears the name Postillae Perpetuae in Universa Biblia, was much esteemed by Luther, who acknowledged his indebtedness to it. Hence, the jest of his opponents, Si Lyra non lyrasset, Lutherus non saltasset (a notice of Lyra may be seen in Farrar, op. cit., 274-78).

3. Reformation and Post-Reformation Periods:

The Reformation brought men's minds back to the Scriptures and opened a new era in Biblical exposition and commentary. It became the custom to expound the Scriptures on Sundays and week-days in all the pulpits of the Protestant churches. "Luther's custom was to expound consecutively in a course of sermons the Old and New Testaments" (Kostlin). The Reformation began at Zurich with a series of discourses by Zwingli on the Gospel of Matthew. The same was true of Calvin, Beza, Knox and all associated with them. The production of commentaries or expository homilies was the necessary result.

(1) Luther and Calvin.

As outstanding examples may be mentioned Luther's Commentary on Galatians, and the noble commentaries of Calvin. Not all by any means, but very many of the commentaries of Calvin were the fruit of pulpit prelections (e.g. the expositions of Job, the Minor Prophets, Jeremiah, Daniel). Others, as the commentaries on Romans and the Psalms (reputed his best), were prepared with great care. Calvin's supreme excellence as a commentator is disputed by no one. From every school and shade of opinion in Christendom could be produced a chorus of testimony to the remarkable gifts of mind and heart displayed in his expositions of Scripture—to his breadth, moderation, fairness and modernness of spirit, in exhibiting the sense of inward genius of Holy Writ. The testimony of Arminius is as striking as any: "I exhort my pupils to peruse Calvin's commentaries .... for I affirm that he excels beyond comparison in the interpretation of Scripture, and that his commentaries ought to be more highly valued than all that is handed down to us by the library of the Fathers."

(2) Beza, Grotius, etc.

Lutheranism had its distinguished exegetes (Brenz, died 1572), who wrote able commentaries on the Old Testament, and in both the Calvinistic and Arminian branches of the Reformed church the production of commentaries held a chief place. Beza, Calvin's successor, is acknowledged to have possessed many of the best exegetical qualities which characterized his master. Grotius, in Holland (died 1645), occupies the foremost place among the expositors in this century on the Arminian side. His exegetical works, if not marked by much spirituality, show sagacity and learning, and are enriched by parallels from classical literature. The school of Cocceius (died 1669) developed the doctrine of the covenants, and reveled in typology. Cocceius wrote commentaries on nearly all the books of Scripture. His pupil Vitringa (died

1716) gained renown by his expositions of Isa and the Apocalypse.

(3) Later writers.

Partly fostered by the habit of basing commentary on pulpit exposition, the tendency early set in to undue prolixity in the unfolding of the meaning of Scripture. "In the Lutheran church," says Van Oosterzee, "they began to preach on whole books of the Bible; sometimes in a very prolix manner, as, e. g. in the case of the 220 sermons by one Striegnitz, a preacher at Meissen, on the history of Jonah, of which four are devoted to the consideration of the words ‘Unto Jonah’ "(Practical Theol., 120). The habit spread. The commentaries of Peter Martyr (Swiss Reformer, died 1562) on Judges and Romans occupy a folio each; N. Byfield (Puritan, died 1622) on Colossians fills a folio; Caryl (Independent, died 1673) on Job extends to 2 folios; Durham (died 1658) on Isa 53 consists of 72 sermons; Venema (Holland, died 1787) on Jeremiah fills 2 quartos, and on the Psalms no less than 6 quartos. These are only samples of a large class. H. Hammond’s A Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament, from an Arminian Standpoint belong to this period (1675). Another work which long took high rank is M. Poole’s elaborate Synopsis Criticorum Biblicorum (5 volumes, folio, 1669-76)—a summary of the opinions of 150 Biblical critics; with which must be taken his English Annotations on the Holy Bible, only completed up to Isa 58 at the time of his death (1679). The work was continued by his friends.

4. 18th Century:

(1) Calmet, M. Henry, etc.

The 18th century is marked by greater sobriety in exegesis. It is prolific in commentaries, but only a few attain to high distinction. Calmet (died 1757), a learned Benedictine, on the Roman Catholic side, produced his Commentaire litteral sur tous les livres de l’Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, in 23 quarto volumes—a work of immense erudition, though now necessarily superseded in its information. On the Protestant side, Matthew Henry’s celebrated Exposition of the Old and New Testament (1708-10) easily holds the first place among devotional commentaries for its blending of good sense, quaintness, original and felicitous remark, and genuine insight into the meaning of the sacred writers. It is, of course, not a critical work in the modern acceptation, and often is unduly diffuse. M. Henry’s work extends only to the end of Acts; the remaining books were done by various writers after his death (1714). Le Clerc (died 1736) may be named as precursor of the critical views now obtaining on the composition and authorship of the Pentateuch His commentaries began with Ge in 1693 and were not Completed till 1731. Other commentators of note of Arminian views were Daniel Whitby (died 1726; converted to Arianism), and, later, Adam Clarke, Wesleyan (1762-1832), whose work extends into the next century. Clarke’s Commentary on the Holy Scriptures (1810-26), still held by many in high esteem, is marred to some extent by eccentricities of opinion.

(2) Patrick, Lowth, Scott.

In the Anglican church the names of chief distinction in this century are Bishop Patrick, Bishop Lowth,

and later, Thomas Scott. Bishop Patrick, usually classed with the Cambridge Platonists (died 1707), contributed paraphrases and commentaries on the Old Testament from Genesis to Canticles, while Bishop Lowth (died 1787) acquired lasting fame by his Prelections on Hebrew Poetry, and A New Translation, with Notes on Isaiah. He was among the first to treat the poetical and prophetic writings really as literature. The commentaries of Patrick and Lowth were subsequently combined with those of Whitby and other divines (Arnold, etc.) to form a complete Critical Commentary (1809), which went through many editions. The well-known commentary of Thomas Scott (1747-1821), representing a moderate Calvinism, is a solid and "judicious" piece of work, inspired by an earnest, believing spirit, though not presenting any marked originality or brilliance. Brilliance is not the characteristic of many commentators of this age.

(3) Gill, Doddridge.

Two other English writers deserving notice are Dr. John Gill (died 1771; Calvinistic Baptist), who wrote Expositions on the Old Testament and the New Testament and a separate Exposition of the So of Solomon—learned, but ponderous and controversial; and Dr. Philip Doddridge (died 1751), whose Family Expositor, embracing the entire New Testament, with a harmony of the Gospels, and paraphrases of the meaning, is marked by excellent judgment, and obtainea wide acceptance.

(4) Bengel.

Meanwhile a new period had been preluded in Germany by the appearance in 1742 of the Gnomon Novi Testamenti of J. A. Bengel (died 1751), a work following upon his critical edition of the New Testament issued in 1734. Though belonging to the 18th century, Bengel’s critical and expository labors really herald and anticipate the best work in these departments of the 19th century His scholarship was exact, his judgment sound, his critical skill remarkable in a field in which he was a pioneer; his notes on the text, though brief, were pregnant with significance, and were informed by a spirit of warm and living piety.

The modern period, to which Bengel in spirit, if not in date, belongs, is marked by great changes in the style and character of commentaries. The critical temper was now strong; great advances had been made in the textual criticism of both Old Testament and New Testament (see TEXTUAL CRITICISM); the work of the higher criticism had begun in the Old Testament; in Germany, the spirit of humanism, inherited from Lessing, Herder and Goethe, had found its way into literature; knowledge of the sciences, of oriental civilizations, of other peoples and religions, was constantly on the increase; scholarship was more precise and thorough; a higher ideal of what commentary meant had taken possession of the mind.

5. The Modern Period—Its Characteristics:

Learning, too, had enlarged its borders, and books on all subjects poured from the press in such numbers that it was difficult to cope with them. This applies to commentaries as to other departments of theological study. Commentaries in the 19th century, and in our own, are legion. Only the most

prominent landmarks can be noted.

(1) Germany

(a) The liberal school.

In Germany, as was to be anticipated, the rise of the critical spirit and the profound influence exercised by it are reflected in most of the commentaries produced in the first half of the century. On the liberal side, the rationalistic temper is shown in the rejection of miracle, the denial of prediction in prophecy, and the lowering of the idea of inspiration generally. The scholarship, however, is frequently of a very high order. This temper is seen in De Wette (died 1849), whose commentaries on the New Testament, written when his views had become more positive, show grace and feeling; in Gesenius (died 1842), who produced an epoch-making commentary on Isaiah; in Knobel (died 1863), pronouncedly rationalistic, but with keen critical sense, as evinced in his commentaries on the Pentateuch and Joshua, Ecclesiastes, and Isaiah; in Hupfeld (died 1866) in his Commentary on the Psalms (4 volumes); in Hitzig (died 1875), acute but arbitrary, who wrote on the Psalms and most of the Prophets; above all, in Ewald (died 1875), a master in the interpretation of the poetical and prophetical books, but who commented also on the first three Gospels, on the writings of John, and on Paul's epistles. Ewald's influence is felt in the History of the Jewish Church by Dean Stanley, in England. The Exegetical Handbook (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch) embraced compendious annotations by Knobel, Hitzig, Bertbeau (school of Ewald), etc., but also Olshausen (died 1839; wrote likewise on the New Testament), on all the books of the Old Testament.

(b) Believing tendency.

On the believing side, from a variety of standpoints, evangelical, critical, mediating, confessional, a multitude of commentaries on the Old Testament and New Testament were produced.

(i) Conservative:

The extremely conservative position in criticism was defended by Hengstenberg (died, 1869; on Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Ezekiel, John, Revelation), by Keil (died 1888) in the well-known Keil and Delitzsch series (Genesis to Esther, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Minor Prophets; also New Testament commentaries), and by Havernick (died 1845; Daniel, Ezekiel). Delitzsch (died 1890) wrote valued commentaries on Genesis, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah; also on Hebrews.

(ii) Critical:

After the rise of the Wellhausen school, he considerably modified his views in the newer critical direction. His New Commentary on Genesis (1887) shows this change, but, with his other works, is still written in a strongly believing spirit. On the other hand, the critical position (older, not newer) is frankly represented by A. Dillmann (died 1894) in his commentaries on the books of the Pentateuch and Joshua

(English translation of Genesis, 1897; many also of the above works are translated).

(iii) Mediating:

The mediating school, largely penetrated by the influence of Schleiermacher, had many distinguished representatives. Among the most conspicuous may be named Lucke (died 1855), who wrote on John; Bleek, the Old Testament and New Testament critical scholar (died 1859), who has a work on the first three Gospels, and lectures on Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Hebrews and Revelation (his Commentary on Hebrews is the best known), and Tholuck (died 1877), whose expositions and commentaries on Psalms, John, Romans and Hebrews with his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, are fine pieces of exegetical work.

A special place must be given to two names of high distinction in the present connection. One is J. P. Lange (died 1884), the projector and editor of the great Bibelwerk (theological and homiletical) in 22 volumes, to which he himself contributed the commentaries on Genesis to Numbers, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Matthew, Mark, John, Romans, Revelation, with introductions and homiletic hints. The other is H. A. W. Meyer (died 1873), whose Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament from Matthew to Philippians (the remaining books being done by other scholars, Lunemann, Huther, etc.) is an essential part of every New Testament scholar's equipment.

(iv) Confessional:

With the more positive and confessional theologians may be ranked E. R. Stier (died 1862). whose Words of the Lord Jesus (English translation in 8 volumes; Biblical, mystical, tendency to prolixity), with commentaries on 70 selected Psalms, Proverbs, 2nd Isaiah, Ephesians, Hebrews, James and Jude, found much acceptance. A. von Harless (died 1879) wrote a Commentary on Ephesians, praised by Tholuck as one of the finest extant. Philippi (died 1882), of Jewish extraction, best known by his Commentary on Romans, was strictly Lutheran. One of the ablest of the Lutheran Confessionalists was Luthardt (died 1892), whose works include a Commentary on John's Gospel. Ebrard (died 1887), as stoutly confessional on the Reformed side, has an esteemed Commentary on Hebrews.

(v) Godet (Swiss):

An eminent continental theologian who cannot be overlooked is the Swiss F. L. Godet (died 1900), whose admirable Commentary on John's Gospel, and commentaries on Romans and Corinthians are highly appreciated.

(2) Britain and America.

Meanwhile the English speaking countries were pursuing their own paths in the production of commentaries, either in continuing their old traditions, or in striking out on new lines, under the foreign influences which, from the beginning of the century, had begun to play upon them. In England Bishop

Blomfield (died 1857) published Lectures on John and Acts. In the United States there appeared from the pen of Dr. J. A. Alexander, of Princeton (died 1860), a noteworthy Commentary on Isaiah, fully abreast of the modern learning, but staunchly censervative; also a Commentary on Psalms. From the same seminary proceeded the massive commentaries of Dr. Charles Hodge (Calvinistic) on Romans, Ephesians and Corinthians. Adapted for popular use and greatly in demand for Sunday-school purposes were the Notes, Critical, Explanatory and Practical of Albert Barnes (died 1871; New School Presbyterian). These Notes, the fruit of the use of the early morning hours in a busy pastoral life, covered the whole of the New Testament, with several books of the Old Testament (Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel). Sensible and informative, rather than original or profound, they proved helpful to many. Over 1,000,000 copies are stated to have been sold. Of similar aim, though less widely known, were the Notes of Professor M. W. Jacobus (died 1876; on the New Testament, Genesis and Exodus).

(i) Alford, Eadie:

A new era was opened in critical commentary in England by the publication of the Greek Testament (1849-61) of Dean Alford (died 1871), followed by his New Testament for English Readers (1868). Here was presented a thoroughly critical treatment of the texts, with a full display of the critical apparatus, and notes philological and exegetical, accompanied by learned and lucid introductions, on all the books of the New Testament. About the same time appeared the solid, if more theological and homiletical, commentaries of the Scottish scholar, J. Eadie (died 1876), on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians.

(ii) Ellicott and Lighfoot:

Anglican scholarship produced its ripest fruits in this line in the classical Critical and Grammatical Commentary of Bishop Ellicott (died 1905) on Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, Thessalonians, Pastoral Epistles, and the yet more remarkable series of commentaries of Bishop J. B. Lightfoot (died 1889), massive in learning, and wider in outlook than Ellicott’s, on Galatians, Philemon, Colossians and Philemon. A large part of the value of Lightfoot’s works consists in the special essays or dissertations on important subjects embodied in them (e.g. "St. Paul and the Three", "The Christian Ministry," "The Colossian Heresy," etc.).

(iii) Westcott:

With these names should be associated that of Bishop Westcott, Dr. Lightfoot’s successor in the see of Durham (died 1901), whose commentaries on the Gospel and Epistles of John, and on He, take a place among the foremost. Bishop Moule, who, in turn, succeeded Dr. Westcott; has also written commentaries, simpler in character, on Romans, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, in the Cambridge Bible Series, and on Romans in the Expositor’s Bible. In Old Testament exposition mention should be made of Bishop Perowne’s valuable work on the Book of Psalms (2nd edition, revised, 1870), with his contributions to the Cambridge Bible (see below).

(iv) Critical Influences—Broad Church

Stanley and Jowett:

The critical and theological liberalism of Germany has made its influence felt in England in the rise of a Broad Church party, the best products of which in commentary were Dean Stanley's (died 1881) graphic and interesting Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians (1855) and Dr. B. Jowett's Epistles of Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, with Critical Notes and Dissertations (1855). The new spirit culminated in the appearance of the famous Essays and Reviews (1860), and in the works of Bishop Colenso on the Pentateuch and Joshua (1862-79). Bishop Colenso had already published a translation of Romans, with commentary (1861).

(v) General Commentaries (Series):

Besides works by individual authors, there appeared during this period several general commentaries, to the production of which many writers contributed. The following may be mentioned. The Speaker's Commentary (10 volumes, 1871-82), under the general editorship of Canon F. C. Cook (died 1889), was called forth by the agitation over Bishop Colenso. Dr. Cook himself wrote introductions to Exodus, Psalms and Acts, and contributed the entire commentaries on Job, Habakkuk, Mark, Luke, 1 Peter, with parts of commentaries on Exodus, Psalms and Matthew. The work is of unequal value. A serviceable series is the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges (1877 ff), edited by Bishop Perowne, with Smaller Cambridge Bible for Schools, and Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges (still in process). Dr. Perowne (died 1904) himself contributed to the first-named the commentaries on Obadiah, Jonah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi and Galatians. Many valuable contributions appear in this series, e.g. A. F. Kirkpatrick on 1 and 2 Samuel and Psalms, A. B. Davidson on Job and Ezekiel, Driver on Daniel, G. G. Findlay on Thessalonians, etc. Next, under the editorship of Bishop Ellicott, were produced (1877-84) A New Testament Commentary for English Readers (3 volumes), and An Old Testament Commentary for English Readers (5 volumes), which contained some valuable work (Genesis by R. Payne Smith, Exodus by Canon G. Rawlinson, etc.). Akin to this in character was the Popular Commentary on the New Testament (4 volumes, 1879-83), edited by Dr. W. Schaff. This embraced, with other excellent matter, commentaries on Thessalonians by Dr. Marcus Dods, and on 1 and 2 Peter by Dr. S. D. F. Salmond. The Pulpit Commentary (49 volumes, 1880 ff), edited by J. S. Exell and Canon H. D. M. Spence, has expositions by good scholars, and an abundance of homiletical material by a great variety of authors. The series of Handbooks for Bible Classes (T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh) has a number of valuable commentaries, e.g. that of Dr. A. B. Davidson on He.

6. Recent Period:

In the most recent period the conspicuous feature has been the production of commentaries in series or by individual writers embodying the results of an advanced Old Testament criticism—in less degree of a radical New Testament criticism.

(1) Germany.

In Germany, in addition to the Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch, of older standing (see above), to which Dillmann contributed, may be mentioned Marti's Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Altes Testament (1897 ff) and Nowack's Handkommentar zum Altes Testament; also Strack-and Zockler's Kurzgefasster Kommentar (Old Testament and New Testament; critical, but moderate). Marti contributes to his Hand-Commentar the volumes on Isaiah, Daniel and the Minor Prophets; Nowack contributes to his Handkommentar the volumes on Judges and Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel and the Minor Prophets (of special importance in Nowack's series are the volumes on Genesis by H. Gunkel, and on Deuteronomy and Joshua by C. Steuernagel); Strack writes in his own work the volumes on Genesis to Numbers (Oettli contributes Deuteronomy, Joshua and Judges). Much more conservative in spirit are the commentaries of H. C. von Orelli (Basel) on Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets. In the New Testament, Meyer's Commentary has been "revised" by later writers, many of them (J. Weiss, W. Bousset, etc.) of much more advanced tendency than the original author.

(2) Britain and America.

In Britain and America like currents are observable. Professor T. K. Cheyne, who wrote a helpful commentary on the Prophecies of Isa (1880-81), and subsequently commentaries on Micah and Hosea (Cambridge Bible), Jeremiah (Pulpit Commentary), and on The Book of Psalms (1884), has become more and more extreme in his opinions. Of works in series the most important is The International Critical Commentary, edited by Drs. Driver and Plummer in England, and Dr. C. A. Briggs in the United States, of which 16 volumes in the Old Testament and the New Testament have already appeared. It need not be said that the commentaries in this series are always scholarly and able; those on the Old Testament are, however, all built on the Wellhausen foundations (see CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE. III). Dr. Driver himself writes on Deuteronomy; Dr. J. Skinner, on Genesis; Dr. G. F. Moore, on Judges; Dr. H. P. Smith, on 1 and 2 Samuel; Dr. Briggs, on Psalms; Dr. Toy, on Proverbs; Dr. W. R. Harper (died 1906), on Amos and Hosea; while Matthew in the New Testament is covered by W. C. Allen, Luke by Dr. Plummer, Romans by Drs. Sanday and Headlam, etc. A similar series is the Westminister Commentary, recently commenced, to which Dr. Driver contributes the volume on Genesis (1904; 7th edition, 1909). Yet another recent popular series is The Century Bible, to which again leading critical scholars lend their aid (Dr. W. H. Bennett on Genesis; also on "General Epistles"; Dr. A. R. S. Kennedy on 1 and 2 Samuel; Dr. Skinner on 1 and 2 Kings; Dr. A. S. Peake on Job; also on Hebrews; Dr. Driver on a group of the Minor Prophets, etc.). A well-planned one-vol Commentary on the Holy Bible, by various writers, has recently been edited by J. R. Dummelow (Cambridge). It is prefaced by a general Introduction, with a large number of articles on the principal subjects with which a reader of the Bible will desire to be acquainted.

It need only be added that very many of the foreign works mentioned above (not simply those specially noted) are now accessible in English translations.

LITERATURE.

Works and articles specially devoted to commentaries are not numerous. Dr. S. Davidson has an article "Commentary" in Kitto’s Biblical Encyclopedia, Vol I. See also F. W. Farrar’s Hist of Interpretation (Bampton Lects for 1885). G. H. Spurgeon’s popular talks on Commenting and Commentaries are accompanied by extensive lists of Commentaries on all parts of the Bible (severely exclusive of works deemed dangerous). Lists of commentaries on the Bible as a whole, on the Old Testament and New Testament separately, and on the several books, may be seen in most good works on Introduction, or in prolegomena to commentaries on the different books; e.g. in the general Introduction prefixed to Lange’s Commentary on Genesis; also in the lengthy sections on Jewish, Greek, Latin and Protestant commentators, and again in the "Index of the More Important Expository Works on the Books of the Old Testament." In Bleek’s Introduction to the Old Testament, very full information is given up to the author’s date. Full bibliographies of modern books, including commentaries on the Old Testament, are furnished in Dr. Driver’s Introduction. Similar lists are given in other works regarding the New Testament. For the writers of the commentaries on the special books in the above-noted German and English series, lists may generally be seen attached to each volume of the series.

James Orr

COMMENTARIES, HEBREW

he’-broo:

1. Philo Judaeus

2. Targum

3. Midrash

4. Talmud

5. Karaites

6. Middle Ages

(1) Saadia ben Joseph

(2) Rashi

(3) Joseph Kara

(4) Abraham ibn Ezra

(5) Qimchis

(6) Maimonides

(7) Maimunists

(8) Kabbalists

(9) The "Zohar"

(10) Isaac Arama

7. Modern Times

Abarbanel

8. The Bi’urists

(1) Mendelssohn

(2) Zunz, etc.

(3) Malbim, Ehrlich, etc.

(4) Halevy, Hoffmann, Mueller

(5) Geiger, Graetz, Kohler

LITERATURE

The following outline alludes to the leading Jewish commentators and their works in chronological order. However widely the principles which guided the various Jewish schools of exegesis, or the individual commentatom, differ from those of the modern school, the latter will find a certain suggestiveness in the former’s interpretation which well merits attention.

1. Philo Judaeus:

Philo Judaeus: A Hellenistic Jew of Alexandria, Egypt. Born about 20 BC; died after 40 AD. By his allegorical method of exegesis (a method he learned from the Stoics), Philo exercised a far-reaching influence not only on Jewish thought, but even more so on the Christian church. We have but to mention

his influence on Origen and other Alexandrian Christian writers. His purpose in employing his allegorical method was, mainly, to reconcile Greek philosophy with the Old Testament.

See PHILO, JUDAEUS.

Josephus cannot be called a Bible commentator in the proper sense of the term.

See JOSEPHUS.

2. Targum:

Targum (plural Targumim): The Aramaic translation of the Old Testament. Literally, the word designates a translation in general; its use, however, has been restricted to the Aramaic version of the Old Testament, as contrasted with the Hebrew text which was called miqra’. The Targum includes all the books of the Old Testament except Daniel and Ezra-Nehemiah, which are written in part in Aramaic. Its inception dates back to the time of the Second Temple, and it is considered a first approach to a commentary before the time of Jesus. For the Targum is not a mere translation, but rather a combination of a translation with a commentary, resulting in a paraphrase, or an interpretative translation—having its origin in exegesis. The language of this paraphrase is the vernacular tongue of Syria, which began to reassert itself throughout Palestine as the language of common intercourse and trade, as soon as a familiar knowledge of the Hebrew tongue came to be lost. The Targumim are:

TO THE PENTATEUCH

(1) Targum Onkelos or Babylonian Targum (the accepted and official);

(2) Targum yerushalmi or Palestinian Targum ("Pseudo-Jonathan"; aside from this (complete) Targum there are fragments of the Palestinian Targum termed "Fragment Targrim").

TO THE PROPHETS

(1) Targrim Jonathan ben Uzziel (being the official one; originated in Palestine and was then adapted to the vernacular of Babylonia);

(2) A Palestinian Targrim, called Targum yerushalmi (Palestinian in origin; edition Lagarde, "Prophetae Chaldaice"). Other Targumim (not officially recognized):

(1) To the Psalms and Job;

(2) to Proverbs;

(3) to the Five Rolls;

(4) to Chronicles—all Palestinian.

See TARGUM.

3. Midrash:

Midhrash: Apparently the practice of commenting upon and explaining the meaning of the Scriptures originated in the synagogues (in the time of Ezra), from the necessity of an exposition of the Law to a congregation many of whom did not or might not understand the language in which it was read. Such commentaries, however, were oral and extempore; they were not until much later crystallized into a definite form. When they assumed a definite and, still later, written shape, the name Midhrash (meaning "investigation," "interpretation," from darash, "to investigate" a scriptural passage) was given. The word occurs in 2Ch 13:22 where the Revised Version (British and American) translates "commentary." From this fact some have drawn the inference that such Midhrashim were recognized and extant before the time of the Chronicler. They are: Midhrash Rabba' on the Pentateuch and the Five Rolls (the one on Ge occupies a first position among the various exegetical Midhrashim, both on account of its age and importance). Next comes the one on Lamentations. (Zunz pointed out that the Midhrash Rabba' consists of ten entirely different Midhrashim.) On the same ten books there is a similar collection, called ha-Midhrash ha-gadhol (the "Great Midrash"), being a collection of quotations from a good many works including the Midhrash Rabba'. Other Midhrashim are: The Midhrash Tanchuma' on the Pentateuch; the Mekhilta' on Exodus (this has been (Leipzig, 1909) translated into German by Winter and Wuensche; the latter also published, under the main title Bibliotheca Rabbinica, a collection of the old Midhrashim in a German translation with introductions and notes). Further, Ciphra' on Leviticus; Ciphre on Numbers and Dr; peciqta', which comments on sections taken from the entire range of Scriptures for various festivals. There are also extant separate Midhrashim on the Psalms, Proverbs, etc.

In this connection we have yet to mention the YalquT Shim'oni, a haggadic compilation attributed to the 11th or, according to Zunz, the 13th century. The YalquT extends over the whole of the Old Testament and is arranged according to the sequence of those portions of the Bible to which reference is made. Further, the YalquT ha-Maqiri, a work similar in contents to the YalquT Shim'oni, edition Greenup.

See COMMENTARIES; MIDRASH.

4 Talmud:

Talmud (Talmudh): This term is used here to designate the entire body of literature exclusive of the Midhrash. Ample exegetical material abounds in the Talmud as it does in the Midhrashim. The critical notes on the Bible by some Talmudists are very characteristic of their intellectual temper. Some of them were extremely radical, and expressed freely their opinions on important problems of Bible criticism, such as on the integrity of the text, on doubtful authorship, etc. An Amora' of the 3rd century AD held

the opinion that the story of Job is purely fictitious, both as to the name of the hero and as to his fate. The Talmudists also generalized, and set up critical canons. The "Baraitha', of the Thirty-two Rules" is the oldest work on Biblical hermeneutics (Philo's hermeneutical rules being rather fantastic), and contains exegetical notices valid to this very day. Hermeneutics, of course, is not exegesis proper, but theory of exegesis; one results from the other, however. This Baraitha' calls attention, for instance, to the fact that words occur in the Old Testament in an abbreviated form—a thing now generally accepted.

See TALMUD.

5. Karaites:

Karaites: "Followers of the Bible." They are sometimes referred to as the "Protestants of the Jews," professing to follow the Old Testament to the exclusion of the rabbinical tradition. The founder of this Jewish sect was a Bah Jew in the 8th century, Anan ben David, by name; hence, they were first called Ananites. The principal Karaite commentators of the 9th, 10th and 11th centuries are: Benjamin Al-Nahawendi (he was the first to use the term "Karaites," "Ba'ale Miqra'"), Solomon ben Jeroham, Sahl ibn Mazliah, Yusuf al-Basir, Yafith ibn Ali (considered the greatest of this period), and Abu al- Faraij Harum. Of a later date we will mention Aaron ben Joseph and Aaron ben Elijah (14th century).

The struggle between the Rabbinites and the Karaites undoubtedly gave the impetus to the great exegetical activity among the Jews in Arabic speaking countries during the 10th and 11th centuries. The extant fragments of Saadia's commentary on the Pentateuch (not less than his polemical writings proper) are full of polemics against the Karaite interpretation. And the same circumstance aroused Karaites to like efforts.

6. Middle Ages:

Middle Ages: In the old Midhrashim as well as elsewhere the consciousness of a simple meaning of a text was never entirely lost. The principal tendencies in exegesis were four; these were afterward designated by the acrostic "PARDEC": i.e. PeshaT (or the simple philological explanation of words); Remez (or the allegorical); Derash (or the ethicohomiletical); and Codh (or the mystical). Naturally enough this division could never be strictly carried out; hence, variations and combinations are to be found.

(1) Saadia ben Joseph:

Saadia ben Joseph (892-942), the severest antagonist of the Karaites, translated the Old Testament into Arabic with notes. The parts published are: Pentateuch, Isa, Pr and Job.

Moses ha-Darshan (the Preacher) of Narbonne, France, and Tobiah ben Eliezer in Castoria, Bulgaria (11th century), are the most prominent representatives of midrashic-symbolic Bible exegesis. The former's work is known only by quotations, and contained Christian theological conceptions; the latter is

the author of "Leqach Tobh" or "Peciqta’ ZuTarta’" on the Pentateuch and the five Meghilloth.

(2) Rashi:

Rashi (Solomon ben Isaac, of Troyes; born 1040, died 1105) wrote a very popular commentary, which extends over the whole of the Old Testament, with the exception of Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and the last part of Job. He strives for the PeshaT, i.e. for a sober, natural and rational interpretation of the Bible. His is still a commentary both for the boy and the man among the Jews. Christian exegetes of the Middle Ages as well as of more modern times made Use of his Bible commentary. Nicolas de Lyra (see COMMENTARIES) followed Rashi closely; and it is a known fact that Luther’s translation of the Bible is dependent upon Nicolas de Lyra. Rashi’s commentary has called forth numerous supercommentaries.

(3) Joseph Kara:

An independent and important exegete was Joseph Kara’ (about 1100). He edited and partly completed Rashi’s commentary, particularly the part on the Pentateuch

(4) Abraham ibn Ezra:

Abraham ibn Ezra’s (1092-1168) commentary on the Pentateuch, like Rashi’s commentaries, has produced many supercommentaries. His is very scholarly. He was the first to maintain that Isa contains the work of two authors; and his doubts respecting the authenticity of the Pentateuch were noticed by Spinoza.

(5) Qimchis:

The grammarians and the lexicographers were not merely exegetical expounders of words, but many of them were likewise authors of actual commentaries. Such were the Qimchis, Joseph (father), Moses and David (his sons); especially the latter. The Qimchis were the most brilliant contributors to Bible exegesis and Hebrew philology (like Ibn Ezra) in medieval times.

(6) Maimonides:

Maimonides (1135-1204): Philo employed his allegorical method for the purpose of bringing about a reconciliation of Plato with the Old Testament. Maimonides had something similar in view. To him Aristotle was the representative of natural knowledge and the Bible of supernatural—and he sought for a reconciliation between the two in his religious philosophy. Exegesis proper was the one field, however, to which this great genius made no contribution of first-class importance.

(7) Maimunist:

The Maimunist, those exegetes of a philosophical turn, are: Joseph ibn Aknin, Samuel ibn Tibbon, his

son Moses, and his son-in-law, Jacob ben Abba Mari Anatolio, whose Malmadh ha-Talmidhim is the most important work of philosophical exegesis of the period.

Joseph ibn Kacpi, chiefly known as a philosopher of the Maimunist type, deserves attention. Ibn Kacpi is an exegete of the first quality. His exposition of Isa 53 might be the work of the most modern scholar. He refers the prophecy to Israel, not to an individual, and in this his theory is far superior to that of some other famous Jewish expositors who interpret the chapter as referring to Hezekiah.

Through the philosophical homily, which began to be used after the death of Maimonides, Aristotle was popularized from the pulpit. The pulpit changed to a chair of philosophy. Aristotle's concepts—as Matter and Form, the Four Causes, Possibility and Reality—were then something ordinary in the sermon, and were very popular.

(8) Kabbalists:

The principal commentators with a Kabbalistic tendency are: Nachmanides (1194-1270?) whose great work is his commentary on the Pentateuch; Immanuel of Rome (1270?-1330?) who does, however, not disregard the literal meaning of the Scriptures; Bahya ben Asher (died 1340) who formulated the four methods of exegesis of "PaRDeC." referred to above; he took Nachmanides as his model; many supercommentaries were written on his commentary on the Pentateuch; and Gersonides (1288-1334), a maternal grandson of Nachmanides, who sees symbols in many Biblical passages; on account of some of his heretical ideas expressed in his philosophy, some rabbis forbade the study of his commentaries.

(9) The "Zohar":

We must not fail to make mention of the Zohar (the "Bible of the Kabbalists"), the book of all others in the Middle Ages that dominated the thinking and feeling of the Jews for almost 500 years, and which was in favor with many Christian scholars. This work is pseudepigraphic, written partly in Aramaic and partly in Hebrew. It first appeared in Spain in the 131h century, and was made known through Moses de Leon, to whom many historians attribute it.

(10) Isaac Arama:

Mention must also be made of Isaac Arama (1430-94), whose 'Aqedhah, his commentary on the Pentateuch (homiletical in style), was the standard book for the Jewish pulpit for centuries, much esteemed by the Christian world, and is still much read by the Jews, especially in Russia and Poland.

7. Modern Times:

Abarbanel:

Isaac Abravanel (or Abarbanel; 1437-1508): A statesman and scholar who came nearest to the modern idea of a Bible commentator by considering not only the literary elements of the Bible but the political and social life of the people as well. He wrote a general introduction to each book of the Bible, setting forth its character; and he was the first to make use of Christian commentaries which he quotes without the least prejudice. Moses Alshech (second half of 16th century) wrote commentaries, all of which are of a homiletical character. In the main the Jewish exegesis of the 16th and 17th centuries branched out into homileties.

We will pass over the critical annotations connected with the various editions of the Hebrew Bible, based upon the comparison of manuscripts, on grammatical and Massoretic studies, ete, such as those of Elijah Levita, Jacob ben Hayyim of Tunis (afterward a convert to Christianity), etc.

8. The "Bi'urists":

(1) Mendelssohn:

The "Bi'urists" ("Commentators"): A school of exegetes which had its origin with Mendelssohn's (1729-86) literal German translation of the Bible, at a time when Christian Biblical studies of a modern nature had made some progress, and under whose influence the Bi'urists wrote. They are: Dubno, Wessely, Jaroslav, tt. Homberg, J. Euchel, etc. They laid a foundation for a critieo-historical study of the Bible among modern Jews. It bore its fruit in the 19th century in the writings of Philippson, Munk, Fuerst, etc.

(2) Zunz, etc.:

The same century produced Zunz's (1794-1886) Gottesdienstlichen Vortraege der Juden, the book of "Jewish science."

(3) Malbim, Ehrlich, etc.:

It also produced three Jewish exegetes, Luzzatto in Italy, Malbim and Ehrlich in Russia (the latter since 1878 residing in New York); he published, in Hebrew a commentary on the Old Testament, entitled Miqra' ki-PeshuTah (Berlin, 1899-1901, 3 volumes), and, in German, Randglossen z. hebr. Bibel, two scholarly works written from the conservative standpoint (Leipzig, 1908-). Malbim was highly esteemed by the Christian commentators Franz Delitzsch and Muehlau, who studied under him.

(4) Halevy, Hoffmann, Mueller:

Others are Joseph Halevy, a French Jew, a most original Bible investigator, and D. Hoffmann (the last two named are adversaries of "higher criticism") and D. H. Mueller. M. Heilprin wrote a collection of Bibelkritische Notizen (Baltimore, 1893), containing comparisons of various passages of the Bible, and The Historical Poetry of the Ancient Hebrews (N. Y., 1879-80, 2 volumes), and the American rabbi B, Szold, a Commentary on Job (Baltimore, 1886), written in classic Hebrew, and with accurate

scholarship and in which full account is taken of the work of the Massorites. A new Hebrew commentary on the whole of the Old Testament has been since 1903 in progress under the editorship of A. Kahana. This is the first attempt since Mendelssohn's Bi'ur to approach the Bible from the Jewish side with the latest philological and archaeological equipment. Among the authors are Kahana on Genesis and Jonah, Krauss on Isaiah, Chajes on Psalms and Amos, Wynkoop on Hosea and Joel, and Lambert on Daniel. This attempt well deserves attention and commendation.

There is still to be mentioned the work of M. M. Kalisch (1828-85), whose special object was to write a full and critical commentary on the Old Testament. Of his Historical and Critical Commentary on the Old Testament, with a New Tr, only the following parts were published: Exodus, 1855; Genesis, 1858; Leviticus (pts 1-2), 1867-72. They contain a resume of all that Jewish and Christian learning had accumulated on the subject up to the dates of their publication. In his Le he anticipated Wellhausen to a large extent.

(5) Geiger, Graetz, Kohler:

We conclude with some names of the liberals: Geiger (whose Urschrift is extremely radical), Graetz, the great Jewish historian, and Kohler (president of the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, O.) whose Der Segen Jacobs is one of the earliest essays of "higher criticism" written by a Jew.

LITERATURE.

Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, London. 1857; Zunz. Gottesdienstlichen Vortraege der Juden, 2nd edition, Frankfurt a. M., 1892; Jew Encyclopedia (articles by Bacher and Ginzberg); Catholic Encyclopedia (article "Commentaries"); Rosenau, Jewish Biblical Commentators, Baltimore, 1906 (popular); Winter-Wuensche, Geschichte der Juedischen Literatur, Leipzig. 1892-95, 3 volumes (the best existing anthology of Jewish literature in a modern language; it contains very valuable introductions); Wogue, Histoire de la Bible et l'exegese biblique jusqu' a nos jours. Paris, 1881.

Adolph S. Oko

COMMENTARY

kom'-en-ta-ri (midhrash, "an investigation," from darash, "to search," "inquire," "explore"; the King James Version "story"): "The commentary of the prophet Iddo" (2Ch 13:22), "the commentary of the book of the kings" (2Ch 24:27). In these passages the word is not used exactly in its modern sense. The Hebrew term means "an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, especially a didactic or homiletic exposition, or an edifying religious story" (Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 5, 497). In the commentaries (Midhrashim) mentioned by the Chronicler as among his sources, the story of Abijah's reign was presumably related and elaborated with a view to moral instruction rather than historic accuracy.

See CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF; COMMENTARIES, HEBREW.

M. O. Evans

COMMERCE

kom’-ers (emporia):

I. Old Testament Times.

1. Early Overland Commerce:

There were forces in early Hebrew life not favorable to the development of commerce. Intercourse with foreigners was not encouraged by Israel’s social and religious customs. From the days of the appearance of the Hebrews in Canaan, however, some commercial contact with the peoples around was inevitable. There were ancient trade routes between the East and the West, as well as between Egypt and the Mesopotamian valley. Palestine lay as a bridge between these objective points. There were doubtless traveling merchants from very remote times, interchanging commodities of other lands for those of Palestine Some of the Hebrew words for "trading" and "merchant" indicate this (compare cachar, "to travel," rakhal, "to go about"). In the nomadic period, the people were necessarily dependent upon overland commerce for at least a part of their food supply, such as grain, and doubtless for articles of clothing, too. Frequent local famines would stimulate such trade. Companies or caravans carrying on this overland commerce are seen in Ge 37:25,28, "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites, merchantmen," on their way to Egypt, with spices, balm and myrrh. Jacob caused his sons to take certain products to Egypt as a present with money to Joseph in return for grain: balsam, spices, honey, myrrh, nuts, almonds (Ge 43:11 f). The presence of a "Bab mantle" among the spoils of Ai (Jos 7:21) indicates commerce between Canaan and the East.

2. Sea Traffic:

While there are slight indications of a possible sea trade as early as the days of the Judges (Jud 5:17; compare Ge 49:13), we must wait till the days of the monarchy of David and especially Solomon for the commerce of ships. Land traffic was of course continued and expanded (1Ki 10:15,28,29; 2Ch 1:16). Sea trade at this time made large strides forward. The Philistines were earlier in possession of the coast. Friendship with Hiram king of Tyre gave Solomon additional advantages seaward (1Ki 5; 9:26; 10:19-29; 2Ch 8:17; 9:14), since the Phonicians were pre-eminently the Miditerranean traders among all the people of Palestine Later, commerce declined, but Jehoshaphat attempted to revive it (1Ki 22:48; 2Ch 20:36), but without success. Tyre and Sidon as great commercial centers, however, long impressed the life of Israel (Isa 23; Eze 26-27). Later, in the Maccabean period, Simon acquired Joppa as a Jewish port (1 Macc 14:5), and so extended Mediterranean commerce.

3. Land Traffic in the Time of the Kings:

During the peaceful reign of Solomon, there came, with internal improvements and foreign friendships, a stimulus to traffic with Egypt and the Far East over the ancient trade routes as well as with Phoenicia on the northwest. He greatly added to his wealth through tariffs levied upon merchantmen (1Ki 10:15). Trade with Syria in the days of Omri and Ahab is indicated by the permission Benhadad gave to Israelites to open streets, or trading quarters, in Damascus, as Syrians had in Samaria (1Ki 20:34). The prophets disclose repeatedly the results of foreign commerce upon the people in the days of Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, and of Jeroboam II, under whom great material prosperity was attained, followed by simple luxury (Isa 2:6,7,16; Ho 12:1,7,8; Am 6:3-6). The people in their greed of gain could not observe Sabbaths and feast days (Am 8:5); compare Sabbath trading and its punishment in the days of the restoration (Ne 13:15-22). "Canaanite" became the nickname for traffickers (Zec 14:21; compare Isa 23:8).

II. New Testament Times.

After the conquests of Alexander 333 BC, trade between East and West was greatly stimulated. Colonies of Jews for trade purposes had been established in Egypt and elsewhere. The dispersion of the Jews throughout the Greek and Roman world added to their interest in commerce. The Mediterranean Sea, as a great Roman lake, under Roman protection, became alive with commercial fleets. The Sea of Galilee with its enormous fish industry became the center of a large trading interest to all parts. The toll collected in Galilee must have been considerable. Matthew was called from his collectorship to discipleship (Mt 9:9); Zaccheus and other publicans became rich collecting taxes from large commercial interests like that of balsam. Jesus frequently used the commerce of the day as illustration (Mt 13:45; 25:14-30). Along the Palestinian coast there were several ports where ships touched: Lydda, Joppa, Caesarea; and further north Ptolemais, Tyre, Sidon and Antioch (port Seleucia).

The apostle Paul made use of ships touching at points on the coast of Asia Minor, and the islands along the coast, and also doing coast trade with Greece, Italy and Spain, to carry on his missionary emterprises (Ac 13:4-13; 16:11 f; 18:18; 20:13-16; 21:1-8; 27:1-44; 28:1-14). The rapidity with which the gospel spread throughout the Roman world in the 1st century was due no little to the use of the great Roman highways, built partly as trade routes; as well as to the constant going to and fro of tradesmen of all sorts; some of whom like Aquila and Priscilla (Ac 18:2,18,26), Lydia, (Ac 16:14,40) and Paul himself (who was a traveling tent-maker) were active in disseminating the new faith among the Gentiles. In Jas 4:13 we have a good representation of the life of a large number of Jews of this period, who would "go into such a city, and continue there a year, and buy and sell, and get gain" (the King James Version).

See also TRADE.

Edward Bagby Pollard

COMMIT

ko-mit’:Used in two senses:

(1) "To give in charge" or "entrust": sim, "to put" (Job 5:8); galal, "to roll" (Ps 37:5; Pr 16:3); paqadh, "to give, in charge" (Ps 31:5 the King James Version; compare Lu 23:46); tithemi, "committed to us (the Revised Version, margin "placed in us") the word of reconciliation" (2Co 5:19); paratheke, "that which I have committed unto him" (2Ti 1:12; the Revised Version, margin "that which he hath committed unto me," Greek "my deposit"); "that which is committed unto thee" (1Ti 6:20, Greek "the deposit"); "that good thing," etc. (2Ti 1:14, Greek "the good deposit").

(2) "To do or practice (evil)": prasso "commit such things" (Ro 1:32, the Revised Version (British and American) "practice"; compare Ro 2:2). In 1Jo 3:4,8 "doeth sin" (poieo, the King James Version "committeth sin") shows that it is not committing a single sin that is in view, but sinful practice.

W. L. Walker

COMMODIOUS

ko-mo’-di-us (aneuthetos, "not well placed"): The word occurs only in Ac 27:12. "As regards wintering, the place was certainly ‘not commodious,’ but as regards shelter from some winds (including Northwest), it was a good anchorage" (Code of Hammurabi, XXIII, 639).

COMMON

kom’-un: koinos, in the classics, and primarily in the New Testament, means what is public, general, universal, as contrasted with idios, what is peculiar, individual, not shared with others. Thus, "common faith" (Tit 1:4), "common salvation" (Jude 1:3), refer to that in which the experience of all Christians unites and is identical: "common," because there is but one faith and one salvation (Eph 4:4-6). From this comes the derived meaning of what is ordinary and, therefore, to be disesteemed, as contrasted with what pertains to a class, and to be prized, because rare. This naturally coincides with Old Testament exclusivism, particularity and separation. Its religion was that of a separated people, with a separated class as its ministers, and with minute directions as to distinctions of meat, drink, times, places, rites, vessels, etc. Whatever was common or ordinary, it avoided. The New Testament, on the other hand, with its universalism of scope, and its spirituality of sphere, rose above all such externals. The salvation which it brought was directed to the redemption of Nature, as well as of man, sanctifying the creature, and pervading all parts of man’s being and all relations of life. The antithesis is forcibly illustrated in Ac 10:14 f, where Peter says: "I have never eaten anything that is common and unclean," and the reply is: "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common."

H. E. Jacobs

COMMONWEALTH

kom’-un-welth (politeia): Spoken of theocracy (Eph 2:12). The same word is rendered "freedom," the King James Version; "citizenship" the Revised Version (British and American). Also in the sense of commonwealth in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 4:11; 8:17; 13:14); in the sense of citizenship (3 Macc 3:21,23).

See CITIZENSHIP.

COMMUNE; COMMUNICATE; COMMUNICATION

ko-mun’, komun’-i-kat, ko-mu-ni-ka’-shun: To commune is to converse confidentially and sympathetically. It is represented in both Hebrew and Greek by several words literally signifying to speak (compare Lu 6:11, dialaleo; also Lu 22:4; Ac 24:26, homileo). To communicate is to impart something to another, so that it becomes common to giver and receiver. In 1Ti 6:18, "willing to communicate" (the Revised Version, margin "sympathize"), represents a single word koinonikoi, and refers to the habit of sharing with others either sympathy or property. the Revised Version (British and American) gives "companionships" for homiliai in 1Co 15:33 (the King James Version "communications").

See also COMMUNION.

COMMUNION WITH DEMONS; DEVILS

de’-monz, (dev’-’-lz):

I. Use of Term:

The actual expression "communion with demons" (koinonoi ton daimonion) occurs but once in Scripture (1Co 10:20) where its figurative meaning is evident, but it is implied in the English version of a number of passages by the terms "one who has" or "those who have" "familiar spirits" (Le 19:31; 20:6,27; De 18:11; 1Sa 28:3,7,8,9; 2Ki 21:6; 23:24; 1Ch 10:13; 2Ch 33:6; Isa 8:19; 19:3; 29:4). These passages seem to be somewhat incongruous with Paul’s statement, but are in reality so intimately related to it as to give and receive light through the connection.

II. Teaching of Scripture.

To begin with, we may safely say, in general, that there is no ground for asserting that the Bible admits the possibility of conscious and voluntary communion with spirits. This is an essential element of popular demonology in all ages, but it is absent from Scripture. Even in the passages mentioned above which refer to necromancers and wizards, while, as we shall see, the words indicate that such practitioners professed to rely upon spirits in their divinations, the Scriptures carefully refrain from sanctioning these claims, and a number of features in the various passages serve to indicate that the true

scriptural view is quite the opposite. As this is not a prevalent opinion, we should do well to examine the passages with some little care.

1. The New Testament:

(1) We may first deal with the New Testament. In the Gospels the demoniacs are consistently looked upon and treated as unconscious and helpless victims (see DEMON, DEMONOLOGY). The frequent use of this term "demonized" (daimonizomenoi) together with all that is told us of the methods of treating these eases adopted by our Lord and His apostles (see EXORCISM) indicates the belief of the New Testament writers that the control of demons over men is obtained outside of or below the region of conscious volition and that the condition of the sufferers is pathological.

(2) The same must be said of the Lydian maiden whose cure by Paul is recorded in Ac 16:16. This is the one instance in the New Testament where divination is connected with spirits. The account emphasizes the excitable neurosis of the patient; and the belief on the part of the apostles and of the writer of Ac that the girl was not the conscious accomplice of her masters, but their unfortunate victim through her mysterious malady, is clear. She was treated, as the other eases recorded in the New Testament, not as a conscious wrongdoer, but as a sick person to be healed.

2. The Old Testament:

(1) Turning now to the Old Testament, the instance which requires the most careful treatment, because it holds the key to all the rest, is the narrative of Saul's visit to the Witch of Endor in 1Sa 28:3-25. The Hebrew word ‘obh which is usually translated "one who has a familiar spirit" (see list of passages at beginning of article) occurs in this narrative four times (verses 3, 7 twice, 8). According to the ordinary interpretation it is used in three different senses, two of which occur here. These three senses are

(a) a person who controls a spirit,

(b) the spirit controlled,

(c) the power to control such a spirit.

This meaning appears to be altogether too broad. Omitting to translate the word we have: (verse 3) "Saul had put away ‘obhoth, and yidh‘onim"; (verse 7), a woman, a mistress of an ‘obh; (verse 8) "Divine unto me .... by the ‘obh." It is extremely unlikely that the same word should be used in two senses so far apart as "person who has a spirit" and the "spirit itself" in the same context. In the last passage mentioned (verse 8) there is a double indication that the word ‘obh cannot have either signification mentioned. Saul says: "Divine unto me by the ‘obh and bring me up whomsoever I shall name unto thee." The expression "divine by" clearly points to some magical object used in divination. Control of a spirit through some magical object is familiar enough. The rest of Saul's statement confirms this view. The result of the divination is the calling up of a spirit. A spirit would hardly be used to call up another spirit. This

conclusion is confirmed by the etymology. The word ‘obh is supposed to mean "one who has a familiar spirit," from its root-significance of hollow and its primary meaning of wineskin. According to this derivation the word is applied to a necromancer on the supposition that the spirit inhabits his body and speaks from within. The transference to spirit is extremely unlikely and the explanation is not consistent with primitive ideas on spirit manifestation (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, ‘owb end).

(2) We, therefore, hold with H. P. Smith (International Critical Commentary, "Samuel" in the place cited.), though partly on different grounds, that the word ‘obh has the same meaning in all the passages where it occurs, and that it refers to a sacred object or fetish by which spiritistic divination was carried on.

The significance of this conclusion is that the misleading expression "familiar spirit" disappears from the text, for Dr. Driver’s interpretation of the companion word yidh‘onim (see International Critical Commentary, Commentary on Deuteronomy in the place cited.) will scarcely be maintained in the face of this new meaning for ‘obh. The prohibition contained in the law (Le 20:27) against ‘ohboth, and those using them, places them in the same catalogue of offense and futility with idol-worship in general.

(3) This opinion is confirmed by two separate items of evidence.

(a) In the Witch of Endor story Samuel’s appearance, according to the idea of the narrator, was due to a miracle, not to the magic power of the feeble and cheating old woman to whom Saul had resorted. God speaks through the apparition a stern message of doom. No one was more startled than the woman herself, who for once had a real vision (1Sa 28:12). She not only gave a loud cry of astonishment and alarm but she described the figure which she saw as "a god coming up out of the each." The story is told with fidelity and clearly indicates the opinion that the actual appearance of a spirit is so violently exceptional as to indicate the immediate power and presence of God.

(b) In Isa 8:19 the ‘obhoth and yidh‘onim are spoken of as those who "chirp and mutter." These terms refer to the necromancers themselves (Septuagint translates ‘obhoth by eggastromuthoi = ventriloquists) who practiced ventriloquism in connection with their magical rites. In Isa 29:4 it is said "Thy voice shall be as an ‘obh, out of the ground." Here ‘obh is usually interpreted as "ghost," but it is far more probable (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament sub loc.) that it refers as in 8:19 to the ventriloqustic tricks of those who utter their oracles in voices intended to represent the spirits which they have evoked. They are stamped in these passages, as in the Witch of Endor narrative, as deceivers practicing a fraudulent article. By implication their power to evoke spirits with whom they were in familiar intercourse is denied.

3. The Meaning of Idol-Worship:

This leaves the way clear for a brief consideration of the words of Paul in 1Co 10:20 in connection with cognate passages in the Old Testament.

(1) He argues that since idol-worship is really demon-worship, the partaking of heathen sacrifice is a communion with demons and a separation from Christ. It is usually taken for granted that this characterization of heathen worship was simply a part of the Jewish-Christian polemic against idolatry. Our fuller knowledge of the spiritism which conditions the use of images enables us to recognize the fact that from the viewpoint of heathenism itself Paul's idea was strictly correct. The image is venerated because it is supposed to represent or contain an invisible being or spirit, not necessarily a deity in the absolute sense, but a super-human living being capable of working good or ill to men.

(2) In the King James Version the term devils is used in four Old Testament passages (Le 17:7; De 32:17; 2Ch 11:15; Ps 106:37). In the Revised Version (British and American) "devils" has disappeared from the text—the word he-goats appears in Le 17:7 and 2Ch 11:15, while "demons" appears in De 32:17 and Ps 106:37. The translation of se'irim as "he-goats" is literally correct, but conveys an erroneous conception of the meaning. The practice reprobated is the worship of Satyrs (see SATYR) or wood-demons supposed to be like goats in appearance and to inhabit lonely places. The same word is used in Isa 13:21; 34:14. The word translated "demons" in the Revised Version (British and American) is shedhim, a term used only twice and both times in connection with the rites and abominations of heathen worship. It is interesting to note that the word shidu is applied to the beings represented by the bull-colossi of Assyria (Driver, De in the place cited.). Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament holds that the word shedhim is an Assyrian loan-word, while Briggs (ICC, Ps 106:37) holds that shedhim were ancient gods of Canaan. In either case the word belongs to heathenism and is used in Scripture to describe heathen worship in its own terminology. The interpretation of these beings as evil is characteristic of Biblical demonism in general (see DEMON, etc.). The worship of idols was the worship of personal beings more than man and less than God, according to Jewish and Christian ideas (see Driver op. cit., 363). Septuagint translates both the above words by daimonia.

4. Conclusion:

The term "communion with demons" does not imply any power on the part of men to enter into voluntary relationship with beings of another world, but that, by sinful compliance in wrongdoing, such as idol-worship and magical rites, men may enter into a moral identification with evil powers against which it is their duty to fight.

LITERATURE.

The Dictionaries and Commentaries dealing with the passages quoted above contain discussions of the various aspects of the subject. Jewish superstitions are ably treated by Edersheim, Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah (8th edition), II, 771, 773.

Louis Matthews Sweet

COMMUNION; (FELLOWSHIP)

ko-mun’-yun: The terms "communion" and "fellowship" of the English Bible are varying translations of the words koinonia, and koinoneo, or their cognates. They designate acts of fellowship observed among the early Christians or express the unique sense of unity and fellowship of which these acts were the outward expression. The several passages in which these terms are used fall into two groups: those in which they refer to acts of fellowship, and those in which they refer to fellowship as experienced.

I. Ac of Fellowship.

The acts of fellowship mentioned in the New Testament are of four kinds.

1. The Lord’s Supper:

Our information concerning the nature of the fellowship involved in the observance of this sacrament is confined to the single notice in 1Co 10:16,17, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" Owing to the presence of the material elements in the sacrament there is a temptation to limit the word for communion to the sense of partaking. This, however, does not entirely satisfy the requirements of the context. The full significance of the term is to be sought in the light of the argument of the whole section (verses 14-22).

Paul is making a protest against Christians participating in idolatrous feasts on the ground that such feasts are really celebrated in honor of the demons associated with the idols, and that those who participate in them come into fellowship with demons. As a proof of this point the apostle cites the Lord’s Supper with which his readers are familiar. By partaking of the cup and the bread the communicants are linked together in unity: "We, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread." Thus the communion of the elements is a real communion of the worshippers one with another and with Christ. Unless the communion be understood in this spiritual sense Paul’s illustration falls short of the mark.

See EUCHARIST.

2. Communism:

The term for fellowship as used in Ac 2:42 is by some interpreted in this sense: "They continued stedfastly in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." The fact that the four terms are used in pairs and that three of them refer to specific acts observed by the company of believers suggests that the term for fellowship also refers to some definite act similar to the others. It is very plausible to refer this to the community of goods described in the verses immediately following (see COMMUNITY OF GOODS). The author might, however, with equal propriety have regarded the interchange of spiritual experiences as an act of worship in the same class with "the breaking of bread

and the prayers."

3. Contributions:

Christian fellowship found a natural mode of expression in almsgiving. This is enjoined as a duty in Ro 12:13; 1Ti 6:18; Heb 13:16. An example of such giving is the great collection raised among the Gentileconverts for the poor saints of Jerusalem (Ro 15:26; 2Co 8:4; 9:13). To this collection Paul attached so much importance as a witness to the spirit of fellowship which the gospel inspires in all hearts alike, whether Jew or Gentile, that he desired even at the peril of his life to deliver it with his own hand.

See COLLECTION.

4. Cooperation:

A form of fellowship closely related to almsgiving was that of formal aid or cooperation in Christian work, such as the aid given to Paul by the Philippians (Php 1:5). A unique form of this cooperation is the formal endorsement by giving the fight hand of fellowship as described in Ga 2:9.

II. Fellowship as Experienced.

From the very beginning the early Christians experienced a peculiar sense of unity. Christ is at once the center of this unity and the origin of every expression of fellowship. Sometimes the fellowship is essentially an experience and as such it is scarcely susceptible of definition. It may rather be regarded as a mystical union in Christ. In other instances the fellowship approaches or includes the idea of intercourse. In some passages it is represented as a participation or partnership. The terms occur most frequently in the writings of Paul with whom the idea of Christian unity was a controlling principle.

In its various relations, fellowship is represented:

(1) As a communion between the Son and the Father. The gospel record represents Jesus as enjoying a unique sense of communion and intimacy with the Father. Among many such expressions those of Mt 11:25-27 (compare Lu 10:21,22) and Joh 14-15 are especially important.

(2) As our communion with God, either with the Father or the Son or with the Father through the Son or the Holy Spirit. "Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1Jo 1:3; compare also Joh 14:6,23,16).

(3) As our communion one with another. "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another" (1Jo 1:7). Sometimes the idea of communion occurs in relation with abstract ideas or experiences: "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness" (Eph 5:11);

"the fellowship of his sufferings" (Php 3:10); "the fellowship of thy faith" (Phm 1:6). In three passages the relation of the fellowship is not entirely clear: the "fellowship of the Spirit" (Php 2:1); "the communion of the Holy Spirit" (2Co 13:14); and "the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ" (1Co 1:9). The fellowship is probably to be understood as that prevailing among Christians by virtue of the grace of Christ and the ministry of the Holy Spirit.

It is not to be inferred that the idea of fellowship is limited to the passages in which the specific words for communion are used. Some of the clearest and richest expressions of unity and fellowship are found in the Gospels, though, these words do not occur in them. In fact, perhaps, the most familiar and forcible expressions of the idea are those in which they are represented symbolically, as in the parable of the Vine and the Branches (Joh 15:1 ff) or in the figure of the Body and its Members (Mt 5:29 ff; Ro 12:5; 1Co 12).

Russell Benjamin Miller

COMMUNITY OF GOODS

ko-mu’-ni-ti, (hapanta koina eichon, literally, "They had all things (in) common"): In Ac 2:44, it is said that, in the infant church at Jerusalem, "all that believed were together, and had all things common," and (Ac 4:34 f) "as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid them at the apostles’ feet." The inference from this, that there was an absolute disposal of all the property of all the members of the church, and that its proceeds were contributed to a common fund, has been disputed upon the ground that the example of Barnabas in selling "a field" for this purpose (Ac 4:37) would not have been mentioned, if this had been the universal rule. The thought conveyed is that all believers in that church held their property as a trust from the Lord, for the benefit of the entire brotherhood, and, as there was need, did as Barnabas.

No commandment, of which record has been preserved, prescribed any such course. It came from the spontaneous impulse of the sense of brotherhood in Christ, when the band of disciples was still small, making them in a sense one family, and under the external constraint of extreme want and persecution. So much there was, that they realized, under such conditions they had in common, that they were ready to extend this to all things. It was, in a sense, a continuance of the practice of a common purse in the band of immediate followers of our Lord during his ministry. The penalty inflicted on Ananias and Sapphira was not for any failure to comply fully with this custom, but because this freedom which they possessed (Ac 5:4) they falsely professed to have renounced, thus receiving in the estimation of their brethren a credit that was not their due. This custom did not last long. It was possible only within a limited circle, and under very peculiar circumstances. The New Testament recognizes the right of individual property and makes no effort to remove the differences that exist among believers themselves. The community of goods which it renders possible is spiritual (1Co 3:21 f), and not one of visible and external things. With respect to the latter, it enjoins upon the Christian, as a steward of God, the possession and administration of property for the progress of the kingdom of God, and the highest interests of men. The spirit of Ac 4:34 is always to pervade the association of believers as a true

Christian community. Meyer, on the above passage, has suggested that it is not unlikely that the well-known poverty of the church at Jerusalem, and its long dependence upon the alms of other churches, may be connected with this early communistic practice, which, however justifiable and commendable at the time, bore its inevitable fruits in a subsequent season of great scarcity and lack of employment.

H. E. Jacobs

COMPACT; COMPACTED

kom-pakt', kom-pakt'-ed (chabhar, "to be joined"; sumbibazo, "to raise up together"): "Compact" appears as translation of chabhar in Ps 122:3, "Jerus .... a city that is compact together" (well built, its breaches restored, walls complete, and separate from all around it); and "compacted" (sumbibazo) occurs in the King James Version Eph 4:16, "fitly joined together and compacted," the Revised Version (British and American) "fitly framed and knit together." In the Revised Version (British and American) "compacted" is also the translation of sunistemi, "to set together" (2Pe 3:5), "an earth compacted out of water and amidst (margin, through) water," which suggests the idea of water as the primary material (compare Ge 1:2).

W. L. Walker

COMPANY

kum'-pa-ni: The fertility of the original languages in synonyms and varied shades of meaning is seen by the fact that 20 Hebrew and 12 Greek words are represented by this single term. An analysis of these words shows that "company" is both an indefinite and limitless term, signifying few or many, and all kinds of assemblages of people, e.g.:

(1) Caravan,

(a) migratory (Isa 21:13 the King James Version);

(b) commercial (Ge 37:25 the King James Version); Job 6:19, "The companies of Sheba waited (in vain) for them."

(2) Military, gedhudh, "troop," hamon, 2Ch 20:12; ro'sh, "head," "detachment"; Jud 7:16,20: "three companies"; Jud 9:34,37,43: "four companies."

(3) Band (chebher) or "gang," as rendered by Keil and Delitzsch; a gang of murderous priests (Ho 6:9).

(4) Camp or encampment (Ge 32:8,21; 50:9).

(5) Religious body, "company of prophets" (1Sa 19:20).

(6) Assembly, congregation, "company of nations" (Ge 35:11; Eze 38:4,7,13,15).

(7) A tumultuous crowd (2Ki 9:17).

(8) Associate, companion, often with reference to moral affinity (Job 34:8; Pr 29:3; Ac 10:28), kollaomai, "to glue or cement together," indicative of the binding power of moral affinity (the Revised Version (British and American) "to join himself"); as a verb, to "company with" or "keep company" (Ac 1:21; 1Co 5:9,11; 2Th 3:14). In Apocrypha in the sense of "to cohabit" (Susanna 1:54,57,58).

(9) A host. "Great was the company," etc. (Ps 68:11 the Revised Version (British and American) "The women .... are a great host"). In the East it is the women who celebrate victories with song and dance (see 1Sa 18:6,7).

(10) A chorus, dance (mecholah). "The company of two armies" (So 6:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "the dance of Mahanaim").

(11) Meal party, klisia, "a reclining company at meals." "Make them sit down (Greek "recline") in companies" (Lu 9:14). Compare "companion," from Latin com, "together," and panis, "bread."

(12) A myriad, a ten-thousand, an indefinite number (murias; Heb 12:22 (the Revised Version (British and American) "hosts")).

(13) Companions on a journey, sunodia, "a journeying together" (Lu 2:44).

(14) Signifying kinship of spirit, idios, "one’s own." "They came to their own company" (Ac 4:23).

(15) A mob (Ac 17:5 (the Revised Version (British and American) "a crowd")).

Dwight M. Pratt

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

kom-par’-a-tiv:

I. THE SUBJECT IN GENERAL

1. Universality of Religion

2. Theories of Its Origin and Growth of Religion

3. Evolution

II. RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO ETHNIC FAITHS AND THEIR TENETS

1. Karma

2. God

3. The Summum Bonum

4. Self-Revelation of God

5. Incarnation

6. Salvation

7. Faith

8. Approach to God

III. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ETHNIC FAITHS

1. Tenets Common to All Religions

2. Tendency to Degradation, not to Progress, in Ethnic Faiths

3. Mythology and Religion

4. Religion And Morality in Ethnic Faiths

IV. SUPPOSED RESEMBLANCES TO REVEALED RELIGION

1. Rites

2. Dogmas

3. Asserted Parallels to Gospel History

4. Virgin Birth

5. Heathen Aspirations and Unconscious Prophecies

6. Lessons Taught by Comparative Religion

LITERATURE

I. The Subject in General.

The science of comparative religion is perhaps the latest born of all sciences. Largely in consequence of this fact, our knowledge of what it really proves is still far from definite, and men draw most contradictory conclusions on this point. As in the case of all new sciences in the past, not a few people have endeavored under its shelter to attack Christianity and all revealed religion. These assaults already give signs of failure—as in similar cases previously—and a new evidence of Christianity is emerging from the conflict. It is only "a little learning" that is proverbially dangerous. The subject with which the science of comparative religion deals is religion in general and all the facts which can be learnt about all religions ancient and modern, whether professed by savages or prevalent among highly civilized communities, whether to be studied in sacred books or learnt orally from the people.

1. Universality of Religion:

In this way we learn first of all that religion is a universal phenomenon, found among all nations, in all conditions, though differing immensely in its teachings, ceremonies and effects in different places. It is perhaps the most powerful for good or evil of all the instincts (for it is an instinct) which influence mankind.

2. Theories of Origin and Growth of Religion:

To account for the origin and growth of religion various theories have been propounded:

(1) "Humanism," which is the revival of the ancient view of Euhemeros (circa 400 BC) that all religion arose from fear of ghosts, and all the gods were but men who had died;

(2) "Animism," which traces religion to early man’s fancy that every object in Nature had a personality like his own;

(3) the Astral Theory, which supposes that religion originated from worship of the heavenly bodies.

It is clear that there are facts to support each of these hypotheses, yet no one of them satisfies all the conditions of the case. To (1) it has been replied that most tribes from the earliest times clearly distinguished between those deities who had been men, and the gods proper, who had never been men and had never died. Regarding (2), it should be observed that it admits that man’s consciousness of his

own personality and his fancy that it exists in other creatures also does not account for his worshipping them, unless we grant the existence of the sensus numinis within him: if so, then this explains, justifies, and necessitates religion. (3) The Astral Theory is in direct opposition to Euhemerism or Humanism. It ascribes personality to the heavenly bodies in man's early fancy; but it, too, has to presuppose the sensus numinis, without which religion would be impossible, as would be the science of optics if man had not the sense of sight.

3. Evolution:

It is often held that religion is due to evolution. If so, then its evolution, resulting ex hypothesi in Christianity as its acme, must be the working out of a Divine "Eternal Purpose" (prothesis ton aionon, Eph 3:11), just as has been the evolution of an amoeba into a man on the Evolutionary Theory. This would be an additional proof of the truth of Christianity. But, though doubtless there has been evolution —or gradual progress under Divine guidance—in religion, the fact of Christ is sufficient to show that there is a Divine self-revelation too. Hence, the claim of Christianity to be the absolute religion. "The pre-Christian religions were the age-long prayer, the Incarnation was the answer" (Illingworth). Christianity as revealed in Christ adds what none of the ethnic faiths could prove their claim to—authority, holiness, revelation.

II. Relation of Christianity to Ethnic Faiths and Their Tenets.

It is very remarkable that Christianity—though clearly not a philosophy but a religion that has arisen under historical circumstances which preclude the possibility of supposing it the product of Eclecticism —yet sums up in itself all that is good in all religions and philosophies, without the bad, the fearful perversions and corruptions of the moral sense, too often found in them. The more the study of comparative religion is carried on the more plainly evident does this become. It also supplements in a wonderful way the half-truths concealed rather than revealed in other systems, whether religious or philosophical. We subjoin a few instances of this.

1. Karma:

Karma is strongly insisted on in Hinduism and Buddhism. These teach that every deed, good or bad, must have its result, that "its fruit must be eaten" here or hereafter. So does Christianity quite as forcibly (Ga 6:7,8). But neither Indian faith explains how sin can be forgiven, evil be overruled for good, nor how, by trampling under foot their vices, men may rise higher (Aug., Sermo iii, De Ascensione). They recognize, in some sense, the existence of evil, and illogically teach that rites and certain ascetic practices help to overcome it. They know of no Atonement, though modern Hinduism endeavors to propitiate the deities by sacrifices, as indeed was done in Vedic times. Conscience they cannot explain. Christianity, while showing the heinousness of sin as no other system does, and so supplementing the others, supplements them still further by the Atonement, showing that God is just, and teaching how His very righteousness can be brought to "justify" the sinner (Ro 3:26).

2. God:

Mahayana Buddhism proclaims an immanent but not transcendent being (Dharma-kaya), who is "the ultimate reality that underlies all particular phenomena" (Suzuki), who wills and reflects, though not fully personal. He is not the Creator of the world but a kind of Animus mundi. He is the sum total of all sentient beings, and they have no individual existence, no "ego-soul." The world of matter has no real existence but is his self-manifestation. Christianity supplements and corrects this by teaching the transcendence as well as the immanence (Ac 17:28) of the Creator, who is at least personal, if not something higher, who is the Source of reality though not Himself the sole reality, and of our personality and life, and "who only hath immortality" (1Ti 6:16).

3. The "Summum Bonum":

Vedantism and Cuffiism proclaim that ultimr~te absorption in the impersonal "It" is the summum bonum, and the Chandogya Upanishad says, "There is just one thing, without a second" (Book VI, 2 1, 2). Of this one thing everything is, so to speak, a part: there being no ultimate difference between the human and the Divine. Thus sin is denied and unreality proclaimed (Maya, illusion). The yearning for union with God underlying all this is satisfied in Christianity, which provides reconciliation with God and shows how by new spiritual birth men may become children of God (Joh 1:12,13) and "partakers of the divine nature" (2Pe 1:4), without being swallowed up therein like a raindrop in the ocean: the union being spiritual and not material.

4. Self-Revelation of God:

Orthodox (Sunni) Muslim theology declares God to be separated from man by an impassable gulf and hence, to be unknowable. Philosophically this leads to Agnosticism, though opposed to Polytheism. Among the Jews the philosophy of Maimonides ends in the same failure to attain to a knowledge of the Divine or to describe God except by negations (Cepher Ha-madda‘, 1 11). The Bible, on the other hand, while speaking of Him as invisible, and unknowable through merely human effort (Job 11:7,8; Joh 1:18), yet reveals Him in Christ, who is God and man. Jewish mysticism endeavored to solve the problem of creation by the invention of the ‘Adham qadhmon (archetypal man), and earlier by Philo’s Logos doctrine and the Memra’ of the Targums. But these abstractions have neither reality nor personality. The Christian Logos doctrine presents no theoretical but the actual historical, eternal Christ (compare Joh 1:1-3; Heb 1:2).

5. Incarnation:

Heathenism seeks to give some idea of the Invisible by means of idols; Vaishnavism has its doctrine of avataras; Babiism and Bahaiism their dogma of "manifestations" (mazhar) in human beings; the ‘Ali-ilahis are so called because they regard ‘Ali as God. Instead of these unworthy theories and deifications, Christianity supplies the holy, sinless, perfect Incarnation in Christ.

6. Salvation:

Hinduism offers mukti (moksha), "deliverance" from a miserable existence; Christianity in Christ offers pardon, deliverance from sin, and reconciliation with God.

7. Faith:

Krishnaism teaches unreasoning "devotion" (bhakti) of "mind, body, property" to certain supposed incarnations of Krishna (Vishnu), quite regardless of their immoral conduct; Christianity inculcates a manly, reasonable "faith" in Christ, but only after "proving all things."

8. Approach to God:

Pilgrimages in Islam and Hinduism indicate but do not satisfy a need for approach to God; Christianity teaches a growth in grace. and in likeness to Christ, and so a spiritual drawing near to God.

III. General Characteristics of Ethnic Faiths.

1. Tenets Common to All Religions:

In all religions we find, though in many various forms, certain common beliefs, such as:

(1) the existence of some spiritual power or powers, good or bad, superior to man and able to affect his present and future life;

(2) that there is a difference between right and wrong, even though not clearly defined;

(3) that there is an afterlife of some sort, with happiness or misery often regarded as in some measure dependent upon conduct or upon the observance of certain rites here.

In the main the fact of the all but universal agreement of religions upon these points proves that they are true in substance. Even such an agnostic philosophy as original Buddhism was, has been constrained by human need to evolve from itself or admit from without deistic or theistic elements, and thus Buddha himself has been deified by the Mahayana School. Yet no ethnic faith satisfies the "human soul naturally Christian," as Tertullian calls it (Liber Apologeticus, cap. 17), for none of them reveals One God, personal, holy, loving, just, merciful, omniscient and omnipotent. Even Islam fails here. Ethnic religions are either

(1) polytheistic, worshipping many gods, all imperfect and some evil, or

(2) mystical, evaporating away, as it were, God’s Personality, thus rendering Him a mental abstraction,

as in the Hindu philosophical systems and in Mahayana Buddhism. Christianity as revealed in Christ does just what all other faiths fail to do, reconciling these two tendencies and correcting both.

2. Tendency to Degradation, not to Progress, in Ethnic Faiths:

As a general rule, the nearer to their source we can trace religions, the purer we find them. In most cases a degradation and not to progressive improvement manifests itself as time goes on, and this is sometimes carried to such an extent that, as Lucretius found in Rome and Greece, religion becomes a curse and not a blessing. Thus, for example, regarding ancient Egypt, Professor Renouf says: "The sublimer portions of the Egyptian religion are not the comparatively late result of a process of development. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient, and the last stage of the Egyptian religion was by far the grossest and most corrupt" (Hibbert Lectures, 91). Modern Hinduism, again, is incomparably lower in its religious conceptions than the religion of the Vedas. In Polynesia the same rule holds good, as is evident from the myths about Tangaroa. In Samoa he was said to be the son of two beings, the "Cloudless Heaven" and the "Outspread Heaven." He originally existed in open space. He made the sky to dwell in. He then made the earth. Somewhat later he was supposed to be visible in the moon! But a lower depth was reached. In Hawaii, Tangaroa has sunk to an evil being, the leader of a rebellion against another god, Tane, and is now condemned to abide in the lowest depths of darkness and be the god of death. In South Africa, Australia and elsewhere, traditions still linger of a Creator of all things, but his worship has been entirely laid aside in favor of lower and more evil deities.

3. Mythology and Religion:

Almost everywhere mythology has arisen and perverted religion into something very different from what it once was. The same tendency has more than once manitested itself in the Christian church, thus rendering a return to Christ’s teachings necessary. As an instance, compare the modern popular religion of Italy with that of the New Testament. It is remarkable that no religion but the Christian, however, has shown its capability of reform.

4. Religion and Morality in Ethnic Faiths:

For the most part, in ethnic religions, there is no recognized connection between religion and morality. The wide extension of phallic rites and the existence of hierodoulai and hierodouloi in many lands show that religion has often consecrated gross immorality. Mythology aids in this degradation. Hence, Seneca, after mentioning many evil myths related of Jupiter, etc., says: "By which nothing else was effected but the removal from men of their shame at sinning, if they deemed such beings goals" (L. A. Seneca, De beata vita cap. 26). With the possibly doubtful exception of the religion of certain savage tribes, in no religion is the holiness of God taught except in Christianity and its initial stage, Judaism. Ethnic deities are mostly born of heaven and earth, if not identified with them in part, and are rarely regarded as creating them. It was otherwise, however, with Ahura Mazda in Zoroastrianism, and with certain Sumerian deities, and there are other exceptions, too. The "religions of Nature" have generally produced gross immorality, encouraged and even insisted upon as a part of their ritual; compare Mylitta-worship

in Babylon and that of the "Mater deum," Venus, Anahita, etc.

IV. Supposed Resemblances to Revealed Religion.

1. Rites:

Much attention has been called to real or supposed community of rites and "myths," especially when any ethnic faith is compared with Christianity. Sacrifice, for instance, is an essential part of every religion. In Christianity none are now offered, except the "living sacrifice" of the believer, though that of Christ offered once for all is held to be the substance foreshadowed by Jewish sacrifices. Purificatory bathings are found almost everywhere, and that very naturally, because of the universality of conscience and of some sense of sin.

2. Dogmas:

Belief in the fiery end of the world existed among the Stoics, and is found in the Eddas of Scandinavia and the Puranas of India. Traditions of an age before sin and death came upon mankind occur in many different lands. Many of these traditions may easily be accounted for. But in some cases the supposed resemblance to revealed religion does not exist, or is vastly exaggerated. The Yoga philosophy in India is popularly supposed to aim at union with God, as does Christianity; but (so understood) the Yoga system, as has already been said, implies loss of personality and absorption into the impersonal, unconscious "It" (Tat). The doctrine of a Trinity is nowhere found, only Triads of separate deities. Belief in a resurrection is found in only very late parts of the Persian (Zoroastrian) scriptures, composed after centuries of communication with Jews and Christians. In the earlier Avesta only a "restoration" of the world is mentioned (compare Ac 3:21). Original (Hinayana) Buddhism teaches "immortality" (amata), but by this is meant Nirvana ("extinction"). Mithraism has been said to teach the "resurrection of the body," but, according to Eubulus and Porphyry, it taught rather the transmigration of the soul.

3. Asserted Parallels to Gospel History:

The assertion is often made that many of the leading gospel incidents in the life of our Lord are paralleled in other religions. It is said, for instance, that the resurrection of Adonis, Osiris and Mithra was believed in by their followers. It is true that, in some places, Adonis was said to have come to life the day after he had met his death by the tusk of a boar (the cold of winter); but everywhere it was recognized that he was not a man who had been killed, but the representative of the produce of the soil, slain or dying down in the cold weather and growing again in spring. As to Osiris, his tomb was shown in more than one place in Egypt, and his body was never supposed to have come to life again, though his spirit was alive and was ruler of the underworld. Mithra was admitted to be the genius of the sun. He was said to have sprung from a rock (in old Persian and Sanskrit the same word means "sky," "cloud" and "rock"), but not to have been incarnated, nor to have died, much less to have risen from the dead. The modern erroneous fancy that Mithraists believed in his resurrection rests solely on one or at most two passages in Christian writers, which really refer to the burial of Osiris and the removal of his body

from the tomb by his hostile brother Typhon (Set). The high morality attributed to Mithraism and even to the worship of Isis rests on no better foundation than the wrong rendering of a few passages and the deliberate ignoring of many which contradict theory.

4. Virgin Birth:

Virgin birth, we have been told, is a doctrine of many religions. As a matter of fact, it is found in hardly one ethnic faith. Nothing of the kind was believed regarding Osiris, Adonis, Horus, Mithra, Krishna, Zoroaster. Of Buddha it is denied entirely in all the books of the Southern Canon (Pali), and is found expressed only vaguely in one or two late uncanonical works of the Northern (Sanskrit) School. It was doubtless borrowed from Christianity. Supernatural birth of quite a different (and very repulsive) kind is found in many mythologies, but that is quite another thing.

5. Heathen Aspirations and Unconscious Prophecies:

Heathenism contains some vague aspirations and unconscious prophecies, the best example of which is to be found in Vergil’s Fourth Eclogue, if that be not rather due to Jewish influence. Any such foregleams of the coming light as are real and not merely imaginary, such, for instance, as the Indian doctrine of the avataras or "descents" of Vishnu, are to be accounted for as part of the Divine education of the human race. The "false dawn," so well known in the East, is not a proof that the sun is not about to rise, nor can its existence justify anyone in shutting his eyes to stud rejecting the daylight when it comes. It is but a harbinger of the real dawn.

6. Lessons Taught by Comparative Religion:

Comparative religion teaches us that religion is essential to and distinctive of humanity. The failures of the ethnic faiths no less than their aspirations show how great is man’s need of Christ, and how utterly unable imagination has ever proved itself to be even to conceive of such an ideal character as He revealed to us in the full light of history and in the wonder-working effects of His character upon the lives and hearts of those who then and in all ages since have in Him received life and light.

LITERATURE.

Tylor, Anthropology; Jordan, Comparative Religion, Its Genesis and Growth; Falke, Zum Kampfe der drei Weltreligionen; Gould, Origin and Development of Religious Belief; Jevons, Introduction to the History of Religion; Reville, Prolegomena to the History of Religions; Max Muller, Introduction to the Science of Religion; Hardwick, Christ and Other Masters; Kellogg, The Light of Asia and the Light of the World; Farrar, The Witness of History to Christ; A. Lung, Magic and Religion; The Making of Religion; Johnson, Oriental Religions and Their Relation to Universal Religion; Farnell, The Evolution of Religion; Howitt, The Native Tribes of Southeast Australia; Smith, Religion of the Semites; Reinach, Cultes, mythes et religions; Dilger, Erloschen des Menschen nach Hinduismus und Christentum; Rhys Davids, Origin and Growth of Religion; Kuenen, National Religions and Universal Religion (Hibbert

Lectures, 1882); Dollinger, The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ (1862); Dodson, Evolution and Its Bearing on Religion; MacCulloch, Comparative Theology; Baumann, Uber Religionen und Religion; Waitz, Anthropologie der Naturvolker; Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics; Frazer, Adonis, Attis, Osiris; Dufourcq, Hist. comparee des rel. paiennes et de la religion juive; Oesterley, Evolution of Religious Ideas; Martindale, Bearing of Comp. Study of Religions on Claims of Christianity; W. Clair Tisdall, Comparative Religion.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

COMPARE

kom-par' (damah, mashal, ['arakh]; paraballo, sugkrino): "Compare" is the translation of damah, "to be like" (So 1:9); of mashal, "to liken," "compare" (Isa 46:5); of 'arakh, "to set in array," "compare" (Ps 89:6; Isa 40:18); of shawah, "to be equal" (Pr 3:15; 8:11).

In the New Testament sugkrino, "to judge" or "sift together," is translated "comparing," "comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1Co 2:13 the English Revised Version), the American Standard Revised Version "combining" ("adapting the discourse to the subject," Thayer), the Revised Version, margin "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual (men)."

W. L. Walker

COMPASS; COMPASSES

kum'-pas, kum'-pas-iz: "Compass," noun, is the translation of chugh, "a circle," "vault" or "arch" ("when he set a compass upon the face of the depth" Pr 8:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version "circle"; compare Job 26:10; and see CIRCLE; VAULT OF EARTH); of karkobh, "a margin" "border" (Ex 27:5, "the compass of the altar," the Revised Version (British and American) "the ledge round," so 38:4); the phrase "to fetch a compass" is the translation of sabhabh, "to turn about," "go round about" (Nu 34:5; Jos 15:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "turn about," 2Sa 5:23; 2Ki 3:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "make a circuit"); of perierchomai, "to go about" (Ac 28:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "made a circuit"; margin "Some ancient authorities read cast loose"; see CIRCUIT).

"Compasses" is the Revised Version (British and American) for "compass," mechughah, an instrument for describing a circle: "He marketh it out with the compasses" (Isa 44:13) in making an idol.

The verb "to compass" occurs frequently in the senses of "to surround" and "to go round about," e.g. Ge 2:11, "which compasseth the whole land of Havilah," De 2:1, "We compassed (went around) mount Seir many days"; in Jer 31:22 we have "A new thing on the earth: a woman shall compass a man," the Revised Version (British and American) "encompass"; possibly as a suitor; but more probably as a protector. In those happy days, the protection of women (under God, 31:28) will be sufficient, while the

men are at their work; "to encompass" ("The cords of death compassed me" Ps 18:4; "the waves of death," 2Sa 22:5). "To gird" (Isa 50:11 the Revised Version (British and American)); "to lie around," "to be laid around" (Heb 5:2, "compassed with infirmity" (clothed with it); Heb 12:1, "compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses").

In Apocrypha we have "compassed about with yawning darkness" (The Wisdom of Solomon 19:17); "compassed the circuit of heaven" (Ecclesiasticus 24:5); "compassed with pomegranates of gold" (Ecclesiasticus 45:9); "The rainbow compasseth the heaven" (Ecclesiasticus 43:12); the course of the sun (1 Esdras 4:34).

W. L. Walker

COMPASSION

kom-pash'-un: Compassion is the translation of racham, "to love," "pity," "be merciful" (De 13:17; 30:3); of rachamim, "mercies" (1Ki 8:50); of chamal, "to pity," "spare" (Ex 2:6; 1Sa 23:21); rachum (Ps 78:38; 86:15; 111:4; 112:4; 145:8), is rendered by the American Standard Revised Version "merciful." We have splagchnizomai, "to have the bowels yearning," in Mt 9:36; 14:14, etc.; sumpatheo (Heb 10:34), "to suffer with (another)"; sumpathes (1Pe 3:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "compassionate," margin, Greek, "sympathetic"); metriopatheo (Heb 5:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "who can bear gently with"); eleeo, "to show mildness," "kindness" (Mt 18:33; Mr 5:19; Jude 1:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "mercy"); oikteiro, "to have pity" or "mercy" (Ro 9:15 bis).

Both racham and splagchnizomai are examples of the physical origin of spiritual terms, the bowels being regarded as the seat of the warm, tender emotions or feelings. But, while racham applied to the lower viscera as well as the higher, splagchnon denoted chiefly the higher viscera, the heart, lungs, liver.

The Revised Version (British and American) gives "compassion" for "mercy" (Isa 9:17; 14:1; 27:11; 49:13; Jer 13:14; 30:18; Da 1:9 the King James Version "tender love with"; for "bowels of compassion," 1Jo 3:17); for "mercy" (Heb 10:28); "full of compassion" for "merciful" (the American Standard Revised Version "merciful" in all cases) (Ex, 34:6; Ne 9:17; Ps 103:8; Joe 2:13; Jon 4:2); "compassions for mercies" (Isa 63:15; Php 2:1), for "repentings" (Ho 11:8).

Compassion, literally a feeling with and for others, is a fundamental and distinctive quality of the Biblical conception of God, and to its prominence the world owes more than words can express.

(1) It lay at the foundation of Israel's faith in Yahweh. For it was out of His compassion that He, by a marvelous act of power, delivered them from Egyptian bondage and called them to be His own people. Nothing, therefore, is more prominent in the Old Testament than the ascription of compassion, pity, mercy, etc., to God; the people may be said to have gloried in it. It is summed up in such sayings as that of the great declaration in Ex 34:6: "Yahweh—a God full of compassion (the American Standard

Revised Version merciful) and gracious" (compare Ps 78:38; 86:15; 111:4; 112:4; 145:8; La 3:22, "His compassions fail not"). And, because this was the character of their God, the prophets declared that compassion was an essential requirement on the part of members of the community (Ho 6:6; Mic 6:8; compare Pr 19:17).

(2) In Jesus Christ, in whom God was "manifest in the flesh," compassion was an outstanding feature (Mt 9:36; 14:14, etc.) and He taught that it ought to be extended, not to friends and neighbors only, but to all without exception, even to enemies (Mt 5:43-48; Lu 10:30-37).

The God of the New Testament, the Father of men, is most clearly revealed as "a God full of compassion." It extends to the whole human race, for which He effected not merely a temporal, but a spiritual and eternal, deliverance, giving up His own Son to the death of the cross in order to save us from the worst bondage of sin, with its consequences; seeking thereby to gain a new, wider people for Himself, still more devoted, more filled with and expressive of His own Spirit. Therefore all who know the God and Father of Christ, and who call themselves His children, must necessarily cultivate compassion and show mercy, "even as he is merciful." Hence, the many apostolic injunctions to that effect (Eph 4:32; Col 3:12; Jas 1:27; 1Jo 3:17, etc.). Christianity may be said to be distinctively the religion of Compassion.

W. L. Walker

COMPEL

kom-pel’:Our English word always has in it now the flavor of force, not always, however, physical. It may be strong moral urgency, though "constrain" better expresses this.

1. In the Old Testament:

There are several words indicative of such strong pressure:

(1) ‘anac "to press": "none could compel" to drink (Es 1:8);

(2) nadhach, "to drive," "force": "compelled Judah thereto" (the King James Version, the Revised Version, margin); "led Judah astray" the Revised Version (British and American) (2Ch 21:11). The same word rendered "force," as the adulteress by flattering words her victim (Pr 7:21);

(3) ‘adhadh, "to serve": not to compel him to serve as a bond servant (Le 25:39 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "make him serve");

(4) parats, "to break forth upon," "urge": "his servants compelled him" (1Sa 28:23 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "constrained").

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament two words are found:

(1) aggareuo: The word is of Persian origin and means to employ a courier. The Aggaroi were public couriers stationed by appointment of the kings of Persia, at fixed localities, with horses ready for use, to transmit speedily from one to another the royal messages. These couriers had authority to press into their service, in case of need, horses, vessels, and even men, they might meet (Josephus, Ant, XIII ii, 3); "compel thee to go a mile" (Mt 5:41 the King James Version; the Revised Version, margin "impress"); "compelled Simon to bear his cross" (Mt 27:32; Mr 15:21 the King James Version; the Revised Version, margin "impressed").

(2) anagkazo, "to constrain," whether by force, threats, entreaties, persuasion, etc.: "compel them to come in" (Lu 14:23 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "constrain"). This has been a favorite text of religious persecutors. As Robertson says in his history of Charles V, "As they could not persuade, they tried to compel men to believe." But it simply means that utmost zeal and moral urgency should be used by Christians to induce sinners to enter the Kingdom of God. Compare Ac 26:11.

George Henry Trever

COMPLAINING

kom-plan'-ing (tsewachah, "cry," "outcry," siach, "meditation," "complaint"): tsewachah is translated "complaining" (Ps 144:14, the Revised Version (British and American)) "outcry," "no complaining (outcry) in our streets," i.e. "open places" where the people commonly assembled near the gate of the city (compare 2Ch 32:6; Ne 8:1); a picture of peace in the city (compare Isa 24:11; Jer 14:2); some render "battlecry"; siach (the Revised Version (British and American) Pr 23:29, the King James Version "babbling"), of the drunkard.

COMPLETE

kom-plet':In the King James Version for pleroo, the verb ordinarily used for the coming to pass of what had been predicted. the King James Version translates this "complete" in Col 2:10; 4:12 to express the final and entire attainment of what is treated, leaving nothing beyond to be desired or hoped for; otherwise rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) ("made full"). In the Revised Version (British and American), c. appears once for Greek artios, from aro, "to join," in 2Ti 3:17, in sense of "accurately fitted for," where the King James Version has "perfect."

COMPOSITION; COMPOUND

kom-po-zish’-un, kom’-pound (mathkoneth, "measure"); (subst.) (raqach, "to make perfume," roqach, "perfume"): Used of the sacred anointing oil (Ex 30:25,32,33) and of the holy perfume (Ex 30:37,38), which were not to be used for any profane purpose.

COMPREHEND

kom-pre-hend’:Used in a twofold sense in both the Old Testament and New Testament. This double meaning appears in two Hebrew and two Greek words which signify in turn

(1) mental or spiritual perception,

(2) capacity to hold or contain, as in a measure or in an all-inclusive principle, e.g.:

(1) yadha‘, "to see with the eyes or the mind," hence, "know," "understand." Job was urged by Elihu to accept as inscrutable the ways of God, inasmuch as His operations in the physical world are so mighty and mysterious that "we cannot comprehend" them (Job 37:5). Modern science, in unveiling the secrets of Nature, is opening the way for a better understanding of God’s creative purpose and plan.

katalambano, "to lay hold of," hence, mentally to apprehend: used of the spiritual capacity of the Christian "to comprehend (the Revised Version (British and American) "apprehend") with all saints" (Eph 3:18) the measureless love of God; and of the inability of the unrenewed heart to know or perceive the revelation of God made in Christ: "the darkness comprehended it not" (Joh 1:5 the Revised Version (British and American) "apprehended"; the Revised Version, margin "overcame"; compare Joh 12:35).

(2) kul, "to measure" or "contain," as grain in a bushel. So God’s immeasurable greatness is seen in His being able to hold oceans in the hollow of His hand and "comprehend the dust of the earth in a measure" (Isa 40:12).

anakephalaioo, "to sum up under one head," e.g. love includes every other moral principle and process. The entire law on its manward side, says Paul, "is comprehended (the Revised Version (British and American) "summed up") in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Ro 13:9).

Dwight M. Pratt

CONANIAH

kon-a-ni’-a (konanyahu, "Jah has rounded or sustained"; the King James Version Cononiah):

(1) A Levite, appointed with his brother Shimei by Hezekiah, the king, and Azariah, the ruler of the house of God, to be overseer of the oblations and tithes and the dedicated things (2Ch 31:12,13).

(2) One of the chiefs of the Levites mentioned in connection with the passover celebration in Josiah's reign (2Ch 35:9).

CONCEAL

kon-sel' (parakalupto): Found but once in the New Testament (Lu 9:45). The primary meaning is to cover by hanging something in front of the object hidden. The purpose of the one concealing is made prominent. There is, therefore, a reserve and studied progress in regard to the statement of facts, that is not always a suppression of truth (Pr 12:16,23). God withholds more than He reveals (Pr 25:2; compare Ps 97:2; 1Ti 6:16).

CONCEIT

kon-set':An idiomatic rendering of a phrase, phronimoi en heautois, in Ro 11:25; 12:16; meaning literally, "wise with one's self," i.e. "in one's own opinion," or, as in parallel Old Testament passages (Pr 26:5,12 the Revised Version, margin), "in his own eyes" (Hebrew 'ayin).

CONCEPTION, IMMACULATE

See IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

CONCEPTION; CONCEIVE

kon-sep'-shun, kon-sev' (harah, and derivatives; sullambano): Physically, the beginning of a new life in the womb of a mother, "to catch on," used thus some forty times, as in Ge 3:16; 4:1; Ps 51:5. Metaphorically, applied to the start and growth within the heart, of thought, purpose, desire, e.g. "conceive mischief" (Job 15:35; Ps 7:14), "conceive chaff" (Isa 33:11). This figure is carried out in details in Jas 1:15: "Lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin."

CONCERNING

kon-surn'-ing:

The Revised Version (British and American) makes frequent changes, such as "for," "as for," "from," "about," for "concerning"; "concerning" instead of "for," "of," "over," "in," "against," etc. Some of the other changes are, "unto that which is good" for "concerning" (Ro 16:19), "concerning" instead of "because of" (Jer 23:9), for "the miracle of" (Mr 6:52); for "with" (Mr 10:41), for "of the Lord" (Ac 18:25), "concerning Jesus" (diferent text), "by way of disparagement" (2Co 11:21), instead of "concerning reproach"; "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good?" (Mt 19:17) instead of "Why callest thou me good?" (different text; see the Revised Version, margin).

W. L. Walker

CONCISION

kon-sizh’-un (katatome, "mutilation," "cutting"): A term by which Paul contemptuously designates the merely fleshly circumcision upon which the Judaizers insisted as being necessary for Gentileconverts (Php 3:2), as distinguished from peritome, the true circumcision (Php 3:3). Compare Ga 5:12 and De 23:1, and see CIRCUMCISION.

CONCLUDE

kon-klood’ (sumbibazo): Used only in Ac 16:10, where the King James Version has "assuredly gathering," i.e. "inferring." Where the King James Version has "conclude," the Revised Version (British and American) more accurately renders "reckon" (Ro 3:28); "giving judgment" (Ac 21:25); "shut up" (Ro 11:32; Ga 3:22).

CONCLUSION

kon-kloo’-zhun (coph): In Ec 12:13 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "the end," namely, a summary of the entire argument of the book.

CONCORDANCE

kon-kor’-dans:

1. Nature of Work

2. Classes of Concordances

3. Their Indispensableness

4. Concordances to Latin Vulgate

5. Concordances to the Hebrew Old Testament

6. Concordances to the Septuagint

7. Concordances to the Greek New Testament

8. Concordances to the English Bible

LITERATURE

1. Nature of Work:

The object of a concordance of Scripture is to guide the reader to any passage he is in search of by means of an alphabetical arrangement of the words found in Scripture, and the bringing together under each word of all the passages in which that word occurs. Thus, in the verse: "Cast thy burden upon Yahweh" (Ps 55:22), the reader will look in the concordance under the words "cast" or "burden," and there will find a reference to the text. The merit of a concordance is obviously exhaustiveness and clearness of arrangement. There are abridged concordances of the Bible which give only the most important words and passages. These are seldom satisfactory, and a fuller work has in the end frequently to be resorted to.

2. Classes of Concordances:

The ordinary reader is naturally most familiar with concordances of the English Bible, but it will be seen that, for scholarly purposes, concordances are just as necessary for the Scriptures in their original tongues, and for versions of the Scriptures other than English There are required concordances of the Old Testament in Hebrew, of the New Testament in Greek, of the Septuagint version (Greek) of the Old Testament, of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) version (Latin) of the New Testament, as well as of the translations of the Scriptures into German, French and other living languages. There are now, further, required concordances of the RVV of the English Old Testament and New Testament, as well as of the King James Version. There are needed, besides, good concordances to the Apocrypha, alike in its the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) forms. Textual criticism leads to modifications of the earlier concordances of the Hebrew and Greek texts. It is customary in concordances of the English version to facilitate reference by giving not only single words, but also phrases under which several passages are grouped, and to make the work more useful by furnishing lists of Scripture proper names, with their meanings, and, in the larger works, references to the Hebrew or Greek words for which the English words stand.

3. Their Indispensableness:

The indispensableness of a good concordance for the proper study of the Bible is so apparent that it is not surprising that, since the idea was first conceived, much labor has been expended on the preparation of such works. The wonder rather is that the idea did not occur earlier than it did. No single scholar could ever hope to produce a perfect work of the kind by his own efforts. Modern concordances are based upon the labors of previous generations.

4. Concordances to Latin Vulgate:

The oldest concordances date from the 13th century, and are based, as was then natural, upon the Latin

Vulgate. A Concordantiae Morales is attributed to Antony of Padua (died 1231). The first concordance of which we have actual knowledge is that of Hugo of Caro, Dominican monk and cardinal (died 1263). It was called Concordantiae S. Jacobi from the monastery in which it was compiled. 500 monks are said to have been engaged upon its preparation. Hugo's Concordance became the basis of others into which successive improvements were introduced. The words of passages, at first wanting, were inserted; indeclinable particles were added; alphabetic arrangement was employed. Verse divisions were unknown till the time of Robert Stephens (1555).

See BIBLE.

5. Concordances to Hebrew Old Testament:

The earliest Hebrew concordance seems to have been that of Rabbi Mordecai ben Nathan (1438-48). It went through several editions and was translated into Latin by Reuchlin the (1556). Both original and translation contained many errors. It was improved by Calasio, a Franciscan friar (1621), and more thoroughly by John Buxtorf, whose Concordance was published by his son (1632). This latter formed the basis of Dr. Julius Furst's Libr. Sacrorum Vet. Test. Concordantive Heb atque Chaldaic; 1840 (English translation, Hebrew and Chaldean Concordance). A later Hebrew Concordance in Germany is that of Solomon Mandelkern (1896). In England, in 1754, appeared the valuable Hebrew Concordance, Adapted to the English Bible, by Dr. Taylor, of Norwich. With it may be classed The Englishman's Hebrew and Chaldaic Concordance (1843; revised edition, 1876).

6. Concordances to the Septuagint:

Though earlier attempts are heard of, the first printed concordance of the Septuagint (the Greek Old Testament) was that of Trommius, published in Amsterdam in 1718, in the author's 84th year. This important work remained the standard till quite lately.

It is very complete, giving references not only to the Septuagint, but to other versions (Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion) in which the words occur, and showing by an index at the end the Hebrew or Chaldaic words to which the Greek words correspond. In 1887 Bagster published A Handy Concordance of the Septuagint. Earlier works are superseded by the recent publication (1892, 1897, 1900) of Hatch and Redpath's scholarly Concordance to the Septuagint, and Other Greek versions of the Old Testament.

7. Concordances to the Greek New Testament:

Concordances of the Greek New Testament began with that of Xystus Betulius (his real name was Birck) in 1554. The Concordance (Tameion) of Erasmus Schmid (1638) has often been reprinted and reedited. On it is based the useful abridged Concordance published by Bagster. Recent works are Bruder's (1842; 4th edition, 1888; based on Schmid, with many improvements); in America, Hudson's Critical Greek and English Concordance, revised by Ezra Abbot (1870); in England, Moulton and Geden's Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf,

and the English Revisers (1897).

8. Concordances to the English Bible:

The list of concordances to the English Bible is a long one; it is necessary here to particularize only a few of the chief. The oldest is a Concordance of the New Testament, brought out before 1540 by one Thomas Gybson, though, as appears from the Preface, it was principally the work of the printer John Day (the producer of Foxe's Book of Martyrs). The first Concordance to the whole Bible was that of John Marbeck (1550). In the same year was published a translation by Walter Lynne of the Index Librorum of Bullinger, Conrad Pelican and others, under the title of A Briefe and a Compendious Table, in manor of a Concordance, openying the waye to the principall Histories of the whole Bible, etc. Alex. Cruden, whose own Concordance, the most adequate of all, was published in 1737, enumerates most of his predecessors in the intervening period. Cruden's personal history is a pathetic one. A recurring mental malady overshadowed his career; but his indomitable perseverance and fixity of purpose, joined with a clear idea of what he wished to accomplish, enabled him to overcome all obstacles, and produce a book for which the Christian world is grateful. The work is entitled A Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, etc.; to which is added, a Concordance to the Books called Apocrypha. Mr. Spurgeon said regarding it, "Be sure you buy a genuine unabridged Cruden, and none of the modern substitutes, good as they may be at the price. .... You need only one; have none but the best." Many editions of this valuable book have been published. It no longer remains, however, the only authority, nor even the most complete and serviceable, though perhaps still the most convenient, for the purpose of the student. In 1873 was published the Analytical Concordance to the Bible by Robert Young, LL. D., to which an appendix has since been added. This bulky work contains "every word in alphabetical order, arranged under its Hebrew or Greek original; with the literal meaning of each and its pronunciation." It marks 30,000 various readings, and gives geographical and antiquarian notes. Yet more comprehensive is The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible by James Strong, LL. D. This includes the new feature of a comparative concordance of the Authorized and Revised (English) versions It embraces also condensed Dictionaries of the Hebrew and Greek words, to which references are made from the English words by figures. It thus differs in plan from Young's, which gives the Hebrew and Greek words in the body of the concordance at the head of the passages coming under them. Lastly must be noticed the very valuable work published in the same year (1894) in America by J. B. R. Walker, Comprehensive Concordance, with an Introduction by Marshall Curtiss Hazard. It is stated to give 50,000 more passages than Cruden.

LITERATURE.

See articles on "Concordance" in the various Dictionaries and Encyclopedias; articles by Dr. Beard in Kitto's Encyclopedia (Volume I); and by Dr. C. R. Gregory in the New The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge Encyclopedia (Volume III); Preface to Cruden's complete Concordance, and Introduction by Hazard to Walker's Comprehensive Concordance.

James Orr

CONCOURSE

kon’-kors (hamah, "to hum," "to make a noise"; sustrophe, "a turning" or "twisting together"): Hamah, usually translated by some word signifying "sound" is rendered "concourse" in Pr 1:21 (perhaps from the noise made by people thronging and talking together; compare 1Ki 1:41, "uproar"), "She (wisdom) crieth in the chief place of concourse," the Revised Version, margin, Hebrew "at the head of the noisy (streets)"; sustrophe is translated "concourse" (Ac 19:40), a riotous crowd. Compare Judith 10:18.

CONCUBINAGE

kon-ku’-bi-naj.

See FAMILY.

CONCUPISCENCE

kon-ku’-pi-sens (epithumia): Not used in the Revised Version (British and American), but in the King James Version, Ro 7:8; Col 3:5; 1Th 4:5. The Greek noun, like the verb from which it comes, meaning "to yearn," "to long," "to have the heart set upon a thing," is determined in its moral quality by the source whence it springs or the object toward which it is directed. Thus, our Lord uses it to express the intensest desire of His soul (Lu 22:15). As a rule, when the object is not expressed, it refers to longing for that which God has forbidden, namely, lust. It is not limited to sexual desire, but includes all going forth of heart and will toward what God would not have us to have or be, as its use in the Septuagint of the Ten Commandments clearly shows, for "Thou shalt not covet" (Ex 20:17).

H. E. Jacobs

CONDEMN; CONDEMNATION

kon-dem’, kon-dem-na’-shun:

1. In the Old Testament:

(1) The causative stem of rasha‘ "to declare (or make) wrong," "to condemn," whether in civil, ethical or religious relations. Taken in this sense the word needs no comment (Ex 22:9; De 25:1; Job 40:8); "Who then can condemn?" (Job 34:29, the King James Version "make trouble").

(2) ‘anash, "to fine." "Condemned the land" (2Ch 36:3 the King James Version; the King James Version margin "mulcted"; the Revised Version (British and American) "amerced"; the American Standard Revised Version "fined"); "wine of the condemned" (Am 2:8; the Revised Version (British and American) "fined" (unjustly)).

(3) The active participle of shaphaT, "to judge." "From those that condemn his soul" (Ps 109:31 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "that judge his soul").

2. In the New Testament:

The New Testament usage is much more complicated, both because of the greater number of Greek words rendered "condemn" and "condemnation," and because the King James Version translates the same word in several different ways, apparently with no rule whatever.

(1) The most important word is krino, "to judge." From it are a number of derivative verbs and nouns. the Revised Version (British and American) has rigidly excluded the harsh words "damn" and "damnation," substituting "judge," "condemn," "judgment," "condemnation." This is proper, since the word damn (Latin, damnare, "to inflict loss" upon a person, "to condemn"), and its derivatives has, in process of time, suffered degradation, so that in modern English it usually refers to eternal punishment. This special application of the word for some centuries ran side by side with the original meaning, but even as late as Wycliffe's version the word "damn" is usually employed in the sense of condemn, as in Job 9:20, "My mouth shall dampne me." It is even applied to the condemnation of Jesus by the chief priests and scribes (Mr 10:33). This degeneration of the word is perhaps due, as Bishop Sanderson says, "not so much to good acts as to bad manners." Krino is rendered uniformly "judge" by the Revised Version (British and American), even where the context. compels the thought of condemnation (Joh 3:17,18; 12:47; Ac 7:7; "might be damned," 2Th 2:12 the King James Version; Ro 14:22; Jas 5:9).

(2) The more specific sense of condemn, however, is found in katakrino, "to judge one down" (Mt 12:41,42; Mr 14:64): "is damned if he eat" (Ro 14:23; 1Co 11:32 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "condemned"). See also Mr 16:16; 2Pe 2:6.

(3) For "condemnation" there is the noun krima, or krima (for accent see Thayer's Lexicon), in a forensic sense, "the sentence of the judge" (Lu 23:40; Mt 23:14, omitted in the Revised Version (British and American); "condemnation of the devil" 1Ti 3:6; 5:12; Jude 1:4).

(4) Much stronger is katakrima, "condemnation" (Ro 5:16,18; 8:1) with reference to the Divine judgment against sin.

(5) krisis, "the process of judgment," "tribunal" (Joh 3:19; 5:24), with reference to "the judgment brought by men upon themselves because of their rejection of Christ."

(6) A stronger word is the adjective autokatakritos, "self-condemned" (Tit 3:11; compare 1Jo 3:20,21).

G. H. Trever

CONDESCENSION, OF CHRIST

kon-de-sen’-shun.

See KENOSIS.

CONDUCT

kon’-dukt.

See ETHICS.

CONDUIT

kon’-dit.

See CISTERN.

CONEY

ko’-ni (shaphan (Le 11:5; De 14:7; Ps 104:18; Pr 30:26)): The word "coney" (formerly pronounced cooney) means "rabbit" (from Latin cuniculus). Shaphan is rendered in all four passages in the Septuagint choirogrullios, or "hedge-hog," but is now universally considered to refer to the Syrian hyrax, Procavia (or Hyrax) Syriaca, which in southern Palestine and Sinai is called in Arabic wabar, in northern Palestine and Syria Tabsun, and in southern Arabia shufun, which is etymologically closely akin to shaphan. The word "hyrax" (hurax) itself means "mouse" or "shrew-mouse" (compare Latin sorex), so that it seems to have been hard to find a name peculiar to this animal. In Le 11:5 the Revised Version, margin, we find "rock badger," which is a translation of klip das, the rather inappropriate name given by the Boers to the Cape hyrax. The Syrian hyrax lives in Syria, Palestine and Arabia. A number of other species, including several that are arboreal, live in Africa. They are not found in other parts of the world. In size, teeth and habits the Syrian hyrax somewhat resembles the rabbit, though it is different in color, being reddish brown, and lacks the long hind legs of the rabbit. The similarity in dentition is confined to the large size of the front teeth and the presence of a large space between them and the back teeth. But whereas hares have a pair of front teeth on each jaw, the hyrax has one pair above and two below. These

teeth differ also in structure from those of the hare and rabbit, not having the persistent pulp which enables the rabbit’s front teeth to grow continually as they are worn away. They do not hide among herbage like hares, nor burrow like rabbits, but live in holes or clefts of the rock, frequently in the faces of steep cliffs. Neither the hyrax nor the hare is a ruminant, as seems to be implied in Le 11:5 and De 14:7, but their manner of chewing their food may readily have led them to be thought to chew the cud. The hyrax has four toes in front and three behind (the same number as in the tapir and in some fossil

members of the horse family), all furnished with nails that are almost like hoofs, except the inner hind toes, which have claws. The hyraxes constitute a family of ungulates and, in spite of their small size, have points of resemblance to elephants or rhinoceroses, but are not closely allied to these or to any other known animals.

The camel, the coney and the hare are in the list of unclean animals because they "chew the cud but divide not the hoof," but all three of these are eaten by the Arabs.

The illustration is from a photograph of a group of conies in the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut, prepared by Mr. Douglas Carruthers, who collected these specimens in a cliff in the neighborhood of Tyre. Specimens from the Dead Sea are redder than those from Syria.

Alfred Ely Day

CONFECTION; CONFECTIONARY

kon-fek’-shun, kon-fek’-shun-a-ri (roqach "perfume," "spice," raqqahah, feminine "perfumer"):

(1) "Confection" is found in the King James Version only and but once "a confection after the art of the apothecary" (Ex 30:35; the Revised Version (British and American) "perfume"); but the Revised Version (British and American) renders 1Ch 9:30, "the confection (the King James Version "ointment") of the spices." It stands for something "made up," a mixture of perfumes or medicines, but never sweetmeats, as confection means with us.

(2) Likewise a "confectionary" is a perfumer. This word, too, is found but once (1Sa 8:13), "He will take your daughters to be perfumers (the King James Version "confectionaries"), and to be cooks, and to be bakers."

See PERFUME.

George B. Eager

CONFEDERATE; CONFEDERACY

kon-fed’-er-at, kon-fed’-er-a-si: "Confederate" as an adjective in the sense of united or leagued is twice the translation of berith "covenant," in several instances translated "league" (Ge 14:13, ba‘al berith, "lord or master of a covenant," "an ally,") "these were confederate with Abram"; compare Ps 83:5; once of nuach, "to rest," "Syria is confederate with Ephraim" (Isa 7:2, the Revised Version, margin "resteth on Ephraim"; also 1 Macc 10:47).

As a noun "confederate" occurs in 1 Macc 10:16, summachos, "confederates" (1 Macc 8:20,24,31;

14:40; 15:17).

Confederacy, as a "league," occurs as the translation of berith, "the men of thy confederacy" (Obad 1:7); as a conspiracy it occurs in Isa 8:12 twice, as translation of qesher from qashar, "to bind": "Say ye not, a confederate." Compare 2Sa 15:12; 2Ki 12:20, etc.

W. L. Walker

CONFER; CONFERENCE

kon’-fer, kon’-ferens: The equivalent of three Greek words of different shades of meaning. In Ga 1:16, prosanatithemi, had been used in classical writers for resorting to oracles (Lightfoot on Ga 2:6; Ellicott on Ga 1:16); hence, "to take counsel with," "to consult." In Ac 4:15, sumballo, "to compare views," "discuss"; and in Ac 25:12, sullaleo, "to talk together." Compare the single passage in the Old Testament (1Ki 1:7).

CONFESSION

kon-fesh’-un (yadhah; homologeo, and their derivatives): The radical meaning is "acknowledgment," "avowal," with the implication of a change of conviction or of course of conduct on the part of the subject. In English "profession" (the King James Version 1Ti 6:12; Heb 3:1; 4:14), besides absence of the thought just suggested, emphasizes the publicity of the act. Confession, like its Greek equivalent, connotes, as its etymology shows (Latin, con; Greek, homou), that the act places one in harmony with others. It is the uniting in a statement that has previously been made by someone else. Of the two Greek words from the same root in the New Testament, the compound with the Greek preposition ek found, among other places, in Mt 3:6; Ac 19:18; Ro 14:11; Php 2:11, implies that it has come from an inner impulse, i.e. it is the expression of a conviction of the heart. It is referred anthropopathically to God in Job 40:14, where Yahweh says to the patriarch sarcastically: "Then will I also confess of (unto) thee"; and in Re 3:5, where it means "to recognize" or "acknowledge."

When man is said to confess or make confession, the contents of the confession are variously distinguished. All, however, may be grouped under two heads, confession of faith and confession of sin. Confessions of faith are public acknowledgments of fidelity to God, and to the truth through which God is revealed, as 1Ki 8:33. They are declarations of unqualified confidence in Christ, and of surrender to His service; Mt 10:32: "Every one .... who shall confess me before men." In Php 2:11, however, confession includes, alongside of willing, also unwilling, acknowledgment of the sovereignty of Jesus. The word confession stands also for everything contained in the Christian religion—"the faith" used in the objective and widest sense, in Heb 3:1; 4:14. In both these passages, the allusion is to the New Testament. The "High Priest of our confession" (Heb 3:1) is the High Priest, of whom we learn and with whom we deal in that new revelation, which in that epistle is contrasted with the old.

Confessions of sins are also of various classes:

(1) To God alone. Wherever there is true repentance for sin, the penitent freely confesses his guilt to Him, against whom he has sinned. This is described in Ps 32:3-6; compare 1Jo 1:9; Pr 28:13. Such confession may be made either silently, or, as in Da 9:19, orally; it may be general, as in Ps 51, or particular, as when some special sin is recognized; it may even extend to what has not been discovered, but which is believed to exist because of recognized inner depravity (Ps 19:12), and thus include the state as well as the acts of sin (Ro 7:18).

(2) To one's neighbor, when he has been wronged (Lu 17:4): "If he sin against thee seven times in the day, and seven times turn again to thee, saying, I repent; thou shalt forgive him." It is to this form of c. that James refers (5:16): "Confess .... your sins one to another"; compare Mt 5:23 f.

(3) To a spiritual adviser or minister of the word, such as the c. of David to Nathan (2Sa 12:13), of the multitudes to John in the wilderness (Mt 3:6), of the Ephesians to Paul (Ac 19:18). This c. is a general acknowledgment of sinfulness, and enters into an enumeration of details only when the conscience is particularly burdened.

(4) To the entire church, where some crime has created public scandal. As "secret sins are to be rebuked secretly, and public sins publicly," in the apostolic age, where there was genuine penitence for a notorious offense, the acknowledgment was as public as the deed itself. An illustration of this is found in the well-known case at Corinth (compare 1Co 5:3 ff with 2Co 2:6 f).

For auricular confession in the sense of the medieval and Roman church, there is no authority in Holy Scripture. It is traceable to the practice of examining those who were about to make a public confession of some notorious offense, and of giving advice concerning how far the circumstances of the sin were to be announced; an expedient that was found advisable, since as much injury could be wrought by injudicious publishing of details in the confession as by the sin itself. The practice once introduced for particular cases was in time extended to all cases; and the private confession of sin was demanded by the church as a condition of the absolution, and made an element of penitence, which was analyzed into contrition, confession and satisfaction. See the Examen Concilii Tridentini (lst edition, 1565) of Dr. Martin Chemnitz, superintendent of Brunswick, for a thorough exegetical and historical discussion of this entire subject. On the historical side, see also Henry Charles Lea, History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church (3 volumes, Philadelphia, 1896).

H. E. Jacobs

CONFIDENCE

kon'-fi-dens (baTach, and forms, kecel; parrhesia; peitho, pepoithesis, hupostasis): The chief Hebrew word translated "confidence" (baTach, and its forms) means, perhaps, radically, "to be open," showing thus what originated the idea of "confidence"; where there was nothing hidden a person felt safe; it is very frequently rendered "trust." In Ps 118:8,9 we have "It is better to take refuge in Yahweh than to put

confidence in princes," and in 65:5, "O God of our salvation, thou that art the confidence (mibhTach) of all the ends of the earth." MibhTach is translated "confidence" in Job 18:14; 31:24; Pr 21:22, etc.

Kecel ("firmness," "stoutness") is rendered "confidence" in Pr 3:26, and kiclah in Job 4:6; peitho ("to persuade") is translated "confidence" in 2Co 2:3; Ga 5:10, etc.; pepoithesis, in 2Co 1:15; 8:22, etc.; hupostasis ("what stands under"), in 2Co 11:17; Heb 3:14; 2Co 9:4; parrhesia ("out- spokenness," "boldness") is invariably translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "boldness" (Ac 28:31; Heb 3:6; 4:16; 10:35; 1Jo 2:28; 3:21; 5:14); tharseo or tharrheo ("to have good courage") is so translated in the Revised Version (British and American), "being therefore always of good courage" (2Co 5:6); "I am of good courage concerning you" (2Co 7:16), the King James Version "confident" and "confidence." Revised Version has "confidence" for "hope" (Job 8:14); for "assurance" (Isa 32:17); for "trust" (2Co 3:4); for "same confident boasting" (2Co 9:4); "is confident" for "trusted" (Job 40:23); "to have confidence" for "thinketh that he hath whereof he might trust" (Php 3:4); "confidently" for "constantly" (Ac 12:15); "confidently affirm" for "affirm" (1Ti 1:7); conversely, we have for "his confidence" (Job 18:14), "wherein he trusteth," for "with confidence" (Eze 28:26) "securely therein."

The Bible teaches the value of confidence (Isa 30:15; Heb 10:35), but neither in "gold" (Job 31:24), nor in man, however great (Ps 118:8,9; Jer 17:5), nor in self as revealed in Christ (Eph 3:12; 1Jo 5:13,14). (Pr 14:16; Php 3:3), but in God (Ps 65:5; Pr 3:26; 14:26),

W. L. Walker

CONFIRM; CONFIRMATION

kon-furm, konfer-ma'-shun: In the Old Testament represented by several Hebrew words, generally with reference to an increase of external strength, as "c. the feeble knees" (Isa 35:3); "c. the kingdom" (2Ki 15:19); "c. inheritance" (Ps 68:9). In the New Testament, this external, objective sense is expressed by bebaioo, as in Mr 16:20; Ro 15:8. The strengthening of mind, purpose, conviction, i.e. the inner or subjective sense (Ac 14:22; 15:32,41) corresponds to episterizo. Used also of ratifying or making valid (kuroo) a covenant (Ga 3:15). The noun is used in the second sense (Heb 6:16; Php 1:7). Confirmation, the rite, in some denominations, of admission to the full communion of the church, which the Roman church has elevated to the place of a sacrament, has only ecclesiastical, but no Scriptural, authority. It is grounded, however, in the Scriptural precedent of the laying on of hands after baptism.

See HANDS, IMPOSITION, LAYING ON OF.

H. E. Jacobs

CONFISCATION

kon-fis-ka'-shun.

See PUNISHMENTS.

CONFLICT

kon’-flikt (agon, "contest," "fight"): In Php 1:30, "having the same c. which ye saw in me," and Col 2:1 the King James Version; 1Th 2:2 (the King James Version "contention"); athlesis (literally, "combat in the public games"), in Heb 10:32 (the King James Version "fight").

See also AGONY.

CONFORM; CONFORMABLE

kon-form’, kon-form’-a-b’-l (summorphoo "to become or be like," or "of the same form"): Indicating an inner change of nature, working into the outward life (Ro 8:29; Php 3:10,21); while suschematizo, "fashioned according to" (Ro 12:21 the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version. "conformed"), refers to that which is external.

CONFOUND

kon-found’:The physical origin of spiritual terms is well illustrated by the principal Hebrew words for "confounded" (rendered also "ashamed," etc.); bosh, is "to become pale" (2Ki 19:26; Job 6:20; Ps 83:17; 129:5 the King James Version; Isa 19:9, etc.); chapher, "to become red" (Ps 35:4; Isa 1:29; 24:23, "the moon shall be confounded," Mic 3:7); yabhash, "to be dried up" (Jer 46:24 the King James Version; Jer 48:1,20 the King James Version; Jer 50:2 the King James Version; Zec 10:5); kalam, "to blush" (Ps 69:6 the King James Version; Isa 41:11, etc.). In Ge 11:7,9, of the confusion of tongues, the word is balal, "to mix," "mingle." In Jer 1:17 the King James Version it is chathath, "to bring or put down."

In New Testament, kataischuno, "to put to shame" (1Co 1:27 the King James Version; 1Pe 2:6 the King James Version); and sugchuno, "to pour together," "bewilder’ "(Ac 2:6; 9:22). the Revised Version (British and American) frequently gives "ashamed" and "put to shame" instead of "confounded." W. L. Walker

CONFUSION

kon-fu’-zhun (bosheth, "shame, paleness," kelimmah, "blushing," tohu; akatastasia, sugchusis): In the Old Testament bosheth (1Sa 20:30; Ps 109:29 the King James Version) and kelimmah (Ps 44:15; Isa 30:3) are the words most frequently translated "confusion"; tohu, "wastiness," "emptiness" is so translated (Isa 24:10; 34:11; 41:29), also qalon, "lightness," "contempt" (Job 10:15 = ignominy, the American Standard Revised Version) and tebhel, "profanation" (Le 18:23; 20:12); ra‘ash, "shaking," "trembling," rendered "confused" in Isa 9:5 the King James Version; compare the Revised Version

(British and American). Greek akatashatasia, "instability" is translated "confusion" (1Co 14:33; Jas 3:16); sugchusis, "a pouring out together" (Ac 19:29). In The Wisdom of Solomon 14:26, "changing of kind" (the King James Version) is rendered "confusion of sex." W. L. Walker

CONFUSION OF TONGUES

See BABEL, TOWER OF; TONGUES, CONFUSION OF

CONGREGATION

kon-gre-ga'-shun (qahal, 'edhah).

1. Terms Employed:

These two words rendered by "congregation" or "assembly" are used apparently without any difference of sense. They appear to include an assembly of the whole people or any section that might be present on a given occasion. Indeed, sometimes the idea appears to correspond closely to that conveyed by "horde," or even by "crowd." 'Edhah is once used of bees (Jud 14:8). It has been sought to distinguish the two words by means of Le 4:13, "if the whole 'edhah of Israel err, and the thing be hid from the eyes of the qahal." The qahal would then be the smaller body representing the whole 'edhah, but the general usage is not favorable to this view (compare e.g. Ex 12:19, "cutting off from the 'edhah of Israel," with Nu 19:20, "cutting off from the qahal"). The idea denoted by these words is said by Wellhausen to be "foreign to Hebrew antiquity," though it "runs through the Priestly Code from beginning to end" (Prolegomena 78). Yet it is Deuteronomy that presents us with laws excluding certain classes from the qahal, and the word is also found in Ge 49:6; Nu 22:4 (the Revised Version (British and American) "multitude"); De 5:22; 9:10; 31:30; Jos 8:35; 1Sa 17:47; 1Ki 8:14; Mic 2:5, and other early passages, while 'edhah occurs in 1Ki 12:20 (see further, Eerdmans, Das Buch Exodus, 80 f). On the other hand taste and euphony appear to be responsible for the choice of one or other of the words in many cases. Thus the Chronicler uses qahal frequently, but 'edhah only once (2Ch 5:6 = 1Ki 8:5).

2. Legal Provisions:

Moses provided for the summoning of the congregation by trumpets (Nu 10:2-8). For the sin offering to be brought if the whole congregation erred, see Le 4:13-21.

De 23:1-8 (in Heb 2-9) excludes bastards, Ammonites and Moabites from the assembly, even to the tenth generation, while Edomites and Egyptians were admitted in the third. Those who suffer from certain physical defects are also excluded.

3. Other Terms:

One other word must be noted, mo‘edh. It occurs often in the phrase ‘ohel mo‘edh ("tent of meeting"; see TABERNACLE). But in Nu 16:2 we find it used of certain princes who were "men of renown called to the assembly."

For atsereth, rendered by the Revised Version (British and American) "solemn assembly", see FEASTS. On miqra’, see CONVOCATION.

Harold M. Wiener

CONGREGATION, MOUNT OF

(har-mo‘edh Isa 14:13): The prophet has depicted the excitement caused in Sheol by the descent of the once mighty king of Babylon into the world of shades, and now himself points the contrast between the monarch’s former haughty boastings and his present weak and hopeless condition: "Thou saidst in thy heart, I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; and I will sit upon the mount of congregation, in the uttermost parts of the north." Instead he is brought down "to the uttermost parts of the pit" (Isa 14:15). By the "mount of congregation" (meeting or assembly) is evidently meant the fancied Olympus of the gods on some lofty northern height. The king vaunted that he would make his abode with the gods in heaven; now he is cast down to the depths of Sheol.

James Orr

CONIAH

ko-ni’-a (konyahu, "Jah is creating"): A form of the name Jehoiachin, found in Jer 22:24,28; 37:1.

See JEHOIACHIN.

CONONIAH

kon-o-ni’a.

See CONANIAH.

CONQUEROR

kon’-ker-er: Known only in the compound verb (hupernikomen, Ro 8:37): A usual meaning of the preposition in composition is "above all measure"; hence, "more than conquerors," the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version. The comparison is to the completeness of the victory. Others may place their enemies in subjection; those here mentioned master not only their foes, but themselves. Others destroy their foes and their resources; while those who are "more than conquerors"

convert foes into means of still farther promoting the interests for which they struggle (Ro 3:3- 5). Nor is the victory external and transient, but internal and permanent.

H. E. Jacobs

CONSCIENCE

kon’-shens (he suneidesis):

I. SEQUENT CONSCIENCE

1. Judicial

2. Punitive

3. Predictive

4. Social

II. ANTECEDENT CONSCIENCE

III. INTUITIONAL AND ASSOCIATIONAL THEORIES

IV. THE EDUCATION OF CONSCIENCE

V. HISTORY AND LITERATURE

1. Earlier Views

2. Reformation and After

I. Sequent Conscience.

The aspect of conscience earliest noticed in literature and most frequently referred to at all times is what is called the Sequent Conscience—that is to say, it follows action.

1. Judicial:

This is judicial. No sooner is a decision formed than there ensues a judgment favorable or adverse, a sentence of guilty or not guilty. Conscience has often been compared to a court of law, in which there

are culprit, judge, witnesses and jury; but these are all in the subject's own breast, and are in fact himself.

2. Punitive:

It is punitive. In the individual's own breast are not only the figures of justice already mentioned, but the executioner as well; for, on the back of a sentence of condemnation or acquittal, there immediately follows the pain of a wounded or the satisfaction of an approving conscience; and of all human miseries or blisses this is the most poignant. Especially has the remorse of an evil conscience impressed the human imagination, in such instances as Cain and Judas, Saul and Herod; and the poets, those knowers of human nature, have found their most moving themes in the delineation of this aspect of human experience. The ancient poets represented the terrors of conscience under the guise of the Erinyes or Furies, who, with swift, silent, unswerving footstep, tracked the criminal and pulled him down, while Shakespeare, in such dramas as Macbeth and Richard the Third, has burned the same lessons into the imagination of all readers of his works. The satisfaction of a good conscience may stamp itself on the habitual serenity of one face, and the accusations of an evil conscience may impart a hunted and sinister expression to another (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 17:11).

3. Predictive:

It is predictive. There is no instinct in the soul of man more august than the anticipation of something after death—of a tribunal at which the whole of life will be revised and retribution awarded with perfect justice according to the deeds done in the body. It is this which imparts to death its solemnity; we instinctively know that we are going to our account. And such great natural instincts cannot be false.

4. Social:

It is social. Not only does a man's own conscience pass sentence on his conduct, but the consciences of others pass sentence on it too; and to this may be due a great intensification of the consequent sensations. Thus, a crime may lie hidden in the memory, and the pain of its guilt may be assuaged by the action of time, when suddenly and unexpectedly it is found out and exposed to the knowledge of all; and, only when the force of the public conscience breaks forth on the culprit, driving him from society, does he feel his guilt in all its magnitude. The "Day of Judgment" (which see), as it is represented in Scripture, is an application of this principle on a vast scale; for there the character and conduct of everyone will be submitted to the conscience of all. On the other hand, a friend may be to a man a second conscience, by which his own conscience is kept alive and alert; and this approval from without may, in some cases, be, even more than the judgment within, an encouragement to everything that is good or a protection against temptation.

II. Antecedent Conscience.

From the Sequent is distinguished the Antecedent Conscience, which designates a function of this

faculty preceding moral decision or action. When the will stands at the parting of the ways, seeing clearly before it the right course and the wrong, conscience commands to strike into the one and forbids to choose the other. This is its imperative; and—to employ the language of Kant—it is a categorical imperative. What conscience commands may be apparently against our interests, and it may be completely contrary to our inclinations; it may be opposed to the advice of friends or to the solicitations of companions; it may contradict the decrees of principalities and powers or the voices of the multitude; yet conscience in no way withdraws or modifies its claim. We may fail to obey, giving way to passion or being overborne by the allurements of temptation; but we know that we ought to obey; it is our duty; and this is a sublime and sacred word. The great crises of life arise when conscience is issuing one command and self-interest or passion or authority another, and the question has to be decided which of the two is to be obeyed. The interpreters of human life have known how to make use of such moments, and many of the most memorable scenes in literature are of this nature; but the actual history of mankind has also been dignified with numerous instances in which confessors and martyrs, standing on the same ground, have faced death rather than contravene the dictates of the authority within; and there never passes an hour in which the eye of the All-seeing does not behold someone on earth putting aside the bribes or self- interest or the menaces of authority and paying tribute to conscience by doing the right and taking the consequences.

III. Intuitional and Associational Theories.

Up to this point there is little difficulty or difference of opinion; but now we come to a point at which very differing views emerge. It was remarked above, that when anyone stands at the parting of the ways, seeing clearly the right course and the wrong, conscience imperatively commands him which to choose and which to avoid; but how does anyone know which of the two alternatives is the right and which the wrong? Does conscience still suffice here, or is he dependent on another faculty? Here the Intuitional and the Associational, or—speaking broadly—the Scotch and the English, the German and the French schools of ethics diverge, those on the one side holding that conscience has still essential guidance to give, while those on the other maintain that the guidance must now be undertaken by other faculties. The Sensational or Experimental school holds that we are dependent on the authority of society or on our own estimate of the consequences of actions, while the opposite school teaches that in the conscience there is a clear revelation of certain moral laws, approving certain principles of action and disapproving others. The strong point of the former view is the diversity which has existed among human beings in different ages and in different latitudes as to what is right and what is wrong. What was virtuous in Athens might be sinful in Jerusalem; what is admired as heroism in Japan may be despised as fool-hardiness in Britain. To this it may be replied, first, that the diversity has been greatly exaggerated; the unanimity of the human conscience under all skies being greater than is allowed by philosophers of this school. "Let any plain, honest man," says Butler, "before he engages in any course of action, ask himself, Is this I am going about right, or is it wrong? Is it good, or is it evil? and I do not in the least doubt but that this question will be answered agreeably to truth and virtue by almost any fair man in almost any circumstances." Then, there are many moral judgments supposed to be immediate verdicts of conscience which are really logical inferences from the utterances of this faculty and are liable to all the fallacies by which reasoning in any department of human affairs is beset. It is only for the major premise, not for the conclusion, that conscience is responsible. The strong point of the Intuitional school,

on the other hand, is the power and right of the individual to break away from the habits of society, and, in defiance of the commands of authority or the voices of the multitude, to follow a course of his own. When he does so, is it a logical conclusion as to the consequences of action he is obeying, or a higher intuition? When, for example, Christianity announced the sinfulness of fornication in opposition to the laxity of Greece and Rome, was it an argument about consequences with which she operated successfully, or an instinct of purity which she divined at the back of the actions and opinions of heathendom? The lettering of the moral law may have to be picked out and cleansed from the accumulations of time, but the inscription is there all the same.

IV. The Education of Conscience.

It may be, however, that a more exact analysis of the antecedent conscience is requisite. Between the categorical imperative, which commands to choose the right path and avoid the wrong, and the indicative, which declares that this is the right way and that the wrong, there ought perhaps to be assumed a certainty that one of the alternative ways is right and must be pursued at all hazards, while the other is wrong and must be abandoned at whatever cost. This perception, that moral distinctions exist, separate from each other as heaven and hell, is the peculiarity of conscience; but it does not exclude the necessity for taking time to ascertain, in every instance, which of the alternatives has the one character and which the other, or for employing a great variety of knowledge to make this sure. Those who would limit conscience to the faculty which utters the major premises of moral reasoning are wont to hold that it can never err and does not admit of being educated; but such a use of the term is too remote from common usage, and there must be room left for the conscience to enlighten itself by making acquaintance with such objective standards as the character of God, the example of Christ, and the teaching of Scripture, as well as with the maxims of the wise and the experience of the good.

Another question of great interest about the conscience is, whether it involves an intuition of God. When it is suffering the pain of remorse, who is it that inflicts the punishment? Is it only the conscience itself? Or is man, in such experiences aware of the existence of a Being outside of and above himself? When the will is about to act, it receives the command to choose the right and refuse the wrong; but who issues this command? Is it only itself, or does the imperative come with a sanction and solemnity betokening a higher origin? Conscience is an intuition of moral law—the reading, so to speak, of a luminous writing, which hangs out there, on the bosom of Nature—but who penned that writing? It used to be thought that the word Conscience implied, in its very structure, a reference to God, meaning literally, "knowledge along with another," the other being God. Though this derivation be uncertain, many think that it exactly expresses the truth. There are few people with an ethical experience of any depth who have not sometimes been overwhelmingly conscious of the approval or disapproval of an unseen Being; and, if there be any trustworthy argument for the existence of a Deity, prior to supernatural revelation, this is where it is to be found.

V. History and Literature.

Only a few indications of history can be given here.

1. Earlier Views:

The conscience, at least the sequent conscience, was identified in the ancient world, and the rise of a doctrine on the subject belongs to the period when the human mind, being shut out from public activity through political changes, was thrown back upon itself and began to watch closely its own symptoms. The word has a specially prominent place in the philosophical writings of Cicero. Strange to say, it does not occur in the Old Testament; but, though not the name, the thing appears there frequently enough. On the very first page of revelation, the voice of God is heard calling among the trees of the garden (Ge 3:8); and, in the very next incident, the blood of Abel cries out to heaven from the ground (Ge 4:10). In the New Testament the word occurs with tolerable frequency, especially in the speeches (Ac 24:16, etc.) and writings of Paul (Ro 2:15; 9:1; 13:5; 1Co 6:7-12, etc.); and this might have been expected to secure for it a prominent place in the doctrine of the church. But this did not immediately take effect, although Chrysostom already speaks of Conscience and Nature as two books in which the human mind can read of God, previous to supernatural revelation. In the Middle Ages the conscience received from two sources so much stimulation that both thing and name were certain to come into greater prominence in the speculations of the schools. The one of these influences was the rise of Monasticism, which, driving human beings into solitude, made the movements of their own minds the objects of everlasting study to themselves; and the other was the practice of auricular confession, which became, especially to many of the inmates of the houses of religion, the most interesting business of life; because, in order to meet the confessor, they scanned every thought and weighed every scruple, becoming adepts at introspection and self-discipline. Thus it came to pass that ethics took the form of Cases of Conscience, the priest having to train himself, or to be trained by professors and through books, to be able to answer every query submitted to him in the confessional. The ripest fruit of this method appears in the Summa of Aquinas, who discusses elaborately the doctrine of conscience, dividing it into two parts—synderesis (from sunteresis) and conscientia—the one of which supplies the major premises and cannot err, while the other draws the inferences therefrom and is liable to make mistakes. The Mystics identified the synderesis as the point in the spirit of man at which it can be brought into contact and connection with the Spirit of God.

2. Reformation and After:

At the Reformation the conscience was much in the mouths of men, both because the terrors of conscience formed a preparation for comprehending justification by faith and because, in appearing before principalities and powers in vindication of their action, the Reformers took their stand on conscience, as Luther did so memorably at the Diet of Worms; and the assertion of the rights of conscience has ever since been a conspicuous testimony of Protestantism; whereas Romanists, especially as represented by the Jesuits, have treated the conscience as a feeble and ignorant thing, requiring to be led by authority—that is, by themselves. The forms of medievalism long clung even to Protestant literature on this subject. It may not be surprising to find a High Churchman like Jeremy Taylor, in his Ductor Dubitantium, discussing ethics as a system of cases of conscience, but it is curious to find a Puritan like Baxter (in his Christian Directory), and a Scottish Presbyterian like David Dickson (in his Therapeutica Sacra) doing the same. Deism in England and the Enlightenment in Germany magnified

the conscience, to which they ascribed such a power of revealing God as made any further revelation unnecessary; but the practical effect was a secularization and vulgarization of the general mind; and it was against these rather than the system which had produced them that Butler in England and Kant in Germany had to raise the standard of a spiritual view of life. The former said of the conscience that, if it had power as it had right, it would absolutely govern the world; and Kant's sublime saying is well known, at the close of his great work on Ethics: "Two things fill the soul with ever new and growing wonder and reverence, the oftener and the longer reflection continues to occupy itself with them—the starry heavens above and the moral law within." The rise of an Associational and Developmental Philosophy in England, represented by such powerful thinkers as the Mills, father and son, Professor Bain and Herbert Spencer, tended to dissipate the halo surrounding the conscience, by representing it as merely an emotional equivalent for the authority of law and the claims of custom, so stamped on the mind by the experience of generations that, its earthly source forgotten, it came to be attributed to supernatural powers. But this school was antagonized with success by such thinkers as Martineau and T. H. Green. R. Rothe regarded conscience as a term too popular and of too variable signification to be of much use in philosophical speculation; but most of the great succession of writers on Christian ethics who followed him have treated it seriously; Dorner especially recognizing its importance, and Newman Smyth bestowing on it a thoroughly modern treatment. Among German works on the subject that of Gass, which contains an appendix on the history of the term synderesis, is deserving of special attention; that by Kahler is unfinished, as is also the work in English by Robertson; The Christian Conscience by Davison is slight and popular. Weighty discussions will be found in two books on Moral Philosophy—the Handbook of Calderwood, and the Ethics of Mezes. But there is abundance of room for a great monograph on the subject, which would treat conscience in a comprehensive manner as the subjective standard of conduct, formed by progressive familiarity with the objective standards as well as by practice in accordance with its own authority and with the will of God.

James Stalker

CONSECRATE; CONSECRATION

kon'-se-krat, kon-se-kra'-shun.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament for several Hebrew words of different meanings:

(1) charam: "I will consecrate (the Revised Version (British and American) "devote") their gain unto the Lord," i.e. the spoil of the nations shall be dedicated to the service of Yahweh (Mic 4:13).

See BAN; CURSE.

(2) nazar, nezer (Nu 6:7,9,12; the Revised Version (British and American) "separate").

See NAZIRITE.

(3) qadhesh: "to be set apart," or "to be holy": of Aaron and his sons (Ex 28:3; 30:30; the Revised Version (British and American) "sanctify"). The silver and gold and brass and iron of the banned city of Jericho are "consecrated" things (the Revised Version (British and American) "holy") unto the Lord (Jos 6:19); of the priests (2Ch 26:18); of sacrifices (2Ch 29:33; 31:6; Ezr 3:5).

See HOLINESS.

(4) mille' yadh, literally, "to fill the hand"; and substantive plural millu'im, a peculiar idiom used frequently and generally for the installation of a priest into his office; and substantive for the installation offerings which were probably put into the priest's hands to symbolize his admission into office; hence, the phrase, "and thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons" (Ex 29:9; 28:41; 29:29:33,15; 32:29; Le 8:33; 16:32; 21:10; Nu 3:3; Jud 17:5,12; 2Ch 29:31); of Jeroboam's non-Levitical priesthood (1Ki 13:33; 2Ch 13:9); of the altar (Eze 43:26) and of those who contributed to build the temple (1Ch 29:5). Subst. of an act of installation (Le 7:37; 8:33), and of installation offerings (Ex 29:22,26,27,31; Le 8:22,28,29,31).

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament teleioo, "to make perfect" (Heb 7:28; the Revised Version (British and American) "perfected"); egkainizo, "to make new" (Heb 10:20; the Revised Version (British and American) "dedicated").

T. Rees

CONSENT

kon-sent':The verb implies compliance with the guidance and direction of another, and, therefore, a secondary and subordinate relation of approval, sympathy and concurrence on the part of the one who consents. He does not take the initiative, but yields to what the principal proposes. The phrase ek sumphonou, "by consent," means "by mutual agreement" (1Co 7:5), both parties concerned being placed on an equality. "With one consent" (Ze 3:9, Hebrew "with one shoulder"; Lu 14:18) suggests, although it does not necessarily imply, the result of deliberation and consultation; it may have no other force than that of unanimity.

H. E. Jacobs

CONSIDER

kon-sid'-er: In the New Testament the force of the word is brought out most vividly in Mt 6:26 (katamanthano), where it means to "examine closely," as though the observer had to bend down for this

purpose, and in Lu 12:27; Heb 10:24 (katanoeo, to "observe well"), while in Heb 13:7 the anatheoreo, "look up toward" or "look again at" is consistent with the reverential regard commended in the context. Used in the Old Testament for a variety of Hebrew terms, signifying inspecting (Pr 31:16), examining (Le 13:13), giving serious thoughts to (Ps 77:5 ; Isa 1:3), it often means little more than "see" or "behold" (Ps 8:3; 9:13).

H. E. Jacobs

CONSIST

kon-sist’ (sunistemi): To stand together, exist, subsist (Col 1:17, "in him all things consist," i.e. the continuance of the universe is dependent upon His support and administration). In Lu 12:15, it translates the verb eimi, "to be," to express the thought that wealth is only an accident, not an essential to the highest ideal of life.

CONSOLATION

kon-so-la’-shun (paraklesis): "Consolation of Israel" (Lu 2:25), refers to the fulfillment of the promises in Isa 40:1 ff. See COMFORT. "Son of consolation" (Ac 4:36 the King James Version and the American Revised Version, margin).

See BARNABAS.

CONSORT

kon-sort’ (proskleroo, "to allot," Ac 17:4). The verb may be either in the middle or passive voice. the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version, and Luther’s German translation regard it as middle, and render it: "cast their lots with," "associated," "united with." In advocacy of the passive, see Alford’s Greek Testament, proposing: "were added," as if by lot, the allotment eing determined by God who gave them the Holy Spirit directing their choice. The English has the Latin for "lot" as its base.

CONSPIRACY

kon-spir’-a-si.

See CONFEDERACY.

CONSTANT; CONSTANTLY

kon’-stant, kon’-stant-li: In 1Ch 28 (chazaq) meaning "firm," "strong." In Pr 21:28 the adverb

("constantly") of the King James Version is replaced in the American Standard Revised Version by "shall speak so as to endure," the English Revised Version "unchallenged." the Revised Version (British and American) gives "confidently" for the King James Version "constantly" in Ac 12:15; Tit 3:8.

CONSTELLATIONS

kon-ste-la'-shuns (kecilim, literally, "Orions").

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 11.

CONSTRAIN

kon-stran':Generally in the sense of pressing urgently (2Ki 4:8; Lu 24:29; Ac 16:15), to impel or carry away (2Co 5:14); sometimes to be compelled of necessity (Job 32:18; Ac 28:19; compare Ga 6:12).

See COMPEL.

CONSULT

kon-sult' (sha'al, malakh, ya'ats (Aramaic) ye'aT; sumbouleuomai):

(1) "To ask," "inquire," "seek advice." Ezekiel speaks of the king of Babylonian consulting the teraphim (Eze 21:21) and the Israelites were admonished to have noting to do with "a consulter with a familiar spirit" (De 18:11).

See ASTROLOGY; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS; DIVINATION.

(2) "To take counsel," "devise," "plan." The various officials of Babylon "consulted together to establish a royal statute" (Da 6:7; compare Mt 26:4).

(3) "To deliberate with one's self," "make up one's mind." Nehemiah consulted with himself as to what might be done for Jerusalem (Ne 5:7). Jesus spoke of a king "consulting" (the King James Version) whether he be able to wage a war (Lu 14:31; the Revised Version (British and American) "take counsel").

A. W. Fortune

CONSUME

kon-sum' (akhal, kalah, tamam; analisko): In Old Testament 'akhal ("to eat," "devour") occurs very frequently, and is translated "consumed" (Ge 31:40; Ex 15:7; Ps 78:63, etc.); kalah ("to finish") is also

frequently translated "consume," "consumed" (Ge 41:30; Ex 32:10; Ps 59:13, etc.); tamam, "to be perfect," "finished" (Nu 17:13; De 2:15; Ps 73:19, etc.). There are many other words translated "consume" and "consumed," e.g. cuph, "to end" (Jer 8:13; Zec 1:2,3); balah, "to fade," "wear away" (Job 13:28; Ps 49:14); gazal, implying violence (Job 24:19); caphah, "to end" (Ge 19:15,17; Isa 7:20, etc.); ashesh, "to be old" (Ps 6:7; 31:9,10 the King James Version); maqaq, "to become completed" (Eze 4:17; Zec 14:12 bis); ‘asah kalah is rendered "utterly consume" (Ne 9:31); analisko, "to use up," occurs in Lu 9:54; Ga 5:15; 2Th 2:8 (the King James Version); dapanao, "to spend," is translated "consume" in Jas 4:3 (the Revised Version (British and American) "spend"); katanalisko, "to consume utterly," occurs only in Heb 12:29; "for our God is a consuming fire."

In the Revised Version (British and American) "devour," "devoured" are several times substituted for "consume," "consumed," e.g. Job 20:26; Jer 49:27; Nu 16:35; "boil well" (Eze 24:10); for "be consumed with dying" (Nu 17:13), "perish all of us"; "consume" is substituted for "corrupt" in Mt 6:19; "my spirit is consumed," for "my breath is corrupt" (Job 17:1); instead of "the flame consumeth the chaff" (Isa 5:24) we have "as the dry grass sinketh down in the flame"; and for "whom the Lord shall consume" (2Th 2:8), the Revised Version (British and American) reads (after a different text) "whom the Lord Jesus shall slay," "consume" in the American Revised Version, margin.

W. L. Walker

CONSUMMATION

kon-su-ma’-shun (killayon from kalah): The word, meaning destruction, completion, or failing (Isa 10:23; 28:22; Da 9:27) is translated interchangeably in the King James Version for another Hebrew word referring to a physical disease, and best translated "consumption"; compare Le 26:16; De 28:22. Not used in the Revised Version (British and American). The Hebrew variously but more accurately translated "full end"; compare Da 9:27; Isa 10:23; and "destruction"; compare Isa 10:22; 28:22. There seems therefore to be an inconsistency on the part of both the Authorized and Revised translations.

Walter G. Clippinger

CONSUMPTION

kon-sump’-shun (shachepheth, "wasting away"): One of the punishments which was to follow neglect or breach of the law. It may mean pulmonary consumption, which occurs frequently in Palestine; but from its association with fever in the texts, Le 26:16; De 28:22, it is more likely to be the much more common condition of wasting and emaciation from prolonged or often recurring attacks of malarial fever.

CONTAIN

kon-tan’.

See CONTINENCY.

CONTEND; CONTENTION

kon-tend’, kon-ten’-shun: The meeting of effort by effort, striving against opposition; sometimes physically, as in battle (De 2:9), or with horses (Jer 12:5), sometimes orally (Ne 13:11), sometimes spiritually (Isa 57:16). In the New Testament diakrinein, for the hostile separation of one from another, dispute (Jude 1:9), or epagonizomai (Jude 1:3), descriptive of the strain to which a contestant is put. The noun is almost universally used with an unfavorable meaning, and as worthy of condemnation, for an altercation arising from a quarrelsome disposition. "By pride cometh only contention" (Pr 13:10). The contentions at Corinth (1Co 1:11) called forth the rebukes of Paul. Where used in the King James Version in a good sense (1Th 2:2) the Revised Version (British and American) has "conflict." In Ac 15:39, the noun has a peculiar force, where English Versions of the Bible translates paroxusmos (whence English "paroxysm") by "sharp contention." The Greek word refers rather to the inner excitement and irritation than to its outward expression.

H. E. Jacobs

CONTENT; CONTENTMENT

kon-tent’, kon-tent’-ment (ya‘al; arkeo): To be free from care because of satisfaction with what is already one’s own. The Hebrew means simply "to be pleased." The Greek brings out the full force of the word in 1Ti 6:8; Heb 13:5. Contentment (1Ti 6:6) is more inward than satisfaction; the former is a habit or permanent state of mind, the latter has to do with some particular occurrence or object.

CONTINENCY

kon’-ti-nen-si (egkrateuomai "to have self-control" or "continency" the Revised Version (British and American), "to contain" the King James Version): Paul, although he would that all men were like himself unmarried, yet advises that they should marry if they cannot control their sexual passions, and hold them in complete subjection to Christian motives (1Co 7:9). The same Greek verb is used in 1Co 9:25, and translated "is temperate" (the King James Version and the English Revised Version) of the athlete who during the period of training abstains from all indulgence in food, ‘drink, and sexual passion. For the general principle as expressed in substantive egkrateia (Ac 24:25; Ga 5:23; 2Pe 1:6) and adjective egkrates (Tit 1:8) see TEMPERANCE, TEMPERATE.

T. Rees

CONTINUAL; CONTINUALLY

kon-tin’-u-al, kon-tin’-u-a-li: Without cessation, although there may be intervals between its presence;

that which regularly recurs throughout a period, as has Lu 24:53: "(They) were continually in the temple"; "lest .... by her continual coming" (Lu 18:5). In Old Testament for Hebrew tadhir, "pursue," as one drop of rain follows another in swift succession, but more frequently by tamidh for offerings repeated at intervals, as Ex 29:42; occasionally the Hebrew the phrase literally meaning "all the day" (kol ha-yom), as Ge 6:5. In the New Testament most frequently for dia pantos, "through all" ("always" Mt 18:10; Heb 13:15), "sometimes," adialeiptos, "incessantly" (Ro 9:2 the King James Version) and dienekes, "continuously" (Heb 7:3).

H. E. Jacobs

CONTINUANCE

kon-tin'-u-ans: Not in the Revised Version (British and American); in Ps 139:16 the King James Version, as an interpretation of Hebrew yamim, "days," treating of God's prevision, where the Revised Version (British and American) has: "They were all written, even the days that were ordained for me," i. e. all my days were in view, before one of them actually existed. In Isa 64:5 the King James Version, for 'olam, "of long time," the Revised Version (British and American); in Ro 2:7, for hupomone, "patience," the Revised Version (British and American), or still better, "steadlfastness," the Revised Version, margin.

CONTRADICTION

kon-tra-dik'-shun: the King James Version for antilogia (Heb 7:7; 12:3). In the former passage, the Revised Version (British and American) has "without any dispute," i.e. what has been said requires no argument; in the latter "gainsaying" which is scarcely an improvement, the reference being to the oral attacks upon the words and character of Jesus.

CONTRARY

kon'-tra-ri (qeri; enantios): In the Old Testament it has the sense of antagonistic, as one person opposed or hostile to the other, especially in Le 26:21,23,14,27,28,40,41, where Yahweh declares His attitude toward the people in such phrases as: "If ye will not for all this hearken unto me, but walk contrary unto me; then I will walk contrary unto you in wrath."

In the New Testament it has a more varied significance and is applied to both material and human relations as simply opposite, set over against an object or thing. Used of the wind as in Mt 14:24; Mr 6:48; Ac 27:4, where it is spoken of as contrary. Refers also to conflicting doctrines, customs or beliefs, as 1Ti 1:10, "and if there be any other thing contrary to the sound doctrine." Several other Greek words are translated with almost an identical meaning. Occasionally a prefix gives a slightly different shade of meaning.

Walter G. Clippinger

CONTRIBUTION

kon-tri-bu’-shun (koinonia, "communion" or "fellowship," Ro 15:26; 2Co 9:13): The meaning "contribution" is drawn from the context, rather than from the Greek word. The phrase in the passage cited, literally rendered, would be "to exercise" or "put fellowship into activity." The koinonia subsisting among believers because of their inner communion with Christ places them and their gifts and possessions at the service of one another (see COMMUNION). They are enjoined. not to forget to communicate (Heb 13:16). To be "communicative" (koinonikoi) is to be a habit of their lives, the Christian principle being that of the holding of all property as a trust, to be distributed as there is need (Ac 2:44 f; 2Co 8:14 f). The first occasion for calling this fellowship into activity, by way of "contributions," was within the church at Jerusalem and for its needy members (see COMMUNITY OF GOODS). The second occasion was repeatedly from the infant Gentilechurches for the poor within the same church (Ac 11:29; Ro 15:26; 2Co 8:1-4; 9:2); the fellowship thus widening from intra-congregational to general church benevolence. These contributions were gathered weekly (1Co 16:2 f), were proportioned to the means of the givers (Ac 11:29; 1Co 16:2), were not exacted or prescribed, in a legalistic manner, but were called forth as the free-will offerings of grateful hearts (2Co 8:7), springing from th community spirit, and were sent to their destination by accredited representatives of the congregations (1Co 16:3; Ac 11:30).

H. E. Jacobs

CONTRITE; CONTRITION

kon’-trit, kontrish’-un (dakka’," bruise"): Only in Old Testament (Ps 34:18; Ps 51:17; Isa 57:15); nakheh, "smitten" (Isa 66:2). Contrite, "crushed," is only the superlative of "broken"; "a contrite heart" is "a heart broken to pieces." In Holy Scripture, the heart is the seat of all feeling, whether joy or sorrow. A contrite heart is one in which the natural pride and self-sufficiency have been completely humbled by the consciousness of guilt. The theological term "contrition" designates more than is found in these passages. It refers to the grief experienced as a consequence of the revelation of sin made by the preaching of the law (Jer 23:29). The Augsburg Confession (Article XII) analyzes repentance into two parts: "Contrition and faith," the one the fruit of the preaching of the law, the other of the gospel. While contrition has its degrees, and is not equal in all persons, the promise of forgiveness is not dependent upon the degree of contrition, but solely upon the merit of Christ. It is not simply a precondition of faith, but, as hatred of sin, combined with the purpose, by God’s aid, to overcome it, grows with faith.

H. E. Jacobs

CONTROVERSY

kon’-tro-ver-si (ribh, "strife," "contention"; homologoumenos, "confessedly," "without controversy"):

Used frequently of disputes among men (as De 17:8) and then transferred to the justice of God as directed against the sins of men. Thus we read of Yahweh's controversy with the nations (Jer 25:31); with the inhabitants of the land (Ho 4:1); with His people (Mic 6:2). "Without controversy" (1Ti 3:16), a positive rather than a negative expression, "by common consent," or better, "as unanimously confessed," introducing a quotation from a hymn or rhythmical confession of the early church.

H. E. Jacobs

CONVENIENT

kon-ven'-yent: In the Revised Version (British and American) limited to translation of kairos, "suitable time," "season," and its compounds: "that which is seasonable" or "opportune" (Mr 6:21; Ac 24:25). the King James Version is replaced, in Pr 30:8 the Revised Version (British and American), by "needful" (Hebrew choq), "feed me with the food that is needful for me"; Jer 40:4, by "right"; Eph 5:4, by "befitting"; in Ro 1:28, by "fitting," and in 1Co 16:12, by "opportunity."

CONVENT

kon-vent':Found in the King James Version margin of Jer 49:19: "Who will convent me in judgment?" and in Jer 50:44: "Who will convent me to plead?" The Hebrew term which is rendered convent is ya'adh, and it means to summon to a court, to call on to plead. Convent is obsolete, but it was formerly used, and meant to summon, or to call before a judge. Shakespeare used it several times. In King Henry VIII, Act V, he said, "The lords of the council hath commanded that the archbishop be convented to the council board."

CONVERSANT

kon-vur'-sant (halakh, "to go on," "to walk"): This word is translated "conversant" in Jos 8:35 the King James Version (margin "walked"), and 1Sa 25:15 the King James Version meaning "going along with them;" the American Standard Revised Version "went."

CONVERSATION

kon-ver-sa'-shun (anastrophe, homilia): This word is another illustration of the changes which time makes in a living language. The modern sense of the term is mutual talk, colloquy, but in the King James Version it never means that, but always behavior, conduct. This broader meaning, at a time not much later than the date of the King James Version, began to yield to the special, limited one of today, perhaps, as has been suggested, because speech forms so large a part of conduct. The New Testament words for "converse" in the modern sense are homileo (Lu 24:14,15; Ac 20:11) and sunomileo (Ac 10:27).

(1) In the Old Testament the word used to indicate conduct is derekh, "way" the course one travels (the King James Version Ps 37:14; margin 50:23). It is the common Hebrew idea of conduct, possibly due, as Hatch thinks, to the fact that in Syria intercourse between village and village was so much on foot, with difficulty on stony tracks over the hills, and this is reflected in the metaphor.

(2) In the New Testament the idea of deportment is once rendered by tropos, "Let your conversation be without covetousness" (Heb 13:5 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "be ye free from the love of money"; the Revised Version, margin "let your turn of mind be free"). But the usual Greek word is anastrophe, "a turning up and down," possibly due to the fact, as Hatch again avers, that life in the bustling streets of Athens and Rome gave rise to the conception of life as quick motion to and fro. "Ye have heard of my conversation" (Ga 1:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "manner of life"). So also Eph 4:22; 1Ti 4:1; Heb 13:7; "Let him show out of a good conversation" (Jas 3:13 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "by his good life"); "vexed with the filthy conversation" (2Pe 2:7 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "lascivious life"); "holy conversation" (2Pe 3:11 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "holy living"); "Our conversation is in heaven" (Php 3:20 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "citizenship" (which see)). See also in the Apocrypha (Tobit 4:14; 2 Macc 5:8).

The translations in the Revisions put a wholesome emphasis upon conduct, and eliminate the danger of much misunderstanding. See further Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek.

G. H. Trever

CONVERSION

kon-vur’-shun:

I. The Words "Conversion," "Convert," in Biblical Usage.

1. In the English Bible:

The noun "conversion" (epistrophe) occurs in only one passage in the Bible, "They passed through both Phoenicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles" (Ac 15:3). Derived forms of the verb "convert" are used in the Revised Version (British and American) in Jas 5:19, "convert," "converteth" (5:20), "converted" (Ps 51:13, margin "return"), "converts" (Isa 1:27, margin "they that return"). In other instances where the King James Version uses forms of the verb "convert" the Revised Version (British and American) employs "turn again" (Isa 6:10; Lu 22:32; Ac 3:19), or "turn" (Isa 60:5; Mt 13:15; 18:3; Mr 4:12; Joh 12:40; Ac 28:27). In Ps 19:7 the reading of the King James Version, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul," has been changed by the revisers into "restoring the soul." The words commonly used in the English Bible as equivalent with the Hebrew and Greek terms are "turn," "return," "turn back," "turn again" (compare De 4:30; Isa 55:7; Jer 3:12 ff; 25:5; 35:15; Eze

18:21-23; 33:11; Mal 3:7). Thus "convert" is synonymous with "turn," and "conversion" with "turning."

2. In the Old Testament:

The principal Hebrew word is :shubh; other words are panah, haphakh, cabhabh, in Hiphil. They are used

(1) in the literal sense, for instance, Ge 14:7; De 17:16; Ps 56:9; Isa 38:8.

(2) In the later prophetical writings the verb shubh refers, both in the Qal and Hiphil forms, to the return from the captivity (Isa 1:27; Jer 29:14; 30:3; Eze 16:53; Ze 2:7).

(3) In the figurative, ethical or religious sense

(a) from God (Nu 14:43; 1Sa 15:11; 1Ki 9:6);

(b) more frequently to turn back to God (1Sa 7:3; 1Ki 8:33; Isa 19:22; Joe 2:12; Am 4:6 ff; Ho 6:11; 7:10).

3. In the New Testament:

The words used in the Septuagint and New Testament are strephein, and its compounds, apostr., anastr., epanastr., hupostr., and especially epistrephein. The latter word occurs 39 times in the New Testament. It is used

(1) in the literal sense in Mt 9:22; 10:13; 24:18; Ac 9:40; 15:36, etc.;

(2) in the figurative sense, in transitive form. (Lu 1:16 f; Jas 5:19 f). In Ga 4:9 and 2Pe 2:21 it denotes to turn from the right way to the wrong. The opposite meaning, to turn from the wrong way to the right, we find in Lu 22:32; Ac 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18; 2Co 3:16; 1Th 1:9; 1Pe 2:25. In connection with metanoein, "repent," it is used in Ac 3:19; 26:20. The root word strephein is used in the figurative sense in Mt 18:3; Joh 12:40. Septuagint and Textus Receptus of the New Testament have here epistrephein.

II. The Doctrine.

While the words "conversion" and "convert" do not occur frequently in our English Bible the teaching contained therein is fundamental in Christian doctrine. From the words themselves it is not possible to derive a clearly defined doctrine of conversion; the materials for the construction of the doctrine must be gathered from the tenor of Biblical teaching.

1. Vague Use of the Word:

There is a good deal of vagueness in the modern use of the term. By some writers it is used in "a very general way to stand for the whole series of manifestations just preceding, accompanying, and immediately following the apparent sudden changes of character involved" (E. D. Starbuck, The Psychology of Religion, 21). "‘ To be converted,’ ‘to be regenerated,’ ‘to receive grace,’ ‘to experience religion,’ ‘to gain an assurance,’ are so many phrases which denote the process, gradual or sudden, by which a self, hitherto divided and consciously wrong, inferior and unhappy, becomes unified and consciously right, superior and happy in consequence of its hold upon religious realities. This at least is what conversion signifies in general terms" (William James, The Varieties of Religious Experience, 189). In this general, vague way the term is used not only by psychologists, but also by theological writers and in common religious parlance. A converted man is a Christian, a believer, a man who has religion, who has experienced regeneration.

2. Specific Meaning:

In its more restricted meaning the word denotes the action of man in the initial process of salvation as distinguished from the action of God. Justification and regeneration are purely Divine acts, repentance, faith, conversion are human acts although under the influence and by the power of the Divine agency. Thus, conversion denotes the human volition and act by which man in obedience to the Divine summons determines to change the course of his life and turns to God. Arrested by God’s call man stops to think, turns about and heads the opposite way. This presupposes that the previous course was not directed toward God but away from Him. The instances of conversion related in the Bible show that the objective point toward which man’s life was directed may be either the service of idols (1Th 1:9) or a life of religious indifference, a self-centered life where material things engross the attention and deaden the sense of things spiritual (rich young ruler, Lu 18:22), or a life of sensuality, of open sin and shame (prodigal son, Lu 15:13) or even a mistaken way of serving God (Saul, Ac 26:9). Accordingly in conversion either the religious or the ethical element may predominate. The moral man who turns from self to God or, as Saul did, from an erroneous notion concerning God’s will to a clear conception of his relation to God is more conscious of the religious factor. Conversion brings him into vital, conscious fellowship with God through Jesus Christ. The immoral man who is awakened to a realization of the holiness of God, of the demands of His law, and of his own sin and guilt is more conscious of the outward change in his manner of life. The ethical change is the more outstanding fact in his experience, although it can never be separated from the religious experience of the changed relation to God.

3. Mode:

The mode of conversion Varies greatly according to the former course of life. It may be a sudden crisis in the moral and intellectual life. This is very frequently the case in the experience of heathen who turn from the worship of idols to faith in Jesus Christ. A sudden crisis is frequently witnessed in the case of persons who, having lived a life of flagrant sin, renounce their former life. Conversion to them means a complete revolution in their thoughts, feelings and outward manner of life. In other instances conversion appears to be the climax of prolonged conflict for supremacy of divergent motives; and, again, it may be the goal of a gradual growth, the consummation of a process of discerning ever more clearly and

yielding ever more definitely and thus experiencing ever more vitally truths which have been implanted and nurtured by Christian training. This process results in the conscious acceptance of Jesus Christ as the personal Saviour and in the consecration of life to His service. Thus conversion may be an instantaneous act, or a process which is more or less prolonged. The latter is more frequently seen in the case of children and young people who have grown up in Christian families and have received the benefit of Christian training. No conversions of this kind are recorded in the New Testament. This may be explained by the fact that most of our New Testament writings are addressed to the first generation of Christians, to men and women who were raised in Jewish legalism or heathen idolatry, and who turned to Christ after they had passed the age of adolescence. The religious life of their children as distinguished in its mode and manifestations from that of the adults does not appear to have been a matter of discussion or a source of perplexity so as to call forth specific instruction.

4. Conversion and Psychology:

Conversion comprises the characteristics both of repentance and of faith. Repentance is conversion viewed from its starting-point, the turning from the former life; faith indicates the objective point of conversion, the turning to God.

Of late the psychology of conversion has been carefully studied and elaborately treated by psychologists. Much valuable material has been gathered. It is shown that certain periods of adolescent life are particularly susceptible to religious influences (compare G. Stanley Hall, Adolescence, II, chapter xiv; E. D. Starbuck, Psychology of Religion, etc.). Yet conversion cannot be explained as a natural process, conditioned by physiological changes in the adolescent, especially by approaching puberty. The laws of psychology are certainly God’s laws as much as all other laws of Nature, and His Spirit works in harmony with His own laws. But in genuine conversion there is always at work in a direct and immediate manner the Spirit of God to which man, be he adolescent or adult, consciously responds. Any attempt to explain conversion by eliminating the direct working of the Divine Spirit falls short of the mark.

See REGENERATION; REPENTANCE.

LITERATURE.

See REGENERATION.

J. L. Nuelsen

CONVICT; CONVICTION

kon-vikt’, kon-vik’-shun (elegcho and compounds, "to prove guilty"): Usual translation of English Versions of the Bible, where the King James Version has "convince," as in Joh 8:46; Tit 1:9; Jas 2:9; once also replacing the King James Version "reprove" (Joh 16:8), while the Revised Version (British

and American) changes the King James Version "convince" into "reprove" in 1Co 14:24. It always implies the presentation of evidence. It is a decision presumed to be based upon a careful and discriminating consideration of all the proofs offered, and has a legal character, the verdict being rendered either in God's judgment (Ro 3:19), or before men (Joh 8:46) by an appeal to their consciences in which God's law is written (Ro 2:15). Since such conviction is addressed to the heart of the guilty, as well as concerning him externally, the word "reprove" is sometimes substituted. To "convict .... in respect of righteousness, and of judgment" (Joh 16:8), refers to the conviction of the inadequacy and perversity of the ordinary, natural standards of righteousness and judgment, and the approval of those found in Christ, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, as the great interpreter and applier of the work of Christ.

H. E. Jacobs

CONVINCE

kon-vins' (elegcho): Another form etymologically of "convict," means to bring to a decision concerning the truth or the falsehood of a proposition (Job 32:12). As usually applied to what is of a more individual and private character, and having reference to what is either good or bad, or what is in itself without moral quality, it has given way in the Revised Version (British and American) to either "convict," "reprove" or "confute."

See CONVICT.

CONVOCATION

kon-vo-ka'-shun: A rendering for miqra' chiefly in the frequent "Holy Convocation"; but the word is sometimes used alone, e.g. Nu 10:2; Isa 1:13; 4:5. On a holy convocation no work could be done. The phrase differs from "solemn assembly," which in the Pentateuch is only applied to the concluding festivals at the end of Passover and Tabernacles, while "Holy Convocation" is used of the Sabbath and all the great holy days of the Mosaic legislation.

CONVULSING

kon-vuls'-ing (Mr 1:26 margin (the King James Version torn)).

See UNCLEAN SPIRIT.

COOKING

kook'-ing.

See FOOD.

COOL

kool (ruach, "wind"; katapsucho, "to cool down"): "Cool of the day" (Ge 3:8, margin "wind"), when the evening breeze has tempered the heat of the day, enabling Orientals to walk abroad. "Cool my tongue" (Lu 16:24), a phrase reflecting the Jewish notion that Abraham had power to rescue his descendants from the fires of Hades.

COOS

ko’-os.

See COS.

COPING

ko’-ping.

See HOUSE.

COPPER

kop’-er (nechosheth): The word is translated "copper" in only one passage (Ezr 8:27 the King James Version). In the American Standard Revised Version of this passage, "brass" has been substituted. Neither describes the actual alloy according to present definitions so well as the word "bronze." Copper was one of the earliest metals to be known and utilized in alloy, but copper, as a single metal, was probably little used. The remains of spears, balances, arms, vases, mirrors, statues, cooking utensils, implements of all kinds, etc., from Bible times are principally of an alloy of copper hardened with tin known today as bronze (see BRASS). In such passages as De 8:9, where reference is made to the native metal or ores, "copper" should be substituted for "brass" as in the American Standard Revised Version (compare Job 40:18). This is true also of coins as chalkos, in Mt 10:9.

Our modern English word "copper" is derived from an old name pertaining to the island of Cyprus. Copper was known to the ancients as Cyprian brass, probably because that island was one of the chief sources for this metal. The Sinai peninsula and the mountains of northern Syria also contributed to the ancient world’s supply (see Tell el-Amarna Letters). No evidences of copper ore in any quantity are found in Palestine proper.

See METAL; MINE.

James A. Patch.

COPPERSmith

kop’-er-smith (chalkeus): The word is found in New Testament once only, in 2Ti 4:14: "Alexander the coppersmith did (margin "showed") me much evil." As the Bible word rendered "copper" (see Ezr 8:27 the King James Version) is translated "brass" by the Revised Version (British and American), so the word here rendered "c." should be rendered "brazier," or "worker in brass."

See COPPER.

COPTIC VERSIONS

kop’-tik vur’-shunz:

I. LANGUAGE AND ALPHABET

1. Alphabet

2. Dialects.

II. VERSIONS

III. CHIEF EDITIONS

LITERATURE

I. Language and Alphabet.

1. Alphabet:

The Coptic alphabet consists of the Greek uncial letters, plus seven characters taken from the Egyptian demotic to express sounds not represented in the Greek It can be traced back to the 4th century, as the oldest Coptic manuscripts belong to the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century. The language still prevailed in Egypt in the 9th century, but was no longer understood in Middle Egypt in the 12th. Its last speaker died in 1633.

2. Dialects:

There were at least five written dialects and subdialects of Coptic. Of these the most important from a

literary point of view was the

(1) Buchairic, the dialect of Lower Egypt, often called Coptic paragraph excellence, and also (wrongly) Memphitic. It is used as the ecclesiastical language in the services of the Coptic church. The other four dialects are somewhat more closely allied to one another than to Buchairic, which shows greater traces of Greek influence. These dialects are,

(2) the Sahidic (Sa‘idi, or dialect of upper Egypt), also called Thebaic;

(3) the Bashmuric—or rather Bushmuric—(for which Fayyumic has been suggested);

(4) the Middle Egyptian proper (known from manuscripts found in the monastery of Jeremias near the Theban Serapeum), differing but little from (3); and

(5) the Akhmimic (Akhmim = the ancient Chemmis). Akhmimic is more primitive and more closely related to ancient Egyptian than any other. Only a few fragments in it (of Exodus, Ecclesiastes, 2 Maccabees, the Minor Prophets, and Catholic epistles) have yet been found. The last three dialects are often classed together as "Middle Egyptian" and (4) is then called "Lower Sahidic."

II. Versions.

In all 5 dialects more or less complete versions of the Bible once existed. They were the earliest made after the early Syriac At latest they began in the 3rd century, though some (e.g. Hyvernat) say as early as the 2nd. It is thought that the Sahidic version was the earliest, then the Middle Egyptian and finally the Buchairic. The latter represents an early and comparatively pure Greek text, free from what are generally termed western additions, while the Sahidic, on the other hand, contains most of the peculiar western readings. It sometimes supports Codex Sinaiticus, sometimes Codex Vaticanus (B), sometimes both, but generally it closely agrees with codex D (Bezae), especially in the Acts. A Coptic (Sahidic) MS, written considerably before 350 AD, and published by the British Museum in April, 1912, contains Deuteronomy, Jonah, and Acts, and is older than any other Biblical manuscript (except a few fragments) yet known to exist. It proves that this Sahidic version was made about 200 AD. It in general supports the "Western" text of codex Bezae (D). Much of the New Testament especially still exists in Sahidic, though not Revelation. In Bubairic we have the Pentateuch, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, the 12 Minor Prophets, and fragments of the historical books of the Old Testament, besides the whole New Testament, though the Book of Revelation is later than the rest. In the other dialects much less had been preserved, as far as is known. In Bushmuric we have fragments of Isaiah, Lamentations, Ep. Jeremiah, and a good many fragments of the New Testament. In more than one dialect we have apocryphal gospels (see Texts and Studies, IV, number 2, 1896) and Gnostic papyri, etc. The Old Testament was translated from the Septuagint. The Psalms seem to have been translated about 303 AD.

III. Chief Editions.

The Buchairic Psalms were first published in 1659. Wilkins published the Buchairic New Testament at London in 1716, and the Pentateuch in 1731; Schwartze the Gospels in 1846-47; de Lagarde the Ac and Epistles in 1852. He also edited the Psalms (transliterated) in 1875, 151 in number, of which the last celebrates David's victory over Goliath. He added fragments of the Sahidic Psalter and of the Buchairic Proverbs Tattam published the Minor Prophets in 1836 and the Major in 1852 an edition of the Gospels in London in 1847, and of the rest of the New Testament in 1852 (SPCK), with a literal Arabic version. Horner's edition of the Buchairic New Testament (4 volumes, 1898, etc., Clarendon Press) and of Sahidic Gospels (1910, 3 vols) is the standard edition Ford published part of the Sahidic New Testament in 1799. Various editions of parts of Old Testament and New Testament have since appeared: e.g. Ciasca published fragments of the Sahidic Old Testament (Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-Sahidica Musei Borgiani) at Rome, 1885-89.

LITERATURE.

Realencyclopadie fur prot. Theol. und Kirche, III; Hyvernat, Etude sur les versions coptes; Revue biblique, 1896, 1897; Zeitschrift fur agypt. Sprache; Journal of Theol. Studies, I, 3; Nestle, Text. Crit of Greek New Testament; Forbes Robinson, Texts and Studies, IV; Oesterley in Murray's New Bible Dict.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

COR

kor (kor): A liquid and dry measure, same as the homer, of about 90 gals. capacity (Eze 45:14).

See HOMER; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

COR-ASHAN

kor-ash'-an, ko-ra'-shan (English Revised Version, the King James Version Chor-ashan; kor 'ashan, 1Sa 30:30): The original reading was probably Bor- ashan, "well of Ashan."

See ASHAN.

CORAL

kor'-al (ra'moth, peninim): The red coral or precious coral, Corallium rubrum, is confined to the Mediterranean and Adriatic seas. It is the calcareous axis of a branching colony of polyps. It does not form reefs, but occurs in small masses from 40 to 100 fathoms below the surface. It differs totally in structure from the white corals which form coral reefs, belonging to the order of Octactinia or Eight-rayed Polyps, while the reef-building corals belong to the Hexactinia or Six-rayed Polyps.

Ra’moth, apparently from r. ra’am, "to be high" (compare rum, "to be high"), occurs in three passages. In Pr 24:7, EVV have "too high": "Wisdom is too high for a fool." In Job 28:12-19, where various precious things are compared with wisdom, English Versions of the Bible has "Coral"(king James Version, margin "Ramoth"). It is mentioned here along with ceghor, "gold" (the Revised Version, margin "treasure"); kethem, "gold of Ophir"; shoham, "onyx" (the Revised Version, margin "beryl"); cappir, "sapphire"; zahabh, "gold"; zekhukhith, "crystal" (the Revised Version (British and American) "glass"); paz, "gold"; gabhish, "pearls" (the Revised Version (British and American) "crystal"); peninim, "rubies" (the Revised Version, margin "red coral" or "pearls"); piTedhah, "topaz." While the real meaning of some of these terms is doubtful (see STONES, PRECIOUS), they all, including ra’moth, appear to be precious stones or metals. In Eze 27:16, ra’moth occurs with nophekh, "emeralds" (the Revised Version, margin "carbuncles"); ‘argaman, "purple"; riqmah, "broidered work"; buts, "fine linen"; kadhkodh, "Agate"(king James Version, margin "chrysoprase," the Revised Version (British and American) "rubies"). Here the context does not require a precious stone or metal, and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) has sericum, i. e. "Chinese material" or "silk." Notwithstanding, therefore, the traditional rendering, "coral," the real meaning of ra’moth must be admitted to be doubtful.

Peninim (from the root panan, "to divide up," "to separate"; compare Arabic fanan, "a branch of a tree") occurs in Job 28:18; Pr 3:15; 8:11; 20:15; 31:10; La 4:7. In all these passages English Versions of the Bible has "rubies" (Job 28:18, the Revised Version, margin "red coral" or "pearls"; La 4:7, the Revised Version, margin "corals"). Everywhere a precious substance is indicated, but nowhere does the context give any light as to the nature of the substance, except in La 4:7, where we have the statement that the nobles of Jerusalem "were more ruddy in body" than peninim. This and the etymology favor a branching red substance such as precious coral. The occurrence of peninim and ra’moth together in Job 28:18 is, if we give the precedence to peninim, a further argument against ra’moth meaning "coral."

Alfred Ely Day

CORBAN

kor’-ban (qorban; doron; translated "a gift," "a sacrificial offering," literally, "that which is brought near," namely, to the altar): An expression frequently used in the original text of the Old Testament; in the English Bible it occurs in Mr 7:11; compare also Mt 15:5. It is the most general term for a sacrifice of any kind. In the course of time it became associated with an objectionable practice. Anything dedicated to the temple by pronouncing the votive word "Corban" forthwith belonged to the temple, but only ideally; actually it might remain in the possession of him who made the vow. So a son might be justified in not supporting his old parents simply because he designated his property or a part of it as a gift to the temple, that is, as "Corban" There was no necessity of fulfilling his vow, yet he was actually prohibited from ever using his property for the support of his parents. This shows clearly why Christ singled out this queer regulation in order to demonstrate the sophistry of tradition and to bring out the fact of its possible and actual hostility to the Scripture and its spirit.

William Baur

CORBE

kor’-be.

See CHORBE.

CORD

kord (chebhet, yether, methar, ‘abhoth; schoinion):

(1) The Arabic chab’l corresponds to the Hebrew chebhel and is still the common name for cord or rope throughout the East. Such ropes or cords are made of goat’s or camel’s hair, first spun into threads and then twisted or plaited into the larger and stronger form. Chebhel is translated rather inconsistently in the Revised Version (British and American) by "cord" (Jos 2:15; Job 36:8, etc.); by "line" (2Sa 8:2; Mic 2:5; Ps 16:6; 78:55; Am 7:17; Zec 2:1); by "ropes" (1Ki 20:31), and by "tacklings" (Isa 33:23).

(2) Yether corresponds to the Arabic wittar, which means catgut. With a kindred inconsistency it is translated the Revised Version (British and American) by "withes" (Jud 16:7 the Revised Version, margin "bowstring"); by "cord" (Job 30:11), where some think it may mean "bowstring," or possibly "rein" of a bridle, and by "bowstring" (Ps 11:2), doubtless the true meaning.

(3) Methar is considered the equivalent of Arabic atnab, which means tent ropes, being constantly so used by the Bedouin. They make the thing so called of goat’s or camel’s hair. It is used of the "cords" of the tabernacle (Jer 10:20), of the "cords" of the "hangings" and "pillars" of the courts of the tabernacle in Exodus and Numbers, and figuratively by Isa 54:2, "Lengthen thy cords," etc.

(4) ‘Abhoth is thought to have its equivalent in the Arabic rubuts, which means a band, or fastening. See BAND. It is translated by "cords" in Ps 118:27; 129:4; by "bands" in Eze 3:25; Job 39:10; Ho 11:4; by "ropes" in Jud 15:13,14, and by "cart rope" in Isa 5:18. See CART. See also Nu 15:38 and AMULET. It Seems to have the meaning of something twisted or interlaced.

(5) In the New Testament "cord" is found in Joh 2:15, translating schoinion, but in Ac 27:32 the same Greek word is rendered "ropes."

Figurative:

(1) of affliction (Job 36:8);

(2) of God’s laws (Ps 2:3);

(3) of the artifices of the wicked (Ps 129:4; 140:5);

(4) of sinful habits (Pr 5:22);

(5) of true friendship or companionship (Ec 4:12);

(6) possibly of the spinal cord (Ec 12:6);

(7) of falsehood (Isa 5:18);

(8) of the spirit of enterprise and devotion (Isa 54:2);

(9) of God’s gentleness.

George B. Eager

CORDS, SMALL

kordz (schoinion, the diminutive of schoinos, "a rush," hence, "a rope of rushes"): Translated "small cords" (Joh 2:15 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "cords"). The same word is translated "ropes" in Ac 27:32. See also Job 41:2 margin.

CORE

ko’-re (Kore): In the King James Version, Jude 1:11, used as a variant for Korah.

See KORAH, 3.

CORIANDER

kor-i-an’-der (gadh; korion): The fruit of the Coriandrum Sativum (Natural Order Umbelliferae), a plant indigenous around the Mediterranean and extensively cultivated. The fruits are aromatic and stomatic-carminative. They are of a grayish-yellow color, ribbed, ovate-globular and in size about twice that of a hemp-seed. "The manna was like coriander seed" (Nu 11:7; see also Ex 16:31).

CORINTH

kor’-inth (Korinthos, "ornament"): A celebrated city of the Peloponnesus, capital of Corinthia, which lay North of Argolis, and with the isthmus joined the peninsula to the mainland. Corinth had three good harbors (Lechaeum, on the Corinthian, and Cenchrea and Schoenus on the Saronic Gulf), and thus commanded the traffic of both the eastern and the western seas. The larger ships could not be hauled

across the isthmus (Ac 27:6,37); smaller vessels were taken over by means of a ship tramway with wooden rails. The Phoenicians, who settled here very early, left many traces of their civilization in the industrial arts, such as dyeing and weaving, as well as in their religion and mythology. The Corinthian cult of Aphrodite, of Melikertes (Melkart) and of Athene Phoenike are of Phoenician origin. Poseidon, too, and other sea deities were held in high esteem in the commercial city. Various arts were cultivated and the Corinthians, even in the earliest times, were famous for their cleverness, inventiveness and artistic sense, and they prided themselves on surpassing the other Greeks in the embellishment of their city and in the adornment of their temples. There were many celebrated painters in Corinth, and the city became famous for the Corinthian order of architecture: an order, which, by the way, though held in high esteem by the Romans, was very little used by the Greeks themselves. It was here, too, that the dithyramb (hymn to Dionysus) was first arranged artistically to be sung by a chorus; and the Isthmian games, held every two years, were celebrated just outside the city on the isthmus near the Saronic Gulf. But the commercial and materialistic spirit prevailed later. Not a single Corinthian distinguished himself in literature. Statesmen, however, there were in abundance: Periander, Phidon, Timoleon.

Harbors are few on the Corinthian Gulf. Hence, no other city could wrest the commerce of these waters from Corinth. According to Thucydides, the first ships of war were built here in 664 BC. In those early days Corinth held a leading position among the Greek cities; but in consequence of her great material prosperity she would not risk all as Athens did, and win eternal supremacy over men: she had too much to 1ose to jeopardize her material interests for principle, and she soon sank into the second class. But when Athens, Thebes, Sparta and Argos fell away, Corinth came to the front again as the wealthiest and most important city in Greece; and when it was destroyed by Mummius in 146 BC, the treasures of art carried to Rome were as great as those of Athens. Delos became the commercial center for a time; but when Julius Caesar restored Corinth a century later (46 BC), it grew so rapidly that the Roman colony soon became again one of the most prominent centers in Greece. When Paul visited Corinth, he found it the metropolis of the Peloponnesus. Jews flocked to this center of trade (Ac 18:1-18; Ro 16:21 ff; 1Co 9:20), the natural site for a great mart, and flourishing under the lavish hand of the Caesars; and this is one reason why Paul remained there so long (Ac 18:11) instead of sojourning in the old seats of aristocracy, such as Argos, Sparta and Athens. He found a strong Jewish nucleus to begin with; and it was in direct communication with Ephesus. But earthquake, malaria, and the harsh Turkish rule finally swept everything away except seven columns of one old Doric temple, the only object above ground left today to mark the site of the ancient city of wealth and luxury and immorality—the city of vice paragraph excellence in the Roman world. Near the temple have been excavated the ruins of the famous fount of Peirene, so celebrated in Greek literature. Directly South of the city is the high rock (over 1,800 ft.) Acrocorinthus, which formed an impregnable fortress. Traces of the old ship-canal across the isthmus (attempted by Nero in 66-67 AD) were to be seen before excavations were begun for the present canal. At this time the city was thoroughly Roman. Hence, the many Latin names in the New Testament: Lucius, Tertius, Gaius, Erastus, Quartus (Ro 16:21-23), Crispus, Titus Justus (Ac 18:7,8), Fortunatus, Achaicus (1Co 16:17). According to the testimony of Dio Chrysostomus, Corinth had become in the 2nd century of our era the richest city in Greece. Its monuments and public buildings and art treasures are described in detail by Pausanias.

The church in Corinth consisted principally of non-Jews (1Co 12:2). Paul had no intention at first of

making the city a base of operations (Ac 18:1; 16:9,10); for he wished to return to Thessalonica (1Th 2:17,18). His plans were changed by a revelation (Ac 18:9,10). The Lord commanded him to speak boldly, and he did so, remaining in the city eighteen months. Finding strong opposition in the synagogue he left the Jews and went to the Gentiles (Ac 18:6). Nevertheless, Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue and his household were believers and baptisms were numerous (Ac 18:8); but no Corinthians were baptized by Paul himself except Crispus, Gaius and some of the household of Stephanas (1Co 1:14,16) "the firstfruits of Achaia" (1Co 16:15). One of these, Gaius, was Paul's host the next time he visited the city (Ro 16:23). Silas and Timothy, who had been left at Berea, came on to Corinth about 45 days after Paul's arrival. It was at this time that Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Thessalonians (1Th 3:6). During Gallio's administration the Jews accused Paul, but the proconsul refused to allow the case to be brought to trial. This decision must have been looked upon with favor by a large majority of the Corinthians, who had a great dislike for the Jews (Ac 18:17). Paul became acquainted also with Priscilla and Aquila (Ac 18:18,26; Ro 16:3; 2Ti 4:19), and later they accompanied him to Ephesus. Within a few years after Paul's first visit to Corinth the Christians had increased so rapidly that they made quite a large congregation, but it was composed mainly of the lower classes: they were neither 'learned, influential, nor of noble birth' (1Co 1:26).

Paul probably left Corinth to attend the celebration of the feast at Jerusalem (Ac 18:21). Little is known of the history of the church in Corinth after his departure. Apollos came from Ephesus with a letter of recommendation to the brethren in Achaia (Ac 18:27; 2Co 3:1); and he exercised a powerful influence (Ac 18:27,28; 1Co 1:12); and Paul came down later from Macedonia. His first letter to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus. Both Titus and Timothy were sent to Corinth from Ephesus (2Co 7:13,15; 1Co 4:17), and Timothy returned by land, meeting Paul in Macedonia (2Co 1:1), who visited Greece again in 56-57 or 57-58.

LITERATURE.

Leake, Travels in the Morea, IlI, 229-304; Peloponnesiaca, 392 ff; Curtius, Peloponnesos, II, 514 ff; Clark, Peloponnesus, 42-61; Conybeare and Howson, The Life and Epistles' of Paul, chapter xii; Ramsay, "Corinth" (in HDB); Holm, History of Greece, I, 286 ff; II, 142, and 306-16; III, 31-44, and 283; IV, 221, 251, 347 and 410-12.

J. E. Harry

CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO THE

ko-rin'-thi-anz:

I. AUTHENTICITY OF THE TWO EPISTLES

1. External Evidence

2. Internal Evidence

3. Consent of Criticism

4. Ultra-Radical Attack (Dutch School)

II. TEXT OF 1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS

Integrity of 1 Corinthians

III. PAUL'S PREVIOUS RELATIONS WITH CORINTH

1. Corinth in 55 AD

2. Founding of the Church

IV. DATE OF THE EPISTLE

V. OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE

1. A Previous Letter

2. Letter from Corinth

VI. CONTENTS

1. General Character

2. Order and Division

3. Outline

(1) 1 Corinthians 1-6

(2) 1 Corinthians 7-10

(3) 1 Corinthians 11-16

VII. DISTINGUISHING FEATURES

1. Party Spirit

2. Christian Conscience

3. Power of the Cross

LITERATURE

I. Authenticity of the Two Epistles.

1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians and Romans, all belong to the period of Paul's third missionary journey. They are the most remarkable of his writings, and are usually distinguished as the four great or principal epistles; a distinction which not only is a tribute to their high originality and intrinsic worth, but also indicates the extremely favorable opinion which critics of almost all schools have held regarding their authenticity. Throughout the centuries the tradition has remained practically unbroken, that they contain the very pectus Paulinum, the mind and heart of the great apostle of the Gentiles, and preserve to the church an impregnable defense of historical Christianity. What has to be said of their genuineness applies almost equally to both.

1. External Evidence:

The two epistles have a conspicuous place in the most ancient lists of Pauline writings. In the Muratorian Fragment (circa 170) they stand at the head of the nine epistles addressed to churches, and are declared to have been written to forbid heretical schism (primum omnium Corinthiis schisma haeresis intredicens); and in Marcion's Apostolicon (circa 140) they stand second to Gal. They are also clearly attested in the most important writings of the subapostolic age, e.g. by Clement of Rome (circa 95), generally regarded as the friend of the apostle mentioned in Php 4:3; Ignatius (Ad Ephes., chapter xviii, second decade of 2nd century); Polycarp (chapters ii, vi, xi, first half of 2nd century), a disciple of John; and Justin Martyr (born at close of let century); while the Gnostic Ophites (2nd century) were clearly familiar with both epistles (compare Westcott, Canon, passim, and Index II; also Charteris, Canonicity, 222-224, where most of the original passages are brought together). The witness of Clement is of the highest importance. Ere the close of the let century he himself wrote a letter to the Corinthians, in which (chapter xlvii, Lightfoot's edition, 144) he made a direct appeal to the authority of 1 Cor: "Take up the letter of Paul the blessed apostle; what did he write to you first in the beginning of the gospel? Verily he gave you spiritual direction regarding himself, Cephas, and Apollos, for even then you were dividing yourselves into parties." It would be impossible to desire more explicit external testimony.

2. Internal Evidence:

Within themselves both epistles are replete with marks of genuineness. They are palpitating human documents, with the ring of reality from first to last. They admirably harmonize with the independent narrative of Acts; in the words of Schleiermacher (Einltg., 148), "The whole fits together and completes

itself perfectly, and yet each of the documents follows its own course, and the data contained in the one cannot be borrowed from those of the other." Complex and difficult as the subjects and circumstances sometimes are, and varying as the moods of the writer are in dealing with them, there is a naturalness that compels assent to his good faith. The very difficulty created for a modern reader by the incomplete and allusive character of some of the references is itself a mark of genuineness rather than the opposite; just what would most likely be the ease in a free and intimate correspondence between those who understood one another in the presence of immediate facts which needed no careful particularization; but what would almost as certainly have been avoided in a fictitious composition. Indeed a modicum of literary sense suffices to forbid classification among the pseudepigrapha. To take but a few instances from many, it is impossible to read such passages as those conveying the remonstrance in 1Co 9, the alternations of anxiety and relief in connection with the meeting of Titus in 2Co 2 and 7, or the ever-memorable passage which begins at 2Co 11:24 of the same epistle: "Of the Jews five times received I," ere, without feeling that the hypothesis of fiction becomes an absurdity. No man ever wrote out of the heart if this writer did not. The truth is that theory of pseudonymity leaves far more difficulties behind it than any it is supposed to solve. The unknown and unnamable literary prodigy of the 2nd century, who in the most daring and artistic manner gloried in the fanciful creation of those minute and life-like details which have imprinted themselves indelibly on the memory and imagination of mankind, cannot be regarded as other than a chimera. No one knows where or when he lived, or in what shape or form. But if the writings are the undoubted rescripts of fact, to whose life and personality do they fit themselves more exquisitely than to those of the man whose name stands at their head, and whose compositions they claim to be? They suit beyond compare the apostle of the missionary journeys, the tender, eager, indomitable "prisoner of the Lord," and no other. No other that has even been suggested is more than the mere shadow of a name, and no two writers have as yet seriously agreed even as to the shadow. The pertinent series of questions with which Godet (Intro to New Testament; Studies on the Epistles, 305) concludes his remarks on the genuineness may well be repeated: "What use was it to explain at length in the 2nd century a change in a plan of the journey, which, supposing it was real, had interest only for those whom the promised visit of the apostle personally concerned? When the author speaks of five hundred persons who had seen the risen Christ, of whom the most part were still alive at the time when he was writing, is he telling his readers a mere story that would resemble a bad joke? What was the use of discussing at length and giving detailed rules on the exercise of the glossolalia at a time when that gift no longer existed, so to say, in the church? Why make the apostle say: ‘We who shall be alive (at the moment of the Parousia)’ at a time when everyone knew that he was long dead? In fine, what church would have received without opposition into its archives, as an epistle of the apostle, half a century after his death, a letter unknown till then, and filled with reproaches most severe and humiliating to it?"

3. Consent of Criticism:

One is not surprised, therefore, that even the radical criticism of the 19th century cordially accepted the Corinthian epistles and their companions in the great group. The men who founded that criticism were under no conceivable constraint in such a conclusion, save the constraint of obvious and incontrovertible fact. The Tubingen school, which doubted or denied the authenticity of all the rest of the epistles, frankly acknowledged the genuineness of these. This also became the general verdict of the "critical" school which followed that of Tubingen, and which, in many branches, has included the names of the

leading German scholars to this day. F. C. Baur's language (Paul, I, 246) was: "There has never been the slightest suspicion of unauthenticity cast on these four epistles, and they bear so incontestably the character of Pauline originality, that there is no conceivable ground for the assertion of critical doubts in their case." Renan (St. Paul, Introduction, V) was equally emphatic: "They are incontestable, and uncontested."

4. Ultra-Radical Attack (Dutch School):

Reference, however, must be made to the ultra-radical attack which has gathered some adherents, especially among Dutch scholars, during the last 25 years. As early as 1792 Evanson, a retired English clergyman, rejected Rome on the ground that, according to Acts, no church existed in Rome in Paul's day. Bruno Bauer (1850-51-52) made a more sweeping attack, relegating the whole of the four principal epistles to the close of the 2nd century. His views received little attention, until, in 1886 onward, they were taken up and extended by a series of writers in Holland, Pierson and Naber, and Loman, followed rapidly by Steck of Bern, Volter of Amsterdam, and above all by Van Manen of Leyden. According to these writers, with slight modifications of view among themselves, it is very doubtful if Paul or Christ ever really existed; if they did, legend has long since made itself master of their personalities, and in every case what borders on the supernatural is to be taken as the criterion of the legendary. The epistles were written in the 1st quarter of the 2nd century, and as Paul, so far as he was known, was believed to be a reformer of anti-Judaic sympathies, he was chosen as the patron of the movement, and the writings were published in his name. The aim of the whole series was to further the interests of a supposed circle of clever and elevated men, who, partly imbued with Hebrew ideals, and partly with the speculations of Greek and Alexandrian philosophy, desired the spread of a universalistic Christianity and true Gnosis. For this end they perceived it necessary that Jewish legalism should be neutralized, and that the narrow national element should be expelled from the Messianic idea. Hence, the epistles The principles on which the main contentions of the critics are based may be reduced to two:

(1) that there are relations in the epistles so difficult to understand that, since we cannot properly understand them, the epistles are not trustworthy; and

(2) that the religious and ecclesiastical development is so great that not merely 20 or 30 years, but 70 or 80 more, are required, if we are to be able rationally to conceive it: to accept the situation at an earlier date is simply to accept what cannot possibly have been.

It is manifest that on such principles it is possible to establish what one will, and that any historical literature might be proved untrustworthy, and reshaped according to the subjective idiosyncrasies of the critic. The underlying theory of intellectual development is too rigid, and is quite oblivious of the shocks it receives from actual facts, by the advent in history from time to time of powerful, compelling, and creative personalities, who rather mould their age than are moulded by it. None have poured greater ridicule on this "pseudo-Kritik" than the representatives of the advanced school in Germany whom it rather expected to carry with it, and against whom it complains bitterly that they do not take it seriously. On the whole the vagaries of the Dutch school have rather confirmed than shaken belief in these epistles;

and one may freely accept Ramsay's view (HDB, I, 484) as expressing the modern mind regarding them, namely, that they are "the unimpeached and unassailable nucleus of admitted Pauline writings." (Reference to the following will give a sufficiently adequate idea of the Dutch criticism and the replies that have been made to it: Van Manen, EB, article "Paul," and Expository Times, IX, 205, 257, 314; Knowling, Witness of the Epistles; Clemen, Einheitlichkeit der p. B.; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, ICC; Godet, Julicher and Zahn, in their Introductions; Schmiedel and Lipsius in the Hand-Commentar.)

II. Text of 1 and 2 Corinthians:

Integrity of 1 Corinthians:

The text of both epistles comes to us in the most ancient VSS, the Syriac (Peshito), the Old Latin, and the Egyptian all of which were in very early use, undoubtedly by the 3rd century. It is complete in the great Greek uncials: Codex Sinaiticus (original scribe) and a later scribe, 4th century, Codex Vaticanus (B, 4th century), Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century, minus two verses, 2Co 4:13; 12:7), and very nearly complete in Codex Ephraemi (C, 5th century), and in the Greek-Latin Claromontanus (D, 6th century); as well as in numerous cursives. In both cases the original has been well preserved, and no exegetical difficulties of high importance are presented. (Reference should be made to the Introduction in Sanday and Headlam's Romans, ICC (1896), where section 7 gives valuable information concerning the text, not only of Roman, but of the Pauline epistles generally; also to the recent edition (Oxford, 1910), New Testament Graecae, by Souter, where the various readings of the text used in the Revised Version (British and American) (1881) are conveniently exhibited.) On the whole the text of 1Co flows on consistently, only at times, in a characteristic fashion, winding back upon itself, and few serious criticisms are made on its unity, although the case is different in this respect with its companion epistle Some writers, on insufficient grounds, believe that 1 Corinthians contains relics of a previous epistle (compare 1Co 5:9), e. g. in 1Co 7:17-24; 9:1-10:22; 15:1-55.

III. Paul's Previous Relations with Corinth.

1. Corinth in 55 AD:

When, in the course of his 2nd missionary journey, Paul left Athens (Ac 18:1), he sailed westward to Cenchrea, and entered Corinth "in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling" (1Co 2:3). He was doubtless alone, although Silas and Timothy afterward joined him (Ac 18:5; 2Co 1:19). The ancient city of Corinth had been utterly laid in ruins when Rome subjugated Greece in the middle of the 2nd century BC. But in the year 46 BC Caesar had caused it to be rebuilt and colonized in the Roman manner, and during the century that had elapsed it had prospered and grown enormously. Its population at this time has been estimated at between 600,000 and 700,000, by far the larger portion of whom were slaves. Its magnificent harbors, Cenchrea and Lechaeum, opening to the commerce of East and West, were crowded with ships, and its streets with travelers and merchants from almost every country under heaven. Even in that old pagan world the reputation of the city was bad; it has been compared (Baring-

Gould, Study of Paul, 241) to an amalgam of new-market, Chicago and Paris, and probably it contained the worst features of each. At night it was made hideous by the brawls and lewd songs of drunken revelry. In the daytime its markets and squares swarmed with Jewish peddlers, foreign traders, sailors, soldiers, athletes in training, boxers, wrestlers, charioteers, racing-men, betting-men, courtesans, slaves, idlers and parasites of every description. The corrupting worship of Aphrodite, with its hordes of hierodouloi, was dominant, and all over the Greek-Roman world, "to behave as a Corinthian" was a proverbial synonym for leading a low, shameless and immoral life. Very naturally such a polluted and idolatrous environment accounts for much that has to be recorded of the semi-pagan and imperfect life of many of the early converts.

2. Founding of the Church:

Paul was himself the founder of the church in Corinth (1Co 3:6,10). Entering the city with anxiety, and yet with almost audacious hopefulness, he determined to know nothing among its people save Jesus Christ and Him crucified (1Co 2:2). Undoubtedly he was conscious that the mission of the Cross here approached its crisis. If it could abide here, it could abide anywhere. At first he confined himself to working quietly at his trade, and cultivating the friendship of Aquila and Priscilla (Ac 18:2 f); then he opened his campaign in the synagogue where he persuaded both Jews and Greeks, and ultimately, when opposition became violent, carried it on in the house of Titus Justus, a proselyte. He made deep impressions, and gradually gathered round him a number who were received into the faith (Ac 18:7,8; 1Co 1:14-16). The converts were drawn largely but not entirely from the lower or servile classes (1Co 1:26; 7:21); they included Crispus and Sosthenes, rulers of the synagogue, Gaius, and Stephanas with his household, "the firstfruits of Achaia" (1Co 16:15). He regarded himself joyfully as the father of this community (1Co 4:14,15), every member of which seemed to him like his own child.

IV. Date of the Epistle.

After a sojourn of eighteen months (Ac 18:11) in this fruitful field, Paul departed, most probably in the year 52 (compare Turner, article "Chron. New Testament," HDB, I, 422 ff), and, having visited Jerusalem and returned to Asia Minor (third journey), established himself for a period of between two and three years (trietia, Ac 20:31) in Ephesus (Ac 18:18 onward). It was during his stay there that his epistle was written, either in the spring (pre- Pentecost, 1Co 16:8) of the year in which he left, 55; or, if that does not give sufficient interval for a visit and a letter to Corinth, which there is considerable ground for believing intervened between 1Co and the departure from Ephesus, then in the spring of the preceding year, 54. This would give ample time for the conjectured events, and there is no insuperable reason against it. Pauline chronology is a subject by itself, but the suggested dates for the departure from Ephesus, and for the writing of 1 Corinthians, really fluctuate between the years 53 and 57. Harnack (Gesch. der altchrist. Litt., II; Die Chron., I) and McGiffert (Apos Age) adopt the earlier date; Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler), 56; Lightfoot (Bib. Essays) and Zahn (Einl.), 57; Turner (ut supra), 55. Many regard 57 as too late, but Robertson (HDB, I, 485-86) still adheres to it.

V. Occasion of the Epistle.

1. A Previous Letter:

After Paul’s departure from Corinth, events moved rapidly, and far from satisfactorily. He was quite cognizant of them. The distance from Ephesus was not great—about eight days’ journey by sea—and in the constant coming and going between the cities news of what was transpiring must frequently have come to his ears. Members of the household of Chloe are distinctly mentioned (1Co 1:11) as having brought tidings of the contentions that prevailed, and there were no doubt other informants. Paul was so concerned by what he heard that he sent Timothy on a conciliatory mission with many commendations (1Co 4:17; 16:10 f), although the present epistle probably reached Corinth first. He had also felt impelled, in a letter (1Co 5:9) which is now lost, to send earnest warning against companying with the immoral. Moreover, Apollos, after excellent work in Corinth, had come to Ephesus, and was received as a brother by the apostle (1Co 3:5,6; 16:12). Equally welcome was a deputation consisting of Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus (1Co 16:17), from whom the fullest information could be gained, and who were the probable bearers of a letter from the church of Corinth itself (1Co 7:1), appealing for advice and direction on a number of points.

2. Letter from Corinth:

This letter has not been preserved, but it was evidently the immediate occasion of our epistle, and its tenor is clearly indicated by the nature of the apostle’s reply. (The letter, professing to be this letter to Paul, and its companion, professing to be Paul’s own lost letter just referred to, which deal with Gnostic heresies, and were for long accepted by the Syrian and Armenian churches, are manifestly apocryphal. (Compare Stanley’s Corinthians, Appendix; Harnack’s Gesch. der altchrist. Litt., I, 37-39, and II, 506-8; Zahn, Einleitung., I, 183-249; Sanday, Encyclopedia Biblica, I, 906-7.) If there be any relic in existence of Paul’s previous letter, it is possibly to be found in the passage 2Co 6:14-7:1; at all events that passage may be regarded as reminiscent of its style and message.) So that 1 Corinthians is no bow drawn at a venture. It treats of a fully understood, and, on the whole, of a most unhappy situation. The church had broken into factions, and was distracted by party cries. Some of its members were living openly immoral lives, and discipline was practically in abeyance. Others had quarrels over which they dragged one another into the heathen courts. Great differences of opinion had also arisen with regard to marriage and the social relations generally; with regard to banquets and the eating of food offered to idols; with regard to the behavior of women in the assemblies, to the Lord’s Supper and the love-feasts, to the use and value of spiritual gifts, and with regard to the hope of the resurrection. The apostle was filled with grief and indignation, which the too complacent tone of the Corinthians only intensified. They discussed questions in a lofty, intellectual way, without seeming to perceive their real drift, or the life and spirit which lay imperiled at their heart. Resisting the impulse to visit them "with a rod" (2Co 4:21), the apostle wrote the present epistle, and dispatched it, if not by the hands of Stephanas and his comrades, most probably by the hands of Titus.

VI. Contents.

1. General Character:

In its general character the epistle is a strenuous writing, masterly in its restraint in dealing with opposition, firm in its grasp of ethical and spiritual principles, and wise and faithful in their application. It is calm, full of reasoning, clear and balanced in judgment; very varied in its lights and shadows, in its kindness, its gravity, its irony. It moves with firm tread among the commonest themes, but also rises easily into the loftiest spheres of thought and vision, breaking again and again into passages of glowing and rhythmical eloquence. It rebukes error, exposes and condemns sin, solves doubts, upholds and encourages faith, and all in a spirit of the utmost tenderness and love, full of grace and truth. It is broad in its outlook, penetrating in its insight, unending in its interest and application.

2. Order and Division:

It is also very orderly in its arrangement, so that it is not difficult to follow the writer as he advances from point to point. Weizsacker (Apos Age, I, 324-25) suggestively distinguishes the matter into

(1) subjects introduced by the letter from Corinth, and

(2) those on which Paul had obtained information otherwise.

He includes three main topics in the first class: marriage, meat offered to idols and spiritual gifts (there is a fourth—the logia or collection, 1Co 16:1); six in the second class: the factions, the case of incest, the lawsuits, the free customs of the women, the abuse connected with the Supper and the denial of the resurrection. It is useful, however, to adhere to the sequence of the epistle In broadly outlining the subject-matter we may make a threefold division:

(1) chapters 1-6;

(2) chapters 7-10; and

(3) chapter 11 through end.

3. Outline:

(1) 1 Corinthians 1-6:

After salutation, in which he associates Sosthenes with himself, and thanksgiving for the grace given to the Corinthians (1Co 1:1-9), Paul immediately begins (1Co 1:10-13) to refer to the internal divisions among them, and to the unworthy and misguided party cries that had arisen. (Many theories have been formed as to the exact significance of the so-called "Christus-party," a party whose danger becomes more obvious in 2 Cor. Compare Meyer- Heinrici, Comm., 8th edition; Godet, Intro, 250 ff; Stanley, Cor, 29-30; Farrar, Paul, chapter xxxi; Pfleiderer, Paulinism, II, 28-31; Weiss, Intro, I, 259-65; Weizsacker, Apos Age, I, 325-33, and 354 ff. Weizsacker holds that the name indicates exclusive

relation to an authority, while Baur and Pfleiderer argue that it was a party watchword (virtually Petrine) taken to bring out the apostolic inferiority of Paul. On the other hand a few scholars maintain that the name does not, strictly speaking, indicate a party at all but rather designates those who were disgusted at the display of all party spirit, and with whom Paul was in hearty sympathy. See McGiffert, Apos Age, 295-97.) After denouncing this petty partisanship, Paul offers an elaborate defense of his own ministry, declaring the power and wisdom of God in the gospel of the Cross (1:14-2:16), returning in chapter 3 to the spirit of faction, showing its absurdity and narrowness in face of the fullness of the Christian heritage in "all things" that belong to them as belonging to Christ; and once more defending his ministry in chapter 4, making a touching appeal to his readers as his "beloved children," whom he had begotten through the gospel. In chapter 5 he deals with the case of a notorious offender, guilty of incest, whom they unworthily harbor in their midst, and in the name of Christ demands that they should expel him from the church, pointing out at the same time that it is against the countenancing of immorality within the church membership that he specially warns, and had previously warned in his former epistle Ch 6 deals with the shamefulness of Christian brethren haling one another to the heathen courts, and not rather seeking the settlement of their differences within themselves; reverting once more in the closing verses to the subject of unchastity, which irrepressibly haunts him as he thinks of them.

(2) 1 Corinthians 7-10:

In 1Co 7 he begins to reply to two of the matters on which the church had expressly consulted him in its ep., and which he usually induces by the phrase peri de, "now concerning." The first of these bears (chapter 7) upon celibacy and marriage, including the case of "mixed" marriage. These questions he treats quite frankly, yet with delicacy and circumspection, always careful to distinguish between what he has received as the direct word of the Lord, and what he only delivers as his own opinion, the utterance of his own sanctified common-sense, yet to which the good spirit within him gives weight. The second matter on which advice was solicited, questions regarding eidolothuta, meats offered to idols, he discusses in chapter 8, recurring to it again in chapter 10 to end. The scruples and casuistries involved he handles with excellent wisdom, and lays down a rule for the Christian conscience of a far-reaching kind, happily expressed: "All things are lawful; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful; but not all things edify. Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbor’s good" (10:23,14). By lifting their differences into the purer atmosphere of love and duty, he causes them to dissolve away. Chapter 9 contains another notable defense of his apostleship, in which he asserts the principle that the Christian ministry has a claim for its support on those to whom it ministers, although in his own case he deliberately waived his right, that no challenge on such a matter should be possible among them. The earlier portion of chapter 10 contains a reference to Jewish idolatry and sacramental abuse, in order that the evils that resulted might point a moral, and act as a solemn warning to Christians in relation to their own rites.

(3) 1 Corinthians 11-16:

The third section deals with certain errors and defects that had crept into the inner life and observances of the church, also with further matters on which the Corinthians sought guidance, namely, spiritual gifts

and the collection for the saints. 1Co 11:1-16 has regard to the deportment of women and their veiling in church, a matter which seems to have occasioned some difficulty, and which Paul deals with in a manner quite his own; passing thereafter to treat of graver and more disorderly affairs, gross abuses in the form of gluttony and drunkenness at the Lord's Supper, which leads him, after severe censure, to make his classic reference to that sacred ordinance (verse 20 to end). Chapter 12 sets forth the diversity, yet true unity, of spiritual gifts, and the confusion and jealousy to which a false conception of them inevitably leads, obscuring that "most excellent way," the love which transcends them all, which never faileth, the greatest of the Christian graces, whose praise he chants in language of surpassing beauty (chapter 13). He strives also, in the following chapter, to correct the disorder arising from the abuse of the gift of tongues, many desiring to speak at once, and many speaking only a vain babble which no one could understand, thinking themselves thereby highly gifted. It is not edifying: "I had rather," he declares, "speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (1Co 14:19). Thereafter follows the immortal chapter on the resurrection, which he had learned that some denied (1Co 15:12). He anchors the faith to the resurrection of Christ as historic fact, abundantly attested (verses 3-8), shows how all-essential it is to the Christian hope (verses 13-19), and then proceeds by reasoning and analogy to brush aside certain naturalistic objections to the great doctrine, "then they that are Christ's, at his coming" (verse 23), when this mortal shall have put on immortality, and death be swallowed up in victory (verse 54). The closing chapter gives directions as to the collection for the saints in Jerusalem, on which his heart was deeply set, and in which he hoped the Corinthians would bear a worthy share. He promises to visit them, and even to tarry the winter with them. He then makes a series of tender personal references, and so brings the great epistle to a close.

VII. Distinguishing Features.

It will be seen that there are passages in the epistle of great doctrinal and historical importance, especially with reference to the Person of Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Eucharist and the Resurrection; also many that illuminate the nature of the religious meetings and services of the early church (compare particularly on these, Weizsacker, Apos Age, II, 246 ff). A lurid light is cast on many of the errors and evils that not unnaturally still clung to those who were just emerging from paganism, and much allowance has to be made for the Corinthian environment. The thoroughness with which the apostle pursues the difficulties raised into their relations and details, and the wide scope of matters which he subjects to Christian scrutiny and criterion, are also significant. Manifestly he regarded the gospel as come to fill, not a part, but the whole, of life; to supply principles that follow the believers to their homes, to the most secluded sanctum there, out again to the world, to the market-place, the place of amusement, of temptation, of service, of trial, of worship and prayer; and all in harmony with knowing nothing "save Jesus Christ, and him crucified." For Paul regards that not as a restriction, but as a large and expansive principle. He sets the cross on an eminence so high that its shadow covers the whole activities of human life.

1. Party Spirit:

Three broad outstanding features of a practical kind may be recognized. The first is the earnest warning

it conveys against a factious spirit as inimical to the Christian life. The Corinthians were imbued with the party spirit of Greek democracy, and were infected also by the sporting spirit of the great games that entered so largely into their existence. They transferred these things to the church. They listened to their teachers with itching ears, not as men who wished to learn, but as partisans who sought occasion either to applaud or to condemn. Paul recognizes that, though they are not dividing on deep things of the faith, they are giving way to "schisms" of a pettier and perhaps even more perilous kind, that appeal to the lowest elements in human nature, that cause scandal in the eyes of men and inflict grievous wounds on the Body of Christ. In combating this spirit he takes occasion to go below the surface, and to reveal the foundations of true Christian unity. That must simply be "in Christ." And this is true even if the divergence should be on higher and graver things. Any unity in such a case, still possible to cherish, must be a unity in Christ. None can be unchurched who build on Him; none severed from the true and catholic faith, who confess with their lips and testify with their lives that He is Lord.

2. Christian Conscience:

The epistle also renders a high ethical service in the rules it lays down for the guidance of the Christian conscience. In matters where the issue is clearly one of the great imperatives, the conflict need never be protracted. An earnest man will see his way. But beyond these, or not easily reducible to them, there are many matters that cause perplexity and doubt. Questions arise regarding things that do not seem to be wrong in themselves, yet whose abuse or the offense they give to others, may well cause debate. Meat offered to idols, and then brought to table, was a stumbling-block to many Corinthian Christians. They said: "If we eat, it is consenting to idolatry; we dare not partake." But there were some who rose to a higher level. They perceived that this was a groundless scruple, for an idol is nothing at all, and the meat is not affected by the superstition. Accordingly, their higher and more rational view gave them liberty and left their conscience free. But was this really all that they had to consider? Some say: "Certainly"; and Paul acknowledges that this is undoubtedly the law of individual freedom. But it is not the final answer. There has not entered into it a consideration of the mind of Christ. Christian liberty must be willing to subject itself to the law of love. Granted that a neighbor is often short-sighted and over-scrupulous, and that it would be good neither for him nor for others to suffer him to become a moral dictator; yet we are not quite relieved. The brother may be weak, but the very claim of his weakness may be strong. We may not ride over his scruples roughshod. To do so would be to put ourselves wrong even more seriously. And if the matter is one that is manifestly fraught with peril to him, conscience may be roused to say, as the apostle says: "Wherefore, if meat maketh my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore."

3. Power of the Cross:

A third notable feature of the epistle is its exaltation of the cross of Christ as the power and wisdom of God unto salvation. It was the force that began to move and unsettle, to lift and change from its base, the life of that old heathen world. It was neither Paul, nor Apollos, nor Cephas who accomplished that colossal task, but the preaching of the crucified Christ. The Christianity of Corinth and of Europe began with the gospel of Calvary and the open tomb. It can never with impunity draw away from these central facts. The river broadens and deepens as it flows, but it is never possible for it to sever itself from the

living fountain from which it springs.

LITERATURE.

The following writers will be found most important and helpful:

1. On Matters of Introduction (Both Epistles):

Holtzmann, Weiss, Hausrath, Harnack, Pfleiderer, Godet, Weizsacker, Julicher, Zahn, Salmon, Knowling, McGiffert, J. H. Kennedy, Ramsay, Sabatier, Farrar, Dobschutz, Robertson (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)), Sanday (Encyclopaedia Biblica), Plummer (DB), Ropes (Encyclopedia Brittanica, 11th edition).

2. Commentaries and Lectures (on 1 Corinthians or Both):

Meyer-Heinrici, Godet, T. C. Edwards, Hodge, Beet, Ellicott, Schmiedel (Hand-Comm.), Evans (Speakers' Commentary), Farrar (Pulpit Commentary), Lightfoot (chapters i through vii in Biblical Ess.), Lias (Cambridge Greek Testament), McFadyen, F. W. Robertson, Findlay (Expos. Greek Test.); and on 2 Corinthians alone: Klopper, Waite (Speakers' Comm.), Denney (Expos. Bible), Bernard (Expos. Greek Test.).

3. Ancient Writers and Special Articles:

For ancient writers and special articles, the list at close of Plummer's article in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible should be consulted.

R. Dykes Shaw

CORINTHIANS, SECOND EPISTLE TO THE

I. TEXT, AUTHENTICITY AND DATE

1. Internal Evidence

2. External Evidence

3. Date

II. RESUME OF EVENTS

III. THE NEW SITUATION

1. The Offender

2. The False Teachers

3. The Painful Visit

4. The Severe Letter

IV. HISTORICAL RECONSTRUCTION

V. INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE

1. 2 Corintians 6:14-7:1

2. 2 Corintians 10:1-13:10

VI. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE

1. 2 Corintians 1-7

2. 2 Corintians 8-9

3. 2 Corintians 10-13

VII. VALUE OF THE EPISTLE LITERATURE

I. Text, Authenticity and Date.

1. Internal Evidence:

Compare what has already been said in the preceding article. In the two important 5th-century uncials, Codex Alexandrinus (A) and Codex Ephraemi (C), portions of the text are lacking. As to the genuineness internal evidence very vividly attests it. The distinctive elements of Pauline theology and eschatology, expressed in familiar Pauline terms, are manifest throughout. Yet the epistle is not doctrinal or didactic, but an intensely personal document. Its absorbing interest is in events which were profoundly agitating Paul and the Corinthians at the time, straining their relations to the point of rupture, and demanding strong action on Paul’s part. Our imperfect knowledge of the circumstances necessarily hinders a complete comprehension, but the references to these events and to others in the personal

history of the apostle are so natural, and so manifestly made in good faith, that no doubt rises in the reader's mind but that he is in the sphere of reality, and that the voice he hears is the voice of the man whose heart and nerves were being torn by the experiences through which he was passing. However scholars may differ as to the continuity and integrity of the text, there is no serious divergence among them in the opinion that all parts of the epistle are genuine writings of the apostle.

2. External Evidence:

Externally, the testimony of the sub-apostolic age, though not so frequent or precise as in the case of 1 Corinthians, is still sufficiently clear to establish the existence and use of the epistle in the 2nd century Clement of Rome is silent when he might rather have been expected to use the epistle (compare Kennedy, Second and Third Corinthians, 142 ff); but it is quoted by Polycarp (Ad Phil., ii.4 and vi.1), and in the Epistle to Diognetus 5 12, while it is amply attested to by Irenaeus, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria.

3. Date:

It was written from Macedonia (probably from Philippi) either in the autumn of the same year as that in which 1 Corinthians was written, 54 or 55 AD, or in the autumn of the succeeding year.

II. Resume of Events.

Great difficulty exists as to the circumstances in which the epistle was written, and as to the whole situation between 1 and 2 Corinthians. In 1 Corinthians Paul had intimated his intention of visiting the Corinthians and wintering with them, coming to them through Macedonia (1Co 16:5-7; compare also Ac 19:21). In 2Co 1:15,16 he refers to a somewhat different plan, Corinth—Macedonia—Corinth—Judaea; and describes this return from Macedonia to Corinth as a second or double benefit. But if this plan, on which he and his friends had counted, had not been entirely carried out, it had been for good reason (2Co 1:17), and not due to mere fickleness or light-hearted change to suit his own convenience. It was because he would "spare" them (2Co 1:23), and not come to them "again with sorrow" (2Co 2:1). That is, he had been with them, but there had been such a profound disturbance in their relations that he dared not risk a return meantime; instead, he had written a letter to probe and test them, "out of much affliction and anguish of heart .... with many tears" (2Co 2:4) Thank God, this severe letter had accomplished its mission. It had produced sorrow among them (2Co 2:2; 7:8,9)but it had brought their hearts back to him with the old allegiance, with great clearing of themselves, and fear and longing and zeal (2Co 7:11). There was a period, however, of waiting for knowledge of this issue, which was to him a period of intense anxiety; he had even nervously regretted that he had written as he did (2Co 7:5-8). Titus, who had gone as his representative to Corinth, was to return with a report of how this severe letter had been received, and when Titus failed to meet him at Troas 2Co 2:13, he had "no relief for his spirit," but pushed on eagerly to Macedonia to encounter him the sooner. Then came the answer, and the lifting of the intolerable burden from his mind. "He that comforteth the lowly, even God, comforted" him (2Co 7:6). The Corinthians had been swayed by a godly sorrow and repentance (2Co 7:8), and the sky had

cleared again with almost unhoped-for brightness. One who had offended (2Co 2:5 and 2Co 7:12)—but whose offense is not distinctly specified—had been disciplined by the church; indeed, in the revulsion of feeling against him, and in sympathy for the apostle, he had been punished so heavily that there was a danger of passing to an extreme, and plunging him into despair (2Co 2:7). Paul accordingly pleads for leniency and forgiveness, lest further resentment should lead only to a further and sadder wrong (2:6-11). But in addition to this offender there were others, probably following in his train, who had carried on a relentless attack against the apostle both in his person and in his doctrine. He earnestly defends himself against their contemptuous charges of fleshliness and cowardice (chapter 10), and crafty venality (2Co 12:16,17). Another Jesus is preached, a different spirit, a different gospel (2Co 11:4). They "commend themselves" (2Co 10:12), but are false apostles, deceitful workers, ministers of Satan, fashioning themselves into ministers of Christ (2Co 11:13,14). Their attacks are vehemently repelled in an eloquent apologia (chapters 11 and 12), and he declares that when he comes the third time they will not be spared (2Co 13:2). Titus, accompanied by other well-known brethren, is again to be the representative of the apostle 2Co 8:6,17 ff. At no great interval Paul himself followed, thus making his third visit (2Co 12:14; 13:1), and so far fulfilled his original purpose that he spent the winter peacefully in Corinth (compare Ac 20:2,3; Ro 15:25-27 and 1Co 16:23).

III. The New Situation.

It is manifest that we are in the presence of a new and unexpected situation, whose development is not clearly defined, and concerning which we have elsewhere no source of information. To elucidate it, the chief points requiring attention are:

(1) The references to the offender in 2Co 2 and 7, and to the false teachers, particularly in the later chapters of the ep.;

(2) the painful visit implicitly referred to in 2:1; and

(3) the letter described as written in tears and for a time regretted (2:4; 7:8).

1. The Offender:

The offender in 1Co 5:1-5 had been guilty of incest, and Paul was grieved that the church of Corinth did not regard with horror a crime which even the pagan world would not have tolerated. His judgment on the case was uncompromising and the severest possible—that, in solemn assembly, in the name and with the power of the Lord Jesus, the church should deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh. On the other hand, the offender in 2Co 2:5 ff is one who obviously has transgressed less heinously, and in a way more personal to the apostle. The church, roused by the apostle to show whether they indeed cared for him and stood by him (2Co 2:9; 13:7), had, by a majority, brought censure to bear on this man, and Paul now urged that matters should go no farther, lest an excess of discipline should really end in a triumph of Satan. It is not possible to regard such references as applying to the crime dealt with in 1 Corinthians. Purposely veiled as the statements are, it would yet appear that a personal

attack had been made on the apostle; and the "many" in Corinth (2Co 2:6), having at length espoused his cause, Paul then deals with the matter in the generous spirit he might have been expected to display. Even if the offender were the same person, which is most improbable, for he can scarcely have been retained in the membership, the language is not language that could have been applied to the earlier case. There has been a new offense in new circumstances. The apostle had been grievously wronged in the presence of the church, and the Corinthians had not spontaneously resented the wrong. That is what wounded the apostle most deeply, and it is to secure their change in this respect that is his gravest concern.

2. The False Teachers:

Esp. in the later chapters of 2 Corinthians there are, as we have seen, descriptions of an opposition by false teachers that is far beyond anything met with in 1 Corinthians. There indeed we have a spirit of faction, associated with unworthy partiality toward individual preachers, but nothing to lead us to suspect the presence of deep and radical differences undermining the gospel. The general consensus of opinion is that this opposition was of a Judaizing type, organized and fostered by implacable anti-Pauline emissaries from Palestine, who now followed the track of the apostle in Achaia as they did in Galatia. As they arrogated to themselves a peculiar relation to Christ Himself ("Christ's men" and "ministers of Christ," 2Co 10:7; 11:13), it is possible that the Christus-party of 1 Corinthians (and possibly the Cephas-party) may have persisted and formed the nucleus round which these newcomers built up their formidable opposition. One man seems to have been conspicuous as their ring-leader (2Co 10:7,11), and to have made himself specially obnoxious to the apostle. In all probability we may take it that he was the offender of 2Co 2 and 7. Under his influence the opposition audaciously endeavored to destroy the gospel of grace by personal attacks upon its most distinguished exponent. Paul was denounced as an upstart and self-seeker, destitute of any apostolic authority, and derided for the contemptible appearance he made in person, in contrast with the swelling words and presumptuous claims of his epistles It is clear, therefore, that a profound religious crisis had arisen among the Corinthians, and that there was a danger of their attachment to Paul and his doctrine being destroyed.

3. The Painful Visit:

2Co 12:14 and 2Co 13:1,2 speak of a third visit in immediate prospect, and the latter passage also refers to a second visit that had been already accomplished; while 2:1 distinctly implies that a visit had taken place of a character so painful that the apostle would never venture to endure a similar one. As this cannot possibly refer to the first visit when the church was founded, and cannot easily be regarded as indicating anything previous to 1 Corinthians which never alludes to such an experience, we must conclude that the reference points to the interval between 1 and 2 Corinthians. It was then beyond doubt that the visit "with sorrow," which humbled him (2Co 12:21) and left such deep wounds, had actually taken place. "Any exegesis," says Weizsacker justly, "that would avoid the conclusion that Paul had already been twice in Corinth is capricious and artificial" (Apostolic Age, I, 343). Sabatier (Apostle Paul, 172 note) records his revised opinion: "The reference here (2Co 2:1) is to a second and quite recent visit, of which he retained a very sorrowful recollection, including it among the most bitter trials of his apostolical career."

4. The Severe Letter:

Paul not only speaks of a visit which had ended grievously, but also of a letter which he had written to deal with the painful circumstances, and as a kind of ultimatum to bring the whole matter to an issue (2Co 2:4; 7:8). This letter was written because he could not trust himself meantime to another visit. He was so distressed and agitated that he wrote it "with many tears"; after it was written he repented of it; and until he knew its effect he endured torture so keen that he hastened to Macedonia to meet his messenger, Titus, halfway. It is impossible by any stretch of interpretation to refer this language to 1 Corinthians, which on the whole is dominated by a spirit of didactic calm, and by a consciousness of friendly rapport with its recipients. Even though there be in it occasional indications of strong feeling, there is certainly nothing that we can conceive the apostle might have wished to recall. The alternative has generally been to regard this as another case of a lost epistle Just as the writer of Ac appears to have been willing that the deplorable visit itself should drop into oblivion, so doubtless neither Paul nor the Corinthians would be very anxious to preserve an epistle which echoed with the gusts and storms of such a visit. On the other hand a strong tendency has set in to regard this intermediate epistle as at least in part preserved in 2Co 10-13, whose tone, it is universally admitted, differs from that of the preceding chapters in a remarkable way, not easily accounted for. The majority of recent writers seem inclined to favor this view, which will naturally fall to be considered under the head of "Integrity."

IV. Historical Reconstruction.

In view of such an interpretation, we may with considerable probability trace the course of events in the interval between 1 and 2 Corinthians as follows: After the dispatch of 1 Corinthians, news reached the apostle of a disquieting character; probably both Titus and Timothy, on returning from Corinth, reported the growing menace of the opposition fostered by the Judaizing party. Paul felt impelled to pay an immediate visit, and found only too sadly that matters had not been overstated. The opposition was strong and full of effrontery, and the whole trend of things was against him. In face of the congregation he was baffled and flouted. He returned to Ephesus, and poured out his indignation in a severe epistle, which he sent on by the hands of Titus. Before Titus could return, events took a disastrous form in Ephesus, and Paul was forced to leave that city in peril of his life. He went to Troas, but, unable to wait patiently there for tidings of the issue in Corinth, he crossed to Macedonia, and met Titus, possibly in Philippi. The report was happily reassuring; the majority of the congregation returned to their old attachment, and the heavy cloud of doubt and anxiety was dispelled from the apostle’s mind. He then wrote again—the present epistle—and forwarded it by Titus and other brethren, he himself following a little later, and finally wintering in Corinth as he had originally planned. If it be felt that the interval between spring and autumn of the same year is too brief for these events, the two epistles must be separated by a period of nearly 18 months, 1 Corinthians being referred to the spring of 54 or 55, and 2 Corinthians to the autumn of 55 or 56 AD. (Reference on the reconstruction should especially be made to Weizsacker’s Apostolic Age, English translation, I; to Sabatier’s Note to the English edition (1893) of his Apostle Paul; and to Robertson’s article in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes).)

V. Integrity of the Epistle.

Although the genuineness of the various parts of the epistle is scarcely disputed, the homogeneity is much debated. Semler and some later writers, including Clemen (Einheitlichkeit), have thought that 2Co 9 should be eliminated as logically inconsistent with chapter 8, and as evidently forming part of a letter to the converts of Achaia. But the connection with chapter 8 is too close to permit of severance, and the logical objection, founded on the phraseology of 9:1, is generally regarded as hypercritical. There are two sections, however, whose right to remain integral parts of 2Co has been more forcibly challenged.

1. 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1:

The passage 2Co 6:14 to 2Co 7:1 deals with the inconsistency and peril of intimate relations with the heathen, and is felt to be incongruous with the context. No doubt it comes strangely after an appeal to the Corinthians to show the apostle the same frankness and kindness that he is showing them; whereas 7:2 follows naturally and links itself closely to such an appeal. When we remember that the particular theme of the lost letter referred to in 1Co 5:9 was the relation of the converts to the immoral, it is by no means unlikely that we have here preserved a stray fragment of that epistle

2. 2 Corinthians 10:1-13:10:

It is universally acknowledged that there is a remarkable change in the tone of the section 2Co 10:1-13:10, as Compared with that of the previous chapters In the earlier chapters there is relief at the change which Titus has reported as having taken place in Corinth, and the spirit is one of gladness and content; but from chapter 10 onward the hostility to the apostle is unexpectedly represented as still raging, and as demanding the most strenuous treatment. The opening phrase, "Now I Paul" (2Co 10:1), is regarded as indicating a distinctive break from the previous section with which Timothy is associated (2Co 1:1), while the concluding verse, 2Co 13:11 to end, seem fittingly to close that section, but to be abruptly out of harmony with the polemic that ends at 2Co 13:10. Accordingly it is suggested that 13:11 should immediately follow 9:15, and that 2Co 10:1-13:10 be regarded as a lengthy insertion from some other epistle. Those who, while acknowledging the change of tone, yet maintain the integrity of the epistle, do so on the ground that the apostle was a man of many moods, and that it is characteristic of him to make unexpected and even violent transitions; that new reports of a merely scotched antagonism may come in to ruffle and disturb his comparative contentment; and that in any case he might well deem it advisable finally to deliver his whole soul on a matter over which he had brooded and suffered deeply, so that there might be no mistake about the ground being cleared when he arrived in person. The question is still a subject of keen discussion, and is not one on which it is easy to pronounce dogmatically. On the whole, however, it must be acknowledged that the preponderance of recent opinion is in favor of theory of interpolation. Hausrath (Der Vier-Capitel-Brief des Paulus an die Korinther, 1870) gave an immense impetus to the view that this later section really represents the painful letter referred to in 2Co 2 and 7. As that earlier letter, however, must have contained references to the personal offender, the present section, which omits all such references, can be regarded as at most only a part of it. This theory is ably and minutely expounded by Schmiedel (Hand-Kommentar); and Pfleiderer, Lipsius, Clemen, Krenkel,

von Soden, McGiffert, Cone, Plummer, Rendall, Moffatt, Adeney, Peake, and Massie are prominent among its adherents. J. H. Kennedy (Second and Third Cor) presents perhaps the ablest and fullest argument for it that has yet appeared in English. On the other hand Sanday (Encyclopaedia Biblica) declares against it, and Robertson (Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)) regards it as decidedly not proven; while critics of such weight as Holtzmann, Beyschlag, Klopper, Weizsacker, Sabatier, Godet, Bernard, Denney, Weiss, and Zahn are all to be reckoned as advocates of the integrity of the epistle.

VI. Contents of the Epistle.

The order of matter in 2 Corintians is quite clearly defined. There are three main divisions:

(1) chapters 1-7;

(2) chapters 8-9; and

(3) chapters 10-13.

1. 2 Corinthians 1-7:

The first seven chapters in 2 Corinthians as a whole are taken up with a retrospect of the events that have recently transpired, joyful references to the fact that the clouds of grief in connection with them have been dispelled, and that the evangelical ministry as a Divine trust and power is clearly manifested. After a cordial salutation, in which Timothy is associated, Paul starts at once to express his profound gratitude to God for the great comfort that had come to him by the good news from Corinth, rejoicing in it as a spiritual enrichment that will make his ministry still more fruitful to the church (2Co 1:3-11). He professes his sincerity in all his relations with the Corinthians, and particularly vindicates it in connection with a change in the plan which had originally promised a return ("a second benefit") to Corinth; his sole reason for refraining, and for writing a painful letter instead, being his desire to spare them and to prove them (2Co 1:12; 2:4,9). Far from harboring any resentment against the man who had caused so much trouble, he sincerely pleads that his punishment by the majority should go no farther, but that forgiveness should now reign, lest the Adversary should gain an advantage over them (2Co 2:5-11). It was indeed an agonizing experience until the moment he met Titus, but the relief was all the sweeter and more triumphant when God at length gave it, as he might have been sure He would give it to a faithful and soul-winning servant of Christ (2Co 2:12-17). He does not indeed wish to enter upon any further apologies or self-commendation. Some believe greatly in letters of commendation, but his living testimonial is in his converts. This he has, not of himself, but entirely through God, who alone has made him an efficient minister of the new and abiding covenant of the Spirit, whose glory naturally excels that of the old dispensation which fadeth because it really cannot bring life. Regarding this glorious ministry he must be bold and frank. It needs no veil as if to conceal its evanescence. Christ presents it unveiled to all who turn to Him, and they themselves, reflecting His glory, are spiritually transformed (2Co 3:1-18). As for those who by God’s mercy have received such a gospel ministry, it is impossible for them to be

faint-hearted in its exercise, although the eyes of some may be blinded to it, because the god of this world enslaves them (2Co 4:4). It is indeed wonderful that ministers of this grace should be creatures so frail, so subject to pressure and affliction, but it is not inexplicable. So much the more obvious is it that all the power and glory of salvation are from God alone (2Co 4:7,15). Yea, even if one be called to die in this ministry, that is but another light and momentary affliction. It is but passing from a frail earthly tent to abide forever in a heavenly home (2Co 5:1). Who would not long for it, that this mortal may be swallowed up in immortality? Courage, therefore, is ours to the end, for that end only means the cessation of our separation from Christ, whom it is a joy to serve absent or present. And present we shall all ultimately be before Him on the judgment throne (2Co 5:10). That itself unspeakably deepens the earnestness with which preachers of the gospel seek to persuade men. It is the love of Christ constraining them (2Co 5:14) in the ministry of reconciliation, that they should entreat men as ambassadors on Christ's behalf (2Co 5:20). So sacred and responsible a trust has subdued the apostle's own life, and is indeed the key to its manifold endurance, and to the earnestness with which he has striven to cultivate every grace, and to submit himself to every discipline (2Co 6:1-10). Would God the Corinthians might open their hearts to him as he does to them! (Let them have no fellowship with iniquity, but perfect holiness in the fear of God, 2Co 6:14-7:1.) He has never wronged them; they are enshrined in his heart, living or dying; he glories in them, and is filled with comfort in all his affliction (2Co 6:11-13; 7:2-4). For what blessed comfort that was that Titus brought him in Macedonia to dispel his fears, and to show that the things he regretted and grieved to have written had done no harm after all, but had rather wrought in them the joyful change for which he longed! Now both they and he knew how dear he was to them. Titus, too, was overjoyed by the magnanimity of their reception of him. The apostle's cup is full, and "in everything he is of good courage concerning them" (2Co 7:16).

2. 2 Corinthians 8-9:

In the second section, 2Co 8-9, the apostle, now abundantly confident of their good-will, exhorts the Corinthians on the subject of the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem. He tells them of the extraordinary liberality of the Macedonian churches, and invites them to emulate it, and by the display of this additional grace to make full proof of their love (2Co 8:1-8). Nay, they have a higher incentive than the liberality of Macedonia, even the self-sacrifice of Christ Himself (2Co 8:9). Wherefore let them go on with the good work they were so ready to initiate a year ago, giving out of a willing mind, as God hath enabled them (2Co 8:10-15). Further to encourage them he sends on Titus and other well-known and accredited brethren, whose interest in them is as great as his own, and he is hopeful that by their aid the matter will be completed, and all will rejoice when he comes, bringing with him probably some of those of Macedonia, to whom he has already been boasting of their zeal (2Co 8:16-9:5). Above all, let them remember that important issues are bound up with this grace of Christian liberality. It is impossible to reap bountifully, if we sow sparingly. Grudging and compulsory benevolence is a contradiction, but God loveth and rewardeth a cheerful giver. This grace blesseth him that gives and him that takes. Many great ends are served by it. The wants of the needy are supplied, men's hearts are drawn affectionately to one another, thanksgivings abound, and God himself is glorified (2Co 9:6- 15).

3. 2 Corinthians 10-13:

The third section, 2Co 10-13, as has been pointed out, is a spirited and even passionate polemic, in the course of which the Judaizing party in Corinth is vigorously assailed. The enemies of the apostle have charged him with being very bold and courageous when he is absent, but humble enough when he is present. He hopes the Corinthians will not compel him to show his courage (2Co 10:2). It is true, being human, he walks in the flesh, but not in the selfish and cowardly way his opponents suggest. The weapons of his warfare are not carnal, yet are they mighty before God to cast down such strongholds as theirs, such vain imaginations and disobedience. Some boast of being "Christ's," but that is no monopoly; he also is Christ's. They think his letters are mere "sound and fury, signifying nothing"; by and by they will discover their mistake. If he should glory in his authority, he is justified, for Corinth was verily part of his God-appointed province, and he at least did not there enter on other men's labors. But it would be well if men who gloried confined themselves to glorying "in the Lord." For after all it is His commendation alone that is of any permanent value (2Co 10:3-18). Will the adepts-Corinthians bear with him in a little of this foolish boasting? Truly he ventures on it out of concern for them (2Co 11:2). And as they are manifest in toleration, abounding in patience toward those who have come with a different gospel, they may perhaps extend some of their indulgence to him, for though he cannot lay claim to a polished oratory comparable to that of these "super-eminent" apostles, yet at least he is not behind them in knowledge (2Co 11:4-6). Can it be that he really sinned in preaching the gospel to them without fee or reward? Was it a mark of fleshly cunning when he resolved not to be burdensome to them, while he accepted supplies from Macedonia? Ah! it was not because he did not love them, but because he decided to give no occasion to those who were too ready to blame him—those false apostles, who, like Satan himself, masqueraded as angels of light and ministers of righteousness (2Co 11:7-15). Come, then, let him to this glorying, this poor folly, which they in their superlative wisdom bear with so gladly in the case of those insolent creatures who now bully and degrade them (2Co 11:16-21). Hebrews! Israelites! So is he. Ministers of Christ! There he excels them- in labors, in perils, in persecutions; in burdens, anxieties, sympathies; in visions and revelations of the Lord; in infirmities and weaknesses that have made more manifest in him the strength of Christ 2Co 11:22-12:10. Certainly all this is folly, but they are most to blame for it who, through lack of loyalty, have forced him to it. Did he injure them by declining to be burdensome? Is it so sore a point? Let it be forgiven! Yet when he comes again he will take no other course (2Co 12:11-18). They must not imagine that in all this he is excusing himself to them. He is sincerely and affectionately concerning himself for their edifying. He trembles lest when they meet again they should be disappointed in each other; lest they should be found in unworthy strife and tumults, and lest he should be humbled of God before them, having cause to mourn over some who are hardened and impenitent in their sins (2Co 12:19-21). For they must meet again—he is coming for the third time—and this time he will not spare. Let them prove themselves whether they be in the faith; for surely they must know whether Christ be in them. He earnestly prays for their goodness and honor; not to the end that no display of his power may be called for, but simply that he will be glad to appear weak if they should appear strong. Could they but believe it, their perfecting is the aim of all his labors (2Co 13:1-10). And so, with words of grace and tenderness, exhorting them to unity and peace, and pronouncing over them the threefold benediction, he bids them farewell (2Co 13:11-4). **VII. Value of the Epistle.** The chief element of value in this epistle is the revelation it gives of the apostle himself. Through all its changing moods, Paul, in perfect abandon, shows us his very soul, suffering, rejoicing, enduring, overcoming. It has been truly said that "it enables us, as it were, to lay our hands upon his breast, and feel the very throbbings of his heart."

(1) In relation to his converts, it shows us how sensitive he was, how easy it was to touch him on the quick, and to wound his feelings. The apostle was very human, and nowhere are his kindred limitations more obvious than in these present incidents. He would probably be the first to acquiesce, if it were said that even with him the creed was greater than the life. In the hastily written and nervously repented passages of that severe epistle; in the restless wandering, like a perturbed spirit, from Troas to Macedonia, to meet the news and know the issue of his acts, we see a man most lovable indeed, most like ourselves when issues hang in the balance, but a man not already perfect, not yet risen to the measure of the stature of Christ. Yet we see also the intensity with which Paul labored in his ministry—the tenacity with which he held to his mission, and the invincible courage with which he returned to the fight for his imperiled church. He loved those converts as only a great soul in Christ could love them. His keenest sorrow came in the disaster that threatened them, and he flew to their defense. He had not only won them for Christ, he was willing to die that he might keep them for Christ.

(2) The epistle is charged with a magnificent consciousness on the apostle’s part of his high calling in Christ Jesus. He has been called with a Divine calling to the most glorious work in which a man can engage, to be to this estranged earth an ambassador of heaven. Received as Divine, this vocation is accepted with supreme devotion. It has been a ministry of sorrow, of strain and suffering, of hairbreadth escapes with the bare life; with its thorn in the flesh, its buffering of Satan. Yet through it all there rings the note of abounding consolation in Christ Jesus, and never was the "power of Christ," resting on frail humanity, more signally manifested.

LITERATURE.

See the references to both epistles, and to 2 Corinthians alone, under this heading in the preceding article. To the list there given should be added Moffatt’s Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 1911; valuable for its critical presentation of recent views, and for its references to the literature.

R. Dykes Shaw

CORINTHUS

ko-rin’-thus: Latin form for Greek Korinthos in the subscription to Ro (the King James Version).

See CORINTH.

CORMORANT

kor’-mo-rant (shalakh; kataraktes; Latin Corvus marinus): A large sea-fowl belonging to the genus Phalacrocorax and well described by the Hebrew word used to designate it—which means a "plunging bird." The bird appears as large as a goose when in full feather, but plucked, the body is much smaller.

The adult birds are glossy black with bronze tints, touched with white on the cheeks and sides as a festal dress at mating season, and adorned with filamentary feathers on the head, and bright yellow gape. These birds if taken young and carefully trained can be sent into the water from boats and bring to their masters large quantities of good-sized fish: commonly so used in China. The flesh is dark, tough and quite unfit to eat in the elders on account of their diet of fish. The nest is built mostly of seaweed. The eggs are small for the size of the birds, having a rough, thick, but rather soft shell of a bluish white which soon becomes soiled, as well as the nest and its immediate surroundings, from the habits of the birds. The young are leathery black, then covered with soft down of brownish black above and white beneath and taking on the full black of the grown bird at about three years. If taken in the squab state the young are said to be delicious food, resembling baked hare in flavor. The old birds are mentioned among the abominations for food (Le 11:13-19; De 14:12-18).

Gene Stratton-Porter

CORN

korn (daghan; sitos): A word used for cereals generally (Ge 27:28,37, etc., the King James Version) much as our English word "corn." the American Standard Revised Version almost invariably substitutes "grain" for "corn." The latter may be taken to include

(1) barley,

(2) wheat,

(3) fitches (vetches),

(4) lentils,

(5) beans,

(6) millet,

(7) rye—the wrong translation for vetches,

(8) pulse—for all these see separate articles.

Rye and oats are not cultivated in Palestine For many references to corn see AGRICULTURE; FOOD. "A corn kokkos, the Revised Version (British and American) "grain" of wheat" is mentioned (Joh 12:24).

CORNELIUS

kor-ne’-li-us (Kornelios, "of a horn"): The story of Cornelius is given in Ac 10:1-11:18.

1. His Family and Station:

The name is Roman and belonged to distinguished families in the imperial city, such as the Scipios and Sulla. Thus he was probably an Italian of Roman blood. Julian the Apostate reckons him as one of the few persons of distinction who became a Christian. He was evidently a man of importance in Caesarea and well known to the Jews (Ac 10:22). He was a centurion in the Italian cohort. To understand this we must note that the Roman army was divided into two broad divisions, the legions and the auxiliary forces.

See ARMY, ROMAN.

Legions were never permanently quartered in Palestine until the great war which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD. From the year 6 AD, when Palestine was made into province of the second rank, until 66 AD, it was garrisoned by auxiliary troops recruited amongst the Samaritans and Syrian Greeks. The headquarters were naturally at Caesarea, the residence of the procurator. But it would not have been prudent for a garrison in Palestine to be composed wholly of troops locally recruited. Therefore the Roman government mingled with the garrison 600 soldiers, free Italian volunteers. With this cohort Cornelius was connected as centurion.

2. His Character:

He is described as devout and God-fearing, i.e. at least, one of those men so numerous in that effete age of decadent heathenism who, discontented with polytheism, yearned for a better faith, embraced, therefore, the monotheism of the Jews, read the Scriptures, and practiced more or less of the Jewish rites. He was well reported of by the Jews, and his religion showed itself in prayer at the regular hours, and in alms to the people (of Israel). Even Jewish bigotry was dumb in presence of so noble a man. Moreover, he seems to have made his house a sort of church, for his kinsfolk and friends were in sympathy with him, and among the soldiers who closely attended him were some devout ones (Ac 10:1,27).

3. His Admission into the Christian Church:

The story of his conversion and admission into the Christian church is told with some minuteness in Ac 10. Nothing further is known of Cornelius, though one tradition asserts that he founded the church in Caesarea, and another legend that he became the bishop of Scamandros.

4. Significance of the Incident:

The exact importance of the incident depends upon the position of Cornelius before it occurred. Certainly he was not a proselyte of the sanctuary, circumcised, under the law, a member of the Jewish

communion. This is abundantly evident from Ac 10:28,34,45; 11:3,18; 15:7,14. But was he not an inferior form of proselyte, later called "proselytes of the gate"? This question has been much debated and is still under discussion. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 43) says that the expression, "God-fearing," applied to him, is always used in Ac with reference to this kind of proselytes. Such were bound to observe certain regulations of purity, probably those, this author thinks, mentioned in Ac 15:29, and which stand in close relation to the principles laid down in Le 17-18 for the conduct of strangers dwelling among Israel. Renan, on the other hand, denies that Cornelius was a proselyte at all, but simply a devout Gentile who adopted some of the Jewish ideas and religious customs which did not involve a special profession. The importance of the whole transaction to the development of the church seems to depend on the circumstance that Cornelius was probably not a proselyte at all. Thus we regard Cornelius as literally the first-fruits of the Gentiles. The step here taken by Peter was therefore one of tremendous importance to the whole development of the church. The significance of the incident consists exactly in this, that under Divine direction, the first Gentile, not at all belonging to the old theocracy, becomes a Spirit-filled Christian, entering through the front door of the Christian church without first going through the narrow gate of Judaism. The incident settled forever the great, fundamental question as to the relations of Jew and Gentile in the church. The difficulties in the way of the complete triumph of Peter's view of the equality of Jews and Gentiles in the Kingdom of Christ were enormous. It would have been indeed little short of miraculous if the multitude of Christian Pharisees had not raised the question again and again. Did they not dog Paul's steps after the Council? Certainly Ramsay is wrong in saying that the case of Cornelius was passed over or condoned as exceptional, for it was used as a precedent by both Peter and James (Ac 15:7,14).

As for Peter's subsequent conduct at Antioch, no one who knows Peter need be surprised at it. The very accusation that Paul hurled at him was that for the moment he was carried into inconsistency with his principles (hupokrisis). Of course, this incident of Cornelius was only the first step in a long development; but the principle was forever settled. The rest in due time and proper order was sure to follow. By this tremendous innovation it was settled that Christianity was to be freed from the swaddling bands of Judaism and that the Christian church was not to be an appendix to the synagogue. The noble character of Cornelius was just fitted to abate, as far as possible, the prejudices of the Jewish Christians against what must have seemed to them a dangerous, if not awful, innovation.

G. H. Trever

CORNER

kor'-ner (miqtsoa', pe'ah, pinnah; arche, gonia, akrogoniaios): In Ex 26:24; Eze 41:22; 46:21,22, miqtsoa', "angle" is translated "corner"; pe'ah, "side," "quarter" and pinnah "corner," "front," "chief," are more frequently so translated, e.g. Ex 25:26; Le 19:9; Jer 9:26; 25:23; and Ex 27:2; 1Ki 7:34; Ps 118:22; Isa 28:16 ("corner-stone"); Jer 51:26. Other words are kanaph, "wing" (Isa 11:12; Eze 7:2); katheph, "shoulder" (2Ki 11:11 the King James Version, twice); pa'am, "foot" (Ex 25:12 the King James Version); zawiyoth, "corner-stones" (Ps 144:12; Zec 9:15, translated "corners"). For "corner" the Revised Version (British and American) has "side" (Ex 36:25), "corner-stone" (Zec 10:4), also for

"stay" (Isa 19:13); instead of "teacher removed into a corner" (Isa 30:20), "be hidden," "hide themselves"; for "corners" we have "feet" (Ex 25:12; 1Ki 7:30); "ribs" (Ex 30:4; 37:27); for "divide into corners" (Ne 9:22), "allot after their portions"; for "into corners" (De 32:26), "afar"; the words to Israel (Isa 41:9) "called thee from the chief men ‘atsilim thereof" are rendered by the Revised Version (British and American) "called thee from the corners thereof" (of the earth).

In the New Testament we have gonia ("angle," "corner"), "in the corners of the streets" (Mt 6:5), "the head of the corner" (Mt 21:42), "the four corners of the earth" (Re 7:1; 20:8); arche ("a beginning") (Ac 10:11; 11:5); "chief corner stone" (Eph 2:20; 1Pe 2:6), is a translation of akrogoniaios ("at the extreme angle").

W. L. Walker

CORNER GATE

kor’-ner gat.

See JERUSALEM.

CORNER-STONE

kor’-ner ston (pinnah, zawith; akrogoniaios): Part of the public or imposing buildings, to which importance has been attached in all ages and in many nations, both on account of its actual service and its figurative meaning. Ordinarily its use in the Bible is figurative, or symbolical. No doubt the original meaning was some important stone, which was laid at the foundation of a building.

(1) With the Canaanites, who preceded Israel in the possession of Palestine, corner-stone laying seems to have been a most sacred and impressive ceremonial. Under this important stone of temples, or other great structures, bodies of children or older persons would be laid, consecrating the building by such human sacrifice (see FORTIFICATION, II, 1). This was one of many hideous rites and practices which Israel was to extirpate. It may throw light on the curse pronounced upon the rebuilding of Jericho (Jos 6:26; see PEFS, January, 1904, July, 1908).

See CANAAN.

(2) Old Testament references.—The Hebrew word pinnah, "corner," is found or implied in every occurrence of this idea. Derived from a root signifying "to turn," it means "turning," and therefore "edge" or "corner." Ordinarily it is used with ‘ebhen, "stone" (Ps 118:22); or it may occur alone, having acquired for itself through frequent use the whole technical phrase-idea (Zec 10:4 the King James Version).

Figurative Uses:

While all the passages indicate the stone at the corner, there appear to be two conceptions:

(a) the foundation-stone upon which the structure rested (Job 38:6; Isa 28:16; Jer 51:26); or

(b) the topmost or cap-stone, which linked the last tier together (Ps 118:22; Zec 4:7); in both cases it is an important or key-stone, and figurative of the Messiah, who is "the First and the Last."

In Job 38:6 it beautifully expresses in figures the stability of the earth, which Yahweh created. In Zec 10:4 the leader or ruler in the Messianic age is represented by the corner-stone. The ancient tradition of the one missing stone, when the temple was in building, is reflected in or has been suggested by Ps 118:22 (Midrash quoted by Pusey under Zec 4:7). It is probable that we should read in Ps 144:12 not "corner-stones," but "corner-pillars," or supports (compare Greek Caryatides) from a different Hebrew word, zawith, Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, under the word

(3) New Testament passages.—Ps 118:22 is quoted and interpreted as fulfilled in Jesus Christ in a number of passages: Mt 21:42; Mr 12:10; Lu 20:17; Ac 4:11 and 1Pe 2:7; it is also the evident basis for Eph 2:20. Isa 28:16 is quoted twice in the New Testament: Ro 9:33, from Septuagint combined with the words of Isa 8:14, and in 1Pe 2:6, which is quoted with some variation from Septuagint. The Old Testament passages were understood by the rabbis to be Messianic, and were properly so applied by the New Testament writers.

See also HOUSE.

Edward Mack

CORNERS OF THE EARTH

See EARTH, CORNERS OF THE.

CORNET

kor’-net.

See MUSIC.

CORNFLOOR

korn’-flor (goren daghan): "Thou hast loved a reward upon every cornfloor" (Ho 9:1 the King James

Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "hire upon every grainfloor"). Israel had deserted Yahweh for supposed material benefits and regarded bounteous crops as the gift of the heathen gods which they worshipped. Yahweh would therefore cause the corn (grain) and wine to fail (Ho 9:2).

See also thRESHING-FLOOR.

CORONATION

kor-o-na'-shun (protoklisia): Occurs in 2 Macc 4:21 (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "enthronement") where Apollonius was sent into Egypt for the coronation of Ptolemy Philometor as king. The Greek word protoklisia occurs nowhere else, and its meaning is uncertain. The reading in Swete is protoklesia, and this means "the first call."

CORPSE

korps: This word in the King James Version is the translations of two Hebrew words, pegher, and gewiyah, while nebhelah, and guphah, which mean the same, are translated "body," with which the English word "corpse" (Latin, corpus) was originally synonymical. Therefore we find the now apparently unnecessary addition of the adjective "dead" in 2Ki 19:35 and Isa 37:36. The Greek equivalent is ptoma, literally, "a fallen body," "a ruin" (from pipto, "to fall"), in Mr 6:29; Re 11:8,9.

Corpses were considered as unclean and defiling in the Old Testament, so that priests were not to touch dead bodies except those of near kinsfolk (Le 21:1-3), the high priest and a Nazirite not even such (Le 21:11; Nu 6:6-8). Nu 19 presents to us the ceremonial of purification from such defilement by the sprinkling with the ashes of a red heifer, cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet.

It was considered a great calamity and disgrace to have one's body left unburied, a "food unto all birds of the heavens, and unto the beasts of the earth" (De 28:26; 2Sa 21:10; Ps 79:2; Isa 34:3; Jer 7:33, etc.). Thence is explained the merit of Rizpah (2Sa 21:10), and of the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead, who protected or recovered and buried the mutilated bodies of Saul and his sons (1Sa 31:11-13; 2Sa 2:4-7; compare 1Ch 10:11,12).

See BURIAL.

Even the corpses of persons executed by hanging were not to remain on the tree "all night," "for he that is hanged is accursed of God; that thou defile not thy land which Yahweh thy God giveth thee for an inheritance" (De 21:23).

H. L. E. Luering

CORRECTION

ko-rek’-shun (mucar, usually rendered "instruction," is translated "correction" in several passages): The verb from which the noun is derived signifies "to instruct" or "chastise." The idea of chastisement was very closely connected in the Hebrew mind with that of pedagogy. See CHASTISEMENT. the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have changed "correction" of the King James Version to "instruction" in Jer 7:28, reversing the order in the margins. shebheT, rendered "rod" in Job 21:9, is unnecessarily changed to "correction" in 37:13. In 2Ti 3:16, epanorthosis, is translated "correction." The difference between correction, discipline and instruction Was not clearly drawn in the Hebrew mind.

W. W. Davies

CORRUPTION

ko-rup’-shun: The Hebrew words mishchath, mashchath, mashchith, and their Greek equivalents, phthora, and diaphthora, with numerous derivatives and cognate verbs, imply primarily physical degeneration and decay (Job 17:14; Ac 2:27, etc.). The term shachath, which the King James Version translates with "corruption" in Jon 2:6, ought to be rendered "pit,". as in Ps 30:9; 35:7 et passim, while shachath beli in Isa 38:17 means the "pit of nothingness," i.e. of destruction.

Figurative: At an early time we find the above-given words in a non-literal sense denoting moral depravity and corruption (Ge 6:11; Ex 32:7; Ho 9:9; Ga 6:8, etc.), which ends in utter moral ruin and hopelessness, the second death. The question has been raised whether the meaning of these words might be extended so as to include the idea of final destruction and annihilation of the spirit. Upon careful examination, however, this question must be denied both from the standpoint of the Old Testament and of the New Testament. Apart from other considerations we see this from the metaphors used in the Scriptures to illustrate the condition of "corruption," such as the "unquenchable fire," the "worm" which "dieth not" (Mr 9:43,18; compare Isa 66:24), and "sleep" (Da 12:2), where a careful distinction is made between the blissful state after death of the righteous and the everlasting disgrace of the godless. The later Jewish theology is also fully agreed on this point. The meaning of the words cannot therefore extend beyond the idea of utter moral degradation and depravity.

H. L. E. Luering

CORRUPTION, MOUNT OF

(har ha-mashchith; to oros tou Mosoath): The hill on the right hand of which Solomon built high places for Ashtoreth, Chemosh and Milcom (2Ki 23:13). The mountain referred to is no doubt the Mount of Olives. The high places would, therefore, be on the southern height called in later Christian writings the "Mount of Offence," and now, by the Arabs, Baten el-Hawa. Har ha-mashchith is probably only a perversion of har ha-mishchah, "Mount of Anointing," a later name of the Mount of Olives.

W. Ewing

COS

kos (Kos, "summit"; the King James Version Coos): An island off the coast of Caria, Asia Minor, one of the Sporades, mountainous in the southern half, with ridges extending to a height of 2,500 ft.; identified with the modern Stanchio. It was famous in antiquity for excellent wine, amphorae, wheat, ointments, silk and other clothing (Coae vestes). The capital was also called Cos. It possessed a famous hospital and medical school, and was the birthplace of Hippocrates (the father of medicine), of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and of the celebrated painter Apelles. The large plane tree in the center of the town (over 2,000 years old) is called "the tree of Hippocrates" to this day. The older capital, Astypalaea, was in the western part of the island, the later (since 366 BC) in the eastern part. From almost every point can be seen beautiful landscapes and picturesque views of sea and land and mountain.

Cos was one of the six Dorian colonies. It soon became a flourishing place of commerce and industry; later, like Corinth, it was one of the Jewish centers of the Aegean, as well as one of the financial centers of the commercial world in the eastern Mediterranean. Among the benefactors of the people of Cos was Herod the Great. It is mentioned in connection with Paul’s third missionary journey in Ac 21:1, and in its relations with the Jews in 1 Macc 15:23; Ant, XIV, vii, 2; x, 15; BJ, I, xxi. 11. For a list of works on the island see Paton-Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos, ix.

J. E. Harry

COSAM

ko’-sam (Kosam): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy in the 5th generation before Zerubbabel (Lu 3:28).

COSMOGONY

koz-mog’-o-ni.

See ANTHROPOLOGY; CREATION; EARTH; EVOLUTION; WORLD.

COSMOLOGY

koz-mol’-o-ji.

See WORLD; PROVIDENCE.

COSTLINESS

kost’-li-nes (timiotes, "preciousness," "an abundance of costly things"): Found only in Re 18:19, "made rich by reason of her costliness."

COTES

kots.

See SHEEPCOTE.

COTTAGE

kot’-aj.

See HOUSE.

COTTON

kot’-’-n (karpac is the better translation, as in the Revised Version, margin, where the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "green" in Es 1:6): The Hebrew karpac is from the Persian kirpas and the Sanskrit karpasa, "the cotton plant." The derived words originally meant "muslin" or "calico," but in classical times the use of words allied to karpac—in Greek and Latin—was extended to include linen. The probability is in favor of "cotton" in Es 1:6. This is the product of Gossypium herbaceum, a plant originally from India but now cultivated in many other lands.

COUCH

kouch (substantive.).

See BED.

Couch (verb): rabhats, "to crouch," "lurk," as a beast in readiness to spring on its prey. "If thou doest not well, sin coucheth at the door" (Ge 4:7, the King James Version "lieth"), waiting for it to open. Cain is warned to beware of the first temptations to evil, in his case especially a sullen and jealous disposition (compare Dante, Inferno, I, 30). See ABEL; CAIN. The tribe of Judah is compared for its bravery to a recumbent lion or lioness (Ge 49:9; compare Nu 24:9 f); and Issachar to "a strong ass, couching down between the sheepfolds" (Ge 49:14, the King James Version "between two burdens"; compare Jud 5:16). "The deep that coucheth beneath" (De 33:13), probably the springs of water, or possibly, as Driver suggests, "the subterranean deep, pictured as a gigantic monster."

See ABYSS.

M. O. Evans

COUCHING-PLACE

kouch’-ing-plas (marbets; once in English Versions of the Bible, Eze 25:5): The same Hebrew word, however, which means simply "place of lying down" of animals in repose, is used also in Ze 2:15 where the translation is "a place .... to lie down in." The figure, a common one in Scripture (see besides, Isa 17:2; 27:10), suggests desolation.

COULTER

kol’-ter.

See PLOW.

COUNCIL; COUNCILLOR

koun’-sil, koun’-siler (sumboulion): An assembly of advisers (Ac 25:12); a body of those taking counsel (see Schurer’s Jewish People in the Time of Christ, I (1), 60). Distinguished from sunedrion, the supreme court of the Jews, by being of a less formal character, i.e. less of an institution. For "council" in the latter sense, its most frequent use, see SANHEDRIN. A councilor (Greek bouleutes) was a member of the Sanhedrin. Applied to Joseph of Arimathea (Mr 15:43; Lu 23:50). In the King James Version "counsellor."

COUNSEL; COUNSELLOR

koun’-sel, koun’-seler (sumboulion): Ordinarily found as object of verb "to take" or "to give," expressing, beside the idea of a practical end to be reached, that of consultation and deliberation among those united in a common cause (Mt 12:14; Mr 3:6). A counselor (sumboulos) is a confidential adviser (Ro 11:34); often in the Old Testament (Isa 9:6; Pr 24:6, etc.). Confounded in the King James Version with "councillor" (see above), the latter being an official adviser, which the former does not necessarily mean.

COUNT

kount (caphar, manah; psephizo): Used of arithmetical computation "to number" (Ps 139:18; Nu 23:10); also for kathabh, "to reckon," to indicate classification among or identification with, "count for a stranger" (Job 19:15); "count for his enemy" (Job 33:10). In the New Testament the arithmetical computation is less prominent, except in the sense of "calculate," psephizo, sumpsephizo, "to reckon with pebbles," each pebble representing a unit (Lu 14:28; Ac 19:19); of moral estimate, hegeomai and

logizomai (Php 3:7,13). The noun, from Hebrew kacath, "a count of" (Ex 12:4), namely, in the arithmetical sense.

H. E. Jacobs

COUNTENANCE

koun’-te-nans:

(1) The noun (see also under the word FACE) is the translation of a variety of Hebrew and Greek expressions, panim; prosopon, being the most frequent. Besides these there are found mar’eh, "appearance," "shape," "comeliness," "visage," ‘ayin, "the eye," to’ar, "appearance," "figure," etc., and Aramaic ziw. To the Oriental the countenance mirrors, even more than to us, the character and feelings of the heart. The countenance (mar’eh) is"fair" (1Sa 17:42; 2Sa 14:27; Da 1:15); in 1Sa 16:12, literally, "fair of eyes"; "comely" (So 2:14); "beautiful" (~to’ar, 1Sa 25:3); "cheerful" (panim, Pr 15:13); "angry" (Pr 15:23); "fierce" (Da 8:23); "troubled" (Eze 27:35); "sad" (1Sa 1:18; Ne 2:2,3; Ec 7:3). The countenance is "sharpened" i.e. made keen (Pr 27:17); it "falls," i.e. looks despondent, disappointed (Ge 4:5,6); is "cast down" (Job 29:24); "changed" (Job 14:20; compare "altered" into glory, Lu 9:29; Da 5:6,9,10; 7:28, Aramaic ziw). To settle one’s countenance stedfastly upon a person (2Ki 8:11) is synonymous with staring or gazing at a person. Not infrequently we find compound expressions such as "light of countenance," i.e. favor (Job 29:24; Ps 4:6; 44:3; 89:15; 90:8); "health of countenance" (Ps 41:11; 43:5); "help of countenance" (Ps 42:5); "rebuke of countenance" (Ps 80:16); "pride of countenance" (Hebrew ‘aph, literally, "haughty," "lofty nose," Ps 10:4).

(2) As verb (Hebrew hadhar, "to countenance") we find the word in the King James Version of Ex 23:3, where the Revisers translate "Neither shalt thou favor (the King James Version "countenance") a poor man in his cause." Here the meaning seems to be that no distinction of persons shall be made by the judge. See Le 19:15, where, however, a different word is used. There is therefore no need of the emendation proposed by Knobel and accepted by Kautzsch, who would read gadhol, "great," for wedhal, "and the poor" of the text. The Septuagint has penes, "poor."

H. L. E. Luering

COUNTER-CHARM

koun’-ter-charm.

See AMULET; CHARM.

COUNTERFEIT

koun’-ter-fit (kibdelos, anatupoo, homoioo): "Counterfeit" occurs as the translation of kibdelos, "mixed with dross," "not genuine" (The Wisdom of Solomon 15:9, "to make counterfeit things," the Revised Version (British and American) "mouldeth counterfeits," "spurious things, imitations"); 2:16 the Revised Version (British and American) "base metal" (compare Septuagint Le 19:19; De 22:11, "mingled garment," and 2Co 13:5,6, adokimos, "reprobate" (silver)). "Counterfeit" in the older sense of a representation occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 14:17 (anatupoo, "to make a likeness"), "counterfeit of his visage," the Revised Version (British and American) "imagining the likeness from afar," and Ecclesiasticus 38:27 (homoioo, "to make like"), "to counterfeit imagery," the Revised Version (British and American) "to preserve likeness in his portraiture."

W. L. Walker

COUNTERVAIL

koun-ter-val’ (shawah, "equalize"): To thwart or overcome by acting against with equal force; thus, "The enemy could not countervail the king’s damage" or loss (Es 7:4 the American Standard Revised Version reads "The adversary could not have compensated for the king’s damage"). "Nothing doth countervail (the Revised Version (British and American) "can be taken in exchange for") a faithful friend" (Ecclesiasticus 6:15).

COUNTRY

kun’-tri (’erets, "land," sadheh, "field"; agros, "field," chora, "region"): The foregoing are the principal words rendered "country" in English Versions of the Bible, though we find also ‘adhamah, "earth" (Jon 4:2); ‘i, "island" (Jer 47:4 the King James Version); gelilah, "circuit" (Eze 47:8 the King James Version); chebhel, "rope" (De 3:14); maqom, "place" (Ge 29:26 the King James Version); nepheth,"hill" or "height" (Jos 17:11 the King James Version); genos, "race" (Ac 4:36 the King James Version); ge, "earth" (Mt 9:31 the King James Version; Ac 7:3 the King James Version); patris, "native land" (Lu 4:23; Joh 4:44; Heb 11:14); perichoros, "country (the American Standard Revised Version "region") round about" (Mt 14:35; Lu 3:3; 4:37; 8:37). In Heb 11:14 ff, "heaven" is referred to as a country. Egypt and Assyria were "far countries" (Jer 8:19 the King James Version; Zec 10:9). The hill country (compare the numerous Gibeahs (gibh‘ah, "a hill")) was the mountainous region to the North or to the South of Jerusalem. The low country, shephelah (see SHEPHELAH), consisted of the foothills to the west of the hill country. The south country or NEGEB (neghebh), which see, was the dry, extreme southern part of Palestine, approximately between Beersheba and Kadesh-barnea.

Alfred Ely Day

COUNTRYMAN

kun’-tri-man (sumphuletes): "Of the same tribe" (1Th 2:14); also in idiomatic rendering (genos) for those of one’s own race or kin (2Co 11:26; Ga 1:14 the King James Version, "one’s own nation").

Compare Mr 6:4; Ro 9:3; and see COUSIN; KINSMAN, etc.

COUPLE

kup’-l:

(1) Used as a noun, indicates two objects of the same kind that are considered together. Thus we read of a couple of cakes (2Sa 13:6, used loosely), and a couple of asses (2Sa 16:1, Hebrew tsemedh).

(2) Used as a verb, it means to join or fasten one thing to another. This term occurs most frequently in the description of the tabernacle (see Ex 26:6,9,11; 36:10,13,16). Couple is used in 1Pe 3:2 to describe the joining of fear to chaste behavior (Hebrew chabhar) .

COUPLING

kup’ling: Is the FV rendering of machbereth. This Hebrew word means joining, or the place where one thing is joined to another, as of the curtains of the tabernacle (Ex 26:4,5), and of the different parts of the ephod (Ex 28:27; 39:20).

It is also the English Versions of the Bible rendering of mechabberoth, and this refers more to the thing that joins the two objects, as beams of wood (2Ch 34:11), or hooks of iron (1Ch 22:3).

COURAGE

kur’-aj: Hebrew chazaq, "to show oneself strong" (Nu 13:20; 2Sa 10:12; 1Ch 19:13; 2Ch 15:8; Ezr 10:4; Ps 27:14; 31:24; Isa 41:6); ruach, "spirit," "animus" (Jos 2:11 the King James Version); ‘amats, "to be alert" (physically and mentally), "to be agile," "quick," "energetic" (De 31:6,7,23; Jos 1:6,9,18; 10:25; 1Ch 22:13; 28:20); lebhabh, "the heart," and figuratively, "person," "spirit" (Da 11:25); Greek tharsos, "cheer" (Ac 28:15). A virtue highly esteemed among all nations, one of the four chief "natural" (cardinal) virtues (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:7), while cowardice ranks as one of the mortal sins (Ecclesiasticus 2:12,13; Re 21:8).

COURSE

kors (from Latin cursus, "a running," "race," "voyage," "way"):

(1) euthudromeo, "forward or onward movement," as of a ship: "We made a straight course" (Ac 16:11; compare Ac 21:1); "We had finished our course." (the Revised Version (British and American) "voyage," Ac 21:7).

(2) A (prescribed or self-appointed) path, as of the sun: "Swift is the sun in his course" (1 Esdras 4:34);

of the stars: "The stars in their courses fought against Sisera" (Jud 5:20 the King James Version) (see ASTRONOMY; ASTROLOGY); of a river (or irrigating canal?): "as willows by the watercourses" (Isa 44:4); of a race (techo "that the word of the Lord may have free course.") (the Revised Version (British and American) "may run") (2Th 3:1).

(3) A career in such a course (dromos): "I have finished my (the Revised Version (British and American) "the") course" (2Ti 4:7); "as John fulfilled (the Revised Version (British and American) "was fulfilling") his course" (Ac 13:25); "that I might finish (the Revised Version (British and American) "may accomplish") my course" (Ac 20:24).

(4) A way or manner, as of life: "Every one turned to his course" (Jer 8:6); "their course is evil" (Jer 23:10); "walked according to the course aion, the Revised Version, [margin "age"] of this world" (Eph 2:2).

(5) Orderly succession: "sang together by course" (the American Standard Revised Version "sang one to another") (Ezr 3:11); "by course" (the Revised Version (British and American) "in turn") (1Co 14:27); the courses of the priests and Levites (1Ch 27:1-15; 1Ch 28:1; 2Ch 5:11; Lu 1:5,8).

See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

(6) A row or layer, as of masonry: "All the foundations of the earth are out of count" (the Revised Version (British and American) "are moved"; the American Standard Revised Version "are shaken") (Ps 82:5).

(7) (The tongue) "setteth on fire the course (the Revised Version (British and American) "wheel") of nature" (Jas 3:6). The cycle of generation (ton trochon tes geneseos) here means the physical world as constituted by the round of origin and decay, and typified by the Orphic (legendary) cycle of births and deaths through which the soul passes in metempsychosis.

See also GAMES.

William Arthur Heidel

COURSE OF PRIESTS AND LEVITES

See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

COURT

kort.

See HOUSE.

COURT OF THE GENTILES

See TEMPLE (HEROD'S).

COURT OF THE SABBATH

See COVERED WAY.

COURT OF THE SANCTUARY; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE

kort, sank'~-tu-a-ri: By "court" (chatser) is meant a clear space enclosed by curtains or walls, or surrounded by buildings. It was always an uncovered enclosure, but might have within its area one or more edifices.

1. The Tabernacle:

The first occurrence of the word is in Ex 27:9, where it is commanded to "make the court of the tabernacle." The dimensions for this follow in the directions for the length of the linen curtains which were to enclose it. From these we learn that the perimeter of the court was 300 cubits, and that it consisted of two squares, each 75 ft., lying East and West of one another. In the westerly square stood the tabernacle, while in that to the East was the altar of burnt offering. This was the worshipper's square, and every Hebrew who passed through the entrance gate had immediate access to the altar (compare W. Robertson Smith, note on Ex 20:26, Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 435). The admission to this scene of the national solemnities was by the great east gate described in Ex 27:13-16 (see EAST GATE).

2. Solomon's Temple:

The fundamental conception out of which grew the resolve to build a temple for the worship of Yahweh was that the new structure was to be an enlarged duplicate in stone of the tent of meeting (see TEMPLE). The doubling in size of the holy chambers was accompanied by a doubling of the enclosed area upon which the holy house was to stand. Hitherto a rectangular oblong figure of 150 ft. in length and 75 ft. in breadth had sufficed for the needs of the people in their worship. Now an area of 300 ft. in length and 150 ft. in breadth was enclosed within heavy stone walls, making, as before, two squares, each of 150 ft. This was that "court of the priests" spoken of in 2Ch 4:9, known to its builders as "the inner court" (1Ki 6:36; compare Jer 36:10). Its walls consisted of "three courses of hewn stone, and a course of cedar beams" (1Ki 6:36), into which some read the meaning of colonnades. Its two divisions may have been marked by some fence. The innermost division, accessible only to the priests, was the site of the new temple. In the easterly division stood the altar of sacrifice; into this the Hebrew laity had

access for worship at the altar. Later incidental allusions imply the existence of "chambers" in the court, and also the accessibility of the laity (compare Jer 35:4; 36:10; Eze 8:16).

3. The Great Court:

In distinction from this "inner" court a second or "outer" court was built by Solomon, spoken of by the Chronicler as "the great court" (2Ch 4:9). Its doors were overlaid with brass (bronze). Wide difference of opinion obtains as to the relation of this outer court to the inner court just described, and to the rest of the Solomonic buildings—particularly to "the great court" of "the house of the forest of Lebanon" of 1Ki 7:9,10. Some identify the two, others separate them. Did this court, with its brass-covered gates, extend still farther to the East than the temple "inner" court, with, however, the same breadth as the latter? Or was it, as Keil thinks, a much larger enclosure, surrounding the whole temple area, extending perhaps 150 cubits eastward in front of the priests' court (compare Keil, Biblical Archaeology, I, 171, English translation)? Yet more radical is the view, adopted by many modern authorities, which regards "the great court" as a vast enclosure surrounding the temple and the whole complex of buildings described in 1Ki 7:1-12 (see the plan, after Stade, in G. A. Smith's Jerusalem, II, 59). In the absence of conclusive data the question must be left undetermined.

4. Ezekiel's Temple:

In Ezekiel's plan of the temple yet to be built, the lines of the temple courts as he had known them in Jerusalem are followed. Two squares enclosed in stone walling, each of 150 ft., lie North and South of one another, and bear the distinctive names, "the inner court" and "the outer court" (Eze 8:16; 10:5).

5. Temple of Herod:

In the Herodian temple the old nomenclature gives place to a new set of terms. The extensive enclosure known later as "the court of the Gentiles" does not appear under that name in the New Testament or in Josephus What we have in the tract Middoth of the Mishna and in Josephus is the mention of two courts, the "court of the priests" and "the court of Israel" (Middoth, ii.6; v. 1; Josephus, BJ, V, v, 6). The data in regard to both are difficult and conflicting. In Middoth they appear as long narrow strips of 11 cubits in breadth extending at right angles to the temple and the altar across the enclosure—the "court of Israel" being railed off from the "court of the priests" on the East; the latter extending backward as far as the altar, which has a distinct measurement. The design was to prevent the too near approach of the lay Israelite to the altar. Josephus makes the 11 cubits of the "court of Israel" extend round the whole "court of the priests, " inclusive of altar and temple (see TEMPLE; and compare G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 506- 9, with the reconstruction of Waterhouse in Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 111 ff). For the "women's court," see TREASURY.

Many expressions in the Psalms show how great was the attachment of the devout-minded Hebrew in all ages to those courts of the Lord's house where he was accustomed to worship (e.g. Ps 65:4; 84:2; 92:13; 96:8; 100:4; 116:19). The courts were the scene of many historical events in the Old Testament and New

Testament, and of much of the earthly ministry of Jesus. There was enacted the scene described in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican (Lu 18:10-14).

W. Shaw Caldecott

COURTS, JUDICIAL

joo-dish'-al, ju-dish'-al.

1. Their Organization:

At the advice of Jethro, Moses appointed judges (shopheTim, Ex 18). In Egypt it appears that the Hebrews did not have their own judges, which, of course, was a source of many wrongs. Leaving Egypt, Moses took the judicial functions upon himself, but it was impossible that he should be equal to the task of administering justice to two and one-half million people; hence, he proceeded to organize a system of jurisprudence. He appointed judges over tens, fifties, hundreds, thousands—in all 78,600 judges. This system was adequate for the occasion, and these courts respectively corresponded practically to our Justices of the Peace, Mayor's Court, District Court, Circuit Court. Finally, there was a Supreme Court under Moses and his successors. These courts, though graded, did not afford an opportunity of appeal. The lower courts turned their difficult cases over to the next higher. If the case was simple, the judge over tens would take it, but if the question was too intricate for him, he would refer it to the next higher court, and so on until it finally reached Moses. There were certain kinds of questions which the tens, fifties, and hundreds would not take at all, and the people understood it and would bring them to the higher courts for original jurisdiction. When any court decided it, that was the end of that case, for it could not be appealed (Ex 18:25,26). On taking possession in Palestine, the judges were to be appointed for every city and vicinity (De 16:18), thus giving to all Israel a speedy and cheap method of adjudication. Though not so prescribed by the constitution, the judges at length were generally chosen from among the Levites, as the learned class. The office was elective. Josephus states this plainly, and various passages of the Scriptures express it positively by inference (see De 1:13). Jephthah's election by vote of the people is clearly set forth (Jud 11:5-11).

2. Character of the Judges:

Among the Hebrews, the law was held very sacred; for God Himself had given it. Hence, those who administered the law were God's special representatives, and their person was held correspondingly sacred. These circumstances placed upon them the duty of administering justice without respect to persons (De 1:17; 16:18). They were to be guided by the inalienable rights granted to every citizen by the Hebrew constitution:

(1) No man was to be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law (Nu 35:9-34).

(2) Two or three witnesses were required to convict anyone of crime (De 17:6; 19:2-13).

(3) Punishment for crime was not to be transferred or entailed (De 24:16).

(4) A man’s home was inviolate (De 24:10,11).

(5) One held to bondage but having acquired liberty through his own effort should be protected (De 23:15,16).

(6) One’s homestead was inalienable (Le 25:23-28,34).

(7) Slavery could not be made perpetual without the person’s own consent (Ex 21:2-6).

3. Their Work:

Gradually a legal profession developed among the Hebrews, the members of which were designated as "Lawyers" or "Scribes" also known as "Doctors of the Law" (Lu 2:46). Their business was threefold:

(1) to study and interpret the law;

(2) to instruct the Hebrew youth in the law; and

(3) to decide questions of the law. The first two they did as scholars and teachers; the last either as judges or as advisers in some court, as, for instance, the Senate of Jerusalem or some inferior tribunal. No code can go into such details as to eliminate the necessity of subsequent legislation, and this usually, to a great extent, takes the form of judicial decisions founded on the code, rather than of separate enactment; and so it was among the Hebrews. The provisions of their code were for the most part quite general, thus affording large scope for casuistic interpretation. Regarding the points not explicitly covered by the written law, a substitute must be found either in the form of established custom or in the form of an inference drawn from the statute.

As a result of the industry with which this line of legal development was pursued during the centuries immediately preceding our era, Hebrew law became a most complicated science. For the disputed points, the judgments of the individual lawyers could not be taken as the standard; hence, the several disciples of the law must frequently meet for a discussion, and the opinion of the majority then prevailed. These were the meetings of the "Doctors." Whenever a case arose concerning which there had been no clear legal decision, the question was referred to the nearest lawyer; by him, to the nearest company of lawyers, perhaps the Sanhedrin, and the resultant decision was henceforth authority.

Before the destruction of Jerusalem technical knowledge of the law was not a condition of eligibility to the office of judge. Anyone who could command the confidence of his fellow-citizens might be elected, and many of the rural courts undoubtedly were conducted, as among us, by men of sterling quality, but limited knowledge. Such men would avail themselves of the legal advice of any "doctor" who might be

within reach; and in the more dignified courts of a large municipality it was a standing custom to have a company of lawyers present to discuss and decide any new law points that might arise. Of course, frequently these men were themselves elected to the office of judge, so that practically the entire system of jurisprudence was in their hands.

4. Limitations under Roman Rule:

Though Judea at this time was a subject commonwealth, yet the Sanhedrin, which was the body of supreme legislative and judicial authority, exercised autonomous authority to such an extent that it not only administered civil cases in accordance with Jewish law—for without such a right a Jewish court would be impossible—but it also took part to a great extent in the punishment of crime. It exercised an independent police power, hence, could send out its own officers to make arrests (Mt 26:47; Mr 14:43; Ac 4:3; 5:17,18). In cases that did not involve capital punishment, its judgments were final and untrammeled (Ac 4:2-23; 5:21-40). Only in capital punishment cases must the consent of the procurator be secured, which is not only clearly stated in Joh 18:31, but is also evident in the entire course of Christ's trial, as reported by the Synoptic Gospels. In granting or withholding his consent in such cases, the procurator could follow his pleasure absolutely, applying either the Jewish or Roman law, as his guide. In one class of cases the right to inflict capital punishment even on Roman citizens was granted the Sanhedrin, namely, when a non-Jewish person overstepped the bounds and entered the interior holy place of the temple. Even in this case the consent of the procurator must be secured, but it appears that the Roman rulers were inclined to let the law take its course against such wanton outrage of the Jews' feelings. Criminal cases not involving capital punishment need not be referred to the procurator.

5. Time and Place of Sessions:

The city in which the Sanhedrin met was Jerusalem. To determine the particular building, and the spot on which the building stood, is interesting to the archaeologist, not to the student of law. The local courts usually held their sessions on the second and fifth day (Monday and Thursday) of the week, but we do not know whether the same custom was observed by the Great Sanhedrin. On feast days no court was held, much less on the Sabbath. Since the death penalty was not to be pronounced until the day after the trial, such cases were avoided also on the day preceding a Sabbath or other sacred day. The emphasis placed on this observance may be seen from the edicts issued by Augustus, absolving the Jews from the duty of attending court on the Sabbath.

See DOCTOR; LAWYER; SANHEDRIN; SCRIBES.

Frank E. Hirsch

COUSIN

kuz'-'-n (anepsios): Only in Col 4:10, where Mark is said to be "cousin" (Revised Version) to Barnabas, and not as in the King James Version, "sister's son." The renderings "cousin" of the King James Version

for suggenes, in Lu 1:36,58 were probably understood at the time of the translation, in the wider, and not in the more restricted, sense of the term, now almost universally prevalent. In view of this the renderings "kinswoman," "kinsfolk" in the Revised Version (British and American) are preferable. As a title of honor and dignity, it occurs in 1 Esdras 4:42, etc.

See KINSMAN.

COUTHA

kou’-tha, koo’-tha.

See CUTHAH.

COVENANT OF SALT

solt (berith melach; halas, classical Greek hals): As salt was regarded as a necessary ingredient of the daily food, and so of all sacrifices offered to Yahweh (Le 2:13), it became an easy step to the very close connection between salt and covenant-making. When men ate together they became friends. Compare the Arabic expression, "There is salt between us"; "He has eaten of my salt," which means partaking of hospitality which cemented friendship; compare "eat the salt of the palace" (Ezr 4:14). Covenants were generally confirmed by sacrificial meals and salt was always present. Since, too, salt is a preservative, it would easily become symbolic of an enduring covenant. So offerings to Yahweh were to be by a statute forever, "a covenant of salt for ever before Yahweh" (Nu 18:19). David received his kingdom forever from Yahweh by a "covenant of salt" (2Ch 13:5). In the light of these conceptions the remark of our Lord becomes the more significant: "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another" (Mr 9:50).

Edward Bagby Pollard

COVENANT, ARK OF THE

kuv’-e-nant, kuv’-e-nant.

See ARK OF THE COVENANT.

COVENANT, BOOK OF THE

(cepher ha-berith):

1. Historical Connection

2. Analysis

3. Critical Theories

4. True, or Biblical Conception

5. Nature of the Laws

LITERATURE

The name given in Ex 24:7 to a code or collection of laws found in the preceding chapters, 20-23, as the terms of the covenant made with Yahweh, and given for Israel’s guidance until a more complete legislation should be provided. In this covenant between Yahweh and Israel, Moses served as mediator; animals were sacrificed, the blood thus shed being also called "the blood of the covenant" (dam haberith, Ex 24:8).

1. Historical Connection:

This brief book of laws occupies a fitting and dearly marked place in the Pentateuchal collection. Examination of the historical context shows that it is put where it belongs and belongs where it is put. A few months after the Exodus (Ex 19:1) Israel arrived at Sinai. Immediately at the command which Moses had received from Yahweh in the Mount, they prepared themselves by a ceremonial of sanctification for entrance into covenant relation with Yahweh. When the great day arrived for making this covenant, Moses in the midst of impressive natural phenomena went again to meet Yahweh in the top of the mountain. On his return (Ex 19:25), the words of the law, or the terms of the covenant, were declared to the people, and accepted by them. The first part of these covenant-terms, namely, the Decalogue (Ex 20:2-17), was spoken by the Divine voice, or its declaration was accompanied by awe-inspiring natural convulsions (Ex 20:18). Therefore in response to the pleadings of the terrified people Moses went up again into the mountain and received from Yahweh for them the rest of the "words" and "ordinances" (Ex 24:3); and these constitute the so-called Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:22-23). In this direct and unequivocal manner the narrator connected the book with the nation’s consecration at Sinai. The prophets regarded the making of the Sinaitic covenant as the marriage of Israel and Yahweh, and these laws were the terms mutually agreed upon in the marriage contract.

2. Analysis:

While it is not possible to arrange the materials of this document into hard-and-fast divisions, the following analysis may be suggestive and serviceable:

(1) directions concerning worship, specifying prohibition of images and the form of altar for animal sacrifices (Ex 20:23-26);

(2) ordinances for protection of Hebrew slaves, including betrothal, for a price, of daughter (Ex 21:2-11);

(3) laws concerning injuries,

(a) to man by man (Ex 21:12-27),

(b) to man by beast (Ex 21:28-32),

(c) to beast by man (Ex 21:33,14),

(d) to beast by beast (Ex 21:35,36);

(4) concerning theft (Ex 22:1-4);

(5) concerning damage to a neighbor's property, including violence to his daughter (Ex 22:5-17);

(6) sundry laws against profaning Yahweh's name, under which are included proper worship, avoidance of oppression and dutiful offering of first-fruits (Ex 22:18-31);

(7) against various forms of injustice and unbrotherliness (Ex 23:1-9);

(8) festal occasions, including the Sabbatical year and the three annual feasts: unleavened bread, first-fruits and ingathering (Ex 23:10-17);

(9) warning against certain wrong practices in their sacrifices (Ex 23:18,19);

(10) in conclusion, a promise of God's continual presence with them in the person of His Angel, and the consequent triumph over enemies (Ex 23:20-33).

3. Critical Theories:

In this legislation are found two forms of laws or deliverances:

(1) the ordinances (mishpaTim), which deal principally with civil and moral matters, are like court decisions, and are introduced by the hypothetical "if";

(2) words, or commands (debharim), which relate chiefly to religious duties, being introduced by the imperative "thou shalt."

The critical analysis and dismemberment of the books of Moses, if accepted, renders the simple

historical explanation of the introduction to this body of laws untrue and impossible. The four chapters are assigned to JE, the Decalogue to E, and the Book of the Covenant to the Jahwist (Jahwist) or Elohim (E), the repetition of the Decalogue in Ex 32-34 being the Jahwist's account. Ordinarily the Book of the Covenant is held to be earlier than the Decalogue, and is indeed the oldest body of Hebrew legislation. However, it could not have been given at one time, nor in the wilderness, since the laws are given for those in agricultural life, and seem to be decisions made at various times and finally gathered together. Furthermore, this more primitive code either contradicts the later legislation of the Deuteronomist (D) and the Priestly Code (P) or reveals an entirely different point of view. The chief contradictions or divergences are: nature and number of altars, absence of an official priestly class, and simpler conception of the annual feasts as agricultural celebrations. Jahwist-Elohim (JE) came into united form in the 9th or 8th century, but this body of laws existed much earlier, embodying the earliest legal developments of Hebrew life in Canaan. It is suggested by some, as Driver, LOT, although he does not attempt the analysis, that this code is itself a composite of various layers and ages.

See CRITICISM (GRAF-WELLHAUSEN HYPOTHESIS).

4. True, or Biblical Conception:

But in favor of the simpler interpretation of these laws as the ethical obligations of the new bond between Yahweh and Israel some statements deserve to be made. If a solemn league and covenant was made at Sinai—and to this all the history, all the prophets and the Psalms give testimony—there must have been some statement of the germinal and fundamental elements of the nation's moral relation to Yahweh. Such statement need not be final nor exhaustive, but rather intended to instruct and guide until later and more detailed directions might be given. This is exactly the position and claim of the Book of the Covenant; and that this was the thought of the editor of the Pentateuch, and that this is the first and reasonable impression made by the unsuspecting and connected reading of the record, can hardly be questioned by candid minds. In answer to the criticism that the agricultural flavor of the laws presupposes settlement in Canaan—a criticism rather remarkable for its bland ignorance—it may be suggested:

(1) Israel had occupied in Egypt an agricultural section, and must have been able either to form or to receive a body of laws dealing with agricultural pursuits.

(2) They were on the march toward a land in which they should have permanent settlement in agricultural life; and not the presence of allusions to such life, but rather their absence, should cause surprise.

(3) However, references to settled farm life are not so obtrusively frequent as those seeking signs would have us think. References to the animal life of the flock and herd of a shepherd people, such as the Israelites were at Sinai, are far more frequent (Ex 21:28,33,15; 22:1,10; 23:4, etc.). The laws are quite generic in form and conception, enforcing such duties as would devolve upon both temporary nomad and prospective tillers of the soil. R. B. Taylor therefore (article in one-vol Hastings, Dictionary of the

Bible (five volumes)) accepts this code as originating in the desert wanderings.

In answer to the view, best presented by Wellhausen in Proleg. and W. R. Smith in OTJC, that this code is in conflict with later legislation, it may be said that the Book of the Covenant, as an ethical and civil summary, is in its proper place in the narrative of the sojourn at Sinai, and does not preclude the expectancy of more elaborate organization of both ceremonial and civil order. But the whole question relates more properly to discussion of the later legislation or of the particular topics in dispute (which see). For a thorough treatment of them consult W. H. Green, Hebrew Feasts.

5. Nature of the Laws:

In the Book of the Covenant the moral elements strongly emphasized are: simplicity, directness and spirituality of worship; a high and equitable standard of right; highest consideration for the weak and the poor; humane treatment of dumb animals; purity in the relations of life; the spirit of brotherhood; and the simple and joyful life. Whatever development in details came with later legislation did not nullify the simple but lofty standards of the earlier laws.

LITERATURE.

Driver, Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, under "Exodus"; Wellhausen, Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel; Comp. d. Hexateuch; W. R. Smith, Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church; W. H. Green, Hebrew Feasts; Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch; Dillmann, Commentary on Exodus-Leviticus.

Edward Mack

COVENANT, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Diatheke, was the word chosen by the Septuagint translators to render the Hebrew berith, and it appears thus nearly 300 times in the Greek Old Testament in the sense of covenant, while suntheke and entolai are each used once only. The choice of this word seems to have been occasioned by a recognition that the covenant which God makes with men is not fully mutual as would be implied in suntheke, the Greek word commonly used for covenant (although not a New Testament word), while at the same time the rarity of wills among the Jews made the common sense of diatheke relatively unfamiliar. The Apocryphal writers also frequently use the same word in the same sense and no other.

In the New Testament diatheke is used some thirty times in a way which makes it plain that its translation must be "covenant." In Ga 3:15 and Heb 9:15-17 it is held by many that the sense of covenant must be set aside in favor of will or testament. But in the former passage it can be taken in the sense of a disposition of affairs or arrangement made by God, a conception in substantial harmony with its regular New Testament use and with the sense of berith. In the passage in Hebrews the interpretation is more difficult, but as it is acknowledged on all hands that the passage loses all argumentative force if the

meaning testament is accepted, it seems best to retain the meaning covenant if possible. To do this it is only necessary to hold that the death spoken of is the death of the animal sometimes, if not, indeed, commonly slain in connection with the making of a covenant, and that in the mind of the author this death symbolized the death of the contracting parties so far at least as to pledge them that thereafter in the matter involved they would no more change their minds than can the dead. If this view is taken, this passage falls in line with the otherwise invariable use of the word diatheke by Jewish Hellenists.

See TESTAMENT.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Commentary on Gal; Ramsay, Commentary on Gal; Westcott, Commentary on Hebrews; article on Heb 9:15-17, Baptist Review and The Expositor., July, 1904.

David Foster Estes

COVENANT, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

kuv'-e-nant (berith):

I. GENERAL MEANING

II. AMONG MEN

1. Early Idea

2. Principal Elements

3. Different Varieties

4. Phraseology Used

III. BETWEEN GOD AND MEN

1. Essential Idea

2. Covenants Recorded in the Old Testament

3. Phraseology Used

4. History of Covenant Idea

LITERATURE

I. General Meaning.

The etymological force of the Hebrew berith is not entirely certain. It is probable that the word is the same as the Assyrian biritu, which has the common meaning "fetter," but also means "covenant." The significance of the root from which this Assyrian word is derived is uncertain. It is probable that it is "to bind," but that is not definitely established. The meaning of biritu as covenant seems to come directly from the root, rather than as a derived meaning from fetter. If this root idea is to bind, the covenant is that which binds together the parties. This, at any rate, is in harmony with the general meaning of the word.

In the Old Testament the word has an ordinary use, when both parties are men, and a distinctly religious use, between God and men. There can be no doubt that the religious use has come from the ordinary, in harmony with the general custom in such cases, and not the reverse. There are also two shades of meaning, somewhat distinct, of the Hebrew word: one in which it is properly a covenant, i.e. a solemn mutual agreement, the other in which it is more a command, i.e. instead of an obligation voluntarily assumed, it is an obligation imposed by a superior upon an inferior. This latter meaning, however, has clearly been derived from the other. It is easy to see that an agreement, including as the contracting parties those of unequal position, might readily include those agreements which tended to partake of the nature of a command; but the process could not readily be reversed.

II. Among Men.

1. Early Idea:

We consider first a covenant in which both contracting parties are men. In essence a covenant is an agreement, but an agreement of a solemn and binding force. The early Semitic idea of a covenant was doubtless that which prevailed among the Arabs (see especially W. Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, 2nd edition, passim). This was primarily blood-brotherhood, in which two men became brothers by drinking each other’s blood. Ordinarily this meant that one was adopted into the clan of the other. Hence, this act involved the clan of one of the contracting parties, and also brought the other party into relation with the god of this clan, by bringing him into the community life of the clan, which included its god. In this early idea, then, "primarily the covenant is not a special engagement to this or that particular effect, but bond of troth and life- fellowship to all the effects for which kinsmen are permanently bound together" (W. Robertson Smith, op. cit., 315 f). In this early ceremonial the religious idea was necessarily present, because the god was kindred to the clan; and the god had a special interest in the covenant because he especially protects the kindred blood, of which the stranger thus becomes a part. This religious side always persisted, although the original idea was much modified. In later usage there were various substitutes for the drinking of each other’s blood, namely, drinking together the

sacrificial blood, sprinkling it upon the parties, eating together the sacrificial meal, etc.; but the same idea found expression in all, the community of life resulting from the covenant.

2. Principal Elements:

The covenant in the Old Testament shows considerable modification from the early idea. Yet it will doubtless help in understanding the Old Testament covenant to keep in mind the early idea and form. Combining statements made in different accounts, the following seem to be the principal elements in a covenant between men. Some of the details, it is to be noted, are not explicitly stated in reference to these covenants, but may be inferred from those between God and men.

(1) A statement of the terms agreed upon (Ge 26:29; 31:50,52). This was a modification of the earlier idea, which has been noted, in which a covenant was all-inclusive.

(2) An oath by each party to observe the terms, God being witness of the oath (Ge 26:31; 31:48-53). The oath was such a characteristic feature that sometimes the term "oath" is used as the equivalent of covenant (see Eze 17:13).

(3) A curse invoked by each one upon himself in case disregard of the agreement. In a sense this may be considered a part of the oath, adding emphasis to it. This curse is not explicitly stated in the case of human covenants, but may be inferred from the covenant with God (De 27:15-26).

(4) The formal ratification of the covenant by some solemn external act.

The different ceremonies for this purpose, such as have already been mentioned, are to be regarded as the later equivalents of the early act of drinking each other's blood. In the Old Testament accounts it is not certain that such formal act is expressly mentioned in relation to covenants between men. It seems probable, however, that the sacrificial meal of Ge 31:54 included Laban, in which case it was a covenant sacrifice. In any case, both sacrificial meal and sprinkling of blood upon the two parties, the altar representing Yahweh, are mentioned in Ex 24:4-8, with allusions elsewhere, in ratification of the covenant at Sinai between Yahweh and Israel. In the covenant of God with Abraham is another ceremony, quite certainly with the same purpose. This is a peculiar observance, namely, the cutting of animals into two parts and passing between the severed portions (Ge 15:9-18), a custom also referred to in Jer 34:18. Here it is to be noted that it is a smoking furnace and a flaming torch, representing God, not Abraham, which passed between the pieces. Such an act, it would seem, should be shared by both parties, but in this case it is doubtless to be explained by the fact that the covenant is principally a promise by Yahweh. He is the one who binds Himself. Concerning the significance of this act there is difference of opinion. A common view is that it is in effect a formal expression of the curse, imprecating upon oneself the same, i.e. cutting in pieces, if one breaks the terms of the covenant. But, as W. R. Smith has pointed out (op. cit., 481), this does not explain the passing between the pieces, which is the characteristic feature of the ceremony. It seems rather to be a symbol that the two parties "were taken within the mystical life of the victim." (Compare the interpretation of Heb 9:15-17 in COVENANT, IN

THE NEW TESTAMENT.) It would then be an inheritance from the early times, in which the victim was regarded as kindred with the tribe, and hence, also an equivalent of the drinking of each other's blood.

The immutability of a covenant is everywhere assumed, at least theoretically.

Other features beyond those mentioned cannot be considered as fundamental. This is the case with the setting up of a stone, or raising a heap of stones (Ge 31:45,46). This is doubtless simply an ancient custom, which has no direct connection with the covenant, but comes from the ancient Semitic idea of the sacredness of single stones or heaps of stones. Striking hands is a general expression of an agreement made (Ezr 10:19; Eze 17:18, etc.).

3. Different Varieties:

In observing different varieties of agreements among men, we note that they may be either between individuals or between larger units, such as tribes and nations. In a great majority of cases, however, they are between the larger units. In some cases, also, when an individual acts it is in a representative capacity, as the head of a clan, or as a king. When the covenant is between tribes it is thus a treaty or alliance. The following passages have this use of covenant: Ge 14:13; 21:27,32; 26:28; 31:44; Ex 23:32; 34:12,15; De 7:2; Jos 9:6,7,11,15,16; Jud 2:2; 1Sa 11:1; 1Ki 3:12; 15:19 parallel 2Ch 16:3; 1Ki 20:34; Ps 83:5; Isa 33:8; Eze 16:61; 17:13-19; 30:5; Da 11:22; Am 1:9. In other cases it is between a king and his subjects, when it is more a command or ordinance, as 2Sa 3:12,13,11; 5:3 parallel 1Ch 11:3; Jer 34:8-18; Da 9:27. In other cases it is between individuals, or between small groups, where it is an agreement or pledge (2Ki 11:4 parallel 2Ch 23:1; Job 31:1; 41:4; Ho 10:4). Between David and Jonathan it is more specifically an alliance of friendship (1Sa 18:3; 20:8; 23:18), as also apparently in Ps 55:20. It means an alliance of marriage in Mal 2:14, but probably not in Pr 2:17, where it is better to understand the meaning as being "her covenant with God."

4. Phraseology Used:

In all cases of covenants between men, except Jer 34:10 and Da 9:27, the technical phrase for making a covenant is karath berith, in which karath meant originally "to cut." Everything indicates that this verb is used with reference to the formal ceremony of ratification above mentioned, of cutting animals in pieces.

III. Between God and Men.

1. Essential Idea: As already noted, the idea of covenants between God and men doubtless arose from the idea of covenants between men. Hence, the general thought is similar. It cannot in this case, however, be an agreement between contracting parties who stand on an equality, but God, the superior, always takes the initiative. To some extent, however, varying in different cases, is regarded as a mutual agreement; God with His commands makes certain promises, and men agree to keep the commands, or, at any rate, the promises are conditioned on human obedience. In general, the covenant of God with men

is a Divine ordinance, with signs and pledges on God's part, and with promises for human obedience and penalties for disobedience, which ordinance is accepted by men. In one passage (Ps 25:14), it is used in a more general way of an alliance of friendship between God and man.

2. Covenants Recorded in the Old Testament:

A covenant of this general kind is said in the Old Testament to have been made by God with Noah (Ge 9:9-17 and elsewhere). In this the promise is that there shall be no more deluge. A covenant is made with Abraham, the thought of which includes his descendants. In this the promise of God is to multiply the descendants of Abraham, to give them the land of Canaan, and to make them a blessing to the nations. This is narrated in Ge 15:18; 17:2-21, etc. A covenant is made with the nation Israel at Sinai (Horeb) (Ex 19:5; 24:7,8; 34:10,27,28, etc.), ratified by a covenant sacrifice and sprinkling of blood (Ex 24:4-8). This constituted the nation the peculiar people of God, and was accompanied by promises for obedience and penalties for disobedience. This covenant was renewed on the plains of Moab (De 29:1). In these national covenants the individual had a place, but only as a member of the nation. The individual might forfeit his rights under the covenant, however, by deliberate rebellion against Yahweh, sinning "with a high hand" (Nu 15:30 f), and then he was regarded as no longer a member of the nation, he was "cut off from among his people," i.e. put to death. This is the teaching of the Priestly Code (P), and is also implied elsewhere; in the mercy of God, however, the punishment was not always inflicted. A covenant with the tribe of Levi, by which that became the priestly tribe, is alluded to in De 33:9; Jer 33:21; Mal 2:4 ff. The covenant with Phinehas (Nu 25:12,13) established an everlasting priesthood in his line. The covenant with Joshua and Israel (Jos 24) was an agreement on their part to serve Yahweh only. The covenant with David (2Sa 7 parallel 1Ch 17; see also Ps 89:3,18,34,39; 132:12; Jer 33:21) contained a promise that his descendants should have an everlasting kingdom, and should stand to God in the relation of sonship. The covenant with Jehoiada and the people (2Ki 11:17 parallel 2Ch 23:3) was an agreement on their part to be the people of Yahweh. The covenant with Hezekiah and the people (2Ch 29:10) consisted essentially of an agreement on their part to reform the worship; the covenant with Josiah and the people (2Ki 23:3), of an agreement on their part to obey the Book of the Law. The covenant with Ezra and the people (Ezr 10:3) was an agreement on their part to put away foreign wives and obey the law. The prophets also speak of a new covenant, most explicitly in Jeremiah, but with references elsewhere, which is connected with the Messianic time (see Isa 42:6; 49:8; 55:3; 59:21; 61:8; Jer 31:31,33; 32:40; 50:5; Eze 16:60,62; 20:37; 34:25; 37:26; Ho 2:18).

3. Phraseology Used:

Various phrases are used of the making of a covenant between God and men. The verb ordinarily used of making covenants between men, karath, is often used here as well. The following verbs are also used: heqim, "to establish" or "confirm"; nathan, "to give"; sim, "to place"; tsiwwah, "to command"; ‘abhar, "to pass over," followed by be, "into"; bo, "to enter," followed by be; and the phrase nasa’ berith ‘al pi, "to take up a covenant upon the mouth of someone."

4. History of Covenant Idea:

The history of the covenant idea in Israel, as between God and man, is not altogether easy to trace. This applies especially to the great covenants between God and Israel, namely, the one with Abraham, and the one made at Sinai. The earliest references to this relation of Israel to Yahweh under the term "covenant" are in Ho 6:7; 8:1. The interpretation of the former passage is doubtful in details, but the reference to such a covenant seems clear. The latter is considered by many a later addition, but largely because of this mention of the covenant. No other references to such a covenant are made in the prophets before Jeremiah. Jeremiah and Ezekiel speak of it, and it is implied in Second-Isaiah. It is a curious fact, however, that most of the later prophets do not use the term, which suggests that the omission in the earlier prophets is not very significant concerning a knowledge of the idea in early times.

In this connection it should be noted that there is some variation among the Hexateuchal codes in their treatment of the covenants. Only one point, however, needs special mention. The Priestly Code (P) gives no explicit account of the covenant at Sinai, and puts large emphasis upon the covenant with Abraham. There are, however, apparent allusions to the Sinaitic covenant (Le 2:13; 24:8; 26:9,15,25,44,45). The facts indicate, therefore, principally a difference of emphasis.

In the light partly of the facts already noted, however, it is held by many that the covenant idea between God and man is comparatively late. This view is that there were no covenants with Abraham and at Sinai, but that in Israel’s early conceptions of the relation to Yahweh He was their tribal God, bound by natural ties, not ethical as the covenant implies. This is a larger question than at first appears. Really the whole problem of the relation of Israel to Yahweh throughout Old Testament history is involved, in particular the question at what time a comprehensive conception of the ethical character of God was developed. The subject will therefore naturally receive a fuller treatment in other articles. It is perhaps sufficient here to express the conviction that there was a very considerable conception of the ethical character of Yahweh in the early history of Israel, and that consequently there is no sufficient reason for doubting the fact of the covenants with Abraham and at Sinai. The statement of W. Robertson Smith expresses the essence of the matter (op. cit., 319): "That Yahweh’s relation is not natural but ethical is the doctrine of the prophets, and is emphasized, in dependence on their teaching, in the Book of Deuteronomy. But the passages cited show that the idea had its foundation in pre prophetic times; and indeed the prophets, though they give it fresh and powerful application, plainly do not regard the conception as an innovation."

A little further consideration should be given to the new covenant of the prophets. The general teaching is that the covenant was broken by the sins of the people which led to the exile. Hence, during the exile the people had been cast off, the covenant was no longer in force. This is stated, using other terminology, in Ho 3:3 f; 1:9; 2:2. The prophets speak, however, in anticipation, of the making of a covenant again after the return from the exile. For the most part, in the passages already cited, this covenant is spoken of as if it were the old one renewed. Special emphasis is put, however, upon its being an everlasting covenant, as the old one did not prove to be, implying that it will not be broken as was that one. Jeremiah’s teaching, however, has a little different emphasis. He speaks of the old covenant as passed away (31:32). Accordingly he speaks of a new covenant (31:31,33). This new covenant in its provisions, however, is much like the old. But there is a new emphasis upon individuality in approach to

God. In the old covenant, as already noted, it was the nation as a whole that entered into the relation; here it is the individual, and the law is to be written upon the individual heart.

In the later usage the specific covenant idea is sometimes less prominent, so that the term is used practically of the religion as a whole; see Isa 56:4; Ps 103:18.

LITERATURE.

Valeton, ZATW, XII, XIII (1892-93); Candlish, The Expositor Times, 1892, Oct., Nov.; Kraetzschmar, Die Bundesvorstellung im Altes Testament, Marburg, 1896; articles "Covenant" in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) and Encyclopedia Biblica.

George Ricker Berry

COVENANT, THE NEW

(berith chadhashah, Jer 31:31; he diatheke kaine, Heb 8:8,13, etc., or nea, Heb 12:24: the former Greek adjective has the sense of the "new" primari1y in reference to quality, the latter the sense of "young," the "new," primarily in reference to time):

1. Contrast of "New" and "Old"—The Term "Covenant"

2. Christ’s Use at the Last Supper

3. Relation to Exodus 24

4. Use in Epistle to the Hebrews

5. The Mediator of the New Covenant

6. "Inheritance" and "Testament"

7. Relation to Jeremiah 31:31-34

8. To Ezekiel

9. Contrast of Old and New in 2 Corinthians 3

1. Contrast of "New" and "Old"—the Term "Covenant":

The term "New" Covenant necessarily implies an "Old" Covenant, and we are reminded that God’s

dealings with His people in the various dispensations of the world's history have been in terms of covenant. The Holy Scriptures by their most familiar title keep this thought before us, the Old Testament and the New Testament or Covenant; the writings produced within the Jewish "church" being the writings or Scriptures of the Old Covenant, those within the Christian church, the Scriptures of the New Covenant. The alternative name "Testament"—adopted into our English description through the Latin, as the equivalent of the Hebrew berith, and the Greek diatheke, which both mean a solemn disposition, compact or contract—suggests the disposition of property in a last will or testament, but although the word diatheke may bear that meaning, the Hebrew berith does not, and as the Greek usage in the New Testament seems especially governed by the Old Testament usage and the thought moves in a similar plane, it is better to keep to the term "covenant." The one passage which seems to favor the "testament" idea is Heb 9:16,17 (the Revisers who have changed the King James Version "testament" into "covenant" in every other place have left it in these two verses), but it is questionable whether even here the better rendering would not be "covenant" (see below). Certainly in the immediate context "covenant" is the correct translation and, confessedly, "testament," if allowed to stand, is an application by transition from the original thought of a solemn compact to the secondary one of testamentary disposition. The theological terms "Covenant of Works" and "Covenant of Grace" do not occur in Scripture, though the ideas covered by the terms, especially the latter, may easily be found there. The "New Covenant" here spoken of is practically equivalent to the Covenant of Grace established between God and His redeemed people, that again resting upon the eternal Covenant of Redemption made between the Father and the Son, which, though not so expressly designated, is not obscurely indicated by many passages of Scripture.

2. Christ's Use at Last Supper:

Looking at the matter more particularly, we have to note the words of Christ at the institution of the Supper. In all the three Synoptists, as also in Paul's account (Mt 26:28; Mr 14:24; Lu 22:20; 1Co 11:25) "covenant" occurs. Matthew and Mark, "my blood of the (new) covenant"; Lu and Paul, "the new covenant in my blood." The Revisers following the critical text, have omitted "new" in Matthew and Mark, but even if it does not belong to the original MS, it is implied, and there need be little doubt that Jesus used it. The old covenant was so well known to these Jewish disciples, that to speak of the covenant in this emphatic way, referring manifestly to something other than the old Mosaic covenant, was in effect to call it a "new" covenant. The expression, in any case, looks back to the old and points the contrast; but in the contrast there are points of resemblance.

3. Relation to Exodus 24:

It is most significant that Christ here connects the "new" covenant with His "blood." We at once think, as doubtless the disciples would think, of the transaction described in Ex 24:7, when Moses "took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people" those "words," indicating God's undertaking on behalf of His people and what He required of them; "and they said, All that Yahweh hath spoken will we do, and be obedient," thus taking up their part of the contract. Then comes the ratification. "Moses took the blood (half of which had already been sprinkled on the altar), and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant which Yahweh hath made with you

concerning all these words" (verse 8). The blood was sacrificial blood, the blood of the animals sacrificed as burnt offerings and peace offerings (Ex 24:5,6). The one half of the blood sprinkled on the altar tells of the sacrifice offered to God, the other half sprinkled on the people, of the virtue of the same sacrifice applied to the people, and so the covenant relation is fully brought about. Christ, by speaking of His blood in this connection, plainly indicates that His death was a sacrifice, and that through that sacrifice His people would be brought into a new covenant relationship with God. His sacrifice is acceptable to God and the virtue of it is to be applied to believers—so all the blessings of the new covenant are secured to them; the blood "is poured out for you" (Lu 22:20). He specifically mentions one great blessing of the new covenant, the forgiveness of sins—"which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:28).

4. Use in Epistle to the Hebrews:

This great thought is taken up in Hebrews and fully expounded. The writer draws out fully the contrast between the new covenant and the old by laying stress upon the perfection of Christ's atonement in contrast to the material and typical sacrifices (Heb 9:11-23). He was "a high priest of the good things to come," connected with "the greater and more perfect tabernacle." He entered the heavenly holy place "through his own blood," not that of "goats and calves," and by that perfect offering He has secured "eternal redemption" in contrast to the temporal deliverance of the old dispensation. The blood of those typical offerings procured ceremonial cleansing; much more, therefore, shall the blood of Christ avail to cleanse the conscience "from dead works to serve the living God"—that blood which is so superior in value to the blood of the temporal sacrifices, yet resembles it in being sacrificial blood. It is the blood of Him "who, through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God." It is the fashion in certain quarters nowadays to say that it is not the blood of Christ, but His spirit of self-sacrifice for others, that invests the cross with its saving power, and this verse is sometimes cited to show that the virtue lies in the surrender of the perfect will, the shedding of the blood being a mere accident. But this is not the view of the New Testament writers. The blood-shedding is to them a necessity. Of course, it is not the natural, material blood, or the mere act of shedding it, that saves. The blood is the life. The blood is the symbol of life; the blood shed is the symbol of life outpoured—of the penalty borne; and while great emphasis must be laid, as in this verse it is laid, upon Christ's perfect surrender of His holy will to God, yet the essence of the matter is found in the fact that He willingly endured the dread consequences of sin, and as a veritable expiatory sacrifice shed His precious blood for the remission of sins.

5. The Mediator of the New Covenant:

On the ground of that shed blood, as the writer goes on to assert, "He is the mediator of a new covenant, that a death having taken place for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant, they that have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance" (Heb 9:15). Thus Christ fulfils the type in a twofold way: He is the sacrifice upon which the covenant is based, whose blood ratifies it, and He is also, like Moses, the Mediator of the covenant. The death of Christ not only secures the forgiveness of those who are brought under the new covenant, but it was also for the redemption of the transgressions under the first covenant, implying that all the sacrifices gained their value by being types of Christ, and the forgiveness enjoyed by the people of God in former days was

bestowed in virtue of the great Sacrifice to be offered in the fullness of time.

6. "Inheritance" and "Testament":

Not only does the blessing of perfect forgiveness come through the new covenant, but also the promise of the "eternal inheritance" in contrast to the earthly inheritance which, under the old covenant, Israel obtained. The mention of the inheritance is held to justify the taking of the word in the next verse as "testament," the writer passing to the thought of a testamentary disposition, which is only of force after the death of the testator. Undoubtedly there is good ground for the analogy, and all the blessings of salvation which come to the believer may be considered as bequeathed by the Saviour in His death, and accruing to us because He has died. It has, in that sense, tacitly to be assumed that the testator lives again to be His own executor and to put us in possession of the blessings. Still, we think there is much to be said in favor of keeping to the sense of "covenant" even here, and taking the clause, which, rendered literally, is: "a covenant is of force (or firm) over the dead," as meaning that the covenant is established on the ground of sacrifice, that sacrifice representing the death of the maker of the covenant. The allusion may be further explained by a reference to Ge 15:9,10,17, which has generally been considered as illustrating the ancient Semitic method of making a covenant: the sacrificial animals being divided, and the parties passing between the pieces, implying that they deserved death if they broke the engagement. The technical Hebrew phrase for making a covenant is "to cut a covenant."

There is an interesting passage in Herodotus iii. 8, concerning an Arabian custom which seems akin to the old Hebrew practice. "The Arabians observe pledges as religiously as any people; and they make them in the following manner; when any wish to pledge their faith, a third person standing between the two parties makes an incision with a sharp stone in the palm of the hand, nearest the longest fingers of both the contractors; then taking some of the nap from the garments of each, he smears seven stones placed between him and the blood; and as he does this he invokes Bacchus and Urania. When this ceremony is completed, the person who pledges his faith binds his friends as sureties to the stranger, or the citizen, if the contract is made with a citizen; and the friends also hold themselves obliged to observe the engagement"—Cary’s translation.

Whatever the particular application of the word in Ge 15:17, the central idea in the passage is that death, blood-shedding, is necessary to the establishment of the covenant, and so he affirms that the first covenant was not dedicated without blood, and in proof quotes the passage already cited from Ex 24, and concludes that "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb 9:22).

See COVENANT, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

7. Relation to Jeremiah 31:31-34:

This new covenant established by Christ was foretold by the prophet Jeremiah, who uses the very word "new covenant" in describing it, and very likely Christ had that description in mind when He used the term, and meant His disciples to understand that the prophetic interpretation would in Him be realized.

There is no doubt that the author of He had the passage in mind, for he has led up to the previous statement by definitely quoting the whole statement of Jer 31:31-34. He had in Jer 7 spoken of the contrast between Christ s priesthood "after the order of Melchizedek" (verse 11) and the imperfect Aaronic priesthood, and he designates Jesus as "the surety of a better covenant" (verse 22). Then in Jer 8, emphasizing the thought of the superiority of Christ's heavenly high-priesthood, he declares that Christ is the "mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises" (verse 6). The first covenant, he says, was not faultless, otherwise there would have been no need for a second; but the fault was not in the covenant but in the people who failed to keep it, though perhaps there is also the suggestion that the external imposition of laws could not suffice to secure true obedience. "For finding fault with them he saith, Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." The whole passage (Jer 8-12) would repay careful study, but we need only note that not only is there prominence given to the great blessings of the covenant, perfect forgiveness and fullness of knowledge, but, as the very essence of the covenant—that which serves to distinguish it from the old covenant and at once to show its superiority and guarantee its permanence—there is this wonderful provision: "I will put my laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people." This at once shows the spirituality of the new covenant. Its requirements are not simply given in the form of external rules, but the living Spirit possesses the heart; the law becomes an internal dominating principle, and so true obedience is secured.

8. To Ezekiel:

Ezekiel had spoken to the same effect, though the word "new covenant" is not used in the passage, Eze 36:27: "I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep mine ordinances, and do them." In chapter 37 Ezekiel again speaks of the great blessings to be enjoyed by the people of God, including cleansing, walking in God's statutes, recognition as God's people, etc., and he distinctly says of this era of blessing: "I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an everlasting covenant with them" (verse 26). Other important foreshadowings of the new covenant are found in Isa 54:10; 55:3; 59:21; 61:8; Ho 2:18-23; Mal 3:1-4. We may well marvel at the spiritual insight of these prophets, and it is impossible to attribute their forecasts to natural genius; they can only be accounted for by Divine inspiration.

The writer to the Hebrews recurs again and again to this theme of the "New Covenant"; in Heb 10:16,17 he cites the words of Jeremiah already quoted about writing the law on their minds, and remembering their sins no more. In Heb 12:24, he speaks of "Jesus the mediator of a new covenant," and "the blood of sprinkling," again connecting the "blood" with the "covenant," and finally, in Heb 13:20, he prays for the perfection of the saints through the "blood of an eternal covenant."

9. Contrast of Old and New in 2 Corinthians 3:

In 2Co 3 Paul has an interesting and instructive contrast between the old covenant and the new. He begins it by saying that "our sufficiency is from God; who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new

covenant; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life" (2Co 3:5,6). The "letter" is the letter of the law, of the old covenant which could only bring condemnation, but the spirit which characterizes the new covenant gives life, writes the law upon the heart. He goes on to speak of the old as that "ministration of death" which nevertheless "came with glory" (2Co 3:7), and he refers especially to the law, but the new covenant is "the ministration of the spirit," the "ministration of righteousness" (2Co 3:8,9), and has a far greater glory than the old. The message of this "new covenant" is "the gospel of Christ." The glory of the new covenant is focused in Christ; rays forth from Him. The glory of the old dispensation was reflected upon the face of Moses, but that glory was transitory and so was the physical manifestation (2Co 3:13). The sight of the shining face of Moses awed the people of Israel and they revered him as leader specially favored of God (2Co 3:7-13). When he had delivered his message he veiled his face and thus the people could not see that the glow did not last; every time that he went into the Divine presence he took off the veil and afresh his face was lit up with the glory, and coming out with the traces of that glory lingering on his countenance he delivered his message to the people and again veiled his face (compare Ex 34:29-35), and thus the transitoriness and obscurity of the old dispensation were symbolized. In glorious contrast to that symbolical obscurity, the ministers of the gospel, of the new covenant, use great boldness of speech; the veil is done away in Christ (2Co 3:12 ff). The glory which comes through Him is perpetual, and fears no vanishing away.

Archibald McCaig

COVER; COVERING

kuv'-er, kuv'-er-ing: The translation of several Hebrew words. The covering of the ark (mikhceh, Ge 8:13) was possibly the lid of a hatchway (compare Mitchell, World before Abraham, 215).

To the sons of Kohath was assigned the task of caring for the furniture of the Tabernacle whenever the camp was moved, a suitable covering (kacah) of sealskin being designated for each of the specially sacred objects, the temple curtains also being used (Nu 4:8,9,11,12 ff).

Nu 19:15 (tsamidh) may refer to anything used as a lid or covering; Job 24:7; 31:19 (kecuth) refer to clothing or bed-covering.

Figurative: "Abaddon hath no covering"; (kecuth) from God (Job 26:6); "He will destroy .... the face of the covering (ha-loT) that covereth all peoples" (Isa 25:7). The removal of the veil, often worn as a token of mourning (compare 2Sa 19:4), signified the destruction of death.

W. N. Stearns

COVERED WAY

kuv'-erd wa (mecakh, "a covered walk"): Mentioned in 2Ki 16:18 (the King James Version "covert") as a gallery belonging to the temple, concerning the purpose of which opinions differ. Some consider it to

have been the place where the king stood or sat during the Sabbath services; others, a public place for teaching; others, the way by which the priest entered the sanctuary on the Sabbath.

COVERING, FOR THE HEAD

kuv'-er-ing, (peribolaion): Mentioned in the New Testament only in 1Co 11:15: "For her hair is given her for a covering," literally, "something cast round," probably equivalent to "veil" (which see). Read in the light of the context: "Every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head" (verse 5). The meaning would seem to be that Nature itself, in providing women with a natural veil, has taught the lesson underlying the prevailing custom, that woman should not be unveiled in the public assemblies.

George B. Eager

COVERT

kuv'-ert: Now seldom used, except for game, and then generally spelt "cover." "A covered way" (2Ki 16:18 the King James Version); also a shelter of any kind (Isa 4:6); "a hiding place," "a lair," "a hut" (Job 38:40); "a place of secrecy," "a secret way" (1Sa 25:20; Job 40:21; Ps 61:4; Isa 16:4; 32:2); "a den," "a lair" (Jer 25:38).

COVET

kuv'-et ('awah; zeloo, "to desire earnestly," "to set the heart and mind upon anything"): Used in two senses: good, simply to desire earnestly but legitimately. e.g. the King James Version 1Co 12:31; 14:39; bad, to desire unlawfully, or to secure illegitimately (batsa'; epithumeo, Ro 7:7; 13:9, etc.); hence, called "lust" (Mt 5:28; 1Co 10:6), "concupiscence" (the King James Version Ro 7:8; Col 3:5).

COVETOUSNESS

kuv'-et-us-nes: Has a variety of shades of meaning determined largely by the nature of the particular word used, or the context, or both. Following are some of the uses:

(1) To gain dishonestly (batsa'), e.g. the King James Version Ex 18:21; Eze 33:31.

(2) The wish to have more than one possesses, inordinately, of course (pleonexia), e.g. Lu 12:15; 1Th 2:5.

(3) An inordinate love of money philarguros, the King James Version Lu 16:14; 2Ti 3:2; philarguria, 1Ti 6:10; negative in Heb 13:5, the King James Version.

Covetousness is a very grave sin; indeed, so heinous is it that the Scriptures class it among the very gravest and grossest crimes (Eph 5:3). In Col 3:5 it is "idolatry," while in 1Co 6:10 it is set forth as excluding a man from heaven. Its heinousness, doubtless, is accounted for by its being in a very real sense the root of so many other forms of sin, e.g. departure from the faith (1Ti 6:9,10); lying (2Ki 5:22-25); theft (Jos 7:21); domestic trouble (Pr 15:27); murder (Eze 22:12); indeed, it leads to "many foolish and hurtful lusts" (1Ti 6:9). Covetousness has always been a very serious menace to mankind, whether in the Old Testament or New Testament period. It was one of the first sins that broke out after Israel had entered into the promised land (Achan, Jos 7); and also in the early Christian church immediately after its founding (Ananias and Sapphira, Ac 5); hence, so many warnings against it. A careful reading of the Old Testament will reveal the fact that a very great part of the Jewish law—such as its enactments and regulations regarding duties toward the poor, toward servants; concerning gleaning, usury, pledges, gold and silver taken during war—was introduced and intended to counteract the spirit of covetousness.

Eerdmans maintains (Expos, July, 1909) that the commandment, "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house" (Ex 20:17), meant to the Israelite that he should not take anything of his neighbor's possessions that were momentarily unprotected by their owner. Compare Ex 34:23 ff. Thus, it refers to a category of acts that is not covered by the commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." It is an oriental habit of mind from of old that when anyone sees abandoned goods which he thinks desirable, there is not the least objection to taking them, and Ex 20:17 b is probably an explanation of what is to be understood by "house" in Ex 20:17 a.

Examples of covetousness: Achan (Jos 7); Saul (1Sa 15:9,19); Judas (Mt 26:14,15); Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5:1-11); Balaam (2Pe 2:15 with Jude 1:11).

William Evans

COW; KINE

kou, kin (baqar (compare Arabic baqar, "cow"); 'eghlath baqar (Isa 7:21); parah (compare Arabic furar, "young of a sheep, goat, or cow"); paroth 'aloth (1Sa 6:7,10), "milch kine," from 'ul ," to suckle"; 'eleph): In Am 4:1, the term, "kine of Bashan," is applied to the voluptuous women of Samaria. In Ge 41:1-36 is the narration of Pharaoh's dream of the seven fat and seven lean kine. In Isaiah's vision (Isa 11:7) we have: "And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together." Cows do not seem to have been sacrificed. The sacrifice of the kine that brought the ark back from the Philistines (1Sa 6:14) was due to the exceptional circumstances.

See CALF; CATTLE.

Alfred Ely Day

COZ

koz (kots, "thorn"): A man of Judah (1Ch 4:8). the American Standard Revised Version has added the article, making the name Hakkoz without sufficient reason. The name occurs with the article (Ha-qots) in Ezr 2:61; Ne 3:4,21; 7:63, and 1Ch 24:10, but not with reference to the same person. Coz was of the tribe of Judah, while Hakkoz belonged to the family of Aaron.

COZBI

koz'-bi (kozbi, "deceitful"): A Midianite woman, distinguished as the daughter of Zur, "head of the people of a fathers' house in Midian." She was slain by Phinehas at Shittim in company with "Zimri, the son of Salu, a prince of a fathers' house among the Simeonites" (Nu 25:6-18).

COZEBA

ko-ze'-ba (1Ch 4:22).

See ACHZIB.

CRACKNEL

krak'nel: Occurs in 1Ki 14:3, where Jeroboam bids his wife go to Abijah to inquire concerning their son: "And take with thee ten loaves and cracknels" (King James Version margins "cakes," the English Revised Version "cracknels," the American Standard Revised Version "cakes"). The Hebrew word is niqquddim, from naqadh, "to prick" or "mark"; most probably cakes with holes pricked in them like our biscuits.

CRAFT; CRAFTINESS; CRAFTY

kraft, kraf'-ti-nes, kraf'-ti, (panourgia), (panourgos): The original meaning is that of "ability to do anything," universally applied in a bad sense to unscrupulous wickedness, that stops short of no measure, however reprehensible, in order to attain its purposes; then, in a modified form, to resourcefulness in wrong, cunning (Da 8:25; 2 Macc 12:24; the Revised Version, margin "jugglery"). In Lu 20:23, Jesus perceives "the craftiness" of His adversaries, i.e. the complicated network which they have laid to ensnare Him. The art with which a plot is concealed, and its direction to the ruin of others, are elements that enter into the meaning. Heinrici on 1Co 3:19 illustrates from Plato the distinction between craftiness and wisdom. There is a touch of humor in 2Co 12:16, when Paul speaks of his conduct toward the Corinthians as having been "crafty."

H. E. Jacobs

CRAFTS

I. SOURCES OF OUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE CRAFTS OF THE BIBLE

1. Written Records and Discoveries of Craftsmanship

(1) Jewish

(2) Canaanitish and Phoenician

(3) Assyrian and Babylonian

(4) Egyptian

2. Post-Biblical Writings

3. Present Methods in Bible Lands

II. CRAFTS MENTIONED IN THE BIBLE

1. Brickmaking

2. Carpentering (Wood-Working)

3. Carving (Engraving)

4. Ceramics

5. Dyeing and Cleansing

6. Embroidering (Needlework)

7. Glass-Making

8. Grinding

9. Mason Work

10. Metal-Working (Mining)

11. Oil-Making

12. Painting

13. Paper-Making

14. Perfume-Making

15. Plastering

16. Spinning and Weaving

17. Tanning

18. Tent-Making

19. Wine-Making

III. CRAFTSMEN

LITERATURE

I. Sources of Our Knowledge of the Crafts of the Bible.

1. Written Records and Discoveries of Craftsmanship:

Our knowledge of the arts and crafts of Bible times has come to us through two principal ways. First, from Biblical, Assyrian, Babylonian and Egyptian written records. Of these the Egyptian are the most illuminating. Second, from examples of ancient handicraft which have been buried and preserved through many centuries and brought to light again by modern discoveries.

(1) Jewish.

The chief written documents from which we may learn about Hebrew handicraft are the Bible records. A study of what few references there are leads us to believe that before the Israelites came in contact with the people of Canaan and Phoenicia they had not developed any considerable technical skill (1Ki 5:6; 1Ch 14:1; 2Ch 2:7,14; Ezr 3:7). Some of the simpler operations, such as the spinning and weaving of the common fabrics and the shaping of domestic utensils, were performed in the household (Ex 35:25,26) but the weaving and dyeing of fine fabrics, carving, inlaying, metal-working, etc., was the work of foreigners, or was learned by the Jews after the Exodus, from the dwellers in Palestine

The Jews, however, gradually developed skill in many of these crafts. It is believed that as early as Nehemiah’s time, Jewish craftsmen had organized into guilds (Ne 3:8,31,32). In post-Biblical times the

Jews obtained monopolies in some of the industries, as for example, glass-making and dyeing. These trades remained the secrets of certain families for generations. It is because of this secrecy and the mystery that surrounded these trades, and is still maintained in many places, that we know so little as to how they were conducted. Until recently the principal indigo dyers in Damascus were Jews, and the Jews shared with Moslem craftsmen the right to make glass. In some of the Syrian cities Jewish craftsmen are now outnumbering other native workmen in certain trades.

Few examples of Hebrew handicraft have been discovered by the archaeologists which shed much light upon early Hebrew work. Aside from the pottery of the Israelite period, and a few seals and coins, no traces of Hebrew workmanship remain. It is even doubtful how many of the above objects are really the work of this people.

(2) Canaanitish and Phoenician.

It is generally conceded that what technical skill the Hebrews acquired resulted from their contact with the Canaanites and Phoenicians. Frequent mention of the workmanship of these peoples is made in the Bible, but their own records are silent. Ezekiel’s account of the glories of Tyre (Eze 27) gives some idea of the reputation of that city for craftsmanship: "Thy builders have perfected thy beauty" (Eze 27:4); "Syria was thy merchant .... Damascus was thy merchant for the multitude of thy handiworks" (Eze 27:16,18). Adad-nirari III (812-783 BC), the Assyrian king, enumerates the tribute which he exacted from the king of Damascus.

"Variegated cloth, linen, an ivory bed, a seat of inlaid ivory, a table" were among the captured articles. These were probably Phoenician work.

Many examples of Phoenician craftsmanship have been discovered. These are characterized, from the standpoint of art, by a crudeness which distinguishes them from the more delicately and artistically wrought work of their teachers, the Babylonians and Egyptians. The credit remains, however, to the Phoenicians of introducing skilled workmanship into Palestine. The Phoenicians, too, furnished the means of intercourse between the Babylonians and Egyptians. From the very earliest times there was an interchange of commodities and ideas between the people of the Nile and those of the Tigris and Euphrates.

(3) Assyrian and Babylonian.

The Babylonians and Assyrians made few references to their own handicraft in their records, but the explorers of recent years have revealed many examples of the remarkable workmanship of the early inhabitants of Mesopotamia. In referring to a silver vase found in that country (Telloh), dating from the 4th millennium BC, Clay (see "Literature") says "the whole is exceedingly well rendered and indicates remarkable skill, which in no respect is less striking than that of Egyptian contemporaries in this handicraft." Jewelry, weapons, votive images, various utensils, tools of many kinds, statues in the hardest stones, delicately wrought, gems, dating from the times of Abraham and earlier, lead us to ask

when these people acquired their skill.

2. and 3. Egyptian and Post-Biblical Craftsmanship:

(4) Egyptian.

The written records of Egypt are doubly important, because they not only refer to the various crafts, but also illustrate the processes by drawings which can leave no doubt as to how the workmen accomplished their ends. The extensive explorations in Egypt have given to the world many priceless relics of craftsmanship, some of them dating from the very dawn of civilization. Among the ruins of early Syrian and Palestinian cities are found numerous objects witnessing to the skill of the Egyptians. These objects and the evidences of the influence of their work on the Phoenician arts show the part that the Egyptians played in moulding the ideas of the workmen who were chosen to build the temple at Jerusalem. In the following brief summary of the crafts mentioned in the Bible, it will be noticeable how well they may be illustrated by the monuments of the Nile country. To confirm the knowledge derived from the above sources, post-Biblical writings and some of the present-day customs in Bible lands are valuable. These will be mentioned in discussing the various crafts.

II. Crafts Mentioned in the Bible.

(For a more detailed treatment of the crafts see under separate articles.)

1. Brickmaking:

This industry probably originated in Babylonia, but the knowledge of the process was early carried to Egypt, where later the Hebrews, along with other captives, were driven to making the bricks of the Egyptian kings. The making of sun-dried bricks called for little skill, but the firing and glazing of bricks required trained workmen.

See BRICK.

2. Carpentering (Wood-Working):

Wood was extensively used by ancient builders. With the exception of the Egyptian antiquities, little remains but the records to indicate this fact. Numerous references are made to the carpenter work in building the temple and subsequent repairing of this structure (1Ki 5:6; 2Ch 2:3; 2Ki 12:11; 2Ch 24:12; 2Ki 22:6; Ezr 3:7; 4:1). David’s house and that of Solomon and his favorite wife were made partly of wood. In the story of the building of the tabernacle, wood-working is mentioned (Ex 25). The people of Tyre built ships of cypress, with masts of cedar wood and oars of oak (Eze 27:5,6). Idols were carved from wood (De 29:17; 2Ki 19:18; Isa 37:19; 45:20). The Philistines built a wooden cart to carry the ark (1Sa 6:7). Threshing instruments and yokes were made of wood (2Sa 24:22). Ezra read the law from a pulpit of wood (Ne 8:4). Solomon’s chariots were made of wood (So 3:9). Inlaid work, still a favorite

form of decoration in Syria, was used by the Phoenicians (Eze 27:6). How the ancient carpenters did their work can assumed from the Egyptian monuments. Some of the operations there pictured are still performed in the same ways.

See TOOLS; CARPENTER.

3. Carving (Engraving):

The terms "carving" and "engraving" are used interchangeably in translating Old Testament passages. The first mention made of engraved objects is the signet of Judah (Ge 38:18). The art of engraving on various hard objects, such as clay, bone, ivory, metals and precious stones, probably came from Mesopotamia. The Hebrews learned engraving from the Canaanites. The nature of this engraving is shown by the Assyrian cylinders and Egyptian scarabs. It is doubtful how many of the signets found in Palestine are Hebrew work, as the engraved devices are mostly Phoenician or Egyptian. From the earliest times it has been the custom in the Orient for men of affairs to carry constantly with them their signets. The seal was set in a ring, or, as was the case with Judah, and as the Arabs do today, it was worn on a cord suspended about the neck. One of the present-day sights in a Syrian city street is the engraver of signets, seated at his low bench ready to cut on one of his blank seals the buyer’s name or sign.

The second form of carving is suggested by the Decalogue (Ex 20:4). The commandment explains why sculpturing remained undeveloped among the Jews, as it has to this day among the Moslems. In spite of the commandment, however, cherubim were carved on the wooden fittings of the temple interior (1Ki 6:23).

Among the peoples with whom the Jews came in contact, stone-cutting had reached a high degree of perfection. No stone proved too hard for their tools. In Egyptian and Phoenician tombs the carving was often done on plastered surfaces.

See CARVING.

4. Ceramics:

Both the Egyptians and Babylonians were skilled in molding and baking objects of clay. The early Babylonian records consist of burnt clay tablets. Glazed bricks formed an important decorative feature. In Egypt, idols, scarabs and amulets were often made of fired clay, glazed or unglazed. By far the most important branch of ceramic art was the making of jars for holding water or other liquids. These jars have been used throughout the East from earliest times. The Jews learned what they knew about this art from the Phoenicians.

See POTTERY.

5. Dyeing and Cleansing:

Dyeing is one of the oldest of the crafts. The only references to the act of dyeing in the Bible are

(a) in connection with the dyed skins of animals (Ex 25:5; 26:14), and

(b) Jud 5:30.

That it was a highly developed trade is implied in the many other references to dyed stuffs both in the Bible and in profane literature. Cleansing was done by the fuller, who was probably a dyer also.

See COLOR; DYE; FULLER.

6. Embroidering (Needlework):

Very little is known of the work of embroidering, further than that it was the working-in of color designs on cloth. In Eze 27:7 we learn that it was one of the exports of Egypt.

See EMBROIDERY.

7. Glass-Making:

In De 33:19 "hidden treasures of the sand" is interpreted by some to mean the making of glass objects from the sand. There can be no question about the Hebrews being acquainted with glass-making, as its history extends back to very early times. The Egyptians and Phoenicians made bottles, glass beads, idols, etc. These objects are among those usually found in the tombs. Glass beads of very early manufacture were found in the mound at Gezer. Some of the pigments used for painting were made of powdered colored glass. In the New Testament we read of the "sea of glass like unto crystal" (Re 4:6).

See GLASS. 8. Grinding:

Grinding was a domestic task and can hardly be classed as one of the crafts. When flour was needed, the housewife, or more likely the servant, rubbed the wheat or barley between two millstones (see MILLSTONE) or, with a rounded river stone, crushed the wheat on a large flat stone. It is still a common custom in Syria and Palestine for two women to work together as indicated in Mt 24:41 and Lu 17:35. Grinding of meal was a menial task, considered the employment of a concubine; hence, setting Samson to grinding at the mill was intended as a disgrace.

9. Mason Work:

The rhythmic sound of the stone cutter at his work never ceases in the prosperous oriental city. It is more common today, however, than in the earlier centuries when only high officials could afford stone

houses. Frequently only the temple or shrines or tombs of a city were made of stone. As such buildings were very common, and much attention was paid to every detail of their construction, there was developed an efficient corps of masons, especially in Egypt and Syria. When the Israelites abandoned their nomadic life, among the first things that they planned were permanent places of worship. As these developed into structures more pretentious than mere piles of stones, the builders naturally resorted to the skill of the master builders of the country. A visitor to Jerusalem may still see the work of the ancient masons. The so-called Solomon's quarries under the city, the great drafted stones of the temple area, belong to an early date. The very shape of the masons' tools may be determined from the marks on the stones.

See MASON.

10. Metal-Working (Mining):

Among the oldest objects that have been preserved are those of silver, gold and bronze. These are proof that the ancients understood the various processes of mining, smelting, refining and working of metals.

See MINING; METAL WORKING.

11. Oil-Making:

The oil referred to in the Bible is olive oil. Pliny mentions many other oils which were extracted in Egypt. The oils were usually extracted by first crushing the fruit and then pressing the crushed mass. At Gezer, Tell es Cafi and other ancient ruins old oil presses have been discovered.

See OIL.

12. Painting:

One who has visited the tombs and temples of Egypt will never forget the use which the ancient Egyptian painters made of colors. The otherwise somber effect produced by expansive plain walls was overcome by sculpturing, either in relief or intaglio, on a coating of stucco, and then coloring these engravings in reds, yellows, greens and blues. Architectural details were also painted. The capitals of columns and the columns themselves received special attention from the painter. Colors were similarly used by the Greeks and Phoenicians. In the Sidon tombs, at Palmyra and similar ruins, traces of painting are still evident.

See PAINTING.

13. Paper-Making:

The word "paper" occurs twice, once in the Old Testament (Isa 19:7 the King James Version) and once

in New Testament (2Jo 1:12). In Isa 19:7 the Revised Version (British and American) renders "paper reeds," "meadows." PAPYRUS (which see) occurs in Isa 18:2 and the Revised Version, margin of Ex 2:3. The nearest approach to our paper which the ancients possessed was that made from a species of papyrus. The process consisted in spreading out, side by side, long strips of the inner lining of the papyrus reed, then over these other strips at right angles to the first, afterward soaking with some adhesive material and finally pressing and drying. Sheets made in this way were fastened together with glue into a long scroll. The Greek for papyrus plant is "biblos," from which the English word "Bible" is derived. Parchment, leather and leaves were also used as paper. The natives of Syria and Palestine still call a sheet of paper a "leaf" (Arabic waraqet).

14. Perfume-Making:

The art of perfume-making dates back to the ancient Egyptians. In Ex 30:35 we have the first mention of scented anointing oils. The perfumers' (the King James Version "confectioner" or "apothecary") products were used

(a) for religious rites as offerings and to anoint the idols and

(b) for personal use on the body or clothes. Some perfumes were powders (incense); others were scented oils or fats (ointments).

See PERFUME.

15. Plastering:

(The King James Version "Plaistering.") The trade of plastering dates back to the beginning of the history of building. There were two reasons for using plastering or stucco:

(a) to render the buildings more resisting to the weather and

(b) to make the surfaces more suitable for decoration by engraving or painting.

See PLASTER.

16. Spinning and Weaving:

The arts of spinning and weaving were early practiced in the household (Ex 35:25). Many different fibers were spun and woven into cloth. Fabrics of wool, cotton, flax, silk, wood fiber have been preserved from Bible times. In the more progressive communities, the weaving of the fabrics was taken over by the weavers who made it their profession. In 1Ch 4:21 it is stated that many of the families of the house of Asbea were workers in fine linen. The modern invasion of European manufacturers has not

yet driven out the weavers who toil at looms much like those described by the ancient Egyptian drawings.

See SPINNING; WEAVING.

17. Tanning:

Although it is known that tanning was practiced, the only reference to this trade mentioned in the Bible is to Simon the tanner (Ac 9:43; 10:6,32). Leather girdles are mentioned in 2Ki 1:8; Mt 3:4. Relics taken from the tombs show that the ancients understood the various methods for preserving skins which are used in present-day practice.

See TANNER.

18. Tent-Making:

We think of Paul as the tent-maker. The tents which he made however were probably not like those so frequently referred to in the Old Testament. Tents in Paul's time were made from Cilician cloth. Paul's work was probably the sewing together of the proper lengths of cloth and the attaching of ropes and loops. In Old Testament times the tents were made of strips of coarse goat's hair cloth or of the skins of animals.

See TENT.

19. Wine-Making:

This article is being written within sound of festivities about the winepresses of Mt. Lebanon where men and women are gathered for the annual production of wine and molasses (Arabic, dibs). Their process is so like that of Bible times that one is transported in thought to similar festivities that must have attended the wine-making even so far back as the early Egyptian kings. That these workers understood the precautions necessary for procuring a desirable product is evidenced by early writings. The choice of proper soil for the vineyards, the adding of preservatives to keep the wine, boiling the juice to kill undesirable ferments, guarding against putting new wine into old bottles, are examples of their knowledge of wine-making.

See WINE PRESS.

III. Craftsmen.

Craftsmen were early segregated into groups. A trade usually remained in a family. This is true to some extent in the East today. In such cities as Beirut, Damascus, or Aleppo the shops of the craftsmen of a

given trade will be found grouped together. There is a silver and goldsmiths' market (Arabic suq), an iron market, a dyeing quarter, etc. Jewish craftsmen in early times sat separately in the synagogues. Some crafts were looked upon with disfavor, especially those which brought men in contact with women, as for example, the trade of goldsmith, carder, weaver, fuller or tanner. There was a fellow-feeling among craftsmen referred to by Isaiah (Isa 41:6,7). This same feeling is observed among Syrian workmen today. The Arab has many phrases of encouragement for a man at his work, such as, "Peace to your hands," "May God give you strength." A crowd of men pulling at a pulley rope, for example, shout or sing together as they pull.

LITERATURE.

Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in Sardinia, Judea, etc.; History of Art in Ancient Egypt; History of Art in Phoenicia and Cyprus; Wilkinson, The Ancient Egyptians; Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer; Standard Dict. of the Bible; Bliss, Macalister and Wunsch, Excavations in Palestine; Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century; Harper, The Bible and Modern Discoveries; Delitzsch, Jewish Artisan Life, etc.; Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel; Jewish Encyclopedia.

James A. Patch

CRAG

krag (shen (1Sa 7:12; 14:4; Job 39:28 the King James Version and the English Revised Version)): In a mountainous country composed of sedimentary rocks, like the cretaceous rocks of Palestine, cliffs are formed on a slope where hard strata are underlaid by softer strata. The soft strata wear away more rapidly, undermining the hard strata above them, which for a time project, but finally break off by vertical joint planes, the fragments rolling down to form the talus slope at the foot of the cliff. As the breaking off of the undermined hard strata proceeds irregularly, there are left projecting crags, sometimes at the top of the cliff, and sometimes lower down. Two such crags (shen ha-cela', "sharp rock," the Revised Version (British and American) "rocky crag"), which were given particular names, Bozez and Seneh, marked the scene of the exploit of Jonathan described in 1Sa 14. Conder failed to identify the crags, and it has been proposed to alter the text rather extensively to make it read: "wall of rock" instead of "crag" (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Michmash"). Such rocks form safe resting-places for birds of prey, as it is said of the eagle in Job 39:28 English Revised Version: " She dwelleth on the rock and hath her lodging there, Upon the crag of the rock, and the stronghold." Alfred Ely Day

CRANE

kran ('aghur; geranos; Latin Grus cinerea): A bird of the family gruidae. The crane is mentioned twice in the Bible: once on account of its voice (Isa 38:14: "Like a swallow or a crane, so did I chatter"); again because of the unforgettable picture these birds made in migration (Jer 8:7): "Yea, the stork in the

heavens knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle-dove and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the law of Yahweh." Some commentators have adduced reasons for dropping the crane from the ornithology of the Bible, but this never should be permitted. They were close relatives of stork, heron and ibis; almost as numerous as any of these, and residents of Palestine, except in migration. The two quotations concerning them fit with their history, and point out the two features that made them as noticeable as any birds of Palestine. Next to the ostrich and pelican they were the largest birds, having a wing sweep of 8 ft. from tip to tip and standing 4 ft. in height. In migration such immense flocks passed over Palestine as to darken the sky, and when they crossed the Red Sea they appeared to sweep from shore to shore, and so became the most noticeable migratory bird, for which reason, no doubt, they were included in Isaiah's reference to spring migration with the beloved doves, used in sacrifice and for caged pets, and with the swallows that were held almost sacred because they homed in temples. Not so many of them settled in Palestine as of the storks, but large flocks lived in the wilderness South of Jerusalem, and a few pairs homed near water as far north as Merom. The grayish-brown cranes were the largest, and there were also a crested, and a white crane. They nested on the ground or in trees and laid two large eggs, differing with species. The eggs of the brown bird were a light drab with brown speckles, and those of the white, rough, pale-blue with brown splotches. They were not so affectionate in pairs or to their young as storks, but were average parents. It is altogether probable that they were the birds intended by Isaiah, because they best suited his purpose, the crane and the swallow being almost incessant talkers among birds. The word "chatter," used in the Bible, exactly suits the notes of a swallow, but is much too feeble to be used in describing the vocalizing of the crane. They migrated in large wedge-shaped companies and cried constantly on wing. They talked incessantly while at the business of living, and even during the watches of the night they scarcely ceased passing along word that all was well, or sending abroad danger signals. The Arabs called the cry of the cranes "bellowing." We usually express it by whooping or trumpeting. Any of these words is sufficiently expressive to denote an unusual voice, used in an unusual manner, so that it appealed to the prophet as suitable for use in a strong comparison.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CRASHING

krash'-ing (shebher): This word, meaning "a breach," figuratively "destruction," is translated "crashing" in Ze 1:10: "a great crashing from the hills," representing the doom to fall on evil-doers in Jerusalem, as the enemy advanced against the city from the north.

CRATES

kra'-tez (Krates), governor of the Cyprians, left as deputy of Sostratus when the latter, who was governor of Jerusalem, was summoned to Antioch by Antiochus Epiphanes, in consequence of a dispute with Menelaus (2 Macc 4:29). As Cyprus was not at the time in the possession of Antiochus, the words have been generally taken to mean Krates "who had formerly been, or afterward was, governor of the Cyprians." The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) translates the Greek into "Sostratus

autem praelatus est Cypriis."

CREATION

kre-a’-shun (bara’ "to create"; ktisis, "that which is created," "creature"):

1. Creation as Abiding

2. Mistaken Ideas

3. True Conception

4. The Genesis Cosmogony

5. Matter not Eternal

6. "Wisdom" in Creation

7. A Free, Personal Act

8. Creation and Evolution

9. Is Creation Eternal?

10. Creation ex nihilo

11. From God’s Will

12. Error of Pantheism

13. First Cause a Necessary Presupposition

14. The End—the Divine Glory

LITERATURE

1. Creation as Abiding:

Much negative ground has been cleared away for any modern discussion of the doctrine of creation. No idea of creation can now be taken as complete which does not include, besides the world as at first

constituted, all that to this day is in and of creation. For God creates not being that can exist independently of Him, His preserving agency being inseparably connected with His creative power. We have long ceased to think of God's creation as a machine left, completely made, to its own automatic working. With such a doctrine of creation, a theistic evolution would be quite incompatible.

2. Mistaken Ideas:

Just as little do we think of God's creative agency, as merely that of a First Cause, linked to the universe from the outside by innumerable sequences of causes and effects. Nature in her entirety is as much His creation today as she ever was. The dynamic ubiquity of God, as efficient energy, is to be affirmed. God is still All and in All, but this in a way sharply distinguished from pantheistic views, whether of the universe as God, or of God as the universe. Of His own freedom He creates, so that Gnostic theories of natural and necessary emanation are left far behind. Not only have the "carpenter" and the "gardener" theories—with, of course, the architect or world-builder theory of Plato—been dismissed; not only has the conception of evolution been proved harmonious with creative end, plan, purpose, ordering, guidance; but evolutionary science may itself be said to have given the thought of theistic evolution its best base or grounding. The theistic conception is, that the world—that all cosmic existences, substances, events—depend upon God.

3. True Conception:

The doctrine of creation—of the origin and persistence, of all finite existences—as the work of God, is a necessary postulation of the religious consciousness. Such consciousness is marked by deeper insight than belongs to science. The underlying truth is the anti-patheistic one, that the energy and wisdom—by which that, which was not, became—were, in kind, other than its own. For science can but trace the continuity of sequences in all Nature, while in creation, in its primary sense, this law of continuity must be transcended, and the world viewed solely as product of Divine Intelligence, immanent in its evolution. For God is the Absolute Reason, always immanent in the developing universe. Apart from the cosmogonic attempts at the beginning of Genesis, which are clearly religious and ethical in scope and character, the Old Testament furnishes no theoretic account of the manner and order in which creative process is carried on.

4. The Genesis Cosmogony:

The early chapters of Genesis were, of course, not given to reveal the truths of physical science, but they recognize creation as marked by order, continuity, law, plastic power of productiveness in the different kingdoms, unity of the world and progressive advance. The Genesis cosmogony teaches a process of becoming, as well as a creation (see EVOLUTION). That cosmogony has been recognized by Haeckel as meritoriously marked by the two great ideas of separation or differentiation, and of progressive development or perfecting of the originally simple matter. The Old Testament presents the conception of time-worlds or successive ages, but its real emphasis is on the energy of the Divine Word, bringing into being things that did not exist.

5. Matter not Eternal:

The Old Testament and the New Testament, in their doctrine of creation, recognize no eternal matter before creation. We cannot say that the origin of matter is excluded from the Genesis account of creation, and this quite apart from the use of bard', as admitting of material and means in creation. But it seems unwise to build upon Genesis passages that afford no more than a basis which has proved exegetically insecure. The New Testament seems to favor the derivation of matter from the non-existent —that is to say, the time-worlds were due to the effluent Divine Word or originative Will, rather than to being built out of God's own invisible essence. So the best exegesis interprets Heb 11:3.

6. "Wisdom" in Creation:

In Old Testament books, as the Psalms, Proverbs, and Jeremiah, the creation is expressly declared to be the work of Wisdom—a Wisdom not disjoined from Goodness, as is yet more fully brought out in the Book of Job. The heavens declare the glory of God, the world manifests or reveals Him to our experience, as taken up and interpreted by the religious consciousness. The primary fact of the beginning of the time-worlds—the basal fact that the worlds came into being by the Word of God—is something apprehensible only by the power of religious faith, as the only principle applicable to the case (Heb 11:3). Such intuitive faith is really an application of first principles in the highest—and a truly rational one (see LOGOS). In creation, God is but expressing or acting out the conscious Godhood that is in Him. In it the thought of His absolute Wisdom is realized by the action of His perfect Love. It is philosophically necessary to maintain that God, as the Absolute Being, must find the end of creation in Himself. If the end were external to, and independent of, Him, then would He be conditioned thereby.

7. A Free, Personal Act:

What the religious consciousness is concerned to maintain is, the absolute freedom of God in the production of the universe, and the fact that He is so much greater than the universe that existence has been by Him bestowed on all things that do exist. The Scriptures are, from first to last, shot through with this truth. Neither Kant nor Spencer, from data of self-consciousness or sense-perception, can rise to the conception of creation, for they both fail to reach the idea of Divine Personality. The inconceivability of creation has been pressed by Spencer, the idea of a self-existent Creator, through whose agency it has been made, being to him unthinkable. As if it were not a transparent sophism, which Spencer's own scientific practice refuted, that a hypothesis may not have philosophical or scientific valuee, because it is what we call unthinkable or inconceivable. As if a true and sufficient cause were not enough, or a Divine act of will were not a vera causa. Dependent existence inevitably leads thought to demand existence that is not dependent.

8. Creation and Evolution:

Creation is certainly not disproved by evolution, which does not explain the origin of the homogeneous stuff itself, and does not account for the beginning of motion within it. Of the original creative action,

lying beyond mortal ken or human observation, science—as concerned only with the manner of the process—is obviously in no position to speak. Creation may, in an important sense, be said not to have taken place in time, since time cannot be posited prior to the existence of the world. The difficulties of the ordinary hypothesis of a creation in time can never be surmounted, so long as we continue to make eternity mean simply indefinitely prolonged time. Augustine was, no doubt, right when, from the human standpoint, he declared that the world was not made in time, but with time. Time is itself a creation simultaneous with, and conditioned by, world-creation and movement. To say, in the ordinary fashion, that God created in time, is apt to make time appear independent of God, or God dependent upon time. Yet the time-forms enter into all our psychological experience, and a concrete beginning is unthinkable to us.

9. Is Creation Eternal?:

The time-conditions can be transcended only by some deeper intuition than mere logical insight can supply—by such intuitive endeavor, in fact, as is realized in the necessary belief in the self-existent God If such an eternal Being acts or creates, He may be said to act or create in eternity; and it is legitimate enough, in such wise, to speak of His creative act as eternal. This seems preferable to the position of Origen, who speculatively assumed an eternal or unbeginning activity for God as Creator, because the Divine Nature must be eternally self-determined to create in order to the manifestation of its perfections. Clearly did Aquinas perceive that we cannot affirm an eternal creation impossible, the creative act not falling within our categories of time and space. The question is purely one of God’s free volition, in which—and not in "nothing"—the Source of the world is found.

10. Creation ex nihilo:

This brings us to notice the frequently pressed objection that creation cannot be out of nothing, since out of nothing comes nothing. This would mean that matter is eternal. But the eternity of matter, as something other than God, means its independence of God, and its power to limit or condition Him. We have, of course, no direct knowledge of the origin of matter, and the conception of its necessary self-existence is fraught with hopeless difficulties and absurdities. The axiom, that out of nothing nothing comes, is not contradicted in the case of creation. The universe comes from God; it does not come from nothing. But the axiom does not really apply to the world’s creation, but only to the succession of its phenomena. Entity does not spring from non-entity. But there is an opposite and positive truth, that something presupposes something, in this case rather some One—aliquis rather than aliquid.

11. From God’s Will:

It is enough to know that God has in Himself the powers and resources adequate for creating, without being able to define the ways in which creation is effected by Him. It is a sheer necessity of rational faith or spiritual reason that the something which conditions the world is neither hule, nor elemental matter, but personal Spirit or originative Will. We have no right to suppose the world made out of nothing, and then to identify, as Erigena did, this "nothing" with God’s own essence. What we have a right to

maintain is, that what God creates or calls into being owes its existence to nothing save His will alone, Ground of all actualities. Preexistent Personality is the ground and the condition of the world's beginning.

12. Error of Pantheism:

In this sense, its beginning may be said to be relative rather than absolute. God is always antecedent to the universe—its prius, Cause and Creator. It remains an effect, and sustains a relation of causal dependence upon Him. If we say, like Cousin, that God of necessity creates eternally, we run risk of falling into Spinozistic pantheism, identifying God, in excluding from Him absolute freedom in creation, with the impersonal and unconscious substance of the universe. Or if, with Schelling, we posit in God something which is not God—a dark, irrational background, which original ground is also the ground of the Divine Existence—we may try to find a basis for the matter of the universe, but we are in danger of being merged—by conceptions tinged with corporeity—in that form of pantheism to which God is but the soul of the universe.

The universe, we feel sure, has been caused; its existence must have some ground; even if we held a philosophy so idealistic as to make the scheme of created things one grand illusion, an illusion so vast would still call for some explanatory Cause. Even if we are not content with the conception of a First Cause, acting on the world from without and antecedently in time, we are not yet freed from the necessity of asserting a Cause. An underlying and determining Cause of the universe would still need to be postulated as its Ground.

13. First Cause a Necessary Presupposition:

Even a universe held to be eternal would need to be accounted for—we should still have to ask how such a universe came to be. Its endless movement must have direction and character imparted to it from some immanent ground or underlying cause. Such a self-existent and eternal World-Ground or First Cause is, by an inexorable law of thought, the necessary correlate of the finitude, or contingent character of the world. God and the world are not to be taken simply as cause and effect, for modern metaphysical thought is not content with such a mere ens extra-mundanum for the Ground of all possible experience. God, self-existent Cause of the ever-present world and its phenomena, is the ultimate Ground of the possibility of all that is.

14. The End—the Divine Glory:

Such a Deity, as causa sui, creatively bringing forth the world out of His own potence, cannot be allowed to be an arbitrary resting-place, but a truly rational Ground, of hidest thought. Nor can His Creation be allowed to be an aimless and mechanical universe: it is shot through with end or purpose that tends to reflect the glory of the eternal and personal God, who is its Creator in a full and real sense. But the Divine. action is not dramatic: of His working we can truly say, with Isa 45:15, "Verily thou art a God that thyself." As creation becomes progressively disclosed to us, its glory, as revealing God, ought

to excite within us an always deeper sense of the sentiment of Ps 8:1,9, "O Yahweh our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!"

See also ANTHROPOLOGY; EARTH; WORLD.

LITERATURE.

James Orr, Christian View of God and the World, 1st edition, 1893; J. Iverach, Christianity and Evolution, 1894; S. Harris, God the Creator and Lord of All, 1897; A. L. Moore, Science and the Faith, 1889; B. P. Bowne, Studies in Theism, new edition, 1902; G. P. Fisher, Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief, new edition, 1902; J. Lindsay, Recent Advances in Theistic Philosophy of Religion, 1897; A. Dorner, Religionsphilosophie, 1903; J. Lindsay, Studies in European Philosophy, 1909; O. Dykes, The Divine Worker in Creation and Providence, 1909; J. Lindsay, The Fundamental Problems of Metaphysics, 1910.

James Lindsay

CREATOR

kre-a’-ter (ktistes, 1Pe 4:19): The distinctive characteristic of Deity, as the Creator, is that He is the Cause of the existent universe—Cause of its being, not merely of its evolution or present arrangements.

1. God as Creator:

The doctrine of His being the Creator implies, that is to say, that He is the real and the exclusive Agent in the production of the world. For, as Herder remarked, the thought of the Creator is the most fruitful of all our ideas. As Creator, He is the Unconditioned, and the All-conditioning, Being. The universe is thus dependent upon Him, as its causative antecedent. He calls it, as Aquinas said, "according to its whole substance," into being, without any presupposed basis. His power, as Creator, is different in kind from finite power. But the creative process is not a case of sheer almightiness, creating something out of nothing, but an expression of God, as the Absolute Reason, under the forms of time and space, causality and finite personality. In all His work, as Creator, there is no incitement from without, but it rather remains an eternal activity of self- manifestation on the part of a God who is Love.

2. Purpose in Creation:

God’s free creative action is destined to realize archetypal ends and ideals, which are peculiar to Himself. For thought cannot be content with the causal category under which He called the world into being, but must run on to the teleological category, wherein He is assumed to have created with a purpose, which His directive agency will see at last fulfilled. As Creator, He is distinct from the universe, which is the product of the free action of His will. This theistic postulation of His freedom, as Creator, rules out all theories of necessary emanation. His creative action was in no way necessarily

eternal—not even necessary to His own blessedness or perfection, which must be held as already complete in Himself. To speak, as Professor James does, of "the stagnant felicity of the Absolute's own perfection" is to misconceive the infinite plenitude of His existence, and to place Him in a position of abject and unworthy dependence upon an eternal activity of world-making.

3. Relation to Time:

God's action, as Creator, does not lower our conception of His changelessness, for it is a gratuitous assumption to suppose either that the will to create was a sudden or accidental thing, or that He could not will a change, without, in any proper sense, changing His will. Again, grave difficulties cluster around the conception of His creative thought or purpose as externalized in time, the chief source of the trouble being, as is often imperfectly realized, that, in attempting to view things as they were when time began, we are really trying to get out of, and beyond, experience, to the thinking of which time is an indispensable condition. God's work as Creator must have taken place in time, since the world must be held as no necessary element in the Absolute Life.

4. Christ in Creation:

The self-determined action of the Divine Will, then, is to be taken as the ultimate principle of the cosmos. Not to any causal or meta-physical necessity, but to Divine or Absolute Personality, must the created world be referred. "Of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things" (Ro 11:36). This creative action of God is mediated by Christ—by whom "were all things created, in the heavens and upon the earth, things visible and things invisible, whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers; all things have been created through him, and unto him" (Col 1:16).

See CREATION.

James Lindsay

CREATURE

kre'-tur: The word "creature," as it occurs in the New Testament, is the translation and also the exact English equivalent of the Greek ktisis, or ktisma, from ktizo, "to create." In the Old Testament, on the other hand, it stands for words which have in the original no reference to creation, but which come from other roots. Nephesh, "living creature" (literally, "a breathing thing"), occurs in the accounts of the Creation and the Flood and at the close of the lists of clean and unclean animals in Le 11:46. Chay, "living creature" (literally, "a living thing"), occurs 13 times in Eze 1; 3 and 10 (see CREATURE, LIVING). Sherets, "moving creature" (literally, "a swarming thing," generally rendered "creeping thing," which see), occurs once in Ge 1:20. 'Ochim, "doleful creatures," occurs once only in Isa 13:21. It appears to be an onomatopoetic word referring to the mournful sounds emitted by the animals in question. From the context it is fair to suppose that owls may be the animals referred to.

See OWL; CREATION.

Alfred Ely Day

CREATURE, LIVING

(chayyah; zoon): "Living creature" (chayyah) is the designation of each of the composite figures in Ezekiel’s visions (Eze 1:5,13 ff; 3:13; 10:15,17,20) and, the Revised Version (British and American), of the similar beings in the visions of the Apocalypse, instead of the extremely unfortunate translation of zoon in the King James Version by "beasts" (Re 4:6 ff; 5:6 ff; 6:1 ff; 7:11; 14:3; 15:7; 19:4), which, however, went back to Wycliff, in whose time the word had not the low meaning which "beast," "beastly" have with us; hence, he translates 1Co 15:44, "It is sowen beestli body," meaning simply animal (see Trench’s Select Glossary); in Re "the beasts of the earth," the "beasts" that came up, the notable "beast" that men worshipped, represent the Greek therion, "a wild beast."

The "living creatures" in Ezekiel’s vision (Eze 1:5 ff) were four in number, "with the general appearance of a man, but each with four faces and four wings, and straight legs with the feet of an ox. Under their wings are human hands, and these wings are so joined that they never require to turn. The front face is that of a man; right and left of this are the faces of a lion and (of) an ox, and behind, that of an eagle .... out of the midst of them gleam fire, torches, lightnings, and connected with them are four wheels that can turn in every direction, called whirling wheels (Eze 10:12,13). Like the creatures, these are alive, covered with eyes, the sign of intelligence; the spirit of the living creatures is in them. They are afterward discovered by the prophet to be cherubim" (Schultz, Old Testament Theology, II, 233). See CHERUBIM. In Ezekiel’s vision they seem to be the bearers of the throne and glory of God; the bearers of His presence and of His revelation (Eze 9:3; 10:3). They also sound forth His praise (Eze 3:12; 10:2). (See Schultz as above.)

The four living creatures in Re 4:6 are not under the throne but "in the midst of the throne" (the American Revised Version, margin "before"; see Re 7:17; compare Re 5:6) and "round about the throne." They are also cherubim, and seem to represent the four beings that stand at the head of the four divisions of the creation; among the untamed animals the lion; among cattle the calf or ox; among birds the eagle; among all created beings the man. It gives "a perfect picture of true service, which should be as brave as the lion, patient as the ox, aspiring as the eagle, intelligent as man" (Milligan in the place cited.). They represent the powers of Nature—of the creation, "full of eyes" as denoting its permeation with the Divine Reason, the wings signifying its constant, ready service, and the unceasing praise the constant doing of God’s will. The imagery is founded on Ezekiel as that had been modified in apocalyptic writings and as it was exalted in the mind of the Seer of Patmos.

W. L. Walker

CREDIT

kred’-it (pisteuein; 1 Macc 10:46 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "gave no credence"; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:6 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "trusted"; 1 Macc 1:30 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "credence"): In the modern commercial sense the noun "credit" does not occur in the canonical Scriptures or in the Apocrypha.

CREDITOR

kred’-i-ter:

(a) nosheh, participle of nashah: Ex 22:24 (English translation: 25); 2Ki 4:1; Isa 50:1; translated "extortioner," Ps 109:11; "taker of usury," Isa 24:2 the King James Version;

(b) malweh, participle of lawah, Isa 24:2 the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version "lender";

(c) ba‘al mashsheh yadho: "lord of the loan of his hand," De 15:2;

(d) danistes: Lu 7:41, "creditor" the King James Version, "lender" the Revised Version (British and American); compare further danistos, Sirach 29:28, "lender" the King James Version, "money-lender" the Revised Version (British and American):

In the ideal social system of the Old Testament, debts are incurred only because of poverty, and the law protected the poor debtor from his creditor, who in Ex 22:25 is forbidden to demand interest, and in De 15:2 to exact payment in view of the nearness of the year of release. 2Ki 4:1 shows that the actual practice was not so considerate, and in consequence the creditor fell into bad repute. In Ps 109:11 he is the extortioner; in Pr 29:13 the oppressor is evidently the creditor, though a different word is used; compare also Pr 22:7. In Sirach 29:28 the importunity of the creditor is one of the hardships of the poor man of understanding. The actual practice of the Jews may be gathered from Ne 5:1 ff; Jer 34:8 ff; and Sirach 29:1-11.

See also DEBT.

Walter R. Betteridge

CREED; CREEDS

kred:

I. SCRIPTURAL BASIS

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the New Testament—Gospels

3. In the Epistles

(1) Paul

(2) Later Writings

(3) Hebrews

II. HISTORICAL FORMS

1. The Apostles’ Creed

2. The Nicene Creed

(1) Origin, Date, Character

(2) "Filioque" Clause

3. The Athanasian Creed

(1) Authorship

(2) Question of Imposture

(3) Value and Features

4. The Reformation Creeds

LITERATURE

By "creed" we understand the systematic statement of religious faith; and by the creeds of the Christian church we mean the formal expression of "the faith which was delivered unto the saints." The word is derived from the first word of the Latin versions of the Apostles’ Creed, and the name is usually applied to those formulas known as the Apostles’, the Nicene and the Athanasian creeds.

In this article we shall first indicate the Scriptural foundation and rudimentary Biblical statements upon which the distinctive dogmas of the church are based; and, secondly, briefly describe the origin and

nature of the three most important symbols of belief which have dominated Christian thought.

I. Scriptural Basis.

There are three forms in which the religious instinct naturally expresses itself—in a ritual, a creed and a life. Men first seek to propitiate the Deity by some outward act and express their devotion in some external ceremony. Next they endeavor to explain their worship and to find a rationale of it in certain facts which they formulate into a confession; and lastly, not content with the outward act or the verbal interpretation of it, they attempt to express their religion in life.

Pagan religion first appears in the form of a rite. The worshipper was content with the proper performance of a ceremony and was not, in the earliest stage at least, concerned with an interpretation of his act. The myths, which to some extent were an attempt to rationalize ritual, may be regarded as the earliest approach to a formulated statement of belief. But inasmuch as the myths of early pagan religion are not obligatory upon the reason or the faith of the worshipper, they can scarcely be regarded as creeds. Pagan religion, strictly speaking, has no theology and having no real historical basis of facts does not possess the elements of a creed. In this respect it is distinguished from revealed religion. This latter rests upon facts, the meaning and interpretation of which are felt to be necessary to give to revelation its values and authority.

1. In the Old Testament:

Even in the Old Testament there are not wanting the germs of a creed. In the Decalogue we have the beginnings of the formulation of belief, and in the proclamation, "Hear, O Israel: Yahweh our God is one Yahweh" (De 6:4), we have what may be regarded as the symbol of the Old Testament faith and the earliest attempt to enunciate a doctrine.

2. In the New Testament—Gospels:

It is to the New Testament, however, we must turn to find the real indications of such a statement of belief as may be designated a creed. We must remember that Christ lived and taught for a time before any attempt was made to portray His life or to record His sayings. The earliest writings are not the Gospels, but some of the Epistles, and it is to them we must look for any definite explanation of the facts which center in the appearance of Christ upon the earth. At the same time in the sequence of events the personality and teaching of Jesus come first, and in the relation to Him of His disciples and converts and in their personal confessions and utterances of faith we have the earliest suggestions of an expression of belief. The confession of Nathanael (Joh 1:49), "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God," and still more the utterance of Peter (Mt 16:16), "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and the exclamation of Thomas (Joh 20:28), contain the germ of a creed. It is to be noted that all these expressions of belief have Christ as their object and give utterance with more or less explicitness to a conviction of His Divine nature and authority.

3. In the Epistles:

(1) Paul:

But while these sayings in the Gospels were no doubt taken up and incorporated in later interpretations, it is to the Epistles that we must first go, for an explanation of the facts of Christ's person and His relation to God and man. Paul's Epistles are really of the nature of a confession and manifesto of Christian belief. Communities of believers already existed when the apostle directed to them his earliest letters. In their oral addresses the apostles must have been accustomed not only to state facts which were familiar to their hearers, but also to draw inferences from them as to the meaning of Christ and the great truths centering in His person—His incarnation, His death and resurrection (as we may see from the recorded sermons of Peter and Paul in Acts). It is to these facts that the Epistles appeal. It was at once natural and necessary that some expression of the faith once delivered to the saints should be formulated for a body whose members were pledged to each other and united for common action, and whose bond of union was the acknowledgment of "one Lord, one faith." Paul recognizes it as vital to the very spirit of religion that some definite profession of belief in Christ should be made: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved" (Ro 10:9). These words would seem to imply that a confession of the Deity, the atoning death, and resurrection of Jesus was the earliest form of Christian creed.

It must also be observed that from the very first the confession of faith seems to have been connected with the administration of baptism. Already in the story of the Ethiopian eunuch (Ac 8:37 the King James Version) (a passage indeed of doubtful genuineness but attested by Irenaeus and therefore of great antiquity) we find that as a condition of baptism the convert is asked to declare his belief in Jesus Christ as the Son of God. The passage in 1Ti 6:12; (compare Heb 10:23), "Lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou wast called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses," may refer to a confession required only of those who were being ordained: but the context leads us to infer that it was a baptismal vow asked of members not less than of ministers of the church. The probability is that the earliest form of creed reflected little more than Christ's final command to baptize all men "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28:19), or perhaps simply "into the name of the Lord Jesus" (Ac 19:5). The verse in Ac 8:37 the King James Version, though disputed by some, is instructive in this connection. Faith in Jesus Christ was regarded as the cardinal point of the New Revelation and may have been taken to imply a relation to the Father as well as a promise of the Holy Spirit.

It is evident that the creeds that have come down to us are mainly an expression of the doctrine of the Trinity as embodied in the original baptismal formula derived from Our Lord's commission. Already indeed in some places of the Old Testament this doctrine is foreshadowed; but it is first clearly incorporated in the Lord's command just mentioned and in the benediction of Paul (2Co 13:14), and subsequently in the Christian doxologies. Some scholars have preferred to find traces in the later writings of the New Testament of a more definite summary of belief: as in the allusion to the form of sound words (2Ti 1:13), the "deposit" or "good deposit" which was to be kept (1Ti 6:20 the Revised Version, margin; 2Ti 1:14 the Revised Version, margin); also in "the faithful words" enumerated in

these epistles (1Ti 1:15; 3:1; 4:8,9; 2Ti 2:11); and in the remarkable passage in the beginning of Heb 6 in which the elementary doctrines of the Christian religion are enumerated; first on the subjective side, repentance and faith, and then objectively, the resurrection and the judgment. There are also brief summaries in several of the Pauline Epistles of what the apostle must have considered to be essential tenets. Thus for example we have the death, burial and resurrection of Christ mentioned in 1Co 15:3 f; Ro 1:3 f. Such summaries or confessions of personal faith as in 2Th 2:13 f are frequent in Paul's writings and may correspond to statements of truth which the apostle found serviceable for catechetical purposes as he moved from one Christian community to another.

See CATECHIST.

(2) Later Writings:

It is not indeed till a much later age—the age of Irenaeus and Tertullian (175-200 AD)—that we meet with any definite summary of belief. But it cannot be doubted that these Scriptural passages to which we have referred not only served as the first forms of confession but also contributed the materials out of which the articles of the church's faith were formulated. As soon as Christian preaching and teaching were exercised there would be a felt need for explicit statement of the truths revealed in and through Jesus Christ. It may be said that all the main facts which were subsequently embodied in the creeds have their roots in the New Testament Scripture and especially in the Pauline Epistles. The only exception which might be made is in the case of the virgin birth. It does not lie within the scope of this article to comment upon the silence of the epistles on this subject. This, however, we may say, that the omissions of Paul's reference to it does not prove it untrue. It only proves at most that it was not a part of the ground upon which the Christ was commended to the first acceptance of faith. But though no direct allusion to the virgin birth occurs in Paul's writings the truth which gives spiritual value to the fact of the virgin conception, namely, God's new creation of humanity in Christ, is a vital and fundamental element in the faith both of Paul and of the whole early church. The Christian life is essentially a new creation (2Co 5:17; Ga 6:15; Ro 6:4) in Jesus Christ, the second Adam (Ro 5:12-21), who is from heaven (1Co 15:47). Into this spiritual context the facts recorded by Matthew and Luke introduce no alien or incompatible element (compare W. Richmond, The Creed in the Epistles of Paul; Orr, The Virgin Birth of Christ). And therefore the story of Christ's birth as we have it in the Synoptics finds a natural place in the creed of those who accept the Pauline idea of a new creation in Christ.

See VIRGIN BIRTH.

(3) Hebrews:

It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss the evidences of development in the main doctrines of the gospel, but however the later ages may have elaborated them, the leading tenets of the subsequent faith of the church—the doctrine of the Trinity; our Lord's divinity and real humanity; His atoning death and resurrection; the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and of the catholicity and unity of the church—stand clear and distinct in these earliest Scriptural sources.

II. Historical Forms.

Faith implies a creed as a confession and testimony. Such a confession and testimony answers to a natural impulse of the soul. Hence, a profession of faith is at once a personal, a social and a historical testimony. A formal creed witnesses to the universality of faith, binds believers together, and unites the successive ages of the church. It is the spontaneous expression of the life and experience of the Christian society. As the purpose of this article is chiefly to indicate the Scriptural sources of the creeds rather than to discuss their origin and history, we can only briefly describe the main historical forms which have prevailed in the Christian church.

1. The Apostles' Creed:

The Apostles' Creed, in ancient times called the Roman Creed, though popularly regarded as the earliest, was probably not the first in chronological order. Its origin and growth are involved in considerable obscurity (see separate article, APOSTLES' CREED; and compare Heurtley, Harmonia Symbolica).

2. The Nicene Creed:

(1) Origin, Date, Character:

The Nicene Creed, called sometimes "the Creed of the 318" from the number of bishops reputed to have been present, was authorized at the Council of Nice in 325 AD, and completed by the Council of Constantinople in 381, when the clauses which follow the mention of the Holy Ghost were added. The opinions of Arius at the beginning of the 4th century created such unrest as to call forth not only the admonition of bishops but also the intervention of the emperor Constantine, who, as a professed Christian, had become the patron of the church. The efforts of the emperor, however, had no effect in allaying the dissensions of the church at Alexandria, which, upon the banishment of Arius, spread throughout eastern Christendom. It was decided, therefore, to convoke a general council of bishops in which the Catholic doctrine should be once and for all formally declared. This, the first ecumenical council, met at Nicea in Bithynia in 325 AD. There is no detailed record of the proceedings. "We do not know whether it lasted weeks or days" (Stanley, Lects on East Ch.). Arius; being only a presbyter, had no seat in the conclave, but was allowed to express his opinions. His chief opponent was Athanasius.

(2) "Filioque" Clause:

The controversy turned upon the nature of the Son and His relation to the Father. The word homoousios ("of one substance with"), used in the course of the argument with a view of disputeing the extreme orthodox position, became the battleground between the parties. The Arians violently condemned. The Sabellians or Semi-Arians to evade its full force contended for the term homoiousios ("of like substance"). But the majority finally adopted the former expression as the term best suited to

discriminate their view of the relation of the Father and Son from the Arian view. The assent of the emperor was gained and the words "being of one substance with the Father" were incorporated into the creed. The clauses descriptive of the Holy Spirit were added or confirmed at a later council (382), and were designed to refute the Macedonian heresy which denied His equality with the Father and Son, and reduced the Holy Spirit to a level with the angels.

The phrase "proceedeth from the Father and the Son" is also of historical importance. The last three words are a later addition to the creed by western churches, formally adopted by the Council of Toledo in 589. But when the matter was referred in the 9th century to Leo III he pronounced against them as unauthorized. This interpolation, known as the Filioque, marks the difference still between the Latin and Greek churches. From the 9th century no change has been made in the Nicene Creed. It has remained, without the Filioque clause, the ecumenical symbol of the Eastern Church; and with the addition of that word it has taken its place among the three great creeds of the Western Church.

3. The Athanasian Creed:

(1) Authorship:

The Athanasian Creed, or the Symbolum Quicunque, as it is called, from its opening words, differs entirely in its origin and history from those we have just considered. It is not a gradual growth like the Apostles’ Creed, nor is it the outcome of synodical authority like the Nicene Creed. "When the composition appears for the first time as a document of authority it is cited in its completeness and as the work of the Father whose name it has since, in the most part, borne, although it was not brought to light for many centuries after his death" (Lumby, History of the Creeds). Without going into the full and intricate evidence which has been brought forward by scholars to prove that it is incorrectly attributed to Athanasius, it is sufficient to observe that both authorship and date are uncertain. Dr. Swainson proves in the most conclusive manner that the existence of this creed cannot be traced before the age of Charlemagne, and that its origin may probably be ascribed to then existing demand for a more detailed exposition of the faith than was to be found in the Apostles’ Creed. It is nowhere mentioned at synods before the end of the 8th century, whose special business it was to discuss the very matters which were afterward embodied within it in such detail.

(2) Question of Imposture:

The question of imposture has been raised with regard to this creed, and it has been maintained by some that it was originally a forgery of the same nature as the "false decretals" and the equally famous "Donation of Constantine" (Swainson). But it may be said that the word "imposture" is incorrectly applied to "a natural and inevitable result of the working of the mind of the Western Church toward a more elaborate and detailed confession of its Trinitarian faith" (Tulloch, Encyclopedia Brit). The imposture, if there was any, consisted not in the origin of the creed but in the ascription of it to a name and a date with which it had no connection. This was done no doubt to secure for it credit and authority, and was supposed to be justified by its special doctrinal import.

(3) Value and Features:

This symbol, though too compendious and elaborate to serve the purposes of a creed, itself standing in need of exposition and explanation, has its value as representing a further stage of doctrinal development. If the Apostles' Creed determined the nature of God and the Nicene Creed defined the character and relation of the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Athanasian Creed may be regarded as establishing the great doctrine of the Trinity. Its distinguishing features are the monitory clauses and its uncompromising statement of the value of the Christian faith. The other creeds set forth the mercies of Revelation; this adds the danger of rejecting them. The others declare the faith; this insists also on its necessity. This, also, alone insists upon the necessity of good works (Yonge, An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed). The closing warning is based on Christ's own words: "Depart from me," etc. (Mt 25:41,46). If this creed is solemn in its admonitions, we must remember that so also are the Gospels. On the whole it is a comprehensive summary of truth, laying down the rule of faith as a foundation, following out its issues of good or evil. True belief is closely connected with right action.

With the adoption of the "Athanasian" symbol, the creed-making of the early and medieval church ceases. Of the three mentioned one only in the broadest sense, the Nicene, is Catholic. Neither the Apostles' nor the Athanasian Creed is known to the Greek or oriental church which remained faithful to the faith settled by the holy Fathers at Nicea. The two others adopted by the West are really gradual growths or consequences from it, without any definite parentage or synodic authority. But the faith as defined at Nicea and ratified by subsequent councils is the only true Catholic symbol of the universal church.

4. The Reformation Creeds:

With the Reformation a new era of creed-formation began. It will not, however, be necessary to do more than mention some of the confessions of the Reformed churches which consist mainly of elaborations of the original creeds with the addition of special articles designed to emphasize and safeguard the distinctive doctrines and ecclesiastical positions of particular branches of the church. Of this nature are the Confessions of the Lutheran church—the Augsburg Confession of 1530; the Genevese or Calvinistic of 1549 consisting of 26 articles, defining particularly the nature of the Sacraments; confessions of the Dutch church confirmed at the Synod of Dort in 1619 and known as the "Decrees of Dort"; and the famous Heidelberg Catechism. To this series of Protestant confessions must be added the 39 Articles of the Church of England and the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is the doctrinal standard not only. of the churches of Scotland, but of the principal Presbyterian churches of Britain and America.

LITERATURE.

Winer, Doctrines and Confessions of Christendom (translation Clark, 1873): Lumby, History of the Creeds; Swainson, The Nicene and Apostles' Creeds (1875); Heurtley, Harmonia Symbolica (1858); Zahn, Apost. Symb. (1892); Harnack, Apost. Glaubensbekenntnis; Swete, Apostles' Creed; Hefele, Councils of the Church; Schaff, The Creeds of Christendom. For exposition, and of a more popular

nature, may be mentioned the works of Hooker, Barrow, and Beveridge, and especially Bishop Pearson; Westcott, Historic Faith; Norris, Rudiments of Theology; W. W. Harvey, The Three Creeds; J. Eyre Yonge, An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed (1888); Wilfred Richmond, The Creed in the Epistles of Paul (1909).

Arch. B. D. Alexander

CREEK

krek, colloq. krik (kolpos (Ac 27:39), the Revised Version (British and American) "bay"): The spot has been identified as the traditional Bay of Paul about 8 miles Northwest of the town of Valetta in the island of Malta.

See MELITA.

CREEPING THING

krep'-ing (remes, sherets; herpeton): Remes and sherets, with the root verbs ramas and sharats, are used without any sharp distinction for insects and other small creatures. Ramas means clearly "to creep," and is used even of the beasts of the forest (Ps 104:20), while sharats is rather "to swarm." But in at least one passage (Le 11:44), we have the noun, sherets, with the verb ramas; "with any manner of creeping thing that moveth upon the earth." The principal passages where these words occur are the accounts of the Creation and the Flood and the references to unclean animals in Le and in the vision of Peter. In the last we have the word herpeton as the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew words (Ac 10:12). Winged creeping things (sherets ha-'oph, Le 11:20 ff), as well as the wingless, are unclean, but an exception is made in favor of the locusts, "which have legs above their feet, where-with to leap upon the earth."

See INSECTS; LOCUST.

Alfred Ely Day

CREMATION

kre-ma'-shun (compare saraph, Jos 7:15, etc., "shall be burnt with fire"; kaio, 1Co 13:3, "If I give my body to be burned," etc.): Cremation, while the customary practice of the ancient Greeks, and not unknown among the Romans, was certainly not the ordinary mode of disposing of the dead among the Hebrews or other oriental peoples. Even among the Greeks, bodies were often buried without being burned (Thuc. i. 134,6; Plato Phaedo 115 E; Plut. Lyc. xxvii). Cicero thought that burial was the more ancient practice, though among the Romans both methods were in use in his day (De leg. ii.22,56). Lucian (De luctu xxi) expressly says that, while the Greeks burned their dead, the Persians buried them (see BURIAL, and compare 2Sa 21:12-14). In the case supposed by Amos 6:10, when it is predicted that

Yahweh, in abhorrence of "the excellency of Jacob," shall "deliver up the city," and, "if there remain ten men in one house, that they shall die," and "a man's kinsman (ARVm) shall take him up, even he that burneth him," etc., the suggestion seems to be that of pestilence with accompanying infection, and that this, or the special judgment of Yahweh, is why burning is preferred. When Paul (1Co 13:3) speaks of giving his body to be burned, he is simply accommodating his language to the customs of Corinth. (But see Plutarch on Zarmanochegas, and C. Beard, The Universal Christ.)

How far religious, or sanitary, or practical reasons were influential in deciding between the different methods, it is impossible to say. That bodies were burned in times of pestilence in the Valley of Hinnom at Jerusalem is without support (see Eze 39:11-16). The "very great burning" at the burial of Asa (2Ch 16:14) is not a case of cremation, but of burning spices and furniture in the king's honor (compare Jer 34:5). Nor is 1Ki 13:2 a case in point; it is simply a prophecy of a king who shall take the bones of men previously buried, and the priests of the high places that burn incense in false worship, and cause them to be burned on the defiled altar to further pollute it and render it abominable.

There is in the New Testament no instance of cremation, Jewish, heathen or Christian, and clearly the early Christians followed the Jewish practice of burying the dead (see Tert., Apol., xlii; Minuc. Felix, Octav., xxxix; Aug., De civ. Dei, i.12,13). Indeed, cremation has never been popular among Christians, owing largely, doubtless, to the natural influence of the example of the Jews, the indisputable fact that Christ was buried, the vivid hope of the resurrection and the more or less material views concerning it prevalent here and there at this time or that. While there is nothing anti-Christian in it, and much in sanitary considerations to call for it in an age of science, it is not likely that it will ever become the prevailing practice of Christendom.

George B. Eager

CRESCENS

kres'-enz (Kreskes, "increasing"): An assistant of Paul, mentioned in 2Ti 4:10 as having gone to Galatia. That he was one of the Seventy, and that he founded the church in Vienna in Gaul, are traditions without any trustworthy basis.

CRESCENTS

kres'-ents (saharonim): Moon-shaped necklaces (Jud 8:21,26; Isa 3:18).f Paul, mentioned in 2Ti 4:10 as having gone to Galatia. That he was one of the Seventy, and that he founded the church in Vienna in Gaul, are traditions without any trustworthy basis.

CRETE

kret (Krete, ethnic Kretes, Ac 2:11; Tit 1:12): An island bounding the Aegean Sea on the South. It

stretches from 34 degrees 50’ to 35 degrees 40’ North latitude and from 23 degrees 30’ to 26 degrees 20’ East long. With Cythera on the North and Carpathos and Rhodos on the Northeast, it forms a continuous bridge between Greece and Asia Minor. The center of the island is formed by a mountain chain rising to a height of 8,193 ft. in Mt. Ida, and fringed with low valleys beside the coast. There are no considerable rivers; the largest, the Metropole, on the South, is a tiny stream, fordable anywhere. An island of considerable extent (156 miles long, and from 7 to 30 miles broad), in several districts very fertile and possessing one or two good harbors, it seems marked out by its position for an important role in the history of the eastern Mediterranean. But never since an age which was already legendary when Greek history began has Crete occupied a dominating position among the powers of the surrounding continents. Internal dissensions, due in ancient times to the diversity of races inhabiting its soil (Eteocretans—the original inhabitants—Pelasgians, Acheans, Cydonians and Dorians), and in modern times to the fact that a large minority of the population has accepted the Ottoman religion along with Ottoman government, have kept Crete in a position of political inferiority throughout the historical period.

1. Early History:

Mt. Ida in Crete was famous in Greek legend as the birthplace of Zeus. The half-legendary, half-historical King Minos was said to be the son of Zeus, and to have derived from his father the wisdom to which, by a type of myth common in Greek lands, the constitution of the Cretan cities was ascribed. Minos was accepted as a historical personage by Thucydides and Aristotle, who say that he was the first dynast in Greece to establish dominion on the sea. One of his exploits was the suppression of piracy in Cretan waters, a feat which had to be repeated by the Roman Pompeius at a later period. Aristotle compares the Cretan institutions with those of Sparta; the island was said to have been colonized by Dorians from Peloponnesus (Politics ii.10). The most important cities in Crete were Knossos (whose palace has been excavated with fruitful results by Mr. Arthur Evans), Gortyna, near the Gulf of Messara, and Cydonia, with its river Iardanus. The excavations of Mr. Evans at Knossos and of the Italians at Phastos (near Fair Havens) prove that Crete was a center of Mediterranean civilization in an early age. In the Homeric poems, Crete is said to have contained an hundred cities; at that period the Cretans were still famed as daring sailors. In the classical age of Greek history they never held a leading position. They are mentioned chiefly as traders and mercenary soldiers, skilled especially in archery. During the Hellenistic period Crete remained free. Demetrius Nicator made the island his base of operations before his defeat at Azotus in 148.

2. The Jews in Crete:

In 141, the Cretan Jews were influential enough to secure the patronage of Rome. They were being oppressed by the people of Gortyna, and appealed to Rome, which granted them protection. In strengthening the position of the Jews, the Romans were copying the Seleucid policy in Asia Minor; both the Seleucids and the Romans found the Jews among their most devoted supporters in their subject states. This interference of Rome in the interest of her future partisans paved the way for her annexation of the island in the following century. From this date, there was a strong and prosperous body of Jews in Crete, and Cretans are mentioned among the strangers present at the Feast of Pentecost in Ac 2:11. Its

alliance with Mithradates the Great, and the help it gave to the Cilician pirates gave Rome the pretext she desired for making war on Crete, and the island was annexed by. Metellus in 67 BC. With Cyrene on the North coast of Africa, it was formed into a Roman province. When Augustus divided the Empire between the Senate and himself, Crete and Cyrene were sufficiently peaceful to be given to the Senate.

3. Later History:

They formed one province till the time of Constantine, who made Crete a separate province. The Saracens annexed Crete in 823 AD, but it was recaptured for the Byzantine Empire by Nicephorus Phokas in the following century. From the 13th till the 17th century it was held by the Venetian Republic: from this period dates its modern name "Kandia," which the Venetians gave to the Saracen capital Khandax, and afterward to the whole island. After a desperate resistance, lasting from 1645 to 1669 AD, Crete fell into the hands of the Turks, who still exercise a nominal suzerainty over the island.

4. Crete in the Old Testament:

In 1Sa 30:14; Eze 25:16, and Ze 2:5, the Philistines are described as Cherethites, which is usually taken to mean Cretans. The name is connected with Caphtor and the Caphtorim (De 2:23; Jer 47:4; Am 9:7). The similarity between the river-names Jordan and Iardanos (Homer Odyssey iii. 292) "about whose streams the Kydones dwelt," has suggested that. Caphtor is to be identified with Cydonia; or possibly it was the name of the whole island. Tacitus believed in an ancient connection between Crete and Palestine; the Jews, he said, were fugitives from Crete, and derived their name Iudaei from Mt. Ida (Hist. v.2). Crete is mentioned in connection with the campaign of Demetrius Nicator, referred to above, in 1 Macc 10:67.

See CAPHTOR; CHERETHITES.

5. Crete in the New Testament:

Crete owes its connection with Pauline history to the accident of a gale which forced the ship carrying Paul to Rome to take shelter on the South coast of the island. In the harbor of Myra, on the coast of Lycia, the centurion in charge of Paul transferred him from the Adramyttian ship which had brought them from Caesarea, to a ship from Alexandria in Egypt, bound for Ostia with a cargo of grain. The fact that the centurion was in virtual command of the ship (Ac 27:11) proves that it was one of the vessels in the imperial transport service. Leaving Myra they came opposite Cnidus with difficulty, against a head-wind. The ordinary course from Cnidus in good weather was to steer straight for Cythera, but on this occasion the West or Northwest winds made this route impracticable, and they sailed under the lee of Crete, whose South coast would shelter them from a Northwest gale, and afford occasional protection from a West gale. They passed Salmone, the Northeast corner of Crete, with difficulty, and worked round the coast to Fair Havens, a harbor somewhat to the East of Cape Matala. The great Feast fell while they were at Fair Havens; in 59 AD it was On October 5, in the middle of the season when the equinoxes made sailing impossible. Paul advised the centurion to winter in Fair Havens, but the captain wished to

reach Phoenix, a harbor farther to the West, where ships from Egypt were accustomed to put in during the stormy season. It was decided to follow the captain’s advice; but on its way to Phoenix the ship was struck by a Northeast wind called Euraquilo, which rushed down from Mt. Ida. The ship was carried out to sea; it managed to run under the lee of Cauda, an island 23 miles West of Cape Matala, where the crew hauled in the boat, undergirded the ship, and slackened sail. On the fourteenth night they were driven on the coast of Malta, and wrecked.

The narrative does not state that Paul landed in Crete, but as the ship lay for some time at Fair Havens (Ac 27:8,9) he had plenty of opportunity to land, but not to travel inland. The centurion gave him permission to land at Sidon. Paul left Titus in Crete (Tit 1:5); tradition made the latter its first bishop, and patron saint.

6. The Cretans:

Cretans were present, as noted above, at the Feast of Pentecost (Ac 2:11). Paul’s estimate of the Cretan character (Tit 1:10-16) was the one current in antiquity. Paul quotes (Tit 1:12) a well-known line of the Cretan poet Epimenides (who lived about 600 BC) on the mendacity of the Cretans. The sentiment was repeated by Callimachus (Hymn to Zeus 8). Other ancient witnesses to the detestation in which the Cretan character was held are Livy xliv.45, and Plutarch Aemilius section 23.

LITERATURE.

Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen, 320-30. On Crete in Greek and Roman times, consult e.g. Grote, Holm, and Mommsen. A succinct account of the prehistoric archaeology of the island is given in Burrows, The Discoveries in Crete, and Bailkie, The Sea Kings of Crete.

W. M. Calder

CRIB

(’ebhuc): "Crib" translates the Hebrew word [~’ebhuc] exactly, as it denotes "a barred receptacle for fodder used in cowsheds and foldyards; also in fields, for beasts lying out in the winter." The Hebrew is from a word meaning to feed (’abhac), and is used in the precise sense of the English word in Job 39:9 of the "crib" of the wild ox, in Pr 14:4, "Where no oxen are, the crib is clean," and in Isa 1:3, "The ox knoweth his owner, and the ass his master’s crib." section 23.

CRICKET

krik’-et (chargol): This occurs in Le 11:22 (the King James Version "beetle"), and doubtless refers to some kind of locust or grasshopper.

See BEETLE; LOCUST; INSECTS.

CRIER

kri’-er (qara’; compare boao):

(1) Neither is this exact word found in English Versions of the Bible, nor a word exactly corresponding to it in the Hebrew Bible, but the character it stands for appears as "one who cries aloud," i.e., proclaims mandates or gives public messages. In Pr 1:21 it is said, "She (Wisdom) crieth in the chief place of concourse." John the Baptist calls himself "the voice of one crying in the wilderness" (Joh 1:23)—like a herald going before the king.

(2) In the East today every village even has its public crier, selected for his loud or penetrating voice, and appointed to give notice of the fresh orders or mandates of the mudir ("governor") or other authorities. The muezzin of the Moslems, who at the five appointed times of prayer mounts the minaret and calls the faithful to prayer, is another striking example. Something like the ancient "heralds" of the king were the "heralds" of the Middle Ages in Europe who, preceded by trumpeters, made official proclamations:

George B. Eager

CRIME; CRIMES

krim, krimz: This. term is used in English as the equivalent of the Hebrew mishpaT, "judgment," "verdict" (Eze 7:23); zimmah, "a heinous crime" (Job 31:11); ‘asham =" a fault," "sin" (Ge 26:10, English Versions of the Bible "guiltiness"); and Greek aitia, "case," "cause" (Ac 25:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "charges"). In the King James Version Joh 18:38; 19:4,6, the rendition is "fault."

egklema, "indictment," "charge" (Ac 25:16 the King James Version) is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "matter." A crime is a transgression against the public right; serious offense against the law; a base weakness or iniquity, all of which are regarded by the Bible as offenses against

(1) God, or

(2) man, or

(3) both.

An injury to the creature is regarded as obnoxious to the Creator. Specific forms of crime are the following:

Adultery.

See separate article.

Assassination.

This term does not occur in the English Versions of the Bible, but, of course, is included in the more general "to kill," or "to slay" (haragh =" to smite with deadly intent" "destroy," "kill," "murder," "put to death"). The law distinguished between unpremeditated and premeditated slaying, pronouncing a curse upon the latter (De 27:25). David expresses the deepest abhorrence of such an act (2Sa 4:9-12). Instances are found recorded in Jud 3:15-22; 2Sa 3:27; 4:5-7; 13:28,29; 20:9,10; 2Ki 12:20; 19:37; Isa 37:38. See also separate article.

Bestiality.

According to Webster: "unnatural connection with a beast." This form of vice was treated by the Mosaic law as something exceedingly loathsome and abhorrent, calling for extreme language in its description and rigorous measures in its punishment. Both the beast and the guilty human were to be put to death (Ex 22:19; Le 18:23; 20:15,16; De 27:21), in order, as the Talmud says, to obliterate all memory of the crime.

Blasphemy.

See separate article.

Breach of Covenant.

Breach of Covenant (parar ‘eth ha-berith).—According to Poucher (HDB, article "Crimes"), this term included:

(1) failure to observe the Day of Atonement (Le 23:29); work on that day (Le 23:28);

(2) sacrifice of children to Moloch (Le 20:3);

(3) neglect of circumcision (Ge 17:14; Ex 4:26);

(4) unauthorized manufacture of the holy oil (Ex 30:33);

(5) anointing an alien therewith (Ex 30:33);

(6) neglect of the Passover (Nu 9:13).

Note also the following: Ge 17:14; Le 26:15-44; De 29:25; 31:16,20. Paul (Ro 1:31) speaks of asunthetoi =" Convenant—breakers."

Breach of Ritual.

A term not found in the Scriptures, but designed to cover a number of acts prohibited by the ceremonial law. They have been exhaustively enumerated by Poucher (HDB, article "Crimes"):

(1) eating blood, whether of fowl or beast (Le 7:27; 17:14);

(2) eating fat of the beast of sacrifice (Le 7:25);

(3) eating leavened bread during the Passover (Ex 12:15,19);

(4) failure to bring an offering when an animal is slaughtered for food (Le 17:4);

(5) offering sacrifice while the worshipper is under the ban of uncleanness. (Le 7:20,21; 22:3,4,9);

(6) making holy ointment for private use (Ex 30:32,33);

(7) using the same for perfume (Ex 30:38);

(8) neglect of purification in general (Nu 19:13,10);

(9) slaughtering an animal for food away from the door of the tabernacle (Le 17:4,9); even the alien must comply, so that the introduction of worship at other places might be avoided;

(10) touching holy things illegally (Nu 4:16,20 the Revised Version (British and American) "the sanctuary").

The punishment for the non-observance of these prohibitions was the "cutting off" from the transgressor’s people (nikhrath miqqerebh =" cut off from among," i.e. excommunicated).

Breach of Trust.

See TRUST, BREACH OF.

Bribery.

See separate article.

Burglary.

This term does not occur. The corresponding act is defined as "thievery accompanied by breaking," and it places the offender beyond protection from violence (Ex 22:2). The crime might be committed in various degrees, and to burglarize the "devoted things" was punishable by death (Jos 7:25), as was also man-stealing (Ex 21:16; De 24:7).

Debt.

See separate article.

Deception.

See separate article.

Disobedience.

See separate article.

Divination.

See separate article.

Drunkenness.

See separate article.

Evil Speaking (Slander).

See Speaking Evil.

Falsehood.

Occurs as the rendition of ma‘al =" treachery," "sin," "trespass" (Job 21:34); and of sheqer =" a sham," "deceit," "lying" (2Sa 18:13; Ps 7:14; 119:118; 144:8,11; Isa 28:15; 57:4; 59:13; Jer 10:14; 13:25; Ho 7:1; Mic 2:11). In every case willful perversion of the truth or preference for the untruth is at least presupposed, hence, falsehood always marks an evil disposition, enmity against truth, and hence, against God; consequently is criminal in the fullest sense.

False Swearing.

"Swearing to a lie or falsehood" (sheqer) is mentioned in Le 6:3,1; 19:12; Jer 5:2; 7:9; Ho 10:4; Zec 5:4. From these passages and their context, it appears that this crime was considered in the twofold sense of a wrong against

(1) the neighbor, and

(2) against God, for the oath was an appeal to God as a witness to the truthfulness of the statement; hence, to swear falsely was to represent God as supporting a false statement.

Fornication.

Hebrew, zanah =" to commit adultery," especially of the female, and less frequently of mere fornication, seldom of involuntary ravishment; also used figuratively in the sense of idolatry, the Jewish people being regarded as the spouse of Yahweh (2Ch 21:11; Isa 23:17; Eze 16:26). Once we find the derivative noun taznuth (Eze 16:29). In the New Testament, with both the literal and the figurative application, we find porneia, and porneuo (Mt 5:32; 15:19; Joh 8:41; Ac 15:20; 1Co 5:1; 6:13,18; 7:2; 10:8; 2Co 12:21; Ga 5:19; Eph 5:3; Col 3:5; 1Th 4:3; Re 2:14,20,21; 9:21; 14:8; 17:2,4). The intensive ekporneuo =" to be utterly unchaste" is found in Jude 1:7. Every form of unchastity is included in the term "fornication."

Forswear.

Found only in Mt 5:33 in the sense of committing perjury (epiorkeo).

Harlotry.

The avocational or at least habitual, notorious practice of unchastity. In most instances the ordinary term for unchaste living, zanah, is employed (Ge 34:31; 38:15,24; Le 21:14; Jos 2:1 (Rahab); Jud 11:1; 16:1; 1Ki 3:16; Pr 7:10; 29:3; Jer 5:7; Am 7:17). For the publicly known woman of the street and the professional devotee in the pagan temple-worship, the term kedheshah, was employed (Ge 38:21,22 the King James Version; Ho 4:14). The Greek porne, occurs in Mt 21:31 f; Lu 15:30; 1Co 6:15,16; Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25. Figurative: Often used metaphorically of idolatry or any defection from the Divine covenant, and applied particularly to Jerusalem (Isa 1:21); the Jewish nation (Jer 2:20; 3:1,6 ff; often in Eze 16 and Eze 23; Mic 1:7); Israel (Ho 4:15); Nineveh (Na 3:4); Tyro, with reference to the various arts employed to renew her commerce (Isa 23:16) and to her restored traffic (Isa 23:17); and to antiChristian "Babylon" (Re 17:5,15; 19:2). See also Fornication.

Homicide.

"Manslayer" (ratsach, "to dash in pieces," "to kill," "to murder"; Greek androphonos, with the same meaning): Mentioned in Nu 35:6,12; 1Ti 1:9. The Hebrew law distinguished between the premeditated

and the unpremeditated slaying. See separate article.

Idolatry.

See separate article.

Ill-treatment of Parents (Ex 21:15,17; Le 20:9; De 21:18 ff).

See below.

Injuries to the Person (Ex 21:18 ff; Le 24:19 f; De 25:11).

Irreverence.

Lack of respect for God or His natural representatives, the parents or governmental officers. See also Parents, Crimes against; Blasphemy.

Incest.

Designated in Hebrew by zimmah, "vice," "wickedness," "refined immorality" (Le 18:17; 20:14); also "unnatural vice," tebhel, the same word that is used to designate the unnatural commingling with beasts. Amnon’s deed is designated as checedh, indicating the degradation of the tenderness natural between brothers and sisters into a tenderness of an immoral character (2Sa 13). The crime of sexual relation of persons within the degrees of relationship forbidden by the Levitical law, as for instance, that of Lot’s daughters with their father (Ge 19:33); the son with his father’s concubines, as for instance, Reuben (Ge 35:22), and Absalom (2Sa 16:22; compare 1Co 5:1); that of the father-in-law with his daughter-in-law (Ge 38:15 ff; compare Eze 22:11); of the brother with the sister or half-sister, as for instance, Amnon (2Sa 13:14); of the brother-in-law with the sister-in-law (Mt 14:3); with the wife’s mother, or the wife’s daughter while living in apparent marriage with the mother (Le 20:14; 18:17). Illicit relation with the brother’s widow is designated (Le 20:21) as a disgraceful deed, literally, "uncleanness" (excepting the levirate marriage). Such acts were forbidden on the ground that the Jews were to avoid the evil practices of the Canaanites and the Egyptians in regard to marriage within the specified limits, because this would naturally result in breaking down the sanctity of the bonds connecting near relatives, and in throwing open the flood gates of immorality among them. It is the Divine plan that the unions based on mutual choice and love, mingled with carnality, shall become clarified more and more into the purer love of close consanguineal relations; not vice versa. Then, too, such provisions would secure higher results in training and in the production of mentally and physically healthy children, the balancing and evening up of contrasts of Nature, and the production of new and improved types. The principle on which the prohibitions are imposed seems to be this: Marriage is forbidden between any person and a direct ancestor or a direct descendant or any close relative, such as brother or sister of either himself or any of his ancestors or any of his immediate descendants.

Infanticide.

This crime, in the form in which it has been and is prevalent among barbarous nations, seems to have been quite foreign to the minds of the Hebrews, for they had too lofty a conception of the value of human life, and children were considered a blessing; their absence in the home, a curse (compare Ex 1:17,21; Ps 127; Ps 128). For this reason, there appeared to be no reason to prohibit it by law, except as the Israelites might be influenced to sacrifice their children to Molech when following the religious customs of the Canaanites.

See MOLECH.

Kidnapping (Man-Stealing).

andrapodistes =" man-stealer," "slave-dealer" (1Ti 1:10). This was a mortal offense; but it seems that it, like some other forms of iniquity, was unknown to the Hebrews, except as they came in contact with it through their intercourse with other nations, such as the Romans and the Greeks, whose mythology frequently alludes to such acts. Lying, Malice, Manslaughter, Murder, Oath.

See separate articles.

Parents, Crimes against.

The law enjoined upon the infant all the reverence toward his parents, especially the father, that he could bestow on a merely human being. The reason for this lay in the fact that the heads of families were expected to transmit the Divine law to their household, and thus to stand in the place of God. That the mother was to share this reverence practically on equal terms with the father is shown by the fact that each is mentioned separately whenever obedience and reverence are enjoined upon the child (De 5:16). As the specific crime against Yahweh consisted in blasphemy and open rebellion against the law, so the crime against parents consisted in deliberate disobedience and stubbornness (De 21:18). And here again both the father and the mother are directed to lay hands upon him and bring him unto the elders for punishment. How greatly such conduct was held in horror is seen in many of the Proverbs, especially 30:17. It would be hard to specify all the acts which, in view of the above, would be considered crimes against the parents, but it is evident that everything which would lower their dignity and influence or violate their sense of just recognition must be carefully avoided, as witness the curse visited upon Ham (Ge 9:20-27).

Perjury.

See False Swearing; Forswear above; also article OATH.

Prophesying, False.

By reason of his position as the recognized mouthpiece of Yahweh, the prophet’s word was weighty in influence; hence, to prophesy falsely was equivalent to practicing fraud publicly. Jeremiah described the condition as "wonderful and horrible," which made such things possible (Jer 5:30,31). See also Jer 23,12; 29:8,9; Eze 21:23; Zec 10:2; Mt 7:15; 24:11,24; Mr 13:22; Lu 6:26; Ac 13:6 (Bar-Jesus); 2Pe 2:1; 1 Joh 4:1; Re 16:13; 19:20; 20:10. See also separate article.

Prostitution.

Hebrew and Christian morality never condoned this practice, though the Bible recognizes its existence as a fact even among God’s people. The Hebrew father was forbidden (Le 19:29) to give his daughter over to a life of shame (chalal, "to profane a person, place or thing," "to pollute"). See also Fornication, Harlotry, and Whoredom below.

Rape.

chazak =" to seize," "bind," "restrain," "conquer," "force," "ravish." The punishment for this crime was greater when the act was committed against a betrothed woman (De 22:25-29). See also Seduction.

Removing Landmarks. (De 19:14).

See LANDMARK.

Reviling (Ex 22:28).

See Irreverence above and article REVILE.

Robbery.

gazal =" to pluck off," "strip," "rob," "take away by force or violence"; forbidden in the law and frequently referred to as despicable (Le 19:13; 26:22; 1Sa 23:1; Pr 22:22; Isa 10:2,13; 17:14; Eze 33:15; 39:10; Mal 3:8,9).

Sabbath-Breaking.

As the Hebrew Sabbath was regarded as a day of rest, all acts absolutely unnecessary were considered a violation, a "breaking" of the Sabbath, which appears sufficiently from the commandment (Ex 20:8-11); and the head of the household was held responsible for the keeping of this commandment on the part of all sojourners under his roof.

No other law gave the sophistical legalists of later Judaism so much opportunity for hair-splitting distinctions as did this. In answer to the question what labors were forbidden, they mentioned 39 specific

forms of work, and then proceeded to define what constituted each particular form. But as even these definitions would not cover all possible questions, special precepts were invented. In order that one might not be caught in the midst of unfinished labors, when the Sabbath began (at sunset), certain forms of work must not be undertaken on Friday. Thus it was forbidden to fry meat, onions or eggs, if there was not sufficient time for them to be fully cooked before evening. No bread, no cakes, must be put into the oven, if there was not sufficient time remaining for their surface to brown before night.

See SABBATH.

Seduction.

ta‘ah, "to dissemble," "seduce," and Ta‘ah, with the same meaning; apoplanao, "to lead astray"; planao, "to go astray," "deceive," "err," "seduce"; and goes, "a wizard," "an impostor," "seducer." In all the passages in which the idea of seduction is expressed in the English the term is used not in the modern sense of a trespass against a woman’s person, but in the more general and figurative sense of leading into sin generally (2Ki 21:9; Pr 12:26 the King James Version.; Isa 19:13 the King James Version; Eze 13:10; Mr 13:22 the King James Version; 2Ti 3:13 the King James Version; 1Jo 2:26 the King James Version; Re 2:20). However, the modern English idea of the word is expressed in the law found in Ex 22:16,17.

Slander.

See separate article.

Sodomy.

See Unnatural Vice.

Speaking Evil.

"To bring an evil (ra‘) name upon" (De 19:15; 1Ki 22:23; Ps 34:13; 41:5; 50:19; 109:20; 140:11; Pr 15:28; 16:30). Evil speaking is considered a crime because it is simply the expression of the evil intents of the heart. This is brought out more clearly in the New Testament (Mt 7:17,18; 12:34,35; Mr 9:39; Lu 6:45). As such, evil speaking (blasphemia) is represented as entirely unworthy a Christian character (Eph 4:31; 1Pe 4:4,14; 2Pe 2:2,10,12; Jas 4:11; Jude 1:10); and katalaleo =" babble against," "gossip." It will be noticed from the above that evil speaking against those in authority is designated with the same word ("blasphemy") as raillery against God, they being considered God’s representatives on earth.

See also EVIL-SPEAKING; SLANDER.

Stealing.

Hebrew ganabh =" to thieve" (literal, or figurative); by implication, "to deceive," "carry away," "secretly bring," "steal away" (Ge 44:8; Ex 20:15; 21:16; 22:1; Pr 6:30; Zec 5:3; Ge 31:20,26 f; 2Sa 15:6; 19:3; Job 27:20; Pr 9:17 ("Stolen waters are sweet"; the forbidden is attractive; compare Ro 7:7)). Greek klepto =" to filch," "steal" (Mt 6:19,20; 19:18; Joh 10:10; Ro 2:21; 13:9; Eph 4:28). See Theft.

Suicide.

No special law is found against this crime, for it is included in the prohibition against killing. Contrary to the practice and the philosophy of paganism, the act was held in deep abhorrence by the Hebrews because of the high value placed on human life. It was held inexcusable that any but the most degraded and satanic should lay hands on their own lives. Only the remorse of the damned could drive one to it, as witness Saul (1Sa 31:4) and Judas (Mt 27:5).

Theft.

Hebrew genebhah "stealing" (concrete), "something stolen," "theft" (Ex 22:3,1); mentioned in connection with other wickedness (klope) in Mt 15:19; Mr 7:21; and (klemma) in Re 9:21. All three words are used abstractly for the act and concretely for the thing stolen.

See thIEF.

Unchastity. No other form of sin is mentioned with disapproval and threats more frequently than the various forms of carnal vice, for no other sin is more natural or widespread.

See CHASTITY; LEWDNESS; MARRIAGE.

Unnatural Vice (Sodomy).

Alluded to with delicacy, but positively condemned as an abomination (Ge 13:13; 19:5,7; Le 18:22; 20:13). It was the specific form of wickedness through which Sodom became notorious, so that "sodomite" is the regular translation of qadhesh, "a (quasi) sacred person," i.e. (technically) "a (male or female) devotee to licentious idolatry" (De 23:17; 1Ki 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; 2Ki 23:7; Job 36:14 margin). Though permitted and even encouraged in heathen cult, it was never to be tolerated in the worship of Yahweh.

Usury.

See separate article.

Witnessing, False.

The Hebrew idiom is ‘edh sheqer, "witness of a falsehood," "lie" (Ex 20:16; De 19:16,18; Pr 6:19; 14:5,25; 19:5,9); Greek pseudomartureo, "to bring false testimony"; -marturia, "bearing of false testimony" (Mr 10:19; 14:56,57). It goes without saying that the law was emphatic in its denunciation of this practice, and in order that the innocent might be protected against the lying accuser, a criminal was to be convicted only on the testimony of at least two or three witnesses, testifying to the same facts (Nu 35:30). If one be found testifying falsely, he was to be punished by suffering the penalty which would have been inflicted on him against whom he testified, had he been convicted (De 19:16-19).

Whoredom.

Hebrew zanah =" to commit adultery," "fornication or illicit incontinence of any kind"; and its derivative taznuth =" fornication," "harlotry," "whoredom"; Greek porneuo (verb), and porneia (noun), of the same meaning. The following passages will reveal the estimate in which such uncleanness was held, and the fact that men and women given to it were held in equal abhorrence and designated by the same terms: Ge 38:24; Le 19:29; Nu 14:33; 25:1; Eze 16; 23:3,7,8,11,27,29,43; 43:7,9; Ho 1:2; 2:4; 4:11,12; 6:10; Na 3:4; Mt 5:32; Ro 1:26 f; 1Co 5:1; 7:2; 10:8; Jude 1:7; Re 2:14,20f; 18:9; 19:2.

Figurative: Because of the infidelity to the lifemate and to right living involved in such acts, the practice became symbolical of infidelity to God and His law, and thus served as a frequent figure of speech for Israel’s error and apostasy.

See HARLOT.

Frank E. Hirsch

CRIMSON krim’-z’-n.

See COLORS.

CRIPPLE

krip’-’-l (cholos): Only occurs in Ac 14:8, denoting the congenitally lame man at Lystra. In the King James Version (1611) the word is spelled "creeple." It originally meant one whose body is bent together as in the attitude of creeping. This was probably a case of infantile paralysis.

CRISPING PINS

kris’-ping: Pins for crisping, or curling, the hair. Thus the King James Version renders Hebrew chariTim (Isa 3:22; compare Vulgate). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes more correctly "satchels" (so Qimchi (compare 2Ki 5:23); compare Arabic). Others think of girdles; still others of veils or head-bands.

CRISPUS

kris’-pus (Krispos, "curled"): One of the small number baptized by Paul among the Corinthian Christians (1Co 1:14). He had been ruler of the Jewish synagogue, but he "believed in the Lord with all his house"; and, following Paul, withdrew from the synagogue (Ac 18:7,8). He seems to have been succeeded by Sosthenes (Ac 18:17). According to tradition he became bishop of Aegina.

CRITICISM

(The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis)

I. PRELIMINARY

1. Thesis

2. Historical Perspective

3. Inspiration and Criticism

II. THE LEGISLATION

1. Groups

2. Covenant Code

3. The Sanctuary

4. Kinds of Sacrifice

5. Sacrifice in General

6. Vestments

7. Priests and Levites

8. Dues

9. Miscellaneous

10. Summary

11. Additional Note

III. THE HISTORY

1. Chronicles

2. Kings, etc.

3. The Conquest

4. Ideas of God

5. Priesthood

6. Summary

IV. RECONSTRUCTION

1. Covenant Code

2. Deuteronomy

3. Later

4. Evaluation

LITERATURE

I. Preliminary.

1. Thesis:

In Jer 7:22,23 we read: "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices: but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people." It is the contention of the present article that this statement of the prophet is correct (compare II, 5).

More specifically, it is contended that evidence can be produced from the Old Testament to show that Israel’s religion can be seen in a long period of growth; and in this growth a fixed sacrificial law, with a

minutely regulated ritual obligatory on all Israelites, the culmination and not the beginning of the process. It is contended, moreover, that this conception of the development of the institutional side of the religion of the Old Testament is attained by the strictest evaluation of all the Old Testament evidence and by no a priori considerations.

2. Historical Perspective:

To be sure, one is met at once in the Old Testament by what seem to be complete denials of this point of view. In the Pentateuch we find statement after statement that a given law was due not to some late author but to Moses himself, and there are numerous passages in the historical books (most notably in Chronicles) that speak of these laws as in effect from the earliest times. Such evidence must be paid all possible respect and must be overruled only on the most imperative considerations.

However, if for the moment the books of the Old Testament be viewed only as historical documents, it will be admitted that the possibility of overruling such evidence may well arise. And it may very well arise without calling in question in the slightest degree the good faith of the writers of questioned passages; for an acquisition of historical perspective comes very late in intellectual evolution, particularly —though not only—in the realm of religious history. Even the trained scholar has to be on his guard lest he read back the concepts of his own time into some past generation, while the non-specialist never succeeds in avoiding this error completely. For the uncultured mind, especially for the Oriental, the problem scarcely exists. That which is generally accepted and which is not obviously novel tends to be classified as that which "always has been." A law so old that its actual source is forgotten is referred as a matter of course to some great lawgiver of the past. A custom that in a writer’s own day is universally observed by the pious must always have been observed by the pious. Even documentary evidence to the contrary is not convincing to such a writer, for that documents may be wrong is not a modern discovery. To be sure, the older document may be copied mechanically or the discrepancy may not even be noticed. But it is never surprising when we find a writer simply accrediting the pious men of old with the customs of his own day, since even documentary evidence to the contrary he felt could not be right. This is not forgery, as we understand the word, nor need there be the faintest moral reproach connected with such conduct. Quite on the contrary, such a writer may well be acting in the only sense that the conscience of any man of his generation could conceive right.

3. Inspiration and Criticism:

However, the Old Testament is not a mere collection of human documents, and another question arises. Does the acceptance of inspiration compel us to assume that in every case a writer’s ordinary historical methods were entirely overruled? The question is a rather broad one and does not relate merely to the correct transmission of historic facts. To be asked, rather, is this: Did God present to His instruments a mechanically accurate set of past facts which would give a conception of history that no one of the sacred writer’s generation could understand? Or did He suffer His revelation to find expression in terms of the current conceptions of history, much as we are accustomed to say it found expression in terms of the current conceptions of science? A full discussion of the various theological arguments involved

would be quite outside the province of an article of this Encyclopedia, but reference must be made to two important Biblical arguments:

(1) In a question which thus affects the amount covered by the inspiration of the Bible, quotations from the Bible itself beg the question when adduced to show entire infallibility. So appeals to the New Testament are hardly helpful. Moreover, they prove too much. In Jude 1:14,15 there is a quotation from the Book of Enoch (1:9), which is made in the most formal manner possible. But will anyone maintain that this compels us to believe that our Book of Enoch was actually written by Enoch, the seventh from Adam? Yet if the quotation had been taken from an Old Testament work, precisely this would have been maintained.

(2) Far more important is the use of the Old Testament by Christ, for here a quite different authority comes in. But the question must be asked: Just how far did our Lord's use of a passage involve ratification of all the current ideas about that passage? A good answer is supplied by Ac 1:6,7. When He is asked, "Dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" we know that the pedantically "correct" answer would have been, "The kingdom never will be restored to Israel in any such sense as ye conceive of it." Yet this is precisely what Christ does not say. "It is not for you to know times or seasons." No hint was given at all that the kingdom was universal, for the disciples would find that out for themselves in good time. In order that they should be able to do God's work there was no need to bewilder them with a truth as yet altogether revolutionary. And any close student of the "Kingdom of God" passages soon realizes how often Christ uses current terminology without comment, even when it seems almost materialistic. A literal exegesis of Lu 22:18 would necessitate believing that grapes will grow in the world to come and that Christ will drink wine made from them, and almost certainly the disciples gathered just this idea from the words. But no one today finds them in the least a difficulty. The exact extent of the kingdom and the exact nature of the happiness in it were irrelevant to what the disciples had to do. And so it cannot be thought an injustice to treat Christ's use of the Old Testament by exactly the same rules, all the more as nowhere, not even in Mr 12:36, does the argument turn on the original human author or the date of writing. What Christ Himself, in His inner consciousness, knew on the subject is something beyond our immediate data. But His use of the Old Testament lends no support to a Kenotic theory, not even on the wildest Old Testament critical hypotheses.

See KENOSIS.

II. The Legislation.

As is well known, among the laws of the Pentateuch there exist several well-marked groups, of which the most formal is De 12-26.

1. Groups:

Another such group is Le 17-26 or the Holiness Code (H), and still another is Ex 20:22-23:19 or the Covenant Code (CC). With this last is closely connected the Decalogue and the little compend Ex 34:17-

26. Now it will be convenient for present purposes to designate the remaining mass of Pentateuchal legislation under the non- committal symbol X.

2. Covenant Code:

In the first place, attention may be directed to Covenant Code as a whole. Whatever it was meant to be, it was not meant as a mere interims code for the period of the wanderings, either in its civil or its religious prescriptions. One piece of evidence alone is enough to show the contrary: in the laws touching settlements of disputes it is presupposed that Moses himself is not accessible. And the life assumed is agricultural. Men are living in fields with settled boundaries (Ex 22:5,6). The vine and the olive are both under cultivation (Ex 22:5,29; 23:11), under such settled circumstances that the rest of the Sabbatical year can be observed. And of the feasts, Weeks and Tabernacles are connected with the harvests (Ex 23:16). Of course, Moses may very well have given commands that looked to the future, but the present contention is simply that it was the remote and not the immediate future that is in point on this assumption. The life is Canaan and not the wilderness. But, now, the life is very primitive life. Flocks are of great importance, as is shown by the proportion of space given to laws about them. Rulers are mentioned only in Ex 22:28 (nasi'), and judges, as settled officers, are not mentioned at all, for the very rare word in Ex 21:22 (palil, De 32:31; Job 31:11 only) should be translated "umpire." Indeed in Ex 23:1-9 the duties of citizens, witness and judge are so intermingled as to suggest that judgment was administered by a general gathering of the people. It is taken for granted that a master has marital rights over his maidservants (Ex 21:7-11). Coined money is mentioned only in Ex 21:32, if there. There is no attempt to define proportions exactly; compare Ex 22:5 ("best of his own field") and Ex 22:29 (the amount of the gift—a tenth?—not stated). Similarly there is no precise dating of the feasts of Weeks and Tabernacles in 23:16, while the exact day in Abib (Ex 23:15) is at least not specified. Now, if this code could be isolated from the rest of the legislation, would not one refer it naturally on the above grounds alone to a time not very far either way from that of Saul?

Now, in what follows, the prescriptions of the various codes will be compared with each other in regard to the various institutions of Israel's religion and also studied in the wider evidence of the historical books. The evidence of Chronicles, however, will be omitted for the most part, as a separate section is devoted to it (III, 1).

3 The Sanctuary:

(1) The firstling is to be with its dam seven days, but on the eighth (not later!) it is to be given to God. The offerings from the harvest and from the presses (wine and olives) are to be offered without delay (Ex 22:29,30). Consequently the place of offering must have been readily accessible. By what has been said above and by the mention of "presses" here, ready accessibility in Palestine is presupposed. But this implies a multiplicity of sanctuaries. And in Samuel-Kings this multiplicity of sanctuaries is exactly what is found. Samuel sacrifices in Mizpah (1Sa 7:9), in Ramah (1Sa 9:12 ff), in Gilgal (1Sa 11:15) and in Bethlehem (1Sa 16:5). David's family held a yearly sacrifice in Bethlehem, which David attended regularly (1Sa 20:6). Solomon received a special revelation from God at Gibeon (1Ki 3:4 ff—for the

account in Chronicles see III, 1). Although the heart of Asa was perfect and the way of Jehoshaphat right, yet the many altars were suffered to remain (1Ki 15:14; 22:43—again for Chronicles see III, 1). The destruction of the altars of God was to Elijah a terrible calamity (1Ki 19:10). While Amos and Hosea abound in denunciations of sacrifices as substitutes for righteousness, yet they never even intimate a duty to offer sacrifices in some other place (Am 1:2; Ho 3:5 are irrelevant). Not even do Mic 4:2 and Isa 2:2 imply that Jerusalem was to have the sole right to the cult.

(2) Ezekiel is the first prophet who makes the place of sacrifice a matter of paramount importance, and this importance of the place is, in the Pentateuch, emphasized primarily in Deuteronomy. It is needless to collect the familiar evidence from Deuteronomy, but an illuminating comparison with Covenant Code is given by the laws for firstlings. No longer is the firstling given on the eighth day. It must be kept, but not worked or shorn, until the time when "year by year" it may be eaten in the chosen place (De 15:19,20). So now the fruits of the field and the "presses" are not offered "without delay" but again "year by year," with a provision for turning them into money if the way be too long to the sanctuary (De 14:22-27). Deuteronomy and Covenant Code evidently have distinct conceptions—and again attention may be called to the fact that Covenant Code contains laws for Palestine, not for the wilderness. The Law of Holiness (H), Le 17-26, is as explicit as Deuteronomy—sacrifice anywhere except at the Tent is a capital offense (Le 17:8,9). And the evidence of X need not be collected, but, passing out of the Pentateuch for the moment, Jos 22:10-34 represents Israel as understanding from the first entrance into Canaan that sacrifice at any altar but the one was the worst of crimes.

(3) How is the offering of sacrifices in various places by such men as Samuel to be explained? That the worship was disorganized and the proper sanctuary could not be reached is hardly an explanation. For no disorganization of the country could be great enough to justify the offering of sacrifices in places not only unauthorized but flatly forbidden in Le 17:8,9. On theory of Mosaic origin for the whole of the Pentateuchal legislation, Samuel knew as much about the clear statements of the Law as does any Jew of today, but it is clearly enough recognized by all Jews that no disorganization of the county or Divine reprobation of the Temple justifies sacrifice in any other place. A key, however, seems to be found in De 12:8-11, where sacrifice in various places is actually authorized until such a time as the land should be pacified and the Divine choice given to a place—a time represented in the history of Israel as about the time of David, or perhaps Solomon. This certainly does explain the situation as it is found in Samuel-Kings. Only, it is in flat contradiction with H and X.

This point is important. De 12:8-11 not only represents sacrifice in various places as permitted until some later time, but it represents Moses and the Israelites as practicing the same things in the wilderness —"the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes; for ye are not as yet come," etc.; i.e. Deuteronomy’s conception was that in the wilderness Moses and the Israelites offered sacrifice wherever they thought good. This was to continue until God gave them rest from their enemies round about. Then the sacrifices were to be brought to the chosen place and to be offered nowhere else. Now, the conception in H and X is wholly different. On the mount Moses received directions for the building of the Tabernacle, with its altar. From the beginning it was a capital offense to offer sacrifices on any other altar than this (Le 17:8,9), which was carried everywhere on the wanderings and brought into Canaan. In the very days of Phinehas, the offering of sacrifices on a different altar was

enough to make civil war justifiable (Jos 22:12). For further discussion see III, 2.

(4) The difficulties of these data are obvious but are completely satisfied by the assumption that different conceptions of past history are present. Deuteronomy belongs to a period when the unity of the sanctuary had become an established fact, but still before the memory of the many altars as comparatively legitimate was extinguished. H and X, however, belong to a considerably later day, when the unity of the sanctuary had been so long taken for granted that no pious Israelite could conceive that anything else had ever existed. The reference of the commands to Moses is altogether in oriental manner.

NOTE.—Ex 20:24 has not been used in the above argument, but with the evidence presented there seems to be no obstacle to the translations of the EV. The familiar evidence of Judges is of course merely cumulative.

Le 1-7 contains a list of the various kinds of sacrifices:

4. Kinds of Sacrifice:

(a) the sin offering and the trespass offering, very elaborately treated and obviously of the highest importance;

(b) the whole burnt offering and the peace offering; and, standing a little by itself, the meal offering.

The latter is of no especial significance for the present discussion and may be neglected. Now a curious fact may be noted. In the prophetic writings before Ezekiel there is not one single reference to class (a). This is not simply the argument from silence, for sacrifices with their special names are mentioned freely and sacrificial rites described- -invariably of class (b), even when presented for penitential purposes. If the offering is not burnt whole, the worshipper eats of it—it is a peace offering. Jer 7:21 is a particularly significant example, but compare Am 4:4,5; 5:22,25; Ho 8:13; 9:4; Isa 1:11; 22:12-14; 28:7,8; Jer 6:20. Turning to Samuel-Kings we find this borne out. The names of the sin and trespass offerings appear in 2Ki 12:16, but it is money that is referred to (the English Versions of the Bible should be checked with the Hebrew here), just as the golden mice appear as a trespass offering in 1Sa 6:3 ff. And in the codes, neither Covenant Code nor Deuteronomy mentions class (a) and even in H they appear only in Le 19:21,22; i.e. what in later times appear as the greatest sacrifices of Israel—by Le 8 Israel's first sacrifice was a sin offering—are found only in X and are mentioned in the prophets for the first time in Eze 40:39, while the other classes are mentioned frequently. It seems difficult to escape the inference that class (a) appeared relatively late in Israel's history, a point discussed more fully in IV.

5. Sacrifice in General:

The problem presented by Jer 7:22 is a very serious one. Obviously, to say that the command to offer sacrifice was not given on the day of the Exodus but on Sinai, is quite unsatisfactory, for this would

make Jeremiah quibble. He denies categorically that a command to offer sacrifice was part of the Divine Law at all. Now, if it be noted that the offering of firstlings and first-fruits was altogether distinct from the regular sacrifices, it will be seen that Jer can very well presuppose Covenant Code or even Deuteronomy, both of which contain only regulative prescriptions for sacrifice. (Whether Jeremiah actually did conceive Covenant Code and Deuteronomy as binding is another question.) But by what exegesis of the passage can Jeremiah pre-suppose X? The natural inference is that the regulations of X became obligatory on Israel after Jeremiah's day.

6. Vestments:

What follows is in itself an infinitesimal matter but the evidence is significant. The prohibition of steps for the altar in Ex 20:26 is based on the fact that the ministrants X were very scantily clad (compare the light clothing of pilgrims at Mecca). This is corroborated in 2Sa 6:14,20-22, where Michal reproves David for exposing himself. But in the priests wear rather elaborate vestments, over linen breeches (Ex 28:42). And, to call in Chronicles for the moment, this is the conception found there of David's religious zeal at the bringing in of the ark. Besides the ephod he wears a long linen robe and Michal despises him, not for exposing himself, but only for dancing (1Ch 15:27-29).

7. Priests and Levites:

(1) Covenant Code has no regulations regarding the priesthood, but of course it does not follow that this silence has any significance. However, Samuel-Kings furnish us with certain evidence. Samuel, although an Ephraimite (1Sa 1:1), offers sacrifice repeatedly (see 3, above). In 2Sa 20:25,26 the Hebrew says that Zadok and Abiathar were kohanim, and also Ira the Jairite was kohen unto David. Exactly the same word is used for Zadok and Ira in practically the same sentence, and no one without prior conceptions would have dreamed of giving it entirely distinct translations under the circumstances, as do the King James Version and the Revised Version texts (not margins). Again in 2Sa 8:18 it is said that David's sons were kohanim and in 1Ki 4:5 that Zabud was kohen. Now if kohen does not mean "priest" in these passages, they are the only cases out of a total of 750 occurrences. That the Chronicler understood the word to mean priest is shown by the fact that in his parallel to 2Sa 8:18 (1Ch 18:17) he uses a different word altogether. The natural inference from these passages is that the restriction of priestly ministration to a certain line came about after Solomon's time (compare Jud 17:12,13, a Levite is desirable but not essential).

(2) In Deuteronomy the priesthood appears as limited to the sons of Levi, but it is at least safe to say that no explicit distinction is made within the tribe. In Deu 21:5 the priests are the "sons of Levi," just as in Deu 17:9; 18:1; 24:8 the term is "the priests the Levites." In Deu 10:8 the right to bless and in Deu 33:8-11 the right to offer incense and sacrifice are in no ways said to be restricted to a very small proportion of the tribe. Compare Jer 33:21,22 (here questions of authenticity are irrelevant). A clear distinction within the tribe of Levi appears in the prophetic writings for the first time in Eze 44:10-31, where two kinds of Levites are spoken of, "the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok" (verse 15) and the Levites, simply (verse 10). No third class is recognized (compare Eze 40:45,46, where the distinction is between

two classes of priests). Now, the distinction between the Zadokian and non-Zadokian Levites is based by Ezekiel on one thing only, in the past the former had been faithful and the latter had not (Eze 44:10-15). Because the former had ministered before idols, therefore should they not come to execute the office of a priest, but perform only inferior ministrations. Now this can mean only that the non-Zadokians are excluded from priestly privileges that they once possessed. The non-Zadokians, if they had not sinned, would still have been legitimate priests in Ezekiel's eyes, for otherwise the exclusion from the altar would be eviscerated of all meaning as a punishment; i.e. Ezekiel knows of only two kinds of Levites, both kinds originally legitimate priests, but one class now to be forbidden access to the altar because of sin. A third class of Levite, non- Aaronites, who never had had access to the altar, but who, because of their righteousness, had been blessed with the privilege to perform minor ministerial acts, is conspicuous in Ezekiel by its absence. And this absence, in the face of the immense amount of minute detail contained in Eze 40-48, can be explained on no other hypothesis than that Ezekiel did not know of such a class. When the immense importance of the non-Aaronite Levites in Chronicles, Ezra, etc., is thought of, what other explanation can be given for their omission in Ezekiel's elaborate regulations for the cult? To whom did Ezekiel consider the more menial work in the Temple would have fallen if the non-Zadokians had not sinned? Probably he never raised the question at all, but there is no objection to supposing that he would have assigned it to the priesthood as a whole.

(3) It is needless to collect the evidence of X. The non-Aaronite Levites appear there as ministers of the greatest importance, elaborately set apart, and with their duties and privileges accurately defined (Nu 8, especially). Now, it is submitted that this evidence points in its most natural interpretation to a gradual narrowing of the priestly privileges in Israel through a period of many centuries. It is natural, though by no means necessary, to identify the non-Zadokians of Ezekiel with the non-Aaronites of X. At all events it is argued that in course of time, long after the priesthood had become restricted to Levites only, a considerable proportion of the latter lost their priestly privilege. Ezekiel stood near enough to the change (that he was the actual innovator is improbable) to state the fact of the degradation and its cause. X regarded the distinction as of such long standing that it must be accredited to Moses himself. It is highly probable that evidence of the change is to be found in De 18:6-8, but this will not be pressed here.

8. Dues:

(1) In Covenant Code first-fruits are to be offered in Ex 23:19 and a portion (perhaps a tenth, but not specified as such) of the whole harvest in 22:29. Nothing is said about their disposition. In Deuteronomy, the first-fruits of grain, wine and oil (with fleece) belong to the "priests the Levites" (18:4). And the basket of "fruit" in the beautiful rite of 26:1-11 probably had the same destination. Of the general harvest the tithe is to be dedicated, as explained at length in 14:22-29. The worshipper is to eat it himself, but shall take care to see that the Levite receives a portion. Every third year, however, the tithe is to be spent for the benefit of all who need charity, including the Levite. Note that in either case the Levite receives only a part of the tithe. In X the first-fruits are again assigned to the clergy (but now specifically to the priests—Nu 18:12,13). But it appears that the tithe is to be given wholly to the Levites in Nu 18:21-24. The contradiction with De 14:22-29 is real. That two tithes were to be paid by the worshipper may safely be assumed as impossible, as a tax of one-fifth would have been unendurable. (It may be noted, though, that in later days the very pious took this interpretation—

compare Tobit 1:7—but it is certain that no such ruling ever maintained generally.) An alternative explanation offered is that it could be assumed that the Levite would invite the worshipper to join in a feast on the tithe. Frankly, it is difficult to treat this as quite candid. In Deuteronomy the worshipper is anything rather than a mere guest at another man's banquet. When the tithe has been brought as money, the worshipper is to spend it on anything that best pleases him, and of the Levite it is said only "thou shalt not forsake him." Moreover, the tithe is to be consumed at the sanctuary and nowhere else (De 14:23; compare Deu 12:11). In Nu 18, however, the tithe becomes the exclusive property of the Levite and it is assigned him as his source of income (verses 25-32) and so exclusively is it his that it in turn is tithed. And, far from being turned into a feast at which the worshipper shares, it need not be consumed at the sanctuary at all but may be eaten in "every place," wherever the Levite and his family may happen to live (verse 31). It would be hard to conceive of two rules more mutually exclusive than the tithe directions in Deuteronomy and Numbers. That the livelihood provided for the Levites in Deuteronomy is pitiful is hardly in point and at all events he received more than did the widow and the orphan. But compare IV.

(2) Firstlings in Covenant Code must be offered on the eighth day (Ex 22:30), but in De 15:19-22 they were preserved, without being worked or shorn, until "year by year" they could be taken up to the sanctuary. (Apparently by 14:23-25 it might be converted into money in case of great distance.) Here the worshipper was to offer it and eat of it (a peace offering). But in Nu 18:15-18 the firstling becomes the personal property of the priest and he receives the flesh of the animal, if it can be sacrificed (i.e. it is his peace offering, not the worshipper's). There is no question of giving back a portion to the worshipper, again. Note, moreover, that in De 15:21-23, an animal not fit for sacrifice was eaten at home by the worshipper and so did not come in contact with the priest at all; contrast Nu 18:15.

(3) A minor matter is found in the portion of the peace offering that went to the priest. In De 18:3 it is specified as the shoulder, two cheeks and maw. In X (Ex 29:26- 28, etc.) this has become the breast and the right thigh—a considerably more advantageous portion.

(4) In De it is laid down that a Levite has no inheritance among his brethren (Deu 10:9; 12:12; 18:1) and hence, is recommended as an object of charity, like the widow and the orphan. And, like the widow and the orphan, he lives "within thy gates" (Deu 12:12, etc.), i.e. in the same cities as the rest of the Israelites. Now in X the adjurations to charity disappear, because he receives a fixed income (from the tithe), but it is said that this tithe is given the Levites in lieu of an inheritance, "Among the children of Israel they shall have no inheritance" (Nu 18:21-24), In another part of X, however, there is still a different conception—the Levites receive no less than forty- eight cities with ample "suburbs," expressly said to be given them "from the inheritance" of Israel (Nu 35:1-8). So in Le 25:32-34 the houses of the Levites are "their possession among the children of Israel," and the fields "their perpetual possession" and inalienable. Is there any natural explanation of these passages except that they represent increasing efforts to provide properly for the Levites as time went on? That the different rules represent advances within Moses' own period cannot be taken seriously, especially as on this hypothesis the De laws would have been the latest. See, in addition, III.

9. Miscellaneous:

(1) Covenant Code and De have little mention of coined money and little attempt to define fractions exactly. Contrast the elaborate regulations of, e.g. Le 27. It is not contended that the Israelites could not have had enough culture in Moses' day to calculate so accurately, but attention must be drawn to the extreme contrast.

(2) In Covenant Code (Ex 23:16) the year begins in the fall, in H (Le 23:5) and X (Ex 12:2; Nu 9:5; 28:16) it begins in the spring.

(3) De 16:3 explains the use of unleavened bread at the Passover as due to the haste with which the Israelites left Egypt (as in Ex 12:39), while Ex 12:15-20 makes this use depend on the positive command of God before the first-born were slain. And note that, in Ex 12:18-20 is a simple repetition of Ex 12:15-17 with a more precise dating added. For this matter of dating compare the rough statements of Covenant Code with the exactness of Le 23.

(4) In Covenant Code marital rights of the master over his maidservants are taken for granted (Ex 21:7-11); in De 15:17 the maidservant has the same privilege of release as the manservant, with the evident assumption that slavery does not confer marital rights on the master. (It is of course gratuitous to assume that two different kinds of maidservants are meant, particularly as in both cases the maidservant is contrasted in general with the manservant in general.) Note, moreover, that in Ex 20:17 "wife" follows "house" in the prohibition against coveting, while in De 5:21 "wife" precedes "house" and a different verb is used. The inference is natural that between Covenant Code and De woman, both as slave and as wife, had risen to a higher position.

(5) In both Covenant Code (Ex 21:6) and De 15:17 life-long slavery is permitted, if the slave desires it, otherwise the slave is free at the end of the sixth year. In H (Le 25:39-43), the slave serves until the Jubilee year and then goes free absolutely.

10. Summary:

Now, it is not claimed that all the discrepancies in the above lists are incapable of reconciliation, although the examples chosen are among those where reconciliation is extremely difficult. The claim is made, however, that all of this evidence is cumulative and that each successive item points more and more forcibly toward a single conclusion—that in the legislation of the Pentateuch, especially when considered in connection with the Prophets and with Samuel-Kings, there have been incorporated laws belonging to very different periods. And, for the most part, a development from the simple to the highly organized can be traced. And this conclusion explains all the facts.

11. Additional Note:

The above examples have been chosen as those where no changes in the text need be made. Of the other instances, only one need be considered—Le 17. On its surface, this chapter appears to refer solely to life

in the wilderness. But in Le 17:8,10,12,13,15 it appears that living in the midst of the Israelites are settled non-Israelites. And the "open field" of Le 17:5 is a contrast to city, not to tent, life. Now in Le 17:3-5 the question is not at all idolatry but eating of blood at an ordinary meal. An exact commentary is found on this in 1Sa 14:32-35, where the Israelites sin in eating the blood of animals "slain on the ground"; i.e. in both Le 17 and 1Sa 14, at every slaying of an animal for food, some formal disposition of the blood had to be made. In Le 17:4 this is sacrificial, and the appearance of the altar in 1Sa 14:35 points in the same direction. Now this investing of every slaying of an animal with a sacrificial character, explains the permission of De 12:20-25 to eat flesh "after all the desire of thy soul," a permission inexplicable unless there had been an earlier contrary practice. It is to be noted, moreover, that in De 12:16 the blood is to be disposed of by pouring it on the earth, the practice condemned in 1Sa 14:32. The conclusion is that before the legislation of Deuteronomy the Israelite offered the blood of every slain sacrificial animal at the local sanctuary. Deuteronomy's rigid enforcement of the one sanctuary made this impossible, and so permission was given to eat flesh at home, provided the blood was not eaten, and provided that it was disposed of in a non-sacrificial way. Now in Le 17:3-5 it becomes clear what has happened. The passage read originally something like this: 'What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, and hath not brought it to offer it as an oblation unto Yahweh, blood shall be imputed unto that man. ....' This offering was to take place at the local sanctuary. But when the passage was incorporated into the whole body of the legislation, the editor was working at a time when the legitimacy of the local sanctuaries had long been forgotten. And so references to the "camp" and "the tent of meeting" were inserted, in accordance with the only laws that the editor conceived could ever have prevailed. The discrepancies with Le 17:5,8, etc., were probably not observed.

It is to be understood that this passage is not used as presenting a basic argument for the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis. But it is cited as an example of other passages where the text is to be considered. And, also, because the assertion is made that this particular passage is a death-blow to the "critical" hypothesis. Naturally, it is nothing of the sort.

III. The History.

1. Chronicles:

It may be said at the outset that many of the attacks on the historic value of Chronicles have been very gravely exaggerated. But, none the less, a close comparison with Samuel-Kings shows that the Chronicler has most certainly read back into history the religious institutions of his own late day—it need not be said, with perfect innocence and sincerity. For instance, in comparing 2Ki 11:4 with 2Ch 23:2-6, we find the statement of Kings that Jehoiada brought captains of the Carites and of the guard into the house of Yahweh quite altered. In Chronicles Jehoiada summons Levites and heads of houses, with the express provision that only Levites shall enter into the house of Yahweh. So holy a priest as Jehoiada could not have acted as Kings says he did act. Similarly, the statement in 1Ki 15:14 that Asa did not remove the high places is changed into the statement that he did remove the high places (2Ch 14:3-5), and only those in (northern) Israel were left (2Ch 15:17). So did Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:6), although in

2Ch 20:33 the explicit statement to the contrary is copied (unnoticed?) from 1Ki 22:43. Such righteous kings must have enforced the single sanctuary. The almost trivial matter of David's garb when the ark was brought into Jerusalem (contrast 2Sa 6:20-22 with 1Ch 15:27-29) has been noticed already in II, 6. The important matter in Chronicles, however, is the history of the Tabernacle. In 1Ch 16:39-42 the Tabernacle is at Gibeon, with the full ministry surrounding it, with the exception of a detail left before the Ark in Jerusalem (compare 1Ch 9:17-32). And in 2Ch 5:5 it is brought up to Jerusalem, although the disposition made of it is not explained. Otherwise it is mentioned in 1Ch 6:48; 21:29; 2Ch 1:3. But the narrative presents some serious difficulties. Why did David build a special tent for the Ark in Jerusalem (1Ch 16:1), if the one Divinely appointed covering for the Ark was still standing—not to be brought to Jerusalem until its utility was past (2Ch 5:5)? That it was too fragile to be moved can hardly be taken seriously. In the first place, this explanation is without the least support in the text. And, in the second place, it is incredible for such a solid structure of wood, silver and brass, however much repair the curtains might have needed. Moreover, this explanation will not do at all for Bezalel's brazen altar, which was still quite usable in 2Ch 1:5, making the construction of a new altar (2Ch 4:1) altogether inexplicable. The impression is created at once that the Chronicler has injected the Tabernacle into a narrative that knew nothing of it. This is corroborated by 1Ch 21:29,30; the altar at the floor of Ornan is explained by the difficulty of reaching the Tabernacle. But the Ark, the natural means for an inquiry of God, was in Jerusalem, with an altar by it (1Ch 16:1)—why this third altar on the threshing-floor? The inaccessibility of the Tabernacle is invoked here only to solve what was a difficulty to the Chronicler. Now if 2Ch 1:3 be compared with 1Ki 3:2-4, the key of the whole is discovered. Kings not only does not mention the presence of the Tabernacle at Gibeon, but excludes it. Solomon's sacrificing at Gibeon is explained by saying that such was the custom of all Israel, who sacrificed in high places before the Temple was built; Solomon also sacrificed in highplaces and Gibeon was a great high-place. This is an apology for Solomon's conduct—why should the editor of Kings have apologized for sacrifice offered at the Divinely appointed Tabernacle? The Chronicler, however, could not believe that God blessed Solomon when offering sacrifice in a way forbidden by the law of Chronicle's times, and hence, he solves the difficulty by bringing in something that is unknown to the narrative in Kings.

2. Kings, etc.:

Indeed, Kings mentions the Tabernacle only in 1Ki 8:4. Samuel mentions the Tabernacle as such only in 1Sa 2:22. Jud does not mention the Tabernacle at all (Jud 18:31 is the only possibility and the word there is "house"). Now 1Sa 2:22 is not found in the Vatican Septuagint, and the description of the Tabernacle as a tent contradicts 1Sa 1:9; 3:15, where it appears as a temple or house. So it must be dropped as a gloss. Nor will it be denied that 1Ki 8:4 looks suspiciously like a gloss as well, particularly in view of the presence of Levites there, who are practically unmentioned elsewhere in Samuel-Kings. At all events, there are only these two possible mentions of what should have been the center of Israel's worship in all of Judges-Samuel-Kings. This is not the ordinary argument from silence, it is silent about what should have been the most vital matter of all. Deuteronomy knows nothing of the Tabernacle, and, as has already been shown in II, states as clearly as language only can that in the wilderness the centralization of worship was not observed. The argument from silence alone would be conclusive here, for how could the author of De in his passionate advocacy of the single sanctuary fail to appeal to the single sanctuary already established by God's decree, if he knew anything about it? But not only is there

no such mention in Deuteronomy but a positive exclusion of such a sanctuary in express terms. The case would seem to be complete. The Tabernacle of X and Chronicles is an ideal structure projected back into the past, just as the temple of Ezekiel is an ideal structure projected into the future. And it is needless to appeal to the familiar argument that the Tabernacle of Ex 26 would have been blown to pieces by the first storm. It had no provision for tent poles deeply sunk, which alone could resist the blasts of the desert.

It is impossible in the space of the present article to enter into all the corroborative evidence, but a very few important arguments may be mentioned.

3. The Conquest:

Simple people tend most naturally to think of heroes of the past as more and more glorious as time passes. Now Jud 1 describes the conquest of Canaan as a slow and laborious process after Joshua's death. But in Jos 10:40-43; 11:10-23; 21:43-45—especially 11:16-19—Canaan was completely swept of its inhabitants by Joshua in a series of annihilatory campaigns, making Jud 1 quite impossible. Evidently the Joshua passages cited belong to a very much later conception of the past history. The fate of Hebron is especially interesting. In Jud 1:20 Caleb takes Hebron after Joshua's death. But in Jos 15 Caleb takes Hebron during Joshua's lifetime and at the latter's direction. In Jos 10:36,37, however, Joshua takes Hebron personally and annihilates its inhabitants. Here are three distinct conceptions of Hebron's fate, again. But still a fourth is found in Jos 21:11,12: it was not Caleb who received the city but the Levites. This evidently belongs to the time when the Levitical right to cities had become a commonplace, and was therefore referred to the earliest days. The accounts of the annihilation of the Canaanites arose naturally enough. Accordings to Judges the conquest was gradual and merciful. But the Canaanites seduced Israel to idolatry repeatedly. Therefore they should have been routed out (De 20:16-18). But Joshua was righteous and had all power. Therefore he must have rooted them out. How they suddenly reappeared again was a question that was not raised. But perhaps it may be thought a relief to understand that the ruthless campaigns of the Israelites are due to reflection and not to descriptions of what actually happened.

4. Ideas of God:

Simple people think of God quite naturally and reverently as a greater man. So in Ex 24:9-11 we read that Moses and many others met God in the mount, they all saw Him. and ate and drank before Him. A slightly more refined point of view is in Ex 33:11, where Moses (but no one else) sees God face to face, and Nu 12:8, where again he (alone) sees the form of God. But in Ex 33:20 no man, not even Moses, can see God face to face. In De 4:11-15 it is laid down that only darkness was seen- -"ye saw no form." Perhaps Moses was thought of as an exception, but the contradiction of the concept that conceived over seventy Israelites besides Moses to have seen God is complete.

5. Priesthood:

The reading back of an official priesthood into the time of Moses can be seen in certain passages where Aaron appears predominantly. Contrast, e.g. Ex 8:20-24; 15:23- 26; 17:1-7 with Ex 7:1-19; 16:9,10; Nu 20:2-13. Yet despite the importance of Aaron in the latter passages, in Ex 33:11 the minister of Moses in the Tent is Joshua, who is not a priest at all. Contrast similarly De 31:14,15 with Nu 27:18-21, noting how Eleazar appears in the latter passage, although the former excludes him. At the time of X it was not thought possible that Moses could have acted without the official mediation of the official priest.

6. Summary:

Reasons of space preclude a further discussion of the other arguments here, such as the linguistic. As a matter of fact, the sections that contain the more developed concepts contain also a different vocabulary. To be repeated, however, is the fact that the argument is cumulative and that a single explanation of the differences is offered in the hypothesis of very varying dates for the various portions. Of course an exact analysis of every verse and a rigorous reconstruction of every source is not claimed to be possible. Many scholars have been carried by their enthusiasm for analysis into making preposterous dissections. But the principal lines of division are sufficiently clear. And it may be hoped the reader will not think that the acceptance of them has been dictated by any motive except that of facing the truth—least of all by any motive of a weakened faith in the power of God or a suspicion of the miraculous.

IV. Reconstruction.

1. Covenant Code:

Israel came into Canaan, after having received through the mediation of Moses a covenant relation with God and (almost certainly) some accompanying legislation. But this legislation seems not to have prescribed the ritual form that the worship of God was to take. In part, old forms were simply continued and in part new forms were gradually developed or appropriated, the emphasis of the Law at that time being on the moral and the ritual being left quite free. In especial, sacrifices were offered wherever Israelites happened to live, doubtless frequently at former Canaanite sanctuaries, now rededicated to Yahweh. The local sanctuary was the center of the life. Men went thither to learn God’s will and to give a religious character to what we should call purely secular transactions (contracts, etc.). Firstlings were offered there on the eighth day, first-fruits at once, every meal of flesh food was given a sacrificial character (peace offering), and, for more solemn purposes, the whole burnt offering was offered. So the local sanctuary corresponded to our "village church"; it was the religious home of the people. Certain of these sanctuaries had an especial dignity, above all Shiloh, where the Ark was. Later, when a united Israel had been realized, David brought the Ark to Jerusalem that the national capital might become the center of the national religious life as well, and Solomon enshrined the Ark in the Temple. So to Jerusalem there resorted naturally the best of Israel’s religious leaders, and there the worship of God would be found in its purest form, normally speaking.

2. Deuteronomy:

As time went on, the progress of culture and the freer contact with other nations had bad effects as well as good. New and degrading religious practices flowed into the country and they revived old but equally degrading religious practices that had survived from the Canaanites. The priesthood at Jerusalem did not escape a taint, but the place where such rites gained the readiest foothold was of course the obscure local sanctuaries. Not the best-minded king or the most zealous prophet, could watch all the services at them all, and attempts at purging them of idolatry or idolatrous rites (Elijah, Jehu, etc.) could not effect permanent improvement. And it could not have been very long after David's own day that the idea must have begun to grow that complete prohibition of country sacrifices and the rigid centralization of everything at Jerusalem was the only measure possible. This would soon become a fixed conviction of the better class of the Jerusalem priesthood and in a few generations would be a tradition. Detailed precepts to carry this tradition into effect arose necessarily and in turn became a tradition and in course of time were regarded as Moses' work and committed to writing. In this way the legislation of De took form and at the time of its discovery under Josiah there is not the slightest occasion to attribute fraud to anyone engaged in the transaction. The document agreed fairly well with what was the tradition of Jerusalem, and no one at that day could distinguish between a writing a century old or even less and a writing of Moses own time. The country priests and the mass of the people were not consulted as to enforcing it, and they would not have known if they had been consulted. On any reading of the history, the reforms proceeded from a very small group, and any general "tradition of the Jews" was nonexistent.

3. Later:

(1) The reforms added to theoretical tradition the additional influence of practical experience and the idea of course dominated the minds of the more earnest among the exiles. Ezekiel, in particular, realized that only at a single sanctuary could the worship of God be kept pure—the single sanctuary was God's will. And Ezekiel's influence was immense. Now it is to be noted that at the return only those came back who had a real enthusiasm for Jerusalem, as Babylonia was, materially speaking, a far more attractive place than the Palestine of that day. That the single sanctuary could have been questioned by any of these Jews or that they could have conceived of Moses as instituting anything of less dignity is impossible.

(2) Other reforms also had been at work. Even in De the more primitive note of joyousness was maintained in the sacrifices. But joyousness in simple life is often dissipation in cultured life and the peace offering could be made a debauch (Isa 22:12-14; Pr 7:14). A sense of personal guilt had become far better developed and the incongruity of penitential worship with a festal meal was recognized. A very slight change was made: the portion was to be eaten by the priest instead of the worshipper—and the sin and trespass offerings emerged. The abuses were cut away by this one stroke and the peace offering proper retired into the background. And sacrifices were made the proper center of the official worship. In accord with the growing culture, proportions of gifts, dates of feasts, etc., were specified more and more exactly, the worship was surrounded with a more impressive ritual, and, in particular, the officiating priests substituted vestments suited to the better taste of the time for the old loin-cloth. Traces are left in the Old Testament of difficulties regarding the rights of the various classes of priests to minister but the matter was settled eventually in a manner that satisfied all. Priests formerly guilty of idolatry and their descendants were admitted to share in the worship and the priestly revenues, but the

actual offering of sacrifice was restricted to those who had been faithful. The proper support of the clergy so formed required, in accordance with their dignity, more elaborate provisions than had been needed in the simpler times of old, but was accomplished in a manner again entirely satisfactory. The religion of no other nation could have survived the Babylonian exile intact. But Israel returned, with the elements formerly necessary but now outgrown changed into a form adapted to the new task the nation had before it—the preparation of itself and the world for the advent of Christ.

4. Evaluation:

This growth toward the higher, involving as it did the meeting of all kinds of obstacles, the solving of all kinds of problems, the learning when to abandon elements that had been transcended, is unique in the history of religions. And the explanation of its uniqueness can be found only in the guidance of God. And in the history as reconstructed God is seen truly as the Father, who trained His children little by little, giving them only what they were able to receive but bringing them surely to Himself. And in the documents that contain the precepts for each stage of progress God's hand can be seen no less clearly. To be sure, in the secular science of history (as in physics or astronomy) His revelation was expressed in forms that His people could understand. This alteration—and this alteration only—in our view of what is covered by Biblical inspiration is the sacrifice demanded by the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis.

LITERATURE.

This is overwhelming and reference must be made to the separate articles. The standard analysis is that of The Oxford Hexateuch (1900), more briefly in The Composition of the Hexateuch by Carpenter and Harford (Battersby) (1902). Marx, Die Bucher Moses und Josua (1907), is the best brief introduction. Gunkel's Genesis (1910) in the Nowack series, his more popular Die Urgeschichte und die Patriarchen (1911), and his "Die israelitische Literatur" in Die Kultur der Gegenwart, I, 7 (1906), should on no account be neglected. The best treatment of the inspiration question from the standpoint of pure dogmatics is F. J. Hall's Authority: Ecclesiastical and Biblical (1908).

In the above discussion it has been assumed that our text of the Old Testament is at least relatively trustworthy. The reader interested in what can be done by textual reconstruction will find the opposite poles represented in the works of Wiener and of Cheyne.

Burton Scott Easton

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—The promoters of the Encyclopedia are not to be understood as endorsing all the views set forth in Dr. Easton's article (see CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE). It was thought right, however, that, in such a work of reference, there should be given a full and adequate presentation of so popular a theory.)

CRITICISM AND ARCHAEOLOGY

See ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM.

CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE

krit’-i-siz’-m: Criticism in General

I. Divisions

1. Lower or Textual Criticism

2. Higher Criticism

II. LOWER OR TEXTUAL CRITICISM

1. Origin of the Science

2. Methods Employed

3. Causes of Error

4. Weighing of Authorities

(1) The Old Testament

Manuscripts and Versions

(2) The New Testament

(a) Manuscripts and Versions

(b) The Western Text

(c) Results

III. HIGHER CRITICISM

1. The Old Testament

(1) Astruc and Successors

(2) Hupfeld

(3) Graf and Wellhausen

(4) Literary and Historical Grounds of Theory

(5) The Codes

(6) Effects on History, etc.

(7) General Results

(8) Criticism of Theory

2. The New Testament

(1) The School of Baur

(2) Synoptical Criticism

(a) Oral, Documentary, and Dependence Theories

(b) The "Logia"

(c) Two-Source Theory

(d) Authorship—Lukan and Johannine Questions

(3) Modern "Critical-Historical" School

(4) Remaining Writings of New Testament

LITERATURE

Criticism in General:

So much has been said and written in recent years on "Criticism" that it is desirable that the reader should have an exact idea of what criticism is, of the methods it employs, and of the results it reaches, or believes itself to have reached, in its application to Scripture. Such a survey will show the legitimacy and indispensableness of a truly scientific criticism, at the same time that it warns against the hasty acceptance of Speculative and hypothetical constructions. Criticism is more than a description of

phenomena; it implies a process of sifting, testing, proving, sometimes with the result of establishing, often with that of modifying or reversing, traditional opinions. Criticism goes wrong when used recklessly, or under the influence of some dominant theory or prepossession. A chief cause of error in its application to the record of a supernatural revelation is the assumption that nothing supernatural can happen. This is the vitiating element in much of the newer criticism, both of the Old Testament and of the New Testament.

I. Divisions.

1. Lower or Textual Criticism:

Criticism of Scripture ("Biblical criticism") is usually divided into what is called "lower or textual criticism" and "higher criticism"—the latter a phrase round which many misleading associations gather. "Lower criticism" deals strictly with the text of Scripture, endeavoring to ascertain what the real text of each book was as it came from the hands of its author; "higher criticism" concerns itself with the resultant problems of age, authorship, sources, simple or composite character, historical worth, relation to period of origin, etc.

2. Higher Criticism:

The former—"textual criticism"—has a well-defined field in which it is possible to apply exact canons of judgment: the latter—"higher criticism"—while invaluable as an aid in the domain of Biblical introduction (date, authorship, genuineness, contents, destination, etc.), manifestly tends to widen out illimitably into regions where exact science cannot follow it, where, often, the critic’s imagination is his only law.

It was only gradually that these two branches of criticism became differentiated. "Textual criticism" for long took the lead, in association with a sober form of Biblical "introduction." The relations now tend to be reversed. "Higher criticism," having largely absorbed "introduction" into itself, extends its operations into the textual field, endeavoring to get behind the text of the existing sources, and to show how this "grew" from simpler beginnings to what it now is. Here, also, there is wide opening for arbitrariness. It would be wrong, however, to deny the legitimate place of "higher criticism," or belittle the great services it is capable of rendering, because of the abuses to which it is frequently liable.

It is now necessary that these two forms of criticism should be looked at more particularly.

II. Lower or Textual Criticism.

1. Origin of the Science:

We take first lower or textual criticism. There has never been a time when criticism of Scripture—lower and higher—has been altogether absent. The Jews applied a certain criticism to their sacred writings,

alike in the selection of the books, and in the settlement of the text. Examples are seen in the marginal notes to the Hebrew Scriptures (Qere and Kethibh). The Fathers of the early church compared manuscripts of the New Testament books, noting their differences, and judging of the books themselves. The Reformers, it is well known, did not accept blindly the judgments of antiquity, but availed themselves of the best light which the new learning afforded. The materials at the disposal of scholars in that age, however, were scanty, and such as existed were not used with much thoroughness or critical discernment. As aids multiplied with progress of discovery, comparison of manuscripts and versions one with another and with patristic quotations, revealed manifold divergencies and it became apparent that, in both Old Testament and New Testament, the text in current use in the church was far from perfect. "Various readings" accumulated. Not a few of these, indeed, were obvious blunders; many had little or no support in the more ancient authorities; for others, again, authority was fairly equally divided. Some were interpolations which had no right to be in the text at all. How, in these circumstances, was the true text to be ascertained? The work was one of great delicacy, and could only be accomplished by the most painstaking induction of facts, and the strictest application of sound methods. Thus arose a science of textual criticism, which, ramifying in many directions, has attained vast dimensions, and yielded an immense body of secure knowledge in its special department.

2. Methods Employed:

The materials with which textual criticism works (apparatus criticus) are, as just said, chiefly manuscripts, versions (translations into other tongues), quotations and allusions in patristic writings, with lectionaries (church service-books), and similar aids. The first step is the collection and collation of the material, to which fresh discovery is constantly adding; the noting of its peculiarities, and testing of its age and value; the grouping and designation of it for reference. A next important task is the complete collection of the "various readings" and other diversities of text (omissions, interpolations, etc.), brought to light through comparison of the material, and the endeavor to assign these to their respective causes.

3. Causes of Error:

More frequently than not errors manuscripts are unintentional, and the causes giving rise to them are sufficiently obvious. Such are the carelessness of scribes, lapses of memory, similarity of sounds (in dictation), or in shape of letters (in copying), wrong dividing of words, omission of a line or clause owing to successive lines or clauses ending with the same word. Intentional changes, again, arise from insertion in the text of marginal notes or glosses, from motives of harmonizing, from the substitution of smoother for harsher or more abrupt expressions—more rarely, from dogmatic reasons.

4. Weighing of Authorities:

Mistakes of the above kinds can generally be detected by careful scrutiny of sources, but a large number of cases remain in which the correct reading is still doubtful. These, next, have to be dealt with by the impartial weighing and balancing of authorities; a task involving new and delicate inquiries, and the application of fresh rules. It does not suffice to reckon numbers; manuscripts and versions have

themselves to be tested as respects reliability and value. Through the presence of peculiarities pointing to a common origin manuscripts come to be grouped into classes and families, and their individual testimony is correspondingly discounted. Older authorities, naturally, are preferred to younger but the possibility has to be reckoned with that a later manuscript may preserve a reading which the older manuscripts have lost. Such rules obtain as that, of two readings, preference is to be given to the more difficult, as less likely to be the result of corruption. But even this has its limits, for a reading may be difficult even to the point of unintelligibility, yet may arise from a simple blunder. As a last resort, in cases of perplexity, conjectural emendation may be admitted; only, however, as yielding probability, not certainty.

In the application of these principles an important distinction has to be made between the Old Testament and the New Testament, arising from the relative paucity of material for critical purposes in the one case, and the abundance in the other. The subject is treated here generally; for details see articles on LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(1) The Old Testament:

Manuscripts and Versions:

In the Old Testament, textual criticism labors under the peculiar disadvantage that, with one minute exception (a papyrus fragment of the 2nd century, giving a version of the Decalogue), all known Hebrew manuscripts are late (the oldest not going beyond the 9th century AD); further, that the manuscripts seem all to be based on one single archetype, selected by the rabbis at an early date, and thereafter adhered to by copyists with scrupulous care (compare G. A. Smith, OTJC, 69 ff; Driver, Text of Sam, xxxvii ff; Strack, however, dissents). The variations which these manuscripts present, accordingly, are slight and unimportant. For a knowledge of the state of the text prior to the adoption of this standard, criticism is dependent on comparison with the versions—especially the SEPTUAGINT (which see), with the SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH (which see), and with parallel passages in the Old Testament itself (e.g. in Samual, Kings, Chronicles). Frequent obscurities in the Hebrew text, with undeniable discrepancies in names and numbers, show that before the fixing of the text extensive corruption had already entered. A simple instance of mistake is in Isa 9:3, where the King James Version reads: "Thou hast multiplied the nation, and not increased the joy." The context shows that the "not" is out of place: the Revised Version (British and American) therefore rightly reads (with the Hebrew Qere: the sounds are similar), "thou hast increased their joy." In the Septuagint the divergences are often very great in order, arrangement, and readings; there are extensive interpolations and omissions (in Jeremiah, Graf reckons that 2,700 words of the Massoretic text are omitted); evidences, where the alterations are not of design, that the Hebrew manuscripts employed by the translators often differed widely from those approved in Palestin. The Samaritan recension likewise exhibits considerable differences.

It does not follow that, where difference exists, these rival texts are to be preferred to the Massoretic. Few, since the exhaustive examination of Gesenius, would affirm the superiority of the Samaritan to the

Hebrew; even in regard to the Septuagint the trend of opinion seems increasingly in favor of the text of the Massoretes (compare Skinner, "Genesis," International Critical Commentary, xxxv-xxxvi). There is no need, however, to maintain the general superiority of the above texts to the Massoretic to be convinced that, in many instances, the Septuagint, in some cases, probably, even the Sam, has retained readings from which the Massoretic Text has departed. Old Testament criticism has, therefore, a clear field for its labors, and there can be little doubt that, in its cautious application, it has reached many sound results. Less reliance can be placed on the conjectural criticism now so largely in vogue. Dr. G. A. Smith has justly animadverted on the new textual criticism of the poetical and prophetical books, "through which it drives like a great plowshare, turning up the whole surface, and menacing not only the minor landmarks, but, in the case of the prophets, the main outlines of the field as well" (Quarterly Review, January, 1907). This, however, trenches on the domain of the higher criticism.

(2) The New Testament:

In the New Testament the materials of criticism are vastly more abundant than in the Old Testament; but, with the abundance, while a much larger area of certainty is attainable, more intricate and difficult problems also arise. The wealth of manuscripts of the whole or parts of the Greek New Testament far exceeds that existing for any other ancient writings (Nestle mentions 3,829: 127 uncials and 3,702 cursives: Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament, English translation, 34-35, 81); the manuscripts of versions (excluding the Vulgate, reckoned by thousands), are likewise very numerous.

(a) Manuscripts and Versions:

Greek manuscripts are usually divided into uncials and cursives (or minuscules) from the character of the writing; the oldest uncials go back to the 4th and 5th centuries. The five chief, that alone need be named, are the Codex Sinaiticus (4th century), the Codex Vaticanus (B, 4th century), the Codex Alexandrinus (A, 5th century), the Codex Ephraemi (C, 5th century), the Codex Bezae (D, Gospels and Acts, Greek and Latin, 6th century). These manuscripts again are grouped according to affinities (Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, are here chief precursors; Westcott and Hort, chief modern authority), Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus (B) going together as representing one type of text, in the opinion of Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek the best (the so-called "Neutral"); Codex Bezae (D) representing a "Western" text, with marked peculiarities; A and C exhibiting mixed texts. The VSS, in turn, Syriac, Old Latin, Egyptian (originating with 2nd and 3rd centuries), present interesting problems in their relations to one another and to the Greek manuscripts Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, and Codex Bezae. With the Syriac versions (Sinaitic, Curetonian, Peshitta), Tatian’s Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels, ought to be mentioned. Formerly the Peshitta was taken to be the oldest Syriac version (2nd century); now, especially since the discovery of the Lewis (Sinaitic) palimpsest, it tends to be regarded as a later revision of the older Syriac texts (probably by Rabula of Edessa, beginning of the 5th century). The Old Latin, also the old Syriac, manuscripts show marked affinities with the text of Codex Bezae (D)—the "Western" type.

(b) The Western Text:

The question chiefly exercising scholars at the present time is, accordingly, the relation of the Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in the Greek text based on Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus to the Western text represented by Codex Bezae, but now finding early support from the Old Latin and Syriac, as well as from quotations in the 2nd and 3rd Fathers. The Western text is discounted by Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek for its para-phrastic character, and "astonishing freedom" in changing, inserting and omitting (Westcott-Hort, 122 ff); yet, on internal grounds, certain important omissions in this text of the last three chapters of Luke are accepted by these authorities as representing the purer text, the rejected readings being termed "non-Western interpolations." A newer school, however, is disposed to accept the Western readings, as, to a much larger extent than was formerly supposed, the more original; while some writers, as Blass, Nestle, in part Zahn (compare Nestle, op. cit., 324 ff), seek a solution of the difference of texts in theory of two editions (Blass, Luke and Acts; Zahn, Ac alone). This theory has not met with much acceptance, and the problems of the Western text must still be regarded as unsolved. The question is not, indeed, vital, as no important doctrine of the New Testament is affected; but it touches the genuineness of several passages to which high value is attached. E. g. the words at the Supper, "which is given for you," etc. (Lu 22:19,20, not in D), are excluded by Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek as a non-Western interpolation; while the passage on the angel and the bloody sweat (Lu 22:43,14 in both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Bezae), and the first word on the cross, "Father, forgive them," etc. (Lu 23:34, in Codex Sinaiticus, omitted by Codex Bezae (D) and the Sinaitic Syriac), are rejected as Western interpolations. The Revised Version (British and American) retains these passages with marginal note.

(c) Results:

As respects results, it may be said generally that the labors of a long line of scholars have given us a New Testament text on which, in nearly all essential respects, we can safely rely. Others, it is to be owned, take a less sanguine view (compare Nestle, op. cit., 227 ff). The correct reading seems undeniably settled in a large majority of cases. The the Revised Version (British and American) embodies most of the assured results; doubtful cases are noted in the margin. Among passages long known to be interpolations, now altogether removed, is that on the three witnesses in 1Jo 5:8. The two longest passages noted as not belonging to the original text are the last 12 verses of Mr (16:9-20), and the story of the woman taken in adultery (Joh 7:53-8:11).

III. Higher Criticism.

The scope of the higher criticism has already been indicated. Many of the inquiries it undertakes were formerly covered by what was called Biblical introduction; the flight of the newer science, however, is bolder, and the problems it seeks to solve are more complicated and far-reaching. An important part of its work is the analysis of books, with the view of determining their component parts (e.g. the J, E, P, D, of the Pentateuch), the age, origin, and characteristics of each, their connection with external conditions and the state of belief and life of the time. The nature of its task will be better understood from a rapid

survey of its procedure.

1. The Old Testament:

Higher criticism began, mainly, with the Old Testament. Already in the 2nd century, Gnostics assailed the Old Testament as the work of an inferior deity (the Demiurge), and heretical Ebionites (Clementine Recognitions and Homilies) declared it to be corrupted with false prophecy. In the 17th century Spinoza prepared the way in his Tractatus (1670) for future rationalistic attacks.

(1) Astruc and Successors.

The beginning of higher criticism in the stricter sense is commonly associated with the French physician Astruc, who, in his Conjectures, in 1753, drew attention to the fact that, in some sections of Genesis, the Divine name employed is "Elohim" (God), in others, "Yahweh." This he accounted for by the use of distinct documents by Moses in the composition of the book. Eichhorn (1779), to whom the name "higher criticism" is due, supplemented Astruc's theory by the correct observation that this distinction in the use of the names was accompanied by other literary peculiarities. It soon became further evident that, though the distinction in the names mostly ceased after the revelation of Yahweh to Moses (Ex 3:6), the literary peculiarities extended much farther than Gen, indeed till the end of Jos (Bleek, 1822; Ewald, 1831; Stahelin, 1835). Instead of a "Pentateuch," recognized as of composite authorship, there was now postulated a "Hexateuch" (see PENTATEUCH; HEXATEUCH). Meanwhile De Wette (1805-6), on grounds of style and contents, had claimed for De an origin not earlier than the reign of Josiah. "Fragmentary" theories, like Vater's, which contributed little to the general development, may be left unnoticed. A conservative school, headed by Hengstenberg (1831) and Havernick (1837), contested these conclusions of the critics, and contended for the unity and Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch Bolder spirits, as Vatke (1835), anticipated the conclusions of the newer critical school in declaring that the Levitical laws were latest of all in origin. Their voices were as yet unheeded.

(2) Hupfeld. A distinct advance on preceding theories was made by Hupfeld (1853; in part anticipated by Ilgen, 1789). Hitherto the prevailing assumption had been that there was one fundamental document —the so-called Elohistic, dated usually in the age of the Judges, or the time of Saul or David—and that the Yahwistic parts were "supplementary" to this (not a separate document). It was the merit of Hupfeld to perceive that not a few of the sections in the "Elohistic" document did not bear the usual literary marks of that writing, but closely resembled the "Yahwistic" sections in everything but the use of the Divine name. These portions he singled out and erected into a document by themselves (though they bear no signs of being such), while the Yahwistic parts were relieved of their "supplementary" character, and regarded as belonging to a distinct document also. There were thus now 3 documents, attributed to as many authors—the original Elohist, the 2nd or Younger Elohist (E) and the Jahwist (Jahwist). Deuteronomy, as a distinct book, was added to these, making 4 documents in all.

(3) Graf and Wellhausen.

Thus matters stood till the appearance of Graf's work, The Historical Books of the Old Testament, in 1866, through which something like a revolution in the critical outlook was effected. Following in the track of Vatke, earlier, Reuss, of Strassburg, had taken up the idea that the Levitical legislation could not, as was commonly presumed, be earlier than Deuteronomy, but was, on the contrary, later—in fact, a product of the age of the exile. Graf adopted and developed this theory. He still for a time, while putting the laws late, maintained an earlier date for the Elohistic narratives. He was soon led, however, to see that laws and history must go together; so the whole Elohistic writing was removed from its former place, and brought down bodily to the end of the religious development. Graf, at the same time, did not regard it as an independent document. At first theory was scouted, but gradually, through the able advocacy of Kuenen and Wellhausen—especially the latter—it secured ascendancy, and is now regarded as the critical view paragraph excellence. Order and nomenclature of the assumed documents were now changed. The Elohist, instead of standing first, was put last under the designation P or Priestly Code; Wellhausen's symbol for this writing was Q. Its date was taken to be post-exilian. The Jahwist becomes J; the Elohist becomes E. These are placed in the 9th or 8th centuries BC (circa 850-750), but are supposed to have been combined a cent or so later (JE). Deuteronomy, identified with the law-book found in the temple in the reign of Josiah (2Ki 22), is thought to have been written shortly before that time. The order is therefore no longer 1st Elohist-Jahwist and 2nd Elohist-D, but J and E-D- P. The whole, it is held, was finally united into the great law-book (Pent) brought by Ezra to Jerusalem from Babylon (458 BC; Ezr 7:6-10), and read by him before the people 14 years later (444 BC; Ne 8).

(4) Literary and Historical Grounds of Theory.

A sketch like the above gives, of course, no proper idea of the grounds on which, apart from the distinction in the Divine names, the critical theory just described is based. The grounds are partly literary —the discrimination of documents, e.g. resting on differences of style and conception, duplicates, etc. (see PENTATEUCH)—but partly also historical, in accordance with the critic's conception of the development of religion and institutions in Israel. A main reliance is placed on the fact that the history, with its many sanctuaries up to the time of Deuteronomy, is in conflict with the law of that book, which recognizes only one sanctuary as legitimate (chapter 12), and equally with the Priestly Code, which throughout assumes this centralizing law. The laws of De and Priestly Code, therefore, cannot be early. The prophets, it is held, knew nothing of a Levitical legislation, and refused to regard the sacrificial system as Divine (Jer 7:22 ff).

(5) The Codes:

The code under which older Israel lived was that formulated in the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20-23), which permitted many altars (Ex 20:24 f). The law of Deuteronomy was the product of a centralizing movement on the part of the prophets, issuing in the reformation of Josiah. The Priestly Code was the work of fertile brains and pens of post-exilian priests and scribes, incorporating older usage, devising new laws, and throwing the whole into the fictitious form of Mosaic wilderness legislation.

(6) Effects on History, etc.

The revolution wrought by these newer constructions, however, is not adequately realized till regard is had to their effects on the picture given in the Old Testament itself of Israel's history, religion and literature. It is not too much to say that this picture is nearly completely subverted. By the leaders of the school (Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen, Duhm, Stade, etc.) the supernatural element in the history and religion is totally eliminated; even by those who do not go so far, little is left standing. The history of the Pentateuch—indeed the history down to the time of the kings—is largely given up. Genesis is legend, Exodus hardly more trustworthy, Jos a romance. The histories of Samuel and David are "written up" by a theocratic narrator. None of the laws—even the Decalogue—are allowed to be certainly Mosaic. Monotheism is believed to have come in with Amos and Hosea; earlier, Yahweh was a "tribal" God. Ark, tabernacle, priesthood, feasts, as depicted in the Priestly Code, are post-exilic fiction. The treatment accorded to the Pentateuch necessarily reacts on the other historical books; the prophetic literature suffers in an almost equal degree through disintegration and mutilation. It is not Isaiah alone—where the question has long been mooted of the post-exilian origin of chapters 40-66 (see ISAIAH); the critical knife is applied with scarcely less freedom to the remaining prophetical books. Few, if any, of the psalms are allowed to be preexilic. Daniel is a work of the Maccabean age.

(7) General Results.

As a general summary of the results of the movement, which it is thought "the future is not likely to reverse," the following may be quoted from Professor A. S. Peake: "The analysis of the Pentateuch into four main documents, the identification of the law on which Josiah's reformation was based with some form of the Deuteronomic Code, the compilation of that code in the reign of Manasseh at the earliest, the fixing of the Priestly Code to a date later than Ezekiel, the highly composite character of some parts of the prophetic literature, especially the Book of Isaiah, the post-exilian origin of most of the Psalms, and large parts of the Book of Prov, the composition of Job not earlier than the exile and probably later, the Maccabean date of Daniel, and the slightly earlier date of Ecclesiastes" ("Present Movement of Biblical Science," in Manchester, Inaugural Lects, 32).

(8) Criticism of Theory.

The criticism of this elaborate theory belongs to the arts which deal with the several points involved, and is not here attempted at length (compare the present writer's Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament). The gains that have accrued from it on the literary side in a more exact and scholarly knowledge of the phenomena to be explained (e.g. distinction in the Divine names; distinction of P element in the Pentateuch from that known as JE) are not to be questioned; on the historical and religious sides also much has been done to quicken interest, enlarge knowledge and correct older ideas which have proved untenable—in general, to place the whole facts of the Old Testament in a clearer and more assured light. On the other hand, much even in the literary criticism is subjective, arbitrary and conjectural, while the main hypothesis of the subsequentness of the Levitical law to Ezekiel, with the general view taken of the historical and religious development in Israel, is open to the most serious exception. The Old Testament has its own account to give of the origin of its religion in the monotheism of Abraham, the covenants with the patriarchs, the legislation through Moses, which is not thus readily to be set aside in the

interests of a theory resting largely on naturalistic pre-suppositions (see BIBLE). There is not a word in the history in Ne 8 to suggest that the law introduced by Ezra was a new one; it was received without demur by a deeply divided community as the ancient law of Moses. So with the law of Deuteronomy in the time of Josiah (2Ki 22). Its genuineness was doubted by no one. The position of theory, generally, is by no means so secure as many of its adherents suppose. Internally, it is being pushed to extremes which tend to discredit it to sober minds, and otherwise is undergoing extensive modifications. Documents are multiplied, dates lowered, authors are converted into "schools." Archaeologists, in large majority, declare against it. The facts they adduce tend to confirm the history in parts where it had been most impugned. The new Babylonian school in Germany (that of Winckler) assails it in its foundations. Recently, the successor of Kuenen in Leyden, Professor B. D. Eerdmans, formerly a supporter, has broken with theory in its entirety, and subjects the documentary hypothesis to a damaging criticism. It is too early yet to forecast results, but the opinion may be hazarded that, as in the case of the Tubingen New Testament critical school in last cent referred to below, the prevailing critical theory of the Old Testament will experience fundamental alteration in a direction nearer to older ideas, though it is too much to expect that traditional views will ever be resuscitated in their completeness.

2. The New Testament:

Higher criticism of the New Testament may be said to begin, in a Deistic spirit, with Reimarus (Fragments, published by Lessing, 1778), and, on Hegelian lines, with Strauss (Life of Jesus, 1835). In the interests of his mythical theory, Strauss subjected every part of the gospel history to a destructive criticism.

(1) The School of Baur.

In a more systematic way, F. Baur (1826-60), founder of the famous Tubingen school, likewise proceeding from Hegel, applied a drastic criticism to all the documents of the New Testament. Strauss started with the Gospels. Baur sought firmer ground in the phenomena of the Apostolic Age. The key to Baur’s theory lies in the alleged existence of Pauline and Petrine parties in the early church, in conflict with one another. The true state of matters is mirrored, he holds, not in the Book of Acts, a composition of the 2nd century, written to gloss over the differences between the original apostles and Paul, but in the four contemporary and undoubtedly genuine epistles of Paul, Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Roman, and in the Book of Revelation. In these documents the church is seen rent by a schism that threatened its very existence. By and by attempts were made at conciliation, the stages of which are reflected in the Gospels and remaining writings of the New Testament. The Fourth Gospel, about 170 AD, brings up the rear. This theory, which found influential support in the scholarship of the time (Schwegler, Zeller, etc.), could not stand the test of impartial investigation, and is now on all sides discredited. Professor Bacon, in a recent work, pronounces its theory of the Johannine writings to be "as obsolete as the Ptolemaic geography" (Fourth Gospel, 20). Its influence on later criticism has, however, been considerable. (2) Synoptic Criticism.

Meanwhile more sober scholarship was concerning itself with the intricate problem of the relations of

the Synoptic Gospels. The problem is a very real one (see GOSPELS). The three gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke are seen on inspection to exhibit an amount of agreement in subject-matter, order, often in language, which cannot be accounted for except on theory of some common source. Suppose the Gospels divided into sections, in 52 of these the narratives coincide, 12 more are common to Matthew and Mark, 5 to Mark and Luke, and 14 to Matthew and Luke, while 5 are peculiar to Matthew, 2 to Mark and 9 to Luke. The verbal agreement is greater in the recital of the words of others, particularly of words of Jesus, than in the narrative portions.

(i) Oral, Documentary, and Dependence Theories:

How is this to be explained? Three forms of theory were early propounded—the oral, the documentary, and the hypothesis of dependence of one gospel upon another. Of these theories, the oldest is the 3rd (Augustine already held that Mark was an abridgment of Matthew and Luke), and to it, in combination with the 2nd, though in reversed order (Mark being put first), it will be seen below that criticism has largely reverted. The oral theory, proposed by Gieseler (1818), has, till recently, been the favorite one in England (Westcott, Alford, etc., with Godet, Pressense, Ebrard, etc., on the Continent). In it resemblances in the three Gospels are explained by an oral tradition assumed to have attained a relatively fixed form while the apostles were yet teaching together in Jerusalem. The documentary theory took its origin with Eichhorn (1794), but in the hands of Marsh (1801), finally in Eichhorn's own (1804), received so elaborate a development as completely to discredit it. The dependence theory, in turn, went through every possible shape. Gradually, with sifting, certain combinations were eliminated (those which put Luke first, or Matthew last, or made Mark a middle term), till only two remained- -Matthew, Luke, Mark (Griesbach 1789-90, Baur, etc.), and Mark, Matthew, Luke (Weisse, 1838, Wilke, 1838, etc.). The prestige of the Baur school obtained a temporary ascendancy for the former view—that which put Mark last; this, however, has now quite given way in favor of Mark's priority. There remained a division of opinion as to whether the Mark employed by the other evangelists was the canonical Mark (Weisse, Meyer, B. Weiss, etc.), or an ur-Markus (Holtzmann, Reuss, etc.), but the difficulties of the latter hypothesis proved so insurmountable that Holtzmann finally gave it up.

(ii) The "Logia":

It is obvious, however, that the use of Mark by the other evangelists, even if granted, does not yet completely solve the synoptical problem. There is still to be considered that large mass of matter—chiefly discourses—common to Matthew and Luke, not to speak of the material peculiar to Luke itself. For the explanation of these sections it becomes necessary to postulate a second source, usually identified with the much-canvassed Logia of Papias, and designated by recent scholars (Wellhausen, etc.) Q. It is regarded as a collection of discourses, possibly by Matthew, with or without an admixture of narrative matter (B. Weiss, etc.).

(iii) Two-Source Theory:

This yields the "two-source" theory at present prevailing in synoptical criticism (for a different view,

compare Zahn’s Introduction). Matthew and Luke, on this view, are not independent Gospels, but are drawn up on the basis of

(1) Mark and

(2) Q = the Logia, with original material on the part of Luke (see GOSPELS).

A theory which commands the assent of so many scholars has necessarily great weight. It cannot, however, be regarded as finally established. Many grave difficulties remain; there is, besides, a prima facie improbability in a Gospel like Mark’s being treated in the manner supposed or included among the "attempts" which Luke’s own Gospel was designed to supersede (Lu 1:1-4; compare Wright, Luke’s Gospel in Greek, xiv, xv).

(iv) Authorship—Lukan and Johannine Questions:

With criticism of the sources of the Gospels there goes, of course, the question of authorship. A powerful vindication of the Lucan authorship of the 3rd Gospel and the Book of Ac has recently come from the pen of Professor A. Harnack, who maintains that in this, as in most other points regarding early Christian literature, "tradition is right" (compare his Luke, the Physician, English translation). Outside the Synoptics, the burning question still is the authorship of the Johannine writings. Here also, however, the extreme positions of the Baur school are entirely given up ("It is perfectly apparent," says Professor Bacon, "that Baur mistook the period of dissemination for that of origin," op. cit., 21), and powerful defenses of Johannine authorship have of late appeared (notably Sanday’s Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, and ex-Principal Drummond’s Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel).

See JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

(3) Modern "Historical-Critical" School.

On the other hand, a new and intensely aggressive radical school has recently come to the front, the so-called "historical-critical," which treats the text and history of the Gospels generally with a recklessness to which no limits can be put. It is even doubted if Jesus claimed to be the Messiah (Wrede). Sayings are accepted, rejected, or mutilated at pleasure. The latest phase of this school is the "Apocalyptic," which finds the essence of Christ’s message in His insistence on the approaching end of the world (compare Schweitzer, Von Reimarus zu Wrede; English translation The Quest of the Historical Jesus). These excesses may be depended on to cure themselves.

(4) Remaining Writings of the New Testament.

For the rest of the writings on the New Testament, the trend of criticism has been in the main in a conservative direction. One by one the Pauline Epistles have been given back to the apostle—doubt chiefly still resting in certain minds on the Pastorals. The Book of Re is restored by most to the age of

Domitian, where tradition places it. Its relation to the Fourth Gospel and to John is still in dispute, and some moderns would see in it a groundwork of Jewish apocalypse. These and kindred questions are discussed in the arts devoted to them.

LITERATURE.

Articles on Text, manuscripts, VSS, of Old Testament and New Testament in Bible Dicts. and Encyclopedias: works on Introduction to Old Testament and New Testament.

On the Old Testament.

S. Davidson, Revision of the English Old Testament; W. R. Smith, Old Testament in the Jewish Church; Wellhausen, Prol to the Hist of Israel (English translation); Kuenen, The Hexateuch (English translation); Oxford Hexateuch according to the Revised Version (British and American); Orr, Problem of the Old Testament, and Bible Under Trial; H. M. Wiener, Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism; W. Moller. Are the Critics Right? (English translation).

On the New Testament.

Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Intro; F. G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament; Nestle, Textual Crit of the Greek Testament (English translation); Scrivener, Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 4th edition; K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament; Ebrard, Gospel History (English translation); F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission; Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research; Schweitzer, Von Reimarus zu Wrede (English translation: The Quest of the Historical Jesus): A. S. Peake, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament.

James Orr

CROCODILE

krok’-o-dil.

See LEVIATHAN; DRAGON.

CROCODILE, LAND

See CHAMELEON.

CROOK-BACKED

krook’-bakt (gibben; kurtos): A disqualification for the priesthood (Le 21:20); was probably an angular curvature of the spine, usually the result of tubercular caries of the vertebrae. It was by no means uncommon in ancient Egypt, where I have found a considerable number of spines affected with this disease. Some Talmudic authorities explain it as meaning "very dark colored," but this is unlikely.

The woman bound by the spirit of infirmity and unable to lift herself (Lu 13:11-17) was affected with senile kyphosis, a chronic bone disease often found among aged men (and more frequently women) whose lives have been spent in agricultural labor. In these the vertebrae become altered in shape so that it is impossible to straighten the back. Some rabbinical authorities believed all deformities to be due to Satan, and to this our Lord seems to have alluded in his rebuke to those who caviled at His healing on the Sabbath. I have found this condition in some Egyptian skeletons, and have seen it in a Palestinian fellah. A skeleton affected with a similar curvature was found buried under the threshold of a house at Gezer, where she had evidently been offered as a foundation sacrifice.

Alex. Macalister

CROOKED

krook’-ed (‘awah, ‘aqash, ‘aqalqal, ‘aqallathon, pethaltol; skolios): Primarily designates something that is bent, twisted or deformed (Isa 27:1; 45:2 the King James Version).

Figurative:

(1) It designates a course of action that deviates from rectitude, especially deceit, guile, hypocrisy (De 32:5; Pr 2:15; Ec 1:15; Lu 3:5; compare Php 2:15);

(2) trials (sent by God, Ec 7:13; La 3:9);

(3) difficulties (removed by God, Isa 42:16).

CROOKED SERPENT

krook’-ed sur’-pent.

See ASTRONOMY.

CROP

(1) As noun the translation of mur’-ah (Le 1:16), which is the craw of a bird, especially of doves and pigeons, which had to be removed by the priest before he offered the birds as a burnt sacrifice.

(2) As a verb it is (Eze 17:4,22) the translation of qaTaph, which has the meaning of "cutting off," "cutting down," "plucking."

CROSS

(stauros, "a cross," "the crucifixion"; skolops, "a stake," "a pole"): The name is not found in the Old Testament. It is derived from the Latin word crux. In the Greek language it is stauros, but sometimes we find the word skolops used as its Greek equivalent. The historical writers, who transferred the events of Roman history into the Greek language, make use of these two words. No word in human language has become more universally known than this word, and that because all of the history of the world since the death of Christ has been measured by the distance which separates events from it. The symbol and principal content of the Christian religion and of Christian civilization is found in this one word.

1. Forms of the Cross:

The cross occurs in at least four different forms:

(1) the form usually seen in pictures, the crux immissa, in which the upright beam projected above the shorter crosspiece; this is most likely the type of cross on which the Saviour died, as may be inferred from the inscription which was nailed above His head;

(2) the crux commissa, or Anthony’s cross, which has the shape of the letter T;

(3) the Greek cross of later date, in which the pieces are equally long;

(4) the crux decussata, or Andrew’s cross, which has the shape of the letter X.

2. Discovery of the True Cross:

The early church historians Socrates (1, 17), Sozomen (2, 1), Rufinus (1, 7) and Theodoret (1, 18) all make mention of this tradition. The most significant thing is that Eusebius (Vit. Const., iii.26-28), who carries more weight than they all together, wholly omits it.

According to it, Helena, the mother of Constantine the Great, in 325 AD, when she was 79 years old, discovered the true cross of Jesus by an excavation she caused to be made on the traditional spot of His grave. With the cross of the Saviour were found the two crosses of the malefactors who were crucified with Him. A miracle of healing, wrought by touching the true cross, revealed its identity. Whenfound it was intact, even the holy nails of the crucifixion being discovered. The main part of the cross was deposited by Helena in a church erected over the spot. Of the remainder, a portion was inserted into the head of the statue of Constantine, and the balance was placed in a new church, specially erected for it at Rome and named after it Santa Croce. Small fragments of the wood of the true cross were sold, encrusted with gold and jewels, and since many among the wealthy believers were desirous of

possessing such priceless relics, the miracle of the "multiplication of the cross" was devised, so that the relic suffered no diminution "et quasi intacta maneret" (Paulinus epistle 11 ad Sev). Fragments of the true cross are thus to be found in many Roman Catholic churches of many countries, all over Christendom. It is said that the East celebrated the staurosimos hemera (Crucifixion Day) on September 14, since the 4th century. The evidence for this fact is late and untrustworthy. It is certain that the West celebrated the Invention of the Cross, on May 3, since the time of Gregory the Great in the 6th century. The finding and publication of the apocryphal "Doctrina Addaei" has made it evident that the entire legend of the discovery of the cross by Helena is but a version of the old Edessa legend, which tells of an identical discovery of the cross, under the very same circumstances, by the wife of the emperor Claudius, who had been converted to Christianity by the preaching of Peter.

3. Symbolical Uses of the Cross:

(1) Extra-Scriptural.

The sign of the cross was well known in the symbolics of various ancient nations. Among the Egyptians it is said to have been the symbol of divinity and eternal life, and to have been found in the temple of Serapis. It is known either in the form of the Greek cross or in the form of the letter "T". The Spaniards found it to be well known, as a symbol, by the Mexicans and Peruvians, perhaps signifying the four elements, or the four seasons, or the four points of the compass.

(2) Scriptural.

The suffering implied in crucifixion naturally made the cross a symbol of pain, distress and burden-bearing. Thus Jesus used it Himself (Mt 10:38; 16:24). In Paulinic literature the cross stands for the preaching of the doctrine of the Atonement (1Co 1:18; Ga 6:14; Php 3:18; Col 1:20). It expresses the bond of unity between the Jew and the Gentile (Eph 2:16), and between the believer and Christ, and also symbolizes sanctification (Ga 5:24). The cross is the center and circumference of the preaching of the apostles and of the life of the New Testament church.

4. Crucifixion:

As an instrument of death the cross was detested by the Jews. "Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree" (Ga 3:13; compare De 21:23), hence, it became a stumbling-block to them, for how could one accursed of God be their Messiah? Nor was the cross differently considered by the Romans. "Let the very name of the cross be far away not only from the body of a Roman citizen, but even from his thoughts, his eyes, his ears" (Cicero Pro Rabirio 5). The earliest mode of crucifixion seems to have been by impalation, the transfixion of the body lengthwise and crosswise by sharpened stakes, a mode of death-punishment still well known among the Mongol race. The usual mode of crucifixion was familiar to the Greeks, the Romans, the Egyptians, Persians and Babylonians (Thuc. 1, 110; Herod. iii.125, 159). Alexander the Great executed two thousand Tyrian captives in this way, after the fall of the city. The Jews received this form of punishment from the Syrians and Romans (Ant., XII, v, 4; XX, vi, 2; BJ, I, iv,

6). The Roman citizen was exempt from this form of death, it being considered the death of a slave (Cicero In Verrem i. 5, 66; Quint. viii.4). The punishment was meted out for such crimes as treason, desertion in the face of the enemy, robbery, piracy, assassination, sedition, etc. It continued in vogue in the Roman empire till the day of Constantine, when it was abolished as an insult to Christianity. Among the Romans crucifixion was preceded by scourging, undoubtedly to hasten impending death. The victim then bore his own cross, or at least the upright beam, to the place of execution. This in itself proves that the structure was less ponderous than is commonly supposed. When he was tied to the cross nothing further was done and he was left to die from starvation. If he was nailed to the cross, at least in Judea, a stupefying drink was given him to deaden the agony. The number of nails used seems to have been indeterminate. A tablet, on which the feet rested or on which the body was partly supported, seems to have been a part of the cross to keep the wounds from tearing through the transfixed members (Iren., Adv. haer., ii.42). The suffering of death by crucifixion was intense, especially in hot climates. Severe local inflammation, coupled with an insignificant bleeding of the jagged wounds, produced traumatic fever, which was aggravated the exposure to the heat of the sun, the strained of the body and insufferable thirst. The swelled about the rough nails and the torn lacerated tendons and nerves caused excruciating agony. The arteries of the head and stomach were surcharged with blood and a terrific throbbing headache ensued. The mind was confused and filled with anxiety and dread foreboding. The victim of crucifixion literally died a thousand deaths. Tetanus not rarely supervened and the rigors of the attending convulsions would tear at the wounds and add to the burden of pain, till at last the bodily forces were exhausted and the victim sank to unconsciousness and death. The sufferings were so frightful that "even among the raging passions of war pity was sometimes excited" (BJ, V, xi, 1). The length of this agony was wholly determined by the constitution of the victim, but death rarely ensued before thirty-six hours had elapsed. Instances are on record of victims of the cross who survived their terrible injuries when taken down from the cross after many hours of suspension (Josephus, Vita, 75). Death was sometimes hastened by breaking the legs of the victims and by a hard blow delivered under the armpit before crucifixion. Crura fracta was a well-known Roman term (Cicero Phil. xiii.12). The sudden death of Christ evidently was a matter of astonishment (Mr 15:44). The peculiar symptoms mentioned by John (19:34) would seem to point to a rupture of the heart, of which the Saviour died, independent of the cross itself, or perhaps hastened by its agony.

See BLOOD AND WATER.

Henry E. Dosker

CROSSWAY

kros’-wa (perek, literally, "division"): A forking or dividing of the way. Obadiah warns Edom, "And stand thou not in the crossway, to cut off those of his that escape" (Obad 1:14). In Septuagint, "a mountain pass."

CROWN

kroun: The word crown in the Old Testament is a translation of five different Hebrew words, and in the New Testament of two Greek words. These express the several meanings, and must be examined to ascertain the same.

1. In Hebrew:

The five Hebrew words are as follows:

(1) qodhqodh, from qadhadh;

(2) zer, from zarar;

(3) nezer, or nezer, both from nazar;

(4) aTarah, from ‘atar;

(5) kether, from kathar.

(1) Qodhqodh means "the crown of the head," and is also rendered in the King James Version "top of the head," "scalp," "pate." It comes from qadhadh, meaning "to shrivel up," "contract," or bend the body or neck through courtesy. Both the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, in De 28:35 and 33:16, translation it "crown" instead of "top" as in the King James Version. Jacob in his prophecy concerning his sons says: "The blessings of thy father .... shall be on the head of Joseph, and on the crown of the head of him that is prince among his brethren" (Ge 49:26 the American Revised Version, margin). Other references are: De 33:20; 2Sa 14:25; Job 2:7; Isa 3:17; Jer 2:16; 48:45. Translated "scalp" in Ps 68:21 and "pate" in Ps 7:16.

(2) Zer means a "chaplet," something spread around the top as a molding about the border, and because of its wreath-like appearance called a crown. "That which presses, binds" (BDB). Comes from zarar, meaning "to diffuse" or "scatter." It is used in Ex 25:11,24,25; 30:3,1; 37:2,11,12,26,27.

(3) Nezer means something "set apart"; i.e. a dedication to the priesthood or the dedication of a Nazarite, hence, a chaplet or fillet as a symbol of such consecration. The word in the King James Version is rendered "crown," "consecration," "separation," "hair." Comes from nazar, meaning "to hold aloof" from impurity, even from drink and food, more definitely, "to set apart" for sacred purposes, i.e. "to separate," "devote," "consecrate." It is found in Ex 29:6; 39:30; Le 8:9; 21:12; 2Sa 1:10; 2Ki 11:12; 2Ch 23:11; Ps 89:39; 132:18; Pr 27:24; Zec 9:16.

(4) ‘ATarah means a crown in the usual sense. Comes from ‘aTar, meaning "to encircle," as in war for offense or defense; also actually and figuratively "to crown." Rendered sometimes "to compass." It is used in 2Sa 12:30; 1Ch 20:2; Es 8:15; Job 19:9; 31:36; Ps 21:3; Pr 4:9; 12:4; 14:24; 16:31; 17:6; So 3:11; Isa 28:1,3,1; 62:3; Jer 13:18; La 5:16; Eze 16:12; 21:26; 23:42; Zec 6:11,14; "crowned," So 3:11;

"crownest," Ps 65:11; "crowneth," Ps 103:4. the Revised Version (British and American) translations "crowned," of Ps 8:5 "hast crowned." the American Standard Revised Version prefers to translation "crowning," in Isa 23:8, "the bestower of crowns."

(5) Kether means a "circlet" or "a diadem." From kathar, meaning "to enclose": as a friend, "to crown"; as an enemy, "to besiege." Variously translated "beset round," "inclose round," "suffer," "compass about." Found in Es 1:11; 2:17, 6:8; "crowned," in Pr 14:18.

2. In Greek:

The two Greek words of the New Testament translated crown are:

(1) stephanos, from stepho, and

(2) diadema, from diadeo, "to bind round."

(1) Stephanos means a chaplet (wreath) made of leaves or leaf-like gold, used for marriage and festive occasions, and expressing public recognition of victory in races, games and war; also figuratively as a reward for efficient Christian life and service (see GAMES). This symbol was more noticeable and intricate than the plain fillet. Only in the Re of John is stephanos called "golden." The "crown of thorns" which Jesus wore was a stephanos (woven wreath) of thorns; the kind is not known (Mt 27:29; Mr 15:17; Joh 19:2,5). Luke makes no mention of it. Whether intended to represent royalty or victory, it was caricature crown. Stephanos is found in 1Co 9:25; Php 4:1; 1Th 2:19; 2Ti 4:8; Jas 1:12; 1Pe 5:4; Re 2:10; 3:11; 6:2; 12:1; 14:14; plural in Re 4:4,10; 9:7; "crowned" in 2Ti 2:5; Heb 2:9; "crownedst" in Heb 2:7.

(2) Diadema is the word for "diadem," from dia (about) and deo (bound), i.e. something bound about the head. In the three places where it occurs (Re 12:3; 13:1; 19:12) both the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version translation it not "crowns" but "diadems," thus making the proper distinction between stephanos and diadema, such as is not done either in the King James Version or the Septuagint (see Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament). According to Thayer the distinction was not observed in Hellenic Greek "Diadems" are on the dragon (Re 12:3), the beast (Re 13:1) and on the Rider of the White Horse, "the Faithful and True" (Re 19:12). In each case the "diadems" are symbolic of power to rule.

3. Use and Significance:

There are five uses of the crown as seen in the Scripture references studied, namely, decoration, consecration, coronation, exaltation, and remuneration. (1) Decoration.

The zer of Ex, as far as it was a crown at all, was for ornamentation, its position not seeming to indicate any utility purpose. These wavelet, gold moldings, used in the furnishings of the tabernacle of Moses,

were placed about

(a) the table of shewbread (Ex 25:24; 37:11);

(b) the ark of the covenant (Ex 25:11; 37:2);

(c) the altar of incense (Ex 30:3,1; 37:26,27). The position of these crowns is a debated question among archaeologists. Their purpose other than decoration is not known. The encircling gold might signify gratitude, parity and enduring worth.

(2) Consecration.

The nezer had a twofold use as the crown of consecration:

(a) It was placed as a frontlet on the miter of the high priest, being tied with a blue lace (Ex 39:30). The priestly crown was a flat piece of pure gold, bearing the inscription, "Holy to Yahweh," signifying the consecration of the priest as the representative of the people (Ex 29:6; Le 8:9).

(b) Likewise the Hebrew king (2Ki 11:12) was set apart by God in wearing on his head a royal nezer, whether of silk or gold we do not know. It was set with jewels (Zec 9:16) and was light enough to be taken into battle (2Sa 1:10).

(3) Coronation.

The ordinary use of the crown. There were three kinds of kingly crowns used in coronation services:

(a) The nezer or consecration crown, above referred to, was the only one used in crowning Hebrew kings. What seems to be an exception is in the case of Joshua, who represented both priest and king (Zec 6:11 the American Revised Version, margin).

(b) The ‘aTarah, and

(c) the kether were used in crowning foreign monarchs.

No king but a Hebrew could wear a nezer—a "Holy to Yahweh" crown. It is recorded that David presumed to put on his own head the ‘atarah of King Malcam (2Sa 12:30 the American Revised Version, margin). The kether or jeweled turban was the crown of the Persian king and queen (Es 1:11; 2:17; 6:8).

(4) Exaltation.

The ‘atarah, the stephanos and the diadema were used as crowns of exaltation. Stephanos was the usual

crown of exaltation for victors of games, achievement in war and places of honor at feasts. The ‘atarah was worn at banquets (So 3:11; Isa 28:1,3), probably taking the form of a wreath of flowers; also as a crown of honor and victory (Eze 16:12; 21:26; 23:42). Stephanos is the crown of exaltation bestowed upon Christ (Re 6:2; 14:14; Heb 2:9). "Exaltation was the logical result of Christ’s humiliation" (Vincent). The Apocalyptic woman and locusts receive this emblem of exaltation (Re 12:1; 9:7). The symbolic dragon and beast are elevated, wearing diadema, (Re 12:3; 13:1). The conquering Christ has "upon his head .... many diadems" (Re 19:12). See further Tertullian, De corona.

(5) Remuneration.

Paul, witnessing the races and games, caught the vision of wreath-crowned victors flush with the reward of earnest endeavor. See GAMES. He also saw the persistent, faithful Christian at the end of his hard-won race wearing the symbolic stephanos of rejoicing (1Th 2:19 the King James Version), of righteousness (2Ti 4:8), of glory (1Pe 5:4), of life (Jas 1:12; Re 2:10). Paul’s fellow Christians were his joy and stephanos (Php 4:1), "of which Paul might justly make his boast" (Ellicott). Long before Paul, his Hebrew ancestors saw the ‘aTarah of glory (Pr 4:9) and the ‘aTarah of a good wife, children’s children, riches and a peaceful old age (Pr 12:4; 14:24; 16:31; 17:6). For Apocrypha references see 1 Macc 10:29; 11:35; 13:39.

William Edward Raffety

CROWN OF THORNS

thornz (akdnthinos stephanos): Three of the four evangelists mention the crown of thorns, wherewith the rude Roman soldiers derided the captive Christ (Mt 27:29; Mr 15:17; Joh 19:2). All speak of the akanthine (Acanthus) crown, but there is no certainty about the peculiar plant, from the branches of which this crown of cruel mockery was plaited. The rabbinical books. mention no less than twenty-two words in the Bible signifying thorny plants, and the word akantha in the New Testament Greek is a generic and not a specific term. And this word or its adjective is used in the three Gospels, quoted above. It is therefore impossible definitely to determine what was the exact plant or tree, whose thorny branches were selected for this purpose. Tobler (Denkbl., 113, 179) inclines to the Spina Christi, as did Hasselquist. Its botanical name is Zizyphus Spina Christi, It is very common in the East. Its spines are small and sharp, its branches soft, round and pliable, and the leaves look like ivy, with a dark, shiny green color, making them therefore very adaptable to the purpose of the soldiers. Others have designated the Paliurus aculeatus or the Lycium horridum. Both Geikie (Life of Christ, 549) and Farrar (Life of Christ, note 625) point to the Nubk (Zizyphus lotus). Says the latter, "The Nubk struck me, as it has all travelers in Palestine, as being most suitable both for mockery and pain, since its leaves are bright and its thorns singularly strong. But though the Nubk is very common on the shores of Galilee, I saw none of it near Jerusalem." The settlement of the question is manifestly impossible.

Henry E. Dosker

CRUCIFIXION

kroo-si-fik’-shun.

See CROSS; PUNISHMENTS.

CRUEL; CRUELTY

kroo’-el, kroo’-el-ti ‘akhzar, ("harsh," "fierce," chamac, "violence"): There are various uses of the word "cruel" in the Old Testament:

(a) "the cruel (deadly) venom of asps" (De 32:33);

(b) spoken of men of relentless hate: "They hate me with cruel hatred" (Ps 25:19; compare Pr 5:9; 11:17; 12:10; Jer 6:23; 50:42);

(c) Job speaks of God’s dealings with him as "cruel" and arbitrary: "Thou art turned to be cruel to me" (Job 30:21); conscious of his virtue, yet holding God to be the author of his sufferings, Job is driven to the conclusion that God has become his enemy and is bent upon destroying him;

(d) the "day of Yahweh"—a prophetic phrase to denote the time of God’s manifestation in judgment—is described as coming, "cruel, with wrath and fierce anger" (Isa 13:9). The word "cruelty" has nearly disappeared from the Bible. In the Revised Version (British and American) it occurs only in Ps 27:12. The King James Version has it in Ge 49:5; Ps 74:20 (the Revised Version (British and American) "violence"); Eze 34:4 (perekh, "crushing," the Revised Version (British and American) "rigor").

The Old Testament records many acts on the part of chosen individuals and the elect nation which are marked by gross cruelty, particularly when measured by the leaders are standards of our own age. Some of these acts are sanctioned by Scripture or even presented as commanded by God, as, for example, the sacrifice of Isaac, the extermination of the Canaanites, the authorization of the avenger of blood and of human slavery, and of retaliation for evil. Some of the deeds performed by Divinely appointed of Israel are characterized by inhumanity. Samuel "hewed Agag in pieces" (1Sa 15:33). David massacred the Ammonites with great barbarity (2Sa 12:31). Elijah slew the prophets of Baal (1Ki 18:40; compare 2Ki 1:10; 10:25). Some of the utterances of the Psalmists breathe spirit of hate and revenge, as in the so-called imprecatory psalms (Ps 137:8,9; 139:21 f). This has often been a matter of great perplexity to the devout student of the Bible. He has found it difficult to reconcile such practices, which bear the stamp of Divine approval, with the highest standards of Christian morality. It is sometimes urged in justification that these deeds are permitted, but not commanded by God. But this answer if we recognize the fact, which Jesus emphasizes, that the in attendant cruelties and horrors. The Old Testament religion is a self-accommodation to the low moral standard of those whom it was designed to instruct. This He reiterates in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:22,28,34), and affirms in His reference to the hardness of the ancestral Jewish heart (Mt 19:8). In the Old Testament we are dealing with the childhood of the world,

in which revelation is compelled to limit itself to the comprehension of its subjects. It must speak so that they can understand. It must start with them where it finds them. It walk, that character may grow step by step. A gradual development of spiritual and ethical ideals may clearly be traced in the sacred records. We must therefore read the Old Testament narratives and interpret their teaching, not according to the standards of our own age, but the light of the age to which these narratives belong. The spirit of Elijah may not be the spirit of Christ (Lu 9:55). While many of the acts of cruelty and barbarity recorded in the Old Testament are indicative of an age of a low type of morality, yet we must at the same time recognize the fact, that Israel's religion by emphasizing holy living and righteous conduct created an atmosphere favorable for the growth of high ethical ideals. Wherever this religion is seen at its best, as in the teachings of the prophets, it is the mark of the righteous man to treat human life as sacred and to refrain scrupulously from inflicting unnecessary pain. Even the Gentiles shall be brought to judgment for their barbarities and inhuman practices (Am 1:2 f; 2Ki 25:7). Among the blessings of the Messianic kingdom, predicted by the prophets, is the cessation of war with all of its Law of Israel also reflected this tendency toward humanity, and many of its ordinances, while seemingly inhuman, really tended to mitigate prevailing barbarity. Instances of such ordinances those referring to the maltreatment of slaves (Ex 21:20), to the Cities of Refuge (Nu 35:19 ff; compare Jos 20), to rules of warfare (De 20:10 f), etc. The extermination of the Canaanites is represented as a Divine judgment upon a morally corrupt civilization (Ge 15:16; De 12:30). It is declared necessary in order to guard the Hebrews from contamination by the sins of the Canaanites (Ex 23:32). It is not so far back, that many of the practices that are condemned by the most enlightened Christianity of our day, prevailed universally and were not thought incompatible with Christian civilization. Even our own time needs to secure a more widespread practical recognition of the principles of humanity, kindness and justice, which are professedly the law of the Christian life. L. Kaiser must lead them along lines in which they of their own volition can hardly meets the facts of the case. We shall arrive at a truer answer

CRUMB

krum (psichion, "a little bit"): Occurs only in the New Testament, of remnants of food, scraps. Lazarus desired "to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table" (Lu 16:21). "Even the (little) dogs eat of the crumbs" (Mt 15:27; Mr 7:28), "possibly the fragments of bread on which the guests wiped their hands (after thrusting them into the common dish), and flung to the dogs" (Farrar, Life of Christ, I, 476).

CRUSE

kroos: A small earthen vessel or flask, usually for holding liquids: tsappachath; as water, 1Sa 26:11,12,16; 1Ki 19:6; it being porous, the liquid is kept cool; also for holding oil, as in 1Ki l7:12,14,16.

In 1Ki 14:3 ("a cruse of honey") the word baqbuq, would be better rendered "bottle," doubtless deriving its name from the gurgling sound of issuing liquids. In 2Ki 2:20 tselochith, is not a jar or flask, but a dish, or platter, for salt or other substances.

In the New Testament a small jar or vial, alabastron, "alabaster cruse" or flask, for holding ointment; not "box" as in the King James Version (Mt 26:7; Mr 14:3; Lu 7:37; compare 1Sa 10:1; 2Ki 9:1,3, where "box" in the King James Version is used for "vial" the Revised Version (British and American)).

Edward Bagby Pollard

CRY, CRYING

kri'-ing (zaaq, tsa'aq (and forms), qara', shawa', rinnah; boao, krazo, phoneo):

Various words are translated "cry," "crying," etc., the chief of which are those above given; za'aq and tsa'aq denote especially a cry for help, from pain or distress, and are frequently used for crying to God, e. g. (za'aq, Ex 2:23; Jud 3:9,15; Ps 22:5; 107:13,19; Mic 3:4); (tsa'aq, Ex 8:12; 15:25; Ps 34:17; 77:1; Isa 19:20; La 2:18); qara' (a mimetic word) has the widest signification, but is often used of appealing to God (frequently translated "call," "called," etc., Ge 39:14,15,18; 41:43; De 15:9; 24:15; 1Ki 18:27; Ps 3:4; 22:2; 27:7; Pr 1:21; Isa 34:14; Jer 2:2, etc.); shawa', "to cry aloud" (Job 29:12; 30:20,28; Ps 18:6,41; 88:13; Jon 2:2; Hab 1:2, etc.); rinnah, "a shouting," whether for joy or grief (1Ki 8:28; Ps 17:1; 61:1; 88:2; 119:169; 142:6; Isa 43:14 the Revised Version (British and American) "rejoicing," etc.). Other Hebrew words are 'anaq, "to groan" (Eze 9:4; 24:17 the King James Version; Eze 26:15 the King James Version); hamah, "to make a noise" (Ps 55:17 the King James Version); rua', "to shout" (Jud 7:21 the King James Version; Job 30:5; Isa 42:13, etc.); ranan, "to cry aloud" (Ps 84:2; La 2:19); shoa', "crying" (Isa 22:5); teshu'oth, "crying," "noise" (Job 39:7 the King James Version).

In the New Testament we have boao, "to cry," "shout" (Mt 3:3; Mr 1:3; 15:34; Ga 4:27, etc.); krazo (mimetic, the hoarse cry of the raven), "to cry out" (Mt 9:27; 14:30; 21:9; 27:50; Mr 5:5; Ga 4:6; Re 6:10; 7:2, etc.); phoneo, "to give forth the voice," "sound" (Lu 8:8; 16:24; 23:46; Ac 16:28; Re 14:18 the King James Version); anaboao, "to cry out" (Mt 27:46; Lu 9:38); aphiemi, "to let go," "to send away" (Mr 15:37 the King James Version); epiboao, "to cry about" (anything) (Acts, 25:24); epiphoneo, "to give forth the voice upon" (Lu 23:21 the King James Version); kraugazo, "to make a cry, or outcry, or clamor" (Mt 12:19; 15:22; Joh 11:43; 18:40; 19:6,15; Ac 22:23); anakrazo, "to cry out" (Mr 1:23; Lu 4:33, etc.); krauge, "a crying out" (Mt 25:6; Ac 23:9 the King James Version; Heb 5:7; Re 21:4).

For "cry" the Revised Version (British and American) has "sound" (2Ch 13:12); "cry because of these things" (Job 30:24 the English Revised Version); "cry out" (Job 31:38; Isa 42:14); "call" (Ps 28:1; 61:2; 141:1); "be blind" (Isa 29:9); "groan" (Eze 26:15); "pant" (Joe 1:20); "cry aloud" (Mt 12:19); "clamor" (Ac 23:9). Among the other changes are, "moan" for "cry aloud" (Ps 55:17); "sound an alarm" (Ho 5:8); "take your pleasure," margin "blind yourselves." for "cry ye out" (Isa 29:9): "sigh, but not aloud" for "forbear to cry" (Eze 21:17); "shoutings" for "crying" (Job 39:7); "destruction" for "crying" (Pr 19:18, where we have instead of "let not thy soul spare for his crying," "set not thy heart on his destruction," margin, Hebrew "causing him to die" (muth, "to put to death")); "went up" for "crying aloud" (Mr 15:8, different text); "cry" for "voice" (Lu 1:42); for "had cried" (Lu 23:46), the American Standard Revised Version has "crying."

W. L. Walker

CRYSTAL

kris’-tal: In English Versions of the Bible the word is probably intended to signify rock-crystal, crystallized quartz. This the Greeks called krustallos, "ice," believing it to have been formed from water by intense cold. Thus in Re 4:6; 21:11; 22:1, either "crystal" (EV) or "ice" (Greek, krustallos) suits the context. The word rendered "crystal" in Eze 1:22 (qerach) is ambiguous in precisely the same way (the Revised Version, margin "ice"). In Job 28:17 the context favors the King James Version "crystal," rather than the Revised Version (British and American) "glass" (zekhukhith). Finally, in Job 28:18 the Revised Version (British and American) reads "crystal" for the King James Version "pearls" (Hebrew gabhish; the weight of evidence favors the Revised Version (British and American) in spite of the parallelism suggested by the King James Version).

See also STONES, PRECIOUS. F. K. Farr

CUB

kub (kubh; the King James Version Chub): The word occurs only in Eze 30:5. There it is almost certainly a corruption, and we should read, as in Septuagint, "Lub," i.e. Libya. Libya, in the earlier part of the same verse (the King James Version), is a mistr of "Put," thus correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American).

CUBIT

ku’-bit (’ammah; pechus): The standard for measures of length among the Hebrews. They derived it from the Babylonians, but a similar measure was used in Egypt with which they must have been familiar. The length of the cubit is variously estimated, since there seems to have been a double standard in both countries, and because we have no undisputed example of the cubit remaining to the present time. The original cubit was the length of the forearm, from the elbow to the end of the middle finger, as is implied from the derivation of the word in Hebrew and in Latin (cubitum). It seems to be referred to also in De 3:11: "after the cubit of a man." But this was too indefinite for a scientific standard, and the Babylonians early adopted a more accurate method of measurement which passed to the nations of the West. They had a double standard, the so-called royal cubit and the ordinary one. From the remains of buildings in Assyria and Babylonia, the former is made out to be about 20,6 inches, and a cubit of similar length was used in Egypt and must have been known to the Hebrews. This was probably the cubit mentioned by Eze 40:5 and perhaps that of Solomon’s temple, "cubits after the first measure" (2Ch 3:3), i.e. the ancient cubit. The ordinary cubit of commerce was shorter, and has been variously estimated at between 16 and 18 or more inches, but the evidence of the Siloam inscription and of the tombs in Palestine seems to indicate 17,6 inches as the average length. See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. This was the cubit of six palms, while the longer one was of seven (Eze 40:5). The cubit

mentioned in Jud 3:16 is from a different word in Hebrew (gomedh) and was probably shorter, for Ehud girded it on his thigh under his clothing.

The New Testament references are Mt 6:27; Lu 12:25, "Which of you .... can add a cubit unto the measure of his life?"; Joh 21:18, "about two hundred cubits off"; Re 21:17, "the wall thereof, a hundred and forty and four cubits."

H. Porter

CUCKOW; CUCKOO

kook'-oo, kuk'-oo (shachaph; laros; Latin Cuculus canorus): The Hebrew root from which the word shachaph is derived means "to be lean" and "slender," and in older versions of the Bible was translated cuckow (cuckoo). It was mentioned twice in the Bible (Le 11:16, and practically the same in De 14:15 the King James Version "cuckoo"), in the list of unclean birds. The Latin term by which we designate the bird is very similar to the Arabic, and all names for it in different countries are so nearly the same that they prove themselves based on its double cry, "cuck-oo," or the single note "kowk" or "gouk." The bird is as old as history, and interesting because the European species placed its eggs in the nests of other birds, which gave rise to much fiction concerning its habits. The European bird is a brownish gray with white bars underneath, and larger than ours, which are a beautiful olive gray, with tail feathers of irregular length touched with white, knee tufts, black or yellow bill, according to species, and beautiful sleek head and shining eyes. Our birds build their own nests, attend their young with care and are much loved for their beauty. Their food is not repulsive in any species; there never was any reason why they should have been classed among the abominations, and for these reasons scientists in search of a "lean, slender" bird of offensive diet and habit have selected the "sea-mew" (which see) which is substituted for cuckoo in the Revised Version (British and American) with good natural-history reason to sustain the change.

Gene Stratton-Porter

CUCUMBER

ku'-kum-ber (qishshu'im; sikuos): One of the articles of food for which Israel in the wilderness looked back with longing to Egypt (Nu 11:5). Cucumbers are great favorites with all the people of Palestine. Two varieties occur, Cucumis sativus (Arabic, Khyar), originally a product of Northwest India, which is smooth-skinned, whitish and of delicate flavor, and requires much water in its cultivation, and Cucumis chate (Arabic, faqqus), which is long and slender but less juicy than the former. Probably the Biblical reference is to this latter as it is a plant much grown in Egypt where it is said to attain unusual excellence.

A "garden of cucumbers" or more literally a "place of cucumbers" (miqshdh), is mentioned in Isa 1:8; Baruch 6:70. "A lodge in a garden of cucumbers" (Isa 1:8) is the rough wooden booth erected by the

owner from which he keeps guard over his ripening vegetables. It is commonly raised upon poles and, when abandoned for the season, it falls into decay and presents a dreary spectacle of tottering poles and dead leaves.

E. W. G. Masterman

CUD

See CHEW.

CULTURE

kul’-tur: Found only in 2 Esdras 8:6 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "give .... culture to our understanding," i.e. to nourish it as seed in the ground.

CUMBER; CUMBERED

kum’-ber, (katargeo, "to make idle," perispaomai, "to be drawn about," in mind "to be distracted"): Spoken of the barren fig tree in the parable: "Cut it down; why doth it also cumber (block up, make unproductive) the ground?" (Lu 13:7). Cumbered means to be over-occupied with cares or business, distracted: "But Martha was cumbered about much serving" (Lu 10:40). The word cumbrance occurs only in De 1:12: "How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance?" (Torach, "an encumbrance," "a burden"). Compare Isa 1:14, where the Revised Version, margin has "cumbrance," the Revised Version (British and American) "trouble."

CUMI

koo’-me, ku’-mi.

See TALITHA CUMI.

CUMMIN

kum’-in (kammon; kuminon): The seed of the herb Cuminum cyminum (Natural Order Umbelliferae). It has carminative properties and is used for flavoring various dishes, especially during fasts. In flavor and appearance it resembles caraway, though it is less agreeable to western palates. As an illustration of Yahweh’s wisdom it is said (Isa 28:25,27) that cummin is scattered in sowing and beaten out with a rod in threshing. These facts are true in Palestine today. The Jews paid tithes of cummin (Mt 23:23) (see cut on following page).

CUN

kun (kun, A, ek ton eklekton poleon, "from the chosen cities"): One of the cities of Hadarezer, king of Syria, spoiled by David (1Ch 18:8, the King James Version "Chun"). In the parallel passage (2Sa 8:8) its place is taken by BEROTHAH, which see.

CUNNING

kun'-ing (chakham, chashabh): In Bible-English "cunning" means always "wise" or "skilful"; the word does not occur in the bad sense, and it is found in the Old Testament only. The chief Hebrew words are chakham, "wise," "skilful" (2Ch 2:7 the King James Version "a man cunning to work in gold"; 2Ch 2:13; Isa 3:3 the King James Version, etc.); chashabh, "to think," "devise," "desire" (Ex 26:1,31; 28:6,15 the King James Version, etc.). We have also da'ath, "knowledge" (1Ki 7:14 the King James Version); bin, "to be intelligent" (1Ch 25:7 the King James Version); machasbebheth, "thought," "device," "design" (Ex 31:4; 35:33,15 the King James Version); 'aman, "artificer" (So 7:1 the King James Version); yadha', "to know," once translated "cunning" (Da 1:4 the King James Version).

For cunning the American Standard Revised Version gives "skilful" (Ex 31:4, etc.; Isa 3:3 "expert"); for "cunning work" the work of the "skilful workman" (Ex 26:1,31, etc., the English Revised Version "cunning workman"); for "curious," "skilfully woven," the English Revised Version "cunningly woven" (Ex 28:8, etc.).

W. L. Walker

CUP

(Most frequently, koc; four other words in one passage each; poterion): A vessel for drinking from, of a variety of material (gold, silver, earthenware), patterns (Es 1:7) and elaboration.

Figurative: By ordinary figure of speech, put sometimes for the contents of the cup, namely, for that which is drunk (Mt 26:39). In both Old Testament and New Testament applied figuratively to that which is portioned out, and of which one is to partake; most frequently used of what is sorrowful, as God's judgments, His wrath, afflictions, etc. (Ps 11:6; 75:8; Isa 51:17; Re 14:10). In a similar sense, used by Christ concerning the sufferings endured by Him (Mt 26:39), and the calamities attending the confession of His name (Mt 20:23). In the Old Testament applied also to the blessedness and joy of the children of God, and the full provision made for their wants (Ps 16:5; 23:5; 116:13; compare Jer 16:7; Pr 31:6). All these passages refer not only to the experience of an allotted joy and sorrow, but to the fact that all others share in this experience. Within a community of those having the same interests or lot, each received his apportioned measure, just as at a feast, each cup is filled for the individual to drain at the same time that his fellow-guests are occupied in the same way.

The Holy Supper is called "the cup of the Lord" (1Co 10:21), since it is the Lord who makes the feast,

and tenders the cup, just as "the cup of demons" with which it is contrasted, refers to what they offer and communicate. In 1Co 11:25, the cup is called "the new covenant in my blood," i.e. it is a pledge and seal and means of imparting the blessings of the new covenant (Heb 10:16 f)—a covenant established by the shedding of the blood of Christ. The use of the word "cup" for the sacrament shows how prominent was the part which the cup had in the Lord's Supper in apostolic times. Not only were all commanded to drink of the wine (Mt 26:27), but the very irregularities in the Corinthian church point to its universal use (1Co 11:27). Nor does the Roman church attempt to justify its withholding the cup from the laity (the communion in one form) upon conformity with apostolic practice, or upon direct Scriptural authority. This variation from the original institution is an outgrowth of the doctrines of transubstantiation and sacramental concomitance, of the attempt to transform the sacrament of the Eucharist into the sacrifice of the Mass, and of the wide separation between clergy and laity resulting from raising the ministry to the rank of a sacerdotal order. The practice was condemned by Popes Leo I (died 461) and Gelasius (died 496); but gained a firm hold in the 12th century, and was enacted into a church regulation by the Council of Constance in 1415.

See also BLESSING, CUP OF.

As to the use of cups for divination (Ge 44:5), the reference is to superstitious practice derived from the Gentiles. For various modes of divining what is unknown by the pouring of water into bowls, and making observations accordingly, see Geikie, Hours with the Bible, I, 492 f, and article DIVINATION.

H. E. Jacobs

CUPBEARER

kup'-bar-er (mashqeh, "one giving drink"; oinochoos): An officer of high rank at ancient oriental courts, whose duty it was to serve the wine at the king's table. On account of the constant fear of plots and intrigues, a person must be regarded as thoroughly trustworthy to hold this position. He must guard against poison in the king's cup, and was sometimes required to swallow some of the wine before serving it. His confidential relations with the king often endeared him to his sovereign and also gave him a position of great influence. This officer is first mentioned in Scripture in Ge 40:1 ff, where the Hebrew word elsewhere translated "cupbearer" is rendered "butler." The phrase "chief of the butlers" (Ge 40:2) accords with the fact that there were often a number of such officials under one as chief (compare Xen. Hellen. vii.1, 38). Nehemiah (compare Ne 1:11) was cupbearer to Artaxerxes Longimanus, and was held in high esteem by him, as the record shows. His financial ability (Ne 5:8,10,14,17) would indicate that the office was a lucrative one. Cupbearers are mentioned further in 1Ki 10:5; 2Ch 9:4, where they, among other evidences of royal splendor, are stated to have impressed the queen of Sheba with Solomon's glory. The title Rabshakeh (Isa 36:2), once thought to mean "chief of the cupbearers," is now given a different derivation and explained as "chief of the officers," or "princes" (BDB under the word). See further on cupbearers Herod. iii.34; Xen. Cyrop. i.3, 8, 9; Josephus, Ant, XVI, viii, 1; Tobit 1:22.

Benjamin Reno Downer

CUPBOARD

kub’-erd (kulikion, 1 Macc 15:32): A kind of sideboard in or on which Simon’s gold and silver vessels were displayed, and which, among other evidences of his glory, amazed the Syrian envoy Athenobius. Compare the Roman abacus, said to have been introduced into Rome from Asia.

CURDLE

kur’-dl (qapha’," to congeal," "harden," "curdle"): Occurs in Job 10:10, "Hast thou not .... curdled me like cheese?" i.e. made him take solid form. "The formation of the embryo is a mystery on which the Hebrew dwells with a deep and reverential awe: compare Ps 139:13-16." These similes are often met with in the Koran and oriental poetry. See Speaker’s Commentary in the place cited

CURE; CURES

kur: Represents the words gahah, marpe’, raphdh; therapeuo, iasis. Gahah in Pr 17:22 translated "medicine" means properly the removal of a bandage from a healed wound, and, is used figuratively in Ho 5:13; marpe’," healing," is used in the sense of deliverance of the city in Jer 33:6; with a negative particle in 2Ch 21:18 it is used to describe the bowel disease of Jehoram as incurable. The Greek words are used of physical cures (iasis in Lu 13:32) as contradistinguished from the casting out of demons as Mt 17:16; Lu 7:21; Joh 5:10. Cure is only used in the New Testament in the sense of physical healing; in the Old Testament usually in the sense of spiritual or national deliverance from danger.

Alex. Macalister

CURIOUS

ku’-ri-us (machashebheth; periergos): The above Hebrew word, meaning "thought," "device," "design," is translated "curious," Ex 35:32 the King James Version "curious works"; the English Revised Version "cunning"; the American Standard Revised Version "skilful"; cheshebh ("device," "devised work"), translated the King James Version "curious girdle," is translated by the English Revised Version "cunningly woven band," the American Standard Revised Version "skilfully" (Ex 28:8,27,28; 29:5; 39:5,20,21; Le 8:7). In Ps 139:15 raqam, "embroidered," "variegated" is used figuratively of a child in the womb, translated "curiously wrought"; "the body or the fetus is described as woven together of so many different-colored threads, like a cunning and beautiful network or tapestry" (Perowne in the place cited.). See also CURDLE. Periergos, "working round about," is used of the "curious arts" of some in Ephesus who brought their books to be burned (Ac 19:19 the American Standard Revised Version "magical").

See ASTROLOGY 14.

W. L. Walker

CURRENT MONEY

See MONEY, CURRENT.

CURSE

kurs (’alah (Nu 5:21,23,17, etc.), me’erah (Pr 3:33; Mal 2:2, etc.), klalah (Ge 27:12,13); katara (Ga 3:10,13)): This word as noun and verb renders different Hebrew words, some of them being more or less synonymous, differing only in degree of strength. It is often used in contrast with "bless" or "blessing" (De 11:29). When a curse is pronounced against any person, we are not to understand this as a mere wish, however violent, that disaster should overtake the person in question, any more than we are to understand that a corresponding "blessing" conveys simply a wish that prosperity should be the lot of the person on whom the blessing is invoked. A curse was considered to possess an inherent power of carrying itself into effect. Prayer has been defined as a wish referred to God. Curses (or blessings) were imprecations referred to supernatural beings in whose existence and power to do good or inflict harm primitive man believed. The use of magic and spells of all kinds is based on the belief that it is possible to enlist the support of the superhuman beings with whom the universe abounds, and to persuade them to carry out the suppliant’s wishes. It has been suggested that spells were written on pieces of parchment and cast to the winds in the belief that they would find their way to their proper destination—that some demoniac being would act as postman and deliver them at the proper address. In Zec 5:1-3 the "flying roll," with curses inscribed on it "goeth forth over the face of the whole land." It would find its way into the house of every thief and perjurer. But it was not always possible to commit curses to writing, it was enough to utter them aloud. Generally the name of some deity would be coupled with such imprecations, as Goliath cursed David by his gods (1Sa 17:43). Such curses once uttered possessed the power of self-realization. It was customary for heads of families in their declining years to bless their children, such a blessing being, not simply a paternal wish that their children should prosper in life, but a potent factor in determining their welfare (Ge 9:25). in this case Jacob seeks his father’s blessing, which was more than his father’s good wishes for his future career. Such blessings and curses were independent of moraI considerations. Before moral distinctions played any part in molding theological conceptions it was not necessary, before a spell could be effectual, that the individual against whom the spell was pronounced should be deserving, on moral grounds, of the fate which was invoked on him. It was sufficient that he should be the foe of the author of the curse. We may assume that such curses signalized the commencement of a battle. But in process of time such indiscriminate imprecations would not satisfy enlightened moral judgment. In the dramatic situation depicted in De 11:29; 27:12 f the curse was placed on Mt. Ebal and the blessing. on Mr. Gerizim. But the curse was the penalty for disobedience, as the blessing was the reward for obedience. The Book of Pr 26:2 summarily dismisses the traditional belief —"the curse that is causeless alighteth not." "In the discourses of Jesus we find blessings and curses. They are however simply authoritative declarations of the eternal connection between right doing and happiness, wrong doing and misery" (Cheyne).

Whereas curses by ordinary persons were considered more or less efficacious—some god being always only too glad to speed them on their way to their destination—yet special persons—"holy" persons—in virtue of their special relation to Divine beings possessed special powers of pronouncing effectual curses on account of their powers of enlisting supernatural aid. Balaam, according to the narrative in Nu 22 f, was an expert in the article Balak was convinced that Balaam's curse would bring about the defeat of the Israelites (see Gray, "Numbers," ICC).

The term—and the thing signified—plays an important part in Paul's interpretation of the cross. In the light of the law all men are guilty. There is no acquittal through appeal to a law that commands and never forgives—prohibits and never relents. The violator of the law is under a curse. His doom has been pronounced. Escape is impossible. But on the cross Jesus Christ endured the curse—for "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree" (Ga 3:10,13)—and a curse that has overtaken its victim is a spent force.

See PUNISHMENTS.

Jesus commands His disciples, "Bless them that curse you" (Lu 6:28; compare Ro 12:14). He Himself cursed the fruitless fig tree (Mr 11:21)—a symbol of the doom of a fruitless people.

Curse as the rendering of cherem, implies a totally different, idea.

See ACCURSED.

T. Lewis

CURTAIN

kur'-t'-n, -ten, -tin: The word ordinarily used for curtain is yeri'ah. Thus in Ex 26:1 ff; 36:8 ff of the curtains of the tabernacle (see TABERNACLE); in 2Sa 7:2; Ps 104:2; So 1:5; Isa 54:2; Jer 4:20; 10:20; 49:29; Hab 3:7.

Figurative: In Isa 40:22 (like Ps 104:2, of the heavens), the word used is doq, literally, "gauze."

CUSH (1)

kush (kush):

1. The Ancestor of Many Nations:

(1) The first of the sons of Ham, from whom sprang Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah and Sabtecah. He was also the father of Nimrod, who rounded Babel (Babylon) and the other great states of Shinar or Babylonia (Ge 10:6-8). The meaning of the name is uncertain.

(2) The name of the country around which the Gihon flowed (Ge 2:13), rendered "Ethiopia" in the King James Version, but in view of the distance of that country from the other rivers mentioned, this seems to be an unlikely identification.

2. A District of the Garden of Eden:

Fried. Delitzsch has suggested (Wo lag das Paradies? 74 ff) that the watercourse in question is the canal Gu-hande or Arahtu, which, coming from the South, entered Babylon a little to the East of the Euphrates, and, flowing alongside the Festival-Street, entered the Euphrates to the North of Nebuchadrezzar's palace. Koldewey (Tempel von Babylon und Borsippa, 38) regards the Gu-hande as the section of the Euphrates itself at this point. There is no indication, however, that the district which it enclosed was ever called Kusu or Cush, and the suppression of the final syllable of Gu-hande would remain unexplained. Moreover, the identification of Cush with a possible Cas, for Kasdu, "Chaldea," seems likewise improbable, especially as that name could only have been applied, in early times, to the district bordering on the Persian Gulf (see CHALDEA).

3. Probably not in Asia Minor:

Another theory is, that the Cush of Ge 2:13 is the Kusu of certain Assyrian letters, where it seems to designate a district in the neighborhood of Cappadocia. This identification apparently leads us back to an ancient tradition at one time current in the East, but later forgotten, which caused the Pyramus river to assume the name of Jihun (i.e. Gihon). This stream rises in the mountains Northeast of the Gulf of Alexandretta, and, taking a southwesterly course, flows into the Mediterranean near Karatash. Though nearer than the Ethiopian Cush, this is still too far West, and therefore unsatisfactory as an identification —all the streams or waterways of the Garden of Eden ought to flow through the same district.

4. The Ethiopian Cush:

(3) The well-known country of Cush or Ethiopia, from Syene (Eze 29:10) southward—Egyptian Kos, Babylonian Kusu, Assyrian Kusu. This name sometimes denotes the land (Isa 11:11; 18:1; Ze 3:10; Eze 29:10; Job 28:19; Es 1:1; 8:9); sometimes the peopl (Isa 20:4; Jer 46:9; Eze 38:5); but is in many passages uncertain. Notwithstanding that the descendants of Ham are always regarded as non-Semites, the Ethiopians, Ge'ez, as they called themselves, spoke a Semitic language of special interest on account of its likeness to Himyaritic, and its illustration of certain forms in Assyro-Babylonian. These Cushites were in all probability migrants from another (more northerly) district, and akin to the Canaanites—like them, dark, but by no means black, and certainly not Negroes. W. Max Muller (Asien und Europa, 113 note) states that it cannot be proved whether the Egyptians had quite black neighbors (on the South). In earlier times they are represented as brown, and later as brown mingled with black, implying that negroes only came to their knowledge as a distinct and extensive race in comparatively late times. Moses' (first?) wife (Nu 12:1) was certainly therefore not a Negress, but simply a Cushite woman, probably speaking a Semitic language—prehistoric Ge'ez or Ethiopian (see CUSHITE WOMAN). In all probability Semitic tribes were classed as Hamitic simply because they acknowledged the supremacy of

the Hamitic Egyptians, just as the non-Sem Elamites were set down as Semites (Ge 10:22) on account of their acknowledging Babylonian supremacy. It is doubtful whether the Hebrews, in ancient times, knew of the Negro race—they probably became acquainted with them long after the Egyptians.

5. Negroes Probably not Included:

In the opinion of W. Max Mailer (A, und East, 112), the Egyptians, when they became acquainted with the Negroes, having no word to express this race, classed them with the nechese, which thereafter included the Negroes. If the Hebrew name Phinehas (Pi-nechas) be really Egyptian and mean "the black," there is still no need to suppose that this meant "the Negro," for no Israelite would have borne a name with such a signification. The treasurer of Candace queen of Meroe (Ac 8:27-39)—the Ethiopian eunuch—was an Abyssinian, not a Negro; and being an educated man, was able to read the Hebrew Scriptures in the Greek (Septuagint) version. Cush (mat Kusi, pr. Kushi) is frequently mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions in company with Melubha (Merohha) to indicate Ethiopia and Meroe.

See EDEN; ETHIOPIA; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. Pinches

CUSH (2)

kush (kush; Septuagint Chousei, Ps 7 title): A Benjamite, perhaps he that "was without cause" the "adversary" of David (compare Ps 7:4).

See CUSHI.

CUSHAN

kushan: In the psalm of Habakkuk (Hab 3:7) "the tents of Cushan" are mentioned in an individualizing description of the effects of a theophany. Parallel is the phrase "the curtains of the land of Midian." Septuagint renders Cushan, kushan, by Aithiopon, reading perhaps kushim, or kushin (kushin). The context indicates that the same land or people is intended as the Old Testament elsewhere calls Cush, yet vaguely and not in any strict geographical usage that would limit it to Africa.

CUSHAN-RISHATHAIM

ku’-shan-rish-a-tha’-im (kushan rish‘athayim, translated, or rather interpreted, as "man from Cush, he of the twofold crime"; Septuagint Chousarsathaim, the King James Version Chushan-rishathaim): Mentioned in Jud 3:8-10 as a king of Mesopotamia who was chosen by God as his tool to chastise the Israelites for their idolatry. After Joshua’s death the children of Israel soon began to affiliate themselves with the heathen peoples among whom they dwelt. This was the fertile source of all their troubles. God

delivered ("sold") them into the hands of the heathen. C.-r. is the first whose name is given in this connection. Barring this short passage in Jud nothing is known of the man. Eight years the Israelites were under his dominion, when the Lord raised up a deliverer to them, Othniel, the son of Kenaz, Caleb’s younger brother—the first of the judges.

William Baur

CUSHI

ku’-shi: This name represents kushi, (in the original Septuagint Chousei, Chousi), either with or without the article. With the article (so in 2Sa 18:21-32 seven out of eight times, all readings supported by the Septuagint) it simply indicate that the person so designated was of the Cushite people, as in Jer 38:7 ff. Its use without the article has doubtless developed out of the foregoing according to a familiar process. For the Cush of Ps 7, title read "Cushi" with Septuagint.

(1) The messenger (the Revised Version (British and American) "the Cushite") sent by Joab to acquaint David with the victory over Absalom. That this man was in fact a foreigner is indicated by his ignorance of a shorter path which Ahimaaz took, by his being unrecognized by the watchman who recognizes Ahimaaz, and by his ignorance, as compared with Ahimaaz, of the sentiments of David, whom he knows only as a king and not as a man. 2Sa 18:21 (twice, the second time without the article), 2Sa 18:22,23,11 (twice), 2Sa 18:32 (twice).

(2) The great-grandfather of Jehudi, a contemporary of Jeremiah (Jer 36:14). The name Jehudi itself ("a man of Judah") is sufficient refutation of the opinion that the use of Cushi as or in lieu of a proper name "seems to show that there were but few Cushites among the Israelites."

(3) The father of Zephaniah the prophet (Ze 1:1).

J. Oscar Boyd

CUSHION

koosh’-un (proskephalaion): In New Testament, only in Mr 4:38 the Revised Version (British and American). The word means literally, a cushion for the head (the King James Version "pillow") but was also used of one for sitting or reclining upon, e.g. of a rower’s cushion. The article used with it in this passage suggests that it was one of the customary furnishings of the boat, and it was probably similar to the cushion placed for the comfort of passengers in the stern of modern boats on the Sea of Galilee. "Silken cushions" of Am 3:12 the Revised Version (British and American) is a rendering of the Hebrew demesheq from its supposed connection with damask. These cushions formed the divan, often the only article of furniture in an oriental reception room. "Cushions" occurs further in the somewhat doubtful the Revised Version, margin rendering of Pr 7:16; 31:22.

Benjamin Reno Downer

CUSHITE

kush’-it: Whereas kushi, is elsewhere rendered Ethiopian, in 2Sa 18:21-32 it is rendered Cushite in the Revised Version (British and American) (see CUSHI and compare CUSHITE WOMAN). Its plural, which occurs in Zephaniah, Daniel and 2 Chronicles, also in the form kushiyim, in Amos, is uniformly translated Ethiopians, following Septuagint. The other Old Testament books use simply kush, for people as well as land.

CUSHITE WOMAN; ETHIOPIAN WOMAN

kush’-it: In Nu 12:1 Moses is condemned by his sister Miriam and his brother Aaron "because of the Cushite woman ha-’ishshah ha-kushith whom he had married"; and the narrator immediately adds by way of needed explanation, "for he had married a Cushite woman" (’ishshah khushith). Views regarding this person have been of two general classes:

(1) She is to be identified with Zipporah (Ex 2:21 and elsewhere), Moses’ Midianite wife, who is here called "the Gushite," either in scorn of her dark complexion (compare Jer 13:23) and foreign origin (so most older exegetes), or as a consequence of an erroneous notion of the late age when this apocryphal addition, "because of the Cushite," etc., was inserted in the narrative (so Wellhansen).

(2) She is a woman whom Moses took to wife after the death of Zipporah, really a Cushite (Ethiopian) by race, whether the princess of Meroe of whom Josephus (Ant., II, x, 2) romances (so Targum of Jonathan), or one of the "mixed multitude" (Ex 12:38; compare Nu 11:4) that accompanied the Hebrews on their wanderings (so Ewald and most). Dillmann suggests a compromise between the two classes of views, namely, that this woman is a mere "variation in the saga" from the wife elsewhere represented as Midianite, yet because of this variation she was understood by the author as distinct from Zipporah. The implication of the passage, in any case, is clearly that this connection of Moses tended to injure his prestige in the eyes of race-proud Hebrews, and, equally, that in the author’s opinion such a view of the matter was obnoxious to God.

J. Oscar Boyd

CUSTODY

kus’-to-di (yadh, pequddah): In Es 2:3,8 bis. 14, yadh, "the hand," is translated "Custody": pequddah, "numbering," "chanrge"; occurs in Nu 3:36 the Revised Version (British and American) "the appointed charge," margin, Hebrew "the office of the charge."

CUSTOM (1)

kus’-tum (tax):

(a) halakh, Ezr 4:13,10; 7:24 the King James Version;

(b) belo, Ezr 4:13, etc.;

(c) telonion, Mt 9:9; Mr 2:14; Lu 5:27, "receipt of custom" the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "place of toll," the collectors’ office;

(d) telos, Mt 17:25 (the Revised Version (British and American) "toll"); Ro 13:7; 1 Macc 11:35 (the Revised Version (British and American) "tolls"; compare 1 Macc 10:31).

The tax designated by halakh in Ezr 4:13, etc., is usually taken to mean a road tax, a toll, from root halakh, but compare Winckler, Altorientalische Forschungen, II, 463, which derives from root ilku, a command, a decree, hence, an imposed tax. Belo from root yabhal is supposed to be a tax on merchandise or produce (as distinguished from "tribute" or the tax on houses, lands and persons), usually paid in kind and levied for the support of the native or provincial government. See Ryle, Cambridge Bible, Ezra- Nehemiah, in the place cited Telos in New Testament and Macc is an indirect tax farmed out to the publicans.

Walter R. Betteridge

CUSTOM (2)

kus’-tum (usage): In the Old Testament, except, Ge 31:35 where the Revised Version (British and American) renders, better, "manner" (derekh, "way"), the words translated "custom" are choq, chuqqah, "statute," and mishpaT, "judgment." Such passages as Jud 11:39; Jer 32:11, and especially Ezr 3:4 (the King James Version "custom," the Revised Version (British and American) "ordinance"), illustrate the difficulty of deciding upon the proper translation, in cases where "custom" might become "statute," "usage" establish itself as "law." In Le 18:30; Jer 10:3 the reference is to heathen religious practices.

In the New Testament Lu 1:9; 2:42; Ac 6:14; 15:1 (the King James Version "manner"); Lu 16:21; 21:21 (ethos), and Lu 2:27 from the same Greek root, refer likewise to definitely established religious practices; in every case except Ac 16:21, those of the Jewish law. The Revised Version (British and American) makes the translation of ethos uniform, reading "custom" in Lu 22:39 (the King James Version "wont") and in Joh 19:40; Ac 25:16; Heb 10:25 (the King James Version "manner"). Greek eiothos, from the same root, is rendered "custom" in Lu 4:16 by English Versions of the Bible, and by the Revised Version (British and American) also in Ac 17:2, its only other occurrence in the New Testament. In Joh 18:39; 1Co 11:16 "custom" is the translation of Greek sunetheia, in the sense of "usage" rather than of "law."

F. K. Farr

CUT; CUTTING

(karath, gadha‘, kachadh, nathach; apokopto, ekkopto): Many Hebrew words are translated "cut." Of these karath, "to cut down, out, off," is the most frequent. As "cut off" it is used in the sense of laying or destroying (Ge 9:11; De 12:29; 1Ki 11:16; Ps 101:8, etc.), also for cutting off transgressors from the community of Yahweh, which meant probably separation, or exclusion, rather than death or destruction (Ge 17:14; Ex 12:15,19). Other words are damam, ("to be silent," "cease" Jer 25:37 the King James Version; Jer 48:2); tsamath "to destroy" (Ps 54:5 the King James Version; Ps 94:23, etc.); gadhadh, "to cut, one’s self," is used of the cutting of one’s flesh before heathen gods and in mourning for the dead, which was forbidden to the Israelites, (De 14:1; 1Ki 18:28; Jer 16:6; 41:5; 47:5); sereT, sareTeth, "incision," are also used of those "cuttings of the flesh" (Le 19:28; compare Le 21:5). See CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH. The cutting of the hair of head and beard in mourning for the dead is referred to in Isa 15:2; "Every, beard is cut off" (gadha‘), and Jer 7:29, gazaz, "Cut off thy hair" (the Revised Version, margin "thy crown"), O Jerusalem (compare Isa 22:12; Jer 16:6; Eze 7:18; Am 8:10). This early and widespread practice was also forbidden to the Israelites as being unworthy of them in their relation to Yahweh (Le 19:27; De 14:1).

Charosheth, "carving," "engraving," is used for the cutting of stones (Ex 31:5; 35:33).

In the New Testament we have apokopto "to cut away" (Mr 9:43,15; Ga 5:12 the King James Version; see CONCISION); diaprio, "to saw through" (Ac 5:33, "they were cut to the heart"); dichotomeo, "to cut in two" (Mt 24:51); suntemno, "to cut together" (Ro 9:28), "finishing it and cutting it short," i. e; "making it conclusive and brief."

"mutilate themselves," the American Standard Revised Version "go "rest"), "noontide," margin "Or, tranquillity" (Gesenius, Delitzsch, etc., "in the quiet of my days"); instead of, "I would that they were even cut off which trouble you" (Ga 5:12), Among the changes of the Revised Version (British and American) are "brought to silence" for "cut down" (Jer 25:37), also for "cut off" (Zec 12:3); for "cut off," "pass through" (Job 11:10), head" (Am 9:1), "break them in pieces on the head of"; for "in the cutting off of my days" (Isa 38:10; Hebrew demi, "silence," the English Revised Version has "cut themselves off," margin beyond circumcision," margin, Greek: "mutilate themselves." W. L. Walker "gone" (Ps 90:10); "rolled up" (Isa 38:12); "cut off" for "destroy" (Ps 18:40; 69:4; 118:10,11,12); for "cut them in the (Jer 49:26; 50:30); "sore wounded" for "cut in pieces"

CUTH; CUTHAH

kuth, ku’-tha (kuth, kuthah; Choua, Chountha): The longer writing is the better of the two, and gives the Hebrew form of the name of one of the cities from which Sargon of Assyria brought colonists to fill the places of the Israelites which he deported from Samaria in 772 BC (2Ki 17:24,30). Probably in consequence of their predominating numbers, the inhabitants of Samaria in general were then called

kuthiyim, or Cutbeans. 1. The Ruins of Cuthah:

From contract-tablets found at Tel-Ibrahim by the late Hormuzd Hassam, on which the ancient name of the place is given as Gudua or Kutu, it would seem that that is the site which has to be identified with the Biblical Cuthah. It lies to the Northeast of Babylon, and was one of the most important cities of the Babylonian empire. The explorer describes the ruins as being about 3,000 ft. in circumference and 280 ft. high, and adjoining them on the West lies a smaller mound, crowned with a sanctuary dedicated to Ibrahim (Abraham). From the nature of the ruins, Rassam came to the conclusion that the city was much more densely populated after the fall of Babylon than in earlier times. A portion of the ruins were in a very perfect state, and suggested an unfinished building.

2. The Temple:

The great temple of the city was called E-mes-lam, and was dedicated to Nergal (compare 2Ki 17:30), one of whose names was Meslam-ta-ea. Both city and temple would seem to have been old Sumerian foundations, as the name Gudua and its later Sere form, Kutu, imply.

LITERATURE.

See Rassam, Asshur and the Land of Nimrod, 396, 409, and, for details of the worship of Nergal, PSBA, December, 1906, 203-18.

T. G. Pinches

CUTHA

ku'-tha (Koutha; 1 Esdras 5:32, the King James Version Coutha): Head of a family of temple servants who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon; not mentioned in the canonical lists.

CUTHAH

See CUTH, CUTHAH.

CUTHEAN; CUTHITE

ku-the'-an, kuth'-it.

See CUTH; SAMARITANS.

CUTTING ASUNDER

See ASUNDER; PUNISHMENTS.

CUTTING OFF

See CONCISION; PUNISHMENTS.

CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH

(sereT, sareTeth): For relatives or friends to cut or beat themselves even to free blood-flowing, especially in the violence of grief in mourning for their dead (see BURIAL; MOURNING), was a widely prevalent custom among ancient peoples, and is well-nigh universal among uncivilized races today (see Spencer, Prin. of Soc., 3rd edition, I, 163 ff). The fact is abundantly attested for most of the nations of antiquity, but there are two notable exceptions, the Egyptians (Herod. ii.61, 85; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptian II, 374), and the Hebrews (De 14:1; Le 21:5). According to Plutarch (Sol. 21) Solon forbade the women of Athens to beat themselves to the effusion of blood, and the laws of the Twelve Tables, quoted by Cic. (De leg. ii.23) contained a like injunction. Among the ancient Arabs the forbidden practice was associated, as among the Hebrews, with the cutting off of the hair (Wellhausen, Skizzen, III, 160 f).

That the prohibition among the Hebrews was urgently called for is made clear by the way it is dealt with by the Law and the prophets. The Law of Holiness reads: "Ye are the children of Yahweh your God: ye shall not cut yourselves" (De 14:1), or "make any incision" (sereT; Le 19:28, sareTeth; Septuagint entomis) in the flesh "for the dead." Probably the earliest reference to the custom as actually prevalent among the Hebrews is in Ho 7:14 (ERVm). It was widely prevalent in the time of Jeremiah among his countrymen, even as among the Philistines (Jer 47:5) and the Moabites (Jer 48:37; compare Am 8:10; Isa 3:24; 15:2; 22:12; Mic 1:16; Eze 7:18).

In seeking for the reason or purpose underlying all such prohibitions, we may note, first, that the "cuttings" and "baldness" forbidden are alike said to be "for the dead." Not less explicitly are they said to be incompatible with Israel’s unique relation to Yahweh—a relation at once of sonship (De 14:1) and of consecration (De 14:2). Moreover such mutilations of the body are always dealt with as forming part of the religious rites of the heathen (as of the Canaanitish Baal (1Ki 18:28) note "after their manner," see article in HDB, under the word). Both such shedding of blood and the dedication of the hair are found in almost all countries of that day in intimate connection with the rituals of burial and the prevailing belief in the necessity of propitiating the spirit of the deceased. The conclusion, then, seems clearly warranted that such tokens of grief were prohibited because they carried with them inevitably ideas and associations distinctly heathen in character and so incompatible with the pure religion of Yahweh, and unworthy of those who had attained to the dignity of the sons ("children") of Yahweh.

See also STIGMATA, MARK;

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, Heb Arch., section 23; Nowack, Heb Arch., I, 33 f; Tylor, Prim. Cult.; W. R. Smith, Rel Semitic, Lect IX; and Comm., Knobel-Dillmann, Ex-Le on Le 19:28; Driver, De on 14:1; and Lightfoot, Ga on 6:17.

George B. Eager

CYAMON

si’-a-mon (Kuamon, Judith 7:3): Probably identical with JOKNEAM (which see).

CYMBAL

sim’-bal.

See MUSIC.

CYPRESS

si’-pres.

See HOLM-TREE.

CYPRIANS

sip’-ri-ans (Kuprioi): Occurs in 2 Macc 4:29. Menelaus who was high priest at Jerusalem, and Sostratus who was governor of the citadel, were summoned by King Antiochus to appear before him. "Menelaus left his own brother Lysimachus for his deputy in the high-priesthood; and Sostratus left Crates, who was over the Cyprians." The Cyprians were the inhabitants of the island of Cyprus. Barnabas, who was Paul’s associate on his first missionary journey, was a Cyprian (Kuprios; see Ac 4:36). the Revised Version (British and American) designates him as a man of Cyprus. The governor of the island was called a Cypriarch (see 2 Macc 12:2, and compare ASIARCH).

A. W. Fortune

CYPRUS

si’-prus (Kupros):

1. Name:

An island situated near the Northeast corner of the Levant, in an angle formed by the coasts of Cilicia and Syria. In the Old Testament it is called Kittim, after the name of its Phoenician capital Kition. The identification is expressly made by Josephus (Ant., I, vi, 1) and by the Cyprian bishop Epiphanius (Haer., xxx.25). In the tablets from Tell el- Amarna it is referred to as Alashia (E. Meyer, Gesch. des Alterthums, 12, section 499), in Egyptian records as Asi, while in the Assyrian cuneiform inscriptions it is named Yavnan.

2. Geography:

The island is the largest in the Mediterranean with the exception of Sardinia and Sicily, its area being about 3,584 square miles. It lies in 34 degrees 30'-35 degrees 41' North latitude and 32 degrees 15'-34 degrees 36' East longitude, only 46 miles distant from the nearest point of the Cilician coast and 60 miles from the Syrian. Thus from the northern shore of the island the mainland of Asia Minor is clearly visible and Mt. Lebanon can be seen from Eastern Cyprus. This close proximity to the Cilician and Syrian coasts, as well as its position on the route between Asia Minor and Egypt, proved of great importance for the history and civilization of the island. Its greatest length, including the Northeast promontory, is about 140 miles, its greatest breadth 60 miles. The Southwest portion of Cyprus is formed by a mountain complex, culminating in the peaks of Troodos (6,406 ft.), Madhari (5,305 ft.), Papofitsa (5,124 ft.) and Machaira (4,674 ft.). To the Northeast of this lies the great plain of the Mesorea, nearly 60 miles in length and 10 to 20 in breadth, in which lies the modern capital Nicosia (Lefkosia). It is watered chiefly by the Pediaeus (modern Pedias), and is bounded on the North by a mountain range, which is continued to the East-Northeast in the long, narrow promontory of the Karpass, terminating in Cape Andrea, the ancient Dinaretum. Its highest peaks are Buffavento (3,135 ft.) and Hagios Elias (3,106 ft.). The shore-plain to the North of these hills is narrow, but remarkably fertile.

3. Products:

Cyprus is richly endowed by nature. Its fruits and flowers were famous in antiquity. Strabo, writing under Augustus, speaks of it as producing wine and oil in abundance and corn sufficient for the needs of its inhabitants (XIV, 684). The elder Pliny refers to Cyprian salt, alum, gypsum, mica, unguents, laudanum, storax, resin and precious stones, including agate, jasper, amethyst, lapis lazuli and several species of rock-crystal. His list includes the diamond (xxxvii.58) and the emerald (xxxvii.6, 66), but there is reason to believe that under these names a variety of rock-crystal and the beryl are intended. The chief source of the island's wealth, however, lay in its mines and forests. Silver is mentioned by Strabo (loc. cit.) among its products; copper, which was called by the Greeks after the name of the island, was extensively mined there from the earliest period down to the Middle Ages; iron too was found in considerable quantities from the 9th century until Roman times. Scarcely less important were the forests, which at an early date are said to have covered almost the whole island. The cypress seems to have been the principal tree, but Pliny tells of a giant cedar, 130 Roman feet in height, felled in Cyprus (xvi.203), and the island supplied timber for shipbuilding to many successive powers.

4. Early History:

The original inhabitants of Cyprus appear to have been a race akin to the peoples of Asia Minor. Its vast resources in copper and timber gained for it a considerable importance and wide commercial relations at a very remote period. Its wealth attracted the attention of Babylonia and Egypt, and there is reason to believe that it was conquered by Sargon I, king of Accad, and about a millennium later by Thothmes III, of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty (1501-1447 BC). But the influences which molded its civilization came from other quarters also. Excavation has shown that in Cyprus were several seats of the Minoan culture, and there can be little doubt that it was deeply influenced by Crete. The Minoan writing may well be the source of the curious Cyprian syllabic script, which continued in use for the representation of the Greek language down to the 4th century BC (A. J. Evans, Scripta Minoa, I). But the Minoan origin of the Cyprian syllabary is still doubtful, for it may have been derived from the Hittite hieroglyphs. Phoenician influences too were at work, and the Phoenician settlements—Citium, Amathus, Paphos and others—go back to a very early date. The break-up of the Minoan civilization was followed by a "Dark Age," but later the island received a number of Greek settlers from Arcadia and other Hellenic states, as we judge not only from Greek tradition but from the evidence of the Cyprian dialect, which is closely akin to the Arcadian. In 709 BC Sargon II of Assyria made himself master of Cyprus, and tribute was paid by its seven princes to him and to his grandson, Esarhaddon (681-667 BC). The overthrow of the Assyrian Empire probably brought with it the independence of Cyprus, but it was conquered afresh by Aahmes (Amasis) of Egypt (Herod. ii. 182) who retained it till his death in 526 BC; but in the following year the defeat of his son and successor Psamtek III (Psammenitus) by Cambyses brought the island under Persian dominion (Herod. iii.19, 91).

5. Cyprus and the Greeks:

In 501 the Greek inhabitants led by Onesilus, brother of the reigning prince of Salamis, rose in revolt against the Persians, but were decisively beaten (Herodotus v.104 ff), and in 480 we find 150 Cyprian ships in the navy with which Xerxes attacked Greece (Herod. vii.90). The attempts of Pausanias and of Cimon to win Cyprus for the Hellenic cause met with but poor success, and the withdrawal of the Athenian forces from the Levant after their great naval victory off Salamis in 449 was followed by a strong anti- Hellenic movement throughout the island led by Abdemon, prince of Citium. In 411 Euagoras ascended the throne of Salamis and set to work to assert Hellenic influence and to champion Hellenic civilization. He joined with Pharnabazus the Persian satrap and Conon the Athenian to overthrow the naval power of Sparta at the battle of Cnidus in 394, and in 387 revolted from the Persians. He was followed by his son Nicocles, to whom Isocrates addressed the famous panegyric of Euagoras and who formed the subject of an enthusiastic eulogy by the same writer. Cyprus seems later to have fallen once again under Persian rule, but after the battle of Issus (333 BC) it voluntarily gave in its submission to Alexander the Great and rendered him valuable aid at the siege of Tyre. On his death (323) it fell to the share of Ptolemy of Egypt. It was, however, seized by Demetrius Poliorcetes, who defeated Ptolemy in a hotly contested battle off Salamis in 306. But eleven years later it came into the hands of the Ptolemies and remained a province of Egypt or a separate but dependent kingdom until the intervention of Rome (compare 2 Macc 10:13). We hear of a body of Cyprians, under the command of a certain Crates, serving among the troops of Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria and forming part of the garrison of Jerusalem about 172 BC (2 Macc 4:29). This interpretation of the passage seems preferable

to that according to which Crates had been governor of Cyprus under the Ptolemies before entering the service of Antiochus.

6. Cyprus and Rome:

In 58 BC the Romans resolved to incorporate Cyprus in their empire and Marcus Porcius Cato was entrusted with the task of its annexation. The reigning prince, a brother of Ptolemy Auletes of Egypt, received the offer of an honorable retirement as high priest of Aphrodite at Paphos, but he preferred to end his life by poison, and treasures amounting to some 7,000 talents passed into Roman hands, together with the island, which was attached to the province of Cilicia. In the partition of the Roman empire between Senate and Emperor, Cyprus was at first (27-22 BC) an imperial province (Dio Cassius liii.12), administered by a legatus Augusti pro praetore or by the imperial legate of Cilicia. In 22 BC, however, it was handed over to the Senate together with southern Gaul in exchange for Dalmatia (Dio Cassius liii. 12; liv.4) and was subsequently governed by ex-praetors bearing the honorary title of proconsul and residing at Paphos. The names of about a score of these governors are known to us from ancient authors, inscriptions and coins and will be found in D. G. Hogarth, Devia Cypria, App. Among them is Sergius Paulus, who was proconsul at the time of Paul's visit to Paphos in 46 or 47 AD, and we may notice that the title applied to him by the writer of the Ac (13:7) is strictly accurate.

7. Cyprus and the Jews:

The proximity of Cyprus to the Syrian coast rendered it easy of access from Palestine, and Jews had probably begun to settle there even before the time of Alexander the Great. Certainly the number of Jewish residents under the Ptolemies was considerable (1 Macc 15:23; 2 Macc 12:2) and it must have been increased later when the copper mines of the island were farmed to Herod the Great (Josephus, Ant, XVI, iv, 5; XIX, xxvi, 28; compare Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, 2628). We shall not be surprised, therefore, to find that at Salamis there was more than one synagogue at the time of Paul's visit (Ac 13:5). In 116 AD the Jews of Cyprus rose in revolt and massacred no fewer than 240,000 Gentiles. Hadrian crushed the rising with great severity and drove all the Jews from the island. Henceforth no Jew might set foot upon it, even under stress of shipwreck, on pain of death (Dio Cassius lxviii.32).

8. The Church in Cyprus:

In the life of the early church Cyprus played an important part. Among the Christians who fled from Judea in consequence of the persecution which followed Stephen's death were some who "travelled as far as Phoenicia, and Cyprus" (Ac 11:19) preaching to the Jews only. Certain natives of Cyprus and Cyrene took a further momentous step in preaching at Antioch to the Greeks also (Ac 11:20). Even before this time Joseph Barnabas, a Levite born in Cyprus (Ac 4:36), was prominent in the early Christian community at Jerns, and it was in his native island that he and Paul, accompanied by Barnabas nephew, John Mark, began their first missionary journey (Ac 13:4). After landing at Salamis they passed "through the whole island" to Paphos (Ac 13:6), probably visiting the Jewish synagogues in its cities. The Peutinger Table tells us of two roads from Salamis to Paphos in Roman times, one of which ran

inland by way of Tremithus, Tamassus and Soil, a journey of about 4 days, while the other and easier route, occupying some 3 days, ran along the south coast by way of Citium, Amathus and Curium. Whether the "early disciple," Mnason of Cyprus, was one of the converts made at this time or had previously embraced Christianity we cannot determine (Ac 21:16). Barnabas and Mark revisited Cyprus later (Ac 15:39), but Paul did not again land on the island, though he sighted it when, on his last journey to jerus, he sailed south of it on his way from Patara in Lycia to Tyre (Ac 21:3), and again when on his journey to Rome he sailed "under the lee of Cyprus," that is, along its northern coast, on the way from Sidon to Myra in Lycia (Ac 27:4). In 401 AD the Council of Cyprus was convened, chiefly in consequence of the efforts of Theophilus of Alexandria, the inveterate opponent of Origenism, and took measures to check the reading of Origen's works. The island, which was divided into 13 bishoprics, was declared autonomous in the 5th century, after the alleged discovery of Matthew's Gospel in the tomb of Barnabas at Salamis. The bishop of Salamis was made metropolitan by the emperor Zeno with the title "archbishop of all Cyprus," and his successor, who now occupies the see of Nicosia, still enjoys the privilege of signing his name in red ink and is primate over the three other bishops of the island, those of Paphos, Kition and Kyrenia, all of whom are of metropolitan rank.

9. Later History:

Cyprus remained in the possession of the Roman and then of the Byzantine emperors, though twice overrun and temporarily occupied by the Saracens, until 1184, when its ruler, Isaac Comnenus, broke away from Constantinople and declared himself an independent emperor. From him it was wrested in 1191 by the Crusaders under Richard I of England, who bestowed it on Guy de Lusignan, the titular king of Jerusalem, and his descendants. In 1489 it was ceded to the Venetians by Catherine Cornaro, widow of James II, the last of the Lusignan kings, and remained in their hands until it was captured by the Ottoman Turks under Sultan Selim II, who invaded and subjugated the island in 1570 and laid siege to Famagusta, which, after a heroic defense, capitulated on August 1, 1571. Since that time Cyprus has formed part of the Turkish empire, in spite of serious revolts in 1764 and 1823; since 1878, however, it has been occupied and administered by the British government, subject to an annual payment to the Sublime Porte of $92,800 and a large quantity of salt. The High Commissioner, who resides at Nicosia, is assisted by a Legislative Council of 18 members. The estimated population ia 1907 was 249,250, of whom rather more than a fifth were Moslems and the remainder chiefly members of the Greek Orthodox church.

LITERATURE.

An exhaustive bibliography will be found in C. D. Cobham, An Attempt at a Bibliography of Cyprus, Nicosia, 4th edition, 1900. The following works may be specially mentioned: E. Oberhummer, Aus Cypern, Berlin, 1890-92; Studien zur alten Geographic yon Kypros, Munich 1891; A. Sakellarios, Ta Kupriaka, Athens, 1890-91. References in ancient sources are collected in J. Meursius, Cyprus, Amsterdam, 1675, and W. Engel, Kypros, Berlin, 1841. For Cyprian archaeology see P. Gardner, New Chapters in Greek History, chapter vi, London, 1892; J. L. Myres and M. OhnefalschRichter, Catalogue of the Cyprus Museum, Oxford, 1899; M. O. Richter, Kypros, die Bibel und Homer, Berlin, 1893; D. G. Hogarth, Devia Cypria, London, 1889; and J. L. Myres' article on "Cypriote Archaeology" in

Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, VII, 697 ff. For excavations, Journal of Hellenic Studies, IX, XI, XII, XVII, and Excavations Cyprus, London (British Museum), 1900; for art, G. Perrot and C. Chipiez, Art in Phoenicia and Cyprus, English translation, London, 1885; for coins, B. V. Head, Historia Numorum, Oxford, 1911; for inscriptions, Sammlung der griech. Dialekt-Inschriften, I, Gottingen, 1883; for the Cyprian church, J. Hackett, History of the Orthodox Church of Cyprus, London, 1901; for authorities on medieval and modern history, CL. D. Cobham, Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), 11th edition, VII, 701.

Marcus N. Tod

CYRAMA

si-ra’-ma, sir’-a-ma.

See KIRAMA.

CYRENE

si-re’-ne (Kurene "wall"):

1. Location:

Cyrene was a city of Libya in North Africa, lat. 32 degrees 40’ North, long. 22 degrees 15’ East. It lay West of ancient Egypt, from which it was separated by a portion of the Libyan desert, and occupied the territory now belonging to Barca and Tripoli. It was situated upon an elevated plateau about 2,000 ft. above the sea, from which it was distant some 10 miles. A high range of mountains lies to the South, about 90 miles inland. This shelters the coast land from the scorching heat of the Sahara. The range drops down toward the North in a series of terrace-like elevations, thus giving to the region a great variety of climate and vegetation. The soil is fertile.

2. History:

Cyrene was originally a Greek colony rounded by Battus in 630 BC. Because of the fertility of the soil, the great variety in climate and vegetation, together with its commercial advantages in location, the city soon rose to great wealth and importance. Greater fame, however, came to it through its distinguished citizens. It was the home of Callimachus the poet, Carneacles the founder of the New Academy at Athens, and Eratosthenes the mathematician. To these must be added, from later times, the elegant ancient Christian writer Synesius. So important did this Greek colony become that, in little more than half a century, Amasis II of Egypt formed an alliance with Cyrene, marrying a Greek lady of noble, perhaps royal, birth (Herod. ii.181). Ptolemy III (Euergetes I), 231 BC, incorporated Cyrene with Egypt. The city continued, though with much restlessness, a part of the Egyptian empire until Apion, the last of

the Ptolemies, willed it to Rome. It henceforth belonged to a Roman province.

In the middle of the 7th century, the conquering Saracens took possession of Cyrene, and from that time to this it has been the habitation of wandering tribes of Arabs.

3. Biblical Importance:

Cyrene comes into importance in Biblical history through the dispersion of the Jews. Ptolemy I, son of Lagus, transported Jews to this and other cities of Libya (Josephus, CAp, II, 4) and from this time on Jews were very numerous there. By the return of the Jews of the Dispersion to the feasts at Jerusalem, Cyrenians came to have a conspicuous place in the New Testament history. "A man of Cyrene, Simon by name," was caught by the Roman soldiers and compelled to bear the cross of Jesus (Mt 27:32; compare Mr 15:21; Lu 23:26). See CYRENIAN. Jews from Cyrene were among those present on the day of Pentecost. Their city appears as one of the important points in the wide circle of the Dispersion described by Peter in his sermon on that occasion (Ac 2:10). Cyrenian Jews were of sufficient importance in those days to have their name associated with a synagogue at Jerusalem (Ac 6:9). And when the persecution arose about Stephen, some of these Jews of Cyrene who had been converted at Jerusalem, were scattered abroad and came with others to Antioch and preached the word "unto the Jews only" (Ac 11:19,20 the King James Version), and one of them, Lucius, became a prophet in the early church there. In this case, as in so many others, the wise providence of God in the dispersion of the Jews in preparation for the spread of the gospel of the Messiah is seen.

4. Archaeology:

In the ruins of Cyrene are to be seen the remains of some beautiful buildings, and a few sculptures have been removed. The most interesting remains of the wondrous civilization of this Greek colony are in a great system of tombs, some built, but the finest cut in the solid rock of the cliff. Doric architecture and brilliant decorative painting adorn these tombs.

LITERATURE

Herodotus ii; Josephus, Apion; Thrige, Res Cyrenensium.

M. G. Kyle

CYRENIAN; CYRENIANS

si-re’-ni-an (Kurenaios, "a native or inhabitant of Cyrene"): Two Jews of Cyrene are mentioned in the New Testament, namely, Simon (Mr 15:21 and Lu 23:26 the King James Version) who was impressed to bear the Lord’s cross (Mr 15:21 the Revised Version, margin), and Lucius, a Christian teacher at Antioch (Ac 13:1). See CYRENE; LUCIUS; SIMON. For Cyrenians see CYRENE.

CYRENIUS

si-re’-ni-us (Kurenios, "of Cyrene").

See QUIRINIUS.

CYRIA

sir’-i-a (Kuria): The word means "lady," feminine of lord, and it is so translated in the King James Version and the text of the Revised Version (British and American) (2 Joh 1:5 the Revised Version, margin). But it is possible that the word is a proper name, and this possibility is recognized by placing Cyria, the usual transliteration of the word, in the margin by the Revised Version (British and American).

CYRUS

si’-rus (koresh; Old Persian Kurus; Babylonian Kur(r)as, Kur(r)asu; Greek Kuros, 2Ch 36:22, etc.):

1. Genealogy of Cyrus

2. His Country, Ansan or Anzan

3. His Origin (Herodotus)

4. His Origin (Xenophon)

5. His Origin (Nicolaus of Damascus)

6. His Origin (Ctesias)

7. Babylonian Records of His Reign—the Cylinder of Nabonidus 8. The Babylonian Chronicle

9. The Babylonian Chronicle—The Capture of Babylon

10. The Cylinder of Cyrus

11. Cyrus’ History from Greek Sources

12. The Massagetae

13. The Sacae, Berbices, etc.

14. Doubt as to the Manner of His Death

15. Cyrus' Reputation

16. Why Did the Babylonians Accept Him?

17. Cyrus and the Jews

18. Cyrus in Persia—His Bas-relief

1. Genealogy of Cyrus:

The son of the earlier Cambyses, of the royal race of the Achemenians. His genealogy, as given by himself, is as follows: "I am Cyrus, king of the host, the great king, the mighty king, king of Tindir (Babylon), king of the land of Sumeru and Akkadu, king of the four regions, son of Cambyses, the great king, king of the city Ansan, grandson of Cyrus, the great king, king of the city Ansan, great-grandson of Sispis (Teispes), the great king, king of the city Ansan, the all-enduring royal seed whose sovereignty Bel and Nebo love," etc. (WAI, V, plural 35, 20-22).

2. His Country, Ansan or Anzan:

As, in the Babylonian inscriptions, Assan (Ansan, Anzan) is explained as Elam—the city was, in fact, the capital of that country—it is probable that Cyrus' name was Elamite; but the meaning is doubtful. The Greek etymology connecting it with khor, "the sun" in Persian, may therefore be rejected. According to Strabo, he was at first called Agradates, the name by which he was universally known being taken from that of the river Cyrus. This, however, is more likely to have been the reason why his grandfather (after whom he was probably named) was called Cyrus.

3. His Origin (Herodotus):

Several versions of his birth and rise to power are recorded. Herodotus (i.95) mentions three. In that which he quotes (i.107 ff), it is said that Mandane was the daughter of the Median king Astyages, who, in consequence of a dream which he had had, foretelling the ultimate triumph of her son over his dynasty, gave her in marriage to a Persian named Cambyses, who was not one of his peers. A second dream caused him to watch for her expected offspring, and when Cyrus came into the world Astyages delivered the child to his relative, Harpagus, with orders to destroy it. Being Unwilling to do this, he handed the infant to a Shepherd named Mitradates, who, his wife having brought forth a still-born child, consented to spare the life of the infant Cyrus. Later on, in consequence of his imperious acts, Cyrus was recognized by Astyages, who came to learn the whole story, and spared him because, having once been made king by his companions in play, the Magians held the predictions concerning his ultimate royal

state to have been fulfilled. The vengeance taken by Astyages upon Harpagus for his apparent disobedience to orders is well known: his son was slain, and a portion, disguised, given him to eat. Though filled with grief, Harpagus concealed his feelings, and departed with the remains of his son's body; and Cyrus, in due course, was sent to stay with his parents, Cambyses and Mandane. Later on, Harpagus persuaded Cyrus to induce the Persians to revolt, and Astyages having blindly appointed Harpagus commander- in-chief of the Median army, the last-named went over to the side of Cyrus. The result was an easy victory for the latter, but Astyages took care to impale the Magians who had advised him to spare his grandson. Having gathered another, but smaller, army, he took the field in person, but was defeated and captured. Cyrus, however, who became king of Media as well as of Persia, treated him honorably and well.

4. His Origin (Xenophon):

According to Xenophon, Cyropedia i. section 2, Cambyses, the father of Cyrus, was king of Persia. (NOTE: He may have added Persia to his dominion, but according to Cyrus himself, he was king of Ansan or Elam.) Until his 12th year, Cyrus was educated in Persia, when he was sent for, with his mother, by Astyages, to whom he at once manifested much affection. Astyages is said to have been succeeded by his son Cyaxares, and Cyrus then became his commander-in-chief, subduing, among others, the Lydians. He twice defeated the Assyrians (= Babylonians), his final conquest of the country being while the Median king was still alive. As, however, the Cyropedia is a romance, the historical details are not of any great value.

5. His Origin (Nicolaus of Damascus):

Nicolaus of Damascus describes Cyrus as the son of a Mardian bandit named Atradates, his mother's name being Argoste. While in service in the palace of Astyages, he was adopted by Artembarks, cupbearer, and thus obtained prominence. Cyrus now made his bandit-father satrap of Persia, and, with base ingratitude, plotted against his king and benefactor. The preparations for a revolt having been made, he and his general Oibaras were victorious at Hyrba, but were defeated at Parsagadae, where his father Atradates was captured and later on died. Cyrus now took refuge in his mountain home, but the taunts of the women sent him and his helpers forth again, this time to victory and dominion.

6. His Origin (Ctesias):

Ctesias also states that there was no relationship between Cyrus and Astyages (Astyigas), who, when Cyrus conquered Media, fled to Ecbatana, and was there hidden by his daughter Amytis, and Spitamas her husband. Had not Astyages yielded, Cyrus, it is said, would have tortured them, with their children. Cyrus afterward liberated Astyages, and married his daughter Amytis, whose husband he had put to death for telling a falsehood. The Bactrians are said to have been so satisfied at the reconciliation of Cyrus with Astyages and his daughter, that they voluntarily submitted. Cyrus is said by Ctesias to have been taken prisoner by the Sacae, but he was ransomed. He died from a wound received in battle with the Derbices, assisted by the Indians.

7. Babylonian Records of His Reign—the Cylinder of Nabonidus:

In the midst of so much uncertainty, it is a relief to turn to the contemporary documents of the Babylonians, which, though they do not speak of Cyrus' youth in detail, and refer only to other periods of his career in which they were more immediately interested, may nevertheless, being contemporary, be held to have an altogether special authority. According to the inscriptions, the conflict with Astyages took place in 549 BC. From the cylinder of Nabonidus we learn that the Medes had been very successful in their warlike operations, and had gone even as far afield as Haran, which they had besieged. The Babylonjan King Nabonidus desired to carry out the instructions of Merodach, revealed in a dream, to restore the temple of Sin, the Moon-god, in that city. This, however, in consequence of the siege, he could not do, and it was revealed to him in a dream that the power of Astyages would be overthrown at the end of three years, which happened as predicted. "They (the gods Sin and Merodach) then caused Cyrus, king of Anzan, his (Merodach's) young servant, with his little army, to rise up against him (the Median); he destroyed the extensive Umman-manda (Medes), Istuwegu (Astyages), king of the Medes, he captured, and took (him) prisoner to his (own) land." The account of this engagement in the Babylonian Chronicle (which is, perhaps, Cyrus' own), is as follows: "(Astyages) gathered his army, and went against Cyrus, king of Ansan, to capture him, and (as for) Astyages, his army revolted against him and took him, and gave him to Cyrus."

8. The Babylonian Chronicle:

Cyrus went to the land of Ecbatana, his royal city. He carried off from Ecbatana silver, gold, furniture, merchandise, and took to the land of Ansan the furniture and merchandise which he had captured.

The above is the entry for the 6th year of Nabonidus, which corresponds with 549 BC; and it will be noticed that he is here called "king of Ansan." The next reference to Cyrus in the Babylonian Chronicle is the entry for Nabonidus' 9th year (546 BC), where it is stated that "Cyrus, king of the land of Parsu (Persia) gathered his army, and crossed the Tigris below Arbela," and in the following month (Iyyar) entered the land of Is- ...., where someone seems to have taken a bribe, garrisoned the place, and afterward a king ruled there. The passage, however, is imperfect, and therefore obscure, but we may, perhaps, see therein some preparatory move on the part of Cyrus to obtain possession of the tract over which Nabonidus claimed dominion. The next year (545 BC) there seems to have been another move on the part of the Persians, for the Elamite governor (?) is referred to, and had apparently some dealings with the governor of Erech. All this time things seem to have been the same in Babylonia, the king's son (he is not named, but apparently Belshazzar is meant) and the soldiers remaining in Akkad (possibly used in the old sense of the word, to indicate the district around Sippar), where it was seemingly expected that the main attack would be delivered. The reference to the governor of Erech might imply that some conspiracy was on foot more to the south—a movement of which the native authorities possibly remained in ignorance.

9. The Babylonian Chronicle—the Capture of Babylon:

After a gap which leaves four years unaccounted for, we have traces of four lines which mention the goddess Ishtar of Erech, and the gods of the land of Par ....(? Persia) are referred to. After this comes the long entry, which, though the date is broken away, must refer to the 17th year of Nabonidus. A royal visit to a temple is referred to, and there is mention of a revolt. Certain religious ceremonies were then performed, and others omitted. In the month Tammuz, Cyrus seems to have fought a battle in Opis, and succeeded in attacking the army of Akkad situated on the Tigris. On the 14th of the month, Sippar was taken without fighting, and Nabonidus fled. On the 16th Ugbaru (Gobryas) governor of Media, entered Babylon, with the army of Cyrus, without fighting, and there Nabonidus was captured with his followers. At this time E-saggil and the temples of the land seem to have been closed, possibly to prevent the followers of Nabonidus from taking sanctuary there, or else to prevent plotters from coming forth; and on the 3rd of Marcheswan (October), Cyrus entered Babylon. "Crowds collected before him, proposing peace for the city; Cyrus, command the peace of Babylon, all of it." Gobryas, his vice-regent, then appointed governors in Babylon, and the gods whom Nabonidus had taken down to Babylon, were returned to their shrines. On the night of the 11th of Marcheswan, Ugbaru went against (some part of Babylon), and the son of the king died; and there was mourning for him from the 27th of Adar to the 3rd of Nisan (six days). There is some doubt as to whether the text speaks of the king or the son of the king, but as there is a record that Nabonidus was exiled to Carmania, it would seem most likely that the death of Belshazzar "in the night" is here referred to. The day after the completion of the mourning (the 4th of Nisan), Cambyses, son of Cyrus, performed ceremonies in the temple E-nig-had-kalamma, probably in connection with the new year’s festival, for which Cyrus had probably timed his arrival at Babylon. According to Herodotus (i.191), Babylon’ was taken during a festival, agreeing with Da 5:1 ff.

10. The Cylinder of Cyrus:

The other inscription of Cyrus, discovered by Mr. H. Rassam at Babylon, is a kind of proclamation justifying his seizure of the crown. He states that the gods (of the various cities of Babylonia) forsook their dwellings in anger that he (Nabonidus) had made them enter within Su-anna (Babylon). Merodach, the chief divinity of Babylon, sought also a just king, the desire of his heart, whose hand he might hold—Cyrus, king of Ansan, he called his title—to all the kingdoms together (his) name was proclaimed.

The glory of Cyrus’ conquests probably appealed to the Babylonians, for Cyrus next states that Merodach placed the whole of the troops of Qutu (Media) under his feet, and the whole of the troops of the Manda (barbarians and mercenaries). He also caused his hands to hold the people of the dark head (Asiatics, including the Babylonians)—in righteousness and justice he cared for them. He commanded that he should go to his city Babylon, and walked by his side like a friend and a companion—without fighting and battle Merodach caused him to enter Su-anna. By his high command, the kings of every region from the upper sea to the lower sea (the Mediterranean to the Persian Gulf), the kings of the Amorites, and the dwellers in tents, brought their valuable tribute and kissed his feet within Su-anna (Babylon). From Nineveh(?), the city Assur, Susa, Agade, the land of Esnunnak, Zamban, Me-Turnu, and Deru, to the borders of Media, the gods inhabiting them were returned to their shrines, and all the people were collected and sent back to their dwellings. He finishes by soliciting the prayers of the gods to Bel and Nebo for length of days and happiness, asking them also to appeal to Merodach on behalf of Cyrus "his worshipper," and his son Cambyses.

11. Cyrus' History from Greek Sources:

It was probably between the defeat of Astyages and the capture of Babylon that Cyrus defeated Croesus and conquered Lydia. After preparing to attack the Greek cities of Asia Minor, he returned to Ecbatana, taking Croesus with him. The states which had formed the Lydian empire, however, at once revolted, and had again to be reduced to submission, this time by Harpagus, his faithful general, after a determined resistance. It was at this period that Cyrus subdued the nations of Upper Asia, his next objective being Babylonia (section 9 and the two preceding paragraphs). In this connection it is noteworthy that, in the Babylonian official account, there is no mention of his engineering works preparatory to the taking of Babylon—the turning of the waters of the Gyndes into a number of channels in order to cross (Herod. i.189); the siege of Babylon, long and difficult, and the final capture of the city by changing the course of the Euphrates, enabling his army to enter by the bed of the river' (Herodotus i.190-91). There may be some foundation for this statement, but if so, the king did not boast of it—perhaps because it did not entail any real labor, for the irrigation works already in existence may have been nearly sufficient for the purpose. It seems likely that the conquest of Babylon opened the way for other military exploits. Herodotus states that he next attacked the Massagetae, who were located beyond the Araxes.

12. The Massagetae:

One-third of their army was defeated, and the son of Tomyris, the queen, captured by a stratagem; but on being freed from his bonds, he committed suicide. In another exceedingly fierce battle which followed, the Persian army was destroyed, and Cyrus himself brought his life to an end there, after a reign of 29 years. (He had ruled over Media for 11, and over Babylonia (and Assyria) for 9 years.) According to the Babylonian contract-tablets, Cambyses, his son, was associated with him on the throne during the first portion of his 1st year of rule in Babylon.

13. The Sacae, Berbices, etc.:

According to Ctesias, Cyrus made war with the Bactrians and the Sacae, but was taken prisoner by the latter, and was afterward ransomed. He died from a wound received in battle with the Berbices. Diodorus agrees, in the main, with Herodotus, but relates that Cyrus was captured by the Scythian queen (apparently Tomyris), who crucified or impaled him.

14. Doubt as to the Manner of His Death:

It is strange that, in the case of such a celebrated ruler as Cyrus, nothing certain is known as to the manner of his death. The accounts which have come down to us seem to make it certain that he was killed in battle with some enemy, but the statements concerning his end are conflicting. This absence of any account of his death from a trustworthy source implies that Herodotus is right in indicating a terrible disaster to the Persian arms, and it is therefore probable that he fell on the field of battle—perhaps in

conflict with the Massagetae, as Herodotus states. Supposing that only a few of the Persian army escaped, it may be that not one of those who saw him fall lived to tell the tale, and the world was dependent on the more or less trustworthy statements which the Massagetae made.

15. Cyrus' Reputation:

That he was considered to be a personage of noble character is clear from all that has come down to us concerning him, the most noteworthy being Xenophon's Cyropedia and Institution of Cyrus. The Babylonian inscriptions do not reproduce Babylonian opinion, but the fact that on the occasion of the siege of Babylon the people trusted to his honor and came forth asking peace for the city (apparently with every confidence that their request would be granted); and that the Babylonians, as a whole, were contented under his rule, may be regarded as tacit confirmation. Nabonidus, before the invasion of his territory by the Persian forces, was evidently well disposed toward him, and looked upon him, as we have seen, as "the young servant of Merodach," the patron deity of Babylon.

16. Why Did the Babylonians Accept Him?:

It is not altogether clear, however, why theBabylonians submitted to him with so little resistance—their inscriptions contain no indication that they had real reason to be dissatisfied with the rule of Nabonidus —he seems to have been simply regarded as somewhat unorthodox in his worship of the gods; but could they expect an alien, of a different religion, to be better in that respect? Dissatisfaction on the part of the Babyloninn priesthood was undoubtedly at the bottom of their discontent, however, and may be held to supply a sufficient reason, though it does not redound to the credit of Babylonian patriotism. It has been said that the success of Cyrus was in part due to the aid given him by the Jews, who, recognizing him as a monotheist like themselves, gave him more than mere sympathy; but it is probable that he could never have conquered Babylonia had not the priests, as indicated by their own records, spread discontent among the people. It is doubtful whether we may attribute a higher motive to the priesthood, though that is not altogether impossible. The inner teaching of the Babylonian polytheistic faith was, as is now well known, monotheistic, and there may have been, among the priests, a desire to have a ruler holding that to be the true faith, and also not so inclined as Nabonidus to run counter to the people's (and the priests') prejudices. Jewish influence would, in some measure, account for this.

17. Cyrus and the Jews:

If the Jews thought that they would be more sympathetically treated under Cyrus' rule, they were not disappointed. It was he who gave orders for the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem (2Ch 36:23; Ezr 1:2; 5:13; 6:3), restored the vessels of the House of the Lord which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away (Ezr 1:7), and provided funds to bring cedar trees from Lebanon (Ezr 3:7). But he also restored the temples of theBabylonians, and brought back the images of the gods to their shrines. Nevertheless the Jews evidently felt that the favors he granted them showed sympathy for them, and this it probably was which caused Isaiah (44:28) to see in him a "shepherd" of the Lord, and an anointed king (Messiah, . to Christo mou, Isa 45:1)—a title suggesting to later writers that he was a type of Christ (Hieron.,

Commentary on Isa 44:1).

18. Cyrus in Persia—His Bas-relief:

From Persia we do not get any help as to his character, nor as to the estimation in which he was held. His only inscription extant is above his idealized bas-relief at Murghab, where he simply writes: "I am Cyrus, the Achemenian." The stone shows Cyrus standing, looking to the right, draped in a fringed garment resembling those worn by the ancientBabylonians, reaching to the feet. His hair is combed back in the Persian style, and upon his head is an elaborate Egyptian crown, two horns extending to front and back, with a uraeus serpent rising from each end, and between the serpents three vase-like objects, with discs at their bases and summits, and serrated leaves between. There is no doubt that this crown is symbolical of his dominion over Egypt, the three vase-like objects being modifications of the triple helmet-crown of the Egyptian deities. The king is represented as four-winged in the Assyro-Babylonian style, probably as a claim to divinity in their hierarchy as well as to dominion in the lands of Merodach and Assur. In his right hand, which is raised to the level of his shoulder, he holds a kind of scepter seemingly terminating in a bird’s head—in all probability also a symbol of Babylonian dominion, though the emblem of the Babylonian cities of the South was most commonly a bird with wings displayed.

T. G. Pinches

DABAREH

dab’-a-re.

See DABERATH.

DABBESHETH

dab’-e-sheth (dabbesheth; Dabasthai; the King James Version Dabbasheth, dab’a-sheth): A town on the western boundary of Zebulun (Jos 19:11). It is probably identical with the modern Dabsheh, a ruined site to the East of Acre.

DABERATH

dab’-e-rath (ha-dabherath, "pasture"; Dabeiroth): A city in the territory of Issachar, on the boundary between that tribe and Zebulun (Jos 19:12). It was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (Jos 21:28; 1Ch 6:72). The most probable identification is with Dabuiriyeh, a village on the lower western slopes of Tabor.

DABRIA

da’-bri-a: One of the five who wrote down the visions of Esdras, described (2 Esdras 14:24) as "ready to write swiftly."

DACUBI; DACOBI

da-ku’-bi, da-ko’-bi, King James Version: Head of a family of gate-keepers (1 Esdras 5:28).

See AKKUB; DAKUBI.

DADDEUS

da-de’-us, the Revised Version (British and American); LODDEUS (Loddaios), which see.

DAGGER

dag’-er.

See ARMOR, ARMS.

DAGON

da’-gon (daghon; apparently derived from dagh, "fish"): Name of the god of the Philistines (according to Jerome on Isa 46:1 of the Philistines generally); in the Bible, Dagon is associated with Gaza (Jud 16) but elsewhere with Ashdod (compare 1Sa 5 and 1 Macc 10:83 f; 11:4); in 1Ch 10:10 there is probably an error (compare the passage 1Sa 31:10). The god had his temple ("the house of Dagon") and his priests. When the ark was captured by the Philistines, it was conducted to Ashdod where it was placed in the house of Dagon by the side of the idol. But on the morrow it was found that the idol lay prostrate before the ark of the Lord. It was restored to its place; but on the following day Dagon again lay on the ground before the ark, this time with the head and both hands severed from the body and lying upon the miphtan (the word is commonly interpreted to mean "threshold"; according to Winckler, it means "pedestal"); the body alone remained intact. The Hebrew says: "Dagon alone remained." Whether we resort to an emendation (dagho, "his fish-part") or not, commentators appear to be right in inferring that the idol was half-man, half-fish. Classic authors give this form to Derceto. The sacred writer adds that from that time on the priests of Dagon and all those that entered the house of Dagon refrained from stepping upon the miphtan of Dagon. See 1Sa 5:1-5. The prophet Zephaniah (Ze 1:9) speaks of an idolatrous practice which consisted in leaping over the miphtan. The Septuagint in 1 Samuel indeed adds the clause: "but they were accustomed to leap." Leaping over the threshold was probably a feature of the Philistine ritual which the Hebrews explained in their way. A god Dagon seems to have been worshipped by the Canaanites; see BETH-DAGON.

LITERATURE

Commentaries on Judges and 1 Samuel; Winckler, Altoriental. Forschungen, III, 383.

Max L. Margolis

DAILY

da’-li: This word, coming as it does from the Hebrew yom "day," and the Greek hemera, suggests either day by day (Ex 5:13), that which is prepared for one daily (Ne 5:18), as e.g. our "daily bread," meaning bread sufficient for that day (Mt 6:11); or day by day continuously, one day after another in succession, as "the daily burnt offering" (Nu 29:6 the King James Version), "daily ministration" (Ac 6:1), and "daily in the temple" (Ac 5:42 the King James Version). The meaning of the word "daily" as used in the Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6:11) seems to indicate sufficient for our need, whether we consider that need as a day at a time, or day after day as we are permitted to live. "Give us bread sufficient for our sustenance."

William E. Vans

DAILY OFFERING; DAILY SACRIFICE

See SACRIFICE.

DAINTIES; DAINTY (MEATS)

dan’-tis (maT‘ammoth, "things full of taste," man‘ammim, ma‘adhan; liparos, "fat," "shining"): Jacob is represented as predicting of Asher, "He shall yield royal dainties" (Ge 49:20; compare parallel clause, "His bread shall be fat," and De 33:24, "Let him dip his foot in oil"). David, praying to be delivered from the ways of "men that work inquiry," cries, "Let me not eat of their dainties" (Ps 141:4). The man who sitteth "to eat with a ruler" (Pr 23:1-3) is counseled, "If thou be a man given to appetite, be not desirous of his dainties; seeing they are deceitful food" (compare John’s words in the woes upon Babylon (Re 18:14), "All things that were dainties and sumptuous are perished from thee," and Homer’s Iliad (Pope). xviii.456). "Dainties," then, are luxuries, costly, delicate and rare. This idea is common to all the words thus rendered; naturally associated with kings’ tables, and with the lives of those who are lovers of pleasure and luxury. By their associations and their softening effects they are to be abstained from or indulged in moderately as "deceitful food" by those who would live the simple and righteous life which wisdom sanctions. They are also "offered not from genuine hospitality, but with some by-ends." He should also shun the dainties of the niggard (Pr 23:6), who counts the cost (Pr 23:7 the Revised Version, margin) of every morsel that his guest eats.

See DELICATE; FOOD, etc.

George B. Eager

DAISAN

da’-san, da’-i-san (Daisan): Head of a family of temple servants (1 Esdras 5:3:1) called Rezin in Ezr 2:48; Ne 7:50, the interchange of "D" and "R" in Hebrew being not uncommon.

DAKUBI

da-ku’-bi, da-koo’-bi (Dakoub, Dakoubi; the King James Version Dacobi): Head of a family of gate-keepers (1 Esdras 5:28) called "Akkub" in the canonical lists.

DALAIAH

da-la’-a, da-la-i’-a.

See DELAIAH.

DALAN

da’-lan (Dalan; the King James Version Ladan): Head of a family that returned to Jerusalem, but which "could shew neither their families, nor their stock, how they were of Israel" (1 Esdras 5:37); corresponds to Delaiah (Ezr 2:60). Another reading is "Asan."

DALE, KING’S

(dal, ‘emeq hamelekh) :

(1) "Absalom in his lifetime had taken and reared up for himself the pillar, which is in the king’s dale" (2Sa 18:18). According to Josephus (Ant., VII, x, 3) this was a marble pillar, which he calls "Absalom’s hand" and it was two furlongs from Jerusalem. Warren suggests that this dale was identical with the KING’S GARDEN (which see), which he places at the open valley formed at the junction of the Tyropoen with the Kidron (see JERUSALEM). The so-called Absalom’s Pillar, which the Jews still pelt with stones in reprobation of Absalom’s disobedience, and which a comparatively recent tradition associates with 2Sa 18:18, is a very much later structure, belonging to the Greco- Roman period, but showing Egyptian influence.

(2) King’s Vale (Ge 14:17; the King James Version dale). See KING’S VALE; VALE.

E. W. G. Masterman

DALETH

da’-leth (...): The 4th letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and as such used in Ps 119 to designate the 4th section; transliterated in this Encyclopedia with the dagesh as d, and, without, as dh (= th in "the"). It came also to be used for the number four (4), and with the dieresis for 4,000. With the apostrophe it is sometimes used as abbreviation for the tetragrammaton. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

DALLY

dal’-i: Occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 12:26: "But they that would not be reformed by that correction wherein he dallied with them" (paigniois epitimeseos, "child play of correction"), the reference being to the earlier and lighter plagues of Egypt; Version (British and American) renders "by a mocking correction as of children," "by a correction which was as children’s play," Greek (as above). He first tried them by those lighter inflictions before sending on them the heavier. In later usage "daily" implies delay.

DALMANUTHA

dal-ma-nu’-tha. See MAGADAN. Compare Mr 8:10; Mt 15:39.

DALMATIA

dal-ma’-shi-a (Dalmatia, "deceitful"): A district of the Roman empire lying on the eastern shore of the Adriatic. Writing from Rome to Timothy during his second imprisonment (in 66 or 67 AD, according to Ramsay’s chronology), Paul records the departure of Titus to Dalmatia (2Ti 4:10). No mention is made of his special mission, and we cannot tell whether his object was to traverse regions hitherto unevangelized or to visit churches already formed. Nor can we determine with certainty the meaning of the word Dalmatia as here used. Originally it denoted the land of the barbarous Dalmatae or Delmatae, a warlike Illyrian tribe subjugated by the Romans after a long and stubborn resistance; it was then applied to the southern portion of the Roman province of Illyricum, lying between the river Titius (modern Kerka) and the Macedonian frontier; later the name was extended to the entire province. On the whole it seems most probable that the apostle uses it in this last sense. See further under the word ILLYRICUM.

Marcus N. Tod

DALPHON

dal’-fon (dalphon, "crafty"): The second of the ten sons of Haman, slain by the Jews (Es 9:7).

DAM

(’em, ordinary Hebrew word for "mother"): Hebrew law prohibited the destruction of the "dam" and the young of birds at the same time, commanding that if the young be taken from a nest the dam be allowed to escape (De 22:6,7). In the same spirit it enjoined the taking of an animal for slaughter before it had been seven days with its "dam" (Ex 22:30; Le 22:27; compare Ex 23:19).

DAMAGE

dam’-aj (chabhala’): This word expresses any inflicted loss of value or permanent injury to persons or things. "Why should damage grow to the hurt of the kings?" (Ezr 4:22). In Pr 26:6 "damage" means "wrong," "injury" (Hebrew chamac). The translation of Es 7:4 is doubtful: "Although the adversary could not have compensated for the king’s damage" (the Revised Version, margin "For our affliction is not to be compared with the king’s damage" the King James Version "could not countervail the king’s damage") but Hebrew nezeq (Es 7:4) and Aramaic naziq (Da 6:2) have the meaning of "molestation" or "annoyance" (see Ges.6 Buhl Dict. (15th edition) 489, 806, 908). We therefore ought to read ‘for that oppression would not have been worthy of the molestation of the king’ (Es 7:4) and ‘that the king should have no molestation’ (Da 6:2). The Greek zemia, "loss" and zemioo, "to cause loss"; the Revised Version (British and American) therefore translates Ac 27:10 "will be with injury and much loss" (the King James Version "damage"), and 2Co 7:9 "that ye might suffer loss by us in nothing" (the King James Version "damage").

A. L. Breslich

DAMARIS

dam’-a-ris (Damaris, possibly a corruption of damalis, "a heifer"): The name of a female Christian of Athens, converted by Paul’s preaching (Ac 17:34). The fact that she is mentioned in this passage together with Dionysius the Areopagite has led some, most probably in error, to regard her as his wife. The singling out of her name with that of Dionysius may indicate some personal or social distinction. Compare Ac 17:12.

DAMASCENES

dam-a-senz’, dam’-a-senz ten polin Damaskenon, ("the city of the Damascenes"): The inhabitants of Damascus under Aretas the Arabian are so called (2Co 11:32).

DAMASCUS

da-mas’-kus:

1. The Name

2. Situation and Natural Features

3. The City Itself

4. Its History

(1) The Early Period (to circa 950 BC)

(2) The Aramean Kingdom (circa 950-732 BC)

(3) The Middle Period (732 BC-650 AD)

(4) Under Islam

1. Name:

The English name is the same as the Greek Damaskos. The Hebrew name is Dammeseq, but the Aramaic form Darmeseq, occurs in 1Ch 18:5; 2Ch 28:5. The name appears in Egyptian inscriptions as Ti-mas-ku (16th century BC), and Sa-ra-mas-ki (13th century BC), which W. M. Muller, Asien u. Europa, 227, regards as representing Ti-ra-mas-ki, concluding from the "ra" in this form that Damascus

had by that time passed under Aramaic influence. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters the forms Ti-ma-as-gi and Di-mas-ka occur. The Arabic name is Dimashk esh-Sham ("Damascus of Syria") usually contrasted to Esh-Sham simply. The meaning of the name Damascus is unknown. Esh-Sham (Syria) means "the left," in contrast to the Yemen (Arabia) =" the right."

2. Situation and Natural Features:

Damascus is situated (33 degrees 30’ North latitude, 36 degrees 18’ East longitude) in the Northwest corner of the Ghuta, a fertile plain about 2,300 ft. above sea level, West of Mt. Hermon. The part of the Ghuta East of the city is called el-Merj, the "meadow-land" of Damascus. The river Barada (see ASANA) flows through Damascus and waters the plain, through which the Nahr el-Awaj (see PHARPAR) also flows, a few miles South of the city.

Surrounded on three sides by bare hills, and bordered on the East, its open side, by the desert, its well-watered and fertile Ghuta, with its streams and fountains, its fields and orchards, makes a vivid impression on the Arab of the desert. Arabic literature is rich in praises of Damascus, which is described as an earthly paradise. The European or American traveler is apt to feel that these praises are exaggerated, and it is perhaps only in early summer that the beauty of the innumerable fruit trees—apricots, pomegranates, walnuts and many others—justifies enthusiasm. To see Damascus as the Arab sees it, we must approach it, as he does, from the desert. The Barada (Abana) is the life blood of Damascus. Confined in a narrow gorge until close to the city, where it spreads itself in many channels over the plain, only to lose itself a few miles away in the marshes that fringe the desert, its whole strength is expended in making a small area between the hills and the desert really fertile. That is why a city on this site is inevitable and permanent. Damascus, almost defenseless from a military point of view, is the natural mart and factory of inland Syria. In the course of its long history it has more than once enjoyed and lost political supremacy, but in all the vicissitudes of political fortune it has remained the natural harbor of the Syrian desert.

3. The City Itself:

Damascus lies along the main stream of the Barada, almost entirely on its south bank. The city is about a mile long (East to West) and about half a mile broad (North to South). On the south side a long suburb, consisting for the most part of a single street, called the Meidan, stretches for a mile beyond the line of the city wall, terminating at the Bawwabet Allah, the "Gate of God," the starting-point of the Haj, the annual pilgrimage to Mecca. The city has thus roughly the shape of a broad-headed spoon, of which the Meidan is the handle. In the Greek period, a long, colonnaded street ran through the city, doubtless the "street which is called Straight" (Ac 9:11). This street, along the course of which remains of columns have been discovered, runs westward from the Babesh-Sherki, the "East Gate."

Part of it is still called Derb el-Mustakim ("Straight Street"), but it is not certain that it has borne the name through all the intervening centuries. It runs between the Jewish and Christian quarters (on the left and right, respectively, going west), and terminates in the Suk el-Midhatiyeh, a bazaar built by Midhat

Pasha, on the north of which is the main Moslem quarter, in which are the citadel and the Great Mosque. The houses are flat-roofed, and are usually built round a courtyard, in which is a fountain. The streets, with the exception of Straight Street, are mostly narrow and tortuous, but on the west side of the city there are some good covered bazaars. Damascus is not rich in antiquities.

The Omayyad Mosque, or Great Mosque, replaced a Christian church, which in its time had taken the place of a pagan temple. The site was doubtless occupied from time immemorial by the chief religious edifice of the city. A small part of the ancient Christian church is still extant. Part of the city wall has been preserved, with a foundation going back to Roman times, surmounted by Arab work. The traditional site of Paul's escape (Ac 9:25; 2Co 11:33) and of the House of Naaman (2Ki 5) are pointed out to the traveler, but the traditions are valueless.

The charm of Damascus lies in the life of the bazaars, in the variety of types which may be seen there—the Druse, the Kurd, the Bedouin and many others—and in its historical associations. It has always been a manufacturing city. Our word "damask" bears witness to the fame of its textile industry, and the "Damascus blades" of the Crusading period were equally famous; and though Timur (Tamerlane) destroyed the trade in arms in 1399 by carrying away the armorers to Samarcand, Damascus is still a city of busy craftsmen in cloth and wood. Its antiquity casts a spell of romance upon it. After a traceable history of thirty-five centuries it is still a populous and flourishing city, and, in spite of the advent of the railway and even the electric street car, it still preserves the flavor of the East.

4. Its History:

(1) The Early Period (to circa 950 BC).

The origin of Damascus is unknown. Mention has already been made (section 1) of the references to the city in Egyptian inscriptions and in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. It appears once—possibly twice—in the history of Abraham. In Ge 14:15 we read that Abraham pursued the four kings as far as Hobah, "which is on the left hand (i.e. the north) of Damascus." But this is simply a geographical note which shows only that Damascus was well known at the time when Ge 14 was written. Greater interest attaches to Ge 15:2, where Abraham complains that he is childless and that his heir is "Dammesek Eliezer" (English Revised Version), for which the Syriac version reads "Eliezer the Damaschul." The clause, however, is hopelessly obscure, and it is doubtful whether it contains any reference to Damascus at all. In the time of David Damascus was an Aramean city, which assisted the neighboring Aramean states in their unsuccessful wars against David (2Sa 8:5 f). These campaigns resulted indirectly in the establishment of a powerful Aramean kingdom in Damascus. Rezon, son of Eliada, an officer in the army of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, escaped in the hour of defeat, and became a captain of banditti. Later he established himself in Damascus, and became its king (1Ki 11:23 ff). He cherished a not unnatural animosity against Israel and the rise of a powerful and hostile kingdom in the Israelite frontier was a constant source of anxiety to Solomon (1Ki 11:25).

(2) The Aramean Kingdom (circa 950-732 BC).

Whether Rezon was himself the founder of a dynasty is not clear. He has been identified with Hezion, father of Tab-rimmon, and grandfather of Ben-hadad (1Ki 15:18), but the identification, though a natural one, is insecure. Ben-hadad (Biridri) is the first king of Damascus, after Rezon, of whom we have any detailed knowledge. The disruption of the Hebrew kingdom afforded the Arameans an opportunity of playing off the rival Hebrew states against each other, and of bestowing their favors now on one, and now on the other. Benhadad was induced by Asa of Judah to accept a large bribe, or tribute, from the Temple treasures, and relieve Asa by attacking the Northern Kingdom (1Ki 15:18 ff). Some years later (circa 880 BC) Ben-hadad (or his successor?) defeated Omri of Israel, annexed several Israelite cities, and secured the right of having Syrian "streets" (i.e. probably a bazaar for Syrian merchants) in Samaria (1Ki 20:34). Ben-hadad II (according to Winckler the two Ben-hadads are really identical, but this view, though just possible chronologically, conflicts with 1Ki 20:34) was the great antagonist of Ahab. His campaigns against Israel are narrated in 1Ki 20:22. At first successful, he was subsequently twice defeated by Ahab, and after the rout at Aphek was at the mercy of the conqueror, who treated him with generous leniency, claiming only the restoration of the lost Israelite towns, and the right of establishing an Israelite bazaar in Damascus.

On the renewal of hostilities three years later Ahab fell before Ramoth-gilead, and his death relieved Ben-hadad of the only neighboring monarch who could ever challenge the superiority of Damascus. Further light is thrown upon the history of Damascus at this time by the Assyrian inscriptions. In 854 BC the Assyrians defeated a coalition of Syrian and Palestine states (including Israel) under the leadership of Ben-hadad at Karqar. In 849 and 846 BC renewed attacks were made upon Damascus by the Assyrians, who, however, did not effect any considerable conquest. From this date until the fall of the city in 732 BC the power of the Aramean kingdom depended upon the activity or quiescence of Assyria. Hazael, who murdered Ben-hadad and usurped his throne circa 844 BC, was attacked in 842 and 839, but during the next thirty years Assyria made no further advance westward. Hazael was able to devote all his energies to his western neighbors, and Israel suffered severely at his hands. In 803 Mari’ of Damascus, who is probably identical with the Ben-hadad of 2Ki 13:3, Hazael’s son, was made tributary to Ramman-nirari III of Assyria. This blow weakened Aram, and afforded Jeroboam II of Israel an opportunity of avenging the defeats inflicted upon his country by Hazael. In 773 Assyria again invaded the territory of Damascus.

Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 BC) pushed vigorously westward, and in 738 Rezin of Damascus paid tribute. A year or two later he revolted, and attempted in concert with Pekah of Israel, to coerce Judah into joining an anti- Assyrian league (2Ki 15:37; 16:5; Isa 7). His punishment was swift and decisive. In 734 the Assyrians advanced and laid siege to Damascus, which fell in 732. Rezin was executed, his kingdom was overthrown, and the city suffered the fate which a few years later befell Samaria.

(3) The Middle Period (circa 732 BC-650 AD).

Damascus had now lost its political importance, and for more than two centuries we have only one or two inconsiderable references to it. It is mentioned in an inscription of Sargon (722-705 BC) as having taken part in an unsuccessful insurrection along with Hamath and Arpad. There are incidental references

to it in Jer 49:23 ff and Eze 27:18; 47:16 ff. In the Persian period Damascus, if not politically of great importance, was a prosperous city. The overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander was soon followed (301 BC) by the establishment of the Seleucid kingdom of Syria, with Antioch as its capital, and Damascus lost its position as the chief city of Syria. The center of gravity was moved toward the sea, and the maritime commerce of the Levant became more important than the trade of Damascus with the interior. In 111 BC the Syrian kingdom was divided, and Antiochus Cyzicenus became king of Coele-Syria, with Damascus as his capital. His successors, Demetrius Eucaerus and Antiochus Dionysus, had troubled careers, being involved in domestic conflicts and in wars with the Parthians, with Alexander Janneus of Judea, and with Aretas the Nabatean, who obtained possession of Damascus in 85 BC. Tigranes, being of Armenia, held Syria for some years after this date, but was defeated by the Romans, and in 64 BC Pompey finally annexed the country.

The position of Damascus during the first century and a half of Roman rule in Syria is obscure. For a time it was in Roman hands, and from 31 BC-33 AD its coins bear the names of Augustus or Tiberius. Subsequently it was again in the hands of the Nabateans, and was ruled by an ethnarch, or governor, appointed by Aretas, the Nabatean king. This ethnarch adopted a hostile attitude to Paul (2Co 11:32 f) . Later, in the time of Nero, it again became a Roman city. In the early history of Christianity Damascus, as compared with Antioch, played a very minor part. But it is memorable in Christian history on account of its associations with Paul’s conversion, and as the scene of his earliest Christian preaching (Ac 9:1-25). All the New Testament references to the city relate to this event (Ac 9:1:25; 22:5-11; 26:12,20; 2Co 11:32 f; Ga 1:17). Afterward, under the early Byzantine emperor, Damascus, though important as an outpost of civilization on the edge of the desert, continued to be second to Antioch both politically and ecclesiastically. It was not until the Arabian conquest (634 AD when it passed out of Christian hands, and reverted to the desert, that it once more became a true capital.)

(4) Under Islam.

Damascus has now been a Moslem city, or rather a city under Moslem rule, for nearly thirteen centuries. For about a century after 650 AD it was the seat of the Omayyad caliphs, and enjoyed a position of preeminence in the Moslem world. Later it was supplanted by Bagdad, and in the 10th century it came under the rule of the Fatimites of Egypt. Toward the close of the 11th century the Seljuk Turks entered Syria and captured Damascus. In the period of the Crusades the city, though never of decisive importance, played a considerable part, and was for a time the headquarters of Saladin. In 1300 it was plundered by the Tartars, and in 1399 Timur exacted an enormous ransom from it, and carried off its famous armorers, thus robbing it of one of its most important industries. Finally, in 1516 AD, the Osmanli Turks under Sultan Selim conquered Syria, and Damascus became, and still is, the capital of a province of the Ottoman Empire.

C. H. Thomson

DAMMESEK ELIEZER

(Ge 15:2 the English Revised Version). See ELIEZER (1).

DAMN; DAMNATION; DAMNABLE

dam, dam-na'-shun, dam'-na-bl: These words have undergone a change of meaning since the King James Version was made. They are derived from Latin damnare =" to inflict a loss," "to condemn," and that was their original meaning in English Now they denote exclusively the idea of everlasting punishment in hell. It is often difficult to determine which meaning was intended by the translators in the King James Version. They have been excluded altogether from the Revised Version (British and American). The words for which they stand in the King James Version are:

(1) apoleia, "destruction," translated "damnable" and "damnation" only in 2Pe 2:1-3 (the Revised Version (British and American) "destructive," "destruction"). False prophets taught doctrines calculated to destroy others, and themselves incurred the sentence of destruction such as overtook the fallen angels, the world in the Deluge, and the cities of the Plain. Apoleia occurs otherwise 16 times in the New Testament, and is always translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) by either "perdition" or "destruction": twice of waste of treasure (Mt 26:8 = Mr 14:4); twice of the beast that comes out of the abyss and goes into perdition (Re 17:8,11). In all other cases, it refers to men, and defines the destiny that befalls them as the result of sin: Judas is the "son of perdition" (Joh 17:12). Peter consigns Simon Magus and his money to perdition (Ac 8:20). Some men are "vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction" (Ro 9:22), and others, their "end is perdition" (Php 3:19). It is the antithesis of salvation (Heb 10:39; Php 1:28). Of the two ways of life, one leads to destruction (Mt 7:13). Whether it is utter, final and irretrievable destruction is not stated.

(2) krino, translated "damned" only in the King James Version of 2Th 2:12 (the Revised Version (British and American) "judged") means "to judge" in the widest sense, "to form an opinion" (Lu 7:43), and forensically "to test and try" an accused person. It can only acquire the sense of "judging guilty" or "condemning" from the context.

(3) katakrino, translated "damned" only in the King James Version of Mr 16:16; Ro 14:23 ("condemned" in the Revised Version (British and American)), means properly "to give judgment against" or "to condemn" and is so translated 17 times in the King James Version and always in the Revised Version (British and American).

(4) krisis, translated "damnation" in the King James Version of Mt 23:33; Mr 3:29; Joh 5:29 (the Revised Version (British and American) "judgment," but in Mr 3:29, "sin" for hamartema), means (a) judgment in general like krino, and is so used about 17 times, besides 14 times in the phrase "day of judgment"; (b) "condemnation," like katakrino, about 14 times.

(5) krima, translated in the King James Version "damnation" 7 times (Mt 23:14 = Mr 12:40 = Lu 20:47; Ro 3:8; 13:2; 1Co 11:29; 1Ti 5:12), "condemnation" 6 times, "judgment" 13 times, "law" and "avenged" once each; in the Revised Version (British and American) "condemnation" 9 t (Mt 23:14 only inserted in

margin), "judgment" 17 times, and once in margin, "lawsuit" and "sentence" once each. "Judgment" may be neutral, an impartial act of the judge weighing the evidence (so in Mt 7:2; Ac 24:25; Ro 11:33; Heb 6:2; 1Pe 4:17; Re 20:4) and "lawsuit" (1Co 6:7); or it may be inferred from the context that judgment is unto condemnation (so in Ro 2:2,3; 5:16; Ga 5:10; 2Pe 2:3; Re 17:1; 18:20, and the Revised Version (British and American) Ro 13:2; 1Co 11:29). In places where krima and krisis are rightly translated "condemnation," and where "judgment" regarded as an accomplished fact involves a sentence of guilt, they together with katakrino define the relation of a person to the supreme authority, as that of a criminal, found and held guilty, and liable to punishment. So the Roman empire regarded Jesus Christ, and the thief on the cross (Lu 23:40; 24:20).

But generally these words refer to man as a sinner against God, judged guilty by Him, and liable to the just penalty of sin. They imply nothing further as to the nature of the penalty or the state of man undergoing it, nor as to its duration. Nor does the word "eternal" (aion, aionios, often wrongly translated "everlasting" in the King James Version) when added to them, determine the question of duration. Condemnation is an act in the moral universe, which cannot be determined under categories of time.

These terms define the action of God in relation to man’s conduct, as that of the Supreme Judge, but they express only one aspect of that relation which is only fully conceived, when coordinated with the more fundamental idea of God’s Fatherhood. See ESCHATOLOGY; JUDGMENT.

LITERATURE. Salmond, Christian Doctrine of Immortality; Charles, Eschatology.

T. Rees

DAMSEL

dam’-zel: A young, unmarried woman; a girl (lass); maiden (compare French demoiselle). The Revised Version (British and American) in Mt 26:69; Joh 18:17; Ac 12:13; 16:16 gives "maid" for paidiske, "a girl," i.e. (spec.) a maidservant or young female slave (the King James Version "damsel"), and "child" for paidion, "a half-grown boy or girl," in Mr 5:39,40 bis. 41.

DAN (1); DAN, TRIBE OF

(dan, "judge"; Dan).

1. Name:

The fifth of Jacob’s sons, the first borne to him by Bilhah, the maid of Rachel, to whom, as the child of her slave, he legally belonged. At his birth Rachel, whose barrenness had been a sore trial to her, exclaimed "God hath judged me .... and hath given me a son," so she called his name Dan, i.e. "judge" (Ge 30:6). He was full brother of Naphtali. In Jacob’s Blessing there is an echo of Rachel’s

words, "Da shall judge his people" (Ge 49:16). Of the patriarch Da almost nothing is recorded. Of his sons at the settlement in Egypt only one, Hushim, is mentioned (Ge 46:23). The name in Nu 26:42 is Shuham.

2. The Tribe:

The tribe however stands second in point of numbers on leaving Egypt, furnishing 62,700 men of war (Nu 1:39); and at the second census they were 64,400 strong (Nu 26:43). The standard of the camp of Da in the desert march, with which were Asher and Naphtali, was on the north side of the tabernacle (Nu 2:25; 10:25; compare Jos 6:9 the King James Version margin, "gathering host"). The prince of the tribe was Ahiezer (Nu 1:12). Among the spies Da was represented by Ammiel the son of Gemalli (Nu 13:12). Of the tribe of Da was Oholiab (the King James Version "Aholiab") one of the wise-hearted artificers engaged in the construction of the tabernacle (Ex 31:6). One who was stoned for blasphemy was the son of a Danite woman (Le 24:10 f). At the ceremony of blessing and cursing, Da and Naphtali stood on Mount Ebal, while the other Rachel tribes were on Gerizim (De 27:13). The prince of Da at the division of the land was Bukki the son of Jogli (Nu 34:22).

3. Territory:

The portion assigned to Da adjoined those of Ephraim, Benjamin and Judah, and lay on the western slopes of the mountain. The reference in Jud 5:17: "And Dan, why did he remain in ships?" seems to mean that on the West, Da had reached the sea. But the passage is one of difficulty. We are told that the Amorites forced the children of Da into the mountain (Jud 1:34), so they did not enjoy the richest part of their ideal portion, the fertile plain between the mountain and the sea. The strong hand of the house of Joseph kept the Amorites tributary, but did not drive them out. Later we find Da oppressed by the Philistines, against whom the heroic exploits of Samson were performed (Jud 14 ff). The expedition of the Danites recorded in Jud 18 is referred to in Jos 19:47 ff.

4. The Danite Raid:

The story affords a priceless glimpse of the conditions prevailing in those days. Desiring an extension of territory, the Danites sent out spies, who recommended an attack upon Laish, a city at the north end of the Jordan valley. The people, possibly a colony from Sidon, were careless in their fancied security. The land was large, and there was "no want of anything that was in the earth." The expedition of the 600, their dealings with Micah and his priest, their capture of Laish, and their founding of an idol shrine with priestly attendant, illustrate the strange mingling of lawlessness and superstition which was characteristic of the time. The town rebuilt on the site of Laish they called Dan—see following article. Perhaps 2Ch 2:14 may be taken to indicate that the Danites intermarried with the Phoenicians. Divided between its ancient seat in the South and the new territory in the North the tribe retained its place in Israel for a time (1Ch 12:35; 27:22), but it played no part of importance in the subsequent history.

The name disappears from the genealogical lists of Chronicles; and it is not mentioned among the tribes

in Re 7:5 ff.

Samson was the one great man produced by Dan, and he seems to have embodied the leading characteristics of the tribe: unsteady, unscrupulous, violent, possessed of a certain grim humor; stealthy in tactics—"a serpent in the way, an adder in the path" (Ge 49:17)—but swift and strong in striking—"a lion's whelp, that leapeth forth from Bashan" (De 33:22). Along with Abel, Da ranked as a city in which the true customs of old Israel were preserved (2Sa 20:18 Septuagint).

W. Ewing

DAN (2)

A city familiar as marking the northern limit of the land of Israel in the common phrase "from Da even to Beer- sheba" (Jud 20:1; 1Sa 3:20, etc.). Its ancient name was Laish or Leshem (Jud 18:7, etc.). It was probably an outlying settlement of Tyre of Sidon. Its inhabitants, pursuing the ends of peaceful traders, were defenseless against the onset of the Danite raiders. Having captured the city the Danites gave it the name of their own tribal ancestor (Jud 18). It lay in the valley near Beth-rehob (Jud 18:28). Josephus places it near Mt. Lebanon and the fountain of the lesser Jordan, a day's journey from Sidon (Ant., V, iii, 1; VIII, viii, 4; BJ, IV, i, 1). Eusebius, Onomasticon says it lay 4 Roman miles from Paneas on the way to Tyre, at the source of the Jordan.

This points decisively to Tell el-Qady, in the plain West of Banias. The mound of this name—Kady is the exact Arabic equivalent of the Hebrew Dan—rises from among the bushes and reeds to a height varying from 40 to 80 ft. The largest of all the springs of the Jordan rises on the west side. The waters join with those of a smaller spring on the other side to form Nahr el-Leddan which flows southward to meet the streams from Banias and Chasbeiyeh. The mound, which is the crater of an extinct volcano, has certain ancient remains on the south side, while the tomb of Sheikh Marzuk is sheltered by two holy trees. The sanctuary and ritual established by the Danites persisted as long as the house of God was in Shiloh, and the priesthood in this idolatrous shrine remained in the family of Jonathan till the conquest of Tiglath-pileser (Jud 18:30; 2Ki 15:29). Here Jeroboam I set up the golden calf. The ancient sanctity of the place would tend to promote the success of his scheme (1Ki 12:28 f, etc.). The calf, according to a Jewish tradition, was taken away by Tiglath-pileser. Da fell before Benhadad, king of Syria (1Ki 15:20; 2Ch 16:4). It was regained by Jeroboam II (2Ki 14:25). It shared the country's fate at th hands of Tiglath-pileser (2Ki 15:29).

It was to this district that Abraham pursued the army of Chedorlaomer (Ge 14:14). For Dr. G. A. Smith's suggestion that Da may have been at Banias see HGHL1, 473, 480 f.

W. Ewing

DAN (3)

(Eze 27:19 the King James Version). See VEDAN.

DAN-JAAN

dan-ja’-an (dan ya‘-an; B, Da Eidan kai Oudan): A place visited by Joab and his officers when taking the census (2Sa 24:6). It is mentioned between Gilead and Sidon. Some would identify it with Khan Danian, a ruined site North of Achzib. The text is probably corrupt. Klostermann would read "toward Da and Ijon" (compare 1Ki 15:20).

DANCING

dan’-sing. See GAMES.

DANDLE

dan’-d’-l. (sha‘-osha‘, a Pulpal form, from root (sha‘-a‘) with sense of to "be caressed"). Occurs in Isa 66:12, "shall be dandled upon the knees."

DANGER

dan’-jer: Danger does not express a state of reality but a possibility. In Mt 5:21 f, however, and also the King James Version Mr 3:29 (the Revised Version (British and American)) "but is guilty of an eternal sin"the expression "danger" refers to a certainty, for the danger spoken of is in one case judgment which one brings upon himself, and in the other the committing of an unpardonable sin. Both are the necessary consequences of a man’s conduct. The reason for translating the Greek (enochos, literally, "to be held in anything so one cannot escape") by "is in danger," instead of "guilty" or "liable," may be due to the translator’s conception of these passages as a warning against such an act rather than as a statement of the judgment which stands pronounced over every man who commits the sin.

A. L. Breslich

DANIEL

dan’-yel (daniye’l, dani’-el, "God is my judge"; Daniel):

(1) One of the sons of David (1Ch 3:1).

(2) A Levite of the family of Ithamar (Ezr 8:2; Ne 10:6).

(3) A prophet of the time of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, the hero and author of the Book of Daniel.

1. Early Life:

We know nothing of the early life of Daniel, except what is recorded in the book bearing his name. Here it is said that he was one of the youths of royal or noble seed, who were carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar in the third year of Jehoiakim, king of Judah. These youths were without blemish, well-favored, skillful in all wisdom, endued with knowledge, and understanding science, and such as had ability to stand in the king's palace. The king commanded to teach them the knowledge and tongue of the Chaldeans; and appointed for them a daily portion of the king's food and of the wine which he drank. After having been thus nourished for three years, they were to stand before the king. Ashpenaz, the master or chief of the eunuchs, into whose hands they had been entrusted, following a custom of the time, gave to each of these youths a new and Babylonian name. To Daniel, he gave the name Belteshazzar.

In Babylonian this name was probably Belu-lita-sharri-usur, which means "O Bel, protect thou the hostage of the king," a most appropriate name for one in the place which Daniel occupied as a hostage of Jehoiakim at the court of the king of Babylon. The youths were probably from 12 to 15 years of age at the time when they were carried captive. (For changes of names, compare Joseph changed to Zaphenath-paneah (Ge 41:45); Eliakim, to Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:34); Mattaniah, to Zedekiah (2Ki 24:17); and the two names of the high priest Johanan's brother in the Sachau Papyri, i.e. Ostan and Anani.)

Having purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the food and drink of the king, Daniel requested of Ashpenaz permission to eat vegetables and drink water. Through the favor of God, this request was granted, notwithstanding the fear of Ashpenaz that his head would be endangered to the king on account of the probably resulting poor appearance of the youths living upon this blood-diluting diet, in comparison with the expected healthy appearance of the others of their class. However, ten days' trial having been first granted, and at the end of that time their countenances having been found fairer and their flesh fatter than the other youths', the permission was made permanent; and God gave to Daniel and his companions knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom, and to Daniel understanding in all visions and dreams; so that at the end of the three years when the king communed with them, he found them much superior to all the magicians and enchanters in every matter of wisdom and understanding.

2. Dream-Interpreter:

Daniel's public activities were in harmony with his education. His first appearance was as an interpreter of the dream recorded in Da 2. Nebuchadnezzar having seen in his dream a vision of a great image, excellent in brightness and terrible in appearance, its head of fine gold, its breast and its arms of silver, its belly and its thighs of brass, its legs of iron, its feet part of iron and part of clay, beheld a stone cut out without hands smiting the image and breaking it in pieces, until it became like chaff and was carried away by the wind; while the stone that smote the image became a great mountain and filled the whole earth. When the king awoke from his troubled sleep, he forgot, or reigned that he had forgotten, the dream, and summoned the wise men of Babylon both to tell him the dream and to give the interpretation

thereof. The wise men having said that they could not tell the dream, nor interpret it as long as it was untold, the king threatened them with death. Daniel, who seems not to have been present when the other wise men were before the king, when he was informed of the threat of the king, and that preparations were being made to slay all of the wise men of Babylon, himself and his three companions included, boldly went in to the king and requested that he would appoint a time for him to appear to show the interpretation, Then he went to his house, and he and his companions prayed, and the dream and its interpretation were made known unto Daniel. At the appointed time, the dream was explained and the four Hebrews were loaded with wealth and given high positions in the service of the king. In the 4th chapter, we have recorded Daniel's interpretation of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar about the great tree that was hewn at the command of an angel, thus prefiguring the insanity of the king.

3. Interpreter of Signs: Daniel's third great appearance in the book is in chapter 5, where he is called upon to explain the extraordinary writing upon the wall of Belshazzar's palace, which foretold the end of the Babylonian empire and the incoming of the Medes and Persians. For this service Daniel was clothed with purple, a chain of gold put around his neck, and he was made the third ruler in the kingdom.

4. Seer of Visions:

Daniel, however, was not merely an interpreter of other men's visions. In the last six chapters we have recorded four or five of his own visions, all of which are taken up with revelations concerning the future history of the great world empires, especially in their relation to the people of God, and predictions of the final triumph of the Messiah's kingdom.

5. Official of the Kings:

In addition to his duties as seer and as interpreter of signs and dreams, Daniel also stood high in the governmental service of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, and perhaps also of Cyrus. The Book of Dnl, our only reliable source of information on this subject, does not tell us much about his civil duties and performances. It does say, however, that he was chief of the wise men, that he was in the gate of the king, and that he was governor over the whole province of Babylon under Nebuchadnezzar; that Belshazzar made him the third ruler in his kingdom; and that Darius made him one of the three presidents to whom his hundred and twenty satraps were to give account; and that he even thought to set him over his whole kingdom. In all of these positions he seems to have conducted himself with faithfulness and judgment.

While in the service of Darius the Mede, he aroused the antipathy of the other presidents and of the satraps. Unable to find any fault with his official acts, they induced the king to make a decree, apparently general in form and purpose, but really aimed at Daniel alone. They saw that they could find no valid accusation against him, unless they found it in connection with something concerning the law of his God. They therefore caused the king to make a decree that no one should make a request of anyone for the space of thirty days, save of the king. Daniel, having publicly prayed three times a day as he was in the habit of doing, was caught in the act, accused, and on account of the irrevocability of a law of the

Medes and Persians, was condemned in accordance with the decree to be cast into a den of lions. The king was much troubled at this, but was unable to withhold the punishment. However, he expressed to Daniel his belief that his God in whom he trusted continually would deliver him; and so indeed it came to pass. For in the morning, when the king drew near to the mouth of the den, and called to him, Daniel said that God had sent His angel and shut the mouths of the lions. So Daniel was taken up unharmed, and at the command of the king his accusers, having been cast into tile den, were destroyed before they reached the bottom.

LITERATURE.

Besides the commentaries and other works mentioned in the article on the Book of Daniel, valuable information may be found in Josephus and in Payne Smith's Lectures on Daniel.

R. Dick Wilson

DANIEL, BOOK OF

dan'-yel:

I. NAME

II. PLACE IN THE CANON III. DIVISIONS OF THE BOOK

IV. LANGUAGES

V. PURPOSE OF THE BOOK

VI. UNITY

VII. GENUINENESS

1. The Predictions

2. The Miracles

3. The Text

4. The Language

5. The Historical Statements

VIII. INTERPRETATION

IX. DOCTRINES

Commentaries and Introductions

X. APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS

LITERATURE

I. Name.

The Book of Daniel is rightly so called, whether we consider Daniel as the author of it, or as the principal person mentioned in it.

II. Place in the Canon.

In the English Bible, Daniel is placed among the Major Prophets, immediately after Ezk, thus following the order of the Septuagint and of the Latin Vulgate (Jerome's Bible, 390-405 A. D.) In the Hebrew Bible, however, it is placed in the third division of the Canon, called the Kethuvim or writings, by the Hebrews, and the hagiographa, or holy writings, by the Seventy. It has been claimed, that Daniel was placed by the Jews in the third part of the Canon, either because they thought the inspiration of its author to be of a lower kind than was that of the other prophets, or because the book was written after the second or prophetical part of the Canon had been closed. It is more probable, that the book was placed in this part of the Hebrew Canon, because Daniel is not called a nabhi' ("prophet"), but was rather a chozeh ("seer") and a chakham ("wise man"). None but the works of the nebhi'im were put in the second part of the Jewish Canon, the third being reserved for the heterogeneous works of seers, wise men, and priests, or for those that do not mention the name or work of a prophet, or that are poetical in form. A confusion has arisen, because the Greek word prophet is used to render the two Hebrew words nabhi' and chozeh. In the Scriptures, God is said to speak to the former, whereas the latter see visions and dream dreams. Some have attempted to explain the position of Daniel by assuming that he had the prophetic gift without holding the prophetic office. It must be kept in mind that all reasons given to account for the order and place of many of the books in the Canon are purely conjectural, since we have no historical evidence bearing upon the subject earlier than the time of Jesus ben Sirach, who wrote probably about 180 BC.

III. Divisions of the Book.

According to its subject-matter, the book falls naturally into two great divisions, each consisting of six chapters, the first portion containing the historical sections, and the second the apocalyptic, or

predictive, portions; though the former is not devoid of predictions, nor the latter of historical statements. More specifically, the first chapter is introductory to the whole book; Da 2-6 describe some marvelous events in the history of Daniel and his three companions in their relations with the rulers of Babylon; and chapters 7-12 narrate some visions of Daniel concerning the great world-empires, especially in relation to the kingdom of God.

According to the languages in which the book is written, it may be divided into the Aramaic portion, extending from Da 2:4 to the end of chapter 7, and a Hebrew portion embracing the rest of the book.

IV. Languages.

The language of the book is partly Hebrew and partly a dialect of Aramaic, which has been called Chaldee, or Biblical Aramaic This Aramaic is almost exactly the same as that which is found in portions of Ezra. On account of the large number of Babylonian and Persian words characteristic of this Aramaic and of that of the papyri recently found in Egypt, as well as on account of the general similarity of the nominal, verbal and other forms, and of the syntactical construction, the Aramaic of this period might properly be called the Babylonian-Persian Aramaic With the exception of the sign used to denote the sound "dh," and of the use of qoph in a few cases where Daniel has ‘ayin, the spelling in the papyri is the same in general as that in the Biblical books. Whether the change of spelling was made at a later time in the manuscripts of Daniel, or whether it was a peculiarity of the Babylonian Aramaic as distinguished from the Egyptian or whether it was due to the unifying, scientific genius of Daniel himself, we have no means at present to determine.

In view of the fact that the Elephantine Papyri frequently employ the "d" sign to express the "dh" sound, and that it is always employed in Ezra to express it; in view further of the fact that the "z" sign is found as late as the earliest Nabatean inscription, that of 70 BC (see Euting, 349: 1, 2, 4) to express the "dh" sound, it seems fatuous to insist on the ground of the writing of these two sounds in the Book of Daniel, that it cannot have been written in the Persian period. As to the use of qoph and ‘ayin for the Aramaic sound which corresponds to the Hebrew tsadhe when equivalent to an Arabic dad, any hasty conclusion is debarred by the fact that the Aramaic papyri of the 5th century BC, the manuscripts of the Samaritan Targum and the Mandaic manuscripts written from 600 to 900 AD all employ the two letters to express the one sound. The writing of ‘aleph and he without any proper discrimination occurs in the papyri as well as in Daniel.

The only serious objection to the early date of upon the ground of its spelling is that which is based upon the use of a final "n" in the pronominal suffix of the second and third persons masculine plural instead of the margin of the Aramaic papyri and of the Zakir and Sendschirli inscriptions. It is possible that was influenced in this by the corresponding forms of the Babylonian language. The Syriac and Mandaic dialects of the Aramaic agree with the Babylonian in the formation of the pronominal suffixes of the second and third persons masculine plural, as against the Hebrew, Arabic, Minaean, Sabean and Ethiopic. It is possible that the occurrence of "m" in some west Aramaic documents may have arisen through the influence of the Hebrew and Phoenician, and that pure Aramaic always had "n" just as we

find it in Assyrian and Babylonian, and in all east Aramaic documents thus far discovered.

The supposition that the use of "y" in Daniel as a preformative of the third person masculine of the imperfect proves a Palestinian provenience has been shown to be untenable by the discovery that the earliest east Syriac also used "y". (See M. Pognon, Inscriptions semitiques, premiere partie, 17.)

This inscription is dated 73 AD. This proof that in the earlier stages of its history the east Aramaic was in this respect the same as that found in Daniel is confirmed by the fact that the forms of the 3rd person of the imperfect found in the proper names on the Aramaic dockets of the Assyrian inscriptions also have the preformative y. (See Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, II, 47.)

V. Purpose of the Book.

The book is not intended to give an account of the life of Daniel. It gives neither his lineage, nor his age, and recounts but a few of the events of his long career. Nor is it meant to give a record of the history of Israel during the exile, nor even of the captivity in Babylon. Its purpose is to show how by His providential guidance, His miraculous interventions, His foreknowledge and almighty power, the God of heaven controls and directs the forces of Nature and the history of nations, the lives of Hebrew captives and of the mightiest of the kings of the earth, for the accomplishment of His Divine and beneficent plans for His servants and people.

VI. Unity.

The unity of the book was first denied by Spinoza, who suggested that the first part was taken from the chronological works of the Chaldeans, basing his supposition upon the difference of language between the former and latter parts. Newton followed Spinoza in suggesting two parts, but began his second division with Da 7, where the narrative passes over from the 3rd to the 1st person. Kohler follows Newton, claiming, however, that the visions were written by the Daniel of the exile, but that the first 6 chapters were composed by a later writer who also redacted the whole work. Von Orelli holds that certain prophecies of Daniel were enlarged and interpolated by a Jew living in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, in order to show his contemporaries the bearing of the predictions of the book upon those times of oppression. Zockler and Lange hold to the unity of the book in general; but the former thought that Da 11:5-45 is an interpolation; and the latter, that 10:1-11:44 and 12:5-13 have been inserted in the original work. Meinhold holds that the Aramaic portions existed as early as the times of Alexander the Great—a view to which Strack also inclines. Eichhorn held that the book consisted of ten different original sections, which are bound together merely by the circumstance that they are all concerned with Daniel and his three friends. Finally, De Lagarde, believing that the fourth kingdom was the Roman, held that Da 7 was written about 69 AD. (For the best discussion of the controversies about the unity of Daniel, see Eichhorn, Einleitung, sections 612-19, and Buhl in See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, IV, 449-51.)

VII. Genuineness.

With the exception of the neo-Platonist Porphyry, a Greek non-Christian philosopher of the 3rd century AD, the genuineness of the Book of was denied by no one until the rise of the deistic movement in the 17th century. The attacks upon the genuineness of the book have been based upon:

(1) the predictions,

(2) the miracles,

(3) the text,

(4) the language,

(5) the historical statements.

1. The Predictions:

The assailants of the genuineness of Daniel on the ground of the predictions found therein, may be divided into two classes—those who deny prediction in general, and those who claim that the apocalyptic character of the predictions of Daniel is a sufficient proof of their lack of genuineness. The first of these two classes includes properly those only who deny not merely Christianity, but theism; and the answering of them may safely be left to those who defend the doctrines of theism, and particularly of revelation. The second class of assailants is, however, of a different character, since it consists of those who are sincere believers in Christianity and predictive prophecy.

They claim, however, that certain characteristics of definiteness and detail, distinguishing the predictive portions of the Book of Daniel from other predictions of the Old Testament, bring the genuineness of Daniel into question. The kind of prediction found here, ordinarily called apocalyptic, is said to have arisen first in the 2nd century BC, when parts of the Book of Enoch and of the Sibylline Oracles were written; and a main characteristic of an apocalypse is said to be that it records past events as if they were still future, throwing the speaker back into some distant past time, for the purpose of producing on the reader the impression that the book contains real predictions, thus gaining credence for the statements of the writer and giving consolation to those who are thus led to believe in the providential foresight of God for those who trust in Him.

Since those who believe that God has spoken unto man by His Son and through the prophets will not be able to set limits to the extent and definiteness of the revelations which He may have seen fit to make through them, nor to prescribe the method, style, time and character of the revelations, this attack on the genuineness of Daniel may safely be left to the defenders of the possibility and the fact of a revelation. One who believes in these may logically believe in the genuineness of Daniel, as far as this objection goes. That there are spurious apocalypses no more proves that all are spurious than that there are spurious gospels or epistles proves that there are no genuine ones.

The spurious epistles of Philaris do not prove that Cicero's Letters are not genuine; nor do the false statements of 2 Macc, nor the many spurious Ac of the Apostles, prove that 1 Macc or Luke's Ac of the Apostles is not genuine. Nor does the fact that the oldest portions of the spurious apocalypses which have been preserved to our time are thought to have been written in the 2nd century BC, prove that no apocalypses, either genuine or spurious, were written before that time. There must have been a beginning, a first apocalypse, at some time, if ever. Besides, if we admit that the earliest parts of the Book of Enoch and of the Sibylline Oracles were written about the middle of the 2nd century BC, whereas the Book of Esdras was written about 300 AD, 450 years later, we can see no good literary reason wh Daniel may not have antedated Enoch by 350 years. The period between 500 BC and 150 BC is so almost entirely devoid of all known Hebrew literary productions as to render it exceedingly precarious for anyone to express an opinion as to what works may have characterized that long space of time.

2. The Miracles:

Secondly, as to the objections made against the Book of Daniel on the ground of the number or character of the miracles recorded, we shall only say that they affect the whole Christian system, which is full of the miraculous from beginning to end. If we begin to reject the books of the Bible because miraculous events are recorded in them, where indeed shall we stop?

3. The Text:

Thirdly, a more serious objection, as far as Daniel itself is concerned, is the claim of Eichhorn that the original text of the Aramaic portion has been so thoroughly tampered with and changed, that we can no longer get at the genuine original composition. We ourselves can see no objection to the belief that these Aramaic portions were written first of all in Hebrew, or even, if you will, in Babylonian; nor to the supposition that some Greek translators modified the meaning in their version either intentionally, or through a misunderstanding of the original. We claim, however, that the composite Aramaic of Daniel agrees in almost every particular of orthography, etymology and syntax, with the Aramaic of the North Semitic inscriptions of the 9th, 8th and 7th centuries BC and of the Egyptian papyri of the 5th century BC, and that the vocabulary of Daniel has an admixture of Hebrew, Babylonian and Persian words similar to that of the papyri of the 5th century BC; whereas, it differs in composition from the Aramaic of the Nabateans, which is devoid of Persian, Hebrew, and Babylonian words, and is full of Arabisms, and also from that of the Palmyrenes, which is full of Greek words, while having but one or two Persian words, and no Hebrew or Babylonian. As to different recensions, we meet with a similar difficulty in Jeremiah without anyone's impugning on that account the genuineness of the work as a whole. As to interpolations of verses or sections, they are found in the Samaritan recension of the Hebrew text and in the Samaritan and other Targums, as also in certain places in the text of the New Testament, Josephus and many other ancient literary works, without causing us to disbelieve in the genuineness of the rest of their works, or of the works as a whole.

4. The Language:

Fourthly, the objections to the genuineness of Daniel based on the presence in it of three Greek names of musical instruments and of a number of Persian words do not seem nearly as weighty today as they did a hundred years ago. The Greek inscriptions at Abu Simbal in Upper Egypt dating from the time of Psamtek II in the early part of the 6th century BC, the discovery of the Minoan inscriptions and ruins in Crete, the revelations of the wide commercial relations of the Phoenicians in the early part of the 1st millennium BC, the lately published inscriptions of Sennacherib about his campaigns in Cilicia against the Greek seafarers to which Alexander Poly-histor and Abydenus had referred, telling about his having carried many Greeks captive to Nineveh about 700 BC, the confirmation of the wealth and expensive ceremonies of Nebuchadnezzar made by his own building and other inscriptions, all assure us of the possibility of the use of Greek musical instruments at Babylon in the 6th century BC. This, taken along with the well-known fact that names of articles of commerce and especially of musical instruments go with the thing, leave no room to doubt that a writer of the 6th century BC may have known and used borrowed Greek terms. The Arameans being the great commercial middlemen between Egypt and Greece on the one hand and Babylon and the Orient on the other, and being in addition a subject people, would naturally adopt many foreign words into their vocabulary.

As to the presence of the so-called Persian words in Daniel, it must be remembered that many words which were formerly considered to be such have been found to be Babylonian. As to the others, perhaps all of them may be Median rather than Persian; and if so, the children of Israel who were carried captive to the cities of the Medes in the middle of the 8th century BC, and the, Arameans, many of whom were subject to the Medes, at least from the time of the fall of Nineveh about 607 BC, may well have adopted many words into their vocabulary from the language of their rulers. Daniel was not writing merely for the Jews who had been carried captive by Nebuchadnezzar, but for all Israelites throughout the world. Hence, he would properly use a language which his scattered readers would understand rather than the purer idiom of Judea. Most of his foreign terms are names of officials, legal terms, and articles of clothing, for which there were no suitable terms existing in the earlier Hebrew or Aramaic There was nothing for a writer to do but to invent new terms, or to transfer the current foreign words into his native language. The latter was the preferable method and the one which he adopted.

5. The Historical Statements:

Fifthly, objections to the genuineness of the Book of Daniel are made on the ground of the historical misstatements which are said to be found in it. These may be classed as:

(1) chronological,

(2) geographical, and

(3) various.

(1) Chronological Objections.

The first chronological objection is derived from Da 1:1, where it is said that Nebuchadnezzar made an expedition against Jerusalem in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim, whereas Jeremiah seems to imply that the expedition was made in the 4th year of that king. As Daniel was writing primarily for the Jews of Babylon, he would naturally use the system of dating that was employed there; and this system differed in its method of denoting the 1st year of a reign from that used by the Egyptians and by the Jews of Jerusalem for whom Jeremiah wrote.

The second objection is derived from the fact that Daniel is said (Da 1:21) to have lived unto the 1st year of Cyrus the king, whereas in Da 10:1 he is said to have seen a vision in the 3rd year of Cyrus, king of Persia. These statements are easily reconciled by supposing that in the former case it is the 1st year of Cyrus as king of Babylon, and in the second, the 3rd year of Cyrus as king of Persia.

The third chronological objection is based on Da 6:28, where it is said that Daniel prospered in the kingdom of Darius and in the kingdom of Cyrus the Persian. This statement is harmonized with the facts revealed by the monuments and with the statements of the book itself by supposing that Darius reigned synchronously with Cyrus, but as sub-king under him.

The fourth objection is based on Da 8:1, where Daniel is said to have seen a vision in the third year of Belshazzar the king. If we suppose that Belshazzar was king of the Chaldeans while his father was king of Babylon, just as Cambyses was king of Babylon while his father, Cyrus, was king of the lands, or as Nabonidus II seems to have been king of Harran while his father, Nabonidus I, was king of Babylon, this statement will harmonize with the other statements made with regard to Belshazzar.

(2) Geographical Objections.

As to the geographical objections, three only need be considered as important. The first is, that Shushan seems to be spoken of in Da 7:2 as subject to Babylon, whereas it is supposed by some to have been at that time subject to Media. Here we can safely rest upon the opinion of Winckler, that at the division of the Assyrian dominions among the allied Medes and Babylonians, Elam became subject to Babylon rather than to Media. If, however, this opinion could be shown not to be true, we must remember that Daniel is said to have been at ShuShan in a vision. The second geographical objection is based on the supposition that Nebuchadnezzar would not have gone against Jerusalem, leaving an Egyptian garrison at Carchemish in his rear, thus endangering his line of communication and a possible retreat to Babylon. This objection has no weight, now that the position of Carchemish has been shown to be, not at Ciressium, as formerly conjectured, but at Jirabis, 150 miles farther up the Euphrates. Carchemish would have cut off a retreat to Nineveh, but was far removed from the direct line of communication with Babylon. The third geographical objection is derived from the statement that Darius placed 120 satraps in, or over, all his kingdom. The objection rests upon a false conception of the meaning of satrap and of the extent of a satrapy, there being no reason why a sub-king under Darius may not have had as many satraps under him as Sargon of Assyria had governors and deputies under him; and the latter king mentions 117 peoples and countries over which he appointed his deputies to rule in his place.

(3) Other Objections.

Various other objections to the genuineness of Daniel have been made, the principal being those derived from the supposed non-existence of Kings Darius the Mede and Belshazzar the Chaldean, from the use of the word Chaldean to denote the wise men of Babylon, and from the silence of other historical sources as to many of the events recorded in Daniel. The discussion of the existence of Belshazzar and Darius the Mede will be found under BELSHAZZAR and DARIUS. As to the argument from silence in general, it may be said that it reduces itself in fact to the absence of all reference to Daniel on the monuments, in the Book of Ecclus, and in the post-exilic literature. As to the latter books it proves too much; for Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, as well as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, refer to so few of the older canonical books and earlier historical persons and events, that it is not fair to expect them to refer to Daniel—at least, to use their not referring to him or his book as an argument against the existence of either before the time when they were written.

As to Ecclesiasticus, we might have expected him to mention Daniel or the So of Three Children; but who knows what reasons Ben Sira may have had for not placing them in his list of Hebrew heroes? Perhaps, since he held the views which later characterized the Sadducees, he may have passed Daniel by because of his views on the resurrection and on angels. Perhaps he failed to mention any of the four companions because none of their deeds had been wrought in Palestine; or because their deeds exalted too highly the heathen monarchies to which the Jews were subject. Or, more likely, the book may have been unknown to him, since very few copies at best of the whole Old Testament can have existed in his time, and the Book of Daniel may not have gained general currency in Palestine before it was made so preeminent by the fulfillment of its predictions in the Maccabean times.

It is not satisfactory to say that Ben Sira did not mention Daniel and his companions, because the stories concerning them had not yet been imbedded in a canonical book, inasmuch as he does place Simon, the high priest, among the greatest of Israel’s great men, although he is not mentioned in any canonical book. In conclusion, it may be said, that while it is impossible for us to determine why Ben Sira does not mention Daniel and his three companions among his worthies, if their deeds were known to him, it is even more impossible to understand how these stories concerning them cannot merely have arisen but have been accepted as true, between 180 BC, when Ecclesiasticus is thought to have been written, and 169 BC, when, according to 1 Maccabees, Matthias, the first of the Asmoneans, exhorted his brethren to follow the example of the fortitude of Ananias and his friends. As to the absence of all mention of Daniel on the contemporary historical documents of Babylon and Persia, such mention is not to be expected, inasmuch as those documents give the names of none who occupied positions such as, or similar to, those which Daniel is said to have filled.

VIII. Interpretation.

Questions of the interpretation of particular passages may be looked for in the commentaries and special works. As to the general question of the kind of prophecy found in the Book of Daniel, it has already been discussed above under the caption of "Genuineness." As to the interpretation of the world

monarchies which precede the monarchy of the Messiah Prince, it may be said, however, that the latest discoveries, ruling out as they do a separate Median empire that included Babylon, support the view that the four monarchies are the Babylonian, the Persian, the Greek, and the Roman. According to this view, Darius the Mede was only a sub-king under Cyrus the Persian. Other interpretations have been made by selecting the four empires from those of Assyria, Babylonia, Media, Persia, Medo-Persia, Alexander, the Seleucids, the Romans, and the Mohammedans. The first and the last of these have generally been excluded from serious consideration. The main dispute is as to whether the 4th empire was that of the Seleucids, or that of the Romans, the former view being held commonly by those who hold to the composition of in the 2nd century BC, and the latter by those who hold to the traditional view that it was written in the 6th century BC.

IX. Doctrines.

It is universally admitted that the teachings of Daniel with regard to angels and the resurrection are more explicit than those found elsewhere in the Old Testament. As to angels, Daniel attributes to them names, ranks, and functions not mentioned by others. It has become common in certain quarters to assert that these peculiarities of Daniel are due to Persian influences. The Babylonian monuments, however, have revealed the fact that the Babylonians believed in both good and evil spirits with names, ranks, and different functions. These spirits correspond in several respects to the Hebrew angels, and may well have afforded Daniel the background for his visions. Yet, in all such matters, it must be remembered that Daniel purports to give us a vision, or revelation; and a revelation cannot be bound by the ordinary laws of time and human influence.

As to the doctrine of the resurrection, it is generally admitted that Daniel adds some new and distinct features to that which is taught in the other canonical books of the Old Testament. But it will be noted that he does not dwell upon this doctrine, since he mentions it only in Da 12:2. The materials for his doctrine are to be found in Isa 26:14,21 and 66:24; Eze 37:1-14, and in Job 14:12; 19:25; Ho 6:2; 1Ki 17:4; 2Ki 4$ 2Ki 8:1-5, as well as in the use of the words for sleep and awakening from sleep, or from the dust, for everlasting life or everlasting contempt in Isa 26:19; Ps 76:6; 13:3; 127:2; De 31:16; 2Sa 7:12; 1Ki 1:21; Job 7:21, and Jer 20:11; 23:40. The essential ideas and phraseology of Daniel’s teachings are found in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. The first two parts of the books of Enoch and 2 Maccabees make much of the resurrection; but on the other hand, Ecclesiastes seems to believe not even in the immortality of the soul, and Wisdom and 1 Maccabees do not mention a resurrection of the body. That the post-exilic prophets do not mention a resurrection does not prove that they knew nothing about Daniel any more than it proves that they knew nothing about Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel.

There are resemblances, it is true, between the teachings of Daniel with regard to the resurrection and those of the Avesta. But so are there between his doctrines and the ideas of the Egyptians, which had existed for millenniums before his time. Besides there is no proof of any derivation of doctrines from the Persians by the writers of the canonical books of the Jews; and, as we have seen above, both the ideas and verbiage of Daniel are to be found in the generally accepted early Hebrew literature. And finally, this attempt to find a natural origin for all Biblical ideas leaves out of sight the fact that the Scriptures contain revelations from God, which transcend the ordinary course of human development. To a

Christian, therefore, there can be no reason for believing that the doctrines of Daniel may not have been promulgated in the 6th century BC.

Commentaries and Introductions:

The best commentaries on Daniel from a conservative point of view are those by Calvin, Moses Stuart, Keil, Zockler, Strong in Lange's Bibelwerk, Fuller in the Speaker's Commentary, Thomson in the Pulpit Commentary, and Wright, Daniel and His Critics. The best defenses of Daniel's authenticity and genuineness are Hengstenberg, Authenticity of the Book of Daniel, Tregelles, Defense of the Authenticity, Auberlen, The Prophecies of Daniel, Fuller, Essay on the Authenticity of Daniel, Pusey, Daniel the Prophet (still the best of all), C. H. H. Wright, Daniel and His Critics, Kennedy, The Book of Daniel from the Christian Standpoint, Joseph Wilson, Daniel, and Sir Robert Anderson, Daniel in the Critics' Den. One should consult also Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia, Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, and Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament. For English readers, the radical school is best represented by Driver in his Literature of the Old Testament and in his Daniel; by Bevan, The Book of Daniel; by Prince, Commentary on Daniel, and by Cornill in his Introduction to the Old Testament.

X. Apocryphal Additions.

In the Greek translations of Daniel three or four pieces are added which are not found in the original Hebrew or Aramaic text as it has come down to us. These are The Prayer of Azarias, The So of the Three Children, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon. These additions have all been rejected from the Canon by the Protestant churches because they are not contained in the Hebrew Canon. In the Church of England they are "read for example of life and instruction of manners." The So of Three Children was "ordered in the rubric of the first Prayer Book of Edward VI (AD 1549) to be used in Lent as a responsory to the Old Testament Lesson at the Morning Prayer." It contains the Prayer of Azarias from the midst of the fiery furnace, and the song of praise by the three children for their deliverance; the latter being couched largely in phrases borrowed from Ps 148.

Susanna presents to us the story of a virtuous woman who resisted the seductive attempts of two judges of the elders of the people, whose machinations were exposed through the wisdom of Daniel who convicted them of false witness by the evidence of their own mouth, so that they were put to death according to the law of Moses; and from that day forth Daniel was held in great reputation in the sight of the people. Bel and the Dragon contains three stories. The first relates how Daniel destroyed the image of Bel which Nebuchadnezzar worshipped, by showing by means of ashes strewn on the floor of the temple that the offerings to Bel were devoured by the priests who came secretly into the temple by night. The second tells how Daniel killed the Dragon by throwing lumps of mingled pitch, fat and hair into his mouth, so causing the Dragon to burst asunder. The third gives a detailed account of the lions' den, stating that there were seven lions and that Daniel lived in the den six days, being sustained by broken bread and pottage which a prophet named Habakkuk brought to him through the air, an angel of the Lord having taken him by the arm and borne him by the hair of his head and through the vehemency of his

spirit set him in Babylon over the den, into which he dropped the food for Daniel’s use.

LITERATURE.

For commentaries on the additions to the Book of Daniel, see the works on Daniel cited above, and also The Apocrypha by Churton and others; the volume on the Apocrypha in Lange’s Commentary by Bissell; "The Apocrypha" by Wace in the Speaker’s Commentary, and Schurer, History of the Jewish People.

R. Dick Wilson

DANITES

dan’-its (ha-dani): Occurs as describing those belonging to Da in Jud 13:2; 18:1,11; 1Ch 12:35.

DANNAH

dan’-a (dannah): One of the cities in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:49) between Socoh and Kiriath-sannah (Debir), probably Idhna—the Iedna of the Onom—8 miles W. of Hebron. See PEF, III, 305, 330.

DAPHNE

daf’-ne (Daphne, "bay-tree"): A suburb of Antioch on the Orontes, according to Strabo and the Jerusalem itinerary, about 40 furlongs, or 5 miles distant. It is identified with Beit el-Ma’ on the left bank of the river, to the Southwest of the city. Here were the famous grove and sanctuary of Apollo. The grove and shrine owed their origin to Seleucus Nicator. It was a place of great natural beauty, and the Seleucid kings spared no outlay in adding to its attractions. The precincts enjoyed the right of asylum. Hither fled Onias the high priest (171 BC) from the wrath of Menelaus whom he had offended by plain speech. To the disgust and indignation of Jew and Gentile alike, he was lured from the sanctuary by Andronicus and basely put to death (2 Macc 4:33-38). It sheltered fugitives dyed with villainy of every shade. It was the great pleasure resort of the citizens of Antioch; and it gained an evil repute for immorality, as witnessed by the proverbial Daphnici mores. In Tiberim defluxit Orontes, says Juvenal (iii.62), indicating one main source of the corruption that demoralized the imperial city. The decline of Daphne dates from the days of Christian ascendancy in the reign of Julian. The place is still musical with fountains and luxuriant with wild vegetation; but nothing now remains to suggest its former splendor. See ANTIOCH; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chapter xxiii.

W. Ewing

DARA

dar’-a (dara‘). See DARDA.

DARDA

dar’-da (darda‘, "pearl of wisdom"): One of the wise men to whom Solomon is compared (1Ki 4:31). He was either a son of Mahol (ibid.) or a son of Zerah, son of Judah (1Ch 2:6, where the corresponding name in the same list is given as DARA). In rabbinic lore the name has been interpreted as dor dea, "the generation of knowledge"—the generation of the wilderness.

DARE

dar: The expression "to dare" in the Scriptures never has the meaning of "to defy," "to challenge," or "to terrify." It is always found as the translation of tolmao, "to manifest courage." This is particularly evident from 2Co 10:12, "for we are not bold to number or compare ourselves" (the King James Version "for we dare not make ourselves of the number").

DARIC

dar’-ik (darkemon, and ‘adharkon; dareikos): A Persian gold coin about a guinea or five dollars in value. The first form of the word occurs in 1Ch 29:7; Ezr 2:69, and Ne 7:70-72; the second in Ezr 8:27 and is rendered, "dram" in the King James Version and "daric" in the Revised Version (British and American). In the passage in Chronicles, it must refer to a weight, since at the time of David there were no coins, but in the days of Ezra and Nehemiah the Persian darics were current. See MONEY.

DARIUS

da-ri’-us: The name of three or four kings mentioned in the Old Testament. In the original Persian it is spelled "Darayavaush"; in Babylonian, usually "Dariamush"; in Susian(?), "Tariyamaush"; in Egyptian "Antaryuash"; on Aramaic inscriptions, d-r-y-h-w-sh or d-r-y-w-h-w-sh; in Hebrew, dareyawesh; in Greek, Dareios; in Latin, "Darius." In meaning it is probably connected with the new Persian word Dara, "king." Herodotus says it means in Greek, Erxeies, coercitor, "restrainer," "compeller," "commander."

(1) Darius the Mede (Da 6:1; 11:1) was the son of Ahasuerus (Xerxes) of the seed of the Medes (Da 9:1). He received the government of Belshazzar the Chaldean upon the death of that prince (Da 5:30,31; 6:1), and was made king over the kingdom of the Chaldeans.

From Da 6:28 we may infer that Darius was king contemporaneously with Cyrus. Outside of the Book of Daniel there is no mention of Darius the Mede by name, though there are good reasons for identifying him with Gubaru, or Ugbaru, the governor of Gutium, who is said in the Nabunaid-Cyrus Chronicle to have been appointed by Cyrus as his governor of Babylon after its capture from the Chaldeans. Some reasons for this identification are as follows:

(a) Gubaru is possibly a translation of Darius. The same radical letters in Arabic mean "king," "compeller," "restrainer." In Hebrew, derivations of the root mean "lord," "mistress," "queen"; in Aramaic, "mighty," "almighty."

(b) Gutium was the designation of the country North of Babylon and was in all possibility in the time of Cyrus a part of the province of Media.

(c) But even if Gutium were not a part of Media at that time, it was the custom of Persian kings to appoint Medes as well as Persians to satrapies and to the command of armies. Hence, Darius-Gubaru may have been a Mede, even if Gutium were not a part of Media proper.

(d) Since Daniel never calls Darius the Mede king of Media, or king of Persia, it is immaterial what his title or position may have been before he was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans. Since the realm of the Chaldeans never included either Media or Persia, there is absolutely no evidence in the Book of Daniel that its author ever meant to imply that Darius the Mede ever ruled over either Media or Persia.

(e) That Gubaru is called governor (pihatu), and Darius the Mede, king, is no objection to this identification; for in ancient as well as modern oriental empires the governors of provinces and cities were often called kings.

Moreover, in the Aramaic language, no more appropriate word than "king" can be found to designate the ruler of a sub-kingdom, or province of the empire.

(f) That Darius is said to have had 120 satraps under him does not conflict with this; for the Persian word "satrap" is indefinite as to the extent of his rule, just like the English word "governor." Besides, Gubaru is said to have appointed pihatus under himself. If the kingdom of the Chaldeans which he received was as large as that of Sargon he may easily have appointed 120 of these sub-rulers; for Sargon names 117 subject cities and countries over which he appointed his prefects and governors.

(g) The peoples, nations and tongues of chapter 6 are no objection to this identification; for Babylonia itself at this time was inhabited by Babylonians, Chaldeans, Arabians, Arameans and Jews, and the kingdom of the Chaldeans embraced also Assyrians, Elamites, Phoenicians and others within its limits.

(h) This identification is supported further by the fact that there is no other person known to history that can well be meant. Some, indeed, have thought that Darius the Mede was a reflection into the past of Darius Hystaspis; but this is rendered impossible inasmuch as the character, deeds and empire of Darius Hystaspis, which are well known to us from his own monuments and from the Greek historians, do not resemble what Daniel says of Darius the Mede.

(2) Darius, the fourth king of Persia, called Hystaspes because he was the son of a Persian king named

Hystaspis, is mentioned in Ezr (4:5, et al.), Hag (1:1) and Zec (1:1). Upon the death of Cambyses, son and successor to Cyrus, Smerdis the Magian usurped the kingdom and was dethroned by seven Persian nobles from among whom Darius was selected to be king. After many rebellions and wars he succeeded in establishing himself firmly upon the throne (Ant., XI, i). He reorganized and enlarged the Persian empire. He is best known to general history from his conflict with Greece culminating at Marathon, and for his re-digging of the Suez Canal. In sacred history he stands forth as the king who enabled the Jews under Jeshua and Zerubbabel to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem.

(3) Darius, called by the Greeks Nothus, was called Ochus before he became king. He reigned from 424 to 404 BC. In the Scriptures he is mentioned only in Ne 12:22, where he is called Darius the Persian, probably to distinguish him from Darius the Mede.

It is not necessary to suppose that Darius Codomannus who reigned from 336 to 330 BC, is meant by the author of Ne 12, because he mentions Jaddua; for (a) Johanan, the father of this Jaddua, was high priest about 408 BC, as is clear from the Aramaic papyrus from Elephantine lately published by Professor Sachau of Berlin, and Jaddua may well have succeeded him in those troubled times before the death of Darius Nothus in 404 BC. And (b) that a high priest named Jaddua met Alexander in 332 BC, is attested only by Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 5). It is not fair to take the testimony of Josephus as to Jaddua without taking his testimony as to the meeting with Alexander and as to the appeal of Jaddua to the predictions of the Book of Daniel. But even if Josephus be right, there may have been two Jadduas, one high priest in 404 BC, and the other in 332 BC; or the one who was alive and exercising his functions in 404 BC may still have been high priest in 332 BC. He need not have exceeded 90 years of age.

According to the Eshki Harran inscription, which purports to have been written by himself, the priest of the temple in that city had served for 104 years. In our own time how many men have been vigorous in mind and body at the age of 90, or thereabouts; Bismarck and Gladstone, for example?

R. Dick Wilson

DARK SAYINGS

(Pr 1:6; Ps 78:2; singular, Ps 49:4,5; chidhoth, singular chidhah, elsewhere rendered "riddle," "proverb"): In the heading to the canonical Book of Proverbs, the general term "proverbs" is made to include "a proverb mashal, and a figure (or, an interpretation, melitsah), the words (singular dabhar) of the wise, and their dark sayings (or, riddles)."

The "proverb" is either a saying current among the people (compare 1Sa 10:12; "the proverb of the ancients" 24:13 (14)), or a sentence of ethical wisdom composed by the order of wise men (chakhamim). Of the latter kind are the sententious maxims of the Wisdom literature (chiefly Proverbs, but also Job, Ecclesiastes, and among the uncanonical writings, Ecclesiasticus). They are characterized by a secular touch; wisdom, moreover, flourished among the neighbors of Israel as well; so in Edom and elsewhere.

Whatever the date of the collection known as the "Proverbs of Solomon," the wise men existed in Israel at a very early period; the prophets allude to them. But the Hebrew mashal is sometimes of a more elaborate character corresponding to our "parables"; frequently a vein of taunt runs through them, and they played an important part in compositions directed against other nations (compare Nu 21:27). The prophets are fond of employing this genre of literary production; in their hands the mashal becomes a figurative or allegorical discourse (compare Eze 21:5 ff (8 ff)). The mashal in the sense of a didactic poem occurs also in the Psalms (Pss 49 and 78). Hence, it is that "proverb" and "figure," or "proverb" and "dark saying" are interchangeable terms. The "dark saying" is the popular "riddle" (compare Jud 14) raised to the dignity of elaborate production.

It is in short an allegorical sentence requiring interpretation. Both prophets and psalmists avail themselves thereof. The word of God comes to the prophet in the form of a vision (compare the visions of Amos or Jeremiah), i.e. the truth presents itself to them in the form of a simile. To the perfect prophet of the type of Moses the revelation comes direct in the shape of the naked truth without the mediation of figures of speech or obscure utterances requiring elucidation (compare Nu 12). In the same way Paul (1Co 13) distinguishes between the childish manner of speaking of things spiritual and the manner of a man: "For now we see in a mirror, darkly (Greek "in a riddle"); but then face to face." The rabbis say that, whereas all the other prophets saw God and things Divine in a dim mirror, Moses saw them in a polished, clear mirror. Both Paul and the rabbis feel the difference between mediate and immediate vision, the revelation which requires dark figurative language as a vehicle and the clear perception which is the direct truth.

Max L. Margolis

DARK; DARKNESS

dark, dark’-nes (choshekh; skotos):

1. Darkness and Light in Palestine:

The day and night, light and darkness, are notable antitheses in Palestine. There the day does not slowly fade away into the night after a period of twilight, but before sunset there is the brightness of day, and when the sun has disappeared everything has changed and night is at hand. From sunset until the darkness of night is less than an hour.

2. Symbolic Uses:

In the Bible the main use of darkness is in contrast to light. Light is the symbol of God’s purity, wisdom and glory. Darkness is the opposite. Miraculous occurrence of darkness in the land of Egypt for three days is recorded in Ex 10:21,22, and at the death of Christ (Mt 27:45). See PLAGUE; ECLIPSE.

The figurative uses of darkness are many and various. It is used as a symbol

(a) of moral depravity and its punishment. The wicked walk and work in darkness (Ps 82:5; Pr 2:13; Joh 3:19; Ro 13:12), and their reward is to "sit in darkness" (Ps 107:10) or to be "cast forth into the outer darkness" (Mt 8:12);

(b) of things mysterious or inexplicable (1Ki 8:12; Ps 97:2);

(c) of trouble and affliction (2Sa 22:29; Job 5:14; Pr 20:20; Isa 9:2; compare Ge 15:12);

(d) of punishment (La 3:2; Eze 32:8; Ze 1:15); (e) of death (1Sa 2:9; Job 10:21 f; Ec 11:8); (f) of nothingness (Job 3:4-6); (g) of human ignorance (Job 19:8; 1 Joh 2:11).

"A dark (the Revised Version, margin "squalid") place" (2Pe 1:19) refers especially to the state of things described in 2Pe 2.

Alfred H. Joy

DARKLY

dark'-li: The word occurs in 1Co 13:12, "For now we see in a mirror, darkly," in translation of the words en ainigmati, the Revised Version, margin "in a riddle." The contrast is with the "face to face" vision of Divine things in eternity. Earth's best knowledge is partial, obscure, enigmatic, a broken reflection of the complete truth ("broken lights of Thee").

DARKON

dar'-kon (darqon, "carrier"): Ancestor of a subdivision of "Solomon's servants," so called, in post-exilic times (Ezr 2:56; Ne 7:58; Lozon, 1 Esdras 5:33).

DARLING

dar'-ling (yachidh, "only," the King James Version margin, "only one"; the American Revised Version, margin, "dear life"): Used poetically for the life or soul (Ps 22:20; 35:17).

DART

dart (chets; belos): A pointed missile weapon, as an arrow or light spear (2Sa 18:14; Job 41:26). See ARMOR; ARMS, III, 4; ARROW. Figurative:

(1) Of the penalty of sin (Pr 7:23 the King James Version);

(2) of strong suggestions and fierce temptations to evil (Eph 6:16; compare 1 Macc 5:51).

DART-SNAKE

dart'-snake (Isa 34:15). See ARROWSNAKE.

DASH

The idea of "to throw violently" or "to strike" with purpose of causing destruction is usually connected with the word "to dash." There is perhaps but one exception to this: Ps 91:12 and the quotations of this passage in the New Testament (Mt 4:6; Lu 4:11, proskopto), have the meaning "to strike against accidentally" and not intentionally. Na 2:1, "he that dasheth in pieces" is doubtful. "He that scatters" would be in better harmony with the Hebrew mephits, and the following description of destruction. In all other cases "to dash" is connected with the idea of destruction, especially the infliction of punishment which is usually expressed by raTash, "to dash to the ground" (2Ki 8:12; Isa 13:16 ff, et al., "to dash in pieces," the King James Version simply "to dash"), but also by naphats, "to break to pieces" (Ps 2:9; 137:9, et al.). See also PUNISHMENTS.

A. L. Breslich

DATES

dats (debhash): Arabic, dibbs (2Ch 31:5, King James Version margin); English Versions of the Bible HONEY (which see). See also PALM TREE.

DATHAN

da'-than (dathan, meaning and derivation unknown, though the name is found in Assyrian, in the records of Shalmaneser II): The son of Eliab the son of Pallu the son of Reuben (Nu 26:5 ff; De 11:6; Ps 106:17). He and his brother Abiram, with others, followed Korah the Levite in disputing the authority of Moses and Aaron in the wilderness (Nu 16-17; 26; De 11:6; Ps 106:17). Other followers of Korah perished by fire before the tent of meeting, but Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by the earth, with their families and their goods, at their tents. See KORAH.

Willis J. Beecher

DATHEMA

dath'-e-ma (Dathema): A stronghold (1 Macc 5:29) in Gilead to which the Jews fled for refuge from the heathen (1 Macc 5:9). They were delivered by Judas and Jonathan his brother. It was within a night's march from Bosora. It may possibly be identical with 'Athaman which lies East of el-Muzeribe in

disputing the authority of Moses and Aaron in the wilderness (Nu 16-17; 26; De 11:6; Ps 106:17). Other followers of Korah perished by fire before the tent of meeting, but Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by the earth, with their families and their goods, at their tents.

DAUB

dob: "To daub" always has the meaning "to cover," "to smear with" in the Scriptures. Ezekiel compares the flatteries of the false prophets to a slight wall covered with whitewash (literally, "spittle"). See Eze 13:10, 22:28. In Ex 2:3 "daubed it with slime and with pitch" (Hebrew wattachmerah, denominative of chemar, "bitumen" or "asphalt"), "to daub" has the same meaning as in the Ezekiel passage.

DAUGHTER

do’-ter (bath; thugater): Used in Scriptures in several more or less distinct senses:

(a) for daughter in the ordinary, literal sense (Ge 46:25; Ex 1:16);

(b) daughter-in-law (Ru 2:2);

(c) grand-daughter or other female descendant (Ex 21; Lu 1:5; 13:16);

(d) the women of a country, or of a place, taken collectively (Lu 23:28), of a particular religion (Mal 2:11);

(e) all the population of a place, taken collectively, especially in Prophets and poetic books (Ps 9:14; Isa 23:10; Jer 46:24; Mt 21:5);

(f) used in familiar address, "Daughter, be of good comfort" (Mt 9:22 the King James Version; Mr 5:34; Lu 8:48);

(g) women in general (Pr 31:29);

(h) the personification of towns or cities, as of the female sex (Isa 47:1; Eze 16:44,46; compare Na 3:4,7), especially of dependent towns and villages (Ps 48:11; Nu 21:25 margin; Jud 1:27 margin);

(i) in Hebrew idiom for person or thing belonging to or having the characteristics of that with which it is joined, as "daughter of ninety years," of Sarah, ninety years old (Ge 17:17); "daughters of music," singing birds, or singing women (Ec 12:4); daughters of a tree, i. e. branches; daughter of the eye, i. e. the pupil.

Daughters were not so highly prized as sons, not being usually mentioned by name. A father might

sometimes sell his daughter as bondwoman (Ex 21:7); though not to a foreigner (Ex 21:8); daughters might sometimes inherit as did sons, but could not take the inheritance outside of the tribe (Nu 36:1-12).

Edward Bagby Pollard

DAUGHTER-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

DAVID

da'-vid (dawidh, or dawidh, "beloved"; Daueid, also in New Testament, Dauid, Dabid; see Thayer's Lexicon):

I. NAME AND GENEALOGY

II. EARLY YEARS

1. Shepherd

2. Slinger

3. Harpist

4. Poet

5. Psalmist

6. Tribesman

III. IN THE SERVICE OF SAUL

1. David First Meets Saul

2. His First Exploit

3. Envy of Saul and Flight of David

4. Jonathan and David

IV. DAVID IN EXILE

1. David as Outlaw

2. David Joins the Philistines

V. DAVID AS KING

1. Civil War

2. Conquests Abroad

3. Political Situation

4. The Ark

VI. DOMESTIC LIFE

1. His Wives and Children

2. Domestic Troubles

VII. HIS OFFICIALS

1. Prophets

2. Priests

3. Military Officers

4. Other Officials

5. Mutual Rivalry

VIII. PERSONAL CHARACTER OF DAVID

1. Chronicles

2. Psalms

3. Complex Character

4. Physical Courage

5. Moral Courage

6. Prudence

7. Strategy

8. Nobility

9. David in Relation to His Family

10. David in Relation to His Friends

11. His Success

12. His Foreign Friends

13. Nemesis

14. References in the New Testament

LITERATURE.

I. Name and Genealogy.

This name, which is written "defectively" in the older books, such as those of Samuel, but fully with the yodh in Chronicles and the later books, is derived, like the similar name Jedidish (2Sa 12:25), from a root meaning "to love." The only person who bears this name in the Bible is the son of Jesse, the second king of Israel. His genealogy is given in the table appended to the Book of Ru (Ru 4:18-22). Here the following points are to be noted: David belonged to the tribe of Judah: his ancestor Nahshon was chieftain of the whole tribe (Nu 1:7; 2:3; 1Ch 2:10) and brother-in-law of Aaron the high priest (Ex 6:23). As no other descendants of Nahshon are mentioned, his authority probably descended to Jesse by right of primogeniture. This supposition is countenanced by the fact that Salma (Salmon), the name of the son of Nahshon and father of Boaz, is also the name of a grandson of Caleb who became "father" of Bethlehem, the home of Jesse (1Ch 2:51). David was closely connected with the tribe of Moab, the mother of his grandfather Obed being Ru the Moabitess. Of the wife or wives of Jesse we know nothing, and consequently are without information upon a most interesting point—the personality of the mother of David; but that she too may have been of the tribe of Moab is rendered probable by the fact that,

when hard pressed, David placed his parents under the protection of the king of that country (1Sa 22:3,1).

II. Early Years.

The home of David when he comes upon the stage of history was the picturesque town of Bethlehem.

1. Shepherd:

There his family had been settled for generations, indeed ever since the Israelite nation had overrun the land of Canaan. His father was apparently not only the chief man of the place, but he seems to have been chieftain of the whole clan to which he belonged—the clan of Judah. Although the country round Bethlehem is more fertile than that in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, the inhabitants joined to the cultivation of the soil the breeding of cattle (Lu 2:8). David's father, not only cultivated his ancestral fields, but kept flocks of sheep and goats as well. The flocks were sent out every day to pasture in the neighboring valleys attended by the herdsmen armed so as to defend themselves and their charge, not only against marauders from the surrounding deserts, but also from the lions and bears with which the country was then infested. David seems to have been in the habit of accompanying his father's servants in their task (1Sa 17:20,22), and on occasion would be left in full charge by himself. Nor was his post at such times a sinecure. He had not only to keep a sharp lookout for thieves, but on more than one occasion had with no other weapon than his shepherd's club or staff to rescue a lamb from the clutches of a lion or a bear (1Sa 17:34 ff). Such adventures, however, must have been rare, and David must often have watched eagerly the lengthening of the shadow which told of the approach of sunset, when he could drive his charge into the zariba for the night and return home. There is, indeed, no life more monotonous and enervating than that of an eastern shepherd, but David must have made good use of his idle time. He seems, in fact, to have made such good use of it as to have neglected his handful of sheep. The incidents of which he boasted to Saul would not have occurred, had his proper occupation taken up all his thoughts; but, like King Alfred, his head seems to have been filled with ideas far removed from his humble task.

2. Slinger:

David, like Nelson, does not seem to have known what it was to be afraid, and it was not to be expected that he could be satisfied with the lot of the youngest of eight sons of the now aged chief (1Sa 17:12; 1Ch 2:13 ff). In the East every man is a soldier, and David's bent was in that direction. The tribesmen of Benjamin near whose border his home was situated were famed through all Israel as slingers, some of whom could sling at a hair and not miss (Jud 20:16). Taught, perhaps, by one of these, but certainly by dint of constant practice, David acquired an accuracy of aim which reminds one of the tales of William Tell or Robin Hood (1Sa 17:49).

3. Harpist:

Another of the pastimes in the pursuit of which David spent many an hour of his youthful days was music. The instrument which he used was the "harp" (Hebrew kinnor). This instrument had many forms, which may be seen on the Assyrian and Egyptian monuments; but the kind used by David was probably like the modern Arabic, rubaba, having only one or two strings, played not with a plectrum (Ant., VII, xii, 3) but by the hand (compare 1Sa 16:23, etc., which do not exclude a quill). Whatever the nature of the instrument was, David acquired such proficiency in playing it that his fame as a musician soon spread throughout the countryside (1Sa 16:18). With the passing of time he becomes the Hebrew Orpheus, in whose music birds and mountains joined (compare Koran, chapter 21).

4. Poet:

To the accompaniment of his lyre David no doubt sang words, either of popular songs or of lyrics of his own composition, in that wailing eastern key which seems to be an imitation of the bleating of flocks. The verses he sang would recount his own adventures or the heroic prowess of the warrior of his clan, or celebrate the loveliness of some maiden of the tribe, or consist of elegies upon those slain in battle. That the name of David was long connected with music the reverse of sacred appears from the fact that Amos denounces the people of luxury of his time for improvising to the sound of the viol, inventing instruments of music, like David (6:5). (It is not clear to which clause "like David" belongs, probably to both.) The only remains of the secular poetry of David which have come down to us are his elegies on Saul and Jonathan and on Abner (2Sa 1:19-27; 3:33,14), which show him to have been a true poet.

5. Psalmist:

Did David also compose religious verses? Was he "the sweet psalmist of Israel" (2Sa 23:1)? In the oldest account which we have, contained in the books of Samuel, David appears as a musician and as a secular poet only, for it is obvious the poetical passages, 2Sa 22:1-23:7, do not belong to the original form of that book but are thrust in in the middle of a long list of names of David’s soldiers. The position is the same in Am 6:5. It is in the later books and passages that sacred music and psalms begin to be ascribed to him. Perhaps the earliest instance is the passage just cited containing the "last words" of David (2Sa 23:1-7). The Chronicler (about 300 BC) seems to put parts of Psalms 105; 96, and 106 into the mouth of David (1Ch 16:7 ff), and Ne 12:36 regards him apparently as the inventor of the instruments used in the Temple service (1Ch 23:5), or as a player of sacred music. So too in the Septuagint psalter (Ps 150:2) we read, "My hands made an organ, my fingers fashioned a psaltery"; and gradually the whole of the Psalms came to be ascribed to David as author. In regard to this question it must be remembered that in the East at any rate there is no such distinction as that of sacred and secular. By sacred poetry we mean poetry which mentions the name of God or quotes Scripture, but the Hebrew or Arab poet will use the name of God as an accompaniment to a dance, and will freely sprinkle even comic poetry with citations from his sacred book. David must have composed sacred poems if he composed at all, and he would use his musical gift for the purposes of religion as readily as for those of amusement and pleasure (2Sa 6:14,15). Whether any of our psalms was composed by David is another question. The titles cannot be considered as conclusive evidence, and internal proofs of his authorship are wanting. Indeed the only psalm which claims to have been written by David is the 18th (= 2Sa 22). One cannot help wishing that the 23rd Psalm had been sung by the little herd lad as he watched his

father’s flocks and guarded them from danger.

6. Tribesman:

There are sayings of Mohammed that the happiest life is that of the shepherd, and that no one became a prophet who had not at one time tended a flock of sheep. What Mohammed meant was that the shepherd enjoys leisure and solitude for reflection and for plunging into those day dreams out of which prophets are made. If David, like the Arab poet Tarafa, indulged in sport, in music and in poetry, even to the neglect of his charge, he must have sought out themes on which to exercise his muse; and it must have been with no little chagrin that he learnt that whereas the tribes of Ephraim, Benjamin, Naphtali, Manasseh, Issachar, Zebulun, Levi, Dan, and even the non-Israelite tribes of Kenaz and the debatable land of Gilead could boast of having held the hegemony of Israel and led the nation in battle, his own tribe of Judah had played a quite subordinate part, and was not even mentioned in the national war song of Deborah. As contrasted with the poets of these tribes he could boast in his verses only of Ibzan who belonged to his own town of Bethlehem (Jud 12:8). The Jerahmeelites were no doubt a powerful clan, but neither they nor any other of the subdivisions of Judah had ever done anything for the common good. Indeed, when the twelve pathfinders had been sent in advance into Canaan, Judah had been represented by Caleb, a member of the Uitlander tribe of Kenaz (Nu 13:6). He became apparently the adopted son of Hezron and so David might claim kinship with him, and through him with Othniel the first of the judges (Jud 1:13). David thus belonged to the least efficient of all the Israelite tribes except one, and one which, considering its size and wealth, had till now failed to play a worthy part in the confederacy. It is difficult to believe that the young David never dreamed of a day when his own tribe should take its true place among its fellows, and when the deliverer of Israel from its oppressors should belong for once to the tribe of Judah.

III. In the Service of Saul.

The earliest events in the career of David are involved in some obscurity.

1. David First Meets Saul:

This is due mainly to what appears to be an insoluble difficulty in 1 Samuel 16 and 17. In chapter 16, David is engaged to play before Saul in order to dispel is melancholy, and becomes his squire or armor-bearer (16:21), whereas in the following chapter he is unknown to Saul, who, after the death of Goliath, asks Abner who he is, and Abner replies that he does not know (17:55). This apparent contradiction may be accounted for by the following considerations:

(a) 16:14-23 may be inserted out of its chronological order for the sake of the contrast with the section immediately preceding—"the spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon David from that day forward .... the spirit of Yahweh departed from Saul" (16:13,14);

(b) the fact of David becoming Saul’s squire does not imply constant personal attendance upon him; the

text says David became an (not his) armor-bearer to Saul. The king would have many such squires: Joab, though only commander-in-chief, had, it seems, eighteen (2Sa 23:37 reads "armor-bearers");

(c) David would not play before Saul every day: his presence might not be required for a space of weeks or months;

(d) Saul's failure to recognize David may have been a result of the 'evil spirit from Yahweh' and Abner's denial of knowledge may have been feigned out of jealousy. If we accept all the statements of the dramatis personae in these narratives we shall not get very far.

2. His First Exploit:

The facts seem to have been somewhat as follows: It had become evident that Saul was not equal to the task to which he had been set—the task of breaking the Philistine power, and it became the duty of Samuel, as the vicar of Yahweh and as still holding very large powers, to look about for a successor. He turned to the tribe of Judah (the full brother of his own ancestor Levi), a tribe which was fast becoming the most powerful member of the federation. The headman of this clan was Jesse of Bethlehem. His name was well known in the country—Saul does not require to be told who he is (1Sa 16:18; 17:58)—but he was by this time advanced in years (1Sa 17:12). He had, however, many sons. Old men in the East often foretell a great future for a young boy (compare Lu 2:34). Samuel saw that David was formed of other clay than his brothers, and he anointed him as he had done Saul (1Sa 10:1). But whereas the anointing of Saul was done surreptitiously and for a definite purpose which was explained at the time (1Sa 10:1), that of David was performed before his whole family, but with what object he was not told (1Sa 16:13). His brothers do not seem to have thought the matter of much consequence (compare 1Sa 17:28), and all David could conclude from it was that he was destined to some high office—perhaps that of Samuel's successor (compare 1Ki 19:15,16). It would have the effect of nerving him for any adventure and raising his hopes high and steeling his courage. Whether by accident or by contrivance he became attached to Saul as minstrel (compare 2Ki 3:15) and subsequently as one of his armor-bearers. He would probably be at this time about twenty years of age. It must have been after an interval of some months that an event happened which made it impossible for Saul ever again to forget the existence of David. This was the famous duel between David and the Philistine Goliath, which saved the situation for Saul for the time (1Sa 17). In regard to this narrative it must be noted that 1Sa 17:12-31,41,50,55-58 and 18:1-5 are lacking in the best manuscript of the Septuagint, that is, the sending of David from Bethlehem and his fresh introduction to Saul and Saul's failure to recognize him are left out. With the omission of these verses all the difficulties of the narrative vanish. For the reason why David could not wear the armor offered him was not because he was still a child, which is absurd in view of the fact that Saul was exceptionally tall (1Sa 9:2), but because he had had no practice with it (1Sa 17:39). It is ridiculous to suppose that David was not at this time full-grown, and that two armies stood by while a child advanced to engage a giant. The event gained for David the reputation won in modern times at the cannon's mouth, but also the devoted friendship of Jonathan and the enmity of Saul (1Sa 18:1-9).

The next years of David's life were spent in the service of Saul in his wars with the Philistines. David's

success where Saul had failed, however, instead of gratifying only inflamed the jealousy of the latter, and he determined to put David out of the way. More than once he attempted to do so with his own hand (1Sa 18:11; 19:10), but he also employed stratagem. It came to his ears that his daughter Michal, as well as his son Jonathan, loved David, and Saul undertook to give her to David on the condition of his killing one hundred Philistines.

3. Envy of Saul and Flight of David:

The gruesome dowry was paid, and David became Saul's son-in-law. The Hebrew text states that Saul first offered his elder daughter to David, and then failed to implement his promise (1Sa 18:17-19,21), but this passage is not found in the Greek. David's relation to Saul did not mitigate the hatred of the latter; indeed his enmity became so bitter that David determined upon flight. With the help of stratagem on the part of Michal, this was effected and David went to Samuel at Ramah for counsel and advice (1Sa 19:18). There Saul pursued him, but when he came into the presence of the prophet, his courage failed and he was overcome by the contagion of the prophetic ecstasy (1Sa 19:24) as he had been on a previous occasion (1Sa 10:11). David returned to Gibeah, while the coast was clear, to meet Jonathan, but Saul also returned immediately, his hatred more intense than before. David then continued his flight and came to Ahimelech, the priest at Nob (1Sa 21:1). It is sometimes supposed that we have here two inconsistent accounts of David's flight, according to one of which he fled to Samuel at Ramah, and according to the other to Ahimelech at Nob; but there is no necessity for such a supposition, and even if it were correct, it would not clear up all the difficulties of the narrative. There is evidently much in these narratives that is left untold and our business should be to fill up the gaps in a way consistent with what we are given. That Saul made sure that David would not return is shown by the fact that he gave his daughter Michal to a man of the tribe of Benjamin as wife (1Sa 25:44).

4. Jonathan and David:

The relation existing between Jonathan and David was one of pure friendship. There was no reason why it should not be so. A hereditary monarchy did not yet exist in Israel. The only previous attempt to establish such an institution—that of Gideon's family (Jud 9$)—though not of Gideon himself (1Sa 8:22) —had ended in failure. The principle followed hitherto had been that of election by the sheikhs or caids of the clans. To this Saul owed his position, for the lot was a kind of ballot. Moreover, behind all national movements there lay the power of the prophets, the representatives of Yahweh. Saul was indebted for his election to Samuel, just as Barak was to Deborah (Jud 4:6). Like the judges who preceded him he had been put forward to meet a definite crisis in the national affairs—the rise of the Philistine power (1Sa 9:16). Had he succeeded in crushing these invaders, the newly-established kingdom would in the absence of this bond of union have dissolved again into its elements, as had happened on every similar occasion before. He was the only judge who had failed to accomplish the task for which he was appointed, and he was the only one who had been appointed on the understanding that his son should succeed him, for this constitutes the distinction between king and judge. Moreover, not only was Saul aware that he had failed, but he saw before him the man who was ready to step into his place and succeed. His rival had, besides, the backing of the mass of the people and of Samuel who was still virtual head of the state and last court of appeal. It is not to be wondered at that Saul was hostile to

David. Jonathan, on the other hand, acquiesced in the turn things had taken and bowed to what he believed to be the inevitable. Such was his love for David that he asked only to be his wazeer (vizier) when David came to the throne (1Sa 23:17). David's position was perhaps the most difficult imaginable. He had to fight the battles of a king whose one idea was to bring about his ruin. He was the bosom friend of a prince whom he proposed to supplant in his inheritance. His hope of salvation lay in the death of his king, the father of his wife and of his best friend. The situation would in ordinary circumstances be intolerable, and it would have been impossible but for the fact that those concerned were obsessed by a profound belief in Fate. Jonathan bore no grudge against David for aiming at the throne, because to the throne he was destined by the will of Yahweh. To David it would never occur that he had the choice of declining the high destiny in store for him. Had he had the power to refuse what he believed to be the decree of Fate, he would hardly escape censure for his ambition and disloyalty.

IV. David in Exile.

1. David as Outlaw:

From the moment of his flight David became an outlaw and remained so until the death of Saul. This period of his career is full of stirring adventures which remind us of Robert Bruce or William Wallace of Scotland. Like King Arthur and other heroes he carried a famous sword—the sword of Goliath (1Sa 21:9). Having obtained it of Ahimelech, he for the first time left Israelite territory and went to the Philistine city of Gath (1Sa 21:10). Not feeling safe here he left and took up his abode in the cave of Adullam (1Sa 22:1) in the country of Judah, almost within sight of his native Bethlehem. This cave was admirably suited to the outlaw's purpose and no doubt David had many a time explored its recesses when a boy. Here he was joined by his parents and brothers, with their servants, as well as by all sorts of persons who were at war with the government, debtors, fugitives from justice, and discontented persons generally. David thus became the chief of a band of outlaws who numbered about 400. Of such stuff some of his bravest soldiers were made (2Sa 23:13 ff). He had an augur, too, to direct his actions, and, after the massacre of the priests at Nob, a priest, Abiathar, carrying an ephod with which to cast lots (1Sa 22:5; 23:6). During this period he supported himself and his men by making raids on the Philistine outposts and levying blackmail on his own countrymen (1Sa 25:2 ff) in return for giving them his protection from the Philistines (1Sa 23:1 ff). Hard pressed both by Saul and the Philistines (who had established themselves even in Bethlehem) he committed his parents to the keeping of the king of Moab, and began to rove as a freebooter through the country (1Sa 23:5,15,25,29). On two occasions David had Saul in his power, but refused to seize the opportunity of taking his life (1Sa 24-26). Here again there are no adequate grounds for supposing we have two accounts of one and the same incident. During his wandering David's followers increased in numbers (compare 1Sa 22:2; 23:13; 25:13). His chief lieutenant was his nephew Abishai, the son of his sister Zeruiah, but his brothers, Joab and Asahel, do not seem to have joined David yet. Another of his nephews, Jonathan the son of Shimei (Shammah), is mentioned (2Sa 21:21; compare 1Sa 16:9) and the Chronicler thinks many other knights joined him during this period (1Ch 11:10 ff). The position of David at this time was very similar to that of the brigand Raisuli of late in Morocco. That there was some stability in it is shown by his taking two wives at this time—Ahinoam and Abigail (1Sa 25:42,43).

2. David Joins the Philistines:

David now, abandoning all hope of ever conciliating the king (1Sa 27:1), made a move which shows at once his reckless daring and consummate genius. He offered the services of himself and his little army of 600 men to the enemies of his country. The town of Gath appears to have been an asylum for fugitive Israelites (1Ki 2:39). David's first impulse on his flight from Saul had been to seek safety there (1Sa 21:10-15). Then, however, he was the hero of Israel, whose assassination would be the highest gain to the Philistines; now he was the embittered antagonist of Saul, and was welcomed accordingly. Achish placed at his disposal the fortified town of Ziklag in the territory of the now extinct tribe of Simeon, and there he and his followers, each of whom had his family with him, took up their quarters for sixteen months (1Sa 27:6,7). The advantages to David were many. He was safe at last from the persecution of Saul (1Sa 27:4); he could secure ample supplies by making raids upon the Amalekites and other tribes hostile to Israel toward the South (1Sa 27:8); and if the opportunity presented itself he could deal a serious blow at the Philistine arms. The position was no doubt a precarious one. It could last just as long as David could hoodwink Achish by persuading him that his raids were directed against his own tribe (1Sa 27:10). This he succeeded in doing so completely that Achish would have taken him with him on the campaign which ended in the decisive battle of Gilboa, but the other chiefs, fearing treachery, refused to allow him to do so. David was forced to return with his followers to Ziklag, only to find that town razed to the ground and all the women and children carried off by his old enemies the Amalekites (1Sa 30:1,2). By the time he had recovered the spoil and returned in triumph to Ziklag the battle of Gilboa had been fought and Saul was slain. The conduct of David in his relations with the Philistines was not more reprehensible than that of the Cid who allied himself with Al-Mu'taman of Saragossa, or of Coriolanus who went over to the Volsci. David composed upon the death of Saul and Jonathan an elegy every sentence of which has become classic.

V. David as King.

1. Civil War: David immediately removed from Ziklag and took up his quarters at Hebron, where he was at once anointed king over his own tribe of Judah. Thus began the cleavage between Judah and Israel. Here he was joined, apparently for the first time, by his nephew Joab. Abner, however, loyal to his former master, had Esh-baal (1Ch 8:33), son of Saul, anointed king over the remaining tribes at Mahanaim, a fortified town East of the Jordan. War continued between David and Abner for several years, fortune always favoring David. Seeing things were going against him Abner forced Esh-baal into a personal quarrel with himself and then transferred his allegiance and persuaded his side to transfer theirs to David (2Sa 3:21). He did not reap the fruit of his defection, as he was immediately after assassinated by Joab in revenge for the death of Asahel whom Abner had killed in self-defence (2Sa 3:27). Deprived of his chief support Esh-baal also fell a victim to assassination (2Sa 4:2 ff). David denounced both crimes with apparent sincerity. He composed an elegy and fasted for Abner (2Sa 3:33 ff) and avenged the death of Esh-baal (2Sa 4:9 ff). Yet these acts of violence laid the sovereignty of all Israel at his feet. Of the male heirs of Saul there remained only a son of Jonathan, Merib-baal (1Ch 8:34) who was a crippled child of 7. David was therefore elected king over the nation (2Sa 5:1 ff). His sovereignty of Judah is said to have lasted 7 1/2 years and that over the undivided people 33, making a reign of 40 years, beginning from David's 30th year (2Sa 5:5; 1Ch 3:4; in 2Sa 2:10 the text is probably

corrupt). These are round numbers.

2. Conquests Abroad:

King of all the Israelite tribes, David found his hands free to expel the foreigners who had invaded the sacred territory. His first step was to move his headquarters from the Southern Hebron, which he had been compelled at first to make his capital, to the more central Jerusalem. The fort here, which was still held by the aboriginal Jebusites, was stormed by Joab, David's nephew, who also superintended the rebuilding for David. He was in consequence appointed commander-in-chief (1Ch 11:6,8), a post which he held as long as David lived. The materials and the skilled workmen for the erection of the palace were supplied by Hiram of Tyre (2Sa 5:11). David now turned his attention to the surrounding tribes and peoples. The most formidable enemy, the Philistines, were worsted in several campaigns, and their power crippled (2Sa 5:17 ff; 8:1). In one of these David so nearly came by his death, that his people would not afterward permit him to take part in the fighting (2Sa 21:16,17). One of the first countries against which David turned his arms was the land of Moab, which he treated with a severity which would suggest that the Moabite king had ill-treated David's father and mother, who had taken refuge with him (2Sa 8:2). Yet his conduct toward the sons of Ammon was even more cruel (2Sa 12:31), and for less cause (10:1 ff). The king of Zobah (Chalkis) was defeated (2Sa 8:3), and Israelite garrisons were placed in Syria of Damascus (2Sa 8:6) and Edom (2Sa 8:14). The sons of Ammon formed a league with the Syrian kingdoms to the North and East of Palestine (2Sa 10:6,16), but these also had no success. All these people became tributary to the kingdom of Israel under David (2Sa 10:18,19) except the sons of Ammon who were practically exterminated for the time being (2Sa 12:31). Thus, Israel became one of the "great powers" of the world during the reign of David and his immediate successor.

3. Political Situation:

There is no doubt that the expansion of the boundaries of Israel at this period almost to their ideal limits (De 11:24, etc.) was largely due to the fact that the two great empires of Egypt and Assyria were at the moment passing through a period of weakness and decay. The Assyrian monarchy was in a decadent state from about the year 1050 BC, and the 22nd Dynasty—to which Shishak belonged (1Ki 14:25)—had not yet arisen. David, therefore, had a free hand when his time came and found no more formidable opposition than that of the petty states bordering upon Palestine. Against the combined forces of all the Israelite tribes these had never been able to effect much.

4. The Ark:

It had been the custom of the Israelites on setting out upon expeditions in which the nation as a whole took part to carry with them the sacred box or "ark" which contained the two stone tables (Jos 4:7, etc.). When David had secured the fortress of Jebus for his metropolis one of his first thoughts was to bring into it this emblem of victory. It was then lying at Kiriath-jearim, possibly Abu Gosh about 8 miles Northwest of Jerusalem (compare Ps 132). Owing to the sudden death of one of the drivers, which he interpreted as indicative of anger on the part of Yahweh, David left the ark at the house of a Philistine

which happened to be near at hand. Since no misfortune befell this person, but on the contrary much prosperity, David took courage after three months to bring the sacred chest and its contents into his royal city. The ceremony was conducted with military honors in 2Sa 6:1 and with religious dancing and music (6:5,14) and festivity (6:18,19). A tent was pitched for it, in which it remained (7:2), except when it was sent with the army to the seat of war (11:11; 15:24). David, however, had already built for himself a stone palace, and he wished now to add to it a chapel royal in the shape of a small temple, such as the neighboring kings had. He was the more anxious to so do since he had much of the material ready at hand in the precious metals which formed the most valuable part of the plunder of the conquered races, such as bronze from Chalkis (8:8), gold and silver (8:11) and the vessels which he had received as a present from the king of Hamath (8:10). He was persuaded, however, by the prophet Nathan to forego that task, on the ground of his having shed much human blood, and to leave it to his successor (1Ch 22:8; 28:3).

VI. Domestic Life.

1. His Wives and Children:

In accordance with the practice of the kings of his time, David had several wives. His first wife was Michal, the younger daughter of Saul. When David fled from Saul she was given to Phaltiel, but was restored to David after Saul’s death. She does not appear to have borne any children. In 2Sa 21:8 "Michal" should be Merab (1Sa 18:19). During the period of separation from Michal, David took to wife Ahinoam of Jezreel and Abigail the wife of Nabal (1Sa 25:43,12), who accompanied him to Ziklag (1Sa 27:3 ff), when they were among those captured by the Amalekites (1Sa 30:5). A fourth wife was the daughter of Talmai of Geshur, Maacah, whom he had captured in war (1Sa 27:8; 2Sa 3:3). When he removed to Hebron Ahinoam bore him his oldest son Amnon, and Abigail his second son Chileab or Daniel (2Sa 3:2,3; 1Ch 3:1); his third son was Absalom, whose mother was Maacah, and his fourth Adonijah. His mother’s name was Haggith; nothing is known about her. Two other sons, Shephatiah and Ithream were also born in Hebron (2Sa 3:2-5; 1Ch 3:1-4). When David added the kingdom of Israel to that of Judah, he, in accordance with custom, took more wives with a view to increase his state and dignity. One of these was Bathsheba, who became the mother of Solomon (2Sa 5:13 ff; 1Ch 3:5 ff; 14:3 ff). David’s sons discharged priestly functions (2Sa 8:18; compare Nathan in Zec 12:12).

2. Domestic Troubles:

It was perhaps inevitable that in so large a household the usual dissensions and crimes of the harem should have sprung up in plenty. A most unvarnished account of these is given in 2Sa 11-20—it has been suggested by Abiathar the priest in order to avenge himself on Solomon for his disgrace (1Ki 2:26,27), Solomon’s mother being Bathsheba (2Sa 11; 12). 1Ch 13 recounts the wrong done to Tamar, the daughter of David and Maacah, and sister of Absalom, and how the last named, having avenged his sister’s honor by killing Amnon, his oldest brother, fled for asylum to his mother’s father, the king of-Geshur. Thence after two years he returned (chapter 14), only to foment rebellion against his father (chapter 15), leading to civil war between David and Judah on the one side and Absalom and Israel on

the other (chapters 16; 17), and ending in the death of himself (chapter 18) and of Amasa, David's nephew, at the hands of his cousins Joab and Abishai (20:7 ff), as well as nearly precipitating the disruption of the newly founded kingdom (19:43). The rebellion of Absalom was probably due to the fact of Solomon having been designated David's successor (compare 12:24; 1Ch 22:9), for Absalom had the best claim, Amnon being dead and Chileab apparently of no account.

VII. His Officials.

As David's circumstances improved he required assistance in the management of his affairs.

1. Prophets:

The beginning of his good fortune had been the friendship of the prophet Samuel (1Sa 16:13; 19:18). The prophet or seer was keeper of the king's conscience and was not appointed by him, but claimed divine authority (2Sa 7:3,1 ff; 12:1 ff; 24:11 ff). Among the persons who discharged this duty for David were Gad the seer (1Sa 22:5) and Nathan the prophet (1Ki 1:11 ff). All these are said to have written memoirs of their times (1Ch 29:29; 2Ch 9:29).

2. Priests:

Next to the prophet came the priest. The kohen (priest) was, as the name indicates, a soothsayer or diviner. The duty of Abiathar, David's first priest (1Sa 22:20 ff), was to carry the ephod—an object used for casting lots (1Sa 23:6 ff), in order to decide what to do in cases where there was no other way of making up one's mind (1Sa 30:7). It is not to be confused with the dress of the same name (1Sa 2:18). Later, at Hebron, Abiathar was given a colleague, Zadok (1Ch 12:28), and it became their duty to carry the ark in expeditions (2Sa 15:24). Shortly after the death of David, Abiathar was deposed by Solomon for his part in Adonijah's attempt to seize the throne (1Ki 2:26,27), and Zadok remained sole priest to the king (1Ki 2:35). David's sons also acted in the same capacity (2Sa 8:18). An extra private priest is mentioned in 2Sa 20:26 (compare 2Sa 23:26,38).

3. Military Officers:

When still an outlaw David required the services of a henchman to take command of his men in his absence. This post was held at first by different persons according to circumstances, but generally, it seems, by his nephew Abishai (1Sa 26:6). It was only after the death of Saul that his brother Joab threw in his lot with David. His great military talents at once gave him a leading place, and as a reward for the capture of Jebus he was given the chief command, which he held against all rivals (2Sa 3:27; 20:10) during the whole reign. David's special body-guard of Philistine troops—the Cherethites and Pelethites—were commanded by Benaiah, who in the following reign, succeeded Joab (1Ki 2:35).

4. Other Officials:

The office of recorder or magister memoriae was held during this reign and in the following by Jehoshaphat (2Sa 8:16); and that of secretary by Seraiah (2Sa 8:17), also called Shavsha (1Ch 18:16) or Shisha (1Ki 4:3). There were also the counselors, men noted for their great acumen and knowledge of human nature, such as Ahithophel and Hushai.

5. Mutual Rivalry:

It was natural that there should be much mutual jealousy and rivalry among these officials, and that some of them should attach themselves to one of David's many sons, others to another. Thus, Amnon is the special patron of David's nephew Jonadab (2Sa 13:3; compare 2Sa 21:21), and Absalom is backed by Amasa (2Sa 17:25). The claim of Adonijah to the throne is supported by Joab and Abiathar (1Ki 1:7), as against that of Solomon who is backed by Nathan, Benaiah, Zadok (1Ki 1:8) and Hushai (compare Ant, VII, xiv, 4). Ahithophel sides with Absalom; Hushai with David (2Sa 15:12,32).

VIII. Personal Character of David.

1. Chronicles:

We would obtain a very different idea of the personal character of David if we drew our conclusions from the books of Samuel and Kings or from the books of Chronicles. There is no doubt whatever that the former books are much truer to fact, and any estimate or appreciation of David or of any of the other characters described must be based upon them. The Chronicler, on the other hand, is biased by the religious ideas of his own time and is prejudiced in favor of some of those whose biographies he writes and against others. He accordingly suppresses the dark passages of David's life, e. g. the murder of Uriah (1Ch 20$), or sets them in a favorable light, e. g. by laying the blame of the census upon Satan (1Ch 21:1). David's success, especially as against Saul's misfortune, is greatly exaggerated in 1Ch 12:2,22. Ceremonial functions are greatly elaborated (chapter 16; compare 2Sa 6). The various orders of priests and singers in the second temple have their origin traced back to David (16:4 ff, 37 ff; 1Ch 23-27), and the temple of Solomon itself is to all intents and purposes built by him (chapters 22; 28). At the same time there may be much material in the shape of names and isolated statements not found in the older books, which so long as they are not tinged with the Chronicler's pragmatism or "tendency," may possibly be authentic records preserved within the circle of the priestly caste, e. g. we are told that Saul's skull was fastened in the temple of Dagon (1Ch 10:10). There is no doubt that the true names of Ish-bosheth, Mephibosheth and Eliada (2Sa 2:8; 4:4; 5:16) were Ish-baal (Esh-baal), Merib-baal and Beeliada (1Ch 8:33; 9:39; 8:34; 9:40; 14:7); that the old name of Jerusalem was Jebus (11:4,5; compare Jud 19:10,11); perhaps a son of David called Nogah has to be added to 2Sa 5:15 from 1Ch 3:7; 14:6; in 2Sa 8:8 and 21:18, for Betah and Gob read Tebah (Tibhath) and Gezer (1Ch 18:8; Ge 22:24; 1Ch 20:4). The incident recounted in 2Sa 23:9 ff happened at Pasdammim (1Ch 11:13). Shammah the Harodite was the son of Elika (2Sa 23:25; compare 1Ch 11:27), and other names in this list have to be corrected after the readings of the Chronicler. Three (not seven) years of famine was the alternative offered to David (2Sa 24:13; compare 1Ch 21:12).

2. Psalms:

If we could believe that the Book of Psalms was in whole or in part the work of David, it would throw a flood of light upon the religious side of his nature. Indeed, we should know as much about his religious life as can well be known about anyone. Unfortunately the date and authorship of the Psalms are questions regarding which the most divergent opinions are held. In the early Christian centuries all the Psalms were ascribed to David and, where necessary, explained as prophecies. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Book of Psalms simply as "David" (Heb 4:7). The Greek text, however, of that book ascribes only some 87 of the poems to David, and the Hebrew only 73. Some of these are not David's, and in the whole book there is only one which professes from its contents to be his, namely, Ps 18 (= 2Sa 22). The occasion on which a psalm was composed is stated only in the case of thirteen psalms, all of which are ascribed to David. Each of these is referred to some incident recorded in the books of Samuel, although sometimes the citation is erroneous (see PSALMS). The Septuagint supplies occasions to two or three more psalms; but all such statements are merely the conjectures of readers and scribes and are of no historical value.

3. Complex Character:

To form a correct opinion of anyone is much more difficult than to state the facts of his life; to form an opinion which will be generally accepted is impossible. Of David's character the most opposite estimates have been formed. On one hand he is extolled as a saint, and yet few men have committed worse crimes. The character of David must remain, like that of everyone, an insoluble enigma. A person is to be judged by his motives rather than by his actions, and one's true motives are unknown even to oneself (Jer 17:9). There are several sides of David's nature in regard to which there cannot be two opinions.

4. Physical Courage:

Perhaps the feature of his character which stands out most prominently in his earlier years, at any rate, is his boundless physical courage. He never shirked danger (1Sa 17:28,34 ff) and delighted in hairbreadth escapes in 1Sa 26:6. Like most Semites he was fond of gambling and liked to take risks (18:26; compare 23:9; 30:7), even when modesty would have led him to decline them (17:32; compare Jud 8:20). A native indifference to the shedding of blood grew into a liking for it, giving rise to acts of gross cruelty (1Sa 27:9; 2Sa 8:2; 16:7, etc.). He had need, indeed, to be a brave man, considering the character of the men whom he ruled (1Sa 22:2). Yet he could rule them by gentleness as well as by force (30:23). All classes had unbounded confidence in his personal courage and soldierly qualities (2Sa 18:3), and were themselves driven to restrain his military ardor (2Sa 21:17).

5. Moral Courage:

Whether David possessed moral courage to an equal degree is another matter. Had he done so he would hardly have permitted the execution of seven sons of Saul (2Sa 21:1 ff), and that, too, at the cost of

breaking his plighted word (1Sa 24:21); he would not have stood in awe of the sons of his sister Zeruiah (2Sa 3:39), and would have punished Joab instead of weakly invoking an imprecation on his head (2Sa 3:29), however much he might have felt the loss of his services. But in many matters his natural sense of justice was blunted by the superstitions of the age in which he lived.

6. Prudence:

But David was even more prudent than courageous. He is so described by the person who recommended him (somewhat eulogistically) to Saul (1Sa 16:18). Prudence or wisdom was indeed what his biographer most remarks in him (1Sa 18:5,30), and situated as he was he could not have too much of it. It shows itself in the fact that he consistently made as many friends and as few enemies as was possible. His wonderful foresight is shown in such acts as his conciliating the Judean chiefs with gifts taken from his spoil (1Sa 30:26 ff), in his commendation of the men of Ja-besh-gilead (2Sa 2:5-7), and in his reception of Abner (2Sa 3:20). Yet it must be confessed that this constant looking forward to the future takes away from the spontaneity of his virtue. His gratitude is often a keen sense of favors to come. His kindness to Merib-baal did him no harm and some advantage (2Sa 9; 19:24 ff), and his clemency to Shimei helped to win him the tribe of Benjamin (2Sa 19:16 ff). Even in his earliest youth he seems to have preferred to attain his ends by roundabout ways. The means by which he obtained introduction or reintroduction to Saul (1Sa 17:26 ff) afford some justification for the opinon which his oldest brother held of him (1Sa 17:28). Perhaps nothing proves the genius of David better than his choice of Jebus as the capital of the country—which it still continues to be after a lapse of three thousand years.

7. Strategy:

Yet it must be confessed that David’s prudence often degenerates into cunning. With true oriental subtlety he believed firmly in keeping one’s secret to oneself at all costs (1Sa 21:2). The manner in which he got himself out of Gath after this first visit there (1Sa 21:13) and the fact that he hoodwinked Achish during sixteen months (1Sa 27; 28:1) may excite our admiration but not our respect. The Oriental, however, delights in a display of cunning and makes use of it without shame (2Sa 15:34), just as the European does in secret. There is something curiously modern in the diplomacy which David employed to ensure his own return in due state (2Sa 19:11 ff). We must remember, however, that David lived among persons hardly one of whom he could trust. Joab accuses Abner of deceit, while he himself was faithful to none except David (2Sa 3:25). Ziba accuses Merib-baal of treachery, and Merib-baal accuses Ziba of falsehood, and David cannot tell which is speaking the truth (2Sa 16:1; 19:24 ff). David himself is out-witted by Joab, though with a friendly purpose (2Sa 14:1 ff). The wonder, therefore, is, not that David was guilty of occasional obliquity, but that he remained as straightforward and simple as he was.

8. Nobility:

David was, indeed, a man very much ahead of the times in which he lived. His fine elegies upon the death of Saul and Jonathan, Abner and Absalom show that his nature was untainted with malice. It was

no superstitious fear but a high sense of honor which kept him back from putting out of his way his arch-enemy when he had him in his power (1Sa 24-26). He even attempts to find an excuse for him (1Sa 26:19), while depreciating himself (1Sa 24:14; 26:20) in phrases which are more than a mere oriental metonymy (2Sa 9:8). It was the ambition of his life to be the founder of a permanent dynasty (2Sa 7:29), yet he was willing that his house should be sacrificed to save his nation from destruction (2Sa 24:17). Like most Orientals he was endowed with a refinement of feeling unknown in the West. His refusal to drink of water obtained at the cost of bloodshed has become classic (2Sa 23:17). And he seems to have been gifted with the saving sense of humor (1Sa 26:15). That he was a religious person goes without saying (2Sa 7; 8:11). He probably did not believe that outside the land of Israel Yahweh ceased to rule: the expression used in 1Sa 26:19 is not a term of dogmatic theology. Like other Hebrews David had no theology. He believed in Yahweh alone as the ruler, if not of the universe, at any rate of all the world known to him. He certainly did not believe in Chemosh or Milcom, whether in the lands of Moab and Ammon or out of them (2Sa 12:30; for "their king" read Malcam (Milcom)).

9. David in Relation to His Family:

David discharged, as most Orientals do, his duty toward his parents (1Sa 22:3). To Michal, his first wife, his love was constant (2Sa 3:13), although she did not bear him any children. In accordance with the custom of the times, as his estate improved, he took other wives and slave-girls. The favorite wife of his latter days was Bathsheba. His court made some show of splendor as contrasted with the dwellings of the peasantry and the farmer class (2Sa 19:28,35), but his palace was always small and plain, so that it could be left to the keeping of ten women when he removed from it (2Sa 15:16). David and Michal seem to have lived on terms of perfect equality (2Sa 6:20 ff). In this he contrasts somewhat with Ahab (1Ki 21:5 ff). David’s chief weakness in regard to his family was his indulgence of some of his sons and favoring some above others, and want of firmness in regard to them. He could refuse them nothing (2Sa 13:27). His first favorite was his oldest son Amnon (2Sa 13:21, Septuagint). After the death of Amnon, Absalom became the favorite (2Sa 18:33), and after the death of Absalom, Adonijah (1Ki 1:6). Yet David lived for two whole years in Jerusalem along with Absalom without seeing him (2Sa 14:28), and he was succeeded not by Adonijah, but by Solomon, whose mother was the favorite wife of his later years.

10. David in Relation to His Friends:

Not only did David know the value of having many friends, but he was capable of sincere attachment. There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of his love for Jonathan, although it is not so completely cut off from all suspicion of self-interest as is that of Jonathan for him. David, indeed, had the faculty of winning the confidence and love of all sorts and conditions of people, not only of Jonathan (1Sa 18:1 ff; 20; 23:16 ff), but of Jonathan’s sister Michal (1Sa 18:20), of the whole people (1Sa 18:28 Septuagint; 2Sa 19:14), and even of his people’s enemies (2Sa 17:27 ff). His friendship lasted as long as the object of it lived (2Sa 1:17 ff; 10:1 f). In the case of his officers this was partly due to his faculty for choosing good men (2Sa 8:16 ff), so that the same persons often held the same offices during David’s life (2Sa 20:23 ff). Yet the services of one of them at least were retained more by compulsion than by choice (2Sa 3:39). He seems, indeed, to have continued Joab in his post because he felt he could not do without him.

Joab was devoted to David with the devotion of Caleb Balderstone to his master, and he was as utterly unscrupulous. He did not hesitate to commit any crime that would benefit David. The latter dared not perpetrate these atrocities himself, but he did not mind taking advantage of such a useful instrument, and never punished Joab for them, save with an impotent curse (2Sa 3:29). He dealt otherwise with malefactors who could be better spared (2Sa 1:14 ff; 4:9 ff). Indeed, a suspicious juryman might find that David put both Abner and Amasa, in the way of Joab (2Sa 3:23 ff; 19:13; 4 ff). It does not say much for David that he fell so low as to fear losing the good opinion even of Joab, this ready instrument of his worst crime (2Sa 11:25).

11. His Success:

One reason for the high position David held in the popular estimation was no doubt his almost uninterrupted success. He was regarded as the chosen of Heaven, by friend and foe alike (1Sa 23:17). Fortune seemed to favor him. Nothing could have been more timely than the death of Saul and Jonathan, of Ishbaal and Abner, of Absalom and Amasa, and he did not raise his hand against one of them. As a guerrilla chief with his 600 bandits he could keep at bay. Saul with his 3,000 picked men (1Sa 24:2; 26:2), but he was not a great general. Most of the old judges of Israel did in one pitched battle what David effected in a campaign (1Sa 18:30; 19:8; 23:1 ff; 2Sa 5:17 ff; 21:15 ff). Most of his conquests were won for him by Joab (1Ch 11:6; 2Sa 11:1), who willingly accorded David the credit of what he himself had done (2Sa 12:27,28; compare 2Sa 8:13; 1Ch 18:11 with the title of Ps 60$). And to crown all, when he came to turn his arms east and west, he found his two most formidable opponents in these directions crippled and harmless. That he ever survived Saul he owed to a timely incursion of the Philistines (1Sa 23:24 ff), and his whole career is largely to be explained by the fact that, at the moment, the tribe of Judah as a whole was passing from insignificance to supremacy.

12. His Foreign Friends:

In the prosecution of his military achievements David employed everyone who came to his hand as an instrument without any question of nationality. This is not to impugn his patriotism. Eastern peoples are united not by the ties of country but of religion. Still it does seem strange that two of David’s best friends were two enemies of his nation—Nahash, king of the sons of Ammon (1Sa 11:1; 2Sa 10:1 ff) and Achish, lord of Gath (1Sa 21:10; 27$; 28:1 ff; 29$). He appears to have found the Philistines more reliable and trustworthy than the Hebrews. When he became king, his personal body-guard was composed of mercenaries of that nation—the Cherethites and Pelethites—with whom he had become acquainted when at Ziklag (1Sa 30:14; 2Sa 8:18; 20:23). It was to a native of Gath that he committed the care of the sacred ark on its passage from Kiriath-jearim to Jerusalem (2Sa 6:10,11). When the rebellion broke out under Absalom, he committed one-third of his forces to a banished soldier of the same town, who had come to him a little while before with a band of followers (2Sa 15:19 ff; 18:2). Some of the soldiers in whom he placed the greatest confidence were Hittites (1Sa 26:6; 2Sa 11:6), and his commissariat was furnished by persons outside of Israel (2Sa 17:27; the Machir tribe were half Syrian; Gilead is the son of Machir, 1Ch 7:14). The threshing-floor of a Jebusite became the site of the temple of Solomon (2Sa 24:18 ff).

13. Nemesis:

David was a strong believer in the power of Nemesis, and that daughter of Night played a considerable part in his life. He felt a peculiar satisfaction in being undeservedly cursed by Shimei, from a conviction that poetic justice would in the end prevail (2Sa 16:12). He must have felt that the same unseen power was at work when his own oldest son was guilty of a crime such as his father had committed before him (2Sa 13 and 11), and when the grandfather of the wife of Uriah the Hittite became the enemy whom he had most to fear (2Sa 11:3; 23:34; compare Ps 41:9; 55:12 f). And David's own last hours, instead of being spent in repose and peace following upon a strenuous and successful life, were passed in meting out vengeance to those who had incurred his displeasure as well as commending those who had done him service (1Ki 2:5 ff).

14. References in the New Testament:

Even as early as Ezekiel, David became the ruler who was to govern the restored people of Israel (34:23,14; 37:24). If there were to be a ruling house, it must be the Davidic dynasty; it did not occur to the Jews to think of any other solution (Am 9:11; Ho 3:5; Jer 30:9; Zec 12:8). That Jesus was descended from David (Mt 9:27, etc.) is proved by the fact that his enemies did not deny that he was so (Mt 22:41 ff). In the New Testament, David is regarded as the author of the Psalms (Ac 4:25; Ro 4:6; Heb 4:7). He is also one of the Old Testament saints (Heb 11:32) whose actions (unless otherwise stated) are to be imitated (Mt 12:3); but yet not to be compared with the Messiah (Ac 2:29 ff; 13:36) who has power over the life to come (Re 3:7) and who is "the Root of David" (Re 5:5; 22:16).

LITERATURE.

See the commentaries on the books of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Psalms, and histories of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, especially Wellhausen and Kittel. A sketch of the life and historical position of David from the modern Continental point of view will be found in G. Beer, Saul, David, Salomo, published by Mohr, Tubingen, 1906.

Thomas Hunter Weir

DAVID, CITY OF

See ZION.

DAVID, ROOT OF

root (he rhiza Daueid, Re 5:5; 22:16): Root here means stock, family, descendant, hence, "the Root of David" is that which descended from David, not that from which David descended. Jesus Christ in His human nature and family connections was a descendant of David, a member of his family.

DAVID, TOWER OF

tou’-er. See JERUSALEM.

DAWN; DAWNING

don: The word means the approach of the morning light, the breaking of the day. There are several words in the Bible that indicate this. nesheph, "twilight" of the morning (Job 7:4; Ps 119:147). The same word is used for evening twilight (1Sa 30:17; 2Ki 7:5,7); penoth ha-boqer, "the turning" of the morning, the change from darkness to light, approach of the morning (Jud 19:26); ‘aph‘-appe shachar, "the eyelids" of the morning (Job 3:9; 41:18 (10)); aloth ha-shachar, "the ascent" or "rise" of the morning (Jos 6:15); epi-phosko, "to grow light," the approach of the dawn (Mt 28:1; Lu 23:54 margin); diaugazo, "to grow bright", "lustrous" (2Pe 1:19), "until the day dawn" figurative of the Second Coming of Christ (compare 2Pe 1:16).

H. Porter

DAY

da (yom; hemera): This common word has caused some trouble to plain readers, because they have not noticed that the word is used in several different senses in the English Bible. When the different uses of the word are understood the difficulty of interpretation vanishes. We note several different uses of the word:

(1) It sometimes means the time from daylight till dark. This popular meaning is easily discovered by the context, e. g. Ge 1:5; 8:22, etc. The marked periods of this daytime were morning, noon and night, as with us. See Ps 55:17. The early hours were sometimes called "the cool of the day" (Ge 3:8). After the exile the day. or daytime was divided into twelve hours and the night into twelve (see Mt 20:1-12; Joh 11:9; Ac 23:23); 6 a. m. would correspond to the first hour, 9 a. m. to the third; 12 noon to the sixth, etc. The hours were longer during the longer days and shorter during the shorter days, since they always counted 12 hours between sunrise and sunset.

(2) Day also means a period of 24 hours, or the time from sunset to sunset. In Bible usage the day begins with sunset (see Le 23:32; Ex 12:15-20; 2Co 11:25, where night is put before day). See DAY AND NIGHT.

(3) The word "day" is also used of an indefinite period, e. g "the day" or "day that" means in general "that time" (see Ge 2:4; Le 14:2); "day of trouble" (Ps 20:1); "day of his wrath" (Job 20:28); "day of Yahweh" (Isa 2:12); "day of the Lord" (1Co 5:5; 1Th 5:2; 2Pe 3:10); "day of salvation" (2Co 6:2); ." day of Jesus Christ" (Php 1:6).

(4) It is used figuratively also in Joh 9:4, where "while it is day" means "while I have opportunity to work, as daytime is the time for work." In 1Th 5:5,8, "sons of the day" means spiritually enlightened ones.

(5) We must also bear in mind that with God time is not reckoned as with us (see Ps 90:4; 2Pe 3:8).

(6) The apocalyptic use of the word "day" in Da 12:11; Re 2:10, etc., is difficult to define. It evidently does not mean a natural day. See APOCALYPSE.

(7) On the meaning of "day" in the story of Creation we note (a) the word "day" is used of the whole period of creation (Ge 2:4); (b) these days are days of God, with whom one day is as a thousand years; the whole age or period of salvation is called "the day of salvation"; see above. So we believe that in harmony with Bible usage we may understand the creative days as creative periods. See also ASTRONOMY; CREATION; EVOLUTION.

G. H. Gerberding

Figurative: The word "day" is used figuratively in many senses, some of which are here given.

(1) The span of human life.—Ge 5:4: "And the days of Adam .... were eight hundred years." "And if thou wilt walk .... then I will lengthen thy days" (1Ki 3:14; compare Ps 90:12; Isa 38:5).

(2) An indefinite time.—Existence in general: Ge 3:14: "All the days of thy life" (compare Ge 21:34; Nu 9:19; Jos 22:3; Lu 1:24; Ac 21:10).

(3) A set time.—Ge 25:24: "And when her days .... were fulfilled"; Da 12:13: "Thou shalt stand in thy lot, at the end of the days" (compare Le 12:6; Da 2:44).

(4) A historic period.—Ge 6:4: "The Nephilim were in the earth in those days"; Jud 17:6: "In those days there was no king in Israel" (compare 1Sa 3:1; 1Ch 5:17; Ho 2:13).

(5) Past time.—Ps 18:18: "the day of my calamity"; Ps 77:5: "I have considered the days of old" (of Mic 7:20; Mal 3:7; Mt 23:30).

(6) Future time.—De 31:14: "Thy days approach that thou must die"; Ps 72:7: "In his days shall ...."(compare Eze 22:14; Joe 2:29; Mt 24:19; 2Pe 3:3; Re 9:6).

(7) The eternal.—In Da 7:9,13, where God is called "the ancient of days."

(8) A season of opportunity.—Joh 9:4: "We must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh, when no man can work" (compare Ro 13:12,13; 1Th 5:5-8). See DAY (4), above.

(9) Time of salvation.—Specially referring to the hopes and prospects of the parousia (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). Ro 13:12: "The night is far spent, and the day is at hand."

Henry E. Dosker

DAY AND NIGHT

"Day," yom; ordinarily, the Hebrew "day" lasted from dawn to the coming forth of the starts (Ne 4:21). The context usually makes it clear whether the term "day" refers to the period of twenty-four hours or to daytime; when there was a possibility of confusion, the term laylah, "night," was added (Ge 7:4,12; 31:39). The "day" is reckoned from evening to evening, in accordance with the order noted in the account of Creation, namely, "And there was evening and there was morning, one day" (Ge 1:5); Le 23:32 and Da 8:14 reflect the same mode of reckoning the day. The phrase ‘erebh boker, "evening-morning," used in this last passage, is simply a variation of yom and laylah, "day" and "night"; it is the equivalent of the Greek nuchthemeron (2Co 11:25). That the custom of reckoning the day as beginning in the evening and lasting until the following evening was probably of late origin is shown by the phrase "tarry all night" (Jud 19:6-9); the context shows that the day is regarded as beginning in the morning; in the evening the day "declined," and until the new day (morning) arrived it was necessary to "tarry all night" (compare also Nu 11:32).

The transition of day to night begins before sunset and lasts till after sunset; the change of night to day begins before sunrise and continues until after sunrise. In both cases, neither ‘erebh, "evening," nor boqer, "morning," indicate an exact space of time (compare Ge 8:11; Ex 10:13; De 16:6).

The term nesheph, is used for both evening twilight and morning dawn (compare 1Sa 30:17; 2Ki 7:5,7; Job 7:4). Since there were no definite measurements of the time of day, the various periods were indicated by the natural changes of the day; thus "midday" was the time of the day when the sun mounted its highest (cohorayim); afternoon was that part of the day when the sun declined (neToth ha-yom); and evening was the time of the going down of the sun (‘erebh). "Between the evenings" (ben ha-‘arbayim) was the interval between sunset and darkness. The day was not divided into hours until a late period. [~sha‘ah = Aramaic] (Da 3:6), is common in Syriac and in later Hebrew; it denoted, originally, any short space of time, and only later came to be equivalent to our "hour" (Driver). The threefold division of the day into watches continued into post-exilic Roman times; but the Roman method of four divisions was also known (Mr 13:35), where all four divisions are referred to: "at even" (opse), "midnight" (mesonuktion), "at cock crowing" (alektorophonia), "in the morning" (proi). These last extended from six to six o’clock (of also Mt 14:25; Mr 13:35). Ac 12:4 speaks of four parties of four Roman soldiers (quaternions), each of whom had to keep guard during one watch of the night. In Berakhoth 3b, Rabbi Nathan (2nd century) knows of only three night-watches; but the patriarch, Rabbi Judah, knows four. See also DAY.

Horace J. Wolf

DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH

(he paraskeue, "preparation"): Considered as a day of preparation, in accordance with Ex 16:23, both before the regular Sabbath and before a feast Sabbath (Mt 27:62; Mr 15:42; Lu 23:54; Joh 19:14,31,42). At 3 p. m., the Hebrews began to prepare their food for the next day, and to perform all labors which were forbidden to be done on the Sabbath and yet must be done. They bathed and purified themselves, dressed in festive apparel, set their tables, and lighted their lamps. On the day before Easter, the Hebrews of the later period made it their chief business to remove all leaven from the house (1Co 5:7). This custom of converting at least a portion of the day before the Sabbath into a holy day was recognized by the Romans to such an extent that, according to a rescript of Augustus, Jews need not appear in court after 3 p. m. on such days. Criminal cases were not brought before court on this day, and journeys exceeding 12 Roman miles were prohibited. The signal for the preparations was given by the priests by means of trumpets blown six times at intervals.

Frank E. Hirsch

DAY OF ATONEMENT

See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

DAY OF CHRIST

See DAY OF THE LORD.

DAY OF JUDGMENT

See JUDGMENT, LAST.

DAY OF THE LORD (YAHWEH) (yom Yahweh; he hemera tou Kuriou): The idea is a common Old Testament one. It denotes the consummation of the kingdom of God and the absolute cessation of all attacks upon it (Isa 2:12; 13:6,9; 34:8; Eze 13:5; 30:3; Joe 1:15; 2:11; Am 5:18; Ze 1:14; Zec 14:1) It is a "day of visitation" (Isa 10:3), a day "of the wrath of Yahweh" (Eze 7:19), a "great day of Yahweh" (Ze 1:14). The entire conception in the Old Testament is dark and foreboding.

On the other hand the New Testament idea is pervaded with the elements of hope and joy and victory. In the New Testament it is eminently the day of Christ, the day of His coming in the glory of His father. The very conception of Him as the "Son of Man" points to this day (E. Kuehl, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 68). Joh 5:27: "And he gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is a son of man" (compare Mt 24:27,30; Lu 12:8). It is true in the New Testament there is a dark background to the bright picture, for it still remains a "day of wrath". (Ro 2:5,6), a "great day" (Re 6:17; Jude 1:6), a "day

of God" (2Pe 3:12), a "day of judgment" (Mt 10:15; 2Pe 3:7; Ro 2:16).

Sometimes it is called "that day" (Mt 7:22; 1Th 5:4; 2Ti 4:8), and again it is called "the day" without any qualification whatever, as if it were the only day worth counting in all the history of the world and of the race (1Co 3:13). To the unbeliever, the New Testament depicts it as a day of terror; to the believer, as a day of joy. For on that day Christ will raise the dead, especially His own dead, the bodies of those that believed in Him—"that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day" (Joh 6:39). In that day He comes to His own (Mt 16:27), and therefore it is called "the day of our Lord Jesus" (2Co 1:14),"the day of Jesus Christ" or "of Christ" (Php 1:6,10), the day when there "shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven" (Mt 24:30). All Paulinic literature is especially suffused with this longing for the "parousia," the day of Christ's glorious manifestation. The entire conception of that day centers therefore in Christ and points to the everlasting establishment of the kingdom of heaven, from which sin will be forever eliminated, and in which the antithesis between Nature and grace will be changed into an everlasting synthesis. See also ESCHATOLOGY (OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT).

Henry E. Dosker

DAY OF YAHWEH

See DAY OF THE LORD.

DAY'S JOURNEY

jur'-ni (derekh yom, Ge 30:36; Nu 10:33; 11:31; hemeras hodos, Lu 2:44): The common way of estimating distances in the East is by hours and days. This is natural in a country where roads are mere bridle paths or non-existent, as in the desert. The distance traveled must of course differ largely according to the difficulties of the way, and it is more important to know where night will overtake the traveler than the actual distance accomplished. A day's journey is now commonly reckoned at about 3 miles per hour, the distance usually covered by a loaded mule, the number of hours being about 8. Hence, a day's journey is about 24 miles, and this may be taken as a fair estimate for Bible times.

H. Porter

DAY, BREAK OF

See BREAK OF DAY.

DAY, JOSHUA'S LONG_

See BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF.

DAY, LAST

(he eschate hemera): Repeatedly used by Jesus in Joh 6:39,40,44,54; 11:24; 12:48, for the day of resurrection and judgment (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). Compare the usage in the Old Testament (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1) and the New Testament (Ac 2:17; 2Ti 3:1; 2Pe 3:3; 1 Joh 2:18; Jude 1:18) of "last days" and "last time" to denote the Messianic age.

See LATTER DAYS; LAST DAYS; LAST TIME.

In Joh 7:37, "the last day, the great day of the feast" refers to the eighth day of the feast of Tabernacles. This closing day was observed as a Sabbath (Le 23:36). On it the libation of water made on other days was not made; hence, the allusion of Jesus to Himself as the Giver of the living water.

James Orr

DAY, LORD'S

See LORD'S DAY.

DAY, THAT (THE)

See DAY OF THE LORD.

DAY-STAR

(helel ben-shachar, Isa 14:12; phosphoros, 2Pe 1:19): The Old Testament passage is rendered in the King James Version "Lucifer, son of the morning," in the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) "day-star," i.e. the morning star. The reference is to the king of Babylon (Isa 14:4). In 2Pe 1:19, "Until .... the daystar arise in your hearts," the word is literally, "light-bringer." It is applicable, therefore, not only to the planet Venus, seen as a morning star, herald of the dawn, but to the sun itself, and is used here as a title of our Lord. See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 6.

DAYS, LAST

See LAST DAYS.

DAYSMAN

daz'-man (yakhach, "to argue, decide, convince," the Revised Version (British and American) UMPIRE): The use of this word appears to have been more common in the 16th century than at the later

date of the translation of the King James Version, when its adoption was infrequent. The oldest instance of the term given in the Oxford English Dictionary is Plumpton Corresp. (1489), p. 82: "Sir, the dayesmen cannot agre us." It appears also in the 1551 edition of the Old Testament in 1Sa 2:25, where the English Versions of the Bible "judge" is translated "dayes-man." Tyndale's translation has for Ex 21:22, "He shall paye as the dayesmen appoynte him" (EV as the "judges determine"). See also Edmund Spenser's Faerie Queene, ii, c. 8, published in 1590. As used in the King James Version (Job 9:33) the word means an arbitrator, umpire, referee; one who stands in a judicial capacity between two parties, and decides upon the merits of their arguments or case at law. "Neither is there-any daysman (the Revised Version (British and American) "umpire") betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both" (compare Ge 31:37). It was the eastern custom for a judge to lay his hands upon the heads of the two parties in disagreement, thus emphasizing his adjudicatory capacity and his desire to render an unbiased verdict. Job might consider a human judge as capable of acting as an umpire upon his own claims, but no man was worthy to question the purposes of Yahweh, or metaphorically, to "lay his hands upon" Him.

In the New Testament (1Co 4:3, anthropine, hemera) "man's judgment" is literally, "man's day," in the sense of a day fixed for the trial of a case. Both Tyndale and Coverdale so translate. See also 1Ti 2:5, where the Saviour is termed the "one mediator .... between God and men." Here the word understands a pleader, an advocate before an umpire, rather than the adjudicator himself (see Job 19:25-27).

Arthur Walwyn Evans

DAYSPRING

da'-spring: This beautiful English word, in current use in the time of the King James Version, is found in the Old Testament as the translation of shachar, "Hast thou .... caused the dayspring to know his place?" (Job 38:12 the King James Version). This is no doubt intended literally for the dawn. The "place" of the dayspring is the particular point of the horizon at which the sun comes up on any given day. This slowly changes day by day through the year, moving northward from midwinter till midsummer, and back again southward from midsummer to midwinter. See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 2. Also once in the New Testament for anatole, "a rising." "The dayspring from on high hath visited us" (the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American)) "shall visit us," Lu 1:78). Also in Apocrypha, "At the dayspring pray unto thee" (AV; the Revised Version (British and American) "plead with thee at the dawning of the light," The Wisdom of Solomon 16:28). Both the Hebrew and Greek words, however, are of frequent occurrence, but variously rendered "dawn," "break of day," "morning," "sunrise," "east." Note especially "the spring of the day" (1Sa 9:26), "the day began to spring" (Jud 19:25). Used with heliou, "sun," for rising of the sun (Re 7:2; 16:12). In the Septuagint the same Greek word is used for Hebrew tsemach, "branch," to designate the Messiah (Jer 23:5; Zec 6:12. But this sense of the word is wholly unknown in profane Greek The word is also employed in Septuagint to express the rising of a heavenly body, as the moon (Isa 60:19). This is good Greek See the kindred verb anatello, "to rise" (the Septuagint, Isa 60:1; Mal 4:2).

What is the meaning of anatole in Lu 1:78? Certainly not branch; that does not fit any of the facts, unless it be rendered "branch of light" (see Reynolds, John the Baptist, 115).

It occurs in Zacharias' hymn over the birth of his son. The ode consists of two parts, "The glory and security of the Messiah's kingdom," and "The glory of the Forerunner." The expression before us is in the latter part. It naturally refers, therefore, not to the Messiah himself, but to John. He is the dayspring from on high who hath visited the people who sat in darkness and the shadow of death. With Godet we believe that the picture is borrowed from the caravan which has missed its way in the desert. The unfortunate pilgrims, overtaken by the night, are sitting down expecting death, when suddenly a star brightly beams above them. They take courage at the sight. The whole caravan leaps to its feet. It is the herald of the coming day and soon they see the great orb himself filling the east with orient pearl and gold. Is not one tempted to go a little farther and see here the morning star, herald of the coming sun to be obliterated by his rising? 'He must wax, but I must wane' (Joh 3:30). What was John's work but, by his own testimony, to guide the benighted pilgrims into the way of peace, that is, to Him who was the Prince of Peace? If, however, as by most commentators, it be taken to refer to the Messiah, it probably implies prophetic knowledge that the conception of Jesus had already taken place, and that the Messianic era was at hand, when the Jewish world should be filled with spiritual splendor. See DAY-STAR.

G. H. Trever

DEACON; DEACONESS

de'-k'-n, de'-k'-n-es: The term diakonos, and its cognates occur many times in the New Testament, as do its synonyms huperetes, and doulos, with their respective cognates. It may be said in general that the terms denote the service or ministration of the bondservant (doulos), underling (huperetes) or helper (diakonos), in all shades and gradations of meaning both literal and metaphorical. It would serve no useful purpose to list and discuss all the passages in detail. Christianity has from the beginning stood for filial service to God and His kingdom and for brotherly helpfulness to man, and hence, terms expressive of these functions abound in the New Testament. It behooves us to inquire whether and where they occur in a technical sense sufficiently defined to denote the institution of a special ecclesiastical office, from which the historical diaconate may confidently be said to be derived.

Many have sought the origin of the diaconate in the institution of the Seven at Jerusalem (Ac 6), and this view was countenanced by many of the church Fathers.

The Seven were appointed to "serve tables" (diakonein trapezais), in order to permit the Twelve to "continue stedfastly in prayer, and in the ministry (diakonia) of the word." They are not called deacons (diakonoi), and the qualifications required are not the same as those prescribed by Paul in 1Ti 3:8-12; furthermore, Stephen appears in Ac preeminently as a preacher, and Philip as an evangelist. Paul clearly recognizes women as deaconesses, but will not permit a woman to teach (1Ti 2:12). The obvious conclusion is that the Seven may be called the first deacons only in the sense that they were the earliest

recorded helpers of the Twelve as directors of the church, and that they served in the capacity, among others, of specially appointed ministrants to the poor.

Paul says, "I commend unto you Phoebe our sister, who is a servant (the Revised Version, margin "or, deaconess") of the church that is at Cenchrea" (Ro 16:1). This is by many taken as referring to an officially appointed deaconess; but the fact that there is in the earlier group of Paul's epistles no clear evidence of the institution of the diaconate, makes against this interpretation. Phoebe was clearly an honored helper in the church closely associated with that at Corinth, where likewise evidence of special ecclesiastical organization is wanting.

In Php 1:1 Paul and Timothy send greetings "to all the saints .... at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Here then we find mention of "deacons" in a way to suggest a formal diaconate; but the want of definition as to their qualifications and duties renders it impossible to affirm with certainty the existence of the office.

In 1Ti 3:8-12, after prescribing the qualifications and the method of appointment of a bishop or overseer, Paul continues: "Deacons in like manner must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them serve as deacons, if they be blameless. Women in like manner must be grave, not slanderers, temperate, faithful in all things. Let deacons be husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Deacons and deaconesses are here provided for, and the character of their qualifications makes it clear that they were to be appointed as dispensers of alms, who should come into close personal relations with the poor.

We conclude, therefore, that the Seven and Phoebe did not exercise the diaconate in a technical sense, which appears first certainly in 1Ti 3, although it is not improbably recognized in Php 1:1, and was foreshadowed in the various agencies for the dispensing of alms and the care of the poor of the church instituted in various churches at an earlier date.

See also BISHOP; CHURCH; CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

William Arthur Heidel

DEAD

ded (muth; nekros): Used in several senses:

(1) as a substantive, denoting the body deprived of life, as when Abraham speaks of burying his dead (Ge 23);

(2) as a collective noun including all those that have passed away from life (as Re 20:12). In several passages dead in this sense is used in contrast to the quick or living (as Nu 16:48). This collective mode

of expression is used when resurrection is described as "rising from the dead";

(3) as an adjective, coupled with body, carcass or man, as De 14:8 the King James Version;

(4) most frequently it is used as a complement of the verb "to be," referring to the condition of being deceased or the period of death, e. g. 2Sa 12:19; Mr 5:35;

(5) in the sense of being liable to death it occurs in Ge 20:3; Ex 12:33; 2Sa 16:9;

(6) as an intensive adjective it is used in the phrase "dead sleep," to mean profound sleep simulating death (Ps 76:6);

(7) figuratively "dead" is used to express the spiritual condition of those who are unable to attain to the life of faith. They are dead in trespasses, as in Eph 2:1, or conversely, those who by the New Birth are delivered from sin, are said to be dead to the Law (as Col 2:20, etc.). A faith which does not show its life in the practical virtues of Christianity is called dead (Jas 2:17);

(8) in Ro 4:19; Heb 11:12, "dead" signifies the senile condition of loss of vigor and virility.

The passage in Job 26:5, wherein in the King James Version "dead things" seem to mean things that never had life, is more accurately translated in the Revised Version (British and American) as "they that are deceased," i.e. the shades of the dead.

There are few references to the physical accompaniments of the act of dying. Deborah has a poetical account of the death of Sisera (Jud 5:24 ff), and in Ec 12, where the failure of the bodily faculties in old age culminates in death, it is pictorially compared to the breaking of a lamp extinguishing the flame ("golden" being probably used of "oil," as it is in Zec 4:12), and the loosing of the silver chebhel or chain by which the lamp is suspended in the tent of the Arabic.

The dead body defiled those who touched it (Le 11:31) and therefore sepulture took place speedily, as in the case of Lazarus (Joh 11:17-39) and Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5:6-10). This practice is still followed by the fellahin.

The uselessness of the dead is the subject of proverb (Ec 9:4) and the phrase "dead dog" is used as a contemptuous epithet as of a person utterly worthless (1Sa 24:14; 2Sa 9:8; 16:9).

Alex. Macalister

DEAD BODY

See CORPSE.

DEAD SEA, THE

I. PRESENT AREA

II. FORMER ENLARGEMENT

III. LEVEL OF THE DEAD SEA IN EARLY HISTORIC TIMES

IV. CONSTITUTION OF THE WATER

V. CLIMATE

VI. ROADS

VII. MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

1. The Plain of the Jordan

2. Ain Jidi (En-gedi)

3. The Fortress of Masada

4. Jebel Usdum (Mount of Sodom)

5. Vale of Siddim

6. El-Lisan

VIII. HISTORY

LITERATURE

The name given by Greek and Latin writers to the remarkable inland lake occupying the deepest part of the depression of the ARABAH (which see). In the Bible it is called the Salt Sea (Ge 14:3; De 3:17); the Sea of the Plain (‘Ardbhah). (Jos 3:16); and the (East) Eastern Sea (Eze 47:18; Joe 2:20). Among the Arabs it is still called Bahr Lut (Sea of Lot). By the time of Josephus it was called Lake Asphaltires (Ant., I, ix) from the quantities of bitumen or asphalt occasionally washed upon its shores and found in some of the tributary wadies.

I. Present Area.

The length of the lake from North to South is 47 miles; its greatest width is 10 miles narrowing down to less than 2 miles opposite Point Molyneux on el-Lisan. Its area is approximately 300 square miles. From various levelings its surface is found to be 1,292 ft. below that of the Mediterranean, while its greatest depth, near the eastern shore 10 miles South of the mouth of the Jordan is 1,278 ft. But the level varies from 10 to 15 ft. semiannually, and more at longer intervals; and we are not sure from which one of these levels the above figures have been derived. Throughout the northern half of the lake on the East side the descent to the extreme depth is very rapid; while from the western side the depth increases more gradually, especially at the extreme northern end, where the lake has been filled in by the delta of the Jordan.

About two-thirds of the distance to the southern end, the peninsula, el-Lisan ("the Tongue"), projects from the East more than half-way across the lake, being in the shape, however, of a boot rather than a tongue, with the toe to the North, forming a bay between it and the eastern mainland. The head of this bay has been largely filled in by the debris brought down by Wady Kerak, and Wady Ben Hamid, and shoals very gradually down to the greatest depths to the North. The toe of this peninsula is named Point Costigan, and the heel, Point Molyneux, after two travelers who lost their lives about the middle of the 19th century in pioneer attempts to explore the lake. Over the entire area South of Point Molyneux, the water is shallow, being nowhere more than 15 ft. deep, and for the most part not over 10 ft., and in some places less than 6 ft. In high water, the lake extends a mile or more beyond low-water mark, over the Mud Flat (Sebkah) at the south end.

From the history of the crossing of the Jordan by Joshua and the expedition of Chedorlaomer when Lot was captured, it is evident that the outlines of the sea were essentially the same 3,500 years ago as they are now, showing that there has been no radical change in climatic conditions since then.

II. Former Enlargement.

But if we go back a few thousand years into prehistoric times the evidence is abundant that the valley has witnessed remarkable climatic changes (see ARABAH). At Ain Abu Werideh, about 40 miles beyond the south end of the lake, Hull in 1883 discovered deposits of an abandoned shore line 1,400 ft. above its level (see ARABAH). A pronounced abandoned shore line at the 650 ft. level had been observed first by Tristram, and noted afterward by many travelers. But from the more detailed examination made by Professor Ellsworth Huntington in 1909 (see Palestine and Its Transformation) five abandoned shore lines of marked size have been determined, surrounding the valley at the following approximate heights above the present level of the lake: 1,430, 640, 430, 300 and 250 ft. He writes that "at its greatest extent the sea stretched at least 30 miles south of its present termination, while northward it probably covered the Sea of Galilee and the Waters of Merom, and sent an arm into the Vale of Jezreel. .... Lacustrine deposits exist in the Jordan valley shortly south of the Sea of Galilee. A mile north of Jisr el-Mujamiyeh, as the modern railroad bridge is called, a tilted series of clays, apparently lacustrine, lies under some untilted whitish clays, also apparently lacustrine. The elevation here is about

840 ft. below that of the Mediterranean Sea, or 450 above the Dead Sea. .... So far as can be detected by the aneroid the highest deposits (about the Dead Sea) lie at the same elevation on all sides of the lake."

There are also numerous minor strands below the 250 ft. major strand. These are estimated by Huntington as 210, 170, 145, 115, 90, 70, 56, 40, 30 and 12 ft. above the lake successively, It is noted, also, that the lower beaches all show less erosion than those above them. This certainly points to a gradual diminution of the water in the basin during the prehistoric period, while on the other hand there is much evidence that there has been a considerable rise in the water within the historic period. Date palms and tamarisks are seen standing out from the water in numerous places some little distance from the present shore where the water is several feet deep. These are of such size as to show that for many years the soil in which they grew was not subject to overflow. As long ago as 1876 Merrill noticed such trees standing in the water 40 ft. from the shore, near the Northeast corner of the lake (East, of the Jordan, 224). Numerous trunks of date palms and tamarisks can now be seen submerged to a similar extent along the western shore. In 1818 Irby and Mangles (Travels, 454) saw a company of Arabs ford the lake from Point Molyneux to the west side, and noted that the line of the ford was marked by branches of trees which had been stuck into the bottom. In 1838 Robinson found the water at such a stage that the ford was impracticable and so it has been reported by all travelers since that time. But Mr. A. Forder, having recently examined the evidence for the Palestine Exploration Fund, learns from the older Arabs that formerly there was a well-known causeway leading from el-Lisan opposite Wady Kerak to Wady Umm Baghek, across which sheep, goats and men could pass, while camels and mules could be driven across anywhere in the water. Moreover the Arab guide said that the channel "was so narrow that the people of his tribe used to sit on the edge of the Lisan and parley with Arabs from the west as to the return of cattle that had been stolen by one or other of the parties." (See PEFS (April, 1910), 112.)

III. Level of, in Early Historic Times.

Numerous general considerations indicate that in the early historic period the level of the water was so much lower than now that much of the bay South of Point Molyneux was dry land. In Jos 15:2,5 f the south border of Judah is said to extend from "the bay (tongue, Lisan) that looketh southward"; while the "border of the north quarter was from the bay (tongue, Lisan) of the sea at the end of the Jordan; and the border went up to Beth-hoglah, and passed along by the north of Beth-arabah." If the limits of the north end of the Dead Sea were the same then as now the boundary must have turned down to the mouth of the Jordan by a sharp angle. But according to the description it runs almost exactly East and West from beyond Jerusalem to Beth-hoglah, and nothing is said about any change in direction, while elsewhere, any such abrupt change in direction as is here supposed is carefully noted. Furthermore, in detailing the boundary of Benjamin (Jos 18:19) we are told that "the border passed along to the side of Beth-hoglah northward; and the goings out of the border were at the north bay (tongue, Lisan) of the Salt Sea, at the south end of the Jordan: this was the south border." This can hardly have any other meaning than that the north end of the Dead Sea was at Beth-hoglah. From these data Mr. Clermont-Ganneau (see Recueil d’archeologie orientale, V (1902), 267-80) inferred that in the time of Joshua the level of the sea was so much higher than now that a tongue-like extension reached the vicinity of Beth- hoglah, while the underlying topography was essentially the same as now. On the contrary, our present knowledge of the geologic forces in operation would indicate that at that time the Dead Sea was considerably lower than

now, and that its rise to its present level has been partly caused by the silting up of a bay which formerly extended to Beth-hoglah.

The geological evidence concerning this point is so interesting, and of so much importance in its bearing upon our interpretation of various historical statements concerning the region, that it is worth while to present it somewhat in detail. As already stated (see ARABAH), the present level of the Dead Sea is determined by the equilibrium established between the evaporation (estimated at 20,000,000 cubic ft. per diem) over the area and the amount of water brought into the valley by the tributary streams. The present area of the sea is, in round numbers, 300 square miles. The historical evidence shows that this evaporating surface has not varied appreciably since the time of Abraham. But the encroachments of the delta of the Jordan upon this area, as well as of the deltas of several other streams, must have been very great since that period. The effect of this would be to limit the evaporating surface, which would cause the water to rise until it overflowed enough of the low land at the south end to restore the equilibrium.

It is easy to make an approximate calculation of the extent to which these encroachments have tended to narrow the limits of the original lake. The sediment deposited by the Jordan, at the north end of the Dead Sea, is practically all derived from the portion of the drainage basin between it and the Sea of Galilee—the latter serving as a catch-basin to retain the sediment brought down from the upper part of the valley. The Zor, or narrow channel which the Jordan has eroded in the sedimentary plain through which it flows (see JORDAN, VALLEY OF), is approximately half a mile wide, 100 feet deep, and 60 miles long. All the sediment which formerly filled this has been swept into the head of the sea, while the Jarmuk, the Jabbok, and a score of smaller tributaries descending rapidly from the bordering heights of Gilead, three or four thousand ft. above the valley, bring an abnormal amount of debris into the river, as do a large number of shorter tributaries which descend an equal amount from the mountains of Galilee, Samaria, and Judah. The entire area thus contributing to this part of the Jordan is not less than 3,000 square miles.

All writers are impressed by the evidence of the torrential floods which fill these water courses after severe storms. The descent being so rapid, permits the water after each rainfall to run off without delay, and so intensifies its eroding power. The well-known figure of our Lord (Mt 7:26 ff) in describing the destruction of the house which is built upon the sand, when the rains descend and the winds beat upon it, is drawn from Nature. The delta terraces at the mouths of such mountain streams where they debouch on the lowlands are formed and re-formed with extreme rapidity, each succeeding storm tending to wash the previous delta down to lower levels and carry away whatever was built upon it.

The storms which descend upon the plains of Gilead, as well as those upon the Judean hills, are exceedingly destructive. For though the rainfall at Jerusalem, according to the observations of Chaplin (see J. Glaisher, "On the Fall of Rain at Jerusalem," PEFS (January, 1894), 39) averages but 20 inches annually, ranging from 32,21 inches in 1878 to 13,19 inches in 1870, nearly all occurs in the three winter months, and therefore in quantities to be most effective in erosive capacity. And this is effective upon both sides of the Jordan valley, in which the rainfall is very slight. "Day after day," Tristram remarks, "we have seen the clouds, after pouring their fatness on Samaria and Judea, pass over the valley, and then descend in torrents on the hills of Gilead and Moab," a phenomenon naturally resulting from the rising column of heated air coming up from the torrid conditions of the depressed Jordan

valley.

Tristram (The Land of Moab, 23, 24) gives a vivid description of the effect of a storm near Jerusalem. As his party was encamped during the night the whole slope upon which they pitched became a shallow stream, while "the deep ravines of the wilderness of Judah (were) covered with torrents, and tiny cascades rolling down from every rock. .... So easily disintegrated is the soft limestone of these wadies, that the rain of a few hours .... did more to deepen and widen the channels than the storms of several years could effect on a Northumbrian hillside. No geologist could watch the effect of this storm without being convinced that in calculating the progress of denudation, other factors than that of time must be taken into account, and that denudation may proceed most rapidly where rains are most uncertain." Lieutenant Lynch writes that while ascending the Kerak "there came a shout of thunder from the dense cloud which had gathered at the summit of the gorge, followed by a rain, compared to which the gentle showers of our more favored clime are as dew drops to the overflowing cistern. .... The black and threatening cloud soon enveloped the mountain tops, the lightning playing across it in incessant flashes, while the loud thunder reverberated from side to side of the appalling chasm. Between the peals we soon heard a roaring and continuous sound. It was the torrent from the rain cloud, sweeping in a long line of foam down the steep declivity, bearing along huge fragments of rocks, which, striking against each other, sounded like mimic thunder."

I can bear similar testimony from observations when traveling in Turkestan where the annual rainfall is only about 4 inches. At one time a storm was seen raging upon the mountains 20 miles away, where it spent its entire force without shedding a drop upon the plain. Upon skirting the base of the mountain the next day, however, the railroad track was covered for a long distance 2 or 3 ft. deep with debris which had been washed down by the cloudburst. No one can have any proper comprehension of the erosive power of the showers of Palestine without duly taking into account the extent and the steepness of the descent from the highlands on either side, and the irregularity of the rainfall. These form what in the Rocky Mountains would be called arroyos. After the debris has been brought into the Jordan by these torrents, and the rise of water makes it "overflow all its banks," the sediment is then swept on to the Dead Sea with great rapidity.

All these considerations indicate that the deltas of the streams coming into the valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea must be increasing at an unusually rapid rate. It will be profitable, therefore, to compare it with other deltas upon which direct observations have been made. The Mississippi River is sweeping into the Gulf of Mexico sediment at a rate which represents one foot of surface soil over the whole drainage basin, extending from the Rocky Mountains to the Alleghenies, in a little less than 5,000 years. The Hoang-Ho is lowering its drainage basin a foot in 1,464 years, while the river Po is reducing its level a foot in 729 years. So rapidly has the river Po filled up its valley that the city of Adria, which was a seaport 2,000 years ago, is now 14 miles from the mouth of the river. The Tigris and Euphrates rivers have silted up the head of the Persian Gulf nearly 100 miles. (See Croll, Climate and Time, 332, 333; Darwin, Formation of Vegetable Mould through the Action of Worms, 233.) From these considerations it is a conservative estimate that the tributaries of the Jordan valley between the Lake of Galilee and the Dead Sea bring down sediment enough to lower the basin one foot in 2,000 years, so that since the time of Abraham 167,270,400,000 cubic feet of solid matter have been added to its delta. This would cover

25 square miles 250 ft. deep. Taking into consideration the probable depth of water at the north end of the sea, it is, therefore, not an extravagant supposition that the Jordan delta has encroached upon the sea to the extent of 15 or 20 square miles, limiting the evaporating surface to that extent and causing the level of the water to rise, and extend an equal amount over the low lands at the south end.

At the same time the other streams coming directly into the lake have been contributing deltas to narrow its margin at various points. The Kerak, the Amen and the Zerka Ma'ain bring in an immense amount of sediment from the East; el-Hessi, el-Jeib and el-Fikri from the South; and Wady el. Muhauwdt, el-Areyeh and the Kedron, with numerous smaller intermediate streams, from the West. A detailed examination of these deposits will serve the double purpose of establishing the point in question and of giving a vivid conception of the sea and its surroundings.

Throughout the lower part of its course the river Jordan flows as has been already said, through a narrow gorge called the Zor, which the river has eroded in the soft sedimentary deposits which cover the bottom of the valley (or Ghor) from side to side. Opposite Jericho the Ghor is about 15 miles wide. The Zor, however, does not average more than one-half mile in width and is about 100 ft. lower than the general level of the Ghor, But at "the Jews' Castle." about 8 miles from the mouth of the Jordan, the Zor begins to enlarge and merge into a true delta. The embankment of the Zor slopes away in a Southwest direction till it reaches the Judean mountains at Khurbet Kumran. 10 miles distant, leaving a triangle of low land between it and the Dead Sea averaging fully one mile in width and being nearly 3 miles wide opposite the mouth of the Jordan. The face of the embankment separating the Zor from the Ghor has in several places been deeply cut into by the small wadies which come down from the western mountains, and the wash from these wadies as well as that from more temporary streams after every shower has-considerably raised the western border of the Zor throughout this distance. But it can safely be estimated that the original boundary of the Dead Sea has here been encroached upon to the extent of 10 or 15 square miles. Again, upon the eastern side of the Jordan the other limb of the delta, though smaller, is equally in evidence. Merrill (East of the Jordan, 223, 224), in describing his survey of the region, says he was compelled to walk for some hours along the shore and then north to reach his horses, which evidently had been coming over the harder and more elevated surface of the Ghor. "The plain." he says, "for many square miles north of the sea is like ashes in which we often. sank over shoe."

Returning to the Northwest corner of the lake we find the delta deposit which we left at Khurbet Kumran extending 2 miles farther south with an average width of one-half mile to Ras Feshkah, which rises abruptly from the water's edge, and renders it impossible for travelers to follow along the shore. But just beyond Ras Feshkah a delta half a mile or more in length and width is projected into the sea at the mouth of Wady en Nar, which comes down from Jerusalem and is known in its upper portions as Kedron. This is the wady which passes the convent of Mar Saba and is referred to in such a striking manner in Eze 47. Like most of the other wadies coming into the Dead Sea, this courses the most of its way through inaccessible defiles and has built up a delta at its mouth covered with "fragments of rock or boulders swept along by the torrent in its periodical overflows" (De Saulcy, I, 137, 138).

From Ras Feshkah to Ras Mersid, a distance of 15 miles, the shore is bordered with a deposit of sand and gravel averaging a half a mile in width, while opposite Wady edition Derajeh and Wady Husasa

(which descend from Bethlehem and the wilderness of Tekoah) the width is, fully one mile. At the mouth of one of the smaller gorges De Saulcy noted what geologists call a "cone of dejection" where "the gravel washed down from the heights was heaped up to the extent of nearly 250 yards" (I, 44).

Ras Mersid, again, obstructs the passage along the shore almost as effectually as did Ras Feshkah, but farther south there is no other obstruction. The plain of En-gedi, connected in such an interesting manner with the history of David and with numerous other events of national importance, is described by the Palestine Exploration Fund as "about half a mile broad and a mile in length." This consists of material brought down for the most part by Wady el-'Areijeh, which descends from the vicinity of Hebron with one branch passing through Tekoah. The principal path leading from the west side of the Dead Sea to the hills of Judea follows the direction of this wady.

Between En-gedi and Sebbeh (Masada), a distance of 10 miles, the limestone cliffs retreat till they are fully 2 miles from the shore. Across this space numerous wadies course their way bringing down an immense amount of debris and depositing it as deltas at the water's edge. These projecting deltas were noticed by Robinson as he looked southward from the height above En-gedi, but their significance was not understood.

"One feature of the sea," he says, "struck us immediately, which was unexpected to us, namely, the number of shoal-like points and peninsulas which run into its southern part, appearing at first sight like flat sand-banks or islands. Below us on the South were two such projecting banks on the western shore, composed probably of pebbles and gravel, extending out into the sea for a considerable distance. The larger and more important of these is on the South of the spot called Birket el-Khulil, a little bay or indentation in the western precipice, where the water, flowing into shallow basins when it is high, evaporates, and deposits salt. This spot is just South of the mouth of Wady el-Khubarah" (BR, I, 501). One of these deltas is described by De Saulcy as 500 yds. in breadth and another as indefinitely larger.

Six miles South of Masada, probably at the mouth of Wady Umm Baghek, Lynch notes a delta extending "half a mile out into the sea." Still farther South the combined delta of the Wady Zuweirah and Wady Muhauwat covers an area of 2 or 3 square miles, and is dotted with boulders and fragments of rock a foot or more in diameter, which have been washed over the area by the torrential floods. Beyond Jebel Usdum, Wady el-Fikreh, draining an area of 200 or 300 square miles, has deposited an immense amount of coarse sediment on the West side of the Sebkah (a mud flat which was formerly occupied, probably by a projection of the Dead Sea). Into the South end of the depression, extending from the Sebkah to the Ascent of Akrabbim, deltas of Wady el-Jeib, Wady el-Khanzireh and Wady Tufileh have in connection with Wady Fikreh encroached upon the valley to the extent of 12 or 15 square miles. Although these wadies drain an area of more than 3,000 sq. miles, and the granitic formations over which they pass have been so disintegrated by atmospheric influences that an excessive amount of coarse sediment is carried along by them (see Hull, Mount Seir, etc., 104-106). In ascending them, one encounters every indication of occasional destructive floods.

Following up the eastern shore, Wady el-Hessi coming down from the mountains of Edom has built up

the plain of Safieh which pushes out into the neck of the Sebkah and covers an area of 3 or 4 square miles. Farther North, Wady Kerak and Wady Beni Hamid have with their deltas encroached to the extent of 2 or 3 square miles upon the head of the bay, projecting into the Lisan east of Point Costigan. Still farther North, Wady Mojib (the Arnon) and Wady Zerka Ma'ain (coming down from the hot springs of Callirrhoe) have built up less pronounced deltas because of the greater depth of the water on the East side, but even so they are by no means inconsiderable, in each case projecting a half-mile or more into the lake. Putting all these items together, there can be little doubt that the area of the Dead Sea has been encroached upon to the extent of 25 or 30 square miles since the time of Abraham and that this has resulted in a rise of the general level of the water sufficient to overflow a considerable portion of the lagoon at the South end, thus keeping the evaporating area constant. The only escape from this conclusion is the supposition that the rainfall of the region is less than it was at the dawn of history, and so the smaller evaporating area would be sufficient to maintain the former level. But of this we have no adequate evidence. On the contrary there is abundant evidence that the climatic conditions connected with the production of the Glacial Period had passed away long before the conquest of the Vale of Siddim by Amraphel and his confederates (Ge 14). The consequences of this rise of water are various and significant. It lends credibility to the persistent tradition that the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah are covered by the shallow water at the South end of the sea, and also to the statement of Scripture that the region about these cities (on the supposition that they were at the South end of the sea) was like the garden of the Lord; for that plain was then much larger than it is now, and was well watered, and possessed greater elements of fertility than are now apparent. Furthermore, this supposed lower level of the lake in early times may have greatly facilitated the passage of armies and caravans from one end to the other, thus rendering it more easy to understand the historical statements relating to the earliest periods of occupation. Even now the road at the base of Jebel Usdum which is open at low water is impassable at high water. On the last of December, 1883, Professor Hull (Mount Seir, etc., 133) traversed the shore at the base of the salt cliffs along a gravel terrace 100 ft. wide, which "abruptly terminated in a descent of about 5 ft. to the line of driftwood which marked the upper limit of the waters." On the 1st of January, 1901, the water along the base of the salt cliffs was so deep that it was impossible for my party to pass along the shore. It is easy to believe that the level might have been lowered sufficiently to expose a margin of shore which could be traversed on the West side from one end to the other.

IV. Constitution of the Water.

As in the case of all enclosed basins, the waters of the Dead Sea are impregnated to an excessive degree with saline matter. "The salt which they contain," however, "is not wholly or even principally common salt, but is mostly the chloride and bromide of magnesium and calcium, so that they are not merely a strong brine, but rather resemble the mother liquors of a saltpan left after the common salt has crystallized out" (Dawson, Egypt and Syria, 123). The following analysis is given by Booth and Muckle of water brought by Commander Lynch and taken by him May 5 from 195 fathoms deep opposite the mouth of Wady Zerka Ma'ain. Other analyses vary from this more or less, owing doubtless to the different localities and depths from which the specimens had been obtained. Specific gravity at 60 degrees ..... 1,22742 Chloride of magnesium ..... 145,8971 Chloride of

calcium ..... 31.0746 Chloride of
sodium ..... 78,5537 Chloride of
potassium ..... 6,5860 Bromide of
potassium ..... 1,3741 Sulphate of
lime ..... 0,7012———sub-total: 264,1867
Water ..... 735,8133———Total:
1000.0000 Total amount of solid matter found

by direct experiment ..... 264.0000 What is here labeled bromide of potassium, however, is called by most other analysts bromide of magnesium, it being difficult to separate and distinguish these elements in composition. The large percentage of bromide, of which but a trace is found in the ocean, is supposed to have been derived from volcanic emanations. As compared with sea water, it is worthy of note that that of the Dead Sea yields 26 lbs. of salts to 100 lbs. of water, whereas that of the Atlantic yields only 6 lbs. in the same quantity. Lake Urumiah is as salty as the Dead Sea.

As results of this salinity the water is excessively buoyant and is destructive of all forms of animal life. Lynch found that his metal boats sank an inch deeper in the Jordan when equally heavily laden than they did in the Dead Sea. All travelers who bathe in it relate that when they throw themselves upon their backs their bodies will be half out of the water. Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4) relates that the emperor Vespasian caused certain men who could not swim to be thrown into the water with their hands tied behind them, and they floated on the surface. Dead fish and various shells are indeed often found upon the shore, but they have evidently been brought in by the tributary fresh-water streams, or belong to species which live in the brackish pools of the bordering lagoons, which are abundantly supplied with fresh water.

The report extensively circulated in earlier times that birds did not fly over the lake has no foundation in fact, since some species of birds are known even to light upon the surface and frolick upon the waters. The whole depression is subject to frequent storms of wind blowing through its length. These produce waves whose force is very destructive of boats encountering them because of the high specific gravity of the water; but for the same reason the waves rapidly subside after a storm, so that the general appearance of the lake is placid in the extreme.

The source from which these saline matters have been derived has been a subject of much speculation—some having supposed that it was derived from the dissolution of the salt cliffs in Jebel Usdum. But this theory is disproved by the fact that common salt forms but a small portion of the material held in solution by the water. It is more correct to regard this salt mountain as a deposit precipitated from the saturated brine which had accumulated, as we have supposed, during the Cretaceous age. Probably salt is now being deposited at the bottom of the lake from the present saturated solution to appear in some future age in the wreck of progressive geological changes. The salts of the Dead Sea, like those in all similarly enclosed basins, have been brought in by the streams of water from all over the drainage basin. Such streams always contain more or less solid matter in solution, which becomes concentrated through the evaporation which takes. place over enclosed basins. The ocean is the great reservoir of such

deposits, but is too large to be affected to the extent noticeable in smaller basins. The extreme salinity of the Dead Sea water shows both the long continuance of the isolation of the basin and the abundance of soluble matter contained in the rocks of the inscribed area. The great extent of recent volcanic rocks, especially in the region East of the Jordan, accounts for the large relative proportion of some of the ingredients.

V. Climate.

Because of the great depression below sea level, the climate is excessively warm, so that palms and other tropical trees flourish on the borders of the rivers wherever fresh water finds soil on which to spread itself. Snow never falls upon the lake, though it frequently covers the hills of Judea and the plateau of Moab. As already explained the rainfall in the Jordan valley is less than on the bordering mountains. During the winter season the Arab tribes go down to the valley with their flocks of sheep and goats and camp upon the surrounding plains. But the excessive heat of the summer, rising sometimes to 130 degrees F., drives them back to the hills again.

VI. Roads.

Except at the North end, the approaches to the Dead Sea are few and very difficult to travel. On the West side the nearest approach is at En-gedi, and this down a winding descent of 2,000 ft. where a few men at the top of the cliff could hold an army at bay below. The path up Wady Zuweirah from the North end of Jebel Usdum is scarcely better. Upon the South end the path leads up Wady Fikreh for a considerable distance on the West side of the Mud Flat, and then crosses over to the Wady el-Jeib, up whose torrential bed during the dry season caravans can find their way through the Arabah to Akabah. More difficult paths lead up from the East of the Mud Flat into the Arabah, and through the mountains of Moab to Petra into the plains beyond and the Pilgrim route from Damascus to Mecca. From the Lisan a difficult path leads up Wady Kerak to the fortress of the same name 20 miles distant and 5,000 ft. above the lake. Another path a little farther north leads up the Wady Beni Hamid to Ar of Moab. From the Arnon to the North end of the Dead Sea the mountains are so precipitous that travel along the shore is now practically impossible. But there are, according to Tristram (The Land of Moab, 355), remnants of an "old and well-engineered road of ancient times" extending as far South at least as the Zerka Ma’ain.

VII. Miscellaneous Items.

There are numerous points around the border of the lake of special interest:

1. The Plain of the Jordan:

When Lot and Abraham looked down from the heights of Bethel (Ge 13:10 ff) they are said to have beheld "all the Plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered every where, before Yahweh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like the garden of Yahweh, like the land of Egypt, as thou goest unto Zoar. So Lot chose him all the Plain of the Jordan; and Lot journeyed east: .... and Lot dwelt in the cities of the

Plain, and moved his tent as far as Sodom." The word here translated "Plain" is kikkar (Ciccar), meaning "circle," and indicating the appearance from Bethel of the Jordan valley surrounding the North end of the Dead Sea. From this fact, many recent writers have located Sodom and Gomorrah at that end of the sea (see CITIES OF THE PLAIN). But it is by no means certain that it is necessary thus to narrow down the meaning of the phrase. Though the South end. of the Dead Sea is not visible from the heights of Bethel, it is so connected with the general depression that it may well have been in the minds of Abraham and Lot as they were dividing the country between them, one choosing the plain, a part of which was visible, the other remaining on the bordering mountainous area, so different in all its natural resources and conditions. The extent of the region chosen by Lot may therefore be left to be determined by other considerations.

2. Ain Jidi (En-gedi):

Ain Jidi, "fountain of the kid" (?)(see EN-GEDI) is an oasis at the base of the western cliffs about half-way between the North and the South ends of the lake, fed by springs of warm water which burst from beneath the overhanging cliffs. The 650 ft. shore line composed of shingle and calcareous marl is here prominent, and, as already remarked, there is an extensive gravel terrace at the present water level. Palms and vines formerly flourished here (So 1:14), but now only a few bushes of acacia and tamarisk are to be found. From time immemorial, however, it has been the terminus of the principal trail which zig-zags up the cliffs to the plateau, across which paths lead to Hebron and Bethlehem.

3. The Fortress of Masada:

The Fortress of Masada was the last stronghold held by the fanatical Jews (Zealots) after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, and offers a bird’s-eye view of the Dead Sea, which is as instructive as it is interesting. It is situated half-way between Jebel Usdum and En-gedi, directly opposite the northern promontory of el-Lisan. Here on a precipitous height, 2,000 ft. above the sea, is a plateau about 700 yds. long, and 200 wide, adorned with ruins of dwellings, palaces and temples of the Herodian age. Standing upon this height one sees the outlines of the Roman camp, near the shore of the sea, and those of another camp in a depression several hundred yards to the West, from which the final attack of the besiegers was made over a pathway constructed along a sloping ridge. Here many miles away from their base of supplies the Romans slowly but irresistibly drew in their besieging lines to the final tragic consummation when the last remnant of the defenders committed suicide (BJ, VII, ix, 1). The view gives one a profound impression of the difficulties attending military campaigns in all that region. Upon lifting up one’s eyes to take in the broader view, he sees the Dead Sea in its whole length with the low ridge of Jebel Usdum, the Valley of Salt, the Ascent of Akrabbim, the depression of the Arabah, and Mt. Hor, to the South, while across the whole horizon to the East is the long wall of Moab dissected by Wady Kerak and the river Arnon, leading up to the strongholds of Ker, Aroer and Dibon, of Moab; while immediately in the front are the white cliffs of el-Lisan, and to the North, near by, the green oasis of En-gedi, and, dimmed by distance, the plains of Jericho, and the cluster of peaks surrounding Mt. Pisgah; while the sea itself sparkles like a gem of brilliant azure in the midst of its desolate surroundings, giving no token of the deadly elements which permeate its water.

4. Jebel Usdum (Mount of Sodom):

Jebel Usdum (Mount of Sodom) is a salt mountain extending 7 or 8 miles along the Southwest shore of the lake and on the West side of the Valley of Salt to its southern boundary. Its name is derived from the traditional belief that Sodom was located at the South end of the sea; but, on the other hand, it is not unlikely that the name would become attached to it because of its seeming to contain the pillar of salt, which, according to the ordinary translation, marked the place where Lot's wife was overwhelmed. The mountain rises 600 ft. above the lake, and has a general level surface except where streams have worn furrows and gullies in it. The eastern face presents a precipitous wall of rock salt, which, as said above, at the time of my visit (January, 1901), was washed by the waves of the lake making it impossible to pass along its base. At other times. when the water is low, travelers can pass along the whole length of the shore. This wall of salt presents much the appearance of a glacier, the salt being as transparent as ice, while the action of the waves has hollowed out extensive and picturesque caverns and left isolated towers and connected pinnacles of salt often resembling a Gothic cathedral. These towers and pinnacles are, of course, being displaced from time to time, while others are formed to continue the illusion. Any pillar of salt known to the ancients must be entirely different from those which meet the eye of the modern traveler. It follows also as a matter of course that the gradual dissolution of this salt must partly account for the excessive salinity of the Dead Sea.

It is uncertain how deep the deposit extends below the surface. It rises upward 200 or 300 ft., where it is capped by consolidated strata of sedimentary material, consisting of sand and loam, which most geologists think was deposited at the time of the formation of the 650 ft. terrace already described, and which they connect with the climatic conditions of the Glacial period.

This view is presented as follows by Professor B. K. Emerson: "In the earlier portion of the post-glacial stadium, a final sinking of a fraction of the bottom of the trough, near the South end of the lake, dissected the low salt plateau, sinking its central parts beneath the salt waters, while fragments remain buttressed against the great walls of the trench forming the plains of Jebel Usdum and the peninsula el-Lisan with the swampy Sebkah between. .... It exposed the wonderful eastern wall of Jebel Usdum: 7 miles long, with 30-45 m. of clear blue salt at the base, capped by 125-140 m. of gypsum-bearing marls impregnated with sulphur, and conglomerates at times cemented by bitumen" ("Geological Myths," Proc. Am. Assoc. for Adv. of Sci. (1896), 110, 111). If this was the case there has been a depression of the South end of the Dead Sea to the extent of several hundred feet within a comparatively few thousand years, in which case the traditional view that Sodom and Gomorrah were overwhelmed by Dead Sea water at the time of their destruction would refer to an occurrence exactly in line with movements that have been practically continuous during Tertiary, Glacial, and post- Glacial times.

With more reason, Lartet contends that this salt is a Cretaceous or Tertiary deposit covered with late Tertiary strata, in which case the sinking of the block between Jebel Usdum and el-Lisan, for the most part, took place at a much earlier date than the formation of the 650 ft. terrace. A striking corollary of this supposition would be that the climatic conditions have been practically the same during all of the post-Carboniferous times, there having been cycles of moist and dry climate in that region succeeding

each other during all these geological periods.

The Vale of Siddim (Ge 14:3,8,10) is probably the same as the Valley of Salt (2Ki 14:7; 1Ch 18:12; 2Ch 25:11).

5. Vale of Siddim:

This is in all probability the plain extending from the southern end of the Dead Sea to the "Ascent of Akrabbim" which crosses the valley from side to side, and forms the southern margin of the Ghor. At present the area of the vale is about 50 square miles; but if our theory concerning the lower level of the Dead Sea in the time of Abraham is correct, it may then have included a considerable portion of the lagoon South of el-Lisan and so have been a third larger than now. In Ge 14:10 the vale is said to have been full of slime (that is, of bitumen or asphalt) pits. In modern times masses of asphalt are occasionally found floating in the southern part of the Dead Sea. After the earthquake of 1834 a large quantity was cast upon the shore near the Southwest corner of the lake, 3 tons of which were brought to market by the Arab natives. After the earthquake of January, 1837, a mass of asphalt was driven aground on the West side not far from Jebel Usdum. The neighboring Arabs swam off to it, cut it up with axes and carried it to market by the camel load, and sold it to the value of several thousand dollars. At earlier times such occurrences seem to have been still more frequent. Josephus affirms that "the sea in many places sends up black masses of asphalt having the form and size of headless oxen"; while Diodorus Siculus relates that the bitumen (asphalt) was thrown up in masses covering sometimes two or three acres and having the appearance of islands (Josephus, BJ, IV, viii, 4; Diod. Sic. ii.48; Pliny, NH, vii.13; Tac. Hist. verse 6; Dioscor., De re Med., i.99).

Since asphalt is a product of petroleum from which the volatile elements have been evaporated, the ultimate source of these masses is doubtless to be found in the extensive beds of bituminous limestone which appear in numerous places on both sides of the Dead Sea. An outcrop of it can be observed at Neby Mousa, on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, which Dawson describes as resembling dry chalk saturated with coal tar. When long weathered this becomes white and chalky at the surface, so that a mass of it, quite white externally, reveals an intense blackness when broken. It is this that the people of Bethlehem call "Dead Sea stone," and which they carve into various ornamental articles and expose for sale. Some specimens of it are sufficiently bituminous to burn with flame like cannel-coal. These beds are still more abundant around the South end of the lake and doubtless underlie the whole region, and for all time must have been exuding bituminous and gaseous matter, but much more abundantly in former times than now.

In these accumulations of bitumen at the South end of the Ghor we probably have the incentive which led the Babylonians under Amraphel and Chedorlaomer to make such long expeditions for the sake of conquering the region and holding it under their power. Bitumen was much in demand in Babylonia.

6. El-Lisan:

El-Lisan (the Tongue), which projects half-way across the lake from the mouth of Wady Kerak, is, like Jebel Usdum, a promontory of white calcareous sediment containing beds of salt and gypsum, and breaking off on its western side in a cliff 300 ft. high. Its upper surface rises in terraces to the 600 ft. level on the East, as Jebel Usdum does on the West. The length of the promontory from North to South is 9 miles. This corresponds so closely in general structure and appearance to Jebel Usdum on the opposite side of the lake that we find it difficult to doubt theory of Professor Emerson, stated above, that the formation originally extended across and that a block of the original bottom of the lake has dropped down, leaving these remnants upon the sides. Frequent occurrences similar to this are noted by the United States geologists in the Rocky Mountain region.

VIII. History.

Difficulty of access has prevented the Dead Sea from playing any important part in history except as an obstruction both to commerce and to military movements. Boats have never been used upon it to any considerable extent. From earliest times salt has been gathered on its western shores and carried up to market over the difficult paths leading to Jerusalem. A similar commerce has been carried on in bitumen; that from the Dead Sea being specially prized in Egypt, while as already remarked, it is by no means improbable that the pits of bitumen which abounded in the "Vale of Siddim" were the chief attraction leading the kings of Babylonia to undertake long expeditions for the conquest of the region. Productive as may have been the plain at the South end of the sea, it was too far outside the caravan route leading through Petra to the South end of the Arabah and the mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula to divert the course of travel. Still the settlements on the eastern border of the Vale of Siddim were of sufficient importance in medieval times to induce the Crusaders to visit the region and leave their marks upon it. The Arabian town of Zoghar, probably the Biblical Zoar, appears at one time to have been a most important place, and was the center of considerable commercial activity. Indigo was grown there, and the oasis was noted for its fine species of dates. The country round about abounded in springs and there was much arable land (see Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 286 ff). The hot springs upon the eastern shore of the Dead Sea at Callirrhoe some distance up the Wady Zerka Ma’ain were much resorted to for their medicinal properties. Here Herod came as a last resort, to secure relief from his loathsome malady, but failed of help. The fortress of Macherus, where John the Baptist was imprisoned, is situated but a few miles South of the Zerka Ma’ain, but access to this region is possible only through a difficult road leading over the mountains a few miles East of the sea.

On four occasions important military expeditions were conducted along the narrow defiles which border the Southwest end of the Dead Sea:

(1) That of Amraphel and his confederates from Babylonia, who seem first to have opened the way past Petra to the mines of the Sinaitic Peninsula, and then to have swept northward through the land of the Amalekites and Amorites and come down to the Dead Sea at En-gedi, and then to have turned to subdue the Cities of the Plain, where Lot was dwelling. This accomplished, they probably retreated along the west shore of the lake, which very likely afforded at that time a complete passageway to the valley of the Jordan. Or they may have gone on eastward to the line of the present pilgrim route from Damascus to Mecca and followed it northward.

(2) In the early part of the reign of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20), the Moabites, Ammonites and some other tribes joined together, forming a large army, and, following around the South end of the Dead Sea, marched along the West shore to En-gedi, and having ascended the zigzag path leading up the precipitous heights to the wilderness of Tekoa, were there thrown into confusion and utterly annihilated.

(3) Not many years later Jehoram and Jehoshaphat "fetched a compass (the Revised Version (British and American) "made a circuit") of seven days' journey" (2Ki 3:9) around the South end of the Dead Sea and attacked the Moabites in their own country, but returned without completing the conquest. The particulars of this expedition are given in 2Ki 3 and in the inscription on the Moabite Stone.

(4) The Romans shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem conducted a long siege of the fortress of Masada, of which an account has already been given in a previous section (VII, 3). All their supplies must have come down the tortuous path to En-gedi and thence been brought along the western shore to the camp, the remains of which are still to be seen at the base of the fortress.

For many centuries, indeed for nearly 1,800 years, the Dead Sea remained a mystery, and its geology and physical characteristics were practically unknown. The first intimation of the depression of the lake below sea level was furnished in 1837 by Moore and Beke, who made some imperfect experiments with boiling water from which they inferred a depression of 500 ft. In 1841 Lieutenant Simmons of the British navy, by trigonometrical observations, estimated the depression to be 1,312 ft. In 1835. Costigan, and again in 1847 Lieutenant Molyneux ventured upon the sea in boats; but the early death of both, consequent upon their exposures, prevented their making any full reports. Appropriately, however, their names have been attached to prominent points on the Lisan. In 1848 Lieutenant Lynch, of the United States navy, was dispatched to explore the Jordan and the Dead Sea. The results of this expedition were most important. Soundings of the depths were carefully and systematically conducted, and levels were run from the Dead Sea by Jerusalem to the Mediterranean, giving the depression at the surface of the Dead Sea as 1,316,7 ft., and its greatest depth 1,278 ft. More recently Sir C. W. Wilson in connection with the Ordinance Survey of Palestine carried levels over the same route with the result of reducing the depression to 1,292 ft., which is now generally accepted to be correct. But as already stated the stage of water in the lake is not given, and that is known to vary at least 15 ft. annually, and still more at longer intervals.

LITERATURE.

Hull, Mount Seir, Sinai and Western Palestine, 1889; Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation, 1911; Lartet, Voyage d'exploration de la Mer Morte, 1880; Lynch, Report of U. S. Expedition to the Jordan and Dead Sea, 1852; Robinson, BR, 1841; De Saulcy, Voyage dans la Syrie, 1853; Tristram, Land of Israel, 2nd edition, 1872, The Land of Moab, 1873; G. A. Smith, HGHL; Wright; Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament Hist, 1906, and Journal of Biblical Lit., 1911.

George Frederick Wright

DEAD, BAPTISM FOR THE

See BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

DEAD, STATE OF THE

See HADES.

DEADLY

ded'-li: In the Old Testament two words are used in the sense of a "mortal (Hebrew nephesh, "hateful," "foul") enemy" (Ps 17:9), and in the sense of "fatal disease," the destructiveness of which causes a general panic (Hebrew maweth, "death," 1Sa 5:11).

In the New Testament we have in Re 13:3,12 the expression "deadly wound" (Greek thanatos), better "death-stroke," as in the Revised Version (British and American), and the phrases "deadly thing," i.e. poison (thanasimon ti, Mr 16:18), and "full of deadly poison" (meste iou thanatephorou, Jas 3:8), said of an unruly tongue. Both Greek words convey the idea of "causing or bringing death" and occur in classical literature in a variety of uses in combination with the bite of venomous reptiles, deadly potions, mortal wounds and fatal contagion.

H. L. E. Luering

DEAF

def (cheresh; kophos): Used either in the physical sense, or figuratively as expressing unwillingness to hear the Divine message (Ps 58:4), or incapacity to understand it for want of spirituality (Ps 38:13). The prophetic utterances were sufficiently forcible to compel even such to hear (Isa 42:18; 43:8) and thereby to receive the Divine mercy (Isa 29:18; 35:5).

The expression "deaf adder that stoppeth her car" (Ps 58:4) alludes to a curious notion that the adder, to avoid hearing the voice of the charmer, laid its head with one car on the ground and stopped the other with the tip of its tail (Diary of John Manninghan, 1602). The adder is called deaf by Shakespeare (2 Hen VI, iii, 2, 76; Troilus and Cressida, ii, 2, 172). The erroneous idea probably arose from the absence of external ears. Physical deafness was regarded as a judgment from God (Ex 4:11; Mic 7:16), and it was consequently impious to curse the deaf (Le 19:14).

In New Testament times deafness and kindred defects were attributed to evil spirits (Mr 9:18 ff). See DUMB.

Alex. Macalister

DEAL

del: The noun "deal" is not found in the Revised Version (British and American). The King James Version translation of ‘issaron, "the tenth deal" (Ex 29:40; Le 14:10, et al.) is rendered uniformly "the tenth part" in the Revised Version (British and American) (see WEIGHTS AND MEASURES). The verb "to deal" often means "to apportion," "to distribute" (compare 2Sa 6:19; 1Ch 16:3; Isa 58:7; Ro 12:3), but more frequently it is used in the sense of "to act" "to do," "to have transaction of any kind with." In the Psalms "to deal" always means "to confer benefit," "to deal bountifully," with the exception of Ps 105:25, where it means "to deal subtly with." The expression "to deal," i.e. "to be engaged in," is not found in the Scriptures. The translation of sugchraomai, in Joh 4:9, "Jews have no dealings with Samaritans," conveys the idea that they have nothing in common.

A. L. Breslich

DEAR; DEARLY

der, der’-li ("held at a great price," "highly valued"): In Ac 20:24, Paul does not hold his life "dear" (timios, "at a price"); compare 1Co 3:12, "costly stones"; 1Pe 1:19, "precious blood." Lu 7:2, the servant was "dear" to the centurion (entimos, "highly prized"; compare Php 2:29; 1Pe 2:6). 1Th 2:8, "very dear to us" (agapetos, "beloved"). In the Revised Version (British and American), agapetos is generally translated "beloved." "Dearly" before "beloved" of the King James Version is omitted in all passages in the Revised Version (British and American). The word "dear" occurs but once in the Old Testament, namely, Jer 31:20. the Revised Version (British and American) correctly changes "dear Son" of the King James Version (Col 1:13) into "the Son of his love."

H. E. Jacobs

DEARTH

durth. See FAMINE.

DEATH

(maweth; thanatos):

PHYSIOLOGICAL AND FIGURATIVE VIEW

The word "Death" is used in the sense of

(1) the process of dying (Ge 21:16);

(2) the period of decease (Ge 27:7);

(3) as a possible synonym for poison (2Ki 4:40);

(4) as descriptive of person in danger of perishing (Jud 15:18; "in deaths oft" 2Co 11:23). In this sense the shadow of death is a familiar expression in Job, the Psalms and the Prophets;

(5) death is personified in 1Co 15:55 and Re 20:14. Deliverance from this catastrophe is called the "issues from death" (Ps 68:20 the King James Version; translated "escape" in the Revised Version (British and American)). Judicial execution, "putting to death," is mentioned 39 times in the Levitical Law.

Figuratively: Death is the loss of spiritual life as in Ro 8:6; and the final state of the unregenerate is called the "second death" in Re 20:14.

Alex. Macalister

THEOLOGICAL VIEW

1. Conception of Sin and Death:

According to Ge 2:17, God gave to man, created in His own image, the command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, and added thereto the warning, "in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Though not exclusively, reference is certainly made here in the first place to bodily death. Yet because death by no means came upon Adam and Eve on the day of their transgression, but took place hundreds of years later, the expression, "in the day that," must be conceived in a wider sense, or the delay of death must be attributed to the entering-in of mercy (Ge 3:15).

However this may be, Ge 2:17 places a close connection between man’s death and his transgression of God’s commandment, thereby attaching to death a religious and ethical significance, and on the other hand makes the life of man dependent on his obedience to God. This religious-ethical nature of life and death is not only decidedly and clearly expressed in Ge 2, but it is the fundamental thought of the whole of Scripture and forms an essential element in the revelations of salvation. The theologians of early and more recent times, who have denied the spiritual significance of death and have separated the connection between ethical and physical life, usually endeavor to trace back their opinions to Scripture; and those passages which undoubtedly see in death a punishment for sin (Ge 2:17; Joh 8:44; Ro 5:12; 6:23; 1Co 15:21), they take as individual opinions, which form no part of the organism of revelation. But this endeavor shuts out the organic character of the revelation of salvation. It is true that death in Holy Scripture is often measured by the weakness and frailty of human nature (Ge 3:19; Job 14:1,12; Ps 39:5,6; 90:5; 103:14,15; Ec 3:20, etc.).

Death is seldom connected with the transgression of the first man either in the Old Testament or the New Testament, or mentioned as a specified punishment for sin (Joh 8:44; Ro 5:12; 6:23; 1Co 15:21; Jas 1:15); for the most part it is portrayed as something natural (Ge 5:5; 9:29; 15:15; 25:8, etc.), a long life being presented as a blessing in contrast to death in the midst of days as a disaster and a judgment (Ps 102:23 f; Isa 65:20). But all this is not contrary to the idea that death is a consequence of, and a punishment for, sin. Daily, everyone who agrees with Scripture that death is held out as a punishment for sin, speaks in the same way. Death, though come into the world through sin, is nevertheless at the same time a consequence of man's physical and frail existence now; it could therefore be threatened as a punishment to man, because he was taken out of the ground and was made a living soul, of the earth earthy (Ge 2:7; 1Co 15:45,47). If he had remained obedient, he would not have returned to dust (Ge 3:19), but have pressed forward on the path of spiritual development (1Co 15:46,51); his return to dust was possible simply because he was made from dust (see ADAM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT). Thus, although death is in this way a consequence of sin, yet a long life is felt to be a blessing and death a disaster and a judgment, above all when man is taken away in the bloom of his youth or the strength of his years. There is nothing strange, therefore, in the manner in which Scripture speaks about death; we all express ourselves daily in the same way, though we at the same time consider it as the wages of sin. Beneath the ordinary, everyday expressions about death lies the deep consciousness that it is unnatural and contrary to our innermost being.

2. The Meaning of Death:

This is decidedly expressed in Scripture much more so even than among ourselves. For we are influenced always more or less by the Greek, Platonic idea, that the body dies, yet the soul is immortal. Such an idea is utterly contrary to the Israelite consciousness, and is nowhere found in the Old Testament. The whole man dies, when in death the spirit (Ps 146:4; Ec 12:7), or soul (Ge 35:18; 2Sa 1:9; 1Ki 17:21; Jon 4:3), goes out of a man. Not only his body, but his soul also returns to a state of death and belongs to the nether-world; therefore the Old Testament can speak of a death of one's soul (Ge 37:21 (Hebrew); Nu 23:10 m; De 22:21; Jud 16:30; Job 36:14; Ps 78:50), and of defilement by coming in contact with a dead body (Le 19:28; 21:11; 22:4; Nu 5:2; 6:6; 9:6; 19:10 ff; De 14:1; Hag 2:13). This death of man is not annihilation, however, but a deprivation of all that makes for life on earth. The Sheol (she'ol) is in contrast with the land of the living in every respect (Job 28:13; Pr 15:24; Eze 26:20; 32:23); it is an abode of darkness and the shadow of death (Job 10:21,22; Ps 88:12; 143:3), a place of destruction, yea destruction itself (Job 26:6; 28:22; 31:12; Ps 88:11; Pr 27:20), without any order (Job 10:22), a land of rest, of silence, of oblivion (Job 3:13,17,18; Ps 94:17; 115:17), where God and man are no longer to be seen (Isa 38:11), God no longer praised or thanked (Ps 6:5; 115:17), His perfections no more acknowledged (Ps 88:10-13; Isa 38:18,19), His wonders not contemplated (Ps 88:12), where the dead are unconscious, do no more work, take no account of anything, possess no knowledge nor wisdom, neither have any more a portion in anything that is done under the sun (Ec 9:5,6,10). The dead ("the Shades" the Revised Version, margin; compare article DECEASE) are asleep (Job 26:5; Pr 2:18; 9:18; 21:6; Ps 88:11; Isa 14:9), weakened (Isa 14:10) and without strength (Ps 88:4).

3. Light in the Darkness:

The dread of death was felt much more deeply therefore by the Israelites than by ourselves. Death to them was separation from all that they loved, from God, from His service, from His law, from His people, from His land, from all the rich companionship in which they lived. But now in this darkness appears the light of the revelation of salvation from on high. The God of Israel is the living God and the fountain of all life (De 5:26; Jos 3:10; Ps 36:9). He is the Creator of heaven and earth, whose power knows no bounds and whose dominion extends over life and death (De 32:39; 1Sa 2:6; Ps 90:3). He gave life to man (Ge 1:26; 2:7), and creates and sustains every man still (Job 32:8; 33:4; 34:14; Ps 104:29; Ec 12:7). He connects life with the keeping of His law and appoints death for the transgression of it (Ge 2:17; Le 18:5; De 30:20; 32:47). He lives in heaven, but is present also by His spirit in Sheol (Ps 139:7,8). Sheol and Abaddon are open to Him even as the hearts of the children of men (Job 26:6; 38:17; Pr 15:11). He kills and makes alive, brings down into Sheol and raises from thence again (De 32:39; 1Sa 2:6; 2Ki 5:7). He lengthens life for those who keep His commandments (Ex 20:12; Job 5:26), gives escape from death, can deliver when death menaces (Ps 68:20; Isa 38:5; Jer 15:20; Da 3:26), can take Enoch and Elijah to Himself without dying (Ge 5:24; 2Ki 2:11), can restore the dead to life (1Ki 17:22; 2Ki 4:34; 13:21). He can even bring death wholly to nothing and completely triumph over its power by rising from the dead (Job 14:13-15; 19:25-27; Ho 6:2; 13:14; Isa 25:8; 26:19; Eze 37:11,12; Da 12:2).

4. Spiritual Significance:

This revelation by degrees rejects the old contrast between life on earth and the disconsolate existence after death, in the dark place of Sheol, and puts another in its place. The physical contrast between life and death gradually makes way for the moral and spiritual difference between a life spent in the fear of the Lord, and a life in the service of sin. The man who serves God is alive (Ge 2:17); life is involved in the keeping of His commandments (Le 18:5; De 30:20); His word is life (De 8:3; 32:47). Life is still for the most part understood to mean length of days (Pr 2:18; 3:16; 10:30; Isa 65:20). Nevertheless it is remarkable that Pr often mentions death and Sheol in connection with the godless (Pr 2:18; 5:5; 7:27; 9:18), and on the other hand only speaks of life in connection with the righteous. Wisdom, righteousness, the fear of the Lord is the way of life (Pr 8:35,36; 11:19; 12:28; 13:14; 14:27; 19:23). The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death (Pr 14:32). Blessed is he who has the Lord for his God (De 33:29; Ps 1:1,2; 2:12; 32:1,2; 33:12; 34:9, etc.); he is comforted in the greatest adversity (Ps 73:25-28; Hab 3:17-19), and sees a light arise for him behind physical death (Ge 49:18; Job 14:13-15; 16:16-21; 19:25-27; Ps 73:23-26). The godless on the contrary, although enjoying for a time much prosperity, perish and come to an end (Ps 1:4-6; 73:18-20; Isa 48:22; Mal 4:3, etc.).

The righteous of the Old Testament truly are continually occupied with the problem that the lot of man on earth often corresponds so little to his spiritual worth, but he strengthens himself with the conviction that for the righteous it will be well, and for the wicked, ill (Ec 8:12,13; Isa 3:10,11). If they do not realize it in the present, they look forward to the future and hope for the day in which God’s justice will extend salvation to the righteous, and His anger will be visited on the wicked in judgment. So in the Old

Testament the revelation of the new covenant is prepared wherein Christ by His appearance hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel (2Ti 1:10). See ABOLISH. This everlasting life is already here on earth presented to man by faith, and it is his portion also in the hour of death (Joh 3:36; 11:25,26). On the other hand, he who lives in sin and is disobedient to the Son of God, is in his living dead (Mt 8:22; Lu 15:32; Joh 3:36; 8:24; Eph 2:1; Col 2:13); he shall never see life, but shall pass by bodily death into the second death (Re 2:11; 20:6,14; 21:8).

5. Death in Non-Christian Religions and in Science:

This view of Scripture upon death goes much deeper than that which is found in other religions, but it nevertheless receives support from the unanimous witness of humanity with regard to its unnaturalness and dread. The so-called nature-peoples even feel that death is much more of an enigma than life; Tiele (Inleiding tot de goddienst- artenschap, II (1900), 202, referring to Andrew Lang, Modern Mythology, chapter xiii) says rightly, that all peoples have the conviction that man by nature is immortal, that immortality wants no proof, but that death is a mystery and must be explained. Touching complaints arise in the hearts of all men on the frailty and vanity of life, and the whole of mankind fears death as a mysterious power. Man finds comfort in death only when he hopes it will be an end to a still more miserable life. Seneca may be taken as interpreter of some philosophers when he says: Stultitia est timore morris mori ("It is stupid to die through the fear of death") and some may be able, like a Socrates or a Cato, to face death calmly and courageously; what have these few to say to the millions, who through fear of death are all their lifetime subject to bondage (Heb 2:15)? Such a mystery has death remained up to the present day. It may be said with Kassowitz, Verworm and others that the "cell" is the beginning, and the old, gray man is the natural end of an uninterrupted life-development, or with Metschnikoff, that science will one day so lengthen life that it will fade away like a rose at last and death lose all its dread; death still is no less a riddle, and one which swallows up all the strength of life. When one considers, besides, that a number of creatures, plants, trees, animals, reach a much higher age than man; that the larger half of mankind dies before or shortly after birth; that another large percentage dies in the bloom of youth or in the prime of life; that the law of the survival of the fittest is true only when the fact of the survival is taken as a proof of their fitness; that the graybeards, who, spent and decrepit, go down to the grave, form a very small number; then the enigma of death increases more and more in mysteriousness.

The endeavors to bring death into connection with certain activities of the organism and to explain it by increasing weight, by growth or by fertility, have all led to shipwreck. When Weismann took refuge in the immortality of the "einzellige Protozoen," he raised a hypothesis which not only found many opponents, but which also left mortality of the "Korperplasma" an insoluble mystery (Beth, "Ueber Ursache und Zweck des Todes, Glauben und Wissen" (1909), 285-304, 335-48). Thus, science certainly does not compel us to review Scripture on this point, but rather furnishes a strong proof of the mysterious majesty of death. When Pelagius, Socinus, Schleiermacher, Ritschl and a number of other theologians and philosophers separate death from its connection with sin, they are not compelled to do so by science, but are led by a defective insight into the relation between ethos and phusis. Misery and death are not absolutely always consequences and punishment of a great personal transgression (Lu 13:2; Joh 9:3); but that they are connected with sin, we learn from the experience of every day. Who can

number the victims of mammonism, alcoholism and licentiousness? Even spiritual sins exercise their influence on corporal life; envy is a rottenness of the bones (Pr 14:30). This connection is taught us in a great measure by Scripture, when it placed the not yet fallen man in a Paradise, where death had not yet entered, and eternal life was not yet possessed and enjoyed; when it sends fallen man, who, however, is destined for redemption, into a world full of misery and death; and at last assigns to the wholly renewed man a new heaven and a new earth, where death, sorrow, crying or pain shall no longer exist (Re 21:4). Finally, Scripture is not the book of death, but of life, of everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord. It tells us, in oft-repeated and unmistakable terms, of the dreaded reality of death, but it proclaims to us still more loudly the wonderful power of the life which is in Christ Jesus. See also DECEASE.

Herman Bavinck

DEATH, BODY OF

See BODY OF DEATH.

DEATH, SECOND

(ho deuteros thanatos): An expression, peculiar to the Book of Rev.(re 2:11; 20:6,14; 21:8) in Scripture, denoting the final penalty of the unrighteous; parallel with another expression likewise peculiar, "the lake of fire," in Re 20:14; 21:8. See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

DEBATE

de-bat’:This word is used only once in the Revised Version (British and American) (Pr 25:9). It evidently refers to the settling of a difficulty with a neighbor, and anticipates Mt 18:15. It argues for and shows the advantage of private, peaceable settlement of difficulties. Compare Ecclesiasticus 28:9, and see MAKEBATES.

DEBIR (1)

de’-ber (debhir, or debhir, "oracle"): King of Eglon, one of the five Amorite kings whose confederation against Israel was overcome and who were killed by Joshua (Jos 10:3).

DEBIR (2)

de’-ber (debhir; Dabeir): "And Joshua returned, and all Israel with him, to Debir, and fought against it: and he took it, and the king thereof, and all the cities thereof; and they smote them with the edge of the sword .... he left none remaining" (Jos 10:38,39). In Jos 15:15-17 and Jud 1:11-13 is an account of how Othniel captured Debir, which "beforetime was Kiriath-sepher," and won thereby the hand of Achsah, Caleb’s daughter. In Jos 15:49 Debir is called Kiriath-sannah. It had once been inhabited by the Anakim

(Jos 11:21). It was a Levitical city (Jos 21:15; 1Ch 6:58).

1. The Meaning of the Name:

(1) Debir is usually accepted as meaning "back," but this is doubtful; the word debhir is used to denote the "holy of holies" (1Ki 6:5). According to Sayce (HDB), "the city must have been a sacred one with a well-known temple." Kiriath-sepher is translated "town of books," and Sayce and others consider that in all probability there was a great storehouse of clay tablets here; perhaps the name may have been qiryath copher, "town of scribes." Kiriath-sannah (Jos 15:49) is probably a corruption of Kiriath-sepher; the Septuagint has here as in references to the latter polis grammaton, "town of books."

2. The Site:

Unfortunately this site, important even if the speculations about the books are doubtful, is still a matter of uncertainty. Edh-Dhaheriyeh, some 11 miles Southwest of Hebron, has a good deal of support. It was unquestionably a site of importance in ancient times as the meeting-place of several roads; it is in the Negeb (compare Jud 1:15), in the neighborhood of the probable site of Anab (Jos 11:21; 15:50); it is a dry site, but there are "upper" and "lower" springs about 6 1/2 miles to the North. A more thorough examination of the site than has as yet been undertaken might produce added proofs in favor of this identification. No other suggestion has any great probability. See PEF, III, 402; PEFS, 1875.

(2) Debir, on the border between Judah and Benjamin (Jos 15:7), must have been somewhere East of Jerusalem not far from the modern Jericho road. Thoghgret edition Debr, "the pass of the rear," half a mile Southwest of the Tal‘at edition Dumm (see ADUMMIM), close to the so-called, "Inn of the Good Samaritan," may be an echo of the name which has lingered in the neighborhood. Many authorities consider that there is no place-name in this reference at all, the text being corrupt.

(3) Debir the Revised Version, margin, Lidebir (Jos 13:26), a town on the border of Gad, near Mahanaim; Ibdar, South of the Yarmuk has been suggested. May be identical with Lo-debar (2Sa 9:4).

E. W. G. Masterman

DEBORAH

deb’-o-ra (debhorah, signifying "bee"):

(1) Rebekah’s nurse, who died near Bethel and was buried under "the oak of weeping" (Ge 35:8 margin).

(2) A prophetess, fourth in the order of the "judges." In aftertime a palm tree, known as the "palm tree of Deborah," was shown between Ramah and Bethel, beneath which the prophetess was wont to administer justice. Like the rest of the "judges" she became a leader of her people in times of national distress. This

time the oppressor was Jabin, king of Hazor, whose general was Sisera. Deborah summoned Barak of Kedesh-naphtali and delivered to him the Divine message to meet Sisera in battle by the brook Kishon. Barak induced Deborah to accompany him; they were joined by 10,000 men of Zebulun and Naphtali. The battle took place by the brook Kishon, and Sisera's army was thoroughly routed. While Barak pursued the fleeing army, Sisera escaped and sought refuge with Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite, near Kedesh. The brave woman, the prototype of Judith, put the Canaanite general to sleep by offering him a draft of milk and then slew him by driving a peg into his temple.

Thus runs the story in Jud 4. It is on the whole substantiated by the ode in chapter 5 which is ascribed jointly to Deborah and Barak. It is possible that the editor mistook the archaic form qamti, in 5:7 which should be rendered "thou arosedst" instead of "I arose." Certainly the ode was composed by a person who, if not a contemporary of the event, was very near it in point of time. The song is spoken of as one of the oldest pieces of Hebrew literature. Great difficulties meet the exegete. Nevertheless the general substance is clear. The Lord is described as having come from Sinai near the "field of Edom" to take part in the battle; 'for from heaven they fought, the very stars from their courses fought against Sisera' (5:20). The nation was in a sad plight, oppressed by a mighty king, and the tribes loth to submerge their separatist tendencies. Some, like Reuben, Gilead, Da and Asher remained away. A community by the name of Meroz is singled out for blame, 'because they came not to the help of Yahweh, to the help of Yahweh among the mighty' (5:23; compare the Revised Version, margin).

Ephraim, Issachar, Machir, Benjamin were among the followers of Barak; "Zebulun .... jeopardized their lives unto the death, and Naphtali, upon the high places of the field" (verse 18). According to the song, the battle was fought at Taanach by the waters of Megiddo; Sisera's host was swept away by "that ancient river, the river Kishon" (verse 21). Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite, receives here due reward of praise for her heroic act. The paean vividly paints the waiting of Sisera's mother for the home-coming of the general; the delay is ascribed to the great booty which the conqueror is distributing among his Canaanite host. "So let all thine enemies perish," concludes the song; "O Yahweh: but let them that love him be as the sun when he goeth forth in his might." It is a song in praise of the "righteous acts" of the Lord, His work of victory which Israel's leaders, 'the long-haired princes,' wrought, giving their lives freely to the nation's cause. And the nation was sore bestead because it had become faithless to the Lord and chosen new gods. Out of the conflict came, for the time being, victory and moral purification; and the inspiring genius of it all was a woman in Israel, the prophetess Deborah.

(3) Tobit's grandmother (the King James Version "Debora," Tobit 1:8).

Max L. Margolis

DEBT; DEBTOR

det, det'-er: It is difficult nowadays to think of debt without associating with it the idea of interest, and even usury. Certain it is that this idea is associated with the Old Testament idea of the word, at least in the later period of Old Testament history. This is true of the New Testament entire. The Hebrew word

(neshi) always carries with it the idea of "biting interest" (compare 2Ki 4:7). The Greek words daneion (Mt 18:27), and opheile (Mt 18:32), may point only to the fact of indebtedness; the idea of interest, however, is clearly taught in the New Testament (compare Mt 25:27).

Quite extensive legislation is provided in the Old Testament governing the matter of debt and debtors. Indebtedness and loaning had not, however, the commercial aspect among the Jews so characteristic of the nations surrounding Palestine. Indeed the Mosaic legislation was seemingly intended to guard against just such commercialism. It was looked upon as a misfortune to be in debt; it indicated poverty brought on probably by blighted harvests; consequently those in debt were to be looked upon with pity and dealt with in leniency. There must be no oppression of the poor under such circumstances (Ex 22:25; De 23:19,20; Eze 18:18). Even where a pledge is given and received, certain restrictions are thrown around it, e. g. the creditor must not take a mill, nor a necessary garment, nor a widow's ox, etc., in pledge (Ex 22:25-27; De 24:6,10-13; Job 22:6; Am 2:8). And further, the pledge is to be restored in some instances "before the sun goeth down" (Ex 22:26,27), and in all cases full redemption in the seventh and jubilee years (Ne 10:31, etc.). The Jews were strictly exhorted to take no interest at all from their own nation (Ex 22:25; De 23:19,20). Strangers, however, might be charged interest (ibid.). A devout Jew would not lend money to another Jew on interest.

It would seem that as Israel came into contact with the surrounding nations, debt became increasingly a commercial matter. The Mosaic laws regarding clemency toward the poor who were compelled for the time being to become debtors were utterly disregarded, and the poor were oppressed by the rich. An illustration of the severity with which debtors came to be dealt with is to be found in 2Ki 4:1-7, in which, because of the inability of a widow to pay a small debt contracted by her dead husband, the woman complains to the prophet that the creditors have come to sell her two children in order that the debt might be paid. Strangely the prophet, while helping the widow by miraculously multiplying the oil in order that the debt might be paid, says nothing by way of condemnation of such conduct on the part of the creditors. Are we to understand by this that commercialism had already so powerful a grip upon Israel that even to a prophet the practice had come to seem proper, or at least expected? The debtor himself or his family might be sold for debt, or the debtor might become a slave for a certain length of time until the debt was paid (Le 25:39,47; Isa 50:1). So oppressive had the commercial system in Israel become that the debtor cursed the creditor and the creditor the debtor (Jer 15:10). Sometimes debtors were outlawed, as in the case of the men who came to David in the cave of Adullam (1Sa 22:2). That the matter of borrowing and lending had assumed very grievous proportions is evident from the very sharp warnings concerning the matter in the Book of Pr (Pr 6:1; 11:15; 20:16, etc.).

The teaching of the New Testament on this subject is confined very largely to the parables of our Lord. Some think that the expression, "Owe no man anything" (Ro 13:8), is an absolute warning against indebtedness. Quite a noticeable advance in the matter of debts and debtors is noticed as we enter the time of the New Testament. We read of bankers, exchangers, moneychangers, interest, investments, usury (Mt 25:16-27; Joh 2:13-17). The taking of interest does not seem to be explicitly condemned in the New Testament. The person of the debtor, as well as his family and lands, could be seized for non-payment of debt (Mt 18:21-26). Indeed, the debtor was often cast into prison and tormented because of non-payment (Mt 18:30,34). That compassion and leniency should be exercised toward those in debt is

the clear teaching of Christ in the parables of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:23-35) and the Two Debtors (Lu 7:41-43).

Figurative: Debt and debtor are used in a moral sense also as indicating the obligation of a righteous life which we owe to God. To fall short in righteous living is to become a debtor. For this reason we pray, "Forgive us our debts" (Mt 6:12). Those who are ministered to in spiritual things are said to be debtors to those who minister to them (Ro 15:27). To make a vow to God is to put one's self in debt in a moral sense (Mt 23:16-18; the Revised Version, margin "bound by his oath"). In a deeply spiritual sense the apostle Paul professed to be in debt to all men in that he owed them the opportunity to do them good (Ro 1:14).

The parables of Jesus as above named are rich with comforting truth. How beautiful is the willingness of God, the great and Divine Creditor, to release us from our indebtedness! Just so ought we to be imitators of the Father in heaven who is merciful.

William Evans

DECALOGUE

dek'-a-log.

See TEN COMMANDMENTS.

DECAPOLIS

de-kap'-o-lis (Dekapolis): The name given to the region occupied by a league of "ten cities" (Mt 4:25; Mr 5:20; 7:31), which Eusebius defines (in Onomastica) as "lying in the Peraea, round Hippos, Pella and Gadara." Such combinations of Greek cities arose as Rome assumed dominion in the East, to promote their common interests in trade and commerce, and for mutual protection against the peoples surrounding them.

This particular league seems to have been constituted about the time of Pompey's campaign in Syria, 65 BC, by which several cities in Decapolis dated their eras. They were independent of the local tetrarchy, and answerable directly to the governor of Syria. They enjoyed the rights of association and asylum; they struck their own coinage, paid imperial taxes and were liable to military service (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; BJ, I, vii, 7; II, xviii, 3; III, ix, 7; Vita, 65, 74). Of the ten cities, Scythopolis, the ancient Bethshean, alone, the capital of the league, was on the West side of Jordan. The names given by Pliny (NH, v.18) are Scythopolis (Beisan), Hippos (Susiyeh), Gadara (Umm Qeis), Pella (Fahil), Philadelphia ('Amman), Gerasa (Jerash), Dion (Adun?), Canatha (Qanawat), Damascus and Raphana. The last named is not identified, and Dion is uncertain. Other cities joined the league, and Ptolemy, who omits Raphans, gives a list of 18. The Greek inhabitants were never on good terms with the Jews; and the herd of swine (Mr 5:11 ff) indicates contempt for what was probably regarded as Jewish prejudice. The ruins still seen at

Gadara, but especially at Kanawat (see KENATH) and Jerash, of temples, theaters and other public buildings, attest the splendor of these cities in their day.

W. Ewing

DECAY

de-ka’:Although this word is still in good use in both its literal sense, of the putrefaction of either animal or vegetable matter, and its derived sense, denoting any deterioration, decline or gradual failure, the Revised Version (British and American) has replaced it by other expressions in Le 25:35; Ec 10:18; Isa 44:26; Heb 8:13; in some of these cases with a gain in accuracy of translation. In Ne 4:10 (kashal, "to be feeble," "stumble") the Revised Version (British and American) retains "is decayed"; in Job 14:11 (charebh, "to be dried up") the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "wasteth," and in Joh 11:39 the American Standard Revised Version has "the body decayeth" instead of the more literal translation offensive to modern ears (ozei, "emits a smell").

F. K. Farr

DECEASE, IN NEW TESTAMENT

de-ses’ (teleutao, "to come to an end," "married and deceased" (Mt 22:25)): With thanato, "death," "die the death" (Mt 15:4; Mr 7:10, the Revised Version, margin "surely die"). Elsewhere the word is translated "die" (Mt 2:19; 9:18; Mr 9:48 and often; Heb 11:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "end was nigh").

Also the substantive, exodos, "exodus," "exit," "departure," "his decease which he was about to accomplish" (Lu 9:31, the Revised Version, margin "departure"); "after my decease" (2Pe 1:15, the Revised Version, margin "departure").

DECEASE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND APOCYPHRA

de-ses’ (rapha’, plural repha’im, "ghosts," "shades," is translated by "dead," "dead body," and "deceased" in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)): The word seems to mean "soft," "inert," but its etymology is uncertain (see REPHAIM). The various writers of the Old Testament present, as is to be expected on such a subject, different conceptions of the condition of the deceased. In the beginning probably a vague idea of the continuation of existence was held, without the activities (Isa 59:10) and the joys of the present life (Ps 49:17). They dwell in the "land of forgetfulness" (Job 14:21; Ps 88:5; compare Isa 26:14), they "tremble" of cold (Job 26:5), they totter and "stumble at noonday as in the twilight" (Isa 59:10), their voice is described as low and muttering or chirping (Isa 8:19; 29:4), which may refer to the peculiar pitch of the voice of the spirit medium when a spirit speaks through him. (The calling up of the dead, which was strictly forbidden to Israel (Le 19:31;

20:27) is referred to in 1Sa 28:13 and perhaps in Isa 14:9.) The deceased are separated from their friends; love and hatred have both ceased with them (Ec 9:5,6); "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in Sheol" (Ec 9:10). The deceased are unable to praise Yahweh (Ps 6:5; 88:10-12; Isa 38:18; Baruch 2:17; Sirach 17:27,28). Nor does there seem to have been at first an anticipation of reward or punishment after death (Ps 88:10; Sirach 41:4), probably because the shades were supposed to be lacking the organs by which either reward or punishment could be perceived; nevertheless they are still in the realm of God's power (1Sa 2:6; Ps 86:13; 139:8; Pr 15:11; Isa 7:11; Ho 13:14; Am 9:2; Tobit 13:2).

Gradually the possibility of a return of the departed was conceived (Ge 5:24; 2Ki 13:21; Ps 49:15; 73:24; 86:13; Ho 13:14; The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1-7; 4:13,14; 6:18,19; 10:14). Even here it is often more the idea of the immortality of the soul than that of the resurrection of the body, and some of these passages may be interpreted as allegorical expressions for a temporal rescue from great disaster (e. g. 1Sa 2:6); nevertheless this interpretation presupposes the existence of a deliverance from the shadows of Sheol to a better life in the presence of Yahweh. Some passages refer clearly to such an escape at the end of the age (Da 12:2; Isa 26:19). Only very few of the Old Testament believers reached the sublime faith of Job (19:25,26) and none the blessed expectation taught in the New Testament, for none but Christ has "brought life and immortality to light" (2Ti 1:10; Joh 5:28,29).

The opinion that the dead or at least the newly buried could partake of the food which was placed in graves, a custom which recent excavations have clearly shown to have been almost universal in Palestine, and which is referred to in De 26:14 and Tobit 4:17, was soon doubted (Sirach 30:18), and food and drink prepared for the funeral was henceforth intended as the "bread of comfort" and the "cup of consolation" for the mourners (Jer 16:7; 2Sa 3:35; Eze 24:17). Similarly the offering and burning of incense, originally an homage to the deceased, became a relief for the mourner (2Ch 16:14; 21:19; Jer 34:5). See also The Wisdom of Solomon 3:2; 7:6; Sirach 38:23, and articles on CORPSE; DEATH; HADES; SHEOL.

H. L. E. Luering

DECEIT

de-set' (mirmah; (dolos)): The intentional misleading or beguiling of another; in Scripture represented as a companion of many other forms of wickedness, as cursing (Ps 10:7), hatred (Pr 26:24), theft, covetousness, adultery, murder (Mr 7:22; Ro 1:29). The Revised Version (British and American) introduces the word in Pr 14:25; 2Th 2:10; but in such passages as Ps 55:11; Pr 20:17; 26:26; 1Th 2:3, renders a variety of words, more accurately than the King James Version, by "oppression," "falsehood," "guile," "error."

DECEIVABLENESS; DECEIVE

de-sev'-a-b'-l-nes, de-sev' (nasha'," to lead astray"): "The pride of thy heart hath deceived thee" (Jer

49:16), i.e. "Thy stern mountain fastnesses have persuaded thee that thou art impregnable." In Jer 20:7, "O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived," pathah, signifies "to be enticed," "persuaded," as in the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version, margin.

In the Old Testament most often, and in the New Testament regularly, the various words rendered in the King James Version "deceive" denote some deliberate misleading in the moral or spiritual realm. False prophets (Jer 29:8), false teachers (Eph 5:6) and Satan himself (Re 12:9) are deceivers in this sense. In the gospels, the King James Version "deceive" (planao, 9 times Mt 24:4,5 parallel Mr 13:5,6 parallel Lu 21:8; Mt 24:11,24; Joh 7:12,47) becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) "lead astray"; the same change is made in 1Joh 2:26; 3:7; but elsewhere (13 t) both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render planao by "deceive."

"Deceivableness" (apate), only in 2Th 2:10, signifies power to deceive, not liability to deception; the Revised Version (British and American) "deceit."

F. K. Farr

DECENTLY

de'-sent-li (euschemonos): Only once is this word found in our English Bible (1Co 14:40). It is in the last verse of that remarkable chapter on the proper use of spiritual gifts in the church and the proper conduct of public worship. It does not refer here to absence of impurity or obscenity. It rather refers to good order in the conduct of public worship. All things that are done and said in public worship are to be in harmony with that becoming and reverent spirit and tone that befit the true worshippers of God.

DECISION

de-sizh'-un: Has several different shades of meaning. It expresses the formation of a judgment on a matter under consideration. It expresses the quality of being firm or positive in one's actions. It expresses the termination of a contest or question in favor of one side or the other, as the decision of the battle, or the decision of the judge.

1. National Decisions:

Until recent times the decision of disputed points between nations was determined by force of arms. Thus the questions of dispute were decided between Israel and the surrounding tribes, between Israel and Assyria, between Israel and Egypt, and later between Judea and Rome.

2. Judicial Decisions:

In the earliest times the questions of dispute between individuals were decided by the patriarch who was

the head of the family. When Israel became a nation men were appointed to decide the difficulties between the people. At first this was one of the most important duties of Moses, but when the task became too great he appointed judges to assist him (see Ex 18:13-26). One important function of those who are called judges was to decide the difficulties between the people (see Jud 4:4,5). The kings also decided questions of dispute between individuals (see 2Sa 15:1-6; 1Ki 3:16-28). As the people developed in their national ideals the decisions in judicial matters were rendered by councils appointed for that purpose.

3. Methods of Forming Decisions:

Perplexing questions were many times decided by the casting of lots. The people believed that God would in this way direct them to the right decision (Pr 16:33; Jos 7:10-21; 14:2; 1Sa 10:20 f). Casting lots must have been a common method of deciding perplexing questions (see 1Sa 14:41,42; Jon 1:7). It was resorted to by the apostles to decide which of the two men they had selected should take the place of Judas (Ac 1:21-26). The custom gradually lost in favor, and decisions, even of perplexing questions, were formed by considering all the facts. See AUGURY, IV, 3; LOTS.

A. W. Fortune

DECISION, VALLEY OF

See JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.

DECLARATION; DECLARE

dek-la-ra’-shun, deklar’:"Declare" is the translation of a variety of Hebrew and Greek words in the Old Testament and New Testament, appearing to bear uniformly the meaning "to make known," "set forth," rather than (the older meaning) "to explain" (De 1:5). Declaration (Es 10:2 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "full account"; Job 13:17; Ecc 43:6; Lu 11 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "narrative"; 2Co 8:19 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "to show") has the like meaning.

DECLINE

de-klin’ [(@cur], or sur, naTah): In the King James Version this word occurs 9 times in its original sense (now obsolete) of "turn aside." the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "turn aside" in Ex 23:2; De 17:11; 2Ch 34:2; Job 23:11. In Ps 102:11; 109:23, the lengthening shadows of afternoon are said to "decline," and the Revised Version (British and American) introduces the word in the same general sense in Jud 19:8; 2Ki 20:10; Jer 6:4. See AFTERNOON.

DEDAN; DEDANITES

de’-dan, de’dan-its (the King James Version Dedanim, ded’-a-nim; dedhan, "low," dedhanim): An Arabian people named in Ge 10:7 as descended from Cush; in Ge 25:3 as descended from Keturah. Evidently, they were, like the related Sheba (Sabaeans), of mixed race (compare Ge 10:7,28). In Isa 21:13 allusion is made to the "caravans of Dedanites" in the wilds of Arabia, and Eze mentions them as supplying Tyre with precious things (Eze 27:20; in verse 15, "Dedan" should probably be read as in Septuagint, "Rodan," i.e. Rhodians). The name seems still to linger in the island of Dadan, on the border of the Persian Gulf. It is found also in Min. and Sab. inscriptions (Glazer, II, 392 ff).

James Orr

DEDICATE; DEDICATION

ded’-i-kat, ded-ika’-shun (chanukkah, "initiation," "consecration"; qadhesh, "to be clean," "sanctify"; cherem, "a thing devoted (to God)"): Often used in Hebrew of the consecration of persons, but usually in the English Versions of the Bible of the setting apart of things to a sacred use, as of the altar (Nu 7:10 f, 84,88; compare Da 3:2,3, "the dedication of the image"), of silver and gold (2Sa 8:11; 2Ki 12:4), of the Temple (1Ki 8:63; Ezr 6:16 f; compare Ex 29:44), of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:27), of private dwellings (De 20:5). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "devoted" for "dedicated" in Eze 44:29. See CONSECRATION; SANCTIFICATION.

DEDICATION, FEAST OF

ded-i-ka’-shun (ta egkainia, Joh 10:22): A feast held by the Jews throughout the country for eight days, commencing on the 25th Kiclev (December), in commemoration of the cleansing of the temple and dedication of the altar by Judas Maccabeus after their desecration by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 4:56,59). The feast was to be kept "with mirth and gladness." 2 Macc 10:6,7 says it was kept like the Feast of the Tabernacles, with the carrying of palm and other branches, and the singing of psalms. Josephus calls it "Lights," from the joy which accompanied it (Ant., XII, vii, 7). At this winter feast Jesus delivered in the temple the discourse recorded in Joh 10:24 ff, at Jerusalem.

James Orr

DEED

ded: Used in its ordinary modern sense in EV. In the Old Testament it is used to translates five Hebrew words: gemylah, literally, "recompense" (Isa 59:18); dabhar, literally, "word," "thing" (2Ch 35:27 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "acts"; Es 1:17,18; Jer 5:28); ma‘aseh (Ge 20:9; 44:15; Ezr 9:13); ‘alilah (1Ch 16:8 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "doings"; Ps 105:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "doings"); po‘al (Ps 28:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "work"; Jer 25:14).

In the New Testament "deed" very frequently translates ergon (same root as English "work"; compare "energy"), which is still more frequently (espescially in the Revised Version (British and American)) rendered "work." In Lu 23:51; Ac 19:18; Ro 8:13; Col 3:9 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "doings," it stands for Greek praxis (literally, "a doing," "transaction"), each time in a bad sense, equivalent to wicked deed, crime, a meaning which is frequently associated with the plural of praxis (compare English "practices" in the sense of trickery; so often in Polybius; Deissmann maintains that praxis was a technical term in magic), although in Mt 16:27 (the King James Version "works") and Ro 12:4 the same Greek word has a neutral meaning. In Jas 1:25 the King James Version "deed" is the translation of Greek poiesis, more correctly rendered "doing" in the Revised Version (British and American).

D. Miall Edwards

DEEP

(tehom; abussos, Lu 8:31 the King James Version; Ro 10:7 the King James Version; bathos, Lu 5:4; buthos, 2Co 11:25):

The Hebrew word ("water in commotion") is used

(1) of the primeval watery waste (Ge 1:2), where some suggest a connection with Babylonian Tiamat in the creation-epic;

(2) of the sea (Isa 51:10 and commonly);

(3) of the subterranean reservoir of water (Ge 7:11; 8:2; 49:25; De 33:13; Eze 31:4, etc.). In the Revised Version (British and American) the Greek word first noted is rendered, literally, "abyss." See ABYSS; also ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 7.

DEEP SLEEP

See SLEEP, DEEP.

DEER

der (’ayyal, feminine ‘ayyalah, and ‘ayyeleth (compare Arabic, ‘ayyal and ‘iyal, "deer" and ‘ayil, "ram," and Latin caper and capra, "goat," caprea, capreolus, "wild goat," "chamois," or "roe deer")); yachmur (compare Arabic, yachmur, "deer"); ya‘alah, feminine of ya‘el (compare Arabic, wa‘l, "Pers wild goat"); tsebhi, and feminine tsebhiyah (compare Arabic, zabi and feminine zabiyah, "gazelle"); ‘opher (compare Arabic, ghafr and ghufr, "young of the mountain goat"):

Of the words in the preceding list, the writer believes that only the first two, i.e. ‘ayyal (with its feminine forms) and yachmur should be translated "deer," ‘ayyal for the roe deer and yachmur for the fallow deer. Further, he believes that ya‘el (including ya‘alah) should be translated "ibex," and tsebhi, "gazelle." ‘Opher is the young of a roe deer or of a gazelle.

‘Ayyal and its feminine forms are regularly in English Versions of the Bible rendered "hart" and "hind," terms which are more commonly applied to the male and female of the red deer, Cervus elaphus, which inhabits Great Britain, the continent of Europe, the Caucasus and Asia Minor, but which has never been reported as far south as Syria or Palestine. The roe deer, Capreolus caprea, however, which inhabits the British Isles, the greater part of Europe, the Caucasus and Persia, is certainly found in Palestine. The museum of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut possesses the skeleton of a roe deer which was shot in the mountains near Tyre. As late as 1890 it was fairly common in southern Lebanon and Carmel, but has now (1912) become very scarce. The fallow deer, Cervus dama, is a native of Northern Africa and countries about the Mediterranean. It is found in central Europe and Great Britain, where it has been introduced from its more southern habitat. A variety of the fallow deer, sometimes counted as a separate species under the name of Cervus Mesopotamicus, inhabits northeastern Mesopotamia and Persia. It may in former times have been found in Palestine, and Tristram reports having seen the fallow deer in Galilee (Fauna and Flora of Pal), but while Tristram was a remarkably acute observer, he appears sometimes to have been too readily satisfied, and his observations, when unaccompanied, as in this case, by specimens, are to be accepted with caution. Now ‘ayyal (and its feminine forms) occurs in the Bible 22 times, while yachmur occurs only twice, i.e. in the list of clean animals in De 14:5, and in 1Ki 4:23, in the list of animals provided for Solomon’s table. In both places the King James Version has "fallow deer" and the Revised Version (British and American) "roebuck." In view of the fact that the roe deer has within recent years been common in Palestine, while the occurrence of the fallow deer must be considered doubtful, it seems fair to render ‘ayyal "roe deer" or "roebuck," leaving yachmur for fallow deer.

The Arabs call the roe deer both ‘ayyal and wa‘l. Wa‘l is the proper name of the Persian wild goat, Capra aegagrus, and is also often used for the Arabic or Sinaitic ibex, Capra beden, though only by those who do not live within its range. Where the ibex is at home it is always called beden. This looseness of nomenclature must be taken into account, and we have no reason to suppose that the Hebrews were more exact than are the Arabs. There are many examples of this in English, e. g. panther, coney, rabbit (in America), locust, adder and many others.

Ya‘el (including ya‘alah) occurs 4 times. In Job 39:1; Ps 104:18; 1Sa 24:2, English Versions of the Bible render ya‘el by "wild goat." For ya‘alah in Pr 5:19, the King James Version has "roe," while the Revised Version (British and American) has "doe," which is non-committal, since the name, "doe," may be applied to the female of a deer or of an ibex. Since the Arabic, wa‘l, which is etymologically closely akin to ya‘el, means the Persian wild goat, it might be supposed that that animal was meant, were it not that it inhabits the plains of the Syrian desert, and not the mountains of Southern Palestine, where the ibex lives. At least two of the passages clearly indicate the latter locality, i.e. Ps 104:18: "The high mountains are for the wild goats," and 1Sa 24:2: "Saul .... went to seek David and his men upon the

rocks of the wild goats." The conclusion then seems irresistible that ya‘el, and consequently ya‘alah, is the ibex.

Tsebhi (including tsebhiyah) is uniformly rendered "roe" or "roebuck" in the King James Version, while the Revised Version (British and American), either in the text or in the margin, has in most cases "gazelle." In two places "roe" is retained in the Revised Version (British and American) without comment, i.e. 2Sa 2:18: "Asahel was as light of foot as a wild roe," and 1Ch 12:8: "were as swift as the roes upon the mountains." ‘Ayyal and tsebhi occur together in De 12:15,22; 14:5; 15:22; 1Ki 4:23; So 2:9,17, i.e. in 7 of the 16 passages in which we find tsebhi. If therefore it be accepted that ‘ayyal is the roe deer, it follows that tsebhi must be something else. Now the gazelle is common in Palestine and satisfies perfectly every passage in which we find tsebhi. Further, one of the Arabic names of the gazelle is zabi, a word which is etymologically much nearer to tsebhi than appears in this transliteration.

‘Opher is akin to ‘aphar, "dust," and has reference to the color of the young of the deer or gazelle, to both of which it is applied. In So 2:9,17 and 8:14, we have ‘opher ha- ‘ayyalim, English Versions of the Bible "young hart," literally, "fawn of the roe deer." In So 4:5 and 7:3, we have ‘opharim te’ome tsebhiyah, the King James Version "young roes that are twins," the Revised Version (British and American) "fawns that are twins of a roe," the Revised Version, margin "gazelle" (for "roe"). For further reference to these questions, see ZOOLOGY.

With the exception of mere lists of animals, as in De 14 and 1Ki 4, the treatment of these animals is highly poetical, and shows much appreciation of their grace and beauty.

Alfred Ely Day

DEFAME; DEFAMING

de-fam’, de-fam’-ing: These words occur but twice in the King James Version, and are translations of dibbah, "slander," from dabhath, "to slander," or spread an evil report, and blasphemeo, "to speak injuriously" of anyone (Jer 20:10; 1Co 4:13). "To defame" differs from "to revile" in that the former refers to public slander, the latter to personal abuse.

DEFECT; DEFECTIVE

de-fekt’, de-fekt’-iv (hettema, "loss," "a defect"): Occurs in 1Co 6:7: "Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you (the King James Version "there is utterly a fault among you"), that ye have lawsuits one with another." "Defect" means "want or absence of something necessary for completeness" (the Revised Version, margin "a loss to you"). The meaning of the passage in the Revised Version (British and American) is that when Christians have lawsuits one with another it produces a lack of something which brings them short of completeness, they suffer a spiritual loss or defeat, and perhaps defect is not quite strong enough fully to express that idea.

Defective: Sirach 49:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "committed trespass."

A. W. Fortune

DEFENCE

de-fens’. See COURTS, JUDICIAL.

DEFENCED

See FORTIFICATION.

DEFER

de-fur’ (’achar (in Hiphil), ‘arakh (in Hiphil), mashakh (in Niphal), "to postpone," more or less definitely; "delay": In Old Testament passages such as Isa 48:9; Eze 12:25,28; Da 9:19, the idea of indefinite postponement agrees with the Hebrew and with the context. In the only New Testament occurrence of the word anaballo, in the middle voice, Ac 24:22) a definite postponement is implied.

DEFILE; DEFILEMENT

de-fil’, de-fil’-ment (Anglo-Saxon, afylau, etc.; Middle English, defoulen, "make foul," "pollute," render (the King James Version) 9 Hebrew roots (the Revised Version (British and American) six): ga‘al, "defile"; chalal, "defile" (from "untie, loosen, open," i.e. "make common," hence, "profane"); chaneph, "incline away" (from right or religion), hence, "profane," "defile" (Jer 3:9, the American Standard Revised Version "pollute"); Tame’, the principal root, over 250 times translated "defile" 74 times "to become, or render, unclean"; Tanaph, "to soil" (So 5:3); ‘alal, "deal severely, or decidedly, with," "roll" (Job 16:15, the King James Version, the American Revised Version, margin); ‘anah, "humble" (Ge 34:2 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "humble"); qadhash, "separate," "sanctify," "devote to religious use," hence, "forfeit" (De 22:9 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "forfeit," margin "consecrated"). They also render 6 (the King James Version) Greek roots (American Revised Version, 4): koinos, etc., "common" or "unclean," because appertaining to the outside world and not to the people of God, opposite of katharos, "clean," used 13 times; miaino, miasma, miasmos, "stain," "tinge," "dye": "In their dreamings defile the flesh," Jude 1:8; moluno, "stain," "contaminate": "not defile their garments" (Re 3:4); spiloo, "spot," "stain": "defile the whole body" (Jas 3:6); phtheiro, "corrupt," "destroy": the temple of God (1Co 3:17 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "destroyeth"); arsenokoites: "defile themselves with men" (1Ti 1:10 the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version "abusers of")):

1. Defilement in the Old Testament:

Defilement in the Old Testament was physical, sexual, ethical, ceremonial, religious, the last four, especially, overlapping.

(1) Physical: "I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" (So 5:3).

(2) Sexual: which might be ceremonial or moral; of individuals by illicit intercourse (Le 18:20), or by intercourse at forbidden times (Le 15:24; 1Sa 21:5); of the land by adultery: "Shall not that land be greatly defiled?" (Jer 3:1 the American Standard Revised Version "polluted," usually substituted where the moral or religious predominates over the ceremonial).

(3) Ethical: "Your hands are defiled with blood" (Isa 59:3); "Neither shall they defile themselves any more with .... any of their transgressions" (Eze 37:23).

(4) Ceremonial: to render ceremonially unclean, i.e. disqualified for religious service or worship, and capable of communicating the disqualification.

(a) Persons were defiled by contact with carcasses of unclean animals (Le 11:24); or with any carcass (Le 17:15); by eating a carcass (Le 22:8); by contact with issues from the body, one's own or another's, e. g. abnormal issues from the genitals, male or female (Le 15:2,25); menstruation (Le 15:19); by contact with anyone thus unclean (Le 15:24); copulation (Le 15:16-18); uncleanness after childbirth (Le 12:2-5); by contact with unclean persons (Le 5:3), or unclean things (Le 22:6), or with leprosy (especially defiling; Le 13:14), or with the dead (Nu 6:12), or with one unclean by such contact (Nu 19:22), or by funeral rites (Le 21:1); by contact with creeping things (Le 22:5), or with unclean animals (Le 11:26).

(b) Holy objects were ceremonially defiled by the contact, entrance or approach of the defiled (Le 15:31; Nu 19:13); by the presence of dead bodies, or any remains of the dead (Eze 9:7; 2Ki 23:16: Josiah's defilement of heathen altars by the ashes of the priests); by the entrance of foreigners (Ps 79:1; see Ac 21:28); by forbidden treatment, as the altar by being tooled (Ex 20:25); objects in general by contact with the unclean. Ceremonial defilement, strictly considered, implied, not sin, but ritual unfitness.

(5) Religious: not always easily distinguished or entirely distinguishable from the ceremonial, still less from the ethical, but in which the central attitude and relationship to Yahweh as covenant God and God of righteousness, was more fully in question. The land might be defiled by bloodshed (Nu 35:33), especially of the just or innocent; by adultery (Jer 3:1); by idolatry and idolatrous practices, like sacrificing children to idols, etc. (Le 20:3; Ps 106:39); the temple or altar by disrespect (Mal 1:7,12); by offering the unclean (Hag 2:14); by any sort of unrighteousness (Eze 36:17); by the presence of idols or idolatrous paraphernalia (Jer 7:30).

2. Defilement in New Testament:

The scope of defilement in its various degrees (direct, or primary, as from the person or thing defiled; indirect, or secondary, tertiary, or even further, by contact with the defiled) had been greatly widened by rabbinism into a complex and immensely burdensome system whose shadow falls over the whole New Testament life. Specific mentions are comparatively few. Physical defilement is not mentioned. Sexual defilement appears, in a figurative sense: "These are they that were not defiled with women" (Re 14:4). Ceremonial defilement is found in, but not approved by, the New Testament. Examples are: by eating with unwashed, "common," not ceremonially cleansed, hands (Mr 7:2); by eating unclean, "common," food (Ac 10:14; Peter's vision); by intimate association with Gentiles, such as eating with them (not expressly forbidden in Mosaic law; Ac 11:3), or entering into their houses (Joh 18:28; the Pharisees refusing to enter the Pretorium); by the presence of Gentiles in the Temple (Ac 21:28).

But with Christ's decisive and revolutionary dictum (Mr 7:19): "This he said, making all meats clean," etc., and with the command in Peter's vision: "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common" (Ac 10:15), and with Paul's bold and consistent teaching: "All things indeed are clean" (Ro 14:20, etc.), the idea of ceremonial or ritual defilement, having accomplished its educative purpose, passed. Defilement in the New Testament teaching, therefore, is uniformly ethical or spiritual, the two constantly merging. The ethical is found more predominantly in: "The things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart; and they defile the man" (Mt 15:18); "that did not defile their garments" (Re 3:4); "defileth the whole body" (Jas 3:6). The spiritual seems to predominate in: "defiled and unbelieving" (Tit 1:15); "conscience being weak is defiled" (by concession to idolatry.) (1Co 8:7); "lest any root of bitterness springing up trouble you, and thereby the many be defiled" (Heb 12:15). For the supposed origins of the idea and details of defilement, as from hygienic or aesthetic causes, "natural aversions," "taboo," "totemism," associations with ideas of death, or evil life, religious symbolism, etc., see POLLUTION; PURIFICATION; UNCLEANNESS. Whatever use God may have made of ideas and feelings common among many nations in some form, the Divine purpose was clearly to impress deeply and indelibly on the Israelites the ideas of holiness and sacredness in general, and of Yahweh's holiness, and their own required holiness and separateness in particular, thus preparing for the deep New Testament teachings of sin, and of spiritual consecration and sanctification.

Philip Wendell Crannell

DEFY

de-fi' (charaph, za'am): In 1Sa 17:10,25,26,36,45 (the story of David and Goliath) and kindred passages, this word is used in its most familiar sense—"to taunt," "challenge to combat" (Hebrew charaph). In Nu 23:7,8 "denounce" would be a better translation than "defy" (Hebrew za'am).

DEGENERATE

de-jen'-er-at: Only in Jer 2:21, where Judah is compared to a "noble vine" which it "turned into the degenerate branches of a foreign vine." It represents Hebrew curim =" stray" or "degenerate (shoots),"

from cur =" to turn aside," especially to turn aside from the right path (Greek pikria, literally, "bitterness").

DEGREE

de-gre’ (ma‘alah, "a going up" or "ascent," hence, a staircase or flight of steps; "rank": tapeinos, "low"): By derivation it should mean "a step down" (Latin, de, down, gradus, step). It is used, however, of any step, up or down; then of grade or rank, whether high or low.

(1) In its literal sense of step (as of a stair), it is used in the plural to translate Hebrew ma‘aloth ("steps"), in the parallel passages 2Ki 20:9-11 the King James Version (5 t); Isa 38:8 the King James Version (3 t), where we read of the "degrees" (the Revised Version (British and American) "steps") on the "dial of Ahaz" (Hebrew "steps of Ahaz"). See DIAL OF AHAZ. It seems to mean steps or progressive movements of the body toward a certain place in the phrase "A So of Degrees" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Ascents"), which forms the title of each of the Psalms 120-134, probably because they were sung on the way up to the great feasts at Jerusalem. See PSALMS

(2) The secondary (but now the more usual) sense of rank, order, grade is found in the following passages:

(a) 1Ch 15:18, "their brethren of the second (degree)," literally, "of the seconds" (Hebrew mishnim; compare 2Ch 28:7, "Elkanah that was next to the king," Hebrew, "the king’s second," i.e. in rank);

(b) 1Ch 17:17, "a man of high degree" (Hebrew ma‘alah, "step");

(c) Ps 62:9, "men of low degree .... men of high degree," a paraphrase of Hebrew "sons of man .... sons of man," the first "man" being Hebrew ‘adham ("common humanity"; compare Greek anthropos, Latin homo, Welsh dyn), and the second Hebrew ‘ish (man in a superior sense; compare Greek aner, Latin vir, Welsh gwr) ;

(d) "of low degree" for Greek tapeinos in Sirach 11:1; Lu 1:52; Jas 1:9;

(e) In 1Ti 3:13 the King James Version "a good degree" (Greek bathmos kalos, the Revised Version (British and American) "a good standing") is assured to those who have "served well as deacons." Some take this to mean promotion to a higher official position in the church; but it probably means simply a position of moral weight and influence in the church gained by faithfulness in service (so Hort).

D. Miall Edwards

DEGREES, SONGS OF

(shir ha-ma‘aloth; Septuagint ode ton anabathmon; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) canticum graduum, the Revised Version (British and American) "a song of ascents"): The title prefixed to 15 psalms (Pss 120-134) as to the significance of which there are four views:

(1) The Jewish interpretation. According to the Mishna, Middoth 2 5, Cukkah 51b, there was in the temple a semi-circular flight of stairs with 15 steps which led from the court of the men of Israel down to the court of the women. Upon these stairs the Levites played on musical instruments on the evening of the first day of Tabernacles. Later Jewish writers say that the 15 psalms derived their title from the 15 steps.

(2) Gesenius, Delitzsch and others affirm that these psalms derive their name from the step-like progressive rhythm of their thoughts. They are called Songs of Degrees because they move forward climactically by means of the resumption of the immediately preceding word. But this characteristic is not found in several of the group.

(3) Theodoret and other Fathers explain these 15 hymns as traveling songs of the returning exiles. In Ezr 7:9 the return from exile is called "the going up (ha-ma‘alah) from Babylon." Several of the group suit this situation quite well, but others presuppose the temple and its stated services.

(4) The most probable view is that the hymns were sung by pilgrim bands on their way to the three great festivals of the Jewish year. The journey to Jerusalem was called a "going up," whether the worshipper came from north or south, east or west. All of the songs are suitable for use on such occasions. Hence, the title Pilgrim Psalms is preferred by many scholars. See DIAL OF AHAZ.

John Richard Sampey

DEHAITES

de-ha’-tez (dehawe’; the King James Version Dehavites): A people enumerated in Ezr 4:9 with Elamites, ere, as among those settled by the Assyrian king Osnappar (Assurbanipal) in Samaria. The identification is uncertain.

DEHORT de-hort’ (apostrepho; the Revised Version (British and American) DISSUADE): Not found in the English Bible; once only in Apocrypha (1 Macc 9:9). An obsolete English word; the opposite of "exhort." It means "to dissuade," "to forbid," "to restrain from."

DEKAR

de’-kar (deqer, "lancer"): Father of one of Solomon’s commissaries (1Ki 4:9 the King James Version). See BEN-DEKER.

DELAIAH

de-la’-ya (delayah, "God has raised"):

(1) A descendant of David (1Ch 3:24; the King James Version "Dalaiah").

(2) One of David’s priests and leader of the 23rd course (1Ch 24:18).

(3) One of the princes who pleaded with Jehoiakim not to destroy the roll containing the prophecies of Jeremiah (Jer 36:12,25).

(4) The ancestor of a post-exilic family whose genealogy was lost (Ezr 2:60; Ne 7:62; 1 Esdras 5:37 margin). See DALAN.

(5) The father of timorous Shemaiah (Ne 6:10).

DELAY

de-la’:The noun "delay" (Ac 25:17, "I made no delay"; the King James Version "without any delay") means "procrastination." The verb "to delay" (Ex 22:29; ‘achar) involves the idea "to stop for a time," the people being admonished not to discontinue a custom. The Pil. perfect of bush (Ex 32:1), "Moses delayed to come," expresses not only the fact that he tarried, but also the disappointment on the part of the people, being under the impression that he possibly was put to shame and had failed in his mission, which also better explains the consequent action of the people. "To delay" (chronizo) is used transitively in Mt 24:48 (the Revised Version (British and American) "My lord tarrieth") and in Lu 12:45. The meaning here is "to prolong," "to defer."

A. L. Breslich

DELECTABLE

de-lek’-ta-bl (chamadh, "to desire"): Found only in Isa 44:9, King James Version: "Their delectable things shall not profit," the King James Version margin"desirable." the American Standard Revised Version translates: "the things that they delight in." The reference is to idols or images. Delitzsch renders the phrase: "Their darlings are good for nothing." The word may be traced back to the Latin delectabilis, "pleasant," or "delightful."

DELICACY

del’-i-ka-si (to strenos): Found only in Re 18:3, King James Version: "The merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies." the Revised Version (British and American) has

very properly changed delicacies to "wantonness," and "luxury" in the margin, which is much nearer to the original.

DELICATE; DELICATELY

del'-i-kat, del'-i-kat-li ('edhen, 'anogh; en truphe): "Delicate" usually an adjective, but once a substantive (Jer 51:34 the King James Version). "He hath filled his belly (the Revised Version (British and American) "maw") with my delicates." the Revised Version (British and American) retains the word, but the American Standard Revised Version very properly has replaced it with "delicacies." In Sirach 30:18, the Revised Version (British and American) agatha, "good things." The adjective seems to have two meanings, though not easily distinguished:

(1) tenderly reared, and

(2) wanton or voluptuous. In De 28:54,56; Isa 47:1; Jer 6:2, "luxurious" or "daintily bred" would certainly be nearer the original than "delicate." "Delicate children" of Mic 1:16, the King James Version, is changed by the Revised Version (British and American) to "children of thy delight," i.e. beloved children, rather than children begotten in passion. The adverb "delicately" is employed in the same sense as the adjective (La 4:5; Lu 7:25). In the old English writers "delicate" is often used for voluptuous: "Dives for his delicate life to the devil went" (Piers Ploughman). The meaning of "delicately" (ma'adhan) in 1Sa 15:32 (the King James Version) is a real puzzle. The King James Version reads, "And Agag came unto him delicately," with a possible suggestion of weakness or fear. the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version, margin substitute "cheerfully." Others, by metathesis or change of consonants in the Hebrew word, translation "in bonds" or "fetters."

W. W. Davies

DELICIOUSLY

de-lish'-us-li (streniao "to live hard or wantonly"): "She (Babylon) .... lived deliciously" (Re 18:7,9 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "wantonly," the Revised Version, margin "luxuriously").

DELIGHT

de-lit' (verb, chaphets, ratsah, sha'a'; sunedomai): "To delight" is most frequently expressed by chaphets, which means originally "to bend" (compare Job 40:17, "He moveth his tail"), hence, "to incline to," "take pleasure in." It is used of God's pleasure in His people (Nu 14:8; 2Sa 22:20; Ps 18:19, etc.), and in righteousness, etc. (Isa 66:4; Jer 9:24; Mic 7:18, etc.), also of man's delight in God and His will (Ps 40:8; 73:25; the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "There is none upon earth that I desire besides thee"), and in other objects (Ge 34:19; 1Sa 18:22; Es 2:14; Isa

66:3); sha‘a‘, "to stroke," "caress," "be fond of," occurs in Ps 94:19, "Thy comforts delight my soul"; Ps 119:16,47,70, "I will delight myself in thy statutes." Similarly, Paul says (Ro 7:22), "I delight (sunedomai) in (margin, the Revised Version (British and American) "Greek with") the law of God after the inward man." This is the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament.

"To delight one’s self" (in the Lord) is represented chiefly by ‘anagh (Job 22:26; 27:10; Ps 37:4,11; Isa 58:14).

Delight (noun), chiefly chephets (1Sa 15:22; Ps 1:2; 16:3), ratson (Pr 11:1,20; 12,22; 15:8), sha‘ashu‘im (Ps 119:24,77,92,143,174; Pr 8:30,31). the Revised Version (British and American) has "delight" for "desire" (Ne 1:11; Ps 22:8; 51:16), for "observe," different reading (Pr 23:26), "no delight in" for "smell in" (Am 5:21), "delightest in me" for "favorest me" (Ps 41:11), "his delight shall be in" (m "Hebrew ‘scent’ ") for "of quick understanding" (Isa 11:3).

The element of joy, of delight in God and His law and will, in the Hebrew religion is noteworthy as being something which we are apt to fall beneath even in the clearer light of Christianity.

W. L. Walker

DELIGHTSOME

de-lit’-sum: chephets, is rendered "delightsome": Mal 3:12, "Ye shall be a delightsome land," literally, "a land of delight."

DELILAH

de-li’-la (delilah, "dainty one," perhaps; Septuagint Daleida, Dalida): The woman who betrayed Samson to the Philistines (Jud 16). She was presumably a Philistine, though that is not expressly stated. She is not spoken of as Samson’s wife, though many have understood the account in that way. The Philistines paid her a tremendously high price for her services. The account indicates that for beauty, personal charm, mental ability, self-command, nerve, she was quite a wonderful woman, a woman to be admired for some qualities which she exhibits, even while she is to be utterly disapproved. See SAMSON.

Willis J. Beecher

DELIVER

de-liv’-er (natsal, nathan; rhuomai, paradidomi): Occurs very frequently in the Old Testament and represents various Hebrew terms.

The English word is used in two senses,

(1) "to set free," etc.,

(2) "to give up or over."

(1) The word most often translated "deliver" in the first sense is natsal, meaning originally, perhaps, "to draw out." It is used of all kinds of deliverance (Ge 32:11; Ps 25:20; 143:9, etc.; Jer 7:10; Eze 3:19, etc.; Ze 1:18, etc.). The Aramaic netsal occurs in Da 3:29; 6:14; 8:4,7; yasha‘, "to save," in Jud 3:9,31 the King James Version, etc. ; malaT, "to let or cause to escape," in Isa 46:2, "recover," etc. In the New Testament rhuomai, "to rescue," is most frequently translated "deliver" in this sense (Mt 6:13 the King James Version, "Deliver us from evil"); katargeo, "to make useless" or "without effect" (Ro 7:6 the Revised Version (British and American), "discharged"). In the New Testament "save" takes largely the place of "deliver" in the Old Testament, and the idea is raised to the spiritual and eternal.

(2) For "deliver" in the sense of "give over, up," etc., the most frequent word is nathan, the common word for "to give" (Ge 32:16; 40:13 the King James Version; Ex 5:18). Other words are maghan (Ho 11:8, the King James Version and the English Revised Version "How shall I deliver thee Israel?" i. e. "How shall I give thee up?" as in the first clause of the verse, with a different word (nathan), the American Standard Revised Version "How shall I cast thee off?"), yehabh, Aramaic (Ezr 5:14). In the New Testament paradidomi, "to give over to," is most frequent (Mt 5:25; 11:27, "All things have been delivered (given or made over) unto me of my Father"; Mr 7:13; Lu 1:2; 1Ti 1:20, etc.); charizomai, "to grant as a favor" (Ac 25:11,16 the King James Version).

(3) Yaladh, "to bring forth," is also rendered "deliver" in the sense of childbirth (Ge 25:24; Ex 1:19, etc.). In the New Testament this sense is borne by tikto (Lu 1:57; 2:6; Re 12:2,4), and gennao (Joh 16:21).

In the Revised Version (British and American) there are many changes, such as, for "deliver," "restore" (Ge 37:22; 40:13; Ex 22:26; De 24:13); for "delivered," "defended" (1Ch 11:14); for "cannot deliver thee," "neither .... turn thee aside" (Job 36:18); for "betray," "betrayed" we have "deliver," "delivered up," etc. (Mt 10:4 margin; Mr 13:12; 14:10 f; Lu 21:16); for "delivered into chains," "committed to pits" (2Pe 2:4, margin "some ancient authorities read chains"; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 17:17); "Deliver us from evil," omitted in Lu 11:4, margin "Many ancient authorities add but deliver us from the evil one (or, from evil)." W. L. Walker

DELOS

de’-los (Delos): An island, now deserted, one of the Cyclades in the Aegean Sea, about 3 miles long and 1 mile broad, with a rocky mountain (Cynthus) several hundred feet high in the center. In antiquity Delos enjoyed great prosperity. According to Greek legend the island once floated on the surface of the water, until Poseidon fastened it on four diamond pillars for the wandering Leto, who, like Io, was pursued by the vengeful Hera. It was here that Apollo and Artemis were born; hence, the island was

sacred, and became one of the chief seats of worship of the two deities. Numerous temples embellished Delos. The most magnificent was that of Apollo, which contained a colossal statue of the god, a dedicatory offering of the Naxians. This temple was a sanctuary visited by all the Greeks, who came from far and near to worship at the deity's shrine. There was a Dorian peripteral temple in Delos from the beginning of the 4th century BC. To the North was a remarkable altar composed entirely of ox-horns. The various Ionian cities sent sacred embassies (theoriai) with rich offerings. There was also a celebrated oracle in Delos which was accounted one of the most trustworthy in the world. Every five years the famous Delian festival was celebrated with prophecies, athletic contests and games of every kind. All the nations of Greece participated.

The earliest inhabitants of Delos were Carians; but about 1000 BC the island was occupied by Ionians. For a long time it enjoyed independence. In 478 Delos was chosen as the place for the convention of the representatives of the Greek states for deliberation about means for defense against Persia. The treasury of the Athenian Confederacy was kept here after 476. The island became independent of Athens in 454. During the 2nd and 1st centuries BC it became one of the chief ports of the Aegean. This was partly due to its location, and partly to the fact that the Romans, after 190 BC, favored the island as a rival to the sea-power of Rhodes. In 166 Delos was given to Athens; the inhabitants fled to Achea, and the island was colonized by Athenians, together with Romans.

The ruins of the city of Delos, which became a flourishing commercial port, are to the North of the temple. It became the center of trade between Alexandria and the Black Sea, and was for a long time one of the chief slave markets of the Greek world. But Delos received a severe blow, from which it never recovered, in the war between Rome and Mithridates. The latter's general landed in 88 BC and massacred many, and sold the remainder of the defenseless people, and sacked and destroyed the city together with the temple and its countless treasures. At the conclusion of peace (84) Delos came into the possession of the Romans, who later gave it back to Athens. Under the Empire the island lost its importance entirely.

Delos was one of the states to which Rome addressed letters in behalf of the Jews (138-137 BC; see 1 Macc 15:16-23). Among those who came to Delos from the East must have been many of this nation. Josephus cites in full a decree passed in Delos which confirmed the Jewish exemption from military service (Ant., XIV, x, 4).

The excavations of the French have laid bare 8 temples within the sacred enclosure (Apollo, Artemis, Dionysus). Numerous statues, dating from the earliest times of Greek art down to the latest, have been discovered; also 2,000 inscriptions, among which was an inventory of the temple treasure.

By the side of Delos, across a very narrow strait, lies Rheneia, another island which was the burying-ground of Delos; for on the sacred isle neither births, deaths nor burials were permitted. In 426 BC Delos was "purified" by the Athenians—by the removal of the bodies that had been interred there previously.

LITERATURE.

Lebegue, Recherches sur Delos (Paris, 1876); V. v. Schoffer, De Deli Insulae rebus, Berliner Studien fur klass. Phil. (Berlin, 1889); Homolle, S. Reinach and others, in the Bulletin de corresp. Hellen. (VI, 1-167; VII, 103-25, 329-73; VIII, 75-158; XIV, 389-511; XV, 113-68); Homolle, Archives de l'intendance sacree a Delos; Jebb, Journal of Hellenic Studies (1880), 7-62.

J. E. Harry

DELUGE OF NOAH

del'-uj

1. The Biblical Account

2. "Noah's Log Book"

3. The Egyptian Tradition

4. The Indian Tradition

5. The Chinese Tradition

6. The Greek Tradition

7. The British Tradition

8. The American Indian Traditions

9. The Babylonian Tradition

10. Cuneiform Tablets

11. Was the Flood Universal?

1. The Biblical Account:

The means described in Ge 6-8 by which the Lord destroyed, on account of their wickedness, all the members of the human race except Noah and his family. According to the account, Noah was warned of the event 120 years before (Ge 6:3; 1Pe 3:20; 2Pe 2:5). During all this time he is said to have been a "preacher of righteousness" "while the ark was a preparing," when we may well suppose (according to

theory to be presently propounded) the physical events leading up to the final catastrophe may have given point to his preaching. When the catastrophe came, the physical means employed were twofold, namely, the breaking up of the "fountains of the great deep" and the opening of "the windows of heaven" (Ge 7:11). But the rain is spoken of as continuing as a main cause only 40 days, while the waters continued to prevail for 150 days (Ge 7:24), when (Ge 8:2,3) "the fountains also of the deep and the windows of heaven were stopped, and the rain from heaven was restrained; and the waters returned from off the earth continually," so that after 10 months the ark rested upon "the mountains of Ararat" (not the peak of Mount Ararat, but the highlands of Armenia in the upper part of the valley of the Euphrates and Tigris; see ARARAT). Here it rested 40 days before the water subsided sufficiently to suggest disembarking, when a raven (which could easily find its food on the carcasses of the animals which had been destroyed) was sent forth, and did not return (Ge 8:7); but a dove sent out at the same time found no rest and returned empty to the ark (Ge 8:9). After 7 days, however, it was sent out again and returned with a fresh olive leaf (Ge 8:11). After 7 days more the dove was sent forth again and did not return. After 56 days more of waiting Noah and his family departed from the ark.

2. "Noah’s Log Book":

The following are the leading points in the story which has been appropriately styled by Sir William Dawson "Noah’s log book" (see Southeast Bishop’s article in Biblical Sac. (1906), 510-17, and Joseph B. Davidson in the author’s Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, 180-184).

It will thus be seen that there is no need of supposing any duplication and overlapping of accounts in the Biblical story. There is continual progress in the account from beginning to end, with only such repetitions for literary effect as we are familiar with in oriental writings. In Ge 6:5-7:13 the wickedness of the world is assigned as the reason which prevailed in the Divine counsels for bringing about the contemplated catastrophe. While emphasizing the righteousness of Noah which led to his preservation, Ge 6:13-21 contains the direction for the making of the ark and of the preparations to bring into it a certain number of animals. This preparation having been made, the order was given (Ge 7:1-4) for the embarkation which (Ge 7:5) was duly accomplished. We are then told that Noah and his family, and beasts both clean and unclean, were shut up in the ark during the prevalence of the water and its final subsidence. Altogether the account is most graphic and impressive (see W. H. Green, Unity of the Book of Genesis, 83 ff).

Compared with other traditions of the Deluge, the Biblical account appears in a most favorable light, while the general prevalence of such traditions strongly confirms the reality of the Biblical story.

3. The Egyptian Tradition:

An Egyptian legend of the Deluge is referred to in Plato’s Timaeus, where the gods are said to have purified the earth by a great flood of water from which only a few shepherds escaped by climbing to the summit of a high mountain. In the Egyptian documents themselves, however, we find only that Ra’ the creator, on account of the insolence of man, proceeded to exterminate him by a deluge of blood which

flowed up to Heliopolis, the home of the gods; but the heinousness of the deed so affected him that he repented and swore never more to destroy mankind.

4. The Indian Tradition:

In Indian mythology there is no reference to the Flood in the Rig Veda, but in the laws of Manu we are told that a fish said to Manu, "A deluge will sweep all creatures away ..... Build a vessel and worship me. When the waters rise enter the vessel and I will save thee ..... When the Deluge came, he had entered the vessel. .... Manu fastened the cable of the ship to the horn of the fish, by which means the latter made it pass over the mountains of the North. The fish said: 'I have saved thee; fasten the vessel to a tree that the water may not sweep it away while thou art in the mountain; and in proportion as the waters decrease, thou shalt descend.' Manu descended with the waters, and this is what is called the Descent of Manu on the mountains of the North. The Deluge had carried away all creatures, and Manu remained alone" (translated by Max Muller).

5. The Chinese Tradition:

The Chinese tradition is embodied in sublime language in their book of Li-Ki: "And now the pillars of heaven were broken, the earth shook to its very foundation; the sun and the stars changed their motions; the earth fell to pieces, and the waters enclosed within its bosom burst forth with violence, and overflowed. Man having rebelled against heaven, the system of the universe was totally disordered, and the grand harmony of nature destroyed. All these evils arose from man's despising the supreme power of the universe. He fixed his looks upon terrestrial objects and loved them to excess, until gradually he became transformed into the objects which he loved, and celestial reason entirely abandoned him."

6. The Greek Tradition:

The Greeks, according to Plutarch, had five different traditions of the Deluge, that of Deucalion being the most important. According to this, Prometheus warned his son Deucalion of the flood which Zeus had resolved to bring upon the earth by reason of its wickedness. Accordingly, Deucalion constructed an ark and took refuge in it, but with his vessel was stranded on Mount Parnassus in Thessaly, whereupon they disembarked and repopulated the earth by the fantastic process revealed to them by the goddess Themis of throwing stones about them, those which Deucalion threw becoming men and those which Pyrrha threw becoming women. Lucian's form of the legend, however, is less fantastic and more nearly in line with Semitic tradition. In the Greek legend as in the Semitic, a dove is sent forth which returns both a first and a second time, its feet being tinged with mud the second time, intimating the abatement of the flood. But neither Homer nor Hesiod have this tradition. Probably it was borrowed from the Semites or the Hindus.

7. The British Tradition:

In Britain there is a Druid legend that on account of the profligacy of mankind, the Supreme Being sent

a flood upon the earth when "the waves of the sea lifted themselves on high round the border of Britain. The rain poured down from heaven and the waters covered the earth." But the patriarch, distinguished for his integrity, had been shut up with a select company in a strong ship which bore them safely upon the summit of the waters (Editor Davies in his Mythology and Rites of British Druids). From these the world was again repopulated. There are various forms of this legend but they all agree in substance.

8. The American Indian Traditions:

Among the American Indians traditions of the Deluge were found by travelers to be widely disseminated. Mr. Catlin says, "Among the 120 different tribes which I visited in North, South, and Central America, not a tribe exists that has not related to me distinct or vague traditions of such a calamity, in which one, or three, or eight persons were saved above the waters upon the top of a high mountain" (quoted by Wm. Restelle in Biblical Sac. (January, 1907), 157). While many, perhaps most, of these traditions bear the stamp of Christian influence through the early missionaries, the Mexican legend bears evident marks of originality. According to it the 4th age was one of water, when all men were turned into fishes except Tezpi and his wife Hochiquetzal and their children, who with many animals took refuge in a ship which sailed safely over the tumultuous waters which overwhelmed the earth. When the flood subsided the ship stranded on Mount Cohuacan, whereupon he sent forth a vulture which did not return, and then a humming bird which returned with some leaves in its beak. The Peruvian story differs from this in many particulars. According to it a single man and woman took refuge in a box and floated hundreds of miles from Cuzco to an unknown land where they made clay images of all races, and animated them.

The Moravian missionary Cranz, in his History of Greenland, says that "the first missionaries among the Greenlanders found a tolerably distinct tradition of the Deluge" to the effect that "the earth was once tilted over and all men were drowned" except one "who smote afterward upon the ground with a stick and thence came out a woman with whom he peopled the earth again." Moreover, the Greenlanders point to the remains of fishes and bones of a whale on high mountains where men never could have dwelt, as proof that the earth was once flooded. Among the North American Indians generally legends of the Deluge are so embellished that they become extremely fantastic, but in many of them there are peculiarities which point unquestionably to a common origin of extreme antiquity.

The unprejudiced reader cannot rise from the study of the subject without agreeing in general with Francois Lenormant, who writes: "As the case now stands, we do not hesitate to declare that, far from being a myth, the Biblical Deluge is a real and historical fact, having, to say the least, left its impress on the ancestors of three races—Aryan, or Indo-European, Semitic, or Syrio-Arabian, Chamitic, or Kushite—that is to say on the three great civilized races of the ancient world, those which constitute the higher humanity—before the ancestors of these races had as yet separated, and in the part of Asia together inhabited" (Contemporary Review, November, 1879).

9. The Babylonian Tradition:

The most instructive of these traditions are those which have come down to us from Babylonia, which until recently were known to us only through the Greek historian Berosus of the 4th century BC, who narrates that a great deluge happened at some indefinite time in the past during the reign of Xisuthrus, son of Ardates. Xisuthrus was warned beforehand by the deity Cronos, and told to build a ship and take with him his friends and relations and all the different animals with all necessary food and trust himself fearlessly to the deep, whereupon he built "a vessel 5 stadia (3,000 ft.) long and 2 stadia (1,200 ft.) broad." After the flood subsided Xisuthrus, like Noah, sent out birds which returned to him again. After waiting some days and sending them out a second time, they returned with their feet tinged with mud. Upon the third trial they returned no more, whereupon they disembarked and Xisuthrus with his wife, daughter and pilot offered sacrifice to the gods and were translated to live with the gods. It was found that the place where they were was "the land of Armenia," but they were told to return to Babylon. Berosus concluded his account by saying that "the vessel being thus stranded in Armenia, some part of it yet remains in the Corcyrean mountains."

10. Cuneiform Tablets:

An earlier and far more important tradition was found inscribed on cuneiform tablets in Babylonia dating from 3000 BC. These were discovered by George Smith in 1870 and filled as many as 180 lines. The human hero of the account, corresponding to Noah of the Bible and Xisuthrus of Berosus, is Gilgamesh, who lived is Shurippak, a city full of violence, on the banks of the Euphrates. He was warned of an approaching flood and exhorted to pull down his house and build a ship and cause "seed of life of every sort to go up into it." The ship, he says, was to be "exact in its dimensions, equal in its breadth and its length. .... Its sides were 140 cubits high, the border of its top equaled 140 cubits. .... I constructed it in 6 stories, dividing it into 7 compartments. Its floors I divided into 9 chambers. .... I chose a mast (or rudder pole), and supplied what was necessary. Six sars of bitumen I poured over the outside; three sars of bitumen over the inside." After embarking, the storm broke with fearful violence and the steering of the ship was handed over to Bezur-Bel, the ship man. But amidst the roll of thunder and the march of mountain waves the helm was wrenched from the pilot’s hands and the pouring rain and the lightning flashes dismayed all hearts. "Like a battle charge upon mankind" the water rushed so that the gods even were dismayed at the flood and cowered like dogs, taking refuge in the heaven of Anu while Ishtar screamed like a woman in travail, and repenting of her anger, resolved to save a few and "to give birth to my people" till like "the fry of fishes they fill the sea." The ship was therefore turned to the country of Nizir (Armenia).

It is worthy of notice that the cuneiform tablet exhibits as much variety of style as does the Biblical account. Plain narrative and rhetorical prose are intermingled in both accounts, a fact which effectually disposes of the critical theory which regards the Biblical account as a clumsy combination made in later times by piecing together two or more independent traditions. Evidently the piecing together, if there was any, had been accomplished early in Babylonian history. See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA.

On comparing the Biblical account with that of the cuneiform tablets, the following similarities and contrasts are brought to light:

(1) That the cuneiform inscription is from start to finish polytheistic (II. 3-17), whereas the narrative in Ge is monotheistic.

(2) The cuneiform agrees with the Biblical narrative in making the Deluge a Divine punishment for the wickedness of the world (II. 5, 6).

(3) The names differ to a degree that is irreconcilable with our present knowledge.

(4) The dimensions of the ark as given in Ge (6:15) are reasonable, while those of Berosus and the cuneiform tablets are unreasonable. According to Gen, the ark was 300 cubits (562 1/2 ft.) long, 50 cubits (93 2/3 ft.) wide, and 30 cubits (56 1/4 ft.) deep, which are the natural proportions for a ship of that size, being in fact very close to those of the great steamers which are now constructed to cross the Atlantic. The "Celtic" of the White Star line, built in 1901, is 700 ft. long, 75 ft. wide and 49 1/3 ft. deep. The dimensions of the "Great Eastern," built in 1858 (692 ft. long, 83 ft. broad, and 58 ft. deep), are still closer to those of the ark. The cuneiform tablets represent the length, width and depth each as 140 cubits (262 ft.) (II. 22, 23, 38-41), the dimensions of an entirely unseaworthy structure. According to Berosus, it was 5 stadia (3,000 ft.) and 2 stadia (1,200 ft.) broad; while Origen (Against Celsus, 4,41), represented it to be 135,000 ft. (25 miles) long, and 3,750 ft. (3/4 mile) wide.

(5) In the Biblical account, nothing is introduced conflicting with the sublime conception of holiness and the peculiar combination of justice and mercy ascribed to God throughout the Bible, and illustrated in the general scheme of providential government manifest in the order of Nature and in history; while, in the cuneiform tablets, the Deluge is occasioned by a quarrel among the gods, and the few survivors escape, not by reason of a merciful plan, but by a mistake which aroused the anger of Bel (II. 146-50).

(6) In all the accounts, the ark is represented as floating up stream. According to Gen, it was not, as is usually translated, on "Mount Ararat" (8:4), but in the "mountains of Ararat," designating an indefinite region in Armenia upon which the ark rested; according to the inscriptions, it was in Nizir (II. 115-20), a region which is watered by the Zab and the Tornadus; while, according to Berosus, it was on the Corcyrean Mountains, included in the same indefinite area. In all three cases, its resting-place is in the direction of the headwaters of the Euphrates valley, while the scene of the building is clearly laid in the lower part of the valley.

(7) Again, in the Biblical narrative, the spread of the water floating the ark is represented to have been occasioned, not so much by the rain which fell, as by the breaking-up of "all the fountains of the great deep" (Ge 7:11), which very naturally describes phenomena connected with one of the extensive downward movements of the earth’s crust with which geology has made us familiar. The sinking of the land below the level of the ocean is equivalent, in its effects, to the rising of the water above it, and is accurately expressed by the phrases used in the sacred narrative. This appears, not only in the language concerning the breaking-up of the great deep which describes the coming-on of the Flood, but also in the description of its termination, in which it is said, that the "fountains also of the deep .... were stopped, ... and the waters returned from off the earth continually" (Ge 8:2,3). Nothing is said of this in the other

accounts.

(8) The cuneiform tablets agree in general with the two other accounts respecting the collecting of the animals for preservation, but differ from Ge in not mentioning the sevens of clean animals and in including others beside the family of the builder (II. 66-69).

(9) The cuneiform inscription is peculiar in providing the structure with a mast, and putting it in charge of a pilot (II. 45, 70, 71).

(10) The accounts differ decidedly in the duration of the Flood. According to the ordinary interpretation of the Biblical account, the Deluge continued a year and 17 days; whereas, according to the cuneiform tablets, it lasted only 14 days (II. 103-7, 117-22).

(11) All accounts agree in sending out birds; but, according to Ge (8:8) a raven was first sent out, and then in succession two doves (8:8-12); while the cuneiform inscription mentions the dove and the raven in reverse order from Gen, and adds a swallow (II. 121-30).

(12) All accounts agree in the building of an altar and offering a sacrifice after leaving the ark. But the cuneiform inscription is overlaid with a polytheistic coloring: "The gods like flies swarmed about the sacrifices" (II. 132-43).

(13) According to the Biblical account, Noah survived the Flood for a long time; whereas Nuhnapishtim and his wife were at once deified and taken to heaven (II. 177-80).

(14) Both accounts agree in saying that the human race is not again to be destroyed by a flood (Ge 9:11; II. 162-6).

Close inspection of these peculiarities makes it evident that the narrative in Genesis carries upon its face an appearance of reality not found in the other accounts. It is scarcely possible that the reasonable dimensions of the ark, its floating up stream, and the references to the breaking-up of the fountains of the great deep should have been hit upon by accident. It is in the highest degree improbable that correct statements of such unobvious facts should be due to the accident of legendary guesswork. At the same time, the duration of the Deluge, according to Genesis, affords opportunity for a gradual progress of events which best accords with scientific conceptions of geological movements. If, as the most probable interpretation would imply, the water began to recede after 150 days from the beginning of the Flood and fell 15 cubits in 74 days, that would only be 3 2/3 inches per day—a rate which would be imperceptible to an ordinary observer. Nor is it necessary to suppose that the entire flooded area was uncovered when Noah disembarked. The emergence of the land may have continued for an indefinite period, permitting the prevailing water to modify the climate of all western and central Asia for many centuries. Evidence that this was the case will be found in a later paragraph.

11. Was the Flood Universal?:

In considering the credibility of the Biblical story we encounter at the outset the question whether the narrative compels us to believe the Flood to have been universal. In answer, it is sufficient to suggest that since the purpose of the judgment was the destruction of the human race, all the universality which it is necessary to infer from the language would be only such as was sufficient to accomplish that object. If man was at that time limited to the Euphrates valley, the submergence of that area would meet all the necessary conditions. Such a limitation is more easily accepted from the fact that general phrases like "Everybody knows," "The whole country was aroused," are never in literature literally interpreted. When it is said (Ge 41:54-57) that the famine was "in all lands," and over "all the face of the earth," and that "all countries came into Egypt .... to buy grain," no one supposes that it is intended to imply that the irrigated plains of Babylonia, from which the patriarchs had emigrated, were suffering from drought like Palestine (For other examples of the familiar use of this hyperbole, see De 2:25; Job 37:3; Ac 2:25; Ro 1:8.)

As to the extent to which the human race was spread over the earth at the time of the Flood, two suppositions are possible. First, that of Hugh Miller (Testimony of the Rocks) that, owing to the shortness of the antediluvian chronology, and the violence and moral corruption of the people, population had not spread beyond the boundary of western Asia. An insuperable objection to this theory is that the later discoveries have brought to light remains of prehistoric man from all over the northern hemisphere, showing that long before the time of the Flood he had become widely scattered.

Another theory, supported by much evidence, is that, in connection with the enormous physical changes in the earth's surface during the closing scenes of the Glacial epoch, man had perished from off the face of the earth except in the valley of the Euphrates, and that the Noachian Deluge is the final catastrophe in that series of destructive events (see ANTEDILUVIANS). The facts concerning the Glacial epoch naturally lead up to this conclusion. For during the entire epoch, and especially at its close, the conditions affecting the level of the land surfaces of the northern hemisphere were extremely abnormal, and continued so until some time after man had appeared on the earth.

The Glacial epoch followed upon, and probably was a consequence of, an extensive elevation of all the land surfaces of the northern hemisphere at the close of the Tertiary period. This elevation was certainly as much as 2,000 ft. over the northern part of the United States, and over Canada and Northern Europe. Snow accumulated over this high land until the ice formed by it was certainly a mile thick, and some of the best authorities say 2, or even 3 miles. The surface over which this was spread amounted to 2,000,000 square miles in Europe and 4,000,000 in North America. The total amount of the accumulation would therefore be 6,000,000 cubic miles at the lowest calculation, or twice or three times that amount if the largest estimates are accepted. (For detailed evidence see Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th edition) But in either case the transference of so much weight from the ocean beds to the land surfaces of the northern hemisphere brings into the problem a physical force sufficient to produce incalculable effects. The weight of 6,000,000 cubic miles of ice would be twenty-four thousand million million (24,000,000,000,000,000) tons, which is equal to that of the entire North American continent above sea level. Furthermore this weight was first removed from the ocean beds, thus disturbing still more the balance of forces which secure the stability of the land. The geological evidence is abundant

that in connection with the overloading of the land surfaces in the Northern Hemisphere, and probably by reason of it, the glaciated area and a considerable margin outside of it sank down until it was depressed far below the present level. The post-Glacial depression in North America was certainly 600 ft. below sea level at Montreal, and several hundred feet lower further north. In Sweden the post-Glacial sea beaches show a depression of the land 1,000 ft. below the sea.

The evidences of a long-continued post-Glacial subsidence of the Aral-Caspian basin and much of the surrounding area is equally conclusive. At Trebizond, on the Black Sea, there is an extensive recent sea beach clinging to the precipitous volcanic mountain back of the city 750 ft. above the present water level. The gravel in this beach is so fresh as to compel a belief in its recent origin, while it certainly has been deposited by a body of water standing at that elevation after the rock erosion of the region had been almost entirely effected. The deposit is about 100 ft. thick, and extends along the precipitous face of the mountain for a half-mile or more. So extensive is it that it furnishes an attractive building place for a monastery. When the water was high enough to build up this shore line, it would cover all the plains of southern Russia, of Western Siberia and of the Aral-Caspian depression in Turkestan. Similar terraces of corresponding height are reported by competent authorities on the south shore of the Crimea and at Baku, on the Caspian Sea.

Further and most interesting evidence of this post-Glacial land depression is found in the existence of Arctic seal 2,000 miles from the Arctic Ocean in bodies of water as widely separated as the Caspian Sea, the Aral Sea and Lake Baikal. Lake Baikal is now 1,500 ft. above sea level. It is evident, therefore, that there must have been a recent depression of the whole area to admit the migration of this species to that distant locality. There are also clear indications of a smaller depression around the eastern shores of the Mediterranean Sea, where there are abandoned sea beaches from 200 to 300 ft. above tide, which abound in species of shells identical with those now living nearby.

These are found in Egypt, in the valley of the Red Sea, and in the vicinity of Joppa and Beirut. During their formation Asia and Africa must have been separated by a wide stretch of water connecting the Mediterranean with the Red Sea. The effect of such lingering wide expanses of water upon the climate of Western Asia must have been profound, and would naturally provide those conditions which would favor the early development of the human race in Armenia (where even now at an elevation of 5,000 ft. the vine is indigenous), from which the second distribution of mankind is said to have taken place.

Furthermore there is indubitable evidence that the rainfall in central Asia was, at a comparatively recent time, immensely greater than it has been in the historic period, indicating that gradual passage from the conditions connected with the Deluge to those of the present time, at which we have hinted above. At the present time the evaporation over the Aral Sea is so great that two rivers (the ancient Oxus and the Jaxartes), coming down from the heights of central Asia, each with a volume as great as that of Niagara, do not suffice to cause an overflow into the Caspian Sea. But the existence of such an overflow during the prehistoric period is so plain that it has been proposed to utilize its channel (which is a mile wide and as distinctly marked as that of any living stream) for a canal.

Owing to the comparatively brief duration of the Noachian Deluge proper, we cannot expect to find many positive indications of its occurrence. Nevertheless, Professor Prestwich (than whom there has been no higher geological authority in England during the last century) adduces an array of facts relating to Western Europe and the Mediterranean basin which cannot be ignored (see Phil. Trans. of the Royal Soc. of London, CXXIV (1893), 903-84; Wright, Scientific Confirmation of the Old Testament History, 238-82). Among these evidences one of the most convincing is to be found in the cave of San Ciro at the base of the mountains surrounding the plain of Palermo in Sicily. In this cave there was found an immense mass of the bones of hippopotami of all ages down to the fetus, mingled with a few of the deer, ox and elephant. These were so fresh when discovered that they were cut into ornaments and polished and still retained a considerable amount of their nitrogenous matter. Twenty tons of these bones were shipped for commercial purposes in the first six months after their discovery. Evidently the animals furnishing these bones had taken refuge in this cave to escape the rising water which had driven them in from the surrounding plains and cooped them up in the amphitheater of mountains during a gradual depression of the land. Similar collections of bones are found in various ossiferous fissures, in England and Western Europe, notably in the Rock of Gibraltar and at Santenay, a few miles South of Chalons in central France, where there is an accumulation of bones in fissures 1,000 ft. above the sea, similar in many respects to that in the cave described at San Ciro, though the bones of hippopotami did not appear in these places; but the bones of wolves, bears, horses and oxen, none of which had been gnawed by carnivora, were indiscriminately commingled as though swept in by all-pervading currents of water. Still further evidence is adduced in the deposits connected with what is called the rubble drift on both sides of the English Channel and on the Jersey Islands. Here in various localities, notably at Brighton, England, and near Calais, France, elephant bones and human implements occur beneath deep deposits of unassorted drift, which is not glacial nor the product of limited and local streams of water, but can be accounted for only by general waves of translation produced when the land was being reelevated from beneath the water by a series of such sudden earthquake shocks as cause the tidal waves which are often so destructive.

Thus, while we cannot appeal to geology for direct proof of the Noachian Deluge, recent geological discoveries do show that such a catastrophe is perfectly credible from a scientific point of view; and the supposition that there was a universal destruction of the human race, in the northern hemisphere at least, in connection with the floods accompanying the melting off of the glacial ice is supported by a great amount of evidence. There was certainly an extensive destruction of animal species associated with man during that period. In Europe the great Irish elk, the machairodus, the cave lion, the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus and the elephant disappeared with prehistoric man, amid the floods at the close of the Glacial epoch. In North America equally large felines, together with horses, tapirs, llamas, great mastodons and elephants and the huge megalonyx went to destruction in connection with the same floods that destroyed so large a part of the human race during the dramatic closing scenes of the period. It is, therefore, by no means difficult for an all-round geologist to believe in a final catastrophe such as is described in Gen. If we disbelieve in the Biblical Deluge it is not because we know too much geology, but too little.

George Frederick Wright

DELUSION

de-lu’-zhun:

(1) Isa 66:4, "I also will choose their delusions" (the Revised Version, margin "mockings"), Hebrew ta‘alulim, which occurs only here and Isa 3:4 (where it is translated "babes," the Revised Version, margin "childishness"). Its meaning is somewhat ambiguous. The best translation seems to be "wantonness," "caprice." "Their wanton dealing, i .e. that inflicted on them" (BDB). Other translations suggested are "insults" (Skinner), "freaks of fortune" (Cheyne), "follies" (Whitehouse). Septuagint has empaigmata, "mockings," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) illusiones.

(2) 2Th 2:11 the King James Version, "God shall send them strong delusion" (the Revised Version (British and American) "God sendeth them a working of error"), plane, "a wandering," "a roaming about," in the New Testament "error" either of opinion or of conduct.

D. Miall Edwards

DEMAND

de-mand’:The peremptory, imperative sense is absent from this word in its occurrences in the King James Version, where it means no more than "ask," "inquire" (compare French, demander) one or the other of which the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes in 2Sa 11:7; Mt 2:4; Lu 3:14; 17:20; Ac 21:33. the Revised Version (British and American) retains "demand" in Ex 5:14; Job 38:3; 40:7; 42:4; Da 2:27; and inserts it (the King James Version "require") in Ne 5:18.

DEMAS

de’-mas (Demas, "popular"): According to Col 4:14; 2Ti 4:10; Phm 1:24, one who was for a time a "fellow-worker" with Paul at Rome (Col, Philem), but at last, "having loved this present world," forsook the apostle and betook himself to Thessalonica (2 Tim). No other particulars are given concerning him. See APOSTASY; DEMETRIUS.

DEMETRIUS (1)

de-me’-tri-us (Demetrios, "of" or "belonging to Demeter," an ordinary name in Greece):

(1) Demetrius I, surnamed Soter ("saviour"), was the son of Seleucus IV (Philopator). He was sent as a boy to Rome, by his father, to serve as a hostage, and remained there quietly during his father’s life. He was detained also during the reign of his uncle, ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES (which see) from 175 to 164 BC; but when Antiochus died Demetrius, who was now a young man of 23 (Polyb. xxxi.12), chafed at a longer detention, particularly as his cousin, Antiochus Eupator, a boy of 9, succeeded to the

kingdom with Lysias as his guardian. The Roman Senate, however, refused to listen to his plea for the restoration to Syria, because, as Polybius says, they felt surer of their power over Syria with a mere boy as king.

In the meantime, a quarrel had arisen between Ptolemy Philometor and Euergetes Physkon (Livy Epit. 46; Diod. Sic. fr xi), and Gnaeus Octavius, who had been sent to quell the disorder, was assassinated in Syria, while plundering the country. Demetrius, taking advantage of the troubled condition of affairs, consulted with his friend Polybius as to the advisability of attempting to seize the throne of Syria (op. cit. xxxi. 19). The historian advised him not to stumble twice on the same stone, but to venture something worthy of a king, so after a second unsuccessful appeal to the Senate, Demetrius escaped to Tripolis, and from there advanced to Antioch where he was proclaimed king (162 BC). His first act was to put to death young Antiochus, his cousin, and his minister Lysias (Appian, Syriac., c. 47; Ant, XII, x, 1; 1 Macc 7:1-4; 2 Macc 14:1,2).

As soon as he was established in power, Demetrius made an attempt to placate the Romans by sending them valuable gifts as well as the assassin of Gn. Octavius (Polyb. xxi.23); and he then tried to secure the Hellenizing party by sending his friend BACCHIDES (which see) to make the wicked Alcimus high priest. After a violent struggle and much treachery on the part of Bacchides (Ant., XII, x, 2), the latter left the country, having charged all the people to obey Alcimus, who was protected by an army.

The Jews under Judas resented his presence, and Judas inflicted severe punishment on all who had gone over to Alcimus (1 Macc 7:24). Alcimus, in fear, sent a message for aid to Demetrius, who sent to his assistance Nicanor, the best disposed and most faithful of his friends, who had accompanied him in his flight from Rome (Ant., XII, x, 4). On his arrival in Judea, he attempted to win by guile, but Judas saw through his treachery, and Nicanor was forced to fight openly, suffering two signal defeats, the first at Capharsalama (1 Macc 7:31,32), and the second (in which Nicanor himself was killed), at Adasa (1 Macc 7:39 ff; 2 Macc 15:26 ff).

In a short while, however, Demetrius, hearing of the death of Nicanor, sent Bacchides and Alcimus into Judea again (1 Macc 9:1). Judas arose against them with an army of 3,000 men, but when these saw that 20,000 opposed them, the greater part of them deserted, and Judas, with an army of 800, lost his life, like another Leonidas, on the field of battle (1 Macc 9:4,6,18). Then Bacchides took the wicked men and made them lords of the country (1 Macc 9:25); while Jonathan, who was appointed successor to Judas, fled with his friends (1 Macc 9:29 ff).

During the next seven years, Demetrius succeeded in alienating both the Romans (Polyb. xxxii.20) and his own people, and ALEXANDER BALAS (which see) was put forward as a claimant to the throne, his supporters maintaining that he was the son of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 10:1-21; Ant, XIII, ii, 1-3). Both Alexander and Demetrius made bids for the support of the Jews, the former offering the high-priesthood and the title of King’s Friend (1 Macc 10:20), and the latter freedom from taxes, tributes and customs (1 Macc 10:28 ff). Alexander’s bait proved more alluring, since the Jews "gave no credence" to the words of Demetrius, and with the aid of the Maccabees, he vied with Demetrius for the space of two

years for the complete sovereignty of Syria. At the end of this time, a decisive battle took place, in which Demetrius was slain, and Alexander became king of Syria (150 BC) (1 Macc 10:48-50; Ant, XIII, ii, 4; Polyb. iii.5; see also MACCABEES).

(2) Demetrius II, surnamed Nikator ("conqueror"), was the son of Demetrius Soter. When Balas was warring with Demetrius I, he sent his son to a place of safety in Crete. Three years after his father's death (147 BC), the unpopularity of Alexander gave the young man an opportunity to return and seize the government. He landed in Cilicia with Cretan mercenaries and secured the support of all Syria with the exception of Judea (1 Macc 10:67 ff). Apollonius, his general, the governor of Coele-Syria, who essayed the conquest of the Jews, was defeated at Azotus with great loss.

Ptolemy Philometor, whose daughter was the wife of Alexander Balas, now entered into the struggle, and taking Cleopatra, his daughter, from Alexander, he gave her to Demetrius (1 Macc 11:12). He then joined Demetrius' army and the combined forces inflicted a defeat on Balas (145 BC), and from this Demetrius received his surname Nikator (Ant., XIII, iv, 8; 1 Macc 11:14 ff).

Jonathan now concluded a favorable treaty with Demetrius, whereby three Samaritan provinces were added to Judea and the whole country was made exempt from tax (1 Macc 11:20-37; Ant, XIII, iv, 9). Demetrius then dismissed his army except the foreigners, thinking himself safe with the loyalty of the Jews assured. In the meantime, Tryphon, one of Balas' generals, set up the son of Alexander, Antiochus, as a claimant to the throne, and secured the assistance of the discarded army of Demetrius. Jonathan's aid was sought and he quelled the rebellion, on condition that the Syrian garrison be removed from Jerusalem (1 Macc 11:41-52; Ant, XIII, v, 2-3).

The king, however, falsified all that he had said, and kept none of his promises, so the Jews, deserting him, took sides with Tryphon and supported the claims of the boy Antiochus (1 Macc 11:53-59; Ant, XIII, v, 5-11). Demetrius' generals then entered Syria but were defeated by Jonathan at Hazor (1 Macc 11:63-74), and by skillful generalship he made futile a second attempt at invasion (1 Macc 12:24 ff).

Tryphon, who was now master of Syria, broke faith with Jonathan (1 Macc 12:40) and essayed the conquest of Judea. Jonathan was killed by treachery, and Simon, his successor, made proposals of peace to Demetrius, who agreed to let bygones be bygones (1 Macc 13:36-40; Ant, XIII, vi, 7). Demetrius then left Simon to carry on the war, and set out to Parthia, ostensibly to secure the assistance of the king, Mithridates, against Tryphon (1 Macc 14:1). Here he was captured and imprisoned (14:3; Ant, XIII, v, 11; Josephus, however, puts this event in 140 rather than 138 BC).

After an imprisonment of ten years, he was released and resumed the sovereignty 128 BC, but becoming involved in a quarrel with Ptolemy Physkon, he was defeated in battle at Damascus. From this place, he fled to Tyre, where he was murdered in 125 BC, according to some, at the instigation of Cleopatra, his wife (Josephus, Ant, XIII, ix, 3).

(3) Demetrius III, Eukairos ("the fortunate"), was the son of Antiochus Grypus, and grandson of

Demetrius Nikator. When his father died, civil war arose, in which his two elder brothers lost their lives, while Philip, the third brother, secured part of Syria as his domain. Demetrius then took up his abode in Coele-Syria with Damascus as his capital (Ant., XIII, xiii, 4; BJ, I, iv, 4).

War now broke out in Judea between Alexander Janneus and his Pharisee subjects, who invited Demetrius to aid them. Thinking this a good opportunity to extend his realm, he joined the insurgent Jews and together they defeated Janneus near Shechem (Ant., XIII, xiv, 1; BJ, 1, iv, 5).

The Jews then deserted Demetrius, and he withdrew to Berea, which was in the possession of his brother Philip. Demetrius besieged him, and Philip summoned the Parthians to his assistance. The tables were turned, and Demetrius, besieged in his camp and starved into submission, was taken prisoner and sent to Arsaces, who held him captive until his death (Ant., XIII, xiv, 3). The dates of his reign are not certain.

Arthur J. Kinsella

DEMETRIUS (2)

de-me’-tri-us (Demetrios, "belonging to Ceres"): The name of two persons:

(1) A Christian disciple praised by John (3Joh 1:12).

(2) A silversmith of Ephesus who manufactured the little silver shrines of the goddess Diana to sell to the visiting pilgrims (Ac 19:23 ff). Because the teachings of Paul were injuring the trade of the silversmiths, there arose a riot of which Demetrius was the chief. Upon an inscription which Mr. Wood discovered among the ruins of the city, there appeared the name Demetrius, a warden of the Ephesian temple for the year 57 AD, and some authors believe the temple warden to be identical with the ringleader of the rebellion. The name, however, has been most common among the Greeks of every age. Because of its frequent use it cannot be supposed that Demetrius, the disciple of 3Joh 1:12, was the silversmith of Ephesus, nor that Demas of 2Ti 4:10, who bore the name in a contracted form, may be identified with him.

E. J. Banks

DEMON; DEMONIAC; DEMONOLOGY

dem’-mon, de-mo’-ni-ak, de-mon-ol’-o-ji (daimonion, earlier form daimon = pneuma akatharton, poneron, "demon," "unclean or evil spirit," incorrectly rendered "devil" in the King James Version):

I. Definition.

The word daimon or daimonion seems originally to have had two closely related meanings; a deity, and

a spirit, superhuman but not supernatural. In the former sense the term occurs in the Septuagint translation of De 32:17; Ps 106:37; Ac 17:18. The second of these meanings, which involves a general reference to vaguely conceived personal beings akin to men and yet belonging to the unseen realm, leads to the application of the term to the peculiar and restricted class of beings designated "demons" in the New Testament.

II. The Origin of Biblical Demonology.

An interesting scheme of development has been suggested (by Baudissin and others) in which Biblical demonism is brought through polytheism into connection with primitive animism.

1. The Evolutionary Theory:

A simple criticism of this theory, which is now the ascendant, will serve fittingly to introduce what should be said specifically concerning Biblical demonology.

(1) Animism, which is one branch of that general primitive view of things which is designated as spiritism, is theory that all Nature is alive (see Ladd, Phil. Rel., I, 89 f) and that all natural processes are due to the operation of living wills.

(2) Polytheism is supposed to be the outcome of animism. The vaguely conceived spirits of the earlier conception are advanced to the position of deities with names, fixed characters and specific functions, organized into a pantheon.

(3) Biblical demonology is supposed to be due to the solvent of monotheism upon contemporary polytheism. The Hebrews were brought into contact with surrounding nations, especially during the Persian, Babylonian and Greek periods, and monotheism made room for heathenism by reducing its deities to the dimension of demons. They are not denied all objective reality, but are denied the dignity and prerogatives of deity.

2. Objections to the Theory:

The objections to this ingenious theory are too many and too serious to be overcome.

(1) The genetic connection between animism and polytheism is not clear. In fact, the specific religious character of animism is altogether problematical. It belongs to the category of primitive philosophy rather than of religion. It is difficult to trace the process by which spirits unnamed and with characteristics of the vaguest become deities—especially is it difficult to understand how certain spirits only are advanced to the standing of deities. More serious still, polytheism and animism have coexisted without close combination or real assimilation (see Sayce, Babylonia and Assyria, 232; Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 75 f) for a long course of history. It looks as if animism and polytheism had a different raison d’etre, origin and development. It is, at least, unsafe to construct a theory on the basis of

so insecure a connection.

(2) The interpretation of heathen deities as demons by no means indicates that polytheism is the source of Biblical demonology. On general principles, it seems far more likely that the category of demons was already familiar, and that connection with polytheism brought about an extension of its application. A glance at the Old Testament will show how comparatively slight and unimportant has been the bearing of heathen polytheism upon Biblical thought. The demonology of the Old Testament is confined to the following passages: Le 16:21,22; 17:7; Isa 13:21; 34:13; De 32:17; Ps 106:37 (elsewhere commented upon; see COMMUNION WITH DEMONS). Gesenius well says of Le 16:21 that it is "vexed with the numerous conjectures of interpreters." If the prevalent modern view is accepted we find in it an actual meeting-point of popular superstition and the religion of Yahweh (see AZAZEL). According to Driver (HDB, I, 207), this item in the Levitical ritual "was intended as a symbolical declaration that the land and the people are now purged from guilt, their sins being handed over to the evil spirit to whom they are held to belong, and whose home is in the desolate wilderness remote from human habitations (verse 22, into a land cut off)." A more striking instance could scarcely be sought of the way in which the religion of Yahweh kept the popular spiritism at a safe distance. Le 17:7 (see COMMUNION WITH DEMONS) refers to participation in the rites of heathen worship. The two passages—Isa 13:20,21; 34:13,14—are poetical and really imply nothing as to the writer's own belief. Creatures both seen and unseen supposed to inhabit places deserted of man are used, as any poet might use them, to furnish the details for a vivid word-picture of uninhabited solitude. There is no direct evidence that the narrative of the Fall (Ge 3:1-19) has any connection with demonology (see HDB, I, 590 note), and the suggestion of Whitehouse that the mention of satyrs and night-monsters of current mythology with such creatures as jackals, etc., implies "that demons were held to reside more or less in all these animal denizens of the ruined solitude" is clearly fanciful. It is almost startling to find that all that can possibly be affirmed of demonology in the Old Testament is confined to a small group of passages which are either legal or poetical and which all furnish examples of the inhibiting power of high religious conceptions upon the minds of a naturally superstitious and imaginative people. Even if we add all the passages in which a real existence seems to be granted to heathen deities (e. g. Nu 21:29; Isa 19:1, etc.) and interpret them in the extreme sense, we are still compelled to affirm that evidence is lacking to prove the influence of polytheism in the formation of the Biblical doctrine of demons.

(3) This theory breaks down in another still more vital particular. The demonology of the Bible is not of kin either with primitive animism or popular Sere demonism. In what follows we shall address ourselves to New Testament demonology—that of the Old Testament being a negligible quantity.

III. New Testament Demonology.

The most marked and significant fact of New Testament demonology is that it provides no materials for a discussion of the nature and characteristics of demons. Whitehouse says (HDB, I, 593) that New Testament demonology "is in all its broad characteristics the demonology of the contemporary Judaism stripped of its cruder and exaggerated features." How much short of the whole truth this statement comes will appear later, but as it stands it defines the specific direction of inquiry into the New Testament treatment of demons; namely, to explain its freedom from the crude and exaggerated features

of popular demonism. The presence among New Testament writers of an influence curbing curiosity and restraining the imagination is of all things the most important for us to discover and emphasize. In four of its most vital features the New Testament attitude on this subject differs from all popular conceptions:

(a) in the absence of all imaginative details concerning demons;

(b) in the emphasis placed upon the moral character of demons and their connection with the ethical disorders of the human race; (c) in the absence of confidence in magical methods of any kind in dealing with demons;

(d) in its intense restrictions of the sphere of demoniacal operations.

A brief treatment under each of these heads will serve to present an ordered statement of the most important facts.

(a) In the New Testament we are told practically nothing about the origin, nature, characteristics or habits of demons. In a highly figurative passage (Mt 12:43) our Lord speaks of demons as passing through "waterless places," and in the story of the Gadarene demoniac (Lu 8:31) the "abyss" is mentioned as the place of their ultimate detention. The method of their control over human beings is represented in two contrasted ways (compare Mr 1:23 ff; Lu 4:33 ff), indicating that there was no fixed mode of regarding it. With these three scant items our direct information ceases. We are compelled to infer from the effects given in the limited number of specific instances narrated. And it is worthy of more than passing mention that no theoretical discussion of demons occurs. The center of interest in the Gospels is the person of Jesus, the sufferers and the cures. Interest in the demons as such is absent. Certain passages seem to indicate that the demons were able to speak (see Mr 1:24,26,34; Lu 4:41, etc.), but comparing these statements with others (compare Mr 1:23; Lu 8:28) it is seen that no distinction is drawn between the cries of the tormented in the paroxysms of their complaint and the cries attributed to the demons themselves. In other particulars the representation is consistent. The demons belong to the unseen world, they are incapable of manifestation except in in the disorders which they cause—there are no materializations, no grotesque narratives of appearances and disappearances, no morbid dealing with repulsive details, no license of speculation in the narratives. In contrast with this reticence is not merely the demonology of primitive people, but also that of the non-canonical Jewish books. In the Book of Enoch demons are said to be fallen angels, while Josephus holds that they are the spirits of the wicked dead. In the rabbinical writings speculation has run riot in discussing the origin, nature and habits of demons. They are represented as the offspring of Adam and Eve in conjunction with male and female spirits, as being themselves sexed and capable of reproduction as well as performing all other physical functions. Details are given of their numbers, haunts and habits, of times and places where they are especially dangerous, and of ways and methods of breaking their power (see EXORCISM). Full sweep is also given to the imagination in descriptive narratives, oftentimes of the most morbid and unwholesome character, of their doings among men. After reading some of these narratives one can agree with Edersheim when he says, "Greater contrast could scarcely be conceived than between what we read in the New Testament and the views and practices mentioned in Rabbinic writings" (LTJM, II,

776).

(b) It is also clearly to be noted that while in its original application the term daimonion is morally indifferent, in New Testament usage the demon is invariably an ethically evil being. This differentiates the New Testament treatment from extra-canonical Jewish writings. In the New Testament demons belong to the kingdom of Satan whose power it is the mission of Christ to destroy. It deepens and intensifies its representations of the earnestness of human life and its moral issues by extending the sphere of moral struggle to the invisible world. It clearly teaches that the power of Christ extends to the world of evil spirits and that faith in Him is adequate protection against any evils to which men may be exposed. (For significance of this point see Plummer, Luke (ICC), 132-33.)

(c) The New Testament demonology differs from all others by its negation of the power of magic rites to deliver from the affliction. Magic which is clearly separable from religion at that specific point (see Gwatkin, Knowledge of God, I, 249) rests upon and is dependent upon spiritism. The ancient Babylonian incantation texts, forming a surprisingly large proportion of the extant documents, are addressed directly to the supposed activities and powers of demons. These beings, who are not trusted and prayed to in the sense in which deities are, command confidence and call forth prayer, are dealt with by magic rites and formulas (see Rogers, op. cit., 144). Even the Jewish non-canonical writings contain numerous forms of words and ceremonies for the expulsion of demons. In the New Testament there is no magic. The deliverance from a demon is a spiritual and ethical process (see EXORCISM).

(d) In the New Testament the range of activities attributed to demons is greatly restricted. According to Babylonian ideas: "These demons were everywhere; they lurked in every corner, watching for their prey. The city streets knew their malevolent presence, the rivers, the seas, the tops of mountains; they appeared sometimes as serpents gliding noiselessly upon their victims, as birds horrid of mien flying resistlessly to destroy or afflict, as beings in human forms, grotesque, malformed, awe-inspiring through their hideousness. To these demons all sorts of misfortune were ascribed—a toothache; a headache, a broken bone, a raging fever, an outburst of anger, of jealousy, of incomprehensible disease" (Rogers, op. cit., 145). In the extra-canonical Jewish sources the same exuberance of fancy appears in attributing all kinds of ills of mind and body to innumerable, swarming hosts of demons lying in wait for men and besieging them with attacks and ills of all descriptions. Of this affluence of morbid fancy there is no hint in the New Testament. A careful analysis of the instances will show the importance of this fact. There are, taking repetitions and all, about 80 references to demons in the New Testament. In 11 instances the distinction between demon-possession and diseases ordinarily caused is clearly made (Mt 4:24; 8:16; 10:8; Mr 1:32,34; 6:13; 16:17,18; Lu 4:40,41; 9:1; 13:32; Ac 19:12). The results of demon-possession are not exclusively mental or nervous (Mt 9:32,33; 12:22). They are distinctly and peculiarly mental in two instances only (Gadarene maniac, Mt 8:28 and parallels, and Ac 19:13 f). Epilepsy is specified in one case only (Mt 17:15). There is distinction made between demonized and epileptic, and demonized and lunatic (Mt 4:24). There is distinction made between diseases caused by demons and the same disease not so caused (compare Mt 12:22; 15:30). In most of the instances no specific symptoms are mentioned. In an equally large proportion, however, there are occasional fits of mental excitement often due to the presence and teaching of Christ.

Conclusions:

A summary of the entire material leads to the conclusion that, in the New Testament cases of demon-possession, we have a specific type of disturbance, physical or mental, distinguishable not so much by its symptoms which were often of the most general character, as by its accompaniments. The aura, so to say, which surrounded the patient, served to distinguish his symptoms and to point out the special cause to which his suffering was attributed. Another unique feature of New Testament demonology should be emphasized. While this group of disorders is attributed to demons, the victims are treated as sick folk and are healed. The whole atmosphere surrounding the narrative of these incidents is calm, lofty and pervaded with the spirit of Christ. When one remembers the manifold cruelties inspired by the unreasoning fear of demons, which make the annals of savage medicine a nightmare of unimaginable horrors, we cannot but feel the worldwide difference between the Biblical narratives and all others, both of ancient and modern times, with which we are acquainted. Every feature of the New Testament narratives points to the conclusion that in them we have trustworthy reports of actual cures. This is more important for New Testament faith than any other conclusion could possibly be.

It is also evident that Jesus treated these cases of invaded personality, of bondage of depression, of helpless fear, as due to a real superhuman cause, to meet and overcome which He addressed Himself. The most distinctive and important words we have upon this obscure and difficult subject, upon which we know far too little to speak with any assurance or authority, are these: "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer" (Mr 9:29).

LITERATURE.

(1) The most accessible statement of Baudissin’s theory is in Whitehouse’s article "Demons," etc., in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes).

(2) For extra-canonical Jewish ideas use Lange, Apocrypha, 118, 134; Edersheim, LTJM, Appendices XIII, XVI.

(3) For spirit-lore in general see Ladd, Phil. Rel., index under the word, and standard books on Anthropology and Philosophy of Religion under Spiritism.

(4) For Babylonian demonology see summary in Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 144 ff.

Louis Matthews Sweet

DEMOPHON

dem’-o-fon (Demophon): A Syrian general in Palestine under Antiochus V (Eupator) who continued to harass the Jews after covenants had been made between Lysias and Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 12:2).

DEN

(ma‘on, me‘onah, "habitation"; me‘arah, and spelaion, "cave"; me’urah (Isa 11:8), "a light-hole," from ‘or, "light," perhaps for me‘arah; cokh (Ps 10:9 the King James Version), and cukkah (Job 38:40), "a covert," elsewhere "booth"; ‘erebh (Job 37:8), "covert," as in the Revised Version (British and American); gobh; compare Arabic jubb, "pit" (Da 6:7); minharoth, "fissure" or "cleft" (Jud 6:2)): In the limestone mountains of Palestine caves, large and small, are abundant, the calcium carbonate, of which the rock is mainly composed, being dissolved by the water as it trickles over them or through their crevices. Even on the plains, by a similar process, pits or "lime sinks" are formed, which are sometimes used by the Arabs for storing straw or grain. Of this sort may have been the pit, bor, into which Joseph was cast by his brethren (Ge 37:20). Caves and crevices and sometimes spaces among piled-up boulders at the foot of a cliff or in a stream bed are used as dens by jackals, wolves and other wild animals. Even the people, for longer or shorter periods, have lived as troglodytes. Compare Jud 6:2: "Because of Midian the children of Israel made them the dens (minharoth) which are in the mountains, and the caves (me‘arah), and the strongholds (metsadh)." The precipitous sides of the valleys contain many caves converted by a little labor into human habitations. Notable instances are the valley of the Kidron near Mar-Saba, and Wadi-ul-Chamam near the Sea of Tiberias. See CAVE.

Alfred Ely Day

DENARIUS

de-na’-ri-us (denarion): A Roman silver coin, 25 of which went to the aureus, the standard gold coin of the empire in the time of Augustus, which was equal in value to about one guinea or $5,25; more exactly £1.0,6 =$ 5.00, the £ =$ 4,866. Hence, the value of the denarius would be about 20 cents and this was the ordinary wage of a soldier and a day laborer. The word is uniformly rendered "penny" in the King James Version and "shilling" in the American Standard Revised Version, except in Mt 22:19; Mr 12:15 and Lu 20:24, where the Latin word is used, since in these passsages it refers to the coin in which tribute was paid to the Roman government. See MONEY.

H. Porter

DENOUNCE

de-nouns’:Occurs in De 30:18: "I denounce unto you this day, that ye shall surely perish." It is used here in the obsolete sense of "to declare," to make known in a solemn manner. It is not found in the Bible with the regular meaning of "to censure," "arraign," etc.

DENY

de-ni’:This word is characteristic of the New Testament rather than the Old Testament, although it

translates three different Hebrew originals, namely, kachash, "to lie," "disown" (Ge 18:15; Jos 24:27; Job 8:18; 31:28; Pr 30:9); mana‘, "to withhold," "keep back" (1Ki 20:7; Pr 30:7); shubh, "to turn back," "say no" (1Ki 2:16).

In the New Testament, antilego, is once translated "deny," in the case of the Sadducees who denied the resurrection (Lu 20:27 the King James Version), and where it carries the sense of speaking against the doctrine. But the word commonly is arneomai, with or without the prefix ap-. In the absence of the prefix the sense is "to disown," but when it is added it means "to disown totally" or to the fullest extent. In the milder sense it is found in Mt 10:33; 26:70,72; of Simon Peter, Mr 14:68,70 (Ac 3:13,14; 2Ti 2:12,13; 2Pe 2:1; 1 Joh 2:22,23; Jude 1:4; Re 2:13; 3:8). But it is significant that the sterner meaning is associated with Mt 16:24 and its parallels, where Christ calls upon him who would be His disciple to deny himself and take up his cross and follow Him. See also PETER, SIMON.

James M. Gray

DEPOSIT

de-poz’-it (paratheke, 1Ti 6:20; 2Ti 1:12,14 the Revised Version, margin, paraphrased in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) into "that which is committed" (see COMMEND)): The noun was used in the classical Greek, just as its English equivalents, for "that which is placed with another for safe keeping," a charge committed to another’s hands, consisting often of money or property; compare Ex 22:7; Le 6:2. This practice was common in days when there were no banks.

(1) In 1Ti 6:20; also 2Ti 1:14, the reference is to a deposit which God makes with man, and for which man is to give a reckoning. The context shows that this deposit is the Christian faith, "the pattern of sound words" (2Ti 1:13), that which is contrasted with the "oppositions of the knowledge which is falsely so called" (1Ti 6:20). "Keep the talent of the Christian faith safe and undiminished" (Vincentius Lirenensis).

(2) In 2Ti 1:12, the deposit is one which man makes with God. The key to the meaning of this expression is found probably in Ps 31:5: "Into thy hand I commend my spirit: Thou hast redeemed me," i. e. "All that I am, with all my interests, have been entrusted to Thy safe keeping, and, therefore, I have no anxieties with respect to the future. The day of reckoning, ‘that day,’ will show how faithful are the hands that hold this trust."

H. E. Jacobs

DEPTH

See ABYSS.

DEPUTY

dep’-u-ti: This is the correct rendering of nitsabh (1Ki 22:47). In Es 8:9, 9:3 the term improperly represents caghan, in the King James Version, and is corrected to "governor" in the Revised Version (British and American). In the New Testament "deputy" represents anthupatos (Ac 13:7,8,12; 18:12; 19:38), which the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "proconsul" (which see). The Roman proconsuls were officers invested with consular power over a district outside the city, usually for one year. Originally they were retiring consuls, but after Augustus the title was given to governors of senatorial provinces, whether they had held the office of consul or not. The proconsul exercised judicial as well as military power in his province, and his authority was absolute, except as he might be held accountable at the expiration of his office. See GOVERNMENT.

William Arthur Heidel

DERBE

dur’-be (Derbe, Ac 14:20,21; 16:1; Derbaios, 20:4; Derbetes, Strabo, Cicero): A city in the extreme Southeast corner of the Lycaonian plain is mentioned twice as having been visited by Paul (on his first and second missionary journeys respectively), and it may now be regarded as highly probable that he passed through it on his third journey (to the churches of Galatia). The view that these churches were in South Galatia is now accepted by the majority of English and American scholars, and a traveler passing through the Cilician Gates to Southern Galatia must have traversed the territory of Derbe.

1. History:

Derbe is first mentioned as the seat of Antipater, who entertained Cicero, the Roman orator and governor of Cilicia. When the kingdom of Amyntas passed, at his death in 25 BC, to the Romans, it was made into a province and called Galatia (see GALATIA). This province included Laranda as well as Derbe on the extreme. Southeast, and for a time Laranda was the frontier city looking toward Cappadocia and Cilicia and Syria via the Cilician Gates. But between 37 and 41 AD Laranda was transferred to the "protected" kingdom of Antiochus, and Derbe became the frontier city. It was the last city on distinctively Roman territory, on the road leading from Southern Galatia to the East; it was here that commerce entering the province had to pay the customs dues. Strabo records this fact when he calls Derbe a limen or "customs station." It owed its importance (and consequently its visit from Paul on his first journey) to this fact, and to its position on a great Roman road leading from Antioch, the capital of Southern Galatia, to Iconium, Laranda, Heracleia-Cybistra, and the Cilician Gates. Roman milestones have been found along the line of this road, one at a point 15 miles Northwest of Derbe. It was one of those Lycaonian cities honored with the title "Claudian" by the emperor Claudius; its coins bear the legend "Claudio-Derbe." This implied considerable importance and prosperity as well as strong pro-Roman feeling; yet we do not find Derbe standing aloof, like the Roman colonies Iconium and Lystra, from the Common Council of Lycaonian cities (Koinon Lykaonias).

Derbe remained in the province Galatia till about 135 AD, when it passed to the jurisdiction of the triple province Cilicia-Isauria-Lycaonia. It continued in this division till 295 AD, and was then included in the newly formed province Isauria. This arrangement lasted till about 372 AD, when Lycaonia, including Derbe, was formed into a separate province. The statement of Stephanus of Byzantium that Derbe was "a fortress of Isauria" originated in the arrangement which existed from 295 to 372 AD. Coins of the city represent Heracles, Fortuna and a winged Victory writing on a shield (after the pattern of the Venus of Melos, in the Louvre, Paris). Derbe is mentioned several times in the records of the church councils. A bishop, Daphnus of Derbe, was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381.

2. Situation:

The site of Derbe was approximately fixed by the American explorer Sterrett, and more accurately by Sir W. M. Ramsay, who, after carefully examining all the ruins in the neighborhood, placed it at Gudelisin. Up to 1911, certain epigraphic evidence fixing the site had not been found, but Ramsay's identification meets all the conditions, and cannot be far wrong. On the East, Derbe was conterminous with Laranda, on the Northeast with Barata in the Kara Dagh. It bordered on the territory of Iconium on the Northwest, and on Isauria on the West. Its territory touched the foothills of Taurus on the South, and the site commands a fine view of the great mountain called Hadji Baba or the Pilgrim Father. The Greeks of the district say that the name is a reminiscence of Paul, "over whose travels" the mountain "stood as a silent witness."

The remains are mostly of the late Roman and Byzantine periods, but pottery of an earlier date has been found on the site. An inscription of a village on the territory of Derbe records the erection of a building by two architects from Lystra. A line of boundary stones, separating the territory of Derbe from that of Barata, is still standing. It probably belongs to an early delimitation of the territory of the frontier town of Galatia (Ramsay).

3. Paul at Derbe:

In Ac 14:20,21, it is narrated that Paul and Barnabas, after being driven out of Lystra, departed to Derbe, where they "preached the gospel .... and made many disciples." But they did not further. Paul's mission included only the centers of Greco-Roman civilization; it was no part of his plan to pass over the frontier of the province into non- Roman territory. This aspect of his purpose is illustrated by the reference to Derbe on his second journey (Ac 16:1). Paul started from Antioch and "went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Ac 15:41). "Then he came to Derbe and Lystra" (Ac 16:1 the King James Version). The unwarned reader might forget that in going from Cilicia to Derbe, Paul must have, passed through a considerable part of Antiochus' territory, and visited the important cities of Heracleia-Cybistra and Laranda. But his work ends with the Roman Cilicia and begins again with the Roman Galatia; to him, the intervening country is a blank. Concentration of effort, and utilization only of the most fully prepared material were the characteristics of Paul's missionary journeys in Asia Minor. That Paul was successful in Derbe may be gathered (as Ramsay points out) from the fact that he does not mention Derbe among the places where he had suffered persecution (2Ti 3:11). Gaius of Derbe (among others)

accompanied Paul to Jerusalem, in charge of the donations of the churches to the poor in that city (Ac 20:4).

LITERATURE.

The only complete account of Derbe is that given in Sir W. M. Ramsay's Cities of Paul, 385-404. On Paul's mission there, see the same author's Paul the Traveler and Roman Citizen, 119, 178. Many inscriptions of the later Roman period are collected in Sterrett, Wolfe Expedition to Asia Minor, Numbers 18-52. The principal ancient authorities, besides Acts, are Cicero Ad Fam. xiii.73; Strabo xxx.569; Ptolemeus, v.6, 17; Steph. Byz., Hierocl., 675; Notit, Episcop., I, 404, and the Acta Conciliorum.

W. M. Calder

DERISION

de-rizh'-un: Three verbs are so translated luts, "scorn" (Ps 119:51); la'agh, "mock" (Ps 2:4; 59:8; Eze 23:32); and sachaq, "laugh at" (Job 30:1; Ex 32:25 margin, "a whispering"; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 5:3). This word is found almost exclusively in the Psalms and Prophets; Jeremiah is fond of it. It is used both as a substantive and a verb, the latter in the phrase "to have in derision:"

DESCEND; DESCENT

de-send', de-sent' (yaradh; katabaino, "go down"); (katabasis): Of Yahweh (Ex 34:5); of the Spirit (Mt 3:16); of angels (Ge 28:12; Mt 28:2; Joh 1:51); of Christ (1Th 4:16; Eph 4:9). "He also descended into the lower parts of the earth" is variously interpreted, the two chief interpretations being the one of the incarnation, and the other of the "descent into hell" (1Pe 3:19). The former regards the clause "of the earth," an appositive genitive, as when we speak of "the city of Rome," namely, "the lower parts, i.e. the earth." The other regards the genitive as possessive, or, with Meyer, as governed by the comparative, i.e. "parts lower than the earth." For the former view, see full discussion in Eadie; for the latter, Ellicott and especially Meyer, in commentaries on Eph.

H. E. Jacobs

DESCENT, OF JESUS

de-sent'.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

DESCRIBE

de-skrib’:This verb, now obsolete, in the sense used in Jos 18:4,6,8,9 and Jud 8:14, is a translation of kathabh, usually rendered "to write" or "inscribe." But in the above passages it has the Old English meaning of dividing into parts or into lots, as for example: "Walk through the land, and describe it according to their inheritance" (Jos 18:4); that is, describe in writing the location and size of the several parcels of land thus portioned out. In Jud 8:14 "described" should be translated "wrote down a list of." "Describe" occurs twice in the King James Version of the New Testament (Ro 4:6, 10:5), where lego, and grapho, are both rendered "describeth." the Revised Version (British and American) corrects both, and substitutes "pronounceth" in the first and "writeth" in the second passage.

Description =" list" (1 Esdras 5:39).

W. W. Davies

DESCRY

de-skri’:This word like "describe" came into the English through the French descrire (Latin, describere); it occurs only in the King James Version of Jud 1:23: "And the house of Joseph sent to Bethel." tur the verb thus translated, signifies "to explore" or "examine," and the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "sent to spy out."

DESERT

dez’-ert midhbar, chorbah, yeshimon, ‘arabhah, tsiyah, tohu; eremos, eremia: Midhbar, the commonest word for "desert," more often rendered "wilderness," is perhaps from the root dabhar, in the sense of "to drive," i.e. a place for driving or pasturing flocks. Yeshimon is from yasham, "to be empty", chorbah (compare Arabic kharib, "to lie waste"; khirbah, "a ruin"; kharab, "devastation"), from charabh "to be dry"; compare also ‘arabh, "to be dry," and ‘arabhah, "a desert" or "the Arabah" (see CHAMPAIGN). For ‘erets tsiyah (Ps 63:1; Isa 41:18), "a dry land," compare tsiyim, "wild beasts of the desert" (Isa 13:21, etc.). Tohu, variously rendered "without form" (Ge 1:2 the King James Version), "empty space," the King James Version "empty place" (Job 26:7), "waste," the King James Version "nothing" (Job 6:18), "confusion," the Revised Version, margin, "wasteness" (Isa 24:10 the English Revised Version), may be compared with Arabic tah, "to go astray" at-Tih, "the desert of the wandering." In the New Testament we find eremos and eremia: "The child (John) .... was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (Lu 1:80); "Our fathers did eat manna in the desert" (Joh 6:31 the King James Version).

The desert as known to the Israelites was not a waste of sand, as those are apt to imagine who have in mind the pictures of the Sahara. Great expanses of sand, it is true, are found in Arabia, but the nearest one, an-Nufud, was several days’ journey distant from the farthest southeast reached by the Israelites in their wanderings. Most of the desert of Sinai and of Palestine is land that needs only water to make it fruitful. East of the Jordan, the line between "the desert" and "the sown" lies about along the line of the

Chijaz railway. To the West there is barely enough water to support the crops of wheat; to the East there is too little. Near the line of demarcation, the yield of wheat depends strictly upon the rainfall. A few inches more or less of rain in the year determines whether the grain can reach maturity or not. The latent fertility of the desert lands is demonstrated by the season of scant rains, when they become carpeted with herbage and flowers. It is marvelous, too, how the camels, sheep and goats, even in the dry season, will find something to crop where the traveler sees nothing but absolute barrenness. The long wandering of the Israelites in "the desert" was made possible by the existence of food for their flocks and herds. Compare Ps 65:11,12: " Thou crownest the year with thy goodness; And thy paths drop fatness. They drop upon the pastures of the Wilderness. And the hills are girded with joy"; and also Joe 2:22: "The pastures of the wilderness do spring."

"The desert" or "the wilderness" (ha-midhbar) usually signifies the desert of the wandering, or the northern part of the Sinaitic Peninsula. Compare Ex 3:1 King James Version: "MOSES .... led theflock (of Jethro) to the backside of the desert"; Ex 5:3 King James Version: "Let us go .... three days' journey into the desert"; Ex 19:2 King James Version: "They .... were come to the desert of Sinai"; Ex 23:31 King James Version: "I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even unto the sea of the Philistines, and from the desert unto the river" (Euphrates). Other uncultivated or pasture regions are known as Wilderness of Beersheba (Ge 21:14), West of Judah (Jud 1:16), West of En-gedi (1Sa 24:1), West of Gibeon (2Sa 2:24), West of Maon (1Sa 23:24), West of Damascus; compare Arabic Badiyet-ush-Sham (1Ki 19:15), etc. Midhbar yam, "the wilderness of the sea" (Isa 21:1), may perhaps be that part of Arabia bordering upon the Persian Gulf.

Aside from the towns and fields, practically all the land was midhbar or "desert," for this term included mountain, plain and valley. The terms, "desert of En-gedi," "desert of Maon," etc., do not indicate circumscribed areas, but are applied in a general way to the lands about these places. To obtain water, the shepherds with their flocks traverse long distances to the wells, springs or streams, usually arranging to reach the water about the middle of the day and rest about it for an hour or so, taking shelter from the sun in the shadows of the rocks, perhaps under some overhanging ledge.

Alfred Ely Day

DESIRE

de-zir':The verb "to desire" in the Scriptures usually means "to long for," "to ask for," "to demand," and may be used in a good or bad sense (compare De 7:25 the King James Version). the Revised Version (British and American) frequently renders the more literal meaning of the Hebrew. Compare Job 20:20, "delight"; Pr 21:20, "precious"; Ps 40:6, "delight"; aiteo (except Col 1:9), and erotao (except Lu 7:36) are rendered "to ask" and zeteo, "to seek" (compare Lu 9:9 et. al.). The Hebrew kacaph, literally, "to lose in value," is translated (Zep 2:1) by "hath no shame" (the Revised Version, margin "longing," the King James Version "not desired"). The literal translation "to lose in value," "to degenerate," would be more in harmony with the context than the translations offered. The Hebrew chemdah (2Ch 21:20, "without

being desired"), means according to the Arabic "to praise," "to give thanks." The context brings in contrast the burial of the king Jehoram with that of his fathers. In the latter case there was "burning," i.e. recognition and praise, but when Jehoram died, there was no chemdah, i.e. there was no praise for his services rendered to the kingdom. For "desire" in Ec 12:5, see CAPERBERRY.

A. L. Breslich

DESIRE OF ALL NATIONS

This phrase occurs only in Hag 2:7 (King James Version, the English Revised Version "desirable things," the American Revised Version, margin "things desired"), and is commonly applied to the Messiah.

At the erection of the temple in Ezra's time, the older men who had seen the more magnificent house of Solomon were disappointed and distressed at the comparison. The prophet, therefore, is directed to encourage them by the assurance that Yahweh is with them nevertheless, and in a little while will shake the heavens, the earth, the sea, the dry land and the nations, and "the desire of all nations" shall come, and the house shall be filled with glory, so that "the later glory of this house shall be greater than the former."

(1) Many expositors refer the prophecy to the first advent of Christ. The shaking of the heavens, the earth, the sea and the dry land is the figurative setting of the shaking of the nations, while this latter expression refers to those changes of earthly dominion coincident with the overthrow of the Persians by the Greeks, the Greeks by the Romans, and so on down to the beginning of our era. The house then in process of construction was filled with glory by the later presence of the Messiah, which glory was greater than the Shekinah of Solomon's time. Objections are presented to this view as follows: First, there is the element of time. Five centuries, more or less, elapsed between the building of Ezra's temple and the first advent of Christ, and the men of Ezra's time needed comfort for the present. Then there is the difficulty of associating the physical phenomena with any shaking of the nations occurring atthe first advent. Furthermore, in what sense, it is asked, could Christ, when He came, be said to be the desire of all nations? And finally, what comfort would a Jew find in this magnifying of the Gentiles?

(2) These difficulties, though not insuperable, lead others to apply the prophecy to the second advent of Christ. The Jews are to be restored to Jerusalem, and another temple is to be built (Eze 40-48). The shaking of the nations and the physical phenomena find their fulfillment in the "Great Tribulation" so often spoken of in the Old Testament and Revelation, and which is followed by the coming of Christ in glory to set up His kingdom (Mal 3:1; Mt 24:29,30 and other places). Some of the difficulties spoken of in the first instance apply here also, but not all of them, while others are common to both interpretations. One such common difficulty is that Ezra's temple can hardly be identified with that of the time of Herod and Christ, and certainly not with that of Ezekiel; which is met, however, by saying that all the temples, including Solomon's, are treated as but one "house"—the house of the Lord, in the religious sense, at least, if not architecturally. Another such difficulty touches the question of time, which, whether it

includes five centuries or twenty, is met by the principle that to the prophets, "ascending in heart to God and the eternity of God, all times and all things of this world are only a mere point." When the precise time of particular events is not revealed, they sometimes describe them as continuous, and sometimes blend two events together, having a near or partial, and also a remote or complete fulfillment. "They saw the future in space rather than in time, or the perspective rather than the actual distance." It is noted that the Lord Jesus so blends together the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, AD 70, and the days of the anti-Christ at the end of this age, that it is difficult to separate them, and to say which belongs exclusively to either (Mt 24). That the words may have an ultimate fulfillment in the second advent of Christ receives strength from a comparison of Hag 2:21,22 with Heb 12:26,27. The writer of that epistle condenses the two passages in Hag 2:6,7 and Hag 2:21,22, implying that it was one and the same shaking, of which the former verses denote the beginning, and the latter the end. The shaking, in other words, began introductory to the first advent and will be finished at the second. Concerning the former, compare Mt 3:17; 27:51; 28:2; Ac 2:2; 4:31, and concerning the latter, Mt 24:7; Re 16:20; 20:11 (Bengel, quoted by Canon Faussett).

(3) Other expositors seek to cut the Gordian knot by altogether denying the application to the Messiah, and translating "the desire of all nations" by "the beauty," or "the desirable things of all nations," i.e. their precious gifts (see Isa 60:5,11; 61:6). This application is defended in the following way:

(a) The Hebrew word means the quality and not the thing desired;

(b) the Messiah was not desired by all the nations when He came;

(c) the verb "shall come" is plural, which requires the noun to be understood in the plural, whereas if the Messiah be intended, the noun is singular;

(d) "The silver is mine," etc. (Hag 2:8) accords with the translation "the desirable things of all nations";

(e) the agreement of the Septuagint and Syriac versions with such rendering.

All these arguments, however, can be fairly met by counter-arguments, leaving the reader still in doubt.

(a) An abstract noun is often put for the concrete;

(b) the result shows that while the Jews rejected Christ, the Gentiles received and hence, desired Him;

(c) where two nouns stand together after the manner of "the desire" and "nations," the verb agrees in number sometimes with the latter, even though the former be its nominative;

(d) the 8th verse of the prophecy can be harmonized about as easily with one view as the other;

(e) the King James Version is sustained by the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) and early

Jewish rabbis.

James M. Gray

DESOLATE

des'-o-lat (very frequently in the Old Testament for shamem, and its derivatives; less frequently, charebh, and its derivatives, and other words. In the New Testament it stands for eremos (Mt 23:38; Ac 1:20; Ga 4:27) eremoo (Re 17:16), and monoo (1Ti 5:5)): From Latin de, intens., solus, alone. Several shades of meaning can be distinguished:

(1) Its primary sense is "left lonely," "forlorn," e. g. Ps 25:16, "Have mercy upon me; for I am desolate" (Hebrew yachidh, "alone"); 1Ti 5:5, "she that is a widow indeed, and desolate" (Greek memonomene, "left alone").

(2) In the sense of "laid waste," "destitute of inhabitants," e. g. Jer 4:7, "to make thy land desolate, that thy cities be laid waste, without inhabitant."

(3) With the meaning "comfortless," "afflicted," e. g. Ps 143:4, "My heart within me is desolate."

(4) In the sense of "barren," "childless," "unfruitful," e. g. Job 15:34; Isa 49:21 (Hebrew galmudh).

D. Miall Edwards

DESOLATION, ABOMINATION OF

See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

DESPAIR

de-spar':The substantive only in 2Co 4:8, "perplexed, but not in (the Revised Version (British and American) "yet not unto") despair," literally, "being at a loss, but not utterly at a loss." "Unto despair" here conveys the force of the Greek prefix ex ("utterly," "out and out"). Desperate, in Job 6:26; Isa 17:11. In the latter instance, the Hebrew adjective is derived from a verb =" to be sick," and the literally, rendering would be "incurable" (compare Job 34:6, "my wound is incurable"). Desperately in Jer 17:9 the King James Version, where the heart is said to be "desperately (i.e. incurably) wicked" or "sick."

DESPITE; DESPITEFUL

de-spit', de-spit'-fool: "Despite" is from Latin despectus, "a looking down upon." As a noun (=" contempt") it is now generally used in its shortened form, "spite," while the longer form is used as a

preposition (=" in spite of"). In English Versions of the Bible it is always a noun. In the Old Testament it translates Hebrew she'aT, in Eze 25:6, and in the Revised Version (British and American) Eze 25:15; 36:5 ("with despite of soul"). In Heb 10:29 ("hath done despite unto the Spirit of grace") it stands for Greek enubrizo, "to treat with contempt."

The adjective "despiteful" occurs in the King James Version Eze 25:15; 36:5; Sirach 31:31 ("despiteful words," the Revised Version (British and American) "a word of reproach"); Ro 1:30 (the Revised Version (British and American) "insolent" = Greek hubristes, from huper, "above"; compare English "uppish").

D. Miall Edwards

DESSAU

des'-o, des'-a-u (Dessaou (2 Macc 14:16)): the Revised Version (British and American) LESSAU (which see).

DESTINY, (MENI)

des'-ti-ni: A god of Good Luck, possibly the Pleiades.

See ASTROLOGY, 10; MENI.

DESTROYER

de-stroi'-er: In several passages the word designates a supernatural agent of destruction, or destroying angel, executing Divine judgment.

(1) In Ex 12:23, of the "destroyer" who smote the first-born in Egypt, again referred to under the same title in Heb 11:28 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "he that destroyed").

(2) In Job 33:22, "the destroyers" (literally, "they that cause to die") = the angels of death that are ready to take away a man's life during severe illness. No exact parallel to this is found in the Old Testament. The nearest approach is "the angel that destroyed the people" by pestilence (2Sa 24:16,17 parallel 1Ch 21:15,16); the angel that smote the Assyrians (2Ki 19:35 = Isa 37:36 parallel 2Ch 32:21); "angels of evil" (Ps 78:49).

(3) In the Apocrypha, "the destroyer" is once referred to as "the minister of punishment" (Revised Version; literally, "him who was punishing"), who brought death into the world (The Wisdom of Solomon 18:22-25).

(4) In 1Co 10:10, "the destroyer" is the angelic agent to whose instrumentality Paul attributes the plague of Nu 16:46-49.

In later Jewish theology (the Targums and Midrash), the "destroyer" or "angel of death" appears under the name Sammael (i.e. the poison of God), who was once an arch-angel before the throne of God, and who caused the serpent to tempt Eve. According to Weber, he is not to be distinguished from Satan. The chief distinction between the "destroyer" of early thought and the Sammael of later Judaism is that the former was regarded as the emissary of Yahweh, and subservient to His will, and sometimes was not clearly distinguished from Yahweh Himself, whereas the latter was regarded as a perfectly distinct individuality, acting in independence or semi-independence, and from purely malicious and evil motives. The change was largely due to the influence of Persian dualism, which made good and evil to be independent powers.

D. Miall Edwards

DESTRUCTION

de-struk'-shun: In the King James Version this word translates over 30 Hebrew words in the Old Testament, and 4 words in the New Testament. Of these the most interesting, as having a technical sense, is 'abhaddon (from verb 'abhadh, "to be lost," "to perish"). It is found 6 times in the Wisdom Literature, and nowhere else in the Old Testament; compare Re 9:11. See ABADDON.

DESTRUCTION, CITY OF; HELIOPOLIS or CITY OF THE SUN (Isa 19:18). See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 2; IR-HA-HERES; ON.

DETERMINATE

de-tur'-mi-nat (horismenos, "determined," "fixed"): Only in Ac 2:23, "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of. God," Greek horismenos, from horizo, "to set boundaries," "determine," "settle" (compare English word "horizon"—literally, "that which bounds"). It is remarkable that Peter in one and the same sentence speaks of the death of Christ from two quite distinct points of view.

(1) From the historical standpoint, it was a crime perpetrated by men who were morally responsible for their deed ("him .... ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay").

(2) From the standpoint of Divine teleology, it was part of an eternal plan ("by the determinate," etc.). No effort is made to demonstrate the logical consistency of the two ideas. They represent two aspects of the one fact. The same Greek word is used in Lu 22:22, where Christ speaks of His betrayal as taking place "as it was (the Revised Version (British and American) "hath been") determined" (kata to horismenon). Compare Lu 24:26.

D. Miall Edwards

DETERMINE

de-tur’-min:

(1) "To resolve," "decide." This is the primary meaning of the word and it is also the one that is the most common. In the New Testament the Greek word krino, is translated "determine," and it has the above meaning (Ac 20:16; 25:25; 1Co 2:2). The word occurs frequently in the Old Testament with this meaning (see Ex 21:22; 1Sa 20:7,9,33).

(2) "To decree," "ordain," "mark out." The Greek word that is rendered "determine" with this meaning is horizo. See DETERMINATE.

The Hebrew term charats is translated "determine" with the above meaning; as "his days are determined" (Job 14:5); "a destruction is determined" (Isa 10:22); "desolations are determined" (Da 9:26). The Hebrew term mishpaT, which means "judgment" or "sentence," is translated "determination" in Ze 3:8.

A. W. Fortune.

DETESTABLE, THINGS

de-tes’-ta-b’-l, (shiqquts; sheqets, synonymous with to‘ebhah, "abomination," "abominable thing"): The translation of shiqqutsim in Jer 16:18; Eze 5:11; 7:20; 11:18,21; 37:23; a term always applied to idol-worship or to objects connected with idolatry; often also translated "abomination," as in 1Ki 11:5,7 (bis); Jer 4:1; Eze 20:7,8,30. Sheqets, translated "abomination," is applied in the Scriptures to that which is ceremonially unclean (Le 7:21), creatures forbidden as food, as water animals without fins or scales in Le 11:10-12, birds of prey and the like (verse 18), winged creeping things (verses 20,23), creeping vermin (verses 41 f). Compare also Isa 66:17. By partaking of the food of the animals in question one makes himself detestable (Le 11:43; 20:25). Similarly the idolatrous appurtenances are to be held in detestation; nothing of the kind should be appropriated for private use (De 7:26). See ABOMINATION.

Max L. Margolis

DEUEL

du’-el, de-u’-el de‘u’el, ("knowledge of God"): A Gadite, the father of Eliasaph, the representative of the tribe of Gad in the census-taking (Nu 1:14), in making the offering of the tribe at the dedication of the altar (Nu 7:42,47), and as leader of the host of the tribe of the children of Gad in the wilderness (Nu 10:20). Called Reuel in Nu 2:14, daleth (d) being confused with resh (r).

DEUTERO-CANONICAL, BOOKS

du-ter-o-ka-non'-i-kal: A term sometimes used to designate certain books, which by the Council of Trent were included in the Old Testament, but which the Protestant churches designated as apocryphal (see APOCRYPHA), and also certain books of the New Testament which for a long time were not accepted by the whole church as Scripture. Webster says the term pertains to "a second Canon or ecclesiastical writing of inferior authority," and the history of these books shows that they were all at times regarded by a part of the church as being inferior to the others and some of them are so regarded today. This second Canon includes Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclusiasticus, 2 Esdras, 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees of the Old Testament, and Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude, and Revelation of the New Testament.

1. The Old Testament Books:

The Old Testament books under consideration were not in the Hebrew Canon and they were originally designated as apocryphal. The Septuagint contained many of the apocrphyal books, and among these were most of those which we have designated deutero-canonical. The Septuagint was perhaps the Greek Bible of New Testament times and it continued to be the Old Testament of the early church, and hence, these books were widely distributed. It seems, however, that they did not continue to hold their place along with the other books, for Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, in his Festal Epistle in 367 gave a list of the books of the Bible which were to be read, and at the close of this list he said: "There are also other books besides these, not canonized, yet set by the Fathers to be read to those who have just come up and who wish to be informed as to the word of godliness: Wisdom, Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit, the so-called Teaching of the Apes, and the Shepherd of Hermas." Jerome also made a distinction between the apocryphal books and the others. In his Preface, after enumerating the books contained in the Hebrew Canon, he adds: "This prologue I write as a preface to the books to be translated by us from the Hebrew into Latin, that we may know that all the books which are not of this number are apocrphyal; therefore Wisdom, which is commonly ascribed to Solomon as its author, and the book of Jesus the son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit and the Shepher are not in the Canon." Rufinus made the same distinction as did Jerome. He declared that "these books are not canonical, but have been called by our forefathers ecclesiastical." Augustine included these books in his list which he published in 397. He begins the list thus: "The entire canon of Scripture is comprised in these books." Then follows a list of the books which includes Tobit, Judith, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, 2 Esdras, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, and it closes with these words: "In these 44 books is comprised all the authority of the Old Testament." Inasmuch as these books were regarded by the church at large as ecclesiastical and helpful, and Augustine had given them canonical sanction, they rapidly gained in favor and most of them are found in the great manuscripts.

See CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

2. The New Testament Books:

It is not probable that there was any general council of the church in those early centuries that set apart

the various books of the New Testament and canonized them as Scripture for the whole church. There was no single historical event which brought together the New Testament books which were everywhere to be regarded as Scripture. These books did not make the same progress in the various provinces and churches. A careful study of conditions reveals the fact that there was no uniform New Testament canon in the church during at least the first 3 centuries. The Ethiopic church, for example, had 35 books in its New Testament, while the Syrian church had only 22 books.

From an early date the churches were practically agreed on those books which are sometimes designated as the protocanonical, and which Eusebius designated as the homologoumena. They differed, however, in regard to the 7 disputed books which form a part of the so-called deutero-canon, and which Eusebius designated as the antilegomena. They also differed in regard to other ecclesiastical writings, for there was no fixed line between canonical and non-canonical books. While there was perhaps no council of the church that had passed on the books and declared them canonical, it is undoubtedly true that before the close of the 2nd century all the books that are in our New Testament, with the exception of those under consideration, had become recognized as Scripture in all orthodox churches.

The history of these seven books reveals the fact that although some of them were early used by the Fathers, they afterward fell into disfavor. That is especially true of Hebrews and Revelation. Generally speaking, it can be said that at the close of the 2nd century the 7 books under consideration had failed to receive any such general recognition as had the rest; however, all, with perhaps the exception of 2 Peter, had been used by some of the Fathers. He was freely attested by Clement of Rome and Justin Martyr; James by Hermas and probably by Clement of Rome; 2 John, 3 John and Jude by the Muratorian Fragment; Revelation by Hermas and Justin Martyr who names John as its author.

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Jerome, who prepared the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) in the closing years of the 4th century, accepted all 7 of the doubtful books, yet he held that 2 John and 3 John were written by the Presbyter, and he intimated that 2 Peter and Jude were still rejected by some, and he said the Latins did not receive He among the canonical Scriptures, neither did the Greek churches receive Augustine, who was one of the great leaders during the last part of the 4th century and the first part of the 5th, accepted without question the 7 disputed books. These books had gradually gained in favor and the position of Jerome and Augustine practically settled their canonicity for the orthodox churches. The Council of Carthage, held in 397, adopted the catalogue of Augustine. This catalogue contained all the disputed books both of the New Testament and the Old Testament.

Since the Reformation.

The Canon of Augustine became the Canon of the majority of the churches and the Old Testament books which he accepted were added to the Vulgate, but there were some who still held to the Canon of Jerome. The awakening of the Reformation inevitably led to a reinvestigation of the Canon, since the Bible was made the source of authority, and some of the disputed books of the New Testament were

again questioned by the Reformers. The position given the Bible by the Reformers led the Roman church to reaffirm its sanction and definitely to fix the books that should be accepted. Accordingly the Council of Trent, which convened in 1546, made the Canon of Augustine, which included the 7 apocphyal books of the Old Testament, and the 7 disputed books of the New Testament, the Canon of the church, and it pronounced a curse upon those who did not receive these books. The Protestants at first followed the example of Rome and adopted these books which had long had the sanction of usage as their Bible. Gradually, however, the questioned books of the Old Testament were separated from the others. That was true in Coverdale's translation, and in Matthew's Bible they were not only separated from the others but they were prefaced with the words, "the volume of the book called Hagiographa." In Cranmer's Bible, Hagiographa was changed into Apocrypha, and this passed through the succeeding edition into the King James Version.

A. W. Fortune

DEUTERONOMY

du-ter-on'-o-mi:

1. Name

2. What Deuteronomy Is

3. Analysis

4. Ruling Ideas

5. Unity

6. Authorship

7. Deuteronomy Spoken Twice

8. Deuteronomy's Influence in Israel's History

9. The Critical Theory

LITERATURE

1. Name:

In Hebrew 'elleh ha-debharim, "these are the words"; in Greek, Deuteronomion, "second law"; whence

the Latin deuteronomii, and the English Deuteronomy. The Greek title is due to a mistranslation by the Septuagint of the clause in De 17:18 rendered, "and he shall write for himself this repetition of the law." The Hebrew really means "and he shall write out for himself a copy of this law." However, the error on which the English title rests is not serious, as Deuteronomy is in a very true sense a repetition of the law.

2. What Deuteronomy Is:

Deuteronomy is the last of the five books of the Pentateuch, or "five-fifths of the Law." It possesses an individuality and impressiveness of its own. In Exodus—Numbers Yahweh is represented as speaking unto Moses, whereas in Deuteronomy, Moses is represented as speaking at Yahweh's command to Israel (De 1:1-4; 5:1; 29:1). It is a hortatory recapitulation of various addresses delivered at various times and places in the desert wanderings—a sort of homily on the constitution, the essence or gist of Moses' instructions to Israel during the forty years of their desert experience. It is "a Book of Reviews"; a translation of Israel's redemptive history into living principles; not so much a history as a commentary. There is much of retrospect in it, but its main outlook is forward. The rabbins speak of it as "the Book of Reproofs." It is the text of all prophecy; a manual of evangelical oratory; possessing "all the warmth of a Bernard, the flaming zeal of a Savonarola, and the tender, gracious sympathy of a Francis of Assisi." The author's interest is entirely moral. His one supreme purpose is to arouse Israel's loyalty to Yahweh and to His revealed law. Taken as a whole the book is an exposition of the great commandment, "Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." It was from Deuteronomy that Jesus summarized the whole of the Old Covenant in a single sentence (Mt 22:37; compare De 6:5), and from it He drew His weapons with which to vanquish the tempter (Mt 4:4,7,10; compare De 8:3; 6:16,13).

3. Analysis:

Deuteronomy is composed of three discourses, followed by three short appendices:

(1) De 1:1-4:43, historical; a review of God's dealings with Israel, specifying in great detail where and when delivered (De 1:1-5), recounting in broad oratorical outlines the chief events in the nation's experience from Horeb to Moab (De 1:6-3:29), on which the author bases an earnest appeal to the people to be faithful and obedient, and in particular to keep clear of all possible idolatry (De 4:1-40). Appended to this first discourse is a brief note (De 4:41-43) concerning Moses' appointment of three cities of refuge on the East side of the Jordan.

(2) De 4:44-26:19, hortatory and legal; introduced by a superscription (De 4:44-49), and consisting of a resume of Israel's moral and civil statutes, testimonies and judgments. Analyzed in greater detail, this second discourse is composed of two main sections:

(a) chapters 5-11, an extended exposition of the Ten Commandments on which theocracy was based;

(b) chapters 12-26, a code of special statutes concerning worship, purity, tithes, the three annual feasts,

the administration of justice, kings, priests, prophets, war, and the private and social life of the people. The spirit of this discourse is most ethical and religious. The tone is that of a father no less than that of a legislator. A spirit of humanity pervades the entire discourse. Holiness is its ideal.

(3) De 27:1-31:30, predictive and minatory; the subject of this third discourse being "the blessings of obedience and the curses of disobedience." This section begins with directions to inscribe these laws on plastered stones to be set up on Mt. Ebal (De 27:1-10), to be ratified by an antiphonal ritual of blessings and cursings from the two adjacent mountains, Gerizim and Ebal (De 27:11-26). These are followed by solemn warnings against disobedience (De 28:1-29:1), and fresh exhortations to accept the terms of the new covenant made in Moab, and to choose between life and death (De 29:2-30:20). Moses' farewell charge to Israel and his formal commission of Joshua close the discourse (De 31). The section is filled with predictions, which were woefully verified in Israel's later history. The three appendices, spoken of above, close the book:

(a) Moses' So (De 32), which the great Lawgiver taught the people (the Law was given to the priests, De 31:24-27);

(b) Moses' Blessing (De 33$), which forecast the future for the various tribes (Simeon only being omitted);

(c) a brief account of Moses' death and burial (De 34$) with a noble panegyric on him as the greatest prophet Israel ever had. Thus closes this majestic and marvelously interesting and practical book. Its keyword is "possess"; its central thought is "Yahweh has chosen Israel, let Israel choose Yahweh."

4. Ruling Ideas:

The great central thought of Deuteronomy is the unique relation which Yahweh as a unique God sustains to Israel as a unique people. "Hear O Israel; Yahweh our God is one Yahweh." The monotheism of Deuteronomy is very explicit. Following from this, as a necessary corollary almost, is the other great teaching of the book, the unity of the sanctuary. The motto of the book might be said to be, "One God, one sanctuary."

(1) Yahweh, a Unique God.

Yahweh is the only God, "There is none else besides him" De (De 4:35,39; 6:4; 32:39), "He is God of gods, and Lord of lords" (De 10:17), "the living God" (De 5:26), "the faithful God, who keepeth covenant and lovingkindness with them that love him and keep his commandments" (7:9), who abominates graven images and every species of idolatry (De 7:25,26; 12:31; 13:14; 18:12; 20:18; 27:15), to whom belong the heavens and the earth (De 10:14), who rules over all the nations (De 7:19), whose relation to Israel is near and personal (De 28:58), even that of a Father (De 32:6), whose being is spiritual (De 4:12,15), and whose name is "Rock" (De 32:4,15,18,30,31). Being such a God, He is jealous of all rivals (De 7:4; 29:24-26; 31:16,17), and hence, all temptations to idolatry must be utterly

removed from the land, the Canaanites must be completely exterminated and all their altars, pillars, Asherim and images destroyed (De 7:1-5,16; 20:16-18; 12:2,3).

(2) Israel, a Unique People.

The old Israel had become unique through the covenant which Yahweh made with them at Horeb, creating out of them "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Ex 19:6). The new Israel who had been born in the desert were to inherit the blessings vouchsafed to their fathers, through the covenant just now being made in Moab (De 26:16-19; 27:9; 29:1; 5:2,3). By means of it they became the heirs of all the promises given unto their fathers the patriarchs (De 4:31; 7:12; 8:18; 29:13); they too became holy and peculiar, and especially beloved of Yahweh (De 7:6; 14:2,21; 26:18,19; 28:9; 4:37), disciplined, indeed, but for their own good (De 8:2,3,5,16), to be established as a people, as Yahweh's peculiar lot and inheritance (De 32:6,9; 4:7).

(3) The Relation between Yahweh and Israel a Unique Relation.

Other nations feared their deities; Israel was expected not only to fear Yahweh but to love Him and cleave to Him (De 4:10; 5:29; 6:5; 10:12,20; 11:1,13,12; 13:3,4; 17:19; 19:9; 28:58; 30:6,16,20; 31:12,13). The highest privileges are theirs because they are partakers of the covenant blessings; all others are strangers and foreigners, except they be admitted into Israel by special permission (De 23:1-8).

5. Unity:

The essential unity of the great kernel of Deuteronomy (De 5-26) is recognized and freely allowed by nearly everyone (e. g. Kautzsch, Kuenen, Dillmann, Driver). Some would even defend the unity of the whole of De 1-26 (Knobel, Graf, Kosters, Colenso, Kleinert). No other book of the Old Testament, unless it be the prophecies of Ezekiel, bears such unmistakable signs of unity in aim, language and thought. "The literary style of Deuteronomy," says Driver, "is very marked and individual; in his command of a chaste, yet warm and persuasive eloquence, the author of Deuteronomy stands unique among the writers of the OT" (Deuteronomy, lxxvii, lxxxviii). Many striking expressions characterize the style of this wonderful book of oratory: e. g. "cause to inherit"; "Hear O Israel"; the oft-repeated root, meaning in the Qal verb-species "learn," and in the Piel verb-species "teach"; "be willing"; "so shalt thou exterminate the evil from thy midst"; "as at this day"; "that it may be well with thee"; "the land whither thou goest in to possess it"; "with all thy heart and with all thy soul"; and many others, all of which occur frequently in Deuteronomy and rarely elsewhere in the Old Testament, thus binding, so far as style can, the different sections of the book into one solid unit. Barring various titles and editorial additions (De 1:1-5; 4:44-49; 29:1; 33:1,7,9,22; 34:1) and a few archaeological notes such as De 2:10-12,20-23; 3:9,11,14; 10:6-9, and of course the last chapter, which gives an account of Moses' death, there is every reason necessary for supposing that the book is a unit. Few writings in the entire field of literature have so clear a unity of purpose or so uniform a style of address.

6. Authorship:

There is one passage bearing upon the authorship of Deuteronomy wherein it is stated most explicitly that Moses wrote "this law." It reads, "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi. .... And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished (i.e. to the end), that Moses commanded the Levites, that bare the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (De 31:9,24-27). This passage is of more than traditional value, and should not be ignored as is so often done (e. g. by Ryle, article "Deuteronomy," HDB). It is not enough to say that Moses was the great fountain-head of Hebrew law, that he gave oral but not written statutes, or, that Moses was only the traditional source of these statutes. For it is distinctly and emphatically stated that "Moses wrote this law." And it is further declared (De 31:22) that "Moses wrote this song," contained in De 32. Now, these statements are either true, or they are false. There is no escape. The authorship of no other book in the Old Testament is so explicitly emphasized. The present writer believes that Moses actually wrote the great body of Deuteronomy, and for the following general reasons:

(1) Deuteronomy as a Whole Is Eminently Appropriate to What We Know of Moses' Times.

It closes most fittingly the formative period of Israel's history. The historical situation from first to last is that of Moses. The references to foreign neighbors—Egypt, Canaan, Amalek, Ammon, Moab, Edom—are in every case to those who flourished in Moses' own times. As a law book its teaching is based upon the Ten Commandments. If Moses gave the Ten Commandments, then surely he may have written the Book of Deuteronomy also. Besides, the Code of Hammurabi, which antedates Moses by at least 700 years, makes it possible certainly that Moses also left laws in codified or written form.

(2) Deuteronomy Is Represented as Emanating from Moses.

The language is language put into Moses' mouth. Nearly forty times his name occurs, and in the majority of instances as the authoritative author of the subject-matter. The first person is used predominatingly throughout: "I commanded Joshua at that time" De (De 3:21); and "I charged your judges at that time" (1:16); "And I commanded you at that time" (De 1:18); "I have led you forty years in the wilderness" (De 29:5). "The language surely purports to come from Moses; and if it was not actually used by him, it is a most remarkable case of impersonation, if not of literary forgery, for the writer represents himself as reproducing, not what Moses might have said, but the exact words of Moses" (Zerbe, The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Lit., 1911, 261).

(3) Deuteronomy Is a Military Law Book, a Code of Conquest, a Book of Exhortation.

It was intended primarily neither for Israel in the desert nor for Israel settled in Canaan, but for Israel on the borderland, eager for conquest. It is expressly stated that Moses taught Israel these statutes and judgments in order that they should obey them in the land which they were about to enter (De 4:5,14;

5:31). They must expel the aborigines (De 7:1; 9:1-3; 20:17; 31:3), but in their warfare they must observe certain laws in keeping with theocracy (De 20:1-20; 23:9-14; 21:10-14; 31:6,7), and, when they have finally dispossessed their enemies, they must settle down to agricultural life and live no longer as nomads but as citizens of a civilized land (De 19:14; 22:8-10; 24:19-21). All these laws are regulations which should become binding in the future only (compare Kittel, History Of the Hebrews, I, 32). Coupled with them are prophetic exhortations which seem to be genuine, and to have had their birth in Moses' soul. Indeed the great outstanding feature of Deuteronomy is its parenetic or hortatory character. Its exhortations have not only a military ring as though written on the eve of battle, but again and again warn Israel against allowing themselves to be conquered in religion through the seductions of idolatry. The book in short is the message of one who is interested in Israel's political and religious future. There is a paternal vein running throughout it which marks it with a genuine Mosaic, not a merely fictitious or artificial, stamp. It is these general features, so characteristic of the entire book, which compel one to believe in its Mosaic authorship.

7. Deuteronomy Spoken Twice:

Certain literary features exist in Deuteronomy which lead the present writer to think that the bulk of the book was spoken twice; once, to the first generation between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea in the 2nd year of the Exodus wanderings, and a second time to the new generation, in the plains of Moab in the 40th year. Several considerations point in this direction:

(1) The Names of the Widely Separated Geographical Places Mentioned in the Title (De 1:1,2).

"These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond the Jordan in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Suph, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Di-zahab"; to which is added, "It is eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea." If these statements have any relevancy whatever to the contents of the book which they introduce, they point to a wide area, from Horeb to Moab, as the historico-geographical background of the book. In other words, Deuteronomy, in part at least, seems to have been spoken first on the way between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea, and later again when Israel were encamped on the plains of Moab. And, indeed, what would be more natural than for Moses when marching northward from Horeb expecting to enter Canaan from the south, to exhort the Israel of that day in terms of De 5-26? Being baffled, however, by the adverse report of the spies and the faithlessness of the people, and being forced to wait and wander for 38 years, what would be more natural than for Moses in Moab, when about to resign his position as leader, to repeat the exhortations of De 5-26, adapting them to the needs of the new desert-trained generation and prefacing the whole by a historical introduction such as that found in De 1-4?

(2) The Double Allusion to the Cities of Refuge (De 4:41-43; 19:1-13).

On the supposition that De 5-26 were spoken first between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea, in the 2nd year of the Exodus, it could not be expected that in this section the names of the three cities chosen East of the Jordan should be given, and in fact they are not (De 19:1-13); the territory of Sihon and Og had not yet

been conquered and the cities of refuge, accordingly, had not yet been designated (compare Nu 35:2:14). But in De 4:41-43, on the contrary, which forms a part of the historical introduction, which ex hypothesi was delivered just at the end of the 39 years' wanderings, after Sihon and Og had been subdued and their territory divided, the three cities of refuge East of the Jordan are actually named, just as might be expected.

(3) Section De 4:44-49.

The section De 4:44-49, which, in its original form, very probably introduced chapters 5-26 before these chapters were adapted to the new situation in Moab.

(4) The Phrase "Began Moses to Declare This Law" (De 1:5).

The phrase "began Moses to declare this law" (De 1:5), suggesting that the great lawgiver found it necessary to expound what he had delivered at some previous time. The Hebrew word translated "to declare" is found elsewhere in the Old Testament only in De 27:8 and in Hab 2:2, and signifies "to make plain."

(5) The Author's Evident Attempt to Identify the New Generation in Moab with the Patriarchs.

"Yahweh made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day," i.e. with us who have survived the desert discipline (De 5:3). In view of these facts, we conclude that the book in its present form (barring the exceptions above mentioned) is the product of the whole 39 years of desert experience from Horeb on, adapted, however, to meet the exigencies of the Israelites as they stood between the victories already won on the East of the Jordan and those anticipated on the West. The impression given throughout is that the aged lawgiver's work is done, and that a new era in the people's history is about to begin.

8. Deuteronomy's Influence in Israel's History:

The influence of Deuteronomy began to be felt from the very beginning of Israel's career in Canaan. Though the references to Deuteronomy in Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings are comparatively few, yet they are sufficient to show that not only the principles of Deuteronomy were known and observed but that they were known in written form as codified statutes. For example, when Jericho was taken, the city and its spoil were "devoted" (Jos 6:17,18) in keeping with De 13:15 ff (compare Jos 10:40; 11:12,15 with De 7:2; 20:16,17). Achan trespassed and he and his household were stoned, and afterward burned with fire (Jos 7:25; compare De 13:10; 17:5). The fact that his sons and his daughters were put to death with him seems at first sight to contradict De 24:16, but there is no proof that they suffered for their father's sin (see ACHAN; ACHOR); besides the Hebrews recognized the unity of the household, even that of Rahab the harlot (Jos 6:17). Again when Ai was taken, "only the cattle and the spoil" did Israel take for a prey unto themselves (Jos 8:27), in keeping with De 20:14; also, the body of the king of Ai was taken down before nightfall from the tree on which he had been hanged (Jos 8:29), which was in

keeping with De 21:23 (compare Jos 10:26,27). As in warfare, so in worship. For instance, Joshua built an altar on Mt. Ebal (Jos 8:30,31), "as Moses the servant of Yahweh commanded" (De 27:4-6), and he wrote on them a copy of the law (Jos 8:32), as Moses had also enjoined (De 27:3,8). Moreover, the elders and officers and judges stood on either side of the ark of the covenant between Ebal and Gerizim (Jos 8:33), as directed in De 11:29; 27:12,13, and Joshua read to all the congregation of Israel all the words of the law, the blessings and the cursings (Jos 8:34,35), in strict accord with De 31:11,12.

But the passage of paramount importance is the story of the two and a half tribes who, on their return to their home on the East side of the Jordan, erected a memorial at the Jordan, and, when accused by their fellow-tribesmen of plurality of sanctuary, emphatically disavowed it (Jos 22:29; compare De 12:5). Obviously, therefore, Deuteronomy was known in the days of Joshua. A very few instances in the history of the Judges point in the same direction: e. g. the utter destruction of Zephath (Jud 1:17; compare De 7:2; 20:16 f); Gideon’s elimination of the fearful and faint-hearted from his army (Jud 7:1-7; compare De 20:1-9); the author’s studied concern to justify Gideon and Manoah for sacrificing at altars other than at Shiloh on the ground that they acted in obedience to Yahweh’s direct commands (Jud 6:25-27; 13:16); especially the case of Micah, who congratulated himself that Yahweh would do him good seeing he had a Levite for a priest, is clear evidence that Deuteronomy was known in the days of the Judges (Jud 17:13; compare De 10:8; 18:1-8; 33:8-11). In 1Sa 1:1-9,21,24 the pious Elkanah is pictured as going yearly to worship Yahweh at Shiloh, the central sanctuary at that time. After the destruction of Shiloh, when the ark of the covenant had been captured by the Philistines, Samuel indeed sacrificed at Mizpah, Ramah and Bethlehem (1Sa 7:7-9,17; 16:5), but in doing so he only took advantage of the elasticity of the Deuteronomic law: "When .... he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety; then it shall come to pass that to the place which Yahweh your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there, thither shall ye bring all that I command you: your burnt-offerings, and your sacrifices" (De 12:10,11). It was not until Solomon’s time that Israel’s enemies were all subdued, and even then Solomon did not observe strictly the teachings of Deuteronomy; "His wives turned away his heart," so that he did not faithfully keep Yahweh’s "covenant" and "statutes" (1Ki 11:3,11). Political disruption followed, and religion necessarily suffered. Yet Jehoiada the priest gave the youthful Joash "the crown" and "the testimony" (2Ki 11:12; compare De 17:18). King Amaziah did not slay the children of the murderers who slew his father, in conscious obedience apparently to the law of Deuteronomy (2Ki 14:6; compare De 24:16). Later on, Hezekiah, the cultured king of Judah, reformed the cult of his day by removing the high places, breaking down the pillars, cutting down the Asherahs, and even breaking in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made (2Ki 18:4,22). Hezekiah’s reforms were unquestionably carried through under the influence of Deuteronomy.

It is equally certain that the prophets of the 8th century were not ignorant of this book. For example, Hosea complains of Israel’s sacrificing upon the tops of the mountains and burning incense upon the hills, and warns Judah not to follow Israel’s example in coming up to worship at Gilgal and Beth-aven (Ho 4:13,15). He also alludes to striving with priests (Ho 4:4; compare De 17:12), removing landmarks (Ho 5:10; compare De 19:14), returning to Egypt (Ho 8:13; 9:3; compare De 28:68), and of Yahweh’s tender dealing with Ephraim (Ho 11:3; compare De 1:31; 32:10). The courage of Amos, the shepherd-prophet of Tekoa, can best be explained, also, on the basis of a written law such as that of Deuteronomy with which he and his hearers were already more or less familiar (Am 3:2; compare De 7:6; 4:7,8). He

condemns Israel's inhumanity and adultery in the name of religion, and complains of their retaining overnight pledges wrested from the poor, which was distinctly forbidden in Deuteronomy (Am 2:6-8; compare De 24:12-15; 23:17). Likewise, in the prophecies of Isaiah there are conscious reflections of Deuteronomy's thought and teaching. Zion is constantly pictured as the center of the nation's religion and as Yahweh's secure dwellingplace (Isa 2:2-4; 8:18; 28:16; 29:1,2; compare Mic 4:1- 4). In short, no one of the four great prophets of the 8th century BC—Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea—ever recognized "high places" as legitimate centers of worship.

9. The Critical Theory:

Over against the Biblical view, certain modern critics since De Wette (1805) advocate a late origin of Deuteronomy, claiming that it was first published in 621 BC, when Hilkiah found "the book of the law" in the temple in the 18th year of King Josiah (2Ki 22:8 ff). The kernel of Deuteronomy and "the book of the law" discovered by Hilkiah are said to be identical. Thus, Dr. G. A. Smith claims that "a code like the Book of Deuteronomy was not brought forth at a stroke, but was the expression of the gradual results of the age-long working of the Spirit of the Living God in the hearts of His people" (Jerusalem, II, 115). According to Dr. Driver, "Deuteronomy may be described as the prophetic reformulation and adaptation to new needs, of an older legislation." It is probable that there was a tradition, if not a written record, of a final legislative address delivered by Moses in the steppes of Moab: the plan followed by the author would rest upon a more obvious motive, if he thus worked upon a traditional basis. But be that as it may, the bulk of the laws contained in Deuteronomy is undoubtedly far more ancient than the author himself.

...." What is essentially new in Deuteronomy is not the matter, but the form. .... The new element in Deuteronomy is thus not the laws, but their parenetic setting" (Deuteronomy, lxi, lvi). This refined presentation of the matter would not be so very objectionable, were Drs. Smith and Driver's theory not linked up with certain other claims and allegations to the effect that Moses in the 15th century BC could not possibly have promulgated such a lofty monotheism, that in theological teaching "the author of Deuteronomy is the spiritual heir of Hosea," that there are discrepancies between it and other parts of the Pentateuch, that in the early history of Israel down to the 8th century plurality of sanctuaries was legally permissible, that there are no traces of the influence of the principal teachings of a written Deuteronomy discoverable in Hebrew literature until the time of Jeremiah, and that the book as we possess it was originally composed as a program of reform, not by Moses but in the name of Moses as a forgery or pseudepigraph. For example, F. H. Woods says, "Although not a necessary result of accepting the later date, the majority of critics believe this book of the law to have been the result of a pious fraud promulgated by Hilkiah and Shaphan with the retention of deceiving Josiah into the belief that the reforms which they desired were the express command of God revealed to Moses" (HDB, II, 368). Some are unwilling to go so far. But in any case, it is claimed that the law book discovered and published by Hilkiah, which brought about the reformation by Josiah in 621 BC, was no other than some portion of the Book of Deuteronomy, and of Deuteronomy alone. But there are several considerations which are opposed to this theory:

(1) Deuteronomy emphasizes centralization of worship at one sanctuary (12:5); Josiah's reformation was directed rather against idolatry in general (2Ki 23:4 ff).

(2) In De 18:6-8, a Levite coming from the country to Jerusalem was allowed to minister and share in the priestly perquisites; but in 2Ki 23:9, "the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Yahweh in Jerusalem, but they did eat unleavened bread among their brethren." And according to the critical theory, "Levites" and "priests" are interchangeable terms.

(3) The following passages in Exodus might almost equally with Deuteronomy account for Josiah's reformation: Ex 20:3; 22:18,20; 23:13,14,32,33; 34:13,14-17.

(4) The law book discovered by Hilkiah was recognized at once as an ancient code which the fathers had disobeyed (2Ki 22:13). Were they all deceived? Even Jeremiah (compare Jer 11:3,4)? "There were many persons in Judah who had powerful motives for exposing this forgery if it was one" (Raven, Old Testament Introduction, 112).

(5) One wonders why so many archaic and, in Josiah's time, apparently obsolete laws should have been incorporated in a code whose expre (De 7:18,22), and to blot out Amalek (De 25:17-19), the last remnants of whom were completely destroyed in Hezekiah's time (1Ch 4:41-43). Especially is this true of the score and more of laws peculiar to Deuteronomy, concerning building battlements on the roofs of houses (De 22:8), robbing birds' nests (De 22:6,7), the sexes exchanging garments (De 22:5), going out to war (De 20:1 ff), etc.

(6) Especially remarkable is it that if Deuteronomy were written, as alleged, shortly before the reign of Josiah, there should be no anachronisms in it betraying a post-Mosaic origin. There are no allusions to the schism between Judah and Israel, no hint of Assyrian oppression through the exaction of tribute, nor any threats of Israel's exile either to Assyria or Babylonia, but rather to Egypt (De 28:68). "Jerusalem" is never mentioned. From a literary point of view, it is psychologically and historically well-nigh impossible for a writer to conceal all traces of his age and circumstances. On the other hand, no Egyptologist has ever discovered any anachronisms in Deuteronomy touching Egyptian matters. From first to last the author depicts the actual situation of the times of Moses. It is consequently hard to believe, as is alleged, that a later writer is studying to give "an imaginative revivification of the past."

(7) The chief argument in favor of Deuteronomy's late origin is its alleged teaching concerning the unity of the sanctuary. Wellhausen lays special emphasis upon this point. Prior to Josiah's reformation, it is claimed, plurality of sanctuaries was allowed. But in opposition to this, it is possible to point victoriously to Hezekiah's reformation (2Ki 18:4,22), as a movement in the direction of unity; and especially to Ex 20:24, which is so frequently misinterpreted as allowing a multiplicity of sanctuaries. This classical passage when correctly interpreted allows only that altars shall be erected in every place where Yahweh records His name, "which presumably during the wanderings and the time of the judges would mean wherever the Tabernacle was" (Mackay, Introduction to Old Testament, 110). This interpretation of this passage is confirmed and made practically certain, indeed, by the command in Ex 23:14-19 that Israel shall repair three times each year to the house of Yahweh and there present their offering. On the other hand, Deuteronomy's emphasis upon unity of sanctuary is often exaggerated. The

Book of Deuteronomy requires unity only after Israel's enemies are all overcome (De 12:10,11). "When" Yahweh giveth them rest, "then" they shall repair for worship to the place which "God shall choose." As Davidson remarks: "It is not a law that is to come into effect on their entry into Canaan; it is to be observed from the time that Yahweh shall have given them rest from all their enemies round about; that is, from the times of David, or more particularly, Solomon; for only when the temple was built did that place become known which Yahweh had chosen to place His name there" (Old Testament Theology, 361). Besides, it should not be forgotten that in Deuteronomy itself the command is given to build an altar in Mt. Ebal (De 27:5-7). As a matter of fact, the unity of sanctuary follows as a necessary consequence of monotheism; and if Moses taught monotheism, he probably also enjoined unity of worship. If, on the other hand, monotheism was first evolved by the prophets of the 8th century, then, of course, unity of sanctuary was of 8th-century origin also.

(8) Another argument advanced in favor of the later origin of Deuteronomy is the contradiction between the laws of Deuteronomy and those of Lev-Nu concerning the priests and Levites. In Nu 16:10,35,40, a sharp distinction is drawn, it is alleged, between the priests and common Levites, whereas in De 18:1-8, all priests are Levites and all Levites are priests. But as a matter of fact, the passage in Deuteronomy does not invest a Levite with priestly but with Levitical functions (compare De 18:7). "The point insisted upon is that all Levites shall receive full recognition at the sanctuary and be accorded their prerogatives. It goes without saying that if the Levite be a priest he shall serve and fare like his brethren the priests; if he be not a priest, he shall enjoy the privileges that belong to his brethren who are Levites, but not priests" (J. D. Davis, article "Deuteronomy," in Smith, Dictionary of the Bible, 117). The Book of Deuteronomy teaches not that all the tribe, but only the tribe of Levi may exercise priestly functions, thus restricting the exercise of priestly prerogatives to one and only one tribe. This was in perfect harmony with Lev-Nu and also in keeping with the style of popular discourse.

(9) Recently Professor Ed. Naville, the Egyptologist, has propounded a theory of the origin of "the Book of the Law" discovered by Hilkiah, which is not without some value. On the analogy of the Egyptian custom of burying texts of portions of "the Book of the Dead" at the foot of statues of gods and within foundations of temple walls, as at Hermopolis, he concludes that Solomon, when he constructed the Temple, probably deposited this "Book of the Law" in the foundations, and that when Josiah's workmen were about their tasks of repairing the edifice, the long-forgotten document came to light and was given to Hilkiah the priest. Hilkiah, however, upon examination of the document found it difficult to read, and so, calling for Shaphan the scribe, who was more expert in deciphering antique letters than himself, he gave the sacred roll to him, and he in turn read it to both Hilkiah and the king. The manuscript may indeed have been written in cuneiform. Thus, according to Naville, "the Book of the Law," which he identifies with Deuteronomy, must be pushed back as far as the age of Solomon at the very latest. Geden shares a similar view as to its date: "some time during the prosperous period of David and the United Monarchy" (Intro to the Hebrew Bible, 1909, 330).

But why not ascribe the book to the traditional author? Surely there can be no philosophical objection to doing so, in view of the now-known Code of Hammurabi, which antedates Moses by so many hundreds of years! No other age accounts so well for its origin as that of the great lawgiver who claims to have written the bulk of it. And the history of the disintegration of the book only shows to what extremes a

false method may lead; for example, Steuernagel separates the "Thou" and "Ye" sections from each other and assigns them to different authors of late date: Kennett, on the other hand, assigns the earliest strata to the period of the Exile (Jour. of Theol. Studies, 1904), On the whole, no theory is so satisfactory as that which, in keeping with De 31:22,24, ascribes to Moses the great bulk of the book. See also CRITICISM; PENTATEUCH.

LITERATURE.

On the conservative side: James Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, The Bross Prize, 1906; article "Deuteronomy," Illustrated Bible Dict., 1908; James Robertson, The Early Religion of Israel, 1892; article "Deuteronomy," The Temple Bible Dict., 1910; John D. Davis, article "Deuteronomy," Davis' Dict. of the Bible, 1911; John H. Raven, Old Testament Intro, 1906; A. S. Geden, Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, 1909; W. Moller, Are the Critics Right? 1903; R. B. Girdlestone, The Student's Deuteronomy, 1899; Hugh Pope, The Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy, 1911; A. S. Zerbe, The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Lit., 1911; Ed. Naville, The Discovery of the Book of the Law under King Josiah, 1911; E. C. Bissell, The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure, 1885; G. L. Robinson, The Expositor, "The Genesis of Deuteronomy," October and November, 1898, February, March, May, 1899; W. H. Green, Moses and the Prophets, 1891; The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch, 1895; A. M. Mackay, The Churchman's Introduction to the Old Testament, 1901; J. W. Beardslee, Outlines of an Introduction to the Old Testament, 1903; G. Vos, The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes, 1886.

On the other side: S. R. Driver, A Crit. and Exeg. Commentary on Deuteronomy, 1895; The Hexateuch, by J. Estlin Carpenter and G. Harford-Battersby, I, II, 1900; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 1908; W. Robertson Smith, The Old Testament in the Jewish Church, 1895; A. Kuenen, The Hexateuch, 1886; H. E. Ryle, article "Deuteronomy," HDB, 1898; G. F. Moore, article "Deuteronomy," Encyclopedia Bibl., 1899; J. A. Paterson, article "Deuteronomy," Encyclopedia Brit, VIII, 1910.

In German: De Wette, Dissert. crit-exeget., 1805; Kleinert, Das De u. d. Deuteronomiker, 1872; Wellhausen, Die Comp. des Hexateuch. u. d. hist. Bucher des Altes Testament, 1889; Gesch. Israels, 1895; Steuernagel, Der Rahmen des Deuteronomy, 1894; Entsteh. des dt. Gesetzes, 1896.

George L. Robinson

DEVICE

de-vis':"A scheme," "invention," "plot." In the Old Testament it stands for six Hebrew words, of which the most common is machashebheth (from chashabh, "to think," "contrive"). In the New Testament it occurs only twice, once for Greek enthumesis (Ac 17:29), and once for noema (2Co 2:11). Sometimes the word means simply that which is planned or invented, without any evil implication, as in 2Ch 2:14; Ac 17:29 (of artistic work or invention), and Ec 9:10 (in the general sense of reasoning or contriving). But more frequently it is used in an evil sense, of a wicked purpose or plot, "Let us devise devices against Jeremiah" (Jer 18:18); "For we are not ignorant of his (i.e. Satan's) devices" (2Co 2:11), etc.

D. Miall Edwards

DEVIL

dev’-’-l. See DEMON; SATAN.

DEVOTED, THINGS

de-vot’-ed, (cherem).

See CURSE; DEDICATE.

DEVOTION; DEVOTIONS

de-vo’-shun, (sebasmata): For the King James Version "your devotions" (Ac 17:23), the Revised Version (British and American) has "the objects of your worship," which is probably the intended meaning of the King James Version. the Revised Version (British and American) reads "devotion" for the King James Version "prayer" in Job 15:4 (the Revised Version, margin "meditation," Hebrew siach).

DEVOUT

de-vout’ (eulabes, eusebes, sebomai, "pious," "dutiful," "reverential"): The word is peculiar to Luke. Applied to Simeon (Lu 2:25), Cornelius (Ac 10:2,7), Ananias (Ac 22:12). "Devout proselytes" (Ac 13:43, the King James Version "religious proselytes"), with possible reference to the proselytes of righteousness as distinguished from the proselytes of the gate (see PROSELYTE). "Devout women of honorable estate" (Ac 13:50), proselytes to Judaism and wives of the men in high position among the heathen (see Josephus, BJ, II, xx, 2). "Devout Greeks" (Ac 17:4), probably, though not necessarily, proselytes of the gate, heathen by birth, who attended the synagogue services and worshipped God. "Devout persons" (Ac 17:17), proselytes of the gate.

M. O. Evans

DEW

du (Tal; drosos).

1. Formation of Dew:

Two things are necessary for the formation of dew, moisture and cold. In moist countries there is less dew because the change in temperature between day and night is too small. In the deserts where the

change in temperature between day and night is sometimes as much as 40 degrees F., there is seldom dew because of lack of moisture in the atmosphere. Palestine is fortunate in being near the sea, so that there is always a large percentage of water vapor in the air. The skies are clear, and hence, there is rapid radiation beginning immediately after sunset, which cools the land and the air until the moisture is condensed and settles on cool objects. Air at a low temperature is not capable of holding as much water vapor in suspension as warm air. The ice pitcher furnishes an example of the formation of dew. Just as the drops of water form on the cool pitcher, so dew forms on rocks, grass and trees.

2. Value of Dew in Palestine:

In Palestine it does not rain from April to October, and were it not for the dew in summer all vegetation would perish. Dew and rain are equally important. If there is no rain the winter grass and harvests fail; if no dew, the late crops dry up and there is no fruit. Failure of either of these gifts of Nature would cause great want and hardship, but the failure of both would cause famine and death. Even on the edge of the great Syrian desert in Anti-Lebanon, beyond Jordan and in Sinai, a considerable vegetation of a certain kind flourishes in the summer, although there is not a drop of rain for six months. The dews are so heavy that the plants and trees are literally soaked with water at night, and they absorb sufficient moisture to more than supply the loss due to evaporation in the day. It is more surprising to one who has not seen it before to find a flourishing vineyard practically in the desert itself. Some of the small animals of the desert, such as the jerboa, seem to have no water supply except the dew. The dew forms most heavily on good conductors of heat, such as metals and stones, because they radiate their heat faster and cool the air around them. The wetting of Gideon’s fleece (Jud 6:38) is an indication of the amount of dew formed, and the same phenomenon might be observed any clear night in summer in Palestine

3. Importance to Israel:

Dew was a present necessity to the people of Israel as it is today to the people of the same lands, so Yahweh says, "I will be as the dew unto Israel" (Ho 14:5). Dew and rain are of equal importance and are spoken of together in 1Ki 17:1. It was especially valued by the children of Israel in the desert, for it supplied the manna for their sustenance (Ex 16:13; Nu 11:9).

4. Symbol of Blessing:

Isaac in blessing Jacob asked that the "dew of heaven" (Ge 27:28) may be granted to him; that these things which make for fertility and prosperity may be his portion. "The remnant of Jacob shall be in the midst of many peoples as dew from Yahweh" (Mic 5:7), as a means of blessing to the nations. "Blessed of Yahweh for .... dew" (De 33:13).

5. Symbol of Refreshment:

Dew is the means of refreshing and reinvigorating all vegetation. Many Scripture references carry out this idea. The song of Moses says, "My speech shall distill as the dew" (De 32:2). "A cloud of dew" (Isa

18:4) refreshes the harvesters. "My head is filled with dew" (So 5:2). "Like the dew of Hermon" (Ps 133:3). "Thou hast the dew of thy youth" (Ps 110:3). "Thy dew is as the dew of herbs" (Isa 26:19). Job said of the time of his prosperity, "The dew lieth all night upon my branch" (Job 29:19).

Other figures use dew as the symbol of stealth, of that which comes up unawares (2Sa 17:12), and of inconstancy (Ho 6:4; 13:3). God's knowledge covers the whole realm of the phenomena of Nature which are mysteries to man (Job 38:28; Pr 3:20).

Alfred H. Joy

DI-ZAHAB

di'-za-hab, diz'-a-hab di-za-habh; Septuagint Katachrusea, (literally, "abounding in gold"):

The name occurs in a list apparently intended to fix definitely the situation of the camp of Israel in the plains of Moab (De 1:1). No place in the region has been found with a name suggesting this; and there is no other clue to its identification. Some names in the list are like those of stations earlier in the wanderings. Thinking that one of these may be intended Burckhardt suggested Mina edh-Dhahab, a boat harbor between Ras Mohammad and 'Aqaba. Cheyne gets over the difficulty by accepting a suggestion of Sayee that Di-zahab corresponds to Me-zahab (Ge 36:39); this latter he then transforms into Mitzraim, and identifies it with the North Arabian Mucri (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word). The changes, however, seem greater than can be justified.

W. Ewing

DIADEM

di'-a-dem: There are seven Bible references to the diadem, four in the Old Testament and three in the New Testament. The Hebrew words do not mark any clear distinctions.

(1) tsaniph, tsanoph, tsaniphah (all from tsanaph, primarily "to wrap," "dress," "roll") mean a headdress in the nature of a turban or piece of cloth wrapped or twisted about the head. The word is also rendered "hood," "mitre." Job 29:14: "My justice was as a robe and a diadem" (RVm, "turban"); Isa 62:3: "a royal diadem in the hand of thy God."

(2) tsephirah, means "a crown," "diadem," i.e. something round about the head; Isa 28:5 "a diadem of beauty, unto the residue of his people."

(3) mitsnepheth, means an official turban or tiara of priest or king, translated also "mitre." Eze 21:26: "Remove the mitre, and take off the crown."

(4) diadema, the Greek word in the New Testament for "diadem," means "something bound about the head." Found 3 t, all in Re 12:3: "a great red dragon .... and upon his heads seven diadems" (the King James Version "crowns"); Re 13:1: "a beast .... and on his horns ten diadems"; 19:11,12: "a white horse .... and upon his head are many diadems." See CROWN.

William Edward Raffety

DIAL OF AHAZ

di’-al, a’-haz:

1. Hezekiah’s Sickness and the Sign

2. The Sign a Real Miracle

3. The "Dial" a Staircase

4. Time of Day of the Miracle

5. Hezekiah’s Choice of the Sign

6. Meaning of the Sign

7. The Fifteen "Songs of Degrees"

1. Hezekiah’s Sickness and the Sign:

One of the most striking instances recorded in Holy Scripture of the interruption, or rather reversal, of the working of a natural law is the going back of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz at the time of Hezekiah’s recovery from his illness. The record of the incident is as follows. Isaiah was sent to Hezekiah in his sickness, to say:

"Thus saith Yahweh, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I will heal thee; on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of Yahweh. .... And Hezekiah said unto Isaiah, What shall be the sign that Yahweh will heal me, and that I shall go up unto the house of Yahweh the third day? And Isaiah said, This shall be the sign unto thee from Yahweh, that Yahweh will do the thing that he hath spoken: shall the shadow go forward ten steps, or go back ten steps? And Hezekiah answered, It is a light thing for the shadow to decline ten steps: nay, but let the shadow return backward ten steps. And Isaiah the prophet cried unto Yahweh; and he brought the shadow ten steps backward, by which it had gone down on the dial of Ahaz" (2Ki 20:5-11). And in Isa 38:8, it is said, "Behold, I will cause the shadow on the steps, which is gone down on the dial of Ahaz with the sun, to return backward

ten steps. So the sun returned ten steps on the dial whereon it was gone down."

2. The Sign a Real Miracle:

The first and essential point to be noted is that this was no ordinary astronomical phenomenon, nor was it the result of ordinary astronomical laws then unknown. It was peculiar to that particular place, and to that particular time; otherwise we should not read of "the ambassadors of the princes of Babylon, who sent .... to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (2Ch 32:31). It is impossible, therefore, to accept the suggestion that the dial of Ahaz may have been improperly constructed, so as to produce a reversal of the motion of the shadow at certain times. For such a maladjustment would have occasioned the repetition of the phenomenon every time the sun returned to the same position with respect to the dial. The narrative, in fact, informs us that the occurrence was not due to any natural law, known or unknown, since Hezekiah was given the choice and exercised it of his own free will, as to whether a shadow should move in a particular direction or in the opposite. But there are no alternative results in the working of a natural law. "If a state of things is repeated in every detail, it must lead to exactly the same consequences." The same natural law cannot indifferently produce one result, or its opposite. The movement of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz was, therefore, a miracle in the strict sense of the term. It cannot be explained by the working of any astronomical law, known or unknown. We have no information as to the astronomical conditions at the time; we can only inquire into the setting of the miracle.

3. The "Dial" a Staircase:

It is unfortunate that one important word in the narrative has been rendered in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) by a term which describes a recognized astronomical instrument. The word "dial" (ma’aloth) is usually translated "degrees," "steps," or "stairs," and indeed is thus rendered in the same verse. There is no evidence that the structure referred to had been designed to serve as a dial or was anything other than a staircase, "the staircase of Ahaz." It was probably connected with that "covered way for the sabbath that they had built in the house, and the king’s entry without," which Ahaz turned "round the house of Yahweh, because of the king of Assyria" (2Ki 16:18 the Revised Version, margin). This staircase, called after Ahaz because the alteration was due to him, may have been substituted for David’s "causeway that goeth up," which was "westward, by the gate of Shallecheth" (1Ch 26:16), or more probably for Solomon’s "ascent by which he went up unto the house of Yahweh" which so impressed the queen of Sheba (2Ch 9:4).

4. Time of Day of the Miracle:

At certain times of the day the shadow of some object fell upon this staircase, and we learn from both 2Ki and Isa that this shadow had already gone down ten steps, while from Isa we learn in addition that the sun also was going down. The miracle therefore took place in the afternoon, when the sun moves on its downward course, and when all shadows are thrown in an easterly direction. We are not told what was the object that cast the shadow, but it must have stood to the west of the staircase, and the top of the

staircase must have passed into the shadow first, and the foot of the staircase have remained longest in the light. The royal palace is understood to have been placed southeast of the Temple, and it is therefore probable that it was some part of the Temple buildings that had cast its shadow down the stairway in full view of the dying king, as he lay in his chamber. If the afternoon were well advanced the sun would be moving rapidly in altitude, and but little in azimuth; or, in other words, the shadow would be advancing down the steps at its quickest rate, but be moving only slowly toward the left of those who were mounting them. It may well have been the case, therefore, that the time had come when the priests from Ophel, and the officials and courtiers from the palace, were going up the ascent into the house of the Lord to be present at the evening sacrifice; passing from the bright sunshine at the foot of the stairs into the shadow that had already fallen upon the upper steps. The sun would be going straight down behind the buildings and the steps already in shadow would sink into deeper shadow, not to emerge again into the light until a new day's sun had arisen upon the earth.

5. Hezekiah's Choice of the Sign:

We can therefore understand the nature of the choice of the sign that was offered by the prophet to the dying king. Would he choose that ten more steps should be straight- way engulfed in the shadow, or that ten steps already shadowed should be brought back into the light? Either might serve as a sign that he should arise on the third day and go up in renewed life to the house of the Lord; but the one sign would be in accordance with the natural progress of events, and the other would be directly opposed to it. It would be a light thing, as Hezekiah said, for the shadow to go forward ten steps; a bank of cloud rising behind the Temple would effect that change. But no disposition of cloud could bring the shadow back from that part of the staircase which had already passed into it, and restore it to the sunshine. The first change was, in human estimation, easily possible, "a light thing"; the second change seemed impossible. Hezekiah chose the seemingly impossible, and the Lord gave the sign and answered his prayer. We need not ask Whether the king showed more or less faith in choosing the "impossible" rather than the "possible" sign. His father Ahaz had shown his want of faith by refusing to put the Lord to the test, by refusing to ask a sign, whether in the heaven above or in the earth beneath. The faith of Hezekiah was shown in asking a sign, which was at once in the heaven above and in the earth beneath, in accepting the choice offered to him, and so putting the Lord to the test. And the sign chosen was most fitting, Hezekiah lay dying, whether of plague or of cancer we do not know, but his disease was mortal and beyond cure; he was already entering into the shadow of death. The word of the Lord was sure to him; on "the third day" he would rise and go up in new life to the house of God.

6. Meaning of the Sign:

But what of the sign? Should the shadow of death swallow him up; should his life be swiftly cut off in darkness, and be hidden until a new day should dawn, and the light of a new life, a life of resurrection, arise? (Compare Joh 11:24.) Or should the shadow be drawn back swiftly, and new years be added to his life before death could come upon him? Swift death was in the natural progress of events; restoration to health was of the impossible. He chose the restoration to health, and the Lord answered his faith and his prayer.

We are not able to go further into particulars. The first temple, the royal palace, and the staircase of Ahaz were all destroyed in the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and we have no means of ascertaining the exact position of the staircase with respect to Temple or palace, or the number of the steps that it contained, or the time of the day, or the season of the year when the sign was given. It is possible that if we knew any or all of these, a yet greater significance, both spiritual and astronomical, might attach to the narrative.

7. The Fifteen "Songs of Degrees":

Fifteen years were added to the life of Hezekiah. In the restoration of the second temple by Herod fifteen steps led from the Court of the Women to the Court of Israel, and on these steps the Levites during the Feast of Tabernacles were accustomed to stand in order to sing the fifteen "songs of degrees" (Pss 120-134). At the head of these same steps in the gateway, lepers who had been cleansed from their disease presented themselves to the priests. It has been suggested that Hezekiah himself was the compiler of these fifteen "songs of the steps," in thankfulness for his fifteen years of added life. Five of them are ascribed to David or as written for Solomon, but the remaining ten bear no author's name. Their subjects are, however, most appropriate to the great crises and desires of Hezekiah's life. His great Passover, to which all the tribes were invited, and so many Israelites came; the blasphemy of Rabshakeh and of Sennacherib's threatening letter; the danger of the Assyrian invasion and the deliverance from it; Hezekiah's sickness unto death and his miraculous restoration to health; and the fact that at that time he would seem to have had no son to follow him on the throne—all these subjects seem to find fitting expression in the fifteen Psalms of the Steps.

E. W. Maunder

DIAMOND

di'-a-mund. See STONES, PRECIOUS.

DIANA; ARTEMIS

di-an'-a (Artemis "prompt," "safe"): A deity of Asiatic origin, the mother goddess of the earth, whose seat of worship was the temple in Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province of Asia. Diana is but the Latinized form of the Greek word Artemis, yet the Artemis of Ephesus should not be confused with the Greek goddess of that name.

She may, however, be identified with the Cybele of the Phrygians whose name she also bore, and with several other deities who were worshipped under different names in various parts of the Orient. In Cappadocia she was known as Ma; to the Syrians as Atargatis or Mylitta; among the Phoenicians as Astarte, a name which appears among the Assyrians as Ishtar; the modern name Esther is derived from it. The same goddess seems to have been worshipped by the Hittites, for a female deity is sculptured on the rocks at Yazili Kaya, near the Hittite city of Boghazkeui. It may be shown ultimately that the various

goddesses of Syria and Asia Minor all owe their origin to the earlier Assyrian or Babylonian Ishtar, the goddess of love, whose chief attributes they possessed. The several forms and names under which she appears axe due to the varying developments in different regions.

Tradition says that Diana was born in the woods near Ephesus, where her temple was built, when her image of wood (possibly ebony; Pliny, NH, xvi. 40; Ac 19:35) fell from the sky (see also ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 8 (2)). Also according to tradition the city which was later called Ephesus was founded by the Amazons, and Diana or Cybele was the deity of those half-mythical people. Later when Ephesus fell into the possession of the Greeks, Greek civilization partly supplanted the Asiatic, and in that city the two civilizations were blended together. The Greek name of Artemis was given to the Asiatic goddess, and many of the Greek colonists represented her on their coins as Greek. Her images and forms of worship remained more Asiatic than Greek Her earliest statues were figures crudely carved in wood. Later when she was represented in stone and metals, she bore upon her head a mural headdress, representing a fortitled city wall; from it, drapery hung upon each side of her face to her shoulders. The upper part of her body was completely covered with rows of breasts to signify that she was the mother of all life. The lower arms were extended. The lower part of the body resembled a rough block, as if her legs had been wrapped up in cloth like those of an Egyptian mummy. In later times her Greek followers represented her with stags or lions standing at her sides. The most renowned of her statues stood on the platform before the entrance to her temple in Ephesus. As the statues indicate, she impersonated the reproductive powers of men and of animals and of all other life.

At the head of her cult was a chief priest, originally a eunuch who bore the name and later the title Megabyzos. Under him were priests known as Essenes, appointed. perhaps from the city officials, for but a single year; it was their duty to offer the sacrifices to the goddess in behalf of the city. Other subordinate classes of priests known as Kouretes, Krobatai and Hilroi performed duties which are now obscure. The priestesses were even more numerous, and, probably from their great numbers, they were called Melissai or bees; the Ephesian symbol therefore which appears commonly upon the coins struck in the city, is a bee. The Melissai, which in the early times were all virgins, were of three classes; it is no longer known just what the special duties of each class were. The ritual of the temple services consisted of sacrifices and of ceremonial prostitution, a practice which was common to many of the religions of the ancient Orient, and which still exists among some of the obscure tribes of Asia Minor.

The temple of Diana was not properly the home of the goddess; it was but a shrine, the chief one, devoted to her service. She lived in Nature; she was everywhere wherever there was life, the mother of all living things; all offerings of every possible nature were therefore acceptable to her; hence, the vast wealth which poured into her temple. Not only was she worshipped in her temple, but in the minute shrines or naoi which were sometimes modeled after the temple. More frequently the shrines were exceedingly crude objects, either of silver or stone or wood or clay. They were made at Ephesus by dependents of the temple, and carried by the pilgrims throughout the world. Before them Diana might also be worshipped anywhere, just as now from the soil of the sacred Mesopotamian city of Kerbela, where the sons of Ali were martyred, little blocks are formed and are carried away by the Shiah Moslems that they may pray upon sacred ground wherever they may be. The makers of the shrines of Diana formed an exceedingly large class among whom, in Paul’s time, was Demetrius (Ac 19:24). None

of the silver shrines have been discovered, but those of marble and of clay have appeared among the ruins of Ephesus. They are exceedingly crude; in a little shell-like bit of clay, a crude clay female figure sits, sometimes with a tambourine in one hand and a cup in the other, or with a lion at her side or beneath her foot. Though the shrines were sold as sacred dwelling-places of the goddess, that the pilgrims who carried them to their distant homes, or buried them in the graves with their dead, might be assured of her constant presence, their real purpose was to increase the temple revenues by their sale at a price which was many times their cost. With the shrines of Diana may be compared the household gods of clay found in abundance among the ruins of the earlier Babylonian cities, especially those cities in which temples to the goddess Ishtar stood.

E. J. Banks

DIASPORA

di-as’-po-ra. See DISPERSION.

DIBLAH

dib’-la (dibhlah, "circle"; Deblatha): The name occurs only in Eze 6:14 (the King James Version "Diblath"), and the place has not been identified. If the reading is correct it may possibly be represented by Dibl, a village in Upper Galilee, South of Tibnin. But more likely it is a scribal error for Riblah.

DIBLAIM

dib’-la-im, dib-la’-im (dibhlayim, "two cakes"): A native of Northern Israel and father of Gomer, the wife of Hosea (Ho 1:3).

DIBLATH

dib’-lath.

See DIBLAH.

DIBLATHAIM

dib-la-tha’-im.

See ALMON-DIBLATHAIM.

DIBON; DIBON-GAD

di’-bon (dibhon, "washing"; Daibon):

(1) A city of Moab captured by the Amorites (Nu 21:30), and held by them at the invasion by Israel. It was taken and given to the tribe of Gad, whence it is called Dibon-gad (Nu 32:34; 33:45). In Jos 13:17 it is reckoned to Reuben. Along with other cities in the territory North of the Arnon, Dibon changed hands several times between Moab and Israel. Mesha claims it (MS), and in Jer 48:18,22 it is named among the cities of Moab. The form of the name, Dimon, in Isa 15:9, may have been given to make it resemble the Hebrew dam, "blood," to support the play upon words in the verse (HDB, under the word). It is represented by the modern Dhiban, about 4 miles North of Aroer (‘Ara‘ir), on the line of the old Roman road. The ruins that spread over two adjacent knolls are of no importance: walls, a tower, cistern, etc. Near Dibon the famous Moabite Stone was found.

(2) A town in Judah, occupied after the exile (Ne 11:25). It may be the same as Dimonah (Jos 15:22); unidentified.

W. Ewing

DIBRI

dib’-ri (dibhri, "eloquent" (?)): A Danite, whose daughter Shelomith married an Egyptian. Their son was "cut off" (stoned) for blasphemy (Le 24:11).

DICE-PLAYING

See GAMES.

DICTIONARIES

dik’-shun-a-riz: A dictionary is a word-book or a list of words arranged in some fixed order, generally alphabetical, for ready reference, and usually with definitions or longer treatises. The vocabulary or glossary is a mere list of words, often without definitions; the Lexicon or dictionary of language (words or concepts) has bare definitions, and the alphabetical encyclopedia or dictionary of knowledge or information (objects, things, subjects, topics, etc.) has longer treatises, but they are all dictionaries: the alphabetical order being the main essential in modern use. There is, however, historically no good reason why the dictionary should not be logical or chronological. The earliest use of the word as quoted by Murray’s Dictionary (Joh. de Garlandia, circa 1225) was of a collection of words classified and not alphabetical. So, too, almost the earliest use in English (J. Withal’s Dictionarie, 1556) was of a book of words classified by subjects. A book like Roget’s Thesaurus, which is a list of classified words without definition, or a systematic encyclopedia of treatises like Coleridge’s unfortunate experiment, the Encyclopedia Metropolitana, is a dictionary in the historic sense. The earliest books usually quoted in the lists of Biblical dictionaries were also in fact classified or chronological, and not alphabetical

(Eusebius' Onomasticon; Jerome's De viris illustribus). Classified word lists, syllabaries, etc., of pre-alphabetic times, as well as in Chinese and other non-alphabetic languages of today, are of course also non-alphabetic, but strictly dictionaries.

In pre-alphabetic times the dictionaries include, besides the syllabaries of which there were many examples in Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, Cyprus, etc., and the word lists proper, chronological lists of kings and various classified lists of tribute, and of astronomical or other objects. They include, in short, all the many lists where the material is grouped round a series of catchwords.

The alphabetical dictionary began with the alphabet itself, for this is a list of names of objects. The earlier alphabetical dictionaries were sometimes called alphabets. In a sense the alphabetical acrostics are dictionaries rather than acrostics, and Ps 119, where considerable material is grouped under each letter of the alphabet, comes rather close to the dictionary idea.

So long as the quantity of literary material remained small, there was very little need for the development of the alphabetical dictionary, and the examples are rather few, the Lexicon of Suidas being perhaps the most noteworthy. With the immense increase in literary material there was a rapidly growing appreciation of the advantage of alphabetical arrangement, over the chronological or the systematic, in all cases where the object is to refer to a specific topic, rather than to read a book through or survey many topics with reference to their relation to one another. The number of alphabetical dictionaries of knowledge increased rapidly with the growth of learning from the 13th century; now it has become legion and there are few subjects so narrow that they cannot boast their dictionary of information.

1. Bible Dictionaries:

The earliest Bible dictionary is usually counted the Eusebius, Onomasticon of Eusebius, a geographical encyclopedia; then came Jerome's De nominibus hebraicis, and his De viris illustribus (chronological). The more noteworthy steps in the history of Bible dictionaries are represented by the names of Alsted, Calmet, Winer, Kitto, William Smith, Fairbairn, Schenkel. The best recent dictionaries among the larger works are the Encyclopedia Biblica, standing for the extreme higher critical wing; Hastings, representing the slightly less radical; and this present International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, which represents a growing distrust of the extreme positions of the 19th century higher critics. All of these are on a large scale and stand for the latest and best scholarship, and the same quality is reflected in at least two of the recent single-volume dictionaries, A Standard Bible Dictionary (M. W. Jacobus), and the single-volume Hastings' dictionary. Both of these in tendency stand between Cheyne's Encyclopedia Biblica and this dictionary, Hastings facing rather toward Cheyne, and Jacobus toward this present work.

2. Bibliography:

The John Crerar Library list of encyclopedias forms an excellent guide to the literature of general encyclopedias within its scope, which includes chiefly technology and physical and social sciences, but

includes among its reference books very admirably chosen first-reference dictionaries to language, history, fine arts, and even philosophy and religion.

Kroeger, Alice B. Guide to the Study and Use of Reference Books, 2nd edition, Boston, 1908, is an admirable introduction. Its select lists and bibliographical references supplemented by the John Crerar and other reference library lists will give complete orientation.

Following is a list of previous dictionaries:

BIBLICAL DICTIONARIES

Ayre, J. Treasury of Bible Knowledge. London, 1866.

Barnum, Samuel W. A Comprehensive Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Appleton, 1867.

Barr, John. A Complete Index and Concise Dictionary of the Holy Bible. New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1852.

Bastow, J. A. Biblical Dictionary. London, 1848, 3 volumes; condensed edition, London, 1859; 4th edition, 1877.

Beck, J. C. Vollstand. bibl. Worterbuch. Basel, 1770, 2 volumes.

Besser, H. Bibl. Worterbuch. Gotha, 1866.

Bible Cyclopaedia, The. London: Parker, 1841.

Bost, J. A. Dictionnaire de la Bible. Paris, 1865.

Bourazan, F. A. Sacred Dictionary. London: Nisbet, 1890.

Brown, John. A Dictionary of the Holy Bible. Edinburgh, 1768, 4th edition; London: Murray, 1797; American edition, from the 12th Edinburgh edition, New York: Harper, 1846.

Calmet, A. Dict. historique, critique, chronologique, geographique et litteral de la Bible. Paris, 1719.

Calmet, Augustine. Dictionary of the Holy Bible. 5th edition, revised and enlarged, 5 volumes, London: Holdsworth, 1829; new edition, London: Bohn, 1847; abridged by Buckley, new edition, London: Routledge, 1862.

Cassell’s Bible Dictionary. Illustrated with nearly 600 engravings; London and New York, 2 volumes:

Cassell, 1866; new edition, 1869.

Cheyne, T. K. and Black, J. S. Encyclopedia Biblica. London, 1899-1903, 4 volumes.

Conder, F. R. and C. R. A Handbook to the Bible. London: Longmans, 1879; 2nd edition, 1880, New York: Randolph, no date (1880).

Dalmasius, J. A. Dictionarium manuale biblicum. Aug. Vind., 1776, 2 volumes.

Davis, J. D. Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia, 1898; new edition, 1903.

Eadie, John. A Biblical Cyclopaedia. London: Rel. Tr. Soc., 1848; 14th edition, London: Griffin, 1873.

Easton, M. G. Illustrated Bible Dictionary. London: Nelson; New York: Methodist Book Concern, 1893.

Fairbairn, Patrick. The Imperial Bible Dictionary. London: Blackie, 1866, 2 volumes.

Farrar, John. A Biblical and Theological Dictionary. London: Mason, 1852; new edition, London: Wesl. Conf. Off., 1889.

Faussett, A. R. The Englishman's Bible Encyclopedia. London: Hodder, 1878. Republished with title. Bible Cyclopaedia, Critical and Expository. New York: Funk, 1891.

Gardner, J. Christian Encyclopedia. Edinburgh, no date

Gebhardt, G. L. Biblisches Worterb. Lemgo, 1793-96, 3 volumes.

Goodhue, W. and Taylor, W. C. Pictorial Dictionary of the Holy Bible. London, 1843, 2 volumes.

Granbery, John C. Bible Dictionary. Nashville: So. Meth. Pub. Soc., 1883.

Green, S. Biblical and Theol. Dictionary. London, 1840, 1860.

Guthe, H. Kurzes Bibelworterbuch. 1903.

Hagen. Lexicon biblicum. Paris, 1905-, 4 volumes (Roman Catholic).

Hamburger. Realencyklopadie fur Bibel und Talmud. New edition 1896-97; 2 volumes and 4 supplementary volumes (Jewish point of view).

Hamburger, J. Biblisch-talmudisches Worterbuch. Strelitz, 1866.

Hastings. Dictionary of the Bible. Edinburgh and New York, 1898-1902, 4 volumes and supplementary vol, 1904. 1-vol edition, 1909.

Hastings, James, and others. Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. New York: Scribner; Edinburgh: Clark, 1906-8, 2 volumes.

Haupt, C. G. Bibl. Real-Encyklopadie. Quedlinb., 1820-27, 3 volumes.

Hezel, W. F. Biblisches Real-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1783-85, 3 volumes.

Hoffmann, A. C. Allgem. Volks-Bibellexikon. Leipzig, 1842.

Hunter, R. Concise Bible Dict. London: Cassell, 1894.

Inglis, James. Bible Text Cyclopaedia. London: Houlston, 1861; new edition, Rel. Tr. Soc., 1865, Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1877.

Jacobus, M. W. A Standard Bible Dictionary. New York: Funk, 1909.

Jones, William. The Biblical Cyclopaedia; or Dictionary of the Holy Scriptures. London: Wightman, 1840; new edition, Tegg, 1847; revised, 1873.

Kitto, John. Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature. 3rd ed., edition Alexander, Edinburgh, 1862-65, 3 volumes (best edition of Kitto), and after.

Krehl. Neutestamentl. Handworterbuch. Gottingen, 1857.

Lawson, J. P. Bible Cyclopaedia. London, 1849, 3 volumes.

Leun, F. G. Bibl. Encyklopadie. Gotha, 1793-98, 4 volumes.

Macbean, A. Dictionary of the Bible. London, 1779.

Macpherson, John. The Universal Bible Dictionary. London: Hodder, 1892.

Malcom, Howard. New Bible Dictionary. Boston: Gould; New York: Sheldon, 1852.

Malcom, H. Dictionary of the Bible. London, 1854.

Oetinger, F. C. Biblisches Worterb. Stuttgart, 1849.

Oliver, P. Scripture Lexicon. Birmingham, 1784; London, 1843.

Otho, J. H. Lex. Rabbinico-philologicum. Geneva, 1675.

Rand, W. W. A Dictionary of the Holy Bible. New York: Am. Tr. Soc., no date (1859); rev. edition, 1886.

Ravanel, P. Bibliotheca Sacra. Geneva, 1660.

Rawson, A. L. The Bible Handbook, for Sunday Schools. 4th edition, New York: Thompson, 1870.

Rechenbergius, A. Hierolexicon reale collectum. Leipzig und Frankfort, 1714, 2 volumes.

Rice, Edwin W. People's Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia: Am. S. S. U., 1893.

Riehm and Bathgen. Handworterbuch des biblischen Altertums. Bielefeld, 1893-94, 2 volumes.

Roberts, Francis. Clavis Bibliorum. 1675.

Robinson, E. Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Worthington, 1879.

Schaff, Philip. A Dictionary of the Bible. Philadelphia: Am. S. S. U., 1880; 5th edition, 1890.

Schenkel. Bibel Lexikon. 1869-75, 5 volumes.

Schneider, M. C. F. Worterb. ub. d. Bibel. Leipzig, 1795-1817, 4 volumes.

Simon, Richard. Grand dictionnaire de la Bible. Lyons, 1693.

Smith, W. Dictionary of the Bible. London, 1860-63, 3 volumes; 2nd edition, Smith and Fuller, 1893.

Smith, W. Dictionary of the Bible. Boston, no date, 4 volumes.

Smith, W. Bible Dictionary. Acme edition, New York: Alden, 1885.

Vigouroux. Dictionnaire de la Bible contenant tous les noms de personnes, de lieux .... mentionnes dans les s. Ecritures. Paris, 1895-.

Vollbeding, J. C. Bibl. Worterb. Berlin, 1800-1805, 3 volumes.

Watson, R. Biblical and Theol. Dictionary. London, 1831; New York, also Nashville.

Wahl, C. A. Bibl. Handworterb. Leipzig, 1828, 2 volumes.

Walbrecht, C. L. Biblisch. Worterbuch. Gottingen, 1837.

Westcott, A., and Watt, J. Concise Bible Dictionary. London: Isbister, 1893.

Wilson, T. Complete Christian Dictionary. London, 1661.

Winer, G. B. Biblisches Realworterb. 3rd edition, 1847-48, 2 volumes (still useful).

Zeller, H. Biblisches Worterb. Stuttgart, 1855-58, 2 volumes.

Other recent one-volume dictionaries are: Angus (1907), Bevis (1900); Gamble (1906), Ewing (1910), Hyamson (1907), Piercy (1908).

3. General Religious Encyclopedias:

Next in importance for Bible students to the Bible dictionaries are the general dictionaries of religious knowledge. Many of the more recent of these, such as the Hauck edition of RE, the new Sch-Herz, Jew Encyclopedia, the Catholic Encyclopedia, and in general all the larger and some of the smaller recent ones have articles of real importance for Bible study, often better than some of the specific Bible dictionaries.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARIES

Abbott, Lyman. A Dictionary of Religious Knowledge. New York: Harper, 1875.

Addis, William E. A Catholic Dictionary. New York: Cath. Pub. Soc. Co., 1884; 4th edition, revised, London: Paul, 1893.

Aschbach. Kirchenlexikon. n. p. 1846-51, 4 volumes.

Benham, William. Dictionary of Religion. London and New York: Cassell, 1887.

Buchberger. Kirchliches Handlexikon. Munchen, 1907 (short but comprehensive).

Buck, Charles. A Theological Dictionary. Enlarged by Dr. Henderson. London: Tegg, 1847; American edition, revised and enlarged by George Bush; Philadelphia: Desliver, no date

Ceccaroni, A. Dizionaro ecclesiastico illustrato. Milano.

Dwight, H. O., Tupper, H. O., Jr. and Bliss, E. M. The Encyclopedia of Missions. New York, 1904.

Eadie, J. The Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia. London: Griffin, 1847; new edition, 1875.

Eden, Robert. The Churchman's Theological Dictionary. 2nd edition, London: Parker, 1846; new edition, 1859.

Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, The; or, Dictionary of the Bible. Rev. edition, Philadelphia: Claxton, 1870.

Farrar, John. An Ecclesiastical Dictionary. London: Mason, 1853, revised, 1871.

Gardner, James. The Christian Encyclopedia. London: Groombridge, 1854; new edition, 1858.

Glaire, J. B. Dictionnaire universel des sciences eccl~esiastiques. Paris, 1868, 2 volumes.

Herbermann, Pace, Pellen, Shahan and Wynne. Catholic Encyclopedia. New York, 1906-, 15 volumes.

Herzog. Realencyclopadie fur protestantische Theologie u. Kirche. 1853-68, 21 volumes; 3rd ed., edition Hauck, 1896-1908, 21 volumes, translation New York, 1908-(best of all the ecclesiastical dictionaries).

Herzog, J. J. A Protestant, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia. Vols I and II. Philadelphia: Lindsay, 1858-60.

Holtzmann and Zopffel. Lexikon fur Theologie und Kirchenwesen. 2nd edition, Brunswick, 1888 (Prot).

Jackson, Samuel Macauley. Concise Dictionary of Religious Knowledge and Gazetteer. New York: Christian Lit. Co., 1890, 1891; 3rd edition, New York: Maynard, 1893.

Jackson, S. M. The New Schaff-Herzog. New York: Funk, 1908, sq. (good and modern).

Jewish Encyclopedia. New York, 1901-6, 12 volumes (most scholarly).

Lichtenberger, F. Dict. des sci. eccl. Paris, 1877-82, 15 volumes (French Protestant).

McClintock, John and Strong, James. Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature. 10 volumes. New York: Earper, 1867-81. With supplements in 2 volumes, 1890.

Marsden, J. B. A Dictionary of Christian Churches and Sects. London: Bentley, 1857.

Migne. Encycl. theologique. Paris, 1844-75 (over 100 special lexicons).

Moroni. Dizionario di erudizione storico-ecclesiastica. Venice, 1840-79, 103 volumes, and Index, 6 volumes.

Among the older ones the huge encyclopedia of Migne, which is a classified series of alphabetical dictionaries, and the Moroni, with its 109 volumes, are still of great usefulness to the scholar on out-of-the-way topics, not so much for Biblical topics but at least for Biblical related matters.

Perthes. Handlexikon fur evangelische Theol. Gotha, 1890-1901, 3 volumes.

Robinson, John. Theological, Biblical and Ecclesiastical Dictionary. London: Whittaker, 1815; 4th edition, 1835.

Schaff, Philip and Jackson, Samuel Macauley. A Religious Encyclopedia. New York: Christian Lit. Co., 1882; 3rd edition, New York: Funk, 1891. Together with an Encyclopedia of Living Divines, etc.

Schaffer. Handlexikon der kath. Theologie. Ratisbon, 1881-91, 3 volumes.

Schiele. Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tubingen, 1909-, 5 volumes.

Shipley, Orby. A Glossary of Ecclesiastical Forms. London: Rivingtons, 1871.

Staunton, William. An Ecclesiastical Dictionary, New York: Prot. Ep. S. S. U., 1861.

Vacant and Mangenot. Dictionnaire de theologie catholique. Paris, 1903-.

Wetzer and Welte. Kirchenlexicon. Freiburg, 1847-60; 2nd edition, 1880-91, 13 volumes, and index, 1903 (Roman Catholic scientific best).

4. Dictionaries of Comparative Religion:

The monumental dictionary in this class superseding all others is Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, but Forlong has served a useful purpose and some of the special dictionaries like Roscher are quite in the same class with Hastings.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION

Balfour, E. Cyclopaedia of India, and of East and South Asia. 3rd edition, London, 1885, 3 volumes.

Beale, Th. W. Oriental Biographical Dictionary. Calcutta, 1881; London, 1894.

Brewer, E. C. Dictionary of Phrase and Fable. London, 1905.

Encyclopedia of Islam. London: Luzac.

Forlong, J. G. R. Faiths of Man; a Cyclopaedia of Religions. London, 1906, 3 volumes.

Hastings, James. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edinburgh, Clark; New York, Scribner, 1908-.

Hazlitt, W. C. Faiths and Folklore; a Dictionary of National Beliefs. London, 1905.

Hughes, T. P. Dictionary of Islam. London, 1885.

5. Denominational Dictionaries:

The admirable Jewish and Catholic encyclopedias mentioned above, like the Methodist M'Clintock and Strong, belong rather to general than denominational encyclopedias, but the Catholic dictionaries of Addis and of Thien are denominational in the same sense as those of the Episcopal, Lutheran, etc., churches, mentioned below, among which perhaps the best executed example is the Lutheran Encyclopedia of Jacobs.

DICTIONARIES OF DENOMINATIONS

Addis, W. E. A Catholic Dictionary, 3rd edition, New York, 1884.

Benton, A. A. The Church Cyclopaedia. Philadelphia, 1884.

Burgess, G. A. Free Baptist Cyclopaedia. Chicago: Free Bapt. Cyclop. Co., 1889.

Cathcart, Wm. The Baptist Encyclopedia. Philadelphia, 1881, 2 volumes.

Catholic Encyclopedia. New York, 1907 and following. See General Religious Encyclopedias.

Hook, Walter F. A Church Dictionary. Philadelphia: Butler, 1853; 7th edition, Tibbals, 1875.

Jacobs, H. E. and Haas, J. A. W. The Lutheran Cyclopedia. New York, 1905.

Jewish Encyclopedia. See General Theological Encyclopedias.

Nevin, A. Encyclopedia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia, 1884.

Simpson, M. Cyclopaedia of Methodism. Philadelphia, 1878.

Thein, J. Ecclesiastical Dictionary. New York, 1900 (Roman Catholic).

SPECIAL DICTIONARIES: ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL HISTORY

Blunt, J. H. Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, etc. London, 1892.

Blunt, J. H. Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology. Philadelphia, 1870.

Brewer, E. C. A Dictionary of Miracles. Philadelphia, 1884.

Brodrick, M. Concise Dictionary of Egyptian Archaeol. London, 1902.

Cabrol. Dictionnaire d'archeologie chretienne et de liturgie. Paris, 1907-.

Chevalier, Ul. Repertoire des sources hist. du moyen-age. Bio-bibliog. Paris, 1905-7.

———Repertoire des sources historiques du moyen-age. Topo-bibliog. Montbeliard, 1894-1903, 2 volumes.

Fabricius, J. A. Bibliotheca latina mediae et infimae aetatis. Patavii, 1754, 6 volumes in 3.

Julian, J. edition A Dictionary of Hymnology. New York, 1892.

Kraus. Real-Encyklopadie der christlichen Alterthumer. Freiburg i. Br., 1882-86, 2 volumes.

Lee, F. G. A Glossary of Liturgical and Ecclesiastical Terms. London, 1877.

Martigny. Dictionnaire des antiquites chretiennes. 2nd edition, Paris, 1877.

Pauly. Realencyk. der klass. Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart, 1842-66, 6 volumes; edition Wissowa, 1894 and later.

Roscher, W. H. Lexikon der griechischen und romischen Mythologie. Leipzig, 1884-1902, 5 volumes.

Smith, Wm. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. Boston, 1849, 3 volumes.

Smith, Wm. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. Boston, 1854-57, 2 volumes.

Smith, Sir William, Wayte, William, and Marindin, G. E. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. 3rd edition, enlarged London: Murray; Boston: Little, 1890-91, 2 volumes.

Smith, W. and Cheetham, A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities. Boston, 1875-1880, 2 volumes.

Smith, W. and Wace, H. A Dictionary of Christian Biography. Boston, 1877-87, 4 volumes; abridged edition by Wace and Piercy, 1911.

Stadler and Helm. Heiligenlexikon. 1858-82, 5 volumes.

Wolcott, Mackenzie E. C. Sacred Archaeology. London: Reeve, 1868.

6. Universal Encyclopedias:

What has been said of general religious encyclopedias applies almost equally to Biblical articles in the good general encyclopedias. Among these the Encyclopedia Britannica, of which a new edition appeared in 1911, is easily first, and has maintained through its many editions a high standard. The previous edition was edited by Professor Robertson Smith, who gave a peculiarly high quality of scholarship to its Biblical articles, while at the same time rather tingeing them with extreme views. Among the British encyclopedias, Chambers' is still kept up to a high standard. The recent American editions include the New International, the Nelson, and the Americana, the former, perhaps, contributing most on Bible matters. The annual supplement to the International gives a useful resume of the progress of Biblical archaeology during each year.

UNIVERSAL ENCYCLOPAEDIAS

America and England

Adams, Charles Kendall. Universal Cyclopaedia and Atlas. New York: Appleton, 1905, 12 volumes.

American Cyclopaedia. New York, 1858-63, 16 volumes; new edition, 1873-76 ("Appleton's encyclopedia").

Chambers, Ephraim. Cyclopaedia. London, 1728.

Chambers' Encyclopedia. London, 1860-68, 10 volumes; new edition, 1901.

Colby, Frank Moore. Nelson's Encyclopedia. (circa 1905-6), 12 volumes.

Encyclopedia Americana. New York: The Americana Co. (circa 1903-4), 16 volumes.

Encyclopedia Britannica. 1771; 9th edition, 1875-89, 29 volumes and Index, sup., 11 volumes, Index and atlas, 1902-3; 11th edition, Cambridge, England, 1910-11, 28 volumes.

Gilman, D. C. New International Encyclopedia. New York: Dodd, 1907 (circa 1902-7), 20 volumes.

Hunter. Encyclopaedic Dictionary. London, New York, 1879-88, 7 volumes.

Johnson's New Universal Encyc. New York, 1874-78, 4 volumes; new edition, 1893-95, 8 volumes.

Knight. English Cyclopedia. London, 1854-73, 27 volumes, and 4 supplementary volumes.

New International Year Book. New York: Dodd, 1908-.

Rees. New Encyclopedia. London, 1802-20. 45 volumes.

Schem. Deutsch-amerikanisches Konversations-Lex. New York, 1870-74.

Smedley (Coleridge?). Encyclopedia Metropolitana. 1818-45, 30 volumes (classed with some alphabetical sections).

France

Bayle. Dict. historique et critique. Rotterdam, 1695-97 (very widely circulated).

Berthelot, Derenbourg and others. La grande encyclopedie. See below.

Corneille, Thomas. (Dict.) Paris, 1694.

Dictionnaire de la conversation et de la lecture. 1851-58, 16 volumes.

Diderot and D'Alembert. Encyclopedic. Paris, 1751-52, 28 volumes; 5 sup. volumes, Amsterdam, 1776-77; 2 volumes Index, Paris, 1780. (Also Voltaire, Rousseau, etc. This is in the history of dictionary encyclopedias "the encyclopedia" paragraph excellence and epoch-making in the history of "free thought." Many editions; 1st edition, 30,000 copies.)

Encyclopedie des gens du monde. 1833-45, 22 volumes.

Encyclopedie du XIXe siecle. 1837-59, 75 volumes; 3rd edition, 1867-72. Continues as Annuaire encyc.

Encyclopedie moderne. 1846-51; new edition, 1856-72, 30 volumes, 12 sup. volumes, atlas, 2 volumes.

Furetiere. (Dict.) Rotterdam, 1690.

Grande encyclopedic. Paris: Lamirault, 1885-1903, 31 volumes (known as Lamirault's).

Larousse. Diet. univ., 1865-90; 17 volumes; new edition, 1895.

———. Dict. complet illustre. 129th edition, 1903.

Moerin. Grand dict. historique. Lyons, 1674.

Nouveau Larousse illustre. Paris, 1898-1904, 8 volumes.

Panckoucke and Agasse. Encyclopedie methodique. Paris, 1782-1832, 166 volumes, text, 51 volumes, illus. (classed -alphabetic method like Migne).

Germany

Allgemeine Realencyklopadie fur das katholische Deutschland. 1846-49, 13 volumes; 4th edition, 1880-90.

Brockhaas. Konversationslexikon. 14th edition, 1901 (B. and Meyer are the standard German encyclopedias).

Ersch and Gruber. Allgemeine encyklopadie. 1813-90, 99 plus 43 plus 25 volumes (scholarly and exhaustive; many articles are complete treatises).

Herder. Konversationslexikon. Freiburg, 1853-57, 5 volumes; 3rd edition, 1901-8, 8 volumes (Roman Catholic; high grade).

Hubner. Reales-, Staats-, Zeitungs-und Konversations-Lexikon; 31st edition, Leipzig, 1824-28.

Jablonski. Lexikon .... Leipzig, 1721.

Koster and Roos. (Encyc.) Frankfort, 1778-1804, 23 volumes (stops at "Kinol").

Krunitz (and others). Oekonomisch-technolog. Encykl. Berlin, 1773-1858, 242 volumes.

Ludewig, Y. J. von. Grosses, vollstandiges, Universal-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1731-54, 68 volumes ("Zedler," which was publisher's name; most admirable and still useful; on account of the vast number of topics it often serves when all other sources fail).

Meyer. Konversations-lexikon. Leipzig, 1840-52, 37 volumes; 6th edition, 1902, 20 volumes; 7th edition, abridged, 1907, 6 volumes (Meyer and Brockhaus are the standard German encyclopedias).

Pierer. Universallexikon. 7th edition, 1888-93, 12 volumes.

Spamer. Illustriertes Konversationslexikon. 1869-79, 8 volumes, supplementary volumes, 1879-82; 2nd edition, 1884-91.

Zedler. Universal-Lexikon. See Ludewig above.

Italy

Berri. Enciclopedia popolare economica. Milan, 1871. Coronelli. Biblioteca universale. Venice, 1701, 7 volumes (incomplete).

Lessona and Valle. Dizionario universale. Milan, 1874-83.

Nuova encic. popolare italiana. Turin, 1841-51, 14 volumes; 6th edition, 1875-89, 25 volumes, sup., 1889-99.

Piccola enciclopedia Hoepli. Milan, 1891.

Netherlands

De algemeene Nederlandsche Encyclopedic. Zutphen, 1865-68, 15 volumes.

Lobel. (Encyc.) Amsterdam, 1796-1810 ("first enc according to modern ideas").

Mollerup. Nordisk Konversationsleksikon. 3rd edition, Copenhagen, 1883-94.

Nieuwenhuis Woordenboek. Leyden, 1851-68.

Sijthoff. Woordenboek voor Kennis en Kunst. Leyden, 1891.

Winkler Prins. Geillustreerde Encyclopedie. Amsterdam, 1905, sq. 3rd edition

Russia and Poland

Meijer. Konversationsleksikon. 1889-94.

Brockhaus and Efron. Entciklopedicheskij Slovai. Petersburg, 1890-1902, 35 volumes.

Jushakow. Boljsaja Enciklopedija. Petersburg, 1899.

Sikoroski, Warsaw, 1890.

Orgelbrand. Encjklopedya Powszechna. Warsaw, 1859-68, 28 volumes.

Scandinavia

Blangstrup. Store Illustererede Konversationsleksikon. Copenhagen, 1891-1901, 12 volumes.

Johnsen, Norsk Haandbog. 1879-88.

Nordisk Familjsbok; Konversationslexikon. Stockholm, 1876-99, 20 volumes.

Salmonsen. Store Illustrerede Konversationsleksikon. Kjobenhavn, 1893-1907, 18 volumes.

Spain and Portugal

Diccionario Popular Hist. Geogr. Mytholog. Biograph. Lisbon, 1876-90, 16 volumes.

Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada Europeo-Americana. Barcelona, 1907-(Catholic).

Costa. Diccionario Universal Portuguez.

Lemos. Enciclopedia Portugueza Illustrada. 254 numbers to 1903.

Mellados. Enciclopedia moderna. Madrid, 1848-51, 34 volumes; 3 volumes of charts.

Montaner y Simon. Diccionario Encic Hispano-Americano. Barcelona, 1887-99, 25 volumes.

Other

Arabian Encyc. Discontinued when it reached the 9th vol, Beirut, 1876-87.

Enciclop. Romana. Herrmannstadt, 1896-1903, 3 volumes (Rumanian).

Kober. Slovnik Nancny. Prague, 1860-87, 12 volumes.

Otto. Ottuv Slovnik Nancny. Prague, 1888-1901, 17 volumes.

Pallas Nagy Lexikona. Budapest, 1893-97, 16 volumes; sup. 1900.

7. Dictionaries of Philosophy:

The dictionaries of philosophy often bear on Bible study almost as much as the religious dictionaries. Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, which is the most comprehensive work, is also very full in its bibliographical reference, and has in volumes III and IV a colossal bibliography of philosophy continued and kept up to date in the Psychological Index. The dictionary of Eisler is on the historical principle and of very great importance in interpreting the doctrines of Biblical theology.

DICTIONARIES OF PHILOSOPHY

Baldwin, J. M. Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology, New York, 1901 and following.

Eisler, R. Philosophisches Worterbuch. Berlin, 1904, 2 volumes; new edition, 3 volumes.

Frank. Dictionnaire des sciences philosophiques. 3rd edition, 1885.

8. Dictionaries of Art and Music:

The dictionaries of architecture often treat of Egyptian Babylonian, and sometimes Palestinian matters. The dictionaries of painting, engraving, music, etc., have less direct matter but are important and necessary in view of the fact that so large a part of the best work is on Biblical themes.

ART

Architectural Publication Society. Dictionary of Architecture. London, 1852-92, 6 volumes.

Bryan, Michael. Bryan's Dictionary of Painters and Engravers. New edition London: Bell, 1903-5, 5 volumes.

Champlin, John Denison, Jr. Cyclopedia of Painters and Painting. New York: Scribner, 1892 (circa 1885-87), 4 volumes.

Clement, Mrs. Clara Erskine Handbook of Christian Symbols.

Gwilt, Joseph. Encyclopedia of Architecture. New edition London: Longmans, 1888.

James, Ralph N. Painters and Their Works. London, 1896.

Muller, Hermann Alexander. Allgemeines Kunstlerlexicon. 3rd edition Frankfurt a. M., 1895-1901, 5 volumes.

Nagler, G. K. Neues allgemeines Kunstlerlexikon. 2. Aufl. Linz., 1904-7, volumes 1-10.

Seubert. Allgemeines Kunstlerlex. Frankfurt, 1879, 3 volumes.

Sturgis, Russell. Dictionary of Architecture and Building. New York: Macmillan, 1901, 3 volumes.

Thieme, Ulrich, and Becker, Felix. Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Kunstler. Leipzig, 1907.

Viollet-le-Duc, Eugene Emmanuel. Dictionnaire raisonne de l'architecture. Paris, 1868, 10 volumes.

MUSIC

Baker, Theodore. Biographical Dictionary of Musicians. New York: Schirmer, 1900.

Champlin, John Denison, Jr. Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians. New York: Scribner, 1893.

Eitner, R. Biog-bibliog. Lexikon d. Musiker. Leipzig, 1900-4, 10 volumes.

Fetis, Frantsois Joseph. Biographie universelle des musiciens. 2nd edition Paris, 1860-66, 8 volumes; 2nd sup. 1875-81.

Grove, George. Dictionary of Music. London: 1878-89, 4 volumes and supplements, 2nd edition by J. A. Fuller Maitland, 1905.

Kornmuller. Lexikon der kirchlichen Tonkunst. 2nd edition Ratisbon, 1891-95, 2 volumes.

Mendel and Reissmann. Musikalisches Konversations-lexikon. Berlin, 1870-83, 12 volumes and supplements.

Riemann, Hugo. Musik-Lexikon. 4th edition, 1894.

———. Dictionary of Music. London (1899).

Many of these bear occasionally or indirectly on Biblical topics.

9. Dictionaries of Social Science:

SOCIAL SCIENCES

Birkmeyer. Encykl. der Rechtswissenschaft. Berlin, 1901.

Bliss, William Dwight Porter. New Encyclopedia of Social Reform. New York: Funk, 1908.

Bluntschli. Deutsches Staatsworterbuch. 1857-70, 2 volumes; new edition, 1869-74, 3 volumes.

Bruder. Staats-Lexikon of the Gorres Society. Freiburg i. Br., 1889-97, 5 volumes; 4th ed., edition Bachem, 1908-(Roman Catholic).

Buisson, F. Dictionnaire de pedagogie. Paris, 1882, 4 volumes.

Conrad, J. Handworterbuch der Staatswissenschaften. Jena, 1898 sq. 3rd edition to Vol XVIII (1911).

Conrad, Elster, Lexis and Loening. Handworterbuch der Staatswissenschaften. 1889-98, 6 volumes; 2 sup. volumes.

Cyclopaedia of Temperance and Prohibition. New York: Funk, 1891.

Elster. Worterbuch der Volkswirtschaft, 1808, 2 volumes; 2nd edition, 1907-.

Fay and Chailley. Nouveau dict. d'economie politique. Paris: 1891-92, 2 volumes.

Holtzendorff, F. von. Encyk. der Rechtswissenschaft. 6th edition, 1903-.

Lalor, J. J. Cyclopaedia of Political Science. New York, 1889-90, 3 volumes.

Palgrave, R. H. I. Dictionary of Political Economy. London, 1894-96, 3 volumes.

Reichesberg. Handworterbuch der schweizer. Volkswirtschaft. 1901.

Rotteck and Welcker. Staatslex. Altona, 1835-44, 15 volumes; 3rd edition, 1856-66, 14 volumes.

Schmid, K. A. Encyclopadie d. Erziehungswesens. Gotha.

Sonnenschein, W. S. Cyclopaedia of Education, arr. and edition by A. W. Fletcher, Syracuse, 1899.

Wagener, H. Staats-und Gesellschafts-Lex. Berlin, 1859-68, 26 volumes.

10. Dictionaries of Geography:

The modern gazetteers are indispensable for identifications.

MODERN GAZETTEERS

Chisholm, George Goudie. Longmans' Gazetteer of the World. London, 1902.

Hunter, W. W. Imperial Gazetteer of India. London, 1881, 9 volumes.

Lippincott's New Gazetteer. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1906.

Ritter's geographisch-statistisches Lexikon. 9. umgearb. Aufl. Leipzig, 1905-6. 2 volumes.

Vivien de Saint Martin, Louis. Nouveau dictionnaire de geographie universelle. Paris, 1879-95, 7 volumes.

11. Biographical Dictionaries:

The great modern biographical dictionaries, although of little use for Scripture names, are of much value to the Biblical student for the writings on Biblical subjects, and in the case of ancient biography, of much value for contemporary persons in other lands.

MODERN BIOGRAPHY

Aa, Anton Jacobus van der. Biographisch Woorden-boek der Nederlander. Haarlem, 1876-78, 21 volumes.

Academie royale de Belgique. Biographie nationale. Bruxelles. 1866-1907, volumes 1-19.

Allgemeine deutsche Biographie. Leipzig: 1875-1906, 52 volumes.

Allgemeine deutsche Biographie. Leipzig: Duncker, 1875-1900, 45 volumes.

Allibone, S. A. A Critical Dictionary of English Literature. Philadelphia, 1870-72, 3 volumes; 1891, 2 volumes.

Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography, edition by J. G. Wilson. New York: Appleton, 1888-1900, 7 volumes.

Biografiskt Lexikon ofver namnkunnige svenske Man. Stockholm, 1874, 23 volumes.

Biographisches Jahrbuch und deutscher Nekrolog. Berlin, 1897-1906, 9 volumes.

Bricka, Carl Frederik. Dansk biografisk Lexikon. 1887-1905, 19 volumes.

Century Cyclopedia of Names, edition by B. E. Smith. New York: Century Co. (circa 1894).

Dictionary of National Biography, edition by Leslie Stephen. London: Smith; New York: Macmillan, 1885-1900, 63 volumes.

Feller, F. X. de. Biographie universelle ou dictionnaire historique. Paris, 1847-50, 8 volumes in 4.

Giles, Herbert Allen. A Chinese Biographical Dictionary. London: Quaritch, 1898.

Glasius, B. Godeleerd Nederland. 1851-56, 3 volumes.

Hoefor, Ferdinand. Nouvelle biographie universelle. Paris: Didot, 1852-66, 46 volumes.

Hofberg, Herman. Svenskt biografiskt Handlexikon. Stockholm, 1906, volumes 1-2.

Joecher, C. G. Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon. Leipzig, 1750-51.

Lamb's Biographical Dictionary of the United States. Boston, 1900-1903, 7 volumes.

Michaud, Joseph Frantsois. Biographie universelle. Paris, 1842-65, 45 volumes.

National Cyclopaedia of American Biography. New York: White, 1892-1906, 13 volumes.

Schaff and Jackson. Encyclopedia of Living Divines and Christian Workers. New York, 1887.

Vapereau, L. G. Dictionnaire universel des litterateurs. Paris, 1876.

Vapereau. Dictionnaire des contemporains. Paris, 1858; 6th edition, 1893; supplements, 1895.

———. Dictionnaire des litterateurs. 1876; 2nd edition, 1884.

Wurzbach, C. von. Biographisches Lexikon Oesterreichs. 1856-91, 60 volumes.

———. Biographisches Lexikon des Kaiserthums Oesterreichs. Wien: Zamarski, 1856-91, 60 volumes.

12. Dictionaries of Language:

The lexicons of the Biblical languages and versions are treated under the head of the respective

languages. The chief dictionaries in English are the great Murray and the encyclopaedic Century. The best one-vol dictionaries are perhaps the Standard and the last edition of Webster.

DICTIONARIES OF LANGUAGE

Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C. A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Boston, 1906.

Thayer, J. H. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York, 1887; corrected edition, 1889.

Century-Dictionary, an Encyclopedic Lexicon. New York: Century Co. (circa 1889-1901), 6 volumes.

Murray, James Augustus Henry. New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1888-.

Standard Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Funk.

Stormonth’s Dictionary of the English Language. New York: Scribner, 1899.

Webster, Noah. International Dictionary of the English Language. Springfield (Mass.), 1891 (circa 1864-90); new edition, 1909.

Worcester, Joseph Emerson. Dictionary of the English Language. New edition, enlarged Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1891.

The article, "Dictionary" in the new Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) (11th edition) covers the whole matter of dictionaries of language with extraordinary fullness.

E. C. Richardson

DIDACHE

did’-a-ke.

See LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC.

DIDRACHMA

di-drak’-ma: Two drachmas.

See DRACHMA, DRAM.

DIDYMUS

did’-i-mus (Didumos, i.e. "twin"): The surname of thOMAS (which see).

DIE

(muth, gawa‘; apothnesko, teleutao): "To die," etc., is of very frequent occurrence, and in the Old Testament is generally the translation of muth, meaning perhaps originally, "to be stretched out" or "prostrate." "To die," should be the consequence of eating the forbidden fruit (Ge 2:17; compare Ge 20:7; 2Ki 1:4,6). "Die" is commonly used of natural death (Ge 5:8; 25:8). It is used also of violent death (Ge 26:9,11; Ex 21:20); punitive (Ex 19:12; 21:12,14; 28:43; Nu 4:15; Eze 3:1:8 ff); as the result of willfulness or indifference (Pr 10:21; 15:10; 19:16). To die "the death of the righteous" is something to be desired (Nu 23:10).

In the New Testament the word for "to die," etc., is generally apothnesko, "to die off or away," used of dying in all forms: of natural death (Mt 22:24); of violent death (Joh 11:50,51; 19:7; Ac 25:11); of the death of Christ (Joh 12:33); of death as the consequence of sin (Joh 8:21,24; Ro 8:13); teleutao, "to end (life)," also occurs several times (Mt 15:4); thnesko, "to die," occurs once (Joh 11:21), and apollumi, "to destroy" (Joh 18:14); in Ac 25:16 (Textus Receptus) we have eis apoleian, "to destruction."

Figurative Use:

The figurative use of "to die" is not frequent, if indeed it ever occurs. In 1Sa 25:37 it may be equivalent to "faint," "His heart died within him, and he became as a stone," but this may be meant literally. In Am 2:2 it is said that Moab "shall die," i. e. perish as a nation. Paul describes the condition of the apostles of Christ as "dying, and behold, we live" (2Co 6:9), and says, "I die daily" (1Co 15:31), but the references may be to exposure to death. When in Ro 7:9 he says, "When the commandment came .... I died," he may mean that it rendered him liable to death. In Ro 6:2 we have "we who died to sin," i.e. in Christ, and in our acceptance of His death as representing ours; similarly we read in 2Co 5:14, "One died for all, therefore all died" (Revised Version (British and American)), i.e. representatively, and in Col 2:20 "if ye died with Christ"; 3:3, "for ye died," the Revised Version (British and American) (in Christ). Compare 2Ti 2:11; 1Pe 2:24. Of the changes in the Revised Version (British and American) may be mentioned "abode" for "died" (Ge 25:18, margin "or settled, Hebrew fell"); "he that is to die" for "worthy of death" (De 17:6); "died" for "are dead" (Joh 6:49,58, and the American Standard Revised Version Joh 8:52,53); "though he die" for "were dead" (Joh 11:25); "many died" for "were dead" (Ro 5:15); "died for nought" for "in vain" (Ga 2:21); "when his end was nigh" for "died" (Heb 11:22). Of special importance are the changes from "be, are, were, dead" in Ro 6:2,7,8; 2Co 5:14; Col 2:20; 3:3; 2Ti 2:11, and "having died" for "being dead" in 1Pe 2:24, as bringing out the truth that in the sight of God all men died in Christ. See also DEATH.

W. L. Walker

DIET

di’-et (’aruchah, "prescribed"): A daily allowance or portion of food, as that given by King Evil-merodach to Jehoiachin, king of Judah (Jer 52:34 the King James Version; compare 2Ki 25:30).

DIG

(qur, "to dig", chathar; diorusso, "to dig through"): "I have digged (dug) and drunk strange waters" (2Ki 19:24). In his campaigns on foreign soil, where the enemy had stopped up the watersprings, Sennacherib would at once dig fresh wells for his armies. "They dig through houses" (Job 24:16; Mt 6:19,20 margin). Walls of eastern houses are often made of mud or clay, and frequently have no windows; and as the threshold of a Syrian house is sacred, the thief breaks in through the wall (see Trumbull, The Threshold Covenant).

M. O. Evans

DIGNITIES; DIGNITY

dig’-ni-tiz, dig’-ni-ti (Hebrew marom, se’eth, gedhullah): Rank or position, not nobility or austerity of personal character or bearing, is denoted by this word in its Old Testament occurrences (Ge 49:3; Es 6:3; Ec 10:6; Hab 1:7). In 2Pe 2:10; Jude 1:8, "dignities" (doxai) are angels, lofty spiritual beings, possible objects of blasphemy; compare the context in both passages.

DIKE

di’-ke (dike, "justice"): The avenging justice of God personified as a goddess (Ac 28:4). See JUSTICE.

DIKLAH

dik’-la (diqlah, "place of palms"): One of the "sons" of Joktan (Ge 10:27; 1Ch 1:21). Perhaps a south-Arabian tribal or place-name connected with a palm-bearing district.

DILEAN

dil’-e-an (dil‘an, "cucumber"): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Migdal-gad and Mizpeh (Jos 15:38, the English Revised Version "Dilan"), which lay probably on the North of Lachish and Eglon. It has not been identified.

DILIGENCE; DILIGENT; DILIGENTLY

dil’-i-jens, dil’-i-jent-li: This word is used in various senses in our English Bibles.

1. In the Old Testament:

In Ezr 5:8, "with diligence" means "with care"; in Ezr 6:12; 7:17, "with speed," "speedily"; in Pr 4:23 "watchfulness"; in De 4:9; 6:17; 19:18; Ps 77:6; Pr 27:23; Isa 55:2; Mic 7:3, "with care," "scrupulously," "earnestly." Sometimes it means "early" "with haste" (Job 8:5; Pr 8:17). It may mean "industrious," "exacting" (Pr 10:4; 12:27; 22:29).

2. In the New Testament:

The American revisers have rendered "diligence" for various words in the King James Version, e. g. for "business" in Ro 12:11; "giving diligence" for "endeavoring" (Eph 4:3); "give diligence" for "study" (2Ti 2:15,), for "labor" (Heb 4:11); "diligently" for "carefully" (Php 2:28; Heb 12:17); "be diligent in" for "meditate upon" (1Ti 4:15). It is well also to remember that the Old English meaning of diligence is "with love," from diligo, "to love."

G. H. Geberding

DILL

See ANISE.

DIMINISH

di-min’-ish: the Revised Version (British and American) has retained nearly all passages of the King James Version where "to diminish" is used. Some of these uses have become obsolete: De 4:2, "neither shall ye diminish from it." "Diminish" generally means "to reduce," "to lessen." In this sense it is employed in Eze 5:11 from the Hebrew gara‘, literally, "to shear." The picture of shearing the beard, expressing degradation and loss of manhood, may underlie this passage.

DIMNAH

dim’-na (dimnah, "dung"; Damna): A city of the Merarite Levites in the territory of Zebulun (Jos 21:35). The name is probably a clerical error for Rimmon.

DIMON; DIMONAH

di’-mon, di-mo’-na. See DIBON.

DINAH

di’-na (dinah, "justice"): The daughter of Jacob and Leah, whose violation by Shechem, son of Hamor, caused her brothers, especially Simeon and Levi, to slay the inhabitants of Shechem, although they had induced the Shechemites to believe, if they would submit to circumcision, Shechem, the most honored of all the house of his father, would be permitted to have the maiden to whom his soul clave for wife (Ge 34:1-31). The political elements of the story (compare Ge 34:21-23, 30) suggest a tribal rather than a personal significance for the narrative.

Nathan Isaacs

DINAITES

di’-na-its (dinaye’): A people mentioned in Ezr 4:9, as settled in the city of Samaria by Osnappar (Assurbanipal). The identification is uncertain.

DINHABAH

din’-ha-ba, din-ha’-ba (dinhabhah): The royal city of Bela, son of Beor; king of Edom (Ge 36:32; 1Ch 1:43). There may be a resemblance in the name of Hodbat et-Teneib. about 8 miles East of Heshbon; but this is in the land of Moab, and probably much too far to the North. No satisfactory identification has been proposed.

DINNER

din’-er (ariston; Mt 22:4; Lu 11:38 (the Revised Version, margin "breakfast"); Lu 14:12; compare Ru 2:14; Joh 21:13): In oriental as in classical lands it was customary, in ancient times, as now, to have but two meals in the day, and the evidence, including that of Josephus, goes to show that the second or evening meal was the principal one. The "morning morsel," as the is Talmud calls it, was in no sense a "meal." The peasant or artisan, before beginning work, might "break (his) fast" (Joh 21:12,15) by taking a bit of barley bread with some simple relish, but to "eat (a full meal) in the morning" was a reproach (Ec 10:16). The full meal was not to be taken until a little before or after sunset, when the laborers had come in from their work (Lu 17:7; compare the "supper time" of Lu 14:17). The noon meal, taken at an hour when climatic conditions called for rest from exertion (the ariston of the Greeks, rendered "dinner" in English Versions of the Bible, Mt 22:4; Lu 11:38, the Revised Version, margin "breakfast"), was generally very simple, of bread soaked in light wine with a handful of parched corn (Ru 2:14), or of "pottage and bread broken into a bowl" (Bel and the Dragon 33), or of bread and broiled fish (Joh 21:13). Many, when on journey especially, content with one meal a day, taken after sunset. In general, eating at other times casual and informal; evening is the time for the formal meal, or feast. See MEALS.

George B. Eager

DIONYSIA

di-o-nish’-i-a (Dionusia, "festivals of Dionysus" (Bacchus)): The rural (vintage) Dionysia were celebrated in the month of Poseideon (19th day), which is roughly our December. The celebration consisted of feasts, processions, songs and (sometimes) scenic performances. The Ascolia formed one of the most prominent features. After sacrificing a goat to the god, they filled the wine-skin with wine, made it slippery on the outside with oil, and then tried to hop on it with one leg. Whoever fell down furnished great sport for the spectators, but if anyone succeeded in maintaining an upright position to the end, he was declared victor. The demarch conducted the festival, the expenses of which were paid by the deme. The Lenea were celebrated on the 12th of Gamelion (January) in Athens, and later in Ionia in Asia Minor. At this festival also the new wine was tasted. A procession was formed and they marched through the city, indulging in all sorts of jesting and buffoonery, to attend the pantomimic performances.

The Anthesteria (Flower-Feast) came in the month of Anthesterion (February), when the first flowers appeared. This festival resembled somewhat our Christmas. On the first day (11th of the month) the wine-cask was opened; on the second was the feast of pitchers. Wine was drunk, and contests in trumpet-playing were held. At the drinking contest everybody was permitted to make as much merriment as he pleased. There was also a mystic marriage of the king archon’s wife to Dionysus (compare the marriage of the Doges of Venice to the sea). On the third day they offered pots filled with vegetables to Hermes, Conductor of the Dead. This day was sacred to the gods of the nether world and to the spirits of the departed (All Souls’ Day); and the people celebrated Persephone’s resurrection and reunion with the god.

The Greater, or City Dionysia, were held in Elaphebolion (March) as a spring festival. This is the most important of all the Dionysia (for us), since practically all the great tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides were performed in conjunction with this festival. All the demes took part. They accompanied the ancient image of Dionysus Eleutherios (from Eleutherae in Boeotia, one of the first places in which the worship of the god was established in Greece), as it was carried in solemn procession from the Lenaeon (the original center of his cult in Athens) to a small temple in the Ceramicus in the northwestern part of the city, while choruses of men and boys sang the dithurambos (the ancient hymn to Dionysus). Crowned with the vine and dressed in unusual costumes, they greeted the god with loud shouts of joy.

The festival was revived with great pomp by the Pisistratidae. In theater of Dionysus all the people beheld an imposing rehearsal of their great achievements. Even the poorest and humblest were given an opportunity to see and hear the contests between the professional rhapsodists, who recited Homer, between choruses specially trained to sing the dithyrambs, and between poets, whose great dramatic productions were presented for the first time. The state set aside a special fund for the purchase of tickets for those who were too poor to buy for themselves. Comedies, tragedies and satyr dramas were presented after elaborate preparation and at a great expenditure of money. The prize, a bronze tripod,

was erected with an appropriate inscription on the Street of Tripods. The awarding of prizes to the victors concluded the festival.

The quinquennial festival at Brauron in Attica was also celebrated with extraordinary license and merriment. The city of Athens sent delegates regularly to attend the festival.

There were also Dionysiac clubs in Athens at the time of the Peloponnesian War. These had peculiar doctrines and observances. They had their foundation in Orphic mysticism. The members refrained from eating the flesh of animals. They possessed holy scriptures and had peculiar propitiatory rites. The Dionysiac religious observance continued as a state cult down to 366 AD. See BACCHUS.

J. E. Harry

DIONYSIUS

di-o-nish’-i-us (Dionusios, surnamed "the Areopagite"): One of the few Athenians converted by Paul (Ac 17:34). We know nothing further about him (see AREOPAGUS). According to one account he was the first bishop of the church at Athens; according to another he suffered martyrdom in that city under Domitian. We are even told that he migrated to Rome and was sent to Paris, where he was beheaded on Montmartre (Mount of the Martyr). The patron saint of France is Denys; compare the French "Denys d’Halicarnasse" (Dionysius of Halicarnassus). The mystical writings which were circulated in the Middle Ages and are still extant, are pronounced by the best authorities to be forgeries, and date from a period not earlier than the 5th century.

J. E. Harry

DIONYSUS, (BACCHUS)

di-o-ni’-sus (Dionusos): The youngest of the Greek gods. In Homer he is not associated with the vine. In later Greek legend he is represented as coming from India, as traversing Asia in a triumphal march, accompanied by woodland beings, with pointed ears, snub noses and goat-tails. These creatures were called satyrs. The vine was cultivated among European-Aryans first in Thrace, and here Dionysus is said to have established his worship first in Europe. Then the cult of Dionysus passed down through the Balkan peninsula to Thebes; and in the localized form of the myth the deity was born here—son of Zeus and Semele. " Offspring of Zeus on high ..... Thou that carest for all Who on Bacchus in Italy call And in Deo’s sheltered plain Of Eleusis lord dost reign, Whither worshippers repair! O Bacchus that dwellest in Thebes, On whose broad and fertile glebes Fierce warriors from the dragon’s teeth rose, Where Ismenus softly flows, The city that Semele bare!" —Sophocles, Antigone. Among all the Greek deities none appealed more vividly to the imagination than Dionysus. Greek tragedy is a form of worship, the ritual cult of the god of wine, who makes the initiate wise and the ungodly mad.

Dionysus speaks most strongly to the sense and to the spirit at the same time. There is nothing monotonous in the Dionysiac legend; it is replete with both joy and sorrow—in some aspects it is a "passion" in others a triumph. All the passion plays of the world (even the Oberammergau Schauspiel) are in the ancient spirit. One Dionysus after another has been substituted, but from the first there has been a desire on the part of the devotee to realize his god vividly with thrilling nearness, to partake of his joys and sorrows and triumphs in his manifold adventures. In the early myths Dionysus was one of the lesser gods; he is mentioned only twice in the Iliad and twice in the Odyssey; but he is always represented as being more nearly akin to man than the great august deities of Olympus.

He is a man-god, or god-man. To the inhabitants of the vine-clad slopes of Attica, to which his cult had been brought from Phrygia through Thracian Boeotia, he was particularly dear. At their vintage feasts last year's cask of wine was opened; and when the new year brought life again to the vines, the bountiful god was greeted with songs of joyful praise. The burial of the wine in the dark tomb of the jars through the winter, and the opening of these jars at the spring festival symbolized the great awakening of man himself, the resurrection of the god's worshippers to a fuller and more joyous life. The vine was not the only manifestation of the god—oil and wheat were also his; he was the god of ecstasy, the giver of physical joy and excitement, the god of life, the god of certain laws of Nature, germination and extinction, the external coming into being and the dying away of all things that are, fructification in its widest aspect whether in the bursting of the seed-grain that lies intreasured in the earth, or in the generation of living creatures. Hence, the prominence given to the phallus in the solemn processions in honor of the god.

Nicanor (2 Macc 14:33) and Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 6:7) thought that the cult of Dionysus would not be objectionable to the Jews. Ptolemy Philopator branded the Jews with an ivy-leaf (3 Macc 2:29), which was sacred to Dionysus. See also BACCHUS.

J. E. Harry

DIOSCORINTHIUS

di-os-ko-rin'-thi-us: A certain (unidentified) month (2 Macc 11:21). See CALENDAR; TIME.

DIOSCURI

di-os'-ku-ri (Dioscouroi; in Ac 28:11, the King James Version Castor and Pollux, the Revised Version (British and American) thE TWIN BROTHERS; in margin, "Dioscuri"): The sign of the ship on which Paul sailed from Melita to Syracuse and Rhegium. The Dioscuri (i.e. sons of Zeus), Castor and Pollux, are the two chief stars in the constellation of the Twins. Some 4,000 years BC they served as pointers to mark the beginning of the new year by setting together with the first new moon of springtime. The constellation of the Twins was supposed to be especially favorable to sailors, hence, ships were often placed under the protection of the twin gods.

E. W. Maunder

DIOTREPHES

di-ot’-re-fez (Diotrephes): A person mentioned in 3Joh 1:9,10 as contentiously resisting the writer’s authority and forbidding others from exercising the Christian hospitality which he himself refused to show.

The words "who loveth to have the preeminence, among them" may indicate that he was a church official, abusing his position, chief stars in the constellation of the Twins. Some 4,000 years BC they served as pointers to mark the beginning of the new year by setting together with the first new moon of springtime. The constellation of the Twins was supposed to be especially favorable to sailors, hence, ships were often placed under the protection of the twin gods.

DIP

Priests when offering a sin offering were required to dip a finger into the blood of the sacrificed bullock and "to sprinkle of the blood seven times before Yahweh" (compare Le 4:6, et al.). See also the law referring to the cleansing of infected houses (Le 14:51) and the cleansing of a leper (Le 14:16). In all such cases "to dip" is "to moisten," "to besprinkle," "to dip in," the Hebrew Tabhal, or the Greek bapto. See also ASHER. In Ps 68:23 "dipping" is not translated from the Hebrew, but merely employed for a better understanding of the passage: "Thou mayest crush them, dipping thy foot in blood" (the King James Version "that thy foot may be dipped in the blood"). Re 19:13 is a very doubtful passage. the King James Version reads: "a vesture dipped in blood" (from bapto, "to dip"); the Revised Version (British and American) following another reading (either rhaino, or rhantizo, both "to sprinkle"), translates "a garment sprinkled with blood." the Revised Version, margin gives "dipped in." See also SOP.

A. L. Breslich

DIPHATH

di’-fath (diphath): A son of Gomer, son of Japheth, son of Noah (1Ch 1:6), called RIPHATH (which see) in the corresponding genealogy in Ge 10:3.

DISALLOW

dis-a-lou’:"To disallow" as used in the Scriptures means either "to oppose," "not permit" (Hebrew no’, Nu 30:5,8,11), or "to reject" (Greek apodokimazo, literally, "to consider useless," 1Pe 2:4,7 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "rejected").

DISANNUL

dis-a-nul’. See ANNUL.

DISAPPOINT

dis-a-point’:"To disappoint" may be used transitively or intransitively. In the former case it naturally has a more forceful meaning. Therefore the Revised Version (British and American) changes the translation of the King James Version wherever "disappoint" is used with an object: Job 5:12, "frustrateth"; Ps 17:13, "confront him," the Revised Version, margin "forestall"; Judith 16:6, "brought them to nought"; but the Revised Version (British and American) retains "disappoint" where the person wh disappoints is not expressed. Compare Pr 15:22.

DISCERN

di-zurn’:Five Hebrew words are thus translated: bin, yadha‘, nakhar, ra’ah and shama‘. It may simply mean "observe" (bin), "I discerned among the youths" (Pr 7:7); or discriminating knowlege, "A wise man’s heart discerneth time and judgment" (Ec 8:5, yadha‘); "He discerned him not, because his hands," etc. (Ge 27:23, nakhar); "Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked" (Mal 3:18, ra’ah); "So is my lord the king to discern good," etc. (2Sa 14:17, shama‘). In the New Testament the words anakrino, diakrino and dokimazo are thus translated, expressing close and distinct acquaintance with or a critical knowledge of things. Used in 1Co 2:14 the King James Version of "the things of the spirit of God"; in 1Co 11:29 of "the (Lord’s) body" in the sacrament; in Mt 16:3 of "the face of the heaven"; in Heb 5:14 of a clear knowledge of good and evil as the prerogative of a full-grown man. See also next article.

Henry E. Dosker

DISCERNINGS OF SPIRITS

di-zurn’-inz, (diakriseis pneumaton, "judicial estimation," "through judgment or separation"): Occurs in 1Co 12:10 as being one of the gifts of the Spirit. The Greek word occurs in Heb 5:14; and Ro 14:1: "But him that is weak in faith receive ye, yet not for decision of scruples." This translation scarcely expresses the meaning, which Thayer has freely rendered, "not for the purpose of passing judgment on opinions, as to which one is to be preferred as the more correct." Taking these three passages together it is evident that the Greek term which is rendered "discerning" means a distinguishing or discriminating between things that are under consideration; hence, the one who possessed the gift of "discernings of spirits" was able to make distinction between the one who spoke by the Spirit of God and the one who was moved by a false spirit. This gift seems to have been exercised chiefly upon those who assumed the role of teachers, and it was especially important in those days, because there were many false teachers abroad (see 2Joh 1:7; Ac 20:29,30). See also SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

A. W. Fortune

DISCIPLE

di-si’-p’-l:

(1) Usually a substantive (mathetes, "a learner," from manthano, "to learn"; Latin discipulus, "a scholar"): The word is found in the Bible only in the Gospels and Acts. But it is good Greek, in use from Herodotus down, and always means the pupil of someone, in contrast to the master or teacher (didaskalos). See Mt 10:24; Lu 6:40. In all cases it implies that the person not only accepts the views of the teacher, but that he is also in practice an adherent. The word has several applications. In the widest sense it refers to those who accept the teachings of anyone, not only in belief but in life. Thus the disciples of John the Baptist (Mt 9:14; Lu 7:18; Joh 3:25); also of the Pharisees (Mt 22:16; Mr 2:18; Lu 5:33); of Moses (Joh 9:28). But its most common use is to designate the adherents of Jesus. (a) In the widest sense (Mt 10:42; Lu 6:17; Joh 6:66, and often). It is the only name for Christ’s followers in the Gospels. But (b) especially the Twelve Apostles, even when they are called simply the disciples (Mt 10:1; 11:1; 12:1, et al.). In the Acts, after the death and ascension of Jesus, disciples are those who confess Him as the Messiah, Christians (Ac 6:1,2,7; 9:36 (feminine, mathetria); Ac 11:26, "The disciples were called Christians"). Even half-instructed believers who had been baptized only with the baptism of John are disciples (Ac 19:1-4).

(2) We have also the verb, matheteuo, "Jesus’ disciple" (literally, "was discipled to Jesus," Mt 27:57); "Make disciples of all the nations" (the King James Version "teach," Mt 28:19); "had made many disciples" (the King James Version "taught many," Ac 14:21); "every scribe who hath been made a disciple to the kingdom of heaven" (the King James Version "instructed," Mt 13:52). The disciple of Christ today may be described in the words of Farrar, as "one who believes His doctrines, rests upon His sacrifice, imbibes His spirit, and imitates His example."

The Old Testament has neither the term nor the exact idea, though there is a difference between teacher and scholar among David’s singers (1Ch 25:8), and among the prophetic guilds the distinction between the rank and file and the leader (1Sa 19:20; 2Ki 6:5).

G. H. Trever

DISCIPLINE

dis’-i-plin (mucar): In the King James Version only in Job 36:10, where it refers to moral discipline, the strenuous cultivation of the righteous life; the Revised Version (British and American) "instruction." the Revised Version (British and American) in 2Ti 1:7 has "discipline" for a Greek word (sophronismos) meaning "sobering"; in 2Ti 3:16 margin, for Greek paideia, "instruction." In classic Greek paideia means "education," mental culture. Through the influence of the Septuagint, which translates the Hebrew mucar

by paideia, the meaning of "chastisement" accompanies paideia in the New Testament. Compare Heb 12:5,7,8,11.

See CHASTISEMENT; and for ecclesiastical discipline see CHURCH.

DISCOMFIT; DISCOMFITURE

dis-kum'-fit, dis-kum'-fi-tur (hum, mehumah): These words are now obsolete or at least obsolescent and are confined in Biblical literature wholly to the Old Testament. The meaning in general is "to annoy," "harass," "confuse," "rout" and "destroy." The most common usage is that based upon the root meaning, "to trouble" or "annoy," sometimes to the point of destruction (Jos 10:10; Jud 4:15; 1Sa 7:10; 2Sa 22:15).

The King James Version errs in the translation in Isa 31:8, where the meaning is obviously "to become subject to task work" or "to place a burden upon one." There seems also to be an unwarranted use of the word in Nu 14:45, where it means rather "to bruise" or "strike." The purest use is perhaps in 1Sa 14:20, where the statement is made that "every man's sword was against his fellow, and there was a very great discomfiture."

Walter G. Clippinger

DISCOURSE

dis-kors':In the Revised Version (British and American) of Ac 20:7,9, the translation of Greek dialegomai (the King James Version "preach"), elsewhere rendered, according to the implications of the context, "reason" or "dispute," as Ac 17:2; 19:9 (the King James Version "disputing," the Revised Version (British and American) "reasoning"); Jude 1:9.

DISCOVER

dis-kuv'-er: In modern usage the word "discover" signifies "to get first sight or knowledge of," "to ascertain," or "to explore." Such usage appears in 1Sa 22:6 of the discovery of David's hiding-place, where the Hebrew uses yadha'. In the King James Version the word "discover" often occurs in a sense now archaic or even obsolete. (Note in the cases cited below the Hebrew word is galah, except Jer 13:26 (chashaph, "to make bare") and Hab 3:13 ('arar, "to make naked").)

(1) "To exhibit," "uncover" (or "betray"), in which examples the English Revised Version also reads with the King James Version "discover"; the American Standard Revised Version "uncover" (Ex 20:26; Job 12:22; Isa 57:8 ("discovered thyself" the King James Version and the English Revised Version); Jer 13:26; La 2:14; Ho 7:1; Na 3:5).

(2) "To cause to be no longer a covering," "to lay bare" (2Sa 22:16 the King James Version).

(3) "To bring to light," "disclose" (1Sa 14:8,11 (the English Revised Version with the King James Version "discover")).

(4) "To unmask" or "reveal oneself" (Pr 18:2 the King James Version).

(5) "To take away the covering of" (Isa 22:8 the King James Version).

(6) "To lay bare" (Hab 3:13). In Ps 29:9, the King James Version reads: "The voice of the Lord .... discovereth the forests," where the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "strippeth the forests bare," i.e. "strippeth the forests of their leaves" (Perowne, The Psalms, I, 248); "strippeth bare the forests" (Briggs, Psalms, I, 251, 253).

In the New Testament (the King James Version), the word "discover" occurs as a translation of the Greek anaphanantes in Ac 21:3, and for katenooun in Ac 27:39, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads in the first instance "had come in sight of," and in the latter case "perceived."

W. N. Stearns

DISCREPANCIES, BIBLICAL

dis-krep’-an-siz, bib’-li-kal:

1. Definition:

By this term should be understood substantial disagreements in the statements of Biblical writers. Such disagreements might subsist between the, statements of different writers or between the several statements of a single writer. Contradictions of Biblical views from extra-Biblical sources as history, natural science, philosophy, do not fall within the scope of our subject.

2. Criticism versus Doctrine of Inerrancy:

Observant Bible readers in every age have noted, with various degrees of insight, that the Scriptures exhibit manifold interior differences and contrasts. Differences of literary form and method have ever seemed, except to those who maintained a mechanical theory of inspiration, wholly natural and fitting. Moreover, that there was progress in the Biblical revelation, especially that the New Testament of Jesus Christ signifies a vastly richer revelation of God than the Old Testament, has been universally recognized. In fulfilling the law and the prophets Christ put a marked distance between Himself and them, yet He certainly affirmed rather than denied them. The Christian church has ever held to the essential unity of the Divine library of the Holy Scriptures. Moreover, the evangelical churches have

recognized the Bible as "the only and sufficient rule of both faith and practice." Indeed, in the generation following the Reformation, the strictest and most literal theory of inspiration and inerrancy found general acceptance. Over against such a body of presuppositions, criticism, some generations later, began to allege certain errors and discrepancies in the Bible. Of course the orthodox sought to repel all these claims; for they felt that the Bible, whatever the appearances might seem to indicate, must be free from error, else it could not be the word of God. So there came with criticism a long period of sturdy defense of the strictest doctrine of Biblical inerrancy. Criticism, however, kept on its way. It has forced the church to find a deeper and surer ground of confidence in the authority of the Bible as the witness to God's self-revelation to man. In our day the church has for the most part overcome the notion that the certainty of the saving grace of God in Christ stands or falls with the absolute inerrancy of each several statement contained in the Bible. Still there remains, and doubtless ever must remain, a need of a clear understanding of the issue involved in the allegation—along with other "human limitations"—of Biblical discrepancies.

3. Synopsis of the Argument:

Alleged discrepancies pertain

(1) to statements of specific, concrete facts, and

(2) to the utterance of principles and doctrines. Under the first head fall disagreements respecting numbers, dates, the form and order of historical events, records of spoken words, geography, natural history, etc. Under the second head fall disagreements respecting moral and religious truths, the "superhistorical" realities and values. Our inquiry resolves itself into three parts:

(1) to determine whether there be discrepancies, of either or both sorts, in the Bible;

(2) to obtain at least a general understanding of the conditions and causes that may have given rise to the discrepancies, real or apparent;

(3) to determine their significance for faith.

4. Alleged Discrepancies Pertaining to Facts:

As to the first point, it should be observed that apparent inconsistencies may not be real ones; as so often in the past, so again it may come about that the discovery of further data may resolve many an apparent contradiction. On the other hand, the affirmation a priori that there can be and are no real discrepancies in the Bible is not only an outrage upon the human understanding, but it stands also in contradiction to the spirit of freedom that is of faith. Besides, it should not be overlooked that the discoveries of modern historical and archaeological research, which have tended to confirm so many Biblical statements, seem just as surely to reveal error in others.

In any event we must bow to reality, and we may do this with fearless confidence in "the God of things as they are." But are there real discrepancies in the Bible? It is no part of the present plan to attempt the impossible and at all events useless task of exhibiting definite statistics of all the alleged discrepancies, or even of all the principal ones. Passing by the childish folly that would find a "discrepancy" in mere rhetorical antitheses, such as that in Pr 26:4,5 ("Answer not a fool," and "Answer a fool according to his folly"), or instances of merely formal contrariety of expression, where the things intended are manifestly congruous (e. g. Mt 12:30; Lu 11:23 contrasted with Mr 9:40; Lu 9:50: "He that is not with me is against me," "He that is not against us is for us"), it will serve our purpose to notice a few representative examples of real or apparent discrepancy.

The chronologies of Kings and Chronicles are inconsistent (compare CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). The genealogies in Ge 46; Nu 26; 1Ch 2:7 show considerable variations. The two lists of exiles who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2; Ne 7:6 ff) show many discrepancies, including a marked difference in the enumeration. The accounts of the creation in Ge 1 and 2 (compare CREATION)—to take an example dependent upon the results of modern criticism—are mutually independent and in important particulars diverse. But the center of interest in our inquiry is the gospel history. Since Tatian and his Diatessaron in the 2nd century, the variations and contrasts in the Gospels have not only been noted and felt, but many have striven to "harmonize" them. After all, however, there remain some irreducible differences. The Gospels, generally speaking, do not give us ipsissima verba of Jesus; in reporting His discourses they show many variations. In so far as the essential meaning is the same in all, no one speaks of discrepancies; but where the variation clearly involves a difference of meaning (e. g. Mt 12:39,40 and Lu 11:29,30), one may say that at least a technical discrepancy exists. In recording sayings or events the evangelists manifestly do not always observe the same chronological order; Lk, e. g. records in wholly different connections sayings which Mt includes as parts of the Sermon on the Mount (e. g. the Lord’s Prayer, Mt 6:9 ff; Lu 11:1-4; compare JESUS CHRIST; CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). We have two distinct genealogies of Jesus (Mt 1:1-16; Lu 3:23 ff; compare GENEALOGY). We may even note that Pilate’s superscription over the cross of Jesus is given in four distinct forms. Here, however, the discrepancy is not real except in the most technical sense, and is worth mentioning only to show that the evangelists’ interest does not lie in a mere objective accuracy. That a perfect agreement as to the significance of an event exists where there are undeniable discrepancies in external details may be illustrated by the two accounts of the healing of the centurion’s servant (Mt 8:5 ff; Lu 7:1 ff). Of enormously greater interest are the various accounts of the appearances of the risen Christ. If a complete certainty as to the form and order of these events is necessary to faith, the case is not a happy one, for the harmonists have been unable to render a perfect account of these matters (compare JESUS CHRIST; RESURRECTION). Turning from the Gospels to apostolic history, we meet some real problems, e. g. how to relate Paul’s autobiographical notes in Ga 1$ with the accounts in Acts.

5. Alleged Discrepancies Pertaining to Doctrine:

The discrepancies thus far noted pertain to historical matters, and not one of them involves the contradiction of a fact in which faith is interested. But are there also real or apparent discrepancies in matters of doctrine? Many scholars maintain, for instance, that the ideal of the prophets and that of the

priestly class stand in a relative (not absolute) opposition to each other (compare, e. g. Isa 1:11; Mic 6:8 with the ritualism of Le and Dt). Or, to turn to the New Testament, some would assert—among them Luther—that James stands in opposition to Paul in respect to faith and works (compare Jas 2:17 ff in contrast with Ga 2:16 and many other passages in Paul). But particular interest attaches to the problem of Christ's attitude toward the Old Testament law. His "but I say unto you" (Mt 5:22 and passim) has been interpreted by many as a distinct contradiction of the Old Testament. Another question of acute interest is the agreement of the Johannine picture of Jesus with that of the Synoptists.

It can scarcely require proof that some of these alleged discrepancies are not such at all. For example, Jesus' attitude toward the Old Testament was one of profound reverence and affirmation. He was perfectly conscious that the Old Testament law represented a stage in the Divine education of mankind. His "but I say unto you" was not a denying of the degree of advancement represented by the Old Testament law, but a carrying out of the principle of the law to its full expression (compare LAW; FULFIL). Of course, the Divine education of Israel did not mean the mere inculcation of the truth in a fallow and hitherto unoccupied soil. There was much superstition and error to be overcome. If then one should insist that the errors, which revelation was destined to overcome, still manifest themselves here and there in the Old Testament, it may be replied that at all events the one grand tendency of Divine revelation is unmistakably clear. An idea is not "Scriptural" simply by virtue of its having been incidentally expressed by a Biblical writer, but because it essentially and inseparably belongs to the organic whole of the Biblical testimony. In the case of James versus Paul the antithesis is one of emphasis, not of contradiction of a first principle. And as for the variations in the gospel history, these do not deserve to be called real discrepancies so long as the Gospels unite in giving one harmonious picture and testimony concerning the personal life and the work and teaching of Jesus. Even from this point of view, John, though so much more theological, preaches the same Christ as the Synoptists.

6. Causes of Discrepancies:

As to the conditions under which discrepancies may arise, it may suffice, first, to call attention to the general law that God in revealing Himself to men and in moving men by His Spirit to speak or write, never lifts them out of the normal relations of human intelligence, so far as matters of history or science are concerned. It is their witness to Himself and His will which is the result of revelation and inspiration. Their references to history and Nature are not therefore in any sense super-human; accordingly they have no direct authority for faith (compare REVELATION; INSPIRATION). On this basis the divergences of human traditions or documents as exhibited in different genealogies, chronologies and the like are natural in the best sense and wholly fitting. As for the rest, errors of copyists have played a part.

7. Their Significance for Faith:

Faith, however, has no interest in explaining away the human limitations in God's chosen witnesses. It is God's way to place the heavenly "treasure in earthen vessels" (2Co 4:7). It seems that God has purposely led the church to see, through the necessity of recognizing the human limitations of the Bible, just where

her faith is grounded. God has made Himself known through His Son. The Scriptures of the New Testament, and of the Old Testament in preparation for Him, give us a clear and sufficient testimony to the Christ of God. The clearness and persuasive power of that testimony make all questions of verbal and other formal agreement essentially irrelevant. The certainty that God has spoken unto us in His Son and that we have this knowledge through the Scripture testimony lifts us above all anxious concern for the possible errors of the witnesses in matters evidently nonessential.

LITERATURE.

Besides the literature noted under REVELATION and INSPIRATION, see J. W. Haley, An Examination of the Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible, Andover, 1873; M. S. Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics, New York, 1883; Kahler, Zur Bibelf rage, Leipzig, 1907.

J. R. Van Pelt

DISCUS

dis'-kus (diskos, "the summons of the discus," 2 Macc 4:14 margin, "to the game of the discus," the King James Version "the game of discus"): The discus was a round stone slab or metal plate of considerable weight (a kind of quoit), the contest of throwing which to the greatest distance was one of the exercises in the Greek gymnasia, being included in the pentathlon. It was introduced into Jerusalem by Jason the high priest in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, 175-164 BC, in the Palaestra he had formed there in imitation of the Greek games. His conduct led to his being described in 2 Macc 4:13,14 as that "ungodly man" through whom even the priests forsook their duties to play at the discus. A statue of a discobolos (discus-thrower) is in the British Museum. From discus we have the words "disc," "dish," "desk." See GAMES.

W. L. Walker

DISEASE; DISEASES

di-zez', di-zez'-iz (chalah, choli; nosos): Palestine, from its position and physical conditions, ought to be a healthy country. That it is not so depends on the unsanitary conditions in which the people live and the absence of any attempts to check the introduction or development of zymotic diseases. The number of marshes or pools is fairly small, and the use of active measures to destroy the larvae of mosquitos might easily diminish or abolish the malarial fevers which now prevail all over the country.

The freeing of Ismailieh and Port Said from these pests is an object-lesson in sanitation. When one examines the conditions of life in towns and villages all over the country, the evidences of the ravages of these fevers and their sequelae appear on every hand as they affect all ages from infancy to middle age, and one meets but few individuals of extreme old age. The absence of any adequate system of drainage

and the pollution of the water supplies are also factors of great importance in preserving this unhealthiness.

In ancient times it was regarded as healthier than Egypt, as it well might be, hence, the diseases of Egypt are referred to as being worse than those of Palestine (De 7:15; 28:60; Am 4:10). The sanitary regulations and restrictions of the Priestly Code would doubtless have raised the standard of public health, but it is unlikely that these were ever observed over any large area. The types of disease which are referred to in the Bible are those that still prevail. Fevers of several kinds, dysentery, leprosy, intestinal worms, plague, nervous diseases such as paralysis and epilepsy, insanity, ophthalmia and skin diseases are among the commonest and will be described under their several names. Methods of treatment are described under MEDICINE; PHYSICIAN. The word "disease" or "diseases" in the King James Version is changed to "sickness" in the Revised Version (British and American) in 2Ki 1:2; 8:8; Mt 9:35, and left out in Joh 5:4; while in Mt 8:17 "sicknesses" is replaced by "diseases." the Revised Version (British and American) also changes "infirmity" in Lu 7:21 to "diseases," and in Ps 38:7 "a loathsome disease" is changed to "burning."

Alex. Macalister

DISEASES OF THE EYE

See EYES, DISEASES OF THE.

DISH

The rendering in English Versions of the Bible in some connections of three Hebrew and one Greek word. The qe‘arah of Ex 25:29; 37:16; Nu 4:7 was apparently a kind of salver, in this case of gold, for holding the loaves of the "presence bread." The same word represents the silver "platters" (Nu 7:13 ff) brought by the princes as a dedication gift. The cephel of Jud 5:25 was a large bowl, so translated in Jud 6:38. "Lordly dish" is literally, "bowl of (fit for) nobles." The tsallachath of 2Ki 21:13; Pr 19:24; 26:15 (last two the King James Version "bosom" after the Septuagint) refers probably to the wide, deep dish in which the principal part of the meal was served. Of somewhat similar form may have been the trublion (Septuagint for qe‘arah) mentioned in connection with the Passover meal (Mt 26:23; Mr 14:20).

Benjamin Reno Downer

DISHAN; DISHON

di’-shan, di’-shon (dishan, dishon, "antelope," "pygarg"): A Horite clan, mentioned as the youngest "son" and elsewhere as the "grandson" of Seir. The form Dishon occurs several times in the list of Horite clans, together with many other totem names (Ge 36$ passim; 1Ch 1:38,41). See Gray, HPN, 89.

DISHONESTY

dis-on’-es-ti: Only in 2Co 4:2, the King James Version rendering of Greek aischune; the King James Version elsewhere and the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly, "shame."

DISOBEDIENCE; DISOBEDIENT

dis-o-be’-di-ens, (marah; apeitheo, parakouo): The word used chiefly in the New Testament has the general meaning of a lack of regard for authority or rulership. The stronger meaning of actual stubbornness or violence is perhaps conveyed in the Old Testament (1Ki 13:26; Ne 9:26; compare 1Ki 13:21).

In the New Testament there seem to be two rather clearly defined uses of the word, one objective and practical, the other ethical and psychological. The first refers more to conduct, the second to belief and one’s mental attitude toward the object of disobedience. To the first belong such passages as refer to the overt act of disobedience to one’s parents (Ro 1:30; 2Ti 3:2). Illustrating this more fully, the translation according to the King James Version of 1Ti 1:9 is given as "unruly" in the Revised Version (British and American). By far the greater emphasis, however, is placed upon the distinctly ethical quality in which disobedience is really an attitude of the mind and finds its essence in a heart of unbelief and unfaithfulness (1Pe 2:7,8; Eph 2:2; 5:6; Col 3:6). In the latter three references "children (sons) of disobedience" are mentioned, as if one should become the very offspring of such an unhappy and unholy state of mind. The classic phrase of New Testament literature (Ac 26:19) contains both the practical and the ethical aspects. Paul’s convictions were changed by the vision and his conduct was made to conform immediately to it.

Walter G. Clippinger

DISORDERLY

dis-or’-der-li (ataktos): The word is found four times in the Epistles to the Thess (1Th 5:14; 2Th 3:6,7,11), "Withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly."; "We behaved not ourselves disorderly."; "We hear of some that walk among you disorderly." The word is a military term and has reference to the soldier who does not keep the ranks (inordinatus, Liv). Then it refers to people who refuse to obey the civil laws, and thus it gets its meaning, "disorderly." It points to members in the early church, who, by their lives, became a reproach to the gospel of Christ (compare 1Th 4:11,12).

Henry E. Dosker

DISPATCH

dis-pach’:Occurs Tobit 7:8 in the sense of dispatch of business, "Let this business be dispatched" (the

Revised Version (British and American) "finished"); 2 Macc 12:18, "before he had dispatched anything" (the Revised Version (British and American) "without accomplishing"); The Wisdom of Solomon 11:19 (20) in the sense of finishing, destroying, "dispatch them at once" (the Revised Version (British and American) "consume"); 2 Macc 9:4 "dispatch the journey" (katanuein), which may mean "finish it quickly" Revised Version (British and American) spells "despatch."

DISPENSATION

dis-pen-sa'-shun: The Greek word (oikonomia) so translated signifies primarily, a stewardship, the management or disposition of affairs entrusted to one. Thus 1Co 9:17, the King James Version "A dispensation of the gospel is committed unto me," the Revised Version (British and American) "I have stewardship entrusted to me." The idea is similar in Eph 3:2 parallel Col 1:25 (the Revised Version, margin "stewardship"). In Eph 1:10 God's own working is spoken of as "dispensation."

DISPERSION OF NATIONS

See BABEL; DISPERSION; TABLE OF NATIONS.

DISPERSION, THE

dis-pur'-shun, (diaspora):

1. Golah and Dispersion

2. Purpose of Dispersion

3. Causes of Dispersion

4. Extent of Dispersion

5. The Eastern Dispersion

6. The Egyptian Dispersion

7. Testimony of Aramaic Papyri

8. Jewish Temple at Syene

9. Theories of the Syene Settlement

10. Importance of the Discovery

11. A New Chapter of Old Testament History

12. Alexandrian Judaism

13. The Jews and Hellenism

14. The Septuagint

15. Early Evidence of a Jewish Community

16. The Dispersion in Syria

17. In Arabia

18. In Asia Minor

19. Among Greeks Proper

20. The Roman Dispersion

21. Jews and Pompey

22. Jews and the First Caesars

23. Influence of Jews in the Early Roman Empire

24. Jews in Italy, Gaul, Spain and North Africa.

25. The Numbers of the Dispersion

26. Jewish Proselytism

27. Internal Organization

28. Unity of the Jewish People

29. Dispersion Influenced by Greek Thought

30. The Dispersion a Preparation for the Advent of Christ

31. The Dispersion an Auxiliary to the Spread of the Gospel

1. Golah and Dispersion:

The Dispersion is the comprehensive designation applied to Jews living outside of Palestine and maintaining their religious observances and customs among the Gentiles. They were known as the Golah (Aramaic Galutha'), the captivity—an expression describing them in relation to their own land; and the Diaspora, the Dispersion, an expression describing them in relation to the nations among whom they were scattered. On a notable occasion Jesus said, "Ye shall seek me, and shall not find me: and where I am, ye cannot come. The Jews therefore said among themselves, Whither will this man go that we shall not find him? Will he go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?" (Joh 7:34,35).

2. Purpose of Dispersion:

In 2 Maccabees certain priests of Jerusalem are represented as praying to God: "Gather together our Dispersion, set at liberty them that are in bondage among the heathen" (2 Macc 1:27; compare 2 Esdras 2:7; Jas 1:1; 1Pe 1:1). The thought of such a Dispersion as a punishment for the disobedience of the people finds frequent expression in the Prophets: Hosea (Ho 9:3), Jeremiah (Jer 8:3; 16:15, etc.), Ezekiel (Eze 4:13), and Zechariah (Zec 10:9). And it appears also in the Deuteronomic Law (De 28:25; 30:1). That the Dispersion of the Jews was for the benefit of the Gentiles is a conception to which expression is given in utterances of psalmists and prophets (Ps 67; Mic 5:7, etc.). It is found also in the Apocrypha Baruch, a work belonging to the 1st century AD: "I will scatter this people among the Gentiles, that they may do good to the Gentiles" (1:7).

3. Causes of Dispersion:

The causes of the Dispersion most obvious to the student of Old Testament history were the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, when the king of Assyria carried Israel away into his own land and placed them in Halah, and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes (2Ki 17:5 ff); and when in the reign of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, Judah was carried away into Babylonia (2Ki 24:14). See CAPTIVITY. But there were other captivities which helped to scatter the children of Abraham. Ptolemy I of Egypt (322-285 BC) by his expeditions to Palestine and his capture of Jerusalem added largely to the Jewish population of Alexandria. Antiochus the Great of Syria (223-187 BC) removed from the Jewish communities in Mesopotamia and Babylon 2,000 families and settled them in Phrygia and Lydia (Josephus, Ant, XII, iii, 4). Pompey after his capture of Jerusalem in 63 BC carried off hundreds of Jews to Rome, where they were sold as slaves, but, afterward, many of them obtained their freedom and civic rights.

4. Extent of Dispersion:

There was, besides, a voluntary emigration of Jewish settlers for purposes of trade and commerce into the neighboring countries, and especially into the chief cities of the civilized world. The successors of

Alexander, and their successors in turn, encouraged immigration into their territories and the mingling of nationalities. They needed colonists for the settlements and cities which they established, and with the offer of citizenship and facilities for trade and commerce they attracted many of the Jewish people.

"In this way," says Philo, "Jerus became the capital, not only of Judea, but of many other lands, on account of the colonies which it sent out from time to time into the bordering districts of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coele-Syria, and into the more distant regions of Pamphylia, Cilicia, the greater part of Asia Minor as far as Bithynia, and the remotest corners of Pontus. And in like manner into Europe: into Thessaly, and Boeotia, and Macedonia, and Aetolia, and Attica and Argos, and Corinth, and into the most fertile and fairest parts of the Peloponnesus. And not only is the continent full of Jewish colonists, but also the most important islands, such as Euboea, Cyprus, and Crete. I say nothing of the countries beyond the Euphrates. All of them except a very small portion, and Babylon, and all the satrapies which contain fruitful land, have Jewish inhabitants" (Philo, Leg ad Caium, 36).

About the middle of the 2nd century BC the Sibylline Oracles could say of the Jewish people: "Every land and every sea is full of thee" (3:271). About the same period the Roman Senate, being anxious to extend protection to the Jews, had a circular letter written in their favor to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia and Parthia, and to a great number of provinces, cities and islands of the Mediterranean, where presumably there was a larger or smaller number of Jews (1 Macc 15:15 ff). It is no surprise, therefore, to read that for the Feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem, there were present after the ascension of Jesus: "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians" (Ac 2:9-12).

5. The Eastern Dispersion:

The Eastern Dispersion, caused by the Assyrian and Babylonian captivities, seems to have increased and multiplied, and to have enjoyed a considerable measure of liberty, and of prosperity. When the return from the captivity took place Under Zerubbabel, it was only a small proportion of the exiles who sought a home again in the land of their fathers. Nor did the numbers who accompanied Ezra from Babylon greatly diminish the exiles who remained behind. In the time of Christ, Josephus could speak of the Jews in Babylenia by "innumerable myriads" (Ant., XI, v, 2). He also tells us of the 2,000 Jewish families whom Antiochus transferred from Babylon and Mesopotamia to Phrygia and Syria. Of the peculiarities of the Jews as a people living apart and observing their own customs and arousing the ill-will of the neighbors, we have a glimpse in the Persian period in the Book of Es (3:8). Babylonia remained a focus of eastern Judaism for centuries, and from the discussions in rabbinical schools there were elaborated the Talmud of Jerusalem in the 5th century of our era, and the Talmud of Babylon a century later. The two chief centers of Mesopotamian Judaism were Nehardea, a town on the Euphrates, and Nisibis on the Mygdonius; an affluent of the Chaboras, which were also centers of Syrian Christianity.

6. The Egyptian Dispersion:

The Egyptian Dispersion is of special interest and importance, and recent discoveries have thrown unexpected light upon it. As far back as the days of Sheshenq, the founder of the 22nd Dynasty, the Shishak of 1Ki 14:25 f; 2Ch 12:2 f, who invaded Palestine in the 10th century BC, and engraved on the South wall of the great Temple of Karnak the names of many districts and cities he had captured, prisoners of war and hostages may have been carried off to Egypt by the conqueror. At a later time Jewish mercenaries are said to have fought in the expedition of Psammetichus II against Ethiopia, to which expedition belong the famous inscriptions of Abu Simbel (594-589 BC). So we learn from the well-known Letter of Aristeas. But the clearest and best-known example of a settlement of Jews in Egypt is that connected with the prophet Jeremiah. When Gedaliah, the governor of Judea, after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 BC, had been treacherously murdered, the depressed and dispirited remnant under Johnnan, the son of Kareah, resolved to take flight into Egypt, against the counsel of Jeremiah. A host of fugitives, including Jeremiah and his friend Baruch, accordingly set out thither, and settled at Migdol and Tahpanhes and Noph (Memphis), and in the country of Pathros in upper Egypt (Jer 43$; 44$). It was in Egypt with those fugitives that Jeremiah ended his life. Many of the fugitives were taken prisoners by Nebuchadrezzar on one of his latest expeditions to the west, and were transported to Babylon (Josephus, Ant, X, ix, 7; compare Jer 43:8 f).

7. Testimony of Aramaic Papyri:

Of this colony of Jews it is natural to see a strong confirmation in the recent discovery of Aramaic papyri at Assouan, the Syene of the ancients. The papyri were the contents of a deed box of a member of a Jewish colony in upper Egypt, and the deeds refer to house property in which Jews are concerned. Here then at Assouan, about 470 BC is a colony of Jews who have acquired houses and other property, and have become bankers and money lenders, within a century of the death of Jeremiah. In the papyri there is evidence of the existence of a tribunal of the Hebrews, a court where cases could be decided, as fully recognized by law as any of the other courts, Egyptian or Persian, for Egypt, "the basest of kingdoms," was then subject to a Persian suzerain. Most significant of all, Yahweh is acknowledged as the God of the Jews, and the existence of a chapel and even of an altar of sacrifice is beyond all doubt. Evidently these Jews in Egypt did not consider that an altar of Yahweh could not stand anywhere else than at Jerusalem, or that outside Jerusalem the worship of the synagogue was the only worship of the God of their fathers. These facts are rendered still more striking when we regard them as a fulfillment of Isaiah’s prophecy: "In that day there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Yahweh of hosts; one shall be called the city of destruction. In that day there shall be an altar to Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Yahweh" (Isa 19:18,19). These papyri give information similar to that which the clay tablets discovered at Nippur give regarding the house of Murashu Sons (see CAPTIVITY) about the same time—the time when Ezra was setting out from Babylon to restore at Jerusalem the worship of the temple which Zerubbabel had rebuilt. It was just about a century from the time that Jeremiah had gone down to Egypt that we have the first of these deeds, and it was the grandfathers, or great-grandfathers, of the persons concerned whom he had accompanied thither so much against his will.

8. Jewish Temple at Syene:

These papyri were discovered in 1904, and a year or two later, additional papyri were discovered in a mound which stands on the site of the ancient Elephantine or Yeb, an island in the Nile, on the frontier also. One of these papyri contains a petition from the Jewish colony in Elephantine addressed to Bagohi (called Bagoas by Josephus, Ant, XI, vii, 7), the Persian governor of Judah, about 408 BC. They ask for assistance to enable them to rebuild the temple of Yahweh in Elephantine, which had been destroyed at the instigation of the priests of the rain-headed Egyptian god Khnub, who had a temple in the fortress of Yeb or Elephantine. This Jewish temple had been erected to Yahweh at least 125 years before and had been spared by Cambyses in 525 BC when he destroyed all the temples erected to the gods of Egypt. The destruction of the temple at Yeb occurred in the 14th year of Darius, 411 BC. It contained an altar for burnt sacrifice, and there were gold and silver vessels in which the blood of sacrifice was collected. The head of the college of priests presenting this petition is Jedoniah, a name found in an abbreviated form in Jadon (Ne 3:7).

9. Theories of the Syene Settlement:

An attempt has been made to show that the bearers of these Hebrew names were descended from the captivity of the Northern Kingdom. It is suggested that they had come into Egypt with the Persian army under Cambyses from their adopted homes in Assyria and the cities of the Medes and had obtained possessions on the southern frontier of Egypt. Names believed to point to the Northern Kingdom, like Hosea and Menahem, occur very frequently, but this is too narrow a foundation for such a theory, and the Israelite origin of the Syene colonists is not established (JQR (1907), 441 ff). There is more to be said in favor of the view that they were the descendants of a Jewish military colony. That Jewish mercenaries fought in the campaigns of the Pharaohs we have already seen. And that Elephantine was an important garrison town on the frontier is also certain. Josephus (Ant., XIV, vi, 2) mentions a Jewish military colony holding a post at Pelusium in the century before Christ, and this might be a similar garrison stationed at the opposite extremity of the land in the 5th century. Such a garrison would attract Jews engaged in business and in the occupations of civil life, and so a distinct Jewish community would be formed. It has even been suggested that the tidings of the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem furnished the motive to these Egyptian Jews to build the temple and rear the altar of burnt offering which the heathen priests of Khnub had destroyed.

10. Importance of the Discovery:

While the petition to the religious authorities at Jerusalem indicates that the priests of Elephantine regarded their temple as dependent upon the temple at Jerusalem, it is significant. that they were also, as is shown in their letter, in communication with Delaiah and Shelemiah the sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria. That this was Nehemiah’s enemy (Ne 4:1; 6:1, etc.) is impossible, for he lived nearly a century earlier. But the association with descendants of his, themselves Samaritans, gives a schismatical appearance to the position of the Elephantine temple. The existence of this temple with its priesthood, its altar of sacrifice, and its offerings, from 500 years BC, is an important fact in the history of the Dispersion. It was meant to keep those Jewish exiles true to the religion of their fathers and in religious fellowship with their brethren in Palestine. For a like purpose the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis was erected in the early years of the Maccabean struggle. Onias had to flee from Jerusalem

with a number of priests and Levites, and for the aid he rendered to Ptolemy Philometor, the king of Egypt, he received a gift of land upon which he built a temple like to the Temple at Jerusalem. Professor Flinders Petrie believes he has discovered this temple of Onias IV at Tel el-Yehudiyeh (Hyksos and Israelite Cities, 31). The discovery confirms the account given of the temple by Josephus, who is our only authority for its erection (Ant., XIII, iii, 2; XIV, viii, 2).

11. A New Chapter of Old Testament History:

The Elephantine-Syene papyri have added a new and valuable chapter to Old Testament history. We know now of a Jewish temple in Egypt which certainly reaches 400 years further into antiquity than the temple of Onias IV at Leontopolis, and we obtain important information as to the relations of its priesthood with the leaders of the Jerusalem Jews and the Samaritans. We know now from unbiased authorities that the Jewish settlements in the Valley of the Nile are much older than has hitherto been believed. We have valuable confirmation not only of the notices in the Book of Jeremiah, but also of the statements in the later Hellenistic literature. Moreover, it is now shown that the skepticism which has prevailed in some quarters as to the very existence of any considerable Egyptian Dispersion before the time of Alexander the Great is unwarranted (Peters, Die judische Gemeinde von Elephantine-Syene, 50 f; Schurer, GJV4, III, 19 f) .

12. Alexandrian Judaism:

What exactly were the fortunes of this Jewish community at a later time, no record has yet been found to tell. Possibly it decayed in course of time, for Herodotus who visited Egypt about 450 BC makes no mention of it and found no Jews in sufficient numbers to attract his attention. It was undoubtedly with the founding of Alexandria in 332 BC that the flourishing period of Judaism in Egypt commenced. Alexander the Great had hastened from the field of victory at Issus 333 BC, through Syria by way of Tyre, the siege of which occupied him some months, showing clemency to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and severity to the recalcitrant inhabitants of Gaza till by its eastern gate he entered Egypt and took possession of the land of the Pharaohs. The Jews appear to have been friendly to Macedonian conquest, and in Alexander’s new city they received the rights of citizenship and two quarters all to themselves. That they were restricted to their own quarters does not appear, and in the time of Philo, at the commencement of the Christian era, they had synagogues and places of prayer in all parts of the city. Alexander died in 323 BC but the favor which he had accorded to the Jews was continued by the Ptolemies who succeeded to his Egyptian empire. The first Ptolemy, Lagi or Soter (322-285 BC), increased the Jewish population of Alexandria by raids into Palestine on which he brought back a large number of captives, both Jews and Samaritans. Other Jews, hearing of his liberality and of the prosperity of their coreligionists, were attracted to Egypt and settled in Alexandria of their own accord (Josephus, Ant, XII, i, 1). Under their own ethnarch they enjoyed great prosperity and had full religious liberty. The principal synagogue of the city was on a scale of great magnificence. In the reign of Ptolemy Philometor (182-146 BC) they were allowed to set up the temple at Leontopolis, as we have already noticed. In the time of Philo the Jewish colony in Egypt was considered to number a million.

13. The Jews and Hellenism:

It was in Alexandria that the Jews first came so powerfully under the influence of Hellenism, and here that the peculiar Greco- Jewish philosophy sprang up of which Philo was the most notable representative. The same soil was eminently favorable to early Christianity which had from the end of the 2nd century onward its greatest teachers and their learned catechetical school. See ALEXANDRIA.

14. The Septuagint:

The great monument of Hellenistic Judaism, which had its chief seat in Alexandria, is the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, which became such a powerful praeparatio evangelica, and was the Bible of the Apostles and the first Christians, even of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. It is ascribed in the Letter of Aristeas to the interest of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285- 247 BC) in a proposal to secure a copy of the Jewish Law in an accessible translation for the famous Royal Library. It is more likely that as familiarity with their Hebrew tongue diminished in their new surroundings, the need of an intelligible version of the Law to begin with was felt, and Jewish hands were set to work to produce it. In course of time the rest followed, but from the tradition of its being the work of 70 or 72 translators it is known as the Septuagint. See SEPTUAGINT.

15. Early Evidence of a Jewish Community:

The question has been raised whether too much has not been made of a Jewish community in Alexandria so early, and it has been asserted that we can scarcely speak of a Jewish Dispersion anywhere before the Maccabean period in the second half of the 2nd century BC. The evidence as we have seen points to the existence of Jewish communities continuously from the days of Jeremiah. Papyri prove the presence of Jews in Egypt, not only in the towns but in country districts from a comparatively early period. A remarkable inscription has recently come to light showing that at Schedia, some 20 miles from Alexandria, there existed a Jewish community which had built a synagogue and dedicated it to the honor of Ptolemy III Euergetes (247-222 BC) and his queen Berenice. If such a community was organized in the little town of Schedia at that date, we can well believe the cosmopolitan city of Alexandria to have had a considerable Jewish community at a still earlier date.

16. Dispersion in Syria:

When we turn to Syria, we find large numbers of Jews, notwithstanding the hatred of Greeks and Syrians. Josephus (BJ, VII, iii, 3) says that it is the country which has the largest percentage of Jewish inhabitants, and Antioch among the towns of Syria had the preeminence. In Damascus, which seems to have had a Jewish quarter or Jewish bazaars in the days of Ahab (1Ki 20:34 and Burney’s note at the place), the Jewish population was numbered by thousands. From Galilee and Gilead and the region of the Hauran, Judas Maccabeus and his brother Jonathan brought bodies of Jews, who were settlers among a pagan population, for safety to Judea (1 Macc 5).

17. In Arabia:

Even in Arabia Judaism had considerable footing. Edward Glaser, who prosecuted valuable archaeological researches in Arabia (see Hilprecht, Recent Researches in Bible Lands, 131 ff), professes to have found Himyaritic inscriptions of the 4th and 5th centuries of our era which are monotheistic and therefore Jewish, but there is still uncertainty as to this. In the beginning of the 6th century a Jewish king actually reigned in Arabia, and because of his persecution of the Christians he was attacked and overthrown by the Christian king of Abyssinia.

18. In Asia Minor:

Of the widespread distribution of the Dispersion in Asia Minor there is abundant testimony, not only in the texts of the apostles, but in classical and early Christian literature and in the epigraphic literature which has been accumulating for the last 30 years. At Pergamum, in Lydia, in Karia, at Magnesia, at Tralles, at Miletum, in Cappadocia, Bithynia, and Pontus, considerable Jewish communities existed at the beginning of the Christian era. At Smyrna the Jews played a prominent part in the death of Polycarp 155 AD, being especially zealous in heaping up fagots upon the fire that consumed the martyr. In his Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia Sir William Ramsay mentions numerous indications found on inscriptions of Jewish settlers, and his chapter on "The Jews in Phrygia" focuses the results of his inquiries (op. cit., 667 ff; compare 649 ff). He has also made it extremely probable that long before Paul’s day there was a strong body of Jews in Tarsus of Cilicia, and he holds that a Jewish colony was settled there as early as 171 BC. "The Seleucid kings," he says, like the Ptolemies, "used the Jews as an element of the colonies which they founded to strengthen their hold on Phrygia and other countries." But it is difficult to trace out the profound influence they exerted in the development of their country from the fact that they adopted to such an extent Greek and Roman names and manners, and were thus almost indistinguishable. At Laodicea and Hierapolis there have been found many evidences of their presence: for example, at the latter place an inscription on a gravestone tells how the deceased Publius Aelius Glycon mortified a sum of money to provide for the decoration of his tomb every year at the Feast of Unleavened Bread.

19. Among Greeks Proper:

The Dispersion among the Greeks proper had attained to considerable dimensions in the time of Christ. Philo, as noticed above, mentions Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aetolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth and the fairest and most fertile parts of the Peloponnesus as having Jewish inhabitants. Inscriptions recovered from Delphi and elsewhere relating to the manumission of slaves in the 2nd century BC contain the names of Jews (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 325 f). In Sparta and Sicyon, Jews lived in the days of the Maccabees (1 Macc 15:23). At Philippi we know from Ac 16:16 there was a proseuche, or place of of prayer, and at Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth there were synagogues in Paul’s time. On the islands of the Greek archipelago and the Mediterranean there were Jews. Cyprus, the home of Barnabas, had a large Jewish population; and Euboea and Crete are named by Philo as Jewish centers. Rhodes has the distinction of having produced two opponents of Judaism in the first half of the 1st

century BC. Clearchus of Soli, a disciple of Aristotle, introduces in one of his dialogues a Jew from Coele-Syria, Hellenic not in speech only but in mind, representing him as having come in his travels to Asia Minor and there conversed with Aristotle. Such an experience may have been rare so early; the incident may not be fact, but fiction; yet such as it is it tells a tale of the spread of Judaism.

20. The Roman Dispersion:

The relations of Rome with the Jewish people lend special interest to the Dispersion there. Jews do not appear to have been settled in Rome before the Maccabean period. There is a certain pathos in the appeal made to the Roman state by Judas Maccabeus, amid the difficulties that were gathering round his position, for "a league of amity and confederacy" with the Roman people (1 Macc 8:17-32). His brother and successor, Jonathan, followed this up later (1 Macc 12:1-4,16). And in 140 BC Simon sent a delegation which concluded a treaty, offensive and defensive, with Rome, which was duly intimated by the Senate to their allies in various countries, especially of the East. During the stay of the mission at Rome its members seem to have made attempts at religious propagandism, and the praetor Hispalus compelled them to return to their homes for attempting to corrupt Roman morals by introducing the worship of Jupiter Sabazius which is no doubt the Roman interpretation of the Lord of Hosts (Yahweh Sabaoth). But ere long in Rome, as in Alexandria, they formed a colony by themselves, occupying Trastevere, the Transtiberine portion of the city, together with an island in the Tiber. Their prosperity grew with their numbers. When Cicero in 59 BC was defending Flaccus he speaks of gold being sent out of Italy, and all the provinces, to Jerusalem, and there was present among his listeners a large body of Jews interested in the case.

21. Jews and Pompey:

When Pompey had captured Jerusalem in 63 BC, he brought back with him to Rome a number of Jewish captives. They were sold as slaves, but many of them received their freedom and rights to citizenship. When Julius Caesar, who was a great patron and protector of the Jews, was assassinated, they wept over him for nights on end.

22. Jews and the First Caesars:

Augustus protected and encouraged them. Tiberius, however, adopted repressive measures toward them, and 4,000 Jews were deported by him to Sardinia while others were driven out of the city. With the downfall of Sejanus, the unworthy favorite of Tiberius, this repressive policy was reversed and they were allowed to return to Rome. Claudius again devised measures against them (circa 50 AD), and they were banished from the city. They had, however, so multiplied and they had attained such influence that it was impossible to get rid of them altogether.

23. Influence of Jews in the Early Roman Empire:

Their customs and religious observances brought down upon them the scorn of Juvenal and others, while

Empire their faith and worship had attractions for the thoughtful and the superstitious.

"The Jews from the time of the first Caesar," says Sir Samuel Dill, "have worked their way into every class of society. A Jewish prince had inspired Caligula with an oriental ideal of monarchy. There were adherents of Judaism in the household of the great freedmen of Claudius, and their growing influence and turbulence compelled that emperor to expel the race from his capital. The worldly, pleasure-loving Poppea had, perhaps, yielded to the mysterious charms of the religion of Moses. But it was under the Flavians, who had such close associations with Judea, that Jewish influences made themselves most felt. And in the reign of Domitian, two members of the imperial house, along with many others, suffered for following the Jewish mode of life" (Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, 84).

In recent excavations, which have laid bare much of subterranean Rome, many Jewish tombs have been examined and have yielded much additional knowledge of the conditions of Jewish life in the capital of the Caesars. Probably Jews gracing Pompey’s triumph after his Syrian campaign, 61 BC, made the first Roman catacombs similar to those on Jewish hillsides and especially round Jerusalem; and in these Jewish catacombs pagans and Christians were never laid.

24. Jews in Italy, Gaul, Spain and North Africa:

In Italy, apart from Roman and Southern Italy, where they were widely spread, the number of Jews at the beginning of our era was not large. In Southern Gaul they were numerous and in Spain they were numerous and powerful. In North Africa there were Jewish communities in many centers, and Cyrene was the home of a large and flourishing Jewish population.

25. The Numbers of the Dispersion:

It is not easy to form a trustworthy estimate of the Jewish population of the world in the times of Christ. Harnack reckons up four or four and a half millions (Expansion of Christianity, I, 10) within the Roman Empire. The Judaism of the Dispersion would at least be several times more numerous than the Judaism of Palestine.

26. Jewish Proselytism:

The question has been discussed how far the Jews of the Dispersion recruited their ranks by proselytism. That they should maintain a propaganda on behalf of their ancestral faith would only be in keeping with the character of their religion as a religion of revelation. Although they had to live within "the hedge of the Law" to protect them against the corruptions and idolatries of the Gentiles, there was nevertheless at the heart of Judaism a missionary purpose, as we see from the universalism of the Psalms and the Prophets. Judaism was burdened with a message which concerned all men, to the effect that there was one God, holy and spiritual, Creator of heaven and earth, who had committed to the family of Abraham in trust for the world His Law. To witness for the Living God, and to proclaim His Law, was the chief element of the Jewish propaganda in the Roman empire, and their system of proselytism enabled them to

gain adherents in numbers. In this the Old Testament Scriptures and the observance of the Sabbath were important factors, and enabled them to win the adherence of intelligent and educated people.

27. Internal Organization: That the Jews of the Dispersion had an internal organization with courts of their own, having considerable jurisdiction, not only in spiritual but in civil affairs, there is no doubt. This would only be in accordance with the analogy of their constitution as seen in the New Testament, and of their commercial organization in many lands to this day.

28. Unity of the Jewish People:

In all the lands of their Dispersion the Jews never lost touch with the land of their fathers, or Jerusalem, the city of the Great King. The bond of unity was maintained by the pilgrimages they made from all the countries where they were scattered to their three great national feasts; by the payment of the half-shekel toward the services of the Temple as long as it stood; and by their voluntary submission, so long as they had a national polity, to the decrees of the great Sanhedrin.

29. Dispersion Influenced by Greek Thought:

That Judaism was influenced in its Dispersion by contact of the larger world of life and thought in which the Jews had their place outside of Palestine we can see by the example of Alexandria. It was there that it felt most powerfully the penetrating and pervasive influence of Greek thought, and the large apocryphal and apocalyptic literature which sprang up there is one of the most notable results. "The Alexandrian Jew was in reality both a Jew and a Greek; he held the faith of Yahweh and sincerely worshipped the God of his fathers, but he spoke the Greek language, had received a Greek education, and had contracted many Greek ideas and habits. Still those in his position were Jews first, and Greeks afterward, and on all ‘The fundamentals’ were in thorough sympathy with their Palestinian brethren" (Fairweather, From the Exile to the Advent, 109 f).

30. The Dispersion a Preparation for the Advent of Christ:

The Jewish people thus widely distributed over the Roman world with their monotheism, with their Scriptures, and with their Messianic hopes, did much to prepare the way for the advent of the Redeemer who was to be the fulfillment of Jewish expectation and hope. It was due to the strange and unique influence of Judaism and to the circulation of the glowing visions of Israel’s prophets among the nations, that there was so widespread an expectation, mentioned by Tacitus, by Suetonius and by Josephus, that from Judea would arise a Ruler whose dominion would be over all. It is now believed that Virgil’s conception of the Better Age which was to be inaugurated by the birth of a child was derived from Isaiah’s prophecies. And not only did the Jewish Dispersion thus prepare the way for the world’s Redeemer in the fullness of the time, but when He had come and suffered and died and risen and ascended, it furnished a valuable auxiliary to the proclamation of the gospel. Wherever the apostles and the first preachers traveled with the good news, they found Jewish communities to whom they offered first the great salvation.

31. The Dispersion an Auxiliary to the Spread of the Gospel:

The synagogue services lent themselves most effectively to the ministry of Paul and his colleagues, and it was to the synagogue that they first repaired in every city they visited. Even to this day this preservation of "the dispersed of Israel" is one of the marvels of the Divine government of the world, proving the truth of the word of God by one of the earliest prophets: "I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth" (Am 9:9).

LITERATURE.

Schurer, GJV4, III, 1 ff; Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, I, 1-40; Fairweather, Background of the Gospel and From the Exile to the Advent; Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Diaspora"; Sayce and Cowley, Aramaic Papyri Discovered at Assuan; Oestcrley and Box, Religion and Worship of the Synagogue.

T. Nicol.

DISPOSITION

(dis-po-zish'-un diatagai): Only in Ac 7:53, "received the law by the disposition of angels," where it bears the meaning of "administration"; the Revised Version (British and American) "as it was ordained by angels."

DISPUTATION

dis-pu-ta'-shun: In Ac 15:2, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "questioning" for the King James Version "disputation" (Greek suzetesis). In Ro 14:1, the King James Version "doubtful disputations" becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) "decision of scruples" (Greek diakriseis dialogismon, literally, "discussions of doubts"). The Greek in neither case implies what the word "dispute" has come to mean in modern English, but rather "to discuss" or "argue."

DISTAFF

dis'-taf (pelekh): This word occurs once in Pr 31:19; "spindle" is found in the same passage. In the Revised Version (British and American) the meanings of the two words have been exchanged. See SPINNING.

DISTIL

dis-til':Only found twice in the English Bible (De 32:2; Job 36:27), in both cases in its original meaning

of "to fall in drops," as dew or rain (derived through French from Latin de, "down," stillo, "to drop"). It does not occur in its later technical sense, for the process we call distilllation was not known in ancient times.

DISTINCTLY

dis-tinkt'-li: Only Ne 8:8, "They read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly." Probably the better rendering is the Revised Version, margin "with an interpretation," i.e. translating into Aramaic. The Hebrew word is a participle of the verb parash =" to make distinct." The corresponding Aramaic word occurs in Ezr 4:18 =" plainly" the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), better "translated" the Revised Version, margin.

DITCH

dich: The word is used indiscriminately in the King James Version to represent at least three different ideas: a conduit or trench (2Ki 3:16); a reservoir or cistern; or simply a pit or hole in the ground. In the Revised Version (British and American) this distinction is observed more carefully. Compare Job 9:31; Ps 7:15 ("pit"), and Isa 22:11 ("reservoir"), the former meaning a pit or any similar place of destruction or corruption; the latter a reservoir or cistern of water. The New Testament usage (Mt 15:14 the King James Version) corresponds somewhat with the former. See also 2Ki 3:16 ("trenches").

DIVERS; DIVERSE; DIVERSITIES

di'-verz, di-vurs', di-vur'-si-tiz: "Divers" meaning "various," "different in kind," is now obsolete and used only as a synonym of "several," i.e. more than one. The distinction between "divers" and "diverse" in the King James Version seems to be that the former is the wider term, the latter being restricted to the meaning of "different in kind," while "divers" is also used to express difference of number. the Revised Version (British and American) retains "diverse" in all instances but changes "divers" nearly everywhere, except where it has the meaning "several." Compare Mt 24:7; Lu 21:11; Heb 9:10, and others. It is hard to understand why the Revised Version (British and American) retains "divers" as a translation of poikilos, in Mt 4:24 Mr 1:34, et al., because poikilos certainly cannot have the meaning "several" but "different in kind," and the idea expressed in these passages is not that some of the people had several diseases but that different people had different kinds of diseases. The same is true in Heb 13:9 where "divers" does not refer to number but to various kinds of teaching. Heb 2:4 and Jas 1:2 rightly change the reading of the King James Version "divers" to "manifold."

In other passages the Revised Version (British and American) changes "divers" to "diverse," and thus renders the idea of the original text "different in kind." Compare De 25:13 f; Pr 20:10,23. Other passages are changed the better to render the original text: De 22:9, "two kinds of seed"; Jud 5:30, "dyed"; 2Ch 30:11, "certain men"; Mr 8:3 and Ac 19:9, "some." the King James Version reads. in all these passages "divers." the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version Heb 1:1 "at sundry times and in divers manners," an expression often found in Old English, to "by divers portions

and in divers manners."

"Diversities" is found twice as translation of diairesis, literally, "distribution" (1Co 12:4 ff), but the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version, 1Co 12:28, "diversities" to "divers kinds," as translation of gene, "kinds."

A. L. Breslich

DIVES

di'-vez. See LAZARUS.

DIVIDE

di-vid':It is difficult to decide whether ragha' (Job 26:12; Isa 51:15; Jer 31:35) should be rendered "to stir up" or "to still." The Hebrew has both meanings. Some render "He causes the sea to tremble." the Revised Version (British and American) reads "to stir" in text and "to still" in margin, while the King James Version has "to divide" in all three cases. 2Ch 35:13, "carried them quickly" (the King James Version "divided them speedily"). Since cholaq, may mean either "to distribute" or "to be smooth," Ho 10:2 reads "their heart is divided" in the text, but offers "smooth" in margin (the King James Version "divided"). The Greek orthotomeo, means "to cut straight," hence, the more literal translation of 2Ti 2:15, "handling aright the word of truth" (note "holding a straight course in the way of truth" or "rightly dividing the word of truth"; the King James Version "rightly dividing").

A. L. Breslich

DIVINATION

div-i-na'-shun:

1. Definition

2. Kinds of Divination

3. Fundamental Assumption in Divination

4. Legitimate and Illegitimate Divination

5. The Bible and Divination

6. Modes of Divination Mentioned in the Bible:

Those Approved and Those Condemned

7. Terms Used in the Old Testament in Connection with Divination

8. Divination and Prophecy

LITERATURE

1. Definition:

Divination is the act of obtaining secret knowledge, especially that which relates to the future, by means within the reach almost exclusively of special classes of men.

2. Kinds of Divination:

Of this there are two main species:

(1) artificial,

(2) inspirational, or, as it was called in ancient times (Cicero, Lord Bacon, etc.), natural divination.

Artificial divination depends on the skill of the agent in reading and in interpreting certain signs called omens. See AUGURY. In inspirational or natural divination the agent is professedly under the immediate influence of some spirit or god who enables the diviner to see the future, etc., and to utter oracles embodying what he sees. Among the Romans artificial divination prevailed almost exclusively, the other having vogue largely among the Greeks, a proof surely of the more spiritual trend of the Greek mind. Yet that great Roman, Cicero, in his memorable treatise on Divination, says he agrees with those who take cognizance of these two distinct kinds of divination. As examples of inspirational divination he instances men dreaming or in a state of ecstasy (De Divinatione, i. 18). But though Cicero arranges diviners according to their pretentions, he does not believe in any superhuman communication. Thus he explains dreams on psychological principles much as modern psychologists would (op. cit. ii.63 ff). As a matter of fact Cicero was an atheist, or at least an agnostic.

The Latin word divinatio was confined almost exclusively to divination by outward signs, though its etymology (deus, "god") suggests that it denoted originally the other kind—that due to the inspiration of superhuman beings. Chrysippus (died at Athens 207 BC), though himself a Greek philosopher, defines the word in a way which would have commanded the approval of nearly every Roman, including Cicero himself who gives it. "Divination," Cicero makes him say (op. cit. ii.63), is "a power in man which foresees and explains those signs which the gods throw in his way." The Greeks were, on the other hand, a more imaginative and emotional people, and with them inspirational divination held much the larger

place. The Greek (mantis) bears a close resemblance to the Old Testament prophet, for both claimed to be inspired from without and to be superhumanly informed. The Greek term for divination (he) mantike (= he mantike techne) has reference to the work of the mantis, and it hardly ever means divination of the lower sort—that by means of signs.

3. Fundamental Assumption in Divination:

Underlying all methods of divination there lay the belief that certain superhuman spiritual beings (gods, spirits) possess the secret knowledge desired by men, and that, on certain conditions, , they are willing to impart it.

(1) The word "divination" itself, from deus, "god," or divus, "pertaining to god," carries with it the notion that the information obtained came from deity. Similarly the Greek mantike implies that the message comes to the mantis from gods or spirits by way of inspiration.

(2) Astrology, or astromancy, is but one form of divination and it rests upon the ultimate belief that the heavenly bodies are deities controlling the destinies of men and revealing the future to those who have eyes to see. According to the Weltanschauung or conception of the universe advocated by Hugo Winckler, Alfred Jeremias (see The Old Testament in the Light of the East) and others, terrestrial events are but shadows of the celestial realities (compare Plato's doctrine of ideas). These latter represented the mind of the gods (see ASTROLOGY secs. 1,2).

(3) On hepatoscopy, or divining from the liver, see below, 6, (2), (c).

(4) It can be proved that among the ancient peoples (Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc.) the view prevailed that not only oracles but also omens of all kinds are given to men by the gods and express the minds of these gods.

4. Legitimate and Illegitimate Divination:

Among the ancient Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks and Romans the diviner stood in the service of the state and was officially consulted before wars and other great enterprises were undertaken. But among these and other ancient peoples certain classes of diviners were prohibited by the government from exercising their calling, probably because they were supposed to be in league with tile gods of other and hostile nations. The gods of a people were in the beliefs of the time the protectors of their people and therefore the foes of the foes of their proteges. It is on this account that witchcraft has been so largely condemned and punished (see WITCHCRAFT). Necromancy is uniformly forbidden in the Old Testament (see Le 19:31; De 18:11; Isa 8:19; 19:3), probably on account of its connection with ancestor worship. But among other ancient peoples it was allowed and largely practiced. Note that the Hebrew words translated (De 18:11) "consulter with a familiar spirit" and "wizards" denote alike such persons as seek oracles from the spirits of the dead (see the present writer's Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews, 85 ff). The early Fathers believed that in the divination of heathenism we have the

work of Satan who wished to discredit the true religion by producing phenomena among pagan races very similar to the prophetical marvels of the chosen people. This of course rests on a view of the Old Testament prophet which makes him a "predicter" and little if anything more. See PROPHECY.

5. The Bible and Divination:

The attitude of the Bible toward divination is on the whole distinctly hostile and is fairly represented by De 18:10 f, where the prophet of Yahweh is contrasted with diviners of all kinds as the only authorized medium of supernatural revelation. Yet note the following:

(1) Balaam (Nu 22-24) was a heathen diviner whose words of blessing and of cursing were believed to have magical force, and when his services are enlisted in the cause of Yahwism, so that, instead of cursing he blessed Israel, there is not a syllable of disapproval in the narrative.

(2) In Isa 3:2 diviners are ranked with judges, warriors and prophets as pillars of the state. They are associated with prophets and seers in Jer 27:9; 29:8; Eze 22:28 (compare 13:6-9; 12:24). It is true that the prophets and diviners mentioned in these passages use utter falsehoods, saying peace where there is none; all the same the men called prophets and diviners are classed together as similar functionaries.

Pure Yahwism in its very basal principle is and must ever have been antagonistic to divination of every kind, though inspirational divination has resemblances to prophetism and even affinities with it. Why then does the Bible appear to speak with two voices, generally prohibiting but at times countenancing various forms of divination? In the actual religion of the Old Testament we have a syncretism in which, though Yahwism forms the substructure, there are constituents from the religions of the native aborigines and the nations around. The underlying thought in all forms of divination is that by employing certain means men are able to obtain knowledge otherwise beyond their reach. The religion of Israel made Yahweh the source of that knowledge and the prophet the medium through which it came to men. We have an analogous example of syncretism resulting in the union of opposite elements in ancient Zarathustraism (Zoroastrianism) which, though in its central principle inconsistent with divination by omens, yet took on from the native Turanian cults of Persia certain forms of divination, especially that by lot (see Lenormant, La Divination, 22 ff). Nor should it be forgotten that the Bible is a library and not a book, and where so many writers, living at widely separated times, have been at work it is natural to look for diversity of teaching, though no one can deny that in fundamental matters Bible authors are wonderfully consistent.

6. Modes of Divination Mentioned in the Bible:

For modes of divination in vogue among the ancient Babylonians, Egyptians, Greeks, Romans, etc., see the relevant works and dictionary articles. The species of divination spoken of in the Bible may be arranged under two heads: (1) those apparently sanctioned, and (2) those condemned in the Bible.

Those Approved and Those Condemned:

(1) Methods of Divination Tacitly or Expressly Sanctioned in the Bible.

(a) The following are instances of inspirational divination:

(i) The case of Balaam has already been cited. He was a Moabite and therefore a heathen soothsayer. His word of blessing or of curse is so potent that whether he blesses or curses his word secures its own realization. So far is his vocation from being censured that it is actually called into the service of Yahweh (see Nu 22-24).

(ii) To dreams the Bible assigns an important place as a legitimate means of revealing the future. Such dreams are of two kinds:

(aa) Involuntary or such as come unsought. Even these are regarded as sent for guidance in human affairs. The bulk of the dreams spoken of in the Bible belong to this class: see Ge 20:3,1 (Abimelech); 28:2 f; 31:10-14 (Jacob); 37:5-9 (Joseph; see ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 6); 40:5-21 (Pharaoh's butler and baker); 41:1-35 (Pharaoh); Jud 7:9-14 (Gideon and an unnamed man); Da 1:17 (Daniel had understanding of dreams); Da 2:1-49 (Nebuchadnezzar's dream and its interpretation by Daniel); Mt 1:20; 2:13 f, 19 f (Joseph, husband of Mary the virgin); 27:19; see also Jer 23:25 ff, where the lawfulness of prophetic dreams is assumed (compare 23:32, where "lying dreams" imply genuine ones). In the document usually ascribed by modern critics to the Elohist (E), dreams bulk largely as the above examples serve to show. Among the Babylonians belief in the significance of dreams gave rise to a science (oneiromancy) so elaborate that only special interpreters called seers (singular, baru) were considered able to explain them (see Lenormant, op. cit., 143, for examples).

(bb) The other species of dreams consists of such as are induced by what is called "incubation," i.e. by sleeping in a sacred place where the god of the place is believed to reveal his secrets to the sleeper. Herodotus (iv.172) says that the Nasamonians, an Egyptian tribe, used to practice divination by sleeping in the graves of their ancestors. The dreams which then came to them were understood to be revelations of their deified ancestors. See Herod. i.181 for another instance of incubation in Nineveh. We have a reference to this custom in Isa 65:4 ("that sit among the graves"), where Yahweh enters into judgment with the Jews for their sin in yielding to this superstition. Solomon's dream (1Ki 3:5-15) came to him at the high place of Gibeon. See also DREAM, DREAMER.

(b) But the Bible appears in some places to give its approval to some kinds of artificial or (as it may be called) ominal divination.

(i) Sortliege or divination by lot. The use of the lot as a means of ascertaining the will of Deity is referred to at least without expressed censure, and, as the present writer thinks, with tacit approval, in many parts of the Bible. It was by lot that Aaron decided which of the two goats was to be for Yahweh and which for Azazel (Le 16:7-10). It was by lot that the land of Canaan was divided after the conquest (Nu 26:56 ff; Jos 18; 19). For other Biblical instances see Jos 7:14 (Achan found out by lot); 1Ch 6:54

ff; 24:5 ff; 25:8 f; 26:13 f; Es 3:7 ("They cast Pur, that is, the lot"; see Century Bible in the place cited.); Ne 10:34; 11:1; Jon 1:7 ("The lot fell upon Jonah"); Mt 27:35; Ac 1:26. In the URIM AND THUMMIM (which see), as explained by modern scholars, the same principle is applied, for these two words, though etymologically still obscure, stand for two objects (pebbles?), one denoting yes or its equivalent, and the other number Whichever the high priest took from his ephod was believed to be the answer to the question asked. In all cases it is taken for granted that the lot cast was an expression and indication of the Divine will. See AUGURY, IV, 3.

(ii) Hydromancy, or divination by water. In Ge 44:5 Joseph is represented as practicing this kind of divination and not a word of disapproval is expressed. See AUGURY, IV, 2.

(Iii)we read in the Old Testament of other signs or omens which are implicitly approved of, thus Jud 6:36-40 (Gideon’s fleece); 1Sa 14:8-13 (Jonathan decides whether or not he is to attack the Philistines by the words which he may happen to hear them speak).

(2) Modes of Divination Condemned.

The following methods of divination are explicitly or implicitly condemned in the Old Testament:

(a) Astromancy (= Astrology). See ASTROLOGY.

(b) Rhabdomancy, or the use of the divining rod, referred to apparently in Ho 4:12 (which may be paraphrased: "My people ask counsel of a bit of wood, and the rod made thereof answers their questions"); Eze 8:17 ("They put a rod (EV "the branch") to their nose").

(c) By an examination of the liver of animals; see Eze 21:21. This mode of divining, hepatoscopy, as it is has been called, was very widespread among the Babylonians, Greeks, Romans, etc., of the ancient world, and it is still in vogue in Borneo, Burma and Uganda. We have no evidence that it was practiced among the Israelites, for in the above passage it is the king of Babylon (Nebuchadnezzar) who is said to have "looked in the liver."

Opinions differ as to how the state of the liver could act as an omen. Jastrow says the liver was considered to be the seat of life, and that where the liver of the animal sacrificed (generally a sheep) was accepted, it took on the character of the deity to whom it was offered. The soul of the animal as seen in the liver became then a reflector of the soul of the god (see EB, XX, 102 f). On the other hand, Alfred Jeremias says that in the view of the ancient Babylonians the lines and forms of the sheep’s liver were regarded as reflecting the universe and its history (The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, I, 61). Neither of these explanations is made probable by its advocates.

(d) By teraphim (compare TERAPHIM); see 1Sa 15:23; Eze 21:21; Zec 10:2.

(e) Necromancy, or consulting the dead; see Le 19:31; 20:6; De 18:11; Isa 8:19; 19:3; see above.

(f) Divination through the sacrifice of children by burning (see De 18:10). The context makes it almost certain that the words translated "that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire" (EV; but read and render "that burns his son or his daughter in the fire") refer to a mode of obtaining an oracle (compare 2Ki 3:27). The Phoenicians and Carthaginians sacrificed their children to Kronos in times of grave national danger or calamity (Porphyry Apud Euseb. Praep. Ev. iv.64,4; Diod. Sic. xx.14).

7. Terms Used in the Old Testament in Connection with Divination:

These are examined in detail in T. Witton Davies' Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbors. See also the article "Divination" in Encyclopedia Biblica by the same writer. The following brief notes must suffice here.

(1) kecem, generally rendered "divination," is a general term for divination of all kinds. In Eze 21:21 (26) it stands for divination by arrows while in 1Sa 28:8 it is used of divination through the medium of an 'obh ("familiar spirit"). On the derivation of the word see EB, article "Magic," section 3.

(2) me'onen, probably from a Semitic root (compare Arabic 'anna) which denotes to emit a hoarse nasal sound such as was customary in reciting the prescribed formula (see CHARM). For "oak of the me'onim" see AUGUR'S OAK. Some say the word means one who divines from the clouds, deriving from 'anan, "a cloud," though nothing in the context suggests this sense, and the same remark applies to the meaning "one who smites with the evil eye," making the term a denominative from 'ayin, "eye." The usual rendering in the King James Version is plural "observers of times" and in the Revised Version (British and American) "them that practice augury" (Dt. 18:10,14).

(3) The verb nichesh, of which lichesh, is but a variant, is probably a denominative from nachash, "a serpent" (l and n interchange in Hebrew), denoting "to hiss," "to whisper" (like a serpent), then "to utter divinatory formulas." As it is used for so many kinds of divination, W. R. Smith concludes that it came to be a general term for divine. The participle of this verb is translated "enchanter" in De 18:10, the cognate verb, "to use enchantments" in Le 19:26; 2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6, and the corresponding noun "enchantment" in Nu 23:23; 24:1.

(4) gazerin, literally, "cutters," i.e. such as kill (in Arab, the cognate verb =" to slaughter") for the purpose of examining the liver or entrails as omens. Perhaps the etymology implies "sacrifice," animals being sacrificed as an appeal to deity. The word occurs only in Da (2:27; 4:7 (4); 5:7,11), and is translated "soothsayers." Some think they were "astrologers," the etymology in that case referring to the dividing of the heavens with a view, by casting the horoscope, to forecasting the future.

(5) 'ashshaph (the King James Version "astrologer," the Revised Version (British and American) "enchanter"), occurs only in Da in the Hebrew (1:20; 2:2) and in the Aramaic (2:10; 4:4 (7), etc.) parts of the book. The term is probably taken from the Babylonian and denotes a magician and especially an exorcist rather than a diviner.

(6) kasda’im, the same word as the Greek (Chaldaioi) (English Verisons, "Chaldeans"), denotes in Da (1:4, etc.) where alone it occurs, not the people so designated but a class of astrologers. This usage (common in classical writers) arose after the fall of the Babylonian empire, when the only Chaldeans known were astrologers and soothsayers. See further, MAGIC. For "spirit of divination" (Ac 16:16) see PYTHON; PHILIPPI.

8. Divination and Prophecy:

Inspirational divination and Old Testament prophecy have much in common. Both imply the following conditions:

(1) the primitive instinct that, craves for secret knowledge, especially that relating to the future;

(2) the belief that such knowledge is possessed by certain spiritual beings who are willing on certain terms to impart it;

(3) such secret knowledge is imparted generally to special classes of men (rarely women) called diviners or (Bab) seers and prophets.

Many anthropologists (Tylor, Frazer, etc.) and Old Testament scholars (Wellhausen, W. Robertson Smith, etc.) consider prophecy to be but an outgrowth and higher form of divination. The older theologians almost to a man, and a goodly number of moderns, take precisely the opposite view, that divination is a corruption of prophecy. Probably neither view is strictly true. Sometimes in human life we find evidences of progress from lower to higher. Sometimes the process is the very reverse. It is important to take notice of the differences as well as the resemblances between the diviner and the prophet.

(1) The Old Testament prophet believes in a personal God whose spokesman he considers himself to be. When he spoke or wrote it was because he was, at least professedly, inspired and informed by Yahweh. "Thus says Yahweh," was the usual formula with which he introduced his oracles. The Greek and Roman mantis, on the other hand, worked himself up to the necessary ecstatic state by music, drugs (intoxicants, etc.), sacrificial smoke and the like. Sometimes it has been thought a sufficient means of divination to swallow the vital portions of birds and beasts of omen. It was believed that by eating the hearts of crows, or moles, or of hawks, men took into their bodies the presaging soul of the creature (Frazer, Golden Bough (NOTE: Separation, distinction: "I will put a division (the Revised Version, margin "sign of deliverance") between my people and thy people" (Ex 8:23). The Hebrew word here is pedhuth =" ransom," "redemption" (compare Ps 111:9), but the reading is doubtful. The King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) follow Septuagint, Syriac and Vulgate, which render "set a distinction," perhaps on the basis of a different reading from that of our Hebrew text.), II, 355).

(2) The mantis practiced his art as a remunerative occupation, charging high fees and refusing in most cases to ply his calling without adequate remuneration. The local oracle shrines (Delphi, Clavis, etc.) were worked for personal and political ends. The Old Testament prophet, on the other hand, claimed to speak as he was bidden by his God. It was with him a matter of conviction as to what lives men ought to live, what state of heart they should cultivate. So far from furthering his own material interests, as he could by saying what kings and other dignitaries wished to hear, he boldly denounced the sins of the time, even when, as often, he had to condemn the conduct of kings and the policy of governments. Look, for example, at Isaiah's fearless condemnation of the conduct of Ahaz in summoning the aid of Assyria (Isa 7 ff), and at the scathing words with which Jeremiah censured the doings of the nation's leaders in his day (Jer 9:26, etc.), though both these noble prophets suffered severely for their courage, especially Jeremiah, who stands out as perhaps the finest recorded example of what, in the face of formidable opposition, the religious teacher ought ever to be. Of Micaiah ben Iralab, King Ahab of Israel said, "I hate him; for he doth not prophesy good concerning me, but evil." What reward did this prophet have for his fidelity to his conscience and his God? Imprisonment (1Ki 22:1-35). Had he pleased the king by predicting a happy, prosperous future that was never to be, he would have been clothed in gorgeous robes and lodged in a very palace.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the references above and the full bibliography prefixed to the present writer's book named above (Magic, etc.), note the following: Bouche-Leclercq, Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquite; E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture 3, I, 78-81; 117- 33; II, 155; J. G. Frazer, Golden Bough 2, I, 346; II, 355; III, 342, et passim, and the articles in the principal Bible dictionaries.

T. Witton Davies

DIVINE NAMES

See GOD, NAMES OF.

DIVINE VISITATION

See PUNISHMENTS

DIVINE; DIVINER

di-vin, di-vin'-er. See AUGURY; ASTROLOGY; DIVINATION.

DIVISION

di-vizh'-un: Used in English Versions of the Bible in the following senses:

(1) A separate body of people

(a) of the tribal divisions of Israel (Jos 11:23; 12:7; 18:10);

(b) of sections of a tribe, "the divisions of Reuben" (Jud 5:15,16 the King James Version; but the Revised Version (British and American) rightly substitutes "the watercourses of Reuben"; in Job 20:17 the same word is rendered "rivers");

(c) of the (late) organization of priests and Levites into classes or families who ministered in the temple in rotation; translated "courses" generally in the King James Version, and always in the Revised Version (British and American) (1Ch 24:1; 26:1,12,19; Ne 11:36; compare 2Ch 35:5). Much prominence is given by the Chronicler to the 24 classes of priests, singers, and doorkeepers, who served in turns in the temple (compare Lu 1:5,8).

(3) In the New Testament, dissension, disunion, schism (Lu 12:51; Ro 16:17; 1Co 3:3 the King James Version, omitted the Revised Version (British and American); 1Co 1:10; 11:18; Ga 5:20).

D. Miall Edwards

DIVORCE

see DIVORCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT; DIVORCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

DIVORCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

(to apostasiou): The Scripture doctrine of divorce is very simple. It is contained in Mt 19:3-12.

We are not called upon to treat of divorce in the Mosaic legislation (De 24:1-4). That was passed upon by Jesus in the above discussion and by Him ruled out of existence in His system of religion. After Jesus had spoken as above, the Mosaic permission of divorce became a dead letter. There could not be practice under it among His disciples. So such Old Testament divorce is now a mere matter of antiquarian curiosity.

It may be of interest in passing to note that the drift of the Mosaic legislation was restrictive of a freedom of divorce that had been practiced before its enactment. It put in legal proceedings to bar the personal will of one of the parties. It recognized marriage as a social institution which should not be disrupted without reference to the rights of society in it. In this restrictive character "the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ" (Ga 3:24). But here, as in numerous other instances, Christ went behind the enactments to primitive original principles whose recognition would make the law of none effect, because no practice was to be permitted under it. Thus the Old Testament is disposed of.

Of course what Jesus said will dominate the New. In fact, Jesus is the only author in the New Testament who has treated of divorce. It has been thought that Paul had the subject in hand. But we shall find on examination, further along, that he did not. We need then look nowhere but to Mt 19 for the Scripture doctrine of divorce.

True, we have other reports of what Jesus said (Mr 10:2-12; Lu 16:18). But in Mt 19 we have the fullest report, containing everything that is reported elsewhere and one or two important observations that the other writers have not included. Luke has only one verse where Matthew has ten. Luke's verse is in no necessary connection with context. It seems to be a mere memorandum among others of the spiritual or ethical teachings of Christ. Luke however caught the gist of the whole teaching about divorce in recording the prohibition to put away one wife and marry another. The records in Mt 19 and Mr 10 cover one and the same occasion. But there is nothing in Mark that is not in Matthew; and the latter contains nearly a third more of text than the former. There is nothing, however, essential in Matthew that is not in Mark, save the clause "except for fornication." That exception will be treated further along. We seem to be justified then in saying that the total doctrine of the Scripture pertaining to divorce is contained in Mt 19.

Attention must be called to the fact that, in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:27-32), Jesus treated of divorce, and that in every essential particular it agrees with the elaboration in Mt 19. Jesus there as plainly as in the argument with the Pharisees put Moses' permission of divorce under ban; as plainly there declared the putting away of one partner to marry another person to be adultery. This may also be noticed, that the exception to the absolute prohibition is in the text of the Sermon on the Mount.

We have then a summary of the New Testament doctrine of divorce stated by Christ Himself as follows: "Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery" (Mt 19:9). This puts Him in line with the ideal of the monogamic, indissoluble family which pervades the whole of the Old Testament.

1. The Family:

It may be well here to treat of the exception which Christ made in His rule to the indissolubility of marriage. It is very widely maintained in the Christian church that there should be no divorce for any cause whatever. This position is in plain contradiction to Christ's teaching in Mt 15 and Mt 19. One of the grounds adduced for this denial of divorce in case a partner is guilty of adultery is that Luke and Mark do not record the exception. It is a difficult matter to invade the psychology of writers who lived nearly two thousand years ago and tell why they did not include something in their text which someone else did in his. Neither Luke nor Mark were personal disciples of the Lord. They wrote second hand. Matthew was a personal disciple of Christ and has twice recorded the exception. It will be a new position in regard to judgment on human evidence when we put the silence of absentees in rank above the twice expressed report of one in all probability present—one known to be a close personal attendant.

This may be said: Matthew's record stands in ancient manuscript authority, Greek and also the Versions.

And on this point let it be noted that the testimony of the manuscripts was up before the English and American Revisers, and they have deliberately reaffirmed the text of 1611 and given us the exception in Christ's rule in each place (Mt 5:32; 19:9). This makes the matter as nearly res adjudicata as can be done by human wisdom.

Let us consider the rationality of the exception. That feature has had scant attention from theologians and publicists, yet it will bear the closest scrutiny. In fact it is a key to much that is explanatory of the basic principle of the family. To begin with, the exception is not on its face an after-thought of some transcriber, but was called out by the very terms of the question of the Pharisees: "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" This plainly called for a specification from Jesus of exceptions which he would allow to the rule against divorce. It is fortunate that the Pharisees asked the question in the form they did, for that put on Jesus the necessity of enumerating such exceptions as he would allow. He mentioned one, and but one in reply. That puts the matter of exceptions under the rule in logic: Expressio unius-exclusio alterius. All other pretenses for divorce were deliberately swept aside by Christ —a fact that should be remembered when other causes are sought to be foisted in alongside this one allowed by Christ. The question may come up, Whose insight is likely to be truest?

Why, then, will reason stand by this exception? Because adultery is per se destructive of monogamic family life. Whoever, married, is guilty of adultery has taken another person into family relation. Children may be born to that relation—are born to it. Not to allow divorce in such case is to force an innocent party in marriage to live in a polygamous state. There is the issue stated so plainly that "the wayfaring man need not err therein," and "he who runs may read," and "he who reads may run." It is the hand of an unerring Master that has made fornication a ground for divorce from the bond of matrimony and limited divorce to that single cause. Whichever way we depart from strict practice under the Savior's direction we land in polygamy. The society that allows by its statutes divorce for any other cause than the one that breaks the monogamic bond, is simply acting in aid of polygamy, consecutive if not contemporaneous.

Advocates of the freedom of divorce speak of the above view as "the ecclesiastical." That is an attempt to use the argument ad invidiam. The church of Christ held and holds its views, not because ecclesiastics taught it, but because Christ taught it, and that in His teaching we have a statement out from the righteousness, wisdom, insight and rationality of the all-wise God.

2. Paul:

Paul is the only other New Testament author besides Christ who has been supposed to treat of divorce. But a careful examination of Paul's writing will disclose the fact that he has nowhere discussed the question—for what cause or causes a man might put away his wife, or a woman her husband, with liberty of marriage to another person. If Paul has treated of divorce at all it is in 1Co 7. But even a careless reading of that chapter will disclose the fact that Paul is not discussing the question for what causes marriage might be disrupted, but the question of manners and morals in the relation. Paul has not modified Christ in any respect. It has been supposed that in 7:15 Paul has allowed divorce to a believing

partner who has been deserted by one unbelieving, and so he has been sometimes understood as adding desertion to the exception Christ made as cause for divorce.

But Paul has not said in that verse or anywhere else that a Christian partner deserted by a heathen may be married to someone else. All he said is: "If the unbelieving departeth, let him depart: the brother or the sister is not under bondage (dedoulotai) in such cases: but God hath called us in peace." To say that a deserted partner "hath not been enslaved" is not to say that he or she may be remarried. What is meant is easily inferred from the spirit that dominates the whole chapter, and that is that everyone shall accept the situation in which God has called him just as he is. "Be quiet" is a direction that hovers over every situation. If you are married, so remain. If unmarried, so remain. If an unbelieving partner deserts, let him or her desert. So remain. "God hath called us in peace." Nothing can be more beautiful in the morals of the marriage relation than the direction given by Paul in this chapter for the conduct of all parties in marriage in all trials.

Many reasons might be given why Paul could not have given liberty of remarriage, besides the one that he did not in his text; but attention should be called to the fact that such an assumption of authority in divorce would soon have brought him into conflict with the Roman government. Paul’s claim that he was a Roman citizen was of some value to himself. Would not some Roman citizen have claimed to scrutinize pretty closely Paul’s right to issue a decree of divorce against him because he had "departed" from a wife who had become a Christian? There would be two sides to such divorces. Would not Paul, careful, shrewd, politic as he was, have known that, and have avoided an open rupture with a government that did not tolerate much interference with its laws? That neither Paul nor anyone else ever put such construction upon his language, is evidenced by the fact that there is no record in history of a single case where it was attempted for 400 years after Paul was in his grave, and the Roman Empire had for a century been Christian. Then we wait 400 years more before we find the suggestion repeated. That no use was ever made of such construction of Paul in the whole era of the adjustment of Christianity with heathenism is good evidence that it was never there to begin with. So we shall pass Paul as having in no respect modified the doctrine of divorce laid down by Christ in Mt 19.

3. Remedies for Marriage Ills:

In all civilized countries the machinery of legislation and law can always be open for removal or relief of troubles in marriage without proceeding to its annulment. If a father is cruel to his children, we do not abolish the parental relation, but punish the father for his cruelty. If he deserts his children, we need not assist him to rear other children whom he can desert in turn, but we can punish him for his desertion. What can be done by law in case of parent and child can be done in case of husband and wife. By putting in absolute divorce (frequently for guilty and innocent alike) we invite the very evils we seek to cure. We make it the interest of a dissatisfied party to create a situation that a court will regard as intolerable, and so he or she may go free. Then by affording an easy way out of the troubles of married life we are inviting carelessness about entering marriage. We say by divorce statutes to a young woman: "If your husband deserts you, you may have another. If he is cruel, you may have another. If he fails to support you, you may have another. If he is drunken, you may have another. If he is incompatible or makes you unhappy, you may have another"—and yet others beyond these. When an easy road is thus

made out of marriage, will there be proper caution about entering into marriage? By just as much as a crevice for relief of the miseries of married life is opened by divorce, by so much the flood gates are opened into those miseries. The more solemnly society is impressed that the door of marriage does not swing outward as well as inward the more of happiness and blessing will it find in the institution. See FAMILY.

C. Caverno

DIVORCE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

di-vors’:

1. Subordinate Position of Woman:

Woman, among the Hebrews, as among most nations of antiquity, occupied a subordinate position. Though the Hebrew wife and mother was treated with more consideration than her sister in other lands, even in other Semitic countries, her position nevertheless was one of inferiority and subjection. The marriage relation from the standpoint of Hebrew legislation was looked upon very largely as a business affair, a mere question of property. A wife, nevertheless, was, indeed, in most homes in Israel, the husband’s "most valued possession." And yet while this is true, the husband was unconditionally and unreservedly the head of the family in all domestic relations. His rights and prerogatives were manifest on every side. Nowhere is this more evident than in the matter of divorce. According to the laws of Moses a husband, under certain circumstances, might divorce his wife; on the other hand, if at all possible, it was certainly very difficult for a wife to put away her husband. Unfortunately a double standard of morality in matters pertaining to the sexes is, at least, as old as Moses (see Ex 7-11).

2. Law of Divorce: Deuteronomy 24:1-4:

The Old Testament law concerning divorce, apparently quite clear, is recorded most fully in De 24:1 ff. A perusal of the commentaries will, nevertheless, convince anyone that there are difficulties of interpretation. The careful reader will notice that the renderings of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) differ materially. the King James Version reads in the second part of De 24:1: "then let him write a bill," etc., the Revised Version (British and American) has "that he shall write," etc., while the Hebrew original has neither "then" nor "that," but the simple conjunction "and." There is certainly no command in the words of Moses, but, on the other hand, a clear purpose to render the proceeding more difficult in the case of the husband. Moses’ aim was "to regulate and thus to mitigate an evil which he could not extirpate." The evident purpose was, as far as possible, to favor the wife, and to protect her against an unceremonious expulsion from her home and children.

3. Marriage a Legal Contract:

As already suggested, marriage among the Hebrews, as among most Orientals, was more a legal contract

than the result of love or affection. It would be, however, a great mistake to assume that deep love was not often present, for at all times the domestic relations of the Hebrew married couple have compared most favorably with those of any other people, ancient or modern. In its last analysis it was, nevertheless, a business transaction. The husband or his family had, as a rule, to pay a certain dowry to the parents or guardians of the betrothed before the marriage was consummated. A wife thus acquired could easily be regarded as a piece of property, which, without great difficulty, could be disposed of in case the husband, for any reason, were disposed to rid himself of an uncongenial companion and willing to forfeit the mohar which he had paid for his wife. The advantage was always with the husband, and yet a wife was not utterly helpless, for she, too, though practically without legal rights, could make herself so intolerably burdensome and hateful in the home that almost any husband would gladly avail himself of his prerogatives and write her a bill of divorcement. Thus, though a wife could not divorce her husband, she could force him to divorce her.

4. Divorce Applicable Only to Wives:

The following words of Professor Israel Abrahams, Cambridge, England, before "the Divorce Commission" (London, November 21, 1910), are to the point: "In all such cases where the wife was concerned as the moving party she could only demand that her husband should divorce her. The divorce was always from first to last, in Jewish law, the husband's act." The common term used in the Bible for divorce is shilluach 'ishshah, "the sending away of a wife" (De 22:19,29). We never read of "the sending away of a husband." The feminine participle, gerushah, "the woman thrust out," is the term applied to a divorced woman. The masculine form is not found.

5. Process and Exceptions:

The Mosaic law apparently, on the side of the husband, made it as difficult as possible for him to secure a divorce. No man could unceremoniously and capriciously dismiss his wife without the semblance of a trial. In case one became dissatisfied with his wife,

(1) he had to write her a BILL OF DIVORCEMENT (which see) drawn up by some constituted legal authority and in due legal form. In the very nature of the case, such a tribunal would use moral suasion to induce an adjustment; and, failing in this, would see to it that the law in the case, whatever it might be, would be upheld.

(2) Such a bill or decree must be placed in the hand of the divorced wife.

(3) She must be forced to leave the premises of her former husband. Divorce was denied two classes of husbands:

(1) The man who had falsely accused his wife of antenuptial infidelity (De 22:13 ff), and

(2) a person who had seduced a virgin (De 22:28 f). In addition, a heavy penalty had to be paid to the

father of such damsels.

It is probable that a divorced wife who had not contracted a second marriage or had been guilty of adultery might be reunited to her husband. But in case she had married the second time she was forever barred from returning to her first husband, even if the second husband had divorced her or had died (De 24:3 f). Such a law would serve as an obstacle to hasty divorces. Divorces from the earliest times were common among the Hebrews. All rabbis agree that a separation, though not desirable, was quite lawful. The only source of dispute among them was as to what constituted a valid reason or just cause.

6. Grounds of Divorce (Doubtful Meaning of Deuteronomy 24:1):

The language in De 24:1 ff has always been in dispute. The Hebrew words, ‘erwath dabhar, on which a correct interpretation depends, are not easy of solution, though many exegetes, influenced possibly by some preconceived notion, pass over them quite flippantly. The phrase troubled the Jewish rabbis of olden times, as it does Jewish and Christian commentators and translators in our day. the King James Version renders the two words, "some uncleanness," and in the margin, "matter of nakedness." The latter, though a literal translation of the Hebrew, is quite unintelligible. the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version both have: "some unseemly thing." Professor Driver translates the same words "some indecency." The German the Revised Version (British and American) (Kautzsch) has "etwas Widerwartiges" ("something repulsive"). We know of no modern version which makes ‘erwath dabhar the equivalent of fornication or adultery. And, indeed, in the very nature of the case, we are forced to make the words apply to a minor fault or crime, for, by the Mosaic law, the penalty for adultery was death (De 22:20 ff). It is, however, a question whether the extreme penalty was ever enforced. It is well known that at, and some time before, the time of our Saviour, there were two schools among the Jewish rabbis, that of Shammai and that of Hillel. Shammai and his followers maintained that ‘erwath dabhar signified nothing less than unchastity or adultery, and argued that only this crime justified a man in divorcing his wife. Hillel and his disciples went to the other extreme. They placed great stress upon the words, "if she find no favor in his eyes" immediately preceding ‘erwath dabhar (De 24:1), and contended that divorce should be granted for the flimsiest reason: such as the spoiling of a dish either by burning or careless seasoning. Some of the rabbis boldly taught that a man had a perfect right to dismiss his wife, if he found another woman whom he liked better, or who was more beautiful (Mishnah, GiTTin, 14 10). Here are some other specifications taken from the same book: "The following women may be divorced: She who violates the Law of Moses, e. g. causes her husband to eat food which has not been tithed . . . She who vows, but does not keep her vows . . . She who goes out on the street with her hair loose, or spins in the street, or converses (flirts) with any man, or is a noisy woman. What is a noisy woman? It is one who speaks in her own house so loud that the neighbors may hear her." It would be easy to extend the list, for the Mishna and rabbinic writings are full of such laws.

From what has been said, it is clear that adultery was not the only valid reason for divorce. Besides, the word adultery had a peculiar significance in Jewish law, which recognized polygamy and concubinage as legitimate. Thus a Hebrew might have two or more wives or concubines, and might have intercourse with a slave or bondwoman, even if married, without being guilty of the crime of adultery (Le 19:20),

for adultery, according to Jewish law, was possible only when a man dishonored the "free wife" of a Hebrew (Le 20:10 ff).

Divorcement, Bill of:

This expression, found in De 24:1,3; Isa 50:1; Jer 3:8 is the translation of the Hebrew cepher kerithuth. The two words, literally rendered, signify a document or book of cutting off, i.e. a certificate of divorce given by a husband to a wife, so as to afford her the opportunity or privilege of marrying another man. The Hebrew term is rendered by the Septuagint biblion apostasion. This is also found in the New Testament (Mr 10:4). Mt 5:31 has "writing of divorcement" in English Versions of the Bible, but Mt 19:7 the King James Version has "writing," while the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have "bill." The certificate of divorce is called geT, plural giTTin, in the Talmud. There is an entire chapter devoted to the subjects in the Mishna It is not positively known when the custom of writing bills of divorcement commenced, but there are references to such documents in the earliest Hebrew legislation. The fact that Joseph had in mind the putting away of his espoused wife, Mary, without the formality of a bill or at least of a public procedure proves that a decree was not regarded as absolutely necessary (Mt 1:19). The following was the usual form of a decree:

On the ____ day of the week ____ in the month ____ in the year ____ from the beginning of the world, according to the common computation in the province of ____ I ____ the son of ____ by whatever name I may be known, of the town of ____ with entire consent of mind, and without any constraint, have divorced, dismissed and expelled thee ____ daughter of____by whatever name thou art called, of the town who hast been my wife hitherto; But now I have dismissed thee ____ the daughter of ____ by whatever name thou art called, of the town of ____ so as to be free at thy own disposal, to marry whomsoever thou pleasest, without hindrance from anyone, from this day for ever. Thou art therefore free for anyone (who would marry thee). Let this be thy bill of divorce from me, a writing of separation and expulsion, according to the law of Moses and Israel. ____ , the son of ____ , witness

Spiritual Application.

The Hebrew prophets regarded Yahweh not only as the father and king of the chosen people, and thus entitled to perfect obedience and loyalty on their part, but they conceived of Him as a husband married to Israel. Isaiah, speaking to his nation, says: "For thy Maker is thy husband; Yahweh of hosts is his name" (54:5). Jeremiah too makes use of similar language in the following: "Return, O backsliding children, saith Yahweh; for I am a husband unto you" (3:14). It is perfectly natural that New Testament writers should have regarded Christ’s relation to His church under the same figure. Paul in 2Co says: "I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ" (11:2); see also Mt 9:15; Joh 3:29; Re 19:7. Any unfaithfulness or sin on the part of Israel was regarded as spiritual adultery, which necessarily broke off the spiritual ties, and divorced the nation from God (Isa 1:21; Eze 16:22; Re 2:22). See also MARRIAGE.

LITERATURE.

Amram, Jewish Law of Divorce according to the Bible and Talmud, London, 1897; Abrahams, Jewish Life in the Middle Ages, London, 1896; Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs, London, 1898; The Mishna, Translated into English, De Sola and Raphall, London, 1843; Benzinger, Hebraische Archdalogie, Freiburg, 1894; Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebraischen Archdologie, 1894.

W. W. Davies

DOCTOR

dok'-ter: (In Lu 2:46 didaskalos) "doctor" is equivalent to "teacher," which latter is the translation of the Revised Version (British and American). So in Lu 5:17; Ac 5:34, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "doctors," "doctor," of the law (nomodidaskalos). See EDUCATION; RABBI; SCRIBES.

DOCTRINE

dok'-trin: Latin doctrina, from doceo, "to teach," denotes both the act of teaching and that which is taught; now used exclusively in the latter sense.

1. Meaning of Terms:

(1) In the Old Testament for

(a) leqach "what is received," hence, "the matter taught" (De 32:2; Job 11:4; Pr 4:2; Isa 29:24, the American Standard Revised Version "instruction");

(b) she-mu'ah, "what is heard" (Isa 28:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "message," the Revised Version, margin "report");

(c) mucar, "discipline" (Jet 10:8 margin), "The stock is a doctrine" (the Revised Version British and American) "instruction" of vanities, i. e. "The discipline of unreal gods is wood (is like themselves, destitute of true moral force" (BDB)).

(2) In the New Testament for

(i) didaskalia =

(a) "the act of teaching" (1Ti 4:13,16; 5:17; 2Ti 3:10,16), all in the Revised Version (British and American) "teaching";

(b) "what is taught" (Mt 15:9; 2Ti 4:3). In some passages the meaning is ambiguous as between (a) and (b).

(ii) didache, always translated "teaching" in the Revised Version (British and American), except in Ro 16:17, where "doctrine" is retained in the text and "teaching" inserted in the margin =

(a) the act of teaching (Mr 4:2; Ac 2:42, the King James Version "doctrine");

(b) what is taught (Joh 7:16,17; Re 2:14,15,24, the King James Version "doctrine"). In some places the meaning is ambiguous as between (a) and (b) and in Mt 7:28; Mr 1:22; Ac 13:12, the manner, rather than the act or matter of teaching is denoted, namely, with authority and power.

2. Christ's Teaching Informal:

The meaning of these words in the New Testament varied as the church developed the content of its experience into a system of thought, and came to regard such a system as an integral part of saving faith (compare the development of the meaning of the term "faith"):

(1) The doctrines of the Pharisees were a fairly compact and definite body of teaching, a fixed tradition handed down from one generation of teachers to another (Mt 16:12, the King James Version "doctrine"; compare Mt 15:9; Mr 7:7).

(2) In contrast with the Pharisaic system, the teaching of Jesus was unconventional and occasional, discursive and unsystematic; it derived its power from His personality, character and works, more than from His words, so that His contemporaries were astonished at it and recognized it as a new teaching (Mt 7:28; 22:33; Mr 1:22,27; Lu 4:32). So we find it in the Synoptic Gospels, and the more systematic form given to it in the Johannine discourses is undoubtedly the work of the evangelist, who wrote rather to interpret Christ than to record His ipsissima verba (Joh 20:31).

3. Apostolic Doctrines:

The earliest teaching of the apostles consisted essentially of three propositions:

(a) that Jesus was the Christ (Ac 3:18);

(b) that He was risen from the dead (Ac 1:22; 2:24,32); and

(c) that salvation was by faith in His name (Ac 2:38; 3:16). While proclaiming these truths, it was necessary to coordinate them with Hebrew faith, as based upon Old Testament revelation.

The method of the earliest reconstruction may be gathered from the speeches of Peter and Stephen (Ac

2:14-36; 5:29-32; 7:2-53). A more thorough reconstruction of the coordination of the Christian facts, not only with Hebrew history, but with universal history, and with a view of the world as a whole, was undertaken by Paul. Both types of doctrine are found in his speeches in Acts, the former type in that delivered at Antioch (Ac 13:16-41), and the latter in the speeches delivered at Lystra (Ac 14:15-17) and at Athens (Ac 17:22-31). The ideas given in outline in these speeches are more fully developed into a doctrinal system, with its center removed from the resurrection to the death of Christ, in the epistles, especially in Galatians, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians. But as yet it is the theological system of one teacher, and there is no sign of any attempt to impose it by authority on the church as a whole. As a matter of fact the Pauline system never was generally accepted by the church. Compare James and the Apostolic Fathers.

4. Beginnings of Dogma:

In the Pastoral and General Epistles a new state of things appears. The repeated emphasis on "sound" or "healthy doctrine" (1Ti 1:10; 6:3; 2Ti 1:13; 4:3; Tit 1:9; 2:1), "good doctrine" (1Ti 4:6) implies that a body of teaching had now emerged which was generally accepted, and which should serve as a standard of orthodoxy. The faith has become a body of truth "once for all delivered unto the saints" (Jude 1:3). The content of this "sound doctrine" is nowhere formally given, but it is a probable inference that it corresponded very nearly to the Roman formula that became known as the Apostles' Creed. See DOGMA.

T. Rees

DOCUS

do'-kus. See DOK.

DODAI

do'-di, do'-da-i (1Ch 27:4). See DODO.

DODANIM

do'-da-nim (dodhanim, "leaders"): In Ge 10:4, the son of Javan, the son of Japheth. This would place the Dodanim among the Ioninns. The parallel passage 1Ch 1:7, with the Septuagint and Samaritan Pentateuch, has, however, "Rodanim," which is probably the true reading. This identifies the people with the Rhodians (compare on Eze 27:15 under DEDAN).

DODAVAHU

do-dav'-a-hu (dodhawahu, "loved of God"; the King James Version Dodavah): Father of Eliezer of

Mareshah, a prophet in the days of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:37).

DODO; DODAI

do’-do, (dodho, dodhay, "beloved"):

(1) The grandfather of Tola of the tribe of Issachar, one of the judges (Jud 10:1).

(2) "The Ahohite," father of Eleazar, one of David’s heroes, and (2Sa 23:9; 1Ch 11:12) himself the commander of one of the divisions of the army (1Ch 27:4).

(3) The Bethlehemite, father of Elhanan, one of David’s mighty men (2Sa 23:24; 1Ch 11:26).

DOE

do. See DEER.

DOEG

do’-eg (do’-egh "anxious," "cared for"): "The Edomite," a servant of Saul, who watched David’s intercourse with the priest Ahimelech, then denounced the priest to the king, and later executed his command to slay the priests at Nob. The position he held is described as that of "the mightiest" of Samuel’s herdsmen (1Sa 21:7 margin). Septuagint reads: "tending the mules." Rabbinical legends speak of him as the greatest scholar of his time. The traditional title of Ps 52 associates the composition of that Psalms with the events that led to the slaying of the priests (1Sa 21:7; 22:9,18,22).

Nathan Isaacs

DOG

kelebh; (compare Arabic kelb, "dog"); kuon; (and diminutive kunarion): References to the dog, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, are usually of a contemptuous character. A dog, and especially a dead dog, is used as a figure of insignificance. Goliath says to David (1Sa 17:43):" Am I a dog, that thou comest to me with staves?" David says to Saul (1Sa 24:14): "After whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea." Mephibosheth says to David (2Sa 9:8): "What is thy servant, that thou shouldest look upon such a dead dog as I am?" The same figure is found in the words of Hazael to Elisha (2Ki 8:13). The meaning, which is obscure in the King James Version, is brought out well in the Revised Version: "But what is thy servant, who is but a dog, that he should do this great thing?" The characteristically oriental interrogative form of these expressions should be noted.

Other passages express by inference the low esteem in which dogs are held. Nothing worse could

happen to a person than that his body should be devoured by dogs (1Ki 14:11; 16:4; 21:19,23, etc.). Job 30:1 says of the youth who deride him that he disdained to set their fathers with the dogs of his flock. In Php 3:2 and Re 22:15, dogs are coupled with evil-workers, sorcerers, etc. In Mt 7:6 we read: "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast your pearls before the swine." Job 30:1 (cited above) refers to the use of dogs to guard flocks; and the comparison of inefficient watchmen with dumb dogs (Isa 56:10) implies that at least some dogs are useful. In the apocryphal Book of Tob, Tobias' dog is his companion on his travels (Tobit 5:16; 11:4; on this see Expository Times, XI, 258; HDB, IV, 989; Geiger, Civilization of E. Iranians, I, 85 ff).

There is further the reference to the greyhound (Pr 30:31 English Versions) as one of the four things which are "stately in their going." But the rendering, "greyhound," rests solely upon inference, and is contrary to the Septuagint and Vulgate, which have respectively alektor and gallus, i.e. "cock," the King James Version margin "horse." The Hebrew has zarzir mothnayim, which the King James Version margin renders "girt in the loins." the Revised Version, margin has "warhorse," Hebrew "well girt (or, well knit) in the loins." In support of the meaning, "girt," for zarzir, there is the word zer, which, with zarzir, is assigned to the obsolete root zarar and the Arabic zirr, "button," from zarr, "to button", "to compress." Further, to render zarzir by "cock" logically requires a change in the text, for mothnayim, "loins," becomes superlative and inappropriate (see Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Cock"). On the other hand, the Arabic zarzur is a starling (compare Arabic zarzar, "to utter cries," said of birds; carcar, "to cry out"; carcar, "cockroach," or "cricket"). Also, according to Encyclopedia Biblica (s. v. "Cock"), "the Talmudic zarzir .... means some bird (a kind of raven)." If the text stands, there appears to be no better rendering than "girt in the loins," which might fairly be taken to refer to a war horse or to a greyhound. The Persian greyhound would in that case be understood, a hairy race, which, according to the Royal Natural History, is less fleet than the English breed and is used in chasing gazelles and in hunting the wild ass, and which according to Doughty (Arabia Deseria) is kept by the Bedouin. "These dogs are said to be sometimes girdled by their owners to prevent them from over-eating and becoming fat" (L. Fletcher, British Museum (Natural History)).

Domestic dogs have probably been derived from various species of wolves and jackals. In this connection, it is noteworthy that the dogs of certain regions greatly resemble the wolves of those regions. The pariah dogs of Syria and Palestine resemble the jackals, especially in color and in the tail, differing in their greater size and in the shape of muzzle and ears. It is fair to assume that they are much the same as existed in Bible times. They are in general meek and harmless creatures, and are valuable as scavengers, but disturb the night with their barking. Each quarter of the city has its own pack of dogs, which vigorously resents any invasion of its territory. A dog which for any reason finds itself in foreign territory gets home as quickly as possible, and is lucky if it does not have to run the gauntlet of a pack of vicious foes. The pariah dog is sometimes brought up to be a sheep dog, but the best shepherd dogs are great wolfish creatures, which are usually obtained from Kurdistan.

Alfred Ely Day

DOGMA

dog’-ma (dogma, from dokeo, "that which seems," "an opinion," particularly the opinion of a philosopher):

1. As Law and Ordinance:

In the decadent period of Greek philosophy, the opinion, or ipse dixit, of the master of a philosophical school came to be quoted as authoritative truth; also, the opinion of a sovereign imposed as law upon his subjects: a decree or ordinance of the civil authority. The word never appears in English Versions of the Bible, although it is used 5 times in the Greek New Testament, but with the one exception of Ac 16:4, in a sense widely different from that which ecclesiastical usage has given to it from the 2nd century downward. "Dogma" is used in the New Testament,

(1) of Roman laws: "a decree (Greek dogma) from Caesar Augustus" (Lu 2:1); "the decrees of Caesar" (Ac 17:7) = the whole body of Roman law;

(2) of ordinances of religious law: "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" (Eph 2:15); "the bond written in ordinances" (Col 2:14) = the Mosaic ordinances as expressing the moral law which condemned the sinner, and whose enmity Christ abolished by His death. It is a significant revelation of the spirit of Greek theology that all the Greek commentators understood by ordinances in these two places, the gospel as a body of dogmas which had removed the commandment or bond that was against us (see Lightfoot, Colossians, at the place);

(3) of the decrees of the Council of Jerusalem (Ac 15:20), which Paul and his companions delivered to the Gentilechurches (Ac 16:4). Here we have one element that entered into the later ecclesiastical meaning of the word. These dogmas were decisions on religious matters, imposed by a more or less authoritative council of the church as a condition of admission to its membership.

2. As Formulated Teaching:

There is however one important difference. These decrees relate to moral and ceremonial matters, but from the 2nd century downward, dogma means especially a theological doctrine. In Greek theology "doctrine" and "dogma" meant the same thing. Each had its origin in the opinion of some great teacher; each rested upon revelation and claimed its authority; each meant an exposition of a particular truth of the gospel, and of the whole Christian truth, which the church adopted as the only right exposition. Each word might be used for the teaching of a philosopher, or of a heretic, although for the latter, "heresy" became the regular term. On the one side stood the doctrines or dogmas of the majority or the "Catholic" church, and on the other side, those of the heretics. So long as the "Catholic" ideal of orthodoxy and uniformity of belief held the field, there was no room for the distinction now made between "doctrine," as a scientific and systematic expression of the truth of the Christian religion, and "dogma," as those truths "authoritatively ratified as expressing the belief of the church." This distinction could only arise when men began to think that various expressions of Christian truth could coexist in the church, and is therefore quite modern and even recent. Dogma in this sense denotes the ancient conception of theology

as an authoritative system of orthodoxy, and doctrine, the modern conception, outside the dogmatic churches, where theology is regarded as a scientific exposition of truth.

LITERATURE.

Harnack, History of Dogma, I, chapter i; Drummond, Studies in Christian Doctrine, 1-7.

T. Rees

DOK

dok (Dok, Dagon): A small fortress, "little stronghold" near Jericho (1 Macc 16:15), built by Ptolemy, son of Abubus, where he entertained and murdered his father-in-law Simon Maccabeus and his two sons. Josephus (Ant., XIII, viii, 1; BJ, I, ii, 3) calls the place Dagon and places it above Jericho. The name persists in Ain Duk with its copious springs of excellent water about 4 miles Northwest of Jericho. Some ancient foundations in the neighborhood are possibly those of Ptolemy's fortress, but more probably of a Templars' station which is known to have stood there as late as the end of the 13th century. For its importance in earlier Jewish history, see Smith, HGHL, 250, 251.

J. Hutchinson

DOLEFUL

dol'-fool ('oach, "howling"): The "doleful creatures" referred to in Isa 13:21 are probably "jackals," although some have suggested "leopard," or "hyena." The older English Versions of the Bible gives "great owls." The word rendered "doleful lamentation" in Mic 2:4 (niheyah) is simply a form of the word ordinarily translated "wailing" (nehi). Compare the King James Version margin.

DOLPHIN

dol'-fin. See BADGER.

DOMINION

do-min'-yun: In Eph 1:21; Col 1:16 the word so translated (kuriotes) appears to denote a rank or order of angels. The same word is probably to be so interpreted in Jude 1:8 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "dominion"), and in 2Pe 2:10 (the King James Version "government," the Revised Version (British and American) "dominion"). See ANGEL.

DOOM

doom: Occurs only once in the King James Version (2 Esdras 7:43), "The day of doom shall be the end of this time" (the Revised Version (British and American) "the day of judgment"); but the Revised Version (British and American) gives it as the rendering of tsephirah, in Eze 7:7,10 (the King James Version "the morning," the Revised Version, margin "the turn" or "the crowning time"; but the meaning is not yet quite certain); and in 1Co 4:9 (epithanatios, "as men doomed to death," the King James Version "appointed (originally "approved") unto death"). Our word "doom" is connected with the word "deem," and signifies either the act of judging or (far more often) the sentence itself or the condition resulting therefrom (compare "Deemster" of Isle of Man and Jersey). Generally, but not always, an unfavorable judgment is implied. Compare Dryden, Coronation of Charles II, i, 127: " Two kingdoms wait your doom, and, as you choose, This must receive a crown, or that must lose." J. R. Van Pelt

DOOR

dor: Most commonly the rendering of Hebrew pethach, "doorway," deleth, "door" proper (the two distinguished in Ge 19:6), or of Greek thura, which represents both meanings. The door proper was usually of wood, frequently sheeted with metal, sometimes of one slab of stone, as shown in excavations in the Hauran. It turned on pivots (the "hinges" of Pr 26:14) working in sockets above and below, and was provided with a bolt (2Sa 13:17) or with lock and key (Jud 3:23). The doorway was enclosed by the stone threshold (1Ki 14:17), the two doorposts on either side, and the lintel above (Ex 12:7). Doors were frequently two-leaved, and folding ones are mentioned in connection with the temple (1Ki 6:34). Where "door" is used in connectio with city gates (Ne 3:1 ff) it refers to the door proper which swings on its hinges as distinguished from the whole structure. The custom of fastening to the doorposts small cases containing a parchment inscribed with the words of De 6:4-9; 11:13-21 had its origin in the command there given. See also GATE; HOUSE.

Figurative:

(1) Christ is "the door" into the gospel ministry (Joh 10:1,2,7); ministers must receive their authority from Him, and exercise it in His spirit.

(2) ‘Through faith in Him also both shepherds and sheep enter into the kingdom of God (Joh 10:9), and find all their spiritual needs supplied.’

(3) The figure in Re 3:20 is expressive of Christ’s patient, persistent and affectionate appeal to men.

(4) Elsewhere also of opportunity (Mt 25:10; Ac 14:27; 1Co 16:9; 2Co 2:12; Re 3:8).

(5) Of freedom and power (Col 4:3). See also ACHOR; SHEPHERD.

Benjamin Reno Downer

DOORKEEPER

dor’-kep-er (sho‘er): The gates of an oriental city and of the temple courts so closely resembled the door of a house that the same Hebrew word was used for doorkeeper and gatekeeper. It is often translated by the less definite word "porter". In the preexilic writings (2Sa 18:26; 2Ki 7:10,11) reference is made to porters at the gates of the cities Mahanaim and Samaria. In these early writings there is also mention of a small number of "keepers of the threshold" of the temple, whose duties included the gathering of money from the people for temple purposes, and the care of the sacred vessels (2Ki 12:9; 22:4; 23:4). They held an honorable position (2Ki 25:18), and occupied chambers in the temple (Jer 35:4). The same term is used to describe officers in the household of the king of Persia (Es 2:21; 6:2).

Differing from these "keepers of the threshold" in some respects are the doorkeepers or porters mentioned in Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. These formed a numerous sacred order (1Ch 9:22; 23:5) from the time of David. Their duties and the words describing them in two passages, "keepers of the thresholds" (1Ch 9:19) and "porters of the thresholds" (2Ch 23:4), connect them in some measure with the "keeper of the threshold" referred to above. They guarded the gates of the house of Yahweh (1Ch 9:23), closing and opening them at the proper times (1Ch 9:27) and preventing the unclean from entering the sacred enclosure (2Ch 23:19); they had charge of the sacred vessels and of the free-will offerings (2Ch 31:14), and dwelt in the chambers about the temple (1Ch 9:27). They were Levites, and came in from the Levitical villages every seventh day for service in their turn (1Ch 9:25). Their office was honorable, ranking with the singers, after the priests and Levites (Ezr 2:42; 1Ch 15:18).

In Ps 84:10, "I had rather be a doorkeeper in the house of my God," the word is not used in its technical sense. the Revised Version, margin gives "stand (the King James Version margin "sit") at the threshold," to an eastern mind a situation of deep humility (compare title of the Ps and 1Ch 9:19).

In the New Testament the order of temple doorkeepers is not referred to. But a doorkeeper (thuroros) is mentioned in connection with a private house (Mr 13:34), with the high priest’s house (Joh 18:16,17), and with sheep-folds (Joh 10:3), a maid serving as doorkeeper in some cases (Ac 12:13).

George Rice Hovey

DOORPOST

dor’-post. See HOUSE.

DOPHKAH

dof’-ka (dophqah, "drover"): A desert camp of the Israelites, the first after leaving the wilderness of Sin (Nu 33:12,13). See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

DOR; DORA

dor, do’-ra (do’r, dor, "habitation," "circle"; Dor; Josephus, Dora; modern TanTurah): A town of the coast of Palestine, South of Carmel (Apion, II, 10; Vita, 8), about 8 miles North of Caesarea. It was occupied in the earliest times by the Canaanites and probably belonged to Phoenicia, tradition saying that it was a Sidonian colony. It furnished an abundance of the shell-fish so valuable for the manufacture of the Tyrian purple, and this would have led the Phoenicians to occupy the site. In the 12th century BC, the region was occupied by the northern people who raided the whole Syrian coast and Egypt. They were driven back by the Egyptians, but renewed the attack, and the weakness of Egypt in the middle of the century enabled them to settle in the coast region South of Carmel; a tribe of them occupied Dor, and others the territory to the limits of the desert of Sinai, and became the Philistine people so well known by their contests with the Hebrews. Naphoth-dor, "the heights of Dor," may be the slopes of Carmel inland from TanTurah. Dor fell within the territory assigned to Manasseh (Jos 17:11; compare Ant, V, i, 22). It was the seat of a king who possessed other towns on the heights back of the coast. He was one of the allies of Jabin of Hazor in the conflict with Joshua (Jos 11:2) and was conquered by him (Jos 12:23), but Dor was not occupied by the Israelites (Jos 17:11; Jud 1:27).

The inhabitants of Dor were at enmity with the Phoenician towns and it would seem that the Sidonians seized it to obtain its rich supplies of shell-fish, and this probably caused the war of retaliation waged by the Philistines, under the lead of Ashkelon, against Sidon in the middle of the 11th century. Sidon was besieged by land, and the inhabitants were compelled to flee to Tyre. Dor seems to have been occupied by Solomon since he placed one of his purveyors in the town (1Ki 4:11), and Tiglath-pileser III reduced it and set a governor over it (Rawl., Phoenician., 84). Here Tryphon was besieged by Antiochus, but escaped to Apamea (1 Macc 15:11,13,15; Ant, XIII, vii, 2). It was made free by Pompey, and joined to the province of Syria (XIV, iv, 4). The youths of the place set up a statue of Tiberius in the Jewish synagogue, an outrage that was reported to Publius Petronius by Agrippa, and reparation was made (XIX, vi, 3). It does not seem to have been of much importance in later times, though the fortifications still remaining on the ruined site, from the period of the Middle Ages, show that it was then occupied. It is now only a miserable village nestled in the ruins.

H. Porter

DORCAS

dor’-kas (Dorkas, the Greek equivalent of Aramaic tabitha, "a gazelle"): The name was borne by a Christian woman of Joppa. She is called a disciple (mathetria: Ac 9:36, the only place in the New Testament where the feminine form is used). She seems to have had some means and also to have been a leader in the Christian community. Dorcas was beloved for the manner in which she used her position and means, for she "was full of good works, and almsdeeds which she did." Among her charities was the clothing of the poor with garments she herself made (Ac 9:39), and by following her example, numerous "Dorcas societies" in the Christian church perpetuate her memory. There is a local memorial in the "Tabitha School" in Jaffa devoted to the care and education of poor girls.

Her restoration to life by Peter is recorded. At the time of her death Peter was in Lydda where he had healed Aeneas. Being sent for, he went to Joppa, and, by the exercise of the supernatural powers granted to him, "he presented her alive" to the mourning community. In consequence of this miracle "many believed on the Lord" (Ac 9:42).

S. F. Hunter

DORYMENES

do-rim'-e-nez (Dorumenes): Father of Ptolemy Macron (1 Macc 3:38; 2 Macc 4:45); probably the same man who fought against Antiochus the Great (Polyb. v.61).

DOSITHEUS

do-sith'-e-us (Dositheos):

(1) A captain of Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 12:19-25); along with Sosipater he captured Timotheus after the battle of Carnion, but granted him his life and freedom on the representation that "he had in his power the parents of many of them and the brethren of some," who, if they put him to death, should "be disregarded."

(2) A soldier in the army of Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 12:35); he made a special attack upon Gorgias, governor of Idumaea, the opposing general, and would have taken the "accursed man" prisoner but for the interference of a Thracian horseman.

(3) A Jew, son of Drimylus (3 Macc 1:3) who rescued Ptolemy Philopator from a plot of Theodotus. He afterward proved an apostate from Judaism.

(4) A Levite priest who "in the 4th year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra" carried the translation of the Book of Esther to Alexandria (Additions to Esther 11:1).

J. Hutchison

DOTAEA

do-te'-a (the King James Version, incorrectly, Judea; Dotaia): Another form of the name DOTHAN (which see).

DOTE

dot: "To dote" means either "to be weakminded" or "to be foolishly fond." In the latter sense it is employed in Eze 23:5 ff; in the former, in Jer 50:36 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "shall become fools"); the King James Version Sirach 25:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) "lacking understanding"), and the King James Version 1Ti 6:4 (the Revised Version, margin "to be sick"; the King James Version margin"a fool").

DOTHAIM

do’-tha-im: Mentioned in Judith 4:6 and frequently in connection with the invasion of Holofernes. See next article.

DOTHAN

do’-than (dothayin, dothan, "two wells," "double feast"; Dothaeim): A place to the North of Shechem whither Jacob’s sons went for pasture for the flocks; where Joseph who followed them was sold to the Ishmaelites, after having been imprisoned in a "pit" (Ge 37:17 ff). Here in later days the eyes of Elisha’s servant were opened to see the mountain "full of horses and chariots of fire," guarding his master from the encircling Syrians (2Ki 6:13 ff). This is certainly to be identified with Tell Dothan, which lies on the East of the ancient road leading from Gilead across Esdraelon to the seacoast, and thence to Egypt. It is about 5 miles to the Southwest of Jenin. There are some traces of old buildings, two cisterns—Dothayin or Dothayin =" two cisterns" or "pits"- -and one copious spring. Excellent pasture is found in the surrounding plain, and on the adjoining slopes.

W. Ewing

DOUBLE

dub’-’-l (shanah, "to repeat," as in counting; kaphal, "to fold over," or "double," as a cloth): A word used quite frequently in the Old Testament. Jacob ordered his sons to take double money in their hands, i.e. twice the necessary amount (Ge 43:12,15). If a thief be caught with a living animal he was to restore double (Ex 22:4); if property be stolen out of the house of one to whom it is entrusted he was to restore double (Ex 22:7,9). The firstborn was to receive a double portion of the inheritance (De 21:17). Likewise also by a beautiful symbol Elisha asked for a double portion of Elijah’s spirit to fall upon him (2Ki 2:9). Degrees of punishment or sufferings were also expressed by the idea of a doubling (Isa 61:7; Jer 16:18; 17:18; Zec 9:12).

The use of the second Hebrew form in Job 11:6 and Job 41:13 seems quite confusing in its translation. the King James Version translates it simply "double," but the Revised Version (British and American) gives it its expanded and derived meaning, "manifold in understanding," and "who shall come within his jaws," respectively, "manifold" in the first instance meaning multiplied, and "jaws" doubtless meaning the double row of teeth. The classic phrases in the New Testament are those used by James to represent instability and a wavering disposition, dipsuchos, literally, "doubleminded" (Jas 1:8; 4:8).

Walter G. Clippinger

DOUBT

dout: This word, found only a score of times in the Bible, translates nevertheless about half as many different Hebrew and Greek originals with a corresponding variety of meanings.

In Ge 37:33 "without doubt" is to be taken in the common sense of "certainly"; in Job 12:2 in the sarcastic sense of "indeed!" In Da 5:12,16, it is used as a difficult problem or mystery to be explained, and these are the only cases of its employment in the Old Testament.

In the New Testament it is about equally used to translate diaporeo, and diakrino, and their cognates. The first means "to be without resource," "utterly at a loss," "nonplussed"; and the second, "to judge diversely." For the first, see Joh 13:22; Ac 2:12 the King James Version; Ac 5:24 the King James Version; Ac 10:17 the King James Version; Ac 25:20 the King James Version; and Ga 4:20 the King James Version. For the second see Mt 21:21; Mr 11:23; Ac 10:20; Ro 14:23. The last-named is deserving of particular attention. "He that doubteth is condemned (the King James Version "damned") if he eat," means that in a case of uncertainty as to one’s Christian liberty, it were better to err on the side of restraint. In Lu 12:29 "to be of doubtful mind" (meteorizo, literally, "to suspend"; see Thayer, under the word), means "to be driven by gusts," or "to fluctuate in mid-air."

Here, as in Mt 14:31, "doubt" does not indicate a lack of faith, but rather "a state of qualified faith": its weakness, but not its absence.

In Joh 10:24 "doubt" translates airo psuchen, which literally means "to lift up the soul" or "to keep one in suspense"; so the Revised Version (British and American). See also DISPUTATION.

James M. Gray

DOUGH

do. See BREAD.

DOVE

duv (tor, yonah; peristera; Latin Zenaedura carolinensis): A bird of the family Columbidae. Doves and pigeons are so closely related as to be spoken and written of as synonymous, yet there is a distinction recognized from the beginning of time. It was especially marked in Palestine, because doves migrated, but pigeons remained in their chosen haunts all the year. Yet doves were the wild birds and were only confined singly or in pairs as caged pets, or in order to be available for sacrifice. Pigeons, without

question, were the first domesticated birds, the record of their conquest by man extending if anything further back than ducks, geese and swans. These two were the best known and the most loved of all the myriads of birds of Palestine. Doves were given preference because they remained wild and were more elusive. The thing that escapes us is usually a little more attractive than the thing we have. Their loving natures had been noted, their sleek beautiful plumage, their plump bodies. They were the most precious of anything offered for sacrifice. Their use is always specified in preference to pigeons if only one bird was used; if both, the dove is frequently mentioned first. Because of their docility when caged, their use in sacrifice, and the religious superstition concerning them, they were allowed to nest unmolested and, according to species, flocked all over Palestine. The turtle-dove nested in gardens and vineyards, and was almost as tame as the pigeons. The palm turtle-dove took its name from its love of homing in palm trees, and sought these afield, and in cities, even building near the temple in Jerusalem. It also selected thorn and other trees. It has a small body, about ten inches in length, covered with bright chestnut-colored feathers, the neck dappled with dark, lustrous feathers. The rock dove swarmed over, through, and among the cliffs of mountains and the fissures of caves and ravines. The collared turtle-dove was the largest of the species. It remained permanently and homed in the forests of Tabor and Gilead, around the Dead Sea, and along the Jordan valley. This bird was darker than the others and took its name from a clearly outlined collar of dark feathers encircling the neck, and was especially sought for caged pets on account of its size and beauty.

In all, the dove is mentioned about fifty times in the Bible. Many of these references are concerning its use in sacrifice and need not all be mentioned. The others are quoted and explained from a scientific standpoint and in accordance with the characteristics and habits of the birds. The first reference to the dove occurs in Ge 8:8-12, in the history of the flood; then follows its specified use in sacrifice; note of its migratory habits is made, and then in poetry, prophecy, comparison, simile and song, it appears over and over throughout the Bible.

In Ge 8:8-12, we read, "And he sent forth a dove from him, to see if the waters were abated." Noah first sent out a raven, because it was a strong, aggressive bird and would return to its mate. But the raven only flew over the water and returned to perch on the ark. This was not satisfactory, so Noah in looking for a bird better suited to his purpose, bethought him of the most loving and tender bird he knew—the dove. It not only would return to the ark, but would enter and go to the cage of its mate, and if it found green food it would regurgitate a portion for her or its young, or if not nesting he could tell by its droppings if greenery had been eaten and so decide if the waters were going down. And this is precisely what happened. The dove came back, and the watching Noah saw it feed its mate little green olive leaves, for the dove never carries food in the beak, but swallows and then regurgitates it to mate and young. This first reference to birds was made on account of the loving, tender characteristics of the species; the next, because they were the most loved by the people, and therefore chosen as most suitable to offer as sacrifice (Ge 15:9). In Le 1:14 f, doves are mentioned as sacrifice: "And the priest shall bring it unto the altar, and wring off its head, and burn it on the altar; and the blood thereof shall be drained out on the side of the altar." In Le 5:7 the proper preparation of the sacrifice is prescribed. For method of handling sacrifice see 5:8,9,10. In Le 12:6 the law for a sacrifice for a mother is given, and 12:8 of same chapter provides that if she be too poor to offer a lamb, doves or pigeons will suffice. In Le 14:4-8 the reference for the sacrifice of a leper is merely to "birds," because it is understood that they are pigeons and doves,

and it contains the specification that if the victim is too poor to afford so elaborate a sacrifice, a smaller one will suffice. The birds are named in 14:22: "Two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, such as he is able to get; and the one shall be a sin-offering, and the other a burnt-offering" (compare Le 15:14,29; Nu 6:10). When David prayed for the destruction of the treacherous, he used the dove in comparison, and because he says he would "lodge in the wilderness" he indicates that he was thinking of the palm turtle. " And I said, Oh that I had wings like a dove! Then would I fly away, and be at rest" (Ps 55:6). In chanting a song of triumph, David used an exquisite thought. " When ye lie among the sheepfolds, It is as the wings of a dove covered with silver, And her pinions with yellow gold" (Ps 68:13). He referred to the rock dove because the metallic luster on its neck would gleam like gold in sunshine, and the soft grayish- white feathers beneath the wings as he would see the bird above him in flight would appear silver-like. By this quotation David meant that in times of peace, when men slept contentedly at home among their folds, their life was as rich with love and as free in peace as the silver wing of the dove that had the gold feathers and was unmolested among the inaccessible caves and cliffs. In Ps 74:19 the term "turtle-dove" is used to indicate people whom the Almighty is implored to protect: "Oh deliver not the soul of thy turtle-dove unto the wild beast: forget not the life of thy poor for ever."

Solomon uses the dove repeatedly in comparison or as a term of endearment. In So 1:15; 4:1; 5:12, he compares the eyes of his bride full, tender, beautiful, with those of a dove. In So 2:12 he uses the voice of the dove as an indication of spring. In So 2:14 he addresses the bride as a rock dove, In So 5:2 is another term of endearment, this time used in the dream of the bride (compare So 6:9). Isa 38:14 has reference to the wailing, mournful dove note from which the commonest species take the name "mourning dove." The reference in Isa 60:8 proves that the prophet was not so good an observer, or so correct in his natural history as David, who may have learned from the open. As a boy, David guarded the flocks of his father and watched the creatures around him. When exulting over the glory of the church in the numerous accessions of Gentiles, Isaiah cried, "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" This proves that he confounded pigeons and doves. Doves were wild, mostly migratory, and had no "windows." But the clay cotes of pigeons molded in squares so that one large cote sheltered many pairs in separate homes had the appearance of latticed windows and were used as a basis in estimating a man’s wealth. This reference should be changed to read, "and as pigeons to their windows." In Jer 8:7 the fact is pointed out that doves were migratory; and in Jer 48:28 people are advised to go live in solitary places and be peaceable, loving and faithful, like the rock doves. See also Eze 7:16: "But those of them that escape shall escape, and shall be on the mountains like doves of the valleys, all of them moaning, every one in his iniquity." This merely means that people should be driven to hide among the caves and valleys where the rock doves lived, and that the sound of their mourning would resemble the cry of the birds. It does not mean, however, that the doves were mourning, for when doves coo and moan and to our ears grow most pitiful in their cries, they are the happiest in the mating season. The veneration cherished for doves in these days is inborn, and no bird is so loved and protected as the dove—hence, it is unusually secure and happy and its mournful cry is the product of our imagination only. The dove is the happiest of birds. Ho 7:11 and Ho 11:11 each compares people with doves; the first, because the birds at times appear foolishly trusting; the second, because, while no bird is more confiding, none is more easily frightened. "And Ephraim is like a silly dove, without understanding: they call unto Egypt, they go to Assyria" (Ho 7:11). "They shall come trembling as a bird

out of Egypt, and as a dove out of the land of Assyria; and I will make them to dwell in their houses, saith Yahweh" (Ho 11:11). The reference in Na 2:7 is to the voice of the birds.

New Testament references will be found in a description of the baptism of Jesus (Mt 3:16). People are admonished to be "harmless as doves" (Mt 10:16). "And Jesus entered into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the money-changers, and the seats of them that sold the doves" (Mt 21:12). This proves that these birds were a common article of commerce, probably the most used for caged pets, and those customarily employed for sacrifice.

Dove's Dung (chari yonim, Kethibh for dibhyonim): 2Ki 6:25: "And there was a great famine in Samaria: and, behold, they besieged it, until an ass's head was sold for fourscore pieces of silver, and the fourth part of a kab of dove's dung for five pieces of silver." This seems so repulsive that some commentators have tried to prove the name applied to the edible root of a plant, but the history of sieges records other cases where matter quite as offensive was used to sustain life. The text is probably correct as it stands.

Gene Stratton-Porter

DOWRY

dou'-ri: In all Hebrew marriages, the dowry held an important place. The dowry sealed the betrothal. It took several forms. The bridegroom presented gifts to the bride. There was the mohar, "dowry" as distinguished from matttan, "gifts to the members of the family" (compare Ge 24:22,53; Ge 34:12). The price paid to the father or brothers of the bride was probably a survival of the early custom of purchasing wives (Ge 34:12; Ex 22:17; 1Sa 18:25; compare Ru 4:10; Ho 3:2). There was frequently much negotiation and bargaining as to size of dowry (Ge 34:12). The dowry would generally be according to the wealth and standing of the bride (compare 1Sa 18:23). It might consist of money, jewelry or other valuable effects; sometimes, of service rendered, as in the case of Jacob (Ge 29:18); deeds of valor might be accepted in place of dowry (Jos 15:16; 1Sa 18:25; Jud 1:12). Occasionally a bride received a dowry from her father; sometimes in the shape of land (Jud 1:15), and of cities (1Ki 9:16). In later Jewish history a written marriage contract definitely arranged for the nature and size of the dowry.

Edward Bagby Pollard

DOXOLOGY

dok-sol'-o-ji (doxologia, "a praising," "giving glory"): A hymn or liturgical formula expressive of praise to God, as the Gloria in Excelsis (an expansion of Lu 2:14), sometimes called the Greater Doxology, and the Gloria Patri ("Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, world without end, Amen") also known as the Lesser Doxology.

The clause, "as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be," was probably added to the original

simple formula to emphasize the church’s dissent from the Arian conception of Christ.

The term is applied in particular to the concluding paragraph of the Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6:13 margin, "For thine is the kingdom," etc.; compare 1Ch 29:11, and see LORD’S PRAYER).

To the same general class belong Ps 41:13; 72:18 f; 89:52; Ro 16:27; Eph 2:20; 1Ti 1:17; Jude 1:25; Re 5:13 f; 19:1-3, and the modern stanza beginning "Praise God, from whom all blessings flow."

M. O. Evans

DRACHMA; DRAM

drak’-ma, (drachme): The word is used in the Septuagint as the rendering of beqa‘, "half-shekel," which must refer to the light standard for the shekel, as its weight was about 62 grains. In the New Testament the word occurs only in Lu 15:8,9, where it is rendered "a piece of silver" (m "drachma"). It was commonly taken as equivalent to the Roman denarius, though not strictly so.

DRAGON

drag’-un (tannin, plural tannim, tannoth; drakon):

Tannin and the plural tanninim occur 14 times, and in English Versions of the Bible are variously rendered "dragon," "whale," "serpent" or "sea-monster"; but La 4:3, the King James Version "sea-monster," the King James Version margin"sea calves," the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals." Tannim occurs 12 times, and is rendered "dragons," the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals," except in Eze 29:3, where the King James Version has "dragon" (the American Standard Revised Version "monster"), and in Eze 32:2, where the King James Version has "whale" and the English Revised Version and the King James Version margin"dragon" (the American Standard Revised Version "monster"). Tannoth occurs once, in Mal 1:3, where it is rendered "dragons," the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals." Drakon occurs 12 times in Re 12; 13; 16; and 20, where it is uniformly rendered "dragon." (Compare Arabic tinnin, the constellation, Draco.) Tannoth (Septuagint domata, "dwellings") is a feminine plural form as if from tannah, but it suits the context to give it the same meaning as tannim.

In Ex 7:9,10,12, tannin is used of the serpents which were produced from Aaron’s rod and the rods of the Egyptian magicians, whereas in Ex 4:3 and 7:15, for the serpent produced from Aaron’s rod, we find nachash, the ordinary word for serpent. In two passages we find "whale," the Revised Version (British and American) "sea-monster"; Ge 1:21: "And God created the great sea-monsters, and every living creature that moveth"; Job 7:12: "Am I a sea, or a sea-monster, that thou settest a watch over me?" Other passages (the English Revised Version and the King James Version) are De 32:33: "Their wine is the poison of dragons (the American Standard Revised Version "serpents"), and the cruel venom of asps"; Ne 2:13: "And I went out by night by the valley gate, even toward the dragon’s (the American Standard

Revised Version "jackal's") well" (the King James Version "dragon well"); Ps 91:13: "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the serpent (the King James Version "dragon") shalt thou trample under foot "; Ps 148:7: "Praise Yahweh from the earth, ye sea-monsters (the King James Version "dragons"), and all deeps"; Jer 51:34: "Nebuchadrezzar the king of Babylon hath devoured me, ... like a monster" (the King James Version "dragon"). Here also two tannim passages; Eze 29:3: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: Behold, I am against thee, Pharaoh king of Egypt, the great monster (the King James Version "dragon") that lieth in the midst of his rivers, that hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself"; and Eze 32:2: "Son of man, take up a lamentation over Pharaoh king of Egypt, and say unto him, Thou wast likened unto a young lion of the nations: yet art thou as a monster (the English Revised Version "dragon," the King James Version "whale") in the seas; and thou didst break forth with thy rivers and troubledst the waters with thy feet, and fouledst their rivers." The foregoing passages offer no especial difficulties in the interpretation of the word tannin. All may fairly be understood to refer to a serpent or sea-monster or some imaginary creature, without invoking any ancient myths for their elucidation. The same may be said of the passages in Revelation. A dragon is taken as the personification of Satan, as of Pharaoh in the passages in Ezekiel. It is of course true that ancient myths may more or less distantly underlie some of these dragon and serpent references, and such myths may be demonstrated to throw additional light in certain cases, but at least the passages in question are intelligible without recourse to the myths. This however is not equally true of all the tannin passages. In Ps 74:12 we read: "Yet God is my King of old, working salvation in the midst of the earth. Thou didst divide the sea by thy strength: thou brakest the heads of the sea-monsters (the King James Version "dragons") in the waters." Compare Isa 27:1; 51:9 f.

The three passages just cited seem to denote each some particular act, and are referred by Canon Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Dragon") to the old Babylonian myth of the conflict of Marduk and Tiamat in the Assyrian creation- legend (thus Gunkel, etc.). Indeed he refers to that myth not only these passages, but also Jer 5:24; Eze 29:3-6; 32:2-8 and Job 7:12, which have been cited above. In translating the last two passages, Canon Cheyne uses the definite article, "the dragon," instead of "a" as in the Revised Version (British and American), which makes a great difference in the meaning. In Ps 87:4, it is clear that Rahab is a country, i.e. Egypt. Isa 30:7 is to the same point. In Isa 51:9,10, "that didst cut Rahab in pieces" and "that didst pierce the monster" (the King James Version "dragon"), are two coordinate expressions of one idea, which is apparently the defeat of the Egyptians, as appears in the reference to the passage of the Red Sea. In Isa 27:1, "leviathan the swift serpent" and "leviathan the crooked serpent" and "the monster (the King James Version and the English Revised Version "dragon") that is in the sea" have been identified with Babylon, Persia and Egypt (Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word "Dragon," 4). It is more probable that the first two expressions are coordinate, and amount to "leviathan the swift and crooked serpent," and that the verse may therefore refer to Babylonia and Egypt. Ps 74:12-15 is more in line with the idea of the article in EB, but it is nevertheless susceptible of an explanation similar to that of the other two passages.

Tannim, "dragons" (the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals") occurs in Job 30:29; Ps 44:19; Isa 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer 9:11; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; tannoth, "dragons" (the Revised Version (British and American) "jackals") is found in Mal 1:3. In all these passages, "jackal" suits the context better than "dragon," "sea-monster" or "serpent." An exception to the rendering of

"dragon" or "serpent" or "sea-monster" for tannin is found in La 4:3: "Even the jackals draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones." the King James Version has "seamonster," the King James Version margin"sea calves." A mammal is indicated, and the Revised Version (British and American) apparently assumes that tannin is an error for tannim. Two other exceptions are in Eze 29:3 and Eze 32:2, where English Versions of the Bible renders tannim by "dragon," since in these two passages "jackal" obviously will not suit. See JACKAL.

On the constellational dragons or snakes, see ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 1-5.

Alfred Ely Day

DRAGON WELL

(Ne 2:13 the King James Version). See JACKAL'S WELL.

DRAGON, BEL AND THE

See BEL AND THE DRAGON.

DRAGON, RED

See REVELATION OF JOHN.

DRAM

See DRACHMA; MONEY.

DRAMA MIMIC

dra'-ma mim'-ik. See GAMES.

DRAUGHT

draft (aphedron; Mt 15:17; Mr 7:19): "Closet," "sink" or "privy" (Rheims), literally, "place for sitting apart" (compare 2Ki 10:27, "draught-house," and Mishna "water-house"). According to the Mishna, Jehu turned the temple of Baal in Samaria into public latrines, "waterhouses." Mark adds here (Mr 7:19) that by this saying Jesus cleansed all articles of food, i.e., declared them to be clean.

DRAWER OF WATER

dro’-er, (sho’ebh mayim, from sha’abh, "to bale up" water): In Syria and Palestine, outside of Mt. Lebanon and the Anti- Lebanon, the springs of water are scarce and the inhabitants of these less favored places have always depended upon wells and cisterns for their water supply. This necessitates some device for drawing the water. In the case of a cistern or shallow well, an earthenware water jar or a bucket made of tanned goats’ skin is lowered into the water by a rope and then raised by pulling up the rope hand over hand (probably the ancient method), or by running the rope over a crude pulley fixed directly over the cistern or well. In the case of deep wells, the rope, attached to a larger bucket, is run over a pulley so that the water may be raised by the drawers walking away from the well as they pull the rope. Frequently animals are hitched to the rope to do the pulling.

In some districts where the water level is not too deep, a flight of steps leading down to the water’s edge is constructed in addition to the opening vertically above the water. Such a well is pointed out near Haran in Mesopotamia as the one from which Rebekah drew water for Abraham’s servant. In Ge 24:16 we read that Rebekah "went down to the fountain, and filled her pitcher, and came up."

The deep grooves in their curbs, worn by the ropes as the water was being raised, attest to the antiquity of many of the wells of Palestine and Syria. Any one of the hundreds of grooves around a single well was many years in being formed. The fact that the present method of drawing water from these wells is not making these grooves, shows that they are the work of former times.

The drawing of water was considered the work of women or of men unfit for other service (Ge 24:11,13,13; 1Sa 9:11; Joh 4:7). In Syria, today, a girl servant willingly goes to draw the daily supply of water, but seldom is it possible to persuade a boy or man to perform this service. When the well or fountain is at a distance, or much water is needed, tanned skins or earthen jars are filled and transported on the backs of men or donkeys.

Water drawing was usually done at evening time (Ge 24:11), and this custom has remained unchanged. There is no sight more interesting than the daily concourse at a Syrian water source. It is bound to remind one of the Bible stories where the setting is a wellside (Ge 24; Joh 4).

The service of water drawing was associated, in early times, with that of hewer of wood (De 29:11). Joshua made the Gibeonites hewers of wood and drawers of water in exchange for their lives (Jos 9:21,23,17). The inhabitants of Nineveh were exhorted to draw water and fill the cisterns of their fortresses in preparation for a siege (Na 3:14).

Figurative: Water drawing is mentioned in the metaphor of Isa 12:3, "Ye draw water out of the wells of salvation."

James A. Patch

DREAM; DREAMER

drem, drem’-er (chalom, chelem; onar): In all time dreams and their interpretation have been the occasion of much curious and speculative inquiry. Because of the mystery by which they have been enshrouded, and growing out of a natural curiosity to know the future, much significance has been attached to them by people especially of the lower stages of culture. Even the cultured are not without a superstitious awe and dread of dreams, attaching to them different interpretations according to local color and custom.

Naturally enough, as with all other normal and natural phenomena for which men could assign no scientific and rational explanation, they would be looked upon with a certain degree of superstitious fear. " Dreams, Which are the children of an idle brain, Begot of nothing but vain fantasy, Which is as thin of substance as the air And more inconstant than the wind." —Shakespeare.

1. Physiological and Psychological Ground:

While a fully satisfactory theory of dreams has not yet been established and while it is hardly possible that there will ever be a satisfactory explanation for each individual dream, yet through the rapid discoveries of physiological psychology in the recent decade or more, much new light is thrown on the subject. With the contribution modern psychology has made to our knowledge of the association of ideas through the connected relation of certain cortical centers and areas, it has come to be pretty well established that the excitation of certain bodily organs or surfaces will stimulate certain brain areas. Conversely the stimulation of certain cortical areas will produce a response in certain bodily regions over which these centers or areas preside.

Connecting thought processes are therefore dependent upon the proper correlation of ideas through what are known physiologically as the association centers. If then it comes to pass that, as occurs in dreams, only fragmentary ideas or loosely connected trains of thought occur, and if, as frequently happens, there is momentary connection, but little connection with normal waking experience, it will easily be seen that the excitation of certain centers will awaken certain trains of thought which are but poorly related to the balance of one’s thinking processes. Much is being said about the dissociation of ideas and the disturbance of personality of which dreams are one of several forms. Others are hallucinations, trances, visions, etc.

Dreams are abnormal and sometimes pathological. Sleep is a normal experience. Perfect and natural sleep should be without dreams of any conscious occurrence. Perhaps psychologically there can be no such thing as perfectly dreamless sleep. Such a condition would probably be death itself. Nature doubtless has her silent vigils, keeping watch in the chambers of the soul during the deepest sleep. The only difference is that they do not come to the threshold of consciousness. Thus, dreams are to the sleeping state what visions and hallucinations are to the waking state, and like them have their ground in a distorted image-making function. While the source of the materials and the excitant may not be the same in each case, yet functionally they are the same.

The stimuli of dreams may be of two kinds. First, they may be physical and objective, or they may be due to suggestions and the association of ideas. They may be due to some physical disorder, such as imperfect digestion or circulation, improper ventilation or heating, or an uncomfortable position. Since by the very nature of the case dreams do not occur in a conscious state, the real cause cannot easily be discoverable and then only after the subject is entirely awakened through the effects of it.

They may also be due to the association of ideas. Suggestion plays a large part. The vividness and recency of a conscious impression during the waking state may be thrown up from the subconscious region during the sleeping hours. The usual distorted aspect of dreams is doubtless due to the uncoupling of groups of ideas through the uncoupling of the cortical association areas, some of them being less susceptible than others to the existing stimulus.

The materials of dreams need not be recent; they may have been furnished by the conscious processes a long time before, but are brought to the threshold only by means of some train of ideas during a semi-conscious state. It is interesting to note that while time and space seem quite real in dreams, the amount covered in a single dream may occupy but a moment of time for the dreamer.

2. History of Belief in Dreams:

Dreams have always played an important part in the literature and religion of all peoples. They have furnished mythologies; they have been the sources of systems of necromancy; they have become both the source and the explanation of otherwise inexplicable acts of Providence. Growing out of them we have a theory of nightmares and demonology. They have become the working material of the prophet both Biblical and pagan. Medieval civilization is not without its lasting effects of dreams, and modern civilization still clings with something of reverence to the unsolved mystery of certain dreams. While we have almost emerged from anything like a slavish adherence to a superstitious belief in dreams, we must still admit the possibility of the profound significance of dreams in the impressions they make upon the subject.

3. Dreams in the Old Testament:

The Bible, contrary to a notion perhaps too commonly held, attaches relatively little religious significance to dreams. Occasionally, however, reference is made to communications from God through dreams (Ge 20:6; 1Ki 3:5; Mt 1:20; 2:12,13,19,22). It recognizes their human relations more frequently. In the Old Testament literature, dreams play but little part except in the books of Genesis and Daniel, in which there are abundant references to them. For their moral bearings the most important ones perhaps are those referred to in Ge 37:5-10. An uncritical attitude will give to them a lifeless and mechanical interpretation. A sympathetic and rational explanation gives them beauty, naturalness and significance. Joseph was the youngest and most beloved son of Jacob. He was just in the prime of adolescence, the very period of day dreaming. He was perhaps inordinately ambitious. This was doubtless heightened by the attentions of a doting father. The most natural dream would be that suggested by his usual waking state, which was one of ambition and perhaps unhealthy rivalry (see ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 6). The

source of Pharaoh's dreams and his solicitude are likewise capable of interpretation on somewhat natural grounds (Ge 41:7-32). The significance of them was given by Joseph.

Another illustration of the psychological exposition preceding is the dream of Solomon (1Ki 3:5,11-15). In this narrative, after Solomon had done what pleased Yahweh and had offered a most humble prayer on an occasion which to him was a great crisis and at the same time a moment of great ecstasy in his life, he doubtless experiences a feeling of sweet peace in consequence of it. His sleep would naturally be somewhat disturbed by the excitement of the day. The dream was suggested by the associations and naturally enough was the approving voice of Yahweh.

Dreaming and the prophetic function seem to have been closely associated (De 13:1,3,1). Whether from a coldly mechanical and superstitious, a miraculous, or a perfectly natural point of view, this relation is consistent. The prophet must be a seer, a man of visions and ideals. As such he would be subject, as in his waking states, so in his sleeping states, to extraordinary experiences. The remarkable dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, who stands out as an exceptional example, afford an illustration of what may be styled a disturbed personality (Da 2:3-45; 4:5-19). The effort made by the magicians, the enchanters, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers, according to the best skill of the Orientals, was unavailing. Daniel, whether by extraordinary intellectual insight or by Divine communication, was able by his interpretation and its moral to set before the king a powerful lesson.

The New Testament gives still less place and importance to dreams than the Old Testament. There are only six references and one citation to dreams or dreamers. It is significant that all these references are by Mt, and still more significant that Jesus nowhere refers to dreams, evidently attaching little if any importance to them. The references in Matthew are confined entirely to warnings and announcements (Mt 1:20; 2:12,13,19,22; 27:19). Once a citation (Ac 2:17) is used for illustrative purposes (compare Joe 2:28). See also \AUGURY, IV, 5; DIVINATION, VI, 1, l(b); MAGIC; REVELATION.

Whether God communicates directly or indirectly by dreams is still unsettled. With our present knowledge of spirit communication it would not seem unreasonable to assume that He may reveal Himself directly; and yet on the other hand the safest and perhaps surest explanation for our own day and experience is that in dream states the mind is more impressionable and responsive to natural causes through which God speaks and operates. That dreams have been and are valuable means of shaping men's thoughts and careers cannot be denied, and as such, have played an important part in the social and moral life of individuals and of society. A valuable modern illustration of this is the dream of Adoniram Judson Gordon (see How Christ Came to Church), through the influence of which his entire religious life and that of his church were completely transformed.

LITERATURE.

Judd, Psychology; Cutten, The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity; Ladd, Philosophy of Knowledge; Baldwin, Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology; Ellis, The World of Dreams (Houghton, Mifflin Co.).

Walter G. Clippinger

DREDGE

drej: A mixture of oats and barley (Job 24:6 the King James Version margin; the King James Version "corn"; the Revised Version (British and American) "provender"). The Hebrew word is belil, usually "mixed grain," ZDMG, XLVIII, 236: grain not ground and boiled in water. Compare Job 6:5; Isa 30:24.

DREGS

dregs: The "sediments," "lees," "grounds of liquor"; only in plural. In the King James Version it stands for:

(1) Hebrew qubba‘ath, "bowl," "chalice," found only in Isa 51:17,22: "the dregs of the cup of trembling"; "the dregs of the cup of my fury." the Revised Version (British and American) correctly changes "dregs" into "bowl."

(2) Hebrew shemarim, "sediments" or "dregs," especially lees of wine. "The dregs thereof, all the wicked of the earth shall wring (the American Standard Revised Version "drain") them out and drink them" (Ps 75:8), i.e. God gives to the wicked the cup of wrathful judgment, which they must drink to the last drop.

DRESS

In the Hebrew and Greek there is a wonderful wealth of terminology having to do with the general subject of dress among the ancient Orientals. This is reflected in the numerous synonyms for "dress" to be found in English Versions of the Bible, "apparel," "attire," "clothes," "raiment," "garments," etc. But the words used in the originals are often greatly obscured through the inconsistent variations of the translators. Besides there are few indications even in the original Hebrew or Greek of the exact shape or specific materials of the various articles of dress named, and so their identification is made doubly difficult. In dealing with the subject, therefore, the most reliable sources of information, apart from the meaning of the terms used in characterization, are certain well-known facts about the costumes and dress-customs of the orthodox Jews, and others about the forms of dress worn today by the people of simple life and primitive habits in modern Palestine. Thanks to the ultraconservatism and unchanging usages of the nearer East, this is no mean help. In the endeavor to discover, distinguish and deal with the various oriental garments, then, we will consider:

1. The Meaning of Terms;

2. The Materials;

3. The Outer Garments;

4. The Inner Garments;

5. The Headdress;

6. The Foot-gear;

7. The Dress of Jesus and His Disciples.

1. Meaning of Terms:

There was originally a sharp distinction between classical and oriental costume, but this was palpably lessened under the cosmopolitanism of the Roman Empire. This of course had its effect both in the modification of the fashions of the day and upon the words used for articles of clothing in the New Testament.

(1) The terms most used for clothes in general were, in the Old Testament, cadhin, simlah, salmah, and in the New Testament himation (Mt 21:7; 24:18; 26:65; Lu 8:27) and enduma (Mt 22:11 f; compare Mt 7:15), plural, though the oldest and most widely distributed article of human apparel was probably the "loin-cloth" (Hebrew ‘ezor), entirely different from "girdle" (Greek zone). Biblical references for clothes are nearly all to the costume of the males, owing doubtless to the fact that the garments ordinarily used indoors were worn alike by men and women.

(2) The three normal body garments, the ones most mentioned in the Scriptures, are cadjin, a rather long "under garment" provided with sleeves; kethoneth (Greek chiton), a long-sleeved tunic worn over the cadhin, likewise a shirt with sleeves (see Masterman, DCG, article "Dress"); and simlah (Greek himation), the cloak of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), used in the plural for "garments" in general; and the "girdle" (Greek zone; Arabic zunnar). The "headdress" (two types are now in use, the "turban" and the "kufiyeh") is never definitely named in the Bible, though we know it was the universal custom among ancient Orientals to cover the head.

(3) The simlah (Greek himation) signifies an "outer garment" (see below), a "mantle," or "cloak" (see lexicons). A kindred word in the Greek himatismos, (translated "raiment" in Lu 9:29, "garments" in Mt 27:35, and "vesture" in Joh 19:24) stands in antithesis to himation. The Greek chiton, Hebrew kethoneth, the "under garment," is translated "coat" in Mt 5:40, "clothes" in Mr 14:63. The Hebrew word me‘il, Greek stole, Latin stola, stands for a variety of garment used only by men of rank or of the priestly order, rendered the Revised Version (British and American) "robe." It stands for the long garments of the scribes rendered "long robes" (Mr 12:38; Lu 20:46) and "best robe" in the story of the Prodigal Son (Lu 15:22). (For difference between me‘il and simlah, see Kennedy, one-vol HDB, 197.) Oriental influences led to the adoption of the long tunic in Rome, and in Cicero’s time it was a mark of effeminacy. It came to be known in its white form as tunica alba, or "white tunic," afterward in English "alb."

Other New Testament terms are porphuran, the "purple" (Lu 16:19); the purple robe of Jesus is called himation in Joh 19:2; lention, "the towel" with which Jesus girded himself (13:4,5); then othonion, "linen cloth" (Lu 24:12; Joh 19:40); sindon, "linen cloth" (Mt 27:59); and bussos, "fine linen" (Lu 16:19).

The primitive "aprons" of Ge 3:7, made of "sewed fig-leaves," were quite different from the "aprons" brought to the apostles in Ac 19:12. The latter were of a species known among the Romans as semicinctium, a short "waist-cloth" worn especially by slaves (Rich, Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq.).

2. The Materials:

Anthropology, Scripture and archaeology all witness to the use by primitive man of skins of animals as dress material (Ge 3:21, "coats of skin"; compare Heb 11:37, "went about in sheepskins, in goatskins").

Even today the traveler will occasionally see in Palestine a shepherd clad in "a coat of skin." Then, as now, goat's hair and camel's hair supplied the materials for the coarser fabrics of the poor. John the Baptist had his raiment, enduma, of camel's hair (literally, "of camel's hairs," Mt 3:4). This was a coarse cloth made by weaving camel's hairs. There is no evidence that coats of camel's skin, like those made of goat's skin or sheep's skin have ever been worn in the East, as imagined by painters (see Meyer, Bleek, Weiss and Broadus; but compare HDB, article "Camel"). The favorite materials, however, in Palestine, as throughout the Orient, in ancient times, were wool (see Pr 27:26, "The lambs are for thy clothing") and flax (see Pr 31:13, where it is said of the ideal woman of King Lemuel, "She seeketh wool and flax, and worketh willingly with her hands"). The finest quality of ancient "linen" seems to have been the product of Egypt (see LINEN). The "silk" of Pr 31:22 the King James Version is really "fine linen," as in the Revised Version (British and American). The first certain mention of "silk" in the Bible, it is now conceded, is in Re 18:12, as the word rendered "silk" in Eze 16:10,13 is of doubtful meaning.

3. The Outer Garments:

(1) We may well begin here with the familiar saying of Jesus for a basal distinction: "If any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat (Greek chiton), let him have thy cloak (himation) also" (Mt 5:40). Here the "coat" (Hebrew kethoneth) was the ordinary "inner garment" worn by the Jew of the day, in which he did the work of the day (see Mt 24:18; Mr 13:16). It resembled the Roman "tunic," corresponding most nearly to our "long shirt," reaching below the knees always, and, in case it was designed for dress occasions, reaching almost to the ground. Sometimes "two coats" were worn (Lu 3:11; compare Mt 10:10; Mr 6:9), but in general only one. It was this garment of Jesus that is said by John (Joh 19:23) to have been "without seam, woven from the top throughout."

(2) The word himation, here rendered "cloak," denotes the well-known "outer garment" of the Jews (see Mt 9:20,21; 14:36; 21:7,8; but compare also Mt 9:16; 17:2; 24:18; 26:65; 27:31,35). It appears in some cases to have been a loose robe, but in most others, certainly, it was a large square piece of cloth, like a

modern shawl, which could be wrapped around the person, with more or less taste and comfort. Now these two, with the "girdle" (a necessary and almost universal article of oriental dress), were commonly all the garments worn by the ordinary man of the Orient. The "outer garment" was frequently used by the poor and by the traveler as his only covering at night, just as shawls are used among us now.

(3) The common Hebrew name for this "outer garment" in the Old Testament is as above, simlah or salmah. In most cases it was of "wool," though sometimes of "linen," and was as a rule certainly the counterpart of the himation of the Greek (this is its name throughout the New Testament). It answered, too, to the pallium of the Romans. It belonged, like them, not to the endumata, or garments "put on," but to the periblemata, or garments "wrapped, around" the body. It was concerning this "cloak" that the Law of Moses provided that, if it were taken in pawn, it should be returned before sunset—"for that is his only covering, it is his raiment for his skin: wherein shall he sleep? .... for I am gracious" (Ex 22:27). The Jewish tribunals would naturally, therefore, allow the "inner garment" to be taken by legal process, rather than the outer one (Mt 5:40; Lu 6:29); but Jesus virtually teaches that rather than have difficulty or indulge animosity one would better yield one's rights in this, as in other matters; compare 1Co 6:7.

Some identify the simlah of the ancient Hebrews with modern aba, the coarse blouse or overcoat worn today by the Syrian peasant (Nowack, Benzinger, Mackie in HDB); but the distinction between these two garments of the Jews, so clearly made in the New Testament, seems to confirm the conclusion otherwise reached, that this Jewish "outer garment" closely resembled, if it was not identical with, the himation of the Greeks (see Jew Encyclopedia, article "Cloke" and 1-vol HDB, "Dress," 197; but compare Masterman, DCG, article "Dress," 499, and Dearmer, DCG, article "Cloke"). In no respect has the variety of renderings in our English Versions of the Bible done more to conceal from English readers the meaning of the original than in the case of this word simlah. For instance it is the "garment" with which Noah's nakedness was covered (Ge 9:23); the "clothes" in which the Hebrews bound up, their kneading-troughs (Ex 12:34); the "garment" of Gideon in Jud 8:25; the "raiment" of Ru (3:3); just as the himation of the New Testament is the "cloak" of Mt 5:40, the "clothes" of Mt 24:18 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "cloak"), the "garment" (Mr 13:16 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "cloak").

4. The Under Garments:

(1) In considering the under garments, contrary to the impression made by English Versions of the Bible, we must begin with the "loin-cloth" (Hebrew ‘ezor), which unlike the "girdle" (see GIRDLE), was always worn next to the skin. The figurative use made of it in Isa 11:5, and Jer 13:11, e. g. will be lost unless this is remembered. Often it was the only "under garment," as with certain of the prophets (Elijah, 2Ki 1:8; compare John the Baptist, Mt 3:4; Isa 20:2, Jer 13:1 ff). In later times it was displaced among the Hebrews by the "shirt" or "tunic" (see TUNIC). The universal "sign of mourning" was the girding of the waist with an ‘ezor or "hair-cloth" (English Versions, "sack-cloth"). A "loincloth" of "linen" was worn by the priests of early times and bore the special name of ‘ephodh (1Sa 2:18; compare 2Sa 6:14 ff).

(2) The ordinary "under garment," later worn by all classes—certain special occasions and individuals being exceptions—was the "shirt" (Hebrew kethoneth) which, as we have seen, reappears as chiton in Greek, and tunica in Latin It is uniformly rendered "coat" in English Versions of the Bible, except that the Revised Version, margin has "tunic" in Joh 19:23. The well-known piece of Assyrian sculpture, representing the siege and capture of Lachish by Sennacherib, shows the Jewish captives, male and female, dressed in a moderately tight garment, fitting close to the neck (compare Job 30:18) and reaching almost to the ankles; which must represent the kethoneth, or kuttoneth of the period, as worn in towns at least. Probably the kuttoneth of the peasantry was both looser and shorter, resembling more the modern kamis of the Syrian fellah (compare Latin camisa, and English "chemise").

(3) As regards sleeves, they are not expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, but the Lachish tunics mentioned above have short sleeves, reaching half-way to the elbows. This probably represents the prevailing type of sleeve among the Hebrews of the earlier period. An early Egyptian picture of a group of Semitic traders (circa 2000 BC) shows a colored tunic without sleeves, which, fastened on the left shoulder, left the right bare. Another variety of sleeves, restricted to the upper and wealthy classes, had long and wide sleeves reaching to the ground. This was the tunic worn by Tamar, the royal princess (2Sa 13:18, "A garment of divers colors upon her; for with such robes were the king’s daughters that were virgins appareled"), "the tunic of (i.e. reaching to) palms and soles" worn by Joseph, familiarly known as the "coat of many colors" (Ge 37:3), a rendering which represents now an abandoned tradition (compare Kennedy, HDB). The long white linen tunic, which was the chief garment of the ordinary Jewish priest of the later period, had sleeves, which, for special reasons, were tied to the arms (compare Josephus, Ant., III, vii, 2).

(4) Ultimately it became usual, even with the people of the lower ranks, to wear an under "tunic," or "real shirt" (Josephus, Ant., XVII, vi, 7; Mishna, passim, where it is called chaluq). In this case the upper tunic, the kuttoneth proper, would be removed at night (compare So 5:3, "I have put off my garment").

The material for the tunic might be either

(1) woven on the loom in two pieces, and afterward put together without cutting (compare Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq., article "Tunica"), or

(2) the garment might be woven whole on a special loom, "without seam," i.e. so as to require no sewing, as we know from the description given in Joh 19:23, and from other sources, was the chiton worn by our Lord just before His crucifixion. The garments intended by the Hebrew (Da 3:21-27), rendered "coats" the King James Version, have not been certainly made out. The King James Version margin has "mantles" the English Revised Version "hosen" the American Standard Revised Version "breeches" (see HOSEN). For "coat of mail" (1Sa 17:5) see ARMOR.

5. The Headdress:

When the Hebrews first emerged into view, they seem to have had no covering for the head except on

special demand, as in case of war, when a leather-helmet was worn (see ARMOR). Ordinarily, as with the fellah of Palestine today, a rope or cord served as a fillet (compare 1Ki 20:32, and Virgil, Aeneid (Dryden), iv.213: "A golden fillet binds his awful brows"). Such "fillets" may be seen surviving in the representation of Syrians on the monuments of Egypt. Naturally, in the course of time, exposure to the Syrian sun in the tropical summer time would compel recourse to some such covering as the modern kufiyeh, which lets in the breeze, but protects in a graceful, easy way, the head, the neck and the shoulders. The headgear of Ben- hadad's tribute carriers (see above) resembles the Phrygian cap.

The head covering, however, which is best attested, at least for the upper ranks of both sexes, is the turban (Hebrew tsaniph, from a root meaning to "wind round"). It is the ladies' "hood" of Isa 3:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "turban"; the "royal diadem" of Isa 62:3, and the "mitre" of Zec 3:5, the Revised Version, margin "turban" or "diadem." Ezekiel's description of a lady's headdress: "I bound thee with attire of fine linen" (Eze 16:10 margin), points to a turban. For the egg-shaped turban of the priests see BONNET (the Revised Version (British and American) "head-tires"). The hats of Da 3:21 (the Revised Version (British and American) "mantles") are thought by some to have been the conical Babylonian headdress seen on the monuments. According to 2 Macc 4:12 the Revised Version (British and American) the young Jewish nobles were compelled by Antiochus Epiphanes to wear the petasos, the low, broad-brimmed hat associated with Hermes. Other forms of headdress were in use in New Testament times, as we learn from the Mishna, as well as from the New Testament, e. g. the suddar (soudarion) from Latin sudarium (a cloth for wiping off perspiration, sudor) which is probably the "napkin" of Joh 11:44; 20:7, although there it appears as a kerchief, or covering, for the head. The female captives from Lachish (see above) wear over their tunics an upper garment, which covers the forehead and falls down over the shoulders to the ankles. Whether this is the garment intended by the Hebrew in Ru 3:15, rendered "vail" by the King James Version and "mantle" by the Revised Version (British and American), and "kerchiefs for the head" (Eze 13:18 the Revised Version (British and American)), we cannot say. The "veil" with which Rebekah and Tamar "covered themselves" (Ge 24:65; 38:14) was most likely a large "mantle" in which the whole body could be wrapped, like the cadhin (see above). But it seems impossible to draw a clear distinction between "mantle" and "veil" in the Old Testament (Kennedy). The case of Moses (Ex 34:33) gives us the only express mention of a "face-veil."

6. Footgear:

The ancient Hebrews, like Orientals in general, went barefoot within doors. Out of doors they usually wore sandals, less frequently shoes. The simplest form of sandal then, as now, consisted of a sole of untanned leather, bound to the foot by a leather thong, the shoe-latchet of Ge 14:23 and the latchet of Mr 1:7, etc. In the obelisk of Shalmaneser, however, Jehu's attendants are distinguished by shoes completely covering the feet, from the Assyrians, who are represented as wearing sandals fitted with a heel-cap. Ladies of Ezekiel's day wore shoes of "sealskin" (Eze 16:10 the Revised Version (British and American)). The soldiers' "laced boot" may be intended in Isa 9:5 (the Revised Version (British and American), margin). Then, as now, on entering the house of a friend, or a sacred precinct (Ex 3:5; Jos 5:15), or in case of mourning (2Sa 15:30), the sandals, or shoes, were removed. The priests performed their offices in the Temple in bare feet (compare the modern requirement on entering a mosque).

7. The Dress of Jesus and His Disciples:

In general we may say that the clothes worn by Christ and His disciples were of the simplest and least sumptuous kinds. A special interest must attach even to the clothes that Jesus wore. These consisted, it seems quite certain, not of just five separate articles (see Edersheim, LTJM, I, 625), but of six. In His day it had become customary to wear a linen shirt (chaluq) beneath the tunic (see above). That our Lord wore such a "shirt" seems clear from the mention of the laying aside of the upper garments (himatia, plural), i.e. the "mantle" and the "tunic," before washing His disciples' feet (Joh 13:4). The tunic proper worn by Him, as we have seen, was "woven without seam" throughout, and was of the kind, therefore, that fitted closely about the neck, and had short sleeves. Above the tunic would naturally be the linen girdle, wound several times about the waist. On His feet were leather sandals (Mt 3:11). His upper garment was of the customary sort and shape, probably of white woolen cloth, as is suggested by the details of the account of the Transfiguration (Mr 9:3), with the four prescribed "tassels" at the corners. As to His headdress, we have no description of it, but we may set it down as certain that no Jewish teacher of that day would appear in public with the head uncovered. He probably wore the customary white linen "napkin" (sudarium), wound round the head as a turban, with the ends of it falling down over the neck. The dress of His disciples was, probably, not materially different.

In conclusion it may be said that, although the dress of even orthodox Jews today is as various as their lands of residence and their languages, yet there are two garments worn by them the world over, the Tallith and the 'arba' kanephoth (see DCG, article "Dress," col. 1). Jews who affect special sanctity, especially those living in the Holy Land, still wear the Tallith all day, as was the common custom in Christ's time. As the earliest mention of the 'arba' kanephoth is in 1350 AD, it is clear that it cannot have existed in New Testament times.

LITERATURE.

Nowack's and Benzinger's Hebrew Archaologie; Tristram, Eastern Customs in Bible Lands; Rich, Dict. of Roman and Greek Antiq.; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 625, and elsewhere; articles on "Dress," "Clothing," "Costumes," etc., HDB, DCG, Jew Encyclopedia (by Noldeke) in Encyclopedia Biblica (by Abrahams and Cook); Masterman, "Dress and Personal Adornment in Mod. Palestine," in Biblical World, 1902, etc.

George B. Eager

DRINK

See FOOD; DRINK, STRONG.

DRINK OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

DRINK, STRONG

(shekhar; sikera; from shakhar, "to be or become drunk"; probably from the same root as sugar, saccharine): With the exception of Nu 28:7, "strong drink" is always coupled with "wine." The two terms are commonly used as mutually exclusive, and as together exhaustive of all kinds of intoxicants.

Originally shekhar seems to have been a general term for intoxicating drinks of all kinds, without reference to the material out of which they were made; and in that sense, it would include wine. Reminiscences of this older usage may be found in Nu 28:7 (where shekhar is clearly equivalent to wine, as may be seen by comparing it with 28:14, and with Ex 29:40, where the material of the drink offering is expressly designated "wine").

When the Hebrews were living a nomadic life, before their settlement in Canaan, the grape-wine was practically unknown to them, and there would be no need of a special term to describe it. But when they settled down to an agricultural life, and came to cultivate the vine, it would become necessary to distinguish it from the older kinds of intoxicants; hence, the borrowed word yayin ("wine") was applied to the former, while the latter would be classed together under the old term shekhar, which would then come to mean all intoxicating beverages other than wine (Le 10:9; Nu 6:3; De 14:26; Pr 20:1; Isa 24:9). The exact nature of these drinks is not clearly indicated in the Bible itself. The only fermented beverage other than grape-wine specifically named is pomegranate-wine (So 8:2: "the juice of my pomegranate," the Revised Version, margin "sweet wine of my pomegranate"); but we may infer that other kinds of shekhar besides that obtained from pomegranates were in use, such as drinks made from dates, honey, raisins, barley, apples, etc. Probably Jerome (circa 400 AD) was near the mark when he wrote, "Sikera in the Hebrew tongue means every kind of drink which can intoxicate, whether made from grain or from the juice of apples, or when honeycombs are boiled down into a sweet and strange drink, or the fruit of palm oppressed into liquor, and when water is colored and thickened from boiled herbs" (Ep. ad Nepotianum). Thus shekhar is a comprehensive term for all kinds of fermented drinks, excluding wine.

Probably the most common sort of shekhar used in Biblical times was palm or date-wine. This is not actually mentioned in the Bible, and we do not meet with its Hebrew name yen temarim ("wine of dates") until the Talmudic period. But it is frequently referred to in the Assyrian-Babylonian contract tablets (cuneiform), and from this and other evidence we infer that it was very well known among the ancient Semitic peoples. Moreover, it is known that the palm tree flourished abundantly in Biblical lands, and the presumption is therefore very strong that wine made of the juice of dates was a common beverage. It must not be supposed, however, that the term shekhar refers exclusively to date-wine. It rather designates all intoxicating liquors other than grape-wine, while in few cases it probably includes even wine.

There can be no doubt that shekhar was intoxicating. This is proved

(1) from the etymology of the word, it being derived from shakhar, "to be or become drunk" (Ge 9:21; Isa 29:9; Jer 25:27, etc.); compare the word for drunkard (shikkar), and for drunkenness (shikkaron) from the same root;

(2) from descriptions of its effects: e. g. Isaiah graphically describes the stupefying effect of shekhar on those who drink it excessively (Isa 28:7,8).

Hannah defended herself against the charge of being drunk by saying, "I have drunk neither wine nor strong drink," i.e. neither wine nor any other intoxicating liquor (1Sa 1:15). The attempt made to prove that it was simply the unfermented juice of certain fruits is quite without foundation. Its immoderate use is strongly condemned (Isa 5:11,12; Pr 20:1; see DRUNKENNESS). It was forbidden to ministering priests (Le 10:9), and to Nazirites (Nu 6:3; Jud 13:4,7,14; compare Lu 1:15), but was used in the sacrificial meal as drink offering (Nu 28:7), and could be bought with the tithe-money and consumed by the worshipper in the temple (De 14:26). It is commended to the weak and perishing as a means of deadening their pain; but not to princes, lest it might lead them to pervert justice (Pr 31:4-7).

D. Miall Edwards

DROMEDARY

drum’-e-da-ri, drom’-e-da-ri. See CAMEL.

DROP, DROPPING

"To drop" expresses a "distilling" or "dripping" of a fluid (Jud 5:4; Pr 3:20; So 5:5,13; Joe 3:18; Am 9:13; compare 1Sa 14:26, "the honey dropped" (margin "a stream of honey")); Job 29:22 and Isa 45:8 read "distil" (the King James Version "drop"). The continuous "droppings" of rain through a leaking roof (roofs were usually made of clay in Palestine, and always liable to cracks and leakage) on a "very rainy day" is compared to a contentious wife (Pr 19:13; 27:15); "What is described is the irritating, unceasing, sound of the fall, drop after drop, of water through the chinks in the roof" (Plumptre, in the place cited); compare also the King James Version Ec 10:18 (the Revised Version (British and American) "leaketh").

DROPSY

drop’-si (hudropikos, "a man afflicted with hudrops or dropsy"): Both forms of this disease occur in Palestine, that in which the limbs and body are distended with water called anasarca, depending generally on cardiac or renal disease, and the form confined to the abdomen, usually the result of liver infection. The latter is the commoner, as liver disease is a frequent result of recurrent attacks of malarial fever. The man was evidently able to move about, as he had entered into the Pharisee’s house (Lu 14:2).

DROSS

dros (sigh): The refuse of smelting of precious metal (Pr 25:4; 26:23); used figuratively of what is base or worthless (Isa 1:22,25; Eze 22:18,19; Ps 119:119).

DROUGHT

drout. See FAMINE.

DROVE

drov. See CATTLE.

DROWNING

droun'-ing. See PUNISHMENTS.

DRUM

drum (tumpanon): This was the Hebrew toph, "tabret" or "timbrel," a hand-drum, consisting of a ring of wood or metal covered with a tightly drawn skin, with small pieces of metal hung around the rim, like a tambourine. It was raised in the one hand and struck with the other, usually by women, but sometimes also by men, at festivities and on occasions of rejoicing. See 1 Macc 9:39, the Revised Version (British and American) "timbrels."

DRUNKENNESS drunk'-'-n-nes (raweh, shikkaron, shethi; methe):

I. Its Prevalance.

The Bible affords ample proof that excessive drinking of intoxicants was a common vice among the Hebrews, as among other ancient peoples. This is evident not only from individual cases of intoxication, as Noah (Ge 9:21), Lot (Ge 19:33,15), Nabal (1Sa 25:36), Uriah made drunk by David (2Sa 11:13), Amnon (2Sa 13:28), Elah, king of Israel (1Ki 16:9), Benhadad, king of Syria, and his confederates (1Ki 20:16), Holofernes (Judith 13:2), etc., but also from frequent references to drunkenness as a great social evil. Thus, Amos proclaims judgment on the voluptuous and dissolute rulers of Samaria "that drink wine in (large) bowls" (Am 6:6), and the wealthy ladies who press their husbands to join them in a carousal (Am 4:1); he also complains that this form of self-indulgence was practiced even at the expense of the poor and under the guise of religion, at the sacrificial meals (Am 2:8; see also Isa 5:11,12,22; 28:1-8; 56:11 f). Its prevalence is also reflected in many passages in the New Testament (e. g. Mt 24:49; Lu 21:34; Ac 2:13,15; Eph 5:18; 1Th 5:7). Paul complains that at Corinth even the love- feast of the Christian church which immediately preceded the celebration of the Eucharist, was sometimes the scene of excessive drinking (1Co 11:21). It must, however, be noted that it is almost invariably the well-to-do

who are charged with this vice in the Bible. There is no evidence to prove that it prevailed to any considerable extent among the common people. Intoxicants were then an expensive luxury, beyond the reach of the poorer classes. See DRINK, STRONG.

II. Its Symptoms and Effects.

These are most vividly portrayed:

(1) some of its physical symptoms (Job 12:25; Ps 107:27; Pr 23:29; Isa 19:14; 28:8; 29:9; Jer 25:16);

(2) its mental effects: exhilaration (Ge 43:34), jollity and mirth (1 Esdras 3:20), forgetfulness (1 Esdras 3:20), loss of understanding and balance of judgment (Isa 28:7; Ho 4:11);

(3) its effects on man’s happiness and prosperity: its immediate effect is to make one oblivious of his misery; but ultimately it "biteth like a serpent, and stingeth like an adder," and leads to woe and sorrow (Pr 23:29-32) and to poverty (Pr 23:21; compare Pr 21:17; Ecclesiasticus 19:1); hence, wine is called a "mocker" deceiving the unwise (Pr 20:1);

(4) its moral and spiritual effects: it leads to a maladministration of justice (Pr 31:5; Isa 5:23), provokes anger and a contentious, brawling spirit (Pr 20:1; 23:29; 1 Esdras 3:22; Ecclesiasticus 31:26,29 f), and conduces to a profligate life (Eph 5:18; "riot," literally, profligacy). It is allied with gambling and licentiousness (Joe 3:3), and indecency (Ge 9:21 f). Above all, it deadens the spiritual sensibilities, produces a callous indifference to religious influences and destroys all serious thought (Isa 5:12).

III. Attitude of the Bible to the Drink Question.

Intemperance is condemned in uncompromising terms by the Old Testament and the New Testament, as well as by the semi- canonical writings. While total abstinence is not prescribed as a formal and universal rule, broad principles are laid down, especially in the New Testament, which point in that direction.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament, intemperance is most repugnant to the stern ethical rigorism of the prophets, as well as to the more utilitarian sense of propriety of the "wisdom" writers. As might be expected, the national conscience was but gradually quickened to the evil of immoderate drinking. In the narratives of primitive times, excessive indulgence, or at least indulgence to the point of exhilaration, is mentioned without censure as a natural thing, especially on festive occasions (as in Ge 43:34 the Revised Version, margin). But a conscience more sensitive to the sinfulness of overindulgence was gradually developed, and is reflected in the denunciations of the prophets and the warning of the wise men (compare references under I and II, especially Isa 5:11 f, Isa 22$; 28:1-8; Pr 23:29-33). Nowhere is the principle of total abstinence inculcated as a rule applicable to all. In particular cases it was recognized as a duty.

Priests while on duty in the sanctuary were to abstain from wine and strong drink (Le 10:9; compare Eze 44:21). Nazirites were to abstain from all intoxicants during the period of their vows (Nu 6:3 f; compare Am 2:12), yet not on account of the intoxicating qualities of wine, but because they represented the simplicity of the older pastoral life, as against the Canaanite civilization which the vine symbolized (W. R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, 84 f). So also the Rechabites abstained from wine (Jer 35:6,8,14) and social conveniences, because they regarded the nomadic life as more conducive to Yahweh-worship than agricultural and town life, with its temptations to Baal-worship. In Daniel and his comrades we have another instance of voluntary abstinence (Da 1:8-16). These, however, are isolated instances. Throughout the Old Testament the use of wine appears as practically universal, and its value is recognized as a cheering beverage (Jud 9:13; Ps 104:15; Pr 31:7), which enables the sick to forget their pains (Pr 31:6). Moderation, however, is strongly inculcated and there are frequent warnings against the temptation and perils of the cup.

2. Deutero-Canonical and Extra-Canonical Writings:

In Apocrypha, we have the attitude of prudence and common sense, but the prophetic note of stern denunciation is wanting. The path of wisdom is the golden mean. "Wine is as good as life to men, if thou drink it in its measure; .... wine drunk in season and to satisfy is joy of heart, and gladness of soul: wine drunk largely is bitterness of soul, with provocation and conflict" (Ecclesiasticus 31:27-30 the Revised Version (British and American)). A vivid picture of the effects of wine-drinking is given in 1 Esdras. 3:18-24. Stronger teaching on the subject is given in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs. The use of wine is permitted to him who can use it temperately, but abstinence is enjoined as the wiser course (Testament to the Twelve Patriarchs, Jud 1:16:3).

3. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament, intemperance is treated as a grave sin. Only once, indeed, does our Lord explicitly condemn drunkenness (Lu 21:34), though it is implicitly condemned in other passages (Mt 24:49 = Lu 12:45). The meagerness of the references in our Lord’s teaching is probably due to the fact already mentioned, that it was chiefly prevalent among the wealthy, and not among the poorer classes to whom our Lord mainly ministered. The references in Paul’s writings are very numerous (Ga 5:21; Eph 5:18, et al.). Temperance and sobriety in all things are everywhere insisted on (e. g. Ac 24:25; Ga 5:23; 2Pe 1:6). A bishop and those holding honorable position in the church should not be addicted to wine (1Ti 3:2 f; Tit 1:7 f; 2:2 f). Yet Jesus and His apostles were not ascetics, and the New Testament gives no rough-and-ready prohibition of strong drink on principle. In contrast with John the Baptist, who was a Nazirite from birth (Lu 1:15), Jesus was called by His enemies a "wine-bibber" (Mt 11:19). He took part in festivities in which wine was drunk (Joh 2:10).

There are indications that He regarded wine as a source of innocent enjoyment (Lu 5:38 f; 17:8). To insist on a distinction between intoxicating and unfermented wine is a case of unjustifiable special pleading. It must be borne in mind that the drink question is far more complex and acute in modern than in Biblical times, and that the conditions of the modern world have given rise to problems which were

not within the horizon of New Testament writers. The habit of excessive drinking has spread enormously among the common people, owing largely to the cheapening of alcoholic drinks. The fact that the evil exists today in greater proportions may call for a drastic remedy and a special crusade. But rather than defend total abstinence by a false or forced exegesis, it were better to admit that the principle is not formally laid down in the New Testament, while maintaining that there are broad principles enunciated, which in view of modern conditions should lead to voluntary abstinence from all intoxicants. Such principles may be found, e. g. in our Lord's teaching in Mt 16:24 f; Mr 9:42 f, and in the great Pauline passages—Ro 14:13-21; 1Co 8:8-13.

IV. Drunkenness in Metaphor.

Drunkenness very frequently supplies Biblical writers with striking metaphors and similes. Thus, it symbolizes intellectual or spiritual perplexity (Job 12:25; Isa 19:14; Jer 23:9), bewilderment and helplessness under calamity (Jer 13:13; Eze 23:33). It furnishes a figure for the movements of sailors on board ship in a storm (Ps 107:27), and for the convulsions of the earth on the day of Yahweh (Isa 24:20). Yahweh's "cup of staggering" is a symbol of affliction, the fury of the Lord causing stupor and confusion (Isa 51:17-23; compare Isa 63:6; Jer 25:15 ff; Eze 23:33; Ps 75:8). The sword and the arrow are said to be sodden with drink like a drunkard with wine (De 32:42; Jer 46:10). In the Apocalypse, Babylon (i.e. Rome) is portrayed under the figure of a "great harlot" who makes kings "drunken with the wine of her fornication"; and who is herself "drunken with the blood of the saints, and ... of the martyrs of Jesus" (Re 17:2,6).

D. Miall Edwards

DRUSILLA

droo-sil'-a (Drousilla, or Drousilla): Wife of Felix, a Jewess, who along with her husband "heard (Paul) concerning the faith in Christ Jesus" during Paul's detention in Caesarea (Ac 24:24).

Beta text gives the rendering "Drusilla the wife of Felix, a Jewess, asked to see Paul and to hear the word." The fact that Drusilla was a Jewess explains her curiosity, but Paul, who was probably acquainted with the past history of her and Felix, refused to satisfy their request in the way they desired, and preached to them instead concerning righteousness and self-restraint and the final judgment. At this "Felix was terrified" (Ac 24:25). Beta text states that Paul's being left in bonds on the retirement of Felix was due to the desire of the latter to please Drusilla (compare Ac 24:27). Probably this explanation, besides that of the accepted text, was true also, as Drusilla, who was a member of the ruling house, saw in Paul an enemy of its power, and hated him for his condemnation of her own private sins.

The chief other source of information regarding Drusilla is Josephus. Drusilla was the youngest of the three daughters of Agrippa I, her sisters being Bernice and Mariamne. She was born about 36 AD and was married when 14 years old to Azizus, king of Emeza. Shortly afterward she was induced to desert her husband by Felix, who employed a Cyprian sorcerer, Simon by name, to carry out his purpose. She

was also influenced to take this step by the cruelty of Azizus and the hatred of Bernice who was jealous of her beauty. Her marriage with Felix took place about 54 AD and by him she had one son, Agrippa, who perished under Titus in an eruption of Mt. Vesuvius. The mention by Josephus of "the woman" who perished along with Agrippa (Ant., XX, vii, 2) refers probably not to his mother Drusilla but to his wife.

C. M. Kerr

DUALISM du'-al-iz'-m. See PHILOSOPHY.

DUE

du. See DUTY.

DUKE

duk: The rendering in the King James Version in Ge 36:15 ff; Ex 15:15, and 1Ch 1:51 ff of ‘alluph (the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version, margin "chief"), and in Jos 13:21 of necikhim ("dukes," the Revised Version (British and American) "princes"). It occurs also, as the rendering of strategos, in 1 Macc 10:65 (the Revised Version (British and American) "captain"). Elsewhere necikhim is translated "princes" or "principal men." The fact that with two exceptions the term is applied in English Versions of the Bible only to the chiefs of Edom has led to the impression that in the family of Esau the chiefs bore a special and hereditary title. But ‘alluph was a general term for tribal chief or prince (compare Zec 9:7; 12:5,6; the Revised Version (British and American) "chieftains," the King James Version "governors").

Moreover, at the time the King James Version was made the word "duke" was not used as a title in England: the term had the same general force as dux, the word employed in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) So Sir T. Elyot (died 1546) speaks of "Hannibal, duke of Carthage" (The Governor, II, 233); Shakespeare, Henry V, III, 2, 20, "Be merciful, great duke, to men of mould" (compare Midsummer Night's Dream, I, 1, 21); Sylvester (1591) Du Bartas, "The great Duke, that in dreadful aw upon Mt. Horeb learned the eternal law." In a still earlier age Wycliff uses the word of the Messiah (Mt 2:6); and in Select Works, III, 137, "Jesus Christ, duke of oure batel."

Yet in all probability the Hebrew word was more specific than "chief" or "duke" in the broad sense. For if ‘alluph is derived from ‘eleph, "thousand," "tribe," the term would mean the leader of a clan, a "chiliarch" (compare Septuagint, Zec 9:7; 12:5,6). the American Standard Revised Version has eliminated the word "duke." See CHIEF.

J. R. Van Pelt

DULCIMER

dul’-si-mer. See MUSIC under Nebhel and Sumphonia.

DUMAH

du’-ma (dumah, "silence"): This word occurs in the Old Testament with the following significations:

(1) the land of silence or death, the grave (Ps 94:17; 115:17);

(2) a town in the highlands of Judah between Hebron and Beersheba, now ed-Daume (Jos 15:52);

(3) an emblematical designation of Edom in the obscure oracle (Isa 21:11,12);

(4) an Ishmaelite tribe in Arabia (Ge 25:14; 1Ch 1:30). According to the Arabic geographies this son of Ishmael rounded the town of Dumat-el-Jandal, the stone-built Dumah, so called to distinguish it from another Dumah near the Euphrates. The former now bears the name of the Jauf ("belly"), being a depression situated half-way between the head of the Persian Gulf and the head of the gulf of Akaba. Its people in the time of Mohammed were Christians of the tribe of Kelb. It contained a great well from which the palms and crops were irrigated. It has often been visited by European travelers in recent times. See Jour. Royal Geog. Soc., XXIV (1854), 138-58; W. G. Palgrave, Central and Eastern Arabia, chapter ii. It is possible that the oracle in Isa (number 3 above) concerns this place.

Thomas Hunter Weir

DUMB

dum (alam, ‘illem, literally, "tied in the tongue"; kophos): Used either as expressing the physical condition of speechlessness, generally associated with deafness, or figuratively as meaning the silence produced by the weight of God’s judgments (Ps 39:2-9; Da 10:15) or the oppression of external calamity (Ps 38:13). As an adjective it is used to characterize inefficient teachers destitute of spirituality ("dumb dogs," Isa 56:10). The speechlessness of Saul’s companions (Ac 9:7) was due to fright; that of the man without the wedding garment was because he had no excuse to give (Mt 22:12). Idols are called mute, because helpless and voiceless (Hab 2:18,19; 1Co 12:2). The dumbness of the sheep before the shearer is a token of submission (Isa 53:7; Ac 8:32).

Temporary dumbness was inflicted as a sign upon Ezekiel (3:26; 24:27; 33:22) and as a punishment for unbelief upon Zacharias (Lu 1:22). There are several cases recorded of our Lord’s healing the dumb (Mt 15:30; Mr 7:37; Lu 11:14, etc.). Dumbness is often associated with imbecility and was therefore regarded as due to demoniac possession (Mt 9:32; 12:22). The evangelists therefore describe the healing of these as effected by the casting out of demons.

This is especially noted in the case of the epileptic boy (Mr 9:17). The deaf man with the impediment in

his speech (Mr 7:32) is said to have been cured by loosening the string of his tongue. This does not necessarily mean that he was tongue- tied, which is a condition causing lisping, not stammering; he was probably one of those deaf persons who produce babbling, incoherent and meaningless sounds. I saw in the asylum in Jerusalem a child born blind and deaf, who though dumb, produced inarticulate noises.

In an old 14th-century psalter "dumb" is used as a verb in Ps 39: "I doumbed and meked and was ful stille."

Alexander Macalister

DUNG; DUNG GATE

dung (’ashpoth, domen, peresh; skubalon, etc.): Nine different words occurring in the Hebrew have been translated "dung" in the Old Testament. The word used to designate one of the gates of Jerusalem (’ashpoth, Ne 2:13; 3:14) is more general than the others and may mean any kind of refuse. The gate was probably so named because outside it was the general dump heap of the city. Visitors in recent years riding outside the city walls of Jerusalem, on their way to the Mt. of Olives or Jericho, may have witnessed such a dump against the wall, which has existed for generations.

The first mention made of dung is in connection with sacrificial rites. The sacred law required that the dung, along with what parts of the animal were not burned on the altar, should be burned outside the camp (Ex 29:14; Le 4:11; 8:17; 16:27; Nu 19:5). The fertilizing value of dung was appreciated by the cultivator, as is indicated by Lu 13:8 and possibly Ps 83:10 and Isa 25:10.

Dung was also used as a fuel. Eze 4:12,15 will be understood when it is known that the dung of animals is a common fuel throughout Palestine and Syria, where other fuel is scarce. During the summer, villagers gather the manure of their cattle, horses or camels, mix it with straw, make it into cakes and dry it for use as fuel for cooking, especially in the winter when wood or charcoal or straw are not procurable. It burns slowly like peat and meets the needs of the kitchen. In Mesopotamia the writer saw it being used with forced draft to fire a steam boiler. There was no idea of uncleanness in Ezekiel’s mind, associated with the use of animal dung as fuel (Eze 4:15).

Figuratively: Dung was frequently used figuratively to express the idea

(a) of worthlessness, especially a perishable article for which no one cares (1Ki 14:10; 2Ki 6:25; 9:37; Job 20:7; Ps 83:10; Jer 8:2; 9:22; 16:4; 25:33; Ze 1:17; Php 3:8 (the American Standard Revised Version "refuse")). Dunghill was used in the same way (1Sa 2:8; Ezr 6:11; Ps 113:7; Isa 25:10; Da 2:5; 3:29; Lu 14:35; La 4:5);

(b) as an expression of disgust (2Ki 18:27; Isa 36:12);

(c) of rebuke (Mal 2:3).

James A. Patch

DUNGEON

dun’-jun. See PRISON.

DUNGHILL

dung’-hil (’ashpoth, 1Sa 2:8, madhmenah, etc., with other words; kopria, Lu 14:35): Dung heap, or place of refuse. To sit upon a dunghill (1Sa 2:8; Ps 113:7; La 4:5) is significant of the lowest and most wretched condition. To turn a house into a dunghill (Da 2:5; 3:29), or be flung upon a dunghill (Lu 14:35), marks the extreme of ignominy. See also DUNG.

DURA

du’-ra (dura’): The name of the plain on which Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, set up the great golden image which all his subjects were ordered to worship (Da 3:1). Oppert placed it to the Southeast of Babylon, near a small river and mounds bearing the name of Douair or Duair, where, also, was what seemed to be the base of a great statue (Exped. scientifique en Mesopotamie, I, 238 f). Others have believed that name to indicate a portion of the actual site of Babylon within the great wall (duru) of the city—perhaps the rampart designated dur Su-anna, "the rampart (of the city) Lofty-defense," a name of Babylon.

The fact that the plain was within the city of Babylon precludes an identification with the city Duru, which seems to have lain in the neighborhood of Erech (Hommel, Grundriss, 264, note 5). It is noteworthy that the Septuagint substitutes Deeira, for Dura, suggesting that the Greek translators identified it with the Babylonian Deru, a city which apparently lay toward the Elamite border. It seems to have been called also Dur-ili, "god’s rampart." That it was at some distance is supported by the list WAI, IV, 36 [38], where Duru, Tutul and Gudua (Cuthah), intervene between Deru or Dur-ili and Tindir (Babylon). "The plain of the dur" or "rampart" within Babylon would therefore seem to be the best rendering.

T. G. Pinches

DURE

dur (proskairos): Used for "endure" (which see), the King James Version Mt 13:21 (the Revised Version (British and American) "endureth").

DUST

dust (‘aphar; koniortos, chous): Small particles of earth. The word has several figurative and symbolic meanings:

(1) Dust being the material out of which God is said to have formed man (Ge 2:7), it became a symbol of man’s frailty (Ps 103:14, "For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust"; compare Ge 18:27; Job 4:19, etc.), and of his mortality (Ge 3:19, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return"; compare Job 34:15; Ps 104:29; Ec 3:20; 12:7, etc.) Hence, it is used figuratively for the grave (Ps 22:15,29; 30:9; Da 12:2).

(2) Such actions as to lie in the dust, to lick the dust, to sprinkle dust on the head, are symbols expressive of deep humiliation, abasement or lamentation (e. g. Job 2:12; 42:6, Ps 72:9; Isa 2:10; 47:1; 49:23; La 2:10; 3:29; Eze 27:30; Mic 7:17; Re 18:19). Hence, such expressions as "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust," i.e. out of their state of lowliness (1Sa 2:8; Ps 113:7).

(3) Throwing dust was an act expressive of execration. Thus, Shimei "cursed" David and "threw stones at him, and cast dust," literally, "dusted (him) with dust" (2Sa 16:13). So the crowd which Paul addressed at Jerusalem manifested their wrath against him by tossing about their garments and casting dust into the air (Ac 22:23).

(4) Shaking the dust off one’s feet against anyone (Mt 10:14; Mr 6:11; Lu 9:5; 10:11; Ac 13:51) is symbolic of renunciation, as we would say "washing one’s hands of him," an intimation that all further intercourse was at an end. It was practiced by the Pharisees on passing from Gentileto Jewish soil, it being a rabbinical doctrine that the dust of a heathen land defiles.

(5) It is also used figuratively for an innumerable multitude (e. g. Ge 13:16; 28:14; Job 27:16; Ps 78:27).

(6) The expression "Yahweh will make the rain of thy land powder and dust" (De 28:24) means the dust in consequence of the drought shall fall down instead of rain on the dry ground. In Judea and vicinity during a sirocco, the air becomes filled with sand and dust, which are blown down by the wind with great violence.

D. Miall Edwards

DUTY

du’-ti (dabhar; opheilo):

The word duty occurs only three times in the Old Testament and twice in the New Testament. In the Old Testament it is the translation of dabhar, which, meaning originally "speech," or "word," came to denote any particular "matter" that had to be attended to. In the two places where it is rendered "duty" (2Ch 8:14; Ezr 3:4) the reference is to the performance of the Temple services—praise and sacrifice—and it is

probably from these passages that the phrase "taking duty" in church services is derived. In other passages we have different words employed to denote the priests' dues: the King James Version Le 10:13,14, hok ("statutory portion"); De 18:3, mishpat ("judgment"). In Pr 3:27, we have a reference to duty in the moral sense, "Withhold not good from them to whom it is due," ba'-al (i.e. as in the King James Version margin, "from the owners thereof"). In Ex 21:10 we have the "duty of marriage" ('onah), that which was due to the wife.

In the New Testament "duty" is expressed by opheilo, "to owe," "to be due." In Lu 17:10, we have "Say, ... we have done that which it was our duty to do," and in Ro 15:27 the King James Version, it is said of the Gentiles with reference to the Jewish Christians, "Their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things," the American Standard Revised Version "they owe it." In Mt 18:34 we have "till he should pay all that was due" (opheilo, "owing"), and in 1Co 7:3 the King James Version, "Render unto the wife due opheile benevolence," the American Standard Revised Version "her due." See also ETHICS.

W. L. Walker

DWARF

dworf:

The rendering in English Versions of the Bible of the Hebrew word dak, "thin," "small," in Le 21:20, where a list is given of physical failings which forbade man of the seed of Aaron to officiate at the altar, though he might partake of the sacrificial gifts. The precise meaning of the Hebrew word here is uncertain; elsewhere it is used of the lean kine (Ge 41:3) and blasted ears (verse 23) of Pharaoh's dream; of the grains of manna (Ex 16:14), of the still, small voice (1Ki 19:12), of dust (Isa 29:5), etc. Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) suggest defective eyes; but "withered" would perhaps best express the meaning. See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

F. K. Farr

DWELL

dwel:

(1) In the Old Testament "dwell" is a translation of 9 words, of which by far the most frequent is yashabh, "to sit down," translated "dwell" over 400 times (Ge 4:20; Jos 20:4; 1Ch 17:1,4,5, etc.); also very frequently "sit," and sometimes "abide," "inhabit," "remain." Another word often rendered "dwell" is shakhan or shakhen ("to settle down"), from which is derived the rabbinic word shekhinah (literally, "that which dwells"), the light on the mercy-seat which symbolized the Divine presence (Ex 25:8, etc.). In order to avoid appearing to localize the Divine Being, wherever God is said to "dwell" in a place, the Targum renders that He "causes His Shekinah to dwell" there.

(2) In the New Testament "dwell" most frequently stands for oikeo, or one of its compounds; also skenoo, and (chiefly in the Johannine writings) meno, which, however, is always translated "abide" in the Revised Version (British and American), and generally in the King James Version. Mention may be made of the mystical significance of the word in some New Testament passages, of the indwelling of the Father or of the Godhead in Christ (Joh 14:10; Col 1:19; 2:9), of the believer in Christ (Joh 6:56 the King James Version; Eph 3:17), and in God (1 Joh 4:15 the King James Version; compare Ps 90:1; 91:1), and of the Holy Spirit or God in the believer (Joh 14:17; the King James Version 1Joh 3:24; 4:15 f).

D. Miall Edwards

DYE; DYEING

di, di'-ing (me'oddam, hamuc, tebhul, cebha'):

Four different Hebrew words have been translated "dyed": the King James Version

(a) me'-oddam, found in Ex 25:5; 26:14; 35:7; 36:19; 39:34;

(b) hamuts (the Revised Version, margin "crimsoned") (Isa 63:1);

(c) tebhul (Eze 23:15). Tebhul is probably more correctly rendered "flowing turban" as in the Revised Version (British and American) of the above verses (Brown-Driver-Briggs' Hebrew Lexicon);

(d) gebha', "dyed" is so translated in the American Standard Revised Version of Jud 5:30 (BDB); compare Arabic sabagh.

The above references and other color words mentioned elsewhere (see COLOR) indicate that the Israelites were acquainted with dyed stuffs, even if they themselves did not do the dyeing. An analysis of the various Biblical references shows but four colors which were produced on cloth by dyeing, namely, purple, blue (violet), crimson and scarlet. Of these, purple is the one best known because of the many historical references to it. It was the symbol of royalty and luxury. Because of its high price, due to the expensive method of obtaining it, only royalty and the rich could afford purple attire. One writer tells us that the dyestuff was worth its weight in silver. Probably it was because of its scarcity, and because it was one of the very limited number of dyes known, rather than for any remarkable beauty of color, that the purple was so much sought after. If Pliny's estimate is to be accredited, then "in the dye the smell of it was offensive and the color itself was harsh, of a greenish hue and strongly resembling that of the sea when in a tempestuous state."

1. Purple and Blue:

The purple and blue dyes were extracted from shellfish. The exact process used by the ancients is still a question in spite of the attempts of early writers to describe it. Tyre and Sidon were noted as the suppliers of these colors, hence, the name "Tyrian purple." The inhabitants of these cities were at first simply dealers in the purple (Eze 27:7,24), but they afterward became the manufacturers, as the heaps of the emptied shells of the Murex trunculus, which still exist in the vicinity of these cities, testify. The pigment was secreted by a gland in the lining of the stomach. The shell was punctured and the fish removed in order to secure the dye. The juice, at first whitish, changed on exposure to yellowish or greenish and finally to red, amethyst or purple, according to the treatment. A modified color was obtained by first dipping the textile in a cochineal bath and then in the purple, Tyrian purple was considered most valuable when it was "exactly the color of clotted blood and of a blackish hue" (Pliny). See also LYDIA; thYATIRA.

Besides the shellfish above mentioned, several other species are noted by different writers, namely, Murex branderis, Murex erinaceus, Murex buccinum (purpura haemastoma). This latter species is still used by the dwellers on the shores where it is found. Various species of the murex are found today at Haifa (Syria), about the Greek isles and on the North coast of Africa. The purple color has been produced from them by modern chemists, but it is of historical interest only, in the light of the discovery of modern artificial dyes with which it could not compete commercially.

Two words have been used in the Hebrew Bible to describe the colors from shellfish:

(a) ‘argaman (Greek porphura). This has been translated "purple";

(b) tekheleth which was probably a shade of violet, but has been translated "blue" in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American).

2. Crimson and Scarlet:

As indicated elsewhere (See COLORS), three Hebrew words have been rendered crimson or scarlet:

(a) karmil (compare Arabic kirmiz and English "carmine"),

(b) tola’, and

(c) shani. We know nothing further about the method of producing these colors than that they were both obtained from the kermes insect which feeds on a species of live oak growing in Southern Europe and Turkey in Asia. The modern dyer can obtain several shades from the cochineal insect by varying the mordants or assistants used with the dye. Pliny mentions the same fact as being known by the ancient Egyptians. Some of the Syrian dyers still use the kermes, commonly called dud ("worms"), although most of them hove resorted to the artificial European dyes which they indiscriminately call dud frangy ("foreign worms").

The "rams' skins dyed red" mentioned in Exodus are still made in Syria. After the ram's skin has been tanned in sumac, it is laid out on a table and a solution of the dye, made by boiling dud in water, is rubbed on. After the dye is dry, the skin is rubbed with oil and finally polished. No native product is more characteristic of the country than the slippers, Bedouin shoes, and other leather articles made from "rams' skins dyed red" (see TANNER).

3. Other Dyes Probably Known:

Other dyes probably known were:

(1) Madder.

In Jud 10:1, we read that "after Abimelech there arose to save Israel Tola the son of Puah." These were probably names of clans. In the Hebrew they are also color words. Tola‘ is the scarlet dye and pu'ah, if, as is probable, it is the same as the Arabic fuwah, means "madder." This would add another dyestuff. Until the discovery of alizarin, which is artificial madder, the growing of fuwah was one of the industries of Cyprus and Syria. It was exported to Europe and was also used locally for producing "Turkey red" on cotton and for dyeing dull reds on wool for rug making (see thYATIRA). It was the custom near Damascus for a father to plant new madder field for each son that was born. The field began to yield in time to support the boy and later become his inheritance. Madder is mentioned in the Talmud and by early Latin writers. A Saracenic helmet and a shield of similar origin, in the possession of the writer, are lined with madder-dyed cotton.

(2) Indigo. Another dye has been discovered among the Egyptian mummy cloths, namely, indigo. Indigo blue was used in weaving to form the borders of the cloths. This pigment was probably imported from India.

(3) Yellows and Browns. Yellows and browns of doubtful origin have also been found in the Egyptian tombs. The Jews acquired from the Phoenicians the secret of dyeing, and later held the monopoly in this trade in some districts. A Jewish guild of purple dyers is mentioned on a tombstone in Hieropolis. In the 12th century AD Jews were still dyers and glass workers at Tyre. Akhissar, a Jewish stronghold in Asia Minor, was famous as a dyeing city. See also ATTIRE; DYED ATTIRE.

LITERATURE.

See "Crafts" especially in Wilkinson, Perrot and Chipiez, Jew Encyclopedia, and HDB.

James A. Patch

DYSENTERY

dis’-en-ter-i (dusenteria):

In Ac 28:8 the Revised Version (British and American) uses this word in place of the phrase "bloody flux" of the King James Version to describe the disease by which the father of Publius was affected in Malta at the time of Paul’s shipwreck. The acute form of this disease is often attended with high temperature, hence, Luke speaks of it as "fever and dysentery" (puretois kai dusenteria).

The disease is still occasionally epidemic in Malta where there have been several bad outbreaks among the garrison in the last century, and it has proved to be an intractable and fatal disease there. It is due to parasitic microbe, the Bacillus dysenteriae. In 2Ch 21:19 there is reference to an epidemic of a similar nature in the days of Jehoram. The malady, as predicted by Elisha, attacked the king and assumed a chronic form in the course of which portions of the intestine sloughed. This condition sometimes occurs in the amoebic form of dysentery, cases of which sometimes last over two years.

Alexander Macalister

EAGLE

e’-g’-l (nesher; aetos; Latin aquila): A bird of the genus aquila of the family falconidae.

The Hebrew nesher, meaning "to tear with the beak," is almost invariably translated "eagle," throughout the Bible; yet many of the most important references compel the admission that the bird to which they applied was a vulture.

There were many large birds and carrion eaters flocking over Palestine, attracted by the offal from animals slaughtered for tribal feasts and continuous sacrifice. The eagle family could not be separated from the vultures by their habit of feeding, for they ate the offal from slaughter as well as the vultures. One distinction always holds good. Eagles never flock. They select the tallest trees of the forest, the topmost crag of the mountain, and pairs live in solitude, hunting and feeding singly, whenever possible carrying their prey to the nest so that the young may gain strength and experience by tearing at it and feeding themselves. The vultures are friendly, and collect and feed in flocks. So wherever it is recorded that a "flock came down on a carcass," there may have been an eagle or two in it, but the body of it were vultures. Because they came in such close contact with birds of prey, the natives came nearer dividing them into families than any birds. Of perhaps a half-dozen, they recognized three eagles, they knew three vultures, four or five falcons, and several kites; but almost every Biblical reference is translated "eagle," no matter how evident the text makes it that the bird was a vulture.

For example, Mic 1:16: "Make thee bald, and cut off thy hair for the children of thy delight: enlarge thy baldness as the eagle (m "vulture"); for they are gone into captivity from thee." This is a reference to the custom of shaving the head when in mourning, but as Palestine knew no bald eagle, the text could refer only to the bare head and neck of the griffon vulture. The eagles were, when hunger-driven, birds of prey; the vultures, carrion feeders only. There was a golden eagle (the osprey of the King James Version), not very common, distinguished by its tan-colored head; the imperial eagle, more numerous and easily identified by a dark head and white shoulders; a spotted eagle; a tawny eagle, much more common and readily distinguished by its plumage; and the short-toed eagle, most common of all and especially a bird of prey, as also a small hooded eagle so similar to a vulture that it was easily mistaken for one, save that it was very bold about taking its own food.

The first Biblical reference to the eagle referred to the right bird. Ex 19:4: "Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles’ wings, and brought you unto myself." This "bare you on eagles’ wings" must not be interpreted to mean that an eagle ever carried anything on its back. It merely means that by strength of powerful wing it could carry quite a load with its feet and frequently was seen doing this. Vultures never carried anything; they feasted and regurgitated what they had eaten to their young.

The second reference is found in Le 11:13 and repeated in De 14:12, the lists of abominations. It would seem peculiar that Moses would find it necessary to include eagles in thislist until it is known that Arab mountaineers were eating these birds at that time. The next falls in De 28:49: "Yahweh will bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as the eagle flieth; a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand." This also refers to the true eagle and points out that its power of sustained flight, and the speed it could attain when hastening to its hunger- clamoring young, had been observed. The next reference is in De 32:11: "As an eagle that stirreth up her nest, That fluttereth over her young, He spread abroad his wings, he took them, He bare them on his pinions."

This is good natural history at last. Former versions made these lines read as if the eagle carried its young on its wings, a thing wholly incompatible with flight in any bird. Samuel’s record of the lamentation of David over Saul and Jonathan is a wonderful poetic outburst and contains reference to this homing flight of the eagle (2Sa 1:23). In Job 9:26 the arrow-like downward plunge of the hunger-driven eagle is used in comparison with the flight of time. In Job 39, which contains more good natural history than any other chapter of the Bible, will be found everything concerning the eagle anyone need know:

"Is it at thy command that the eagle mounteth up, And maketh her nest on high? On the cliff she dwelleth, and maketh her

home, Upon the point of the cliff, and the stronghold. From thence she spieth out the prey; Her eyes behold it afar off. Her young ones also suck up blood: And where the slain are, there is she" (Job 39:27-30). Ps 103:5 is a reference to the long life of the eagle. The bird has been known to live to an astonishing age in captivity; under natural conditions, the age it attains can only be guessed.

"Who satisfieth thy desire with good things, So that thy youth is renewed like the eagle." Pr 23:5 compares the flight of wealth with that of an eagle; Pr 30:17 touches on the fact that the eye of prey is the first place attacked in eating, probably because it is the most vulnerable point and so is frequently fed to the young. Pr 30:19: "The way of an eagle in the air; The way of a serpent upon a rock: The way of a ship in the midst of the sea; And the way of a man with a maiden."

This reference to the eagle is to that wonderful power of flight that enables a bird to hang as if frozen in the sky, for long periods appearing to our sight immovable, or to sail and soar directly into the eye of the sun, seeming to rejoice in its strength of flight and to exult in the security and freedom of the upper air. The word "way" is here improperly translated. To the average mind it always means a road, a path. In this instance it should be translated:

The characteristics of an eagle in the air; The habit of a serpent upon the rock; The path of a ship in the midst of the sea; And the manner of a man with a maid. Each of these lines stood a separate marvel to Agur, and had no connection with the others (but compare The Wisdom of Solomon So 5:10,11, and see WAY).

Isa 40:31 is another flight reference. Jer 49:16 refers to the inaccessible heights at which the eagle loves to build and rear its young. Jer 49:22 refers to the eagle’s power of flight. Eze 1:10 recounts a vision of the prophet in which strange living creatures had faces resembling eagles. The same book (17:3) contains the parable of the eagle: "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh: A great eagle with great wings and long pinions, full of feathers, which had divers colors, came unto Lebanon, and took the top of the cedar." Ho 8:1 is another flight reference. Obad 1:4 is almost identical with Jer 49:16. The next reference is that of Micah, and really refers to the griffon vulture (Mic 1:16). In Hab 1:8 the reference is to swift flight. Mt 24:28 undoubtedly refers to vultures. In Re 4:7 the eagle is used as a symbol of strength. In Re 8:13 the bird is represented as speaking: "And I saw, and I heard an eagle (the King James Version "angel"), flying in mid heaven, saying with a great voice, Woe, woe, woe, for them that dwell on the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, who are yet to sound." The eagle makes its last appearance in the vision of the woman and the dragon (Re 12:14).

Gene Stratton-Porter

EANES

e’-a-nez (APC 1Es 9:21):

the Revised Version (British and American)

MANES (which see), the Revised Version, margin "Harim."

EAR

er (’ozen; ous, otion, the latter word (literally, "earlet") in all the Gospels only used of the ear of the high priest’s servant, which was cut off by Peter: Mt 26:51; Mr 14:47; Lu 22:51 (not 22:50); Joh 18:10,26):

(1) The physical organ of hearing which was considered of peculiar importance as the chief instrument by which man receives information and commandments. For this reason the ear of the priest had to be specially sanctified, the tip of the right ear being touched with sacrificial blood at the consecration (Le 8:23). Similarly the ear of the cleansed leper had to be rededicated to the service of God by blood and oil (Le 14:14,17,25,28). The ear-lobe of a servant, who preferred to remain

with the family of his master rather than become free in the seventh year, was to be publicly bored or pierced with an awl in token of perpetual servitude (Ex 21:6). It has been suggested that Ps 40:6 should be interpreted in this sense, but this is not probable (see below). The cutting off of the ears and noses of captives was an atrocious custom of war frequently alluded to in oriental literature, (Eze 23:25). The phrase "to open the ear," which originally means the uncovering of the ear by partially removing the turban, so as to permit a clearer hearing, is used in the sense of revealing a secret or of giving important (private) information (1Sa 9:15; 20:2,12,13; 2Sa 7:27; 1Ch 17:25; Ps 40:6), and the New Testament promises similarly that "things which eye saw not, and ear heard not" are to be revealed by the reconciled God to the heart that in gladsome surrender has come to Him to be taught by His spirit (1Co 2:9).

(2) The inner ear, the organ of spiritual perception. If the ear listens, the heart willingly submits, but often the spiritual ear is "hardened" (Isa 6:10; Zec 7:11; Mt 13:15; Ac 28:27), or "heavy" (Isa 6:10; De 29:4), either by self-seeking obstinacy or by the judgment of an insulted God. Such unwilling hearers are compared to the "deaf adder .... which hearkeneth not to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely" (Ps 58:4,5; Pr 21:13; 28:9; Ac 7:57). The expression "He that hath ears to hear let him hear" is frequent in the Synoptic Gospels, occurring 7 or 8 times: Mt 11:15; Mt 13:9,43; Mr 4:9,23 (7:16 the Revised Version (British and American) omits); Lu 8:8; 14:35, and while not found in the Fourth Gospel, it occurs seven times in Re 2 and 3. "Itching ears," on the other hand, are those that have become tired of the sound of oft-repeated truth and that long for new though deceitful teaching (2Ti 4:3). Ears may "tingle" at startling news, especially of disaster (1Sa 3:11; 2Ki 21:12; Jer 19:3).

(3) God’s ears are often mentioned in the anthropopathic style of Scripture, signifying the ability of God to receive the petitions of His people, for "He that planted the ear, shall he not hear?" (Ps 94:9 also Ps 10:17; 34:15; 130:2; Is 59:1; 1Pe 3:12). But God also hears the murmurings of the wicked against Him (Nu 11:1; 2Ki 19:28; APC Wis 1:10; Jas 5:4); still it lies in His power to refuse to hear (Eze 8:18; La 3:8 compare also La 3:56).

H. L. E. Luering

EARING

er’-ing (harish):

The Hebrew word is twice translated "earing" in the King James Version (Ge 45:6; Ex 34:21). The Revised Version (British and American) rendering is "plowing": "There shall be neither plowing nor harvest."

See also De 21:4; 1Sa 8:12; Isa 30:24.

EARLY

ur’-li (orthros, and related words; proi):

The word generally refers to the day, and means the hour of dawn or soon after (Ge 19:2; 2Ch 36:15; Ho 6:4; Lu 24:22). Sometimes it refers to the beginning of the season, eg. the early rain (Ps 84:6; Jas 5:7; see RAIN). It may also have the sense of "speedily" (Ps 46:5). The early morning is frequently commended as the hour for prayer. See examples of Jesus (Mr 1:35; Lu 21:38; Joh 8:2); also Abraham (Ge 19:27), Jacob (Ge 28:18), Gideon (Jud 6:38), Samuel(1Sa 15:12), David (1Sa 17:20).

G. H. Gerberding

EARNEST

ur’-nest (arrhabon):

Found three times in the New Testament: The "earnest of our inheritance" (Eph 1:14); "the earnest of the Spirit" (2Co 1:22; 5:5).

It has an equivalent in Hebrew ‘erabhon (found in Ge 38:17,18,20), in Latin arrabo, French arrhes and the Old English arles. The term is mercantile and comes originally from the Phoenicians. Its general meaning is that of a pledge or token given as the assurance of the fulfillment of a bargain or promise. It also carries with it the idea of forfeit, such as is now common in land deals, only from the obverse side. In other words, the one promising to convey property, wages or blessing binds the promise with an advance gift or pledge partaking of the quality of the benefit to be bestowed. If the agreement be about wages, then a part of the wages is advanced; if it be about land, then a clod given to the purchaser or beneficiary may stand as the pledge of final and complete conveyance of the property.

Figurative: In the spiritual sense, as used in the passages above named, the reference is to the work of the Spirit of God in our hearts being a token and pledge of a perfect redemption and a heavenly inheritance. There is more than the idea of security in the word as used, for it clearly implies the continuity and identity of the blessing.

C. E. Schenk

EARRING

er’-ring:

An ornamental pendant of some kind hanging from the ears has been worn by both sexes in oriental lands from the earliest times. Among the Greeks and Romans, as with western peoples in general, its use was confined to females. The ears in the statue of the Medicean Venus are pierced and probably were originally ornamented with earrings. It is clear, however, that among the Hebrews and related oriental peoples earrings were worn by both sexes. Abraham’s servant "put the earring upon (Rebekah’s) face, and the bracelets upon her hands" (Ge 24:47 King James Version), in accordance with custom, evidently, but it is implied that it was customary for men also to wear earrings, in that the relatives and friends of Job "every one (gave him) an earring of gold" (Job 42:11 King James Version).

Such ornaments were usually made of gold, finely wrought, and often set with precious stones, as archaeology has shown. Such jewels were worn in ancient times for protective as well as for decorative purposes. the Revised Version (British and American) renders "amulets" for the King James Version "earrings" in Isa 3:20, the Hebrew word (lechashim) being elsewhere associated with serpent-charming; but the earrings of Ge 35:4, also, were more than mere ornaments, so the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) may both be right in their renderings here (Kennedy). The influence of Egypt, where amulets of various kinds were worn by men and gods, by the living and the dead, is shown by recent excavations at Gezer, Taanach and Megiddo.

See AMULET; ORNAMENT.

George. B. Eager

EARTH

urth (’adhamah, ‘erets, ‘aphar; ge, oikoumene):

In a hilly limestone country like Palestine, the small amount of iron oxide in the rocks tends to be oxidized, and thereby to give a prevailing reddish color to the soil. This is especially the case on relatively barren hills where there is little organic

matter present to prevent reddening and give a more blackish tinge.

‘Adhamah (compare ‘adham, "a man," and Adam) is from ‘adham, "to be red," and is used in the senses: "earth" (Ex 20:24), "land" (Ps 105:35), a "land" or country (Isa 14:2), "ground" (Ge 4:11), "the earth" (Ge 7:4).

The word most in use is ‘erets, undoubtedly from a most ancient root occurring in many languages, as English "earth," German Erde, Arabic ‘ard. It is used in most of the senses of ‘adhamah, but less as "soil" and more as "the earth" as a part of the universe; frequently with shamayim, "heavens," as in Ge 1:1: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."

‘Aphar and its root word and derivatives are closely paralleled in the Arabic, and refer mainly to "dust" or "dry earth" (compare Arabic ‘afir, "to be of the color of dust"; ‘afar "dust"; ya‘fur, "a gazelle"; Hebrew ‘opher, "a gazelle"). Compare Ge 2:7: "Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground"; Job 2:12: ".... sprinkled dust upon their heads"; Ps 104:29: ".... they die, and return to their dust"; Ge 18:27: "dust and ashes."

In the Septuagint and New Testament, ge is used in nearly all cases, oikoumene being used a few times for the "habitable earth," as in Lu 21:26 the King James Version.

See further ANTHROPOLOGY; ASTRONOMY; EVOLUTION; WORLD.

Alfred Ely Day

EARTH, CIRCLE OF THE

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 1, 3.

EARTH, CORNERS OF THE

The "corners" or "ends" of the earth are its "wings" (kanephoth ha-’arets), i.e. its borders or extremities. The word in general means a wing, because the wing of a bird is used as a covering for its young, and from this meaning it acquires that of the extremity of anything stretched out. It is thus used in De 22:12: "Thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four borders (wings) of thy vesture, wherewith thou coverest thyself." It thus also means the coasts or boundaries of the land surface of the earth; its extremities. It is translated "corners" in Isa 11:12; "ends" in Job 37:3, 38:13. The "four corners" of the earth (Isa 11:12) or "land" (Eze 7:2) are therefore simply the extremities of the land in the four cardinal directions.

See also ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 3.

E. W. Maunder

EARTH, ENDS OF THE

See EARTH, CORNERS OF THE.

EARTH, PILLARS OF THE

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 2.

EARTH, THE NEW

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, IX; HEAVENS, NEW;

EARTH, VAULT, OF THE

volt:

In one passage God is said to have "founded his vault (’aghuddah) upon the earth" (Am 9:6). It is not quite certain whether this dome or vault refers to the earth itself, or to the heavens arched above it.

The latter is the usual interpretation, but in either case the reference is rather to the strength of the structure than to its form; the word implying something that is firmly bound together and hence, an arch or dome because of its stability.

See also ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 2.

EARTHEN VESSELS

urth’-’-n, (cheres, yetser; ostrakinos):

These vessels were heat-resisting and were used for cooking and for boiling clothes (Le 6:28; 11:33; 14:5,50). They were probably non-porous and took the place of the kidri or ma’ajin used in Syria today. A traveler in the interior of Palestine may still meet with the hospitality showed to David (2Sa 17:28). The generous natives brought not only gifts of food but the necessary vessels in which to cook it. An earthen vessel was used to preserve a land deed (Jer 32:14).

Figurative: In Jer 19:1 breaking of an earthen vessel was symbolical of the destruction of Jerusalem. These vessels were also used to symbolize the commonness (La 4:2) and frailness of our bodies (2Co 4:7).

See POTTERY.

James A. Patch

EARTHLY

urth’-li (epigeios, "existing upon the earth," "terrestrial," from epi, "upon" and ge, "earth"; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) terrenus):

Of or pertaining to the earth, or to the present state of existence. The word epigeios is not found in Septuagint, but occurs in classical Greek from Plato down. In Plutarch Mor. 566 D, it occurs in the remarkable phrase, "that which is earthly of the soul."

Its meaning is primarily merely local ("being on the earth"). The word ge ("earth") has not in itself an ethical significance, and does not carry a suggestion of moral taint, such as the word kosmos ("world") has, especially in the Johannine writings, and sarx ("flesh"), especially in Paul. It does, however, suggest a certain limitation or frailty; and in some passages, the context gives the adjective epigeios an ethical color, though in the New Testament the purely local meaning is never lost sight of. It is translated "earthly" in the following passages:

(1) Joh 3:12, "if I told you earthly things," i.e. things which are realized on earth, things within the circle of human observation, truths of subjective experience (eg. the new birth); in contrast to "heavenly things," the objective truths which, as not directly realizable in human experience, must be revealed from above (the mysteries of the Divine purpose and

plans). Clearly "earthly" here implies no moral contrast to the heavenly or spiritual.

(2) 2Co 5:1, "the earthly house of our tabernacle," i.e. the body with which we are clothed on earth, in contrast to the spiritual resurrection-body, "which is from heaven" (verse 2). Here again the word has a merely local, not an ethical, significance.

(3) Php 3:19, "whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things," i.e. whose thoughts rest on earth, on the pleasures of life here below.

(4) Jas 3:15, "This wisdom is not a wisdom that cometh down from above, but is earthly," i.e. it is on the plane of life on earth, merely human, incapable of ascending to the level of Divine wisdom. In the last two passages, the literal local meaning is still evident, but the word shades off into the moral and suggests that which is opposed to the spiritual in character. The same word is translated "terrestrial" in 1Co 15:40, and "things in (the Revised Version (British and American) "on") earth" in Php 2:10 the King James Version has "earthly" in Joh 3:31, where it translates ek tes ges = literally, "out of the earth," the reference being to the character and mission of the Baptist as partaking of the limitations of his earthly (human) origin, in contrast to the Messiah "that cometh from heaven." The the King James Version rendering is somewhat misleading, for it introduces a confusion with the "earthly" of Joh 3:12 (see Westcott in the place cited.). The Revised Version (British and American) rightly renders "of the earth."

"Earthly" is to be distinguished from "earthy" = made of earth or clay (choikos, from chous, "earth dug out," 1Co 15:47 ff).

D. Miall Edwards

EARTHQUAKE

urth'-kwak (ra'ash; seismos):

1. Earthquakes in Palestine: The last earthquake which worked any damage in Palestine and Syria occurred in 1837, and destroyed the village of Safed, near Mt. Hermon, and was felt even all the way to Hebron. Since that time a few feeble shocks have been felt but no damage was done. The region is just on the edge of the great earthquake circle whose center is in Armenia, and is liable to earthquakes. The large number of references in the Bible to earthquakes, and the evident fear in the minds of the people of those times, would seem to indicate that they were more frequent in Bible times than recently.

2. Causes of Earthquakes: There are three main causes of earthquakes:

(1) Earthslips. In the slow process of cooling, the crust of the earth tends to wrinkle and fold as it contracts. This causes a stress to be set up in the strata composing the crust. If the strata are too rigid to bend there must come after a time a break or fault. The shock caused by the break, which is usually several miles below the surface of the earth, is an earthquake, and it spreads in the form of earth waves from the break as center. Seismographs in all parts of the world are now adjusted to receive the waves even though the origin is on the opposite side of the earth.

(2) Explosion of Steam or Gases under the Surface. Some earthquakes, especially those underneath the sea, are thought to be caused by water seeping through the soil and rocks and finding its way to the heated masses below. Steam is formed and if there is no escape for it, an explosion takes place whose force is felt on the surface.

(3) Volcanic. As earthquakes are of common occurrence in volcanic regions it seems likely that there is some connection between the two, but the relation has not been fully traced. It may be that the second cause is the origin of both the volcano and earthquake.

See further, DELUGE OF NOAH.

3. Earthquakes in Jerusalem: Many destructive earthquakes have been recorded in the history of Syria, but they have been mostly in the north, in the region of Aleppo. Jerusalem itself has seldom been affected by earthquakes. The Hauran beyond the Jordan is covered with volcanic remains and signs of violent shocks, and the cities on the coast have suffered much, but Jerusalem on the higher ground between has usually escaped with little destruction.

4. Earthquakes in Scripture: A number of earthquakes are mentioned in the Scriptures: (1) At Mount Sinai (Ex 19:18); (2) Korah and companions destroyed in fissure and sinking ground (Nu 16:31 Ant, IV, iii, 3); (3) in the Philistine camp in the days of Saul (1Sa 14:15); (4) after Elijah's flight (1Ki 19:11); (5) in the reign of Uzziah, between 790 and 740 BC (Am 1:1); Zec 14:5 probably refers to the same (Ant., IX, x, 4); (6) at Christ's death (Mt 27:51-54); (7) at Christ's resurrection (Mt 28:2); (8) at Philippi when Paul and Silas were freed from prison (Ac 16:26). Most of these shocks seem to have been slight and caused little loss of life. Josephus mentions one in the reign of Herod, "such as had not happened at any other time, which was very destructive to men and cattle" (Ant., XV, v, 2). Professor G. A. Smith in his recent work on Jerusalem is of the opinion that earthquakes were sufficiently frequent and strong to account for the appearance and disappearance of Nehemiah's Fountain (Jerus, I, 74). The Hebrew ra'ash is commonly used to mean a great noise. Large earthquakes are sometimes accompanied by a rumbling noise, but as a rule they come silently and without warning.

5. Symbolic Use: In the Scriptures earthquakes are mentioned as tokens of God's power (Job 9:6) and of His presence and anger (Ps 68:8; 18:7; Isa 13:13): "She shall be visited of Yahweh of hosts .... with earthquake, and great noise" (Isa 29:6); also as a sign of Christ's "coming, and of the end of the world" (Mt 24:3-7). See also Re 11:13,19; 16:18.

LITERATURE. Milne, Earthquakes (Inter. Scient. series); Plumptre, Biblical Studies, 136; Dutton, Earthquakes.

Alfred H. Joy

EASE

ez (sha'anan, shal'anan, chiefly, "at ease"):

Used 19 times in the Old Testament and once in the New Testament, most frequently meaning tranquillity, security or comfort of mind; in an ethical sense, indicating carelessness or indifference with reference to one's moral or religious interests.

The prophet Jeremiah used the phrase as an indication of national or tribal indifference: "Moab hath been at ease from his youth" (Jer 48:11); "I am very sore displeased with the nations that are at ease" (Zec 1:15). Frequent allusions are made also by various prophets to individuals or groups of individuals, as "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion" (Am 6:1); "Rise up, ye women that are at ease" (Isa 32:9), and "Tremble, ye women that are at ease" (Isa 32:11).

The word in another form is used also in a verbal sense and to apply to physical ease and comfort, as "My couch shall ease my complaint" (Job 7:13 compare especially 2Ch 10:4,9). Simple mental tranquillity or peace of mind is also expressed by it (Jer 46:27).

The single instance of its use in the New Testament is illustrative of its figurative but most common usage in the Old Testament, where it refers to moral indifference in the parable of the Rich Fool: "Soul .... take thine ease, eat, drink, be merry" (Lu 12:19).

Walter G. Clippinger

EAST (EASTERN), SEA

es’-tern (Zec 14:8).

See DEAD SEA.

EAST COUNTRY

kun’-tri (’erets mizrach):

Lit. "country of the sunrise" over against the "country of the sunset" (Zec 8:7). The two together form a poetical expression indicating the whole earth.

EAST GATE

See GATE, EAST.

EAST WIND

See WIND.

EAST, CHILDREN OF THE

est, (mizrach, qedhem, qedhem, and other derivatives of the same root; anatole):

Mizrach is the equivalent of the Arabic meshriq, "the orient" or "place of sunrise." In the same way ma‘arabh, "west," corresponds to the Arabic maghrib, and both mizrach and ma‘arabh occur in Ps 103:12: "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us." Qadham, "to precede" (whence qedhem, "east"), and its derivatives correspond closely to the Arabic qadham, except that the Arabic derivatives do not include the signification "east." In the majority of cases "east" and other words of direction require no explanation, but the expressions "the children of the east" (bene qedhem), "the land of the children of the east" (’erets bene qedhem), and "the east country" (’erets qedhem), belong to a different category. In the story of Gideon (Jud 6:3,13; 7:12; 8:10), we find several times the expression "the Midianites and the Amalekites and the children of the east." In Jud 8:24 it is said of the same host: "For they Go up to Kedar, and destroy the children of the east. Their tents and had golden earrings, because they were Ishmaelites." In Jer 49:28,29: "Go up to Kedar, and destroy the children of the east. Their tents and their flocks shall they take." In Ge 25:6: "But unto the sons of the concubines, that Abraham had, Abraham gave gifts; and he sent them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward, unto the east country." Now Ishmael is the son of Abraham and Hagar, Midian of Abraham and Keturah, Kedar the son of Ishmael, and Amalek the grandson of Esau, dwelling in Edom. It is evident that we have to do with the Syrian desert and in a general way with Arabia, especially its northern part, and with peoples like the modern Bedouin who kept camels and dwelt in tents, ‘houses of hair’ (buyut sha‘r), as they are called by the Arabs of today.

A striking passage is Ge 29:1: "Then Jacob went on his journey, and came to the land of the children of the east." As one journeys eastward through the country East of the Jordan he traverses first a region of towns and villages with fields of grain, and then the wide desert where the Bedouin wander with their herds. The line is a sharp one. Within a very few hours he passes from the settled part where the rain, though scanty, is sufficient to bring the grain to maturity, to the bare desert.

Job was "the greatest of all the children of the east" (Job 1:3). These desert people had a name for wisdom as we see from 1Ki 4:30, "Solomon's wisdom excelled the wisdom of all the children of the east, and all the wisdom of Egypt"; and from Mt 2:1: "Now when Jesus was born .... Wisemen from the east came."

Alfred Ely Day

EASTER

es'-ter (pascha, from Aramaic paccha' and Hebrew pecach, the Passover festival):

The English word comes from the Anglo-Saxon Eastre or Estera, a Teutonic goddess to whom sacrifice was offered in April, so the name was transferred to the paschal feast.

The word does not properly occur in Scripture, although the King James Version has it in Ac 12:4 where it stands for Passover, as it is rightly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). There is no trace of Easter celebration in the New Testament, though some would see an intimation of it in 1Co 5:7. The Jewish Christians in the early church continued to celebrate the Passover, regarding Christ as the true paschal lamb, and this naturally passed over into a commemoration of the death and resurrection of our Lord, or an Easter feast. This was preceded by a fast, which was considered by one party as ending at the hour of the crucifixion, i.e. at 3 o'clock on Friday, by another as continuing until the hour of the resurrection before dawn on Easter morning. Differences arose as to the time of the Easter celebration, the Jewish Christians naturally fixing it at the time of the Passover feast which was regulated by the paschal moon. According to this reckoning it began on the evening of the 14th day of the moon of the month of Nican without regard to the day of the week, while the GentileChristians identified it with the first day of the week, i.e. the Sunday of the resurrection, irrespective of the day of the month. This latter practice finally prevailed in the church, and those who followed the other reckoning were stigmatized as heretics. But differences arose as to the proper Sunday for the Easter celebration which led to long and bitter controversies. The Council of Nice, 325 AD, decreed that it should be on Sunday, but did not fix the particular Sunday. It was left to the bishop of Alexandria to determine, since that city was regarded as the authority in astronomical matters and he was to communicate the result of his determination to the other bishops.

But this was not satisfactory, especially to the western churches, and a definite rule for the determination of Easter was needed. By some it was kept as early as March 21, and by others as late as April 25, and others followed dates between. The rule was finally adopted, in the 7th century, to celebrate Easter on the Sunday following the 14th day of the calendar moon which comes on, or after, the vernal equinox which was fixed for March 21. This is not always the astronomical moon, but near enough for practical purposes, and is determined without astronomical calculation by certain intricate rules adopted by ecclesiastical authority. These rules involve the Dominical Letters, or the first seven of the alphabet, representing the days of the week, A standing for the first day of the year and the one on which Sunday falls being called the Dominical for that year. There are also involved the Golden Numbers and the Epacts, the first being the numbers from 1 to 19, the cycle of the moon when its phases recur on the same days of the year, the first of the cycle being that in which the new moon falls on January 1. The Epacts indicate the moon's age at the beginning of each year. Easter was thus fixed by these rules, but another difficulty arose when the Gregorian calendar was adopted in 1582, the difference between it and the Julian being then 10 days. This of course affected the determination of Easter, and its celebration by the Greek church, which has never admitted the Gregorian calendar, occurs usually at a different time from that followed by the western churches. This difference may be as much as five weeks and it may occur as late as April 30, while in the West it cannot occur later than April 25 nor earlier than March 22. Occasionally the two come together but this is rare, since the difference between the two calendars is now 13 days.

The Easter feast has been and still is regarded as the greatest in the Christian church, since it commemorates the most important event in the life of its Founder.

H. Porter

EBAL, MOUNT

e’-bal, (har ‘ebhal; Gaibal):

Rises North of the vale of Shechem, over against Mt. Gerizim on the South. The mountain (Arabic el-Iclamiyeh) reaches a height of 1,402 ft. above the floor of the valley, and 3,077 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean. The Samaritans feign that Gerizim is the higher; but it is more than 200 ft. lower than Ebal. These two mountains overhang the pass through which runs the main artery of intercourse between East and West, the city of Nablus lying in the throat of the valley to the West. The ancient Shechem probably stood farther to the East. The lower slopes of Ebal as one ascends from Nablus are covered with gardens and orchards, the copious streams from the fountains under Gerizim washing its foot, and spreading fertility and beauty. The vine, the fig and the olive grow luxuriantly. Higher up we scramble over rough rocky terraces, where grow only the ubiquitous thistles and prickly shrubs.

From the broad summit a view of surpassing interest and beauty rewards the climber’s toil. Westward beyond the hills and the plain of Sharon with its coast line of yellow sand running from Jaffa to Carmel, stretch the blue waters of the Mediterranean. From Carmel to Gilboa, Little Hermon and Tabor, roll the fruitful breadths of Esdraelon: the uplands of Galilee, with Nazareth showing on the brow above the plain, rise away to the buttresses of Lebanon in the North. From the snowy peak of Hermon the eye ranges over the Jaulan and Mount Gilead to the Mountain of Bashan in the East, with the steep eastern wall of the Jordan valley in the foreground. The land of Moab is visible beyond the Dead Sea; and the heights around Jerusalem close the view on the South.

Round this splendid mountain, seen from afar on all sides, religious associations have gathered from old time. The Moslem Weley on the top—the usual white-domed sanctuary—where it is said the head of the Baptist is buried, is doubtless the modern representative of some ancient seat of worship. The ruins of a church show that Christians also came under the spell of the hill.

The slopes of Ebal toward Gerizim played their part in that memorable scene, when, having conquered the central region of Palestine, Joshua led the people hither, erected an altar of unhewn stones, wrote upon the stones—either engraving on the stone itself, or impressing on plaster placed there for the purpose—a copy of the law, and then, as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded, placed half the tribes on the slope of Gerizim, and half on those of Ebal, and the ark with the priests and Levites in the center. Then with dramatic responses from the two divisions of the people, the blessings and the cursings of the law were read (Jos 8:30 ff; compare De 27:11 ff). In all the future, therefore, this mountain, towering aloft in the very heart of the land, would remind beholders far and near of their people’s covenant with God. It has sometimes been questioned if the reading of the law could be heard by the people in the way described. The formation of the sides of the valley at the narrowest part, and the acoustics, which have been tested more than once, leave no reasonable doubt as to the possibility.

The importance of the mountain from a military point of view is illustrated by the ruins of a massive fortress found on the summit.

W. Ewing

EBAL; OBAL

e’-bal (‘ebhal, "bare") or (‘obhal):

(1) A people and region of Joktanite, Arabia. See Dillmann, Genesis, and Glaser, Skizze, II, 426. The latter form of the name is that given in Ge 10:28, the former in 1Ch 1:22 and in the Sam text of Ge 10:28.

(2) A son of Shobal, son of Seir, the Horite (Ge 36:23; 1Ch 1:40).

EBED

e’-bed (‘ebhedh, "servant"):

(1) Father of Gaal, who rebelled against Abimelech (Jud 9:26-35).

(2) A companion of Ezra in his return (Ezr 8:6) = Obeth (APC 1Esdras 8:32).

EBED-MELECH

e-bed-me’-lek, eb-ed-me’-lek (‘ebhedh-mekekh, "servant of the king" or "of (god) Melek"):

An Ethiopian eunuch in the service of King Zedekiah, who interceded with the king for the prophet Jeremiah and rescued him from the dungeon into which he had been cast to die (Jer 38:7-13). For this, the word of Yahweh through Jeremiah promised Ebed-meleeh that his life should be spared in the fall of Jerusalem (Jer 39:15-18).

EBEN-BOHAN

See BOHAN.

EBEN-EZEL

See EZEL.

EBEN-EZER

eb-en-e’-zer (’ebhen ha-‘ezer, "stone of the help"; Abenezer):

(1) Here Israel was defeated by the Philistines, 4,000 men falling in the battle (1Sa 4:1 ff). It appears also to have been the scene of the disaster when the ark of God was captured (1Sa 4:3 ff). The place is not identified. It was over against Aphek; but this site is also unknown (compare Jos 12:18). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it between Jerusalem and Ascalon, in the neighborhood of Beth-shemesh. Conder suggests Deir Aban, fully 2 miles East of ‘Ain Shems (PEF, III, 24).

(2) A stone set up by Samuel to perpetuate the memory of the signal victory granted to Israel over the Philistines in answer to his prayer (1Sa 7:12). It stood between Mizpeh and Shen. The latter is probably identical with ‘Ain Sinia, North of Bethel. This defines the district in which it may be found; but no identification is yet possible.

W. Ewing

EBER

e’-ber (‘ebher; Eber, in Gen; Obed, in Ch):

(1) Occurs in the genealogies (Ge 10:21,25; 11:14 ff) as the great-grandson of Shem and father of Peleg and Joktan. The word means "the other side," "across," and the form "Hebrew," which is derived from it, is intended to denote the people or

tribe who came "from the other, side of the river" (i.e. the Euphrates), from Haran (Ge 11:31), whence Abraham and his dependents migrated to Canaan.

(2) A Gadite (1Ch 5:13).

(3) & (4) Two Benjamites (1Ch 8:12,22).

(5) The head of a priestly family (Ne 12:20).

A. C. Grant

EBEZ

e'-bez ('ebhets, meaning unknown; Rhebes; the King James Version Abez):

One of the 16 cities in Issachar (Jos 19:20). The name seems to be cognate to that of the judge Ibzan (Jud 12:8-10). All else concerning it is conjecture.

EBIASAPH

e-bi'-a-saf:

A descendant of Kohath the son of Levi (1Ch 6:37).

See ABIASAPH.

EBIONISM; EBIONITES

e'-bi-o-niz'-m, e'-bio-nits (Ebionaioi, from 'ebhyonim, "poor people"):

Contents

General Statement

I. ORIGIN OF THE NAME

1. The Poor Ones 2. Origin of the Name

II. AUTHORITIES FOR THE OPINIONS OF THE EBIONITES

1. Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus 2. Origen and Jerome 3. Epiphanius' Description 4. Justin Martyr

III. LITERATURE OF THE EBIONITES

1. The Gospel According to the Hebrews 2. The Clementines 3. Apocalyptic Literature

IV. HISTORY OF EBIONISM

1. Ebionites and Essenes 2. Organization of Ebionites

V. EVIDENCE FROM EBIONISM FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH

1. Christology of the Early Church 2. Paulinism of the Early Church

LITERATURE

General Statement:

The Ebionites were a sect of heretics frequently mentioned by the early Fathers. In regard to their opinions, as in regard to those of most early heretical sects, there is the difficulty that to a large extent we are dependent for our information on their opponents. These opponents were not generally very careful to apprehend exactly the views of those whose opinions they undertook to refute. It adds to the difficulty in the present case that there is a dubiety as to the persons designated by the title. Sometimes, it is admitted, the name was used to designate all Jewish Christians irrespective of their opinions; at other times it denotes a sect akin to the Gnostics, who ascribed a purely human origin to our Lord.

There are, however, certain works, the Clementine writings, which from statements of the Fathers may be assumed to represent the views of this sect, but as these represent views to some extent divergent, it is difficult to decide which is the truly Ebionitic. There are also certain apocalyptic books which present affinities with Ebionism. The quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews—the only gospel the Ebionites received—likewise afford means of appreciating their views. This gospel has come down to us only in isolated quotations, for the accuracy of which we have no guarantee. Finally, it has to be borne in mind that no sect can persist through centuries of changing circumstances, and not in turn undergo change.

I. Origin of the Name.

1. The Poor Ones:

Tertullian and Epiphanius assume the sect to have received its name from a certain Ebion or Hebion. Others of the Fathers, without affirming it, use language which seems to imply the belief in a person called Ebion. This, however, is generally now regarded as a mistake. No trace of the existence of such a person is to be found. The sect in question seems to have assumed the name Ebionites, "the poor ones," from the first Beatitude (Mt 5:3), claiming to be the continuation into the new dispensation of the "poor and needy" of the Psalms, eg. psalm 69:33; 70:5; 74:21.

It has been mooted that the sect may have had a leader who assumed the title the poor man. Besides that we have no trace of his existence, the name would almost certainly have been treated as an Aramaic word and put in the status emphaticus as Ebiona, which in Greek would have become Ebionas.

2. Origin of the Name:

The ordinary view of the origin of the name has the advantage of analogy in its favor. The pre-Reformation Protestants of the 12th and 13th centuries in France called themselves "the poor men" (of Lyons). The fact that the apostle James in his Epistle implies a natural union between poverty and piety (2:5), "Did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith ....?" would confirm the Jewish Christians in their use of the name.

Some have been inclined to press unduly a play on the name in which some of the Fathers indulge, as if the poor views of this sect as to the person of Christ had led to their receiving this name from without.

II. Authorities for the Opinions of the Ebionites.

1. Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus:

As indicated above, the main authorities for these are Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus. The characteristics of the Ebionites noted by them were, first, the negative one that they did not, like the other Gnostics, distinguish between the Supreme God and the Creator of the world—the demiurge—who was identified with the God of the Jews. With them Yahweh was the Supreme God—the God of Israel and the Creator of the heavens and the earth. The second characteristic, also negative, was that they denied the supernatural birth of our Lord. He was the son of Joseph and Mary in the ordinary sense of the word. The third was that they, along with the Cerinthians and Carpocratians, affirmed that a Divine power came down on Jesus at His baptism—the reward of His perfect holiness. According to one form of theory, the Holy Ghost was the eternal Son of God. Another view was that the power which descended upon Him was the Divine wisdom, the Logos. By the influence of this Divine power He performed miracles and taught with superhuman wisdom. But this Divine influence deserted Jesus on the Cross, hence, the cry of being forsaken (Mt 27:46). The Divine power, however, raised Him from the dead and caused Him to ascend on high. Hippolytus brings the Ebionites into close connection with the Elkasaites and with a certain Alcibiades, whose views he had to combat in Rome. The last claimed to found his views on a work of Elkasai.

2. Origen and Jerome:

From two other sources we derive further information: Origen and Jerome both notify the fact that the Ebionites translated ‘almah "young woman" (it is rendered "virgin" in our the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). This translation, so far as the mere word is concerned, is indubitably correct. There is another point in which both afford us information. The first says (Contra Celsum, v.61) that there are two classes of Ebionites, one of which denies the miraculous conception and birth of our Lord, the other of which affirms it. Jerome, in his letter to Augustine, not only asserts the same thing but calls the one class, those affirming the miraculous birth, Nazareans, and the other Ebionites. Origen in his second book against Celsus speaks as if the only distinction between the Ebionites and other Christians was their obedience to the Mosaic law, and by their example rebuts the assertion that the Jews in becoming Christians deserted the law of their fathers. Another feature of Ebionism presented to us by Jerome (In Jesaiam, lxvi.24) is their chiliastic view —the personal reign of our Lord for 1,000 years as the Jewish Messiah.

3. Epiphanius’ Description:

The writer who gives the most voluminous account of the Ebionites—"Ebionaeans" as he calls them—is Epiphanius. With him it is at once heresy No. X and heresy No. XXX. Before discussing the Ebionites he takes up the closely related sect of the Nazareans as heresy No. XXIX. He had already in a more compendious way considered a similarly named sect, numbering it No. XVIII. It, however, is Jewish while this is Christian. The Jewish sect is distinguished by eating no animal food and offering no sacrifices. They have thus an affinity with the Essenes. They have a peculiarity that, while they honored the patriarchs, they rejected the Pentateuch which related their history. These Nazareans dwelt East of the Jordan in Gilead and Bashan. Heresy No. XXIX is the Christian Nazareans. This name had been at first applied to all Christians. Epiphanius identifies them with the Essenes and declares their distinguishing peculiarity to be the retention of circumcision and the ceremonial law. They use the Gospel of Matthew but without the genealogies. As Heresy No. XXX he proceeds to consider the Ebionites. Ebion, Epiphanius assumes to have been a man, and calls him a "polymorphic portent," and asserts that he was connected with the Samaritans, the Essenes, the Cerinthians and Carpocratians, yet desired to be regarded a Christian. The heresy originated after the flight of the church to Pella. They denied the miraculous birth of our Lord, but maintained that a Divine influence came down upon Him at His baptism. This Divine wisdom had inspired, and in a sense dwelt, in all the patriarchs. In some sense the body of Jesus was regarded as that of Adam revived. This body was crucified and rose again. They receive only the Gospel of Matthew in the form the Cerinthians use it, i.e. the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Epiphanius gives some account of this gospel and its defects. They use also other books; one which he especially describes, The Journeyings of Peter, appears to be in the main identical with the

Clementine Homilies. He connects the Ebionites, as does Hippolytus, with Elkasai; from him they learned that the heavenly Christ was 96 miles high and 24 broad, and that the Holy Ghost had a female form of similar dimensions, only invisible. Although he connects the Ebionites with the Essenes he mentions that, unlike the Essenes of Josephus and Philo, the Ebionites not only permitted but enjoined matrimony on young men. Epiphanius adds as an especial enormity that the Ebionites permit second, third and even seventh marriages. Although they enjoin marriage they have a low opinion of women, crediting Eve with originating heathenism, in this agreeing with the Essenian opinion of the sex. Mysteriously Epiphanius represents, the Ebionites as not only rejecting the prophets in a body but deriding them. He also mentions the rejection of Paul by the Ebionites. It is exceedingly difficult to form a clear, self-consistent view of the doctrines of the Ebionites from the statements of Epiphanius, yet there are points in which his information is of value.

4. Justin Martyr:

Though Justin Martyr does not name the Ebionites in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew (47), he mentions two classes of Jewish Christians:

(a) those who not only themselves observe the law but would compel the Gentilebelievers also to be circumcised and keep the whole law, and will hold no communion with those who refuse to become Jews;

(b) those who, observing the Mosaic law themselves, enter into communion with uncircumcised Gentilebelievers.

The former appear to be an early form of Ebionites. It is to be noted that Justin does not ascribe to them any doctrinal divergence from the orthodox views. In the following chapter he mentions some that denied the divinity of our Lord, but these were Gentiles (hemeterougenous) "of our race."

III. Literature of the Ebionites.

One thing of importance we do owe to Epiphanius—the indication of the literature produced by the Ebionites, from which we may get their views at first hand. This includes the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Clementines (Homilies and Recognitions); to which we would add the Ascension of Isaiah and the Odes of Solomon. It may be remarked that this literature appears to represent the opinion of different classes of the Ebionites. We shall merely consider here the bearing these works have on the Ebionites.

1. The Gospel According to the Hebrews:

The Gospel according to the Hebrews we know only through quotations. We can have no certainty that these quotations are accurate. The quotations may have been interpolated, and further the book from which the quotations have been made has probably passed through several recensions. The discussion of the question of the relation of this book to the canonical Gospel of Mt is considered elsewhere (see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS). One thing is clear, there were at least two recensions of this gospel, one nearer and the other farther from the canonical Gospel; the former, the Nazarean, differed only by omitting the genealogy from the First Gospel of the Canon. The other was more strictly Ebionite and omitted all mention of the miraculous birth. The Ebionite recension began, as Epiphanius tells us, abruptly with the calling of the Apostles. The assertion of Epiphanius that the Ebionites rejected the prophets is supported by a quotation from the Gospel according to the Hebrews in Jerome (Adv. Pelag., iii.2): "In the prophets, after they were anointed by the Spirit, sin was found." The change from akridas ("locusts") to egkridas (literally, "cakes of honey and oil"; compare Ex 16:31; Nu 11:8) in the account of the food of John may be due to the avoidance of animal food attributed to this sect. One passage, which appears to be a denunciation of wealth in itself, is an addition of a second rich man to the story of the young ruler of the synagogue. A singular verse, quoted from this gospel both by Origen and Jerome, deserves special notice for several reasons: "My mother, the Holy Ghost, took me by one of my hairs and bore me to the great mountain Tabor." The designation of the Holy Ghost as "my mother" is unexampled. It implies a materialistic view of the doctrine of the Trinity after the form of a human family. It is a note of geographical ignorance to call Tabor a "great" mountain. It is only some

2,000 ft. high and behind it are the mountains of the hill country of Galilee rising up to 4,000 ft. in Jebel Jermuk, and behind that the white top of Hermon, 10,000 ft. It is difficult to understand anyone resident in Palestine calling Tabor a "great" mountain. Rising from the plain of Esdraelon it is prominent, but with the higher mountains behind it, it could not even seem great. In a quotation by Jerome (Adv. Pelag., iii.2) our Lord declares Himself unwilling to be baptized by John as unconscious of sin. This suits the representation of Ebionite views which we find in Irenaeus that it was His sinlessness that made Jesus capable of receiving the Holy Ghost.

2. The Clementines:

The Clementine literature attributed by Epiphanius to the Ebionites is a more important source of information for their opinions. It has come down to us complete in three or four forms, the Homilies, the Recognitions, and two Epitomes which, however, differ less than the two larger works. They all seem to be recensions of an earlier work which has disappeared. The foundation of all of these is a species of religious novel on which are grafted sermons of Peter and his discussions with Simon Magus. Clement, a young Roman orphan of rank in search of a religion, meets Barnabas, who tells him of Christ, describing Him as the "Son of God," and says that He had appeared in Judea. To learn more about Jesus, Clement proceeds to Caesarea, where he meets Peter. He thereafter accompanies Peter to the various places whither the apostle pursues Simon Magus, and in course of his journeyings he meets and recognizes his father, his brother and his mother; hence, the title Recognitions. It is in the discourses of Peter that the Ebionism appears. Its theology is fundamentally Jewish and Essenian. That it is Judaizing is evidenced by the covert hostility to the apostle Paul. There are elements that are not those of orthodox Judaism. The Messiah is coequal, or nearly so, with the devil; in other words, the position is a modification of Parseeism (Hom., III, 5). If the discourse of Barnabas is excluded, our Lord is always called the "prophet" (Hom.), the "Teacher" (Recog.). He is never asserted nor assumed to be Divine. Nothing is said of His miraculous birth. At the same time in the Recognitions He is regarded as not merely man. It is said He "assumed a Jewish body" (Recog, I, 60). This agrees with what Epiphanius says of the Ebionite idea that it was as the body of Adam that the Christ appeared. The apostle Peter, who is represented as the model Christian, eats only herbs and practices frequent ablutions, quite in the manner of the Essenes. In his discourses Peter declares that the true prophet "quenches the fire of altars and represses war." These are Essenian peculiarities, but he "sanctions marriage," against Essenism as we find it in Philo and Josephus The phrase implies an opposition to some who not only did not sanction, but forbade, marriage (Hom., III, 26).

3. Apocalyptic Literature:

If the ignoring of the work and apostleship of Paul be regarded as the criterion of the Judaizers, that is to say, the Ebionites, then in apocalyptic literature we find works from which we can draw information as to views. The Ascension of Isaiah was one of the earliest of these books to be recovered in modern times. The writer refers to the martyrdom of Peter in Rome, but makes no mention of Paul (IV, 3). The description of elders and shepherds hating one another (III, 29), "lawless elders and unjust shepherds who will ravage their sheep" (III, 24), seems a view of the church’s state as it appeared to a Judaizer when the Pauline view was prevailing. Notwithstanding this not only is the Divine dignity maintained, but the doctrine of the Trinity, "They all glorified the Father of all and His beloved Son and the Holy Spirit" (VIII, 18), is affirmed. As to the person of Christ, He descended through the successive heavens to the earth to be born (IX, 13; X, 8-31). The virginity of Mary is affirmed (X, 12), and the child is born without pain, miraculously (XI, 8-14). A similar view of the birth of Christ is to be found in the Odes of Solomon (XIX, 7).

IV. History of Ebionism.

1. Ebionites and Essenes:

All authorities combine in asserting a close connection between the Ebionites and the Essenes. At first sight there are serious points of difference, principally these, the Ebionites enjoined marriage, while the Essenes, if we may believe Philo and Josephus, forbade it. This forbiddal, however, appears to have been true only of the Coenobites of Engedi. Moreover,

some of the Judaizers, that is Ebionites, are charged with forbidding to marry (1Ti 4:3). The Essenes in all their varieties seem to have come over to Christianity on the fall of the Jewish state and the retreat of the church to Pella. When they joined the believers in their exile the Parsee elements began a ferment in the church and Ebionism was one of the products. This probably is the meaning of the statement that Ebion began to teach his doctrines at Pella. If we may judge from the statements of Scripture and from the earliest of the noncanonical apocalypses, the Ebionites were not at first heretical in their Christology. Only they maintained the universal obligation of the ceremonial law, holding that believers of Gentiledescent could be received into the church only if they were first circumcised. The keen dialectic of Paul forced them from this position. The abrogation of the Law was closely connected in Paul's reasonings with the Divinity of our Lord; consequently some of them may have felt that they could maintain their views more easily by denying His supreme Divinity and the reality of the incarnation. The phenomena of His life rendered it impossible for anyone to declare Him to be merely man. Hence, the complex notion of a Divine influence—an eon, coming down upon Him. If, however, His birth were miraculous, then the supreme greatness of Moses would be impugned, consequently they were led to deny the virgin birth.

Not till Theodotus appeared was the purely humanitarian view of our Lord's person maintained. All the Hebrew Christians, however, did not pursue the above course. A large section remained at each general stage, and to the end one portion, the Nazareans, maintained their orthodox doctrinal position, and at the same time obeyed the requirements of the Law. The dualism which is found in the Clementines is an endeavor to explain the power of evil in the world and the function of Satan. The Clementines confirm the statement of the Fathers that the Ebionites used only the Gospel of Mark, for there are more quotations from Mt than from all the other books of the New Testament put together: These quotations are, however, all from chapters after the 3rd chapter. There are, it is to be noted, several unmistakable quotations from the Fourth Gospel. In the Clementines as noticed above there is an avoidance of attributing Divinity to our Lord. He is the Teacher, the Prophet; only in the discourse ascribed to Barnabas is He called the Son of God. This, we are aware, is the reverse of the ordinarily received idea of the historic succession of beliefs. It is thought that, beginning with the belief in the purely ordinary nature of our Lord's birth, these Jewish believers gradually added feature after feature until He was regarded as a Divine person, the Divine Logos made flesh by miraculous conception and birth. The abstract possibility of such being the course of events is not denied, but we do say that what evidence we have tends in the direction we have taken. There are elements kindred to Ebionism in the Epistle of James, the prominence given to the poor, the little prominence given to the Divinity of Our Lord or to the doctrines of grace all tend in that direction. Yet there is no developed Ebionism; the Divinity of Christ, if not stated in terms, is implied. Schwegler, followed in more recent times by Dr. Campbell of Dundee, finds a strong Ebionite bias in the Gospel of Luke, in which certainly there is no lessening of our Lord's supreme Divinity. All that it amounts to is a prominence given to the poor. The identification of the poor with the righteous has not come down to us as a tenet of the Ebionites; it has been ascribed to them from their name. As already stated in the Ascension of Isaiah, the Divinity of the Messiah is strongly asserted. The farther down the stream of history we go more and more clearly do the Ebionite features appear, till by the time when Alcibiades, the follower of Elkasai, appeared in Rome, we have something widely removed from the Ebionism of the Clementines, far as that is from the simple position occupied by the Nazareans.

2. Organization of Ebionites:

The Jewish Christians appear to have formed an organization of their own, separate from the church Catholic. The places where they assembled they did not call ekklesiai, "churches," but sunagogai, "synagogues." If we may believe the Clementine Homilies they had evolved a complete episcopal system for themselves. We, however, must not think that every variation of faith had a separate organization for itself. Strict Jewish ceremonial allowed no Jew to eat with any other not a Jew. The "love-feasts" of the early church implied this eating in common. If GentileChristians were present, the Ebionites could not join, hence, the need of a separate church. All Jewish Christians who reverenced the law could meet together and partake of the "love-feast," whatever their belief as to the person of Christ. In short, Ebionism was a thing of individuals, whose opinion ran through the whole gamut of faith, from the Nazareans, who differed from the orthodox simply in remaining Jews, to those whose Judaism alone prevented them from becoming followers of Theodotus of Byzantium, and who therefore sank back into pure Judaism.

V. Evidence from Ebionism for the Doctrine of the Primitive Church.

1. Christology of the Early Church:

In dealing with this branch of our subject we have to consider that the tendency of those who in the early days wrote against heresy was to exaggerate the difference between the heretics and the orthodox. On the other hand we have to consider the psychological difficulty involved in a person recognizing that anyone whom he daily met, whom he saw eating and sleeping like other men, was more than man, was Divine. This difficulty, great to all, was doubly so to the Jew. Yet again we have to consider what the origin of Christian theology was. It was an attempt to give a reasoned and systematic explanation of the phenomenon of Jesus Christ. Christ's character, His deeds and His claims had to be explained. The orthodox explanation which gradually became more definite as time rolled on was that He was the second person of the Trinity become incarnate, and the purpose of this incarnation that He might save many from their sins. This purpose He accomplished by dying on the cross and rising again. The primitive church owed its theology to Paul and John. Repugnant as much of this was to the Jews, yet the Ebionites, earnest, prejudiced Jews as they were, could not affirm in the presence of the facts of His career that Jesus was merely a man. They had to imagine a Divine influence coming down upon Him at His baptism, setting Him apart from all others. We have no trace of this at first: it stands at the end of a process of degradation of the ideal concerning the person of Christ. It was only when the effect of His personality had somewhat faded that men began to doubt His Divinity. The division of the personality seems to emerge at the same time. The earlier Ebionites, like the rest of the 1st-century believers, regarded Christ as one person; only later do they reach the notion of a heavenly eon separate from Jesus. The Ebionites seem to have held under varying forms a doctrine of the Trinity, and their holding it is an evidence that the church at large held it, not of course in that definiteness it assumed later, but essentially.

2. Paulinism of the Early Church:

To some extent the same may be said in regard to the Pauline doctrine of redemption. It is to be observed that both writers, he of the Homilies as well as the writer of the Recognitions, dislike and ignore Paul, even if they do not attempt to pillory him under the image of Simon Magus, as many have thought that they do. What, however, is also to be observed, is that they do not venture to denounce him by name. Paul and his teachings must have been, in the early part of the 2nd century, held in such deep reverence that no one could hope to destroy them by direct assault; the only hope was a flank attack. This reverence for Paul implies the reception of all he taught. All the specially Pauline doctrines of original sin, of redemption through the sacrificial death of Christ, and all the cognate ideas must have been held strongly by the early church or the Ebionites would have denounced Paul in the Clementines by name. Schwegler would argue that Justin Martyr was an Ebionite because he neither mentions nor quotes Paul. To this it may be answered that as the emperors to whom he addressed his apologies were heathens, and Trypho, with whom he had his dialogue, was a Jew, he naturally did not name one whose authority would be valueless to those he was addressing. He is equally silent as to Peter, James and John. If he does not quote Paul there are several indubitable echoes of his phrases and his thoughts.

In the face of the recent discoveries made in Egypt one cannot despair of manuscripts turning up which may throw needed light on this heresy. Were the Gospel according to the Hebrews to be found, or a manuscript of Hegesippus, we should be in a better position to decide a number of questions.

LITERATURE.

Contemporary writers on Ebionites: Irenaeus; Tertullian; Hippolytus; Origen; Eusebius, III, 27; Epiphanius; Jerome; Justin Martyr (Trypho, 47, 48) refers to the Ebionites without naming them.

Ebionite writings: Clementine Homilies; Clementine Recognitions; Clementine Epitomes; Asc Isa; Odes of Solomon.
Modern church historians: Neander, General History of the Christian Religion and Church; Schrock, Kirchengeschichte; Walch, Historic der Ketzereien, I, 95-124; Baur, Kirchengeschichte, I, 172-74, and Dogmengeschichte, 140-61, and

Christliche Gnosis; Schwegler, Nachapostolisches Zeitalter, 17-198; Ritschl, Altkatholische Kirche, 107-271; Matter, Gnosticisme, III, 11-28; Harnack, History of Dogma, 1-89 ff; Reuss, Hist. de la Theologie, I, 115-25; Donaldson, Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council, I, 39 ff; Mansel, Gnostic Heresies, 123-26; Helgenfeld, Ketzergeschichte, 421-46, and Clementines.

Articles in theological dictionaries: Smith and Wace; RE, 1st, 2nd and 3rd eds; Jewish Encyclopedia; Holtzman u. Zopffel; Lightfoot, Galatians, Disc. III; Colin Campbell, Studies in Luke.

J. E. H. Thomson

EBIONITES, GOSPEL OF THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; EBIONISM.

EBONY

eb’-o-ni (hobhnim (pl. only), vocalization uncertain; compare Arabic abnus):

Mentioned (Eze 27:15) along with ivory as merchandise of Tyre brought by the men of Dedan. This is the heavy, black, heart-wood of various species of Diospyros, natives of Southern India and Ceylon; the best kind is obtained from D. ebenum.

The sap-wood, being white and valueless, is cut away, but the trunks are sufficiently large to leave blocks of heart-wood 2 ft. in diameter and 10 or more ft. long. Ebony was used by the ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Romans, as well as the Phoenicians, for various purposes; it was frequently inlaid with ivory. In Europe it has been a favorite for cabinet-making down to recent times.

E. W. G. Masterman

EBRON

e’-brun (‘ebhron; the King James Version wrongly, Hebron):

A town in the territory of Asher (Jos 19:28). Probably we should read here Abdon, as in Jos 21:30; 1Ch 6:74, the substitution of the Hebrew letter resh ("r") for the Hebrew letter daleth ("d") being a common copyist’s error.

See ABDON.

EBRONAH

e-bro’-na:

In the King James Version (Nu 33:34,35)

for ABRONAH, which see.

ECANUS

e-ka’-nus:

the Revised Version (British and American)

ETHANUS (which see).

ECBATANA

ek-bat’-a-na

(Ezr 6:2 margin).

See ACHMETHA.

ECCE HOMO

ek’-se ho’-mo (idou ho anthropos, "Behold, the man!" Joh 19:5):

Pilate’s statement regarding Jesus during His trial. While the significance of this statement is somewhat debatable, yet there is little doubt, as judged from his attitude and statement immediately following, that Pilate was endeavoring to appeal to the accusers’ sympathies and to point out to them the manly qualities of Jesus. The ordinary punctuation which places an exclamation point after "Behold" and a period after "the man" is evidently incorrect if the grammatical structure in the Greek is to be observed, which gives to the second and third words the nominative form, and which therefore admits of a mild exclamation, and therefore of the emphasis upon "the man." Some, however, hold the contrary view and maintain that the utterance was made in a spirit of contempt and ridicule, as much as to say, "Behold here a mere man." See especially on this view Marcus Dods in Expositor’s Greek Testament. It would seem, however, that the former of the two views would be sustained by the chief facts in the case.

Walter G. Clippinger

ECCLESIASTES, THE PREACHER

e-kle-zi-as’-tez, or (qoheleth; Ekklesiastes, perhaps "member of assembly"; see below):

Contents

1. Structure of the Book

2. The Contents

3. Composite Authorship?

4. Qoheleth

5. "King in Jerusalem"

6. Date and Authorship

7. Linguistic Peculiarities

8. Certain Inconclusive Arguments

9. Canonicity

1. Structure of the Book:

Reading this book one soon becomes aware that it is a discussion of certain difficult problems of human life. It begins with a title Ec (1:1), followed by a preface (1:2-11). It has a formal conclusion (12:8-13). Between the preface and the conclusion the body of the book is made up of materials of two kinds—first a series of "I" sections, sections uttered in the 1st person singular, a record of a personal experience; and second, an alternating series of gnomic sections, sections made up of proverbs (say 4:5,6,9-12; 5:1-12; 7:1-14,16-22; 8:1-8; 9:7-10; 10:1-4; 10:8-12:7). These may be called the "thou" sections, as most of them have the pronoun of the 2nd person singular. The idea of the vanity of all things characterizes the record of experience, but it also appears in the "thou" sections (eg. 9:9). On the other hand the proverb element is not wholly lacking in the "I" sections (eg. 4:1-3).

2. The Contents:

In the preface the speaker lays down the proposition that all things are unreal, and that the results of human effort are illusive Ec (1:2,3). Human generations, day and night, the wind, the streams, are alike the repetition of an unending round (1:4-7). The same holds in regard to all human study and thinking (1:8-11). The speaker shows familiarity with the phenomena which we think of as those of natural law, of the persistence of force, but he thinks of them in the main as monotonously limiting human experience. Nothing is new. All effort of Nature or of man is the doing again of something which has already been done.

After the preface the speaker introduces himself, and recounts his experiences. At the outset he had a noble ambition for wisdom and discipline, but all he attained to was unreality and perplexity of mind (Ec 1:12-18). This is equally the meaning of the text, whether we translate "vanity and vexation of spirit" or "vanity and a striving after wind," ("emptiness, and struggling for breath"), though the first of these two translations is the better grounded.

Finding no adequate satisfaction in the pursuits of the scholar and thinker, taken by themselves, he seeks to combine these with the pursuit of agreeable sensations—alike those which come from luxury and those which come from activity and enterprise and achievement Ec (2:1-12). No one could be in better shape than he for making this experiment, but again he only attains to unreality and perplexity of spirit. He says to himself that at least it is in itself profitable to be a wise man rather than a fool, but his comfort is impaired by the fact that both alike are mortal (2:13-17). He finds little reassurance in the idea of laboring for the benefit of posterity; posterity is often not worthy (2:18-21). One may toil unremittingly, but what is the use (2:22,23)?

He does not find himself helped by bringing God into the problem. ‘It is no good for a man that he should eat and drink and make his soul see good in his toil’ Ec (2:24-26, as most naturally translated), even if he thinks of it as the gift of God; for how can one be sure that the gift of God is anything but luck? He sees, however, that it is not just to dismiss thus lightly the idea of God as a factor in the problem. It is true that there is a time for everything, and that everything is "beautiful in its time." It is also true that ideas of infinity are in men’s minds, ideas which they can neither get rid of nor fully comprehend (3:1-18). Here are tokens of God, who has established an infinite order. If we understood His ways better, that might unravel our perplexities. And if God is, immortality may be, and the solution of our problems may lie in that direction. For a moment it looks as if the speaker were coming out into the light, but doubt resumes its hold upon him. He asks himself, "Who knoweth?" and he settles back into the darkness. He has previously decided that for a man to "eat and drink, and make his soul enjoy good" is not worth while; and now he reaches the conclusion that, unsatisfactory as this is, there is nothing better (3:19-22).

And so the record of experiences continues, hopeful passages alternating with pessimistic passages. After a while the agnosticism and pessimism recede somewhat, and the hopeful passages become more positive. Even though "the poor man's wisdom is despised," the speaker says, "the words of the wise heard in quiet are better than the cry of him that ruleth among fools" Ec (9:17). He says "Surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God" (8:12), no matter how strongly appearances may indicate the contrary.

The gnomic sections are mostly free from agnosticism and pessimism. The book as a whole sums itself up in the conclusion, "Fear God, and keep his commandments" (Ec 12:13).

Of course the agnostic and pessimistic utterances in Ec are to be regarded as the presentation of one side of an argument. Disconnect them and they are no part of the moral and religious teaching of the book, except in an indirect way. At no point should we be justified in thinking of the author as really doubting in regard to God or moral obligation. He delineates for us a soul in the toils of mental and spiritual conflict. It is a delineation which may serve for warning, and which is in other ways wholesomely instructive; and in the outcome of it, it is full of encouragement.

In some passages the speaker in Ecclesiastes has in mind the solution of the problems of life which we are accustomed to call Epicurean (eg. 5:18-20; 7:16,17; 8:15; but not 2:24)—the solution which consists in avoiding extremes, and in getting from life as many agreeable sensations as possible; but it is not correct to say that he advocates this philosophy. He rather presents it as an alternative.

His conclusion is the important part of his reasoning. All things are vanity. Everything passes away. Yet (he says) it is better to read and use good words than bad words. Therefore because the Great Teacher is wise, he ever teaches the people knowledge, and in so doing he ever seeks good words, acceptable words, upright words, words of truth. "The words of the wise are as goads; and as nails well fastened" ("clinched at the back") (12:11). Such are the words of all the great masters. So (he ends) my son, be warned! There are many books in this world. Choose good ones. And his conclusion is: Reverence the Mighty Spirit. Keep to good principles. That is the whole duty of man. For everything at last becomes clear; and "good" stands out clearly from "evil."

3. Composite Authorship?:

We have noticed that our book has "I" sections and "thou" sections. Certainly these are structural marks, but as such they are capable of being interpreted in various ways. Partitional hypotheses can easily be formed, and perhaps there is no great objection to them; but there are no phenomena which cannot be accounted for by the hypothesis that we have here just the work of one author, who sometimes quotes proverbial utterances, either his own or those of other men. As proving the integrity of the book three points present themselves. First, in some cases (eg. Ec 7:14 b-16) the experience matter and the gnomic matter are closely combined in sense and in grammatical construction. Second, it is possible to interpret all the gnomic sections as a part of the continuous argument. Third, if we so interpret them the book is a unit, the argument moving forward continuously out of the speculative into the practical, and out of the darkness into the light.

4. Qoheleth:

The speaker in Ecclesiastes calls himself Qoheleth (1:1,2,12 and other places), rendered "the Preacher" in the English Versions. The word does not occur elsewhere, although it is from a stem that is in common use. Apparently it has been coined for a purpose by the author of Ecclesiastes. In form it is a feminine participle, though it denotes a man. This is best explained as a case of the using of an abstract expression for a concrete, as when in English we say "Your Honor," "Your Majesty." The other words of the stem are used of people gathering in assemblies, and the current explanation is to the effect that Qoheleth is a person who draws an audience whom he may address. To this there are two objections: First, the participle is intransitive; its natural implication is that of a person who participates in an assembly, not of one who causes the participants to assemble. Second, the assembly distinctively indicated by the words of this stem is the official assembly

for the transaction of public business. Worked out on this basis Qoheleth seems to mean citizenship, or concretely, a citizen —a citizen of such respectability that he is entitled to participate in public assemblies. It is in the character of citizen-king that the speaker in Ecclesiastes relates his experiences and presents his ideas.

This word for "assembly" and its cognates are in the Greek often translated by ekklesia and its cognates (eg. De 4:10; 9:10; Jud 20:2; 21:5,8). So we are not surprised to find Qoheleth rendered by the Greek Ekklesiastes, and this Latinized into Ecclesiastes.

5. "King in Jerusalem":

The speaker in Ec speaks not only in the character of Qoheleth, but in that of "the son of David, king in Jerus" (1:1). So far as this clause is concerned the king in question might be either Solomon or any other king of the dynasty, or might be a composite or an ideal king. He is represented (1:12-2:11) as "king over Israel," and as distinguished for wisdom, for his luxuries, for his great enterprises in building and in business. These marks fit Solomon better than any other king of the dynasty, unless possibly Uzziah. Possibly it is not absurd to apply to Solomon even the phrase "all that were before me over Jerusalem," or "in Jerus" (1:16; 2:7,9; compare 1Ch 29:25; 1Ki 3:12; 2Ch 1:12). It is safer, however, to use an alternative statement. The speaker in Ec is either Solomon or some other actual or composite or ideal king of the dynasty of David.

6. Date and Authorship:

If it were agreed that Solomon is the citizen king who, in Ecclesiastes, is represented as speaking, that would not be the same thing as agreeing that Solomon is the author of the book. No one thinks that Sir Galahad is the author of Tennyson’s poem of that name. Qoheleth the king is the character into whose mouth the author of Ecclesiastes puts the utterances which he wishes to present, but it does not follow that the author is himself Qoheleth.

The statement is often made that Jewish tradition attributes the writing of Ecclesiastes to Solomon; but can anyone cite any relatively early tradition to this effect? Is this alleged tradition anything else than the confusing of the author with the character whom he has sketched? The well-known classic tradition in Babha’ Bathra’ attributes Ec to "Hezekiah and his company," not to Solomon. And the tradition which is represented by the order in which the books occur in the Hebrew Bibles seems to place it still later. Concerning this tradition two facts are to be noted: First, it classes Ecclesiastes with the 5 miscellaneous books (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther) known as the five meghilloth, the five Rolls. Second, in the count of books which makes the number 22 or 24 it classes Ecclesiastes as one of the last 5 books (Ecclesiastes, Esther, Dan, Ezra-Nehemiah, 1 and 2 Chronicles). That the men who made this arrangement regarded the books of this group as the latest in the Bible is a natural inference.

7. Linguistic Peculiarities:

This agrees with the internal marks which constitute the principal evidence we have on this point. The grammatical character and the vocabulary of Ecclesiastes are exceptionally peculiar, and they strongly indicate that the book was written in the same literary period with these other latest books of the Old Testament. The true date is not much earlier or later than 400 BC (see CHRONICLES), though many place it a century or a century and a half later. Details concerning these phenomena may be found in Driver’s Introduction or other Introductions, or in commentaries. Only a few of the points will be given here, with barely enough illustrative instances to render the points intelligible.

In Ecclesiastes the syntax of the verb is peculiar. The imperfect with waw consecutive, the ordinary Hebrew narrative tense, occurs—for example, "And I applied my heart" (1:17)—but it is rare. The narrator habitually uses the perfect with waw (eg. 1:13; 2:11,12,14,15 bis. 17). In any English book we should find it very noticeable if the author were in the habit of using the progressive form of the verb instead of the ordinary form—if instead of saying "And I applied my heart" he should say "And I was applying my heart," "And I was looking on all the works," "And I was turning" (1:13; 2:11,12), and

so on. Another marked peculiarity is the frequent repeating of the pronoun along with the verb: ‘I said in my heart, even I’;‘ And I was hating, even I, all my labor’ (2:1,18 and continually). The use of the pronoun as copula is abnormally common in Ecclesiastes as compared with other parts of the Hebrew Bible (eg. 4:2). The abbreviated form of the relative pronoun is much used instead of the full form, and in both forms the pronoun is used disproportionately often as a conjunction. In these and many similar phenomena the Hebrew language of Ecclesiastes is affiliated with that of the later times.

The vocabulary presents phenomena that have the same bearing. Words of the stem taqan appear in Ecclesiastes (1:15; 7:13; 12:9) and in the Aramaic of Daniel (4:36), and not elsewhere in the Bible; they are frequent in the Talmud Words of the stem zaman (3 1) are used only in Ecclesiastes, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, Esther. Words of the stem shalaT, the stem whence comes our word "sultan," are frequent in Ecclesiastes—words which are used elsewhere only in the avowedly post-exilian books and in Ge 42:6, though a different word of this stem appears in the history of the time of David. Only in Ecclesiastes and Esther are found the verb kasher, "to be correct" (whence the modern Jewish kosher) and its derivative kishron. The Persian word pardec, "park" (Ec 2:5), occurs elsewhere only in Nehemiah and Canticles, and the Persian word pithgam, "official decision" or "record" (Ec 8:11), only in Es 1:20, and in the Aramaic parts of Ezra and Daniel. Ecclesiastes also abounds in late words formed from earlier stems—for example, cekhel and cikheluth, "folly" (Ec 10:6; 2:3 et al.); or medhinah, "province" (Ec 5:8), frequent in the latest books, but elsewhere found only in one passage in 1Ki (20:14,15,17,19). Especially common are new derivatives that end in "-n," for example, yithron, "profit"; ‘inyan, "travail"; checron, "that which is missing"; ra‘yon, "vexation" (Ec 1:3,13,15,17 and often). To these add instances of old words used in new meanings, and the various other groups of phenomena that are usual in such cases. No parts of the book are free from them.

The arguments for a later date than that which has been assigned are inconclusive. The Hebrew language of Ecclesiastes is more like the language of the Talmuds than is that of the Chronicler or Daniel or even Esther; but if one infers that Ecclesiastes is therefore later than the others the inference will prove to be in various ways embarrassing. The differences are better accounted for by the fact that Ecclesiastes belongs to a different type of literature from the others.

8. Certain Inconclusive Arguments:

Various passages have local color in Ec (eg. 11:1), or make the impression of being allusions to specific events (eg. 4:13-16; 6:2,3; 9:13-18), but the difficulty lies in locating the events. Dr. Kleinert argues plausibly for the writing of the book in Egypt in the time of the Ptolemies, but other equally probable hypotheses might be devised.

It is alleged that Ecclesiastes copies from Ecclesiasticus, but it is more probable that the latter copied from the former. It is alleged that the Wisdom disputes Ecclesiastes; if it does, that does not prove that the two are contemporary. It is alleged that the writer is familiar with the philosophy of Epicurus, and therefore must have lived later than Epicurus, who died 270 BC, or even later than Lucretius of the 1st century BC. If there were proof that this was a case of borrowing, Epicurus or Lucretius might have been the borrowers; but there is no such proof; the selfishness which constitutes the nucleus of Epicureanism has exhibited itself in human literature from the beginning. The strong resemblances between Ecclesiastes and Omar Khayyam have no weight to prove that the Hebrew author was later than the Persian Ecclesiastes presents a perfectly distinct doctrine of immortality, whether it affirms the doctrine or not; but that proves a relatively early date for the doctrine, rather than a late date for Ecclesiastes. At every point the marks of Ecclesiastes are those of the Persian period, not of the Greek.

9. Canonicity:

In the early Christian centuries, as in all the centuries since, there have been disputes concerning the canonicity of Ecclesiastes. It was not questioned that Ecclesiastes belonged to the canon as traditionally handed down. No question of admitting it to the canon was raised. But it was challenged because of the agnostic quality of some of its contents, and, every time, on close examination, the challenge was decided in its favor.

LITERATURE.

There are volumes on Ecclesiastes in all the great commentaries, and treatments of it in the volumes on Introduction. A few of the many separate commentaries are those of Moses Stuart, Andover, 1864; H. Gratz, Leipzig, 1871; G. Wildeboer, Tubingen, 1898; E. H. Plumptre, Cambridge, 1881. Other works are those of J. F. Genung, Ecclesiastes, and Omar Khayyam, 1901, Words of Koheleth, 1904, and The Hebrew Literature of Wisdom in the Light of Today, 1906; C. H. H. Wright, Book of Koheleth, 1883; S. Schiffer, Das Buch Coheleth nach Talmud und Midrasch, 1885; A. H. McNeile. Introduction to Ecclesiastes, New York, 1904.

Willis J. Beecher

ECCLESIASTICUS

e-kle-zi-as’-ti-kus.

See SIRACH.

ECLIPSE

e-klips’.

See ASTRONOMY.

ED

(’edh, "witness"):

The name of the altar erected by the trans-Jordanic tribes upon finally taking possession of Gilead (Jos 22:10,11,34); probably East of the Jordan opposite Jericho. But neither the Massoretic Text nor the Septuagint contained the word. Both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), however, insert the word on the authority of a few manuscripts. It has been suggested that it is the final ‘edh in Gal‘edh, the name given by Laban and Jacob to the memorial heap of stones erected by them in the vicinity (Ge 31:47,48). According to the Massoretic Text, the name of the altar is the entire sentence: "It is a witness between us that Yahweh is God." The opposition of the ten tribes to the erection of this altar was on the score that it was built after the pattern of the great altar of burnt offering (Jos 22:11,29), which was a horned altar forbidden in ordinary lay sacrifice. There is in it, therefore, no indication of a general opposition to lay sacrifices on altars of earth or unhewn stone (see Wiener, EPC, 198).

George Frederick Weight

EDAR

e’-dar.

See EDER.

EDDIAS

ed-i’-as.

See IEDDIAS.

EDDINUS

ed’-i-nus (Eddeinous, Codex Alexandrinus, Eddinous):

One of the "holy singers" at Josiah’s Passover (1 Esdras 1:15). the King James Version reads here Jeduthun, the corresponding name in the parallel passage (2Ch 35:15).

EDEN

e’-d’-n (‘edhen, "delight"; Edem):

(1) The land in which "Yahweh God planted a garden," where upon his creation "he put the man whom he had formed" (Ge 2:8).

In the Assyrian inscriptions idinu (Accadian, edin) means "plain" and it is from this that the Biblical word is probably derived. Following are the references to Eden in the Bible, aside from those in Ge 2 and 3: Ge 4:16; Isa 51:3; Eze 28:13; 31:9,16,18; 36:35; Joe 2:3. The Garden of Eden is said to be "eastward, in Eden" Ge (2:8); where the vegetation was luxurious (2:9) and the fig tree indigenous (3:7), and where it was watered by irrigation.

All kinds of animals, including cattle, beasts of the field and birds, were found there (2:19,20). Moreover, the climate was such that clothing was not needed for warmth. It is not surprising, therefore, that the plural of the word has the meaning "delights," and that Eden has been supposed to mean the land of delights, and that the word became a synonym for Paradise.

The location of Eden is in part to be determined from the description already given. It must be where there is a climate adapted to the production of fruit trees and of animals capable of domestication, and in general to the existence of man in his primitive condition. In particular, its location is supposed to be determined by the statements regarding the rivers coursing through it and surrounding it. There is a river (nahar) (Ge 2:10) which was parted and became four heads (ro’shim), a word which (Jud 8:16; Job 1:17) designates main detachments into which an army is divided, and therefore would more properly signify branches than heads, permitting Josephus and others to interpret the river as referring to the ocean, which by the Greeks was spoken of as the river (okeanos) surrounding the world. According to Josephus, the Ganges, the Tigris, the Euphrates and the Nile are the four rivers, being but branches of this one river. Moreover, it is contended by some, with much show of reason, that the word perath translated Euphrates is a more general term, signifying "the broad" or "deep" river, and so may here refer to some other stream than the Euphrates, possibly to a river in some other region whose name is perpetuated in the present Euphrates, as "the Thames" of New England perpetuates the memory of the Thames of Old England. In ancient times there was a river Phrath in Persia, and perhaps two. It is doubtful whether the phrase "eastward, in Eden" refers to the position with reference to the writer or simply with reference to Eden itself. So far as that phrase is concerned, therefore, speculation is left free to range over the whole earth, and this it has done.

1. Central Asia:

Columbus when passing the mouth of the Orinoco surmised that its waters came down from the Garden of Eden. It is fair to say, however, that he supposed himself to be upon the East coast of Asia. The traditions of its location somewhere in Central Asia are numerous and persistent. Naturalists have, with Quatrefages, pretty generally fixed upon the portion of

Central Asia stretching East from the Pamir, often referred to as the roof of the world, and from which flow four great rivers—the Indus, the Tarim, the Sur Daria (Jaxartes), and the Ainu Daria (Oxus)—as the original cradle of mankind. This conclusion has been arrived at from the fact that at the present time the three fundamental types of the races of mankind are grouped about this region. The Negro races are, indeed, in general far removed from the location, but still fragments of them both pure and mixed are found in various localities both in the interior and on the seashore and adjacent islands where they would naturally radiate from this center, while the yellow and the white races here meet at the present time in close contact. In the words of Quatrefages, "No other region of the globe presents a similar union of extreme human types distributed round a common center" (The Human Species, 176).

Philology, also, points to this same conclusion. On the East are the monosyllabic languages, on the North the polysyllabic or agglutinative languages, and on the West and South the inflectional or Aryan languages, of which the Sanskrit is an example, being closely allied to nearly all the languages of Europe. Moreover, it is to this center that we trace the origin of nearly all our domesticated plants and animals. Naturally, therefore, the same high authority writes, "There we are inclined to say the first human beings appeared and multiplied till the populations overflowed as from a bowl and spread themselves in waves in every direction" (ibid., 177). With this conclusion, as already said, a large number of most eminent authorities agree. But it should be noted that if, as we believe, there was a universal destruction of antediluvian man, the center of dispersion had in view by these naturalists and archaeologists would be that from the time of Noah, and so would not refer to the Eden from which Adam and Eve were driven. The same may be said of Haeckel’s theory that man originated in a submerged continent within the area of the Indian Ocean.

2. The North Pole:

Dr. William F. Warren has with prodigious learning attempted to show that the original Eden was at the North Pole, a theory which has too many considerations in its support to be cast aside unceremoniously, for it certainly is true that in preglacial times a warm climate surrounded the North Pole in all the lands which have been explored. In Northern Greenland and in Spitzbergen abundant remains of fossil plants show that during the middle of the Tertiary period the whole circumpolar region was characterized by a climate similar to that prevailing at the present time in Southern Europe, Japan, and the southern United States (see Asa Gray’s lectures on "Forest Geography and Archaeology" in the American Journal of Science, CXVI, 85-94, 183-96, and Wright, Ice Age in North America, 5th edition, chapter xvii). But as the latest discoveries have shown that there is no land within several hundred miles of the North Pole, Dr. Warren’s theory, if maintained at all, will have to be modified so as to place Eden at a considerable distance from the actual pole. Furthermore, his theory would involve the existence of "Tertiary man," and thus extend his chronology to an incredible extent, even though with Professor Green (see ANTEDILUVIANS) we are permitted to consider the genealogical table of Ge 5 as sufficiently elastic to accommodate itself to any facts which may be discovered.

3. Armenia:

Much also can be said in favor of identifying Eden with Armenia, for it is here that the Tigris and Euphrates have their origin, while two others, the Aras (Araxes) emptying into the Caspian Sea and the Choruk (thought by some to be the Phasis) emptying into the Black Sea, would represent the Gihon and the Pishon. Havilah would then be identified with Colchis, famous for its golden sands. But Cush is difficult to find in that region; while these four rivers could by no possibility be regarded as branches of one parent stream.

4. Babylonia:

Two theories locate Eden in the Euphrates valley. Of these the first would place it near the head of the Persian Gulf where the Tigris and Euphrates after their junction form the Shatt el-’Arab which bifurcates into the eastern and the western arm before reaching the Gulf. Calvin considered the Pishon to be the eastern arm and the Gihon the western arm. Other more recent authorities modify theory by supposing that Gihon and Pishon are represented by the Karum and the Kerkhah rivers which come into the Shatt el-’Arab from the east. The most plausible objection to this theory is that the Biblical account

represents all these branches as down stream from the main river, whereas this theory supposes that two of them at least are up stream. This objection has been ingeniously met by calling attention to the fact that 2,000 years before Christ the Persian Gulf extended up as far as Eridu, 100 miles above the present mouth of the river, and that the Tigris and the Euphrates then entered the head of the Gulf through separate channels, the enormous amount of silt brought down by the streams having converted so much of the valley into dry land. In consequence of the tides which extend up to the head of the Gulf, the current of all these streams would be turned up stream periodically, and so account for the Biblical statement. In this case the river (nahar) would be represented by the Persian Gulf itself, which was indeed called by the Babylonians nar marratum, "the bitter river." This theory is further supported by the fact that according to the cuneiform inscriptions Eridu was reputed to have in its neighborhood a garden, "a holy place," in which there grew a sacred palm tree. This "tree of life" appears frequently upon the inscriptions with two guardian spirits standing on either side.

The other theory, advocated with great ability by Friedrich Delitzsch, places Eden just above the site of ancient Babylon, where the Tigris and Euphrates approach to within a short distance of one another and where the country is intersected by numerous irrigating streams which put off from the Euphrates and flow into the Tigris, whose level is here considerably lower than that of the Euphrates—the situation being somewhat such as it is at New Orleans where the Mississippi River puts off numerous streams which empty into Lake Pontchartrain. Delitzsch supposes the Shatt el-Nil, which flows eastward into the Tigris, to be the Gihon, and the Pallacopas, flowing on the West side of the Euphrates through a region producing gold, to be the Pishon. The chief difficulties attending this theory pertain to the identification of the Pishon with the Pallacopas, and the location of Havilah on its banks. There is difficulty, also, in all these theories in the identification of Cush (Ethiopia), later associated with the country from which the Nile emerges, thus giving countenance to the belief of Josephus and many others that that river represented the Gihon. If we are compelled to choose between these theories it would seem that the one which locates Eden near the head of the Persian Gulf combines the greater number of probabilities of every kind.

(2) A Levite of the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12; 31:15).

LITERATURE.

Dawson Modern Science in Bible Lands; Friedrich Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? (1881); Sayce, HCM, 95 ff; Hommel, Anc. Hebrew Tradition, 314; William F. Warren, Paradise Found, 1885.

George Frederick Wright

EDEN, CHILDREN OF

See CHILDREN OF EDEN.

EDEN, HOUSE OF

See AVEN; BETH-EDEN; CHILDREN OF EDEN.

EDER (1)

e’-der (’edher, "flock"):

(1) One of the "uttermost cities" of Judah in the Negeb ("South") near the border of Edom (Jos 15:21), possibly Kh. el ‘Adar, 5 miles South of Gaza, but probably this is too far west.

(2) Eder (the King James Version Edar) or better Migdal Eder, mighdal ‘edher, "the tower of the flock"; Gader. After

Rachel died and was buried "in the way to Ephrath (the same is Bethlehem) .... Israel journeyed, and spread his tent beyond the tower of Eder" (Ge 35:19,21). In Ge 35:27 he is described as proceeding to Hebron. This "tower of the flock," which may have been only a tower and no town, must therefore be looked for between Bethlehem and Hebron. Jerome says that it was one Roman mile from Bethlehem. In the Septuagint, however, 35:16 and 21 are transposed, which suggests that there may have been a tradition that Migdal Eder was between Bethel and Bethlehem. There must have been many such towers for guarding flocks against robbers. Compare "tower of the watchman" (2Ki 18:8, etc.). The phrase "Migdal Eder" occurs in Mic 4:8 where Jerusalem is compared to such a tower.

E. W. G. Masterman

EDER (2)

e’-der (‘edher, "flock").

(1) A Merarite Levite in the days of David (1Ch 23:23; 24:30); son of Mushi.

(2) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:15, the King James Version "Ader").

EDES

e’-dez: the Revised Version (British and American)

EDOS (which see).

EDGE

ej:

Very frequently occurs in the phrase "the edge of the sword" (Jos 10:28, et al.) from the Hebrew peh, "lip," or saphah, "lip." Ex 28:7 and 39:4 read "ends," from qatsah, "end" (the King James Version "edge"), and Jos 13:27 has "uttermost part" for the same Hebrew word (the King James Version "edge"). In Jer 31:29 and Eze 18:2, "The children’s teeth are set on edge" (qahah, "to be blunt"), i.e. set hard one against another.

EDIFICATION; EDIFY

ed-i-fi-ka’-shun, ed’-i-fi:

The Greek words oikodomeo, "to build," oikodome, "the act of building," are used both literally and figuratively in the New Testament; "edify," "edifying," "edification," are the translation of the King James Version in some 20 passages, all in the figurative sense of the promotion of growth in Christian character. the Revised Version (British and American) in 2Co 10:8; 13:10; Eph 4:12,16; 1Th 5:11 renders "build up," "building up," making the force of the figure clearer to the English reader. In 1Ti 1:4 the Greek text followed by the Revised Version (British and American) has oikonomia, "dispensation," instead of oikodomia, "edifying" (the King James Version).

F. K. Farr

EDNA

ed’-na (Edna):

Wife of Raguel and mother of Sarah who married Tobias (Tobit 7:2, etc.; 10:12; 11:1). "Edna" in Hebrew means "pleasure" and corresponds to Latin Anna.

EDOM; EDOMITES

e’-dum, e’-dum-its ‘edhom, "red"; Edom:

1. Boundaries:

The boundaries of Edom may be traced with some approach to accuracy. On the East of the ‘Arabah the northern border ran from the Dead Sea, and was marked by Wady el-Kurachi, or Wady el-Chasa. On the East it marched with the desert. The southern border ran by Elath and Ezion-geber (De 2:8). On the West of the ‘Arabah the north boundary of Edom is determined by the south border of Israel, as indicated in Nu 34:3 f: a line running from the Salt Sea southward of the Ascent of Akrabbim to Zin and Kadesh-barnea. This last, we are told, lay in the "uttermost" of the border of Edom (Nu 20:16). The line may be generally indicated by the course of Wady el-Fiqrah. How much of the uplands West of the ‘Arabah southward to the Gulf of ‘Aqaba was included in Edom it is impossible to say.

2. Character and Features:

The land thus indicated varies greatly in character and features. South of the Dead Sea in the bottom of the valley we have first the stretch of salt marsh land called es-Sebkha; then, beyond the line of white cliffs that crosses the valley diagonally from Northwest to Southeast, a broad depression strewn with stones and sandhills, the debris of an old sea bottom, rises gradually, and 60 miles to the South reaches a height of about 700 ft. above the level of the Red Sea, 2,000 ft. above that of the Dead Sea. From this point it sinks until it reaches the shore of the Gulf of ‘Aqaba, 45 miles farther South. The whole depression is known today as Wady el-‘Arabah (compare Hebrew ha-‘arabhah, De 2:8 the Revised Version (British and American), etc.). On either side the mountains rise steeply from the valley, their edges carved into many fantastic shapes by the deep wadys that break down from the interior (see ARABAH). The northern part of the plateau on the West forms the spacious grazing ground of the ‘Azdzimeh Arabs. The mountains rise to a height of from about 1,500 ft. to a little over 2,000 ft. This district was traversed by the ancient caravan road to South Palestine; and along the eastern side traces of the former civilization are still to be seen. The desert region to the South is higher, reaching to as much as 2,600 ft. The mountain range East of the ‘Arabah is generally higher in the South than in the North. Jebel Harun beside Petra, is 4,780 ft. above sea-level; while East of ‘Aqaba, Jebel el-Chisma may be as much as 5,900 ft. in height.

Limestone, porphyry and Nubian sandstone are the prevailing formation; but volcanic rocks are also found. The range consists mainly of rough rocky heights with many almost inaccessible peaks separated by deep gorges. But there are also breadths of fertile land where wheat, grapes, figs, pomegranates and olives are grown to advantage. The northern district is known today by the name el-Jebal, corresponding to the ancient Gebal. Seir is the name applied to the eastern range in Ge 36:8; De 2:1,5; 2Ch 20:23. It is also called Edom, and the Mount of Esau (Ob 1:8 f). Seir, however, is used for the western highlands in De 33:2. This seems to be its meaning also in Jud 5:4, where it appears as the equivalent of "the field of Edom." With this same phrase, however, in Ge 32:3 it may more fitly apply to the eastern range.

See illustration under DESERT.

3. Origin of Name:

The name Edom, "red," may have been derived from the red sandstone cliffs characteristic of the country. It was applied to Esau because of the color of his skin (Ge 25:25), or from the color of the pottage for which he sold his birthright (Ge

25:30). In Ge 36:8 Esau is equated with Edom as dwelling in Mt. Seir; and he is described as the father of Edom (36:9, Hebrew). The name however is probably much older. It may be traced in the records of the Twelfth Dynasty in Egypt. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Brit Mus No. 64) Udumu, or Edom, is named; and in Assyrian inscriptions the name Udumu occurs of a city and of a country. The latter may have been named from the former: this again may have been derived from a deity, Edom, who may be traced in such a name as Obed-edom (2Sa 6:10).

4. History:

The children of Esau are said to have "destroyed" the Horites who dwelt in Seir before them (Ge 14:6; De 2:22). This only means that the Horites were subdued. Esau married the daughter of Anah, a Horite (Ge 36:20—in verse 2 he is called a Hivite); and the lists in this chapter show that the races intermingled. The Horite government was in the hands of "dukes" (Ge 36:29 f, the Revised Version (British and American) "chiefs"). They were succeeded by dukes of the house of Esau (Ge 36:40 ff). This form of government gave way to that of an elective monarchy (Ge 36:31 ff); and this had existed some time before Israel left the wilderness. The then reigning king would not permit Israel to pass through the land (Nu 20:14 ff; 21:4). Israel was forbidden to "abhor an Edomite," on the ground that he was a brother; and children of the third generation might enter the assembly of the Lord (De 23:7 f). War with Edom was out of the question.

Some thirty years after the Exodus, Ramses III "smote the people of Seir." The Israelites could not have been far off. We first hear of war between Israel and Edom under Saul (1Sa 14:47). David prosecuted the war with terrific energy, slaying 18,000 Edomites (so read instead of "Syrians") in the Valley of Salt (2Sa 8:13 f) ; Joab remaining for six months in the country, which was garrisoned by Israelites, "until he had cut off every male in Edom" (1Ki 11:15 f). Hadad of the blood royal of Edom escaped to Egypt, and later became a source of trouble to Solomon (1Ki 11:14 ff, 25). The conquest of Edom opened to Israel the ports of the Red Sea, whence the expeditions of Solomon and Jehoshaphat set out. In Jehoshaphat’s time the king is called a "deputy" (1Ki 22:47). Its king acknowledged the supremacy of Judah (2Ki 3:9, etc.). Under Jehoram son of Jehoshaphat, Edom revolted. Jehoram defeated them at Zair, but was unable to quell the rebellion (2Ki 8:20 ff). Amaziah invaded the country, slew 10,000 in the Valley of Salt, and took Sela which he named Joktheel (2Ki 14:7). Uzziah restored the Edomite port of Elath (2Ki 14:22). In the Syrian war Rezin regained Elath for Syria, and cast out the Jews. It was then permanently occupied by Syrians—here also probably we should read Edomites (2Ki 16:6). From the cuneiform inscriptions we learn that when Tiglath-pileser subdued Rezin, among the kings from whom he received homage at Damascus was Qaus-malaka of Edom (736 BC). Later Malik-ram paid homage to Sennacherib. To Ezarhaddon also they were compelled to render service. They gave what help they could to Nebuchadnezzar, and exulted in the destruction of Jerusalem, stirring the bitterest indignation in the hearts of the Jews (La 4:21; Eze 25:12; 35:3 ff; Ob 1:10 ff). The Edomites pressed into the now empty lands in the South of Judah. In 300 BC Mt. Seir with its capital Petra fell into the hands of the Nabateans.

5. Idumaea and the Idumeans:

West of the ‘Arabah the country they occupied came to be known by the Greek name Idumaea, and the people as Idumeans. Hebron, their chief city, was taken by Judas Maccabeus in 165 BC (1 Macc 4:29,61; 5:65). In 126 BC the country was subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled the people to become Jews and to submit to circumcision. Antipater, governor of Idumaea, was made procurator of Judea, Samaria and Galilee by Julius Caesar. He paved the way to the throne for his son Herod the Great. With the fall of Judah under the Romans, Idumaea disappears from history.

The names of several Edomite deities are known: Hadad, Qaus, Koze, and, possibly, Edom; but of the religion of Edom we are without information. The language differed little from Hebrew.

W. Ewing

EDOS

e’-dos (Edais; the King James Version Edes):

One who agreed to put away his foreign wife (APC 1Esdras 9:35); called Iddo, the King James Version "Jadan," in Ezr 10:43.

EDREI

ed’-re-i (’edhre‘i; Edra-ein):

(1) One of the cities of Og, not far from Ashtaroth, where the power of his kingdom received its deathblow from the invading Israelites (Jos 12:4; Nu 21:33 ff, etc.). It seems to mark the western limit of Bashan as against Salecah on the East (De 3:10). It was given to Machir, son of Manasseh (Jos 13:31). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 24 Roman miles from Bostra. The most probable identification is with Der‘ah, a town of between 4,000 and 5,000 inhabitants, on the southern lip of Wady Zeideh, about 29 miles as the crow flies East of the Sea of Galilee. It is the center of an exceedingly fruitful district. The accumulated rubbish in the town covers many remains of antiquity. It is, however, chiefly remarkable for the extraordinary subterranean city, as yet only partially explored, cut in the rock under the town. This is certainly very ancient, and was doubtless used by the inhabitants as a refuge in times of stress and peril. For a description see Schumacher, Across the Jordan, 121 ff.

(2) A place not identified, between Kedesh and En-hazor (Jos 19:37).

W. Ewing

EDUCATION

ed-u-ka’-shun:

Contents

I. EDUCATION DEFINED

II. EDUCATION IN EARLY ISRAEL

1. Nomadic and Agricultural Periods 2. The Monarchical Period 3. Deuteronomic Legislation 4. Reading and Writing

III. EDUCATION IN LATER ISRAEL

1. Educational Significance of the Prophets 2. The Book of the Law 3. Wise Men or Sages 4. The Book of Proverbs 5. Scribes and Levites 6. Greek and Roman Influences

IV. EDUCATION IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

1. Subject Matter of Instruction 2. Method and Aims 3. Valuable Results of Jewish Education 4. The Preeminence of Jesus as a Teacher 5. Educational Work of the Early Disciples

V. LITERATURE

I. Education Defined.

By education we understand the sum total of those processes whereby society transmits from one generation to the next its accumulated social, intellectual and religious experience and heritage. In part these processes are informal and incidental, arising from participation in certain forms of social life and activity which exist on their own account and not for the sake of their educative influence upon the rising generation. The more formal educative processes are designed

(1) to give the immature members of society a mastery over the symbols and technique of civilization, including language (reading and writing), the arts, the sciences, and religion, and

(2) to enlarge the fund of individual and community knowledge beyond the measure furnished by the direct activities of the immediate environment (compare Dewey, article on "Education" in Monroe's CE; compare Butler, ME).

Religious education among ancient and modern peoples alike reveals clearly this twofold aspect of all education. On its informal side it consists in the transmission of religious ideas and experience by means of the reciprocal processes of imitation and example; each generation, by actually participating in the religious activities and ceremonies of the social group, imbibing as it were the spirit and ideals of the preceding generation as these are modified by the particular economic and industrial conditions under which the entire process takes place. Formal religious education begins with the conscious and systematic effort on the part of the mature members of a social group (tribe, nation, or religious fellowship) to initiate the immature members by means of solemn rites and ceremonies, or patient training, or both, into the mysteries and high privileges of their own religious fellowship and experience. As regards both the content and form of this instruction, these will in every case be determined by the type and stage of civilization reflected in the life, occupations, habits and customs of the people. Among primitive races educational method is simpler and the content of formal instruction less differentiated than on higher culture levels (Ames, PRE). All education is at first religious in the sense that religious motives and ideas predominate in the educational efforts of all primitive peoples. The degree to which religion continues preeminent in the educational system of a progressive nation depends upon the vitality of its religion and upon the measure of efficiency and success with which from the first that religion is instilled into the very bone and sinew of each succeeding generation. Here lies the explanation of the religious-educational character of Hebrew national life, and here, too, the secret of Israel's incomparable influence upon the religious and educational development of the world. The religion of Israel was a vital religion and it was a teaching religion (Kent, GTJC).

II. Education in Early Israel.

In their social and national development the Hebrews passed through several clearly marked cultural stages which it is important to note in connection with their educational history. At the earliest point at which the Old Testament gives us any knowledge of them, they, like their ancestors, were nomads and shepherds. Their chief interest centered in the flocks and herds from which they gained a livelihood, and in the simple, useful arts that seem gradually to have become hereditary in certain families. With the settlement of the Hebrew tribes in Palestine and their closer contact with Canaanitish culture, a more established agricultural life with resulting changes in social and religious institutions gradually superseded the nomadic stage of culture. A permanent dwelling-place made possible, as the continual warfare of gradual conquest made necessary, a closer federation of the tribes, which ultimately resulted in the establishment of the monarchy under David (W. R. Smith, RS; Davidson, HE).

1. Nomadic and Agricultural Periods:

In these earliest cultural periods, both the nomadic and the agricultural, there was no distinct separation between the spheres of religion and ordinary life. The relation of the people to Yahweh was conceived by them in simple fashion as involving on their part the obligation of filial obedience and loyalty, and on Yahweh's part reciprocal parental care over them as His people. The family was the social unit and its head the person in whom centered also religious authority and leadership, The tribal head or patriarch in turn combined in himself the functions which later were differentiated into those of priest and prophet and king. Education was a matter of purely domestic interest and concern. The home was the only

school and the parents the only teachers. But there was real instruction, all of which, moreover, was given in a spirit of devout religious earnestness and of reverence for the common religious ceremonies and beliefs, no matter whether the subject of instruction was the simple task of husbandry or of some useful art, or whether it was the sacred history and traditions of the tribe, or the actual performance of its religious rites. According to Josephus (Ant., IV, viii, 12) Moses himself had commanded, "All boys shall learn the most important parts of the law since such knowledge is most valuable and the source of happiness"; and again he commanded (Apion, II, 25) to teach them the rudiments of learning (reading and writing) together with the laws and deeds of the ancestors, in order that they might not transgress or seem ignorant of the laws of their ancestors, but rather emulate their example. Certain it is that the earliest legislation, including the Decalogue, emphasized parental authority and their claim on the reverence of their children: "Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which Yahweh thy God giveth thee" (Ex 20:12); "And he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death. And he that curseth his father or his mother, shall surely be put to death" (Ex 21:15,17); while every father was exhorted to explain to his son the origin and significance of the great Passover ceremony with its feast of unleavened bread: "And thou shalt tell thy son in that day, saying, It is because of that which Yahweh did for me when I came forth out of Egypt" (Ex 13:8).

2. The Monarchical Period:

The period of conquest and settlement developed leaders who not only led the allied tribes in battle, but served as judges between their people, and were active in the maintenance of the ancestral religion. In time, sufficient cooperation was obtained to make possible the organization of strong intertribal leagues and, finally, the kingship. "This increasing political unification," says Ames, "was accompanied by a religious consciousness which became ultimately the most remarkable product of the national development" (Ames, PRE, 174 f). The establishment of the kingdom and the beginnings of city and commercial life were accompanied by more radical cultural changes, including the differentiation of religious from other social institutions, the organization of the priesthood, and the rise and development of prophecy. Elijah, the Tishbite, Amos, the herdsman from Tekoa, Isaiah, the son of Amoz, were all champions of a simple faith and ancient religious ideals as over against the worldly-wise diplomacy and sensuous idolatry of the surrounding nations. Under the monarchy also a new religious symbolism developed. Yahweh was thought of as a king in whose hands actually lay the supreme guidance of the state: "Accordingly the organization of the state included provision for consulting His will and obtaining His direction in all weighty matters" (W. R. Smith, RS, 30). Under the teaching of the prophets the ideal of personal and civic righteousness was moved to the very forefront of Hebrew religious thought, while the prophetic ideal of the future was that of a time when "the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Yahweh, as the waters cover the sea" (Isa 11:9), when all "from the least of them unto the greatest of them" shall know him (Jer 31:34). Concerning the so-called "schools of the prophets" which, in the days of Elijah, existed at Bethel, Jericho and Gilgal (2Ki 2:3,1; 4:38 f), and probably in other places, it should be noted that these were associations or brotherhoods established for the purpose of mutual edification rather than education. The Bible does not use the word "schools" to designate these fraternities. Nevertheless, we cannot conceive of the element of religious training as being entirely absent.

3. Deuteronomic Legislation:

Shortly before the Babylonian captivity King Josiah gave official recognition and sanction to the teachings of the prophets, while the Deuteronomic legislation of the same period strongly emphasized the responsibility of parents for the religious and moral instruction and training of their children. Concerning the words of the law Israel is admonished: "Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up" (De 6:7; 11:19). For the benefit of children as well as adults the law was to be written "upon the door-posts" and "gates" (De 6:9; 11:20), and "very plainly" upon "great stones" set up for this purpose upon the hilltops and beside the altars (De 27:1-8). From the Deuteronomic period forward, religious training to the Jew became the synonym of education, while the word Torah, which originally denoted simply "Law" (Ex 24:12; Le 7:1; 26:46), came to mean "religious instruction or teaching," in which sense it is used in De 4:44; 5:1, "This is the law which Moses set before the children of Israel: .... Hear, O Israel, the statutes and the ordinances which I speak in your ears this day, that ye may learn them, and observe to do them"; and in Pr 6:23,

"For the commandment is a lamp; and the law is light; And reproofs of instruction are the way of life."

(Compare Ps 19:8; Pr 3:1; 4:2.)

4. Reading and Writing:

With the development and reorganization of the ritual, priests and Levites, as the guardians of the law, were the principal instructors of the people, while parents remained in charge of the training of the children. In families of the aristocracy the place of the parents was sometimes taken by tutors, as appears from the case of the infant Solomon, whose training stems to have been entrusted to the prophet Nathan (2Sa 12:25). There is no way of determining to what extent the common people were able to read and write. Our judgment that these rudiments of formal education in the modern sense were not restricted to the higher classes is based upon such passages as Isa 29:11,12, which distinguishes between the man who "is learned" (literally, "knoweth letters") and the one who is "not learned," and Isa 10:19, referring to the ability of a child "to write," taken together with such facts as that the literary prophets Amos and Micah sprang from the ranks of the common people, and that "the workman who excavated the tunnel from the Virgin's Spring to the Pool of Siloam carved in the rock the manner of their work" (Kennedy in HDB). It should be added that the later Jewish tradition reflected in the Talmud, Targum and Midrash, and which represents both public, elementary and college education as highly developed even in patriarchal times, is generally regarded as altogether untrustworthy.

III. Education in Later Israel.

The national disaster that befell the Hebrew people in the downfall of Jerusalem and the Babylonian captivity was not without its compensating, purifying and stimulating influence upon the religious and educational development of the nation. Under the pressure of adverse external circumstances the only source of comfort for the exiled people was in the law and covenant of Yahweh, while the shattering of all hope of immediate national greatness turned the thought and attention of the religious leaders away from the present toward the future. Two types of Messianic expectation characterized the religious development of the exilic period. The first is the priestly, material hope of return and restoration reflected in the prophecies of Ezekiel. The exiled tribes are to return again to Jerusalem; the temple is to be restored, its ritual and worship purified and exalted, the priestly ordinance and service elaborated. The second is the spiritualized and idealized Messianic expectation of the Second Isaiah, based on teachings of the earlier prophets. For the greatest of Hebrew prophets Yahweh is the only God, and the God of all nations as well as of Israel. For him Israel is Yahweh's servant, His instrument for revealing Himself to other nations, who, when they witness the redemption of Yahweh's suffering Servant, will bow down to Yahweh and acknowledge His rule. "Thus the trials of the nation lead to a comprehensive universalism within which the suffering Israel gains an elevated and ennobling explanation" (Ames, PRE, 185). In the prophetic vision of Ezekiel we must seek the inspiration for the later development of Jewish ritual, as well as the basis of those eschatological hopes and expectations which find their fuller expression in the apocalypse of Daniel and the kindred literature of the later centuries. The prophecies of the Isaiahs and the Messianic hope which these kindled in the hearts of the faithful prepared the way for the teachings of Jesus concerning a Divine spiritual kingdom, based upon the personal, ethical character of the individual and the mutual, spiritual fellowship of believers.

1. Educational Significance of the Prophets:

The educational significance of the prophetic writings of this as of the preceding periods is that the prophets themselves were the real religious leaders and representative men (Kulturtrager) of the nation. In advance of their age they were the heralds of Divine truth; the watchmen on the mountain tops whose clear insight into the future detected the significant elements in the social and religious conditions and tendencies about them, and whose keen intellect and lofty faith grasped the eternal principles which are the basis of all individual and national integrity and worth. These truths and principles they impressed upon the consciousness of their own and succeeding generations, thereby giving to future teachers of their race the essence of their message, and preparing the way for the larger and fuller interpretation of religion and life contained in the teachings of Jesus. The immediate influence of their teaching is explained in part by the variety and effectiveness of

their teaching method, their marvelous simplicity and directness of speech, their dramatic emphasis upon essentials and their intelligent appreciation of social conditions and problems about them.

2. The Book of the Law:

The immediate bond of union, as well as the textbook and program of religious instruction, during the period of the captivity and subsequently, was the Book of the Law, which the exiles carried with them to Babylon. When in 458 BC a company of exiles returned to Palestine, they along with their poorer brethren who had not been carried away, restored the Jewish community at Jerusalem, and under the suzerainty of Persia, founded a new nationalism, based, even more than had been the earlier monarchy, upon the theocratic conception of Israel's relation to Yahweh. During this period it was that writings of poets, lawgivers, prophets and sages were brought together into one sacred collection of scrolls, known later as the Old Testament canon, of which the Torah (the law) was educationally the most significant. The recognized teachers of this period included, in addition to the priests and Levites, the "wise men," or "sages" and the "scribes" or copherim (literally, "those learned in Scriptures").

3. Wise Men or Sages:

Whether or not the sages and scribes of the later post-exilic times are to be regarded as one and the same class, as an increasing number of scholars are inclined to believe, or thought of as distinct classes, the wise men clearly antedate, not only the copherim but in all probability all forms of book learning as well. Suggestions of their existence and function are met with in earliest times both in Israel and among other nations of the East. As illustrations of their appearance in preexilic Old Testament history may be cited the references in 2Sa 14:1-20; 1Ki 4:32; Isa 29:10. It is no lesser personage than King Solomon who, both by his contemporaries and later generations as well, was regarded as the greatest representative of this earlier group of teachers who uttered their wisdom in the form of clever, epigrammatic proverbs and shrewd sayings. The climax of Wisdom-teaching belongs, however, to the later post-exilic period. Of the wise men of this later day an excellent description is preserved for us in the Book of Ecclesiasticus 39:3-10; 1:1-11

"He seeks out the hidden meaning of proverbs, And is conversant with the subtleties of parables, He serves among great men, And appears before him who rules; He travels through the land of strange nations; For he hath tried good things and evil among men".

"He shows forth the instruction which he has been taught, And glories in the law of the covenant of the Lord".

"Nations shall declare his wisdom, And the congregation shall tell out his praise."

4. The Book of Proverbs:

Of the pedagogic experience, wisdom and learning of these sages, the Book of Proverbs forms the Biblical repository. Aside from the Torah it is thus the oldest handbook of education. The wise men conceive of life itself as a discipline. Parents are the natural instructors of their children:

"My son, hear the instruction of thy father, And forsake not the law of thy mother." Pr 1:8.

(Compare 4:1-4 ff; 6:20; 13:1.) The substance of such parental teaching is to be the 'fear of Yahweh' which "is the beginning of wisdom"; and fidelity in the performance of this parental obligation has the promise of success: "Train up a child in the way he should go, And even when he is old he will not depart from it." Pr 22:6.

In their training of children, parents are to observe sternness, not hesitating to apply the rod of correction, when needed (compare Pr 23:13,14), yet doing so with discretion, since wise reproof is better than "a hundred stripes" (Pr 17:10).

Following the home training there is provision for further instruction at the hands of professional teachers for all who would really obtain unto "wisdom" and who can afford the time and expense of such special training. The teachers are none other than the wise men or sages whose words "heard in quiet" (Ec 9:17) are "as goads, and as nails well fastened" (Ec 12:11). Their precepts teach diligence Pr (6:6-11), chastity (7:5), charity (14:21), truthfulness (17:7) and temperance (21:17; 23:20,21,29-35); for the aim of all Wisdom-teaching is none other than

"To give prudence to the simple, To the young man knowledge and discretion: That the wise man may hear, and increase in learning; And that the man of understanding may attain unto sound counsels." —Pr 1:4,5.

5. Scribes and Levites:

The copherim or "men of book learning" were editors and interpreters as well as scribes or copyists of ancient and current writings. As a class they did not become prominent until the wise men, as such, stepped into the background, nor until the exigencies of the situation demanded more teachers and teaching than the ranks of priests and Levites, charged with increasing ritualistic duties, could supply. Ezra was both a priest and a copher (Ezr 7:11; Ne 8:1 f), concerning whom we read that he "set his heart to seek the law of Yahweh, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and ordinances" (Ezr 7:10). Likewise the Levites often appear as teachers of the law, and we must think of the development of sopherism (scribism) as a distinct profession as proceeding very gradually. The same is true of the characteristic Jewish religious-educational institution, the synagogue, the origin and development of which fell within this same general period (compare SYNAGOGUE). The pupils of the copherim were the Pharisees (perushim or "separatists") who during the Maccabean period came to be distinguished from the priestly party or Sadducees.

6. Greek and Roman Influences:

The conquest of Persia by Alexander (332 BC) marks the rise of Greek influence in Palestine. Alexander himself visited Palestine and perhaps Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant, X, i, 8), befriended the Jews and granted to them the privilege of seir-government, and the maintenance of their own social and religious customs, both at home and in Alexandria, the new center of Greek learning, in the founding of which many Jews participated (see ALEXANDRIA). During the succeeding dynasty of the Ptolemies, Greek ideas and Greek culture penetrated to the very heart of Judaism at Jerusalem, and threatened the overthrow of Jewish social and religious institutions. The Maccabean revolt under Antiochus Epiphanes (174-164 BC) and the reestablishment of a purified temple ritual during the early part of the Maccabean period (161-63 BC) were the natural reaction against the attempt of the Seleucids forcibly to substitute the Greek gymnasium and theater for the Jewish synagogue and temple (Felten, NZ, I, 83 f; compare 1 Macc 1, 3, 9, 13 and 2 Macc 4-10). The end of the Maccabean period found Phariseeism and strict Jewish orthodoxy in the ascendancy with such Hellenic tendencies as had found permanent lodgment in Judaism reflected in the agnosticism of the aristocratic Sadducees. The establishment of Roman authority in Palestine (63 BC) introduced a new determining element into the environmental conditions under which Judaism was to attain its final distinguishing characteristics. The genius of the Romans was practical, legalistic and institutional. As organizers and administrators they were preeminent. But their religion never inspired to any exalted view of life, and education to them meant always merely a preparation for life’s practical duties. Hence, the influence of Roman authority upon Judaism was favorable to the development of a narrow individualistic Phariseeism, rather than to the fostering of Greek idealism and universalism. With the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans a little more than a century later (70 AD) and the cessation of the temple worship, the Sadducees as a class disappeared from Judaism, which has ever since been represented by the Pharisees devoted to the study of the law. Outside of Jerusalem and Palestine, meanwhile, the Jewish communities at Alexandria and elsewhere were much more hospitable to Greek culture and learning, at the same time exerting a reciprocal, modifying influence upon Greek thought. It was, however, through its influence upon early Christian theology and education that the Hellenistic philosophy of the Alexandrian school left its deeper impress upon the substance and method of later Christian education.

IV. Education in New Testament Times.

Elementary schools: Jewish education in the time of Christ was of the orthodox traditional type and in the hands of scribes, Pharisees and learned rabbis. The home was still the chief institution for the dispensation of elementary instruction, although synagogues, with attached schools for the young were to be found in every important Jewish community. Public elementary schools, other than those connected with the synagogues were of slower growth and do not seem to have been common until, some time after Joshua ben Gamala, high priest from 63-65 AD, ordered that teachers be appointed in every province and city to instruct children having attained the age of 6-7 years. In the synagogue schools the chazzan, or attendant, not infrequently served as schoolmaster (compare SCHOOL; SCHOOLMASTER).

1. Subject Matter of Instruction:

As in earlier times the Torah, connoting now the sacred Old Testament writings as a whole, though with emphasis still upon the law, furnished the subject-matter of instruction. To this were added, in the secondary schools (colleges) of the rabbis, the illustrative and parabolical rabbinical interpretation of the law (the haggadhah) and its application to daily life in the form of concise precept or rule of conduct (the halakhah). Together the haggadhah and halakhah furnish the content of the Talmud (or Talmuds), as the voluminous collections of orthodox Jewish teachings of later centuries came to be known.

2. Method and Aims:

As regards teaching method the scribes and rabbis of New Testament times did not improve much upon the practice of the copherim and sages of earlier centuries. Memorization, the exact reproduction by the pupil of the master’s teaching, rather than general knowledge or culture, was the main objective. Since the voice of prophecy had become silent and the canon of revealed truth was considered closed, the intellectual mastery and interpretation of this sacred revelation of the past was the only aim that education on its intellectual side could have. On its practical side it sought, as formerly, the inculcation of habits of strict ritualistic observance, obedience to the letter of the law as a condition of association and fellowship with the selected company of true Israelites to which scribes and Pharisees considered themselves to belong. The success with which the teachings of the scribes and rabbis were accompanied is an evidence of their devotion to their work, and more still of the psychological insight manifested by them in utilizing every subtle means and method for securing and holding the attention of their pupils, and making their memories the trained and obedient servants of an educational ideal. The defects in their work were largely the defects in that ideal. Their theory and philosophy of education were narrow. "Their eyes were turned too much to the past rather than the present and future." They failed to distinguish clearly the gold from the dross in their inherited teachings, or to adapt these to the vital urgent needs of the common people. In its struggle against foreign cults and foreign culture, Judaism had encased itself in a shell of stereotyped orthodoxy, the attempt to adapt which to new conditions and to a constantly changing social order resulted in an insincere and shallow casuistry of which the fantastic conglomerate mass of Talmudic wisdom of the 4th and 6th centuries is the lasting memorial.

3. Valuable Results of Jewish Education:

Nevertheless, Jewish education, though defective both in matter and in method, and tending to fetter rather than to free the mind, achieved four valuable results:

(1) it developed a taste for close, critical study;

(2) it sharpened the wits, even to the point of perversity;

(3) it encouraged a reverence for law and produced desirable social conduct; and

(4) it formed a powerful bond of union among the Jewish people. To these four points of excellence enumerated by Davidson (Historia Ecclesiastica, 80) must be added a fifth which, briefly stated, is this:

(5) Jewish education by its consistent teaching of lofty monotheism, and its emphasis, sometimes incidental add sometimes outstanding, upon righteousness and holiness of life as a condition of participation in a future Messianic kingdom, prepared the way for the Christian view of God and the world, set forth in its original distinctness of outline and incomparable simplicity in the teachings of Jesus.

4. The Preeminence of Jesus as a Teacher:

Jesus was more than a teacher; but He was a teacher first. To His contemporaries he appeared as a Jewish rabbi of exceptional influence and popularity. He used the teaching methods of the rabbis; gathered about Him, as did they, a group of chosen disciples (learners) whom He trained and taught more explicitly with a view to perpetuating through them His own influence and work. His followers called Him Rabbi and Master, and the scribes and Pharisees conceded His popularity and power. He taught, as did the rabbis of His time, in the temple courts, in the synagogue, in private, and on the public highway as the exigencies of the case demanded. His textbook, so far as He used any, was the same as theirs; His form of speech (parable and connected discourse), manner of life and methods of instruction were theirs. Yet into His message and method He put a new note of authority that challenged attention and inspired confidence. Breaking with the traditions of the past He substituted for devotion to the letter of the law an interest in men, with boundless sympathy for their misfortune, abiding faith in their worth and high destiny and earnest solicitude for their regeneration and perfection. To say that Jesus was the world's greatest and foremost example as a teacher is to state a fact borne out by every inquiry, test and comparison that modern educational science can apply to the work and influence of its great creative geniuses of the past. Where His contemporaries and even His own followers saw only "as in a glass, darkly," He saw clearly; and His view of God and the world, of human life and human destiny, has come down through the ages as a Divine revelation vouchsafed the world in Him. Viewed from the intellectual side, it was the life philosophy of Jesus that made His teachings imperishable; esthetically it was the compassionate tenderness and solicitude of His message that drew the multitudes to Him; judged from the standpoint of will, it was the example of His life, its purpose, its purity, its helpfulness, that caused men to follow Him; and tested by its immediate and lasting social influence, it was the doctrine, the ideal and example of the human brotherliness and Divine sonship, that made Jesus the pattern of the great teachers of mankind in every age and generation. With a keen, penetrating insight into the ultimate meaning of life, He reached out, as it were, over the conflicting opinions of men and the mingling social and cultural currents of His time backward to the fundamental truths uttered by the ancient prophets of His race and forward to the ultimate goal of the race. Then with simple directness of speech He addressed Himself to the consciences and wills of men, setting before them the ideal of the higher life, and with infinite patience sought to lift them to the plane of fellowship with Himself in thought and action.

5. Educational Work of the Early Disciples:

It remained for the disciples of Jesus to perpetuate His teaching ministry and to organize the new forces making for human betterment. In this work, which was distinctly religious-educational in character, some found a field of labor among their own Jewish kinsmen, and others, like Paul, among the needy Gentiles (Ga 1:16; 2:7; 1Ti 2:7). As regards a division of labor in the apostolic church, we read of apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers (1Co 12:28; Eph 4:11). The apostles were the itinerant leaders and missionaries of the entire church. Their work was largely that of teaching, Paul insisting on calling himself a teacher as well as an apostle (2Ti 1:11; 1Co 4:17). The prophets were men with a special message like that of Agabus (Ac 21:10,11). The evangelists were itinerant preachers, as was Philip (Ac 8:40), while the pastors, also called bishops, had permanent charge of individual churches. The professional teachers included both laymen and those ordained by the laying on of hands. Their work was regarded with highest honor in the church and community. In contrast with the itinerant church officers, apostles and evangelists, they, like the pastors, resided permanently in local communities. With this class the author of the Epistle of Jas identifies himself, and there can be little doubt that the epistle which he wrote reflects both the content and form of the instruction which these earliest Christian teachers gave to their pupils. Before the close of the 1st century the religious educational work of the church had been organized into a more systematic form, out of which there developed gradually the catechumenate of the early post-apostolic period (see CATECHIST). In the Didache, or Teachings of the Apostles, there has been reserved for us a textbook of religious instruction from this earlier period (Kent, GTJC). Necessarily, the entire missionary and evangelistic work of the apostolic

church was educational in character, and throughout this earliest period of church history we must think of the work of apostles, evangelists and pastors, as well as that of professional teachers, as including a certain amount of systematic religious instruction.

See further SCHOOL; TEACHER; TUTOR.

LITERATURE.

Ames, Psychology of Religious Experience, chapter x; Box, article "Education," in Encyclopedia Biblica; Butler, The Meaning of Education; Davidson, History of Education; Dewey, article "Education," in Monroe's Cyclopedia of Education; Edersheim, "The Upbringing of Jewish Children," in SJSL, and Life and Times of Jesus, I, 225 f; Fairweather, Background of the Gospels; Felten, "Schriftgelehrten, Synagogen u. Schulen," in Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, I; Ginsburg, article "Education," in Kitto's Biblical Cyclopedia; Hiegemoser u. Bock, Quellenbuch u. Uberblick d. Geschichte d. Padagogik; Katzer, articles "Jesus als Lehrer" and "Judenchristenturn," in Rein's Encyklopadisches Handbuch d. Padagogik; Kennedy, article "Education," in HDB, I; Kohler and Gudemann, article "Education" in Jew Encyclopedia, V; Kent, Great Teachers of Judaism and Christianity and Makers and Teachers of Judaism; Laurie, Historical Survey of Pre-Christian Education; Lewit, Darstellung d. theoretischen u. praktischen Padagogik im jud. Altertume; Oehler, article "Padagogik d. Alten Testaments," in Schmid's Encyclopadie d. Gesammten Erziehungs-u. Unterrichtswesen; Schurer, "Schriftgelehrsamkeit, Schule u. Synagoge," in Geschichte d. jud. Volkes (ed 1907); W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites; Straussburger, Geschichte d. Unterrichts bei d. Israeliten; von Rohden, article "Katechetik" in Rein's EHP.

H. H. Meyer

EDUTH

e'-duth ('edhuth, "testimony," a technical term for the Ten Commandments or for the Law):

In Ps 60 title, "set to Shushan Eduth" (literally, "a lily (is) the testimony"); 80 title, "set to Shoshannim Eduth" (literally, "lilies (is) the testimony"). The Hebrew words appear to be intended to designate a melody by the first few words ordinarily associated with it.

See PSALMS.

EFFECT; EFFECTUAL

e-fekt', e-fek'-tu-al:

In the Old Testament, the Revised Version (British and American) renders "fulfilment" for "effect" in Eze 12:23 (Hebrew dabhar, "matter"); and in Jer 48:30 "His boastings have wrought nothing" for the vaguer "His lies shall not so effect" of the King James Version. In the King James Version of the New Testament, "make of none effect" occurs repeatedly: as the translation of Greek akuroo, "render void" (Mt 15:6; Mr 7:13); of katargeo, "annul" (Ro 3:3 (the King James Version "make without effect"); Ro 4:14; Ga 3:17); and of kenoo, "make empty" (1Co 1:17). the Revised Version (British and American) renders "make of none effect" in Ro 3:3; Ga 3:17; "make void" in the other cases, with no apparent reason for the lack of uniformity. Greek energeo is the opposite in meaning of katargeo above. Its derivative energes, "effective," is rendered "effectual" by English Versions of the Bible in 1Co 16:9; Phm 1:6. the Revised Version (British and American) dispenses with "effectual," "effectually," in the other cases where the King James Version has used these words as auxiliary in the translation of energeo or of energeia, "working" (2Co 1:6; Ga 2:8; Eph 3:7; 4:16; 1Th 2:13; Jas 5:16).

F. K. Farr

EGG

(betsah; oon; Latin ovum):

An oval or spheroid body produced by birds, fishes and reptiles, from which their young emerge when incubated or naturally developed. The fertile egg of a bird consists of the yolk, a small disk from which the embryo develops, the albuminous white, and a calcareous shell. The most ancient records prove that eggs have been used as an article of diet ever since the use of the flesh of fowl began. Chickens were unknown in Palestine in the days of Job, so that his query concerning the taste of the white of an egg might have referred to those of pigeons, ducks, eggs taken from the nests of geese or swans, game birds or ostriches. "Can that which hath no savor be eaten without salt? Or is there any taste in the white of an egg?" (Job 6:6, the Revised Version, margin "the juice of purslain"). In Lu 11:12 there is every possibility that the egg of our common domestic fowl is referred to as "chickens" (which see) had been imported and were numerous in Palestine at that time. "Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?" The reference in Isa 59:5 is to the egg of a serpent, and is figurative of the schemes of evil men: "They hatch adders' eggs, and weave the spider's web: he that eateth of their eggs dieth; and that which is crushed breaketh out into a viper."

Gene Stratton-Porter

EGLAH

eg'-la ('eghlah, "heifer"):

Wife of David and mother of Ithream (2Sa 3:5 parallel 1Ch 3:3).

EGLAIM

eg'-la-im ('eghlayim; Agaleim):

A place named in Isa 15:8, possibly in the South of Moab. Eusebius (Onomasticon) identifies it with Agallim, a village 8 Roman miles South of Areopolis. It cannot now be identified.

EGLATH-SHELISHIYAH

eg'-lath-shel-i-shi'-ya ('eghlath shelishiyah):

Found in Isa 15:5; Jer 48:34 (Hebrew) in oracles against Moab. the King James Version translates "an heifer of three years old"; the Revised Version (British and American) takes it as the name of a place, but the American Revised Version, margin has "a heifer three years old," according to Septuagint. In the former case strong and unconquered cities, Zoar and Horonaim, are compared to the heifer not yet broken to the yoke. Such use of "heifer" is not infrequent (compare Jer 46:20; Ho 10:11, etc.). The majority of scholars, however, take it as a place-name. Some would read "the third Eglath," as if there were three towns of that name. No probable identification has been suggested.

W. Ewing

EGLON (1)

eg’-lon (‘eghlon, "circle"):

A king of Moab in the period of the Judges who, in alliance with Ammon and Amalek, overcame Israel and made Jericho his capital, presumably driven across the Jordan by the turmoil in his own kingdom which at that time was probably being used as a battle ground by Edom and the desert tribes (compare Ge 36:35). After 18 years of servitude the children of Israel were delivered by Ehud the Benjamite, who like so many other Benjamites (compare Jud 20:16) was left-handed. Under the pretext of carrying a present to the tyrant, he secured a private interview and assassinated him with a two-edged sword which he had carried concealed on his right side (Jud 3:19-22). Ehud made his escape, rallied the children of Israel about him and returned to conquer the Moabites (Jud 3:30).

Ella Davis Isaacs

EGLON (2)

eg’-lon (‘eghlon; Odollam):

A royal Canaanite city whose king joined the league headed by Adonizedek of Jerusalem against the Gibeonites, which suffered overwhelming defeat at the hands of Joshua (Jos 10). Joshua passed from Libnah to Lachish, and from Lachish to Eglon on his way to Hebron (10:31 ff). It was in the Shephelah of Judah (15:39). The name seems to be preserved in that of Khirbet ‘Ajlan, about 10 miles West of Beit Jibrin. Professor Petrie, however, thinks that the site of Tell Nejileh better suits the requirements. While Khirbet ‘Ajlan is a comparatively modern site, the city at Tell Nejileh must have been contemporary with that at Tell el-Chesy (Lachish). It lies fully three miles Southeast of Tell el-Chesy.

W. Ewing

EGYPT

e’-jipt:

I. THE COUNTRY

1. The Basis of the Land 2. The Nile Valley 3. Earliest Human Remains 4. Climate 5. Conditions of Life 6. The Nile 7. The Fauna 8. The Flora 9. The Prehistoric Races

II. THE HISTORY

1. 1st and 2nd Ages: Prehistoric 2. 3d Age: Ist and IInd Dynasties 3. 4th Age: IIIrd through VIth Dynasties 4. 5th Age: VIIth through XIVth Dynasties 5. 6th Age: XVth through XXIVth Dynasties 6. 7th Age: XXVth Dynasty to Roman Times 7. 8th Age: Arabic 8. Early Foreign Connections

III. THE OLD TESTAMENT CONNECTIONS

1. Semitic Connections 2. Abramic Times 3. Circumcision 4. Joseph 5. Descent into Egypt 6. The Oppression 7. The Historic Position 8. The Plagues 9. Date of the Exodus 10. Route of the Exodus 11. Numbers of the Exodus 12. Israel in Canaan 13. Hadad 14. Pharaoh’s Daughter 15. Shishak 16. Zerakh 17. The Ethiopians 18. Tahpanhes 19. Hophra 20. The Jews of Syene 21. The New Jerusalem of Oniah 22. The Egyptian Jew 23. Cities and Places Alphabetically

IV. THE CIVILIZATION

1. Language 2. Writing 3. Literature 4. Four Views of Future Life 5. Four Groups of Gods 6. Foreign Gods 7. Laws 8. Character

V. LITERATURE

Egypt (mitsrayim; he Aiguptos):

Usually supposed to represent the dual of Mitsrayim, referring to "the two lands," as the Egyptians called their country. This dualism, however, has been denied by some.

I. The Country.

1. The Basis of the Land:

Though Egypt is one of the earliest countries in recorded history, and as regards its continuous civilization, yet it is a late country in its geological history and in its occupation by a settled population. The whole land up to Silsileh is a thick mass of Eocene limestone, with later marls over that in the lower districts. It has been elevated on the East, up to the mountains of igneous rocks many thousand feet high toward the Red Sea. It has been depressed on the West, down to the Fayum and the oases below sea-level. This strain resulted in a deep fault from North to South for some hundreds of miles up from the Mediterranean. This fault left its eastern side about 200 ft. above its western, and into it the drainage of the plateau poured, widening it out so as to form the Nile valley, as the permanent drain of Northeast Africa. The access of water to the rift seems to have caused the basalt outflows, which are seen as black columnar basalt South of the Fayum, and brown massive basalt at Khankah, North of Cairo.

2. The Nile Valley:

The gouging out of the Nile valley by rainfall must have continued when the land was 300 ft. higher than at present, as is shown by the immense fails of strata into collapsed caverns which were far below the present Nile level. Then, after the excavations of the valley, it has been submerged to 500 ft. lower than at present, as is shown by the rolled gravel beds and deposits on the tops of the water-worn cliffs, and the filling up of the tributary valleys—as at Thebes—by deep deposits, through which the subsequent stream beds have been scoured out. The land still had the Nile source 30 ft. higher than it is now within the human period, as seen by the worked flints in high gravel beds above the Nile plain. The distribution of land and water was very different from that at present when the land was only 100 ft. lower than now. Such a change would make the valley an estuary up to South of the Fayum, would submerge much of the western desert, and would unite the Gulf of Suez and the Mediterranean. Such differences would entirely alter the conditions of animal life by sea and land. And as the human period began when the water was considerably higher, the conditions of climate and of life must have greatly changed in the earlier ages of man’s occupation.

3. Earliest Human Remains:

The earliest human remains belonging to the present condition of the country are large paleolithic flints found in the side valleys at the present level of the Nile. As these are perfectly fresh, and not rolled or altered, they show that paleolithic man lived in Egypt under the present conditions. The close of this paleolithic age of hunters, and the beginning of a settled population of cultivators, cannot have been before the drying up of the climate, which by depriving the Nile of tributary streams enfeebled it so that its mud was deposited and formed a basis for agriculture. From the known rate of deposit, and depth of mud soil, this change took place about 10,000 years ago. As the recorded history of the country extends 7,500 years, and we know of two prehistoric ages before that, it is pretty well fixed that the disappearance of paleolithic man, and the beginning of the continuous civilization must have been about 9,000 to 10,000 years ago. For the continuation of this subject see the section on "History" below.

4. Climate:

The climate of Egypt is unique in the world. So far as solar heat determines it, the condition is tropical; for, though just North of the tropic which lies at the boundary of Egypt and Nubia, the cloudless condition fully compensates for higher latitude. So far as temperature of the air is concerned, the climate is temperate, the mean heat of the winter months being 52 degree and of the summer about 80 degree, much the same as Italy. This is due to the steady prevalence of north winds, which maintain fit conditions for active, strenuous work. The rainlessness and dry air give the same facility of living that is found in deserts, where shelter is only needed for temperature and not for wet; while the inundation provides abundant moisture for the richest crops.

5. Conditions of Life:

The primitive condition—only recently changed—of the crops being all raised during five cool months from November to April, and the inundation covering the land during all the hot weather, left the population free from labor during the enervating season, and only required their energies when work was possible under favorable conditions. At the same time it gave a great opportunity for monumental work, as any amount of labor could be drawn upon without the smallest reduction in the produce of the country. The great structures which covered the land gave training and organization to the people, without being any drain upon the welfare of the country. The inundation covering the plain also provided the easiest transport for great masses from the quarries at the time when labor was abundant. Thus the climatic conditions were all in favor of a great civilization, and aided its production of monuments. The whole mass of the country being of limestone, and much of it of the finest quality, provided material for construction at every point. In the south, sandstone and granite were also at hand upon the great waterway.

6. The Nile:

The Nile is the great factor which makes life possible in Northeast Africa, and without it Egypt would only be a desolate corner of the Sahara. The union of two essentially different streams takes place at Kharrum. The White or light Nile comes from the great plains of the Sudan, while the Blue or dark Nile descends from the mountains of Abyssinia. The Sudan Nile from Gondokoro is filtered by the lakes and the sudd vegetation, so that it carries little mud; the Abyssinian Nile, by its rapid course, brings down all the soil which is deposited in Egypt, and which forms the basis for cultivation. The Sudan Nile rises only 6 ft. from April to November; while the Abyssinian Nile rises 26 ft. from April to August. The latter makes the rise of the inundation, while the Sudan Nile maintains the level into the winter. In Egypt itself the unchecked Nile at Aswan rises 25 ft. from the end of May to the beginning of September; while at Cairo, where modified by the irrigation system, it rises 16 ft. from May to the end of September. It was usually drained off the land by the beginning of November, and cultivation was begun. The whole cultivable land of Egypt is but the dried-up bed of the great river, which fills its ancient limits during a third of the year. The time taken by a flush of water to come down the Nile is about 15 days from 400 miles above Khartum to Aswan, and about 6 days from Aswan to Cairo, or 80 to 90 miles a day, which shows a flow of 3 to 3 1/2 miles an hour when in flood.

7. The Fauna:

The fauna has undergone great changes during the human period. At the close of the prehistoric age there are represented the giraffe, elephant, wild ox, lion, leopard, stag, long-necked gazelle and great dogs, none of which are found in the historic period. During historic times various kinds of antelopes have been exterminated, the hippopotamus was driven out of the Delta during Roman times, and the crocodile was cleared out of Upper Egypt and Nubia in the last century. Cranes and other birds shown on early sculptures are now unknown in the country. The animals still surviving are the wolf, jackal, hyena, dogs, ichneumon, jerboa, rats, mice, lizards (up to 4 ft. long) and snakes, besides a great variety of birds, admirably figured by Whymper, Birds of Egypt. Of tamed animals, the ox, sheep, goat and donkey are ancient; the cat and horse were brought in about 2000 BC, the camel was not commonly known till 200 AD, and the buffalo was brought to Egypt and Italy in the Middle Ages.

8. The Flora:

The cultivated plants of Egypt were numerous. In ancient times we find the maize (durrah), wheat, barley and lentil; the vine, currant, date palm, dum palm, fig, olive and pomegranate; the onion, garlic, cucumber, melon and radish; the sont acacia, sycamore and tamarisk; the flax, henna and clover; and for ornament, the lotus, convolvulus and many others. The extension of commerce brought in by the Greek period, the bean, pea, sesame, lupin, helbeh, colocasia and sugar-cane; also the peach, walnut, castor-oil and pear. In the Roman and Arabic ages came in the chick pea, oats, rice, cotton, orange and lemon. In recent times have come the cactus, aloe, tomato, Indian corn, lebbek acacia and beetroot. Many European flowering and ornamental plants were also used in Egypt by the Greeks, and brought in later by the Arabs.

9. The Prehistoric Races:

The original race in Egypt seems to have been of the steatopygous type now only found in South Africa. Figures of this race are known in the caves of France, in Malta, and later in Somaliland. As this race was still known in Egypt at the beginning of the neolithic civilization, and is there represented only by female figures in the graves, it seems that it was being exterminated by the newcomers and only the women were kept as slaves. The neolithic race of Egypt was apparently of the Libyan stock. There seems to have been a single type of the Amorites in Syria, the prehistoric Egyptians and the Libyans; this race had a high, well-filled head, long nose slightly aquiline, and short beard; the profile was upright and not prognathous, the hair was wavy brown. It was a better type than the present south Europeans, of a very capable and intelligent appearance. From the objects found, and the religious legends, it seems that this race was subdued by an eastern, and probably Arabian race, in the prehistoric age.

II. The History.

The founders of the dynastic history were very different, having a profile with nose and forehead in one straight line, and rather thick, but well-formed lips. Historically the indications point to their coming from about Somali land by water, and crossing into Egypt by the Koptos road from the Red Sea. The IInd Dynasty gave place to some new blood, probably of Sudany origin. In the VIth and VIIth Dynasties foreigners poured in apparently from the North, perhaps from Crete, judging by their foreign products. The XVth and XVIth Dynasties were Hyksos, or Semitic "princes of the desert" from the East. The XVIIth and XVIIIth Dynasties were Berber in origin. The XIXth Dynasty was largely Semitic from Syria. The XXIId Dynasty was headed by an eastern adventurer Sheshenq, or Shusinak, "the man of Susa." The XXVth Dynasty was Ethiopian. The XXVIth Dynasty was Libyan. The Greeks then poured into the Delta and the Fayum, and Hellenized Egypt. The Roman made but little change in the population; but during his rule the Arab began to enter the eastern side, and by 641 AD the Arab conquest swept the land, and brought in a large part—perhaps the majority—of the ancestors of the present inhabitants. After 3 centuries the Tunisians—the old Libyans—conquered Egypt again. The later administrations by Syrians, Circassians, Turks and others probably made no change in the general population. The economic changes of the past century have brought in Greeks, Italians and other foreigners to the large towns; but all these only amount to an eightieth of the population. The Coptics are the descendants of the very mixed Egyptians of Roman age, kept separate from the Arab invaders by their Christianity. They are mainly in Upper Egypt, where some villages are entirely Coptic, and are distinguished by their superior cleanliness, regularity, and the freedom of the women from unwholesome seclusion. The Coptics, though only a fifteenth of the population, have always had a large share of official posts, owing to their intelligence and ability being above that of the Muslim.

1. 1st and 2d Ages: Prehistoric:

In dealing with the history, we here follow the dating which was believed and followed by the Egyptians themselves. All the monumental remains agree with this, so far as they can check it; and the various arbitrary reductions that have been made on some periods are solely due to some critics preferring their internal sense to all the external facts. For the details involved in the chronology, see Historical Studies, II (British School of Archaeology in Egypt). The general outline of the

periods is given here, and the detailed view of the connection with Old Testament history is treated in later sections.

1st Age.

The prehistoric age begins probably about 8000 BC, as soon as there was a sufficient amount of Nile deposit to attract a settled population. The desert river valley of Egypt was probably one of the latest haunts of steatopygous Paleolithic man of the Bushman type. So soon as there was an opening for a pastoral or agricultural people, he was forced away by settlers from Libya. These settlers were clad in goatskins, and made a small amount of pottery by hand; they knew also of small quantities of copper, but mainly used flint, of which they gradually developed the finest working known in any age. They rapidly advanced in civilization. Their pottery of red polished ware was decorated with white clay patterns, exactly like the pottery still made in the mountains of Algeria. The forms of it were very varied and exquisitely regular, although made without the wheel. Their hardstone vases are finer than any of those of the historic ages. They adopted spinning, weaving and woodwork.

2nd Age.

Upon these people came in others probably from the East, who brought in the use of the Arab face-veil, the belief in amulets, and the Persian lapis lazuli. Most of the previous forms of pottery disappear, and nearly all the productions are greatly altered. Copper became common, while gold, silver and lead were also known. Heliopolis was probably a center of rule.

2. 3d Age: Ist and IId Dynasties:

About 5900 BC a new people came in with the elements of the art of writing, and a strong political ability of organization. Before 5800 BC they had established kings at Abydos in Upper Egypt, and for 3 centuries they gradually increased their power. On the carved slates which they have left, the standards of the allied tribes are represented; the earliest in style shows the standard of Koptos, the next has a standard as far North as Hermopolis, and the latest bears the standard of Letopolis, and shows the conquest of the Fayum, or perhaps one of the coast lakes. This last is of the first king of the Ist Dynasty, Mena.

The conquest of all Egypt is marked by the beginning of the series of numbered dynasties beginning with Mena, at about 5550 BC. The civilization rapidly advanced. The art was at its best under the third king, Zer, and thence steadily declined. Writing was still ideographic under Mena, but became more syllabic and phonetic toward the end of the dynasty. The work in hardstone was at its height in the vases of the early part of the Ist Dynasty, when an immense variety of beautiful stones appear. It greatly fell off on reaching the IId Dynasty. The tombs were all of timber, built in large pits in the ground.

3. 4th Age: IIIrd through VIth Dynasties:

The IInd Dynasty fell about 5000 BC, and a new power rapidly raised the art from an almost barbarous state to its highest triumphs by about 4750 BC, when the pyramid building was started. Khufu, the builder of the Great Pyramid in the IVth Dynasty, was one of the greatest rulers of Egypt. He organized the administration on lines which lasted for ages. He reformed the religious system, abolishing the endowments, and substituting models for the sacrifice of animals. He trained the largest body of skilled labor that ever appeared, for the building of his pyramid, the greatest and most accurate structure that the world has ever seen. The statuary of this age is more lifelike than that of any later age. The later reigns show steady decay in the character of work, with less dignity and more superficiality in the article

4. 5th Age: VIIth through XIVth Dynasties:

By about 4050 BC, the decline of Egypt allowed of fresh people pressing in from the North, probably connected with Crete. There are few traces of these invaders; a curious class of barbaric buttons used as seals are their commonest

remains. Probably the so-called "Hyksos sphinxes" and statues are of these people, and belong to the time of their attaining power in Egypt. By 3600 BC, the art developed into the great ages of the XIth to the XIIth Dynasties which lasted about 2 centuries. The work is more scholastic and less natural than before; but it is very beautiful and of splendid accuracy. The exquisite jewelry of Dahshur is of this age. After some centuries of decay this civilization passed away.

5. 6th Age: XVth through XXIVth Dynasties:

The Semitic tribes had long been filtering into Egypt, and Babylonian Semites even ruled the land until the great migration of the Hyksos took place about 2700 BC. These tribes were ruled by kings entitled "princes of the desert," like the Semitic Absha, or Abishai, shown in the tomb of Beni-hasan, as coming to settle in Egypt. By 1700 BC the Berbers who had adopted the Egyptian civilization pressed down from the South, and ejected the Hyksos rule. This opened the most flourishing period of Egyptian history, the XVIIIth Dynasty, 1587-1328 BC. The profusion of painted tombs at Thebes, which were copied and popularized by Gardner Wilkinson, has made the life of this period very familiar to us. The immense temples of Karnak and of Luqsor, and the finest of the Tombs of the Kings have impressed us with the royal magnificence of this age. The names of Thothmes I and III, of the great queen Hatshepsut, of the magnificent Amenhotep III, and of the monotheist reformer Akchenaton are among those best known in the history. Their foreign connections we shall notice later.

The XIXth and XXth Dynasties were a period of continual degradation from the XVIIIth. Even in the best work of the 6th Age there is hardly ever the real solidity and perfection which is seen in that of the 4th or 5th Ages. But under the Ramessides cheap effects and showy imitations were the regular system. The great Rameses II was a great advertiser, but inferior in power to half a dozen kings of the previous dynasty. In the XXth Dynasty one of the royal daughters married the high priest of Amen at Thebes; and on the unexpected death of the young Rameses V, the throne reverted to his uncle Rameses VI, whose daughter then became the heiress, and her descendants, the high priests of Amen, became the rightful rulers. This priestly rule at Thebes; beginning in 1102 BC, was balanced by a purely secular rule of the north at Tanis (Zoan). These lasted until the rise of Sheshenq I (Shishak) in 952 BC, the founder of the XXIId Dynasty. His successors gradually decayed till the fall of the XXIIIrd Dynasty in 721 BC. The Ethiopian XXVIth Dynasty then held Egypt as a province of Ethiopia, down to 664 BC.

6. 7th Age: XXVth Dynasty to Roman Times:

It is hard to say when the next age began—perhaps with the Ethiopians; but it rose to importance with the XXVIth Dynasty under Psamtek (Psammitichos I), 664-610 BC, and continued under the well-known names of Necoh, Hophra and Amasis until overthrown by the Persians in 525 BC. From 405 to 342 the Egyptians were independent; then the Persians again crushed them, and in 332 they fell into the hands of the Macedonians by the conquest of Alexander.

The Macedonian Age of the Ptolemies was one of the richest and most brilliant at its start, but soon faded under bad rulers till it fell hopelessly to pieces and succumbed to the Roman subjection in 30 BC. From that time Egypt was ground by taxation, and steadily impoverished. By 300 AD it was too poor to keep even a copper currency in circulation, and barter became general. Public monuments entirely ceased to be erected, and Decius in 250 AD is the last ruler whose name was written in the old hieroglyphs, which were thenceforward totally forgotten. After three more centuries of increasing degradation and misery, the Arab invasion burst upon the land, and a few thousand men rode through it and cleared out the remaining effete garrisons of the empire in 641 AD.

7. 8th Age: Arabic:

The Arab invasion found the country exhausted and helpless; repeated waves of tribes poured in, and for a generation or two there was no chance of a settlement. Gradually the majority of the inhabitants were pressed into Islam, and by about 800 AD a strong government was established from Bagdad, and Egypt rapidly advanced. In place of being the most impoverished country it became the richest land of the Mediterranean. The great period of medieval Egypt was under the

guidance of the Mesopotamian civilization, 800-969 AD. The Tunisian dominion of the Fatimites, 969-1171, was less successful. Occasionally strong rulers arose, such as Salah-ed-Din (Saladin), but the age of the Mamalukes, 1250-1577, was one of steady decline. Under the Turkish dominion, 1517, Egypt was split up into many half-independent counties, whose rulers began by yielding tribute, but relapsed into ignoring the Caliphate and living in continual internal feuds. In 1771 Aly Bey, a slave, succeeded in conquering Syria. The French and British quarrel left Muhamed Aly to rise supreme, and to guide Egypt for over 40 years. Again Egypt conquered Syria, 1831-39, but was compelled by Europe to retreat. The opening of the Suez Canal (1869) necessarily led to the subjection of Egypt to European direction.

8. Early Foreign Connections:

The foreign connections of Egypt have been brought to light only during the last 20 years. In place of supposing that Egypt was isolated until the Greek conquest, we now see that it was in the closest commercial relation with the rest of the world throughout its history. We have already noted the influences which entered by conquest. During the periods of high civilization in Egypt, foreign connections came into notice by exploration and by trade. The lazuli of Persia was imported in the prehistoric age, as well as the emery of Smyrna. In the Ist Dynasty, Egypt conquered and held Sinai for the sake of the turquoise mines. In the IIIrd Dynasty, large fleets of ships were built, some as much as 160 ft. long; and the presence of much pottery imported from Crete and the north, even before this, points to a Mediterranean trade. In the Vth Dynasty, King Unas had relations with Syria. From the XIIth Dynasty comes the detailed account of the life of an Egyptian in Palestine (Sanehat); and Cretan pottery of this age is found traded into Egypt.

III. The Old Testament Connections.

1. Semitic Connections:

The Hyksos invasion unified the rule of Syria and Egypt, and Syrian pottery is often found in Egypt of this age. The return of the wave, when Egypt drove out the Hyksos, and conquered Syria out to the Euphrates, was the greatest expansion of Egypt. Tahutmes I set up his statue on the Euphrates, and all Syria was in his hands. Tahutmes III repeatedly raided Syria, bringing back plunder and captives year by year throughout most of his reign. The number of Syrian artists and of Syrian women brought into Egypt largely changed the style of art and the standard of beauty. Amenhotep III held all Syria in peace, and recorded his triumphs at the Euphrates on the walls of the temple of Soleb far up in Nubia. His monotheist son, Amenhotep IV, took the name of Akhenaton, "the glory of the sun’s disc," and established the worship of the radiant sun as the Aton, or Adon of Syria. The cuneiform letters from Tell el-Amarna place all this age before us in detail. There are some from the kings of the Amorites and Hittites, from Naharain and even Babylonia, to the great suzerain Amenhotep III. There is also the long series describing the gradual loss of Syria under Akhenaton, as written by the governors and chiefs, of the various towns. The main letters are summarized in the Students’ History of Egypt, II, and full abstracts of all the letters are in Syria and Egypt, arranged in historical order.

Pal was reconquered by Seti I and his son Rameses II, but they only held about a third of the extent which formerly belonged to Amenhotep III. Merenptah, son of Rameses, also raided Southern Palestine. After that; it was left alone till the raid of Sheshenq in 933 BC. The only considerable assertion of Egyptian power was in Necoh’s two raids up to the Euphrates, in 609 and 605 BC. But Egypt generally held the desert and a few minor points along the south border of Palestine. The Ptolemies seldom possessed more than that, their aspirations in Syria not lasting as permanent conquests. They were more successful in holding Cyprus.

2. Abramic Times:

We now come to the specific connections of Egypt with the Old Testament. The movement of the family of Abram from Ur in the south of Mesopotamia up to Haran in the north (Ge 11:31) and thence down Syria into Egypt (Ge 12:5,10) was like that of the earlier Semitic "princes of the desert," when they entered Egypt as the Hyksos kings about 2600 BC. Their earlier dominion was the XVth Dynasty of Egypt, and that was followed by another movement, the XVIth Dynasty, about

2250 BC, which was the date of the migration of Terah from Ur. Thus the Abramic family took part in the second Hyksos movement. The cause of these tribal movements has been partly explained by Mr. Huntington's researches on the recurrence of dry periods in Asia (Royal Geogr. Soc., May 26, 1910: The Pulse of Asia). Such lack of rain forces the desert peoples on to the cultivated lands, and then later famines are recorded. The dry age which pushed the Arab tribes on to the Mediterranean in 640 AD was succeeded by famines in Egypt during 6 centuries So as soon as Abram moved into Syria a famine pushed him on to Egypt (Ge 12:10). To this succeeded other famines in Canaan (Ge 26:1), and later in both Canaan and Egypt (Ge 41:56; 43:1; 47:13). The migration of Abram was thus conditioned by the general dry period, which forced the second Hyksos movement of which it was a part. The culture of the Hyksos was entirely nomadic, and agrees in all that we can trace with the patriarchal culture pictured in Gen.

3. Circumcision:

Circumcision was a very ancient mutilation in Egypt, and is still kept up there by both Muslim and Christian. It was first adopted by Abram for Ishmael, the son of the Egyptian Hagar (Ge 16:3; 17:23), before Isaac was promised. Hagar married Ishmael to an Egyptian (Ge 21:21), so that the Ishmaelites, or Hagarenes, of Gilead and Moab were three-quarters Egyptian.

At Gerar, in the south of Palestine, Egyptian was the prevailing race and language, as the general of Abimelech was Phichol, the Egyptian name Pa-khal, "the Syrian," showing that the Gerarites were not Syrians.

4. Joseph:

The history of Joseph rising to importance as a capable slave is perfectly natural in Egypt at that time, and equally so in later periods down to our own days. That this occurred during the Hyksos period is shown by the title given to Joseph—Abrekh, ('abhrekh) (Ge 41:43) which is Abarakhu, the high Babylonian title. The names Zaphnath-paaneah, Asenath, and Potipherah have been variously equated in Egyptian, Naville seeing forms of the XVIIIth Dynasty in them, but Spiegelberg, with more probability, seeing types of names of the XXIInd Dynasty or later. The names are most likely an expansion of the original document; but there is not a single feature or incident in the relations of Joseph to the Egyptians which is at all improbable from the history and civilization that we know. See JOSEPH.

5. Descent into Egypt:

The descent into Egypt and sojourn there are what might be expected of any Semitic tribe at this time. The allocation in Goshen (Ge 47:27) was the most suitable, as that was on the eastern border of the Delta, at the mouth of the Wady Tumilat, and was a district isolated from the general Egyptian population. The whole of Goshen is not more than 100 square miles, being bounded by the deserts, and by the large Egyptian city of Budastis on the West. The accounts of the embalming for 40 days and mourning for 70 days (Ge 50:3), and putting in a coffin (Ge 50:26) are exact. The 70 days' mourning existed both in the Ist Dynasty and in the XXth.

6. The Oppression:

The oppression in Egypt began with a new king that knew not Joseph. This can hardly be other than the rise of the Berber conquerors who took the Delta from the Hyksos at the beginning of the XVIIIth Dynasty, 1582 BC, and expelled the Hyksos into Syria. It could not be later than this, as the period of oppression in Egypt is stated at 4 centuries (Ge 15:13; Ac 7:6), and the Exodus cannot be later than about 1220 BC, which leaves 360 years for the oppression. Also this length of oppression bars any much earlier date for the Exodus. The 360 years of oppression from 430 of the total sojourn in Egypt, leaves 70 years of freedom there. As Joseph died at 110 (Ge 50:26), this implies that he was over 40 when his family came into Egypt, which would be quite consistent with the history.

7. The Historic Position:

The store cities Pithom and Raamses are the sites Tell el-Maskhuta and Tell Rotab in the Wady Tumilat, both built by Rameses II as frontier defenses. It is evident then that the serving with rigor was under that king, probably in the earlier part of his long reign of 67 years (1300-1234 BC), when he was actively campaigning in Palestine. This is shown in the narrative, for Moses was not yet born when the rigor began (Ex 1; 2:2), and he grew up, slew an Egyptian, and then lived long in Midian before the king of Egypt died (Ex 2:23), perhaps 40 or 50 years after the rigorous servitude began, for he is represented as being 80 at the time of the Exodus (De 34:7). These numbers are probably not precise, but as a whole they agree well enough with Egyptian history. After the king died, Moses returned to Egypt, and began moving to get his kin away to the eastern deserts, with which he had been well acquainted in his exile from Egypt. A harsher servitude ensues, which might be expected from the more vigorous reign of Merenptah, after the slackness of the old age of Rameses. The campaign of Merenptah against Israel and other people in Palestine would not make him any less severe in his treatment of Semites in Egypt.

8. The Plagues:

The plagues are in the order of usual seasonal troubles in Egypt, from the red unwholesome Nile in June, through the frogs, insects, hail and rain, locusts, and sandstorms in March. The death of the firstborn was in April at the Passover.

9. Date of the Exodus:

The date of the Exodus is indicated as being about 1200 BC, by the 4 centuries of oppression, and by the names of the land and the city of Rameses (Ge 47:4; compare Ex 1:11). The historical limit is that the Egyptians were incessantly raiding Palestine down to 1194 BC, and then abandoned it till the invasion of Shishak. As there is no trace of these Egyptian invasions during all the ups and downs of the age of the Judges, it seems impossible to suppose the Israelites entered Canaan till after 1194 BC. The setting back of the Exodus much earlier has arisen from taking three simultaneous histories of the Judges as consecutive, as we shall notice farther on. The facts stated above, and the length of all three lines of the priestly genealogies, agree completely with the Egyptian history in putting the Exodus at about 1220 BC, and the entry into Canaan about 1180 BC.

10. Route of the Exodus:

The route of the Exodus was first a concentration at Raamses or Tell Rotab, in the Wady Tumliat, followed by a march to Succoth, a general name for the region of Bedawy booths; from there to Etham in the edge of the wilderness, about the modern Nefisheh. Thence they turned and encamped before Pi-hahiroth, the Egyptian Pa-qaheret, a Serapeum. Thus turning South to the West of the Red Sea (which then extended up to Tell el-Maskhuta), they had a Migdol tower behind them and Baal-zephon opposite to them. They were thus "entangled in the land." Then the strong east wind bared the shallows, and made it possible to cross the gulf and reach the opposite shore. They then went "three days in the wilderness," the three days' route without water to Marah, the bitter spring of Hawara, and immediately beyond reached Elim, which accords entirely with the Wady Gharandel. Thence they encamped by the Red Sea. All of this account exactly agrees with the traditional route down the West of the Sinaitic peninsula; it will not agree with any other route, and there is no reason to look for any different location of the march.

See EXODUS 1.

11. Numbers of the Exodus:

The numbers of the Israelites have long been a difficulty. On the one hand are the census lists (Nu 1; 2 ; 26), with their summaries of 600,000 men besides children and a mixed multitude (Ex 12:37,38; 38:26; Nu 1:46; 11:21). On the other hand there are the exact statements of there being 22,273 firstborn, that is, fathers of families (Nu 3:43), and that 40,000 armed men entered Canaan with Joshua (Jos 4:13), also the 35,000 who fought at Ai (Jos 8:3,12), and the 32,000 who

fought against Midian (Jud 7:3). Besides these, there are the general considerations that only 5,000 to 10,000 people could live in Goshen, that the Amalekites with whom the Israelites were equally matched (Ex 17:11) could not have exceeded about 5,000 in Sinai, that Moses judged all disputes, and that two midwives attended all the Israelite births, which would be 140 a day on a population of 600,000. Evidently, the statements of numbers are contradictory, and the external evidence is all in accord with lesser numbers. Proposals to reduce arbitrarily the larger numbers have been frequent; but there is one likely line of misunderstanding that may have originated the increase. In the census lists of the tribes, most of the hundreds in the numbers are 400 or 500, others are near those, and there are none whatever on 000, 100, 800 or 900. Evidently, the hundreds are independent of the thousands. Now in writing the statements, such as "Reuben, 46,500," the original list would be 46 ‘eleph, 5 hundred people, and ‘eleph means either "thousands" or else "groups" or "families." Hence, a census of 46 tents, 500 people, would be ambiguous, and a later compiler might well take it as 46,500. In this way the whole census of 598 tents, 5,550 people, would be misread as 603,550 people. The checks on this are, that the number per tent should be reasonable in all cases, that the hundreds should not fluctuate more than the tents between the first and last census, and that the total should correspond to the known populations of Goshen and of Sinai; these requirements all agree with this reading of the lists. The ulterior details beyond the Egyptian period are dealt with in Egypt and Israel, 45, 55.

See EXODUS 4.

12. Israel in Canaan:

Two points need notice here as incidentally bearing on the Egyptian connections:

(1) the Israelites in Palestine before the Exodus, indicated by Merenptah triumphing over them there before 1230 BC, and the raids during the Egyptian residence (1Ch 7:21);

(2) the triple history of the Judges, west, north, and east, each totaling to 120 years, in accord with the length of the four priestly genealogies (1Ch 6:4-8,22-28,33-35,39-43,14-47), and showing that the dates are about 1220 BC the Exodus, 1180 BC the entry to Canaan, 1150 BC the beginning of Judges, 1030 BC Saul (Egypt and Israel, 52-58).

13. Hadad:

The connections with the monarchy soon begin. David and Joab attacked Edom (2Sa 8:14), and Hadad, the young king, was carried off by his servants to Egypt for safety. The Pharaoh who received and supported him must have been Siamen, the king of Zoan, which city was then an independent capital apart from the priest kings of Thebes (1Ki 11:15-22). Hadad was married to the Egyptian queen’s sister when he grew up, probably in the reign of Pasebkhanu II.

14. Pharaoh’s Daughter:

The Pharaoh whose daughter was married to Solomon must have been the same Pasebkhanu; he reigned from 987-952 BC, and the marriage was about 970 in the middle of the reign. Another daughter of Pasebkhanu was Karamat, who was the wife of Shishak. Thus Solomon and Shishak married two sisters, and their aunt was queen of Edom. This throws light on the politics of the kingdoms. Probably Solomon had some child by Pharaoh’s daughter, and the Egyptians would expect that to be the heir. Shishak’s invasion, on the death of Solomon, was perhaps based upon the right of a nephew to the throne of Judah.

15. Shishak:

The invasion of Shishak (Egyptian, Sheshenq) took place probably at the end of his reign. His troops were Lubim (Libyans), Sukkim (men of Succoth, the east border) and Kushim (Ethiopians). The account of the war is on the side of the great fore- court at Karnak, which shows long lists of places in Judah, agreeing with the subjugation recorded in 1Ki 14:25,26, and 2Ch 12:2-4.

16. Zerakh:

Zerakh, or Usarkon, was the next king of Egypt, the son of Karamat, Solomon's sister-in-law. He invaded Judah unsuccessfully in 903 BC (2Ch 14:9) with an army of Libyans and Sudanis (2Ch 16:8). A statue of the Nile, dedicated by him, and naming his descent from Karamat and Pasebkhanu, is in the British Museum.

17. The Ethiopians:

After a couple of centuries the Ethiopian kings intervened. Shabaka was appointed viceroy of Egypt by his father Piankhy, and is described by the Assyrians as Sibe, commander-in-chief of Muzri, and by the Hebrews as Sua or So, king of Egypt (2Ki 17:4). Tirhakah next appears as a viceroy, and Hezekiah was warned against trusting to him (2Ki 19:9). These two kings touch on Jewish history during their vice-royalties, before their full reigns began. Necoh next touches on Judah in his raid to Carchemish in 609 BC, when he slew Josiah for opposing him (2Ki 23:29,30; 2Ch 35:20-24).

18. Tahpanhes:

After the taking of Jerusalem, for fear of vengeance for the insurrection of Ishmael (2Ki 25:25,26; Jer 40; Jer 41; Jer 42), the remnant of the Jews fled to the frontier fortress of Egypt, Tahpanhes, Tehaphnehes, Greek Daphnae, modern Defenneh, about 10 miles West of the present Suez Canal (Jer 43:7-13). The brick pavement in front of the entrance to the fortress there, in which Jeremiah hid the stones, has been uncovered and the fortress completely planned. It was occupied by Greeks, who there brought Greek words and things into contact with the traveling Jews for a couple of generations before the fall of Jerusalem.

19. Hophra:

The prophecy that Hophra would be delivered to them that sought his life (Jer 44:30) was fulfilled, as he was kept captive by his successor, Amasis, for 3 years, and after a brief attempt at liberty, he was strangled.

20. The Jews at Syene:

The account of the Jews settled in Egypt (Jer 44) is singularly illustrated by the Aramaic Jewish papyri found at Syene (Aswan). These show the use of Aramaic and of oaths by Yahu, as stated of 5 cities in Egypt (Isa 19:18). The colony at Syene was well-to-do, though not rich; they were householders who possessed all their property by regular title- deeds, who executed marriage settlements, and were fully used to litigation, having in deeds of sale a clause that no other deed could be valid. The temple of Yahu filled the space between two roads, and faced upon 3 houses, implying a building about 60 or 70 ft. wide. It was built of hewn stone, with stone columns, 7 gates, and a cedar roof. It was destroyed in 410, after lasting from before Cambyses in 525 BC, and a petition for rebuilding it was granted in 407.

21. The New Jerusalem of Oniah:

The most flourishing period of the Jews in Egypt was when Oniah IV, the son of the rightful high priest Oniah, was driven from Jerusalem by the abolition of Jewish worship and ordinances under Antiochus. In 170 BC he fled to Egypt, and there established a new Jerusalem with a temple and sacrifices as being the only way to maintain the Jewish worship. Oniah IV was a valiant man, general to queen Cleopatra I; and he offered to form the Jewish community into a frontier guard on the East of Egypt, hating the Syrians to the uttermost, if the Jews might form their own community. They so dominated the eastern Delta that troops of Caesar could not pass from Syria to Alexandria without their assent. The new Jerusalem was 20 miles North of Cairo, a site now known as Tell el-Yehudiyeh. The great mound of the temple still remains there, with the Passover ovens beneath it, and part of the massive stone fortifications on the front of it. This remained a stronghold of

free Judaism until after Titus took Jerusalem; and it was only when the Zealots tried to make it a center of insurrection, that at last it was closed and fell into decay. Josephus is the original authority for this history (see Egypt and Israel, 97- 110).

22 The Egyptian Jew:

The Jew in Egypt followed a very different development from the Babylonian Jew, and this Egyptian type largely influenced Christianity. In the colony at Syene a woman named "Trust Yahweh" had no objection to swearing by the Egyptian goddess Seti when making an Egyptian contract; and in Jer 44:15-19, the Jews boasted of their heathen worship in Egypt. Oniah had no scruple in establishing a temple and sacrifices apart from Jerusalem, without any of the particularism of the Maccabean zealots. Philo at Alexandria labored all his life for the union of Jewish thought with Greek philosophy. The Hermetic books show how, from 500 to 200 BC, religious thought was developing under eclectic influence of Egyptian Jewish, Persian, Indian and Greek beliefs, and producing the tenets about the second God, the Eternal Son, who was the Logos, and the types of Conversion, as the Divine Ray, the New Birth, and the Baptism. Later the Wisdom literature of Alexandria, 200-100 BC, provided the basis of thought and simile on which the Pauline Epistles were built. The great wrench in the history of the church came when it escaped from the Babylonian-Jewish formalism of the Captivity, which ruled at Jerusalem, and grew into the wider range of ideas of the Alexandrian Jews. These ideas had been preserved in Egypt from the days of the monarchy, and had developed a great body of religious thought and phraseology from their eclectic connections. The relations of Christianity with Egypt are outside our scope, but some of them will be found in Egypt and Israel, 124-41.

23. Cities and Places Alphabetically:

The Egyptian cities, places and peoples named in the Old Testament may briefly be noted. AVEN (Eze 30:17) or ON (Ge 41:45) is the ‘An of Egyptian, the Greek Heliopolis, now Matarieh, 7 miles North of Cairo. It was the seat of prehistoric government, the royal emblems were kept there as the sacred relics of the temple, and its high priest was "the great seer," one of the greatest of the religious officials. The schools of Heliopolis were celebrated, and it seems to have always been a center of learning. The site is now marked by the great enclosure of the temple, and one obelisk of Senusert (XIIth Dynasty). It was here that the Egyptian kings had at their installation to come and bathe in the lake in which the sun bathes daily, the ‘Ainesh-Shems, or "Lake of the Sun" of the Arabs, connected with the fresh spring here which Christian tradition attributes to the visit of the Virgin and Child. The great sycamore tree here is the successor of that under which the Virgin is said to have rested.

BAAL-ZEPHON was a shrine on the eastern site of the head of the Red Sea, a few miles South of Ismailiyeh; no trace is now known of it (Ex 14:2).

CUSHIM or Ethiopians were a part of the Egyptian army of Shishak and of Usarkon (2Ch 12:3; 16:8). The army was in 4 brigades, that of Ptah of Memphis, central Egypt; that of Amen of Thebes, Southern Egypt and Ethiopia; that of Set of the eastern frontier (Sukkim); and that of Ra, Heliopolis and the Delta.

COSHEN was a fertile district at the west end of the Wady Tumilat, 40 to 50 miles Northeast of Cairo. It was bounded by the deserts on the North and Southeast, and by the Egyptian city of Bubastis on the West. Its area was not over 100 square miles; it formerly supported 4,000 Bedouin and now about 12,000 cultivators.

LUBIM, the Libyans who formed part of the Egyptian army as light-armed archers, from very early times.

MIGDOL is the name of any tower, familiar also as Magdala. It was applied to some watchtower on the West of the Red Sea, probably on the high land above the Serapeum.

No is Thebes, in Assyrian Nia, from the Egyptian Nu, "the city." This was the capital of the XIIth Dynasty, and of the XVIIth-XXIst Dynasties. Owing to the buildings being of sandstone, which is not of much use for reworking, they have

largely remained since the desolation of the city under Ptolemy X. The principal divisions of the site are:

(1) Karnak, with the temple of the XIIth Dynasty, built over by all the successive kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty, and enlarged by Seti I and Rameses II, and by Shishak, Tirhakah, and the Ptolemies. The whole temple of Amon and its subsidiary temples form the largest mass of ruins that is known.

(2) Luqsor, the temple to commemorate the divine birth of Amenhotep III (1440 BC), added to by Rameses II.

(3) The funerary temples, bordering the western shore, of the kings of the XVIIIth to XXth Dynasties. These have mostly been destroyed, by the unscrupulous quarrying done by each king on the work of his predecessors; the only temple in fair condition is that of Rameses III, which is left because no later king required its material for building.

(4) The great cemetery, ranging from the splendid rock halls of the Tombs of the Kings, covered with paintings, down to the humblest graves. For any detailed account see either Baedeker's or Murray's Guides, or Weigall's Guide to Antiquities.

NOPH, the Egyptian Men-nofer, Greek Memphis, now Mitraheny, 12 miles South of Cairo. This was the capital from the foundation at the beginning of the dynasties. Thebes and Alexandria shared its importance, but it was the seat of government down to the Arab invasion. In Roman times it was as large as London North of the Thames. The outlying parts are now all buried by the rise of the soil, but more than a mile length of ruins yet remains, which are now being regularly worked over by the British School. The heart of the city is the great metropolitan temple of Ptah, nearly all of which is now under 10 feet of soil, and under water most of the year. This is being excavated in sections, as it is all private property. At the north end of the ruins is the palace mound, on which has been cleared the palace of Apries (Hophra). Other temples have been located, as well as the foreign quarter containing early Greek pottery and the temple of Proteus named by Herodotus (see Memphis, I, II, III).

PATHROS is the usual name for Upper Egypt in the prophets. It is the Egyptian Pa-ta-res, "the south land."

PIBESETH is the Egyptian Pa-Bast, Greek Bubastis, at the eastern side of the Delta, the city of the cat-headed goddess Bast. The ruins are still large, and the temple site has been excavated, producing sculptures from the IVth Dynasty onward.

PITHOM is the Egyptian Pa-Tum, the city of the Sun-god Tum or Atmu, who was worshipped on the East of the Delta. The site has remains of the fortress of Rameses II, built by the Israelites, and is now known as Tell el-Maskhuta, 11 miles West of Ismailia.

RAAMSES is the other city built by the Israelites, now Tell Rotab, 20 miles West of Ismailia. A wailed camp existed here from early times, and the temple of Rameses was built on the top of the older ruins. A large part of the temple front is now at Philadelphia, excavated by the British School.

SIN is the Greek Pelusium, Assyrian Siinu, Arabic Tineh, now some desolate mounds at the extreme East coast of Egypt.

SUCCOTH was the district of "booths," the eastern part of the Wady Tumilat. It was written in Egyptian Thuku and abbreviated to Thu in which form it appears as a Roman name. The people of Succoth were Sukkim, named in the army of Shishak (2Ch 12:3).

SYENE, Hebrew Seweneh, modern Aswan, the southern border town of Egypt at the Cataract. The greater part of the old town was on the island of Elephantine. There the Jewish papyri were found, and that was probably the Jewish settlement with the temple of Yahu. The town on the eastern bank—the present Aswan—was of less importance.

TAHPANHES, TEHAPHNEHES, Greek Daphnae, Arabic Tell Defeneh. This was the first station on the Syrian road which touched the Nile canals, about 10 miles West of Kantara on the Suez Canal. It seems to have been founded by Psammetichus about 664 BC, to hold his Greek mercenaries. The fort, built by him, abounded in Greek pottery, and was finally desolated about 566 BC, as described by Herodotus. The fort and camp have been excavated; and the pavement described by Jeremiah (chapter 43), as opposite to the entrance, has been identified.

ZOAN, Greek Tanis, Arabic San, is about 26 miles from the Suez Canal, and slightly more from the coast. The ruins of the temple are surrounded by the wall of Pasebkhanu, 80 ft. thick of brickwork, and a ring of town ruins rises high around it. The temple was built in the VIth Dynasty, adorned with many statues in the XIIth and XIIIth Dynasties, and under Rameses II had many large granite obelisks and statues, especially one colossus of the king in red granite about 90 ft. high. It is probable that the Pharaoh lived here at the time of the Exodus.

IV. The Civilization.

1. Language:

We now turn to some outline of the civilization of the Egyptians. The language had primitive relations with the Semitic and the Libyan. Perhaps one common stock has separated into three languages—Semitic, Egyptian, and Libyan. But though some basal words and grammar are in common, all the bulk of the words of daily life were entirely different in the three, and no one could be said to be derived from the other. Egyptian so far as we can see, is a separate language without any connection as close as that between the Indo-European group. From its proximity to Syria, Semitic loan words were often introduced, and became common in the XVIIIth Dynasty and fashionable in the XIXth. The language continually altered, and decayed in the later periods until Coptic is as different from it as Italian is from Latin.

2. Writing:

The writing was at first ideographic, using a symbol for each word. Gradually, signs were used phonetically; but the symbol, or some emblem of the idea of the word, continued to be added to it, now called a determinative. From syllabic signs purely alphabetic signs were produced by clipping and decay, so that by 1000 to 500 BC the writing was almost alphabetic. After that it became modified by the influence of the short Greek alphabet, until by 200 AD it was expressed in Greek letters with a few extra signs. The actual signs used were elaborate pictures of the objects in the early times, and even down to the later periods very detailed signs were carved for monumental purposes. But as early as the Ist Dynasty a very much simplified current hand had been started, and during the pyramid period this became hardly recognizable from the original forms. Later on this current hand, or hieratic, is a study by itself and was written much more fully than the hieroglyphs on monuments, as its forms were so corrupt that an ample spelling was needed to identify the word. By about 800 BC begins a much shortened set of signs, still more remote from their origins, known as demotic, which continued as the popular writing till Roman times. On public decrees the hieroglyphic and demotic are both given, showing that a knowledge of one was useless for reading the other, and that they were separate studies.

3. Literature:

The literature begins during the pyramid period, before 4000 BC, with biographies and collections of maxims for conduct; these show well-regulated society, and would benefit any modern community in which they were followed. In the XIIth Dynasty tales appear, occupied with magic and foreign travel and wonders. A long poem in praise of the king shows very regular versification and system, of the type of Ps 136, the refrain differing in each stanza and being probably repeated in chorus, while the independent lines were sung by the leader. In the XVIIIth Dynasty, tales of character begin to develop and show much skill, long annals were recorded, and in the XIXth Dynasty there is an elaborate battle poem describing the valor of Rameses II. At about 700 BC there is a considerable tale which describes the quarrels of the rival chiefs, and the great fight regulated like a tournament by which the differences were settled. Such are the principal literary works apart from business documents.

4. Four Views of Future Life:

The religion of Egypt is an enormous subject, and that by which Egypt is perhaps most known. Here we can only give an outline of the growth and subdivisions of it. There never was any one religion in Egypt during historic times. There were at least four religions, all incompatible, and all believed in at once in varying degrees. The different religions can best be seen apart by their incongruity regarding the future life.

(1) The dead wandered about the cemetery seeking food, and were partly fed by the goddess in the sycamore tree. They therefore needed to have plates of food and jars of water in the tomb, and provided perpetually by their descendants in front of the doorway to the grave. The deceased is represented as looking out over this doorway in one case. Here came in the great principle of substitution. For the food, substitute its image which cannot decay, and the carved table of offerings results. For the farmstead of animals, substitute its carved image on the walls and the animal sculptures result. For the life of the family, substitute their carved figures doing all that was wanted, sacrificing and serving, and the family sculptures result. For the house, substitute a model upon the grave, and the pottery soul-houses appear with their furniture and provisions. For the servants, put their figures doing household work, and their service is eternal. For the master himself, put the most lifelike image that can be made, and his soul will occupy that as a restful home fitted for it. This principle is still believed in. Funeral offerings of food are still put even in Muslim graves, and a woman will visit a grave, and, removing a tile, will talk through a hole to her dead husband.

(2) The dead went to the kingdom of Osiris, to which only the good were admitted, while the evil were rejected, and consumed either by monsters or by fire. This heavenly kingdom was a complete duplicate of the earthly life. They planted and reaped, sported and played. And as the Egyptian felicity consisted in making others work for them, so each man was provided with a retinue of serfs to cultivate the land for him. These ushabti figures in later times usually number 400, and often 1 in 10 of them is clad as an overseer. A special chapter of the Book of the Dead is to be recited to animate them, and this, more or less abbreviated, is often inscribed upon the figures.

(3) The dead joined the company of the immortal gods, who float on the heavenly ocean in the boat of the sun. With them they have to face the terrors of the hours of the night when the sun goes through the underworld. Long charms and directions are needed for safety in this passage, and these form a large part of the funerary tests, especially on the Tombs of the Kings in the XVIIIth-XXIst Dynasties. To reach the boat of the sun a boat must be provided in the tomb, with its sailors and sails and oars. Such are frequent from the VIth-XIIIth Dynasties.

(4) The dead were carried off by the Hathor cow, or a bull, to wait for a bodily resurrection. In order to preserve the body for some life after the present age, each part must be protected by an appropriate amulet; hence, dozens of different amulets were placed on the body, especially from about 600-400 BC.

Now it will be seen that each of these beliefs contradicts the other three, and they represent, therefore, different religious origins.

5. Four Groups of Gods:

The mythology is similarly diverse, and was unified by uniting analogous gods. Hence, when we see the compounds such as Ptah-Sokar-Osiris, or Amen-Ra or Osiris-Khentamenti, it is clear that each god of the compound belongs to a different religion, like Pallas-Athene or Zeus-Labrandeus, in Greek compounds. So far as we can at present see, the gods linked with each of the beliefs about the soul are as follows:

(1) The Soul in the Tombs and Cemetery.

With this belief belong the animal gods, which form the earliest stratum of the religion; also Sokar the god of "Silence,"

and Mert Sokar, the "Lover of Silence," as the gods of the dead. With this was allied a belief in the soul sometimes going to the west, and hence, Khent-amenti, a jackal-headed god, "he who is in the west," became the god of the dead.

(2) The Soul in the Heavenly Kingdom.

Osiris is the lord of this kingdom, Isis his sister-wife, Horus their son, Nebhat (Nephthys) the sister of Isis, and Set her husband. Set also was regarded as coequal with Horus. This whole mythology results probably from the fusion of tribes who were originally monotheistic, and who each worshipped one of these deities. It is certain that the later parts of this mythology are tribal history, regarded as the victories and defeats of the gods whom the tribes worshipped.

(3) The Soul in the Sun-Boat.

Ra was the Sun-god, and in other forms worshipped as Khepera and Atmu. The other cosmic gods of the same group are Nut, the heaven, and her husband Geb, the earth; Shu, space, and his sister Tefnut. Anher the Sky-god belongs to Upper Egypt.

(4) The Mummy with Amulets, Preserved for a Future Life.

Probably to this group belong the gods of principles, Hathor the female principle; Min the male principle; Ptah the architect and creator of the universe; his spouse Maat, abstract truth and justice.

6. Foreign Gods:

Foreign gods frequently appear also in Egypt, mostly from Syria. Two importations were of great effect. Aton the radiant energy of the sun, the Adon or "lord," Adonai, Adonis, was introduced as a sole deity by Akhenaton 1380 BC, and all other gods were proscribed. This was a strictly rational and scientific religion, attributing all life and power to the action of the sun’s rays; but it only lasted 20 years in Egypt, and then vanished. The other important worship was that of Zeus Sarapis. The Zeus statue is said to have been imported from Sinope by Ptolemy I, but the Sarapis was the god of Memphis, Osarhapi, the Osiris form of the Hapi bull. The Egyptian worshipped his old gods; the Greek was satisfied with Zeus; and both nations united in adoring Zeus Sarapis. The temples and ritual are too wide a subject to touch in our present space; but the essential principle was that of providing a banquet for the god, and feasting in his temple, not that of an expiatory sacrifice or burnt offering, which is Semitic.

7. Laws:

The laws are but little known until the late Greek accounts. Marriage was usual with a sister, but this may have been with a half-sister, as among the Greeks and early Hebrews. Polygamy was unusual, but was legal, as many as six wives being represented in one instance. Kings of course had unlimited harems. Divorce was unusual, but was probably easy. In Coptic times a marriage contract provides for divorce by either party, upon paying six times the marriage gift. Property was strictly guarded.

8. Character:

The national character was easygoing, kindly, never delighting in torture like the Assyrians and Romans, but liable to be too slack and careless. Firmness, decision and fortitude were held up as the leading virtues. The structure of society, the arts and the industries are outside of the scope of this article.

(For differing views on chronology and sites, see articles EXODUS; WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL; PITHOM; RAAMSES, etc., and on individual kings, etc., articles under their names, and EGYPTIAN KINGS.)

LITERATURE.

Works in English, that are the most accessible, are stated in preference to foreign works, the references to which will be seen in the books stated below.

The Country: Baedeker’s Egypt; on the flora, Petrie, Hawara, Biahmu, and Arsioe.

The History: Prehistoric: Petrie, Diospolis Parva, etc.; de Morgan, Recherches; Maspero, The Dawn of Civilization, The Struggle of the Nations, The Passing of the Empires; Petrie, Student’s History of Egypt; Breasted, A History of Egypt, etc. On the Ist-IInd Dynasties, Petrie, Royal Tombs. On the IIId-VIth Dynasties, Petrie, The Pyramids and Temples of Gizeh; Murray, Saqqara Mastabas I. On the VIIth-XIVth Dynasties, Petrie, Gizeh and Rifeh; de Morgan, Dahchour, I, II. On the XVth-XXIVth Dynasties, Weigall, Guide to Antiquities; Baedeker on Thebes; Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes. On the XXVth Dynasty to Roman times, Petrie, Temple of Apries; Mahaffy, The Empires of the Ptolemies; Milne, History of Egypt under Roman Rule. On the early foreign connections, Petrie, Methods and Aims in Archaeology.

On the Semitic Connections: Petrie, Syria and Egypt from the Tell el-Amarna Tablets. On the Old Testament Connections: Petrie, Egypt and Israel.

On the Language: Murray, Elementary Grammar.

On the Writing and Literature: Erman, Life in Ancient Egypt; Petrie, Egyptian Tales, I, II.

On the Religion: Wiedemann, Religion of the Ancient Egyptians.

On the Customs: Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians.

On the Arts: Petrie, The Arts and Crafts of Ancient Egypt.

W. M. Flinders Petrie

EGYPT, BROOK (RIVER, STREAM) OF

See BROOK OF EGYPT.

EGYPTIAN KINGS (LATER)

See PHARAOH; HOPHRA; NECO; SHISHAK; EGYPT, III.

EGYPTIAN VERSIONS

vur’-shuns.

See COPTIC VERSIONS.

EGYPTIAN, THE

e-jip’-shan (ho Aiguptios):

Mentioned in Ac 21:38, by Claudius Lysias as having "before these days stirred up to sedition and led out into the wilderness the four thousand men of the ASSASSINS" (which see). Reference to this Egyptian and to the suppression of his rebellion by the procurator Felix is likewise found in Josephus (Ant., XX, viii, 6; BJ, II, xiii, 5).

EGYPTIANS, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

EHI

e’-hi (’ehi):

Apparently a contracted form (Ge 46:21).

See AHIRAM.

EHUD

e’-hud (ehudh, "united," "strong"):

A Benjamite, son of Gera, deliverer of Israel from oppression by Moab (Jud 3:15-30). Gaining access alone to the presence of King Eglon under pretense of a secret errand connected with the payment of Israel’s tribute, Ehud, a left-handed man, drew the sword he had concealed upon his right side, and thrust the king through. He locked the doors of the upper chamber after him, made his escape, and with the Israelites overcame Moab at the fords of the Jordan, slaying some 10,000. Ehud’s name occurs again in the Benjamite genealogy (1Ch 7:10).

F. K. Farr

EITHER

e’-ther, i’-ther:

Often in the sense still common, "one or the other" (1Ch 21:21; Mt 6:24, etc.), but also in the obsolete sense of "both" or "each" (Le 10:1; 1Ki 7:15; Joh 19:18; Re 22:2), or in place of (Revised Version) "or" (Lu 6:42; 15:8; Php 3:12; Jas 3:12).

EKER

e’-ker (’eqer, "root"):

A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:27).

EKREBEL

ek’-re-bel (Ekrebel):

Appears only in APC Judith 7:18. It lay on the brook Mochmur, South of Dothart. It is identical with Akrabbein, of which Eusebius (Onomasticon) speaks as the capital of the district of Akrabattine. It corresponds to the modern ‘Akrabeh, 8 miles

Southeast of Nablus.

EKRON; EKRONITE

ek’-ron, ek’-ron-it ‘eqron, "migration," "rooting out"; Akkaron:

The most northerly of the chief cities of the Philistines. It was not subdued by Joshua (13:3) but was allotted, in the division of the land, first to Judah and then to Da (Jos 15:11,45,46; 19:43). It was taken by Judah (Jud 1:18). The people of Ekron are prominent in the story of the ark in the land of the Philistines. It was they who proposed to have it sent back to Israel (1Sa 5:10; 6:16,17). After the defeat of the Philistines, when David killed Goliath, the Israelites pursued them to the gates of Ekron, which was evidently the nearest walled town in which the fugitives could take refuge (1Sa 17:52). It was the seat of the worship of the god Baalzebub, as appears in the account of the sickness and death of Ahaziah (2Ki 1:2,3,6:16). It is included among other cities in the denunciations of Amos (1:8) and of Jeremiah (25:20). Zephaniah declares that it shall be rooted up (2:4), and Zechariah speaks of its consternation at the fall of Tyre (9:5,7).

From the Assyrian records we learn that it revolted against Sennacherib and expelled Padi, the governor he had placed over it, and sent him to Hezekiah, at Jerusalem, for safe keeping. Sennacherib marched against it and Ekron called in the aid of the king of Mutsri, formerly supposed to be Egypt but now regarded by some scholars as a district of Northwestern Arabia. Sennacherib raised the siege of Ekron to defeat this army, which he did at Eltekeh, and then returned and took the city by storm and put to death the leaders of the revolt and carried their adherents into captivity. He then compelled Hezekiah to restore Padi, who was once more made governor. This affair led to the famous attack of Sennacherib on Hezekiah and Jerusalem (Rawl., Anc. Mon., II, 159). Ekron is mentioned in 1 Macc 10:89 as being given by Alexander Balas to Jonathan Maccabeus, and it appears in the accounts of the first Crusade.

Ekronite:

An inhabitant of Ekron, used in plural in Jos 13:3 and 1Sa 5:10.

H. Porter

EL

See GOD, NAMES OF.

EL ELYON

el e-li’-on.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

EL ROI

(Ge 16:13 margin).

See GOD, NAMES OF.

EL SHADDAI

el shad’-a-i, el shad’-i.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

EL-BETH-EL

el-beth’-el (el beth-’el, "God of Bethel"; Baithel):

By this name Jacob called the scene of his vision at Luz, when he returned from Paddan-aram (Ge 35:7).

EL-ELOHE-ISRAEL

el-e-lo’-he-iz’-ra-el, el-el’-o-he-iz’-ra-el (’el ‘elohe yisra’el, translated "God, the God of Israel" in the American Revised Version, margin and the King James Version margin):

Found only in Ge 33:20 as the name given to the altar erected at Shechem by Jacob, henceforth, known as Israel, on the parcel of ground purchased by him from the inhabitants of Shechem, his first encampment of length and importance since the return to Palestine from Paddan-aram and the eventful night at Peniel (Ge 32:30). This unusual combination of names has given occasion for much speculation and for various text emendations. Already the Septuagint sought to meet the difficulty by reading wa-yiqra’ ‘el ‘elohe yisra’el, "and he called upon the God of Israel," instead of the wa-yiqra’ lo ‘el of Massoretic Text, "and he called it El" etc. Wellhausen, followed by Dillmann, Driver and others, changes "altar" to "pillar," because the Hebrew verb, hitstsibh, is used with mitstsbhah, "pillar," in Ge 35:14,20, so making this religious act a parallel to that at Bethel. But Delitzsch, New Commentary on Genesis, properly rejects this purely fanciful change, and understands the compound name as the altar’s inscription. Dillmann well suggests that "altar" (or "pillar") be supplied, reading thus: "called it the altar of El, the God of Israel." The peculiar phrase is best and most readily understood in its close connection with the struggle at Peniel, recorded in Ge 32. Being victorious in that struggle, Jacob received the new name "Israel"; and to his first altar in Palestine he gave that name of God which appeared in his own new name, further explaining it by the appositive phrase "Elohe-Israel." Thus, his altar was called, or dedicated to, "El, the God of Israel."

Edward Mack

EL-PARAN

el-pa’-ran.

See PARAN.

ELA

e’-la (Ela, APC 1Esdras 9:27):

(1) Same as Elam (Ezr 10:26).

(2) Father of Shimei (1Ki 4:18, the King James Version "Elah").

See ELAH, 2.

ELADAH

el’-a-da.

See ELEADAH.

ELAH (1)

e’-la (’elah, "oak" or "terebinth"):

(1) A "duke" or "sheik" (head of a clan, the Revised Version (British and American) "chief") of Edom (Ge 36:41).

(2) Shimei-ben-Elah, Solomon’s commissary in Benjamin (1Ki 4:18 the King James Version).

(3) A son of Caleb the son of Jephunneh (1Ch 4:15).

(4) Father of Hoshea, last king of Israel (2Ki 15:30; 17:1).

(5) A Benjamite, son of Uzzi, one of the chiefs of the tribes when the country was settled (1Ch 9:8).

(6) King of Israel. See next article.

ELAH (2)

e’-la.

Son of Baasha, fourth king of Israel (1Ki 16:6-14).

He reigned two years, 888-887 BC. The statement that he came to the throne in the 26th year of Asa, reigned two years, and died in the 27th year of Asa, illustrates the Hebrew method of synchronizing the reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah (compare 1Ki 15:33; 16:8). Elah appears to have been a debauchee. While he was drinking himself drunk in the house of Azra, his chamberlain, Zimri, one of his military leaders, conspired against him and murdered him. According to Josephus (VIII, xii, 4) he took advantage of the absence of the army, which was at Gibbethon, to kill Elah. The extirpation of the royal family followed the murder of the king. Baasha’s dynasty had its origin in a murder and it ended in a murder. The government had no stability. These revolutions illustrate the truth that "they who take the sword shall perish with the sword."

S. K. Mosiman

ELAH, VALE OF

(‘emeq ha-’elah, "valley of the terebinth"; he koilas Ela; A, tes druos):

The scene of the events of 1Sa 17:2 ff, referred to also in 1Sa 21:9. There can be no doubt that this is the Wady ec CunT ("valley of the tercbinth"), or part of it. This is the southernmost of the great valleys which cut through the Shephelah. Commencing near Hebron, close to Beit Sur, it descends under the name Wady es Sur in a more or less northerly direction until near Beit Nettif where it turns abruptly west and receives the name Wady ec CunT. Here it is joined by the Wady en Najil, coming from the North, and from the East by the Wady el-Jindy, down which descends an ancient road from Bethlehem. Where all these valleys coalesce the Wady ec CunT expands into a wide and level bottom, half a mile across. On a steep hill to the southern side and a little Southeast of the wide expanse is Kh. esh-Shuweikeh, the site of Socoh. That

the great events of 1Sa 17:2 ff took place here there can be no doubt: the Philistines ranged themselves upon the southern hills; the Israelites to the North or Northeast. Upon the wide level valley the contest with Goliath occurred. The exact position of Saul’s forces may be a matter of speculation, but the late Principal Miller of Madras, who made a special study of the locality (Least of All Lands, chapter v), considered that the little valley ascending Northeast from Wady ec CunT to Belt Nettif was probably the actual Vale of Elah and that here the Israelites had their fortifications. His elucidation of the whole story is most convincing.

E. W. G. Masterman

ELAM

e’-lam (‘elam):

(1) A son of Shem (Ge 10:22; 1Ch 1:17; see ELAMITES).

(2) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:24).

(3) A Korahite (1Ch 26:3).

(4) Heads of families in the return (Ezr 2:7 parallel Ne 7:12; Ezr 2:31 parallel Ne 7:34; Ezr 8:7; 10:2,26).

(5) A chief of the people (Ne 10:14).

(6) A priest (Ne 12:42).

ELAM; ELAMITES

e’-lam, e’-lam-its (‘elam; Ailam; Jer 49:36. Codex Sinaiticus ‘the original scribe’ reads Elam)

The scene of the events of 1Sa 17:2 ff, referred to also in 1Sa 21:9. There can be no doubt that this is the Wady ec CunT ("valley of the tercbinth"), or part of it. This is the southernmost of the great valleys which cut through the Shephelah. Commencing near Hebron, close to Beit Sur, it descends under the name Wady es Sur in a more or less northerly direction until near Beit Nettif where it turns abruptly west and receives the name Wady ec CunT. Here it is joined by the Wady en Najil, coming from the North, and from the East by the Wady el-Jindy, down which descends an ancient road from Bethlehem. Where all these valleys coalesce the Wady ec CunT expands into a wide and level bottom, half a mile across. On a steep hill to the southern side and a little Southeast of the wide expanse is Kh. esh-Shuweikeh, the site of Socoh. That the great events of 1Sa 17:2 ff took place here there can be no doubt: the Philistines ranged themselves upon the southern hills; the Israelites to the North or Northeast. Upon the wide level valley the contest with Goliath occurred. The exact position of Saul’s forces may be a matter of speculation, but the late Principal Miller of Madras, who made a special study of the locality (Least of All Lands, chapter v), considered that the little valley ascending Northeast from Wady ec CunT to Belt Nettif was probably the actual Vale of Elah and that here the Israelites had their fortifications. His elucidation of the whole story is most convincing.

Contents

1. Geographical Position and Names 2. Surface Configuration 3. Mountain Ranges 4. Rivers 5. Climate 6. Vegetation 7. Fauna 8. The Population 9. The Principal Cities 10. Apirti and the "Bandit Nations" 11. The Languages of Elam 12. History (1) The Earliest Period (2) Sargon of Agade and His Successors (3) The Suzerainty of the Kings of Ur (4) Elam Becomes Predominant 2280 Years BC (5) The

Extension of Elamite Authority Westward (6) Babylonia Again Supreme (7) Hurbatila’s Challenge to Kuri-galzu (8) Elam Again Supreme (9) Elam Again Defeated, but Recovers (10) The Conflict between Elam and Assyria (11) Sennacherib against Chaldea and Elam (12) Assyrian Friendship and Elamite Ingratitude (13) Te-umman and the Elamite Seed-royal; Assyria’s Triumph (14) Elamite Ingratitude and Treachery (15) Elam’s Further Changes of Rulers (16) King Tammaritu’s Treachery (17) Dominion Passes from Assyria (18) The Later State of Elam 13. Elamite Religion 14. Elam’s Importance; Her Literature 15. Art during the 1st and 2nd Prehistoric Periods 16. Art in the Archaic Period, That of the Viceroys, and That of the Kings 17. Temperament of the Inhabitants of Elam

LITERATURE

1. Geographical Position and Names:

A well-known tract, partly mountainous, whose western boundary, starting on the Northeast side of the Persian Gulf, practically followed the course of the lower Tigris. It was bounded on the North by Media, on the East by Persia and on the West by Babylonia. The Assyro-Babylonians called the tract Elamtu, expressed ideographically by the Sumerian characters for Nimma or Numma, which seems to have been its name in that language. As Numma or Elam apparently means "height," or the like, these names were probably applied to it on account of its mountainous nature. Another name by which it was known in early times was Ashshan, for Anshan or Anzan (Anzhan), one of its ancient cities. The great capital of the tract, however, was Susa (Shushan), whence its Greek name of Susiana, interchanging with Elymais, from the Semitic Elam.

2. Surface Configuration:

Elam consisted of a plain occupying a depression in the mountains of Iran or Persia. Of this the smaller part—which, however, was also the most ancient historically—lay between the Pusht-e-Kuh on the West, the Lur mountains on the North, the Bakhtiari heights to the East and Southeast, and the hills of Ahwaz to the South. The larger plain has as its northern boundary these same Ahwaz hills, and reaches to the sea on the South.

3. Mountain Ranges:

The Pusht-e-Kuh mountains are a series of very high parallel ranges described as "a veritable wall" between Mesopotamia and the elevated depression of the Kerkha. Its principal peak is in the Kebir-Kuh (2,500 meters = 8,200 ft.)—a difficult range of surprising regularity. The valleys on the Southwest slope belong properly to Babylonia, and could be invaded on that side with ease, but Northeast of the Kebir-Kuh the country is well protected not only against Mesopotamia, on the West, but also against Persia on the East. The nomad Lurs of the present day are practically independent of Persia. The mountain ranges of Luristan increase in height as one approaches the Persian plain, the loftiest summits of the principal range attaining a height of 5,000 meters (= 16,400 ft.).

4. Rivers:

From these mountain ranges descend large rivers which flow through Elam to the sea. The Kerkha (Gamas-ab) rises in the Persian plain near Nehavend, and is practically a torrent until it reaches Susa, below which it becomes less rapid, and loses itself in the Hawizeh marshes. The Ab-e-Diz, a river with a greater volume of water, is formed by the uniting of two streams above Dizful. It is so violent that it carries down boulders and even tree-trunks from the mountains, and after a winding course joins the Karun at Kut-e-Bende-Kir. The Belad-Rud, between the Ab-e-Diz and the Kerkha, rises in the mountains of Luristan, and varies greatly as to its volume, being sometimes a mere brook, and at others a large river. The Karun, with which a number of small streams unite, rises in the Bakhtiari mountains. After receiving the Ab-e-Diz and the Belad-Rud at Kut-e-Bende-Kir, it becomes an important waterway, navigable as far as Shuster. This is identified with the

Biblical Ulai (Assyrian Ulaa, classical Eulaeus). In ancient times emptying itself into the Persian Gulf, which in past centuries extended much farther inland than now, it at present joins the Shattel-Arab at Mohammerah.

5. Climate:

The climate is a variable one. Between November 1 and 15 the rains begin, with Southeast and South winds, and the mountains are covered with snow. In January and February there are violent storms, and the night brings 8 degrees or 10 degrees of frost. Spring begins at the end of February, and vegetation advances so rapidly that harvest takes place about the end of April. The wind then turns South and Southwest, bringing with it a heat rising sometimes to 140 degree F., destroying all the verdure of the country. Notwithstanding the rigors of the climate, however, it was in ancient times a well-populated district, and exceedingly fruitful, as now. That the district of Arabistan is poor and barren is due to the carelessness and improvidence of the people, who, like the people of the Turkish province of Bagdad, have neglected the ancient irrigation canals which fertilized the land.

6. Vegetation:

The vegetation of Susiana is said not to be very varied. On the river banks are to be found willows, tamarisks and many kinds of acacias. Apparently there are no forests—the sacred groves referred to by Assur-bani-apli are thought by De Morgan to have been artificial plantations. Oranges and lemons, which are at present cultivated there, are late importations. The date palm has been brought from the banks of the Shatt-el-Arab, and the pomegranate and other fruit trees from the Iranian plain. Wheat and barley, sown in October and November, are harvested in April. Sorghum remains in the ground all through the dry season, and is watered artificially until October, and cut in November. Castor beans, indigo, lentils, haricots, etc., are less cultivated.

7. Fauna:

The fauna is said at present to be less numerous than formerly. It contains species both of central Asia, Europe, and, to a certain extent, Africa. The elephant, wild ass, wild ox and ostrich are no longer to be found on the Chaldeo-Elamite plain, but a few examples of the lion still exist there. Bears, panthers, wild boars, wolves, wild cats, foxes, jackals, and several species of wild dogs, however, still exist. Numbers of porcupines inhabit the brushwood by the rivers and marshes. Among the birds which do not leave the country are the eagle, vulture, falcon, raven, francolin, martin, sparrow, tomtit, wagtail, etc. The winter birds of passage are the pelican, stork, crane, cormorant, sea gull, many species of wild duck, the wild goose, bustard, woodcock, snipe, pigeon, turtledove, and numerous brilliantly colored waders. The water-courses are full of fish, among them being the barbel, silurus, carp (sometimes of great size), and gurnards similar to those of the Nile. Some of the rivers being salt, sea fish are also to be found, and it is not rare to see sharks at Shuster, and eels in the lower Karun.

8. The Population:

The population is naturally not homogeneous. Arab tribes, who are in reality Semites, occupy the plains, while Iranians inhabit the cities and dwell at the mountain bases. According to De Morgan, the original population was mainly negritic, and has mingled with the Arab stock to such an extent that mulattoes among them are not rare. He regards this type as being represented among the soldiers as well as among the people conquered by Naram-Sin about 3000 BC. Nevertheless pure Semites had settled in the country at a very early date, and it is probably on account of this that Elam is called (Ge 10:22) a son of Shem—indeed, the many Sere inscriptions found by the French explorers at Susa show how strong their influence was. It was to all appearance during the 2nd millennium BC that certain Kassites overran West Mesopotamia, and settled in the northern part of Elam, which was thereafter called by the Assyrians mat Kassi, "the land of the Cosseans." As these people seem to have spoken an Aryan language, there was apparently no really new race introduced in consequence of their invasion.

9. The Principal Cities:

The two principal cities were Susa or Shushan, called Susun in the native texts, and regarded as the old capital, situated on the Ulai (Karkha); and Anzan (Ashshan, Anshan), more to the Southwest. This latter was the capital of Cyrus the Great and his immediate predecessors, the tract having been conquered apparently by Sispis (Teispes), his ancestor, at the end of the 6th century BC. Susa, an important commercial center in the 3rd millennium BC, became again one of the three capitals of the Pets empire during the rule of the Achemenians.

10. Apirti and the "Bandit Nations":

From the inscriptions of Mal-Amir, to the East, we learn that that was the place of another kingdom called Apirti, the land of the Apharsites of Ezr 4:9. In the 2nd (so-called Median or Scythian) version of the late Persian inscriptions this name is given as Hapirti, Halpirti, and Haltupirti, and appears as the equivalent of the Babylonian Elammat (Elamtu) or Elam without the nominative ending. In the Persian version this appears as (H)uwaja or (H)uwazha, whence the modern Huz or Khuzistan. This implies that the kings of Apirti at one time held dominion over Susa, and perhaps the whole of Elam. Strabo (xi.13,1,6), quoting Nearchus, speaks of "four bandit nations" who occupied the mountains East of the Euphrates—the Amardians or Mardians on the Persian border, the Uxians, and Elymeans on the borders of Persia and Susa, and the Cosseans (Kassites) by the Medes. The Amardians would seem to have been the Apirti (Hapirti), the Uxians were probably from (H)uwaja, while the Elymeans (compare 1 Macc 6:1) were the Elamites. Among the tribes who made the history of the country, therefore, were probably the Uxians, who seem not to be mentioned in the early inscriptions.

11. The Languages of Elam:

The dialects of Susa, the second Achemenian VSS, and of Apirti, differ but slightly from each other. They are variants of an agglutinative tongue, and are apparently not related to any other known language. The statement in Ge 10:22, therefore, applies only to the Semitic section of the population, as it is unlikely that the people speaking Apirtian could be described as "sons of Shem."

12. History:

(1) The Earliest Period.

Beginning with the semi-mythical period, we have the story of the fight of the Babylonian hero Gilgames with the Elamite tyrant Humbaba, who was defeated by the hero and his helper Enki-du, and beheaded. The earliest really historical reference to the Elamites as the foes of Babylonia, however, is apparently that contained in a letter from the priest Lu-enna to the priest En-e-tarzi announcing that the Elamites had invaded Lagas and carried off considerable booty. The writer, however, had attacked the Elamites, and taken plunder from them in his turn. As there seems to be a reference to division of spoil, this is an excellent parallel to the Elamite expedition, made in alliance with the Babylonians, against the cities of the plain (Ge 14).

(2) Sargon of Agade and His Successors.

Sargon of Agade, early in his reign, attacked the Elamites, but apparently Elam only fell under the dominion of the Babylonians during the time of Naram-Sin, his son, who is seemingly shown leading his troops in that region on the splendid stele bearing his name that was found at Susa. Elam apparently regained its independence, however, during the time of Uruwus king of Kis, who invaded the country, and brought back considerable spoil. One of the chiefs of Susa about this time was Simbi-ishak. Chaldean domination, however, did not last long, for Dungi, king of Ur of the Chaldees, about 2500 BC, invaded the country, accompanied by his vassal Gudea, viceroy of Lagas. Dungi has left evidences of his conquests in the buildings which he erected at Susa, but the principal buildings of this period were constructed by Ba-sa-Susinak, son of Simbi-ishak, viceroy of Susa and potentate in Elam. He built a temple to the god Sugu, reservoirs, the gate

of Susinak, and dug the Sidur canal. He was evidently one of the great rulers of the land.

(3) The Suzerainty of the Kings of Ur.

Somewhat later came Idadu I, his son Kal-Ruhuratir, and his grandson Idadu II, who in turn occupied the throne during the time of Bur-Sin, king of Ur. Elam was at this time still under Babylonian suzerainty, which continued under his successor, Gimil-Sin, who also built at Susa, his vassal being Ebarti-kin-Daddu, viceroy of Susa. Gimil-Sin was succeeded by his son Ibi-Sin as overlord in Elam, who invaded and devastated the country, probably to suppress a a revolt. There was apparently no ill-will between the two nations, however, for the viceroy of Susa is said to have married a daughter of Ibi-Sin. Another and possibly later viceroy seems to have married Mekubi, daughter of Billama, viceroy of Asnunnak, who, as Elamite princess, erected buildings at Susa.

(4) Elam Becomes Predominant 2280 Years BC.

It was probably shortly after this that Kudur-Nahhunte threw off the Semitic yoke, and, invading Babylonia, brought back much spoil to Elam. The date indicated for this ruler by the inscriptions of Assurbani-apli is 2280 BC. The positions of the rulers of Elam and Babylonia were now changed, and the kings of Babylon had to acknowledge Elamite suzerainty. As Elamite and Babylonian sovereign, Kudur-Nahhunte entrusted Susa to a feudatory ruler, and among the viceroys who governed Elam may be mentioned Sirukdu', who constructed at Susa, and Temti-Agun, his sister's son, who built in that city the temple to Isme-karab, "for the health of Kutir-Nahhunte and his family." After passing to other rulers, the government of Susa fell to Ebari, father of Silhaha, during whose reign Simti-Silhak ruled in Babylonia. Nur-Addi and Rim-Anum, kings of Larsa (Elassar), were his vassals.

(5) The Extension of Elamite Authority Westward.

Attapaksu (or Attahusu), Silhaha's sister's son, then became "shepherd of Susa." Among the temples which he built was one dedicated to the goddess Narute, and he erected a bridge near his residence. Kudur-mabuk, son of Simti-Silhak, was at this time adda ("father," probably meaning protector) of Emutbalu and the West—Amurru, the land of the Amorites, whither marched Chedorlaomer and Amraphel, with their allies, in the time of Abraham (Ge 14). Kudur-mabuk of Larsa was succeeded by his son Eri-Aku (probably the Iri-Agun of Larsa of the Elamite texts), and if he be really, as seems probable, the Arioch of Ge 14:1,9, then this is also the period when Chedorlaomer ruled in Elam. The strange thing, however, is, that the name of this last does not occur in any recognizable form, unless it be the Kudurlahgumal of certain half- legendary inscriptions (see CHEDORLAOMER). The Elamite line in Larsa was continued after the death of Eri-Aku by Rim-Sin, his brother, who succeeded him.

(6) Babylonia Again Supreme.

What the history of Elam during this period was remains to be discovered, but Hammurabi, who is identified with the Amraphel of Ge 14:1,9, seems to have invaded the country in his 30th year. In his 31st he defeated Rim-Sin of Larsa, following this up, in his 32nd, by overthrowing the army of Asnunnak. All these successes in Elam and its dependencies probably made the kingdom of Babylon supreme in the land. But more details bearing upon this period are needed. It is thought probable that the Elamite king Sadi(?) or Taki (?) came into conflict with, and was defeated by, Ammi-caduga, the 4th in descent from Hammurabi, who reigned about 1890 BC. Apparently the Elamite ruler had tried to regain his independence, but failed.

(7) Hurbatila's Challenge to Kuri-galzu.

Omitting the names of rulers concerning whom but little or nothing is known, we come to the reign of Untas-Gal, patron of the articles Numerous temples were built by him, and sanctuaries at Susa dedicated. He has left a magnificent bronze statue representing his queen Napir-Asu. He seems to have been overthrown by Untahas-Gal, of a more legitimate line,

who was likewise a builder of temples. After the apparently short reign of Kidin-Hutran came that of Hurpatila (Hurbatila), who, desiring to throw off the Babylonian yoke, challenged Kuri-galzu, king of Babylon, to battle at Dur-Dungi. The challenge was accepted, with disastrous results, for Hurbatila was captured by the Babylonian king at the place named. This, however, did not put an end to the strife, and in the end Kidin-Hutrudas was victorious over Belnadin-sum, king of Babylon, about 1180 BC.

(8) Elam Again Supreme.

Later came the military exploits of Sutruk-Nahhunte, who invaded Babylonia, slew the king Zagaga-sum-iddina, and helped by his son Kutir-Nahhunte, destroyed Sippar, and took away the stele of Naram-Sin, the code of Hammurabi, and several other monuments, which were carefully preserved at Susa. He also defeated the king of Asnunnak. It is this collection of spoils which has contributed to make the success of the French excavations at Susa what it is.

(9) Elam Again Defeated, but Recovers.

The war between Babylonia and Elam recorded for the reign of Nebuchadrezzar I (circa 1020 BC) probably took place, according to Scheil, during the reign of Silbina-hamru-Laqamar. The Elamite king was defeated on the banks of the Ulai, Elam was ravaged, and much spoil taken. The principality called Namar was detached from Susian territory and reunited to the domain of Babylonia. Apparently the Elamites now turned their attention to regaining their military prestige, the result being that an Elamite king occupied the Babylonian throne from 939 to 934 BC. The history of this period has still to be discovered, but the Babylonians apparently soon shook off the Elamite yoke. It is about this time, however, that another power—Assyria—appeared on the scene, and took the field—not only against Babylon, but also on the borders of Elam. An Elamite contemporary of Nabonassar of Babylon was Humbanigas, 742 BC.

(10) The Conflict between Elam and Assyria.

At this time, however, the Assyrians became dominant in Babylonia (see TIGLATH-PILESER and SHALMANESER), but it was probably not until the reign of Sargon of Assyria (see SARGON) that Elam came into conflict with Assyria. Merodach-baladan, a pretender to the throne of Babylon, made common cause with Humbanigas, who fought with the Assyrian army at Der. Naturally the Assyrians claim the victory, but the Babylonians say that they were defeated. After the death of Humbanigas, his successor, Sutur-Nahhundi or Ishtar-hundu (Babylonian), still befriended Merodach-baladan, and advanced to his help. Sargon first attacked the Chaldeans and defeated them at Dur-Athara, and, entering Elam, stormed and captured the cities of the land. The Elamite king took refuge in the mountains, and Merodach-baladan had to resist the Assyrians unaided.

(11) Sennacherib against Chaldea and Elam.

As Sargon had his attention fully occupied elsewhere, he made no attempt to follow up his success, and it seems not to have been until the reign of Sennacherib that any serious invasion of the country on the part of the Assyrians was made. In 697 BC that king marched again against Merodach-baladan, who had taken refuge at Nagitu and other places on the Elamite side of then elongated Persian Gulf. Here the Chaldeans, with their Elamite allies, were defeated, and the Elamite cities plundered and destroyed. Hallusu, king of Elam, on the retirement of the Assyrian troops, invaded Babylonia as being part of the territories of the Assyrian king, and having captured Assur-nadin-sum, Sennacherib's son, who had ruled in Babylon 6 years, carried him off to Elam, setting Nergal-usezib on the throne of Babylonia. On the arrival of the Assyrian avenging host in Baby1onia, Nergal-usezib fled to Elam, but was captured near Niffer. The Elamites were evidently very dissatisfied with their king—possibly owing to his policy—and killed him in a revolt after a reign of six years. This action on the part of the Elamites, however, did not save the people from Assyrian vengeance, for Sennacherib invaded and ravaged the country from Ras to Bit-Burnaki. Apparently the Elamites had expected their new ruler, Kudurru (Kudur-Nahhunte), to save them from the reprisals of the Assyrians, but as he had failed to do this, he, in his turn, was deposed and killed after a reign of 10 months. The new king of Elam was Umman- Menanu, who espoused the cause of

Musezib-Marduk, the new king of Babylon, and gathering a force of Babylonians and Elamites at Halule, fought a battle there, in which the Babylonians record success for the allies. Sennacherib, however, himself claims the victory, and describes with great wealth of detail the horrors of the fight. Next year (689 BC) Sennacherib marched into Babylonia to complete the work, and Musezib-Marduk, having been captured, was sent prisoner to Assyria. Umman-Menanu died at the end of the year, after a 4 years' reign, and was succeeded by Humba- haldasu I (689-682 BC), of whom nothing is known. In 682 BC Humba- haldasu II mounted the throne. The death of Sennacherib and the troubles attending the accession of Esarhaddon encouraged Nabuzer-napisti-Itsir, son of Merodach- baladan, again to raise the standard of revolt. Defeat was the result, and he fled to Elam, there to be captured by Humba- haldasu and put to death.

(12) Assyrian Friendship and Elamite Ingratitude.

Friendship with Assyria was a complete reversal of Elamite policy, and to all appearance peace, though probably unpopular, persisted between the two countries for several years. Humba-haldasu's two brothers revolted against him and assassinated him, and Urtaku, one of the murderers, took the Elamite throne. Not daring to be openly hostile to Assyria, however, he sent his brother Te-umman to intrigue in Chaldea in favor of a man named Nabuusallim, but the Chaldean chiefs answered that Na'id-Marduk, their lord, lived, and they were the servants of the king of Assyria. Also, during a famine in Elam, certain Elamite tribes migrated into Assyria to escape the scarcity, and were kindly treated by Assur-bani-apli, who had succeeded his father on the Assyrian throne. Notwithstanding this, however, Urtaku invaded Babylonia as ally of certain Chaldean tribes. Overtaken by the Assyrian army, he fought with them near his own border, but was defeated and fled. He died prematurely (by his own hand) the same year, and was succeeded by his brother Te-umman (Tepti-Humban).

(13) Te-umman and the Elamite Seed-royal; Assyria's Triumph.

This king, who is described by Assur-bani-apli as being in the likeness of an evil spirit, immediately set to work to secure the death of all the sons of Urtaku and Umman-aldase (Humba-Haldasu II), his brother; and these princes, five in number, with 60 of the royal seed of Elam, fled and sought refuge with the Assyrian king. Te-umman immediately sent two messengers to Assur-bani-apli demanding the surrender of the fugitives. This was refused, and war broke out between the two countries immediately after. The Assyrians came up with the Elamites at Der, but Te-umman feared to join issue there, and retreating, took up a strong position near his capital, Susa, with his front protected by the river Ulai. Defections from his army now so weakened the forces of Te-umman that he endeavored to treat with Assur-bani-apli, who naturally refused to listen to terms, and ordered his troops to attack. The defeat of the Elamites was a foregone conclusion, and Te-umman perished, with his son, in the thick of the battle, as is dramatically depicted by the sculptors of Assur-bani-apli in the bas-reliefs which adorned the walls of his palace. An Assyrian general was now sent to Susa with Umman-igas, the prince chosen to succeed Te-umman, and he was proclaimed while the bodies of the fallen Elamites covered the battlefield, and the waters of the Ulai carried others down to the place of its outflow. Tammaritu, the new king's youngest brother, was at the same time made king of Hidalu, in the mountain region. In the triumphal procession at Nineveh which took place on the Assyrian army's return, the head of Te-umman and his son Tamritu figured, the former hanging from the neck of Dunanu, king of Gambulu, and the latter from the neck of Samgunu, Dunanu's brother.

(14) Elamite Ingratitude and Treachery.

For a time there was peace in Elam, but soon the discontent of Samas-sum-ukin, king of Babylon, Assur-bani-apli's brother, sought to break it. Urged by him, Umman-igas forgot the benefits which he had received at the hands of Assur-bani-apli, and sent an army into Babylonia under the command of Undasi, son of Te-umman, telling him to avenge upon Assyria the killing of his father. Notwithstanding the great strength of the allied army, they did not succeed in making headway against the Assyrians. Tammaritu, nephew of Umman-igas, after the defeat of the Elamite forces in Chaldea, revolted against him, and having defeated him, cut off his head, and took the crown. Samas-sum-ukin immediately turned his attention to the new ruler, and induced him by fresh presents to come likewise to his aid. Tammaritu therefore marched at the head of an army into Babylonia, but in his absence Indabigas, one of his servants, headed a revolt against him, and

proclaimed himself king in Susa. In the battle which ensued between the two pretenders, Tammaritu was defeated, and fled to the seacoast with a part of the Elamite royal family. He ultimately embarked in a ship on the Persian Gulf with the intention of escaping, but was wrecked, and gave himself up to an Assyrian officer, who sent him to Assyria.

(15) Elam's Further Changes of Rulers.

Indabigas, the new Elamite king, now sent an embassy to make peace with Assur-bani-apli, who at once demanded the surrender of Nabu-bel-sumati, son of Merodach-baladan, and the Assyrians whom he had enticed and taken with him. Before this demand could reach Indabigas, however, his people had revolted against him and put him to death, and Umman-aldasu, son of Attametu, sat on the throne, after defeating Indabigas on the banks of the Huthut. The same demand was made to Ummanaldasu as had been made to Indabigas, but Nabubel-sumati, not wishing to fall into the hands of the Assyrians, called on his armor-bearer to dispatch him, and the two ran each other through with their swords.

(16) King Tammaritu's Treachery.

Nevertheless Assur-bani-apli decided to replace Tammaritu, the former Elamite king, on the throne, and to this end invaded Elam. The Assyrians were, as usual, successful, and on learning this, Umman-aldas fled to the mountains. Entering Susa, Tammaritu was once more proclaimed king of Elam, he, in return, promising to regard Assur-bani-apli as his lord, and to pay tribute. No sooner had the Assyrian army departed, than the new king of Elam began to plot against the power which had raised him. To all appearance his intentions to revolt were reported to the Assyrian king, who at once sent an army and plundered the country, and Tammaritu again fell into Assur-bani-apli's hands. Umman-aldas now returned and resumed the government. Unwilling to regard his former efforts as fruitless, the Assyrian king decided to finally subdue the land, and to this end invaded it, the pretext being that the Elamites refused to deliver up the image of the goddess Nana, which had been carried off from Erech 1,635 years before, in the time of Kudur-Nahhunte (see (4) above). The two armies faced each other on the banks of the Itite, and after an attack in which the Assyrians were at a disadvantage, the Elamites gave way, and Umman-aldas fled to the mountains. According to the Assyrian king's record, an enormous booty was taken, including many sacred and ancient royal statues preserved at Susa. The image of Nana was restored to its shrine at Erech with great rejoicing. In the triumphal celebrations at Nineveh, Tammaritu was one of the captive kings who drew the Assyrian king's chariot to the temple of Ishtar, when he rendered the goddess thanks for his victories.

(17) Dominion Passes from Assyria.

To all appearance Elam now became a province of the Assyrian empire, though not for long, as this collapsed in the year 606 BC, and the center of government was shifted to Babylon, under Nabopolassar, who became its ruler. Nebuchadrezzar (604), Evil-Merodach (561), Neriglissar (559), and Nabonidus (555-538 BC), were successively masters of Elam. The mention of the kings of Elam in Jer 25:25, however, suggests that the old states of the country had practically resumed their independence; though 49:35-39 prophesies the dismemberment of the country, and the destruction of its king and princes. This is thought to refer to the annexation of the country by Teispes, and its passing, through his line—Cyrus, Cambyses, and Cyrus the Great, who were all kings of Anzan—to Darius Hystaspis. In Isa 21:2 it is apparently the later Cyrus who is referred to when Elam, with Media, is called upon "to go up" to the siege of Babylon.

(18) The Later State of Elam.

After Cyrus, the history of Elam was that of Persia, of which it henceforth formed a part. In all probability, however, the Elamites were as warlike and as intractable as ever. During the reign of the little-known Kharacenian king, Aspasine, they made incursions into Babylonia, one of the opponents of this king's generals being Pittit, "the enemy, the Elamite"—a phrase of old standing, apparently. Elam, to its whole extent, was smitten with the sword, and Pittit (was slain or captured). One of the cities which they attacked was Apameia, probably that on the Sellas river. Ac 2:9 implies that the old language of Elam was still in use, and the Elamites were still recognized as a nationality, as late as the 1st century of our era.

13. Elamite Religion:

Owing to the many Semites in Elam, and the nearness of the Babylonian states, Babylonian deities—Anu and Anatu, Enlil and Ninlil, Merodach and Zer-panitu, Samas and Aa, Tammuz and Ishtar, Ninip, Nergal, Hadad or Rimmon, etc.—were largely worshipped (see BABEL, BABYLON). The chief deity of the non-Semitic pantheon seems to have been Insusinak, the patron-deity of Susa, identified with Ninip, the son of Enlil, by the Babylonians, who guote also other names applied to him—Lahuratil Simes, Adaene, Susinak, and Dagbak. Merodach seems to have been represented by the Sumerian character Gal, "great," and Zer-panitu was apparently called Nin-sis in Elam. Ishtar was known as Usan. Lagamar, Laqamar, or Lagamal, was apparently identified with the Babylonian Lagamal, one of the gods of Dailem near Babylon—his name is generally regarded as forming part of the name CHEDORLAOMER (which see). Nahhunte, Na'hunte, or (Babylonian) Nan-hundi was the Babylonian sun-god Samas; Kunzibami was the W. Semitic Hadad, also known by his Mitannian (Hittite) name of Tesup. Humban, Human, or Umman (Assyrian), "the god of gods," "the king," was possibly regarded as the Babylonian Merodach. The currency of Babylonian myths in Elam is suggested by the name of the goddess Belala, possibly the Babylonian Belili, sister of Tammuz. The word for "god" in Elamite was nap, explained by the Babylonians as one of the names of Enlil, implying that the Elamites regarded him as "the god" by divine right. Of their deities, six (one of them being Lagamar) were worshipped only by Elamite kings. Elam had temples and temple-towers similar to those in Babylonia, as well as sacred groves, wherein no stranger penetrated. (See ERE, under the word "Elamites.")

14. Elam's Importance; Her Literature:

The rediscovery of the history of Elam is one of the most noteworthy things of modern research. It has revealed to us the wonderful development which that kingdom had made at an exceedingly early date, and shows that it was politically just as important as the Babylonian states 4,000 years BC, though probably hardly so advanced in art and literature. Nevertheless, the country had adopted the cuneiform method of writing, and possessed also another script, seemingly of more ancient date. As both Semitic Babylonian and Susian (Anzanite) were spoken in the country, numerous documents in both languages have been found, mostly historical, or of the nature of dedications, some of which are inscribed on objects presented to temples. There are also a number of archaic tablets of the nature of accounts, written in a peculiar cuneiform character. The cylinder-seals are either inscribed with dedications, or with the name of the owner, his father, and the god whom he worshipped, as in Babylonia. Of other literature there are but mere traces—an exorcism against mosquitos shows the desire of the people to rid themselves of the discomforts of this life. Contracts testify to the existence of laws, but the laws themselves have yet to be discovered. The stele of Hammurabi, which was found at Susa, did not belong to Elamitic literature, but to that of Babylonia.

15. Art during the 1st and 2nd Prehistoric Periods:

Elamite art during the first period was naturally rude, and it is doubtful whether metals were then used, as no traces of them were found. There were also no inscribed monuments. The pottery, however, was of extreme delicacy, and very elegant. The second period is described as being less artistic than the first. The pottery is more ordinary, and also more roughly made, though better ware also exists. Painted ornamentation is found. Vessels of white or pink limestone, some of them very large, occur, but alabaster is exceedingly rare. There is no indication of writing at this period, but rudely engraved seals, with animal forms, are found. The buildings were of crude brick or piled-up earth, though baked brick was sometimes used. A change seems to have taken place in the conditions of life at the end of this period, implying invasion by a more civilized race.

16. Art in the Archaic Period, That of Viceroys, and That of the Kings:

The indications of invasion during the second prehistoric period are confirmed, according to M. Jequier, by what is found in the layer of the archaic period, which succeeded it. This is accentuated by the numerous inscribed clay tablets, some of

the which have impressions of quite remarkable cylinder-seals. The pottery is scanty and not characteristic, but the working of alabaster into vases had developed considerably, and some of the smaller forms (ointment or scent-bottles) are good and varied. Some have the form of the duck, the wild boar, and other animals. During the period of the issake or viceroys, fine sculptures in low relief occur—the scorpion-man and the sacred tree, military prisoners with their guard, siegeoperations and the dead on the battlefield; and as examples of work in the round, ivory and alabaster statuettes. Later on, during the time of the kings of Elam and Susa, the objects of art increase in number, though large objects in the round are rare. Noteworthy are the statuettes and statues in bronze, the former being very numerous. The largest production of this kind is the almost lifesize statue of queen Napir-Asu, consort of Untas-Gal, which, however, is unfortunately headless. It is a remarkable piece of work, and has great artistic merit.

17. Temperament of the Inhabitants of Elam:

In all probability Elam was much hindered in her material and intellectual development by the intractable and warlike nature of her people—indeed, the history of the country, as far as it is known, is a record of strife and conflict, and the temperament indicated by the ancient records seems to have been inherited by the wild tribes which occupy the more inaccessible districts. What conduced to quarrels and conflicts in ancient times was the law of succession, for the Elamite kings were not generally succeeded by their eldest sons, but by their brothers (see ELLASAR). The inhabitants of the towns at the present time in all probability do not differ in any essential respect from those of Persia in general, and among them there is probably no great amount of ancient Elamite blood, though the Elamite type is met with, and probably occurs, in consequence of ancient mingling, in various parts of modern Persia.

LITERATURE.

For the most complete account of the discoveries in Elam, see Memoires de la delegation en Perse, I ff, Mission scientifique en Perse, I ff, and Histoire et travaux de la delegation en Perse, all under the editorship of J. de Morgan, and written by De Morgan, V. Scheil, G. Lampre, G. Jequier, etc.; also W. K. Loftus, Chaldea and Susiana, 1857.

T. G. Pinches

ELASA

el’-a-sa, ele-a’sa (Alasa; the King James Version Eleasa):

The place where Judas pitched his camp before the battle in which he was overwhelmed and slain (APC 1Macc 9:5).

It probably corresponds to the modern Khirbet il‘asa, between the two Beth-horons.

ELASAH

el’-a-sa (’el‘asah, "God has made"):

(1) An Israelite who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:22).

(2) A son of Shaphan, by whom, with Gemariah, King Zedekiah sent a message to Babylon (Jer 29:3).

See ELEASAH.

ELATH; ELOTH

e’-lath, or e’-loth (’eloth, ‘elath; Ailon (De 2:8), Ailath (2Ki 16:6)):

A seaport on the Red Sea in the territory of Edom. It is named along with Ezion-geber in the account of Israel’s journey round the land of Edom (De 2:8). It appears as Ailath, and Alion in the Septuagint, and in Josephus as Ilanis (Ant., VIII, vi, 4), while Eusebius (Onomasticon) has Aila. From this we may gather that the Aramaic Ilan or Ilana was in use as well as the Hebrew ‘elath or ‘eloth. The name, "grove," was doubtless derived from the presence of certain sacred trees. It may be identical with El-paran of Ge 14:6, and Elah of Ge 36:41. When David conquered Edom, Elath passed into the hands of Israel (2Sa 8:14). It was a position of great importance in connection with the trade with South Arabia. Here the merchant fleets of Solomon and Jehoshaphat were fitted out, and hence, they sailed (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17; 1Ki 22:48).

In the reign of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, Edom shook off the hand of Judah (2Ki 8:20), but under Amaziah and Uzziah it was again subdued (2Ki 14:7,10,22). Finally it was taken from Ahaz by Rezin, king of Syria. The Jews were driven out and the Syrians (Edomites?) took permanent possession (2Ki 16:6). It is identical with the modern ‘Aqaba, at the head of the gulf of that name.

W. Ewing

ELBERITH

el-be’-rith (Jud 9:46).

See BAAL-BERITH.

ELCIA

el’-shi-a, the Revised Version (British and American)

ELKIAH (which see).

ELDAAH

el-da’-a (’elda‘ah, "God has called"?):

A son of Midian (Ge 25:4; 1Ch 1:33).

ELDAD

el’-dad (’eldadh, "God has loved"):

One of the 70 elders chosen by Moses at the command of Yahweh to share "the burden of the people" (Nu 11:16-25). Eldad and his companion Medad were not present with the rest at the tent of meeting, yet the Spirit rested also upon them and they prophesied in the camp (Nu 11:26-29).

ELDAD AND MODAD, BOOK OF

el’-dad, mo’-dad:

In the Septuagint they are called Eldad and Modad. In the King James Version the names are given as Eldad and Medad;

meaning "God has loved" ("God loves") and "object of love" (?).

They were two of the seventy elders chosen by Moses (Nu 11:26), and while the others obeyed the summons and went to the tabernacle, these two remained in the camp and prophesied (Nu 11:26). The nature of their prophecy is not recorded, and this naturally became a good subject for the play of the imagination. It furnished the basis for a lost work which was quoted by Hermas (Vis 2 3): "The Lord is near to them who return unto him, as it is written in Eldad and Modad, who prophesied to the people in the wilderness." The Palestine Targums also filled in the subject of the prophecy of Eldad and Modad, and, as they have it, it related to the coming of Gog and Magog against Israel at the end of the days. One of the Targums has the expression, "The Lord is near to them that are in the hour of tribulation." The authors of the Targums were either dependent upon that work or upon a similar tradition; and the former of these views is the more probable. Lightfoot and Holtzman think the lengthy quotation in 1 Clem 23 and 2 Clem 11 is from the Book of Eldad and Modad. The work is found in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and consists of 400 stichoi, which would make it about twice the length of the Cant.

A. W. Fortune

ELDER

see ELDER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT; ELDER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

ELDER IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

(presbuteros):

(1) The word is used adjectivally to denote seniority (Lu 15:25; 1Ti 5:2).

(2) Referring to the Jewish elders of the synagogue, usually associated with the scribes and Pharisees, and New Testament passages cited in the previous article.

(3) It denotes certain persons appointed to hold office in the Christian church, and to exercise spiritual oversight over the flock entrusted to them. From the references in Ac 14:23; 20:17 it may be inferred that the churches generally had elders appointed over them. That "elders" and "bishops" were in apostolic and sub-apostolic times the same, is now almost universally admitted; in all New Testament references their functions are identical. The most probable explanation of the difference of names is that "elder" refers mainly to the person, and "bishop" to the office; the name "elder" emphasizes what he is, while "bishop," that is "overseer," emphasizes what the elder or presbyter does.

See BISHOP; CHURCH GOVERNMENT; MINISTRY.

A. C. Grant

ELDER IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

el'-der, (zaqen):

Among primitive peoples authority seems naturally to be invested in those who by virtue of greater age and, consequently, experience are best fitted to govern thus Iliad iii.149. Later the idea of age became merged in that of dignity (Il. ii.404, ii.570; Odyssey ii.14). In like manner the word patres came to be used among the Romans (Cic. Rep. 2,8,14). So also among the Germans authority was entrusted to those who were older; compare Tacitus Agricola. The same is true among the Arabians to the present day, the sheik being always a man of age as well as of authority.

From the first the Hebrews held this view of government, although the term "elder" came later to be used of the idea of the authority for which, at first, age was regarded necessary. Thus the office appears in both the Jahwist, J (9th century BC) (Ex 3:16; 12:21; 24:1, of the elders of the Hebrews; and of the Egyptians, Ge 50:7); and Elohist (E) (8th century BC) (Ex 17:5; 18:12; 19:7 (the second Deuteronomist (D2)); Jos 24:31, elders of Israel, or of the people. Compare the principle of selection of heads of tens, fifties, etc., Ex 18:13 ff, seventy being selected from a previous body of elders); compare Jahwist (j)-Elohist(e) (Nu 11:16,24). Seventy are also mentioned in Ex 24:1, while in Jud 8:14 seventy-seven are mentioned, although this might be taken to include seven princes. Probably the number was not uniform.

Elder as a title continues to have place down through the times of the Judges (Jud 8:16; 2:7); compare Ru 4:2 ff into the kingdom. Saul asked to be honored before the elders (1Sa 15:30); the elders of Bethlehem appeared before Samuel (1Sa 16:4); the elders appeared before David in Hebron (2Sa 17:15; 1Ch 11:3); elders took part in the temple procession of Solomon (1Ki 8:3; 2Ch 5:4). They continued through the Persian period Ezr 5:5,9; 6:7,14; 10:8,14; Joe 1:14 margin and the Maccabean period APC Judith 6:16; 7:23; 8:10; 10:6; 13:12; 1Macc 12:35, while the New Testament presbuteros, Mt 16:21; 26:47,57; Mr 8:31; Lu 9:22; Ac 4:5,23 makes frequent mention of the office.

The elders served as local magistrates, in bringing murderers to trial (De 19:12; 21:1 ff; Jos 20:4), punishing a disobedient son (De 21:19), inflicting penalty for slander (De 22:15), for noncompliance with the Levirate marriage law (De 25:7 ff), enforcing the Law (De 27:1), conducting the service in expiation of unwitting violation of the Law (Le 4:13 ff).

In certain passages different classes of officers are mentioned as "judges and officers" (De 16:18), "elders" and "officers" (De 31:28), "heads, tribes, elders officers" (De 29:10; Hebrew 9). It is probable that both classes were selected from among the elders, and that to one class was assigned the work of judging, and that the "officers" exercised executive functions (Schurer). In entirely Jewish communities the same men would be both officers of the community and elders of the synagogue. In this case the same men would have jurisdiction over civil and religious matters.

LITERATURE.

Schurer, GJV3, section 23, especially 175 ff Eng. edition, II, i, 149 ff; Benzinger, H A2, 51; Deissmann, Bibelstudien, 153 ff (sv. ...); BDB, 278 (...); Preuschen, Griechisch-Deutsches Handworterbuch, under the word, 958 f.

W. N. Stearns

ELEAD

el’-e-ad (’el‘adh, "God has testified"):

An Ephraimite, slain while making a raid, by the men of Gath (1Ch 7:21).

ELEADAH; ELADAH

el-e-a’-da, (the King James Version) (’el‘adhah, "God has adorned"):

An Ephraimite (1Ch 7:20).

ELEALEH

e-le-a’-le (’el‘aleh, "God has ascended"):

Lay in the country taken from Sihon and within the lot given to Reuben (Nu 32:3,17 f). "Their names being changed" seems to apply to all the towns mentioned. There is no indication of the other names. Elealeh is noticed with Heshbon in the oracles against Moab in Isa 15:4; 16:9; Jer 48:34. Eusebius (Onomasticon) locates it one Roman mile from Heshbon. It is represented today by el'Al, a mound crowned with ruins, about a mile North of Chesban.

ELEASA

el-e-a'-sa.

See ELASA.

ELEASAH

el-e-a'-sa (in Hebrew identical with ELASAH, which see):

(1) A descendant of Judah (1Ch 2:39,40).

(2) A Benjamite, a descendant of Saul (1Ch 8:37; 9:43).

ELEAZAR

el-e-a'-zar, e-le-a'-zar ('el-'azar; Eleazar, "God is helper"):

(1) The 3rd son of Aaron by Elisheba (Ex 6:23; Nu 3:2).

He married one of the daughters of Putiel, who bore him Phinehas (Ex 6:25). With his father and 3 brothers he was consecrated to the priest's office (Ex 28:1). After the destruction of Nadab and Abihu, he occupied a more important position, and he and Ithamar "ministered in the priest's office in the presence of Aaron their father" (Le 10:6 f; Nu 3:4; 1Ch 24:2 ff). He was given the oversight of the Levites and had charge of the tabernacle and all within it (Nu 3:32; 4:16). To Eleazar fell the duty of beating out for an altar covering the censers of Korah and his fellow-conspirators who had attempted to seize the priesthood (Nu 16:37,39). On the death of Aaron, Eleazar succeeded him (Nu 20:25 ff). He assisted Moses with the census after the plague in the plains of Moab (Nu 26:1 ff), and with Moses and the elders heard the petition of the daughters of Zelophehad who wished to be served as heirs to their father (Nu 27:1 ff). After the entrance into Canaan, Eleazar and Joshua gave effect to the decision arrived at by giving the daughters of Zelophehad a share in the land of Manasseh (Jos 17:4). He was priest and adviser to Joshua, the successor of Moses (Nu 27:19; 31:12 ff), whom he also assisted in partitioning Canaan among the tribes (Nu 34:17; Jos 14:1; 19:51; 21:1). He was buried in the hill (the Revised Version, margin "Gibeah") of Phinehas his son in the hill country of Ephraim (Jos 24:33). For some reason unknown the descendants of Ithamar seem to have held the chief position among the priests from Eli till the accession of Solomon, when Abiathar was sent into retirement, and Zadok, the descendant of Eleazar, was appointed in his place (1Ki 2:26 ff). Ezra was a descendant of Zadok (Ezr 7:1 ff); and the high priest's office was in the family of Zadok till the time of the Maccabees.

(2) The son of Abinadab, sanctified to keep the ark of Yahweh, when it was brought from Beth-shemesh to Kiriath-jearim after being sent back by the Philistines (1Sa 7:1).

(3) The son of Dodai, one of David's three mighty men. A famous feat of arms with David at Ephes-dammim is recorded (2Sa 23:9 f; 1Ch 11:12 f where he is named the son of Dodo).

(4) A Levite, a son of Mahli, a Merarite. It is recorded that he had no sons, but daughters only, who were married to their cousins (1Ch 23:21,22; 24:28).

(5) A priest who accompanied Ezra from Babylon (Ezr 8:33); the son of Phinehas. (5) and (6) may be identical.

(6) A priest who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:42).

(7) A son of Mattathias and brother of Judas Maccabeus (APC 1Macc 2:5; 6:43 f; 2Macc 8:23).

See ASMONEANS; MACCABEES.

(8, 9) Two others are mentioned in APC 1Macc 8:17; 2Macc 6:18 ff.

(10) An ancestor of Jesus, 3 generations before Joseph (Mt 1:15).

S. F. Hunter

ELEAZURUS

el-e-a-zu'-rus, the Revised Version (British and American)

ELIASIBUS (which see).

ELECT

e-lekt':

That is, "chosen," "selected."

In the Old Testament the word represents derivatives of bachar, elegit;

In the New Testament eklektos. It means properly an object or objects of selection.

This primary meaning sometimes passes into that of "eminent," "valuable," "choice"; often thus as a fact, in places where the King James Version uses "chosen" (or "elect") to translate the original (eg. Isa 42:1; 1Pe 2:6). In the King James Version "elect" (or "chosen") is used of Israel as the race selected for special favor and to be the special vehicle of Divine purposes (so 4 times in Apocrypha, Tobit and Ecclus); of the great Servant of Yahweh (compare Lu 23:35; the "Christ of God, his chosen"); compare eminent saints as Jacob, Moses, Rufus (Ro 16:13); "the lady," and her "sister" of 2 Jn; of the holy angels (1Ti 5:21); with a possible suggestion of the lapse of other angels. Otherwise, and prevalently in the New Testament, it denotes a human community, also described as believers, saints, the Israel of God; regarded as in some sense selected by Him from among men, objects of His special favor, and correspondingly called to special holiness and service.

See further under ELECTION. In the English versions "elect" is not used as a verb: "to choose" is preferred; eg. Mr 13:20; Eph 1:4.

Handley Dunelm

ELECT LADY

e-lekt' la'-di (eklekte kuria; 2 Joh 1:1):

In accordance with strict grammatical usage these words of address may be translated in three ways: "to an elect lady" (which as an address is too indefinite); or, both words being taken as proper names, "to Eklekte Kuria" (an improbable combination of two very rare names); or "to Eklekte, lady" = anglice, "to the lady (or ‘Madam’) Eklekte."

The other translations which have been given—"to the elect lady" or "to the elect Kuria"—are open to objection on account of the omission of the article; but this violation of rule is perhaps not without parallel (compare 1Pe 1:1).

The translation adopted will partly depend upon whether we regard the epistle as addressed to an individual or to a community. Dr. Rendel Harris believes this question to be settled by the discovery in the papyri of numerous instances which prove that kurios and kuria were used by ancient letter-writers as terms of familiar endearment, applicable to brother, sister, son, wife, or intimate friend of either sex (Expositor, March, 1901; see also Findlay, Fellowship in the Life Eternal, chapter iii). In the light of this suggestion we should naturally translate, "to my (dear) lady Eklekte."

Grammatically, this is strongly supported by 1Ti 1:2 and 2Ti 1:2 (Timotheo gnesio .... agapeto .... tekno =" to Tim othy my true .... beloved .... child"); and the fact that the name Eklekte has not yet been discovered, though Eklektos has, offers no grave objection. This is the translation favored by Clement of Alexandria, who says of the epistle: scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam nomine Electam, significat autem electionem ecclesiae sanctae ("It is written to a certain Babylonian, Electa by name; but it signifies the further election of the holy church"). It seems doubtful whether he means by the last clause that Electa is simply a personification of the church, or a real person whose name was derived from the Christian idea of election. Either way the rendering, "to the lady Electa," is suitable, and upon the whole it seems the best. Eklekte is not an adjective but a noun. If a person is intended, it is "the lady Electa"; if a church, it is designated, not "the elect Lady," but "the lady Elect." The mention of "thy elect sister" in 2 Joh 1:13 does not hinder either supposition.

See further CYRIA; JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF. Robert Law

ELECTION

e-lek’-shun (ekloge, "choice," "selection"):

Contents

I. THE WORD IN SCRIPTURE

II. THE MYSTERIOUS ELEMENT

III. INCIDENCE UPON COMMUNITY AND INDIVIDUAL

IV. COGNATE AND ILLUSTRATIVE BIBLICAL LANGUANGE

V. LIMITATIONS OF INQUIRY HERE. SCOPE OF ELECTION

VI. PERSEVERANCE

VII. CONSIDERATIONS IN RELIEF OF THOUGHT

1. Antinomies 2. Fatalism Another Thing 3. The Moral Aspects 4. "We know in Part" 5. The Unknown Future

I. The Word in Scripture.

The word is absent from the Old Testament, where the related Hebrew verb (bachar) is frequent. In the New Testament it occurs 6 times (Ro 9:11; 11:5,7,28; 1Th 1:4; 2Pe 1:10). In all these places it appears to denote an act of Divine selection taking effect upon human objects so as to bring them into special and saving relations with God: a selection such as to be at once a mysterious thing, transcending human analysis of its motives (so eminently in Ro 9:11), and such as to be knowable by its objects, who are (2 Pet) exhorted to "make it sure," certain, a fact to consciousness. It is always (with one exception, Ro 9:11; see below) related to a community, and thus has close affinity with the Old Testament teachings upon the privileged position of Israel as the chosen, selected race (see under ELECT). The objects of election in the New Testament are, in effect, the Israel of God, the new, regenerate race called to special privilege and special service. From one point of view, that of the external marks of Christianity, they may thus be described as the Christian community in its widest sense, the sense in which the sacramental position and the real are prima facie assumed to coincide. But from 2 Peter it is manifest that much more than this has to be said if the incidence of the word present to the writer's mind is to be rightly felt. It is assumed there that the Christian, baptized and a worshipper, may yet need to make "sure" his "calling and election" as a fact to his consciousness. This implies conditions in the "election" which far transcend the tests of sacred rite and external fellowship.

II. The Mysterious Element.

Such impressions of depth and mystery in the word are confirmed by the other, passages. In Ro 9:11 the context is charged with the most urgent and even staggering challenges to submission and silence in the presence of the inscrutable. To illustrate large assertions as to the liberty and sovereignty of the Divine dealings with man, the apostle brings in Esau and Jacob, individuals, twins as yet unborn, and points to the inscrutable difference of the Divine action toward them as such. Somehow, as a matter of fact, the Eternal appears as appointing to unborn Esau a future of comparative disfavor and to Jacob of favor; a future announced to the still pregnant mother. Such discrimination was made and announced, says the apostle, "that the purpose of God according to election might stand." In the whole passage the gravest stress is laid upon the isolation of the "election" from the merit or demerit of its objects.

III. Incidence upon Community and Individual.

It is observable that the same characteristic, the inscrutable, the sovereign, is attached in the Old Testament to the "election" of a favored and privileged nation. Israel is repeatedly reminded (see eg. De 7) that the Divine call and choice of them to be the people of God has no relation to their virtues, or to their strength. The reason lies out of sight, in the Divine mind. So too "the Israel of God" (Ga 6:16) in the New Testament, the Christian community, "the new, peculiar race," holds its great privileges by quite unmerited favor (eg. Tit 3:5). And the nature of the case here leads, as it does not in the case of the natural Israel, to the thought of a Divine election of the individual, similarly inscrutable and sovereign. For the idea of the New Israel involves the thought that in every genuine member of it the provisions of the New Covenant (Jer 31:31 f) are being fulfilled: the sins are remembered no more, and the law is written in the heart. The bearer of the Christian name, but not of the Christian spiritual standing and character, having "not the Spirit of Christ, is none of his" (Ro 8:9). The chosen community accordingly, not as it seems ab extra, but as it is in its essence, is a fellowship of individuals each of whom is an object of unmerited Divine favor, taking effect in the new life. And this involves the exercise of electing mercy. Compare eg. 1Pe 1:3. And consider Ro 11:4-7 (where observe the exceptional use of "the election," meaning "the company of the elect").

IV. Cognate and Illustrative Biblical Language.

It is obvious that the aspects of mystery which gather round the word "election" are not confined to it alone. An important class of words, such as "calling," "predestination" "foreknowledge," "purpose," "gift," bears this same character; asserting or connoting, in appropriate contexts, the element of the inscrutable and sovereign in the action of the Divine will upon man, and particularly upon man's will and affection toward God. And it will be felt by careful students of the Bible in its larger and more general teachings that one deep characteristic of the Book, which with all its boundless multiplicity is yet

one, is to emphasize on the side of man everything that can humble, convict, reduce to worshipping silence (see for typical passages Job 40:3,1; Ro 3:19), and on the side of God everything which can bring home to man the transcendence and sovereign claims of his almighty Maker. Not as unrelated utterances, but as part of a vast whole of view and teaching, occur such passages as Eph 2:8,9 and Ro 11:33-36, and even the stern, or rather awestruck, phrases of Ro 9:20,21, where the potter and the clay are used in illustration.

V. Limitations of Inquiry Here. Scope of Election.

We have sought thus in the simplest outline to note first the word "election" and then some related Scriptural words and principles, weighing the witness they bear to a profound mystery in the action of the Divine will upon man, in the spiritual sphere. What we have thus seen leaves still unstated what, according to Scripture, is the goal and issue of the elective act. In this article, remembering that it is part of a Bible Encyclopedia, we attempt no account of the history of thought upon election, in the successive Christian centuries, nor again any discussion of the relation of election in Scripture to extra-Scriptural philosophies, to theories of necessity, determination, fatalism. We attempt only to see the matter as it lies before us in the Bible. Studying it so, we find that this mysterious action of God on man has relation, in the Christian revelation, to nothing short of the salvation of the individual (and of the community of such individuals) from sin and condemnation, and the preservation of the saved to life eternal. We find this not so much in any single passage as in the main stream of Biblical language and tone on the subject of the Divine selective action. But it is remarkable that in the recorded thought of our Lord Himself we find assertions in this direction which could hardly be more explicit. See Joh 6:37,44,45; 10:27-29. To the writer the best summary of the Scriptural evidence, at once definite and restrained, is the language of the 17th Anglican art.: "They which be endued with so excellent a benefit of God be called according to God’s purpose by His Spirit working in due season; they through grace obey the calling; they be justified freely; they be made sons of God by adoption; they be made like the image of His only begotten Son Jesus Christ; they walk religiously in good works, and at length, by God’s mercy, they attain to everlasting felicity."

VI. Perseverance.

The anxious problem of PERSEVERANCE will be treated under that word. It may be enough here to say that alike what we are permitted to read as revealed, and what we may humbly apprehend as the reason of the case, tend to the reverent belief that a perseverance (rather of the Lord than of the saints) is both taught and implied. But when we ponder the nature of the subject we are amply prepared for the large range of Scriptures which on the other hand condemn and preclude, for the humble disciple, so gross a misuse of the doctrine as would let it justify one moment’s presumption upon Divine mercy in the heart which is at the same time sinning against the Divine love and holiness.

VII. Considerations in Relief of Thought.

We close, in view of this last remark, with some detached notes in relief, well remembering the unspeakable trial which to many devout minds the word before us has always brought.

1. Antinomies:

First in place and importance is the thought that a spiritual fact like election, which belongs to the innermost purpose and work of the Eternal, necessarily leads us to a region where comprehension is impossible, and where we can only reverently apprehend. The doctrine passes upward to the sphere where antinomies live and move, where we must be content to hear what sound to us contradictions, but which are really various aspects of infinite truth. Let us be content to know that the Divine choice is sovereign; and also that "his tender mercies are over all his works," that ‘He willeth not the death of a sinner,’ that "God is love." Let us relieve the tension of such submissive reliance by reverently noting how the supreme antinomy meets one type of human need with its one side, and with its other another. To the "fearful saint" the Divine sovereignty of love is a sacred cordial. To the seeking penitent the Divine comprehensiveness of love opens the door of peace. To the deluded theorist who does not love and obey, the warnings of a fall and ruin which are possible, humanly,

from any spiritual height, are a merciful beacon on the rocks.

2. Fatalism Another Thing:

Further, we remember that election, in Scripture, is as different as possible from the fatal necessity of, eg. the Stoics. It never appears as mechanical, or as a blind destiny. It has to do with the will of a God who has given us otherwise supreme proofs that He is all-good and all-kind. And it is related to man not as a helpless and innocent being but as a sinner. It is never presented as an arbitrary force majeure. Even in Ro 9 the "silence" called for is not as if to say, "You are hopelessly passive in the grasp of infinite power," but, "You, the creature, cannot judge your Maker, who must know infinitely more of cause and reason than his handiwork can know." The mystery, we may be sure, had behind it supreme right and reason, but in a region which at present at least we cannot penetrate. Again, election never appears as a violation of human will. For never in the Bible is man treated as irresponsible. In the Bible the relation of the human and Divine wills is inscrutable; the reality of both is assured.

3. The Moral Aspects:

Never is the doctrine presented apart from a moral context. It is intended manifestly to deepen man’s submission to—not force, but—mystery, where such submission means faith. In the practical experience of the soul its designed effect is to emphasize in the believer the consciousness (itself native to the true state of grace) that the whole of his salvation is due to the Divine mercy, no part of it to his merit, to his virtue, to his wisdom. In the sanctified soul, which alone, assuredly, can make full use of the mysterious truth, is it designed to generate, together and in harmony, awe, thanksgiving and repose.

4. "We Know in Part":

A necessary caution in view of the whole subject is that here, if anywhere in the regions of spiritual study, we inevitably "know in part," and in a very limited part. The treatment of election has at times in Christian history been carried on as if, less by the light of revelation than by logical processes, we could tabulate or map the whole subject. Where this has been done, and where at the same time, under a sort of mental rather than spiritual fascination, election has been placed in the foreground of the system of religious thought, and allowed to dominate the rest, the truth has (to say the least) too often been distorted into an error. The Divine character has been beclouded in its beauty. Sovereignty has been divorced from love, and so defaced into an arbitrary fiat, which has for its only reason the assertion of omnipotence. Thus, the grievous wrong has been done of aischron ti legein peri tou Theiou, "defamation of God." For example, the revelation of a positive Divine selection has been made by inference to teach a corresponding rejection ruthless and terrible, as if the Eternal Love could ever by any possibility reject or crush even the faintest aspiration of the created spirit toward God. For such a thought not even the dark words of Ro 9:18 give Scriptural excuse. The case there in hand, Pharaoh’s, is anything but one of arbitrary power trampling on a human will looking toward God and right. Once more, the subject is one as to which we must on principle be content with knowledge so fragmentary that its parts may seem contradictory in our present imperfect light. The one thing we may be sure of behind the veil is, that nothing can be hidden there which will really contradict the supreme and ruling truth that God is love.

5. The Unknown Future:

Finally, let us from another side remember that here, as always in the things of the Spirit, "we know in part." The chosen multitude are sovereignly "called, ... justified, ... glorified" (Ro 8:29,30). But for what purposes? Certainly not for an end terminating in themselves. They are saved, and kept, and raised to the perfect state, for the service of their Lord. And not till the cloud is lifted from the unseen life can we possibly know what that service under eternal conditions will include, what ministries of love and good in the whole universe of being.

Handley Dunelm

ELECTRUM

e-lek’-trum:

The Revised Version, margin rendering of chashmal, of Eze 1:4,27; 8:2 Septuagint elektron, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) electrum). Both the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "amber" while the American Standard Revised Version has "glowing metal." Gesenius says electrum must not be understood as being here used for amber, but for a kind of metal remarkable for brightness, compounded of gold and silver. "Amber" is undoubtedly a poor rendering, as the Hebrew term means "polished brass." the American Standard Revised Version has the more correct rendering. Amber, however, may well have been known to Ezekiel (Encyclopaedia Biblica, which see).

See also STONES, PRECIOUS; BUYING, IV.

A. W. Fortune

ELEMENT; ELEMENTS

el’-e-ment, (ta stoicheia, "the letters of the alphabet," "the elements out of which all things are formed," "the heavenly bodies," "the fundamental principles of any art or science"):

(1) In 2Pe 3:10, the constituent parts of the physical universe ("elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat," the American Revised Version, margin "the heavenly bodies").

(2) In Ga 4:3,1, the Revised Version (British and American) has "rudiments," as in the King James Version margin, and in Col 2:8,20, where the reference is to imperfect Jewish ordinances.

See RUDIMENTS.

ELEPH

e’-lef (ha-’eleph, "the ox"):

A place in the lot of Benjamin not far from Jerusalem (Jos 18:28). The name is omitted by Septuagint, unless, indeed, it is combined with that of Zelah. It may be identical with Lifta, a village W. of Jerusalem (Conder, HDB, under the word).

Others identify Lifta with Nephtoah.

ELEPHANT

el’-e-fant

(Job 40:15 the King James Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin "hippopotamus," the Revised Version (British and American) "ivory"); 1Ki 10:22 the King James Version margin; 2Ch 9:21 the King James Version; APC 1Macc 3:34; 6:28 ff; 8:6 Possibly in Job it is the extinct mammoth.

See BEHEMOTH; IVORY.

ELEPHANTINE

el-e-fan-ti’-ne.

See SEVENEH.

ELEUTHERUS

e-lu’-ther-us (Eleutheros; APC 1Macc 11:7; 12:30):

A river separating Syria and Phoenicia.

ELEVEN, THE

e-lev’-’-n, (hoi hendeka):

The eleven apostles remaining after the death of Judas. The definite article used serves to designate them as a distinct and definite group whose integrity was not destroyed by the loss of one of the twelve. The college of "the Twelve" had come to be so well recognized that the gospel writers all used on occasions the word with the definite article to represent the Twelve Apostles chosen by Jesus. This custom still remained and the numeral merely changed, as, "Afterward he was manifested unto the eleven" (Mr 16:14; compare Lu 24:9,33; Ac 2:14). On the other hand, however, the substantive is also sometimes used, as "The eleven disciples went into Galilee" (Mt 28:16; compare also Ac 1:26). As an illustration of the fixedness of usage, Paul refers to the eleven as "the twelve" when he recounts the appearances of Jesus after His resurrection: "And that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve" (1Co 15:5).

Walter G. Clippinger

ELEVEN; STARS

e-lev’-’-n.

See ASTRONOMY.

ELHANAN

el-ha’-nan (’elchanan, "whom God gave"):

(1) A great warrior in the army of David who slew a Philistine giant. There is a discrepancy between 2Sa 21:19 and 1Ch 20:5. In the former passage we read, "And there was again war with the Philistines at Gob; and Elhanan, the son of Jaare-oregim the Beth-lehemite, slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam"; while in the latter we are told, "And there was again war with the Philistines; and Elhanan the son of Jair slew Lahmi the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam." Most modern critics prefer as the original text of the latter part of the two discrepant statements the following: "and Elhanan the son of Jair the Beth-lehemite slew Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a weaver’s beam." It is contended that the Chronicler slightly modified the text before him, in order to bring it into harmony with 1Sa 17, where David is said to have slain a Philistine giant Goliath. There is almost unanimous agreement that "Jaare-oregim" is a corrupt reading, and the "Jair" in 1Ch is to be preferred. From Jerome to the present some scholars identify Elhanan with David, and thus remove the discrepancy. Ewald (Hist, III, 70) argued that the name "Goliath" was inserted in 1Sa 17 and 21 by the narrators whose compositions are embodied in Samuel, Elhanan being the real victor over Goliath, while David’s antagonist was simply called "the Philistine."

(2) The son of Dodo of Bethlehem, one of David's mighty men (2Sa 23:24; 1Ch 11:26). Some moderns think that there was only one Elhanan, and that he was the son of Dodo of the clan of Jair.

John Richard Sampey

ELI

e'-li ('eli):

A descendant of Ithamar, the fourth son of Aaron, who exercised the office of high priest in Shiloh at the time of the birth of Samuel. For the first time in Israel, Eli combined in his own person the functions of high priest and judge, judging Israel for 40 years (1Sa 4:18). The incidents in Eli's life are few; indeed, the main interest of the narrative is in the other characters who are associated with him. The chief interest centers in Samuel. In Eli's first interview with Hannah (1Sa 1:12 ff), she is the central figure; in the second interview (1Sa 1:24 ff), it is the child Samuel. When Eli next appears, it is as the father of Hophni and Phinehas, whose worthless and licentious lives had profaned their priestly office, and earned for them the title "men of Belial" (or "worthlessness").

Eli administered no stern rebuke to his sons, but only a gentle chiding of their greed and immorality. Thereafter he was warned by a nameless prophet of the downfall of his house, and of the death of his two sons in one day (1Sa 2:27-36), a message later confirmed by Samuel, who had received this word directly from Yahweh Himself (1Sa 3:11 ff). The prophecy was not long in fulfillment. During the next invasion by the Philistines, the Israelites were utterly routed, the ark of God was captured, and Hophni and Phinehas were both slain. When the news reached Eli, he was so overcome that he "fell from off his seat backward by the side of the gate; and his neck brake, and he died" (1Sa 4:18). The character of Eli, while sincere and devout, seems to have been entirely lacking in firmness. He appears from the history to have been a good man, full of humility and gentleness, but weak and indulgent. His is not a strong personality; he is always overshadowed by some more commanding or interesting figure.

A. C. Grant

ELI, ELI, LAMA, SABACHTHANI

e'-li or a'-le, la'-ma, sa-bak'-tha-ni.

See ELOI.

ELIAB

e-li'-ab ('eli'abh, "God is father"):

(1) Prince of the tribe of Zebulun in the Exodus (Nu 1:9; 2:7; 7:24,29; 10:16).

(2) A Reubenite, father of Dathan and Abiram (Nu 16:11,12; 26:8 f; De 11:6).

(3) Eldest son of Jesse and brother of David (1Sa 16:6), once called Elihu (1Ch 27:18). He was of commanding appearance (1Sa 16:6) and when serving with Saul's army at the time when it was confronting the Philistines and Goliath, was inclined to lord it over his brother David (1Sa 17:28 f). His daughter Abihail became a Wife of Rehoboam (2Ch 11:18).

(4) An Ephraimite, an ancestor of Samuel (1Ch 6:27); called Eliel in 1Ch 6:34, and Elihu in 1Sa 1:1.

(5) A Gadire warrior with David (1Ch 12:9), one of 11 mighty men (1Ch 12:8,14).

(6) A Levite musician (1Ch 15:18,20; 16:5).

(7) An ancestor of Judith (APC Judith 8:1; compare APC Judith 9:2).

F. K. Farr

ELIADA; ELIADAH

e-li’-a-da, (’elyadha‘, "God is knowing." Compare HPN, 219, 266, 301; Epidae, or Elidae):

(1) One of the sons of David (2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 3:8; called BEELIADA, 1Ch 14:7 (which see)).

(2) A descendant of Benjamin and a captain in the army of Jehoshaphat, commander of 200,000 men (2Ch 17:17).

(3) Father of Rezon, an "adversary" of Solomon (1Ki 11:23, the King James Version "Eliadah").

ELIADAS

e-li’-a-das (Eliadas):

A son of Zamoth who had married a strange wife (APC 1Esdras 9:28); called Elioenai in Ezr 10:27.

ELIADUN

e-li’-a-dun, the Revised Version (British and American)

ILIADUN (which see).

ELIAH

e-li’-a.

See ELIJAH.

ELIAHBA

e-li’-a-ba, e-li-a’-ba (’elyach-ba’," God hides"):

One of David’s 30 mighty men (2Sa 23:32; 1Ch 11:33).

ELIAKIM

e-li’-a-kim (’elyaqim; Eliakeim, "God sets up"):

(1) The son of Hilkiah who succeeded Shebna as gorvernor of the palace and "grand vizier" under Hezekiah (Isa 22:20).

The functions of his office are seen from the oracle of Isaiah in which Shebna is deposed and Eliakim set in his place (Isa 22:15 ff). He is the "treasurer" (the Revised Version, margin "steward"), and is "over the house" (Isa 22:15).

At his installation he is clothed with a robe and girdle, the insignia of his office, and, having the government committed into his hand, is the "father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah" (Isa 22:21). The key of the house of David is laid on his shoulder, and he alone has power to open and shut, this being symbolic of his absolute authority as the king's representative (Isa 22:22).

One of Solomon's officials is the first mentioned as occupying this position (1Ki 4:6), and this office was continued in both the Northern and Southern Kingdom (1Ki 16:9; 18:3; 2Ki 10:5; 15:5). Its importance is seen from the fact that after Azariah was smitten with leprosy, Jotham his heir "was over the household, judging the people of the land" (2Ki 15:5).

When Sennacherib sent an army against Jerusalem in 701, Eliskim was one of these Jewish princes who held on behalf of Hezekiah a parley with the Assyrian officers (2Ki 18:18,26,37; Isa 36:3,11,22). As a result of the invader's threats, he was sent by Hezekiah in sackcloth to Isaiah, entreating his prayers to Yahweh on behalf of Jerusalem (2Ki 19:2; Isa 37:2).

(2) The original name of Jehoiakim, the son of Josiah, whom Pharaoh-necoh made king of Judah (2Ki 23:34; 2Ch 36:4).

(3) A priest who assisted at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, rebuilt after his return from Babylon (Ne 12:41).

(4) A grandson of Zerubbabel and ancestor of Jesus (Mt 1:13).

(5) An ancestor of Jesus (Lu 3:30).

S. F. Hunter

ELIALI

e-li'-a-li (Elialei):

APC 1Esdras 9:34; possibly corresponds to "Binnui" in Ezr 10:38.

ELIAM

e-li'-am ('eli'-am, "people's God"?):

(1) Father of Bathsheba (2Sa 11:3); in 1Ch 3:5 called Ammiel.

(2) One of David's "thirty," son of Ahithophel the Gilonite (2Sa 23:34).

ELIAONIAS

e-li-a-o-ni'-as (Elialonias):

A descendant of Phaath Moab (APC 1Esdras 8:31); called "Eliehoenai" in Ezr 8:4.

ELIAS

e-li’-as.

See ELIJAH.

ELIASAPH

e-li’-a-saf (’elyacaph, "God has added"):

(1) Son of Deuel; prince of the tribe of Gad in the Exodus (Nu 1:14; 2:14; 7:42,47; 10:20).

(2) Son of Lael; prince of the Gershonites (Nu 3:24).

ELIASHIB

e-li’-a-shib (’elyashibh, "God restores"):

(1) A descendant of David (1Ch 3:24).

(2) Head of the eleventh course of priests (1Ch 24:12).

(3) The high priest in the time of Nehemiah. He, with his brethren the priests, helped in the rebuilding of the wall (Ne 3:1). But later he was "allied unto Tobiah" the Ammonite (Ne 13:4) and allowed that enemy of Nehemiah the use of a great chamber in the temple (Ne 13:5); and one of his grandsons, a son of Joiada, married a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite and was for this expelled from the community by Nehemiah (Ne 13:28).

See SANBALLAT.

(4, 5, 6) Three Israelites, one a "singer," who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:24,27,36).

(7) Father of Jehohanan (Ezr 10:6); probably identical with (3) above. Called Eliasib in APC 1Esdras 9:1.

F. K. Farr

ELIASIB

e-li’-a-sib.

See ELIASHIB.

ELIASIBUS

e-li-as’-i-bus (Eliasibos, the King James Version Eleazurus):

One of the holy singers who had married a foreign wife (APC 1Esdras 9:24); called "Eliashib" in Ezr 10:27.

ELIASIMUS

e-li-as’-i-mus (Eliasimos; the King James Version Elisimus):

One who had married a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:28).

ELIASIS

e-li’-a-sis (Eliasis):

One who had married a foreign wife (APC 1Esdras 9:34); corresponds to "Jaasu" in Ezr 10:37.

ELIATHAH

e-li’-a-tha (’eli’-athah, "God has come"):

A Hemanite, head of the twentieth division of the temple musicians (1Ch 25:4,27).

ELIDAD

e-li’-dad (’elidhadh, "God has loved"):

Prince of Benjamin in the division of the land (Nu 34:21);

perhaps the same as ELDAD (which see).

ELIEHOENAI

e-li-e-ho’-e-ni (’elyeho‘enay, "to Yahweh are mine eyes"):

(1) (the King James Version Elioenai) a Korahite doorkeeper (1Ch 26:3).

(2) (the King James Version Elihoenai) Head of a family in the Return (Ezr 8:4).

ELIEL

e-li’-el, el’-i-el (’eli’el, "El is God," or "my God is God"):

(1, 2, 3) Mighty men of David (1Ch 11:46,47; 12:11).

(4) A chief of Manasseh, east of the Jordan (1Ch 5:24).

(5, 6) Two chiefs of Benjamin (1Ch 8:20,22).

(7) A chief Levite from Hebron (1Ch 15:9,11):

(8) A Kohathite in the line of Elkshah, Samuel and Heman (1Ch 6:34).

See ELIAB (4).

(9) A Levite of the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:13).

ELIENAI

el-i-e’-na-i (’eli‘enay):

A Benjamite chief (1Ch 8:20).

ELIEZER

el-i-e’-zer, e-li-e’-zer (’eli‘ezer; Eliezer, "God is help"):

(1) The chief servant of Abram (Ge 15:2); the American Standard Revised Version "Eliezer of Damascus," the English Revised Version "Dammesek Eliezer." The Hebrew is peculiar: literally, "And the son of the possession (mesheq) of my house is Dammeseq (of) Eliezer." A possible but unlikely meaning is that his property would become the possession of Damascus, the city of Eliezer. Targum Syriac (Revised Version margin) read "Eliezer the Damascene": this supposes a reading, "Eliezer ha- dammasqi" or "mid-dammeseq." The text may be corrupt: the assonance between mesheq and Dammeseq is suspicious. Abram calls Eliezer "one born in my house" i.e. a dependant, a member of his household, and so regards him as his heir, Lot having gone from him (Ge 13). Eliezer is probably the servant, "the eider of his house, that ruled over all that he had," of Ge 24.

(2) The 2nd son of Moses and Zipporah, called thus for "the God of my father was my help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (Ex 18:4; 1Ch 23:15 ff).

(3) A son of Becher, one of the sons of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8).

(4) A priest who assisted in bringing up the ark from the house of Obed-edom to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:24).

(5) The son of Zichri, ruler over the Reubenites in the time of David (1Ch 27:16).

(6) The son of Dodavahu of Mareshah who prophesied the destruction of the ships which Jehochaphat, king of Judah, built, because he had done so in cooperation with Ahaziah, king of Israel (2Ch 20:35 ff).

(7) One of the messengers whom Ezra sent to Iddo, the chief at Casiphia, with the request for ministers for the Temple (Ezr 8:16 ff).

(8, 9, 10) A priest, a Levite, and one of the sons of Harim who had married non-Israelitish women (Ezr 10:18,23,11).

(11) An ancestor of Jesus in the genealogy given by Luke (Lu 3:29).

S. F. Hunter

ELIHABA

e-li’-ha-ba.

See ELIAHBA.

ELIHOENAI

el-i-ho-e’-na-i.

See ELIEHOENAI.

ELIHOREPH

el-i-ho’-ref (’elichoreph, "God of autumn"?):

A scribe of Solomon and son of Shisha (1Ki 4:3).

ELIHU (1)

e-li’-hu (’elihu; Eleiou, "He is (my) God," or "my God is He"):

(1) An ancestor of Samuel (1Sa 1:1), called Eliel in 1Ch 6:34 and Eliab in 1Ch 6:27. See ELIAB.

(2) Found in 1Ch 27:18 for Eliab, David’s eldest brother (1Sa 16:6); called "one of the brethren of D."

(3) A Manassite who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20).

(4) A Korahite porter (1Ch 26:7).

(5) A friend of Job. See next article.

(6) An ancestor of Judith (APC Judith 8:1).

ELIHU (2)

(’elihu, ‘elihu’," He is (my) God"; Elious):

One of the disputants in the Book of Job; a young man who, having listened in silence to the arguments of Job and his friends, is moved to prolong the discussion and from his more just views of truth set both parties right. He is of the tribe of Buz (compare Ge 22:21), a brother-tribe to that of Uz, and of the family of Ram, or Aram, that is, an Aramean. He is not mentioned as one of the characters of the story until chapter 32; and then, as the friends are silenced and Job’s words are ended, Elihu has the whole field to himself, until theophany of the whirlwind proves too portentous for him to bear. His four speeches take up chapters 32-37. Some critics have considered that the Elihu portion of the Book of Job was added by a later hand, and urge obscurities and prolixities, as well as a different style, to prove that it was the work of an inferior writer. This estimate seems, however, to take into account only the part it plays in a didactic treatise, or a theological debate. It looks quite different when we read it as a real dramatic element in a story; in other words, when we realize that the prevailing interest of the Book of Job is not dialectic but narrative.

Thus viewed, the Elihu episode is a skillfully managed agency in preparing the denouncement. Consider the situation at the end of Job’s words (Job 31:40). Job has vindicated his integrity and stands ready to present his cause to God (Job 31:35-37). The friends, however, have exhausted their resources, and through three discourses have been silent, as it were, snuffed out of existence. It is at this point, then, that Elihu is introduced, to renew their contention with young constructive blood, and represent their cause (as he deems) better than they can themselves. He is essentially at one with them in

condemning Job (Job 34:34-37); his only quarrel with them is on the score of the inconclusiveness of their arguments (32:3,1). His self-portrayal is conceived in a decided spirit of satire on the part of the writer, not unmingled with a sardonic humor. He is very egotistic, very sure of the value of his ideas; much of his alleged prolixity is due to that voluble self-deprecation which betrays an inordinate opinion of oneself (compare Job 32:6-22). This, whether inferior composition or not, admirably adapts his words to his character. For substance of discourse he adds materially to what the friends have said, but in a more rationalistic vein; speaks edifyingly, as the friends have not done, of the disciplinary value of affliction, and of God's means of revelation by dreams and visions and the interpreting of an intercessory friend (Job 33:13-28).

Very evidently, however, his ego is the center of his system; it is he who sets up as Job's mediator (Job 33:5-7; compare Job 9:32-35), and his sage remarks on God's power and wisdom in Nature are full of self-importance. All this seems designed to accentuate the almost ludicrous humiliation of his collapse when from a natural phenomenon the oncoming tempest shows unusual and supernatural signs. His words become disjointed and incoherent, and cease with a kind of attempt to recant his pretensions. And the verdict from the whirlwind is: "darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge." Elihu thus has a real function in the story, as honorable as overweening self-confidence is apt to be.

John Franklin Genung

ELIJAH

e-li'-ja ('eliyahu or (4 times) 'eliyah, "Yah is God"; Septuagint Eleiou, New Testament Eleias or Elias, the King James Version of New Testament Elias):

Contents

I. THE WORKS OF ELIJAH

1. The Judgment of Drought 2. The Ordeal by Prayer 3. At Horeb 4. The Case of Naboth 5. Elijah and Ahaziah 6. Elijah Translated 7. The Letter to Jehoram

II. THE WORK OF ELIJAH

III. CHARACTER OF THE PROPHET

IV. MIRACLES IN THE ELIJAH NARRATIVES

V. ELIJAH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

VI. LITERATURE

(1) The great prophet of the times of Ahab, king of Israel. Elijah is identified at his first appearance (1Ki 17:1) as "Elijah the Tishbite, who was of the sojourners of Gilead." Thus his native place must have been called Tishbeh. A Tishbeh (Thisbe) in the territory of Naphtali is known from Tobit 1:2; but if (with most modern commentators) the reading of the Septuagint in 1Ki is followed, the word translated "sojourners" is itself "Tishbeh," locating the place in Gilead and making the prophet a native of that mountain region and not merely a "sojourner" there.

I. The Works of Elijah.

In 1Ki 16:29-34 we read of the impieties of Ahab, culminating in his patronage of the worship of the Tyrian Baal, god of his Tyrian queen Jezebel (1Ki 16:31). 1Ki 16:34 mentions as another instance of the little weight attached in Ahab's time to ancient prophetic threatenings, the rebuilding by Hiel the Bethelite of the banned city of Jericho, "with the loss" of Hiel's eldest and youngest sons. This is the situation which calls for a judgment of Yahweh, announced beforehand, as is often the case, by a faithful prophet of Yahweh.

1. The Judgment of Drought:

Whether Elijah was already a familiar figure at the court of Ahab, the narrative beginning with 1Ki 17:1 does not state. His garb and manner identified him as a prophet, in any case (2Ki 1:8; compare Zec 13:4). Elijah declared in few words that Yahweh, true and only rightful God of Israel, whose messenger he was, was even at the very time sending a drought which should continue until the prophet himself declared it at an end. The term is to be fixed, indeed, not by Elijah but by Yahweh; it is not to be short ("these years"), and it is to end only when the chastisement is seen to be sufficient. Guided, as true prophets were continually, by the "word of Yahweh," Elijah then hid himself in one of the ravines east of ("before") the Jordan, where the brook Cherith afforded him water, and ravens brought him abundant food ("bread and flesh" twice daily), 1Ki 17:2-6. As the drought advanced the brook dried up. Elijah was then directed, by the "word of Yahweh," as constantly, to betake himself beyond the western limit of Ahab's kingdom to the Phoenician village of Zarephath, near Sidon. There the widow to whom Yahweh sent him was found gathering a few sticks from the ground at the city gate, to prepare a last meal for herself and her son. She yielded to the prophet's command that he himself should be first fed from her scanty store; and in return enjoyed the fulfillment of his promise, uttered in the name of Yahweh, that neither barrel of meal nor cruse of oil should be exhausted before the breaking of the drought. (Josephus, Ant, VIII, xiii, 2, states on the authority of Menander that the drought extended to Phoenicia and continued there for a full year.) But when the widow's son fell sick and died, the mother regarded it as a Divine judgment upon her sins, a judgment which had been drawn upon her by the presence of the man of God. At the prayer of Elijah, life returned to the child (1Ki 17:17-24).

"In the third year," 1Ki 18:1 (Lu 4:25; Jas 5:17 give three years and six months as the length of the drought), Elijah was directed to show himself to Ahab as the herald of rain from Yahweh. How sorely both man and beast in Israel were pressed by drought and the resulting famine, is shown by the fact that King Ahab and his chief steward Obadiah were in person searching through the land for any patches of green grass that might serve to keep alive some of the king's own horses and mules (1Ki 18:5,6). The words of Obadiah upon meeting with Elijah show the impression which had been produced by the prophet's long absence. It was believed that the Spirit of God had carried Elijah away to some unknown, inaccessible, mysterious region (1Ki 18:10,12). Obadiah feared that such would again be the case, and, while he entreated the prophet not to make him the bearer of a message to Ahab, appealed to his own well-known piety and zeal, as shown in his sheltering and feeding, during Jezebel's persecution, a hundred prophets of Yahweh. Elijah reassured the steward by a solemn oath that he would show himself to Ahab (1Ki 18:15). The king greeted the prophet with the haughty words, "Is it thou, thou troubler of Israel?" Elijah's reply, answering scorn with scorn, is what we should expect from a prophet; the woes of Israel are not to be charged to the prophet who declared the doom, but to the kings who made the nation deserve it (1Ki 18:17,18).

2. The Ordeal by Prayer:

Elijah went on to challenge a test of the false god's power. Among the pensioners of Jezebel were 450 prophets of Baal and 400 prophets of the Asherah—still fed by the royal bounty in spite of the famine. Accepting Elijah's proposal, Ahab called all these and all the people to Mt. Carmel (1Ki 18:19,20). Elijah's first word to the assembly implied the folly of their thinking that the allegiance of a people could successfully be divided between two deities: "How long go ye limping between the two sides?" (possibly "leaping over two thresholds," in ironical allusion to the custom of leaping over the threshold of an idol temple, to avoid a stumble, which would be unpropitious; compare 1Sa 5:1-5). Taking the people's silence as an indication that they admitted the force of his first words, Elijah went on to propose his conditions for the test: a bullock was to be offered to Baal, a bullock to Yahweh, but no fire put under; "The God that answereth by fire, let him be God." The voice of the people approved the proposal as fair (1Ki 18:22-24). Throughout a day of blazing sunshine the

prophets of Baal called in frenzy upon their god, while Elijah mocked them with merciless sarcasm (1Ki 18:25-29). About the time for the regular offering of the evening sacrifice in the temple of Yahweh at Jerusalem, Elijah assumed control. Rebuilding an ancient altar thrown down perhaps in Jezebel's persecution; using in the rebuilding twelve stones, symbolizing an undivided Israel such as was promised to the patriarch Jacob of old; drenching sacrifice and wood with water from some perennial spring under the slopes of Carmel, until even a trench about the altar, deep and wide enough to have a two-ce'ah (half-bushel) measure set in it, was filled—the prophet called in few and earnest words upon the God of the fathers of the nation (1Ki 18:30-37). The answer of Yahweh by fire, consuming bullock, wood, altar and the very dust, struck the people with awe and fear. Convinced that Yahweh was God alone for them, they readily carried out the prophet's stern sentence of death for the prophets of the idol god (1Ki 18:38-40). Next the prophet bade Ahab make haste with the meal, probably a sacrificial feast for the multitude, which had been made ready; because rain was at hand. On the mountain top Elijah bowed in prayer, sending his servant seven times to look out across the sea for the coming storm. At last the appearance of a rising cloud "as small as a man's hand" was reported; and before the hurrying chariot of the king could cross the plain to Jezreel it was overtaken by "a great rain" from heavens black with clouds and wind after three rainless years. With strength above nature, Elijah ran like a courier before Ahab to the very gate of Jezreel (1Ki 18:41-46).

3. At Horeb:

The same night a messenger from Jezebel found Elijah. The message ran, "As surely as thou art Elijah and I am Jezebel" (so the Septuagint), "so let the gods do to me, and more also" (i.e. may I be cut in pieces like a sacrificed animal if I break my vow; compare Ge 15:8-11,17,18; Jer 34:18,19), "if I make not thy life as the life of one of" the slain prophets of Baal "by to-morrow about this time." Explain Elijah's action how we may—and all the possible explanations of it have found defenders—he sought safety in instant flight. At Beersheba, the southernmost town of Judah, he left his "servant," whom the narrative does not elsewhere mention. Going onward into the southern wilderness, he sat down under the scanty shade of a desert broom-bush and prayed that he might share the common fate of mankind in death (1Ki 19:1-4). After sleep he was refreshed with food brought by an angel. Again he slept and was fed. In the strength of that food he then wandered on for forty days and nights, until he found himself at Horeb, the mountain sacred because there Yahweh had revealed Himself to Moses (1Ki 19:5-8). The repetition of identical words by Elijah in 1Ki 19:10 and 14 represents a difficulty. Unless we are to suppose an accidental repetition by a very early copyist (early, since it appears already in the Septuagint), we may see in it an indication that Elijah's despondency was not easily removed, or that he sought at Horeb an especial manifestation of Yahweh for his encouragement, or both. The prophet was bidden to take his stand upon the sacred mount; and Yahweh passed by, heralded by tempest, earthquake and thunderstorm (19:9-12). These were Yahweh's fore-runners only; Yahweh was not in them, but in the "still small voice," such as the prophets were accustomed to hear within their souls. When Elijah heard the not unfamiliar inner voice, he recognized Yahweh present to hear and answer him. Elijah seems to be seeking to justify his own retreat to the wilderness by the plea that he had been "very jealous," had done in Yahweh's cause all that mortal prophet could do, before he fled, yet all in vain! The same people who had forsaken the law and "covenant" of Yahweh, thrown down His altars and slain His prophets, would have allowed the slaughter of Elijah himself at the command of Jezebel; and in him would have perished the last true servant of Yahweh in all the land of Israel (19:13,14).

Divine compassion passed by Elijah's complaint in order to give him directions for further work in Yahweh's cause. Elijah must anoint Hazael to seize the throne of Syria, Israel's worst enemy among the neighboring powers; Jehu, in like manner, he must anoint to put an end to the dynasty of Ahab and assume the throne of Israel; and Elisha, to be his own successor in the prophetic office. These three, Hazael and his Syrians, Jehu and his followers, even Elisha himself, are to execute further judgments upon the idolaters and the scorners in Israel. Yahweh will leave Himself 7,000 (a round number, a limited but not an excessively small one, conveying a doctrine, like the doctrine of later prophets, of the salvation of a righteous remnant) in Israel, men proof against the judgment because they did not share the sin. If Elijah was rebuked at all, it was only in the contrast between the 7,000 faithful and the one, himself, which he believed to number all the righteous left alive in Israel (1Ki 19:15-18).

4. The Case of Naboth:

The anointing of Hazael and of Jehu seems to have been left to Elijah's successor; indeed, we read of no anointing of Hazael, but only of a significant interview between that worthy and Elisha (2Ki 8:7-15). Elijah next appears in the narrative as rebuker of Ahab for the judicial murder of Naboth. In the very piece of ground which the king had coveted and seized, the prophet appeared, unexpected and unwelcome, to declare upon Ahab, Jezebel and all their house the doom of a shameful death (1Ki 21). There was present at this scene, in attendance upon the king, a captain named Jehu, the very man already chosen as the supplanter of Ahab, and he never forgot what he then saw and heard (2Ki 9:25,26).

5. Elijah and Ahaziah:

Ahab's penitence (1Ki 21:28,29) averted from himself some measure of the doom. His son Ahaziah pulled it down upon his own head. Sick unto death from injuries received in a fall, Ahaziah sent to ask an oracle concerning his recovery at the shrine of Baal-zebub in Ekron. Elijah met the messengers and turned them back with a prediction, not from Baal-zebub but from Yahweh, of impending death. Ahaziah recognized by the messengers' description the ancient "enemy" of his house. A captain and fifty soldiers sent to arrest the prophet were consumed by fire from heaven at Elijah's word. A second captain with another fifty met the same fate. A third besought the prophet to spare his life, and Elijah went with him to the king, but only to repeat the words of doom (2Ki 1).

6. Elijah Translated:

A foreboding, shared by the "sons of the prophets" at Beth-el and Jericho, warned Elijah that the closing scene of his earthly life was at hand. He desired to meet the end, come in what form it might, alone. Elisha, however, bound himself by an oath not to leave his master. Elijah divided Jordan with the stroke of his mantle, that the two might pass over toward the wilderness on the east. Elisha asked that he might receive a firstborn's portion of the spirit which rested upon his master. "A chariot of fire, and horses of fire" appeared, and parted the two asunder; "and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2Ki 2:1-11).

7. The Letter to Jehoram:

In 2Ch 21:12-15 we read of a "writing" from Elijah to Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. The statements of 2Ki 3:11,12 admit of no other interpretation than that the succession of Elisha to independent prophetic work had already occurred in the lifetime of Jehoshaphat. It has been pointed out that the difficult verse, 2Ki 8:16, appears to mean that Jehoram began to reign at some time before the death of his father; it is also conceivable that Elijah left a message, reduced to writing either before or after his departure, for the future king of Judah who should depart from the true faith.

II. The Work of Elijah.

One's estimate of the importance of the work of Elijah depends upon one's conception of the condition of things which the prophet confronted in Northern Israel. While it is true that the reign of Ahab was outwardly prosperous, and the king himself not without a measure of political sagacity together with personal courage, his religious policy at best involved such tolerance of false faiths as could lead only to disaster. Ever since the time of Joshua, the religion of Yahweh had been waging its combat with the old Canaanite worship of the powers of Nature, a worship rendered to local deities, the "Baalim" or "lords" of this and that neighborhood, whose ancient altars stood "upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree" (De 12:2). The god imported from Phoenicia by Jezebel bore also the title Baal; but his character and his worship were worse and more debasing than anything that had before been known. Resistance offered by the servants of Yahweh to the claims of the queen's favored god led to persecution, rightly ascribed by the historian to Jezebel (1Ki 18:4). In the face of this danger, the differences between the worship of Yahweh as carried on in the Northern Kingdom and the same worship as practiced at Jerusalem sank out of sight. The one effort of Elijah was to recall the people from the Tyrian Baal to Yahweh, the God of their fathers. The vitality of the true religion in the crisis is shown by the fidelity of such a man as Obadiah (1Ki 18:3 f), or by the perseverance of a righteous remnant of 7,000, in spite of all that had happened of persecution (1Ki 19:18). The work begun by Elijah was finished, not without blood, by Jehu; we hear

no more of the worship of the Tyrian Baal in Israel after that anointed usurper's time (2Ki 9; 10). To say that Elijah at Horeb "learns the gentleness of God" (Strachan in HDB) is to contradict the immediate text of the narrative and the history of the times. The direction given Elijah was that he should anoint one man to seize the throne of Syria, another to seize that of Israel, and a prophet to continue his own work; with the promme and prediction that these three forces should unite in executing upon guilty Israel the judgment still due for its apostasy from Yahweh and its worship of a false god. Elijah was not a reformer of peace; the very vision of peace was hidden from his eyes, reserved for later prophets for whom he could but prepare the way. It was his mission to destroy at whatever cost the heathen worship which else would have destroyed Israel itself, with consequences whose evil we cannot estimate. Amos and Hosea would have had no standing-ground had it not been for the work of Elijah and the influences which at Divine direction he put in operation.

III. Character of the Prophet.

It is obvious that the Scripture historian does not intend to furnish us with a character-study of the prophet Elijah. Does he furnish even the material upon which such a study may profitably be attempted? The characterization found in Jas 5:17, "Elijah was a man of like passions (margin, "nature") with us," is brief indeed; but examination of the books which have been written upon the life of Elijah leads to the conclusion that it is possible to err by attaching to events meanings which those events were never intended to bear, as well as by introducing into one's study too much of sheer imagination. It is easy, for example, to observe that Elijah is introduced to the reader with suddenness, and that his appearances and disappearances in the narrative seem abrupt; but is one warranted in arguing from this a like abruptness in the prophet's character? Is not the sufficient explanation to be reached by observing that the historian's purpose was not to give a complete biography of any individual, whether prophet or king, but to display the working of Yahweh upon and with the kingdoms of Israel and Judah through the prophets? Few personal details are therefore to be found recorded concerning even such a prophet as Elijah; and none at all, unless they have a direct bearing upon his message. The imagination of some has discerned a "training of Elijah" in the experiences of the prophet; but to admit that there must have been such a training does not oblige us to discover traces of it in the scenes and incidents which are recorded. Distrusting, for the reasons above suggested, any attempt at a detailed representation of the prophet's inner life, one may seek, and prize, what seems to lie upon the surface of the narrative: faith in Yahweh as God of Nature and as covenant God of the patriarchs and their descendants; consuming "zeal" against the false religion which would displace Yahweh from the place which must be His alone; keen vision to perceive hypocrisy and falsehood, and sharp wit to lash them, with the same boldness and disregard of self that must needs mark the true prophet in any age.

IV. Miracles in the Elijah Narratives.

The miraculous element must be admitted to be prominent in the experiences and works of Elijah. It cannot be estimated apart from the general position which the student finds it possible to hold concerning miracles recorded in the Old Testament. The effort to explain away one or another item in a rationalistic way is wholly unprofitable. Elijah's "ravens" may indeed be converted by a change of vowel-points into "Arabians"; but, in spite of the fact that Orientals would bring offerings of food to a holy hermit, the whole tenor of the narrative favors no other supposition than that its writer meant "ravens," and saw in the event another such exercise of the power of Yahweh over all things as was to be seen in the supply of meal and oil for the prophet and the widow of Zarephath, the fire from heaven, the parting of the Jordan, or the ascension of the prophet by whirlwind into heaven. Some modern critics recognize a different and later source in the narrative of 2Ki 1; but here again no real difficulty, if any difficulty there be, is removed. The stern prophet who would order the slaughter of the 450 Baal prophets might well call down fire to consume the soldiers of an apostate and a hostile king. The purpose and meaning of the Elijah chapters is to be grasped by those who accept their author's conception of Yahweh, of His power, and of His work in Nature and with men, rather than by those who seek to replace that conception by another.

V. Elijah in the New Testament.

Malachi (4:5) names Elijah as the forerunner of "the great and terrible day of Yahweh," and the expectation founded upon

this passage is alluded to in Mr 6:15 parallel Lu 9:8; Mt 16:14 parallel Mr 8:28 parallel Lu 9:19; Mt 27:47-49 parallel Mr 15:35,36. The interpretation of Malachi's prophecy foreshadowed in the angelic annunciation to Zacharias (Lu 1:17), that John the Baptist should do the work of another Elijah, is given on the authority of Jesus Himself (Mt 11:14). The appearance of Elijah, with Moses, on the Mount of Transfiguration, is recorded in Mt 17:1-13 parallel Mr 9:2-13 parallel Lu 9:28-36, and in Mt 11:14 parallel Mr 9:13 Jesus again identifies the Elijah of Malachi with John the Baptist. The fate of the soldiers of Ahaziah (2Ki 1) is in the mind of James and John on one occasion (Lu 9:54). Jesus Himself alludes to Elijah and his sojourn in the land of Sidon (Lu 4:25,26). Paul makes use of the prophet's experience at Horeb (Ro 11:2-4). In Jas 5:17,18 the work of Elijah affords an instance of the powerful supplication of a righteous man.

(2) A "head of a father's house" of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:27, the King James Version "Eliah").

(3) A man of priestly rank who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:21).

(4) A layman who had married a foreign wife Ezr 10:26.

LITERATURE.

The histories of Israel and commentaries on Kings are many. Those which tend to rationalizing tend also to decrease the importance of Elijah to the history. F. W. Robertson, Sermons, 2nd series, V; Maurice, Prophets and Kings of the Old Testament, Sermon VIII; Milligan, Elijah ("Men of the Bible" series); W. M. Taylor, Elijah the Prophet.

F. K. Farr

ELIKA

e-li'-ka ('eliqa'," God is rejector(?)"):

The Harodite (Uradite), one of David's guard, the "thirty" (2Sa 23:25).

Omitted from 1Ch 11:27.

ELIM

e'-lim ('elim, "terebinths"; Aileim):

The second encampment of the Israelites after crossing the Red Sea. It was a contrast to the previous camp called "Marah" because of the bitterness of the waters, for there "were twelve springs of water, and threescore and ten palm trees" (Ex 15:27; 16:1; Nu 33:9 f). The traditional site is an oasis in Wady Ghurundel, circa 63 miles from Suez.

See EXODUS; WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

ELIMELECH

e-lim'-e-lek ('elimelekh, "my God is king"; Abeimelech, Alimelek):

Elimelech was a member of the tribe of Judah, a native of Bethlehem Judah, a man of wealth and probably head of a family or clan (Ru 1:2,3; 2:1,3). He lived during the period of the Judges, had a hereditary possession near Bethlehem, and is chiefly known as the husband of Naomi, the mother-in-law of Ru and ancestress of David the king. Because of a severe

famine in Judea, he emigrated to the land of Moab with his wife and his sons, Mahlon and Chilion. Not long afterward he died, and his two sons married Moabite women, Ru and Orpah. Ten years in all were spent in Moab, when the two sons died, and the three widows were left. Soon afterward Naomi decided to return to Judah, and the sequel is told in the Book of Ruth.

See RUTH; NAOMI.

J. J. Reeve

ELIOENAI

e-li-o-e’-na-i.

See ELIEHOENAI.

ELIONAS

el-i-o’-nas (Elionas, Elionais): The name of two men who had married foreign wives (APC 1Esdras 9:22,23), corresponding respectively to "Elioenai" and "Eliezer" in Ezr 10:22,31.

ELIPHAL

e-li’-fal, el’-i-fal (’eliphal, "God has judged"):

Son of Ur, one of the mighty men of David’s armies (1Ch 11:35). the Revised Version (British and American) in a footnote identifies him with Eliphelet, son of Ahasbai, the son of the Maachathite (2Sa 23:34; ef Davis, Dict. of the Bible, under the word "Ur"). See also 1Ch 14:5,7.

ELIPHALAT

e-lif’-a-lat (Eliphalet; APC 1Esdras 8:39; 9:33):

Called "Eliphelet" in Ezr 8:13; 10:33.

ELIPHAZ (1)

el’-i-faz, e-li’-faz (’eliphaz, "God is fine gold" (?)):

(1) Son of Esau by Adah, and father of Teman, Kenaz and Amalek (Ge 36:4,10; 1Ch 1:35 f).

(2) See next article.

ELIPHAZ (2)

The first and most prominent of the three friends of Job (Job 2:11), who come from distant places to condole with and comfort him, when they hear of his affliction.

That he is to be regarded as their leader and spokesman is shown by the greater weight and originality of his speeches (contained in Job 4; Job 5; Job 15; Job 22), the speeches of the other friends being in fact largely echoes and emotional enforcements of his thoughts, and by the fact that he is taken as their representative (Job 42:7) when, after the address from the whirlwind, Yahweh appoints their expiation for the wrong done to Job and to the truth.

He is represented as a venerable and benignant sage from Teman in Idumaea, a place noted for its wisdom (compare Jer 49:7), as was also the whole land of Edom (compare Ob 1:8); and doubtless it is the writer's design to make his words typical of the best wisdom of the world. This wisdom is the result of ages of thought and experience (compare Job 15:17-19), of long and ripened study (compare Job 5:27), and claims the authority of revelation, though only revelation of a secondary kind (compare Eliphaz' vision, Job 4:12 ff, and his challenge to Job to obtain the like, Job 5:1).

In his first speech he deduces Job's affliction from the natural sequence of effect from cause (Job 4:7-11), which cause he makes broad enough to include innate impurity and depravity (Job 4:17-19); evinces a quietism which deprecates Job's selfdestroying outbursts of wrath (Job 5:2,3; compare Job's answer, Job 6:2,3; 30:24); and promises restoration as the result of penitence and submission. In his second speech he is irritated because Job's blasphemous words are calculated to hinder devotion (Job 15:4), attributes them to iniquity (Job 15:5,6), reiterates his depravity doctrine (Job 15:14-16), and initiates the lurid descriptions of the wicked man's fate, in which the friends go on to overstate their case (Job 15:20-35). In the third speech he is moved by the exigencies of his theory to impute actual frauds and crimes to Job, iniquities indulged in because God was too far away to see (22:5-15); but as a close holds open to him still the way of penitence, abjuring of iniquity, and restoration to health and wealth (22:21-30). His utterances are well composed and judicial (too coldly academic, Job thinks, 16:4,5), full of good religious counsel abstractly considered.

Their error is in their inveterate presupposition of Job's wickedness, their unsympathetic clinging to theory in the face of fact, and the suppressing of the human promptings of friendship.

John Franklin Genung

ELIPHELEHU

e-lif'-e-le-hu ('eliphelehu, "May God distinguish him," the King James Version Elipheleh):

The eleventh of the fourteen doorkeepers mentioned as "brethren of the second degree" and as appointed in connection with the bringing up of the ark to Jerusalem by David (1Ch 15:18).

ELIPHELET

e-lif'-e-let.

See ELIPHALAT; ELIPHAL.

ELISABETH

e-liz'-a-beth (Elisabet, Westcott and Hort Eleisdbet, from Heb 'elishebha' (Elisheba), "God is (my) oath," i.e. a worshipper of God):

Wife of Zacharias the priest and mother of John the Baptist (Lu 1:5 ff). Elisabeth herself was of priestly lineage and a "kinswoman" (the King James Version COUSIN, which see) of the Virgin Mary (Lu 1:36), of whose visit to Elisabeth a remarkable account is given in Lu 1:39-56.

See ZACHARIAS.

ELISEUS

el-i-se’-us.

See ELISHA.

ELISHA

e-li’-sha ‘elisha‘, "God is salvalion"; Septuagint Eleisaie; New Testament Elisaios, Eliseus, (Lu 4:27 the King James Version):

Contents

I. HIS CALL AND PREPARATION

1. His Call 2. His Preparation 3. The Parting Gift of Elijah

II. His PROPHETIC CAREER

1. Record of His Career 2. His Ministry in a Private Capacity 3. His Ministry in a Public and National Capacity 4. Characteristics of His Ministry

(1) In Comparison with Elijah

(2) General Features of His Ministry

III. GENERAL ESTIMATE LITERATURE

A prophet, the disciple and successor of Elijah. He was the son of Shaphat, lived at Abel-meholah, at the northern end of the Jordan valley and a little South of the Sea of Galilee. Nothing is told of his parents but the father’s name, though he must have been a man of some wealth and doubtless of earnest piety. No hint is given of Elisha’s age or birth-place, and it is almost certain that he was born and reared at Abel-meholah, and was a comparatively young man when we first hear of him. His early life thus was spent on his father’s estate, in a god-fearing family, conditions which have produced so many of God’s prophets. His moral and religious nature was highly developed in such surroundings, and from his work on his father’s farm he was called to his training as a prophet and successor of Elijah.

==========

I. His Call and Preparation.

The first mention of him occurs in 1Ki 19:16. Elijah was at Horeb, learning perhaps the greatest lesson of his life; and one of the three duties with which he was charged was to anoint Elisha, the son of Shaphat of Abelmeholah, as prophet in his stead.

1. His Call:

Elijah soon went northward and as he passed the lands of Shaphat he saw Elisha plowing in the rich level field of his father's farm. Twelve yoke of oxen were at work, Elisha himself plowing with the twelfth yoke. Crossing over to him Elijah threw his mantle upon the young man (1Ki 19:19). Elisha seemed to understand the meaning of the symbolic act, and was for a moment overwhelmed with its significance. It meant his adoption as the son and successor of Elijah in the prophetic office. Naturally he would hesitate a moment before making such an important decision. As Elijah strode on, Elisha felt the irresistible force of the call of God and ran after the great prophet, announcing that he was ready to follow; only he wished to give a parting kiss to his father and mother (1Ki 19:20). Elijah seemed to realize what it meant to the young man, and bade him "Go back again; for what have I done to thee?" The call was not such an urgent one as Elisha seemed to think, and the response had better be deliberate and voluntary. But Elisha had fully made up his mind, slew the yoke of oxen with which he was plowing, boiled their flesh with the wood of the implements he was using, and made a farewell feast for his friends. He then followed Elijah, making a full renunciation of home ties, comforts and privileges. He became Elijah's servant; and we have but one statement describing their relationship (2Ki 3:11): he "poured water on the hands of Elijah."

2. His Preparation:

They seem to have spent several years together (1Ki 22:1; 2Ki 1:17), for Elisha became well known among the various schools of the prophets. While ministering to the needs of his master, Elisha learned many deep and important lessons, imbibed much of his spirit, and developed his own religious nature and efficiency until he was ready for the prophetic service himself. It seems almost certain that they lived among the schools of the prophets, and not in the mountains and hills as Elijah had previously done. During these years the tie between the two men became very deep and strong. They were years of great significance to the young prophet and of careful teaching on the part of the older. The lesson learned at Horeb was not forgotten and its meaning would be profoundly impressed upon the younger man, whose whole afterlife shows that he had deeply imbibed the teaching.

3. The Parting Gift of Elijah:

The final scene shows the strong and tender affection he cherished toward his master. Aware that the end was near, he determined to be with him until the last. Nothing could persuade him to leave Elijah. When asked what should be done for him, before his master was taken away, he asks for the elder son's portion, a double portion, of his master's spirit (2Ki 2:9). He has no thought of equality; he would be Elijah's firstborn son. The request shows how deeply he had imbibed of his master's spirit already. His great teacher disappears in a whirlwind, and, awestruck by the wonderful sight, Elisha rends his clothes, takes up the garment of Elijah, retraces his steps to the Jordan, smites the waters to test whether the spirit of Elijah had really fallen upon him, and as the water parts, he passes over dry shod. The sons of the prophets who have been watching the proceedings from the hills, at once observe that the spirit of Elijah rested upon Elisha, and they bowed before him in reverence and submission (2Ki 2:12-15). Elisha now begins his prophetic career which must have lasted 50 years, for it extended over the reign of Jehoram, Jehu, Jehoahaz and Joash. The change in him is now so manifest that he is universally recognized as Elijah's successor and the religious leader of the prophetic schools. The skepticism of the young prophets regarding the translation of Elijah found little sympathy with Elisha, but he is conciliatory and humors them (2Ki 2:16-18).

II. His Prophetic Career.

1. Record of His Career:

As we study the life of Elisha we look first at the record of his career. The compiler of these records has followed no strict chronological order. Like other scripture writers he has followed the system of grouping his materials. The records in 2Ki 2:19-5:27 are probably in the order of their occurrence. The events in chapters 6-9 cannot be chronologically arranged, as the name of the king of Israel is not mentioned. In 6:23 we are told that the Syrians came no more into the land of Israel, and 6:24 proceeds to give an account of Ben-hadad's invasion and the terrible siege of Samaria. In chapter 5 Gehazi is

smitten with leprosy, while in chapter 8 he is in friendly converse with the king. In chapter 13 the death of Joash is recorded, and this is followed by the record of his last interview with Elisha (2Ki 13:14-19) which event occurred some years previously.

2. His Ministry in a Private Capacity:

When he began his career of service he carried the mantle of Elijah, but we read no more of that mantle; he is arrayed as a private citizen (2Ki 2:12) in common garmerits (beghadhim). He carries the walking-staff of ordinary citizens, using it for working miracles (2Ki 4:29). He seems to have lived in different cities, sojourning at Bethel or Jericho with the sons of the prophets, or dwelling in his own home in Dothan or Samaria (2Ki 6:24,32). He passed Shunem so frequently on foot that a prophet's chamber was built for his special use (2Ki 4:8-11).

(1) Elijah's ministry began by shutting up the heavens for three and a half years; Elisha's began by healing a spring of water near Jericho (2Ki 2:21). One of these possessed certain noxious qualities, and complaint is made to Elisha that it is unfit for drinking and injurious to the land (2Ki 2:19). He takes salt in a new vessel, casts it into the spring and the waters are healed so that there was not "from thence any more death or miscarrying" (2Ki 2:21).

(2) Leaving Jericho, 'a pleasant situation,' he passes up to the highlands of Ephraim, doubtless by the Wady Suweinit, and approaches Bethel, a seat of Baal worship and headquarters of idolatry. The bald head, or perhaps closely cropped head, of Elisha, in contrast with that of Elijah, provoked the ridicule of some "young lads out of the city" who called after him Go up, thou baldhead,' their taunt manifesting the most blatant profanity and utter disregard of God or anything sacred. Elisha, justly angered, turned and cursed them in the name of Yahweh. Two bears soon break forth from the woods of that wild region and make fearful havoc among the boys. Elisha may have shown severity and a vindictiveness in this, but he was in no way to blame for the punishment which overtook the boys. He had nothing to do with the bears and was in no way responsible for the fate of the lads. The Septuagint adds that they threw stones, and the rabbis tell how Elisha was himself punished, but these attempts to tone down the affair are uncalled for and useless (2Ki 2:23,14).

(3) From Bethel Elisha passed on to Mt. Carmel, the home of a school of the prophets, spent some time there and returned to Samaria the capital (2Ki 2:25). His next deed of mercy was to relieve the pressing needs of a widow of one of the prophets. The name of the place is not given (2Ki 4:1-7)

(4) On his many journeys up and down the country, he frequently passed by the little village of Shunem, on the slopes of "Little Hermon." The modern name is Solam. It was about three miles from Jezreel. Accustomed to accept hospitality of one of the women of the place, he so impressed her with his sanctity that she appealed to her husband to build a chamber for the "holy man of God, that passeth by us continually." This was done, and in return for this hospitality a son was born to the woman, who suddenly dies in early boyhood and is restored to life by the prophet (2Ki 4:8-37).

(5) Elisha is next at Gilgal, residing with the sons of the prophets. It is a time of famine and they are subsisting on what they can find. One of them finds some wild gourds (paqqu'oth), shreds them into the pot and they are cooked. The men have no sooner begun to eat than they taste the poison and cry to Elisha, "O man of God, there is death in the pot." Throwing in some meal, Elisha at once renders the dish harmless and wholesome (2Ki 4:38-41).

(6) Probably at about the same time and place and during the same famine, a man from Baal-shalishah brought provisions as a present to Elisha—twenty loaves of fresh barley bread and fresh ears of grain. Unselfishly Elisha commands that it be given to the people to eat. The servant declared it was altogether insufficient for a hundred men, but Elisha predicts that there will be enough and to spare (2Ki 4:42-44). This miracle closely resembles the two miracles of Jesus.

(7) The next incident is the healing of Naaman, the leprous commander of the Syrian army (2Ki 5:1-19). He is afflicted with the white leprosy, the most malignant kind (2Ki 5:27). A Jewish maiden, captured in one of their numerous invasions of Eastern Palestine, and sold into slavery with a multitude of others, tells her mistress, the wife of Naaman, about the

wonder-working Elisha. The maiden tells her mistress that Elisha can heal the leprosy, and Naaman resolves to visit him. Through the king he obtains permission to visit Elisha with a great train and rich presents. The prophet sends his servant to tell him to dip seven times in the Jordan and he will be healed. Naaman is angered at the lack of deference on the part of Elisha and turns away in a rage to go home. Better counsels prevail, and he obeys the prophet and is cured. Elisha absolutely refuses the rich presents Naaman offers, and permits the Syrian to take some earth from Yahweh's land, that he may build an altar in Syria and worship Yahweh there. The idea was that a God was localized and could be worshipped only on his own land. Elisha grants Naaman permission apparently to worship Rimmon while avowedly he is a worshipper of Yahweh. The prophet appreciates the difficulties in Naaman's path, believes in his sincerity, and by this concession in no way proves that he believes in the actual existence of a god named Rimmon, or that Yahweh was confined to his own land, or in any way sanctions idolatrous worship. He is conciliatory and tolerant, making the best of the situation.

(8) An act of severity on the part of Elisha follows, but it was richly deserved. Gehazi's true character now manifests itself. He covets the rich presents brought by Naaman, runs after him, and by a clever story secures a rich present from the general. Elisha divines his trick and dooms him and his family to be afflicted with Naaman's leprosy forever (2Ki 5:20-27).

(9) A group of the sons of the prophets, probably at Jericho, finding their quarters too small, determine to build new quarters near the Jordan. While felling the timber the ax-head of one, a borrowed tool, fell into the water and disappeared. It would have been useless to have attempted to search for it in that swift and muddy stream, so he cries in distress to the prophet. Elisha breaks off a stick, casts it in the spot where the ax fell, and makes the iron swim on the surface (2Ki 6:1-7).

3. His Ministry in a Public and National Capacity:

Elisha's services to his king and country were numerous and significant.

(1) The first one recorded took place during the attempt of Jehoram to resubjugate Moab which had revolted under King Mesha. In company with Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom, his southern allies, the combined hosts found themselves without water in the wilderness of Edom. The situation is desperate. Jehoram appeals to Jehoshaphat, and on discovering that Elisha was in the camp all three kings appeal to him in their extremity. He refuses any help to Jehoram, bidding him appeal to the prophets of his father Ahab and his mother Jezebel. For Jehoshaphat's sake he will help, calls for a minstrel, and under the spell of the music receives his message. He orders them to dig many trenches to hold the water which shall surely come on the morrow from the land of Edom and without rain. He moreover predicted that Moab would be utterly defeated. These predictions are fulfilled, Mesha is shut up in his capital, and in desperation sacrifices his firstborn son and heir on the walls in sight of all Israel. In great horror the Israelites withdraw, leaving Mesha in possession (2Ki 3:4-27).

(2) His next services occurred at Samaria. The king of Syria finds that his most secret plans are divulged in some mysterious way, and he fails more than once to take the king of Israel. He suspects treachery in his army, but is told of Elisha's divining powers. Elisha is living at Dothan; and thither the king of Syria sends a large army to capture him. Surrounded by night, Elisha is in no way terrified as his servant is, but prays that the young man's eyes may be opened to see the mountains full of the chariots and horses of Yahweh. Going forth to meet the Syrians as they close in, Elisha prays that they may be stricken with blindness. The word canwerim is used only here and in Ge 19:11 and probably means mental blindness, or bewilderment, a confusion of mind amounting to illusion. He now tells them that they have come to the wrong place, but he will lead them to the right place. They follow him into the very heart of Samaria and into the power of the king. The latter would have smitten them, but is rebuked by Elisha who counseled that they be fed and sent away (2Ki 6:8-23). Impressed by such mysterious power and strange clemency the Syrians ceased their marauding attacks.

(3) The next incident must have occurred some time previous, or some time after these events. Samaria is besieged, the Israelites are encouraged to defend their capital to the last, famine prices prevail, and mothers begin to cook their children and eat them. The king in horror and rage will wreak vengeance on Elisha. The latter divines his purpose, anticipates any action on the king's part, and predicts that there will be abundance of food on the morrow. That night a panic seized the

Syrian host. They imagined they heard the Hittires coming against them, and fled in headlong rout toward the Jordan. Four lepers discover the deserted camp and report the fact to the king. He suspects an ambuscade, but is persuaded to send a few men to reconnoiter. They find the camp deserted and treasures strewing the path right to the Jordan. The maritans lose no time in plundering the camp and Elisha's predictions are fulfilled to the letter (2Ki 6:24-7).

(4) The prophet's next act was one of great significance. It was the carrying out of the first order given to Elijah at Horeb, and the time seemed ripe for it. He proceeds north to Damascus and finds Benhadad sick. Hearing of his presence the king sends a rich present by the hands of his chief captain Hazael and inquires whether he will recover. Elisha gives a double answer. He will recover, the disease will not be fatal, yet he will die. Fixing his eyes on Hazael, Elisha sees a fierce and ruthless successor to Benhadad who will be a terrible scourge to Israel. The man of God weeps, the fierce captain is ashamed, and when told of what he shall do, represents himself as a dog and not able to do such things. But the prospect is too enticing; he tells Benhadad he will recover, and on the morrow smothers him and succeeds to the throne (2Ki 8:7-15).

(5) The next, move of Elisha was even more significant. It is the fulfilling of the second order given Elijah at Mt. Horeb. The Israelites are fighting the Syrians in defense of Ramoth-gilead. The king, Jehoram, is wounded and returns home to Jezreel to recover. Elisha seizes on the opportune moment to have the house of Ahab avenged for its many sins. He dispatches one of the young prophets with a vial of oil to Ramoth-gilead with orders to anoint Jehu, one of the captains of the army, as king over Israel. The young prophet obeys, delivers his message and flees. Jehu tries to conceal the real nature of the interview, but is forced to tell, and is at once proclaimed king. He leaps into his chariot, drives furiously to Jezreel, meets the king by the vineyard of Naborb, sends an arrow through his heart, tramples to death the queen Jezebel, butchers the king's sons and exterminates the royal family. He then treacherously murders the priests of Baal and the revolution is complete; the house of Ahab is destroyed, Baal worship overthrown and an able king is upon the throne (2Ki 9; 10).

(6) Elisha retains his fervent and patriotic spirit until the last. His final act is in keeping with his long. life of generous deeds and faithful patriotic service. He is on his death bed, having witnessed the fearful oppressions of Israel by Hazael who made Israelites as dust under his feet. The young king Joash visits him, weeps over him, calling him, "My father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof." The dying prophet bids him take his bow and arrow and shoot eastward, an act symbolic of his victory over Syria. Being then commanded to smite upon the ground, he smites three times and stops. The prophet is angry, tells him he should have smitten many times, then he would have smitten Syria many times, but now he shall smite her only thrice (2Ki 13:14-19).

(7) The last wonder in connection with Elisha occurs after this death. His bones were reported to have vitalizing power (2Ki 13:20-21). Tradition says that the man thus restored to life lived but an hour; but the story illustrates something of the reverence held for Elisha.

4. Characteristics of His Ministry:

(1) In Comparison with Elijah.

In many respects Elisha is a contrast to his great predecessor. Instead of a few remarkable appearances and striking events, his was a steady lifelong ministry; instead of the rugged hills his home was in the quiet valley and on the farm; instead of solitariness he loved the social life and the home. There were no sudden appearances add disappearances, people always knew where to find him. There were no long seasons of hiding or retirement, he was constantly moving about among the people or the prophetic schools. There were no spectacular revolutions, only the effect of a long steady ministry. His career resembled the latter portion of Elijah's more than the earlier. Elijah had learned well his lesson at Horeb. God is not so much in the tempest, the fire and the earthquake, as in the "still small voice" (1Ki 19:12). Elijah was a prophet of fire, Elisha more of a pastor. The former called down fire out of heaven to consume those sent to take him; Elisha anticipates the king when he comes to take him (2Ki 6:32,33) and gives promises of relief. He merely asks for blindness to come upon the army which surrounded him at Dothan, and spares them when the king would have smitten them (2Ki 6:21-23). Elijah was austere and terrible, but Elisha was so companionable that the woman at Shunera built him a chamber. His prophetic

insight could be helped more by the strains of music than by the mountain solitude (2Ki 3:15). Some of his miracles resemble Elijah's. The multiplication of the oil and the cruse is much like the continued supply of meal and oil to the widow of Zarephath (1Ki 17:10-16), and the raising of the Shunammite's son like the raising of the widow's son at Zarephath (1Ki 17:17-24).

(2) General Features of His Ministry.

His services as a pastor-prophet were more remarkable than his miracles. He could be very severe in the presence of deliberate wrongdoing, stern and unflinching when the occasion required. He could weep before Hazael, knowing what he would do to Israel, yet he anointed him king of Syria (2Ki 8:11-15). When the time was ripe and the occasion opportune, he could instigate a revolution that wiped out a dynasty, exterminated a family, and caused the massacre of the priests of Baal (2Ki 8; 9). He possessed the confidence of kings so fully that they addressed him as father and themselves as sons (2Ki 6:21; 13:14). He accompanied an army of invasion and three kings consult him in extremity (2Ki 3:11-19). The king of Syria consults him in sickness (2Ki 8:7,8). The king of Israel seems to blame him for the awful conditions of the siege and would have wreaked vengeance on him (2Ki 6:31). He was something of a military strategist and many times saved the king's army (2Ki 6:10). The king of Israel goes to him for his parting counsel (2Ki 13:14-19). His advice or command seemed to be always taken unhesitatingly. His contribution to the religious life of Israel was not his least service. Under Jehu he secured the destruction of the Baal worship in its organized form. Under Hazael the nation was trodden down and almost annihilated for its apostasy. By his own ministry many were saved from bowing the knee to Baal. His personal influence among the schools of the prophets was widespread and beneficial. He that escaped the sword of Hazael was slain by Jehu, and he that escaped Jehu was slain by Elisha. Elisha finished the great work of putting down Baal worship begun by Elijah. His work was not so much to add anything to religion, as to cleanse the religion already possessed. He did not ultimately save the nation, but he did save a large remnant. The corruptions were not all eradicated, the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat were never fully overcome. He passed through a bitter and distressing national humiliation, but emerged with hope. He eagerly watched every turn of events and his counsels were more frequently adopted than those perhaps of any other prophet. He was "the chariots of Israel and tire horsemen thereof" (2Ki 13:14). No condemnation of calf-worship at Da and Bethel is recorded, but that does not prove that he fully sanctioned it. His was a contest between Yahweh worship and Baal worship. The corrupted form of Yahweh worship was a problem which Amos and Hosea had to face nearly a century later.

III. General Estimate.

His character was largely molded by his home life. He was friend and benefactor of foreigner as well as of Israelite. He was large-hearted and generous, tolerant to a remarkable degree, courageous and shrewd when the occasion required, a diplomat as well as a statesman, severe and stern only in the presence of evil and when the occasion demanded. He is accused of being vindictive and of employing falsehood with his enemies. His faults, however, were the faults of his age, and these were but little manifested in his long career. His was a strenuous pastor's life. A homeloving and social man, his real work was that of teaching and helping, rather than working of miracles. He continually went about doing good. He was resourceful and ready and was gifted with a sense of humor. Known as "the man of God," he proved his right to the title by his zeal for God and loving service to man.

LITERATURE.

Driver, LOT, 185 f; W. R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, 85 ff; Cornill, Isr. Prophets, 14 f, 33 ff; Farrar, Books of Kings; Kuenen, Religions of Israel, I, 360 ff; Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures, 94 f; Maurice, Prophets and Kings, 142; Liddon, Sermons on Old Testament Subjects, 195-334.

J. J. Reeve

ELISHAH

e-li’-sha (’elishah, "God saves"; Elisa, Eleisai):

Mentioned in Ge 10:4 as the eldest son of Javan, and in Eze 27:7 as the source from which the Tyrians obtained their purple dyes. On the ground of this latter statement attempts have been made to identify it with Southern Italy or the north of Africa. Josephus (Ant., I, vi, 1) identified Elisha with the Aeolians. The Targum on Ezekiel gives "the province of Italy." Other suggestions include Hellas, Ells, and Alsa; the last named is a kingdom mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, but its precise location is unknown. It is impossible as yet to claim certainty for any of these conjectures.

A. C. Grant

ELISHAMA

e-lish’-a-ma (’elishama‘, "God has heard"):

(1) Grandfather of Joshua and son of Ammihud; prince of the tribe of Ephraim in the Exodus (Nu 1:10; 7:48,53; 1Ch 7:26).

(2) A son of David, born in Jerusalem (2Sa 5:16; 1Ch 3:8).

(3) By textual corruption in 1Ch 3:6 for Elishua, another of David’s sons; compare 2Sa 5:15.

(4) A scribe of Jehoiakim (Jer 36:12,20,21).

(5) One "of the seed royal," grandfather of Ishmael, the slayer of Gedaliah (2Ki 25:25; Jer 41:1).

(6) A man of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:41).

(7) One of the priests appointed by Jehoshaphat to teach the law (2Ch 17:8).

F. K. Farr

ELISHAPHAT

e-lish’-a-fat (’elishaphat, "God is judge"):

This man figures in the Levitical conspiracy against Athaliah, to make Joash king. He was one of the "captains of hundreds" employed in the enterprise by Jehoiada the priest (2Ch 23:1).

ELISHEBA

e-lish’-e-ba (’elishebha‘, "God swears," "God is an oath"):

Daughter of Amminadab, sister of Nashon, wife of Aaron, mother of Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar, the foundress, therefore, of the entire Levitical priesthood (Ex 6:23).

ELISHUA

el-i-shu’-a, e-lish’-u-a (’elishua‘, "‘ God is rich," "God is salvation"):

Son of David (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 14:5); apparently called Elishama (1Ch 3:6). In the latter locus we have most probably a misreading by the copyist of the name Elishua.

ELISIMUS

e-lis’-i-mus, the Revised Version (British and American)

ELIASIMUS (which see).

ELIU

e-li’-u (Eliou; the Revised Version (British and American) ELIHU):

One of the ancestors of Judith (APC Judith 8:1), and therefore of the tribe of Simeon.

ELIUD

e-li’-ud (Elioud, "God my praise"):

An ancestor of Jesus, four generations before Joseph (Mt 1:15).

ELIZAPHAN

el-i-za’-fan, e-liz’-a-fan (’elitsaphan; Septuagint Eleisaphan, Elisaphan, Elisapa, Elisaphat, "God has protected; compare tsephanyah, Zephaniah, "Yah has protected," and the Phoenician, tsephanba‘al, Baal has protected"):

(1) The son of Uzziel, the son of Kohath, and so a prince of the Levitical class of the Kohathites (Nu 3:30; 1Ch 15:8; 2Ch 29:13). But in 1Ch 15:8; 2Ch 29:13 his class seems to be coordinate with that of the Kohathites. He is called Elzaphan in Ex 6:22; Le 10:4.

(2) A "prince" or chief of Zebulun, who represented that tribe in the division of the land (Nu 34:25). Walter R. Betteridge

ELIZUR

e-li’-zur (’elitsur; Septuagint Eleiour, Elisour, "My God is a rock"; compare Zuriel "my rock is God" (Nu 3:35)):

A chief or prince of the tribe of Reuben (Nu 1:5; 2:10; 7:30,35; 10:18).

ELKANAH

el-ka’-na (’elqanah, "God has possessed"):

(1) An Ephraimite, the father of Samuel (1Sa 1:1-28; 2:11-20). Of his two wives, Hannah, the childless, was best beloved. At Shiloh she received through Eli the promise of a son. Elkanah, with Hannah, took the young Samuel to Shiloh when he was weaned, and left him with EIi as their offering to Yahweh. They were blessed with three other sons and two daughters.

(2) The second son of Korah (Ex 6:24), who escaped the fate of Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Nu 26:11).

(3) One "next to the king" in Jerusalem in the time of Ahaz; slain by one Zichri of Ephraim in war with Pekah (2Ch 28:7).

(4) One of the Korahites among David's "mighty men" (1Ch 12:1,6).

(5) A Levite, possibly the same as (2) above (1Ch 6:23,15,36).

(6) Another Levite of the same line (1Ch 6:26,35).

(7) Another Levite, ancestor of Berechiah (1Ch 9:16).

(8) Another Levite (if not the same as (4) above), one of the "doorkeepers for the ark" (1Ch 15:23).

F. K. Farr

ELKIAH

el-ki'-a (Elkia; the King James Version Elcia):

An ancestor of Judith (APC Judith 8:1).

ELKOSHITE

el'-kosh-it (ha-'elqoshi; Septuagint Elkesaiou, Elkaiseou, Elkeseou):

Used with the article "the Elkoshite" (Na 1:1). Probably a gentilic adjective giving the home of the prophet; not definitely identified. Three traditions may be noted:

(1) The Nestorians venerate the supposed tomb of the prophet in the village of Alqush not far from the east bank of the Tigris, about two days' journey almost directly north of Mosul.

(2) Jerome states in the prologue to his commentary on Na that the village of Helkesei in Galilee was pointed out to him as Elkosh. This Helkesei is probably El-Kauzeh between Ramieh and Bint Jebeil.

(3) The treatise De Vitis Prophetarum of the Pseudo-Epiphanius says that Nahum came from "Elkesei beyond Jordan towards Begabor and was of the tribe of Simeon." Nestle has shown that the words "beyond Jordan" are probably a gloss, and that for Begabor should be read Betogabra, the modern Beit Jibrin in Southern Palestine. In favor of this identification may be urged the following facts:

(a) that parallels to the name Elkosh, such as Eltekeh and Eltekon, are found in the southern country;

(b) that the word probably contains the name of the Edomite god Qaush, whose name appears in the names of Edomite kings in the Assyrian inscriptions of the 8th and 7th centuries BC, such as Qaush-malaka and the like.

(c) that the internal evidence of the prophecy makes the Judean origin of the prophet almost certain.

LITERATURE. Davidson, "Nah," "Hab," "Zeph," in Cambridge Bible, 9-13; G. A. Smith, "Book of the Twelve," in

Expositor's Bible, Commentary on Nah; Billerbeck and Jeremias, Beitraege zur Assyriologie, III, 91 ff; Peiser, ZATW, 1897, 349; Nestle, PEFS, 1879, 136.

Walter R. Betteridge

ELLASAR

el-a'-sar ('ellacar):

1. The Name and Its Etymology:

The city over which Arioch (Eri-Aku) and other Babylonian kings ruled (Ge 14:1). The Semitic-Babylonians form of its name is (al) Larsa, "the city Larsa," a form which implies that the Hebrew has interchanged r and s, and transposed the final vowel. Its Sumerian name is given as Ararwa, apparently for Arauruwa, "light-abode," which, in fact, is the meaning of the ideographic group with which it is written. The ruins of this ancient site are now known as Senqara, and lie on the East bank of the Euphrates, about midway between Warka (Erech) and Muqayyar (Ur of the Chaldees). In addition to the name Larsa, it seems also to have been called Aste azaga "the holy (bright, pure) seat" (or throne), and both its names were apparently due to its having been one of the great Babylonian centers of sun-god worship.

2. Its Holy Places:

Like most of the principal cities of Babylonia, it had a great temple-tower, called E-dur-an-ki, "house of the bond of heaven and earth." The temple of the city bore the same name as that at Sippar, i.e. E-babbar, "House of Light," where the sun-god Samas was worshipped. This temple was restored by Ur-Engur, Hammurabi (Amraphel), Burna-burias, Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus. Among the tablets found on this site by Loftus was that which gives measures of length and square and cube roots, pointing to the place as one of the great centers of Babylonian learning. Besides the remains of these temples, there are traces of the walls, and the remains of houses of the citizens. The city was at first governed by its own kings, but became a part of the Babylonian empire some time after the reign of Hammurabi.

LITERATURE.

Loftus, Chaldea and Susiana; Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies?; Zehnpfund, Babylonien in seinen wichtigsten Ruinenstatten, 53- 54.

T. G. Pinches

ELM

elm:

Ho 4:13 the King James Version, but in the Revised Version (British and American)

TEREBINTH (which see).

ELMADAM

el-ma'-dam (WH Elmadam; Textus Receptus of the New Testament Elmodam; the King James Version Elmodam):

An ancestor of Jesus, according to Luke’s genealogy, in the 6th generation before Zerubbabel (Lu 3:28).

ELNAAM

el-na’-am (’elna‘am, "God is delightfulness"; compare Phoenician "Gadnaam"):

According to Massoretic Text the father of two of David’s warriors (1Ch 11:46); according to Septuagint himself one of the warriors.

ELNATHAN

el-na’-than (’elnathan, "God has given"):

(1) The grandfather of Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:8).

(2) A courtier of Jehoiakim; he was one of those sent to Egypt to bring back the prophet Uriah (Jer 26:22), and one of those who heard the reading of Jeremiah’s roll and entreated Jehoiakim not to burn the roll (Jer 36:12,25)—possibly the same person as (1) above.

(3, 4, 5) The name of two "chief men"—unless textual corruption has introduced the name at its second occurrence—and of one "teacher" sent for by Ezra from the camp at the river Ahava (Ezr 8:16).

F. K. Farr

ELO-BETH-HANAN

e-lon-beth-ha’-nan.

See ELON.

ELOHIM

e-lo’-him, el’-o-hem.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

ELOI

e’-loi, e-lo’-i.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

ELOI; ELOI; LAMA; SABACHTHA; ELI; ELI; LAMA SABACHTHANI

e’-loi, e-lo’i, la’-ma, sa-bakh-tha’-ni, or (Eloi, eloi, lama sabachthanei):

The forms of the first word as translated vary in the two narratives, being in Mark as first above and in Mt as in second

reading.

With some perversions of form probably from Ps 22:1 (’eli ‘eli lamah ‘azabhtani). A statement uttered by Jesus on the cross just before his death, translated, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mt 27:46; Mr 15:34).

There is an interesting but difficult problem in connection with the interpretation of this passage. There seems to be a mixture of Aramaic and Hebrew.

The first two words, whether in Hebrew or Aramaic, have sufficient similarity to each other and each sufficient similarity to the name itself to warrant the jeer that Jesus was calling upon Elias, or the sincere supposition of those who might not fully understand the language, that he was actually calling on Elias.

The forms lema and lama used in Matthew and Mark respectively (Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek) represent the various possible forms, the first the Aramaic, and the second the Hebrew. The various readings and translations of the latter word, sabachthani, only add confusion to an effort at ultimate explanation of the real statement. Certainly the influence of the Aramaic played a geat part in the translation and transmission of the original. The spirit revealed by Jesus in this utterance seems to be very much like that displayed in the Garden when He cried out to have the cup removed from Him.

Walter G. Clippinger

ELON (1)

e’-lon (’elon "terebinth"):

(1) A Zebulunite, who judged Israel ten years, and was buried in Aijalon (Jud 12:11,12).

(2) A son of Zebulun (Ge 46:14; Nu 26:26).

(3) A Hittite whose daughter Esau wedded (Ge 26:34; 36:2).

ELON (2)

e’-lon (’elon, a "terebinth"; Ailon):

An unidentified town in the territory of Da named between Ithlah and Timnah (Jos 19:43). It is possibly identical with Elon-beth-Hanan which, along with Shaalbim and Bethshemesh, formed one of Solomon’s commissariat districts (1Ki 4:9).

Conder has suggested Beit’ Anan, about 4 miles Northwest of Neby Samwil: it is quite uncertain.

ELONITES

e’-lon-its: Descendants of ELON (which see (2) Nu 26:26).

ELOQUENT

el’-o-kwent:

"Moses said .... I am not eloquent" (’ish debharim, "a man of words" (Ex 4:10)); but Aaron could "speak well." In Isa 3:3 the Revised Version (British and American) bin, "intelligent," is rendered "skilful (enchanter)," the King James Version "eloquent (orator)." Apollos was "an eloquent man" (logios, "full of words" (Ac 18:24, the King James Version margin, "a learned man")).

ELOTH

e’-loth.

See ELATH.

ELPAAL

el-pa’-al (’elpa‘al, "God has wrought" (compare el‘asah, Jer 29:3)):

The name of a descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 8:11,12,18).

ELPALET

el-pa’-let: (the Revised Version (British and American) ELPELET):

The name of a son of David (1Ch 14:5).

See ELIPHALAT.

ELPELET

el’-pe-let.

See ELIPHALAT.

ELTEKE; ELTEKEH

el’-te-ke, (’elteqeh Jos 19:44, ‘elteqe’ (Jos 21:23); Codex Vaticanus Alkatha; Codex Alexandrinus, Elketho):

A place in the territory of Da named between Ekron and Gibbethon (Jos 19:44), and again between Beth-horon and Gibbethon, as given to the Kohathite Levites (Jos 21:23). It is probably identical with the Assyrian Altaqu, where Sennacherib (Hexagon prism inscrip.) claims to have defeated the allied armies of the Philistines and the Egyptians. It should probably be sought somewhere East of Ekron. Beit Likia, the place marked Eltekeh on the PEF map, seems a position for such an encounter.

It is about 2 1/2 miles Southwest of Beth-horon the Upper.

W. Ewing

ELTEKON

el’-te-kon (’elteqon, "founded by God"):

A city in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:59) near BETH-ANOTH (which see) to be looked for, therefore, a little North of Hebron. Site unknown.

ELTOLAD

el-to’-lad (’eltoladh, "kindred of God"):

A city of Judah in the Negeb near Edom (Jos 15:30); in Jos 19:4 ascribed to Simeon. Probably the same as Tolad (1Ch 4:29), the Arabic article "el" being omitted. Site unknown.

ELUL

e’-lul, e-lool’ (’elul, Ne 6:15; Eloul, APC 1Macc 14:27):

The 6th month of the Hebrew year, corresponding to August-September. The derivation is uncertain.

See TIME.

ELUZAI

e-lu’-za-i (’el‘uzai, "God is my strength"; compare UZZIEL):

One of David’s heroes (1Ch 12:5).

ELYMAEANS

el-i-me’-ans.

See ELAMITES.

ELYMAIS

el-i-ma’-is (Elumais):

This name, representing the Old Testament Elam (see ELAM), was given to a district of Persia lying South of Media and North of Susiana. In APC 1Macc 6:1 the common reading, which is adopted by the King James Version, refers to Elymais as a rich city in Persia. No other reference, however, to such a city is found except in Josephus (Ant., XII, ix, 1) who simply follows 1 Macc. The text should therefore be corrected to read as in the Revised Version (British and American), "in Elymais in Persia there was a city."

ELYMAS

el’-i-mas (Elumas, "wise"; Ac 13:8).

See BAR-JESUS.

ELYON

e-li’-on.

See EL ELYON; GOD, NAMES OF.

ELZABAD

el-za’-bad (’elzabhadh, "God has given"; Compare ZABDIEL and ZEBADIAH):

(1) The ninth of David’s Gadite heroes (1Ch 12:12).

(2) A Korahite doorkeeper (1Ch 26:7).

ELZAPHAN

el-za’-fan.

See ELIZAPHAN.

EMADABUN

e-ma’-da-bun (Emadaboun); the King James Version, Madiabun (APC 1Esdras 5:58):

The head of a family of Levites who superintended the repair of the temple; not named in Ezr 3:9.

EMATHEIS

e-ma-the’-is (Amathias; Emeus; Codex Vaticanus, Emaththis; Codex Alexandrinus, Ematheis; the King James Version, Amatheis):

One of the sons of Bebai (APC 1Esdras 9:29), called "Athlai" in Ezr 10:28.

EMBALMING

em-bam’-ing (chanaT, "to spice"):

Embalming. is mentioned in Scripture only in the cases of Jacob and Joseph (Ge 50:2 f, 26). It was a distinctly Egyptian invention and method of preserving the bodies of men and animals. Examples of it reach back to over 3,000 years ago.

It prevailed to some extent among the peoples of Asia, and at a later period among the Greeks and Romans, but was in origin and use distinctly non-Israelitish.

See BURIAL.

EMBRACE

em-bras’:The word has two distinct meanings in the Old Testament:

(1) to clasp and hold fondly in the arms, pointing to a common custom (Ge 29:13; 33:4; 48:10; 2Ki 4:16; So 2:6; 8:3 compare Ac 20:10), and

(2) to have sexual intercourse (Pr 4:8; 5:20; Ec 3:5). It seems to have acquired this technical sense in later Jewish usage.

EMBROIDERY

em-broid’-er-i (riqrnah; the King James Version Needlework):

Riqmah was applied to any kind of cloth which showed designs in variegated colors. The method of manufacture is unknown. The designs may have been woven into cloth or drawn in by a needle or hook (Jud 5:30; Ps 45:14; Eze 16:10,13,18; 26:16; 27:7,16,24).

Ma‘aseh raqam is translated "the work of the embroiderer" in the Revised Version (British and American) instead of "needlework" (Ex 26:36; 27:16; 28:39; 36:37; 38:18; 39:29; Jud 5:30; Ps 45:14).

Raqam, "embroiderer," occurs in Ex 35:35; 38:23. The fact that this word is used instead of ‘aragh, "weaver," would lead us to suppose that the embroiderers’ work was either different from that of the weaver or that a "raqam" was especially skilled in fine weaving. Another word, choshebh, is used to describe a skillful weaver. "Cunning work" in the King James Version of Ex 26:1,31; 28:6,15; 35:33,15; 36:8,35; 39:3,1 is rendered in the American Standard Revised Version "work of the skillful workmen." The passage has been freely rendered "designers."

In the Revised Version (British and American) of Ex 28:39 shabhats is translated "weave."

In Ex 28:4 occurs the word tashbets, which is translated "broidered" in the King James Version and "checker work" in the Revised Version (British and American). If this kind of work is what it is supposed to be, it is more truly "needlework" than the embroidery. This work is still done in some of the Syrian cities and towns, especially in Damascus. Small caps for men to wear under their ordinary headdress and loose outer garments or dressing-gowns are the forms in which it is commonly seen. The checker-work effect is obtained by sewing in a cotton string between two pieces of cloth, so as to form designs. The patterns Usually run to straight lines such as zigzags or squares. The effect is striking, and we can well imagine would have made an impressive priest’s robe, especially if costly materials were used.

See also CRAFTS.

James A. Patch

EMEK-KEZIZ

e-mek-ke’-ziz (‘emeq qetsits; the King James Version Valley of Keziz (Jos 18:21)):

A town in Benjamin named between Beth-hoglah and Beth-arabah, and therefore to be sought in the plain, probably South of Jericho. The name has not been recovered.

EMERALD

em’-er-ald.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

EMERODS

em'-er-odz 'ophalim, techorim:

These words are used in the account of the plague which broke out among the Philistines while the captive Ark of the Covenant was in their land. 'Ophalim literally means rounded eminences or swellings, and in the Revised Version (British and American) is translated "tumors" (1Sa 5:6-12). In the Hebrew text of this passage the Qere substitutes for it the word techorim, a term which occurs in the next chapter in the description of the golden models of these swellings that were made as votive offerings (1Sa 6:11-17). The swellings were symptoms of a plague, and the history is precisely that of the outbreak of an epidemic of bubonic plague. The older writers supposed by comparison of the account in 1Sa with Ps 78:66 that they were hemorrhoids (or piles), and the older English term in the King James Version is a 16th-century form of that Greek word, which occurs in several medical treatises of the 16th and 17th centuries. There is, however, no evidence that this identification is correct. In the light of the modern research which has proved that the rat-flea (Pulex cheopis) is the most active agent in conveying the virus of plague to the human subject, it is worthy of note that the plague of tumors was accompanied by an invasion of mice ('akhbor) or rats. The rat is not specifically mentioned in the Bible, although it was as common in Canaan and Israelite times as it is today, a fact demonstrated by the frequency with which their bones occur in all strata of the old Palestinian cities, so it is probable that the term used was a generic one for both rodents.

The coincidence of destructive epidemics and invasions of mice is also recorded by Herodotus (ii.141), who preserves a legend that the army of Sennacherib which entered Egypt was destroyed by the agency of mice. He states that a statue of Ptah, commemorating the event, was extant in his day. The god held a mouse in his hand, and bore the inscription: "Whosoever sees me, let him reverence the gods." This may have been a reminiscence of the story in Isa 37:36.

For other references see PLAGUE.

Alex. Macalister

EMIM

e'-mim ('emim; Ommaein, Ommein, or Ommiein):

Stated to have been the earlier inhabitants of Moab (De 2:10,11), and to have been of tall stature, and hence, "accounted Rephaim (or giants) as the Anakim" or the Zamzummim of Ammon (De 2:20). As the name was given to them by the Moabites, it may not have been that by which they called themselves. A tall race, known to the Israelites as REPHAIM (which see), once existed in Southern Palestine as well as on the East side of the Jordan, but its exact relationship is unknown. In the time of Abraham the Emim were living in the Moabite district of Shaveh-kiriathaim, identified with the modern Kureiyat (Ge 14:5).

A. H. Sayce

EMINENT

em'-i-nent:

In the King James Version (only in Eze 16:24,31,39; 17:22) refers literally to physical elevation; the Revised Version (British and American) in the last passage renders "lofty" (Hebrew talul, "uplifted," "heaped up") and in the others "vaulted place" (Hebrew gabh, "rounded place," "mound" the English Revised Version, margin "a vaulted chamber").

EMMANUEL

e-man’-n-el.

See IMMANUEL.

EMMAUS

e-ma’-us, em’-a-us (Emmaous, derivation uncertain, but probably from chammath, "a hot spring"):

Josephus (BJ, IV, i, 3) says: "Now Emmaus, if it be interpreted, may be rendered ‘a warm bath’ for therein is a spring of warm water useful for healing." Here he is referring to the hot springs near Tiberias. Possibly the same Greek name may not always have been derived from the same Hebrew, and as Cheyne suggests (2) may have come from ha-motsah (see below).

1. Emmaus of the Apocrypha:

A place where Judas Maccabeus defeated Gorgias (APC 1Macc 4); it was "in the plain" (APC 1Macc 3:40); it was subsequently fortified by Bacchides (APC 1Macc 9:50). It is frequently mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XIV, xi, 2; BJ, I, xi, 2; II, v, 1; xx, 4; IV, viii, 1; V, i, 6), and also in the Talmud and Midrash. It is now the modern mud-village of ‘Amwas, 20 miles along, and a little North of, the main road from Jerusalem to Jaffa. In the 3rd century it was called Nicopolis and was an episcopal see; in early Christian times it was famous for a spring of reputed healing qualities.

2. Emmaus of Luke:

The Emmaus of Lu 24:13, a village 60 furlongs (stadia) from Jerusalem. Early Christian tradition appears to have identified it with (1) and hence, to harmonize the distance, some manuscripts have 160 furlongs. Eusebius and Jerome place this Emmaus at ‘Amwas; but in the first place

(1) was a city and not a village (kome), and secondly

(2) the distance, 40 miles there and back, is an almost impossible one for the narrative.

In Crusading times this difficulty appears to have been realized, and on what grounds is not known, Kubeibeh at just over 60 stadia, Northwest of Jerusalem, was selected as the site of Emmaus. There a fine church was built which has in recent years been rebuilt and today a Franciscan hospice and school, attached to the church, and a newer German Roman Catholic hospice, combine with the considerable picturesqueness of the place itself to fortify the tradition.

A much more probable site is Quloniyeh, a village about 35 stadia from Jerusalem, on the road to Jaffa. Josephus narrates (BJ, VII, vi, 6) that Vespasian "assigned a place for 800 men only whom he had dismissed from his army which he gave them for their habitation; it is called Emmaus and is distant from Jerusalem 60 furlongs." This is almost certainly the Emmaus of Luke; it is highly probable that the name quloniyeh is derived from the fact of its being this Colonia. Close to this place is a ruin known as Bet Mizza, which is probably the Mozah (ha-motsah) of Jos 18:26 which in the Talmud (Cukk. 45) is also described as a colonia. Today it is a "colony" of Jews who have revived and always use the old name Motsah for their settlement.

Other suggestions for this Emmaus are

(a) el Khamsa, considerably over 60 stadia Southwest of Jerusalem (Conder);

(b) Koriet el ‘enab, some 10 stadia farther a1ong the Jerus-Jaffa road than Kuloniyeh (LB, etc.); and

(c) ‘Artas, S. of Bethlehem, where remains of Roman baths have been found (Mrs. Finn). In not one of the places suggested are there any hot springs.

E. W. G. Masterman

EMMER

em’-er (Emmer):

Head of a family, some of whom had married foreign wives (APC 1Esdras 9:21).

Called "Immer" in Ezr 10:20.

EMMERUTH

em’-er-uth (Emmerouth; the King James Version Meruth; APC 1Esdras 5:24):

Corresponding to "Immer" in Ezr 2:37.

EMMOR

em’-or:

Transliterated from the Greek Emmor, the translation of Hebrew chamor, "ass" (Ac 7:16 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "Hamor", which see).

EMPEROR

emp’-er-er ho sebastos; Latin augustus:

The title of the Roman emperors; (Ac 25:21,25).

See AUGUSTUS; CAESAR.

EMPTY; EMPTIER

emp’-ti, emp’-ti-er (kenos):

"Empty," adjective meaning void, etc., as the translation of req, riq, reqam, etc., occurs in the literal sense of "with nothing" (Ge 31:42; Job 22:9); in 2Sa 1:22, it is equivalent to "in vain," "hungry" (Isa 29:8); in some instances the meaning is comparative only; baqaq, "to gush out," "to pour out," "to empty" is used adjectivally (Ho 10:1, "Israel is an empty vine"; but the Revised Version (British and American) takes the Hebrew word in its original sense of "pouring out," rendering "Israel is a luxuriant vine"); tohu, "emptiness" (Job 26:7); kenos, "empty" is so translated (Mr 12:3); in Mt 12:44, the Greek word is scholazo, "to be free," "unoccupied"; "to empty" (verb) is the translation of baqaq (Na 2:2), of

dalal, "to become poor," etc. (Isa 19:6, the English Revised Version "minished," the American Standard Revised Version "diminished"). the Revised Version (British and American) has "empty" for "vain" (Eph 5:6), "emptied himself" for "made himself of no reputation" (Php 2:7), "emptied out" for "gathered" (2Ki 22:9; 2Ch 34:17, margin "poured out").

W. L. Walker

EMULATION

em-u-la'-shun (zelos, parazeloo):

Occurs twice in the New Testament, once in a bad sense and once in a good sense.

(1) In Ga 5:20 the King James Version it is the translation of zelos ("zeal," "earnestness," "enthusiasm") where it is classed among "the works of the flesh" and signifies the stirring up of jealousy or envy in others, because of what we are, or have, or profess. The Greek word is used in this sense in Ac 13:45; Ro 13:13; 1Co 3:3; Jas 3:14,16; 2Co 12:20; Ga 5:20; the Revised Version (British and American) translated by "jealousy." It denotes a work of the flesh or lower nature, which Christians often fail sufficiently to guard against; it pleases "the flesh" to excite such a feeling in others.

(2) In Ro 11:14 the King James Version "emulation" is the translation of parazeloo ("to make one zealous or jealous"), and is there used in a good sense. "If by any means I may provoke to emulation (the Revised Version (British and American) jealousy) them that are my flesh" (compare Ro 10:19, quoted from De 32:21). It is well to "provoke to emulation" in this sense, those who are slow or indifferent, by the example of earnestness and zeal on our part. This is not to please "the flesh," but to serve "the Spirit."

W. L. Walker

EN-

('ayin (compare Arabic 'Ain)):

The Hebrew word for "spring" or "fountain" (Ge 16:7; Nu 33:9; Ne 2:14; Pr 8:28 (feminine plural)). It occurs in numerous compound words, as EN-GEDI, EN-HADDAH, EN-HAKKORE, EN-HAZOR, EN-RIMMON, EN-ROGEL, EN-SHEMESH (which see). In the same way the word 'Ain is a very common component of Arabic names of places throughout Palestine and Syria at the present day. Places with names compounded with "En-" were almost certainly located near a spring.

See FOUNTAIN; WELL.

EN-DOR

en'-dor 'en dor, Jos 17:11; 'en dor, 1Sa 28:7; 'en do'r, Ps 83:10; Codex Alexandrinus, Nendor; Codex Vaticanus, Aeldor:

A town in the lot of Issachar assigned to Manasseh (Jos 17:11). Here dwelt the woman who had a familiar spirit, whom Saul consulted on the night before the battle of Gilboa (1Sa 28:7). Here also, according to Ps 83:10, perished fugitives of Sisera's army, after their defeat at the Kishon. The place was therefore not far from the Kishon and Tabor.

It is generally identified with the modern Endur, a small village on the northern slope of Jebel ed-Duchy, with several ancient caves. It is not far from Nain and Shunem, and looks across the valley along which the broken ranks of Sisera may

have attempted to make their way eastward to the open uplands, and thence to their native North. Coming hither from Gilboa, eluding the Philistine outposts under cover of the darkness, Saul would cross the Vale of Jezreel, and pass round the eastern base of the mountain, the Philistines being on the west.

W. Ewing

EN-DOR, WITCH OF

wich:

In 1Sa 28:3-25, it is narrated how Saul, in despair of mind because Yahweh had forsaken him, on the eve of the fatal battle of Gilboa, resorted in disguise to "a woman that had a familiar spirit" (’obh: see DIVINATION; NECROMANCY), at En-dor, and besought the woman to divine for him, and bring him up from the dead whom he should name. On the woman reminding him how Saul had cut off from the land those who practiced these arts—a proof of the existence and operation of the laws against divination, witchcraft, necromancy, etc. (Le 19:31; De 18:9-14)—the king assured her of immunity, and bade her call up Samuel. The incidents that followed have been the subject of much discussion and of varied interpretation. It seems assumed in the narrative that the woman did see an appearance, which the king, on her describing it, recognized to bethat of Samuel.

This, however, need be only the narrator’s interpretation of the events. It is not to be credited that the saintly Samuel was actually summoned from his rest by the spells of a professional diviner. Some have thought that Samuel, by God’s permission, did indeed appear, as much to the woman’s dismay as to the king’s; and urge in favor of this the woman’s evident surprise and terror at his appearance (1Sa 28:12 ff), and the true prophecy of Saul’s fate (1Sa 28:16-19).

It may conceivably have been so, but the more reasonable view is that the whole transaction was a piece of feigning on the part of the woman. The Septuagint uses the word eggastrimuthos ("a ventriloquist") to describe the woman and those who exercised kindred arts (1Sa 28:9). Though pretending ignorance (1Sa 28:12), the woman doubtless recognizes Saul from the first. It was she who saw Samuel, and reported his words; the king himself saw and heard nothing. It required no great skill in a practiced diviner to forecast the general issue of the battle about to take place, and the disaster that would overtake Saul and his sons; while if the forecast had proved untrue, the narrative of the witch of En-dor would never have been written. Saul, in fact, was not slain, but killed himself. The incident, therefore, may best be ranked in the same category as the feats of modern mediumship.

James Orr

EN-EGLAIM

en-eg’-la-im, en-eg-la’-im (‘en ‘eghlayim, "fountain of calves"?):

In Ezekiel’s vision of the waters it is one of the two points between which "fishers shall stand" (Eze 47:10).

The situation must be near the entrance of the Jordan into the Dead Sea (see EN-GEDI).

Tristram (Bible Places, 93) identifies it with ‘Ain Hajlah (compare BETH-HOGLAH);

Robinson (BRP, II, 489), with ‘Ain Feshkah.

EN-GADDI

en-gad’-i (Sirach 24:14 the Revised Version (British and American), "on the sea shore").

See EN-GEDI.

EN-GANNIM

en-gan’-im (‘en gannim, "spring of gardens"):

(1) A town in the territory of Judah, named with Zanoah and Eshtaol (Jos 15:34). It is probably identical with the modern Umm Jina, South of Wady ec-Carar, not far from Zanoah (Zanu‘a).

(2) A town in the lot of Isaachat (Jos 19:21), assigned to the Gershonite Levites (21:29). In 1Ch 6:73 it is replaced by Anem. It probably corresponds to the Ginnea of Josephus (Ant., XX, vi, 1; BJ, III, iii, 4), and may certainly be identified with the modern Jenin, a prosperous village on the southern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, with beautiful gardens, fruitful orchards and plentiful supplies of water from the local springs.

W. Ewing

EN-GEDI

en’-ge-di, en-ge’-di (‘en gedhi, "fountain of the kid"):

Identical with the present Ain Jidi. According to 2Ch 20:2 it is the same as Hazazon-tamar, mentioned in Ge 14:7 as occupied by the Amorites and as having been attacked by Chedorlaomer after leaving Kadesh and El Paran on his way to the Vale of Siddim. The place is situated upon the West shore of the Dead Sea about midway between the North and the South ends, and was included in the territory of Judah (Jos 15:62). The spot is rendered attractive by the verdure clothing it by reason of immense fountains of warm water, 80 degrees F., which pour out from beneath the limestone cliffs.

In the time of Solomon (So 1:14) palms and vines were cultivated here. Josephus also mentions its beautiful palm groves.

In the time of Eusebius it was still a place of importance, but since the Middle Ages it has been almost deserted, being occupied now only by a few Arabs. The oasis occupies a small area a few hundred feet above the Dead Sea marked by the 650 ft. sedimentary terrace heretofore described (see DEAD SEA). The limestone borders rise so abruptly to a height of 2,000 ft. immediately on the West, that the place can be approached only by a rock-cut path. Two streams, Wady Sugeir and Wady el- Areyeh, descend on either side through precipitous rocky gorges from the uninhabitable wilderness separating it from Bethlehem and Hebron. It was in the caves opening out from the sides of these gorges that David took refuge from Saul (1Sa 24:1). During the reign of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:2), the children of Ammon, Moab and Mt. Seir attempted to invade Judah by way of En-gedi, but were easily defeated as they came up from the gorges to occupy the advantageous field of battle chosen by Jehoshaphat.

George Frederick Wright

EN-HADDAH

en-had’-a (‘en chaddah, "swift fountain"):

A town in the lot of Issachar mentioned along with En-gannim (Jos 19:21).

It is probably identical with Kefr Adan, a village some 3 miles West of Jenin.

EN-HAKKORE

en-hak’-o-re, en-hak-o’-re (‘en ha-qore’," spring of the partridge"):

Interpreted (Jud 15:19) as meaning "the spring of him that called." So the Septuagint: pege tou epikaloumenou. The spring was in Lehi but the site is unknown.

EN-HAZOR

en-ha’-zor (‘en chatsor; pege Asor):

A city in the territory of Naphtali mentioned along with Kedesh, Edrei and Iron (Jos 19:37). The ancient name probably survives in that of Hazireh, on the slopes West of Kedesh. "En" however points to a fountain. and no fountain has been found here.

EN-MISHPAT

en-mish’-pat.

See KADESH.

EN-RIMMON

en-rim’-on (‘en-rimmon, "the fountain of Rimmon" (see RIMMON), or perhaps "the spring of the pomegranate"; Eromoth, Rhemmon):

A city of Judah (Jos 15:32), "Ain and Rimmon"; ascribed to Simeon (Jos 19:7; 1Ch 4:32, "Ain, Rimmon"). In Ne 11:29 mentioned as reinhabited after the Captivity. Zec 14:10, runs: "All the land shall be made like the Arabah, from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem." It must have been a very southerly place. In the Eusebius, Onomasticon, ("Erimmon") it is described as a "very large village 16 miles South of Eleutheropolis." Kh. Umm er Rumamin, 9 miles North of Beersheba is the usually accepted site. See PEF, 398; Sh XXIV.

E. W. G. Masterman

EN-ROGEL

en-ro’-gel (‘en roghel; pege Rhogel; meaning uncertain, but interpreted by some to mean "the spring of the fuller"):

No argument from this meaning can be valid because

(1) it is a very doubtful rendering and

(2) "fulling" vats are common in the neighborhood of most town springs and are today plentiful at both the proposed sites. G. A. Smith thinks "spring of the current," or "stream," from Syriac rogulo, more probable.

(1) En-rogel was an important landmark on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (Jos 15:7; 18:16). Here David’s

spies, Jonathan and Ahimaaz, hid themselves (2Sa 17:17), and here (1Ki 1:9) "Adonijah slew sheep and oxen and fatlings by the stone of Zoheleth, which is beside En-rogel," when he anticipated his father's death and caused himself rebelliously to be proclaimed king.

(2) The identification of this important landmark is of first-class importance in Jerusalem topography. Two sites have been proposed:

(a) The older view identifies En-rogel with the spring known variously as "the Virgin's Fount," 'Ain sitti Miriam and 'Ain Umm el deraj, an intermittent source of water which rises in a cave on the West side of the Kedron valley opposite Siloam (see GIHON). The arguments that this is the one Jerusalem spring and that this must have been a very important landmark are inconclusive. The strongest argument for this view is that put forward by M. Clermont-Ganneau, who found that a rough rock surface on the mountain slope opposite, an ascent to the village of Silwan, is known as es Zechweleh, a word in which there certainly appears to linger an echo of Zoheleth. The argument is, however, not as convincing as it seems. Firstly, Zoheleth was a stone; this is a natural rock scarp; such a stone might probably have been transferred from place to place. Secondly, it is quite common for a name to be transferred some miles; instances are numerous. Thirdly, the writer, after frequent inquiries of the fellahin of Silwan, is satisfied that the name is by no means confined to the rock scarp near the spring, but to the whole ridge running along from here to, or almost to, Bir Eyyub itself. The strongest argument against this identification is, however, that there are so much stronger reasons for identifying the "Virgin's Fount" with Gihon (see GIHON), and that the two springs En-rogel and Gihon cannot be at one site, as is clear from the narrative in 1Ki 1.

(b) The view which places En-rogel at Bir Eyyub in every way harmonizes with the Bible data. It has been objected that the latter is not a spring but a well. It is today a well, 125 ft. deep, but one with an inexhaustible supply—there must be a true spring at the bottom. Probably one reason it only overflows today after periods of heavy rain is that such enormous quantities of debris have now covered the original valley bed that the water cannot rise to the surface; much of it flows away down the valley deep under the present surface. The water is brackish and is impregnated with sewage, which is not extraordinary when we remember that a large part of the rock strata from which the water comes is overlaid by land constantly irrigated with the city's sewage.

Although the well may itself be of considerable antiquity, there is no need to insist that this is the exact position of the original spring En-rogel. The source may in olden times have arisen at some spot in the valley bottom which is now deeply buried under the rubbish, perhaps under the southernmost of the irrigated gardens of the fellahin of Silwan. The neighborhood, at the junction of two deep valleys—not to count the small el wad, the ancient Tyropceon—is a natural place for a spring. There would appear to have been considerable disturbance here. An enormous amount of debris from various destructions of the city has collected here, but, besides this, Josephus records a tradition which appears to belong to this neighborhood. He says (Ant., IX, x, 4) that an earthquake took place once at Eroge—which appears to be En-rogel—when "half of the mountain broke off from the remainder on the West, and rolling 4 furlongs, came to stand on the eastern mountain till the roads, as well as the .king's gardens, were blocked." It is sufficient that En-rogel is to be located either at Bir Eyyub or in its immediate neighborhood; for practical purposes the former will do. En-rogel was an important point on the boundary line between Judah and Benjamin. The line passed down the lower end of the Kidron valley, past En- rogel (Bir Eyyub) and then up the Valley of Hinnom (Wady er Rababi)—a boundary well adapted to the natural conditions.

With regard to David's spies (2Sa 17:17), whereas the Virgin's Fount—the great source of the city's water supply (see GIHON)—just below the city walls (see ZION) was an impossible place of hiding, this lower source, out of sight of almost the whole city and removed a considerable distance from its nearest point, was at least a possible place. Further, the facts that it was off the main road, that it afforded a supply of one of the main necessities of life—water—and that there were, as there are today, many natural caves in the neighborhood, greatly added to its suitability.

Here too was a most appropriate place for Adonijah's plot (1Ki 1:9). He and his confederates dared not go to Gihon, the original sacred spring, but had to content themselves with a spot more secluded, though doubtless still sacred. It is

recorded (1Ki 1:40,41) that the adherents of Solomon saluted him at Gihon (the Virgin’s Fount) and the people "rejoiced with great joy, so that the earth rent with the sound of them. And Adonijah and all the guests that were with him (at En-rogel) heard it as they had made an end of eating." The relative positions of these two springs allow of a vivid reconstruction of the narrative as do no other proposed identifications. The two spots are out of sight the one of the other, but not so far that the shout of a multitude at the one could not be carried to the other.

E. W. G. Masterman

EN-SHEMESH

en-she’-mesh (‘en shemesh, "spring of the sun"):

An important landmark on the boundary line between Judah and Benjamin (Jos 15:7; 18:17).

The little spring ‘Ain el chand, East of Bethany, the last spring on the road descending to Jericho, seems to suit the conditions. ‘Ain el chaud is usually called the "Apostles’ Fountain" by Christians, on account of a tradition dating from the 15th century that the apostles drank there.

EN-TAPPUAH

en-tap’-u-a, en-ta-pu’-a (‘en tappuach; pege Thaphthoth, "apple spring"):

Probably in the land of Tappuah which belonged to Manasseh, although Tappuah, on the border of Manasseh, belonged to Ephraim (Jos 17:7 f). It lay on the border of Ephraim which ran southward East of Shechem, and is probably to be identified with the spring at Yasuf, about 3 miles North of Lebonah.

ENABLE

en-a’-b’-l:

Only in 1Ti 1:12 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) in the sense of "strengthen" (Greek endunamoo, "endue with strength").

ENAIM

e-na’-im (‘enayim, "place of a fountain"; Ainan; Ge 38:14 (the King James Version "in an open place"; Ge 38:21 the King James Version "openly")):

A place which lay between Adullam and Timnath; probably the same as Enam (Jos 15:34). Also mentioned in close connection with Adullam. It was in the Shephelah of Judah. The Talmud (Pesik. Rab. 23) mentions a Kephar Enaim. Conder proposes Khurbet Wady ‘Alin, which is an ancient site, evidently of great strength and importance, lying between Kh. ‘Ain Shems and the village of Deir Aban. The ruins crown a lofty and almost isolated hill; the greatest objection to the identification is that there is no fountain at all in the immediate neighborhood. There may have been one in earlier times. See PEF, III, 128.

E. W. G. Masterman

ENAM

e’-nam.

See preceding article.

ENAN

e’-nan (‘enan, "having fountains," or "eyes," i.e. "keen-eyed"; in Septuagint Ainan):

The father of Ahira, and prince of Naphtali at the first census of Israel (Nu 1:15; 2:29; 7:78,83; 10:27).

ENASIBUS

e-nas’-i-bus (Enasibos, APC 1Esdras 9:34):

Corresponding to "Eliashib" in Ezr 10:36.

ENCAMPMENT

en-kamp’-ment.

See WAR.

ENCAMPMENT BY THE RED SEA

According to the version of the wanderings of Israel given in Nu 33, they "encamped by the Red Sea" (Nu 33:10) after leaving Elim and before entering the Wilderness of Sin.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

ENCHANTMENT

en-chant’-ment:

The occult arts, either supposedly or pretentiously supernatural, were common to all oriental races. They included enchantment, sorcery, witchcraft, sooth-saying, augury, necromancy, divination in numberless forms, and all kinds of magic article Nine varieties are mentioned in one single passage in the Pentateuch (De 18:10,11); other varieties in many passages both in the Old Testament and New Testament, eg. Le 19:26,31; Isa 2:6; 57:3; Jer 27:9; Mic 5:12; Ac 8:9,11; 13:6,8; Ga 5:20; Re 9:21.

The extent of the magic arts (forbidden under Judaism and Christianity) may incidentally be seen from the fact that the Scriptures alone refer to their being practiced in Chaldea (Da 5:11), Babylon (Eze 21:21), Assyria (2Ki 17:17), Egypt (Ex 7:11), Canaan (Le 18:3,11; 19:26,31), Asia (Ephesus, Ac 19:13,19), Greece (Ac 16:16), Arabia also, as "customs from the East," etc. (Isa 2:6) indicates. These secret arts were prohibited by the laws of Moses (De 18:9-12), inasmuch as they constituted a peculiar temptation to Israel to apostatize. They were a constant incentive to idolatry, clouded the mind with superstition, tended and were closely allied to imposture (Mt 24:24). The term "enchantment" is found only in the Old Testament and its Hebrew originals indicate its varieties.

(1) laTim, and lehaTim "to wrap up," "muffie," "cover," hence, "clandestine," "secret." It was this hidden element that enabled the magicians of Egypt to impose on the credulity of Pharaoh in imitating or reproducing the miracles of Moses and Aaron; "They .... did in like manner with their enchantments" (Ex 7:11,22). Their inability to perform a genuine miracle is shown by Ex 8:18.

(2) nachash, "to hiss," "whisper" referring to the mutterings of sorcerers in their incantations. Used as a derivative noun this Hebrew word means "a serpent." This involves the idea of cunning and subtlety. Although employed in the wider sense of augury or prognostication, its fundamental meaning is divination by serpents. This was the form of enchantment sought by Balaam (Nu 24:1). Its impotence against the people of God is shown by Nu 23:23 m. Shalmaneser forced this forbidden art upon the Israelites whom he carried captive to Assyria (2Ki 17:17). It was also one of the heathen practices introduced during the apostasy under Ahab, against which Elijah protested (compare 1Ki 21:20).

(3) lachash, "to whisper," "mutter," an onomatopoetic word, like the above, in imitation of the hiss of serpents. It is used of the offensive practice of serpent charming referred to in Ec 10:11, and as Delitzsch says, in the place cited., "signifies the whispering of formulas of charming." See also Isa 3:3, "skilful enchanter"; Jer 8:17, "serpents, cockatrices (the Revised Version (British and American) "adders") .... which will not be charmed"; Ps 58:4,5, "the voice of charmers (the Revised Version, margin "enchanters"), charming never so wisely." Ophiomancy, the art of charming serpents, is still practiced in the East.

(4) chebher, "spell," from chabhar, "to bind," hence, "to bind with spells," "fascinate," "charm," descriptive of a species of magic practiced by binding knots. That this method of imposture, eg. the use of the magic knot for exorcism and other purposes, was common, is indicated by the monuments of the East. The moral mischief and uselessness of this and other forms of enchantment are clearly shown in Isa 47:9,12. This word is also used of the charming of serpents (De 18:11; Ps 58:5).

(5) ‘anan, "to cover," "to cloud," hence, "to use covert arts." This form of divination was especially associated with idolatry (so Gesenius, Hebrew Lexicon). Delitzsch, however, in a note on this word (Isa 2:6), doubts the meaning "conceal" and thinks that it signifies rather "to gather auguries from the clouds." He translates it "cloud-interpretive" (Mic 5:12). This view is not generally supported. Rendered "enchanters" (Jer 27:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "soothsayers"; so also in Isa 2:6). Often translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "practice augury," as in Le 19:26; De 18:10,14; 2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6; a form of magical art corresponding in many respects to that of the Greek mantis, who uttered oracles in a state of divine frenzy. Septuagint kledonizomai, i.e. augury through the reading or acceptance of a sign or omen. A kindred form of enchantment is mentioned in the New Testament (2Ti 3:13; Greek goetes, "enchanters," "jugglers," the original indicating that the incantations were uttered in a kind of howl; rendered "seducers" the King James Version, "impostors" the Revised Version (British and American); compare Re 19:20). The New Testament records the names of several magicians who belonged to this class of conscious impostors: Simon Magus (Ac 8:9); Bar-Jesus and Elymas (Ac 13:6,8); the slave girl with the spirit of Python ("divination," Ac 16:16); "vagabond (the Revised Version (British and American) "strolling") Jews, exorcists" (Ac 19:13; compare Lu 11:19); also the magicians of Moses’ day, named Jannes and Jambres (2Ti 3:8).

All these forms of enchantment claimed access through supernatural insight or aid, to the will of the gods and the secrets of the spirit world. In turning away faith and expectation from the living God, they struck a deadly blow at the heart of true religion. From the enchanters of the ancient Orient to the medicine-men of today, all exponents of the "black art" exercise a cruel tyranny over the benighted people, and multitudes of innocent victims perish in body and soul under their subtle impostures. In no respect is the exalted nature of the Hebrew and Christian faiths more clearly seen than in their power to emancipate the human mind and spirit from the mental and moral darkness, the superstition and fear, and the darkening effect of these occult and deadly articles.

For more detailed study see DIVINATION; ASTROLOGY.

Dwight M. Pratt

END

qets, ‘ephec, kalah; telos, sunteleo:

The end of anything is its termination, hence, also, final object or purpose.

It is the translation of several Hebrew and Greek words, chiefly in the Old Testament of qets (properly, "a cutting off") and other words from the same root (Ge 6:13, "The end of all flesh is come before me"); ‘acharith, "hinder part," is also frequently translated "end" (De 11:12; Ps 37:37,38, American Revised Version: "There is a happy end to the man of peace .... The end of the wicked shall be cut off"; the English Revised Version "latter end" (Ps 37:37), margin "reward" or "future posterity"; Ps 73:17; Jer 5:31); coph (from cuph "to come to an end") is several times translated "end" (2Ch 20:16; Ec 3:11; 7:2). "End" in the sense of purpose is the translation of lema‘an, "to the intent" (Ex 8:22, "to the end thou mayest know"), and of dibhrah (from dabhar, "to speak"); Ec 7:14 "to the end that man should find nothing after him" (the Revised Version (British and American) "should not find out anything (that shall be) after him"). "Ends of the earth" is the translation of ‘ephec, "extremities" (De 33:17; Ps 22:27), also of kanaph, "wing" (Job 37:3; 38:13). Other words are netsah, "utmost" (Job 34:36), tequphah, "circuit," "revolution" (Ex 34:22; 2Ch 24:23, the Revised Version, margin "revolution"), etc. The verb occurs almost invariably in the phrase "to make an end," as the translation of kalah, "to finish," "complete" (Ge 17:3; De 20:9; Jer 26:8, etc.); also of nalah, "to complete" (Isa 33:1), and shalam, "to finish" (Isa 38:12,13).

In Da 9:24, the Iteb text has chatham, "to seal up" ("to complete or finish"), but the margin, followed by the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American), Driver and most moderns, has hathem, "to finish," "end," "complete," a difference of one letter, but practically none in the sense, "to bring to an end"; compare "to finish the transgression," which precedes.

In the New Testament the common word for "end" is telos "an end," "completion," "termination" (Mt 10:22; 24:6; Joh 13:1, the Revised Version, margin "to the uttermost"; Ro 6:21, "The end of those things is death"; Ro 6:22, "the end eternal life; Ro 10:4, Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness"; Re 21:6; Re 22:13, etc.); ekbasis, "outgoing" (Heb 13:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "issue"); sunteleia, "full end," is used of "the end of the world" (Mt 13:39; Heb 9:26); peras, "extremity," "the ends of the world" (Ro 10:18); akros, "a point, end" (Mt 24:31, "from one end of heaven to the other"). End as purpose is the translation of eis to, "with a view to" (Ac 7:19; Ro 1:11; 4:16; 1Th 3:13); of eis touto, "unto this" (Joh 18:37; Ro 14:9; 2Co 2:9); of pros to, "toward this" (Lu 18:1). "To end" (verb) is pleroo, "to fill up" (Lu 7:1; Ac 19:21); once ginomai, "to become" (Joh 13:2, "supper being ended," which the Revised Version (British and American) corrects, giving, "during supper").

For "end" the Revised Version (British and American) has "uttermost part" (Jos 15:8, etc.), "latter end" (Ps 73:17; the English Revised Versionps 37:38; Pr 5:4); "issue" (Da 12:8, margin "latter end"; Heb 13:7); "side" (Eze 41:12). Conversely, it has "end" for "uttermost part" (Jos 15:5); for "side" (De 4:32); for "conclusion" (Ec 12:13); for "an end" (Pr 23:18); "a reward," margin "sequel" or "future," Hebrew "latter end"; "final" (Heb 6:16); for "an end of" (Job 18:2), "snares for" (the American Standard Revised Version "hunt for"); for "at one end" (Jer 51:31), "on every quarter"; for "until the day and night come to an end" (Job 26:10), "unto the confines of light and darkness"; for "have an end" (Lu 22:37), "hath fulfillment," margin, Greek "end"; for "to the end for" (1Pe 1:13), "perfectly on"; "at the end of" for "in these last days" (Heb 1:2); "His end was nigh" for "He died" (Heb 11:22); "its own end," instead of "for himself" (Pr 16:4, margin "his own purpose"); "neither is there any end to" instead of "for thine iniquities are infinite" (Job 22:5); "to this end" for "therefore" (Mr 1:38; 1Ti 4:10); for "for this cause," "to this end" (Joh 18:37 twice), "unto this end" (1Pe 4:6); "to this end" for "for this purpose" (Ac 26:16; 1 Joh 3:8); "to which end" for "wherefore" (2Th 1:11); "to the end" is inserted in Ge 18:19 bis, and several other passages.

For "ends of the earth" see ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 2.

W. L. Walker

END OF THE WORLD

See ESCHATOLOGY; WORLD, END OF THE.

ENDAMAGE

en-dam'-aj:

Archaic for "damage"; Ezr 4:13 the King James Version: "Thou shalt damage the revenue of the kings," the Revised Version (British and American) "It will be hurtful unto the kings" (Aramaic nezaq);

compare APC 1Esdras 6:33.

ENDEAVOR

en-de'-ver:

The sense of this word has suffered weakening since the time of the King James Version. Then it implied utmost exertion and success; now rather forlorn hope and possible failure. Thus the Revised Version (British and American) reads "giving diligence," "give diligence," for the King James Version "endeavoring," "endeavor," in Eph 4:3; 2Pe 1:15, respectively; but "endeavored" is suffered to remain in 1Th 2:17 (spoudazo, "hasten," "exert oneself"). Compare also Ac 16:10, the King James Version "endeavored," the Revised Version (British and American) "sought" (Greek zeteo, "seek").

ENDIRONS

end'-i-urnz (shephattayim):

Used once (Eze 40:43 the King James Version) in the margin only. In text, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "hooks," denoting stalls or places for the fastening of victims for sacrifice, or perhaps the two hearthstones. The term is a corruption from another word similar in form and identity of usage. This word, "andiron," from Middle English, has assumed many peculiar forms, as "anderne," "aundirne," from which the form is doubtless derived, though this is not the original and has no relation to it. the American Revised Version, margin reads, "According to Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) and Syriac, ledges."

ENDLESS

end'-les (akatalutos (Heb 7:16), aperantos (1Ti 1:4)):

This English word occurs twice in the New Testament, and is there represented by the two Greek words above noted.

(1) In Heb 7:16 Jesus is said to be a priest "after the power of an endless life." The word means literally, as in the Revised Version, margin, "indissoluble." It is not simply that Christ's priesthood was eternal. The priesthood was based upon His possession, by nature, of a life which in time and eternity death could not touch. This distinguished Him essentially from priests under the law.

(2) In 1Ti 1:4, Paul warns Timothy against giving heed in his ministry to "fables (muthoi) and endless (limitless) genealogies." The allusion seems to be to the series of emanations (aeons) in Gnostic speculation, to which no limit could be set.

Distinct from the above are the words denoting "everlasting," "eternal," which see.

James Orr

ENDOW; ENDUE

en-dou', en-du':

"Endow" meant originally "to provide with a dowry"; "indue" took the meaning "clothe"; the likeness between the literal meanings has confused the metaphorical use of the words in spite of their difference in origin. Thus we find in Ge 30:20, the King James Version "endued me with a good dowry" the Revised Version (British and American) "endowed" (zabhadh, "bestow upon," "endow"); Ex 22:16, the King James Version "endow her to be his wife" the Revised Version (British and American) "pay a dowry for her" mahar, "purchase" "endow"; compare De 22:29; 2Ch 2:12,13, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "endued" with understanding (from yadha', "know"); and Lu 24:49, the King James Version "endued with power," the Revised Version (British and American) "clothed" (enduo, "clothe").

F. K. Farr

ENDS OF THE EARTH

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 2.

ENDURE

en-dur':

Used in the Bible

(1) in the sense of "continue," "last," as in Ps 9:7, "The Lord shall endure for ever" (the American Standard Revised Version "Yahweh sitteth as king forever"); Ps 30:5, "Weeping may endure for a night" (the Revised Version (British and American) "tarry" margin "may come in to lodge at even"); Joh 6:27, "the meat which endureth," the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the food which abideth";

(2) in the sense of "bear" (Heb 12:20): "bear up under," hardship, persecution, etc. (2Ti 3:11; 1Pe 2:19); "to remain under" (Heb 10:32; 12:2; Jas 1:12; 5:11); "to be strong, firm" (Heb 11:27); "to persevere" beneath a heavy burden (Mt 10:22).

ENEMESSAR

en-e-mes'-ar (Enemessar, Enemessaros):

Generally allowed, since Grotius, to be a corruption, though occasionally defended as an alternative form, of Shalmaneser (APC Tobit 1:2,15, etc.) who carried Israel captive to Nineveh, as related in 2 Ki. Among the captives was Tobit, taken

from Thisbe in Gilead, where the prophet Elijah was born and for a time lived. The writer of Tobit makes Sennacherib the son (1 15), as well as the successor of Enemessar, whereas, according to the Assyrian inscriptions, Sennacherib was the son of Sargon. This is only one of several serious historical difficulties in the narrative of Tobit. The corruption of the name is variously explained. Rawlinson supposes the first syllable of the word "Shal" to have been dropped, comparing the Bupalussor of Abydenus for Nabopolassar. Dr. Pinches takes Enemessar for Senemessar, the "sh" being changed to "s" and then to the smooth breathing, though the rough breathing more commonly takes the place of a dropped "s"; both scholars admit the easy transposition of the liquids "m" and "n". Shalman-asharid is the Assyrian form of Shalmaneser.

J. Hutchison

ENEMY

en'-e-mi ('oyebh, tsar, tsar; echthros):

"Enemy," "enemies," are frequent words in the Old Testament. The Hebrew word most often so translated is 'oyebh, meaning perhaps literally, "one who hates"; very frequent in the Psalms, eg. 3:7; 6:10; 7:5; 8:2; 9:3,1; 13:2, where the cry is often for deliverance from enemies. Another word for "enemy," found chiefly in the poetical books, is tsar, or tsar, "distresser," "straitener" (Nu 10:9; Job 16:9; Ps 27:2,12, the Revised Version (British and American) "adversary," etc.); also tsarar (Es 3:10; Ps 8:2; 10:5 the King James Version, etc.). Other words are 'ar, "one awake" (1Sa 28:16 the King James Version; Da 4:19 the King James Version); sane', perhaps, "to be sharp or bite" (Ex 1:10; Pr 25:21; 27:6); sharar, "to watch" (Ps 5:8; 27:11), and qum, "to stand up," or "withstand" (Ex 32:25).

In the New Testament echthros, "enemy," "opponent," is the only word translated "enemy" (Mt 5:43,14; Mr 12:36; Lu 1:71,74, etc.; Ro 5:10; 11:28, etc.), once with anthropos ("a man"), joined to echthros (Mt 13:28).

In the Revised Version (British and American) "adversary" is frequently substituted for "enemy" (Nu 24:8; De 32:41; Ps 6:7; 7:6; 44:10, etc.); for "O thou enemy," etc. (Ps 9:6) we have "The enemy are come to an end"; instead of "When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him" (Isa 59:19) we have "For he will come as a rushing stream, which the breath of Yahweh driveth" (with the text of the King James Version in margins); for "The fire of thine enemies shall devour them" (Isa 26:11), "Fire shall devour thine adversaries" (text of the King James Version in the margin).

The frequent reference to enemies in the Old Testament is what we should expect to see in these early times on the part of a people settling in a land that had been occupied by other tribes, worshipping other gods. The spirit of their law was that expressed by our Lord in His Sermon on the Mount, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy." This He changed: "but I say unto you, Love your enemies." An approach toward this spirit had been made in the later prophets by their inclusion of the whole world under one God, who had a gracious purpose toward all, but the near statement of it we only find in Pr 25:21 (quoted by Paul, Ro 12:20). See also Ex 23:4, and compare 2Ki 6:22; 2Ch 28:15.

W. L. Walker

ENENEUS

e-ne'-ne-us, en-e-ne-us (Enenios; the King James Version Enenius, the Revised Version, margin "Enenis"):

Occurring only in Apocrypha. According to APC 1Esdras 5:8, Eneneus was one of the 12 leaders over the returning exiles from Babylon under Zerubbabel. Ezr 2 contains the parallel list of the returning leaders but omits Eneneus, giving only 11; but Eneneus corresponds to Nahamani (Ne 7:7).

ENFLAME

See INFLAME.

ENGAGE

en-gaj’:

From ‘arabh, "to pledge," Jer 30:21, the King James Version "Who is this that engaged his heart?"; the Revised Version (British and American) "he that hath had boldness?"; the Revised Version, margin Hebrew "hath been surety for his heart?"

ENGINE

en’-jin (2Ch 26:15; Eze 26:9; APC 1Macc 6:51; 13:43 f).

See SIEGE.

ENGLISH VERSIONS

in’-glish vur’-shunz:

Contents

1. Introductory 2. The Bible in Anglo-Saxon and Norman Times 3. John Wycliffe 4. How Far Was the 14th-Century Version Wycliffe’s Work? 5. From Wycliffe to Tyndale 6. William Tyndale 7. Miles Coverdale 8. Matthew’s Bible 9. Richard Taverner 10. The Great Bible (Cranmer’s Bible) 11. Reaction, 1541-57 12. Edward VI 13. Mary 14. The Geneva Bible (the "Breeches Bible") 15. The Bishops’ Bible 16. Rheims and Douai Version 17. The Authorized Version 18. The Apocrypha 19. Further Revisions 20. English Revised Version 21. American Revised Version 22. Has the Revised Version (British and American) Displaced the King James Version? 23. LITERATURE

==========

English Versions of the Scriptures.

1. Introductory:

The battle for vernacular Scripture, the right of a nation to have the sacred writings in its own tongue, was fought and won in England. Ancient VSS, such as the Syriac and the Gothic, were produced to meet obvious requirements of the teacher or the missionary, and met with no opposition from any quarter. The same was the case with the efforts of the Anglo-Saxon church to provide portions of Scripture for the use of the people. Even in later times the Latin church seems to have followed no consistent policy in permitting or forbidding the translation of the Scriptures. In one country the practice was forbidden, in another it was regarded with forbearance or permitted under authority (Addis and Arnold, Catholic Dictionary, London, 1884, article "Bible"); and so it came about that the different nations of Europe came by the inestimable boon of an open Bible in different ways. Germany, for example, after the attempts of numerous translators who seem to have been quite untrammeled in their work owed, under Providence, to the faith, the intrepidity and the genius of Luther the national version which satisfied it for more than three centuries, and, after a recent and essentially conservative revision, satisfies it still. In England, as related below, things took a different course. In the Reformation

period the struggle turned mainly on the question of the translation of the Bible.

2. The Bible in Anglo-Saxon and Norman Times:

The clergy and learned men had always of course access to the Scriptures in the Vulgate, a translation of the original Scriptures into Latin completed by Jerome at the very beginning of the 5th century; and from this version—the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.)—practically all further translations were made till the days of Luther. Within a century or little more after the landing of Augustine in England and his settlement at Canterbury (597 AD) Caedmon, a monk of Whitby, produced (670) his metrical version of the Bible, hardly indeed to be reckoned a version of the Scriptures in the ordinary sense, though it paved the way for such. Bede of Jarrow (672-735) translated the Creed and the Lord's Prayer and, according to the beautiful letter of his pupil, Cuthbert, breathed his last on the completion of his translation of the Gospel of John into the language of the people. Aldhelm, bishop of Sherborne in the county of Dorset (died 709), translated the Psalter in another translation with which the name of King Alfred is associated; and the other efforts of that ruler to spread the knowledge of the Scriptures among his people are well known. Notice, too, should be taken of the glosses. "The gloss," says Eadie (English Bible, I, 14, note), "was neither a free nor yet a literal translation, but the interlinear insertion of the vernacular, word against word of the original, so that the order of the former was really irrespective of idiom and usage." The finest example of these is seen in the Lindisfarne Gospels, which were written in Latin about the year 700, and provided with an interlinear translation about 950 by Aldred, the priest. These with a version of a considerable section of the Old Testament by Aelfric, archbishop of Canterbury about the year 990, comprise the main efforts at Bible translation into English before the Norman Conquest. In Anglo-Saxon there is no proof of the existence of any translation of the complete Bible, or even of the complete New Testament. The sectional VSS, moreover, cannot be shown to have had any influence upon succeeding versions. For nearly three centuries after the Conquest the inter-relations of the different sections of the people and the conditions of the language prevented any real literary progress. The period, however, was marked by the appearance of fragmentary translations of Scripture into Norman French. From some Augustinian monastery, too, in the north of the East Midland district of England, about the year 1200, appeared the Ormulum, a curious metrical work of some 20,000 lines, consisting of a paraphrase of the Gospel of the day and an explanatory homily for 32 days of the year. Like the work of Caedmon the monk, it was not exactly Bible translation, but it doubtless prepared the way for such. Three versions of the Psalter, naturally always a favorite portion of Scripture with the translator, are assigned to the first half of Wycliffe's century. The reformer himself in one of his tracts urges a translation of the Bible to suit the humbler classes of society, on the plea that the upper classes already have their version in French. It was only in the long and splendid reign of Edward III (1327-77), when the two races that had existed in the country since the Conquest were perfectly united, that the predominance of English asserted itself, and the growth of the power and of the mental activity of the people instinctively demanded a new form of expression. The century of Wycliffe, it is to be remembered, was also that of Langland, Gower and Chaucer.

3. John Wycliffe:

Born in Yorkshire about the year 1320, Wycliffe was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, of which he soon became a Fellow and was for a short time Master, resigning the latter position in the year 1361 on his presentation to a living in Lincolnshire. He died at Lutterworth in Leicestcrshire in 1384. It was during the last quarter of his life that he came forward as a friend of the people and as a prolific writer on their behalf. Notwithstanding the external glory of the reign of Edward III, there was much in the ecclesiastical and social circumstances of the time to justify popular discontent. The Pope derived from England alone a revenue larger than that of any prince in Christendom. The nobles resented the extortion and pretensions of the higher clergy; and, according to Green, "the enthusiasm of the Friars, who in the preceding century had preached in praise of poverty, had utterly died away and left a crowd of impudent mendicants behind it." The Black Death, "the most terrible plague the world ever witnessed," fell in the middle of the century and did much further to embitter the already bitter condition of the poor. In France things were no better than in England, and the Turk had settled permanently in Europe. It is not wonderful that Wycliffe began, as is said, his version of the New Testament with the Book of Revelation. With his social teaching the present article is not specially concerned. It probably involved no more than the inculcation of the inherently democratic and leveling doctrines of Christianity, though some of the Lollards, like the Munster peasants in the German Reformation, associated it with dangerous socialistic practice. In any case the application

of Christianity to the solution of social problems is not in any age easy to effect in practice. His tracts show (Eadie, I, 59 ff) that it was from what Wycliffe had felt the Bible to be to himself that there sprang his strong desire to make the reading of it possible for his countrymen. To this was due the first English version of the Bible. To this also was likewise due the institution of the order of "poor priests" to spread the knowledge of the Bible as widely as possible throughout the country.

4. How Far Was the 14th-Century Version Wycliffe's Work?:

There is some uncertainty as to the exact share which Wycliffe had in the production of the 14th century version. The translation of the New Testament was finished about the year 1380 and in 1382 the translation of the entire Bible was completed, the greater part of the Old Testament being the work of Nicholas Hereford, one of the reformer's most ardent supporters at Oxford. The work was revised on thoroughly sound principles of criticism and interpretation, as these are explained in the prologue to the new edition, by John Purvey, one of Wycliffe's most intimate friends during the latter part of his life, and finished in 1388. "Other scholars," says Mr. F. G. Kenyon, of the British Museum, "assisted him in his work, and we have no certain means of knowing how much of the translation was actually done by himself. The New Testament is attributed to him, but we cannot say with certainty that it was entirely his own work" (Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts, 200, 3rd edition, London, 1898). This entirely corresponds with the position taken up by Forshall and Madden, the editors of the great Oxford edition of Wycliffe's version issued in 4 large quarto volumes in 1850. That work was undertaken to honor Wycliffe and in some measure to repay England's indebtedness to the reformer. The editors were men of the first literary rank; they spent 22 years upon this work; and it is recognized as a credit at once to the scholarship and research of Oxford and of England. Its honest and straightforward Introduction answers by anticipation by far the greater part of the criticisms and claims put forth by Dr. Gasquet (Our Old English Bible and Other Essays, London, 1898; 2nd edition, 1908). The claim is made that the work published in Oxford in 1850 is really not Wycliffe's at all but that of his bitterest opponents, the bishops of the English church who represented the party of Rome. Gasquet's work on this subject is mainly worthy of notice on account of his meritorious research in other departments of the English Reformation. His arguments and statements are met by Kenyon (op. cit., 204-8). The controversy is further noticed in The Age of Wycliffe, by G. M. Trevelyan (2nd edition, London, 1908), a work which cannot be too highly praised for its deep research, its interesting exposition and its cordial appreciation of the reformer and his works. "Nothing," says Trevelyan (Appendix, 361), "can be more damning than the licenses to particular people to have English Bibles, for they distinctly show that without such licenses it was thought wrong to have them." The age of printing, it is to be remembered, was not yet. The Wycliffe Bible was issued and circulated in copies each of which was written by the hand. About 170 copies of this manuscript Bible are still in existence. They form a striking proof of what England and the world owe to the faith, the courage and the labor of John Wycliffe and his "poor priests."

5. From Wycliffe to Tyndale:

It is a remarkable fact that before the year 1500 most of the countries of Europe had been supplied with a version of the Scriptures printed in the vernacular tongue, while England had nothing but the scattered copies of the Wycliffe manuscript version. Even Caxton, eager as was his search for works to translate and to print, while he supplied priests with service-books, preachers with sermons, and the clerk with the "Golden Legende," left the Scriptures severely alone. Nor was there a printed English version, even of the New Testament, for close on half a century after Caxton's death, a circumstance largely due to the energy of the Tudor dictatorship and the severity of the Arundelian Constitutions enacted by Convocation at Oxford in the year 1408:against Wycliffe and his work. These enactments forbade "upon pain of the greater excommunication the unauthorized translation of any text of the Scriptures into English or any other tongue by way of a book, pamphlet, treatise or the reading of such." Meanwhile the study of the new learning, including that of the original languages of Scripture, though generally resisted by the clergy, was greatly promoted by the invention of printing.

6. William Tyndale:

Erasmus, perhaps the chief representative name of the new age in the domain of learning, was professor of Greek at Cambridge from 1509 to 1524, and in the 2nd year of his professorship William Tyndale, an Oxford student in the 26th

year of his age, migrated to Cambridge to study Greek. Ten years later Tyndale returned to his native county—Gloucestershire—to take up a private tutorship and there formed the determination which became the one fixed aim of his life—to put an English translation, not of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) but of the original Greek and Hebrew Scriptures, into the hands of his countrymen. "If God spared him life," he said, "ere many years he would cause a boy that driveth a plow to know more of the Scriptures than the Pope did." Erasmus at Cambridge had uttered a similar aspiration. "He boldly avows his wish for a Bible open and intelligible to all. ....' I long for the day when the husbandman shall sing to himself portions of the Scriptures as he follows the plow, when the weaver shall hum them to the time of his shuttle, when thetraveler shall while away with their stories the weariness of his journey'"(Green, History of the English People, 1st edition, 308). In 1522 Tyndale went to London to try to find a patron for his work in Tunstall, bishop of London, who had studied Greek with Latimer at Padua and was one of the most noted humanists of the day. To show himself capable for the work, Tyndale took with him to London a version of a speech of Isocrates. But the Bishop of London's service was full; and after spending a year with a friendly alderman in London, "at last," he says in the Preface to his Five Books of Moses, "I understood not only that there was no room in my Lord of London's palace to translate the New Testament, but also that there was no place to do it in all England." He left the country and never returned to it. He spent the remaining twelve years of his life in exile and for the most part in great hardship, sustained by steady labor and by the one hope of his life—the giving to his countrymen of a reliable version of the Holy Scriptures in their own tongue. He went first to Hamburg, and there, as it seems, issued in the year 1524 versions of Mt and Mr separately, with marginal notes. Next year he removed to Cologne, and arranged for the printing of the complete New Testament, the translation of which he accomplished alone, from the study of the Greek text of Erasmus in its original and revised editions and by a comparison of these with the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) and several European vernacular versions which, as already stated, had anticipated that of England. The story of the interruption by Cochlaeus of the actual work of printing, and of his warning the King and Wolsey of the impending invasion of England by Lutheranism, reads like a romance. His interference resulted in the prohibition by the city authorities of the printing of the work and in the sudden flight of Tyndale and his assistant, Joye, who sailed up the Rhine with the precious sheets already printed of their 3,000 quarto edition to Worms, the city of the famous Diet in which Luther four years before had borne his testimony before the Emperor. The place was now Lutheran, and here the work of printing could be carried out in security and at leisure. To baffle his enemies, as it seems, a small octavo edition was first printed without glosses; then the quarto edition was completed. The "pernicious literature" of both editions, without name of the translator, was shipped to England early in 1526; and by 1530 six editions of the New Testament in English (three surreptitiously) were distributed, numbering, it is computed, 15,000 copies. The unfavorable reception of Tyndale's work by the King and the church authorities may in some measure be accounted for by the excesses which at the moment were associated with the Reformation in Germany, and by the memories of Lollardism in connection with the work of Wycliffe.

So vehement was the opposition at any rate to Tyndale's work, and so determined the zeal in buying up and burning the book, that of the six editions above mentioned there "remains of the first edition one fragment only; .... of the second one copy, wanting the title-page, and another very imperfect; and of the others, two or three copies which are not however satisfactorily identified" (Westcott, History of the English Bible, 45, London, 1868). Meanwhile Tyndale took to working on the Old Testament. Much discussion has taken place on the question whether he knew Hebrew (see Eadie, I, 209 ff). Tyndale's own distinct avowal is that it was from the Hebrew direct that such translation of the Old Testament as he accomplished was made. Very early in 1531 he published separately versions of Ge and Deuteronomy, and in the following year the whole of the Pentateuch in one volume, with a preface and marginal glosses. In 1534 appeared the Book of Jon, with a prologue; and in the same year a new version of the New Testament to counteract one made by Joye from the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) This has been described by Westcott (op. cit., 185) as "altogether Tyndale's noblest monument," mainly on account of its short and pregnant glosses. "Bengel himself is not more terse or pointed." A beautifully illuminated copy of this edition was struck off on vellum and presented to Queen Anne Boleyn; and an edition of his revised New Testament was printed in London—"The first volume of Holy Scripture printed in England"—in 1536, the year of the Queen's death. Tyndale had for some time lived at Antwerp, enjoying a "considerable yearly exhibition" from the English merchants there; but his enemies in England were numerous, powerful and watchful. In 1534 he was betrayed and arrested; and after an imprisonment of nearly a year and a half at the castle of Vilorde, about 18:miles from Brussels, he was strangled and then burned in 1536, the same year as that of the death of the Queen. The last days of the hero and martyr may have been cheered by the news of the printing of his revised edition of the New

Testament in England.

7. Miles Coverdale:

Miles Coverdale, who first gave England a complete and authorized version of the Bible, was a younger contemporary of Tyndale. Tyndale was a year younger than Luther, who was born in 1483, and Coverdale was four years younger than Tyndale. Born in the North Riding of Yorkshire, he found his way to Cambridge at the time when Erasmus was professor of Greek, and appears at an early date—how is not known—to have got into the good graces of Crumwell, the "malleus monachorum," factotum and secretary to Wolsey, and later on the King's principal abettor in his efforts to render the Church of England thoroughly national, if not to an equal extent Protestant. Adopting the liberal party in the church, he held Lutheran or evangelical views of religion, east off his monastic habit, and, as Bale says, gave himself up wholly to the preaching of the gospel. He is found in 1527 in intimate connection with More and Crumwell and probably from them he received encouragement to proceed with a translation of the Bible. In 1528 he was blamed before Tunstall, bishop of London, as having caused some to desert the mass, the confessional and the worship of images; and seeking safety, he left England for the Continent. He is said by Foxe to have met Tyndale at Hamburg in 1529, and to have given him some help in the translation of the Pentateuch. An uncertainty hangs over Coverdale's movements from 1529 to 1535, a period during which much was happening that could not fail to be powerfully changing opinion in England.

The result of the Assembly held at Westminster by Warham in May, 1530, and of the Convocation held under his successor, Cranmer, in December, 1534, was that in the latter it was petitioned that "his Majesty would vouchsafe to decree that the sacred Scriptures should be translated into the English tongue by certain honest and learned men, named for that purpose by his Majesty, and should be delivered to the people according to their learning." Crumwell, meanwhile, who had a shrewd forecast of the trend of affairs, seems to have arranged with Coverdale for the printing of his translation. However this may be, by the year 1534 "he was ready, as he was desired, to set forth" (i.e. to print) his translation; and the work was finished in 1535. And thus, "as the harvest springs from the seed which germinates in darkness, so the entire English Bible, translated no one knows where, presented itself, unheralded and unanticipated, at once to national notice in 1535" (Eadie, I, 266). It is declared on the title-page to be "faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe: MDXXXV." Coverdale's own statements about his work leave the impression that he was a conspicuously honest man. Unlike Tyndale who regarded himself as, in a way, a prophet, with his work as a necessity Divinely laid upon him, Coverdale describes that he had no particular desire to undertake the work—and how he wrought, as it were, in the language of these days, under a committee from whom he took his instructions and who "required-him to use the Douche (i. e. the German) and the Latyn." He claims further to have done the work entirely himself, and he certainly produced a new version of the Old Testament and a revised version of the New Testament. He used, he says, five sundry interpreters of the original languages. These interpreters were, in all probability, the Vulgate, Luther's version, the Zurich or Swiss-German Bible, the Latin version of Pagninus, and he certainly consulted Tyndale on the Pentateuch and the New Testament. He successfully studied musical effect in his sentences and many of the finest phrases in the King James Version are directly traced to Coverdale. His version of the Psalms is that which is retained and is still in daily use in the ritual of the Church of England. Two new editions of Coverdale's version were issued in 1537 "with the King's most gracious license," and after this the English Bible was allowed to circulate freely. Certain changes in the title-page, prefaces and other details are discussed in the works mentioned at the end of this article.

8. Matthew's Bible:

Convocation meanwhile was not satisfied with Coverdale's translation, and Coverdale himself in his honest modesty had expressed the hope that an improved translation should follow his own. Accordingly in 1537—probably at the suggestion of, and with some support from, Crumwell and certainly to his satisfaction—a large folio Bible appeared, as edited and dedicated to the King, by Thomas Matthew. This name has, since the days of Foxe, been held to be a pseudonym for John Rogers, the protomartyr of the Marian persecution, a Cambridge graduate who had for some years lived in intimacy with Tyndale at Antwerp, and who became the possessor of his manuscript at his death. Besides the New Testament, Tyndale, as above mentioned, had published translations of the Pentateuch, the Book of Jonah, and portions of the Apocrypha, and

had left a manuscript version of Joshua to 2 Chronicles. Rogers, apparently taking all he could find of the work of Tyndale, supplemented this by the work of Coverdale and issued the composite volume with the title, "The Bible, which is all the Holy Scriptures, in which are contayned the Olde and Newe Testaments, truely and purely translated into English by Thomas Matthew. Esaye I, Hearken to, ye heavens, and thou earth, geave eare: for the Lord speaketh. MDXXXVII." After the banning and burning of Tyndale's New Testament on its arrival in England 11 years before, it is not easy to account for the royal sanction with which the translation appeared. It was probably granted to the united efforts of Cranmer and Crumwell, aided perhaps by the King's desire to show action independent of the church. The royal sanction, it will be noted, was given in the same year in which it was given to Coverdale's second edition. That version became the basis of our present Bible. It was on Matthew's version that for 75 years thereafter all other versions were based.

9. Richard Taverner:

Matthew's first edition of 1,500 copies was soon exhausted, and a new edition was issued with some revision by Richard Taverner, a cultivated young layman and lawyer who had in his early years been selected by Wolsey for his college at Oxford. He was imprisoned in its cellar for reading Tyndale's New Testament; but he was soon released for his singular musical accomplishments. He was an excellent Grecian, of good literary taste and of personal dignity. For the Old Testament curiously enough he made, good Grecian as he was, no use of the Septuagint; but throughout aimed successfully at idiomatic expression, as also at compression and vividness. Some of his changes are kept in the King James Version, such as "parables" for "similitudes" and in Mt 24:12, "The love of the many shall wax cold," and others. He also does greater justice to the Greek article. His dedication to the king is manly and dignified and compares most favorably with the dedications of other translators, including that of the King James Version. The book appeared in two editions, folio and quarto, in 1539, and in the same year two editions, folio and quarto, of the New Testament. The Bible and the New Testament were each reprinted once, and his Old Testament was adopted in a Bible of 1551. But with these exceptions Taverner's version was practically outside of influence on later translations.

10. The Great Bible (Cranmer's Bible):

The next Bible to appear was named from its size. Its pages are fully 15 inches long and over 9 inches broad. It was meant to be in a way a state edition, and is known as the Great Bible. As sufficiently good type, paper and other requisites could not be found in England, it was resolved that it should be printed in Paris. Coverdale and Grafton, the printer, went to Paris to superintend the printing; but the French church authorities interfered and the presses, types and workmen had to be transferred to London where the work was finished. It was the outcome of the Protestant zeal of Crumwell who wished to improve upon the merely composite volume of Tyndale and Coverdale. Its origin is not very accurately known, and authorities such as Hume, Burnet and Froude have ventured upon statements regarding it, for which there is really no proof (Eadie, I, 356 ff). The duty of editor or reviser was by Crumwell assigned to Coverdale who, as a pliant man and really interested in the improvement of the English version, was quite willing to undertake a work that might supersede his own. The rapidity with which the work was executed and the proofs of the minute care devoted to it by Coverdale may appear remarkable to those who are acquainted with the deliberate and leisurely methods of the large committee that produced the King James Version in the reign of King James or the Revised Version (British and American) in the reign of Queen Victoria. Of course Coverdale had been over all the work before and knew the points at which improvements were to be applied; and a zealous and expert individual can accomplish more than a committee. Luther translated the New Testament and, after revising his work with Melanchthon, had it printed and published in less than a year. The printing of the Great Bible began in May, 1538, and was completed in April, 1539, a handsome folio, printed in black letter, with the title, "The Byble in Englyshe, that is to say, the contents of all the holy scripture, bothe of the olde and newe testament, truly translated after the veryte of the Hebrue and Greke textes, by the dylygent studye of dyverse excellent learned men, expert in the forsayde tongues. Prynted by Rychard Grafton and Edward Whitchurch. Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum. 1539." The elaborate notes for which asterisks and various other marks are provided were never supplied; but the actual translation shows devoted attention to the work and much fine appreciation of the original languages and of English. In the New Testament the version derived assistance from the Latin version of Erasmus, and in the Old Testament from Munster and Pagninus. Variations in the text could of course be got from the Complutensian Polyglot. The Great Bible shows considerable improvement upon Tyndale in the New Testament, and upon Coverdale in the Old Testament. "So careful,"

says Eadie (I, 370), "had been Coverdale's revision and so little attachment had he to his own previous version, that in the 53rd chapter of Isaiah the Bible of 1539 differs in nearly forty places from his version of 1535." The clergy of course had no love for Crumwell and still less for his work, though to avert clerical prejudices, Coverdale had made concessions in his translation. The work was cordially welcomed by the people, and a copy was ordered to be printed for every parish church, the cost to be paid half by the parson and half by the parishioners. A further revision of this version was carried out by Coverdale for a second edition which appeared in April, 1540, and is known as Cranmer's Bible, mainly from the judicious and earnest preface which the archbishop wrote for it. "It exhibits a text formed on the same principles as that of 1539, but after a fuller and more thorough revision" (Westcott, 254). Two other editions followed in the same year and three more in the year following (1541).

11. Reaction, 1541-57:

After the publication of the Great Bible (1539-41) no further advance took place for many years. The later years of Henry VIII indeed were marked by serious reaction. In 1542 Convocation with the royal consent made an attempt, fortunately thwarted by Cranmer, to Latinize the English version and to make it in reality what the Romish version of Rheims subsequently became. In the following year Parliament, which then practically meant the King and two or three members of the Privy Council, restricted the use of the English Bible to certain social classes that excluded nine-tenths of the population; and three years later it prohibited the use of everything but the Great Bible. It was probably at this time that there took place the great destruction of all previous work on the English Bible which has rendered examples of that work so scarce. Even Tunstall and Heath were anxious to escape from their responsibility in lending their names to the Great Bible. In the midst of this reaction Henry VIII died, January 28, 1547. 12. Edward VI:

No new work marked the reign of Edward VI, but great activity prevailed in the printing of previous versions Thirty-five New Testaments and thirteen Bibles were published during his reign of six years and a half; and injunctions were issued urging every person to read "the very lively Word of God" and for a copy of the Great Bible with the English paraphrase of Erasmus to be set up in every church. By royal order a New Testament was to be sold for 22nd, a sum representing as many shillings of present value.

13. Mary:

Less repressive work regarding the translation and diffusion of Scripture than might have been expected occurred in the reign of Mary, though in other directions the reaction was severe enough. According to Lord Burghley, during the three years and nine months of Mary's reign, the number of 400 persons perished—men, women, maidens and children—by imprisonment, torment, famine and fire. Among the martyrs were Cranmer and Rogers; Coverdale escaped martyrdom only by exile and the powerful intervention of the king of Denmark. The copies of the Bibles in the churches were of course burned; and—though individual translations were not specified—proclamations were issued against certain books and authors. Still the books were not, as formerly, bought up and confiscated; and so the activity of Edward's reign in the production of Bibles left copies widely distributed throughout the country at the close of Mary's reign. At this time a New Testament was printed at Geneva which had great influence upon future versions of the Bible.

14. The Geneva Bible (the Breeches Bible):

This New Testament was issued in 1557 and was most probably the work of West Whittingham, an English exile who had married Calvin's sister. It was translated from the Greek and compared carefully with other versions It had also a marginal commentary which was more complete than anything similar that had yet appeared in England; and it was the first translation that was printed in roman letter and in which chapters were divided into verses. Calvin wrote for it an introductory epistle, and it had also an address by the reviser himself. A few months after its publication the more serious task of the revision of the whole Bible was begun and continued for the space of two years and more, the translators working at it "day and night." Who the translators were is not said; but Whittingham, probably with Gilby and Sampson, stayed at Geneva for a year and a half after Elizabeth came to the throne, and saw the work through. It was finished in

1560, and in a dignified preface was dedicated to Elizabeth. The cost was met by members of the Congregation at Geneva, among whom was John Bodley, father of the founder of the great library at Oxford. Its handy form—a modest quarto—along with its vigorously expressed commentary, made it popular even with people who objected to its source and the occasional Calvinistic tinge of its doctrines. It became and remained the popular edition for nearly three- quarters of a century. The causes of its popularity are explained in Westcott, 125 f. Bodley had received the patent for its publication; and upon his asking for an extension of the patent for twelve years, the request was generously granted by Archbishop Parker and Grindly, bishop of London, though the Bishops' Bible was already begun.

The "Breeches Bible."

The Geneva version is often called the "Breeches Bible" from its translation of Ge 3:7: "They sewed figleaves together, and made themselves breeches." This translation, however, is not peculiar to the Genevan version. It is the translation of perizomata in both the Wycliffe VSS; it is also found in Caxton's version of the "Golden Legende."

15. The Bishops' Bible:

Queen Elizabeth, the beginning of whose reign was beset with great difficulties, restored the arrangements of Edward VI. A copy of the Great Bible was required to be provided in every church, and every encouragement was given to the reading of the Scriptures. The defects of the Great Bible were admitted, and were the not unnatural result of the haste with which—notwithstanding its two revisions—it had been produced. These became more apparent when set beside the Geneva version, which, however, the archbishop and clergy could hardly be expected to receive with enthusiasm, as they had had nothing to do with its origin and had no control over its renderings and marginal notes. Archbishop Parker, moreover, who had an inclination to Biblical studies, had at the same time a passion for uniformity; and probably to this combination of circumstances may be traced the origin of the Bishops' Bible. Parker superintended the work, which was begun in 1563-64; he was aided by eight bishops—from whom the version received its name—and other scholars. It appeared in a magnificent volume in 1568, without a word of flattery, but with a preface in which the revisers express a lofty consciousness of the importance of their work. It was published in 1568: cum privilegio regiae Majestatis. A revised and in many places corrected edition was issued in 1572, and another in 1575, the year of the archbishop's death. The general aim of the version is a quaint literality, but along with this is found the use of not a few explanatory words and phrases not found in the original text. More exact notice also than in previous versions is taken of the use of the Greek article and of the particles and conjunctions. It bears marks, however, of the hand of the individual translators by whom the work was done; and of the want of the revision of each translator's work by the rest, and of some general revision of the whole. The Genevan version was the work of collegiate labor, to which much of its superiority is due. Though Parker did not object to the circulation of the Genevan version, Convocation after his death made some unsuccessful attempts to popularize the Bishops' Bible; but the Genevan translation was not easily thrust aside. "It grew," says Eadie (II, 35), "to be in greater demand than the Bishops' or Cranmer's. Ninety editions of it were published in the reign of Elizabeth, as against forty of all the other versions Of Bibles, as distinct from New Testaments, there were twenty-five editions of Cranmer's and the Bishops', but sixty of the Genevan."

16. Rheims and Douai Version:

The production of an official version of the sacred Scriptures for English Roman Catholics was probably due more to rivalry with the Reformers than to any great zeal of the authorities of the Roman church for the spread of vernacular Scripture; though, according to the Arundelian Constitution above mentioned, it was only to the printing and reading of unauthorized translations that objection was then taken by the Roman authorities. But if there was to be a special version for Catholics, it was clearly reasonable that the work should be done by Catholics and accompanied by Catholic explanations. This was undertaken by some English Catholic scholars who, on the success of the Reformation in England, had left the country and settled at Douai in the Northeast of France, with a short transference of their seminary to Rheims. The version was probably produced under the influence of (Cardinal) Allen and an Oxford scholar, Gregory Martin. It was made from the Vulgate, the Bible of Jerome and Augustine, and not, like the Protestant VSS, from the Hebrew and Greek

originals. The New Testament was issued from Rheims in 1582 and the Old Testament from Douai in 1609. The main objection to the version is the too close adherence of the translators to the words of the original and the too great Latinizing of the English, so that their translation "needs," as Fuller said, "to be translated." Still they have a few words which along with a few Latinisms were adopted by the translators of the King James Version, such as "upbraideth not," "bridleth his tongue," at his own charges, and others; and they have the special merit of preserving uniformity of rendering. The translation met with no great success and the circulation was not large.

17. The Authorized Version:

The King James Version owed its origin to a chance remark regarding mistranslations in the existing versions made at the Hampton Court Conference, a meeting of bishops and Puritan clergy held (1604) in the interest of religious toleration before James was actually crowned. The meeting was ineffectual in all points raised by the Puritans, but it led to the production of the English Bible. Dr. Reynolds, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, probably with some reference to the rivalry between the Bishops' Bible and the Genevan version, remarked on the imperfections of the current Bibles. The remark was not very enthusiastically received except by the King, who caught eagerly at the suggestion of a fresh version, "professing that he could never yet see a Bible well translated in English," and blaming specially the Genevan version, probably on account of the pointed character of its marginal notes. Probably with the aid of the universities, the King without delay nominated the revisers to the number of fifty-four from among the best Hebrew and Greek scholars of the day. Only 47 actually took part in the work which, however—officially at least—they were in no hurry to begin; for, although named in 1604 and with all the preliminaries arranged before the end of that year, they did not begin their work till 1607. Their remuneration was to be by church preferment, for which the archbishop was to take measures. The immediate expenses, the King suggested, should be supplied by the bishops and chapters who, however, did not respond. "King James' version never cost King James a farthing," says Eadie (II, 153 f), who here gives some interesting information on this aspect of the revision. They wrought in six companies of which two met respectively in Westminster, Cambridge and Oxford. Elaborate rules, given in full in most histories of the Bible, were laid down for the revisers' guidance, the King being particularly insistent upon Rule 9, which provided for the revision of the work of each Company by the rest. When any Company had finished the revision of a book, it was to be sent to all the rest for their criticism and suggestions, ultimate differences of opinion to be settled at a general meeting of each Company. Learned men outside the board of revisers were to be invited to give their opinions in cases of special difficulty.

18. The Apocrypha:

One of the Cambridge Companies was specially appointed to revise the Apocrypha, in which considerable license was taken, as the seven members composing the Company had probably no very firm belief in the inspiration of its books. The marginal notes, too, are freer in character than those of the Old Testament. By the early translators, Tyndale and Coverdale, the Apocrypha was simply accepted as part of the heritage of the church; it had a place likewise in the Great Bible, the Bishops' Bible and most even of the Gentvan copies. But by the middle of the 17th century opinion even in the Church of England had changed regarding it, and it was about this time that Bibles began to be printed having the canonical books only. The Apocrypha is now hardly at all printed otherwise than separately (note also should be taken of the treatment of the Apocrypha in the Revised Version (British and American), as stated below).

Impressed with the importance of their task, the revisers worked strenuously at it for two years; and nine months more were devoted to revision by a special committee consisting of two members from each center, and in 1611 the result of the work appeared. It is not wonderful that the work was described by a contemporary entitled to give a judgment on it (Selden, Table Talk) as "the best translation in the world"—a verdict that later opinion has abundantly ratified. It was the copestone of a work on which 90 years of solid labor had by different hands been expended, and it was done by half a hundred of the foremost scholars of the day who knew Hebrew and Greek, and who also knew English For three centuries it has grown in popular esteem, and it is justly regarded as one of the best possessions and one of the most unifying influences of the widely scattered English-speaking race.

On the title-page as issued in 1611 the version is described as "newly translated out of the original tongues" and as "appointed to be read in churches," two statements not easy to reconcile with the actual facts. The first rule for the revisers' guidance provided that the work was to consist in a revision of the Bishops' Bible: it was not said that it was to be a new translation. There is, further, no sanction of the version by King, Parliament, Convocation or Privy Council. Like Jerome's version twelve centuries before, it was left to find acceptance as best it might by its own intrinsic merit.

19. Further Revisions:

Already in the days of the Commonwealth proposals were made for a new version; but though several meetings were held of a committee appointed by Parliament for the purpose in 1657, nothing came of the movement (Lewis, History of Translations, 354). For nearly half a century the chief rival of the King James Version was the Geneva Bible which was in wide private use. Formal revision was not undertaken again till the reign of Queen Victoria. But between 1611 and the date of the recent revision not a few small alterations had been silently introduced into the King James Version, as was indeed only to be expected if the changes in the orthography of the language were to be correctly represented on the printed page. Advancing literary criticism, too, and minute linguistic study showed that since the days of the revisers many words had changed their meaning, and that verbal inaccuracies and a few less venial errors could be proved in the revisers' work. But what probably weighed most with scholars in inducing them to enter upon a new version was the extraordinary increase that since the last revision had taken place in our knowledge of the Hebrew text and more especially of the Greek text of Scripture. Important manuscripts had been brought to light of which the 17th-century revisers knew nothing, and scholars had with minute care examined and compared all the early copies of the Scripture studies which, without altering the main import of the gospel story, were shown to have considerable importance on the actual words' and sometimes on the meaning of the text. After much discussion of the subject in special volumes and in the leading magazines and reviews of Britain and America, there was a general agreement among scholars that a fresh version was advisable.

20. English Revised Version:

The history of the English revision is given at length in the preface to the English Revised Version of the New Testament. It originated with the Convocation of Canterbury of the Church of England in the year 1870, when a committee of 16 members was appointed with power to add to its numbers. By this committee invitations to join it were issued to the outstanding Hebrew and Greek scholars of the country, irrespective of religious denomination, and eventually two Companies were formed, one for the Old Testament and one for the New Testament, consisting each of 27 members, in which all the churches of the country were represented, the Roman Catholics alone excepted, and Dr. Newman had been invited to join the New Testament committee. The churches of America were also invited to cooperate, and this they did by forming two Companies corresponding to the British with due provision for the mutual comparison of results and suggestions. Where the suggestions from America were not accepted by the British revisers, they were recorded in an appendix to the published volume. The names of the revisers and the rules and principles laid down for the procedure of both Companies will be found in Eadie (II, 481 ff). The New Testament was published in May, 1881; the work occupied the Company for about 40 days in each year for 10 years. The Old Testament revision occupied the Company for 792 days in a period of 14 years. The entire Bible was published in May, 1885. It did not include the Apocrypha, a revision of which was issued separately in 1895.

21. American Revised Version:

This was undertaken, not by Convocation, but by the University Presses, a special Company being formed for the purpose from the Old Testament and New Testament Companies. For AMERICAN REVISED VERSION see separate article.

On REVISED VERSION see also BIBLE.

22. Has the Revised Version (British and American) Displaced the American Version?:

The Revised Version (British and American) has been before the English-speaking world for a quarter of a century and it can hardly be said with safety that it has as yet made any progress in displacing the King James Version in public esteem. Of course as much could be said for the King James Version in its day. It was very slow in gaining acceptance with the people: and yet unreasoning affection for its very words and phraseology is now one of the main obstacles to the acceptance of an admittedly more scientifically based original text and a more correct and not displeasing rendering of the same. A large number of the changes are certainly not such as appeal strongly to popular sympathy. "The Greek text of the New Testament of 1881 has been estimated to differ from that of 1611 in no less than 5,788: readings, of which about a quarter are held notably to modify the subject-matter; though even of these only a small proportion can be considered as of first-rate importance" (Kenyon, 239). On the other hand Hebrew, and especially the cognate Semitic languages, are now a great deal better known than before 1611, and considerable improvement is noticeable in the bringing out of the meaning in the poetical and prophetical books. The Revised Version (British and American) contains the best results of the scholarship of the Victorian age and cannot fail to be regarded as of the greatest utility to the reader and student of the King James Version. In the religious life the mind is essentially conservative, and nothing but time will show whether the undoubted merits of the Revised Version (British and American) are such as to outweigh the claims of sentiment and affection with which the King James Version is held.

See further AMERICAN REVISED VERSION.

23. LITERATURE.

Perhaps the most complete work on the subject in all its aspects is that by Dr. John Eadie, The English Bible: an External and Critical History of the Various English Translations of Scripture, 1876. Eadie was himself one of the revisers of 1870, and some of his concluding chapters contain "Remarks on the Need of Revision of the English New Testament." He is also highly appreciative but judiciously critical of his predecessors in the same field, eg. of Lewis, Complete History of Several Translations of the Holy Bible and New Testament into English, 1731, 1818; and Christopher Anderson, The Annals of the English Bible, 2 volumes, 1845, 1 volume rev. edition, 1862. An earlier and also very good book is Westcott’s General View of the History of the English Bible, 1868. Westcott was also one of the revisers of 1870 and criticizes the work of the various translators as well as narrates the succession of the translations. A good discussion of the internal history of the text will also be found in the History of the English Bible by Dr. Moulton, another of the revisers. Kenyon, Our Bible and Ancient manuscripts, 1895, considers specially the text on which the successive English versions were based. He writes judiciously also on the Wycliffe period and on the Revised Version (British and American). The Wycliffe period should also be studied in Forshall and Madden, 4 volumes, 4to, Oxford, 1850; England in the Age of Wycliffe, by G. M. Trevelyan; Dr. Gasquet’s Our Old English Bible and Other Essays, 1908; and Lechler’s John Wycliffe and His English Precursors, translated and edited by Lorimer. For the Reformation period generally Foxe’s History of the Ac and Monuments of the Church still deserves to be studied. "Foxe’s story is doubtless substantially true, although disfigured by credulity and bitter prejudice." For Tyndale’s special work see William Tyndale, a Biography, by R. Demaus, new edition by Lovett, 1886; and Fry’s Bibliographical Descriptions of the Editions of the New Testament, Tyndale’s Version in English Fry has also written special works on the Great Bible, Cranmer’s Bible and the Genevan Version. The King James Version is very fully described in the works above mentioned, and in this connection notice is due to Scrivener, The Authorised Edition of the English Bible, 1884, and more especially to his careful and thorough "Introduction" to the Quarto Paragraph Bible, 1873. More popular histories of the Bible are those of Stoughton, Pattison, 1874, and Professor Milligan of Glasgow, 1895. General histories of England and of English literature may also be profitably consulted on the history of the Bible and its translation into the vernacular, such as those of Hume, Burnet, Hallam, Froude, Green and Gardiner. The revision of the King James Version called forth a large literature, either in the way of preparation for it or of criticism of it when carried through. To this literature many of the revisers themselves contributed, among whom may be mentioned Eadie, Ellicott, Westcott, Humphry, Newth and Kennedy; nor should the important contributions of Archbishop Trench and Dean Alford, though of a slightly earlier generation, be overlooked. The American revisers also republished a series of Essays written by some of their number on Biblical Revision: Its Necessity and Purpose, 1879; and account should be taken also of the Documentary History of the American Committee on Revision prepared by that committee for the use of its members.

J. Hutchison

ENGRAFT

en-graft’ (Jas 1:21 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) IMPLANT).

ENGRAVING

en-grav’-ing.

See CARVING; CRAFTS.

ENIGMA

e-nig’-ma.

See GAMES.

ENJOIN

en-join’:

Its usual sense is "to impose something," as a command, a charge or a direction. In this last sense it is used in Job 36:23, i. e. "Who hath directed?" In Es 9:31 it means "to command"; in Phm 1:8, "to order" or "direct."

ENLARGE; ENLARGEMENT

en-larj’, en-larj’-ment:

"To enlarge" is very frequently used figuratively: "God enlarge Japheth" (Ge 9:27), i.e. "make him a great nation"; or "Thou hast enlarged my steps under me" (2Sa 22:37), i.e. "Thou hast given me success." A very peculiar use of "enlarge" is found in the King James Version Ps 4:1: "Thou hast enlarged me" (the Revised Version (British and American) "set me at large"), i.e. "Thou hast given me freedom, deliverance from distress." "Our heart is enlarged" (platuno; 2Co 6:11), and "Be ye also enlarged" (2Co 6:13), express great love of one party to another. See also 1Sa 2:1, "My mouth is enlarged," i.e. "full of praise." Eze 41:7, "were broader" (the King James Version "an enlarging").

Enlargement, the King James Version, Es 4:14 from rawach, "to enlarge," "to respite," is rendered "relief" by the Revised Version (British and American) in better harmony with "deliverance" with which the word is paired.

A. L. Breslich

ENLIGHTEN

en-lit’-’-n:

(1) ‘or, "illumination" in every sense, used in the ordinary sense of giving natural light (Ps 97:4 the King James Version; see also Ezr 9:8) or as a sign of health and vigor (1Sa 14:27,29). "His eyes were enlightened," literally, "became bright."

He had become weary and faint with the day's exertions and anxieties, and now recovers (see Job 33:30 and compare Ps 13:3). Thus in sickness and grief, the eyes are dull and heavy; dying eyes are glazed; but health and joy render them bright and sparkling, as with a light from within.

(2) In Ps 18:28 the King James Version, The word naghah, figuratively describes the believer's deliverance from the gloom of adversity and the restoration of joy in the knowledge of God.

(3) Most frequently the terms so translated mean the giving of spiritual light to the soul (Ps 19:8; Eph 1:18, photizo; Heb 6:4; 10:32). This spiritual enlightening the Spirit of God brings about through the Divine word (Ps 119:130; 2Ti 3:15; 2Pe 1:19). Sin mars the intellectual discernment; "but he that is spiritual discerneth all things" (1Co 2:15 King James Version, margin).

M. O. Evans

ENMITY

en'-mi-ti ('ebhah; echthra):

"Enmity" (hate) occurs as the translation of 'ebhah in Ge 3:15, "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed," and in Nu 35:21,22, where the absence of enmity on the part of the man-slayer modifies the judgment to be passed on him.

In the New Testament "enmity" is the translation of echthra: Lu 23:12; Ro 8:7, "The mind of the flesh is enmity against God." Jas 4:4, "The friendship of the world is enmity with God" (because "the world" is preferred to God); in Eph 2:15,16, Christ is said to have "abolished in his flesh the enmity," by His cross to have "slain the enmity," that is, the opposition between Jew and Gentile, creating in Himself "one new man, (so) making peace."

See also ABOLISH; HATE.

W. L. Walker

ENNATAN

en'-a-tan (Ennatan; the King James Version Eunatan (a misprint)):

One of Ezra's messengers to fetch Levites for the temple service (APC 1Esdras 8:44); called "Elnathan" in Ezr 8:16.

ENOCH

e'-nok (chanokh, "initiated"; Henoch):

(1) The eldest son of Cain (Ge 4:17,18).

(2) The son of Jared and father of Methuselah, seventh in descent from Adam in the line of Seth (Jude 1:14). He is said (Ge 5:23) to have lived 365 years, but the brief record of his life is comprised in the words, "Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him" (Ge 5:24). The expression "walked with God" denotes a devout life, lived in close communion with God, while the reference to his end has always been understood, as by the writer of He, to mean, "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death; and he was not found, because God translated him" (Heb 11:5).

See further, APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. II, i, 1.

A. C. Grant

ENOCH (CITY)

In Ge 4:17 it is narrated that Cain, who had taken up his abode in the land of Nod, East of Eden (verse 16), built there a city, and called it after the name of his firstborn son Enoch. It is impossible to fix more definitely the locality of this first of cities, recorded, as Delitzsch says (Genesis, in the place cited.), as registering an advance in civilization. The "city" would be a very simple affair, a place of protection for himself, wife and household, perhaps connected with the fear spoken of in Ge 4:14.

ENOCH, BOOK OF

see ENOCH, ETHIOPIC, BOOK OF; ENOCH, SLAVONIC, BOOK OF

ENOCH, ETHIOPIC, BOOK OF

e-thi-op’-ik.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ENOCH, SLAVONIC, BOOK OF

sla-von’-ik.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ENOCH; THE BOOK OF THE SECRETS OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ENORMITY

e-nor’-mi-ti:

The marginal rendering in the King James Version of Ho 6:9 for "lewdness," and in the Revised Version (British and American) of Le 18:17; 19:29; 20:14 for "wickedness." In each case it is the translation of zimmah, meaning originally, "thought" or "plot," mostly in a bad sense, lewdness, wickedness; in Le it is unnatural wickedness—incest.

ENOS; ENOSH

e’-nos, e’-nosh (’enosh, "mortal"; ‘Enos):

In the New Testament (the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version) and the Old Testament (the King James Version except 1Ch 1:1), the form is Enos; in the Old Testament (the Revised Version (British and American) and 1Ch 1:1 the King James Version), the form is Enosh. The son of Seth and grandson of Adam (Ge 4:26; 5:6

ff; 1Ch 1:1; Lu 3:38). Enosh denotes man as frail and mortal. With Enosh a new religious development began, for "then began men to call upon the name of Yahweh" (Ge 4:26). There seems to be an implied contrast to Ge 4:17 ff which records a development in another department of life, represented by Enoch the son of Cain.

S. F. Hunter

ENQUIRE

en-kwir’:

This is an Old English word now obsolescent. It is common in the King James Version. In the American Standard Revised Version it is nearly always replaced by the more modern "inquire," a few times by "seek" and "ask," once by "salute" (1Ch 18:10). With this one exception in the Old Testament the change does not affect the meaning. In Ac 23:15, "enquire something more perfectly" is substituted by "judge more exactly." In Mt 10:11, "search out" replaces it. In Mt 2:7,16, "learned exactly" replaces "inquired diligently."

See INQUIRE.

ENROLMENT

en-rol’-ment.

See QUIRINIUS; TAX.

ENSAMPLE

en-sam’-p’-l.

See EXAMPLE.

ENSIGN

en’-sin.

See BANNER.

ENSUE

en-su’:

Synonymous with "to pursue," "ensue" is found in 1Pe 3:11 the King James Version as a translation of dioko, "to follow after," "to pursue."

Also in APC Judith 9:5, "such as ensued after" (ta metepeita, "the things that follow").

ENTANGLE

en-tan’-g’-l:

Found but 5 times in the Scriptures (the King James Version), once in the Old Testament, yet most significant as illustrating the process of mental, moral and spiritual confusion and enslavement.

(1) Physical:

Used of physical entanglement, as in the mazes of a labyrinth (bukh, to involve, "be perplexed"). At Moses’ command the children of Israel, before crossing the Red Sea, took the wrong way in order to give Pharaoh the impression that they were lost in the wilderness and cause him to say "They are entangled in the land" (Ex 14:3).

(2) Mental:

pagideuo, "to entrap," "ensnare," with words, as birds are caught in a snare; compare Ec 9:12. The Pharisees sought to "entangle" (the Revised Version (British and American) "ensnare") Jesus in His talk (Mt 22:15).

(3) Moral:

‘empleko, "to inweave," hence, intertwine and involve. "A god soldier of Jesus Christ," says Paul, does not "entangle himself," i.e. become involved, "in the affairs of this life" (2Ti 2:4). Having "escaped the defilements of the world," Christians are not to be "again entangled therein" (2Pe 2:20).

(4) Spiritual:

enecho, "to hold in," hence, to hold captive, as a slave in fetters or under a burden. Having experienced spiritual emancipation, freedom, through Christ from bondage to sin and false religion (Ga 5:1; compare Ga 4:8), the Gentiles were not to become "entangled again in a yoke of bondage" by submission to mere legal requirements, as the external rite of circumcision.

With reference to the thoroughness and irresistibleness of God’s judgments, we read in Na 1:10, "For entangled like thorns" (the King James Version "while they be folden together as thorns"), damp, closely packed and intertwined, "they are consumed utterly as dry stubble" (the King James Version "devoured as stubble fully dry").

Dwight M. Pratt

ENTREAT

en-tret’.

See INTREAT.

ENVY

en’-vi (qin’ah; zelos, phthonos):

"Envy," from Latin in, "against," and video, "to look," "to look with ill-will," etc., toward another, is an evil strongly condemned in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. It is to be distinguished from jealousy. "We are jealous of our own; we are envious of another man’s possessions. Jealousy fears to lose what it has; envy is pained at seeing another have" (Crabb’s English Synonyms). In the Old Testament it is the translation of qin’ah from kana’," to redden," "to

glow" (Job 5:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy," margin "indignation"; in Isa 26:11 the Revised Version (British and American) renders "see thy zeal for the people"; Pr 27:4, etc.); the verb occurs in Ge 26:14, etc.; Nu 11:29 the King James Version; Ps 106:16; Pr 3:31, etc.; in the New Testament it is the translation of phthonos, "envy" (Mt 27:18; Ro 1:29; Ga 5:21, "envyings," etc.); of zelos, "zeal", "jealousy," "envy" (Ac 13:45), translated "envying," the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy" (Ro 13:13; 1Co 3:3; 2Co 12:20; Jas 3:14,16); the verb phthoneo occurs in Ga 5:26; zeloo in Ac 7:9; 17:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "moved with jealousy"; 1Co 13:4, "charity (the Revised Version (British and American) "love") envieth not."

The power of envy is stated in Pr 27:4: "Who is able to stand before envy?" (the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy"); its evil effects are depicted in Job 5:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) "jealousy"), in Pr 14:30 (the Revised Version, margin "jealousy"); it led to the crucifixion of Christ (Mt 27:18; Mr 15:10); it is one of "the works of the flesh" (Ga 5:21; compare Ro 1:29; 1Ti 6:4); Christian believers are earnestly warned against it (Ro 13:13 the King James Version; 1Co 3:3 the King James Version; Ga 5:26; 1Pe 2:1). In Jas 4:5 "envy" is used in a good sense, akin to the jealousy ascribed to God. Where the King James Version has "The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy," the Revised Version (British and American) reads "Doth the spirit which he made to dwell in us long unto envying?"; the American Revised Version, margin "The spirit which he made to dwell in us he yearneth for even unto jealous envy"; compare Jer 3:14; Ho 2:19 f; or the English Revised Version, margin "That spirit which he made to dwell in us yearneth (for us) even unto jealous envy." This last seems to give the sense; compare "Ye adulteresses" (Ho 2:4), the American Revised Version, margin "That is, who break your marriage vow to God."

W. L. Walker

EPAENETUS

ep-e’-ne-tus (Epainetos, "praised"):

One of the Christians at Rome to whom greetings are sent by Paul (Ro 16:5). All that is known of him is told here. Paul describes him as

(1) "my beloved,"

(2) "who is the firstfruits of Asia unto Christ."

Textus Receptus of the New Testament has "firstfruits of Achaia" but this wrong reading is due to 1Co 16:15. He was one of the first Christians in the Roman province of Asia.

This salutation brings up the question of the destination of Ro 16:3-16, for it is argued that they are addressed to the church in Ephesus owing to the fact that Prisca and Aquila and Epenetus are known to have dwelt in Asia. On the other hand, there are more than 20 others in this list who are not known to have spent any time in Asia. Prisca and Aquila had once dwelt in Rome (Ac 18:2), and there is nothing unusual in an Ephesian dwelling in the capital of the empire. An interesting discovery was made in Rome of an inscription in which was the name of Epenetus, an Ephesian.

S. F. Hunter

EPAPHRAS

ep’-a-fras (Epaphras):

A contracted form of Epaphroditus. He must not, however, be confounded with the messenger of the Philippian

community. He was with Paul during a part of his 1st Roman imprisonment, joining in Paul's greetings to Philemon (Phm 1:23). Epaphras was the missionary by whose instrumentality the Colossians had been converted to Christianity (Col 1:7), and probably the other churches of the Lycus had been founded by him. In sending his salutation to the Colossians Paul testified, "He hath much labor for you, and for them in Laodicea, and for them in Hierapolis" (Col 4:13). Epaphras had brought to Paul good news of the progress of the gospel, of their "faith in Christ Jesus" and of their love toward all the saints (Col 1:4). Paul's regard for him is shown by his designating him "our beloved fellow-servant," "a faithful minister of Christ" (Col 1:7), and "a bondservant of Christ Jesus" (Col 4:12 margin) . The last designation Paul uses several times of himself, but only once of another besides Epaphras (Php 1:1).

S. F. Hunter

EPAPHRODITUS

e-paf-ro-di'-tus (Epaphroditos, "lovely"):

Mentioned only in Php 2:25; 4:18. The name corresponds to the Latin Venustus (= handsome), and was very common in the Roman period. "The name occurs very frequently in inscriptions both Greek and Latin, whether at full length Epaphroditus, or in its contracted form Epaphras" (Lightfoot, Philippians, 123). Epaphroditus was the delegate of the Christian community at Philippi, sent with their gift to Paul during his first Roman imprisonment. Paul calls him "my brother and fellow-worker and fellow-soldier." "The three words are arranged in an ascending scale: common sympathy, common work, common danger and toil and suffering" (Lightfoot, l. c.). On his arrival at Rome, Epaphroditus devoted himself to "the work of Christ," both as Paul's attendant and as his assistant in missionary work. So assiduously did he labor that he lost his health, and "was sick nigh unto death." He recovered, however, and Paul sent him back to Philippi with this letter to quiet the alarm of his friends, who had heard of his serious illness. Paul besought for him that the church should receive him with joy and hold him in honor.

S. F. Hunter

EPHAH (1)

e'-fa 'ephah, "darkness"; Gephar (Ge 25:4), Gaipha (Isa 60:6):

The name of three persons in the Old Testament, both masculine and feminine

(1) The son of Midian, descended from Abraham by his wife Keturah (Ge 25:4; 1Ch 1:33), mentioned again in Isa 60:6 as a transporter of gold and frankincense from Sheba, who shall thus bring enlargement to Judah and praise to Yahweh. According to Fried. Delitzsch, Schrader, and Hommel, 'Ephah is an abbreviation of 'Ayappa, the Kha-yappa Arabs of the time of Tiglath-pileser III and Sargon. See treatment of this view in Dillmann's Commentary on Ge (Ge 25:4).

(2) A concubine of Caleb (1Ch 2:46).

(3) The son of Jahdai, a descendant of Judah (1Ch 2:47).

Charles B. Williams

EPHAH (2)

e'-fa ('ephah):

A dry measure of about one bushel capacity. It corresponds to the bath in liquid measure and was the standard for measuring grain and similar articles since it is classed with balances and weights (Le 19:36; Am 8:5) in the injunctions regarding just dealing in trade. In Zec 5:6-10 it is used for the utensil itself.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

EPHAI

e'-fi, e'-fa-i ('ephay, in Qere, 'ophai, in Kethibh; Iophe, Ophe, "gloomy," "obscuring," in the Septuagint, Septuagint):

"The Netophathite," whose sons were numbered among "the captains of the forces" left in Judah after the carrying away to Babylon (Jer 40 Jer 47). His sons assembled at Mizpah with Gedaliah, governor of the scattered Jews, and with him were slain by Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah (Jet 41:3).

EPHER

e'-fer 'epher, "calf," "young deer"; Apher, Opher:

(1) The second son of Midian, descended from Abraham by his wife Keturah (Ge 25:4; 1Ch 1:33). See further Dillmann's Commentary on Genesis (Ge 25:4).

(2) The third son of Ezra, descended from the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:17).

(3) The first of five heads of their fathers' houses, "mighty men of valor, famous men," in the halftribe of Manasseh, who dwelt between Bashan and Mt. Hermon (1Ch 5:23,14).

EPHES-DAMMIM

e-fes-dam'-im ('ephec dammim):

Some spot between Socoh and Azekah (1Sa 17:1) where the Philistines were encamped; called in 1Ch 11:13, "Pas-dammin." Ephes" end of" or "boundary" and the whole word may mean the "boundary of blood." The deep red color of the newly plowed earth in this situation is noticeable and may have given origin to the idea of "blood" (compare ADUMMIM). Cheyne suggests that from 'adhummin, to dammim, is an easy step, and that the former, meaning "red brown earth," may have been the original. No other satisfactory locality has been found to explain the name or fix the site.

E. W. G. Masterman

EPHESIAN; EPHESIANS

e-fe'-zhan (Ephesios), e-fe'-zhanz:

A term which, as in Ac 19:28,34,35 and Ac 21:29, was applied to those natives or residents of the city of Ephesus who were adherents of the cult of the goddess Diana. A Jew or a Christian, though a native of Ephesus, would probably have been designated as such, rather than as an Ephesian.

EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO THE

Contents

I. AUTHENTICITY

1. External Evidence 2. Internal Evidence

II. PLACE AND DATE OF WRITING

III. DESTINATION

1. Title 2. The Inscription 3. The Evidence of the Letter Itself 4. Conclusion

IV. RELATION TO OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

1. Peter 2. Johannine Writings 3. Colossians

V. THE PURPOSE

VI. ARGUMENT

VII. TEACHING

VIII. LITERATURE

==========

I. Authenticity.

1. External Evidence:

None of the epistles which are ascribed to Paul have a stronger chain of evidence to their early and continued use than that which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians. Leaving for the moment the question of the relation of Eph to other New Testament writings, we find that it not only colors the phraseology of the Apostolic Fathers, but is actually quoted. In Clement of Rome (circa 95 AD) the connection with Ephesians might be due to some common liturgical form in xlvi.6 (compare Eph 4:6); though the resemblance is so close that we must feel that our epistle was known to Clement both here and in lxiv (compare Eph 1:3-4); xxxviii (compare Eph 5:21); xxxvi (compare Eph 4:18); lix (compare Eph 1:18; 4:18). Ignatius (died 115) shows numerous points of contact with Ephesians, especially in his Epistle to the Ephesians. In chap. xii we read: "Ye are associates and fellow students of the mysteries with Paul, who in every letter makes mention of you in Christ Jesus." It is difficult to decide the exact meaning of the phrase "every letter," but in spite of the opinion of many scholars that it must be rendered "in all his epistle," i.e. in every part of his epistle, it is safer to take it as an exaggeration, "in all his epistles," justified to some extent in the fact that besides Ephesians, Paul does mention the Ephesian Christians in Ro (16:5); 1Co (15:32; 16:8,19); 2Co (1:8 f); 1Ti (1:3) and 2Ti (1:18). In the opening address the connection with Eph 1:3-6 is too close to be accidental. There are echoes of our epistle in chap. i (Eph 6:1); ix (Eph 2:20-22); xviii (oikonomia, Eph 1:10); xx (Eph 2:18; 4:24); and in Ignat. ad Polyc. v we have close identity with Eph 5:25 and less certain connection with Eph 4:2, and in vi with Eph 6:13-17.

The Epistle of Polycarp in two passages shows verbal agreement with Eph: in chap. i with Eph 1:8, and in xii with Eph 4:26, where we have (the Greek is missing here) ut his scripturis dictum est. Hermas speaks of the grief of the Holy Spirit in such a way as to suggest Ephesians (Mand. X, ii; compare Eph 4:30). Sim. IX, xiii, shows a knowledge of Eph 4:3-6,

and possibly of 5:26 and 1:13. In the Didache (4) we find a parallel to Eph 6:5: "Servants submit yourselves to your masters." In Barnabas there are two or three turns of phrase that are possibly due to Ephesians. There is a slightly stronger connection between II Clement and Ephesians, especially in chap. xiv, where we have the Ephesian figure of the church as the body of Christ, and the relation between them referred to in terms of husband and wife. This early evidence, slight though it is, is strengthened by the part Ephesians played in the 2nd century where, as we learn from Hippolytus, it was used by the Ophites and Basilides and Valentinus. The latter (according to Hip., Phil., VI, 29) quoted Eph 3:16-18, saying, "This is what has been written in Scripture," while his disciple Ptolemais is said by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.8, 5) to have attributed Eph 5:13 to Paul by name. According to the addenda to the eighth book of the Stromateis of Clement of Alexandria, Theodotus, a contemporary of Valentinus, quoted Eph 4:10 and 30 with the words: "The apostle says," and attributes Eph 4:24 to Paul. Marcion knew Ephesians as Tertullian tells us, identifying it with the epistle referred to in Col 4:16 as ad Laodicenos. We find it in the Muratorian Fragment (10b, l. 20) as the second of the epistles which "Paul wrote following the example of his predecessor John." It is used in the letter from the church of Lyons and Vienne and by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and later writers. We can well accept the dictum of Dr. Hort that it "is all but certain on this evidence that the Epistle was in existence by 95 AD; quite certain that it was in existence by about fifteen years later or conceivably a little more" (Hort, Judaistic Christianity, 118).

2. Internal Evidence:

To this very strong chain of external evidence, reaching back to the very beginning of the 2nd century, if not into the end of the 1st, showing Ephesians as part of the original Pauline collection which no doubt Ignatius and Polycarp used, we must add the evidence of the epistle itself, testing it to see if there be any reason why the letter thus early attested should not be accredited to the apostle.

(1) That it claims to be written by Paul is seen not only in the greeting, "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God, to the saints that are at Ephesus," but also in Eph 3:1, where we read: "For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Christ Jesus in behalf of you Gentiles," a phrase which is continued in 4:1: "I therefore, the prisoner in the Lord." This claim is substantiated by the general character of the epistle which is written after the Pauline norm, with greeting and thanksgiving, leading on to and serving as the introduction of the special doctrinal teaching of the epistle. This is the first great division of the Pauline epistles and is regularly followed by an application of the teaching to practical matters, which in turn yields to personal greetings, or salutations, and the final benediction, commonly written by the apostle's own hand. In only one particular does Ephesians fail to answer completely to this outline. The absence of the personal greetings has always been marked as a striking peculiarity of our letter. The explanation of this peculiarity will meet us when we consider the destination of the epistle (see III below).

(2) Further evidence for the Pauline authorship is found in the general style and language of the letter. We may agree with von Soden (Early Christ. Lit., 294) that "every sentence contains verbal echoes of Pauline epistles, indeed except when ideas peculiar to the Epistle come to expression it is simply a mosaic of Pauline phraseology," without accepting his conclusion that Paul did not write it. We feel, as we read, that we have in our hands the work of one with whom the other epistles have made us familiar. Yet we are conscious none the less of certain subtle differences which give occasion for the various arguments that critics have brought against the claim that Paul is the actual author. This is not questioned until the beginning of the last century, but has been since Schleiermacher and his disciple Usteri, though the latter published his doubts before his master did his. The Tubingen scholars attacked the epistle mainly on the ground of supposed traces of Gnostic or Montanist influences, akin to those ascribed to the Colossians. Later writers have given over this claim to put forward others based on differences of style (De Wette, followed by Holtzmann, von Soden and others); dependence on Colossians (Hitzig, Holtzmann); the attitude to the Apostles (von Soden); doctrinal differences, especially those that concern Christology and the Parousia, the conception of the church (Klopper, Wrede and others). The tendency, however, seems to be backward toward a saner view of the questions involved; and most of those who do not accept the Pauline authorship would probably agree with Julicher (Encyclopedia Biblica), who ascribes it to a "Pauline Christian intimately familiar with the Pauline epistles, especially with Colossians, writing about 90," who sought in Ephesians "to put in a plea for the true catholicism in the meaning of Paul and in his name."

(3) Certain of these positions require that we should examine the doctrinal objections. (a) First of these is the claim that Ephesians has a different conception of the person and work of Christ from the acknowledged epistles of Paul. Not only have we the exaltation of Christ which we find in Col 1:16 ff, but the still further statement that it was God's purpose from the beginning to "sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens, and the things upon the earth" (Eph 1:10). This is no more than the natural expansion of the term, "all things," which are attributed to Christ in 1Co 8:6, and is an idea which has at least its foreshadowing in Ro 8:19,20 and 2Co 5:18,19. The relation between Christ and the church as given in Eph 1:22 and 5:23 is in entire agreement with Paul's teaching in Ro 12, and 1Co 12. It is still the Pauline figure of the church as the body of Christ, in spite of the fact that Christ is not thought of as the head of that body. The argument in the epistle does not deal with the doctrine of the cross from the standpoint of the earlier epistles, but the teaching is exactly the same. There is redemption (Eph 1:7,14; 4:30); reconciliation (Eph 2:14-16); forgiveness (Eph 1:7; 4:32). The blood of Christ shed on the cross redeems us from our sin and restores us to God. In like manner it is said that the Parousia is treated (Eph 2:7) as something far off. But Paul has long since given up the idea that it is immediately; even in 2Th 2 he shows that an indeterminate interval must intervene, and in Ro 11:25 he sees a period of time yet unfulfilled before the end. (b) The doctrine of the church is the most striking contrast to the earlier epistles. We have already dealt with the relation of Christ to the church. The conception of the church universal is in advance of the earlier epistles, but it is the natural climax of the development of the apostle's conception of the church as shown in the earlier epistles. Writing from Rome with the idea of the empire set before him, it was natural that Paul should see the church as a great whole, and should use the word ekklesia absolutely as signifying the oneness of the Christian brotherhood. As a matter of fact the word is used in this absolute sense in 1Co 12:28 before the Captivity Epistles (compare 1Co 1:2; 10:32). The emphasis here on the unity of Jew and Gentile in the church finds its counterpart in the argument of the Epistle to the Romans, though in Ephesians this is "urged on the basis of God's purpose and Christian faith, rather than on the Law and the Promises."

Neither is it true that in Ephesians the Law is spoken of slightingly, as some say, by the reference to circumcision (2:11). In no case is the doctrinal portion of the epistle counter to that of the acknowledged Pauline epistles, though in the matter of the church, and of Christ's relationship to it and to the universe, there is evidence of progress in the apostle's conception of the underlying truths, which none the less find echoes in the earlier writings. "New doctrinal ideas, or a new proportion of these ideas, is no evidence of different authorship." (c) In the matter of organization the position of Ephesians is not in any essential different from what we have in 1 Cor.

(4) The linguistic argument is a technical matter of the use of Greek words that cannot well be discussed here. The general differences of style, the longer "turgid" sentences, the repetitions on the one hand; the lack of argument, the full, swelling periods on the other, find their counterpart in portions of Romans. The minute differences which show themselves in new or strange words will be much reduced in number when we take from the list those that are due to subjects which the author does not discuss elsewhere (e.g. those in the list of armor in Eph 6:13 ff). Holtzmann (Einl, 25) gives us a list of these hapax legomena (76 in all). But there are none of these which, as Lock says, Paul could not have used, though there are certain which he does not use elsewhere and others which are only found in his accepted writings and here. The following stand out as affording special ground for objection. The phrase "heavenly places" (ta epourania, Eph 1:3,10; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12) is peculiar to this epistle. The phrase finds a partial parallel it in 1Co 15:49 and the thought is found in Php 3:20. The devil (ho diabolos, Eph 4:27; 6:11) is used in place of the more usual Satan (satanas).

But in Ac Paul is quoted as using diabolos in 13:10 and satanas in 26:18. It is at least natural that he would have used the Greek term when writing from Rome to a Greek-speaking community. The objection to the expression "holy" (hagiois) apostles (Eph 3:5) falls to the ground when we remember that the expression "holy" (hagios) is Paul's common word for Christian and that he uses it of himself in this very epistle (Eph 3:8). In like manner "mystery" (musterion), "dispensation" (oikonomia) are found in other epistles in the same sense that we find them in here. The attack on the epistle fails, whether it is made from the point of teaching or language; and there is no ground whatever for questioning the truth of Christian tradition that Paul wrote the letter which we know as the Epistle to the Ephesians.

II. Place and Date of Writing.

The time and place of his writing Ephesians turn on the larger question of the chronology of Paul's life (see PAUL) and the relation of the Captivity Epistles to each other; and the second question whether they were written from Caesarea or Rome (for this see PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO). Suffice it here to say that the place was undoubtedly Rome, and that they were written during the latter part of the two years' captivity which we find recorded in Ac 28:30. The date will then be, following the later chronology, 63 or 64 AD; following the earlier, which is, in many ways, to be preferred, about 58 AD.

III. Destination.

To whom was this letter written?

1. Title:

The title says to the Ephesians. With this the witness of the early church almost universally agrees. It is distinctly stated in the Muratorian Fragment (10b, 1. 20); and the epistle is quoted as to the Ephesians by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., v.14, 3; 24, 3); Tertullian (Adv. Marc., v.11, 17; De Praesc., 36; De Monag., v); Clement of Alexandria (Strom., iv.65; Paed., i.18) and Origen (Contra Celsum, iii.20). To these must be added the evidence of the extant manuscripts and VSS, which unite in ascribing the epistle to the Ephesians. The only exception to the universal evidence is Tertullian's account of Marcion (circa 150 AD) who reads Ad Laodicenos (Adv. Marc., v.11: "I say nothing here about another epistle which we have with the heading 'to the Ephesians,' but the heretics 'to the Laodiceans' ....(v.17): According to the true belief of the church we hold this epistle to have been dispatched to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans; but Marcion had to falsify its title, wishing to make himself out a very diligent investigator").

2. The Inscription:

This almost universal evidence for Ephesus as the destination of our epistle is shattered when we turn to the reading of the first verse. Here according to Textus Receptus of the New Testament we read "Paul unto the saints which are at Ephesus (en Epheso) and to the faithful in Christ Jesus." When we look at the evidence for this reading we find that the two words en Epheso are lacking in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, and that the corrector of the cursive known as 67 has struck them out of his copy. Besides these a recently described MS, Cod. Laura 184, giving us a text which is so closely akin to that used by Origen that the scribe suggests that it was compiled from Origen's writings, omits these words (Robinson, Ephesians, 293). To this strong manuscript evidence against the inclusion of these two words in the inscription we must add the evidence of Origen and Basil. Origen, as quoted in Cramer's Catena at the place, writes: "In the Ephesians alone we found the expression 'to the saints which are,' and we ask, unless the phrase 'which are' is redundant, what it can mean. May it not be that as in Exodus He who speaks to Moses declares His name to be the Absolute One, so also those who are partakers of the Absolute become existent when they are called, as it were, from non-being into being?" Origen evidently knows nothing here of any reading en Epheso, but takes the words "which are" in an absolute, metaphysical sense. Basil, a century and a half later, probably refers to this comment of Origen (Contra Eun., ii.19) saying: "But moreover, when writing to the Ephesians, as to men who are truly united with the Absolute One through clear knowledge, he names them as existent ones in a peculiar phrase, saying 'to the saints which are and faithful in Christ Jesus.' For so those who were before us have handed it down, and we also have found (this reading) in old copies." In Jerome's note on this verse there is perhaps a reference to this comment on Origen, but the passage is too indefinitely expressed for us to be sure what its bearing on the reading really is. The later writers quoted by Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, 384 f) cannot, as Robinson shows (Eph, 293), be used as witnesses against the Textus Receptus. We may therefore conclude that the reading en Epheso was wanting in many early manuscripts, and that there is good ground for questioning its place in the original autograph. But the explanations suggested for the passage, as it stands without the words, offend Pauline usage so completely that we cannot accept them. To take "which are" in the phrase "the saints which are" (tois ousin) as absolute, as Origen did; or as meaning "truly," is impossible. It is possible to take the words with what follows, "and faithful" (kai pistois), and interpret this latter expression (pistois) either in the New Testament sense of "believers" or in the classical sense of "steadfast." The clause would then read either "to the saints who are also believers," or "to the saints who are also faithful," i.e. steadfast. Neither of these is wholly in accord with Paul's normal usage, but they are at least possible.

3. The Evidence of the Letter Itself:

The determining factor in the question of the destination of the epistle lies in the epistle itself. We must not forget that, save perhaps Corinth, there was no church with which Paul was so closely associated as that in Ephesus. His long residence there, of which we read in Ac (chapters 19; 20), finds no echo in our epistle. There is no greeting to anyone of the Christian community, many of whom were probably intimate friends. The close personal ties, that the scene of Ac 20:17-38 shows us existed between him and his converts in Ephesus, are not even hinted at. The epistle is a calm discussion, untouched with the warmth of personal allusion beyond the bare statement that the writer is a prisoner (Eph 3:1; 4:1), and his commendation of Tychicus (Eph 6:21,22), who was to tell them about Paul's condition in Rome. This lack of personal touch is intensified by the assumption underlying Eph 3 and 4 that the readers do not know his knowledge of the mysteries of Christ. In 3:2 and 4:21,22 there is a particle (eige, "if indeed") which suggests at least some question as to how far Paul himself was the missionary through whom they believed. All through the epistle there is a lack of those elements which are so constant in the other epistles, which mark the close personal fellowship and acquaintance between the apostle and those to whom he is writing.

4. Conclusion:

This element in the epistle, coupled with the strange fact of Marcion's attributing it to the Laodiceans, and the expression in Col 4:16 that points to a letter coming from Laodicea to Colosse, has led most writers of the present day to accept Ussher's suggestion that the epistle is really a circular letter to the churches either in Asia, or, perhaps better, in that part of Phrygia which lies near Colosse. The readers were evidently Gentiles (Eph 2:1; 3:1,2) and from the mission of Tychicus doubtless of a definite locality, though for the reasons given above this could not well be Ephesus alone. It is barely possible that the cities to whom John was bidden to write the Revelation (Re 1-3) are the same as those to whom Paul wrote this epistle, or it may be that they were the churches of the Lycus valley and its immediate neighborhood. The exact location cannot be determined. But from the fact that Marcion attributed the epistle to Laodicea, possibly because it was so written in the first verse, and from the connection with Colossians, it is at least probable that two of these churches were at Colosse and Laodicea. On this theory the letter would seem to have been written from Rome to churches in the neighborhood of, or accessible to, Colosse, dealing with the problem of Christian unity and fellowship and the relations between Christ and the church and sent to them by the hands of Tychicus. The inscription was to be filled in by the bearer, or copies were to be made with the name of the local church written in, and then sent to or left with the different churches. It was from Ephesus, as the chief city of Asia in all probability, that copies of this circular letter reached the church in the world, and from this fact the letter came to be known in the church at large as that from Ephesus, and the title was written "to the Ephesians," and the first verse was made to read to the "saints which are in Ephesus."

IV. Relation to Other New Testament Writings.

Ephesians raises a still further question by the close resemblances that can be traced between it and various other New Testament writings.

1. Peter:

The connection between Ephesians and 1 Peter is not beyond question. In spite of the disclaimer of as careful a writer as Dr. Bigg (ICC) it is impossible to follow up the references given by Holtzmann and others and not feel that Peter either knew Ephesians or at the very least had discussed these subjects with its author. For, as Dr. Hort tells us, the similarity is one of thought and structure rather than of phrase. The following are the more striking passages with their parallels in 1 Peter: Eph 1:3 (1Pe 1:3); 1:18-20 (1Pe 1:3-5); 2:18-22 (1Pe 2:4-6); 1:20-22 (1Pe 3:22); 3:9 (1Pe 1:20); 3:20 (1Pe 1:12); 4:19 (1Pe 1:14). The explanations that 1 Peter and Ephesians are both from the pen of the same writer, or that Ephesians is based on 1 Pet, are overthrown, among other reasons, by the close relation between Ephesians and Colossians.

2. Johannine Writings:

The connection with the Apocalypse is based on Eph 2:20 as compared with Re 21:14; Eph 3:5 and Re 10:7; Eph 5:11 and Re 18:4, and the figure of the bride of the Lamb (Re 19:7; compare Eph 5:25). Holtzmann adds various minor similarities, but none of these are sufficient to prove any real knowledge of, let alone dependence on Ephesians. The contact with the Fourth Gospel is more positive. Love (agape) and knowledge (gnosis) are used in the same sense in both Ephesians and the Gospel. The application of the Messianic title, the Beloved (Eph 1:6), to Christ does not appear in the Gospel (it is found in Mt 3:17), but the statement of the Father's love for Him constantly recurs. The reference to the going up and coming down of Christ (Eph 4:9) is closely akin to Joh 3:13 ("No man hath ascended into heaven, but he," etc.). So, too, Eph 5:11,13 finds echo in Joh 3:19,20; Eph 4:4,7 in Joh 3:34; Eph 5:6 in Joh 3:36. Eph 5:8 f is akin to 1 Joh 1:6 and Eph 2:3 to 1 Joh 3:10.

3. Colossians:

When we turn to Colossians we find a situation that is without parallel in the New Testament. Out of 155 verses in Ephesians, 78 are found in Colossians in varying degrees of identity. Among them are these: Eph 1:6 parallel Col 1:13; Eph 1:16 ff parallel Col 1:9; Eph 1:21 ff parallel Col 1:16 ff; Eph 2:16 parallel Col 2:20; Eph 4:2 parallel Col 3:12; Eph 4:15 parallel Col 2:19; Eph 4:22 parallel Col 3:9; Eph 4:32 parallel Col 3:12 ff; Eph 5:5 parallel Col 3:5; Eph 5:19 ff parallel Col 3:16 ff; Eph 6:4 parallel Col 3:21; Eph 6:5-9 parallel Col 3:22-4:1. For a fuller list see Abbott (ICC, xxiii). Not only is this so, but there is an identity of treatment, a similarity in argument so great that Bishop Barry (NT Commentary for English Readers, Ellicott) can make a parallel analysis showing the divergence and similarity by the simple device of different type. To this we must add that there are at least a dozen Greek words common to these two epistles not found elsewhere. Over against this similarity is to be set the dissimilarity. The general subject of the epistles is not approached from the same standpoint.

In one it is Christ as the head of all creation, and our duty in consequence. In the other it is the church as the fullness of Christ and our duty—put constantly in the same words—in consequence thereof. In Ephesians we have a number of Old Testament references, in Colossians only one. In Ephesians we have unique phrases, of which "the heavenly spheres" (ta epourania) is most striking, and the whole treatment of the relation of Jew and Gentile in the church, and the marriage tie as exemplified in the relation between Christ and the church. In Colossians we have in like manner distinct passages which have no parallel in Ephesians, especially the controversial section in chapter 2, and the salutations. In truth, as Davies (Ephesians, Paul to Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians.) well says: "It is difficult indeed to say, concerning the patent coincidences of expression in the two epistles, whether the points of likeness or of unlikeness between them are the more remarkable." This situation has given rise to various theories. The most complicated is that of H. Holtzmann, who holds that some passages point to a priority of Colossians, others to that of Ephesians; and as a result he believes that Colossians, as we have it, is a composite, based on an original epistle of Paul which was expanded by the author of Ephesians—who was not Paul—after he had written this epistle. So Holtzmann would give us the original Colossians (Pauline), Ephesians (based on it), and the present Colossians (not Pauline) expanded from the former through the latter. The theory falls to the ground on its fundamental hypothesis, that Colossians as it stands is interpolated. The most reasonable explanation is that both Colossians and Ephesians are the work of Paul, written at practically the same time, and that in writing on the same subjects, to different people, there would be just the differences and similarity which we have in these epistles. The objection that Paul could not repeat himself and yet differ as these two letters do is purely imaginary. Zahn shows us that men do just this very thing, giving an account of Bismarck's speaking on a certain subject to a group of officers and later to a large body of men, and yet using quite different language. Moreover, Paul is not averse to repeating himself (compare Romans and Galatians and 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy) when to do so will serve his purpose. "Simultaneous authorship by one writer," and that writer Paul, is the only explanation that will satisfy all the facts in the case and give them due proportion.

V. The Purpose.

If our interpretation of the circumstances, composition and destination of Ephesians be right, we are now in a position to look beneath the surface and ask why the apostle wrote it. To understand its central theme we must remember that Paul, the prisoner of the Lord, is writing in the calm of his imprisonment, far from the noise and turmoil, the conflict and strife, that marked his earlier life. He is now able to look out on the church and get a view of it in its wholeness, to see the part it is to play in God's scheme for the restoration of the human race, to see God's purpose in it and for it and its relation to Him. With this stand-point he can write to the churches about Ephesus on the occasion of Tychicus' return to Colosse, not to correct false views on some special point, but to emphasize the great central truth which he had put in the very forefront of his letter. God's eternal purpose is to gather into one the whole created universe, to restore harmony among His creatures and between them and Himself. The apostle's whole prayer is for this end, his whole effort and desire is toward this goal: that they may have full, clear knowledge of this purpose of God which He is working out through Christ Jesus, who is the head of the church, the very fullness of Him who is being fulfilled all over the world. Everything, for the apostle, as he looks forth upon the empire, centers in the purpose of God. The discord between the elements in the church, the distinction between Jew and Gentile, all these must yield to that greater purpose. The vision is of a great oneness in Christ and through Him in God, a oneness of birth and faith and life and love, as men, touched with the fire of that Divine purpose, seek to fulfil, each in himself, the part that God has given him to play in the world, and, fighting against the foes of God, to overcome at last.

It is a noble purpose to set before men this great mystery of the church as God's means by which, in Christ, He may restore all men to union with Himself. It is an impossible vision except to one who, as Paul was at the time, is in a situation where the strife and turmoil of outside life can enter but little, but a situation where he can look out with a calm vision and, in the midst of the world's discord, discern what God is accomplishing among men.

VI. Argument.

The Argument of Ephesians is as follows:

Ephesians 1:1,2: Greeting.

Ephesians 1:3-10: Hymn of praise to God for the manifestation of His purpose for men in Christ Jesus, chosen from the beginning to a holy life in love, predestined to adoption as sons through Jesus Christ, in whom as the Beloved He has given us grace (1:3-6). Redeemed by the blood of Christ by whom we have forgiveness of sins through His grace abounding in us and making us know the mystery of His purpose, namely, to unite all in one, even the entire universe (1:7-10).

Ephesians 1:11-14: For this Israel has served as a preparation, and to this the Gentiles are come, sealed unto salvation by the Holy Spirit of power.

Ephesians 1:15,16 a: Thanksgiving for their faith.

Ephesians 1:16-21: Prayer that they may, by the spirit of wisdom and revelation, know their destiny and the power of God to fulfill it.

Ephesians 1:22-2:10: Summary of what God has done in Christ. Christ's sovereignty (1:22,23), and headship in the church (1:22,23); His work for men, quickening us from a death of sin into which man has sunk, and exalting us to fellowship with Christ by His grace, who has created us for good works as part of His eternal purpose (2:1-10).

Ephesians 2:11-13: The contrast between the former estate of the Gentiles, as strangers and aliens, and their present one, "near" by the blood of Christ.

Ephesians 2:14-18: Christ, who is our peace, uniting Jew and Gentile and reconciling man to God through the cross; by

whom we all have access to the Father.

Ephesians 2:19-22: This is theirs who as fellow-citizens of the saints, built up on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, become a sanctuary of God in the Spirit.

Ephesians 3:1-21: A digression on the "mystery," i.e. the revelation to Paul, together with a prayer that men may grasp it. The "mystery" is that all men, Jews and Gentiles, are partakers of the promise. Of this Paul is a minister, to whom has been given the stewardship of that mystery, unfolding to all creatures God's wisdom, in accord with His eternal purpose (3:1-13). Prayer that they may live up to their opportunities (3:14-19). Doxology (3:20,21).

Ephesians 4:1-6: The outcome of this privilege, the fulfillment of the Divine purpose, must show itself in unity of life in the Christian fellowship.

Ephesians 4:7-16: The different gifts which the Christians have are for the upbuilding of the church into that perfect unity which is found in Christ.

Ephesians 4:17-24: The spiritual darkness and corruption of the old Gentilelife set over against the enlightenment and purity and holiness of the new life in Christ.

Ephesians 4:25-6:9: Special features of the Christian life, arising out of the union of Christians with Christ and making for the fellowship in the church. On the side of the individual: sins in word (4:25-30); of temper (4:31,32); self-sacrifice as opposed to self- indulgence (5:1-8); the contrast of the present and the past repeated (5:9-14); general behavior (5:15-20); on the side of social relations: husband and wife exemplified in the relation of Chris~t and the church (5:23-33); children and parents (6:1-4); servants and masters (6:5-9).

Ephesians 6:19-20: The Christian warfare, its foes and armor and weapons.

Ephesians 6:21-24: Conclusion.

VII. Teaching

The keynote to the doctrinal basis of the epistle is struck at the very outset. The hymn of praise centers in the thought of God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is to Him that the blessing is due, to Him, who had chosen us from the beginning, in whom there is redemption in Eph (1:3-7). God as the very heart and soul of everything, "is over all, and through all, and in all" (4:6). He is the Father from whom all revelation comes (1:17), and from whom every human family derives its distinctive characteristics (3:15). But He is not only Father in relation to the universe: He is in a peculiar sense the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (1:3). The eternity of our Lord is distinctly asserted (1:4,5) as of one existing before the foundation of the world, in whom everything heavenly as well as earthly is united, summed up (1:10; compare 2:12; 4:18). He is the Messiah (the Beloved (1:6) is clearly a Messianic term, as the voice from heaven at Christ's baptism, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased," shows (Mt 3:17)). In Him we are quickened (2:5). He is made flesh (2:15). He died on the cross (2:16), and by His blood (1:7) we have redemption (4:30), and reconciliation with God (2:16). He whom God raised from the dead (1:20), now is in heaven (1:20; 4:8) from which place He comes (4:8), bringing gifts to men. (This interpretation makes the descent follow the ascent, and the passage teaches the return of Christ through His gifts of the Spirit which He gave to the church.)

He who is in heaven fills all things (4:10); and, from a wealth which is unsearchable (3:8), as the Head of the church (1:22), pours out His grace to free us from the power of sin (2:1). To this end He endues us with His Spirit (3:16). This teaching about God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is no abstract theorizing. It is all intensely practical, having at its heart the purpose of God from the ages, which, as we saw above, is to restore again the unity of all things in Him (1:9,10); to heal the breach between man and God (2:16,17); to break down the separation between Jew and Gentile, and to abolish the

enmity not only between them, but between them and God. This purpose of God is to be accomplished in a visible society, the one church, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets (2:20), of which Jesus Christ is the head of the corner, into which men are to be admitted by holy baptism, where they own one Lord, hold to one faith, in one God and Father of all who is above all and through all (4:4-7).

The teaching as to the church is one of the most striking elements of the epistle. In the first place we have the absolute use of the term, which has been already discussed. The apostle sees the whole Christian community throughout the world bound together into a unity, one fellowship, one body. He has risen to a higher vision than man had ever had before. But there is a further teaching in the epistle. Not only is the church throughout the world one body, but it is the body of Christ who is its Head (Eph 1:21 f). He has, as Lightfoot suggests, the same relation to the church which in Eph 1:10 He has to the universe. He is its Head, "the inspiring, ruling, guiding, combining, sustaining power, the mainspring of its activity, the center of its unity, and the seat of its life." But the relation is still closer. If, as the evidence adduced would necessitate, one accepts J. Armitage Robinson's explanation of pleroma, as that without which a thing is incomplete (Eph, 255 f), then the church, in some wonderful mystery, is the complement of Christ, apart from which He Himself, as the Christ, lacks fullness. We are needed by Him, that so He may become all in all. He, the Head of restored humanity, the Second Adam, needs His church, to fulfill the unity which He came upon earth to accomplish (compare Stone, Christian Church, 85, 86). Still further, we find in this epistle the two figures of the church as the Temple of the Spirit (2:21 ff; , and the Bride of Christ (5:23 ff)). Under the latter figure we find the marriage relation of the Lord to Israel, which runs through the Old Testament (Hos 2:16, et al.), applied to the union between Christ and the church. The significance is the close tie that binds them, the self-sacrificing love of Christ and the self-surrender of obedience on the part of the church; and the object of this is that so the church may be free from any blemish, holy and spotless. In the figure of the Temple, which is an expansion of the earlier figure in 1Co 3:16; 2Co 6:16, we see the thought of a spiritual building, a sanctuary, into which all the diverse elements of the churches grow into a compact unity.

These figures sum up the apostle's thought of that in which the Divine purpose finds its fulfillment. The progress forward to that fulfillment is due to the combined effort of God and man. "The church, the society of Christian men .... is built and yet it grows. Human endeavor and Divine energy cooperate in its development" (Westcott). Out of this doctrinal development the apostle works out the practical life by which this Divine purpose can find its fulfillment. Admitted into the fellowship of the church by baptism, we become members one of another Eph (4:25). It is on this basis that he urges honesty and patience and truth in our intercourse with each other, and pleads for gentleness and a forgiving spirit (4:25-32). As followers of God we are to keep free from the sins that spring from pride and self-indulgence and any fellowship with the spirit of evil (5:1-14). Our life is to be lived as seeking the fulfillment of God's purpose in all the relationships of life (5:15-6:9). All is to be done with the full armor of the Christian soldier, as is fitting for those who fight spiritual enemies (6:10 ff). The epistle is preeminently practical, bringing the significance of the great revelation of God's will to the everyday duties of life, and lifting all things up to a higher level which finds its ideal in the indwelling of Christ in our hearts, out of which we may be filled with all the fullness of God (3:17-19).

VIII. LITERATURE. J. Armitage Robinson, Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; Westcott, Epistle to the Ephesains; Abbott, "Ephesians and Colossians," International Critical Commentary; Moule, "Ephesians," Cambridge Bible; Salmond, "Ephesians," Expositor's Greek Testament; Macpherson, Commentary on Ephesians; Findlay, "Epistle to the Ephesians," Expositor's Bible; Alexander, "Colossians and Ephesians," Bible for Home and School; Haupt, Meyer's Exeget. und krit. Kommentar; von Soden, Handcommentar; Hort, Prolegomena to the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians; Dale, Lectures on the Ephesians.

Charles Smith Lewis

EPHESUS

ef'-e-sus (Ephesos, "desirable"):

A city of the Roman province of Asia, near the mouth of the Cayster river, 3 miles from the western coast of Asia Minor, and opposite the island of Samos. With an artificial harbor accessible to the largest ships, and rivaling the harbor at Miletus, standing at the entrance of the valley which reaches far into the interior of Asia Minor, and connected by highways with the chief cities of the province, Ephesus was the most easily accessible city in Asia, both by land and sea. Its location, therefore, favored its religious, political and commercial development, and presented a most advantageous field for the missionary labors of Paul. The city stood upon the sloping sides and at the base of two hills, Prion and Coressus, commanding a beautiful view; its climate was exceptionally fine, and the soil of the valley was unusually fertile.

Tradition says that in early times near the place where the mother goddess of the earth was born, the Amazons built a city and a temple in which they might worship. This little city of the Amazons, bearing at different times the names of Samorna, Trachea, Ortygia and Ptelea, flourished until in the early Greek days it aroused the cupidity of Androclus, a prince of Athens. He captured it and made it a Greek city. Still another tradition says that Androclus was its founder. However, under Greek rule the Greek civilization gradually supplanted that of the Orientals, the Greek language was spoken in place of the Asiatic; and the Asiatic goddess of the temple assumed more or less the character of the Greek Artemis. Ephesus, therefore, and all that pertained to it, was a mixture of oriental and Greek Though the early history of the city is obscure, it seems that at different times it was in the hands of the Carians, the Leleges and Ionians; in the early historical period it was one of a league of twelve Ionfan cities. In 560 BC it came into the possession of the Lydians; 3 years later, in 557, it was taken by the Persians; and during the following years the Greeks and Persians were constantly disputing for its possession. Finally, Alexander the Great took it; and at his death it fell to Lysimachus, who gave it the name of Arsinoe, from his second wife. Upon the death of Attalus II (Philadelphus), king of Pergamos, it was bequeathed to the Roman Empire; and in 190, when the Roman province of Asia was formed, it became a part of it. Ephesus and Pergamos, the capital of Asia, were the two great rival cities of the province. Though Pergamos was the center of the Roman religion and of the government, Ephesus was the more accessible, the commercial center and the home of the native goddess Diana; and because of its wealth and situation it gradually became the chief city of the province. It is to the temple of Diana, however, that its great wealth and prominence are largely due. Like the city, it dates from the time of the Amazons, yet what the early temple was like we now have no means of knowing, and of its history we know little except that it was seven times destroyed by fire and rebuilt, each time on a scale larger and grander than before. The wealthy king Croesus supplied it with many of its stone columns, and the pilgrims from all the oriental world brought it of their wealth. In time the temple possessed valuable lands; it controlled the fishcries; its priests were the bankers of its enormous revenues. Because of its strength the people stored there their money for safe-keeping; and it became to the ancient world practically all that the Bank of England is to the modern world.

In 356 BC, on the very night when Alexander the Great was born, it was burned; and when he grew to manhood he offered to rebuild it at his own expense if his name might be inscribed upon its portals. This the priests of Ephesus were unwilling to permit, and they politely rejected his offer by saying that it was not fitting for one god to build a temple to another. The wealthy Ephesians themselves undertook its reconstruction, and 220 years passed before its final completion. Not only was the temple of Diana a place of worship, and a treasure-house, but it was also a museum in which the best statuary and most beautiful paintings were preserved. Among the paintings was one by the famous Apelles, a native of Ephesus, representing Alexander the Great hurling a thunderbolt. It was also a sanctuary for the criminal, a kind of city of refuge, for none might be arrested for any crime whatever when within a bowshot of its walls. There sprang up, therefore, about the temple a village in which the thieves and murderers and other criminals made their homes. Not only did the temple bring vast numbers of pilgrims to the city, as does the Kaaba at Mecca at the present time, but it employed hosts of people apart from the priests and priestesses; among them were the large number of artisans who manufactured images of the goddess Diana, or shrines to sell to the visiting strangers.

Such was Ephesus when Paul on his 2nd missionary journey in Ac (18:19-21) first visited the city, and when, on his 3rd journey (19:8-10; 20:31), he remained there for two years preaching in the synagogue (19:8,10), in the school of Tyrannus (19:9) and in private houses (20:20). Though Paul was probably not the first to bring Christianity to Ephesus, for Jews had long lived there (2:9; 6:9), he was the first to make progress against the worship of Diana. As the fame of his teachings was carried by the pilgrims to their distant homes, his influence extended to every part of Asia Minor. In time the pilgrims, with decreasing faith in Diana, came in fewer numbers; the sales of the shrines of the goddess fell off; Diana of the

Ephesians was no longer great; a Christian church was rounded there and flourished, and one of its first leaders was the apostle John. Finally in 262 AD, when the temple of Diana was again burned, its influence had so far departed that it was never again rebuilt. Diana was dead. Ephesus became a Christian city, and in 341 AD a council of the Christian church was held there. The city itself soon lost its importance and decreased in population. The sculptured stones of its great buildings, which were no longer in use and were falling to ruins, were carried away to Italy, and especially to Constantinople for the great church of Saint Sophia. In 1308 the Turks took possession of the little that remained of the city, and deported or murdered its inhabitants. The Cayster river, overflowing its banks, gradually covered with its muddy deposit the spot where the temple of Diana had once stood, and at last its very site was forgotten.

The small village of Ayasaluk, 36 miles from Smyrna on the Aidin R. R., does not mark the site of the ancient city of Ephesus, yet it stands nearest to its ruins. The name Ayasaluk is the corruption of three Greek words meaning "the Holy Word of God." Passing beyond the village one comes to the ruins of the old aqueduct, the fallen city walls, the so-called church of John or the baths, the Turkish fort which is sometimes called Paul’s prison, the huge theater which was the scene of the riot of Paul’s time, but which now, with its marble torn away, presents but a hole in the side of the hill Prion. In 1863 Mr. J. T. Wood, for the British Museum, obtained permission from the Turkish government to search for the site of the lost temple of Diana. During the eleven years of his excavations at Ephesus, $80,000 were spent, and few cities of antiquity have been more thoroughly explored. The city wall of Lysimachus was found to be 36,000 ft. in length, enclosing an area of 1,027 acres. It was 10 1/2 ft. thick, and strengthened by towers at intervals of 100 ft. The six gates which pierced the wall are now marked by mounds of rubbish. The sites and dimensions of the various public buildings, the streets, the harbor, and the foundations of many of the private houses were ascertained, and numerous inscriptions and sculptures and coins were discovered. Search, however, did not reveal the site of the temple until January 1, 1870, after six years of faithful work. Almost by accident it was then found in the valley outside the city walls, several feet below the present surface. Its foundation, which alone remained, enabled Mr. Wood to reconstruct the entire temple plan. The temple was built upon a foundation which was reached by a flight of ten steps. The building itself was 425 ft. long and 220 ft. wide; each of its 127 pillars which supported the roof of its colonnade was 60 ft. high; like the temples of Greece, its interior was open to the sky. For a further description of the temple, see Mr. Wood’s excellent book, Discoveries at Ephesus.

E. J. Banks

EPHLAL

ef’-lal (’ephlal, "judgment"):

A descendant of Judah (1Ch 2:37).

EPHOD (1)

ef’-od (’ephowdh (28 times), ‘ephodh (20 times), ‘ephodh; Septuagint epomis, ephoth, ephod, ephoud, stole exallos, stole bussine):

(1) A sacred vestment originally designed for the high priest (Ex 28:4 ff; 39:2 ff), and made "of gold, blue, and purple, and scarlet, and fine twined linen," held together by two shoulder-pieces and a skillfully woven band which served as a girdle for the ephod. On the shoulderpieces were two onyx stones on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. It is not known whether the ephod extended below the hips or only to the waist. Attached to the ephod by chains of pure gold was a breastplate containing twelve precious stones in four rows. Underneath the ephod was the blue robe of the ephod extending to the feet of the priest. The robe of the ephod was thus a garment comprising, in addition to the long robe proper, the ephod with its shoulderpieces and the breastplate of judgment.

(2) From the historical books we learn that ephods were worn by persons other than the high priest. Thus, the boy Samuel was girded with a linen ephod while assisting the aged high priest (1Sa 2:18); the priests at Nob, 85 in number, are

described as men wearing a linen ephod (1Sa 22:18); and David was girded with a linen ephod when he danced in the procession that brought the ark into Jerusalem (2Sa 6:14). The ephod was considered appropriate for the king on this solemn and happy occasion; but it would be reading into the narrative more than it contains to infer that lay worshippers were regularly clothed with the ephod; nor are we to suppose that priests other than the high priest were accustomed to wear ephods as rich and elaborate as that of the high priest. Abiathar, who became high priest after the assassination of his father by Doeg, probably brought to the camp of David the ephod worn by the high priest in his ministrations at Nob (1Sa 23:6), and through this ephod David sought in certain crises to learn Yahweh's will (1Sa 23:9; 30:7). Some have argued that the ephod, which Abiathar brought in his hand, was an image rather than a priestly garment, but there seems no sufficient reason for regarding it as other than a vestment for the high priest. The ephod behind which the sword of Goliath was kept wrapped in a cloth may well have been a garment suspended from the wall or itself wrapped in a protecting cloth (1Sa 21:9).

(3) The ephod mentioned in Jud 17:5; 18:14 f; Ho 3:4 is associated with teraphim and other idolatrous images. We may frankly confess that we do not know the shape, size and use of the ephod in these cases, though even here also the ephod may well have been a priestly garment. The same remark holds good of the ephod made by Gideon, and which became an object of idolatrous worship in Israel (Jud 8:27). It has been argued that a vestment would not cost seventeen hundred shekels of gold. Possibly Gideon set up an apparatus of worship containing other articles just as the mother of Micah began with the promise to make a graven image and a molten image, and afterward added an ephod and teraphim (Jud 17:1-5). Moreover, if gems and brilliants were put on Gidcon's ephod, who can say that it did not cost seventeen hundred shekels?
LITERATURE.

Braun, De vestitu sacerdotum (1698), 462 ff; Ugolini, Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum (1744-69), XII, 785 f; Ancessi, Annales de philos. chretienne, 1872; Konig, Rel. Hist. of Israel, 107 ff; Van Hoonackcr, Le sacerdoce levitique (1899), 370 ff; Foote, The Ephod, in "Johns Hopkins University Circulars," 1900.

John Richard Sampey

EPHOD (2)

e'-fod ('ephodh):

Father of Hanniel, prince of Manasseh (Nu 34:23).

EPHPHATHA

ef'-a-tha, ef-a'-tha (Ephphatha):

Aramaic word used by Christ (Mr 7:34), the 'ethpa'al imperative of Aramaic pethach (Hebrew pathach), translated, "Be (thou) opened"; compare Isa 35:5. The Aramaic was the sole popular language of Palestine (Shurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, IIg, 9) and its use shows that we have here the graphic report of an eyewitness, upon whom the dialectic form employed made a deep impression. This and the corresponding act of the touch with the moistened finger is the foundation of a corresponding ceremony in the Roman Catholic formula for baptism.

EPHRAIM (1)

e'-fra-im, e'-fra-im ('ephrayim, "double fruit"):

1. The Patriarch:

The younger of the two sons of Joseph and Asenath, born in Egypt. He and his brother Manasseh were adopted by Jacob, and ranked as his own sons, each becoming the ancestor of a tribe in Israel. In blessing his grandchildren, despite their father's protest, Jacob preferred the younger, foreshadowing the future eminence of his descendants (Ge 41:50 ff; 48:20 ff). In the Blessing of Jacob however, the two are included under the name of Joseph (Ge 49:22 f).

2. The Tribe:

At the first census on leaving Egypt, Ephraim's men of war numbered 40,500; and at the second census they are given as 32,500 (Nu 1:33; 26:37). See, however, article NUMBERS. The head of the tribe at the Exodus was Elishama, son of Ammihud (Nu 1:10). With the standard of the tribe of Ephraim on the West of the tabernacle in the desert march were Manasseh and Benjamin (Nu 2:18 ff). The Ephraimite among the spies was Hoshea (i.e. Joshua), the son of Nun (Nu 13:8). At the division of the land Ephraim was represented by prince Kemuel, son of Shiphtan (Nu 34:24). The future power of this tribe is again foreshadowed in the Blessing of Moses (De 33:17). When Moses died, a member of the tribe, Joshua, whose faith and courage had distinguished him among the spies, succeeded to the chief place in Israel. It was natural that the scene of national assemblies, and the center of the nation's worship, should be chosen within the land occupied by the children of Joseph, at Shechem and Shiloh respectively. The leadership of Ephraim was further emphasized by the rule of Samuel. From the beginning of life in Palestine they enjoyed a certain prestige, and were very sensitive on the point of honor (Jud 7:24; 8:1; 12:1 ff). Their acceptance of and loyalty to Saul, the first king chosen over Israel, may be explained by his belonging to a Rachel tribe, and by the close and tender relations existing between Joseph and Benjamin. But they were never reconciled to the passing of the scepter to Judah in the person of David (2Sa 2:8 f). That Israel would have submitted to the sovereignty of Absalom, any more than to that of David, is not to be believed; but his revolt furnished an opportunity to deal a shrewd blow at the power of the southern tribe (2Sa 15:13). Solomon's lack of wisdom and the crass folly of Rehoboam in the management of the northern tribes fanned the smoldering discontent into a fierce flame. This made easy the work of the rebel Jeroboam; and from the day of the disruption till the fall of the Northern Kingdom there was none to dispute the supremacy of Ephraim, the names Ephraim and Israel being synonymous. The most distinguished of Ephraim's sons were Joshua, Samuel and Jeroboam I.

3. The Territory:

The central part of Western Palestine fell to the children of Joseph; and, while the boundaries of the territory allotted to Ephraim and Manasseh respectively are given in Jos 16; 17:1 ff, it seems to have been held by them in common for some time (17:14). The Canaanites in certain cities of both divisions were not driven out. It was probably thought more profitable to enslave them (16:10; 17:13). The boundaries of Ephraim cannot be followed with accuracy, but roughly, they were as follows: The southern boundary, agreeing with the northern border of Benjamin, started from Bethel, and passed down westward by nether Beth-horon and Gezer toward the sea (16:3; in verse 5 it stops at upper Beth-horon); it turned northward to the southern bank of the brook Kanah (Wady Kanah) along which it ran eastward (17:10) to Michmethath (the plain of Mukhneh); thence it went northward along the western edge of the plain to Shechem. It then bent eastward and southward past Taanath-shiloh (Ta'ana), Janoah (Yankun) to Ataroth and Naarah (unidentified) and the Jordan (16:7). From Ataroth, which probably corresponds to Ataroth-addar (16:5), possibly identical with the modern et-Truneh, the southern border passed up to Bethel. Along the eastern front of the land thus defined there is a steep descent into the Jordan valley. It is torn by many gorges, and is rocky and unfruitful. The long slopes to the westward, however, furnish much of the finest land in Palestine. Well watered as it is, the valleys are beautiful in season with cornfields, vineyards, olives and other fruit trees. The uplands are accessible at many points from the maritime plain; but the great avenue of entrance to the country runs up Wady esh-Sha'ir to Nablus, whence, threading the pass between Gerizim and Ebal, it descends to the Jordan valley. In this favored region the people must have lived in the main a prosperous and happy life. How appropriate are the prophetic allusions to these conditions in the days of Ephraim's moral decay (Isa 28:1,4; Jer 31:18; Ho 9:13; 10:11, etc.)!

W. Ewing

EPHRAIM (2)

(1) A position apparently of some importance, since the position of Baal-hazor (probably = Tell ‘Asur) where Abraham’s sheep- farm was located, is determined by relation to it (2Sa 13:23). That it lay North of Jerusalem seems to be indicated in 2Sa 13:34. It may be identical with the Ephraim of Eusebius, Onomasticon, 20 Roman miles North of Jerusalem, and therefore to be sought somewhere in the neighborhood of Sinjil and el- Lubban. Connected with this may have been the name Aphaerema, a district in Samaria mentioned in 1 Macc 11:34; Ant, XIII, iv, 9.

(2) The town near the wilderness to which Jesus retired after the raising of Lazarus (Joh 11:54). This probably corresponds to Ephrem of Eusebius, Onomasticon (s .v. "Afra") 5 Roman miles East of Bethel. This may be the place named along with Bethel by Josephus (BJ, IV, ix, 9). It probably answers to eT-Taiyebeh, a large village about 4 miles North of Beitin. The antiquity of the site is attested by the cisterns and rock tombs. It stands on a high hill with a wide outlook including the plains of Jericho and the Dead Sea.

See EPHRON.

W. Ewing

EPHRAIM, FOREST OF

(ya‘ar ‘ephrayim):

The word ya‘ar (Hebrew) probably agrees in meaning with the Arabic wa‘r, which indicates a rough country, abounding in rocks, stones and scrub, with occasional trees; not a "forest," as we understand the term. Here Absalom was defeated and slain (2Sa 18:6 ff, the King James Version "wood of Ephraim"). It must be sought, therefore, East of the Jordan, in the neighborhood of Mahanaim; but no identification is yet possible.

EPHRAIM, GATE OF

See JERUSALEM.

EPHRAIM, MOUNT

(har ‘ephrayim):

Means that part of the mountain which fell to Ephraim (Jos 19:50, etc.). The natives speak today of Jebel Nablus, Jebel Cafed, etc., meaning that section of the central range which is subject to each city. It is better therefore to retain the rendering of the King James Version, and not to read with the Revised Version (British and American) "hill-country of Ephraim."

EPHRAIM, WOOD OF

See EPHRAIM, FOREST OF.

EPHRAIMITE

e’-fra-im-it (’ephrayim; singular ‘ephrathi):

A member of the tribe of Ephraim (Jos 16:10, etc.).

See also EPHRATHITE.

EPHRAIN

e’-fra-in (2Ch 13:19), the Revised Version (British and American)

EPHRON, which see.

EPHRATH; EPHRATHAH

ef’-rath, e’-frath, ef’-ra-tha, ef-ra’-tha (’ephrath; Ephratha; Ge 35:16; 48:7); (’ephrathah, in the other references: Jos 15:59 (in added verse of Septuagint only); Ru 4:11; 1Ch 2:19,24,50; Ps 132:6; Mic 5:2, the King James Version "Ephratah"):

The name either of Bethlehem itself or of a district in which Bethlehem was situated. A man of this place was called an Ephrathite (Ru 1:2; 1Sa 17:12). It is held by many authorities that the Ephrath where Rachel was buried (Ge 35:16; 48:7) was a different place, the words "the same is Bethlehem" being a gloss. The reading in Ps 132:6 is doubtful; the Revised Version, margin has "Ephraim."

E. W. G. Masterman

EPHRATHITE

ef’-rath-it, e’-frath-it.

See EPHRATH.

EPHRON (1)

e’-fron (’ephron, "fawnlike"):

The Hittite of whom Abraham bought the field and cave of Machpelah (Ge 23:8 ff; 25:9; 49:30). The transaction was conducted in true oriental fashion, with excessive courtesy; but the large sum of 400 shekels’ weight of silver was in the end required (compare 33:19; 1Ki 16:24).

See also MONEY; MONEY, CURRENT.

EPHRON (2)

e’-fron (‘ephron; Ephron):

(1) 2Ch 13:19: "And Abijah pursued after Jeroboam, and took cities from him, Beth-el with the towns thereof, and Jeshanah with the towns thereof, and Ephron with the towns thereof." Another reading is "Ephraim" (Revised Version, margin). This is thought by many to be identical with Ophrah (‘ophrah, Jos 18:23) and perhaps with Ephraim (‘ephrayim, 2Sa 13:23) which both have been localized at the lofty town of eT Taiyibeh.

(2) A city East of the Jordan between Carnion (Ashteroth-karnain) and Scythopolis (Beisan): "Then Judas gathered

together all the Israelites that were in the country. .... Now when they came unto Ephron (this was a great city in the way as they should go, very well fortified) they could not turn from it either on the right hand or on the left, but they must needs pass through the midst of it" (1 Macc 5:45,46 the King James Version; Ant, XII, viii, 5; also 2 Macc 12:27). Buhl and Schumacher propose Kacr Wady el Ghafr, a ruined tower which completely commands the deep Wady el Ghafr, but the ruins appear to be scanty.

(3) Mt. Ephron: The border of Judah is described (Jos 15:9): "It went out to the cities of Mount Ephron." The position will depend on that of Nephtoah and of Kiriath-jearim.

E. W. G. Masterman

EPICUREANS

ep-i-ku-re'-anz (Epikoureioi):

Contents

1. Social and Political Causes 2. Egoistic Hedonism 3. Back to Nature 4. Ataraxy 5. Pleasure Is the Absence of Pain 6. Social Contract 7. Atomic Theory 8. Materialism 9. Theory of Ideas 10. Epicurean Gods 11. Consensus Gentium 12. Causes of Success 13. Complete Antithesis of Paul's Teaching 14. LITERATURE

==========

The Epicureans with the STOICS (which see) encountered Paul in Athens (Ac 17:18). They were the followers of Epicurus, a philosopher who was born in Samos in 341 BC, and who taught first in Asia Minor and afterward in Athens till his death in 270 BC. His system, unlike most philosophies, maintained its original form, with little development or dissent, to the end of its course. The views of Paul's opponents of this school may therefore be gathered from the teaching of Epicurus.

1. Social and Political Causes:

The conditions for the rise of Epicureanism and Stoicism were political and social rather than intellectual. Speculative thought had reached its zenith in the great constructive ideals of Plato, and the encyclopaedic system of Aristotle. Criticism of these would necessarily drive men back upon themselves to probe deeper into the meaning of experience, as Kant did in later times. But the conditions were not propitious to pure speculation. The breaking up of the Greek city-states and the loss of Greek independence had filled men's minds with a sense of insecurity. The institutions, laws and customs of society, which had hitherto sheltered the individual, now gave way; and men demanded from philosophy a haven of rest for their homeless and weary souls. Philosophy, therefore, became a theory of conduct and an art of living.

Epicurus deprecated the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, whether as philosophy or science, and directed his inquiries to the two practical questions: What is the aim of life? and How to attain to it? Philosophy he defined as "a daily business of speech and thought to secure a happy life."

2. Egoistic Hedonism:

His ethical teaching is therefore the central and governing factor of Epicurus' philosophy. It belongs to the type generally described as Egoistic Hedonism. The same general principles had been taught by Aristippus and his school, the Cyrenaics, a century earlier, and they were again revived in the 17th century in England by Thomas Hobbes. The aim and end of life for every man is his own happiness, and happiness is primarily defined as pleasure. "Wherefore we call pleasure the Alpha

and Omega of a blessed life. Pleasure is our first and kindred good. It is the starting-point of every choice and of every aversion, and to it we come back, inasmuch as we make feeling the rule by which to judge every good thing" (Epicurus, Letter to Menoeceus). So far Epicurus might seem to be simply repeating the view of the Cyrenaics. But there are important differences. Aristippus held the pleasure of the moment to be the end of action; but Epicurus taught that life should be so lived as to secure the greatest amount of pleasure during its whole course. And in this larger outlook, the pleasures of the mind came to occupy a larger place than the pleasures of the body. For happiness consists not so much in the satisfaction of desires, as in the suppression of wants, and in arriving at a state of independence of all circumstances, which secures a peace of mind that the privations and changes of life cannot disturb. Man's desires are of various kinds: "Some are natural, some are groundless; of the natural, some are necessary as well as natural, and some are natural only. And of the necessary desires, some are necessary if we are to be happy, some if the body is to be rid of uneasiness, some if we are even to live." Man's aim should be to suppress all desires that are unnecessary, and especially such as are artificially produced. Learning, culture, civilization and the distractions of social and political life are proscribed, much as they were in the opposite school of the Cynics, because they produce many desires difficult to satisfy, and so disturb the peace of the mind. This teaching has been compared to that of Rousseau and even of Buddha. Like the former, Epicurus enjoins the withdrawal of life from the complexities and perplexities of civilization, to the bare necessities of Nature, but he stops short of the doctrine of Nirvana, for life and the desire to live he regards as good things.

3. Back to Nature:

He even rises above Naturalism to a view that has some kinship with modern Spiritualism, in his affirmation of the mastery of mind over adverse circumstances. "Though he is being tortured on the rack, the wise man is still happy."

4. Ataraxy:

Epicurus' definition of the end of life and of the way to it bears a superficial resemblance to that of his opponents, the Stoics. The end sought by both is ataraxia, "imperturbability," a peace of mind that transcends all circumstances, and the way to it is the life according to Nature. But Nature for Epicurus is purely physical and material, and the utmost happiness attainable is the complete absence of pain.

5. Pleasure Is the Absence of Pain:

He justly protests against the representation of his teaching as gross and immoral. "When we say, then, that pleasure is the end and aim, we do not mean the pleasures of the prodigal, or the pleasures of sensuality, as we are understood to do by some, through ignorance, prejudice or willful misrepresentation. By pleasure we mean the absence of pain in the body and trouble in the soul" (Letter to Menoeceus). His own life was marked by a simplicity verging on asceticism, and by kindly consideration for his friends. But theory was capable of serving the purposes of worse men to justify license and selfishness.

6. Social Contract:

Justice and ordinary morality were recognized in the system as issuing from an original social compact, such as Hobbes and Rousseau supposed, and resting upon the self-interest and happiness of individuals who entered into the compact the better to gain those ends. Ordinary morality has therefore no stronger sanction than the individual's desire to secure his own happiness. Against public violations of the moral code, the sanction finds its agent in the social order and the penalties it inflicts; but the only deterrent from secret immorality is the fear of being found out, and the necessarily disturbing character of that fear itself. Friendship, the supreme virtue of Epicureanism, is based upon the same calculating selfishness, and is to be cultivated for the happiness it begets to its owners. The fundamental defect of the system is its extreme individualism, which issues in a studied selfishness that denies any value of their own to the social virtues, and in the negation of the larger activities of life.

Epicurus had no interest in knowledge for its own sake, whether of the external world, or of any ultimate or supreme, reality. But he found men's minds full of ideas about the world, immortality and the gods, which disturbed their peace and filled them with vain desires and fears. It was therefore necessary for the practical ends of his philosophy to find a theory of the things outside of man that would give him tranquillity and serenity of mind.

7. Atomic Theory:

For this purpose Epicurus fell back upon Democritus' atomic theory of the world. The original constituents of the universe, of which no account could be given, were atoms, the void, and motion. By a fixed law or fate, the atoms moved through the void, so as to form the world as we know it. The same uniform necessity maintains and determines the abiding condition of all that exists. Epicurus modified this system so far as to admit an initial freedom to the atoms, which enabled them to divert slightly from their uniform straight course as they fell like rain through space, and so to impinge, combine and set up rotatory motions by which the worlds, and all that is in them, came into being.

8. Materialism:

He did not follow the idea of freedom in Nature and man beyond the exigencies of his theory, and the thoroughly materialistic nature of his universe precluded him from deducing a moral realm. By this theory he gets rid of the causes of fear and anxiety that disturb the human mind. Teleology, providence, a moral order of the universe, the arbitrary action of the gods, blind fate, immortality, hell, reward and punishment after death, are all excluded from a universe where atoms moving through space do everything. The soul, like the body, is made of atoms, but of a smaller or finer texture. In death, the one like the other dissolves and comes to its end.

9. Theory of Ideas:

From the same premises one would expect the complete denial of any Divine beings. But it is a curiosity of the system that a grossly materialistic theory of knowledge should require the affirmation of the existence of the gods. Men's ideas are derived from thin material films that pass from the objects around them into the kindred matter of their minds. It follows that every idea must have been produced by a corresponding object. Men generally possess ideas of gods. Therefore, gods must exist to produce those ideas, which come to men in sleep and dreams. But they are not such gods as men generally believe to exist. They are constituted of the same atomic matter as men, but of a still finer texture. They dwell in the intermundia, the interspaces outside the worlds, where earthly cares and the dissolution of death cannot approach them. They are immortal and completely blessed. They cannot therefore know anything of the world, with its pain and its troubles, nor can they be in any way concerned with it. They are apotheoses of the Epicurean sage, entirely withdrawn from the world's turmoil, enjoying a life of calm repose, and satisfied with the bounty that Nature provides for them.

10. Epicurean Gods:

"For the nature of the gods must ever in itself of necessity enjoy immortality with supreme repose, far removed and withdrawn from our concerns; since exempt from every pain, exempt from all dangers, strong in its own resources, not wanting aught of us, it is neither gained by favors nor moved by anger" (Lucretius). All religion is banned, though the gods are retained. Epicurus' failure to carry the logic of his system to the denial of the gods lies deeper than his theory of ideas.

11. Consensus Gentium:

He was impressed by the fact that "a steadfast unanimity continues to prevail among all men without exception" that gods exist. "A consciousness of godhead does not allow him to deny the existence of God altogether. Hence, his attempt to explain the fact so as not to interfere with his general theory" (Wallace, Epicureanism, 209). During his lifetime, Epicurus attracted a large following to his creed, and it continued to flourish far down into the Christian era. It was presented to the Roman world by the poet Lucretius in his poem De natura rerum, which is still the chief source for the knowledge of it.

One Old Testament writer, the author of Eccl, may have been influenced by its spirit, though he did not adopt all its ideas.

12. Causes of Success:

The personal charm and engaging character of Epicurus himself drew men to him, and elevated him into the kind of ideal sage who personified the teaching of the school, as was the custom of all schools of philosophy. The system was clear-cut and easily understood by ordinary men, and it offered a plausible theory of life to such as could not follow the profounder and more difficult speculations of other schools. Its moral teaching found a ready response in all that was worldly, commonplace and self-seeking in men that had lost their high ideals and great enthusiasms. Above all it delivered men from the terrors of a dark superstition that had taken the place of religion. It is a remarkable revelation of the inadequacy of Greek religion that Epicurus should have relegated the gods from the visible world, without any sense of loss, but only the relief of a great deliverance.

13. Complete Antithesis of Paul’s Teaching:

It was inevitable that the teaching of Paul should have brought this school up against him. He came to Athens teaching a God who had become man, who had suffered and died to accomplish the utmost self-sacrifice, who had risen from the dead and returned to live among men to guide and fashion their lives, and who at last would judge all men, and according to their deeds reward or punish them in a future world. To the Epicurean this was the revival of all the ancient and hated superstitions. It was not only folly but impiety; for Epicurus had taught that "not the man who denies the gods worshipped by the multitude, but he who affirms of the gods what the multitude believe about them, is truly impious."

14. LITERATURE.

Hicks, Stoic and Epicurean (whose translations are adopted in all quotations in this article); Zeller, Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics; Wallace, Epicureanism; Lucretius, De natura rerum.

T. Rees

EPILEPSY

ep’-i-lep-si.

See LUNATIC.

EPIPHANES

e-pif’-a-nez.

See ANTIOCHUS IV.

EPIPHI

ep’-i-fi (Epiphi):

Name of a month mentioned in connection with Pachon in APC 1Macc 6:38.

See TIME.

EPISTLE

e-pis’-’-l (epistole, "a letter," "epistle"; from epistello, "to send to"):

Contents

1. New Testament Epistles 2. Distinctive Characteristics 3. Letter-Writing in Antiquity 4. Letters in the Old Testament 5. Letters in the Apocrypha 6. Epistolary Writings in the New Testament 7. Epistles as Distinguished from Letters 8. Patristic Epistles 9. Apocryphal Epistles

==========

1. New Testament Epistles:

A written communication; a term inclusive of all forms of written correspondence, personal and official, in vogue from an early antiquity. As applied to the twenty-one letters, which constitute well-nigh one-half of the New Testament, the word "epistle" has come to have chiefly a technical and exclusive meaning. It refers, in common usage, to the communications addressed by five (possibly six) New Testament writers to individual or collective churches, or to single persons or groups of Christian disciples. Thirteen of these letters were written by Paul; three by John; two by Peter; one each by James and Jude; one—the epistle to the Hebrews—by an unknown writer.

2. Distinctive Characteristics:

As a whole the Epistles are classified as Pauline, and Catholic, i.e. general; the Pauline being divided into two classes: those written to churches and to individuals, the latter being known as Pastoral (1 and 2 Timothy, and Titus; some also including Philemon; see Lange on Romans, American edition, 16). The fact that the New Testament is so largely composed of letters distinguishes it, most uniquely, from all the sacred writings of the world. The Scriptures of other oriental religions—the Vedas, the Zend Avesta, the Tripitaka, the Koran, the writings of Confucius—lack the direct and personal address altogether. The Epistles of the New Testament are specifically the product of a new spiritual life and era. They deal, not with truth in the abstract, but in the concrete. They have to do with the soul’s inner experiences and processes. They are the burning and heart-throbbing messages of the apostles and their confreres to the fellow-Christians of their own day. The chosen disciples who witnessed the events following the resurrection of Jesus and received the power (Ac 1:8) bestowed by the Holy Spirit on, and subsequent to, the Day of Pentecost, were spiritually a new order of men. The only approach to them in the spiritual history of mankind is the ancient Hebrew prophets. Consequently the Epistles, penned by men who had experienced a great redemption and the marvelous intellectual emancipation and quickening that came with it, were an altogether new type of literature. Their object is personal. They relate the vital truths of the resurrection era, and the fundamental principles of the new teaching, to the individual and collective life of all believers. This specific aim accounts for the form in which the apostolic letters were written. The logic of this practical aim appears conspicuously in the orderly Epistles of Paul who, after the opening salutation in each letter, lays down with marvelous clearness the doctrinal basis on which he builds the practical duties of daily Christian life. Following these, as each case may require, are the personal messages and affectionate greetings and directions, suited to this familiar form of address.

The Epistles consequently have a charm, a directness, a vitality and power unknown to the other sacred writings of the world. Nowhere are they equaled or surpassed except in the personal instructions that fell from the lips of Jesus. Devoted exclusively to experimental and practical religion they have, with the teachings of Christ, become the textbook of the spiritual life for the Christian church in all subsequent time. For this reason "they are of more real value to the church than all the systems of theology, from Origen to Schleiermacher" (Schaff on St. Paul’s Epistles, History of the Christian Church, 741). No writings in history so unfold the nature and processes of the redemptive experience. In Paul and John,

especially, the pastoral instinct is ever supreme. Their letters are too human, too personal, too vital to be formal treatises or arguments. They throb with passion for truth and love for souls. Their directness and affectionate intensity convert their authors into prophets of truth, preachers of grace, lovers of men and missionaries of the cross. Hence, their value as spiritual biographies of the writers is immeasurable. As letters are the most spontaneous and the freest form of writing, the New Testament Epistles are the very life-blood of Christianity. They present theology, doctrine, truth, appeal, in terms of life, and pulsate with a vitality that will be fresh and re-creative till the end of time. (For detailed study of their chronology, contents and distinguishing characteristics, see articles on the separate epistles.)

3. Letter-Writing in Antiquity:

While the New Testament Epistles, in style and quality, are distinct from and superior to all other literature of this class, they nevertheless belong to a form of personal and written address common to all ages. The earliest known writings were epistolary, unless we except some of the chronologies and inscriptions of the ancient Babylonian and Assyrian kings. Some of these royal inscriptions carry the art of writing back to 3800 BC, possibly to a period still earlier (see Goodspeed, Kent's Historical Series, 42-43, secs. 40-41), and excavations have brought to light "an immense mass of letters from officials to the court—correspondence between royal personages or between minor officials," as early as the reign of Khammurabi of Babylon, about 2275 BC (ibid., 33). The civilized world was astonished at the extent of this international correspondence as revealed in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1480 BC), discovered in Egypt in 1887, among the ruins of the palace of Amenophis IV. This mass of political correspondence is thus approximately synchronous with the Hebrew exodus and the invasion of Canaan under Joshua.

4. Letters in the Old Testament:

As might be expected, then, the Old Testament abounds with evidences of extensive epistolary correspondence in and between the oriental nations. That a postal service was in existence in the time of Job (Job 9:25) is evident from the Hebrew term ratsim, signifying "runners," and used of the mounted couriers of the Persians who carried the royal edicts to the provinces. The most striking illustration of this courier service in the Old Testament occurs in Es 3:13,15; 8:10,14 where King Ahasuerus, in the days of Queen Esther, twice sends royal letters to the Jews and satraps of his entire realm from India to Ethiopia, on the swiftest horses. According to Herodotus, these were usually stationed, for the sake of the greatest speed, four parasangs apart. Hezekiah's letters to Ephraim and Manasseh were sent in the same way (2Ch 30:1,6,10). Other instances of epistolary messages or communications in the Old Testament are David's letter to Joab concerning Uriah and sent by him (2Sa 11:14,15); Jezebel's, to the elders and nobles of Jezreel, sent in Ahab's name, regarding Naboth (1Ki 21:8,9); the letter of Ben-hadad, king of Syria, to Jehoram, king of Israel, by the hand of Naaman (2Ki 5:5-7); Jehu's letters to the rulers of Jezreel, in Samaria (2Ki 10:1,2,6,7); Sennacherib's letter to Hezekiah (2Ki 19:14; Isa 37:14; 2Ch 32:17), and also that of Merodach- baladan, accompanied with a gift (2Ki 20:12; Isa 39:1). Approximating the New Testament epistle in purpose and spirit is the letter of earnest and loving counsel sent by Jeremiah to the exiles in Babylon. It is both apostolic and pastoral in its prophetic fervor, and is recorded in full (Jer 29:1,4-32) with its reference to the bitterly hostile and jealous letter of Shemaiah, the false prophet, in reply.

As many writers have well indicated, the Babylonian captivity must have been a great stimulus to letter-writing on the part of the separated Hebrews, and between the far East and Palestine. Evidences of this appear in the histories of Ezra and Nehemiah, e.g. the correspondence, back and forth, between the enemies of the Jews at Jerusalem and Artaxerxes, king of Persia, written in the Syrian language (Ezr 4:7-23); also the letter of Tattenai (the King James Version "Tatnai") the governor to King Darius (Ezr 5:6-17); that of Artaxerxes to Ezra (Ezr 7:11 ff), and to Asaph, keeper of the royal forest (Ne 2:8); finally the interchange of letters between the nobles of Judah and Tobiah; and those of the latter to Nehemiah (Ne 6:17,19; so Sanballat verse 5).

5. Letters in the Apocrypha:

The Old Testament Apocrypha contains choice specimens of personal and official letters, approximating in literary form

the epistles of the New Testament. In each case they begin, like the latter, in true epistolary form with a salutation: "greeting" or "sendeth greeting" (APC 1Macc 11:30,32; 12:6,20; 15:2,16), and in two instances closing with the customary "Fare ye well" or "Farewell" (2 Macc 11:27-33,34-38; compare 2Co 13:11), so universally characteristic of letter-writing in the Hellenistic era.

6. Epistolary Writings in the New Testament:

The most felicitous and perfect example official correspondence in the New Testament is Claudius Lysias' letter to Felix regarding Paul (Ac 23:25-30). Equally complete in form is the letter, sent, evidently in duplicate, by the apostles and elders to their Gentilebrethren in the provinces of Asia (Ac 15:23-29). In these two letters we have the first, and with Jas 1:1, the only, instance of the Greek form of salutation in the New Testament (chairein). The latter is by many scholars regarded as probably the oldest letter in epistolary form in the New Testament, being in purport and substance a Pastoral Letter issued by the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem to the churches of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. It contained instructions as to the basis of Christian fellowship, similar to those of the great apostle to the churches under his care.

The letters of the high priest at Jerusalem commending Saul of Tarsus to the synagogues of Damascus are samples of the customary letters of introduction (Ac 9:2; 22:5; compare Ac 28:21; also Ac 18:27). As a Christian apostle Paul refers to this common use of "epistles of commendation" (2Co 3:1; 1Co 16:3) and himself made happy use of the same (Ro 16:1 ff); he also mentions receiving letters, in turn, from the churches (1Co 7:1). Worthy of classification as veritable epistles are the letters, under the special guidance of the Holy Spirit, to the seven churches of Asia (Re 2:1-3:22). In fact, the entire Book of Re is markedly epistolary in form, beginning with the benedictory salutation of personal and apostolic address, and closing with the benediction common to the Pauline epistles. This again distinguishes the New Testament literature in spirit and form from all other sacred writings, being almost exclusively direct and personal, whether in vocal or written address. In this respect the gospels, histories and epistles are alike the product and exponent of a new spiritual era in the life of mankind.

7. Epistles as Distinguished from Letters:

This survey of epistolary writing in the far East, and especially in the Old Testament and New Testament periods, is not intended to obscure the distinction between the letter and the epistle. A clear line of demarcation separates them, owing not merely to differences in form and substance, but to the exalted spiritual mission and character of the apostolic letters. The characterization of a letter as more distinctly personal, confidential and spontaneous, and the epistle as more general in aim and more suited to or intended for publication, accounts only in part for the classification. Even when addressed to churches Paul's epistles were as spontaneous and intimately and affectionately personal as the ordinary correspondence. While intended for general circulation it is doubtful if any of the epistolary writers of the New Testament ever anticipated such extensive and permanent use of their letters as is made possible in the modern world of printing. The epistles of the New Testament are lifted into a distinct category by their spiritual eminence and power, and have given the word epistle a meaning and quality that will forever distinguish it from letter. In this distinction appears that Divine element usually defined as inspiration: a vitality and spiritual endowment which keeps the writings of the apostles permanently "living and powerful," where those of their successors pass into disuse and obscurity.

8. Patristic Epistles:

Such was the influence of the New Testament Epistles on the literature of early Christianity that the patristic and pseudepigraphic writings of the next century assumed chiefly the epistolary form. In letters to churches and individuals the apostolic Fathers, as far as possible, reproduced their spirit, quality and style.

See LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC.

9. Apocryphal Epistles:

Pseudo-epistles extensively appeared after the patristic era, many of them written and circulated in the name of the apostles and apostolic Fathers. See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES. This early tendency to hide ambitious or possibly heretical writings under apostolic authority and Scriptural guise may have accounted for the anathema pronounced by John against all who should attempt to add to or detract from the inspired revelation (Re 22:18,19). It is hardly to be supposed that all the apostolic letters and writings have escaped destruction. Paul in his epistles refers a number of times to letters of his that do not now exist and that evidently were written quite frequently to the churches under his care (1Co 5:9; 2Co 10:9,10; Eph 3:3); "in every epistle" (2Th 3:17) indicates not merely the apostle's uniform method of subscription but an extensive correspondence. Col 4:16 speaks of an "epistle from Laodicea," now lost, doubtless written by Paul himself to the church at Laodicea, and to be returned by it in exchange for his epistle to the church at Colosse.

Dwight M. Pratt

EPISTLES, CAPTIVITY

See PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.

EPISTLES, SPURIOUS

spu'-ri-us.

See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES.

EPISTLES, THE PASTORAL

See PASTORAL EPISTLES.

EQUAL

e'-kwal isos:

In Eze 18:25; 29; 33:17,20, "The way of the Lord is not equal" translates Hebrew yittakhen for takhan, "to weigh," and means "is not adjusted to any fixed standard," "arbitrary," "fitful," and, therefore, "not equitable, fair, or impartial" Septuagint ("is not set straight"). Compare same Hebrew word in 1Sa 2:3, where the Lord is said to 'weigh actions.' "Equal," therefore, is what will bear the closest investigation and strictest judgment. In Mt 20:12, "made them equal" means "put them upon the same footing," i.e. regarded their brief service as though it were the very same as our long hours of toil. In Lu 20:36 the context restricts the equality to a particular relation. The precise meaning of isos in Joh 5:18, "making himself equal with God," is clearly defined by the preceding clause, for our Lord's opponents say that He has "called God his own Father" (Greek idion patera, i.e. His Father in a peculiar and exclusive sense; compare idiou huiou of Ro 8:32, applying the same adjective to the Son in His relation to the Father, i.e. His Son in a sense in which no one else can claim the title). They correctly interpreted the language of Jesus as declaring that He was the Son of God in a way that put Him on an equality with God. The charge against Him is not that He said that He was "like" (homoios), but that He was "equal" (isos), i.e. of the very same rank and authority.

H. E. Jacobs

EQUALITY

e-kwol'-i-ti (isotes):

In 2Co 8:14, literally, ." out of equality," i.e. "in equal proportion" or "that there may be equality." In Php 2:6, it occurs in a paraphrase of Greek to einai isa theo, "the being on an equality with God." In this much-discussed passage, isa, according to a not unusual Attic idiom, is construed adverbially (see Meyer on passage), meaning, therefore, not ‘the being equal’ (the King James Version), which would require ison, but "the having equal prerogatives and privileges." The personal equality is one thing; the equality of attributes is another, and it is the latter which is here expressed (Lightfoot). The "being on an equality" and the "having equal prerogatives" are both deductions from the possession of "the form of God." The thought is that if He who had "the form of God" had under all circumstances exercised His Divine attributes, He would have been employing only what belonged to Him, and would in no way have derogated from what belongs only to God. We regard this as referring to the incarnate Son in His historical manifestation.

H. E. Jacobs

EQUITY

ek’-wi-ti:

Is synonymous with "uprightness," which is found in Pr 17:26; Isa 59:14; Mal 2:6 in place of the King James Version "equity." Ec 2:21 has "skilfulness" and the Revised Version, margin "success" for the King James Version "equity." The context favors this translation of kishron, which is derived from kasher, "to succeed."

Equity is the spirit of the law behind the letter; justice is the application of the spirit of equity; honesty is the general everyday use of justice or fairness, equity being the interior or abstract ideal. The Court of Equity overrides the Court of Common Law, deciding not upon terms, but the spirit of the deed.

M. O. Evans

ER

ar (‘er, "watcher"; Er’):

(1) The eldest son of Judah, the son of Jacob, by Shua the Canaanite. Judah took for him a wife named Tamar. It is recorded that Er "was wicked in the sight of Yahweh; and Yahweh slew him" (Ge 38:3,6,7; 46:12).

(2) "Er the father of Lecah" is mentioned among "the sons of Shelah the son of Judah" (1Ch 4:21).

(3) An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy in the 7th generation before Zerubbabel (Lu 3:28).

ERA

e’-ra:

We find no definite era in use in Old Testament times, and such usage does not appear until we reach the period of the Maccabees. There are some references to important events that might have served as eras had they been generally accepted and constantly employed. Such was the Exodus; and this is referred to as the starting-point in fixing the date of the building of Solomon’s temple (1Ki 6:1), and also for the date of Aaron’s death (Nu 33:38).

An earthquake is referred to by Amos 1:1 as a well-known event by which to date the beginning of his prophetic career;

and Ezekiel in two passages refers to the captivity of Judah as a date for marking certain events in his life. Of these the Exodus would have been the most appropriate event to use as an era, since it marked the birth of the Hebrew nation; but the universal custom of antiquity was to date from the regnal years of the kings, as we see in the history of Egypt and Babylonia and Assyria; this custom was followed by the Israelites as soon as the kingdom was established, and was continued down to the Captivity. After the return of the Jews they naturally adopted the regnal years of the Persian kings, under whose rule they were, until the overthrow of the kingdom by Alexander. After this event, the era that prevailed most widely in Syria was that of the Seleucid kingdom, which began in 312 BC, and must have been familiar to the Jews, and we have evidence that they made use of it. When Simon the Maccabee secured the independence of the Jews from the Seleucid king, Demetrius II, in 141-140, they began to date their instruments and contracts from this event as is stated in 1 Macc 13:41,42; and we find that the year of their independence is fixed by reference to the Seleucid era, the first year of Simon being the 170th of that era (see Josephus, Ant, XIII, vi, 7).

After this they used the era of Simon, dating by his regnal years; but whether they used this as a permanent era during the Asmonean Dynasty or dated simply from the accession of each king, we do not know. There is no doubt that the Seleucid era continued to be used throughout the country for several centuries after the downfall of the Seleucid kingdom, as we have abundant evidence from inscriptions. When the Romans took possession of Syria and Palestine, their era was of course employed by Roman officials, but this did not prevail among the people. The dynasty of the Herods sometimes employed their own regnal years and sometimes those of the emperors, as appears from their coins. The Jews must have been familiar with the eras employed by some of the Phoenician towns, such as Tyre and Sidon. Tyre had a local era which began in 126 BC, and Sidon one beginning in 112 BC; and most of the towns on the coast used the era of Alexander, dating from the battle of Issus, until the establishment of the Seleucid era. The Jews would be familiar with these from their commercial connections with the coast towns, but we do not know that they used them. They did not adopt the era of the Creation until after the time of Christ. It was fixed at 4,000 years before the destruction of the later temple, or 3760 BC.

H. Porter

ERAN

e’-ran (‘eran, "watcher," "watchful"; Eden):

The son of Ephraim’s oldest son Shuthelah (Nu 26:36).

Eranites, the descendants of Eran (same place) .

ERASTUS

e-ras’-tus (Erastos, "beloved"):

The name occurs three times, each time denoting a companion of Paul.

(1) Erastus was sent with Timothy from Ephesus into Macedonia while Paul remained in Asia for a while. They are designated "two of them that ministered unto him" (Ac 19:22).

(2) "Erastus the treasurer of the city" sent greetings to the Christians in Rome (Ro 16:23). He was apparently an important person in the Corinthian community, and with Gaius probably represented that church in these fraternal relations with the Roman community.

(3) Erastus is one who, in 2Ti 4:20, "remained at Corinth."

We have no means of discovering whether one or more than one person is meant in these references. A. C. Headlam (HDB, under the word) thinks it improbable that one who held an office implying residence in one locality should have been one of Paul's companions in travel. On the other hand Paul may be designating Erastus (Ro 16:23) by an office he once held, but which he gave up to engage in mission work.

S. F. Hunter

ERECH

e'-rek, er'-ek ('erekh; Orech):

1. Etymology of the Name:

The second of the cities founded by Nimrod, the others being Babel, Accad and Calneh (Ge 10:10). The derivation of the name is well known, Erech being the Semitic-Babylonian Uruk, from the Sumerian Unug, a word meaning "seat," probably in the sense of "residential city." The character with which it is written enters into the composition of the Babylonian names of Larsa and Ur of the Chaldees.

2. Position and Nature of the Ruins:

Its identification with Warka, on the left bank of the Euphrates, half-way between Hillah (Babylon) and Korna, is beyond a doubt. It is thought that the Euphrates must have flowed nearer to the city in ancient times, as the Gilgames legend relates that that hero and his companion Enkidu washed their hands in the stream after having killed the divine bull sent by the goddess Ishtar to destroy them. The shape of the ruin is irregular, the course of the walls of the Northeast having been seemingly determined by that of the Nile canal (Shatt-en-Nil), which flowed on that side. The extreme length of the site from North to South is over 3,000 yds., and its width about 2,800 yds. This space is very full of remains of buildings; and the foundations of the walls, with their various windings, gateways and defenses, are traceable even now.

3. Its Patron-Deities and Their Temples:

Two great deities, Ishtar and Nanaa, were worshipped in this city, the temple of the former being E-anna, "the house of heaven" (or "of Anu," in which case it is probable that the god of the heavens, Anu, was also one of the patrons of the city). The shrine dedicated to Ishtar is apparently now represented by the ruin known as Buwariyya or "reed-mats," and so called on account of the layers of matting at intervals of 4 or 5 ft. This is the great temple-tower (ziq-qurat) of the place, called E-gipar-imina, "the house of 7 enclosures." The remains are situated in a large courtyard measuring 350 ft. by 270 ft. As in the case of other Babylonian erections, the corners are directed toward the cardinal points, and its height is about 100 ft. above the desert-plain.

As Erech is mentioned with Babylon, Niffer (Calneh) and Eridu, as one of the cities created by Merodach (Nimrod), it is clear that it was classed with the oldest foundations in Babylonia. It was the city of Gilgames, the half-mythical king of the earliest period, who seems to have restored the walls and temples. Its earliest known ruler of historical times was Ensag-kus-anna, about 4,000 BC.

4. History of the City's Temples, etc.:

The celebrated shrine of Ishtar was already in existence in the time of Lugal-zaggi-si, who came somewhat later. King Dungi (2600 BC) restored E-anna and built its great wall. This was in the time of the great Ur Dynasty, but later the city seems to have come under the dominion of the kings of Isin, Libit-Ishtar having apparently restored the sanctuary of Ishtar on E- gipara. Another great ruler of the early period was Sin-gasid, king of Erech, who was a patron of E-anna; and when

he restored this shrine, he endowed it with grain, wool, oil and 1 shekel of gold. There seems also to have been a shrine to Nergal, god of war, which was restored by King Sin-gamil. About 2280 BC Kudur-Nanchunde, the Elamite king, plundered the city, and carried off the statue of the goddess Nanaa, which was only restored to its place by Assur-bani-apli, the Assyrian king, about 635 BC. Samsu-iluna seems to have surpassed his father Hammurabi (Amraphel) in the restoration of the city's temples, and other rulers who did not forget Erech were Nebuchadrezzar and Nabonidus.

5. Literature Referring to Erech:

Many tablets have been found on the site, and give promise of interesting discoveries still to come. Having been the capital of the hero-king Gilgames, who saw the wonders of the wide world, spoke with the Babylonian Noah face to face, and almost attained immortality as a living man, it was always a place of romance. Poetical compositions concerning it exist, one of the most interesting being a lamentation possibly written after the invasion of Kudur-Nanchundi, when famine was rife in the city, blood flowed like water in E-ulbar, the house of Istar's oracle, and the enemy heaped up fire in all the goddess' lands as one heaps up embers.

6. The City's Numerous Names:

The consideration in which the city was held is made plain by the geographical lists, from which it would seem that it had no less than 11 names, among them being Illab or Illag, Tir-anna, "the heavenly grove"; Ub-imina, "the 7 regions"; Uru-gipara-imina, "the city of the 7 enclosures"; and Uruk-supuri, "Erech of the folds" (the name which it always bears in the Gilgames legend), given to it either on account of its being a center where pastoral tribes gathered, or because of the flocks kept for sacrifice to its deities.

7. Tablets and Tombs of Late Date:

Besides the inscriptions of the kings already mentioned, tablets of the reigns of Nabopolassar, Nebuchadrezzar, Nabonidus, Cyrus, Darius and some of the Seleucids have been found on the site. In the ruins of the town and the country around, numerous glazed earthenware (slipper-shaped) coffins and other receptacles, used for and in connection with the burial of the dead, occur. These are mostly of the Parthian period, but they imply that the place was regarded as a necropolis, possibly owing to the sanctity attached to the site.

LITERATURE.

Schrader, KAT; Loftus, Chaldoea and Susiana, 162 ff; Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 221 f; Zehnpfund, Babylonien in seinen wichtigsten Ruinenstatten, 48 ff.

T. G. Pinches

ERI-AKU

er-i-a-koo', e-ri-a-ku':

1. The Name and Its Etymology:

This is the probable Sumerian reading of the well-known Babylonian name written with the characters for "servant" (Sem wardu or ardu) and the group standing for the Moon-god Sin (written En-zu = Zu-en), otherwise Aku, the whole meaning "servant of the Moon-god." This ruler, who was king of Larsa (ELLASAR, compare that article), is generally identified with the ARIOCH (which see) of Ge 14:9. Several Assyriologists read the name with the Semitic Babylonian pronunciation of Warad-Sin; and, if this be correct, there would be a certain amount of doubt as to the generally received

identification; though this, on the other hand, might simply prove that the ancient Hebrews obtained their transcription from a Sumerian source.

2. Inscriptions Mentioning Eri-Aku:

In addition to a number of contract-tablets, the following inscriptions mentioning Eri-Aku or Warad-Sin are known:

(1) A dedication, by Kudur-mabuk, "father of Martu" (Amurru, the land of the Amorites), son of Simti-Silchak, of some sacred object to the Moon-god Nannar, for his own life and that of Eri-Aku, his son, the king of Larsa.

(2) A dedication, by Eri-Aku, to Ishtar of Challabu, for his own life and that of his father and begetter Kudur-mabuk. The text records the restoration of Istar’s sanctuary.

(3) A dedication, by Eri-Aku, to the god Nannar, for the preservation of his own life and that of his father, Kudur-mabuk. The restoration of several temples is referred to.

(4) An inscription of Eri-Aku, "the powerful man," "the nourisher of Ur (of the Chaldees), the king of Larsa, the king of Sumer and Akkad; son of Kudur-mabuk, the father of Emutbala." The text records that he raised the wall of Ur, called "Nannar is the consolidator of the foundations of the land," high like a mountain.

(5) A dedication by Eri-Aku to Nin-insina (titles as above). It records the building of the temple E-u-namtila, for his own life, and the life of Kudurmabuk, the father his begetter.

3. The Nationality of His Family:

These inscriptions and others show that Eri-Aku belonged to an Elamite family which held the throne of Larsa, a state which, in common with Babylonia itself, acknowledged the suzerainty of Elam. Kudurmabuk would seem, from motives of policy, to have given his sons Sumerian and Semitic Babylonian names; and it is noteworthy that he did not retain the rule of Larsa for himself, but delegated it to his offspring, keeping for himself the dominion of Emutbala and, as his own inscription shows, the land of the Amorites. With regard to these it may be noted, that the expression adda, "father," probably means simply "administrator."

4. Eri-Aku and Rim-Sin:

Eri-Aku seems to have died while his father was still alive, and was succeeded by Rim-Sin, who, as Francois Thureau-Dangin points out, must have been his brother. As in the case of Eri-Aku, Kudur-mabuk inaugurated the reign of Rim-Sin by a dedication; but there seems to be no inscription in which Rim-Sin makes a dedication for the life of his father, implying that Kudur-mabuk died soon after his second son came to the throne.

And here the question of the identification of Eri-Aku with Eri-Eaku (var. -Ekua) claims consideration. This name occurs on certain tablets of late date from Babylonia, and is coupled with a name which may be read Kudur-lachgumal (for Kudurlachbgomar, i.e. Chedorlaomer), and Tud-chul, 1 (NOTE: 1 Written Tudchula, but the syllabaries indicate the final a as silent.) the Biblical Tidal.

5. Is Eri-Aku to Be Identified with Eri-Eaku?:

These inscriptions are very mutilated, but from the smaller one it would seem that Eri-(E)aku had a son named Durmah-ilani, who ravaged some district, and there were floods at Babylon. (But) his son slaughtered him like a lamb, and old man and child (were slain) with the sword. Similar things seem to be said of Tudchul or Tidal. The larger fragment gives further

details of the life of Durmach-ilani, who had usurped royal power and had been killed with the sword. If the events recorded belong to this period, they must have taken place after the death of Eri-Aku (-Eaku, -Ekua), but before that of Kudur-lachgumal. It is to be noted that, in accordance with Elamite usage, the crown did not pass to the eldest son after a king's death, but to the king's eldest brother. In Elam this led to endless conflicts, and the same probably took place in Larsa until incorporated with the states of Babylonia.

6. A Historical Romance:

The fact that the history of Kudur-lachgumal (?) forms the subject of a poetical legend suggests that the texts mentioning these kings may have belonged to a kind of historical romance, of which Chedorlaomer (Amraphel), Arioch, and Tidal were the heroes—and, in truth, this is implied by their style. That they are utterly apocryphal, however, remains to be proved.

LITERATURE.

See "Inscriptions and Records Referring to Babylonia and Elam," etc., Journal of the Victoria Institute, 1895-96 (also separately); and the articles CHEDORLAOMER and ELAM, section 12 (5).

T. G. Pinches

ERI; ERITES

e'-ri, e'-rits ('eri, "watcher"):

The fifth of the seven sons of Gad (Ge 46:16; Nu 26:16).

Patronymic, Erites (same place) , a clan of Gad.

ERR; ERROR

ur, er'-er:

To err is in the Old Testament the translation of shaghah, and ta'ah, both of which mean literally, ." to wander," "to go astray." We have shaghah in 1Sa 26:21, "I have played the fool, and have erred"; Job 19:4, "Mine error remaineth with myself," i.e. "is my own concern," or, perhaps, "only injures myself"; Ps 119:118; Isa 28:7 the King James Version (thrice); ta'ah, Ps 95:10; Pr 14:22; Isa 35:8. It means also "to cause to err" (Isa 3:12; 30:28, "a bridle that causeth to err"; Jer 23:13,12; "Their lies (i.e. the unreal deities, creatures of their own imagination) have caused them to err," Am 2:4).

In the New Testament the word is generally planaomai, "to wander" (Mr 12:24,27; Heb 3:10; Jas 5:19); astocheo, "to miss the mark," "to swerve," occurs twice (1Ti 6:21; 2Ti 2:18).

Error in the Old Testament represents various words: sheghaghah, "mistake," "oversight" (Ec 5:6; compare Pr 20:25 and see INQUIRE); meshughah, with the same meaning, "wandering" (Job 19:4; compare Ps 19:12); shal, "rashness," "mistake" (2Sa 6:7, "God smote him there for his error," the Revised Version, margin "rashness"); shalu, Aramaic "mistake" (Da 6:4); to'ah, "injury" (Isa 32:6).

In the New Testament we have plane, "wandering" (Ro 1:27; Jas 5:20; 1 Joh 4:6; Jude 1:11, "the error of Balaam"); agnoema, "ignorance" (Heb 9:7, margin, Greek "ignorances"). For "is deceived" (Pr 20:1) the Revised Version (British and American) has "erreth," margin "or reeleth"; for "them that are out of the way" (Heb 5:2), "the ignorant and erring"; for

"deceit" (1Th 2:3), "error."

The English word "error" has the same original meaning as the Hebrew and Greek main words, being derived from erro, "to wander." "To err is human," but there are errors of the heart as well as of the head. The familiar phrase just quoted seems to have its equivalent in the marginal rendering of Ge 6:3, "in their going astray they are flesh." Errors through ignorance are in the Bible distinguished from errors of the heart and willful errors (Le 5:18; Nu 15:22; Eze 45:20).

W. L. Walker

ESAIAS

e-za’-yas.

See ISAIAH.

ESARHADDON

e-sar-had’-on (’ecar-chaddon; Assyrian Asur-ach-iddina, "Ashur hath given a brother"):

During his lifetime, Sennacherib, king of Assyria, made his favorite son, Esarhaddon (680-668 BC), the viceroy of Babylon; and although he was not the eldest son, he decreed that he should become the legal heir to the throne of Assyria. Sennacherib, having been slain in 681, apparently by two of his sons, who are called in the Old Testament Adrammelech and Sharezer (2Ki 19:37), Esarhaddon proceeded to Nineveh, where the rebellion which followed the death of his father collapsed, having existed for about a month and a half. The Old Testament informs us that the murderers of his father fled to Armenia. This is corroborated by the inscriptions which say that at Melid, in the land of Hanirabbat, which can be said to be in Armenia, Esarhaddon fought the rebels and defeated them; whereupon he was proclaimed king. His father had been so displeased with Babylon that he had attempted to annihilate the city by making it a swamp. Esarhaddon, however, having been infatuated with the ancient culture of the Babylonians, adopted a conciliatory attitude toward the people. Immediately he planned to restore the city on magnificent proportions. The foundations of his work were laid with impressive ceremonies, and in every way he endeavored to ameliorate the inhabitants by his gracious deeds. Even at Nippur evidences of his work in restoring the ancient shrine of Ellil are seen. The kings of the West who became his vassals, among them being Manasseh of Judah, were required to furnish building materials for his operations in Babylonia. His work in that land explains why the Judean king was incarcerated at Babylon (2Ch 33:11) instead of Assyria.

Esarhaddon was first compelled to defend the kingdom against the inroads of the hordes from the North. The Gimirra (perhaps referring to Gomer of the Old Testament), who were called Manda, seemed to pour into the land. A decisive victory was finally gained over them, and they were driven back into their own country. Afterward, the Medes and the Chaldeans were also subjugated. He then directed his attentions toward the West. Sidon having revolted against Assyria, Esarhaddon laid siege to the city, which after three years was finally captured and destroyed. He built another city upon the same site, which he called Kar-Esarhaddon, and endeavored to revive its commerce. And, as is mentioned in Ezr 4:2; compare 10, he repopulated the city (Samaria) with captives from Elam and Babylonia.

The capture of Tyre was also attempted, but, the city being differently situated, a siege from the land was insufficient to bring about submission, as it was impossible to cut off the commerce by sea. The siege, after several years, seems to have been lifted. Although on a great monolith Esarhaddon depicts Ba‘al, the king of Tyre, kneeling before him with a ring through his lips, there is nothing in the inscriptions to bear this out.

His work in Canaan was preparatory to his conquest of Egypt. Tirhakah, the Ethiopian king of Egypt, was attacked on the borders, but no victory was gained. Several years later he crossed the borders and gained a decisive victory at Iskhupri. He

then proceeded to lay siege to Memphis, which soon capitulated; and Egypt, to the confines of Nubia, surrendered to Assyria. Esarhaddon reorganized the government, and even changed the names of the cities. Necoh was placed over the 22 princes of the land. In 668, Egypt revolted and Esarhaddon, while on his way to put down the revolt, died. He had arranged that the kingdom be divided between two of his sons: Ashurbanipal was to be king of Assyria, and Shamash-shum-ukin was to reign over Babylonia. The nobles decreed, however, that the empire should not be divided, but Shamash-shum-ukin was made viceroy of Babylonia.

A. T. Clay

ESAU

e'-so ('esaw, "hairy"; Esau):

Son of Isaac, twin brother of Jacob. The name was given on account of the hairy covering on his body at birth: "all over like a hairy garment" (Ge 25:25). There was a prenatal foreshadowing of the relation his descendants were to sustain to those of his younger brother, Jacob (Ge 25:23). The moment of his birth also was signalized by a circumstance that betokened the same destiny (Ge 25:26).

The young Esau was fond of the strenuous, daring life of the chase—he became a skillful hunter, "a man of the field" ('ish sadheh). His father warmed toward him rather than toward Jacob, because Esau's hunting expeditions resulted in meats that appealed to the old man's taste (Ge 25:28). Returning hungry from one of these expeditions, however, Esau exhibited a characteristic that marked him for the inferior position which had been foretokened at the time of his birth. Enticed by the pottage which Jacob had boiled, he could not deny himself, but must, at once, gratify his appetite, though the calm and calculating Jacob should demand the birthright of the firstborn as the price (Ge 25:30-34). Impulsively he snatched an immediate and sensual gratification at the forfeit of a future glory. Thus he lost the headship of the people through whom God's redemptive purpose was to be wrought out in the world, no less than the mere secular advantage of the firstborn son's chief share in the father's temporal possessions. Though Esau had so recklessly disposed of his birthright, he afterward would have secured from Isaac the blessing that appertained, had not the cunning of Rebekah provided for Jacob. Jacob, to be sure, had some misgiving about the plan of his mother (Ge 27:12), but she reassured him; the deception was successful and he secured the blessing. Now, too late, Esau bitterly realized somewhat, at least, of his loss, though he blamed Jacob altogether, and himself not at all (Ge 27:34,36). Hating his brother on account of the grievance thus held against him, he determined upon fratricide as soon as his father should pass away (Ge 27:41); but the watchful Rebekah sent Jacob to Haran, there to abide with her kindred till Esau's wrath should subside (Ge 27:42-45).

Esau, at the age of forty, had taken two Hittite wives, and had thus displeased his parents. Rebekah had shrewdly used this fact to induce Isaac to fall in with her plan to send Jacob to Mesopotamia; and Esau, seeing this, seems to have thought he might please both Isaac and Rebekah by a marriage of a sort different from those already contracted with Canaanitish women. Accordingly, he married a kinswoman in the person of a daughter of Ishmael (Ge 28:6,9). Connected thus with the "land of Seir," and by the fitness of that land for one who was to live by the sword, Esau was dwelling there when Jacob returned from Mesopotamia. While Jacob dreaded meeting him, and took great pains to propitiate him, and made careful preparations against a possible hostile meeting, very earnestly seeking Divine help, Esau, at the head of four hundred men, graciously received the brother against whom his anger had so hotly burned. Though Esau had thus cordially received Jacob, the latter was still doubtful about him, and, by a sort of duplicity, managed to become separated from him, Esau returning to Seir (Ge 33:12-17). Esau met his brother again at the death of their father, about twenty years later (Ge 35:29). Of the after years of his life we know nothing.

Esau was also called Edom ("red"), because he said to Jacob: "Feed me, I pray thee, with that same red pottage" (Ge 25:30). The land in which he established himself was "the land of Seir," so called from Seir, ancestor of the Horites whom Esau found there; and called also Edom from Esau's surname, and, it may be, too, from the red sandstone of the country (Sayce).

"Esau" is sometimes found in the sense of the descendants of Esau, and of the land in which they dwelt (De 2:5; Ob 1:6,8,18,19).

E. J. Forrester

ESAY

e’-sa (Esaias):

the King James Version for Isaiah (APC 2Esdras 2:18; Ecclesiasticus 48:22).

ESCHATOLOGY

see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, I-V

es-ka-tol’-o-ji:

Contents

I. DOCTRINAL AND RELIGIOUS SIGNIFICANCE

II. GENERAL STRUCTURE

III. COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT

IV. GENERAL AND INDIVIDUAL ESCHATOLOGY

V. THE PAROUSIA

1. Definition

2. Signs Preceding the Parousia

3. Events Preceding the Parousia

(1) The Conversion of Israel

(2) The Coming of the Antichrist

4. The Manner of the Parousia

VI. THE RESURRECTION

1. Its Universality

2. The Millennium

3. The Resurrection of Believers

4. The Resurrection-Body

VII. THE CHANGE OF THOSE LIVING AT THE PAROUSIA

VIII. THE JUDGMENT

IX. THE CONSUMMATE STATE

X. THE INTERMEDIATE STATE

XI. LITERATURE

==========

I. Doctrinal and Religious Significance.

The subject of eschatology plays a prominent part in New Testament teaching and religion. Christianity in its very origin bears an eschatological character. It means the appearance of the Messiah and the inauguration of His work; and from the Old Testament point of view these form part of eschatology. It is true in Jewish theology the days of the Messiah were not always included in the eschatological age proper, but often regarded as introductory to it (compare Weber, Judische Theol. 2, 371 ff). And in the New Testament also this point of view is to some extent represented, inasmuch as, owing to the appearance of the Messiah and the only partial fulfillment of the prophecies for the present, that which the Old Testament depicted as one synchronous movement is now seen to divide into two stages, namely, the present Messianic age and the consummate state of the future. Even so, however, the New Testament draws the Messianic period into much closer connection with the strictly eschatological process than Judaism. The distinction in Judaism rested on a consciousness of difference in quality between the two stages, the content of the Messianic age being far less spiritually and transcendentally conceived than that of the final state. The New Testament, by spiritualizing the entire Messianic circle of ideas, becomes keenly alive to its affinity to the content of the highest eternal hope, and consequently tends to identify the two, to find the age to come anticipated in the present. In some cases this assumes explicit shape in the belief that great eschatological transactions have already begun to take place, and that believers have already attained to at least partial enjoyment of eschatological privileges. Thus the present kingdom in our Lord’s teaching is one in essence with the final kingdom; according to the discourses in John eternal life is in principle realized here; with Paul there has been a prelude to the last judgment and resurrection in the death and resurrection of Christ, and the life in the Spirit is the first- fruits of the heavenly state to come. The strong sense of this may even express itself in the paradoxical form that the eschatological state has arrived and the one great incision in history has already been made (Heb 2:3,1; 9:11; 10:1; 12:22-24). Still, even where this extreme consciousness is reached, it nowhere supersedes the other more common representation, according to which the present state continues to lie this side of the eschatological crisis, and, while directly leading up to the latter, yet remains to all intents a part of the old age and world-order. Believers live in the "last days," upon them "the ends of the ages are come," but "the last day," "the consummation of the age," still lies in the future (Mt 13:39,40,49; 24:3; 28:20; Joh 6:39,44,54; 12:48; 1Co 10:11; 2Ti 3:1; Heb 1:2; 9:26; Jas 5:3; 1Pe 1:5,20; 2Pe 3:3; 1 Joh 2:18; Jude 1:18).

The eschatological interest of early believers was no mere fringe to their religious experience, but the very heart of its inspiration. It expressed and embodied the profound supernaturalism and soteriological character of the New Testament faith. The coming world was not to be the product of natural development but of a Divine interposition arresting the process of history. And the deepest motive of the longing for this world was a conviction of the abnormal character of the present world, a strong sense of sin and evil. This explains why the New Testament doctrine of salvation has grown up to a

large extent in the closest interaction with its eschatological teaching. The present experience was interpreted. in the light of the future. It is necessary to keep this in mind for a proper appreciation of the generally prevailing hope that the return of the Lord might come in the near future. Apocalyptic calculation had less to do with this than the practical experience that the earnest of the supernatural realities of the life to come was present in the church, and that therefore it seemed unnatural for the full fruition of these to be long delayed. The subsequent receding of this acute eschatological state has something to do with the gradual disappearance of the miraculous phenomena of the apostolic age.

II. General Structure.

New Testament eschatology attaches itself to the Old Testament and to Jewish belief as developed on the basis of ancient revelation. It creates on the whole no new system or new terminology, but incorporates much that was current, yet so as to reveal by selection and distribution of emphasis the essential newness of its spirit. In Judaism there existed at that time two distinct types of eschatological outlook. There was the ancient national hope which revolved around the destiny of Israel. Alongside of it existed a transcendental form of eschatology with cosmical perspective, which had in view the destiny of the universe and of the human race. The former of these represents the original form of Old Testament eschatology, and therefore occupies a legitimate place in the beginnings of the New Testament development, notably in the revelations accompanying the birth of Christ and in the earlier (synoptical) preaching of John the Baptist. There entered, however, into it, as held by the Jews, a considerable element of individual and collective eudaemonism, and it had become identified with a literalistic interpretation of prophecy, which did not sufficiently take into account the typical import and poetical character of the latter. The other scheme, while to some extent the product of subsequent theological development, lies prefigured in certain later prophecies, especially in Dnl, and, far from being an importation from Babylonian, or ultimately Persian, sources, as some at present maintain, represents in reality the true development of the inner principles of Old Testament prophetic revelation. To it the structure of New Testament eschatology closely conforms itself.

In doing this, however, it discards the impure motives and elements by which even this relatively higher type of Jewish eschatology was contaminated. In certain of the apocalyptic writings a compromise is attempted between these two schemes after this manner, that the carrying out of the one is merely to follow that of the other, the national hope first receiving its fulfillment in a provisional Messianic kingdom of limited duration (400 or 1,000 years), to be superseded at the end by the eternal state. The New Testament does not follow the Jewish theology along this path. Even though it regards the present work of Christ as preliminary to the consummate order of things, it does not separate the two in essence or quality, it does not exclude the Messiah from a supreme place in the coming world, and does not expect a temporal Messianic kingdom in the future as distinguished from Christ’s present spiritual reign, and as preceding the state of eternity. In fact the figure of the Messiah becomes central in the entire eschatological process, far more so than is the case in Judaism. All the stages in this process, the resurrection, the judgment, the life eternal, even the intermediate state, receive the impress of the absolute significance which Christian faith ascribes to Jesus as the Christ. Through this Christocentric character New Testament eschatology acquires also far greater unity and simplicity than can be predicated of the Jewish schemes. Everything is practically reduced to the great ideas of the resurrection and the judgment as consequent upon the Parousia of Christ. Much apocalyptic embroidery to which no spiritual significance attached is eliminated. While the overheated fantasy tends to multiply and elaborate, the religious interest tends toward concentration and simplification.

III. Course of Development.

In New Testament eschatological teaching a general development in a well-defined direction is traceable. The starting-point is the historico-dramatic conception of the two successive ages. These two ages are distinguished as houtos ho aion, ho nun aion, ho enesios aion, "this age," "the present age" (Mt 12:32; 13:22; Lu 16:8; Ro 12:2; 1Co 1:20; 2:6,8; 3:18; 2Co 4:4; Ga 1:4; Eph 1:21; 2:2; 6:12; 1Ti 6:17; 2Ti 4:10; Tit 2:12), and ho aion ekeinos, ho aion mellon, ho aion erchomenos, "that age," "the future age" (Mt 12:32; Lu 18:30; 20:35; Eph 2:7; Heb 6:5). In Jewish literature before the New Testament, no instances of the developed antithesis between these two ages seem to be found, but from the way in which it occurs in the teaching of Jesus and Paul it appears to have been current at that time. (The oldest undisputed occurrence is a saying of

Johanan ben Zaqqay, about 80 AD.) The contrast between these two ages is (especially with Paul) that between the evil and transitory, and the perfect and abiding. Thus, to each age belongs its own characteristic order of things, and so the distinction passes over into that of two "worlds" in the sense of two systems (in Hebrew and Aramaic the same word ‘olam, ‘olam, does service for both, in Greek aion usually renders the meaning "age," occasionally "world" (Heb 1:2; 11:3), kosmos meaning "world"; the latter, however, is never used of the future world). Compare Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, I, 132-46. Broadly speaking, the development of New Testament eschatology consists in this, that the two ages are increasingly recognized as answering to two spheres of being which coexist from of old, so that the coming of the new age assumes the character of a revelation and extension of the supernal order of things, rather than that of its first entrance into existence. Inasmuch as the coming world stood for the perfect and eternal, and in the realm of heaven such a perfect, eternal order of things already existed, the reflection inevitably arose that these two were in some sense identical. But the new significance which the antithesis assumes does not supersede the older historicodramatic form. The higher world so interposes in the course of the lower as to bring the conflict to a crisis.

The passing over of the one contrast into the other, therefore, does not mark, as has frequently been asserted, a recession of the eschatological wave, as if the interest had been shifted from the future to the present life. Especially in the Fourth Gospel this "de-eschatologizing" process has been found, but without real warrant. The apparent basis for such a conclusion is that the realities of the future life are so vividly and intensely felt to be existent in heaven and from there operative in the believer’s life, that the distinction between what is now and what will be hereafter enjoyed becomes less sharp. Instead of the supersedure of the eschatological, this means the very opposite, namely, its most real anticipation. It should further be observed that the development in question is intimately connected and keeps equal pace with the disclosure of the preexistence of Christ, because this fact and the descent of Christ from heaven furnished the clearest witness to the reality of the heavenly order of things. Hence, it is especially observable, not in the earlier epistles of Paul, where the structure of eschatological thought is still in the main historico-dramatic, but in the epistles of the first captivity (Eph 1:3,10-22; 2:6; 3:9,10; 4:9,10; 6:12; Php 2:5-11; 3:20; Col 1:15,17; 3:2; further, in Heb 1:2,3; 2:5; 3:4; 6:5,11; 7:13,16; 9:14; 11:10,16; 12:22,23). The Fourth Gospel marks the culmination of this line of teaching, and it is unnecessary to point out how here the contrast between heaven and earth in its christological consequences determines the entire structure of thought. But here it also appears how the last outcome of the New Testament progress of doctrine had been anticipated in the highest teaching of our Lord. This can be accounted for by the inherent fitness that the supreme disclosures which touch the personal life of the Saviour should come not through any third person, but from His own lips.

IV. General and Individual Eschatology.

In the Old Testament the destiny of the nation of Israel to such an extent overshadows that of the individual, that only the first rudiments of an individual eschatology are found. The individualism of the later prophets, especially Jeremiah and Ezekiel, bore fruit in the thought of the intermediate period. In the apocalyptic writings considerable concern is shown for the ultimate destiny of the individual. But not until the New Testament thoroughly spiritualized the conceptions of the last things could these two aspects be perfectly harmonized. Through the centering of the eschatological hope in the Messiah, and the suspending of the individual’s share in it on his personal relation to the Messiah, an individual significance is necessarily imparted to the great final crisis. This also tends to give greater prominence to the intermediate state. Here, also, apocalyptic thought had pointed the way. None the less the Old Testament point of view continues to assert itself in that even in the New Testament the main interest still attaches to the collective, historical development of events. Many questions in regard to the intermediate period are passed by in silence. The Old Testament prophetic foreshortening of the perspective, immediately connecting each present crisis with the ultimate goal, is reproduced in New Testament eschatology on an individual scale in so far as the believer’s life here is linked, not so much with his state after death, but rather with the consummate state after the final judgment. The present life in the body and the future life in the body are the two outstanding illumined heights between which the disembodied state remains largely in the shadow. But the same foreshortening of the perspective is also carried over from the Old Testament into the New Testament delineation of general eschatology. The New Testament method of depicting the future is not chronological. Things lying widely apart to our chronologically informed experience are by it drawn closely together. This law is adhered to doubtless not from mere limitation of subjective human knowledge, but by reason of adjustment to the general method of prophetic revelation in Old Testament and New Testament alike.

V. The Parousia.

1. Definition:

The word denotes "coming," "arrival." It is never applied to the incarnation of Christ, and could be applied to His second coming only, partly because it had already become a fixed Messianic term, partly because there was a point of view from which the future appearance of Jesus appeared the sole adequate expression of His Messianic dignity and glory. The explicit distinction between "first advent" and "second advent" is not found in the New Testament. It occurs in Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Abraham 92:16. In the New Testament it is approached in Heb 9:28 and in the use of epiphaneia for both the past appearance of Christ and His future manifestation (2Th 2:8; 1Ti 6:14; 2Ti 1:10; 4:1; Tit 2:11,13). The Christian use of the word parousia is more or less colored by the consciousness of the present bodily absence of Jesus from His own, and consequently suggests the thought of His future abiding presence, without, however, formally coming to mean the state of the Saviour's presence with believers (1Th 4:17). Parousia occurs in Mt 24:3,17,39; 1Co 15:23; 1Th 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2Th 2:1,8; Jas 5:7,8; 2Pe 1:16; 3:4,12; 1 1Joh 2:28. A synonymous term is apokalupsis, "revelation," probably also of pre- Christian origin, presupposing the pre-existence of the Messiah in hidden form previous to His manifestation, either in heaven or on earth (compare Apocrypha Baruch 3:29; 1:20; Ezra 4; APC 2Esdras 7:28; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Testament of Levi 18; Joh 7:27; 1Pe 1:20). It could be adopted by Christians because Christ had been withdrawn into heaven and would be publicly demonstrated the Christ on His return, hence used with special reference to enemies and unbelievers (Lu 17:30; Ac 3:21; 1Co 16; 2Th 1:7,8; 1Pe 1:13,10; 5:4). Another synonymous term is "the day of the (Our) Lord," "the day," "that day," "the day of Jesus Christ." This is the rendering of the well-known Old Testament phrase. Though there is no reason in any particular passage why "the Lord" should not be Christ, the possibility exists that in some cases it may refer to God (compare "day of God" in 2Pe 3:12). On the other hand, what the Old Testament with the use of this phrase predicates of God is sometimes in the New Testament purposely transferred to Christ. "Day," while employed of the parousia generally, is, as in the Old Testament, mostly associated with the judgment, so as to become a synonym for judgment (compare Ac 19:38; 1Co 4:3). The phrase is found in Mt 7:22; 24:36; Mr 13:32; Lu 10:12; 17:24; 21:34; Ac 2:20; Ro 13:12; 1Co 1:8; 3:13; 5:5; 2Co 1:14; Php 1:6; 2:16; 1Th 5:2,4 (compare 5:5,8); 2Th 2:2; 2Ti 1:12,18; 4:8; Heb 10:25; 2Pe 3:10.

2. Signs Preceding the Parousia:

The parousia is preceded by certain signs heralding its approach. Judaism, on the basis of the Old Testament, had worked out the doctrine of "the woes of the Messiah," chebhele ha-mashiach, the calamities and afflictions attendant upon the close of the present and the beginning of the coming age being interpreted as birth pains of the latter. This is transferred in the New Testament to the parousia of Christ. The phrase occurs only in Mt 24:8; Mr 13:8, the idea, in Ro 8:22, and allusions to it occur probably in 1Co 7:26; 1Th 3:3; 5 Besides these general "woes," and also in accord with Jewish doctrine, the appearance of the Antichrist is made to precede the final crisis. Without Jewish precedent, the New Testament links with the parousia as preparatory to it, the pouring out of the Spirit, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple, the conversion of Israel and the preaching of the gospel to all the nations. The problem of the sequence and interrelation of these several precursors of the end is a most difficult and complicated one and, as would seem, at the present not ripe for solution. The "woes" which in our Lord's eschatological discourse (Mt 24; Mr 13; Lu 21) are mentioned in more or less close accord with Jewish teaching are:

(1) wars, earthquakes and famines, "the beginning of travail";

(2) the great tribulation;

(3) commotions among the heavenly bodies; compare Re 6:2-17.

For Jewish parallels to these, compare Charles, Eschatology, 326, 327. Because of this element which the discourse has in

common with Jewish apocalypses, it has been assumed by Colani, Weiffenbach, Weizsacker, Wendt, et al., that here two sources have been welded together, an actual prophecy of Jesus, and a Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse from the time of the Jewish War 68-70 (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 5, 3). In the text of Mark this so-called "small apocalypse" is believed to consist of 13:7,8,14-20,24-27,30,31. But this hypothesis mainly springs from the disinclination to ascribe to Jesus realistic eschatological expectations, and the entirely unwarranted assumption that He must have spoken of the end in purely ethical and religious terms only. That the typically Jewish "woes" bear no direct relation to the disciples and their faith is not a sufficient reason for declaring the prediction of them unworthy of Jesus. A contradiction is pointed out between the two representations, that the parousia will come suddenly, unexpectedly, and that it will come heralded by these signs. Especially in Mr 13:30,32 the contradiction is said to be pointed. To this it may be replied that even after the removal of the assumed apocalypse the same twofold representation remains present in what is recognized as genuine discourse of Jesus, namely, in Mr 13:28,29 as compared with 13:32,33-37 and other similar admonitions to watchfulness. A real contradiction between 13:30 and 13:32 does not exist. Our Lord could consistently affirm both: "This generation shall not pass away, until all these things be accomplished," and "of that day or that hour knoweth no one." To be sure, the solution should not be sought by understanding "this generation" of the Jewish race or of the human race. It must mean, according to ordinary usage, then living generation. Nor does it help matters to distinguish between the prediction of the parousia within certain wide limits and the denial of knowledge as to the precise day and hour. In point of fact the two statements do not refer to the same matter at all. "That day or that hour" in 13:32 does not have "these things" of 13:30 for its antecedent. Both by the demonstrative pronoun "that" and by "but" it is marked as an absolute self-explanatory conception. It simply signifies as elsewhere the day of the Lord, the day of judgment. Of "these things," the exact meaning of which phrase must be determined from the foregoing, Jesus declares that they will come to pass within that generation; but concerning the parousia, "that (great) day," He declares that no one but God knows the time of its occurrence. The correctness of this view is confirmed by the preceding parable, Mark 13:28,29, where in precisely the same way "these things" and the parousia are distinguished. The question remains how much "these things" (verse 29; Lu 21:31), "all these things" (Mt 24:33,14, Mr 13:30), "all things" (Lu 21:32) is intended to cover of what is described in the preceding discourse. The answer will depend on what is there represented as belonging to the precursors of the end, and what as strictly constituting part of the end itself; and on the other question whether Jesus predicts one end with its premonitory signs, or refers to two crises each of which will be heralded by its own series of signs. Here two views deserve consideration. According to the one (advocated by Zahn in his Commentary on Mt, 652-66) the signs cover only Mt 24:4-14.

What is related afterward, namely, "the abomination of desolation," great tribulation, false prophets and Christs, commotions in the heavens, the sign of the Son of Man, all this belongs to "the end" itself, in the absolute sense, and is therefore comprehended in the parousia and excepted from the prediction that it will happen in that generation, while included in the declaration that only God knows the time of its coming. The destruction of the temple and the holy city, though not explicitly mentioned in Mt 24:4-14, would be included in what is there said of wars and tribulation. The prediction thus interpreted would have been literally fulfilled. The objections to this view are:

(1) It is unnatural thus to subsume what is related in 24:15-29 under "the end." From a formal point of view it does not differ from the phenomena of 24:4-14 which are "signs."

(2) It creates the difficulty, that the existence of the temple and the temple-worship in Jerusalem are presupposed in the last days immediately before the parousia.

The "abomination of desolation" taken from Da 8:13; 9:27; 11:31; 12:11; compare Sirach 49:2—according to some, the destruction of the city and temple, better a desecration of the temple-site by the setting up of something idolatrous, as a result of which it becomes desolate—and the flight from Judea, are put among events which, together with the parousia, constitute the end of the world. This would seem to involve chiliasm of a very pronounced sort. The difficulty recurs in the strictly eschatological interpretation of 2Th 2:3,1, where "the man of sin" (see SIN, MAN OF) is represented as sitting in "the temple of God" and in Re 11:1,2, where "the temple of God" and "the altar," and "the court which is without the temple" and "the holy city" figure in an episode inserted between the sounding of the trumpet of the sixth angel and that of the seventh. On the other hand it ought to be remembered that eschatological prophecy makes use of ancient traditional

imagery and stereotyped formulas, which, precisely because they are fixed and applied to all situations, cannot always bear a literal sense, but must be subject to a certain degree of symbolical and spiritualizing interpretation. In the present case the profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes may have furnished the imagery in which, by Jesus, Paul and John, anti-Christian developments are described of a nature which has nothing to do with Israel, Jerusalem or the temple, literally understood.

(3) It is not easy to conceive of the preaching of the gospel to all the nations as falling within the lifetime of that generation. It is true Ro 1:13; 10:18; 15:19-24; Col 1:6; 1Ti 3:16; 2Ti 4:17 might be quoted in support of such a view. In the statement of Jesus, however, it is definitely predicted that the preaching of the gospel to all the nations not only must happen before the end, but that it straightway precedes the end: "Then shall the end come" (Mt 24:14). To distinguish between the preaching of the gospel to all the nations and the completion of the Gentilemission, as Zahn proposes, is artificial. As over against these objections, however, it must be admitted that the grouping of all these later phenomena before the end proper avoids the difficulty arising from "immediately" in Mt 24:29 and from "in those days" in Mr 13:24.

The other view has been most lucidly set forth by Briggs, Messiah of the Gospels, 132-65. It makes Jesus' discourse relate to two things:

(1) the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple;

(2) the end of the world.

He further assumes that the disciples are informed with respect to two points:

(1) the time;

(2) the signs.

In the answer to the time, however, the two things are not sharply distinguished, but united into one prophetic perspective, the parousia standing out more conspicuously. The definition of the time of this complex development is: (a) negative (Mr 13:5-8); (b) positive (Mr 13:9-13). On the other hand in describing the signs Jesus discriminates between (a) the signs of the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (Mr 13:14-20); (b) the signs of the parousia (Mr 13:24-27). This view has in its favor that the destruction of the temple and the city, which in the question of the disciples figured as an eschatological event, is recognized as such in the answer of Jesus, and not alluded to after a mere incidental fashion, as among the signs. Especially the version of Lu 21:20-24 proves that it figures as an event. This view also renders easier the restriction of Mr 13:30 to the first event and its signs. It places "the abomination of desolation" in the period preceding the national catastrophe. The view that the two events are successively discussed is further favored by the movement of thought in Mr 13:32 ff. Here, after the Apocalypse has been brought to a close, the application to the disciples is made, and, in the same order as was observed in the prophecy, first, the true attitude toward the national crisis is defined in the parable of the Fig Tree and the solemn assurance appended that it will happen in this generation (13:28-31); secondly, the true attitude toward the parousia is defined (13:32-37). The only serious objection that may be urged against this view arises from the close concatenation of the section relating to the national crisis with the section relating to the parousia (Mt 24:29: "immediately after .... those days"; Mr 13:24: "in those days"). The question is whether this mode of speaking can be explained on the principle of the well-known foreshortening of the perspective of prophecy. It cannot be a priori denied that this peculiarity of prophetic vision may have here characterized also the outlook of Jesus into the future which, as Mr 13:32 shows, was the prophetic outlook of His human nature as distinct from the Divine omniscience. The possibility of misinterpreting this feature and confounding sequence in perspective with chronological succession is in the present case guarded against by the statement that the gospel must first be preached to all the nations (compare Ac 3:19,25,26; Ro 11:25; Re 6:2) before the end can come, that no one knows the time of the parousia except God, that there must be a period of desolation after the city shall have been destroyed, and that the final coming of Jesus to the people of Israel will be a coming not of judgment, but one in which they shall hail Him as blessed (Mt 23:38,39; Lu 13:34,35), which presupposes

an interval to account for this changed attitude (compare Lu 21:24: "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled"). It is not necessary to carry the distinction between the two crises joined together here into the question as put by the disciples in Mt 24:3, as if "when shall these things be?" related to the destruction of the temple exclusively, as the other half of the question speaks of the coming of Jesus and the end of the world. Evidently here not the two events, but the events (complexly considered) and the signs are distinguished. "These things" has its antecedent not exclusively in 24:2, but even more in 23:38,39.

The disciples desired to know not so much when the calamitous national catastrophe would come, but rather when that subsequent coming of the Lord would take place, which would put a limit to the distressing results of this catastrophe, and bring with it the reacceptance of Israel into favor. This explains also why Jesus does not begin His discourse with the national crisis, but first takes up the question of the parousia, to define negatively and positively the time of the latter, and that for the purpose of warning the disciples who in their eagerness for the ultimate issue were inclined to foreshorten the preceding calamitous developments. That Jesus could actually join together the national and the cosmical crises appears from other passages, such as Mt 10:23, where His interposition for the deliverance of the fugitive disciples is called a "coming" of the Son of Man (Mt 16:28; Mr 9:1; Lu 9:27, where a coming of the Son of Man in His kingdom (Matthew), or a coming of the kingdom of God with power (Mark), or a seeing of the kingdom of God (Luke) is promised to some of that generation). It is true these passages are frequently referred to the parousia, because in the immediately preceding context the latter is spoken of. The connection of thought, however, is not that the parousia and this promised coming are identical. The proximate coming is referred to as an encouragement toward faithfulness and self- sacrifice, just as the reward at the parousia is mentioned for the same purpose. The conception of an earlier coming also receives light from the confession of Jesus at His trial (Mt 26:64; where the "henceforth" refers equally to the coming on the clouds of heaven and to the sitting at the right hand of God; compare Mr 14:62; Lu 22:69). The point of the declaration is, that He who now is condemned will in the near future appear in theophany for judgment upon His judges. The closing discourses of John also have the conception of the coming of Jesus to His disciples in the near future for an abiding presence, although here this is associated with the advent of the Spirit (Joh 14:18,19,21,23; 16:16,19,22,23). Finally the same idea recurs in Rev, where it is equally clear that a preliminary visitation of Christ and not the parousia for final judgment can be meant (Joh 2:5,16; 3:3,10; compare also the plural "one of the days of the Son of man" in Lu 17:22).

3. Events Preceding the Parousia:

(1) The Conversion of Israel:

To the events preceding the parousia belongs, according to the uniform teaching of Jesus, Peter and Paul, the conversion of Israel (Mt 23:39; Lu 13:35; Ac 1:6,7; 3:19,21; where the arrival of "seasons of refreshing" and "the times of restoration of all things" is made dependent on the (eschatological) sending of the Christ to Israel), and this again is said to depend on the repentance and conversion and the blotting out of the sins of Israel; Ro 11, where the problem of the unbelief of Israel is solved by the twofold proposition: (1) that there is even now among Israel an election according to grace; (2) that in the future there will be a comprehensive conversion of Israel (Ro 11:5,25-32).

(2) The Coming of the Antichrist:

Among the precursors of the parousia appears further the Antichrist. The word is found in the New Testament in 1Joh 2:18,22; 4:3; 2Joh 1:7 only, but the conception occurs also in the Synoptics, in Paul and in Revelation. There is no instance of its earlier occurrence in Jewish literature. Anti may mean "in place of" and "against"; the former includes the latter. In Joh it is not clear that the heretical tendencies or hostile powers connected with the anti- Christian movement make false claim to the Messianic dignity. In the Synoptics the coming of false Christs and false prophets is predicted, and that not merely as among the nearer signs (Mr 13:6), but also in the remote eschatological period (Mr 13:22). With Paul, who does not employ the word, the conception is clearly the developed one of the counter-Christ. Paul ascribes to him an apokalupsis as he does to Christ (2Th 2:6,8); his manner of working and its pernicious effect are set over against the manner in which the gospel of the true Christ works (2Th 9-12). Paul does not treat the idea as a new one; it must have

come down from the Old Testament and Jewish eschatology and have been more fully developed by New Testament prophecy; compare in Da 7:8,20; 8:10,11 the supernaturally magnified figure of the great enemy. According to Gunkel (Schopfung und Chaos, 1895) and Bousset (Der Antichrist in der Uberlieferung des Judenthums, des New Testament und der allen Kirche, 1875) the origin of the conception of a final struggle between God and the supreme enemy must be sought in the ancient myth of Chaos conquered by Marduk; what had happened at the beginning of the world was transferred to the end. Then this was anthropomorphized, first in the form of a false Messiah, later in that of a political tyrant or oppressor. But there is no need to assume any other source for the idea of a last enemy than Old Testament eschatological prophecy (Ezekiel and Daniel and Zechariah). And no evidence has so far been adduced that the Pauline idea of a counter-Messiah is of pre-Christian origin. This can only be maintained by carrying back into the older period the Antichrist tradition as found later among Jews and Christians. It is reasonable to assume in the present state of the evidence that the combination of the two ideas, that of the great eschatological enemy and that of the counter- Messiah, is a product of Christian prophecy. In fact even the conception of a single last enemy does not occur in pre- Christian Jewish literature; it is found for the first time in Apocrypha Baruch 40:1,2, which changes the general conception of 4 Ezra to this effect. Even in the eschatological discourse of Jesus the idea is not yet unified, for false Christs and false prophets in the plural are spoken of, and the instigator of "the abomination of desolation," if any is presupposed, remains in the background. In the Epistle of John the same plural representation occurs (1Joh 2:18,22; 2Joh 1:7), although the idea of a personal Antichrist in whom the movement culminates is not only familiar to the author and the reader (1Joh 2:18, "as ye heard that antichrist cometh"), but is also accepted by the writer (1Joh 4:3, "This is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already"; compare 2Th 2:7, "The mystery of lawlessness doth already work").

Various views have been proposed to explain the concrete features of the Pauline representation in 2Th 2 and that of Re 13 and 17. According to Schneckenburger, JDT, 1859, and Weiss, SK, 1869, Paul has in mind the person whom the Jews will acclaim as their Messiah. The idea would then be the precipitate of Paul’s experience of hostility and persecution from the part of the Jews. He expected that this Jewish Messianic pretender would, helped by Satanic influence, overthrow the Roman power. The continuance of the Roman power is "that which restraineth," or as embodied in the emperor, "one that restraineth now" (2Th 2:6,7). (For an interesting view in which the roles played by these two powers are reversed, compare Warfield in The Expositor, 3rd series, IV, 30-44.) The objection to this is that "the lawless one," not merely from Paul’s or the Christian point of view, but in his own avowed intent, opposes and exalts himself against all that is called God or worshipped. This no Jewish pretender to the Messiahship could possibly do: his very Messianic position would preclude it. And the conception of a counter-Christ does not necessarily point to a Jewish environment, for the idea of Messiahship had in Paul’s mind been raised far above its original national plane and assumed a universalistic character (compare Zahn, Einleitung in das NT(1), I, 171). Nor does the feature that according to 2Th 2:4, "the lawless one" will take his seat in the temple favor the view in question, for the desecration of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes and later similar experiences may well have contributed to the figure of the great enemy the attribute of desecrator of the temple. It is not necessary to assume that by Paul this was understood literally; it need mean no more than that the Antichrist will usurp for himself Divine honor and worship. Patristic and later writers gave to this feature a chiliastic interpretation, referring it to the temple which was to be rebuilt in the future. Also the allegorical exegesis which understands "the temple" of the Christian church has found advocates. But the terms in which "the lawless one" is described exclude his voluntary identification with the Christian church. According to a second view the figure is not a Jewish but a pagan one. Kern, Baur, Hilgenfeld and many others, assuming that 2Th is post-Pauline, connect the prophecy with the at-one- time current expectation that Nero, the great persecutor, would return from the East or from the dead, and, with the help of Satan, set up an anti-Christian kingdom. The same expectation is assumed to underlie Re 13:3,12,14 (one of the heads of the beast smitten unto death and his death stroke healed); 17:8,10,11 (the beast that was, and is not, and is about to come up out of the abyss; the eighth king, who is one of the seven preceding kings).

As to Paul’s description, there is nothing in it to make us think of a Nero reappearing or redivivus. The parousia predicated of the lawless one does not imply it, for parousia as an eschatological term means not "return" but "advent." The Antichrist is not depicted as a persecutor, and Nero was the persecutor paragraph excellence. Nor does what is said about the "hindering" or the "hinderer" suit the case of Nero, for the later Roman emperors could not be said to hold back Nero’s reappearance. As to Revelation, it must be admitted that the role here ascribed to the beast would be more in keeping with the character of Nero. But, as Zahn has well pointed out (Einleitung in das NT(1), II, 617-26), this interpretation is

incompatible with the date of Revelation. This book must have been written at a date when the earlier form of the expectation that Nero would reappear still prevailed, namely, that he would return from the East to which he had fled. Only when too long an interval had elapsed to permit of further belief in Nero's still being alive, was this changed into the superstition that he would return from the dead. But this change in the form of the belief did not take place until after Revelation must have been written. Consequently, if the returning Nero did figure in Revelation, it would have to be in the form of one reappearing from the East. As a matter of fact, however, the beast or the king in which Nero is found is said by Re 13:1; 17:8 to have been smitten unto death and healed of the death stroke, to come up out of the sea or the abyss, which would only suit the later form of the expectation. It is therefore necessary to dissociate the description of the beast and its heads and horns entirely from the details of the succession of the Roman empire; the prophecy is more grandly staged; the description of the beast as partaking of several animal forms in Re 13:2 refers back to Daniel, and here as there must be understood of the one world-power in its successive national manifestations, which already excludes the possibility that a mere succession of kings in one and the same empire can be thought of. The one of the heads smitten unto death and the death stroke healed must refer to the world-power to be made powerless in one of its phases, but afterward to revive in a new phase. Hence, here already the healing of the death stroke is predicated, not merely of one of the heads, but also of the beast itself (compare Re 13:3 with 13:12).

And the same interpretation seems to be required by the mysterious statements of Re 17, where the woman sitting upon the beast is the metropolis of the world-power, changing its seat together with the latter, yet so as to retain, like the latter in all its transformations, the same character whence she bears the same name of Babylon (17:5). Here as in Re 13 the beast has seven heads, i.e. passes through seven phases, which idea is also expressed by the representation that these seven heads are seven kings (17:10), for, as in Da 7, the kings stand not for individual rulers, but for kingdoms, phases of the world-power. This explains why in Re 17:11 the beast is identified with one of the kings. When here the further explanation, going beyond Re 13, is added, that the beast was and is not and is about to come up out of the abyss (13:8), and in 13:10,11 that of the seven kings five are fallen, one is, the other is not yet come, and when he comes must continue a little while, to be followed by the eighth, who is identical with the beast that was and is not, and with one of the seven, the only way to reconcile these statements lies in assuming that "the beast," while in one sense a comprehensive figure for the world-power in all its phases, can also in another sense designate the supreme embodiment and most typical manifestation of the world-power in the past; in respect to this acute phase the beast was and is not and is to appear again, and this acute phase was one of seven successive forms of manifestation, and in its reappearance will add to this number the eighth. Although a certain double sense in the employment of the figures thus results, this is no greater than when on the other view Nero is depicted both as "the beast" and as one of the heads of "the beast." Which concrete monarchies are meant by these seven phases is a matter of minor importance. For a suggestion compare Zahn, op. cit., II, 624: (1) Egypt; (2) Assyria; (3) Babylon; (4) the Medo-Persian power; (5) the Greco-Alexandrian power; (6) the Roman power; (7) a short-lived empire to succeed Rome; (8) the eighth and last phase, which will reproduce in its acute character the fifth, and will bring on the scene the Antichrist, the counterpart and, as it were, reincarnation of Antiochus Epiphanes. The seer evidently has his present in the Roman phase of the power of the beast, and this renders it possible for him to give in Re 17:9 another turn to the figure of the seven heads, interpreting it of the seven mountains on which the woman sits, but this apocalyptic looseness of handling of the imagery can furnish no objection to the view just outlined, since on any view the two incongruous explanations of the seven heads as seven mountains and seven kings stand side by side in Re 17:9 and 10. Nor should the mysterious number of 666 in 13:18 be appealed to in favor of the reference of the beast to Nero, for on the one hand quite a number of other equally plausible or implausible solutions of this riddle have been proposed, and on the other hand the interpretation of Nero is open to the serious objection, that in order to make out the required number from the letters of Nero's name this name has to be written in Hebrew characters and that with scriptio defectiva of Qesar (Neron Qesar) instead of Qeisar, the former of which two peculiarities is out of keeping with the usage of the book elsewhere (compare Zahn, op. cit., II, 622, 624, 625, where the chief proposed explanations of the number 666 are recorded). Under the circumstances the interpretation of the figure of the beast and its heads must be allowed to pursue its course independently of the mystery of the number 666 in regard to which no certain conclusion appears attainable.

The following indicates the degree of definiteness to which, in the opinion of the writer, it is possible to go in the interpretation of the prophecy. The terms in which, Paul speaks remind of Daniel's description of the "little horn." Similarly Re attaches itself to the imagery of the beasts in Daniel. Both Paul and Re also seem to allude to the self-

deification of rulers in the Hellenistic and Roman world (compare Zeitsehrift fur neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1904, 335 ff). Both, therefore, appear to have in mind a politically organized world-power under a supreme head. Still in both cases this power is not viewed as the climax of enmity against God on account of its political activity as such, but distinctly on account of its self-assertion in the religious sphere, so that the whole conception is lifted to a higher plane, purely spiritual standards being applied in the judgment expressed. Paul so thoroughly applies this principle that in his picture the seductive, deceptive aspect of the movement in the sphere of false teaching is directly connected with the person of "the lawless one" himself (2Th 2:9-12), and not with a separate organ of false prophecy, as in Re 13:11-17 (the second beast). In Revelation, as shown above, the final and acute phase of anti-Christian hostility is clearly distinguished from its embodiment in the Roman empire and separated from the latter by an intermediate stage. In Paul, who stands at a somewhat earlier point in the development of New Testament prophecy, this is not so clearly apparent. Paul teaches that the "mystery of lawlessness" is already at work in his day, but this does not necessarily involve that the person of "the lawless one," subsequently to appear, must be connected with the same phase of the world-power, with which Paul associates this mystery already at work, since the succeeding phases being continuous, this will also insure the continuity between the general principle and its personal representative, even though the latter should appear at a later stage. It is impossible to determine how far Paul consciously looked beyond the power of the Roman empire to a later organIzation as the vehicle for the last anti-Christian effort. On the other hand, that Paul must have thought of "the lawless one" as already in existence at that time cannot be proven. It does not follow from the parallelism between his "revelation" and the parousia of Christ, for this "revelation" has for its correlate simply a previous hidden presence for some time somewhere, not an existence necessarily extending to Paul’s time or the time of the Roman empire, far less a pre- existence, like unto Christ’s, in the supernatural world. Nor is present existence implied in what Paul says of "the hindering power." This, to be sure, is represented as asserting itself at that very time, but the restraint is not exerted directly upon "the lawless one"; it relates to the power of which he will be the ultimate exponent; when this power, through the removal of the restraint, develops freely, his revelation follows. According to 13:9 his "parousia is according to the working of Satan," but whether this puts a supernatural aspect upon the initial act of his appearance or relates more to his subsequent presence and activity in the world, which will be attended with all powers and signs and lying wonders, cannot be determined with certainty. But the element of the supernatural is certainly there, although it is evidently erroneous to conceive of "the lawless one" as an incarnation of Satan, literally speaking. The phrase "according to the working of Satan" excludes this, and "the lawless one" is a true human figure, "the man of sin" (or "the man of lawlessness," according to another reading; compare the distinction between Satan and "the beast" in Re 20:10), Re 13:3. The "power" and "signs" and "wonders" are not merely "seeming"; the genitive pseudous is not intended to take them out of the category of the supernatural, but simply means that what they are intended to accredit is a lie, namely, the Divine dignity of "the lawless one." Most difficult of all is the determination of what Paul means by the hindering power or the hinderer in 13:7.

The most common view refers this to the Roman authority as the basis of civil order and protection, but there are serious objections to this. If Paul at all associated the Antichrist in any way with the Roman power, he cannot very well have sought the opposite principle in the same quarter. And not only the hindering power but also the hindering person seems to be a unit, which latter does not apply to the Roman empire, which had a succession of rulers. It is further difficult to dismiss the thought that the hindering principle or person must be more or less supernatural, since the supernatural factor in the work of "the lawless one" is so prominent. For this reason there is something attractive in the old view of von Hofmann, who assumed that Paul borrowed from Dnl, besides other features, also this feature that the historical conflict on earth has a supernatural background in the world of spirits (compare Da 10). A more precise definition, however, is impossible. Finally it should be noticed that, as in the eschatological discourse of Jesus "the abomination of desolation" appears connected with an apostasy within the church through false teaching (Mr 13:22,23), so Paul joins to the appearance of "the lawless one" the destructive effect of error among many that are lost (2Th 2:9-12). The idea of the Antichrist in general and that of the apostasy in particular reminds us that we may not expect an uninterrupted progress of the Christianization of the world until the parousia. As the reign of the truth will be extended, so the forces of evil will gather strength, especially toward the end. The universal sway of the kingdom of God cannot be expected from missionary effort alone; it requires the eschatological inter-position of God.

4. The Manner of the Parousia:

In regard to the manner and attending circumstances of the parousia we learn that it will be widely visible, like the lightning (Mt 24:27; Lu 17:24; the point of comparison does not lie in the suddenness); to the unbelieving it will come unexpectedly (Mt 24:37-42; Lu 17:26-32; 1Th 5:2,3). A sign will precede, "the sign of the Son of Man," in regard to the nature of which nothing can be determined. Christ will come "on the clouds," "in clouds," "in a cloud," "with great power and glory" (Mt 24:30; Mr 13:26; Lu 21:27); attended by angels (Mt 24:31(compare Mt 13:41; 16:27; Mr 8:38; Lu 9:26); Mr 13:27; 2Th 1:7).

Continued 8177

ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, VI-X

VI. The Resurrection.

The resurrection coincides with the parousia and the arrival of the future neon (Lu 20:35; Joh 6:40; 1Th 4:16). From 1Th 3:13; 4:16 it has been inferred that the dead rise before the descent of Christ from heaven is completed; the sounds described in the later passage are then interpreted as sounds accompanying the descent (compare Ex 19:16; Isa 27:13; Mt 24:31; 1Co 15:52; Heb 12:19; Re 10:7; 11:15; "the trump of God" = the great eschatological trumpet). The two words for the resurrection are egeirein, "to wake," and anistanai, "to raise," the latter less common in the active than in the intransitive sense.

1. Its Universality:

The New Testament teaches in some passages with sufficient clearness that all the dead will be raised, but the emphasis rests to such an extent on the soteriological aspect of the event, especially in Paul, where it is closely connected with the doctrine of the Spirit, that its reference to non-believers receives little notice. This was already partly so in the Old Testament (Isa 26:19; Da 12:2). In the intervening Jewish literature the doctrine varies; sometimes a resurrection of the martyrs alone is taught (Enoch 90); sometimes of all the righteous dead of Israel (Psalms of Solomon 3:10 ff; Enoch 91-94.); sometimes of all the righteous and of some wicked Israelites (Enoch 1-36); sometimes of all the righteous and all the wicked (Ezra 4 APC 2Esdras 5:45; 7:32;). Josephus ascribes to the Pharisees the doctrine that only the righteous will share in the resurrection. It ought to be noticed that these apocalyptic writings which affirm the universality of the resurrection present the same phenomena as the New Testament, namely, that they contain passages which so exclusively reflect upon the resurrection in its bearing upon the destiny of the righteous as to create the appearance that no other resurrection was believed in. Among the Pharisees probably a diversity of opinion prevailed on this question, which Josephus will have obliterated. our Lord in His argument with the Sadducees proves only the resurrection of the pious, but does not exclude the other (Mr 12:26,27); "the resurrection of the just" in Lu 14:14 may suggest a twofold resurrection. It has been held that the phrase, he anastasis he ek nekron Lu 20:35; Ac 4:2, always describes the resurrection of a limited number from among the dead, whereas he anastasisis ton nekron would be descriptive of a universal resurrection Plummer, Commentary on Lu 20:35, but such a distinction breaks down before an examination of the passages.

The inference to the universality of the resurrection sometimes drawn from the universality of the judgment is scarcely valid, since the idea of a judgment of disembodied spirits is not inconceivable and actually occurs. On the other hand the punishment of the judged is explicitly affirmed to include the body (Mt 10:28). It cannot be proven that the term "resurrection" is ever in the New Testament eschatologically employed without reference to the body, of the quickening of the spirit simply (against, Fries, in ZNTW, 1900, 291 ff). The sense of our Lord’s argument with the Sadducees does not require that the patriarchs were at the time of Moses in possession of the resurrection, but only that they were enjoying the covenant-life, which would in due time inevitably issue in the resurrection of their bodies. The resemblance (or "equality") to the angels (Mr 12:25) does not consist in the disembodied state, but in the absence of marriage and propagation. It has been suggested that Hebrews contains no direct evidence for a bodily resurrection (Charles, Eschatology, 361), but compare 11:22,35; 12:2; 13:20. The spiritualism of the epistle points, in connection with its Pauline type of teaching, to the conception of a pneumatic heavenly body, rather than to a disembodied state.

2. The Millennium:

The New Testament confines the event of the resurrection to a single epoch, and nowhere teaches, as chiliasm assumes, a resurrection in two stages, one, at the parousia, of saints or martyrs, and a second one at the close of the millennium. Although the doctrine of a temporary Messianic kingdom, preceding the consummation of the world, is of pre-Christian Jewish origin, it had not been developed in Judaism to the extent of assuming a repeated resurrection; the entire resurrection is always placed at the end. The passages to which this doctrine of a double resurrection appeals are chiefly Ac 3:19-21; 1Co 15:23-28; Php 3:9-11; 1Th 4:13-18; 2Th 1:5-12; Re 20:1-6. In the first-named passage Peter promises "seasons of refreshing," when Israel shall have repented and turned to God. The arrival of these coincides with the sending of the Christ to the Jews, i.e. with the parousia. It is argued that Peter in Ac 3:21, "whom the heavens must (present tense) receive until the times of restoration of all things," places after this coming of Jesus to His people a renewed withdrawal of the Lord into heaven, to be followed in turn, after a certain interval, by the restoration of all things. The "seasons of refreshing" would then constitute the millennium with Christ present among His people. While this interpretation is not grammatically impossible, there is no room for it in the general scheme of the Petrine eschatology, for the parousia of Christ is elsewhere represented as bringing not a provisional presence, but as bringing in the day of the Lord, the day of judgment (Ac 2:17-21). The correct view is that "the seasons of refreshing" and "the times of restoration of all things" are identical; the latter phrase relates to the prospects of Israel as well as the former, and should not be understood in the later technical sense. The present tense in Ac 3:21 "must receive" does not indicate that the reception of Christ into heaven still lies in the future, but formulates a fixed eschatological principle, namely, that after His first appearance the Christ must be withdrawn into heaven till the hour for the parousia has come. In 1Co 15:23-28 two tagmata, "orders," of the resurrection are distinguished, and it is urged that these consist of "believers" and "non-believers." But there is no reflection here upon non-believers at all, the two "orders" are Christ, and they that are Christ's. "The end" in 15:24 is not the final stage in the resurrection, i.e. the resurrection of non- believers, but the end of the series of eschatological events. The kingdom of Christ which comes to a close with the end is not a kingdom beginning with the parousia, but dates from the exaltation of Christ; it is to Paul not future but already in operation.

In 1Th 4:13-18 the presupposition is not that the readers had worried about a possible exclusion of their dead from the provisional reign of Christ and from a first resurrection, but that they had sorrowed even as the Gentiles who have no hope whatever, i.e. they had doubted the fact of the resurrection as such. Paul accordingly gives them in 4:14 the general assurance that in the resurrection of Jesus that of believers is guaranteed. The verb "precede" in 4:15 does not imply that there was thought of precedence in the enjoyment of glory, but is only an emphatic way of affirming that the dead will not be one moment behind in inheriting with the living the blessedness of the parousia. In 4:17, "so shall we ever be with the Lord," the word "ever" excludes the conception of a provisional kingdom. 2Th 1:5-12 contains merely the general thought that sufferings and glory, persecution and the inheritance of the kingdom are linked together. There is nothing to show that this glory and kingdom are aught else but the final state, the kingdom of God (2Th 1:5). In Php 3:9-11, it is claimed, Paul represents attainment to the resurrection as dependent on special effort on his part, therefore as something not in store for all believers. Since the general resurrection pertains to all, a special grace of resurrection must be meant, i.e. inclusion in the number of those to be raised at the parousia, at the opening of the millennial kingdom. The answer to this is, that it was quite possible to Paul to make the resurrection as such depend on the believer's progress in grace and conformity to Christ, seeing that it is not an event out of all relation to his spiritual development, but the climax of an organic process of transformation begun in this life. And in verse 20 the resurrection of all is joined to the parousia (compare for the Pauline passages Vos, "The Pauline Eschatology and Chiliasm," PTR, 1911, 26-60).

The passage Re 20:1-6 at first sight much favors the conception of a millennial reign of Christ, participated in by the martyrs, brought to life in a first resurrection, and marked by a suspension of the activity of Satan. And it is urged that the sequence of visions places this millennium after the parousia of Christ narrated in Re 19. The question of historic sequence, however, is in Revelation difficult to decide. In other parts of the book the principle of "recapitulation," i.e. of cotemporaneousness of things successively depicted, seems to underlie the visions, and numbers are elsewhere in the book meant symbolically. These facts leave open the possibility that the thousand years are synchronous with the earlier developments recorded, and symbolically describe the state of glorified life enjoyed with Christ in heaven by the martyrs

during the intermediate period preceding the parousia. The terms employed do not suggest an anticipated bodily resurrection. The seer speaks of "souls" which "lived" and "reigned," and finds in this the first resurrection. The scene of this life and reign is in heaven, where also the "souls" of the martyrs are beheld (Re 6:9). The words "this is the first resurrection" may be a pointed disavowal of a more realistic (chiliastic) interpretation of the same phrase. The symbolism of the thousand years consists in this, that it contrasts the glorious state of the martyrs on the one hand with the brief season of tribulation passed here on earth, and on the other hand with the eternal life of the consummation. The binding of Satan for this period marks the first eschatological conquest of Christ over the powers of evil, as distinguished from the renewed activity to be displayed by Satan toward the end in bringing up against the church still other forces not hitherto introduced into the conflict. In regard to a book so enigmatical, it were presumptuous to speak with any degree of dogmatism, but the uniform absence of the idea of the millennium from the eschatological teaching of the New Testament elsewhere ought to render the exegete cautious before affirming its presence here (compare Warfield, "The Millennium and the Apocalypse," PTR, 1904, 599-617).

3. The Resurrection of Believers:

The resurrection of believers bears a twofold aspect. On the one hand it belongs to the forensic side of salvation. On the other hand it belongs to the pneumatic transforming side of the saving process. Of the former, traces appear only in the teaching of Jesus (Mt 5:9; 22:29-32; Lu 20:35,36). Paul clearly ascribes to the believer’s resurrection a somewhat similar forensic significance as to that of Christ (Ro 8:10,23; 1Co 15:30-32,55-58). Far more prominent with him is, however, the other, the pneumatic interpretation. Both the origin of the resurrection life and the continuance of the resurrection state are dependent on the Spirit (Ro 8,10,11; 1Co 15:45-49; Ga 6:8). The resurrection is the climax of the believer’s transformation (Ro 8:11; Ga 6:8). This part ascribed to the Spirit in the resurrection is not to be explained from what the Old Testament teaches about the Spirit as the source of physical life, for to this the New Testament hardly ever refers; it is rather to be explained as the correlate of the general Pauline principle that the Spirit is the determining factor of the heavenly state in the coming eon. This pneumatic character of the resurrection also links together the resurrection of Christ and that of the believer. This idea is not yet found in the Synoptics; it finds expression in Joh 5:22-29; 11:25; 14:6,19. In early apostolic teaching a trace of it may be found in Ac 4:2. With Paul it appears from the beginning as a well-established principle. The continuity between the working of the Spirit here and His part in the resurrection does not, however, lie in the body. The resurrection is not the culmination of a pneumatic change which the body in this life undergoes. There is no preformation of the spiritual body on earth. Ro 8:10,11; 1Co 15:49; 2Co 5:1,2; Php 3:12 positively exclude this, and 2Co 3:18; 4:7-18 do not require it.

The glory into which believers are transformed through the beholding (or reflecting) of the glory of Christ as in a mirror is not a bodily but inward glory, produced by illumination of the gospel. And the manifestation of the life of Jesus in the body or in the mortal flesh refers to the preservation of bodily life in the midst of deadly perils. Equally without support is the view that at one time Paul placed the investiture with the new body immediately after death. It has been assumed that this, together with the view just criticized, marks the last stage in a protracted development of Paul’s eschatological belief. The initial stage of this process is found in 1 Thessalonians: the resurrection is that of an earthly body. The next stage is represented by 1 Corinthians: the future body is pneumatic in character, although not to be received until the parousia. The third stage removes the inconsistency implied in the preceding position between the character of the body and the time of its reception, by placing the latter at the moment of death (2 Corinthians, Romans, Colossians), and by an extreme flight of faith the view is even approached that the resurrection body is in process of development now (Teichmann, Charles). This scheme has no real basis of fact. 1 Thessalonians does not teach an unpneumatic eschatology (compare 4:14,16). The second stage given is the only truly Pauline one, nor can it be shown that the apostle ever abandoned it. For the third position named finds no support in 2Co 5:1-10; Ro 8:19; Col 3:4. The exegesis of 2Co 5:1-10 is difficult and cannot here be given in detail. Our understanding of the main drift of the passage, put into paraphrase, is as follows: we feel assured of the eternal weight of glory (4:17), because we know that we shall receive, after our earthly tent-body shall have been dissolved (aorist subjunctive), a new body, a supernatural house for our spirit, to be possessed eternally in the heavens. A sure proof of this lies in the heightened form which our desire for this future state assumes. For it is not mere desire to obtain a new body, but specifically to obtain it as soon as possible, without an intervening period of nakedness, i.e. of a disembodied state of the spirit. Such would be possible, if it were given us to survive till the parousia, in which case we

would be clothed upon with our habitation from heaven (= supernatural body), the old body not having to be put off first before the new can be put on, but the new body being superimposed upon the old, so that no "unclothing" would have to take place first, what is mortal simply being swallowed up of life (5:2,4). And we are justified in cherishing this supreme aspiration, since the ultimate goal set for us in any case, even if we should have to die first and to unclothe and then to put on the new body over the naked spirit, since the ultimate goal, I say, excludes under all circumstances a state of nakedness at the moment of the parousia (5:3). Since, then, such a new embodied state is our destiny in any event, we justly long for that mode of reaching it which involves least delay and least distress and avoids intermediate nakedness. (This on the reading in 5:3 of ei ge kai endusamenoi ou gumnoi heurethesometha. If the reading ei ge kai ekdusamenoi be adopted the rendering of 5:3 will have to be: "If so be that also having put off (i.e. having died), we shall not at the end be found naked." If eiper kai ekdusamenoi be chosen it will be: "Although even having put off (i.e. having died) we shall not at the end be found naked." These other readings do not materially alter the sense.) The understanding of the passage will be seen to rest on the pointed distinction between being "clothed upon," change at the parousia without death (5:2,4), to be "unclothed," loss of the body in death with nakedness resulting (5:4), and "being clothed," putting on of the new body after a state of nakedness (5:3). Interpreted as above, the passage expresses indeed the hope of an instantaneous endowment with the spiritual body immediately after this life, but only on the supposition that the end of this life will be at the parousia, not for the case that death should intervene before, which latter possibility is distinctly left open. In Ro 8:19 what will happen at the end to believers is called a "revealing of the sons of God," not because their new body existed previously, but because their status as sons of God existed before, and this status will be revealed through the bestowal upon them of the glorious body. Col 3:3,1 speaks of a "life .... hid with Christ in God," and of the "manifestation" of believers with Christ in glory at the parousia, but "life" does not imply bodily existence, and while the "manifestation" at the parousia presupposes the body, it does not imply that this body must have been acquired long before, as is the case with Christ's body. In conclusion it should be noted that there is ample evidence in the later epistles that Paul continued to expect the resurrection body at the parousia (2Co 5:10; Php 3:20,21).

4. The Resurrection-Body:

The main passage informing us as to the nature of the resurrection body is 1Co 15:35-58. The difficulty Paul here seeks to relieve does not concern the substance of the future body, but its kind (compare 1Co 15:35 "With what manner of body do they come?"). Not until 1Co 15:50 is the deeper question of difference in substance touched upon. The point of the figure of "sowing" is not that of identity of substance, but rather this, that the impossibility of forming a concrete conception of the resurrection body is no proof of its impossibility, because in all vegetable growth there appears a body totally unlike that which is sown, a body the nature and appearance of which are determined by the will of God. We have no right to press the figure in other directions, to solicit from it answers to other questions. That there is to be a real connection between the present and the future body is implied rather than directly affirmed. 1Co 15:36 shows that the distinction between the earthly body and a germ of life in it, to be entrusted with it to the grave and then quickened at the last day, does not lie in the apostle's mind, for what is sown is the body; it dies and is quickened in its entirety. Especially the turn given to the figure in 15:37—that of a naked grain putting on the plant as a garment—proves that it is neither intended nor adapted to give information on the degree of identity or link of continuity between the two bodies. The "bare grain" is the body, not the spirit, as some would have it (Teichmann), for it is said of the seed that it dies; which does not apply to the Pneuma (compare also 15:44). The fact is that in this entire discussion the subjective spirit of the believer remains entirely out of consideration; the matter is treated entirely from the standpoint of the body. So far as the Pneuma enters into it, it is the objective Spirit, the Spirit of Christ. As to the time of the sowing, some writers take the view that this corresponds to the entire earthly life, not to the moment of burial only (so already Calvin, recently Teichmann and Charles). In 15:42,43 there are points of contact for this, inasmuch as especially the three last predicates "in dishonor," "in weakness," "a natural body," seem more applicable to the living than to the dead body. At any rate, if the conception is thus widened, the act of burial is certainly included in the sowing. The objection arising from the difficulty of forming a conception of the resurrection body is further met in 15:39-41, where Paul argues from the multitude of bodily forms God has at His disposal. This thought is illustrated from the animal world (15:39); from the difference between the heavenly and the earthly bodies (15:40); from the difference existing among the heavenly bodies themselves (15:41). The structure of the argument is indicated by the interchange of two words for "other," allos and heteros, the former designating difference of species within the genus, the latter difference of genus, a distinction lost in the English version. In all this the reasoning

revolves not around the substance of the bodies but around their kind, quality, appearance (sarx in 15:39 = soma, "body," not =" flesh").

The conclusion drawn is that the resurrection body will differ greatly in kind from the present body. It will be heteros, not merely allos. The points of difference are enumerated in 15:42,43. Four contrasts are named; the first three in each case appear to be the result of the fourth. The dominating antithesis is that between the soma psuchikon and the soma pneumatikon. Still Paul can scarcely mean to teach that "corruption," "dishonor," "weakness" are in the same sense necessary and natural results of the "psychical" character of the earthly body, as the corresponding opposites are necessary and natural concomitants of the pneumatic character of the resurrection body. The sequel shows that the "psychical body" was given man at creation, and according to 15:53 corruption and death go together, whereas death is not the result of creation but of the entrance of sin according to Paul's uniform teaching elsewhere. Hence, also the predicate sarkikos is avoided in 15:46,47, where the reference is to creation, for this word is always associated in Paul with sin. The connection, therefore, between the "natural (psychical, margin) body" and the abnormal attributes conjoined with it, will have to be so conceived, that in virtue of the former character, the body, though it need not of itself, yet will fall a prey to the latter when sin enters. In this lies also the explanation of the term "psychical body." This means a body in which the psuche, the natural soul, is the vitalizing principle, sufficient to support life, but not sufficient to that supernatural, heavenly plane, where it is forever immune to death and corruption. The question must be asked, however, why Paul goes back to the original state of man's body and does not content himself with contrasting the body in the state of sin and in the state of eternal life. The answer is found in the exigency of the argument. Paul wished to add to the argument for the possibility of a different body drawn from analogy, an argument drawn from the typical character of the original creation-body. The body of creation, on the principle of prefiguration, pointed already forward to a higher body to be received in the second stage of the world-process: 'if there exists a psychical body, there exists also a pneumatic body' (15:44). The proof lies in Ge 2:7. Some think that Paul here adopts the Philonic doctrine of the creation of two men, and means 1Co 15:45 b as a quotation from Ge 1:27. But the sequence is against this, for Paul's spiritual man appears on the scene last, not first, as in Philo. Nor can the statement have been meant as a correction of Philo's sequence, for Paul cannot have overlooked that, once a double creation were found in Ge 1 and 2, then Philo's sequence was the only possible one, to correct which would have amounted to correcting Scripture.

If Paul does here correct Philo, it must be in the sense that he rejects the entire Philonic exegesis, which found in Genesis a twofold creation (compare 1Co 11:7). Evidently for Paul, Ge 2:7 taken by itself contains the proof of his proposition, that there is both a psychical and a pneumatic body. Paul regarded the creation of the first Adam in a typical light. The first creation gave only the provisional form in which God's purpose with reference to man was embodied, and in so far looked forward to a higher embodiment of the same idea on a higher pneumatic plane (compare Ro 5:14): "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is of heaven" (1Co 15:47); "of" or "from heaven" does not designate heavenly material, for even here, by not giving the opposite to choikos, "earthly," Paul avoided the question of substantiality. A "pneumatic" body is not, as many assume, a body made out of pneuma as a higher substance, for in that case Paul would have had pneumatikon ready at hand as the contrast to choikon. Only negatively the question of substance is touched upon in 1Co 15:50: "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," but the apostle does not say what will take their place. Compare further, for the non-substantial meaning of pneumatikos, Ro 15:27; 1Co 9:11; 10:3,1; Eph 1:3; 5:19; 6:12; Col 1:9. The only positive thing which we learn in this direction is formal, namely, that the resurrection body of the believer will be the image of that of Christ (1Co 15:49).

VII. The Change of Those Living at the Parousia.

This is confined to believers. Of a change in the body of non-believers found living or raised at the parousia the New Testament nowhere speaks. The passages referring to this subject are 1Co 15:51-53; 2Co 5:1-5; Php 3:20,21. The second of these has already been discussed: it represents the change under the figure of a putting-on of the heavenly body over the earthly body, in result of which what is mortal is swallowed up so as to disappear by life. This representation starts with the new body by which the old body is absorbed. In 1Co 15 and Php 3, on the other hand, the point of departure is from the old body which is changed into a new. The difference between the resurrection and the charge of the living is brought out in 2Co 5:1-5 in the two figures of "putting on" and "putting on over" endusasthai and ependusasthai. Some exegetes find in

1Co 15:51-53 the description of a process kept in such general terms as to be equally applicable to those raised and to those transformed alive. If this be adopted it yields new evidence for the continuity between the present body and the resurrection body. Others, however, find here the expectation that Paul and his readers will "all" survive until the parousia, and be changed alive, in which case no light is thrown on the resurrection- process. The more plausible exegesis is that which joins the negative to "all" instead of to the verb, and makes Paul affirm that "not all" will die, but that all, whether dead or surviving, will be changed at the parousia; the difficulty of the exegesis is reflected in the early attempts to change the reading. In Php 3:20,21 there are no data to decide whether the apostle conceives of himself and his readers as living at the moment of the parousia or speaks generally so as to cover both possibilities.

VIII. The Judgment.

The judgment takes place on a "day" (Mt 7:22; 10:15; 24:36; Lu 10:12; 21:34; 1Co 1:8; 3:13; 2Ti 4:8; Re 6:17), but this rests on the Old Testament conception of "the day of Yahweh," and is not to be taken literally, whence also "hour" interchanges with "day" (Mr 13:32; Re 14:7). While not confined to an astronomical day the judgment is plainly represented as a definitely circumscribed transaction, not as an indefinite process. It coincides with its parousia. Of a judgment immediately after death, the New Testament nowhere speaks, not even in Heb 9:27,28. Its locality is the earth, as would seem to follow from its dependence on the parousia (Mt 13:41,42; Mr 13:26,27), although some infer from 1Th 4:17 that, so far as believers are concerned, it will take place in the air. But this passage does not speak of the judgment, only of the parousia and the meeting of believers with Christ. The judge is God (Mt 6:4,6,14,18; 10:28,32; Lu 12:8 ff; 21:36; Ac 10:42; 17:30,31; Ro 2:2,3,5,16; 14:10; 1Co 4:3-5; 5:13; Heb 12:25; 13:4; 1Pe 1:17; 2:23; Re 6:10; 14:7), but also Christ, not only in the great scene depicted in Mt 25:31-46, but also in Mr 8:38; 13:26 ff; Mt 7:22; Lu 13:25-27; Ac 17:31; 2Co 5:10; Re 19:11, whence also the Old Testament conception of "the day of Yahweh" is changed into "the day of the Lord" (1Co 5:5; 2Co 1:14; 1Th 5:2; 2Pe 3:10). In the sense of the final assize the judgment does not in earlier Jewish eschatology belong to the functions of the Messiah, except in Enoch 51:3; 55:4; 61:8 ff; 62:1 ff; 63. Only in the later apocalypses the Messiah appears as judge (4 Ezra (2 Esdras) 13; Apocrypha Baruch 72:2 (compare Sibylline Oracles 3 286)). In the more realistic, less forensic, sense of an act of destruction, the judgment forms part of the Messiah’s work from the outset, and is already assigned to Him by the Baptist and still more by Paul (Mt 3:10,11,12 = Lu 3:16,17; 2Th 2:8,10,12).

The one representation passes over into the other. Jesus always claims for Himself the judgment in the strictly forensic sense. Already in His present state He exercises the right to forgive sin (Mr 2:5,10). In the Fourth Gospel, it is true, He denies that His present activity involves the task of judging (Joh 8:15; 12:47). That this, however, does not exclude His eschatological judgeship appears from Joh 5:22,27 (notice the article in 5:22 "the whole judgment," which proves the reference to the last day). But even for the present, though not directly, yet indirectly by His appearance and message, Christ according to John effects a judgment among men (8:16; 9:39), which culminates in His passion and death, the judgment of the world and the Prince of the world (12:31; 14:30; 16:11). A share of the judgment is assigned to angels and to the saints (Mt 13:39,41,49; 16:27; 24:31; 25:31; 1Th 3:13; 2Th 1:7; Jude 1:14 f). In regard to the angels this is purely ministerial; of believers it is affirmed only in 1Co 6:1-3 that they will have something to do with the act of judgment itself; passages like Mt 19:28; 20:23; Lu 22:30; Re 3:21 do not refer to the judgment proper, but to judging in the sense of "reigning," and promise certain saints a preeminent position in the kingdom of glory. The judgment extends to all men, Tyre, Sidon, Sodom, as well as the Galilean cities (Mt 11:22,24); all nations (Mt 25:32; Joh 5:29; Ac 17:30,31; Ro 2:6,16; 2Co 5:10). It also includes the evil spirits (1Co 6:3; 2Pe 2:4; Jude 1:6). It is a judgment according to works, and that not only in the case of non-believers; of believers also the works will come under consideration (Mt 25:34 ff; 1Co 4:5; 2Co 5:10; Re 22:12). Side by side with this, however, it is taught already in the Synoptics that the decisive factor will be the acknowledgment of individuals by Jesus, which in turn depends upon the attitude assumed by them toward Jesus here, directly or indirectly (Mt 7:23; 19:28; 25:35-45; Mr 8:38).

By Paul the principle of judgment according to works is upheld, not merely hypothetically as a principle preceding and underlying every soteriological treatment of man by God (Ro 2), and therefore applying to non-Christians for whose judgment no other standard is available, but also as remaining in force for Christians, who have already, under the

soteriological regime of grace, received absolute, eternal acquittal in justification. This raises a twofold problem: (a) why justification does not render a last judgment superfluous; (b) why the last judgment in case of Christians saved by grace should be based on works. In regard to (a) it ought to be remembered that the last judgment differs from justification in that it is not a private transaction in foro conscientiae, but public, in foro mundi. Hence, Paul emphasizes this element of publicity (Ro 2:16; 1Co 3:13; 2Co 5:10). It is in accordance with this that God the Father is always the author of justification, whereas as a rule Christ is represented as presiding at the assize of the last day. As to (b), because the last judgment is not a mere private but a public transaction, something more must be taken into account than that on which the individual eternal destiny may hinge. There can be disapproval of works and yet salvation (1Co 3:15). But the trial of works is necessary for the sake of the vindication of God. In order to be a true theodicy the judgment must publicly exhibit and announce the complete overthrow of sin in man, and the complete working out in him of the idea of righteousness, including not merely his acquittal from the guilt, but also his deliverance from the power, of sin, not merely his imputed righteousness, but also his righteousness of life. In order to demonstrate this comprehensively, the judgment will have to take into account three things: faith (Ga 5:5), works done in the Christian state, sanctification. Besides this the works of the Christian appear as the measure of gracious reward (Mt 5:12,46; 6:1; 10:41,42; 19:28; 20:1-16; 25:14-45; Mr 9:41; Lu 6:23,15; 1Co 3:8,14; 9:17,18; Col 2:18; 3:24; Heb 10:35). These works, however, are not mechanically or commercially appraised, as in Judaism, for Paul speaks by preference of "work" in the singular (Ro 2:7,15; 1Co 3:13; 9:1; Ga 6:4; Eph 4:12; Php 1:6,22; 1Th 1:3; 2Th 1:11). And this one organic product of "work" is traced back to the root of faith (1Th 1:3; 2Th 1:11 where the genitive pisteos is a gen. of origin), and Paul speaks as a rule not of poiein but of prassein, i.e. of the practice, the systematic doing, of that which is good.

The judgment assigns to each individual his eternal destiny, which is absolute in its character either of blessedness or of punishment, though admittedly of degrees within these two states. Only two groups are recognized, those of the condemned and of the saved (Mt 25:33,14; Joh 5:29); no intermediate group with as yet undetermined destiny anywhere appears. The degree of guilt is fixed according to the knowledge of the Divine will possessed in life (Mt 10:15; 11:20-24; Lu 10:12-15; 12:47,48; Joh 15:22,24; Ro 2:12; 2Pe 2:20-22). The uniform representation is that the judgment has reference to what has been done in the embodied state of this life; nowhere is there any reflection upon the conduct or product of the intermediate state as contributing to the decision (2Co 5:10). The state assigned is of endless duration, hence described as aionios, "eternal." While this adjective etymologically need mean no more than "what extends through a certain eon or period of time," yet its eschatological usage correlates it everywhere with the "coming age," and, this age being endless in duration, every state or destiny connected with it partakes of the same character. It is therefore exegetically impossible to give a relative sense to such phrases as pur aionion, "eternal fire" (Mt 18:8; 25:41; Jude 1:7), kolasis aionios, "eternal punishment" (Mt 25:46), olethros aionios, "eternal destruction" (2Th 1:9), krisis aionios or krima aionion, "eternal judgment" (Mr 3:29; Heb 6:2). This is also shown by the figurative representations which unfold the import of the adjective: the "unquenchable fire" (Mt 3:12), "the never-dying worm" (Mr 9:43-48), "The smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever" (Re 14:11), "tormented day and night forever and ever" (Re 20:10). The endless duration of the state of punishment is also required by the absolute eternity of its counterpart, zoe aionios, "eternal life" (Mt 25:46). In support of the doctrine of conditional immortality it has been urged that other terms descriptive of the fate of the condemned, such as apoleia, "perdition," phthora, "corruption," olethros, "destruction," thanatos, "death," point rather to a cessation of being. This, however, rests on an unscriptural interpretation of these terms, which everywhere in the Old Testament and the New Testament designate a state of existence with an undesirable content, never the pure negation of existence, just as "life" in Scripture describes a positive mode of being, never mere existence as such. Perdition, corruption, destruction, death, are predicated in all such cases of the welfare or the ethical spiritual character of man, without implying the annihilation of his physical existence. No more support can be found in the New Testament for the hypothesis of an apokatastasis panton, "restoration of all things," i.e. absolute universalism implying the ultimate salvation of all men. The phrase occurs only in Ac 3:21, where, however, it has no cosmical reference but relates to the fulfillment of the promises to Israel.

Josephus uses it of the restoration of the Jews to their land after the Captivity, Philo of the restoration of inheritances in the year of jubilee (compare Mal 4:6; Mt 17:11; Mr 9:12; Ac 1:6). Absolute universalism has been found in Ro 5:18; 1Co 15:22,28; Eph 1:10; Col 1:20, but in all these passages only a cosmical or national universalism can be found, not the doctrine of the salvation of all individuals, which latter would bring the statements in question in direct contradiction to the most explicit deliverances of Paul elsewhere on the principle of predestination and the eternity of the destiny of the

wicked.

IX. The Consummate State.

Side by side with "the future age," and characterizing it from a less formal point of view, the phrase "kingdom of God" designates the consummate state, as it will exist for believers after the judgment. Jesus, while making the kingdom a present reality, yet continues to speak of it in accordance with its original eschatological usage as "the kingdom" which lies in the future (Mt 13:43; 25:34; 26:29; Mr 9:47; Lu 12:32; 13:28,29; 21:31). With Paul the phrase bears preponderatingly an eschatological sense, although occasionally he uses it of the present state of believers (Ro 14:17; 1Co 4:20; 6:9,10; 15:24,50; Ga 5:21; Eph 5:5; Col 1:13; 4:11; 1Th 2:12; 2Th 1:5; 2Ti 4:1,18). Elsewhere in the NewTestament the eschatological use occurs in Heb 12:28; Jas 2:5; 2Pe 1:11; Re 11:15. The idea is universalistic, unpolitical, which does not exclude that certain privileges are spoken of with special reference to Israel. Although the eschatological kingdom differs from the present kingdom largely in the fact that it will receive an external, visible embodiment, yet this does not hinder that even in it the core is constituted by those spiritual realities and relations which make the present kingdom. Still it will have its outward form as the doctrine of the resurrection and the regenerated earth plainly show. Hence, the figures in which Jesus speaks of it, such as eating, drinking, reclining at table, while not to be taken sensually, should not on the other hand be interpreted allegorically, as if they stood for wholly internal spiritual processes: they evidently point to, or at least include, outward states and activities, of which our life in the senses offers some analogy, but on a higher plane of which it is at present impossible to form any concrete conception or to speak otherwise than in figurative language. Equivalent to "the kingdom" is "life." But, unlike the kingdom, "life" remains in the Synoptics an exclusively eschatological conception.

It is objectively conceived: the state of blessedness the saints will exist in; not subjectively as a potency in man or a process of development (Mt 7:14; 18:8,9; 19:16,29; 25:46; Mr 10:30). In John "life" becomes a present state, and in connection with this the idea is subjectivized, it becomes a process of growth and expansion. Points of contact for this in the Synoptics may be found in Mt 8:22 (Lu 9:60); Lu 15:24; 20:38. When this eschatological life is characterized as aionios, "eternal," the reference is not exclusively to its eternal duration, but the word has, in addition to this, a qualitative connotation; it describes the kind of life that belongs to the consummate state (compare the use of the adjective with other nouns in this sense: 2Co 5:1; 2Ti 2:10; Heb 5:9; 9:12,15; 2Pe 1:11, and the unfolding of the content of the idea in 1Pe 1:4). With Paul "life" has sometimes the same eschatological sense (Ro 2:7; 5:17; Tit 1:2; 3:7), but most often it is conceived as already given in the present state, owing to the close association with the Spirit (Ro 6:11; 7:4,8,11; 8:2,6; Ga 2:19; 6:8; Eph 4:18). In its ultimate analysis the Pauline conception of "life," as well as that of Jesus, is that of something dependent on communion with God (Mt 22:32; Mr 12:27 = Lu 20:38; Ro 8:6,7; Eph 4:18). Another Pauline conception associated with the consummate state is that of doxa,"glory." This glory is everywhere conceived as a reflection of the glory of God, and it is this that to the mind of Paul gives it religious value, not the external radiance in which it may manifest itself as such. Hence, the element of "honor" conjoined to it (Ro 1:23; 2:7; 8:21; 9:23; 1Co 15:43). It is not confined to the physical sphere (2Co 3:18; 4:16,17). The outward doxa is prized by Paul as a vehicle of revelation, an exponent of the inward state of acceptance with God. In general Paul conceives of the final state after a highly theocentric fashion (1Co 15:28); it is the state of immediate vision of and perfect communion with God and Christ; the future life alone can bring the perfected sonship (Ro 6:10; 8:23,19; compare Lu 20:36; 2Co 4:4; 5:6,7,8; 13:4; Php 1:23; Col 2:13; 3:3,1; 1Th 4:17).

The scene of the consummate state is the new heaven and the new earth, which are called into being by the eschatological palingenesia "regeneration" (Mt 5:18; 19:28; 24:35; 1Co 7:31; Heb 1:12; 12:26,27; 2Pe 3:10; 1 Joh 2:17; Re 21:1, in which last passage, however, some exegetes understand the city to be a symbol of the church, the people of God). An annihilation of the substance of the present world is not taught (compare the comparison of the future world-conflagration with the Deluge in 2Pe 3:6). The central abode of the redeemed will be in heaven, although the renewed earth will remain accessible to them and a part of the inheritance (Mt 5:5; Joh 14:2,3; Ro 8:18-22; and the closing visions of the Apocalypse).

X. The Intermediate State.

In regard to the state of the dead, previously to the parousia and the resurrection, the New Testament is far less explicit than in its treatment of what belongs to general eschatology. The following points may here briefly be noted:

(1) The state of death is frequently represented as a "sleeping," just as the act of dying as a "falling asleep" (Mt 9:24; Joh 9:4; 11:11; 1Co 7:39; 11:30; 15:6,18,20,51; 1Th 4:13,15; 2Pe 3:4). This usage, while also purely Greek, rests on the Old Testament. There is this difference, that in the New Testament (already in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical books) the conception is chiefly used with reference to the righteous dead, and has associated with it the thought of their blessed awaking in the resurrection, whereas in the Old Testament it is indiscriminately applied to all the dead and without such connotation. With Paul the word always occurs of believers. The representation applies not to the "soul" or "spirit," so that a state of unconsciousness until the resurrection would be implied. It is predicated of the person, and the point of comparison is that as one who sleeps is not alive to his surroundings, so the dead are no longer en rapport with this earthly life. Whatever may have been the original implications of the word, it plainly had become long before the New Testament period a figurative mode of speech, just as egeirein, "to wake," was felt to be a figurative designation of the act of the resurrection. Because the dead are asleep to our earthly life, which is mediated through the body, it does not follow that they are asleep in every other relation, asleep to the life of the other world, that their spirits are unconscious. Against the unconsciousness of the dead compare Lu 16:23; 23:43; Joh 11:25,26; Ac 7:59; 1Co 15:8; Php 1:23; Re 6:9-11; 7:9. Some have held that the sleep was for Paul a euphemism employed in order to avoid the terms "death" and "to die," which the apostle restricted to Christ. 1Th 4:16 shows that this is unfounded.

(2) The New Testament speaks of the departed after an anthropomorphic fashion as though they were still possessed of bodily organs (Lu 16:23,14; Re 6:11; 7:9). That no inference can be drawn from this in favor of the hypothesis of an intermediate body appears from the fact that God and angels are spoken of in the same manner, and also from passages which more precisely refer to the dead as "souls," "spirits" (Lu 23:46; Ac 7:59; Heb 12:23; 1Pe 3:19; Re 6:9; 20:4).

(3) The New Testament nowhere encourages the living to seek converse with the dead. Its representation of the dead as "sleeping" with reference to the earthly life distinctly implies that such converse would be abnormal and in so far discountenances it, without explicitly affirming its absolute impossibility. Not even the possibility of the dead for their part taking knowledge of our earthly life is affirmed anywhere. Heb 12:1 does not necessarily represent the Old Testament saints as "witnesses" of our race of faith in the sense of spectators in the literal sense, but perhaps in the figurative sense, that we ought to feel, having in memory their example, as if the ages of the past and their historic figures were looking down upon us (Lu 16:29; Ac 8:9; 13:6 ff; 19:13 ff).

(4) As to the departed saints themselves, it is intimated that they have mutual knowledge of one another in the intermediate state, together with memory of facts and conditions of the earthly life (Lu 16:9,19-31). Nowhere, however, is it intimated that this interest of the departed saints in our earthly affairs normally expresses itself in any act of intercession, not even of intercession spontaneously proffered on their part.

(5) The New Testament does not teach that there is any possibility of a fundamental change in moral or spiritual character in the intermediate state. The doctrine of a so-called "second probation" finds in it no real support. The only passages that can with some semblance of warrant be appealed to in this connection are 1Pe 3:19-21 and 4:6. For the exegesis of the former passage, which is difficult and much disputed, compare SPIRITS IN PRISON. Here it may simply be noted that the context is not favorable to the view that an extension of the opportunity of conversion beyond death is implied; the purport of the whole passage points in the opposite direction, the salvation of the exceedingly small number of eight of the generation of Noah being emphasized (1Pe 3:20). Besides this it would be difficult to understand why this exceptional opportunity should have been granted to this peculiar group of the dead, since the contemporaries of Noah figure in Scripture as examples of extreme wickedness. Even if the idea of a gospel-preaching with soteriological purpose were actually found here, it would not furnish an adequate basis for building upon it the broad hypothesis of a second probation for all the dead in general or for those who have not heard the gospel in this life. This latter view the passage is especially ill fitted to support, because the generation of Noah had had the gospel preached to them before death. There is no intimation that the transaction spoken of was repeated or continued indefinitely. As to the second passage (1Pe 4:6), this

must be taken by itself and in connection with its own context. The assumption that the sentence "the gospel (was) preached even to the dead" must have its meaning determined by the earlier passage in 1Pe 3:19-21, has exercised an unfortunate influence upon the exegesis. Possibly the two passages had no connection in the mind of the author. For explaining the reference to "the dead" the connection with the preceding verse is fully sufficient. It is there stated that Christ is "ready to judge the living and the dead." "The living and the dead" are those who will be alive and dead at the parousia. To both the gospel was preached, that Christ might be the judge of both. But that the gospel was preached to the latter in the state of death is in no way indicated. On the contrary the telic clause, "that they might be judged according to men in the flesh," shows that they heard the gospel during their lifetime, for the judgment according to men in the flesh that has befallen them is the judgment of physical death. If a close connection between the passage in 1Pe 3 and that in chapter 4 did exist, this could only serve to commend the exegesis which finds in the earlier passage a gospel-preaching to the contemporaries of Noah during their lifetime, since, on that view, it becomes natural to identify the judgment in the flesh with the Deluge.

(6) The New Testament, while representing the state of the dead before the parousia as definitely fixed, nevertheless does not identify it, either in degree of blessedness or punishment, with the final state which follows upon the resurrection. Although there is no warrant for affirming that the state of death is regarded as for believers a positively painful condition, as has been mistakenly inferred from 1Co 11:30; 1Th 4:13, nevertheless Paul shrinks from it as from a relatively undesirable state, since it involves "nakedness" for the soul, which condition, however, does not exclude a relatively high degree of blessedness in fellowship with Christ (2Co 5:2-4,6,8; Php 1:23). In the same manner a difference in the degree or mode of punishment between the intermediate state and the age to come is plainly taught. For on the one hand the eternal punishment is related to persons in the body (Mt 10:28), and on the other hand it is assigned to a distinct place, Gehenna, which is never named in connection with the torment of the intermediate state. This term occurs in Mt 5:22,29,30; 10:28; Lu 12:5; 18:9; 23:33; Mr 9:43,15,47; Jas 3:6. Its opposite is the eschatological kingdom of God (Mr 9:47). The term abussos differs from it in that it is associated with the torment of evil spirits (Lu 8:31; Ro 10:7; Re 9:1,2; 11:7; 20:1), and in regard to it no such clear distinction between a preliminary and final punishment seems to be drawn (compare also the verb tartaroun, "to bind in Tartarus"; of evil spirits in 2Pe 2:4). Where the sphere of the intermediate state is locally conceived, this is done by means of the term Hades, which is the equivalent of the Old Testament She’ol. The passages where this occurs are Mt 11:23; 16:18; Lu 16:23; Ac 2:27,31; 1Co 15:55 (where others read "death"); Re 1:18; 6:8; 20:13,14. These passages should not be interpreted on the basis of the Greek classical usage, but in the light of the Old Testament doctrine about She’ol. Some of them plainly employ the word in the non-local sense of the state of death (Mt 16:18; possibly Ac 2:27,31; 1Co 15:55 (personified); Re 1:18; 6:8 (personified); Re 20:13 (personified)). The only passage where the conception is local is Lu 16:23, and this occurs in a parable, where aside from the central point in comparison, no purpose to impart topographical knowledge concerning the world beyond death can be assumed, but the imagery is simply that which was popularly current. But, even if the doctrine of Hades as a place distinct from Gehenna should be found here, the terms in which it is spoken of, as place of torment for Dives, prove that the conception is not that of a general abode of neutral character, where without blessedness or pain the dead as a joint- company await the last judgment, which would first assign them to their separate eternal habitations. The parable plainly teaches, whether Hades be local and distinct from Gehenna or not, that the differentiation between blessedness and punishment in its absolute character (Lu 16:26) is begun in it and does not first originate at the judgment (see further, HADES).

LITERATURE.

Besides the articles on the several topics in the Bible Dictionaries and in Cremer’s Lexicon of New Testament Greek, and the corresponding chapters in the handbooks on New Testament Theology, the following works and articles may be consulted: Bousset, Die Religion des Judenthums2, 1906, especially 233-346; id, Der Antichrist in der Ueberlieferung des Judenthums, des New Testament und der alten Kirche, 1895; Bruston, La vie future d’apres Paul, 1895; Charles, Eschatology Hebrew, Jewish and Christian: A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, 1899; Cremer, Ueber den Zustand nach dem Tode3, 1892; Grimm, "Ueber die Stelle 1 Kor 15:20-28," ZWT, 1873; Haupt, Die eschatologischen Aussagen Jesu in den synoptischen Evangelien, 1895; Kabisch, Eschatologie des Paulus in ihren Zusammenhangen mit dem Gesamtbegriff des Paulinismus, 1893; Kennedy, Paul’s Conceptions of the Last Things, 1904; Kliefoth, Christliche Eschatologie, 1886; Klopper, "Zur Paulinischen Lehre von der Auferstehung: Auslegung von 2 Kor 5:1-6," JDT, 1862 (the

author modified his views in his commentary on 2 Cor); Kostlin, "Die Lehre des Apostels Paulus von der Auferstehung," JDT, 1877; Luthardt, Lehre von den letzten Dingen3, 1885; Muirhead, The Eschatology of Jesus, 1904; Oesterley, The Doctrine of the Last Things, 1908; Philippi, Die biblische und kirchliche Lehre vom Antichrist, 1877; Rinck, Vom Zustande nach dem Tode, 1885; Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality5, 1901; Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode, 1892; Sharman, The Teaching of Jesus about the Future According to the Synoptic Gospels, 1909; Stahelin, "Zur Paulinischen Eschatologie," JDT, 1874; Teichmann, Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht, 1896; Volz, Judische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba, 1903; Waitz, "Ueber 2 Kor 5:1-4," JPT, 1882; Wetzel, "Ueber 2 Kor 5:1-4," SK, 1886; Wendt, Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch, 1878.

Geerhardus Vos

ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

es-ka-tol’-o-ji

Contents (A) Scope of Article (B) Dr. Charles’ Work (C) Individual Religion in Israel

I. FUNDAMENTAL IDEAS

1. Idea of God 2. Idea of Man Body, Soul and Spirit 3. Sin and Death

II. CONCEPTIONS OF THE FUTURE LIFE—SHEOL

Had Israel No Belief in a Future Life? 1. Reserve on This Subject: Hopes and Promises Largely Temporal 2. A Future State not Therefore Denied Belief Non-Mythological 3. Survival of Soul, or Conscious Part 4. The Hebrew Sheol

III. THE RELIGIOUS HOPE—LIFE AND RESURRECTION

(a) Nature and Grace—Moral Distinctions (b) Religious Hope of Immortality 1. Sheol, Like Death, Connected with Sin 2. Religious Root of Hope of Immortality Not Necessarily Late 3. Hope of Resurrection (1) Not a Late or Foreign Doctrine (2) The Psalms (3) The Book of Job (4) The Prophets (5) Daniel—Resurrection of Wicked

IV. THE IDEA OF JUDGMENT—THE DAY OF YAHWEH

Judgment a Present Reality 1. Day of Yahweh (1) Relation to Israel (2) To the Nations 2. Judgment beyond Death (1) Incompleteness of Moral Administration (2) Prosperity of Wicked (3) Suffering of Righteous with Wicked 3. Retribution beyond Death

V. LATER JEWISH CONCEPTIONS—APOCRYPHAL, APOCALYPTIC, RABBINICAL

1. Sources (1) Apocrypha (2) Apocalyptic Literature (3) Rabbinical Writings 2. Description of Views (1) Less Definite Conceptions (2) Ideas of Sheol (3) The Fallen Angels (4) Resurrection (5) Judgment The Messiah (6) The Messianic Age and the Gentiles (7) Rabbinical Ideas LITERATURE

==========

Eschatology of the Old Testament (with Apocryphal and Apocalyptic Writings).

(A) Scope of Article:

By "eschatology," or doctrine of the last things, is meant the ideas entertained at any period on the future life, the end of the world (resurrection, judgment; in the New Testament, the Parousia), and the eternal destinies of mankind. In this article it is attempted to exhibit the beliefs on these matters contained in the Old Testament, with those in the Jewish apocryphal and apocalyptic writings that fill up the interval between the Old Testament and the New Testament.

(B) Dr. Charles' Work:

The subject here treated has been dealt with by many writers (see "Literature" below); by none more learnedly or ably than by Dr. R. H. Charles in his work on Hebrew, Jewish and Christian eschatology (A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity). The present writer is, however, unable to follow Dr. Charles in many of his very radical critical positions, which affect so seriously the view taken of the literary evidence, and of the development of Israel's religion; is unable, therefore, to follow him in his interpretation of the religion itself. The subject, accordingly, is discussed in these pages from a different point of view from his.

(C) Individual Religion in Israel.

One special point in which the writer is unable to follow Dr. Charles in his treatment, which may be noticed at the outset, is in his idea—now so generally favored—that till near the time of the Exile religion was not individual—that Yahweh was thought of as concerned with the well-being of the people as a whole, and not with that of its individual members. "The individual was not the religious unit, but the family or tribe" (op. cit., 58). How anyone can entertain this idea in face of the plain indications of the Old Testament itself to the contrary is to the present writer a mystery. There is, indeed, throughout the Old Testament, a solidarity of the individual with his family and tribe, but not at any period to the exclusion of a personal relation to Yahweh, or of individual moral and religious responsibility. The pictures of piety in the Book of Genesis are nearly all individual, and the narratives containing them are, even on the critical view, older than the 9th century. Adam, Noah, Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, are all of them, to the writers of the history, individuals; Moses, Joshua, Caleb, are individuals; the deeds of individuals are counted to them for righteousness; the sins of others slay them. If there had been ten righteous persons in Sodom, it would have been spared (Ge 18:32). It was as an individual that David sinned; as an individual he repented and was forgiven. Kings are judged or condemned according to their individual character. It is necessary to lay stress on this at the beginning; otherwise the whole series of the Old Testament conceptions is distorted.

I. Fundamental Ideas.

The eschatology of the Old Testament, as Dr. Charles also recognizes, is dependent on, and molded by, certain fundamental ideas in regard to God, man, the soul and the state after death, in which lies the peculiarity of Israel's religion. Only, these ideas are differently apprehended here from what they are in this writer's learned work.

1. Idea of God:

In the view of Dr. Charles, Yahweh (Yahweh), who under Moses became the God of the Hebrew tribes, was, till the time of the prophets, simply a national God, bound up with the land and with this single people; therefore, "possessing neither interest nor jurisdiction in the life of the individual beyond the grave. .... Hence, since early Yahwism possessed no eschatology of its own, the individual Israelite was left to his hereditary heathen beliefs. These beliefs we found were elements of Ancestor Worship" (op. cit., 52; compare 35). The view taken here, on the contrary, is, that there is no period

known to the Old Testament in which Yahweh—whether the name was older than Moses or not need not be discussed—was not recognized as the God of the whole earth, the Creator of the world and man, and Judge of all, nations. He is, in both Ge 1 and Ge 2, the Creator of the first pair from whom the whole race springs; He judged the whole world in the Flood; He chose Abraham to be a blessing to the families of the earth (Ge 12:3); His universal rule is acknowledged (Ge 18:25); in infinite grace, displaying His power over Egypt, He chose Israel to be a people to Himself (Ex 19:3-6). The ground for denying jurisdiction over the world of the dead thus falls. The word of Jesus to the Sadducees is applicable here: "Have ye not read .... I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (Mt 22:31,32). The Old Testament instances of resurrection in answer to prayer point in the same direction (1Ki 17:21 ff; 2Ki 4:34 ff; compare Ps 16:10; 49:15, etc.; see further, below).

2. Idea of Man:

According to Dr. Charles, the Old Testament has two contradictory representations of the constitution of man, and of the effects of death. The older or pre-prophetic view distinguishes between soul and body in man (pp. 37 ff, 45 ff), and regards the soul as surviving death (this is not easily reconcilable with the other proposition (p. 37) that the "soul or nephesh is identical with the blood"), and as retaining a certain self-consciousness, and the power of speech and movement in Sheol (pp. 39 ff). This view is in many respects identical with that of ancestor worship, which is held to be the primitive belief in Israel (p. 41). The other and later view, which is thought to follow logically from the account in Ge 2:7, supposes the soul to perish at death (pp. 41 ff). We read there that "Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." The "breath of life" (nishmath chayyim) is identified with the "spirit of life" (ruach chayyim) of Ge 6:17, and is taken to mean that the soul has no independent existence, but is "really a function of the material body when quickened by the (impersonal) spirit" (p. 42). "According to this view the annihilation of the soul ensues inevitably at death, that is, when the spirit is withdrawn" (p. 43). This view is held to be the parent of Sadduceeism, and is actually affirmed to be the view of Paul (pp. 43-44, 409)—the apostle who repudiated Sadduceeism in this very article (Ac 23:6-9). Body, Soul and Spirit.

The above view of man’s nature is here rejected, and the consistency of the Old Testament doctrine affirmed. The Biblical view has nothing to do with ancestor worship (compare the writer’s Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament, 135-36). In Ge 1:26,27 man is created in God’s image, and in the more anthropomorphic narrative of Ge 2:7, he becomes "a living soul" through a unique act of Divine inbreathing. The soul (nephesh) in man originates in a Divine inspiration (compare Job 32:8; 33:4; Isa 42:5), and is at once the animating principle of the body (the blood being its vehicle, Le 17:11), with its appetites and desires, and the seat of the self-conscious personality, and source of rational and spiritual activities. It is these higher activities of the soul which, in the Old Testament, are specially called "spirit" (ruach). Dr. Charles expresses this correctly in what he says of the supposed earlier view ("the ruach had become the seat of the highest spiritual functions in man," p. 46; see more fully the writer’s God’s Image in Man, 47 ff). There is no ground for deducing "annihilation" from Ge 2:7. Everywhere in Ge man is regarded as formed for living fellowship with God, and capable of knowing, worshipping and serving Him.

See SOUL; SPIRIT.

3. Sin and Death:

It follows from the above account that man is regarded in the Old Testament as a compound being, a union of body and soul (embracing spirit), both being elements in his one personality. His destiny was not to death, but to life—not life, however, in separation of the soul from the body (disembodied existence), but continued embodied life, with, perhaps, as its sequel, change and translation to higher existence (thus Enoch, Elijah; the saints at the Parousia). This is the true original idea of immortality for man (see IMMORTALITY). Death, accordingly, is not, as it appears in Dr. Charles, a natural event, but an abnormal event—a mutilation, separation of two sides of man’s being never intended to be separated—due, as the Scripture represents it, to the entrance of sin (Ge 2:17; 3:19,22; Ro 5:12; 1Co 15:21,22). It is objected that nothing further is said in the Old Testament of a "Fall," and a subjection of man to death as the result of sin. In truth,

however, the whole picture of mankind in the Old Testament, as in the New Testament, is that of a world turned aside from God, and under His displeasure, and death and all natural evils are ever to be considered in relation to that fact (compare Dillmann, Alttest. Theol., 368, 376 ff; God's Image in Man, 198 ff, 249 ff). This alone explains the light in which death is regarded by holy men; their longing for deliverance from it (see below); the hope of resurrection; the place which resurrection—"the redemption of our body" (Ro 8:23)—after the pattern of Christ's resurrection (Php 3:21), has in the Christian conception of immortality.

II. Conceptions of the Future Life—Sheol.

Had Israel No Belief in a Future Life?:

It is usual to find it contended that the Israelites, in contrast with other peoples, had not the conception of a future life till near the time of the Exile; that then, through the teaching of the prophets and the discipline of experience, ideas of individual immortality and of judgment to come first arose. There is, however, a good deal of ambiguity of language, if not confusion of thought, in such statements. It is true there is development in the teaching on a future life; true also that in the Old Testament "life" and "immortality" are words of pregnant meaning, to which bare survival of the soul, and gloomy existence in Sheol, do not apply. But in the ordinary sense of the expression "future life," it is certain that the Israelites were no more without that notion than any of their neighbors, or than most of the peoples and races of the world to whom the belief is credited.

1. Reserve on This Subject: Hopes and Promises Largely Temporal:

Israel, certainly, had not a developed mythology of the future life such as was found in Egypt. There, life in the other world almost over-shadowed the life that now is; in contrast with this, perhaps because of it, Israel was trained to a severer reserve in regard to the future, and the hopes and promises to the nation—the rewards of righteousness and penalties of transgression—were chiefly temporal. The sense of individual responsibility, as was shown at the commencement, there certainly was—an individual relation to God. But the feeling of corporate existence—the sense of connection between the individual and his descendants—was strong, and the hopes held out to the faithful had respect rather to multiplication of seed, to outward prosperity, and to a happy state of existence (never without piety as its basis) on earth, than to a life beyond death. The reason of this and the qualifications needing to be made to the statement will afterward appear; but that the broad facts are as stated every reader of the Old Testament will perceive for himself. Abraham is promised that his seed shall be multiplied as the stars of heaven, and that the land of Canaan shall be given them to dwell in (Ge 12:1-3; 15); Israel is encouraged by abundant promises of temporal blessing (De 11:8 ff; 28:1-14), and warned by the most terrible temporal curses (De 28:15 ff); David has pledged to him the sure succession of his house as the reward of obedience (2Sa 7:11 ff). So in the Book of Job, the patriarch's fidelity is rewarded with return of his prosperity (chapter 42). Temporal promises abound in the Prophets (Ho 2:14 ff; 14; Isa 1:19,26, etc.); the Book of Pr likewise is full of such promises (3:13 ff, etc.).

2. A Future State not Therefore Denied:

All this, however, in no way implies that the Israelites had no conceptions of, or beliefs in, a state of being beyond death, or believed the death of the body to be the extinction of existence. This was very far from being the case. A hope of a future life it would be wrong to call it; for there was nothing to suggest hope, joy or life in the good sense, in the ideas they entertained of death or the hereafter. In this they resembled most peoples whose ideas are still primitive, but to whom it is not customary to deny belief in a future state. They stand as yet, though with differences to be afterward pointed out, on the general level of Semitic peoples in their conceptions of what the future state was. This is also the view taken by Dr. Charles. He recognizes that early Israelite thought attributed a "comparatively large measure of life, movement, knowledge and likewise power (?) to the departed in Sheol" (op. cit., 41). A people that does this is hardly destitute of all notions of a future state. This question of Sheol now demands more careful consideration. Here again our differences from Dr. Charles will reveal themselves.

Belief Non-Mythological.

It would, indeed, have been amazing had the Israelites, who dwelt so long in Egypt, where everything reminded of a future life, been wholly destitute of ideas on that subject. What is clear is that, as already observed, they did not adopt any of the Egyptian notions into their religion. The simplicity of their belief in the God of their fathers kept them then and ever after from the importation of mythological elements into their faith. The Egyptian Amenti may be said, indeed, to answer broadly to the Hebrew Sheol; but there is nothing in Israelite thought to correspond to Osiris and his assessors, the trial in the hall of judgment, and the adventures and perils of the soul thereafter. What, then, was the Hebrew idea of Sheol, and how did it stand related to beliefs elsewhere?

3. Survival of Soul, or Conscious Part:

That the soul, or some conscious part of man for which the name may be allowed to stand, does not perish at death, but passes into another state of existence, commonly conceived of as shadowy and inert, is a belief found, not only among the lower, so-called nature-peoples, but in all ancient religions, even the most highly developed. The Egyptian belief in Amenti, or abode of the dead, ruled over by Osiris, is alluded to above; the Babylonian Arallu (some find the word "Sualu" = she'ol), the land of death, from which there is no return; the Greek Hades, gloomy abode of the shades of the departed, are outstanding witnesses to this conception (the various ideas may be seen, among other works, in Salmond, Christian Doctrine of Immortality, I (ideas of lower races, Indian, Egyptian Babylonian, Persian and Greek beliefs); in Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, Religion of Ancient Babylonians, and Gifford Lectures, Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia; Dr. Charles, Eschatology, chapter iii, on Greek conceptions). The Hebrew conception of Sheol, the gathering-place of the dead, is not in essentials dissimilar. "The resemblance," says Dr. Salmond, "between the Hebrew Sheol, the Homeric Hades, and Babylonian Arallu is unmistakable" (op. cit., 3rd edition, 173). As to its origin, Dr. Charles would derive the belief from ancestor worship. He supposes that "in all probability Sheol was originally conceived as a combination of the graves of the clan or nation, and as thus its final abode" (op. cit., 33). It is far from proved, however, that ancestor worship had the role he assigns to it in early religion; and, in any case, the explanation inverts cause and effect. The survival of the soul or shade is already assumed before there can be worship of ancestors. Far simpler is the explanation that man is conscious from the first of a thinking, active principle within him which disappears when death ensues, and he naturally thinks of this as surviving somewhere else, if only in a ghost-like and weakened condition (compare Max Muller, Anthropological Religion, 195, 281, 337-38). Whatever the explanation, it is the case that, by a sure instinct, peoples of low and high culture alike all but universally think of the conscious part of their dead as surviving. On natural grounds, the Hebrews did the same. Only, in the Scriptural point of view, this form of survival is too poor to be dignified with the high name of "immortality."

4. The Hebrew Sheol:

It is not necessary to do more than sketch the main features of the Hebrew sheol (see SHEOL). The word, the etymology of which is doubtful (the commonest derivations are from roots meaning "to ask" or "to be hollow," sha'al), is frequently, but erroneously, translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "grave" or "hell." It denotes really, as already said, the place or abode of the dead, and is conceived of as situated in the depths of the earth (Ps 63:9; 86:13; Eze 26:20; 31:14; 32:18,24; compare Nu 16:30; De 32:22). The dead are there gathered in companies; hence, the frequently recurring expression, "gathered unto his people" (Ge 25:8; 35:29; 49:33; Nu 20:24, etc.), the phrase denoting, as the context shows, something quite distinct from burial. Jacob, e.g. was "gathered unto his people"; afterward his body was embalmed, and, much later, buried (Ge 50:2 ff). Poetical descriptions of Sheol are not intended to be taken with literalness; hence, it is a mistake, with Dr. Charles, to press such details as "bars" and "gates" (Job 17:16; 38:17; Ps 9:14; Isa 38:10, etc.). In the general conception, Sheol is a place of darkness (Job 10:21,22; Ps 143:3), of silence (Ps 94:17; 115:17), of forgetfulness (Ps 88:12; Ec 9:5,6,10). It is without remembrance or praise of God (Ps 6:5), or knowledge of what transpires on earth (Job 14:21). Even this language is not to be pressed too literally. Part of it is the expression of a depressed or despairing (compare Isa 38:10 ff) or temporarily skeptical (thus in Ecclesiastes; compare 12:7,13,14) mood; all of it is relative, emphasizing the contrast with the brightness, joy and activity of the earthly life (compare Job 10:22, "where the light is as

midnight"—comparative). Elsewhere it is recognized that consciousness remains; in Isa 14:9 ff the shades (repha'im) of once mighty kings are stirred up to meet the descending king of Babylon (compare Eze 32:21). If Sheol is sometimes described as "destruction" (Job 26:6 margin; Job 28:22; Pr 15:11 margin) and "the pit" (Ps 30:9; 55:23), at other times, in contrast with the weariness and trouble of life, it is figured and longed for as a place of "rest" and "sleep" (Job 3:17 ff; 14:12,13). Always, however, as with other peoples, existence in Sheol is represented as feeble, inert, shadowy, devoid of living interests and aims, a true state of the dead (on Egyptian Babylonian and Greek analogies, compare Salmond, op. cit., 54-55, 73-74, 99 ff, 173-74). The idea of Dr. Charles, already commented on, that Sheol is outside the jurisdiction of Yahweh, is contradicted by many passages (De 32:22; Job 26:6; Pr 15:11; Ps 139:8; Am 9:2, etc.; compare above).

III. The Religious Hope—Life and Resurrection.

(a) Nature and Grace—Moral Distinctions:

Such is Sheol, regarded from the standpoint of nature; a somewhat different aspect is presented when it is looked at from the point of view of grace. As yet no trace is discernible between righteous and wicked in Sheol; the element of retribution seems absent. Reward and punishment are in this world; not in the state beyond. Yet one must beware of drawing too sweeping conclusions even here. The state, indeed, of weakened consciousness and slumbrous inaction of Sheol does not admit of much distinction, and the thought of exchanging the joys of life for drear existence in that gloomy underworld may well have appalled the stoutest hearts, and provoked sore and bitter complainings. Even the Christian can bewail a life brought to a sudden and untimely close. But even on natural grounds it is hardly credible that the pious Israelite thought of the state of the godly gathered in peace to their people as quite the same as those who perished under the ban of God's anger, and went down to Sheol bearing their iniquity. There is a pregnancy not to be overlooked in such expressions as, "The wicked shall be turned back unto Sheol" (Ps 9:17), a "lowest Sheol" unto which God's anger burns (De 32:22), "uttermost parts of the pit" (Isa 14:15; Eze 32:23) to which the proud and haughty in this life are consigned. Dr. Charles goes so far as to find a "penal character of Sheol" in Psalms 49 and 73 (op. cit., 74). Consolation breathes in such utterances as, "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for there is a happy end to the man of peace" (Ps 37:37), or (with reference to the being taken from the evil to come), "He entereth into peace; they rest in their beds, each one that walketh in his uprightness" (Isa 57:2; compare Isa 57:21 "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked"). Even Balaam's fervent wish, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his" (Nu 23:10), seems weakened when interpreted only of the desire for a green and blessed old age. It is possible to read too much into Old Testament expressions; the tendency at the present time would seem to be to read a great deal too little

(P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, I, 173 ff, 422 ff, may profitably be consulted).

(b) Religious Hope of Immortality:

To get at the true source and nature of the hope of immortality in the Old Testament, however, it is necessary to go much farther than the idea of any happier condition in Sheol. This dismal region is never there connected with ideas of "life" or "immortality" in any form. Writers who suppose that the hopes which find utterance in passages of Psalms and Prophets have any connection with existence in Sheol are on an altogether wrong track. It is not the expectation of a happier condition in Sheol, but the hope of deliverance from Sheol, and of restored life and fellowship with God, which occupies the mind. How much this implies deserves careful consideration.

1. Sheol, Like Death, Connected with Sin:

It has already been seen that, in the Old Testament, Sheol, like death, is not the natural fate of man. A connection with sin and judgment is implied in it. Whatever Sheol might be to the popular, unthinking mind, to the reflecting spirit, that really grasped the fundamental ideas of the religion of Yahweh, it was a state wholly contrary to man's true destiny. It was, as seen, man's dignity in distinction from the animal, that he was not created under the law of death. Disembodied existence, which is of necessity enfeebled, partial, imperfect existence, was no part of the Divine plan for man. His immortality was

to be in the body, not out of it. Separation of soul and body, an after-existence of the soul in Sheol, belong to the doom of sin. Dr. Salmond fully recognizes this in his discussion of the subject. "The penal sense of death colors all that the Old Testament says of man's end. It is in its thoughts where it is not in its words" (op. cit., 159; see the whole passage; compare also Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, I, 242 ff, English translation; A. B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament, 432 ff, 439 ff). The true type of immortality is therefore to be seen in cases like those of Enoch (Ge 5:24; compare Heb 11:5) and Elijah (2Ki 2:11); of a bare "immortality of the soul," Scripture has nothing to say.

It is on all hands conceded that, so far as the hope of immortality, in any full or real sense, is found in the Old Testament, it is connected with religious faith and hope. It has not a natural, but a religious, root. It springs from the believer's trust and confidence in the living God; from his conviction that God—his God—who has bound him to Himself in the bonds of an unchanging covenant, whose everlasting arms are underneath him (De 33:27; compare Ps 90:1), will not desert him even in Sheol—will be with him there, and will give him victory over its terrors (compare A. B. Davidson, Commentary on Job, 293-95; Salmond, op. cit., 175).

2. Religious Root of Hope of Immortality:

Life is not bare existence; it consists in God's favor and fellowship (Ps 16:11; 30:5; 63:3). The relevant passages in Psalms and Prophets will be considered after. Only, it is contended by the newer school, this hope of immortality belongs to a late stage of Israel's religion—to a period when, through the development of the monotheistic idea, the growth of the sense of individuality, the acute feeling of the contradictions of life, this great "venture" of faith first became possible. One asks, however, Was it so? Was this hope so entirely a matter of "intuitous ventures, and forecasts of devout souls in moments of deepest experience or keenest conflict," as this way of considering the matter represents? Not Necessarily Late.

That the hope of immortality could only exist for strong faith is self-evident. But did strong faith come into existence only in the days of the prophets or the Exile? Exception has already been taken to the assumption that monotheism was a late growth, and that individual faith in God was not found in early times. It is not to be granted without demur that, as now commonly alleged, the Psalms and the Book of Job, which express this hope, are post-exilian products. If, however, faith in a covenant-keeping God is of earlier date—if it is present in patriarchal and Mosaic days—the question is not, Why should it not give rise to similar hopes? but rather, How should it be prevented from doing so? If a patriarch like Abraham truly walked with God, and received His promises, could he, any more than later saints, be wholly distrustful of God's power to keep and deliver him in and from Sheol? It is hard to credit it. It is replied, there is no evidence of such hope. Certainly these ancient saints did not write psalms or speak with the tongues of prophets. But is there nothing in their quiet and trustful walk, in their tranquil deaths, in their sense of uncompleted promises, in their pervading confidence in God in all the vicissitudes of life, to suggest that they, too, were able to commit themselves into the hands of God in death, and to trust Him to see that it was, or would ultimately be, well with them in the future? Thus at least Jesus understood it (Mt 22:32); thus, New Testament writers believed (Heb 11:13,14). Faith might falter, but in principle, this hope must have been bound up with faith from the beginning.

3. Hope of Resurrection:

This raises now the crucial question, What shape did this hope of immortality assume? It was not, as already seen, an immortality enjoyed in Sheol; it could only then be a hope connected with deliverance from the power of Sheol—in essence, whether precisely formulated or not, a hope of resurrection. It is, we believe, because this has been overlooked, that writers on the subject have gone so often astray in their discussions on immortality in the Old Testament. They have thought of a blessedness in the future life of the soul (thus Charles, op. cit., 76-77); whereas the redemption the Bible speaks of invariably embraces the whole personality of man, body and soul together. Jesus, it may be remembered, thus interprets the words, "I am the God of Abraham," etc. (Mt 22:32), as a pledge not simply of continued existence, but of resurrection. This accords with what has been seen of the connection of death with sin and its abnormality in the case of man. The immortality man would have enjoyed, had he not sinned, would have been an immortality of his whole person. It will be seen immediately that this is borne out by all the passages in which the hope of immortality is expressed in the Old

Testament. These never contemplate a mere immortality of the soul, but always imply resurrection.

(1) Not a Late or Foreign Doctrine.

If the above is correct, it follows that it is a mistake to place the belief in resurrection so late as is often done, still more to derive it from Zoroastrianism (thus, Cheyne, Origin of Psalter, lecture viii) or other foreign sources. It was a genuine corollary from the fundamental Israelite beliefs about God, man, the soul, sin, death and redemption. Professor Gunkel emphasizes "the immeasurable significance" of this doctrine, and speaks of it as "one of the greatest things found anywhere in the history of religion," but thinks "it cannot be derived from within Judaism itself, but must take its origin from a ruling belief in the Orient of the later time" (Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verstandniss des New Testament, 32-33; for criticism of Gunkel's positions see the writer's Resurrection of Jesus, 255 ff). To make good his theory, however, he has to discount all the evidences for the belief furnished by the earlier Old Testament writings, and this, it is believed, cannot be done successfully. It was before noted that cases of resurrection appear in the historical books (1Ki 17:21 ff; 2Ki 4:34 ff). It is not impossible that the reverent care of the patriarchs for their dead was, as with the Egyptians, inspired by some hope of this kind (Ge 23; 50:5,25; Ex 13:19; compare Heb 11:22). In any case an impartial survey of the evidence proves that the thought of resurrection colors all the later expressions of the hope of immortality (see IMMORTALITY; compare also the writer's appendix on the subject in Christian View of God, 2OO ff).

(2) The Psalms.

The passages in the Psalms in which faith rises to the hope of immortality are principally Ps 16:8-11; 17:15; 49:14,15; 73:24. There are a few others, but these are the chief, and so far as they are allowed to express a hope of immortality at all, they do so in a form which implies resurrection. Dr. Cheyne, believing them to be influenced by Zoroastrianism, formerly granted this (Origin of Psalter, lecture viii); now he reads the passages differently. There is no good reason for putting these psalms in post-exilian times, and, taken in their most natural sense, their testimony seems explicit. Ps 16:8-11 (cited in Ac 2:24-31 as a prophecy of the resurrection of Christ) reads "My flesh also shall dwell in safety (or confidently, margin). For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption (or the pit, margin). Thou wilt show me the path of life," etc. In Ps 17:15, the Psalmist, after describing the apparent prosperity of the wicked, says, "As for me, I shall behold thy face in rightousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with beholding thy form" (King James Version, the English Revised Version, "with thy likeness"). Cheyne (op. cit., 406) refers this to the resurrection (compare Delitzsch, Perowne, etc.). Yet more explicit is Ps 49:14,15, "They (the wicked) are appointed as a flock for Sheol .... and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning. .... But God will redeem my soul from the power (hand, margin) of Sheol; for he will receive me." The last clause, literally, ." He will take me," has, as Perowne, Delitzsch, Cheyne (formerly), even Duhm, allow, allusion to cases like those of Enoch and Elijah. It cannot, however, contemplate actual bodily translation; it must therefore refer to resurrection. Similar in strain is Ps 73:24, "Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory." Dr. Charles grants that, in Psalms 49 and 73, "God takes the righteous to Himself" in heaven (pp. 76- 77), but fails to connect this with the doctrine of resurrection which he finds appearing about the same time (p. 78).

(3) The Book of Job.

Before looking at the prophets, a glance should be taken at the Book of Job, which, irrespective of date (it is quite unwarrantably made post-exilian), reflects patriarchal conditions. Ch 14 raises the question, "If a man die, shall he live again?" (14:14), and it is to be remarked that the form in which it does it, is the possibility of bodily revival. The appearances hostile to man's living again are enumerated (14:7-12), then faith, reasserting itself, flings itself on God to accomplish the apparently impossible: "Oh that thou wouldest hide me in Sheol, that thou wouldest keep me secret, until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldest appoint me a set time and remember me. .... Thou wouldest call and I would answer thee: thou wouldest have a desire to the work of thy hands" (14:13-15; margin reads "Thou shalt call," etc.). Dr. A. B. Davidson says, "To his mind this involves a complete return to life again of the whole man" (Cambridge Commentary on Job, in the place cited.). With this must be taken the splendid outburst in 19:25-27, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc.,

which, whatever doubts may attach to the precise rendering of certain clauses, undoubtedly expresses a hope not inferior in strength to that in the verse just quoted.

(4) The Prophets.

The presence of the idea of resurrection in the Prophets is not doubted, but the passages are put down to exilic or preexilic times, and are explained of "spiritual" or "national," not of individual, resurrection (compare Charles, op. cit., 128-29). It seems plain, however, that, before the figure of resurrection could be applied to the nation, the idea of resurrection must have been there; and it is by no means clear that in certain of the passages the resurrection of individuals is not included. Cheyne granted this regarding the passages in Isa (25:6-8; 26:19): "This prospect concerns not merely the church-nation, but all of its believing members, and indeed all, whether Jews or not, who submit to the true king, Yahweh" (op. cit., 402). There is no call for putting the remarkable passages in Hos—"After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him" (6:2); "I will ransom them from the power of Sheol: I will redeem them from death: O death, where are thy plagues? O Sheol, where is thy destruction?" (13:14)—later than the time of that prophet. In them the idea of resurrection is already fully present; as truly as in the picture in Eze 37:1-10 of the valley of dry bones. The climax is, however, reached in Isa 25:6-8; 26:19, above referred to, from which the individual element cannot be excluded (compare Salmond, op. cit., 211-12: "The theme of this great passage, 26:19, therefore, is a personal, not a corporate resurrection").

(5) Daniel—Resurrection of Wicked.

Finally, in the Old Testament we have the striking statement in Da 12:2, "And many of them that sleep in the dust .... shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament," etc. The peculiarity of this passage is, that in it, for the first time, is announced a resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous (compare in the New Testament Joh 5:28,29; Ac 24:15; Re 20:12 ff). The word "many" is not to be understood in contrast with "all," though probably only Israel is in view. The event is connected with a "time of trouble" (Da 12:1) following upon the overthrow of Antiochus, here representative of Antichrist. The really difficult problem is, How did this conception of the resurrection of the wicked come about? The resurrection of the righteous, it has been seen, is a corollary from the covenant-faithfulness of Yahweh. But this does not apply to the wicked. Whence then does the idea come? It is given as a revelation, but even revelation connects itself with existing ideas and experiences. The resurrection of the wicked, certainly, does not arise, like that of the righteous, from the consciousness of an indissoluble union with God, but it may well arise from the opposite conviction of the judgment of God. As the sense of individuality grew strong—and it is granted that the teaching of the prophets did much to strengthen that feeling—and the certainty of moral retribution developed, it was inevitable that this should react on the conception of the future, in making it as certain that the wicked should be punished, as that the good should be rewarded, in the world to come. Naturally too, as the counterpart of the other belief, this shaped itself into the form of a resurrection to judgment. We are thus brought, as a last step, to consider the idea of judgment and its effects as found in the prophetic teaching.

IV. The Idea of Judgment—the Day of Yahweh.

Judgment a Present Reality:

It was seen that, under Mosaism, the promises and threatenings of God were mainly confined to the present life, and that the sense of distinctions in Sheol, though not absent, was vague and wavering. Through temporal dispensations men were trained to faith in the reality of moral retribution. Under the prophets, while the judgments of God on nations and individuals were still primarily viewed as pertaining to this life, there gradually shaped itself a further idea—that of an approaching consummation of history, or Day of Yahweh, when God’s enemies would be completely overthrown, His righteousness fully vindicated and His kingdom established in triumph throughout the earth. The developments of this idea may now briefly be exhibited. In this relation, it need only be stated that the writer does not follow the extraordinary mangling of the prophetic texts by certain critics, accepted, though with some misgiving, by Dr. Charles.

1. Day of Yahweh:

The "Day of Yahweh," in the prophetic writings, is conceived of, sometimes more generally, as denoting any great manifestation of God's power in judgment or salvation (e.g. the locusts in Joe 2), sometimes more eschatologically, of the final crisis in the history of God's kingdom, involving the overthrow of all opposition, and the complete triumph of righteousness (e.g. Isa 2:2-5; Joe 3; Am 9:11 ff; Zec 14, etc.). The two things are not unconnected; the one is the prelude, or anticipatory stage, of the other. That feature of prophetic vision sometimes spoken of as the absence of perspective is very conspicuous in the fact that chronology is largely disregarded, and the "Day of Yahweh" is seen looming up as the immediate background of every great crisis in which the nation may for the time be involved (Assyrian invasions; Babylonian captivity; Maccabean persecution). The one thing ever certain to the prophet's mind is that the "Day" is surely coming—it is the one great, dread, yet for God's people joyful, event of the future—but the steps by which the goal is to be reached are only gradually revealed in the actual march of God's providence.

(1) Relation to Israel.

The "Day" is in its primary aspect a day of judgment (Isa 2:12); not, however, to be thought of as a day of vengeance only on the adversaries of Israel (Am 5:18 ff). Israel itself would be the first to experience the strokes of the Divine chastisement: "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities" (Am 3:2). God's judgments on Israel, while retributive, were also purifying and sifting; a "remnant" would remain, who would be the seed of a holier community (Isa 6:13; Am 9:9; Ze 3:13,10, etc.). The Book of Ho beautifully exhibits this aspect of the Divine dealings.

(2) To the Nations.

Of wider scope is the relation of the "Day" to the Gentileworld. The nations are used as the instruments of God's judgments on Israel (Assyrians, Chaldeans, Persians), but they, too, would in turn be judged by Yahweh (compare the prophecies against the nations in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nahum, Habakkuk, etc.). The end would be, although this does not fully appear in every prophet, that a remnant of the heathen also would turn to Yahweh, and be rescued from the judgment (Zec 14:16). More generally, an extension of the kingdom of God would take place till the earth was filled with God's glory (e.g. Isa 2:2-5, with Mic 4:1-5; Isa 42:4; 66:3-6; Jer 12:14-16; 16:19-21; Eze 16:53,55,61, God will turn the captivity of Sodom and her daughters; Am 9:11; Hab 2:14; compare Ps 22:27-31; 65:2,5; 86:9). These events, in prophetic speech, belong to "the latter days" (Isa 2:2; Jer 48:47; Eze 38:16; Ho 3:5; Mic 4:1). In Daniel's great prophecy of the four kingdoms, these are represented as broken in pieces by the kingdom of heaven, symbolized by a stone cut out of the mountain without hands (Da 2:44,45; compare Dan 7:27). The kingdom is given by the Ancient of Days to one "like unto a son of man" (Da 7:13). Haggai and Zechariah, the post-exilian prophets, share in these glowing hopes (Hag 2:6,7; Zec 2:10; 8:20-23; 14:16). In Malachi is found one of the noblest of all the prophetic utterances: "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles," etc. (1:11); and prophecy closes with the announcement of Him, Yahweh's messenger, by whom this "great and terrible day of Yahweh" is to be brought in (Mal 4).

2. Judgment beyond Death:

The purview, in what is said of the "Day of Yahweh," is thus seen to be confined to earth, though the references to resurrection, and the passages in the close of Isa (65:17; 66:22) about "new heavens and a new earth" imply a further vista. The hope of immortality—of resurrection life—in the case of the righteous has already been considered. But what of judgment after death in the case of the wicked? Only dim premonitions of retribution, it was seen, are found in the earlier doctrine of Sheol. There are frequent references to "judgment" in the Psalms, sometimes on the world (e.g. 96:13; 98:9; compare 50), sometimes on individuals (e.g. 1:5), but it is doubtful if any of them look beyond earth. Yet many things combined to force this problem on the attention.

(1) Incompleteness of Moral Administration.

There was the sharpening of the sense of individual responsibility in the prophetic age (Jer 31:29,30; Eze 18:2 ff), and the obvious fact of the incompleteness of the Divine moral administration in the present life, as respects the individual. The working of moral laws could be discerned, but this fell far short of exact individual retribution. Life was full of moral anomalies and perplexities (compare JOB, BOOK OF).

(2) Prosperity of Wicked.

There was the special difficulty that the wicked did not always seem to meet with the punishment due to their misdeeds in time. On the contrary they often seemed to flourish, to have success in their schemes, to triumph over the godly, who were afflicted and oppressed. This was the enigma that so painfully exercised the minds of the psalmists (Pss 10; 17; 37; 49; 73, etc.). The solution they found was that the prosperity of the wicked did not endure. It came to a sudden end (Ps 37:35,36; 73:18-20), while the righteous had a sure compensation in the future (Ps 17:15; 49:15; 73:24, etc.). It was not, however, always the case that the wicked were thus visibly cut off. Besides, a sudden end hardly seemed an adequate punishment for a long career of triumphant iniquity, and, if the righteous were recompensed hereafter, the thought lay near that the wicked might be, and should be, also.

(3) Suffering of Righteous with Wicked.

There was the kindred fact that, in the calamities that overtook the wicked, the righteous were often the involuntary sharers. The wicked did not suffer by themselves; the godly were involved in the storm of judgment (war, captivity, plagues) that broke upon them. Here was something else calling for redress at the hands of a God of righteousness.

3. Retribution beyond Death:

From these causes the thought almost necessarily presented itself of the extension of retribution for the wicked into the state beyond death. Hence, as before seen, Sheol did come in the later age to assume something of a penal character for the unrighteous. There was a wrath of God that burned to the lowest Sheol (De 32:22; compare Charles, op. cit., 74). But this abode of the shades was not, for the evil any more than for the good, a fitting sphere for moral recompense. If, for the complete reward of the righteous, a resurrection-state was necessary, did not the same hold true for the wicked? It is questioned whether the very definite announcements of an individual judgment in Ec 11:9; 12:14 refer to the state beyond death—it is probable that they do (compare Salmond, op. cit., 216-17). The first clear intimation of a resurrection of the wicked, however, is found, as already said, in Da 12:2, which likewise implies judgment. Perhaps a hint of the same idea is given in Isa 66:24: "They shall go forth (the prophet is speaking of the times of the new heavens and the new earth, verse 22), and look upon the dead bodies of the men that have transgressed against me: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." Dr. Charles connects this with the idea of Gehenna as "a place of punishment for rebellious and apostate Jews," which he thinks also to be implied in Isa 50:11 (op. cit., 158). It is the same word "abhorrence" (dera’on), found in the above passage, which is rendered in Da 12:2 "contempt," and the punishment "is conceived of as eternal" (pp. 158-59).

It is hardly possible to carry the subject farther within the limits of the Old Testament. Further developments belong to the later Judaism.

V. Later Jewish Conceptions—Apocryphal, Apocalyptic, Rabbinical.

1. Sources:

The sources of our knowledge of the eschatological conceptions among the Jews in the immediately pre-Christian period

are:

(1) Apocrypha.

The books of the Old Testament Apocrypha (see APOCRYPHA), taken over, with the exception of 2 Esdras, from the Septuagint. 2 Esdras, better known as 4 Esdras, is more properly classed with the apocalyptic writings. The original work consists only of chapters 3-14, with a passage in chapter 7 not found in the ordinary version. The book is post-Christian (circa 80-96 AD).

(2) Apocalyptic Literature.

(See article under that head, II, i, 1; II, ii.) The remains of this litereature consist of the Sibylline Oracles (oldest parts, Book III, from 2nd century BC), the Book Enoch (see below), the Psalms of Solomon (70-40 BC), with the Apocrypha Baruch (50-100 AD), the Book of Jubilees, and Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (see below), the Assumption of Moses (early 1st century AD), and the Ascension of Isaiah (before 50 AD). A good deal turns on the dating of some of these books. Several (Apocrypha Baruch, Assumption of Moses, Ascension of Isaiah, with 4 Esdras) are post-Christian. The Book of Jubilees and Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs have also usually been regarded as such, but Dr. Charles argues for dates going back to the close of the 2nd century BC for both. Late Jewish and Christian additions are recognized in the latter. Formerly Dr. Charles dated Jubilees "before 10 AD." The chief dispute relates to (the "Similitudes") of the Book of Enoch chapters 37-70. These important sections are held by some (Dr. Stanton, etc.) to be post-Christian (end of 1st century AD)- -a view to which we incline; Dr. Charles and others place them in the 1st century BC. Most of the remaining portions of the book are assigned to dates in the 2nd century BC. To the above should be added the notices of Jewish opinions in Josephus

(3) Rabbinical Writings.

For rabbinical ideas, we are chiefly dependent on the Talmudic writings and the Targums—sources whose late character makes their witness often doubtful (see TALMUD; TARGUM).

2. Description of Views:

It is only possible to summarize very briefly the varying and frequently conflicting conceptions on eschatological subjects to be gleaned from this extensive literature. The representations are often wildly imaginative, and, so far as they are not genuine developments from Old Testament ideas, have value only as they may be supposed to throw light on the teachings of the New Testament. With one or two exceptions, little is to be gathered from the apocryphal books, and it will be best to treat the subject under headings.

(1) Less Definite Conceptions.

In the apocryphal Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of the Son of Sirach) we remain still on the old ground of Sheol as a place in which there is no remembrance, thanksgiving or retribution (Sirach 17:27,28; 41:3,1, etc.; a somewhat different note is heard in 21:10). It is the same in Baruch (2:17) and Tobit (3:6). In 1 Macc we have simply the Old Testament phrases, "gathered to his fathers" (2:69), "gathered to his people" (14:30). In the Book of Wisdom, the influence of Greek ideas is seen in a doctrine of the immortality of the soul only (2:23; 3:1-4; 4:13,14; 15:3; not a resurrection), possibly of pre-existence (8:20). The wicked suffer punishment in Sheol (3:1-10; 5:1-14, etc.).

(2) Ideas of Sheol.

Generally, however, in the apocalyptic books, a marked change is seen in the ideas of Sheol. It is still the place of the dead,

but is regarded more as a state intermediate between death and the resurrection for such as shall be raised; in which righteous and wicked are separated; in which the wicked suffer punishment. The Book of Enoch distinguishes four abodes for the departed—two for the righteous, and two for the wicked (21:1-13). One class of the wicked (those already punished in this life) remain there forever, while the others are raised, and pass to the torment of Gehenna (17:2). The righteous are in Paradise—"the garden of life" (61:12), "the garden of righteousness" (67:3). This character of Sheol as a place of punishment (intermediate or final) is met with frequently (Book of Jubilees 7:29; 22:22; 2 Macc 6:23; Psalter of Solomon 14:6; 15:11; 16:2, etc.). In certain places, Dr. Charles says, "Sheol has become an abode of fire, and therefore synonymous so far with Gehenna. .... In several passages in the Similitudes, and throughout Enoch 91-104, Sheol and Gehenna are practically identical" (op. cit., 237). Similar ideas are found in the Slavonic version of Enoch (ibid., 261 ff).

(3) The Fallen Angels.

Much prominence in the Book of Enoch is given to the fallen angels (those who sinned with women, Ge 6:2). They are consigned in the judgment to ever-burning fire (En 21:1-6; 90:20-25).

(4) Resurrection.

Ideas of the resurrection vary, In Enoch 22, the righteous and one class of the wicked are raised; elsewhere all the righteous are raised and none of the wicked (En 61:5; 90:33; Psalter of Solomon 3:16); sometimes there is to be a resurrection of all, just and unjust (En 51:1,2). 2 Macc dwells much on the resurrection, which seems to embrace all Israel (3:16; 13:9; 7:9,14,23, etc.). For the Gentiles there is no resurrection (7:14,36). In Enoch 90:38, the bodies of the righteous are described as "transformed" in the resurrection (compare in the "Similitudes," 39:7; 51:4; 62:15). The doctrine of the resurrection (universal) is taught in the Apocrypha Baruch 30:2-5; 50; 51, and in 4 Esdras 7:32-37. In Josephus the Pharisees are said to have believed in the resurrection of the righteous only (Ant., XVIII, i, 3). This does not coincide with Paul’s statement in Ac 24:15.

(5) Judgment.

The reality of a final judgment, supervening upon the intermediate judgment in Sheol, is strongly affirmed in most of the apocalyptic books. The Book of Enoch speaks much of this final judgment. It describes it as "the great day," "the righteous judgment," "the great day of judgment" "the last judgment," "the judgment of all eternity" (10:6,12; 16:1; 19:1; 22:4,11; 25:4; 90:26,27, etc.). Wicked angels and men are judged, and sentenced to Gehenna—a doom without end.

The Messiah:

An interesting point is the relation of the Messiah to this judgment. With the exception of 4 Esd, the apocryphal books are silent on the Messiah. In the apocalyptic books the Messiah does appear, but not always in the same light. In the Sibylline Oracles (3), Psalms of Solomon (17; 18), Apocrypha Baruch (39; 40) and in 4 Esdras (13:32 ff) the appearance of Messiah is associated with the overthrow and judgment of the ungodly worldly powers; in the older portions of Enoch (90:16-25) God Himself executes this judgment, and holds the great assize—the Messiah does not appear till after. In the section of Enoch, chapters 37-70, on the other hand, the Messiah appears definitely as the judge of the world, and titles resembling those in the New Testament, "the Righteous One" (38:2; 53:6), "the Elect One" (40:5; 45:3,4, etc.), above all, "the Son of Man" (46:2-4; 48:2, etc.), are given Him. It is these passages which suggest Christian influence, especially as the conception is not found elsewhere in pre-Christian Apocalypse, and the Book of Jubilees, which refers otherwise to Enoch, makes no mention of these passages. Yet another idea appears in later Apocalypse, that, namely, of a limited reign of Messiah, after which take place the resurrection and judgment. 4 Esdras has the extraordinary notion that, after a reign of 400 years, the Messiah dies (7:28,29). God in this case is the judge.

(6) The Messianic Age and the Gentiles.

The Messianic age, when conceived of as following the judgment (the older view), is unlimited in duration, has Jerusalem for its center, and includes in the scope of its blessing the converted Gentiles (Sibylline Oracles 3:698-726; Enoch 90:30,37; compare 48:5; 53:1; Psalms of Solomon 17:32-35). The righteous dead of Israel are raised to participate in the kingdom. Already in Enoch 90:28,29 is found the idea that the new Jerusalem is not the earthly city, but a city that comes down from heaven, where, as in 4 Esdras, the Messianic reign is limited, the blessed life after resurrection is transferred to heaven.

(7) Rabbinical Ideas.

Little is to be added from the rabbinical conceptions, which, besides being difficult to ascertain precisely, are exceedingly confused and contradictory. Most of the ideas above mentioned appear in rabbinical teaching. With the destruction of the hostile world-powers is connected in later rabbinism the appearance of "Armilus"—an Antichrist. The reign of Messiah is generally viewed as limited in duration—400 years (as in 4 Esdras), and 1,000 years being mentioned (compare Schurer, History of Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div. II, Vol. II, 179, English translation). At its close takes place a renovation of the world, resurrection (for Israelites only, certain classes being excluded), judgment, and eternal heavenly happiness for the righteous. The punishments of the wicked appear mostly to be regarded as eternal, but the view is also met with of a limited duration of punishment (see authorities in Schurer, op. cit., 183; Edersheim, Jesus the Messiah, appendix. XIX, and other works noted in "Literature" below).

LITERATURE.

R. H. Charles, D. D., A Crit. History of the Doctrine of a Future Life (1899); apocalyptic works translated and edited by same writer (Book of Enoch, Apocrypha Baruch, Book of Jubilees, Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, etc.); V. H. Stanton, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah (1886); S. D. F. Salmond, Christian Doct of Immortality (4th edition, 1901); A. Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, edition 1906 (especially appendix. XIX); E. Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (Div. II, Vol. II, English translation). Old Testament Theologies: Oehler, A. B. Davidson, etc.; articles in Dictionaries: Hastings, Encyclopedia Biblica, etc. For fuller lists, see Charles.

James Orr

ESCHEW

es-choo’ (cur; ekklino):

Only 4 times in the King James Version (Job 1:1,8; 2:3; 1Pe 3:11), in all of which the American Standard Revised Version renders by the appropriate form of "turn away from."

ESDRAELON, PLAIN OF

es-dra-e’-lon, (yizre‘e’l; in Apocrypha the name varies: Esdrelon, Esdraelon, Esdrelom, Esrelon, Esrechon):

1. The Name:

The Greek name of the great plain in Central Palestine (Judith 3:9; 7:3, etc.). It is known in Scripture by the Hebrew name "valley of Jezreel" (Jos 17:16; Jud 6:33, etc.). It is called ‘emeq in Jud 5:15, which properly denotes "a depression," or "deepening," and is used more commonly of the vale running eastward between Gilboa and Little Hermon. Biq‘ah is the term usually employed (2Ch 35:22, etc.), which accurately describes it, "an opening," a level space surrounded by hills. The modern name is Merj ibn ‘Amr, "meadow of the son of Amr."

2. Position and Description:

It lies between Gilboa and Little Hermon on the East, and Mt. Carmel on the West. It is enclosed by irregular lines drawn from the latter along the base of the foothills of Nazareth to Tabor; from Tabor, skirting Little Hermon and Gilboa to Jenin, and from Jenin along the North edge of the Samaritan uplands to Carmel. These sides of the triangle are, respectively, about 15, 15 and 20 miles in length. North of Jenin a bay of the plain sweeps eastward, hugging the foot of Mt. Gilboa. An offshoot passes down to the Jordan valley between Gilboa and Little Hermon; and another cuts off the latter hill from Tabor. The average elevation of the plain is 200 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean. The Vale of Jezreel between Zer‘in and Beisan, a distance of about 12 miles, descends nearly 600 ft., and then sinks suddenly to the level of the Jordan valley. The chief springs supplying water for the plain are those at Jenin and at Megiddo. The former are the most copious, and are used to create a "paradise" on the edge of the plain. Those at Megiddo drive mills and serve for irrigation, besides forming extensive marshes. The springs near Zer‘in, three in number, ‘Ain Jalud, possibly identical with the well of Harod, being the most copious, send their waters down the vale to the Jordan. The streams from the surrounding heights are gathered in the bed of the Kishon, a great trench which zigzags through the plain, carrying the water through the gorge at Carmel to the sea. For the most of its course this sluggish stream is too low to be available for irrigation. The deep, rich soil, however, retains the moisture from the winter rains until far on in the year, the surface only, where uncovered by crops, being baked to brick in the sun. When winter sets in it quickly absorbs the rain, great breadths being turned to soft mud. This probably happened in the battle with Sisera: the northern cavalry, floundering in the morass, would be an easy prey to the active, lightly armed foot-soldiers. The fertility of the plain is extraordinary: hardly anywhere can the toil of the husbandman find a greater reward. The present writer has ridden through crops of grain there, when from his seat on the saddle he could no more than see over the tops of the stalks. Trees do not flourish in the plain itself, but on its borders, eg. at Jenin, the palm, the olive and other fruit trees prosper. The oak covers the slopes of the hills North of Carmel.

3. Part Played in History:

This wide opening among the mountains played a great part in the history of the land. This was due to the important avenues of communication between North and South that lay across its ample breadths. The narrow pass between the promontory of Carmel and the sea was not suitable for the transport of great armies: the safer roads over the plain were usually followed. So it happened that here opposing hosts often met in deadly strife. Hardly an equal area of earth can so often have been drenched with the blood of men. No doubt many conflicts were waged here in far-off times of which no record remains. The first battle fought in the plain known to history was that in which Sisera’s host was overthrown (Jud 5:20). The children of the East were surprised and routed by Gideon’s 300 chosen men in the stretches North of Zer‘in (Jud 7). Near the same place the great battle with the Philistines was fought in which Saul and his sons, worsted in the plain, retired to perish on the heights of Gilboa (1Sa 31). In the bed of the Kishon at the foot of Carmel Elijah slaughtered the servants of Baal (1Ki 18:40). Dark memories of the destruction of Ahab’s house by the furiously driving Jehu linger round Jezreel. Ahaziah, fleeing from the avenger across the plain, was overtaken and cut down at Megiddo (2Ki 9). In the vale by Megiddo Josiah sought to stay the northward march of Pharaoh-necoh, and himself fell wounded to death (2Ki 23:30; 2Ch 35:20 ff). The army of Holofernes is represented as spreading out over all the southern reaches of the plain (Judith 7:18,19). Much of the fighting during the wars of the Jews transpired within the circle of these hills. It is not unnatural that the inspired seer should place the scene of war in "the great day of God" in the region so often colored crimson in the history of his people—the place called in the Hebrew tongue "Har-Magedon" (Re 16:14,16).

Esdraelon lay within the lot of Issachar (Jos 19:17). The Canaanite inhabitants were formidable with their chariots of iron (Jos 17:16,18). The tribe does not appear to have prosecuted the conquest with vigor. Issachar seems to have resumed the tent life (De 33:18), and ignobly to have secured enjoyment of the good things in the land by stooping to "taskwork" (Ge 49:14 f).

4. Arab Raids:

Through many centuries the plain was subject to raids by the Arabs from the East of the Jordan. The approach was open

and easy, and the rich breadths of pasture irresistibly attracted these great flock masters. The Romans introduced some order and security; but with the passing of the eastern empire the old conditions resumed sway, and until comparatively recent times the alarm of an Arab invasion was by no means infrequent.

The railway connecting Haifa with Damascus and Mecca crosses the plain, and enters the Jordan valley near Beisan.

W. Ewing

ESDRAS 5 AND 6

(or 4 Ezr):

These names have been applied respectively to the first two and the last two chapters of 2 (4) Esdras in the Latin Bible of 1462. In matter these chapters, which are of Christian origin, agree in the main with the genuine parts of 2 (4) Esdras. See foregoing article.

ESDRAS, FOURTH BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. II, i, 5.

ESDRAS, SECOND BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. II, i, 5.

ESDRAS, THE FIRST BOOK OF

ez’-dras, es’-dras:

Contents

1. Name 2. Contents 3. Relation to Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah 4. Versions 5. Date and Authorship

LITERATURE

==========

1. Name:

In some of the Greek uncials (Codex Vaticanus, etc.) of the Septuagint the book is called Esdras, Codex Alexandrinus (or Proton); so in the editions of Fritzsche, Tischendorf, Nestle and Swete. It is absent from Codex Sinaiticus and in Codex Alexandrinus its name is Ho Hiereus = The Priest, i.e. Ezra, who is emphatically the priest. It is also called 1 Esdras in the old Latin and Syriac VSS, as well as in the English, Welsh and other modern translations. In the English and other Protestant Bibles which generally print the Apocrypha apart, this book stands first in the Apocrypha under the influence partly of its name, and in part on account of its contents, as it seemed a suitable link between the canonical and the apocryphal writings. The English 2 Esdras is the apocalyptic Esdras and stands immediately after the English and Greek 1 Esdras. The Vulgate, following Jerome’s version, gave the names 1, 2 and 3 Esdras to our Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Esdras, respectively, and in editions of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) down to that of Pope Sixtus (died 1590) these three books appear in that order. The name 3 Esdras is, therefore, that current in the Roman church, and it has the

sanction of the 6th article of the Anglican Creed and of Miles Coverdale who in his translation follows the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) in naming the canonical Ezra, Nehemiah and the apocryphal 1 Esdras, 1, 2 and 3 Esdras, respectively. Other reformers adhered to these titles. In Fritzsche's commentary on the Apocrypha 3 Esdras is preferred and he treats this book first. In Kautzsch's German edition of the Apocrypha and in most recent German works the Latin designation 3 is revived. The English commentators Bissell (Lange) and Wace (Speaker's Commentary) follow the custom of the Bible and speak of 1 Esdras, placing the book first in the collection, and this is the prevailing custom among English Protestant theologians. The name 2 Esdras has also been given to this book, the canonical Ezra and Nehemiah being then counted as one—1 Esdras. See Origen quoted by HE, V, 25; Zunz, Der Gottesdienst, Vortrage Berlin, 1832, 15.

2. Contents:

With the exception of 1 Esdras 3:1-5:6—the incident of the royal banquet and the contest for a prize of the three young men—the present books agree in everything essential, down to the minutest details, with the canonical Ezra and part of 2 Chronicles and Nehemiah. Before discussing the relation between 1 Esdras and the Biblical books named (see next section), it will be advantageous to give an outline of the book now specially under consideration, with reference to the parallel passages in the corresponding parts of the Canon. It will be seen that practically the whole of Ezr is concerned, and for explanations of the parts common to this book and to Ne reference may be made to the Century Bible Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther.

1. 1 Esdras 1 = 2Ch 35:1-36:21 and maybe analyzed thus: 1 Esdras 1:1-20 = 2Ch 35:1-19: Josiah's great Passover. 1 Esdras 1:21 f has no exact parallel. 1 Esdras 1:23-31 = 2Ch 35:20-27: The death of Josiah. This took place on the battlefield at Megiddo according to 2Ki 23:29, but 1 Esdras 1:31 and 2Ch 35:24 say he died at Jerusalem. 1 Esdras 1:32-58 = 2Ch 36:1-21, closing years of the monarchy followed by the exile in Babylon.

2. 1 Esdras 2:1-15 = Ezr 1:1-11: The return from Babylon through the edict of Cyrus.

3. 1 Esdras 2:16-26 = Ezr 4:7-24. Certain Persian officials in Samaria induced King Artaxerxes I (died 424 BC) to stop the work of rebuilding the temple, which is not resumed until the second year of the reign of Darius Hystaspis (519 BC).

4. 1 Esdras 3:1-5:6 has no parallel in any part of the Old Testament. King Darius (Hystaspis?) makes a great feast, after which he returns to his bedchamber but finds sleeping very difficult. Three young men belonging to his bodyguard resolve each to make a sentence to be written down and placed under the king's pillow, so that upon rising from his bed he might hear the three sayings read to him. The question which each one seeks to answer is, What in this world is strongest? The first says it is "wine," the second, that it is "the king." The reply of the third is "woman, though strongest of all is truth" (from this arose the Latin saying Magna dst veritas et prevalebit). The third is declared the best, and as a reward the king offers him whatever he might wish. This young man happened to be Zerubbabel (Zorobabel), and the request that he makes is that King Darius might perform the vow which he made on coming to the throne to rebuild Jerusalem and its temple and to restore the sacred vessels removed to Babylon. This request is at once granted, and there follows an account of the home-coming of Jews exiled in Babylon and the protection accorded them by the Persian government similar to what we read of in 1 Esdras 1 as taking place in the reign of Cyrus. But many things in this narrative are striking and indeed odd. Zerubbabel is called a young man. Among those mentioned in 1 Esdras 5:5 Zerubbabel is not named, though his son Joakim is. In the very next verse (5:6) this Joakim is identified with the young man (Zerubbabel) who won the king's prize for writing the wisest sentence, though the sense is not quite clear; perhaps Zerubbabel is meant in 1 Esdras 5:6. Fritzsche argues that Joakim can alone be meant. This whole episode stands in no organic connection with the rest of 1 Esdras, and if it is omitted the narrative is continuous. Besides this the account given of the return from Babylon contradicts what is said in 1 Esdras 1 and the corresponding part of Ezr. We must regard 1 Esdras 3:1-5:6 as a Jewish haggadah which at an early time was written in the margin as supplying illustrative matter and then got incorporated into the text. Nevertheless, from a literary point of view this part of the book is the gem of the whole.

5. 1 Esdras 5:7-73 = Ezr 2-4:1-5: The names of those who returned with number of animals (horses, etc.) (1 Esdras 5:7-43); altar of burnt offering erected (1 Esdras 5:48); sacrifices offered on it (1 Esdras 5:50). Foundation of the temple laid (1 Esdras 5:56 f). The Jews refuse the offer of the Samaritan party to help in the rebuilding of the temple, with the result that this party had the work stopped (1 Esdras 5:66-73). Ezra 4:6-24 finds its parallel in 1 Esdras 2:16-30 (see above). 1 Esdras 2:30 and 5:73 are evidently duplicates.

6. 1 Esdras 6:1-7:15 = Ezr 5:1-6:22: Building of the temple resumed through the preaching of Haggai and Zechariah (1 Esdras 6:1 f). Persian officials unsuccessfully oppose the work (1 Esdras 6:3-34) which is soon completed, the temple being then dedicated (1 Esdras 7:1-11). Observance of the Passover (1 Esdras 7:12-15). Between 1 Esdras 7 and 8 there is an interval of some 60 years, for chapter 8 begins with the arrival of Ezra (458 BC).

7. 1 Esdras 8:1-67 = Ezr 7:1-8:36: Journey of Ezra and his party from Babylon to Jerusalem bearing letters of authority from King Artaxerxes I (died 424 BC) (1 Esdras 8:1-27); list of those who return (1 Esdras 8:28-40); gathering together of the party by the river Ahava; incidents of the journey; the arrival (1 Esdras 8:41).

8. 1 Esdras 8:68-90 = Ezr 9: Ezra’s grief on hearing of the marriage of some Jews with foreign wives (1 Esdras 8:68- 73). His confession and prayer (1 Esdras 8:74-90).

9. 1 Esdras 8:91-9:36 = Ezr 10: The means used to end the mixed marriages; lists of the men (priests and others) who had married strange wives.

10. 1 Esdras 9:37-55 = Ne 7:73 b through 8:12: The reforms of Ezra. In the Canonical Scriptures Ne 7:73 b through 10 gives the history of Ezra, not that of Nehemiah—the two never labored or lived together at Jerusalem. (The name Nehemiah in Ne 8:9 and 10:1 is an evident interpolation.) In 1 Esdras Nehemiah is not once mentioned in this section. In 1 Esdras 9:49 (parallel Ne 8:9) "Attharates" is the word used, and as a proper name (see 1 Esdras 5:40, "Nehemiah and Attharates"). The majority of modern scholars assign this section to Ezra, adding it to Ezr 10, or incorporating it into the Ezra narrative. So Ewald, Wellhausen, Schrader, Klostermann, Baudissin, Budde and Ryssel. The present writer defends this view in the Century Bible in Ezra- Nehemiah-Esther, 242 f. In this case 1 Esdras borrows from Chronicles and Ezra alone and not from Nehemiah. It should be remembered however that Ezra-Nehemiah formed originally but one book. Some will say that Chronicles preceded Ezra-Nehemiah as a single book, but for this there is no evidence (see Century Bible, 4). The last verse of 1 Esdras in all manuscripts ends in the middle of a sentence: "And they assembled ...." showing that the closing part of the book has been lost. The present writer suggests that the missing part is Ne 8:13-10, which begins, "And on the second day were gathered together (assembled) the heads of fathers’ houses," etc., the same verb being used in the Septuagint Greek of both passages with a very slight difference (episunechthesan, and sunechthesan, in Ezra and Esdras respectively).

3. The Relation to Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah:

Since Ne 7:73 b through 8:12 belongs to the Book of Ezra (see above) describing the work of Ezra, not that of Nehemiah, the contents of 1 Esdras are parallel with those of Ezra alone with the exception of chapter 1 which agrees with 2Ch 35:1-36:21. Various explanations have been offered, the following being the principal: (1) that 1 Esdras is a compilation based on the Septuagint of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah: so Keil, Bissell and formerly Schurer (GJV, II, ii, 179 f; Herzog2, I, 496); the arguments for this opinion are well marshaled by Bissell in his Commentary on the Apocrypha (Lange); (2) that 1 Esdras is an independent Greek translation from a now lost Hebrew (or Aramaic) origin in many respects superior to our Massoretic Text: so Whiston, Pohlmann, Herzfeld, Fritzsche, Ginsburg, Cheyne, Thackeray, Nestle, Howarth, Torrey and Bertholet. Most of these writers hold that the original 1 Esdras included the whole of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah; (3) the bulk of those who support view 2 argue that the original 1 Esdras formed the real Septuagint version of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, what exists in our present Septuagint being another Greek translation, probably by Theodotion (fl, about 150 AD), just as we now know that what up to 1772 (the date of the publication in Rome of the Codex Chisianus) was considered as the Septuagint of Da is really Theodotion’s version. Howarth (see articles in the Academy, 1893; PSBA,

XXIX, etc.), and Torrey (Ezra Studies) stoutly champion this view. The evidence offered is of two kinds, external and internal:

(1) External Evidence.

(a) Josephus uses this version as his source for the period, though for other Old Testament books he follows the Septuagint. (b) In the foreword to the Syriac version of 1 Esdras in Walton's Polyglot it is said that this version follows the Septuagint, which surely counts for nothing since copies of the Septuagint known to us contain both 1 Esdras and the Greek translation reckoned up to recently as the true Septuagint. (c) Howarth maintains, but without proof, that in Origen's Hexapla, 1 Esdras takes the place of our Septuagint version, and that the same is true of the Virus Itala.

(2) Internal Evidence.

(a) It is said by Dr. Gwyn, Thackeray and Howarth that the Greek of the true Septuagint of Daniel and that of 1 Esdras are very similar in character, which however only goes to prove that one man translated both.

(b) Howarth holds that the Greek of Daniel and Ezra in the orthodox Septuagint version is very literal, as was all Theodotion's translation work. But such statements have to be received with very great caution, as in judging of style so much depends on the personal equation. The present writer has compared carefully parts ascribed with confidence to Theodotion and the Septuagint without reaching the above conclusions. At the most the matter has not been set at rest by any facts or reasoning as yet supplied. It must be admitted that 1 Esdras and Josephus preserve the true sequence of the events chronicled in Ne 7:73 b through 10, the Massoretic Text and the Greek version based on it having gone wrong at this point, probably through the mixing of Hebrew skins or leaves. Those who see in 1 Esdra the true Septuagint agree almost to a man that 1 Esdras 3:1-5:6 is a late interpretation, never having had a Hob original. This may account in a large degree for the vigor and elegance of the Greek Howarth, however, parts company with his friends Torrey, Bertholet, etc., by arguing strenuously for this part. (See more fully in Century Bible, Ezra, etc., 27 ff.)

4. Versions:

1 Esdras exists in the following ancient versions in addition to the Greek text which may or may not be a translation (see 3 above):

(1) Latin: (a) Jerome. (b) Vulgate.

(2) Syriac: (a) The Peshitta. The Peshitta, given in Walton's Polyglot and with a critically revised text by Lagarde (Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocrypha Syriace, 1861). (b) The Hexaplar Syriac version. For details of manuscripts, etc., see "Literature" below.

5. Date and Authorship:

Nothing is known or can be conjectured as to the author or translator of 1 Esdras, nor can anything be positively affirmed as to the date. If the work be the genuine Septuagint text this would give it an earlier origin than the view which makes it depend on the Septuagint. But this is to say but little. As Josephus (died 95 AD) used this book it must have been written some years before he wrote his history (say 67 AD). We must assume that it existed some time before the beginning of our era. Ewald, on account of some resemblances to the earliest of the Sibylline Books, dates 1 Esdras about 190 BC. But admitting dependence in this matter—which is doubtful—it is impossible to say which is dependent and which is independent in such cases.

LITERATURE.

The most important books have been named at the end of the general article on APOCRYPHA (which see). Recent contributions by Howarth and Torrey have been mentioned in the course of the foregoing article.

T. Witton Davies

ESDRAS, THE SECOND (FOURTH) BOOK OF; APOCALYPTIC ESDRAS

Or The Apocalyptic Esdras:

Contents

1. Name 2. Contents 3. Language 4. Versions 5. Origin of the Book 6. Date

LITERATURE

==========

This book was not received by the Council of Trent as canonical, nor has it ever been acknowledged as such by the Anglican church.

1. Name:

The book is not found in the Septuagint and no complete copy of the Greek text is known, though at one time it did exist. The oldest extant name is "The Prophet Ezra" (Esdras ho prophetes; see Clement of Alexandria, Strom., iii.16): It has been often called the Latin Esdras because it exists more completely in that language; compare the name Greek Esdras for 1 Esdras.

3 Esdras is the designation in old editions of the Vulgate, 1 Esdras being Ezr and Neh, 2 Esdras denoting what in English is called 1 Esdras. But in editions of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) later than the Council of Trent, and also in Walton’s Polyglot, Ezra is called 1 Esdras, Nehemiah, 2 Esdras, 1 Esdras = 3 Esdras, the present book (the Latin Esdras) being known as 4 Esdras. In authorized copies of the Vulgate, i.e. in those commonly used, this book is lacking. On account of its contents, Westcott, following the example of Anastasius Sinaita (bishop of Antioch from 559 AD), called the book the "Apocalypse of Esdras." But as Tischendorf in 1866 edited a later and inferior work with this title the present writer suggests the name "The Apocalyptic Esdras." Of all the Jewish apocalypses this is the sublimest and most pleading.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. II, 1, 5.

2. Contents:

The original work consists of 2 Esdras 3-14, chapters 1 f and 15 f being late additions. The entire book of 16 chapters exists in the Latin version only, the other versions containing chapters 3-14 only. The real 2nd (apocalyptic) Esdras, consisting of chapters 3-14, is made up of 7 visions given to Ezra in exile 30 years after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. The drift of these visions is, How can a just and loving God allow His own people to suffer so much? The problem thus raised is fully and beautifully dealt with. For lack of space the present writer must refer for a fuller analysis to the article APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. I, 5, and the literature there cited. For 2 Esdras 1 ff and 15 ff see under ESDRAS 5 AND 6.

3. Language:

Though no complete text even of 2 Esdras 3-14 has survived, a careful examination of the Latin shows that it has been made from a Greek original.

(1) Some fragments of the Greek can be traced, as 5:35 in Clement of Alexandria and 8:23 in the Apostolical Constitutions.

(2) The order of the twelve prophets in 1:39 f follows that in the Septuagint.

(3) The Latin version bears throughout clear traces of Greek idiom.

Thus the gen. is used with the comparative (5:3; 11:29); we have the genitive (not ablative) absolute in 10:9, the double negative and the use of de (Greek apo) and ex (Greek ek) with the genitive in various parts. But there are cogent reasons for concluding that the Greek version implied in the Latin itself implies a Hebrew original, and the proof is similar to that of a Greek version as the basis of the Latin In the Greek there are idioms which are Hebrew, not Greek, not even in their frequency Hellenistic Greek. The participle used to strengthen the finite verb is the regular Hebrew idiom of the absolute with the finite verb: see 4:2 (excedens excessit); 5:30 (odiens odisti). For other examples see Gunkel (in Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen u. Pseud. des Altes Testament, 332 f); R. H. Charles (Enc Brit, X, 106). Ewald was the first to defend a Hebrew original, but in 1866 he was followed by his distinguished pupil Wellhausen and also by R. H. Charles (Apoc Bar, lxxii).

4. Versions:

(1) Latin.

The Latin version is far the most important and on it the English Versions of the Bible depends. But all published editions of the Latin text (those of Fabricius, Hilgenfeld, Fritzsche, etc.) go back to one and the same MS, the so-called Codex Sangermanensis (date 822), which omits a large part of the text between 2 Esdras 7:36 and 7:37 Any reader of the English text can see the lack of continuity between these verses. In 1875 Bensly published the missing fragment with an Introduction and critical notes. In 1895 Bensly and James published a critical edition of The Fourth Book of Ezra in Latin, restoring the missing fragment and correcting with the aid of the best-known manuscripts.

(2) Other Versions.

There are Syriac (Peshitta), Ethiopic, Arabic, Armenian and yet other VSS, but all depend on the lost Greek except one of the two extant Arabic translations. The number and variety of versions show that 2 Esdras was widely circulated. By the Greek and Latin Fathers it was quoted as a genuine prophetical work. Its importance in the estimation of the medieval Roman church is vouched for by the fact that it has reached us in a number of wellknown manuscripts of the Scriptures, and that it was added to the authorized Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) as an appendix.

5. Origin of the Book:

Two main views may briefly be noted:

(1) That of Kabisch (Das vierte Buch Esra, 1889) who holds that the editor of the book freely used a goodly number of sources, subtracting, adding and altering to suit his purpose. He gives a list of probable sources. R. H. Charles (Enc Brit, X, 107) is inclined to adopt this analysis.

(2) Gunkel (loc. cit.) maintains and tries to prove that the book is the production of a single writer. Yet he admits that the book contains a large number of inconsistencies which he explains by assuming that the editor made free use of oral and

written traditions. The two views do not therefore stand very far apart, for both take for granted that several sources have been used. It is simply a question of more or less.

Wellhausen is probably right in saying that the author of 2 (4) Esdras had before him the Apocrypha of Baruch, written under the impression awakened by the destruction of Jerusalem in 71 AD.

6. Date:

The opinion of the best modern scholars is that the book was written somewhere in the East in the last decade of the 1st century of our era. This conclusion rests mainly on the most likely interpretation of the vision of the Eagle and the Lion in 2 Esdras 11:1-12:51; but also on the fact that Clement of Alexandria (died 217 AD) quotes the Greek of 5:35.

LITERATURE.

Besides the literature referred to above see Schurer, A Hist of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, iii, 93 ff (Ger. edition 4, III, 315 ff); the articles in HDB (Thackeray) and Encyclopedia Biblica (James); the New Sch-Herz under the word "Pseudepigrapha, Old Testament" (G. Beer), and in the present work under APOCRYPHA and APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

T. Witton Davies

ESDRIS

ez’-dris, es’-dris (Esdris):

A leader mentioned in APC 2Macc 12:36 in best texts and adopted in the Revised Version (British and American) for Gorgias of the King James Version. Grotius conjectured "men of Ephron" from 12:27.

ESEBON

es’-e-bon (APC Judith 5:15) = HESHBON (Revised Version (British and American)), the chief city of the Ammonites.

ESEBRIAS

es-e-bri’-as, e-se’-bri-as.

See ESEREBIAS; SHEREBIAH.

ESEK

e’-sek (eseq; Septuagint Adikia):

The name given by Isaac to a well dug by his servants, for the use of which the herdsmen of Gerar strove with them —"contention" (Ge 26:20). It lay in the neighborhood of Rehoboth and Gerar: but the site is not identified.

ESEREBIAS

es-er-e-bi’-as (Eserebias):

One of the chiefs of the priests (APC 1Esdras 8:54).

ESHAN

e’-shan (’esh‘an; Esan; the King James Version Eshean):

A town of Judah in the uplands of Hebron (Jos 15:52). No satisfactory identification has yet been suggested. Some think the name may be a corruption of Beersheba (Encyclopaedia Biblica, which see).

ESHBAAL

esh’-ba-al.

See ISH-BOSHETH.

ESHBAN

esh’-ban (’eshban; perhaps "thoughtful," "intelligent"; Asban):

Name of a chief of the Horites (Ge 36:26; 1Ch 1:41).

ESHCOL (1)

esh’-kol (’eshkol, "cluster"; Eschol):

The brother of Mamre and Aner, the Amorite allies of Abraham who took part with him in the pursuit and defeat of Chedorlaomer’s forces (Ge 14:13,14). He lived in the neighborhood of Hebron (Ge 13:18), and may have given his name to the valley of Eshcol, which lay a little North of Hebron (Nu 13:23).

ESHCOL (2)

esh’-kol (’eshkol; Pharagx botruos), "a cluster of grapes":

The spies came to Hebron "and they came unto the valley of Eshcol, and cut down from thence a branch with one cluster of grapes" (Nu 13:23,14; 32:9; De 1:24). It was a valley near Hebron rich in vineyards. Fruitful vineyards are still the most characteristic feature of the environs of Hebron, especially on the North. No particular valley can be identified, though popular tradition favors the wide and fertile valley, near the traditional site of "Abraham’s oak," a little to the West of the carriage road just before it enters the outskirts of Hebron.

E. W. G. Masterman

ESHEAN

esh’-e-an, e’-she-an.

See ESHAN.

ESHEK

e’-shek (‘esheq, "oppressor"):

A descendant of Jonathan, son of Saul, first king of Israel (1Ch 8:39).

ESHKALONITE

esh’-ka-lon-it.

See ASHKELONITES.

ESHTAOL

esh’-ta-ol (’eshta’ol; Astaol):

A town in the Shephelah of Judah named next to Zorah (Jos 15:33; 19:41). Between these two cities lay Mahaneh-dan (the camp of Dan) where the Spirit of the Lord began to move Samson (Jud 13:25), and where he was buried (Jud 16:31). A contingent from Eshtaol formed part of the 600 Danites who captured Laish (Jud 18:2,11).

It is probably represented by the modern Ashu‘a, about a mile and a half East of Zorah, the modern Car‘ah.

ESHTAOLITES; ESHTAULITES

esh’-ta-ol-its, eshta-u’-lits (ha’eshta’uli, literally, "the Eshtaolite"; the King James Version):

Inhabitants of Eshtaol, named among the descendants of Shobal, the son of Caleb (1Ch 2:53).

ESHTEMOA

esh-te-mo’-a, esh’-te-mo-a (’eshtemoa‘):

A Levitical city in the hill country of Judah (Jos 21:14; 1Ch 6:57); Eshtemoh (’eshtemoh, Jos 15:50). In 1ch 4:17,19, Eshtemoa is said to be a Maacathite and "son" of Ishbah. David after routing the Amalekites sent a present to his friends in (among other places) Eshtemoa (1Sa 30:28).

It is now es-Semu‘a, a considerable village of evident antiquity some 8 miles South of Hebron.

ESHTEMOH

esh’-te-mo.

See ESHTEMOA.

ESHTON

esh’-ton (’eshton, "uxorious"):

A name found in the genealogical table of Judah (1Ch 4:12).

ESLI

es’-li (Eslei, Esli; probably for Hebrew ‘atsalyahu):

An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy, the 10th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lu 3:25).

ESORA

e-so’-ra.

See AESORA.

ESPOUSAL; ESPOUSE

es-pouz’-al, es-pouz’:

In the King James Version these words, following English usage of an earlier day, are used to signify either marriage or betrothal, while the American Standard Revised Version discriminates, and uses them only for marriage. For example, in 2Sa 3:14, "I espoused to me" (Hebrew ‘erasti li) becomes "I betrothed to me." So also, in Mt 1:18; Lu 1:27; 2:5 which refer to the relation between Joseph and Mary before the birth of Jesus, "espoused" (mnesteuo) becomes "betrothed." On the other hand, "espoused" is retained in So 3:11 ("the day of his espousals"—that is, day of marriage); in Jer 2:2 ("the love of thine espousals"—that is, the love of married state); and in 2Co 11:2 ("I espoused (hermosamen) you to one husband").

E. J. Forrester

ESPY

es-pi’:

"Espy" in modern English means "to catch sight of," rather than "to explore secretly." the Revised Version (British and American) therefore retains it in Ge 42:27, "He espied his money" (Hebrew ra’ah, "see"), while in Jos 14:7 "espy out the land" (the King James Version) becomes "spy out the land." the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "watch" for "espy" in Jer 48:19, and "searched out" for "espied" in Eze 20:6, with a gain in accuracy of rendering

(compare the context).

ESRIL

es’-ril, ez’-ril:

the Revised Version (British and American) EZRIL (which see).

ESROM

es’-rom, ez’-rom (Esrom):

the King James Version, the Greek form of Hezron (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Mt 1:3; Lu 3:33).

ESSENES

es-senz',(Essenoi, Essaioi):

Contents I. THE NAME

Forms It Assumes—Etymology, Origin

II. AUTHORITIES FOR THE TENETS OF THE ESSENES

1. Philo (1) Description from Quod Omnis Probus Liber (2) Description from Quotation in Eusebius, Preposition Evang. (3) Description of Therapeutae from De Vita Contemplativa

2. Josephus (1) Description from Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, i, 5 (2) Description from Wars of the Jews, II, viii, 2-13 (3) Incidental Notices

3. Pliny 4. Hegesippus 5. Porphyry 6. Hippolytus—Uses Josephus, but to Some Extent Independent 7. Epiphanius—Confused Account

III. DEDUCTIONS AND COMBINATIONS

1. Government 2. Doctrines

IV. HISTORY AND ORIGIN

1. Essenes and Chasidhim 2. Position of Essenes in Josephus 3. Doctrinal Affinities 4. Essenes and Pythagoras 5. Buddhism and Essenism 6. Parseeism and Essenism 7. Essenism Mainly Jewish

V. RELATION TO APOCALYPTIC BOOKS

1. Reasons for Holding the Essenes to Be the Writers of the Apocalypses 2. Objections Answered

VI. THE ESSENES AND CHRISTIANITY

1. Resemblances between Essenism and Christianity 2. Points of Difference 3. Disappearance of Essenism in Christianity 4. Monachism LITERATURE

==========

When Josephus describes the sects of the Jews, he devotes most of his time and attention to the third of these sects, the Essenes. Strangely enough, although there are frequent references in the New Testament to the other two sects, the Sadducees and Pharisees, no reference has been found to the Essenes. Notwithstanding this silence of the Gospels, the prominence of this third sect is undeniable. Even in Egypt they are known. Philo, the Jewish philosopher, gives an account

of these Essenes in terms that, while in the main resembling those used in Josephus, yet differ enough to prove him clearly an independent witness. Another contemporary, Pliny the Naturalist, also mentions these Essenes. Approximately a century later we have a long account of the habits and tenets of these sectaries in Hippolytus' Refutation of All Heresies. A century and a half later still Epiphanius describes these under various titles. Despite the fact that no reference to the Essenes can be found in the Gospels or the Acts, at all events under that name, there can be no doubt of their existence. Would one understand the Palestine in which our Lord's ministry was carried on, he must comprehend the place occupied by the Essenes.

I. The Name.

This assumes several forms in different authors—indeed sometimes two forms appear in the same author. Josephus uses most frequently the form of the name which stands at the head of this article, but sometimes he speaks of individuals as "Essaeans" (BJ, II, vii, 3; viii, 4). This latter form is that preferred by Philo, a form that is adopted by Hegesippus as quoted by Eusebius, IV, 22. Pliny in his Natural History, v.15 writes "Essaeans." Hippolytus also has "Essenus." Epiphanius has mixed his information so that this sect appears with him under several names as "Ossaei" and "Jessaei." Forms It Assumes—Etymology, Origin:

It is clear that the name is not primarily Greek—it has passed into Greek from another tongue, since none of the forms has any easy derivation in Greek. Notwithstanding, there have been attempts to derive it from some Greek root, but all are preposterous as etymologies. The etymology must be sought either in Hebrew or its cognate, Aramaic The usage in regard to the translation of proper names is our only guide. Reasoning from the practice as seen in the Greek translation of the Scriptures and in Josephus, we can deduce that the first letter of the original word must have been one of the gutturals ', chapter, h, '.That the second letter was a sibilant is certain, and the last was probably y, ',for the final "n" in the common form of the name is due to the desire to render the word suitable for Greek accidence. We may say that to us the two most likely derivations are 'asiya'," doers" or 'aciya'," healers." Our preference is for the latter, as one of the characteristics of the Essenes dwelt upon by Josephus is the fact that they were healers by means of herbs and incantations (BJ, II, viii, 6). This view is held by the great mass of investigators, as Bellerman, Gfrorer, Hamburger, Herzfeld, Dahm, etc. The name "Therapeutae" given by Philo to the kindred sect in Egypt supports this etymology, as it would be in one of its senses a translation of it. Lightfoot's objection that it is improbable that the ordinary name of the sect "should have been derived from a pursuit which was merely secondary and incidental" does not follow analogy. The term "Methodist" was derived from a purely temporary characteristic of the society that gathered round Wesley. The extreme probability, from the fact that the name is not found in the New Testament, is that it was the nature of a nickname, like "Quakers" applied to the Society of Friends. The multitude that followed Our Lord affords evidence of the influence that a reputation for healing gave to one.

II. The Authorities for the Tenets of the Essenes.

Philo and Josephus, as contemporaries and Jews, are necessarily our principal sources of information. Next is Pliny, though a contemporary of the sect, yet as a Roman, of necessity receiving his information secondhand. There is next in point of date Hippolytus in his work Refutation of All Heresies, written more than a century after the fall of the Jewish state and the disappearance of the Essenes. One point in his favor as an authority is his habit of quoting from sources that would be reckoned good even now. He seems to have founded to some extent on Josephus, but he appears to have made use of some other source or sources as well. Slightly later is Porphyry. He avowedly draws all his information from Josephus The latest of the ancients who may be reckoned as authorities is Epiphanius. Writing in the 4th century, and naturally of a somewhat confused intellect, any statement of his unsupported by other authority is to be received with caution.

1. Philo:

In estimating the evidence that Philo gives concerning the Essenes, we must remember that he was living in Alexandria,

not shut up in a Ghetto, but mingling to some extent with the scholars and philosophers of that city. The Jewish community there appears to have been more completely Hellenized than any other assemblage of Jews. The object of Philo's numerous works seems to have been the twofold one of commending Jewish religious thought to the Greek philosophic society in which he mingled, and of commending Greek philosophy to his Jewish kinsmen. The geographic distance from Palestine may be to some degree neglected from the frequent communications between it and Egypt. The work in which Philo devotes most attention to the Essenes is his early work, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, "that every good man is free." This treatise is intended for a Gentile audience—the "Lawgiver of the Jews" is introduced casually first, and then more emphatically, till he is named. The Essenes are brought forward as the very flower and perfection of Mosaism.

(1) Description from Quod Omnis Probus Liber.

"There is a portion of that people called Essenes—over four thousand in my opinion. They are above all servants (therapeutai) of God. They do not sacrifice animals but study to preserve the sanctity of life. They live in villages, avoiding all cities on account of the lawlessness of those that inhabit them. Some of these men cultivate the soil, others live by peaceful arts and so benefit themselves and all their neighbors. They do not lay up treasures of gold or silver for themselves, judging contentment and frugality the great riches. With them are no makers of arms or of military engines and no one is occupied with anything connected with war. They all avoid commerce and navigation, thinking that these employments make for covetousness. They possess no slaves, holding all men to be free and all are expected to aid one another as real (gnesiois) brethren. They devote their attention to the moral part of philosophy—to the neglect of logic—using, as instructors, the laws of their country which it would have been impossible for the human mind to devise save by Divine inspiration. They abstain from all work on the seventh day, which they look on as sacred. On it they assemble in sacred buildings which are called synagogues and, seated in order according to age, they hear the Scriptures (tas biblous) read and expounded. They are thus taught to choose what is right and to avoid what is wrong. They use a threefold criterion—love of God, love of virtue, love of man. They carefully avoid oaths and falsehood—they regard God as the author of all good. They all dwell in companies, so that no one has a dwelling absolutely his own. They have everything in common, their expenses, their garments, their food. When they work for wages they do not retain these for themselves, but bring it into the common stock. The sick are not neglected when they are unable to contribute to the common store. They respect their seniors as if they were their parents. Such men never can be enslaved. As a proof of this none of the many oppressors of their land were able to bring any accusation against the Holy Essenes."

The above is a very much condensed summary of the passage on the Essenes in Philo, QOPL. No one can fail to be struck with the resemblance all this has in the first place to the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount and the practice of the early church. Although celibacy is not mentioned it is implied in the picture here presented of the Essenes. There is another account in a passage quoted from Philo by Eusebius, Preparatio Evangelica, VIII, 11:

(2) Description from Quotation in Eusebius, Preposition Evang.

"Our lawgiver trained (eleipsen, "anointed") ten thousands of his followers and formed them into a community called Essenes from their holiness. They dwell as numerous communities in many cities and villages of Judea." It will be observed that this contradicts the statement above that there were only 4,000 Essenes and that they avoided cities. "This sect is not hereditary. There are no children nor youths among the Essenes as such persons are unstable. No one among them has property of his own. They regard all possessions as part of a common stock. They all dwell in the same place, forming themselves into clubs and societies. They do everything for the benefit of the whole society, but different members take up different employments, laboring ceaselessly despite cold or heat. Before sunrise they go to their work and do not quit it till sunset. Some are tillers of the soil, some shepherds, some tend bees, some are artisans. These men when they have received their wages give them up to the general manager who purchases what is necessary. Those who live together eat at the same table day after day. Their dress also is common. In winter they have thick cloaks, in summer light mantles. Each takes what he wants. When anyone falls sick he is cured from their common resources. Old men, even if they happen to be childless, are as if they had a numerous offspring of affectionate children. They repudiate marriage because they look on woman as a selfish creature and specially addicted to jealousy and hypocrisy, thus likely to dissolve

their brotherhood. A man bound to a woman is hampered by his affection, is no longer a free man but a slave" (compare 1Co 7:1. Paul mentions the same difficulties in regard to wedlock).

(3) Description of Therapeutae from De Vita Contemplativa:

In his Treatise De Vita Contemplativa Philo, commencing with a reference to the Essenes, passes on to describe a similar class of coenobites who have their settlements near the Moerotic Lake. These he calls Therapeutae, or in the feminine, Therapeutrides, a title which he interprets as "healers." While there are many points of resemblance, there are also not a few features of difference. We shall give as full an extract as in the previous instances.

It is related that they have separate houses and only come together for worship or for feasts. They have parallel societies for men and for women. As in the case of the Essenes there is a reading of ancient sacred books and an exposition of the passage read. The name Therapeutae, with the explanation of the name given by Philo, affords a link, as said above, with the Essenes, if the etymology of their name which we have seen reason to prefer be the true one. There seems also to be some connection between these Jewish monks and the Christian monks of some three centuries later. It ought to be remarked that many suspicions have been thrown on the authenticity of De Vita Contemplativa. Although critical names of authority may be named on that side, yet it may be doubted whether the reasons are sufficient. Lucius, who is the main opponent, does so mainly to invalidate the existence of the Therapeutae. He thinks De Vita Contemplativa was composed by a Christian to give an antiquity to the Christian monks. To prove a practice to have been Jewish would be far from commending it to Christians. But more, the resemblance to the Christian monks, although close on some points, in others of importance the difference is equally prominent. While the common feast suggests the Agapae of the early church, we must remember that this was not a monastic peculiarity. The fact that a female community existed alongside of the male and joined with them in worship is out of harmony with what we know of early monasticism. The feast of the 50th day has no parallel in Christianity.

2. Josephus:

Like Philo, Josephus wrote for a non-Jewish audience. In Rome the philosophic ideas held in the Hellenic world were prevalent, so he, as much as Philo, had a temptation to be silent on any subject which might shock the sensibilities or provoke the ridicule of his masters. In particular, in describing the habits and tenets of the Essenes, for whom he professed so high an admiration, he would need to be specially careful to avoid causes of offense, as in such a case he would be liable to be involved in their condemnation. In dealing with the notices he gives of the Essenes we would consider the descriptions at length first, and then the incidental notices of individual Essenes.

(1) Description from Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, i, 5

The description which comes earliest in history—not, however, the earliest written—is in Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, in connection with the census and survey under Quirinius (Cyrenius) and the resistance to it by Judas of Gamala. He there (Ant., XVIII, i, 5) begins by referring to their theological position, that they believed in the most absolute preordination. They teach the immortality of souls and a state of rewards and punishments. Although they dedicated gifts to the temple they offered no sacrifices, presumably bloody sacrifices, as they have offerings of their own. A singular statement is made that "they are on this account excluded from the common court" (koinou temenismatos). They occupy themselves with husbandry. "They excel in justice all other men." They have all things in common. They neither marry wives nor keep slaves. He says, as does Philo, that they number over four thousand men. They appoint "good men priests who should receive the fruits of their labor for the sake of corn and food."

(2) Description from Wars of the Jews, II, viii, 2-13

A much fuller account is found in the earlier written treatise on the Wars of the Jews, II, viii, 3. In this work he emphasizes the ascetic side of Essenism.

"The Essenes," he says, "reject pleasures as vice. They despise marriage though they do not absolutely repudiate it, but are suspicious of women. They despise riches and have all things in common. They think oil a defilement. They wear white garments. They elect overseers (epimeletai) to manage their common affairs, much as the Christian bishops did those of the churches under them. They have no one city but many of them dwell in every city." It may be observed that this statement is a contradiction of Philo's statement and that of Josephus himself above, that they were only 4,000. "When any of them go from one city to another they find the houses of those of their sect open to them as if they were their own." It is probable that as the apostles, when sent out by our Lord to preach, were on entering a city to ask who in it was worthy, the traveling Essenes would inquire who in it were Essenes. Like the apostles they took nothing with them when they traveled save weapons for defense against robbers, just as the apostles had at the time of the Last Supper two swords with which they had likely provided themselves for similar reasons. "They get up before sunrise and offer up prayers which they have received from their ancestors. They are then dismissed to their several employments to the fifth hour, they bathe in cold water, put on white linen garments and enter the refectory as if into a temple. Food is set before each." Much like the Christian grace before meat, a priest offers up prayer. Again, as grace after meat, when the meal is finished the priest again prays. "Both before and after their refection they sing praise to God. As Christ commanded His disciples and said, 'Swear not at all,' they avoid oaths, indeed esteem them worse than perjury. New members were admitted to the society by baptism, and oaths were laid upon them that they were to be submissive to those in authority in the society. They were to keep the doctrines of the sect secret. They kept the Sabbath with greater strictness than did any other section of the Jews. Heinous sins were punished by expulsion from the order which, as they felt their oaths still binding on them, amounted to death. Judicial sentences are arrived at with the utmost care; decisions are come to by an assembly of not less than a hundred who are chosen to be judges. When once the sentence has been pronounced it stands fixed. They regard the bodies as corruptible but the souls are immortal. They believe in a Paradise resembling the Islands of the Blest." One thing is to be observed: "they are bound by oath to preserve the sacred books of their sect, ta haireseos auton biblia, and the names of the angels." They utter predictions by means of their sacred books, which predictions are generally fulfilled. There is, however, another sort of Essenes who do not avoid marriage.

The philosopher Porphyry mentions that Josephus had an account of the Essenes in the second book against the Gentiles. If this means Contra Apienem, no such passage is to be found in that work now. It may, however, be some work of Josephus which has not come down to us, which Porphyry has misnamed, though this is unlikely.

(3) Incidental Notices:

This is not, however, the whole of the information concerning the Essenes which we can gather from Josephus. The earliest of these incidental notices occurs under the reign of Jonathan (Ant., XIII, v, 9), when the historian mentions the three sects of the Jews, when the only peculiarity he assigns to the Essenes is that they believe that everything happens according to fate. Next, in relating the fate of Antigenus, he tells how Judas, an Essene teaching in the temple, when he saw Antigonus, declared that he was proved a false prophet, as he had foretold that Antigonus was to die that day at Struto's tower (Caesarea), and he was now six hundred furlongs off from there. Here the statement that the Essenes were excluded from the temple seems directly contradicted. In the days of Herod (XV, x, 4,5) Josephus relates that while Herod demanded oaths of submission from others he excused the Essenes, from the favor he had to them on account of one Menahem, a member of this sect, who foretold his reign. This Essene seems to have been about the court and to have nothing of the coenobitic agriculturist about him. The Essenian fame for prediction and the interpretation of dreams is related in regard to Archelaus, the son of Herod (BJ, II, vii, 3). Archelaus had a dream, and applied to an Essene, Simon or Simeon, who foretold the end of his reign. In singular contrast to what had been said by Philo of the objection the Essenes had in regard to everything connected with war, one of the leading generals of the Jews when they rebelled against the Romans was John the Essene, who was made governor of certain toparchies in the North (BJ, II, xx, 4). He was killed in the battle near Ascalon with which the war began, which ended in the capture of Jerusalem by Titus (BJ, III, ii, 1). There is also mention of a gate of the Essenes in Jerusalem, which seems to imply that a number of them permanently resided there.

3. Pliny:

Pliny speaks of the Essenes in his Natural History (v.17) in somewhat rhetorical terms. They dwell on the west side of the Dead Sea—"a wonderful race without women, without money, associates of the palms." They are recruited by those wearied of life, broken in fortunes. "Thus a race is eternal through thousands of ages (seculorum) in which no one is born; so fruitful to them is repentance of life in others." He refers to the fertility of Engedi and adds, "now burned up."

4. Hegesippus:

There is an enigmatical passage quoted by Eusebius from Hegesippus in which the Essaeans (Essenes), the Galileans, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans and Pharisees are declared to hold different opinions about circumcision among the sons of Israel "against the tribe of Judah and of Christ" (kata tes phules Iouda kai Christou).

5. Porphyry:

Porphyry’s note regarding the Essenes is simply taken from Josephus

6. Hippolytus:—Uses Josephus, but to Some Extent Independent

In the great work of the mysterious bishop, Hippolytus, discovered some sixty years ago, there is a description of the Essenes. Although the work is a Refutation of All Heresies, implying that the opinions maintained were erroneous and required to be refuted, the author does nothing to exhibit the erroneousness of the Essene tenets or habits. In regard to the Gnostic heresies Hippolytus endeavored to reach original sources; presumably he did so in the present case. Although there is no doubt of his indebtedness to Josephus, yet for the features where he differs from Josephus, or supplements him, we may assume that he has behind his statements some authority which he regarded as valid. In some cases there may be a suspicion that in his eagerness to show that certain heresies were derived from this or that heathen philosophical system he has modified the heresy to suit the derivation he has supposed. This, however, does not apply to the Essenes. In the ninth book of his Refutation of All Heresies, Hippolytus takes up Jewish sects (haireseis) which, following Josephus, he reckons as three. The first he discusses is the Essenes. They are very devotional and temperate and eschew matrimony. They despise wealth, and from sharing with the destitute they do not turn away (compare Mt 5:42; the verb used is the same). Anyone joining the sect must sell all that he has (compare Mt 19:21; the same words are used in Ac 4:32,37). Overseers epimeletai are chosen by show of hands cheirotonein (Ac 14:23). They do not stay in one city but many settle in every city. They dress always in white, but do not own two cloaks or two pairs of shoes, much as our Lord’s instructions to His apostles when He sent them out two and two (Mt 10:10). Their daily course of conduct is described very much in the same terms as those used by Josephus Before dawn they begin their day by prayer and singing a hymn. They return from their work before midday, at the fifth hour, and bathemselves in cold water and clothemselves in garments of white linen. After that they repair into the common apartment. They seat themselves in silence; the cook places food before each individual. The priest prays and pronounces a blessing on the food. At the end of the meal the priest again prays, and those who have partaken join in singing a hymn of thanksgiving. They lay aside their white linen garments, and resume their ordinary clothing and betake themselves again to their occupations. Supper at sunset is conducted in a similar manner. All obey the president (proestos) in whatever he enjoins. No one amongst them is in the habit of swearing. They are careful to read the law and the prophets. Other works of faithful men they also study. All that join the sect are put on probation. The entrant receives a white robe and a linen girdle, and is supplied with an axe for the purposes mentioned in De 23:13. He has to take solemn oaths to worship God, to be just, not to hate anyone who injures him, but to pray for him (compare Mt 5:44). He promises also to show respect to all in authority, as all authority is from God (1Pe 2:13). He is not to divulge the secret doctrines of the society. There follows a description of the fate of those expelled from the society and the mode of conducting trials, borrowed from Josephus Hippolytus proceeds to give an account of four different subsects of the Essenes, all seeming of more than even the wonted fanaticism of the Essenes. One sect would not use coins because of the image of the Emperor on them, inasmuch as this was of the nature of idolatry. Others were prepared to enforce circumcision at the point of the sword. According to Hippolytus the Zealots were Essenes. Later he mentions the class that were freer and did not abjure marriage. A very marked point of difference between the tenets of the Essenes, as described by Philo and Josephus, and those attributed to them by Hippolytus, is in regard to the doctrine of the resurrection.

Hippolytus affirms that they did believe in the resurrection of the body. The others, while not in terms denying that they did believe in it, ignore it in such a way as might lead the reader, as indeed it did Bishop Lightfoot, to think that they denied it altogether. The treatment Paul received at Athens when he preached the resurrection showed how incongruous this doctrine seemed to the Greeks. Philo and Josephus wrote for Greek audiences—for the Romans, so far as culture went, were Greeks—and had to consider their taste. Another point held in abeyance by both those writers was the Messianic hopes that we know from the New Testament were so prevalent. Hippolytus says "all sections look for the Messiah," but held that He was to be merely man born in the ordinary way. The reason of Philo's silence and that of Josephus is easily understood. They had commended the Essenes so highly; if they mentioned that they had treasonable hopes of a Messiah who should rule the world, their own personal loyalty would become doubtful. For our part we should regard all the positive elements in Hippolytus' description as worthy of acceptance.

7. Epiphanius—Confused Account:

The last authority to whom we would refer is Epiphanius. In his anxiety to make up the number of heresies, the Essenes figure repeatedly under different names. He declares the Essenes to be a sect of the Samaritans closely associated with the Sebuans and Gortheni. Among the Jews he has three sects whom he calls Hemerobaptistae, Nazaraei and Osseni. Besides he has a sect called Sampseans, evidently also Essenes, which he mixes up with the followers of Elkaisa. He does not seem to have any clear idea about their tenets or habits. The Samaritan sects differ about the three Jewish feasts, but he does not make it clear in what they differ. The Sebuans seem to have reversed the order of the Jewish feasts, but whether the Essenes and Gortheni did so likewise is not clear. That the Essenes whom we are considering were not Samaritans appears to be as certain as anything about this enigmatic sect can be. The obscure sentence quoted by Eusebius from Hegesippus might be interpreted as supporting this statement of Epiphanius, but it is too enigmatic to be pressed. As to the three Jewish sects the first named—Hemerobaptistae—suits the daily washings of the Essenes, but he asserts that they agree with the Sadducees in denying the resurrection. The Nazareans or Nazarenes are not to be confounded with a Christian sect of nearly the same name. They resided in the district East of Jordan. They held with the Jews in all their customs, believing in the patriarchs, but did not receive the Pentateuch, though they acknowledged Moses. The Osseni are the likest to the Essenes, as they are said to dwell near the Dead Sea, only it is on the side opposite to Engedi. Epiphanius leaves them to denounce Elxai and his brother Jexais, of which latter nothing further is known.

III. Deductions and Combinations.

From the characteristics so many, so confusing, indeed, in some respects so contradictory, it is difficult to get a consistent picture. They are said to be only four thousand, yet they are many ten thousands. They reside in Engedi, a company of coenobites. They dwell in villages and avoid towns, yet they dwell many in every city and in populous communities. They avoid everything connected with war, yet one of their number is one of the trusted generals of the Jews in their rebellion against the Romans. They keep away from the Temple, yet one of them, Judas, is teaching in the Temple when he sees Antigonus, whose death he had foretold. The only way in which any consistency can be brought into these accounts is by taking advantage of what Josephus and Hippolytus say about the subsections into which the Essenes were distinguished.

A parallel the present writer has elsewhere used of the Methodists is illuminative. While the most prominent body of Methodists are Arminians, there are the Calvinistic Methodists. While Wesleyan Methodists do not allow women to preach, the Primitive Methodists do. This is so far confirmed by the fact that while the abjuring of marriage is a marked feature in the representation of Philo, yet the latter says that one class of the Essenes not only do not themselves oppose matrimony but regard those that do oppose it as enemies of the human race. The residents in Engedi formed but a small proportion of the Essenes. It is probable that of them the statement, found alike in Philo and Josephus, that they were 4,000, applies. All the features of the picture of the daily common meals, rising before sunrise, joint devotions, may be true in their fullness only of the community by the Dead Sea. What Philo says (quoted by Eusebius, Preposition Evan., VIII, 11), that among the Essenes "there are no youths or persons just entering on manhood, only men already declining towards old age," would indicate that the settlement at Engedi was an asylum for those who, having borne the burden and heat of the day, now retired to enjoy repose.

1. Government:

They had communities apparently all over Palestine, if not also beyond its bounds, over each of which there was a president appointed (Hip., IX, 15). This would mean that in towns of any size they would have a synagogue. They appear to have had houses of call, though it may have been that every member of the Essene community kept open house for all members of their sect who might be traveling. The traveler, when he came to a city, would inquire for any that were Essenes, as the apostles were commanded by their Lord, in similar circumstances, to inquire ("search out") who in a city were "worthy." The common meals might to some extent be observed in these different scattered communities, probably at intervals, not daily as at Engedi. At these the secret sacred books, read and studied with so great regularity at Engedi, would also be read. In this synagogue not only would the canonical books be preserved but also those other books which gave them the names of the angels, as now in the synagogues of Palestine the library preserved in the synagogue may be used by those connected with it throughout the week. The head of the community at Engedi might have some suzerainty over all the different communities, but in regard to this we have no information. One external feature which would at once make the Essenes known to each other was the fact that they always dressed in white linen. They had priests probably in every one of their communities. The Jewish exorcists in Ephesus, in whom Bishop Lightfoot (Col, 93) recognizes Essenes, were the sons of one Sceva, a high priest (archiereus, Ac 19:14). The high-priesthood was evidently not connected with the temple at Jerusalem, for no such name appears in the list of high priests. It thus most probably was an Essenian high-priesthood.

2. Doctrines:

In regard to their tenets, their belief in the absolute preordination by God of everything appears the feature in the doctrinal position which most appealed to Josephus Hippolytus affirms in terms their belief in the resurrection of the body. This point, as above noted, Philo and Josephus ignore. The passage in Hippolytus is the more striking from the fact that the latter portion so closely resembles the parallel passage in Josephus. Josephus as we have suggested above, avoided crediting the Essenes with belief in resurrection because of the ridicule to which it would expose not only the Essenes, his proteges, but also himself. Hippolytus, writing with information other than what might be got from Josephus or Philo and as, writing for Christian readers, without the fear of ridicule, in regard to the resurrection of the body, boldly and in terms ascribes that doctrine to them. The silence of our two main witnesses as to the Essenes cherishing any Messianic hopes cannot be pressed, as their silence may be explained as above mentioned by fear of the suspicions of Rome in regard to any such hopes. The statement of Hippolytus that all the Jews had these expectations may be said to cover this case. The abjuring of marriage and the shunning of everything connected with war seem to be prominent opinions in some sections of the Essenes, but not held by others.

IV. History and Origin.

There is much in Essenism that is difficult to understand. We have seen contradictory features assigned to the Essenes by different authorities; but even in the case of those features concerning which there is least dubiety the new difficulty emerges as to how it appeared as a characteristic of a Jewish sect. This is especially the case in regard to abstinence from marriage. Easterners always have an earnest desire to have sons to keep their memory green, for on a death many of them had and still have ceremonies which only the son of the dead can perform. Yet despite this they avoided marriage. The Jews with their Messianic hopes desired children, as no one knew but that his child might prove the child of promise, the Christ of God.

1. Essenes and Chasidhim:

The earliest note of the existence of the Essenes, as of the Pharisees and Sadducees, is under the pontificate of Jonathan, the successor of Judas Maccabeus (Ant., XIII, v, 9). Josephus says "at this time there were three sects of the Jews," and proceeds to name them. If this, however, were precisely true, it is singular that there is no mention of any of these sects in either of the books of the Maccabees. The only sect named is the Hasideans (chacidhim) who are called (1 Macc 2:42)

"mighty men of Israel, every one that offered himself willingly for the law" (the King James Version "voluntarily devoted himself to the law"; Greek hekousiazomenos). These again are not mentioned by Josephus The meaning of the word is "saints," and in this sense it appears frequently in the Psalms. A parallel in modern history to their warlike activity and their claim to saintliness may be found in the Cameronians of "society folk" in Scotland toward the end of the 17th century. They were Peden's "praying folk," yet they fought and won battles. When William of Orange came they formed the Cameronian regiment which helped to quell the clans and checked their advance after Killiecrankie. Some have identified these Hasideans with the Pharisees (as W. Robertson Smith, article "Assidaeans," Encyclopedia Biblica, and others). Hitzig would regard their successors as the Essenes. The great resemblance there was between the Pharisees and the Essenes renders it not improbable that originally they were really one sect and split off. If Josephus is to be trusted this division must have occurred, if not before the Maccabean struggle, at least early during its continuance. The Sadducean authors of 1 Maccabees may have grouped them together. According to Josephus, John Hyrcanus was a Pharisee, from which it may be presumed that Judas Maccabeus and his brethren belonged to the same sect of the Jews. The Assideans deserted Maccabeus, so that it would seem at least possible that by that time the separation had become complete, so that the Hasideans are now to be regarded as Essenes. It would seem as if they deserted the Maccabeans when they—the Maccabeans—made alliances with heathen powers like Rome. Then they objected to the high-priestly family being passed over for the Hasmoneans, hence their foolish surrender to Bacchides because Alcimus (called by Josephus Jacimus = Jehoiakim) was with him, a descendant of the race of the high priests. All this is utterly unlike the quiet contemplative lives of the coenobites in Engedi. It would seem that the thousand who died in the wilderness themselves, their wives, their children and their cattle (1 Macc 1:29- 38), were more like the inhabitants of Engedi. Before leaving the Hasideans it must be said that the representation of the connection of the Hasideans with Judas Maccabeus put in the mouth of Alcimus by the writer of 2 Macc 14:6 is not trustworthy. After this desertion of the Maccabeans the more religious of them retired to Engedi, while the rest of the party were scattered over the country in the various cities and villages.

2. Position of Essenes in Josephus:

As above mentioned the earliest mention of Essenes is by Josephus (Ant., XIII, v, 9) while Jonathan was high priest. The next is the story of Judas the Essene seated in the Temple surrounded by his scholars "who attended him (paremenon) in order to learn the art of foretelling," thinking that the appearance of Antigonus in the Temple courts proved his prophecy false that he was that day to die in Strato's tower (Caesarea). Judas is evidently a resident in Jerusalem and meets his pupils in the Temple courts. This would imply that he had no horror of the Temple nor was debarred from its courts. He had no repugnance for residence in cities. Menahem, the next figure that presents itself, shows a man who is mingling in court circles. He inflicts on Herod, the son of the favorite counselor of the high priest, a playful domestic chastisement and prophesies his future greatness. Herod, as we are told, always favored the Essenes in consequence. Later Archelaus consults Simon or Simeon, an Essene, as to the interpretation of a dream. He is at all events resident in Jerusalem and known in the court circles. He may have been Simeon of Lu 2:25-35. It must, however, be observed that the name is one of the commonest among the Jews at that time. After this they disappear, unless Hippolytus' identification of the Zealots with a section of the Essenes is admitted. Those in Engedi were aside from the course of the war, though if Pliny's representation is to be taken as accurate the vines and palm trees of Engedi had been burned and the settlement had been rendered desolate. They may have betaken themselves to Pella like the Christians, so as not to be involved in the destruction of the city and the Temple. The communities of the sect in Asia Minor disappear also. To all appearance they are absorbed in the church.

3. Doctrinal Affinities:

Owing to the fact that so many of the doctrines and practices attributed to the Essenes have no resemblance to anything else in Judaism the question of origin has a special meaning in regard to them. Although like all Easterners the Jews have a desire for progeny—indeed the man who has no child occupies a secondary place in social esteem-yet the Essenes, or at all events some of them, shunned marriage. Despite the elaborate system of animal sacrifices that claimed to originate with Moses whom they venerated, they abjured bloody sacrifices. Although the seed of Aaron were anointed priests, they set up priests of their own. Their habit of morning and evening prayer, timed by the rising and setting of the sun, suggested sun-worship. The external resemblance of these tenets of the Essenes to those of the Pythagoreans impressed Josephus, and

was emphasized by him all the more readily, since thus he brought himself and his nation into line with Greek thought. This suggestion of Josephus has led some, eg. Zeller, to the deduction that they were Jewish neo-Pythagoreans. The features of resemblance are formidable when drawn out in catalogue. He shows that like the Pythagoreans the Essenes regarded asceticism a means of holiness. Both abstained from animal food and bloody sacrifices, admired celibacy and, dressing in white linen garments, had frequent washings. Both prohibited oaths, both formed a corporate body into which admission was had by act of initiation and after probation. Community of goods was the custom in both. Both believed in transmigration of souls. The value of this formidable list is lessened by the fact that there is something of uncertainty on both sides as to the precise views and customs. Philo and Josephus unquestionably Hellenized the views of the Essenes when they presented them before readers educated in Greek culture; further the views of Pythagoras have come down to us in a confused shape.

4. Essenes and Pythagoras:

As to the assertion that the Pythagoreans dressed in white linen, Diogenes Laertius says that linen was not yet invented. Zeller has no sufficient evidence that the Essenes avoided the flesh of animals as food, and Diogenes Laertius expressly says that Pythagoras ate fish, though rarely (VIII, 18). While there seems no doubt as to the Pythagorean belief in the transmigration of souls, it seems certain that this was not a doctrine of the Essenes. Neither Philo nor Josephus attribute this view to them. This is the more striking that, immediately after dealing with the Essenes, Josephus proceeds to take up the doctrines of the Pharisees to whom he does attribute that view. Moreover the distinctive views of the Pythagoreans as to numbers and music have no sign of being held by the Essenes. On the other hand the fact that Pythagoras had a wife seems to throw doubt on their alleged preference for celibacy. Another chronological difficulty has to be met. The Pythagoreans as a society were put down in the 5th century before Christ. They may be regarded as having disappeared, till in the 2nd century AD they reappear as prominent neo-Pythagoreans. It is true that Cicero and Seneca mention Pythagoreans, but only as individuals who would claim to be the followers of Pythagoras, and not as members of a sect: they were without influence even in Italy.

5. Buddhism and Essenism:

Chronology is equally against the view favored by Hilgenfeld that the influence of Buddhism may be traced in Essenism. As late as the end of the 2nd century AD, Clement of Alexandria, although acquainted with the name Buddha, is ignorant of his tenets and of divisions of his followers. The Alexandria which Hilgenfeld identified with Alexandria of Egypt, in which there was a Buddhist settlement, was really to be found in Bactria, where a Buddhist settlement was likely.

6. Parseeism and Essenism:

There is more to be alleged in favor of Parsee influence being traceable. Neither geography nor chronology protests against this influence. The Jews were for centuries under the domination of the Persians, who were followers of Zoroaster. They seem on the whole to have been favored by the Persian rulers, a state of matters that would make the Jews all the more ready to view with sympathy the opinions and religion of these masters. Moreover the Persian worship had spread away to the west, far beyond Syria. At the same time it is easy to exaggerate the points of resemblance. The dualism alleged to be a leading feature in Essenism is more a matter of deduction than of distinct statement. Indeed the proofs alleged by Zeller are almost ludicrous in their insufficiency, since Philo says that the Essenes shun marriage because women are selfish (philautos), and Josephus, that they do so because women are addicted to excess (aselgeia); that therefore they regard the female generally as under the dominion of the evil principle, the fact being that this is really a part of the Hellenizing which the Essene views underwent at the hands of Philo and Josephus. The alleged sun-worship is scarcely more worthy of credit: it is a deduction not even plausible. When carefully looked at the evidence points the other way. Their first prayer is offered not at sunrise but before it (BJ, II, viii, 5); in other words, they work while it is day. Their evening orisons are offered after the sun has set. At the same time their elaborate angelology seems to be due to the influence of the Zend-Avesta, but in this the Essenes merely shared with the rest of the Jews. We know that the Jews brought the names of the angels with them from Babylon.

7. Essenism Mainly Jewish:

The most singular feature in Essenism is really a feature of Judaism emphasized out of proportion. It was unlike the Jews to shun marriage, yet in seasons when special holiness was required intercourse between the sexes was forbidden (Ex 19:15; 1Sa 21:5). The whole act of sexual intercourse was regarded as unclean (Le 15:16-18). In the Pauline Epistles uncleanness is used as equivalent to fornication (Ro 1:24; 6:19, etc.). So also in 2Pe 2:10. Such a view naturally led to the idea which soon became regnant in Christianity that the state of virginity was one of special sanctity (Re 14:4). The respect they gave to the unmarried state may be exaggerated. If Philo's representation (quoted in Euseb., Preposition Evan., VIII, 11) be correct, men were not admitted until maturity was attained and passed, when, therefore, such desires had begun to die down. Their avoidance of marriage is a matter of less importance. Their extreme reverence for the Sabath is of a piece with their celibacy. Their avoidance of the Temple sacrifices, so far as they did so, may well be due to something of more than contempt for the religion of the Sadducean high-priestly party. Moreover the long residence of Israel in Babylon, when the Temple worship had to be in abeyance, and the consequent prevalence of synagogue worship, tended to lessen the importance of the sacrifices of the Temple. Thus it would seem that the Essenes were really a Jewish sect that had retained more of the Zoroastrian elements than had the rest of the Jews.

V. Relation to the Apocalyptic Books.

Among the features of Essenism which seem to have impressed Josephus most was the fact that they had sacred books of their sect which they preserved, as also the names of the angels, thus bringing the Essenian special books into connection with angelology. These books their proselytes were bound by oath to preserve (BJ, II, viii, 7). Concerning the kindred sect of the Therapeutae, Philo says, "They have also writings of ancient men" (De Vita Contemp., III). On the other hand we have a mass of writings the same in character, dependent on one another, all apparently proceeding from one school of Jewish thought. Of the three sects of the Jews from which alone they could have proceeded the Sadducees are excluded because, while the apocalyptic books are full of angels, they believe neither in angel nor spirit (Ac 23:8). While doctrinally the Pharisees might suit, the fact that practically there is no reference to any of these books in the Talmud, which proceeded from the Pharisaic school, renders them unlikely to have been the authors. The Essenes seem to us to have been the school from which these apocalyptic works proceeded. The sect, at the fall of the Jewish state, disappeared in Christianity, and in the Christian church these books are preserved.

1. Reasons for Holding the Essenes to Be the Writers of the Apocalypses:

The section of the Essenes who dwelt as coenobites beside the Dead Sea were in circumstances specially liable to see visions and to have distorted views of morality, so that the composition of pseudonymous writings, literary forgeries, might seem right. As seen in the study of the apocalyptic books there is the undue prominence given to sexual sin—a prominence that seems to be symptomatic of the unhealthy mental state engendered by celibacy. These writings are the product of a school that professed to have secret sacred books. In 2 (4) Esdras 14:45,46 we have an account of how, while 24 of the sacred books were published to the multitude, 70 were retained for the "worthy," that is, for some inner circle, some brotherhood like the Essenes. In the Assumption of Moses, Joshua is commanded to place the revelations given him "in certain vessels and anoint them with oil of cedar." Such an order would be held as explaining at once the disappearance of the book for the years succeeding Moses and its opportune reappearance. On the one hand we have a sect that professes to have secret sacred books, and on the other we have sacred books that have been composed by a school that must have had many features which we recognize as Essenian. Further, the Essenes disappeared in the Christian church, and in the Christian church and not among the Jews are these books preserved.

2. Objections Answered:

The main objection to this ascription is the prominence of the Messianic hope in the apocalyptic books, and the absence of any notice in Josephus and Philo that the Essenes had this hope. But from neither of these writers could be discovered that

any of the Jews cherished this hope. Yet from the New Testament we know that this hope was a prominent feature in national aspirations. Philo, associating perpetually with Greeks, would be sensitive to the ridicule to which such views would expose him, and how it would undo much of his laborious efforts to commend Judaism to the Greeks as a higher philosophy. Josephus had not only that motive, but the more serious one of personal safety. To have enlarged on Messianic hopes and declared these hopes to have been cherished by these Essenes whom he had praised so much would be liable to bring him under suspicion of disloyalty to Rome. The silence of these two writers proves nothing because it proves too much; and further we have easy explanation of this silence. The assumption of Dr. Charles that the Essenian ideal was ethical and individualistic is pure assumption. There is another objection that while the doctrine of resurrection is recognized in these books we know nothing of the Essenes holding it. That the Greeks and their scholars in philosophy, the Romans, looked at the idea of resurrection from the dead as a subject for ridicule would be reason sufficient for Philo and Josephus to suppress such a feature in their description of the Essenes. From them it could not be learned that the Pharisees ever had any such belief. It is also objected that while the Essenes held the pre-existence of souls, there is no trace of this belief in the apocalyptic books. Josephus, however, does not really assert that they believed in the prior existence of individual souls, but rather in a soul-stuff from which individual souls were separated. Thus both positively and negatively we think there is a strong case for the Essenes being regarded as the authors of the apocalyptic books. Further objections are brought forward by Dr. Charles as applicable to the Assumption of Moses specially. One is the interest manifested in the Temple by the writer while, so says Dr. Charles, "the Essene was excluded from its courts," and refers to Josephus, Ant, XVIII, i, 5. He must have forgotten, while penning this sentence, Ant, XIII, xi, 2, in which Judas, the Essene, is represented as teaching in the Temple. His objection that Josephus credits the Essenes with a belief in a paradise beyond the ocean like the Greek Islands of the Blest, appears to us to lay too much stress on what is in both cases figurative language. Moreover, in Enoch the description of Paradise (chapters 24-26) would almost seem to be the original from which Josephus (BJ, II, viii, 11) drew his picture. He seems to regard our ignorance of how far the Essenes agreed with the rest of their countrymen in considering the enemies of Israel "the wicked," as evidence that they disagreed with them on that point.

VI. The Essenes and Christinaity.

1. Resemblances between Essenism and Christianity:

That there were many points of resemblance between the Essenes and the church in its earliest form cannot be denied. The Essenes, we are told, maintained a community of goods and required anyone who joined their society to sell all he had and present it to the community (Hippolytus, Adv. Heret., ix; x; Josephus, BJ, II, viii, 3), just as so many of the primitive Christians did in Jerusalem (Ac 4:37). Another peculiarity of the Essenes—noted by Josephus (BJ, II, viii, 4)—that they moved about from city to city, and wherever they went found accommodation with members of their order, although perfect strangers, may be compared with our Lord’s instructions to His disciples when He sent them forth (Mt 10:11): "Into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter, search out who in it is worthy." When one thinks of who those worthy persons could be, and what was the evidence by which their worthiness was expected to be established, one is almost obliged to suppose that it was some specially easily recognized class that was so designated. If the worthiness in question was the moral quality, there are so many ideas of moral worth that when the apostles inquired, on entering a city, who was worthy, before they could act on the answer they would need to discover what was the criterion of worthiness in the mind of him from whom they had inquired. If, however, this term was the private designation of the members of a sect, one by which they, in speaking of each other, indicated that they were co-members, as the "Quakers" speak of each other as "Friends," the inquiry for those who were worthy would be simple enough. If the Essenes were "the worthy," then identification would be complete, but we cannot assume that. The majority of the points in which the Essenes resembled the primitive Christians are noted above in connection with each feature as it appears in the passage or passages of the authorities that record it, and to these we refer our readers.

2. Points of Difference:

At the same time, although there are thus many points of likeness, it is not to be denied that there are also many features in

Essenism which are at variance with the practice of the early church and the teaching of our Lord and His apostles. The most prominent of these is the difference of attitude toward marriage and the female sex. Our Lord sanctified marriage by His presence at the marriage at Cana of Galilee, although He himself never married. He used the festivities of marriage again and again as illustrations. He drew women to Him and had none of the contempt of the sex which Josephus and Philo attribute to the Essenes. The apostles assume the marriage relationship as one into which Christians may be expected in due course to enter, and give exhortations suited to husbands and wives (1Pe 3:1-7; Eph 5:22-33; Col 3:18,19). The apostle Paul uses the relation of husband and wife as the symbol of the relation of Christ to His church (Eph 5:32). The writer of the Epistle to the He declares, "Marriage is honorable in all" (Heb 13:4 the King James Version). Another point in which the Essenes differed from the practice of our Lord and His disciples was the exaggerated reverence the former gave to the Sabbath, not even moving a vessel from one place to another on the seventh day. our Lord's declaration, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mr 2:27), cuts at the feet of that whole attitude. The point of His conflict with the Pharisees was His disregard of the Sabbath as fenced by their traditions. The Essenes shrank from contact with oil, which our Lord certainly did not do. On the contrary He rebuked the Pharisee for his neglect (Lu 7:46). He was twice anointed by women, and in both cases commended the deed. The purely external and material bulked largely in the opinions of the Essenes. our Lord emphasized the internal and spiritual. Many have held and do hold that our Lord was an Essene. If at the beginning of His career He belonged to this sect He must have broken with it long before the end of His ministry.

Why our Lord Never Meets the Essenes. There are some phenomena which, irrespective of these resemblances and differences, have a bearing on the relation between Essenism and Christianity. The first is the fact that our Lord, who met so many different classes of the inhabitants of Palestine—Pharisees and Sadducees, Zealots and Herodians, publicans, Samaritans, Greeks—never is recorded to have met an Essene. The common answer, which satisfied even Bishop Lightfoot, is that they were so few and lived so retired that it was no marvel that He never encountered any of them. They had little or no effect on the national life. This mistaken answer is due to forgetting that though both Josephus and Philo say the Essenes were 4,000 they also declare that they were "many in every city," that there were "ten thousands of them." our Lord must have met them; but if the name "Essene" was a designation given from without like "Quakers," then they may appear in the Gospels under another name. There is a class of persons three times referred to—those "that waited for the consolation of Israel" (Lu 2:25 the King James Version), "looking for the redemption" (Lu 2:38), "waited for the kingdom of God" (Mr 15:43 the King James Version; Lu 23:51 the King James Version). There are thus Simeon and Anna at the beginning of His earthly life, and Joseph of Arimathea at the end, connected with this sect. If, then, this sect were the Essenes under another name, the difficulty would be removed. If, further, in any sense our Lord belonged, or had belonged, to the Essenes, then as He would be perpetually meeting and associating with them, these meetings would not be chronicled. A man cannot meet himself. If they are the authors of the apocalyptic books, as we contend, then the title "waiters for the kingdom of God" would be most suitable, full as these books are of Messianic hopes. If this opinion is correct our Lord's assumption of the title "Son of Man" is significant, taken in connection with the prominence given to that title in the Enoch books.

3. Disappearance of Essenism in Christianity:

Another significant phenomenon is the disappearance of Essenism in Christianity. Bishop Lightfoot, in his dissertation on the Colossian Heresy (Comm. on Col, 21-111), proves that it was Essenism. These Essenes must have been baptized into Christ, or they could not have got entry into the Christian communities which had been drawn to Christ from heathenism. But that is not the only heresy that is connected with the Essenes. The Ebionites seem to have been Essenes who had passed over into Christianity. In the Apostolical Constitutions the Ebionites and Essenes are brought into very close connection. Epiphanius, in his confused way, mixes up the various names under which the Essenes appear in his works with a certain Elkaisa, a connection also to be found in Hippolytus, an earlier and better authority. But Elkaisa claimed to be a Christian. His leading follower, Alcibiades, appeared in Rome and was resisted by Hippolytus. The Clementine Homilies, a religious novel of which Peter is the hero, has many Essenian features. It is assumed to be Ebionite, but that only makes the evidence that the Essenes had become Christians all the more convincing. The Ebionites were Christians, if defective in their views, and the presence of Essenian features in a work proceeding from them emphasizes the identity. See EBIONISM.

4. Monachism:

There is another phenomenon, more extensive and important than those we have considered above—the presence of Monachism in the church. Notwithstanding that our Lord prayed "not that" the disciples be taken "out of the world," but that they be kept "from the evil" (Joh 17:15), implying that they were not to retire into solitude, and that the apostle Paul regards it as demonstrating the falsity of our possible interpretation of an exhortation of his that it would imply that the disciples "must needs go out of the world" (1Co 5:10); yet the monks did retire from the world and regarded themselves as all the holier for so doing, and were regarded so by others. The apostle Paul declares the "forbidding to marry" one of "the doctrines of demons," yet very soon asceticism set in and virginity was regarded as far holier than the married state. Retirement from the world and asceticism were the two cardinal characteristics of Monachism. Despite that these were in antagonism to the teachings of Christ and His apostles, within little more than a century after our Lord's ascension Monachism began to appear, and prevailed more and more and continues to this day. These characteristics, retirement from the world and asceticism, especially forbidding to marry, were marked features of Essenism. The wholesale entrance of the Essene sect into the church would explain this. On the other hand this wholesale passing over into Christianity of so intensely Jewish a sect implies a historic connection or affinity. It is true that the catechetic school of Alexandria praises the contemplative life, so admired by their contemporaries, the neo-Platonists, and that philosophy which had been looked at askance by the church was, so to say, taken under their protection by the Alexandrian school, and the retirement of solitaries into the deserts or the formation of monasteries served to promote this contemplation. This led to all the extravagances of the monks being regarded as heights of philosophy. Such views were a cause, but as certainly were they also effects. The cause of these effects as it seems to us was to some extent the admiration extended by Philo, the Alexandrian, to the Essenes and Therapeutae, and the influence of Philo on his Christian successors in Alexandria.

LITERATURE.

Sources: Philo, Josephus, Pliny, Hegesippus, Porphyry, Hippolytus, Epiphanius. Secondary Literature: Besides works specially on the Essenes, the following are mentioned: Frankel, Die Essaer; Lucius, Der Essenismus; Ginsburg, Essenes; and portions of books, as Delaunay, Moines et Sibylles, 1-88; Thomson, Books Which Influenced our Lord, 74-122; Ritschl, Die Entstehung der alt-katholischen Kirche, 179-203; Lightfoot, Commentary on Col, 7-111, 347-417.

There are in histories of the Jews discussions of the questions in order. Of these may be noted: Ewald, Hist of Israel, V, 370-71; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, III, 657-63; Schurer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, ii, 188-218, translation. This opens with a fairly full account of the literature up to the date of the 2nd German edition; Zeller, Geschichte der Philos. der Griechen, III, ii, 2, pp. 235-93. There are also articles in various Bible and theological dictionaries, as Smith and Wace, Dict. of Eccles Biography; Smith and Fuller, Dict. of the Bible; HDB; Jewish Encyclopedia; RE; Schenkel, Bibel-Lexikon; M'Clintock, Theological Dict.

At the same time, while submitting these as a sample, and only as a sample, of the vast literature of the subject, we agree in the advice given by F. C. Conybeare—in HDB, under the word: "The student may be advised to study for himself the very limited documentary sources relating to the Essenes and then to draw his own conclusions." We feel the importance of this advice all the more that perusal has shown us that most of these secondary writers have considered exclusively the coenobite community at Engedi to the neglect of the wider society. After the student has formed opinions from a careful study of the sources he may benefit by these secondary works.

J. E. H. Thomson

ESTATE

es-tat':

While the King James Version uses both "estate" and "state" with the meaning of "condition," the American Standard Revised Version distinguishes, using "state" for the idea of condition, "estate" for position; and replaces "estate" of the King James Version by more definite expressions in many cases. Compare Col 4:7 the King James Version, "All my state shall Tychicus declare unto you," but 4:8, the King James Version "might know your estate" the Revised Version (British and American) "may know our state"; Lu 1:48 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "the low estate" (of the Lord's hand-maiden); Mr 6:21, the King James Version "chief estates" the Revised Version (British and American) "chief men"; Da 11:7,20,21,38, the King James Version "his estate," the Revised Version (British and American) "his place," both with margin "his office."

F. K. Farr

ESTEEM

es-tem' (chashabh; hegeomai):

"To esteem" means sometimes simply "to think" or "reckon"; in other connections it means "to regard as honorable" or "valuable." We have examples of both senses in the Bible. The word most often so translated in the Old Testament is chashabh, meaning perhaps originally, "to bind," hence, "combine," "think," "reckon" (Job 41:27 the King James Version; Isa 29:16,17; 53:4; La 4:2). In Isa 53:3 we have the word in the higher sense, "We esteemed him not." This sense is expressed also by 'arakh, "to set in array," "in order" (Job 36:19, the King James Version "Will he esteem thy riches?" the English Revised Version "Will thy riches suffice?" margin "Will thy cry avail?" which the American Standard Revised Version adopts as the text); also by tsaphan, "to hide," "to conceal" (Job 23:12, the King James Version "I have esteemed the words of his mouth," the Revised Version (British and American) "treasured up"); qalah, "to be light," is translated "lightly esteemed" (1Sa 18:23, "I am a poor man, and lightly esteemed"), also qalal, same meaning (1Sa 2:30, "They that despise me shall be lightly esteemed"). In the New Testament, hegeomai, "to lead out," is used in the sense of "counting honorable," etc. (Php 2:3 the Revised Version (British and American) "counting"; 1Th 5:13; perhaps Heb 11:26, but the Revised Version (British and American) has simply "accounting"); krino, "to judge," is used in the sense of "to reckon" (Ro 14:5 twice); also logizomai, "to reckon" (Ro 14:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "accounteth"); hupselos, "high," "exalted," is rendered "highly esteemed" in Lu 16:15 the King James Version, but in the Revised Version (British and American) "exalted"; exoutheneo, "to think nothing of," is translated "least esteemed" (1Co 6:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "of no account").

The following changes in the Revised Version (British and American) are of interest: for "He that is despised and hath a servant, is better than he that honoreth himself and lacketh bread" (Pr 12:9), "Better is he that is lightly esteemed"; for "Better is he than both they, which hath not yet been" (Ec 4:3), "Better than them both did I esteem him," margin "Better than they both is he"; for "Surely your turning of things upside down shall be esteemed as the potter's clay" (Isa 29:16), "Ye turn things upside down!" (margin, "Oh your perversity!"), "Shall the potter be esteemed (the English Revised Version "counted") as clay," etc.—in this connection a forcible assertion of the necessary possession of knowledge by the Creator of man.

W. L. Walker

ESTHER

es'-ter ('ecter, akin to the Zend tstara, the Sanskrit stri, the Greek aster, "a star," Esther):

Esther was a Jewish orphan, who became the queen of Xerxes, in some respects the greatest of the Persian kings. She was brought up at Susa by her cousin Mordecai, who seems to have held a position among the lower officials of the royal palace. Vashti, Xerxes' former queen, was divorced; and the most beautiful virgins from all the provinces of the empire

were brought to the palace of Susa that the king might select her successor. The choice fell upon the Jewish maiden. Soon after her accession a great crisis occurred in the history of the Jews. The entire people was threatened with destruction. The name of Esther is forever bound up with the record of their deliverance. By a course of action which gives her a distinguished place among the women of the Bible, the great enemy of the Jews was destroyed, and her people were delivered. Nothing more is known of her than is recorded in the book which Jewish gratitude has made to bear her name.

Change of Name:

The change in the queen's name from Hadassah hadacah, "a myrtle," to Esther, "a star," may possibly indicate the style of beauty for which the Persian queen was famous. The narrative displays her as a woman of clear judgment, of magnificent self- control, and capable of the noblest self-sacrifice.

See ESTHER, BOOK OF.

John Urquhart

ESTHER, BOOK OF

Contents

1. The Canonicity of Esther 2. Its Authorship 3. Its Date 4. Its Contents 5. The Greek Additions 6. The Attacks upon the Book 7. Some of the Objections 8. Confirmations of the Book

This book completes the historical books of the Old Testament. The conjunction "w" (waw = and), with which it begins, is significant. It shows that the book was designed for a place in a series, the waw linking it on to a book immediately preceding, and that the present arrangement of the Hebrew Bible differs widely from what must have been the original order. At present Esther follows Ecclesiastes, with which it has no connection whatever; and this tell-tale "and," like a body- mark on a lost child, proves that the book has been wrenched away from its original connection. There is no reason to doubt that the order in the Septuagint follows that of the Hebrew Bible of the 3rd or the 4th century BC, and this is the order of the Vulgate, of the English Bible, and other VSS: The initial waw is absent from Genesis, Deuteronomy, 1 Chronicles and Nehemiah. The historical books are consequently arranged, by the insertion and the omission of waw, into these four divisions: Genesis to Numbers; Deuteronomy to 2 Kings; 1 Chronicles to Ezra; Nehemiah and Esther.

==========

1. The Canonicity of Esther:

Of the canonicity of the book there is no question. That there was a distinct guardianship of the Canon by the Jewish priesthood has figured less in recent discussions than it should. Josephus shows that there was a Temple copy which was carried among the Temple spoils in the triumph of Vespasian. The peculiarities of the Hebrew text also prove that all our manuscripts are representatives of one standard copy. In the Jewish Canon Esther had not only a recognized, but also a distinguished, place. The statement of Junilius in the 6th century AD that the canonicity of Esther was doubted by some in his time has no bearing on the question. The high estimation of the book current among the ancient Jews is evident from its titles. It is usually headed "Megillath Esther" (the volume of Esther), and sometimes "Megillah" (the volume). Maimonides says that the wise men among the Jews affirm that the book was dictated by the Holy Spirit, and adds: "All the books of the Prophets, and all the Hagiographa shall cease in the days of the Messiah, except the volume of Esther; and, lo, that shall be as stable as the Pentateuch, and as the constitutions of the oral law which shall never cease."

2. Its Authorship:

By whom was the book written? This is a point in regard to which no help is afforded us either by the contents of the book or by any reliable tradition. Mordecai, whose claims have been strongly urged by some, is excluded by the closing words (Es 10:3), which sum up his life work and the blessings of which he had been the recipient. The words imply that when the book was written, that great Israelite had passed away.

3. Its Date:

Light is thrown upon the date of the book by the closing references to Ahasuerus (Es 10:2): "And all the acts of his power and of his might, ... are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Media and Persia?" The entire history, therefore, of Xerxes was to be found in the state records when the book was written. In other words, Xerxes had passed away before it saw the light. That monarch was assassinated by Artabanus in 465 BC. This gives us, say 460 BC, as the highest possible date. The lowest possible date is the overthrow of the Persian empire by Alexander in 332 BC; for the royal records of the Median and Persian kings are plainly in existence and accessible, which they would not have been had the empire been overthrown. The book must have been written, therefore, some time within this interval of 128 years. There is another fact which narrows that interval. The initial waw shows that Esther was written after Neh, that is, after 430 BC. The interval is consequently reduced to 98 years; and, seeing that the Persian dominion was plainly in its pristine vigor when Esther was written, we cannot be far wrong if we regard its date as about 400 BC.

4. Its Contents:

The book is characterized by supreme dramatic power. The scene is "Shushan the palace," that portion of the ancient Elamitic capital which formed the fortified residence of the Persian kings. The book opens with the description of a high festival. All the notabilities of the kingdom are present, together with their retainers, both small and great. To grace the occasion, Vashti is summoned to appear before the king’s guests; and, to the dismay of the great assembly, the queen refuses to obey. A council is immediately summoned. Vashti is degraded; and a decree is issued that every man bear rule in his own house (Es 1). To find a successor to Vashti, the fairest damsels in the empire are brought to Shushan; and Hadassah, the cousin and adopted daughter of Mordecai, is of the number. Esther (2) closes with a notice of two incidents:

(1) the coronation of Hadassah (now and henceforth named "Esther") as queen;

(2) Mordecai’s discovery of a palace plot to assassinate the king.

Chapter 3 introduces another leading personage, Haman, the son of Hammedatha, whose seat the king had set "above all the princes that were with him." All the king’s servants who are at the king’s gates prostrate themselves before the powerful favorite. Mordecai, who is not a trained courtier but a God-fearing Jew, refrains. Though expostulated with, he will not conform. The matter is brought to Haman’s notice for whose offended dignity Mordecai is too small a sacrifice. The whole Jewish people must perish. Lots are cast to find a lucky day for their extermination. The king’s consent is obtained, and the royal decree is sent into all the provinces fixing the slaughter for the 13th day of the 12th month.

The publication of the decree is followed by universal mourning among the Jews (Es 4). News of Mordecai’s mourning is brought to Esther, who, through the messengers she sends to him, is informed of her own and her people’s danger. She is urged to save herself and them. She eventually decides to seek the king s presence at the risk of her life. She presents herself (chapter 5) before the king and is graciously received. Here we breathe atmosphere of the place and time. Everything depends upon the decision of one will—the king’s. Esther does not attempt too much at first: she invites the king and Haman to a banquet. Here the king asks Esther what her petition is, assuring her that it shall be granted. In reply she requests his and Haman’s presence at a banquet the following day. Haman goes forth in high elation. On his way home he passes Mordecai, who "stood not up nor moved for him." Haman passes on filled with rage, and unbosoms himself to his wife and all his friends. They advise that a stake, fifty cubits high, be prepared for Mordecai’s impalement; that on the morrow he obtain the royal permission for Mordecai’s execution; and that he then proceed with a merry heart to banquet with the queen. The stake is made ready.

But (Es 6) that night Xerxes cannot sleep. The chronicles of the kingdom are read before him. The reader has come to Mordecai's discovery of the plot, when the king asks what reward was given him. He is informed that the service had received no acknowledgment. It is now early morn, and Haman is waiting in the court for an audience to request Mordecai's life. He is summoned to the king's presence and asked what should be done to the man whom the king desires to honor. Believing that the king can be thinking only of him, he suggests that royal honors be paid him. He is appalled by the command to do so to Mordecai. Hurrying home from his lowly attendance upon the hated Jew, he has hardly time to tell the mournful story to his wife and friends when he is summoned to Esther's banquet. There, at the king's renewed request to be told her desire, she begs life for herself and for her people (Es 7). The king asks in astonishment, who he is, and where he is, who dared to injure her and them. The reply is that Haman is the adversary. Xerxes, filled with indignation, rises from the banquet and passes into the palace garden. He returns and discovers that Haman, in the madness of his fear, has thrown himself on the queen's couch, begging for his life. That act seals his doom. He is led away to be impaled upon the very stake he had prepared for the Jew. The seal of the kingdom is transferred to Mordecai (Es 8). Measures are immediately taken to avert the consequence of Haman's plot (Es 9-10). The result is deliverance and honor for the Jews. These resolve that the festival of Purim should be instituted and be ever after observed by Jews and proselytes. The decision was confirmed by letters from Esther and Mordecai.

5. The Greek Additions:

The Septuagint, as we now have it, makes large additions to the original text. Jerome, keeping to the Hebrew text in his own translation, has added these at the end. They amount to nearly seven chapters. There is nothing in them to reward perusal. Their age has been assigned to 100 BC, and their only value consists in the indication they afford of the antiquity of the book. That had been long enough in existence to perplex the Hebrew mind with the absence of the name of God and the omissions of any reference to Divine worship. Full amends are made in the additions.

6. The Attacks upon the Book:

The opponents of the Book of Esther may undoubtedly boast that Martin Luther headed the attack. In his Table-Talk he declared that he was so hostile "to the Book of Esther that I would it did not exist; for it Judaizes too much, and has in it a great deal of heathenish naughtiness." His remark in his reply to Erasmus shows that this was his deliberate judgment. Referring to Esther, he says that, though the Jews have it in their Canon, "it is more worthy than all" the apocryphal books "of being excluded from the Canon." That repudiation was founded, however, on no historical or critical grounds. It rested solely upon an entirely mistaken judgment as to the tone and the intention of the book. Luther's judgment has been carried farther by Ewald, who says: "We fall here as if from heaven to earth; and, looking among the new forms surrounding us, we seem to behold the Jews, or indeed the small men of the present day in general, acting just as they now do." Nothing of all this, however, touches the historicity of Esther.

The modern attack has quite another objective. Semler, who is its real fens et origo, believed Esther to be a work of pure imagination, and as establishing little more than the pride and arrogance of the Jews. DeWette says: "It violates all historical probability, and contains striking difficulties and many errors with regard to Persian manners, as well as just references to them." Dr. Driver modifies that judgment. "The writer," he says, "shows himself well informed on Persian manners and institutions; he does not commit anachronisms such as occur in Tobit or Judith; and the character of Xerxes as drawn by him is in agreement with history." The controversy shows, however, no sign of approaching settlement. Th. Noldeke (Encyclopaedia Biblica) is more violent than De Wette. "The story," he writes, "is in fact a tissue of improbabilities and impossibilities." We shall look first of all at the main objections urged by him and others and then at the recent confirmations of the historicity of Esther.

7. Some of the Objections:

(1) "There is something fantastic, but not altogether unskillful," says Noldeke, "in the touch whereby Mordecai and Haman

are made to inherit an ancient feud, the former being a member of the family of King Saul, the latter a descendant of Agag, king of Amalek." It is surely unworthy of a scholar to make the book responsible for a Jewish fable. There is absolutely no mention in it of either King Saul or Agag, king of Amalek, and not the most distant allusion to any inherited feud. "Kish, a Benjamite" is certainly mentioned (Es 2:5) as the great-grandfather of Mordecai; but if this was also the father of Saul, then the first of the Israelite kings was a sharer in the experiences of the Babylonian captivity, a conception which is certainly fantastic enough. One might ask also how an Amalekite came to be described as an Agagite; and how a childless king, who was cut in pieces, became the founder of a tribe. But any semblance of a foundation which that rabbinic conceit ever had was swept away years ago by Oppert's discovery of "Agag" in one of Sargon's inscriptions as the name of a district in the Persian empire. "Haman the son of Hammedatha the Agagite" means simply that Haman or his father had come from the district of Agag.

(2) The statement that Es 2:5,6 represents Mordecai as having been carried away with Jeconiah from Jerusalem, and as being therefore of an impossible age, is unworthy of notice. The relative "who" (2:6) refers to Kish, his great-grandfather.

(3) "Between the 7th and the 12th years of his reign, Xerxes' queen was Amestris, a superstitious and cruel woman (Herod. vii.114; ix.112), who cannot be identified with Esther, and who leaves no place for Esther beside her" (Driver). Scaliger long ago identified Esther with Amestris, an identification which Prideaux rejected on account of the cruelty which Herodotus has attributed to that queen. Dr. Driver has failed to take full account of one thing—the striking fact that critics have leveled this very charge of cruelty against the heroine of our book. It is quite possible that Esther, moving in a world of merciless intrigue, may have had to take measures which would form a foundation for the tales recorded by the Greek historian.

(4) The aim of the book is said to be the glorification of the Jews. But, on the contrary, it is merely a record of their being saved from a skillfully planned extirpation.

(5) The description of the Jews (Es 3:8) as "dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of" the kingdom is said to be inapplicable to the Persian period. That argument is based upon an ignorance of the ancient world which investigation is daily correcting. We now know that before the time of Es Jews were settled both in Eastern and in Southern Egypt, that is, in the extreme west of the Persian empire. In the troubles at the end of the 7th and of the 6th centuries BC, multitudes must have been dispersed, and when, at the latter period, the ties of the fatherland were dissolved, Jewish migrations must have vastly increased.

(6) The Hebrew of the book is said to belong to a much later period than that of Xerxes. But it is admitted that it is earlier than the Hebrew of Chronicles; and recent discoveries have shown decisively that the book belongs to the pers period.

(7) The suggestion is made (Driver) "that the danger which threatened the Jews was a local one," and consequently, that the book, though possessed of a historical basis, is a romance. But against that are the facts that the observance of the feast has from the first been universal, and that it has not been observed more fully or more enthusiastically in any one place than in the others.

(8) There is no reference to it, it is urged, by Chronicles, Ezra or Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus). But Chronicles ends with the proclamation of Cyrus, granting permission to the Jews to return and to rebuild the Temple. There is little to be wondered at that it contains no reference to events which happened 60 years afterward. In Ezra, which certainly covers the period of Esther, reference to the events with which she was connected is excluded by the plan of the work. It gives the history of the return, the first part under Zerubbabel in 536 BC, the second under Ezra himself, 458 BC. The events in Esther (which were embraced within a period of a few months) fell in the interval and were connected with neither the first return nor the second. Here again the objector is singularly oblivious of the purpose of the book to which he refers. There is quite as little force in the citation of Ecclesiasticus. In dealing with this time Ben Sira's eye is upon Jerusalem. He magnifies Zerubbabel, "Jesus the son of Josedek," and Nehemiah (49:11-13). Even Ezra, to whom Jerusalem and the new Jewish state owed so much, finds no mention. Why, then, should Esther and Mordecai be named who seem to have had no part

whatever in rebuilding the sacred city?

(9) The book is said to display ignorance of the Persian empire in the statement that it was divided into 127 provinces, whereas Herodotus tells us that it was partitioned into 20 satrapies. But there was no such finality in the number, even of these great divisions of the empire. Darius in his Behistun inscriptions gives the number as 21, afterward as 23, and in a third enumeration as 29. Herodotus himself, quoting from a document of the time of Xerxes, shows that there were then about 60 nations under the dominion of Persia. The objector has also omitted to notice that the medhinah ("province") mentioned in Es (1:1) is not a satrapy but a subdivision of it. Judea is called a medhinah in Ezr 2:1, and that was only a small portion of the 5th satrapy, that, namely, of Syria. But the time is past for objections of this character. Recent discoveries have proved the marvelous accuracy of the book. "We find in the Book of Esther," says Lenormant (Ancient History of the East, II, 113), "a most animated picture of the court of the Persian kings, which enables us, better than anything contained in the classical writers, to penetrate the internal life and the details of the organization of the central government established by Darius."

8. Confirmations of the Book:

These discoveries have removed the discussion to quite another plane—or rather they have ended it. Since Grotefend in 1802 read the name of Xerxes in a Persian inscription and found it to be, letter for letter, the Ahasuerus of Eat, research has heaped up confirmation of the historical character of the book. It has proved, to begin with that the late date suggested for the book cannot be maintained. The language belongs to the time of the Persian dominion. It is marked by the presence of old Persian words, the knowledge of which had passed away by the 2nd century BC, and has been recovered only through the decipherment of the Persian monuments. The Septuagint translators were unacquainted with them, and consequently made blunders which have been repeated in our own the King James Version and in other translations. We read (Es 1:5,6 the King James Version) that "in the court of the garden of the king’s palace," "were white, green, and blue hangings, fastened with cords of fine linen and purple," etc. As seen in the ruins of Persepolis, a marked feature in the Persian palace of the period was a large space occupied by pillars which were covered with awnings. It may be noted in passing that these were situated, as the book says, in the court of the palace garden. But our knowledge of the recovered Persian compels us now to read: "where was an awning of fine white cotton and violet, fastened with cords of fine white linen and purple." White and blue (or violet) were the royal Persian colors. In accord with this we are told that Mordecai (Es 8:15) "went forth from the presence of the king in royal apparel of blue and white." The highly organized postal system, the king’s scribes, the keeping of the chronicles of the kingdom, the rigid and elaborate court customs, are all characteristic of the Persia of the period. We are told of the decree obtained by Haman that "in the name of King Ahasuerus was it written, and sealed with the king’s ring" (or signet). It was not signed but sealed. That was the Persian custom. The seal of Darius, Xerxes’ father, has been found, and is now in the British Museum. It bears the figure of the king shooting arrows at a lion, and is accompanied by an inscription in Persian, Susian and Assyrian: "I, Darius, Great King." The identification of Ahasuerus, made by Grotefend and which subsequent discoveries amply confirmed, placed the book in an entirely new light. As soon as that identification was assured, previous objections were changed into confirmations. In the alleged extravagances of the monarch, scholars saw then the Xerxes of history. The gathering of the nobles of the empire in "the third year of his reign" (Es 1:3) was plainly the historical assembly in which the Grecian campaign was discussed; and "the seventh year," in which Esther was made queen, was that of his return from Greece. The book implies that Susa was the residence of the Persian kings, and this was so. The proper form of the name as shown by the inscriptions was "Shushan"; "Shushan the Palace" indicates that there were two Susas, which was the fact, and birah ("palace") is a Persian word meaning fortress. The surprisingly rigid etiquette of the palace, to which we have referred, and the danger of entering unbidden the presence of the king have been urged as proof that the book is a romance. The contrary, however, is the truth. "The palace among the Persians," says Lenormant, "was quite inaccessible to the multitude. A most rigid etiquette guarded all access to the king, and made it very difficult to approach him. .... He who entered the presence of the king, without having previously obtained permission, was punished with death" (Ancient History of the East, II, 113-14; compare Herodotus i.99). But a further, and peculiarly conclusive, testimony to the historical character of the book is afforded by the recovery of the palace of Xerxes and Esther. An inscription of Artaxerxes Mnemon found at Susa tells us that it was destroyed by fire in the days of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the son and successor of Xerxes. Within some 30 years, therefore, from the time of Esther, that palace passed from the knowledge of men. Nevertheless, the references in the book are in

perfect accord with the plan of the great structure as laid bare by the recent French excavations. We read (Es 4) that Mordecai, clad in sackcloth, walked in "the broad palace of the city, which was before the king's gate." The ruins show that the House of the Women was on the East side of the palace next to the city, and that a gate led from it into "the street of the city." In Es 5:1, we read that Esther "stood in the inner court of the king's house, over against the king's house." "The king," we also read, "sat upon his royal throne in the royal house, over against the entrance of the house," and that from the throne he "saw Esther the queen standing in the court." Every detail is exact. A corridor led from the House of the Women to the inner court; and at the side of the court opposite to the corridor was the hall, or throne-room of the palace. Exactly in the center of the farther wall the throne was placed and from that lofty seat the king, overlooking an intervening screen, saw the queen waiting for an audience. Other details, such as that of the king's passing from the queen's banqueting-house into the garden, show a similarly exact acquaintance with the palace as it then was. That is a confirmation the force of which it is hard to overestimate. It shows that the writer was well informed and that his work is characterized by minute exactitude.

The utter absence of the Divine name in Esther has formed a difficulty even where it has not been urged as an objection. But that is plainly part of some Divine design. The same silence is strictly maintained throughout in regard to prayer, praise and every approach toward God. That silence was an offense to the early Jews; for, in the Septuagint additions to the book, there is profuse acknowledgment of God both in prayer and in praise. But it must have struck the Jews of the time and the official custodians of the canonical books quite as painfully; and we can only explain the admission of Esther by the latter on the ground that there was overwhelming evidence of its Divine origin and authority. Can this rigid suppression be explained? In the original arrangement of the Old Testament canonical books (the present Hebrew arrangement is post-Christian), Esther is joined to Nehemiah. In 1895 I made a suggestion which I still think worthy of consideration: More than 60 years had passed since Cyrus had given the Jews permission to return. The vast majority of the people remained, nevertheless, where they were. Some, like Nehemiah, were restrained by official and other ties. The rest were indifferent or declined to make the necessary sacrifices of property and of rest. With such as these last the history of God's work in the earth can never be associated. In His providence He will watch over and deliver them: but their names and His will not be bound together in the record of the labor and the waiting for the earth's salvation.

John Urquhart

ESTHER, THE REST OF

Contents

Introductory

1. Name 2. Contents 3. Original Language 4. Versions 5. Date

LITERATURE

==========

Introductory.

The Book of Esther in the oldest manuscripts of the Septuagint (BAN, etc.) contains 107 verses more than in the Hebrew Bible. These additions are scattered throughout the book where they were originally inserted in order to supply the religious element apparently lacking in the Hebrew text. In Jerome's version and in the Vulgate, which is based on it, the longest and most important of these additions are taken out of their context and put together at the end of the canonical book, thus making them to a large extent unintelligible. In English, Welsh and other Protestant versions of the Scriptures the whole of the additions appear in the Apocrypha.

1. Name:

In the English Versions of the Bible the full title is "The Rest of the Chapters of the Book of Esther, which are found neither in the Hebrew, nor in the Chaldee." Since in the Septuagint, including the editions by Fritzsche, Tischendorf and Swete, these chapters appear in their original context, they bear no separate title. The same is true of Brereton's English translation of the Septuagint; but in Thompson's translation the whole of the Apocrypha is omitted, so that it is not strictly a translation of the whole Septuagint.

2. Contents:

In Swete's edition of the Septuagint the interpretations constituting "the Rest of Esther" (sometimes given as "Additions to Esther") are designated by the capital letters of the alphabet, and in the following enumeration this will be followed. The several places in the Greek Bible are indicated in each case.

A (Latin, English, Ad Es 11:2; 12:6): Mordecai's dream; how he came to honor. Precedes Es 1:1.

B (Latin, English, Ad Es 13:1-7): Letter of Artaxerxes. Follows Es 3:13.

C (Latin, English, Ad Es 13:8-14:19): The prayers of Mordecai and Esther. Follows Es 4:17.

D (Latin, Ad Es 15:4-19; English, 16:1-16): Esther visits the king and wins his favor. Follows C, preceding immediately Es 5.

E (Latin, English, Ad Es 16:1-24): Another letter of Artaxerxes. Follows Es 8:12. F (Latin, English, Ad Es 10:4-11): Epilogue describing the origin of the Feast Purim. Follows Es 10:3.

But besides the lengthy interpolations noticed above there are also in the Septuagint small additions omitted from the Latin and therefore from the English, Welsh, etc., Apocrypha. These short additions are nearly all explanatory glosses. In the Century Bible (Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther) the exact places where the insertions occur in the Septuagint are indicated and described in the notes dealing with the relevant passages of the canonical text. With the help thus given any English reader is able to read the additions in their original setting. Unless they are read in this way they are pointless and even in most cases senseless.

3. Original Language:

All scholars agree that "The Rest of Esther" was written originally in Greek Both external and internal evidence bears this out. But the Greek text has come down to us in two recensions which differ considerably.

(1) The commonly received text supported by the manuscripts B, A, N, and by Josephus (Ant., XI, i).

(2) A revision of (1) contained in the manuscripts 19, 93a and 108b. In the last two manuscripts both recensions occur. This revised text has been ascribed by many recent scholars (Lagarde, Schurer, R. H. Charles) to Lucian. In his Libr. Vet. Test. Canon. Graece, Pars Prior, 1833 (all published), Lagarde gives on parallel pages both recensions with critical notes on both.

4. Versions:

The two Greek texts are also given by Fritzsche (1871) and Swete (1891) in their editions of the Septuagint, and also by Scholz in his German Commentary on the Book of Esther (1892). For the ancient versions see "Esther Versions."

5. Date:

Practically all modern scholars agree in holding that "The Rest of Esther" is some decades later than the canonical book. In his commentary on Es (Century Bible) the present writer has given reasons for dating the canonical Es about 130 BC. One could not go far astray in fixing the date of the original Greek of the Additions to Esther at about 100 BC. It is evident that we owe these interpolations to a Jewish zealot who wished to give the Book of Es a religious character. In his later years John Hyrcanus (135-103 BC) identified himself with the Sadducean or rationalistic party, thus breaking with the Pharisee or orthodox party to which the Maccabeans had hitherto belonged. Perhaps we owe these additions to the zeal aroused among orthodox Jews by the rationalizing temper prevailing in court circles. R. H. Charles (Encyclopedia Brit, XI, 797b) favors a date during the early (?) Maccabean period; but this would give the Ad Esther an earlier date than can be ascribed to the canonical Esther.

LITERATURE.

See the literature cited above, and in addition note the following: Fritzsche, Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen (1851), 67-108; Schurer, History of the Jewish People, II, iii, 181 ff (Ger. edition 4, III, 449 ff); Ryssel (in Kautzsch, Apocrypha, 193 ff); Swete, Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 257 if; the articles in the principal Bible Dictionaries, including Jewish Encyclopedia and Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition).

See also under ESTHER.

T. Witton Davies

ESTIMATE; ESTIMATION

es’-ti-mat, es-ti-ma’-shun (‘arakh, ‘erekh):

These words, meaning "to set in order," "valuation," are used in connection with the priestly services in Le 5:15,18; 6:6; 27:14, and frequently; Nu 18:16.

ESYELUS

e-si-e’-lus (Esuel, Esuelos; the King James Version Syelus):

One of the governors of the Temple in the time of Josiah (APC 1Esdras 1:8); called "Jehiel" in 2Ch 35:8.

ETAM

e’-tam ‘eTam; Codex Alexandrinus, Apan, Codex Vaticanus, Aitan:

(1) Mentioned in Septuagint along with Tekoa, Bethlehem and Phagor (Jos 15:59). In 2Ch 11:6 it occurs, between Bethlehem and Tekoa, as one of the cities built "for defense in Judah" by Rehoboam. Josephus writes that "there was a certain place, about 50 furlongs distant from Jerusalem which is called Ethan, very pleasant it is in fine gardens and abounding in rivulets of water; whither he (Solomon) used to go out in the morning" (Ant., VIII, vii, 3). Mention of ‘Ain ‘Aitan, which is described as the most elevated place in Palestine, occurs in the Talmud (Zebhachim 54b), and in the Jer. Talmud (Yoma’ 3 fol 41) it is mentioned that a conduit ran from ‘Atan to the Temple.

The evidence all points to ‘Ain ‘Atan, the lowest of the springs supplying the aqueduct running to Solomon’s pools. The

gardens of Solomon may very well—by tradition, at any rate—have been in the fertile valley below ‘Urtas. The site of the ancient town Etam is rather to be looked for on an isolated hill, with ancient remains, a little to the East of ‘Ain ‘Atan. 1Ch 4:3 may also have reference to this Etam.

(2) A town assigned to Simeon (1Ch 4:32). Mentioned with EN-RIMMON (which see), identified by Conder with Khurbet ‘AiTun in the hills Northwest of Beersheba.

(3) The rock of Etam, where Samson took up his dwelling after smiting the Philistines "hip and thigh with a great slaughter" (Jud 15:8,11), was in Judah but apparently in the low hill country (same place) . The rocky hill on which lies the village of Beit ‘Atab, near Sur‘ah (Zorah), was suggested by Conder, but unless (3) is really identical width (1), which is quite possible, the cavern known as ‘Arak Isma‘in, described by Hanauer (PEFS, 1886, 25), suits the requirements of the story better. The cavern, high up on the northern cliffs of the Wady Isma‘in, is a noticeable object from the railway as the train enters the gorge.

E. W. G. Masterman

ETERNAL

e-tur’-nal (‘olam; aionios, from aion):

The word "eternal" is of very varying import, both in the Scriptures and out of them.

1. ‘Olam:

In the Old Testament, the Hebrew word ‘olam is used for "eternity," sometimes in the sense of unlimited duration, sometimes in the sense of a cycle or an age, and sometimes, in later Hebrew, in the signification of world. The Hebrew ‘olam has, for its proper New Testament equivalent, aion, as signifying either time of particular duration, or the unending duration of time in general. Only, the Hebrew term primarily signified unlimited time, and only in a secondary sense represented a definite or specific period. Both the Hebrew and the Greek terms signify the world itself, as it moves in time.

2. Aion, Aionios:

In the New Testament, aion and aionios are often used with the meaning "eternal," in the predominant sense of futurity. The word aion primarily signifies time, in the sense of age or generation; it also comes to denote all that exists under time-conditions; and, finally, superimposed upon the temporal is an ethical use, relative to the world’s course. Thus aion may be said to mean the subtle informing spirit of the world or cosmos—the totality of things. By Plato, in his Timaeus, aion was used of the eternal Being, whose counterpart, in the sense-world, is Time. To Aristotle, in speaking of the world, aion is the ultimate principle which, in itself, sums up all existence.. In the New Testament, aion is found combined with prepositions in nearly three score and ten instances, where the idea of unlimited duration appears to be meant. This is the usual method of expressing eternity in the Septuagint also. The aionios of 2Co 4:18 must be eternal, in a temporal use or reference, else the antithesis would be gone.

3. Aidios:

In Ro 1:20 the word aidios is used of Divine action and rendered in the King James Version "eternal" (the Revised Version (British and American) "everlasting"), the only other place in the New Testament where the word occurs being Jude 1:6, where the rendering is "everlasting," which accords with classical usage. But the presence of the idea of eternal in these passages does not impair the fact that aion and aionios are, in their natural and obvious connotation, the usual New Testament words for expressing the idea of eternal, and this holds strikingly true of the Septuagint usage also. For, from

the idea of aeonian life, there is no reason to suppose the notion of duration excluded. The word aionios is sometimes used in the futurist signification, but often also, in the New Testament, it is concerned rather with the quality, than with the quantity or duration, of life. By the continual attachment of aionios to life, in this conception of the spiritual or Divine life in man, the aeonian conception was saved from becoming sterile.

4. Enlargement of Idea:

In the use of aion and aionios there is evidenced a certain enlarging or advancing import till they come so to express the high and complex fact of the Divine life in man. In Greek, aiones signifies ages, or periods or dispensations. The aiones of Heb 1:2, and 11:3, is, however, to be taken as used in the concrete sense of "the worlds," and not "the ages," the world so taken meaning the totality of things in their course or flow.

5. Eternal Life:

Our Lord decisively set the element of time in abeyance, and took His stand upon the fact and quality of life—life endless by its own nature. Of that eternal life He is Himself the guarantee—"Because I live, ye shall live also" (Joh 14:19). Therefore said Augustine, "Join thyself to the eternal God, and thou wilt be eternal."

See ETERNITY.

James Lindsay

ETERNITY

e-tur’-ni-ti (olam; Greek equivalent, aion):

Contents

1. Contrast with Time 2. In the Old Testament 3. In the New Testament 4. The Eternal "Now" 5. Defect of This View 6. Philosophical Views 7. Time Conceptions Inadequate 8. All Succession Present in One Act to Divine Consciousness 9. Yet Connection between Eternity and Time 10. The Religious Attitude to Eternity

LITERATURE

==========

1. Contrast with Time:

Eternity is best conceived, not in the merely negative form of the non-temporal, or immeasurable time, but positively, as the mode of the timeless self-existence of the Absolute Ground of the universe. The flux of time grows first intelligible to us, only when we take in the thought of God as eternal—exalted above time. Timeless existence—being or entity without change—is what we here mean by eternity, and not mere everlastingness or permanence through time. God, in His internal being, is raised above time; in His eternal absoluteness, He is throned above temporal development, and knows, as the Scriptures say, no changeableness. The conception of eternity, as without beginning or ending, leaves us with but a negation badly in need of filling out with reality. Eternity is not a mere negative idea; to make of eternity merely a blank and irrelevant negation of temporality would not satisfy any proper theory of being; it functions as the positive relation to time of that eternal God, who is King of all the eons.

2. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament, God’s eternity is only negatively expressed, as implying merely indefinitely extended time (Ge 21:33; De 33:27), though Isa 40:28 takes more absolute form. Better is the view of eternity, objectively considered, as a mode of being of God in relation to Himself. For He was eternal, while as yet the world and time were not. But even in the New Testament, the negative form of expression prevails.

3. In the New Testament:

Time, with its succession of events, helps to fill out such idea as we can form of the eternal, conceived as an endless progress. But, as finite beings, we can form no positive idea of eternity. Time is less contradictory of eternity, than helpful in revealing what we know of it. Plato, in his Timaeus, says that time is the "moving image of eternity," and we may allow that it is its type or revelation. Not as the annulment of time, though it might be held to be in itself exclusive of time, is eternity to be taken, but rather as the ground of its reality.

4. The Eternal "Now":

Eternity might, no doubt, be taken as just time no longer measured by the succession of events, as in the finite universe. But, on a strict view, there is something absurd in an eternity that includes time, and an eternity apart from time is a vain and impossible conception. Eternity, as a discharge from all time limits, is purely negative, though not without importance. Eternity, absolutely taken, must be pronounced incommensurable with time; as Aquinas said, non sunt mensurae unius generis. Eternity, that is to say, would lose its character as eternal in the very entering into relations with the changeful or becoming. Eternity, as in God, has, since the time of Augustine and the Middle Ages, been frequently conceived as an eternal Now. The Schoolmen were wont to adopt as a maxim that "in eternity is one only instant always present and persistent." This is but a way of describing eternity in a manner characteristic of succession in time; but eternal Deity, rather than an eternal Now, is a conception far more full of meaning for us.

5. Defect of This View:

To speak of God’s eternity as an eternal Now—a present in the time-sense—involves a contradiction. For the eternal existence is no more described by the notion of a present than by a past or a future. Such a Now or present presupposes a not-now, and raises afresh the old time-troubles, in relation to eternity. Time is certainly not the form of God’s life,

His eternity meaning freedom from time. Hence, it was extremely troublesome to theology of the Middle Ages to have a God who was not in time at all, supposed to create the world at a particular moment in time.

6. Philosophical Views:

Spinoza, in later times, made the eternity of God consist in His infinite—which, to Spinoza, meant His necessary—existence. For contingent or durational existence would not, in Spinoza’s view, be eternal, though it lasted always. The illusoriness or unreality of time, in respect of man’s spiritual life, is not always very firmly grasped. This wavering or uncertain hold of the illusiveness of time, or of higher reality as timeless, is still very prevalent; even so strong- souled a poet as Browning projects the shadow of time into eternity, with rarely a definite conception of the higher life as an eternal and timeless essence; and although Kant, Hegel and Schopenhauer may have held to such a timeless view, it has by no means become a generally adopted doctrine so far, either of theologians or of philosophers. If time be so taken as unreal, then eternity must not be thought of as future, as is done by Dr. Ellis McTaggart and some other metaphysicians today. For nothing could, in that case, be properly future, and eternity could not be said to begin, as is often done in everyday life.

The importance of the eternity conception is seen in the fact that neo-Kantian and neo-Hegelian thinkers alike have shown a general tendency to regard time-conceptions as unfit, in metaphysics, for the ultimate explanation of the universe.

7. Time-Conceptions Inadequate:

Eternity, one may surely hold, must span or include, for God's eternal consciousness, the whole of what happens in time, with all of past, present or future, that lies within the temporal succession. But we are by no means entitled to say, as does Royce, that such wholeness or totality of the temporal constitutes the eternal, for the eternal belongs to quite another order, that, namely, of timeless reality. Eternity is not to be defined in terms of time at all. For God is to us the supra-temporal ens perfectissimum, but One whose timeless self-sufficiency and impassable aloofness are not such as to keep Him from being strength and helper of our temporal striving. Our metaphysical convictions must not here be of barren and unfruitful sort for ethical results and purposes.

8. All Succession Present in One Act to Divine Consciousness:

Eternity is, in our view, the form of an eternal existence, to which, in the unity of a single insight, the infinite series of varying aspects or processes are, together-wise, as a totum simul, present. But this, as we have already shown, does not imply that the eternal order is nowise different, essentially, from the temporal; time is not to be treated as a segment of eternity, nor eternity regarded as interminable duration; the eternal cannot pass over into the temporal; for, an eternal Being, who should think all things as present, and yet view the time-series as a succession, must be a rather self-contradictory conception. For the Absolute Consciousness, time does not exist; the future cannot, for it, be thought of as beginning to be, nor the past as having ceased to be.

9. Yet Connection Between Eternity and Time:

After all that has been said, however, eternity and time are not to be thought of as without connection. For the temporal presupposes the eternal, which is, in fact, its positive ground and its perpetual possibility. These things are so, if only for the reason that the Divine mode of existence does not contradict or exclude the human mode of existence. The continuity of the latter—of the temporal—has its guaranty in the eternal. The unconditioned eternity of God brings into harmony with itself the limitations and conditions of the temporal. For time is purely relative, which eternity is not. No distinctions of before and after are admissible in the eternity conception, hence, we have no right to speak of time as a portion of eternity. Thus, while we maintain the essential difference between eternity and time, we at the same time affirm what may perhaps be called the affinity between them. The metaphysics of eternity and its time-relations continue to be matter of proverbial difficulty, and both orders—the eternal and the temporal—had better be treated as concrete, and not left merely to abstract reflection. Our idea of the eternal will best be developed, in this concrete fashion, by the growth of our God-idea, as we more completely apprehend God, as actualized for us in His incarnate Son.

10. The Religious Attitude to Eternity:

Thus, then, it is eternity, not as immeasurable time, but rather as a mode of being of the immutable God, who is yet progressively revealing Himself in time, which we have here set forth. This is not to say that the religious consciousness has not its own need of the conception of God as being "from everlasting to everlasting," as in Ps 90:2, and of His kingdom as "an everlasting kingdom" (Da 4:3). Nor is it to make us suppose that the absolute and self-existent God, who so transcends all time-dependence, is thereby removed far from us, while, on the contrary, His very greatness makes Him the more able to draw near unto us, in all the plenitude of His being. Hence, it is so truly spoken in Isa 57:15, "Thus saith the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy: I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite." Hence, also the profound truthfulness of sayings like that in Ac 17:27,28, "He is not far from each one of us: for in him we live, and move, and have our being." After all that has been said, our best knowledge of eternity, as it exists in God, is not developed in any metaphysical fashion, but after the positive and timeless modes of the spiritual life—the modes of trust and love.

LITERATURE.

H. Cremer, Lexicon of New Testament Greek, English edition, 1880; G. B. Winer, Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3rd edition, 1882; R. C. French, Synonyms of the New Testament, 9th edition, 1880; E. H. Plumptre, The Spirits in Prison, 3rd edition, 1885; J. Orr, Christian View of God and the World, lst edition, 1893; I. A. Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, English edition, 1885; J. H. Stirling, Philosophy and Theology, 1890; J. Lindsay, Studies in European Philosophy, 1909; The Fundamental Problems of Metaphysics, 1910.

James Lindsay

ETH-KAZIN

eth-ka'-zin ('ittah qatsin; the King James Version Ittah Kazin):

A town on the eastern border of Zebulun, mentioned between Gath-hepher and Rimmon (Jos 19:13). The site is not identified. "Ittah" of the King James Version is due to misunderstanding of the Hebrew letter "he" locale.

ETHAM

e'-tham ('etham; Othom, Ex 13:20; Bouthan, Nu 33:6,7; in 33:8 the Septuagint has a different reading, "in their wilderness" showing another pointing for the word):

The name used to be explained as the Coptic Atium, "border of the Sea" (Gesenius, Lexicon, under the word) which would agree with the Hebrew (Nu 33:8) where the "wilderness of Etham" is noticed instead of that of Shur (Ex 15:22) East of the Red Sea (see SHUR). At Etham (Ex 13:20), the Hebrews camped in the "edge," or at "the end," of the desert West of the sea that they were to cross (see EXODUS). This camp was probably near the North end of the Bitter Lakes, a march from Succoth. Brugsch (Hist. Egypt, II, 359) would compare Etham with the Egyptian Khetam ("fort"), but the Hebrew word has no guttural. The word Khetam is not the name of a place (see Pierret, Vocab. hieroglyph., 453), and more than one such "fort" seems to be noticed (see PITHOM). In the reign of Seti II a scribe's report mentions the pursuit of two servants, apparently from Zoan, to the fortress of I-k-u southward, reaching Khetam on the 3rd day; but if this was the "Khetam of Rameses II," or even that "of Minepthah," it would not apparently suit the position of Etham.

See MIGDOL.

C. R. Conder.

ETHAN

e'-than ('ethan, "firm," "enduring"; Gaithan):

(1) A wise man with whom Solomon is compared (1Ki 4:31). Called there "Ethan the Ezrahite," to whom the title of Ps 89 ascribes the authorship of that poem.

(2) A "son of Kishi," or "Kishaiah," of the Merari branch of the Levites, and, along with Heman and Asaph, placed by David over the service of song (1Ch 6:44; 15:17,19).

See JEDUTHUN.

(3) An ancestor of Asaph of the Gershomite branch of the Levites (1Ch 6:42).

ETHANIM

eth’-a-nim (’ethanim):

The seventh month of the Jewish year (1Ki 8:2). The word is of Phoenician origin and signifies "perennial," referring to living streams. It corresponds to September-October.

See CALENDAR; TIME.

ETHANUS

e-tha’-nus, the King James Version Ecanus (Apocrypha):

One of the scribes who wrote for forty days at the dictation of Ezra (APC 2Esdras 14:24).

ETHBAAL

eth-ba’-al, eth’-ba-al (’ethba‘al, "with Baal"):

"King of the Sidonians," and father of Jezebel whom Ahab king of Israel took to wife (1Ki 16:31).

ETHER

e’-ther (‘ether; Ather):

A town in Judah (Jos 15:42), near Libnah, assigned to Simeon (Jos 19:7). Kh. el ‘Atr (identical in spelling with Ether) is possibly the site.

It is near Beit Jibrin and is described as "an ancient site: cisterns, foundations, quarried rock and terraces" (PEF, III, 261, 279).

ETHICS OF JESUS

eth’-iks:

Contents I. IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

1. The Blessings of the Kingdom (1) Nature of the Kingdom (2) Blessedness of the Kingdom (3) Righteousness—Its Contrasts (4) Apocalyptic Theories

2. The Character of the Subjects of the Kingdom (1) Condition of Entrance (2) Christ’s Attitude to Sin (3) Attainment of Righteousness (a) Repentance (b) Faith "Coming" to Christ (c) Imitation of Christ—Service Example of Jesus

3. Commandments of the King The Great Commandments (a) Love to God God’s Worship, etc. The Church (b) Duty to Man Exemplified in Christ The New Motives

II. IN THE FOURTH GOSPEL

1. Eternal Life 2. Its Source in God 3. Through the Son 4. Need of New Birth 5. Nature of Faith 6. Fruits of Union with Christ LITERATURE

==========

I. In the Synoptic Gospels.

If, following the custom prevalent at present, we adopt, as the general name for the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptists, the Kingdom of God, then the divisions of His ethical teaching will be (1) the Blessings of the Kingdom, (2) the Character of the Subjects, (3) the Commandments of the King.

1. The Blessings of the Kingdom:

(1) Nature of the Kingdom.

"The Kingdom of God" was not a phrase invented by Jesus. It was used before Him by the Baptist. Its proximate source, for both Jesus and John, was the prophet Daniel, who uses it in very striking passages (2:44,45; 7:13,14). The idea of a kingdom of God goes back to the very commencement of the monarchy in Israel, when the prophet Samuel told those who demanded a king that Yahweh was their king, and that they should desire no other. Through all the subsequent history of the monarchy, which was, on the whole, so disappointing to patriotic and pious minds, the conviction lingered that, if God Himself were king, all would be well; and, when at length the Hebrew state was destroyed and the people were carried into captivity, the prophets still believed that for their country there was a future and a hope, if only Yahweh would take to Himself His great power and reign. In the period between the Old Testament and the New Testament such sentiments so greatly prevailed that Schurer has compiled, from the apocryphal literature, a kind of Messianic creed, embracing no fewer than eleven articles, which he supposes to have prevailed before the Advent. It may be doubtful how far such beliefs had taken possession of the general mind. Many of the Sadducees were too satisfied with things as they were to concern themselves about such dreams. But the Pharisees undoubtedly gave a large place in their minds to Messianic expectations, and for these the Zealots were ready to fight. It is, however, to the prosdechomenoi, as they are called, because they were "waiting for the consolation of Israel," that we must look for the purest expression of this heritage derived from the piety of the past. In the hymns at the beginning of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, with which the birth of Jesus was greeted, we encounter an intense and lofty conception of the kingdom of God; and, as the earthly home in which Jesus grew up belonged to this select section of the population, there is little doubt that it was here He imbibed both His Messianic ideas and the phraseology in which these were expressed. His use of the term, the kingdom of God, has sometimes been spoken of as an accommodation to the beliefs and language of His fellow-countrymen. But it was native to Himself; and it is not unlikely that the very commonness of it in the circle in which He grew up rendered Him unconscious of the difference between His own conception and that which prevailed outside of this circle. For, as soon as He began to preach and to make known the sentiments which He included within this phrase, it became manifest that He and His contemporaries, under a common name, were thinking of entirely different things.

They emphasized the first half of the phrase—"the kingdom"; He the second—"of God." They were thinking of the external attributes of a kingdom—political emancipation, an army, a court, subject provinces; He of the doing of God’s will on earth as it is done in heaven. Even He had felt, at one stage, the glamor of their point of view, as is manifest from the account of the Temptation in the Wilderness; but He had decisively rejected it, resolving not to commence with an external framework on a large scale, to be subsequently filled with character, but to begin with the individual, and trust to time and Providence for visible success. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem proves that He never abandoned the claim to be the fulfiller of all the Old Testament predictions about the kingdom of God; but His enemies not unnaturally interpreted the failure of that attempt as a final demonstration that their own view had been the correct one all along. Still, God was not mocked, and Jesus was not mocked. When, at the end of a generation, the Jewish state sank into ruin and the city by which Jesus was martyred had been destroyed, there were springing up, all over the world, communities the members of

which were bound more closely to one another than the members of any other kingdom, obeyed the same laws and enjoyed the same benefits, which they traced up to a King ruling in the heavens, who would appear again on the great white throne, to be the Judge of quick and dead.

(2) Blessedness of the Kingdom.

The enemies of Jesus may be said to have carried out to the bitter end their conception of the kingdom of God, when they nailed Him to a tree; but, in the face of opposition, He carried out His own conception of it too, and He never abandoned the practice of employing this phrase as a comprehensive term for all the blessings brought by Him to mankind. He used, however, other nomenclature for the same objects, such as Gospel, Peace, Rest, Life, Eternal Life, Blessedness. His exposition of the last of these, at the commencement of the Sermon on the Mount, is highly instructive. Seldom, indeed, has the structure of the Beatitudes been clearly understood. Each of them is an equation, in which "blessed" stands on the one side and on the other two magnitudes—the one contained in the subject of the sentence, such as "the poor in spirit," "the meek," and so on; and the other contained in a qualifying clause introduced by "for." Sometimes one of these magnitudes may be a minus quantity, as in "they that mourn"; but the other is so large a positive magnitude that the two together represent a handsome plus, which thoroughly justifies the predicate "blessed." It is remarkable that the first and the eighth of the reasons introduced by "for" are the same: "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven," justifying the statement that this is Christ's own name for the blessedness brought by Him to the world; and the sentences between these, introduced in the same way, may be looked upon as epexegetic of this great phrase. They embrace such great conceptions as comfort, mercy, the inheritance of the earth, the vision of God and sonship, which are all certainly blessings of the kingdom; and the list does not finish without mentioning a great reward in heaven—an immortal hope, which is the greatest blessing of all.

(3) Righteousness—Its Contrasts.

If the preacher of the Sermon on the Mount was to expound at length any one of these bright conceptions, it might have been expected to be the kingdom of God itself; and this we should have desired. But the one to which this honor fell has still to be mentioned. It is "righteousness." In one of the Beatitudes the speaker had promised that to be filled with this should be part of the blessedness which He was expounding; and, when He had finished the Beatitudes, He turned back to this conception and devoted the rest of His discourse to its interpretation. Nowhere else, in the reports of His preaching which have come down to us, is there to be found an exposition so sustained and thorough. There is no better way of describing a new thing, with which those who listen are unfamiliar, than to contrast it with something with which they are perfectly acquainted; and this was the method adopted by Jesus. He contrasted the righteousness with which the subjects of the kingdom were to be blessed with the figure of the righteous man familiar to them, first, in the discourses of the scribes, to which they were wont to listen in the synagogue, and secondly, in the example of the Pharisees, to whom they were wont to look up as the patterns of righteousness. It is well known what ample opportunities He found, by means of this felicitous disposition, for probing to the very depths of morality, as well as for covering His opponents with ridicule and exploding the honor in which they stood with the masses. The whole of this scheme is, however, exhausted long before the Sermon comes to a close; and the question is, whether, in the latter half of the Sermon, He still keeps up the exposition of righteousness by contrasting it with the ordinary course of the world. I am inclined to think that this is the case, and that the key to the latter half of the discourse is the contrast between righteousness and worldliness. The doctrine, at all events, which issues from the whole discussion is that the righteousness promised is distinguished by three characteristics—inwardness, as distinguished from the externality of those who believed morality to extend to outward words and deeds alone, and not to the secret thoughts of the heart; secrecy, as distinguished from the ostentation of those who blew a trumpet before them when they were doing their alms; and naturalness, like that of the flower or the fruit, which grows spontaneously from a healthy root, without forcing.

See SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

(4) Apocalyptic Theories. This substitution of righteousness for the kingdom in the greatest public discourse which has

come down to us is a significant indication of the direction in which the mind of Jesus was tending, as He drew away from the notions and hopes of contemporary Judaism. It is evident that He was filling the idea of the kingdom more and more with religious and moral contents, and emptying it of political and material elements. There are scholars, indeed, at the present day, who maintain that His conception of the kingdom was futuristic, and that He was waiting all the time for an apocalyptic manifestation, which never came. He was, they think, expecting the heavens to open and the kingdom to descend ready made to the earth, like the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse. But this is to assume toward Jesus exactly the attitude taken up toward Him in His own day by Pharisees and high priests, and it degrades Him to the level of an apocalyptic dreamer. It ignores many sayings of His, of which the parable of the Mustard Seed may be taken as an example, which prove that He anticipated for Christianity a long development such as it has actually passed through; and it fails to do justice to many passages in His teaching where He speaks of the kingdom as already come. Of the latter the most remarkable is where He says, "The kingdom of God is within you"—a statement preceded by a distinct rejection of the notion of an apocalyptic manifestation; for the word "observation," which He employs in describing the way in which the kingdom is not to come, is an astronomical term, describing precisely such a phenomenon as He is supposed by such scholars as John Weiss and Schweitzer to have been expecting. The more it became evident that He was not to command the homage of the nation, the more did He devote Himself to the education of the Twelve, that they might form the nucleus of His kingdom upon earth; and it was certainly not with apocalyptic visions that He fed their receptive minds.

2. The Character of the Subjects of the Kingdom:

(1) Conditions of Entrance.

The righteousness described so comprehensively in the Sermon on the Mount is not infrequently spoken of as the condition of entrance to the kingdom of God; but this is altogether to misunderstand the mind of Jesus. The righteousness described by Him is the gift of God to those who are already inside the kingdom; for it is the supreme blessing for the sake of which the kingdom is to be sought; and the condition imposed on those who are outside is not the possession of righteousness, but rather a bottomless sense of the want of it. The more utterly they feel their own lack of righteousness, the more ready are they for entrance into the kingdom. They must "hunger and thirst after righteousness." It has been remarked already that the description, in the Beatitudes, of the character of the candidates for the kingdom is sometimes of a negative character; and indeed, this is the account in the teaching of Jesus generally of those whom He attracts to Himself. They are drawn by a sense of boundless need in themselves and by the apprehension of an equivalent fullness in Him; He calls those "that labor and are heavy laden," that He may give them rest.

(2) Christ’s Attitude to Sin.

The first word of the prophetic message in the Old Testament was always the denunciation of sin; and only after this had done its work did the vision of a good time coming rise on the horizon. The same was repeated in the message of John the Baptist; and it did not fail to reappear in the teaching of Jesus, though His mode of treating the subject was entirely His own. He did not, like the prophets, take up much time with convicting gross and open sinners. Perhaps He thought that this had been sufficiently done by His predecessors; or, perhaps He refrained because He understood the art of getting sinners to convict themselves. Yet, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, He showed how profoundly He understood the nature and the course of the commonest sins. If, however, He thus spared transgressors who had no covering for their wickedness, He made up for this leniency by the vigor and even violence with which He attacked those who hid their sins under a cloak of hypocrisy. Never was there a prophetic indignation like that with which He assailed such sinners in Mt 23; and He shaped the same charges into an unforgettable picture in the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican. He never named the Sadducees in the same unreserved manner as He thus designated their antagonists; but in more parables than one it is possible that He had them in view. The Unjust Judge was probably a Sadducee; and so was the Rich Man at whose gate the beggar Lazarus was wont to sit. The sin of the Sadducees, at all events, did not escape His prophetic animadversion. In Lu especially He alludes with great frequency to worldliness and the love of money as cankers by which the life of the human soul is eaten out and its destiny destroyed. Thus did Jesus exercise the prophetic office of denouncing all the sins of His time; and He showed what, in this respect, He thought of mankind in general when He began a sentence with, "If ye then,

being evil" (Lu 11:13), and when He gave the dreadful description of the heart of man which begins, "Out of the heart come forth evil thoughts" (Mt 15:19).

(3) Attainment of Righteousness.

To all serious students of the Sermon on the Mount it is well known that the popular notion of it, as containing a simple religion and an easy-going morality, is utterly mistaken; on the contrary, the righteousness sketched by the Preacher is far loftier than that ever conceived by any other religious teacher whatever. Not only, however, does He thus propose to conduct human beings to a platform of attainment higher than any attempted before, but He, at the same time, recognizes that He must begin with men lower than almost any others have allowed. It is here that the ethics of Jesus differ from those of the philosophers. He takes the task much more seriously; and, as the ascent from the one extreme to the other is much longer, so the means of reaching the goal are much more difficult. Philosophers, assuming that man is equal to his own destiny, lay the demands of the moral law before him at once, taking it for granted that he is able to fulfill them; but the path adopted by Jesus is more remote and humbling. There are in it steps or stages which, in His teaching, it is easy to discern.

(a) Repentance:

The first of these is repentance. This was a watchword of all the prophets: after sin had been denounced, penitence was called for; and no hope of improvement was held out until this had been experienced. In the message of John the Baptist it held the same place; and, in one of the Gospels, it is expressly stated that Jesus began His ministry by repeating this watchword of His predecessor. Not a few of the most touching scenes of His earthly ministry exhibit penitents at His feet, the most moving of them all being that of the woman who was "a sinner"; and, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, we have a full-length picture of the process of repentance.

(b) Faith:

The second step is faith—a word of constant recurrence in the teaching Of Jesus. In many cases it is connected with His healing ministry; but this was a parable of a more interior ministry for the soul. In many cases it formed a school of preparation for the other, as in the case of the man borne of four, who was brought to Christ for the healing of his body, but was presented, in addition, with the gift of the forgiveness of his sins. In healing him Jesus expressly claimed the power of forgiving sins; and, in His great saying at the institution of the Lord’s Supper, He showed the connection which this was to have with His own death.

(c) Imitation of Christ—Service:

Instead of speaking of faith and of believing, Jesus frequently spoke of "coming" to Himself; and then followed the invitation to "follow" Him, which, accordingly, is the third stage. Following Him meant, in many cases, literally leaving home and occupation, in order to accompany Him from place to place, as He journeyed through the land; and, as this involved sacrifice and self-denial, He frequently combined with "following" the invitation to take up "the cross." But by degrees this literal meaning dropped away from the invitation, or at least became secondary to that of imitation, which must be the only meaning when Paul, adopting the language of his Master, calls upon men and women to be "followers" of him, as he was of Christ. It is seldom that Jesus, in so many words, calls upon others to imitate Himself; indeed, He does so less frequently than Paul; but it is implied in following Him, if not literally expressed; and it was a direct consequence of keeping company with Him and coming under the influence of His example. It is highly characteristic that, in the only place where He directly calls upon others to "learn" from Him, the virtue to which He draws attention is meekness —"Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart." The same quality was often emphasized by Him, when He was describing the character which He wished to see exhibited by others, "For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Lu 14:11). In spite, however, of the importance thus attached by Him to humility, He not only combined with it, as has been pointed out by Bushnell, in his famous chapter on the character

of Christ in Nature and the Supernatural, the most stupendous personal claims, but also attributed to His followers a position of personal distinction among men, and called upon them to perform services far beyond the reach of ordinary mortals, saying to them, "Ye are the salt of the earth," "Ye are the light of the world," and ordering them to make disciples of all nations. The principle by which this apparent contradiction is bridged over is another favorite idea of His teaching, namely, Service. He who is able to serve others on a large scale is, in a sense, superior to those he serves, because he is furnished with the resources of which they stand in need; yet he places himself beneath them and forgets his own claims in ministering to their necessities. There are few of the utterances of Jesus in which the very genius of His ethical system is more fully expressed than that in which He contrasts greatness as it is conceived among men of the world with greatness as He conceives it and His followers must learn to conceive it: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant." Of this difficult rule, He was able to add, He Himself had given, and was still to give, the most perfect illustration; for "even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mt 20:25 ff the King James Version).

This reminds us that, while the character of the subjects of the kingdom is to be learned from the words of Jesus, it may be also derived from His example. That which He demanded from others He fulfilled in His own conduct; and thus the dry precepts of the moral law were invested with the charm of a living personality. Brief as the records of His life are, they are wonderfully rich in instruction of this kind; and it is possible, by going through them with study and care, to form a clear image of how He bore Himself in all the departments of human life—in the home, in the state, in the church, as a friend, in society, as a man of prayer, as a student of Scripture, as a worker, as a sufferer, as a philanthropist, as a winner of souls, as a preacher, as a teacher, as a controversialist, and so on. This is the modern imitation of Christ—that of the details of His earthly existence—the Imitation of a Kempis was an imitation of the cosmical history of the Son of God, as He moves on His Divine mission from heaven to the cross and back to the throne of the universe. See the writer’s Imago Christi.

3. Commandments of the King:

The Great Commandments.

In accordance with Scriptural usage, Jesus called by the name of "commandments" those actions which we call "duties"; and He has made this part of our subject easy by reducing the commandments to two: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mt 22:37-39). He did not invent either of these commandments; for both occur in the Old Testament (De 6:5; Le 19:18). There, however, they lie far apart and are buried out of sight. The second of them was still more deeply buried under a misinterpretation of the scribes, to which reference is made in the Sermon on the Mount. Jesus rescued them from oblivion; He showed the vital and indissoluble connection between the sentiments which they enforce—love of God and love of man—which had been long and violently separated; and He lifted them up into the firmament of ethics, to shine forever as the sun and moon of duty.

(a) Love to God:

It has been denied by some writers on Christian ethics that there can be any such thing as duties to God, and by writers on philosophical ethics love to God is not generally regarded as coming within the scope of their science. But the duty of man is concerned with all the objects, and especially all the beings, he is related to; and to Jesus the outflow of man’s heart toward Him who is the author of his being and the source of all his blessings seemed the most natural of actions. "I love Yahweh" was a sentiment to which mankind had risen even in the Old Testament (Ps 116:1), where it corresponds with not a few expressions of the Divine love equally fervent; and it is not a figure of speech at all when Jesus demands love for His Father from heart and soul, strength and mind.

Love to God involves, however, love to what may be called the Things of God, toward which Jesus always manifested

tenderness and honor. Those who are not themselves ecclesiastically minded have, indeed, taken it for granted that Jesus

was indifferent, if not hostile, to the objects and actions by which the Almighty is honored; and it is often said that the only service of God which mattered in His eyes was the service of man. But, although, like the prophets before Him, Jesus exposed with withering rebuke the hypocrisy of those who put ritual in the place of righteousness, it requires no more than a glance at His sayings, and the other records of His life, to perceive that His mind was occupied no less with duties to God than with duties to men; indeed, the former bulk more largely in His teaching. The only arrangement of religion with which He seems out of sympathy is the Sabbath; but this was due to a peculiarity of the times; and it is quite conceivable that in other circumstances He might have been a strenuous supporter of Sabbath observance. If there had been in His day a Sadducean attempt to rob the people of the day of rest, He would have opposed it as strenuously as He did the Pharisaic attempt to make it a burden and a weariness to the common man. By declaring the Sabbath to have been made for man (Mr 2:27) He recognized that it was instituted at the beginning and intended for the entire course of man's existence upon earth. With the other things of God, such as His House, His Word, and His Worship, He manifested sympathy equally by word and deed; He frequented both the Temple and the synagogue; so imbued was His mind with the lit of the Old Testament that He spoke habitually in its spirit and phraseology, having its figures and incidents perfectly at command; and by both precept and example He taught others to pray.

Nothing is commoner than the statement that Jesus had nothing to do with the founding of the church or the arrangement of its polity; but this is a subjective prejudice, blind to the facts of the case. Jesus realized that the worship of the Old Testament was passing away, but He was Himself to replace it by a better order. He did not merely breathe into the air a spirit of sweetness and light; if this had been all He did, Christianity would soon have vanished from the earth; but He provided channels in which, after His departure, His influence should flow to subsequent generations. Not only did He found the church, but He appointed the most important details of its organization, such as preaching and the sacraments; and He left the Twelve behind Him not only as teachers, but as those who were able to instruct other teachers also. There may be ecclesiastical arrangements which are worked in a spirit far removed from the love of God; and such are of course contrary to the mind of Christ; but the love of God, if it is strong, inevitably overflows into the things of God, and cannot, in fact, permanently exist without them.

(b) Duty to Man:

As has been hinted above, the sayings of our Lord about the details of duty to man are less numerous than might have been expected, but what may be lacking in numbers is made up for in originality and comprehensiveness. Many single sayings, like the Golden Rule (Mt 7:12) and the lovely word about a cup of cold water given in the name of Christ (Mt 10:42), are revolutionary in the ethical experience of mankind; and so are such parables as the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son and the Unmerciful Servant. The commandment to love enemies and to forgive injuries (Mt 5:43-48), if not entirely novel, received a prominence it had never possessed before. The spirit of all such sayings of Jesus is the same: He seeks to redeem men from selfishness and worldliness and to produce in them a godlike passion for the welfare of their fellow-creatures. These they may bless with gifts of money, where such may be required, still more with sympathy and helpfulness, but most of all with the gospel.

Besides such directions as to the behavior of man to man, there are also among the words of Jesus memorable maxims about the conduct of life in the family, in the state, and in society; and here again He taught even more by example than by precept. As son, brother and friend, He fulfilled all righteousness; but He also, as teacher, determined what righteousness was. Thus He opposed the laxity as to divorce prevalent in His time, pointing back to the pure ideal of Paradise. His conception of womanhood and His tenderness toward childhood have altered entirely the conceptions of men about these two conditions. He was a patriot, glorying in the beauty of His native Galilee and weeping over Jerusalem; and though, from birth to death, He was exposed to constant persecution from the constituted authorities, He not only obeyed these Himself but commanded all others to do the same. Nothing moved Him more than the sight of talents unused, and, therefore, it lay deep in His system of thought to call upon everyone to contribute his part to the service of the body politic; but no less did He recognize the right of those who have done their part of the general task to share in the fruits of industry;

"for the laborer is worthy of his hire" (Lu 10:7).

Priceless, however, as are the commandments of Jesus in regard to the things of man, as well as in regard to the things of God, it is not in these that we have to seek His ethical originality, but in the new motive brought into play by Him for doing the Divine will, when once it has been ascertained. As He made it easy to love God by revealing God's love, so did He make it easy to love man by revealing the greatness of man, as an immortal creature, who has come from God and is going to God. Whatever is done to man, good or evil, Jesus esteems as done to Himself; for the great saying to this effect, in the account of the Last Judgment in Mt 25, though applicable in the first place to Christians, may be extended to men in general. The corollary of the fatherhood of God is the brotherhood of men; and the second great commandment stands under the protection of the first.

II. In the Fourth Gospel.

1. Eternal Life:

In the Fourth Gospel Eternal Life takes the same place as the kingdom of God in the other three. The author is not, indeed, unaware that Jesus employed the latter phrase for the sum of the blessings brought by Him to the world; and it has already been remarked that the Synoptists occasionally employ "life" as an equivalent for the phrase they usually make use of. The reason of John's preference for his own phrase may have lain in some personal idiosyncrasy, or it may have been due to the Gentileenvironment in which he wrote. But the phrase is one suggestive and instructive in itself in the highest degree. It had already entered deeply into the language of religion before the time of Christ; indeed, in every part of Holy Writ the idea is common that separation from God is death, but that union with Him is life.

2. Its Source in God:

In the teaching of Jesus, as this is found in John, the world lies in death, because it has become separated from God, and the children of men are in danger of perishing everlastingly as the punishment of their sin; but "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life" (Joh 3:16).

3. Through the Son:

This life is, first, in God, who abides in everlasting blessedness; but it is not, even in Him, at rest, but agitated with an impulse to communicate itself. Then, it is in the Son—"For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself" (Joh 5:26); not, however, for Himself alone, but for the purpose of being communicated to those destitute of it. For this reason He was made flesh and dwelt among us; and He communicated it through His words, which were "words of eternal life." The words of Jesus, as thus bringing life, are the "light" of the world; and they are the "truth"—two favorite expressions of this Gospel—or He of whom they speak is Himself the light and the truth; He said Himself, "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." He is in His word in such a way that, when it is received in the right spirit, He enters the soul personally—"ye in me, and I in you" (Joh 14:20). As food is taken into the body, to sustain life, so does He become the life of the soul; He is the "bread of life" and the "water of life" (Joh 6:35). As, however, bread has to be broken, before it is eaten, and water to be poured out, when it is drunk, so does the virtue which is in the Son of God only become available through His death—"I am the living bread which came down out of heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: yea and the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world" (Joh 6:51).

4. Need of New Birth:

The world lying dead in sin, a new birth is required for those who are to enter into life; and this is necessary even for so fine a character as Nicodemus (Joh 3:3,5,7). Without this change, the children of men are insensible to Divine revelations; and even the children of privilege, who had enjoyed the Old Testament revelation, were indifferent to eternal life, when it came near to them in the person of Christ. Hence, there was required a special drawing on the part of God to awaken the

sleeping soul—"No man can come to me, except the Father that sent me draw him" (Joh 6:44); and, where this influence was not responded to, there might be the most violent and persistent opposition to Christ on the part of those who believed themselves to be the favorites of heaven. The new birth is accompanied with spiritual vision—"seeing the kingdom of God" (Joh 3:3)—and, throughout the Fourth Gospel, remarkable stress is laid on the virtue of such seeing or knowing. It leads so directly to faith that to "know" and to "believe" are virtually the same act (Joh 10:38). Faith is the reception into the soul of the life eternal, or of Him who has been discerned by the spiritual vision and who is Himself the life. It is the eating of the bread of life, the drinking of the water of life, and it makes and keeps alive.

5. Nature of Faith:

Since faith is thus the means whereby the eternal life becomes a personal possession, it is the one thing needful and the sum of all the commandments—"This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent" (Joh 6:29). It is the unique commandment, comprehending all the commandments, and it "worketh by love" toward the fulfillment of them all. What these are is, however, less brought out in detail in this Gospel than in the others, for it is a peculiarity of the mind of Jesus, as recorded by John, to deal with central principles and to assume that the consequences will follow as a matter of course. Of the organization, for example, of the community which was to perpetuate His influence, after He had left the world, He says much less in this Gospel than even in the Synoptists; yet He characterizes the very essence of the new body in such words as this, "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that thou didst send me, and lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me" (Joh 17:23). In the last half of this saying there is a hint of the influence to be exerted on the outside world by the display of Christian character, with the result of producing belief; but this aim was to be sought more directly through testimony (Joh 15:27) and the "word" of the disciples (Joh 17:20). Thus would even the distant, "which are not of this fold," be brought in, so that there might be "one flock" and "one shepherd" (Joh 10:16). Inside the fold it is the greatest privilege and honor, as well as responsibility, to feed the "sheep" and to feed the "lambs" (Joh 21:15,16,17).

6. Fruits of Union with Christ:

Character and conduct are, even for the disciples of Christ, "commandments," as, indeed, Jesus does not disdain to speak of the various parts of His own vocation by the same humble name, implying the necessity of moral effort and the temptation to failure (Joh 15:10). Therefore, they are also proper subjects for prayer. He prayed for the disciples, both that they might be kept from the evil in the world and that they might be sanctified through the truth (Joh 17:15,17), and doubtless He expected them to ask the same things for themselves, as theirs was to be a life of prayer (Joh 16:24). But, in the last resort, they are the fruits of union with Himself, and eternal life is not merely a gift of the future, to be given at the death of the body, but is enjoyed even now by those who abide in the vine.

LITERATURE.

Monographs on the ethics of Jesus in German by Grimm and in English by King; compare also Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question, and Jesus Christ and the Christian Character; relevant portions works of larger scope, such as Jacoby, New Testament Ethik, Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, and the handbooks of New Testament theology by Weiss, Holtzmann, Schlatter, Feine, Weinel, Stevens. Very ample references to literature in Stalker, The Ethic of Jesus.

James Stalker

ETHICS, I

eth’-iks:

Contents I. NATURE AND FUNCTION OF ETHICS

1. Rise of Ethics 2. Ethics as a Science 3. A Normative Science 4. Relation to Cognate Sciences (1) Ethics and Metaphysics (2) Ethics and Psychology The "Ought" 5. Relation of Christian Ethics to Moral Philosophy (1) Not an Opposition (2) Philosophical Postulates (3) Method 6. Relation of Christian Ethics to Dogmatics (1) The Connection (2) The Distinction (3) Theological Postulates (a) The Christian Idea of God (b) The Christian Doctrine of Sin (c) The Responsibility of Man

II. HISTORICAL SKETCH OF ETHICS

1. Greek Philosophy (1) Sophists (2) Socrates (3) Plato (4) Aristotle (5) Stoics and Epicureans (6) Stoicism (7) Stoicism and Paul 2. Scholasticism 3. Reformation Descartes and Spinoza 4. English Moralists 5. Utilitarianism 6. Evolutionary Ethics 7. Kant 8. German Idealists (1) Hegel (2) Watchwords: Pleasure and Duty

III. PRINCIPLES AND CHARACTERISTICS OF BIBLICAL ETHICS

1. Ethics of the Old Testament (1) Religious Characteristics of Hebrew Ethics (a) The Decalogue (b) Civil Laws (c) Ceremonial Laws (d) Prophecy (e) Books of Wisdom (f) Apocryphal Books (2) Limitations of Old Testament Ethics (a) As to Intent (b) As to Extent 2. Outline of New Testament Ethics (1) Ethics of Jesus and Paul (2) Character (3) Inwardness of Motive (4) Ultimate End 3. The Ethical Ideal (1) Holiness (2) Christlikeness (3) Brotherhood and Unity of Man 4. The Dynamic Power of the New Life (1) The Dynamic on Its Divine Side (2) The Dynamic on Its Human Side 5. Virtues, Duties and Spheres of the New Life (1) The Virtues (a) The Heroic Virtues (b) The Amiable Virtues (c) The Theological Virtues (2) The Duties (a) Duties toward Self (b) Duties in Relation to Others (c) Duties in Relation to God (3) Spheres and Relationships 6. Conclusion Absoluteness, Inwardness and Universality LITERATURE

==========

In this article, which proposes to be of a general and introductory character, we shall first deal with the nature and function of ethics generally, showing its difference from and relation to other cognate branches of inquiry. Secondly, we shall sketch briefly the history of ethics in so far as the various stages of its development bear upon and prepare the way for Christian ethics, indicating also the subsequent course of ethical speculation. Thirdly, we shall give some account of Biblical ethics; treating first of the main moral ideas contained in the Old Testament, and enumerating, secondly, the general principles and leading characteristics which underlie the ethical teaching of the New Testament.

I. Nature and Function of Ethics.

Ethics is that branch of philosophy which is concerned with human character and conduct. It deals with man, not so much as a subject of knowledge, as a source of action. It has to do with life or personality in its inward dispositions, outward manifestations and social relations. It was Aristotle who first gave to this study its name and systematic form. According to the Greek signification of the term, it is the science of customs (ethika, from ethos, "custom," "habit," "disposition"). But inasmuch as the words "custom" and "habit" seem to refer only to outward manners or usages, the mere etymology would limit the nature of the inquiry. The same limitation exists in the Latin designation, "moral," since mores concerns primarily manners.

1. Rise of Ethics:

Men live before they reflect, and act before they examine the grounds of action. So long as there is a congruity between the habits of an individual or a people and the practical requirements of life, ethical questions do not occur. It is only when difficulties arise and new problems appear as to right and duty in which the existing customs of life offer no solution, that doubt awakes, and with doubt reflection upon the actual morality which governs life. It is when men begin to call in question their past usages and institutions and to read-just their attitude to old traditions and new interests that ethics appears. Ethics is not morality but reflection upon morality. When, therefore, Aristotle, following Socrates and Plato, employed the term, he had in view not merely a description of the outward life of man, but rather the sources of action and the objects as ends which ought to guide him in the proper conduct of life. According to the best usage the names Moral Philosophy and Ethics are equivalent and mean generally the rational explanation of our nature, actions and relations as moral and responsible beings. Ethics therefore may be defined as the systematic study of human character, and its function is to show how human life must be fashioned to realize its end or purpose.

2. Ethics as a Science:

But accepting this general definition, how, it may be asked, can we speak of a science of conduct at all? Has not science to do with necessary truths, to trace effects from causes, to formulate general laws according to which these causes act, and to draw inevitable and necessary consequences? But is not character just that concerning which no definite conclusions can be predicted? Is not conduct, dependent as it is on the human will, just that which cannot be explained as the resultant of calculable forces? If the will is free then you cannot decide beforehand what line it will take, or predict what shape character must assume. The whole conception of a science of ethics, it is contended, must fall to the ground if we admit an invariable and calculable element in conduct. But this objection is based partly upon a misconception of the function of science and partly upon a too narrow classification of the sciences. Science has not only to do with cause and effect and the laws according to which phenomena actually occur. Science seeks to deal systematically with all truths that are presented to us; and there is a large class of truths not belonging indeed to the realm of natural and physical events which, however, may be studied and correlated. Ethics is not indeed concerned with conduct, as a natural fact, as something done here and now following from certain causes in the past and succeeded by certain results in the future. It is concerned with judgments upon conduct—the judgment that such conduct is right or wrong as measured by a certain standard or end. Hence, a distinction has been made between the physical sciences and what are called normative sciences.

3. A Normative Science:

The natural or physical sciences are concerned simply with phenomena of Nature or mind, actual occurrences which have to be analyzed and classified. The normative sciences, on the other hand, have to do not with mere facts in time or space, but with judgments about these facts, with certain standards or ends (norms, from norma, "a rule") in accordance with which the facts are to be valued. Man cannot be explained by natural law. He is not simply a part of the world, a link in the chain of causality. When we reflect upon his life and his relation to the world we find that he is conscious of himself as an end and that he is capable of forming purposes, of proposing new ends and of directing his thoughts and actions with a view to the attainment of these ends, and making things subservient to him. Such an end or purpose thus forms a norm for the regulation of life; and the laws which must be observed for the attainment of such an end form the subjects of a normal or normative science. Ethics therefore has to do with the norm or standard of right or wrong, and is concerned primarily with the laws which regulate our judgments and guide our actions.

4. Relation to Cognate Sciences:

Man is of course a unity, but it is possible to view his self-consciousness in three different aspects, and to regard his personality as constituted of an intellectual, sentient and volitional element. Roughly corresponding to these three aspects, one in reality but separable in thought, there arise three distinct though interdependent mental sciences: metaphysics, which has to do with man’s relation to the universe of which he forms a part; psychology, which deals with the nature, constitution and evolution of his faculties and feelings as a psychical being; and ethics, which treats of him as a volitional

being, possessing will or determining activity.

(1) Ethics and Metaphysics.

Ethics, though distinct from, is closely connected with metaphysics on the one hand, and psychology on the other. If we take metaphysics in its widest sense as including natural theology and as positing some ultimate end to the realization of which the whole process of the world is somehow a means, we may easily see how it is a necessary presupposition or basis of ethical inquiry. The world as made and governed by and for an intelligent purpose, and man as a part of it, having his place and function in a great teleological cosmos, are postulates of the moral life and must be accepted as a basis of all ethical study. The distinction between ethics and metaphysics did not arise at once. In early Greek philosophy they were closely united. Even now the two subjects cannot be completely dissociated. Ethics invariably runs back into metaphysics, or at least into theology, and in every philosophical system in which the universe is regarded as having an ultimate end or good, the good of human beings is conceived as identical with or included in the universal good (see Ziegler, Gesch. der christlichen Ethik; also Sidgwick, History of Ethics).

(2) Ethics and Psychology.

On the other hand ethics is closely associated with, though distinguishable from, psychology. Questions of conduct inevitably lead to inquiries as to certain states of the agent's mind, for we cannot pronounce an action morally good or bad until we have investigated the qualities of intention, purpose, motive and disposition which lie at the root of the action. Hence, all students of ethics are agreed that the main object of their investigation must belong to the psychical side of human life, whether they hold that man's ultimate end is to be found in the sphere of pleasure or they maintain that his well-being lies in the realization of virtue. Questions as to existence, evolution and adequacy of a moral faculty (see CONSCIENCE); as to the relation of pleasure and desire; as to the meaning of validity of voluntary action; as to the historical evolution of moral customs and ideals, and man's relation at each stage of his being to the social, political and religious institutions, belong indeed to a science of ethics, but they have their roots in psychology as a study of the human soul.

The very existence of a science of ethics depends upon the answers which psychology gives to such questions. If, for example, we decide that there is no such faculty in man as conscience and that the moral sense is but a natural manifestation which has gradually evolved with the physical and social evolution of man (Darwin, Spencer); or if we deny the self-determining power of human beings and assume that the freedom of the will is a delusion, or in the last resort a negligible element, and treat man as one of the many phenomena of a physical universe, then indeed we may continue to speak of a science of the moral life as some naturalistic writers do, but such a science would not be a science of ethics as we understand it. Whatever be our explanation of conscience and freedom, no theory as to these powers must depersonalize man, and we may be justly suspicious of any system of psychology which undermines the authority of the moral sense or paves the way for a complete irresponsibility. The "Ought."

Ethics is based on the assumption that man is a person possessing rights and having duties—responsible therefore for his intentions as well as his actions. The idea of personality involves not only a sense of accountability but carries with it also the conception of a law to which man is to conform, an ideal at which he is to aim. The end of life with all its implications forms the subject of ethics. It is concerned not simply with what a man is or does, but more particularly with what he should be and do. Hence, the word "ought" is the most distinctive term of ethics. The "ought" of life constitutes at once the end or ideal and the law of man. It comprises end, rule and motive of action. Thus the problem of ethics comes to be regarded as the highest good of man, the to agathon, of the Greeks, the summum bonum of Latin philosophy.

5. Relation of Christian Ethics to Moral Philosophy:

If ethics generally is based upon the postulates of philosophy and psychology, and at each stage of human consciousness grounds its principles of life upon the view of the world and of man to which it has attained, Christian ethics presupposes

the Christian view of life as revealed by Christ, and its definition must be in harmony with the Christian ideal. Christian ethics is the science of morals conditioned by Christianity, and the problems which it discusses are the nature, laws and duties of the moral life as dominated by the Supreme Good which Christians believe to have been revealed in and through the life and teaching of Jesus Christ. Christian ethics is thus a branch or particular application of general ethics. So far from being opposed to moral philosophy it is the inevitable outcome of the evolution of thought. For if the revelation of God through Christ is true, then it is a factor, and the greatest in life and destiny, which must condition man's entire outlook and give a new value to his aims and duties.

(1) Not an Opposition.

In Christianity we are confronted with the motive power of a great Personality entering into the current of human history, and by His preeminent spiritual force giving a direction to the moral life of man. This means that the moral life can only be understood by reference to the creative power of this Personality. If there is any place at all for a distinct science of Christian ethics, that place can be indicated only by starting from the ethical ideal embodied in Christ, and working out from that point a code of morality for the practical guidance of the Christian life. But while this truth gives to Christian ethics its distinctive character and preeminent worth, it neither throws discredit upon philosophical ethics nor separates the two sciences by any hard-and-fast lines. They have much in common. A large domain of conduct is covered by both. The so-called pagan virtues have their worth for Christian character and are in the line of Christian virtues. Man even in his natural state is constituted for the moral life and is not without some knowledge of right and wrong (Ro 1:20). The moral attainments of the ancients are not simply "splendid vices." Duty may differ in content, but it is of the same kind under every system. Purity is purity, and benevolence benevolence, and both are excellences, whether manifested in a heathen or a Christian. While therefore Christian ethics takes its point of departure from the revelation of God and the manifestation of man's possibilities in Christ, it accepts and uses the results of moral philosophy in so far as they throw light upon the fundamental facts of human nature. As a system of morals Christianity claims to be inclusive. It takes cognizance of all the data of consciousness, and assumes all ascertained truth as its own. It completes what is lacking in other systems in so far as their conclusions are based on an incomplete survey of facts. Christian morals, in short, deal with personality in its highest ranges of moral power and spiritual consciousness, and seek to interpret life by its greatest possibilities and loftiest attainments as they have been revealed in Christ.

(2) Philosophical Postulates.

As illustrating what has just been said two distinctive features of Christian morals may be noted, of which philosophical ethics takes little or no account:

(a) Christian ethics assumes a latent spirituality in man awaiting the Spirit of God to call it forth. "Human nature," says Newman Smyth, "has its existence in an ethical sphere and for moral ends of being." There is a natural capacity for ethical life to which man's whole constitution points. Matter itself may be said to exist ultimately for spirit, and the spirit of man for the Holy Spirit (compare Rothe, Theologische Ethik, I, 459). No theory of man's physical beginning can interfere with the assumption that man stands upon a moral plane and is capable of a life which shapes itself to spiritual ends. Whatever be man's history and evolution, he has from the beginning been made in God's image, and he bears the Divine impress in all the lineaments of his body and soul. His degradation cannot wholly obliterate his nobility, and his actual corruption bears witness to his possible holiness. Christian morality is therefore nothing else than the morality prepared from all eternity, and is but the highest realization of that which heathen virtue was striving after. This is the Pauline view of human nature. Jesus Christ, according to the apostle, is the end and consummation of the whole creation. Everywhere there is a capacity for Christ. Man is not simply what he now is, but all that he is yet to be (1Co 15:47-49).

(b) Connected with this peculiarity is another which further differentiates Christian ethics from philosophical—the problem of the re-creation of character. Speculative systems do not advance beyond the formation of moral requirements; they prescribe what ought ideally to be done or avoided. Christianity, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with the question, By what power can I achieve the right and the good? (compare Ottley, Christian Ideas and Ideals, 22). It regards

human nature as in need of renewal and recovery. It points to a process by which character can be restored and transformed. It claims to be the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth (Ro 1:16). Christian ethics thus makes the twofold assumption, and in this its contrast to philosophical ethics is disclosed, that the ideal of humanity has been revealed in Jesus Christ and that in Him also there is supplied a power by which man may become his true self, all that his natural life gives promise of and potentially is.

(3) Method.

Passing from a consideration of the data of Christian ethics to its method, we find that here again there is much that is common to philosophy and Christian morals. The method in both is the rational method. The Christian ideal, though given in Christ, has to be examined, analyzed and applied by the very same faculties as man employs in regard to speculative problems. All science must be furnished with facts, and its task is to give a consistent explanation of them. While the speculative thinker finds his facts in the constitution of the moral world at large, the Christian discovers his in Scripture, and more particularly in the teachings of Christ. But it is sufficient to point out that while the New Testament is largely occupied with ethical matters, there is no attempt at a scientific formulation of them. The materials of systematic treatment are there, but the task of coordinating and classifying principles is the work of the expositor. The data are supplied but these data require to be interpreted, unified and applied so as to form a system of ethics. Consequently in dealing with his facts, the same method must be employed by the Christian expositor as by the student of science. That is the method of rational inquiry and inductive procedure—the method imposed upon all mental problems by the essential nature of the mind itself. The authority to which Christian ethics appeals is not an external oracle which imposes its dictates in a mechanical way. It is an authority embodied in intelligible forms and appealing to the reasoning faculties of man. Christian ethics is not a cut-and-dried, ready-made code. It has to be thought out by man and brought to bear, through the instrumentality of his thinking powers, upon all the relationships of life. According to the Protestant view, at least, ethics is no stereotyped compendium of rules which the Bible or the church supplies to save a man from the trouble of thinking. It is a complete misapprehension of the nature of Scripture and of the purpose of Christ’s example and teaching to assume that they afford a mechanical standard which must be copied or obeyed in a slavish way. Christ appeals to the rational nature of man, and His words are life and spirit only as they are apprehended in an intelligent way and become by inner conviction and personal appropriation the principles of thought and action:

6. Relation of Christian Ethics to Dogmatics:

Within the domain of theology the two main constituents of Christian of teaching are dogmatics and ethics, or doctrine and morals. Though it is convenient to treat these separately, they really form a whole, and are but two sides of one subject. It is difficult to define their limits, and to say where dogmatics ends and ethics begins.

The distinction has sometimes been expressed by saying that dogmatics is a theoretic, while ethics is a practical science. It is true that ethics stands nearer to everyday life and deals with methods of practical conduct, while dogmatics is concerned with beliefs and treats of their origin and elucidation. But on the other hand ethics discusses thoughts as well as actions, and is interested in inner judgments not less than outward achievements. There is a practical side to all doctrine; and there is a theoretic side of all morals. In proportion as dogmatic theology becomes divorced from practical interest there is a danger that it may become mere pedantry. Even the most theoretic of sciences, metaphysics, while, as Novalis said, it bakes no bread, has its justification in its bearing upon life. On the other hand, ethics would lose all scientific value and would sink into a mere enumeration of duties if it had no dogmatic basis and did not draw its motives from beliefs. The common statement that dogmatics shows what we should believe and ethics what we should do is only approximately true and is inadequate. For moral laws and precepts are also objects of faith, and what we should believe involves a moral requirement and has a moral character.

(1) The Connection.

Schleiermacher has been frequently charged with ignoring the differences between the two disciplines, but with scant

justice; for while he regards the two studies as but different branches of Christian doctrine and while emphasizing their intimate connection, he by no means neglects their differences (compare Schleiermacher, Christliche Lehre, 1-24). Recent Christian moralists (Dorner, Martensen, Wuttke, Haering, Lemme) tend to accentuate the distinction and claim for them a separate discussion. The ultimate connection cannot indeed be overlooked without loss to both. It leads only to confusion to talk of a creedless morality, and the attempt to deal with moral questions without reference to their dogmatic implication will not only rob Christian ethics of its distinctive character and justification, but will reduce the exposition to a mere system of emotionalism. Dogmatics and ethics may be regarded as interdependent and mutually serviceable. On the one hand, ethics saves dogmatics from evaporating into unsubstantial speculation, and, by affording the test of life and workableness, keeps it upon the solid foundation of fact. On the other hand, dogmatics supplies ethics with its formative principles and normative standards, and preserves the moral life from degenerating into the vagaries of fanaticism or the apathy of fatalism.

(2) The Distinction.

While both sciences form the complementary sides of theology, and stand in the relation of mutual service, ethics presupposes dogmatics and is based upon its postulates. Dogmatics presents the essence, contents and object of the religious consciousness; ethics presents this consciousness as a power determining the human will (Wuttke). In the one, the Christian life is regarded from the standpoint of dependence on God; in the other, from the standpoint of human freedom. Dogmatics deals with faith in relation to God, and as the receptive organ of Divine grace; ethics considers it rather in its relation to man as a human activity, and as the organ of conduct (compare Lemme, Christliche Ethik, I, 15). Doctrine shows us how our adoption into the kingdom of God is the work of Divine love; ethics shows us how this knowledge of salvation manifests itself in love to God and our neighbor and must be worked out through all the relationships of life (compare Haering).

(3) Theological Postulates.

From this point of view we may see how dogmatics supplies to ethics certain postulates which may briefly be enumerated.

(a) The Christian Idea of God:

God is not merely a force or even a creator as He is presented in philosophy. Divine power must be qualified by what we term the moral attributes of God. We do not deny His omnipotence, but we look beyond it to "the love that tops the power, the Christ in God." Moreover we recognize a gradation in God’s moral qualities:

(a) benevolence or kindness;

(b) more deeply ethical and in seeming contrast to His benevolence, Divine justice—not mere blind benevolence but a kindness which is wise and discriminating (compare Butler);

(c) highest in the scale of Divine attributes, uniting in one comprehensive quality kindness and justice, stands Divine love or grace. The God whom dogmatics postulates to ethics is God in Christ.

(b) The Christian Doctrine of Sin. It is not the province of ethics to discuss the origin of evil or propound a theory of sin. But it must see to it that the view it takes is consistent with the truths of revelation and in harmony with the facts of life. A false or inadequate conception of sin is as detrimental for ethics as it is for dogmatics, and upon our doctrine of evil depends very largely our view of life as to its difficulties and purposes, its trials and triumphs. Three views of sin have been held. According to some (eg. the ancient Greeks) sin is simply a defect or shortcoming, a missing of the mark (hamartia, the active principle, or hamartema, the result); according to others, it is a disease, a thing latent in the constitution or at least an infirmity or limitation inherent in the flesh and resulting from heredity and environment (see EVOLUTION). While there is truth in both of these views, by themselves, each separately, or both in combination, is

defective. They do not sufficiently take account of the personal self-determinative element in all sin. It is a misfortune, a fate from which the notion of guilt is absent. The Christian view implies these conceptions, but it adds its own distinctive note which gives to them their value. Sin is not merely a negative thing, it is something positive, an inward dominating force. It is not merely an imperfection, or want; it is an excess, a trespass. It is not simply an inherited and inherent malady; it is a self-chosen perversion. It is not inherent in the flesh or animal impulses and physical passions: it belongs rather to the mind and will. Its essence lies in selfishness. It is the deliberate choice of self in preference to God. It is personal and willful rebellion. It is to be overcome, therefore, not by the suppression of the body or the excision of the passions, but by the acceptance of a new principle of life and a transformation of the whole man. There are of course degrees and stages of wrongdoing, and there are compensating circumstances which must be taken into account in estimating the significance of evil; but in its last resort Christian ethics postulates the fact of sin and regards it as personal rebellion against the holiness of God, as the deliberate choice of self and the willful perversion of all the powers of man into instruments of unrighteousness.

(c) The Responsibility of Man:

A third postulate arises as a consequence from the Christian view of God and the Christian view of sin, namely, the responsibility of man. Christian ethics treats every man as accountable for his thoughts and actions, and therefore capable of choosing the good as revealed in Christ. While not denying the sovereignty of God or minimizing the mystery of evil and clearly recognizing the universality of sin, Christianity firmly maintains the doctrine of human freedom and accountability. An ethic would be impossible if, on the one side, grace were absolutely irresistible, and if, on the other, sin were necessitated, if at any single point wrongdoing were inevitable. Whatever be our doctrine on these subjects, ethics demands that freedom of the will be safeguarded.

At this point an interesting question emerges as to the possibility, apart from a knowledge of Christ, of choosing the good. Difficult as this question is, and though it was answered by Augustine and many of the early Fathers in the negative, the modern, and probably the more just, view is that we cannot hold mankind responsible unless we accord to all men the larger freedom. If non-Christians are fated to do evil, then no guilt can be imputed. History shows that a love for goodness has sometimes existed, and that many isolated acts of purity and kindness have been done, among people who have known nothing of the historical Christ. The New Testament recognizes degrees of depravity in nations and individuals and a measure of noble aspiration and earnest effort in ordinary human nature. Paul plainly assumes some knowledge and performance on the part of the heathen, and though he denounces their immorality in unsparing terms he does not affirm that pagan society was so utterly corrupt that it had lost all knowledge of moral good.

Continued 8230

ETHICS, II

II. Historical Sketch of Ethics.

A comprehensive treatment of our subject would naturally include a history of ethics from the earliest times to the present. For ethics as a branch of philosophical inquiry partakes of the historical development of all thought, and the problems which it presents to our day can be rightly appreciated only in the light of certain categories and concepts—such as end, good, virtue, duty, pleasure, egoism and altruism—which have been evolved through the successive stages of the movement of ethical thoughts. All we can attempt here, however, is the baldest outline of the different epochs of ethical inquiry as indicating the preparatory stages which lead up to and find their solution in the ethics of Christianity.

1. Greek Philosophy:

(1) Sophists.

All the great religions of the world—of India, Persia and Egypt—have had their ethical implicates, but these have consisted for the most part of loosely connected moral precepts or adages. Before the golden age of Greek philosophy there were no ethics in the strict sense. The moral consciousness of the Greeks takes its rise with the Sophists, and particularly with Socrates, who were the first to protest against the long-established customs and traditions of their land. The so-called "wise men" were in part moralists, but their sayings are but isolated maxims presenting no unity or connection. Philosophy proper occupied itself primarily with purely metaphysical or ontological questions as to the nature of being, the form and origin and primal elements of the world. It was only when Greek religion and poetry had lost their hold upon the cultured and the beliefs of the past had come to be doubted, that questions as to the meaning of life and conduct arose.

(2) Socrates.

Already the Sophists had drawn attention to the vagueness and inconsistency of common opinion, and had begun to teach the art of conduct, but it was Socrates who, as it was said, first brought philosophy down from heaven to the sphere of the earth and directed men's minds from merely natural things to human life. He was indeed the first moral philosopher, inasmuch as, while the Sophists talked about justice and law and temperance, they could not tell, when pressed, what these things were. The first task of Socrates, therefore, was to expose human ignorance. All our confusion and disputes about good arise, says. Socrates, from want of clear knowledge. He aimed, therefore, at producing knowledge, not merely for its own sake, but because he believed it to be the ground of all right conduct. Nobody does wrong willingly. Let a man know what is good, that is, what is truly beneficial, and he will do it. Hence, the famous Socratic dictum, "Virtue is knowledge and vice is ignorance." With all his intellectualism Socrates was really a hedonist, believing that pleasure was the ultimate end of life. For it must not be imagined that he conceived of knowledge of virtue as distinct from interest. Everyone naturally seeks the good because the good is really identified with his happiness. The wise man is necessarily the happy man, and hence, "to know one's self" is to learn the secret of well-being.

(3) Plato.

While Socrates was the first to direct attention to the nature of virtue, his one-sided and fragmentary conception of it received a more systematic treatment from Plato, who attempted to define the nature and end of man by his place in the cosmos. Plato thus brought ethics into intimate connection with metaphysics. He conceived an ideal world in which everything earthly and human had its prototype. The human soul is derived from the world-soul and, like it, is a mixture of two elements. On the one side, in virtue of reason, it participates in the world of ideas, or the life of God; and on the other, by virtue of its animal impulses, it partakes of the world of decay, the corporeal world. These two dissimilar parts are connected by an intermediate element, which Plato calls thumos, embracing courage, the love of honor and the affections of the heart—a term which may be translated by the will. The constitution of the inner man is manifested in his outward organization. The head is the seat of reason, the breast of the heart and the affections, and the lower part of the body of the organs of animal desire. If we ask, Who is the just man? Plato answers, The man in whom the three elements just mentioned harmonize. We thus arrive at the scheme of the so-called "cardinal virtues" which have persisted through all ages and have given direction to all ethical discussion—wisdom, courage, temperance which, in combination, give us justice. It will thus be observed that virtue is no longer simply identified with knowledge; but another form of bad conduct besides ignorance is assumed, namely, the internal disorder and conflict of the soul, in which the lower impulses war with the higher. This, it will be seen, is a distinct advance on the one-sided position of Socrates; but in his attempt to reconcile the two movements in the conflict of life, Plato does not succeed in overcoming the duality. The inner impulses are ever dragging man down, and man's true well-being lies in the attainment of the life of reason. But though there are gleams of a higher solution in Plato, as a rule he falls back upon the idea that virtue is to be attained only by the suppression of the animal passions and the mortifying of the lower life. Plato affords us also the primal elements of social ethics. Morality as conceived by him is not something belonging merely to the individual, but has its full realization in the state. Man is indeed but-a type of the larger cosmos, and it is not as an individual but as a citizen that he is capable of realizing his true life.

(4) Aristotle.

The ethics of Aristotle, while it completes, does not essentially differ from that of Plato. He is the first to treat of the subject formally as a science, which assumes in his hands a division of politics. For, as he says, man is really "a social animal"; and, even more decisively than Plato, he treats of man as a part of society. Aristotle begins his great work on ethics with the discussion of the chief good, which he declares to be happiness or well-being. Happiness does not consist, however, in sensual pleasure, or even in the pursuit of honor, but in a life of well-ordered contemplation, "an activity of the soul in accordance with reason" (Nic. Eth., I, chapter v). But to reach the goal of right thinking and right doing, both favorable surroundings and proper instruction are required. Virtue is not virtue until it is a habit, and the only way to become virtuous is to practice virtue. It will thus be seen that Aristotle balances the one-sided emphasis of Socrates and Plato upon knowledge by the insistence upon habit. Activity must be combined with reason. The past and the present, environment and knowledge, must both be acknowledged as elements in the making of life. The virtues are thus habits, but habits of deliberate choice. Virtue is therefore an activity which at every point seeks to strike the mean between two opposite excesses. Plato's list of virtues had the merit of simplicity, but Aristotle's, though fuller, lacks system and consists generally of right actions which are determined in reference to two extremes. One defect which strikes a modern is that among the virtues benevolence is not recognized except obscurely as a form of liberality; and in general the gentler self-sacrificing virtues so prominent in Christianity have no place. The virtues. are chiefly aristocratic and are impossible for a slave. Again while Aristotle did well, in opposition to previous philosophy, to recognize the function of habit, it must be pointed out that habit of itself cannot make a man virtuous. Mere habit may be a hindrance and not a help to higher attainment. You cannot reduce morality to a succession of customary acts. But the main defect of Aristotle's treatment of virtue is that he regards the passions as wholly irrational and immoral. He does not see that passion in this sense can have no mean. If you may have too much of a good thing, you cannot have even a little of a bad thing. In man the desires and impulses are never purely irrational. Reason enters into all his appetites and gives to the body and all the physical powers an ethical value and a moral use. We do not become virtuous by curbing the passions but by transfiguring them into the vehicle of good. Aristotle, not less than Plato, is affected by the Greek duality which makes an antithesis between reason and impulse, and imparts to the former an external supremacy.

(5) Stoics and Epicureans.

The two conflicting elements of reason and impulse which neither Plato nor Aristotle succeeded in harmonizing ultimately gave rise to two opposite interpretations of the moral life. The Stoics selected the rational nature as the true guide to an ethical system, but they gave to it a supremacy so rigid as to threaten the extinction of the affections. The Epicureans, on the other hand, seizing the doctrine that happiness is the chief good, so accentuated the emotional side of nature as to open the door for all manner of sensual enjoyment. Both agree in determining the happiness of the individual as the final goal of moral conduct. It, is not necessary to dwell upon the particular tenets of Epicurus and his followers. For though both Epicureanism and Stoicism, as representing the chief tendencies of ethical inquiry, have exercised incalculable influence upon speculation and practical morals of later ages, it is the doctrines of Stoicism which have more specially come into contact with Christianity.

(6) Stoicism.

Without dwelling upon the stoic conception of the world, according to which the universe was a whole, interpenetrated and controlled by an inherent spirit, and the consequent view of life as proceeding from God and being in all its parts equally Divine, we may note that the Stoics, like Plato and Aristotle, regarded the realization of man's natural purpose as the true well-being or highest good. This idea they formulated into a principle: "Life according to Nature." The wise man is he who strives to live in agreement with his rational nature in all the circumstances of life. The law of Nature is to avoid what is hurtful and strive for what is appropriate; and pleasure arises as an accompaniment when a being obtains that which is fitting. Pleasure and pain are, however, to be regarded as mere accidents or incidents of life and to be met by the wise man with indifference. He alone is free, the master of himself and the world, who acknowledges the absolute supremacy of reason and makes himself independent of earthly desires. This life of freedom is open to all, for all men are equal, members of one great body. The slave may be as free as the consul and each can make the world his servant by living in harmony with it.

There is a certain sublimity in the ethics of Stoicism. It was a philosophy which appealed to noble minds and "it inspired nearly all the great characters of the early Roman empire and nerved every attempt to maintain the dignity and freedom of the human soul" (Lecky, History of European Morals, I, chapter ii). We cannot, however, be blind to its defects. With all their talk of Divine immanence and providence, it was nothing but an impersonal destiny which the Stoics recognized as governing the universe. "Harmony with Nature" was simply a sense of proud self-sufficiency. Stoicism is the glorification of reason, even to the extent of suppressing all emotion. It has no real sense of sin. Sin is un-reason, and salvation lies in the external control of the passions, in indifference and apathy begotten of the atrophy of desire. The great merit of the Stoics is that they emphasized inner moral integrity as the one condition of all right action and true happiness, and in an age of degeneracy insisted on the necessity of virtue. In its preference for the joys of the inner life and its scorn of the delights of sense; in its emphasis upon duty and its advocacy of a common humanity, together with its belief in the direct relation of each human soul to God, Stoicism, as revealed in the writings of a Seneca, a Marcus Aurelius and an Epictetus, not only showed how high paganism at its best could reach, but proved in a measure a preparation for Christianity with whose practical tenets, in spite of its imperfections, it had much in common.

(7) Stoicism and Paul.

That there are remarkable affinities between Stoicism and Pauline ethics has frequently been pointed out. The similarity both in language and sentiment can scarcely be accounted for by mere coincidence. There were elements in Stoic philosophy which Paul would not have dreamed of assimilating, and features with which he could have no sympathy. The pantheistic view of God and the material conception of the world, the self-conscious pride, the absence of all sense of sin and need of pardon, the temper of apathy and the unnatural suppression of feelings—these were features which could not but rouse in the apostle’s mind strong antagonism. But on the other hand there were certain well-known characteristics of a nobler order in Stoic morality which we may believe Paul found ready to his hand, ideas which he did not hesitate to incorporate in his teaching and employ in the service of the gospel. Without enlarging upon this line of thought (compare Alexander, Ethics of Paul), of these we may mention the immanence of God as the pervading cause of all life and activity; the idea of wisdom or knowledge as the ideal of man; the conception of freedom as the prerogative of the individual; and the notion of brotherhood as the goal of humanity.

2. Scholasticism:

It will be possible only to sketch in a few rapid strokes the subsequent development of ethical thought. After the varied life of the early centuries had passed, Christian ethic (so prominent in the Gospels and Epistles), like Christian theology, fell under the blight of Gnostieism (Alexandrian philosophy; compare Hatch, Hibbert Lectures) and latterly, of Scholasticism. Christian truth stiffened into a cumbrous catalogue of ecclesiastical observances. In the early Fathers (Barnabas, Clement, Origen, Gregory), dogmatic and ethical teaching were hardly distinguished. Cyprian discussed moral questions from the standpoint of church discipline.

The first real attempt at a Christian ethic was made by Ambrose, whose treatise on the Duties is an imitation of Cicero’s work of the same title. Even Augustine, notwithstanding his profound insight into the nature of sin, treats of moral questions incidentally. Perhaps the only writers among the schoolmen, except Alcuin (Virtues and Vices), who afford anything like elaborate moral treatises, are Abelard (Ethica, or Scito te Ipsum), Peter Lombard (Sentences), and, above all, Thomas Aquinas (Summa, II).

3. Reformation:

Emancipation from a legal dogmatism first came with the Reformation which was in essence a moral revival. The relation of God and man came to be re-stated under the inspiration of Biblical truth, and the value and rights of man as man, so long obscured, were disclosed. The conscience was liberated and Luther became the champion of individual liberty. Descartes and Spinoza.

The philosophical writers who most fully express in the domain of pure thought the protestant spirit are Descartes and Spinoza, with whom speculation with regard to man's distinctive nature and obligations took a new departure. Without following the fortunes of philosophy on the continent of Europe, which took a pantheistic form in Germany and a materialistic tone in France (though Rousseau directed the thought of Europe to the constitution of man), we may remark that in England thought assumed a practical complexion, and on the basis of the inquiries of Locke, Berkeley and Hume into the nature and limits of the human understanding, the quest. ions as to the source of moral obligation and the faculty of moral judgment came to the front.

4. English Moralists:

British moralists may be classified mainly cording to their views on this subject. Beginning with Hobbes, who maintained that man was naturally selfish and that all his actions were self-regarding, Cudworth, More, Wallaston, Shaftesbury, Hutchison, Adam Smith and others discussed the problem, with varying success, of the relation of individual and social virtues, agreeing generally that the right balance between the two is due' to moral sense which, like taste or perception of beauty, guides us in things moral. All these intuitional writers fall back upon a native selfish instinct. Selfishness, disguise it as we may, or, as it came to be called, utility, is really the spring and standard of action. Butler in his contention for the supremacy and uniqueness of conscience took an independent but scarcely more logical attitude. Both he and all the later British moralists, Paley, Bentham, Mill, suffer from a narrow, artificial psychology which conceives of the various faculties as separate and independent elements lying in man.

5. Utilitarianism:

Utilitarianism is a scheme of consequences which finds the moral quality of conduct in the effects and feelings created in the subject. With all their differences of detail the representatives of theory are at one in regarding the chief end of man as happiness. Bentham and Mill made the attempt to deduce benevolence from the egoistic startingpoint. "No reason can be given," says Mill (Utilitarianism, chapter iv), "why the general happiness is desirable except that each person .... desires his own happiness .... and the general happiness therefore is a good to the aggregate of all persons." Late utilitarians, dissatisfied with this non-sequitur and renouncing the dogma of personal pleasure, maintain that we ought to derive universal happiness because reason bids us (compare Sidgwick, Methods of Ethics, III, xiii). But what, we may ask, is this reason, and why should I listen to her voice?

6. Evolutionary Ethics:

The intuitional theory has more recently allied itself with the hypothesis of organic evolution. "These feelings of self- love and benevolence are really," says Spencer, "the products of development. The natural instincts and impulses to social good, though existent in a rudimentary animal form, have been evolved through environment, heredity and social institutions to which man through his long history has been subject." But this theory only carries the problem farther back, for, as Green well says (Proleg. to Ethics), "that countless generations should have passed during which a transmitted organism was progressively modified by reaction on its surroundings till an eternal consciousness could realize itself .... might add to the wonder, but it could not alter the results."

7. Kant:

The great rival of the pleasure-philosophy is that which has been styled "duty for duty's sake." This position was first taken by Kant whose principle of the "Categorical Imperative" utterly broke down theory of "pleasure for pleasure's sake." For Kant, conscience is simply practical reason; and its laws by him are reduced to unity. Reason, though limited in its knowledge of objects to phenomena of the senses, in the region of practice transcends the phenomenal and attains the real. The autonomy of the will carries us beyond the phenomenal into the supersensible world. Here the "Categorical Imperative" or moral law utters its "thou shalt" and prescribes' a principle of conduct irrespective of desire or ulterior end. In accordance with the nature of the Categorical Imperative, the formula of all morality is, "Act from a maxim at all times

fit for law universal" (Kritik d. praktischen Vernunft and Grundlage zur Metaphysik der Sitten).

This principle is, however, defective. For while it determines the subjective or formal side of duty, it tells us nothing of the objective side, of the content of duty. We may learn from Kant the grandeur of duty in the abstract and the need of obedience to it, but we do not learn what duty is. Kant's law remains formal, abstract and contentless, without relation to the matter of practical life.

8. German Idealists:

To overcome this abstraction, to give content to the law of reason and find its realization in the institutions and relationships of life and society, has been the aim of the later idealistic philosophy which starts from Kant.

(1) Hegel.

Following Fichte, for whom morality is action according to the ideas of reason—selfconsciousness finding itself in and through a world of deeds—Hegel starts with the Idea as the source of all reality, and develops the conception of Conscious Personality which, by overcoming the antithesis of impulse and thought, gradually attains to the full unity and realization of self in the consciousness of the world and of God. The law of Right or of all ethical ideal is, "Be a person and respect others as persons" (Hegel, Philosophic des Rechtes, section 31). These views have been worked out in recent British and American works of speculative ethics by Green, Bradley, Caird, McTaggart, Harris, Royce, Dewey, Watson. Man as a self is rooted in an infinite self or personality. Our individual self-consciousness is derived from and maintained by an infinite eternal and universal self-consciousness. Knowledge is, therefore, but the gradual discovery of mind in things, the progressive realization of the world as the self-manifestation of an infinite Personality with whom the finite intelligence of man is one. Hence, morality is the gradual unfolding of an eternal purpose whose whole is the perfection of man.

(2) Watchwords: Pleasure and Duty.

We have thus seen that in the history of ethics two great rival watchwords have been sounded—pleasure and duty, or, to put it another way, egoism and altruism. Both have their justification, yet each taken separately is abstract and one-sided. The problem of ethics is how to harmonize without suppressing these two extremes, how to unite social duty and individual right in a higher unity. We have seen that philosophical ethics has sought a synthesis of these conflicting moments in the higher and more adequate conception of human personality—a personality whose ideals and activities are identified with the eternal and universal personality of God. Christianity also recognizes the truth contained in the several types of ethical philosophy which we have passed under review, but it adds something which is distinctively its own, and thereby gives a new meaning to happiness and to duty, to self and to others.

Christian synthesis:

Christianity also emphasizes the realization of personality with all that it implies as the true goal of man; but while Christ bids man "be perfect as God is perfect," He shows us that we only find ourselves as we find ourselves in others; only by dying do we live; and only through profound self-surrender and sacrifice do we become ourselves and achieve the highest good.

Continued 8231

ETHICS, III

III. Principles and Characteristics of Biblical Ethics.

The sketch of the history of ethics just offered, brief as it necessarily is, may serve to indicate the ideas which have shaped modern thought and helped toward the interpretation of the Christian view of life which claims to be the fulfillment of all human attempts to explain the highest good. We now enter upon the third division of our subject which embraces a discussion generally of Biblical ethics, dealing first with the ethics of the Old Testament and next with the leading ideas of the New Testament.

1. Ethics of the Old Testament:

The gospel of Christ stands in the closest relation with Hebrew religion, and revelation in the New Testament fulfils and completes the promise given in the Old Testament. We have seen that the thinkers of Greece and Rome have contributed much to Christendom, and have helped to interpret Bible teaching with regard to truth and duty; but there is no such inward relation between them as that which connects Christian ethics with Old Testament morality. Christ himself, and still more the apostle Paul, assumed as a substratum of his teaching the revelation which had been granted to the Jews. The moral and religious doctrines which were comprehended under the designation of "the Law" formed for them, as Paul said (Ga 3:24,25), a paidagogos, or servant whose function it was to lead them to the school of Christ. In estimating the special character of Old Testament ethics, we are not concerned with questions as to authenticity and dates of the various books, nor with the manifold problems raised by modern Biblical criticism. While not forgetting the very long period which these books cover, involving changes of belief and life and embracing successive stages of political society, it is possible to regard the Old Testament simply as a body of writings which represent the successive ethical ideas of the Hebrews as a people.

(1) Religious Characteristics of Hebrew Ethics.

At the outset we are impressed by the fact that the moral ideal of Judaism was distinctly religious. The moral obligations were conceived as Divine commands and the moral law as a revelation of the Divine will. The religion was monotheistic. At first Yahweh may have been regarded merely as a tribal Deity, but gradually this restricted view gave place to a wider conception of God as the God of all men; and as such He was presented by the later prophets. God was for the Jew the supreme source and author of the moral law, and throughout his history duty was embodied in the Divine will. Early in the Pentateuch the note of law is struck, and the fundamental elements of Jewish morality are embedded in the story of Eden and the Fall. God’s commandment is the criterion and measure of man’s obedience. Evil which has its source and head in a hostile though subsidiary power consists in violation of Yahweh’s will.

(a) The Decalogue:

First among the various stages of Old Testament ethic must be mentioned the Mosaic legislation centering in the Decalogue (Ex 20; De 5). Whether the Ten Commandments issue from the time of Moses, or are a later summary of duty, they hold a supreme and formative place in the moral teaching of the Old Testament. All, including even the 4th, are purely moral enactments. But they are largely negative, only the 5th rising to positive duty. They are also chiefly external, regulative of outward conduct, forbidding acts but not taking note of intent and desire. The 6th and 7th commandments protect the rights of persons, while the 8th guards outward property. Though these laws may be shown to have their roots and sanctions in the moral consciousness of mankind and as such are applicable to all times and all men, it is clear that they were at first conceived by the Israelites to be restricted in their scope and practice to their own tribes.

(b) Civil Laws:

A further factor in the ethical education of Israel arose from the civil laws of the land. The Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:23), as revealing a certain advance in political legislation and jurisprudence, may be regarded as of this kind. Still the hard legal law of retaliation—"an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth"—discloses a barbarous conception of right. But along with the more primitive enactments of revenge and stern justice there are not wanting provisions of a kindlier nature, such as the law of release, the protection of the fugitive, the arrangements for the gleaner and the institution of the Year of

Jubilee.

(c) Ceremonial Laws:

Closely connected with the civil laws must be mentioned the ceremonial laws as an element in the moral life of Israel. If the civil laws had reference to the relation of man to his fellows, the ceremonial laws referred rather to the relation of man to God. The prevailing idea with regard to God, next to that of sovereign might, was holiness or separateness. The so-called Priestly Code, consisting of a number of ceremonial enactments, gradually took its place alongside of the Mosaic law, and was established to guard the being of God and the persons of the worshippers from profanation. These had to do (a) with sacrifices and offerings and forms of ritual which, while they typified and preshadowed the ideas of spiritual sanctity, often degenerated into superstitious practices (compare Am 5:25,26; Ho 6:6; Isa 1:11-13); (b) commands and prohibitions with regard to personal deportment—"meats and drinks and divers washings." Some of these had a sanitary significance; others guarded the habits of daily life from heathen defilement.

(d) Prophecy:

The dominant factor of Old Testament ethics lay in the influence of the prophets. They and not the priests were the great moralists of Israel. They are the champions of righteousness and integrity in political life, not less than of purity in the individual. They are the witnesses for God and the ruthless denouncers of all idolatry and defection from Him. They comment upon the social vices to which a more developed people is liable. They preach a social gospel and condemn wrongs done by man to man. Government and people are summoned to instant amendment and before the nation is held up a lofty ideal. The prophets are not only the, preachers, but also the philosophers of the people, and they direct men’s minds to the spiritual and ideal side of things, inveighing against worldliness and materialism.

Under their reflection, theories as to the origin and nature of evil begin to emerge, and the solemnity and worth of life are emphasized. While on the one hand the sense of individual responsibility is dwelt upon, on the other the idea of a hereditary taint of soul is developed, and it is shown that the consequences of sin may affect even the innocent. A man may inherit suffering and incur penalties, not apparently through any fault of his own, but simply by reason of his place in the solidarity of the race. Problems like these awaken deep perplexity which finds a voice not only in the Prophets but also in the Book of Job and in many of the Psalms. The solution is sought in the thought that God works through evil, and by its effects evolves man’s highest good. These conceptions reach their climax in the Second Isa, and particularly in chapter 53. God is constantly represented as longing to pardon and reinstate man in His favor; and the inadequacy of mere ceremonial as well as the failure of all material means of intercourse with Yahweh are repeatedly dwelt upon as preparing the way for the doctrine of salvation. In the Book of Pss—the devotional manual of the people reflecting the moral and religious life of the nation at various stages of its development—the same exalted character of God as a God of righteousness and holiness, hating evil and jealous for devotion, the same profound scorn of sin and the same high vocation of man are prevalent.

(e) Books of Wisdom:

Without dwelling at length on the ethical ideas of the other writings of the Old Testament—the Books of Wisdom, Proverbs, Job, Ecclesiastes—we may remark that the teaching is addressed more to individuals than prophecy is; while not being particularly lofty it is healthy and practical, shrewd, homely common sense. While the motives appealed to are not always the highest and have regard frequently to earthly prosperity and worldly policy, it must not be overlooked that moral practice is also frequently allied with the fear of God, and the fight choice of wisdom is represented as the dictate of piety not less than of prudence.

It is to the sapiential books (canonical and apocryphal) that we owe the most significant ethical figures of the Old Testament—the wise man and the fool. The wise man is he who orders his life in accordance with the laws of God. The fool is the self-willed man, whose life, lacking principle, fails of success. The nature of wisdom lies not in intellectual knowledge so much as in the control of passion and the prudent regulation of desire. The idea of human wisdom is

connected in these books with the sublime conception of Divine wisdom which colors both them and the Psalms. In some of the finest passages, Wisdom is personified as the counselor of God in the creation of the world (Pr 8; APC Wisdom 10; Job 28), or the guide which guards the destinies of man (The Wisdom of Solomon 10:15 ff).

If the sapiential books are utilitarian in tone the Book of Ecclesiastes is pessimistic. The writer is impressed with the futility of life. Neither pursuit of knowledge nor indulgence in pleasure affords satisfaction. All is vanity. Yet there is an element of submission in this book which only escapes despair by a grim and stolid inculcation of obedience to Divine command.

(f) Apocryphal Books:

In an article on the Ethics of the Bible some allusion ought to be made to the spirit of the apocryphal books, reflecting as they do the ideas of a considerable period of Jewish history immediately before and contemporaneous with the advent of Christ. While in general there is a distinct recognition of true moral life and a high regard for the moral law, there is no system of ethics nor even a prevailing ethical principle in these books. The collection presents the ideas of no one man or party, or even of one period or locality. The moral ideas of each book require to be considered separately (see special articles), and they ought to be studied in connection with the philosophy of Philo and generally with the speculation of Alexandria, upon which they exercised considerable influence. The Wisdom of Solomon is supposed by Pfieiderer and others to have affected the Hellenic complexion of Paul’s thought and also to have colored the stoic philosophy.

The apocryphal books as a whole do not give prominence to the idea of an ancient covenant and are not dominated by the notion of a redemptive climax to which the other Old Testament books bear witness. As a consequence their moral teaching lacks the spirituality of the Old Testament; and there is an insistence upon outward works rather than inward disposition as essential to righteousness. While wisdom and justice are commended, there is a certain self-satisfaction and pride in one’s own virtue, together with, on the part of the few select spirits which attain to virtue, a corresponding disparagement of and even contempt for the folly of the many. In Sirach especially this tone of self-righteous complacency is observable. There is a manifest lack of humility and sense of sin, while the attainment of happiness is represented as the direct result of personal virtue (Sirach 14:14 ff).

The Book of The Wisdom of Solomon shows traces of neo-Platonic influences and recognizes the four Platonic virtues (8:7) and while admitting the corruption of all men (9:12 ff) attributes the causes of evil to other sources than the will, maintaining the Greek dualism of body and soul and the inherent evil of the physical nature of man. The Book of Judith presents in narrative form a highly questionable morality. On the whole it must be recognized that the moral teaching of the Apocrypha is much below the best teaching of the Old Testament. While Sirach gives expression to a true piety, it manifests its want of depth in its treatment of sin and in the inculcation of merely prudential motives to goodness. In general the essence of love is unknown, and the moral temper is far inferior to the ethics of Jesus. It is a mundane morality that is preached. Hope is absent and righteousness is rewarded by long life and prosperity (Tobit). Legalism is the chief characteristic (Baruch), and Pharisaic ceremonialism on the one hand, and Sadducaic rationalism on the other are the natural and historical consequences of apocryphal teachings.

(2) Limitations of Old Testament Ethics.

In estimating the ethics of the Old Testament as a whole the fact must not be forgotten that it was preparatory, a stage in the progressive revelation of God’s will. We are not surprised, therefore, that, judged by the absolute standard of the New Testament, the morality of the Old Testament comes short in some particulars. Both in intent and extent, in spirit and in scope, it is lacking.

(a) As to intent:

The tendency to dwell upon the sufficiency of external acts rather than the necessity of inward disposition, may be

remarked; though as time went on, particularly in the later Prophets and some of the Psalms, the need of inward purity is insisted upon. While the ideal both for the nation and the individual is an exalted one—"Be ye holy for I am holy"—the aspect in which the character of God is represented is sometimes stern if not repellent (Ex 24; Nu 14:18; Ge 18; 2Sa 24:17). But at the same time there are not wanting more tender features (Isa 1:17; Mic 6:8), and the Divine Fatherhood finds frequent expression. Even though the penal code is severe and the ceremonial law stern, a gentler spirit shines through many of its provisions, and protection is afforded to the wage- earner, the poor and the dependent, while the regulations regarding slaves and foreigners and even lower animals are merciful (De 24:14,15; Jer 22:13,17; Mal 3:5; De 25:4).

Material motives:

Again we have already remarked that the motives to which the Old Testament appeals are often mercenary and material. Material prosperity plays an important part as an inducement to moral conduct, and the good which the pious patriarch contemplates is earthly plenty, something which will enrich himself and his family. At the same time we must not forget that the revelation of God's purpose is progressive, and His dealing with men educative. There is naturally therefore a certain accommodation of the Divine law to the various stages of moral apprehension of the Jewish people, and on the human side a growing sense of the meaning of life as well as an advancing appreciation of the nature of righteousness. Gradually the nation is being carried forward by the promise of material benefits to the spiritual blessings which they enshrine. If even in the messages of the prophets there is not wanting some measure of threats and penalties, we must remember the character of the people they were dealing with—a people wayward and stubborn, whose imaginations could scarcely rise above the material and the temporal. We must judge prophecy by its best, and we shall see that these penalties and rewards which undoubtedly occupy a prominent place in Old Testament ethics were but goads to spur the apathetic. They were not ends in themselves, nor mere arbitrary promises or threats, but instruments subservient to higher ideals.

(b) As to extent:

With regard to the extent or application of the Hebrew ideal it must be acknowledged that here also Old Testament ethics is imperfect as compared with the universality of Christianity. God is represented as the God of Israel and not as the God of all men. It is true that a prominent commandment given to Israel is that which our Lord endorsed: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Le 19:18). The extent of the obligation, however, would seem to be restricted in the language immediately preceding it: "Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people." It has been pointed out that the term rea‘ is of wider signification than the English word "neighbor," and expresses the idea of friend, and is applied to any person. The wider rendering is enforced by the fact that in Le 19:33,14 the word "stranger" or "foreigner" is substituted for neighbor. The stranger is thus regarded as the special client of God and is commended to look to Him for protection. However this may be, in practice at least the Jews were not faithful to the humanitarianism of their law, and generally, in keeping with other races of antiquity, showed a tendency to restrict Divine favor within the limits of their own land and to maintain an attitude throughout their history of aloofness and repellent isolation toward foreigners. At the same time the obligation of hospitality was regarded as sacred and was practiced in early Hebrew life (Ge 18:1-9). Nor must we forget that whatever may have been the Jewish custom the promise enshrined in their revelation implies the unity of mankind (Ge 19:3), while several of the prophecies and Psalms look forward to a world-wide blessing (Isa 61; Ps 22:27; 48:2,10;). In Isa 54 we even read, "God of the whole earth shall he be called." "Everything," it has been said, "is definitely stated except the equality of all men in God's love." The morality of bare justice is also in some measure transcended. The universal Fatherhood of God, if not clearly stated, is implied in many passages, and in Second Isa and Ho there are most tender revelations of Divine mercy though it is mercy to Israel only. But we know that the apostle Paul drew the inference from God's treatment of Israel that His mercy and salvation would extend to all.

2. Outline of New Testament Ethics:

We are now prepared to indicate briefly the distinctive features of the ethics of Christianity. As this article is, however, professedly introductory, and as the ethics of Jesus forms the subject of a separate treatment (see ETHICS OF JESUS), it

will not be necessary to offer an elaborate statement of the subject. It will be sufficient to suggest the formative principles and main characteristics. What we have to say may conveniently be divided under three heads:

(1) the Christian ideal;

(2) the dynamic power;

(3) the virtues, duties and spheres of Christian activity.

(1) Ethics of Jesus and Paul.

Before, however, entering upon these details, a few words may fittingly be said upon the relation of the ethics of Jesus to those of Paul. It has been recently alleged that a marked contrast is perceptible between the teaching of Jesus and that of Paul, and that there is a great gulf fixed between the Gospels and the Epistles. Jesus is a moralist, Paul a theologian. The Master is concerned with the conditions of life and conduct; the disciple is occupied with the elaboration of dogma. This view seems to us to be greatly exaggerated. No one can read the Epistles without perceiving the ethical character of a large portion of their teaching and noticing how even the great theological principles which Paul enunciates have a profound moral import. Nor does it seem to us that there is any radical difference in the ethical teaching of Christ and that of the Apostle.

(2) Character.

Both lay emphasis on character, and the great words of Christ are the great words of Paul. The inmost spring of the new life of love is the same for both. The great object of the Pauline dialectic is to place man emptied of self in a condition of receptiveness before God. But this idea, fundamental in Paul, is fundamental also in the teaching of Jesus. It is the very first law of the kingdom. With it the Sermon on the Mount begins: "Blessed are the poor in spirit." If we analyze this great saying it surely yields the whole principle of the Pauline argument and the living heart of the Pauline religion. In perfect agreement with this is the fundamental importance assigned both by Jesus and Paul to faith. With both it is something more than mental assent or even implicit confidence in providence. It is the spiritual vision in man of the ideal, the inspiration of life, the principle of conduct.

(3) Inwardness of Motive.

Again the distinctive note of Christ’s ethic is the inwardness of the moral law as distinguished from the externality of the cereMonial law. Almost in identical terms Paul insists upon the need of inward purity, the purity of the inner man of the heart. Once more both lay emphasis upon the fulfillment of our duties to our fellow-men, and both are at one in declaring that man owes to others an even greater debt than duty. Christ’s principle is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself"; Paul’s injunction is "Owe no man anything but to love one another." Christ transforms morality from a routine into a life; and with Paul also goodness ceases to be a thing of outward rule and becomes the spontaneous energy of the soul. For both all virtues are but the various expressions of a single vital principle. "Love is the fulfilling of the law." The dynamic of devotion according to Christ is, "God’s love toward us"; according to Paul, "The love of Christ constraineth us."

Ideal of Life:

And if we turn from the motive and spring of service to the purpose of life, again we find substantial agreement: "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect" is the standard of Christ; to attain to the perfect life—"the prize of the high calling of God in Christ"—is the aim of Paul.

(4) Ultimate End.

Nor do they differ in their conception of the ultimate good of the world. Christ's ethical ideal, which He worked for as the realization of the object of His mission, was a redeemed humanity, a reestablishment of human society, which He designated "the kingdom of God." Paul with his splendid conception of humanity sees that kingdom typified and realized in the Risen Life of his Lord. It is by growing up in all things unto Him who is the Head that the whole body will be perfected in the perfection of its members. And this is what Paul means when he sums up the goal and ideal of all human faith and endeavor—"till we all attain .... unto a fullgrown man, unto .... the fullness of Christ" (Eph 4:13). Paul everywhere acknowledges himself to be a pupil of the Master and a teacher of His ways (1Co 4:17). Without pursuing this subject there can be no doubt that in their hidden depths and in their practical life the precepts of the apostle are in essential agreement with those of the Sermon on the Mount, and have a dommon purpose—the presenting of every man perfect before God (compare Alexander, Ethics of Paul).

3. The Ethical Ideal:

The ethical ideal of the New Testament is thus indicated. The chief business of ethics is to answer the question, What is man's supreme good? For what should a man live? What, in short, is the ideal of life? A careful study of the New Testament discloses three main statements implied in what Christ designates "the kingdom of God": man's highest good consists generally in doing God's will and more particularly in the attainment of likeness to Christ and in the realization of human brotherhood—a relation to God, to Christ and to man. The first is the pure white light of the ideal; the second is the ideal realized in the one perfect life which is viewed as standard or norm; the third is the progressive realization of the ideal in the life of humanity which is the sphere of the new life.

(1) Holiness.

Holiness as the fulfillment of the Divine will is, as we have seen, Christ's own ideal—Be ye perfect as your Father; and it is Paul's—This also we wish, even your perfection (2Co 13:11). The ideas of righteousness and holiness as the attributes of God are the features of the kingdom of God or of heaven, the realization of which Jesus continually set forth as the highest aim of man; and running through all the epistles of Paul the constant refrain is that ye might walk worthy of God who hath called you unto His kingdom and glory. To walk worthy of God, to fulfill His will in all sincerity and purity, is for the Christian as for the Jew the end of all morality. Life has a supreme worth and sacredness because God is its end. To be a man is to fulfill in his own person God's idea of humanity. Before every man, just because he is man with the touch of the Divine hand upon him and his Maker's end to serve, lies this ultimate goal of existence—the realization of the perfect life-according to the idea of God.

(2) Christlikeness.

If Godlikeness or holiness is the end, Christlikeness is the norm or standard in which that end is presented in the Gospel. In Christianity God is revealed to us through Jesus Christ, and the abstract impersonal ideas of holiness and righteousness are transmuted into the features of a living personality whose spirit is to be reproduced in the lives of men. In two different ways Christ is presented in the New Testament as ideal. He is at once the Pattern and the Principle or Power of the new life.

(a) He is the Pattern of goodness which is to be reproduced in human lives. It would lead us to trench on the succeeding article if we were to attempt here a portrayal of the character of Jesus as it is revealed in the Gospels. We only note that it is characteristic of the New Testament writers that they do not content themselves with imaginative descriptions of goodness, but present a living ideal in the historical person of Jesus Christ.

(b) He is also Principle of the new life—not example only, but power—the inspiration and cause of life to all who believe (Eph 1:19,20). Paul says not, "Be like Christ," but "Have the mind in you which was also in Christ." The literal imitation of an example has but a limited reign. To be a Christian is not the mechanical work of a copyist. Kant goes the length of saying that "imitation finds no place in all morality" (Metaphysics of Ethics, section ii). Certainly the imitation of Christ as

a test of conduct covers a quite inadequate conception of the intimate and vital relation Christ bears to humanity. "It is not to copy after Him," says Schultz (Grundriss d. evangelischen Ethik, 5), "but to let His life take form in us, to receive His spirit and make it effective, which is the moral task of the Christian." It is as its motive and creative power that Paul presents Him. "Let Christ be born in you." We could not even imitate Christ if He were not already within us. He is our example only because He is something more, the principle of the new life, the higher and diviner self of every man. "He is our life"; "Christ in us the hope of glory."

(3) Brotherhood and Unity of Man.

The emphasis hitherto has been laid on the perfection of the individual. But both Christ and His apostles imply that the individual is not to be perfected alone. No man finds himself till he finds his duties. The single soul is completed only in the brotherhood of the race. The social element is implied in Christ's idea of the Kingdom, and many of the apostolic precepts refer not to individuals but to humanity as an organic whole. The church is Christ's body of which individuals are the members, necessary to one another and deriving their life from the head. The gospel is social as well as individual, and the goal is the kingdom of God, the brotherhood of man. Paul proclaims the unity and equality before God of Greek and Roman, bond and free.

4. The Dynamic Power of the New Life:

In the dynamic power of the new life we reach the central and distinguishing feature of Christian ethics. Imposing as was the ethic of Greece, it simply hangs in the air. Plato's ideal state remains a theory only. Aristotle's "virtuous man" exists only in the mind of his creator. Nor was the Stoic more successful in making his philosophy a thing of actuality. Beautiful as these old-time ideals were, they lacked impelling force, the power to change dreams into realities. The problems which baffled Greek philosophy it is the glory of Christianity to have solved. Christian ethics is not a theory. The good has been manifested in a life. The Word was made flesh. It was a new creative force—a spirit given and received, to be worked out and realized in the actual life of common men.

(1) The Dynamic on Its Divine Side. The problem with Paul was, How can man achieve that good which has been embodied in the life and example of Jesus Christ? Without entering into the details of this question it may be said at once that the originality of the gospel lies in this, that it not only reveals the good but discloses the power which makes the good possible in the hitherto unattempted derivation of the new life from a new birth under the influence of the Spirit of God. Following his Master, when Paul speaks of the new ethical state of believers he represents it as a renewal or rebirth of the Holy Spirit. It is an act of Divine creative power.

Without following out the Pauline argument we may say he connects the working of the Holy Spirit with two facts in the life of Christ, for him the most important in history—the death and resurrection of our Lord. Here we are in the region of dogmatics, and it does not concern us to present a theory of the atonement. All we have to do with is the fact that between man and the new life lies sin, which must be overcome and removed, both in the form of guilt and power, before reconciliation with God can be effected. The deed which alone meets the case is the sacrifice of Christ. In virtue of what Christ has achieved by His death a fundamentally new relationship exists. God and man are now in full moral accord and vital union.

But not less important as a factor in creating the new life is the resurrection. It is the seal and crown of the sacrifice. It was the certainty that He had risen that gave to Christ's death its sacrificial value. "If Christ be not risen ye are yet in your sins." The new creature is the work of Christ. But His creative power is not an external influence. It is an inner spirit of life. All that makes life life indeed—an exalted, harmonious and completed existence—is derived from the Holy Spirit through the working of the crucified risen Christ.

(2) The Dynamic on Its Human Side.

Possession of power implies obligation to use it. The force is given; it has to be appropriated. The spirit of Christ is not offered to free a man from the duties and endeavors of the moral life. Man is not simply the passive recipient of the Divine energy. He has to make it his own and work it out by an act of free resolution. When we inquire what constitutes the subjective or human element, we find in the New Testament two actions which belong to the soul entering upon the new world in Christ—repentance and faith. These are complementary and constitute what is commonly called conversion. Repentance in the New Testament is a turning away in sorrow and contrition from a life of sin and a breaking with evil under the influence of Christ. If repentance looks back and forsakes, faith looks forward and accepts. In general it is the outgoing of the whole man toward his Lord, the human power or energy by which the individual receives and makes his own the life in Christ. It is not merely intellectual acceptance or moral trust; it is above all appropriating energy. It is the power of a new obedience. As the principle of moral appropriation it has its root in personal trust and its fruit in Christian service. Faith, in short, is the characteristic attitude and action of the whole Christian personality in its relation to the spiritual good offered to it in Christ.

5. Virtues, Duties and Spheres of the New Life:

It but remains to indicate how this new power manifests itself in character and in practical conduct. Character is expressed in virtue, and duty is conditioned by station and relationships.

(1) The Virtues.

The systematic enumeration of the virtues is one of the most difficult tasks of ethics. Neither in ancient nor in modern times has complete success attended attempts at classification. Plato’s list is too meager. Aristotle’s lacks system and is marred by omission. Nowhere in Scripture is there offered a complete description of all the virtues that flow from faith. But by bringing Christ’s words and the apostolic precepts together we have a rich and suggestive cluster (Mt 5; 6; Ga 5:22,23; Col 3:12,13; Php 4:8; 1Pe 2:18,19; 4:7,8; 2Pe 15-8; 1 Joh 3;). We may make a threefold classification:

(a) The Heroic Virtues:

The heroic virtues, sometimes called the cardinal, handed down from antiquity-wisdom, fortitude, temperance, justice. While these were accepted and dwelt upon, Christianity profoundly modified their character so that they became largely new creations. "The old moral currency was still kept in circulation, but it was gradually minted anew" (Strong).

(b) The Amiable Virtues:

The amiable virtues, which are not merely added on to the pagan, but being incorporated with them, give an entirely new meaning to those already in vogue. While Plato lays stress on the intellectual or heroic features of character, Christianity brings to the foreground the gentler virtues. Two reasons may have induced the Christian writers to dwell more on the self-effacing side of character: partly as a protest against the spirit of militarism and the worship of material power prevalent in the ancient world; and chiefly because the gentler self-sacrificing virtues more truly expressed the spirit of Christ. The one element in character which makes it beautiful and effective and Christlike is love—the element of sacrifice. Love evinces itself in humility which lays low all vaunting ambition and proud selfsufficiency. Closely allied to humility are meekhess and its sister, long-suffering—the attitude of the Christian in the presence of trial and wrong. With these again are connected contentment and patience and forbearance, gentle and kindly consideration for others. Lastly there is the virtue of forgiveness. For it is not enough to be humble and meek; we have a duty toward wrongdoers. We must be ready to forget and forgive (Ro 12:20). "Be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you" (Eph 4:32).

(c) The Theological Virtues:

The theological virtues or Christian graces-faith, hope, charity. Some have been content to see in these three graces the

summary of Christian excellence. They are fundamental in Christ's teaching and the apostolic combination of them may have had its basis in some lost word of the Master (Harnack). These graces cannot be separated. They are all of a piece. He who has faith has also love, and he who has faith and love cannot be devoid of hope. Love is the first and last word of apostolic Christianity. No term is more expressive of the spirit of Christ. Love was practically unknown in the ancient world. Pre-Christian philosophy exalted the intellect but left the heart cold. Love in the highest sense is the discovery and creation of the gospel, and it was reserved for the followers of Jesus to teach men the meaning of charity and to find in it the law of freedom. It is indispensable to true Christian character. Without it no profession of faith or practice of good deeds has any value (1Co 13). It is the fruitful source of all else that is beautiful in conduct. Faith itself works through love and finds in its activity its outlet and exercise. If character is formed by faith it lives in love. And the same may be said of hope. It is a particular form of faith which looks forward to a life that is to be perfectly developed and completed in the future. Hope is faith turned to the future—a vision inspired and sustained by love.

(2) The Duties.

Of the duties of the Christian life it is enough to say that they find their activity in the threefold relationship of the Christian to self, to his fellow-men and to God. This distinction is not of course quite logical. The one involves the other. Self-love implies love of others, and all duty may be regarded as duty to God. The individual and society are so inextricably bound together in the kingdom of love that neither can reach its goal without the other.

(a) Duties Toward Self:

Duties toward self are, however, plainly recognized in the New Testament. our Lord's commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," makes a rightly conceived self-love the measure of love to one's neighbor. But the duties of self-regard are only lightly touched upon, and while the truth that the soul has an inalienable worth is insisted upon, to be constantly occupied with the thought of oneself is a symptom of morbid egoism and not a sign of healthy personality. But the chief reason why the New Testament does not enlarge upon the duty of self-culture is that according to the spirit of the gospel the true realization of self is identical with self-sacrifice. Only as a man loses his life does he find it. Not by anxiously standing guard over one's soul but by dedicating it freely to the good of others does one realize one's true self. At the same time several self-respecting duties are recognized, of which mention may be made:

(i) stability of purpose or singleness of aim;

(ii) independence of other's opinion;

(iii) supremacy of conscience and a proper self-estimate.

In this connection may be noticed also the Christian's proper regard for the body which, as the temple of God, is not to be despised but presented as a living sacrifice; his attitude to worldly goods; his obligation to work; his right to recreation; and his contentment with his station—all of which duties are to be interpreted by the apostolic principle, "Use the world as not abusing it." The Christian ideal is not asceticism or denial for its own sake. Each must make the best of himself and the most of life's trust. All the faculties, possessions, pursuits and joys of life are to be used as vehicles of spiritual service, instruments which make a man a fit subject of the kingdom of God to which he belongs.

(b) Duties in Relation to Others:

Duties in relation to others, or brotherly love, are defined as to their extent and limit by the Christian's relation to Christ. Their chief manifestations are:

(i) justice, involving respect for others, negatively refraining from injury and positively yielding deference and honor, truthfulness, in word and deed, "speaking the truth in love," just judgment, avoiding censoriousness and intolerance;

(ii) kindness or goodness, embracing sympathy, service and practical beneficence which provides for physical need, administers comfort and gives, by example and direct instruction, edification;

(iii) patience, comprising forbearance, peaceableness.

(c) Duties in Relation to God:

Here morality runs up into religion and duty passes into love. Love rests on knowledge of God as revealed in Christ, and expresses itself in devotion. Love to God is expressed generally in

(i) thankfulness,

(ii) humility,

(iii) trustfulness; and particularly in worship (sacraments and prayers), and in witness-bearing—adorning the doctrine by beauty of life.

(3) Spheres and Relationships.

Of the various spheres and relationships in which the Christian finds opportunity for the exercise and cultivation of his spiritual life we can only name, without enlarging upon them, the family, the state and the church. Each of these spheres demands its own special duties and involves its own peculiar discipline. While parents owe to their children care and godly nurture, children owe their parents obedience. The attitude of the individual to the state and of the state to the individual are inferences which may be legitimately drawn from New Testament teaching. It is the function of the state not merely to administer iustice but to create and foster those agencies and institutions which work for the amelioration of the lot and the development of the weal of its citizens, securing for each full liberty to make the best of his life. On the other hand it is the duty of the individual to realize his civic obligations as a member of the social organism. The state makes its will dominant through the voice of the people, and as the individuals are so the commonwealth will be.

6. Conclusion:

Absoluteness, Inwardness and Universality.

In closing we may say that the three dominant notes of Christian ethics are, its absoluteness, its inwardness and its universality. The gospel claims to be supreme in life and morals. For the Christian no incident of experience is secular and no duty insignificant, because all things belong to God and all life is dominated by the Spirit of Christ. The uniqueness and originality of the ethics of Christianity are to be sought, however, not so much in the range of its practical application as in the unfolding of an ideal which is at once the power and pattern of the new life. That ideal is Christ in whom the perfect life is disclosed and through whom the power for its realization is communicated. Life is a force, and character is a growth which takes its rise in and expands from a hidden seed. Hence, in Christian ethics all apathy, passivity and inaction, which occupy an important place in the moral systems of Buddhism, Stoicism, and even medieval Catholicism, play no part. On the contrary all is life, energy and unceasing endeavor.

There are many details of modern social life with which the New Testament does not deal: problems of presentday ethics and economics which cannot be decided by a direct reference to chapter and verse, either of the Gospels or Epistles. But Paul’s great principles of human solidarity; of equality in Christ; of freedom of service and love; his teachings concerning the church and the kingdom of God, the family and the state; his precepts with regard to personal purity, the use of wealth and the duty of work, contained the germs of the subsequent renewal of Europe and still contain the potency of social and

political transformation.

LITERATURE.

General Works on Ethics: Lotze, Paulsen, Wundt, Green, Sidgwick, Stephen, Dewey and Tufts, Palmer, Bowne, Mezer; Harris, Moral Evolution; Dubois; Randall, Theory of Good and Evil; Calderwood, Handbook of Moral Philosophy; Muirhead, Elementary Ethics; Sutherland, Origin and Growth of Moral Instinct; Simmel, Einleitung in die Moralwissenschaft; Givycky, Moralphilosophic; Guyot, La morale; Janet, Theory Morals (translation); Mackenzie, Manual of Ethics; Eucken, works generally; Hensel, Hauptproblem der Ethik; Lipps, Die ethischen Grundfragen; Natorp, Socialpadagogik; Schuppe, Grundzuge der Ethik u. Rechtsphilosophie; Schwarz, Das sittliche Leben; Wentscher, Ethik.

General History:

See Histories of Philosophy; Zeller, Erdmann, Windelband, Maurice, Turner, Weber, Rogers, Alexander; Jodl, Geschichte der Ethik in der neueren Philosophic. Works on Theological or Christian Ethics Old Testament: Dillmann, Baudissin, Bertmann, Geschichte der christlichen Sitte; Konig, Hauptprobleme der Altes Testament Religions-Geschichte; Delitzsch, Riehm, Kuenen; Mozley, Ruling Ideas in Early Ages; Hessey, Moral Difficulties in the Bible; Moore, in Lux mundi; Ladd, Doctrine of Sacred Scripture; Robertson, Early Religion of Israel; Caillard, Progressive Revelation; Schultz, Old Testament Theology (English translation); Bruce, Ethics of the Old Testament; N. Smyth, Christian Ethics; Startton; Strong.

New Testament and Christianity:

Martinsen, Wuttke, Schletermacher, Rothe, Dorner, H. Weiss, Harlen, Hofmann, Frank, Luthardt, Beck, Kiibel, Kahler, Pfieiderer, Schultz, Kostlin; Herrmann, Faith and Morals; Communion of the Christian with God; Thomas, Jacoby, Lemme, Strong, Knight, N. Smyth; Ottley in Lux mundi and Christian Ideas and Ideals; W. L. Davidson, Christian Ethics, Guild Series; W. T. Davidson, Christian Interpretation of Life and Christian Conscience; Mackintosh; Murray, Handbook of Christian Ethics; Maurice, Social Morality; Nash, Ethics and Revelation; Dobschiitz, Christian Life in the Primitive Church; Clark, Christian Method of Ethics; Mathews, The Church and the Changing Order; Freemantle, The World as the Subject of Redemption; The Gospel in Secular Life; Sladden, Applied Christianity; Leckie, Life and Religion; Rauschenbusch, Christianity and the Social Order; Peile, The Reproach of the Gospel; Coe, Education in Religion and Morals; Haering, The Ethics of the Christian Life (English translation); Tymms, Ancient Faith in Modern Light; Harris, God, the Creator; Bovon, Morale chretienne; Wace, Christianity and Morality; Kidd, Morality and Religion; Drummond, Via, Veritas, Vita; Hatch, Greek Ideas and the Christian Church; Matheson, Landmarks of New Testament Morality.

Works on New Testament Theology:

Also contain section on Ethics; Weiss, Holtzmann, Beyschlag; Harnack, Das Wesen, or What Is Christianity?; Stevens; Wernle, The Beginnings of Christianity; Adeney, Gould, Gardner, Bosworth, Briggs; Caird, Evolution of Religion. Works on the Teaching of Jesus: Especially Wendt, Bruce, Stevens, Horton, Jackson, Swete, Latham, Pastor Pastorum; Tolstoy; Julicher. See next article for the works on the Ethics of Jesus. Special Works on Apostolic Ethics: Ernesti, Ethik des Apostels Paulus; A. Alexander, The Ethics of Paul; Weinel, Paul; Baur, Paulinismus; Joh. Weiss, Paul and Jesus. History of Christian Ethics:

Wuttke, Sidgwick, Ziegler, Luthardt, Thomas; Martineau, Types of Ethical Theory; Gass; Scharling, Christliche Sittenlehre; Lecky, History of European Morals; Pfleiderer.

Arch. B. D. Alexander

ETHIOPIA

e-thi-o’-pi-a (kush; Aithiopia):

1. Location, Extent and Population:

Critically speaking Ethiopia may refer only to the Nile valley above the First Cataract, but in ancient as in modern times the term was often used not only to include what is now known as Nubia and the Sudan (Soudan), but all the unknown country farther West and South, and also at times Northern, if not Southern, Abyssinia. While Ethiopia was so indefinitely large, yet the narrow river valley, which from the First to the Fifth Cataract represented the main agricultural resources of the country, was actually a territory smaller than Egypt and, excluding deserts, smaller than Belgium (W. Max Muller). The settled population was also small, since in ancient as in modern times Egypt naturally drew away most of the able-bodied and energetic youth as servants, police and soldiers. The prehistoric population of Northern Nubia was probably Egyptian but this was displaced in early historic time by a black race, and the thick lips and woolly hair of the typical African are as well marked in the oldest Egyptian paintings as in the latest. But by the side of these natives of K’sh, the artist also represents various reddish-brown varieties; for from the beginning of historic time the pure Negro stock has been mixed with the fellaheen of Egypt and with the Sere population of the Arabian coast. The rulers of Ethiopia were generally of foreign blood. The Negroes, though brave and frugal, were slow in thought, and although controlled for centuries by cultivated neighbors, under whom they attained at times high official prominence, yet the body of the people remained uninfluenced by this civilization. The country which we now know as Abyssinia was largely controlled, from the earliest known date, by a Caucasian people who had crossed the Red Sea from Arabia. The true Abyssinians, as Professor Littmann shows, contain no Negro blood and no Negro qualities. In general they are "well formed and handsome, with straight and regular features, lively eyes, hair long and straight or somewhat curled and in color dark olive approaching brown." Modern discoveries prove their close racial and linguistic connection with Southern Arabia and particularly with the kingdom of Sheba (the Sabeans), that most powerful people whose extensive architectural and literary remains have recently come to light. The Sabean inscriptions found in Abyssinia go back some 2,600 years and give a new value to the Bible references as well as to the constant claim of Josephus that the queen of Sheba was a "queen of Ethiopia." The Falashas are a Jewish community living near Lake Tsana, of the same physical type and probably of the same race as other Abyssinians. Their religion is a "pure Mosaism" based upon the Ethiopic version of the Pentateuch, but modified by the fact that they are ignorant of the Hebrew language (Jewish Encyclopedia). It is uncertain when they became Jews. The older scholars thought of them as dating back to the Solomonic era, or at least to the Babylonian captivity. Since the researches of Joseph Halevy (1868), some date within the Christian era has seemed preferable, notwithstanding their ignorance of Talmudic rules. However, the newly discovered fact that a strong Jewish community was flourishing at Syene in the 6th century BC makes it clear that Jewish influence may have been felt in Ethiopia at least that early. Although Abyssinians are noted for their strict adherence to ancient custom, Jewish characteristics are prominent all over the entire country. The opening formula of the king in every official letter—"The Lion of the Tribe of Judah has Conquered!"—is no more Jewish than scores of ordinary phrases and customs. Although it is barely possible that some rites, like circumcision and observance of the Sabbath, may have been received from the ancient Egyptians or Christian Coptics (The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge Encyclopedia) yet a strong Hebrew influence cannot be denied. All travelers speak of the "industry" of the Falashas and of the "kindliness and grave courtesy" of the Abyssinians. Besides those named above there are many communities of mixed races in Ethiopia, but the ancient basis is invariably Negro, Semitic or Egyptian

2. History:

The ancient Greek writers are full of fantastic and fabulous stories about Ethiopia. Sometimes they become so puzzled in their geography as to speak of Ethiopia as extending as far as India; their notes concerning the miraculous fauna and flora are equally Munchausian. Homer praises the Ethiopians as the "blameless race," and other writers rank them first among all men for their religious knowledge. This latter notion may have had its origin from a priestly desire to consider the Ethiopian reverence for the priesthood—which had the power of life and death over the kings—as the Divinely ordained

primitive custom, or it may have sprung from the fact that the Egyptian "Land of the Gods" was partly situated in Southern Abyssinia. It is suggestive that the Hebrew prophets never fell into these common errors but invariably "gave a very good idea of geographical and political conditions" (W. Max Muller). The oldest important historic document referring to Ethiopia is from the IVth Dynasty of Egypt. when Sneferu laid waste the land, capturing 7,000 slaves and 100,000 cattle. In the VIth Dynasty the Egyptians reached as far South as the Second Cataract and brought back some dwarfs, but did not establish any permanent control. In the XIIth Dynasty Egypt's real occupation of Ethiopia began. Usertesen III records his contempt by saying: "The Negro obeys as soon as the lips are opened. They are not valiant, they are miserable, both tails and bodies!" Notwithstanding this satiric reference, these naked Ethiopians clad in skins and tails of wild animals, compelled the Pharaoh to make several campaigns before he could establish a frontier at the Second Cataract beyond which no Negro could come without a permit. That the natives were not cowardly may be seen from the songs of triumph over their subjection and from the fact that every later Pharaoh encouraged them to enlist in his army, until finally the very hieroglyphic for archer became a Nubian. The XVIIIth Dynasty pushed the frontier beyond the Third Cataract into the splendid Dongola district and often boasts of the rich tribute from Ethiopia., in one case 2,667 "manloads" of ivory, ebony, perfumes, gold and ostrich feathers besides cattle, wild beasts and slaves. The chairs of ivory and the jewelry sometimes shown seem barbaric in style but excellent in workmanship. Copper and bronze factories and great iron foundries date also to a very early time in Ethiopia (PSBA, XXXIII, 96). The Ethiopian gold mines where hundreds of criminals toiled, with ears and noses mutilated, made gold in Egypt in the 15th century BC as "common as dust." The choicest son of the Pharaoh, next to him in power, was proud to be called "Prince of Kush." Amenhotep IV (1370 BC), the religious reformer, built his second greatest temple (the only one of his works now existent) in Nubia. The XIXth Dynasty sought to colonize Ethiopia., and some of the most magnificent temples ever built by man can be seen as far South as the Fourth Cataract. For over five centuries Egyptian rule was maintained, until about 1000 BC a war for independence began which was so successful that the victorious Ethiopian kings finally carried their armies against Thebes and Memphis and for a century (763-663) ruled all Egypt from Napata—which in religious architecture became the Southern Thebes—and for another century (and even at times during the Ptolemaic era) controlled upper Egypt. While the leaders of this revolution were doubtless descendants of exiled priests from Thebes, yet the mixture of Ethiopian blood is plainly discernible and is perhaps also shown in their "Puritan morals" (Petrie, III, 276) and spirit of clemency, so different from the legitimate Pharaohs. Shabaka = So (715-707) and Taharka = Tirhaqah (693-667), both mentioned in the Bible, were the last great kings of Ethiopia. When Tanutamen, son of Shabaka and nephew of Taharka (667-664), was forced by Ashurbanipal to give up his claim to Egypt and retire to the South, the influence of Ethiopia ceased. Cambyses (525-521) made Ethiopia tributary clear to the Third Cataract(compare Eze 30:4), while King Ergamenes, near the close of the 3rd century BC, broke forever the power of the Egyptian priesthood. Though the Romans held a nominal protectorate over Ethiopia, it was of so little importance as to be scarcely ever mentioned. After being expelled from Egypt the Ethiopians still continued to honor the gods of Thebes, but, as foreign influence ceased, the representations of this worship became more and more African and barbaric. Even after Christianity had triumphed everywhere else, the Nubians, as late as the 5th century AD, were still coming to Philae to give honor to the statue of Isis (Erman). In the 6th century AD a native king, Silko, established a Christian kingdom in the Northern Sudan with Dongola as its capital. This raised somewhat the culture of the land. In the next century the Arabs made Nubia tributary, though it took an immense army to do it. For six centuries thereafter Islam demanded a tribute of 360 slaves annually, and other treasure, though innumerable campaigns were necessary to collect it. The Nubian kings refused all overtures to become Moslems, and Christian churches multiplied along the banks of the Nile. In the 8th century Egypt was invaded by 100,000 Nubians to repay an insult given to the Coptic patriarch and to the sacred pictures in the Egyptian Christian churches. In the 13th century, David, king of Nubia, not only withheld tribute but invaded Egypt. He was terribly punished, however, by the Arabs, who sacked churches and tortured Christians clear to the Fourth Cataract. This was the beginning of the end. By the close of the 15th century almost every Christian altar was desolate and every church destroyed.

3. Bible References:

Winckler long ago proved that the Assyrians designated a district in Northern Arabia by the same name which they ordinarily applied to Ethiopia. Skinner (Genesis, 1910, 208) thinks the Hebrews also made this distinction and were therefore entirely right when they spoke of Nimrod as "son of Gush," since the earliest Babylonian dynasty had as a matter of fact a Semitic origin. There may be other references to an Arabian district, but undoubtedly the African Kush must be

the one generally designated. This is referred to once in the New Testament and over 40 times in the Old Testament. Many secular monuments speak of the high honor paid to women in Ethiopia., and Candace (Ac 8:27) seems certainly to have been an official or dynastic name for a number of Ethiopian queens. One of the pyramids of Meroe was Candace's—her picture can still be seen at Kaga—and to her belonged the wonderful treasure of jewelry found in 1834 by Ferlini and now in the Berlin museum. Petronius (24 BC) raided Ethiopia for Rome and stormed the capital, but Candace sent ambassadors to Rome and obtained peace. The "eunuch" who may have been the treasurer of this very queen was probably "no black proselyte but a Jew who had placed the business ability of his race at the service of the Nubian woman" (W. Max Muller). In the Old Testament Ethiopia is spoken of with great respect, and several Bible characters are named Cushi (2Sa 18:21 the King James Version; Jer 36:14; Ze 1:1); even Moses married an Ethiopian wife (Nu 12:1), and Ebed-melek the Ethiopian is helper to Jeremiah (Jer 38:7). It is a great land situated beyond the frontiers of the civilized world (Eze 29:10), yet with Jews in its farthest district (Ze 3:10). It is very rich (Job 28:19; Isa 43:3); is engaged in trade with Arabia (45:14), and its citizens are proud of their nationality (Ps 87:4). Again and again the relation of Cush with Sheba is mentioned (Ge 10:7,28; Isa 43:3, etc.), which latter statement is strangely corroborated by the recently discovered Sabean inscriptions throughout Abyssinia. Its typical inhabitants have a color as unchangeable as the leopard's spots (Jer 13:23), are careless (Eze 30:9), but very warlike (Eze 38:5; Jer 46:9), giving "infinite" strength to Nineveh (Na 3:9), but who can be resisted by Israel because of Yahweh's favor (2Ch 16:8; Isa 20:5; 36:6). Yahweh is interested in the history of Ethiopia as well as Egypt (Isa 20:3), loves the children of Ethiopia as the children of Israel (Am 9:7), and the time is coming when Ethiopia shall yet stretch out her hands to Yahweh (Ps 68:31). Cush and Mizraim are correctly mentioned as political unit (Isa 20:4 f) , and several kings of Ethiopia are mentioned by name—Zerah (2Ch 14:9), So (2Ki 17:4) and Tirhaqah (2Ki 19:9; Isa 37:9). The statements concerning these kings have been pronounced incorrect because it seemed that Zerah could not possibly be an equivalent for Usarkon or So for Shabaka—the known kings of Egypt at those periods—and also because the reigns of Shabaka and Tirhaqah did not begin until after the dates at which in the Hebrew records they were called "kings of Ethiopia."

Recent, information, however, makes it clear that both Shabaka and Tirhaqah exercised royal authority in the Delta before they were given it farther south, and that the Hebrew transcription of names was very easy and natural. (See W. M. Flinders Petrie, Hist of Egypt, III, 280-309; Egypt and Israel (1911), 76-78.)

4. The Church in Abyssinia:

Sem influence entered Abyssinia at least as early as the 7th or 8th century BC (see above), and the kings of Axum claimed descent from Menelek, Son of Solomon, but the first certain information concerning the kingdom of Axum comes from the middle of the 1st century AD, at which time Axum was a rich capital, and its ancient sacredness was so great that from that period clear down to the 19th century the kings of Abyssinia would travel there to be crowned. There is no reason to doubt that Frumentius (circa 330 AD) was the first to introduce Christianity. Merope of Tyre, according to the often-told story, when returning from India with his two nephews, was captured and killed off the Ethiopian coast, but the two boys were carried to the Abyssinian king; and although one perished the other, Frumentius, succeeded in converting the king and his people to Christianity, and later was himself consecrated by Athanasius of Alexandria as the first Metropolitan of Ethiopia, taking as his title Abu Salama ("Father of Peace"). From that time until now, with but one single interruption, the Abuna ("Father") has always been appointed by the Patriarch of Alexandria and, since the 13th century, has been by legal necessity not a native Abyssinian, but a Copt.

After the Council of Chalcedon (450 AD) condemned all as heretics who did not accept the "double nature" of Christ, both the Egyptian and Abyssinian churches separated themselves from Rome, believing so thoroughly in the Deity of Christ as to refuse to accept His humanity as essential "nature." In the 5th century a great company of monks entered Abyssinia, since which time the monastic tendency has been strongly marked. About 525, Caleb, king of Axum, attacked the Homeritae across the Red Sea—either for their persecution of Christians or their interference with his trade—and for some half a century controlled a large district of Arabia. At this time Abyssinian trade was extensive. Greek influence was also felt, and the Christian cathedral at Axum was a magnificent work of architectural article The early churches were protected by heavy surrounding walls and strong towers. The invasion of Africa by Islam in the 7th century required 300 years of battle for the preservation of Abyssinian liberty and Christian faith. It alone of all the African states succeeded in

preserving both—but its civilization was destroyed, and for 1,000 years it was completely hidden from the eyes of its fellow- Christians in Europe. Occasionally during those centuries a rumor would reach Europe of a "Prester John" somewhere in the Far East who was king of a Christian people, yet it was a thrilling surprise to Christendom when Pedro de Cavilham in the 15th century discovered this lost Christian kingdom of Abyssinia completely surrounded by infidel pagans and bigoted Mohammedans. When, early in the 16th century, the Negus of Abyssinia sent an envoy to the king of Portugal asking his help against the Moslems, the appeal was met with favor. In 1520 the Portuguese fleet arrived in the Red Sea and its chaplain, Father Francisco Alvarez, 20 years later stirred the Christian world by his curious narratives. Not long afterward, when the Arabs actually invaded the country, another Portuguese fleet was sent with a body of military, commanded by Christopher de Gama. These 450 musketeers and the six little pieces of artillery gave substantial aid to the endangered state. Father Lobe tells the story. The Abyssinian king must have been grateful for such help, yet presently the strenuous efforts of the Portuguese clergy to convert him and his people to the Roman Catholic faith became so offensive that Bermudez, the most zealous missionary, was compelled to leave the country and the Jesuits who remained were mistreated. Other efforts to win the Abyssinian Christians to renounce the Monophysitic heresy and accept the doctrine and control of Rome were somewhat more successful. Early in the 17th century Father Pedro Paez, an ecclesiastic of much tact, won the king fully to his faith, and under his direction many churches were erected and advantageous government works carried on. However, his successor Mendez lacked his conciliatory ability and, although a punishment of seven years' chastisement was proclaimed against recalcitrants, the opposition became so violent and universal that the Negus Sysenius finally abdicated in favor of his son Fasilidas, who in 1633 sent all Jesuits out of the country and resumed official relations with the Egyptian church. Since then, although many efforts have been made, no controlling influence has ever been obtained by Rome. Once more, for over a century, Abyssinia became completely hidden from the eyes of the outside world until James Bruce, the explorer, visited the country, 1770-72, and made such a report as to arouse again the interest of Christendom. The translation of the Bible, which was made by his Abyssinian guide, was adopted and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and in 1829 the Church Missionary Society sent out Gobat and Kugler as the first Protestant missionaries to Abyssinia, who were followed shortly after by some Roman Catholics. Owing chiefly to the opposition of native priests the Protestants were expelled in 1838 and the expulsion of the Roman missionaries followed in 1854. In 1858 a Copt who had been influenced as a youth by a Protestant school, became Abuna, and Protestant missionaries were again admitted, but succeeded in doing little permanent work owing to the political disturbances while King Kesa (Theodore)—the Napoleon of Africa—was attempting to consolidate native resources and build up an African empire. At this period the influence of Great Britain began to be felt in Abyssinia. After the suicide of Theodore (1868) and especially after Menelek II had succeeded in making himself emperor (1899), this influence became great. During the 20th century missionaries have been able to work in Abyssinia without much danger, but the Moslem influence is so preponderating that little has been attempted and little done. The religion of the Crescent seems now almost completely victorious over the strange land which for so many centuries, alone and unhelped, held aloft in Africa the religion of the Cross. (See especially The Mohammedan World of Today, by Zwemer, Wherry, and Barton, 1907; Missionary World, 1910-11.)

5. Beliefs and Practices:

In creed, ritual, and practice, the Abyssinian church agrees generally with the Coptic. There are seven sacraments and prayers for the dead, high honor is paid to the Virgin Mary and to the saints; fasts and pilgrimages are in much favor; adults are baptized by immersion and infants by affusion. A blue cord is placed about the neck at baptism. An extract from one of the Gospels, a silver ring, an ear pick and a small cross, often very artistic, are also worn about the neck. No charms or beads or crucifixes ("graven images") are worn. The Jewish as well as the Christian Sabbath is kept sacred, and on an average every other day during the year is a religious holiday. The people are ignorant and superstitious, yet impress observers with their grave kindliness and seem at times eager to learn. The clergy can marry before but not after ordination. Priests must be able to read and recite the Nicene Creed (the "Apostles' Creed" is not known), but do not understand the Ge'ez language in which the liturgies are written. They conduct many and long services and attend to the ceremonial purifications. Deacons must also be able to read; they prepare the bread for the Holy Sacrament and in general help the priests. The monastic clergy have chief care of the education of the young—though this consists mainly in Scripture reading—and their head, the Etshege, ranks next to the Abuna.

The ancient churches were often basilican, but modern native churches are quadrangular or circular. The Holy of Holies always stands in the center, and is supposed to contain an ark. Tradition declares that the ark in the cathedral at Axum is the original ark from Solomon's temple. An outer court surrounds the body of the church, which is freely used by laymen and as a place of entertainment for travelers. Very crude pictures are common. These show both Egyptian and European influence, and are probably not merely decorations but have a relation, as in Egyptian thought, to spiritual advancement in this life or the next (compare Budge, Introduction to the Lives of Maba' Segon and Gabra Krestos, 1898). The services consist of chanting psalms, reading Scriptures and reciting liturgies.

6. Abyssinian Literature:

The Abyssinian canon (Semanya Ahadu) consists of 46 Old Testament and 35 New Testament books. Besides the usually accepted books, they count Shepherd of Hermas, Synodos (Canons), Epistles of Clement, Maccabees, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 4 Ezra, Ascension of Isaiah, Book of Adam, Joseph ben Gorion, Enoch and Jubilees. The Ethiopic texts of the two latter give these books in the most ancient form, and their discovery has led to much valuable discussion. The use of the Ge'ez language in which these are written dates back to a time shortly before the introduction of Christianity. From the 5th to 7th centuries AD, the literature is almost exclusively translated from Greek writers or adaptations of such writings. Quotations abound from Basil, Gregory, Ignatius, Athanasius, Epiphanus, Cyril, Dioscurus, etc. The second literary period begins 1268, when the old "Solomonic" Dynasty regained its place and continues to the present; it consists mainly of translations from the Arabic. In both periods the topics are few: liturgies, hymns, sermons, the heroic deeds of the saints and their orthodoxy. Each saint uses the four Holy Gospels, as David his four stones, to kill every heretical Goliath (compare Goodspeed and Crum, Patrologia Orientalis, IV, 1908). A large place is given to miracles and magic prayers and secret names (compare Budge, Miracles of the Virgin Mary, 1900, and "Magic Book of Disciples," JAOS, 1904). The legends or histories are occasionally well written, as the famous "Magda Queen of Sheba" (English Translation by Mrs. J. Van Vorst, 1907), but usually are as inferior in style as in thought (compare Littmann, Bibliotheca-Abessinica, 1904). A few specimens of "popular literature" and many Abyssinian "proverbs" are extant (JAOS, XXIII, 51-53; XXV, 1-48; Jour. asiatique, IV, 487-95).

7. Nubian Literature:

The modern Nubian does not write, and his ancient predecessors wrote but little. Even in the days of the Pharaohs the hieroglyphics in most Nubian temples were written so poorly as to be almost unintelligible, and in later pre-Christian monuments put up by native rulers the usual tablets accompanying the Divine tableaux are often left blank. Some centuries before our era the necessary monumental inscriptions began to be composed in the Nubian language, though still written in hieroglyphics. Shortly after the beginning of the Christian era a native cursive writing begins to be used on the monuments, closely resembling the Egyptian demotic, from which undoubtedly its alphabet was derived (F. L. Griffith in Areika). Finally, after Nubia became Christian (6th century), another native system appears written in Greek and Coptic letters. Lepsius found two such inscriptions on the Blue Nile and numbers have since been discovered, but until 1906 these were as unreadable as the other two forms of Nubian writing. In that year Dr. Karl Schmidt found in Cairo two precious fragments of parchment which had been owned by some Nubian Christians of probably the 8th or 9th century. One of these contained a selection of passages from the New Testament—as was ascertained by comparing it with the Greek and Coptic Scriptures. By the aid of bilingual cartouches several proper names were soon deciphered. New inscriptions are now being brought to light every few months, and undoubtedly the translation of this important tongue, which contains the "history of an African Negro dialect for some 2,000 years" and also the religious history of the long-lost Christian church of the Sudan, will soon be accomplished. The other fragment found by Schmidt was a curious Hymn of the Cross, well representing the ancient Ethiopian hymnology:

"The cross is the hope of Christians; The cross is the resurrection of the dead; The cross is the physician of the sick; The cross is the liberator of the slave," etc..

—James H. Breasted in Biblical World, December, 1908; Nation, June 2, 1910.

8. Exploration:

Scientific observation of Nubia began with Burckhardt (1813), Cailliaud, and Waddington (1821), and especially with Lepsius (1844), but excavation in the proper sense was begun by the University of Chicago (1905-7), followed (1907-10) by expeditions sent out by the Royal Academy of Berlin, University of Pennsylvania, University of Liverpool, and Oxford University.

LITERATURE.

Besides the works quoted above, among recent Encyclopedias, see especially Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) (11th edition) and New Sck-Herz; and among the more recent books: James T. Bent, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians (1893); Glaser, Die Abessinier in Arabien und Afrika (1895); A. B. Wylde, Modern Abyssinia (1901); R. P. Skinner, Abyssinia of Today (1906); Th. Noeldeke, Die athiopische Litteratur (1906); Louis J. Morie, Les civilisations africaines (1904); Littmann, Geschichte der athiopischen Litteratur (1907); W. Max Muller, Aethiopien (1904); Petrie, Hist of Egypt (1895-1901); J. H. Breasted, Temples of Lower Nubia (1906); Monuments of Sudanese Nubia (1908); A. E. Weigall, Report of Antiquities of Lower Nubia (1906); E. A. W. Budge, The Egyptian Sudan (1907); Kromrei, Glaubenslehre und Gebrauche der alteren abessinischen Kirche (1895); M. Fowler, Christian Egypt (1901); Dowling, Abyssinian Church (1909); "Meroe," the City of the Ethiopians, by Liverpool University Expedition (1909-10); University of Pennsylvania Publications, Egyptian Dept., Eckley B. Coxe, Jr., Expedition to Nubia, I-IV (1909-11); Archeological Survey of Nubia; and Egyptian government reports.

Camden M. Cobern

ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH

e-thi-o’-pi-an u’-nuk eunouchos:

A man who occupied a leading position as treasurer at the court of Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, and who was converted and baptized by Philip the deacon (Ac 8:27-39). Being a eunuch, he was not in the full Jewish communion (compare De 23:1), but had gone up to Jerusalem to worship, probably as a proselyte at the gate. During his return journey he spent the time in studying Isaiah, the text which he used being that of the Septuagint (compare Professor Margoliouth, article "Ethiopian Eunuch" in HDB). On meeting with Philip the deacon, who was on his way to Gaza, he besought of him to shed light upon the difficulties of the Scripture he was reading, and through this was converted. The place of his baptism, according to Jerome and Eusebius, was Bethsura: by some modern authorities, eg. G A. Smith, it has been located at or near Gaza. The verse containing the confession of the eunuch, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God," is omitted either in whole or in part by some texts, but Hilgenfeld, Knowling, etc., regard it as quite in keeping with the context. Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Revised Version (British and American) text, etc., uphold the omission. The verse occurs in the body of the King James Version, but is given only as a footnote in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version. The diligence with which the eunuch pursued his reading, the earnestness with which he inquired of Philip, and the promptness with which he asked for baptism—all testify to the lofty nature of his character.

C. M. Kerr

ETHIOPIAN WOMAN

See CUSHITE WOMAN.

ETHIOPIC LANGUAGE

e-thi-op’-ik lan’-gwaj:

The language commonly called Ethiopic is the language in which the inscriptions of the kings of the ancient Aksumitic (Axumite) empire and most of the literature of Christian Abyssinia are written. It is called lesana Ge‘ez, "the tongue of Ge‘ez," by the Abyssinians themselves, most probably because it was originally the dialect of the Ge‘ez tribe, who in antiquity must have dwelt in or near Aksum (Axum).

The names Ethiopia and Ethiopians have been used in many different meanings by various peoples. To the Greeks, Ethiopia was a country South of Egypt, and in this sense the word is generally used in the histories of Egypt. The Ethiopian kings came from that country which is now called Nubia in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. In Hellenistic times the term received a wider meaning, and Ethiopia was the name of all the land between the Red Sea and the Nile, south of Egypt proper. Sometimes "Indian" and "Ethiopian" were synonymous, or Ethiopia was even considered to stretch as far as to the Atlantic Ocean in the West. But of these countries the Greeks and Romans had very little exact geographical knowledge.

See ETHIOPIA.

The fact that Ethiopia at some time meant the country between the Red Sea and the Nile prompted the pagan kings of Aksum in northern Abyssinia to adopt this name for their own country and to give it a narrower sense than the one which it had at that time. Therefore in the bilingual inscription of King Aeizanas (‘Ezana), the word Aithiopia, is a rendering of the Semitic Chabashat ("Abyssinia," but here more specially referring to Northern Abyssinia). Under this same king, about 350 AD, Abyssinia became Christian; and after the Bible had been translated into the Ge‘ez language, the Abyssinians found that Ethiopia was mentioned there several times. Their national pride was flattered by the thought that their country should be referred to in the Holy Scriptures, and for this reason they were all the more ready to apply the name in question to their own country. Up to the present day they call it Ethiopia (’Itiopiya), and themselves Ethiopians; their legends speak even of an ancestor Itiopis.

We may then, if we choose to do so, speak of a Nubian and an Abyssinian Ethiopia, but the term "Ethiopic language" has come into general usage as an equivalent of lesana Ge‘ez, and should therefore be applied only to the ancient literary language of Abyssinia.

This language is closely allied to the languages of Southern Arabia: it represents the southwestern branch of the southern division of the Semitic languages. The most important branch of this division is, of course, the Arabic language, and with this Ethiopic has a great deal in common. On the other hand there are many words and forms in Ethiopic which are not found in Arabic, but in Hebrew or even in Babylonian and Assyrian. It has been held that the home of the Semites was in Africa; and if that were the case, the people who spoke the Ethiopic language may never have migrated very much. But the majority of scholars who have expressed their opinion upon the subject believe that Asia was the home of the Semites; this is the opinion of the writer of this article also. Then the Semitic inhabitants of Abyssinia must have come from across the Red Sea. Their migration must have begun many centuries BC. It has hardly ever stopped, since Arabs in smaller, and sometimes in larger, numbers have been drifting into Abyssinia at all periods.

The Semitic conquerors of Abyssinia found peoples of two different races in the country where they settled: (1) African aborigines and (2) Kushites, a branch of the Hamitic family. Their languages were different from each other and, of course, different from that of the Semites also; some of them are spoken up to the present day. When the Semites first came and formed their literary language, they did not allow the languages of the country to influence their own speech very much; but gradually this influence grew stronger and stronger, and it is very evident in the modern Semitic languages of Abyssinia. An outline of the history of the Ethiopic language is as follows: Its oldest monument known so far is the Semitic part of the bilingual inscription of King ‘Ezana, which dates from the first half of the 4th century AD. Before that

time Ethiopic must have been spoken, without doubt, but it was not written: Greek and Sabean were written instead. At the time of King ‘Ezana the knowledge of the Sabean language seems to have been very little; but Sabean script was still used. The Semitic part of the inscription just mentioned is in the Ethiopic language, but carved once in Sabean script and a second time in the native Ethiopic script which had been derived from the Sabean. In the first of these two "editions" two or three Sabean words are used instead of their Ethiopic equivalents. A few other ancient inscriptions found in the Aksumitic empire may also be dated from the same period.

Possibly in the same 4th century the translation of the Bible into Ethiopic was begun; and this fact marks the beginning of a real Ethiopic literature. Perhaps the Psalms and the Gospels were translated first, being most needed in the service of the Christian church. The different books of the Scriptures were translated by different men, some of whom rendered literally, some more according to the sense, some having a good, some only a poor, knowledge of the language from which, and the language into which, they translated. Both Testaments were translated from the Greek by men whose mother-tongue was probably Aramaic. This is proved by the presence of Greek and Aramaic words and by the forms in which the Hebrew names appear in Ethiopic transliteration. The oldest influences which the Ethiopic language experienced were therefore:

(1) Sabean; a number of technical terms may have been adopted by the ancient Aksumites from the Sabean at the time when this was their literary language;

(2) African, i.e. Kushite and native African; the Semitic conquerors found a great many new animals and trees or plants, which they did not know, in their new country, and in many cases they adopted their African names;

(3) Aramaic, i.e. Jewish and Christian; these are mostly words referring to religious or theological matters;

(4) Greek; some of the Greek words found in Ethiopic refer to religious matters in the same way as the Aramaic, others denote objects or ideas which the ancient Abyssinians received from the civilized world, others again are mere transliterations of Greek words in the Bible and other religious books, which the translators did not understand.

The time of the Aksumitic empire was the time when the Ethiopic language flourished. This empire was overthrown probably in the 7th or 8th century AD; and we know very little indeed of the history of Abyssinia from about 700 until about 1300 AD. In 1270 the so-called Solomonic Dynasty came to the throne again; the seat of the empire, however, was no longer Aksum but Gondar, North of Lake Tsana. Meanwhile the literary language had become a dead language; new dialects had sprung up and taken its place in everyday conversation. But Ge‘ez continued to be the sacred language; it was the language of the Bible and of the church, and when in the 14th and 15th centuries a revival of Abyssinian literature came about, the literary language was Ge‘ez. But it was influenced by the new dialects, especially by the Amharic, the language of Amhara, where Gondar was situated and where most of the books were written or translated. This influence affected in particular the spelling of Ge‘ez in those books which dealt with religious matters and which therefore had to be written in pure Ge‘ez. In historical books a great many words were taken from the Amharic; and this language, called lesana tarik, "the tongue of the chronicles," has often the appearance of mixed language.

In the 16th and 17th centuries European missionaries came to Abyssinia and tried to convert the monophysite Abyssinian Christians to Romanism. In order to come into close contact with the common people they used Amharic as a literary language, so that everybody, not only the learned, might understand their books. Their example was followed by the defenders of the native church; and since that time Amharic has become a recognized literary language in Abyssinia, although Ge‘ez is still considered the real language of the church.

Amharic was derived from a sister language of the Ethiopic; the direct descendant of the Ethiopic language is modern Tigrina; a language derived from a dialect very closely related to Ge‘ez is modern Tigre. LITERATURE.

Ludolf, Historia Aethiopica, 1681; id, Commentarius ad suam historiam Aethiopicam, 1691; Dillmann, Grammatik der athiopischen Sprache (translated into English by Crichton) 1907, Intro; Littmann, Geschichte der athiopischen Litteratur,

1907.

Enno Littmann

ETHIOPIC VERSIONS

e-thi-op’-ik vur’-shuns:

Christianity was introduced into Abyssinia by Tyrian missionaries, who probably spoke Greek, about the time of Constantine the Great. The Bible was translated into Ethiopic, or, to use the native name, Ge‘ez, the Old Testament being from the Septuagint, between the 4th and 5th centuries, by various hands, though the work was popularly ascribed to Frumentius, the first bishop. The fact of the Scriptures having been translated into Ethiopic was known to Chrysostom (Hom. II, in Joannem). The versions thus made were revised some time about the 14th century, and corrected by means of the Massoretic Text. The Ethiopic Scriptures contain the books found in the Alexandrine recension with the exception of the Books of Macc; but their importance lies in their pseudepigraphic writings, the Asc Isa, the Book of Enoch and the Book of Jubilees. The 1st edition of the New Testament appeared at Rome in 1545-49 (reprinted in Walton), but a critical edition has yet to be made; one issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1830 contains many errors. The Old Testament canonical books and Apocrypha have been edited by Dillmann (the Octoteuch and 1-4 Kings and Apocrypha), Bachmann (died 1894) (Isa, Lam, Ob and Mal), and Ludolph (Pss). The Psalter has been often printed from 1513 on. The Book of Enoch was first translated by Richard Laurence and published at Oxford in 1821, but the standard editions are those of Dillmann (Leipzig, 1853) and R. H. Charles (Oxford, 1893). The importance of this work lies in the fact that "the influence of Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphal books taken together" (Charles, 41). Not only the phraseology and ideas, but the doctrines of the New Testament are greatly influenced by it. Of the canonical books and Apocrypha the manuscripts are too poor and too late to be of any value for the criticism of the Greek text.

Thomas Hunter Weir

ETHMA

eth’-ma (Ethma), the Revised Version (British and American)

NOOMA (which see).

ETHNAN

eth’-nan (’ethnan, "gift" or "hire"; Ethnadi):

A Judahite (1Ch 4:7).

ETHNARCH

eth’-nark (2Co 11:32 margin).

See GOVERNOR.

ETHNI

eth’-ni (’ethni, "gift"):

An ancestor of Asaph, of the Gershom branch of the Levites (1Ch 6:41).

ETHNOGRAPHY; ETHNOLOGY

eth-nog’-ra-fi, eth-nol’-o-ji.

See TABLE OF NATIONS.

EUBULUS

u-bu’-lus (Euboulos, literally, "of good counsel," 2Ti 4:21):

One of the members of the church in Rome at the time of Paul’s second imprisonment in that city.

The apostle mentions how, at his first answer to the charges brought against him at the emperor’s tribunal, the Roman Christians as a whole proved disloyal to him "no one took my part, but all forsook me" (2Ti 4:16). In these circumstances when the desertion of Paul by the Christians in Rome was so disheartening, it is pleasing to find that there were some among them who were true, and Eubulus was one of these. Paul therefore in writing the last of all his epistles sends to Timothy a greeting from Eubulus.

Nothing more is known in regard to Eubulus. As his name is Greek, he was probably a Gentile by birth. John Rutherfurd

EUCHARIST

u’-ka-rist.

See LORD’S SUPPER.

EUMENES II

u’-me-nez (Eumenes, "well-disposed"):

King of Pergamus, son and successor of Attalus I (197 BC). He is mentioned in the Apocrypha (1 Macc 8:8) in connection with the league which Judas Maccabeus made with the Romans. As their ally in the war against Antiochus the Great and in recognition of his signal service at the decisive battle of Magnesia (190 BC), Eumenes II was rewarded with such extensive tracts of country as raised him at once from comparative insignificance to be the sovereign of a great state. The statement in the Apocrypha describing his extension of territory differs from those of Livy, Polybius and Appian, and cannot be correct.

The Romans are said to have taken "India, and Media and Lydia" from Antiochus and to have given them to Eumenes II. Antiochus never had any possessions in India nor had any earlier king of Syria. He was obliged to give up only the countries on the side of Taurus toward Rome. No suggestion for the reading "India" in the narrative has met with acceptance (it may possibly have been a copyist’s error for "Ionia"; see Livy xxxvii.44). Eumenes II cultivated the Roman alliance carefully but became suspected in connection with the affairs of Perseus, the last king of Macedonia. He never came to an open rupture with the Romans, and died in 159 BC, after a reign of 39 years.

J. Hutchison

EUNATAN

u-na’-tan.

See ENNATAN.

EUNICE

u-ni’-se, u’-nis (Eunike, is the correct reading, and not Euneike, which is read by the Textus Receptus of the New Testament of Stephen, three syllables: Eu-ni-ke, literally, "conquering well"; 2Ti 1:5): The mother of Timothy.

1. Eunice’s Home:

Her name is Greek and this might lead to the inference that she was a Gentile by birth, but such a conclusion would be wrong, for we read in Ac 16:1 that she was a Jewess. Her husband however was a heathen Greek She was in all probability a daughter of Lois, the grandmother of Timothy, for both of those Christian women are spoken of, in one breath, by Paul, and this in high terms of commendation.

2. How She Trained Her Son:

Timothy had not been circumcised in childhood, probably because of his father’s being a Gentile; but the mother and the grandmother did all that lay in their power to train Timothy in the fear of God and in the knowledge of the Scriptures of the Old Testament. "From a child" Eunice had taught her boy to "know the holy scriptures" (2Ti 3:15 the King James Version). It is right therefore to connect this home training of Timothy in the fear of God, with his and his mother’s conversion to the gospel. His name Timothy—chosen evidently not by the father, but by Eunice—signifies "one who fears God." The "wisdom" of the Hebrews consisted not in worldly prudence or in speculative philosophy, but in the fear of the Lord, as is shown in such passages as Ps 111:10, and in Job 28, and in Proverbs throughout. His name, as well as his careful home training, shows how he was prepared to give a welcome both to Paul and to the gospel proclaimed by him, when the apostle in his first great missionary journey came to Lystra, one of the cities of Lycaonia or Southern (?) Galatia, where Eunice and her family lived. This is implied in the account of Paul’s second missionary journey (Ac 16:1), where we read that he came to Lystra, and found there a certain disciple named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman who was a Jewess, who believed.

3. Her Conversion to Christ:

It is therefore certain that Eunice and Timothy were not brought to a knowledge of the gospel at this time, but that they were already Christians; she, "a believer"; he, "a disciple." This evidently means that Eunice, Lois and Timothy had been converted on Paul’s former visit to Lystra. This conclusion is confirmed in 2Ti 3:11, where Paul recalls to Timothy the fact that he had fully known the persecutions and afflictions which came to him at Lystra. The apostle repeats it, that Timothy knew what persecutions he then endured. Now this persecution occurred on Paul’s first visit to that city. Eunice was therefore one of those who on that occasion became "disciples." And her faith in Christ, and her son’s faith too, were genuine, and stood the test of the "much tribulation" of which Paul warned them (Ac 14:22 the King James Version); and on Paul’s next visit to Lystra, Eunice had the great joy and satisfaction of seeing how the apostle made choice of her son to be his companion in his missionary work. Eunice is not afterward mentioned in the New Testament; though it is a possible thing that there may be reference to her in what is said about widows and the children of widows in 1Ti 5:4,5.

John Rutherfurd

EUNUCH

u’-nuk (caric; spadon; eunouchos):

Primarily and literally, a eunuch is an emasculated man (De 23:1). The Hebrew word caric seems, however, to have acquired a figurative meaning, which is reflected in English Versions of the Bible where "officer" and "chamberlain" are found as renderings (compare Ge 37:36; 39:1, where caric is applied to married men; Es 4:4). The barbarous practice of self-mutilation and the mutilation of others in this way was prevalent throughout the Orient. The religious disabilities under which men thus deformed labored under the Mosaic law had the effect of making the practice abominable to the Jews as a people (De 23:1; Le 22:23-25). The law excluded eunuchs from public worship, partly because self- mutilation was often performed in honor of a heathen god, and partly because a maimed creature of any sort was deemed unfit for the service of Yahweh (Le 21:16 ff; 22:24). That ban, however, was later removed (Isa 56:4,5). On the other hand, the kings of Israel and Judah followed their royal neighbors in employing eunuchs (1) as guardians of the harem (2Ki 9:32; Jer 41:16), and (2) in military and other official posts (1Sa 8:15 margin; 1Ki 22:9 margin; 2Ki 8:6 margin; 2Ki 23:11 the King James Version margin; 2Ki 24:12,13 margin; 2Ki 25:19 margin; 1Ch 28:1 margin; 2Ch 18:8 margin; Jer 29:2; 34:19; 38:7; compare Ge 37:36; 40:2,7; Ac 8:27). Josephus informs us that eunuchs were a normal feature of the courts of the Herods (Ant., XV, vii, 4; XVI, viii, 1). From the single reference to the practice in the Gospels (Mt 19:12), we infer that the existence and purpose of eunuchs as a class were known to the Jews of Jesus’ time. There is no question with Jesus as to the law of Nature: the married life is the norm of man’s condition, and the union thereby effected transcends every other natural bond, even that of filial affection (Mt 19:5,6).

But He would have His hearers recognize that there are exceptional cases where the rule does not hold. In speaking of the three classes of eunuchs (Mt 19:12), He made a distinction which was evidently well known to those whom He addressed, as was the metaphorical use of the word in application to the third class well understood by them (compare Lightfoot, Horae Hebrew et Talmud; Schottgen, Horae Hebrew, in the place cited.).

How Origen misunderstood and abused the teaching of this passage is well known (Euseb., HE, VI, 8), and his own pathetic comment on the passage shows that later he regretted having taken it thus literally and acted on it. His is not the only example of such a perverted interpretation (see Talmud, Shabbath 152a, and compare Midrash on Ec 10:7). The Council of Nicea, therefore, felt called on to deal with the danger as did the 2nd Council of Aries and the Apos Canons (circa 21). (Compare Bingham’s Ant, IV, 9.)

It is significant that Jesus expresses no condemnation of this horrible practice. It was in keeping with His far-reaching plan of instilling principles rather than dealing in denunciations (Joh 3:17; 8:11). It was by His positive teaching concerning purity that we are shown the lines along which we must move to reach the goal. There is a more excellent way of achieving mastery of the sexual passion. It is possible for men to attain as complete control of this strong instinct as if they were physically sexless, and the resultant victory is of infinitely more value than the negative, unmoral condition produced by self-emasculation. These "make themselves eunuchs" with a high and holy purpose, "for the kingdom of heaven’s sake"; and the interests created by that purpose are so absorbing that neither time nor opportunity is afforded to the "fleshly lusts, which war against the soul" (1Pe 2:11). They voluntarily forego marriage even, undertake virtual "eunuchism" because they are completely immersed in and engrossed by "the kingdom of heaven" (compare Joh 17:4; 1Co 7:29,33 f; 9:5 and see Bengel, Gnomon Novi Test. in the place cited and Clement of Alexandria., Strom., iii.1 ff).

See MARRIAGE.

LITERATURE.

Driver," Deuteronomy," ICC, De 23:1; Commentary on Mt, in the place cited. by Morison and Broadus; Neander, Ch. Hist, II, 493; Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus, 72 ff; The Expositor, IV, vii (1893), 294 ff; Encyclopedia Brit, article

"Eunuch."

George B. Eager

EUODIA u-o’-di-a (Euodia, literally, "prosperous journey)."

1. Women Prominent in Church at Philippi:

The Textus Receptus of the New Testament of Stephen reads Euodia, which means "fragrant," Php 4:2. King James Version has transformed Euodia into Euodias, which is a man’s name. The mistake is rectified in the Revised Version (British and American): A Christian woman, one of the members of the church in Philippi. She and Syntyche, who is named in the same verse, were evidently persons of note, prominent in the work of the church there. At Philippi the gospel was first preached to women Ac 16:13, and the church was first formed among women—evidently in the house of Lydia Ac 16:15,40. Paul here makes a request of Euodia and Syntyche. He requests—the word is never used of prayer from us to God—he asks, he beseeches. Euodia, and then he repeats the word, he beseeches Syntyche, to be of the same mind in the Lord. Possibly, as Lightfoot suggests, they may have been deaconesses in the Philippian church, but whatever their position in this respect may have been, differences had arisen between them on some subject, we know not what.

2. The Difference Which Arose:

But whatever the subject in dispute was, it had become so serious that, instead of the breach being healed, matters had become chronic; and news regarding this lack of forbearance between Euodia and Syntyche had been carried to Paul in his captivity in Rome.

3. Paul Entreats Them:

The state of Christian life in the church at Philippi gave Paul almost unmingled satisfaction. He regarded with joy their faith and steadfastness and liberality. There was no false teaching, no division; among them. The only thing which could cause him any uneasiness was the want of harmony between Euodia and Syntyche. He beseeches them to give up their differences, and to live at peace in the Lord. Such is the motive which he puts before them with a view to bring about their reconciliation; to live in dispute and enmity is not worthy of those who are "in the Lord," who have been redeemed by the Lord, and whose whole life should be an endeavor to please Him.

4. The True Yokefellow:

Paul proceeds to ask a certain person, unnamed, but whom he terms "true yokefellow" to assist them, that is, to assist Euodia and Syntyche; for each of them, he says, "labored with me in the gospel." It is uncertain what is meant by "true yokefellow." He may refer to Epaphroditus, who carried the epistle from Rome to Philippi. Other names have been suggested—Luke, Silas, Timothy. It has been thought by some that Paul here refers to his own wife, or to Lydia. But such a suggestion is untenable, inasmuch as we know from his own words (1Co 7:8) that he was either unmarried or a widower. And the idea that the "true yokefellow" is Lydia, is equally wrong, because the word "true" is in the Greek masculine Another suggestion is that "yokefellow" is really a proper name—Syzygus. If so, then the apostle addresses Syzygus; or if this is not so, then he speaks to the unnamed "true yokefellow"; and what he says is that he asks him to help Euodia and Syntyche, inasmuch as their work in the gospel was no new thing. Far from this, when Paul brought the gospel to Philippi at the first, these two Christian women had been his loyal and earnest helpers in spreading the knowledge of Christ.

5. The Plea for Reconciliation:

How very sad then that any difference should exist between them; how sad that it should last so long! He asks Clement

also, and all the other Christians at Philippi, his fellow-laborers, whose names, though not mentioned by the apostle, are nevertheless in the book of life, to assist Euodia and Syntyche; he asks them all to aid in this work of reconciliation. Doubtless he did not plead in vain.

See SYNTYCHE; YOKE-FELLOW.

John Rutherfurd

EUPATOR

u’-pa-tor (Eupator, "of noble father"):

The name given to Antiochus V who had succeeded his father Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), 164 BC, while still a child under the guardianship of Lysias (APC 1Macc 3:32; 6:17). In the absence of Philip, a friend and foster-brother of the child’s father, whom on his deathbed he had appointed guardian for his son, Lysias continued his duty as guardian, set the king upon the throne and named him Eupator. Shortly after his accession he collected a large army and marched against Jerusalem, accompanied by Lysias, for the relief of a Syrian garrison that was hard pressed by Judas Maccabeus (APC 1Macc 6:19 ff). Judas was repulsed at Bethzacharias and after a severe struggle Bethsura was captured (APC 1Macc 6:31-50). The Jewish force in the temple was hard pressed and indeed reduced to the last extremity (APC 1Macc 6:53), when Lysias, hearing that his rival Philip had returned from Persia and had made himself master of Antioch (Josephus, Ant, XII, ix, 5 f), made a hasty peace and returned to meet Philip, whom he easily overpowered. In the following year (162 BC) Antiochus and Lysias were put to death by Demetrius Soter, son of Seleucus, in requital of wrongs inflicted upon himself by Antiochus Epiphanes (APC 1Macc 7:2-4; 2Macc 14:1,2; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 1).

J. Hutchinson

EUPHRATES

u-fra’-tez (perath; Euphrates, "the good and abounding river"):

The longest (1,780 miles) and most important stream of Western Asia, generally spoken of in the Old Testament as "the river" (Ex 23:31; De 11:24).

Its description naturally falls into 3 divisions—the upper, middle and lower. The upper division traverses the mountainous plateau of Armenia, and is formed by the junction of 2 branches, the Frat and the Murad. The Frat rises 25 miles Northeast of Erzerum, and only 60 miles from the Black Sea. The Murad, which, though the shorter, is the larger of the two, rises in the vicinity of Mt. Ararat. After running respectively 400 and 270 miles in a westerly direction, they unite near Keban Maaden, whence in a tortuous channel of about 300 miles, bearing still in a southwesterly direction, the current descends in a succession of rapids and cataracts to the Syrian plain, some distance above the ancient city of Carchemish, where it is only about 200 miles from the Northeast corner of the Mediterranean. In its course through the Armenian plateau, the stream has gathered the sediment which gives fertility to the soil in the lower part of the valley. It is the melting snows from this region which produce the annual floods from April to June.

The middle division, extending for about 700 miles to the bitumen wells of Hit, runs Southeast "through a valley of a few miles in width, which it has eroded in the rocky surface, and which, being more or less covered with alluvial soil, is pretty generally cultivated by artificial irrigation. .... Beyond the rocky banks on both sides is the open desert, covered in spring with a luxuriant verdure, and dotted here and there with the black tent of the Bedouin" (Sir Henry Rawlinson). Throughout this portion the river formed the ancient boundary between the Assyrians and Hittites whose capital was at Carchemish, where there are the remains of an old bridge. The ruins of another ancient bridge occur 200 miles lower down at the

ancient Thapsacus, where the Greeks forded it under Cyrus the younger. Throughout the middle section the stream is too rapid to permit of successful navigation except by small boats going downstream, and has few and insignificant tributaries. It here has, however, its greatest width (400 yds.) and depth. Lower down the water is drawn off by irrigating canals and into lagoons.

The fertile plain of Babylonia begins at Hit, about 100 miles above Babylon; 50 miles below Hit the Tigris and Euphrates approach to within 25 miles of each other, and together have in a late geological period deposited the plain of Shinar or of Chaldea, more definitely referred to as Babylonia. This plain is about 250 miles long, and in its broadest place 100 miles wide. From Hit an artificial canal conducts water along the western edge of the alluvial plain to the Persian Gulf, a distance of about 500 miles. But the main irrigating canals put off from the East side of the Euphrates, and can be traced all over the plain past the ruins of Accad, Babylon, Nippur, Bismya, Telloh, Erech, Ur and numerous other ancient cities. Originally the Euphrates and Tigris entered into the Persian Gulf by separate channels. At that time the Gulf extended up as far as Ur, the home of Abraham, and it was a seaport. The sediment from these rivers has filled up the head of the Persian Gulf for nearly 100 miles since the earliest monumental records. Loftus estimates that since the Christian era the encroachment has proceeded at the rate of 1 mile in 70 years. In early times Babylonia was rendered fertile by immense irrigating schemes which diverted the water from the Euphrates, which at Babylon is running at a higher level than the Tigris. A large canal left the Euphrates just above Babylon and ran due East to the Tigris, irrigating all the intervening region and sending a branch down as far South as Nippur. Lower down a canal crosses the plain in an opposite direction. This ancient system of irrigation can be traced along the lines of the principal canals "by the winding curves of layers of alluvium in the bed," while the lateral channels "are hedged in by high banks of mud, heaped up during centuries of dredging. Not a hundredth part of the old irrigation system is now in working order. A few of the mouths of the smaller canals are kept open so as to receive a limited supply of water at the rise of the river in May, which then distributes itself over the lower lying lands in the interior, almost without labor on the part of the cultivators, giving birth in such localities to the most abundant crops; but by far the larger portion of the region between the rivers is at present an arid, howling wilderness, strewed in the most part with broken pottery, the evidence of former human habitation, and bearing nothing but the camel thorn, the wild caper, the colocynth-apple, wormwood and the other weeds of the desert" (Rawlinson). According to Sir W. Willcocks, the eminent English engineer, the whole region is capable of being restored to its original productiveness by simply reproducing the ancient system of irrigation. There are, however, in the lower part of the region, vast marshes overgrown with reeds, which have continued since the time of Alexander who came near losing his army in passing through them. These areas are probably too much depressed to be capable of drainage. Below the junction of the Euphrates and the Tigris, the stream is called Shat el Arab, and is deep enough to float war vessels.

LITERATURE.

Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 169 f; Chesney, Narrative of the Euphrates Exped., I; Loftus, Travels, etc., in Chaldoea and Susiana; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, chapters xxi, xxii; Rawlinson, Herodotus, I, essay ix; Ellsworth Huntington, "Valley of the Upper Euphrates River," Bull. Amer. Geog. Soc., XXXIV, 1902.

George Frederick Wright

EUPOLEMUS

u-pol’-e-mus (Eupolemos):

Son of John, the son of Accos = Hakkoz (Akkos; Ne 3:4,21, etc.); was one of the two deputies sent by Judas Maccabeus (APC 1Mac 8:17; 2Mac 4:11) to Rome circa 161 BC to ask the help of the Romans against Demetrius. A critical estimate of the narrative (APC 1Macc 8 and Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6) of the first meeting of the representatives of the Jewish nation and the Romans will be found in Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, III, 350 ff, where it is admitted that "inaccuracies of detail only confirm the general faithfulness of the impression." Keil (Comm., 14) further remarks on this point: "that the author of 1 Macc wrote from twenty to twenty-five years after the destruction of Corinth (146 BC) by

the Romans; and that the Jews of Palestine were not accurately informed concerning the wars of the Romans with the Greeks." Eupolemus has been identified with the historian of the same name quoted by Eusebius (Praep. Ev., IX, 17 ff); but there is no evidence that the historian was of Jewish origin.

J. Hutchison

EURAQUILO

u-rak'-wi-lo (the Revised Version (British and American) eurakulon; the King James Version eurokludon; the King James Version Euroclydon, u-rok'-li-don):

The east or northeast wind which drove Paul's ship to shipwreck at Melita (Ac 27:14). The term seems to have been the sailor's term for that particular wind, and Paul uses the word which was used by them on that occasion. The difference in the text is explained by the fact that the term was not in general use and was therefore subject to being changed. The precise name is doubtful, but "the Euraquilo" is more easily explained as a compound of Greek euros, "east wind," and Latin aquilo, "northeast wind," hence, euraquilo, "east northeast wind." This agrees with the experience of navigators in those waters. For a summary of the various readings see Sanday, Appendices ad New Testament, 140. Full discussion of the circumstances are given in the Lives of Paul by various writers.

Alfred H. Joy

EUTYCHUS

u'-ti-kus (Eutuchos, "fortunate"):

The story of Eutychus occurs in the "we" section of Acts, and is therefore related by an eyewitness of the incidents (Ac 20:7-12). On the first day of the week the Christians of Troas had met for an evening service in an upper chamber, and were joined by Paul and his company. As he was to leave in the morning, Paul "prolonged his speech until midnight." A youth named Eutychus, who was sitting at the open window, became borne down with sleep owing to the lateness of the hour, and ultimately fell through the opening from the third story. He "was taken up dead." This direct statement is evaded by De Wette and Olshausen, who translate "for dead." Meyer says this expresses the judgment of those who took him up. However, Luke, the physician, is giving his verdict, and he plainly believes that a miracle was wrought by Paul in restoring a corpse to life. The intention of Luke in relating this incident is to relate a miracle. Paul went down and embraced the youth while comforting the lamenting crowd, "Make ye no ado; for his life is in him." The interrupted meeting was resumed, the bread was broken, and the conversation continued till break of day. "And they brought the lad alive, and were not a little comforted."

S. F. Hunter

EVANGELIST

e-van'-jel-ist:

This is a form of the word ordinarily translated "gospel" (euaggelion), except that here it designates one who announces that gospel to others (euaggelistes, "a bringer of good tidings"), literally, God Himself is an evangelist, for He "preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham" (Ga 3:8); Jesus Christ was an evangelist, for He also "preached the gospel" (Lu 20:1); Paul was an evangelist as well as an apostle (Ro 1:15); Philip the deacon was an evangelist (Ac 21:8); and Timothy, the pastor (2Ti 4:5); and indeed all the early disciples who, on being driven out of Jerusalem, "went everywhere preaching the word" (Ac 8:4 the King James Version).

But Eph 4:11 teaches that one particular order of the ministry, distinguished from every other, is singled out by the Head of the church for this work in a distinctive sense. All may possess the gift of an evangelist in a measure, and be obligated to exercise its privilege and duty, but some are specially endued with it. "He gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." It will be seen that as an order in the ministry, the evangelist precedes that of the pastor and teacher, a fact which harmonizes with the character of the work each is still recognized as doing. The evangelist has no fixed place of residence, but moves about in different localities, preaching the gospel to those ignorant of it before. As these are converted and united to Jesus Christ by faith, the work of the pastor and teacher begins, to instruct them further in the things of Christ and build them up in the faith.

At a later time, the name of "evangelist" was given the writers of the four Gospels because they tell the story of the gospel and because the effect of their promulgation at the beginning was very much like the work of the preaching evangelist. In character, the Gospels bear something of the same relation to the Epistles as evangelists bear to pastors and teachers.

James M. Gray

EVE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

(Eua; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Heua):

"Eve" occurs twice in the New Testament and both references are in the Pauline writings. In 1Ti 2:12-14 woman's place in teaching is the subject of discussion, and the writer declares that she is a learner and not a teacher, that she is to be in quietness and not to have dominion over a man. Paul elsewhere expressed this same idea (see 1Co 14:34,35). Having stated his position in regard to woman's place, he used the Ge account of the relation of the first woman to man to substantiate his teaching. Paul used this account to illustrate woman's inferiority to man, and he undoubtedly accepted it at its face value without any question as to its historicity. He argued that woman is inferior in position, for "Adam was first formed, then Eve." She is inferior in character, for "Adam was not beguiled, but the woman being beguiled hath fallen into transgression."

See CHILD-BEARING.

In 2Co 11:3, Paul is urging loyalty to Christ, and he uses the temptation of Eve to illustrate the ease with which one is corrupted. Paul seems to have had no thought but that the account of the serpent's beguiling Eve should be taken literally.

A. W. Fortune

EVE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

ev, (chawwah, "life"; Eua; the name given, as the Scripture writer says, Ge 3:20 (Zoe), from her unique function as "the mother of all living"):

The first created woman; created secondarily from Adam (or man) as a "help meet for him" (Ge 2:18-22), and later named and designated as the mother of the human race.

For the literary type and object of the story of Eve, see under ADAM, i, 2.

1. The Names Given to Her:

Two names are given to her, both bestowed by the man, her mate. The first, ishshah, "woman" (literally, "man-ess"), is not

strictly a name but a generic designation, referring to her relation to the man; a relation she was created to fulfill in default of any true companionship between man and the beasts, and represented as intimate and sacred beyond that between child and parents (Ge 2:18-24). The second, Eve, or "life," given after the transgression and its prophesied results, refers to her function and destiny in the spiritual history or evolution of which she is the beginning (Ge 3:16,20). While the names are represented as bestowed by the man, the remarks in Ge 2:24 and 3:20b may be read as the interpretative addition of the writer, suited to the exposition which it is the object of his story to make.

2. Her Relation to Man:

As mentioned in the article ADAM, the distinction of male and female, which the human species has in common with the animals, is given in the general (or P) account of creation (Ge 1:27); and then, in the more particularized (or J) account of the creation of man, the human being is described at a point before the distinction of sex existed. This second account may have a different origin, but it has also a different object, which does not conflict with but rather supplements the other. It aims to give the spiritual meanings that inhere in man's being; and in this the relation of sex plays an elemental part. As spiritually related to the man-nature, the woman-nature is described as derivative, the helper rather than the initiator, yet equal, and supplying perfectly the man's social and affectional needs. It is the writer's conception of the essential meaning of mating and marriage. To bring out its spiritual values more clearly he takes the pair before they are aware of the species meanings of sex or family, while they are "naked" yet "not ashamed" Ge 2:25, and portrays them purely as companions, individual in traits and tendencies, yet answering to each other. She is the helpmeet for him (ezer keneghdo, "a help answering to him").

3. Her Part in the Change of Condition:

True to her nature as the being relatively acted upon rather than acting, she is quicker than the man to respond to the suggestion initiated by the serpent and to follow it out to its desirable results. There is eagerness of desire in her act of taking the fruit quite different from the quasi matter-of-course attitude of the man. To her the venture presents itself wholly from the alluring side, while to him it is more like taking a desperate risk, as he detaches himself even from the will of God in order to cleave to her. All this is delicately true to the distinctive feminine and masculine natures. A part of her penalty is henceforth to be the subordinated one of the pair (Ge 3:16), as if for her the values of life were to be mediated through him. At the same time it is accorded to her seed to perpetuate the mortal antipathy to the serpent, and finally to bruise the serpent's head (Ge 3:15).

4. In Subsequent History:

After these opening chapters of Gen, Eve is not once mentioned, nor even specifically alluded to, in the canonical books of the Old Testament. It was not in the natural scope of Old Testament history and doctrine, which were concerned with Abraham's descendants, to go back to so remote origins as are narrated in the story of the first pair. The name Eve occurs once in the Apocrypha, in the prayer of Tobit (APC Tobit 8:6): "Thou madest Adam, and gavest him Eve his wife for a helper and a stay; of them came the seed of men"; the text then going on to quote Ge 2:18. In 1 Esdras 4:20,21 there is a free quotation, or rather paraphrase, of Ge 2:24. But not even in the somber complaints of 2 Esdras concerning the woe that Adam's transgression brought upon the race is there any hint of Eve's part in the matter.

(see under ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, iii, 2)

John Franklin Genung

EVE, GOSPEL OF

A Gnostic doctrinal treatise mentioned by Epiphanius (Haer., xxvi.2 ff) in which Jesus is represented as saying in a loud voice, "I am thou, and thou art I, and wherever thou art there am I, and in all things I am sown. And from whencesoever

thou gatherest me, in gathering me thou gatherest thyself."

See LOGIA; and compare Ropes, Die Spruche Jesu, 56.

EVEN; EVENING; EVENTIDE

e'-v'-n, ev'-ning, ev-'-n-tid' ("even," "evening," 'erebh; opsia, opse; see Thayer under the word):

The words are used in slightly different meanings:

(1) The time of sunset, the beginning of the Hebrew day, as in Le 15, where directions are given for the removal of uncleanness, which took place at sunset.

(2) Twilight, the time of approaching darkness when lamps are lighted; Ex 30:8 (literally, "between the two evenings"); Jer 6:4 ("the shadows of the evening").

(3) The early part of the night (Pr 7:9; Eze 12:7).

The Greek opse is literally, "late" (Mr 11:19). The Greek hespera, refers evidently to sunset, in Lu 24:29. "Eventide," 'eth 'erebh, "time of evening" (2Sa 11:2; Isa 17:14). "Evening," used in connection with wolves (Jer 5:6; Ze 3:3), is from the Hebrew ['arabhah], which may mean "darkness" or "dark cloud," but more probably "plain" or "desert."

H. Porter

EVENINGS, BETWEEN THE

The time of day (the Revised Version (British and American) reads "at even," margin, "between the two evenings") when the Passover lamb was slain (Ex 12:6; Nu 9:3), or the offering made of the evening portion of the continual burnt offering (Nu 28:4).

See preceding article.

EVENT

e-vent':

In Ec 2:14; 9:2,3, the translation of miqreh, "what happens," "lot," "fate." The English word bore this sense at the time of the King James Version. The meaning of "result," "outcome" ekbaseis, attaches to it in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:8, "events of seasons," the Revised Version (British and American) "issues."

EVERLASTING

ev-er-last'-ing (olam, 'adh; aidios, aionios):

"Everlasting," in strictness, is that which endures forever; either that which has no beginning and will have no end (in which sense it is applicable to God only), or that which, having a beginning, will have no end, but henceforth will exist forever (thus of beings created for immortality; see IMMORTALITY). Figuratively also the term is applied to objects of impressive stability and long duration, as mountains, hills (eg. Ge 49:26; Hab 3:6).

Of the terms indicated as rendered by this word, ‘olam in the Old Testament and aionios in the New Testament, literally, "age-long," generally bear the full sense of "eternal" (always as applied to God, His mercy, His covenant, His kingdom and to the eternal life of believers). Hence, in the Revised Version (British and American) the rendering "everlasting" in the King James Version is, in the New Testament, uniformly changed to "eternal" (eg. Mt 18:8; 25:41,46; Lu 16:9; 18:30; Joh 3:16,36, etc.; Ac 13:46; Ro 6:22; 16:26; Ga 6:8; Heb 13:20). In the Old Testament the rendering "everlasting" is usually retained in the Revised Version (British and American), and sometimes takes the place of other words or phrases, as "lasting" (De 33:15), "ever," "forever" (1Ch 16:36; Ne 9:5), "perpetual" (Hab 3:6; Jer 50:5), "of old" (Hab 3:6 margin). In Ps 100:5; 119:144, on the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American) changes the word to "for ever." In much the larger number of places ‘olam is translated "ever" or "for ever."

The word ‘adh, in the two cases in which it is translated "everlasting" in the King James Version (more frequently "for ever"), is in the Revised Version (British and American), in Isa 9:6, retained, with margin, "Father of Eternity," and in Hab 3:6 is changed into "eternal." Another word, qedhem, with the meaning "ancient time," is rendered "everlasting" in Hab 1:12 ("Art not thou from everlasting?"). With the same meaning it occurs in De 33:27, "The eternal God is thy dwelling-place."

The word which strictly answers to "everlasting" in the New Testament is aidios (Ro 1:20; Jude 1:6), rendered by the King James Version in the former passages "eternal," but correctly by the Revised Version (British and American) in both passages, "everlasting." The sense of the word "everlasting," in application to future punishment, is considered in the article PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING.

The term "everlasting" or "eternal," applied to God, describes Him as filling, or enduring through, all the "ages" of time. It is only thus that we can symbolically represent eternity. In reality, however, the eternity of God is not simply His filling of ever-flowing "ages," but rather that aspect of His being in which He is above time; for which time (the succession-form of existence) does not exist; to which the terms past, present and future do not apply. Yet, while God is not in time (rather holds time in Himself), time-sequence, as the form of existence of the world, is a reality for God.

See ETERNAL; ETERNITY.

James Orr

EVI

e’-vi (’ewi, "desire"; Euei):

One of the five kings, or chiefs of the Midianites, slain by Israel during their sojourn in the plains of Moab (Nu 31:8; Jos 13:21).

EVIDENCE; EVIDENT; EVIDENTLY

ev’-i-dens, ev’-i-dent-li cepher; elegchos, phaneros:

In Jer 32:10,11,12,14,16,44, cepher, "a writing," is translated (the King James Version) "evidence" (of the purchase of the field in Anathoth), the Revised Version (British and American) "deed"; "evidence" is also the translation of elegchos, "conviction," in the King James Version of Heb 11:1, "Now faith is .... the evidence of things not seen," the English Revised Version "proving," margin, "or test," better, as the American Standard Revised Version, "conviction," margin, "or test." The Greek word denotes "putting to the test," examining for the purpose of proof, bringing to conviction (Dr. W. F. Moulton). Thus if "test" or "proving" be adopted, a firm conviction of the reality of things not seen is implied as the result

of putting to the proof. Trench remarks (New Testament Synonyms), "in juristic Greek elegchein is not merely to reply to, but to refute, an opponent." Hence, the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) translation argumentum, followed by Wyclif and Rheims version; Tyndale and Cranmer have "certayntie." (The sense of "conviction" appears in Joh 8:46, "Which of you convinceth (elegchei, the Revised Version (British and American) "convicteth") me of sin?"; Joh 3:20, "reproved," the Revised Version, margin "convicted"; Joh 16:8 the King James Version "He will reprove the world of sin," the Revised Version (British and American) "convict." Compare 1Co 14:24.) "Evident" is the translation of 'al panim ("on the face") in Job 6:28, the King James Version "Look upon me; for it is evident unto you if I lie," margin, "Hebrew before your face," the Revised Version (British and American) "to your face," margin, "And it will be evident unto you if I lie," which is, perhaps, to be preferred to the text; delos, "manifest," is translated "evident" (Ga 3:11); katadelos, "very manifest," is in Heb 7:15, the King James Version "far more evident," the Revised Version (British and American) "more abundantly evident"; prodelos, "manifest before-hand" (Heb 7:14), "evident." "Evidently" occurs only in Ac 10:3, as the translation of phaneros, "openly," "manifestly," the Revised Version (British and American) "openly."

It is important to note the true nature of faith according to the correct translation of Heb 11:1, as being the well- grounded and assured conviction of things not seen.

W. L. Walker

EVIL

ev'-'-l, e'-vil ra'; poneros, @kakos, @kakon:

In the Bible it is represented as moral and physical. We choose to discuss the subject under these heads. Many of the evils that come upon men have not been intended by those who suffer for them. Disease, individual and national calamity, drought, scarcity of food, may not always be charged to the account of intentional wrong. Many times the innocent suffer with, and even for, the guilty. In such cases, only physical evil is apparent. Even when the suffering has been occasioned by sin or dereliction of duty, whether the wrong is active or passive, many, perhaps the majority of those who are injured, are not accountable in any way for the ills which come upon them. Neither is God the author of moral evil. "God cannot be tempted with evil, and he himself tempteth no man" (Jas 1:13).

See TEMPTATION.

1. Moral Evil:

By this term we refer to wrongs done to our fellowman, where the actor is responsible for the action. The immorality may be present when the action is not possible. "But if that evil servant shall say in his heart" (Mt 24:48,49), whether he shall smite his fellow-servants or not, the moral evil is present. See SIN. "All these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man" (Mr 7:21-23). The last six commandments of the Decalogue apply here (Ex 20:12-17). To dishonor one's parents, to kill, to commit adultery, to steal, to bear false witness and to covet are moral evils. The spiritual import of these commandments will be found in Mt 5:21,22,27,28. "But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness" (Mt 6:23). Words and deeds are coined in the heart before the world sees or hears them (Mt 12:34,35). The word ought or its equal may be found in all languages; hence, it is in the mind of all people as well as in our laws that for the deeds and words we do and speak, we are responsible. "Break off thy sins by righteousness" (Da 4:27) shows that, in God's thought, it was man's duty, and therefore within his power, to keep the commandment. "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; learn to do well" (Isa 1:16 f). We cannot think of God commanding men to do what He knew they had no ability to do! God has a standing offer of pardon to all men who turn from their evil ways and do that which is right (Eze 33:11-14 f). Evil begins in the least objectionable things. In Ro 1:18-23, we have Paul's view of the falling away of the Gentiles. "Knowing God" (verse 21), they were "without excuse" (verse 20), but "glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened" (verse 21). "Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" (verse 22). This led the way into idolatry, and

that was followed by all the corruption and wrongdoing to be instigated by a heart turned away from all purity, and practiced in all the iniquity to be suggested by lust without control. Paul gives fifteen steps in the ladder on which men descend into darkness and ruin (Ga 5:19-21). When men become evil in themselves, they necessarily become evil in thought and deed toward others. This they bring upon themselves, or give way to, till God shall give "them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting" (Ro 1:28). Those thus fallen into habits of error, we should in meekness correct, that "they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, having been taken captive by him unto his will" (2Ti 2:25,26).

2. Physical Evil:

Usually, in the Old Testament the Hebrew word ra‘ is employed to denote that which is bad. Many times the bad is physical; it may have been occasioned by the sins for which the people of the nation were responsible, or it may have come, not as a retribution, but from accident or mismanagement or causes unknown. Very many times the evil is a corrective, to cause men to forsake the wrong and accept the right. The flood was sent upon the earth because "all flesh had corrupted their way" (Ge 6:12). This evil was to serve as a warning to those who were to live after. The ground had already been cursed for the good of Cain (Ge 4:12). Two purposes seemed to direct the treatment: (1) to leave in the minds of Cain and his descendants the knowledge that sin brings punishment, and (2) to increase the toil that would make them a better people. God overthrew Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, cities of the plain, making them "an example unto those that should live ungodly" (2Pe 2:6). In the Book of Isa the prophet, we find a number of "burdens": the burden of Babylon (Is 13:1-22); the burden of Moab (Is 15:1-9); the burden of Damascus (Is 17:1-14); the burden of Egypt (Is 19:1-17); the burden of the Wilderness of the Sea (Is 21:1-10); the burden of Dumah (Is 21:11,12); the burden upon Arabia (Is 21:13-17); the burden of the Valley of Vision (Is 22:1-25); the burden of Tyre (Is 23:1-18); the burden of the Beasts of the South (Is 30:6-14); the burden of the Weary Beast (Is 46:1,2). These may serve as an introduction to the story of wrongdoing and physical suffering threatened and executed. Isa contains many denunciations against Israel: against the Ten Tribes for following the sin introduced by Jeroboam the son of Nebat; and the threatening against Judah and Benjamin for not heeding the warnings. Jeremiah saw the woes that were sure to come upon Judah; for declaring them, he was shut up in prison, and yet they came, and the people were carried away into Babylon. These were the evils or afflictions brought upon the nations for their persistence in sin. "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil; I am Yahweh, that doeth all these things" (Isa 45:7). These chastisements seemed grievous, and yet they yielded peaceable fruit unto them that were exercised thereby (Heb 12:11).

David Roberts Dungan

EVIL EYE

(ra‘ ‘ayin, "evil of eye"; ophthalmos poneros):

The superstition of the influence of the "evil eye," so widely spread over the earth, has had a mighty influence on life and language in Palestine, though direct references to it are not frequent in the Scriptures (De 15:9; 28:54,56; Pr 23:6; 28:22; Mt 20:15 (compare Mt 6:23; Lu 11:34); Mr 7:22). In the Bible the expression is synonymous with envy, jealousy and some forms of covetousness. In comparing Ro 1:29 with Mr 7:22 we find that ophthalmos poneros corresponds to phthonos. See Trench, New Testament Synonyms, under the word The eye of the envious (as also the tongue of the invidious by an apparently appreciative word, which, however, only disguises the strong desire of possessing the object of comment or of destroying it for its rightful owner) was supposed to have a baneful influence upon the wellbeing of others, especially of children. Therefore mothers bestowed constant care against the frustration of such fancied designs by means of innumerable sorts of charms. They often allowed their darlings to appear as unlovely as possible, through uncleanliness or rags, so as to spare them the harmful rising of envy in the hearts of others.

Lane, Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians, gives perhaps the most accessible account of this superstition as held at the present day in Egypt, and Thomson, The Land and the Book, does the same for Palestine, while an equal

amount of evidence might be collected from every other oriental country. Instances of the same superstition, though possibly slightly disguised, are by no means wanting among ourselves. Compare the expression, "green-eyed jealousy" (Othello, III, iii; Merchant of Venice, III, ii), etc.

For certain Biblical phrases referring to the "evil eye" see ENVY; EYE.

LITERATURE.

F. T. Elworthy, The Evil Eye, London, 1895.

H. L. E. Luering

EVIL ONE

(ho poneros):

Nearly all peoples who have expressed their religious thought and feeling believe in a spirit that presides over the destinies of men for their good. They believe that there is also a spirit, a person, whose work it is to lead men into temptation: a spirit of light and a spirit of darkness. Feelings and preferences may have much to do with the conclusions. In Mt 5:37,39,45; 6:13, the King James Version gives "evil," the Revised Version (British and American) "the evil one," margin, "evil," the personal form referring to the enemy of the race known by various terms: Satan, "the adversary" or "the accuser," occurs 50 times; Beelzebub is found 7 times; devil, 35 times; it means "accuser," "calumniator."

See SATAN.

David Roberts Duncan

EVIL SPIRIT

See DEMON; DEMONIAC; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS; SATAN.

EVIL THING

(to kakon, plural in Lu 16:25):

An evil thing or evil things may be the thoughts of evil men, their plans or their deeds; or the things men suffer for their own wrongs; or the evils consequent upon the errors of others. In the dark picture of fallen men in Ro 1:30, "inventors of evil things" appear. "The evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil (poneros) things" (Mt 12:35). Men should not lust after evil (kakos) things (1Co 10:6). This fixing the mind upon, with desire, leads to increased wrong. "The mouth of the wicked poureth out evil (ra') things" (Pr 15:28). The rich man had good things in his life, but did not use them to the glory of God or the good of men. The poor man had evil things: sickness, nakedness, hunger. The scene changes after death (Lu 16:25).

David Roberts Dungan

EVIL-DOERS

e-v'-l-doo'-erz mere'im; from ra'-a'; kakopoios, always plural:

Malefactors or offenders of God’s law. Used generally of the ungodly, as, "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers." (Ps 37:1). Sometimes also of personal offenders: "He hath delivered the soul of the needy from the hand of evil-doers." (Jer 20:13).

EVIL-FAVOREDNESS

e-v’-l-fa’-verd-nes

The word is the translation of the Hebrew dabhar ra’, lit "evil thing," and refers to the ritual unfitness for sacrifice of any animal which, though included in the class of clean beasts, yet possesses a blemish (see the word), or otherwise lacks beauty of symmetry, or is lean-fleshed (De 17:1 the King James Version; compare "ill blemish," De 15:21). We find these conditions combined in Ge 41:3,4,19,20,21,27, where the seven "ill-favored and lean-fleshed" kine of Pharaoh’s dream are mentioned.

EVIL-MERODACH

e-vil-me-ro’-dak; -mer’-o-dak ‘ewil merodhakh; Septuagint Eueialmarodek; so B in K, but B in Jeremiah, and A and Q in both places much corrupted:

The name of the son and immediate successor of Nebuchadnezzar II, king of Babylon. The Babylonian form of the name is Amelu- Marduk, that is, "man of Marduk." About 30 contract tablets dated in this reign have been found. They show that Evil-merodach reigned for two years and about five months. He is said by Berosus to have conducted his government in an illegal and improper manner, and to have been slain by his sister’s brother, Nergalshar-ucur, who then reigned in his stead. Evil- merodach is said in 2Ki 25:27-30 and in the parallel passage in Jer 52:31-34 to have taken Jehoiachin, king of Judah, from his prison in Babylon, where he seems to have been confined for 37 years, to have clothed him with new garments, to have given him a seat above all the other kings, and to have allowed him to eat at the king’s table all the days of his life. It is an undesigned coincidence, that may be worthy of mention, that the first dated tablet from this reign was written on the 26th of Elul, and Jer 52:31 says that Jehoiachin was freed from prison on the 25th of the same month.

R. Dick Wilson

EVIL-SPEAKING

e-v’-l-spek’-ing:

Occurs twice in English Versions:

(1) 1Pe 2:1 it is the translation of katalalia, "a speaking against," rendered "backbiting" in 2Co 12:20; compare katalalos, "backbiter" (Ro 1:30); the verb katalaleo is rendered to "speak against" (1Pe 2:12; Jas 4:11; 1Pe 3:16);

(2) of blasphemia, "what is hurtful to the good name of anyone," "detraction," "slander" (Eph 4:31 the Revised Version (British and American), "railing"; compare 1Ti 6:4; Jude 1:9; Col 3:8); the verb blasphemeo is rendered to "speak evil of" (Ro 14:16; 1Co 10:30; Tit 3:2, etc.); to "speak evil" occurs in Mr 9:39 as the translation of kakologeo, "lightly (the Revised Version (British and American) "quickly") speak evil of me"; Ac 19:9 the King James Version "spake evil of that way." In Ps 140:11, we have "evil-speaker" as the translation of ‘ish lashon, "a man of tongue"; so the Revised Version (British and American). The wrong thing condemned as evil-speaking seems to be essentially detraction, what is hurtful to the reputation, and it is often too lightly regarded even among Christians.

See BLASPHEMY; RAILING; SLANDER.

W. L. Walker

EVOLUTION

ev-o-lu’-shun:

1. The Idea of Evolution:

Evolution is a scientific and philosophical theory designed to explain the origin and course of all things in the universe. By origin, however, is not understood the production or emergence of the substance and of the cause or causes of things, but that of the forms in which they appear to the observer. Sometimes the term is vaguely used to cover absolute origin in the sense just excluded. A moment’s reflection will make it clear that such a view can never secure a place in the realm of pure science. The problem of ultimate origin is not one that science can solve. If it is solved at all, it must be by purely philosophical as distinguished from scientific or scientific-philosophical methods. Evolution, therefore, must be viewed in science purely and strictly as a process of orderly change in the form of things. As such it assumes the existence of substance or substances and of a force or forces working its successive transformations. (NOTE: This position is apparently contradicted in the title of Henri Bergson’s L’evolution creatrice. But an examination of Bergson’s system shows that the contradiction is only apparent. Bergson’s evolution is neither substance nor efficient cause or principle. The latter is given in his vital impetus (elan vital); the former in his concept of duration.)

As an orderly change of the form of things, evolution may be viewed as operative in the field of inorganic matter, or in that of life. In the first, it is known and called cosmic evolution; in the second, organic evolution. Of cosmic evolution again there appear two aspects, according as the process, or law. of transformation, is observed to operate in the realm of the lower units of matter (atoms and molecules), or is studied in the region of the great. In the first sphere, it is made to account for the emergence in Nature of the qualities and powers of different kinds of matter called elements. In the second, it explains the grouping together, the movements and transformations of the solar and of stellar systems. Similarly, of organic evolution there appear to be two varieties. The first occurs in the world of life including the vegetable and animal kingdoms. Evolution here accounts for the various forms of living beings building their bodies and passing from one stage to another in their existence as individuals, and for the course of the history of all life as it differentiates into species and genera. The second variety of evolution operates in the higher realm of intelligence, morality, social activity and religion. The idea of a law of orderly change governing all things is not a new one.

Historians of science find it in some form or other embodied in the philosophies of Heraclitus, Democritus, Lucretius and Aristotle. There are those who find it also in the system of Gautama (Buddha).

2. Recent Origin of Notion:

But in none of these was there a sufficiently wide basis of fact inductively brought together, or a thorough enough digestion and assimilation of the material to give the view as presented by them a firm standing. Hegel’s idealistic theory of Development is kindred to the evolution theory in its essence; but it too antedates the working out of the system upon the basis of the scientific induction of the phenomena of Nature.

Until the time of Herbert Spencer, the scientific use of the word evolution was limited to the narrow department of embryology. By him, the term was made synonymous with all orderly change in Nature. The notion that such change is the result of chance, however, was not a part of Spencer’s teaching. On the contrary, that philosopher held that chance is but the expression of laws undiscerned by the human mind. Yet these laws are just as definite and rigid as those already discovered and formulated.

Since the appearance of the inductive method in scientific research, and the rise of the science of biology in particular, the idea of evolution has been elaborated into a great systematic generalization, and proposed as the philosophy of all perceptible phenomena. Beginning as a working hypothesis in a special narrow department, that of biology, it has been extended into all the sciences until all come under its dominance, and it is viewed no longer as a mere working hypothesis, but as a demonstrated philosophy with the force and certainty of fact.

3. Evolution and Biblical Truth:

It was natural that such an important proposition as the explanation of the present form of the whole universe by theory of evolution should in its course have occasioned much controversy. On one side extravagant claims were bound to be put forth in its behalf, combined with a misconception of its field. On the other a stubborn denial of its sufficiency as an explanation, even in the narrow sphere where it first made its appearance, was destined to confront it. This challenge, too, was the result of the misconception of it as an all-sufficient theory of the universe as distinguished from a law or method of the operation of a cause ulterior and superior to itself. The period of this warfare is now nearly, if not altogether, over. The task which remains to be accomplished is to recognize the bearings of theory on forms of thought arrived at apart from the light thrown on the world by itself.

Since such forms of thought are given in the Bible, certain problems arise which must be solved, if possible, in the light of evolution. These problems concern mainly the following topics:

(1) The belief in a personal God, such as the Christian Scriptures present as an object of revelation;

(2) The origin of the different species of living beings as portrayed in the Book of Gen; (3) The particular origin of the human species (the descent (ascent) of man);

(4) The origin of morality and religion, and

(5) The essential doctrines of the Christian faith, such as supernatural revelation, the idea of sin, the person of Christ, regeneration and immortality. Beyond the answers to these primary questions, it will be neither possible nor profitable to enter within the brief compass of the present article.

The relation of creation to evolution has been already suggested in the introductory explanation of the nature of evolution. If creation be the act of bringing into existence material or substance which did not previously exist, evolution does not touch the problem. It has nothing to say of a First Cause. The idea of a first cause may be regarded as material for metaphysics or the ground of religious belief.

4. Evolution and Creation:

It may be speculated about, or it may be assumed by faith. The theory of evolution begins with matter or substance already in existence. A fairly representative statement of this aspect of it is illustrated by Huxley’s dictum, "The whole world living and not living is the result of the mutual attraction according to definite laws of the powers possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebulosity of the universe was composed" (Life of Darwin, II, 210). This statement leaves two things unaccounted for, namely, molecules in the form of a "primitive nebulosity" and "powers possessed by these molecules." How did primitive nebulosity come to exist? How did it come to be composed of molecules possessed of certain powers, and how did there come to be definite laws governing these molecules? The agnostic answers, "We do not know, we shall not know" (ignoramus, ignorabimus, DuBois-Reymond). The pantheist says, "They are the substance and attributes of the Ultimate Being." The theist posits "an uncaused Cause who is greater than they, and possesses all the potentialities exhibited in them, together with much more (therefore at least a personal being), has brought them into existence by the power of His will" (compare EPICUREANS).

Thus the believer in evolution may be an agnostic, a pantheist or a theist, according to his attitude toward, and answer to, the question of beginnings. He is an evolutionist because he believes in evolution as the method of the transformation of molecules under the control of the powers possessed by them. Conversely theist (and by implication the Christian) may be an evolutionist. As an evolutionist he may be thoroughgoing. He may accept evolution either as a working hypothesis or as a well-established generalization, even in the form in which it is defined by Herbert Spencer: the integration of matter out of an indefinite incoherent homogeneity into definite coherent heterogeneity with concomitant dissipation of energy. (For the exact definition in its full length, see First Principles, 367.) In this definition, as in every other form of it, evolution is the name of a process of transformation, not a theory of absolute causation or creation ex nihilo. The human mind may leave the problem of initial creation uninvestigated; it may assume that there is no problem by regarding matter and energy as uncaused and ultimate realities or phases of one reality; or it may trace these back to a First Cause which has at least the powers and characteristics perceptible in the universe and particularly in itself as mind (i.e. individuality, intelligence and freedom), or in other words, to a personal God. In any of these contingencies it may hold to theory of evolution.

5. Evolution and the Origin of Species:

Evolution is strongest in the realm of life. It is here that it first achieved its most signal conquests; and it is here that it was first antagonized most forcibly by the champions of religious faith. Here it proved irresistibly fascinating because it broke down the barriers supposed to exist between different species (whether minor or major) of life. It showed the unity and solidarity of the entire living universe with all its infinite variety. It reduced the life-process to one general law and movement. It traced back all present different forms, whether recognized as individuals, varieties, species, genera, families or kingdoms, to a single starting-point. In this realm the adjective "organic" has been prefixed to it, because the characteristic result is secured through organization. One of its most enthusiastic supporters defines it as "progressive change according to certain laws and by means of resident forces" (LeConte).

The proof for organic evolution is manifold. It cannot be given here at any length. Its main lines, however, may be indicated as follows:

(1) The existence of gradations of structure in living forms beginning with the simplest (the amoeba usually furnishes the best illustration) and reaching to some of the most complex organisms (the human body).

(2) The succession of living forms in time. This means that, according to the evidence furnished by geology, the simpler organisms appeared earlier on the face of the earth than the more complex, and that the progress of forms has been in general from the simpler to the more complex.

(3) The parallelism between the order thus discovered in the history of life upon earth and the order observed in the transformations of the embryo of the highest living forms from their first individual appearance to their full development.

(4) The existence of rudimentary members and organs in the higher forms.

The most striking of these proofs of evolution are the two commonly designated the paleontological and the ontogenetic. The first is based on the fact that in the strata of the earth the simpler forms have been deposited in the earlier, and the more complex in the later. This fact points to the growth in the history of the earth of the later, more complex forms of life, from earlier simpler ones. The second consists in the observation that each individual of complexly constructed species of organisms begins its life in the embryonic stage as the simplest of all living forms, a single cell (constituted in some cases out of parts of two preexisting cells). From this beginning it advances to its later stages of growth as an embryo, assuming successively the typical forms of higher organisms until it attains the full form of its own species, and thus begins its individual post-embryonic life. It thus recapitulates in its individual history the history of its species as read in the paleontological records. This consideration shows that whatever the truth may be as to the species as a whole (for instance of man), each individual of the species (each man) has been evolved in his prenatal life, if not exactly from definitely known and identifiable species (anthropoid individuals perfectly formed), at least from foetal organisms apparently of the

same type as those of anthropoids.

But assuming organic evolution to be true upon these grounds, and upon others of the same character, equally convincing to the scientific man, it must not be left out of account that it is to be distinguished quite sharply from cosmic evolution. These two phases of the law are identical at their basis, but become very different in their application according to the nature of the field in which they operate. Cosmic evolution works altogether through reactions. These are invariable in their cause and effect. Given material elements and conditions, they always issue in the same results. Their operations are grouped together under the sciences of chemistry and physics. Organic evolution works through processes to which the term "vital" is applied. Whether these are identical with the chemico-physical processes in the ultimate analysis is an open question among scientists. In the field of purely descriptive science, however, which limits itself to the observation of facts, it can scarcely emerge as a question, since the true nature of vitality is beyond the reach of observation. And upon the whole, theory that there is an inner difference between vitality and physico-chemical attractions and affinities is supported by certain obvious considerations. But even if vitality should prove to be nothing more than a series of reactions of a chemical and physical nature, the type of evolution to which it yields is differentiated by broad characteristics that distinguish it from merely molecular attractions and affinities.

(1) Vital processes cannot be correlated with the chemico-physical ones. Heat, light, electricity, magnetism, gravitation, chemical affinity, are interchangeable and interchanged among themselves. But none of these can be converted into life as far as now known.

(2) All life is from preexisting life (omne vivum e vivo). Biogenesis still holds the field as far as experimental science has anything to say about it, and abiogenesis is at the most an attractive hypothesis.

(3) The vital processes overcome and reverse the chemical and physical ones. When a living organism is constituted, and as long as it subsists in life, it breaks up and reconstitutes forms of matter into new forms. Carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen and oxygen, in combination with other elements, are separated from one another and reunited in new combinations in the tissues of the plant and the animal. On the other hand, the moment the vital process ceases, the chemical and physical resume their course. The organism in which the vital process has been annihilated is immediately put under the operation of chemical affinities, and reduced into its first elements. So long as the vital process is on, there seems to be a ruling or directive principle modifying and counteracting the normal and natural course of the so-called chemical and physical forces.

(4) The vital process is characterized by the manifestation in matter of certain peculiarities that never show themselves apart from it. These are irritability, assimilation of non-living matter in the process of growth, differentiation or the power in each kind of living organism to develop in its growth regularly recurring characteristics, and

(5) reproduction. The result of the vital process is the tendency in the organic product of it to maintain itself as a unity, and become more and more diversified in the course of its life. These features of organic evolution make it necessary to account not only for the origin of the matter and the energy which are assumed in the cosmic form of evolution, but also for the origin and nature of the unknown something (or combination of things) which is called life in the organism, whether this be a unitary and distinct force or a group of forces. (It is interesting to notice the return to the notion of life as primal energy in the philosophy of Bergson (elan vital); compare Creative Evolution. The same view is advocated by Sir Oliver Lodge, Life and Matter.)

Furthermore, care must be taken not to confuse any special variety of evolutionary theory in the organic realm with the generic theory itself. Evolutionists hold and propound different hypotheses as to the application of the principle. The Lamarckian, the Darwinian, the Weismannian, the De Vriesian views of evolution are quite different from, and at certain points contradictory of, one another. They assume the law to be real and aim to explain subordinate features or specific applications of it as seen in certain given series of facts. They differ from one another in insisting on details which may be real or unreal without affecting the truth of the main law. Lamarckian evolution, for instance (revived recently under the

name neo-Lamarckian), makes. much of the alleged transmissibility through heredity of acquired traits. Darwinian evolution is based largely on the principle of accidental variations worked over by natural selection and the slow insensible accumulation of traits fitting individuals to survive in the struggle for life. Weismannian evolution posits an astonishingly complex germinal starting-point. DeVriesian evolution is built on the sudden appearance of mutations ("sports") which are perpetuated, leading to new species. It is unscientific to array any of these against the other in the effort to undermine the generic theory of evolution, or to take their differences as indicating the collapse of theory and a return to the idea of creation by fiat. The differences between them are insignificant as compared with the gulf which separates them all from the conception of a separate creative beginning for each species at the first appearance of life upon earth. (On some differences between the primitive form of Darwinian and later theories of the same general type, see Rudolph Otto, in Naturalism and Religion (ET).)

With these limitations, the law of organic evolution may be taken into the Biblical account of creation as given in Genesis, chapters 1 and 2. The question raised at once is one of the relation of the doctrine to the Biblical account. If the evolutionary conception is true, it naturally follows that the Biblical account cannot be accepted in its literal interpretation. For the one of these accounts pictures the different species and general types as coming into existence gradually out of preexisting ones, whereas the other (literally interpreted) represents them as created by a Divine fiat. This difference it is true may be artificially exaggerated. Nowhere does the Biblical account explicitly ascribe the creation of each species to the fiat of God. The word "created" (bara’), as used in Genesis, does not necessarily exclude pre-existing matter and form. On the other hand, expressions such as "Let the earth bring forth" (1:11 the King James Version) indicate a certain mediation of secondary powers in the elements ("resident forces," LeConte) through which organisms came into being. "After their kind" suggests the principle of heredity. "Abundantly" suggests the law of rapid and ample reproduction leading to the "struggle for life," "natural selection" and "survival of the fittest." But all efforts to harmonize Ge with science upon this basis lead at the best to the negative conclusion that these two are so far different in their purpose and scope as not to involve radical contradiction. A positive agreement between them cannot be claimed.

The difficulty vanishes in its entirety when it is borne in mind that the two accounts are controlled by different interests, treat primarily of different matters and, where they appear to cover the same ground, do so each in an incidental way. This means that their statements outside of the sphere of their primary interests are popularly conceived and expressed, and cannot be set over against each other as rivals in scientific presentation. Upon this basis the Ge account is the vehicle of religious instruction (not, however, an allegory); its cosmogonic accounts are not intended to be scientifically correct, but popularly adequate. For all that science is concerned, they may be traditional conceptions, handed down in the form of folklore, and purged of the grotesque, purely mythological element so apt to luxuriate in folklore. Between such accounts and the dicta of pure science, it would be absurd either to assume or to seek for harmony or discord. They are parallel pictures; in the one the foreground is occupied by the actual unfolding of the facts, the religious element is concealed deep by the figures in the foreground. In the other the background of haze and cloud is the domain of fact, the foreground of definite figures consists of the religious ideas and teachings. The evolutionary notion of the origin of living forms on the earth can thus in no way be assumed as in contradiction either to the letter or the spirit of the teaching of Gen.

6. The Descent (Ascent) of Man:

A still more important problem arises when the evolutionary theory touches the origin of man upon earth. Here, too, not simply the Biblical account of the creation of Adam and Eve, and their primitive life in the Garden of Eden as recorded in Ge 2 is affected, but all that is said of man as a child of God, clothed with peculiar dignity and eternal worth. (1) The difference between the Biblical and evolutionary records of the creation of man may easily be resolved if the Biblical account (Ge 2) is not viewed as a literal statement of actual occurrences, but as the vehicle of certain determinative thoughts designed to affiliate man in his proper relation to God. This means that what is essential in the Biblical account is that man as a distinctive and different being in the world came into existence as the result of a special act of will on the part of God, that he was created as the golden summit of the whole upward movement of life. He is not a mere creature of Nature, but the offspring of the Divine will, with power to know his Maker, to hold fellowship with Him and to carry in him the rational and moral image of the Creator of all. Against this view of the origin of man, evolutionary science has nothing to set over. It is concerned with the process through which the emergence of such a being as man was

accomplished, and the time and circumstances in which it took place. These points it finds as it finds similar points affecting other living beings.

It would be easy of course to take materialistic forms of the evolutionary theory, such as that advocated by Haeckel, Guyeau, Ray Lankester, and establish an irreconcilable discord between them and the Biblical account; but such varieties of theory are distinguished, not by the occurrence of the idea of evolution in them, but rather by the materialistic metaphysics underlying them; when, for instance, Haeckel defines the notion of evolution by excluding from it intelligence or purpose, and by obliterating differences between the lower animal creation and man, he does so not as an evolutionist in science, but as a materialist (Monist of the materialistic type) in metaphysics. The moment the evolutionist determines to limit himself to the scientific side of his task, and the interpreter of the Biblical account to the religious side of his task, the assumed discord in Ge 2 and the evolutionary theory totally vanishes.

(2) The more important point of contact between theory of evolution and the Biblical conception of man, however, is that of the notion of the dignity and worth of man. The very existence of a Bible is based on the idea that man is of some consequence to the Creator. And through the Bible this idea not only appears early (Ge 1:26), "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness," followed by the statement, "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them," but is interwoven with every fundamental teaching.

It is contended that a representation like this is not compatible with the evolutionary conception of the origin of man from simian ancestors. The contention would be well supported if the evolutionary theory actually obliterated the line of distinction between man and the lower creation; and in any form of it in which such line is ignored, and man is regarded as a being of the same order (neither more or less) as those from which he sprang, it is not capable of being harmonized with the Biblical doctrine. But as a matter of fact, the whole drift and tendency of evolutionary thought ought to be and is the very opposite of belittling man. For according to it, man is the culmination and summit of a process whose very length and complexity simply demonstrate his worth and dignity as its final product. Accordingly, some of the most radical evolutionists, such as John Fiske (Through Nature to God) have extended and strengthened the argument for the immortality of man by an appeal to his evolutionary origin.

7. The Origin and Nature of Religion:

Kindred to the problem of the origin of man, and, in some aspects of it, a part of that problem, is the further problem of the origin and nature of religion. First of all, according to evolution, religion cannot be an exception to the general law of the emergence of the more complex from simpler antecedents. Accordingly, it must be supposed to have evolved from non-religious or pre-religious elements. But the very statement of the case in this form necessitates the clear conception of the idea of religion. If religion is the sense in the human soul of an infinite and eternal being, or beings, issuing in influences upon life, then it is coeval with man and inseparable from the human soul. There never was a time when man was not religious. The very emergence of this sense in the mind of a prehuman ancestor of man would change the brute into the man.

We may speak of the states of the prehuman brute’s mind as "materials for the making of religion," but not as religion. Their transformation into religion is therefore just as unique as the creation of the man himself. Whatever the mental condition of the brute before the emergence of the sense of an eternal reality and the dependence of itself upon that reality, it was not a religious being. Whatever the form of this sense, and whatever its first content and results, after the emergence of man it became religion. What caused it to appear at that particular moment and stage in the course of the onward movement? This is a question of causes, and its answer eludes the search of science, both pure and philosophical, and if undertaken by pure philosophy, leads to the same diversity of hypotheses as has been found to control the solution of the problem of beginnings in general (Agnosticism, Pantheism, Theism).

For the rest, that the general features hold true in the field of religion is obvious at a glance. Religious thought, religious practices, religious institutions, have undergone the same type of changes as are observed in the material universe and in

the realm of life.

8. The Moral Nature:

What is true of religion as an inner sense of a reality or realities transcending the outward world is equally, and even more clearly, true of the moral life which in one aspect of it is the outward counterpart of religion. To speak of the evolution of the conscience from non-ethical instincts is either to extend the meaning and character of the ethical into a region where they can have no possible significance, or to deny that something different has come into being when the sense of obligation, of duty, of virtue, and the idea of the supreme good have appeared.

In other particulars, the development of the moral nature of man, both in the individual and in the community, manifestly follows the process discerned in the material universe at large, and in the realm of organized life in particular. As an observed fact of history, the gradual growth of moral ideas and the mutual play of the inner controlling principle of the sense of oughtness ("the voice of God") and of social conditions and necessities, arising from the nature of man as a social being, are so manifest that they could neither be denied nor better explained in any other way than in accordance with the evolutionary view.

9. Christianity and Christian Doctrine:

But the rise of the evolutionary theory calls for a new consideration not only of the questions of the origin and nature of religion and morality, but also of that of the content of the Gospel.

(1) At the basis of Christianity lies the idea of revelation. The God whom Jesus presented to men is supremely concerned in men. He communicates to them His interest in and His wishes concerning them. This fact the followers of Jesus have in general called "revelation." Some have insisted and still do insist that such revelation must be supernatural. Setting aside the consideration that the term "supernatural" does not occur in Biblical phraseology, and that the notion is deduced by a process of interpretation which leaves a large flexibility to it, i.e. a possibility of conceiving it in a variety of ways, revelation itself is not necessarily bound up with any special method of the communication of the Divine will (compare REVELATION). Analogies drawn from human life furnish many different ways of making known to the minds of intelligent fellow-beings the thought of one’s own mind. These include, first, the pragmatic resort to some act or attitude of a physical nature, as, for instance, the touch of the whip or the point of the spur on the horse; the flown or the smile for the higher class of understanding of the human type. Secondly, the linguistic, wherein by conventional, articulate, highly complex sounds, one tells in words what lies in his own consciousness. All such expression is necessarily partial, indirect and symbolic. Thirdly, the telepathic and mysterious method (whose reality some still doubt) by which communication takes place without the mediation of either language or action. The evolutionary view does not exclude the possibility of any of these methods conceived as ethical and psychological processes. It does exclude any and all of them if understood as magical or preternatural phenomena. There is nothing, however, in a proper interpretation of the facts of Christian revelation to force the magical interpretation of the coming of the Divine message.

On the contrary, there is everything in the gradual and progressive method of the formation of the Christian Scriptures to suggest that the law of evolution was not violated here. One of the latest writers in Scripture plainly represents the whole method of revelation from the Divine point of view as a cumulative delivery of knowledge in different and successive parts and aspects (Heb 1:1). Both at its inception and in the course of its history, the gospel shows conformity to this fundamental law.

(2) Evolution and incarnation: One of the strongest objections to the idea of an all-comprehensive generalization of the law of evolution has been said to be that such a law would destroy the uniqueness of the personality of Jesus Christ. This is, however, due to a confusion of thought. In reality it is no more a denial of uniqueness to say that the Son of God entered the world in accordance with the laws of the world as ordered by the Father, than to say that He was subject to those laws after He entered the world; for instance, that He hungered and thirsted, was weary and needed rest and sleep, that His

hands and feet bled when they were pierced and that He ceased to breathe when His heart failed to beat. It is a denial of uniqueness as to the method of entrance into the world, but not a denial of uniqueness of character, of nature, even of essence in the Nicene sense. It behooved Him, in bringing many sons to perfection, "to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering." The question of the Virgin Birth of Jesus is definitely excluded from the discussion because it is one of historical evidence chiefly, and, in whatever way the evidence may solve it, theory of evolution will have no difficulty to set over against the solution.

See VIRGIN BIRTH.

From the evolutionist's point of view, the incarnation is the climax and culmination of the controlling process of the universe (see INCARNATION). Evolution demands such a consummation as the appearance of a new type of person, and particularly the type which appeared in Jesus Christ. This is not saying that other men can be or have been of the same nature and essence as the incarnate Saviour. It is saying simply that through the incarnation God brings into perfection the ideal embodied and unfolded in previous generations partially, and held in view as the goal through the whole process of previous struggle and attainment. In other words, the New Adam, in Jesus Christ, emerges in the course of the upward ascent of man as the Adam of Ge emerged in the upward ascent from the lower creation. Theology from the point of view of revelation must necessarily explain this as the voluntary entrance of the Son of God into humanity for purposes of redemption. In doing so it does not contradict the evolutionary view, but simply presents another aspect of the subject. Assuming, as is done throughout, that the evolution theory concerns not causes and principles, but the processes of transformation of life, the idea of the world is not complete with the creation of man in the image of God. That image must be brought into perfection through the incoming of eternal life. But eternal life is the life of God lived in the species of time and space. It could only come in a personal form through fellowship with God. The bringing of it must therefore be the necessary goal to which all the age-long ascent pointed.

The Incarnation fulfills the conditions of the evolutionary process in that it inserts into the world by a variation the new type governed by the principle of self-sacrifice for others. This is a new principle with Christ, although it is constituted out of preexisting motives and antecedents, such as the "struggle for others" (compare Drummond, The Ascent of Man) and "altruism" (in its noble instances in human history). It is a new principle, first, because in its pre-Christian and extra-Christian antecedents it is not real self-sacrifice, not being consciously consummated as the result of the outplay of the motive given in eternal life, and secondly, because it reverses the main stream of antecedent motive. It enthrones love by revealing God's supreme character and motive to be love. Thus viewed the Incarnation is the real entrance into the stream of cosmic movement of the Superman. Nietzsche's Superman would be exactly the contrary of this, i.e. the reversion of man to the beast, the denial of the supremacy of love, and the assertion of the supremacy of might.

(3) Another difficulty met by the harmonist of the Christian system with the evolutionary theory is that of the problem of sin. The method of the origin of sin in the human race, as well as its nature, are given in the Biblical account in apparently plain words. The first man was sinless. He became sinful by an act of his own.

As compared with this, according to one common conception of the law of evolution, all the bad tendencies and propensities in man are the survival of his animal ancestry. Cruelty, lust, deceitfulness and the like are but the "tiger and the ape" still lingering in his spiritual constitution, just as the vermiform appendix and the coccyx remain in the physical, mere rudiments of former useful organs; and just like the latter, they are apt to interfere with the welfare of the species later developed. Here, as in every previous stage of our survey, the difficulty arises from the failure to distinguish between that which appears in man as man, and the propensities in animals which lead to acts similar in appearance, but different in their place and function in the respective lives of those animals. As a matter of fact, the tendencies to cruelty, greed, lust and cunning in the brute are not sinful. They are the wholesome and natural impulses through which the individual and the race are preserved from extinction. They are sinful in man because of the dawn in the soul of a knowledge that his Maker is showing him a better way to the preservation of the individual and the race in the human form. Until the sense of the obligation to follow the better way has arisen, there can be no sin. But when it has come, the first act performed in violation of that sense must be regarded as sinful. As the apostle Paul puts it, "I had not known sin, except through the

law." "I was alive apart from the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived (was made to live) and I died" (Ro 7:7,9).

Instead of militating against the idea of a primitive fall, the discovery of the law of evolution confirms it by showing that at some time, as the moral sense in man arose, in the very earliest stage of his existence as man, by an act of his own will, he set aside the new and better principle of conduct presented to him in his inner consciousness (disobeyed the voice of God), and fell back to the prehuman non-moral rule of his life. If this is not the doctrine of the Fall expressed in the terms of present-day science, it would be hard to conceive how that doctrine could be formulated in modern words.

(F. J. Hall, Evolution and the Fall; compare FALL, THE.)

According to this theory, it was possible for man as he first began his career upon the earth to have passed at once into the condition of perfect fellowship with God. Development might have been sinless. But it was not likely. And it was not desirable that it should be (see ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT). For moral character apart from struggle and victory is weak and only negatively perfect. The elimination of sin was to be accomplished by a process which according to the evolutionary philosophy everywhere and always produces higher and stronger types. It is only as progress is achieved by regeneration following degeneration that the best results are secured. Thus "where sin abounded," it was ‘in order that grace might superabound’ (Ro 5:20). Yet neither is sin the less sinful nor grace the less supernatural. It would be reading an unwarrantable doctrine into Scripture to say that upon the whole an unfallen race would have been superior to a fallen and redeemed race. The world as it is is not a mistake but the wisest thought of God.

The mystery of evil in the world is thus left neither more nor less difficult to understand under the evolutionary conception than under any other. The difficulty of an unbroken continuity between the lower and the higher forms of life, culminating in the free will of man, with the necessary possibility of conflict with the will of God, is not treated by the evolutionary philosophy, even though it may not be materially relieved. To this extent, however, it is relieved, that the Divine action is here understood to be analogous and consistent with itself throughout, even though transcending in scope and extent the human intelligence.

(4) In the light of what has already been made clear, it will be easy to dismiss the correlative doctrine of salvation from sin as fully compatible with the idea of evolution. The Christian doctrine of salvation falls into two general parts: the objective mediatorial work of the Redeemer, commonly called the Atonement, and the subjective transforming work of the Holy Spirit, begun in regeneration and continued in sanctification.

The idea of the Atonement lies somewhat remote from the region where the law of evolution is most clearly seen to operate. At first sight it may be supposed to sustain no special relation to evolution either as offering difficulties to it or harmonizing with it and corroborating it. Yet in a system whose parts are vitally interrelated, it would be strange if the acceptance of the evolutionary theory did not in some way and to some extent affect the conception. It does so by fixing attention on the following particulars:

(a) That with the emergence of man as a personality, the relation of the creature to the Creator comes to be personal. If that personal relation is disturbed, it can be restored to its normal state in accordance with the laws observed in the relations of persons to one another. The Atonement is such a restoration of personal relations between God and man.

(b) In achieving the goal of perfect fellowship with Himself on the part of creatures bearing His own image, the Creator must in a sense sacrifice Himself. This Divine self-sacrifice is symbolized and represented in the Cross. Yet the meaning of the Cross is not exhausted in mere external influence upon the sinful creature whose return to the holy Father is thereby aimed at.

(c) Since the alienation of the creature by sin represents an offense to the person of the Creator, there is necessity that this offense should be removed; and this is done through the sacrifice of the Incarnate Son identifying Himself with, and taking

the place of, the sinful creature.

The correlative doctrine of Regeneration stands much nearer the center of the thought of evolution. It has always been conceived and expressed in biological phraseology. The condition of sin postulated by this doctrine is one of death. Into this condition a new life is inserted, an act which is called the New Birth. Whatever life may be in its essence, it overcomes, reverses and directs the lower forces to other results than they are observed to achieve apart from its presence. In analogy to this course of life in the process of regeneration, a new direction is given to the energies of the new-born soul. But the analogy goes farther. Regeneration is from above as life is always from above. It is God's Spirit through the word and work of Christ that begets the new Christian life, nurtures, trains and develops it to its full maturity revealed in the image and stature of Christ Himself (see REGENERATION).

10. Conclusion:

If the above considerations are valid, the evolutionary and the Christian views of the world cannot logically be placed against each other as mutually exclusive and contradictory. They must be conceived as supplementing one another, and fulfilling each the promise and possibility of the other. Evolution is a scientific generalization which, kept within the limits of science, commends itself as a satisfactory explanation of the great law controlling all the movements of matter, life and mind. Christianity, so far as it enters into the intellectual life, is interested in the idea of God and of man's relation to God. It may confidently leave the facts in the lower world of processes of transformation to be schematized under the scientific generalization of evolution.

LITERATURE.

The literature of the subject is vast. At the basis of the discussion stand the works of Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, Spencer, Weismann, Haeckel, Romanes and others. For a clear statement of theory, see Metcalf, An Outline of the Theory of Organic Evolution, 1905; Saleeby, Evolution the Master-Key, 1907; Osborn, From the Greeks to Darwin (historical), 1908. On its relation to religion and Christianity, B. F. Tefft, Evolution and Christianity, 1885; E. Caird, The Evolution of Religion, 1893; Le Conte, Evolution; Its Nature, Its Evidences and Its Religious Thought, 1888; McCosh, The Religious Aspect of Evolution, 1888; Iverach, Christianity and Evolution, 1894. On its bearing on the ideas of man, sin and redemption, Griffith-Jones, The Ascent through Christ, 1900; H. Drummond, The Ascent of Man, 12th edition, 1901; Tyler, The Whence and Whither of Man; Orr, The Image of God in Man, 1907; Sin as a Problem of Today, 1910; Hall, Evolution and the Fall, 1910; Murray, Christian Faith and the New Psychology, 1911; T. A. Palm, The Faith of an Evolutionist, 1911.

Andrew C. Zenos

(EDITORIAL NOTE.—It will be understood, that while Professor Zenos has been asked and permitted to state his views on this question unreservedly, neither the publishers nor the editors are to be held as committed to all the opinions expressed.)

EWE

u (rachel, 'ul, seh, "a female sheep"):

Rachel (compare pr. note Rachel, and Arabic rachala, "to migrate") is the ordinary Hebrew word for ewe, but is translated "sheep," though with clear indication of sex in context, in Isa 53:7 and So 6:6 (the Revised Version (British and American) "ewes"). 'Aloth, participle of 'ul, "to suckle" (compare Arabic ghal) is found in Ps 78:71 and Isa 40:11 (the King James Version "are with young," the English Revised Version "that give suck," the American Standard Revised Version "have their young"). In 1Sa 6:7,10 occurs paroth 'aloth, "milch kine." Seh, in Le 22:28, while translated "ewe," might from the context be "ewe" or "shegoat" and indeed seems to be used here as a term applying equally to either, being used elsewhere

for one of a flock of sheep or goats.

See SHEEP.

Alfred Ely Day

EXACT

eg-zakt’:

(1) naghas (De 15:2,3; 2Ki 23:35; Isa 58:3), to secure by force or pressure interest or money for tribute, and perhaps, in Isa 58:3, labor or toil; but compare the Revised Version, margin "oppress all your laborers"; probably better with a slight change of text, "exact money lent on pledges" (reading for ‘abhoT beyedhekhem, ‘atstsebhekhem).

(2) nasha’, or nashah (Ne 5:7,10,11 (the King James Version not the Revised Version (British and American)) Job 11:6 (but see below); Ps 89:22), to demand interest, to be a harsh and importunate creditor, a practice which Nehemiah asks the Jews to forego. Job 11:6 better with the Revised Version, margin for "exact," "causeth to be forgotten."

(3) yotse’ (2Ki 15:20 (if text is correct)). Menahem secured the tribute which the king of Assyria demanded by levying a tax on the chief men of his kingdom.

(4) prassein (Lu 3:13 the King James Version (compare Da 11:20 Septuagint); APC 1Macc 10:35 the Revised Version (British and American)), to demand money or tribute or taxes of anyone.

Walter R. Betteridge

EXACTION

eg-zak’-shun:

(1) mashsha’ (Ne 10:31), a demand for money lent on pledge, which the Jews agreed to forego in the seventh year;

(2) gerushah (Eze 45:9, "your exactions," the Revised Version, margin "expulsions"), eviction from house and home.

EXACTORS

eg-zak’-ters (noghesayikh (Isa 60:17, the Revised Version, margin "taskmasters"; compare Ex 1:11; 3:7)):

Righteousness personified is in Zion to take the place of the officials who oppress the people. In Isa 14:4 the American Revised Version, margin, Babylon is called an "exactress of gold."

EXALT

eg-zolt’ (rum, gabhah (mappiq he), nasa’; hupsoo):

The Hebrew word most often translated "exalt," "exalted," is rum; "to lift up," "to be or become high." It is used with reference to both God and man, eg. Ex 15:2, "My father’s God, and I will exalt him"; Ps 99:5,9, "Exalt ye Yahweh our God"; compare 107:32; 118:28; 1Sa 2:10, "Exalt the horn of his anointed"; Job 17:4, "Therefore shalt thou not exalt them";

compare Isa 13:2 the King James Version; 14:13; gabhah, "to be high," figuratively "to be exalted," occurs in Job 36:7; Pr 17:19 the King James Version; Isa 5:16, etc.; nasa’," to lift up," occurs in Nu 24:7; 1Ch 29:11, etc.; other words are calal, "to raise up" (Ex 9:17; Pr 4:8), saghabh (Job 5:11; 36:22 the King James Version; Isa 2:11,17; 12:4; 33:5), ramam, "to be high" (Job 24:24; Ps 118:16).

In the New Testament "exalt" is the translation of hupsoo, "to elevate" (not used with reference to God) (Mt 11:23; 23:12; Ac 2:33; 2Co 11:7; 1Pe 5:6, etc.); also (twice) of epairo, "to lift up, upon or against" (2Co 10:5; 11:20), once of huperairo, "to lift up above" (2Th 2:4); in 2Co 12:7 bis, this word is translated "exalted above measure," the Revised Version (British and American) "exalted overmuch"; huperupsoo, "to lift up above" (Php 2:9), is translated "highly exalted"; hupsos, "elevation," is translated "exalted" (Jas 1:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "high estate").

For "it increaseth" (Job 10:16), the Revised Version (British and American) gives "and if my head exalt itself"; instead of "God exalteth by His, power" (Job 36:22), "God doeth loftily in his power"; for "though thou exalt thyself as the eagle" (Ob 1:4), "mount on high"; for "highly esteemed" (Lu 16:15) "exalted"; for "exalteth itself" (2Co 10:5), "is exalted"; for "He shall lift you up" (Jas 4:10), "He shall exalt you." Self-exaltation is strongly condemned, especially by Christ; humbleness is the way to true exaltation (Mt 23:12; Lu 14:11; 18:14; compare Jas 4:10; 1Pe 5:6); the supreme example is that of Christ Himself (Php 2:5-11).

W. L. Walker

EXALTATION OF CHRIST, THE

See CHRIST, THE EXALTATION OF.

EXAMINE; EXAMINATION

eg-zam’-in, eg-zam-i-na’-shun:

darash, "to follow," "inquire," "make inquisition" (Ezr 10:16); and bachan, "to test," "investigate," "prove," "tempt" (Ps 26:2). The former was the judicial term. anakrino, "scrutinize," "investigate," "interrogate" (in court), "judge," "search" (Lu 23:14; Ac 4:9; 12:19; 28:18; 1Co 9:3); and anetazo, "to investigate" (judicially), "examine" (Ac 22:24,29). Also dokimazo, "to test," "examine," "try" (1Co 11:28 the King James Version); and peirazo, "scrutinize," "discipline" (2Co 13:5 the King James Version). The noun anakrisis, "examination," "investigation," occurs in Ac 25:26.

See also COURTS, JUDICIAL.

Frank E. Hirsch

EXAMPLE

eg-zam’-p’-l (tupos, "a pattern," hupodeigma, "copy" "representation" hupogrammos, "a writing-copy," example):

A typical, representative, or illustrative case; a pattern or model for imitation (hupodeigma, Joh 13:15; Heb 8:5 the King James Version; Jas 5:10; hupogrammos, 1Pe 2:21; tupos, 1Ti 4:12 the King James Version) or warning (deigma, "a sample," "exhibition," Jude 1:7; compare 2Pe 2:6; hupodeigma, Heb 4:11; tupos, 1Co 10:6,11)." Ensample" (tupos, APC 2Macc 6:28,31; Php 3:17; 1Th 1:7; 2Th 3:9; 1Ti 4:12; 1Pe 5:3) and "example" have the same meaning, but the former is always suggestive of goodness.

EXCEED; EXCEEDING; EXCEEDINGLY

ek-sed’:

The verb is found in other than its present sense in Job 36:9 the King James Version, "They have exceeded" the (Revised Version (British and American)) "behaved themselves proudly"); 1Sa 20:41, "They .... wept .... until David exceeded" (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). In both these passages the idea is that of going too far, beyond proper bounds (Hebrew, respectively, gabhar, "be strong" (in the Hithpael); gadhal, "be great" (in the Hiphil). "Exceeding" (as an adverb with adjectives and rarely as an adjective) and "exceedingly" occur often as representing various expressions for the superlative in Hebrew and Greek.

EXCELLENCY

ek’-se-len-si (ga-on, ga’awah; huperbole):

"Excellency" in the Old Testament is chiefly the translation of ga’on, "mounting," "swelling" (Ex 15:7; Job 37:4 the King James Version; Ps 47:4 the King James Version; Isa 13:19 the King James Version, etc.); ga’awah, rising, is thrice so rendered (De 33:26,29; Ps 68:34); se’eth, "rising" (twice) (Job 13:11 the King James Version; Ps 62:4 the King James Version); yether, "superabundance" (twice) (Ge 49:3 the King James Version; Job 4:21 the King James Version), and chadhar, "honor," "beauty," "majesty" (twice) (Isa 35:2); gobhah, "uplifted" (Job 40:10); yithron, "advantage" (Ec 7:12); si’," elevation" (Job 20:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "height"). In the New Testament huperbole, "surpassing," "a casting beyond," occurs (2Co 4:7, "that the excellency of the power may be of God," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding greatness"); huperoche, "a holding over" or "beyond," is translated "excellency" (1Co 2:1), and to huperechon, "the pre-eminence" (Php 3:8), "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ."

Instead of "excellency" the Revised Version (British and American) has "pride" (Isa 13:19; Eze 24:21), "majesty" (Job 37:4 and the American Standard Revised Version Job 13:11; 31:23), the American Standard Revised Version has "pre-eminence" (Ge 49:3,4), "glory" (Ps 47:4), "dignity" (Ps 62:4); for "the fat of lambs" (Ps 37:20), the English Revised Version has "the excellency of the pastures," with margin, "the fat of lambs"; the American Standard Revised Version retains the King James Version rendering with the English Revised Version in the margin; instead of "Doth not their excellency which is in them go away?" (Job 4:21), the Revised Version (British and American) has "Is not their tent-cord plucked up within them?" margin, "Is not their excellency which is in them removed?"

W. L. Walker

EXCELLENT

ek’-se-lent ‘addir, yattir (Aramaic); diaphoroteros, kratistos:

The translation of various Hebrew words, chiefly of ‘addir, "great," "honorable" (Ps 8:1,9; 16:3; 76:4); yattir, "surpassing," is Aramaic, occurring in Da 2:31; 4:36; 5:12,14; 6:3. Other words are bachar, "to glow," "try," "choose" (So 5:15); ga’on, "mounting," "swelling" (Isa 4:2; see EXCELLENCY); gadhal, "to make or become great" (Isa 28:29), and other words occurring singly.

In the New Testament we have diaphoroteros, "greater," "better" (Heb 1:4; 8:6); kratistos, "most excellent," "most noble" (Lu 1:3; Ac 23:26); ta diapheronta, "things that differ," "are preeminent" (Ro 2:18; Php 1:10); megaloprepes, "becoming to the great" (2Pe 1:17, the King James Version "a voice to him from the excellent glory," the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version, margin "the Majestic Glory"); kath’ huperbolen "very surpassing" (1Co 12:31, "Yet I show unto you a more excellent way," the Revised Version (British and American) "most excellent"); pleion, "greater," "fuller" (Heb 11:4; see ABEL).

W. L. Walker

EXCHANGE; EXCHANGER

eks-chanj’, eks-chan’-jer.

See BANK, BANKING.

EXCOMMUNICATION

eks-ko-mu-ni-ka’-shun:

Exclusion from church fellowship as a means of personal discipline, or church purification, or both. Its germs have been found in (1) the Mosaic "ban" or "curse" (cherem, "devoted"), given over entirely to God’s use or to destruction (Le 27:29); (2) the "cutting off," usually by death, stoning of certain offenders, breakers of the Sabbath (Ex 31:14) and others (Le 17:4; Ex 30:22-38); (3) the exclusion of the leprous from the camp (Le 13:46; Nu 12:14). At the restoration (Ezr 10:7,8), the penalty of disobedience to Ezra’s reforming movements was that "all his substance should be forfeited (cherem), and himself separated from the assembly of the captivity." Nehemiah’s similar dealing with the husbands of heathen women helped to fix the principle. The New Testament finds a well- developed synagogal system of excommunication, in two, possibly three, varieties or stages. nidduy, for the first offense, forbade the bath, the razor, the convivial table, and restricted social intercourse and the frequenting of the temple. It lasted thirty, sixty, or ninety days. If the offender still remained obstinate, the "curse," cherem, was formally pronounced upon him by a council of ten, and he was shut out from the intellectual, religious and social life of the community, completely severed from the congregation. shammatha’, supposed by some to be a third and final stage, is probably a general term applied to both nidduy and cherem. We meet the system in Joh 9:22: "If any man should confess him to be Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue" (aposunagogos); Joh 12:42: "did not confess .... lest they should be put out of the s."; and Joh 16:2: "put you out of the synagogue." In Lu 6:22 Christ may refer to the three stages: "separate you from their company (aphorisosin), and reproach you (oneidisosin = cherem, "malediction"), and cast out your name as evil (ekbalosin)."

It is doubtful whether an express prescription of excommunication is found in our Lord’s words (Mt 18:15-19). The offense and the penalty also seem purely personal: "And if he refuse to hear the church also, let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican," out of the pale of association and converse. Yet the next verse might imply that the church also is to act: "Verily I say unto you, What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven," etc. But this latter, like Mt 16:19, seems to refer to the general enunciations of principles and policies rather than to specific ecclesiastical enactments. On the whole, Jesus seems here to be laying down the principle of dignified personal avoidance of the obstinate offender, rather than prescribing ecclesiastical action. Still, personal avoidance may logically correspond in proper cases to excommunication by the church. 2Th 3:14: "Note that man, that ye have no company with him"; Tit 3:10: "A factious man .... avoid" (American Revised Version margin); 2 Joh 1:10: "Receive him not into your house," etc., all inculcate discreet and faithful avoidance but not necessarily excommunication, though that might come to be the logical result. Paul’s "anathemas" are not to be understood as excommunications, since the first is for an offense no ecclesiastical tribunal could well investigate: 1Co 16:22, "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema"; the second touches Paul’s deep relationship to his Lord: Ro 9:3, "I myself .... anathema from Christ"; while the third would subject the apostle or an angel to ecclesiastical censure: Ga 1:8,9, "Though we, or an angel .... let him be anathema."

Clear, specific instances of excommunication or directions regarding it, however, are found in the Pauline and Johannine writings. In the case of the incestuous man (1Co 5:1-12), at the instance of the apostle ("I verily, being absent in body but present in spirit"), the church, in a formal meeting ("In the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together"), carrying out the apostle’s desire and will ("and my spirit"), and using the power and authority conferred by Christ ("and with the power of our Lord Jesus"), formally cut off the offender from its fellowship, consigning (relinquishing?) him to the power

of the prince of this world ("to deliver such a one unto Satan"). Further, such action is enjoined in other cases: "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves." 2Co 2:5-11 probably refers to the same case, terminated by the repentance and restoration of the offender. ‘Delivering over to Satan’ must also include some physical ill, perhaps culminating in death; as with Simon Magus (Ac 8:20), Elymas (Ac 13:11), Ananias (Ac 5:5). 1Ti 1:20: "Hymenaeus and Alexander .... that they might be taught not to blaspheme," is a similar case of excommunication accompanied by judicial and disciplinary physical ill. In 3 Joh 1:9,10 we have a case of excommunication by a faction in control: "Diotrephes .... neither doth he himself receive .... and them that would he .... casteth out of the church."

Excommunication in the New Testament church was not a fully developed system. The New Testament does not clearly define its causes, methods, scope or duration. It seems to have been incurred by heretical teaching (1Ti 1:20) or by factiousness (Tit 3:10 (?)); but the most of the clear undoubted cases in the New Testament are for immoral or un-Christian conduct (1Co 5:1,11,13; perhaps also 1Ti 1:20). It separated from church fellowship but not necessarily from the love and care of the church (2Th 3:15 (?)). It excluded from church privileges, and often, perhaps usually, perhaps always, from social intercourse (1Co 5:11). When pronounced by the apostle it might be accompanied by miraculous and punitive or disciplinary physical consequences (1Co 5:5; 1Ti 1:20). It was the act of the local church, either with (1Co 5:4) or without (1Co 5:13; 3 Joh 1:10) the concurrence of an apostle. It might possibly be pronounced by an apostle alone (1Ti 1:20), but perhaps not without the concurrence and as the mouthpiece of the church. Its purpose was the amendment of the offender: "That the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (1Co 5:5); and the preservative purification of the church: "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened" (1Co 5:7). It might, as appears, be terminated by repentance and restoration (2Co 2:5-11). It was not a complex and rigid ecclesiastical engine, held in terrorem over the soul, but the last resort of faithful love, over which hope and prayer still hovered.

LITERATURE.

Arts. in HDB, DB, Jew Eric, DCG; Martensen, Christian Ethics, III, 330 ff; Nowack, Benzinger, Heb Archaeol.; Commentary in the place cited.

Philip Wendell Crannell

EXECUTE; EXECUTIONER

ek’-se-kut, ek-se-ku’-shun-er (‘asah, "to do," din,"to judge," "decide"; poieo, "to do"; spekoulator, Latin speculator, "an attendant"):

"Execute" in the sense of "executing judgment," "vengeance," etc., is often found in the Old Testament (Ex 12:12; De 10:18; Ps 149:7; Jer 22:3; Eze 25:11; Mic 5:15; compare Jer 21:12, "Execute justice in the morning") and a few times in the New Testament (Joh 5:27; Ro 13:4 the King James Version; Jude 1:15). In the sense of punishing capitally, by legal process, it is not found. "Executioner" is found only in Mr 6:27 the King James Version, where Herod, the king, is said to have "sent an executioner" (spekoulator) to behead John the Baptist, but the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have instead, according to the stricter meaning of the text, "The king sent forth a soldier of his guard." The office of executioner, however, was a recognized office in all the great nations of antiquity.

George B. Eager

EXEGESIS

ek-se-je’-sis.

See INTERPRETATION.

EXERCISE

ek’-ser-siz (‘asah; gumnazo, poieo) :

"Exercise" (meaning originally, "to drive or thrust out") has different shades of meaning: It means

(1) "to do," "to put into action" (Jer 9:24, ‘asah, "to do," "Yahweh who exerciseth lovingkindness"; Re 13:12, poieo, "to do," "He exerciseth all the authority of the first"; APC Tobit 12:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "do");

(2) with violence implied, gazal, "to take away violently," "have exercised robbery" (Eze 22:29); "to act habitually" (Ps 131:1, halakh, "to walk," "Neither do I exercise myself in great matters" the Revised Version, margin "walk"; Ac 24:16, askeo, "to work up"; compare APC 2Esdras 15:8; Ecclesiasticus 50:28);

(3) "to train" or "discipline," gumnazo, "to use exercise," "to train up" (1Ti 4:7, "Exercise thyself unto godliness"; Heb 5:14; 12:11; 2Pe 2:14; compare APC 1Macc 6:30; 2Macc 15:12);

(4) "to afflict" (Ec 1:13; 3:10, ‘anah, "to be afflicted," "exercised therewith," "exercised in it"); in Mt 20:25; Mr 10:42, katakurieuo, "to lord it over," and katexousiazo, "to exercise authority," are translated respectively "exercise dominion" and "exercise authority," the English Revised Version "lord it over" and "exercise authority"; in Lu 22:25, the Greek words are kurieuo, "to be lord over" and exousiazo, "to have power or authority over," the Revised Version (British and American) "have lordship," "have authority." In 1Ti 4:8 the noun, gumnasia, meaning gymnastic exercise, occurs (somatike gumnasia), translated "bodily exercise," contrasted with "exercise unto godliness," the Revised Version (British and American) "For bodily exercise is profitable for a little (m "for little"); but godliness is profitable for all things," a saying to which the youth of all times would do well to give heed. In 2 Macc 4:9, Jason is said to have set up "a place of exercise" (gumnasion) in Jerusalem. In 1Pe 5:2 the Revised Version (British and American), "exercising the oversight" is substituted for "taking the oversight."

W. L. Walker

EXHORTATION

ek-sor-ta’-shun (paraklesis):

The Greek word translated "exhortation" (paraklesis) signifies, originally, "a calling near or for" (as an advocate or helper who should appeal on one’s behalf), and carries the twofold sense of "exhortation" and "consolation" (which see). In the Septuagint of the Old Testament it is used in the sense of "consolation"; but in APC 2Macc 7:24, it is translated "exhort," the Revised Version (British and American) "appeal." The verb parakaleo is also translated "exhortation" (1 Macc 13:3 the King James Version) and "exhort" (APC 2Macc 9:26). In the New Testament paraklesis is translated "exhortation" (Ac 13:15; Ro 12:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "exhorting"; 1Co 14:3, the English Revised Version "comfort," the American Revised Version, margin "or comfort"; 2Co 8:17; 1Th 2:3; 1Ti 4:13; Heb 12:5; 13:22). the American Standard Revised Version has also "exhortation," instead of "consolation" in Php 2:1. In Lu 3:18, parakaleo, "to call near or for," is translated "exhortation," "and many other things in his exhortation," the Revised Version (British and American) "with many other exhortations," and in Ac 20:2, parakaleo logo pollo is rendered (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), "had given them much exhortation."

W. L. Walker

EXILE

ek’-sil, eg’-zil (galah, tsa‘ah):

Occurs twice only in the King James Version (2Sa 15:19 (galah, "to remove"); Isa 51:14 (tsa‘ah, "to be bowed down")). In the Revised Version (British and American) "exile" is substituted for "captivity" (Ezr 8:35 (shebhi), and Eze 12:4 (golah)); "go into exile," for "remove and go" (Eze 12:11); "exiles of Ethiopia" for "Ethiopians captives" (Isa 20:4); "He shall let my exiles go free" for "He shall let go my captives" (Isa 45:13); "an exile" for "a captive" (Isa 49:21). "The exile" is in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "the captivity" (which see).

EXODUS, THE

ek’-so-dus:

Contents

I. THE ROUTE

1. The Starting-Point 2. Rameses to Succoth 3. Succoth to Etham 4. Passage of the Sea 5. Other Views of the Route

II. THE DATE

1. Old Testament Chronology 2. Date of Conquest of Palestine 3. Date of Exodus 4. Other Views 5. Astronomical Calculations 6. Relation between Date of Exodus and Date of Patriarchs 7. Agreement between Monuments and Old Testament Chronology 8. A Text of Minepthah

III. THE THEORY OF LEPSIUS

1. 1st Argument: City Rameses 2. 2nd Argument: Manetho’s Statements 3. Relation of Manetho’s Stories to the Exodus 4. Greek and Latin Writings 5. Condition of Egypt under Minepthah 6. Explanations of Minepthah’s Statements (1) Pithore was Heroopolis (2) Rameses II not Named in Judges (3) Some Hebrews Were never in Egypt

IV. THE NUMBERS

1. Colenso’s Criticism of Large Number 2. Increase of Population 3. Number a Corruption of Original Statement 4. Review

==========

I. The Route.

1. The Starting-Point:

On the 14th Abib (early in April) the Hebrews were gathered at Rameses (Nu 33:5) where apparently the hostile Pharaoh was also living (Ex 12:31). From Ps 78:12,43 it appears that the wonders preceding the Exodus occurred in the "field of Zoan," where the starting-point may be placed (see RAAMSES; ZOAN). Dr. Naville has suggested that the court was at Bubastis, not at Zoan, and that the route lay from near Zagazig down Wady Tumeilat—a line well fitted for a people driving flocks and herds. On the other hand, in favor of the starting-point having been at Zoan, we read that the "way of the land of the Philistines" was "near" (Ex 13:17). This route, which was not taken lest the people should be discouraged by defeat at Gaza where the Egyptians always had troops, reached Egypt at Migdol (see MIGDOL, 2), and ran thence to

Daphnai—some 15 miles—and to Zoan by a second march of the same length. The route from Bubastis to Daphnai (some 50 miles) is less likely to have been described as "near." Although an Arab will march 30 miles in a day on foot, yet when moving camp with camels, who travel only about 2 miles an hour, with women and children and herds, he only covers about 12 or 15 miles a day. We cannot suppose the Hebrew cattle to have covered more than this distance without water on any single march.

2. Rameses to Succoth:

We are not told how many days were occupied on the way from Rameses to SUCCOTH (which see), though the general impression is that the stages mentioned (Nu 33) represent a day's journey each. Measuring back from the first camp after crossing the Red Sea, we find that Succoth probably lay in the lower part of Wady Tumeilat, where there was plenty of water and herbage. The direct route from Zoan leads to Phakousa (Tell Faqus) by a march of 15 miles through well-watered lands. A second march, across the desert to Heroopolis and down the valley to Succoth, would be of the same length. The Hebrews departed "in haste," and no doubt made as long marches as they could. If the whole of the people were not in Rameses, but scattered over Goshen, it is possible that some came down the valley from near Bubastis, and that the whole force concentrated at Succoth.

3. Succoth to Etham:

The next march (Ex 13:20; Nu 33:6) led Israel to Etham, on the "edge of the wilderness" which lies West of the Bitter Lakes, not far from where the Nile water then entered them, and no doubt made them sweet. The intention of Moses probably was to reach the desert of Shur by rounding the head of this stretch of water; but we are told (Ex 14:2 f) that he was commanded to "turn"—evidently to the South—and to encamp before "the mouth of the lakes" (see PI-HAHIROTH), in order that Pharaoh might conclude that the Hebrews were "entangled in the land," and shut in between the lakes on their left and the desert mountains on their right. This camp would seem to have been West of the lakes, and some 10 miles North of Suez. It was perhaps two days' journey from Etham, since the lakes are 30 miles long; or, if Etham was farther South than the head of the lakes, the distance may have been covered by one forced march of 20 to 25 miles, the beasts being watered from the lakes if they were then filled with fresh water, as they would be when having an outlet to a tideless sea.

4. Passage of the Sea:

The sea which Israel crossed is not named in the actual account of the journey, but in the So of Moses (Ex 15:4) it is called the "Red Sea" in the English Versions of the Bible, following the Septuagint, the Hebrew name being Yam Cuph, or "weedy sea," a term which applied not only to the Gulf of Suez (Nu 33:10), but also to the Gulf of 'Aqabah (De 28; 1Ki 9:26). We are also told that the route chosen was "the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea" (Ex 13:18). It is generally supposed that the head of the Gulf of Suez at the time of the Exodus was farther North than at present; and, as the Bitter Lakes were then probably filled by the Nile waters flowing down Wddy Tumeildt, they would no doubt have carried the Nile mud into this gulf, which mud had gradually filled up this Nile branch before 600 BC. The probable point of passage was the narrow channel (about 2 miles across) by which the lakes discharged into the sea, and was thus about 10 miles North of Suez. We are told that the water was driven back by "a strong east (or "contrary") wind" in the night (Ex 14:21), and the sea (or "lake," as the word yam often means in the Old Testament; see Gesenius, Lexicon, under the word) was thus "divided," a shoal being formed and the waters being heaped up (Ex 15:8), so that when the wind ceased they rushed back; whereas, during the passage, they were a "wall" or "defence" (Ex 14:22) against any flank attacks by the Egyptians (compare 1Sa 25:16, where David's men are said to have been a "wall" when defending Nabal's shepherds). The effect of the wind on shallow waters can be seen at the mouth of the Kishon, where a shoal exists which is dry with a west wind, but under water and impassable when the wind blows down the river. In 1882, Sir Alexander Tulloch saw the waters of Lake Menzaleh driven back more than a mile by the east wind. Thus, however opportune the occurrence, the drying up of the sea, as described in the Bible, was a perfectly natural phenomenon. The Hebrews crossed in the morning, and a march of 15 miles would bring them to the springs from which Suez is supplied, called 'Ain Naba' and 'Ayyun Musa ("the gushing

spring" and "the spring of Moses"), from which point their wanderings in the desert of Shur would begin (see WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL).

5. Other Views of the Route:

This view of the Exodus route is practically the same as advocated by Dr. Robinson, by Dr. E. Naville, by Sir S. Warren, by Sir W. Dawson, and by others who have visited the region in question. The view advocated by Brugsch, according to which the sea crossed was a lagoon near Pelusium, has found no supporters, because it directly conflicts with the statement that Israel did not follow the shore road to Philistia, but went by the wilderness of the Red Sea. Another theory (see SINAI), according to which the "Red Sea" always means the Gulf of ‘Aqabah, is equally discarded by most writers of experience, because the distance from Egypt to Elath on this gulf is 200 miles, and the Israelites could not have traversed that distance in four marches, especially as the route has hardly any water along it in springtime. As detailed above, the route offers no difficulties that would discredit the historical character of the narrative.

II. The Date.

1. Old Testament Chronology:

The actual statements of the Books of Kings, giving parallel reigns from the time of Solomon’s death down to the fixed date of the fall of Samaria in 722 BC, place the foundation of the Temple within a few years of 1000 BC. It is true that this interval is reduced, by about 30 years, by scholars who accept the very doubtful identification of Ahabu of Sir-lai with Ahab of Israel; but this theory conflicts with the fact that Jehu was contemporary with Shalmaneser II of Assyria; and, since we have no historical account of the chronology of Hebrew kings other than that of the Old Testament, for this period, and no monumental notice of Israel in Egypt, or of the Exodus, we must either adopt Old Testament chronology or regard the dates in question as being unknown.

2. Date of Conquest of Palestine:

We have several statements which show that the Hebrew writers believed the conquest of Palestine by Joshua to have occurred early in the 15th century BC, and this date fully agrees with the most recent results of monumental study of the history of the XVIIIth (or Theban) Dynasty in Egypt, as about to be shown, and with the fact that Israel is noticed as being already in Palestine in the 5th year of Minepthah, the successor of Rameses II. In 1Ki 6:1 we read that the Temple was founded "in the 480th year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt," this referring to the Conquest and not to the Exodus, as appears from other notices. The Septuagint reads "440 years," but the details show that the Hebrew text is preferable. In Jud 11:26 the first victory of Jephthah is said to have occurred 300 years after Joshua’s conquest. The details given for this interval, in other passages of the same book, amount to 326 years; but the periods of "rest" may be given in round numbers, and thus account for this minor discrepancy. Samuel ruled apparently for 20 years (1Sa 7:2), and Saul (the length of whose reign is not stated in our present text of this same book) very probably ruled for 20 years also, as Josephus (Ant., VI, xiv, 9) states. Thus 175 years elapsed between Jephthah’s victory and the foundation of the Temple—a total of 475 years, or rather more, from Joshua’s conquest.

3. Date of Exodus:

The popular belief that many of the judges were contemporary does not agree with these facts, and is indeed in conflict with ten definite statements in Jgs. In Ac 13:19,20 we read that after the Conquest there were judges about the space of 450 years, and this rough estimate (including the rule of Samuel) agrees pretty nearly with the 415, or 420, years of the various passages in the Old Testament. According to the Pentateuch and later accounts (Am 5:25; Ac 7:30), Israel abode in the desert 40 years. We therefore find that Joshua’s conquest is placed about 1480 BC, and the Exodus about 1520 BC. According to the revised chronology of the XVIIIth Dynasty of Egypt (see HITTITES), which rests on the notices of contemporary Kassite kings in Babylon, it thus appears that the Pharaoh of the oppression was Thothmes III—a great

enemy of the Asiatics—and the Pharaoh of the Exodus would be Amenophis II or Thothmes IV. If Moses was 80 at the time of the Exodus, he must have been born when Thothmes III was an infant, and when his famous sister Hatasu (according to the more probable rendering of her name by French scholars) was regent, and bore the title Ma-ka-Ra. She therefore might be the "daughter of Pharaoh" (Ex 2:5) who adopted Moses—no king being mentioned in this passage, but appearing (Ex 2:15) only when Moses was "grown"; for her regency lasted more than 20 years, till Thothmes III came of age.

4. Other Views:

As regards this date, it should be remarked that theory of Lepsius, which has been adopted by Brugsch and by many writers who accept his authority, is not accepted by every scholar. E. de Bunsen supposed that the Exodus occurred early in the times of the XVIIIth Dynasty; Sir Peter le Page Renouf said that "no materials have yet been discovered for fixing historical dates in periods of Egyptian history as far back as the Hebrew Exodus"—which was true when he wrote. Professor J. Lieblein supposes the Exodus to have occurred late in the time of Amenophis III—also of the XVIIIth Dynasty (see Proc. Biblical Arch. Soc., 1890, 157-60; 1892, 60-62; 1898, 277; 1899, 53; 1907, 214). Dr. Hommel has also recently declared in favor of the view that the Exodus took place under the XVIIIth Dynasty (Expository Times, February, 1899). Lepsius asserted that the Exodus occurred in 1314 BC, being the 15th year of Minepthah; but this is generally regarded as at least half a century too early for the year in question, and Israel was not in Egypt even ten years earlier in his reign.

5. Astronomical Calculations:

The approximate dates given by Brugsch for the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties are very close to those which can be deduced from notices of contemporary kings of Babylon (History of Egypt, II, 314). The later dates which Mahler based on certain astronomical calculations of the French astronomer Blot (Academie des inscriptions, March 30, 1831, 597, 602-4) are not accepted by other Egyptologists. Brugsch says that on this question, "scientific criticism has not yet spoken its last word" (Hist Egypt, I, 36). Renouf (Proc. Biblical Arch. Soc., December, 1892, 62) more definitely states that "unfortunately there is nothing on Egyptian documents which have as yet come down to us which can, by astronomical calculations, be made to result in a date." This judgment appears to be justified by recent discoveries, since Mahler's dates are about a century too late, as shown by the known history of the Kassites of Babylon. Biot's calculations were based on recorded observations of the rising of Sirius just before the sun, in certain years of certain Egyptian kings. But Sirius is not in the plane of the earth's orbit, and its rising is not constant in retardation. The "heliacal" rising is now about 2 1/2 min. later each year, but about the date in question the retardation was about 12 min., so that a cycle of 1,461 years cannot be used by simple addition. Blot also assumed that the Egyptian observations were as accurate as those made by a modern astronomer with a telescope, whereas, when using the naked eye, the Egyptian observer may well have been a day wrong, which would make a difference of 120 years in the date, or even more. The Babylonian chronology thus gives a far safer basis than do these doubtful observations. On the basis of Biot's calculations the Exodus has been placed in 1214 BC, or even (by Dr. Flinders Petrie) in 1192 BC (Proc. Biblical Arch. Soc., December, 1896, 248). He thus cuts off more than three centuries in the period of the Judges, many of whom he regards as contemporary. Lepsius in like manner, in order to establish his date, accepted the chronology of the Talmud, which is notoriously 166 years too late for the known date of the fall of Samaria, and he endeavored (while rejecting the Old Testament statement as to the 480 years) to base himself on the number of generations before the Exodus, whereas it is well known that the Hebrew genealogies often give only the better-known names and skip several links.

6. Relation between Date of Exodus and Date of Patriarchs:

As regards the relation between the earlier date for the Exodus (about 1520 BC) and the chronology of the Hebrew patriarchs, the Hebrew text gives an interval of 645 years, and the Greek text of 430 years between the Exodus and the call of Abraham; and the call would thus be dated about 2165 BC or 1950 BC. Abraham is very generally held to have been contemporary with Hammurabi of Babylon (Amraphel), whose accession dates (according to Dr. F. Peiser) in 2139 BC. Dr. Hommel and Mr. King prefer a later date, about 1950 BC, though Nabunahid (the last king of Babylon) places

Hammurabi about 2140 BC. The longer reckoning is reconcilable with the Hebrew text, and the shorter with the Greek text, of Gen, without disturbing the approximate date for the Exodus which has been advocated above.

7. Agreement between Monuments and Old Testament Chronology:

There is in fact no discrepancy between the actual results of monumental study and the chronology of the Old Testament. If the Exodus occurred under Thothmes IV, it would have been useless for Israel to attempt the entrance into Palestine by the "way of the land of the Philistines," because at Gaza, Ashkelon and in other cities, the road was still held by forces of Egyptian chariots, which had been established by Thothmes III. But about 40 years later the rebellion of the Amorites against Egypt began, in the time of the Egyptian general Yankhamu, and general chaos resulted in Southern Palestine The Egyptian garrison at Jerusalem (Amarna Tablets, Berlin, No. 102) was withdrawn in his time—about 1480 BC—and it is then (numbers 102-3-4-6, 199) that a fierce people coming from Seir, and called the ‘Abiri or Chabiri, are noticed by the Amorite king of Jerusalem as "destroying all the rulers" of the country. They are not named in any of the other Amarna letters (the term gum-gaz, or "man of war," though once applying probably to them, being used of other warriors as well); and the name is geographical for they are called (no. 199) "people of the land of the ‘Abiri." The first sign has the guttural sounds ‘A and Chronicles, and has not the sound K, which has been wrongly attributed to it, making the word to mean Kabiri, "or great ones." Nor can it be rendered "allies," for it is the name of a people, and quite another word is used for "allies" in this correspondence. The date agrees with that mentioned in the Old Testament for the Hebrew conquest of Palestine, and the only objection to the identification of the ‘Abiri (who attacked Ajalon, Lachish, Ashkelon and other cities) with the Hebrews is, that it upsets theory of Lepsius and the popular views as to the date of the Exodus which he maintained.

8. A Text of Minepthah:

Nor is this the only evidence which destroys his theory; for Dr. Flinders Petrie (Contemporary Review, May, 1896) has published an equally important text of the 5th year of Minepthah, from Thebes. A slab of black syenite, bearing this text, was reused from a temple of Amenophis III. In it Minepthah boasts of his conquest of the invaders who—as elsewhere stated- -attacked the Delta, and penetrated to Belbeis and Heliopolis. He says that "Sutekh (the Hittite god) has turned his back on their chief"; "the Hittites are quieted, Pa-Kan’ana is ravaged with all violence"—this town being otherwise known to have been near Tyre—"the people of Israel is spoiled, it has no seed"; "Ruten has become as the widows of the land of Egypt." Thus, so far from the Exodus having occurred in the 15th year of Minepthah, Israel is noticed 10 years earlier in connection with a place near Tyre with Hittites yet farther North. Even if the Hebrews had only just arrived, they must have left Egypt 40 years before—in the reign of Rameses II—if we attach any value to Old Testament statements; and all the dates variously given by followers of Lepsius are quite upset; whereas the notice of the ‘Abiri, two centuries before Minepthah’s accession, is quite in accord with this allusion to Israel, as well as with Old Testament chronology.

III. The Theory of Lepsius.

The reasons which influenced Lepsius require, however, to be stated, and the objections to a date for the Hebrew Conquest about 1480 BC (or a little later) to be considered, since theory that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the oppression, and Minepthah the Pharaoh of the Exodus is often said to be a secure result of monumental studies, whereas it is really not so, because the only monumental allusions to Israel and the Hebrews are those just mentioned.

1. 1st Argument: City Rameses:

The arguments adduced in favor of the later date are as follows: In the first place, Lepsius (Letters from Egypt, 1842-44) held that no city called Rameses could have been so named, or built by the Hebrews, before the reign of Rameses II, and he placed the site at Heroopolis. This was a very doubtful assumption (see RAAMSES), and his identification of the city is now abandoned. The theory always was vitiated by an objection which he seems to have overlooked: for the "land of Rameses" is noticed in the time of Jacob (Ge 47:11), and since it is impossible to suppose that Jacob lived in the time of

Rameses II, the followers of Lepsius are obliged to regard this notice as an anachronism, which destroys their case, as it might equally be an anachronism in the account of the Exodus, though it is probably correct.

2. 2nd Argument: Manetho’s Statements:

The second argument is based on the account by Manetho of the expulsion of leprous and unclean tribes from Egypt. Manetho was an Egyptian priest who wrote about 268 BC, and who evidently hated the Jews. His account only reaches us secondhand through Josephus (Apion, I, 14, 15, 26-31), this Hebrew author rejecting it as fabulous. Manetho apparently said that, after the Hyksos kings had ruled for 511 years, and had fortified Avaris (see ZOAN), they agreed with King Thummosis to leave Egypt, and went through the desert to Jerusalem, being afraid of the Assyrians (who had no power in Palestine at this time). He continued to relate that, after Armesses Miamon (Rameses II) had ruled 66 years, he was succeeded by an Amenophis whom Josephus calls a "fictitious king"—and rightly so since the name does not occur in the XIXth Dynasty. Apparently Minepthah was meant—though perhaps confused with Amenophis II—and he is said by Manetho to have sent the leprous people to quarries East of the Nile, but to have allowed them later to live in Avaris where the shepherds had been. They were induced by Osarsiph, a priest of Heliopolls, to renounce the Egyptian gods, and this Osarsiph Manetho identified with Moses. They then induced the shepherds who had been expelled by Thummosis to return from Jerusalem to Avaris, and Amenophis fled to Memphis and Ethiopia. His son Rhampses (apparently Rameses III is meant) was sent later to expel the shepherd and polluted people, whom he met at Pelusium and pursued into Syria. This story Josephus discredits, remarking: "I think therefore that I have made it sufficiently evident that Manetho, while he followed his ancient records, did not much mistake the truth of the history, but that, when he had recourse to fabulous stories without any certain author, he either forged them himself without any probability, or else gave credit to some men who spoke so out of their ill will to us"—a criticism sounder than that of Lepsius, who prefers the libelous account of a prejudiced Egyptian priest of the 3rd century BC, identifying Moses with a renegade priest of Heliopolis named Osarsiph, to the ancient Hebrew records in the Bible.

3. Relation of Manetho’s Stories to the Exodus:

A thread of truth underlay Manetho’s stories, but it has nothing to do with the Exodus, and the details to be found on Egyptian monuments do not agree with Manetho’s tale. The Hyksos rulers were not expelled by any Thothmes, but by Aahmes who took Avaris about 1700 BC, and who reopened the quarries of the Arabian chain. Minepthah, about 1265 BC, was attacked in Egypt by Aryan tribes from the North, who had nothing to do with Hyksos chiefs, being Lycians, Sardians and Cilicians. He repelled them, but they again attacked Rameses III (about 1200 BC), and were again driven to the North. No mention of Israel occurs in connection with any of these events.

4. Greek and Latin Writers:

The story of the leprous Jews was, however, repeated by other Greek writers. Cheremon (see Josephus, Apion I, 32) says that Rameses, the son of Amenophis, defeated and expelled a diseased people led against him, at Pelusium, by Tisithen and Petesiph, whom he identified with Moses and Joseph. Lysimachus said that a scabby people were led by Moses through the desert by Judea and Jerusalem in the time of Bocchoris (735 BC). Diodorus Siculus (Fr. of Bk, 34) repeats the tale, about 8 BC, saying that lepers were driven out of Egypt, and were led by Moses who founded Jerusalem, and "established by law all their wicked customs and practices," and again (Fr. of Bk, 40) that strangers in Egypt caused a plague by their impurity, and being driven out were led by Moses. Tacitus, about 100 AD (Hist, v. ii), believed the Jews to have fled from Crete to Libya and, being expelled from Egypt, to have been led by their "Captains Jerusalem and Judah." Again he says (v. iii) that under Bocchoris (735 BC) there was sickness in Egypt, and that the infected being driven out were led by Moses, and reached the site of their temple on the 7th day.

5. Condition of Egypt under Minepthah:

No true critic of the present time is likely to prefer these distorted accounts of the Exodus, or any of the Greek and Roman

calumnies leveled against the hated Jews, to the simple narration of the Exodus in the Bible. The historic conditions in the 5th year of Minepthah were very different from those at the time of Moses. The invaders of Egypt reached Belbeis and Heliopolis (see Brugsch, History of Egypt, II, 117), and Minepthah states, in his text on the wall of the temple of Amon at Thebes, that he had to defend Hellopolls and Memphis against his foes from the East. The region was then "not cultivated but was left as pasture for cattle, on account of the foreigners. It lay waste from the time of our forefathers." The kings of upper Egypt remained in their entrenchments, and the kings of lower Egypt were besieged in their cities by warriors, and had no mercenaries to oppose them. But Israel, as Minepthah himself has told us now, was in Palestine, not in Egypt, in this year of his reign; and, far from desiring to expel Asiatic pastoral peoples, the same Pharaoh encouraged their immigration into the region of Goshen (see PITHOM) laid waste by the Aryan raid.

6. Explanations of Minepthah's Statements:

Objections to the view that the Exodus occurred two centuries and a half before the reign of Minepthah began, and attempts to explain away the statements on his monuments require some notice.

(1) Pithom was Heroopolis. The first of these objections is due to the belief that Pithom was Heroopolis, and was a city founded by Rameses II; but this (see PITHOM) is too hazardous a conclusion to suffice for the entire neglect of Old Testament chronology which it involves, since the site of this city is still very doubtful.

(2) Rameses II Not Named in Judges.

A second objection is made, that the Old Testament shows complete ignorance of Egyptian history if it makes Rameses II contemporary with Jud because he is not named in that book. But Old Testament references to foreign history are always very slight, while on the other hand it is quite probable that there are allusions, in this book, to the events which took place in the reigns of Rameses II, and of Minepthah. The Hebrews were then confined to the mountains (Jud 1:19) and the Egyptians to the plains. No Pharaoh is mentioned by name in the Old Testament till the time of Rehoboam. In his 8th year Rameses II took various towns in Galilee including Salem (North of Taanach), Merom, Beth-Anath, Anem and Dapur (Daberath at the foot of Tabor). The revolt of Barak probably occurred about the 25th year of Rameses II, and began at Tabor. In the So of Deborah (Jud 5:2), the first words (bi-pheroa‘ pera‘oth), rendered by the Septuagint (Alex MS) "when the rulers ruled," may be more definitely translated "when the Pharaohs were powerful," especially as Sisera—who commanded the Canaanite forces—bears a name probably Egyptian (ses-Ra, or "servant of Ra"), and may have been an Egyptian resident at the court of Jabin. So again when, about 1265 BC, Minepthah says that "Israel is ruined, it has no seed," the date suggests the time of Gideon when wild tribes swarmed over the plains, "and destroyed the increase of the earth, till thou come unto Gaza, and left no sustenance in Israel" (Jud 6:4). The Midianites and Amalekites may have then joined the tribes from Asia Minor who, in the 5th year of Minepthah, ruined the Hittites and invaded the Delta.

(3) Some Hebrews Were Never in Egypt.

But another explanation of the presence of Israel in this year on the line of Minepthah's pursuit of these tribes after their defeat has been suggested, namely, that some of the Hebrews never went to Egypt at all. This of course contradicts the account in the Pentateuch (Ex 1:1-5; 12:41) where we read that all Jacob's family (70 men) went down to Goshen, and that "all the hosts of the Lord" left Egypt at the Exodus; but it is supposed to be supported by a passage (1Ch 7:21) where we read of one of the sons of Ephraim "whom the men of Gath born in the land slew, because they came down to take away their cattle." Ephraim however was born in Egypt (Ge 41:52), and his sons and "children of the third generation" (Ge 50:23) remained there. The meaning no doubt is that men of Gath raided Goshen; and there were probably many such raids by the inhabitants of Philistia during the times of the Hyksos kings, similar to those which occurred in the time of Minepthah and of Rameses III. The objections made to the Old Testament date for the Exodus early in the reign of Amenophis III, or in that of his predecessor Thothmes IV, thus appear to have little force; and the condition of Egypt before the 5th year of Minepthah was unlike that which would have existed at the time of the Exodus. The theory of Lepsius was a purely literary conjecture, and not based on any monumental records. It has been falsified by the evidence of

monuments found during the last 20 years, and these are fully in accord with the history and chronology of the Old Testament.

IV. The Numbers.

1. Colenso's Criticism of Large Number:

The historic difficulty with respect to the Exodus does not lie in the account of plagues natural to Egypt even now, nor in the crossing of the Red Sea, but in a single statement as to the numbers of Israel (Ex 12:37), 'about 600,000 footmen- - strong men—with many children, and also many wanderers.' The women are not mentioned, and it has been supposed that this represents a host of 2,000,000 emigrants at least. The objection was urged by Voltaire, and the consequences were elaborately calculated by Colenso. Even if 600,000 means the total population, the "heroes," or "strong men on foot" would, it is urged, have been as numerous as the largest Assyrian army (120,000 men) employed in the conquest of Syria. With an army of more than half a million Moses would have held control over Egypt and Palestine alike; and the emigrants, even in close column of companies, would have stretched for 20 miles; the births would occur every ten minutes; and the assembly before Sinai would have been impossible.

2. Increase of Population:

It is also difficult to suppose, on ordinary calculations of the increase of population, that in 430 years (Ex 12:40), or in 215 years as given in the Septuagint, a tribe of 70 males (Ge 46:26 f; Ex 1:5; 6:14) could have increased to 600,000, or even 100,000 men. But on the other hand we are specially told (Ex 1:7-20) that the children of Israel "increased abundantly," and the comments of Dr Orr (Problem of the Old Testament, 1906, 363-65) on this question should be studied. A young and vigorous nation might multiply much faster than is now usual in the East. Dr. Flinders Petrie has suggested that for "thousand" we should read "families"; but, though the word (*'eleph*) sometimes has that meaning (Jud 6:15; 1Sa 10:19; 23:23), it is in the singular, and not in the plural, in the passage in question (Ex 12:37).

3. Number a Corruption of Original Statement:

It should not be forgotten that variations in numbers are very commonly found in various texts, VSS, and parallel passages of the Old Testament. Thus for instance (1Sa 13:5) the Syriac version reads 3,000 for the 30,000 chariots mentioned in the Hebrew and Greek; and the Septuagint (1Ki 5:11) gives 20,000 for the 20 measures of oil noticed in the Hebrew text. The probable reason for these discrepancies may be found in the fact that the original documents may have used numeral signs —as did the Egyptians, Assyrians, Hittites and Phoenicians—instead of writing the words in full as they appear in the New Testament. These numeral signs—especially in cuneiform—were apt to be misread, and the sign for "unity" could easily be confused with those denoting "sixty" (the Babylonian unit) and "an hundred"—if, in the latter case, a short stroke was added. In the opinion of the present writer the difficulty is due to a corruption of the original statement, which occurred during the course of some fifteen centuries, or more, of continued recopying; but the reader will no doubt form his own conclusions as to this question.

4. Review:

The general questions of the credibility of that history of the Exodus which is given us in the Pentateuch, and of the approximate date of the event, have been treated above in the light of the most recent monumental information. No reference has yet been found in Egyptian records to the presence of Israel in the Delta, though the Hebrews are noticed as present in Palestine before the 5th year of Minepthah. The Pharaohs as a rule—like other kings—only recorded their victories, and no doubt reckoned Israel only as a tribe of those "hostile Shasu" (or "nomads") whom the Theban kings of the XVIIIth Dynasty drove back into Asia. It would be natural that a disaster at the Red Sea should not be noticed in their proud records still extant on the temple walls in Egypt.

See also WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

C. R. Conder

EXODUS, THE BOOK OF, 1

ek’-so-dus:

Contents

I. IN GENERAL

1. Name 2. Contents in General 3. Connection with the Other Books of the Pentateuch 4. Significance of These Events for Israel 5. Connecting Links for Christianity

II. STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES AND ACCORDING TO MODERN ANALYSES

1. In General 2. In the Separate Pericopes

III. HISTORICAL CHARACTER

1. General Consideration 2. The Miraculous Character 3. The Legislative Portions 4. Chronology 5. Unjustifiable Attacks

IV. AUTHORSHIP

1. Connection with Moses 2. Examination of Objections

LITERATURE

(NOTE: For the signs J (Jahwist), E (Elohist), P or Priestly Code (Priest Codex), R (Redactor) compare the article on GENESIS.)

==========

I. In General.

1. Name:

The second book of the Pentateuch bears in the Septuagint the name of Exodos, in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) accordingly Exodus, on the basis of the chief contents of the first half, dealing with the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt. The Jews named the book after the first words: we-’elleh shemoth ("and these are the names"), or sometimes after the first noun shemoth ("names") a designation already known to Origen in the form of Oualesmoth.

2. Contents in General:

In seven parts, after the Introduction (Ex 1:1-7), which furnishes the connection of the contents with Genesis, the book treats of

(1) the sufferings of Israel in Egypt, for which mere human help is insufficient (Ex 1:8-7:7), while Divine help through human mediatorship is promised;

(2) the power of Yahweh, which, after a preparatory miracle, is glorified through the ten plagues inflicted on Pharaoh and which thus forces the exodus (Ex 7:8-13:16);

(3) the love of Yahweh for Israel, which exhibits itself in a most brilliant manner, in the guidance of the Israelites to Mt. Sinai, even when the people murmur (Ex 13:17-18:27);

(4) making the Covenant at Mt. Sinai together with the revelation of the Ten Words (Ex 20:1 ff) and of the legal ordinances (Ex 21:1 ff) as the condition of making the Covenant (Ex 19:1-24:18);

(5) the directions for the building of the Tabernacle, in which Yahweh is to dwell in the midst of His people (Ex 24:18-31:18);

(6) the renewal of the Covenant on the basis of new demands after Israel's great apostasy in the worship of the Golden Calf, which seemed for the time being to make doubtful the realization of the promises mentioned in (5) above (Ex 32:1-35:3);

(7) the building and erection of the Tabernacle of Revelation (or Tent of Meeting) and its dedication by the entrance of Yahweh (Ex 35:4-40:38).

As clearly as these seven parts are separated from one another, so clearly again are they most closely connected and constitute a certain progressive whole.

In the case of the last four, the separation is almost self-evident. The first three as separate parts are justified by the ten plagues standing between them, which naturally belong together and cause a division between that which precedes and that which follows. Thus in the first part we already find predicted the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh, the miracles of Yahweh and the demonstrations of His power down to the slaying of the firstborn, found in the 2nd part (compare Ex 2:23-7:7).

In part 3, the infatuation of Pharaoh and the demonstration of the power of Yahweh are further unfolded in the narrative of the catastrophe in the Red Sea (Ex 14:4,17). Further the directions given with reference to the Tabernacle (Ex 25:31 taken from P) presuppose the Decalogue (from E); compare eg. Ex 25:16,21; 31:18; as again the 6th section (Ex 32 ff) presupposes the 5th part, which had promised the continuous presence of God (compare Ex 32:34 J; 33:3,5,7 ff JE; 33:12,14-17 J; 34:9 J, with 25:8; 29:45 f P; compare also the forty days in 34:28 J with those in 24:18 P) as in 34:1,28 J and 34:11-27 J refers back to the 4th part, namely, 20:1 ff E; 21:1 ff E; 24:7 JE (Decalogue; Books of the Covenant; Making the Covenant). In the same way the last section presupposes the third, since the cloud in Ex 40:34 ff P is regarded as something well known (compare 13:21 f JE; 14:19 E and J, 14:24 J) . The entire contents of the Book of Exodus are summarized in an excellent way in the word of God to Israel spoken through Moses concerning the making of the covenant: Ye have seen what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself.

Now therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation (Ex 19:4-6). Here reference is made to the powerful deeds of God done to the Egyptians, to His deeds of lovingkindness done to Israel in the history of how He led them to Sinai, to the selection of Israel, and to the conditions attached to the making of the covenant, to God's love, which condescended to meet the people, and to His holiness, which demands the observance of His commandments; but there is also pointed out here the punishment for their transgression. The whole book is built on one word in the preface to the ten commandments: I am Yahweh thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the

house of bondage (Ex 20:2 E; compare 29:45 f P).

3. Connection with the Other Books of the Pentateuch:

The events which are described in the Book of Exodus show a certain contrast to those in Genesis. In the first eleven chapters of this latter book we have the history of mankind; then beginning with 11:27, a history of families, those of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. In Exodus we have following this the beginning of the history of the chosen people. Then there is also a long period of time intervening between the two books. If Israel was 430 years in Egypt (compare 12:40 f P; also Ge 15:13 J; see III, 4 below), and if the oppression began during the long reign of the predecessors of the Pharaoh, during whose reign Israel left the country (Ex 2:23; 1:8), then, too, several centuries must have elapsed between the real beginning of the book (x 1:8 ff), and the conclusion of Genesis. Notwithstanding these differences, there yet exists the closest connection between the two books. Ex 1:1-7 connects the history of the people as found in Exodus with the family history of Genesis, by narrating how the seventy descendants of Jacob that had migrated to Egypt (compare Ex 1:5; Ge 46:27) had come to be the people of Israel, and that God, who offers Himself as a liberator to Moses and the people, is also the God of those fathers, of whom Genesis spoke (compare Ex 3:6 JE; 3:13 E; 3:15 f R; 4:5 J; 6:3 P). Indeed, His covenant with the fathers and His promises to them are the reasons why He at all cares for Israel (Ex 2:24 P; 6:8 P; 33:1 JE), and when Moses intercedes for the sinful people, his most effective motive over against God is found in the promises made to the patriarchs (Ex 32:13 JE).

As is the case with Genesis, Exodus stands in the closest connection also with the succeeding books of the Pentateuch. Israel is certainly not to remain at Sinai, but is to come into the promised land (3:17 JE; 6:8 P; 23:20 ff JE; 32:34 J; 33:1 ff JE; 33:12 ff J; 34:9 ff J and D; compare also the many ordinances of the Books of the Covenant, 21:1 ff E; 34:11 ff D and J). In this way the narratives of the following books, which begin again in Nu 10:11 ff P and JE with the story of the departure from Sinai, continue the history in Exodus. But the legislation in Leviticus also is a necessary continuation and supplement of the Book of Exodus, and is prepared for and pointed to in the latter. The erection of the burnt-offering altar (27:1 ff; 38:1 ff), as well as the mention made of the different kinds of sacrifices, such as the burnt sacrifices and the sin offering (29:18,14) and of the heave offering (29:28), point to the promulgation of a law of sacrifices such as we find in Le 1-7. The directions given in regard to the consecration of the priests (Ex 29) are carried out in Le 8 f. The indefinite commands of Ex 30:10 in reference to the atonement on the horn of the incense altar once every year renders necessary the special ritual of the Day of Atonement in Le 16 as its supplement. The more complete enlargement in reference to the shewbread mentioned in Ex 25:30 is found in Le 24:5-9; and even the repetitions in references to the candlesticks (Ex 25:31 ff; Le 24:1-4; Nu 8:1-4), as also the tamidh ("continuous") sacrifices (compare Nu 28:3-8 with Ex 29:38-42), point to a certain connection between Exodus and the following books. How close the connection between Deuteronomy and Exodus is, both in regard to the historical narratives and also to their legal portions (compare the Decalogue and the Books of the Covenant), can only be mentioned at this place.

4. Significance of These Events for Israel:

When we remember the importance which the exodus out of Egypt and the making of the covenant had for the people of Israel, and that these events signalized the birth of the chosen people and the establishment of theocracy, then we shall understand why the echo of the events recorded in Exodus is found throughout later literature, namely, in the historical books, in the preaching of the prophets and in the Psalms, as the greatest events in the history of the people, and at the same time as the promising type of future and greater deliverances. But as in the beginning of the family history the importance of this family for the whole earth is clearly announced (Ge 12:1-3), the same is the case here too at the beginning of the history of the nation, perhaps already in the expression "kingdom of priests" (Ex 19:6), since the idea of a priesthood includes that of the transmission of salvation to others; and certainly in the conception ‘first-born son of Yahweh’ (Ex 4:22), since this presupposes other nations as children born later.

The passages quoted above are already links connecting this book with Christianity, in the ideas of a general priesthood, of election and of sonship of God. We here make mention of a few specially significant features from among the mass of such

relationships to Christianity.

5. Connecting Links for Christianity:

How great a significance the Decalogue, in which the law is not so intimately connected with what is specifically Jewish and national, as eg. in the injunctions of the Priest Codex, according to the interpretation of Christ in Mt 5, has attained in the history of mankind! But in Mt 5:17 ff Jesus has vindicated for the law in all its parts an everlasting authority and significance and has emphasized the eternal kernel, which accordingly is to be assigned to each of these legal behests; while Paul, on the other hand, especially in Romans, Galatians and Colossians, emphasizes the transitory character of the law, and discusses in detail the relation of the Mosaic period to that of the patriarchs and of the works of the law to faith, while in 2Co 3 he lauds the glory of the service in the spirit over that of the letter (compare Ex 34)—an idea which in reference to the individual legal institutions is also carried out in the Ep. to the Hebrews. Compare on this subject also the articles LEVITICUS and DAY OF ATONEMENT. Then too the Passover lamb was a type of Jesus Christ (compare eg. 1Co 5:7; Joh 19:36; 1Pe 1:19). In Ex 12 the Passover rite and the establishment of the covenant (24:3-8) arc found most closely connected also with the Lord's Supper and the establishment of the New Covenant.

In the permanent dwelling of God in the midst of His people in the pillar of fire and in the Tabernacle there is typified His dwelling among mankind in Christ Jesus (Joh 1:14) and also the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in the Christian congregation (1Pe 2:5; Eph 4:12) and in the individual Christian (1Co 3:16; 6:19; 2Co 6:16; Joh 14:23). The Apocalypse particularly is rich in thought suggested by the exodus out of Egypt. Unique thoughts in reference to the Old Testament are found in the conceptions that the law was given through angels (Ac 7:53; Ga 3:19; Heb 2:2); further that the rock mentioned in Ex 17:6 followed, and was Christ (1Co 10:4); and that in Heb 9:4 the real connection of the altar of incense with the Holy of Holies appears as changed into a local connection (Ex 40:26,27), while the idea found in Heb 9:4 that the manna was originally in the Ark of the Covenant, is perhaps not altogether excluded by Ex 16:33; and the number 430 years, found in Ga 3:17, probably agrees with Ex 12:40,41, in so far as the whole of the patriarchal period could be regarded as a unit (compare on the reading of the Septuagint in Ex 12:40,41, III, 4 below).

Continued 8294

EXODUS, THE BOOK OF, 2

II. Structure of the Book According to the Scriptures and According to Modern Analyses.

In the following section (a) serves for the understanding of the Biblical text; (b) is devoted to the discussion and criticism of the separation into sources.

1. In General:

(a) The conviction must have been awakened already by the general account of the contents given in I, 2 above, that in the Book of Exodus we are dealing with a rounded-off structure, since in seven mutually separated yet intimately connected sections, one uniform fundamental thought is progressively carried through. This conviction will only be confirmed when the details of these sections are studied, the sections being themselves again organically connected by one leading thought. Since, in addition, the Book of Genesis is clearly divided into ten parts by the ten toledhoth ("generations") (compare also the division made by typical numbers in articles LEVITICUS and DAY OF ATONEMENT), thus too the number seven, as itself dividing the Book of Exodus into seven parts, is probably not accidental; and this all the less, as in the subordinate parts too, a division is to be found according to typical numbers, this in many cases appearing as a matter of course, and in other cases traced without difficulty, and sometimes lying on the surface (compare 10 plagues, 10 commandments). Yet in all of the following investigations, as is the case in the articles GENESIS, LEVITICUS and DAY OF ATONEMENT, the demonstration of the fundamental thought must be the main thing for us. The division according to typical numbers is to be regarded merely as an additional confirmation of the literary unity of the book. We refer here first of all to a number of

cases, where certain numbers independently of the separate chief parts combine the Biblical text into a unity. In Nu 14:22 R, Yahweh states that Israel had now tempted Him and been disobedient to Him ten times: compare Ex 14:11 ff JE(?) (Red Sea); 15:23 f JE (Marah); 16:2,3 P; 16:20 JE; 16:27,28 R (Manna); 17:1 ff JE (Massah and Meribah); 32:1 ff JE (Golden Calf); Nu 11:1 ff JE (Tuberah); 11:4 ff JE (Graves of Lust); 14:2 ff P and JE (Spies). Most of these cases are accordingly reported in the Book of Exodus, but in such manner that in this particular a clearly marked progress can be noticed, as Yahweh does not begin to punish until Ex 32; but from here on He does so with constantly increasing severity, while down to Ex 32 grace alone prevails, and in this particular, previous to Ex 32, there is found nothing but a warning (16:27). Ten times it is further stated of Pharaoh, in a great variety of forms of expression, that he hardened his own heart (7:13 P; 7:14 JE; 7:22 P; 8:15 P; 8:32 JE; 9:7,34,35 JE; 13:15 D); ten times the hardening is ascribed to God (4:21 JE; 7:3 P; 9:12 P; 10:1 R; 10:20 JE; 10:27 E; 11:10 R; 14:4,8 P; 17 P ?). Here already we must note that within the narrative of the miracles and the plagues at first there is mention made only of the hardening by Pharaoh himself (7:13 P; 7:14 JE; 7:22 P; 8:11 ff; 8:15 P; 8:28 JE; 9:7 JE, i.e. seven times) before a single word is said that God begins the hardening; and this latter kind of hardening thereupon alone concludes the whole tragedy (14:4,8 P; 17 P?). Ten months cover the time from the arrival at Sinai (19:1 P) to the erection of the sacred dwelling-place of God (40:17 P). Since, further, exactly three months of this time are employed in 19:10,16 JE; 24:3 ff JE; 24:16 P (ten days); 24:18 P (40 days); 34:28 J (40 days), there remain for the building of the tabernacle exactly seven months.

(b) What has been said does anything but speak in favor of the customary division of Exodus into different sources. It is generally accepted that the three sources found in Genesis are also to be found in this book; in addition to which a fourth source is found in Ex 13:3-16, of a Deuteronomistic character. It is true and is acknowledged that the advocates of this hypothesis have more difficulties to overcome in Exodus than in Genesis, in which latter book too, however, there are insufficient grounds for accepting this view, as is shown in the article GENESIS. Beginning with Ex 6 the chief marks of such a separation of sources falls away as far as P and J are concerned, namely, the different uses of the names of God, Elohim and Yahweh. For, according to the protagonists of the documentary theory, P also makes use of the name Yahweh from this chapter on; E, too, does the same from Ex 3:13 ff on, only that, for a reason not understood, occasionally the word Elohim is still used by this source later on, e.g. 13:17 ff; 18:1 ff. But as a number of passages using the name Elohim are unhesitatingly ascribed by the critics to J, this difference in the use of the name of God utterly fails to establish a difference of sources. To this is to be added, that J and E are at this place closely interwoven; that, while the attempt is constantly being made to separate these two sources, no generally accepted results have been reached and many openly acknowledge the impossibility of such a separation, or admit that it can be effected only to a very limited extent. Peculiarities which are regarded as characteristic of the different sources, such as the sin of Aaron in J, the staff of Moses in E, Sinai in J and the Priestly Code (P), Horeb in E, the dwelling of the Israelites in Goshen in J, but according to E their living in the midst of the Egyptians, and others, come to nought in view of the uniform text in the passages considered. This has been proved most clearly, e.g. by Eerdmans in his Alttestamentliche Studien, III ("Das Buck Exodus") in regard to many of these passages. Narratives of a similar character, like the two stories in which Moses is described as striking the rock to produce water (Ex 17:1; Nu 20:1 ff), are not duplicates, but are different events. Compare the different localities in Ex 17:7 and Nu 20:1, as also the improbability that Israel would without cause in the first passage have put into permanent form the story of its shame, and then in the latter there would have been an uncertainty as to the importance of this locality for the career of Moses; and finally, we must notice the distinction expressly made by the additional statement, "waters of Meribah of Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin," in Nu 27:12-14; De 32:51 (compare Eze 47:19; 48:28). Then, too, these occurrences, if we accept the division into J and E at this place, are not reduced to a single event, since both sources would share in both narratives. The same condition of affairs is found in Ex 16 in so far as JE comes into consideration, and in Ex 18 in comparison with Nu 11. In the case of Nu 11 there is express reference made to a former narrative by the word "again" and in the second case all the details in their differences point to different occurrences. Concerning other so-called duplicates in Ex, see later in this article. But the acceptance of P in contradistinction to the text of JE does also not lead to tangible results, notwithstanding that there exists a general agreement with regard to the portions credited to P. Not taking into consideration certain that are peculiar, the following sections are attributed to this source: Ex 1:1-7,13-15; 2:23, 25; 6:2-7:13, 6:28-30; Ex 7:19,20,21,22; 8:1-3,11-15; 9:8-12; 12:1-20,28,37,40-50; 13:1-2,20; Ex 14:1-4,8-10,15-18,21,22-23,19; 16:1-3,1-14,15-18,21-26,31-32,34,35; Ex 17:1; 19:1,2; 24:15-31:17; 34:29-40:38. It is claimed that in the Book of Genesis these sources constitute the backbone of the whole work; but this is not claimed for Ex. The sections ascribed to P constitute in this place, too, anything but an unbroken story. In both language and substance they are, to a certain extent,

most closely connected with the parts ascribed to JE, and in part they are indispensable for the connection whence they have been taken (compare for details below). It is absolutely impossible to separate on purely philological grounds in the purely narrative portions in Exodus the portions belonging to P. That genealogies like Ex 6:14 ff, or chronological notices like 12:40,41,51; 16:1; 19:1, or directions for the cults like Ex 12; 25 ff have their own peculiar forms, is justified by self-evident reasons; but this does not justify the acceptance of separate authors. It is the result of the peculiar matter found in each case. We must yet note that the passages attributed to P would in part contain views which could not be harmonized with theological ideas ascribed to this source, which are said to include an extreme transcendental conception of God; thus in 16:10 the majesty of Yahweh suddenly appears to the congregation, and in 40:34 ff this majesty takes possession of the newly erected dwelling. In 8:19 mention is made of the finger of God, and in 7:1 Moses is to be as God to Pharaoh. In Ex 12:12 the existence of the Egyptian gods is presupposed and the heathen sorcerers are able to act in competition with Moses and Aaron for a while; 7:11,12,22; 8:3. P also describes the Passover, which on account of the handling of the blood in 12:7 cannot be regarded in any other light than as a sacrifice in the house, and in Nu 9:7,13, this act is expressly called a qorban Yahweh ('sacrifice of Yahweh'). Compare also the commands in Ex 12:10,43,18. But more than anything else, what has been said under (a) above goes to show that all these sources have been united in a way that characterizes the work of a systematic writer, and declares against any view that would maintain that these sources have been mechanically placed side by side and interwoven into each other. What has here been outlined for the whole book in general must now be applied to the different parts in particular.

2. In the Separate Pericopes:

(1) Exodus 1:8-7:7:

(a) Everything that is narrated in this section, which in so worthy a manner introduces the whole book, is written from a standpoint of the Egyptian oppression, from which human help could give no deliverance, but from which the mighty power of Yahweh, working through human agency, offered this deliverance. It is a situation which demands faith (4:31). This section naturally falls into ten pericopes, of which in each instance two are still more closely connected. Numbers 1 and 2 (1:8- 14,15-22), namely, the oppression through forced labor and the threat to take the life of the newly born males of the Israelites; and in contrast to this, the Divine blessing in the increase of the people in general and of the midwives in particular; numbers 3 and 4 (Ex 2:1-10,11-22), namely, the birth and youth of Moses stand in contrast. The child seems to be doomed, but God provides for its deliverance. Moses, when grown to manhood, tries to render vigorous assistance to his people through his own strength, but he is compelled to flee into a far-off country. Numbers 5 and 6 (Ex 2:23-4:17; 4:18-31) report the fact that also in the reign of a new Pharaoh the oppression does not cease, and that this causes God to interfere, which in Ex 2:23-25 is expressed in strong terms and repeatedly, and this again leads to the revelation in the burning bush (3:1 ff). And at the same time the narrative shows how little self-confidence Moses still had (three signs, a heavy tongue, direct refusal). The sixth pericope and also the beginning of the last four, describe, from an external viewpoint, the return of Moses to Midian, and his journey from there to Egypt. Here, too, mention is made of the troubles caused by Pharaoh, which God must remove through His power. This deliverance is not at all deserved by Israel, since not even any son in a family had up to this time been circumcised. On the other hand, everything here is what can be expected. Those who sought the life of Moses had died; the meeting with Aaron at the Mount of the Lord; in Egypt the faith of the people. In an effective way the conclusion (4:31) returns to the point where the two companion narratives (2:24 f) begin. After this point, constituting the center and the chief point in the introductory section, numbers 7 and 8 (Ex 5:1-6:1; 6:2-12), everything seems to have become doubtful. Pharaoh refuses to receive Moses and Aaron; the oppression increases; dissatisfaction in Israel appears; Moses despairs; even the new revelations of God, with fair emphasis on fidelity to the Covenant which is to unfold Yahweh's name in full, are not able to overcome the lack of courage on the part of the people and of Moses. Numbers 9 and 10, introduced by Ex 6:13 (6:14-27 and 6:28-7:7), show that after Moses and Aaron have already been mentioned together in 4:14,27 ff; 5:1 ff, and after it has become clear how little they are able of themselves to accomplish anything, they are now here, as it were, for the first time, before the curtain is raised, introduced as those who in the following drama are to be the mediators of God's will (compare the concluding verses of both pericopes, 6:27; 7:7), and they receive directions for their common mission, just at that moment when, humanly speaking, everything is as unfavorable as possible.

(b) The unity of thought here demonstrated is in this case too the protecting wall against the flood-tide of the documentary theory. For this theory involves many difficulties. In Ex 1:13 f there would be an account of the oppression by the Priestly Code (P), but the motive for this can be found only in the preceding verses, which are ascribed to JE; 2:24 speaks of the Covenant of God With Isaac, concerning which P is said to have reported nothing in the Book of Gen, as in the latter book a reference to this matter is found only in Ge 26:2-5 R; 26:24 J. In Ex 6:2 ff Moses and Aaron are mentioned; but as the text of P reads we know absolutely nothing from this source as to who these men are. According to 7:1 ff Aaron is to be the speaker for Moses before Pharaoh. But according to P neither Moses nor Aaron speaks a single word. The omissions that are found by critics in documents J and E—which, if they are separated, have lines of demarcation claimed for the separation that are very unsettled—we here pass over in silence.

On the critical theory, the narratives of the Priestly Code (P), in the Book of Ex, as also in Gen, would have discarded many of the stereotyped formulas characteristic of this source (compare Ex 2:23 ff; 6:2 ff; 7:1 ff), and in both form and contents would be made very similar to the rest of the text Ex 1:9,10,12 JE; 1:20 E; 7:1 P; and to a great extent expressions similar to these are here found and in part refer to these. The same must be said concerning 3:7 JE in its relation to 2:23 ff P; 6:6 ff (sibhloth) P in its relation to 1:11 JE; 2:11 E; 5:4,5 JE (in contrast 1:13,14; 2:23). JE, in 4:9 for "dry land," makes use of the term ha-yabbashah, which in Ge 1:9 f and Ex 14:16 is ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), and a different expression is used for this thought by J in Ge 7:22. In reference to Ex 7:1 P compare 4:14 E (?). In reference to the hardening of Pharaoh, which is found in all the sources (7:3 P), see above under 1a; in reference to the miracles, and their purpose of making Yahweh known to the Egyptians (7:3-5 P) see the following paragraph. The four generations mentioned in 7:14 ff P find their parallel in Ge 15:16 J (compare 46:8 ff); and the sons of Aaron mentioned in Ex 6:23 the Priestly Code (P), Nadab and Abihu, are mentioned also in the text of 24:1,9, ascribed to JE although, except in Le 10 the Priestly Code (P), their names are not found elsewhere in the Pentateuch. In reference to the repetitions, it must be said that Ex 1:13 P is either the continuation (in so far as the Israelites instead of being compulsory laborers became slaves), or is a concluding summary, such as is found frequently. The new revelation of God in Ex 6 the Priestly Code (P), according to chapter 3 JE, finds its psychological and historical motive in the account of the failure described in 5:1 ff JE, and in the discouragement of the Israelites and of Moses resulting therefrom. In the same way the renewed mention by Moses of his difficulties of speech (6:12 P; compare with 4:10 ff J and E (?)) is very characteristic of human ways, and this again necessitates the twice repeated consideration of this matter by God (6:30 R; 4:10 ff J and E (?); concerning the names of God, see GENESIS; GOD, NAMES OF).

One difficulty, which is also not made clear by the proposed division of sources, is found in the name of the father-in-law of Moses; since according to Ex 2:18 J, this name is Reuel, and according to 3:1; 18:1 JE, it is Jethro (4:18 E in the form "Jether"); in Nu 10:29 JE is called Hobab and a son of Reuel (the King James Version "Raguel") for all of these passages are ascribed to J or E. It is probable that the name Jethro is a title ("Excellency"); and as for the rest, in Nu 10:29 chothen probably does not mean father-in-law but brother-in-law (Jud 1:16; 4:11); or in Ex 2:18 we find father and in 2:21 daughter in the place of grandfather and granddaughter; otherwise we should be compelled to accept different traditions, by which view, however, the Mosaic authorship of Exodus would be made impossible (compare IV, below).

(2) Exodus 7:8-13:16:

(a) This section is separated as a matter of course from the rest by the typical number of ten plagues. It is introduced by the transformation of the rod into a serpent in the presence of Pharaoh (7:8-13). To explain the fact that there were ten plagues on the ground of the accidental combination of sources, is from the very outset a precarious undertaking. To this must be added the following reasons that indicate a literary editing of the material. All of the plagues are introduced by the same formula (7:12 JE; 8:1 J; 8:12 P; 8:16 JE; 8:20 JE; 9:1 JE; 9:8 P; 9:13 JE; 10:1,12 JE; 10:21 E; 11:1 E), and in connection with each plague the hardening of the heart of Pharaoh is mentioned (compare (1a) above); compare 7:22 P; 8:11 J; 8:15 P; 8:28 JE; 9:7 JE; 9:12 P; 9:34 JE; 9:35 JE; 10:1 R; 10:20 JE; 10:27 E; 11:10 R; 13:15 D. As is the case in the first section, we find here too in each instance two plagues more closely connected, namely, numbers 1 and 2 already externally united by the double address of Yahweh (compare 7:14 JE; 7:19 P and 7:26 J; 8:1 P), but also by the methods of punishment that are related to each other (water changed to blood and frogs); and, finally, by the extension of the plague (the Nile and

beyond the river). In 3 and 4 we have to deal with insects (stinging flies and dung flies); in 5 and 6 with a kind of pest (pest among cattle, and boils); 7 and 8 are again formally joined by the repeated command of Yahweh to Moses in 9:13,12 JE and 10:1,12 JE, as also by the fullness of the account the two show and their similarity, in both also use being made of the staff (9:23 f JE; 10:13 f JE), in the repetition of the emphasis put on the remarkable character of the plague (9:18,24; 10:6,14 JE). By both plagues vegetation is destroyed; and in the plague of locusts special reference is made also to the hail (compare 10:5,12,15). In the case of 9 and 10, the darkness constitutes a connecting link (compare 10:21 E; 11:4 J; 12:12 P; 12:30,31 JE). By the side of the occasional rhythm formed of two members there is also one formed of three members (after the manner of a triole in a measure of two beats). In the case of each group of three plagues, two are announced beforehand (thus 1 JEP and 2 JP; 4 JE and 5 JE; 7 JE and 8 JE; 10 EJ over against 3 the Priestly Code (P), 6 P and 9 E); the first of each group of three plagues, as 1, 4 and 7, is to be announced by Moses on the following morning to Pharaoh (7:15; 8:20; 9:13 JE). Also in regard to the impression caused by the plagues a distinct progress can be noticed, in this too, that the Egyptian sorcerers are active only down to the third plague. Naturally, too, over against these facts, further peculiarities can be pointed out in the separate plagues, e.g. the fact that Goshen, or rather that Israel, is spared in the 4th, 5th, 7th through 10th plagues (8:22; 9:6,26 JE; 10:23 E; 11:7 J); and in the mention made of the intercession in the 2nd, 4th, 7th, 8th (8:8 J; 8:12; 9:28,33; 10:17 f JE) without thereby destroying the artistic construction of the whole that has been described above, or that in each such case of individuality of presenting the matter there is to be found a reason for claiming a separate source.

(b) In the same way, too, it is not a permissible conclusion, that in the first miracle and in the first three plagues mention is made of the fact that Aaron performed this miracle with his staff (Ex 7:8 ff, 19; 8:5-20 ff P). At any rate, in the parts ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), no absolute uniformity is to be found, since plagues 1 to 3 are commanded to Moses, while the 6th is commanded to Moses and Aaron (Ex 7:19; 8:1,20 over against EX 9:8); and since, further, in the 6th plague (Ex 9:8) it is Moses, and in the 10th (Ex 12:12) it is God Himself who really carries out the command, and not Aaron, as was the case in the introductory miracles and in the first three plagues. Further, according to JE (Ex 4:30), it appears that the presupposition is that we are to consider all of the addresses and actions in general as taking place through Aaron, even in those cases where this is not especially mentioned.

Only the 1st plague (Ex 7:14 ff) furnishes an apparent reason for the acceptance of two sources. In this case mention is made at times of the waters of the Nile only, and then of all other waters being changed into blood; and a separation from this point of view at least could be carried through. But this possibility disappears at once in the case of the 2nd plague (frogs), where the passage Ex 8:1-3, ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), which verses contain the consummation of the plague announced in 7:26-29 J (Hebrew), is altogether necessary for this connection; as otherwise the impression made upon Pharaoh by this plague, which is not mentioned in P at all, would be a torso. The similarity in the construction of the 2nd and the 1st plague, however (compare under (a) above), and the same difference in the mention made of the Nile and of the other waters in the 2nd plague, make it possible and even advisable in the case of the first plague, too, to discard the hypothesis of a difference in sources, because in the 2nd plague this difference cannot be carried out. Then, too, there would be other omissions found in P. According to the customary separation of sources, P would not contain the fulfillment of the threatened tenth plague announced in 12:12 at all. In the same way the statement in 12:28 refers to the carrying out of a command, the announcement of which to Israel in 12:21 ff would be found in another source. Further in 12:37a we would have the Priestly Code (P), as when the parts belonging to P have been eliminated, the other sources too would contain omissions in 12:21 ff, mostly JE; 12:37b E; 13:3 ff D. In the same way the announcement of a large number of miracles (7:3 P; 11:9 R) is too comprehensive, if these verses refer only to the narratives found in P. In addition, there is a remarkable similarity found in all of the narratives of P with those parts which are ascribed to JE; compare the first miracle in 7:8 ff with 4:2 ff J; 4:17 E. In the Priestly Code (P), too, as is the case with JE, it is stated that the purpose of the miracle is, that Pharaoh, or the Egyptians, or Israel, are to recognize that Yahweh is God and the Lord of the earth, or something to this effect (7:5 P; 7:17 JE; 8:10 R; 8:22; 9:14,29,30 JE; 10:2 R; 11:7 J; compare from the next section, 14:4 P; 14:18 the Priestly Code (P), which at the same time is also the fundamental thought that forms the connecting link of the whole section). The position of Ex 11:1-3 E between 10:28,29 E and 11:8 J constitutes a difficulty, because in the last-mentioned passages Moses is represented as standing continuously before Pharaoh. The announcement made by Yahweh to Moses, that one more plague is to come, and that the Israelites should borrow articles of value from the Egyptians, must in reality have been made before, but for good reasons it is mentioned for the first time at this place, in order to explain the

confident utterance of Moses, that he would not again appear before Pharaoh (10:29). But the fact that according to 12:31 JE Pharaoh does in reality once more cause Moses and Aaron to be called, can readily be explained on the ground of the events that happened in the meantime.

The structure of Exodus 12 f contains nothing that could not have been written by one and the same author. Only Moses naturally did not at once communicate (12:21 ff) to the leading men of Israel the command given in 12:15 ff concerning the unleavened bread, which command had been given for later generations; and not until 13:3 ff is this command mentioned in connection with the order given to the people in the meantime concerning the firstborn (13:1 f) . The further fact, that the story of the exodus reaches a preliminary conclusion in 12:42 before the details of the Passover (verses 3 ff) have been given, is in itself justifiable. As far as contents are concerned, everything in chapters 12 f, namely, the exodus, the festival of unleavened bread, the firstborn, and orders pertaining thereto, that the month of the exodus is to be regarded as the first month, etc., are closely connected with the Passover and the 10th plague. Because the latter had to be described more fully than the other plagues, we find already in 11:9,10, after the announcement of this plague and its results, a comprehensive notice concerning all the miracles through which Yahweh demonstrated how He, amid great manifestations of power (7:4 P) and with a mighty hand (6:1 JE), has led His people forth.

(3) Exodus 13:17-18:27:

(a) This section finds its connecting thought in the emphasis placed on the love of Yahweh, on His readiness to help, and His long-suffering in the leading of His at times murmuring people on the road to and as far as Sinai. This section covers two months. What is narrated, beginning with Ex 16:1, transpires even within a single two weeks (compare Ex 19:1). Number 1 (Ex 13:17-22), describes the journey to Etham (out of love God does not lead the people the direct way, since He fears that they will become unfaithful in the event of a battle; Joseph's bones are taken along, since God now really is taking care of His people (compare Ge 50:24,26); Yahweh's friendly presence is shown in the pillar of fire). Number 2 (Ex 14:1-31) contains the passage through the Red Sea (Yahweh the helper; compare Ex 14:10,15,13,14,30,21,24,26 f, 31, notwithstanding the murmuring of Israel, 14:11 f). Number 3 (Ex 15:1 ff) contains the thanksgiving hymn of Moses for Yahweh's help, with which fact each one of the four strophes begins (Ex 15:1 ff, 6 ff, 11,16 b ff). Number 4 (Ex 15:20 f) contains Miriam's responsorium. Number 5 (Ex 15:22-27) treats of Marah and Elim (Yahweh proves Himself to be Israel's helper and physician (Ex 15:25 f) notwithstanding the murmuring of Israel (Ex 15:24)). Number 6 introduces the last five pericopes, with a designation of the time (Ex 16:1-36), and describes the miraculous feeding with manna and quails. (The murmuring is particularly emphasized in Ex 16:2,7-9,12. Israel also gathers more than they have been directed to do (Ex 16:16 f); reserves some for the following day (Ex 16:19 f); collects some on the Sabbath (Ex 16:27); Yahweh, who in Ex 16:6-12 alone is mentioned in rapid succession no fewer than ten times, at first does not even utter a word of reproach, and when the Sabbath has been violated He does nothing more than reprove.) Number 7 (Ex 17:1-7) reports the help of Yahweh (Ex 17:4) at the Waters of Contention (Strife). He even appears on the rock (Ex 17:6), notwithstanding the murmuring (Ex 17:2-4,7). Number 8 (Ex 17:8-16) describes the victory over the Amalekites, which furnished the occasion for the erection of the memorial altar, called 'Yahweh-my- Banner.' Possibly in this connection Joshua ("Yahweh helps") was changed from Hosea (Nu 13:16). Compare Hengstenberg, Authenthic. des Pentateuches, II, 395 f. Number 9 (Ex 18:1-12) shows in a constantly changing variety of expressions that emphasis is laid on the impression which the deeds of God in connection with Israel make on Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, while he was visiting the latter (Ex 18:1,8-12). Effective in this connection is also the mention made of the symbolical names of the sons of Moses (Gershom, "I have been a sojourner in a foreign land"; and Eliezer, "The God of my father was my help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh" (Ex 18:3 f)). Further, the name Mount of God (Ex 18:5; compare Ex 18:12) probably is a reminder of the fulfillment of Ex 3:12. Number 10 (Ex 18:13-17) shows how God helps Moses (compare Ex 18:19) through the advice of Jethro to appoint judges. In this part, too, Ex 13:17-18:27, we have ten sections, which can easily be arranged in groups of two and two. Thus numbers 1 and 2 are connected by their analogous beginnings (13:17,18 RE; 14:1,2 P) and by the cloud of fire (13:21 f JE; 14:19,24 J); numbers 3 and 4 by the responsive hymn; numbers 5 and 6, which already by the feeling of hunger and thirst are connected in thought, by their reference to the ordinances of Yahweh (15:25 D; 16:4 JE ?; 16:28 R); numbers 7 and 8 by the use made of Moses' staff (17:5,9 JE); numbers 9 and 10 by Jethro's person, and the close connection of their contents in point of time (18:13). Further, the Biblical text of this place is clearly presupposed in the list of stations, expressly stated to have been prepared at the command of Moses (Nu 33). This list, as is acknowledged on all

sides, has the characteristics of P; and it takes into consideration not only the portions ascribed to this source, but also the text of JE. Compare Nu 33:9 (Marah and Elim) with Ex 15:22-27, and Nu 33:14 (lack of water in Rephidim) with Ex 17:1 ff.

(b) Over against the analysis into different sources the following data in detail can also be advanced. In P the last demonstration of the power of Yahweh over Pharaoh would be indeed endangered in Ex 14:4,15 ff, 21a, but afterward would not be related. In Ex 16:1 we cannot find in the Priestly Code (P), unless we bring in also 15:27 from JE, how Israel came to be in Elim. On the other hand, in 16:4 ff (JE?) the promise of bread from heaven is groundless without the preceding verses, which are attributed to P; and without 17:1 the Priestly Code (P), we do not know to what the word "there" in 17:3 belonging to JE refers, and how in 17:8 JE the Israelites had come to Rephidim. How entirely data taken from the language utterly fail here in establishing the separation of sources we see from the fact that in Exodus the distribution of the different portions and verses between P and E becomes a matter of doubt, and also in Ex 16 a harmony of view has not been gained as to whether only the Priestly Code (P), or in addition also J, E or JE have contributed to the text. The hymn found in Ex 15:1 ff, which certainly is an old composition, presupposes passages which are assigned to different sources, and in this way speaks for the unity of the text. Compare 15:2 with 14:30 J; 14:13 JE (?); 15:3 with 14:14 JE (?); 14:25 J; 14:4a with 14:9 P; 14:4b with 14:7 JE; 14:8 with 14:22 EP; 14:29 P; with 14:9. On the other hand, Ex 14:19 a and b cannot be utilized in favor of a division of sources E and J; but rather the analogous structure of this passage presupposes the same author, and there is only indicated what elsewhere is always a presupposition, namely, that God Himself has taken His abode somewhere in the cloud of fire (13:21,22 JE; 14:24 J; compare 40:34 ff P) Just as little are the two commands found in 14:16 to be divided between P and E and J, one stating what Moses does, and the other what Yahweh does, since both rather belong together (compare 9:22 f with 9:33; 10:13). At first glance 16:6 ff does not appear to be in its proper place, as Moses and Aaron in 16:6,7 have already told Israel what only in 16:9 ff is revealed through the appearance of Yahweh and His injunction to Moses. But these very verses are in harmony with the character of the whole section (compare under a above), since it is here stated that under all circumstances Israel is to be convinced of this, that Yahweh has proven Himself to be Yahweh, and has heard their murmuring. In addition, the appearance of Yahweh in 16:10 is clearly announced by 16:7. Accordingly, 16:9 ff serve only to confirm and strengthen what is found in 16:6 ff. The fact that not until in 18:2 JE Jethro brings the wife and the sons of Moses, while the latter himself according to 4:20 J had taken them along when he joined Israel, finds a satisfactory explanation in 18:2b. He sent them back doubtless because of the conduct of Zipporah on the occasion of the circumcision of her son (4:25 J). The fact that Jethro comes to Moses at the Mount of God (18:5 JE), while the latter does not arrive at Mt. Sinai until 19:1 ff according to P and J, is no contradiction; for by the Mount of God is meant the whole chain of Horeb, which Moses has already reached according to 17:6 JE; but Mt. Sinai is a single mountain. The special legal ordinances and decisions mentioned in 18:20 JE before the giving of the law (19 ff E and JE) are in perfect harmony with 15:25 D; 16:4 JE (?); 16:28 R.

(4) Exodus 19:1-24:18a:

(a) This fourth section contains the conclusion of the covenant at Mt. Sinai (compare 19:5 R at beginning; 24:7,8 JE toward the end). The contents cover a period of ten days (compare 19:10,11,16; 24:3,1 JE; 24:16 P). The text of this section can again be divided into ten pericopes. After the introduction (19:1-8), which contains a cardinal feature of Exodus (compare under I, 2 above), numbers 1 and 2 (19:9-19,20-25) report the preparation for the conclusion of the Covenant. Number 2 in Ex 19:23 refers expressly to number 1, but is distinguished from number 1 through the new addition in 19:20 after 19:18, as also through the express amplified application of the ordinances referring to purifications and the restriction of the prohibition to the priests (compare 19:22,21,24 with 19:10,12). Numbers 3 and 4 (Ex 20:1-17,18-26) contain the Decalogue and the directions for the cults, together with a description of the impression made by the revelation of the law. Numbers 5 and 6 (Ex 21:1-23:13 expressly circumscribed by a subscription, EX 23:14-19) contain legal ordinances and further directions for the cults. Numbers 3-6 accordingly contain the laws or the conditions of the Covenant. Now follow in numbers 7 and 8 the promises of the Covenant (Ex 23:20-26,27-33), which in verses 20 and 27, 23 and 28 and 24 and 32 f correspond to each other. Numbers 9 and 10 (Ex 24:3-8,9-18 a, combined more closely by Ex 24:1,2) describe the conclusion of the Covenant and the Covenant congregation in different stages. Further, typical numbers at this place also appear in the laws, numbers 3-6. Number 4 (Ex 20:18 ff) contains five directions (Ex 20:23,24,25,26); number 6 (Ex 23:14-19) is divided into 2 X 5 ordinances (compare the anaphoristic addition in Ex 23:14

and 17), namely, verses Ex 23:14,15 a, 15b, 16a, 16b-17,18a, 18b, 19a, 19b. Number 3 (Ex 20:1 ff, the Decalogue) contains, according to Ex 34:28; De 4:13; 10:4, "ten words" margin, according to the two tables doubtless divided into two groups of five each, no matter how in detail we may divide and number them. In the same way number 5 (21:1-23:13) falls into ten sections, separate in form and contents, yet belonging together; and these again are divided into 2 X 5 groups, as will appear presently. Taken altogether then we have in numbers 3-6 (Ex 20:1-23:19) 17 X 5 legal ordinances or groups of laws. While in the historical sections the divisions into 5 X 2 pericopes was made, we here find three times the division into 2 X 5, although here too the beginning of the last five pericopes in the second and third sections is particularly noticeable (compare Ex 9:8 and Ex 16:1), and in the same way a new division can be made at Ex 4:18. Number 5 (Ex 21:1-23:13) is, however, divided as follows: I and II (Ex 21:2-6,7-11) ordinances for the protection of slaves; III and IV (Ex 21:12-17,18-27) protection of life, or liberty, of the dignity of parents, and hygienic laws; V (Ex 21:28-22:3) harm to animals; VI (Ex 22:4-16) to property; VII (Ex 22:17-26) against witchcraft, against imitating the Canaanites, and lack of mercy; VIII (Ex 22:27-30) the relation to God; IX and X (Ex 23:1-5,6-12) ethical and humane law practice. I through IV accordingly contain laws pertaining to persons; V and VI those referring to things; VII through X, those referring to religion, morality, and administration of justice. But the chief line of demarcation is to be made after V; for I through V contain each four ordinances, VI through X each seven, which in the original text in almost each case are in their language separated from each other by particular conjunctions or by the construction. Only in VI (Ex 22:4-16) one command seems to be lacking; for only Ex 22:4,5,6 f, 9-12,13 f, 15 f are distinguished by the "ki" in the beginning; but the seventh ordinance is found in 22:8. Here too, in each case, II and I, two and two as a rule are more closely connected, after the manner of the division in the first three sections, 1:8-7:7; 7:8-13:16; 13:17-18:27; at least this is the case in I and II, III and IV through VII and VIII, IX and X.

(b) In this section, too, Ex 19:1-24:18 a, there is no real occasion for a division into sources. It is claimed that P is found only in 19:1,2a; 24:15-18; but 19:1,2a is indispensable for 19:2b on account of the word "there"; and before 24:15 ff there is an omission, if the preceding verses are to be ascribed to a different source. The duplicates 19:8,9; 19:18,20 are best explained by the assumption of a new beginning in 19:9 at 19:20 (compare above); 24:1,2, which at the same time introduces 24:9 ff, is placed before 24:3, because in point of time it belongs here. According to the original text, the translation at this place must read: "To Moses he spoke," in contrast to the ordinances which, in 21:1 ff, are addressed to the congregation of Israel. Certainly 24:3-8 is purposely formulated to show in almost the same words that 24:3 reports the Violation and 24:4 ff the writing of the decision to obey on the part of Israel (24:3b and 24:7b). It is not perfectly clear to the reader where Moses was during the promulgation of the Decalogue, whether upon the mountain or at the foot of the mountain (compare 19:24 f; 20:18 ff; but also De 5:5). In view of the importance of the matter itself and the vividness of the narrative and the continual change in the place where Moses abode, it is psychologically easily understood that the clearness of the account has suffered somewhat.

(5) Exodus 24:18b through 31:18:

(a) During the forty days which Moses tarries with God on the mountain, and at the conclusion of which he receives the two tables of the law (31:18), God converses with him seven times (25:1; 30:11,17,22,34; 31:1,12). Number 1 (25:1-30:10) contains directions in reference to the building of the Tabernacle, and laws for the priests serving in it. Numbers 2-6 bring a number of directions supplementing number 1, namely, number 2 (Ex 30:11-16), individual tax; number 3 (Ex 30:17-21), copper washing vessels; number 4 (Ex 30:22-33), oil for anointing; number 5 (Ex 30:34-38), incense; number 6 (Ex 31:1-11), the calling of Bezalel and Aholiab to be the master builders; additionally and in conclusion, number 7 (Ex 31:12-17), the Sabbath command. It is probably not accidental that the Sabbath idea is touched upon 7 times, namely, in addition to the present passage, also in (a) Ex 16:5 JE (?); 16:23-29 P and R; (b) 20:8-11 E; (c) 23:10-12 E; (d) 24:16 P; (e) 34:21 J; (f) 35:1-3 the Priestly Code (P), and that as is the case in this present passage, other passages too, such as 24:16 P; 35:1-3 P conclude a main section, and 22:10-22 a subordinate section, with this reference.

The first more complete pericope itself in Exodus (25:1-30:10) is, however, divided into 12 pieces (we cannot at this place enter into details in reference to the typical numbers found so often in the measurements of the Tabernacle, but can refer only to the cubical form of the Holy of Holies on the basis of 10 cubits), namely,

(1) contributions for the sanctuary (25:1-9);

(2) the holy ark (25:10-22);

(3) table of shewbread (25:23-30);

(4) golden candlesticks (25:31-40);

(5) tabernacle (26:1-37) in which at the same time the articles mentioned from 2 to 4 are placed (compare 26:33 ff);

(6) altar for burnt sacrifices (27:1-8);

(7) court (27:9-19) in which this altar stood (compare 40:29,33);

(8) oil for the lights (27:20,21);

(9) sacred garments for the priests (28:1-43);

(10) consecration of priests (29:1-37);

(11) the burnt sacrifices (29:38-46);

(12) incense altar (30:1-10).

The five articles included in 8 to 12 are combined into a contrast to the five in 1 to 7 by their express reference to the priests (compare in addition to 9 and 10 also 27:21; 29:44; 30:7 f, 10). With the incense altar, which was of great importance, and of equal importance with the great altar on the Day of Atonement (30:10), this section closes (compare (b)).

Thus it will under all circumstances be better to search for an explanation for putting oil in the place of the candlesticks and of the incense altar, which at first seems surprising, than in the case of every difficulty to appeal to a redactor's working without system or order. However, the entire portion Ex 24:18 b through 31:18 finds its explanation in the promise of 25:8 that Yahweh will dwell in the midst of Israel (compare 29:45 f). He is enthroned on the ark, in which the accusing law as the expression of the Divine will is deposited (for this reason called ha-'edhuth; 25:16,21; 26:33,14), but above the atonement lid, the kapporeth, at which on the Day of Atonement, the atonement ceremony is carried out (compare 25:17-22; Le 16); see DAY OF ATONEMENT.

(b) This whole section, with the exception of Ex 31:18 E (?) is ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), although at this place, though without good reasons, different strata are distinguished. In regard to the contradiction claimed to exist in the different persons to be anointed (high priest, or all the priests; compare 29:7 over against 28:41; 29:21), see LEVITICUS. Also the duplicates of the tamidh sacrifice and of the candlesticks (compare I, 3, above) are not at all the decisive factor in proof of a difference of sources within the parts treating of the priests, providing it can be shown that each passage stands where it belongs. With regard to the candlesticks, see LEVITICUS. In addition compare passages like Mt 10:39 and 16:25; 10:22 and 24,13; 6:14 ff and 18:35; 5:29 f and 18:8 ff; 19:30 and 20:16. But as far as attributing certain passages to P in general is concerned, it is self-evident that ordinances referring to the cults make use of technical terms pertaining to the cults, without this fact justifying any conclusion as to a particular author or group of authors. On the other hand, it could not at all be understood how P could so often call the Decalogue ha-'edhuth, without having contained this all-important law itself (compare Ex 25:16,21 f; 26:33 f; 34:29; 38:21, etc.). On the other hand, as is well known, the fourth commandment (Ex 20:8-11) expressly refers back to Ge 2:2,3, that is, to P; also Ex 23:15 to 12:20.

(6) Exodus 32:1-35:3:

(a) God's promise to dwell in the midst of Israel, the turning-point in the fifth section, seems to have become a matter of doubt, through the apostasy of Israel, but is nevertheless realized in consequence of the intercession of Moses and of the grace of God, which, next to His primitive holiness, is emphasized very strongly. This entire sixth section is to be understood from this standpoint. As was the case in the preceding section, the forty days are prominent in this too (compare 34:28 J with 24:18 P). We can divide the contents here also into ten pericopes. Number 1 (32:1-14) reports that Yahweh tells Moses of the idolatry with the golden calf, that He is determined to destroy Israel, but is influenced to change this determination by the intercession of Moses. Number 2 (32:15-29) describes the wrath of Moses and the punishment through him. He breaks the tablets into pieces, grinds the golden calf into powder, reproves Aaron, dissolves through the Levites the curse which had for this reason impended over them since Ge 49:5-7 and causes this to be changed into a blessing: three thousand killed. Number 3 (32:30-35) reports that Yahweh at the petition of Moses will send some of His angels, but later on will punish the people for their sins. Number 4 (33:1-6) reports that Yahweh Himself no longer accompanies His people, which, on the one hand, is an act of grace, since the presence of God would even harm the people, but on the other hand is a punishment, and is felt as such by Israel. Number 5 (33:7-11) declares that God meets Moses only outside of the camp in a tent, but communes with him face to face. Number 6 introduces the last six pericopes in a natural way, since God's grace is appearing in constantly increasing glory (33:12-33). Here we have the petition of Moses to Yahweh that He in person should accompany him and show him His glory (Yahweh's grace is made especially prominent in 33:12,13,16,17,19). Number 7 (34:1-10) describes the preparation for the new conclusion of the covenant; Yahweh appears to Moses as the gracious, merciful, long-suffering kind, and faithful God, so that Moses again appeals to His grace. Number 8 (34:11-28) describes the new establishment of the covenant on the basis of the renewal of the Divine and grandiose promises of ordinances pertaining to religion and cults, and the ten words. Number 9 (34:29-35) describes how, in consequence of his close communion with God, Moses' face shines. Number 10 (35:1-3) contains the Sabbath command (see (5a)). Numbers 9 and 10 give expression to the renewed covenant relationship. If we again in the larger group 1 to 8 take two and two together we find that each of these four groups contains a petition of Moses: Ex 32:11 ff; 33:30-32; 33:12 ff; 38:8,9. The entire section brings out equally prominently the love and the holiness of God, and does this in such a way that both characteristics find their expression in each group of two of these ten numbers. The progress beyond the third section (leading Israel to Sinai) is noticeable, since the murmuring is in each case followed only by an expression of the love of God; but equally this present section stands in contrast to Nu 11 ff, where, on the occasion of the continuous murmuring of Israel the love of God is not indeed ignored, but it must take a place in the background as compared with His punitive holiness, which is particularly apparent in the story of the return of the spies in Nu 14:11 ff. Here is at once seen the great similarity with the present section of Nu 14:12,15,16,17 ff and with Ex 32:10,12; 34:6 f, but at the same time the great difference caused by a divergency of the events (compare Nu 14:21 ff). In contrast to this, Ex 32:34 refers back to Nu 14, and Ex 32:35 is a proleptic judgment based on this experience.

(b) It is incomprehensible how critics have found in the renewal of the covenant caused by the apostasy of Israel and in the conditions of this renewal, namely, in the Books of the Covenant and in the Decalogue, duplicates, which are distributed between E and J (Ex 20:1 ff; 21 ff; 24:8-34:1 ff, 28; 34:11-26; 34:27). But in Ex 34:11-26 there is no sign of the number ten being used in connection with the ordinances referring to the religion and the cults. Goethe's attempt to find at this place the original Decalogue, which effort is constantly being repeated, is accordingly without any foundation, even in the use of the number ten. In 34:28 b, according to 34:1 and tradition (compare De 10:2,4; also Ex 24:12; 31:18), Yahweh is to be regarded as the subject. Again Ex 33:4 and 5 ff are not duplicates. In 33:4 the people are described as having laid aside their ornaments a single time as a sign of repentance; according to 33:5,6 the people permanently dispense with these, a state of mind which makes it possible for God again to show His mercy. It is an arbitrary assumption that these ornaments were used in the construction of the Tabernacle, the building of which had been announced beforehand in Ex 25 ff, so that in front of 33:7 a parallel account to 35 ff P taken from JE would have been omitted. In 33:7 ff according to the text the author has in mind a tent already in existence, which up to this time had been standing within the camp and now had to be taken without, because Yahweh for the present can no longer dwell in the midst of the people (32:34; 33:3,1), until Moses, through his intercession, again makes this possible (33:15-17; 34:9,10). And the promised tabernacle takes the place of the provisional tent (Ex 35 ff), which, as is done by the Septuagint, is probably to be preferred to Moses' own tent. In the

Priestly Code (P), to whom 34:29 ff is attributed, such a provisional arrangement is presupposed in 34:35, since already at this place, and before the building of the tabernacle in Ex 35 ff, mention is made of the fact that Moses entered for the purpose of receiving the revelation of God. This accordingly presupposes what is reported in 33:7 ff. Even without the facts mentioned and for other reasons, too, an omission must be accepted before 34:29 ff; for 34:29 speaks of the tables of the Law, concerning the origin of which P has reported nothing; and in 34:32 concerning the commandments which Moses received on Mr. Sinai and had imparted to the people, which, however, do not refer to the directions that were given in Ex 25 ff, since these, according to 35:4 ff, are yet to be expressly communicated to the people.

(7) Exodus 35:4-40:38:

(a) The construction of the Tabernacle. This section is divided into four pericopes, each with four subdivisions (compare Structure of Leviticus 16 in DAY OF ATONEMENT). The same principle of division is found also in the history of Abraham and in De 12-26. Number I (Ex 35:4-36:7) describes the preparation for the construction:

(1) Ex 35:4-19 appeals for contributions for this purpose;

(2) 35:20-29, contributions;

(3) 35:30-36:1, characterization of the builders;

(4) 36:2-7, delivering the contributions to the builders.

Numbers II and III (Ex 36:8-38:31; 39:1-31) report the construction of the Tabernacle and the preparation of the priests garments (compare Ex 39:32,1);

Number II:

(1) Ex 36:8-38, dwelling-place;

(2) 37:1-38:9, utensils;

(3) 38:10-20, court;

(4) 38:24-31, cost of 38:1-3;

Number III

(1) 39:2-7, shoulder garment;

(2) 39:8-21, pocket;

(3) 39:22-26, outer garment;

(4) 39:27-31, summary account concerning coats, miter, bonnets, breeches, girdle, diadem.

Number IV (39:32-40:38) reports the completion:

(1) 39:32-43, consecration of these objects;

(2) 40:1-15, command to erect;

(3) 40:16-33, carrying out this command;

(4) 40:34-38, entrance of the glory of Yahweh.

In this way the dwelling of Yahweh, which had been promised in 25:8 the Priestly Code (P), and in Ex 32-34 JE had been uncertain, has become a reality. The whole section is closely connected with Ex 25-31, yet is independent in character. The full details found in both groups are completely justified by the importance of the object. It is self- evident that at this place, too, the language of the cults is demanded by the object itself.

(b) The attempts to distribute this section among different authors are a total failure in view of the unity of the structure, which is independent also over against Ex 25-31. Since the numbers given in 38:26 agree entirely with the numbers gathered later in Nu 2:32, it is evident that for the latter the lists for the contributions were used, which in itself is very probable because it was practical. In case this section is ascribed to P it is inexplicable how the writer can in Ex 40:34 ff speak of the pillar of fire as of something well known, since this has not yet been mentioned in the parts ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), but has been in 13:21 f JE; 14:19,24 J.

Continued 8295

EXODUS, THE BOOK OF, 3-4

III. Historical Character.

1. General Consideration:

The fact that extra-Israelitish and especially Egyptian sources that can lay claim to historical value have reported nothing authentic concerning the exodus of Israel need not surprise us when we remember how meager these documents are and how one-sided Egyptian history writing is. Whether the expulsion of the lepers and the unclean, who before this had desolated the country and acquired supremacy over it as reported by Manetho and other historians, is an Egyptian version of the exodus of Israel, cannot be investigated at this place, but is to the highest degree improbable. If Israel was oppressed by the Egyptians for a long period, then surely the latter would not have invented the fable of a supremacy on the part of Israel; and, on the other hand, it would be incomprehensible that the Israelites should have changed an era of prosperity in their history into a period of servitude. Over against this the remembrance of the exodus out of Egypt not only is re-echoed through the entire literature of Israel (compare I, 4, above), but the very existence of the people of God forces us imperatively to accept some satisfactory ground for its origin, such as is found in the story of the exodus and only here. In addition, the Book compare Exodus shows a good acquaintance with the localities and the conditions of Egypt, as also of the desert. It is indeed true that we are still in doubt on a number of local details. But other statements in the book have in such a surprising manner been confirmed by discoveries and geographical researches, that we can have the greatest confidence in regard to the other difficulties: compare eg. Naville’s The Store-city of Pithom (Ex 1:11). In general, the opening chapters of Ex, especially the narratives of the different plagues, contain so much Egyptian coloring, that this could scarcely have resulted from a mere theoretical study of Egypt, especially since in the narrative everything makes the impression of resulting from recent experience. The fact that Israel from its very origin received ordinances in regard to religion, morality, law and cults, is explained from the very conditions surrounding this origin and is indispensable for the explanation of the later development of the nation. None of the later books or times claim to offer anything essentially new in this respect; even the prophets appear only as reformers; they know of the election of Israel, and, on the other hand, everywhere presuppose as something self-evident the knowledge of a righteous, well-pleasing relation with God and chide the violation of this relation as apostasy. Ethical monotheism as the normal religion of Israel is reflected in the same way in all the sources of Israel’s history, as has been proven in my work ("Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee

in vorexilischer Zeit," in the May, 1903, issue of Beitrage zur Forderung christlicher Theologie). And the idea that an oriental people, especially if they came out of Egypt, should have had no religious cult, is in itself unthinkable. If all of these norms, also the direction for the cults in the Books of Covenant, of the Priestly Code, or D, at least in the kernel, do not go back to the Mosaic times, then we have to deal with an insoluble problem (compare my work, Are the Critics Right?).

2. The Miraculous Character:

The Book of Exodus is as a matter of fact from its first to its last page filled with miraculous stories; but in this characteristic these contents agree perfectly with the whole history of redemption. In this immediate and harmonious activity of God, for the purpose of establishing a chosen people, all these miracles find their purpose and explanation, and this again is only in harmony with other periods of sacred history. The reason is self-explanatory when these miracles are found grouped at the turning-points in this history, as is the case also in the critical age of Elijah and Elisha, and in the experiences and achievements of "Jonah," so significant for the universality of the Biblical religion. Above all is this true in the ministry of Jesus Christ; and also again in His return to judgment. And in the same way, too, we find this at the beginning of Israel as a nation (see my article in Murray's Dictionary). Compare in this respect the rapid numerical growth of the nation, the miracles, the plagues, in the presence of Pharaoh, the passage through the Red Sea, the miraculous preservation of the people in the desert, the many appearances of God to Moses, to the people, to the elders, the protection afforded by the cloud, the providential direction of the people of Israel and of the Egyptians, and of individual persons (Moses and Pharaoh). The fact that the author himself knows that Israel without the special care and protection of God could not have survived in the desert is in complete harmony with his knowledge of the geographical situation already mentioned.

3. The Legislative Portions:

If any part of the laws in Exodus is to be accepted as Mosaic, it is the Decalogue. It is true that the ten commandments are found in two recensions (Ex 20; De 5). The original form is naturally found in Ex 20. Only Moses could regard himself as inwardly so independent of the Decalogue as it had been written by God, that he did not consider himself bound in De 5 by its exact wording. The legal ordinances in Ex 21:1 ff have found an analogy already in Code of Hammurabi, more than 500 years older although moving in a lower sphere. As Israel had lived in Goshen, and according to Ge 26:12 Isaac had even been engaged in agriculture, and Israel could not remain in the desert but was to settle down in permanent abodes again, the fact of the existence of this law of Israel, which in a religious and ethical sense rises infinitely above the Code of Hammurabi, is in itself easily understood. And again since the sacred ark of the covenant plays an important role also in the other sources of the Pentateuch (Nu 10:33; 14:44 ; De 10:1-8; 31:9,25) and in the history of Israel (compare Jos 3; 6:6-8; 8:33; Jud 20:27; 1Sa 6:2 ff; 2Sa 15:24 f; 1Ki 3:15; 6:19; 8:1-9), then a suitable tent, such as is announced in Ex 25 ff, and was erected according to Ex 35 ff, was an actual necessity.

As the Paschal sacrifice, according to Ex 12:3 ff; 12:43 ff P; 12:21 ff JE (?) was to be killed in the houses, and this on the 14th of Nisan in the evening (12:6), and as P directs that a festival assembly shall be held on the next day at the sanctuary (compare Le 23:6 ff; Nu 28:17 ff), these are conditions which can be understood only in case Israel is regarded as being in the wilderness. For this reason De 16:5 ff changes this direction, so that from now on the Passover is no longer to be celebrated in the houses but at the central sanctuary. In the same way the direction Ex 22:29, which ordered that the firstborn of animals should be given to Yahweh already on the 8th day, could be carried out only during the wanderings in the desert, and is for this reason changed by De 14:23 ff; 15:19 ff to meet the conditions of the people definitely settled after this wandering. Compare my work, Are the Critics Right? 188-89, 194- 95.

4. Chronology:

As is well known, the average critic handles the Biblical chronology in a very arbitrary manner and is not afraid of changing the chronology of events by hundreds of years. If we leave out of consideration some details that often cause

great difficulties, we still have a reliable starting-point in the statements found in 1Ki 6:1 and Ex 12:40 f. According to the first passage, the time that elapsed between the exodus of the Israelites and the building of the temple in the 4th year of Solomon was 480 years; and according to the second passage, the time of the stay in Egypt was 430 years. A material change in the first-mentioned figures is not permitted by the facts in the Book of Judges, even if some particular data there mentioned are contemporaneous; and to reduce the 430 years of the stay in Egypt, as might be done after the Septuagint, which includes also the stay of the patriarchs in Canaan in this period, or to reduce the whole period from the entrance into Egypt to the building of the temple, is contrary to the synchronism of Hammurabi and Abraham (Ge 14). The first-mentioned could not have lived later than 2100 BC. The 430 years in Ex 12:40,41 P are also, independently of this passage, expressly supported by the earlier prediction of an oppression of Israel for 400 years from the time of Abraham (Ge 15:13 J); and the 480 years of 1Ki 6:1 are confirmed by Jud 11:26, according to which, at the time of the suppression by the Amorites and of Jephthah as judge, already 30 years must have elapsed since the east Jordan country had been occupied by the Israelites. According to this the exodus must have taken place not long after 1500 BC. And in perfect agreement with this supposition would be the condition of affairs in Palestine as we know them from the Tell el-Amarna Letters dating about 1450-1400 BC, according to which the different Canaanitish cities had been attacked by the Chabiri in the most threatening manner, as this is reported too in the Book of Joshua. As is well known linguistically, too, the identification of the Chabiri with the Hebrews is unobjectionable. Finally, on the well- known Menepthah stele of the 13th century BC, Israel is mentioned in connection with Canaan, Ashkelon, Gezer, Y-nu‘m (= Janoah, Jos 16:6,7?), and accordingly is already regarded as settled in Canaan. A date supported in such different ways makes it impossible for me to find in Rameses II the Pharaoh of the oppression, and in Menepthah the Pharaoh of the exodus (both between 1300 and 1200 BC). A conclusive proof that the name and the original building of the city Rameses (Ex 1:11; 12:37; Nu 33:3,5) necessarily leads back to Rameses II can, at least at the present time, not yet be given (compare on this point also, Kohler, Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte des Alten Testamentes, I, 238 ff).

5. Unjustifiable Attacks:

All these attacks on the historical character of this book which originate only in the denial of the possibility of miracles, the Christian theologian can and must ignore. Such attacks do not stand on the ground of history but of dogma. Let us accordingly examine other objections. Thus, it is claimed that the number of men in Israel, which in Ex 12:37 is said to have been 600,000, is too high, because not only the desert but Goshen also would not have been able to support two million people, and Israel had been too short a time in Egypt to grow into so populous a nation. Yet Israel, beginning with the time of the oppression, which, according to 2:23; 18 continued many years and hence began before the highest number in population had been reached, had claims for support from the Egyptian corn (grain) granaries; and the 430 years in 12:40 certainly cannot be reduced, as has been shown under (4) above. To this must be added that in Ex 1:7,9 f, 12,20 f the rapid numerical growth of Israel is represented as the result of a Divine blessing. Then, too, in the company of Jacob and his descendants, doubtless servants, male and female, came down to Egypt (compare the 318 servants of Abraham alone in Ge 14). The figures in Ex 12:37 P are further confirmed by Nu 11:21 (according to critics from JE) and by the results of the two enumerations, Nu 1 f (2:31; compare Ex 38:26 (603, 550)) and Nu 26:51 (601, 730). The attacks made also on the existence of the Tabernacle must be rejected as groundless. According to the Wellhauscn school the Tabernacle is only a copy of the temple of Solomon dated back into the Mosaic times; and the fact that there is only one central seat of the cults is regarded as a demand first made by the Deuteronomistic legislation in the 7th century. Against this latter claim militates not only the impossibility of placing De at this time (compare my work Are the Critics Right? 1-55), but also the legislation of the Book of the Covenant, which, in Ex 23:17,19; 34:23,14,26 presupposes a sanctuary, and which even in the passages incorrectly analyzed by Wellhausen, Ex 20:24 (compare again, Are the Critics Right ? 19, 48, 161 ff, 189 ff) speaks only of a single altar (compare also Ex 21:14) and not of several existing at the same time. (The matter mentioned here is the building of an altar, according to a theophany, for temporary use.) Against the critical view we can quote the prophetic utterances of Amos, who condemns the cult in the Northern Kingdom (5:4 f), but teaches that God speaks out of Zion (1:2; compare probably also, 9:1); those of Isaiah (1:12; 2:2 ff; 4:5 f; 6; 8:18; 18:7; 30:29; 33:20; 14:32; 28:16); also the facts of history (compare especially the central sanctuary in Shiloh, 1Sa 1-4; Jud 21:19, which is placed on the same level with Zion in Jer 7:12 ff; 26:6; Ps 78:60-72). To this must be added such statements as 2Sa 7:6; Jos 18:1; 1Ki 3:4; 8:4; 1Ch 16:39,40; 2Ch 1:3. All these facts are not overthrown by certain exceptions to the rule (compare LEVITICUS). But the whole view leads to conclusions that in themselves cannot possibly be accepted. What a foolish fancy that would have

been, which would have pictured the Tabernacle in the most insignificant details as to materials, amounts, numbers, colors, objects, which in Nu 4 has determined with exact precision who was to carry the separate parts of the tent, while eg. for the service of the Tabernacle, so important for later times, only very general directions are given in Nu 18:2,4,6; 8:22 ff. This complete picture would be entirely without a purpose and meaningless, since it would have no connection whatever with the tendency ascribed to it by the critics, but rather, in part, would contradict it. Compare my book, Are the Critics Right? 72 ff, 87 ff.

That particularly in the post-exilic period it would have been impossible to center the Day of Atonement on the covering of the ark of the covenant, since the restoration of this ark was not expected according to Jer 3:16, has already been emphasized in DAY OF ATONEMENT. If God had really determined to give to His people a pledge of the constant presence of His grace, then there can be absolutely no reason for doubting the erection of the Tabernacle, since the necessary artistic ability and the possession of the materials needed for the structure are sufficiently given in the text (compare also Ex 25:9,40; 26:30; 27:8-31:2 ff; 35:30 ff through 12:35; 3:21,22; 11:2 f; Ge 15:14; Ex 33:4 ff). The examination of the separate passages in Ex, such as the relation of 20:24 (see above) to Deuteronomy, or the ordinances concerning the Passover and the firstborn (Ex 12 f), and other laws in the different codices, goes beyond the purpose of this article (compare however under 3 above, at the close).

IV. Authorship.

1. Connection with Moses:

As the Book of Exodus is only a part of a large work (compare I, 3 above), the question as to authorship cannot be definitely decided at this place, but we must in substance restrict ourselves to those data which we find in the book itself. In several parts it is expressly claimed that Moses wrote them. He sang the hymn found in Ex 15, after the passage of the Red Sea, and it breathes the enthusiasm of what the author has himself experienced. Ex 15:13 ff do not speak against the unity of the hymn, but rather for it, since the perfects here found as prophetic perfects only give expression to the certainty that the Israelites will take possession of the land of promise. In the course of history the nations often acted quite differently from what is here stated and often antagonized Israel (compare Nu 14:39-45; 20:18 ff; 21:4,21-35; 22:6; Jos 6-12; also Ex 13:17). In Ex 15:13,17 not only Zion is meant, but all Canaan; compare Le 25:23; Nu 35:34; Jer 2:7; for har, "mountain," compare De 1:7,20 ("hill- country"); 3:25; Ps 78:54,55. According to Ex 17:14 Moses writes in a book the promise of Yahweh to destroy Amalek from the face of the earth. It is absolutely impossible that only this statement should have been written without any connecting thought and without at least a full description of the situation as given in Ex 17:8 ff. And as 17:14 linguistically at least can mean merely ‘to write a sheet,’ as Nu 5:23, it yet appears in the light of the connection of a comparison with related passages, such as Jos 24:26; 1Sa 10:25, much more natural to think of a book in this connection, in which already similar events had been recorded or could at any time be recorded.

The Ten Words (Ex 20:1 ff) were written down by God Himself and then handed over to Moses; compare Ex 24:12; 31:18; 34:1 ff, 28 (De 10:2,4). The laws and judicial ordinances beginning with Ex 21, according to 24:4, were also written down by Moses himself, and the same is true of the ordinances in 34:11 ff, according to 34:27. The proof that formerly had to be furnished, to the effect that the knowledge of the art of writing in the days of Moses was not an anachronism, need not trouble us now, since both in Egypt and Babylon much older written documents have been discovered. But already from the passages quoted we could conclude nothing else than that Moses understood how to make use of different forms of literature—the poetical, the historical and the legal—unless the different statements to this effect by decisive reasons could be shown to be incorrect. In Nu 33, in the catalogue of stations, there is a portion ascribed to Moses that bears the express characteristics of the Priestly Code; and, finally Deuteronomy, with its hortatory, pastoral style, claims him as its author. Already in Ex 17:14 there were reasons to believe that Moses had written not only this statement which is there expressly attributed to him. Thus it becomes a possibility, that in general only in the case of particularly important passages the fact that Moses penned these also was to be made prominent, if it can be shown as probable that he in reality wrote more, as we find in parallel cases in the writings of the prophets (compare Isa 8:1; 30:8; Jer 30:2; Eze 43:11; Hab 2:2). In addition, we notice in this connection that in the catalogue of stations mentioned above and ascribed to Moses (Nu 33), the close

relation of which to the portions attributed to P is certain, not only this part, but also the other words from JE in the present Bible text from Ex 12-19 (see above) are regarded as self-evident as Mosaic (as is the case also later with the corresponding historical part), and this is an important witness in favor of the Mosaic authorship of the historical parts. But Ex 25:31; 35-40 also claim, at least so far as contents are concerned, to be the product of the Mosaic period. The entire portable sanctuary is built with a view to he wanderings in the desert. Aaron and his sons are as yet the only representatives of the priesthood (27:21; 28:4,12,41-43; 29:4 ff, etc.). In view of the relationship which Nu 33 shows with the Priestly Code (P), it is clear, if we accept the genuineness of this part, a matter that is in the highest degree probable, that this style was current in Moses' time, and that he had the mastery of it, even if other hands, too, have contributed to the final literary forms of these laws. In favor of the Mosaic authorship of the whole Book of Exodus we find a weighty reason in the unity and the literary construction of the work as shown above. This indeed does not preclude the use and adaptation of other sources of historical or legal statements, either from the author's own hands or from others, if such a view should perhaps be suggested or made imperative by the presence of many hard constructions, unconnected transitions, unexpected repetitions, etc. But even on the presupposition of the Mosaic authorship, a difference in style in the different kinds of matters discussed is not impossible, just as little as this is the case with peculiarities of language, since these could arise particularly in the course of vivid narration of the story (compare the anacolouths in Paul's writings). But still more a reason for accepting the Mosaic authorship of Exodus is found in the grand and deep conception and reproduction of all the events recorded, which presupposes a congenial prophetic personality; and finally, too, the natural and strong probability that Moses did not leave his people without such a Magna Charta for the future. This Mosaic authorship becomes almost a certainty, in case the Book of Deuteronomy is genuine, even if only in its essential parts. For Deuteronomy at every step presupposes not only P (compare Are the Critics Right? 171 ff), but also the history and the Books of the Covenant (Ex 21 ff; 34:11 ff) as recorded in Exodus.

2. Examination of Objections:

Against the Mosaic authorship of Exodus the use of the third person should no longer be urged, since Caesar and Xenophon also wrote their works in the third person, and the use of this provision is eminently adapted to the purpose and significance of Exodus for all future times. In Isa 20:1 ff Eze 24:24, we have analogies of this in prophetic literature. The statement (Ex 11:3) that Moses was so highly regarded by the Egyptians is entirely unobjectionable in the connection in which it is found. That the book was not written for the self-glorification of Moses appears clearly in 4:10-16; 6:12. In itself it is possible that some individual passages point to a later date, without thereby overthrowing the Mosaic authorship of the whole (compare also under (1)). In this case we are probably dealing with supplementary material. Ex 16:35 declares that Israel received manna down to the time when the people came to the borders of Canaan. Whether it was given to them after this time, too, cannot be decided on the basis of this passage (compare however Jos 5:12). If the entire Book of Exodus was composed by Moses, then Ex 16:35 would be a proof that at least the final editing of the book had been undertaken only a short time before his death. This is suggested also by 16:34b, since at the time when the manna was first given the ark of the covenant did not yet exist; and the statement in 32:35 takes into consideration the later development as found in Nu 13 f. In the same way Ex 16:36 could be a later explanation, but is not necessarily so, if the 'omer was not a fixed measure, of which nothing further is known, and which probably was not to be found in every Israelite household, but a customary measure, the average content of which is given in 16:36. If we take Exodus alone there is nothing that compels us to go later than the Mosaic period (concerning the father-in-law of Moses, see under II, 2, 1 (1:8-7:7) at the close). The question as to whether there are contradictions or differences between the different legal ordinances in Exodus and in later books cannot be investigated at this place, nor the question whether the connection of Exodus with other books in any way modifies the conclusion reached under (1).

LITERATURE.

Books that in some way cover the ground discussed in the article: Against the separation into different sources: Eerdmans, Alttestamentliche Studien, III ("Das Buch Exodus"); Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Moller, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung. In favor of the construction of Ex 21 ff: Merx, Die Bucher Moses und Josua ("Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbucher," II, Series, number 3). For Ex 21 ff in its relation to the Code of Hammurabi: A. Jeremias, Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients; J. Jeremias, Moses und Hammurabi (with fuller literature); Histories of Israel by

Kittel, Konig, Oettli, Kohler, Klostermann, Hengstenberg; Commentaries of Ryssel, Lange, Keil, Strack; Introductions to the Old Testament by Strack, Baudissin, Driver, Sellin. Against the Wellhausen hypothesis: Moller, Are the Critics Right? (with fuller literature); Orr (see above). Against the evolutionary theory: Orr (see above); Moller, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit (with fuller literature). Representatives of other schools: The Introductions of Kuenen and Cornill; the Commentaries of Holzinger and Baentsch; the Histories of Israel by Wellhausen and Stade.

Wilhelm Moller

EXORCISM; EXORCIST

ek’-sor-siz’-m, ek’-sor-sist (Exorkistes, from exorkizo, "to adjure" (Mt 26:63)):

1. Definition:

One who expels demons by the use of magical formulas. In the strict etymological sense there is no exorcism in the Bible. The term "exorcists" is used once (Ac 19:13) in a way to discredit the professional exorcists familiarly known both among Jews and Gentiles.

2. Method of Expelling Demons in the New Testament:

The method of Jesus in dealing with demoniacs was not that of the exorcists. While it is said (Mt 8:16) that He "cast out the spirits with a word," it is abundantly clear that the word in question was not ritualistic but authoritative. In Lu 4:35 we have a typical sentence uttered by our Lord in the performance of His cures: "Hold thy peace, and come out of him." In Mr 9:29 we have Christ’s own emphasis upon the ethical element in dealing with these mysterious maladies: "This kind can come out by nothing, save by prayer." In Mt 12:28 Jesus gives His own explanation of the method and power used in His cures: "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out demons, then is the kingdom of God come upon you."

In Lu 9:1 the terms "authority" and "power" are used in such a way as to show the belief of the evangelists that to cure demon-possession an actual power from God, together with the right to use it, was necessary. This group of passages gives the New Testament philosophy of this dread mystery and its cure. The demons are personal evil powers afflicting human life in their opposition to God. It is beyond man unaided to obtain deliverance from them. It is the function of Christ as the redeemer of mankind to deliver men from this as well as other ills due to sin. Miraculous cures of the same kind as those performed by Christ Himself were accomplished by His disciples in His name (Mr 16:17). The power attributed to "His name" supplies us with the opportunity for a most enlightening comparison and contrast.

3. Exorcism in Ethnic and Jewish Writings:

Exorcism among ancient and primitive peoples rests largely upon faith in the power of magical formulas, ordinarily compounded of the names of deities and pronounced in connection with exorcistic rites, upon the bodies of the afflicted. The words themselves are supposed to have power over the demons, and the mere recital of the correct list of names is supposed to be efficacious.

Attention should be called again to the incantation texts of the Babylonians and Assyrians (see, for translations and full exposition of texts, Rogers, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, 146 ff). In this direction the absurdities and cruelties of superstition have carried men to extreme lengths. In the case of Josephus we are amazed to see how even in the case of an educated man the most abject superstition controls his views of such subjects. In Ant, VIII, v, in speaking of the wisdom of Solomon, he says that "God enabled him to learn that skill which expels demons, which is a science useful and sanitative to him." He also describes, in the same connection, a cure which he alleges to have seen, "in the presence of Vespasian and

his sons," performed in accordance with methods of incantation ascribed to Solomon. A ring to which was attached a kind of root mentioned by Solomon was placed at the nostrils of the demoniac and the demon was drawn out through the nostrils. The proof that exorcism had actually taken place was given in the overturning of a basin placed nearby.

The absurdities of this narrative are more than equaled by the story of exorcism told in the Book of Tobit (see Lunge, Apocrypha, 151-53) where the liver and heart of a fish, miraculously caught, are burned upon the ashes of incense, and the resulting smoke drives away a demon. This whole story is well worthy of careful reading for the light it throws upon the unrestrained working of the imagination upon such matters.

In the rabbinical writers the very limit of diseased morbidness is reached in the long and repulsive details, which they give of methods used in exorcism (see Whitehouse, HDB, article "Demon," I, 592b; compare 593b; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 775-76).

4. Contrasts of New Testament and Popular Methods with Demons:

In most striking contrast with this stand the Biblical narratives. The very point of connection which we have noted is also the point of contrast. The mighty and efficacious word with which Jesus rebuked and controlled demons was no exorcistic formula spoken by rote, but His own living word of holy power. "In the name of Jesus" did not mean that the sacred name formally uttered possessed magical power to effectuate a cure. The ancient Semitic formula, "in the name of," given a deep ethical meaning in the Old Testament, had a still deeper meaning in the New Testament. The proper and helpful use of it meant a reliance upon the presence and living power of Christ from whom alone power to do any mighty work comes (Joh 15:5).

This fundamental difference between the ideas and methods of Jesus and His disciples and current conceptions and usages becomes the more striking when we remember that the lower range of ideas and practices actually prevailed among the people with whom the Lord and His followers were associated. The famous passage (Mt 12:24 and parallel) in which the Pharisees attribute to demoniacal influence the cures wrought by Jesus upon the demonized, usually studied with reference to our Lord’s word about the unforgivable sin, is also remarkable for the idea concerning demons which it expresses. The idea which evidently underlies the accusation against Jesus was that the natural way to obtain control over demons is by obtaining, through magic, power over the ruler of demons. In reply to this Jesus maintains that since the demons are evil they can be controlled only by opposition to them in the power of God.

It is most suggestive that we have in Ac 19:13 ff a clear exposition, in connection with exorcism, of just the point here insisted upon. According to this narrative a group of wandering professional Jewish exorcists, witnessing the cures accomplished by Paul, attempted to do the same by the ritualistic use of the name of Jesus. They failed ignominiously because, according to the narrative, they lacked faith in the living Christ by whose power such miracles of healing were wrought, although they were letter-perfect in the use of the formula. This narrative shows clearly what the New Testament understanding of the expression "in my name" implied in the way of faith and obedience.

Here as elsewhere, the chastened mental restraint under which the New Testament was composed, the high spiritual and ethical results of the intimacy of the disciples with Jesus, are clearly manifest.

Our Lord and His disciples dealt with the demoniacs as they dealt with all other sufferers from the malign, enslaving and wasting power of sin, with the tenderness of an illimitable sympathy, and the firmness and effectiveness of those to whom were granted in abundant measure the presence and power of God.

Louis Matthews Sweet

EXPECT; EXPECTATION

eks-pekt’, eks-pek-ta’-shun:

Of the three Greek words, translated in the New Testament by "expect," prosdokao, meaning to look forward toward what will probably occur, whether in hope or dread (Ac 3:5; Lu 3:15), is not as intense as ekdechomai (Heb 10:13), meaning to wait for that of the realization of which one is assured ("as the husbandman waits for the processes of Nature (Jas 5:7), and the patriarchs for the Divine promise," Westcott), or as vivid as the noun apokaradokia (Ro 8:19; Php 1:20, "earnest expectation"), which describes the stretching forth of the head toward an object that is anticipated (see Ellicott on Php 1:20). In the Old Testament "expectation" always means that which is expected, as Pr 10:28, "The expectation of the wicked shall perish."

H. E. Jacobs

EXPECTATION, MESSIANIC

mes-i-an’-ik.

See CHRISTS, FALSE; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; JESUS CHRIST; MESSIAH.

EXPEDIENT

eks-pe’-di-ent (sumphero):

The Greek word translated "expedient" (sumphero) means literally, "to bear or bring together"; with a personal reference, "to be well or profitable." In the New Testament it never means "profitable" or "convenient" as opposed to what is strictly right. It is translated "expedient" (Joh 11:50, "it is expedient for us," the Revised Version (British and American) "for you"; Joh 16:7, "It is expedient for you that I go away," i.e. "profitable," "for your good," 18:14; 1Co 6:12; 10:23; 2Co 8:10; 12:1). In Mt 19:10, instead of "not good to marry," the Revised Version (British and American) has "not expedient." The modern sense of "expediency" as "hastening" or "acceleration," is not found in the New Testament, any more than its bad sense of "mere convenience." "Nothing but the right can ever be expedient" (Whately).

W. L. Walker

EXPERIENCE

eks-pe’-ri-ens:

This word is employed 3 times. In Ge 30:27 the King James Version, Laban says, to Jacob, "I have learned by experience (the Revised Version (British and American) "divined") that Yahweh hath blessed me for thy sake." Here it translates the Hebrew nachash, "to observe diligently," as when one examines the entrails of a bird or animal for the purpose of divination. In Ec 1:16, the writer says, "I have gotten me great wisdom ....; my heart hath had great experience of wisdom and knowledge." Here the Hebrew (ra’ah) means "hath seen abundantly," and the idea seems to be that of a wide outlook combined with actual trial of the things discovered or known.

In Ro 5:4 the King James Version, the Greek word dokime (the American Standard Revised Version more correctly "approvedness"), means the proof or testing of a thing. We rejoice in tribulation because it works out or produces patience, while the latter develops an experience of God, i.e. it brings out as a proved fact His power and love toward us in our preservation in and deliverance from trial.

Thus it is seen the Bible use of the word is not different from the ordinary, which means "the sum of practical wisdom

taught by the events and observations of life," or, to go a little farther, the personal and practical acquaintance with what is so taught. Heb 5:13 gives a good practical example. the King James Version says, "Every one that useth milk is unskillful (apeiros) in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe," while the Revised Version (British and American) renders "unskilful" by "without experience of." The thought is that he who fails to search out the deep things of the word of God is so lacking in the exercise of his spiritual senses as to be unable really to know truth from error.

James M. Gray

EXPERIMENT

eks-per'-i-ment (dokime, "approvedness," "tried character"):

"The experiment of this ministration" (2Co 9:13 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the proving of you by his ministration"), i.e. the sincerity of their Christian profession was evidenced by their liberal contribution.

EXPIATION

eks-pi-a'-shun:

This word represents no Hebrew or Greek word not rendered also by "atonement." In Nu 8:7 it is employed in the Revised Version (British and American) to translate chaTath and in De 32:43, kipper. This version also employs "expiate" in the margin of several passages, eg. Ps 65:3; 79:9. Always its use in English Versions of the Bible is somewhat more narrow and specific than "atonement" and has especial reference to specific uncleanness or sin.

It will be sufficient to refer to ATONEMENT; SACRIFICE; PROPITIATION.

EXPOSURE, TO WILD BEASTS

eks-po'-zhur.

See PUNISHMENTS.

EXPRESS

eks-pres':

In the King James Version of Heb 1:3 "express" has the meaning "exactly resembling the original," as the impress of a seal resembles the figure engraved upon the seal. Thus "express image" in the verse referred to is a good translation (Greek charakter, literally, "engraving" and hence, "impression"); the Revised Version (British and American) "the very image."

EXQUISITE

eks'-kwi-sit (akribes):

The Greek word means "accurate" "searched out," equivalent to exquisitus from which "exquisite" is derived. It also means in argument "close," "subtle." In Ecclesiasticus 18:29, we have, "They poured forth exquisite parables," the Revised Version (British and American) "apt proverbs," and 19:25, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and

American)

"There is an exquisite subtleity, and the same is unjust."

EXTINCT eks-tinkt’:

In Job 17:1, "My days are extinct" (za‘akh (in Niphal)) and in Isa 43:17, "They are extinct" (da‘akh), the word "extinct" should be recognized as a form of the participle, equivalent to "extinguished," so that in both passages an action, not merely a state, is indicated.

EXTORTION

eks-tor’-shun:

This particular word occurs twice in King James Version: Eze 22:12 (‘osheq), and Mt 23:25 (harpage), and indicates that one who is an extortioner is guilty of snatching away from another by strife, greed and oppression that which does not lawfully belong to him. The element of covetousness and usury is involved in the meaning of this word; for it is greedily gotten gain. The publicans were considered as being specially guilty of this sin; this is clear from the Pharisee’s deprecatory remark: "I am not .... an extortioner ..... as this publican" (Lu 18:11). Paul classes extortion (pleonexia, literally, "over-reaching") among a category of the grossest crimes known to humanity (1Co 5:10,11); indeed, so grievous is it that it closes the door of heaven in the face of the one guilty of it (1Co 6:10).

William Evans

EXTREME; EXTREMITY

eks-trem’, eks-trem’-i-ti We have the adjective "extreme" in APC 2Esdras 5:14, "extreme fear," the Revised Version (British and American) "trembling"; in APC Wisdom 12:27, "extreme (terma) damnation," the Revised Version (British and American) "the last end of condemnation"; in APC 2Macc 7:42, "extreme (huperballousas) tortures," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding barbarities"; in Ecclesiasticus 42:8 it is used as an adverb, "the extreme aged" (eschatogeros), the Revised Version (British and American) "of extreme old age." Extremity: pash; Septuagint paraptoma, occurs only in Job 35:15 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "arrogance," and akme in APC 2Macc 1:7.

EYE

i (‘ayin; ophthalmos):

(1) The physical organ of sight, "the lamp of the body" (Mt 6:22), one of the chief channels of information for man. A cruel custom therefore sanctioned among heathen nations the putting out of the eyes of an enemy or a rival, because thus his power was most effectually shattered (Jud 16:21; 2Ki 25:7; Jer 39:7). Such blinding or putting out of the "right eye" was also considered a deep humiliation, as it robbed the victim of his beauty, and made him unfit to take his part in war (1Sa 11:2; Zec 11:17).

The eye, to be useful, was to be "single," i.e. not giving a double or uncertain vision (Mt 6:22; Lu 11:34). Eyes may grow dim with sorrow and tears (Job 17:7), they may "waste away with griefs" (Ps 6:7; 31:9; 88:9). They may "pour down" (La 3:49), "run down with water" (La 1:16; 3:48). Eyes may "wink" in derision (Ps 35:19; Pr 6:13; 10:10; compare also Pr 16:30; 30:17), and the harlot takes the lustling "with her eyelids" (Pr 6:25). To ‘lift up the eyes’ (Ge 13:10 et passim) means to look up or around for information and often for help; to ‘turn away the eye’ or ‘hide the eyes’ indicates

carelessness and lack of sympathy (Pr 28:27); to ‘cast about the eyes,’ so that they "are in the ends of the earth" (Pr 17:24) is synonymous with the silly curiosity of a fool, and with the lack of attention of him who is everywhere but at his work. In the execution of justice the "eye shall not pity," i.e. not be deflected from the dictates of the law by favorable or unfavorable impressions (De 19:13 et passim), nor spare (Eze 5:11 et passim), and the lexicon talionis demanded "life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot" (Ex 21:24; De 19:21).

(2) Figurative: The eye of the heart or mind, the organ of spiritual perception, which may be enlightened or opened (Ps 119:18). This is done by the law of God (19:8) or by the spirit of God (Eph 1:18), or it may be "darkened" and "holden" (Lu 24:16; compare Mt 13:13; 2Co 4:4).

(3) The eye as an index of the mind and disposition of man. The Bible speaks of the "good" margin, or "bountiful" eye, i.e. the kindly, disposition (Pr 22:9); of "proud", "haughty", "lofty eyes" (Ps 18:27; 131:1; Pr 6:17); of the "lowly eyes" of the humble (Job 22:29 margin; compare also Lu 18:13); of "adulterous eyes", "eyes which play the harlot" (Eze 6:9, in the sense of idolatrous inclinations; 2Pe 2:14). Rage or anger is shown by the "sharpening" of the eyes (Job 16:9).

(4) The eyes of God, as well as the "seven eyes" of the Lamb (Re 5:6) and the ‘many eyes’ of the four living creatures of the Apocalypse (Re 4:6; also Eze 1:18; 10:12) are figurative expressions for the omniscience of God (compare Heb 4:13; Ps 139:16) and of His watchfulness and loving care (Jer 32:19). As the human eye may, with the slightest glance or motion, give an indication, a command, so God is able to "guide" or "counsel" His obedient child "with his eye" (Ps 32:8).

(5) Three Hebrew expressions are translated by "apple of the eye":

(a) ‘ishon, literally, "the little man," which probably means the "pupil of the eye," it being the part of the eye in which the close onlooker may see his image reflected en miniature. Several oriental languages have very similar expressions (De 32:10; Ps 17:8; Pr 7:2).

(b) babhah, literally, "the gate of the eye" (Zec 2:8).

(c) bath-‘ayin, literally, "the daughter of the eye" (Ps 17:8; La 2:18).

All these three phrases seem to indicate the pupil rather than the "apple of the eye," and designate the most sensitive part of the eye, which we protect with the greatest care. Thus the Scriptures declare, for our great comfort, that God will protect and care for those that are His own.

To eye (‘awan, "to watch closely," "to look maliciously at"): "Saul eyed David from that day and forward" (1Sa 18:9).

See ENVY; EVIL EYE.

H. L. E. Luering

EYELID

i’-lid: Eyes and eyelids in Hebrew are sometimes used synonymously, as in the parallelism of Pr 4:25 (compare 6:4; 30:13):

"Let thine eyes look right on, And let thine eyelids look straight before thee."

(Compare Job 41:18; Ps 11:4; Jer 9:18.) The alluring power of the wanton woman is conceived of as centered in her eyes (Pr 6:25; Isa 3:16): "Neither let her take thee with her eyelids." Painting the eyelids was resorted to to intensify the beauty,

antimony (which see) being used for darkening the lashes (2Ki 9:30; Jer 4:30; Eze 23:40).

George B. Eager

EYEPAINT

i’-pant.

See ANTIMONY; EYELID; KEREN-HAPPUCH.

EYES, BLINDING OF THE

blind’-ing.

See EYE; PUNISHMENTS.

EYES, COVERING, OF THE

kuv’-er-ing:

In Ge 20:16, means forgetfulness of the past, a willingness to overlook the wrong to which Sarah had been exposed.

EYES, DISEASES OF THE

di-zez’-is:

Blindness, defects of sight and diseases of the eye are frequently mentioned in the Scriptures, but usually in general terms. It is probable that in the period covered by the Bible, ophthalmia was as common in Palestine and Egypt as it is now. See BLINDNESS. The commonest of the diseases at present is the purulent conjunctivitis which is a highly infectious malady affecting people of all ages, but especially children, and whose germs are carried from eye to eye by the flies, which are allowed to walk freely over the diseased eyes. This is one of the most disgusting sights in a Palestine village, but I have been told by mothers that it is esteemed unlucky to drive off the flies. In this manner the disease is propagated. The number of persons in any Palestine village whose eyes are more or less blemished by disease is on this account phenomenally large.

Blindness incapacitated a man from serving in the priesthood (Le 21:16,18); even a blemish of the eye was regarded as a disqualification (Le 21:20).

The cases in the New Testament of persons blind from their birth (as Joh 9:1) were probably the results of this ophthalmia, but may have been due to congenital malformation. The interesting psychological record of the difficulty of interpreting the new visual sensations by the blind man healed by our Lord (Mr 8:22) indicates that it was probably not a case of congenital blindness, as the evangelist uses the word apokatestathe ("restored"), but he had been so long blind that he had lost the power of appreciating the sense-impressions. This condition has been often discussed as a psycho-physical problem since the days of Molyneux and Locke (Essay on the Human Understanding, II, 9, 8).

The blindness of Paul was probably a temporary paralysis of the retina from the shock of a dazzling light accentuated by the intense emotion which accompanied his vision on the road to Damascus. The "scales" mentioned in Ac 9:18 were not material, but his sight was restored as if (hosei) scales had fallen from his eyes. How far this left his eyes weak we do not

know, but from his inability to recognize the high priest (Ac 23:5) and from his employing an amanuensis for transcribing his epistles (Ro 16:22), as well as from his writing in characters of large size (pelikos; Ga 6:11), it is probable that his vision was defective, and this it has been conjectured was the "thorn in the flesh" of 2Co 12:7.

Senile blindness, the result either of cataract or retinal degeneration, is mentioned in the cases of Isaac (Ge 27:1), Jacob (Ge 48:10) and Eli (1Sa 4:15). The frequency of such senile dimness of sight made the case of Moses the more remarkable that at the age of 120 his eye was not dim (De 34:7).

Tobit's blindness, caused by the irritation of the sparrow's dung (APC Tobit 2:10), was a traumatic conjunctivitis which left an opacity. It is not said that the whiteness was itself sufficiently large to destroy vision. There was with it probably a considerable amount of conjunctival thickening, and it is possible that the remedy might have removed this. It certainly could not remove a cicatricial white spot of the nature of an albugo. The conjecture of a recent commentator that the gall, by coloring the spot, made the eye look as if sight was restored when it really was not, seems ludicrously inept. In any case the historical accuracy of the narrative is so problematical that explanation is unnecessary.

See BLINDNESS.

Alexander Macalister

EYES, TENDER

See BLINDNESS.

EYESALVE

i'-sav (kollourion; collyrium; Re 3:18):

A Phrygian powder mentioned by Galen, for which the medical school of Laodicea seems to have been famous (see Ramsay, The Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia), but the figurative reference is to the restoring of spiritual vision.

EYESERVICE

i'-sur-vis (ophthalmodouleia):

A term coined by Paul to express the conduct of slaves, who work only when they are watched, and whose motive, therefore, is not fidelity to duty, but either to avoid punishment or to gain reward from their masters (Eph 6:6; Col 3:22). "A vice which slavery everywhere creates and exhibits. Hence, the need for drivers and overseers" (Eadie).

EZAR

e'-zar.

See EZER.

EZBAI

ez'-ba-i, ez'-bi ('ezbay, "shining," "blooming"; Azobai):

One of David’s "mighty men" (1Ch 11:37; compare 2Sa 23:35 margin).

EZBON

ez’-bon:

(1) (’etsbon; Peshitta, ‘etsba‘on; Septuagint Thasoban): A son of Gad (Ge 46:16) = Ozni of Nu 26:16 (see OZNI).

(2) (’etsbon; Septuagint Asebon): In 1Ch 7:7 is said to be a grandson of Benjamin. Curtis (Ch., 148) holds that the genealogical table there is that of Zebulun and not Benjamin, and says that Ezbon suggests Ibzan (Jud 12:8-10), a minor judge of Bethlehem of Zebulun (Moore, Judges, 310).

EZECHIAS; EZECIAS

ez-e-ki’-as, ez-e-si’-as.

See EZEKIAS (3).

EZEKIAS

ez-e-ki’-as (Ezekias):

(1) the King James Version Greek form of Hezekiah (thus, the Revised Version (British and American); Mt 1:9,10). A king of Judah.

(2) the King James Version Ezechiad (APC 1Esdras 9:14), called Jahzeiah in Ezr 10:15.

(3) the King James Version Ezecias (APC 1Esdras 9:43), called Hilkiah in Ne 8:4.

EZEKIEL, 1

e-ze’-ki-el:

Contents I. THE PROPHET AND HIS BOOK

1. The Person of Ezekiel Name, Captivity and Trials

2. The Book (1) Its Genuineness (2) Its Structure (3) Relation to Jeremiah (4) Fate of the Book and Its Place in the Canon

II. SIGNIFICANCE OF EZEKIEL IN ISRAEL’S RELIGIOUS HISTORY

1. Formal Characteristics of Ezekiel (1) Visions (2) Symbolical Acts (3) Allegories (4) Lamentations

2. Ezekiel and the Levitical System (1) Ezekiel 44:4 ff: Theory That the Distinction of Priests and Levites Was Introduced by Ezekiel (a) The Biblical Facts (b) Modern Interpretation of This Passage (c) Examination of Theory (i) Not

Tenable for Pre-exilic Period (ii) Not Sustained by Ezekiel (iii) Not Supported by Development after Ezekiel (d) The True Solution (2) Ezekiel 40-48: Priority Claimed for Ezekiel as against the Priestly Codex (a) Sketch of the Modern View (b) One-Sidedness of This View (c) Impossibility That Ezekiel Preceded P (d) Correct Interpretation of Passage (3) Ezekiel's Leviticism 3. Ezekiel and the Messianic Idea 4. Ezekiel and Apocalyptic Literature 5. Ezekiel's Conception of God ==========

I. The Prophet and His Book.

1. The Person of Ezekiel:

The name yehezqe'l, signifies "God strengthens." The Septuagint employed the form Iezekiel, from which the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 AD.) took its "Ezechiel" and Luther "Hesekiel." In Eze 1:3 the prophet is said to be the son of a certain Buzi, and that he was a priest. This combination of the priestly and prophetic offices is not accidental at a time when the priests began to come more and more into the foreground. Thus, too, Jeremiah (1:1) and Zechariah (1:1; compare Ezr 5:1; 6:14; Ne 12:4,16, and my article "Zechariah" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary) were priests and prophets; and in Zec 7:3 a question in reference to fasting is put to both priests and prophets at the same time. And still more than in the case of Zechariah and Jeremiah, the priestly descent makes itself felt in the case of Ezekiel. We here already draw attention to his Levitical tendencies, which appear particularly prominent in Eze 40; Eze 46 (see under II, 2 below), and to the high-priestly character of his picture of the Messiah (21:25 f; 45:22; see II, 3 below).

We find Ezekiel in Tel-abib (3:15) at the river Chebar (1:1,3; 3:15) on a Euphrates canal near Nippur, where the American expedition found the archives of a great business house, "Murashu and Sons." The prophet had been taken into exile in 597 BC. This event so deeply affected the fate of the people and his personal relations that Ezekiel dates his prophecies from this event. They begin with the 5th year of this date, in which year through the appearance of the Divine glory (compare II, 1 below) he had been consecrated to the prophetic office (1:2) and continued to the 27th year (29:17), i.e. from 593 to 571 BC. The book gives us an idea of the external conditions of the exiles. The expressions "prison," "bound," which are applied to the exiles, easily create a false impression, or at any rate a one-sided idea. These terms surely to a great extent are used figuratively. Because the Jews had lost their country, their capital city, their temple, their service and their independence as a nation, their condition was under all circumstances lamentable, and could be compared with the fate of prisoners and those in fetters.

The external conditions in themselves, however, seem rather to have been generally tolerable. The people live in their own houses (Jer 29:5). Ezekiel himself is probably the owner of a house (Eze 3:24; 8:1). They have also retained their organization, for their elders visit the prophet repeatedly (Eze 8:1; 14:1; 20:1). This makes it clear why later comparatively few made use of the permission to return to their country. The inscriptions found in the business house at Nippur contain also a goodly number of Jewish names, which shows how the Jews are becoming settled and taking part in the business life of the country.

Ezekiel was living in most happy wedlock. Now God reveals to him on a certain night that his wife, "the desire of his eye," is to die through a sudden sickness. On the evening of the following day she is already dead. But he is not permitted to weep or lament over her, for he is to serve as a sign that Jerusalem is to be destroyed without wailing or lamentation (24:15 ff). Thus in his case too, as it was with Hosea, the personal fate of the prophet is most impressively interwoven with his official activity.

The question at what age Ezekiel had left Jerusalem has been answered in different ways. From his intimate acquaintance with the priestly institutions and with the temple service, as this appears particularly in chapters 40 to 48, the conclusion is drawn that he himself must have officiated in the temple. Yet, the knowledge on his part can be amply explained if he only in a general way had been personally acquainted with the temple, with the law and the study of the Torah. We accept that

he was already taken into exile at the age of 25 years, and in his 30th year was called to his prophetic office; and in doing this we come close to the statement of Josephus, according to which Ezekiel had come to Babylon in his youth. At any rate the remarkable statement in the beginning of his book, "in the 30th year," by the side of which we find the customary dating, "in the 5th year" (1:1,2), can still find its best explanation when referred to the age of the prophet. We must also remember that the 30th year had a special significance for the tribe of Levi (Nu 4:3,13,10,39), and that later on, and surely not accidentally, both Jesus and John the Baptist began their public activity at this age (Lu 3:23).

It is indeed true that the attempt has been made to interpret this statement of Ezekiel on the basis of an era of Nabopolassar, but there is practically nothing further known of this era; and in addition there would be a disagreement here, since Nabopolassar ruled from 625 on, and his 30th year would not harmonize with the year 593 as determined by Eze 1:2. Just as little can be said for explaining these 30 years as so many years after the discovery of the book of the law in 623, in the reign of Josiah (2Ki 22 f). For this case too there is not the slightest hint that this event had been made the beginning of a new era, and, in addition, the statement in Eze 1:1, without further reference to this event, would be unthinkable.

As in the case of the majority of the prophets, legends have also grown around the person of Ezekiel. He is reported to have been the teacher of Pythagoras, or a servant of Jeremiah, or a martyr, and is said to have been buried in the tomb of Shem and Arphaxad. He indeed did stand in close relationship to Jeremiah (see 2, 3 below). Since the publication of Klostermann’s essay in the Studien und Kritiken, 1877, it has been customary, on the basis of Eze 3:14 f, 26 f; 4:4 ff; 24:27, to regard Ezekiel as subject to catalepsy (compare the belief often entertained that Paul was an epileptic). Even if his condition, in which he lay speechless or motionless, has some similarity with certain forms of catalepsy or kindred diseases, i.e. a temporary suspension of the power of locomotion or of speech; yet in the case of Ezekiel we never find that he is describing a disease, but his unique condition occurs only at the express command of God (3:24 ff; 24:25 ff); and this on account of the stubbornness of the house of Israel (3:26). This latter expression which occurs with such frequency (compare 2:5 ff; 3:9,27, etc.) induces to the consideration of the reception which the prophet met at the hand of his contemporaries.

He lives in the midst of briars and thorns and dwells among scorpions (2:6). Israel has a mind harder than a rock, firmer than adamant (3:8 f). "Is he not a speaker of parables?" is cast up to him by his contemporaries, and he complains to God on this account (20:49); and God in turn sums up the impression which Ezekiel has made on them in the words (33:32): "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument; for they hear thy words, but they do them not." They consequently estimate him according to his aesthetic side (compare II, 1, below), but that is all.

2. The Book:

(1) Its Genuineness.

When compared with almost every other prophetic book, we are particularly favorably situated in dealing with the genuineness of the Book of Ezekiel (compare my work, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, zugleich ein Protest gegen moderne Textzersplitterung), as this is practically not at all called into question, and efforts to prove a complicated composition of the book are scarcely made.

Both the efforts of Zunz, made long ago (compare Zeitschrift der deutsch-morgenlandishchen Gesellschaft, 1873, and Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden), and of Seinecke (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II, 1 ff) to prove a Persian or even a Greek period as the time of the composition of the book; as also the later attempt of Kroetzmann, in his Commentary on Ezekiel, to show that there are two recensions of the book, have found no favor. The claim that Eze 40; Eze 48 were written by a pupil of Ezekiel was made as a timid suggestion by Volz, but, judging from the tendency of criticism, the origin of these chapters will probably yet become the subject of serious debate. But in general the conviction obtains that the book is characterized by such unity that we can only accept or reject it as a whole, but that for its rejection there is not the least substantial ground. This leads us to the contents.

(2) Its Structure.

The parts of the book are in general very transparent. First of all the book is divided into halves by the announcement of the fall of Jerusalem in Eze 33; of which parts the first predominantly deals with punishments and threats; the other with comfort and encouragement. Possibly it is these two parts of the book that Josephus has in mind when he says (Ant., X) that Ezekiel had written two books. That the introduction of prophecies of redemption after those of threats in other prophetical books also is often a matter of importance, and that the right appreciation of this fact is a significant factor in the struggle against the attacks made on the genuineness of these books has been demonstrated by me in my book, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Prophelen (compare 39-40 for the case of Amos; 62 ff, 136 f, for the case of Hosea; 197 ff for Isa 7-12 ff for Micah; see also my article in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary). Down to the time when Jerusalem fell, Ezekiel was compelled to antagonize the hopes, which were supported by false prophets, that God would not suffer this calamity. Over against this, Ezekiel persistently and emphatically points to this fact, that the apostasy had been too great for God not to bring about this catastrophe. There is scarcely a violation of a single command—religious, moral or cultural—which the prophet is not compelled to charge against the people in the three sections, 3:16 ff; 8:1 ff; 20:1 ff, until in 24:1 ff, on the 10th day of the 10th month of the 9th year (589 BC) the destruction of Jerusalem was symbolized by the vision of the boiling pot with the piece of meat in it, and the unlamented destruction of the city was prefigured by the unmourned and sudden death of his wife (see 1 above). After the five sections of this subdivision I, referring to Israel—each one of which subdivisions is introduced by a new dating, and thereby separated from the others and chronologically arranged (1:1 ff, with the consecration of the prophet immediately following it; 3:16 ff; 8:1 ff; 20:1 ff; 24:1 ff)—there follow as a second subdivision the seven oracles against the Ammonites (25:1 ff); the Moabites (25:8 ff); the Edomites (25:12 ff); the Philistines (25:15 ff); Tyre (26:1 ff); Sidon (28:20 ff); Egypt (29:1 ff), evidently arranged from a geographical point of view.

The most extensive are those against Tyre and the group of oracles against Egypt, both provided with separate dates (compare 26:1-29:1; 30:20; 31:1; 32:1,17). The supplement in reference to Tyre (29:17 ff) is the latest dated oracle of Ezekiel (from the year 571 BC), and is found here, at a suitable place, because it is connected with a threat against Egypt (Eze 40; Eze 48 date from the year 573 according to Eze 40:1). The number seven evidently does not occur accidentally, since in other threats of this kind a typical number appears to have been purposely chosen, thus: Isa 13-22, i.e. ten; Jer 46; Jer 51, also ten; which fact again under the circumstances is an important argument in repelling attacks on the genuineness of the book.

Probably the five parts of the first subdivision, and the seven of the second, supplement each other, making a total of twelve (compare the analogous structure of Ex 25:1; 30:10 under EXODUS, and probably the chiastic structure of Eze 34, with 7 and 5 pieces; see below). The oracles against the foreign countries are not only in point of time to be placed between Eze 24 and 33:21, but also, as concerns contents, help splendidly to solve the difficulty suggested by chapter 24, and in this way satisfactorily fill the gap thus made. The arrival of the news of the fall of Jerusalem, in 586 BC (compare 33:21 ff), which had already been foretold in chapter 24, introduced by the mighty watchman's cry to repentance (33:1 ff), and followed by a reproof of the superficial reception of the prophetic word (see 1 above), concludes the first chief part of the book.

The second part also naturally fails into two subdivisions, of which the first contains the development of the nearer and more remote future, as to its inner character and its historical course (Eze 34-39):

(1) the true shepherd of Israel (Eze 34);

(2) the future fate of Edom (Eze 35);

(3) Israel's deliverance from the disgrace of the shameful treatment by the heathen, which falls back upon the latter again (Eze 36:1-15);

(4) the desecration of the name of Yahweh by Israel and the sanctification by Yahweh (Eze 36:15-38);

(5) the revival of the Israelite nation (Eze 37:1-14);

(6) the reunion of the separated kingdoms, Judah and Israel (Eze 37:15-28);

(7) the overthrow of the terrible Gentilepower of the north (Eze 38 f).

The second subdivision (Eze 40-48) contains the reconstruction of the external affairs of the people in a vision, on the birthday of 573, "in the beginning of the year" (beginning of a jubilee year? (Le 25:10); compare also DAY OF ATONEMENT). After the explanatory introduction (Eze 40:1-4), there follow five pericopes:

(1) directions with reference to the temple (compare the subscription Eze 43:12) (Eze 40:5-43:12);

(2) the altar (Eze 43:13-46:24);

(3) the wonderful fountain of the temple, on the banks of which the trees bear fruit every month (Eze 47:1-12);

(4) the boundaries of the land and its division among the twelve tribes of Israel (Eze 47:13-48:29);

(5) the size of the holy city and the names of its twelve gates (Eze 48:30-35).

In (3) to (5) the prominence of the number twelve is clear. Perhaps we can also divide (1) and (2) each into twelve pieces:

(1) would be Eze 40:5 ff, 17 ff, 28 ff, 39 ff, 48 ff; 41:1 ff, 5 ff, 12 ff, 15 ff; 42:1 ff, 15 ff; 43:1 ff; for

(2) it would be 43:13 ff, 18 ff; 44:1 ff, 4 ff, 15 ff; 45:1 ff, 9 ff, 13 ff, 18 ff; 46:1 ff, 16 ff, 19 ff.

At any rate the entire second chief part, Eze 34-48, contains predictions of deliverance. The people down to 586 were confident, so that Ezekiel was compelled to rebuke them. After the taking of Jerusalem a change took place in both respects. Now the people are despairing, and this is just the right time for the prophet to preach deliverance. The most important separate prophecies will be mentioned and examined in another connection (II below).

The transparent structure of the whole book suggests the idea that the author did not extend the composition over a long period, but wrote it, so to say, at one stretch, which of course does not make it impossible that the separate prophecies were put into written form immediately after their reception, but rather presupposes this. When the prophet wrote they were only woven together into a single uniform book (compare also EXODUS, IV, 1, 2).

(3) Relation to Jeremiah.

As Elijah and Elisha, or Amos and Hosea, or Isaiah and Micah, or Haggai and Zechariah, so too Jeremiah and Ezekiel constitute a prophetic couple (compare 1 above); compare e.g. in later time the sending out of the disciples of Jesus, two by two (Lu 10:1), the relation of Peter and John in Ac 3 ff; of Paul and Barnabas in Ac 13 ff; of Luther and Melanchthon, Calvin and Zwingli. Both prophets prophesy about the same time; both are of priestly descent (compare 1 above), both witness the overthrow of the Jewish nation, and with their prophecies accompany the fate of the Jewish state down to the catastrophe and beyond that, rebuking, threatening, warning, admonishing, and also comforting and encouraging. In matters of detail, too, these two prophets often show the greatest similarity, as in the threat against the unfaithful shepherds (Eze 34:2 ff; Jer 23:1 ff); in putting into one class the Northern and the Southern Kingdom and condemning both, although the prediction is also made that they shall eventually be united and pardoned (Eze 23; 16; Jer 3:6 ff; Eze 37:15 ff; Jer 3:14-

18; 23:5 f; 30 f); in the individualizing of religion (compare the fact that both reject the common saying: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," Eze 18:2; Jer 31:29); in their inwardness (Eze 36:25 ff; Jer 24:7; 31:27-34; 32:39; 33:8); in their comparisons of the coming judgment with a boiling pot (Eze 24:1 ff; Jer 1:13 ff); and finally, in their representation of the Messiah as the priest-king (see 1 above; namely, in Eze 21:25 f; 45:22; compare Jer 30:21; 33:17 ff; see II, 3, and my work Messianische Erwartung, 320 ff, 354 ff). Neither is to be considered independently of the other, since the prophetical writings, apparently, received canonical authority soon after and perhaps immediately after they were written (compare the expression "the former prophets" in Zec 1:4; 7:7,12, also the constantly increasing number of citations from earlier prophets in the later prophets, and the understanding of the "exact succession of the prophets" down to Artaxerxes in Josephus, CAp, I, 8), it is possible that Ezekiel, with his waw consecutivum, with which the book begins, is to be understood as desiring to connect with the somewhat older Jeremiah (compare a similar relation of Jonah to Obadiah; see my articles "Canon of the OT" and "Jonah" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary).

(4) Fate of the Book and Its Place in the Canon.

With Jeremiah and Ezekiel, many Hebrew manuscripts, especially those of the German and French Jews, begin the series of "later prophets," and thus these books are found before Isaiah; while the Massorah and the manuscripts of the Spanish Jews, according to the age and the size of the books, have the order, Isa, Jer, Ezk. The text of the book is, in part, quite corrupt, and in this way the interpretation of the book, not easy in itself, is made considerably more difficult. Jerome, Ad Paul., writes that the beginning and the end of the book contained many dark passages; that these parts, like the beginning of Gen, were not permitted to be read by the Jews before these had reached their 30th year. During the time when the schools of Hillel and Shammai flourished, Ezekiel belonged to those books which some wanted "to hide," the others being Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Esther and Canticles. In these discussions the question at issue was not the reception of the book into the Canon, which was rather presupposed, nor again any effort to exclude them from the Canon again, which thought could not be reconciled with the high estimate in which it is known that Es was held, but it was the exclusion of these books from public reading in the Divine service, which project failed. The reasons for this proposal are not to be sought in any doubt as to their authenticity, but in reference to their contents (compare my article "Canon of the Old Testament," in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary). Possibly, too, one reason was to be found in the desire to avoid the profanation of the most sacred vision in the beginning of the book, as Zunz suggests. There is no doubt, however, that the difference of this book from the Torah was a reason that made it inadvisable to read it in public. It was hoped that these contradictions would be solved by Elijah when he should return. But finally, rabbinical research, after having used up three hundred cans of oil, succeeded in finding the solution. These contradictions, as a matter of fact, have not yet been removed, and have in modern times contributed to the production of a very radical theory in criticism, as will be shown immediately under II, 2.

Continued 8324

EZEKIEL, 2

II. Significance of Ezekiel in Israel's Religious History.

Under the first head we will consider the formal characteristics and significance of the book; and the examination of its contents will form the subject under the next four divisions.

1. Formal Characteristics of Ezekiel:

It is not correct to regard Ezekiel merely as a writer, as it is becoming more and more customary to do. Passages like 3:10 f; 14:4 ff; 20:1 ff, 27; 24:18 ff; 43:10 f show that just as the other prophets did, he too proclaimed by word of mouth the revelations of God he had received. However, he had access only to a portion of the people. It was indeed for him even more important than it had been for the earlier prophets to provide for the wider circulation and permanent influence of his message by putting it into written form. We will, at this point, examine his book first of all from its formal and its aesthetic side. To do this it is very difficult, in a short sketch, to give even a general impression of the practically inexhaustible

riches of the means at his command for the expression of his thoughts.

(1) Visions.

Thus, a number of visions at once attract our attention. In the beginning of his work there appears to him the Divine throne-chariot, which comes from the north as a storm, as a great cloud and a fire rolled together. This chariot is borne by the four living creatures in the form of men, with the countenances of a man, of a lion, of an ox and of an eagle, representing the whole living creation. It will be remembered that these figures have passed over into the Revelation of John (Re 4:7), and later were regarded as the symbols of the four evangelists. In Eze 10 f this throne-chariot in the vision leaves the portal of the temple going toward the east, returning again in the prediction of deliverance in Eze 43. Moreover, the entire last nine chapters are to be interpreted as a vision (compare 40:2). We must not forget, finally, the revivification of the Israelite nation in Eze 37, represented in the picture of a field full of dead bones, which are again united, covered with skin, and receive new life through the ruach (word of two meanings, "wind" and "spirit").

As a rule the visions of Ezekiel, like those of Zechariah (compare my article "Zechariah" in Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary), are not regarded as actual experiences, but only as literary forms. When it is given as a reason for this that the number of visions are too great and too complicated, and therefore too difficult of presentation, to be real experiences, we must declare this to be an altogether too unsafe, subjective and irrelevant rule to apply in the matter. However, correct the facts mentioned are in themselves they do not compel us to draw this conclusion. Not only is it uncertain how many visions may be experiences (compare eg. the five visions in Am 7 ff, which are generally regarded as actual experiences), but it is also absolutely impossible to prove such an a priori claim with reference to the impossibility and the unreality of processes which are not accessible to us by our own experience. As these visions, one and all, are, from the religious and ethical sides, up to the standards of Old Testament prophecy, and as, further, they are entirely unique in character, and as, finally, there is nothing to show that they are only literary forms, we must hold to the conviction that the visions are actual experiences.

(2) Symbolical Acts.

Then we find in Ezekiel, also, a large number of symbolical acts. According to Divine command Ezekiel sketches the city of Jerusalem and its siege on a tile (4:1 ff); or he lies bound on his left side, as an atonement, 390 days, and 40 days on his right side, according to the number of years of the guilt of Israel and Judah (4:4 ff). During the 390 days the condition of the people in exile is symbolized by a small quantity of food daily of the weight of only 20 shekels, and unclean, being baked on human or cattle dung, and a small quantity of water, which serves as food and drink of the prophet (4:9 ff).

By means of his beard and the hair of his head, which he shaves off and in part burns, in part strikes with the sword, and in part scatters to the wind, and only the very smallest portion of which he ties together in the hem of his garment, he pictures how the people shall be decimated so that only a small remnant shall remain (Eze 5:1 ff). In Eze 12, he prepares articles necessary for marching and departs in the darkness. Just so Israel will go into captivity and its king will not see the country into which he goes (compare the blinding of Zedekiah, 2Ki 25:7). In Eze 37:15 ff, he unites two different sticks into one, with inscriptions referring to the two kingdoms, and these picture the future union of Israel and Judah. It is perhaps an open question whether or not some of these symbolical actions, which would be difficult to carry out in actuality, are not perhaps to be interpreted as visions; thus, eg. the distributing the wine of wrath to all the nations, in Jer 25:15, can in all probability not be understood in any other way. But, at any rate, it appears to us that here, too, the acceptance of a mere literary form is both unnecessary and unsatisfactory, and considering the religio-ethical character of Ezekiel, not permissible.

(3) Allegories.

In regard to the numerous allegories, attention need be drawn only to the picture of the two unfaithful sisters, Oholah and Oholibah (i.e. Samaria and Jerusalem), whose relation to Yahweh as well as their infidelity is portrayed in a manner that is

actually offensive to over-sensitive minds (Eze 23; compare Eze 16). In Eze 17, Zedekiah is represented under the image of a grapevine, which the great eagle (i.e. the king of Babylon) has appointed, which, however, turns to another great eagle (king of Egypt), and because of this infidelity shall be rooted out, until God, eventually, causes a new tree to grow out of a tender branch.

(4) Lamentations.

Of the lamentations, we mention the following: according to Eze 19, a lioness rears young lions, one after the other, but one after the other is caught in a trap and led away by nose-rings. The ones meant are Jehoahaz and certainly Jehoiachin. The lion mother, who before was like a grapevine, is banished (Zedekiah). Another lamentation is spoken over Tyre, which is compared to a proud ship (compare Eze 27:1 ff); also over the king of Tyre, who is hurled down from the mountain of the gods (Eze 28:11-19); and over Pharaoh of Egypt, who is pictured as a crocodile in the sea (Eze 32:1 ff).

That his contemporaries knew how to appreciate the prophet at least from the aesthetic side, we saw above (I, 1). What impression does Ezekiel make upon us today, from this point of view? He is declared to be "too intellectual for a poet"; "fantastic"; "vividness in him finds a substitute in strengthening and repetition"; "he has no poetical talent"; "he is the most monotonous prose writer among the prophets." These and similar opinions are heard. In matters of taste there is no disputing; but there is food for reflection in the story handed down that Frederick yon Schiller was accustomed to read Ezekiel, chiefly on account of his magnificent descriptions, and that he himself wanted to learn Hebrew in order to be able to enjoy the book in the original. And Herder, with his undeniable and undenied fine appreciation of the poetry of many nations, calls Ezekiel "the Aeschylus and the Shakespeare of the Hebrews" (compare Lange’s Commentary on Ezk, 519).

2. Ezekiel and the Levitical System:

(1) Ezekiel 44:4 ff: Theory That the Distinction of Priests and Levites Was Introduced by Ezekiel.

(a) The Biblical Facts:

In the vision of the reconstruction of the external relations of the people in the future (Eze 40; 48), in the second pericope, which treats of the cult (43:13-46:24; compare I, 2, 2), it is claimed that Ezekiel, at the command of Yahweh, reproaches the Israelites that they engage in their room strangers, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to take charge of the service of Yahweh in the sanctuary, instead of doing this service themselves, and thus desecrate the temple (44:4-8). From now on the Levites, who hitherto have been participating in the service of the idols on the high places and had become for Israel an occasion for guilt, are to attend to this work. They are degraded from the priesthood as a punishment of their guilt, and are to render the above-mentioned service in the temple (Eze 44:9 ff), while only those Levitical priests, the sons of Zadok, who had been rendering their services in the sanctuary in the proper way, while Israel was going astray, are to be permitted to perform priestly functions (Eze 44:15 ff).

(b) Modern Interpretation of This Passage:

The modern interpretation of this passage (Eze 44:4 ff) is regarded as one of the most important proofs for the Wellhausen hypothesis. Down to the 7th century BC it is claimed that there are no signs that a distinction was made between the persons who had charge of the cults in Israel, and this is held to be proved by the history of the preceding period and by the Book of Deuteronomy, placed by the critics in this time. It is said that Ezekiel is the first to change this, and in this passage introduces the distinction between priests and the lower order of Levites, which difference is then presupposed by the Priestly Code. According to this view, the high priest of the Priestly Code, too, would not yet be known to Ezekiel, and would not yet exist in his time. More fully expressed, the development would have to be thought as follows: the Book of Deuteronomy, which abolished the service on the high places, and had introduced the concentration of the cults, had in a humane way provided for the deposed priests who had been serving on the high places, and, in 18:6 ff, had expressly permitted them to perform their work in Jerusalem, as did all of their brethren of their tribe, and to enjoy the same income

as these. While all the other Deuteronomic commands had in principle been recognized, this ordinance alone had met with opposition: for in 2Ki 23:9 we are expressly told that the priests of the high places were not permitted to go up to Jerusalem. Ezekiel now, according to Wellhausen's statement, "hangs over the logic of the facts a moral mantle," by representing the deposition of the priests of the high places as a punishment for the fact that they were priests of the high places, although they had held this position in the past by virtue of legal right.

It is indeed true, it is said, that these priests did not submit to such a representation of the case and such treatment. The violent contentions which are said to have arisen in consequence are thought to have their outcome expressed in Nu 16 f (the rebellion of Korah, the budding staff of Aaron). The Priestly Code, however, continued to adhere to the distinction once it had been introduced, and had become a fact already at the return in 538 BC (compare Ezr 2:36 ff), even if it was found impossible to limit the priesthood to the Zadokites, and if it was decided to make an honorable office out of the degraded position of the Levites as given by Ezekiel. The fact that, according to Ezr 2:36-39, in the year 538 BC, already 4,289 priests, but according to verse 40, only 74 Levites, returned, is also regarded as proving how dissatisfied the degraded priests of the high places had been with the new position, created by Ezekiel, to which they had been assigned. With the introduction of the P Codex in 444 BC, which made a distinction between high priest, priests and Levites within the tribe of Levi, this development reached an end for the time being. While Deuteronomy speaks of the "Levitical priests," which expression is regarded as confirming the original identity of the priests and the Levites, it is claimed that since the days of Ezekiel, priests and Levites constitute two sharply distinguished classes.

(c) Examination of Theory:

Both the exegesis of Eze 44:4 ff and the whole superstructure are in every direction indefensible and cannot be maintained (compare also my work, Are the Critics Right? 30 ff, 124 ff, 196 ff).

(i) Not Tenable for Preexilic Period:

Proof that the hypothesis cannot be maintained for the preexilic period. The claim that down to the 7th century BC there did not exist in Israel any distinction among the persons engaged in the public cults is in itself an absurdity, but has in addition against it the express testimony of history. In preexilic times the high priest is expressly mentioned in 2Ki 12:9 ff; 22:4,8; 23:4. Accordingly he cannot have been a product of the post-exilic period. The rank of an Eli (1Sa 1 ff), Ahimelech (1Sa 21 f), Abiathar (1Ki 2:26 f), Zadok (1Ki 2:35), is vastly above that of an ordinary priest. The fact that the expression "high priest" does not happen to occur here is all the less to be pressed, as the term is found even in the Priestly Code only in Le 21:10; Nu 35:25-28. From De 10:6; Jos 24:33; Jud 20:28, we learn that the office of high priest was transmitted from Aaron to his son, Eleazar, and then to his son, Phinehas (compare also Nu 25:11). Before the time of Eli, according to 1Ch 24:3, it had passed over to the line of the other surviving son of Aaron, that of Ithamar, but, according to 1Ki 2:26 f, 35, at the deposition of Abiathar and the appointment of Zadok, it returned again to the line of Eleazar (compare 1Sa 2:27,28,35 f with 1Ch 24:3). Distinctions within the tribe are also expressly presupposed by Jer 20:1; 29:25 f, 29; 52:24; 2Ki 25:18. In the same way Levites are expressly mentioned in history (compare Jud 17 f; 19-21; 1Sa 6:15; 2Sa 15:24; 1Ki 8:3 ff). This very division of the priestly tribe into three parts possibly suggested the three parts of the temple of Solomon (the holy of holies, the holy place, the forecourt). According to all this, it is not possible that this distinction is not found in Deuteronomy, especially if this book was not written until the 7th century BC and throughout took into consideration the actual condition of affairs at that time, as is generally claimed. But this difference is found in Deuteronomy, the false dating of which we can here ignore, and is probably suggested by it; for, if this were not the case, then the addition of the words "the whole tribe of Levi" to the words "Levitical priests" in De 18:1 would be tautology. But as it is, both expressions already refer to what follows: namely, 18:3-5 to the priests and 18:6 ff to the rest of the Levites. In the same way, the Levites are in 12:12,18 f; 14:27,29; 16:11,14 the objects of charity, while 18:3 ff prescribes a fixed and not insignificant income for the priests. Then, finally, such general statements as are found in 10:8; 18:2 ff; 33:8 ff, not only demand such specific directions as are found only in the Priestly Code (P), but in 10:9; 18:2 there is a direct reference to Nu 18:20,24 (from P). On the other hand, Deuteronomy, in harmony with its general tendency of impressing upon Israel in the spirit of pastoral exhortation the chief demands of the law, does not find it necessary, in every instance, to mention the

distinctions that existed in the tribe of Levi.

In Nu 18:7 we have in P even an analogon to De 10:8; 33:8 ff; since here, too, no distinction is made between priests and high priests separately, but the whole priestly service is mentioned in a summary manner (compare further Le 6:22 in comparison with 6:25; Nu 35 in comparison with Jos 21). That Deuteronomy cannot say "Aaron and his sons," as P does, is certainly self-evident, because Aaron was no longer living at the time when the addresses of Deuteronomy were delivered. And how the expression "Levitical priests," which Deuteronomy uses for the expression found in the Priestly Code (P), and which was entirely suitable, because under all circumstances the priests were of the tribe of Levi, is to be understood as excluding the subordinate members of the cults-officers belonging to the same tribe, is altogether incomprehensible (compare the emphasis put on the Levitical priesthood in P itself, as found in Nu 17; Jos 21:4,10 ff). So are other passages which originated at a time after the introduction by Ezekiel, or, according to the critics, are claimed to have been introduced then (compare Mal 2:1 ff, 4,8; 3:3; Jer 33:18; Isa 66:21; 2Ch 5:5; 23:18; 29:4 ff; 30:27), and even in Eze (44:15). The claims that De is more humane in its treatment of the priests who had engaged in the worship in high places (compare eg. 2Ki 22 f) cannot at all be reconciled with De 13, which directs that death is to be the punishment for such idolatry. If, notwithstanding this, it is still claimed that De 18:6 ff allows the priests of the high places to serve in Jerusalem, then it is incomprehensible how in 2Ki 23:9 these men did not appeal directly to De in vindication of their rights over against all hindrances, since De was regarded as the absolute norm in carrying out the cult tradition.

(ii) Not Sustained by Ezekiel:

Examination of the hypothesis on the basis of Ezekiel: No less unfavorable to the view of the critics must the judgment be when we examine it in the light of the contents of Ezekiel itself. The prophet presupposes a double service in the sanctuary, a lower service which, in the future, the degraded priests of the high places are to perform and which, in the past, had been performed in an unlawful manner by strangers (44:6-9), and a higher service, which had been performed by the Zadokites, the priests at the central sanctuary, in the proper way at the time when the other priests had gone astray, which service was for this reason to be entrusted to them alone in the future (compare, also, 40:45,46; 43:19). Since in 44:6 ff the sharpest rebukes are cast up to Israel (according to the reading of the Septuagint, which here uses the second person, even the charge of having broken the covenant), because they had permitted the lower service to be performed by uncircumcised aliens, it is absolutely impossible that Ezekiel should have been the first to introduce the distinction between higher and lower service, but he presupposes this distinction as something well known, and, also, that the lower service has been regulated by Divine ordinances. As we have such ordinances clearly given only in Nu 18:2 ff (from P) it is in itself natural and almost necessary that Ezekiel has reference to these very ordinances, but these very ordinances direct that the Levites are to have charge of this lower service. This is confirmed by Eze 48:12 f, where the designation "Levites" in contradistinction from the priests is a fixed and recognized term for the lower cult officials. For Ezekiel has not at all said that he would from now on call these temple-servants simply by the name "Levites," but, rather, he simply presupposes the terminology of P as known and makes use of it. He would, too, scarcely have selected this expression to designate a condition of punishment, since the term "Levites" is recognized on all hands to be an honorable title in the sacred Scriptures. And when he, in addition, designates the Zadokites as "Levitical priests" (Eze 44:15), this only shows anew that Ezekiel in his designation of the lower temple-servants only made use of the terminology introduced by P.

But, on the representation of the critics, the whole attitude ascribed to Ezekiel cannot be upheld. It is maintained that a prophet filled with the highest religious and ethical thoughts has been guilty of an action that, from an ethical point of view, is to be most sharply condemned. The prophet is made to write reproaches against the people of Israel for something they could not help (Eze 44:6), and he is made to degrade and punish the priests of the high places, who also had acted in good faith and were doing what they had a right to do (Eze 44:9 ff; compare "the moral mantle" which, according to Wellhausen, "he threw over the logic of facts"). Ezekiel is accordingly regarded here as a bad man; but at the same time he would also be a stupid man. How could he expect to succeed in such an uncouth and transparent trick? If success had attended the effort to exclude from the service in Jerusalem the priests of the high places according to 2Ki 23:9, and notwithstanding De 18:6 ff, which according to what has been said under (a) is most improbable, then this would through the action of Ezekiel again have been made a matter of uncertainty. Or, was it expected that they would suffer themselves to be upraided and punished without protesting if they had done no wrong? Finally, too, the prophet would have belonged

to that class whose good fortune is greater than their common sense. This leads us to the following:

(iii) Not Supported by Development after Ezekiel:

Examination of the development after the time of Ezekiel: Ezekiel's success is altogether incomprehensible, if now the distinction between priests and Levites has, at once, been introduced and at the return from captivity, in the year 538 (Ezr 2:36), certainly was a fact. It is true that we at once meet with a host of difficulties. Why do only 74 Levites return according to Ezr 2:40 if their degradation from the ranks of the priesthood through Ezekiel had not preceded? asks the Wellhausen school. Why did any Levites, at all, return, if they had been so disgraced? is our question. But, how is it at all possible that so many priests could return (4,289 among 42,360 exiles, or more than one-tenth of the whole number; compare Ezr 2:36-38 with verse 64; but many more than one-tenth if women are included in the 42,360), if, since the times of Ezekiel, there were none other than Zadokite priests? In examining the writers claimed as the authors of the Priestly Code (P), all those difficulties recur again which are found in the case of Ezekiel himself. That Nu 16 f indicates and reflects the opposition of the degraded is nothing but an unproved assertion; but if they had revolted, which was probable enough, then there would have been no worse and more foolish means than to change the degraded position of the Levites according to Ezekiel into the honorable position assigned them in the Priestly Code (P). This would only have made the matter worse. The Levites would again have been able to claim their old rights and they would have acquired the strongest weapons for their opposition. The fact that Ezekiel's restoration of the priesthood to the Zadokites would have been ignored by the Priestly Code (P), as also the descent of Aaron through Eleazar and Ithamar, according to the account of the Priestly Code (P), that is, that in reality also others were admitted to the priesthood, would only have the effect of making those who still were excluded all the more rebellious, who could appeal to each case of such an admission as a precedent and accordingly as a violation of the principle. What possible purpose the authors of P could have had in the creation of those products of imagination, Nadab and Abihu, and the portrayal of the terrible fate of these sons of Aaron (Le 10) remains incomprehensible (compare the purposeless and constructive imagination in the description of the details of the Ark of the Covenant, which stands in no connection with the tendency of P; see EXODUS, III, 5). Nor can it be understood why the creators of the Priestly Code would have had assigned other duties to the Levites than Ezekiel had done; the slaying of the burnt offerings and the sacrifices (44:11) and the cooking of the latter (46:24) is lacking in the Priestly Code (P), in which document the transportation of the imaginary tabernacle would have exhausted the duties of the priests (Nu 4), while in other respects, their services would be described only in such general notices as in Nu 8:23 ff; 18:2 ff (compare for this reason the very credible account in Chronicles, which through Eze 44:11; 46:24 only becomes all the more trustworthy, where we are told of the enlargement of the duties of the Levites already by David in 1Ch 23:25 ff). In short, the critical views offer one monstrosity after another, and each greater than its predecessor. We will only mention further that, if the critics are right in this matter, then of the directions found in Eze 40; 48 nothing else has ever been carried out in reality, even when these chapters are correctly understood (see 2 (d) below), and at first nothing was intended to be carried out, so that it would be all the more surprising if this one feature of the program of Ezekiel had alone been picked out and had been carried out with an inexplicable haste, and that too at a time when the whole cult was not at all observed (573, according to 40:1).

(d) The True Solution:

The text as it reads in Eze 44:9 ff actually does speak of a degradation. If the matter involved only a mere putting back into the status quo ante, of the Levites, who on the high places, contrary to the law, had usurped the prerogatives of the higher priestly offices, as this could easily be understood, then the expression in Eze 44:10,12, "They shall bear their iniquity," would lose much of its significance. On the other hand, the whole matter finds its explanation if, in the first place, the lower order of Levites did not put a high estimate on their office, so that they transferred their service to aliens (44:6 ff), and if, in the second place, by those Levites who departed from Yahweh, when Israel was going astray, not all the Levites are to be understood, but only a certain group of priests, who by these words were for themselves and their contemporaries clearly enough designated: namely, the descendants of Aaron through Ithamar and Eleazar in so far as they were not Zadokites, that is, had not officiated at the central sanctuary. The non-Zadokite priests had permitted themselves to be misled to officiate in the idolatry in the services of the high places, and for this reason were for the future to be degraded to

the already existing lower order of the Levites.

The fact that in the ranks of lower participants in the cults, already in the days of David, according to Chronicles, a still further division had taken place (1Ch 23-26), so that by the side of the Levites in the most narrow sense of the word, also the singers and the gate watchmen were Levites of a lower rank (Ne 12:44-47; 13:10), is again in itself entirely credible, and, in addition, is made very probable by Ezr 2:40 ff. This too at once increases the small number of Levites who returned from the exile from 74 to 341. In comparison to the number of priests (4,289) the number yet remains a small one, but from Eze 44:6 ff we learn further that the Levites also before the days of Ezekiel had not appreciated their office, for then they would not have given it over to aliens. In this way not only does everything become clear and intelligible, but the weapon which was to serve for the defense of the Wellhausen school has in every respect been turned against these critics. The historical order can only be: first, the Priestly Code, and after that Ezekiel; never vice versa.

(2) Ezekiel 40-48: Priority claimed for Ezekiel as against the Priest Codex

(a) Sketch of the modern view:

The entire vision of what the external condition of affairs would be in the future in Eze 40-48, and not only what is particularly stated in 44:4 ff, is made a part of Israel's religious development in accordance with the scheme of the Wellhausen school. For this hypothesis, this section is one of the chief arguments, besides the opposition which it claims exists on the part of the prophets against the sacrifices, in addition to the proof taken from the history of the people and from the comparison of the different collections of laws with each other. In Eze 40; 48 many things are different from what they are in the Priestly Code, and in Eze much is lacking that is found in P. How now would a prophet dare to change the legislation in P? Hence, P is regarded as later than Ezk. This is, briefly, the logic of the Wellhausen school.

(b) One-Sidedness of This View:

If we first state the facts in the case and complete the observations of the modern school, the picture will at once assume quite a different form and the conclusions drawn will in their consequences prove very embarrassing. It is a fact that in Ezekiel the high priest so prominent in P is lacking. No mention is made of the equipment of the holy of holies, and in the holy place the table of the shewbread and the candlesticks, old utensils that are mentioned in the tabernacle of the Priestly Code (P), and in part play an important role there. But the differences in Ezekiel are not found only in comparison with the Priestly Code (P), but just as much, too, in features which belong to the legislation of Deuteronomy, as also of the Book of the Covenant, accepted at all hands as preexilic (Ex 21-23; 34). Thus there is lacking in Eze 40-48 not only the tithes of P (Le 27:30-33), also the laws with reference to the firstborn from P (Le 27:26 f; Nu 18:15 f), the ordinances with reference to the portions of the redemption sacrifice to be given to the priests from P (Le 7:31), but equally the ordinance with reference to the tithes, firstborn and sacrificial gifts from De (compare 14:22 ff; 26:12 ff; 14:23-26; 15:19-23; 18:3). The feast of weeks is wanting, which is demanded not only by P in Le 23:15 ff; Nu 28:26 ff, but also by the older legislation (Ex 23:16; 34:22; De 16:9); and in the place of the three parallel feasts demanded everywhere, only the Passover and the Feast of the Tabernacles are prescribed (Eze 45:21). Thus too the direction with regard, e.g. to the Day of Atonement in Eze 45:18 ff is different in regard to number, time and ritual from P in Le 16, etc. (compare DAY OF ATONEMENT, sec. I, 1), but also the command found in Ex 20:26 (from E) that it was not permitted to ascend on steps to the altar of Yahweh is overthrown by Eze 43:17. And, according to what has been described under (1), criticism itself accepts (although without reason) that Ezekiel had changed the commandment of De 18:6 ff, according to which all the Levites in Jerusalem could perform priestly service, so that he not only forbade this, as did 2Ki 23:9, but that he also degraded these priests of the high places as a punishment and reduced them to a lower service.

As is the case in reference to the law, Ezekiel also disagrees with the facts of history. He changes the dimensions of the Solomonic temple entirely (40:5-42:20); he gives an entirely different distribution of the Holy Land (47:13-48:29) from that which was carried out in actual history. What sheer arbitrariness and short-sightedness it would be, to pick out of this condition of affairs only those features in which he differs from the Priestly Code (P), in order, for this reason, to force the

composition of the Priestly Code into the postexilic period, and at the same time to close one's eyes to the necessary conclusion that if this principle of interpretation is correct, then the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy, the temple and the migration into Canaan must also be post-exilic. "The prophet is not allowed to change the Priestly Code (P)," we are told; but as a matter of fact he has changed P no more than he changed the older laws and history. Hence, the claim is false. And then, too, P is not to be regarded as unchangeable. Even the writer of Chronicles, who writes from the standpoint of the Priestly Code (P), has changed P; for he narrates in 1Ch 23:24,27 that the age of the Levites since the time of David had been reduced from 30 or 25 years (Nu 4:3,13,10,35; 8:23) to 20 years (compare also the participation of the Levites in the burnt sacrifices and the Passover under Hezekiah (2Ch 29:34; 30:17,19)), and in P itself, according to Nu 9:6-12, the observation of the Passover after the regular time was permitted, and in general if such changes and adaptations of the law on the part of Eze could not be demonstrated elsewhere, the difficulties for the advocates of the Wellhausen hypothesis would be exactly as great as they are for the adherents of the Biblical views, only that the problem would be inverted to explain how the author of P could have ventured to deviate so far from the will of God as this had been revealed to Ezekiel.

(c) Impossibility That Ezekiel Preceded P:

While the description of the temple in 40:5 ff and of the future dwelling-places of the people (47:13 ff) is comparatively complete, it is the very legislation of the ritual in 43:13-46:24, in which it is maintained that the authors of P followed the precedent of the prophet, that is in itself so full of omissions in Ezek, that it could not possibly have been a first sketch, but must presuppose the Priestly Code (P), if it is not to be regarded as suspended in the air. Eze presupposes not only burnt offerings, peace offerings and food offerings, but also sin offerings (40:39; 42:13; 43:19,21,22,25; 44:27,29; 46:20). Ezekiel is indeed the first and the only prophet who mentioned sin offerings, just as the guilt offerings are found outside of Eze only in Isa 53:10. But this reference is of such a kind that he presupposes on the part of his readers an acquaintance also with these two kinds of sacrifices; hence, it is, in itself, a natural conclusion, that the sacrificial legislation of the Priestly Code (P), that is, chiefly Le 1 to 7, is older, and as the guilt offerings and the sin offerings are prescribed only by the Priestly Code (P), and in Le 4 f appear to be emphasized anew, this conclusion becomes a necessity.

If this is not the case then Eze is without any foundation. In the same way the injunctions with reference to what is clean and unclean are presupposed as known in 44:23,15 f (compare 22:26). How long the uncleanness described in 22:26 continued can be seen only from Nu 19:11 ff. Since in Eze 22:26 there is presupposed a definitely fixed Torah or Law, which it is possible to violate, then it is only natural to conclude that such commands existed before the days of Ezekiel, especially such as are found in Le 11-15. In the same way the general character of the ordinances (Eze 44:30 a), concerning the tithes due to the cult officials, demand such further developments as are found especially in Nu 18 in P. The high priests, too, although Ezekiel makes no mention of them, belong to the period earlier than Ezekiel, as was proved under (1). If there had been no high priest before the days of Ezekiel, it would have been a perfect mystery, in addition, how he would be found after 520 BC (Hag 1:1; Zec 3:8; 6:10), without a word having been mentioned of the establishment of such an important institution. In addition, if the office had been created just at this time, this would make it very uncomfortable for the contentions of the Wellhausen school, since the other ordinances of P were introduced only in 444 BC, and should here be regarded as innovating.

That Ezekiel presupposed the ordinances of P in reference to the cult officials has been demonstrated under (1). Accordingly, there yet remains to be discussed the universally recognized relationship that exists between Eze and the so-called Law of Holiness (H) in Le 17-26 (compare LEVITICUS), which is so great, that for a time Ezekiel was regarded as the author or the editor of this law, a view which, however, has been dropped, because a number of the peculiarities of Ezekiel do not admit of its acceptance. The more advanced critics then went farther, and claimed that the Law of Holiness (H), Le 17-26 is later than Ezekiel, which is the only possible and defensible position. For practical reasons we here examine, in addition to Eze 40-48, also the older parts of the book. Especially do we take into consideration, in addition to chapter 44, also chapters 18, 20 and 22; but in the end the contents of H are suggested by the entire Book of Ezekiel. Especially Le 26 has been very fully used by Ezekiel; compare for the details, Driver's Introduction to the Old Testament; or, Hoffmann, Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese. That Ezekiel could not be the earlier of the two can be concluded as far as P in general is concerned, and for H in particular, especially from this, that Ezkekiel

is just as closely connected with Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, as with P; while, on the other hand, in the passage in question, P is connected only with Ezekiel, while the expressions which Ezekiel has in common with Deuteronomy and those Ezekiel has in common with Jer are not found in P (compare the exceedingly interesting and instructive proof in Hoffmann, op. cit.). Equally striking is the proof of Kohler, Biblische Geschichte, III, 154 ff, who shows that the contents of the Torah (Law) presupposed and recognized by Jeremiah and Ezekiel as dating from the Mosaic period, take into consideration not only the Books of the Covenant (Ex 21 ff; 34) and Deuteronomy, but especially P in general and H in particular. Further, if we place P in a later period, it would be incomprehensible that this body of laws, in which the systematic feature is so important, can differ from the still more systematic ordinances of Ezekiel, and thus become more unsystematic. Thus the sacrifices on the Passover and the Feast of Tabernacles are in number of the same kind in Eze 45:21 ff; but not so in P in Nu 28:16 ff; 29:12 ff. In the same way in the food offerings on the feasts as far as oxen, rams, lambs, and the amount of oil to be given are concerned, there is everywhere the proper proportion in Eze 45:18-46:15, while in Nu 28 this is regulated according to a different principle. Then in Ezekiel are found in the description of the sanctuary (42:15-20; 45:2), of the inner and outer courts (40:23,17,47; compare also 40:19; 48:16 f), square figures in places where they are not found in the tabernacle according to P. To this must be added that no other ordinances of Ezekiel would be carried out in actual practice. Even the ordinances in 44:4 ff, according to the views of the critics, would be changed in the Priestly Code (P), in so far as the establishment and work of the lower cult officials and the enlargement of the powers of the higher cult officials are concerned (compare (1)). The Day of Atonement, whose roots are said to be found in Eze 45:18 ff, would be materially changed in number, length and ritual (compare ATONEMENT, DAY OF, sec. I, 1 and III, 1). When the Israelites returned from captivity, they did not think at all of building the temple or the tabernacle in accordance with Ezekiel’s scheme, or dividing the land according to the directions of his book (both of these subjects have great prominence in Eze 40-48; compare 40:5-43:12; 47:13-48:29), or of harmonizing Ezekiel with the Priestly Code (P), or of carrying out the latter practically. The Wellhausen hypothesis is then in conflict with all ritual legislation, whether real or constructed by Wellhausen himself.

(d) Correct Interpretation of Passage

Eze 40-48: These chapters dare not be made a part of the development of the law in the Old Testament. Ezekiel’s was not a program that was under all circumstances to be carried out or even could be carried out, for it presupposes conditions that were beyond the control of Israel. For in 40:2 ff, a new geographical or geological situation is presupposed, which the country up to this time did not possess (compare the "very high mountain," 40:2), and the same is true in 47:1 ff in reference to the miraculous temple fountain with its equally miraculous powers, and in 47:13 ff in the division of the land. Only after these changes had been effected in the character of the localities by Yahweh, and Yahweh should again have entered the holy city according to 43:1 if, would it be possible to carry out also the other injunctions. It is impossible, either, to interpret these chapters as an allegory. This interpretation is out of the question on account of a large number of directions and measurements. It is, however, true that the whole is an ideal scheme, which portrays to the eye the continuation of the kingdom of God, and represents symbolically the presence of Yahweh, which sanctifies all around about it and creates for itself a suitable outward form. This is particularly apparent in the new name which is assigned to Jerusalem, namely, "Yahweh at that place," or the conclusion of this section and at the same time of the entire book. This, finally, leads us to a brief account of the views presented.

(3) Ezekiel’s Leviticism.

In (1) and (2) above, it has been shown that Ezekiel was not the starting-point of Leviticism in Israel: it rather represents the extreme development of this tendency. It was in harmony with the elementary stage of the Old Testament to give the thoughts and demands of God, not in a purely abstract form, but to clothem in objective and external materials, in order to prepare and educate Israel to understand Christianity. (The negative side of Leviticism, which is not to be overlooked by the side of the positive, is discussed in the article LEVITICUS) It is a matter of utmost importance for the correct understanding of the Old Testament, that we recognize that the prophets too throughout think Levitically; in their discourses, too, sacred trees, sacrifices, times, persons, tithes, play a most important role, notwithstanding all the spiritualization of religion on their part; and where it is thought possible to show an absolute opposition on the part of the

prophets to the Levitical system, namely, in the matter of sacrifices, a close consideration, but especially, too, the analogy of the other external institutions, shows that we have in these cases only a relative antithesis (compare Are the Critics Right? 99 ff; Messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, 333 ff). Thus e.g. Jeremiah who, in 6:20; 7:21 ff, engages as sharply as possible in polemics against the sacrificial system, and in 31:31 ff, in the passage treating of the new covenant, spiritualizes religion as much as possible, has assigned to sacrifices a place in his predictions of the future (compare 17:19 ff, 26; 31:14; 33:18), just as the abiding-place and the revelation of God for this prophet too, are always found connected with the Holy Land, Jerusalem or Zion (compare 3:17; 12:15; 30:18; 31:6,11,12; 32:36 ff; 33:9). That in this the ultimate development of the kingdom of God has not yet been reached, but that the entire Old Testament contains only a preliminary stage, cannot be too sharply emphasized. In so far Ezekiel, in whose book Leviticism appears in its most developed state, more than others, shares in the limitations of the Old Testament. But just as little can it be denied that the Levitical system was really one stage, and that, too, an important and indispensable stage in the development of the kingdom of God; and that in this system, the question at issue is not only that of a change of a religion into a stereotyped formalism or externalism, which is the case if this system loses its contents, but the fact that it contained a valuable kernel which ripened in this shell, but would not have ripened if this shell had been prematurely discarded. The external conditions, their harmonious arrangement, the ceremonial ordinances, keeping clean from external pollution, are indeed only forms; but in them valuable contents succeed in finding their expression; through these Israel learned to understand these contents. The kernel could not be given without the shell nor the contents without the form, until in Christianity the time came when the form was to be broken and the shell discarded. This significance of the Levitical system becomes more evident in Eze than is the case, e.g. in the Priestly Code (P), where indeed a few passages like Ex 25:8; 29:45 ff; 40:34 ff; Le 16; 19:18; 26:31,41 clearly show in what sense the entire legislation is to be understood; but the mere fact that there are so few of these passages makes it easy to overlook them; while in Ezekiel, in addition to the purely Levitical utterances, and in part more closely connected with these, the entire work is saturated with the emphasis put on the highest religious and ethical thoughts, so that both must be in the closest harmony with each other (compare on this subject also Ezekiel's conception of God under 5 below). That Ezekiel and the Law of Holiness stand in such close relations to each other is not to be explained from this, that Ezekiel is in any way to be connected with the composition of the law in Le 17-26, but on the ground of the tendency common to both. The fact that Ezekiel shows a special liking for these chapters in P does not, accordingly, justify the conclusion that Le 17 ff ever existed as a separate legal codex. We must in this connection not forget the close connection of the prophets with the rest of P mentioned under (2) above (compare LEVITICUS). We close this part of the discussion with the statement that Ezekiel constructed his system on the basis of the Levitical ordinance, but as priest-prophet (compare under I, 1) utilized this material independently and freely.

3. Ezekiel and the Messianic Idea:

Chs 40-48 treat of the future, and furnish us the transition to another matter, in which Ezekiel by modern theology has been forced into a wrong light, namely, in regard to the Messianic idea. After the critics had, as a matter of fact, eliminated from the entire preexilic prophetical writings nearly all of the passages speaking of the Messiah on the ground that they were not genuine (e.g. Am 9:8 ff; Ho 1:10,11; 3:5; Mic 2:12 f; 4 f; Isa 4:2-6; 7:14; 9:1-7; 11:1-10, etc.), Marti and Volz have now completed this task. While the former declared as not genuine all the Messianic predictions down to Deutero-Isaiah, the latter has, in his work, Die vorexilische Jahwe-Prophetic und der Messias, halted at Ezekiel, but for this works up the entire material into a uniform fundamental conception with pronounced characteristics. He declares that prophecy and the Messianic idea are two mutually exclusive phenomena, by regarding the Messiah as a purely political and national fact, but the prophetic expectation of the future as something purely religious. Ezekiel he regards as the first prophet with whose views on other matters the Messianic idea indeed did not harmonize, but who, nevertheless, yielded to the tendencies of his times and to the general national feelings, and submitted to the influence of the false prophets, who had created the carnal national expectation of a Messiah and constantly fed this, and accordingly received into his book the Messiah passages in 17:22-24; 21:25 f; 34:23 f; 37:22,24,25. But this too is, all in all, simply a monstrous assumption. It is exegetically incorrect to regard the Messiah merely as a political, national and particularistic person, whenever the religious and ethical and universalistic characteristics of the Messiah are portrayed by prophecy; and it is also incorrect to regard prophecy as abstractly religious, when the national and external side of the kingdom of God is ignored. It is impossible to eliminate the different Messianic passages preceding the time of Ezekiel, as these are proved to be genuine by their contents and form, their close connection with the context, the structure of the prophetic writings, and by the mutual relation of these passages

to each other. But we must here refer to our book, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten. We draw attention to this only because since the publication of Gressmann's book, Der Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie, the critics have begun to be a little less skeptical in reference to the genuine character of the Messianic passages in the older prophetical writings. We here point to the fact, that the positive contentions of Volz, which ascribe to Eze the introduction of the Messianic idea out of the popular faith, are exceedingly inconsiderate. The different passages mentioned above, which in Ezekiel speak of the Messiah, can scarcely be said to add any new features to the picture of the Messiah as it is found in earlier literature (of one exception to this we will speak later). If the Messiah was not yet portrayed in the earlier prophetic literature, then Ezekiel had the less occasion to introduce this new feature, if this feature did not harmonize with his other views, as Volz claims. And, if this is only a mistake, it is yet a fact that in Ezekiel the Messianic idea is not relatively a prominent feature; he, as it were, only recalls the pictures known from the predictions of the earlier prophets; he accepts these pictures as revealed truth, because they, in his conviction, evidently originated in the development of prophecy. Compare for the idea that the Messiah is to come forth from small origins and from a lowly station Eze 17:22-24; Isa 10:33,14; 11:1; Mic 5:1 ff. Eze 21:32 only hints at the general expectation of a Messiah; Eze 34:23 f; 37:22,24,25 connect especially with the promises given to David in 2Sa 7. Then the reunion of the two kingdoms into one scepter is found also in Am 9:11; Ho 2:2; 3:5; Isa 8:23-9:1; Mic 5:2; Jer 3:18; 23:5 f; 1Ki 11:39; the blessing of Nature, Isa 11:6-8; Am 9:13 ff; Ho 2:20 ff; 14:6 ff. At all events the Messianic expectations of Ezekiel exhibit too few peculiar features and are too little prominent in the body of his prophecies to justify the belief that he was the first prophet to have introduced this so important Messianic figure. On the other hand, let us remember too that Ezekiel opposes the national feelings as sharply as possible by representing the entire past history of Israel as an unbroken chain of heathenish abominations (Eze 1-24; 33, especially 16 and 23), and remember it was just he who like Jeremiah saw his most bitter opponents in the false prophets (Eze 13:1 ff; 14:9; 22:28), and that in the most pronounced antithesis to these he proclaimed before the fall of Jerusalem that this fall would and must come. And now it is claimed that he borrowed his Messianic idea from these very people, although this Messianic conception is everywhere represented as being a Divine revelation and not a natural product of the popular consciousness. A greater blunder in theological thought could scarcely be imagined.

In one point, however, we do find in Eze a further development of the Messianic idea, namely, that in His work, in addition to His characteristics as a king, the Messiah has also those of a high priest, as this is shown at the same period by Jeremiah (see under I, 1, and 2, 3; compare later Zec 3 f, and possibly 6:9 ff). The mitsnepheth, which the Messiah bears according to Eze 21:26, is in other connections always the mitre of the high priest (compare Ex 29:6; 39:28,31; see above II, 2, 1a and 2c). At the Passover feast, at least, the prince conducts a purification through a bullock for a sin offering, which, through the fact that this is done for himself and for the entire people of the land, reminds us of the ceremony of the high priest on the day of atonement (Eze 45:22; Le 16:17,24,33; compare DAY OF ATONEMENT, I, 1, and Messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, 356 ff). Over against the current view, we finally emphasize the fact that Ezekiel's expectations of a Messianic feature are not confined to Israel, but like those of Isaiah (2:2 ff; 11:10: Mic 5:3,1) and of other prophets are universal in their scope (compare Eze 17:23; 16:53,11; 34:26).

4. Ezekiel and Apocalyptic Literature:

Ezekiel is also, finally, regarded as the creator of apocalyptic literature, which in prophetic garment sought to satisfy the curiosity of the people and picture the details of the last times. In this connection the critics have in mind especially Eze 38; 39, that magnificent picture of the final onslaught of the nations under Gog and Magog, which will end with the certain victory of the Divine cause and the terrible overthrow of the enemies of Yahweh. On the mountains of Israel the hosts will fall (39:4); seven years it will be possible to kindle fires with the weapons of the enemies (39:9); it takes seven months to bury the dead (39:12); a great feast is prepared for the birds (39:17 ff).

In reply to this there are two things to be said. First of all Ezekiel is not the creator of these thoughts. There is a whole list of passages in the Prophets that already before his time picture how matters will be after and beyond the Messianic age (compare Mic 2:12 b f; 4:11 f; 5:4 f, 7,20; Joe 3:2,12 f; Isa 11:4; 28:6; Ho 2:2). These are, however, all regarded by the critics as not genuine, or as the product of a later period, but they forget in this to observe that Ezekiel in these passages refers to older prophets (38:17; 39:8), and thus they saw off the branch upon which he sits. In regard, however, to painting

the fullest details of the picture, Ezekiel is equaled by none of his predecessors. In this matter, too, he represents the highest point of development, in which he is followed by Zec 12; 13:7 ff; 14:1 ff, and Daniel, and with direct dependence on Eze 38 f by the Apocalypse of John (Re 19:17). On the other hand, Ezekiel is entirely different from the later Jewish apocalyptic literature. The latter borrowed the prophetic form but possesses neither the Divine contents nor the Divine inspiration of the prophet. For this reason the apocalyptic literature appears anonymously or under a pseudonym. Ezekiel, however, openly places his name over his prophecies. In Ezekiel the eschatology is a part of his prophetic mission, and as he in his thoughts throughout remains within the bounds of the religious and ethical ideals of prophecy, this feature, too, of his work is to be regarded as a Divine revelation in a form in harmony with the Old Testament stage of the development of the kingdom of God. We are here indeed considering a matter in connection with which it is especially difficult to determine how much in reality belongs to the eternally valid contents, and how much to the temporary forms. Here too, as is the case in the exegesis of Eze 40-48, Christian theology will vacillate between the extremes of spiritualism and realism, one extreme constantly correcting the other, and in this way constantly approaching the correct middle course, until at some time in the future we will reach the full truth in the matter.

5. Ezekiel’s Conception of God:

A prophet who, from the aesthetic side, enjoyed the highest appreciation of a Schiller and a Herder (see 1 above), who has brought the Leviticism of the Old Testament to the highest stage of development (compare 2 above), who in his portrait of the Messiah has introduced the high-priestly characteristics (compare 3 above), who in eschatology developed new features and laid the foundation for the development that followed in later times (compare 4 above), can scarcely with any right or reason be termed a "secondary character among the prophets." This fact becomes all the more sure when we now finally examine the conception of God as taught in Ezk. In grandeur and variety of thought, in this respect only, Isaiah and Moses can be compared with Ezekiel. Already in the visions, we are struck by the sublimity of God as there pictured, especially in the opening vision, where He appears as the absolute ruler of all creation, over which He sits enthroned (compare II, 1, above). He is constantly called "the Lord Yahweh," over against whom the prophet is at all times only "the son of man." More than fifty times it is said that the purpose of the prophecy was that the heathen nations, as well as the Israelites, shall by His judgments and His promises recognize that He is Yahweh.

On this side Ezekiel stands in an especially close relation to the description of the exodus from Egypt (compare Ex 7:5,17; 8:10,22; 9:14,29,30; 10:2; 11:7; 14:4,18, and see EXODUS, II, 2, on 7:8-13:16). Above everything Yahweh’s honor must be defended (Eze 36:23,12). Here again there is a place where the evolutionist hypothesis of the development of the idea of God is thoroughly put to shame. For in the preprophetic times it is claimed that God is, in the Old Testament, merely placed by the side of other gods and was regarded only as the God of Israel, with which He was indissolubly connected, because His existence had depended on the existence of the nation. As a proof, reference is made to the defense of His honor; and now we find the same thought in Ezekiel, in whose case it is impossible that any doubt as to his absolute monotheism can any longer arise (compare my Entwicklung der Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit, 138 ff 152 ff). The sublimity of this conception of God also appears in its universality. He is declared to be punishing the nations (compare Eze 25 ff; 35 f); He uses them for His purposes (compare Eze 38 f; 17; 19; 24; 33); He intends to give them salvation (Eze 17; 23; 16:53,11; 34:26; compare 3 above).

Most of all, Ezekiel’s conception of God, according to the preceding sketch, reminds us of that of Calvin. By the exalted character of God we find also a second feature. On the one side we find the holy God; on the other, sinful man. The entire development of the people is from the beginning a wrong one. Ezekiel’s thoughts are to be regarded as those for days of penance when he, on the one hand, emphasizes the great guilt of the people as such (compare Eze 16 and 23), and by the side of this maintains the principle that each one must be punished on account of his own sins (Eze 18:2), so that the individual cannot excuse himself, and the individual cannot be freed through the guilt of the people as a totality. But now comes the highest conception. The exalted and holy God comes to be a God of love. What is it but love, that He does not reject His people forever, but promises them a future (compare Eze 34-48, in which also the divided kingdoms are to be reunited, 37:15 ff)? As Exodus finds its culmination point in the indwelling of God among His people, which He promised in Ex 25 ff (25:8; 29:45 f), but seems to have become a matter of doubt again in Ex 32 ff through the apostasy of the

people, and nevertheless is finally realized in Ex 35 ff (40:34 ff), thus too in Eze 10 f, Yahweh leaves the city, but in 43:1 ff He again returns, and now the name of the city is "Yahweh is there" (48:35). But as every single member participates in the sin and the punishment of the people, so too he takes part in the deliverance. Ezekiel is indeed, as little as is Jeremiah, the creator of individualism, which he has often been declared to be. Against this claim, e.g. the character of the patriarchs can be appealed to. But a deeper conception of individualism has actually been brought about by Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The national organization as such was for the present dissolved. Accordingly, these prophets have now to deal more with the individual (compare 1, 2, 3, above). Ezekiel is actually the pastor of those in exile. He has been appointed the watchman of the house of Israel (3:16 ff and 33:1 ff). He can bear the responsibility for the individual souls (compare also Eze 18). The wicked man who dies without having been warned is demanded from his hand by God. Yahweh does not wish the death of the sinner, but that he should repent and live. Here such a clear mirror is given, that before it conscientious Christian preachers must all feel ashamed. Yahweh is the gracious God, who does not treat men simply according to the principle of retaliation, else what would become of man? God rather desires to bestow all things out of free grace; he that repents shall live. This is the highest ideal of the prophet, and with it we close.

The Feast of Weeks, the Pentecost of the Israelites, Ezekiel does not mention (compare II, 2, 2b, above). This festival has come to be one of higher importance since on Pentecost the Holy Spirit was poured out, and this Spirit Ezekiel knows. Besides, such passages as Jer 32:15; 44:1-6; Ps 51:12 ff; Joe 2:28 ff; Jer 31:31 ff, it is Ezekiel which contains the clearest predictions of Pentecost. It is the Spirit who in Eze 37 awakens to new life the dead bones of Israel.

And in Eze 36:25-28 we read: "And I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep mine ordinances, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God."

LITERATURE.

Comm. of Keil, Havernick, Hengstenberg, von Orelli, Smend, Bertholet, Kraetzschmar. For the Messianic Prophecies, the works of von Orelli, Riehm, Delitzsch, Hengstenberg. Compare also Volz, Die vorexilische Jahwe-Prophetie und der Messias; Moller, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, zugleich ein Protest gegen moderne Textzersplitterung; Cornill, The Prophet Ezekiel; Klostermann, Studien und Kritken, 1877. Introductions of Kuenen, Strack, Baudissin, Konig, Cornill, Driver. Histories of Israel, by Kohler, Konig, Kittel, Klostermann, Oettli, Stade, Wellhausen. Bible Lexicons, see under "Ezekiel."

Against the Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis, Moller, Are the Critics Right? In this Encyclopedia, for further literature compare also the article LEVITICUS: Orr, Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament; Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, and The Origin of the Pentateuch; Hoffmann, Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese; Kegel, Wilhelm Vatke u. die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese; Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden; Seinecke, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, II.

Wilhelm Moller

EZEL

e’-zel (ha-’azel; Septuagint para to ergab ekeino):

As it stands, the narrative in 1Sa 20:19 records the tryst of Jonathan with David at the stone Ezel. The name occurs only here. There is general agreement that the text is corrupt, but there is no agreement as to how it should be restored. The Septuagint reads "this mound" (the Revised Version (British and American), margin), or "yonder cairn"; and in 1Sa 20:41 instead of "out of a place toward the South" it reads "from beside the mound" or "cairn." Dr. Cheyne suggests "yonder

juniper tree" (Encyclopaedia Biblica, under the word).

EZEM

e’-zem (‘etsem, "bone"; Boosal, Boasom):

A city in the extreme South of Judah, assigned to Simeon.

Some identify it with Azmon (Jos 15:29; 19:3; 1Ch 4:29).

EZER

e’-zer (‘ezer, "help"):

(1) A Horite chief (Ge 36:21; 1Ch 1:38).

(2) A Judahite (1Ch 4:4).

(3) An Ephraimite, slain by men of Gath (1Ch 7:21).

(4) A Gadite who followed David while in exile on account of the wrath of Saul (1Ch 12:9).

(5) One of those who under direction of Nehemiah repaired the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:19).

(6) A musician in one of the great companies appointed by Nehemiah to give thanks at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:42).

EZERIAS

ez-e-ri’-as (Ezerias):

APC 1Esdras 8:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Zechrias," the Azariah of Ezr 7:1.

EZIAS

e-zi’-as:

the Revised Version (British and American)

OZIAS (which see).

EZION-GEBER

e-zi-on-ge’-ber (’etsyon gebher; Gasion Gaber):

Always mentioned along with Elath ("Eziongaber," Nu 33:35 f the King James Version). When the children of Israel left "the way of the Arabah," having come from the Northwest, they seem to have turned to the Northeast from the

neighborhood of ‘Aqaba, passing up by Wady el-Ithm toward the eastern desert (De 2:8). Elath and Ezion-geber were evidently not far apart. They are named together again in connection with the maritime enterprises of Solomon and Jehoshaphat (1Ki 9:26, etc.). They therefore both lay on the shore of the sea. No trace of Ezion-geber is to be found on the present coast line. It is probable, however, that in ancient times the sea covered a considerable stretch of the mud flats at the South end of Wady el-‘Arabah, and the site of Ezion-geber may be sought near the spring ‘Ain el-Ghudyan, about 15 miles North of the present head of the Gulf of ‘Aqaba.

W. Ewing

EZNITE

ez-’nit (‘etsni or ‘etsno).

See ADINO.

EZORA

e-zo’-ra (Ezora, the King James Version Ozora):

He and his six sons "gave their hands to put away their strange wives" (APC 1Esdras 9:20,34 =" Machnadebai" of Ezr 10:40).

EZRA

ez’-ra (Aramaic or Chaldee, ‘ezra’," help"; a hypocoristicon, or shortened form of Azariah, "Yahweh has helped." The Hebrew spells the name ‘ezrah, as in 1Ch 4:17, or uses the Aramaic spelling of the name, as in Ezr 7:1. The Greek form is Esdras):

(1) A priest who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ne 12:1). In Ne 10:2, Azariah, the full form of the name, is found.

(2) A descendant of Judah and father of Jethro and other sons (1Ch 4:17).

(3) The distinguished priest who is the hero of the Book of Ezra and co-worker with Nehemiah.

1. Family:

The genealogy of Ezra is given in Ezr 7:1-6, where it appears that he was the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah, the son of Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, the son of Ahitub, the son of Amariah, the son of Azariah, the son of Meraioth, the son of Zerahiah, the son of Uzzi, the son of Bukki, the son of Abishua, the son of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron, the high priest. Since Seraiah, according to the Book of Kings, was killed by Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah (2Ki 25:18-21), and since he was the father of Jehozadak, the high priest who was carried into captivity by Nebuchadrezzar (1Ch 6:14,15, Heb 5:14), etc. in 588 BC, and since the return under Ezra took place in 458 BC, the word "son" must be used in Ezr 7:2 in the sense of descendant. Since, moreover, Joshua, or Jeshua, the high priest, who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel, was the son of Jehozadak and the grandson of Seraiah, Ezra was probably the great-grandson or great-great-grandson of Seraiah. Inasmuch as Jehozadak is never mentioned as one of his forefathers, Ezra was probably not descended from Jehozadak, but from a younger brother. He would thus not be a high priest, though he was of high-priestly descent as far as Seraiah. For the sake of shortening the list of names, six names are omitted in Ezr 7:2-7 between Azariah and Meraioth, and one between Shallum and Ahitub from the corresponding list found in 1Ch 6:4-14 (Hebrew 5:30-40).

Being a priest by birth, it is to be supposed that Ezra would have performed the ordinary functions of a member of his order, if he had been born and had lived in Palestine.

2. Occupation:

Jos, indeed, says that he was high priest of his brethren in Babylon, a statement that in view of the revelation of the Elephantine papyri may not be without a foundation in fact. According to the Scriptures and Jewish tradition, however, Ezra was pre-eminently a scribe, and especially a scribe of the law of Moses. He is called "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," a "scribe of the words of the commandments of Yahweh, and of his statutes to Israel," "the scribe of the law of the God of heaven." As early as the time of Jeremiah (compare Jer 8:8), "scribe" had already attained the meaning of one learned in the Scriptures, one who had made the written law a subject of investigation. Ezra is the first who is called by the title of "the scribe," the title by which Artaxerxes designates him in his letter of instructions in Ezr 7:6,11.

3. His Commission:

In the 7th year of Artaxerxes I (459-458 BC) Ezra requested permission of the king to go up to Jerusalem; for "Ezra had set his heart to seek the law of Yahweh, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and ordinances." Artaxerxes granted his request, and gave him a letter permitting as many of the people of Israel and of the priests and Levites as so desired to accompany him to Jerusalem, and commissioning him to inquire concerning Judah and Jerusalem, and to carry a gift of money from the king and his counselors, and all the money to be found in the province of Babylon, and the freewill offerings of the people and priests, with which to buy offerings to offer upon the altar of the house of God which was in Jerusalem. He was commissioned also to carry vessels for the service of the house of God, and to do at the expense of the royal treasury whatever was needful for the house of God. The king decreed, moreover, that the treasurers of the king should assist Ezra with a tribute of wheat, wine, oil and salt, and that they should impose no tribute, custom or toll upon any of those employed in the service of the house of God. Moreover, Ezra was authorized to appoint judges to judge the people according to the law of God and the law of the king, and to inflict punishments upon all who would not obey these laws. Ascribing this marvelous letter of the king to the lovingkindness of his God, and strengthened by this evidence of God’s power, Ezra proceeded to gather together out of Israel the chief men and teachers and ministers of the house to go up with him to Jerusalem. He gathered these men in camp at Casiphia, on the river Ahava. Here he proclaimed a time of fasting and prayer, that God might prosper their journey (Ezr 8:15-23). Then, having delivered the treasures into the hands of the priests, the assembled company departed for Jerusalem, where by the help of God they arrived in safety, delivered over the money and gifts by number and weight, offered burnt offerings and sin offerings, delivered the king’s commissions and furthered the people and the house of God.

Shortly after Ezra’s arrival at Jerusalem, the princes accused the people, the priests, and the Levites of having intermarried with the peoples of the land, even asserting that the princes and rulers had been leaders in the trespass. Upon hearing this, Ezra was confounded, rent his garments, plucked off his hair, fell upon his knees and prayed a prayer of confession, weeping and casting himself down before the house of God. While he prayed the people assembled and wept, acknowledged their sin and promised to do according to the law. The whole people were then assembled in counsel, and in spite of some opposition the strange wives were put away.

In Ne 8, Ezra appears again upon the scene at the Feast of Tabernacles as the chief scribe of the law of Moses, the leader of the priests and Levites who read and explained the law to the people. On his advice the people ceased from their mourning and celebrated the festival according to the law of Moses with joy and thanksgiving and giving of gifts, dwelling also in booths in commemoration of the manner of their fathers’ sojourning while in the wilderness.

4. Traditions:

The traditions with regard to Ezra found in Josephus and in the Talmud are so discrepant that it is impossible to place

reliance upon any of their statements which are not found also in the. canonical Scriptures.

R. Dick Wilson

EZRA-NEHEMIAH

Contents

1. Name. 2. Object 3. Plan 4. Unity 5. Sources 6. Literary Character 7. Languages 8. Historicity 9. Text

LITERATURE

==========

1. Name:

The books of Ezra and Nehemiah, by whomsoever written, are properly so named according to analogy from the principal persons mentioned in them. In the Hebrew Bibles, the former is headed simply, Ezra, and the latter, Nehemiah. The two books are counted in the Talmud, in Josephus, and in the Canon of Melito, 171 AD, as one, and are so treated also in the subscription of the Massoretic Text, which reads: "The totality of the verses of Ezra and Nehemiah is 688, and its sign is ‘Remember, Yahweh, the reproach of thy servants,’ and its two parts (are at the sentence) ‘unto the ascent of the corner’ (Ne 3:31) and its chapters (sedharayw) are ten, and its sign is ‘Upon a high mountain get thee up, O thou that announcest good tidings to Zion.’ " In the Septuagint, Ezra-Nehemiah is called Esdras B, while an apocryphal Book of Ezra is called Esdras A (see below). In the catalogues of the Old Testament writings handed down to us by the Fathers (Origen, Cyril, Melito, Jerome and the Council of Laodicea) our Ezra is called 1 Ezra; Nehemiah, 2 Ezra; the apocryphal Greek Ezra, 3 Ezra; and an apocalyptic book, falsely called a book of Ezra, is denominated 4 Ezra.

2. Object:

The object of the books is to show that God fulfilled His promise, or prophecy, to restore His exiled people to their inheritance, through the instrumentality on the one hand of the great heathen monarchs, Cyrus, Darius and Artaxerxes, and on the other hand by stirring up the spirit of such great men among the chosen people as Joshua and Zerubbabel, Haggai and Zechariah, and Ezra and Nehemiah, through whom the altar, the temple, the houses and walls of Jerusalem, and finally the worship and ceremony of the Jewish people were reestablished, the people being separated from foreign admixtures, customs and idolatry, and their religious observances purified and fixed for all time.

3. Plan:

The object of the work justifies the selection and arrangement of the material and the plan pursued by the composer, or composers; all matter being stringently excluded which does not bear directly upon the purpose in view. However much we may wish that other historical records had been included, it is not proper to criticize the work because of these omissions, nor is it fair to argue that the writer was ignorant of what he has not seen fit to record.

4. Unity:

The unity of the combined work is shown by the fact that they have the same common object, the same plan, and a similarity of language and style; that they treat, for the most part, of the same period of time; and that Ezra is one of the most prominent persons in both. It is not fair to deny the essential unity on the ground that the list of priests and others found in Ezr 2 is repeated in Ne 7; for there is no doubt that Ezra was the compiler of parts at least of the book called after

him, and that Nehemiah also was the original writer of parts of the book that bears his name. Whoever was the final editor of the whole work, he has simply retained the two almost identical lists in their appropriate places in the documents which lay before him.

5. Sources:

The Books of Ezr and Ne are a compilation of genealogical lists, letters and edicts, memoirs and chronicles. We cannot be certain as to who was the composer of either or both books. Many think that Ezra compiled both the books out of preexisting materials, adding parts of his own composition. Others, suppose that Ezra wrote the book named after him, while Nehemiah composed the Book of Nehemiah. Others, again, are of the opinion that neither Ezra nor Nehemiah, but some other unknown editor, most probably the compiler of the Books of Chronicles, put together the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, using largely the memoirs of the two great men who are the principal persons in the records. While there is still much difference of opinion as to who was the final redactor, there is a general agreement as to the composite character of the whole, and that the person who wrote the parts that bind together the original sources was the same as he who wrote the canonical books of Chronicles.

6. Literary Character:

The diversified character of the style, languages and other literary peculiarities of the books is accounted for by the large number and the variety of sources. From the style and contents of the first chapter it has been argued with great plausibility that it was written by Daniel; for similar reasons it has been argued that the portion of Ezra from 3:2 to 4:22 inclusive was written by Haggai the prophet. All admit that the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah in which the 1st person is employed were written by Ezra and Nehemiah respectively. As to who it was who added the other connecting portions there is and must always be great doubt arising from the fact that the author is not mentioned. The style points to the same hand as that which composed the Book of Chronicles. Those who believe that Ezra compiled the Book of Chronicles will believe that he most probably composed also the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. The principal objection to his authorship arises from the inexplicable change from the 1st to the 3rd person occurring in both Ezr and Neh. Inasmuch as the 3rd person is the proper form to use in the best style of Biblical historical composition; inasmuch as Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon often employ it in their histories; inasmuch as some of the Bah monuments mingle the 1st and 3rd persons in the same document; and finally, inasmuch as the prophets and psalmists of Israel likewise interchange the persons in what is for us often an unaccountable manner: this characteristic of the style of Ezra-Nehemiah seems an insufficient reason upon which to base the denial of the claim that Ezra may have been the author.

The facts that there is unevenness in the treatment of the history, and that there are long periods on which the narrator is silent, do not militate against the authorship of Ezra nor do they imply a date long after his age; for the author is perfectly consistent in his purpose to stick to the object and plan which he had in view for himself, that is, to give an account of the reestablishment of the Israelite people and of their Divinely given institutions. That he has omitted other matters-does not imply that he was ignorant of them.

7. Languages:

The language of the books is Hebrew, except Ezr 4:7-6:18 and 7:12-26, which is written in Aramaic. The Hebrew closely resembles that of Daniel, Haggai and Chronicles, much more so than it does that of Ecclesiasticus, which was written probably about 180 BC. The Aramaic (formerly called Chaldee) is very much like that of the Egyptian papyri which are dated in the 5th century BC. It closely resembles also the Aramaic in Daniel.

8. Historicity:

Neither language nor style can be assigned as a ground for asserting a date later than the 5th century BC as the time of the composition of the book. A much stronger reason against placing the final redaction of the books at so early a time is the

mention of a Jaddua among the high priests in Ne 12:11,22, it being assumed that this is the same Jaddua whom Josephus mentions (Ant., XI, viii, 4) as having filled the high-priestly office in the time of Alexander the Great. In view of the fact that Josephus is the only source of information as to the period between 400 and 300 BC, it seems unfair to accept what he says as to the existence of this Jaddua, while rejecting substantially all the rest of the same chapter in Josephus which tells about Sanballat, Manasseh and Alexander's meeting with Jaddua. Inasmuch as the Sachau papyri, written in the 17th year of Darius Nothus, that is, in 410-408 BC, mention the sons of Sanballat the governor of Samaria, the Sanballat who was their father must have lived about 450 BC. The same papyrus mentions Jehohanan (Johnnan of Ne 12:22) as the high priest of the temple at Jerusalem, and Bagohi (Bagoas) was the Persian governor of Jerusalem in 410-408 BC. Since, according to Ne 13:6, Nehemiah was governor in 434-433 BC, the 32nd year of Artaxerxes, Bagoas would be perhaps his immediate successor. If we are to put any confidence in the story of Josephus, then there must have been at least two Sanballats, and probably two Jadduas, and at two different times a son of a high priest must have married a daughter of a Sanballat. While this is not impossible, it seems better to suppose that Josephus has confused matters beyond any possibility of disentanglement, and we might be justified in throwing over entirely his account of a Sanballat, a Manasseh, and a Jaddua as living in the year 330 BC, when Alexander conquered Syria. As far, of course, as the Jaddua of Ne 12:11,22 is concerned, he may well have been high priest as early as 406 BC, and have continued to serve till 330 BC. On the other hand, another of the same name, probably a grandson, may, for all we know to the contrary, have been high priest in 330 BC. In view of the numerous Oniases, Simons, and Johns who served in that position between 600 and 150 BC, and in view, further, of our almost absolute lack of information as to the history of this period, it will be a bold man who will dare to deny, on the ground of the Jaddua of Josephus, that Ezra-Nehemiah might have been written as early as 4OO BC.

The objection against the books having been composed in the Persian period, based upon the use of the titles of the kings of Persia, is fully answered by the fact that the same titles as those used in these books are found to have been used by the Persian kings themselves. (See the articles of the present writer in the Presbyterian Reformed Review for 1905-6.) The "Darius the Persian" of Ne 12:22 is shown by the Sachau papyri to have been Darius Notbus, as Keil long ago suggested. The author may have called him "the Persian" to distinguish him from Darius the Mede. At any rate, it is best for us to remember that our inability to explain why the author called him by this title does not prove that he did not do so. Of all the Dariuses known to history, any one might have been called "the Persian," except Darius the Mede, because all but he were Persians. The assertion that a king of Persia could only have been called a Persian "after the Persian period was past" involves, on the one hand, the assumption of such thorough knowledge of the possibilities of the usus loquendi of that time, and, on the other hand, such real ignorance of the usage of all times in such matters, as well as of the usage of the Persian and Babylonian monuments of the Persian era, as almost to cause one to believe that it can scarcely have been seriously made. (See the writer's articles cited above.) Josephus, it is true, apparently confuses in his account Darius II and Darius III.

The phrase "the days of Nehemiah" (Ne 12:26) certainly implied that the final redactor "looked back upon them as past." But there is no intimation as to how long they were past. According to Ne 5:14, Nehemiah returned to Babylon in the 32nd year of Artaxerxes, that is, in 434 BC. As Bagoas was already governor of Jerusalem, and Johnnan high priest in 408 BC, a writer living about 400 BC can very well have referred to what happened "in the days of Joiakim .... and in the days of Nehemiah the governor, and of Ezra the priest and the scribe" as having occurred "in the days of Zerubbabel, and in the days of Nehemiah" (Ne 12:47). From all we know it appears that these were the only Jews who were ever governors of Jerusalem under the Persian domination. Certainly Bagoas is not a Hebrew name any more than Sanballat, and it looks as if on the death of Nehemiah his place as governor of Jerusalem had been filled by a native Persian just as the governorship of Samaria was held by Sanballat, a Cuthean. If we can trust Josephus, Bagoas treated the Jews with harshness and even desecrated the temple itself (Ant., XI, vii, 1). Already, then, in 405 BC, any patriotic and pious Israelite may have justly looked back upon the days of their native governors with longing and pride, and have written with appropriate eulogy of the days of Zerubbabel, Nehemiah and Ezra—the time of his people's semi-independence and of the glorious and unforgetable restoration of the temple and city, just as we today refer to the time of Bismarck, Victoria, or Lincoln (compare 1Ch 13:3). Waiving the discussion of the probability of Ezra's having called himself "a ready scribe in the law of Moses," and one who had prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, etc., it certainly cannot be denied that someone writing in 405 BC may have employed the language here used. There is not the slightest proof that any of Ezra- Nehemiah is unhistorical, nor the least indication that all of it may not have been written as early as 405 BC. The section Ezr 4:1-6

presents difficulties of date and composition. The section may have been misplaced. It may be episodical. It may be explained, as suggested by Klostermann, as having been inserted here as a sort of resume which is later expanded. But however explained, it is a literary rather than a historical or linguistic problem which it presents, and may safely be left for solution to those who think that everything in literature whose purpose or meaning they cannot perceive is therefore inexplicable.

In conclusion, we Would say in the words of Professor Cornill, that since Ed. Meyer's demonstration of the authenticity of the documents in Ezr 4-7, the hypercritical reconstruction of the books "has lost all claim to serious consideration, and we may rest assured that in Ezra-Nehemiah we have every reason to recognize an essentially trustworthy recital of the events narrated therein."

9. Text:

The most thorough investigation of the text of Ezra-Nehemiah has been made by Professor A. Klostermann, his results being published in the 3rd German edition of RE. After an examination of the Arabic, Syriac, Greek and Latin versions and a comparison of them with the Hebrew Massoretic Text, he comes to the conclusion that our Hebrew text as a whole is of more value than that represented by the versions. The writer of this article has noted a wonderful accuracy in the transmission of the Aramaic part of Ezra, the spelling or writing of the words resembling in many of the smallest particulars that of the Aramaic papyri of Elephantine, which date from the 5th century BC.

LITERATURE.

Commentaries and Introductions: A, Introductions: Sayce, Introduction to Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther; Angus-Suen, The Cyclopedic Hand-Book to the Bible; Rarnu, Introduction to the Old Testament; Keil, Old Testament Intro. B, Commentaries: Keil, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther; Rawlinson, in the Speaker's Comm., and in the Pulpit Commentary; and in Ezra and Nehemiah ("Men of the Bible" series); Lange's Comm.; Meyer, Entstehung des Judenthums; OTJC2; RE2.

R. Dick Wilson

EZRAHITE

ez'-ra-hit ('ezrachi; Asebon):

Found in 1Ki 4:31; Psalm 88; Psalm 89, titles; from which it appears that the word is a patronymic for Ethan and Heman. It may be derived from Zerah, instead of Ezrah, seeing that there were an Ethan and a Heman who were descendants of Zerah, head of a Judahite family (1Ch 2:6).

There were also an Ethan and a Heman who were Levites (1Ch 15:17).

EZRI

ez'-ri ('ezri, "my help"; Ezrai, or Ezdri):

"Ezri, the son of Chelub," appointed by David to be superintendent of agriculture (1Ch 27:26).

EZRIL

ez'-ril (Ezril, the King James Version Esril):

One who had married a foreign wife (APC 1Esdras 9:34); called Azarel in Ezr 10:41.

FABLE

fa’-b’-l (muthos):

(1) Primitive man conceives of the objects around him as possessing his own characteristics. Consequently in his stories, beasts, trees, rocks, etc., think, talk and act exactly as if they were human beings. Of course, but little advance in knowledge was needed to put an end to this mode of thought, but the form of story-telling developed by it persisted and is found in the folk-tales of all nations. More particularly, the archaic form of story was used for the purpose of moral instruction, and when so used is termed the fable. Modern definitions distinguish it from the parable

(a) by its use of characters of lower intelligence than man (although reasoning and speaking like men), and

(b) by its lesson for this life only. But, while these distinctions serve some practical purpose in distinguishing (say) the fables of Aesop from the parables of Christ, they are of little value to the student of folk-lore. For fable, parable, allegory, etc., are all evolutions from a common stock, and they tend to blend with each other.

See ALLEGORY; PARABLE.

(2) The Semitic mind is peculiarly prone to allegorical expression, and a modern Arabian storyteller will invent a fable or a parable as readily as he will talk. And we may be entirely certain that the very scanty appearance of fables in the Old Testament is due only to the character of its material and not at all to an absence of fables from the mouths of the Jews of old. Only two examples have reached us. In Jud 9:7-15 Jotham mocks the choice of AbimeItch as king with the fable of the trees that could find no tree that would accept the trouble of the kingship except the worthless bramble. And in 2Ki 14:9 Jehoash ridicules the pretensions of Amaziah with the story of the thistle that wished to make a royal alliance with the cedar. Yet that the distinction between fable and allegory, etc., is artificial is seen in Isa 5:1,2, where the vineyard is assumed to possess a deliberate will to be perverse.

(3) In the New Testament, "fable" is found in 1Ti 1:4; 4:7; 2Ti 4:4; Tit 1:14; 2Pe 1:16, as the translation of muthos ("myth"). The sense here differs entirely from that discussed above, and "fable" means a (religious) story that has no connection with reality—contrasted with the knowledge of an eyewitness in 2Pe 1:16. The exact nature of these "fables" is of course something out of our knowledge, but the mention in connection with them of "endless genealogies" in 1Ti 1:4 points with high probability to some form of Gnostic speculation that interposed a chain of eons between God and the world. In some of the Gnostic systems that we know, these chains are described with a prolixity so interminable (the Pistis Sophia is the best example) as to justify well the phrase "old wives’ fables" in 1Ti 4:7. But that these passages have Gnostic reference need not tell against the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, as a fairly well developed "Gnosticism" is recognizable in a passage as early as Col 2, and as the description

of the fables as Jewish in Tit 1:14 (compare Tit 3:9) is against 2nd-century references. But for details the commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles must be consulted. It is worth noting that in 2Ti 4:4 the adoption of these fables is said to be the result of dabbling in the dubious. This manner of losing one's hold on reality is, unfortunately, something not confined to the apostolic age.

Burton Scott Easton

FACE

fas: In Hebrew the translation of three expressions:

(1) panim

(2) 'ayin, literally, "eye" and

(3) 'aph, literally, "nose," "nostril," already noted under the word COUNTENANCE, which see.

The first and second of these words are used synonymously, even in metaphorical expressions, as, for example in the phrase "the face of the earth," where panim is used (De 6:15 et passim) and 'ayin (Nu 22:5 et passim). The third expression preserves more clearly its original meaning. It is generally used in the phrases "to bow one's self to the earth," "to fall on one's face," where the nose actually touched the ground. Often "my face," "thy face" is mere oriental circumlocution for the personal pronoun "I," "me," "thou," "thee." "In thy face" means "in thy presence;" and is often so translated. A very large number of idiomatic Hebrew expressions have been introduced into our language through the medium of the Bible translation. We notice the most important of these phrases.

"To seek the face" is to seek an audience with a prince or with God, to seek favor (Ps 24:6; 27:8; 105:4; Pr 7:15; Ho 5:15; compare Pr 29:26, where the Revised Version (British and American) translates "Many seek the ruler's favor," literally, many seek the face (Hebrew pene) of a ruler).

If God "hides his face" He withdraws His presence, His favor (De 32:20; Job 34:29; Ps 13:1; 30:7; 143:7; Isa 54:8; Jer 33:5; Eze 39:23,14; Mic 3:4). Such withdrawal of the presence of God is to be understood as a consequence of man's personal disobedience, not as a wrathful denial of God's favor (Isa 59:2). God is asked to "hide his face," i.e. to disregard or overlook (Ps 51:9; compare Ps 10:11). This is also the idea of the prayer: "Cast me not away from thy presence" (literally, "face," Ps 51:11), and of the promise: "The upright shall dwell in thy presence" (literally, "face," Ps 140:13). If used of men, "to hide the face" expresses humility and reverence before an exalted presence (Ex 3:6; Isa 6:2); similarly Elijah "wrapped his face in his mantle" when God passed by (1Ki 19:13). The "covering of the face" is a sign of mourning (2Sa 19:4 = Eze 12:6,12); a "face covered with fatness" is synonymous with prosperity and arrogance (Job 15:27); to have one's face covered by another person is a sign of hopeless doom, as if one were already dead. This was done to Human, when judgment had been pronounced over him (Es 7:8).

"To turn away one’s face" is a sign of insulting indifference or contempt (2Ch 29:6; Eze 14:6; Sirach 4:4; compare Jer 2:27; 18:17; 32:33); on the part of God an averted face is synonymous with rejection (Ps 13:1; 27:9; 88:14).

"To harden the face" means to harden one’s self against any sort of appeal (Pr 21:29; Isa 50:7; Jer 5:3; compare Eze 3:9).

See also SPIT.

In this connection we also mention the phrase "to respect persons," literally, to "recognize the face" (Le 19:15, or, slightly different in expression, De 1:17; 16:19; Pr 24; 23; 28:21), in the sense of unjustly favoring a person, or requiting him with undue evil. Compare also the Hebrew hadhar (Ex 23:3 the King James Version), "to countenance" (see under the word).

The "showbread" meant literally, "bread of the face," "of the presence," Hebrew lechem panim; Greek artoi enopioi, artoi tes protheseos.

H. L. E. Luering

FACT

Lit. "a deed."

The word occurs only in the heading of the chapter, 2Ki 10 the King James Version, "Jehu excuseth the fact by the prophecy of Elijah," and in 2 Macc 4:36, with reference to the murder of Onias, "certain of the Greeks that abhorred the fact (the deed) also" (summisoponerounton, literally, "hating wickedness together with (others))," the Revised Version (British and American) "the Greeks also joining with them in hatred of the wickedness."

FADE

fad (nabhel; maraino): "To fade" is in the Old Testament the translation of nabhel, "to droop or wither," figuratively, "to fade," or "pass way" (Ps 18:45; Isa 1:30; 24:4; 28:1,4; 40:7,8); once it is the translation of balal "to well up," "to overflow"; perhaps from nabhal (Isa 64:6, "We all do fade as a leaf"); in the New Testament of maraino, "to come to wither or to fade away" (Jas 1:11, "So also shall the rich man fade away in his ways," the Revised Version (British and American) "in his goings"); compare The Wisdom of Solomon 28, "Let us crown ourselves with rosebuds, before they be withered" (maraino); amardntinos (amaranth), "unfading," occurs in 1Pe 5:4, "the crown of glory that fadeth not away," and amarantos (1Pe 1:4), "an inheritance .... that fadeth not away"; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 6:12, "Wisdom is glorious (the Revised Version (British and American) "radiant"), and fadeth not away."

For "fade" (Eze 47:12), the Revised Version (British and American) has "wither"; for "fall" "falleth" "falling" (Isa 34:4), "fade," "fadeth," "fading".

W. L. Walker

FAIL

fal (kalah, karath; ekleipo): "Fail" is both intransitive, "to fall short," "be wanting," and trans, "to be wanting to."

Of the many words translated "fail" in the Old Testament, kalah is the most frequent, meaning "to be consumed," "ended" (Job 11:20; 17:5; Ps 69:3; 71:9, etc.; Pr 22:8; Isa 15:6, etc.; Jer 14:6; La 2:11; 3:22; 4:17); it is the translation of karath, "to be cut off" (2Sa 3:29, of failure in succession; so 1Ki 2:4, etc.); ‘adhar, "to marshal," "to be missed" or "lacking" (Isa 34:16 the King James Version; Isa 40:26 the King James Version; Isa 59:15 the King James Version; Ze 3:5); of raphah, "to become faint" or "to make feeble" (De 31:6,8; "I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee," Jos 1:5; 1Ch 28:20); of’-abhadh, "to perish," "be lost" (Ps 142:4, "Refuge hath failed me"; Eze 12:22, "Every vision faileth"). Many other Hebrew words are translated "fail," "faileth," for the most part in single instances.

In the New Testament, ekleipo, "to leave out" or "off," is thrice rendered "fail" (Lu 16:9 "when it shall fail"; Lu 22:32, "that thy faith fail not"; Heb 1:12, "Thy years shall not fail"); ekpipto, "to fall off or away" (1Co 13:8, "Charity (the Revised Version (British and American) "love") never faileth"); katargeo, "to make useless" (1Co 13:8 the King James Version, "Whether prophecies, they shall fail"); hustereo, "to be behind," "to lack" (Heb 12:15 the King James Version); apopsucho, "to swoon away," "failing" (Lu 21:26 the King James Version).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "fail," in a new translation of Jer 18:14, for "fall" (La 1:14, margin "stumble"); "his hand fail" for "fallen in decay" (Le 25:35); "I will in no wise fail thee" for "I will never leave thee" (Heb 13:5; compare De 31:6; Jos 1:5); "failed to enter" for "entered not" (Heb 4:6); "faileth" (American Standard Revised Version) for "ceaseth" (Ps 49:8), the English Revised Version "must be let alone for ever"; "failing" for "was darkened" (Lu 23:45); for "fail" (Ezr 4:22), "be slack," "be missing" (Isa 34:16); "falleth short of" (Heb 12:15, maqrgin, "falleth bacf from"); for "failed," "was all spent" (Ge 47:15); "wholly" (Jos 3:16); "fail (in looking)" (La 4:17); for "faileth," "is lacking" (Isa 40:26; 59:15); for "men’s hearts failing them" (Lu 21:26), "men fainting," margin "expiring."

W. L. Walker

FAIN

fan (advb.): Occurs twice in English Versions of the Bible, in the sense of "gladly":

(1) in Job 27:22 as the rendering of barach, "to flee with haste" (from anything), "He would fain flee out of his hand," literally, as in in of the King James Version, "in fleeing he would flee";

(2) in Lu 15:16, as the translation of epithumeo, "to fix the mind or desire on," "He would fain have filled his belly with the husks which the swine did eat." the Revised Version (British and American) adds two instances:

(1) Lu 13:31, "Herod would fain kill thee";

(2) Ac 26:28, "Thou wouldest fain make me a Christian."

See ALMOST.

FAINT

fant (‘ayeph, ‘uph, ya‘aph, ‘alaph, aTaph, dawway, yaghea‘, macac, rakhakh, paghar, kahah; ekluo, ekkakeo, kamno): The Hebrew vocabulary for the depressing physical conditions and mental emotions which are rendered in the King James Version by the English words "faint," "fainthess," and other compounds of that stem, is, as will be seen above, wide and varied in derivation. The 11 Hebrew and 3 Greek words and their derivatives are used in 62 passages in the King James Version to express these conditions.

‘Ayeph is used to express the exhaustion from fatigue and hunger in the case of Esau (Ge 25:29,30). This and its variants come from a root which primarily means "to cover or conceal," therefore "to be dark or obscure," and so, figuratively, "to be faint or depressed." Israel’s helpless state when harassed by Amalek (De 25:18) and the plight of Gideon’s weary force when they sought in vain for help at Succoth (Jud 8:4) are described by the same word. Isaiah also uses it to picture the disappointed and unsatisfied appetite of the thirsty man awakening from his dream of refreshment (Isa 29:8). In 2Sa 16:14, ‘ayephim is probably a proper name of a place (Revised Version, margin).

‘Uph in 1Sa 14:28-31 describes the exhaustion of Saul’s host in pursuit of the Philistines after the battle of Michmash. The same word expresses the failure of David’s strength when in conflict with the same foes, which led to his imminent peril and to the consequent refusal of the commander of his army to allow him to take part personally in the combat (2Sa 21:15).

Ya‘-aph is used by Ziba when he brought refreshments to David’s men on the flight from Absalom (2Sa 16:2); see also its use in Isa 40:28. Cognate verbal forms occur in Isa 40:30,31; Jer 2:24; 51:58,64; Hab 2:13, as also in Jud 8:15, meaning in all cases the faintness or exhaustion of fatigue or weariness.

‘Alpah expresses the faintness from thirst in Am 8:13, or from the heat of the sun (Jon 4:8), and figuratively, the despondency which was the result of the captivity (Isa 51:20). Ezekiel uses it

allegorically as describing the withering of the trees for grief at the death of the Assyrian kings (Eze 31:15).

‘ATaph is the weariness of the wanderers in the desert (Ps 107:5), the faintness from hunger (La 2:19), or the despondency of Jonah dispelled by his remembrance of God’s mercies (Jon 2:7).

Dawway, from a root which signifies the sickness produced by exhaustion from loss of blood, is used in Isa 1:5 for the faintness of heart, the result of remorse for sin, and in Jer 8:18 for the prophet’s sorrow for the sins of Israel. A cognate form expresses his sorrow on account of the judgments of God which were incurred as punishments for the national backsliding (La 1:13,12; 5:17).

Macac, literally, "dissolving or melting," is applied to the contagious fear which the example of a cowardly soldier produces among his comrades (De 20:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "melt"). In the remarkable passage in Isa 10:18, in which God pronounces the doom of Assyria when his purposes of chastisement on Israel have been fulfilled, the collapse of Assyria is said to be "as when a standard-bearer fainteth." For this the Revised Version, margin substitutes "as when a sick man pineth away," which is probably the correct rendering. The word macac may mean either a sick man, or else something glittering and seen from afar, such as a standard, but the former sense is more intelligible and suggestive in the context. The rarely used verbal form cognate to macac is used on account of its assonance. Yaghea‘ (yagha‘), which is usually translated "grieved" or "tormented" or "fatigued," is rendered as "fainted" in Jer 45:3. This passage, "I fainted in my sighing" the King James Version, is in Hebrew the same as that which reads, "I am weary with my groaning" in Ps 6:6, and is similarly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American).

Rakhakh, like macac, primarily signifies "to melt" or "to become soft," and is used in prophetic exhortations in which the people are encouraged not to be panic-stricken in the presence of enemies (De 20:3, and also Jer 51:46; Isa 7:4). Another related word, morekh, in the sense of despair and utter loss of courage, is used in expressing the consequences of God’s wrath against Israel (Le 26:36). In its literal sense it signifies "blandness," as of the words of a hypocritical enemy (Ps 55:21).

Paghar is the prostration of utter fatigue whereby one is unable to raise himself or to proceed on a journey, as were some of David’s little band (1Sa 30:10-21). A cognate word describes the prostration of amazement and incredulity with which Jacob heard of Joseph’s condition in Egypt (Ge 45:26).

Kahah, the pining of earnest, longing desire, is translated "fainteth" in Ps 84:2; 119:81; elsewhere it is rendered by words expressing wasting or languishing. The panic in Canaan due to famine is expressed (Ge 47:13) by the word lahah, which implies a state of frenzy.

The only records of actual fainting are

(1) Daniel, in Da 8:27, where the word used is the Niphal of the verb hayah, literally, "became," meaning that he became weak;

(2) swooning is mentioned in Additions to Esther 5:7-14.

In the New Testament "faint" is used in the sense of physical exhaustion (Mt 9:36 the King James Version; Mt 15:32; Mr 8:3), where it is part of the verb ekluo, "to relax." Otherwise it is used figuratively of discouragement of spirit. The same verb is used in Ga 6:9; Heb 12:3,5; but in Lu 18:1; 2Co 4:1-16; Eph 3:13 it is part of the verb ekkakeo (according to some authorities egkakeo, pronounced enkakeo, meaning "to be faint-hearted" or "to be culpably negligent"). In Re 2:3 it is kopiao, literally, "to be tired."

Alexander Macalister

FAIR

far: The word translated in the King James Version from 9 Hebrew and 4 Greek expressions has nowhere in the Bible the modern sense of "blond," "fair-skinned." The translation of Isa 54:11, "fair colors," refers to the cosmetic use of pukh, stibium, antimony powder, with which black margins were painted around the eyelids, so as to make the eyes appear large and dark. The stones of rebuilt Jerusalem, beautifully laid in their black mortar, are compared with such eyes. We can distinguish the following varieties of meaning:

(1) Beautiful, attractive, Tobh, yaphah, yapheh; Aramaic shappir; Septuagint kalos; in the New Testament asteios. This latter word is in both places where it is found used of Moses (Ac 7:20; Heb 11:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "goodly"), and means literally, town bred (as opposed to boorish), polite, polished in manners, urbane, then nice, pretty.

(2) Pure, free of defilement, the Revised Version (British and American) "clean," Tahor (Zec 3:5).

(3) "Fair speech," plausible, persuasive (leqah, Pr 7:21; eulalos, Sirach 6:5; compare eulogia, Ro 16:18).

(4) Making a fine display (euprosopein, Ga 6:12, "to make a fair show").

(5) Good (of weather) (zahabh, "golden," "clear," Job 37:2,2, the Revised Version (British and American) "golden splendor"); eudia (Mt 16:2).

H. L. E. Luering

FAIR HAVENS

far ha'-v'-nz (Kaloi Limenes): A roadstead on the South coast of Crete, about 5 miles East of Cape Matala, the most southerly point of the island. The harbor is formed by a bay, open to the East, and sheltered on the Southwest by two small islands. Here Paul waited for a considerable time (Ac 27:9); but

while it afforded good anchorage and a shelter from North and Northwest winds, "the haven was not commodious to winter in" (Ac 27:8,12).

See CRETE.

FAIRS

farz: Found only 5 times in the King James Version (Eze 27:12,14,16,19,27), apparently incorrect translation of ‘izzabhon, according to modern Hebraists (though Gesenius gives "fair" as one of its meanings). The Septuagint translates the Hebrew of the above five passages by two different words, agora, "market-place" (Eze 27:12,14,16,19), and misthos, "hire," "pay" (Eze 27:27,33). The King James Version follows the Wyclif version in Eze 27:12 and the Geneva version throughout, although it properly translates "wares" in Eze 27:33. the Revised Version (British and American) gives "wares" (which see) throughout.

FAITH

fath:

1. Etymology

2. Meaning: a Divergency

3. Faith in the Sense of Creed

4. A Leading Passage Explained

5. Remarks

6. Conclusion

In the Old Testament (the King James Version) the word occurs only twice: De 32:20 (’emun); Hab 2:4 (’emunah). In the latter the Revised Version (British and American) places in the margin the alternative rendering, "faithfulness." In the New Testament it is of very frequent occurrence, always representing pistis, with one exception in the King James Version (not the Revised Version (British and American)), Heb 10:23, where it represents elpis, "hope."

1. Etymology:

The history of the English word is rather interesting than important; use and contexts, alike for it and its Hebrew and Greek parallels, are the surest guides to meaning. But we may note that it occurs in the form

"feyth," in Havelok the Dane (13th century); that it is akin to fides and this again to the Sanskrit root bhidh, "to unite," "to bind." It is worth while to recall this primeval suggestion of the spiritual work of faith, as that which, on man's side, unites him to God for salvation.

2. Meaning: a Divergency:

Studying the word "faith" in the light of use and contexts, we find a bifurcation of significance in the Bible. We may word distinguish the two senses as the passive and the active; on the one side, "fidelity," "trustworthiness"; and "faith," "trust," on the other. In Ga 5:22, for example, context makes it clear that "fidelity" is in view, as a quality congruous with the associated graces. (the Revised Version (British and American) accordingly renders pistis there by "faithfulness.") Again, Ro 3:3 the King James Version, "the faith of God," by the nature of the case, means His fidelity to promise. But in the overwhelming majority of cases, "faith," as rendering pistis, means "reliance," "trust." To illustrate would be to quote many scores of passages. It may be enough here to call attention to the recorded use of the by our Lord. Of about twenty passages in the Gospels where pistis occurs as coming from His lips, only one (Mt 23:23) presents it in the apparent sense of "fidelity." All the others conspicuously demand the sense of "reliance," "trust." The same is true of the apostolic writings. In them, with rarest exceptions, the words "reliance," "trust," precisely fit the context as alternatives to "faith." 3. Faith in the Sense of Creed:

Another line of meaning is traceable in a very few passages, where pistis, "faith," appears in the sense of "creed," the truth, or body of truth, which is trusted, or which justifies trust. The most important of such places is the paragraph Jas 2:14-26, where an apparent contradiction to some great Pauline dicta perplexes many readers. The riddle is solved by observing that the writer uses "faith" in the sense of creed, orthodox "belief." This is clear from Jas 2:19, where the "faith." in question is illustrated: "Thou believest that God is one." This is the credal confession of the orthodox Jew (the shema'; see De 6:4), taken as a passport to salvation. Briefly, James presses the futility of creed without life, Paul the necessity of reliance in order to receive "life and peace."

4. A Leading Passage Explained:

It is important to notice that Heb 11:1 is no exception to the rule that "faith" normally means "reliance," "trust." There "Faith is the substance (or possibly, in the light of recent inquiries into the type of Greek used by New Testament writers, "the guaranty") of things hoped for, the evidence (or "convincing proof") of things not seen." This is sometimes interpreted as if faith, in the writer's view, were, so to speak, a faculty of second sight, a mysterious intuition into the spiritual world. But the chapter amply shows that the faith illustrated, e. g. by Abraham, Moses, Rahab, was simply reliance upon a God known to be trustworthy. Such reliance enabled the believer to treat the future as present and the invisible as seen. In short, the phrase here, "faith is the evidence," etc., is parallel in form to our familiar saying, "Knowledge is power."

5. Remarks:

A few detached remarks may be added: (a) The history of the use of the Greek pistis is instructive. In the Septuagint it normally, if not always, bears the "passive" sense "fidelity," "good faith," while in classical Greek it not rarely bears the active sense, "trust." In the koine, the type of Greek universally common at the Christian era, it seems to have adopted the active meaning as the ruling one only just in time, so to speak, to provide it for the utterance of Him whose supreme message was "reliance," and who passed that message on to His apostles. Through their lips and pens "faith," in that sense, became the supreme watchword of Christianity.

See JUSTIFICATION; UNION WITH CHRIST.

6. Conclusion:

In conclusion, without trespassing on the ground of other articles, we call the reader's attention, for his Scriptural studies, to the central place of faith in Christianity, and its significance. As being, in its true idea, a reliance as simple as possible upon the word, power, love, of Another, it is precisely that which, on man's side, adjusts him to the living and merciful presence and action of a trusted God. In its nature, not by any mere arbitrary arrangement, it is his one possible receptive attitude, that in which he brings nothing, so that he may receive all. Thus "faith" is our side of union with Christ. And thus it is our means of possessing all His benefits, pardon, justification, purification, life, peace, glory.

As a comment on our exposition of the ruling meaning of "faith" in Scripture, we may note that this precisely corresponds to its meaning in common life, where, for once that the word means anything else, it means "reliance" a hundred times. Such correspondence between religious terms (in Scripture) and the meaning of the same words in common life, will be found to be invariable.

Handley Dunelm

FAITHFUL SAYINGS

sa'-inz (pistos ho logos): "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation" (the King James Version). These words form a striking formula which is found—with slight variations—only in the Pastoral Epistles, in 1Ti 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2Ti 2:11; Tit 3:8. A similar expression occurs in Re 21:5 and Re 22:6 (the King James Version), "These sayings are faithful and true."

The Five "Sayings."

Paul's faithful sayings are thus five in number, and "were no doubt rehearsed constantly in the assemblies, till they became well-known watchwords in the various churches scattered over the Mediterranean-washed provinces of the Roman empire" (Ellicott, New Testament Commentary on 1Ti 1:15).

1. The First "Saying":

The first of the faithful sayings speaks of the pre-existence of Christ, of His coming into the world, and the purpose why He came is distinctly stated—to save the lost, irrespective of race or nationality, sinners who, apart from Christ, are without God and without hope.

2. The Second "Saying":

The second of the faithful sayings refers to the work of being a minister of the gospel, a work then so full of danger and always full of difficulty. The office in question is honorable and Christlike, and, in those early days, it meant stern and ceaseless work, grave and constant danger. This faithful saying would act as a call to young men to offer themselves for the work of proclaiming the gospel to the world, and of witnessing for Christ.

3. The Third "Saying":

The third saying is that godliness has an influence that is world-wide; it consists, not merely in holiness and in that fellowship and communion with God which is the very life of the soul; it is also an active force which springs from "the love of Christ constraining us," and manifests itself in love toward all our fellow-men, for they are God’s creatures. Godliness transfigures every rank and condition of life. It has the promise of the life that now is: to those who seek the kingdom of God first, all other things will be added. And it has the promise of the life that is to come, the rich prospect of eternal blessedness with Christ. Compare with this saying the remarkable words in Tit 1:2, "in hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before times eternal." Godliness gives all gladness here, and future glory too. This is a faithful saying.

4. The Fourth "Saying":

The fourth of the faithful sayings speaks of the Christian believer’s union with Christ, and of the blessedness of that union. The Christian is "dead with Christ," he "suffers with Christ." But the union with Christ is eternal, "We shall also live with him; .... we shall also reign with him" in life that is fadeless, endless and full of glory. Surely then, no one will draw back, for "if we deny him," "if we believe not," "he also will deny us," for "he abideth faithful, he cannot deny himself."

5. The Fifth "Saying":

The fifth and last of the faithful sayings speaks of our former unconverted state, "for we also once were foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures. But .... the kindness and love of God .... toward man appeared, not by works which we did ourselves, but according to his mercy he saved us." Blessedness is now the Christian’s lot, and this is the result not of our works: we owe it all to the tender love of God, to His Divine pity, to His redeeming grace. Yes, this is a faithful saying.

John Rutherfurd

FAITHFUL; FAITHFULNESS

fath’-fool, fath’-fool-nes: 1. Faithfulness of God in the Old Testament

2. Faithfulness of God in the New Testament

LITERATURE

Faithfulness is a quality or attribute applied in the Scripture to both God and man. This article is limited to the consideration of the Scripture teaching concerning the meaning of faithfulness in its application to God.

Faithfulness is one of the characteristics of God’s ethical nature. It denotes the firmness or constancy of God in His relations with men, especially with His people. It is, accordingly, one aspect of God’s truth and of His unchangeableness. God is true not only because He is really God in contrast to all that is not God, and because He realizes the idea of Godhead, but also because He is constant or faithful in keeping His promises, and therefore is worthy of trust (see TRUTH). God, likewise, is unchangeable in His ethical nature. This unchangeableness the Scripture often connects with God’s goodness and mercy, and also with His constancy in reference to His covenant promises, and this is what the Old Testament means by the Faithfulness of God (see UNCHANGEABLENESS).

1. Faithfulfulness of God in the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament this attribute is ascribed to God in passages where the Hebrew words denoting faithfulness do not occur. It is implied in the covenant name Yahweh as unfolded in Ex 3:13-15, which not only expresses God’s self-existence and unchangeableness, but, as the context indicates, puts God’s immutability in special relation to His gracious promises, thus denoting God’s unchangeable faithfulness which is emphasized in the Old Testament to awaken trust in God (De 7:9; Ps 36:5 (Hebrew 6); Isa 11:5; Ho 12:6,9). (For fuller remarks on the name Yahweh in Ex 3:13-15, see article UNCHANGEABLENESS.) It is, moreover, God’s faithfulness as well as His immutability which is implied in those passages where God is called a rock, as being the secure object of religious trust (De 32:4,15; Ps 18:2 (Hebrew 3); 42:9 (Hebrew 10); Isa 17:10, etc.). This same attribute is also implied where God reveals Himself to Moses and to Israel as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and their fathers’ God (Ex 3:6,15,16). The truth concerning God here taught is not simply that He stood in a gracious relation to the Patriarchs, but that He is faithful to His gracious promise to their fathers, and that what He was to them He will continue to be to Moses and to Israel. This is the fundamental idea in the Old Testament concerning the faithfulness of God.

This can be seen also from the Hebrew words which are used to express this quality of God’s nature and

activity. These words are ne’eman, the Niphal participle of the verb ‘aman used as an adjective —"faithful"—and the nouns ‘emeth and ‘emunah—"faithfulness." The verbal stem ‘aman means "to be secure or firm." In the Qal it denotes the firmness of that which supports something, being used in the participle of a nurse who carries a child (Nu 11:12; 2Sa 4:4; Isa 49:23). In the Niphal it denotes the firmness of that which is supported, for example, a child which is carried (Isa 60:4); a well-founded house (1Sa 2:35; 25:28); a wall which firmly holds a nail (Isa 22:23,15); a kingdom firmly established (2Sa 7:16); persons secure in political station (Isa 7:9); a heart which is faithful (Ne 9:8). Hence, in the Niphal the verb comes to have the meaning of being true in the sense of the agreement of words and assertions with reality; for example, of words and revelations (Ge 42:20; Ho 5:9); and of persons (Isa 8:2; Jer 42:5). It has also the meaning of being faithful, being applied to men in Nu 12:7; Ps 101:6; Ne 13:13, etc. In this sense the term is applied to the covenant-keeping Yahweh to express the truth that He is firm or constant, that is, faithful in regard to His covenant promises, and will surely fulfill them (De 7:9; Isa 49:7; and possibly Ho 11:12 (Hebrew 12:1)).

A similar use is made of the nouns ‘emeth and ‘emunah. Apart from the instances where ‘emeth denotes the idea of truth or the correspondence of words and ideas with reality, and the instances where it denotes the agreement of acts and words with the inner disposition, that is, sincerity, it is also used to denote the idea of faithfulness as above defined. As regards the noun ‘emunah, apart from a few passages where it is doubtful whether it means truth or faithfulness, it usually denotes the latter idea. Both these nouns, then, are used to signify the idea of faithfulness, that is, constancy or firmness, especially in the fulfillment of all obligations. In this sense these words are not only applied to men, but also to God to express the idea that He is always faithful to His covenant promises. It is this attribute of God which the Psalmist declares (Ps 40:10 (Hebrew 11)), and the greatness of which he affirms by saying that God’s faithfulness reacheth to the clouds (Ps 36:5 (Hebrew 6)). It is this which he makes the object of praise (Ps 89:1,2 (Hebrew 2,3); Ps 92:2 (Hebrew 3)); and which he says should be praised and reverenced by all men (Ps 89:5,8 (Hebrew 6,9)). And even this faithfulness is itself characterized by constancy, if we may so speak, for the Psalmist says that it endures to all generations (Ps 100:5). Being thus a characteristic of God, it also characterizes His salvation, and becomes the basis of confidence that God will hear prayer (Ps 143:1). It thus becomes the security of the religious man (Ps 91:4); and the source of God’s help to His people (Ps 31:5 (Hebrew 6)). Accordingly in the teaching of prophecy, the salvation of the covenant people rests upon no claim or merit of their own, but solely upon Yahweh’s mercy, grace and faithfulness. When Israel incurred God’s judgments, it might have appeared as if His promise was to fail, but, so far from this being true, as Yahweh, He is faithful to His word of promise which stands forever (Isa 40:8). Even from eternity His counsels are characterized by faithfulness and truth (Isa 25:1); and this is not because of Israel’s faithfulness, but it is for His own sake that Yahweh blotteth out their transgressions (Isa 43:22-25; Mic 7:18-20). It is, moreover, this same characteristic of Yahweh which is asserted in many cases where the Hebrew words ‘emeth and ‘emunah are translated by the word "truth" in the King James Version. In Ex 34:6 it is God’s faithfulness (’emeth) which is referred to, since it evidently signifies His constancy from generation to generation; and in De 32:4 it is also God’s faithfulness (’emunah) which is mentioned, since it is contrasted with the faithlessness of Israel. The same is true of ‘emeth in Mic 7:20; Ps 31:5 (Hebrew 6)); 91:4; 146:6. This is also true of the numerous instances where God’s mercy and truth (’emeth) are combined, His mercy being the source of His gracious promises, and His truth the faithfulness with which He certainly fulfills them (Ps 25:10;

57:3 (Hebrew 4); 61:7 (Hebrew 8); 85:10 (Hebrew 11); 86:15). And since the covenant-keeping Yahweh is faithful, faithfulness comes also to be a characteristic of the New Covenant which is everlasting (Ps 89:28 (Hebrew 29)); compare also for a similar thought, Isa 54:8 ff; Jer 31:35 ff; Ho 2:19 f; Eze 16:60 ff.

It is in this connection, moreover, that God's faithfulness is closely related to His righteousness in the Old Testament. In the second half of the prophecy of Isaiah and in many of the psalms, righteousness is ascribed to God because He comes to help and save His people. Thus righteousness as a quality parallel with grace, mercy and faithfulness is ascribed to God (Isa 41:10; 42:6; 45:13,19,21; 63:1). It appears in these places to widen out from its exclusively judicial or forensic association and to become a quality of God as Saviour of His people. Accordingly this attribute of God is appealed to in the Psalms as the basis of hope for salvation and deliverance (Ps 31:1 (Hebrew 2); 35:24; 71:2; 143:11). Hence, this attribute is associated with God's mercy and grace (Ps 36:5 (Hebrew 6); 36:9 (Hebrew 10); 89:14 (Hebrew 15)); also with His faithfulness (Zec 8:8; Ps 36:6 (Hebrew 7)); Ps 40:10 (Hebrew 11); 88:11,12 (Hebrew 12,13); 89:14 (Hebrew 15); 96:13; 119:137,142; 143:1). Accordingly the Old Testament conception of the righteousness of God has been practically identified with His covenant faithfulness, by such writers as Kautzsch, Riehm and Smend, Ritschl's definition of it being very much the same. Moreover, Ritschl, following Diestel, denied that the idea of distributive and retributive justice is ascribed to God in the Old Testament. In regard to this latter point, it should be remarked in passing that this denial that the judicial or forensic idea of righteousness is ascribed to God in the Old Testament breaks down, not only in view of the fact that the Old Testament does ascribe this attribute to God in many ways, but also in view of the fact that in a number of passages the idea of retribution is specifically referred to the righteousness of God (see RIGHTEOUSNESS; compare against Diestel and Ritschl, Dalman, Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testament).

That which concerns us, however, in regard to this close relation between righteousness and faithfulness is to observe that this should not be pressed to the extent of the identification of righteousness with covenant faithfulness in these passages in the Psalms and the second half of Isa. The idea seems to be that Israel has sinned and has no claim upon Yahweh, finding her only hope of deliverance in His mercy and faithfulness. But this very fact that Yahweh is merciful and faithful becomes, as it were, Israel's claim, or rather the ground of Israel's hope of deliverance from her enemies. Hence, in the recognition of this claim of His people, God is said to be righteous in manifesting His mercy and faithfulness, so that His righteousness, no less than His mercy and faithfulness, becomes the ground of His people's hope. Righteousness is thus closely related in these cases to faithfulness, but it is not identified with it, nor has it in all cases lost entirely its forensic tone. This seems to be, in general, the meaning of righteousness in the Psalms and the second half of Isaiah, with which may also be compared Mic 6:9; Zec 8:8.

The emphasis which this attribute of God has in the Old Testament is determined by the fact that throughout the whole of the Old Testament the covenant relation of Yahweh to His people is founded solely in God's grace, and not on any merit of theirs. If this covenant relation had been based on any claim of Israel, faithfulness on God's part might have been taken for granted. But since Yahweh's covenant relation with Israel and His promises of salvation spring solely from, and depend wholly upon, the grace of God, that which gave firm assurance that the past experience of God's grace would continue

in the future was this immutable faithfulness of Yahweh. By it the experience of the fathers was given a religious value for Israel from generation to generation. And even as the faithfulness of God bridged over the past and the present, so also it constituted the connecting link between the present and the future, becoming thus the firm basis of Israel's hope; compare Ps 89 which sets forth the faithfulness of God in its greatness, its firmness as the basis of the covenant and the ground it affords of hope for future help from Yahweh, and for hope that His covenant shall endure forever. When God's people departed from Him all the more emphasis was put upon His faithfulness, so that the only hope of His wayward people lay not only in His grace and mercy but also in His faithfulness, which stands in marked contrast with the faithlessness and inconstancy of His people. This is probably the meaning of the difficult verse Ho 11:12 (Hebrew 12:1).

2. Faithfulness of God in the New Testament:

In the New Testament teaching concerning the faithfulness of God the same idea of faithfulness to His gracious promises is emphasized and held up as the object of a confident trust in God. This idea is usually expressed by the adjective pistos, and once by the noun pistis, which more frequently has the active sense of faith or trust.

An attempt has been made by Wendt (SK, 1883, 511 f; Teaching of Jesus, English translation, I, 259 f) to interpret the words aletheia and alethes in many instances, especially in the Johannine writings, as denoting faithfulness and rectitude, after the analogy of the Septuagint rendering eleos kai aletheia for the Hebrew phrase "mercy and truth," in which truth is equivalent to faithfulness. But the most that could be inferred from the fact that the Septuagint uses the word aletheia to translate the Hebrew word ‘emeth, and in about one-half the cases where ‘emunah occurs, would be that those Greek words might have been prepared for such a use in the New Testament. But while it is true that there is one usage of these words in John's writings in an ethical sense apparently based on the Old Testament use of ‘emeth and ‘emunah, the Greek words do not have this meaning when employed to denote a characteristic of God. Neither is the adjective alethinos so used.

See TRUTH.

In the Epistles of Paul the word aletheia occurs quite frequently to denote the truth revealed by God to man through reason and conscience, and to denote the doctrinal content of the gospel. In two passages, however, the words alethes and aletheia seem to signify the faithfulness of God (Ro 3:4,7; 15:8). In the former passage Paul is contrasting the faithfulness of God with the faithlessness of men, the word alethes, 3:4, and aletheia, 3:7, apparently denoting the same Divine characteristic as the word pistis, 3:3. In the latter passage (Ro 15:8), the vindication of God's covenant faithfulness, through the realization of His promises to the fathers, is declared to have been the purpose of the ministry of Jesus Christ to the Jews.

This faithfulness of God to His covenant promises is frequently emphasized by Paul, the words he employs being the noun pistis (once) and the adjective: pistos. The noun pistis is used once by Paul in

this sense (Ro 3:3). In this place Paul is arguing that the unbelief of the Jews cannot make void God's faithfulness. Both Jew and Gentile, the apostle had said, are on the same footing as regards justification. Nevertheless the Jews had one great advantage in that they were the people to whom the revelation of God's gracious promises had been committed. These promises will certainly be fulfilled, notwithstanding the fact that some of the Jews were unfaithful, because the fulfillment of these promises depends not on human conduct but on the faithfulness of God, which cannot be made void by human faithlessness and unbelief. And to the supposition that man's faithlessness could make of none effect God's faithfulness, Paul replies 'let God be faithful (alethes) and every man a liar' (Ro 3:4), by which Paul means to say that in the fulfillment of God's promises, in spite of the fact that men are faithless, the faithfulness of God will be abundantly vindicated, even though thereby every man should be proven untrue and faithless. And not only so, but human faithlessness will give an opportunity for a manifestation of the faithfulness (aletheia) of God, abounding to His glory (Ro 3:7). God's faithfulness here is His unchangeable constancy and fidelity to His covenant promises; and it is this fidelity to His promises, or the fact that God's gracious gifts and election are without any change of mind on His part, which gave to Paul the assurance that all Israel should finally be saved (Ro 11:25-29). Moreover this covenant faithfulness of God is grounded in His very nature, so that Paul's hope of eternal life rests on the fact that God who cannot lie promised it before the world began (Tit 1:2); and the certainty that God will abide faithful notwithstanding human faithlessness rests on the fact that God cannot deny Himself (2Ti 2:13). It is because God is faithful that His promises in Christ are yea and amen (2Co 1:18,20). This attribute of God, moreover, is the basis of Paul's confident assurance that God will preserve the Christian in temptation (1Co 10:13); and establish him and preserve him from evil (2Th 3:3). And since God is faithful and His gracious promises trustworthy, this characteristic attaches to the "faithful sayings" in the Pastoral Epistles which sum up the gospel, making them worthy of trust and acceptance (1Ti 1:15; 4:9; Tit 3:8).

This faithfulness of God in the sense of fidelity to His promises is set forth as the object of sure trust and hope by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It was the basis of Sarah's faith that she would bear a child when she was past age (Heb 11:11); and it is because God is faithful to His promise in Christ that we can draw nigh to Him with full assurance of faith, holding fast without wavering the profession of hope (Heb 10:23).

John also ascribes this attribute to God. Since one of the most precious of God's promises through Christ is the pardon of sin through the "blood of Jesus Christ," John says that God's faithfulness, as well as His righteousness, is manifested in the forgiveness of sin (1 Joh 1:9).

The faithfulness of God is viewed from a slightly different point by Peter when he tells his readers that those who suffer as Christians and in accordance with God's will should "commit their soul's in well-doing unto a faithful Creator" (1Pe 4:19). The quality of faithfulness, which in the Scripture is more frequently ascribed to God in His relation to man as gracious Saviour, and as the ground of hope in His gracious promises, is here applied by Peter to God in His relation to man as his Creator, and is made the ground of comfort under persecution and suffering. The omission of the article before the words "faithful Creator" makes emphatic that this is a characteristic of God as Creator, and the position of the words in the sentence throws great emphasis on this attribute of God as the basis of comfort under

suffering. It is as if Peter would say to suffering Christians, "You suffer not by chance but in accordance with God's will; He, the almighty Creator, made you, and since your suffering is in accordance with His will, you ought to trust yourselves to Him who as your Creator is faithful." It is, of course, Christians who are to derive this comfort, but the faithfulness of God is extended here to cover all His relations to His people, and to pledge all His attributes in their behalf.

This attribute is also ascribed to Christ in the New Testament. Where Jesus is called a faithful high priest, the idea expressed is His fidelity to His obligations to God and to His saving work (Heb 2:17; 3:2,6). But when in the Book of Revelation Jesus Christ is called the "faithful witness" or absolutely the "Faithful and True," it is clear that the quality of faithfulness, in the most absolute sense in which it is characteristic of God in contrast with human changeableness, is ascribed to Christ (Re 1:5; 3:14; 19:11). This is especially clear in the last-named passage. The heavens themselves open to disclose the glorified Christ, and He appears not only as a victorious warrior whose name is faithful and true, but also as the one in whom these attributes have their highest realization, and of whom they are so characteristic as to become the name of the exalted Lord. This clearly implies the Deity of Jesus.

In summing up the Scripture teaching concerning God's faithfulness, three things are noteworthy. In the first place, this characteristic of God is usually connected with His gracious promises of salvation, and is one of those attributes which make God the firm and secure object of religious trust. As is the case with all the Scripture teaching concerning God, it is the religious value of His faithfulness which is made prominent. In the second place, the so-called moral attributes, of which this is one, are essential in order to constitute God the object of religion, along with the so-called incommunicable attributes such as Omnipotence, Omnipresence and Unchangeableness. Take away either class of attributes from God, and He ceases to be God, the object of religious veneration and trust. And in the third place, while these moral attributes, to which faithfulness belongs, have been called "communicable," to distinguish them from the "incommunicable" attributes which distinguish God from all that is finite, it should never be forgotten that, according to the Scripture, God is faithful in such an absolute sense as to contrast Him with men who are faithful only in a relative sense, and who appear as changeable and faithless in comparison with the faithfulness of God.

See RIGHTEOUSNESS; TRUTH; UNCHANGEABLENESS.

LITERATURE.

Besides the Commentaries on the appropriate passages, see Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, English translation, 95, 112 f 505: Dillmann, Handbuch der alttest. Theol., 268-76, 269-70; Schlatter, Der Glaube im New Testament, 21-22, 259-60. In the works on New Testament theology this subject is treated under the sections on the truthfulness of God.

On the relation of God's truth and faithfulness, see Wendt, Der Gebrauch der Worter, und im New Testament, SK, 1883, 511 f; Stanton, article "Truth," in HDB, IV, 816 f; and the above-mentioned work of Schlatter. On the relation of the faithfulness to the righteousness of God, see Diestel, "Die Idee der

Gerechtigkeit vorzuglich im Altes Testament," Jahrbucher fur deutsche Theologie, 1860, 173 f; Kautzsch, Ueber die Derivate des Stammes im Altes Testament Sprachgebrauch; Riehm, Altes Testament Theol., 271 f; Smend, Alttest. Religionsgeschichte, 363 f; Ritschl, Justification and Reconciliation; Dalman, Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im Altes Testament; and the above-mentioned Old Testament Theologies of Dillmann and Oehler.

Gaspar Wistar Hodge

FAITHLESS

fath'-les: The translation of apistos, "without faith," having the sense of "unbelieving," "disbelieving." Jesus upbraids the people, "O faithless and perverse generation!" (Mt 17:17; Mr 9:19; Lu 9:41); He says to Thomas, "Be not faithless, but believing" (Joh 20:27); the Revised Version (British and American) adds, "If we are faithless," instead of "believe not" (2Ti 2:13); compare 1Co 7:12-15; 10:27; 14:22,24, etc.; Tit 1:15. In Lu 12:46 apistos has the sense of "unfaithful," so the Revised Version (British and American); perhaps also Re 21:8, "unbelieving."

FALCON

fo'-k'-n, fol'-k'-n, fal'-kun: The Hebrews did not know the word. Their bird corresponding to our falcon, in all probability, was one of the smaller kestrels covered by the word nets, which seemed to cover all lesser birds of prey that we include in the hawk family. That some of our many divisions of species were known to them is indicated by the phrase "after its kind." The word occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) in Job 28:7, to translation 'ayyah, Greek gups (compare Le 11:14; De 14:13):

"That path no bird of prey knoweth,

Neither hath the falcon's eye seen it."

This substitutes "falcon" for "vulture" in the King James Version. The change weakens the force of the lines. All ornithologists know that eagles, vultures and the large hawks have such range of vision that they at once descend from heights at which we cannot see them to take prey on earth or food placed to tempt them. The falcons and sparrow hawks are small members of the family, some of which feed on little birds, some on insects. They are not celebrated for greater range of vision than other birds of the same location and feeding habits. The strength of these lines lay in the fact that if the path to the mine were so well concealed that the piercing eye of the vulture failed to find it, then it was perfectly hidden indeed.

Gene Stratton-Porter

FALL

fol (vb.): The idea of falling is most frequently expressed in Hebrew by naphal, but also by many other words; in Greek by pipto, and its compounds. The uses of the word in Scripture are very varied. There is the literal falling by descent; the falling of the countenance in sorrow, shame, anger, etc. (Ge 4:5,6); the falling in battle (Ge 14:10; Nu 14:3, etc.); the falling into trouble, etc. (Pr 24:16,17); prostration in supplication and reverence (Ge 17:3; Nu 14:5, etc.); falling of the Spirit of Yahweh (Eze 11:5; compare 3:24; 8:1); of apostasy (2Th 2:3; Heb 6:6; Jude 1:24), etc. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently changes "fall" of the King James Version into other words or phrases, as "stumble" (Le 26:37; Ps 64:8; 2Pe 1:10, etc.), "fade" (Isa 33:4), etc.; in Ac 27, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "be cast ashore on rocky ground" for "have fallen upon rocks" (Ac 27:29), "perish" for "fall" (Ac 27:34), "lighting upon" for "falling into" (Ac 27:41).

W. L. Walker

FALL, THE

fol:

1. Meaning of Genesis 3

2. Genesis 3 in the Old and New Testaments

3. The Fall and the Theory of Evolution

4. The Character of the Fall

The question concerning the origin, the age and the written record of the history of the Fall in Ge 3 need not be discussed here. For in the first place, science can never reach to the oldest origins and the ultimate destinies of humanity, and historical and critical inquiry will never be able to prove either the veracity or the unveracity of this history. And in the second place, exactly as it now lies before us, this history has already formed for centuries a portion of holy Scripture, an indispensable element in the organism of the revelation of salvation, and as such has been accepted in faith by the Hebrew congregation (Jewish people), by Christ, by the apostles, and by the whole Christian church.

1. Meaning of Genesis 3:

That Ge 3 gives us an account of the fall of man, of the loss of his primitive innocence and of the misery, particularly death, to which he has since been subjected, cannot reasonably be denied. The opinion of the Ophites, Kant, Schiller, Hegel, etc., that Ge 3 relates the awakening of man to self-consciousness and personality (see ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT), and therefore does not tell us

of a fall, but a marked progression, is disputed by the name which the forbidden tree bears, as indicating to man not merely a tree of knowledge in the ordinary way, but quite specially a tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Ge 3 is not in the least meant to relate to us how man obtained the idea of his nakedness and sexual passions, and from a state of childlike innocence changed in this respect to manlike maturity (Eerdman's De Beteekenis van het Paradijsverhaal, Theologisch Tijdschrift, 1905, 485-511). For according to Genesis, man was created full-grown, received a wife immediately as helpmeet, and at the same time saw himself allotted the task of multiplying and replenishing the earth. Moreover, the idea that sexual desire is something sinful and deserves punishment was entirely foreign to ancient Israel.

Finally, the interpretation of Wellhausen (Geschichte Israels, 1878, 344) cannot be accepted, that man in Ge 3 should obtain "die intellektuelle Welterkenntniss, die metaphysische Erkenntniss der Dinge in ihrem Zusammenhange, ihrem Werth oder Unwerth, ihrem Nutzen oder Schaden" ("the intellectual knowledge of the world, the metaphysical knowledge of things in their connection, their worth or unworth, their utility or hurtfulness"). For in the first place, according to Gen, this was man's peculiar province from the beginning; he received indeed the vocation to subdue the earth, to keep and till the ground, to give the animals their names. And in the second place, the acquiring of this knowledge among the Israelites, who esteemed practical wisdom so highly, is difficult to represent as a fall, or as a punishment deserved for disobedience.

There is no other explanation possible of Ge 3 than that it is the narration of a fall, which consists in the transgression of an explicit command of God, thus bearing a moral significance, and therefore followed by repentance, shame, fear and punishment. The context of the chapter places this interpretation beyond all doubt, for before his fall man is represented as a creature made after God's image and receiving paradise as a dwelling-place, and after the fall he is sent into a rough world, is condemned to a life of labor and sorrow, and increases more and more in sin until the judgment of the Flood.

2. Genesis 3 in the Old and the New Testaments:

It is indeed remarkable how very seldom the Old Testament refers to this history of the Fall. This is not a sufficient reason for pronouncing it of later origin, for the same peculiarity presents itself at the time when, according to all criticism, it was recorded in literature. Prophets, Psalms, Proverbs never quote it; at the most, allusions may be found to it in Ho 6:7 and Ec 7:29; and even Jesus and His apostles in the New Testament very seldom appeal to Ge 3 (Joh 8:44; Ro 5:12; 1Co 15:22; 2Co 11:3; 1Ti 2:14). But it may be considered that the Prophets, Psalms and Proverbs only mention special facts of the past by way of exception, that the apostles even hardly ever quote the words and deeds of Jesus, and that all lived at a time when revelation itself was still proceeding and did not lie before them as a complete whole. With us it is quite a different matter; we are in a certain sense outside revelation, make it a subject of our study and meditation, try to discover the unity which holds all its parts together, and devote our special interest to Adam as a figure and counterpart of Christ. The creation and fall of man occupy therefore a much broader place in the province of our thoughts than they did among the writers of the books of the Old

and New Testaments.

Nevertheless, the Fall is the silent hypothesis of the whole Biblical doctrine of sin and redemption; it does not rest only on a few vague passages, but forms an indispensable element in the revelation of salvation. The whole contemplation of man and humanity, of Nature and history, of ethical and physical evil, of redemption and the way in which to obtain it, is connected in Scripture with a Fall, such as Ge 3 relates to us. Sin, for example, is common to all men (1Ki 8:46; Ps 14:3; 130:3; 143:2), and to every man from his conception (Ge 6:5; 8:21; Job 14:4; Ps 51:7). It arouses God's anger and deserves all kinds of punishment, not only of an ethical but of a physical nature (Ge 3:14-19; 4:14; 6:7,13; 11:8; Le 26:14 f; De 28:15; Ps 90:7, etc.); the whole of Scripture proceeds from the thought that sin and death are connected in the closest degree, as are also obedience and life. In the new heaven and new earth all suffering ceases with sin (Re 21:4). Therefore redemption is possible only in the way of forgiveness (Ps 32:1; Isa 43:25, etc.), and circumcision of the heart (De 10:16; 30:16; Jer 4:4), and this includes, further, life, joy, peace, salvation. When Paul in Ro 5:12; 1Co 15:22 indicates Adam as the origin of sin and death, and Christ as the source of righteousness and life, he develops no ideas which are contrary to the organism of revelation or which might be neglected without loss; he merely combines and formulates the data which are explicitly or silently contained in it.

3. The Fall and the Theory of Evolution:

Tradition does little toward the confirmation and elucidation of the Biblical narrative of the Fall. The study of mythology is still too little advanced to determine the ideal or historical value which may be contained in the legend of a Golden Age, in many people's obsequious honoring of the serpent, in the equally widespread belief in a tree of life. The Babylonian representation also (a seal on which a man and woman, seated, are figured as plucking fruit from a tree, while a serpent curls up behind the woman as if whispering in her ear), which G. Smith, Lenormant and Friedrich Delitzsch compare with the Paradise narrative, shows no similarity on nearer view (A. Jeremias, Das Altes Testament im Lichte des alten Orients2, Leipzig, 1906, 203). Indirectly, however, a very powerful witness for the fall of man is furnished by the whole empirical condition of the world and humanity. For a world, such as we know it, full of unrighteousness and sorrow, cannot be explained without the acceptance of such a fact. He who holds fast to the witness of Scripture and conscience to sin as sin (as anomia) cannot deduce it from creation, but must accept the conclusion that it began with a transgression of God's command and thus with a deed of the will. Pythagoras, Plato, Kant, Schelling, Baader have all understood and acknowledged this with more or less clearness. He who denies the Fall must explain sin as a necessity which has its origin in the Creation, in the nature of things, and therefore in God Himself; he justifies man but accuses God, misrepresents the character of sin and makes it everlasting and indefeasible. For if there has not been a fall into sin, there is no redemption of sin possible; sin then loses its merely ethical significance, becomes a trait of the nature of man, and is inexterminable.

This comes out, in later years, in the many endeavors to unite the Fall with the doctrine of evolution (compare Tennant, The Origin and Propagation of Sin2, 1905; A. S. Peake, Christianity: Its Nature and Its Truth, 1908; W. E. Orchard, Modern Theories of Sin, 1909; Francis J. Hall, Evolution and the Fall, 1910). All these endeavors lead to setting on one side the objective standard of sin, which is the law of

God, and determining the nature and importance of sin subjectively by the feeling of guilt, which in its turn again depends on the knowledge of and the love for the moral ideal, and itself forms an important factor in moral progress. It is true that the strength of all these endeavors is drawn from theory of the descent of man from the animal. But as to this theory, it is worthy of notice:

(1) that it is up to the present day a hypothesis, and is proved by no single observation, whether direct or indirect;

(2) that the fossils of prehistoric men, found in Germany, Belgium, France and elsewhere have demonstrated the low degree of culture in which these men have lived, but in no sense their dissimilarity with mankind of today (W. Branca, Der Stand unserer Kenntnisse vom fossilen Menschen, Leipzig, 1910);

(3) that the uncivilized and prehistoric man may be as little identified with the first man as the unjustly so-called nature-people and children under age;

(4) that the oldest history of the human race, which has become known through the discoveries at Babylon in the last century, was not that of a state of barbarism, but of high and rich culture (D. Gath Whitley, "What was the Primitive Condition of Man?" Princeton Theol. Review, October, 1906; J. Orr, God’s Image in Man, 1906);

(5) that the acceptance of theory of descent as a universal and unlimited rule leads to the denial of the unity of the human race, in a physical and also in an intellectual, moral and religious sense. For it may be possible, even in the school of Darwin, to maintain the unity of the human race so long a time as tradition exercises its influence on the habit of mind; but theory itself undermines its foundation and marks it as an arbitrary opinion. From the standpoint of evolution, there is not only no reason to hold to the "of one blood" of Ac 17:26 the King James Version, but there has never even been a first man; the transition from animal to man was so slow and successive, that the essential distinction fails to be seen. And with the effacing of this boundary, the unity of the moral ideal, of religion, of the laws of thought and of truth, fails also; theory of evolution expels the absolute everywhere and leads necessarily to psychologism, relativism, pragmatism and even to pluralism, which is literally polytheism in a religious sense. The unity of the human race, on the other hand, as it is taught in holy Scripture, is not an indifferent physical question, but an important intellectual, moral and religious one; it is a "postulate" of the whole history of civilization, and expressly or silently accepted by nearly all historians. And conscience bears witness to it, in so far as all men show the work of the moral law written in their hearts, and their thoughts accuse or excuse one another (Ro 2:15); it shows back to the Fall as an "Urthatsache der Geschichte."

4. The Character of the Fall:

What the condition and history of the human race could hardly lead us to imagine, holy Scripture relates to us as a tragic fact in its first pages. The first man was created by God after His own image, not

therefore in brutish unconsciousness or childlike naivete, but in a state of bodily and spiritual maturity, with understanding and reason, with knowledge and speech, with knowledge especially of God and His law. Then was given to him moreover a command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This command was not contained in the moral law as such; it was not a natural but a positive commandment; it rested entirely and only on God's will and must be obeyed exclusively for this reason. It placed before man the choice, whether he would be faithful and obedient to God's word and would leave to Him alone the decision as to what is good or evil, or whether he would reserve to himself the right arbitrarily to decide what is good or evil. Thus the question was: Shall theonomy or autonomy be the way to happiness? On this account also the tree was called the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It did not bear this name in the sense that man might obtain from it the empirical knowledge of good and evil, for by his transgression he in truth lost the empirical knowledge of good. But the tree was so named, because man, by eating of it and so transgressing God's commandment, arrogated to himself "die Fahigkeit zur selbstandigen Wahl der Mittel, durch die man sein Gluck schaffen will": "the capacity of independent choice of the means by which he would attain his happiness" (Koberle, Sunde und Gnade im relig. Leben des Volkes Israel bis auf Christenrum, 1905, 64). Theonomy, as obedience to God from free love, includes as such the idea and the possibility of autonomy, therefore that of antinomy also.

But it is the free act and therefore the guilt of man that has changed the possibility into reality. For the mind, there remains here an insoluble problem, as much in the question, why God allowed this Fall to take place, as in the other, how man, created in the likeness of God, could and did fall. There is a great deal of truth in the often-expressed thought, that we can give no account of the origin of sin, because it is not logical, and does not result as a conclusion drawn from two premises. But facts are brutal. What seems logically impossible often exists in reality. The laws of moral life are different from those of thought and from those also of mechanical nature. The narrative in Ge 3, in any case, is psychologically faithful in the highest degree. For the same way as it appears there in the first man, it repeatedly takes place among ourselves (Jas 1:14,15). Furthermore we ought to allow God to justify Himself. The course of revelation discovers to faith how, through all the ages, He holds sin in its entire development in His own almighty hands, and works through grace for a consummation in which, in the dispensation of the fullness of times, He will gather together in one all things in Christ (Eph 1:10). (J. Orr, Sin as a Problem of Today, London, 1910.)

Herman Bavinck

FALLING STARS

See ASTRONOMY.

FALLOW

fal'-o (damam): Damam is translated only once in the sense of "fallow" (Ex 23:11). The law required that the Israelites allow their ground to lie fallow one year in, seven. the King James Version is (De 14:5) nir, and is translated "fallow" in its more obsolete sense of "tilled ground" in the King James

Version (Jer 4:3; Ho 10:12).

FALSE PROPHETS

See PROPHESYINGS, FALSE.

FALSE SWEARING; FALSE WITNESS

See OATH; PERJURY; CRIMES.

FALSE, CHRISTS

fols.

See CHRISTS, FALSE.

FALSEHOOD

fols'-hood.

See LYING.

FAME

fam (shem, shema'; akoe, pheme): "Fame" has the twofold meaning, (1) of report or rumor, (2) of renown or reputation (in the Old Testament it is not always easy to distinguish the two senses). "Fame," shema', "fame," "rumor," "reports" (Nu 14:15; Job 28:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "rumor") probably means "report"; but in 1Ki 10:1; 2Ch 9:1; Isa 66:19, it is most probably "renown," or "reputation"; shemu'ah (1Ki 10:7; 2Ch 9:6) may have either meaning; shoma' (Jos 6:27; 9:9; Es 9:4) seems to mean "fame" in the sense of reputation; but in Jer 6:24 (as the American Standard Revised Version) "report"; shem, "name," has the sense of reputation (1Ki 4:31; 1Ch 14:17; 22:5; Ze 3:19, the Revised Version (British and American) "name"); qol, "voice," is report (Ge 45:16, the American Standard Revised Version "report"). In the New Testament akoe, "hearing," is "report," so the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 4:24; 14:1; Mr 1:28); pheme, "word," "rumor," is report, fame in this sense (Mt 9:26; Lu 4:14); echos, "a sound," "noise" (Lu 4:37, the Revised Version (British and American) "rumor"), and logos, "word" (Lu 5:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "report") have the same meaning; diaphemizo, "to say throughout," "to report publicly" (Mt 9:31, "they .... spread abroad his fame"), seems to imply fame in the sense of reputation.

In 1 Macc 3:26, we have "fame" in the sense of reputation, "His fame (onoma, the Revised Version (British and American) "name") came near even to the king"; so 3:41, "heard the fame of them."

ERV has "fame" for "report" (shema‘), Jer 50:43.

W. L. Walker

FAMILIAR

fa-mil’-yar: Is found as an adjective qualifying "friend" and "spirit."

(1) Used, in a number of Old Testament passages, of spirits which were supposed to come at the call of one who had power over them. ‘obh, literally, something "hollow"; compare ‘obh, "bottle" (Job 32:19 the King James Version); because the voice of the spirit might have been supposed to come from the one possessed, as from a bottle, or because of the hollow sound which characterized the utterance, as out of the ground (Isa 29:4); or, as some have conjectured, akin to ‘ubh, "return" (nekromantis). Probably called "familiar" because it was regarded as a servant (famulus), belonging to the family (familiaris), who might be summoned to do the commands of the one possessing it. The practice of consulting familiar spirits was forbidden by the Mosaic law (Le 19:31; 20:6,27; De 18:11). King Saul put this away early in his reign, but consulted the witch of Endor, who "had a familiar spirit" (1Sa 28:3,7,8,9; 1Ch 10:13). King Manasseh fell into the same sin (2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6); but Josiah put those who dealt with familiar spirits out of the land (2Ki 23:24).

It seems probable, however, that the practice prevailed more or less among the people till the exile (Isa 8:19; 19:3). See "Divination by the ‘Ob" in The Expositor T, IX, 157; ASTROLOGY, 1; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS.

(2) "Familiars," "familiar friend," from yadha‘, "to know," hence, "acquaintance," one intimately attached (Job 19:14); but more frequently of ‘enosh shalom, "man of (my or thy) peace," that is, one to whom the salutation of peace is given (Ps 41:9; Jer 20:10; 38:22; also in Ob 1:7, rendered "the men that were at peace with thee").

Edward Bagby Pollard

FAMILY

fam’-i-li (mishpachah, bayith; patria):

1. The Foundation

2. Monogamy, the Ideal Relation

3. Equality of the Sexes

4. Polygamy

5. The Commandments and the Family (5th Commandment)

6. The Commandments and the Family (7th Commandment)

7. The Commandments and the Family (10th Commandment)

8. Primitive Monogamic Ideal

9. Reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah

10. The New Testament

11. The Teaching of Jesus

12. The Teaching of Paul

13. Modern Dangers

LITERATURE

1. The Foundation:

The Bible is the world's great teacher of monogamy—the union for life of one man and one woman in marriage as the basis of the family. Whatever may be said about the time of the writing of the books of the Bible, or of parts of them, the testimony of the whole is incontrovertibly to the point that marriage springs from the choice of one man and one woman of each other for a permanent family relation. Over and through the whole of the Bible this ideal is dominant. There may be instances shown here and there of violation of this rule. But such cases are to be regarded as contrary to the underlying principle of marriage—known even at the time of their occurrence to be antagonistic to the principle.

There may be times when moral principle is violated in high places and perhaps over wide reaches in society. The Bible shows that there were such times in the history of man. But it is undeniable that its tone toward such lapses of men and of society is not one of condonation but one of regret and disapproval. The disasters consequent are faithfully set forth. The feeling that finds expression in its whole history is that in such cases there had been violation of the ideal of right in the sex relation. The ideal of monogamic relation is put in the forefront of the history of man.

2. Monogamy, the Ideal Relation:

The race is introduced synthetically as a species in the incoming of life. "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them" (Ge 1:27). But with the first particularization of the relation of the sexes to each other the great charter of monogamy was laid down so clearly that Jesus was content to quote it, when with His limitless ethical scrutiny He explained the marriage relation. "And the man said (when the woman was brought to him), This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Ge 2:23,14). It is well to pause and look at the grammatical number of the nouns: "a man," "his wife." The words of the charter hold the sexes to monogamy. The subsequent words make marriage life-lasting. "They twain shall be one flesh." A dualism becomes an individualism. So said Christ: "Wherefore they are no more twain but one flesh" (Mt 19:6 the King James Version). Nothing but death separates a man from his own flesh. Nothing but life-monogamy can find place in the language of this charter.

There is much in the setting of this charter in the account given in Ge that is suggestive of the fine sentiment which we know has always gone along with love and marriage. That this account should have held the place in history that it has had adds testimony to the fine perception of sentiment and the strong grasp on principle out of which it came.

3. Equality of the Sexes:

Eve, "the mother of all living," comes out as distinctly as Adam on the canvas in the portraiture of the first pair. She is the feminine representative—’ishshah—of the race, as Adam is the masculine—’ish (Ge 2:23). The personality of Eve is as complete as that of Adam. She is a rational and accountable creature, as Adam is. In primitive intellectual and moral transactions she has share on equality with Adam, and is equally involved in their results. Different physical consequences fall on her for "transgression," because she is "woman," "the mother of all living" (Ge 3:16). But Adam does not escape retribution for sin, and it may be questioned whether its burden did not fall hardest on him (Ge 3:18,19), for motherhood has its joy as well as its pain, in the companionship of new-born child-life; but the wrestler for subsistence from a reluctant earth must bear his hardship alone. It cannot but be that much of the primitive conjugal love survived the fall.

4. Polygamy:

According to the record, monogamy seems long to have survived the departure from Eden. It is not till many generations after that event that we find a case of polygamy—that of Lamech (Ge 4:19-24). Lamech is said to have had "two wives." The special mention of "two" seems to show that man had not yet wandered far away from monogamy. The indications seem to be that as the race multiplied and went out over the face of the earth they forgot the original kinship and exhibited all manner of barbarities in social relations. Lamech was a polygamist, but he was also a quarrelsome homicide: "I have slain a man for wounding me, and a young man for bruising me" (Ge 4:23). If such acts and dispositions as are disclosed in the case of Lamech become common, it will certainly not be a long while before the only

apt description of the condition of society must be that upon which we come in Gen. 6:5: "And Yahweh saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually." Out of such condition will come war and slavery, and polygamy—and come they did. It is a straight road from Ge 6:5 to "The Koran, tribute or the sword," and the polygamy of Mohammedans.

5. The Commandments and the Family (5th Commandment):

The commandments (Ex 20:12; De 5:16) are a succinct summary of the supreme moral relations and duties of man. The first four pertain to our relationship to God. The six following concern human relations. Of these six, three have considerations of the family involved in them. Commandments do not come to people ignorant of the subjects to which they relate. A commandment to cover an unknown moral relation is an absurdity. The text of the Fifth Commandment is, "Honor thy father and thy mother." This refers to the relation of children to parents. This commandment could scarcely have arisen when polygamy was a common practice, certainly never from promiscuity. The equality of father and mother is stamped on its face. That idea never could have had strength and solemnity enough, except in a prevailing condition of monogamy, to entitle the command in which it appeared to rank with the important subjects covered by the other commands. Before the gaze of the children to whom this commandment came, the family stood in monogamic honor—the mother a head of the family as well as the father. There is no question about the position of the mother in this commandment. She stands out as clear as Sinai itself. There is no cloud on her majesty. Such honor as goes to the father goes to the mother. She is no chattel, no property, no inferior being, but the mother; no subordinate to the father, but his equal in rank and entitled to equal reverence with him. The commandment would not and could not have so pictured the mother had she been one of the inmates of a harem.

6. The Commandments and the Family (7th Commandment):

The Seventh Commandment (Ex 20:14; De 5:18) gives the family. It secures the home. It says that whatever children are born to the race shall be born in a home and of the home—shall be family-born. The terms adultery and fornication have now become synonymous. Under the influence of polygamous practices a distinction was made in respect to unlawful sex union as to whether one or both of the parties thereto were married or not, or whether one or both were single. Such distinction will not hold in morals. All or any sex union out of marriage is barred by the family idea. Outside of that all sex union is sin.

While it is true that in the laws of Israel sex sin outside the family relation was treated as a subject by itself, yet when we remember how early in life marriage came in those ancient days, and that betrothal in childhood was deemed as sacred as marriage itself, we see that even then the sweep of the commandment was well-nigh universal and over what a broad range it protected the family. The family is the primal eldest institution of man—the greatest and the holiest. Over this institution this commandment stands sentry. It prevents men from breaking up in complete individual isolation, from reverting to solitary savagery. Think to what a child is born outside of the family relation! Then think of all children being so born, and you have the picture of a low plane of animalism from which all trace of

the moral responsibility of fatherhood has disappeared, and where even motherhood will be reduced to simple care during the short period of helpless infancy, to such care as belongs to animal instinct. Put up now the idea that marriage shall be universal and that the children born in marriage shall belong genuinely to it, and you have a new heaven and a new earth ia the sex relations of the race of man.

7. The Commandments and the Family (10th Commandment):

The Tenth Commandment seems almost out of place on the list of the commandments. All the others enjoin specific acts. This tenth seems to be a foregleam of the Savior's method—going to the thoughts and intents of the heart. It is an attempt at regulation in man. It goes beyond outward acts and deals with the spirit. Its purpose seems not regulation of man in society but in himself. So far as it has outward relation it seems to apply primarily to the rights of property. We have at common law the expression, "rights of persons; and rights of things," i.e. to property. But the list of things enumerated in the commandment comprises the things most common to family life: house, servants, animals. One is forbidden not only to take but even to desire such things. They are necessary to family life. In this list of things belonging to a neighbor that a man is forbidden to desire occurs the term "wife." To first thought it may seem strange that she should be listed with property in house and chattels. But it may not be very singular. One of woman's greatest blessings to man is helpfulness. Eve, the mother of all living, came as a helpmeet for Adam. Sarah is mistress of domestic operations. A wife quick of thought, accurate in judgment and deft of hand is usually the key to a man's material prosperity. As such help a man's desire might stray to his neighbor's wife as well as to his cattle. Even on this lower plane she is still a constituent element of the family. Here the thought of sex is scarcely discernible. Covetousness unlimited in the accumulation of property is what comes under ban. To treat of that matter would lead too far astray.

See COVETOUSNESS.

It is well to remember in taking leave of the commandments that half of those pertaining to human relations hold the family plainly in view. This is as it should be. The race is divided equally between male and female, and their relations to each other, we might expect, would call for half of the directions devoted to the whole.

8. Primitive Monogamic Ideal:

The laws against adultery and incest (Le 20 and the like) may seem barbarously severe. Be it so; that fact would show they were carried along by a people tremendously in earnest about the integrity of the family. Beneath pioneer severity is usually a solemn principle. That the children of Israel had a tough grasp on the primitive monogamic ideal is not only apparent in all their history, but it comes out clear in what they held as history before their own began. Mr. Gladstone said the tenth chapter of Genesis is the best document of ancient ethnography known to man. But it is made up on family lines. It is a record of the settlement of heads of families as they went forth on the face of the earth. The common statement for the sons of Noah as they filed out over the lands of which they took possession is, 'these are the sons

of .... after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations.' Mr. Gladstone called attention to the fact that modern philology verifies this classification of the nations which rests on outgrowth from families.

9. Reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah:

Turning now to a very distant point in history—the return of the Jews from captivity in Babylon—we find in Ezra and Nehemiah the most critical regard for genealogy. The effort to establish "pure blood" was fairly a fanaticism and might even be charged with injustice. Yet this effort was ratified by the people—sufferers in degraded name though many of them must have been. This could never have been done had not the monogamic family idea rested in their hearts as just and right. Nehemiah (13:26) unsparingly condemned the mighty Solomon for his polygamy, and Israel upproved the censure.

10. The New Testament

When we come to the times of the New Testament, contemporaneous polygamy in Jewish society was dead. Wherever New Testament influences have gone, contemporaneous polygamy has ceased to be.

There has been in the United States by Mormonism a belated attempt to revive that crime against the family. But it has had its bad day, and, if it lives at all, it is under the ban of social sentiment and is a crime by law. Consecutive polygamy still exists in nations that are called Christian by the permission of divorce laws. But the tide of Christian sentiment is setting strongly against it, and it takes no special clearness of vision to see that it must go to extinction along with polygamy contemporaneous.

Jesus reaffirmed the original charter of the monogamic family (Mt 19:1-12; Mr 10:2-12). It is to be noticed that He affirmed the indissolubility of the family not only against the parties thereto but against the power of society.

See DIVORCE.

11. The Teaching of Jesus:

At first sight it seems a little strange that Jesus said so little about the family. But as we reflect on the nature of His mission we shall catch the explanation of His silence. He said, "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfill" (Mt 5:17), that is, to fill out, to expound and expand. He also said, "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost" (Mt 18:11 the King James Version), and, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners" (Mt 9:13), that is, to rectify what was wrong. To what was right He gave the right of way—let it go on in its own course. When the law was right, He said, not one jot or tittle of it should fail (Mt 5:18). With regard to the family, He held the old charter written in the heart of man, before it was burned in brick or committed to manuscript, was right. It was comprehensive, would and ought to stand. So He stood by that, and that sufficed His purpose. Christ did not try to regulate the family so much as to regulate the persons who entered into

family life. This may explain why we have no utterance from Him in regard to the conduct and duties of children toward parents. Still stood the ancient statute, "Honor thy father and thy mother." He came not to destroy but to fulfill that. That still indicated the right relation of children to parents. If a child had asked about his relation to his parents, Christ would doubtless have referred him to that commandment, as He did other inquirers about duties to the commandments that cover so large a part of the ethical realm.

12. The Teaching of Paul:

Paul, who particularizes so much in explanation of duties in all relations, scarcely gets beyond the old commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," when he says, "Children, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing in the Lord." It has always been well-pleasing in the Lord. To be sure there was new inspiration to obedience from the new revelation of duty which came to them in Christ, but the duty was enforced by the Fifth Commandment, and that was copied from the deeper revelation in the heart of man.

13. Modern Dangers:

In modern society the two great foes of the family are Divorce and Migration. Families no longer live a continuous life together. We have less family life than the old pastoral nomads. They had to keep together for several generations in order to protect their lives and their flocks and herds. So arose the clan, the tribe and the nation. Family influence can be detected through them. Modern Industries are very much localized. We should easily think that families would be under their controlling influence. But they are not; the industries are localized, the workers are becoming rovers. When trouble comes in an industry, a workman’s first resort is to try somewhere else. Cheapness of transportation gives him the opportunity he desires. So with a satchel he goes hunting, much as a barbarian roams the forest for game, alone. He may take his family or leave it behind. He may be separated from his family for months or years—possibly abandon it forever. A very common cause of divorce is abandonment of family by its male head.

In fact, those engaged in a great deal of legitimate industry are looking out for a better place quite as much as to develop the capacities of business in their own locations. The signs over places of business are few that carry the same name in town or city for a generation. Moving is perhaps more the order of the day than movement. The families are few that can be found in the same place for a quarter of a century. The wealthy cannot stay in the same house six months at a time. They have a house in the city for the winter and one in the country for the summer, and then forsake both and fly over the sea, perhaps to remain for years—traveling. How can family ties survive under such migratory life? Society supersedes the family.

Even education is subject to this malign influence. At their most impressive age, when they need family influence most around them, children are sent away to prepare for or to enter upon higher courses of education. This fits them for something else than life in the family from which they sprang and they

rarely return to it. We may not be able to check this drift, but we ought to see its tendency to degrade the estimate of the value of the family.

LITERATURE.

Wolsey, Divorce, Scribners; Publications of the National Divorce Reform League; Reports State and National, ad rem; Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question, chapter iii; Caverno, Divorce, Midland Publishing Co., Madison, Wis.; The Ten Words, Pilgrim Press, Boston.

C. Caverno

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

FAMINE

fam'-in (ra'abh; limos):

1. Natural Causes

2. Famines Mentioned

3. Divine Relations

4. Figurative Uses

The common Old Testament word for "famine" is ra'abh; re'abhon also occurs (Ge 42:19,33; Ps 37:19), and kaphan (Job 5:22; 30:3), all meaning "hunger" and "famine"; in the New Testament the word is limos, meaning primarily "failure," "want of food."

1. Natural Causes:

In early times, especially in lands dependent on their own productions, famines were not infrequent. They were generally caused by local irregularities of the rainfall, by destructive hail storms (Ex 9:23,11,32), by ravages of insects (Ex 10:15; Joe 1:4) and by enemies (De 28:51); in a city a famine might be caused by a siege (2Ki 6:25); pestilence often followed in its wake, and the suffering was great.

2. Famines Mentioned:

Famines are recorded in the time of Abraham (Ge 12:10, etc.), of Isaac (Ge 26:1), of Jacob, when Joseph

was in Egypt—seven years of famine even in Egypt after seven of plenty (Ge 41:54), which also affected Canaan (Ge 42:1), and, indeed, "was over all the face of the earth" (Ge 41:56); in the time of the Judges (Ru 1:1), of David, for three years (2Sa 21:1), of Ahab and Elijah (1Ki 17:1; 18:2; Ecclesiasticus 48:2,3), of Elisha (2Ki 4:38), during the siege of Samaria (2Ki 6:25), the seven years foretold by Elisha (2Ki 8:1), in the reign of Zedekiah in Jerusalem when besieged by Nebuchadnezzar (2Ki 25:3; Jer 52:6; compare 14:1), its great severity is referred to (La 5:10; Baruch 2:25); a "dearth" is also mentioned after the return from Captivity (Ne 5:3); when the city was besieged by Antiochus Eupator (1 Macc 6:54), after the death of Judas (1 Macc 9:24), when Jerusalem was besieged by Simon (1 Macc 13:49), in the time of Claudius (Ac 11:28, in his reign there were frequent famines, one of which in 45 AD severely affected Palestine; Josephus, Ant, XX, v); Christ predicted "famines .... in divers places" as characterizing the end of the age (Mt 24:7; Mr 13:8; Lu 21:11); in the siege of Jerusalem by Titus a terrible famine raged, the consequences of which to the people have never been surpassed.

3. Divine Relations:

Famines are frequently said to be sent as punishments sometimes threatened as such (Le 26:19 f; De 28:49-51; 2Ki 8:1; Ps 105:16; Isa 14:30; 51:19; Jer 14:12,15; 18:21, etc.; Eze 5:16, etc.; Am 8:11; 2 Esdras 15:5,49; 16:19; Tobit 4:13; Ecclesiasticus 39:29; 40:9).

The righteous or godly should be preserved by God in time of famine (Job 5:20, "In famine he will redeem thee from death"; Ps 33:19, "to keep them alive in famine"; 37:19, "In the days of famine they shall be satisfied"); this was a special mark of the Divine favor and power.

4. Figurative Uses:

A famine is used by Amos to indicate the absence of Divine communications as a punishment that should come on the people, a "famine .... of hearing the words of Yahweh" (8:11; compare 1Sa 3:1; 28:6; 2Ch 15:3; Eze 7:26; Mic 3:6); by Zephaniah of the destruction of heathen deities (2:11).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "dearth" for "famine" (Job 5:22); "famine" for "dearth" (Ge 41:54; 2Ch 6:28; Ac 7:11; 11:28); for "hunger" (Jer 38:9; Eze 34:29; Re 6:8); "famines" for "famines and pestilences" (Mt 24:7), "famines and troubles" (Mr 13:8), revised texts.

W. L. Walker

FAMISH

fam’-ish ra‘ebh, razah): "To famish" as a transitive verb is the translation of ra‘ebh, "to hunger" (Ge 41:55): "All the land of Egypt was famished"; of ra‘abh, "hunger" (Isa 5:13), "Their honorable men are famished," margin "Hebrew their glory are men of famine"; of razah, "to make lean," "famish" (Ze 2:11), "For he will famish all the gods of the earth"; it is intransitive as the translation of ra‘ebh (Pr 10:3), "Yahweh will not suffer the soul of the righteous to famish."

FAN, FANNER

fan’-er: The word "fan" occurs 3 times only in the American Standard Revised Version (Jer 15:7; Mt 3:12; Lu 3:17). In Isa 30:24 mizreh is translated "fork," which is a much better translation if the instrument referred to was shaped like the winnowing fork used by the Syrian farmer today and still so called. In Isa 41:16; Jer 4:11; 15:7, the verb zarah is rendered "winnow" in the American Standard Revised Version. In Jer 51:2, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "strangers" for "fanners."

FANCY

fan’-si (phantazo, "to cause to appear," "show"): In Ecclesiasticus 34:5, "And the heart fancieth, as a woman’s in travail" (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 6:16; Heb 12:21).

FAR HOUSE

The marginal explanation in the Revised Version (British and American) of Beth-merhak (beth ha-merchaq, "house of distance"), which is given in the text of 2Sa 15:17 instead of "a place that was far off."

See BETH-MERHAK.

FAR; FARTHER

far, far’-ther: "Far" (adj.), distant, remote; (advb.) widely removed, is most frequently in the Old Testament the translation of rachoq, and in the New Testament of makran, but also of other Hebrew and Greek words. The word chalilah, an exclamation of abhorrence or aversion Septuagint me genoito; see FORBID), is rendered "far from me," "far from thee," etc. (Ge 18:25; 1Sa 2:30; 20:9; 22:15; 2Sa 20:20; 23:17; Job 34:10). Besides its literal sense, distance in a spiritual sense is expressed by "far," as "Salvation is far from the wicked" (Ps 119:155; compare Pr 15:29), "far from righteousness" (Isa 46:12), "not far from the kingdom of God" (Mr 12:34), etc. For "far" the Revised Version (British and American) has "aloof" in Job 30:10; in several places the word in the King James Version is omitted (Jud 9:17; Ps 27:9; Isa 19:6; 26:15; Mr 13:34); "a far country" is changed to "another" (Mt 21:33; 25:14; Mr 13:34), etc. For "God forbid" the Revised Version (British and American) has "far be it," "far be it from me" (Ga 6:14; in the American Standard Revised Version, Ge 44:7,17; 1Sa 12:23; Job 27:5, etc.).

The comparative "farther" occurs only once in the Old Testament (Ec 8:17), and thrice in the New Testament (Mt 26:39; Mr 1:19; 10:1), and in each case is replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by another word or phrase. The Revised Version (British and American), on the other hand, has "its farthest height" for "the height of his border" (Isa 37:24), and "his farthest lodging-place" for

"the lodgings of his borders" (2Ki 19:23).

W. L. Walker

FARE

far: Occurs twice in the Old Testament as the translation of two Hebrew words, shalom, "peace," "prosperity," "completeness" (1Sa 17:18), found in the section on David's family history omitted by the Septuagint translators, and sakhar, "hire," "reward," Septuagint naulon, "passage-money," "fare" (Jon 1:3). In Hebrew both words are substantives; in English the former is a verb meaning "to go," or "get on as to circumstances" (Century Dict.), the latter, a substantive meaning the price which Jonah paid for a sea-voyage to Tarshish.

In Apocrypha the English verb "fare" helps in the translation of three Greek words, kakoo, "fare evil" (the Revised Version (British and American) "fare ill"), Sirach 3:26; elattoo, "fare worse" (the Revised Version (British and American) "suffer loss"), 32:24; rhonnumi, "be strong," "prosper," in 2 pers. (singular) imperat. (err(h)oso) or plural (err(h)osthe) as a farewell salutation, or at the close of a letter, or to describe the welfare (usually physical or social) of a friend (2 Macc 9:20; 11:21,28, etc.). Compare Ac 15:29; 23:30 margin.

In the New Testament the English verb "fare," in addition to its occurrence in the word "farewell" (which see), occurs only once (Lu 16:19), where it is said that the rich man "fared sumptuously every day" (the Revised Version, margin "living in mirth and splendor every day").

The Greek is euphrainomai, "be merry," and occurs 14 times in the New Testament, 10 in a good sense (Lu 15:23,14,29,32, all referring to the merry-making over the return of the lost son; Ac 2:26, translation of Hebrew samach, "be glad"; Ro 15:10, translation of Hebrew ranah, "to sing"; 2Co 2:2; Ga 4:27, translation of Hebrew ranah, "to sing"; Re 12:12; 18:20); 4 in a bad, or less favorable, sense (Lu 12:19; 16:19; Ac 7:41; Re 11:10). The Greek word is variously translated in the New Testament, "be merry," "make merry," "be glad," "rejoice," "make glad," and only once "fare" (Lu 16:19). In the last passage it means the general physical and material welfare of the rich man (so the Geneva (1560), the Bishops' and Rhemish Bibles, the Revised Version (British and American) (1881), and not simply partaking of rich food so Vulgate, Wyclif, Coverdale, Cranmer, Geneva (1557) and the King James Version). Luther translates Lu 16:19, "lebte alle Tage herrlich und in Freuden"; Weizsacker, "genoss sein Leben alle Tage in Glanze"; Ostervald, "se traitoit bien et magnifiquement"; Oltremare, "faisait brillante chere"; Segond, "menait joyeuse et brillante vie"; Weymouth, "enjoyed a splendid banquet every day," all of which virtually agree with the view taken by us as to meaning of "fare." The lampros, "sumptuously," shows that the rich man's manner of living was "brilliant," "magnificent." the Revised Version (British and American) has "fare" for "do" (Ac 15:36), "fared" for "did" (2Sa 11:7), "hath fared" for "was" (Ge 30:29).

Charles B. Williams

FAREWELL

far-wel’ (chairo), Fare ye, or thou, well: Originally a wish at parting for those faring forth (traveling):

(1) As a parting wish at the close of a letter it represents the Greek err(h)oso, "Be strong," imperative of rhonnumi, "to make strong" (Ac 15:29; 23:30 the King James Version; see the Revised Version, margin; 2 Macc 11:21); once chairete (imperative of chairo), "Rejoice!" (2Co 13:11, the Revised Version, margin "Rejoice: be perfected").

(2) As equivalent to our saying "good-bye," it represents the Greek apotassomai, "to separate one’s self," "to take leave," "to bid farewell" (Lu 9:61, "to bid farewell to them that are at my house"; Ac 18:21, "bade them farewell," the Revised Version (British and American) "taking his leave of them").

See FARE; GREETING.

W. L. Walker

FARM

farm: Mt 22:5 is the only passage where agros, has been rendered "farm." In the many other passages where the same word occurs it is rendered "field" or "piece of ground." Farms such as the Occidental is accustomed to see, namely, isolated dwellings with their groups of outbuildings, surrounded by walls or hedges and overlooking the planted fields, were probably unknown in Palestine. For protection against wild beasts and Arab marauders everyone lived in a village and went out to his fields, located perhaps miles away, only as occasion required.

James A. Patch

FARTHING

far’-thing: The rendering of two words in the Greek of the New Testament, assarion, and kodrantes, Latin quadrans. The assarion was the tenth part of the denarius, and hence in value about one penny or two centuries The quadrans was the fourth part of the Roman as, and worth only about three mills, or less than the English farthing, and is the only term rendered farthing by the American Standard Revised Version. It occurs in Mt 5:26 and Mr 12:42, while assarion, which occurs in Mt 10:29 and Lu 12:6, is rendered "penny" by the American Standard Revised Version.

FASHION

fash’-un (mishpaT; schema, the make, pattern, shape, manner or appearance of a thing (from Latin

faction-em, "a making," through Old French fatson, fachon)): In the Old Testament the noun "fashion" represents 3 Hebrew words:

(1) MishpaT = literally, "judgment," hence, judicial sentence, right, custom, manner; usually translated "judgment" (very frequent), but also a few times "sentence," "cause," "charge," and more frequently "manner" (nearly 40 times in the King James Version). In 3 passages it is translated "fashion," in the sense of style, shape, make, in each case of a building or part of a building (Ex 26:30; 1Ki 6:38; Eze 42:11).

(2) Tekhunah = literally, "arrangement," "adjustment" (compare takhan, "to set right," "adjust," from kun, hekhin, "to set up," "establish"); Eze 43:11, "the form of the house, and the fashion thereof." A cognate word in the preceding verse is translated "pattern" (the Revised Version, margin "sum").

(3) Demuth =" resemblance" (from damah, "to be similar"), generally translated "likeness" in English Versions of the Bible, but "fashion" in 2Ki 16:10, where it means pattern or model. The verb "to fashion" stands for

(a) yatsar, "to form," "fashion" (Ps 33:15; 139:16 the King James Version; Isa 22:11 the King James Version; Isa 44:12; 45:9);

(b) ‘asah, "to work," "make," "form" (Job 10:8);

(c) kun, "to set up," "establish," "prepare" (Job 31:15; Ps 119:73; Eze 16:7);

(d) tsur, "to bind up together," "compress" (Ex 32:4, of Aaron fashioning the golden calf out of the golden rings).

In the New Testament, the noun represents 5 Greek words:

(1) Of these, the most interesting is schema, "figure," "shape," "fashion" (from schein, aorist of echein, "to have," compare Latin habitus, from habeo, "I have"). Schema denotes a transient, external semblance or fashion, and so it may be distinguished from its synonym morphe, which denotes the essential intrinsic form of a thing, expressing its real nature. (See Lightfoot, Detached Note on Php 2; Trench, New Testament Syn., 252 ff; Gifford, Incarnation, 22 ff. The distinction is rejected by Meyer, on Ro 12:2, and by others.) In the New Testament, the noun schema occurs but twice: 1Co 7:31, "The fashion of this world passeth away," where there seems to be an allusion to theatrical scenes, which are in their very nature transitory (compare 2 Macc 4:13); and Php 2:8, "being found in fashion as a man," i.e. having the outward figure and bearing of a man, such marks of human nature as strike the senses (contrast morphe Theou, "form of God," Php 2:6, and morphe doulou, "form of servant," 2:7, which describe Christ’s real inner nature). The word schema is found in compound verbs in the following passages: Ro 12:2, "Be not fashioned (sunschematizesthe) according to this world: but be ye transformed (metamorphousthe) by the renewing of your mind" (so the Revised Version (British and

American)), paraphrased by Sanday and Headlam, "Do not adopt the external and fleeting fashion of this world, but be ye transformed in your inmost nature" (Comm. in the place cited.); 2Co 11:13 f, metaschematizomai, the King James Version "transformed," better the Revised Version (British and American) "fashioned," the reference being to "the fictitious, illusory transformation whereby evil assumes the mask of good" (Lightfoot, Commentary on Phil, 131); 1Pe 1:14, "not fashioning yourselves according to your former lusts," paraphrased by Lightfoot, "not falling in with the capricious guidance of the passions" (same place) . In Php 3:21, the adjective summorphos is translated "fashioned" in the King James Version, but better "conformed" as in Revised Version (British and American).

(2) Eioos, eidos, literally, "thing seen," "external appearance," "shape," is translated "fashion" in Lu 9:29, of the glorified appearance of the transfigured Christ.

(3) prosopon, literally, "face," hence, look, appearance, Jas 1:11, "The grace of the fashion of it perisheth."

(4) tupos, type, model, translated "fashion" in Ac 7:44 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "figure"), the Greek word being taken from the Septuagint of the quoted passage, Ex 25:40. The same phrase, kata ton tupon, in the parallel passage, Heb 8:5, is translated "according to the pattern."

(5) In one instance the phrase "on this fashion," "in this manner," represents the Greek adverb houtos, "thus" (Mr 2:12).

D. Miall Edwards

FAST; FASTING

fast, fast’-ing (tsum; ‘innah nephesh, "afflict soul or self," i.e. practice self-denial; nesteia, nesteuein): It is necessary to get rid of some modern notions associated with fasting before we can form a correct idea of its origin and significance in the ancient world. For instance, in the case of many ailments the dieting of the patient is an essential part of the remedy. But we may readily assume that originally fasting was not based on the salutary influence which it exercised on the health of the subject. Considerations of therapeutics played no part in the institution. The theory that fasting, like many other ancient customs, had a religious origin, is in favor with scholars, but we must not assume a religious origin for all practices which in process of time came to be associated with religion.

Many customs, purely secular in their origin, have gradually obtained a religious significance, just as purely religious customs have been dissociated from religion. It is also possible and, in the light of some usages, probable, that different motives operated in the association of fasting, as of some other customs, with religion. Scholars have been too ready to assume that the original significance of fasting was the same in all countries and among all nations. Robertson Smith in his Religion of the Semites advanced and defended theory that fasting was merely a mode of preparation for the tribal meal in which sacrifice

originated, and came to be considered at a later stage as part of the sacrificial act. This hypothesis apparently accounts for the otherwise strange fact that both fasting and feasting are religious acts, but it does not give a satisfactory explanation of the constant association of fasting with the "wearing of sackcloth," the "putting of ashes on the head," and other similar customs. It is obvious that very different motives operated in the institution of fasting and of feasting religious observances.

It is a matter of common observation and experience that great distress causes loss of appetite and therefore occasions abstinence from food. Hannah, who was greatly distressed on account of her childlessness, "wept, and did not eat" (1Sa 1:7). Violent anger produces the same effect (1Sa 20:34). According to 1Ki 21:4, Ahab, "heavy and displeased" on account of Naboth's refusal to part with his estate, sulked and "would eat no bread." Fasting, originally the natural expression of grief, became the customary mode of proving to others the inner emotion of sorrow. David demonstrated his grief at Abner's death (2Sa 3:35) by fasting, just as the Psalmist indicated his sympathy with his adversaries' sorry plight in the same way (Ps 35:13). In such passages as Ezr 10:6; Es 4:3, it is not clear whether fasting is used in its religious significance or simply as a natural expression of sorrow (compare also Lu 5:33 and see below). This view explains the association of fasting with the mourning customs of antiquity (compare 1Sa 31:13; 2Sa 1:12). As fasting was a perfectly natural and human expression and evidence of the subject's grief, it readily claimed a place among those religious customs whose main object was the pacification of the anger of God, or the excital of His compassion. Any and every act that would manifest the distressful state of the suppliant would appeal to the Deity and move Him to pity. The interesting incident recorded in 2Sa 12:16-23 suggests the twofold significance of fasting as a religious act or a mode of appealing to the Deity and as a funeral custom. David defends his fasting before and not after the child's death on the ground that while the child was alive David's prayer might be answered. His fasting was intended to make his petition effectual (compare also 1Ki 21:27; Ezr 8:21; Es 4:16). Occasionally fasting was proclaimed on a national scale, e.g. in case of war (Jud 20:26; 2Ch 20:3) or of pestilence (Joe 1:13 f). Fasting having thus become a recognized mode of seeking Divine favor and protection, it was natural that it should be associated with confession of sin, as indisputable evidence of penitence or sorrow for sin.

Fasting might be partial, i.e. abstinence from certain kinds of food, or total, i.e. abstinence from all food as well as from washing, anointing, sleeping. It might be of shorter or longer duration, e.g. for one day, from sunrise to sunset (Jud 20:26; 1Sa 14:24; 2Sa 1:12; 3:35). In 1Sa 31:13 allusion is made to a seven days' fast, while Daniel abstained from "pleasant bread," flesh, wine and anointing for three weeks (Da 10:3). Moses (Ex 34:28) and Elijah (1Ki 19:8) fasted for 40 days. It is probable that these last three references presuppose a totally different conception of the significance of fasting. It is obvious that dreams made a deep impression on primitive man. They were communications from the departed members of the family. At a later stage they were looked upon as revelations from God. During sleep there is total abstinence from food. It was easy to draw the inference that fasting might fit the person to receive these communications from the world of spirits (Da 10:2). The close connection between fasting and insight—intellectual and spiritual—between simple living and high thinking is universally recognized.

See further under ABSTINENCE; FEASTS AND FASTS.

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebadische Archaologie; Benzinger, Hebadische Archaologie; Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites.

T. Lewis

FASTS AND FEASTS

See FEASTS AND FASTS.

FAT

(chelebh, chelebh): The layer of subcutaneous fat and the compact suet surrounding the viscera and imbedded in the entrails, which, like the blood, was forbidden as food in the Mosaic code (Le 3:17). It was to be sacrificed to God by being burnt upon the altar (Le 3:16; 30). This had to be done on the very day on which a beast had been slaughtered, to remove temptation from the Israelite to use it otherwise (Ex 23:18). The law was probably a sanitary restriction, for, at an early date, leprosy, scrofula and disfiguring cutaneous diseases were thought to be caused by the use of fat as food. It was, moreover, an important pedagogical provision teaching the idea of self-denial, and the maxim that the richest and best meat of the edible animal belonged to Yahweh.

See also FATLING; FOWL, FATTED.

The expression "fat" is often used in figurative senses, e.g. abundant, exuberant, lusty, fertile, robust, outwardly successful (De 32:15; Ps 92:14 the King James Version; Ps 119:70; Pr 11:25; 13:4, etc.).

H. L. E. Luering

FAT (VAT)

WINE, WINE PRESS, II.

FATHER

fa’-ther (Anglo-Saxon, Foeder; German, Vater; Hebrew ‘abh, etymology uncertain, found in many cognate languages; Greek pater, from root pa, "nourisher," "protector," "upholder"):

1. Immediate Male Ancestor:

Immediate male ancestor. The father in the Hebrew family, as in the Roman, had supreme rights over his children, could dispose of his daughter in marriage (Ge 29), arrange his son's marriage (Ge 24), sell his children (Ex 21:7), but not his daughter to a stranger (Ne 5:5), had power of life and death, as in the case of Isaac (Ge 22), Jephthah's daughter (Jud 11:34), the sacrificing of his children to Molech (Le 18:21; 20:3-5), etc. Respect, reverence and affection for fathers (and equally for mothers) is most tenderly, explicitly and sternly prescribed from the earliest times (Ex 20:12; Le 19:3; De 5:16; Mic 7:6; Eze 22:7, etc.). A symmetrical and beautiful picture of the duties and character of the ideal human father may be built up from the Old Testament, with added and enlarged touches from the New Testament. He loves (Ge 37:4); commands (Ge 50:16; Pr 6:20); instructs (Pr 1:8, etc.); guides, encourages, warns (Jer 3:4; 1Th 2:11); trains (Ho 11:3); rebukes (Ge 34:30); restrains (Eli, by contrast, 1Sa 3:13); punishes (De 21:18); chastens (Pr 3:12; De 8:5); nourishes (Isa 1:2); delights in his son (Pr 3:12), and in his son's wisdom (Pr 10:1); is deeply pained by his folly (Pr 17:25); he is considerate of his children's needs and requests (Mt 7:10); considerate of their burdens, or sins (Mal 3:17, "As a man spareth his own son"); tenderly familiar (Lu 11:7, "with me in bed"); considerately self-restrained (Eph 6:4, "Provoke not your children to wrath"); having in view the highest ends (ibid., "Nurture them in the chastening and admonition of the Lord"); pitiful (Ps 103:13, "as a father pitieth his children"); the last human friend (but one) to desert the child (Ps 27:10: "When (a thing to the psalmist incredible) my father and my mother forsake me, then Yahweh will take me up").

2. Ancestors, Immediate or Remote:

(a) Ancestor, immediate or remote: Ge 28:13, "Abraham thy father" (grandfather); 1Ki 22:50, "Jehoshaphat .... David his father"; Jer 35:6, "Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father"; Da 5:11, "Nebuchadnezzar thy father" (personal or official ancestor); Ge 15:15, "Go to thy fathers in peace" (and so (in the plural) in over 500 passages). The expressions "slept with his fathers," "go down to his fathers," "buried with his fathers," "gathered to his fathers," are self-explanatory euphemisms.

(b) The founders of the (Hebrew) race, specifically the patriarchs:' Ro 9:5, "whose are the fathers," considered here also as in a sense the religious ancestors of all believers.

(c) Progenitors of clans, i.e. (Revised Version (British and American)) "fathers' houses": Ex 6:14; 1Ch 27:1, etc.

(d) Gods as progenitors of men: Jer 2:27, "Who say to a stock, thou art my father."

3. Figurative and Derived Uses:

(a) A spiritual ancestor, one who has infused his own spirit into others, whether good, as Abraham, the father of the faithful, Ro 4:11; or bad, as Joh 8:44, "Ye are of your father the devil."

(b) Indicating closest resemblance, kinship, affinity: Job 17:14, "If I have said to corruption, Thou art my father."

(c) A source: Eph 1:17, "Father of glory"; Job 38:28, "Hath the rain a father?"

(d) Creator: Jas 1:17, "the Father of lights."

(e) The inventor or originator of an art or mode of life: Ge 4:20, "father of such as dwell in tents" (a hint here of hereditary occupations? Probably not).

(f) One who exhibits the fatherly characteristics: Ps 68:5, "a father of the fatherless."

(g) One who occupies a position of counsel, care, or control (frequently applied by sultans to their prime ministers): Ge 45:8, "a father to Pharaoh"; Jud 17:10, "Be unto me a father and a priest."

(h) A revered or honored superior: 2Ki 5:13, "My father, if the prophet had bid thee"; but especially applied to prophets: 2Ki 2:12, "My father, my father!" also to elderly and venerable men: 1 Joh 2:13, "I write unto you, fathers"; hence also, with perhaps an outlook on (2) (a), deceased early Christians: 2Pe 3:4, "from the day that the fathers fell asleep." An ecclesiastical title, condemned (in principle) by our Lord: Mt 23:9, "Call no man your father on the earth"; but applied, under the power of the Spirit, to members of the Sanhedrin (probably) by Stephen: Ac 7:2; and by Paul: 22:1, but the latter, perhaps also the former, may simply refer to the elderly among his hearers. Christ's condemnation is clearly of the praise-seeking or obsequious spirit, rather than of a particular custom.

"Father," used by Mary of Joseph, in relation to Jesus, equals "putative father," a necessary reserve at a time when the virgin birth could not yet be proclaimed (Lu 2:49). But note Jesus' answer: "my Father's house."

Philip Wendell Crannell

FATHER'S HOUSE, FATHERS' HOUSE

(beth 'abh, beth 'abhoth): Father's house in the Old Testament is

(1) a dwelling, the family home (Ge 12:1; 31:14,30; 38:11; 1Sa 18:2);

(2) a family or household (Ge 41:51; 46:31; Ex 12:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "fathers' houses");

(3) the group of households, of several of which the "family' or "clan" was constituted, aggregations of which formed the "tribe," generally "fathers' houses" (Nu 1:18,20; 17:2; Ezr 2:59; Ne 10:34, etc.);

(4)the "family" (clan), mishpachah, "fathers' houses" (Ex 6:14 f; Nu 3:20);

(5) the tribe, "fathers' house," "houses" (Nu 7:2; 17:1-3, etc.).

In the New Testament "father's house" (oikos tou patros) occurs in the sense of dwelling, house (Lu 16:27; compare 16:4). our Lord also uses the phrase

(1) of the earthly temple-dwelling of God at Jerusalem (Joh 2:16, "Make not my Father's house a house of merchandise"; compare Ps 11:4; Isa 63:15);

(2) of heaven as the abode of God and His children (Joh 14:2, "In my Father's house are many mansions," the Revised Version, margin "abiding places," oikia "house," "dwelling," also household, family; compare Ps 33:13; Isa 63:15; Mt 6:9). The phrase occurs also (Ac 7:20) of Moses, "nourished .... in his father's house" (oikos).

Revised Version has "father's hquse" for "principal household" (1Ch 24:6), "heads of the fathers' houses" for "chief fathers" (Nu 31:26; 32:28; 36:1; 1Ch 9:34, etc.); "one prince of a father's house," for "each of" (Jos 22:14); "the heads of the fathers' (houses)" for "the chief of the fathers," and "the fathers' houses of the chief," for "the principal fathers" (1Ch 24:31).

W. L. Walker

FATHER, GOD THE

In the Christian religion God is conceived of as "Father," "Our Father .... in heaven" (Mt 6:9,14,26, etc.), "the God and Father of the Lord Jesus" (2Co 11:31, etc.). The tenderness of relation and wealth of love and grace embraced in this profound designation are peculiar to Christ's gospel. Pagan religions also could speak of God as "Father" (Zeus Pater), and in the general sense of Creator God has a universal fatherly relation to the world (Ac 17:24-28). In the Old Testament God was revealed as Father to the chosen nation (Ex 4:22), and to the special representative of the nation, the king (2Sa 7:14), while fatherly love is declared to be the image of His pity for those who fear Him (Ps 103:13). In the gospel of Jesus alone is this Fatherhood revealed to be of the very essence of the Godhead, and to have respect to the individual. Here, however, there is need for great discrimination. To reach the heart of the truth of the Divine Fatherhood it is necessary to begin, not with man, but with the Godhead itself, in whose eternal depths is found the spring of that Fatherly love that reveals itself in time. It is first of all in relation to the eternal Son—before all time—that the meaning of Fatherhood in God is made clear (Joh 1:18). In "God the Father" we have a name pointing to that relation which the first Person in the adorable Trinity sustains to "Son" and "Holy Spirit"—also Divine (Mt 28:19). From this eternal fountain-head flow the relations of God as Father

(1) to the world by creation;

(2) to believers by grace.

Man as created was designed by affinity of nature for sonship to God. The realization of this—his true creature-destiny—was frustrated by sin, and can now only be restored by redemption. Hence, the place of sonship in the gospel, as an unspeakable privilege (1 Joh 3:1), obtained by grace, through regeneration (Joh 1:12,13), and adoption (Ro 8:14,19). In this relation of nearness and privilege to the Father in the kingdom of His Son (Col 1:13), believers are "sons of God" in a sense true of no others. It is a relation, not of nature, but of grace. Fatherhood is now the determinative fact in God's relation to them (Eph 3:14). It is an error, nevertheless, to speak of fatherhood as if the whole character of God was therein sufficiently expressed. God is Father, but equally fundamental is His relation to His world as its Moral Ruler and Judge. From eternity to eternity the holy God must pronounce Himself against sin (Ro 1:18); and His fatherly grace cannot avert judgment where the heart remains hard and impenitent (Ro 2:1-9). For the fuller discussion of these points see GOD; CHILDREN OF GOD; TRINITY.

James Orr

FATHER-IN-LAW

fa'-ther-in-lo.

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

FATHERLESS

fa'-ther-les (yathom; orphanos): The fatherless are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, generally in association with the widow and the stranger, as typical instances of the unprotected and necessitous, who are, specially subject to oppression, and also to God's special protection. Great philanthropic regard is bestowed on this class throughout. In early legislation there is a special clause to guard them against affliction (Ex 22:22-24). They have a still more prominent place in the Deuteronomic legislation, which gives instructions that a charitable fund be formed out of the tithe, once every three years, for the relief of the destitute (De 14:28,29; 26:12-14), and that gleanings be left in the cornfield, the olive garden, and the vineyard for the benefit of this class (De 24:19-22; compare Le 19:9 f; 23:22, where, however, the "fatherless" are not specially mentioned). The Deuteronomist declares that God is on their side (De 10:18), and strongly condemns those who would oppress them (De 24:17; 27:19). The prophets and psalmists are equally emphatic in pleading for mercy and justice to the fatherless, and in declaring that God is their special guardian (Isa 1:17; Jer 7:6; 22:3; Ho 14:3; Zec 7:10; Ps 10:14; 68:5; 82:3; 146:9; compare Pr 23:10). Oppressing the fatherless is frequently mentioned as a typical act of cruelty and injustice (compare Job 6:27; 22:9; 24:3,1; 29:12 f; 31:16,17,21; Ps 94:6; Isa 1:23; 10:2; Jer 5:28; Eze 22:7; Mal 3:5). Here we have instances of the prophetic passion for righteousness and compassion for the helpless, inspired by a profound sense of the value of human life. Passages in the Apocrypha reflect the same spirit (2 Esdras 2:20; Ecclesiasticus 4:10).

In the New Testament the word "fatherless" occurs but once, where James declares, in the spirit of the

Old Testament prophets, that true religious ritual consists in visitation of the fatherless and widows and in moral purity (Jas 1:27). Here the word for "fatherless" is orphanos ("bereft," "orphaned"), which is the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament yathom. In the New Testament the Greek word is found besides only in Joh 14:18, where it means destitute of a teacher or guide (compare La 5:3).

D. Miall Edwards

FATHERS' BROTHER

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

FATHOM

fath'-um (~orguia): The literal meaning is the length of the outstretched arms, and it was regarded as equal to 4 cubits, or about 6 feet. (Ac 27:28).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

FATLING; FATTED

See CALF.

FATNESS

fat'-nes (deshen; piotes):

1. Literal:

The translation of deshen (Jud 9:9, "But the olive-tree said unto them, Should I leave my fatness?"; Job 36:16 (of food)), "full of fatness"; of chelebh, "fat," "the best part," "the marrow" (Job 15:27; Ps 73:7; Isa 34:6,7); of mishman, "fathess," "fertility" (Ge 27:28, "the fatness of the earth"; Isa 17:4, "the fatness of his flesh"); of shemen, "fatness," "oil" (Ps 109:24); of piotes, "fat," "fatness" (Ro 11:17, "partaker .... of the root of the fatness of the olive tree").

2. Figurative:

"Fatness" is used figuratively for the richness of God's goodness; as such it is the translation of deshen ("They shall be abundantly satisfied (margin "Hebrew watered") with the fatness of thy house" (Ps 36:8); "Thy paths drop fatness" (Ps 65:11; compare Isa 55:2; Jer 31:14).

"With fatness" is supplied, De 32:15 the King James Version, "covered with fatness"; the Revised

Version (British and American) has "become sleek"; for "The yoke shall be destroyed because of the anointing" (Isa 10:27) the American Standard Revised Version has "by reason of fatness," margin "Hebrew oil"; the English Revised Version as the King James Version, with margin as the American Standard Revised Version; the text is believed to be corrupt; Septuagint has "from your shoulders."

W. L. Walker

FAUCHION

fo'-shun.

See SCIMITAR.

FAULT

folt (chaTa'; aitia, memphomai): Implies defect, of less moral weight than crime or sin. It is the translation of chaTa'," error," "failure," "sin" (Ex 5:16); of cheT', same meaning (Ge 41:9, "I do remember my faults this day"); of 'awon, "perversity," "iniquity" (2Sa 3:8; Ps 59:4); of rish'ah, "wrongness," "wickedness" (De 25:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "wickedness"); of shechath (Aramaic) "corruption" (Da 6:4 twice); me'umah, "anything" (1Sa 29:3, "no fault in him," literally, "not anything"); of aitia, "cause," "case," "guilt," (Joh 18:38; 19:4,6; Pilate of Jesus, "I find no fault in him," the Revised Version (British and American) "no crime"; the same word is rendered "accusation," i.e. 'legal cause for prosecution,' Mt 27:37; Mr 15:26; compare Ac 25:18,27); of aition, same meaning (Lu 23:4,14; 23:22, aition thanatou "cause of death"); of hettema, "a worse condition," "defect" (1Co 6:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "a defect," margin "a loss to you"); of paraptoma, "a falling aside" (Ga 6:1, "If a man be overtaken in fault," the Revised Version (British and American) "in any trespass," margin "by"; Jas 5:16, "Confess your faults one to another," the Revised Version (British and American) "Confess therefore your sins one to another"); hamartano, "to miss," "err," "sin," is translated "your faults" (1Pe 2:20 the Revised Version (British and American), "when ye sin"); memphomai, "to blame," is translated "to find fault" (Mr 7:2 omitted the Revised Version (British and American); Ro 9:19; Heb 8:8); elegcho, "to convict," "to tell one's fault" (Mt 18:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "show him his fault"); amomos, "without blemish," "spotless," is translated "without fault" (Re 14:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "without blemish," "faultless"; Jude 1:24, "able to present you faultless," the Revised Version (British and American) "without blemish"); amemptos, "blameless," "without reproach" (Heb 8:7, "for if that first covenant had been faultless"). "Faulty" is the translation of 'ashem, "guilty" (2Sa 14:13, "as one which is faulty," the Revised Version (British and American) "guilty"); of 'asham, "to be or become guilty" (Ho 10:2, Revised Version "guilty").

W. L. Walker

FAVOR

fa’-ver (chen, ratson, with other Hebrew words; charis): Means generally good will, acceptance, and the benefits flowing from these; in older usage it meant also the countenance, hence, appearance. Alternating in English Versions of the Bible with "grace," it is used chiefly of man, but sometimes also of God (Ge 18:3; 30:27; 39:21; Ex 3:21; 2Sa 15:25, "in the eyes of Yahweh," etc.). It is used perhaps in the sense of "countenance" in Pr 31:30, "Favor is deceitful, and beauty is vain" (the King James Version), where for "favor" the Revised Version (British and American) has "grace"; the reference is to external appearance. "Favored" is used in the sense of "appearance" in the phrase "well-favored" (Ge 29:17; 39:6; 41:2,4).; conversely, "ill-favored" (Ge 41:3,4). For "favor" the Revised Version (British and American) has "have pity on" (Ps 109:12), "good will" (Pr 14:9), "peace" (So 8:10); the English Revised Version "grace" (Ru 2:13), the American Standard Revised Version "kindness" (Es 2:17; Da 1:9), etc. In the American Standard Revised Version "the acceptable year of the Lord" (Isa 61:2) is changed Into "the year of Yahweh’s favor"; "Do I now persuade men" (Ga 1:10) into, "Am I now seeking the favor of men," and there are other the Revised Version (British and American) changes.

W. L. Walker

FAWN

fon.

See DEER.

FEAR

fer (yir’ah, yare’; phobos, phobeo):

Terms, etc.:

"Fear" is the translation of many words in the Old Testament; the chief are: yir’ah, "fear," "terror," "reverence," "awe," most often "the fear of God," "fear of Yahweh" (Ge 20:11; 2Ch 19:9, etc.); also of "fear" generally (Job 22:4; Isa 7:25; Eze 30:13, etc.); yare’," to be afraid," "to fear," "to reverence" (Ge 15:1; Le 19:3,14; De 6:2, etc.); pachadh, "fear," "terror," "dread" (Ge 31:42,53; De 11:25; 1Sa 11:7 the King James Version; Job 4:14; Isa 2:10 the King James Version, etc.).

"Fearful" (timid) is the translation of yare’ (De 20:8; Jud 7:3); "to be feared," yare’ (Ex 15:11; De 28:58; compare Ps 130:4); in Isa 35:4, it is the translation of mahar, "hasty," "them that are of a fearful heart," margin "Hebrew hasty"; perhaps, ready to flee (for fear).

"Fearfully" (Ps 139:14): yare’," I am fearfully (and) wonderfully made," so the Revised Version (British and American); "and" is not in the text, so that "fearfully" may be equivalent to "extremely," to an

awesome degree; compare Ps 65:5, "by terrible things .... in righteousness"; 66:3, "How terrible are thy works (yare' "fearful "); the Septuagint, Peshitta, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) have "Thou art fearfully wonderful."

"Fearfulness" occurs In Ps 55:5 (yir'ah); Isa 21:4 (pallatsuth), the Revised Version (British and American) "horror"; Isa 33:14 (re'adhah, "trembling"), "Fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites," the Revised Version (British and American) "Trembling hath seized the godless ones."

In the New Testament the chief words are phobos, "fear," "terror," "affright" (Mt 14:26; 28:4,8; Lu 21:26; 1 Joh 4:18, etc.), and phobeo, "to put in fear" (both used of ordinary fear) (Mt 1:20; 10:26; 28:5; 2Co 12:20, etc.); of the fear of God, the noun (Ro 3:18; 2Co 7:1), the verb (Lu 18:4; 23:40, etc.); deilia, "timidity," "fear," occurs in 2Ti 1:7, "God hath not given us the spirit of fear," the Revised Version (British and American) "a spirit of fearfulness"; ekphobos, "frightened out (of one's senses)," "greatly terrified" (Heb 12:21; compare De 9:19; The Wisdom of Solomon 17:9 the King James Version); apo tes eulabeias is translated (Heb 5:7) "(of Christ) who was heard in that he feared," the Revised Version (British and American) "having been heard for his godly fear"; so all the Greek commentators; eulabeia, properly, "caution," "circumspection," is used in the New Testament for godly fear (Heb 12:28, the Revised Version (British and American) "reverence and awe," margin as the King James Version); compare eulabes (Lu 2:25; Ac 2:5; 8:2); eulabeomai, "to act with caution" (Ac 23:10). Deilos, "fearful," "timid," occurs in Mt 8:26; Mr 4:40; Re 21:8, "Their part shall be .... the second death"; phoberos, "fearful," "terrible" (Heb 10:27,31); phobetron, "something fearful," "a terrible sign or portent" (Lu 21:11, Revised Version (British and American) "terrors").

Fear is a natural and, in its purpose, beneficent feeling, arising in the presence or anticipation of danger, and moving to its avoidance; it is also awakened in the presence of superiors and of striking manifestations of power, etc., taking the form of awe or reverence. Fear has been said to be the source of religion, but religion can never have originated from fear alone, since men are impelled to draw nigh with expectation to the object of worship.

"Fear" is certainly a prominent element in Old Testament religion; the "fear of God" or of Yahweh, "the fear of the Lord," is indeed synonymous with religion itself (Ps 34:11; Pr 1:7; Isa 11:2,3; Jer 2:19; Ec 12:13, "the whole duty of man," the Revised Version, margin "the duty of all men"). But although the element of dread, or of "fear" in its lower sense, is not always absent and is sometimes prominent in the earlier stages especially, though not exclusively (Ex 23:27, 'emah; 1Sa 11:7; 2Ch 20:29; Ps 119:120; Isa 2:10,19,21), it is more the feeling of reverent regard for their God, tempered with awe and fear of the punishment of disobedience. As such it is a sentiment commanded and to be cherished toward Yahweh (Ex 20:20; De 6:13; Jos 4:24; 1Sa 12:24; Job 6:14; Ps 33:8; 34:9; Pr 23:17; Ec 5:7, etc.). It is an essential element in the worship and service of Yahweh (2Ki 17 often; Ps 2:11, etc.); it is a Divine qualification of the Messiah (Isa 11:2,3). This "fear of Yahweh" is manifested in keeping God's commandments, walking in His ways, doing His will, avoiding sin, etc. (Ex 20:20; De 6:13,14; 2Sa 23:3; Ps 34:4,9 parallel Pr 8:13; 16:6). It is the true wisdom (Job 28:28; Ps 25:14; Pr 1:7; 15:33); it gives life (Pr 10:27, etc.), blessedness (Ps 128:1,4), sufficiency (Ps 34:9), Divine friendship (Ps 25:14), protection (Ps 34:7), deliverance (Ps 85:9), forgiveness (Ps 130:4). In Ps 90:11 the King James Version

has "According to thy fear so is thy wrath," the Revised Version (British and American) "and thy wrath according to the fear that is due unto thee"; the meaning probably is "thy wrath is in proportion to thy fear."

The "fear of the Lord" is a frequent phrase in Apocrypha, and is highly exalted, e.g. Ecclesiasticus 1:11-30; the idea of it became gradually more and more elevated; in 2:15,16 it is joined with the love of God.

"Fear" is the natural consequence of sin (Ge 3:10; 4:13,14; Pr 28:1); it comes as a punishment (De 28:25,28). The fear of man and of evils are dangers to be avoided, from which the fear of God delivers (Nu 14:9; 21:34; Ps 23:4; 31:14, etc.).

"Fear" sometimes stands for the object of fear (Pr 10:24; Isa 66:4); for the object of worship (Ge 31:42,53, "the God of Abraham, and the Fear of isaac," pachadh).

In the New Testament dread, or fear of God in the lower sense, is removed; He is revealed as the loving and forgiving Father, who gives to men the spirit of sonship (Ro 8:15; 2Ti 1:7; 1 Joh 4:18); we are invited even to come "with boldness unto the throne of grace," with confidence, assurance (parrhesia), which, however, may have its literal meaning of free "utterance" (Heb 4:16; 10:19); but there remains a filial fear and sense of awe and of the greatness of the issues involved (Ro 11:20; Eph 5:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "of Christ"; 1Ti 5:20; Heb 4:1); all other fears should be dismissed (Mt 8:26; 10:26-28,31; Lu 12:32); in Mt 10:28; Lu 12:5, "fear" is used in the sense of "stand in awe of," so perhaps Lu 23:40; to "fear God" is sometimes used in the New Testament as equivalent to religion (Lu 18:4; Ac 10:2,35; 13:16,26, used of proselytes); in Heb 10:27, it is said that if Christ be willfully rejected, nothing remains but "a fearful looking for (the Revised Version (British and American) "expectation") of judgment," and 10:31, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God," in which places "fearful" means "terrible," something well to be feared. the Revised Version (British and American) gives frequently a more literal rendering of the words translated "fear."

W. L. Walker

FEASTS AND FASTS

fests (mo‘edh, "an appointed day" or "an assembling," chagh, from chaghagh, "to dance" or possibly "to make a pilgrimage"; tsom, "fast," ta‘anith, "a day of affliction"):

I. PRE-EXILIC

A) Annual

1. Passover, 15th-22d Nican

2. Pentecost, 6th Ciwan) Pilgrimage

3. Tabernacles, 15th-22d Tishri) Festivals

4. Shemini ‘Atsereth, 23d Tishri

5. New Year, Feast of Trumpets, 1st Tishri

6. Atonement, 10th Tishri

B) Periodic

1. Weekly Sabbath

2. New Moon

3. Sabbath Year

4. Jubilee Year

II. POST-EXILIC

1. Feast of Dedication, 25th Kiclew

2. Fast of Esther, 13th ‘Adhar

3. Feast of Purim, 14th ‘Adhar

4. Fast of the Fourth Month, 17th Tammuz

5. Fast of the Fifth Month, 9th ‘Abh

6. Fast of the Seventh Month, 3rd Tishri

7. Fast of the Tenth Month, 10th Tebheth

8. Feast of Acra, 23d Iyar

9. Feast of Nicanor, 18th ‘Adhar

10. Feast of Woodcarrying, Midsummer Day, 15th ‘Abh

11. New Year for Trees, 15th ShebhaT

12. Bi-weekly Fasts, Mondays and Thursdays after Festivals

13. Second Days of Festivals Instituted

14. New Modes of Observing Old Festivals Instituted

The Nature of the Hebrew Festivals:

The Hebrews had an abundance of holidays, some based, according to their tradition, on agriculture and the natural changes of times and seasons, some on historical events connected with the national or religious life of Israel, and still others simply on immemorial custom. in most instances two or more of these bases coexist, and the emphasis on the natural, the agricultural, the national, or the religious phase will vary with different writers, different context, or different times. Any classification of these feasts and fasts on the basis of original significance must therefore be imperfect.

We should rather classify them as preexilic and post-exilic, because the period of the Babylonian captivity marks a complete change, not only in the kinds of festivals instituted from time to time, but also in the manner of celebrating the old.

I. Pre-exilic.

The pre-exilic list includes the three pilgrimage festivals, the Passover week, Pentecost, and the Feast of Tabernacles, together with the Eighth Day of Assembly at the conclusion of the last of these feasts, and New Year and Atonement Days, the weekly Sabbath and the New Moon.

1. Observances Common to All:

The preexilic festivals were "holy convocations" (Le 23; Nu 28). Special sacrifices were offered on them in addition to the daily offerings. These sacrifices, however, varied according to the character of the festival (Nu 28; 29). On all of them trumpets (chatsotseroth) were blown while the burnt offerings and the peace-offerings were being sacrificed (Nu 10:10). They were all likened to the weekly Sabbath as days of rest, on which there must be complete suspension of all ordinary work (Le 16:29; 23:7,8,21,24,25,28,35,36).

2. Significance of the Festivals:

The three pilgrimage festivals were known by that name because on them the Israelites gathered at Jerusalem to give thanks for their doubly joyful character. They were of agricultural significance as well

as commemorative of national events. Thus, the Passover is connected with the barley harvest; at the same time it is the zeman cheruth, recalling the Exodus from Egypt (Ex 12:6; Le 23:5,8; Nu 28:16-25; De 16:1-8).

Pentecost has an agricultural phase as chagh habikkurim, the celebration of the wheat harvest; it has a religious phase as zeman mattan Thorah in the Jewish liturgy, based on the rabbinical calculation which makes it the day of the giving of the Law, and this religious side has so completely overshadowed the agricultural that among modern Jews the Pentecost has become "confirmation day" (Ex 34:26; Le 23:10-14; Nu 28:26-31).

The Feast of Tabernacles is at once the general harvest festival, chagh he-'aciph, and the anniversary of the beginnings of the wanderings in the wilderness (Ex 23:16; Le 23:33 ff; De 16:13-15). The Eighth Day of Assembly immediately following the last day of Tabernacles (Le 23:36; Nu 29:35 ff; Joh 7:37) and closing the long cycle of Tishri festivals seems to have been merely a final day of rejoicing before the pilgrims returned to their homes.

New Year (Le 23:23-25; Nu 29:1-6) and the Day of Atonement (Le 16:1 ff; 23:26-32; Nu 29:7-11) marked the turning of the year; primarily, perhaps, in the natural phenomena of Palestine, but also in the inner life of the nation and the individual. Hence, the religious significance of these days as days of judgment, penitence and forgiveness soon overshadowed any other significance they may have had. The temple ritual for these days, which is minutely described in the Old Testament and in the Talmud, was the most elaborate and impressive of the year. At the same time Atonement Day was socially an important day of rejoicing.

In addition to these annual festivals the pre-exilic Hebrews celebrated the Sabbath (Nu 28:9,10; Le 23:1-3) and the New Moon (Nu 10:10; 28:11-15). By analogy to the weekly Sabbath, every seventh year was a Sabbath Year (Ex 23:11; Le 25:1-7; De 15:1), and every cycle of seven Sabbath years was closed with a Jubilee Year (Le 25:8-18) somewhat after the analogy of the seven weeks counted before Pentecost.

For further details of all of these preexilic festivals see the separate articles.

II. Post-exilic.

In post-exilic times important historical events were made the basis for the institution of new fasts and feasts. When the first temple was destroyed and the people were carried into captivity, "the sacrifice of the body and one's own fat and blood" were substituted for that of animals (see Talmud, Berakhoth 17a). With such a view of their importance, fasts of all sorts were as a matter of course rapidly multiplied. (Note that the Day of Atonement was the only pre-exilic fast.) Of these post-exilic fasts and feasts, the Feast of Dedication (1 Macc 4:52-59; Joh 10:22; Mishna, Ta'anith 2 10; Mo'edh QaTon 3 9; Josephus, Ant, XII, vii; Apion, II, xxxix) and the Feast of Purim (Es 3:7; 9:24 ff; 2 Macc 15:36); and the fasts of the fourth (Zec 8:19; Jer 39; 52; Mishna, Ta'anith 4 6), the fifth (Zec 7:3,1; 8:19; Ta'anith 4 6), the seventh (Zec 7:5; 8:19; Jer 41:1; 2Ki 25:25; Cedher 'Olam Rabba' 26; Meghillath Ta'anith c. 12),

the tenth months (Zec 8:19; 2Ki 25), and the Fast of Esther (Es 4:16 f; 9:31) have been preserved by Jewish tradition to this day. (The Feast of Dedication, the Feast of Purim and the Fast of Esther are described in separate articles.)

Significance:

The fasts of the fourth, fifth, seventh and tenth months are based on historical incidents connected with one or more national calamities. In several instances the rabbis have by close figuring been able to connect with the dates of the fasts as well as the feasts other important national events than those for which the days were primarily instituted. Not less than four incidents are connected with the fasts of the fourth month (17th of Tammuz):

(a) on this day the Israelites made the golden calf;

(b) Moses broke the tables of law;

(c) the daily sacrifices ceased for want of cattle when the city was closely besieged prior to the destruction of Jerusalem; and

(d) on this day Jerusalem was stormed by Nebuchadnezzar.

The fast of the fifth month (9th day of ‘Abh) receives its significance from the fact that the First Temple was destroyed upon this day by Nebuchadnezzar, and the Second Temple on the same day of the year by Titus. In addition it is said that on this day Yahweh decreed that those who left Egypt should not enter the land of promise; the day is also the anniversary of the capture of the city of Bether by the Emperor Hadrian. The fast of the seventh month (the 3rd day of Tishri) commemorates the murder of Gedaliah at Mizpah. That of the tenth month (10th day of Tebheth) commemorates the beginning of the siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

Other fasts and feasts no doubt were instituted on similar occasions and received a local or temporary observance, for example, the Feast of Acra (1 Macc 13:50-52; compare 1:33), to celebrate the recapture of Acra ("the citadel") on the 23rd of ‘Iyar 141 BC, and the Feast of Nicanor, in celebration of the victory over Nicanor on the 13th day of ‘Adhar 160 BC (1 Macc 7:49).

Several other festivals are mentioned in the Talmud and other post-Biblical writings which may have been of even greater antiquity. The Feast of Woodcarrying (Midsummer Day: Ne 10:34; Josephus, BJ, II, vii, 6; Meghillath Ta‘anith c.v, p. 32, Mishna, Ta‘anith 4 8a), for example, is referred to as the greatest day of rejoicing of the Hebrews, ranking with Atonement Day. It was principally a picnic day to which a religious touch was given by making it the woodgatherers’ festival for the Temple. A New Year for trees is mentioned in the Talmud (Ro’sh ha-Shdnah 1 1). The pious, according both to the Jewish tradition and the New Testament, observed many private or semi-public fasts, such as the Mondays, Thursdays and following Monday after Nisan and Tishri (the festival months: Lu 18:12; Mt 9:14; 6:16;

Mr 2:18; Lu 5:33; Ac 10:30; Meghillah 31a; Ta‘anith 12a; Bdbha’ Qama’ 8 2). The day before Passover was a fast day for the firstborn (Copherim 21 3).

In post-Biblical times the Jews outside of Palestine doubled each of the following days: the opening and closing day of Passover and Tabernacles and Pentecost, because of the capheq, or doubt as to the proper day to be observed, growing out of the delays in the transmission of the official decree of the Sanhedhrin in each season. Differences in hours of sunrise and sunset between Palestine and other countries may have had something to do at least with the perpetuation of the custom. New Year’s Day seems to have been doubled from time immemorial, the forty-eight hours counting as one "long day."

Many new modes of observance appear in post-exilic times in connection with the old established festivals, especially in the high festival season of Tishri. Thus the cimchath beth ha-sho’ebhah, "water drawing festival," was celebrated during the week of Tabernacles with popular games and dances in which even the elders took part, and the streets were so brilliantly illuminated with torches that scarcely an eye was closed in Jerusalem during that week (Talmud, Chullin).

The last day of Tabernacles was known in Talmudic times as yom chibbuT ‘arabhoth, from the custom of beating willow branches, a custom clearly antedating the various symbolical explanations offered for it. Its festivities were connected with the dismantling of the booth. In later times the day was known as hosha‘na’ rabba’, from the liturgical passages beginning with the word hosha‘na’, recited throughout the feast and "gathered" on that day. The day after Tabernacles has been made cimchath Torah, the Feast of the Law, from the custom of ending on that day the cycle of fifty-two weekly portions read in the synagogues.

In general it may be said that although the actual observance has changed from time to time to meet new conditions, the synagogal calendar of today is made up of the same festivals as those observed in New Testament times.

Ella Davis Isaacs

FEASTS, SEASONS FOR

Regulated by the sun and moon.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

FEATHERS

feth’-erz (notsah; Latin penna): "Gavest thou the goodly wings unto the peacocks? or wings (the Revised Version (British and American) "pinions") and feathers (the American Standard Revised Version "plumage") unto the ostrich?" (Job 39:13 the King James Version); "He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust; his truth shall be thy shield and buckler" (Ps 91:4 the King

James Version). In the Revised Version (British and American) this is again changed to pinions. in Da 4:33 the word "feathers" is left. The wonderful plumage of birds was noted and prized in those days, just as now. Old ostriches were too tough and rank of flesh for food. They were pursued for their feathers, which were used for the headdressing and shield ornaments of desert princes. No one doubts that the ships of Solomon introduced peacocks because of their wonderful feathers. Those of the eagle were held in superstitious reverence as late as the days of Pliny, who was ten years old at the time of the crucifixion of Christ. Pliny wrote that the eagle was so powerful that if its feathers be laid in a box with those of other birds, the eagle feathers would "devour and consume all the rest."

Gene Stratton-Porter

FEEBLE KNEES

fe’-b’-l nez: The expression. is found in three places (one being a free quotation of another): Job 4:4, "Thou hast made firm the feeble (kara‘, "bending," "bowing") knees," and Heb 12:12, "Wherefore lift up the hands that hang down, and the palsied (the King James Version "feeble") knees." The Greek word used here (paralelumena, "paralyzed," "motionless") implies the loss of junction, interrupted articulation, the cutting off of vital strength; compare Greek cholos, "lame," and see Delitzsch in his Commentary on Heb, in the place cited

Such an affection of the knees may be due to different causes. It is, e.g., a very frequent symptom of the disease known in the Orient as beriberi, when the muscles of the lower leg shrink to such a degree as to render voluntary locomotion impossible. It always disables its victim, and is therefore often expressive of general debility, e.g. in Ps 109:24, where such weakness is described as the outcome of protracted fasting in Eze 7:17 and 21:7, "All knees shall be weak as water," the expression indicates a complete relaxation of the muscles. Fear effected the same condition in Belshazzar’s case, when he saw the writing on the wall (Da 5:6), "The joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another" (compare Na 2:10).

The "sore boil .... in the knees, and in the legs," a disease announced in De 28:35 as a punishment upon Israel for disobedience, cannot now be fully determined. Driver (in his commentary on the passage) thinks of elephantiasis, which is possible but not probable on account of the additional statement, "whereof thou canst not be healed, from the sole of thy foot unto the crown of thy head" which would be unexplained, as elephantiasis rarely presents a form in which the whole body is sympathetically affected. I rather think of some form of bubonic plague, which causes very high fever all over the body. In De 28:27 in the enumeration of plagues mention is made of the "boil of Egypt," and some commentators have explained this as "bubonic plague." There is, however, no doubt that the "boil or botch of Egypt" is identical with the disease known to modern medicine as bouton du Nil, Biskra button, Bagdad or Aleppo sore.

H. L. E. Luering

FEEBLE-MINDED

fe’-b’-l-min’-ded (oligopsuchos): Only in 1Th 5:14 the King James Version, in the sense of "fainthearted," as in the Revised Version (British and American). In Septuagint it is used as the equivalent of koshel, the tottering or feeble-kneed in Isa 35:3; 54:6; oligopsuchia occurs in Septuagint twice (Ex 6:9; Ps 54:7), for "anguish of spirit" and "trouble." The term refers to weakness of will and vacillation of purpose rather than to idiocy or morbid imbecility.

FEELING

fel’-ing: The following varieties of meaning are to be noted:

(1) "To touch," "handle," "grope after" (mashash (Ge 27:12,22; Ex 10:21; mush, Ge 27:21; Jud 16:26; pselaphao, Ac 17:27).

(2) "To know," "understand," "experience" (bin, Ps 58:9; yadha‘, Pr 23:35; ginosko, Mr 5:29).

(3) "To have a fellow feeling," "to place one’s self into the position of another," especially while suffering, "to have compassion" (sumpathein, Heb 4:15; compare 10:34; which is to be carefully distinguished from the similar verb sumpaschein, which means "to share in the same suffering with another," Ro 8:17; 1Co 12:26). See Delitzsch, Commentary on Heb 4:15.

(4) "To feel harm," "pain," "grief," "to be sensitive" (paschein, with the roots path- and penth-, Ac 28:5); or with the negation: "to have ceased to feel," "to be apathetic," "past feeling," "callous," apelgekos, perfect participle of apalgeo (Eph 4:19) which describes the condition of the sinner, who by hardening his heart against moral influences is left without a sense of his high vocation, without an idea of the awfulness of sin, without reverence to God, without an appreciation of the salvation offered by Him, and without fear of His judgment.

H. L. E. Luering

FEET, WASHING OF

See FOOT; WASHING OF FEET.

FEIGN

fan (badha, nakhar; plastos): Occurs

(1) in the sense of "to devise," "invent" as the translation of badha’," to form," "to fashion" (Ne 6:8, "Thou feignest them out of thine own heart"; compare 1Ki 12:33, English Versions of the Bible "devised

of his own heart"); of plastos, "formed," "molded" (2Pe 2:3, "with reigned words make merchandise of you");

(2) in the sense of "pretense," nakhar, "to be foreign," "strange" (1Ki 14:5, "feign herself to be another woman," 1ki 14:6; compare Ge 42:7; Pr 26:24); ‘abhal, "to mourn," "to act as a mourner" (2Sa 14:2); halal, "to make a show," Hithpael, "to be mad," "to feign madness" (of David, 1Sa 21:13; compare Jer 25:16; 50:38); hupokrinomai, "to give judgment, or act, under a mask" (Lu 20:20, "who feigned themselves to be righteous");

(3) in the sense of "deceit" "fraud," "insincerity," mirmah, "prayer, that goeth not out of feigned lips" (Ps 17:1); sheqer, "falsehood," "a lie," "Judah hath not returned unto me with her whole heart, but feignedly" (Jer 3:10; compare APC 2Esdras 8:28); kahash, "to lie," "to feign, or flatter" (2Sa 12:45; Ps 18:44; 66:3; 81:15), where the text of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "shall submit themselves," is rendered the margin (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), "yield feigned obedience, Hebrew lie." the Revised Version (British and American) has "feign" for "make" (2Sa 13:5), and "feigned" for "made" (2Sa 13:6).

W. L. Walker

FELIX; ANTONIUS

fe’-liks, an-to’-ni-us (Phelix, from Latin felix, "happy"): A Roman procurator of Judea, appointed in succession to Cumanus by the emperor Claudius. The event which led to the introduction of Felix into the narrative of Ac was the riot at Jerusalem (Ac 21:27). There Paul, being attacked at the instigation of the Asiatic Jews for alleged false teaching and profanation of the temple, was rescued with difficulty by Lysias the chief captain. But Lysias, finding that Paul was a Roman citizen, and that therefore the secret plots against the life of his captive might entail serious consequences upon himself, and finding also that Paul was charged on religious rather than on political grounds, sent him on to Felix at Caesarea for trial (Ac 21:31-23:34). On his arrival, Paul was presented to Felix and was then detained for five days in the judgment hall of Herod, till his accusers should also reach Caesarea (Ac 23:33-35). The trial was begun, but after hearing the evidence of Tertullus (see TERTULLUS) and the speech of Paul in his own defense, Felix deferred judgment (Ac 24:1-22). The excuse he gave for delay was the non-appearance of Lysias, but his real reason was in order to obtain bribes for the release of Paul. He therefore treated his prisoner at first with leniency, and pretended along with Drusilla to take interest in his teaching. But these attempts to induce Paul to purchase his freedom failed ignominiously; Paul sought favor of neither Felix nor Drusilla, and made the frequent interviews which he had with them an opportunity for preaching to them concerning righteousness and temperance and the final judgment. The case dragged on for two years till Felix, upon his retirement, "desiring to gain favor with the Jews .... left Paul in bonds" (Ac 24:27). According to the Bezan text, the continued imprisonment of Paul was due to the desire of Felix to please Drusilla.

Felix was the brother of Pallas, who was the infamous favorite of Claudius, and who, according to

Tacitus (Annals xiii. 14), fell into disgrace in 55 AD. Tacitus implies that Felix was joint procurator of Judea, along with Cumanus, before being appointed to the sole command, but Josephus is silent as to this. Both Tacitus and Josephus refer to his succeeding Cumanus, Josephus stating that it was at the instigation of Jonathan the high priest. There is some doubt as to the chronology of Felix' tenure of office. Harnack and Blass, following Eusebius and Jerome, place his accession in 51 AD, and the imprisonment of Paul in 54-56 AD; but most modern commentators incline to the dates 52 AD and 56-58 AD. These latter interpret the statement of Paul, "Thou hast been of many years a judge unto this nation" (Ac 24:10), as referring to some judicial office, not necessarily that of co-procurator (see Tacitus), previously held by Felix in the time of Cumanus, and argue that this earlier connection of Felix with Judea supplied a reason for the advocacy by Jonathan of Felix' claims to the procuratorship on the deposition of Gumanus. The testimony of Ac as to the evil character of Felix is fully corroborated by the writings of Josephus (BJ, II, xiii). Although he suppressed the robbers and murderers who infested Judea, and among them the "Egyptian" to whom Lysias refers (Ac 21:38), yet "he himself was more hurtful than them all." When occasion offered, he did not hesitate to employ the sicarii (see ASSASSINS) for his own ends. Trading upon the influence of his brother at court, his cruelty and rapacity knew no bounds, and during his rule revolts became continuous, and marked a distinct stage in that seditious movement which culminated in the outbreak of 70 AD (so Schurer). His leaving Paul in bonds was but a final instance of one who sacrificed duty and justice for the sake of his Own unscrupulous selfishness. For more detailed information as to dates, etc., compare Knowling (Expos Greek Test., II, 477 ff).

C. M. Kerr

FELLOES

fel'-oz (1Ki 7:33).

See WHEEL.

FELLOW

fel'-o (chabher, rea'; hetairos): Meant originally a "partner," from fe, "property," and lag, "to lay," then "a companion," "an equal," "a person or individual," "a worthless person."

(1) As "companion" it is the translation of chabher, "associate," "companion," "friend" (also chabbar, Job 41:6), where we have the original sense of partnership, translated "bands" the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version "companions"); Ps 45:7, "God hath anointed thee .... above thy fellows"; of habhrah (Ec 4:10; Da 7:20); of rea', "companion," "friend," "another" (Ex 2:13; Jud 7:13,14,22); re'ah (or ra'yah), "a female friend" (Jud 11:37, "I and my fellows," the Revised Version (British and American) "companions"; here the King James Version applies "fellow" to a female; compare Baruch 6:43, "She reproacheth her fellow," he plesion); in Jud 11:38, "companions" is the translation of 'amith, "fellowship"; 'amith (Zec 13:7, "the man that is my fellow," literally, "the man of

my fellowship"); hetairos, "companion" (Mt 11:16); metochos, "partner"; (compare Lu 5:7; Heb 1:9, quoted from Ps 45:7, Septuagint for chabher).

(2) As an individual or person "fellow" is the translation of ‘ish, "a man," "an individual": "make this fellow return" (1Sa 29:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the man"); in the same verse "fellow" is supplied instead of "he"; "fellow" in 1611 meant simply "a man," and it is difficult to say in what passages the ideas of "worthless," etc., are meant to be implied; probably, however, in Jud 18:25, where the Hebrew is simply ‘enosh, "man," and the text is almost the only deviation from the rendering "man," "men," "lest angry (margin, Revised Version "bitter of soul") fellows fall upon you"; also Ac 17:5, aner, "a man," "certain lewd fellows of the baser sort," the Revised Version (British and American) "vile fellows"; compare 2Sa 6:20, "vain (req) fellows" (supplied); APC 1Macc 10:61, "contain pestilent fellows" (aner); Ecclesiasticus 8:15, "a bold fellow" (tolmeros), the Revised Version (British and American) "a rash man"; in several places of the Old Testament "fellow" represents zeh, "this," and in these instances there seems to be something of worthlessness or contempt implied (1Sa 21:15; 25:21; 1Ki 22:27; 2Ki 9:11, and, as before, 1Sa 29:4 the Revised Version (British and American)); in the New Testament also "fellow" often represents houtos, "this," and in most of these cases the King James Version seems to intend something depreciatory to be understood; the Revised Version (British and American) gives simply "man" (Mt 12:24; 26:61,71; Lu 22:59; 23:2; Joh 9:29; Ac 18:13); so Ecclesiasticus 13:23, "If the poor man speaks, they say, What fellow is this?" the Revised Version (British and American) "who is this?" APC 1Macc 4:5, "These fellows flee from us," the Revised Version (British and American) "these men." the Revised Version (British and American) has "fellows" for "persons" (Jud 9:4), for "men" (Jud 11:3); "base fellows" for "men the children of Belial" (De 13:13), margin, "sons of worthlessness"; the American Standard Revised Version "worthless fellow" for "son of Belial" (1Sa 25:17,25), "base fellows" for "sons of Belial" (Jud 19:22; 20:13, etc.); the Revised Version (British and American) has also "companions" for "fellows" (Jud 11:37; Eze 37:19; Da 2:13), "each man his fellow" for "one another" (2Ki 3:23); "fellow by" for "neighbor in" (1Ki 20:35).

Fellow-citizen, Fellow-disciple, Fellow-heirs, Yokefellow, etc. In composition, "fellow" always means partner or companion.

W. L. Walker

FELLOWSHIP

fel’-o-ship.

See COMMUNION.

FEMALE

fe’-mal: Two Hebrew words are thus translated:

(1) neqebhah, which is merely a physiological description of the sexual characteristic (from naqabh, "to perforate"), and which corresponds to zakhar, "male" (see under the word).

(2) ‘ishshah, with the irregular plural nashim (only Ge 7:2, in all other places "wife," "woman"), the feminine form of ‘ish, "man."

The Greek word is thelus, literally, "the nursing one," "the one giving suck" (from thelazo, "to suckle").

Israelitic law seems frequently guilty of unjust partiality in favor of the male sex, but we have to consider that most of these legal and religious disabilities of women can be explained from the social conditions prevailing at the time of legislation. They are therefore found also in contemporaneous Gentilereligions. Though traces of this prejudice against the weaker sex are found in the New Testament, the religious discrimination between the sexes has practically ceased, as is evident from Ga 3:28: "There can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus"; compare also 1Pe 3:7.

H. L. E. Luering

FENCE

fens (batsar, mibhtsar):

Commonly used in the King James Version in the description of fortified places, as the translation of batsar, "to cut off," "to separate," "to fortify" (and forms) (De 3:5; 9:1; 28:52, etc.); mibhtsar, "fenced city," is a fortified place (Nu 32:17,36; Jos 10:20; 19:35, etc.); matsor, "fenced cities," means "bulwark," "citadel" (2Ch 8:5); metsurah, "fortification" (2Ch 11:23; 12:4; 14:6; 21:3); for "fenced" the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "fortified" in all these instances; in Da 11:15, mibhtsar is "a well-fortified city," margin "the fortified cities," the English Revised Version "well-fenced"; "fence" is also the translation of gadher, "a wall" or "fence" (Job 19:8 the American Standard Revised Version, "walled up" (gadhar); Ps 62:3); ‘azaq, "to loosen" (the ground) as with a mattock (Isa 5:2, where the King James Version has "fenced" it (the vineyard), the American Standard Revised Version "digged it," the English Revised Version "made a trench about it," it" margin "digged it" sukh, "to interweave" or "interlace" (Job 10:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "clothed"); male’," to be or become full" (2Sa 23:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "armed," margin "Hebrew filled").

ERV has "fence" for "wall" (Nu 22:24; Isa 5:5; Ho 2:6; the American Standard Revised Version retains "wall"), for "hedge" (Ec 10:8; Eze 13:5; 22:30; the American Standard Revised Version "wall"); "fenced" for "walled" (Nu 13:28; De 1:28; the American Standard Revised Version "fortified"); compare for "strong" Jos 19:29; Ne 9:25; Ps 108:10 (margin Jos 19:29, "the city of Mibzar-zor, that is, the fortress of Tyre," the English Revised Version ,"fenced"), for "hedged" (La 3:7, American Revised Version, "walled"); compare for "defenced," the English Revised Version "fenced," the American Standard Revised Version "fortified" (Isa 36:1; 37:26, etc.); "fences" for "hedges" (Ps 80:12, the

American Standard Revised Version "walls"); in Jer 49:3, the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version have "fences."

See also HEDGE.

W. L. Walker

FENCED CITIES

See FORTIFICATION.

FERRET

fer’-et (’anaqah, the Revised Version (British and American) GECKO): Occurs only in Le 11:30 the King James Version, in the list of animals which are unclean "among the creeping things that creep upon the earth." the Revised Version (British and American) has "gecko" with the marginal note, "Words of uncertain meaning, but probably denoting four kinds of lizards." The list of animals in Le 11:29,30 includes

(1) choledh, English Versions of the Bible "weasel";

(2) ‘akhbar, English Versions of the Bible "mouse";

(3) tsabh, the King James Version "tortoise," the Revised Version (British and American) "great lizard";

(4) ‘anaqkah, the King James Version "ferret," the Revised Version (British and American) "gecko";

(5) koach the King James Version "chameleon," the Revised Version (British and American) "land crocodile";

(6) leTa’ah, English Versions of the Bible "lizard";

(7) chomeT, the King James Version "snail," the Revised Version (British and American) "sand lizard";

(8) tinshemeth, the King James Version "mole," the Revised Version (British and American) "chameleon."

It will be noted that while Revised Version makes the first two mammals and the remaining six reptiles, the King James Version makes not only (1) and (2) but also (4) and (8) mammals, and (7) a mollusk. So far as this general classification is concerned the King James Version follows the Septuagint, except in the case of (7). It must be borne in mind that all these words except (2) and (8) occur only in this

passage, while (2) and (8) occur each in only a few passages where the context throws but uncertain light upon the meaning. Under these circumstances we ought to be content with the rendering of the Septuagint, unless from philology or tradition we can show good reason for differing. For ‘anaqah, Septuagint has mugale, which occurs in Herodotus and Aristotle and may be a shrew mouse or a field mouse. Just as the next word, koach, is found in other passages (see CHAMELEON) with the meaning of "strength," so ‘anaqah occurs in several places signifying "moaning" or "sighing" (Ps 12:5; 79:11; 102:20; Mal 2:13). It seems to be from the root, ‘anaq, "to choke," "to be in anguish" (compare ‘anaq, "a collar"; chanaq, "to choke"; Arabic ‘unq, "neck"; Arabic khanaq, "to strangle"; Greek anagke; Latin angustus; German enge, Nacken; English "anxious," "neck"). Some creature seems to be meant which utters a low cry or squeak, and neither "ferret" (the King James Version) nor "gecko" (Revised Version (British and American)) seems to have a better claim than the older Septuagint rendering of mugale =" shrew mouse" or "field mouse."

Alfred Ely Day

FERRY-BOAT

fer’-i-bot (2Sa 19:18).

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

FERVENT

fur’-vent (dalaq; ektenes, zeo):

"Fervent" (from Latin fervere, "to boil") does not occur in the King James Version of the Old Testament, but the Revised Version (British and American) gives it as the translation of dalaq, "to burn" (Pr 26:23), instead of "burning," "fervent lips and a wicked heart." In the New Testament it is the translation of ektenes, "stretched out," hence, intent, earnest (1Pe 4:8, "being fervent in your love among yourselves"); of zeo, "to boil," "to be hot" (Ro 12:11, "fervent in spirit," Ac 18:25); of zelos, "zeal," "fervor" (2Co 7:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "zeal"), in Jas 5:16 the King James Version has: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," where the Greek is: polu ischuei deesis dikaiou energoumene, which the Revised Version (British and American) renders, "The supplication of a righteous man availeth much in its working."

"Fervently" is the translation of agonizomai, "to strive or struggle" (agonize), Col 4:12 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Epaphras .... striving for you in his prayers"; of ektenos, literally, in an outstretched manner (1Pe 1:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "Love one another from the heart fervently"; compare 1Pe 4:8, "fervent in your love among yourselves"). Christian love too often lacks this fervency, but Christ’s love for us was "stretched out" to the uttermost.

The Revised Version (British and American) has "fervently" for "earnestly" (Jas 5:17, margin "with prayer").

W. L. Walker

FESTIVAL

fes’-ti-val.

See FEASTS AND FASTS.

FESTUS; PORCIUS

fes’-tus, por’-shi-us Porkios Phestos):

The Roman governor or procurator who succeeded Felix in the province of Judea (Ac 24:27), and was thus brought into prominence in the dispute between Paul and the Sanhedrin which continued after the retirement of Felix (Ac 25; 26). Upon the arrival of Festus in Jerusalem, the official capital of his province, the Jews besought of him to send Paul from Caesarea to Jerusalem to appear before them, intending to kill him on the way (Ac 25:3). Festus at first refused their request, and upon his return to Caesarea proceeded himself to examine Paul (Ac 25:6). But on finding that the evidence was conflicting, and reflecting that, as the accused was apparently charged on religious rather than on political grounds, the Sanhedrin was a more suitable court for his case than a Roman tribunal, he asked Paul if he were agreeable to make the journey to Jerusalem (Ac 25:7-9). But Paul, who knew well the nefarious use that the Jews would make of the pleasure which Festus was willing to grant them, made his appeal unto Caesar (Ac 25:10,11). To this request of a Roman citizen accused on a capital charge (compare Ac 25:16), Festus had perforce to give his consent (Ac 25:12). But the manner of his consent indicated his pique at the apparent distrust shown by Paul. By the words "unto Caesar shalt thou go," Festus implied that the case must now be proceeded with to the end: otherwise, had it been left in his own hands, it might have been quashed at an earlier stage (compare also Ac 26:32). Meantime King Agrippa and Bernice had arrived in Caesarea, and to these Festus gave a brief explanation of the circumstances (Ac 25:13-21).

The previous audiences of Festus with Paul and his accusers had, however, served only to confuse him as to the exact nature of the charge. Paul was therefore summoned before the regal court, in order both that Agrippa might hear him, and that the governor might obtain more definite information for insertion in the report he was required to send along with the prisoner to Rome (Ac 25:22-27). The audience which followed was brought to an abrupt conclusion by the interruption of Paul’s speech (Ac 26:1-23) by Festus: "Paul, thou art mad; thy much learning is turning thee mad" (Ac 26:24). Yet the meeting was sufficient to convince both Agrippa and Festus that "this man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds" (Ac 26:31).

While Festus displayed a certain contempt for what he regarded as the empty delusions of a harmless maniac, his conduct throughout the whole proceeding was marked by a strict impartiality; and his straightforward dealing with Paul formed a marked contrast to the dilatoriness of Felix. The praise bestowed upon the latter by Tertullus (Ac 24:2) might with better reason have been bestowed on Festus, in that he freed the country from many robbers (Sicarii: Josephus, Ant, XX, viii-x; BJ, II, xiv, 1); but his procuratorship was too short to undo the harm wrought by his predecessor. The exact date of his accession to office is uncertain, and has been variously placed at 55-61 AD

(compare Knowling in Expositor's Greek Testament, II, 488-89; see also FELIX).

C.M. Kerr

FETCH fech (laqach):

Has generally the meaning of "to bring"; it is commonly the translation of Hebrew laqach, "to take" or "lay hold of," Hoph. "to be brought, seized or snatched away" (Ge 18:4, etc.; Ge 27:9; 42:16; 1Sa 4:3; 1Ki 17:10, etc.); twice of nasa'," to lift up" (2Ch 12:11, the American Standard Revised Version "bare"; Job 36:3); of bo'," to come in" (2Ch 1:17; Ne 8:15); of 'alah, "to cause to come up" (1Sa 6:21; 7:1); of yatsa'," to cause to come out" (Nu 20:10, the American Standard Revised Version "bring forth"; Jer 26:23), and of a number of other words.

In the New Testament it is the translation of exago, "to lead out" (Ac 16:37, "Let them come themselves and fetch us out," the Revised Version (British and American) "bring"); "to fetch a compass" is the translation of cabhabh (Nu 34:5; Jos 15:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "turn," "turned about"; 2Sa 5:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "make a circuit"; 2Ki 3:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "made a circuit"); of perierchomai (aor. 2, perielthon), "to go about," "to wander up and down" (of a ship driven about; Ac 28:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "made a circuit," margin "some ancient authorities read cast loose").

The Revised Version (British and American) has "fetch" for "bring" (1Ki 3:24), for "call for" (Ac 10:5; 11:13); "fetched" for "called for" (Es 5:10), for "took out" (Jer 37:17); "fetched" for "took" (2Ch 8:18).

W. L. Walker

FETTER

fet'-er:

Found only in the plural in both Old Testament and New Testament; fetters of iron (Ps 105:18; 149:8; so probably Mr 5:4; Lu 8:29) or brass (Jud 16:21; 2Ki 25:7) were frequently used for securing prisoners.

See CHAIN.

Figurative: of trouble (Job 36:8).

FEVER

fe’-ver (qaddachath, dalleqeth; puretos, derived from a root signifying "to burn"):

A generic term, applied to all diseases characterized by high temperature of body. Several forms of febrile disease are among the commonest of all maladies in Palestine today, as they were also in the period covered by the Bible history. Of these the most prevalent is ague or intermittent malarial fever, which is common in all parts but especially in low-lying districts or places where there are pools or marshes in which mosquitoes breed, these insects being the commonest carriers of the malaria bacillus. These fevers are generally more severe in late summer and autumn, when the mosquitoes are most numerous, and when there is a liability to chill, owing to the sudden drop of temperature at sunset. During the day one uses as light clothing as possible, but immediately after sunset the air becomes chilly and damp, and the physiological resistance to the influence of the parasite is remarkably diminished. On this account travelers in Palestine at this season should be particular to avoid exposure to these evening damps, and to use mosquito curtains invariably at night.

In most tropical countries now houses are rendered mosquito-proof by close wire netting, and thereby the risk of infection is much diminished. In Palestine the marshes of the north about Banias and the Water of Merom, the Shephelah, and the Jordan valley are the most fever-stricken regions of the country. The word qaddachath is translated burning ague in Le 26:16 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "fever"), and is coupled with dalleqeth, translated inflammation in De 28:22. Septuagint renders the former word puretos, and the latter rhigos in this passage, a collocation which is interesting as Galen uses these words together rhigopuretos in his description of a fever identical with that common in Palestine. In Le the word in Septuagint is ikteros which literally means jaundice, a disease otherwise not mentioned in the Bible.

In Palestine as in other malarious countries the condition of jaundice or yellowing of the skin frequently accompanies repeated and protracted attacks of fever which cause organic disease of the liver. On this account Hippocrates describes all fevers as due to a perverted secretion of bile. These fevers begin with severe shivering fits, hence, the name rhigos which is used by Hippocrates. This is followed by a period of burning dry heat, ending in a period of profuse perspiration. Such attacks may take place daily, a few hours of interval with normal temperature separating the end of one fit from the onset of the next.

The commonest type however is that called tertian, in which a whole day separates one fit from the next. In some of the severe fevers which are rife in the Jordan valley the temperature never falls to the normal, and while there is a short remission between the attacks with a body heat a little above the normal, there is no intermission. Rarer febrile conditions which have been met with in Palestine, such as the Malta fever, present the same characteristics and may continue for months. Cases also of genuine blackwater

fever have been recorded by several authorities. It is probable that in former days these fevers were even worse than they are now, as ancient medicine knew of no certain remedy for them. At present they generally yield at once to treatment by quinine, and in my own experience I believe that the administration of this remedy in large and repeated doses is the most effectual treatment.

Other febrile diseases are rife in certain districts in Palestine, and probably existed in Bible times. Typhoid is common in some crowded towns and villages, and considering how little protected the wells are from contamination, the wonder is that it is not much more prevalent. It is probable also that typhus then, as now, was present as an occasional epidemic in the more crowded cities, but even the physicians of Greece and Rome did not differentiate these diseases. All these fevers seem also to have existed in Egypt to much the same extent as in Palestine. The Papyrus Ebers speaks of "a fever of the gods" (46) and another called "a burning of the heart" (102). Its causation is attributed to the influence of the "god of fever," and the evil sequelae of the disease as it affects the heart, stomach, eyes and other organs are described in terms which remind us of the minatory passages in Le 26 and De 28. The conditions there mentioned, such as consuming the eyes and causing sorrow of heart or pining away of the soul, graphically describe the state frequently seen affecting those in the Shephelah villages who have suffered from frequent returns of fever, and who in consequence have developed serious local affections of the liver, spleen and other organs. Before the introduction of quinine, cases of this kind must have been much more commonly met with than they are now. It is probable that this state is that called shachepheth, or consumption, in these passages.

Another form of fever, charchur, the "extreme burning" of the King James Version or "fiery heat" of the Revised Version (British and American), is coupled with the other forms of fever in De 28:22. This is called in Septuagint erethismos or irritation, and may have been a feverish condition with a reddened skin, possibly erysipelas or else one of the eruptive fevers. At present outbreaks of scarlatina, measles and erysipelas are of fairly frequent occurrence and are often very severe.

In the New Testament fever is mentioned eight times. The disease which affected Simon’s wife’s mother is called a "great fever" (Lu 4:38), and that which nearly proved fatal to the nobleman’s son in the same district was also a fever (Joh 4:52). Cases of the kind are common all round the Sea of Galilee at the present day.

Alexander Macalister

FIELD

feld.

See AGRICULTURE.

FIERY HEAT

fi’-er-i, fir’-i het:

In De 28:22, where the King James Version has "an extreme burning."

See FEVER.

FIERY SERPENT

See SERPENT.

FIG, FIG-TREE

fig’-tre (te’enah, plural te’enim, specially "figs"; paggim, "green figs" only in So 2:13; suke, "fig-tree," sukon, "fig"):

1. Fig-Trees in the Old Testament:

The earliest Old Testament reference to the fig is to the leaves, which Adam and Eve converted into aprons (Ge 3:7). The promised land was described (De 8:8) as "a land of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates," etc. The spies who visited it brought, besides the cluster of grapes, pomegranates and figs (Nu 13:23). The Israelites complained that the wilderness was "no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates" (Nu 20:5). When Egypt was plagued, the fig-trees were smitten (Ps 105:33); a similar punishment was threatened to unfaithful Israel (Jer 5:17; Ho 2:12; Am 4:9). It is only necessary to ride a few miles among the mountain villages of Palestine, with their extensive fig gardens, to realize what a long-lasting injury would be the destruction of these slow-growing trees. Years of patient labor—such as that briefly hinted at in Lu 13:7—must pass before a newly planted group of fig-trees can bear profitably. Plenitude of fruitful vines and fig-trees, specially individual ownership, thus came to be emblematical of long-continued peace and prosperity. In the days of Solomon "Judah and Israel dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree" (1Ki 4:25). Compare also 2Ki 18:31; Isa 36:16; Mic 4:4; Zec 3:10; 1 APC 1Macc 14:12. Only a triumphal faith in Yahweh could rejoice in Him "though the fig-tree shall hot flourish" (Hab 3:17).

2. Natural History of the Fig-Tree:

The Ficus carica, which produces the common fig, is a tree belonging to the Natural Order. Urticaceae, the nettle family, which includes also the banyan, the India rubber fig-tree, the sycamore fig and other useful plants. Fig-trees are cultivated all over the Holy Land, especially in the mountain regions. Wild fig-trees—usually rather shrubs than trees—occur also everywhere; they are usually barren and are described by the fellahin as "male" trees; it is generally supposed that their presence is beneficial to the cultivated variety. The immature flowers harbor small insects which convey pollen to the female flowers and by their irritating presence stimulate the growth of the fruit. Artificial fertilization has been

understood since ancient times, and there may be a reference to it in Am 7:14.

Fig-trees are usually of medium height, 10 or 15 ft. for full-grown trees, yet individual specimens sometimes attain as much as 25 ft. The summer foliage is thick and surpasses other trees of its size in its cool and dense shade. In the summer owners of such trees may be seen everywhere sitting in their shadow (Joh 1:48). Such references as Mac 4:4; Zec 3:10, etc., probably are to this custom rather than to the not uncommon one of having a fig-tree overhanging a dwelling.

3. Figs:

The fruit of the fig-tree is peculiar. The floral axis, instead of expanding outward, as with most flowers, closes, as the flower develops, upon the small internal flowers, leaving finally but a small opening at the apex; the axis itself becomes succulent and fruit-like. The male flowers lie around the opening, the female flowers deeper in; fertilization is brought about by the presence of small hymenopterous insects.

There are many varieties of figs in Palestine differing in sweetness, in color and consistence; some are good and some are bad (compare Jer 24:1,8; 29:17). In Palestine and other warm climates the fig yields two crops annually—an earlier one, ripe about June, growing from the "old wood," i.e. from the midsummer sprouts of the previous year, and a second, more important one, ripe about August, which grows upon the "new wood," i.e. upon the spring shoots. By December, fig- trees in the mountainous regions of Palestine have shed all their leaves, and they remain bare until about the end of March, when they commence putting forth their tender leaf buds (Mt 24:32; Mr 13:28,32; Lu 21:29-33), and at the same time, in the leaf axils, appear the tiny figs. They belong to the early signs of spring:

"The voice of the turtle-dove is heard in our land;

The fig-tree ripeneth her green figs" (paggim)

—So 2:12,13.

4. Early Figs:

These tiny figs develop along with the leaves up to a certain point—to about the size of a small cherry—and then the great majority of them fall to the ground, carried down with every gust of wind. These are the "unripe figs" (olunthos)—translated, more appropriately in the King James Version, as "untimely figs"—of Re 6:13. Compare also Isa 34:4 the King James Version—in the Revised Version (British and American) "leaf" has been supplied instead of "fig." These immature figs are known to the fellahin as taksh, by whom they are eaten as they fall; they may even sometimes be seen exposed for sale in the markets in Jerusalem. In the case of many trees the whole of this first crop may thus abort, so that by May no figs at all are to be found on the tree, but with the best varieties of fig-trees a certain proportion of the early crop of figs remains on the tree, and this fruit reaches ripe perfection about June. Such fruit is known in Arabic as dafur, or "early figs," and in Hebrew as bikkurah, "the first-ripe" (Isa 28:4; Jer

24:2; Ho 9:10). They are now, as of old, esteemed for their delicate flavor (Mic 7:1, etc.).

5. The Cursing of the Barren Fig-Tree:

The miracle of our Lord (Mt 21:18-20; Mr 11:12,13,10,21) which occurred in the Passover season, about April, will be understood (as far as the natural phenomena are concerned) by the account given above of the fruiting of the fig-tree, as repeatedly observed by the present writer in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. When the young leaves are newly appearing, in April, every fig- tree which is going to bear fruit at all will have some taksh ("immature figs") upon it, even though "the time of figs" (Mr 11:13 the King James Version), i.e. of ordinary edible figs—either early or late crop—"was not yet." This taksh is not only eaten today, but it is sure evidence, even when it falls, that the tree bearing it is not barren. This acted parable must be compared with Lu 13:6,9; now the time of judgment was surely coming, the fate of the fruitless Jewish nation was forcibly foretold.

6. Dried Figs:

While fresh figs have always been an important article of diet in their season (Ne 13:15) the dried form is even more used. They are today dried in the sun and threaded on strings (like long necklaces) for convenience of carriage. A "cake of figs" (debhelah, literally, "pressed together") is mentioned (1Sa 30:12); Abigail gave 200 such cakes of figs to David (1Sa 25:18); the people of North Israel sent, with other things, "cakes of figs" as a present to the newly-crowned David (1Ch 12:40). Such masses of figs are much used today—they can be cut into slices with a knife like cheese. Such a mass was used externally for Hezekiah’s "boil" (Isa 38:21; 2Ki 20:7); it was a remedy familiar to early medical writers.

E. W. G. Masterman

FIGHT

See WAR; GAMES.

FIGURE

fig’-ur, fig’-yur (cemel, cemel; tupos):

The translation of cemel, or cemel, "a likeness or image"; perhaps a transposition of tselem, the usual word for likeness; it is elsewhere translated "idol" and "image" (De 4:16, "the similitude of any figure," the Revised Version (British and American) "in the form of any figure"); of tabhnith, "form or likeness" (Isa 44:13, "shapeth it (the idol) .... after the figure of a man"; compare De 4:16); of miqla‘ath, "carving," "carved work" (1Ki 6:29: "And he carved all the walls of the house round about with carved figures of cherubim and palm- trees and open flowers, within and without," only here and in 1Ki 6:32; 7:31 where the word is translated "carving" and "graying"); in the New Testament "figure" is the translation of tupos, primarily "a mark," "print," "impression," "something made by blows," hence,

"figure," "statue," tropically "form," "manner"; a person bearing the form or figure of another, having a certain resemblance, preceding another to come, model, exemplar (Ac 7:43), "the figures (images) which ye made to worship them"; Ro 5:14, "who is the figure (Revised Version, "a figure") of him that was to come," that is, the first Adam was a type of the second Adam, Christ; of antitupon, that which corresponds to a type or model (Heb 9:24 the King James Version, "Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself"); the meaning is simply the correspondence, or likeness (of the tabernacle to heaven), therefore the Revised Version (British and American) renders "like in pattern to the true" (1Pe 3:21, "the like figure whereunto (even) baptism doth also now save us," i.e. baptism is the antitype of the ark "wherein .... eight souls were saved (or brought safely) through water," Revised Version "which also after a true likeness (m "in the antitype") doth now save you even baptism"); of parabole, "a placing alongside", a "comparison," "similitude," hence, image, figure, type (Heb 9:9, "which was a figure for the time then present," the American Standard Revised Version "which is a figure for the time present," the English Revised Version "parable" and "(now) present," namely, the entrance of the high priest into the Holy of Holies was a type of Christ's entrance into heaven; Heb 11:19, "from whence (from the dead) also he received him in a figure," i.e. Abraham received Isaac back from the dead as it were, in the likeness of a resurrection, he not being actually dead, the American Standard Revised Version "from whence he did also in a figure receive him back," the English Revised Version "in a parable"); metaschematizo, "to change the form or appearance," "to transfer figuratively" (1Co 4:6,"these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos"; the Geneva version reads "I have figuratively described in my own person"). Paul is "substituting himself and Apollos for the teachers most in repute at Corinth that he might thus avoid personality." "Figure" is supplied in Ecclesiasticus 49:9, with en ombro, "He made mention of the enemies under the figure of the rain," the Revised Version (British and American) "He remembered the enemies in storm," margin "(Greek) rain."

The Revised Version (British and American) has "a figure" margin "an interpretation," for "the interpretation" (Pr 1:6; the word is melitsah, only here and Hab 2:6, meaning properly what is involved and needs interpretation; in Hab 2:6 it is translated "taunting proverb," the Revised Version, margin "riddle"); "figured stone" for "image of stone" (Le 26:1); "figured stones" for "pictures" (Nu 33:52).

W. L. Walker

FILE

fil:

Found only in 1Sa 13:21, but the text here is obscure.

The Hebrew (petsirah phim) signifies "bluntness of edge," and is so rendered in the Revised Version, margin.

See TOOLS.

FILLET

fil’-et (chuT, chashuq):

(1) Chut, from a root not used, meaning probably "to sew," therefore a string or a measuring rod or cord, and so a line, tape, thread, fillet. Jer 52:21 translated "line" (the King James Version "fillet"), measuring 12 cubits long, encircling brass pillars standing 18 cubits high, part of the temple treasure plundered by the Chaldeans; and many other things "that were in the house of Yahweh, did the Chaldeans break in pieces." Translated "thread," used by Rahab, in Jos 2:18, and "cord," "three fold .... is not quickly broken," in Ec 4:12.

(2) Chashuq, from a root meaning "to join" and therefore something joined or attached, and so a rail or rod between pillars, i.e. a fillet. The hangings of the court of the tabernacle were supported by brass pillars set in brass sockets, "The hooks of the pillars and their fillets shall be of silver" (Ex 27:10,11). The embroidered screen for the door of the Tent was supported by five pillars socketed in brass: "And he overlaid their capitals and their fillets with gold" (Ex 36:38). The pillars for the court and the gate of the court had fillets of silver (Ex 38:10). The verb is used in Ex 27:17; 38:17, "All the pillars of the court were filleted with silver."

William Edward Raffety

FILTH; FILTHINESS; FILTHY

filth, fil’-thi-nes, fil’-thi (tso’ah, Tum’ah; rhupoo):

The word once translated "filth" in the Old Testament is tso’ah, "excrement" or "dung," elsewhere translated "dung" (Isa 4:4, used figuratively of evil doings, sin, "the filth of the daughters of Zion"; compare Pr 30:12); in the New Testament we have perikatharma "cleansings" "sweepings," offscourings (1Co 4:13, "We are made as the filth of the world," the Revised Version, margin "or refuse"); rhupos, "filth," "dirt," Septuagint for tso’ah in Isa 4:4 (1Pe 3:21, "the filth of the flesh").

"Filthiness" is the translation of tum’ah, "uncleanness" (ritual, Le 5:3; 7:20, etc.), used figuratively of moral impurity, translated "filthiness" (Ezr 6:21; La 1:9; Eze 22:15; 24:11,13; 36:25); niddah, "impurity" (2Ch 29:5); figuratively (Ezr 9:11); the Revised Version (British and American) has "uncleanness," but "filthiness" for uncleanness at close of verse (niddah); nechosheth, "brass," figuratively (for "impurity" or "impudence") (Eze 16:36); aischrotes, primarily "ugliness," tropical for unbecomingness, indecency (only Eph 5:4, "nor filthiness, nor foolish talking"; Alford has "obscenity," Weymouth, "shameful"); akathartes, "uncleanness" (Re 17:4 the King James Version), corrected text, ta akatharta, "the unclean things," so the Revised Version (British and American).

"Filthy" is the translation of ‘alach, "to be turbid," to become foul or corrupt in a moral sense (Job 15:16

the King James Version; Ps 14:3; 53:3); ‘iddim, plural of ‘iddah, from ‘adhadh, "to number or compute (monthly courses)"; Isa 64:6, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," the Revised Version (British and American) "as a polluted garment"; compare Eze 36:17; aischros, "ugly," tropical for unbecoming, shameful (Tit 1:11, "for filthy lucre’s sake"; compare Tit 1:7); shameful discourse aischrologia (Col 3:8 the King James Version); rhupoo, "filthy," in a moral sense polluted (Re 22:11, "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still," the Revised Version (British and American) "let him be made filthy still" (corrected text), margin "yet more"; Alford, "Let the filthy (morally polluted) pollute himself still" (in the constant middle sense of passive verbs when the act depends on the man’s self)).

In Apocrypha we have (Ecclesiasticus 22:1): "A slothful man is compared to a filthy (ardaloo) stone," the Revised Version (British and American) "a stone that is defiled," 22:2 "A slothful man is compared to the filth (bolbiton) of a dunghill"; 27:4 "So the filth (skubalon) of a man in his talk (the Revised Version (British and American) "of man in his reasoning") remaineth."

See UNCLEANNESS.

W. L. Walker

FIN

See FISH.

FINE

fin (adj., from Latin finire, "to finish"):

Indicates superior quality. Only in a few instances does "fine" represent a separate word: (1) Tobh, "good," qualifies gold (2Ch 3:5,8, "fine gold"; compare Ge 2:12, "good"); fine gold (La 4:1, the King James Version "most fine gold," the Revised Version (British and American) "most pure gold," literally, "good fine gold"), copper (Ezr 8:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "fine bright brass"); Tabh, Aramaic (Da 2:32, "fine gold"). (2) paz, "refined" (So 5:11, "the most fine gold"). (3) chelebh, "fatness," "the best of any kind"; compare Ge 45:18; De 32:14, etc. (Ps 81:16, "the finest of the wheat," the Revised Version, margin Hebrew "fat of wheat"). (4) sariq, "fine combed" (Isa 19:9, "fine flax," the Revised Version (British and American) "combed flax").

In other places it expresses a quality of the substantive: kethem, "fine gold" (Job 31:24; Da 10:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "pure gold"); paz, used as a noun for refined gold (Job 28:17; Ps 19:10; Pr 8:19; Isa 13:12; La 4:2); charuts, "fine gold" (Pr 3:14; compare Ps 68:13, "yellow gold"); coleth, "flour," rendered "fine flour," rolled or crushed small (Le 2:1,4,5,7, etc.); semidalis, "the finest wheaten flour" (Re 18:13); qemach coleth, "fine meal" (Ge 18:6); cadhin, "linen garment" (Septuagint sindon, Pr 31:24 the King James Version; Isa 3:23); shesh, "white," "fine linen" (Ge 41:42; Ex 25:4, etc.); in Pr 31:22 the King James Version has "silk"; sheshi (Eze 16:13, "fine flour"); ‘eTun, "what is

twisted or spun," "yarn" (Pr 7:16 the King James Version, "fine linen of Egypt" the Revised Version (British and American) "yarn of Egypt"); buts, "fine white cloth," "cotton or linen," "fine linen" (1Ch 4:21; Eze 27:16, etc.; 2Ch 5:12, King James Version "white," the Revised Version (British and American) "fine"); bussos, "byssus," "linen" from buts Septuagint for which, 2Ch 2:14; 3:14), deemed very fine and precious, worn only by the rich (Lu 16:19; Re 18:12); bussinos, "byssine" made of fine linen, Septuagint for buts (1Ch 5:27) (Re 18:16, "clothed in fine linen," the Revised Version (British and American) "arrayed," Re 19:8,14); sindon, "fine linen" (Mr 5:46, "He bought fine linen," the Revised Version (British and American) "a linen cloth"; compare Mr 14:51,52; Mt 27:59; Lu 23:53); it was used for wrapping the body at night, also for wrapping round dead bodies; sindon is Septuagint for cadhin (Jud 14:12,13; Pr 31:24); chalkolibanon (Re 1:15; 2:18, the King James Version "fine brass").

The meaning of this word has been much discussed; chalkos is "brass" in Greek (with many compounds), and libanos is the Septuagint for lebhonah, "frankincense," which word was probably derived from the root labhan, "to burn"; this would give glowing brass, "as if they burned in a furnace"; in Da 10:6 it is nehosheth qalal, the King James Version "polished brass," the Revised Version (British and American) "burnished" (qalal is "to glow"). Plumptre deemed it a hybrid word composed of the Greek chalkos, "brass," and the Hebrew labhan, "white," a technical word, such as might be familiar to the Ephesians; the Revised Version (British and American) has "burnished brass"; Weymouth, "silver-bronze when it is white-hot in a furnace"; the whiteness being expressed by the second half of the Greek word. See Thayer’s Lexicon (s.v.).

In Apocrypha we have "fine linen," bussinos (1 Esdras 3:6), "fine bread"; the adjective katharos, separate (APC Judith 10:5, the Revised Version, margin "pure bread"); "fine flour" (Ecclesiasticus 35:2; 38:11); semidalis (Bel and the Dragon verse 3; APC 2Macc 1:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "meal offering").

W. L. Walker

FINER; FINING

fin’-er, fin’-ing (Pr 25:4 the King James Version).

See REFINER.

FINES

finz.

See PUNISHMENTS.

FINGER (1)

fin’-ger (Hebrew and Aramaic ‘etsba‘; daktulos): The fingers are to the Oriental essential in conversation; their language is frequently very eloquent and expressive. They often show what the mouth does not dare to utter, especially grave insult and scorn. The scandalous person is thus described in Pr 6:13 as "teaching" or "making signs with his fingers." Such insulting gestures (compare e.g. the gesture of Shimei in throwing dust or stones at David, 2Sa 16:6) are even now not infrequent in Palestine. The same habit is alluded to in Isa 58:9 by the expression, "putting forth of fingers. "

The fingers were decorated with rings of precious metal, which, with other jewelry worn ostentatiously on the body, often formed the only possession of the wearer, and were therefore carefully guarded. In the same way the law of Yahweh was to be kept: "Bind them (my commandments) upon thy fingers; write them upon the tablet of thy heart" (Pr 7:3).

Figurative: In 1Ki 12:10 and 2Ch 10:10 Rehoboam gives the remarkable answer to his dissatisfied people, which is, at the same time, an excellent example of the use of figurative language in the Orient: "My little finger is thicker than my father’s loins," a figure explained in the next verse: "Whereas my father did lade you with a heavy yoke, I will add to your yoke: my father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." The Hebrew word used here for little finger is qoTen, literally, "pettiness," "unimportant thing."

The "finger of God," like the "hand of God," is synonymous with power, omnipotence, sometimes with the additional meaning of the infallible evidence of Divine authorship visible in all His works (Ps 8:3; Lu 11:20), especially in His law (Ex 8:19; 31:18; De 9:10; compare Ex 32:15,16).

The finger or digit as a linear measure is mentioned in Jer 52:21 (Greek daktulos; Josephus, Ant, VIII, iii, 4). It is equal to one finger-breadth, 1/4 of a hand-breadth (palm) = 18,6 millimeters or .73 inches.

H. L. E. Luering

FINGER (2)

fin’-ger (’etsba‘):

The smallest of the Hebrew linear measures. It was equal to the breadth of the finger, or about 3/4 inches, four of which made a palm (Jer 52:21).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

FINISH

fin’-ish (kalah; teleo, with other Hebrew and Greek words): The proper sense of "finish" is to end or complete; so for "finish," "finished," in the King James Version, there is sometimes met with in the

Revised Version (British and American) the change to "complete" (Lu 14:28; 2Co 8:6), "accomplish" (Joh 4:34; 5:36; 17:4), "made an end of doing" (2Ch 4:11; compare 2Ch 24:14), etc. In Jas 1:15, for "sin, when it is finished," the Revised Version (British and American) reads "sin when it is full-grown," corresponding to "conceived" of the previous clause. On the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American) has frequently "finished" for other words, as "ended" (Ge 2:2; De 31:30), "accomplished" (Joh 19:28), "filled up," "fulfilled" (Re 15:1,8), etc. The grandest Scriptural example of the word is the cry upon the cross, "It is finished" (Tetelestai, Joh 19:30).

W. L. Walker

FINISHER

fin’-ish-er (teleiotes):

This word is applied to Jesus (Heb 12:2), and comes from teleioo, "to complete," "to make perfect"; hence, it means finisher in the sense of completing; the King James Version "the author and finisher of our faith," the Revised Version (British and American) "the author (margin "captain") and perfecter of our faith"; but "our" is supplied, and in the connection in which the passage stands—after the examples which have been adduced of the power of faith—most probably the best rendering is "the Leader (or Captain) and Perfecter of the Faith," that is of the faith which has been illustrated by those mentioned in Heb 11, who are as "a great cloud of witnesses" to the power of faith; but above all "looking to Jesus, our Leader" in whom it was perfected, as is shown in what follows: "who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross," etc. "In His human nature He exhibited Faith in its highest form, from first to last, and placing Himself as it were at the head of the great army of heroes of Faith, He carried Faith, the source of their strength, to its most complete perfection and to its loftiest triumph" (Westcott).

W. L. Walker

FIR; FIR-TREE

fur, (the Revised Version, margin "cypress"; berosh, 2Sa 6:5; 1Ki 5:8,10, etc.; (berothem (plural only), an Aramaic form, So 1:17):

1. Old Testament References:

This tree was one of the chief trees of Lebanon (Isa 60:13); one of usefulness (Isa 41:19; 55:13); associated with the cedar (2Ki 19:23; Ps 104:17; Isa 14:8; Zec 11:2); its boughs were wide and great (Eze 31:8); it was evergreen (Ho 14:8); it could supply boards and timber for doors (1Ki 6:15,24); beams for roofing the temple (2Ch 3:5); planks for shipbuilding (Eze 27:5). In 2Sa 6:5 we read: "David and all the house of Israel played before Yahweh with all manner of instruments made of fir-wood," etc. It is practically certain that the reading in the parallel passage in 1Ch 13:8 is more correct: "David and all Israel played before God with all their might, even with songs," etc. This view is supported by the

Septuagint translation (en pase dunamei). There is therefore no necessity to suppose that berosh was a wood used for musical instruments.

2. The Identity of "Berosh":

The identity of berosh is uncertain. It was a name applied either to several of the Coniferae in common or to one or more outstanding species. If the latter is the case we can only seek for the most suited to Old Testament requirements. The Aleppo pine, Pinus Halepensis, is a fine tree which flourishes in the Lebanon, but its wood is not of special excellence and durability. A better tree (or couple of trees) is the sherbin of the Syrians; this name includes two distinct varieties in the suborder Cypressineae, the fine tall juniper, Juniperis excelsa and the cypress, Cypressus sempervirens. They both still occur in considerable numbers in the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; they are magnificent trees and produce excellent wood—resinous, fragrant, durable. If these trees were not classed locally, as now, under one name, then the cypress is of the two more probably the berosh. The coffins of Egyptian mummies were made of cypress; a compact variety of this cypress is cultivated all over the Turkish empire by the Moslems as an ornament in cemeteries. From early times the cypress has been connected with mourning.

In the Apocrypha there are two definite references to the cypress (kuparissos). In APC Sirach 24:13, Wisdom says:

"I was exalted like a cedar in Libanus,

And as a cypress tree on the mountains of Hermon."

And in Sirach 50:10 the high priest Simon is said to be

"As an olive tree budding forth fruits,

And as a cypress growing high among the clouds."

These passages, especially the former, certainly favor the idea that berosh was the cypress; the name may, however, have included allied trees.

E. W. G. Masterman

FIRE

fir (’esh; pur):

These are the common words for fire, occurring very frequently. ‘Ur, "light" (Isa 24:15 the King James Version; compare the Revised Version (British and American); Isa 31:9, and see FIRES), nur (Aramaic)

(Da 3:22 ff) are found a few times, also ‘eshshah (Jer 6:29), and be‘erah (Ex 22:6), once each. Ac 28:2,3 has pura, "pyre," and Mr 14:54; Lu 22:56, phos, "light," the Revised Version (British and American) "in the light (of the fire)." "To set on fire," yatsath (2Sa 14:31), lahat (De 32:22, etc.), phlogizo (Jas 3:6).

Fire was regarded by primitive peoples as supernatural in origin and specially Divine. Molech, the fire-god, and other deities were worshipped by certain Canaanitish and other tribes with human sacrifices (De 12:31; 2Ki 17:31; Ps 106:37), and, although this was specially forbidden to the Israelites (Le 18:21; De 12:31; 18:10), they too often lapsed into the practice (2Ki 16:3; 21:6; Jer 7:31; Eze 20:26,31).

See MOLECH; IDOLATRY.

1. Literal Usage:

Fire in the Old Testament is specially associated with the Divine presence, e.g. in the making of the Covenant with Abraham (Ge 15:17), in the burning bush. (Ex 3:2-4), in the pillar of fire (Ex 13:21), on Sinai (Ex 19:18), in the flame on the altar (Jud 13:20). Yahweh was "the God that answereth by fire" (1Ki 18:24,38). In the Law, therefore, sacrifices and offerings (including incense) were to be made by fire (Ex 12:8,9,10; Le 1). Fire from Yahweh signified the acceptance of certain special and separate sacrifices (Jud 6:21; 1Ki 18:38; 1Ch 21:26). In Le 9:24 the sacrificial fire "came forth from before Yahweh." The altar-fire was to be kept continually burning (Le 6:12,13); offering by "strange fire" (other than the sacred altar-fire) was punished by "fire from before Yahweh" (Le 10:1,2). Fire came from heaven also at the consecration of Solomon’s Temple (2Ch 7:1).

According to APC 2Macc 1:19-22, at the time of the Captivity priests hid the sacred fire in a well, and Nehemiah found it again, in a miraculous way, for the second Temple. Later, Maccabeus is said to have restored the fire by "striking stones and taking fire out of them" (10:3).

Fire was a frequent instrument of the Divine primitive wrath (Ge 19:24; Ex 9:23 (lightning); Nu 11:1; 16:35, etc.; Ps 104:4, the American Standard Revised Version "Who maketh .... flames of fire his ministers"). Fire shall yet dissolve the world (2Pe 3:12). It was frequently used by the Israelites as a means of destruction of idolatrous objects and the cities of their enemies (De 7:5,25; 12:3; 13:16; Jos 6:24; Jgs, frequently); sometimes also of punishment (Le 20:14; 21:9; Jos 7:25; APC 2Macc 7:5).

The domestic use of fire was, as among other peoples, for heating, cooking, lighting, etc., but according to the Law no fire could be kindled on the Sabbath day (Ex 35:3). It was employed also for melting (Ex 32:24), and refining (Nu 31:23; 3:2,3, etc.). For the sacrificial fire wood was used as fuel (Ge 22:3,1; Le 6:12); for ordinary purposes, also charcoal (Pr 25:22; Isa 6:6, the Revised Version, margin "or hot stone"; Hab 3:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "fiery bolts," margin "or burning coals"; Joh 21:9, "a fire of coals" the Revised Version, margin "Gr, a fire of charcoal"; Ro 12:20); branches (Nu 15:32; 1Ki 17:12); thorns (Ps 58:9; 118:12; Ec 7:6; Isa 33:12); grass and other herbage (Mt 6:30; Lu 12:28).

2. Figurative Use:

Fire was an emblem

(1) of Yahweh in His glory (Da 7:9);

(2) in His holiness (Isa 6:4);

(3) in His jealousy for His sole worship (De 4:24; Heb 12:29; Ps 79:5; perhaps also Isa 33:14);

(4) of His protection of His people (2Ki 6:17; Zec 2:5);

(5) of His righteous judgment and purification (Zec 13:9; Mal 3:2,3; 1Co 3:13,15);

(6) of His wrath against sin and punishment of the wicked (De 9:3; Ps 18:8; 89:46; Isa 5:24; 30:33, "a Topheth is prepared of old"; Mt 3:10-12; 5:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "the hell of fire," margin "Greek, Gehenna of fire"; see Isa 30:33; Jer 7:31; Mt 13:40,42; 25:41, "eternal fire"; Mr 9:45-49; see Isa 66:24; 2Th 1:7; Heb 10:27; Jude 1:7);

(7) of the word of God in its power (Jer 5:14; 23:29);

(8) of Divine truth (Ps 39:3; Jer 20:9; Lu 12:49);

(9) of that which guides men (Isa 50:10,11);

(10) of the Holy Spirit (Ac 2:3);

(11) of the glorified Christ (Re 1:14);

(12) of kindness in its melting power (Ro 12:20);

(13) of trial and suffering (Ps 66:12; Isa 43:2; 1Pe 1:7; 4:12);

(14) of evil (Pr 6:27; 16:27; Isa 9:18; 65:5); lust or desire (Ho 7:6; APC Sirach 23:16; 1Co 7:9); greed (Pr 30:16);

(15) of the tongue in its evil aspects (Jas 3:5,6);

(16) of heaven in its purity and glory (Re 15:2; see also Re 21:22,23).

W. L. Walker

FIRE BAPTISM

See BAPTISM OF FIRE; MOLECH.

FIRE, LAKE OF

See LAKE OF FIRE.

FIRE, STRANGE

See FIRE.

FIRE, UNQUENCHABLE

See UNQUENCHABLE FIRE.

FIREBRAND

fir’-brand (’udh, used for a burning stick taken out of the fire):

In Jud 15:4,5 describing the "brands" (margin "torches") which Samson tied to the foxes’ tails, the word is lappidh ("lamp"; see Jud 7:16,20 the Revised Version (British and American), "torches"). Other words are ziqqim, "sparks," "flames" (fiery darts; Pr 26:18), and ziqoth (Isa 50:11); ‘udh is used figuratively of angry men (Isa 7:4), and of those mercifully rescued from destruction (Am 4:11; Zec 3:2; the Revised Version (British and American) "brand"). the Revised Version (British and American) gives "firebrand" as translation of moqedh (the King James Version "hearth") in Ps 102:3, "My bones are burned as a firebrand" (margin "as a hearth").

See BRAND.

W. L. Walker

FIREPAN

fir’-pan (machtah, "firepan," "censer," "snuffdish," from chathah, "to snatch up"):

A vessel for carrying coals. Brazen firepans were part of the furnishings of the altar of burnt offerings (Ex 27:3; 38:3, and in Nu 4:14, where the King James Version wrongly reads "censers," the context indicating a vessel belonging to the brazen altar).

The same word is translated "snuffdishes" in Ex 25:38; 37:23; Nu 4:9, where it refers to golden firepans which belonged to the golden candlestick or lamp stand, and were used to receive the burnt ends of the wicks. In 1Ki 7:50 and 2Ch 4:22, although the King James Version reads "censers," the context points to the firepans belonging to the candlestick; as also in 2Ki 25:15 and Jer 52:19, translated "firepans" in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American). A similar firepan designated by the same Hebrew word but translated "censer" was used to carry the burning coals upon which the incense was thrown and burned (Le 10:1; 16:12; Nu 16:6,17 ff).

See CENSER.

The firepan or censer of the Hebrews was doubtless similar to the censer of the Egyptians, pictures of which have been found. It consisted of a pan or pot for the coals, which was held by a straight or slightly curved long handle. The style of censer used in recent centuries, swung by three chains, came into use about the 12th century AD.

George Rice Hovey

FIRES

firz:

In Isa 24:15 the King James Version translates ‘urim ("lights," especially Urim in the phrase "Urim and Thummim") "fires." The Revised Version (British and American), understanding the word to mean the region of light, translates "east," which satisfies the context far better, and is adopted by many modern scholars. In Eze 39:9,10 the Revised Version (British and American) has "fires"; in 39:9 "make fires" is a translation of a verb of different root; in Eze 39:10 "fires" translates the common singular noun for fire.

FIRKIN

fur’-kin (metretes):

The liquid measure used in Joh 2:6 to indicate the capacity of the water-pots mentioned in the narrative of the miracle of turning the water into wine. It is regarded as equivalent to the Hebrew bath, and thus contained about nine gallons.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

FIRMAMENT

fur’-ma-ment.

See ASTRONOMY. III, 3.

FIRST

furst (’echadh, ri’shon; proton, to proton, protos):

Of these words, which are those most frequently used for "first," ri’shon is from rosh, "the head, and is used for the highest, chief, etc.; also of time, the beginning, e.g. Ge 8:13, in the first month"; in Isa 44:6; 48:12, it is used of Yahweh as Eternal and solely Supreme—the First and the Last (compare Isa 41:4). Special usages are in connection with "firstborn," "first- fruit," etc.; proton is used of that which is first in order; but also of that which is first or chief in importance, etc. (Mt 6:33; Jas 3:17). In 1Ti 1:15, Paul says Jesus came "to save sinners; of whom I am chief," literally, "first"; the same word is used by Jesus of the "first" of the commandments (Mr 12:29); where we read in 1Co 15:3, "I delivered unto you first of all," it is en protois ("in the foremost place"); "The first and the last" is applied to Christ as Eternal and Supreme (Re 1:17; 2:8; 22:13); protos is "the first day" (Mt 26:17; Mr 16:9); in Mt 28:1; Mr 16:2; Lu 24:1; Joh 20:1,19; Ac 20:7, it is mia ("one").

W. L. Walker

FIRST-BEGOTTEN

furst-be-got’-’-n (prototokos):

This Greek word is translated in two passages in the King James Version by "first-begotten" (Heb 1:6; Re 1:5), but in all other places in the King James Version, and always in the Revised Version (British and American), by "firstborn." It is used in its natural literal sense of Jesus Christ as Mary’s firstborn (Lu 2:7; Mt 1:25 the King James Version); it also bears the literal sense of Jesus Christ as Mary’s firstborn (Lu 2:7; Mt 1:25 the King James Version); it also bears the literal sense of the firstborn of the firstborn of men and animals (Heb 11:28). It is not used in the New Testament or Septuagint of an only child, which is expressed by monogenes (see below).

Metaphorically, it is used of Jesus Christ to express at once His relation to man and the universe and His difference from them, as both He and they are related to God. The laws and customs of all nations show that to be "firstborn" means, not only priority in time, but a certain superiority in privilege and authority. Israel is Yahweh’s firstborn among the nations (Ex 4:22; compare Jer 31:9). The Messianic King is God’s firstborn Septuagint prototokos), "the highest of the kings of the earth" (Ps 89:27). Philo applies the word to the Logos as the archetypal and governing idea of creation. Similarly Christ, as "the firstborn of all creation" (Col 1:15), is not only prior to it in time, but above it in power and authority. "All things have been created through him, and unto him" (Col 1:16).

He is "sovereign Lord over all creation by virtue of primo-geniture" (Lightfoot). It denotes His status and character and not His origin; the context does not admit the idea that He is a part of the created universe. So in His incarnation He is brought into the world as "firstborn," and God summons all His angels to worship Him (Heb 1:6). In His resurrection He is "firstborn from the dead" (Col 1:18) or "of the dead" (Re 1:5), the origin and prince of life. And finally He is "firstborn among many brethren" in the consummation of God's purpose of grace, when all the elect are gathered home. Not only is He their Lord, but also their pattern, God's ideal Son and men are "foreordained to be conformed to (his) image" (Ro 8:29). Therefore the saints themselves, as growing in His likeness, and as possessing all the privileges of eldest sons, including the kingdom and the priesthood, may be called the "church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven" (Heb 12:23).

See also BEGOTTEN, and Lightfoot on Col 1:15.

T. Rees

FIRST-FRUITS

furst'-froots (re'shith, bikkurim; aparche. Septuagint translates re'shith by aparche, but for bikkurim it uses the word protogennemata; compare Philo 22 33):

In acknowledgment of the fact that the land and all its products were the gift of Yahweh to Israel, and in thankfulness for His bounty, all the first-fruits were offered to Him. These were offered in their natural state (e.g. cereals, tree fruits, grapes), or after preparation (e.g. musk, oil, flour, dough), after which the Israelite was at liberty to use the rest (Ex 23:19; Nu 15:20; 18:12; De 26:2; Ne 10:35,37). No absolute distinction can be made between re'shith and bikkurim, but re'shith seems generally to mean what is prepared by human labor, and bikkurim the direct product of Nature. The phrase "the first of the first-fruits" (Ex 23:19; 34:26; Eze 44:30), Hebrew re'shith bikkure, Greek aparchai ton protogennematon, is not quite clear. It may mean the first-ripe or the choicest of the first-fruits.

The re'shith offerings were individual, except that a re'shith of dough was to be offered as a heave offering (Nu 15:17-21). The priest waved a re'shith of corn before the Lord on the morrow after the Sabbath in the week of unleavened bread (Le 23:9-11). These offerings all fell to the priest (Nu 18:12). Bikkurim refers specially to things sown (Ex 23:16; Le 2:14). At the Feast of Weeks, seven weeks after the offering of the sheaf, bikkurim of corn in the ear, parched with fire and bruised, were brought to the House of the Lord as a meal offering (Ex 34:22-26; Le 2:14-16). The bikkurim also fell to the priest, except a portion which was burned as a memorial (Le 2:8-10,16).

The beautiful ceremony of the offering of the re'shith in the House of God is described in De 26:1-11, and is enlarged upon in the Talmud (Bikkurim 3 2). According to the Talmud (Terumoth 4 3) a sixtieth part of the first-fruits in a prepared form was the minimum that could be offered; the more generous brought a fortieth part, and even a thirtieth. The fruits of newly planted trees were not to be gathered during the first three years; the fruits of the fourth year were consecrated to Yahweh, and from the fifth

year the fruits belonged to the owner of the trees (Le 19:23-25). According to Mishna, ‘Orlah i.10, even the shells of nuts and pomegranates could not be used during the first three years as coloring matter or for the lighting of fires. It is held by some scholars that the institution of the tithe (see TITHE) is a later development from the first-fruits.

Figurative: In the Old Testament, in Jer 2:3, Israel is called "the re’shith of his increase." In the New Testament aparche is applied figuratively to the first convert or converts in a particular place (Ro 16:5; 1Co 16:15); to the Christians of that age (Jas 1:18; 2Th 2:13, WHm), and to the 144,000 in heaven (Re 14:4); to Christ, as the first who rose from the dead (1Co 15:20,23); also to the blessings which we receive now through the Spirit, the earnest of greater blessings to come (Ro 8:23).

Paul Levertoff

FIRSTBORN; FIRSTLING

furst’-born, furst’-ling (bekhor; prototokos):

The Hebrew word denotes the firstborn of human beings as well as of animals (Ex 11:5), while a word from the same root denotes first-fruits (Ex 23:16). All the data point to the conclusion that among the ancestors of the Hebrews the sacrifice of the firstborn was practiced, just as the firstlings of the flocks and the first-fruits of the produce of the earth were devoted to the deity. The narrative of the Moabite war records the sacrifice of the heir to the throne by Mesha, to Chemosh, the national god (2Ki 3:27). The barbarous custom must have become extinct at an early period in the religion of Israel (Ge 22:12). It was probably due to the influence of surrounding nations that the cruel practice was revived toward the close of the monarchical period (2Ki 16:3; 17:17; 21:6; Jer 7:31; Eze 16:20; 23:37; Mic 6:7). Jeremiah denies that the offering of human beings could have been an instruction from Yahweh (7:31; 19:5).

The prophetic conception of God had rendered such a doctrine inconceivable. Clear evidence of the spiritualization and humanizati0n of religion among the Israelites is furnished in the replacement, at an early stage, of the actual sacrifice of the firstborn by their dedication to the service of Yahweh. At a later stage the Levites were substituted for the firstborn. Just as the firstlings of unclean animals were redeemed with money (Ex 13:13; 34:20), for the dedication of the firstborn was substituted the consecration of the Levites to the service of the sanctuary (Nu 3:11-13,15). On the 30th day after birth the firstborn was brought to the priest by the father, who paid five shekels for the child’s redemption from service in the temple (compare Lu 2:27; Mishna Bekhoroth viii.8). For that service the Levites were accepted in place of the redeemed firstborn (Nu 3:45). See note. According to Ex 22:29-31 the firstborn were to be given to Yahweh. (The firstborn of clean animals, if free from spot or blemish, were to be sacrificed after eight days, Nu 18:16 ff.) This allusion to the sacrifice of the firstborn as part of the religion of Yahweh has been variously explained. Some scholars suspect the text, but in all probability the verse means no more than similar references to the fact that the firstborn belonged to Yahweh (Ex 13:2; 34:19). The modifying clause, with regard to the redemption of the firstborn, has been omitted. The firstborn possessed definite privileges which were denied to other members of the family. The Law

forbade the disinheriting of the firstborn (De 21:15-17). Such legislation, in polygamous times, was necessary to prevent a favorite wife from exercising undue influence over her husband in distributing his property, as in the case of Jacob (Ge 25:23). The oldest son’s share was twice as large as that of any other son. When Elisha prayed for a double portion of Elijah’s spirit, he simply wished to be considered the firstborn, i.e. the successor, of the dying prophet. Israel was Yahweh’s firstborn (Ex 4:22 privileges. She occupied a unique position in virtue of the special relationship between Yahweh and the nation. In three passages (Ro 8:29; Col 1:15; Heb 1:6), Jesus Christ is the firstborn—among many brethren (Ro 8:29); of every creature (Col 1:16). This application of the term to Jesus Christ may be traced back to Ps 89:27 where the Davidic ruler, or perhaps the nation, is alluded to as the firstborn of Yahweh.

See CHILD; CIRCUMCISION; FIRST-BEGOTTEN; PLAGUES OF EGYPT.

NOTE—The custom of redeeming the firstborn son is preserved among the Jews to this day. After thirty days the father invites the "Kohen," i.e. a supposed descendant of Aaron, to the house. The child is brought and shown to the "Kohen," and the father declares the mother of the child to be an Israelite. If she is a "Kohen," redemption is not necessary. The "Kohen" asks the father which he prefers, his child or the five shekels; the father answers that he prefers his son, and pays to the "Kohen" a sum equivalent to five shekels. After receiving the redemption-money, the "Kohen" puts his hands on the child’s head and pronounces the Aaronite blessing (Nu 6:22-27).

T. Lewis

FIRSTLING

See FIRSTBORN.

FISH

(dagh, daghah, da’gh; ichthus, ichthudion, opsarion):

1. Natural History:

Fishes abound in the inland waters of Palestine as well as the Mediterranean. They are often mentioned or indirectly referred to both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, but it is remarkable that no particular kind is distinguished by name. In Le 11:9-12 and De 14:9 f, "whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters" is declared clean, while all that "have not fins and scales" are forbidden. This excluded not only reptiles and amphibians, but also, among fishes, siluroids and eels, sharks, rays and lampreys. For our knowledge of the inland fishes of Palestine we are mainly indebted to Tristram, NHB and Fauna and Flora of Palestine; Lortet, Poissons et reptiles du Lac de Tiberiade; and Russegger, Reisen in Europa, Asien, Afrika, 1835- 1841. The most remarkable feature of the fish fauna of the Jordan valley is its relationship to that of the Nile and of East Central Africa. Two Nile fishes, Chromis nilotica Hasselquist, and Clarias macracanthus Gunth., are found in the Jordan valley, and a number of

other species found only in the Jordan valley belong to genera (Chromis and Hemichromis) which are otherwise exclusively African. This seems to indicate that at some time, probably in the early Tertiary, there was some connection between the Palestinian and African river systems. No fish can live in the Dead Sea, and many perish through being carried down by the swift currents of the Jordan and other streams. There are, however, several kinds of small fish which live in salt springs on the borders of the Dead Sea, springs which are as salt as the Dead Sea but which, according to Lortet, lack the magnesium chloride which is a constituent of the Dead Sea water and is fatal to the fish. Capoeta damascina Cuv. and Val., one of the commonest fishes of Syria and Palestine, has been taken by the writer in large numbers in the Arnon and other streams flowing into

the Dead Sea. This is surprising in view of the fact that the Dead Sea seems to form an effective barrier between the fishes of the different streams flowing into it. The indiscriminate mention of fishes without reference to the different kinds is well illustrated by the numerous passages in which "the fishes of the sea, the birds of the heavens, and the beasts of the field," or some equivalent expression, is used to denote all living creatures, e.g. Ge 1:26; 9:2; Nu 11:22; De 4:18; 1Ki 4:33; Job 12:8; Ps 8:8; Eze 38:20; Ho 4:3; Ze 1:3; 1Co 15:39.

2. Jonah’s Fish:

An unusually large shark might fulfill the conditions of Jonah’s fish (dagh, daghah; but Mt 12:40, ketos, "whale" or "sea monster"). The whale that is found in the Mediterranean (Balaena australis) has a narrow throat and could not swallow a man. No natural explanation is possible of Jonah’s remaining alive and conscious for three days in the creature’s belly. Those who consider the book historical must regard the whole event as miraculous. For those who consider it to be a story with a purpose, no explanation is required.

3. Fishing:

The present inhabitants of Moab and Edom make no use of the fish that swarm in the Arnon, the Hisa and other streams, but fishing is an important industry in Galilee and Western Palestine. Now, as formerly, spear hooks and nets are employed. The fish-spear (Job 41:7) is little used. Most of the Old Testament references to nets have to do with the taking of birds and beasts and not of fishes, and, while in Hab 1:15 cherem is rendered "net" and mikhmereth "drag," it is hot clear that these and the other words rendered "net" refer to particular kinds of nets. In the New Testament, however, sagene (Mt 13:47), is clearly the dragnet, and amphiblestron (Mt 4:18), is clearly the casting net. The word most often used is diktuon. Though this word is from dikein, "to throw," or "to cast," the context in several places (e.g. Lu 5:4; Joh 21:11) suggests that a dragnet is meant. The dragnet may be several hundred feet long. The upper edge is buoyed and the lower edge is weighted. It is let down from a boat in a line parallel to the shore and is then pulled in by ropes attached to the two ends, several men and boys usually pulling at each end. The use of the casting net requires much skill. It forms a circle of from 10 to 20 feet in diameter with numerous small leaden weights at the circumference. It is lifted by the center and carefully gathered over the right arm. When well thrown it goes to some distance, at the same time

spreading out into a wide circle. A cord may be attached to the center, but this is not always the case. When lifted again by the center, the leads come together, dragging over the bottom, and sometimes a large number of fish may be enclosed. The novice has only to try, to realize the dexterity of the practiced fishermen.

Figurative: The fact that so many of our Lord’s disciples were fishermen lends a profound interest to their profession. Christ tells Simon and Andrew (Mt 4:19; Mr 1:17) that He will make them fishers of men. The Kingdom of Heaven (Mt 13:47) is likened unto a net that was cast into the sea, and gathered of every kind; which, when it was filled, they drew up on the beach; and they sat down and gathered the good into vessels, but the bad they cast away. Tristram (NHB) says that he has seen the fishermen go through their net and throw out into the sea those that were too small for the market or were considered unclean. In Jer 16:16, we read: "Behold, I will send for many fishers, saith Yahweh, and they shall fish them up; and afterward I will send for many hunters, and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the clefts of the rocks." In the vision of Ezekiel (Eze 47:9 f), the multitude of fish and the nets spread from En-gedi to En-eglaim are marks of the marvelous change wrought in the Dead Sea by the stream issuing from the temple. The same sign, i.e. of the spreading of nets (Eze 26:5,14), marks the desolation of Tyre. It is a piece of broiled fish that the risen Lord eats with the Eleven in Jerusalem (Lu 24:42), and by the Sea of Galilee (Joh 21:13) He gives the disciples bread and fish.

Alfred Ely Day

FISH GATE

See JERUSALEM.

FISHER’S COAT

kot: This expression is found in Joh 21:7 where the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version have "coat." John here, after representing Peter as "naked" (gumnos), pictures him as girding on his "coat" (ependutes), literally, "upper garment," and not at all specifically a "fisher’s coat."

See DRESS.

FISHER; FISHERMAN

fish’-er fish’-er-man (dayyagh, dawwagh; halieus; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek haleeus):

Although but few references to fishermen are made in the Bible, these men and their calling are brought

into prominence by Jesus' call to certain Galilee fishermen to become His disciples (Mt 4:18,19; Mr 1:16,17). Fishermen, then as now, formed a distinct class. The strenuousness of the work (Lu 5:2) ruled out the weak and indolent. They were crude in manner, rough in speech and in their treatment of others (Lu 9:49,54; Joh 18:10). James and John before they became tempered by Jesus' influence were nicknamed the "sons of thunder" (Mr 3:17). The fishermen's exposure to all kinds of weather made them hardy and fearless. They were accustomed to bear with patience many trying circumstances. They often toiled for hours without success, and yet were always ready to try once more (Lu 5:5; Joh 21:3). Such men, when impelled by the same spirit as filled their Master, became indeed "fishers of men" (Mt 4:19; Mr 1:17).

One of the striking instances of the fulfillment of prophecy is the use by the Syrian fishermen today of the site of ancient Tyre as a place for the spreading of their nets (Eze 26:5,14).

Figurative: Fish were largely used as food (Hab 1:16), hence, the lamentation of the fishermen, who provided for all, typified general desolation (Isa 19:8). On the other hand, abundance of fish and many fishermen indicated general abundance (Eze 47:10). Our modern expression, "treated like a dog," had its counterpart in the language of the Old Testament writers, when they portrayed the punished people of Judah as being treated like fish. Yahweh would send many fishers to fish them up and put sticks or hooks through their cheeks as a fisherman strings his fish (Jer 16:16; Job 41:2). Such treatment of the people of Judah is depicted on some of the Assyrian monuments.

James A. Patch

FISHHOOK

fish'-hook (cir dughah, chakkah):

The word "fishhooks" occurs but twice in the American Standard Revised Version (Job 41:1; Am 4:2). In other passages the word hook or "angle" is applied to this instrument for fishing (Isa 19:8; Job 41:2). The ancient Egyptian noblemen used to amuse themselves by fishing from their private fishpools with hook and line. The Egyptian monuments show that the hook was quite commonly used for catching fish. The hook is still used in Bible lands, although not as commonly as nets. It is called a cinnarat, probably from the same root as tsinnah, the plural of which is translated hooks in Am 4:2. In Mt 17:27, agkistron (literally, "fishhook"), is rendered "hook."

James A. Patch

FISHING

fish'-ing (halieuo): Several methods of securing fish are resorted to at the present day along the seashores of Palestine. Two of these, dynamiting and poisoning with the juice of cyclamen bulbs or other poisonous plants, can be passed over as havi ng no bearing on ancient methods.

(1) With Hooks:

Some fishing is done with hooks and lines, either on poles when fishing from shore, or on trawls in deep-sea fishing. The fishhooks now used are of European origin, but bronze fishhooks of a very early date have been discovered. That fishing with hooks was known in Jesus' time is indicated by the Master's command to Peter (Mt 17:27).

See FISHHOOK.

(2) With Spears:

Job 41:7 probably refers to an instrument much like the barbed spear still used along the Syrian coast. It is used at night by torchlight.

(3) With Nets:

In the most familiar Bible stories of fisherman life a net was used. Today most of the fishing is done in the same way. These nets are homemade. Frequently one sees the fishermen or members of their families making nets or repairing old ones during the stormy days when fishing is impossible.

Nets are used in three ways:

(a) A circular net, with small meshes and leaded around the edge, is cast from the shore into the shallow water in such a manner that the leaded edge forms the base of a cone, the apex being formed by the fisherman holding the center of the net in his hand. The cone thus formed encloses such fish as cannot escape the quick throw of the fisher.

(b) A long net or seine of one or two fathoms depth, leaded on one edge and provided with floats on the other, is payed out from boats in such a way as to surround a school of fish. Long ropes fastened to the two ends are carried ashore many yards apart, and from five to ten men on each rope gradually draw in the net. The fish are then landed from the shallow water with small nets or by hand. This method is commonly practiced on the shore of the Sea of Galilee.

(c) In deeper waters a net similar to that described above, but four or five fathoms deep, is cast from boats and the ends slowly brought together so as to form a circle. Men then dive down and bring one portion of the weighted edge over under the rest, so as to form a bottom. The compass of the net is then narrowed, and the fish are emptied from the net into the boat. Sometimes the net with the fish enclosed is towed into shallow water before drawing. The above method is probably the one the disciples used (Mt 4:18; Mr 1:16; Lu 5:2-10; Joh 21:3-11). Portions of nets with leads and floats, of early Egyptian origin, may be seen in the British Museum.

See NET.

The fishermen today usually work with their garments girdled up about their waists. Frequently they wear only a loose outer garment which is wet much of the time. This garment can be quickly removed by pulling it over the head, When occasion requires the fisherman to jump into the sea. If methods have not changed, Peter had probably just climbed back into the boat after adjusting the net for drawing when he learned that it was Jesus who stood on the shore. He was literally naked and pulled on his coat before he went ashore (Joh 21:7).

James A. Patch

FISHPOOLS

fish’-pools:

This is a mistranslation. The Hebrew berekhoth (So 7:4) simply means "pools" (Revised Version); "fish" is quite unwarrantably introduced in the King James Version. In Isa 19:10, again, instead of "all that make sluices and ponds for fish" (the King James Version), we should certainly read, with the Revised Version (British and American), "All they that work for hire shall be grieved in soul."

FIT, FITLY

fit’-li:

The word "fit" (adjective and verb) occurs a few times, representing nearly as many Hebrew and Greek words. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently alters, as in Le 16:21 (‘itti, "timely," "opportune," "ready"), where for "fit" it reads "in readiness," margin "appointed." In 1Ch 7:11 the Revised Version (British and American) has "that were able"; in Isa 44:13, "shapeth"; in Pr 24:27, "ready," etc. "Fitly" in Pr 25:11 is in the Revised Version, margin "in due season"; in So 5:12, "fitly set" is in the Revised Version, margin "sitting by full streams." In the New Testament "fit" is the translation of euthetos, "well placed" (Lu 9:62; 14:35), of kathekon, "suitable" (Ac 22:22), and of katartizo, "to make quite ready" (Ro 9:22, "vessels of wrath fitted unto destruction").

W. L. Walker

FITCHES

fich’-iz (the English word "fitch" is the same as "vetch"):

(1) qetsach (Isa 28:25,27; the Revised Version, margin has "black cummin" (Nigella sativa)). This is the "nutmeg flower," an annual herb (Natural Order, Ranunculaceae), the black seeds of which are sprinkled

over some kinds of bread in Palestin. They were used as a condiment by the ancient Greeks and Romans. These seeds have a warm aromatic flavor and are carminative in their properties, assisting digestion. They, like all such plants which readily yield their seed, are still beaten out with rods. The contrast between the stouter staff for the "fitches" and the lighter rod for the cummin is all the more noticeable when the great similarity of the two seeds is noticed.

(2) kuccemim (pl.) (Eze 4:9) the Revised Version (British and American) "spelt" (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

FIVE

fiv (chamesh; pente).

See NUMBER.

FLAG

Two Hebrew words:

(1) cuph (Ex 2:3,1, "flags"; Isa 19:6, "flags"; Jon 2:5, "weeds"). This is apparently a general name which includes both the fresh-water weeds growing along a river bank and "seaweeds." The Red Sea was known as Yam cuph.

(2) ‘achu (Ge 41:2,18, the King James Version "meadow," the Revised Version (British and American) "reed-grass"; Job 8:11, "Can the rush grow up without mire? Can the flag (margin "reed-grass") grow without water?"). Some such general term as "sedges" or "fens" would better meet the requirements.

FLAGON

flag’-un:

The translation of ‘ashishah, in the King James Version in 2Sa 6:19; 1Ch 16:3; So 2:5; Ho 3:1. In all, these passages the Revised Version (British and American) reads "cake of raisins" or "raisins." It was probably a pressed raisin cake. the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) read "flagons," in Isa 22:24 as a rendering of nebhalim, which is elsewhere (1Sa 1:24; 10:3; 2Sa 16:1, etc.) rendered "bottles," the Revised Version, margin "skins." These were the bags or bottles made of the whole skin of a kid, goat or other animal. the Revised Version (British and American) has "flagons" in Ex 25:29 and 37:16 as translation of qeshawoth, a golden jug or jar used in the tabernacle from which the drink offerings were poured out. The same word is translated "cups" in Nu 4:7.

George Rice Hovey

FLAKE

flak (mappal, a word of uncertain meaning):

It is used in the sense of "refuse (husks) of the wheat" in Am 8:6. With regard to the body we find it used in Job 41:23 in the description of leviathan (the crocodile): "The flakes of his flesh are joined together: they are firm upon him; they cannot be moved." Baethgen in Kautzsch's translation of the Old Testament translates "Wampen," i.e. the collops or lateral folds of flesh and armored skin. A better translation would perhaps be: "the horny epidermic scales" of the body, differentiated from the bony dermal scutes of the back (Hebrew "channels of shields," "courses of scales"), which are mentioned in Job 41:15 margin.

H. L. E. Luering

FLAME

flam (lahabh, and other forms from same root; phlox):

In Jud 13:20 bis; Job 41:21; Isa 29:6; Joe 2:5, the word is lahabh. Various other words are translated "flame"; mas'eth, "a lifting or rising up" (Jud 20:38,40 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) "cloud" (of smoke); kalil, "completeness" (Jud 20:40 b King James Version margin, "a holocaust, or offering wholly consumed by fire"; compare Le 6:15); shalhebheth (Job 15:30; So 8:6; the American Standard Revised Version "a very flame of Yahweh," margin "or, a most vehement flame"; Eze 20:47, the Revised Version (British and American) "the flaming flame"); shabhibh (Job 18:5; the Revised Version, margin); shebhibh, Aramaic (Da 3:22; 7:9). In Ps 104:4 the American Standard Revised Version has "maketh .... flames of fire his ministers"; the Revised Version (British and American) "flame" for "snare" (Pr 29:8).

Figuratively: "Flame" is used to denote excitement (Pr 29:8 the Revised Version (British and American)), shame, astonishment, "faces of flame" (Isa 13:8); in Re 1:14, the glorified Christ is described as having eyes "as a flame of fire," signifying their searching purity (compare Re 2:18; 19:12). Flame is also a symbol of God's wrath (Ps 83:14; Isa 5:24; 10:17).

See also FIRE.

W. L. Walker

FLAT NOSE

(charum; Septuagint koloborin):

Used only in Le 21:18 as the name of a deformity which disqualified a member of a priestly family for serving the altar.

The root of the word signifies "to cut off" or "to cut flat," and in the Revised Version, margin "slit nose" is substituted. The condition indicated is most probably the depressed, flattened nose which so often accompanies harelip, especially in its double form.

A mere snub-nose can scarcely be regarded as a blemish of sufficient importance to unfit a priest for the service of "offering the bread of God"; but harelip, like blindness or the other congenital malformations or deformities enumerated in this passage, might well render a son of Aaron unfit or unsuitable for public religious duty.

Alexander Macalister

FLAX

flaks pesheth, also pishtah; linon (Mt 12:20)): The above Hebrew words are applied

(1) to the plant: "The flax was in bloom" (the King James Version "bolled"; Ex 9:31);

(2) the "stalks of flax," literally, "flax of the tree," put on the roof to dry (Jos 2:6);

(3) to the fine fibers used for lighting: the King James Version "tow," "flax," the Revised Version (British and American). "A dimly burning wick will he not quench" (Isa 42:3); "They are quenched as a wick" (Isa 43:17). The thought is perhaps of a scarcely lighted wick just kindled with difficulty from a spark.

(4) In Isa 19:9 mention is made of "combed flax," i.e. flax hackled ready for spinning (compare Ho 2:5,9; Pr 31:13). The reference in Jud 15:14 is to flax twisted into cords.

(5) In Jud 16:9; Isa 1:31, mention is made of ne‘oreth, "tow," literally, something "shaken off"—as the root implies—from flax.

(6) The plural form pishtim is used in many passages for linen, or linen garments, e.g. Le 13:47,48,52,59; De 22:11; Jer 13:1 ("linen girdle"); Eze 44:17 f. Linen was in the earliest historic times a favorite material for clothes. The Jewish priestly garments were of pure linen. Egyptian mummies were swathed in linen. Several other Hebrew words were used for linen garments.

See LINEN.

Flax is the product of Linum usitatissimum, a herbaceous plant which has been cultivated from the dawn of history. It is perennial and grows to a height of 2 to 3 ft.; it has blue flowers and very fibrous stalks. The tough fibers of the latter, after the decay and removal of the softer woody and gummy material, make up the crude "flax." Linseed, linseed oil and oilcake are useful products of the same plant.

E. W. G. Masterman

FLAYING

fla’-ing.

See PUNISHMENTS.

FLEA

fle (par‘osh; compare Arabic barghut, "flea," and barghash, "mosquito" (1Sa 24:14; 26:20); kinnim (Ex 8:16), "lice," the Revised Version, margin "sandflies" or "fleas"; Septuagint skniphes, probably best rendered "gnat"; see GNAT; LICE):

In 1Sa 24 Saul seeks David in the wilderness of En-gedi, and David, after cutting off the skirt of Saul’s robe in the cave, calls out to him, "After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea" (24:14). Again in 1Sa 26:20 Saul seeks David in the wilderness of Ziph, and David after taking the spear and cruse from beside Saul while he slept, cries out to him, ".... the king of Israel is come out to seek a flea, as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains." The flea is here used as a symbol of David’s insignificance, coupled perhaps, in the second passage, with a thought of the difficulty that Saul had in laying hands on him. In Encyclopedia Biblica Cheyne finds fault with a similar interpretation given in DB on the ground that it is absurd that David should refer to hunting "a single flea," and proposes to change par‘osh ‘echadh "a flea," to pere’ midhbar, "wild ass of the desert." The writer will only say that no observant resident of Palestine would consider the textual alteration to be called for.

Linnaeus recognized two species of flea, Pulex irritans, the common parasite of man, and Pulex (Sarcopsylla) penetrans, the tropical and sub-tropical jigger flea. More than a hundred species are now listed, and the recent discovery that certain fleas are instrumental in the transmission of the plague has given a new impetus to the study of these tiny pests. A flea that is often commoner in houses than Pulex irritans is the "dog and cat flea," variously known as Pulex serraticeps, Pulex canis, Pulex felis or Ctenocephalus canis.

Alfred Ely Day

FLEE

fle.

See FLY.

FLEECE

fles.

See GIDEON; SHEEP; WOOL.

FLESH

@basar, she’er):

1. Etymology:

Used in all senses of the word, the latter, however, most frequently in the sense of kin, family, relationship (compare sha’arah, "kins-woman," Le 18:17): Le 18:6; 25:49; Pr 11:17; Jer 51:35, and probably Ps 73:26. In all other places she’er means "flesh" = body (Pr 5:11) or = food (Ps 78:20,27; Mic 3:2,3). Tibhchah, is "(slaughtered) flesh for food," "butcher’s meat" (1Sa 25:11). The word ‘eshpar, found only in two parallel passages (2Sa 6:19 = 1Ch 16:3), is of very uncertain meaning. The English versions translate it with "a good piece (portion) of flesh," the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) with "a piece of roast meat," others with "a portion of flesh" and "a measure of wine." It probably means simply "a measured portion." lachum, literally, "eaten," then food (compare lechem, "bread"), has been rarely specialized as flesh or meat (compare Arabic lachm, "meat," "flesh," so in Ze 1:17, where it stands in parallelism with "blood"). The Greek terms are sarx, and kreas, the latter always meaning "butcher’s meat" (Ro 14:21; 1Co 8:13).

We can distinguish the following varieties of meaning in Biblical language:

2. Ordinary Sense:

In a physical sense, the chief substance of the animal body, whether used for food and sacrifice, or not; also the flesh of man (Ge 2:21; Ex 21:10; Isa 31:3; Eze 23:20; 1Co 15:39; Re 19:18,21).

3. The Body:

The whole body. This meaning is the extension of the preceding (pars pro toto). This is indicated by the Septuagint, where basar is often translated by the plural hai sarkes (Ge 40:19; Nu 12:12; Job 33:25), and occasionally by soma, i.e. "body" (Le 15:2; 1Ki 21:27). This meaning is also very clear in passages like

the following: Ex 4:7; Le 17:14; Nu 8:7; 2Ki 4:34; Pr 5:11, where basar and she'er are combined; and Pr 14:30; Ec 12:12.

4. The Term "All Flesh":

Flesh, as the common term for living things, animals and men, especially the latter (Ge 6:13,17,19; Nu 16:22; Jer 12:12; Mr 13:20); often in the phrase "all flesh" (Ps 65:2; Isa 40:5,6; Jer 25:31; Eze 20:48; Joe 2:28; Lu 3:6).

5. As Opposed to the Spirit:

Flesh as opposed to the spirit, both of which were comprised in the preceding meaning (Ge 6:3; Ps 16:9; Lu 24:39, where "flesh and bones" are combined; Joh 6:63). Thus we find in Joh 1:14, "The Word became flesh"; 1Ti 3:16, "He who was manifested in the flesh"; 1 Joh 4:2, and all passages where the incarnation of Christ is spoken of. The word in this sense approaches the meaning of "earthly life," as in Php 1:22,24, "to live in the flesh," "to abide in the flesh"; compare Phm 1:16 and perhaps 2Co 5:16. Under this meaning we may enumerate expressions such as "arm of flesh" (2Ch 32:8; Jer 17:5), "eyes of flesh" (Job 10:4), etc. Frequently the distinction is made to emphasize the weakness or inferiority of the flesh, as opposed to the superiority of the spirit (Isa 31:3; Mt 26:41; Mr 14:38; Ro 6:19). In this connection we mention also the expression "flesh and blood," a phrase borrowed from rabbinical writings and phraseology (see also Sirach 14:18, "the generation of flesh and blood," and 17:31, "man whose desire is flesh and blood" the King James Version). The expression does not convey, as some have supposed, the idea of inherent sinfulness of the flesh (a doctrine borrowed by Gnostic teachers from oriental sources), but merely the idea of ignorance and frailty in comparison with the possibilities of spiritual nature. The capabilities of our earthly constitution do not suffice to reveal unto us heavenly truths; these must always come to us from above.

So Peter's first recognition of the Divine sonship of Jesus did not proceed from a logical conviction based upon outward facts acting upon his mind, but was based upon a revelation from God vouchsafed to his inner consciousness. Christ says therefore to him: "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar- Jonah: for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven" (Mt 16:17). Similarly the kingdom of God, being a realm of perfect spiritual submission to God, cannot be inherited by flesh and blood (1Co 15:50), nor was the richly endowed mind a competent tribunal to which Paul could refer his heaven-wrought conviction of his great salvation and the high calling to be a witness and apostle of Christ, so he did well that he "conferred not with flesh and blood" (Ga 1:16). That "flesh and blood" does not imply a sense of inherent sinfulness is moreover shown in all passages where Christ is declared a partaker of such nature (Eph 6:12; Heb 2:14, where, however, we find in the original text the inverted phrase "blood and flesh").

6. Applied to the Carnal Nature:

Flesh in the sense of carnal nature (sarkikos, "carnal"; the King James Version uses sarkinos in Ro 7:14).

Human nature, being inferior to the spiritual, is to be in subjection to it. If man refuses to be under this higher law, and as a free agent permits the lower nature to gain an ascendancy over the spirit, the "flesh" becomes a revolting force (Ge 6:3,12; Joh 1:13; Ro 7:14; 1Co 3:1,3; Col 2:18; 1 Joh 2:16). Thus, the fleshly or carnal mind, i.e. a mind in subjection to carnal nature, is opposed to the Divine spirit, who alone is a sufficient corrective, Christ having secured for us the power of overcoming (Ro 8:3), if we manifest a deep desire and an earnest endeavor to overcome (Ga 5:17,18).

7. In the Sense of Relationship:

Flesh in the sense of relationship, tribal connection, kith and kin. For examples, see what has been said above on Hebrew she'er. The following passages are a few of those in which basar is used: Ge 2:24; 37:27; Job 2:5; compare the New Testament passages: Mt 19:5,6; Ro 1:3; 9:3,5,8. The expressions "bone" and "flesh" are found in combination (Ge 2:23; 29:14; Jud 9:2; 2Sa 5:1; 19:12,13; Eph 5:31, the latter in some manuscripts only).

8. Other Meanings:

Some other subdivisions of meanings might be added, for example where "flesh" takes almost the place of "person," as in Col 2:1: "as many as have not seen my face in the flesh," i.e. have not known me personally, or 2:5, "absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit," etc.

H. L. E. Luering

FLESH AND BLOOD

See FLESH, 5.

FLESH-HOOK

flesh'-hook (mazlegh, and plural mizlaghoth):

One of the implements used around the sacrificial altar. According to Divine direction given to Moses (Ex 27:3; 38:3), it was to be made of brass, but later David felt impelled by "the Spirit" or "in his spirit" to determine that for use in the magnificent Temple of Solomon it should be made of gold (1Ch 28:17). But Huram made it, with other altar articles, of "bright brass" (2Ch 4:16).

In Samuel's time, it was made with three hook-shaped tines, and was used in taking out the priests' share of the meat offering (1Sa 2:13,14). With the other altar utensils, it was in the special charge of the Kohathites (Nu 4:14). The hooks mentioned in Eze 40:43 were altogether different and for another purpose.

See HOOK.

Leonard W. Doolan

FLESH-POT

flesh’-pot (cir ha-basar, "pot of the flesh"):

One of the six kinds of cooking utensils spoken of as pots or pans or caldrons or basins. Probably usually made of bronze or earthenware. The only mention of flesh-pots, specifically so named, is in Ex 16:3.

See FOOD.

FLIES

fliz.

See FLY.

FLINT

flint (challamish (De 8:15; 32:13; Job 28:9; Ps 114:8), tsor (Ex 4:25; Eze 3:9), tser (Isa 5:28), tsur (Job 22:24; Ps 89:43), tsurim (Jos 5:2 f); (= kechlex "pebble"), kochlax (APC 1Macc 10:73)):

The word challamish signifies a hard stone, though not certainly flint, and is used as a figure for hardness in Isa 50:7, "Therefore have I set my face like a flint." A similar use of tsor is found in Eze 3:9, "As an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead," and Isa 5:28, "Their horses’ hoofs shall be accounted as flint"; and of tsela‘ in Jer 5:3, "They have made their faces harder than a rock." The same three words are used of the rock from which Moses drew water in the wilderness: challamish (De 8:15; Ps 114:8); tsur (Ex 17:6; De 8:15; Ps 78:20; Isa 48:21); cela‘ (Nu 20:8; Ne 9:15; Ps 78:16).

Tsur and cela‘ are used oftener than challamish for great rocks and cliffs, but tsur is used also for flint knives in Ex 4:25, "Then Zipporah took a flint (the King James Version "sharp stone"), and cut off the foreskin of her son," and in Jos 5:2 f, "Yahweh said unto Joshua, Make thee knives of flint (the King James Version "sharp knives"), and circumcise again the children of Israel the second time." Surgical implements of flint were used by the ancient Egyptians, and numerous flint chippings with occasional flint implements are found associated with the remains of early man in Syria and Palestine. Flint and the allied mineral, chert, are found in great abundance in the limestone rocks of Syria, Palestine and Egypt.

See ROCK.

Alfred Ely Day

FLOAT (FLOTE)

flot.

See RAFT; SHIPS AND BOATS

FLOCK

See CATTLE.

FLOOD

flud:

In the King James Version not less than 13 words are rendered "flood," though in the Revised Version (British and American) we find in some passages "river," "stream," "tempest," etc. The word is used for: the deluge of Noah, mabbul (Ge 6:17 ff); kataklusmos (Mt 24:38,39; Lu 17:27); the waters of the Red Sea, nazal (Ex 15:8); the Euphrates, nahar, "Your fathers dwelt of old time on the other side of the flood". (the Revised Version (British and American) "beyond the River" Jos 24:2): the Nile, ye’or, "the flood (the Revised Version (British and American) "River") of Egypt" (Am 8:8); the Jordan, nahar, "They went through the flood (the Revised Version (British and American) "river") on foot" (Ps 66:6); torrent, zerem, "as a flood (the Revised Version (British and American) "tempest") of mighty waters" (Isa 28:2); potamos, "The rain descended and the floods came" (Mt 7:25); plemmura, "When a flood arose, the stream brake against that house" (Lu 6:48).

Figurative: nachal, "The floods of ungodly men (the Revised Version (British and American) "ungodliness," the Revised Version, margin "Hebrew Belial") made me afraid" (2Sa 22:5; Ps 18:4); also ‘or (Am 8:8 (the King James Version)); shibboleth (Ps 69:2); sheTeph (Da 11:22 (the King James Version)); sheTeph (Ps 32:6 (the King James Version)); potamophoretos (Re 12:15 (the King James Version)).

See DELUGE OF NOAH.

Alfred Ely Day

FLOOR

flor.

See HOUSE; THRESHING-FLOOR

FLOTE (FLOAT)

See RAFT; SHIPS AND BOATS.

FLOUR

flour.

See BREAD; FOOD.

FLOURISH

flur’-ish (parach, tsuts; anathallo):

The translation of parach, "to break forth" (Ps 72:7; 92:12,13; Pr 14:11; Isa 66:14; So 6:11; 7:12; the Revised Version (British and American) "budded"); of tsuts "to bloom" (Ps 72:16, 90:6; 92:7; 103:15; 132:18); ra‘anan, "green," "fresh," is translated "flourishing" in Ps 92:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "green," and ra‘anan, Aramaic in Da 4:4; nubh, "to sprout" (Zec 9:17, the King James Version "cheerful").

In an interesting passage (Ec 12:5 the King James Version), the Hiphil future of na’ats, meaning properly "to pierce or strike," hence, to slight or reject, is translated "flourish"; it is said of the old man "The almond tree shall flourish," the Revised Version (British and American) "blossom" (so Ewald, Delitzsch, etc.); na’ats has nowhere else this meaning; it is frequently rendered "contemn;" "despise," etc. Other renderings are, "shall cause loathing" (Gesenius, Knobel, etc.), "shall be despised," i.e. the hoary head; "The almond tree shall shake off its flowers," the silvery hairs falling like the fading white flowers of the almond tree; by others it is taken to indicate "sleeplessness," the name of the almond tree (shaqedh) meaning the watcher or early riser (compare Jer 1:11, "a rod of an almond-tree," literally, "a wakeful (or early) tree"), the almond being the first of the trees to wake from the sleep of winter.

See ALMOND.

"Flourish" appears once only in the New Testament, in the King James Version, as translation of anathallo, "to put forth anew," or "to make put forth anew" (Php 4:10): "Your care for me hath flourished again," the Revised Version (British and American) "Ye have revived your thought for me."

W. L. Walker

FLOWERS

flou’-erz (BLOOM, BLOSSOM, etc.):

(1) gibh‘ol, literally, "a small cup," hence, calyx or corolla of a flower (Ex 9:31, "The flax was in bloom").

(2) nets (Ge 40:10, nitstsah, "a flower" or "blossom"; Job 15:33; Isa 18:5). These words are used of the early berries of the vine or olive.

(3) nitstsan, "a flower"; plural only, nitstsanim (So 2:12, "The flowers appear on the earth").

(4) perach, root to "burst forth" expresses an early stage of flowering; "blossom" (Isa 5:24; 18:5); "flower" (Na 1:4, "The flower of Lebanon languisheth"). Used of artificial flowers in candlesticks (Ex 25:31 ff).

(5) tsits, "flower" (Isa 40:6); plural tsitstsim, flowers as architectural ornaments (1Ki 6:18); tsitsah, "the fading flower of his glorious beauty" (Isa 28:1,4; also Nu 17:8; Job 14:2, etc.).

(6) anthos, in Septuagint equivalent of all the Hebrew words (Jas 1:10,11; 1Pe 1:24).

The beauty of the profusion of flowers which cover Palestine every spring receives but scant reference in the Old Testament; So 2:12 is perhaps the only clear reference. It is noticeable that the native of Syria thinks little of flowers unless it be for their perfume. our Lord’s reference to the flowers ("lilies") is well known (Mt 6:28; Lu 12:27). For details of the flowers of modern Palestine, see BOTANY. The aptness of the expression "flower of the field" for a type of the evanescence of human life (Job 14:2; Ps 103:15; Isa 40:6; Jas 1:10) is the more impressive in a land like Palestine where the annual display of wild flowers, so glorious for a few short weeks, is followed by such desolation. The fresh and brilliant colors fade into masses of withered leaves (not uncommonly cleared by burning), and then even these are blown, away, so that but bare, cracked and baked earth remains for long months where once all was beauty, color and life.

E.W.G. Masterman

FLUE; NET

Floo(king James Version, margin Hab 1:15).

See FISH; FISHING.

FLUTE

floot.

See MUSIC.

FLUX

fluks.

See BLOODY FLUX; DYSENTERY.

FLY

(Verb; ‘uph petaomai, or, contracted, ptaomai):

Used in preference to "flee" when great speed is to be indicated. "To fly" is used: (1) Literally, of birds, ‘uph (Ge 1:20; Ps 55:6); da’ah (De 28:49), of sparks (Job 5:7); of the arrow (Ps 91:5); of the seraphim (Isa 6:2,6); of an angel (Da 9:21, ya‘aph, "to be caused to fly"); of swift action or movement (Ps 18:10; Jer 48:40); of people (Isa 11:14); of a fleet (Isa 60:8; 1Sa 15:19, 14:32, ‘asah, "to do," etc.). (2) Figuratively, of a dream (Job 20:8); of man’s transitory life (Ps 90:10); of riches (Pr 23:5); of national glory (Ho 9:11).

For "fly" the Revised Version (British and American) has "soar" (Job 39:26) "fly down" (Isa 11:14); for "flying" (Isa 31:5) the American Standard Revised Version has "hovering."

W. L. Walker

FLY; FLIES

fli fliz ‘arobh (Ex 8:21 ff; Ps 78:45; 105:31; Septuagint kunomuia; "dog-fly"), zebhubh (Ec 10:1; Isa 7:18; Septuagint muiai, "flies"); compare ba‘al-zebhubh, "Baal-zebub" (2Ki 1:2 ff), and beelzeboul, "Beelzebul," or beelzeboub, "Beelzebub" (Mt 10:25; 12:24,27; Lu 11:15,18,19); compare Arabic dhubab, "fly" or "bee"; (Note: "dh" for Arabic dhal, pronounced like "d" or "z" or like th in "the"):

The references in Psalms as well as in Exodus are to the plague of flies, and the word ‘arobh is rendered "swarm of flies" throughout, except in Ps 78:45; 105:31 the King James Version, where we find "divers sorts of flies" (compare Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) omne genus muscarum). In Ex 8:21 we read, "I will send swarms of flies upon thee, and upon thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thy houses: and the houses of the Egyptians shall be full of swarms of flies, and also the ground whereon they are"; in Ex 8:24, ..." the land was corrupted by reason of the swarms of flies"; in Ps 78:45, "He sent among them swarms of flies, which devoured them." There has been much speculation as to

what the insects were, but all the texts cited, including even Ps 78:45, may apply perfectly well to the common house fly (Musca domestica). Some species of blue-bottle fly (Calliphora) might also suit.

The other word, zebhubh, occurs in Ec 10:1, "Dead flies cause the oil of the perfumer to send forth an evil odor; so doth a little folly outweigh wisdom and honor"; and Isa 7:18, "And it shall come to pass in that day, that Yahweh will hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria:" The house fly would fit perfectly the reference in each, but that in Isa would seem to suggest rather one of the horse flies (Tabanidae) or gad flies (Oestridae). Whatever fly may be meant, it is used as a symbol for the military power of Egypt, as the bee for that of Assyria.

Owing to deficiencies in public and private hygiene, and also for other reasons, house flies and others are unusually abundant in Palestine and Egypt and are agents in the transmission of cholera, typhoid fever, ophthalmia and anthrax. Glossina morsitans, the tsetse fly, which is fatal to many domestic animals, and Glossina palpalis which transmits the sleeping sickness, are abundant in tropical Africa, but do not reach Egypt proper.

See PLAGUE.

Alfred Ely Day

FOAL

fol.

See COLT.

FOAM

fom (qetseph (Ho 10:7); aphros (Lu 9:39), aphrizo (Mr 9:18,20), epaphrizo (Jude 1:13)):

Qetseph from qatsaph, "to break to pieces," or "to break forth into anger," "to be angry," occurs often in the sense of "wrath" or "anger" (e.g. Nu 1:53; Ps 38:1, etc.), and in this passage has been rendered "twigs" or "chips," "As for Samaria, her king is cut off, as foam (the Revised Version, margin "twigs") upon the water" (Ho 10:7). The other references are from the New Testament. In Jude, evil-doers or false teachers are compared to the "wild waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame." In Mark and Luke the references are to the boy with a dumb spirit who foamed at the mouth.

Alfred Ely Day

FODDER

fod’-er.

See PROVENDER.

FOLD; FOLDING

fold fold’-ing (verb; chabhaq, sabhakh; helisso):

The verb occurs only 3 times in the King James Version, and in each instance represents a different word; we have chabhaq "to clasp" (Ec 4:5), "The fool foldeth his hands together" (compare Pr 6:10); cabhak, "to interweave" (Na 1:10, "folded together as thorns," the English Revised Version "like tangled thorns" the American Standard Revised Version "entangled like thorns"; see ENTANGLE); helisso "to roll or fold up" (Heb 1:12, quoted from Ps 102:26 (Septuagint), the Revised Version (British and American) "As a mantle shalt thou roll them up"). Folding occurs as translation of galil, "turning" or "rolling" (1Ki 6:34 bis, folding leaves of door).

See also HOUSE.

W. L. Walker

FOLK

fok:

The translation of ‘am, ‘am "a people or nation" (Ge 33:15, "some of the folk that are with me"; Pr 30:26, "The conies are but a feeble folk"); of le’om, with the same meaning (Jer 51:58, "the folk in the fire," the Revised Version (British and American) "the nations for the fire"); "sick folk" is the translation of arrhostos, "not strong" (Mr 6:5); of ton asthenounton, participle of astheneo, "to be without strength," "weak," "sick" (Joh 5:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "them that were sick"); "sick folks," of astheneis plural of asthenes, "without strength," the Revised Version (British and American) "sick folk" (Ac 5:16).

W. L. Walker

FOLLOW

fol’-o (’achar, radhaph; akoloutheo, dioko) :

Frequently the translation of ‘achar, "after," e.g. Nu 14:24, "hath followed me fully," literally, "fulfilled after me" (Nu 32:11,12; De 1:36; Am 7:15); radhaph is "to pursue," and is often so translated; it is translated "follow" (Ps 23:6; Isa 5:11, etc.); "follow after" (Ge 44:4; Ex 14:4); reghel, "foot," is several

times translated "follow" (literally, "at the foot of"; Ex 11:8; Jud 8:5, etc.); halakh ‘achar, "to go after" (De 4:3; 1Ki 14:8, etc.); yalakh ‘achar, "to go on after" (Ge 24:5; Jud 2:19, etc.); dabheq, "to cause to cleave to" is "follow hard after" (1Sa 14:22; Ps 63:8, etc.).

In the New Testament, in addition to akoloutheo (Mt 4:20,22,25, etc.) various words and phrases are rendered "follow," e.g. Deute opiso mou, "Come after me" (Mt 4:19, "Follow me," the Revised Version (British and American) "Come ye after me"); dioko, "to pursue" (Lu 17:23; 1Th 5:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "follow after," etc.); mimeomai, "to imitate" (Heb 13:7, "whose faith follow," the Revised Version (British and American) "imitate their faith; 2Thes 3:7,9; 3Joh 1:11); compounds of akoloutheo with ex, para sun, etc. (2Pe 1:16; Mr 16:20; Ac 16:17; Mr 5:37, etc.).

English Revised Version, "Follow after faithfulness" makes an important change in Ps 37:3, where the King James Version has "and verily thou shalt be fed"; but the American Standard Revised Version has "feed on his faithfulness," margin "feed securely or verily thou shalt be fed." For "attained" (1Ti 4:6) the Revised Version (British and American) gives "followed until now."

W. L. Walker

FOLLOWER

fol’-o-er (mimetes):

"Followers" is in the King James Version the translation of mimetes, "to imitate" (in the New Testament in the good sense of becoming imitators, or following an example), rendered by the Revised Version (British and American) "imitators" (1Co 4:16; 11:1; Eph 5:1; 1Th 1:6; 2:14; Heb 6:12); summimetai, "joint imitators" (Php 3:17); in 1Pe 3:13, the King James Version "followers of that which is good," the word, according to a better text, is zelotis, the Revised Version (British and American) "if ye be zealous of that which is good."

FOLLY

fol’-i.

See FOOL.

FOOD

food:

I. VEGETABLE FOODS

1. Primitive Habits

2. Cereals

3. Leguminous Plants

4. Food of Trees

II. ANIMAL FOOD

LITERATURE

In a previous article (see BREAD) it has been shown that in the Bible "bread" usually stands for food in general and how this came to be so. In a complementary article on MEALS the methods of preparing and serving food will be dealt with. This article is devoted specifically to the foodstuffs of the Orient, more especially to articles of food in use among the Hebrews in Bible times. These are divisible into two main classes.

I. Vegetable Foods.

1. Primitive Habits:

Orientals in general are vegetarians, rather than flesh eaters. There is some reason to believe that primitive man was a vegetarian (see Ge 2:16; 3:2,6). It would seem, indeed, from a comparison of Ge 1:29 f with 9:3 f that Divine permission to eat the flesh of animals was first given to Noah after the Deluge, and then only on condition of drawing off the blood in a prescribed way (compare the kosher (kasher) meat of the Jews of today).

2. Cereals:

The chief place among the foodstuffs of Orientals must be accorded to the cereals, included in the American Standard Revised Version under the generic term "grain," in the King James Version and the English Revised Version "corn." The two most important of these in the nearer East are wheat (chiTTah) and barley (se‘orim). The most primitive way of using the wheat as food was to pluck the (Le 23:14; 2Ki 4:42), remove the husks by rubbing in the hands (De 23:25; Mt 12:1), and eat the grains raw. A common practice in all lands and periods, observed by the fellaheen of Syria today, has been to parch or roast the ears and eat the grain not ground. This is the parched corn (the American Standard Revised Version "‘grain") so often mentioned in the Old Testament, which with bread and vinegar (sour wine) constituted the meal of the reapers to which Boaz invited Ru (Ru 2:14).

Later it became customary to grind the wheat into flour (kemach), and, by bolting it with a fine sieve, to obtain the "fine flour" (coleth) of our English Versions of the Bible, which, of course, was then made

into "bread" (which see), either without leaven (matstsah) or with (lechem chamets Le 7:13).

Meal, both of wheat and of barley, was prepared in very early times by means of the primitive rubbing-stones, which excavations at Lachish, Gezer and elsewhere show survived the introduction of the hand-mill (see MILL; Compare PEFS, 1902, 326). Barley (se‘orim) has always furnished the principal food of the poorer classes, and, like wheat, has been made into bread (Jud 7:13; Joh 6:9,13). Less frequently millet (Eze 4:9) and spelt (kuccemeth; see FITCHES) were so used. (For details of baking, bread-making, etc., see BREAD. III, 1,2,3.)

3. Leguminous Plants:

Vegetable foods of the pulse family (leguminosae) are represented in the Old Testament chiefly by lentils and beans. The pulse of Da 1:12 (zero‘im) denotes edible "herbs" in general (Revised Version margin, compare Isa 61:11, "things that are sown"). The lentils (‘adhashim) were and are considered very toothsome and nutritious. It was of "red lentils" that Jacob brewed his fateful pottage (Ge 25:29,34), a stew, probably, in which the lentils were flavored with onions and other ingredients, as we find it done in Syria today. Lentils, beans, cereals, etc., were sometimes ground and mixed and made into bread (Eze 4:9). I found them at Gaza roasted also, and eaten with oil and salt, like parched corn.

The children of Israel, when in the wilderness, are said to have looked back wistfully on the "cucumbers .... melons .... leeks .... onions, and the garlic" of Egypt (Nu 11:5). All these things we find later were grown in Palestine. In addition, at least four varieties of the bean, the chickpea, various species of chickory and endive, the bitter herbs of the Passover ritual (Ex 12:8), mustard (Mt 13:31) and many other things available for food, are mentioned in the Mishna, our richest source of information on this subject. Cucumbers (qishshu’im) were then, as now, much used. The oriental variety is much less fibrous and more succulent. and digestible than ours, and supplies the thirsty traveler often with a fine substitute for water where water is scarce or bad. The poor in such cities as Cairo, Beirut and Damascus live largely on bread and cucumbers or melons. The cucumbers are eaten raw, with or without salt, between meals, but also often stuffed and cooked and eaten at meal time. Onions (betsalim), garlic (shummim) and leeks (chatsir) are still much used in Palestine as in Egypt. They are usually eaten raw with bread, though also used for flavoring in cooking, and, like cucumbers, pickled and eaten as a relish with meat (ZDPV, IX, 14). Men in utter extremity sometimes "plucked saltwort" (malluah) and ate the leaves, either raw or boiled, and made "the roots of the broom" their food (Job 30:4).

4. Food of Trees:

In Le 19:23 f it is implied that, when Israel came into the land to possess it, they should "plant all manner of trees for food." They doubtless found such trees in the goodly land in abundance, but in the natural course of things needed to plant more. Many olive trees remain fruitful to extreme old age, as for example those shown the tourist in the garden of Gethsemane, but many more require replanting. Then the olive after planting requires ten or fifteen years to fruit, and trees of a quicker growth, like the fig, are planted beside them and depended on for fruit in the meantime. It is significant that Jotham in his

parable makes the olive the first choice of the trees to be their king (Jud 9:9), and the olive tree to respond, "Should I leave my fatness, which God and man honor in me, and go to wave to and fro over the trees?" (American Revised Version margin). The berries of the olive (zayith) were doubtless eaten, then as now, though nowhere in Scripture is it expressly so stated. The chief use of the berries, now as ever, is in furnishing "oil" (which see), but they are eaten in the fresh state, as also after being soaked in brine, by rich and poor alike, and are shipped in great quantities. Olive trees are still more or less abundant in Palestine, especially around Bethlehem and Hebron, on the borders of the rich plains of Esdraelon, Phoenicia, Sharon and Philistia, in the vale of Shechem, the plain of Moreh, and in the trans-Jordanic regions of Gilead and Bashan. They are esteemed as among the best possessions of the towns, and the culture of them is being revived around Jerusalem, in the Jordan valley and elsewhere throughout the land. They are beautiful to behold in all stages of their growth, but especially in spring. Then they bear an amazing wealth of blossoms, which in the breeze fall in showers like snowflakes, a fact that gives point to Job's words, "He shall cast off his flower as the olive-tree" (Job 15:33). The mode of gathering the fruit is still about what it was in ancient times (compare Ex 27:20).

Next in rank to the olive, according to Jotham's order, though first as an article of food, is the fig (in the Old Testament te'enah, in the New Testament suke), whose "sweetness" is praised in the parable (Jud 9:11). It is the principal shade and fruit tree of Palestine, growing in all parts, in many spontaneously, and is the emblem of peace and prosperity (De 8:8; Jud 9:10; 1Ki 4:25; Mic 4:4; Zec 3:10; APC 1Macc 14:12). The best fig and olive orchards are carefully plowed, first in the spring when the buds are swelling, sometimes again when the second crop is sprouting, and again after the first rains in the autumn. The "first-ripe fig" (bikkurah, Isa 28:4; Jer 24:2), i.e. the early fig which grows on last year's wood, was and is esteemed as a great delicacy, and is often eaten while it is young and green. The late fig (te'enim) is the kind dried in the sun and put up in quantities for use out of season. Among the Greeks and the Romans, as well as among the Hebrews, dried figs were most extensively used. When pressed in a mold they formed the "cakes of figs" (debhelah) mentioned in the Old Testament (1Sa 25:18; 1Ch 12:40), doubtless about such as are found today in Syria and Smyrna, put up for home use and for shipment. It was such a fig-cake that was presented as a poultice (the King James Version "plaster") for Hezekiah's boil (Isa 38:21; compare 2Ki 20:7). As the fruit-buds of the fig appear before the leaves, a tree full of leaves and without fruit would be counted "barren" (Mr 11:12 f; compare Isa 28:4; Jer 24:2; Ho 9:10; Na 3:12; Mt 21:19; Lu 13:7).

Grapes ('anabhim), often called "the fruit of the vine" (Mt 26:29), have always been a much- prized article of food in the Orient. They are closely associated in the Bible with the fig (compare "every man under his vine and under his fig-tree," 1Ki 4:25). Like the olive, the fig, and the date-palm, grapes are indigenous to Syria, the soil and climate being most favorable to their growth and perfection. Southern Palestine especially yields a rich abundance of choice grapes, somewhat as in patriarchal times (Ge 49:11,12). J. T. Haddad, a native Syrian, for many years in the employment of the Turkish government, tells of a variety in the famous valley of Eshcol near Hebron, a bunch from which has been known to weigh twenty-eight pounds (compare Nu 13:23). Of the grapevine there is nothing wasted; the young leaves are used as a green vegetable, and the old are fed to sheep and goats. The branches cut off in pruning, as well as the dead trunk, are used to make charcoal, or for firewood. The failure of such a fruit was naturally regarded as a judgment from Yahweh (Ps 105:33; Jer 5:17; Ho 2:12; Joe 1:7). Grapes, like

figs, were both enjoyed in their natural state, and by exposure to the sun dried into raisins (tsimmuqim), the "dried grapes" of Nu 6:3. In this form they were especially well suited to the use of travelers and soldiers (1Sa 25:18; 1Ch 12:40). The meaning of the word rendered "raisin-cake," the American Standard Revised Version "a cake of raisins" (2Sa 6:19 and elsewhere), is uncertain. In Bible times the bulk of the grape product of the land went to the making of wine (which see). Some doubt if the Hebrews knew grape-syrup, but the fact that the Aramaic dibs, corresponding to Hebrew debhash, is used to denote both the natural and artificial honey (grape-syrup), seems to indicate that they knew the latter (compare Ge 43:11; Eze 27:17; and see HONEY).

Less prominent was the fruit of the mulberry figtree (or sycomore) (shiqmah), of the date-palm (tamar), the dates of which, according to the Mishna, were both eaten as they came from the tree, and dried in clusters and pressed into cakes for transport; the pomegranate (tappuach), the "apple" of the King James Version (see APPLE), or quinch, according to others; the husks (Lu 15:16), i.e. the pods of the carob tree keration), are treated elsewhere. Certain nuts were favorite articles of food—pistachio nuts (boTnim), almonds (sheqedhim) and walnuts (’eghoz); and certain spices and vegetables were much used for seasoning: cummin (kammon), anise, dill (the King James Version) qetsach), mint (heduosmon) and mustard (sinapi), which see. Salt (melach), of course, played an important part, then as now, in the cooking and in the life of the Orientals. To "eat the salt" of a person was synonymous with eating his bread (Ezr 4:14), and a "covenant of salt" was held inviolable (Nu 18:19; 2Ch 13:5).

II. Animal Food.

Anciently, even more than now in the East, flesh food was much less used than among western peoples. In the first place, in Israel and among other Semitic peoples, it was confined by law to the use of such animals and birds as were regarded as "clean" (see CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS), or speaking according to the categories of Le 11:2,3; De 14:4-20, domestic animals and game (see Driver on De 14:4-20). Then the poverty of the peasantry from time immemorial has tended to limit the use of meat to special occasions, such as family festivals (chaggim), the entertainment of an honored guest (Ge 18:7; 2Sa 12:4), and the sacrificial meal at the local sanctuary.

The goat (‘ez, etc.), especially the "kid of the goats" (Le 4:23,18 the King James Version), was more prized for food by the ancient Hebrews than by modern Orientals, by whom goats are kept chiefly for their milk—most of which they supply (compare Pr 27:27). For this reason they are still among the most valued possessions of rich and poor (compare Ge 30:33; 32:14 with 1Sa 25:2). A kid, as less valuable than a lamb, was naturally the readier victim when meat was required (compare Lu 15:29).

The sheep of Palestine, as of Egypt, are mainly of the fat-tailed species (Ovis aries), the tail of which was forbidden as ordinary food and had to be offered with certain other portions of the fat (Ex 29:22; Le 3:9). To kill a lamb in honor of a gue st is one of the highest acts of Bedouin hospitality. As a rule only the lambs are killed for meat, and they only in honor of some guest or festive occasion (compare 1Sa 25:18; 1Ki 1:19). Likewise the "calves of the herd" supplied the daintiest food of the kind, though the flesh of the neat cattle, male and female, was eaten. The "fatted calf" of Lu 15:23 will be recalled, as

also the "fatlings" and the "stalled" (stall-fed) ox of the Old Testament (Pr 15:17). Asharp contrast suggestive of the growth of luxury in Israel is seen by a comparison of 2Sa 17:28 f with 1Ki 4:22 f. The food furnished David and his hardy followers at Mahanaim was "wheat, and barley, and meal, and parched grain, and beans, and lentils, and parched pulse, and honey, and butter, and sheep, and cheese of the herd," while the daily provision for Solomon's table was "thirty measures of fine flour, and threescore measures of meal, ten fat oxen, and twenty oxen out of the pastures, and a hundred sheep, besides harts, and gazelles, and roebucks, and fatted fowl." Nehemiah's daily portion is given as "one ox and six choice sheep" (Ne 5:18).

Milk of large and small animals was a staple article of food (De 32:14; Pr 27:27). It was usually kept in skins, as among the Syrian peasants it is today (Jud 4:19). We find a generic term often used (chem'ah) which covers also cream, clabber and cheese (Pr 30:33). The proper designation of cheese is gebhinah (Job 10:10), but chalabh also is used both for ordinary milk and for a cheese made directly from sweet milk (compare 1Sa 17:18, charitse hechalabh, and our "cottage cheese").

See MILK.

Honey (debhash, nopheth ha-tsuphim), so often mentioned with milk, is ordinary bees' honey (see HONEY). The expression "honey" in the combination debhash wechalabh, for which Palestine was praised, most likely means debhash temarim, i.e. "date-juice." It was much prized and relished (Ps 19:10; Pr 16:24), and seems to have been a favorite food for children (Isa 7:15).

Of game seven species are mentioned (De 14:5). The gazelle and the hart were the typical animals of the chase, much prized for their flesh (De 12:15), and doubtless supplied the venison of Esau's "savory meat" (Ge 25:28; 27:4).

Of fish as food little is said in the Old Testament (see Nu 11:5; Jer 16:16; Eze 47:10; Ec 9:12). No particular species is named, although thirty-six species are said to be found in the waters of the Jordan valley alone. But we may be sure that the fish which the Hebrews enjoyed in Egypt "for nought" (Nu 11:5) had their successors in Canaan (Kennedy). Trade in cured fish was carried on by Tyrian merchants with Jerusalem in Nehemiah's day (Ne 13:16), and there must have been a fish market at or near the fish gate (Ne 3:3). The Sea of Galilee in later times was the center of a great fish industry, as is made clear by the Gospels and by Josephus In the market of Tiberias today fresh fish are sold in great quantities, and a thriving trade in salt fish is carried on. The "small fishes" of our Lord's two great miracles of feeding were doubtless of this kind, as at all times they have been a favorite form of provision for a journey in hot countries.

As to the exact price of food in ancient times little is known. From 2Ki 7:1,16 we learn that one ce'ah of fine flour, and two of barley, sold for a shekel (compare Mt 10:29). For birds allowed as food see De 14:11 and articles on CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS.

Pigeons and turtle doves find a place in the ritual of various sacrifices, and so are to be reckoned as

"clean" for ordinary uses as well. The species of domestic fowl found there today seem to have been introduced during the Persian period (compare 2 Esdras 1:30; Mt 23:37; 26:34, etc.). It is thought that the fatted fowl of Solomon's table (1Ki 4:23) were geese (see Mish). Fatted goose is a favorite food with Jews today, as it was with the ancient Egyptians.

Of game birds used for food (see Ne 5:18) the partridge and the quail are prominent, and the humble sparrow comes in for his share of mention (Mt 10:29; Lu 12:6). Then, as now, the eggs of domestic fowls and of all "clean" birds were favorite articles of food (De 22:6; Isa 10:14; Lu 11:12).

Edible insects (Le 11:22 f) are usually classed with animal foods. In general they are of the locust family (see LOCUST). They formed part of the food of John the Baptist (Mt 3:4, etc.), were regarded by the Assyrians as delicacies, and are a favorite food of the Arabs today. They are prepared and served in various ways, the one most common being to remove the head, legs and wings, to drop it in meal, and then fry it in oil or butter. It then tastes a little like fried frogs' legs. In the diet of the Baptist, locusts were associated with wild honey (see HONEY).

As to condiments (see separate articles on SALT; CORIANDER, etc.) it needs only to be said here that the caperberry (Ec 12:5 margin) was eaten before meals as an appetizer and, strictly speaking, was not a condiment. Mustard was valued for the leaves, not for the seed (Mt 13:31). Pepper, though not mentioned in Scripture, is mentioned margin the Mishna as among the condiments. Before it came into use, spicy seeds like cummin, the coriander, etc., played a more important role than since.

The abhorrence of the Hebrews for all food prepared or handled by the heathen (see ABOMINATION) is to be attributed primarily to the intimate association in early times between flesh food and sacrifices to the gods. This finds conspicuous illustration in the case of Daniel (Da 1:8), Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 5:27), Josephus (Vita, III), and their compatriots (see also Ac 15:20,29; 1Co 8:1-10; 10:19,28). As to sources of food supply and traffic in food stuffs, for primitive usages see Ge 18:7; 27:9; 1Ki 21:2. As to articles and customs of commerce adopted when men became dwellers in cities, see Jer 37:21, where bakers were numerous enough in Jerusalem to give their name to a street or bazaar, where doubtless, as today, they baked and sold bread to the public (compare Mishna, passim). Extensive trade in "victuals" in Nehemiah's day is attested by Ne 13:15 f, and by specific mention of the "fish gate" (3:3) and the "sheep gate" (3:1), so named evidently because of their nearby markets. In John's Gospel (Joh 4:8; 13:29) we have incidental evidence that the disciples were accustomed to buy food as they journeyed through the land. In Jerusalem, cheese was clearly to be bought in the cheesemakers' valley (Tyropoeon), oil of the oil merchants (Mt 25:9), and so on; and Corinth, we may be sure, was not the only city of Paul's day that had a provision market ("shambles," 1Co 10:25 the Revised Version (British and American)).

LITERATURE.

Mishna B.M. i. 1,2 and passim; Josephus, Vita and BJ; Robinson's Researches, II, 416, etc.; and Biblical Dictionaries, articles on "Food," etc.

George B. Eager

FOOL; FOLLY

fool nabhal, ‘ewil, kecil, cakhal and forms; aphron, aphrosune, moros):

I. In the Old Testament.

1. General:

Taking the words generally, apart from the Wisdom literature, we find nabhal frequently translated "fool" and nebhalah, "folly"; nabhal, however, denotes a wicked person, an evil character, "shamelessly immoral," equivalent to "a son of Belial" (Cheyne), rather than a merely "foolish" person, and nebhalah, "wickedness," "shameless impropriety," rather than simple folly. We have almost a definition of nabhal in Isa 32:6: "For the fool will speak folly, and his heart will work iniquity, to practice profaneness, and to utter error against Yahweh, to make empty the soul of the hungry, and to cause the drink of the thirsty to fail." Abigail described her husband, Nabhal, as "a son of Belial" (the Revised Version (British and American) "worthless fellow"), "for as his name is, so is he" (1Sa 25:25), and what we read of him bears out this character. Other occurrences of the words support the above meaning; they are generally associated with some form of wickedness, frequently with base and unnatural lewdness (Ge 34:7; De 22:21; Jos 7:15; Jud 19:23,14; 20:6,10; 2Sa 13:12). When in Ps 14:1; 53:1 it is said, "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God," it is followed by the statement, "They are corrupt, they have done abominable works," showing that more than "folly" is implied. In Isa 32:5,6 the King James Version nabhal is translated "vile person" and nebhalah "villany," the Revised Version (British and American) "fool" and "folly," Jer 29:23; halal, implying loud boasting is in the King James Version translated "foolish," but it means, rather, "arrogant," which the Revised Version (British and American) adopts (Ps 5:5; 73:3; 75:4, margin "fools"); cakhal, "a fool," also occurs (Ge 31:28; 1Sa 13:13, etc.) for which word see (4) below; also ya’al "to be empty," "to be or become foolish" (Nu 12:11; Isa 19:13; Jer 5:4; 50:36).

2. The Wisdom Literature:

In the Chokhmah or Wisdom literature, which, within the Bible, is contained in Job, Proverbs (especially), Ecclesiastes, Canticles, some Psalms and certain portions of the prophetic writings, "fool" and "folly" are frequent and distinctive words. Their significance is best seen in contrast with "Wisdom." This was the outcome of careful observation and long pondering on actual life in the light of religion and the Divine revelation. Wisdom had its seat in God and was imparted to those who "feared" Him ("The fear of Yahweh is the beginning (chief part) of knowledge" Pr 1:7). Such wisdom was the essence of life, and to be without it was to walk in the way of death and destruction. The fool was he who was thoughtless, careless, conceited, self-sufficient, indifferent to God and His Will, or who might even oppose and scoff at religion and wise instruction. See WISDOM. Various words are used to designate "the fool" and his "folly."

(1) nabhal (Job 2:10; 30:8; Ps 53:1; Pr 17:7-21); nebhalah (Job 42:8; Isa 9:17) (see above).

(2) ‘ewil, one of the commonest, the idea conveyed by which is that of one who is hasty, impatient, self-sufficient (Pr 12:15; 15:5; 16:22); despising advice and instruction (Pr 1:7; 14:9; 24:7); ready to speak and act without thinking (Pr 10:14; 12:16; 20:3); quick to get angry, quarrel and cause strife (Pr 11:29; 14:17 ‘iwweleth; 29:9); unrestrained in his anger (Job 5:2; Pr 17:12); silly, stupid even with brute stupidity (Pr 7:22; 26:11; 27:22; compare Isa 19:11; Jer 4:22); he is associated with "transgression" (Ps 107:17; Pr 13:15; 17:18,19), with "sin" (Pr 24:9), with the "scoffer" (same place) ;’ iwweleth, "foolishness" occurs (Ps 38:5; 69:5; Pr 13:16; "folly," Ps 14:8,24,29, etc.).

(3) kecil is the word most frequent in Proverbs. It is probably from a root meaning "thickness," "sluggishness," suggesting a slow, self-confident person, but it is used with a wide reference.

Self-confidence appears (Pr 14:16; 28:26); ignorance (Ec 2:14); hate of instruction (Pr 1:22; 18:2); thoughtlessness (Pr 10:23; 17:24); self-exposure (Pr 14:33; 15:2; 18:7; 29:11; Ec 5:1; 10:12); anger and contention (Pr 18:6; 19:1; Ec 7:9); rage (Pr 14:16; 17:12); indolence and improvidence (Ec 4:5; Pr 21:20); silly merriment (Ec 7:4,5,6); brutishness (Pr 26:11; compare Ps 49:10; 92:6); it is associated with slander (Pr 10:18), with evil (Pr 13:19).

(4) cakhal, cekhel, cikhluth, also occur. These are probably from a root meaning "to be stopped up" (Cheyne), and are generally taken as denoting thickheadedness; but they are used in a stronger sense than mere foolishness (compare 1Sa 26:21; 2Sa 24:10, etc.). These words do not occur in Prov, but in Ec 2:12; 7:25; cikhluth is associated with "madness" ("Wickedness is folly, and .... foolishness is madness").

(5) pethi, "simple," is only once translated "foolish" (Pr 9:6 the King James Version).

(6) ba‘ar, ‘brutish," is translated "foolish" (Ps 73:22 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "brutish").

(7) taphel, "insipid," "untempered," is translated "foolish" (La 2:14); tiphlah, "insipidity" (Job 1:22, "foolishly," the English Revised Version, "with foolishness"; Job 24:12, "folly"; Jer 23:13, "folly," the King James Version margin "unsavoury, or, an absurd thing").

(8) toholah (Job 4:18: "Behold, he putteth no trust in his servants; and his angels he chargeth with folly" (Delitzsch, "imperfection," others, "error"), the King James Version margin "nor in his angels in whom he put light").

II. In the Apocrypha.

In the continuation of the Wisdom literature in The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclus, "fool" frequently occurs with a signification similar to that in Proverbs; in The Wisdom of Solomon we have aphron

(12:24; 15:5, etc.), in Ecclesiasticus, moros (18:18; 19:11, etc.; 20:13; 21:16, etc.).

III. In the New Testament.

In the New Testament we have various words translated "fool," "foolish," "folly," etc., in the ordinary acceptation of these terms; aphron, "mindless," "witless" (Lu 11:40; 12:20; 1Co 15:36); aphrosune, "want of mind or wisdom" (2Co 11:1; Mr 7:22); anoia, "want of understanding" (2Ti 3:9); moraino, "to make dull," "foolish" (Ro 1:22; 1Co 1:20); moros, "dull," "stupid" (Mt 7:26; 23:17; 25:2; 1Co 1:25,27); moria, "foolishness" (1Co 1:18 etc.); morologia, "foolish talk" (Eph 5:4).

In Mt 5:22 our Lord says: "Whosoever shall say (to his brother), Thou fool (more), shall be in danger of the hell of fire (the Gehenna of fire)." Two explanations of this word are possible:

(1) that it is not the vocative of the Greek moros—a word which was applied by Jesus Himself to the Pharisees (Mt 23:17,19), but represents the Hebrew morah, "rebel" applied in Nu 20:10 by Moses to the people, "ye rebels" (for which he was believed to be excluded from the promised land; compare Nu 20:12; hence, we have in the Revised Version, margin "or moreh, a Hebrew expression of condemnation"); or

(2) that, as our Lord spake in the Aramaic it is the Greek translation of a word representing the Hebrew nabhal, "vile, or worthless fellow," atheist, etc. (Ps 14:1; 53:1).

W. L. Walker

FOOLERY

fool’-er-i:

The plural "fooleries" occurs Ecclesiasticus 22:13 King James Version: "Talk not much with a fool .... and thou shalt never be defiled with his fooleries." The Greek word is entinagmos, "a striking or throwing in," "an attack," from entinasso, "to strike into," "cast at," etc. (APC 1Macc 2:36; 2Macc 4:41; 11:11). the Revised Version (British and American) renders "Thou shalt not be defiled in his onslaught," margin "defiled: in his onslaught turn." The meaning is most probably "with what he throws out," i.e. his foolish or vile speeches, as if it were slaver.

FOOT

foot (reghel, qarcol (only twice in parallel passages: 2Sa 22:37 = Ps 18:36, where it probably means ankle); pous): The dusty roads of Palestine and other eastern lands make a much greater care of the feet necessary than we are accustomed to bestow upon them. The absence of socks or stockings, the use of sandals and low shoes rather than boots and, to an even greater degree, the frequent habit of walking

barefoot make it necessary to wash the feet repeatedly every day. This is always done when entering the house, especially the better upper rooms which are usually carpeted. It is a common dictate of good manners to perform this duty to a visitor, either personally or through a servant; at least water for washing has to be presented (Ge 18:4; Lu 7:44). This has therefore become almost synonymous with the bestowal of hospitality (1Ti 5:10). At an early date this service was considered one of the lowest tasks of servants (1Sa 25:41), probably because the youngest and least trained servants were charged with the task, or because of the idea of defilement connected with the foot. It was, for the same reason, if rendered voluntarily, a service which betokened complete devotion. Jesus taught the greatest lesson of humility by performing this humble service to His disciples (Joh 13:4-15). The undoing of the latchets or leather thongs of the sandals (Mr 1:7; Lu 3:16; Joh 1:27) seems to refer to the same menial duty.

Often the feet and shoes were dusted on the highway, as is being done in the Orient to this day, but if it were done in an ostentatious manner in the presence of a person or a community who had refused hospitality to a stranger, it was understood in the same sense in which the cutting in two of the tablecloth was considered in the days of knighthood: it meant rejection and separation (Mt 10:14; Ac 13:51).

The roads of the desert were not only dusty but rough, and the wanderer was almost sure to ruin his ill-made shoes and wound his weary feet. A special providence of God protected the children of Israel from this experience during the long journey through the wilderness. "Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years" (De 8:4; 29:5).

In the house shoes and sandals were never worn; even the most delicate would put on shoes only when going out (De 28:56). The shoes were left outside of the house or in a vestibule. This was especially done in the house of God and at the time of prayer, for whenever or wherever that might be, the law was: "Put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground" (Ex 3:5; Jos 5:15; Ac 7:33). This custom still prevails among the Moslems of our day. Probably it was the idea of defilement through contact with the common ground which gave rise to its moral application by the Preacher, "Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God" (Ec 5:1 (Hebrew 4:17)).

Nakedness of the feet in public, especially among the wealthier classes, who used to wear shoes or sandals, was a token of mourning (Eze 24:17 and probably also Jer 2:25 and Isa 20:2-4). A peculiar ceremony is referred to in De 25:9,10, whereby a brother-in-law, who refused to perform his duty under the Levirate law, was publicly put to shame. "And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed." See also Ru 4:7,8.

Numerous are the phrases in which the word "foot" or "feet" is used in Biblical language. "To cover the feet" (1Sa 24:3) is synonymous with obeying a call of Nature. "To speak with the feet" is expressive of the eloquence of abusive and obscene gesticulation among oriental people, where hands, eyes and feet are able to express much without the use of words (Pr 6:13). "To sit at the feet," means to occupy the place of a learner (De 33:3; Lu 10:39; Ac 22:3). Vanquished enemies had to submit to being trodden upon by the conqueror (a ceremony often represented on Egyptian monuments; Jos 10:24; Ps 8:6; 110:1; compare Isa 49:23). James warns against an undue humiliation of those who join us in the service of

God, even though they be poor or mean-looking, by bidding them to take a lowly place at the feet of the richer members of the congregation (Jas 2:3). We read of dying Jacob that "he gathered up his feet into the bed," for he had evidently used his bed as a couch, on which he had been seated while delivering his charge to his several sons (Ge 49:33). "Foot" or "feet" is sometimes used euphemistically for the genitals (De 28:57; Eze 16:25). In De 11:10 an interesting reference is made to some Egyptian mode of irrigating the fields, ‘the watering with the foot,’ which mode would be unnecessary in the promised land of Canaan which "drinketh water of the rain of heaven." It is, however, uncertain whether this refers to the water-wheels worked by a treadmill arrangement or whether reference is made to the many tributary channels, which, according to representations on the Egyptian monuments, intersected the gardens and fields and which could be stopped or opened by placing or removing a piece of sod at the mouth of the channel. This was usually done with the foot. Frequently we find references to the foot in expressions connected with journeyings and pilgrimages, which formed so large a part in the experiences of Israel, e. g. Ps 91:12, "lest thou dash thy foot against a stone"; 94:18, "My foot slippeth"; 121:3, "He will not suffer thy foot to be moved," and many more. Often the reference is to the "walk," i.e. the moral conduct of life (Ps 73:2; Job 23:11; 31:5).

Figurative: In the metaphorical language of Isa 52:7 "the feet" are synonymous with "the coming."

H. L. E. Luering

FOOTMAN

foot’-man.

See WAR.

FOOTSTOOL

foot’-stool (kebhes; hupopodion, "trodden on"): The 15 Scripture references to this term may be classified as literal or figurative. Of the former are the two passages: 2Ch 9:18 and Jas 2:3. In these the footstool was a sort of step or support for the feet placed before the throne or any pretentious seat.

Of figurative uses, there are the following groups:

(1) Of the earth: Isa 66:1; Mt 5:35; Ac 7:49.

(2) Of the ark: 1Ch 28:2.

(3) Of the Temple: Ps 99:5; 132:7; La 2:1; compare Isa 60:13.

(4) Of heathen enemies subdued by the Messianic King: Ps 110:1; Mt 22:44 the King James Version; Mr

12:36; Lu 20:43; Ac 2:35; Heb 1:13; 10:13.

Thus the uses of this term are mainly metaphorical and symbolic of subjection, either to God as universal Lord or to God’s Son as King by redemptive right. Compare 1Co 15:25-27, in which all things, including death, are represented as subject to Christ and placed beneath His feet.

Leonard W. Doolan

FOR

for (ki (conjunction), le, from ‘el (preposition), and various other words. In the New Testament also the words are various, chiefly gar, kai gar, hoti (conjunctions); anti apo eis dia (accusative), epi (dative and accusative), peri (genitive), pros (genitive and accusative), huper (genitive) (prepositions)): the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version give in many cases more literal or more accurate renderings than those in the King James Version.

In the New Testament the most important preps. from a doctrinal point of view are anti, "face to face," "over against," "instead," "on behalf of," peri, "around," "about," "concerning," huper, "over," "on behalf of." The first has been claimed as stating the substitutionary nature of Christ’s sacrifice as contrasted with huper and peri, more frequently used of it. But, although anti in the New Testament often means "instead of," "answering to," it does not necessarily imply substitution. On the other hand, in classical Greek huper is sometimes used in that sense (see Trench, Synonyms). "Here as always the root idea of the preposition, the root idea of the case, and the context must all be considered" (Robertson, Grammar, 124). Anti is found in this connection only in Mt 20:28, and Mr 10:45. In Mt 26:28; Mr 14:24, we have peri, also in Heb 10:6,8,18,26; 1Pe 3:18; 1 Joh 2:2; 4:10. Lu 22:19,20 has huper, which is the word commonly used by Paul, as in Ro 5:6,8; 8:32; 14:15; 1Co 15:3, etc., also by John in his Gospel, 6:51; 10:11, etc., and 1 Joh 3:16; also Heb 2:9; 10:12; 1Pe 2:21; 3:18; 4:1; in Ro 8:3 it is peri.

W. L. Walker

FORAY

for’-a (2Sa 3:22).

See WAR.

FORBEAR

for-bar’ (chadhal; anechomai): In the Old Testament chadhal, "to leave off," is the word most frequently translated "forbear" (Ex 23:5, etc.); damam, "to be silent," chasakh, "to keep back," mashakh, "to draw or stretch out," occur once each; the Revised Version (British and American) renders Eze 24:17

(damam), "Sigh, but not aloud," margin "Hebrew be silent,"; Pr 24:11 (chasakh), "See that thou hold back," margin "or forbear thou not to deliver," the King James Version "if thou forbear to deliver"; Ne 9:30 (mashakh), "bear" instead of "forbear"; ‘aph literally, "breathing," the "nose," hence, from violent breathing, "anger" (’erekh, "long," understood), and kul "to hold," are translated "forbearing" (Pr 25:15; Jer 20:9, respectively).

In the New Testament we have anechomai, "to hold self back or up," "with longsuffering, forbearing one another" (Eph 4:2, ; Col 3:13); aniemi "to send back," the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "forbear threatening’ (Eph 6:9); pheidomai, "to spare," "but I forbear" (2Co 12:6); meergazesthai, "not to work," "to forbear working" (1Co 9:6); stego, "to cover," "conceal": "when I could no longer forbear" (1Th 3:1,5).

W. L.Walker

FORBEARANCE

for-bar’-ans (anoche):

"Forbearance" (anoche, "a holding back") is ascribed to God (Ro 2:4, "the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering"; 3:25 the Revised Version (British and American), "the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God," the King James Version "remission" (margin "passing over") of sins, that are past, through the forbearance of God"); in Php 4:5, to epieikes is translated by the Revised Version (British and American) "forbearance," margin "gentleness"; it is a Christian grace in likeness to God. "Forbearing" (The King James Version, margin) is substituted by the Revised Version (British and American) for "patient" (anexikakos, "holding up under evil") in 2Ti 2:24.

W. L. Walker

FORBID

for-bid’ (kala; koluo):

Occurs very seldom in the Old Testament except as the rendering of chalilah (see below); it is once the translation of kala’," to restrain" (Nu 11:28, "Joshua .... said My lord Moses forbid them"); twice of tsawah, "to command" (De 2:37, "and wheresoever Yahweh our God forbade us"; De 4:23, "Yahweh thy God hath forbidden thee," literally, "commanded"); once of lo’," not," the Revised Version (British and American) "commanded not to be done" (Le 5:17). In the phrases, "Yahweh forbid" (1Sa 24:6; 26:11; 1Ki 21:13), "God forbid" (Ge 44:7; Jos 22:29; 24:16; 1Sa 12:23; Job 27:5, etc.), "My God forbid it me" (1Ch 11:19), the word is chalilah, denoting profanation, or abhorrence (rendered, Ge 18:25 the King James Version, "that be far from thee"); the English Revised Version leaves the expressions unchanged; the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "far be it from me," "thee," etc., except in 1Sa 14:45; 20:2, where it is, "Far from it."

In the New Testament koluo, "to cut short," "restrain" is the word commonly translated "forbid" (Mt 19:14, "forbid them not," etc.); in Lu 6:29, the Revised Version (British and American) has "withhold not"; diakoluo, with a similar meaning, occurs in Mt 3:14, "John forbade him," the Revised Version (British and American) "would have hindered him"; akolutos, "uncut off" (Ac 28:31), is translated "none forbidding him." The phrase "God forbid" (me genoito, "let it not be," Lu 20:16; Ro 3:4, etc.) is retained by the Revised Version (British and American), with margin "Be it not so," except in Ga 6:14, where the text has "Far be it from me"; me genoito is one of the renderings of chalilah in Septuagint. "God forbid" also appears in Apocrypha (APC 1Macc 2:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "Heaven forbid," margin, Greek "may he be propitious," APC 1Macc 9:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "Let it not be").

W. L. Walker

FORCES

for'-sis (chayil):

(1) The word is used as a military term, equivalent to army, in 2Ki 25:23,16 (where the King James Version reads "armies"); 2Ch 17:2; Jer 40:7, etc.

See ARMY.

(2) In Isa 60:5,11, it is rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) by "wealth," and in Ob verse 11, by "substance."

Two other Hebrew words are also translated "forces" in the King James Version, ma'amatstsim (Job 36:19), and ma'oz (Da 11:38), the latter being rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "fortresses."

FORD

ford (ma'abhar (Ge 32:22; "pass" (of Michmash), 1Sa 13:23; "stroke" (the Revised Version, margin "passing"), Isa 30:32); ma'barah (Jos 2:7; Jud 3:28; 12:5,6; Isa 16:2 "pass" (of Michmash), 1Sa 14:4; "passages" (the Revised Version, margin "fords"), Jer 51:32); 'abharah (2Sa 15:28; 17:16; "ferry-boat" (the Revised Version, margin "convoy"), 2Sa 19:18); from 'abhar, "to pass over"; compare Arabic 'abar, "to pass over" and ma'bar, "a ford"):

In the journeyings of the children of Israel, in addition to the miraculous passages of the Red Sea and the Jordan, they had other streams to pass over, especially the Zered (Chisa') and the Arnon (Maujib) (Nu 21:12,13; De 2:24). The Jabbok (Zarqa) is frequently referred to, particularly in connection with Jacob

(Ge 32:22). The most frequent references are to the Jordan which, in time of flood, was impassable (Jos 3:15).

The lower Jordan is about 100 ft. wide, and from 5 to 12 ft. deep, so that in the absence of bridges, the places where it was possible to ford were of great importance. The passage of the Jordan is referred to in connection with Jacob (Ge 32:10), Gideon (Jud 8:4), the children of Ammon (Jud 10:9), Abner and his men (2Sa 2:29), David (2Sa 10:17; 17:22), Absalom (2Sa 17:24), and others. Jesus undoubtedly crossed the Jordan, and John is thought to have baptized at the ford of the Jordan near Jericho. The fords of the Jordan are specifically mentioned in Jos 2:7 in connection with the pursuit of the spies who were hidden in Rahab's house, and in 2Sa 15:28; 17:16 in connection with the flight of David. In the last two passages we have abharah, the same word which, in the account of David's return (2Sa 19:18), is rendered "ferry-boat" (the Revised Version, margin "convoy").

See JORDAN.

Alfred Ely Day

FORECAST

for-kast';(vb.) (chashabh):

To forecast is both to plan or scheme beforehand and to consider or see beforehand. It is in the first sense that it is used in Da 11:24,25 (the King James Version) as the translation of chashabh, "to think," "meditate," "devise," "plot," "He shall forecast his devices (The King James Version, margin "Hebrew think his thoughts") against the strongholds"; "They shall forecast devices against him," the Revised Version (British and American) "devise his devices"; compare Na 1:9, "What do ye devise against Yahweh?" In the second sense, the word occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 17:11 the Revised Version (British and American), "Wickedness .... always forecasteth the worst lot" (proeilephen), margin "Most authorities read hath added" (proseilephen).

W. L. Walker

FOREFATHER

for'-fa-ther:

(1) 'abh ri'shon, "first father," "chief father," hence, "early ancestor": "turned back to the iniquities of their forefathers" (Jer 11:10).

(2) progonos, "born before," "ancestor": "whom I serve from my forefathers" (2Ti 1:3). It is translated "parents" (including grandparents) in 1Ti 5:4: "and to requite their parents."

FOREFRONT

for’-frunt (panim):

For "forefront," "front" is now generally used, since "back-front" has gone out of use. "Forefront" is the translation of panim, "face" (2Ki 16:14; Eze 40:19; 47:1); of mul panim, "over against the face" (Ex 26:9; Le 8:9, "And he put the mitre upon his head; also upon the mitre even upon his forefront, did he put the golden plate"; for "upon his forefront" the Revised Version (British and American) has "in front; 2Sa 11:15, "in the forefront of the hottest battle"); of ro’sh, "head" (2Ch 20:27); of shen, "tooth" (1Sa 14:5, "The forefront (The King James Version, margin "Hebrew tooth") of the one was situated northward over against Michmash," the Revised Version (British and American) "The one crag rose up on the north in front of Michmash"); in APC 1Macc 4:57 margin it is the translation of prosopon, "face": "They decked the forefront of the temple with crowns of gold."

The Revised Version (British and American) has "forefront" for "face" (Eze 40:15), "in the forefront of" for "over against" (Jos 22:11).

W. L. Walker

FOREGO

for-go’.

See FORGO.

FOREHEAD

for’-ed (metsach; metopon):

(1) In a literal sense the word is used frequently in the Scriptures. Aaron and after him every high priest was to wear on the forehead the golden frontlet having the engraved motto, "Holy to Yahweh" (Ex 28:36,38). The condition of the forehead was an important criterion in the diagnosis of leprosy by the priest (Le 13:42,43; 2Ch 26:20). It was in the forehead that brave young David smote Goliath with the stone from his sling (1Sa 17:49). The faulty translation of the King James Version in Eze 16:12 has been corrected in the Revised Version (British and American), reference being had in the passage to a nose-ring, not to an ornament of the forehead. While the cutting or tattooing of the body was strictly forbidden to the Israelite on account of the heathen associations of the custom (Le 19:28), we find frequent mention made of markings on the forehead, which were especially used to designate slaves (see Philo, De Monarchia, I) or devotees of a godhead (Lucian, De Syria Dea, 59). In 3 Macc 2:29 we read that Ptolemy IV Philopator branded some Jews with the sign of an ivy leaf, marking them as devotees of Bacchus-Dionysos. Possibly we may compare herewith the translation of Isa 44:5 (Revised Version

margin): "And another shall write on his hand, Unto Yahweh" (or Yahweh's slave). Very clear is the passage Eze 9:4,6 (and perhaps Job 31:35), where the word used for "mark" is taw, the name of the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet which in its earliest form has the shape of an upright plus sign (Baal Lebanon Inscr; 11th century BC) or of a lying (St Andrew's) cross X (Moabite Inscr, 9th century BC), the simplest sign in the old Israelite alphabet, and at the same time the character which in the Greek alphabet represents the X, the initial of Christ. In the New Testament we find a clear echo of the above-mentioned Old Testament passage, the marking of the foreheads of the righteous (Re 7:3; 9:4; 14:1; 22:4). The godless followers of the beast are marked on the (right) hand and on the forehead (Re 13:16; 14:9; 20:4), and the apocalyptic woman dressed in scarlet and purple has her name written on her forehead (Re 17:5).

(2) In a metaphorical sense the expression, "a harlot's forehead," is used (Jer 3:3) to describe the shameless apostasy and faithlessness of Israel. Eze speaks of the stiff-necked obstinacy and the persistent unwillingness of Israel to hear the message of Yahweh: "All the house of Israel are of a hard forehead and of a stiff heart" (Jer 3:7), and God makes his prophet's "forehead hard .... as an adamant harder than flint," whereby an unflinching loyalty to God and a complete disregard of opposition is meant (Jer 3:8,9). Compare the phrase: "to harden the face," under the word FACE.

H. L. E. Luering

FOREIGN DIVINITIES

for'-in di-vin'-i-tiz (Ac 17:18 margin).

See GOD, STRANGE.

FOREIGNER

for'-in-er" The translation of nokhri, "unknown," "foreign," frequently rendered "stranger" (De 15:3; Ob 1:11); of toshabh, "a settler," "an alien resident" (Ex 12:45; the Revised Version (British and American) "sojourner"; compare Le 25:47; Ps 39:12); of paroikos, "dwelling near," "sojourner" (Eph 2:19, the Revised Version (British and American) sojourners").

Revised Version has "foreigner" for "stranger" (De 17:15; 23:20; 29:22; Ru 2:10; 2Sa 15:19), for "alien" (De 14:21); "the hand of a foreigner" for "a stranger's hand" (Le 22:25).

See ALIEN; STRANGER AND SOJOURNER.

FOREKNOW; FOREKNOWLEDGE

for-no', for-nol'-ej:

1. Meaning of the Term

2. Foreknowledge as Prescience

3. Foreknowledge Based on Foreordination

4. Foreknowledge as Equivalent to Foreordination

LITERATURE

1. Meaning of the Term:

The word "foreknowledge" has two meanings. It is a term used in theology to denote the prescience or foresight of God, that is, His knowledge of the entire course of events which are future from the human point of view; and it is also used in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) to translate the Greek words proginoskein and prognosis in the New Testament, in which instances the word "fore-knowledge" approaches closely the idea of fore- ordination.

2. Fore-knowledge as Prescience:

In the sense of prescience foreknowledge is an aspect of God’s omniscience (see OMNISCIENCE). God’s knowledge, according to the Scripture, is perfect, that is, it is omniscience. It is true that the Scripture makes use of anthropomorphic forms of expression as regards the way in which God obtains knowledge (Ge 3:8), and sometimes even represents Him as if He did not know certain things (Ge 11:5; 18:21); nevertheless the constant representation of the Scripture is that God knows everything. This perfect knowledge of God, moreover, is not merely a knowledge which is practically unlimited for all religious purposes, but is omniscience in the strictest sense of the term. In the historical books of the Old Testament the omniscience of God is a constant underlying presupposition when it is said that God watches men’s actions, knows their acts and words, and discloses to them the future; while in the Psalms, Prophets and Wisdom literature, this Divine attribute becomes an object of reflection, and finds doctrinal expression. It cannot, however, be said that this attribute of God appears only late in the history of special revelation; it is a characteristic of the Biblical idea of God from the very first, and it is only its didactic expression which comes out with especial clearness in the later books. God’s knowledge, then, is represented as perfect. Since He is free from all limits of space, His omniscience is frequently connected with His omnipresence. This is the thought which underlies the anthropomorphic expressions where God is represented as seeing, beholding and having eyes. God’s eyes go to and fro throughout the whole earth (2Ch 16:9), and are every place beholding the evil and the good (Pr 15:3). Even Sheol is naked and open to God’s sight (Pr 15:11; Job 26:6). The night and darkness are light to Him, and darkness and light for God are both alike (Ps 139:12). All animals and fowls are His, and so are known by Him (Ps 50:11), and as their Creator God knows all the hosts of the heavenly bodies (Ps 147:4; Isa 40:26). He knows also the heart of man and its thoughts (1Sa 16:7; 1Ki 8:39; Ps 7:9 (Hebrew 10); Ps

94:11; 139:2; Jer 11:20; 17:9,10; 20:12; Eze 11:5). Furthermore, God knows man entirely in all his ways (Ps 139:1-5; Pr 5:21). He looks from heaven and sees all men (Ps 11:4; 14:2; 33:13,14,15). Evil and sin are also known to God (Ge 3:11; 6:5,9,13; 2Sa 7:20; Ps 69:5 (Hebrew 6); Jer 16:17; 18:23). In a word, God knows with absolute accuracy all about man (Job 11:11; 34:21; Ps 33:15; Pr 5:21; Ho 5:3; Jer 11:20; 12:3; 17:9 f; 18:23). This perfect knowledge finds its classic expression in Ps 139.

God is also, according to the Old Testament, free from all limitations of time, so that His consciousness is not in the midst of the stream of the succeeding moments of time, as is the case with the human consciousness. God is not only without beginning or end of days, but with Him a thousand years are as one day. Hence, God knows in one eternal intuition that which for the human consciousness is past, present and future. In a strict sense, therefore, there can be no foreknowledge or prescience with God, and the distinction in God's knowledge made by theologians, as knowledge of reminiscence, vision and prescience, is after all an anthropomorphism. Nevertheless this is the only way in which we can conceive of the Divine omniscience in its relation to time, and consequently the Scripture represents the matter as if God's knowledge of future events were a foreknowledge or prescience, and God is represented as knowing the past, present and future.

It is God's knowledge of events which from the human point of view are future that constitutes His foreknowledge in the sense of prescience. God is represented as having a knowledge of the entire course of events before they take place. Such a knowledge belongs to the Scriptural idea of God from the very outset of special revelation. He knows beforehand what Abraham will do, and what will happen to him; He knows beforehand that Pharaoh's heart will be hardened, and that Moses will deliver Israel (Ge 15:13 ff; Ex 3:19; 7:4; 11:1 ff). The entire history of the patriarchal period of revelation exhibits plainly the foreknowledge of God in this sense. In prophecy this aspect of the Divine knowledge is made the subject of explicit assertion, and its religious significance is brought out. Nothing future is hidden from Yahweh (Isa 41:22; 42:9; 43:9-13; 44:6-8; 46:10; Da 2:22; Am 3:7), and this foreknowledge embraces the entire course of man's life (Ps 31:15 (Hebrew 16); Ps 39:5 (Hebrew 6); Ps 139:4-6,16; Job 14:5). These passages from Isa show that it is from the occurrence of events in accordance with Yahweh's prediction that the Prophet will prove his foreknowledge; and that in contrast with the worshippers of idols which are taken by surprise, Israel is warned of the future by the omniscient Yahweh.

In the New Testament likewise, God's omniscience is explicitly affirmed. Jesus taught that God knows the hidden secrets of man's heart (Lu 16:15); and this is also the teaching of the apostles (Ac 1:24; 15:8; 1Co 2:10; 3:20; 1Th 2:4; Re 2:23). In a word, according to the author of the Epistle to the He, everything is open to God, so that He is literally omniscient (Heb 4:13). And as in the Old Testament, so also in the New Testament, foreknowledge in the sense of prescience is ascribed to God. Jesus asserts a foreknowledge by God of that which is hidden from the Son (Mr 13:32), and James asserts that all God's works are foreknown by Him (Ac 15:18). Moreover, the many references in the New Testament to the fulfillment of prophecy all imply that the New Testament writers ascribed foreknowledge, in this sense of foresight, to God.

Denials of the Divine foreknowledge, in this sense of prescience, have been occasioned, not by exegetical considerations, but by the supposed conflict of this truth with human freedom. It was

supposed that in order to be free, an event must be uncertain and contingent as regards the fact of its futurition, and that too in the most absolute sense, that is, from the Divine as well as the human point of view. Hence, the Socinians and some Arminians denied the foreknowledge of God. It was supposed either that God voluntarily determines not to foresee the free volitions of man, or else that since God's omniscience is simply the knowledge of all that is knowable, it does not embrace the free acts of man which are by their nature uncertain and so unknowable. And upon this view of freedom, this denial of God's foreknowledge was logically necessary. If the certainty of events with respect to the fact of their futurition is inconsistent with freedom, then human freedom does conflict with God's foreknowledge, since God cannot know future events as certainly future unless they actually are so. Since, therefore, the Divine foreknowledge is quite as inconsistent with this view of freedom as is the Divine foreordination, the view of those who regard God as a mere onlooker on the course of future events which are supposed to be entirely independent of His purpose and control, does not help matters in the least. If God foreknows future events as certain, then they must be certain, and if so, then the certainty of their actually occurring must depend either upon God's decree and providential control, or else upon a fate independent of God. It was to escape these supposed difficulties that the doctrine known as scientia media was propounded. It was supposed that God has a knowledge of events as conditionally future, that is, events neither merely possible nor certainly future, but suspended upon conditions undetermined by God. But this hypothesis is of no help and is not true. Besides being contrary to the Scripture in its idea that many events lie outside the decree of God, and that God must wait upon man in His government of the world, there is really no such class of events as this theory asserts. If God foreknows that the conditions on which they are suspended will be fulfilled, then these events belong to the class of events which are certainly future; whereas if God does not know whether or not the conditions will be fulfilled by man, then His foreknowledge is denied, and these events in question belong to the class of those merely possible. Nor do the Scripture passages to which appeal is made, such as Ge 11:6; Ex 3:19; De 7:3,4; 1Sa 23:10-13; 2Sa 12:8, etc., afford a basis for this doctrine. The Scripture of course recognizes that God has put all things in relations of mutual dependence, and speaks of what can or cannot happen under such and such conditions; but none of these passages assert or imply that the events are suspended upon conditions which are either unknown or undetermined by God.

3. Foreknowledge Based on Foreordination:

God's foreknowledge, according to the Scripture teaching, is based upon His plan or eternal purpose, which embraces everything that comes to pass. God is never represented as a mere onlooker seeing the future course of events, but having no part in it. That God has such a plan is the teaching of the entire Scripture. It is implied in the Old Testament conception of God as an Omnipotent Person governing all things in accordance with His will. This idea is involved in the names of God in the patriarchal revelation, 'El, 'Elohim, 'El Shadday, and in the prophetic name Yahweh of Hosts. This latter name teaches not only God's infinite power and glory, but also makes Him known as interposing in accordance with His sovereign will and purpose in the affairs of this world, and as having also the spiritual powers of the heavenly world at His disposal for the execution of His eternal purpose. Hence, this idea of God comes to signify the omnipotent Ruler of the universe (Ps 24:10; Isa 6:3; 51:5; 54:5; Jer 10:16; Am 9:5; compare Oehler, Theol. of the Old Testament, English translation, II, 280).

Not only in this conception of God as omnipotent and sovereign Ruler is the thought of His eternal plan evolved; it is explicitly asserted throughout the whole Old Testament. The purpose of God as determining human history in the Book of Ge lies clearly upon the surface of the narrative, as, for example, in the history of Abraham and of Joseph. And where there is no abstract statement of this truth, it is evident that the writer regards every event as but the unfolding of the purpose of God. In the Psalms, Prophets, and Wisdom literature, this truth finds explicit and reiterated assertion. Yahweh has an eternal purpose (Ps 33:11), and this purpose will certainly come to pass (Isa 14:27; 43:13). This purpose includes all events and renders certain their occurrence (Isa 14:24; 40:10; 46:9,10; Zec 1:6). In the Wisdom literature the ethical character of this plan is dwelt upon, as well as its all-embracing character, and the certainty of its fulfillment (Pr 16:4,33; 19:21; 20:24; Job 28:23). The providential control wherewith Yahweh executes this plan includes the heart of man (Pr 21:1).

The New Testament likewise regards all history as but the unfolding of God’s eternal purpose (Ac 4:28), which includes man’s salvation (Eph 1:4,5; 2Ti 1:9), the provision of Christ as Saviour (1Pe 1:20), and the good works of the Christian (Eph 2:10).

See PREDESTINATION.

Now while the writers of the Old Testament and the New Testament do not write in an abstract or philosophical manner nor enter into metaphysical explanations of the relation between God’s foreknowledge and foreordination, it is perfectly evident that they had a clear conception upon this subject. Although anthropomorphisms are used in regard to the manner in which God knows, He is never conceived as if He obtained His knowledge of the future as a mere onlooker gazing down the course of events in time. The idea that the omnipotent Creator and sovereign Ruler of the universe should govern the world and form His plan as contingent and dependent upon a mere foresight of events outside His purpose and control is not only contrary to the entire Scriptural idea of God’s sovereignty and omnipotence, but is also contrary to the Scriptural idea of God’s foreknowledge which is always conceived as dependent upon His sovereign purpose. According to the Scriptural conception, God foreknows because He has foreordained all things, and because in His providence He will certainly bring all to pass. His foreknowledge is not a dependent one which must wait upon events, but is simply the knowledge which God has of His own eternal purpose. Dillmann has called this "a productive foreknowledge" (Handbuch d. attest. Theol., 251). This is not exactly correct. The Old Testament does not conceive God’s foreknowledge as "producing" or causing events. But when Dillmann says that in the Old Testament there is no hint of an "idle foreknowledge" on God’s part, he is giving expression to the truth that in the Old Testament God’s foreknowledge is based upon His foreordination and providential control of all things. The Divine foreknowledge, therefore, depends upon the Divine purpose which has determined the world plan (Am 3:7), and all its details (Job 28:26,27). Before man is born God knows him and chooses him for his work (Jer 1:5; Job 23:13,14), and God’s thorough knowledge of man in Ps 139 is made to rest upon the fact that God has determined man’s lot beforehand (Ps 139:14-16).

The same thing is true of the New Testament teaching on this subject. The Divine foreknowledge is simply God’s knowledge of His own eternal purpose. This is especially clear in those cases where God’s eternal purpose of redemption through Christ is represented as a mystery which is known by God and

which can be known by man only when it pleases God to reveal it (Eph 1:9; 3:4,9).

4. Foreknowledge as Equivalent to Foreordination:

While, therefore, the foreknowledge of God in the sense of prescience is asserted in the New Testament, this is not the meaning of the term when used to translate the Greek words proginoskein and prognosis. These words which are translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) by the word "foreknowledge," and once by the word "foreordain" (1Pe 1:20 the King James Version), mean much more than mere intellectual foresight or prescience. Both the verb and the noun approach the idea of foreordination and are closely connected with that idea in the passages where these words occur. Thus, in Peter's speeches in Ac the predestination which finds expression in 1Pe 4:18 is practically identified with the term prognosis in 2:23. Everything which happened to Jesus took place in accordance with "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God," so that nothing happened except that which God had foreordained. In this verse the term foreknowledge is an expansion of the idea of God's "counsel" or plan, regarding it as an intelligent prearrangement, the idea of foreknowledge being assimilated to that of foreordination. The same idea is found in 1Pe 1:20. Here the apostle speaks of Christ as a lamb "foreordained" by God before the foundation of the world. The Greek verb proegnosmenou, meaning literally, "foreknown" (as in the Revised Version (British and American)) is translated "foreordained" in the King James Version. It is evidently God's foreordination of Jesus as Saviour which Peter has in mind. Also in 1Pe 1:2 those to whom the apostle is writing are characterized as "elect according to the foreknowledge (prognosis) of God," where the election is based on the "foreknowledge." By the prognosis or foreknowledge, however, far more is meant than prescience. It has the idea of a purpose which determines the course of the Divine procedure. If it meant simply prevision of faith or love or any quality in the objects of the election, Peter would not only flatly contradict Paul (Ro 9:11; Eph 1:3,4; 2Ti 1:9); but also such a rendering would conflict with the context of this passage, because the objects of election are chosen "unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of .... Christ," so that their new obedience and relation to Christ are determined by their election by God, which election springs from a "foreknowledge" which therefore cannot mean a mere prescience.

In view of the fact that there was a classical use of the simple verb ginoskein in the sense of "resolve," and more especially of the fact that this word is used in the New Testament to denote an affectionate or loving regard or approbation in accordance with a common use of the Hebrew yadha' (Mt 7:23; 1Co 8:3; Ga 4:9; 2Ti 2:19), there is nothing arbitrary in giving it this sense when compounded with the preposition pro when the context clearly demands it, as it does in the above passage (compare Johnstone, Commentary on Peter in the place cited.: per contra Meyer on passages in Ac and Romans). The word prognosis is, however, discriminated from "predestination." It is that loving regard in God from which the Divine election springs, which election Peter evidently regarded as sovereign, since sanctification is only a confirmation of it (2Pe 1:10), and stumbling and disobedience are referred to 'appointment to unbelief' (1Pe 2:8). Here, then, we have a pregnant use of foreknowledge in which it is assimilated to the idea of purpose, and denotes a sovereign and loving regard.

The word prognosis is also found in this sense in the writings of Paul, in cases where it is manifestly impossible to regard it as a mere intellectual foresight, not only because of Paul's doctrine that election

is absolutely sovereign (Eph 1:3,4; Ro 9:11; 2Ti 1:9), but also because of the contexts in which the term occurs.

In Ro 8:29,30 the word "foreknow" occurs in immediate connection with God's predestination of the objects of salvation. Those whom God foreknew, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His son. Now the foreknowledge in this case cannot mean a mere prescience or foresight of faith (Meyer, Godet) or love (Weiss) in the subjects of salvation, which faith or love is supposed to determine the Divine predestination. This would not only contradict Paul's view of the absolutely sovereign and gracious character of election, but is diametrically opposed to the context of this passage. These verses form a part of the encouragement which Paul offers his readers for their troubles, including their own inward weakness. The apostle tells them that they may be sure that all things work together for good to them that love God; and these are defined as being those whom God has called in accordance with His purpose. Their love to God is evidently their love as Christians, and is the result of a calling which itself follows from an eternal purpose, so that their Christian love is simply the means by which they may know that they have been the subjects of this calll. They have not come within the sphere of God's love by their own choice, but have been "called" into this relationship by God, and that in accordance with an eternal purpose on His part.

What follows, therefore, must have as its motive simply to unfold and ground this assurance of salvation by tracing it all back to the "foreknowledge" of God. To regard this foreknowledge as contingent upon anything in man would thus be in flat contradiction with the entire context of the passage as well as its motive. The word "foreknowledge" here evidently has the pregnant sense which we found it to have in Peter. Hence, those whom God predestinates, calls, justifies and glorifies are just those whom He has looked upon with His sovereign love. To assign any other meaning to "foreknowledge" here would be out of accord with the usage of the term elsewhere in the New Testament when it is put in connection with predestination, and would contradict the purpose for which Paul introduces the passage, that is, to assure his readers that their ultimate salvation depends, not on their weakness, but on God's sovereign love and grace and power.

It is equally impossible to give the word prognosis any other sense in the other passage where Paul uses it. In Ro 11:2, speaking of the Jews, Paul says that "God did not cast off his people which he foreknew." It is quite impossible to regard this as meaning that God had a foresight or mere prevision of some quality in Israel which determined His choice of them, not only because it is the teaching of the entire Scripture that God's choice of Israel was sovereign and gracious, and not only because of the actual history of Israel, but also because of the context. Paul says that it would be absurd to suppose that God had cast off His people because He foreknew them, His foreknowledge of them being adduced as a ground for His not casting them off. Hence, the argument would have no force if anything in Israel, foreseen by God, were supposed to ground an assurance that He had not cast them off, because the context is full of the hardness of heart and unbelief of Israel. The foreknowledge here has evidently the same sense as in the former passage.

Foreknowledge, therefore, in the New Testament is more than mere prescience. It is practically identical

with the Divine decree in two instances, and in the other places where the term occurs it denotes the sovereign loving regard out of which springs God’s predestination or election of men to salvation.

See OMNISCIENCE; PREDESTINATION.

LITERATURE.

Besides the Commentaries on the appropriate passages, especially those on Isaiah, see Dillmann, Handbuch d. alttest. Theol., 249-52; H. Schultz, Alttest. Theol., 417, 421; H Cremer, Die christliche Lehre volume den Eigenschaften Gottes, Beltrage zur Forderung christl. Theol., I, 93- 101; Stewart, article "Foreknowledge," HDB, II, 51-53. Considerable Biblical as well as historical material will be found in works on systematic theology, such as Bohl, Dogmatik, 54-59; Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatik2 I, 182-95. For a history of the discussion of the problem of foreknowledge and freedom see J. Muller, Die christl. Lehre volume der Sunde, III, 2, 2.

See also literature under OMNISCIENCE.

On the relation of foreknowledge and foreordination, and the meaning of prognosis, see K. Muller, Die gottliche Zuvorsehung und Erwahlung, 37 f, 81 f; Pfleiderer, Paulinismus2, 268 f; Urchristentum, 289; Gcnnrich, Studien zur Paulinischen Heilsordnung, S. K., 1898, 377 f; and on the meaning of proginoskein in Ro 8:29 see especially pp. 382-95; also Cremer, Bibl.-theol. Worterb., 263-65; Beyschlag, Neutest. Theol., II, 109; B. Weiss, Bio. Theol. of New Testament, English translation, I, 205 f; II, 6; H. Holtzmann, Lehrbuch d. neutest. Theol., II, 165 f; B.B. Warfield, article "Predestination," HDB, IV, 52-57. See also discussions of the meaning of proginoskein in the Commentaries on 1 Peter and Romans, especially Fritzsche on Ro 8:29, and Johnstone on 1Pe 1:2.

See also literature under PREDESTINATION.

Caspar Wistar Hodge

FOREORDAIN; FORORDINATION

for-or-dan’, for-or-di-na’-shun:

The word "foreordain" is uniformly used in the Revised Version (British and American) to render the Greek proorizo, in the passages where this verb occurs (Ac 4:28; Ro 8:29,30; 1Co 2:7; Eph 15:11). In the passages in Romans and Ephesians it takes the place of the King James Version word "predestinate," a return to the usage of the older English versions The word has simply the sense of determining beforehand. It is thus kindred in meaning with a number of other New Testament words expressing the idea of Divine purpose, as "foreknow" (in pregnant sense, Ac 2:23; Ro 8:29, etc.); "determine" (Ac 17:26); "appoint" (1Pe 2:8). Foreordination, in the widest sense, is coextensive with the sphere of God’s universal providence, being but another name for that Divine plan, purpose or counsel which embraces

all things, great and small (Mt 10:29,30), that happen in Nature, or fall out in human life. Man's free actions are not regarded in Scripture as excluded from it (Ac 2:28). Foreordination, at the same time, is not to be conceived of as in any way overriding, or doing violence to, human freedom. Man acts freely, as Nature acts necessarily, but it is God who appoints the time, place and circumstances of the free act, permits its happening, and overrules it and its issues for the furthering of His own wise and holy ends. See PROVIDENCE. Foreordination in the sphere of grace has respect to the choice, calling and blessing of those who, through faith, are made partakers of eternal life (Ro 8:29,30; Eph 1:5,11). In this, its soteriological aspect, the subject is considered in special articles.

See CHOOSE; ELECTION; PREDESTINATION.

James Orr

FOREPART

for'-part: The translation of panim, "face" (Ex 28:27; 39:20; 1Ki 6:20, the Revised Version (British and American) "within"; Eze 42:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "before"), and of prora, the forward part of a ship, the prow (Ac 27:41, "the forepart stuck fast," the Revised Version (British and American) "the foreship struck").

ARV has "its forepart into" for "with his face towards" (Joe 2:20 margin "with its forepart"); "in the forepart thereof" for "before it" (Ex 28:25; 39:18).

FORERUNNER

for-run'-er (prodromos):

This word occurs but once in the Bible: "Whither as a forerunner Jesus entered for us" (Heb 6:20). The word signifies one who comes in advance to a place where the rest are to follow, or one who is sent on before as a scout to take observations. In this sense Christ is our forerunner for He has gone into heaven to prepare a place for His people into which He will eventually lead them. The idea of a forerunner is peculiar to the Christian dispensation. The Old Testament Levitical economy knew nothing of such. The high priest was a representative, not a forerunner: where he led, namely, into the Holy of Holies, the people could not follow. He was not the pioneer of the people; Christ is. Christ goes nowhere but where His people may follow. He is the file-leader (compare Heb 12:2, "the author .... of faith"). He goeth before His people to prepare the way for them, to open the gates of heaven by His atoning blood and priestly intercession. The believer is led into full fellowship with God through Jesus Christ.

See also JOHN THE BAPTIST; RUNNER.

William Evans

FORESAIL

for’sal, for’-s’-l (Ac 27:40).

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

FORESHIP

for’-ship (Ac 9,7:30).

See FOREPART; SHIPS AND BOATS.

FORESKIN

for’-skin (‘orlah; akrobustia, often euphemistically translated "uncircumcision"):

(1) In the literal sense the word is frequently mentioned owing to the rite of circumcision in vogue in Israel since the days of Abraham (Ge 17:9-14) and among several other peoples of antiquity and modern times. The act of circumcision is represented in the temple of Khonsu, a medical deity, at Karnak. Among the Jews of antiquity circumcision had to be performed by means of a flint or stone knife (Ex 4:25; Jos 5:2,3) on the eighth day after birth (Ge 17:12; 21:4; Le 12:3; Lu 2:21; Php 3:5), even if this day was the Sabbath (Joh 7:23).

Very early we find the practice one of which the descendants of Abraham became proud (Ge 34:14), so that we see the uncircumcised despised and scorned (1Sa 17:26), and in the time of oppression under King Antiochus Epiphanes many Israelites suffered martyrdom rather than give up the distinctive sign of their people (APC 1Macc 1:48,60,61; 2Macc 6:10). Among the Arabs and all Mohammedans the custom of circumcision prevails from pre-Islamic times, for it is nowhere ordered in the Koran, and the appellation "uncircumcised" ghalaf)is considered the greatest possible insult.

A peculiar martial custom is mentioned in 1Sa 18:25,27 (compare 2Sa 3:14), where Saul is represented as asking "a hundred foreskins of the Philistines" as a dowry from David for the hand of Michal. This does not seem to have been an exceptional booty in war, especially if it meant that no very careful operation was expected to be performed, but the act became practically equivalent to extermination. We find in Egyptian history at the time of Ramses III, that an invasion into Egypt had been made by several Libyan tribes (see Diimichen, Histor. Inschr., I, plates I-VI, and II, plates 47 ff). The Egyptian army sent against the invaders defeated them and returned with a large number of karnatha which is a transcription into hieroglyphics of the Semitic word, qarenoth, the word being used euphemistically as is proven by the accompanying determinative sign of a phallus. See Chabas, Etudes sur l’antiquite historique d’apres lee sources egyptienne, , etc., 234; Bondi, Hebr.-Phoen. Lehnworte im Egyptischen, Leipzig, 1886, 72-74. (2) Metaphorically the word is used in a variety of ways: (a) In the sense of "unlawful," "forbidden

as food," "taboo." The fruit of newly planted trees was not to be eaten (Le 19:23-25). (b) In the sense of "obstinacy," "opposition to God's law." The rite of circumcision meant submission under the law. While an outward form could not be identical with an inward attitude toward God, the use of the word "circumcision" was soon extended to that of purity and obedience of the heart (De 10:16; 30:6; Col 2:11, where this circumcision is called a "circumcision not made with hands, ... the circumcision of Christ"). The uselessness of outward circumcision, which does not include obedience and purity, is shown by Paul (Ro 2:25; 1Co 7:18; compare Ac 7:51). (c) In the sense of "Gentiles," "non-Israelites" (Ga 2:7; Eph 2:11; Col 3:11).

See CIRCUMCISION; CONCISION.

H. L. E. Luering

FOREST

for'-est:

(1) choresh (compare proper name Harosheth), 2Ch 27:4. In 1Sa 23:15 ff translated "wood"; in Isa 17:9, "wood"; in Eze 31:3, "forest-like shade." Applied to any thick growth of vegetation but not necessarily so extensive as (3).

(2) pardec: Ne 2:8, margin "park"; Ec 2:5, the King James Version "orchards," the Revised Version (British and American) "parks"; So 4:13, English Versions of the Bible "orchard," the Revised Version, margin "paradise." A word of Persian origin signifying probably an enclosure.

See PARADISE.

(3) ya'ar from root meaning "rugged"; compare Arabic wa'ar, "a rugged, stony region." It is sometimes rendered "forest" and sometimes (but less often in the Revised Version (British and American)) "wood." It is used of certain definite wooded tracts: "the forest in Arabia" (Isa 21:13, margin "thickets"); "the forest of Carmel" (2Ki 19:23 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "of his fruitful field"); "the forest of Hereth" (1Sa 22:5); "the forest of Lebanon" (1Ki 7:2 f; 10:17-21; 2Ch 9:16-20); "the forest of Ephraim," East of the Jordan (2Sa 18:6,8,17). The word ya'ar appears also in well- known Kiriath-jearim, "the city of forests," and Mr. Jearim (Jos 15:10). Among numerous other references the following may be cited: De 19:5; Jos 17:15,18; 1Ch 16:33; 2Ki 2:24; Ps 80:13; 83:14; 96:12; 132:6; Ec 2:6; So 2:3; 1Sa 7:2; 14:25,26; Jer 4:29; 46:23; Eze 34:29; Mic 3:12; 7:14.

(4) cebhakh, from root meaning "to interweave." A "thicket" (Ge 22:13; Jer 4:7); "thicket of trees" (Ps 74:5); "thickets of the forest" (Isa 9:18; 10:34).

(5) 'adbhim, "thicket" (Jer 4:29).

From many references it is evident that Palestine had in Old Testament times much more extensive forests and woodlands than today. For a discussion of the subject see BOTANY.

E. W. G. Masterman

FOREST OF EPHRAIM

See EPHRAIM.

FORETELL; FORETOLD

for-tel’, for-told’:The King James Version occurrences of these words in the New Testament represent as many Greek terms, and are in each case rendered differently in Revised Version:

(1) Mr 13:23 (proeipon), the Revised Version (British and American) "told beforehand";

(2) Ac 3:24 (prokataggello), the Revised Version (British and American) simply "told";

(3) 2Co 13:2 (prolego), the Revised Version (British and American) "said beforehand," margin "plainly"; compare 1Th 3:4.

The foretelling of future events is claimed in the Old Testament as a prerogative of Yahweh (Isa 41:22,23; 42:9, etc.; compare De 18:22).

See PROPHECY.

FORFEIT

for’-fit (charam):

"Forfeit" (from forisfacere, "to act beyond") implies loss through transgression or non-observance of some law or rule. The word occurs only once as the translation of charam, "to shut in," frequently to devote or consecrate a person or thing to God beyond redemption (compare Le 27:28,29; Mic 4:13; Ezr 10:8, "That whosoever came not within three days, ... all his substance should be forfeited, and himself separated from the assembly of the captivity," King James Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version (British and American) "devoted"; compare APC 1Esdras 9:4, "Their cattle should be seized to the use of the temple" (anieroo, "to consecrate," "devote"); 6:32, "all his goods seized for the king" (ta huparchonia autou einai (eis) basilika)).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "forfeited" (qadhesh, "consecrated,’;" devoted") for "defiled" (De 22:9), margin "Hebrew consecrated"; "forfeit his life" for "lose his own soul" (psuche) (Mt

16:26; Mr 8:36); "lose or forfeit his own self" for "lose himself or be cast away" (Lu 9:25, heauton de apolesas e zemiotheis; zemioo is the Septuagint for ‘anash, "to be mulcted," or "fined," Ex 21:22; De 22:19; Pr 17:26; 19:19; 21:11; 22:3); Weymouth renders Lu 9:25, "to have lost or forfeited his own self" (or "had to pay his own self—his own existence—as a fine"); in the other instances of zemioo (1Co 3:15; Php 3:8), the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render "suffer loss," "suffered .... loss"; 2Co 7:9 the King James Version, "receive damage."

W. L. Walker

FORGE; FORGER

forj, for’-jer (Taphal):

"Forgers of lies" occurs in Job’s reply to his comforters (13:4; compare 14:17); the word is the translation of Taphal, "to patch," "lay on," "besmear," hence, to impute, overcharge, etc.; in Ps 119:69, "forged" occurs with a similar meaning: "The proud have forged a lie against me" (compare Sirach 51:2). "Forger," in the sense of "one who forges, makes, anything," is the Revised Version (British and American) rendering of laTas "to smite," or "hammer," in Ge 4:22 King James Version: "Tubal-cain, an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron," the Revised Version (British and American) "the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron," margin "an instructor of every artificer of copper and iron."

W. L. Walker

FORGET; FORGETFUL

for-get’, for-get’-ful (shakhach; epilanthanomai):

"Forget" is to fail to hold in mind, and the forgetfulness may be either innocent or blameworthy. In the Old Testament the word is most frequently used as translation of shakhach in a blameworthy sense: to forget the covenant, the law, Yahweh their God (De 4:9,23,11; 6:12; Jud 3:7; 1Sa 12:9; Ps 44:20, etc.). In an innocent or neutral, sometimes good, sense it is used in Ge 27:45; De 24:19; Job 9:27; 11:16; 24:20; Ps 102:4, etc. It is also used of God forgetting or not seeming to care (Ps 9:12; 10:11,12; 13:1; 42:9; 77:9; Isa 49:15, etc.). To "forget" sometimes means to forsake (Ps 45:10; 74:19, etc.).

In the New Testament epilanthanomai is used of simple forgetting (Mt 16:5; Mr 8:14, etc.; in Lu 12:6 the sense of care is implied); Php 3:13, "forgetting the things which are behind," has the force of leaving behind. "Forgetful" in Jas 1:25 is epilesmone, the Revised Version (British and American) "a hearer that forgetteth." "Forgetfulness" Ps 88:12, "the land of forgetfulness," is a synonym for Sheol, where all forget and are forgotten. the Revised Version (British and American) has "forget not" for "be ignorant of" (2Pe 3:8; similarly 2Pe 3:5).

W. L. Walker

FORGIVENESS

for-giv’-nes (kaphar, nasa’, calach; apoluein charizesthai, aphesis paresis):

1. Etymology

2. Pagan and Jewish Ideas

3. The Teaching of Christ

4. Conditions of Forgiveness

5. The Offended Party

6. Divine and Human Forgiveness

7. Forgiveness and Justification

8. Old Testament Teaching

9. Limitations of Forgiveness

10. Christ’s Power to Forgive Sins

11. The Need of an Atonement

12. The New Testament Doctrine of Atonement

1. Etymology:

Of the seven words, three Hebrew and four Greek, which are used to express the idea of forgiveness, the last two occur in this sense only once each. Apoluein (Lu 6:37) is used because of the analogy of sin to debt, and denotes the release from it. It has the meaning "forgiveness" in 2 Macc 12:45 also, in which passage the word for sin is expressed. In Ro 3:25 Paul uses paresis instead of the usual aphesis. The former means "putting aside," "disregarding," "pretermission"; the latter, "putting away" completely and unreservedly (Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, section xxxiii). It does not mean forgiveness in the complete sense, and in the King James Version is incorrectly translated "remission." Nor does it mean that God had temporarily suspended punishment which at some later date He might inflict (Sanday on Ro 3:25). It was apparent that God had treated sins as though He had forgiven them, though in fact such an attitude on the part of God was without such a foundation as was later supplied by an adequate

atonement, and so the apostle avoids saying that God forgave them. This passing over of sins had the tendency of destroying man's conception of God's righteousness, and in order to avert this Christ was set forth as a propitiation and God's disregard of sin (paresis) became a real forgiveness (aphesis); compare Ac 14:16; 17:30. Charizesthai is not found outside of the writings of Luke and Paul, and in the sense "to forgive sins" is peculiarly Pauline (2Co 2:7; 12:13; Eph 3:2; Col 2:13; 3:13). It expresses, as no other of these words does, his conception of the graciousness of God's pardon. Kaphar (De 21:8; Ps 78:38; Jer 18:23) and calah (Nu 30:5,8,12; 1Ki 30,34,36,39,50, etc.) are used only of Divine forgiveness, while nasa' is used in this sense (Ex 32:32; Nu 14:19; Jos 24:19; Ps 25:18; 32:1,5; 99:8; Isa 2:9), and also of human forgiveness (Ge 50:17; Ex 10:17; 1Sa 25:28). Remission (Mt 26:28; Mr 1:4; Lu 1:77; 24:47; Ac 2:38; 10:43; Heb 9:22; 10:18) and blotting out (Ps 51:1,9; Isa 43:25; Jer 18:23; Ac 3:19) are synonyms of forgiveness, and to understand it fully such words as save, justify, reconcile and atonement should also be considered.

2. Pagan and Jewish Ideas:

Forgiveness was not a pagan virtue. The large-souled man might disregard offenses in cases where he considered them beneath his notice, but to forgive was weak-spirited (F. W. Robertson on 1Co 4:12). Even in the Old Testament, man's forgiveness of his fellow-man is infrequently mentioned. In every case the one asking forgiveness is in a position of subserviency, and is petitioning for that to which he has no just right (Ge 50:17; Ex 10:17; 1Sa 15:25; 25:28). The Imprecatory Psalms attest the fact that forgiveness of enemies was not esteemed as a virtue by Israel. They could appeal to the law which enjoined upon them to seek neither the peace nor the prosperity of their avowed enemies (De 23:6; compare Ezr 9:12). Jesus gave the popular summing-up of the law and not its exact words when he said, "Ye have heard that it was said .... hate thine enemy" (Mt 5:43), and this certainly does represent their attitude and their understanding of the teaching of the Scriptures.

3. The Teaching of Christ:

Christ taught that forgiveness is a duty. No limit can be set to the extent of forgiveness (Lu 17:4) and it must be granted without reserve. Jesus will not admit that there is any wrong so gross nor so often repeated that it is beyond forgiveness. To Him an unforgiving spirit is one of the most heinous of sins (Bruce, Parabolic Teaching, 376 ff). This is the offense which God will not forgive (Mt 18:34,35). It is the very essence of the unpardonable sin (Mr 3:22-30).

It was the one blemish of the elder son which marred an otherwise irreproachable life (Lu 15:28-30). This natural, pagan spirit of implacability Jesus sought to displace by a generous, forgiving spirit. It is so far the essence of His teaching that in popular language "a Christian spirit" is not inappropriately understood to be synonymous with a forgiving disposition. His answer to Peter that one should forgive not merely seven times in a day, but seventy times seven (Mt 18:21,22), not only shows that He thought of no limit to one's forgiveness, but that the principle could not be reduced to a definite formula.

4. Conditions of Forgiveness:

Jesus recognized that there are conditions to be fulfilled before forgiveness can be granted. Forgiveness is part of a mutual relationship; the other part is the repentance of the offender. God does not forgive without repentance, nor is it required of man. The effect of forgiveness is to restore to its former state the relationship which was broken by sin. Such a restoration requires the cooperation of both parties. There must be both a granting and an acceptance of the forgiveness. Sincere, deep-felt sorrow for the wrong which works repentance (2Co 7:10) is the condition of mind which insures the acceptance of the forgiveness. Hence, Jesus commands forgiveness when the offender turns again, saying, "I repent" (Lu 17:3,1). It was this state of mind which led the father joyfully to welcome the Prodigal before he even gave utterance to his newly formed purpose (Lu 15:21).

5. The Offended Party:

It is not to be supposed, however, that failure to repent upon the part of the offender releases the offended from all obligation to extend forgiveness. Without the repentance of the one who has wronged him he can have a forgiving state of mind. This Jesus requires, as is implied by, "if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts" (Mt 18:35). It is also implied by the past tense in the Lord's Prayer: "as we also have forgiven our debtors" (Mt 6:12). It is this forgiving spirit which conditions God's forgiveness of our sins (Mr 11:25; Mt 6:14,15). In such a case the unforgiving spirit is essentially unrepentance (Mt 18:23-35). "Of all acts, is not, for a man, repentance the most Divine?"

The offended is to go even farther and is to seek to bring the wrongdoer to repentance. This is the purpose of the rebuking commanded in Lu 17:3. More explicitly Jesus says, "If thy brother sin against thee, go, show him his fault between thee and him alone" (Mt 18:15-17). He is to carry his pursuit to the point of making every reasonable effort to win the wrongdoer, and only when he has exhausted every effort may he abandon it. The object is the gaining of his brother. Only when this is evidently unattainable is all effort to cease.

The power of binding and loosing, which means forbidding and allowing, was granted to Peter (Mt 16:19) and to the Christian community (Mt 18:18; Joh 20:23). It clearly implies the possession of the power to forgive sins. In the case of Peter's power it was exercised when he used the keys of the kingdom of heaven (Mt 16:19). This consisted in the proclamation of the gospel and especially of the conditions upon which men might enter into relationship with God (Ac 2:38; 10:34). It was not limited to Peter only, but was shared by the other apostles (Mt 16:19; 18:18). Christ left no fixed rules the observance or non-observance of which would determine whether one is or is not in the kingdom of God. He gave to His disciples principles, and in the application of these principles to the problems of life there had to be the exercise of discriminating judgment. The exercise of this judgment was left to the Christian community (2Co 2:10).

It is limited by the principles which are the basis of the kingdom, but within these principles the voice of the community is supreme. The forgiveness here implied is not the pronouncing of absolution for the sins of individuals, but the determination of courses of conduct and worship which will be acceptable. In doing this its decisions will be ratified in heaven (Westcott on Joh 20:23).

That there is a close analogy between human and Divine forgiveness is clearly implied (Mt 5:23,14; 6:12; Mr 11:25; Lu 6:37; Col 1:14; 3:13). God"s forgiveness is conditional upon man’s forgiveness of the wrongs done him, not because God forgives grudgingly but because forgiveness alone indicates that disposition of mind which will humbly accept the Divine pardon.

6. Divine and Human Forgiveness:

Repentance is a necessary ingredient of the fully developed forgiveness. There is no essential difference between the human and the Divine pardon, though the latter is necessarily more complete. It results in the complete removal of all estrangement and alienation between God and man. It restores completely the relationship which existed prior to the sin. The total removal of the sin as a result of the Divine forgiveness is variously expressed in the Scriptures: "Thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back" (Isa 38:17); "Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea" (Mic 7:19); "I will forgive their iniquity, and their sin will I remember no more" (Jer 31:34); "I, even I, am he that blotteth out thy transgressions" (Isa 43:25); "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us" (Ps 103:12). Ideally this same result is attained in human forgiveness, but actually the memory of the sin remains with both parties as a barrier between them, and even when there is a complete restoration of amity the former state of alienation cannot entirely be removed from memory. When God forgives, however, He restores man to the condition of former favor. Release from punishment is involved, though Divine forgiveness is more than this. In most cases the consequences, which in some instances are spoken of as punishment, are not removed, but they lose all penal character and become disciplinary. Nor does the forgiveness remove from human mind the consciousness of sin and the guilt which that involved, but it does remove the mistrust which was the ground of the alienation. Mistrust is changed into trust, and this produces peace of mind (Ps 32:5-7; Ro 5:1); consciousness of the Divine love and mercy (Ps 103:2); removes fear of punishment (2Sa 12:13); and awakens love to God.

7. Forgiveness and Justification:

Paul rarely uses the term "forgiveness," but in its place prefers justification. They are to his understanding practically synonymous (Stevens, Theology of the New Testament, 418). He preferred the latter, however, because it was better fitted to express the idea of secure, present and permanent acceptance in the sight of God. It connoted both a complete and a permanent state of grace. In popular thought forgiveness is not so comprehensive, but in the Biblical sense it means no less than this. It removes all of the guilt and cause of alienation from the past; it assures a state of grace for the present; and promises Divine mercy and aid for the future. Its fullness cannot adequately be conveyed by any one term or formula. Divine, like human, forgiveness is always contingent upon the fulfillment of conditions. It must be preceded by repentance and a firmly fixed intention not to repeat the offense. In addition to this, one was required to conform to certain legal or formal acts before the assurance of pardon was his. These acts were expressive of the sinner’s state of mind. They consisted of certain acts of sacrifice in the pre-Christian times and of baptism during the ministry of John the Baptist (Mr 1:4; Lu 3:3) and under Christ (Ac 2:38; 22:16). These acts are never regarded as in any sense a quid pro quo in

return for which the benefit of forgiveness is granted. It is an act of pure grace on God's part, and these acts are required as expressions of the man's attitude toward God. The state of mind required in order to obtain the gift of forgiveness is that to which the Prodigal Son came (Lu 15:17-19), and that of the sinner who went to his house justified rather than the Pharisee (18:9-14), because he realized that forgiveness was to him an act of pure favor. There was real and actual forgiveness of sins in the Old Testament times as well as since Christ. Certain passages have been construed to teach that the Law provided only for a passing over or rolling back of sins, and that there was not then an actual forgiveness.

8. Old Testament Teaching:

The sacrifices prescribed by the Law were not adequate atonements, so that there was constant necessity of yearly remembrance of sin (Heb 10:3; compare Le 16:21). The atonement of Christ is, however, of permanent adequacy, and became retroactive in the sense that it unified in Christ the Divine arrangement for saving mankind in all ages (Heb 11:40). "The passing over of the sins done aforetime" (Ro 3:25) does not imply a partial or apparent forgiveness, but means that they were forgiven, though seemingly without adequate recognition on the part of God of their heinous character. In view of God's righteous character men might naturally have expected punishment, but instead the offenders were spared (compare Ac 14:16; 17:30). No expression in the Old Testament suggests any inadequacy of the forgiveness extended to Israel, but on the other hand many passages may be quoted to show how rich and full it was deemed to be (Ps 103; Mic 7:19; Isa 38:17, Jer 31:34).

9. Limitations of Forgiveness:

Two passages seem to limit God's forgiveness. They are Christ's discussion of the unpardonable sin (Mt 12:31,32; Mr 3:28-30; Lu 12:10), and the one which mentions the sin unto death (1Joh 5:16; compare Heb 6:4-6). In the former passage there is mentioned a sin which has no forgiveness, and in the latter, one on behalf of which the apostle cannot enjoin prayer that it be forgiven, though he does not prohibit it. In both cases the sin is excluded from the customary forgiveness which is extended to sins of all other classes.

The act of the Pharisees which led Jesus to speak of the unpardonable sin was the attributing of a good deed wrought by Him through the Spirit of God (Mt 12:28) to Beelzebub. No one could do such a thing unless his moral nature was completely warped. To such a person the fundamental distinctions between good and evil were obliterated. No ordinary appeal could reach him, for to him good seemed evil and evil seemed good. The possibility of winning him back is practically gone; hence, he is beyond the hope of forgiveness, not because God has set an arbitrary line of sinfulness, beyond which His grace of forgiveness will not reach, but because the man has put himself beyond the possibility of attaining to that state of mind which is the essential condition of Divine forgiveness. It is practically certain that John did not have any particular sinful act in mind when he spoke of the sin which is unto death.

See BLASPHEMY.

There is no possible way of determining what specific sin, if any, he refers to. Probably the same principle applies in this case as in that of the unpardonable sin. God’s forgiveness is limited solely by the condition that man must accept it in the proper spirit.

There are some passages which seem to imply that forgiveness was the principal Messianic task. This is suggested by the name given to the Messiah during His earthly career (Mt 1:21), and by the fact that He was the Saviour. The remission of sins was the preparation for the advent of the Messiah (Lu 1:77), and repentance and remission of sins were the prerequisites to a state of preparation for the kingdom.

10. Christ’s Power to Forgive Sins:

It is not surprising, therefore, that we find Jesus laying claim to the power to forgive sins. This provoked a bitter controversy with the Jews, for it was axiomatic with them that no one could forgive sins but God only (Mr 2:7; Lu 5:21; 7:49). This Jesus did not question, but He would have them infer from His power to forgive sins that He was the possessor of Divine power. Jesus asserted His possession of this power on two occasions only, though it has been sfficiently inferred from Joh 5:14; 8:11 that He was accustomed to pronounce absolution upon all of those He healed. On one of these occasions He not merely asserted that He possessed the power, but demonstrated it by showing Himself to be the possessor of the Divine gift of healing. The impostor might claim some such intangible power as the authority to forgive sins, but he would never assert the possession of such easily disproved power as the ability to heal the sick. But Jesus claimed both, and based His claim to be the possessor of the former on the demonstration that He possessed the latter. God would not support an impostor, hence, his aid in healing the paralytic proved that Jesus could forgive sins. The multitude accepted this logic and "glorified God, who had given such authority unto men" (Mt 9:2-9; Mr 2:3-12; Lu 5:18-26).

On the other occasion when His possession of this power was under discussion (Lu 7:36-50), He offered no other proof than the forgiven woman’s deep gratitude and love. One expression that He uses, however, has raised some discussion as to the relative order in time of her love and forgiveness (Lu 7:47). Did she love because she was forgiven, or vice versa? Manifestly the forgiveness precedes the love, in spite of the fact that Lu 7:47 seems to assert the opposite, for this is the bearing of the parable of the Two Debtors (7:41-43), and the latter part of 7:47 has the same implication. It is clear that she had previously repented and had been accepted, and the anointing of Jesus was an outpouring of her gratitude.

The phrase of 7:47, "for she loved much," is proof of the greatness of her sin rather than a reason why she was forgiven. In both cases where Jesus forgave sins, He did so because the state of mind of the person forgiven showed worthiness of the blessing. To this as a condition of forgiveness there is no exception. Christ’s prayer on the cross (Lu 23:34) would not avail to secure the pardon of His murderers without their repentance.

11. The Need of an Atonement:

Though forgiveness is on God’s part an act of pure grace prompted by His love and mercy, and though He forgives freely all those who comply with the condition of repentance and abandonment of sin, yet this does not dispense with the necessity of an atonement. The parable of the Prodigal Son was spoken to teach the freedom of God’s forgiveness and acceptance of returning sinners, and the duty of men to assume the same attitude toward them. This much it teaches, but it fails to set forth entirely God’s attitude toward sin. With reference to the sinner God is love and mercy, but with reference to sin He is righteous, and this element of God’s nature is no less essential to Him than His love, and must be considered in any effort to set forth completely the doctrine of God’s forgiveness of sinners. The atonement of Christ and the many atonements of the Law were manifestations of this phase of God’s nature.

12. The New Testament Doctrine of Atonement:

The idea of an atonement is fundamental in the teachings of the New Testament (Ro 5:10; 2Co 5:18-21; Col 1:21). It is very clearly implied in such terms as reconciliation and propitiation, and is no less present in pardon, remission and forgiveness. The doctrine of the atonement is not developed by Jesus, but it is strongly hinted at and is unmistakably implied in the language of Mt 20:28; 26:28; Mr 10:45; Lu 24:46,47. John the Baptist’s salute, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" (Joh 1:29), also implies it. In the writings of the apostles it is repeatedly and clearly affirmed that our forgiveness and reconciliation to God is based upon the death of Christ. "In none other is there salvation" (Ac 4:12); through Him is the redemption (Ro 3:24); God set Him forth to be a propitiation (Ro 3:25); through Him "we have now received the reconciliation" (Ro 5:11); "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (2Co 5:19); "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf" (2Co 5:21); and "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Ga 3:13). Such citations might be greatly multiplied. That which was so perfectly accomplished by the offering of Christ was in an analagous though imperfect way accomplished by the sacrifices required by the Law. It had "a shadow of the good things to come" (Heb 10:1).

The unvarying effect of sin is to produce an estrangement between the injurer and the wronged. The nature of God is such and the relationship between Him and man is of such a character that sin brings about an alienation between them. It is this presupposition of an estrangement between them which renders the atonement necessary before forgiveness can be extended to man. This estrangement must be removed, and the alienation be transformed into a reconciliation. In what then does the alienation consist?

The sin of man produces a changed attitude toward each other on the part of both God and man. God holds no personal pique against man because of his sin. The New Testament language is very carefully chosen to avoid any statement which would seem to convey such a conception. Yet God’s holy righteousness is such that He cannot be indifferent to sin. His wrath must rest upon the disobedient (Joh 3:36; Ro 1:18). It is not merely impersonal. It is not enough to say He hates the sin. Man’s unrighteousness has not merely alienated him from God, but God also from him. The word "enemies" (echthroi) of Ro 5:10 is passive, and means the object of God’s enmity (Sunday, at the place). It was because of this fact that God set forth Christ to be a propitiation to show His righteousness

because of the passing over of sins done aforetime (Ro 3:25,26).

God’s passing over, without inflicting punishment, the sins of pre-Christian times had placed in jeopardy His righteousness; had exposed Him to the implication that He could tolerate sin. God could not be true to Himself while He tolerated such an imputation, and so instead of visiting punishment upon all who sinned—which would have been one way of showing His righteousness—He set forth Christ to death ("in his blood"), and in this way placed Himself beyond the imputation of unrighteousness while it enabled Him to show mercy to sinners. The effect of sin upon man was to estrange him from God, to lead him farther and farther away from his Maker. Each successive sin produced a greater barrier between the two. Now the atonement was designed to remove the cause of this estrangement and restore the former relationship between God and man.

This too, it has been observed, is the purpose of forgiveness, so that the atonement finds its completion in forgiveness. It should be noted that the reconciliation originates with God and not with man (Ro 3:25; 2Co 5:19). God woos man before the latter seeks God. The effect of the atonement on man is to reconcile him, attract him, to God. It shows him God’s love for man, and the forgiveness, in that it removes sin completely, takes away the estranging factor between them and so wins man back to God. "We love, because he first loved us." At the same time the atonement is such a complete expression of both the love and the righteousness of God that, while on the one hand it exhibits his yearning for man, on the other it shows that He is not tolerant toward sin. In the atonement of Christ, therefore, is the meeting-place and the reconcilement of God’s holy horror of sin and the free bestowal of forgiveness upon penitent believers.

William Charles Morro

FORGO

for-go’ (from for, negative, and go):

Occurs in Ecclesiasticus 7:19, as translation of astocheo, which means "to miss the mark," "turn or swerve from." "Forgo not a wise and good wife (the King James Version "woman"); for her grace is above gold," meaning "Turn not away from her"; in Ecclesiasticus 8:9, the word is rendered "miss not"; compare 1Ti 1:6; 6:21; 2Ti 2:18.

FORK

fork (shelosh qilleshon):

This compound word, meaning strictly "three points" or "three prongs," is found only once (1Sa 13:21), and doubtless there refers to the agricultural tool now known as the pitchfork. It might, however, also be a weapon.

FORM

form (yatsar, to’ar; morphe):

(1) To form is "to fashion," "create," "produce." In the Old Testament it is for the most part the translation of yatsar, "to form," "to fashion" (Ge 2:7, etc., "Yahweh God formed man of the dust of the ground," etc.); also of chul and chil, "to be twisted" "turned round" "to bring forth (in pain)" (compare Isa 13:8; Mic 4:10; De 32:18 the King James Version, "God that formed thee"; Job 26:13 the King James Version; Ps 90:2, "or ever thou hadst formed the earth" etc.; Pr 26:10 the King James Version). In the New Testament we have morphoo, "to form" (Ga 4:19, "until Christ be formed in you"); plasso, "to form," "to mold" (Ro 9:20, "him that formed it"; 1Ti 2:13, "Adam was first formed"; APC 2Macc 7:23, "the Creator .... who formed the generation of man," the Revised Version (British and American) "fashioned"; 7:22, "that formed the members (diarrhuthmizo)," the Revised Version (British and American) "brought into order").

(2) Form (noun) is used for

(a) appearance, mar’eh, "sight," "appearance" (Job 4:16, "I could not discern the form thereof" the Revised Version (British and American) "appearance" with "form" for "image" (temunah) in next sentence); tselem, Aramaic "image" (Da 3:19, "The form of his visage was changed"); rew, "form," "likeness" (Da 2:31; 3:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "aspect"); to’ar, "visage," "form" (1Sa 28:14, "What form is he of?");

(b) the fixed or characteristic form of anything, tabhnith, "model," "form" (Eze 8:3; 10:8, "the form of a hand"; Eze 8:10, "every form of creeping things"); morphe, characteristic form as distinguished from schema, changing fashion (Php 2:6, "in the form of God"; Php 2:7, "the form of a servant"; less distinctly Mr 16:12, "in another form");

(c) shape, model, pattern, mold, tsurah, "shape," from tsur, "to cut or carve" (Eze 43:11, ter, "the form of the house," etc.); mishpat, "rule" (2Ch 4:7 the King James Version); tupos, "type," "impress" (Ro 6:17, the Revised Version, margin "pattern"); hupotuposis, "outline," pattern (2Ti 1:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "pattern"); morphosis, "form," "appearance" (Ro 2:20, "the form of knowledge");

(d) orderly arrangement, giving shape or form (Ge 1:2; Jer 4:23, the earth was "without form," tohu, the Revised Version (British and American) "waste"; The Wisdom of Solomon APC Wis 11:17, amorphos); "form of speech" (2Sa 14:20, aspect, panim, "face," the Revised Version (British and American) "to change the face of the matter"); as giving comeliness or beauty, to’ar (Isa 52:14; 53:2, "He hath no form nor comeliness"; compare Ge 29:17; 39:6, etc.; The Wisdom of Solomon APC Wis 15:5, "desiring the form (eidos) of a dead image," the Revised Version (British and American) "the breathless form");

(e) Show, without substance, morphosis, "form" (2Ti 3:5, "holding a form of godliness").

ARV has "didst form" for "hast possessed" (Ps 139:13, so the English Revised Version, margin; both have "formed" for "made" (Ps 104:26), the American Standard Revised Version for "framed" twice (Isa 29:16); both for "formed thee," "gave birth" (De 32:18); "pierced" (Job 26:13); "woundeth" (Pr 26:10); "fastened" (Isa 44:10); for "are formed from" (Job 26:5), "tremble"; for "their form" (2Ch 4:7), "the ordinance concerning them"; "form" for "similitude" (Nu 12:8; De 4:12,15); for "size" (1Ki 6:25; 7:37); for "shape" (Lu 3:22; Joh 5:37); "in the form" for "similitude" (De 4:16); for "or the like" (De 4:23,15); the American Standard Revised Version "(beholding) thy form" for "thy likeness" (Ps 17:15, the English Revised Version, margin); "every form" for "all appearance" (1Th 5:22; so the English Revised Version, margin "appearance").

W. L. Walker

FORMER

for’-mer:

The word in the sense of "maker," "framer," occurs only in Jer 51:19, "He is the former (from yatsar, "to form") of all things." The adjective, in the sense of preceding in the order of time, is commonly in Hob the translation of ri’shon, "first," "foremost" (Ge 40:13; Nu 21:26; De 24:4, etc.); in Greek of proteros (Eph 4:22; Heb 10:32; 1Pe 1:14); and in two cases (Ac 1:1; Re 21:4) of protos, where the Revised Version (British and American) has (in Ac in the margin) "the first." As denoting place or position the word occurs in the Old Testament in Zec 14:8, "the former sea" as translation of qadhmoni, "in front," where the Revised Version (British and American) has "eastern," i.e. the Dead Sea, in contrast with the Mediterranean, or western sea (compare Eze 47:18; Joe 2:20). For "former iniquities" (Ps 79:8) the Revised Version (British and American) has simply "the iniquities"; Other changes may be seen in Nu 6:12; Isa 65:7; Eze 36:11; Mic 4:8; Hag 2:3.

W. L. Walker

FORNICATION

for-ni-ka’-shun.

See CRIMES.

FORSWEAR

for-swar’.

See CRIMES.

FORTH

forth: "Forth," adverb (from "for"), signifies movement

(1) forward,

(2) out of,

(3) beyond a certain boundary.

In a few instances in the Old Testament it is the translation of the preposition ‘al, properly "above," "upon" (2Ki 11:15; 2Ch 23:14; Am 7:17 the King James Version), and of chuts, "without" (Ge 39:13; Jud 19:25). "Forth" is often used as an expletive of various verbs, as "break (forth)," "bring (forth)," "call (forth)," etc. In the Gospel of John it is the translation of exo, "without," as "Lazarus, come forth" (11:43; so 15:6; 19:4 the King James Version, etc.; also Ac 5:34; 9:40). "Stand forth" in Mr 3:3 is the translation of egeire eis to meson, margin "Arise into the midst." the Revised Version (British and American) has a great many changes, frequently substituting "out," "away," "abroad," etc.; "forth from" for "out of" (Job 41:21; Isa 45:23); "spread forth" for "stretched out" (Ps 44:20; 88:9; 136:6), etc. In Col 1:6, for "bringeth forth fruit" the Revised Version (British and American) reads "bearing fruit."

W. L. Walker

FORTIFICATION; FORT; FORTIFIED CITIES; FORTRESS

for-ti-fi-ka’-shun (including):

I. IN RECENT EXCAVATIONS

1. Excavation of Tells

2. Sites

3. Primitive Character

4. Walls

5. Towers

6. Acropolis or Castle

7. Masonry

8. Gates

9. Water Supply

II. IN BIBLICAL HISTORY

1. Before the Monarchy

2. In the Period of the Monarchy

3. In the Period of the Return

III. IN THE PSALMS AND THE PROPHETS

1. The Psalms

2. The Prophets

IV. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. In Paul’s Epistles

2. In the Ac of the Apostles

3. In the Gospel History

LITERATURE

Has a number of words representing its various elements and aspects:

(1) mibhtsar, is the term generally rendered "fenced" or "defenced city." In both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of Isa and Jer we find for the most part the more formal "defenced city." It is found by itself (Isa 17:3); with ‘ir, "city" (1Sa 6:18; 2Ki 3:19; plural ‘are mibhtsar, "fenced (the American Standard Revised Version "fortified") cities," Nu 32:17); with tsor, "Tyre" (Jos 19:29; 2Sa 24:7, where it is rendered "stronghold").

(2) misgabh, "high fort" (Isa 25:12; Jer 48:1 the Revised Version, margin; Ps 9:9, and many other places in the Pss).

(3) ma‘oz, "fortress," "stronghold" (Jud 6:26; Ps 31:2; Da 11:39).

(4) metsudhah, "fort" the King James Version, "stronghold" the Revised Version (British and American) (2Sa 5:9,17).

(5) metsurah, "fort" (Isa 29:3 the King James Version; plural the Revised Version (British and American) "siege works").

(6) mutstsabh (Isa 29:3, "fort" the English Revised Version, "mount" the King James Version, "posted troops" the American Standard Revised Version).

(7) dayeq, "fort" (for the siege of a city, the wall of circumvallation cast up by the besiegers, 2Ki 25:1; Jer 52:4; Eze 4:2; 17:17; 21:22; 26:8).

(8) matsor, "fortress" (Jer 10:17 margin, wall of circumvallation: Hab 2:1, "tower" the King James Version, "fortress" the Revised Version, margin; Zec 9:3).

(9) birah, "palace" the King James Version, "castle" the Revised Version (British and American) (Ne 2:8; 7:2). Birah Grecized is baris, which has the double meaning of "palace" and "fortress." Nehemiah’s "castle" figures largely in the books of Maccabees and in Josephus, and is the Castle of Antonia of the Ac of the Apostles.

(10) ochuroma (2Co 10:4, its only occurrence in the New Testament though it is the chief equivalent of mibhtsar in the Septuagint). In this connection it is to be noted that chomah, is Hebrew for "wall," Greek teichos; chel or cheyl, is Hebrew for the "ditch," or "rampart," or "bastion" of a fortress; mighdal, "tower"; pinnah plural pinnoth, "corner towers."

Fortified Places:

From the very beginning of their history as a nation the Israelites were acquainted with fortified cities. The report of cities "great and fortified up to heaven," inhabited by the sons of Anak, by Amalekites, Hittites, Jebusites, Amorites and Canaanites, struck terror into the hearts of the Israelites in the wilderness, and called forth murmurings from them on their way to Canaan (Nu 13:28; De 1:28). Not that these cities were at all of the extent or population of modern cities, or of Nineveh, Babylon and Memphis of old. But to a people who were as yet little better than a horde of fugitives accustomed to the simple camp life of the wilderness and unacquainted with appliances for siege and assault, the prospect of scaling the walls and conquering the inhabitants was appalling. The cities of the Canaanites were already old when Joshua led the Israelites to the conquest of the land. Not a little of their history has become known to us, and the character of their defensive works has been disclosed by Palestinian excavation in recent years.

I. In Recent Excavations.

1. Excavation of Tells:

It has been largely to the tells, or mounds of buried cities, chiefly in the southwest of the land, that exploration has been directed. The Palestine Exploration Fund, drawing its resources from Great Britain and also from America, was the first, and has all along been the foremost, in the work of excavation. Through the labors of Professor Flinders Petrie at Tell el-Hesy; of Dr. F. J. Bliss, and Professor Stewart Macalister at Tell Zakariyah, Tell ec-Safi, Tell ej-Judeideh, Tell Sandahannah, and more recently of Professor Macalister at Gezer, the Fund has added largely to our knowledge of the fenced cities of Canaan. The work of Sir Charles Warren, Sir Charles W. Wilson, Colonel Conder and other explorers at Jerusalem under the same auspices has been of great value for illustrating the defensive works of a later time. Germany and Austria have not been behind. The excavation, first, of Tell Ta'anek in the Plain of Esdraelon, and, at the present time (1911), of Jericho by Professor E. Sellin, formerly of Vienna, now of Rostock; and of Tell el-Mutesellim, the ancient Megiddo, by Gottlieb Schumacher, has yielded results of the highest importance. Since 1908 an American expedition from Harvard University, first under Schumacher and now under Dr. Reisner, who had previously excavated at the Pyramids and other places in Egypt, has explored with remarkable results the site of the capital of the Northern Kingdom, Samaria. Excavations have also been conducted by the German Orient Committee at Sinjerli which have thrown a flood of light upon the archaeology of Northern Syria and especially upon the wonderful Hittite people. The memoirs and reports of these excavations have furnished abundance of material for tracing the evolution and understanding the anatomy of the tell. They usefully supplement the Scripture narratives, and confirm them in many particulars.

2. Sites:

These cities of the primitive inhabitants of Canaan occupied sites easily capable of defense. They were built either upon a projecting spur of a mountain ridge, like Gezer, Megiddo, Tell ec-Safi (believed to be the ancient Gath) and primitive Jerusalem, or upon an isolated eminence in the plain like Tell el-Hesy (Lachish) or Taanach. Compared with modern cities the area was small—in the case of Gezer about a quarter of a mile square, Lachish 15 acres, Megiddo and Taanach 12 to 13 acres. A sufficient water supply within easy reach was an essential feature. Speaking of Gezer, Professor Macalister says: "Water, the first necessity of life, was in abundance. The three primitive modes of livelihood—hunting, pasturing, and agriculture—could be practiced here better than in many places. Further, for defense—another prime necessity in early days—the hill is admirably fitted. It is steep and not easy to climb; and being fairly high it commands a wide prospect, so that the approach of enemies can be seen and prepared for" (Bible Side-Lights from Gezer, 25,26).

3. Primitive Character:

Their history goes back in most cases to a very remote antiquity. "It cannot have been much later than 3000 BC," says Professor Macalister regarding Gezer, "when a primitive race of men first realized that the bare rocky hill (as it then was) would be a suitable dwelling-place. This tribe was a cave-dwelling

race" (as above; and PEFS, 1904, 311 ff). The primitive race had occupied the hill perhaps five hundred years when the Canaanites drove them out, as they in turn were driven out by the Israelites. But the nature of their original habitations, the earliest relics of their social life, and what can be gathered of their religious rites all bear witness to a remote antiquity. From the mound of Tell el-Hesy, now almost certainly identified with the site of Lachish, eleven cities, one above the other have been disinterred, the eleventh or highest having nine cities between itself and the first Amorite buildings reared upon the original bluff. This lowest city is believed to go back some 2000 years BC, Professor Flinders Petrie having dated the successive cities by means of the pottery found in the strata of the mound. One of the eleven cities, possibly the fourth from the bottom, was that of Lachish, which fell a prey to Joshua (Jos 10:32), the walls of which, built of crude brick and 10-12 ft. in thickness, are a witness to its character as a fenced city (Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities, chapter iv).

4. Walls:

While the site of the Canaanite city was chosen for its natural strength, the first settlers soon felt the need of some fortification. At Sinjerli the excavators have been able to trace the general growth of the site from a group of shepherds' huts into a walled town. The earliest fortification attempted was a rampart of earth following the natural contour of the hill (PEFS, 1903, 113). Within some such enclosing wall, houses were built and the inhabitants lived and pursued their avocations safely. The primitive earthbank in the case of Gezer was in course of time replaced first by an inner and then by an outer wall in succession. The outer wall when it was added to strengthen the inner was the chel, rendered in the English version "bulwark" (Isa 26:1) or "rampart" (Na 3:8, where the waters of the Nile served the same purpose). Professor Macalister estimates that the inner wall of Gezer had fallen into disuse and ruin by about 1450 BC and that it was the outer that saw the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. "Even in its present ruined form," says Professor Macalister, "the outer city wall is an imposing structure. In places it still stands to a height of from 10 to 14 ft., and these can hardly be regarded as being much more than the underground foundations. The outer face of the city wall, towering above the hill on which the city was built, may well have seemed impregnable to the messengers of Moses" (Bible Side-Lights, 142). The walls of a later time, as we learn from Assyrian representations, were provided with battlements, very often crenellated, and "thy pinnacles of rubies" (Isa 54:12, the Revised Version (British and American), the Revised Version, margin "windows") may refer to them. For the purpose of strengthening the walls, especially at the least defensible points, revetments or facings of stone or kiln-burnt bricks were sometimes added. Even these again would be rendered less assailable by a trench (chel) serving to cut off a fortress from adjacent level or sloping ground, as may still be seen outside the North wall of Jerusalem, and many parts ofthe walls of Constantinople.

5. Towers:

Towers were sometimes built at the corners or at points on the wall where attack was to be apprehended (Ze 1:16; 2Ch 14:7). Such towers have been disclosed on the crest of the hill at Tell Zakariyah. At Gezer 30 towers were found round the outer wall. On the walls of Sinjerli there rose no fewer than 800 towers (Garstang, Land of the Hittites, 273). On the evidence of the excavations at this ancient Hittite site we gather that the cities about the time of the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan "were already

surrounded by masoned walls, supported by numerous external towers, and entered through gateways barred by a pair of double doors and guarded by wing towers on either hand" (Land of the Hittites, 367). For illustrations, see CITY.

6. Acropolis or Castle:

Every one of these ancient cities had an inner fortress which would be an internal means of protection, and the last refuge of the defenders in extremity. At Tell Zakariyah the acropolis wall has been traced, and its shape has been found to be conditioned by the contours of the hill on which it stood. In an old Hittite settlement a fortress has been found rectangular in shape and supported by an outer and lower wall at a distance of 12 to 30 yds. (Land of the Hittites, 162). There is evidence that the mound or bluff originally occupied remained the fortress or acropolis of the city when it spread out over a larger area, and this seems to have been the case for some time at least with the Jebusite fort taken by David and made the capital of the kingdom. At Sinjerli, while there was a wall surrounding the whole township, there was an outer as well as an inner defensive wall to the citadel. Upon this citadel were found palaces from which the Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser I, copied the plan of a Hittite palace, called in Assyrian Hilani.

7. Masonry:

The excavations enable us to see the progress of the art of fortification from very primitive beginnings. Crude brick and rough stone-work were the materials of the earliest walls. They are usually found of uncoursed masonry in which the large stones are undressed field boulders. The facings of stone and the joints in walls were often packed with pebbles or with limestone chippings, the stones themselves being more or less roughly trimmed and dressed to shape by a hammer. Corner-stones are found in the towers showing marks of the chisel, but it is not till well on in the Hebrew period that stones are found with bosses and marginal drafting. At Zakariyah the walls of the acropolis were of rubble laid in mud, mixed with straw without lime, and they contained some well-worked stones, irregularly intermingled with field stones of various sizes. At a later time mortar was used to cover the walls and give greater strength and support. But the clay used for the purpose was apt to crack unless it was given consistency by treading with the feet and mixing with water. Thus we read of a wall daubed with untempered mortar (Eze 13:10-16; 22:28; compare Na 3:14). In the masonry of the Hittite fortress (see (6) above) the masonry of the inner wall is rough, dry stonewalling, while the outer is built of stones roughly pentagonal in shape, irregular in size, fitted to one another and laid without mortar, somewhat like the Cyclopean walls of the earliest periods of Greek history.

See GEZER.

8. Gates:

The gates of the fenced cities of Canaan may not have had the social importance which the city gate came to possess in later times, but they were an important element in the defensive works of a city. They

were as few as possible, so as to give only the necessary ingress and egress. The gate of Jericho was shut and secured at nightfall (Jos 2:5). The gate of Gaza had two leaves which were not hinged to the two gate-posts, but turned on pins moving in sockets in the sill and lintel, the bar stretching between the two posts and let into them to secure the gate (Jud 16:3, with Moore's notes). The hundred gates of Babylon, according to Herodotus, were all of brass (i.179); and Yahweh promises to Cyrus to break in pieces the doors of brass and to cut in sunder the bars of iron (Isa 45:2). That the bars were sometimes of wood is clear from what is said of the bars of Nineveh (Hab 3:13). To protect the gate it was supplied with towers. Uzziah built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate and at the valley gate, and fortilled them (2Ch 26:9). In the inner wall of Gezer, to which reference has been made, a gate of very remarkable structure has been found. The wall is of stone, but the gateway consists of a passage between two solid towers of brick. The passage is 9 ft. wide and 42 ft. long, roughly paved with stones. Stone slabs on each side of the passageway bear traces of fire, and the absence of any wooden barrier may be due to a conflagration at the capture of the city. The towers remain standing and rise to a total height of about 16 ft. In later times watchmen were set on the tower over the gate to descry the approach of friend or foe or messenger (2Sa 18:24 ff), and the tower had chambers in it which might be occupied by visitors or by a guard. For the more general purposes see GATE.

9. Water Supply:

One of the essential requisites of the primitive Canaanite fortress was a supply of water. At Gezer a copious spring within easy reach was available. Tell el-Hesy commands the only springs in that region (A Mound of Many Cities, 16). It is a strong point in favor of the modern theory of the ridge of Ophel being the site of Zion or David's town that the Virgin's Fountain, the only perennial spring in the whole circuit of Jerusalem, was close to it, and would have been an inducement to the Jebusites to build their fortress there. In the sites that have been excavated, cisterns, sometimes vaulted over and with steps down into them, have been constantly found. Traces have also been observed of concealed passages or tunnels by which access has been obtained to the nearest spring. Some such explanation has been given of the "gutter" (2Sa 5:8 the King James Version, "watercourse" the Revised Version (British and American)), by which Joab obtained access to the fortress of Jebus and enabled David to capture it (1Ch 11:6; compare Vincent, Canaan d'apres l'exploration recente, 26). During an investment of a fortified city by an enemy, it was a point in strategy for the inhabitants to secure the fountain and to divert or conceal the stream flowing from it so that the besiegers might be left without a water supply (2Ki 3:19,25; 2Ch 32:3; compare also 2Sa 12:26,27, Century Bible, Kennedy's note).

II. In Biblical History.

1. Before the Monarchy:

On the passage of the Jordan the Israelites found in Jericho a walled city of great strength barring their progress. The excavations recently made have disclosed the common features of Canaanite fortresses—an outer wall, surrounding the entire area, 6 1/2 ft. thick, a citadel and protecting walls of hardly less substantial workmanship. Nearby also is the essential spring to furnish the water supply. Within the

citadel were found the walls and rooms of Canaanite houses, and in many cases remains of infants buried in jars under the clay floors (Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible, 91 ff). These examples of "foundation sacrifices" with which the excavations at Gezer have made us familiar give point to the account of the resettlement of the city in the days of Ahab, when Hiel the Bethelite rebuilt Jericho, laying the foundation thereof with the loss of Abiram, his firstborn, and setting up the gates thereof with the loss of his youngest son Segub (1Ki 16:34).

See CORNER-STONE; CANAAN.

In the Book of Jud we read of the strong tower, or citadel, of Thebez, into which the inhabitants had crowded and to which Abimelech was setting fire when a woman upon the wall hurled a millstone upon him and broke his skull (Jud 9:51). It does not appear that at this period the Israelites were in possession of the strongholds of the land, for when the Philistines overran the country, they had no fortresses to flee to, but "did hide themselves in caves, and in thickets, and in rocks, and in coverts, and in pits" (1Sa 13:6).

2. In the Period of the Monarchy:

When David captured the Jebusite fortress (2Sa 5:6) and transferred his capital from Hebron to Jerusalem, a new era of independence and even of conquest began. The natural strength of David’s town, with such fortification as had been added, made it impregnable to any Philistine or Syrian foe, and one of the strongest fortresses in Western Asia.

Although Solomon was a man of peace, he included among the great buildings which he executed fortresses and works of defense. He built the wall of Jerusalem round about. He built Millo (called Akra ("citadel") in the Septuagint), and closed the breaches of the city of David, so that there might be no vulnerable point found in the defenses of the city (1Ki 9:15). This fortification is represented in Septuagint, which has here an addition to the Massoretic Text, as securing the complete subjection of the original inhabitants who remained. Solomon also built Hazor to watch Damascus, Megiddo to guard the plain of Jezreel, and Gezer overlooking the maritime plain, his work being one of refortification rather than of building from the foundation. He fortified also Beth-horon, Upper and Nether, to block the way against Philistine invasion. The store cities, and cities to accommodate his chariots and horses, were also part of his military system (1Ki 9:18).

The disruption of the kingdoms, and the jealousy and hostility that followed between Judah and Israel, necessitated fresh undertakings of fortification, on the part of both kingdoms. Rehoboam dwelt in Jerusalem, and built cities for defense in Judah. He fortified the strongholds and provisioned them and stored arms within them in case of siege (2Ch 11:5). One of Jeroboam’s first acts on ascending the throne was to build the two fortresses, Shechem to guard Mr. Ephraim, and Penuel to protect Gilead (1Ki 12:25). Baasha later pushed his frontier within a few miles of Jerusalem, fortifying Ramah to overawe Asa in his very capital. The long war which lasted through the reigns of Jeroboam, Nadab, Baasha and Elah, kings of Israel, was largely a war of sieges, one of them, that of Gibbethon, having

apparently lasted 27 years (1Ki 15:27, compared with 1Ki 16:15).

With Omri there arose in Israel a powerful ruler whose name is mentioned with respect in the Assyrian monuments, which designate the kingdom of Israel Mat Bit Khumri, "the land of the house of Omri." He was the builder of Samaria which remained the capital of the Northern Kingdom till its fall in 722 BC. In excavations but recently carried on by the archaeological expedition of Harvard University, the walls of Omri's palace and fortress were laid bare, giving an impression of the great strength of the place.

While Solomon built the wall of Jerusalem, we read that Uzziah built towers at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turning of the wall, and fortified them (2Ch 26:9). Jotham his son, continued his father's labors in the further fortification of the city (2Ch 27:3,1). Hezekiah had good reason to add still further to the strength of the city, seeing that he had to bear the brunt of Sennacherib's expedition to the west. Sennacherib boasts that of Hezekiah's fortified towns, he captured 46, with innumerable fortresses besides (Schrader, Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, I, 286), but he cannot tell that Jerusalem was among them, for it came through the ordeal unscathed. In the reign of Manasseh Jerusalem was captured and the king himself carried away to Nineveh, but on his repentance he was restored to the throne and set himself to strengthen the fortifications of the city (2Ch 33:14). The city was unable, however, to hold out against Nebuchadrezzar and his captains; for it was taken in 597 BC, and King Jehoiachin and the flower of the population were deported to Babylon. After a siege of two years it was again taken in 586 BC, and temple and city were destroyed, and the walls razed to the ground.

3. In the Period of the Return:

The patriotic labor of Nehemiah in the rebuilding of the wall of Jerusalem belongs properly to the history of the city (see JERUSALEM). In the Maccabean struggle, the Akra (APC 1Macc 1:33; 3:45, etc.), the citadel, was long held by a Syrian garrison, and was in the end delivered up to the high priest by Demetrius (APC 1Macc 10:32). Notable also still later was the castle of Antonia (Ac 22:24) on the site of the earlier castle of Nehemiah's day (Ne 2:8; 7:2).

III. In the Psalms and the Prophets.

1. The Psalms

Under the image of a fortress, or mountain fastness, inaccessible to any common foot, where there is perfect safety from enemies and persecutors, the Psalmist delights to express his confidence in God. Yahweh, in virtue of His righteous judgments, is a high tower to the downtrodden, a place of refuge and security (misgabh) to those who are in trouble (Ps 9:9). When he exults in the strength of God who has given him deliverance, he multiplies words to utter his confidence: "I love Thee, O Yahweh, my strength. Yahweh is my rock, and my fortress (metsudhah), ... my God .... my high tower (misgabh)" (Ps 18:1,2). Thirteen times in the Psalms we find this word: Ps 9:9; 18:2; 46:7,11; 59:9,16,17 (where the King James Version translates "defence" and the Revised Version (British and American)

"high tower"), etc. Elsewhere metsudhah is employed (Ps 31:2; literally, "house of fortresses"; Ps 91:2; 144:2). If we were at liberty to accept such psalms as Psalms 18:59 as Davidic, the appropriateness of them to the circumstances of the Shepherd King when persecuted by Saul, taking refuge in the cave of Adullam and enduring the perils and anxieties of an outlaw's life, would at once be apparent.

2. The Prophets:

Although Jeremiah has been called the weeping prophet, yet for the fearless fulfillment of his commission to a gainsaying people, God made him "a fortified city (‘ir mibhtsar), and an iron pillar, and brazen walls" (Jer 1:18; compare Jer 6:27; 15:20). Hosea in the Northern Kingdom predicted the destruction of its "fortresses" (mibhtsar) by the invading Assyrians (10:14; compare 8:14). The prophets in proclaiming God's message to their day addressed themselves not only to Israel and Judah, but also to those great world-powers with which the Hebrew people had relations. In the oracles of the prophets to the nations—to Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Syria, Edom, and others—we obtain glimpses of great and fortified cities like No-amon (Thebes), Babylon, Nineveh, Damascus, whose natural defenses and added fortifications did not save them from capture and destruction. And the teaching of the prophets for the comfort of Israel and Judah is that Yahweh was a better defense to them than the great rivers of Assyria and Egypt were to those nations. When Nineveh was at the height of her pride, fierceness and worldly glory, Nahum asks her: "Art thou better than No-amon (Thebes of Egypt), that was situate among the rivers, that had the waters round about her; whose rampart (chel) was the sea (the Nile), and her wall (chomah) was of the sea?" (Na 3:8). Of Nineveh itself we know that it was protected, not only by walls and fortresses of great strength, but also by canals and streams drawn round the city. Yet Nahum declares in his sublime apostrophe: "All thy fortresses shall be like figtrees with the first-ripe figs: if they be shaken, they fall into the mouth of the eater" (Na 3:12). Babylon had walls whose strength and height, as described by Herodotus and other historians, were fabulous. Its great monarch Nebuchadrezzar was in his day the greatest ruler of the East, and Sir Henry Layard has told that scarcely a brick unearthed in the mounds of the great Babylonian plain was without his name. Yet when the day of reckoning came, the wall, said to be mountain-high, and 80 ft. thick, with its moat so broad that an arrow could not be shot over it, and all its elaborate works of defense, were as if they had not been; it surrendered to Cyrus without a blow being struck. It is in the visions of the prophets, in the universal peace which is to accompany the restoration of Israel, that we hear of "them that are at rest, that dwell securely, all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates" (Eze 38:11). "In that day shall this song be sung in the land of Judah: We have a strong city; salvation will he appoint for walls and bulwarks" (chel) (Isa 26:1). "Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, desolation nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls Salvation, and thy gates Praise" (Isa 60:18). Building of fenced cities, with riding upon horses and military preparation, was a note of the false prophet, who urged alliances with foreign powers such as Assyria and Egypt, anal relied too much upon the material resources of the nation. The true prophet realized that the strength of the nation lay in God and urged the people to put their trust in Him (Ho 8:14). "Jerusalem," says Zechariah in the days of the Return, "shall be inhabited as villages without walls, by reason of the multitude of men and cattle therein. For I, saith Yahweh, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and I will be the glory in the midst of her" (2:4,5; compare 8:4,5).

IV. In the New Testament.

1. In Paul’s Epistles:

In a well-known passage (2Co 10:3-5), Paul, as he often does, draws upon his knowledge of Roman methods of warfare, and introduces for the enforcement of great spiritual lessons the pulling down of "strong-holds" as the ultimate object of every campaign. The word employed (ochuromata) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew word commonly rendered "fortress" (mibhtsar). "The ‘strongholds’ are the rock forts, such as those which once bristled along the coast of his native Cilicia and of which he must often have heard when his father told him how they were ‘pulled down’ by the Romans in their wars against the pirates. Those ‘high things that exalt themselves’—those high eminences of the pride of Nature—occupied in force by hostile troops—had been a familiar experience in many wars throughout Asia Minor, while one of the grandest of all was the Acropolis that towered over Corinth" (Dean Howson, The Metaphors of Paul, 34 f).

2. In the Ac of the Apostles:

From the stairs of the Castle of Antonia, Paul, by leave of Claudius Lysias, the commandant of the garrison at Jerusalem, in whose charge he was, addressed the excited crowd and told the story of his conversion. Antonia was the quarters, then, as it was in the time of our Lord, of the Roman garrison, which occupied the Jewish capital (Ac 21:37; Joh 18:28); and the same site is to this day covered with a Turkish barracks.

3. In the Gospel History:

Although it is not mentioned by name, the gloomy fortress of Macherus on the East of the Dead Sea is believed to have been the scene of the imprisonment and murder of John the Baptist. The description of it given by Josephus (BJ, VII, vi, 1) shows it to have been a place of immense strength. "It was quite necessary that that fortress should be demolished lest it might draw away many into rebellion because of its strength; for the nature of the place was very capable of affording sure hope of safety to those who held it, and delay and fear to those who attacked it. For what was defended by a fort was itself a rocky hill, rising to a very great height, which circumstance alone made it very difficult to capture it. It was also so contrived by Nature that it could not easily be approached; for it is entrenched by ravines on all sides, so deep that the eye cannot reach their bottoms, nor are they easy to cross over, and it is quite impossible to fill them up with earth." Macherus, like the Herodium, Jotapata, Masada, figured largely in the tragic scenes of the Jewish War so graphically described by Josephus

LITERATURE.

Bliss and Macalister, Excavations in Palestine; Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities; Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from Mound of Gezer; PEFS for 1903-6, referring to Gezer; Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible; Vincent, Canaan d’apres l’exploration recente; Billerbeck, Der Festungsbau im

alten Orient.

T. Nicol.

FORTUNATUS

for-tu-na’-tus (Phortounatos):

A Roman proper name turned into Gr; same as Latin adjective fortunatus, meaning "blest," or "fortunate." Found only once in the Bible (1Co 16:17). Fortunatus, with Stephanas and Achaicus, was an amabassador of the Corinthian church, whose presence at Ephesus refreshed the spirit of the apostle Paul.

FORTUNE

for’-tun (Gad): A god of Good Luck, possibly the Hyades.

See ASTROLOGY, 10.

FORTY

for’-ti (’arba‘im; tessarakonta).

See FOUR (5); NUMBER.

FORUM

fo’-rum:

the King James Version Appii Forum (Ac 28:15), is in the Revised Version (British and American) Market of Appius (see APPII FORUM).

FORWARD; FORWARDNESS

for’-werd for’-werd-nes (hale’ah, naca‘; spoudaios):

As an adverb "forward" has the meaning of "onward" in space or time, or in the movement of affairs. As an adjective it has the sense of "readiness," "willingness," etc. The adverb only is found in the Old Testament. It is the translation of hale’ah, "distance," "onward"; in space (Nu 32:19; 1Sa 10:3); in time (Eze 39:22, "from that day and forward"; Eze 43:27); once of halakh, "to go on" (Ge 26:13, "went

forward," the King James Version margin, Hebrew "went going," the Revised Version (British and American) "grew more and more"); twice of ma‘al, "above," "upward" (1Sa 16:13; 30:25, "from that day forward"); once of ya’al, "to cause to go up," "advance" (Job 30:13, "They set forward (advance or help on) my calamity"); twice of lephanim, "to the front" (Jer 7:24; Eze 10:22, "They went every one straight forward," literally, "on the side of their face"); once of qedhem, "before" (Job 23:8, "Behold, I go forward, but he is not there"); once with nakhah, "to smite" (2Ki 3:24); frequently in Nu, and once in Exodus, of naca‘, "to lift up," "remove," "journey" (Ex 14:15, "Speak unto the children of Israel, that they go forward"; Nu 1:51, "when the tabernacle setteth forward"; Nu 2:24 the King James Version, "They shall go forward," etc.); it is also the translation of natsach (Piel), "to be over," "to take the lead," "to superintend" (1Ch 23:4, "to set forward (to carry onward, to advance) the work of the house of the Lord," the King James Version margin and text of the Revised Version (British and American) "to oversee"; 2Ch 34:12, "to set it forward," the Revised Version (British and American) retains, margin, "to preside over it"; Ezr 3:8 margin, "set forward the work"). This word means also "to lead" in music, to precent; hence, in the title of many psalms, la-menatseach, "For the chief musician." Proerchomai, "to go forward," etc., is translated "went forward" (Mr 14:35); propempo, "to send forward" (3 Joh 1:6, "bring forward," the Revised Version (British and American) "set forward"); proballo, "to throw or put forward" (Ac 19:33, "putting him forward"); as adjective it is the translation of thelo, "to wish," "will" (2Co 8:10, "to be forward a year ago"; the King James Version margin (Greek) "willing," the Revised Version (British and American) "to will"); of spoudaios, "speedy," "earnest" (2Co 8:17, "being more forward," the Revised Version (British and American) "very earnest"); of spoudazo, "to make haste," "to be earnest" (Ga 2:10, "which I also was forward to do," the Revised Version (British and American) "zealous to do").

"Forward" occurs several times in Apocrypha, e.g. APC 1Esdras 1:27, "The Lord is with me hasting me forward" (epispeudo); APC 2Esdras 3:6, "before ever the earth came forward" (adventaret), meaning, perhaps, before it was ready for planting.

Forwardness is the translation of spoude, "speed," "zeal," etc. (2Co 8:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "earnestness"); of prothumia "readiness of mind" (2Co 9:2, "the forwardness of your mind," the Revised Version (British and American) "your readiness"; The Wisdom of Solomon APC Wis 14:17, "that by their forwardness (spoude) they might flatter," the Revised Version (British and American) "zeal").

For "forward" the Revised Version (British and American) has "forth" (Nu 2:24; compare 1Co 16:11); for "go forward" (Nu 10:5), "take their journey"; for "set forward" (Nu 21:10; 22:1), "journeyed"; "forward" for "ready" (De 1:41), for "forth" (Pr 25:6), for "farther" (Mt 26:39); "put forward" for "appointed" (Ac 1:23): "set forward according to" for "took" (Nu 10:12); "set forward" for "went" (Nu 10:14,34), for "departed" (Nu 10:33); "set me forward" for "bring me" (1Co 16:6).

W. L. Walker

FOUL

foul (raphas; akdthartos):

The verb "to foul" (defile) occurs as the translation of raphas, "to trample" or "muddle" (streams) (Eze 32:2; 34:18); of chalmar, "to burn," "to be red" (Job 16:16, "My face is foul with weeping," the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version, margin "red"); of mirpas, "a treading" (Eze 34:19). The adjective is the translation of akathartos, "unclean," "impure," "wicked" (Mr 9:25; Re 18:2, "foul spirit," the Revised Version (British and American) "unclean"), and of cheimon, "winter," "stormy or foul weather" (Mt 16:3). the Revised Version (British and American) has "The rivers shall become foul" (Isa 19:6) instead of the King James Version "They shall turn the rivers far away," the English Revised Version "The rivers shall stink."

W. L. Walker

FOUNDATION

foun-da’-shun:

In Hebrew the words for "foundation" are mostly derivatives from yacadh, "to found," and in Greek two words are used: one, katabole, of "foundation of the world" (Mr 13:35; 15:34; Lu 11:50; Joh 17:24, etc.); the other, themelios, of the foundation of a building (Lu 6:48,49; 14:29; Ac 16:26, etc.), in which sense it is also used metaphorically in various connections (Christ the foundation of the church, 1Co 3:11; or the apostles and prophets the foundation, with Christ as corner-stone, Eph 2:20; the foundation of repentance, Heb 6:1, etc.). In Ps 11:3, "if the foundations be destroyed," the Hebrew word is shath. In Jer 50:15, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "bulwarks" for "foundations"; conversely in Ps 89:14; 97:2, for the King James Version "habitation," the Revised Version (British and American) reads "foundation," and in Isa 6:4 for the King James Version "posts," reads "foundations."

James Orr

FOUNDER

foun’-der (from tsaraph): A worker in molten metal (Jud 17:4, etc.).

The word in the King James Version in Jer 10:9,14; 51:17 is rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "goldsmith," and in 6:29 by a paraphrase, "They go on refining."

See REFINER; GOLDSMITH.

FOUNTAIN

foun’-tin, foun’-tan:

In a country where no rain falls for half of the year, springs sume an importance unknown in more favored lands. In both eastern and western Palestine and even in Lebanon there are many villages which depend entirely upon reservoirs or cisterns of rain water. Others are situated along the courses of the few perennial streams. But wherever a spring exists it is very apt to be the nucleus of a village. It may furnish sufficient water to be used in irrigation, in which case the gardens surrounding the village become an oasis in the midst of the parched land. Or there may be a tiny stream which barely suffices for drinking water, about which the village women and girls sit and talk waiting their turns to fill their jars, sometimes until far in the night. The water of the village fountain is often conveyed by a covered conduit for some distance from the source to a convenient spot in the village where an arch is built up, under which the water gushes out. See CISTERN; SPRING; WELL; EN-, and place-names compounded with EN-.

Figurative:

(1) of God (Ps 36:9; Jer 2:13; 17:13);

(2) of Divine pardon and purification, with an obvious Messianic reference (Zec 13:1);

(3) of wisdom and godliness (Pr 13:14; 14:27);

(4) of wives (Pr 5:18);

(5) of children (De 33:28; compare Ps 68:26; Pr 5:16);

(6) of prosperity (Ps 107:35; 114:8; Ho 13:15);

(7) of the heart (Ec 12:6; see CISTERN);

(8) of life everlasting (Re 7:17; 21:6).

Alfred Ely Day

FOUNTAIN GATE

See JERUSALEM.

FOUR

for (’arba‘; tessares): "Four" (cardinal number) was a sacred and complete number with the Hebrews, as well as with several other peoples. It occurs very frequently in the Old Testament and the New

Testament.

(1) It indicates completeness. We have the four rivers of Paradise (Ge 2:10); the four winds of heaven (Eze 37:9; Da 7:2; 8:8; 11:4; Zec 6:5, the Revised Version, margin "spirits"; APC 2Esdras 13:5); "the four winds" (Mt 24:31; Mr 13:27); "the four corners of the earth" (Isa 11:12; Re 7:1; 20:8, the King James Version "quarters"); "the four corners of the house" (Job 1:19); Jephthah's daughter was bewailed four days a year (Jud 11:40); "four cities" are several times mentioned in Jos in the allotment of inheritances (19:7; 21:18, etc.); Nehemiah's enemies sent to him "four times" (Ne 6:4); "four kinds" (the Revised Version, margin "families" of destroyers were threatened, Jer 15:3); Yahweh's "four sore judgments" (Eze 14:21); "four generations" were seen by Job (Job 42:16).

(2) "Four" is frequent in prophetic visions: Daniel saw "four .... beasts" arise, representing four kings (7:3,17); "four notable horns" (Dan 8:8,22; compare APC 2Esdras 11:39); "four gates" (APC 2Esdras 3:19; four wings, 12:2 the King James Version); "four horns" were seen by Zechariah, as the powers that had scattered Israel, and "four smiths" (Revised Version) as powers that would cast the four horns down (1:18-21); "four chariots and .... horses" represented the "four spirits," the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin (better than "winds"), that went "forth from standing before the Lord of all the earth" (Zech 6:1-5); in the visions of Ezekiel, "four living creatures," each with four faces, four wings, etc., were the bearers of the throne of God (1:5 f, 23); so, in the visions of John there were "four living creatures" before and around the throne (Re 4:6; 5:6,8,14; 6:1; 15:7; 19:4); John saw "four angels" of destruction loosed for their work (Re 9:14).

(3) "Four" occurs frequently in the measurements of the sacred buildings, etc.

(a) of the tabernacle (Ex 25; 26; 27; 28:17; 36, etc.);

(b) of Solomon's temple (1Ki 7:2; 1Ch 9:24);

(c) of Ezekiel's temple (Eze 40:41; 41:5; 42:20; 43:14).

(4) "Four" is used as an alternative with "three" (Pr 30:15,18,21,24,29); we have "three or four" (2 Esdras 16:29,31); "the third and .... the fourth generation" (Ex 20:5; 34:7; Nu 14:18; De 5:9).

(5) Ten times four, or forty is also a special and sacred number, e.g. forty years did Israel eat manna (Ex 16:35); forty years in the wilderness (Nu 14:33; 32:13); "the land had rest forty years" (Jud 3:11; 5:31); Israel was delivered unto the hands of the Philistines for forty years (Jud 13:1); Eli judged Israel forty years (1Sa 4:18); Moses was forty years old when he visited his brethren (Ac 7:23); the flood continued for "forty days and forty nights" (Ge 7:4); Moses was in the Mount "forty days and forty nights" (Ex 24:18; 34:28; De 9:9); Jesus fasted in the desert forty days and nights (Mt 4:2); He remained with His disciples forty days after His resurrection (Ac 1:3).

(6) Fourscore is also frequent (shemonim) (Ex 7:7; Jud 3:30; Jer 41:5, etc.; ogdoekonta, Lu 2:37; 16:7).

(7) Four hundred represents a large number, e.g. the years of the oppression in Egypt (Ge 15:13); Esau’s company (Ge 33:1); the men with David (1Sa 22:2; 25:13; 30:10,17); the prophets of Baal "four hundred and fifty," of Asherah, "four hundred" (1Ki 18:19,22); the prophets of Israel (1Ki 22:6). Four thousand represents a larger number, e.g. the musicians and porters of Solomon’s temple (1Ch 23:5); the stalls for horses in Solomon’s stables (2Ch 9:25); the Assassins who made insurrection under an Egyptian (Ac 21:38); Christ fed "four thousand men, besides women and children" (Mt 15:38). Four hundred thousand represents a very large number, e.g. the congregation of Israel that gathered at Mizpah, "four hundred thousand footmen that drew sword" (Jud 20:2,17); Abijah’s army (2Ch 13:3; Jeroboam’s, twice that number).

(8) The fourth part also frequently occurs (Ex 29:40; Le 23:13; Nu 23:10; Re 6:8, etc.).

W. L. Walker

FOUR HUNDRED

See FOUR.

FOUR THOUSAND

See FOUR.

FOURFOLD

for-fold:

Occurs but twice in English Versions: 2Sa 12:6, "He shall restore the lamb fourfold"; and Lu 19:8 the King James Version, "If I have wrongfully exacted ought .... I restore fourfold." From this statement of Zaccheus we are to understand that fourfold the amount of that which was stolen was the restoration the law required of a thief. This was the extreme penalty the law imposed. In some cases double the amount was to be restored (Ex 22:4,7); in others, a fifth of its value was added to the thing restored (Le 6:5); still again, an amount equal to that taken was to be restored (1Sa 12:3).

FOURSCORE

for’-skor.

See FOUR; NUMBER.

FOURSQUARE

for’-skwar (rabha‘; tetragonos):

"Foursquare," meaning equal in length and breadth, not round, is the translation of rabha‘ (from obsolete rebha‘, "four"); it occurs in the description of the altar of burnt offering (Ex 27:1; 38:1); of the altar of incense (Ex 30:2; 37:25); of the breastplate of the high priest (Ex 28:16; 39:9); of the panels of the gravings upon the mouth of the brazen or molten sea in Solomon’s temple (1Ki 7:31); of the inner court of Ezekiel’s temple (Eze 40:47); of "the holy oblation" of the city of Ezekiel’s vision (Eze 48:20, rebhi‘i, "fourth"); of the new Jerusalem of John’s vision (Re 21:16, tetragonos), and conveys the idea of perfect symmetry. In the King James Version marginof 1Ki 6:31, we have "five-square," square being formerly used for equal-sided, as it still is in "three-square file."

W. L. Walker

FOURTEEN

for’-ten.

See NUMBER.

FOURTH PART

See FOUR.

FOWL

foul (‘oph; peteinon): The word is now generally restricted to the larger, especially the edible birds, but formerly it denoted all flying creatures; in Le 11:20 the King James Version we have even, "all fowls that creep, going upon all four," Le 11:21, "every flying creeping thing that goeth upon all four."

1. Old Testament Terms and References:

The word most frequently translated "fowl" is ‘oph from ‘uph, "to cover," hence, wing; it is used collectively for birds and fowl in general (Ge 1:20, etc.; 2:19,20, etc.); ‘ayit (from ‘ut, "to rush") means a ravenous beasts; or bird of prey, used collectively of ravenous birds (Ge 15:11 the King James Version; Isa 18:6 the King James Version "fowls"; Job 28:7, "a path which no fowl knoweth," the Revised Version (British and American) "no bird of prey"); in Isa 46:11 it is used as a symbol of a conqueror (compare Jer 12:9, "bird," "birds of prey"; Eze 39:4, "ravenous birds"); tsippor, Aramaic tsippar (from tsaphar, "to twitter or chirp"), "a chirper," denotes a small bird or sparrow (De 4:17 the King James Version; Ne 5:18; Da 4:14); to give the carcasses of men to the fowls (birds) of the air was an image of destruction (De 28:26 the King James Version; 1Sa 17:44,46; Ps 79:2; Jer 7:33, etc.); barburim, rendered

(1Ki 4:23) "fatted fowl" (among the provisions for Solomon’s table for one day), is probably a mimetic word, like Greek barbaros, Latin murmuro, English babble, perhaps denoting geese from their cackle (Gesenius, from barar, "to cleanse," referring to their white plumage; but other derivations and renderings are given). They might have been ducks or swans. They could have been guineas or pigeons. The young of the ostrich was delicious food, and no doubt when Solomon’s ships brought peafowl they also brought word that they were a delicacy for a king’s table. The domestic fowl was not common so early in Palestine, but it may have been brought by Solomon with other imports from the East; in New Testament times chickens were common; ba‘al kanaph, "owner of a wing," is used for a bird of any kind in Pr 1:17. "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird," the King James Version margin Hebrew, "in the eyes of everything that hath a wing."

2. In the Levitical Law:

In the Levitical law fowls (birds) were distinguished as clean and unclean (Le 11:13; De 14:11-20; compare Ge 8:20); the first were allowed to be eaten because they fed on grains, seeds, and vegetables; the second were forbidden because they fed on flesh and carrion.

3. New Testament References and Illustrative Uses:

In the New Testament the common word for "fowl" is peteinon, "winged fowl." "The fowls of the air" (the Revised Version (British and American) "the birds of the heaven") are pointed to by our Lord as examples of the providential care of God (Mt 6:26; Lu 12:24); in another connection the "sparrows" (strouthion) sold cheap, probably for food, are so employed (Mt 10:29, "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny?" Lu 12:6, "five .... for two pence"); their quickly picking up seeds from the ground is made to illustrate the influences which render "the word" powerless (Mt 13:4); their being sheltered in the branches, the growth of the kingdom (Mt 13:32, peteinon); the hen’s (ornis) sheltering care for her chickens, His desire to protect and save Jerusalem (Mt 23:37; compare APC 2Esdras 1:30; Ru 2:12); the fowls were shown in vision to Peter as among the things made clean by God (Ac 10:12; 11:6); in Re 18:2; 19:17,21, orneon, "bird," "fowl," a carnivorous bird (the Revised Version (British and American) "bird"), is the representative of desolation and of destruction.

For "fowls" the American Standard Revised Version has "birds" (Ge 6:7,20; 7:3; Le 20:25; Ac 10:12; 11:6; with the English Revised Version Mt 6:26; 13:4; Mr 4:4,32; Lu 8:5; 12:24; 13:19); for "every feathered fowl" (Eze 39:17), the Revised Version (British and American) has "the birds of every sort"; for "all fowls that creep" (Le 11:20) and for "every flying creeping thing" (Le 11:21), "all winged creeping things."

W. L. Walker

FOWL, FATTED

See preceding article.

FOWLER

foul’-er (yoqesh): A professional birdcatcher. In the days previous to firearms, birds were captured with nets spread on the ground, in traps and snares. There was a method of taking young birds from a nest, raising them by hand, and when they had become very tame, they were confined in hidden cages so that their voices would call others of their kind to the spot and they could be killed by arrows of concealed bowmen or the use of the throw-stick (Ecclesiasticus 11:30) This was a stick 1 1/2 feet in length and 1/2 inches in diameter, hurled with a rotary motion at the legs of the birds and was very effective when thrown into flocks of ground birds, such as partridge or quail, especially if the birds were running up hill. There was also a practice of sewing a captured bird’s eyelids together and confining it so that its cries would call large numbers of birds through curiosity and they could then be taken in the several ways mentioned. The fowlers supplied the demand for doves and other birds used for caged pets, and furnished the market with wild pigeons and doves for sacrifice and such small birds as were used for food. Ps 91:3: "For he will deliver thee from the snare of the fowler. And from the deadly pestilence."

This is David’s promise that the Almighty will deliver us from the evil plans laid to ruin us, as a bird sometimes in its struggles slips the hair and escapes from the "snare" (which see) set for it. Ps 124:7:

"Our soul is escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowlers:

The snare is broken, and we are escaped."

Here is the fulfillment of the former promise in a cry of rejoicing. Sometimes the snare held fast, sometimes it broke; then the joy in the heart of a freed man was like the wild exultation in the heart of the escaping bird. Pr 6:5:

"Deliver thyself as a roe from the hands. of the hunter.

And as a bird from the hand of the fowler."

With methods so primitive as these for taking birds, it must have occurred frequently that a stunned, wounded or entrapped bird slipped even from the hand that held it and made good its escape.

Jer 5:26: "For among my people are found wicked men: they watch, as fowlers lie in wait; they set a trap, they catch men." Here is the plain comparison strongly drawn between wicked men entrapping their fellows and fowlers taking unsuspecting birds.

The last reference is in Ho 9:8: "Ephraim was a watchman with my God: as for the prophet, a fowler’s snare is in all his ways, and enmity in the house of his God." Wherever he goes, the prophet is in danger of being trapped.

Gene Stratton-Porter

FOX

(shu‘al; compare Arabic tha‘lab (Jud 15:4; Ne 4:3; Ps 63:10; So 2:15; La 5:18; Eze 13:4); alopex (Mt 8:20; Lu 9:58; 13:32)): The foxes of different parts of Europe and Western Asia differ more or less from each other, and some authors have given the local tyes distinct specific names. Tristram, for instance, distinguishes the Egyptian fox, Vulpes nilotica, of Southern Palestine, and the tawny fox, Vulpes flavescens, of the North and East It is possible that the range of the desert fox, Vulpes leucopus, of Southwestern Asia may also reach Syria. We have, however, the authority of the Royal Natural History for considering all these as merely local races of one species, the common fox, Vulpes alopex or Canis vulpes. The natives of Syria and Palestine do not always distinguish the fox and jackal although the two animals are markedly different. The jackal and wolf also are frequently confounded.

See DRAGON; JACKAL.

In Ps 63:9 f we have, "Those that seek my soul, to destroy it, ... shall be given over to the power of the sword: they shall be a portion for foxes" (shu‘alim). It has been thought that the jackal is meant here (Revised Version margin), and that may well be, though it is also true that the fox does not refuse carrion. In the Revised Version, margin, "jackal" is suggested in two other passages, though why is not clear, since the rendering "fox" seems quite appropriate in both. They are Ne 4:3, ".... if a fox go up, he shall break down their stone wall," and La 5:17 f, ".... our eyes are dim; for the mountain of Zion which is desolate: the foxes walk upon it." the Revised Version, margin also has "jackals" in Jud 15:4 f, where Samson "caught three hundred foxes .... and put a firebrand in the midst between every two tails .... and let them go into the standing grain of the Philistines, and burnt up both the shocks and the standing grain, and also the oliveyards." Jackals are probably more numerous than foxes, but the substitution does not appreciably diminish the difficulties in the way of any natural explanation of the story. In So 2:15 we have a reference to the fondness of the fox for grapes. In Mt 8:20 and Lu 9:58 Jesus says in warning to a would-be follower, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." Foxes differ from most of the Canidae in burrowing holes for their lairs, unless indeed they take possession of the burrow of another animal, such as the badger. In Lu 13:32 Jesus compares Herod to a fox.

Alfred Ely Day.

FRAGMENT

frag’-ment (klasma): "Fragment," a piece broken off, occurs only in the plural, in the accounts of the miracles of the Loaves in the Gospels and references thereto. It is the translation of klasma (from klao, "to break"), "a piece broken off" (Mt 14:20 the King James Version); "broken meat" (Mt 15:37).

The Revised Version (British and American) has in each instance "broken pieces." The change is

important because it shows that the pieces left over were not mere fragments or crumbs left by the people after eating, but some of the original pieces into which it is said in all the synoptic narratives and references Jesus "broke" the "loaves," which, being thin cakes, were usually broken before distribution; hence, the phrase, "breaking of bread." See Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), under the word "Fragment"; Weymouth translates "broken portions," namely, "those into which the Lord had broken the loaves; not mere scraps or crumbs."

W. L. Walker

FRAME

fram:

(1) yetser (from root yatsar, "to knead," mold with the fingers): "For he knoweth our frame; he remembereth that we are dust" (Ps 103:14).

(2) ‘erekh (from root ‘arakh, "to put in order," "to set in a row," "to arrange"): "goodly frame" (Job 41:12, the King James Version "goodly proportion").

(3) ‘otsem "bony frame" "body": "My frame was not hidden from thee, when I was made in secret" (Ps 139:15), the King James Version "my substance," the King James Version margin "my strength, or, my body."

See also BONE.

(4) mibhneh, "building, frame" (Eze 40:2, "frame of a city").

(5) nathan, "to give," "to direct": "They will not frame their doings" (Ho 5:4, the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin).

(6) sunarmologeo, "to fit or join closely together" (Eph 2:21).

(7) katartizo, "to fit out," "make fit," "adjust" (Heb 11:3).

H. L. E. Luering

FRANKINCENSE

frants’-in-sens (lebhonah, from root meaning "whiteness," referring to the milky color of the fresh juice: Ex 30:34; Le 2:1 f, 15 f; 5:11; 6:15; 24:7; Nu 5:15; 1Ch 9:29; Ne 13:5,9; So 3:6; 4:6,14; Isa 43:23; 60:6; 66:3; Jer 6:20; 17:26; 41:5; translated in the last six references "incense" in the King James Version, but

correctly in the Revised Version (British and American); libanos: Mt 2:11; Re 18:13. The English word is derived from old French franc encens, i.e. "pure incense"): The common frankincense of the pharmacopeas is a gum derived from the common fir, but the frankincense of the Jews, as well as of the Greeks and Romans, is a substance now called Olibanum (from the Arabic el luban), a product of certain trees of the genus Boswellia (Natural Order, Amyridaceae), growing on the limestone rocks of south Arabia and Somali-land (Isa 60:6; Jer 6:20). The most important species are B. Carteri and B. Frereana. Some of the trees grow to a considerable height and send down their roots to extraordinary depths. The gum is obtained by incising the bark,

and is collected in yellowish, semitransparent tears, readily pulverized; it has a nauseous taste. It is used for making incense for burning in churches and in Indian temples, as it was among the Jews (Ex 30:34). See INCENSE. It is often associated with myrrh (So 3:6; 4:6) and with it was made an offering to the infant Saviour (Mt 2:11). A specially "pure" kind, lebhonah zakkah, was presented with the shewbread (Le 24:7).

E. W. G. Masterman

FRANKLY

frank’-li (charizomai):

"Frankly" in the sense of "freely," "readily," "graciously," occurs only in the translation of charizomai, properly "to gratify," "to do that which is grateful or pleasing," "to forgive" (Lu 7:42, "He frankly forgave them both," the Revised Version (British and American) has simply "forgave"; the same word is translated in Lu 7:43, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "forgave," in Lu 7:21 the King James Version it is "gave," the Revised Version (British and American) "bestowed," granted to see). It occurs in the New Testament only in Luke and Paul.

FRAY

fra (haradh, "to make afraid," "cause to tremble": the King James Version of De 28:26; Jer 7:33; Zec 1:21; the Revised Version (British and American) "frighten," "terrify").

See WAR.

FRECKLED SPOT

frek’-’-ld, (bohaq; Septuagint alphos, called in the Revised Version (British and American) "a tetter," and described as a bright shining spot (beharoth lebhenoth):

These white eruptions did not render the person so marked ceremonially unclean (Le 13:39). This form

of skin disease is described by Hippocrates as usually of no great importance and indicative of a sluggishness of body; it is probably some form of local psoriasis. There is a cognate modern Arabic word applied to a facial eczematous eruption. For other references to skin diseases, see LEPROSY.

FREE; FREEDOM

See CHOICE; WILL.

FREEDMAN; FREEMAN

fred'-man, fre'-man: The term occurs in 1Co 7:22; Col 3:11, and Re 6:15, and represents two slightly different words. In 1Co 7:22 the word is apeleutheros, "a freeman," one who was born a slave and has received freedom. In this case it refers to spiritual freedom. He that was in bondage to sin has been presented with spiritual freedom by the Lord. In Re 6:15 the word is simply eleutheros, "a free man" as opposed to a slave.

FREELY

fre'-li (chinnam, nedhabhah; dorean parrhesiazomai):

"Freely" occurs in three senses:ts two slightly different words. In 1Co 7:22 the word is apeleutheros, "a freeman," one who was born a slave and has received freedom. In this case it refers to spiritual freedom. He that was in bondage to sin has been presented with spiritual freedom by the Lord. In Re 6:15 the word is simply eleutheros, "a free man" as opposed to a slave.

(1) Gratis, for nothing (Nu 11:5, chinnam, "for nought," "the fish which we did eat in Egypt freely," the Revised Version (British and American) "for nought"); Mt 10:8, dorean, "Freely ye have received, freely give," the Revised Version (British and American) omits "have"; Ro 3:24, "being justified freely by his grace"; 2Co 11:7, "I have preached to you the gospel freely," the Revised Version (British and American) "for nought"; Re 21:6; 22:17, "Take the water of life freely"; charizomai (Ro 8:32) is translated "freely give," ta charisthenta (1Co 2:12), "the things that are freely given," the American Standard Revised Version has "were" for "are."

(2) Willingly, spontaneously: nedhabhah, "willing offering" (Ps 54:6, "I will freely sacrifice unto thee," the Revised Version (British and American) "with a freewill-offering"; Ho 14:4, "I will love them freely"); nadhabh, "to give willingly"(Ezr 2:68, the Revised Version (British and American) "willingly offered"; compare 1:6); nedabh Aramaic (7:15; compare 7:13,16).

(3) Without hindrance or restraint, 'akhal, "to eat" is rendered in Ge 2:16, "Thou mayest freely eat," the King James Version margin" Hebrew, eating thou shalt eat"; 1Sa 14:30, "if .... the people had eaten freely"; parrhesiazomai, "to speak freely, openly, boldly" (Ac 26:26, "Unto whom also I speak freely");

meta parrhesias, "with full speech" (Ac 2:29, "I may say unto you freely").

Revised Version has "have drunk freely" for "well drunk" (Joh 2:10). The word is methusko, Pass. "to become drunk." Comparison with Lu 12:45; Eph 5:18; 1Th 5:7; Re 17:2, where the same word is translated the King James Version "made drunk," the Revised Version (British and American) "made drunken" (Mt 24:49; Ac 2:15; 1Co 11:21; Re 17:6, "drunken"), will show that the meaning is "drunk," which was the rendering of Tyndale and Cranmer; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has cum inebriati fuerint; Plummer renders "have become drunk, are drunk."

W. L. Walker

FREEWILL OFFERING

fre'-wil of'-er-ing. See SACRIFICE.

FREEWOMAN

fre'-woom-an (eleuthera): Found but 4 times in the King James Version (Ga 4:22,23,10,31). In the first three passages it refers to Sarah, the freewoman and true wife of Abraham as in contrast with Hagar, the Egyptian slave girl who became his concubine (Ge 16:1). In the last passage a metaphorical application of the term is made to the Christians who are the children of promise, of freedom, of the spirit, the children of the freewoman, in contrast with the Jews who are the children of the letter, of bondage, of the bondwoman.

FREQUENT

fre'-kwent (peris-soteros):

"Frequent," adjective (from Latin frequens, frequentis, "crowded") occurs only once in the text of the King James Version, as the translation of perissoteros, adverb in comparative degree of perissos, "abundantly," hence, "more abundantly" (compare 2Co 1:12); in 2Co 11:23, "in prisons more frequent," the Revised Version (British and American) "more abundantly"; and once in the margin of the King James Version (Pr 27:6) as translation of 'athar, "to be abundant," the Revised Version (British and American) in text, "profuse."

American Revised Version has "frequent" for "open" (1Sa 3:1, "The word of Yahweh was precious (margin, rare) in those days; there was no frequent vision," margin "(Hebrew) widely spread" (the word is parac, "to break forth," "to scatter," etc.). the English Revised Version retains "open," with "frequent, Hebrew widely spread" in the margin. "Frequent" (the verb) does not occur.

W. L. Walker

FRESH

Adj.:

The translation of hadhash, "new," "fresh" (Job 29:20, "My glory is fresh in me"); of leshadh, "sap," "moisture" (Nu 11:8, of the manna, "as the taste of fresh oil," the Revised Version, margin "cakes baked with oil"); of ra‘anan, "to be fresh and green" (Ps 92:10, "fresh oil"); of glukus, "sweet" (Jas 3:12, "salt water and fresh," the Revised Version (British and American) "sweet"). Fresher is the translation of rutaphash, "to become fresh" (Job 33:25; "His flesh shall be fresher than a child’s").

Revised Version has "fresh" for "green" (Ge 30:37; Le 23:14), for "moist" (Nu 6:3), for "full" (Le 2:14; 2Ki 4:42), for "new" (Jud 15:15; Mt 9:17; Mr 2:22; Lu 5:38).

W. L. Walker

FRET, FRETTING

(charah, ma’ar):

To "fret" is from for (prefix) and etan, "to eat," "to consume." The word is both transitive and intransitive in King James Version:

(1) transitive as translation of charah, "to burn," Hithpael, "to fret one’s self," "to be angry" (Ps 37:1, "Fret not thyself because of evil-doers"; Ps 37:7,8; Pr 24:19); of qatsaph, "to be angry," etc. (Isa 8:21, "They shall fret themselves, and curse," etc.); of raghaz, to be moved" (with anger, etc.) (Eze 16:43, "Thou hast fretted me in all these things," the American Standard Revised Version "raged against me"). For Le 13:55, see under Fretting below.

(2) Intransitive, it is the translation of ra‘am, "to rage," Hiphil, "to provoke to anger" (1Sa 1:6, "Her rival provoked her sore, to make her fret"); of za‘aph, "to be sad," "to fret" (Pr 19:3, "His heart fretteth against Yahweh").

Fretting in the sense of eating away, consuming, is used of the leprosy, ma’ar, "to be sharp, bitter, painful" (Le 13:51,52; 14:44, "a fretting leprosy"; in Le 13:55 we have "it (is) fret inward" ("fret" past participle), as the translation of pehetheth from pahath, "to dig" (a pit), the word meaning "a depression," "a hollow or sunken spot in a garment affected by a kind of leprosy," the Revised Version (British and American) "it is a fret."

Revised Version has "fretful" for "angry" (Pr 21:19), margin "vexation."

W. L. Walker

FRIED

frid.

See BREAD, III, 3, (2); FOOD, II; LOCUST.

FRIEND; FRIENDSHIP

frend, frend’-ship: In the Old Testament two words, variously translated "friend" or "companion": re‘eh, indicating a mere associate, passing friend, neighbor, or companion; ‘ahabh, indicating affection natural or unnatural. In the New Testament also two words: hetairos, "a comrade," or "fellow," and philos, suggesting a more affectionate relation.

Literature abounds in concrete examples of friendship of either kind noted above, and of profoundly philosophic as well as sentimental and poetic expositions of the idea of friendship. Notable among these are the Old Testament examples. Abraham, because of the intimacy of his relations, was called "the friend of God" (2Ch 20:7; Isa 41:8; Jas 2:23). "Yahweh spake unto Moses face to face, as a man .... unto his friend" (Ex 33:11). The romantic aspect of the friendship of Ru and Naomi is interesting (Ru 1:16-18). The devotion of Hushai, who is repeatedly referred to as David’s friend (2Sa 15:37; 16:16), is a notable illustration of the affection of a subordinate for his superior. The mutual friendship of David and Jonathan (1Sa 18:1), from which the author is made to say, "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul," is another example. Again in his pathetic lament for Jonathan (2Sa 1:26), David says in highly emotional tones that his love "was wonderful, passing the love of women." Elijah and Elisha form a unique illustration of semiprofessional affection (2Ki 2).

In the New Testament, Jesus and His disciples illustrate the growth of friendship from that of teacher and disciple, lord and servant, to that of friend and friend (Joh 15:13-15). Paul and Timothy are likewise conspicuous (2Ti 1:2).

In general literature we have the classic incident, recorded by Plutarch, of Damon and Pythias during the rule of Dionysius. Pythias, condemned to death, was about to be executed but desired to see his family. Damon offered himself as a ransom in case he should not return in time for the hour of execution. Returning in time, both were released by the great Dionysius, who asked to be taken into the secret of such friendship. The writings on friendship are many. Plato and Cicero have immortalized themselves by their comments. Cicero held dearly the friendship of Scipio, declaring that of all that Nature or Fortune ever gave him there was nothing which could compare with the friendship of Scipio. Bacon, Emerson, Black, Gladden, King, Hillis, and many others in later days have written extensively concerning friendship. The best illustration of the double use of the word (see above) is that in Pr 18:24, "He that maketh many friends doeth it to his own destruction; but there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother." Again, "Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend" (27:17). The honesty and frankness of genuine friends are set forth in the maxim, "Faithful are

the wounds of a friend" (27:6).

Walter G. Clippinger

FRIENDS; CHIEF FRIENDS

(hoi philoi proton): Expressions used in 1 and 2 Macc to designate the favored courtiers of the Antiochi. Mattathias is promised enrollment among the king’s Friends, to tempt him to apostatize (1 Macc 2:18); Alexander Balas writes Jonathan among his Chief Friends (1 Macc 10:65). Compare also 1 Macc 3:38; 6:10,14; 10:60; 11:26,27; 2 Macc 8:9.

FRINGES

frin’-jis (tsitsith, "tassel, lock" (Nu 15:38,39), gedhilim, "twisted threads," "festoons" (De 22:12)): Tassels worn by the Israelites on the four corners of their garments as reminders of "all the commandments of Yahweh," in accordance with the law set out in Nu 15:37-41 and De 22:12. These tassels originally contained a thread of tekheleth, "violet." Jewish tradition, however, has failed to retain the tekheleth, because of doubt as to the exact meaning of the term, and instead dark blue lines were dyed on the borders of the Tallith or garment in which the fringes were placed. According to tradition any garment having four corners required the mnemonic fringes, the importance of which was weighed against "all the commandments of the Lord." In New Testament times such garments were still worn (compare Mt 9:20; 14:36; 23:5). The later Jews, after adopting the garments of the Diaspora, in order to observe the tsitsith commandment began to use two extra four-cornered fringed garments: the large Tallith while at prayer, and the small Tallith, or ‘arba‘ kanephoth, as an undergarment during the day. Their tradition prescribes the exact manner in which each tassel shall be made, and gives a symbolic meaning to the numbers of windings and knots, somewhat after the manner of the string-writing of several early civilizations (compare the Peruvian quipus). Thus in the tsitsith a long cord is wrapped around seven shorter cords first seven times, then eight, then eleven, and finally thirteen, each series being separated from the others by two knots. The numbers seven and eight constituting fifteen together suggest YH, and the number eleven, WH. Together they make up the holy name YaHWeH. The number thirteen stands for echadh, the letters of which taken as numerals equal thirteen. The sentence Yahweh ‘echadh means "Yahweh is one." Many other suggestions, more or less fanciful, have been worked out, all tending to associate the fringes with the Law in the mind of the wearer.

See DRESS.

Ella Davis Isaacs

FROCK

frok (simlah; homolinon): The hempen frock, mentioned in Ecclesiasticus 40:4 as a mark of the lowly,

was a simple garment consisting of a square piece of cloth wrapped around the body. It is the same as the garment (simlah) which we find the poor man using as his only bed covering by night (Ex 22:26 f); the traveler, as the receptacle for his belongings (compare Ex 12:34); and the common people of both sexes as their general outer garments, though there was some difference in appearance between the simlah of the man and that of the woman (De 22:5).

See DRESS.

Ella Davis Isaacs

FROG

(tsephardea‘; compare Arabic dafda‘ (Ex 8:2 ff; Ps 78:45; 105:30); batrachos (Re 16:13)): The references in Psalms, as well as in Exodus, are to the plague of flogs. In Re 16:13 we have, "And I saw coming out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet, three unclean spirits, as it were frogs." The word tsephardea‘ probably referred both to frogs and to toads, as does the Arabic dafda‘. In Palestine and Syria Rana esculenta, Bufo viridis and Hyla arborea are common. According to Mr. Michael J. Nicoll, assistant director of the Zoological Gardens at Gizah, near Cairo, the commonest Egyptian species are Rana mascariensis and Bufo regularis. Rana esculenta, Bufo viridis and Bufo vittatus are also found, but are much less common.

Alfred Ely Day

FRONTIER

fron’-ter, frun’ter (katseh): The word occurs once in plural in Eze 25:9. the Revised Version, margin has "in every quarter."

FRONTLETS

frunt’-lets (ToTaphoth, from Tuph, "to bind"): Ornaments worn on the forehead, particularly phylacteries (which see), which were worn in this manner and also on the arms (Ex 13:16; De 6:8; 11:18; compare also Ex 13:9).

FROST

frost (kephor, "hoar-frost," Ex 16:14; Job 38:29; chanamal, perhaps "the aphis," Ps 78:47; qerach, "cold," Ge 31:40; Job 37:10 the King James Version; Jer 36:30):

1. Formation:

A temperature of freezing or lower is called frost. Dew forms when the temperature is decreased; and if below freezing, the dew takes the form of a white film or covering over rocks and leaves. This white covering is called hoar-frost. Like dew it is the result of condensation of the moisture of the air on objects which radiate their heat quickly. In order that condensation may take place the atmosphere must be saturated. Frost may be expected on clear, still nights when the radiation is sufficient to reduce the temperature below the freezing-point.

In Syria and Palestine frost is a very rare occurrence at sea-level; but on the hills and elevated plains it is usual in winter, beginning with November, and on the highest elevations throughout the year. Late spring frosts in March or early April do great damage to fruit.

2. In Syria and Palestine:

In clear weather there is often a great variation in the temperature of the day and the night, especially on the inland plains, so that literally, as Jacob said to Laban, "In the day the drought consumed me, and the frost by night" (Ge 31:40); "In the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost" (Jer 36:30; compare Jer 22:19), a passage which suggests that Jehoiakim’s corpse was left unburied.

3. In Egypt:

The meaning of chanamal, translated "frost" in Ps 78:47 (see above), "He destroyed .... their sycomore-trees with frost" (m "great hail stones"), is uncertain. "Frost is unknown in Egypt, and Gesenius suggests ‘ants,’ comparing it with Arabic namal" (Temple, BD, S.V.).

4. Figurative Uses:

The manna in the wilderness is compared to hoarfrost. "A small round thing, small as the hoarfrost" (Ex 16:14). Manna is occasionally found in Syria now as a flaky, gelatinous substance formed on bushes and rocks. The elements of Nature are indications of God’s power, and are referred to as signs of His might: "By the breath of God frost is given" (Job 37:10 the King James Version). "The hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?" (Job 38:29); "He destroyed their vines with hail, and their sycamore-trees with frost" (Ps 78:47); "He scattereth the hoar-frost like ashes" (Ps 147:16).

Alfred H. Joy

FROWARDNESS fro’-werd-nes: The translation of tahpukhoth the plural of tahpukhah, "perversity," "foolishness" (from haphakh, "to turn about") in Pr 2:14, "delight in the frowardness of the wicked," the American Standard Revised Version "the perverseness of evil," margin "the evil man" (compare 2:12; some render "deceit"); 6:14 the American Standard Revised Version, "perverseness"; 10:32, "the mouth of the wicked speaketh frowardness," the American Standard Revised Version "speaketh perverseness," margin "is."

FRUIT

froot.

See FOOD; BOTANY, and special articles on APPLE; FIG; VINE, etc.

FRUSTRATE

frus’-trat (parar; atheteo): "Frustrate" (from frustra, "vain") is the translation of parar, "to break," "to make void," "to bring to nothing" (Ezr 4:5), "to frustrate their purpose" (Isa 44:25, "that frustrateth the signs of the liars"); of atheteo, "to displace," "to reject or make void or null": Ga 2:21, "I do not frustrate the grace of God" (by setting up the righteousness which is "through the law"), the Revised Version (British and American) "make void"; compare APC 1Macc 11:36, "Nothing hereof shall be revoked," the Revised Version (British and American) "annulled" (atheteo).

Revised Version has "frustrateth" for "disappointeth" (Job 5:12, parar).

The adjective appears (APC 2Esdras 10:34), "frustrate of my hope" (APC Judith 11:11, "frustrate of his purpose" (apraktos)).

W. L. Walker

FRYING-PAN

fri’-ing-pan.

See BREAD; PAN.

FUEL

fu’-el (’okhlah, or ma’akholeth, "food"): Is mentioned specifically only in the Old Testament, in Isa 9:5,19; Eze 15:4,6; 21:32. Its general, literal meaning in these connections is "food for fire," and might include any sort of combustible material. The common forms of fuel were wood of various sorts (even including thorns, Ps 58:9; 118:12; Ec 7:6), and dried stalks of flowers or grass (Mt 6:30), charred wood as charcoal (Le 16:12; Isa 44:19, and frequently), and dried dung (Eze 4:12,15). There is no certain indication that our coal was known to the Hebrews as fuel, and their houses, being without chimneys, were not constructed for the extensive use of fuel for warmth.

Leonard W. Doolan

FUGITIVE

fu’-ji-tiv (paliT, from palaT, "to escape"; na‘, from nua‘, "to waver"; nophel, from naphal, "to fall"; bariach, beriach and mibhrach, from barach, "to flee"):

One who flees from danger (Isa 15:5; Eze 17:21); escapes from bondage (APC 2Macc 8:35 (as adjective)); deserts from duty (Jud 12:4; 2Ki 25:11 the King James Version; compare APC Judith 16:12 the King James Version), or wanders aimlessly (Ge 4:12,14).

FULFIL

fool-fil’ (male; pleroo, teleo, with other words): "Fulfill" is used

(1) in a sense more or less obsolete, "to fill up," complete (Ge 29:21,28; Ex 23:26; Job 36:17, the Revised Version (British and American) "full," margin "filled up"; Mt 3:15, "to fulfill all righteousness"; Php 2:2, "Fulfil ye my joy," the American Standard Revised Version "make full"; compare 2Co 10:6);

(2) in the sense of "to accomplish," "to carry into effect," as to fulfill the word of Yahweh (1Ki 2:27; 8:15,24; 2Ch 36:21, etc.); in the New Testament very frequently used of the fulfillment of prophetic Scripture (Mt 1:22; 2:15, etc.). Love is declared to be "the fulfillment (pleroma, "fullness") of the law" (Ro 13:10). For "fulfill" the Revised Version (British and American) has "do" (Re 17:17); for "fulfilled" has "performed" (2Sa 14:22), "accomplished" (Ezr 1:1; Mt 5:18; 24:34; Lu 21:32; Joh 19:28), with numerous other changes.

W. L. Walker

FULLER

fool’-er (kabhac; literally, "to trample," gnapheus): The fuller was usually the dyer, since, before the woven cloth could be properly dyed, it must be freed from the oily and gummy substances naturally found on the raw fiber. Many different substances were in ancient times used for cleansing. Among them were white clay, putrid urine, and the ashes of certain desert plants (Arabic qali, Biblical "soap"; Mal 3:2). The fuller’s shop was usually outside the city (2Ki 18:17; Isa 7:3; 36:2), first, that he might have sufficient room to spread out his cloth for drying and sunning, and second, because of the offensive odors sometimes produced by his processes. The Syrian indigo dyer still uses a cleaning process closely allied to that pictured on the Egyptian monuments. The unbleached cotton is soaked in water and then sprinkled with the powdered ashes of the ishnan, locally called qali, and then beaten in heaps on a flat stone either with another stone or with a large wooden paddle. The cloth is washed free from the alkali by small boys treading on it in a running stream or in many changes of clean water (compare En-rogel, literally, "foot fountain," but translated also "fuller’s fountain" because of the fullers’ method of washing their cloth). Mark describes Jesus’ garments at the time of His transfiguration as being whiter than any fuller on earth could whiten them (Mr 9:3).

James A. Patch

FULLER’S FIELD, THE

fool’-ers feld, (sedheh khobhec): In all references occurs "the conduit of the upper pool, in the highway of the fuller’s field"; this must have been a well-known landmark at Jerusalem in the time of the monarchy. Here stood Rabshakeh in his interview with Eliakim and others on the wall (2Ki 18:17; Isa 36:2); clearly the highway was within easy earshot of the walls. Here Isaiah met Ahaz and Shear-jashub his son by command of Yahweh (Isa 7:3). An old view placed these events somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate, as here runs an aqueduct from the Birket Mamilla outside the walls of the Birket Hamam el Batrah, inside the walls; the former was considered the "Upper Pool" and is traditionally called the "Upper Pool" of Gihon. But these pools and this aqueduct are certainly of later date (see JERUSALEM). Another view puts this highway to the North side of the city, where there are extensive remains of a "conduit" running in from the North. In favor of this is the fact that the North was the usual side for attack and the probable position for Rabshakeh to gather his army; it also suits the conditions of Isa 7:3. Further, Josephus (BJ, V, iv, 2) in his description of the walls places a "Monument of the Fuller" at the Northeast corner, and the name "fuller" survived in connection with the North wall to the 7th century, as the pilgrim Arculf mentions a gate. West of the Damascus gate called Porta Villae Fullonis. The most probable view, however, is that this conduit was one connected with Gihon, the present "Virgin’s Fountain" (see GIHON). This was well known as "the upper spring" (2Ch 32:30), and the pool, which, we know, was at the source, would probably be called the "Upper Pool." In this neighborhood—or lower down the valley near En-rogel, which is supposed by some to mean "the spring of the fuller"—is the natural place to expect "fulling." Somewhere along the Kidron valley between the Virgin’s Fountain and the junction with the Tyropeon was the probable scene of the interview with Rabshakeh; the conversation may quite probably have occurred across the valley, the Assyrian general standing on some part of the cliffs now covered by the village of Siloam.

E. W. G. Masterman

FULLER’S FOUNTAIN

See EN-ROGEL.

FULLNESS

fool’-nes: The translation of pleroma, which is generally, but not invariably, rendered "fullness" in the New Testament. Etymologically, pleroma—which itself is derived from the verb pleroo, "I fill"—signifies "that which is or has been filled"; it also means "that which fills or with which a thing is filled"; then it signifies "fullness," "a fulfilling."

1. "Fullness" in the Gospels:

In the Gospels it occurs as follows: Mt 9:16 and Mr 2:21: in both of these passages it means "the fullness," that by which a gap or rent is filled up, when an old garment is repaired by a patch; Mr 6:43, ‘They took up fragments, the fullness of twelve baskets’; 8:20, ‘The fullness of how many baskets of fragments did ye take up?’ Joh 1:16, ‘out of his fullness we all received.’

2. Its Use in the Pauline Epistles:

Elsewhere in the New Testament "fullness" is used by Paul alone, who employs it 12 t, in addition to the frequent use he makes of the verb "to fill." Of these 12, no fewer than 6 are in Ephesians and Colossians. The references are these: Ro 11:12, "If .... their loss (is) the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fullness?" The "fullness" of Israel here refers to their being, as a nation, received by God to a participation in all the benefits of Christ’s salvation. Ro 11:25, "A hardening .... hath befallen Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in." Ro 13:10, "Love .... is the fulfillment (the fulfilling) of the law"; that is, love is not a partial fulfillment, by obedience to this or that commandment, but a complete filling up of what the law enjoins. Ro 15:29, "I shall come in the fullness of the blessing of Christ." 1Co 10:26, "The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof." Ga 4:4, "when the fullness of the time came." The fullness of the time is that portion of time by which the longer antecedent period is completed. Eph 1:10, "unto a dispensation of the fullness of the times." Eph 1:23, "the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all." The church is the fullness of Christ; the body of believers is filled with the presence, power, agency and riches of Christ. Eph 3:19, "that ye may be filled unto all the fullness of God"—that ye may be wholly filled with God and with His presence and power and grace. Eph 4:13, "unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." Col 1:19, "In him should all the fullness dwell." Col 2:9, "In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (compare Lu 2:40,52; 4:1).

3. "Fullness" in Ephesians and Colossians:

"Fullness" in Ephesians and Colossians is used to present some of the most prominent thoughts in these epistles, sometimes referring to Christ, sometimes to the church and the individual Christian. Christ is Himself to "fulfill" all things in heaven and on earth (Eph 4:10 King James Version margin). We cannot separate "the fullness of Christ" in this passage (Eph 4:13) from the statement in Eph 1:23, that the Christ is being fulfilled, and finds His fullness in the church. When all the saints have come to the unity which is their destined goal, or in other words, to the full-grown man, the Christ will have been fulfilled. Thus they will have together reached "the full measure of the maturity of the fullness of the Christ" (J. Armitage Robinson, Commentary on Ephesians, 183). The church and individual believers, have, by faith, the full possession of all that Christ has to impart—the grace and comfort and strength of Christ received by them now. Compare Joh 1:16; ‘In him ye are complete, are made full’ (Col 2:10); that is, the fullness of moral, intellectual and spiritual perfection is communicated by Christ to all who are united to Him. "When as the result of the Holy Spirit’s inward strengthening, Christ dwells in the heart, and His knowledge-surpassing love is known, the only limit to spiritual excellence is ‘to be filled unto all the fullness of God’!"(HDB, 735).

4. Its Use by the False Teachers at Colosse:

In the passages from Col, "the fullness" in Christ is contrasted with the mediating eons or angel-powers or spiritual manifestations supposed to be intermediate between God and the world. The false teachers at Colosse seem to have used "fullness," as a technical or semi-technical term, for the purpose of their philosophical or theosophical teaching, employing it to signify the entire series of angels or eons, which filled the space or interval between a holy God and a world of matter, which was conceived of as essentially and necessarily evil. Teaching of this sort was entirely derogatory to the person and work of Christ. In opposition, therefore, to the Colossian false teaching in regard to "the fullness," Paul shows what the facts really are, that in Christ dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.

5. The Fullness in Christ:

The fullness of the Godhead is the totality of the Divine powers and attributes, all the wealth of the being and of the nature of God—eternal, infinite, unchangeable in existence, in knowledge, in wisdom, in power, in holiness, in goodness, in truth, in love. This is the fullness of the nature of God—life, light, love; and this has its permanent, its settled abode in Christ. All that is His own by right is His by His Father’s good pleasure also. It was the Father’s good pleasure that in Christ should all the fullness dwell.

Any limitation, therefore, of the meaning of "fullness," which would make the indwelling of the fullness of the Godhead in Christ a matter either of the future, or of the past only, is inconsistent with what is said of "the fullness" in Him, in Col 1:19; 2:9. The reference in both passages is to the timeless and eternal communication of the fullness of the Godhead from the Father to the Son.

It was in a sense developed along the lines of the Colossian teaching regarding "the fullness," that the Gnostics afterward used the term.

See GNOSTICISM.

John Rutherfurd

FUNERAL

fu’-ner-al.

See BURIAL.

FURLONG

fur’-long (stadion, "stadium"; Lu 24:13; Joh 6:19; 11:18; Re 14:20; 21:16): A Greek measure of length, being 600 Greek ft., or 100 orguiai equal to 606 3/4 English ft., and thus somewhat less than a furlong,

which is 660 ft.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

FURNACE

fur'-nas: The word is used in the Old Testament English Versions of the Bible to translate several Hebrew words:

Kibhshan, in Ge 19:28, where the smoke of the destruction of the cities of the plain is said to have ascended "as the smoke of a furnace"; in Ex 9:8, where Yahweh commands to take "handfuls of ashes of the furnace and .... sprinkle it toward heaven," etc.

Kur, in De 4:20, where Yahweh is represented, when speaking of taking the children of Israel out of Egypt, as taking them "out of the iron furnace."

'Alil in Ps 12:6, where "the words of Yahweh" are said to be "pure," "as silver tried in a furnace"; compare Pr 17:3, "furnace for gold."

'Attun, in Da 3:6, where mention is made of "a burning fiery furnace" into which Daniel and his companions were cast. There is good reason to believe that these words all stand for either a brick-kiln or a smelting furnace.

In the New Testament a notable figurative use is made of the word in the phrase "the furnace of fire," he kaminos tou puros. It is found in the parable of the Tares (Mt 13:42) as part of the remarkable imagery of that parable; while in the companion parable of the Drag-Net (Mt 13:50) it stands as a symbol of the final destiny of the impenitent, a synonym of "hell"; compare Jer 29:22; Da 3:6,22; Re 20:14-15, etc., and "eternal fire" (Mt 25:41), "unquenchable fire" (Mt 3:12), "the Gehenna of fire" (Mt 5:22 margin; Mt 18:9 parallel Mr 9:43 margin, etc.). A fact which modern travelers speak of, that furnaces for punishment have been found in Persia as elsewhere in the East, sheds some light upon this use of the expression "the furnace of fire."

George B. Eager

FURNACES, TOWER OF THE

(Ne 3:11).

See JERUSALEM.

FURNISH

fur’-nish (male; plethomai):

To "furnish" is to supply with what is useful or necessary, to fit out, provide, equip. It is the translation of several Hebrew or Greek words: of male’," to fill in or up," "to complete" (Isa 65:11 the King James Version); nasa, "to lift up," "to aid" (1Ki 9:11); ‘anaq, Hiphil, probably "to lay on the neck," "to encircle" (with a bracelet) (De 15:14), of a slave set at liberty; ‘arakh, "to arrange in order," "to lay out a table" (Ps 78:19 the King James Version; Pr 9:2); ‘asah keli, "to make a vessel for containing things" (Jer 46:19, "Furnish thyself to go into captivity," the Revised Version, margin "Hebrew, make thee vessels of captivity"); plethomai, "to be filled" (Mt 22:10 the King James Version); stronnumi, "to strew," "to spread" (Mr 14:15; Lu 22:12); exartizo, "to complete fully," to equip" (2Ti 3:17).

In Ecclesiasticus 29:26 we have "furnish a table" (kosmeo); 44:6, "furnished with ability" (choregeo); APC 1Macc 14:34 the King James Version, "He furnished them with all things" (tithemi).

W. L. Walker

FURNITURE

fur’ni-tur (kar, kelim; skeue): In Ge 31:34 kar is translated "furniture" in the King James Version, but "saddle" in the American Standard Revised Version. The latter is decidedly preferable. It was the "camel-basket," or the basket-saddle of the camel, which was a sort of palanquin bound upon the saddle. Upon this saddle-basket Rachel sat with the teraphim hidden beneath, and her wily father did not suspect the presence of his gods in such a place. In other places the word kelim is used, and is generally rendered "vessels," though sometimes "furniture." It may have many other renderings also (see BDB). Ex 31:7; 39:33 mention the furniture of the Tent, which is specified in other places. Moses is instructed (25:9) to make a sanctuary or tabernacle and the furniture thereof according to the pattern showed him in the Mount. The furniture of the Court consisted of the brazen altar and laver (40:29,30); that of the Holy Place, of the table of showbread, the golden lampstand and altar of incense (39:36; 40:22-26; Heb 9:2); that of the Holy of Holies, of the ark and mercy-seat overshadowed by the cherubim. The tribe of Levi was set apart by Yahweh to "keep all the furniture of the tent of meeting" (Nu 3:8). When David organized the tabernacle-worship in Jerusalem and assigned the Levites their separate duties, certain men "were appointed over the furniture, and over all the vessels of the sanctuary" (1Ch 9:29). In Na 2:9 the singular form of the word keli is used, and is rendered "furniture." The prophet refers to the abundant, costly, luxurious furniture and raiment, largely the results of their conquests and plunder in many countries.

In Ac 27:19 the word skeue is translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "tackling," with "furniture" in the Revised Version, margin.

By way of information regarding the general furniture of the house little is said directly in the Scriptures. The chamber built for Elisha upon the wall contained a bed, a table, a seat, and lampstand. This was

doubtless the furnishing of most bedrooms when it could be afforded. The prophet Amos had a supreme contempt for the luxurious furniture of the grandees of Samaria (3:12; 6:4). For full particulars see HOUSE; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

J. J. Reeve

FURROW

fur’-o (telem):

The word is translated "furrows" in Job 39:10; 31:38; Ps 65:10; Ho 10:4; 12:11 (Ps 65:10 the King James Version, "ridges"). In these passages the fields are pictured as they were in the springtime or late autumn. When the showers had softened the earth, the seed was sown and the soil turned over with the plow and left in furrows, not harrowed and pulverized as in our modern farming. The Syrian farmer today follows the custom of his ancient predecessors.

Another word, ma‘anah, occurs in two passages, first in the figurative sense in Ps 129:3, and second in an obscure passage in 1Sa 14:14. Three other words, gedhudhah, ‘arughah, ‘ayin, translated "furrows" in the King James Version, are probably more properly rendered in the American Standard Revised Version "ridges" (Ps 65:10), "beds" (Eze 17:7,10), and "transgressions" (Ho 10:10).

See AGRICULTURE; PLOW.

James A. Patch

FURTHER; FURTHERANCE

fur’-ther, fur’-therans (yacaph; eti, prokope); Further, adverb and adjective, is comparative of "forth," meaning "to a greater distance," "something more," "moreover," etc.; the verb "to further," means "to help forward," "advance," "assist." The verb occurs (Ezr 8:36) as the translation of nasa’," to lift up": "They furthered the people and the house of God" (compare 1Ki 9:11; Ezr 1:4); of puq "to send forth," "carry out" (Ps 140:8, "Further not his evil device").

Furtherance is the translation of prokope, "a going forward," "advance" (Php 1:12, "the furtherance of the gospel," the Revised Version (British and American) "progress" Php 1:25, "for your furtherance and joy," the Revised Version (British and American) "progress").

Furthermore is the translation of eita, "then," "so then" (Heb 12:9); of to loipon, "for the rest," or "as to the rest" (1Th 4:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "finally then").

Revised Version omits "further" (Ac 12:3); has "further" for "more than right" (Job 34:23), for "farther

thence" (Mr 1:19, different text); "What further need have we of witnesses?" for "What need we any further witnesses?" (Mr 14:63); "your fellowship in furtherance of the gospel" (Php 1:5; 2:22); "to the furthest bound" for "all perfection" (Job 28:3).

W. L. Walker

FURY

fu’-ri (alastor, "not to forget," "significant of revenge"):

Occurs only in APC 2Macc 7:9 the King James Version, "Thou like a fury (the Revised Version (British and American) "Thou, miscreant") takest us out of this present life."

See also WRATH; FIERCENESS; ANGER.

FUTURE

fu’-tur, fu’-chur.

See ESCHATOLOGY.

GAAL

ga’-al (ga‘al, "rejection," or "loathing"; according to Wellhausen, "beetle," HPN, 110): A man of whose antecedents nothing is known, except that his father’s name was Ebed. He undertook to foment and lead a rebellion on the part of the inhabitants of Shechem against Abimelech, son of Gideon, and his rebellion failed (Jud 9:26-45).

See also ABIMELECH.

GAASH

ga’-ash (ga‘-ash): First mentioned in connection with the burial place of Joshua "in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in the hill-country of Ephraim, on the north (side) of the mountain of Gaash" (Jos 24:30; compare Jud 2:9); see TIMNATH-HERES. The "brooks," or rather the wadies or "watercourses" of Gaash are mentioned as the native place of Hiddai (2Sa 23:30), or Hurai (1Ch 11:32), one of David’s heroes. No likely identification has been suggested.

See EPHRAIM, MOUNT.

GABA

ga’-ba (gabha’ (in pause)).

See GEBA.

GABAEL

gab’-a-el (Gabael; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) "Gabelus"):

(1) An ancestor of Tobit (APC Tobit 1:1).

(2) A poor Jew of Rages, a city of Media, to whom Tobit lent ten talents of silver (APC TOBIT 1:14). The money was restored to Tobit in the time of his distress through his son Tobias, whom the angel Raphael led to Gabael at Rages (APC TOBIT 1:14; 4:1,20; 5:6; 6:9; 10:2).

GABATHA

gab’-a-tha (Gabatha): A eunuch of Mardocheus (Additions to Esther 10:1).

GABBAI

gab’-a-i (gabbay, "collector"): One of the chiefs of the Benjamites in Jerusalem after the return from the Babylonian captivity (Ne 11:8).

GABBATHA

gab’-a-tha: Given (Joh 19:13) as the name of a special pavement (to lithostroton), and is probably a transcription in Greek of the Aramaic gabhetha’, meaning "height" or "ridge."

Tradition which now locates the Pretorium at the Antonia and associates the triple Roman arch near there with the "Ecce Homo" scene, naturally identifies an extensive area of massive Roman pavement, with blocks 4 ft. x 3 1/2 ft. and 2 ft. thick, near the "Ecce Homo Arch," as the Gabbatha.

This paved area is in places roughened for a roadway, and in other places is marked with incised designs for Roman games of chance. The site is a lofty one, the ground falling away rapidly to the East and West, and it must have been close to, or perhaps included in, the Antonia. But apart from the fact that it is quite improbable that the Pretorium was here (see PRAETORIUM), it is almost certain that the lithostroton was a mosaic pavement (compare Es 1:6), such as was very common in those days, and the site is irretrievably lost.

E. W. G. Masterman

GABBE

gab’-e (Gabbe; the King James Version Gabdes (APC 1Esdras 5:20)):

Called Geba in Ezr 2:26.

GABRIAS

ga’-bri-as (Gabrias): Brother of GABAEL (which see).

In APC Tobit 4:20 he is described as his father. The readings are uncertain.

GABRIEL

ga’-bri-el (gabhri’-el, "Man of God"; Gabriel):

The name of the angel commissioned to explain to Daniel the vision of the ram and the he-goat, and to give the prediction of the 70 weeks (Da 8:16; 9:21).

In the New Testament he is the angel of the annunciation to Zacharias of the birth of John the Baptist, and to Mary of the birth of Jesus (Lu 1:19,26).

Though commonly spoken of as an archangel, he is not so called in Scripture. He appears in the Book of Enoch (chapters 9, 20, 40) as one of 4 (or 6) chief angels. He is "set over all powers," presents, with the others, the cry of departed souls for vengeance, is "set over the serpents, and over Paradise, and over the cherubim." He is prominent in the Jewish Targums, etc.

See ANGEL.

James Orr

GAD (1)

(gadh, "fortune"; Gad):

1. The Name:

The seventh son of Jacob, whose mother was Zilpah (Ge 30:11), and whose birth was welcomed by Leah with the cry, "Fortunate!" Some have sought to connect the name with that of the heathen deity Gad, of which traces are found in Baal-gad, Migdal-gad, etc. In the blessing of Jacob (Ge 49:19) there is a play upon the name, as if it meant "troop," or "marauding band." "Gad, a troop shall press upon him; but he shall press upon their heel" (Hebrew gadh, gedhudh, yeghudhennu, wehu yaghudh ‘aqebh). Here there is doubtless a reference to the high spirit and valor that characterized the descendants of Gad. The enemy who attacked them exposed himself to grave peril. In the blessing of Moses again (De 33:20) it is said that Gad "dwelleth as lioness, and teareth the arm, yea, the crown of the head." Leonine qualities are ascribed to the Gadites, mighty men of valor, who joined David (1Ch 12:8,14). Their "faces were like the faces of lions, and they were as swift as the roes upon the mountain." Among their captains "he that was least was equal to a hundred, and the greatest to a thousand."

2. The Tribe:

Of the patriarch Gad almost nothing is recorded. Seven sons went down with him into Egypt, when Jacob accepted Joseph s invitation (Ge 46:16). At the beginning of the desert march Gad numbered 45,650 "from twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war" (Nu 1:24). In the plains of Moab the number had fallen to 40,500 (Nu 26:18). The place of Gad was with the standard of the camp of Reuben on the South side of the tabernacle (Nu 2:14). The prince of the tribe was Eliasaph, son of Deuel (Nu 1:14), or Reuel (Nu 2:14). Among the spies Gad was represented by Geuel son of Machi

(Nu 13:15).

See NUMBERS.

3. The Tribal Territory:

From time immemorial the dwellers East of the Jordan have followed the pastoral life. When Moses had completed the conquest of these lands, the spacious uplands, with their wide pastures, attracted the great flock-masters of Reuben and Gad. In response to their appeal Moses assigned them their tribal portions here: only on condition, however, that their men of war should go over with their brethren, and take their share alike in the hardship and in the glory of the conquest of Western Palestine (Nu 32). When the victorious campaigns of Joshua were completed, the warriors of Reuben and Gad returned to their possessions in the East. They halted, however, in the Jordan valley to build the mighty altar of Ed. They feared lest the gorge of the Jordan should in time become all too effective a barrier between them and their brethren on the West. This altar should be for all time a "witness" to their unity in race and faith (Jos 22). The building of the altar was at first misunderstood by the western tribes, but the explanation given entirely satisfied them.

4. Boundaries:

It is impossible to indicate with any certainty the boundaries of the territory of Gad. Reuben lay on the South, and the half-tribe of Manasseh on the North. These three occupied the whole of Eastern Palestine. The South border of Gad is given as the Arnon in Nu 32:34; but six cities to the North of the Arnon are assigned in 32:16 ff to Reuben. Again, Jos 13:26 makes Wady Chesban the southern boundary of Gad. Mesha, however (MS), says that the men of Gad dwelt in Ataroth from old time. This is far South of Wady Chesban. The writer of Nu 32 may have regarded the Jabbok as the northern frontier of Gad; but Jos 13:27 extends it to the Sea of Chinnereth, making the Jordan the western boundary. It included Rabbath-ammon in the East. We have not now the information necessary to explain this apparent confusion. There can be no doubt that, as a consequence of strifes with neighboring peoples, the boundaries were often changed (1Ch 5:18 f). For the Biblical writers the center of interest was in Western Palestine, and the details given regarding the eastern tribes are very meager. We may take it, however, that, roughly, the land of Gilead fell to the tribe of Gad. In Jud 5:17 Gilead appears where we should naturally expect Gad, for which it seems to stand. The city of refuge, Ramoth in Gilead, was in the territory of Gad (Jos 20:8). For description of the country see GILEAD.

5. History:

Reuben and Gad were absent from the muster against Sisera (Jud 5:15); but they united with their brethren in taking vengeance on Benjamin, Jabesh-gilead, from which no contingent was sent, being destroyed (20 f). Jephthah is probably to be reckoned to this tribe, his house, Mizpah (Jud 11:34), being apparently within its territory (Jos 13:26). Gad furnished a refuge for some of the Hebrews during the Philistine oppression (1Sa 13:7). To David, while he avoided Saul at Ziklag, certain Gadites attached

themselves (1Ch 12:8). A company of them also joined in making him king at Hebron (1Ch 12:38). In Gad the adherents of the house of Saul gathered round Ish-bosheth (2Sa 2:8). Hither David came in his flight from Absalom (2Sa 17:24). Gad fell to Jeroboam at the disruption of the kingdom, and Penuel, apparently within its borders, Jeroboam fortified at first (1Ki 12:25). It appears from the Moabite Stone that part of the territory afterward passed into the hands of Moab. Under Omri this was recovered; but Moab again asserted its supremacy. Elijah probably belonged to this district; and the brook Cherith must be sought in one of its wild secluded glens.

Gad formed the main theater of the long struggle between Israel and the Syrians. At Ramoth-gilead Ahab received his death wound (1Ki 22). Under Jeroboam II, this country was once more an integral part of the land of Israel. In 734 BC, however, Tiglath-pileser appeared, and conquered all Eastern Palestine, carrying its inhabitants captive (2Ki 15:29; 1Ch 5:26). This seems to have furnished occasion for the children of Ammon to occupy the country (Jer 49:1). In Ezekiel’s ideal picture (Eze 48:27,34), a place is found for the tribe of Gad. Obadiah seems to have forgotten the tribe, and their territory is assigned to Benjamin (1:19). Gad, however, has his place among the tribes of Israel in Re 7.

W. Ewing

GAD (2)

(gadh, "fortunate"): David’s seer (chozeh, 1Ch 21:9; 29:29; 2Ch 29:25), or prophet (nabhi’; compare 1Sa 22:5; 2Sa 24:11). He appears

(1) to advise David while an outlaw fleeing before Saul to return to the land of Judah (1Sa 22:5);

(2) to rebuke David and give him his choice of punishments when, in spite of the advice of Joab and the traditional objections (compare Ex 30:11 ff), he had counted the children of Israel (2Sa 24:11; 1Ch 21:9);

(3) to instruct David to erect an altar on the threshing-floor of Araunah when the plague that had descended on Israel ceased (2Sa 24:18; 1Ch 21:18); and

(4) to assist in the arrangement of Levitical music with cymbals, psalteries and harps (compare 2Ch 29:25).

Of his writings none are known, though he is said to have written a history of a part of David’s reign (1Ch 29:29).

Ella Davis Isaacs

GAD (3)

(gadh, "fortune"): A god of Good Luck, possibly the Hyades. The writer in Isa 65:11 (margin) pronounces a curse against such as are lured away to idolatry. The warning here, according to Cheyne, is specifically against the Samaritans, whom with their religion the Jews held in especial abhorrence. The charge would, however, apply just as well to superstitious and semi-pagan Jews. "But ye that forsake Yahweh, that forget my holy mountain, that prepare a table for Fortune, and that fill up mingled wine unto Destiny; I will destine you to the sword, and ye shall all bow down to the slaughter." There is a play upon words here: "Fill up mingled wine unto Destiny" (meni) and "I will destine manithi, i.e. portion out) you for the sword" (Isa 65:11,12). Gad and Meni mentioned here are two Syrian-deities (Cheyne, Book of the Prophet Isaiah, 198). Schurer (Gesch. d. jud. Volkes, II, 34 note, and bibliography) disputes the reference of the Greek (Tuche) cult to the Semitic Gad, tracing it rather to the Syrian "Astarte" worship. The custom was quite common among heathen peoples of spreading before the gods tables laden with food (compare Herod. i. 181, 183; Smith, Rel. of Semites, Lect X).

Nothing is known of a Babylonian deity named Gad, but there are Aramean and Arabic equivalents. The origin may have been a personification of fortune and destiny, i.e. equivalent to the Fates. The Nabatean inscriptions give, in plural, form, the name of Meni. Achimenidean coins (Persian) are thought by some to bear the name of Meni. How widely spread these Syrian cults became, may be seen in a number of ways, e.g. an altar from Vaison in Southern France bearing an inscription:

"Belus Fortunae rector, Menisque Magister."

Belus, signifying the Syrian Bel of Apamaea (Driver). Canaanitish place-names also attest the prevalence of the cult, as Baal-gad, at the foot of Hermen (Jos 11:17; 12:7; 13:5); Migdal-gad, possibly Mejdel near Askalon (Jos 15:37); Gaddi and Gaddiel (Nu 13:10 f). In Talmudic literature the name of Gad is frequently invoked (compare McCurdy in Jewish Encyclopedia, V, 544). Indeed the words of Leah in Ge 30:11 may refer not to good fortune or luck but to the deity who was especially regarded as the patron god of Good Fortune (compare Kent, Student’s Old Testament, I, 111). Similar beliefs were held among the Greeks and Romans, e.g. Hor. Sat. ii.8, 61:

".... Fortuna, quis est crudelior in nos te deus?"

Cic. N.D. iii.24, 61:

"Quo in genere vel maxime est Fortuna numeranda."

The question has also an astronomical interest. Arabic tradition styled the planet Jupiter the greater fortune, and Venus the lesser fortune. Jewish tradition identified Gad with the planet Jupiter, and it has been conjectured that Meni is to be identified with the planet Venus.

See, however, ASTROLOGY, 10.

W. N. Stearns

GAD (4)

(’azal, "to go about"): Used once in Jer 2:36, "Why gaddest thou about so much to change thy way?" of going after Egypt and Assyria.

GAD, VALLEY OF

(nachal ha-gadh; the King James Version River of Gad):

In 2Sa 24:5 we read that Joab and the captains of the host passed over Jordan and pitched in Aroer, on the right side of the city that is in the midst of the valley of Gad.

If we refer to Jos 13:25 f, this might seem to indicate a valley near Rabbath-ammon. According to a generally accepted emendation suggested by Wellhausen, however, we should read, "They began from Aroer, and from the city that is in the middle of the torrent valley, toward Gad."

See AR. The valley is evidently the Arnon. W. Ewing

GADARA

gad’-a-ra (Gadara):

1. Country of the Gadarenes:

This city is not named in Scripture, but the territory belonging to it is spoken of as chora ton Gadarenon, "country of the Gadarenes" (Mt 8:28). In the parallel passages (Mr 5:1; Lu 8:26,37) we read: chora ton Gerasenon "country of the Gerasenes." There is no good reason, however, to question the accuracy of the text in either case. The city of Gadara is represented today by the ruins of Umm Qeis on the heights south of el-Chummeh—the hot springs in the Yarmuk valley—about 6 miles Southeast of the Sea of Galilee. It maybe taken as certain that the jurisdiction of Gadara, as the chief city in these regions, extended over the country East of the Sea, including the lands of the subordinate town, GERASA (which see). The figure of a ship frequently appears on its coins: conclusive. proof that its territory reached the sea. The place might therefore be called with propriety, either "land of the Gerasenes," with reference to the local center, or "land of the Gadarenes," with reference to the superior city.

(NOTE.—The Textus Receptus of the New Testament reading. ton Gergesenon, "of the Gergesenes," must be rejected (Westcott-Hort, II. App., 11).)

2. History:

The name Gadara appears to be Semitic It is still heard in Jedur, which attaches to the ancient rock tombs, with sarcophagi, to the East of the present ruins. They are closed by carved stone doors, and are used as storehouses for grain, and also as dwellings by the inhabitants. The place is not mentioned till later times. It was taken by Antiochus the Great when in 218 BC he first invaded Palestine (Polyb. v.71). Alexander Janneus invested the place, and reduced it after a ten months' siege (Ant., XIII, iii, 3; BJ, I, iv, 2). Pompey is said to have restored it, 63 BC (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; BJ, I, vii, 7); from which it would appear to have declined in Jewish hands. He gave it a free constitution. From this date the era of the city was reckoned. It was the seat of one of the councils instituted by Gabinius for the government of the Jews (Ant., XIV, v, 4; BJ, I, viii, 5). It was given by Augustus to Herod the Great in 30 BC (Ant., XV, vii, 3; BJ, I, xx, 3). The emperor would not listen to the accusations of the inhabitants against Herod for oppressive conduct (Ant., XV, x, 2 f). After Herod's death it was joined to the province of Syria, 4 BC (Ant., XVII, xi, 4; BJ, II, vi, 3). At the beginning of the Jewish revolt the country around Gadara was laid waste (BJ, II, xviii, 1). The Gadarenes captured some of the boldest of the Jews, of whom several were put to death, and others imprisoned (ibid., 5). A party in the city surrendered it to Vespasian, who placed a garrison there (BJ, IV, vii, 3). It continued to be a great and important city, and was long the seat of a bishop (Reland, Palestine, 776). With the conquest of the Moslems it passed under eclipse, and is now an utter ruin.

3. Identification and Description:

Umm Cheis answers the description given of Gadara by ancient writers. It was a strong fortress (Ant., XIII, iii, 3), near the Hieromax—i.e. Yarmuk (Pliny N H, xvi)—East of Tiberias and Scythopolis, on the top of a hill, 3 Roman miles from hot springs and baths called Amatha, on the bank of the Hieromax (Onomasticon, under the word). The narrow ridge on which the ruins lie runs out toward the Jordan from the uplands of Gilead, with the deep gorge of Wady Yarmuk—Hieromax—on the North, and Wady el ‘Arab on the South. The hot springs, as noted above, are in the bottom of the valley to the North. The ridge sinks gradually to the East, and falls steeply on the other three sides, so that the position was one of great strength. The ancient walls may be traced in almost their entire circuit of 2 miles. One of the great Roman roads ran eastward to Der‘ah; and an aqueduct has been traced to the pool of el Khab, about 20 miles to the North of Der‘ah. The ruins include those of two theaters, a basilica, a temple, and many important buildings, telling of a once great and splendid city. A paved street, with double colonnade, ran from East to West. The ruts worn in the pavement by the chariot wheels are still to be seen.

That there was a second Gadara seems certain, and it may be intended in some of the passages referred to above. It is probably represented by the modern Jedur, not far from es-Salt (Buhl, Buhl, Geographic des alten Palastina, 255; Guthe). Josephus gives Pella as the northern boundary of Peraea (BJ, III, iii, 3). This would exclude Gadara on the Hieromax. The southern city, therefore, should be understood as "the capital of Peraea" in BJ, IV; vii, 3.

Gadara was a member of the DECAPOLIS (which see).

W. Ewing

GADARENES

gad-a-renz’. See preceding article.

GADDI

gad’-i (gaddi, "my fortune"):

One of the twelve spies, son of Susi, and a chief of Manasseh (Nu 13:11).

GADDIEL

gad’-i-el (gaddi’el, "blest of God"):

One of the twelve men sent by Moses from the wilderness of Paran to spy out the land of Canaan. He represented the tribe of Zebulun (Nu 13:10).

GADDIS

gad’-is (A Gaddis; Kaddis; the King James Version Caddis):

Surname of John, the eldest brother of Judas Maccabeus (APC 1Macc 2:2).

GADI

ga’-di (gadhi, "fortunate"):

The father of Menahem, one of the kings of Israel who reached the throne through blood (2Ki 15:14,17).

GADITES

gad’-its:

Members of the tribe of Gad (De 3:12, etc.).

GAHAM

ga’-ham (gacham):

A son of Nahor, brother of Abraham, by his concubine Reumah (Ge 22:24).

GAHAR

ga’-har (gachar):

A family name of the Nethinim who came up with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem (Ezr 2:47; Ne 7:49); in APC 1Esdras 5:30 called Geddur.

GAI

ga’-i (gay’):

In the Revised Version (British and American) of 1Sa 17:52 for the King James Version "valleys." the Revised Version, margin notes: "The Syriac and some editions of the Septuagint have Gath" (thus also Wellhausen, Budde, Driver, etc.).

GAIN

gan: In the Old Testament the translation of three Hebrew substantives, betsa‘, "unjust gain," "any gain" (Jud 5:19; Job 22:3; Pr 1:19; 15:27; Isa 33:15; 56:11; Eze 22:13,17; Mic 4:13); mechir, "price" for which a thing is sold (Da 11:39, the only place where the Hebrew word is translated "gain" in the King James Version, though it occurs in other places translated "price"); tebhu’ah, "produce," "profits," "fruit" (Pr 3:14). It is the translation of one Hebrew verb, batsa‘, "to gain dishonestly" (Job 27:8); of one Aramaic verb, zebhan, "to buy," "procure for oneself" (Da 2:8, here used of buying time, i.e. "seeking delay" (Gesenius)).

In the New Testament, the translation of three Greek substantives, ergasia, "gain gotten by work," "profit" (Ac 16:16,19; 19:24 (the King James Version)); kerdos, "gain," "advantage" (Php 2:1; 3:7, in the former, Paul asserting that to him to die was a personal advantage, because then he would "be with Christ"; in the latter, he counts as "loss" his personal privileges in the flesh, when compared with "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ"); porismos, "gain," "a source of gain" (1Ti 6:5,6, where the apostle asserts, not "gain" (earthly) is godliness, but godliness is "gain" (real, abiding)).

It is the translation of three Greek vbs., kerdaino, "to gain," "acquire," in Mt 16:26, where Jesus teaches that the soul, or life in its highest sense ("his own self," Lu 9:25), is worth more than the "gaining" of the whole (material) world; Mt 18:15, concerning the winning of a sinning brother by private interview; Mt 25:17,22, the parable of the Talents; Ac 27:21 the King James Version, injury "gained," sustained, by sailing from Crete; 1Co 9:19,20 bis, 21,22, all referring to Paul’s life-principle of accommodation to others to "gain," win, them to Christ; in Jas 4:13 used in a commercial sense; poieo, "to make," "make

gain" (Lu 19:18 the King James Version, the parable of the Pounds); prosergazomai, "to gain by trading" (Lu 19:16, commercial use, in the same parallel).

Charles B. Williams

GAINSAY

gan-sa, gan'-sa (anteipon, antilego, "to say or speak against"): Occurs as anteipon, "not .... able to withstand or to gainsay" (Lu 21:15); as antilego, "a disobedient and gainsaying people" (Ro 10:21); APC 2Esdras 5:29, contradicebant; APC Judith 8:28, anthistemi; APC Judith 12:14, antero; Additions to Esther 9:13, antitasso; APC 1Macc 14:44, anteipon.

Gainsayer, antilego (Tit 1:9, "exhort and convince (the Revised Version (British and American) "convict") the gainsayers").

Gainsaying, antilogia (Jude 1:11, "the gain-saying of Korah"); antilogia is Septuagint for meribhah (Nu 20:13); anantirrhetos, "without contradiction" (Ac 10:29, "without gainsaying").

The Revised Version (British and American) has "gainsaid" for "spoken against" (Ac 19:36); "not gainsaying" for "not answering again" (Tit 2:9); "gainsaying" for "contradiction" Heb 12:3).

W. L. Walker

GAIUS

ga'-yus (Gaios; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Gaios):

(1) The Gaius to whom 3 Joh is addressed. He is spoken of as "the beloved" (3 Joh 1:1,2,5,11), "walking in the truth" (3 Joh 1:3,4), and doing "a faithful work" "toward them that are brethren and strangers withal" (3 Joh 1:5,6). He has been identified by some with the Gaius mentioned in the Apostolical Constitutions (VII, 46), as having been appointed bishop of Pergamum by John.

(2) Gaius of Macedonia, a "companion in travel" of Paul (Ac 19:29). He was one of those who were seized by Demetrius and the other silversmiths in the riot at Ephesus, during Paul's third missionary journey.

(3) Gaius of Derbe, who was among those who accompanied Paul from Greece "as far as Asia," during his third missionary journey (Ac 20:4). In the corresponding list given in the "Contendings of Paul" (compare Budge, Contendings of the Twelve Apostles, II, 592), the name of this Gaius is given as "Gallius."

(4) Gaius, the host of Paul when he wrote the Epistle to the Roman, and who joined in sending his salutations (Ro 16:23). As Paul wrote this epistle from Corinth, it is probable that this Gaius is identical with (5).

(5) Gaius, whom Paul baptized at Corinth (1Co 1:14).

C. M. Kerr

GALAAD

gal'-a-ad (Galaad, Greek form of Gilead (APC 1Macc 5:9,55; Judith 1:8)).

GALAL

ga'-lal (galal):

The name of two Levites, one mentioned in 1Ch 9:15, the other in 1Ch 9:16 and Ne 11:17.

GALATIA

ga-la'-shi-a, ga-la'-sha (Galatia):

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Two Senses of Name

(1) Geographical

(2) Political

2. Questions to Be Answered

II. ORIGIN OF NAME

1. The Gaulish Kingdom

2. Transference to Rome

3. The Roman Province

III. THE NARRATIVE OF LUKE

1. Stages of Evangelization of Province

2. The Churches Mentioned

IV. PAUL'S USE OF "GALATIANS"

I. Introductory.

1. Two Senses of Name:

"Galatia" was a name used in two different senses during the 1st century after Christ:

(1) Geographical

To designate a country in the north part of the central plateau of Asia Minor, touching Paphlagonia and Bithynia North, Phrygia West and South, Cappadocia and Pontus Southeast and East, about the headwaters of the Sangarios and the middle course of the Halys;

(2) Political

To designate a large province of the Roman empire, including not merely the country Galatia, but also Paphlagonia and parts of Pontus, Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia and Isauria. The name occurs in 1Co 16:1; Ga 1:2; 1Pe 1:1, and perhaps 2Ti 4:10. Some writers assume that Galatia is also mentioned in Ac 16:6; 18:23; but the Greek there has the phrase "Galatic region" or "territory," though the English Versions of the Bible has "Galatia"; and it must not be assumed without proof that "Galatic region" is synonymous with "Galatia." If e.g. a modern narrative mentioned that a traveler crossed British territory, we know that this means something quite different from crossing Britain. "Galatic region" has a different connotation from "Galatia"; and, even if we should find that geographically it was equivalent, the writer had some reason for using that special form.

2. Questions to Be Answered:

The questions that have to be answered are: (a) In which of the two senses is "Galatia" used by Paul and Peter? (b) What did Luke mean by Galatic region or territory? These questions have not merely geographical import; they bear most closely, and exercise determining influence, on many points in the biography, chronology, missionary work and methods of Paul.

II. Origin of the Name "Galatia."

1. The Gaulish Kingdom:

The name was introduced into Asia after 278-277 BC, when a large body of migrating Gauls (Galatai in Greek) crossed over from Europe at the invitation of Nikomedes, king of Bithynia; after ravaging a great part of Western Asia Minor they were gradually confined to a district, and boundaries were fixed for them after 232 BC. Thus, originated the independent state of Galatia, inhabited by three Gaulish tribes, Tolistobogioi, Tektosages and Trokmoi, with three city-centers, Pessinus, Ankyra and Tavia (Tavion in Strabo), who had brought their wives and families with them, and therefore continued to be a distinct Gaulish race and stock (which would have been impossible if they had come as simple warriors who took wives from the conquered inhabitants). The Gaulish language was apparently imposed on all the old inhabitants, who remained in the country as an inferior caste. The Galatai soon adopted the country religion, alongside of their own; the latter they retained at least as late as the 2nd century after Christ, but it was politically important for them to maintain and exercise the powers of the old priesthood, as at Pessinus, where the Galatai shared the office with the old priestly families.

2. Transference to Rome:

The Galatian state of the Three Tribes lasted till 25 BC, governed first by a council and by tetrarchs, or chiefs of the twelve divisions (four to each tribe) of the people, then, after 63 BC, by three kings. Of these, Deiotaros succeeded in establishing himself as sole king, by murdering the two other tribal kings; and after his death in 40 BC his power passed to Castor and then to Amyntas, 36-25 BC. Amyntas bequeathed his kingdom to Rome; and it was made a Roman province (Dion Cass. 48, 33, 5; Strabo, 567, omits Castor). Amyntas had ruled also parts of Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycaonia and Isauria. The new province included these parts, and to it were added Paphlagonia 6 BC, part of Pontus 2 BC (called Pontus Galaticus in distinction from Eastern Pontus, which was governed by King Polemon and styled Polemoniacus), and in 64 also Pontus Polemoniacus. Part of Lycaonia was non-Roman and was governed by King Antiochus; from 41 to 72 AD Laranda belonged to this district, which was distinguished as Antiochiana regio from the Roman region Lycaonia called Galatica.

3. The Roman Province:

This large province was divided into regiones for administrative purposes; and the regiones coincided roughly with the old national divisions Pisidia, Phrygia (including Antioch, Iconium, Apollonia), Lycaonia (including Derbe, Lystra and a district organized on the village-system), etc. See Calder in Journal of Roman Studies, 1912. This province was called by the Romans Galatia, as being the kingdom of Amyntas (just like the province Asia, which also consisted of a number of different countries as diverse and alien as those of province Galatia, and was so called because the Romans popularly and loosely spoke of the kings of that congeries of countries as kings of Asia). The extent of both names, Asia and Galatia, in Roman language, varied with the varying bounds of each province. The name "Galatia" is used to indicate the province, as it was at the moment, by Ptolemy, Pliny v.146, Tacitus Hist. ii.9; Ann. xiii. 35; later chroniclers, Syncellus, Eutropius, and Hist. Aug. Max. et Balb. 7 (who derived it from earlier authorities, and used it in the old sense, not the sense customary in their own

time); and in inscriptions CIL, III, 254, 272 (Eph. Ep. v.51); VI, 1408, 1409, 332; VIII, 11028 (Mommsen rightly, not Schmidt), 18270, etc. It will be observed that these are almost all Roman sources, and (as we shall see) express a purely Roman view. If Paul used the name "Galatia" to indicate the province, this would show that he consistently and naturally took a Roman view, used names in a Roman connotation, and grouped his churches according to Roman provincial divisions; but that is characteristic of the apostle, who looked forward from Asia to Rome (Ac 19:21), aimed at imperial conquest and marched across the Empire from province to province (Macedonia, Achaia, Asia are always provinces to Paul). On the other hand, in the East and the Greco-Asiatic world, the tendency was to speak of the province either as the Galatic Eparchia (as at Iconium in 54 AD, CIG, 3991), or by enumeration of its regiones (or a selection of the regiones). The latter method is followed in a number of inscriptions found in the province (CIL, III, passim). Now let us apply these contemporary facts to the interpretation of the narrative of Luke.

III. The Narrative of Luke.

1. Stages of Evangelization of Province:

The evangelization of the province began in Ac 13:14. The stages are:

(1) the audience in the synagogue, Ac 13:42 f;

(2) almost the whole city, 13:44;

(3) the whole region, i.e. a large district which was affected from the capital (as the whole of Asia was affected from Ephesus 19:10);

(4) Iconium another city of this region: in 13:51 no boundary is mentioned;

(5) a new region Lycaonia with two cities and surrounding district (14:6);

(6) return journey to organize the churches in (a) Lystra, (b) Iconium and Antioch (the secondary reading of Westcott and Hort, (kai eis Ikonion kai Antiocheleian), is right, distinguishing the two regions (a) Lycaonia, (b) that of Iconium and Antioch);

(7) progress across the region Pisidia, where no churches were founded (Pisidian Antioch is not in this region, which lies between Antioch and Pamphylia).

Again (in Ac 16:1-6) Paul revisited the two regiones:

(1) Derbe and Lystra, i.e. regio Lycaonia Galatica,

(2) the Phrygian and Galatic region, i.e. the region which was racially Phrygian and politically Galatic. Paul traversed both regions, making no new churches but only strengthening the existing disciples and churches. In Ac 18:23 he again revisited the two regiones, and they are briefly enumerated:

(1) the Galatic region (so called briefly by a traveler, who had just traversed Antiochiana and distinguished Galatica from it);

(2) Phrygia. On this occasion he specially appealed, not to churches as in 16:6, but to disciples; it was a final visit and intended to reach personally every individual, before Paul went away to Rome and the West. On this occasion the contribution to the poor of Jerusalem was instituted, and the proceeds later were carried by Timothy and Gaius of Derbe (Ac 20:4; 24:17; 1Co 16:1); this was a device to bind the new churches to the original center of the faith.

2. The Churches Mentioned:

These four churches are mentioned by Luke always as belonging to two regiones, Phrygia and Lycaoma; and each region is in one case described as Galatic, i.e. part of the province Galatia. Luke did not follow the Roman custom, as Paul did; he kept the custom of the Greeks and Asiatic peoples, and styled the province by enumerating its regiones, using the expression Galatic (as in Pontus Galaticus and at Iconium, CIG, 3991) to indicate the supreme unity of the province. By using this adjective about both regiones he marked his point of view that all four churches are included in the provincial unity.

From Paul’s references we gather that he regarded the churches of Galatia as one group, converted together (Ga 4:13), exposed to the same influences and changing together (Ga 1:6,8; 3:1; 4:9), naturally visited at one time by a traveler (Ga 1:8; 4:14). He never thinks of churches of Phrygia or of Lycaonia; only of province Galatia (as of provinces Asia, Macedonia, Achaia). Paul did not include in one class all the churches of one journey: he went direct from Macedonia to Athens and Corinth, but classes the churches of Macedonia separate from those of Achaia. Troas and Laodicea and Colosse he classed with Asia (as Luke did Troas Ac 20:4), Philippi with Macedonia, Corinth with Achaia. These classifications are true only of the Roman usage, not of early Greek usage. The custom of classifying according to provinces, universal in the fully formed church of the Christian age, was derived from the usage of the apostles (as Theodore Mopsuestia expressly asserts in his Commentary on First Timothy (Swete, II, 121); Harnack accepts this part of the statement (Verbreitung, 2nd edition, I, 387; Expansion, II, 96)). His churches then belonged to the four provinces, Asia, Galatia, Achaia, Macedonia. There were no other Pauline churches; all united in the gift of money which was carried to Jerusalem (Ac 20:4; 24:17).

IV. Paul’s Use of "Galatians."

The people of the province of Galatia, consisting of many diverse races, when summed up together, were called Galatai, by Tacitus, Ann. xv.6; Syncellus, when he says (Augoustos Galatais phorous etheto), follows an older historian describing the imposing of taxes on the province; and an inscription of Apollonia Phrygiae calls the people of the city Galatae (Lebas-Waddington, 1192). If Paul spoke to

Philippi or Corinth or Antioch singly, he addressed them as Philippians, Corinthians, Antiochians (Php 4:15; 2Co 6:11), not as Macedonians or Achaians; but when he had to address a group of several churches (as Antioch, Iconium, Derbe and Lystra) he could use only the provincial unity, Galatae.

All attempts to find in Paul's letter to the Galatians any allusions that specially suit the character of the Gauls or Galatae have failed. The Gauls were an aristocracy in a land which they had conquered. They clung stubbornly to their own Celtic religion long after the time of Paul, even though they also acknowledged the power of the old goddess of the country. They spoke their own Celtic tongue. They were proud, even boastful, and independent. They kept their native law under the Empire. The "Galatians" to whom Paul wrote had Changed very quickly to a new form of religion, not from fickleness, but from a certain proneness to a more oriental form of religion which exacted of them more sacrifice of a ritual type. They needed to be called to freedom; they were submissive rather than arrogant. They spoke Greek. They were accustomed to the Greco-Asiatic law: the law of adoption and inheritance which Paul mentions in his letter is not Roman, but Greco-Asiatic, which in these departments was similar, with some differences; on this see the writer's Historical Commentary on Galatians.

W. M. Ramsay

GALATIANS

ga-la'-shanz. See preceding article.

GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE

I. THE AUTHORSHIP

1. Position of the Dutch School

2. Early Testimony

II. THE MATTER OF THE EPISTLE

A) Summary of Contents

1. Outline

2. Personal History (Galatians 1:11-2:21; 4:12-20; 6:17)

Paul's Independent Apostleship

3. The Doctrinal Polemic (Galatians 3:1-5:12)

(1) Thesis

(2) Main Argument

(3) Appeal and Warning

4. The Ethical Application (Galatians 5:12-6:10)

Law of the Spirit of Life

5. The Epilogue (Galatians 6:11-18)

B) Salient Points

1. The Principles at Stake

2. Present Stage of the Controversy

3. Paul’s Depreciation of the Law

4. The Personal Question

C) Characteristics

1. Idiosyncrasy of the Epistle

2. Jewish Coloring

III. RELATIONS TO OTHER EPISTLES

1. Galatians and Romans

2. Links with 1 and 2 Corinthians

3. With the Corinthians-Romans Group

4. With Other Groups of Epistles

5. General Comparison

IV. THE DESTINATION AND DATE

1. Place and Time Interdependent

2. Internal Evidence

3. External Data

(1) Galatia and the Galatians

(2) Prima facie Sense of Ac 16:6

(3) The Grammar of Ac 16:6

(4) Notes of Time in the Epistle

(5) Paul’s Renewed Struggle with Legalism (6) Ephesus or Corinth?

(7) Paul’s First Coming to Galatia

(8) Barnabas and the Galatians

(9) The Two Antiochs

(10) Wider Bearings of the Problem

LITERATURE

When and to whom, precisely, this letter was written, it is difficult to say; its authorship and purpose are unmistakable. One might conceive it addressed by the apostle Paul, in its main tenor, to almost any church of his Gentilemission attracted to Judaism, at any point within the years circa 45-60 AD. Some plausibly argue that it was the earliest, others place it among the later, of the Pauline Epistles. This consideration dictates the order of our inquiry, which proceeds from the plainer to the more involved and disputable parts of the subject.

I. The Authorship.

1. Position of the Dutch School:

The Tubingen criticism of the last century recognized the four major epistles of Paul as fully authentic,

and made them the corner-stone of its construction of New Testament history. Only Bruno Bauer (Kritik. d. paulin. Briefe, 1850-52) attacked them in this sense, while several other critics accused them of serious interpolations; but these attempts made little impression. Subsequently, a group of Dutch scholars, beginning with Loman in his Quaestiones Paulinae (1882) and represented by Van Manen in the Encyclopedia Biblica (art. "Paul"), have denied all the canonical epistles to the genuine Paul. They postulate a gradual development in New Testament ideas covering the first century and a half after Christ, and treat the existing letters as "catholic adaptations" of fragmentary pieces from the apostle's hand, produced by a school of "Paulinists" who carried their master's principles far beyond his own intentions. On this theory, Galatians, with its advanced polemic against the law, approaching the position of Marcion (140 AD), was work of the early 2nd century. Edwin Johnson in England (Antiqua Mater, 1887), and Steck in Germany (Galaterbrief, 1888), are the only considerable scholars outside of Holland who have adopted this hypothesis; it is rejected by critics so radical as Scholten and Schmiedel (see the article of the latter on "Galatians" in EB). Knowling has searchingly examined the position of the Dutch school in his Witness of the Epistles (1892)—it is altogether too arbitrary and uncontrolled by historical fact to be entertained; see Julicher's or Zahn's Introduction to New Testament (English translation), to the same effect. Attempts to dismember this writing, and to appropriate it for other hands and later times than those of the apostle Paul, are idle in view of its vital coherence and the passionate force with which the author's personality has stamped itself upon his work; the Paulinum pectus speaks in every line. The two contentions on which the letter turns—concerning Paul's apostleship, and the circumcision of GentileChristians—belonged to the apostle's lifetime: in the fifth and sixth decades these were burning questions; by the 2nd century the church had left them far behind.

2. Early Testimony:

Early Christianity gives clear and ample testimony to this document. Marcion placed it at the head of his Apostolikon (140 AD); Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Melito, quoted it about the same time. It is echoed by Ignatius (Philad., i) and Polycarp (Philip., iii and v) a generation earlier, and seems to have been used by contemporary Gnostic teachers. It stands in line with the other epistles of Paul in the oldest Latin, Syriac and Egyptian translations, and in the Muratorian (Roman) Canon of the 2nd century. It comes full into view as an integral part of the new Scripture in Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and Tertullian at the close of this period. No breath of suspicion as to the authorship, integrity or apostolic authority of the Ep. to the Ga has reached us from ancient times.

II. Matter of the Epistle.

A) Summary of Contents:

1. Outline:

A double note of war sounds in the address and greeting (Ga 1:1,4). Astonishment replaces the customary thanksgiving (Ga 1:6-10): The Galatians are listening to preachers of "another gospel" (1:6,7) and traducers of the apostle (1:8,10), whom he declares "anathema." Paul has therefore two objects in

writing—to vindicate himself, and to clear and reinforce his doctrine. The first he pursues from 1:11 to 2:21; the second from 3:1 to 5:12. Appropriate: moral exhortations follow in 5:13-6:10. The closing paragraph (6:11-17) resumes incisively the purport of the letter. Personal, argumentative, and hortatory matter interchange with the freedom natural in a letter to old friends.

2. Personal History (Galatians 1:11-2:21 (4:12-20; 6:17)):

Paul’s Independent Apostleship.

Paul asserts himself for his gospel’s sake, by showing that his commission was God-given and complete (Ga 1:11,12). On four decisive moments in his course he dwells for this purpose—as regards the second manifestly (Ga 1:20), as to others probably, in correction of misstatements:

(1) A thorough-paced Judaist and persecutor (Ga 1:13,14), Paul was supernaturally converted to Christ (Ga 1:15), and received at conversion his charge for the Gentiles, about which he consulted no one (Ga 1:16,17).

(2) Three years later he "made acquaintance with Cephas" in Jerusalem and saw James besides, but no "other of the apostles" (Ga 1:18,19). For long he was known only by report to "the churches of Judea" (Ga 1:21-24).

(3) At the end of "fourteen years" he "went up to Jerusalem," with Barnabas, to confer about the "liberty" of Gentilebelievers, which was endangered by "false brethren" (Ga 2:1-5). Instead of supporting the demand for the circumcision of the "Greek" Titus (Ga 2:3), the "pillars" there recognized the sufficiency and completeness of Paul’s "gospel of the uncircumcision" and the validity of his apostleship (Ga 2:6-8). They gave "right hands of fellowship" to himself and Barnabas on this understanding (Ga 2:9,10). The freedom of GentileChristianity was secured, and Paul had not "run in vain."

(4) At Antioch, however, Paul and Cephas differed (Ga 2:11). Cephas was induced to withdraw from the common church-table, and carried "the rest of the Jews," including Barnabas, with him (Ga 2:12,13). "The truth of the gospel," with Cephas’ own sincerity, was compromised by this "separation," which in effect "compelled the Gentiles to Judaize" (Ga 2:13,14). Paul therefore reproved Cephas publicly in the speech reproduced by Ga 2:14-21, the report of which clearly states the evangelical position and the ruinous consequences (2:18,21) of reestablishing "the law."

3. Doctrinal Polemic (Galatians 3:1-5:12):

(1) Thesis.

The doctrinal polemic was rehearsed in the autobiography (Ga 2:3-5,11-12). In Ga 2:16 is laid down thesis of the epistle: "A man is not justified by the works of law but through faith in Jesus Christ." This

proposition is (a) demonstrated from experience and history in 3:1-4:7; then (b) enforced by 4:8-5:12.

(2) Main Argument.

(a1) From his own experience (Ga 2:19-21) Paul passes to that of the readers, who are "bewitched" to forget "Christ crucified" (Ga 3:1)! Had their life in "the Spirit" come through "works of the law" or the "hearing of faith"? Will the flesh consummate what the Spirit began (Ga 3:2-5)?

(a2) Abraham, they are told, is the father of God's people; but 'the men of faith' are Abraham's true heirs (Ga 3:6-9). "The law" curses every transgressor; Scripture promised righteousness through faith for the very reason that justification by legal "doing" is impossible (Ga 3:10,12). "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law" in dying the death it declared "accursed" (Ga 3:13). Thus He conveyed to the nations "the promise of the Spirit," pledged to them through believing Abraham (Ga 3:7,14).

(a3) The "testament" God gave to "Abraham and his seed" (a single "seed," observe) is unalterable. The Mosaic law, enacted 430 years later, could not nullify this instrument (Ga 3:15-17 the King James Version). Nullified it wound have been, had its fulfillment turned on legal performance instead of Divine "grace" (Ga 3:18).

(a4) "Why then the law?" Sin required it, pending the accomplishment of "the promise." Its promulgation through intermediaries marks its inferiority (Ga 3:19,20). With no power 'to give life,' it served the part of a jailer guarding us till "faith came," of "the paedagogus" training us 'for Christ' (Ga 3:21-25).

(a5) But now "in Christ," Jew and Greek alike, "ye are all sons of God through faith"; being such, "you are Abraham's seed" and 'heirs in terms of the promise' (Ga 3:26-29). The 'infant' heirs, in tutelage, were 'subject to the elements of the world,' until "God sent forth his Son," placed in the like condition, to "redeem" them (Ga 4:1-5). Today the "cry" of "the Spirit of his Son" in your "hearts" proves this redemption accomplished (Ga 4:6,7).

The demonstration is complete; Ga 3:1-4:7 forms the core of the epistle. The growth of the Christian consciousness has been traced from its germ in Abraham to its flower in the church of all nations. The Mosaic law formed a disciplinary interlude in the process, which has been all along a life of faith. Paul concludes where he began (3:2), by claiming the Spirit as witness to the full salvation of the Gentiles; compare Ro 8:1-27; 2Co 3:4-18; Eph 1:13,14. From Ga 4:8 onward to 5:12, the argument is pressed home by appeal, illustration and warning.

(3) Appeal and Warning.

(b1) After "knowing God," would the Galatians return to the bondage in which ignorantly they served as gods "the elements" of Nature? (4:8,9). Their adoption of Jewish "seasons" points to this backsliding (4:10,11).

(b2) Paul’s anxiety prompts the entreaty of 4:12-20, in which he recalls his fervent reception by his readers, deplores their present alienation, and confesses his perplexity.

(b3) Observe that Abraham had two sons—"after the flesh" and "through promise" (4:21-23); those who want to be under law are choosing the part of Ishmael: "Hagar" stands for ‘the present Jerusalem’ in her bondage; ‘the Jerusalem above is free—she is our mother!’ (4:24-28,31). The fate of Hagar and Ishmael pictures the issue of legal subjection (4:29,30): "Stand fast therefore" (5:1). (b4) The crucial moment comes at 5:2: the Galatians are half-persuaded (5:7,8); they will fatally commit themselves, if they consent to ‘be circumcised.’ This will sever them from Christ, and bind them to complete observance of Moses’ law: law or grace—by one or the other they must stand (5:3-5). "Circumcision, uncircumcision"—these "count for nothing in Christ Jesus" (5:6). Paul will not believe in the defection of those who ‘ran’ so "well"; "judgment" will fall on their ‘disturber’ (5:7-10,12). Persecution marks himself as no circumcisionist (5:11)!

4. The Ethical Application (Galatians 5:13-6:10):

Law of the Spirit of Life

The ethical application is contained in the phrase of Ro 8:2, "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus."

(1) Love guards Christian liberty from license; it ‘fulfills the whole law in a single word’ (Ga 5:13-15).

(2) The Spirit, who imparts freedom, guides the free man’s "walk." Flesh and spirit are, opposing principles: deliverance from "the flesh" and its "works" is found in possession by "the Spirit," who bears in those He rules His proper "fruit." ‘Crucified with Christ’ and ‘living in the Spirit,’ the Christian man keeps God’s law without bondage under it (Ga 5:16-26).

(3) In cases of unwary fall, ‘men of the Spirit’ will know how to "restore" the lapsed, ‘fulfilling Christ’s law’ and mindful of their own weakness (Ga 6:1-5).

(4) Teachers have a peculiar claim on the taught; to ignore this is to ‘mock God.’ Men will "reap corruption" or "eternal life," as in such matters they ‘sow to the flesh’ or ‘to the Spirit.’ Be patient till the harvest! (Ga 6:6-10).

5. The Epilogue (Galatians 6:11-18):

The autograph conclusion (Ga 6:11) exposes the sinister motive of the circumcisionists, who are ashamed of the cross, the Christian’s only boast (Ga 6:12-15). Such men are none of "the Israel of God!" (Ga 6:16). "The brand of Jesus" is now on Paul’s body; at their peril "henceforth" will men trouble him! (Ga 6:17). The benediction follows (Ga 6:18).

B) Salient Points:

1. The Principles at Stake:

The postscript reveals the inwardness of the legalists' agitation. They advocated circumcision from policy more than from conviction, hoping to conciliate Judaism and atone for accepting the Nazarene—to hide the shame of the cross—by capturing for the Law the Gentilechurches. They attack Paul because he stands in the way of this attempt. Their policy is treason; it surrenders to the world that cross of Christ, to which the world for its salvation must unconditionally submit. The grace of God the one source of salvation Ga (1:3; 2:21; 5:4), the cross of Christ its sole ground (1:4; 2:19-21; 3:13; 6:14), faith in the Good News its all-sufficient means (2:16,20; 3:2,5-9,23-26; 5:5), the Spirit its effectuating power (3:2-5; 4:6,7; 5:5,16-25; 6:8)—hence, emancipation from the Jewish law, and the full status of sons of God open to the Gentiles (2:4,5,15-19; 3:10-14; 3:28-4:9,26-31; 5:18; 6:15): these connected principles are at stake in the contention; they make up the doctrine of the epistle.

2. Present Stage of the Controversy:

Circumcision is now proposed by the Judaists as a supplement to faith in Christ, as the qualification for sonship to Abraham and communion with the apostolic church (Ga 3:7,29). After the Council at Jerusalem, they no longer say outright, "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Ac 15:1). Paul's Galatian converts, they admit, "have begun in the Spirit"; they bid them "be perfected" and attain the full Christian status by conforming to Moses—"Christ will profit" them much more, if they add to their faith circumcision (Ga 3:3; 5:2; compare Ro 3:1). This insidious proposal might seem to be in keeping with the findings of the Council; Peter's action at Antioch lent color to it. Such a grading of the Circumcision and Uncircumcision within the church offered a tempting solution of the legalist controversy; for it appeared to reconcile the universal destination of the gospel with the inalienable prerogatives of the sons of Abraham. Paul's reply is, that believing Gentiles are already Abraham's "seed"—nay, sons and heirs of God; instead of adding anything, circumcision would rob them of everything they have won in Christ; instead of going on to perfection by its aid, they would draw back unto perdition.

3. Paul's Depreciation of the Law:

Paul carries the war into the enemies' camp, when he argues,

(a) that the law of Moses brought condemnation, not blessing, on its subjects (Ga 3:10-24); and

(b) that instead of completing the work of faith, its part in the Divine economy was subordinate (Ga 3:19-25).

It was a temporary provision, due to man's sinful unripeness for the original covenant (Ga 3:19,24; 4:4). The Spirit of sonship, now manifested in the Gentiles, is the infallible sign that the promise made to

mankind in Abraham has been fulfilled. The whole position of the legalists is undermined by the use the apostle makes of the Abrahamic covenant.

4. The Personal Question:

The religious and the personal questions of the epistle are bound up together; this Ga 5:2 clearly indicates. The latter naturally emerges first (1:1,11 ff). Paul's authority must be overthrown, if his disciples are to be Judaized. Hence, the campaign of detraction against him (compare 2Co 10-12). The line of defense indicates the nature of the attack. Paul was said to be a second-hand, second-rate apostle, whose knowledge of Christ and title to preach Him came from Cephas and the mother church. In proof of this, an account was given of his career, which he corrects in Ga 1:13-2:21. "Cephas" was held up (compare 1Co 1:12) as the chief of the apostles, whose primacy Paul had repeatedly acknowledged; and "the pillars" at Jerusalem were quoted as maintainers of Mosaic rule and authorities for the additions to be made to Paul's imperfect gospel. Paul himself, it was insinuated, "preaches circumcision" where it suits him; he is a plausible time-server (Ga 1:10; 5:11; compare Ac 16:3; 1Co 9:19-21). The apostle's object in his self-defense is not to sketch his own life, nor in particular to recount his visits to Jerusalem, but to prove his independent apostleship and his consistent maintenance of Gentilerights. He states, therefore, what really happened on the critical occasions of his contact with Peter and the Jerusalem church. To begin with, he received his gospel and apostolic office from Jesus Christ directly, and apart from Peter (Ga 1:13-20); he was subsequently recognized by "the pillars" as apostle, on equality with Peter (Ga 2:6-9); he had finally vindicated his doctrine when it was assailed, in spite of Peter (Ga 2:11-12). The adjustment of Paul's recollections with Luke's narrative is a matter of dispute, in regard both to the conference of Ga 2:1-10 and the encounter of 2:11-21; to these points we shall return, iv.3 (4), (5).

C) Characteristics:

1. Idiosyncrasy of the Epistle:

This is a letter of expostulation. Passion and argument are blended in it. Hot indignation and righteous scorn (Ga 1:7-9; 4:17; 5:10,12; 6:12,13), tender, wounded affection (Ga 4:11-20), deep sincerity and manly integrity united with the loftiest consciousness of spiritual authority (Ga 1:10-12,20; 2:4-6,14; 5:2; 6:17), above all a consuming devotion to the person and cross of the Redeemer, fill these few pages with an incomparable wealth and glow of Christian emotion. The power of mind the epistle exhibits matches its largeness of heart. Roman indeed carries out the argument with greater breadth and theoretic completeness; but Ga excels in pungency, incisiveness, and debating force. The style is that of Paul at the summit of his powers. Its spiritual elevation, its vigor and resource, its subtlety and irony, poignancy and pathos, the vis vivida that animates the whole, have made this letter a classic of religious controversy. The blemishes of Paul's composition, which contribute to his mastery of effect, are conspicuous here—his abrupt turns and apostrophes, and sometimes difficult ellipses (Ga 2:4-10,20; 4:16-20; 5:13), awkward parentheses and entangled periods (Ga 2:1-10,18; 3:16,20; 4:25), and outburst of excessive vehemence (Ga 1:8,9; 5:12).

2. Jewish Coloring:

The anti-legalist polemic gives a special Old Testament coloring to the epistle; the apostle meets his adversaries on their own ground. In Ga 3:16,19-20; 4:21-31, we have examples of the rabbinical exegesis Paul had learned from his Jewish masters. These texts should be read in part as argumenta ad hominem; however peculiar in form such Pauline passages may be, they always contain sound reasoning.

III. Relations to Other Epistles.

(1) The connection of Galatians with Romans is patent; it is not sufficiently understood how pervasive that connection is and into what manifold detail it extends. The similarity of doctrine and doctrinal vocabulary manifest in Ga 2:13-6:16 and Ro 1:16-8:39 is accounted for by the Judaistic controversy on which Paul was engaged for so long, and by the fact that this discussion touched the heart of his gospel and raised questions in regard to which his mind was made up from the beginning (1:15,16), on which he would therefore always express himself in much the same way. Broadly speaking, the difference is that Romans is didactic and abstract, where Galatians is personal and polemical; that the former presents, a measured and rounded development of conceptions projected rapidly in the latter under the stress of controversy. The emphasis lies in Romans on justification by faith; in Galatians on the freedom of the Christian man. The contrast of tone is symptomatic of a calmer mood in the writer—the lull which follows the storm; it suits the different address of the two epistles.

1. Galatians and Romans:

Besides the correspondence of purport, there is a verbal resemblance to Romans pervading the tissue of Galatians, and traceable in its mannerisms and incidental expressions. Outside of the identical quotations, we find more than 40 Greek locutions, some of them rare in the language, common to these two and occurring in these only of Paul’s epistles—including the words rendered "bear" (Ro 11:18 and Ga 5:10, etc.); "blessing" or "gratulation" (makarismos), "divisions" (Ro 16:17; Ga 5:20); "fail" or "fall from" (ekpipto); "labor on" or "upon" (of persons), "passions" (pathemata, in this sense); "set free" or "deliver" (eleutheroo); "shut up" or "conclude," and "shut out" or "exclude"; "travail (together)," and such phrases as "die to" (with dative), "hearing of faith," "if possible," "put on (the Lord Jesus) Christ," "those who do such things," "what saith the Scripture?" "where then?" (rhetorical), "why any longer?" The list would be greatly extended by adding expressions distinctive of this pair of letters that occur sporadically elsewhere in Paul. The kinship of Galatians-Romans in vocabulary and vein of expression resembles that existing between Colossians-Ephesians or 1 and 2 Thessalonians; it is twice as strong proportionately as that of 1 and 2 Corinthians. Not only the same current of thought, but with it, much the same stream of language was running through Paul’s mind in writing these two epistles.

The association of Galatians with the two Corinthian letters, though less intimate than that of Galatians-Romans, is unmistakable.

2. Links with 1 and 2 Corinthians:

We count 23 distinct locations shared by 2 Corinthians alone (in its 13 chapters) with Galatians, and 20 such shared with 1 Corinthians (16 chapters)—a larger proportion for the former. Among the Galatians-1 Corinthians peculiarities are the sayings, "A little leaven," etc., "circumcision is nothing," etc., and the phrases, "be not deceived," "it is manifest" (delon as predicate to a sentence), "known by God," "profit nothing" and "to be something," "scandal of the cross," "the spiritual" (of persons), "they that are Christ's (of Christ Jesus)." Peculiar to Ga through 2Co are "another gospel" and "false brethren," "brings into bondage," "devour" and "zealously seek" or "am jealous over" (of persons); "a new creation," "confirm" or "ratify" (kuroo); "I am perplexed," the antithesis of "sowing" and "reaping" (figuratively); the phrase "on the contrary" or "contrariwise" (t'ounantion), etc. The conception of the "two covenants" (or "testaments") is conspicuous in both epistles (Ga 3:17-21; 4:21-31; 2Co 3:8-18), and does not recur in Paul; in each case the ideas of "law" (or "letter"), "bondage," "death," are associated with the one, diatheke, of "spirit," "freedom," "life," with the other. Ga 3:13 ("Christ .... made a curse for us") is matched by 2Co 5:21 ("made sin for us"); in Ga 2:19 and 6:14 we find Paul "crucified to the world" in the cross of his Master and "Christ" alone "living in" him; in 2Co 5:14,15 this experience becomes a universal law for Christians; and where in Ga 6:17 the apostle appears as 'from hence-forth .... bearing in' his 'body the brand of Jesus,' in 2Co 4:10 he is "always bearing about in" his "body the dying of Jesus."

These identical or closely congruous trains of thought and turns of phrase, varied and dominant as they are, speak for some near connection between the two writings. By its list of vices in Ga 5:19,20 Galatians curiously, and somewhat intricately, links itself at once with 2 Corinthians and Roman (see 2Co 12:20; Ro 13:13; 16:17). Galatians is allied by argument and doctrine with Romans, and by temper and sentiment with 2 Corinthians. The storm of feeling agitating our epistle blows from the same quarter, reaches the same height, and engages the same emotions with those which animate 2 Corinthians 10-13.

3. With the Corinthians-Romans Group:

If we add to the 43 locutions confined in the Pauline Epistles to Galatians-Romans the 23 such of Galatians-2 Corinthians, the 20 of Galatians-1 Corinthians, the 14 that range over Galatians- Romans-2 Corinthians, the 15 of Galatians-Romans-1 Corinthians, the 7 of Galatians-1-2 Corinthians, and the 11 running through all four, we get a total of 133 words or phrases (apart from Old Testament quotations) specific to Galatians in common with one or more of the Corinthians-Romans group—an average, that is, of close upon 3 for each chapter of those other epistles.

With the other groups of Pauline letters Galatians is associated by ties less numerous and strong, yet marked enough to suggest, in conjunction with the general style, a common authorship.

4. With Other Groups of Epistles:

The proportion of locutions peculiar to Ga and the 3rd group (Colossians-Philemon-Ephesians-Philippians) is 1 to each of their 15 chapters. The more noticeable of these are in Galatians- Colossians: "elements of the world," and the maxim, "There is no Jew nor Greek," etc., associated with the "putting on of Christ" ("the new man"); "fullness of the time" (or "seasons") and "householders of faith (of God)," also "Christ loved me (the church) and gave up himself for me (her)," in Galatians-Ephesians; "he that supplieth (your supplying of, epichoregia) the Spirit," and "vain-glory" (kenodoxia), in Galatians-Philippians; "redeem" (exagorazo) and "inheritance" are peculiar to Ga with Colossians-Ephesians together; the association of the believer's "inheritance" with "the Spirit" in Galatians-Ephesians is a significant point of doctrinal identity.

The Thessalonians and Timothy-Titus (1st and 4th) groups are outliers in relation to Galatians, judged by vocabulary. There is little to associate our epistle with either of these combinations, apart from pervasive Corinthians-Romans phrases and the Pauline complexion. There are 5 such expressions registered for the 8 chapters of 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 7 for the 13 of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus—just over one to two chapters for each group. While the verbal coincidences in these two cases are, proportionately, but one-half so many as those connecting Galatians with the 3rd group of epistles and one-fifth or one-sixth of those linking it to the 2nd group, they are also less characteristic; the most striking is the contrast of "well-doing" (kalopoieo) with "fainting" or "wearying" (egkakeo) in Ga 6:9 and 2Th 3:13.

5. General Comparison:

No other writing of Paul reflects the whole man so fully as this—his spiritual, emotional, intellectual, practical, and even physical, idiosyncrasy. We see less of the apostle's tenderness, but more of his strength than in Philippians; less of his inner, mystic experiences, more of the critical turns of his career; less of his "fears," more of his "fightings," than in 2 Corinthians. While the 2nd letter to Timothy lifts the curtain from the closing stage of the apostle's ministry, Ga throws a powerful light upon its beginning. The Pauline theology opens to us its heart in this document. The apostle's message of deliverance from sin through faith in the crucified Redeemer, and of the new life in the Spirit growing from this root, lives and speaks; we see it in Galatians as a working and fighting theology, while in Romans it peacefully expands into an ordered system. The immediately saving truth of Christianity, the gospel of the Gospel, finds its most trenchant utterance in this epistle; here we learn "the word of the cross" as Paul received it from the living Saviour, and defended it at the crisis of his work.

IV. The Destination and Date.

1. Place and Time Interdependent:

The question of the people to whom, is bound up with that of the time at which, the Epistle to the Galatians was written. Each goes to determine the other. The expression "the first time" (to proteron) of Ga 4:13 presumes Paul to have been twice with the readers previously—for the first occasion, see 4:13-15; for the second, 1:9; 5:3. The explanation of Round (Date of the Epistle to Galatians, 1906), that the

apostle intended to distinguish his first arrival at the several (South) Galatian cities from his return in the course of the same journey (Ac 14:21-23), cannot be accepted: Derbe, the limit of the expedition, received Paul and Barnabas but once on that round, and in retracing their steps the missionaries were completing an interrupted work, whereas Ga 4:13 implies a second, distinct visitation of the churches concerned as a whole; in Ac 15:36 Paul looks back to the journey of Ac 13:14-14:26 as one event.

Now the apostle revisited the South Galatian churches in starting on the 2nd missionary tour (Ac 16:1-5). Consequently, if his "Galatians" were Christians of Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe (the South Galatian hypothesis), the letter was written in the further course of the 2nd tour—from Macedonia or Corinth about the time of 1 and 2Th (so Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, I, English translation), or from Antioch in the interval between the 2nd and 3rd journeys (so Ramsay); for on this latter journey (Ac 18:23) Paul (ex hyp.) traversed ‘the (South) Galatian country’ a third time. On the other hand, if they were people of Galatia proper, i.e. of North (Old) Galatia, the epistle cannot be earlier than the occasion of Ac 18:23, when Paul touched a second time "the Galatian country," which, on this supposition, he had evangelized in traveling from South Galatia to Troas during the previous tour (Ac 16:6-8). On the North Galatian hypothesis, the letter was dispatched from Ephesus during Paul’s long residence there (Ac 19; so most interpreters, ancient and modern), in which case it heads the 2nd group of the epistles; or later, from Macedonia or Corinth, and shortly before the writing of the Epistle to the Romans (thus Lightfoot, Salmon, A. L. Williams and others).

Per contra, the earlier date, if proved independently, carries with it the South Galatian, the later date the North Galatian theory. The subscription of the Textus Receptus of the New Testament "written from Rome," rests on inferior manuscript authority and late Patristic tradition. Clemen, with no suggestion as to place of origin, assigns to the writing a date subsequent to the termination of the 3rd missionary tour (55 or 57 AD), inasmuch as the epistle reflects the controversy about the Law, which in Romans is comparatively mild, at an acute, and, therefore (he supposes), an advanced stage.

2. Internal Evidence:

Lightfoot (chapter iii of Introduction to Commentary) placed Galatians in the 2nd group of the epistles between 2 Corinthians and Romans, upon considerations drawn from "the style and character" of the epistle. His argument might be strengthened by a detailed linguistic analysis (see III, 1-3, above). The more minutely one compares Galatians with Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, the more these four are seen to form a continuous web, the product of the same experience in the writer’s mind and the same situation in the church. This presumption, based on internal evidence, must be tested by examination of the topographical and chronological data.

3. External Data:

(1) Galatia and the Galatians.

The double sense of these terms obtaining in current use has been shown in the article on GALATIA;

Steinmann sets out the evidence at large in his essay on Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes, 61-76 (1908); see also A. L. Williams' Introduction to Galatians in Cambr. Greek Test. (1910). Roman authors of the period in using these expressions commonly thought of provincial Galatia (NOTE: Schurer seems to be right, however, in maintaining that "Galatia" was only the abbreviated designation for the province, named a parte potiori, and that in more formal description it was styled "Galatia, Pisidia, Phrygia," etc.) which then embraced in addition to Galatia proper a large tract of Southern Phrygia and Lycaonia, reaching from Pisidian Antioch in the west to Derbe in the east; but writers of Asia Minor leaned to the older local and national usage, according to which "Galatia" signified the north-central highlands of the peninsula, on both sides of the river Halys, in which the invading Galatae had settled long before this time. (On their history see the previous article) It is asserted that Paul strictly followed the official, as against the popular, usus loquendi in these matters—a questionable dictum (see A. L. Williams, op. cit., xix, xx, or Steinmann's Leserkreis, 78-104), in view of Ga 1:21,22 (note the Greek double article), to go no farther. There was nothing in Paul's Roman citizenship to make him a precisian in a point like this. Ramsay has proved that all four cities of Ac 13:14-14:23 were by this time included in provincial Galatia. Their inhabitants might therefore, officially, be styled "Galatians" (Galatae); it does not follow that this was a fit or likely compilation for Paul to use. Julicher says this would have been a piece of "bad taste" on his part. The attachment of the southern districts (Phrygian, Pisidian, Lycaonian) to Galatia was recent—Derbe had been annexed so late as the year 41—and artificial. Supposing that their Roman "colonial" rank made the designation "Galatians" agreeable to citizens of Antioch or Lystra, there was little in it to appeal to Iconians or Derbeans (compare Schmiedel, in EB, col. 1604).

(2) Prima Facie Sense of Ac 16:6.

The "Galatian country" (Galatike chora) is mentioned by Luke, with careful repetition, in Ac 16:6 and 18:23. Luke at any rate was not tied to imperial usage; he distinguishes "Phrygia" from "Asia" in Ac 2:9,10, although Phrygia was administratively parceled out between Asia and Galatia. When therefore "Asia" is opposed in 16:6 to "the Phrygian and Galatian country" (or "Phrygia and Galatian country," Zahn), we presume that the three terms of locality bear alike a non-official sense, so that the "Galatian country" means Old Galatia (or some part of it) lying to the Northeast, as "Asia" means the narrower Asia west of "Phrygia." On this presumption we understand that Paul and Silas, after completing their visitation of "the cities" of the former tour (Ac 16:4,5; compare Ac 15:36, in conjunction with Ac 13:14-14:23), since they were forbidden to proceed westward and "speak the word in Asia," turned their faces to the region—first Phrygian, then Galatian—that stretched northward into new territory, through which they traveled toward "Mysia" and "Bithynia" (Ac 16:7). Thus Ac 16:6 fills in the space between the South Galatia covered by 16:4 and 5, and the Mysian-Bithynian border where we find the travelers in 16:7. Upon this, the ordinary construction of Luke's somewhat involved sentence, North Galatia was entered by Paul on his 2nd tour; he retraversed, more completely, "the Galatian region" at the commencement of the 3rd tour, when he found "disciples" there (Ac 18:23) whom he had gathered on the previous visit.

(3) The Grammar of Ac 16:6.

In the interpretation of the Lukan passages proposed by Ramsay, Ac 16:16 a, detached from 16b, is read

as the completion of 16:1-5 (‘And they went through the Phrygian .... region. They were forbidden by the Holy Ghost .... in Asia, and came over against Mysia,’ etc.); and "the Phrygian and Galatian region" means the southwestern division of Provincia Galatia, a district at once Phrygian (ethnically) and Galatian (politically). The combination of two local adjectives., under a common article, to denote the same country in different respects, if exceptional in Greek idiom (15:41 and 27:5 illustrate the usual force of this collocation), is clearly possible—the one strictly parallel geographical expression, "the Iturean and Trachonite country" in Lu 3:1, unfortunately, is also ambiguous. But the other difficulty of grammar involved in the new rendering of Ac 16:6 is insuperable: the severance of the participle, "having been forbidden" (koluthentes), from the introductory verb, "they went through" (diel-thon), wrenches the sentence to dislocation; the aorist participle in such connection "must contain, if not something antecedent to ‘they went,’ at least something synchronous with it, in no case a thing subsequent to it, if all the rules of grammar and all sure understanding of language are not to be given up" (Schmiedel, EB, col. 1599; endorsed in Moulton’s Prolegomena to the Grammar of New Testament Greek, 134; see also Chase in The Expositor, IV, viii, 404-11, and ix, 339-42). Ac 10:29 ("I came .... when I was sent for") affords a grammatical parallel to 16:6 (‘They went through .... since they were hindered’).

Zahn’s position is peculiar (Intro to New Testament, I, 164-202). Rejecting Ramsay’s explanation of Ac 16:6, and of 18:23 (where Ramsay sees Paul a third time crossing South Galatia), and maintaining that Luke credits the apostle with successful work in North Galatia, he holds, notwithstanding, the South Galatian view of the epistle. This involves the paradox that Paul in writing to "the churches of Galatia" ignored those of North Galatia to whom the title properly belonged—an incongruence which Ramsay escapes by denying that Paul had set foot in Old Galatia. In the 1st edition of the Einleitung Zahn had supposed North and South Galatia together included in the address; this supposition is contrary to the fact that the readers form a homogeneous body, the fruit of a single mission (4:13), and are affected simultaneously by the same disturbance (1:6; 5:7-9). Associating the letter in 2nd edition with South Galatians alone, Zahn suggests that while Paul had labored in North Galatia and found "disciples" there on his return, these were too few and scattered to form "churches"—an estimate scarcely in keeping with Luke’s phrase Ac 5:7-9 "all the disciples" (18:23), and raising a distinction between "disciples" and "churches" foreign to the historian’s usage (see Ac 6:2; 9:19; 14:20). We must choose between North and South Galatia; and if churches existed among the people of the north at the time of writing, then the northerners claim this title by right of use and wont—and the epistle with it. The reversal of "Galatian and Phrygia(n)" in Ac 18:23, as compared with 16:6, implies that the apostle on the 3rd tour struck "the Galatian country" first, traveling this time directly North from Syrian Antioch, and turned westward toward Phrygia when he had reached Old Galatia; whereas his previous route had brought him westward along the highroad traversing South Galatia, until he turned northward at a point not far distant from Pisidian Antioch, to reach North Galatia through Phrygia from the southwest. See the Map of Asia Minor.

(4) Notes of Time in the Epistle.

The "3 years" of Ga 1:18 and the "14 years" of 2:1 are both seemingly counted from Paul’s conversion.

(a) The synchronism of the conversion with the murder of Stephen and the free action of the high priest against the Nazarenes (Ac 9:2, etc.), and of Saul's visit to Jerusalem in the 3rd year thereafter with Aretas' rule in Damascus (2Co 11:32,33), forbid our placing these two events further back than 36 and 38—at furthest, 35 and 37 AD (see Turner on "Chronology of the NT" in HDB, as against the earlier dating).

(b) This calculation brings us to 48-49 as the year of the conference of Ga 2:1-10—a date precluding the association of that meeting with the errand to Jerusalem related in Ac 11:30 and 12:25, while it suits the identification of the former with the council of Ac 15. Other indications converge on this as the critical epoch of Paul's apostleship. The expedition to Cyprus and South Galatia (Ac 13; 14) had revealed in Paul 'signs of the apostle' which the chiefs of the Judean church now recognized (Ga 2:7-9; compare Ac 15:12), and gave him the ascendancy which he exercised at this crisis; up to the time of Ac 13:1 "Saul" was known but as an old persecutor turned preacher (Ga 1:23), one of the band of "prophets and teachers" gathered round Barnabas at Antioch. The previous visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem (Ac 11; 12) had no ostensible object beyond that of famine-relief. From Ac 12 we learn that the mother church just then was suffering deadly persecution; Peter certainly was out of the way. There was no opportunity for the negotiation described in Ga 2:1-10, and it would have been premature for Paul to raise the question of his apostleship at this stage. In all likelihood, he saw few Judean Christians then beyond "the elders," who received the Antiochene charity (Ac 11:30). Nothing transpired in connection with this remittance, important as it was from Luke's standpoint, to affect the question of Ga 1; 2; it would have been idle for Paul to refer to it. On the other hand, no real contradiction exists between Ac 15 and Ga 2 "The two accounts admirably complete each other" (Pfleiderer; compare Cambr. Greek Test., 145, 146; Steinmann, Die Abfassungszeit d. Gal.-Briefes, section 7); in matters of complicated dispute involving personal considerations, attempts at a private understanding naturally precede the public settlement. It would be strange indeed if the same question of the circumcision of Gentilebelievers had twice within a few years been raised at Antioch, to be twice carried to Jerusalem and twice over decided there by the same parties—Barnabas and Paul, Peter and James—and with no reference made in the second discussion (that of Acts, ex hyp.) to the previous compact (Ga 2). Granting the epistle written after the council, as both Ramsay and Zahn suppose, we infer that Paul has given his more intimate account of the crisis, about which the readers were already informed in the sense of Ac 15, with a view to bring out its essential bearing on the situation.

(c) The encounter of Paul and Cephas at Antioch (Ga 2:11-21) is undated. The time of its occurrence bears on the date of the epistle. As hitherto, the order of narration presumably follows the order of events, the "but" of Ga 2:11 appears to contrast Cephas' present attitude with his action in Jerusalem just described. Two possible opportunities present themselves for a meeting of Paul and Cephas in Antioch subsequently to the council—the time of Paul's and Barnabas' sojourn there on their return from Jerusalem (Ac 15:35,36), or the occasion of Paul's later visit, occupying "some time," between the 2nd and 3rd tours (Ac 18:22,23), when for aught we know Barnabas and Peter may both have been in the Syrian capital.

The former dating assumes that Peter yielded to the Judaizers on the morrow of the council, that "Barnabas too was carried away" while still in colleagueship with Paul and when the cause of

Gentilefreedom, which he had championed, was in the flush of victory. It assumes that the legalists had no sooner been defeated than they opened a new attack on the same ground, and presented themselves as "from James" when James only the other day had repudiated their agitation (Ac 15:19,24). All this is very unlikely. We must allow the legalists time to recover from their discomfiture and to lay new plans (see II 2, (2), (3), (4). Moreover, Luke's detailed narrative in Ac 15:30-36, which makes much of the visit of Judas and Silas, gives no hint of any coming of Peter to Antioch at that time, and leaves little room for this; he gives an impression of settled peace and satisfaction following on the Jerusalem concordat, with which the strife of Ga 2:11 ff would ill accord. Through the course of the 2nd missionary tour, so far as the Thessalonian epistles indicate, Paul's mind remained undisturbed by legalistic troubles. "The apostle had quitted Jerusalem (after his understanding with the pillars) and proceeded to his 2nd missionary journey full of satisfaction at the victory he had gained and free from anxiety for the future .... The decisive moment of the crisis necessarily falls between the Thessalonian and Galatian epistles .... A new situation suddenly presents itself to him on his return" to Antioch (A. Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, English translation, 10, 11, also 124-36).

(5) Paul's Renewed Struggle with Legalism.

The new situation arose through the vacillation of Peter; and the "certain from James" who made mischief at Antioch, were the forerunners of "troublers" who agitated the churches far and wide, appearing simultaneously in Corinth and North Galatia. The attempt to set up a separate church- table for the circumcised at Antioch was the first movement in a crafty and persistent campaign against Gentileliberties engineered from Jerusalem. The Epistle to the Romans signalized Paul's conclusive victory in this struggle, which covered the period of the 3rd missionary tour. On his revisitation of the Galatians (1:9; 5:3 parallel Ac 18:23), fresh from the contention with Cephas and aware of the wide conspiracy on foot, Paul gave warning of the coming of "another gospel"; it had arrived, fulfilling his worst fears. Upon this view of the course of affairs (see Neander, Planting and Training of the Christian Church, III, vii; Godet's Introduction to the New Testament, Epistles of Paul, 200-201; Sabatier, as above), the mistake of Peter at Antioch was the proximate antecedent of the trouble in Galatia; hence, Ga 2:11-24 leads up to 3:1 and the main argument. Now, if the Antiochene collision befell so late as this, then the epistle is subsequent to the date of Ac 18:22,23; from which it follows, once more, that Ga belongs to the 3rd missionary tour and the Corinthians-Romans group of letters.

(6) Ephesus or Corinth?

Chiefly because of the words, "you are removing so quickly," in Ga 1:6, the epistle is by many referred to the earlier part of the above period, the time of Paul's protracted sojourn in Ephesus (Ac 19:8,10 54-56 AD); "so quickly," however, signifies not "so soon after my leaving you," but "so suddenly" and "with such slight persuasion" (Ga 5:7,8). From Ephesus, had the apostle been there when the trouble arose, he might as easily have visited Galatia as he did Corinth under like circumstances (so much is implied in 2Co 13:1): he is longing to go to Galatia, but cannot (Ga 4:19,20). A more distant situation, such as Macedonia or Corinth (Ac 20:1-3), where Paul found himself in the last months of this tour (56-57 AD), and where, in churches of some standing, he was surrounded by a body of sympathetic "brethren" (Ga 1:1) whose support gave weight to his remonstrance with the Galatians, suits the epistle

better on every account.

(7) Paul’s First Coming to Galatia.

In Ga 4:13-15 the apostle recalls, in words surcharged with emotion, his introduction to the readers. His "preaching the good news" to them was due to "weakness of the flesh"—to some sickness, it seems, which arrested his steps and led him to minister in a locality that otherwise he would have "passed over," as he did Mysia a little later (Ac 16:8). So we understand the obscure language of Ga 4:13. The South Galatian theorists, in default of any reference to illness as affecting the apostle’s movements in Ac 13:13,14, favor Ramsay’s conjecture that Paul fell a victim to malaria on the Pamphylian coast, and that he and Barnabas made for Pisidian Antioch by way of seeking the cooler uplands. The former explanation lies nearer to the apostle’s language: he says "I preached to you," not "I came to you, because of illness." The journey of a hundred miles from Perga to Antioch was one of the least likely to be undertaken by a fever- stricken patient (see the description in Conybeare and Howson’s Life of Paul, or in Ramsay’s Paul the Traveler). Besides, if this motive had brought Paul to Antioch, quite different reasons are stated by Luke for his proceeding to the other South Galatian towns (see Ac 13:50,51; 14:6,19,20). Reading Ga 4:13-15, one imagines the missionary hastening forward to some further goal (perhaps the important cities of Bithynia, Ac 16:7), when he is prostrated by a malady the physical effects of which were such as to excite extreme aversion. As strength returns, he begins to offer his gospel in the neighborhood where the unwilling halt has been made. There was much to prejudice the hearers against a preacher addressing them under these conditions; but the Galatians welcomed him as a heaven-sent messenger. Their faith was prompt and eager, their gratitude boundless.

The deification of Barnabas and Paul by the Lycaonians (Ac 14:11-18) is the one incident of Luke’s narrative of which the apostle’s description reminds us. To this the latter is thought to be alluding when he writes, "You received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus!" But could he speak thus of his reception—hateful at the time—in the character of a heathen god, and of a reception that ended in his stoning? The "welcome" of the messenger implies faith in his message (compare Ga 4:14; 2Co 6:1; 1Th 1:6; Mt 10:40,41, where the same Greek verb is used).

Paul’s mishandling at Lystra (Ac 14:19,20) has suggested a correspondence in the opposite sense between the epistle and the story of the South Galatian mission. The Lystran stones left their print on Paul’s body; in these disfiguring scars one might see "the marks of Jesus" to which he points in Ga 6:17, were it not for the note of time, "from henceforth," which distinguishes these stigmata as a fresh infliction, identifying the servant now more than ever with his Master. The true parallel to Ga 6:17 is 2Co 4:10 (see the context in 4:7-5:4, also 18), which we quoted above (III, 2). When he wrote 2 Cor, the apostle was emerging from an experience of crucial anguish, which gave him an aspect imaging the dying Saviour whom he preached; to this new consecration the appeal of our epistle seems to refer.

(8) Barnabas and the Galatians.

The references to Barnabas in Ga 2:1,9,13, at first sight suggest the South Galatian destination of the

letter. For Barnabas and Paul were companions on the first only of the three tours, and Barnabas is named thrice here and but twice in the rest of the epistles. Yet these very references awaken misgiving. Barnabas was Paul's full partner in the South Galatian mission; he was senior in service, and had introduced Saul to the apostles at Jerusalem; he was the leader at the outset of this journey (Ac 9:27; 11:22-26; 13:1-3; 15:25)—Barnabas was taken for "Zeus" by the heathen of Lystra, while the eloquent Paul was identified with "Hermes" (Ac 14:12). The churches of South Galatia had two founders, and owed allegiance to Barnabas along with Paul. Yet Paul deals with the readers as though he alone were their father in Christ. Referring to Barnabas conspicuously in the letter and as differing from himself on a point affecting the question at issue (Ga 2:13), Paul was the more bound to give his old comrade his due and to justify his assumption of sole authority, if he were in truth addressing communities which owed their Christianity to the two men in conjunction. On the South Galatian hypothesis, the apostle appears ungenerously to have elbowed his colleague out of the partnership. The apostle Paul, it is to be noted, was particularly sensitive on matters of this kind (see 1Co 4:15; 2Co 10:13-16). The name of Barnabas was known through the whole church (see 1Co 9:6; Col 4:10); there is no more difficulty in supposing the North Galatians to be familiar with it than with the names of James and John (Ga 2:9). Possibly Paul, as his responsibilities extended, had left the care of South Galatia to Barnabas, who could readily superintend this district from Antioch in Syria; Paul refers to him in 1Co 9:6, long after the separation of Ac 15:39, as a fellow- worker. This would account for his making direct for North Galatia on the 3rd tour; see IV, 3 (3).

(9) The Two Antiochs.

In Ga 2:11 Paul refers to "Antioch,". the famous city on the Orontes. To South Galatians "Antioch" meant, as in 2Ti 3:11, the Pisidian city of that name. Had Paul been addressing South Galatians, and Antiochenes imprimis, he could not without singular inadvertence have failed to make the distinction. The gaucherie would have been as marked as if, in writing to a circle of West-of-England towns including Bradford-on-Avon, one should mention "Bradford" without qualification, meaning the Yorkshire Bradford.

The arguments drawn from local difference in legal usage—in the matters of adoption, testament, etc.—in favor of the South Galatian destination (see Schmiedel's examination of Ramsay's views in EB, coll. 1608-9), and from the temperament of Paul's "Galatians" in favor of North Galatia (Lightfoot), are too precarious to build upon.

(10) Wider Bearings of the Problem.

On a broad view of the scope of Paul's missionary work and of the relation of his letters to Acts, there is much to commend the South Galatian theory. It simplifies the situation by connecting this cardinal writing of Paul with churches of cardinal importance in Luke's narrative. The South Galatian cities lay along the main route of the apostle's travels, and in the mid-stream of the church's life. The epistle, when associated with the Christian communities of this region, gains a definite setting and a firm point of attachment in New Testament history; whereas the founding of North Galatian Christianity is

indicated by Luke, if at all, in the most cursory fashion, and it held an obscure place in the early church. How, it is asked, could Paul's intimate friend have been (on the North Galatian theory) so uninterested in churches by which Paul himself set such store? And how can Paul have ignored, apart from the allusion of 2Ti 3:11, the South Galatians who formed the first-fruits of his wider labors and supplied a vital link in his chain of churches? In reply, we must point out: (1) that for anything we know Paul wrote many letters to South Galatia; we possess but a selection from his correspondence; the choice of the canonical epistles was not governed by the importance of the parties addressed in them—witness Colossians and Philemon; nor were Paul's concern for his churches, and the empressement with which he wrote, determined by their magnitude and position, but by their needs and their hold on his affections (see Ga 1:6, etc.; 4:12-20). (2) The North Galatian mission lay off the central line of Paul's journeyings and of the advance of GentileChristianity; this is probably the reason why Luke, who was compelled to a strict economy of space, just ignores this field, though he shows himself aware of its existence. The apostle's confession that he preached to the readers, in the first instance, not from choice but necessity (Ga 4:13), accords with the neglect of North Galatia in Acts; the evangelizing of the North Galatians was an aside in Paul's work—an incident beyond the scope of his plans, from which at this period he was compelled again and again to deviate (Ac 16:6-10).

After all, though less important during the 1st century than South Galatia North Galatia was not an unimportant or inaccessible region. It was traversed by the ancient "Royal Road" from the East to the Hellespont, which the apostle probably followed as far as Phrygia in the journey of Ac 18:22,23. Planted by Paul in Old Galatia, the gospel would spread to Bithynia and Pontus farther north, as it certainly had done by the time Peter wrote to the churches of Asia Minor (1Pe 1:1). It is observable that "Galatia" stands between "Pontus and Cappadocia" in Peter's enumeration of the provinces—an order indicating that Christians of North Galatia were particularly in the writer's mind. Had Paul never set foot in North Galatia, had he not worked along the Royal Road and put his message in the Way of reaching the northern provinces of Asia Minor, the claim of Ro 15:19 is difficult to sustain, that "from Jerusalem, and in a circle as far as Illyricum, he had fulfilled the gospel of Christ." On the whole, we find the external evidence in accord with the testimony given by the internal character and affinities of the epistle: we judge that this epistle was written circa the autumn or winter of 56-57 AD, from Macedonia or Corinth, toward the end of Paul's third missionary tour; that it was addressed to a circle of churches situated in Galatia proper or North Galatia, probably in the western part of this country contiguous to (or overlapping) Phrygia (Ac 16:6); and that its place lies between the two Corinthian and the Roman letters among the epistles of the second group.

LITERATURE.

The South Galatian destination was proposed by the Danish Mynster (Einltg. in d. Brief an d. Gal, 1825; M. however included North Galatia), and adopted by the French Perrot (De Galatia Provincia Romana, 1867) and Renan (S. Paul); by the German Clemen (Chronologie d. paulin. Briefe, 1893; Die Adressaten d. Gal.-Briefes; Paulus: sein Leben u. Wirken, 1904), Hausrath (NT Zeitgeschichte, 1873, English Translation), Pfleiderer (Paulinismus, 1873, English translation; Paulinismus2, much altered; Urchristenthum, 1902), Steck (as above), Weizsacker (Das apost. Zeitalter3, 1902, English Translation); after Ramsay (see under GALATIA), by Belser (Beitrage z. Erklarung d. AG, etc.), O. Holtzmann

(Zeitschrift f. KG, 1894), von Soden (Hist of Early Christian Lit., ET; he includes South with North Galatia), Weber (Die Adressaten d. Gal.-Briefes), J. Weiss (RE3, article "Kleinasien"), in Germany; by Askwith (Ep. to Gal: An Essay on Its Destination and Date), Bacon (Expos, V, vii, 123-36; x, 351-67), Bartlet (Expos, V, x, 263-80), Gifford (Expos, IV, x, 1-20), Maclean (1-vol HDB), Rendall (Expos, IV, ix, 254-64; EGT, Introduction to "Galatians"), Round (as above), Sanday (with hesitation, The Expositor, IV, vii, 491-95), Woodhouse (EB, article "Galatia"). The N. Galatian destination, held by earlier scholars up to Lightfoot and Salmon (DB2, an illuminating discussion), is reasserted, in view of Ramsay's findings, by Chase (Expos, IV, viii, 401-19; ix, 331-42), Cheetham (Class. Review, 1894), Dods (HDB, article "Galatians"), Williams (Cambr. Greek Testament., 1910), in this country; by Sabatier (L'Apotre Paul2, English translation, 1891); by Gheorghiu (Adressatii epistle c. Galateni, Cernauti, 1904, praised by Steinmann); and by the German critics Blass (Acta Apost.), yon Dobschutz (Die urchr. Gemeinden, 1902, and Probleme d. apost. Zeitalters), Harnack (Apostelgeschichte, 1908, 87-90), H. Holtzmann (Handcomm. z. New Testament, "AG"), Julicher (NT Intro, English Translation), Lipsius (Handcomm. z. New Testament, "Galater") Lietzmann (doubtfully, Handbuch z. N T, III, i, "Galaterbrief"), Mommsen (ZNTW, 1901, 81-96), Schmiedel (Encyclopedia Biblica), Schurer (Jahrbuch f. prot. Theologie, XVIII, 460- 74), Sieffert (Meyer's Kommentar), Steinmann (as above), Zockler (a full and masterly discussion: Studien u. Kritiken, 1895, 51-102). Mommsen's verdict is thus expressed: "To apprehend 'the Galatians' of Paul otherwise than in the strict and narrower sense of the term, is unallowable. The Provinces associated with Galatia under the rule of a single legate, as e.g. Lycaonia certainly was as early as the time of Claudius, were in no way incorporated in that region; the official inscriptions simply set Galatia at the head of the combined regions. Still less could the inhabitants of Iconium and Lystra be named 'Galatians' in common speech."

Apart from the aforesaid controversy, besides the standard Commentary on Paul's Epistles, Luther's Ad Galatas is of unique historical interest; the interpretations of Usteri (1833), Hilgenfeld (1852), Winer (18594), Holsten (Das Evangel. d. Paulus, 1880), Philippi (1884), in German; Baljon (1889), in Dutch; and of B. Jowett, Ellicott, Beet, are specially serviceable, from different points of view; see also CGT and EB.

George G. Findlay

GALBANUM

gal'-ba-num (chelbenah; chalbdne):

A gum-resin which occurs in small, round, semitranslucent tears or in brownish yellow masses; has a pleasant aromatic odor and a bitter taste; and is today, at any rate, imported from Persia.

It is derived from certain umbelliferous plants, Ferula galbaniflua and F. rubricaulis. It is mentioned in Ex 30:34 as an ingredient of the holy incense, and also in APC Sirach 24:15: "a pleasant odor .... as galbanum."

GALEED

gal’-e-ed (gal‘edh): Derived from the Hebrew gal, "a heap of stones," and ‘edh, "witness." The meaning therefore is "cairn" or "heap of witness," corresponding to yeghar-sahddhutha’ in Aramaic (Ge 31:47). It is applied to the cairn raised by Jacob and Laban, beside which they sealed their covenant in a common meal, the memory of which they appealed to the silent cairn to preserve. The ancient custom of associating events with inanimate objects as witnesses is often illustrated in Hebrew history (Jos 4:4 ff, etc.). There may be in this narrative a suggestion of how the name "Gilead" came to be applied to that country.

W. Ewing

GALGALA

gal’-gal-a (Gallgala):

Greek equivalent for Gilgal. The word occurs in APC 1Macc 9:2 in connection with Arbela, in Galilee —"The way to Galgala"—but it is doubtful which Gilgal is meant. Compare Josephus, Ant, XII, xi, 1

see GILGAL.

GALILEAN

gal-i-le’-an.

See GALILEE.

GALILEE

gal’-i-le (ha-galil, hagelilah, literally, "the circuit" or "district"; he Galilaia):

1. Galilee of the Nations:

Kedesh, the city of refuge, is described as lying in Galilee, in Mt. Naphtali (Jos 20:7; compare Jos 21:32). The name seems originally to have referred to the territory of Naphtali. Joshua’s victorious campaign in the north (Jos 11), and, subsequently, the triumph of the northern tribes under Deborah and Barak (Jud 4 f) gave Israel supremacy; yet the tribe of Naphtali was not able to drive out all the former inhabitants of the land (Jud 1:33). In the time of Solomon the name applied to a much wider region, including the territory of Asher. In this land lay the cities given by Solomon to Hiram (1Ki 9:11). Cabul here named must be identical with that of Jos 19:27. The Asherites also failed to possess certain cities in their allotted portion, so that the heathen continued to dwell among them. To this state of things,

probably, is due the name given in Isa 9:1 to this region, "Galilee of the nations," i.e. a district occupied by a mixed population of Jews and heathen. It may also be referred to in Jos 12:23, where possibly we should read "king of the nations of Galilee" (legalil), instead of "Gilgal" (begilgal). Yet it was within this territory that, according to 2Sa 20:18 (Septuagint) lay the two cities noted for their preservation of ancient Israelite religious customs in their purity—Abel-bethmaacah and Dan.

2. Ancient Boundaries:

There is nothing to guide us as to the northern boundary of Galilee in the earliest times. On the East it was bounded by the upper Jordan and the Sea of Galilee, and on the South by the plain of el-BaTTauf. That all within these limits belonged to Galilee we may be sure. Possibly, however, it included Zebulun, which seems to be reckoned to it in Isa 9:1. In this territory also there were unconquered Canaanite cities (Jud 1,30).

3. Before the Exile:

At the instigation of Asa, king of Judah, Benhadad, son of Tabrimmon of Damascus, moved against Israel, and the cities which he smote all lay within the circle of Galilee (1Ki 15:20). Galilee must have been the arena of conflict between Jehoahaz and Hazael, king of Syria. The cities which the latter captured were recovered from his son Benhadad by Joash, who defeated him three times (2Ki 10:32; 13:22). The affliction of Israel nevertheless continued "very bitter," and God saved them by the hand of Jeroboam son of Joash, the great warrior monarch of the Northern Kingdom, under whom Galilee passed completely into the hands of Israel (2Ki 14:25 ff). But the days of Israel’s supremacy in Northern Palestine were nearly over. The beginning of the end came with the invasion of Tiglath-pileser III, who took the chief cities in Galilee, and sent their inhabitants captive to Assyria (2Ki 14:29). Probably, as in the case of the Southern Kingdom, the poorest of the land were left as husbandmen. At any rate there still remained Israelites in the district (2Ch 30:10 f); but the measures taken by the conqueror must have made for the rapid increase of the heathen element.

4. After the Exile:

In post-exilie times Galilee is the name given to the most northerly of the three divisions of Western Palestine. The boundaries are indicated by Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 1). It was divided into Lower and Upper Galilee, and was encompassed by Phoenicia and Syria. It marched with Ptolemais and Mt. Carmel on the West. The mountain, formerly Galliean, now belonged to the Syrians. On the South it adjoined Samaria and Scythopolis (Beisan) as far as the river Jordan. It was bounded on the East by Hippene, Gadara, Gaulonitis and the borders of the kingdom of Agrippa, while the northern frontier was marked by Tyre and the country of the Tyrians. The northern limit of Samaria was Ginea, the modern Jenin, on the south border of Esdraelon. Lower Galilee, therefore, included the great plain, and stretched northward to the plain of er-Rameh—Ramah of Jos 19:36. Josephus mentions Bersabe, the modern Abu-Sheba, and the Talmud, Kephar Chananyah, the modern Kefr ‘Anan, as the northern border; the former being about a mile North of the latter. The plain reaches to the foot of the mountain chain, which, running East and

West, forms a natural line of division. Upper Galilee may have included the land as far as the gorge of the LiTany, which, again, would have formed a natural boundary to the N. Josephus, however, speaks of Kedesh as belonging to the Syrians (BJ, II, xviii, 1), situated "between the land of the Tyrians and Galilee" (Ant., XIII, v, 6). This gives a point on the northern frontier in his time; but the rest is left indefinite. Guthe, Sunday and others, followed by Cheyne (EB, under the word), on quite inadequate grounds conclude that certain localities on the East of the Sea of Galilee were reckoned as Galilean.

5. Character of the Galileans:

In the mixed population after the exile the purely Jewish element must have been relatively small. In 165 BC Simon Maccabeus was able to rescue them from their threatening neighbors by carrying the whole community away to Judea (1 Macc 5:14 ff). Josephus tells of the conquest by Aristobulus I of Ituraea (Ant., XIII, xi, 3). He compelled many of them to adopt Jewish religious customs, and to obey the Jewish law. There can be little doubt that Galilee and its people were treated in the same way. While Jewish in their religion, and in their patriotism too, as subsequent history showed, the population of Galilee was composed of strangely mingled elements—Aramaean, Iturean, Phoenician and Greek In the circumstances they could not be expected to prove such sticklers for high orthodoxy as the Judeans. Their mixed origin explains the differences in speech which distinguished them from their brethren in the South, who regarded Galilee and the Galileans with a certain proud contempt (Joh 1:46; 7:52). But a fine type of manhood was developed among the peasant farmers of the two Galilees which, according to Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 2), were "always able to make a strong resistance on all occasions of war; for the Galileans are inured to war from their infancy .... nor hath the country ever been destitute of men of courage." Josephus, himself a Galilean, knew his countrymen well, and on them he mainly relied in the war with Rome. In Galilee also the Messianic hope was cherished with the deepest intensity. When the Messiah appeared, with His own Galilean upbringing, it was from the north-countrymen that He received the warmest welcome, and among them His appeal elicited the most gratifying response.

6. Later History:

In 47 BC, Herod the Great, then a youth of 25, was made military commander of Galilee, and won great applause by the fashion in which he suppressed a band of robbers who had long vexed the country (Ant., XIV, ix, 2). When Herod came to the throne, 37 BC, a period of peace and prosperity for Galilee began, which lasted till the banishment of his son Antipas in 40 AD. The tetrarchy of Galilee was given to the latter at his father’s death, 4 BC. His reign, therefore, covered the whole life of Jesus, with the exception of His infancy. After the banishment of Antipas, Galilee was added to the dominions of Agrippa I, who ruled it till his death in 44 AD. Then followed a period of Roman administration, after which it was given to Agrippa II, who sided with the Romans in the subsequent wars, and held his position till 100 AD. The patriotic people, however, by no means submitted to his guidance. In their heroic struggle for independence, the command of the two Galilees, with Gamala, was entrusted to Josephus, who has left a vivid narrative, well illustrating the splendid courage of his freedom-loving countrymen. But against such an adversary as Rome even their wild bravery could not prevail; and the country soon lay at the feet of the victorious Vespasian, 67 AD. There is no certain knowledge of the part played by Galilee in the rebellion under Hadrian, 132-35 AD.

At the beginning of the Roman period Sepphoris (Cafuriyeh), about 3 miles North of Nazareth, took the leading place. Herod Antipas, however, built a new city on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, which, in honor of the reigning emperor, he called Tiberias. Here he reared his "golden house," and made the city the capital of his tetrarchy. See TIBERIAS. After the fall of Jerusalem, Galilee, which had formerly been held in contempt, became the home of Jewish learning, and its chief seat was found in Tiberias where the Mishna was committed to writing, and the Jerusalem Talmud was composed. Thus a city into which at first no pious Jew would enter, in a province which had long been despised by the leaders of the nation, became the main center of their national and religious life.

7. Cities of Galilee:

Among the more notable cities in Galilee were Kedesh Naphtali, the city of refuge, the ruins of which lie on the heights West of el-Chuleh; Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum, North of the Sea of Galilee; Nazareth, the city of the Savior's youth and young manhood; Jotapata, the scene of Josephus' heroic defense against the Romans, which stood at Tell Jefat, North of the plain of Asochis (BJ, III, vii, viii); Cana of Galilee; and Nain, on the northern slope of the mountain now called Little Hermon.

8. General Description:

In physical features Galilee is the most richly diversified and picturesque district in Western Palestine; while in beauty and fertility it is strongly contrasted with the barren uplands of Judah. Cut off from Mt. Lebanon in the North by the tremendous gorge of the Litany, it forms a broad and high plateau, sinking gradually southward until it approaches Cafed, when again it rises, culminating in Jebel Jermuk, the highest summit on the West of the Jordan. From Cafed there is a rapid descent by stony slope and rocky precipice to the shore of the Sea of Galilee. The mountains of which Jebel Jermuk is the Northeast outrunner stretch westward across the country, and drop upon the plain of er-Rameh to the South. Irregular hills and valleys, with breadths of shady woodlands, lie between this plain and that of Asochis (el-Battauf]). The latter is split from the East by the range of Jebel Tor'an. South of Asochis rise lower hills, in a cup-like hollow among which lies the town of Nazareth. South of the town they sink steeply into the plain of Esdraelon. The isolated form of Tabor stands out on the East, while Carmel bounds the view on the West. The high plateau in the North terminates abruptly at the lip of the upper Jordan valley. As the Jordan runs close to the base of the eastern hills, practically all this valley, with its fine rolling downs, is included in Galilee. The plain of Gennesaret runs along the northwestern shore of the Sea of Galilee. From the uplands to the West, stretching from Qurun Chattin (the traditional Mount of Beatitudes) to the neighborhood of Tabor, the land lets itself down in a series of broad and fertile terraces, falling at last almost precipitously on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. The descent toward the Mediterranean is much more gradual; and the soil gathered in the longer valleys is deep and rich.

The district may be described as comparatively well watered. The Jordan with its mighty springs is, of course, too low for purposes of irrigation. But there are many perennial streams fed by fountains among

the hills. The springs at Jenin are the main sources of the river Kishon, but for the greater part of its course through the plain the bed of that river is far below the surface of the adjoining land. The dews that descend from Lebanon and Hermon are also a perpetual source of moisture and refreshment.

9. Products:

Galilee was famous in ancient times for its rich and fruitful soil, "full of the plantations of trees of all sorts, insomuch that it invites the most slothful to pains in its cultivation by its fruitfulness; accordingly it is all cultivated by its inhabitants, and no part of it lies idle" (BJ, III, iii, 2). See also GENNESARET, LAND OF. The grapes grown in Naphtali were in high repute, as were the pomegranates of Shikmona—the Sykaminos of Josephus—which stood on the shore near Mt. Carmel. The silver sheen of the olive meets the eye in almost every valley; and the olive oil produced in Galilee has always been esteemed of the highest excellence. Its wheat fields also yielded an abundant supply, the wheat of Chorazin being proverbial. The great plain of Esdraelon must also have furnished rich provision. It cannot be doubted that Galilee was largely drawn upon for the gifts in kind which Solomon bestowed upon the king of Tyre (2Ch 2:10). At a much later day the inhabitants of Tyre and Sidon depended upon the produce of Galilee (Ac 12:20).

Galilee was in easy touch with the outside world by means of the roads that traversed her valleys, crossed her ridges and ran out eastward, westward and southward. Thus she was connected with the harbors on the Phoenician seaboard, with Egypt on the South, with Damascus on the Northeast, and with the markets of the East by the great caravan routes (see "Roads" under PALESTINE).

10. Contact with the Outside World:

In the days of Christ the coming and going of the merchantmen, the passing of armies and the movements of the representatives of the Empire, must have made these highways a scene of perpetual activity, touching the dwellers in Galilee with the widening influences of the great world’s life.

11. Population:

The peasant farmers of Galilee, we have seen, were a bold and enterprising race. Encouraged by the fruitfulness of their country, they were industrious cultivators of the soil. Josephus estimates the population at 3,000,000. This may be an exaggeration; but here we have all the conditions necessary for the support of a numerous and prosperous people. This helps us to understand the crowds that gathered round and followed Jesus in this district, where the greater part of His public life was spent. The cities, towns and villages in Galilee are frequently referred to in the Gospels. That the Jewish population in the centuries immediately after Christ was numerous and wealthy is sufficiently proved by the remains from those times, especially the ruins of synagogues, e.g. those at Tell Chum, Kerazeh, Irbid, el-Jish, Kefr Bir‘im, Meiron, etc. Near the last named is shown the tomb of the great Jewish teacher Hillel.

Galilee was not without her own heroic memories. The great battlefields of Megiddo, Gilboa, and the

waters of Merom lay within her borders; and among the famous men of the past she could claim Barak, Ibzan, Elon and Tola of the judges; of the prophets, Jonah and Elisha at least; possibly also Hosea who, according to a Jewish tradition, died in Babylon, but was brought to Galilee and buried in Cafed (Neubauer, Geog. der Talmud, 227). When the chief priests and Pharisees said, "Search, and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet," it argued strange and inexcusable ignorance on their part (Joh 7:52). Perhaps, however, in this place we should read ho prophetes, "the prophet," i.e. the Messiah. It is significant that 11 out of the 12 apostles were Galileans.

For detailed description of the country, see ISSACHAR; ASHER; ZEBULUN; NAPHTALI; see also GALILEE, SEA OF.

W. Ewing

GALILEE, MOUNTAIN IN

After the resurrection the disciples "went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them" (Mt 28:16). Here Jesus came to them, declared that all authority in heaven and earth had been given to Him, commanded them to go and make disciples of all nations, concluding with the memorable promise: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Probably it was some well-known height not far from the scenes most frequented during the Galilean ministry. Looking from the western shore at the uplands North of the lake, it is not easy to imagine a more appropriate spot for this never-to-be-forgotten interview than Jebel Qan‘-an, a bold headland not far to the East of Cafed, overlooking the land of Gennesaret and the sea, and commanding from its lofty summit a view of about 80 miles in every direction. Of course, there is no certainty.

W. Ewing

GALILEE, SEA OF

(he thalassa tes Galilaias):

1. The Name:

This is the name 5 times given in the New Testament (Mt 4:18; 15:29; Mr 1:16; 7:31; Joh 6:1) to the sheet of water which is elsewhere called "the sea of Tiberias" (Joh 21:1; compare Joh 6:1); "the lake of Gennesaret" (Lu 5:1); "the sea" (Joh 6:16, etc.), and "the lake" (Lu 5:1, etc.). The Old Testament names were "sea of Chinnereth" (yam-kinnereth: Nu 34:11; De 3:17; Jos 13:27; 19:35), and "sea of Chinneroth" (yam-kineroth: Jos 12:3; compare 11:2; 1Ki 15:20). In 1 Macc 11:67 the sea is called "the water of Gennesar" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Gennesareth"). It had begun to be named from the city so recently built on its western shore even in New Testament times (Joh 21:1; 6:1); and by this name, slightly modified, it is known to this day—Bachr Tabariyeh.

2. General Description:

The sea lies in the deep trough of the Jordan valley, almost due East of the Bay of Acre. The surface is 680 ft. below the level of the Mediterranean. It varies in depth from 130 ft. to 148 ft., being deepest along the course of the Jordan (Barrois, PEFS, 1894, 211-20). From the point where the Jordan enters in the North to its exit in the South is about 13 miles. The greatest breadth is in the North, from el-Mejdel to the mouth of Wady Semak being rather over 7 miles. It gradually narrows toward the South, taking the shape of a gigantic pear, with a decided bulge to the West. The water of the lake is clear and sweet. The natives use it for all purposes, esteeming it light and pleasant. They refuse to drink from the Jordan, alleging that "who drinks Jordan drinks fever." Seen from the mountains the broad sheet appears a beautiful blue; so that, in the season of greenery, it is no exaggeration to describe it as a sapphire in a setting of emerald. It lights up the landscape as the eye does the human face; and it is often spoken of as "the eye of Galilee." To one descending from Mt. Tabor and approaching the edge of the great hollow, on a bright spring day, when the land has already assumed its fairest garments, the view of the sea, as it breaks upon the vision in almost its whole extent, is one never to be forgotten. The mountains on the East and on the West rise to about 2,000 ft. The heights of Naphtali, piled up in the North, seem to culminate only in the snowy summit of Great Hermon. If the waters are still, the shining splendors of the mountain may be seen mirrored in the blue depths. Round the greater part of the lake there is a broad pebbly beach, with a sprinkling of small shells. On the sands along the shore from el-Mejdel to ‘Ain et-Tineh these shells are so numerous as to cause a white glister in the sunlight.

The main formation of the surrounding district is limestone. It is overlaid with lava; and here and there around the lake there are outcrops of basalt through the limestone. At eT-Tabgha in the North, at ‘Ain el Fuliyeh, South of el-Mejdel, and on the shore, about 2 miles South of modern Tiberias, there are strong hot springs. These things, together with the frequent, and sometimes terribly destructive, earthquakes, sufficiently attest the volcanic character of the region. The soil on the level parts around the sea is exceedingly fertile. See GENNESARET, LAND OF. Naturally the temperature in the valley is higher than that of the uplands; and here wheat and barley are harvested about a month earlier. Frost is not quite unknown; but no one now alive remembers it to have done more than lay the most delicate fringe of ice around some of the stones on the shore. The fig and the vine are still cultivated with success. Where vegetable gardens are planted they yield plentifully. A few palms are still to be seen. The indigo plant is grown in the plain of Gennesaret. In their season the wild flowers lavish a wealth of lovely colors upon the surrounding slopes; while bright-blossoming oleanders fringe the shore.

Coming westward from the point where the Jordan enters the lake, the mountains approach within a short distance of the sea. On the shore, fully 2 miles from the Jordan, are the ruins of Tell Chum. See CAPERNAUM. About 2 miles farther West are the hot springs of eT-Tabgha. Here a shallow vale breaks northward, bounded on the West by Tell ‘Areimeh. This tell is crowned by an ancient Canaanite settlement. It throws out a rocky promontory into the sea, and beyond this are the ruins of Khan Minyeh, with ‘Ain et-Tineh close under the cliff. Important Roman remains have recently been discovered here. From this point the plain of Gennesaret (el-Ghuweir) sweeps round to el-Mejdel, a distance of about 4 miles. West of this village opens the tremendous gorge, Wady el Chamam, with the famous robbers’ fastnesses in its precipitous sides, and the ruins of Arbela on its southern lip. From the northern parts of

the lake the Horns of ChaTTin, the traditional Mount of Beatitudes, may be seen through the rocky jaws of the gorge. South of el-Mejdel the mountains advance to the shore, and the path is cut in the face of the slope, bringing us to the hot spring, ‘Ain el-Fuliyeh, where is a little valley, with gardens and orange grove. The road then crosses a second promontory, and proceeds along the base of the mountain to Tiberias. Here the mountains recede from the shore, leaving a crescent-shaped plain, largely covered with the ruins of the ancient city. The modern town stands at the northern corner of the plain; while at the southern end are the famous hot baths, the ancient Hammath. A narrow ribbon of plain between the mountain and the shore runs to the South end of the lake. There the Jordan, issuing from the sea, almost surrounds the mound on which are the ruins of Kerak, the Tarichea of Josephus Crossing the floor of the valley, past Semakh, which is now a station on the Haifa-Damascus railway, we find a similar strip of plain along the eastern shore. Nearly opposite Tiberias is the stronghold of Chal‘-at el Chocn, possibly the ancient Hippos, with the village of Fik, the ancient Aphek, on the height to the East. To the North of this the waters of the sea almost touch the foot of the steep slope. A herd of swine running headlong down the mountain would here inevitably perish in the lake (Mt 8:32, etc.). Next, we reach the mouth of Wady Semak, in which lie the ruins of Kurseh, probably representing the ancient Gerasa. Northward the plain widens into the marshy breadths of el-BaTeichah, and once more we reach the Jordan, flowing smoothly through the fiat lands to the sea.

3. Storms:

The position of the lake makes it liable to sudden storms, the cool air from the uplands rushing down the gorges with great violence and tossing the waters in tumultuous billows. Such storms are fairly frequent, and as they are attended with danger to small craft, the boatmen are constantly on the alert. Save in very settled conditions they will not venture far from the shore. Occasionally, however, tempests break over the lake, in which a boat could hardly live. Only twice in over 5 years the present writer witnessed such a hurricane. Once it burst from the South. In a few moments the air was thick with mist, through which one could hear the roar of the tortured waters. In about ten minutes the wind fell as suddenly as it had risen. The air cleared, and the wide welter of foam-crested waves attested the fury of the blast. On the second occasion the wind blew from the East, and the phenomena described above were practically repeated.

4. Fish:

The sea contains many varieties of fish in great numbers. The fishing industry was evidently pursued to profit in the days of Christ. Zebedee was able to hire men to assist him (Mr 1:20). In recent years there has been a considerable revival of this industry. See FISHING. Four of the apostles, and these the chief, had been brought up as fishermen on the Sea of Galilee. Peter and Andrew, James and John.

The towns around the lake named in Scripture are treated in separate articles. Some of these it is impossible to identify. Many are the ruins of great and splendid cities on slope and height of which almost nothing is known today. But from their mute testimony we gather that the lake in the valley which is now so quiet was once the center of a busy and prosperous population. We may assume that the

cities named in the Gospels were mainly Jewish. Jesus would naturally avoid those in which Greek influences were strong. In most cases they have gone, leaving not even their names with any certainty behind; but His memory abides forever. The lake and mountains are, in main outline, such as His eyes beheld. This it is that lends its highest charm to "the eye of Galilee."

The advent of the railway has stirred afresh the pulses of life in the valley. A steamer plies on the sea between the station at Semakh and Tiberias. Superior buildings are rising outside the ancient walls. Gardens and orchards are being planted. Modern methods of agriculture are being employed in the Jewish colonies, which are rapidly increasing in number. Slowly, perhaps, but surely, the old order is giving place to the new. If freedom and security be enjoyed in reasonable measure, the region will again display its long-hidden treasures of fertility and beauty.

W. Ewing

GALL

gol:

(1) ro’sh, or rosh (De 32:32 only, "grapes of gall"): Some very bitter plant, the bitterness as in (2) being associated with the idea of poison. De 29:18 margin "rosh, a poisonpus herb"; La 3:5,19; Jer 8:14; 9:15; 23:15, "water of gall," margin "poison"; Ho 10:4, translated "hemlock"; Am 6:12, "Ye have turned justice into gall"; Job 20:16, the "poison of asps": here rosh clearly refers to a different substance from the other references, the points in common being bitterness and poisonous properties. Hemlock (Conium maculatum), colocynth (Citrullus colocynthus) and the poppy (Papaver somniferum) have all been suggested as the original rosh, the last having most support, but in most references the word may represent any bitter poisonous substance. Rosh is associated with la‘anah, "wormwood" (De 29:18; La 3:19; Am 6:12).

(2) mererah (Job 16:13), and merorah (Job 20:14,25), both derived from a root meaning "to be bitter," are applied to the human gall or "bile," but like (1), merorah is once applied to the venom of serpents (Job 20:14). The poison of these animals was supposed to reside in their bile.

(3) chole (Mt 27:34), "They gave him wine to drink mingled with gall"; this is clearly a reference to the Septuagint version of Ps 69:21: "They gave me also gall (chole, Hebrew rosh) for my food; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." In Mr 15:23, it says, "wine mingled with myrrh." It is well known that the Romans gave wine with frankincense to criminals before their execution to alleviate their sufferings; here the chole or bitter substance used was myrrh (Pliny Ep. xx.18; Sen. Ep. 83).

E. W. G. Masterman

GALLANT

gal’-ant: The translation of ‘addir, "bright," "splendid," "mighty" (Isa 33:21, "Neither shall gallant (’addir) ship pass thereby"); the word is translated "mighty" in Ex 15:10; 1Sa 4:8; Isa 10:34; Zec 11:2 the King James Version. In Isa 33:21, above, it is applied to Yahweh. "glorious (’addir) Lord" the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Yahweh .... in .... majesty"; compare also Ps 16:3, "the excellent." As a noun it is used in the margin of Na 2:5 as alternative for "worthies," the Revised Version (British and American) "nobles" in Zec 11:2, for "the might "Revised Version" "goodly ones" margin, "glorious"; it is translated "nobles" in Jud 5:13; 2Ch 23:20, etc.

See also SHIPS AND BOATS.

GALLERY

gal’-er-i:

(1) (’attuq, Kethibh; ‘attik, used only in Eze 41:16; 42:3,1; etymology and meaning uncertain; among the more probable suggestions are "pillar," "column," "walk with pillars," "colonnades," "passageway," "porches," "galleries" of "terraces." Cornhill suggests the substitution of kiroth, "walls," to suit the context; others, e.g. Rothstein, would omit it as a dittography or other corruption): A long narrow balcony formed either by pillars or by the receding upper stories of a building. Both kinds are described in Ezekiel’s vision of the Temple restored. They surround the three stories of side chambers around the Temple proper, and also the "building before the separate place which was at the back thereof," and the three-story structure containing rows of chambers in the outer court opposite the side-chambers of the Temple. Those around the Temple proper were apparently supported by pillars, and hence, they did not take away from the width of the 2nd-story and 3rd-story rooms (compare 41:7). On the other hand, the galleries of the outer buildings which were not supported by pillars and therefore not on top of each other, but in terraces, did take away from the upper stories more than from the lowest and middlemost: the upper chambers were shortened or "straitened more than the lowest and the middlemost from the ground."

The lower porches of the outer court were cut off from the view of those of the inner court by a low wall, but in the 3rd story, gallery looked out to gallery across the twenty cubits which belonged to the inner court and the pavement which belonged to the outer court." These "galleries," or ‘attiqim, are one of the few features that distinguish the temple of Ezekiel’s vision from Solomon’s temple. The idea and perhaps the word seem to have been borrowed from the more elaborate architecture of the countries of the Exile, which must have impressed the Jews of Ezekiel’s time very strongly. The building Ezekiel would place in the outer court with its terraces is a perfect Babylonian ziggurat or stage-tower temple (compare Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, II, 374, c-d).

(2) (rahaT, probably "lock of hair," So 7:5; rahiT Qere, rachiT, Kethibh, probably "rafters," So 7:11; both words and also the similar word (rehaTim, Ge 30:38; Ex 2:16), translated "troughs," are probably connected with the Aramaic rehaT "to flow," "to run"): Although the King James Version uses "galleries" in So 7:5 and 1:17 margin, the context in each place clearly points to another meaning. In the

former of these passages, "the king is held captive in the tresses thereof," there follows a description of the head. In the latter passage the word in question is in parallelism with qoroth batenu, "the beams of our house," and "rafters" the King James Version, or possibly "boards," is suggested.

Nathan Isaacs

GALLEY

gal’-i.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (2).

GALLIM

gal’-im (gallim), "heaps"): Probably two distinct places:

(1) A town mentioned among the 11 additional cities of Judah which are in the Septuagint appended to Jos 15:59, and have altogether disappeared from the Hebrew text. It occurs between Karem (‘Ain Kairem) and Baither (Bettir); it is probably the large and flourishing village of Beit Jala, near Bethlehem.

(2) Gallim is mentioned in Isa 10:30; not far from Laishah and Anathoth and certainly North of Jerusalem. It was the home of Palti the son of Laish (1Sa 25:44), and it is by many authorities identified with the Gilgal on the North border of Judah (Jos 15:7), the Geliloth of the parallel passage (Jos 18:17), and the Beth-gilgal of Ne 12:29.

E. W. G. Masterman

GALLIO

gal’-i-o (Gallion): The Roman deputy or proconsul of Achaia, before whom Paul was haled by his Jewish accusers on the apostle’s first visit to Corinth, during his second missionary journey (Ac 18:12-17). The trial was not of long duration. Although Gallio extended his protection to the Jewish religion as one of the religions recognized by the state, he contemptuously rejected the claim of the Jews that their law was binding upon all. In the eyes of the proconsul, the only law universally applicable was that of the Roman code and social morality: under neither was the prisoner chargeable; therefore, without even waiting to hear Paul’s speech in his own defense, he summarily ordered his lictors to clear the court. Even the subsequent treatment meted out to Sosthenes, the chief ruler of the synagogue, was to him a matter of indifference. The beating of Sosthenes is ascribed by different readings to "Jews" and to "Greeks," but the incident is referred to by the writer of Ac to show that the sympathies of the populace lay with Paul, and that Gallio made no attempt to suppress them. Gallio has often been instanced as

typical of one who is careless or indifferent to religion, yet in the account given of him in Acts, he merely displayed an attitude characteristic of the manner in which Roman governors regarded the religious disputes of the time (compare also LYSIAS; FELIX; FESTUS). Trained by his administrative duties to practical thinking and precision of language, he refused to adjudicate the squabbles of what he regarded as an obscure religious sect, whose law was to him a subtle quibbling with "words and names."

According to extra-canonical references, the original name of Gallio was Marcus Annaeus Novatus, but this was changed on his being adopted by the rhetorician, Lucius Junius Gallio. He was born at Cordova, but came to Rome in the reign of Tiberius. He was the brother of the philosopher Seneca, by whom, as also by Statius, reference is made to the affable nature of his character. As Achaia was reconstituted a proconsular province by Claudius in 44 AD, the accession of Gallio to office must have been subsequent to that date, and has been variously placed at 51-53 AD (compare also Knowling in The Expositor's Greek Testament, II, 389-92).

C. M. Kerr

GALLOWS

gal'-oz.

See HANGING; PUNISHMENTS.

GAMAEL

gam'-a-el (Gamael):

Chief of the family of Ithamar who went up from Babylon with Ezra (APC 1Esdras 8:29);

called Daniel in Ezr 8:2.

GAMALIEL

ga-ma'-li-el (gamli'el, "reward or recompense of God"; Gamaliel):

(1) The son of Pedahzur, and "prince of the children of Manasseh," chosen to aid in taking the census in the Wilderness (Nu 1:10; 2:20; 7:54,59; 10:23).

(2) A Pharisee who at the meeting of the "council" succeeded in persuading its members to adopt a more reasonable course when they were incensed at the doctrine of Peter and the rest of the apostles and sought to slay them (Ac 5:33-40). That he was well qualified for this task is attested by the fact that he was himself a member of the Sanhedrin, a teacher of the law, and held in high honor among all the

people. In his speech he pointed out to his fellow-councilors the dire consequences that might ensue upon any precipitous action on their part. While quoting instances, familiar to his hearers, of past insurrections or seditions that had failed, he reminded them at the same time that if this last under Peter "is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them; lest haply ye be found even to be fighting against God." As a result of his arguments, the apostles, after being beaten and admonished to speak no longer in the name of Jesus, were released. In the speech which he was permitted by Lysias to deliver from the stairs of the palace after the riot in Jerusalem, Paul referred to Gamaliel as the teacher of his youth, who instructed him rigidly in the Mosaic law (Ac 22:3).

The toleration and liberality displayed by Gamaliel upon the occasion of his speech before the Sanhedrin were all the more remarkable because of their rarity among the Pharisees of the period. Although the strict observance by the Christians of temple worship, and their belief in immortality, a point in dispute between Pharisees and Sadducees, may have had influence over him (Knowling), no credence is to be attached to the view that he definitely favored the apostles or to the tradition that he afterward became a Christian. The high place accorded him in Jewish tradition, and the fact that the title of Rabban, higher even than Rabbi or Master, was first bestowed upon him, testify that he remained a Pharisee to the end. His speech is rather indicative of one who knew the deeper truth in the Old Testament of the universal fatherhood of God, and who recognized that the presence of His power was the. deciding factor in all human enterprise. His social enactments were permeated by the same broad-minded spirit. Thus his legislation on behalf of the poor was formulated so as to include Gentiles as well as Jews. The authenticity of his speech has been questioned by Wendt and others, chiefly on account of the alleged anachronism in regard to Theudas (see THEUDAS); but the internal evidence is against this view (compare Knowling in The Expositor Greek Test., II, 161). It has also been objected by Baur and the Tubingen school that the liberal, peace-loving Gamaliel could not have been the teacher of the fanatical Saul. To this, reply has been made, firstly, that the charges against Stephen of destroying the temple and subverting the laws of Moses were not brought against Peter and the other apostles, and, secondly, that the doctrines of any teacher, however moderate he himself may be, are liable to be carried to extremes by an over-zealous pupil.

LITERATURE.

Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul, chapter ii; Kitto, Cyclopaedia of Biblical Lit., 1866, article "Gamaliel" (Ginsberg).

C. M. Kerr

GAMES

gamz:

I. ISRAELITISH GAMES

1. Children’s Games

Mimicry

2. Sports

3. Games of Chance and Skill

4. Story-Telling

5. Dancing

6. Proverbs

7. Riddles

II. THE GAMES OF GREECE AND ROME

1. Historical Introduction

2. General References

3. Specific References to Greek Athletics

4. References to the Theater and the Drama

LITERATURE

About the amusements of the ancient Israelites we know but little, partly on account of the nature of our literary sources, which are almost exclusively religious, partly because the antiquities thus far discovered yield very little information on this topic as compared with those of some other countries, and partly because of the relatively serious character of the people. Games evidently took a less prominent place in Hebrew life than in that of the Greeks, the Romans and the Egyptians. Still the need for recreation was felt and to a certain extent supplied in ways according with the national temperament. Mere athletics (apart from Greek and Roman influence) were but little cultivated. Simple and natural amusements and exercises, and trials of wit and wisdom, were more to the Hebrew taste. What is known or probably conjectured may be summed up under the following heads: Games of Children; Sports; Games of Chance and Skill; Story-telling; Dancing; Proverbs; Riddles. The amusements of Greece and Rome, which to some extent influenced later Jewish society and especially those which are directly or indirectly referred to in the New Testament, will be theme of the latter part of the article.

I. Israelite Games

1. Children’s Games:

There are two general references to the playing of children: Zec 8:5: "And the streets of the city shall be full of boys and girls playing in the streets thereof"; and Ge 21:9 margin, where we read of Ishmael "playing" (metscheq). The rendering of our Bibles, "mocking," is open to question. Of specific games and pets there is hardly a mention in the Old Testament. Playing with ball is alluded to in Isa 22:18: "He will .... toss thee like a ball into a large country," but children need not be thought of as the only players. If the balls used in Palestine were like those used by the Egyptians, they were sometimes made of leather or skin stuffed with bran or husks of corn, or of string and rushes covered with leather (compare Wilkinson, Popular Account, I, 198-201; British Museum Guide to the Egyptian Collections, 78). The question of Yahweh to Job (41:5): "Wilt thou play with him (the crocodile) as with a bird? or wilt thou bind him for thy maidens?" suggests that tame birds were petted by Hebrew children, especially by girls. The New Testament has one reference to children’s play, namely, the half-parable about the children in the market-place who would neither dance to the flute as if at a marriage feast nor wail as if at a funeral (Mt 11:16 f parallel Lu 7:32).

Mimicry

There are interesting accounts in Les enfants de Nazareth, by the Abbe Le Camus (60-66; 101-10), of the way in which the children of the modern Nazareth mimic scenes connected with weddings and funerals. That Israelite children had toys (dolls, models of animals, etc.) cannot be doubted in view of the finds in Egypt and elsewhere, but no positive evidence seems to be as yet forthcoming.

2. Sports:

Running was no doubt often practiced, especially in the time of the early monarchy. Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:23), Asahel (2Sa 2:18), Ahimaaz (18:23,27) and some of the Gadites in David’s service (1Ch 12:8) were renowned for their speed, which can only have been the result of training and exercise. The same may be said of the feats of those who ran before a king or a prince (1Sa 8:11; 2Sa 15:1; 1Ki 1:5; 18:46). The Psalmist must have watched great runners before he pictured the sun as rejoicing like a strong man to run his course (Ps 19:5; compare also Ec 9:11; Jer 8:6; 23:10). For running in the Greek games, see the latter part of this article.

Archery practice is implied in the story of Jonathan’s touching interview with David (1Sa 20:20,35-38) and in Job’s complaint: "He hath also set me up for his mark. His archers compass me round about" (Job 16:12 f). Only by long practice could the 700 left-handed Benjamite slingers, every one of whom could sling stones at a hair-breadth and not miss (Jud 20:16), and the young David (1Sa 17:49), have attained to the precision of aim for which they are famous.

In Zec 12:3, "I will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone," literally, "a stone of burden," Jerome found an

allusion to a custom which prevailed widely in Palestine in his day, and has been noticed by a recent traveler, of stone-lifting, i.e. of testing the strength of young men by means of heavy round stones. Some, he says, could raise one of these stones to the knees, others to the waist, others to the shoulders and the head, and a few could lift it above the head. This interpretation is not quite certain (Wright, Comm., 364), but the form of sport described was probably in vogue in Palestine in Biblical times.

High leaping or jumping was probably also practiced (Ps 18:29). The "play" referred to in 2Sa 2:14 ff of 12 Benjamites and 12 servants of David was not a sport but a combat like that of the Horatii and the Curiatii.

3. Games of Chance and Skill:

Dice were known to the ancient Egyptians, and Assyrian dice have been found, made of bronze with points of gold, but there is no trace of them in the Old Testament. Recent research at Ta‘-annek has brought to light many bones which seem to have been used in somewhat the same way as in a game played by the modern Arabs, who call it ka‘ab, the very word they apply to dice. These bones were "the oldest and most primitive form of dice" (Konig after Sellin, RE3, XVIII, 634). The use of dice among the later Jews is attested by the condemnation of dice-players in the Mishna (Sanh., iii. 3). The Syrian soldiers who cast lots for the raiment of Jesus at the cross (Mt 27:35 parallel Mr 15:24; Lu 23:34; Joh 19:24) may have used dice, but that can neither be proved nor disproved.

It has been suggested that the mockery of Jesus before the Sanhedrin described in Mt 26:67 f parallel Mr 14:65; Lu 22:63 f may have been connected with a Greek game in which one of the players held the eyes of another while a third gave him a box on the ear. The last was then asked with what hand he had been struck. A somewhat similar game is represented in an Egyptian tomb picture (Wilkinson, Popular Account, I, 192). This reference, however, though not quite inadmissible, is scarcely probable. Games with boards and men bearing some resemblance to our draughts were in great favor in Egypt (ibid., 190-95), but cannot be proved for the Jews even in New Testament times.

4. Story-Telling:

Listening to stories or recitations has long been a favorite amusement of Orientals (compare Lane, Modern Egyptians, 359-91: "The Thousand and One Nights"), but there seems to be no reference to it in the Bible. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that the Hebrews, like their neighbors, had story-tellers or reciters, axed heard them with delight. Egyptian tales of great antiquity are well known from the two volumes edited by Professor Petrie in 1895; and there are several non- canonical Jewish tales which combine romance and moral teaching: the Books of Tobit and Judith and perhaps the Story of Ahikar, the last of which, with the help of the Aramaic papyri discovered at Elephantine, can be traced back (in some form) to about 400 BC (Schurer, GJ V4, III, 255). There are also many short stories in the Haggadic portions of the Talmud and the Midrash.

5. Dancing:

Dancing, that is, the expression of joy by rhythmical movements of the limbs to musical accompaniment, is scarcely ever mentioned in the Bible as a social amusement, except in a general way (Jud 16:25,27(?); Job 21:11; Ps 30:11; Ec 3:4; Jer 31:4,13; La 5:15; Mt 11:17; Lu 15:25). There is one exception, the dancing of Salome, the daughter of Herodias, before Herod Antipas and his court (Mt 14:6 parallel Mr 6:22), which was a solo dance, probably of a pantomimic character affected by Roman influence. The other Biblical references to dancing can be grouped under two heads: the dance of public rejoicing, and the dance which was more or less an act of worship. Of the former we have two striking examples in the Old Testament: the dance accompanied by the tambourine with which the maidens of Israel, led by Jephthah's daughter, met that leader after his victory (Jud 11:34), and the dances of the Israelite women in honor of Saul and David to celebrate the triumph over the Philistines (1Sa 18:6; 21:11; 29:5).

It was probably usual to welcome a king or general with music and dancing. There is a good illustration in a fine Assyrian sculpture in the British Museum which represents a band of 11 instrumentalists taking part in doing homage to a new ruler. Three men at the head of the procession are distinctly dancing (SBOT, "Psalms," English, 226).

The distinctly religious dance is more frequently mentioned. The clear instances of it in the Bible are the dance of the women of Israel at the Red Sea, headed by Miriam with her tambourine (Ex 15:20); the dance of the Israelites round the golden calf (Ex 32:19); the dance of the maidens of Shiloh at an annual feast (Jud 21:19); the leaping or limping of the prophets of Baal round their altar on Carmel (1Ki 18:26), and the dancing of David in front of the ark (2Sa 6:14,16 parallel 1Ch 15:29). There are general references in Ps 149:3: "Let them praise his name in the dance"; 150:4: "Praise him with timbrel and dance"; and perhaps in 68:25. The allusions in So 6:13, "the dance of Mahanaim," and in the proper name Abel- meholah, "the meadow of the dance" (1Ki 19:16, etc.), are too uncertain to be utilized. The ritual dance was probably widespread in the ancient East. David's performance has Egyptian parallels. Seti I, the father of Rameses II, and three other Pharaohs are said to have danced before a deity (Budge, The Book of the Dead, I, xxxv), and Asiatic monuments attest the custom elsewhere. About the methods of dancing practiced by the ancient Hebrews but little is known. Probably the dancers in some cases joined hands and formed a ring, or part of a ring, as in some heathen representations. The description of David's dance: he "danced before Yahweh with all his might .... leaping and dancing before Yahweh" (2Sa 6:14-16) suggests three features of that particular display and the mode of dancing which it represented: violent exertion, leaping (mephazzez), and whirling round (mekharker). Perhaps the whirling dance of Islam is a modern parallel to the last. Women seem generally to have danced by themselves, one often leading the rest, both in dancing and antiphonal song; so Miriam and the women of Israel, Jephthah's daughter and her comrades, the women who greeted Saul and David, and, in the Apocrypha, Judith and her sisters after the death of Holofernes (Judith 15:12 f). Once the separation of the sexes is perhaps distinctly referred to (Jer 31:13). In public religious dances they may have occasionally united, as was the case sometimes in the heathen world, but there is no clear evidence to that effect (compare, however, 2Sa 6:20 and Ps 68:25). Of the social dancing of couples in the modern fashion there is no trace. There seems to be some proof that the religious dance lingered among the Jews until the time of Christ and later.

If the Mishna can be trusted (Cukkah, v.4), there was a torch-light dance in the temple in the illuminated court of the women at the Feast of Tabernacles in which men of advanced years and high standing took part. The Gemara to the Jerusalem Talmud adds that a famous dancer on these occasions was Rabbi Simeon or Simon, the son of Gamaliel, who lived in the apostolic age (Josephus, BJ, IV, iii, 9). According to another passage (Ta'anith 4 8) the daughters of Jerusalem used to dance dressed in white in the vineyards on Tishri the 10th and Abib the 15th. Religious dancing in the modern East is illustrated not only by the dances of the dervishes mentioned above, but also by occasional dances led by the sheikh in honor of a saint (Curtiss, Primitive Semitic Religion Today, 169). Among the later Jews dancing was not unusual at wedding feasts. More than one eminent rabbi is said to have danced before the bride (Kethubboth 17a). Singing and dancing, with lighted torches, are said to be wedding customs of the modern Arabs.

LITERATURE.

Arts. "Dance" in Smith DB2, HDB, DCG, EB, Jew Encyclopedia (also "Games"); "Tanz" in RE3 and the German Dictionaries of Winer, Riehm, and Guthe (Reigen); Nowack, HA, I, 278 f.

6. Proverbs:

Proverbs (mashal; paroimia) :Proverbs and proverbial expressions seem to have been, to some extent, a means of amusement as well as instruction for the ancient Oriental who delighted in the short, pointed statement of a moral or religious truth, or a prudential maxim, whether of literary or popular origin. Most of these sayings in the Bible belong to the former class, and are couched in poetic form (see PROVERBS; ECCLESIASTES; ECCLESIASTICUS). The others which are shorter and simpler, together with a number of picturesque proverbial phrases, must have recurred continually in daily speech and have added greatly to its vivacity.

The Old Testament supplies the following 10 examples of the popular proverb:

(1) "Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Yahweh" (Ge 10:9);

(2) "As the man is, so is his strength" (Jud 8:21), only two words in the Hebrew;

(3) "Is Saul also among the prophets?" (1Sa 10:11 f; 19:24);

(4) "Out of the wicked (wicked men) cometh forth wickedness" (1Sa 24:13);

(5) "There are the blind and the lame; he cannot come into the house" (2Sa 5:8);

(6) "Let not him that girdeth on his armor boast himself as he that putteth it off" (1Ki 20:11);

(7) "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life" (Job 2:4);

(8) "The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth" (Eze 12:22), a scoffing jest rather than a proverb;

(9) "As is the mother, so is her daughter" (Eze 16:44), two words in the Hebrew;

(10) "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge" (Jer 31:29; Eze 18:2).

In the New Testament we find 10 others:

(1) "Physician, heal thyself" (Lu 4:23); in the Midrash Rabbah on Gen: "Physician heal thine own wound";

(2) "Can the blind guide the blind? shall they not both fall into a pit?" (Lu 6:39);

(3) "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you" (Mt 7:2 parallel Mr 4:24; Lu 6:38), almost identical with a Jewish proverb, "measure for measure" cited several times in the ancient Midrash, the Mekhilta';

(4) "One soweth, and another reapeth" (Joh 4:37);

(5) "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country" (Mt 13:57; Lu 4:24; Joh 4:44; Logion of Oxyrhynchus);

(6) "There are yet four months, and then cometh the harvest" (Joh 4:35), possibly a kind of proverb;

(7) "Wheresoever the carcass is, there will the eagles (m "vultures") be gathered together" (Mt 24:28 parallel Lu 17:37); perhaps a proverb of which there is a trace also in the reference to the vulture: "Where the slain are, there is she" (Job 39:30);

(8) "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad" (Ac 26:14), a Greek proverb: for proof compare Wetstein's note;

(9) "The dog turning to his own vomit again, and the sow that had washed to wallowing in the mire" (2Pe 2:22); Wetstein gives rabbinic parallels for the former half, and Greek for the latter;

(10) "Ye .... strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel" (Mt 23:24).

There are also many proverbial phrases which added piquancy to conversation. Exceeding smallness was likened to the eye of a needle (Mt 19:24 parallel Mr 10:25; Lu 18:25), or to a grain of mustard (Mt 13:31 parallel Mr 4:31; Mt 17:20 parallel Lu 17:6), comparisons both found also in the Talmud, the

Koran, and modern Arabic sayings. Relative greatness was likened to a camel (Mt 19:24, etc.), in the Talmud to a camel or an elephant. Great number was illustrated by reference to "the sand which is upon the sea-shore" (Ge 22:17 and many other passages); "the dust of the earth" (Ge 13:16, etc.; also an Arabian figure); "the grass of the earth" (Job 5:25; Ps 72:16; compare Ps 92:7), an early Babylonian figure; a swarm of locusts (Na 3:15 and Na 4 other passages), a similitude used also by Sennacherib (RP, n.s. VI, 97), and the stars of heaven (Ge 15:5 and 10 other passages). When complete security was promised or described it was said that not a hair of the head was or should be injured or perish (1Sa 14:45; 2Sa 14:11; 1Ki 1:52; Da 3:27; Lu 21:18; Ac 27:34). Overcoming of difficulties was referred to as the removal of mountains (Mt 17:20; 21:21 parallel Mr 11:23; 1Co 13:2), an expression which has rabbinic parallels. Other proverbial phrases may perhaps be found in the saying about the mote and the beam (Mt 7:3-5), jot or tittle (Mt 5:18 parallel Lu 16:17), and the foolish words of Rehoboam and his young advisers (1Ki 12:10 f). Many old proverbs have no doubt perished. Dukes in his Rabbinische Blumenlese gives 665 proverbs and proverbial expressions from the Talmud and related literature, and modern collections show that proverbial lore is still in great favor in the Biblical Orient.

See also PROVERBS.

LITERATURE.

In addition to works already mentioned Konig, Stilistik, etc., DCG ("Jesus' Use of Proverbs"); Murray, DB, article "Proverbs"; Cohen, Ancient Jewish Proverbs, 1911.

7. Riddles:

Riddles (chidhah; ainigma): Riddle-making and riddle-guessing were in favor in the ancient East, both in educated circles and in comparatively common life. There is a tablet in the British Museum (K 4347: Guide to Assyrian and Babylonian Antiquities2, 53) from the library of Ashur-bani-pal which attests the use of riddles not only by the Assyrians of the 7th century BC, but also in a far earlier age, for it contains a Sumer as well as a Semitic text. So it is not surprising that we find a remarkable example in early Israelite history in Samson's famous riddle: "Out of the eater came forth food, and out of the strong came forth sweetness" (Jud 14:14). The riddle is couched in poetic form, as is also the solution: "What is sweeter than honey? and what is stronger than a lion?" (Jud 14:18), and the comment: "If ye had not plowed with my heifer, ye had not found out my riddle" (same place) . The stipulation of a prize or penalty according to the success or failure of the persons challenged to solve the riddle was a custom met with also among the ancient Greeks and in a later age among the Arabs. In 1Ki 10:1 parallel 2Ch 9:1 the word used of Samson's riddle (chidhah) is employed of the "hard questions" put to Solomon by the queen of Sheba. The Septuagint seems to have understood the word as "riddle" here also, for it renders "enigmas," and some of the later Jews not only adopted this interpretation, but actually gave riddles said to have been propounded. Of these riddles which, of course, have no direct historic value, but are interesting specimens of riddle lore, one of the best is the following: "Without movement while living, it moves when its head is cut off"; the answer to which is: "a tree" (Jewish Encyclopedia, article "Riddle"; see also for these riddles Wunsche, Die Rathselweisheit bei den Hebraern, 15-23). If Josephus can be

trusted, historians of Phoenicia recorded a riddle- contest between Solomon and the Phoenician Hiram in which the latter finally won with the help of a Tyrian named Abdemon (Ant., VIII, v, 3; CAp, 1, 18). In this case, too, defeat involved penalty. The testing of ability by riddles has a striking parallel in the Persian epic, the Shah Nameh, in the trial of the hero Sal by the mobeds or wise men (Wunsche, op. cit., 43-47). Solomon's fame as an author of riddles and riddle-like sayings is referred to in Sirach 47:15,17 (Hebrew): "With song, and proverbs, dark sayings (chidhah) and figures, thou didst greatly move the nations." Chidhah occurs only once in Pr (1:6): "the words of the wise, and their dark sayings," but the collection contains several examples of what Konig calls "the numerical riddle": Pr 6:16-19; 30:7 ff, 15 f, 18 f, 21 ff, 24-28,29 ff. In each case the riddle is stated first and then the solution. The saying in Pr 26:10: "As an archer that woundeth all, so is he that hireth the fool and he that hireth them that pass by," has been cited as a riddle, and it is certainly obscure enough, but the obscurity may be due to textual corruption. There are several passages in the Old Testament in which the word chidhah seems to be used in the general sense of "mysterious utterance": Nu 12:8; Ps 49:4; 78:2; Da 5:12 (the Aramaic equivalent of chidhah); Da 8:23; Hab 2:6. In Eze 17:1 it describes the parable or allegory of the Two Eagles and the Cedar and the Vine. Sirach has several numerical riddles: 23:16; 25:1 f, 7 f; 26:5 f; 50:25 f; and there are similar sayings in Ab 5 1-11,16-21 (Taylor's edition). In the Book of Jeremiah (25:26; 51:41; 51:1) are two examples of a cryptic or cipher mode of writing which comes very near the riddle. SHe SHaKH, in the first two passages, represented by the three letters shin, shin, kaph, answering to our sh, sh, k, is meant to be read with the substitution for each letter of the letter as near the beginning of the alphabet as it is near the end, the result being sh = b, sh = b, k = l, that is, B-b-l or Babel/Babylon. In the same way in the last passage the consonants composing the word Lebkamai l, b, k, margin, y, suggest k, s, d, y, margin, that is, Kasdim or Chaldees. This cipher or riddle-writing was called by the Jews 'At-bash (compare Buxtorf, Lexicon Chaldaicum, etc., I, 131, 137 f, edited by Fischer; and modern commentaries on Jer). The New Testament contains no riddle except the numerical puzzle, Re 13:18 (compare NUMBER; GEMATRIA), and has the Greek equivalent of chidhah only in 1Co 13:12, "for now we see .... darkly," the Revised Version, margin "in a riddle" (Greek en ainigmati). There can be little doubt that riddles enlivened marriage festivals, such as that of Cana. Wunsche (op. cit.) gives some interesting specimens of later Jewish riddles, subsequent indeed to our Lord's time, but such as might have been in circulation then.

LITERATURE.

The most important authority is the above-cited monograph of Wunsche. Konig has an interesting paragraph in his Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik, etc., 12 f. Compare also Hamburger, RE, II, 966 ff; articles on "Riddle" in Jew Encyclopedia, Smith's DB, HDB, larger and smaller; Murray's DB; German Bible Dictionaries of Winer, Riehm2, and Guthe; Rosenmuller, Das alte und neue Morgenland, III. 48 f.

II. The Games of Greece and Rome.

1. Historical Introduction:

This is not the place to give a detailed account of the Greek gymnasia and the elaborate contests for

which candidates were prepared in them, or to describe the special forms of sport introduced by the Romans, but these exercises and amusements were so well known in Palestine and throughout the Roman Empire in the time of Christ and the apostles that they cannot be passed over in silence. Some acquaintance with them is absolutely necessary for the interpretation of many passages in the New Testament, especially in the Epistles. Hellenic athletics found their way into Jewish society through the influence of the Greek kingdom ruled over by the Seleucids. Early in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 176 BC) a gymnasium, "place of exercise," was built in Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:14; 2 Macc 4:9,12) and frequented by priests (1 Macc 1:14 f), who are spoken of as "making of no account the honors of their fathers, and thinking the glories of the Greeks best of all." After the success of the Maccabean rising Greek games fell into disrepute among the Jewish population of Palestine, and were thenceforth regarded with suspicion by all strict religionists, even the worldly Josephus sharing the general feeling (Ant., XV, viii, 1). Nevertheless Gentilegames must have been familiar to most in Jerusalem and elsewhere during the Herodian rule and the Roman occupation. Herod the Great built a theater and amphitheater in the neighborhood of the city (Josephus, ibid.; for probable sites, see G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 493), and instituted in the name of Caesar games which included Roman as well as Hellenic sports, celebrated every 5 years. There was also a hippodrome or race-course for horses and chariots, bearing considerable resemblance to the Roman circus (Josephus, Ant, XVII, x, 2; BJ, II, iii, 1). Jericho, too, was provided with a theater, an amphitheater and a hippodrome. There was a hippodrome also at Tarichea. In addition there were scattered over Syria many Hellenic and partially Hellenic cities—Schurer (GJV4, II, 108-221) gives the history of 33—Caesarea Stratonis, Caesarea Philippi, the cities of the Decapolis, Tiberias, etc., which would all have had gymnasia and games. In Tarsus, which must have had a large Greek element in its population, Paul must have heard, and perhaps seen, in his childhood, much of the athletic exercises which were constantly in progress, and in later life he must often have been reminded of them, especially at Corinth, near which were celebrated biennially the Isthmia or Isthmian Games which drew visitors from all parts of the Empire, at Caesarea which possessed a theater, an amphitheater and a stadium, and at Ephesus. The custom, indeed, seems to have been almost universal. No provincial city of any importance was without it (Schurer, op. cit., 48), especially after the introduction of games in honor of the Caesars. The early Christians, therefore, whether of Jewish or Gentileorigin, were able to understand, and the latter at any rate to appreciate, references either to the games in general, or to details of their celebration.

2. General References:

The word which described the assembly gathered together at one of the great Grecian games (agon) was also applied to the contests themselves, and then came to be used of any intense effort or conflict. The corresponding verb (agonizomai) had a similar history. Both these words are used figuratively in the Pauline Epistles: the noun in Php 1:30; Col 2:1; 1Th 2:2; 1Ti 6:12; 2Ti 4:7, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (except in the second passage), "conflict" or "fight"; the verb in Col 1:29; 4:12; 1Ti 4:10; 6:12; 2Ti 4:7, translated "strive," "fight." In 1Co 9:25; 2Ti 2:5 (where another word is used) there are literal references. The former passage English Revised Version: "Every man that striveth in the games (agonizomenos) is temperate in all things," also alludes to the rigid self-control enforced by long training which the athlete must practice. The training itself is glanced at in the exhortation: "Exercise thyself (gumnaze) unto godliness" (1Ti 4:7), and in the remark which follows:

"Bodily exercise (gumnasia) is profitable for a little." It is remarkable that the word gymnasium, or "place of training," which occurs in the Apocrypha (2 Macc 4:9,12) is not met with in the New Testament. The necessity for the observance of rules and regulations is referred to in the words: "And if also a man contend in the games, he is not crowned, except he have contended lawfully" (2Ti 2:5). In all these passages the games will have been more or less in the apostle's thought (for other possible New Testament references compare Heb 5:14; 10:32; 12:1; 2Pe 2:14).

3. Specific References to Greek Athletics:

In addition to these general references there are many allusions to details, again found mainly in the Pauline Epistles. These may most conveniently be grouped in alphabetical order.

(a) Beast-fight.

The combats of wild animals with one another and with men, which were so popular at Rome toward the close of the Republic and under the Empire, were not unknown in Palestine. Condemned criminals were thrown to wild beasts by Herod the Great in his amphitheater at Jerusalem, "to afford delight to spectators," a proceeding which Josephus (Ant., XV, viii, 1) characterizes as impious. After the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD many Jewish captives were slain in fighting with wild beasts (BJ, VII, ii). This horrible form of sport must have been in the apostle's mind when he wrote: "I fought with beasts (etheriomachesa) at Ephesus" (1Co 15:32). The reference is best understood as figurative, as in Ignatius on Ro 5:1, where the same word (theriomacheo) is used, and the soldiers are compared to leopards.

(b) Boxing.

This form of sport is directly referred to in 1Co 9:26: "So box I (Revised Version margin, Greek pukteuo), as not beating the air." The allusion is probably continued in 9:27a: "but I buffet (the Revised Version, margin "bruise," Greek hupopiazo) my body."

(c) The Course.

Foot-races and other contests took place in an enclosure 606 feet 9 inches in length, called a stadium. This is once referred to in a passage in the context of that just mentioned, which almost seems based on observation: "They that run in a race-course (RVm, Greek stadion) run all" (1Co 9:24).

(d) Discus Throwing.

The throwing of the discus, a round plate of stone or metal 10 or 12 inches in diameter, which was a prominent feature of Greek athletics and is the subject of a famous statue, a copy of which is in the British Museum, is not mentioned in the New Testament, but is alluded to in 2 Macc 4:14 as one of the amusements indulged in by Hellenizing priests in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

(e) The Foot-race.

The words for "run" and "race" (Greek trecho and dromos) sometimes clearly, and in other cases probably, allude to foot-races at the games. For obvious references compare 1Co 9:24; Heb 12:1; 2Ti 4:7; for possible references see Ac 13:25; 20:24; Ro 9:16; Ga 2:2; 5:7; Php 2:16; 2Th 3:1. The second of these passages (Heb 12:1) alludes to the necessity for the greatest possible reduction of weight, and for steady concentration of effort. All the passages would remind the first readers of the single-course and double-course foot-races of the games.

(f) The Goal.

The goal of the foot-race, a square pillar at the end of the stadium opposite the entrance, which the athlete as far as possible kept in view and the sight of which encouraged him to redouble his exertions, is alluded to once: "I press on toward the goal" (Php 3:14, Greek skopos).

(g) The Herald.

The name and country of each competitor were announced by a herald and also the name, country and father of a victor. There may be an allusion to this custom in 1Co 9:27: "after that I have been a herald (Revised Version margins, Greek kerusso) to others"; compare also 1Ti 2:7; 2Ti 1:11, where the Greek for "preacher" is kerux, "herald."

(h) The Prize.

Successful athletes were rewarded at the great games by a wreath consisting in the apostolic age of wild olive (Olympian), parsley (Nemean), laurel (Pythian), or pine (Isthmian). This is referred to in a general way in Php 3:14, and in 1Co 9:24: "One receiveth the prize" (Greek in both cases brabeion; compare also Col 3:15: "Let the peace of Christ arbitrate (Revised Version margin) in your hearts," where the verb is brabeuo). The wreath (stephanos) is directly alluded to in 1Co 9:25: "They (the athletes) do it to receive a corruptible crown"; 2Ti 2:5: "A man .... is not crowned, except he have contended lawfully"; and 1Pe 5:4: "Ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away." There may be allusions also in Php 4:1; 1Th 2:19; Heb 2:7,9; Jas 1:12; Re 2:10; 3:11. In the palm-bearing multitude of the Apocalypse (Re 7:9) there is possibly a reference to the carrying of palm-branches by victors at the games. The judges who sat near the goal and who, at Olympia at any rate, had been carefully prepared for their task, may be glanced at in 2Ti 4:8: "The crown .... which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give to me at that day."

(i) Wrestling.

This form of sport, which was in great favor in Greek society from the age of Homer onward, is alluded to once in the New Testament: "Our wrestling (Greek pale) is not against flesh and blood," etc. (Eph 6:12). The exercise made great demands on strength, perseverance and dexterity. There is an indirect

allusion in the term palaestra, which first meant "place for wrestling," and then "place for athletic exercises in general" (2 Macc 4:14).

4. References to the Theater and the Drama:

Although there is no direct reference in the New Testament to the intellectual contests in which the Greeks delighted as much as in athletics, the former cannot be entirely ignored. The word "theater" (Greek theatron) occurs 3 times: twice in the sense of "public hall" (Ac 19:29,31); and once with a clear reference to its use as a place of amusement: "We are made a spectacle" (1Co 4:9). "The drama was strongly discountenanced by the strict Jews of Palestine, but was probably encouraged to some extent by some of the Jews of the Diaspora, especially in Asia Minor and Alexandria. Philo is known to have witnessed the representation of a play of Euripides, and the Jewish colony to which he belonged produced a dramatic poet named Ezekiel, who wrote inter alia a play on the Exodus, some fragments of which have been preserved (Schurer, GJV4, II, 60; III, 500 ff). An inscription found not long ago at Miletus shows that part of theater of that city was reserved for Jews (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 446 ff). The readers of the Pauline Epistles, Jews as well as Gentiles, would be generally more or less familiar with theater and the drama. It has been suggested that there is a glimpse of a degraded form of the drama, the mime or mimic play, which was exceedingly popular in the 1st century and afterward, in the mockery of Jesus by the soldiers (Mt 27:27-30 parallel Mr 15:16-19). The "king" seems to have been a favorite character with the comic mime. The mockery of the Jewish king, Agrippa I, by the populace of Alexandria, a few years later, which furnishes a very striking parallel to the incident recorded in the Gospels (Schurer, GJV4, I, 497), is directly connected by Philo with the mimes. The subject is very ably discussed by a German scholar, Hermann Reich, in a learned monograph, Der Konig mit der Dornenkrone (1905). Certainty is, of course, unattainable, but it seems at least fairly probable that the rude Syrian soldiers, who were no doubt in the habit of attending theater, may have been echoing some mimic play in their mock homage to "the king of the Jews."

LITERATURE.

In addition to works already mentioned see for the whole subject: articles "Games" in Smith, DB2; HDB, large and small; EB; Jewish Encyclopedia; arts. "Spiele" in Winer, RWB, and Riehm2, and especially Konig, "Spiele bei den Hebraern," RE3. On the games of Greece and Rome See articles in Smith’s Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities, "Amphitheatrum," "Circus," "Olympia," "Stadium," etc.

William Taylor Smith

GAMMADIM

gam’-a-dim (gammadhim):

The word occurs only in Eze 27:11, in the King James Version in form "Gammadims," in the English Revised Version "Gammadim." In the American Standard Revised Version, as also in the English

Revised Version, margin, it is rendered "valorous men." Some think a proper name is required, but identification is not possible, and the meaning remains doubtful.

GAMUL

ga’-mul (gamul, "weaned"):

The head of the 22nd of the 24 courses of priests inaugurated by David (1Ch 24:17).

GANGRENE

gan’-gren (gaggraina, pronounced gan-graina; the King James Version canker):

The name was used by the old Greek physicians for an eating ulcer which corrodes the soft parts and, according to Galen, often ends in mortification. Paul compares the corrupting influence of profane babbling or levity, in connection with subjects which ought to be treated with reverence to this disease (2Ti 2:17). The old English word "canker" is used by 16th-and 17th-century authors as the name of a caterpillar which eats into a bud. In this sense it occurs 18 times in Shakespeare (e.g. Midsummer Night’s Dream, II, ii, 3). The canker-worm mentioned 6 times by Joe and Nahum is probably the young stage of Acridium peregrinum, a species of locust. Cankered in Jas 5:3 the King James Version means "rusted" (Greek katiotai), and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). In Susanna verse 52 Coverdale uses the phrase, "O thou old cankered carle," in Daniel’s address to the elder, where English Versions of the Bible has "waxen old in wickedness." The word is still used in the Scottish dialect and applied to persons who are cross-grained and disagreeable.

Alexander Macalister

GAP

The translation of perets, "a breach" (Eze 13:5, "Ye have not gone up into the gaps," the Revised Version, margin "breaches"; Eze 22:30, "I sought for a man among them, that should build up the wall, and stand in the gap before me for the land"). Said of prophets who failed to stand up for the right and to strengthen and preserve the people.

GAR

gar: the King James Version for GAS (which see).

GARDEN

gar’-d’-n (gan, gannah, ginnah; kepos): The Arabic jannah (diminutive, jannainah), like the Hebrew

gannah, literally, "a covered or hidden place," denotes in the mind of the dweller in the East something more than the ordinary garden. Gardens in Biblical times, such as are frequently referred to in Semitic literature, were usually walled enclosures, as the name indicates (La 2:6 the American Revised Version, margin), in which there were paths winding in and out among shade and fruit trees, canals of running water, fountains, sweet-smelling herbs, aromatic blossoms and convenient arbors in which to sit and enjoy the effect. These gardens are mentioned in Ge 2 and Ge 3; 13:10; So 4:12-16; Ec 2:5,6; Eze 28:13; 31:8,9; 36:35; Joe 2:3. Ancient Babylonian, Assyrian and Egyptian records show the fondness of the rulers of these countries for gardens laid out on a grand scale and planted with the rarest trees and plants. The drawings made by the ancients of their gardens leave no doubt about their general features and their correspondence with Biblical gardens. The Persian word pardec (paradeisos) appears in the later Hebrew writings to denote more extensive gardens or parks. It is translated "orchards" in Ec 2:5 the King James Version; So 4:13.

See PARADISE.

Such gardens are still common throughout the Levant. They are usually situated on the outskirts of a city (compare Joh 18:1,26; 19:41), except in the case of the more pretentious estates of rich pashas or of the government seats (compare 2Ki 21:18; Es 1:5; 7:7,8; Ne 3:15; 2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4; 52:7). They are enclosed with walls of mud blocks, as in Damascus, or stone walls capped with thorns, or with hedges of thorny bushes (compare La 2:6 the American Revised Version, margin), or prickly pear. In nearly treeless countries, where there is no rain during 4 or 5 months, at least, of the year, the gardens are often the only spots where trees and other vegetation can flourish, and here the existence of vegetation depends upon the water supply, brought in canals from streams, or raised from wells by more or less crude lifting machines (compare Nu 24:7). Such references as Ge 2:10; Nu 24:6; De 11:10; Isa 1:30; 58:11; So 4:15 indicate that in ancient times they were as dependent upon irrigation in Biblical lands as at present. The planning of their gardens so as to utilize the water supplies has become instinctive with the inhabitants of Palestine and Syria. The writer has seen a group of young Arab boys modeling a garden out of mud and conducting water to irrigate it by channels from a nearby canal, in a manner that a modern engineer would admire. Gardens are cultivated, not only for their fruits and herbs (compare So 6:11; Isa 1:8; 1Ki 21:2) and shade (compare So 6:11; Lu 13:19), but they are planned to serve as dwelling-places during the summer time when the houses are hot and stuffy. That this was an ancient practice is indicated by So 5:2; 6:2; 8:13. A shaded garden, the air laden with the ethereal perfumes of fruits and flowers, accompanied by the music of running water, a couch on which to sit or recline, suggest a condition of bliss dear to the Oriental. Only one who has traveled for days in a dry, glaring desert country and has come upon a spot like the gardens of such a city as Damascus, can realize how near like paradise these gardens can appear. Mohammed pictured such a place as the future abode of his followers

No doubt the remembrances of his visit to Damascus were fresh in his mind when he wrote. El-Jannah is used by the Moslems to signify the "paradise of the faithful."

Gardens were used as places of sacrifice, especially in heathen worship (Isa 1:29; 65:3; 66:17). They sometimes contained burial places (2Ki 21:18,26; Joh 19:41).

Figurative: The destruction of gardens typified desolation (Am 4:9); on the other hand, fruitful gardens figured prosperity (Nu 24:6; Job 8:16; Isa 51:3; 58:11; 61:11; Jer 29:5,28; 31:12; Am 9:14).

James A. Patch

GARDEN, THE KING'S

Mention is made of "the king's garden" in 2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4; 52:7 (fundamentally the same passage), in connection with the flight of Zedekiah from Jerusalem; and again in Ne 3:15. The last passage shows that the "garden" was at the pool of Siloah (the Revised Version (British and American) "Shelah"), at the mouth of Tyropeon, near the "fountain gate." This would seem to be "the gate between the two walls which was by the king's garden" of the passages in 2Ki and Jer (compare 2Ch 32:5). On the topography, see JERUSALEM; also Robinson, Palestine, II, 142. Arnold (in Herzog) thinks the garden is probably identical with "the garden of Uzza" of 2Ki 21:18,26.

James Orr

GARDEN-HOUSE

(beth ha-gan):

A place mentioned in describing the flight of Ahaziah, king of Judah, from Jehu (2Ki 9:27). Probably we ought not to translate the Hebrew, but take it as a proper name, BETH-HAGGAN (which see). If he fled southward, the town might possibly be Jenin, EN-GANNIM, which see.

GARDENER

gar'-d'-n-er (kepouros):

"Gardener" occurs once in the English Versions of the Bible (Joh 20:15), the translation of kepos and ouros, "warden" or "keeper." It is likely that the man referred to was the watchman or keeper (Arabic natur; Hebrew notser), corresponding to those mentioned in 2Ki 17:9; 18:8; Job 27:18, etc., and not one who did the manual labor. It is the common practice in Palestine today to set a watchman over a garden during its productive season.

See WATCHMAN.

GAREB

ga'-reb (garebh):

One of David’s "mighty men of the armies" (2Sa 23:38; 1Ch 11:40), an "Ithrite," i.e. a member of one of the families of Kiriath-jearim (1Ch 2:53). Some, however, read ha-yattiri for ha- yithri, thus making him a native of Jattir.

See IRA.

GAREB, THE HILL OF

ga’-reb, (garebh):

A hill in the neighborhood of Jerusalem, which was one of the landmarks to which the prophet Jeremiah (31:39) foresaw that the city should extend. The site is unknown. Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica) would connect this with the "mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward" (Jos 15:8), but this is too far South; it is inconceivable that the prophet could have imagined the city extending so far in this direction; most probably the hill was to the North—the one natural direction for the city’s extension—and is now incorporated in the modern suburbs.

E. W. G. Masterman

GARIZIM

gar’-i-zim.

See GERIZIM.

GARLAND

gar’-land (stemma, "wreath"):

Mentioned only in Ac 14:13, where it is said that the priest of Jupiter brought oxen and garlands unto the gates with which to offer sacrifices unto Barnabas and Paul. The rendering "oxen and garlands," instead of "oxen garlanded," seems to imply that the garlands were for the priests and altar and worshippers themselves, as well as for the victims sacrificed. Only occasionally did the Hebrews use such ornaments for themselves, and that almost altogether in their later history.

See CROWN.

GARLIC

gar’-lik (shum, used only in plural shumim; compare Arabic thum):

One of the delights of Egypt for which the Israelites in the Wilderness longed (Nu 11:5); we know from other sources that, though originally a product of Central Asia, garlic was known to the ancient Egyptians. It is the bulb of Allium sativum, Natural Order Liliaceae, and is cultivated all over the Orient. It is eaten cooked in stews; its disagreeable penetrating odor is in evidence in the houses and on the breath of most Orientals. A bulb of garlic, hung over a bed or over the door of a house, is a powerful charm against the evil eye and other malign influences.

E. W. G. Masterman

GARMENT

gar’-ment.

See DRESS.

GARMITE

gar’-mit (garmi):

A gentilic name applied to Keilah in 1Ch 4:19.

The reason for this is not known.

GARNER

gar’-ner (mazu; apotheke):

"Garners," derived from zawah, "to gather," occurs in Ps 144:13; ‘otsar is similarly translated in Joe 1:17. In the New Testament apotheke is twice translated "garner" (Mt 3:12; Lu 3:17).

The same word is translated "barns" in Mt 6:26; 13:30; Lu 12:18,24.

GARNISH

gar’-nish (tsippah, shiphrah; kosmeo):

The word is used twice in the Old Testament. In 2Ch 3:6, tsippah means "to overlay," or "to plate." Thus, he "garnished" the house or "overlaid" it, "studded" it, with precious stones, and thus adorned and

beautified it. In Job 26:13, shiphrah is a feminine noun meaning "fairness," "beauty," "brilliancy." "By his Spirit the heavens are garnished," i.e. the clouds are driven off by the wind or breath of Yahweh, and the sky made bright and clear.

In the New Testament (Mt 12:44; 23:29) the word kosmeo means "set in order," "make ready," "adorn," etc. In Mt 25:7 it is translated "trimmed," and in Re 21:19 "adorned."

J. J. Reeve

GARRISON

gar’-i-s’-n.

See WAR.

GAS

gas (Gas):

Named among the "sons of the servants of Solomon" (APC 1Esdras 5:34); not mentioned in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

GASHMU

gash’-mu, gash’-moo (gashmu):

A form of the name GESHEM (which see), found in Ne 6:6 (compare Ne 6:1), "And Gashmu saith it." According to BDB the same termination -u is found in Nabatean proper names.

GATAM

ga’-tam (ga‘tam):

An Edomite chief, grandson of Esau (Ge 36:11,16; 1Ch 1:36).

GATE

gat (Hebrew normally (over 300 times) sha‘ar; occasionally deleth, properly, "gateway" (but compare De 3:5); elsewhere the gateway is pethach (compare especially Ge 19:6); Aramaic tera‘; Greek pulon, pule; the English Revised Version and the King James Version add caph, "threshold," in 1Ch 9:19,22;

and the King James Version adds delathayim, "double-door," in Isa 45:1; thura, "door," Ac 3:2):

(1) The usual gateway was provided with double doors, swung on projections that fitted into sockets in the sill and lintel. Ordinarily the material was wood (Ne 2:3,17), but greater strength and protection against fire was given by plating with metal (Ps 107:16; Isa 45:2). Josephus (BJ, V, v, 3) speaks of the solid metal doors of the Beautiful Gate (Ac 3:2) as a very exceptional thing. Some doors were solid slabs of stone, from which the imagery of single jewels (Isa 54:12; Re 21:21) was derived. When closed, the doors were secured with a bar (usually of wood, Na 3:13, but sometimes of metal, 1Ki 4:13; Ps 107:16; Isa 45:2), which fitted into clamps on the doors and sockets in the post, uniting the whole firmly (Jud 16:3). Sometimes, perhaps, a portcullis was used, but Ps 24:7 refers to the enlargement or enrichment of the gates. As the gate was especially subject to attack (Eze 21:15,22), and as to "possess the gate" was to possess the city (Ge 22:17; 24:60), it was protected by a tower (2Sa 18:24,33; 2Ch 14:7; 26:9), often, doubtless, overhanging and with flanking projections. Sometimes an inner gate was added (2Sa 18:24). Unfortunately, Palestine gives us little monumental detail.

(2) As even farm laborers slept in the cities, most of the men passed through the gate every day, and the gate was the place for meeting others (Ru 4:1; 2Sa 15:2) and for assemblages. For the latter purpose "broad" or open places (distinguished from the "streets" in Pr 7:12) were provided (1Ki 22:10; Ne 8:1), and these were the centers of the public life. Here the markets were held (2Ki 7:1), and the special commodities in these gave names to the gates (Ne 3:1,3,18). In particular, the "gate" was the place of the legal tribunals (De 16:18; 21:19; 25:7, etc.), so that a seat "among the elders in the gates" (Pr 31:23) was a high honor, while "oppression in the gates" was a synonym for judicial corruption (Job 31:21; Pr 22:22; Isa 29:21; Am 5:10). The king, in especial, held public audiences in the gate (2Sa 19:8; 1Ki 22:10; Jer 38:7; compare Jer 39:3), and even yet "Sublime Porte" (the French translation of the Turkish for "high gate") is the title of the Court of Constantinople. To the gates, as the place of throngs, prophets and teachers went with their message (1Ki 22:10; Jer 17:19; Pr 1:21; 8:3; 31:31), while on the other hand the gates were the resort of the town good-for-nothings (Ps 69:12).

(3) "Gates" can be used figuratively for the glory of a city (Isa 3:26; 14:31; Jer 14:2; La 1:4; contrast Ps 87:2), but whether the military force, the rulers or the people is in mind cannot be determined. In Mt 16:18 "gates of Hades" (not "hell") may refer to the hosts (or princes) of Satan, but a more likely translation is ‘the gates of the grave (which keep the dead from returning) shall not be stronger than it.’ The meaning in Jud 5:8,11 is very uncertain, and the text may be corrupt.

See CITY; JERUSALEM; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

Burton Scott Easton

GATE, CORNER, FOUNTAIN, HORSE, SUR

See JERUSALEM.

GATE, EAST

The expressions are found in Ezekiel: "Even the gate that looketh toward the east" (43:1); "The gate whose prospect is toward the east" (43:4); but the idea of a gate on the eastern side as the principal entrance to the court of the sanctuary goes back to the days of the tabernacle (Ex 27:13-16). In addition to its use as admitting to the sanctuary enclosure, it may be presumed, in analogy with the general mode of the administration of justice, to have been the place where in earlier times cases were tried which were referred to the jurisdiction of the sanctuary (compare Ex 18:19-22; De 17:8; 19:16,18; Nu 27:2,3, etc.).

1. The Tabernacle:

In Ex 27:13-16 the "gate" by which the congregation entered the tabernacle is carefully described. An embroidered screen of the three sacred colors (blue, purple and scarlet), 20 cubits in width, hung from 4 pillars (really 5 pillars, 5 cubits apart; on the reckoning see TABERNACLE), in the center of the East side of the tabernacle court. This is further alluded to in Nu 4:26, "the screen for the door of the gate of the court."

2. Solomon’s Temple:

Nothing is said of the position of gates in connection with Solomon’s temple, but there was an "inner" (1Ki 6:36), and also an "outer" or "great" court (2Ch 4:9), the latter with doors overlaid with brass, and analogy makes it certain that here also the chief gate (inner or outer court? see COURT) was on the East side. Provision was made by Solomon in his adjoining palace for the administration of justice in a hall or "porch of judgment" (1Ki 7:7), but graver cases were still, apparently, referred for decision to the sanctuary (Jer 26:10). The trial in Jeremiah’s case, however, took place, not at the East gate, but at "the entry of the new gate of Yahweh’s house" (Jer 26:10; compare 36:10), probably Jotham’s "upper gate" (2Ki 15:35).

3. Ezekiel’s Temple:

In Ezekiel’s ideal temple, "the gate whose prospect was toward the east" was that by which the glory of Yahweh went up from the city (Eze 11:23), and by which the prophet in vision saw it return (Eze 43:4).

4. Second Temple:

Nothing is told of an East gate in the temple of Zerubbabel, but it may be assumed that there was one as in the other cases.

5. Herod’s Temple:

The great East gate of the Herodian temple, which followed those above mentioned, was that "Beautiful

Gate of the temple" where the miracle of the healing of the lame man was performed (Ac 3:1-10).

See GATE, THE BEAUTIFUL; HARSITH; SHECANIAH.

W. Shaw Caldecott

GATE, THE BEAUTIFUL

bu’-ti-fool (he horaia pule tou hierou):

This gate of Herod’s temple is mentioned in the narrative of the healing of the lame man by Peter and John in Ac 3:2,10. Little dispute exists as to the identification of the Beautiful Gate with the splendid "gate of Nicanor" of the Mishna (Mid., i.4), and "Corinthian Gate" of Josephus (BJ, V, v, 3), but authorities are divided as to whether this gate was situated at the entrance to the women’s court on the East, or was the gate reached by 15 steps, dividing that court from the court of the men. The balance of recent opinion inclines strongly to the former view (compare Kennedy, "Problems of Herod’s Temple," The Expositor Times, XX, 170); others take the opposite view (Waterhouse, in Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 110), or leave the question open (thus G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 212). See TEMPLE, HEROD’S.

The gate itself was of unusual size and splendor. It received the name "Nicanor" from its being the work, or having been constructed at the expense, of an Alexandrian Jew of this name. Lately an ossuary was discovered on Mt. Olivet bearing the Greek inscription: "The bones of Nicanor the Alexandrian, who made the doors."

Its other name, "Corinthian," refers to the costly material of which it was constructed—Corinthian bronze. Josephus gives many interesting particulars about this gate, which, he tells us, greatly excelled in workmanship and value all the others (BJ, V, v, 3). These were plated with gold and silver, but this still more richly and thickly. It was larger than the other gates; was 50 cubits in height (the others 40); its weight was so great that it took 20 men to move it (BJ, VI, vi, 3). Its massiveness and magnificence, therefore, well earned for it the name "Beautiful."

W. Shaw Caldecott

GATE, VALLEY

In Ne 2:13 the King James Version, "gate of the valley."

See JERUSALEM.

GATH

gath (gath; Septuagint Geth, "winepress"):

One of the five chief cities of the Philistines (Jos 13:3; 1Sa 6:17). It was a walled town (2Ch 26:6) and was not taken by Joshua, and, although many conflicts took place between the Israelites and its people, it does not seem to have been captured until the time of David (1Ch 18:1). It was rendered famous as the abode of the giant Goliath whom David slew (1Sa 17:4), and other giants of the same race (2Sa 21:18-22). It was to Gath that the Ashdodites conveyed the ark when smitten with the plague, and Gath was also smitten (1Sa 5:8,9).

It was Gath where David took refuge twice when persecuted by Saul (21:10; 27:2-4). It seems to have been destroyed after being taken by David, for we find Rehoboam restoring it (2Ch 11:8). It was after this reoccupied by the Philistines, for we read that Uzziah took it and razed its walls (2Ch 26:6), but it must have been restored again, for we find Hazael of Damascus capturing it (2Ki 12:17). It seems to have been destroyed before the time of Amos (Am 6:2), and is not further mentioned in the Old Testament or Macc, except in Mic 1:10, where it is referred to in the proverb, "Tell it not in Gath" (compare 2Sa 1:20). Since its destruction occurred, probably, in the middle of the 8th century BC, it is easy to understand why the site has been lost so that it can be fixed only conjecturally. Several sites have been suggested by different explorers and writers, such as: Tell es Safi, Beit Jibrin, Khurbet Jeladiyeh, Khurbet Abu Geith, Jennata and Yebna (see PEFS, 1871, 91; 1875, 42, 144, 194; 1880, 170-71, 211-23; 1886, 200-202).

Tradition in the early centuries AD fixed it at 5 Roman miles North of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin, toward Lydda, which would indicate Tell es Safi as the site, but the Crusaders thought it was at Jamnia (Yebna), where they erected the castle of Ibelin, but the consensus of opinion in modern times fixes upon Tell es Safi as the site, as is to be gathered from the references cited in PEFS above. The Biblical notices of Gath would indicate a place in the Philistine plain or the Shephelah, which was fortified, presumably in a strong position on the border of the Philistine country toward the territory of Judah or Dan. Tell es Safi fits into these conditions fairly well, but without other proof this is not decisive. It is described in SWP, II, 240, as a position of strength on a narrow ridge, with precipitous cliffs on the North and West, connected with the hills by a narrow neck, so that it is thrust out like a bastion, a position easily fortified.

In 1144 Fulke of Anjou erected here a castle called Blanchegarde (Alba Specula). The writer on "Gath and Its Worthies" in PEFS, 1886, 200-204, connects the name Safi with that of the giant Saph (2Sa 21:18), regarding him as a native of Gath, but the most direct evidence from early tradition connecting Tell es Safi with Gath is found in a manuscript said to be in the library of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, which informs us that Catherocastrum was situated on a mountain called Telesaphion or Telesaphy, which is clearly Tell es Safi. Catherocastrum must be the Latin for "camp of Gath" (PEFS, 1906, 305).

H. Porter

GATH-HEPHER

gath-he’-fer (gath ha-chepher, "winepress of the pit"):

A town on the boundary of Zebulun (Jos 19:13; the King James Version in error, "Gittah- hapher"), the birthplace of the prophet Jonah (2Ki 14:25). Jerome (Commentary on Jonah) speaks of Geth as an inconsiderable village, about 2 miles from Sepphoris on the Tiberias road, where the tomb of Jonah was shown. Benjamin of Tudela says that Jonah the son of Amittai the prophet was buried "in the mountain" near Sepphoris (Bohn, Early Travels in Palestine, 88). These indications agree with the local tradition which identifies Gath-hepher with el-Meshhed, a village with ancient ruins on a height North of the road as one goes to Tiberias, about 2 miles from Nazareth, and half a mile from Kefr Kennah.

W. Ewing

GATH-RIMMON gath-rim’-un (gath rimmon, "winepress of Rimmon"):

(1) A city in the territory of Da named with Bene-berak and Me-jarkon, in the plain not far from Joppa (Jos 19:45), assigned to the Kohathite Levites (Jos 21:24), reckoned to Ephraim in 1Ch 6:69. Eusebius, Onomasticon locates it 12 miles from Eleutheropolis on the way to Diospolis. This, however, is too far to the South. More probably it is identical with the "Gath" which Eusebius, Onomasticon places between Antipatris and Jamnia. It is not identified.

(2) A town in the territory of Manasseh, West of Jordan, given to the Levites (Jos 21:25). There is nothing to indicate the position of the place, and there is much confusion in the writing of the name: Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus, "Baithsa"; Codex Vaticanus, "Jebatha." In 1Ch 6:70 it is replaced by "Bileam," i.e. IBLEAM (which see).

W. Ewing

GATHER

gath’-er (’acaph, qabhats; sullego, sunago):

"Gather," transitive "to bring together," "collect," etc., and intransitive "to come together," "assemble," etc., occurs frequently and represents many Hebrew and Greek words. It is the translation of ‘acaph, "to bring together," in Jos 6:9, the King James Version margin "gathering host"; Ps 27:10, the King James Version margin "The Lord will gather me"; compare Nu 12:14,15; Isa 52:12 King James Version margin. The phrases "gather thee unto thy fathers," "gathered unto his fathers," "gathered into the grave," etc., are frequently used for "to die" and "death" (Ge 25:8,17; 49:29,33; De 32:50; 2Ki 22:20; 2Ch 34:28; Job 27:19; compare Jer 8:2), etc.; qabhats, "to take or grasp with the hand," is frequently used of the Divine "gathering" or restoration of Israel (De 30:3,1; Ne 1:9; Ps 106:47; Isa 43:5, etc.; Eze

20:34, etc.; Ho 8:10; Mic 2:12; Ze 3:19,20; Zec 10:8,10); figuratively, Isa 40:11, "He shall gather the lambs with (the Revised Version (British and American) "in") his arm" (compare Ps 27:10 King James Version margin); sometimes it denotes bringing together for punishment or destruction (Mic 4:12), "He hath gathered them as the sheaves to the threshing-floor."

In the New Testament we have sullego, "to lay together," "to collect" (Mt 13:28,29,30,40,41,48); sunago "to lead or bring together," "to gather," "to collect" (Mt 25:26, "seek returns"; Joh 4:36, "fruit unto life eternal"); episunago, "to lead or bring together" (Mt 23:37, "even as a hen gathereth her chickens"); anakephalaioomai, "to sum up under one head," "to recapitulate" (Eph 1:10, "that he might gather together in one all things in Christ," the Revised Version (British and American) "to sum up all things in Christ"; compare Eph 2:14; in Ro 13:9 the passive is translated "be briefly comprehended," the Revised Version (British and American) "summed up").

"To gather," in the sense of "to infer," occurs in Ac 16:10 as the translation of sumbibazo, "to bring together" (here, in mind), "assuredly gathering," the Revised Version (British and American) "concluding" (compare 9:22, "proving").

Gatherer occurs in Am 7:14 as the translation of bolec, from balac, to cultivate figs or sycamores, "a gatherer of sycamore fruit," the Revised Version (British and American) "a dresser of sycomore-trees" ("a nipper of sycomore figs, i.e. helping to cultivate a sort of figs or mulberries produced by the real sycamore tree" (used only by the poorest), which requires nipping in the cultivation, perhaps an occupation of shepherds; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) vellicans sycamnia).

Gathering is the translation of episunagoge, "leading together unto" (2Th 2:1), "our gathering together unto him"; in 1Co 16:2 we have "gathering" (logia from lego) in the sense of a collection of many, the Revised Version (British and American) "collection," as the King James Version in 1Co 16:1.

"Gather," etc., occurs frequently in Apocrypha, e.g. "will gather us out of all the nations," sunago (Tobit 13:5); "gather them together" (1 Macc 9:7; 10:8); "Gather together our dispersion," episunagage ten diasporan hemon (2 Macc 1:27); "gathered to his fathers" prosetethe pros ton laon autou, the Revised Version (British and American) "people" (Judith 16:22; Bel and the Dragon verse 1, tous pateras; 1 Macc 2:69); "gathering up briefly," the Revised Version (British and American) "gather," suntemno (2 Macc 10:10); "gathering" in the sense of a collection of money (2 Macc 12:43), the Revised Version (British and American) "collection."

Among the changes in the Revised Version (British and American) we have "hold firm" for "gather" (Jer 51:11); "Gather thee together" for "Go one way or other" (Eze 21:16 margin, "Make thyself one"); for "gather blackness" (Na 2:10), "are waxed pale "; for "or gather together" (Job 11:10), "and call unto judgment," margin Hebrew "call an assembly"; for "even as a hen doth gather her brood" (Lu 13:34) "gathereth her own brood"; for "as the partridge sitteth on eggs and hatcheth them not," the American Standard Revised Version has "that sitteth on eggs which she hath not laid," margin "gathereth young which she hath not brought forth," text of the English Revised Version and the King James Version

margin (Jer 17:11).

W. L. Walker

GAULONITIS

gol-on-i’-tis.

See GOLAN.

GAULS

golz (Galatai):

Galatia in Asia Minor is literally the Gallia of the East; its inhabitants are called Galli by Roman writers, just as the inhabitants of ancient France are called Galatai by Greek writers. In some manuscripts in 2Ti 4:10, eis Gallian is read for eis Galatian.

The emigration of the Gauls from Europe and their settlement in the central region of the peninsula of Asia Minor are somewhat obscure subjects, but the ancient authorities leave no doubt of the main facts. In 1 Macc 8:2 it is difficult to say whether Judas Maccabeus is referring to the Gauls of Europe or the Gauls of Asia Minor. Both became finally subject to the Romans, and about the same time.

It was in 191 BC that Gallia Cisalpina was reduced to the form of a Roman province, and in 189 BC occurred the defeat of Antiochus, king of Asia. Mommsen argues that the reference is to the Gauls in the North of Italy, from the circumstance that they are mentioned as being under tribute to the Romans, and also from their mention in connection with Spain. Not much, however, can be argued from this, as the notice of them is in a manner rhetorical, and the defeat of Antiochus is mentioned practically in the same connection. In APC 2Macc 8:20 the reference is without doubt to the Asiatic Gauls or Galatians, as they are more commonly called. In the Maccabean period they were restless and fond of war, and often hired themselves out as auxiliaries to the Asiatic kings.

J. Hutchison

GAZA

ga’-za (‘azzah, "strong"; Septuagint Gaza; Arabic Ghazzeh):

One of the five chief towns of Philistia and probably the oldest, situated near the coast in lat. 31 degrees 30’ and about 40 miles South of Jaffa. It is on a hill rising 60 to 200 ft. above the plain, with sand dunes between it and the sea, which is about 2 1/2 miles distant. The plain around is fertile and wells abound,

and, being on the border of the desert between Syria and Egypt and lying in the track of caravans and armies passing from one to the other, it was in ancient times a place of importance. The earliest notices of it are found in the records of Egypt.

Thothmes III refers to it in the account of his expedition to Syria in 1479 BC, and it occurs again in the records of the expedition of Seti I in 1313 BC (Breasted, History of Egypt, 285, 409).

It occurs also in the early catalogue of cities and tribes inhabiting Canaan in the earliest times (Ge 10:19). Joshua reached it in his conquests but did not take it (Jos 10:41; 11:22).

Judah captured it (Jud 1:18) but did not hold it long, for we find it in the hands of the Philistines in the days of Samson, whose exploits have rendered it noteworthy (16:1-3,11,30). The hill to which he carried off the gate of the city was probably the one now called el-Muntar ("watch-tower"), which lies Southeast of the city and may be referred to in 2Ki 18:8, "from the tower of the watchmen to the fortified city," Gaza, with the other chief towns, sent a trespass offering to Yahweh when the ark was returned (1Sa 6:17).

Hezekiah defeated and pursued the Philistines to Gaza, but does not seem to have captured it. It was taken by Sargon in 720 BC, in his war with Egypt, since Khanun, the king of Gaza, joined the Egyptians and was captured at the battle of Raphia (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, II, 142). It was probably destroyed (see Am 1:7). It was certainly dismantled by Alexander the Great in 332, when it dared to resist him. It was then exceedingly strong, verifying its name, and was most bravely defended, so that it took Alexander two months to reduce it. He put to death all the men and sold the women and children as slaves (Grote, History of Greece, XI, 467 ff). It was restored, however, and we learn that Jonathan forced it to submit to him (Josephus, Ant, XIII, v, 5; 1 Macc 11:62), and Alexander Janneus took it and massacred the inhabitants who escaped the horrors of the siege (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xiii, 3). Pompey restored the freedom of Gaza (ibid., XIV, iv, 4), and Gabinius rebuilt it in 57 BC (ibid., XIV, v, 3).

Gaza is mentioned only once in the New Testament (Ac 8:26), in the account of Philip and the eunuch. In the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, it became a center of Greek commerce and culture, and pagan influence was strong, while the church rounded there was struggling for existence. Many martyrs there testified to the faith, until finally, under Theodosius, Christianity gained the supremacy (HGHL, 12th edition, 188). It fell into the hands of the Arabs in 634 AD, and became and has remained a Moslem city since the days of Saladin, who recovered it from the Crusaders in 1187, after the battle of Hattin. It is now a city of some 20,000 inhabitants, among whom are a few hundred Christians.

See also AZZAH.

H. Porter

GAZARA

ga-za’-ra (Gazara, Gazera):

A fortress of great strength in Judea, which figures often in the Maccabean wars. To this place Judas pursued Gorgias (APC 1Macc 4:15). It was fortified by the Greek general Bacchides (APC 1Macc 9:52; Ant, XIII, i, 3). It was captured by Simon Maccabeus, who turned out the inhabitants and purified the city. He built here a palace for himself, and appointed his son John commander of his army (APC 1Macc 13:43 ff). A different account of this occurrence is given in APC 2Macc 10:32 ff, where the capture is attributed to Judas. The narrative here, however, is inspired by antagonism to Simon because he had assumed the high-priesthood.

The fortress is identical with Tell Jezer, the ancient GEZER (which see). It is interesting to note that recent excavations have uncovered the ruins of Simon’s palace (PEFS, 1905, 26).

W. Ewing

GAZATHITES

ga’-zath-its (‘azzathim):

The inhabitants of GAZA (which see) (Jos 13:3 the King James Version), rendered "Gazites" (Jud 16:2).

GAZELLE

ga-zel’ (tsebhi, and feminine tsebhiyah; compare Tabeitha (Ac 9:36), and Arabic zabi; also Arabic ghazal; Dorkas (Ac 9:36); modern Greek zarkadi):

The word "gazelle" does not occur in the King James Version, where tsebhi and tsebhiyah, in the 16 passages where they occur, are uniformly translated "roe" or "roebuck." In the Revised Version (British and American) the treatment is not uniform. We find "gazelle" without comment in De 12:15,22; 14:5; 15:22; 1Ki 4:23. We find "roe," with marginal note "or gazelle," in Pr 6:5; So 2:7,9,17; 4:5; 8:14; Isa 13:14. We find "roe" without comment in 2Sa 2:18; 1Ch 12:8; So 3:5; 7:3. In the last passage cited, So 7:3, while the American Standard Revised Version has no note, the English Revised Version refers to So 4:5, where "gazelle" is graven in the margin. In the opinion of the writer, the rendering should be "gazelle" in all of these passages. It must be acknowledged, however, that the gazelle and the roe-deer are of about the same size, and are sometimes confused with each other. The Greek dorkas may refer to either, and in Syria the roe-deer is sometimes called ghazal or even wa‘l, which is the proper name of the Persian wild goat.

The gazelle is an antelope belonging to the bovine family of the even-toed ruminants. There are more than twenty species of gazelle, all belonging to Asia and Africa. The species found in Syria and Palestine is the Dorcas gazelle (Gazella dorcas). It is 2 ft. high at the shoulders. Both sexes have unbranched, lyrate, ringed horns, which may be a foot long. The general coloration is tawny, but it is

creamy white below and on the rump, and has a narrow white line from above the eye to the nostril. Several varieties have been distinguished, but they will not bear elevation to the rank of species, except perhaps Gazelle merilli a form of which a few specimens have been obtained from the Judean hills, having distinctly different horns from those of the common gazelle. The gazelle is found singly or in small groups on the interior plains and the uplands, but not in the high mountains. It is a marvel of lightness and grace, and a herd, when alarmed, makes off with great rapidity over the roughest country (2Sa 2:18; 1Ch 12:8; Pr 6:5; So 8:14). The beauty of the eyes is proverbial. The skin is used for floor coverings, pouches or shoes, and the flesh is eaten, though not highly esteemed.

See DEER; GOAT; ZOOLOGY.

Alfred Ely Day

GAZER

ga’-zer (gazer (in pause)).

See GEZER.

GAZERA

ga-ze’-ra (Gazera):

(1) A fortress of Judea (APC 1Macc 4:15; 7:45); in the Revised Version (British and American) always GAZARA (which see).

(2) Head of a family of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (APC 1Esdras 5:31) =" Gazzam" in Ezr 2:48 and Ne 7:51.

GAZEZ

ga’-zez (gazez, "shearer"):

(1) A son of Ephah, Caleb’s concubine (1Ch 2:46).

(2) A second Gazez is mentioned in the same verse as a son of Haran, another son of Ephah.

GAZING-STOCK

gaz’-ing-stok: This obsolete word occurs twice:

(1) in Na 3:6, as the translation of ro’i, "a sight" or "spectacle" (from ra’ah, "to look," "see," also "to look down upon," "despise,"); "I will .... make thee vile, and will set thee as a gazing-stock," as one set up to be gazed at, mocked and despised—a form of punishment in olden times; compare "mocking stock" (2 Macc 7:7), and "laughing-stock" still in use. The Hebrew word occurs only here and in Ge 16:13; 1Sa 16:12; Job 7:8; 33:21, in which places it does not have the same bad meaning; for a similar threatening compare Isa 14:16; Jer 51:37.

(2) In Heb 10:33, it is the translation of theatrizo, "to bring upon the theater," "to be made a spectacle of," "made a gazing stock both by reproaches and afflictions"; compare 1Co 4:9, theatron ginomai, where Paul says the apostles were "made a spectacle unto the world," the King James Version margin "(Greek) theater." The reference in both instances is to the custom of exhibiting criminals, and especially gladiators, men doomed to death, in theaters. "In the morning men are exposed to lions and bears; at mid-day to their spectators; those that kill are exposed to one another; the victor is detained for another slaughter; the conclusion of the fight is death" (Seneca, Ep. vii, quoted by Dr. A. Clarke on 1Co 4:9). We are apt to forget what the first preachers and professors of Christianity had to endure.

W. L. Walker

GAZITES

gaz’-its:

Inhabitants of Gaza, who were Philistines when the Israelites came into contact with them (Jos 13:3; Jud 16:2), but there was an older stratum of population which occupied the place before the invasion of the Philistines, probably of Amorite stock.

GAZZAM

gaz’-am (gazzam, "devouring"):

Head of a family of Nethinim who returned from exile (Ezr 2:48; Ne 7:51; APC 1Esdras 5:31, "Gazera").

GE-HARASHIM

ge-ha-ra’-shim (ge’charashim): In 1Ch 4:14, the King James Version renders "valley of Charashim." In Ne 11:35, English Versions of the Bible renders "valley of craftsmen"; here it is named with Lod and Ono. Something of the name perhaps survives in Khirbet Hirsa, East of Lydda.

GEBA

ge’-ba (gebha‘, "hill"):

(1) A town on the Northeast boundary of the territory of Benjamin (Jos 18:24), given to the Levites (Jos 21:17; 1Ch 6:60). It stood on the northern frontier of the kingdom of Judah, Geba and Beersheba marking respectively the northern and southern limits (2Ki 23:8). In 2Sa 5:25 "Geba" should be altered to "Gibeon," which stands in the corresponding passage, 1Ch 14:16. In Jud 20:10,33; 1Sa 13:3,16, the Hebrew reads "Geba," the translation "Gibeah" being due to confusion of the two names. From 1Sa 14:5 we gather that Geba stood to the South of the great gorge, Wady Suweinit, commanding the pass at Michmash. This was the scene of Jonathan’s daring enterprise against the Philistines, when, accompanied by his armor-bearer, he accomplished an apparently impossible feat, climbing the rocky steeps of the gorge to the North and putting the enemy to flight. There can be no doubt that the modern village of Jeba‘ occupies the ancient site. It stands to the South of Wady Suweinit, looking toward Michmash—modern Mukhmas—with Seneh, the crag on the southern lip of the gorge, in front of it. The distance from Jerusalem is about 6 miles. It was fortified by Asa with materials that his enemy Baasha had used to fortify Ramah against him (1Ki 15:22). It is named by Isaiah in his description of the terrifying march of the Assyrians upon Jerusalem from the North (10:28 ff). It appears among the cities which were reoccupied by Israel after the Exile (Ezr 2:26; Ne 11:31).

(2) (Gaibai): Between a fortress so named and Scythopolis (Beisan), Holofernes pitched his camp (Judith 3:10). On the high road that runs through Jenin, and down the Vale of Jezreel to Beisan, about 2 miles to the South of Sanur, stands the village of Jeba‘, with which this fortress may be identified.

W. Ewing

GEBAL

ge’-bal (gebhal, "border"; Bublos, and Biblos; Byblus, modern Jebeil):

(1) An ancient Phoenician city, situated on a bluff of the foothills of Lebanon, overlooking the Mediterranean. It was one of the principal seaports of Phoenicia, and had a small but good harbor for small ships. It lies in lat. 34 degrees 8’, nearly, and about 4 miles North of the river Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim). It was regarded as a holy city by the ancients. Philo mentions the tradition that it was founded by Kronos, and was sacred to the worship of Beltis and, later, of Adonis, whose rites were celebrated yearly at the river of the same name and at its source in the mountain, at Apheca (see TAMMUZ). Gebal was the center of quite an extensive district, extending from the Eleutherus on the North to the Tamyras on the South, a distance of 60 or 70 miles along the coast. It is mentioned by Jos (13:5) as the land of the Gebalites (which see) (the King James Version "Giblites"), and the Gebalites are also mentioned in 1Ki 5:18 (Hebrew 32) as aiding in the construction of Solomon’s temple. The "elders" and the "wise men" of Gebal are among the workmen employed on Tyrian ships (Eze 27:9 the American Revised Version, margin). The earliest mention of Gebal found in history is in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, which were composed in the first half of the 14th century BC. It had become, in connection with all Phoenicia, a dependency of Egypt in the days of Thothmes III and was under Egyptian governors, but, in the reign of

Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton), the Hittites and Amorites from the North and Khabiri from the South attacked the territory of Gebal, and its governor wrote letters to Amenhotep, calling for help. There are over 60 of these, describing the desperate condition of the city and of its governor, Ribaddi, who was expelled and took refuge in Beirut, but afterward regained his capital only to be besieged and lose all his dependencies, and finally to fall into the hands of the enemy. Gebal afterward became independent, as is shown by the records of Ramses IX (1442-1423 BC) and of Ramses XII, for its king retained the emissaries of the former 17 years in captivity, and treated a trusted agent of the latter with scant civility. Its king at this time was Zakkar-Baal, and kings of Gebal are mentioned in the Assyrian records, one paying tribute to Ashurnazir-pal (circa 887 BC) and another to Sennacherib (705-680). The latter king was Uru-melek, and kings of Gebal are mentioned in connection with other Phoenician cities under Persian rule. The city submitted to Alexander the Great without opposition, and furnished a fleet to aid him in the siege of Tyre (332). Strabo refers to it as a town of note in the days of Pompey (xvi.2,17), and it is frequently mentioned in Phoenician (CIS, 1) and Assyrian inscriptions in the forms Gubal and Gubli (COT, I, 174).

(2) (gebhal; Gobolitis): A district Southeast of the Dead Sea, which is referred to in Ps 83:7 (Hebrew 8) in connection with Moab, Ammon, Amalek and others, as making a covenant together against Israel (compare 1 Macc 5). Robinson (BR, II, 154) found the name Jebal still applied to this region, and Josephus (Ant., II, i, 2) speaks of a Gebalitis as forming part of Idumaea. It is a hilly region, as the modern name signifies, and includes the towns of Shobek and Tolfieh.

H. Porter

GEBALITES

ge’-bal-its (ha-gibhlim): Inhabitants of GEBAL (which see). According to the present text of Jos 13:5, "the land of the Gebalites" was given to Israel as part of its future territory. But it was never occupied by the Israelites. Septuagint, however, has a very different reading, indicating an early corruption of the text. Perhaps with many modern scholars it is better to read "to the borders of the Gebalites."

In 1Ki 5:18 the King James Version translates this word "stone-squarers," the King James Version margin gives "Giblites," and the Revised Version (British and American) "Gebalites," as workmen who, with the men of Solomon and of Hiram, fashioned the stones for the temple. Here also the text is doubtful, and some by a slight change would read: "and made a border for them" (i.e. for the stones). In Eze 27:9 the men of Gebal are described as the "calkers" of the ships of Tyre and Sidon.

George Rice Hovey

GEBER

ge’-ber (gebher, "man," "strong one"):

(1) According to 1Ki 4:13 the King James Version the father of one of the 12 officers who provided food for Solomon and his household (but here the Revised Version (British and American) "Ben-geber"). His district lay to the Northeast of Jordan.

(2) Another, and the last in the list of Solomon's commissariat officers (1Ki 4:19). His district was also East of the Jordan, but probably to the South of that named in connection with the official of 4:13 (the Revised Version (British and American) "Ben-geber"). According to the rendering of English Versions of the Bible, he is said to have been "the only officer that was in the land." Unless the text, which presents some difficulties, is corrupt, as some suppose, it probably means that this large region was assigned to one official because less able than the others to furnish the required supplies.

Benjamin Reno Downer

GEBIM

ge'-bim (gebhim, "trenches"): A place named only in Isa 10:31. Some would place it at Jebia, identifying it with the Geba of Eusebius, 5 Roman miles from Gophna (modern Jifneh), on the way to Shechem. Its place, however, in the order of names, after Anathoth, seems to point to some position South of that village, to the Northeast of Jerusalem.

GECKO

gek'-o (the Revised Version (British and American) for 'anaqah, only in Le 11:30; Septuagint mugale, "shrew mouse" or "field mouse"; the King James Version ferret): Probably a shrew or a field mouse.

See FERRET; LIZARD; SPIDER.

GEDALIAH

ged-a-li'-a (gedhalyah; except in 1Ch 25:3,9 and Jer 38:1, where it is gedhalyahu, "Yah(u) is great"):

(1) Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam (the friend and protector of Jeremiah) and grandson of Shaphan (the scribe in the reign of Josiah) (2Ki 25:22-25; Jer 39:14; 40:5-16; 41:1-18).

1. His Appointment as Governor in Judah:

After the destruction of Jerusalem and the carrying away captive of the Jews to Babylon (586 BC), Gedaliah was appointed by Nebuchadnezzar governor over the poor Jews who had been left in the land to be vinedressers and husbandmen (2Ki 25:12,22). To his charge were committed also some royal princesses (Jer 43:6) and courtiers (Jer 41:16) who had been allowed to remain as unlikely to cause any trouble. Gedaliah fixed his residence at Mizpah, a few miles Northwest of Jerusalem. Here he was joined

by Jeremiah (40:6).

2. His Conciliatory Spirit and Wise Rule:

The Jewish soldiers who had escaped capture, having heard that the Chaldeans had departed, and that Gedaliah, one of their own nation, had been appointed governor in Judah, came with Ishmael, Johanan and other officers at their head, to Gedaliah at Mizpah (2Ki 25:23,14; Jer 40:7-10). The governor assured them that they need have no fear of vengeance from their conquerors, and promised them on oath protection and security, if they would remain and cultivate the land and become the peaceful subjects of the king of Babylon. This assurance led to a general gathering around Gedaliah of refugees from all the neighboring countries (Jer 40:11,12). For two months (some think longer) Gedaliah's beneficent and wise rule did much to consolidate affairs in Judah and to inspire the feeble remnant of his countrymen with heart and hope.

3. His Treacherous Assassination:

But evil spirits were at work against him. Baalis, king of Ammon, had determined upon his life (Jer 40:13-16). The peaceful and popular rule which was being established by the good governor stood in the way of the accomplishment of any plan of conquest he entertained. Baalis found a ready instrument for his murderous design in Ishmael who, as one of royal birth and in the counsels of the king (Jer 41:1), was doubtless jealous of the man who had been chosen governor in preference to himself. Gedaliah was informed by Johanan and the other captains of the plot to assassinate him, and Johanan at a private interview expressed to him a strong desire to go himself and slay Ishmael secretly, declaring that the safety of the Jews depended upon the life of the governor. But Gedaliah refused to allow Johanan to anticipate his enemy, believing, in the generosity of his heart, that Ishmael was not capable of such an act of treachery. He soon found, however, that his confidence had been sadly misplaced. Ishmael, with ten of his companions, came on a visit to him to Mizpah, and after they had been hospitably entertained they fell upon their good host and murdered him, along with all the Jewish and the Chaldean soldiers whom he had with him for order and protection (2Ki 25:25; Jer 41:1-3). They then cast the bodies of their victims into the cistern which Asa had made (Jer 41:9). Ishmael was pursued and overtaken by Johanan, but he succeeded in effecting his escape to the Ammonites (Jer 41:11-15). Then Johanan and the other captains, afraid lest the Chaldeans should avenge upon them the murder of the governor (Jer 41:16-18), and against the earnest entreaties of Jeremiah (chapter 42), fled to Egypt, taking the prophet and the Jewish remnant with them (43:5-7). In memory of the date of Gedaliah's assassination the Jews kept a fast (which is still retained in the Jewish calendar) on the 3rd day of the 7th month, Tishri (Zec 7:5; 8:19).

4. His Noble Character:

The narratives reveal Gedaliah in a very attractive light, as one who possessed the confidence alike of his own people and their conquerors; a man of rare wisdom and tact, and of upright, transparent character, whose kindly nature and generous disposition would not allow him to think evil of a brother; a

man altogether worthy of the esteem in which he was held by succeeding generations of his fellow-countrymen.

(2) (gedhalyahu): Son of Jeduthun, and instrumental leader of the 2nd of the 24 choirs in the Levitical orchestra (1Ch 25:3,1).

(3) A priest of the "sons of Jeshua," in the time of Ezra, who had married a foreign woman (Ezr 10:18).

(4) (gedhalyahu): Son of Pashhur (who beat Jeremiah and put him in the stocks, Jer 20:1-6), and one of the chiefs of Jerusalem who, with the sanction of the king, Zedekiah, took Jeremiah and let him down with cords into a cistern where he sank in the mud (38:1,4-6).

(5) Grandfather of Zephaniah the prophet, and grandson of Hezekiah, probably the king (Ze 1:1).

James Crichton

GEDDUR

ged’-ur (Geddour): Head of a family of temple-servants (1 Esdras 5:30), corresponding to Gahar of Ezr 2:47 and Ne 7:49.

GEDEON

ged’-e-on (Heb 11:32 the King James Version).

See GIDEON.

GEDER

ge’-der (gedher): A royal city of the Canaanites taken by Joshua along with Lachish, Eglon, Gezer, Debir and Hormah (Jos 12:13 f). It may be the city called "Beth-gader" in 1Ch 2:51, and the birthplace of Baal-hanan, who had charge of David’s olives and sycamores (27:28); unidentified.

GEDERAH; GEDERATHITE

ge-de’-ra, ge-de’-ra-thit (ha-gedherah, "the enclosed place"): A town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Socoh, Azekah, Shaaraim and Adithaim (Jos 15:36). In 1Ch 4:23 the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "the inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah," for the King James Version, "those that dwelt among plants and hedges." It is probably represented by Khirbet Jadireh, about 3 miles Southwest of Gezer. "Gederathite," applied to Jozabad (1Ch 12:4), probably meant an inhabitant of this place.

GEDERITE

ge’-der-it, ge-de’-rit (gedheri): Inhabitant of GEDER, which see (1Ch 27:28).

GEDEROTH

ged’-e-roth, ge-de’-roth (gedheroth): A town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Kithlish, Beth-dagon, Naamah and Makkedah (Jos 15:41). It is mentioned along with Bethshemesh and Aijalon as taken by the Philistines in the reign of Ahaz (2Ch 28:18). It possibly corresponds with the "Kidron" of 1 Macc 15:39,41; 16:9. Eusebius, Onomasticon places a very large village named Gedrom 10 Roman miles from Lydda on the road to Eleutheropolis. This points to Katrah, Southeast of Yebnah.

GEDEROTHAIM

ged-e-ro-tha’-im (gedherathayim, "place of enclosures"): Stands as the 15th in a list which professes to give only the names of 14 cities in the Judean Shephelah (Jos 15:36). the King James Version margin suggests that we might read "or" for "and" after Gederah, but this is impossible. Septuagint reads, "and its cattle shelters." Probably, however, the name has arisen by dittography from the preceding GEDERAH (which see).

GEDOR

ge’-dor (gedhor; Codex Vaticanus, Geddor, Codex Alexandrinus, Gedor):

(1) A town in the mountains of Judah, named with Halhul and Beth-zur (Jos 15:58). It seems to be referred to by Eusebius as Gadeira (Onomasticon, under the word), which he identifies with Gaidora (Jerome calls it Gadora), a village in the borders of Jerusalem, near the terebinth. It is probably represented today by Khirbet Jedur, about 7 miles North of Hebron (PEF, III, 313, Sh XXI).

(2) Among the Benjamites who joined David at Ziklag were the sons of Jeroham of Gedor (1Ch 12:7). No trace of this name is found in the territory of Benjamin. It may be identical with (1).

(3) The Simeonites are said to have gone to the entering in of Gedor in search of pasture for their flocks. They smote and expelled the Meunim, "and dwelt in their stead" (1Ch 4:39). Here the Septuagint reads Gerar, and this is probably correct.

(4) A family in Judah (1Ch 4:4).

(5) An ancestor of Saul (1Ch 8:31).

W. Ewing

GEHAZI

ge-ha’-zi (gechazi, except in 2Ki 4:31; 5:25; 8:4,5, where it is gechazi, perhaps "valley of vision"): The confidential servant of Elisha. Various words are used to denote his relation to his master. He is generally called Elisha’s "boy" (na‘ar), servant or personal attendant; he calls himself (5:25) his master’s servant or slave (‘ebhedh), and if the reference be to him in 4:43 the Revised Version, margin, he receives the designation "minister" (meshareth), or chief servant of Elisha.

1. His Ready Service:

Mention is made of him on three different occasions. He is first brought under notice in the story of the wealthy Shunammite (2Ki 4:8-37) who provided in her house special accommodation for Elisha, which suited his simple tastes, and of which he availed himself as often as he passed that way. By command of his master, Gehazi called the Shunammite, that she might be rewarded by the prophet for her liberal hospitality. Failing to elicit from the lady a desire for any particular favor, and being himself at a loss to know how to repay her kindness, Elisha consulted with his servant, whose quick perception enabled him to indicate to his master the gift that would satisfy the great woman’s heart. When on the death of her child the Shunammite sought out the man of God at Carmel, and in the intensity of her grief laid hold of the prophet’s feet, "Gehazi came near to thrust her away" (2Ki 4:27)—perhaps not so much from want of sympathy with the woman as from a desire to protect his master from what he considered a rude importunity. Then Elisha, who had discovered of himself (2Ki 4:27), from what the woman had said (2Ki 4:28), the cause of her sorrow, directed Gehazi, as a preliminary measure, to go at once to Shunem and lay his staff upon the face of the dead child. Gehazi did so, but the child was "not awaked."

In this narrative Gehazi appears in a favorable light, as a willing, efficient servant, jealous of his master’s honor; a man of quick observation, whose advice was worth asking in practical affairs.

2. His Grievous Sin:

Gehazi, however, reveals himself in a different character in connection with the healing of Naaman (2Ki 5:20-27). As soon as the Syrian general had taken his departure with his retinue from the house of Elisha, the covetous spirit of Gehazi, which had been awakened by the sight of the costly presents the prophet had refused, was no longer able to restrain itself. Running after Naaman, Gehazi begged in the prophet’s name a talent of silver (400 pounds =$ 2,000) and two changes of raiment, alleging, as a specious reason for Elisha’s change of mind, the arrival at his master’s house of two poor scholars of the prophet, who would require help and maintenance. Naaman, glad to have the opportunity he desired of showing his gratitude to Elisha, urged Gehazi to take two talents and sent two servants with him to carry the money and the garments. When they came to the hill in the neighborhood of the prophet’s house, Gehazi dismissed the men and concealed the treasure. Thereafter, with a bold front, as if he had been attending to his ordinary duties, he appeared before his master who at once inquired, "Whence, Gehazi?" (Hebrew). On receiving the ready answer that he had not been anywhere, Elisha, who felt sure

that the suspicion he entertained regarding his beloved servant, his very "heart" (2Ki 5:26), was well grounded, sternly rebuked him for the dishonor he had brought upon God's cause, and called down upon him and his family forever the loathsome disease of the man whose treasures he had obtained by his shameful lie. "And he went out from his presence a leper as white as snow."

By this narrative confidence in Gehazi is somewhat unexpectedly and rudely shaken. The active, zealous servant stands confessed a liar and a thief. Gehazi's sin branched out in different directions. By his falsehood he deceived Naaman and misrepresented Elisha; he not only told a lie, but told a lie about another man, and that man his master and friend. Further, he brought true religion into disrepute; for it was not a time (2Ki 5:26) for a servant of God to allow any commercial idea to be associated with the prophet's work in the mind of the Syrian general to whom God's power had been so strikingly manifested and when many for worldly gain pretended to be prophets. But while Gehazi's sin had ats various ramifications, its one root was covetousness, "the love of money (which) is a root of all kinds of evil" (1Ti 6:10).

3. His Probable Repentance:

Once more Gehazi is mentioned (2Ki 8:1-6) as having been summoned, leper though he was, by King Jehoram to give him an account of all the great things Elisha had done. And when he came to the story of the restoration of the Shunammite's child to life, the woman herself appeared before the king along with her son, craving to be reinstated in her house and land of which she had been dispossessed during her seven years' absence from her native country in a time of famine. Gehazi testified to the identity of both mother and son, with the result that the king at once ordered the restoration not only of all her former possessions, but also of all the profits her land had yielded during her sojourn in Philistia.

The appearance and conduct of Gehazi on this occasion give some ground for the hope that he had repented of his sin and could now be trusted to speak the truth; and the pleasure he seemed to take in rehearsing the wonderful deeds of a master who, though kind and indulgent to a stranger, was hard upon him, may even warrant the belief that in his earlier days there was some good thing in him toward his master's God. If also, as has been indicated above, the word used in 2Ki 4:43 (meshareth) applies to him —the same as is applied to Elisha (1Ki 19:21)—we may be the more readily inclined to see in the history of Gehazi how one besetting sin may prevent a man from taking his natural place in the succession of God's prophets. Let us hope, however, that though Gehazi became a "lost leader," "just for a handful of silver," he was yet saved by a true repentance from becoming a lost soul.

James Crichton

GEHENNA

ga-hen'-a (geenna (see Grimm-Thayer, under the word)): Gehenna is a transliteration from the Aramaic form of the Hebrew ge-hinnom, "valley of Hinnom." This latter form, however, is rare in the Old Testament, the prevailing name being "the valley of the son of Hinnom." Septuagint usually translates;

where it transliterates the form is different from Gehenna and varies. In the New Testament the correct form is Gee'nna with the accent on the penult, not Ge'enna. There is no reason to assume that Hinnom is other than a plain patronymic, although it has been proposed to find in it the corruption of the name of an idol (EB, II, 2071). In the New Testament (King James Version margin) Gehenna occurs in Mt 5:22,29,30; 10:28; 18:9; 23:15,33; Mr 9:43,15,47; Lu 12:5; Jas 3:6. In all of these it designates the place of eternal punishment of the wicked, generally in connection with the final judgment. It is associated with fire as the source of torment. Both body and soul are cast into it. This is not to be explained on the principle that the New Testament speaks metaphorically of the state after death in terms of the body; it presupposes the resurrection. In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Gehenna is rendered by "hell" (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). That "the valley of Hinnom" became the technical designation for the place of final punishment was due to two causes. In the first place the valley had been the seat of the idolatrous worship of Molech, to whom children were immolated by fire (2Ch 28:3; 33:6). Secondly, on account of these practices the place was defiled by King Josiah (2Ki 23:10), and became in consequence associated in prophecy with the judgment to be visited upon the people (Jer 7:32). The fact, also, that the city's offal was collected there may have helped to render the name synonymous with extreme defilement. Topographically the identification of the valley of Hinnom is still uncertain. It has been in turn identified with the depression on the western and southern side of Jerusalem, with the middle valley, and with the valley to the E. Compare EB, II, 2071; DCG, I, 636; RE3, VI.

Geerhardus Vos

GELILOTH

ge-li'-loth (geliloth): This word is used for "districts" or "circuits" perhaps indicating the different parts subject to the several lords of the Philistines (Jos 13:2, the King James Version "borders," the Revised Version (British and American) "regions"); for the quarter of the Jordan valley where the eastern tribes built the altar of Ed (Jos 22:10 f; the King James Version "border of," the Revised Version (British and American) "region about," Jordan); and apparently, for the whole of Philistia (Joe 3:4, the King James Version "coasts of Palestine," the Revised Version (British and American) "regions of Philistia"). But in Jos 18:17, it is clearly used as a place-name. Geliloth lay on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin which passed En-shemesh (probably 'Ain el-Chod, about 2 miles East of Jerusalem), "and went out to Geliloth, which is over against the ascent of Adummim." From this point it "went down" toward the plain. The place cannot therefore be identified with Gilgal in the Jordan valley. Some point on the road leading from Jericho to Tal'at ed-Dumm, about 6 miles from Jerusalem, was probably intended, but no identification is possible.

W. Ewing

GEM

jem (Pr 26:8, the English Revised Version "a bag of gems,").

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

GEMALLI

ge-mal’-i (gemalli, "camel owner"): Father of the spy Ammiel from the tribe of Da (Nu 13:12), who was one of those sent by Moses to spy out the land of Canaan.

GEMARA

ge-ma’-ra.

See TALMUD.

GEMARIAH

gem-a-ri’-a (gemaryahu, gemaryah, "Yahweh hath accomplished"):

(1) Son of Shaphan the scribe, one of the princes, from whose chamber Baruch read Jeremiah’s prophecies to the people. He, with others, sought to stay Jehoiakim from burning the roll (Jer 36:10,11,12,25).

(2) Son of Hilkiah, one of Zedekiah’s ambassadors to Babylon, by whom Jeremiah sent his letter to the captives (Jer 29:3).

GEMATRIA

ge-ma’-tri-a.

See NUMBERS; GAMES.

GENDER

jen’-der (yaladh, ‘abhar; gennao): "Gender" is an abbreviation of "engender." In Job 38:29 yaladh (common for "to bear," "to bring forth") is translated "gender" (after Wycliff), the Revised Version (British and American) "The hoary frost of heaven, who hath gendered it?" margin "given it birth." In 21:10 we have ‘abhar (either the Piel of ‘abhar, "to pass over," etc., or of a separate word meaning "to bear," "to be fruitful"), translated "gendereth," "Their bull gendereth, and faileth not"; in Le 19:19, rabha’," to lie down with," is used of cattle gendering. In Ga 4:24 the King James Version we have "Mount Sinai, which gendereth (gennoa, "to beget") to bondage," the Revised Version (British and American) "bearing children unto bondage" (like Hagar, Abraham’s bondwoman), and in 2Ti 2:23,

which "gender strifes," i.e. beget them.

W. L. Walker

GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST, THE

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Problems Involved

2. Nature and Importance of the Issue

II. THE GENEALOGIES SEPARATELY

1. Peculiarities of Matthew’s Genealogy

2. Explanation of the Foregoing

3. Peculiarities of Luke’s Genealogy

4. Explanation of the Foregoing

III. THE GENEALOGIES COMPARED

1. Divergences

2. Correspondence

IV. THE GENEALOGIES AND THE VIRGIN BIRTH

1. Text of Matthew 1:16

2. General Conclusions

LITERATURE

I. Introduction.

1. The Problems Involved:

The genealogy of Jesus as contained in the First and Third Gospels presents three special problems which lie somewhat part from general questions of New Testament criticism:

(1) the construction and purpose of each list taken separately;

(2) the relation of the two lists, in their coincidences and variations, to each other;

(3) the relationship of both lists to the statement concerning the virgin birth of our Lord with which they are directly connected. These questions necessarily involve the conclusion to be arrived at concerning the trustworthiness of the list of names as forming an actual historical connection between Jesus and His ancestors according to the flesh.

2. Nature and Importance of the Issue:

Before these problems are dealt with, it would be well to consider the kind and degree of importance to be attached to the question at issue. As we see it, the only vital point at stake is the balance, sanity and good judgment of the evangelists.

(1) That Jesus had a line of ancestors by His human birth may be taken for granted. The tradition, universal from the earliest times among believers and granted even by the bitterest opponents, that He was connected with the line of David, may also readily be accepted. The exact line through which that connection is traced is, on general principles, of secondary importance. The fact is that, while natural sonship to David on the part of the Messiah was of vital importance to many Jewish inquirers, it failed of any very enthusiastic endorsement on the part of Jesus Himself (see the truly remarkable interview recorded in Mr 12:35-37). The expressions of Paul in this connection will be referred to later; at this point it is sufficient to say that physical kinship to David cannot be insisted upon as the only justification for his words.

(2) If, then, the purpose of the evangelists in having recourse to these lists is worth while, the question of their correctness need not even be raised. Unless some vital issue is involved, the supposition of a special inspiration to go behind lists currently accepted is gratuitous. No such issue seems to be presented here. The Davidic kinship of Jesus, in any sense essential to His Messiahship, is independent of the lists which are used to justify it. This is preliminary to the actual discussion and need not prevent us from giving all due credit to lists which could not have been carelessly compiled nor lightly used.

II. The Genealogies Separately.

1. Peculiarities of Matthew’s Genealogy:

(1) The construction and incorporation of Joseph’s genealogical tree is, in the light of all the facts, the primary consideration.

(2) The artificial division into three groups of fourteen generations each. The apparent defect in this arrangement as it actually stands (the third group lacks one member) is probably traceable to a defect of the Septuagint version of 1Ch 3:11, which is reproduced in the Greek gospel (see Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, English translation, 564, note 4). This arrangement into groups is the more striking because it makes 14 generations from the captivity to Joseph, where Luke makes 20 or 21, and because the first group of 14 is formed by the omission of three names. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that this artificial grouping is essential to the purpose of the evangelist.

(3) The insertion of the names of brothers, thus following the historical lists and broadening the genealogy by including collateral lines.

(4) The insertion of the names of women—a practice not only foreign but abhorrent to ordinary usage. This peculiarity is the more marked when we notice that these names introduce what would be considered serious blots in the family history of the Davidic house (see Mt 1:5,7).

(5) The principle upon which the division into periods is constructed:

(a) from Abraham to David,

(b) from David to the Captivity,

(c) from the Captivity to Jesus. Attention has repeatedly been called to the fact that this gives a definite historical movement to the genealogy. It involves the origin, the rise to power, the decay and downfall of the house of David (see Allen, ICC, "Matthew," 2; compare Zahn, N T, English translation, I, 535).

2. Explanation of the Foregoing:

Of the many theories which have been constructed to explain the foregoing six peculiarities of the genealogy of Matthew, altogether the most satisfactory is that of Professor Zahn. His contention is that the list was framed not to prove the natural connection of Jesus with the house of David—a fact which no one doubted—but to defend the one vital point where attack had been made, namely, the legitimacy of Jesus' connection with David. No one seems to have questioned that Jesus was born of Mary and was closely connected with the royal house. The question was whether He was of legitimate birth. It was charged—and the slander which was very early in origin and circumstantial in character obtained an extraordinary hold upon the hostile Jewish mind—that Jesus was the illegitimate offspring of Mary. The Gospel of Mt meets that slander by giving a bird's-eye view of the movement of the history from Abraham to the Messiah in the form of a genealogy of Joseph, who in the light of all the facts concerning the origin of Jesus marries Mary and gives her the protection of his stainless name and royal lineage. The extraordinary boldness and brilliancy of this apologetic method ought not to be overlooked. The formal charge that Jesus is son of Mary, not of Joseph, is admitted—the slander involved is refuted by bringing Joseph forward as a witness for Mary. Nothing could have been more natural for a man fearless in the confidence of truth; nothing could have been more impossible for one insecure in his hold

upon the facts. So far as the genealogy is concerned, just the moment we realize that the purpose is not to prove the natural sonship of Jesus to David, but to epitomize the history, all hesitancy and apprehension concerning the historicity of the successive names disappear. The continuity of blood relationship through these successive generations becomes of no essential importance. Zahn's explanation (the argument in full should be read by every student), simple in itself, explains all the facts, as a key fits a complicated lock. It explains the choice of a genealogy as a method of epitomizing history and that genealogy Joseph's, the artificial grouping at the expense of changing the traditional lists, the inclusion of the names of brothers and of women.

3. Peculiarities of Luke's Genealogy:

(1) The choice of Joseph's genealogical tree on the part of one who is so deeply interested in Mary.

(2) The reversal of order in going back from Joseph to his ancestors. Godet emphasizes the fact that, in the nature of the case, a genealogy follows the order of succession, each new individual being added to the roll of his family. Luke's method indicates that his genealogy has been constructed for a special purpose.

(3) The carrying of the line back of the history of the covenant, which begins with Abraham, to Adam, who represents the race in general. This fact, together with another, that the line of Joseph is traced to David through Nathan who was not David's heir, proves that Luke was not concerned with establishing the Davidic standing of Jesus.

(4) The placing of the genealogy, not at the beginning of the Gospel, but at the beginning of the ministry, between the baptism and the temptation.

(5) The omission of the article before the name of Joseph.

4. Explanation of the Foregoing:

(1) In his comment upon the fourth peculiarity enumerated above, namely, the placing of the genealogy at the beginning of the ministry, Godet (Gospel of Luke, American edition, 126) has this to say: "In crossing the threshold of this new era, the sacred historian casts a general glance over the period which thus reaches its close, and sums it up in this document, which might be called the mortuary register of the earlier humanity." In other words, in connecting the genealogy directly with the ministry, Luke exhibits the fact that his interest in it is historical rather than antiquarian or, so to say, genealogical. As Matthew summarizes the history of the covenant people from the days of Abraham by means of the genealogical register, modified so as to make it graphic by its uniformity, so Luke has written the story of the humanity Jesus, as the Second Adam, came to save, by the register of names summarizing its entire course in the world.

It has recently been commented upon that genealogical lists such as those of Genesis and the New

Testament are not infrequently used to convey ideas not strictly germane to the matter of descent or the cognate notion of chronology. For example, the statements as to the longevity of the patriarchs are of historical interest only—they are not and could never have been of value for chronological purposes (see Warfield, "Antiquity and Unity of Human Race," Princeton Review, February, 1911).

(2) In commenting upon the order which Luke adopts, Godet (who has thrown more light upon this portion of the Gospel than anyone else) says: "The ascending form of genealogy can only be that of a private instrument, drawn up from the public document with a view to the particular individual whose name serves as the starting-point of the whole list" (127).

(3) From the fact that the name of Joseph is introduced without an article Godet draws three conclusions:

(a) that this name belongs rather to the sentence introduced by Luke;

(b) that the genealogical document which he consulted began with the name of Heli;

(c) and consequently, that this piece was not originally the genealogy of Jesus or of Joseph, but of Heli (ibid., 128).

(4)

(a) The importance of these considerations is twofold. In the first place it indicates that Luke is bringing together two separate documents, one of which contained a statement of the foster-fatherhood of Joseph, while the other contained the genealogy of Heli, between whom and Joseph there existed a relationship which made Luke desirous of connecting them.

(b) In addition, the absence of the article serves to call attention to something exceptional in the relationship of Joseph to the rest of this ancestral line which is brought into connection with his name. To this point we shall recur later. We have an explanation for all the suggested problems except one, and that one, in a sense, the most difficult of all, namely, the choice of Joseph’s genealogy.

III. The Genealogies Compared.

1. Divergences:

In order, however, to discuss this question intelligently, we must enter upon the second stage of our inquiry—as to the relationship between the two lists.

(1) The most notable fact here is of course the wideness of the divergence together with the contrasted and unintelligible fact of minute correspondence. Between Abraham and David the two lists agree. Between David and Joseph there is evident correspondence in two (see Mt 1:12; Lu 3:27), and possible correspondence in four names (that is, if Abiud (Mt 1:13)) and Judah (Lu 3:30) are the same). This

initial and greatest difficulty is of material assistance to us because it makes one conclusion certain beyond peradventure. The two lists are not divergent attempts to perform the same task. Whatever difficulties may remain, this difficulty is eliminated at the outset. It is impossible that among a people given to genealogies two lists purporting to give the ancestry of a man in the same line could diverge so widely. There is, therefore, a difference between these lists which includes the purpose for which they were compiled and the meaning which they were intended to convey.

2. Correspondence:

(2) Two of the most striking points in the lists as they stand may be brought into connection and made to explain each other. The two lists coincide in the names of Zerubbabel and Shealtiel—they differ as to the name of Joseph's father, who is Jacob according to Matthew and Heli according to Luke. As to the second of these two important items this much is clear. Either these two lists are in violent contradiction, or else Joseph was in some sense son of both Jacob and Heli. Now, in connection with this seeming impossibility, turn to the other item. The names of Shealtiel and Zerubbabel belong to the captivity. Their being common to both lists is easily explained by the fact that during that troubled period a number of collateral family branches might be narrowed down to one or two common representatives (see Zahn, op. cit., 535). In the New Testament genealogies Zerubbabel is the son of Shealtiel—according to 1Ch 3:19 he is the nephew of Shealtiel and the son of Pedaiah. He is, therefore, at one and the same time heir and, legally, son of two men and would appear as such on two collateral lists.

Shealtiel himself appears in Mt (1:12) as the son of Jechoniah and in Lu (3:27) as the son of Neri. In 1Ch 3:17 he appears as son of Jechoniah. The name of Neri is peculiar to Lk, so that we cannot check his use of it and discover the actual parentage of Shealtiel. His appearance in two lists with a double reference of parentage is not surprising in view of what we have already seen. Besides this, a reasonable explanation at once appears. In Jer 36:30 it is asserted that Jehoiakim should have "none to sit upon the throne of David," and of his son (Jehoiachin, Jechoniah, Coniah) it is said (Jer 22:30), "Write ye this man childless," etc. It has been rightly pointed out (see HDB, II 557) that this means simply legal proscription, not actual childlessness. It suggests, however, that it might be thought necessary to provide in the genealogy an heir not of their blood for the two disgraced and proscribed members of the royal house, In view of these facts the contradictory references as to Joseph's parentage present no difficulty.

Joseph may easily have been and undoubtedly was, legally, son and heir of both Jacob and Heli. Godet's objection to this is based upon the supposition that Heli and Jacob were brothers, which leaves the divergence beyond these two names unexplained. It is evident, however, that the kinship between Jacob and Heli might have been more distant than this supposition calls for.

(3) When we come to explain how it happened that Joseph was connected with both these lines and that Matthew chose one list and Luke the other we are necessarily shut up to conjecture. There is one supposition, however, which is worthy of very careful consideration because it solves so many and such difficult problems. The authorities have been divided as to whether Luke's genealogy is Joseph's, as appears, or Mary's. Godet makes a strong showing for the latter, and, after all has been said per contra,

some of his representations remain unshaken (compare Godet and Plummer sub loc.). Most of the difficulties are removed at one stroke, and the known facts harmonized, by the simple supposition that Luke has given us the meeting-point of the lineage both of Joseph and Mary who are akin. This explains the apparent choice of Joseph's list; the peculiar position of his name in that list; the reversal of the order; the coincidences and discrepancies with reference to Matthew's; the early tradition of Mary's Davidic origin; the strange reference in the Talmud (Chaghigha' 77 4) to Mary as the daughter of Heli; the visit of Mary with Joseph to Bethlehem at the time of the registration; the traditional discrepancy of ages between Joseph and Mary, such that (apparently) Joseph disappears from the scene before Jesus reaches maturity. Against this nothing of real weight can be urged (the kinship with Elisabeth is not such: see Edersheim, LTJM, I, 149) except that it is too simple and too felicitous. Its simplicity and felicitous adjustment to the whole complex situation is precisely its recommendation. And there we may let the matter rest.

IV. The Genealogies and the Virgin Birth.

We have now to deal with the relationship of the genealogies to the virgin-birth statement which forms the vital center of the infancy narratives and to the general question of the Davidic origin of Jesus.

See VIRGIN BIRTH.

1. Text of Matthew 1:16:

The first part of this question may be most directly approached by a brief consideration of the text of Mt 1:16. The text upon which the Revised Version (British and American) is based reads: "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ." Beside this there are two readings, one contained in the so-called Ferrar group of manuscripts, and the other in the Sinaitic which, differing among themselves, unite in ascribing the parentage of Jesus to Joseph. This has been seized upon by negative critics (see for list and discussion Machen, Princeton Review, January, 1906, 63; compare Bacon, HDB, article "Genealogy of Jesus Christ," Am. Jour. Theol., January, 1911, who long ago gave in his advocacy to the supposition that the evangelists could easily reconcile the supernatural birth with the actual paternity of Joseph) to support the idea of a primitive Christian tradition that Joseph was the father of Jesus. Of this contention Zahn leaves nothing, and concludes his argument with this statement: "The hope of finding indications in old manuscripts and versions that the authors of lost Gospels or brief writings which may have been worked over in our Mt and Lu regarded Joseph as the physical father of Jesus, should at last be dismissed. An author who knew how to make even the dry material of a genealogy to its least detail contribute to the purpose of his thought concerning the slandered miracle of the Messiah's birth, cannot at the same time have taken over statements from a genealogy of Joseph or Jesus used by him which directly contradicted his conception of this fact. Any text of Mt which contained such statements would be condemned in advance as one altered against the author's interest" (op. cit., 567). It is interesting to note that Allen (ICC, "Matthew," 8), starting from the extreme position that the Sinaitic form of statement, of all extant texts, most nearly represents the original, reaches the same conclusion as Zahn, that Matthew's Gospel from the beginning taught the

virgin birth.

2. General Conclusions:

(1) It is clear, therefore, from the general trend as well as from specific statements of both Gospels, that the genealogies and the birth-narratives were not floating traditions which accidentally touched and coalesced in mid-stream, but that they were intended to weld inseparably the two beliefs that Jesus was miraculously conceived and that He was the heir of David. This could be done only on the basis of Joseph's genealogy, for whatever the lineage of Mary, Joseph was the head of the family, and the Davidic connection of Jesus could only be established by acknowledgment of Him as legal son by Joseph. Upon this basis rests the common belief of the apostolic age (see Zahn, ibid., 567, note references), and in accordance with it all statements (such as those of Paul, Ro 1:3; 2Ti 2:8) must be interpreted.

(2) For it must be remembered that, back of the problem of reconciling the virgin birth and the Davidic origin of Jesus, lay the far deeper problem—to harmonize the incarnation and the Davidic origin. This problem had been presented in shadow and intimation by Jesus Himself in the question: "David himself calleth him Lord; and whence is he his Son?" It is further to be noticed that in the annunciation (Lu 1:32) the promised One is called at once Son of God and Son of David, and that He is the Son of God by virtue of His conception by the Spirit—leaving it evident that He is Son of David by virtue of His birth of Mary. With this should be compared the statement of Paul (Ro 1:3,1): He who was God's Son was "born of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead." This is at least most suggestive (see Orr, Virgin Birth of Christ, 119, with note, p. 121), for it indicates that as Paul and Luke were in very close sympathy as to the person of our Lord, so they are in equally close sympathy as to the mystery of His origin. The unanimity of conviction on the part of the early church as to the Davidic origin of Jesus is closely paralleled by its equally firm conviction as to His supernatural derivation. The meeting-point of these two beliefs and the resolution of the mystery of their relationship is in the genealogies in which two widely diverging lines of human ancestry, representing the whole process of history, converge at the point where the new creation from heaven is introduced.

LITERATURE.

The literature on this subject is very copious. The works referred to in the text will serve to introduce the reader to more extensive investigations. The whole situation is well summarized by Plummer (ICC, "Luke," sub loc.).

Louis Matthews Sweet

GENEALOGY, 1-7

je-na-al'-o-ji, jen-a-al'-o-ji:

1. Definition

2. Biblical References

3. Importance of Genealogies

4. Their Historical Value

5. Principles of Interpretation

6. Principles of Compilation

7. Sources

8. Principal Genealogies and Lists

LITERATURE

1. Definition:

The Old Testament translates (once, Ne 7:5) the noun yachas; cepher ha-yachas, "book of the genealogy"; also translates a denominate verb in Hithpael, yachas, "sprout" "grow" (compare family "tree"); hithyaches, "genealogy"; the idea is conveyed in other phrases, as cepher toledhoth, "book of the generations," or simply toledhoth, "generations." In the New Testament it transliterates genealogia, "account of descent," 1Ti 1:4; Tit 3:9. In Mt 1:1, biblos geneseos, "book of the generation" of Jesus Christ, is rendered in the American Revised Version, margin "the genealogy of Jesus Christ"; a family register, or register of families, as 1Ch 4:33, etc.; the tracing backward or forward of the line of ancestry of individual, family, tribe, or nation; pedigree. In Timothy and Titus refers probably to the Gnostic (or similar) lists of successive emanations from Deity in the development of created existence.

2. Biblical References:

According to the Old Testament, the genealogical interest dates back to the beginnings of sacred history. It appears in the early genealogical tables of Ge 5; 10; 46, etc.; in Ex 6:14-27, where the sons of Reuben, Simeon and especially Levi, are given; in Nu 1:2; 26:2-51, where the poll of fighting men is made on genealogical principles; in Nu 2:2, where the positions on the march and in camp are determined by tribes and families; in David’s division of priests and Levites into courses and companies (1Ch 6-9); is referred to in the account of Jeroboam’s reign (2Ch 12:15 margin, "the words of Iddo, after the manner of genealogies"); is made prominent in Hezekiah’s reforms when he reckoned the whole nation by genealogies (1Ch 4:41; 2Ch 31:16-19); is seen in Jotham’s reign when the Reubenites and Gadites are reckoned genealogically (1Ch 5:17). Zerubbabel took a census, and settled the returning exiles according

to their genealogies (1Ch 3:19-24; 1Ch 9; Ezr 2; Ne 7; 11; 12). With the rigid exclusion of all foreign intermixtures by the leaders of the Restoration (Ezr 10; Ne 10:30; 13:23-31), the genealogical interest naturally deepened until it reached its climax, perhaps in the time of Christ and up to the destruction of Jerusalem. Josephus, in the opening of his Life, states that his own pedigree was registered in the public records. Many families in Christ's time clearly possessed such lists (Lu 1:5, etc.). The affirmed, reiterated and unquestioned Davidic descent of Christ in the New Testament, with His explicit genealogies (Mt 1:1-17; Lu 3:23-38); Paul's statement of his own descent; Barnabas' Levitical descent, are cases in point. Davididae, descendants of David, are found as late as the Roman period. There is a tradition that Herod I destroyed the genealogical lists at Jerusalem to strengthen his own seat, but more probably they persisted until the destruction of Jerusalem.

3. Importance of Genealogies:

Genealogical accuracy, always of interest both to primitive and more highly civilized peoples, was made especially important by the facts that the land was promised to the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, that the priesthood was exclusively hereditary, that the royal succession of Judah lay in the Davidic house, that the division and occupation of the land was according to tribes, families and fathers' houses; and for the Davididae, at least, that the Messiah was to be of the house of David. The exile and return, which fixed indelibly in the Jewish mind the ideas of monotheism, and of the selection and sacred mission of Israel, also fixed and deepened the genealogical idea, prominently so in the various assignments by families, and in the rejection in various ways of those who could not prove their genealogies. But it seems extreme to date, as with many modern critics, its real cultivation from this time. In the importance attached to genealogies the Hebrew resembles many other ancient literatures, notably the Egyptian Greek, and Arabic, but also including Romans, Kelts, Saxons, the earliest history naturally being drawn upon genealogical as well as on annalie lines. A modern tendency to overestimate the likeness and underestimate the unlikeness of the Scripture to its undoubtedly cognate literatures finds in the voluminous artificial genealogical material, which grew up in Arabia after the time of the caliph Omar, an almost exact analogue to the genealogical interest at the time of the return. This, however, is on the assumption of the late date of most of the genealogical material in the older New Testament books, and rests in turn on the assumption that the progress of religious thought and life in Israel was essentially the same as in all other countries; an evolutionary development, practically, if not theoretically, purely naturalistic in its genesis and progress.

4. Their Historical Value:

The direct historical value of the Scripture genealogies is variously estimated. The critically reconstructive school finds them chiefly in the late (priestly) strata of the early books, and dates Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah (our fullest sources) about 300 BC, holding it to be a priestly reconstruction of the national history wrought with great freedom by the "Chronicler." Upon this hypothesis the chief value of the genealogies is as a mirror of the mind and ideas of their authors or recorders, a treasury of reflections on the geographical, ethnological and genealogical status as believed in at their time, and a study of the effect of naive and exaggerated patriotism dealing with the supposed facts of national life, or else, in the extreme instance, a highly interesting example of bold and inventive juggling with facts by

men with a theory, in this particular case a priestly one, as with the "Chronicler." To more conservative scholars who accept the Old Testament at its face value, the genealogies are a rich mine of historical, personal and ethnographic, as well as religious, information, whose working, however, is much hindered by the inevitable corruption of the text, and by our lack of correlative explanatory information. Much interesting illustrative matter may be looked for from such archaeological explorations as those at Gezer and elsewhere under the Palestine Exploration Society, the names on the pottery throwing light on the name- lists in Chronicles, and the similar discoveries on the supposed site of Ahab's palace in Samaria, which also illustrate the conflict between Baal and Yahweh worship by the proportion of the proper names compounded by "Baal" or "Jah" (see Macalister, Bible Sidelights from Gezer, 150 ff; PEF, 1905, 243, 328; Harvard Theological Review, 1911). In spite of all such illustrative data, however, the genealogies must necessarily continue to present many insoluble problems. A great desideratum is a careful and systematic study of the whole question by some modern conservative scholar endowed with the patience and insight of the late Lord A.C. Hervey, and equipped with the fruits of the latest discoveries. While much curious and suggestive information may be derived from an intensive study of the names and relationships in the genealogies (although here the student needs to watch his theories), their greatest present value lies in the picture they present of the large-hearted cosmopolitanism, or international brotherliness, in the older ones, notably Ge 10, recognizing so clearly that God hath made of one all nations to dwell on the earth; and, as they progress, in the successive selection and narrowing as their lines converge upon the Messiah.

5. Principles of Interpretation:

In the evaluation and interpretation of the genealogies, certain facts and principles must be held in mind.

(1) Lists of names necessarily suffer more in transmission than other literature, since there is almost no connectional suggestion as to their real form. Divergences in different versions, or in different stages, of the same genealogy are therefore to be looked for, with many tangles hard to unravel, and it is precisely at this point that analytic and constructive criticism needs to proceed most modestly and restrain any possible tendency unduly to theorize.

(2) Frequently in the Scriptural lists names of nations, countries, cities, districts or clans are found mingled with the names of individuals. This is natural, either as the personification of the clan or nation under the name of its chief, or chief progenitor, or as the designation of the individual clan, family or nation, from its location, so common among many nations. Many of the cases where this occurs are so obvious that the rule may not be unsafe to consider all names as probably standing for individuals where the larger geographical or other reference is not unmistakably clear. This is undoubtedly the intent and understanding of those who transmitted and received them.

(3) It is not necessary to assume that the ancestors of various tribes or families are eponymous, even though otherwise unknown. The Scriptural explanation of the formation of tribes by the expansion and division of families is not improbable, and is entitled to a certain presumption of correctness. Furthermore, it is extremely difficult to establish a stopping-point for the application of the eponymous

theory; under its spell the sons of Jacob disappear, and Jacob, Isaac and even Abraham become questionable.

(4) The present quite popular similar assumption that personal details in the genealogy stand for details of tribal history, as, for instance, the taking of a concubine means rather an alliance with, or absorption of, an inferior tribe or clan, is a fascinating and far-reaching generalization, but it lacks confirmation, and would make of the Scripture an allegorical enigma in which historical personages and events, personified peoples or countries, and imaginary ancestors are mingled in inextricable confusion.

(5) Scriptural genealogies are often given a regular number of generations by omitting various intermediate steps. The genealogies of Jesus, for instance, cover 42 generations, in 3 subdivisions of 14 each. Other instances are found in the Old Testament, where the regularity or symmetry is clearly intentional. Instance Jacob's 70 descendants, and the 70 nations of Ge 10. This has in modern eyes an artificial look, but by no means necessarily involves violence done to the facts under the genealogist's purview, and is readily and creditably accounted for by his conceptions and purposes. The theory that in some cases the requisite number has been built up by the insertion of imaginary names(see Curtis, ICC, "Chronicles," 135) has another aspect, and does not seem necessary to account for the facts, or to have sufficient facts to sustain it. See 21:5, (6) below. It involves a view of the mental and moral equipment and point of view of the Chronicler in particular, which would not seem to leave him many shreds of either historical, or "religious" value, and which a sounder criticism will surely very materially modify.

(6) Much perplexity and confusion is avoided by remembering that other modes of entrance into the family, clan, tribe or nation obtained than that by birth: capture, adoption, the substitution of one clan for another just become extinct, marriage. Hence, "son of," "father of," "begat," have broader technical meanings, indicating adoptive or official connection or "descent," as well as actual consanguinity, nearer or remote, "son" also meaning "grandson," "great-grandson," etc. Instance Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, of the tribe of Judah, styled (1Ch 2:18) a descendant of Hezron and son of Hur, but also, in token of his original descent, called the Kenizzite or "son of Kenaz" (Jos 15:17), etc. Similarly, where in an earlier genealogy a clan or individual is assigned to a certain tribe, and in a later to another, it has been "grafted in." But while these methods of accretion clearly obtained, the nations freely absorbing neighboring or surrounding peoples, families, or persons, families likewise absorbing individuals, as in American Indian, and many other tribes; yet, as in them, the descent and connection by birth constituted the main line, and in any given case has the presumption unless clear facts to the contrary exist.

(7) The repetition of the same name in the same genealogy, as in that of the high priests (1Ch 6:1-15), rouses "suspicion" in some minds, but unnecessarily. It is very natural, and not uncommon, to find grandfathers and grandsons, especially among the Hebrews, receiving the same name (Lu 1:59). This would be especially to be expected in a hereditary caste or office like the priesthood.

(8) The existence of the same name in different genealogies is not uncommon, and neither implies nor should cause confusion.

(9) The omission of one or many links in the succession, often clearly caused by the desire for symmetry, is frequent where the cause is unknown, the writers being careful only to indicate the connection more or less generally, without feeling bound to follow every step. Tribes were divided into families, and families into fathers' houses; tribe, family and fathers' house regularly constituting links in a formal genealogy, while between them and the person to be identified any or all links may be omitted. In similar fashion, there is an absence of any care to keep the successive generations absolutely distinct in a formal fashion, son and grandson being designated as alike "son" of the same ancestor. Ge 46:21, for instance, contains grandsons as well as sons of Benjamin, Bela, Becher, Ashbel, Gera, Nanman, Ehi, etc. This would be especially true where the son as well as the father became founder of a house. Some confusion is occasionally caused by the lack of rigid attention to precise terminology, a characteristic of the Hebrew mind. Strictly the tribe, shebheT (in the Priestly Code (P), maTTeh), is the larger subdivision, then the clan, mishpachah, "family," and then the "house" or "fathers' house," bayith, or beth 'abh, beth 'abhoth; but sometimes a "fathers' house" is a tribe (Nu 17:6), or a clan (1Ch 24:6). In this connection it is to be remembered again that sequence of generations often has to do with families rather than with individuals, and represents the succession to the inheritance or headship, rather than the actual relationship of father and son.

(10) Genealogies are of two forms, the descending, as Ge 10: "The sons of Japheth: Gomer," etc.; "The sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz," etc.; and the ascending, Ezr 7:1 ff: "Ezra, the son of Seraiah, the son of Azariah, the son of Hilkiah," etc. The descending are the usual.

(11) Feminine names are occasionally found, where there is anything remarkable about them, as Sarai and Milcah (Ge 11:29), Rebekah (Ge 22:23), etc.; or where any right or property is transmitted through them, as the daughters of Zelophehad, who claimed and were accorded "a possession among the brethren of (their) father" (Nu 26:33; 27:1-11), etc. In such cases as Azubah and Ephrath, successive wives of Caleb (1Ch 2:18-20), many modern critics find tribal history enshrined in this case, "Caleb" or "dog" tribe having removed from Azubah, "deserted" to Ephrathah, Bethlehem, in Northern Judah. But the principle is not, and cannot be, carried Out consistently.

(12) The state of the text is such, especially in Chronicles, that it is not easy, or rather not possible, to construct a complete genealogical table after the modern form. Names and words have dropped out, and other names have been changed, so that the connection is often difficult and sometimes impossible to trace. The different genealogies also represent different stages in the history and, at many places, cannot with any knowledge now at our command be completely adjusted to each other, just as geographical notices at different periods must necessarily be inconsistent.

(13) In the present state of our knowledge, and of the text, and also considering the large and vague chronological methods of the Hebrews, the genealogies can give us comparatively little chronological assistance. The uncertainty as to the actual length of a generation, and the custom of frequently omitting links in the descent, increases the difficulty; so that unless they possess special marks of completeness, or have outstanding historical relationships which determine or corroborate them, or several parallel genealogies confirm each other, they must be used with great caution. Their interest is historical, biographical, successional or hereditary, rather than chronological.

6. Principles of Compilation:

The principal genealogical material of the Old Testament is found in Ge 5; 10; 11; 22; 25; 29; 30; 35; 36; 46; Ex 6; Nu 1; 2; 7; 10; 13; 26; 34; scattered notices in Josh, Ruth, 1 Sam; 2Sa 3; 5; 23; 1Ki 4; 1Ch 1-9; 11; 12; 15; 23-27; 2Ch 23; 29; Ezr 2; 7; 10; Ne 3; 7; 10; 11; 12. The genealogies of our Lord (Mt 1:1-17; Lu 3:23-38) are the only New Testament material. The Old Testament and New Testament genealogies bring the record down from the creation to the birth of Christ. After tracing the descent from Adam to Jacob, incidentally (Ge 10) giving the pedigree of the various nations within their purview, the Hebrew genealogists give the pedigree of the twelve tribes. As was to be expected, those tribes, which in the developing history assumed greater prominence, received the chief attention. Da is carried down but 1 generation, and credited with but 1 descendant; Zebulun 1 generation, 3 sons; Naphtali 1 generation, 4 sons; Issachar 4 generations, 15 descendants; Manasseh 4 generations, 39 descendants; Asher 7 generations, 40 descendants; Reuben 8 (?) generations, 22 descendants; Gad 10 generations, 28 descendants; Ephraim 14 (?) generations, 25 descendants. Levi, perhaps first as the priestly tribe, Judah next as the royal, Benjamin as most closely associated with the others, and all three as the survivors of the exile (although representatives of other tribes shared in the return) are treated with the greatest fullness.

7. Sources:

Chronicles furnishes us the largest amount of genealogical information, where coincident with the older genealogies, clearly deriving its data from them. Its extra-canonical sources are a matter of considerable difference among critics, many holding that the books cited by the Chronicler as his sources ("The Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah," "The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel," "The History of Samuel the Seer," "The History of Nathan the Prophet," etc., to the number of perhaps 16) are our canonical books, with the addition of a "Midrashic History of Israel," from which he quotes the most freely. But the citations are made with such fullness, vividness, and particularity of reference, that it is hard to believe that he did not have before him extensive extra-canonical documents. This is the impression he clearly seeks to convey. Torrey (AJSL, XXV, 195) considers that he cit, es this array of authority purely "out of his head," for impressiveness’ sake, a theory which leaves the Chronicler no historical value whatever. It is extremely likely that he had before him also oral and written sources that he has not cited, records, private or public lists, pedigrees, etc., freely using them for his later lists and descents. For the post-exilic names and lists, Ezra-Nehemiah also furnish us much material. In this article no attempt is made at an exhaustive treatment, the aim being rather by a number of characteristic examples to give an idea of the quality, methods and problems of the Bible genealogies.

GENEALOGY, 8 part 1

8. Principal Genealogies and Lists:

In the early genealogies the particular strata to which each has been assigned by reconstructive critics is

here indicated by J, the Priestly Code (P), etc. The signs "=" or ":" following individual names indicate sonship.

(1) Genesis 4:16-24.—The Cainites (Assigned to P).

Seven generations to Jabal, Jubal and Tubal-cain, explaining the hereditary origin of certain occupations (supposed by many to be a shorter version of chapter 5).

(2) Genesis 4:25,26.—The Sethites (Assigned to J).

(3) Genesis 5:1-32.—The Book of the Generations of Adam (Assigned to the Priestly Code (P), Except 5:29 J).

Brings the genealogy down to Noah, and gives the chronology to the Flood. The numbers in the Hebrew Massoretic Text, the Samaritan Hebrew, and the Septuagint differ, Massoretic Text aggregating 1,656 years, Samaritan 1,307 years, and Septuagint 2,242 years. Some scholars hold this list to be framed upon that of the ten Babylonian kings given in Berosus, ending with Xisuthrus, the Babylonian Noah. An original primitive tradition, from which both lists are derived, the Hebrew being the nearer, is not impossible. Both the "Cainite" list in Ge 4 and this "Sethite" list end with three brothers.

(4) Genesis 10:1-32.—The Generations of the Sons of Noah.

"The Table of Nations" (assigned to the Priestly Code (P), 10:1-7; J, 10:8-19; the Priestly Code (P), 10:20; J, 10:21; the Priestly Code (P), 10:22; J, 10:24-30; the Priestly Code (P), 10:31,32). Found in abridged form in 1Ch 1:5-24.

I. Japheth = Gomer, Magog, Badai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, Tiras.

1. Gomer = Ashkenaz, Riphath (1Ch 1:6, Diphath), Togarmah.

2. Javan = Elisha, Tarshish, Kittim, Dodanim (Rodanim, 1Ch 17, is probably correct, a "d", having been substituted by a copyist for "r").

II. Ham = Cush, Mizraim, Put, Canaan.

1. Cush = Seba, Havilah, Sibtah, Raamah, Sabteca (Nimrod).

2. Mizraim = Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, Naphtuhim, Pathrusim, Casluhim (whence the Philis), Caphtorim.

3. Canaan = Zidon (Chronicles, Sidon), Heth; the Jebusite, Amorite, Girgashite, Hivite, Arkite, Sinite,

Arvadite, Zemarite, Hittite.

4. Raamah (son of Cush) = Sheba, Dedan.

III. Elam = Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, Aramaic

1. Aram = Uz, Hul, Gether, Mash (Chronicles, Meshech).

2. Arpachshad = Shelah = Eber = Peleg, Joktan.

3. Joktan (son of Eber) = Almodad, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, Hadoram, Uzal, Diklah, Obal, Abimael, Sheba, Ophir, Havilah, Jobab.

4. Peleg (son of Eber) = Reu = Serug = Nahor = Terah = Abraham.

Nearly all these names are of peoples, cities or districts. That Noah, Shem, Ham, Japheth, Nahor, Terah, Abraham, Nimrod, and probably Peleg, Reu, Serug, represent actual persons the general tenor of the narrative and the general teaching of Scripture clearly indicate, although many critics consider these also as purely eponymous. The others can mostly be more or less clearly identified ethnographically or geographically. This table represents the nations known to the writer, and in general, although not in all particulars, expresses the ethnographical relationships as far as they are now known to modern research. It follows a partly ethnological, partly geographical scheme, the descendants of Japheth in general representing the Aryan stock settled in Asia Minor, Media, Armenia, Greece, and the islands of the Mediterranean; those of Ham representing the Hamitic races in Ethiopia, Egypt, in Southwest Arabia, and Southern Babylonia. Many modern writers hold that in making "Nimrod" the son of "Cush," the Scripture writer has confused "Cush," the son of Ham, with another "Gush," the Cassei, living near Elam, since the later Babylonians and Assyrians were clearly Semitic in language and racial characteristics. Nevertheless the Scripture statement is accordant with early traditions of a Hamitic settlement of the country (Oannes the fish-god coming out of the Red Sea, etc.), and perhaps also with the fact that the earliest language of Babylonia was non-Sem. The sons of Canaan represent the nations and peoples found by the Hebrews in Palestine, the Phoenicians and the Canaanites. Heth is the great Hittite nation, by language and racial type strikingly non-Sem. Among the sons of Shem, Eber is by many considered eponymous or imaginary, but the hypothesis is not necessary. Most Assyriologists deny the connection of Elam with Shem, the later Elamites being non-Sem; the inscriptions, however, show that the earlier inhabitants up to 2300 BC were Semitic Lud must be the Lydians of Asia Minor, whose manners and older names resemble the Semitic Asia Minor presents a mixture of races as manifold as does Palestine. The sons of Joktan are tribes in Western and Southern Arabia. Havilah is given both as a son of Cush, Hamite, and of Joktan, Semite, perhaps because the district was occupied by a mixed race. It would seem, however, that "begat" or "son of" often represents geographical as well as ethnological relations. And where the classification of the Scripture writer does not accord with the present deliverances of archaeology, it must be remembered that at this distance conclusions drawn from ethnology, philology and archaeology, considering the present incomplete state of these sciences, the

kaleidoscopic shifting of races, dynasties and tongues through long periods, and our scanty information, are liable to so many sources of error that dogmatism is precarious. The ancient world possessed a much larger amount of international knowledge than was, until recently, supposed. A writer of 300 BC had a closer range and could have had sources of information much more complete than we possess. On the assumption of the Mosaic authorship, that broad, statesmanlike mind, learned in all the knowledge of the Egyptians, and, clearly, profoundly influenced by Babylonian law and literature, may be credited with considerable breadth of vision and many sources of information. Aside from the question of inspiration, this Table of Nations; for breadth of scope, for inclusiveness (though not touching peoples outside of the life of its writer), for genial broadmindedness, is one of the most remarkable documents in any literature.

(5) Genesis 11:10-27.—The Generations of Shem (assigned to P).

From Shem to Abraham. The list is also chronological, but the versions differ, Massoretic Text making 290 years, from Shem to Abraham, Samaritan Hebrew, 940, and Septuagint 1,070. Septuagint inserts Cainan, 130 years, otherwise agreeing with the Samaritan to the birth of Abraham. Arpachshad may be rendered "the territory of Chesed," i.e. of the Chasdim, Chaldeans. Eber therefore is descended from Arpachshad, Abraham, his descendant, coming from Ur-Chasdim.

(6) Genesis 11:23-26; 22:20-24.—The Children of Nahor (11:23-26 P; 22:20-24 J).

Uz, Buz, Kemuel, etc. These descendants of Abraham’s brother probably represent Aramean tribes chiefly East or Northeast of Canaan. Aram may be the ancestor of the Syrians of Damascus. Uz and Buz probably belong to Arabia Petrea, mentioned in Jer 25:23 with the Arabian tribes Dedan and Thema. Chesed in this list probably stands, not for the Chaldeans of Babylonia, but for a related tribe of Northern Syria. In Ge 10:23 (assigned to P) Uz is the son of Aram, and in 10:22 Aram is a son of Shem. On the purely tribal hypothesis, this is either a contradiction, or the later statements represent other tribal relationships or subdivisions. Probably other individuals or tribes are indicated. Chronicles does not have this list, it being a side stream.

(7) Genesis 16:15; 21:1-3; 25 (also 1Ch 1:28-33).—The Sons of Abraham by Sarah, Hagar, Keturah (Ge 16:15 assigned to P; 21:1-3 to J, the Priestly Code (P), J, P; Ge 25:1-6 J; 25:7-11 P; 25:11b J; 25:12-17 P; 25:18 J; 25:19,20 P; 25:21-26a J; 25:26b P; 25:27-34 J).

The descendants of Abraham through Hagar and Ishmael represent the Ishmaelite tribes of Arabia living North and Northwest of the Joktanidae, who chiefly peopled Arabia. Twelve princes are named, possibly all sons of Ishmael, perhaps some of them grandsons. The number has seemed "suspicious" as balancing too exactly the twelve tribes of Israel. But twelve is an approved Semitic number, determining not necessarily the sons born, but the "sons" mentioned. The Arabians generally were frequently given the name Ishmaelites, perhaps because of the greater prominence and closer contact of these northern tribes with the Hebrews. The sons of Keturah seem to have been chiefly Arabian tribes, whose locations are unknown. Midian, of the sons of Keturah, is the well-known and powerful tribe in the Arabian desert near the Aelanitic Gulf, bordered by Edom on the Northwest Sheba and Dedan are also mentioned as

Cushites (Ge 10:7). Very likely the tribes extensively intermarried, and could claim descent from both; or were adopted into one or the other family. Sheba was in Southwestern Arabia. Dedan lived near Edom, where the caravan routes to various parts of Arabia converged. Asshurim are of course not Assyrians, but an Arabian tribe, mentioned by the side of Egypt in Minaean inscriptions. While the two sons of Isaac are to be accepted as real persons, their typical character is also unmistakable, the history of the two nations, Israel and Edom, being prefigured in their relations.

(8) Genesis 29:31-30:24; 35:16-26. The Children of Jacob (29:31-35 Assigned to P; 30:1-3a JE; 30:4a P; 30:4b-24 JE; 35:16-22 JE; 35:23-26 P).

The account of the parentage, birth and naming of the founders of the twelve tribes; by Leah: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun (daughter Dinah); by Bilhah: Dan, Naphtali; by Zilpah: Gad, Asher; by Rachel: Joseph, Benjamin. Much modern criticism agrees that these names are purely those of tribes, some of them perhaps derived from persons or places impossible now to trace, but mostly eponymous. Accordingly, these chapters are to be translated as follows. An Arab tribe, Jacob, wanders in Canaan, quarrels with Edom, migrates to Haran, forms alliances with the Aramean clans Rachel, Bilhah, Leah, Zilpah. Rachel and Jacob constitute a new tribe, Joseph. The federation takes the name Jacob. The other allied clans divide into sub-clans, or new clans join them, until Leah has six "sons," Reuben, Simeon, etc.; Zilpah, two; Bilhah, two. Zilpah and Bilhah are "concubines" because inferior members of the federation, or else have a left-handed connection with it. The formation of the new tribe Benjamin broke up the old tribe Rachel, which (who) accordingly "died." Although such are the original facts imbedded in the documents, they are now set in a framework of personal narrative, and were understood as narrative by the first hearers and readers. The history thus constituted is necessarily "an enigma which it is very hard to solve" (Bennett, Genesis, 284), and with almost as many answers as students. For critical purposes it presents a rich field for exploration, analysis and conjecture, but its edificatory value is chiefly found in reading the narratives as personal: a serious and reverent religious romance rounded on facts or legends, whose real value lies in the sidelights it throws on national character and ethical principles, expressed in a naive, vivid, lifelike story, full of suggestion and teaching. This present article, however, proceeds on the Scripture representation of these details and incidents as personal.

The explanations of the names illustrate the Hebrew fondness for assonances, paronomasia, coming from a time when much importance was attached to words and sounds, but need not be considered mere popular etymologies, the Hebrew individual mother being fully capable of them. Neither do they necessarily represent the original etymology, or reason for the name, but may give the pregnant suggestion occurring to the maternal or other imagination.

Leah, "wild cow," is supposed by many to be so called from the "totem" of the "Leah" tribe. Reuben (re’ubhen), original meaning unknown, unless Leah’s emotional explanation explains the name, rather than is explained by it: ra’ah be‘onyi, "hath looked upon my affliction." Superficially it might be re’u ben, "See, a son," as in the American Revised Version, margin. Others see in the second statement: "My husband will love me," still another etymology, ye’ehdbhani, "will love me." The lover of assonances can find more than one. The tribe is not prominent after Deborah’s time. Simeon, considered by some an

animal (totem) name, the Arabic sim‘u, cross between hyena and wolf, suggests to the mother (or is suggested by that) its likeness to shama‘, "hear": "Yahweh hath heard." It is not much known after the Conquest. Levi, "adhesion, associate": thought by many a gentilic adjective from Leah, the Leah tribe paragraph excellence; the name is adjectival in form. Leah connects it with yillaweh, "He will join," ‘Now will my husband be joined unto me.’ A similar allusion is found in Nu 18:2,4, there applied to the "joining" of the tribe to Aaron. Judah is associated with the verb hadhah, "praise": "Now will I praise Yahweh." Jacob makes the same suggestion in Ge 49:8; no other plausible suggestion of the origin of the name can be made. The etymology and origin of Bilhah are unknown. Da is associated with danah, "judge": "God hath judged"; no other etymology can be found. Naphtali is derived from niphtal, "wrestle": "I have wrestled," the only discoverable etymology. Zilpah, zilpah, perhaps is "dropping," "drop." Gad, gadh, "fortunate," according to Leah. Gad was the well-known Syrian god of "fortune"; but there is no necessary connection here. Asher, from ‘ashar, "happy," ‘ashsher, "call happy"; so Leah; no connection with Asshur, Assyrian god. Issachar, from sakhar, "hire," "man of hire": "God hath given me mine hire," also because Leah had "hired" Jacob with her son’s mandrakes; a similar allusion in Ge 49, "a servant under taskwork." Wellhausen would read ‘ish-sakhar, "man of (some deity, unknown)." Zebulun, from zebhul, "habitation, dwelling": Leah gives two explanations, the first assigned by critics to Elohist (E) (probably), connecting the name with a root found in Zebediah, Zabdi, etc., "endow": "God hath endowed me with a good dowry"; the second with zabhal, "dwell": "Now will my husband dwell with me." Dinah, like Dan, is from dan, "judge." Supposed by some to be an old tribe of Israel, in some way associated with Dan, possibly a twin division. Rachel is "ewe," hence identified with a "ewe" tribe. Joseph has a twofold suggestion: the first (assigned to E) from acaph, "take away": "God hath taken away my reproach"; the second (assigned to J) from yacaph, "add": "Yahweh will add to me another son." None of these three cases of double explanation would so far exhaust Hebrew maternal imagination as to require the hypothesis of two documents, even though in the last "God" is used in the first suggestion and "Yahweh" in the second. Benjamin is called by Rachel Benoni, "the son of my sorrow," which is supposed to be an old tribal name, perhaps related to Onan, a clan of Judah, or the Benjamite city, Ono, and possibly to the Egyptian On. Benjamin, Jacob’s name for him, "son of the right hand," i.e. of happiness, is understood as "son of the south," because originally the southern section of the Joseph tribe. The attempts to trace these names to tribal origins, local allusions, cognate languages, customs and religions have engaged much research and ingenuity, with results exceedingly diverse.

(9) Genesis 36. The Generations of Esau (P).

I. The Descent of the Edomite Chiefs and Clans from Esau through His Three Wives, the Hittite or Canaanite Adah, the Ishmaelite Basemath, and the Horite Oholibamah (Genesis 36:1-19).

The wives’ names here differ from the other statements: In Ge 26:34 and 28:9:

1. Judith, daughter of Beeri the Hittite.

2. Bashemath, daughter of Elan, the Hittite.

3. Mahalath, daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth.

In Ge 36:

1. Oholibamah, daughter of Anah, daughter of Zibeon, the Hivite.

2. Adah, daughter of Elon the Hittite.

3. Bashemath, daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth.

It is not necessary to resort to the hypothesis of different traditions. Bashemath and Adah are clearly identical, Esau perhaps having changed the name; as are Mahalath and the Ishmaelite Basemath, a transcriber's error being probably responsible for the change. As to Judith and Oholibamah, Anah is probably a man, identical with Beeri (Ge 36:24), the son of Zibeon. Both "Hivite" and "Hittite" are apparently errors for "Horite," the difference being in only one consonant. Or "Hittite" may be used as the larger term embracing "Horite." "Edom" (Ge 36:1,8,19) is a personal name; in Ge 36:9,43 (Hebrew the American Revised Version, margin) it is national, indicating that to the writer Esau was a person, not an eponym. Nowhere are personal characteristics more vividly and unmistakably portrayed than in the accounts of Jacob and Esau. In these Esauite names are but two compounds of "El" (’el), none of "Jah" (yah).

II. The Aboriginal Leaders or Clans in Edom, Partly Subdued by, Partly Allied with, the Esauites (Genesis 36:20-30).

These are descendants of "Seir the Horite" in seven branches, and in sub-clans. "Seir" looks like an eponym or a personification of the country, as no personal details have been preserved. Among these names are no "El" (’el) or "Jah" (yah) compounds, although they are clearly cognate with the Hebrew. Several close similarities to names in Judah are found, especially the Hezronite. Many animal names, "Aiah," "bird of prey," "Aran," "wild goat," etc.

III. Eight Edomite "Kings" before the Hebrew Monarchy (Genesis 36:31-39).

One ‘el compound, "Mehitabel," one ba’al compound. It is to be noted that the "crown" was not hereditary and that the "capital" shifted; the office was elective, or fell into the hands of the local chief who could win it.

IV. A List of Esauite Clan Chiefs; "Dukes" (English Revised), "Chiefs" (American Standard Revised Version); "Sheiks" (Genesis 36:40-43).

Apparently arranged territorially rather than tribally. The names seem used here as either clans or places and should perhaps be read: "the chief of Teman," etc. The original ancestor may have given his name to the clan or district, or obtained it from the district or town.

In general this genealogy of Esau shows the same symmetry and balance which rouses suspicion in some minds: excluding Amalek, the son of the concubine, the tribes number twelve. Amalek and his descendants clearly separated from the other Edomites early and are found historically about Kadesh-barnea, and later roaming from the border of Egypt to North Central Arabia.

(10) Genesis 46:8-27.

(In different form, Nu 26:1-51, and much expanded in parts of 1Ch 2-8; compare Ex 6:14-16). Jacob's posterity at the descent into Egypt (considered a late addition to P).

A Characteristic Genealogy.

It includes the ideal number of 70 persons, obtained by adding to the 66 mentioned in Ge 46:26, Jacob, Joseph, Ephraim and Manasseh, the two latter born in Egypt. Septuagint, followed by Stephen (Ac 7:14), reckons 75, adding to Ge 46:20 the names of three grandsons and two great-grandsons of Joseph, obtained from Nu 26:29,35 ff. Some may have been omitted to secure the ideal number so fascinating to the Hebrew mind. It is to be noted that Leah's male descendants are double those of Zilpah, and Rachel's double those of Bilhah, showing the ideal (but not the fictitious) character of the list. The design, also, seems to be to include those descendants of Jacob from whom permanent divisions sprang, even though, like Manasseh and Ephraim and probably Hezron and Hamul, born after the migration, but before Jacob's death. A comparison with the partial parallels also illustrates the corruption of the text, and the difficulty of uniformity in lists of names. The full list follows:

1. Jacob.

2. Leah's descendants.

A. Reuben = Hanoch, Pallu, Hezron, Carmi.

B. Simeon = Jemuel, Jamin, Ohad, Jachin, Zohar, Shaul.

C. Leui = Gershon, Kohath, Merari.

D. Judah = Er, Onan, Shelah, Perez, Zerah; Perez, Hezron, Hamul.

E. Issachar = Tolah, Puvah, Iob, Shimron.

F. Zebulun = Sered, Elon, Jahleel.

G. Dinah, daughter.

3. Zilpah’s descendants, 16.

A. Gad = Ziphion, Haggi, Shuni, Ezbon, Eri, Arodi, Areli.

B. Asher = Imnah, Ishvah, Ishvi, Beriah, Serah (daughter); Beriah = Heber, Malchiel.

4. Rachel’s descendants, 14.

A. Joseph = Manasseh, Ephraim.

B. Benjamin = Bela, Becher, Ashbel, Gera, Naaman, Ehi, Rash, Muppim, Huppin, Ard.

5. Bilhah’ s descendants, 7.

A. Da = Hushim.

B. Naphtali = Jahzeel, Guni, Jezer, Shillem.

The list differs in many respects from those in Numbers and Chronicles, and presents some chronological and other problems. Without entering upon an exhaustive study, a number of names may be touched on.

Carmi, (2A), like the other names in i, might be a gentilic, "the Carmite," like "the Amorite," etc., especially if these names are those of clans, as they are in Numbers, instead of persons, as the Genesis narrative states. A town, "Bethhaccherem," is mentioned in Jer 6:1. But "the vine-dresser" is also a good rendering.

Hezron (2A). Another Hezron is given as a descendant of Judah. This duplication of names is possible in clans; see instances below, but more likely in persons.

Jemuel (2B). Nemuel in Nu 26:12; 1Ch 4:24, an easy error in transcription, yodh, and nun, being easily confused. In Numbers, Nemuel is also a Reubenite name.

Jamin (or Jachin) (2B) is Jarib in Chronicles.

Ohad (2B). Not in Numbers or Chronicles.

Zohar (2B) is Zerah in Numbers and Chronicles.

Gershon (2C). In 1Ch 6:16 Gershom; identified by some with Gershom, son of Moses, on theory that the priestly family of Gershom originally traced its descent to Moses, but its later members were reckoned,

not as priests, but as Levites, thus becoming identified with Levi; precarious; its principal foundation being similarity of name and tribe.

Hezron and Hamul (2D) rouse chronological or exegetical difficulties. Pharez (Ge 33) could not have been old enough at the migration to have two sons; but very possibly Ge 38 is introduced episodically, not chronologically, and therefore its events may have occurred before those of Ge 37. Jacob was 130 years old at the descent, making Judah not 42 but 62, and Pharez old enough for sons. And, as suggested above, the writer may have done with Hezron and Hamul as with Ephraim and Manasseh—included them constructively, they having been born in Egypt, but before Jacob's death, belonging therefore to the generation of the migration and so reckoned, especially as they rounded permanent tribal divisions.

Puvah (2E). Puah in 1Ch 7:1. In Jud 10:1, centuries later, Puah is father of Tola, an illustration of the descent of fathers' names.

Iob (2E) is Jashub (Numbers, Chronicles), the latter probably correct. Septuagint has it here. A copyist, no doubt, omitted the "shin," "sh."

Dinah (2G) is thought by some to be a later insertion, on account of the "awkward Hebrew," "with Dinah." Dinah and Serah as unmarried, and no doubt because of other distinguishing facts, now unknown, are the only women descendants mentioned; married women would not be. On the clan theory of the names, the "Dinah" clan must have disappeared in Egypt, not being found in Number.

Ziphion (3A). Zephon in Numbers, perhaps giving its name to the Gadite city of Zaphon (Jos 13:27).

Ezbon (3A). Ozni (Nu 26:16). Possibly Ozni, on Ezbon's death, took his place, rounding a tribal family, like Hezron and Hamul in Judah. Copyist's error unlikely.

Arodi (3A). In Nu 26:17 Arod.

Ishvah (3B). Omitted in Numbers; perhaps died childless, or his descendants did not constitute a tribal family.

Beriah (3B). Also an Ephraimite (1Ch 7:23); a Benjaminite (8:13,16); a Levite (23:10,11). The repetition of the name indicates individuals rather than clans; but both the Asherite and Benjamite were heads of families.

Serah (3B), serach, "abundance," not the same name as that of Abraham's wife, sarah, "princess."

Heber (3B), chebher; in 1Ch 4:18, a clan of Judah; 8:17, of Benjamin. Not the same name as Eber, 'ebher (5:13; 8:22; and Ge 10:21).

The Sons of Benjamin.

The three lists, Genesis, Numbers, Chronicles, represent marked divergences, illustrating the corruption of perhaps all three texts. This list illustrates the genealogical method of counting all descendants as sons, though of different generations. It gives Benjamin ten "sons." Nu 26:38-40 gives five sons, Naaman and Ard being sons of Bela. The Septuagint of our passage gives only three sons, Bela, Becher, Ashbel. 1Ch 7:6 gives three sons, Bela, Becher, Jediael (Ashbel), and Shuppim and Huppim are Bela's grandsons. Becher is omitted in 8:1, probably through a copyist's error, who took bekher we-'ashbel, for "Becher and Ashbel," bekhoro 'ashbel, "his first-born, Ashbel." Jediael, both by older and newer scholars, is usually, but not with absolute certainty, identified with Ashbel. He may be a later chief. Another explanation is that 7:6 is part of a Zebulunite genealogy which has been transformed into a Benjamite list, Jediael being a remaining Zebulunite "pebble."

Naaman (4B) perhaps appears, by a transcriber's error in 1Ch 8:2, as Nochach, Nochach for Na'aman. If Nohah is not Naaman, and not (Keil) Shephupham, or a chief who succeeded him, he may have been one who was born after the migration and not needed to make up the seventy.

Gera (4B) in similar fashion may appear in 1Ch 8:2 as Rapha. If not, Rapha also may be one born after the migration, and did not found a family.

Ehi (4B) is Ahiram (Nu 26:38); Aharah (1Ch 8:1). Ehi probably arises from some copyist omitting the "ram."

Rosh (4B) is not in Numbers or Chronicles. He rounded no family.

Muppim (4B) troubled the scribes greatly. In Nu 26:39 he is Shephupham, though as compounded in his family name it is Shupham. In 1Ch 7:12 he is Shuppim, and it is not made clear whether he is a son, or other descendant, of Benjamin. He is apparently called, with Huppim, a son of Ir (Iri), son of Bela. In 8:8 he is catalogued as a son of Bela, as Shephuphan. In old Hebrew mem ("m") and shin ("sh") closely resemble each other. As the "sh" also appears in the gentilic names, it is probably the correct form. The corrupt state of the Chronicler's text especially is apparent, and also the fact that "son" may refer to any male descendant.

Huppim (4B) in Nu 26:39 is Hupham; in 1Ch 8:5 is Huram.

Ard (4B) in 1Ch 8:3 is a son of Bela, Addar, the copyist having transposed "d", and "r", or mistaken one for the other. In Septuagint at Ge 46:21 Ard is son of Gera, son of Bela.

Hushim (5A), the same in 1Ch 7:12, is Shuham (Nu 26:42), by transposition of consonants. Another Hushim is a Benjaminite, son of Aher, but Aher may possibly be a corruption of the numeral "one," it being the Chronicler's frequent habit to add numerals. But see under Da 21:6, (3), p. 1194.

Jahzeel (5B) is Jahziel in 1Ch 7:13.

Guni (5B) in 1Ch 5:15 is also a Gadite name.

Shillem (5B), in 1Ch 7:13, Shallum, the commoner form.

(11) Exodus 6:14-25 (Assigned to P).—Partial List of Heads of Fathers' Houses of Reuben, Simeon and Levi.

Reuben and Simeon are as in Genesis. Levi follows:

1. Gershon = Libni, Shimei.

2. Kohath.

A. Amram married Jochebed = Aaron, Moses; Aaron married Elisheba, daughter of Amminadab, sister of Nahshon = Nadab, Abihu, Eleazar, Ithamar; Eleazar married daughter of Putiel = Phinehas.

B. Izhar = Korah, Nepheg, Zichri; Korah, Assir, Elkanah, Abiasaph.

C. Hebron.

D. Uzziel = Mishael, Elzaphan, Sithri.

3. Merari = Mahli, Mushi.

The interest of the list is partly chronological, but chiefly to illustrate the genealogical place of Aaron and Moses. It probably exhibits the genealogical practice of omitting links, Amaram the father of Moses apparently being several links from Amram the son of Kohath. By Moses' time the Amramites numbered some 2,000 males (Nu 3:27, etc.). Jochebed (2A) is an instance of Yah in compounds before the Exodus. Putiel (2A) has been considered a partly Egyptian name, Puti or Poti, "devoted to" -El ('el); but probably Hebrew, "afflicted by God." Hebron is often identified with the city. It is also found in 1Ch 2:42,43, as Judahite.

(12) Numbers 1:5-54; 2:3-29; 7:12 ff; 10:4 ff.—The Heads of Houses Representing and Leading the Tribes (Assigned to P).

I. Reuben: Elizur, Son of Shedeur.

II. Simeon: Shelumiel, Son of Zurishaddai.

Shelumiel found in Judith.

III. Judah: Nahshon, Son of Amminadab.

Both found also in Ex 6:23; Ru 4:9-22; 1Ch 2:10-12: Mt 1:4; Lu 3:32 (genealogies of Christ).

IV. Issachar: Nethanel, Son of Zuar.

Nethanel, name of nine persons in Chronicles, Nehemiah, Ezra, same as Nathaniel.

V. Zebulun: Eliab, Son of Helon.

Other Eliabs, Nu 16:1 (Reubenite); 1Sa 16:6 (Jesse's son, Judah).

VI. Joseph: Ephraim: Elishama, Son of Ammihud.

Other Elishamas: 2Sa 5:16 (son of David); Jer 36:12; 2Ch 17:8. Ammihuds: 2Sa 13:37 m; Nu 34:20,28; 1Ch 9:4 (Judahite).

VII. Joseph: Manasseh: Gamaliel, Son of Pedahzur. New Testament Gamaliel.

VIII. Benjamin: Abidan, Son of Gideoni.

IX. Dan: Ahiezer, Son of Ammishaddai.

Another, 1Ch 12:3 (Benjamite).

X. Asher: Pagiel, Son of Ochran.

XI. Gad: Eliasaph, Son of Deuel.

Another, Nu 3:24 (Levite).

XII. Naphtali: Ahira, Son of Enan.

Seven of these names, Amminadab, Ammihud, Abidan, Ahirah, Ahiezer, Eliab, Elishama, are concededly early. The 5 compounded in Shaddai or Zur are said to be of a type found only in P; 9 of the 24 are compounded in 'el, said to be a characteristic of late names. The 'El is postfixed more times, 5, than it is prefixed, 4; also a characteristic of late names. The proportion of compound names is also greater than in the older names; for these and similar reasons (Gray, ICC, "Nu," 6; HPN, 191-211; The Expositor T, September, 1897, 173-90) it is concluded that though several of the names are, and more

may be, early, the list is late. But see Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 74, 83 ff, 85 ff, 320. The contention rests largely on the late date of the Priestly Code (P) and of Chronicles. But while fashions in names changed in Hebrew life as elsewhere, in view of the persistence of things oriental, the dating of any particular names is somewhat precarious. They may be anticipations or late survivals of classes of names principally prevalent at the later or earlier date. Two of the names, otherwise unknown, have come to us through Ruth, and indicate a source now unknown to us, from which all the names could have been drawn. The fondness for names in ‘el very likely indicates not a late date but an early one. ‘El is the Divine name appearing in personal names previous to Moses, succeeded by Jab from Moses and Joshua on. The recurrence of ‘el in the time of Ezra and later probably indicates the renewed interest in antiquity as well as the at once wider and narrower outlook brought about by the exile and return. Numerous South Arabian compounds both with the "ilu," "ili" (’el), affixed and prefixed, occur in monuments about 1000 BC (AHT, 81 ff).

(13) Numbers 3:1-37.—The Family of Aaron, with the "Princes" of Levi.

Adds nothing to list in Ex 16:16-25 except the Levite "princes."

I. Gershonites: Eliasaph, Son of Lael.

Also a Benjaminite Eliasaph (Nu 1:14).

II. Kohathites: Elizaphan, Son of Uzziel.

A Zebulunite Elizaphan (Nu 34:25). Five other Uzziels, Benjamite, Levite, Simeonite.

III. Merarites: Zuriel, Son of Abihail.

A Gadire Abihail (1Ch 5:14); also father of Queen Esther; also two women: wife of Abishur (1Ch 2:29); wife of Rehoboam (2Ch 11:18). Four ‘el suffixes, two prefixes.

(14) Numbers 13:4-16.—The Twelve Spies (P).

I. Reuben: Shammua, Son of Jaccur.

Other Shammuas (2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 14:4 (David’s son); Ne 11:17, Levite 12:18, priest). Seven other Zaccurs, Simeonites and Levites.

II. Simeon: Shaphat, Son of Hori.

Four other Shaphats, one Gadite, one Judahite; Elisha’s father. Hori looks like the national name of the Horites; perhaps Hori or an ancestor had been adopted, through marriage or otherwise.

III. Judah: Caleb, Son of Jephunneh, the Kenizzite (Numbers 32:12; Joshua 14:6,14).

Another Caleb, Chelubai, son of Hezron, brother of Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:9). Either as an individual, or as a clan, Caleb seems to be originally of the pre-Israelitish stock in Canaan, absorbed into the tribe of Judah. Perhaps Jephunneh the Kenizzite married a woman of Caleb's (brother of Jerahmeel) household, and to their firstborn was given the name of Caleb, he becoming head of the house and prince of Judah. Another Jephunneh, an Asherite (1Ch 7:38).

IV. Issachar: Igal, Son of Joseph.

Other Igals: 2Sa 23:36 (one of David's heroes); 1Ch 3:22. Note the name of another tribe given to a man of Issachar—Joseph (Nu 13:7).

V. Ephraim: Hoshea, Son of Nun;

Hoshea, Joshua's early name. Others: 1Ch 27:20; King Hoshea, 2Ki 15:30; Ne 10:23; Hebrew name of prophet Hosea.

VI. Benjamin: Palti, Son of Raphu. See 16 IV.

VII. Zebulun: Gaddiel, Son of Sodi.

VIII. Joseph-Manasseh: Gaddi, Son of Susi.

A Gaddi is in 1 Macc 2:2.

IX. Dan: Ammiel, Son of Gemali.

Another Ammiel (2Sa 9:4).

X. Asher: Sethur, Son of Michael.

Nine other Michaels, Gadite, Levite, Issacharite, Benjamite, Manassite, Judahite.

XI. Naphtali: Nahbi, Son of Vophsi.

XII. Gad: Geuel, Son of Machi.

Four names in 'el. Nine ending with i; unusual number. The antiquity of the list cannot be readily questioned.

(15) Numbers 26:5-62 (P).—The Heads of Houses at the Second Census.

Related to Nu 1 and 2, and closely follows Ge 46. The divergences in individual names have been noted under (10). This list adds to

I. Reuben:

1. Eliab, son of Pallu (also Nu 16:1,12).

2. Dathan, Abiram, Nemuel, sons of Eliab.

II. Manasseh:

1. Machir; also Ge 50:23.

2. Gilead, son of Machir.

3. Iezer (abbreviation for Abiezer), Helek (not in Chronicles), Asriel, Shechem, Shemida, sons of Gilead.

4. Zelophehad, son of Hepher.

5. Mahlah, Noah, Hoglah, Milcah, Tirzah, daughters of Zelophehad.

III. Ephraim:

1. Shuthelah; also 1Ch 7:21.

2. Becher.

3. Tahan (Tahath, 1Ch 7:20).

4. Eran (Elead, 1Ch 7:21).

The names of Manasseh’s grandsons and great-grandsons are puzzling. Gilead is the district except in Jud 11:1,2, where it is the father of Jephthah. Shechem sounds like the Ephraimite town. Hepher reminds of Gath-Hepher. In Jos 17:1,2 the six sons of Gilead are described as sons of Manasseh; loosely, it is probable; they are to be understood as descendants. Perhaps the references may be summarized: The family of Machir, the son of Manasseh, conquered Gilead, and took its name therefrom, either as a family or in the person of a son, Gilead, whose six sons founded clans named from or giving names to certain towns or districts.

The daughters of Zelophehad are noted for the interesting case at law they presented, claiming and receiving the inheritance of their father, which by Gray, ICC, "Nu," is considered not historical but a fictitious instance, for the purpose of raising the question, these daughters being clans, and not persons.

Among the sons of Ephraim, Becher has perhaps been misplaced from verse 38, and possibly displaces Bered (1Ch 7:20) between Shuthelah and Tahath. It is not found here in the Septuagint. It is possible that an alliance between the Becherites and the Ephraimites caused one portion of the former to be counted with Ephraim and another with Benjamin; or that at different times the clan was allied with the two different tribes. An error in transcription is more probable. Another Shuthelah is found later in the line (1Ch 7:21).

(16) Numbers 34:16-28.—Tribal Representatives in the Allotment.

Reuben, Gad, half-Manasseh, omitted because their allotments had already been assigned East of Jordan; Levi, because receiving none. Changing to the order in (10):

I. Reuben: None.

II. Simeon: Shemuel, Son of Ammihud.

Shemuel is Hebrew of Samuel. Another Shemuel is of Issachar, 1Ch 7:2. Samuel the prophet, a Levite.

III. Judah: Caleb, Son of Jephunneh.

IV. Issachar: Paltiel, Son of Azzan.

Another Paltiel, otherwise Palti, David’s wife Michal’s temporary husband (2Sa 3:15). Another Benjamite spy (Nu 13:9).

V. Zebulun: Elizaphan, Son of Parnach.

Another Elizaphan, Kohathite Levite (Ex 6:18,22).

VI. Gad: None.

VII. Asher: Ahihud, Son of Shelomi.

Another Ahihud, Benjamite (1Ch 8:7).

VIII. Joseph-Ephraim: Kemuel, Son of Shiftan.

Another Kemuel, son of Nahor, an Aramean chief (Ge 22:21); also Levite of David’s time (1Ch 27:17).

IX. Joseph-Manasseh: Hanniel, Son of Ephod.

Hanniel, also an Asherite (1Ch 7:39).

X. Benjamin: Elidad, Son of Chislon.

XI. Dan: Bukki, Son of Jogli.

Bukki, abbreviation of Bukkiah; another, in high-priestly line of Phinehas (1Ch 6:5,51).

XII. Naphtali: Pedahel, Son of Ammihud.

A Simeonite Ammihud above.

Seven "El" names, only one "Jah."

(17) Ru 4:20.—The Ancestry of David (Perez: Hezron: Ram: Amminadab: Nahshon: Salmon (Salmah): Boaz: Obed: Jesse: David).

Contained unchanged in 1Ch 2:9-15; also Mt 1:1-6; also Lu 3:32. Some links have been omitted between Obed and Jesse. Salmon might be traced to the ancestor of the Bethlehemite (1Ch 2:51,54), who is, however, of Caleb’s line, not Ram’s; but the lines may mingle.

(18) 2Sa 3:2-5; 5:14,15. David’s children (also in 1Ch 3:1-9; 14:4-7).

I. Born in Hebron: Amnon, Chileab, Absalom, Adonijah, Shephatiah, Ithream.

II. Born in Jerusalem: Shammua, Shobab, Nathan, Solomon, Ibhar, Elishua, Nepheg, Japhia, Elishama, Eliada, Eliphelet.

Four names in ‘el, all prefixed. Two in "Jah." Chileab is Daniel in 1Ch 3:1; uncertain which is right, but probably Daniel is a corruption. Chronicles adds Nogah to the Jerusalem sons, probably developed in transcription. 1Ch 3:6-8 has two Eliphelets; 14:6 has Elpalet in place of the first; more probable. This gives David 6 sons in Hebron, and, if both Nogah and Elpalet be correct, 12 in Jerusalem. Eliada is Beeliada in 14:7, perhaps the original form, a relic of the time before the Hebrews turned against the use of Baal, "lord," as applied to Yahweh; in which case Baaliada, "Lord knows," was changed to Eliada, "God knows." 3:6 reads Elishama for Elishua. Japhia is also the name of a king of Lachish in Joshua’s time (Jos 10:3-7).

(19) 2 Samuel 23 (also 1 Chronicals 11:11-41).—David’s Knights.

1. Josheb-bashebeth, the Tahchemonite.

In Chronicles it is Jashobeam, and should read Ishbaal, the writer’s religious horror of Baal leading him to substitute the consonants of bosheth, "shame," as in Mephibosheth, Ishbosheth. Septuagint has Iesebada (Codex Vaticanus), Iessebadal, Isbaam (Codex Alexandrinus), in Chronicles, and Iebosthe (Codex Vaticanus), Iebosthai (Codex Alexandrinus) here. In Chronicles he is a Hachmonite, probably correct. "Adino the Heznite" is probably a corruption for "He wielded his spear" (Chronicles).

2. Eleazar, Son of Dodai, the Ahohite.

Dodo in Chronicles; 8 other Eleazars in the Old Testament. Another Dodo is father of Elhanan.

3. Shammah, Son of Agee, a Hararite.

Omitted by Chronicles. Three other Shammahs, one of them a knight of David. "Harari" may be "mountaineer," or "inhabitant of the village Harar."

4. Abishai, Son of Zeruiah, Brother of Joab.

Abshai (1Ch 18:12 margin). Zeruiah perhaps David’s half-sister (2Sa 17:25). Father never mentioned.

5. Benaiah, Son of Jehoaida of Kabzeel.

Eleven other Old Testament Benaiahs, one of them also a knight. This Benaiah succeeded Joab as commander-in-chief, 4 other Jehoiadas, one Benaiah’s grandson, high in David’s counsel, unless a scribe has inverted the order in 1Ch 27:34, which should then read Benaiah, son of Jehoiada.

6. Asahel, Brother of Joab.

Three other Asahels.

7. Elhanan, Son of Dodo of Bethlehem.

Another Elhanan, slayer of the brother of Goliath (2Sa 21:19; 1Ch 20:5). Perhaps the same.

8. Shammah the Harodite.

Chronicals, Shammoth. From Harod, near Gideon’s well (Jud 7:1).

9. Elika the Harodite.

10. Helez the Paltite.

Paltite perhaps local or family name from Pelet, or Palti.

11. Ira, Son of Ikkesh the Tekoite.

Two others, one a knight. Tekoah, Judaite town, home of Amos, etc.

12. Abiezer the Anathothite.

One other, a Manassite (Jos 17:2). Anathoth an hour Northeast of Jerusalem, Jeremiah's town.

13. Mebunnai the Hushathite.

Should read, with Chronicles, Sibbecai.

14. Zalmon the Ahohite.

Zalmon, also name of mountain (Jud 9:48). Descendant of Ahoah, Benjamite of Bela's line. See 1Ch 8:14.

15. Maharai the Netophathite.

From Netophah, town.

16. Heleb, Son of Baanah.

1Ch 11:30, Heled. Three other Bannabs.

17. Ittai, Son of Ribai of Gibeah of the Children of Benjamin.

1Ch 11:31, Ithai. An Ittai of Gath also followed David.

18. Benaiah a Pirathonite.

Pirathon, Amalekite town in Ephraimite territory.

19. Hiddai of the Brooks of Gnash.

Chronicles, Hurai ("d" for "r"). Ga’ash, a Wady in Ephraim.

20. Abi-albon the Arbathite.

Chronicles, Abiel, perhaps corrupted from Abi-Baal; from Beth-arabah, Judah or Benjamin.

21. Azmaveth the Barhumite.

Three others, and a Judaite town, of the same name. Baharumite; Chronicles, Barhumite, a Benjamite town.

22. Eliahba the Shaalbonite.

Shaalbon, a Danite town.

23. The Sons of Jashen (better, Hashem).

Chronicles, "the sons of Hashem the Gizonite." "Sons of" looks like a scribal error, or interpolation, perhaps a repetition of "bni" in "Shaalboni" above.

24. Jonathan, Son of Shammah the Hararite.

Chronicles adds, "the son of Shagee the Hararite." Shagee should perhaps be Agee (2Sa 23:11); but Septuagint indicates Shammah here; both Samuel and Chronicles should read "J., son of Shammah the Ararite."

25. Ahiam, Son of Sharar the Ararite.

Chronicles, Sacar the Hararite. Sacar is supported by Septuagint.

26. Eliphelet, Son of Ahasvai, the Son of the Maacathite.

Chronicles has "Eliphal, son of Ur," and adds "Hepher the Mecherathite." Both texts are corrupt. Chronicles should perhaps read, "Eliphelet the son of ...., the Maacathite, Eliam," etc.

27. Eliham, Son of Ahithophel the Gilonite.

Eliham, possibly father of Bathsheba. Ahithophel, David’s counselor. Gilonite, native of Giloh.

27a. Ahijah the Pelonite (in Chronicals but Not Samuel).

Seven other Ahijahs. Pelonite uncertain, probably a corruption; perhaps inserted by a scribe who could not decipher his "copy," and means "such and such a one," as in 1Sa 21:2.

28. Hezro (Hezrai) the Carmelite.

A scribe confused the Hebrew letters, waw ("w") and yod ("y"). Carmel, near Hebron.

29. Paarai the Arbite.

Chronicles, "Naarai, son of Esbai." Uncertain. Arb, a town of Judah.

30. Igal, Son of Nathan of Zobah.

Chronicles, Joel, brother of Nathan. Igal less common than Joel, hence, more likely to be corrupted; 2 other Igals; 12 other Joels; 5 other Nathans.

30a. Mibhar, Son of Hagri (Chronicles, not Samuel).

Text uncertain as between this and 31.

31. Bani the Gadite (Omitted in Chronicles).

Possibly the Gerarite.

32. Zelek the Ammonite.

Ammon East of Jordan and upper Jabbok.

33. Naharai the Beerothite, Armor-bearer to Joab, Son of Zeruiah.

Beeroth, Benjamite town.

34. Ira the Ithrite.

Ithrites, a family of Kiriath-jearim, Judah.

35. Gareb the Ithrite.

Gareb also a hill West of Jerusalem.

36. Uriah the Hittite.

Bathsheba’s husband; 3 others. From some Hittite town surrounded by Israel at the Conquest.

37. Zabad, Son of Ahlai (Perhaps Dropped out of Samuel), Chronicles.

Chronicles adds 13 others. The filling of vacancies makes the number 37 instead of 30. Two names, perhaps, in ba’al, 5 in yah, 7 in ‘el. As far as guessable, 5 from Judah, 3 from Benjamin, 2 from Ephraim, 1 from Dan, 1 from Issachar, 1 Ammonite, 1 Hittite, 2 (or 4) Hararites, 2 Harodites, 2 Ithrites.

(20) 1 Kings 4:1-19.—Solomon’s "Princes" and Commissaries.

Eleven princes, 12 officers. No mention of their tribal connections; assigned only partly by tribal bounds. 7 yah names, 1 ‘el; 5 of the officers are prefixed ben as if their own names had dropped out.

(21) 1 Chronicals 1-9.—Genealogies, with Geographical and Historical Notices.

By far the largest body of genealogical material, illustrating most fully the problems and difficulties. The estimate of its value depends on the estimate of the Chronicler’s date, purpose, equipment, ethical and mental qualities. He uses freely all previous Old Testament matter, and must have had in hand family or tribal songs, traditions; genealogical registers, as mentioned in Ezr 2:61-69; Ne 7:63-65; local traditions; official genealogies, such as "the genealogies reckoned in the days of Jotham king of Judah, and .... Jeroboam king of Israel" (1Ch 5:17); prophetic, historical and other matter now lost, "the words of Shemaiah .... after the manner of genealogies" (2Ch 12:15), and elsewhere. The results of David’s census seem to have been in his hands (1Ch 27:24). Curtis (ICC, "Chronicles," 528) suggests that his purpose was partly to provide genealogies for contemporary families, implying an accommodating insertion of names "after the manner of genealogies" today. Two main purposes, however, seem clear: the first historical, to give the historical and personal basis and setting to elucidate the Chronicler’s main thesis, that national prosperity depended upon, and national character was measured by, fidelity to the law of God, especially as it centered upon the worship and services of Yahweh’s house. To do this it was necessary to trace the descent of the prominent characters, families, tribes. Hence, the space given to Judah, Levi, Benjamin, the main line of fidelity, the survival of the fittest. The other purpose was to conserve purity of blood in the restored nation, to include all who were entitled and to exclude all who were not. We may also credit him with such regard for his material that he preserved it all (with certain comprehensible exceptions), even though extremely fragmentary here and there. His materials are of many degrees of age. It is thought by some that the antiquity is indicated by the last stage in the descent, the genealogy of Sheshun, e.g. ending with Hezekiah’s time; Heman’s and Asaph’s (1Ch 6,33) in David’s. Name-study and historico-literary criticism seeks still other marks of relative age. The text has suffered much, as lists of names will, from scribal errors. Details of his method will be pointed out in the following analysis. As in this whole article, space forbids exhaustive treatment of the endless textual, critical, historical questions arising. A few illustrative cases only are given.

GENEALOGY, 8 part 2

I. Primeval Genealogies (1 Chronicals 1:1-54).

To show Israel's place among the nations; follows Genesis closely, omitting only the Cainites; boldly, skillfully compressed, as if the omitted facts were well known.

(1) The ten antediluvian Patriarchs, and Noah's three sons (1Ch 1:1-4).

Follows Ge 4:5, giving only the names.

(2) Japheth's descendants (1Ch 1:5-7) (Ge 10:2-4 unchanged).

(3) The Hamites (1Ch 1:8-16) (Ge 10:6-8,13-18 a unchanged).

(4) The Semites (1Ch 1:17-23) (Ge 10:22-29; only scribal changes).

(5) Abram's descent (1Ch 1:24-27) (Ge 11:10-26 abridged, giving only the Patriarchs).

(6) The sons of Abraham, Keturah, Isaac (1Ch 1:28-34).

Ge 25:1-4,13-16,25,26; 32:28. Reverses the order of Ishmael's and Keturah's descendants.

(7) Sons of Esau (1Ch 1:35-52) (Ge 36:4-10).

(8) Kings and sheikhs of Edom (1Ch 1:43,14) (Ge 36:31-43). Scribal changes.

II. Descendants of Jacob (1 Chronicals 2-9).

The tribes arranged chiefly geographically. Judah, as the royal line, is given 100 verses, Levi, as the priestly, 81 verses, Benjamin 50, the other ten 56, Da and Zebulun neglected. His purpose practically confines him to the first three; and these were also the best preserved.

(1) Sons of Israel.

Follows substantially the order in Ge 35. Da is placed before Rachel's sons. 17 different orders of the tribes in Bible lists.

(2) Genealogies of Judah (1Ch 2:3-4:23).

(a) Descent of Jesse's sons from Judah (1Ch 2:3-17).

Largely gleaned from the historical books. The sons of Zerah (1Ch 2:6-8) are not found elsewhere. Chelubai is Caleb. Only 7 sons of Jesse are mentioned. Abishai, Joab, Asahel are always designated by their mother's name, Zeruiah.

(b) Genealogy of Bezalel (1Ch 2:18-20).

The artificer of the tabernacle, hence, greatly interests the Chronicler.

(c) Other descendants of Hezron (1Ch 2:21-24).

(d) The Jerahmeelites (1Ch 2:25-41).

Concededly a very old list of this important clan not found elsewhere. Sheshan (1Ch 2:35), who married his daughter to Jarha, an Egyptian servant, illustrates the introduction of a foreigner into the nation and tribe.

(e) The Calebites (1Ch 2:41-55).

Not elsewhere. The names are largely geographical. A subdivision of the Hezronites. Not Caleb the son of Jephunneh.

(f) David's descendants (1Ch 3:1-24).

Gives first the sons and their birthplaces, then the kings to Jeconiah and Zedekiah, then the Davidic line from Jeconiah to Zerubbabel, then the grandsons of Zerubbabel and the descendants of Shecaniah. Two other lists of David's sons (2Sa 5:14-16; 1Ch 14:4-17). Eliphelet and Nogah here are thought to have developed in transcription, with some other changes. Johanan's name (s. of Josiaih) is given among the kings, though he never reigned. Zedekiah is called son (instead of brother) of Jehoiachin, perhaps a scribal error. "Jah" names extremely numerous. Names of Zerubbabel's sons are highly symbolic: Meshullam, "Recompensed"; Hananiah, "Jah is gracious"; Shelomith, "Peace"; Hashubah, "Consideration"; Ohel, "Tent," i.e. "Dwelling of Yahweh"; Berechiah, "Jah blesses"; Hasadiah, "Jah is kind"; Jushab-hesed, "Loving-kindness returns"; characteristic of the Exile.

1 Chronicles 3:19-24, beginning with Zerubbabel's descendants, are obscure, and a battleground of criticism on account of their bearing on the date of Chronicles. There are three possible interpretations:

(1) Following the Hebrew, Zerubbabel's descendants stop with Pelatiah and Jeshaiah, his grandsons. Then follow three unclassified sets of "sons." No connection is shown between Jeshaiah and these. Then follows Shecaniah's line with four generations. There are several other instances of unrelated names thus being thrown in. This gives two generations after Zerubbabel.

(2) Still following the Hebrew, assume that Shecaniah after Obadiah is in Zerubbabel's line. This gives

six generations after Zerubbabel.

(3) Following Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (but the two latter are of very small critical weight), read in verse 21, "Rephaiah his son, Arnan his son," etc.—a very possible change: eleven generations after Zerubbabel.

According to (3), Ch was written at least 253 years (allowing 23 years to a generation; more probable than 30 or 40) after Zerubbabel (515), hence, after 262 BC; (2) makes it after 373; (1) makes it 459, during Ezra's life. The book's last recorded event is Cyrus' decree (538), which indicates the earliest date. The New Testament casts no light here, none of these names appearing in the genealogies in Matthew or Luke. If Septuagint is correct, Keil suggests that it is a later insertion, a critical device too frequently used to nullify inconvenient facts. The passage itself justifies the statement that "there is no shadow of proof that the families enumerated in 1Ch 3:21, latter part, were descendants of Hananiah the son of Zerubbabel." Against this, and the other indications, the admittedly faulty Septuagint furnishes an insufficient basis for so far-reaching a conclusion.

(g) Fragmentary genealogies of families of Judah (1Ch 4:1-23).

Contains

(1) "sons" of Judah, four or five successive generations;

(2) sons of Shobal and Hur;

(3) sons of Chelub;

(4) sons of Caleb, son of Jephunneh;

(5) sons of Jehaleel;

(6) sons of Ezra (of course, not the priest-scribe of the return);

(7) sons of "Bethiah the daughter of Pharaoh whom Mered took";

(8) sons of Shimon;

(9) sons of Ishi;

(10) sons of Shelah.

It is hard to trace the law of association here; which fact has its bearing on the discussion under (f)

above. Chelub may be another Caleb. 1Ch 4:9-11 give an interesting name-study, where Jabez by prayer transforms into prosperity the omen of his sorrowful name: "Because I bare him with sorrow," a characteristic note. 1Ch 4:21-23 speak of the linenworkers and potters. Similar, even identical, names have been found on pot-handles-in Southern Palestine. (3) Genealogy of Simeon (4:24-43).

(a) Simeon's sons. Genealogy of Shimei. After Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15; Nu 26:12-14.

(b) Dwelling-places of Simeon. After Jos 19:2-8.

(c) Princes and conquests (1Ch 4:34-43).

Source unknown, but considered old. Gray, however, thinks the names of late formation. Meshobab, Jamlech, Joshah, Amaziah, Joel, Jehu, Josibiah, Seraiah, Asiel, Elioenai, Jaakobah, Jeshohaiah, Asaiah, Adiel, Jesimiel, Benaiah, Ziza, Shiphi, Allon, Jedaiah, Shimri, Shemaiah, Ishi, Pelatiah, Neariah, Rephaiah, Uzziel; many undoubtedly old ones; 11 in yah, 5 in 'el. Eliothal sounds post-exilic. The section mentions several exploits of Simeon.

(4) East-Jordanic tribes (1Ch 5:1-24).

As in Simeon above, the usual order, deviated from in instances, is

(1) Introductory: Sons and immediate descendants;

(2) Territory;

(3) Princes or Chiefs;

(4) Incidents.

(a) Reuben (1Ch 5:1-10).

Partly follows Gen, Nu; but only as to first generation. Very fragmentary and connections obscure.

(b) Gad (1Ch 5:11-17).

First generation omitted. Chronicler draws from genealogies "in the days of" Jotham and Jeroboam.

(c) Half-Manasseh (1Ch 5:23,14).

The whole tribe is treated of (1Ch 7:14). Here only the seats and heads of houses.

(5) Levi (1Ch 6:1-81).

Illustrates more fully the Chronicler’s attitude and methods.

(a) High priests from Levi to Jehozadak (the Exile) (1Ch 6:1-15).

(i) Levi’s sons: Gershon, Kohath, Merari (Ge 46:11; Ex 6:16).

(ii) Kohath’s sons: Amram, Izhar, Hebron, Uzziel (Ex 6:18).

(iii) Amram’s "sons": Aaron, Moses, Miriam (Ex 6:20,23 (except Miriam); Nu 26:59 f).

(iv) High priests from Eleazar. Also (partly) Ezra (7:1-5):

1. Eleazar

2. Phinehas

3. Abishua

4. Bukki

5. Uzzi

6. Zerahiah

7. Meraioth

8. Amariah

9. Ahitub

10. Zadok

11. Ahimaaz

12. Azariah

13. Johnnan

14. Azariah

15. Amariah

16. Ahitub

17. Zadok

18. Shallum

19. Hilkiah

20. Azariah

21. Seraiah

22. Jehozadak

Noteworthy omissions: Eli’s house, Eli, Phinehas, Ahitub, Ahimelech, Abiathar, because set aside for Zadok’s in Solomon’s time; Bukki to Zadok being their contemporaries; but the list also omits Amariah in the reign of Jehoshaphat (perhaps), Jehoiada, Joash’s "power behind the throne," Urijah in Ahaz’ day, Azariah in Hezekiah’s. It has been thought that this was done in the interests of a chronological scheme of the Chronicler, making 23 generations of 40 years from the Exodus to the Captivity, or 920 years. The Hebrew generation, however, was as likely to be 30 as 40 years, and as a matter of fact was nearer 20. The apparent number of generations from Aaron to the Captivity, adding the data from the historical books, is 29, making a generation about 24 years. The reasons for the omission here, as for many others, are not apparent. Outside of Chronicles and Ezra we know nothing of Abishua, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerahiah, Meraioth, the first Amaziah, Johanan, Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok 2, Shallum, Azariah 3. The list touches historical notices in Aaron, Eleazar, Phinehas, Zadok, Ahimaaz, Azariah 2, contemporary of Solomon, perhaps Amariah, contemporary of Jehoshaphat, Azariah, contemporary of Uzziah, Hilkiah, contemporary of Joshua, Seraiah slain by the Chaldeans, and Jehozadak. The recurrence of similar names in close succession is characteristically Jewish (but compare names of popes and kings). It is seen in the list beginning with Jehozadak: Joshua, Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Jonathan, Jaddua, Onias, Simon, Eleazar, Manasseh, Onias, Simon, Onias, Joshua. Also about Christ’s time: Eleazar, Jesus, Annas, Ismael, Eleazar, Simon, Joseph, Jonathan, Theophilus, Simon, although these latter do not succeed in a genealogical line.

(b) The three Levitical clans (1Ch 6:16-19). After Ex 6:17-19; Nu 3:17-20.

(c) Lineal descendants of Gershom: seven, 1Ch 6:20,21; thirteen, 1Ch 6:39-43. See also 1Ch 23:7.

The two lists (1Ch 6:20,21 and 6:39-43) are clearly the same:

Gershom Gershom

Libni Jahath

Zimmah Zimmah

Joah Ethan

Iddo Adaiah

Zerah Zerah

Jeatherai Ethni

Malchiah

Baaseiah

Michael

Shimea

Berachiah

Asaph

Jahath, Zimmah, Zerah are in both. By slight changes Joah, yow'ah, is Ethan, 'ethan; Iddo, 'idow, is 'idaiah, Adaiah; Jeatherai, y^{a}'thriy, is Ethni, 'ethniy. Shimei may have dropped from one and Libni from the other. Jahath and Shimei have been transposed. In 1Ch 23:7 Libni is Ladan.

(d) Pedigrees of Samuel (1Ch 6:27,28; 33-35). See also 1Sa 1:1; 8:2.

We have three pedigrees of Samuel, all suffering in transcription:

(1) 1Ch 6:22-24,28

(2) 1Ch 6:33-38

(3) 1Sa 1:1; 8:2

Kohath Kohath

Amminadab Izhar

Korah Korah

Assir, Elkanah,

Ebiasaph Ebiasaph

Assir Assir

Tahath Tahath

Uriel Zephaniah

Uzziah Azariah

Shaul Joel

Elkanah Elkanah

Amasai Amasai

Ahimoth Mahath Elkanah Elkanah

Zophai Zuph Zuph

Nahath Thoah Thohu

Eliab Eliel Elihu

Jeroham Jeroham Jeroham

Elkanah Elkanah Elkanah

Samuel Samuel Samuel

Joe (Vashni) and Joe Joel

Abijah

Heman

The text is obscure. Septuagint reads (1Ch 6:26), "Elkanah his (Ahimoth's) son, Zophai his son." It has Izhar in (1) for Amminadab, as has Hebrew in Ex 6:18,21. Uriel for Zephaniah is unexplainable. Uzziah and Azariah are exchangeable. The other variations are transcriptional. Joe has dropped out of the first list, and the following words, now in 1Sa 8:2, and the Syriac here: "and the second," v-sh-n, have been read "Vashni." 1Sa 1:1 calls Zuph an Ephraimite. The Chronicler's claiming him (and Samuel) seems to some another instance of Levitical bias and acquisitiveness. The genealogy is also found "clearly artificial," Zuph being a territory, and Toah, Tohu, Nahath, a family. But "Ephraimite" is either merely local, the family having been assigned residence there (Jos 21:5; 1Ch 6:66), or (Hengstenberg, Ewald) because, being thus assigned, it has been incorporated into the tribe. Hannah's vow to devote him to Yahweh is said (Curtis, Moore, ICC in the place cited.) to show that he was no Levite, in which case no vow was necessary. But Elkanah's Ephraimite citizenship may have obscured in Hannah's mind the Levitical descent. In the disorganized times of the Judges an Ephraimite woman may well have been ignorant of, or indifferent to, the Levitical regulation, She, or the author of 1Sa 1:1, must also have forgotten that every male that openeth the womb from any tribe is equally God's property A mother's vow to devote her firstborn son to Yahweh, beyond recall or redemption, and to seal his consecration by the significant symbol of the unshaved head, is not hard to imagine in either a Levite or an Ephramite, and equally "unnecessary" in either case. Heman, ending the pedigree (2), was David's contemporary.

(e) Pedigree of Asaiah the Merarite (1Ch 6:29,30).

Merari: Mahli: Libni; Shimei: Uzzah: Shimea: Haggiah: Asaiah. Hard to adjust or place. Libni and Shimei are elsewhere Gershonites, but the same name is frequently found in different tribes or clans. Information below Mahli is entirely wanting.

(f) Descent of David's three singers, Heman, Asaph, Ethan (1Ch 6:33-47).

(i) Heman has been given under (d) ; 20 links.

(ii) Asaph: Getshorn: Jahath: Shimei: Zimmah: Ethan: Adaiah: Zerah: Ethni (Jeatherai): Malchijah: Baaseiah: Michael: Shimea: Berechiah: Asaph; 15 links.

(iii) Ethan: Merari: Mushi: Mahli: Shemet: Bani: Amzi: Hilkiah: Amaziah: Hashabiah: Malluch: Abdi: Kishi: Ethan; 12 links.

Hardly anywhere is the Chronicler's good faith more questioned than in these lists. Finding in his day the three guilds of singers claiming descent from David's three, and through these from Levi, he fits them out with pedigrees, borrowing names from 1Ch 6:16-20, and filling out with his favorite names, or those of his own invention, or from current lists. To make Asaph contemporary with David, he adds Malchijah, Maaseiah, Michael, Shimei, Berechiah. He helps out Ethan with Bani, Amzi, Hilkiah,

Amaziah, Hashabiah, Malluch, Abdi, Kishi. The names added are very frequent in Chronicles and Ezra, not frequent in older writings. Aside from the general objection to this thoroughgoing discredit of Chronicles, and theory of religious development in Israel on which it is based, it may be said:

(1) The Chronicler's failure to give his three families nearly the same number of links is suspicious, but if he took an old list, as it came to him, it is natural.

(2) The fact that these added names occur many more times in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah indicates simply that Levitical names occur frequently in a writer and among a people whose interests are Levitical. No one would look among the Roundheads for either classical or aristocratic names.

(3) In no tribe would such names be more likely to recur, naturally or purposely, than in the Levitical.

(4) The Chronicler has inserted among his new names 6 in yah and only 1 in 'el, and that far down the list.

(5) Of the "added" names Malchijah occurs in Jer 21:1; Masseiah, in 29:21,25; 35:4, in every case priestly or Levitical. Michael occurs in Nu 13:13. Berechiah is the name of the prophet Zechariah's father. Hilkiah is the name of Joshua's high priest. Amaziah reigned 800 BC. Bani is mentioned in 2Sa 23:36 (though this is thought to be copied from Chronicles). Shimea is concededly early. Of the 13 "added names" 8 are found elsewhere. Of the others, Amzi, Abdi, Kishi (Kish, Kushaiah) have an early look. Malluch might be late. If Hashabiah is late the author has scattered it well through the history, 1 several generations before David, 3 in David's time, 1 in Josiah's, 1 in Ezra's, 3 in Nehemiah's, in every case a Levite.

(7) While these "added" names occur more times in Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, than elsewhere, and 5 of the 13 occur nowhere else, it is also true that more than 500 other names also occur only in these three books, and that the total names in these, to say nothing of the "P" portions elsewhere, outnumber the names in the other books about three to one. Other things being equal, three mentions of any common name ought to be found in these books to one in the others. Of all names applied to more than four persons the usual proportion in these books by count is four, to one elsewhere.

(g) Pedigree of Ahimaaz (1Ch 6:50-53). Parallel with 1Ch 6:4-8.

(h) Dwelling-places of Levi.

(6) The six remaining tribes.

(a) Issachar (1Ch 7:1-5).

1 Chronicles 7:1 derived from Ge 46:13; Nu 26:23,14. The rest peculiar to Chronicles. Closes with a record of fighting men, instead of the usual statement of dwelling-places.

(b) Benjamin (1Ch 7:6-13).

A very difficult section. It is considered a Zebulunite genealogy which has been Benjaminized, because

(1) there is a Benjamite list elsewhere;

(2) Benjamin is out of place here, while in 13 out of 17 tribal lists Zebulun comes at this point, and in this list has no other place; (3) the numbers of Benjamin's sons differ from other Benjamite genealogies;

(4) the names of Bela's and Becher's sons are different here;

(5) many names are not Benjamite;

(6) Tarshish, in this list, is a sea-coast name appropriate to Zebulun, but not Benjamin. But (1) it is called Benjamite; (2) doublets are not unknown in Chronicles; (3) Da is also neglected; (4) many Benjamite names are found; (5) both the Zebulunite material and the Benjamite material elsewhere is too scanty for safe conclusions.

(c) Dan, 1Ch 7:12, from Ge 46:23.

Aher (" another") is a copyist's error or substitute for Dan.

(d) Naphtali, 1Ch 7:13, from Ge 46:24 (transcriptional changes).

(e) Manasseh, East and West (1Ch 7:14-19).

The text of 1Ch 7:14,15 very corrupt. No other notice is found of the sons in 1Ch 7:16,17: Peresh, Sheresh, Ulam, Rakere, Bedan.

(f) Ephraim to Joshua (1Ch 7:20-29).

Contains an interesting personal note in the mourning of Ephraim over his sons Ezer and Elead, and the subsequent birth of Beriah. Interpreted to mean that the clans Ezer and Elead met with disaster, on which the clan Beriah became prominent.

(g) The seats of Joseph's sons (1Ch 7:28,29).

Hard to say why this has been placed here.

(h) Asher (1Ch 7:30-40).

The earliest names derived from Ge 46:17. Gray considers the others ancient.

(i) Benjamin (1Ch 8:1-40).

(i) Sons of Benjamin. After Ge 46:21, with variations. See (6) (b).

(ii) Descendants of Ehud (1Ch 8:6-28). Text very corrupt, obscure.

(iii) The house of Saul (1Ch 8:29-38); repeated (1Ch 9:35-44).

In this passage two exceptions to the usual treatment of Baal compounds. Ishbaal and Meribbaal here are Ishbosheth and Mephibosheth in S.

(7) The inhabitants of Jerusalem (1Ch 9:1-34).

With variations in Ne 11:1-13. This passage has been thought an interpolation, but it is the Chronicler's custom to give dwelling-places. Perhaps this and Ne are two independent abridgments of the same document. This probably describes post-exilic conditions. 1Ch 9:1 and 2 here, and Ne 11 seem conclusive on this point. Four classes of returning exiles:

(a) The children of Judah, Benjamin, Ephraim, Manasseh.

Constituting "the laity," "Israel."

(b) The priests.

Agreeing with Nehemiah, but abridged.

(c) The Levites. Paralleling Nehemiah, but not exactly.

(d) Nethinim or porters. Fuller than Nehemiah, and different.

(8) The house of Saul (1Ch 9:35-44, repeating 9:29-38).

(22) David's Knights (1 Chronicals 11:10-47).

Discussed under (19). Adds to the list, Adina, son of Shiza, Reubenite; Hanan, son of Maacah, Joshaphat the Mithnite, Uzziah the Ashterathite, Shama and Jeiel the sons of Hotham the Aroerite, Jediael the son of Shimri, and Joah his brother, the Tizite, Eliel the Mahavite, and Jeribai and Joshaviah, the sons of Elnaam, and Ithmah the Moabite, Eliel, and Obed, and Jaasieh the Mezobaite.

(23) David’s Recruits at Ziklag (1 Chronicals 12-22).

Found only here. Contains 23 names from Benjamin (some may be Judahite); 11 from Gad; 8 from Manasseh; nothing to show that the names are not old.

(24) David’s Musicians and Porters at the Bringing of the Ark (1 Chronicals 15:16-24).

Also 1Ch 16:5,6,37-43. Each division of the Levites represented by a chief musician.

(25) David’s Organization of the Kingdom (1 Chronicals 23-27).

I. The Levites (1 Chronicals 23).

(1) The family of Gershon (1Ch 23:7-11); 9 houses.

(2) The family of Kohath (1Ch 23:12-20); 11 houses.

(3) The family of Merari (1Ch 23:21-23); 4 houses.

II. The Priests (1 Chronicals 24).

24 divisions; 16 divided among descendants of Eleazar, headed by Zadok; 8 among those of Ithamar, headed by Ahimelech (perhaps an error for Abiathar); but perhaps Ahimelech’s. Abiathar, son of Ahimelech, was acting for his father.

(1) Eleazar’s courses: Jehoiarib, Harim, Malchijah, Hakkoz, Joshua, Eliashib, Huppah, Bilgah, Hezer, Aphses, Pethahiah, Jehezekel, Jachin, Gamul, Delaiah, Maaziah.

(2) Ithamar: Jedaiah, Seorim, Mijamin, Abijah, Shecaniah, Jachim, Joshebeab, Immer.

Josephus gives the same names of courses (Ant., VII, xiv, 7; Vita, 1). Several are mentioned in Apocrypha, Talmud, and the New Testament. Jehoiarib, Jedaiah, Harim, Malchijah, Mijarain, Abijah, Shecaniah, Bilgah, Maaziah, are found in one or both of Nehemiah’s lists.

(3) Supplementary list of Levites (1Ch 20-31).

Repeats the Levitical families in 1Ch 23:6-23, omitting the Gershonites, adding to the Kohathites and Merarites.

III. The Singers (1 Chronicals 25).

(1) Their families, classified under the three great groups, descendants of Asaph, Jeduthun (Ethan), Heman.

A curious problem is suggested by the fact that the names in verse 4, beginning with Hanani, with a few very slight changes, read: "Hanan (‘Have mercy’)- iah (‘O Yahweh’); Hanani (~‘Have mercy’); Eli-athah (’Thou art my God’); Giddalti (‘I have magnified’)(and) Romamti (‘exalted’)(thy) Ezer (‘help’); Josh-bekashah (‘In the seat of hardness’); Mallothi (‘I spake of it’); Hothir (‘Gave still’); Mahazioth (‘Visions’)." How, or why, this came among these names, cannot be said.

(2) The 24 courses of 12 singers each, of which courses numbers 1, 3, 5, 7 fell to Asaph; numbers 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 14 fell to Jeduthun; numbers 6, 9, 11, 13, 15-24 fell to Heman.

IV. Gatekeepers and Other Officers (1 Chronicals 26).

(1) Genealogies and stations of the gatekeepers (1Ch 26:1-19).

(2) Those in charge of the temple treasury (1Ch 26:20-28).

(3) Those in charge of the "outward business."

Subordinate magistrates, tax-collectors, etc.

V. The Army, and David’s Officers (1 Chronicals 27).

(1) The army (1Ch 27:1-15).

12 officers, each commanding 24,000 men, and in charge for one month; chosen from David’s knights.

(2) The tribal princes (1Ch 27:16-24).

After the fashion of Nu 12-15. Gad and Asher are omitted. The 12 are made up by including the Levites and the Aaronites.

(3) The king’s twelve stewards (1Ch 27:25-31).

(4) The king’s court officers (1Ch 27:32-34).

Counselor and scribe: Jonathan, the king’s uncle, otherwise unknown; tutor: Jehiel; counselor: Ahithophel; "the king’s friend" (closest confidant?): Hushai. Possibly two priests are next included: Jehoiada the son of Benaiah, and Abiathar, high priest of the Ithamar branch. But perhaps it should read, "Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada." If two priests are intended, it seems strange that Zadok is not one. The

list ends with the commander-in-chief, Joab.

This elaborate organization in every part and branch of the kingdom is looked upon as the Chronicler's glowing Utopian dream of what must have been, underrating the organizing power of the great soldier and statesman.

(26) Ezra 2:1-63.—The Exiles Who Returned with Zerubbabel.

Paralleled in Ne 7:6-73. 9 "Jah," 4 "El" names in 107.

(1) The Leaders (Ezra 2:2).

(2) Numbers, according to Families (Ezra 2:3-19).

18 of Ezra's numbers differ from Nehemiah's.

(3) Numbers according to Localities (Ezra 2:20-35).

10 towns probably Judahite, 7 Benjamite.

(4) The Priests (Ezra 2:39,42).

Only 4 families, representing 3 Davidic courses.

(5) The Levites (Ezra 2:43,14).

Among the singers, only Asaphites.

(6) The Porters (Ezra 2:45).

3 old names, 3 new ones.

(7) The "Nethinim" (Temple-Slaves) (Ezra 2:46-56).

(8) The Children of Solomon's Servants (Slaves) (Ezra 2:57-59).

(9) Those Who Could Not Prove Their Descent.

(a) General population.

Three families, children of Delaiah, Tobiah, Nekoda.

(b) Priestly families.

Hobaiah, Hakkoz, Barzillai. Hakkoz, the seventh of the Davidic courses, perhaps succeeded later in establishing their right (Ne 3:21).

(27) Ezra 6:1-5.—Ezra’s Genealogy.

An ascending genealogy: Ezra, son of Seraiah, son of Azariah, son of Hilkiah, son of Shallum, son of Zadok, son of Ahitub, son of Amaraiah, son of Azariah, son of Meraioth, son of Zerahiah, son of Uzzi, son of Bukki, son of Abishua, son of Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron; 16 links. Follows 1Ch 6:7-10 down to Zadok, then omits 7 to Shallum, besides the 7 omitted in Chronicles.

(28) Ezra 8:1-20.—Numbers and Leaders of Those Who Returned with Zerubbabel.

Numbers much smaller than in Zerubbabel’s list (Ezr 2:1-14). Perhaps 3 new families, Shecaniah, Shelomith, Joah; 7 more leaders. A much smaller proportion of Levites; among them a "man of discretion," perhaps a name, "Ishsecel," of the sons of Mahli, therefore a Merarite, with other Merarites, 39 in all.

(29) Ezra 10:18-44.—Jews Who Had Married Foreign Women.

(1) The Priests (Ezra 10:18-22).

Seventeen in all; members of the high priest’s family, and of the Davidic courses of Immer and Harim, besides the family of Pashhur.

(2) The Levites (Ezra 10:23); 6 in All.

(3) Singers and Porters (Ezra 10:24); 4 in All.

(4) "Israel," "the Laity" (Ezra 10:25-43).

Sixteen families represented; 86 persons. Out of a total of 163 names, 39 yah compounds, 19 ‘el compounds, 8 prefixed.

(30) Nehemiah 3:1-12.—The Leaders in the Repair of the Wall.

Thirty-eight leaders; in 30 instances the father’s name also given. As far as mentioned, all from Judah and Jerusalem.

(31) Nehemiah 7:7-63.—Those Who Returned with Zerubbabel.

Follows Ezr 2:1-63, with transcriptional variations in names and numbers.

(32) Nehemiah 8:4-7.—Levites and Others Who Assisted Ezra in Proclaiming the Law.

(33) Nehemiah 10:1-27.—The Sealers of the Covenant.

Twenty-two priests, 17 Levites, 20 heads of families already mentioned, 24 individuals.

(34) Nehemiah 11:3-36.—Chief Dwellers in Jerusalem and Vicinity.

Parallels in 1Ch 9:9-22. Some omissions and variations; 5 priestly courses given, Joiarib, course number 1; Jedaiah, number 2; Jachin, number 23; Malchijah, number 5; Immer, number 6. 24 "Jah," 6 "El" names out of 82.

(35) Nehemiah 12:1-8.—Priests and Levites Who Went Up with Zerubbabel.

Compare with priests' lists in Ne 10:2-8 (33), and with priests under Joiakim (Ne 12:12-21 (36)). They are names of families. See Ne 12:12.

(36) Nehemiah 12:10,11.—High Priests from Jeshua to Jaddua.

(1) Jeshua, 538 to 520 BC.

(2) Joiakim.

(3) Eliashib, 446 till after 433.

(4) Joiada, about 420.

(5) Jonathan, Johanan, 405 to 362.

(6) Jaddua, to 323.

This list bears upon the date of Ezra-Nehemiah. Jaddua was high priest when Alexander visited Jerusalem, 335 BC. If the Darius of verse 22 is Darius Nothus (425 to 405 BC), and Jaddua, a young boy, is mentioned as the heir to the high-priesthood, this passage was written before 400. If Jaddua's actual high-priesthood is meant, and Darius Codomannus (336 to 330 BC) is the Darius here, the date may be about 330. The enumeration of families here is assigned to the time of Joiakim, before 405, and the latest recorded events to the time of the high priest before Jaddua (Ne 12:23; 13:28), hence, before

362. The hypothesis of an addition by some scribe after 350 is possible, but not necessary.

(37) Nehemiah 12:12-21.—Heads of Priestly Families.

(38) Nehemiah 12:22-26.—Levites and Porters under High Priest Johanan.

(39) Nehemiah 12:31-42.—Princes and Priests at Dedication of the Wall.

(40) Matthew 1:1-17.—The Genealogy of Jesus Christ.

(See separate article).

(41) Luke 3:23-38.—The Genealogy of Jesus.

(See separate article).

LITERATURE.

Commentaries in the place cited., especially on Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, especially C. F. Keil, Bible Comm., 1872; E. Bertheau, in Kurzgef. exeget. Handb. zum Altes Testament, 1873; Bible ("Speaker's") Commentary (Browne, Gen; Clark, Ex; Espin, Nu; Rawlinson, Chronicles, etc.); W. B. Barnes, Cambridge Bible, Chronicles; R. Kittel, Die Bucher der Chronicles; Driver, Westminster Comm., Gen; ICC (Gray, Nu; Moore, Jgs; Curtis, Chronicles, etc.); Pulpit Comm.; W. R. Harvey-Jellie, Ch in Century Bible; S. Oettli, Kgf. Kom., 1889; O. Zoeckler, Lange's Comm., etc.

Encyclopedia arts., especially HDB, E. L. Curtis, "Genealogies"; SBD, A. C. Hervey, "Genealogies"; EB, S. A. Cook, "Genealogies"; EB, 11th edition, S. A. Cook, "Genealogies"; other encyclopedia arts., under specific books, tribes, names, genealogies.

General works: Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names; Hommel, The Ancient Hebrew Tradition; A.C. Hervey, The Genealogies of our Lord; Sprenger, Das Leben u. d. Lehre d. Mohammad; W.R. Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia; J. Wellhausen, De Gentibus et Familiis Judaeis; J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena, 1883 (ET), 177-277; McLennan, Studies in Ancient History.

Magazine articles: H.W. Hogg, "Genealogy of Benjamin," JQR, XI, 1899, 96-133, 329-44; M. Berlin, "Notes on Genealogies of Levi, 1Ch 23-26," Jewish Quarterly Review, XII, 1900, 291-98; M. Berlin, "Gershonite and Merarite Genealogies," JQR, XII, 1901, 291 ff; H. W. Hogg, "Ephraimite Genealogy," JQR, XIII, 1900-1901, 147-54; J. Marquart, "Genealogies of Benjamin," JQR, XIV, 1902, 343-51; J. W. Rothstein, Die Genealogie das Konigs Jojachin und seiner Nachkommen in geschichtlicher Beleuchtung, Berlin: Reuther u. Reichold, 1902; R.S. Macalister, "The Royal Potters, 1Ch 4:23," The Expositor Times, XVI, 1905, 379 ff; R. S. Macalister, "The Craftsmen Guild of the Tribe of Judah," PEFS, 1905, 243-53, 328-42; C. C. Torrey, "The Greek versions of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah," Proceedings of

the Society of Biblical Archaeology, XXV. 1903, 139 ff, and many others.

Philip Wendell Crannell

GENERAL; GENERALLY

jen'-er-al, jen'-er-al-i (kullah; paneguris):

(1) General is the translation of sar, "master," "head," "chief"; used once in the King James Version in the sense of commander-in-chief, "the general of the king's army" (1Ch 27:34), usually in this connection translated "captain," the Revised Version (British and American) "the captain of the king's host."

(2) As an adjective "general assembly" is the translation of paneguris (whence we have panegyric), "an assembly or convocation of the whole people to celebrate any public festival or solemnity, as the public games or sacrifices, hence, a high festival, public convocation, joyful assembly" (Robinson); the word occurs in the New Testament only in Heb 12:23, "to the general assembly and church of the firstborn; paneguris is Septuagint for mo'edh (Eze 46:11; Ho 2:11), "solemn assembly" and for 'atsarah (Am 5:21), with the same meaning. The Greek words translated "and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn" (the King James Version) have been variously arranged and translated; Robinson gives "and to countless throngs (even) the joyful assembly of angels, i. e. as hymning the praises of God around His throne"; compare Re 5:11 f; Ps 148:2; Da 7:10). From both Hebrew and Greek analogies, this is probably correct; similarly, Alford, Delitzsch and others have "festival assembly"; Weymouth translated "to countless hosts of angels, to the great festal gathering and church of the first-born."

(3) Generally, adverb, occurs in Jer 48:38 the King James Version as the translation of kullah (Pual of kalah), "the whole of it," "There shall be lamentation generally (universally) upon all the housetops of Moab," the Revised Version (British and American) "everywhere"; in 2Sa 17:11, 'acaph, "to be gathered," is translated "to be generally gathered," the Revised Version (British and American) "gathered together."

In Apocrypha we have "general" in the sense of "common," "universal" (Additions to Esther 15:10 margin, koinos; 2 Macc 3:18, pandemon); "in general" (2 Esdras 8:15, "man in general"; Ecclesiasticus 18:1, "all things in general," koinos, the Revised Version (British and American) "in common").

W. L. Walker

GENERATION

jen-er-a'-shun (Latin generatio, from genero, "beget"):

(1) The translation

(a) of dor, "circle," "generation," hence, "age," "period," "cycle": "many generations" (De 32:7);

(b) the people of any particular period or those born about the same time: "Righteous before me in this generation" (Ge 7:1); "four generations" (Job 42:16);

(c) the people of a particular class or sort, with some implied reference to hereditary quality; the wicked (De 32:5; Pr 30:11); the righteous (Ps 14:5; 112:2).

(2) toledhoth, "births," hence

(a) an account of a man and his descendants: "The book of the generations of Adam" (Ge 5:1);

(b) successive families: "The families of the sons of Noah, after their generations" (Ge 10:32);

(c) genealogical divisions: "The children of Reuben .... their generations, by their families" (Nu 1:20);
(d) figurative, of the origin and early history of created things: "The generations of the heavens and of the earth" (Ge 2:4).

(3) genea, "a begetting," "birth," "nativity," therefore

(a) the successive members of a genealogy: "All the generations from Abraham unto David" (Mt 1:17);

(b) a race, or class, distinguished by common characteristics, always (in the New Testament) bad: "Faithless and perverse generation" (Mt 17:17);

(c) the people of a period: "This generation shall not pass away" (Lu 21:32);

(d) an age (the average lifetime, 33 years): "Hid for (Greek "from the") ages and (from the) generations" (Col 1:26). The term is also by a figurative transference of thought applied to duration in eternity: "Unto all generations for ever and ever" (Eph 3:21) (Greek "all the generations of the age of the ages").

(4) genesis, "source," "origin": "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ" (Mt 1:1; the American Revised Version, margin "The genealogy of Jesus Christ").

(5) gennema, "offspring," "progeny"; figurative: "O generation of vipers" (Lu 3:7 the King James Version).

(6) genos, "stock," "race," in this case spiritual: "But ye are a chosen generation" (1Pe 2:9; the American

Standard Revised Version "an elect race").

Philip Wendell Crannell

GENESIS, 1-2

jen’-e-sis:

I. GENERAL DATA

1. The Name

2. Survey of Contents

3. Connection with Succeeding Books

II. COMPOSITION OF GENESIS IN GENERAL

1. Unity of the Biblical Text

(1) The Toledhoth

(2) Further Indication of Unity

2. Rejection of the Documentary Theory

(1) In General

(a) Statement of Theory

(b) Reasons Assigned for Divisions

(c) Examination of the Documentary Theory

(i) Style and Peculiarities of Language

(ii) Alleged Connection of Matter

(iii) The Biblico-Theological Data

(iv) Duplicates

(v) Manner in Which the Sources Are Worked Together

(vi) Criticism Carried to Extremes

(2) In View of the Names for God

(a) Error of Hypothesis in Principle

(b) False Basis of Hypothesis

(c) Improbability That Distinction of Divine

Names Is without Significance

(d) Real Purpose in Use of Names for God

(i) Decreasing Use of Yahweh

(ii) Reference to Approach of Man to God, and Departure from Him

(iii) Other Reasons

(iv) Systematic Use in History of Abraham (e) Scantiness of the Materials for Proof

(f) Self-Disintegration of the Critical Position

(g) Different Uses in the Septuagint

III. STRUCTURE OF THE INDIVIDUAL PERICOPES

1. The Structure of the Prooemium (Genesis 1-2:3)

2. Structure of the 10 Toledhoth

IV. THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER

1. History of the Patriarchs (Genesis 12-50)

(1) Unfounded Attacks on the History

(a) From General Dogmatic Principles

(b) From Distance of Time

(c) From Biblical Data

(d) From Comparison with Religion of Arabia

(2) Unsatisfactory Attempts at Explaining the Patriarchal Age

(a) Explanation Based on High Places

(b) The Dating Back of Later Events to Earlier Times

(c) The Patriarchs as heroes eponymi

(d) Different Explanations Combined

(3) Positive Reasons for the Historical Character of Genesis

Individuality of Patriarchs, etc.

2. The Primitive History of Genesis 1-11

(1) Prominence of the Religious Element

(2) Carefulness as Regards Divergent Results of Scientific Research

(3) Frequent Confirmation of the Bible by Science

(4) Superiority of the Bible over Pagan Mythologies Babylonian and Biblical Stories

V. ORIGIN AND AUTHORSHIP OF GENESIS

1. Connection with Mosaic Times

2. Examination of Counter-Arguments

(1) Possibility of Later Additions

(2) "Prophecy after the Event" Idea

(3) Special Passages Alleged to Indicate Later Date

Examination of These

VI. SIGNIFICANCE

1. Lays Foundation for the Whole of Revelation—Creation, Fall, Man in Image of God, Sin, etc.

2. Preparation for Redemption—Promises and Covenants

LITERATURE

I. General Data.

1. The Name:

The first book of Moses is named by the Jews from the first word, namely, bere'shith, i.e. "in the beginning" (compare the Bresith of Origen]). In the Septuagint it is called Genesis, because it recounts the beginnings of the world and of mankind. This name has passed over into the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (Liber Genesis). As a matter of fact the name is based only on the beginning of the book.

2. Survey of Contents:

The book reports to us the story of the creation of the world and of the first human beings (Ge 1); of paradise and the fall (Ge 2 f); of mankind down to the Deluge (Ge 4 f; compare Ge 4, Cain and Abel); of the Deluge itself (Ge 6-9); of mankind down to the age of the Patriarchs (Ge 10:1-11:26; compare 11:1 ff, the building of the tower of Babel); of Abraham and his house (Ge 11:27-25:18); of Isaac and his house (Ge 25:19-37:2); of Jacob and of Joseph (Ge 37:2-50:26). In other words, the Book of Genesis treats of the history of the kingdom of God on earth from the time of the creation of the world down to the beginning of Israel's sojourn in Egypt and to the death of Joseph; and it treats of these subjects in such a way that it narrates in the 1st part (Ge 1:1-11:26) the history of mankind; and in the 2nd part (Ge 11:27-50:26) the history of families; and this latter part is at the same time the beginning of the history of the chosen people, which history itself begins with Ex 1. Though the introduction, Ge 1-11, with its universal character, includes all mankind in the promise given at the beginning of the history of Abraham (12:1-3), it is from the outset distinctly declared that God, even if He did originally set apart one man and his family (Ge 12-50), and after that a single nation (Ex 1), nevertheless intends that this particularistic development of the plan of salvation is eventually to include all mankind. The manner in which salvation is developed historically is particularistic, but its purposes are universal.

3. Connection with Succeeding Books:

By the statements just made it has already been indicated in what close connection Genesis stands with the subsequent books of the sacred Scriptures. The history of the chosen people, which begins with Ex 1 ff, at the very outset and with a clear purpose, refers back to the history as found in Genesis (compare Ex 1:1-6,8 with Ge 46:27; 50:24 ff; and see EXODUS, I, 3), although hundreds of years had clasped between these events; which years are ignored, because they were in their details of no importance for the religious history of the people of God. But to Abraham in Ge 12:1-3 the promise had been given, not only that he was to be the father of a mighty nation that would recognize him as their founder, and the earliest history of which is reported in Exodus and the following books of the Pentateuch, but also that the Holy Land had been promised him. In this respect, the Book of Joshua, which gives the story of the capture of this land, is also a continuation of the historical development begun in Genesis. The blessing of God pronounced over Abraham, however, continued to be efficacious also in the later times among the people who had descended from him. In this way Genesis is an introduction to all of the books of the Old Testament that follow it, which in any way have to do with the fate of this people, and originated in its midst as the result of the special relation between God and this people. But in so far as this blessing of God was to extend to all the nations of the earth (Ge 12:3), the promises given can be entirely fulfilled only in Christ, and can expand only in the work and success of Christian missions and in the blessings that are found within Christianity. Accordingly, this book treats first of beginnings and origins, in which, as in a kernel, the entire development of the kingdom of God down to its consummation is contained (compare VI below).

II. Composition of Genesis in General.

1. Unity of the Biblical Text:

(1) The Toledhoth.

The fact that Genesis is characterized by a far-reaching and uniform scheme has, at least in outline, been already indicated (see I, 2 and 3). This impression is confirmed when we examine matters a little more closely and study the plan and structure of the book. After the grand introitus, which reports the creation of the world (1:1-2:3) there follows in the form of 10 pericopes the historical unfolding of that which God has created, which pericopes properly in each case bear the name toledhoth, or "generations." For this word never signifies creation or generation as an act, but always the history of what has already been created or begotten, the history of generations; so that for this reason, 2:4a, where mention is made of the toledhoth of heaven and of earth, cannot possibly be a superscription that has found its way here from 1:1. It is here, as it is in all cases, the superscription to what follows, and it admirably leads over from the history of creation of the heavens and the earth in Ge 1 to the continuation of this subject in the next chapter. The claim of the critics, that the redactor had at this place taken only the superscription from his source P (the priestly narrator, to whom 1-2:3 is ascribed), but that the section of P to which this superscription originally belonged had been suppressed, is all the more monstrous a supposition as 2:4a throughout suits what follows.

Only on the ground of this correct explanation of the term toledhoth can the fact be finally and fully explained, that the toledhoth of Terah contain also the history of Abraham and of Lot; the toledhoth of Isaac contain the history of Jacob and Esau; the toledhoth of Jacob contain the history of Joseph and his brethren. The ten toledhoth are the following: I, Ge 2:4-4:26, the toledhoth of the heavens and the earth; II, 5:1-6:8, the toledhoth of Adam; III, 6:9-9:29, the toledhoth of Noah; IV, 10:1-11:9, the toledhoth of the sons of Noah; V, 11:10-26, the toledhoth of the sons of Shem; VI, 11:27-25:11, the toledhoth of Terah; VII, 25:12-18, the toledhoth of Ishmael; VIII, 25:19-35:29, the toledhoth of Isaac; IX, 36:1-37:1, the toledhoth of Esau (the fact that 36:9, in addition to the instance in verse 1, contains the word toledhoth a second time, is of no importance whatever for our discussion at this stage, as the entire chapter under any circumstances treats in some way of the history of the generations of Esau; see III, 2:9); X, 37:2-50:26, the toledhoth of Jacob. In each instance this superscription covers everything that follows down to the next superscription.

The number 10 is here evidently not an accidental matter. In the articles EXODUS, LEVITICUS, DAY OF ATONEMENT, also in EZEKIEL, it has been shown what role the typical numbers 4, 7, 10 and 12 play in the structure of the whole books and of the individual pericopes. (In the New Testament we meet with the same phenomenon, particularly in the Apocalypse of John; but compare also in Matthew's Gospel the 3 X 14 generations in Mt 1:1 ff, the 7 parables in 13:1 ff, the 7 woes in 23:13 ff.) In the same way the entire Book of Le naturally falls into 10 pericopes (compare LEVITICUS, II, 2, 1), and Le 19 contains 10 groups, each of 4 (possibly also of 5) commandments; compare possibly also 18:6-18; 20:9-18; see LEVITICUS, II, 2, 21, VI. Further, the number 10, with a greater or less degree of certainty, can be regarded as the basis for the construction of the pericopes: Ex 1:8-7:7; 7:8-13:16 (10 plagues); 13:17-18:27 (see EXODUS, II, 2:1-3); the Decalogue (20:1 ff); the first Book of the Covenant (21:1-23:13; 23:14-19), and the whole pericope 19:1-24:18a, as also 32:1-35:3 (see EXODUS, II, 2, 4, 6). In the Book of Genesis itself compare further the 10 members from Shem to Abraham (11:11-26), as also the pericopes 25:19-35:29; 37:2-50:26 (see III, 2, 8, 10 below), and the 10 nations in Ge 15:19 ff. And just as in the cases cited, in almost every instance, there is to be found a further division into 5 X 2 or 2 X 5 (compare, e.g. the two tables of the Decalogue); thus, too, in the Book of Genesis in each case, 5 of the 10 pericopes are more closely combined, since I-V (toledhoth of Shem inclusive) stand in a more distant, and VI-X (treating of the toledhoth of Terah, or the history of Abraham) in a closer connection with the kingdom of God; and in so far, too, as the first series of toledhoth bring into the foreground more facts and events, but the second series more individuals and persons. Possibly in this case, we can further unite 2 toledhoth; at any rate I and II (the primitive age), III and IV (Noah and his sons), VII and VIII (Ishmael and Isaac), IX and X (Esau and Jacob) can be thus grouped.

(2) Further Indication of Unity.

In addition to the systematic scheme so transparent in the entire Biblical text of the Book of Genesis, irrespective of any division into literary sources, it is to be noticed further, that in exactly the same way the history of those generations that were rejected from any connection with the kingdom of God is narrated before the history of those that remained in the kingdom of God and continued its development. Cain's history (4:17 ff) in Jahwist (Jahwist) stands before the history of Seth (4:25 f J; 5:3 ff P);

Japheth's and Ham's genealogy (10:1 ff P; 10:8 ff P and J) before that of Shem (10:21 ff J and P), although Ham was the youngest of the three sons of Noah (9:24); the further history of Lot (19:29 ff P and J) and of Ishmael's genealogy (25:12 ff P and J) before that of Isaac (25:19 ff P and J and E); Esau's descendants (36:1 ff R and P) before the toledhoth of Jacob (37:2 ff P and J and E).

In favor of the unity of the Biblical text we can also mention the fact that the Book of Genesis as a whole, irrespective of all sources, and in view of the history that begins with Ex 1 ff, has a unique character, so that e.g. the intimate communion with God, of the kind which is reported in the beginning of this Book of Genesis (compare, e.g. 3:8; 7:16; 11:5 J; 17:1,22; 35:9,13 P; 18:1 ff; 32:31 J), afterward ceases; and that in Ex, on the other hand, many more miracles are reported than in the Book of Genesis (see EXODUS, III, 2); that Genesis contains rather the history of mankind and of families, while Exodus contains that of the nation (see I, 2 above); that it is only in Exodus that the law is given, while in the history of the period of the patriarchs we find only promises of the Divine grace; that all the different sources ignore the time that elapses between the close of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus; and further, that nowhere else is found anything like the number of references to the names of persons or things as are contained in Genesis (compare, e.g. 2:23; 3:20; 4:1,25, etc., in J; 17:5,15,17-20, etc., in P; 21:9,17,31, etc., in E; 21:6; 27:36, etc., in J and E; 28:19, etc., in R; 49:8,16,19, etc., in the blessing of Jacob); that the changing of the names of Abram and Sarai to Abraham and Sarah from Ge 17:5,15 goes on through all the sources, while before this it is not found in any source. Finally, we would draw attention to the psychologically finely drawn portraits of Biblical persons in Genesis. The fact that the personal pronoun hu' and the noun na'ar are used of both masculine and feminine genders is characteristic of Genesis in common with all the books of the Pentateuch, without any difference in this regard being found in the different documents, which fact, as all those cited by us in number 1 above, militates against the division of this book into different sources. Let us now examine more closely the reason assigned for the division into different sources.

2. Rejection of the Documentary Theory:

(1) In General.

(a) Statement of Theory:

Old Testament scholars of the most divergent tendencies are almost unanimous in dividing the Biblical text of Genesis into the sources the Priestly Code (P), Jahwist and Elohist, namely Priestly Codex, Jahwist, and Elohist. To P are attributed the following greater and connected parts: 1:1-2:4a; 5; a part of the story of the Deluge in chapters 6-9; 11:10 ff; 17; 23; 25:12 ff; 35:22b ff; the most of 36. As examples of the parts assigned to J we mention 2:4b-4:26; the rest of the story of the Deluge in chapters 6-9; 11:1 ff; 12 f; 16; 18 f, with the exception of a few verses, which are ascribed to P; chapter 24 and others. Connected parts belonging to the Elohist (E) are claimed to begin with chapters 20 and 21 (with the exception of a number of verses which are attributed to P or J or R), and it is thought that, beginning with chapter 22, E is frequently found in the history of Jacob and of Joseph (25:19-50:26), in part, however, interwoven with J (details will be found under III, in each case under 2). This documentary

theory has hitherto been antagonized only by a few individuals, such as Klostermann, Lepsius, Eerdmans, Orr, Wiener, and the author of the present article.

(b) Reasons Assigned for Divisions:

As is well known, theory of separation of certain books of the Old Testament into different sources began originally with the Book of Genesis. The use made of the two names of God, namely Yahweh (Yahweh) and Elohim, caused Astruc to conclude that two principal sources had been used in the composition of the book, although other data were also used in vindication of theory; and since the days of Ilgen the conviction gained ground that there was a second Elohist (now called E), in contradistinction to the first (now called the Priestly Code (P), to whom, e.g., Ge 1 is ascribed). This second Elohist, it was claimed, also made use of the name Elohim, as did the first, but in other respects he shows greater similarity to the Jahwist. These sources were eventually traced through the entire Pentateuch and into later books, and for this reason are discussed in detail in the article PENTATEUCH. In this article we must confine ourselves to the Book of Genesis, and limit the discussion to some leading points. In addition to the names for God (see under 2), it is claimed that certain contradictions and duplicate accounts of the same matters compel us to accept different sources. Among these duplicates are found, e.g., Ge 1:1-2:4 a the Priestly Code (P), and 2:4b ff J, containing two stories of creation; Ge 12:9 ff J; 20:1 ff E; 26:1 ff J; with the narrative of how Sarah and Rebekah, the wives of the two patriarchs, were endangered; chapters 15 J and 17 the Priestly Code (P), with a double account of how God concluded His covenant with Abraham; 21:22 ff E and 26:12 ff J, the stories of Abimelech; chapters 16 J and 21 E, the Hagar episodes; 28:10 ff J and E and 35:1 ff E and the Priestly Code (P), the narratives concerning Bethel, and in the history of Joseph the mention made of the Midianites E, and of the Ishmaelites J, who took Joseph to Egypt (37:25 ff; 39:1); the intervention of Reuben E, or Judah J, for Joseph, etc. In addition a peculiar style, as also distinct theological views, is claimed for each of these sources. Thus there found in P a great deal of statistical and systematic material, as in 5:1 ff; 11:10 ff; 25:12 ff; 36:6 ff (the genealogies of Adam, Shem, Ishmael, Esau); P is said to show a certain preference for fixed schemes and for repetitions in his narratives. He rejects all sacrifices earlier than the Mosaic period, because according to this source the Lord did not reveal himself as Yahweh previous to Ex 6:1 ff. Again, it is claimed that the Elohist (E) describes God as speaking to men from heaven, or through a dream, and through an angel, while according to J Yahweh is said to have conversed with mankind personally. In regard to the peculiarities of language used by the different sources, it is impossible in this place to enumerate the different expressions, and we must refer for this subject to the different Introductions to the Old Testament, and to the commentaries and other literature. A few examples are to be found under (c) below, in connection with the discussion of the critical hypothesis. Finally, as another reason for the division of Genesis into different sources, it is claimed that the different parts of the sources, when taken together, can be united into a smooth and connected story. The documents, it is said, have in many cases been taken over word for word and have been united and interwoven in an entirely external manner, so that it is still possible to separate them and often to do this even down to parts of a sentence or to the very words.

(c) Examination of the Documentary Theory:

(i) Style and Peculiarities of Language:

It is self-evident that certain expressions will be repeated in historical, in legal, and in other sections similar in content; but this is not enough to prove that there have been different sources. Whenever J brings genealogies or accounts that are no less systematic than those of P (compare Ge 4:17 ff; 10:8 ff; 22:20-24); or accounts and repetitions occur in the story of the Deluge (Ge 7:2,7; 7:4,12,17; 8:6; 7:4; 8:8,10,12), this is not enough to make the division into sources plausible. In reference to the linguistic peculiarities, it must be noted that the data cited to prove this point seldom agree. Thus, e.g. the verb bara’," create," in Ge 1:1 is used to prove that this was written by the Priestly Code (P), but the word is found also in 6:7 in J. The same is the case with the word rekhush, "possession," which in 12:5; 13:6; 36:7 is regarded as characteristic of the Priestly Code (P), but in 14:11 f, 16,21 is found in an unknown source, and in 15:14 in J. In 12:5; 13:12a; 16:3; 17:8 it is said that ‘erets kena‘an, "land of Canaan," is a proof that this was written by P; but in chapters 42; 44 f; 47; 50 we find this expression in Jahwist and Elohist, in Nu 32:32 in J (R) ; compare also Nu 33:40 (PR) where Nu 21:1-3 (JE) is quoted; shiphchah, "maid servant," is claimed as a characteristic word of J in contrast to E (compare 16:1 ff); but in 16:3; 29:24,29 we find this word not only in P but in 20:14; 30:4,7,18; in E Min, "kind," is counted among the marks of P (compare e.g. 1:11 ff), but in De 14:13,14,18 we find it in Deuteronomy; rather remarkably, too, in the latest find on the Deluge made by Hilprecht and by him ascribed to 2100 BC. Compare on this subject my book, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung, and Orr, POT, chapter vii, section vi, and chapter x, section i; perhaps, too, the Concordance of Mandelkern under the different words. Even in the cases when the characteristic peculiarities claimed for the sources are correct, if the problem before us consisted only in the discovery of special words and expressions in the different sources, then by an analogous process, we could dissect and sever almost any modern work of literature. Particularly as far as the pieces are concerned, which are assigned to the Priestly Code (P), it must be stated that Ge 1 and 23 are, as far as style and language are concerned, different throughout. Ge 1 is entirely unique in the entire Old Testament. Ge 23 has been copied directly from life, which is pictured with exceptional fidelity, and for this reason cannot be claimed for any special source. The fact that the story of the introduction of circumcision in Ge 17 in many particulars shows similarities to the terminology of the law is entirely natural: The same is true when the chronological accounts refer one date to another and when they show a certain typical character, as is, e.g., the case also in the chronological parts of any modern history of Israel. On the other hand, the method of P in its narratives, both in matter and in form, becomes similar to that of Jahwist and Elohist, just as soon as we have to deal with larger sections; compare Ge 28:1 ff; 35:9 ff; 47:5 ff, and all the more in Exodus and Numbers.

Against the claim that P had an independent existence, we must mention the fact of the unevenness of the narratives, which, by the side of the fuller accounts in Ge 1; 17 and 23, of the genealogies and the story of the Deluge, would, according to the critics, have reported only a few disrupted notices about the patriarchs; compare for this in the story of Abraham, 11:27,31 f; 12:4b f; 13:6a 11b, 12a; 16:1a, 3,15 f; 19:29; 21:1b, 2b-5; 25:7-11a; and in its later parts P would become still more incomprehensible on the assumption of the critics (see III below). No author could have written thus; at any rate he would not have been used by anybody, nor would there have been such care evinced in preserving his writings.

(i) Alleged Connection of Matter:

The claim that the different sources, as they have been separated by critics, constitute a compact and connected whole is absolutely the work of imagination, and is in conflict with the facts in almost every instance. This hypothesis cannot be consistently applied, even in the case of the characteristic examples cited to prove the correctness of the documentary theory, such as the story of the Deluge (see III, 2, in each case under (2)).

(ii) The Biblico-Theological Data:

The different Biblical and theological data, which are said to be characteristic in proof of the separation into sources, are also misleading. Thus God in J communes with mankind only in the beginning (Ge 2 f; 16 ff; 11:5; 18 f), but not afterward. In the beginning He does this also, according to the Priestly Code (P), whose conception of God, it is generally claimed, was entirely transcendental (compare Ge 17:1,22; 35:9,13). The mediatorship of the Angel of Yahweh is found not only in E, (Ge 21:17, 'Elohim), but also in J (Ge 16:7,9-11). In 22:11 in E, the angel of Yahweh (not of the 'Elohim) calls from heaven; theophanies in the night or during sleep are found also in J (compare Ge 15:12 ff; 26:24; 28:13-16; 32:27). In the case of the Priestly Code (P), the cult theory, according to which it is claimed that this source does not mention any sacrifices before Ex 6:1 ff, is untenable. If it is a fact that theocracy, as it were, really began only in Ex 6, then it would be impossible that P would contain anything of the cults before Ex 6; but we have in P the introduction of the circumcision in Ge 17; of the Sabbath in 2:1 ff; and the prohibition against eating blood in 9:1 ff; and in addition the drink offerings mentioned in 35:14, which verse stands between 35:13 and 15, and, ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), is only in the interests of this theory attributed to the redactor. If then theory here outlined is not tenable as far as P is concerned, it would, on the other hand, be all the more remarkable that in the story of the Deluge the distinction between the clean and the unclean (7:2 ff.8) is found in J, as also the savor of the sacrifice, with the term reach ha-nichoach, which occurs so often in P (compare Ge 8:21 with Nu 15:3,7,10,13 f, 24; 18:17); that the sacrifices are mentioned in Ge 8:20 ff, and the number 7 in connection with the animals and days in 7:4; 8:8,10,12 (compare in the Priestly Code (P), e.g. Le 8:33; 13:5 f, 21,26 f, 31,33,10,54; 14:8 f, 38 f; 14:7,51; 16:14 f; Nu 28:11; 29:8, etc.); further, that the emphasis is laid on the 40 days in Ge 7:4,12,17; 8:6 (compare in the Priestly Code (P), Ex 24:1-8; Le 12:2-4; Nu 13:25; 14:34), all of which are ascribed, not as we should expect, to the Levitical the Priestly Code (P), but to the prophetical J. The document the Priestly Code (P), which, according to a large number of critics, was written during the Exile (see e.g. LEVITICUS, III, 1, or EZEKIEL, sec. II, 2) in a most surprising manner, instead of giving prominence to the person of the high priest, would then have declared that kings were to be the greatest blessings to come to the seed of Abraham (Ge 17:6,16); and while, on the critical assumption, we should have the right to expect the author to favor particularistic tendencies, he, by bringing in the history of all mankind in Ge 1-11, and in the extension of circumcision to strangers (17:12,23), would have displayed a phenomenal universality. The strongest counter-argument against all such minor and incorrect data of a Biblical and a theological character will always be found in the uniform religious and ethical spirit and world of thought that pervade all these sources, as also in the unity in the accounts of the different patriarchs, who are pictured in such a masterly, psychological and consistent manner, and who could never be the result of an accidental working together and interweaving of different and independent sources (see III below).

(iii) Duplicates:

In regard to what is to be thought of the different duplicates and contradictions, see below under III, 2, in each case under (2).

(iv) Manner in Which the Sources Are Worked Together:

But it is also impossible that these sources could have been worked together in the manner in which the critics claim that this was done. The more arbitrarily and carelessly the redactors are thought to have gone to work in many places in removing contradictions, the more incomprehensible it becomes that they at other places report faithfully such contradictions and permit these to stand side by side, or, rather, have placed them thus. And even if they are thought not to have smoothed over the difficulties anywhere, and out of reverence for their sources, not to have omitted or changed any of these reports, we certainly would have a right to think that even if they would have perchance placed side by side narratives with such enormous contradictions as there are claimed to be, e.g. in the story of the Deluge in P and J, they certainly would not have woven these together. If, notwithstanding, they still did this without harmonizing them, why are we asked to believe that at other places they omitted matters of the greatest importance (see III, 2, 3)? Further, J and E would have worked their materials together so closely at different places that a separation between the two would be an impossibility, something that is acknowledged as a fact by many Old Testament students; yet, notwithstanding, the contradictions, e.g. in the history of Joseph, have been allowed to stand side by side in consecutive verses, or have even intentionally been placed thus (compare, e.g. Ge 37:25 ff). Then, too, it is in the nature of things unthinkable that three originally independent sources for the history of Israel should have constituted separate currents down to the period after Moses, and that they could yet be dovetailed, often sentence by sentence, in the manner claimed by the critics. In conclusion, the entire hypothesis suffers shipwreck through those passages which combine the peculiarities of the different sources, as e.g. in Ge 20:18, which on the one hand constitutes the necessary conclusion to the preceding story from E (compare 20:17), and on the other hand contains the name Yahweh; or in 22:14 ff, which contains the real purpose of the story of the sacrificing of Isaac from E, but throughout also shows the characteristic marks of J; or in 39:1, where the so-called private person into whose house Joseph has been brought, according to J, is more exactly described as the chief of the body-guard, as this is done by E, in 40:2,4. And when the critics in this passage appeal to the help of the redactor (editor), this is evidently only an ill-concealed example of a "begging of the question." In chapter 34, and especially in chapter 14, we have a considerable number of larger sections that contain the characteristics of two or even all three sources, and which accordingly furnish ample evidence for protesting against the whole documentary theory.

(v) Criticism Carried to Extremes:

All the difficulties that have been mentioned grow into enormous proportions when we take into consideration the following facts: To operate with the three sources J, E and P seems to be rather an easy process; but if we accept the principles that underlie this separation into sources, it is an impossibility to

limit ourselves to these three sources, as a goodly number of Old Testament scholars would like to do, as Strack, Kittel, Oettli, Dillmann, Driver. The stories of the danger that attended the wives of the Patriarchs, as these are found in Ge 12:9 ff and in 26:1 ff, are ascribed to J, and the story as found in Ge 20:1 ff to E. But evidently two sources are not enough in these cases, seeing that similar stories are always regarded as a proof that there have been different authors. Accordingly, we must claim three authors, unless it should turn out that these three stories have an altogether different signification, in which case they report three actual occurrences and may have been reported by one and the same author. The same use is made of the laughter in connection with the name Isaac in Ge 17:17; 18:12; 21:6, namely, to substantiate the claim for three sources, P and J and E. But since 21:9 E; 26:8 J also contain references to this, and as in 21:6 JE, in addition to the passage cited above, there is also a second reference of this kind, then, in consistency, the critics would be compelled to accept six sources instead of three (Sievers accepts at least 5, Gunkel 4); or all of these references point to one and the same author who took pleasure in repeating such references. As a consequence, in some critical circles scholars have reached the conclusion that there are also such further sources as J1 and Later additions to J, as also E1 and Later additions to E (compare Budde, Baudissin, Cornill, Holzinger, Kautzsch, Kuenen, Sellin). But Sievers has already discovered five subordinate sources of J, six of the Priestly Code (P), and three of E, making a total of fourteen independent sources that he thinks can yet be separated accurately (not taking into consideration some remnants of J, E and P that can no longer be distinguished from others). Gunkel believes that the narratives in Genesis were originally independent and separate stories, which can to a great extent yet be distinguished in their original form. But if J and E and P from this standpoint are no longer authors but are themselves, in fact, reduced to the rank of collectors and editors, then it is absurd to speak any more of distinct linguistic peculiarities, or of certain theological ideas, or of intentional uses made of certain names of God in J and E and the Priestly Code (P), not to say anything of the connection between these sources, except perhaps in rare cases. Here the foundations of the documentary theory have been undermined by the critics themselves, without Sievers or Gunkel or the other less radical scholars intending to do such a thing. The manner in which these sources are said to have been worked together naturally becomes meaningless in view of such hypotheses. The modern methods of dividing between the sources, if consistently applied, will end in splitting the Biblical text into atoms; and this result, toward which the development of Old Testament criticism is inevitably leading, will some day cause a sane reaction; for through these methods scholars have deprived themselves of the possibility of explaining the blessed influence which these Scriptures, so accidentally compiled according to their view, have achieved through thousands of years. The success of the Bible text, regarded merely from a historical point of view, becomes for the critic a riddle that defies all solutions, even if all dogmatical considerations are ignored.

(2) In View of the Names for God.

(a) Error of Hypothesis in Principle:

The names of God, Yahweh and Elohim, constituted for Astruc the starting-point for the division of Genesis into different sources (see (1) above). Two chief sources, based on the two names for God, could perhaps as a theory and in themselves be regarded as acceptable. If we add that in Ex 6:1 ff, in the Priestly Code (P), we are told that God had not revealed Himself before the days of Moses by the name

of Yahweh, but only as "God Almighty," it seems to be the correct thing to separate the text, which reports concerning the times before Moses and which in parts contains the name Yahweh, into two sources, one with Yahweh and the other with Elohim. But just as soon as we conclude that the use made of the two names of God proves that there were three and not two sources, as is done from Ge 20 on, the conclusive ground for the division falls away. The second Elohist (E), whom Ilgen was the first to propose (see (1) above), in principle and a priori discredits the whole hypothesis. This new source from the very outset covers all the passages that cannot be ascribed to the Yahweh or the Elohist portions; whatever portions contain the name Elohim, as P does, and which nevertheless are prophetical in character after the manner of J, and accordingly cannot be made to fit in either the Jahwistic or the Elohistic source, seek a refuge in this third source. Even before we have done as much as look at the text, we can say that according to this method everything can be proved. And when critics go so far as to divide J and E and P into many subparts, it becomes all the more impossible to make the names for God a basis for this division into sources. Consistently we could perhaps in this case separate a Yahweh source, an Elohim source, a ha-'Elohim source, an 'El Shadday source, an 'Adhonay source, a Mal'akh Yahweh source, a Mal'akh 'Elohim source, etc., but unfortunately these characteristics of the sources come into conflict in a thousand cases with the others that are claimed to prove that there are different sources in the Book of Genesis.

(b) False Basis of Hypothesis:

But the basis of the whole hypothesis itself, namely, Ex 6:1 ff P; is falsely regarded as such. If Yahweh had really been unknown before the days of Moses, as Ex 6:1 ff P is claimed to prove, how could J then, in so important and decisive a point in the history of the religious development of Israel, have told such an entirely different story? Or if, on the other hand, Yahweh was already known before the time of Moses, as we must conclude according to J, how was it possible for P all at once to invent a new view? This is all the more incredible since it is this author and none other who already makes use of the word Yahweh in the composition of the name of the mother of Moses, namely Jochebed (compare Ex 6:20 and Nu 26:59). In addition, we do not find at all in Ex 6:1 ff that God had before this revealed Himself as 'Elohim, but as 'El Shadday, so that this would be a reason for claiming not an 'Elohim but an 'El Shadday source for P on the basis of this passage (compare 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 48:3 P—43:14 E! compare also 49:25 in the blessing of Jacob). Finally, it is not at all possible to separate Ex 6:1 ff P from that which immediately precedes, which is taken from JE and employs the name Yahweh; for according to the text of P we do not know who Moses and who Aaron really were, and yet these two are in Ex 6:1 ff regarded as well-known persons. The new revelation of God in Ex 6:1 ff (P) by the side of 3:1 ff (JE and E) is also entirely defensible and rests on a good foundation; for Moses after the failure of Ex 5 needed such a renewed encouragement (see EXODUS, sec. II, 2, 1). If this is the case, then the revelation of the name of Yahweh in Ex 6:1 ff cannot mean that that name had before this not been known at all, but means that it had only been relatively unknown, i.e. that in the fullest and most perfect sense God became known only as Yahweh, while before this He had revealed His character only from certain sides, but especially as to His Almighty Power.

(c) Improbability That Distinction of Divine Names Is without Significance:

In view of the importance which among oriental nations is assigned to names, it is absolutely unthinkable that the two names Yahweh and Elohim had originally been used without any reference to their different meanings. The almost total omission of the name Yahweh in later times or the substitution of the name Elohim for it in Psalms 42-83 is doubtless based in part on the reluctance which gradually arose in Israel to use the name at all; but this cannot be shown as probable for older times, in which it is claimed that E was written. In the case of P the rule, according to which the name Elohim is said to have been used for the pre-Mosaic period, and the reason for the omission of Yahweh would have been an entirely different one. Then, too, it would be entirely inexplicable why J should have avoided the use of the name Elohim. The word Elohim is connected with a root that signifies "to fear," and characterizes God from the side of His power, as this is, e.g., seen at once in Ge 1. Yahweh is splendidly interpreted in Ex 3:14 ff; and the word is connected with the archaic form hawah for hayah, "to be," and the word characterizes God as the being who at all times continues to be the God of the Covenant, and who, according to Ge 2:4-3:24, can manifestly be none other than the Creator of the universe in Ge 1:1-2:3, even if from Ge 12 on He, for the time being, enters into a special relation to Abraham, his family and his people, and by the use of the combined names Yahweh-Elohim is declared to be identical with the God who created the world, as e.g. this is also done in the section Ex 7:8-13:16, where, in the 10 plagues, Yahweh's omnipotent power is revealed (compare EXODUS, II, 2, 2); and in 9:30 it is charged against-Pharaoh and his courtiers, that they did not yet fear Yahweh-Elohim, i.e. the God of the Covenant, who at the same time is the God of the universe (compare also 1Ki 18:21,37,39; Jon 4:6).

(d) Real Purpose in Use of Names for God:

But now it is further possible to show clearly, in connection with a number of passages, that the different names for God are in Genesis selected with a perfect consciousness of the difference in their meanings, and that accordingly the choice of these names does not justify the division of the book into various sources.

(i) Decreasing Use of Yahweh:

The fact that the toledhoth of Terah, of Isaac, and of Jacob begin with the name Yahweh but end without this name. In the history of Abraham are to be noted the following passages: Ge 12:1,4,7,8,17; 13:4,10,13,14,18; 14:22; 15:1,2,8; 16:2,5-7,9,10,11,13; 17:1; in the history of Isaac: 25:21,22,23; 26:2,12,22,24,25,28,29; and in the toledhoth of Jacob 38:7,10; 39:2,3,1. In these passages the beginnings are regularly made with the name Yahweh, although with decreasing frequency before the name Elohim is used, and notwithstanding that in all these sections certain selections from P and E must also be considered in addition to J. Beginning with Ge 12, in which the story of the selection of Abraham is narrated, we accordingly find emphasized, at the commencement of the history of each patriarch, this fact that it is Yahweh, the God of the Covenant, who is determining these things. Beginning with Ge 40 and down to about Ex 2 we find the opposite to be the case, although J is strongly represented in this section, and we no longer find the name Yahweh (except in one passage in the blessing of Jacob, which passage has been taken from another source, and hence is of no value for the distinction of the sources J, E and P; this is the remarkable passage Ge 49:18). In the same way the story of Abraham (Ge 25:1-11) closes without mention being made of the name of Yahweh, which name is otherwise found in all of

these histories, except in Ge 23 (see below). The toledhoth of Isaac, too, use the name Yahweh for the last time in 32:10;

and from this passage down to Ge 37:2 the name is not found. It is accordingly clear that in the history of the patriarchs there is a gradual decrease in the number of times in which the name Yahweh occurs, and in each case the decrease is more marked; and this is most noticeable and clearest in the history of Joseph, manifestly in order to make all the more prominent the fact that the revelation of God, beginning with Ex 3:1 ff, is that of Yahweh. These facts alone make the division of this text into three sources J, E and P impossible.

(ii) Reference to Approach of Man to God, and Departure from Him:

The fact, further, that the approach of an individual to God or his departure from God could find its expression in the different uses made of the names of God is seen in the following. In connection with Ishmael and Lot the name Yahweh can be used only so long as these men stood in connection with the kingdom of God through their relation to Abraham (compare Ge 16:7,9,10,11,13 and 13:10; 19:13 f, 16), but only the name Elohim can be used as soon as they sever this connection (compare Ge 21:12,17,19,20 and 19:29). On the other hand, [’Elohim] is used in the beginning of the history of the Gentile Abimelech (Ge 20:3,6,11,13,17; 21:22 f); while afterward, when he has come into closer relations to the patriarchs, the name Yahweh is substituted (Ge 26:28,29). A similar progress is found in separate narratives of the patriarchs themselves, since in Ge 22:1 ff and chapter 28 the knowledge of Elohim is changed into that of Yahweh (compare 22:1,3,1 with 22:11,14,15,16, and 28:12 with 28:13,16).

(iii) Other Reasons:

[’Elohim] can, further, in many cases be explained on the basis of an implied or expressed contrast, generally over against men (compare Ge 22:8,12; in the second of these two passages the fear of God is placed in contrast to godlessness); Ge 30:2; 31:50; 32:2 f; compare with 32:4 and 8; 32:29; 35:5; or on the basis of an accommodation to the standpoint of the person addressed, as in 3:1-5 (serpent); 20:3,6,11,13,17; 23:6; 39:9 (Gentiles); or on the basis of grammar, as in 23:6; 32:3; 28:17,22; because the composition with the proper name Yahweh could never express the indefinite article (a prince of God, a camp of God, a Bethel or house of prayer); or finally in consequence of the connection with earlier passages (compare 5:1 ff with chapter 1; 21:2,4; 28:3 ff; 35:9 ff with chapter 17). A comparison of these passages shows that, of course, different reasons may have induced the author to select the name Elohim, e.g. 23:6; 28:12; 32:12.

(iv) Systematic Use in History of Abraham:

That the names for God are systematically used is finally attested by the fact that in the history of Abraham, after the extensive use of the name Yahweh in its beginning (see above), this name is afterward found combined with a large number of other and different names; so that in each case it is Yahweh of whom all further accounts speak, and yet the name of Yahweh is explained, supplemented

and made clear for the consciousness of believers by the new appellations, while the full revelation of His being indeed begins only in Ex 3 and 6:1 ff, at which place the different rays of His character that appeared in earlier times are combined in one brilliant light. The facts in the case are the following. In the story of Abraham, with which an epoch of fundamental importance in the history of revelation begins, we find Yahweh alone in Ge 12 f. With the exception of chapter 23, where a characteristic appellation of God is not found, and 25:1-11, where we can claim a decadence in the conception of the Divinity (concerning 23:6; 25:11; see above, the name of Yahweh is retained in all of these stories, as these have been marked out (III, 2, 6); but beginning with chapter 14 they do not at all use any longer only one name for God. We here cite only those passages where, in each ease, for the first time a new name for God is added, namely, 14:18, ‘El ‘Elyon; 14:19, Creator of heaven and of earth; 15:2, ‘Adhonay; 16:7, the Angel of Yahweh; 16:13, the God that seeth; 17:1, ‘El Shadday; 17:3, ‘Elohim; 17:18, ha-’Elohim; chapters 18 f, special relation to the three men (compare 18:2 and 19:1); 18:25, the Judge of the whole earth; 20:13, ‘Elohim constructed as a plural; 21:17, the Angel of God; 24:3, the God of heaven and the God of the earth; 24:12, the God of Abraham.

(e) Scantiness of the Materials for Proof:

If we add, finally, that to prove the hypothesis we are limited to the meager materials found in Ge 1:1 through Ex 6:1 if; that in this comparatively small number of chapters Ge 40 to Ex 2 cannot be utilized in this discussion (see above under (d); that all those passages, in which J and E are inseparably united must be ignored in this discussion; that all other passages in which J and E are often and rapidly interchanged from the very outset are suspiciously akin to begging the question; that Ge 20:18, which with its "Yahweh" is ascribed to R, is absolutely needed as the conclusion of the preceding Elohim story; that in 21:33 with its "Yahweh" (Yahweh) in the Jahwist (Jahwist), on the other hand, the opening Elohim story from E, which is necessary for an explanation of the dwelling of Abraham in the south country, precedes; that the angel of Yahweh (22:11) is found in E; that 2:4-3:24 from J has besides Yahweh the name Elohim, and in 3:1b-5 only Elohim (see above); that in 17:1; 21:1 P Yahweh is found; that 5:29, which is ascribed to J, is surrounded by portions of the Priestly Code (P), and contains the name Yahweh, and would be a torso, but in connection with chapter 5 the Priestly Code (P), in reality is in its proper place, as is the intervening remark (5:24 P); that, on the other hand, in 4:25; 6:2,4; 7:9; 9:27; 39:9 Elohim is found—in view of all these facts it is impossible to see how a greater confusion than this could result from the hypothesis of a division of the sources on the basis of the use made of the names of God. And then, too, it is from the very outset an impossibility, that in the Book of Genesis alone such an arbitrary selection of the names for God should have been made and nowhere else.

(f) Self-Disintegration of the Critical Position:

The modern critics, leaving out of consideration entirely their further dissection of the text, themselves destroy the foundation upon which this hypothesis was originally constructed, when Sievers demands for Ge 1 (from P) an original Yahweh Elohim in the place of the Elohim now found there; and when others in Ge 18 f J claim an original Elohim; and when in 17:1-21:1 the name Yahweh is said to have been intentionally selected by P.

(g) Different Uses in the Septuagint:

Naturally it is not possible to discuss all the pertinent passages at this place. Even if, in many cases, it is doubtful what the reasons were for the selection of the names for God, and even if these reasons cannot be determined with our present helps, we must probably, nevertheless, not forget that the Septuagint in its translation of Genesis in 49 passages, according to Eerdman's reckoning, and still more according to Wiener's, departs from the use of the names for God from the Hebrew original. Accordingly, then, a division of Genesis into different sources on the basis of the different names for God cannot be carried out, and the argument from this use, instead of proving the documentary theory, has been utilized against it.

GENESIS, 3

III. The Structure of the Individual Pericopes.

In this division of the article, there is always to be found (under 1) a consideration of the unity of the Biblical text and (under 2) the rejection of the customary division into different sources.

The conviction of the unity of the text of Genesis and of the impossibility of dividing it according to different sources is strongly confirmed and strengthened by the examination of the different pericopes. Here, too, we find the division on the basis of the typical numbers 4,7,10,12. It is true that in certain cases we should be able to divide in a different way; but at times the intention of the author to divide according to these numbers practically compels acceptance on our part, so that it would be almost impossible to ignore this matter without detriment, especially since we were compelled to accept the same fact in connection with the articles EXODUS (II); LEVITICUS (II, 2); DAY OF ATONEMENT (I, 2, 1), and aIso EZEKIEL (I, 2, 2). But more important than these numbers, concerning the importance or unimportance of which there could possibly be some controversy, are the fundamental religious and ethical ideas which run through and control the larger pericopes of the [toledhoth] of Terah, Isaac and Jacob in such a way that it is impossible to regard this as merely the work of a redactor, and we are compelled to consider the book as the product of a single writer.

1. The Structure of the Prooemium (Genesis 1-2:3):

The structure of the proemium (Ge 1:1-2:3) is generally ascribed to P. Following the introduction (Ge 1:1,2; creation of chaos), we have the creation of the seven days with the Sabbath as a conclusion. The first and the second three days correspond to each other (1st day, the light; 4th day, the lights; 2nd day, the air and water by the separation of the waters above and the waters below; 5th day, the animals of the air and of the water; 3rd day, the dry land and the vegetation; 6th day, the land animals and man; compare also in this connection that there are two works on each day). We find Exodus also divided according to the number seven (see EXODUS, II, 1; compare also Ex 24:18 b through 31:18; see EXODUS, II, 2, 5, where we have also the sevenfold reference to the Sabbath idea in Ex, and that, too, repeatedly at the close of different sections, just as we find this here in Genesis); and in Le compare

chapters 23; 25; 27; see LEVITICUS, II, 2, 2; the VIII, IX, and appendix; and in Ge 4:17 ff J; 5:1-24 P; 6:9-9:29; 36:1-37 I (see under 2, 1,2,3,1).

2. Structure of the Ten Toledhoth:

The ten toledhoth are found in Ge 2:4-50:26.

1. The Toledhoth of the Heavens and the Earth (Genesis 2:4-4:26):

(1) The Biblical Text.

(a) Ge 2:4-25, Paradise and the first human beings;

(b) 3:1-24, the Fall;

(c) 4:1-16, Cain and Abel;

(d) 4:17-26, the Cainites, in seven members (see under 1 above) and Seth. The number 4 appears also in 5:1-6:8 (see under 2); 10:1-11:9 (see under 4); and especially 11:27-25:11 (under 6). Evidently (a) and (b), (c) and (d) are still more closely connected.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Ge 1:1-2:4 a P and 2:4b through 4:26 J).

Ch 2 does not contain a new account of creation with a different order in the works of creation. This section speaks of animals and plants, not for their own sakes, but only on account of their connection with man. The creation of the woman is only a further development of Ge 1. While formerly the critics divided this section into 2:4-4:26 J, they now cut it up into J1 and j2 (see under II, 2, 1 (c) (because, they say, the tree of life is mentioned only in 2:9 and 3:23, while in 2:17 and 3:3 ff the Divine command is restricted to the tree of knowledge of good and evil. But it is impossible to see why there should be a contradiction here, and just as little can we see why the two trees standing in the midst of the garden should no~t both have had their significance (compare 2:9; 3:3). It is further asserted that a division of J is demanded by the fact that the one part of J knows of the Fall (6:9 ff), and the other does not know of such a break in the development of mankind (4:17 ff). But the civilization attained by the Cainites could certainly have passed over also to the Sethites (see also 6:2); and through Noah and his sons have been continued after the Deluge. Then, too, the fact that Cain built a city (4:17), and the fact that he became a fugitive and a wanderer (4:12), are not mutually exclusive; just as the beginnings made with agriculture (4:12) are perfectly consistent with the second fact.

2. The Toledhoth of Adam (Ge 5:1-6:8):

(1) The Biblical Text.

(a) Ge 5:1-24, seven generations from Adam to Lamech (see under 1, and Jude 1:14);

(b) Ge 5:25-32, four generations from the oldest of men, Methuselah, down to the sons of Noah;

(c) 6:1-4, intermingling of the sons of God and the sons of men; (d) 6:5-8, corruption of all mankind. Evidently at this place (a) and (b), (c) and (d) correspond with each other.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 5 P with the Exception of 5:29 (see II, 2, 2 (e)); 5:29; 6:1-8 J).

Genesis 6:7 J presupposes chapter 1 P; as, on the other hand, the fact that the generations that, according to chapter 5 the Priestly Code (P), had in the meanwhile been born, die, presupposes the advent of sin, concerning which only J had reported in chapter 3. In the case of the Priestly Code (P), however, in 1:31 it is said that everything was very good.

3. The Toledhoth of Noah (Genesis 6:9-9:29):

(1) The Biblical Text.

Seven sections (see 1 above) viz:

(a) Ge 6:9-22, the building of the ark;

(b) 7:1-9, entering the ark;

(c) 7:10-24, the increase of the Flood;

(d) 8:1-14, the decrease of the Flood;

(e) 8:15-19, leaving the ark;

(f) 8:22-9:17, declaration of a covenant relation between God and Noah;

(g) 9:18-29, transfer of the Divine blessing upon Shem.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 7:1-5,7-10,12,16b, 17,22 f; 8:2b, 3a, 6-12,13b, 20-22; 9:20-27 J, the Rest from P).

In all the sources are found the ideas that the Deluge was the punishment of God for sin; further, the deliverance of the righteous Noah and his wife and three sons Shem, Ham and Japheth and their wives; the deliverance of the different kinds of animals; the announcement of the covenant relations between

God and mankind after the Deluge; the designation of the Deluge with the term mabbul and of the ark with tebhah. In the Babylonian account, which without a doubt stands in some connection with the Biblical, are found certain measurements of the ark, which in the Bible are only in the Priestly Code (P), as also the story of the sending out of the birds when the flood was decreasing, and of the sacrifices of those who had been delivered, which in the Bible are said to be found only in J; and these facts are a very powerful argument against the division into sources. Further, the Priestly Code (P), in case the critics were right, would have contained nothing of the thanks of Noah for his deliverance, although he was a pious man; and in the case of J we should not be informed what kind of an ark it was into which Noah was directed to go (Ge 7:1); nor how he can already in Ge 8:20 build an altar, as he has not yet gone out of the ark; and, further, how the determination of Yahweh, that He would not again curse the earth but would bless it, can be a comfort to him, since only P has reported concerning the blessing (9:1 ff). Even if the distinction is not always clearly made between clean and unclean animals, and different numbers are found in the case of each (6:19 f; 7:14-16 the Priestly Code (P), over against 7:2 f in J), yet this is to be regarded merely as a lack of exactness or, perhaps better, rather as a summary method of procedure. The difficulties are not even made any easier through the separation into sources, since in 7:8 f in J both numbers and the distinction between the two kinds of animals are used indiscriminately. Here, too, in J we find the name Elohim used. The next contradiction that is claimed, namely that the Deluge according to J lasted only 61 days, and is arranged in 40 days (7:4,12,17; 8:6) plus 3 X 7 = 21 days (8:8,10,12), while in P it continues for 1 year and 11 days (7:11,24; 8:3-5,14), is really a self-inflicted agony of the critics. The report of the Bible on the subject is perfectly clear. The rain descends for 40 days (7:12 J); but as in addition also the fountains of the deep are broken up (7:11 P), we find in this fact a reason for believing that they increased still more (7:24 P and 7:17 J). The 40 days in 8:6 J cannot at all be identified with those mentioned in 7:17; for if this were the case the raven would have been sent out at a time when the waters had reached their highest stage, and even according to J the Deluge covered the entire world. In general see above, II, 2, 1 (c).

4. The Toledhoth of the Sons of Noah (Genesis 10:1-11:9):

(1) The Biblical Text.

(a) Ge 10:2-5, the Japhethites;

(b) 10:6-20, the Hamites;

(c) 10:21-32, the Shemites;

(d) 11:1-9, the Babylonian confusion of tongues. Evidently (a) to (c) is to be regarded as in contrast to (d) (compare also 11:1,9 J in addition to 10:32 P).

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 10:1-7,20,22 f, 31 f the Priestly Code (P), the Rest Belonging to J).

The distribution of Genesis 10 between P and J is actually ridiculous, since in this case J does not speak of Japheth at all, and the genealogy of the Hamites would connect directly with the Priestly Code (P), a phenomenon which must have been repeated in 10:24 ff. The Jewish Midrash, in addition, and possibly correctly, counts 70 peoples (compare 46:27; Ex 1:5; Nu 11:16,25; Lu 10:1).

5. The Toledhoth of Shem (Genesis 11:10-26):

10 generations (see under II, 1).

6. The Toledhoth of Terah (Ge 11:27-25:11):

(1) The Biblical Text.

After the introduction (Ge 11:27-32), theme of the history of Abraham is given in Ge 12:1-4 a (12:1, the promise of the holy land; 12:2, promise of many descendants; 12:3, announcement of the double influence of Abraham on the world; 12:4a, the obedience of Abraham's faith in his trust upon the Divine promise). In contrast to the first three thoughts which characterize God's relation to Abraham, the fourth is placed, which emphasizes. Abraham's relation to God (see under (d)). But both thoughts give complete expression to the intimate communion between God and Abraham. On the basis of these representations, which run through the entire story and thus contribute materially to its unification, this section can also be divided, as one of these after the other comes into the foreground. These four parts (12:4b through 14:24; 15:1-18:15; 18:16-21:34; 22:1-25:11) can each be divided again into four subdivisions, a scheme of division that is found also in Ex 35:4-40:38; Le 11-15; 16 (compare EXODUS, II, 2, 7; LEVITICUS, II, 2, 2, III and IV; DAY OF ATONEMENT, I, 2, 1), and is suggested by De 12-26 (compare also my book, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung, the results of the investigation of which work are there reproduced without entering upon the details of the argument).

(a) Ge 12:4 through 14:24, in which the reference to the promised land is placed in the foreground; see 12:1, and the passages and statements in parentheses in the following: (i) 12:4b-8, Abraham's journey to Canaan (12:5 the Priestly Code (P), 6,7,8 J); (ii) 12:9-13:4, descent to Egypt from Canaan, and return (12:9,10; 13:1-4J); 13:5-18, separation from Lot (13:6 the Priestly Code (P), 7,9 J, 12a the Priestly Code (P), 14 f, 17,18 J); chapter 14, expedition against Chedorlaomer, etc. (Abraham is blessed by the priest-king of the country, and receives as homage from the products of the country bread and wine (14:18 f), while he in return gives tithes (14:20)). The division of this section (12:4b through 14:24) is to be based on the similarity of the closing verses (12:8; 13:4; 13:18).

(b) Ge 15:1-18:15, unfolding of the promise of descendants for Abraham by this announcement that he is to have a son of his own; compare 12:2 and what is placed in parentheses in the following: chapter 15, Yahweh's covenant with Abraham (15:2,3 JE, 4 J, 5 E, 13,14,16,18 J). The promise is not fulfilled through Eliezer, but only through an actual son (15:3,1); 16:1-16, Hagar gives birth to Ishmael as the son of Abraham. Hagar's son, too, namely Ishmael, is not the genuine heir, notwithstanding the connection between 16:10 and 12:2 (compare 17:18-20 P); chapter 17 the Priestly Code (P), promise of the birth of

Isaac given to Abraham (17:2-17,19,21); 18:1-15, Sarah also hears that Isaac is promised (18:10,12-15).

(c) Ge 18:16-21:34, the double influence of Abraham on the world; compare 12:3 and what is in parentheses in the following: 18:16-19:38, the pericope dealing with Sodom; (i) 18:16-33, Abraham's petition for the deliverance of Sodom; (ii) 19:1-11, the sin of the Sodomites, while Lot shows some of the characteristics of Abraham; (iii) 19:12-28, story of the destruction, in connection with which Lot receives the benefit of his relation to Abraham (19:16,19,21,22); (iv) Lot ceases to be a part of this history after this destruction; 20:1-18, Abraham with Abimelech (20:6,9 E, 18 R, punishment; 20:7,17, intercession); 21:1-21, Ishmael ceases to be part of this history (21:13,18,20 E); 21:22-34, Abraham's agreement with Abimelech (the latter seeks Abraham's friendship and fears his enmity, 21:27,23 E).

(d) Ge 22:1-25:11 ff, Abraham's faith at its culminating point; compare 12:4a and what is in parentheses in the following: (i) 22:1-19, the sacrifice of Isaac (22:2,12 E, 16,18 R); (ii) chapter 23, purchase of the place to bury the dead, which act was the result of his faith in the promised land; (iii) chapter 24 is introduced by 22:20-24, which has no independent character. With the twelve descendants of Nahor compare the twelve sons of Jacob, the twelve of Ishmael (25:12 ff; 17:20), and on the number 12 see Ex 24:18-30:10, under EXODUS, II, 2, 5; Le 1-7 under LEVITICUS, II, 2, 2, i, and under EZEKIEL, I, 2, 2. Ch 24 itself contains the story of how a wife was secured for Isaac from among his relatives (the faith in the success of this plan is transmitted from Abraham to his servant); (iv) 25:1-11, the sons of the concubine of Abraham (J and R) cease to be a part of this history; transfer of the entire inheritance to the son of promise (Jahwist); burial in the ground bought for this purpose (P) (all of these concluding acts stand in close connection with Abraham's faith). In reference to the force of the names of God in connecting Ge 11:27-25:11, see above under II, 2, 2 (d).

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources (Genesis 11:27,31 f; 12:4b, 5; 13:6a, 11b, 12a; 16:1a, 3,15 f; 17; 19:29; 21:1b, 2b-5; 23; 25:7-11a P; 14 from an unknown source; 15:6; 20:1-17; 21:8-32; 22:1-13,19 E; 15:1-3; 21:6 JE; 20:18; 22:14-18; 25:6 R; all else belongs to J).

Through the passages ascribed to P breaks are caused in the text of J in Ge 11:28 f; 12:4a (Lot); in chapter 16, where the conclusion is lacking; in 18:1 (the reference of the pronoun); in 24:67 (Sarah's death); in 25:1 ff (no mention of Abraham's death). On the other hand P presupposes the text of J in 11:31 f; 12:4b; 16:1b; 19:29. In the case of E we need mention only the abrupt break in 20:1; and, finally, the text of the Priestly Code (P), leaving out of consideration the larger sections (chapters 17 and 23), is entirely too meager to constitute an independent document.

We will here discuss also the so-called duplicates (see under II, 2, 1, a and c). The different stories concerning the danger in which the wives of Abraham and Isaac were involved in Ge 12:9 ff J; 20:1 ff E; 26:1 ff J directly presuppose each other. Thus, in 20:13, the Elohist (E), Abraham regards it as a fact that such situations are often to be met with, and consequently the possibility of an occurrence of such an event could not have appeared so remarkable to an Oriental as it does to a modern critic; chapter 26:1 suggests the story in 12:9 ff. The words used here also show that the three stories in question did not originate independently of each other (compare 26:7; 20:5; 12:19-26:7; 20:11; 12:12-26:10; 20:9; 12:18-

26:3; 20:1; 12:10 (gur); see under II, 2, 1, c). The two Ishmael pericopes (chapters 16 J and P and 21 E) differ from each other throughout, and, accordingly, are surely not duplicates. The two stories of the conclusion of a covenant in chapters 15 J and 17 P are both justified, especially since in 17:7 the author speaks of an "establishment" of the covenant which already existed since chapter 15. Ge 17 P and 18:1 ff J are certainly intended to be pendants, so that it is impossible to ascribe them to different authors; compare the analogous beginning of theophanies of Yahweh in 17:1 and 18:1 (even the pronoun referring to Abraham in 18:1 J, unless taken in connection with chapter 17 the Priestly Code (P), is without any context), also the laughing of Abraham and of Sarah (17:17; 18:12 f; see under II, 2, 1 (c)), the prominence given to their age (17:17; 18:11 f), and the designation of the time in 17:11; 18:10,14.

Nor can we quote in favor of a division into sources the passage Ge 21:14 f E, on the ground that Ishmael is described here as being so small that he could be laid upon the shoulder of his mother and then be thrown by her under a shrub, while according to the Biblical text he must have been 15 years of age (16:16; 21:5 P). For the original does not say that he was carried on her shoulders; and in Mt 15:30 it is even said of adults that they were thrown down. On the other hand, also according to E, Ishmael could not have been so small a child, for in Ge 21:18 b he is led by the hand, and according to 21:9 he already mocks Isaac, evidently because the latter was the heir of the promise.

Sarah’s age, too, according to Ge 20 E, does not speak in favor of a division into sources. That she was still a beautiful woman is not claimed here. Evidently Abimelech was anxious only for a closer connection with the powerful Abraham (compare 21:23,17). Then, too, all the sources ascribe an advanced age to Sarah (compare 21:6 J and E; 18:12 f J; 17:17 P).

7. The Toledhoth of Ishmael (Genesis 25:12-18):

Twelve princes descended from Ishmael (see under 6 (d)).

8. The Toledhoth of Isaac (Genesis 25:19-35:29):

The correct conception of the fundamental thought can be gained at once in the beginning of this section (Ge 25:22 f): Yahweh’s oracle to Rebekah, that the older of the twins, with whom she was pregnant, should serve the younger; also in Ro 9:10 ff with reference to Mal 1:2 f; and finally, the constant reference made to Esau in addition to Jacob until the former ceases to be a factor in this history in Ge 36. Accordingly in the end everything is made dependent on the one hand on Jacob’s election, notwithstanding his wrongdoings, on the other hand, on Esau’s rejection notwithstanding his being the firstborn, or in other words, upon the perfectly free grace of God; and all the different sources alike share in this fundamental thought. But in dividing between the different parts of this section, we must particularly draw attention to this, that in all of these parts both thoughts in some way or other find their expression.

(1) The Biblical Text.

Containing 10 parts (see under II, 1), namely

(a) Ge 25:19-26, the birth of Esau and Jacob;

(b) 25:27-34, Esau despises and loses his birthright;

(c) 26:1-35, Isaac receives the blessing of Abraham, which afterward is transmitted to Jacob, while Esau, through his marriage with heathen women, prepares the way for his rejection (26:34 f);

(d) 27:1-40, Jacob steals the blessing of the firstborn;

(e) 27:41-45, Jacob's flight out of fear of Esau's vengeance;

(f) 27:46-28:9, Jacob is sent abroad out of fear of his brother's bad example;

(g) 28:10-32:33, Jacob in a strange land and his fear of Esau, which is overcome in his contest of prayer in Peniel on his return: 28:10-22, the ladder reaching to heaven in Bethel when he went abroad; 29:1-30:43, twenty years with Laban (see 31:38); 31:1-54, Jacob's departure from Mesopotamia; 32:1-33, his return home;

(h) chapter 33, reconciliation with Esau, who returns to Seir (verse 16; compare 32:4), while Jacob becomes the owner of property in the Holy Land (33:19 f);

(i) 34:1-35:22, Jacob remains in this land, notwithstanding the slaughter made by his sons Simeon and Levi (compare 34:30; 35:5); the new appearance of God in Bethel, with a repetition of the story of the changing of Jacob's name, with which the story of Jacob's youth is closed, and which presupposes the episode at Bethel (compare 35:1,6b, 9-15 with 28:10 ff), and which is not in contradiction with the first change in the name of Jacob in chapter 32 (compare the twofold naming of Peter in Joh 1:43 and Mt 16:18). Esau is yet mentioned in Ge 35:1,7, where there is a reference made to Jacob's flight before him;

(j) 35:23-29, Jacob's 12 sons as the bearers of the promise; while Esau is mentioned only as participating in Isaac's burial, but inwardly he has no longer any part in the history of the kingdom of God, as is seen from chapter 36, and in 32:4; 33:16 is already hinted at. In this section, too, evidently there are groups, each of two parts belonging together, namely (a) and (b) describing the earliest youth; (c) and (d) in which Isaac plays a prominent part; (e) and (f) both of which do not exclude but supplement each other in assigning the motives for Jacob's flight; (g) and (h) Jacob's flight and reconciliation; (i) and (j) Jacob both according to family and dwelling-place as the recognized heir of the promise.

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources.

As Ge 25:29 f, 26b; 26:34 f; 27:46-28:9; 29:24,29; 31:18; 35:6a, 9-12,15; 35:22b-29; 36:6-30,40-43 are

ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), it is clear that these are in part such ridiculously small extracts, that we should be justified in attributing them to a sensible author. The whole sojourn in Mesopotamia is ignored in the Priestly Code (P), according to the critics, except the brief notices in 29:24,29; 33:18. Further, the parts of the rest of the text cannot in many cases be dispensed with; as, e.g. we do not know in 25:26b who was born; nor in 26:34 f who Esau was; nor in 27:46 who Jacob was; nor in 29:24 who Laban was; nor in 29:24,29 in what connection and for what purposes Leah and Rachel are mentioned. P makes no mention of any promise given to Isaac, which is, however, presupposed in 35:12 and later in Ex 2:24. In Ge 28:1 ff P is most closely connected with J (compare 12:1-3, the blessing of Abraham, and chapter 24). It is, further, impossible to separate the sources E and J in chapter 28 (ladder reaching to heaven); compare 28:10-12,17 f, 20-22 E; 28:13-16 J; 28:19, and the name of God in 28:21 R, and this proposed division actually becomes absurd in chapters 29 f in the story of the birth of Jacob's children, which are said to be divided between the sources J and E.

9. The Toledhoth of Esau (Genesis 36:1-37:1):

In 7 divisions (see under 1), namely

(a) Ge 36:1-5 R, Esau's family; the different names for Esau's wives, as compared with 26:34 f; 28:7-9 the Priestly Code (P), are doubtless based on the fact that oriental women are apt to change their names when they marry; and the fact that these names are without further remark mentioned by the side of the others is rather an argument against the division into sources than for it;

(b) 36:6-8, Esau's change of abode to Seir, which, according to 32:4; 33:14,16, already took place before Jacob's return. Only in case that Esau (35:29) would have afterward remained for a longer period in Canaan, could we think of a new separation in this connection. It is more probable that at this place all those data which were of importance in connection with this separation are once more given without any reference to their difference in point of time;

(c) 36:9-14, Esau as the founder of the Edomites (in 36:9 the word [toledhoth] is repeated from verse 1, while the narrative of the descendants of Esau begins only at this later passage in so far as these were from Seir; compare 36:9 with 36:5, and above, under II, 1);

(d) 36:15-19, the leading line of the sons of Esau;

(e) 36:20-30, genealogy of the original inhabitants of the country, mentioned because of their connection with Esau (compare 36:25 with 36:2);

(f) 36:31-39, the elective kingdoms of Edom;

(g) 36:40-43, the Edomites' chief line of descent, arranged according to localities. We have here accordingly geographical accounts, and not historical or genealogical, as in 36:15 ff, 20 ff (30); compare also 36:40,43, for which reason we find also names of women.

10. The Toledhoth of Jacob (Genesis 37:2-50:26):

(1) The Biblical Text.

The key to the history of Joseph is found in its conclusion, namely, in Ge 50:14-21, in the confession of Joseph, in the light of his past, namely, that God has ended all things well; and in 50:22 ff, in his confidence in the fulfillment of the Divine promise in the lives of those God has chosen; compare also Ps 105:16 ff. According to the two viewpoints in Ge 50:14-26, and without any reference to the sources, this whole pericope (37:2-50:15) is divided into two halves, each of five subdivisions, or a total of ten (see under II, 1). In the exact demonstration of this, not only the contents themselves, but also regard for the different names for God will often render good service, which names, with good effect, are found at the close and in harmony with the fundamental thought of the entire section, namely,

(a) 37:2-39:6a, Joseph enters Potiphar's house (4 pieces, see under 6, 1, namely 37:2-11, the hatred of the brethren, 37:12-36, selling Joseph, 38:1 ff, the Yahweh-displeasing conduct in the house of Judah, compare 38:7,10, 39:1-6, Yahweh's pleasure in Joseph, in contrast to;

(b) 39:6b-23, Joseph is cast into prison, but Yahweh was with him (39:21,23);

(c) 40:1-41:52, the exaltation of Joseph, which at the end especially is shown by the naming of Ephraim and Manasseh as caused by God, but which for the present passes by the history of his family (4 pieces, namely, 40:1, interpretation of the dreams of the royal officials, 41:1-36, interpretation of the two dreams of Pharaoh, 41:37-46a, the exaltation of Joseph, 41:46b-52, Joseph's activity for the good of the country);

(d) 41:55-46:7, Joseph becomes a blessing to his family; compare the promise of God to Jacob in Beersheba to be with him in Egypt in 46:2 ff with 45:6-9 (in four pieces, namely, 41:53-57, the general famine, 42:1-38, the first journey of the brothers of Joseph, 43:14-4:34, the second journey (in four subdivisions,

(i) 43:1-14, the departure,

(ii) 43:14-34, the reception by Joseph,

(iii) 44:1-7, final trial of the brethren,

(iv) 44:18-34, the intercession of Judah); 45:1-46:7, Joseph makes himself known and persuades Jacob to come to Egypt);

(e) 46:8-47:26, Joseph continues to be a blessing to his family and to Egypt (in 4 subdivisions, of which the 4th is placed in contrast to the first 3 exactly as this is done in 10:1-11:9 and 11:27-25:11, namely,

(46:8-27, list of the descendants of Jacob, 46:28-34, meeting with Joseph, 47:1-12, Jacob in the presence of Pharaoh, 47:13-26, the Egyptians who have sold themselves and their possessions to Pharaoh laud Joseph as the preserver of their lives). From this point on the attention is now drawn to the future:

(f) 47:27-31, Jacob causes Joseph to take an oath that he will have him buried in Canaan (compare 47:30 J with chapter 23 P) ; in (e) and (f) there is also lacking a designation for God;

(g) chapter 48, Jacob adopts and blesses Ephraim and Manasseh (compare also the emphasis placed on the providential guidance of God in 48:8 f, 11,15 f, especially 48:16 and 20 ff);

(h) 49:1-27, Jacob blesses his 12 sons and prophesies their future fate (here, 49:18, appears the name of Yahweh, which had disappeared since chapter 40; see under II, 2, 2 (d), and other designations for God, 49:24 f);

(i) 49:28-33, Jacob's death after he had again expressed the wish, in the presence of all his sons, that he should be buried in Canaan;

(j) 50:1-13, the body of Jacob is taken to Canaan. In these 10 pericopes again we can easily find groups of two each, namely, (a) and (b), Joseph's humiliation (sold, prison); (c) and (d), Joseph becomes a blessing to Egypt and to his family; (g) and (h), blessing of the, grandchildren and the sons of Jacob;

(i) and (j), Jacob s death and burial; here too the name of God is lacking as in (e) and (f).

(2) Rejection of the Division into Sources.

Here, too, the separation of P from the rest of the text as a distinct source is untenable, since in the section from Ge 37:2-46:34, after 37:2, only the following fragments are attributed to this source, namely, 41:46a; 46:6 f (according to some also to 46:27). In the same way P abruptly sets in at 47:5,27b; 49:28b. Further, 48:3 ff knows nothing of Ephraim or Manasseh, of whom P reports nothing, so that 50:13 f are the only verses that could naturally connect with the preceding statements of P. In 47:5 ff P reports entirely in the manner of ordinary narratives, and there is no sign of any systematic arrangement. But the separation between J and E cannot be carried out either. In the first place, when these two sources are actually separated by the critics, innumerable omissions in the story arise, which we cannot at this place catalogue. The contradictions which are claimed to exist here are the products of the critics' imagination. It is claimed that according to J it is Judah who plays a prominent role, while according to E it is Reuben; but in 37:21 Reuben is mentioned by J, and the role played by Judah in chapter 38 J is anything but creditable. Why cannot both of these brethren have played a prominent role, as this was also the case with Simeon (42:24,36; 43:14) and Benjamin (42:13,10,32 ff, 36,38; 43:3 ff; 44; 45:14)? Just as little are the Midianites in 37:28,36 E and the Ishmaelites of 37:25,27,28; 39:1 J mutually exclusive or contradictory, since the Midianites in the Gideon story, too, in Jud 7 f; 8:24 are called Ishmaelites (compare in the German the name Prager for traveling musicians, whether they are from Prague or not). In J it is further claimed that Joseph's master was a private gentleman (Ge 39:1), while

in E he was the captain of the bodyguard (Ge 40:3 f). But in this instance the documentary theory can operate only when it calls in the assistance of R in Ge 39:1. The fact that in chapter 39:1 the name of the nationality is added to that of the office, is explained on the ground of the contrast to the Ishmaelites who sold Joseph. Finally, it is claimed to have been caused by the combination of the different sources in such a way that Benjamin in 43:8,29; 44:30,31,33 J is described as a boy, but in 46:21, R or the Priestly Code (P), as the father of ten children. But evidently the author of chapter 46 has in view the number 70 (compare verse 27; see Ex 1:5; Nu 11:16,25; Lu 10:1; Ex 15:27; Jud 12:13; and in Ge 10 above, under 4,2); and for this reason, e.g. in Ge 46:17, he mentions only one grand-daughter of Jacob; and for this he mentions all of the descendants of Jacob, even those who were born later in Egypt, but who already, as it were, had come to Egypt in the loins of their fathers, according to the view of the author. It certainly would be remarkable if no more grandchildren had been born to Jacob in Egypt, since Nu 26 does not mention a single son of any of the sons of Jacob later than those reported in Ge 46. In 46:27 Joseph's sons, too, who were born in Egypt, are included in the list, entirely in harmony with De 10:22. For such an arrangement and adjustment of a genealogy compare the 3 X 14 generations in Mt 1. From this point of view no conclusions, as far as the documentary theory is concerned, can be drawn from the ten sons of Benjamin.

GENESIS, 4

IV. The Historical Character.

1. History of the Patriarchs: (Genesis 12-50):

(1) Unfounded Attacks upon the History.

(a) From General Dogmatic Principles:

In order to disprove the historical character of the patriarchs, the critics are accustomed to operate largely with general dogmatic principles, such as this, that no nation knows who its original founder was. In answer to this it can be said that the history of Israel is and was from the beginning to the end unique, and cannot be judged by the average principles of historiography. But it is then claimed that Abraham's entire life appears to be only one continuous trial of faith, which was centered on the one promise of the true heir, but that this is in reality a psychological impossibility. Over against this claim we can in reply cite contrary facts from the history of several thousands of years; and that, too, in the experience of those very men who were most prominent in religious development, such as Paul and Luther.

(b) From Distance of Time:

Secondly, critics emphasize the long period of time that elapsed between these events themselves and their first records, especially if these records can be accredited to so late a period as the 9th or the 8th century BC. In consequence of this, it is claimed that much of the contents of Genesis is myth or fable;

and Gunkel even resolves the whole book into a set of unconnected little myths and fables. Over against this claim we can again appeal to the universal feeling in this matter. I do not think that it can be made plausible, that in any race fables and myths came in the course of time more and more to be accepted as actual facts, so that perchance we should now be willing to accept as historical truths the stories of the Nibelungenlied or Red Riding Hood. But this, according to the critics, must have been the case in Israel. Prophets accepted the story of the destruction of the two cities in the Jordan valley, as recorded in Ge 19, as correct (compare Am 4:11; Isa 1:9; 3:9; Ho 11:8); also Abraham as a historical person (Isa 29:22; 41:8; 51:1; Mic 7:20; Jer 33:26; Eze 33:24; and possibly Mal 2:15); then Isaac (Am 7:9,16; Jer 33:26); also Jacob (Ho 12:3 ff; Am 9:8; Jer 33:26); also Joseph (Am 5:6,15); and these prophets evidently thought that these events and persons were regarded as historical by the people in general. In the New Testament we can cite, for Abraham, Mt 3:9; Ga 3; 4:21 ff; Ro 4:9 ff; 9:7 ff; Heb 7:1 ff; 11:8 ff; Jas 2:21 ff, and especially the words of Jesus in Mt 8:11; Lu 16:22 ff; Joh 8:52 ff; finally in Mt 22:31 f, the whole argument for the resurrection of the dead is without a foundation if the patriarchs are not historical personages. Over against this, there was no period in the history of Israel in which it can be shown that these stories of Genesis Were regarded only as myths. If these events were actual occurrences, then those things which the patriarchs experienced were so unique that these experiences were not forgotten for a long time. Then, too, we can also refer to the strength of the memory of those nations that were not accustomed to have written records of their history.

(c) From Biblical Data:

Finally, the attempt has been made to discover in the Bible itself a pre-Mosaic stage in its ideas of man concerning God, which is claimed to contradict the higher development of Divine ideas in the patriarchs, for which purpose the critics appeal to Eze 23:3,1; 20:7 ff; Jos 24:14 ff. But at these places it is evident that the idolatry of the people is pictured as apostasy. And when in Ex 6:2 ff the name of Yahweh is as a matter of fact represented as something new, it is nevertheless a fact that in these very passages the revelation given is connected with the history of the patriarchs. The same is true of Ex 3:1 ff. The whole hypothesis that the religion before the days of Moses was polytheistic has not been derived from the Bible, but is interpreted into it, and ends in doing violence to the facts there recorded (compare my book, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit).

(d) From Comparison with Religion of Arabia:

The critics further compare the pre-Mosaic religion of Israel with the low grade of religion in Arabia in the 5th century after Christ; but in order to do this, they must isolate Israel entirely, since all the surrounding nations at the time of the Tell el-Amarna Lettershad attained to an altogether different and higher stage of religious development and civilization.

(2) Unsatisfactory Attempts at Explaining the Patriarchal Age.

(a) Explanation Based on High Places:

In denying the historical character of the account of the patriarchs in Genesis, the critics are forced to contrive some scheme in explanation of the existence of these stories, but in doing this they make some bad breaks. Thus, e.g., they say that the Israelites when they entered Canaan found there the high places of the heathen peoples; and since if they wanted to make use of these in the service of Yahweh they must first declare them legitimate places of worship, this was done by inventing the history of the patriarchs, who long before this are said to have already consecrated all these places to the Yahweh worship. But how is it possible on this supposition to explain the story of Joseph, which transpired in Egypt? Then, too, the reasons for the origin of the other stories of the patriarchs would be enshrouded in a remarkable mystery and would be of very inferior character. Again, it is nowhere declared in the passages of Genesis that here come into consideration that they are reporting the beginnings of a permanent cult when they give an account of how God appeared to the patriarchs or when they erected altars in His honor. And, finally, while it is indeed true that the cult localities of the patriarchs are in part identical with those of later times (compare Bethel, Beersheba)—and this is from the outset probable, because certain places, such as hills, trees, water, etc., as it were, of themselves were suitable for purposes of the cult—yet such an identification of earlier and later localities does not cover all cases. And can we imagine that a prophetical method of writing history would have had any occasion in this manner to declare the worship of calves in Bethel a legitimate service?

(b) The Dating Back of Later Events to Earlier Times:

But we are further told that the pre-prophetic condition of affairs in Israel was in general dated back into the primitive period, and this was done in such a way that the character of Abraham was regarded as reproducing ideal Israel, and the character of Jacob the empirical Israel in the past; something that certainly is from the outset an odd speculation of too much learning! If this explanation is correct, what shall we then do with Isaac and Joseph? And why is the whole story of the condition of civilization pictured in Genesis so entirely different from that of later times? And is Abraham really a perfect ideal? Is he not rather, notwithstanding his mighty faith, a human being of flesh and blood, who can even doubt (Ge 15:2 f; 17:17); who can make use of sinful means to realize the promise (Ge 16, Hagar); who tells a falsehood, although for the best of purposes, namely, to protect his wife (Ge 12:9), and for this reason must accept the rebuke of the heathen Abimelech (Ge 20:9 f)? In addition, Abraham is married to his half-sister (Ge 20:12), which, according to De 27:22; Le 18:9,11; 20:17, is forbidden with the penalty of death for the transgressor. In the same way Jacob, according to Ge 29 f, has two sisters as wives, which is also declared by Le 18:18 to be a crime.

(c) The Patriarchs as heroes eponymi:

In the third place, it is said that the people have in the persons of the patriarchs made for themselves eponymous heroes. But why did they make so many at one time? In addition, Abraham cannot possibly be regarded as such a hero as Jacob or Israel is, and in exceptional cases also Isaac and Joseph (Am 7:9,16; 5:6,15). It is not correct to place genealogies like those in Ge 10:1 ff; 25:1 ff, 13 ff on a level with the stories concerning the patriarchs. In the latter case we are dealing with individualities of pronounced character, who in the experiences of their lives represent great fundamental principles and laws in the kingdom of God—Abraham, the principle of the grace of God, to which faith on the part of

man is the counterpart; Jacob, the principle of Divine election; Joseph, that of the providential guidance of life; while Isaac, it is true, when he becomes prominent in the history, evinces no independent character, but merely follows in the footsteps of Abraham (compare 26:1 ff, 3 ff, 15,18,24 ff), but is in this very imitative life pictured in an excellent way.

(d) Different Explanations Combined:

If we combine two or more of these different and unsatisfactory attempts at an explanation of the history of the patriarchs, we must become all the more distrustful, because the outcome of this combination is such an inharmonious scheme.

(3) Positive Reasons for the Historical Character of Genesis.

The individuality of the patriarchs as well as their significance in the entire development of the history of the kingdom of God, and their different missions individually; further, the truthful portraiture of their method of living, which had not yet reached the stage of permanent settlement; and, finally, the fact that the prophets, the New Testament and above all Jesus Himself regard their historical character as something self-evident (see (1b) above), make the conviction a certainty, that we must insist upon their being historical personages; especially, too, because the attacks on this view (see (1) above), as also the efforts to explain these narratives on other grounds (see (2) above), must be pronounced to be failures. To this we must add the following: If Moses were the founder of the religion of Israel, it would scarcely have been possible that a theory would have been invented and have found acceptance that robs Moses of this honor by the invention of the story of the patriarchs. Rather the opposite would be the case. Besides, this older revelation of God is absolutely necessary in order to make Moses' work and success intelligible and possible. For he himself expressly declares that his work is based on the promises of God given to the fathers. Through this connection with the older revelation it was possible for Moses to win the attention and the confidence of the people (compare Ex 2:24; 3:6,13 ff; 4:5; 6:3,1; 15:2; 32:13 f; 33:1; compare also my book, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit, 117 ff; and Strack, Genesis, 93 ff).

Individuality of Patriarchs:

In so far as the history of the patriarchs contains miracles, they are in perfect harmony with the entire character of sacred history (compare EXODUS, III, 2); and as far as the number of miracles is concerned, there are in fact fewer reported in the days of the patriarchs than in the times of Moses.. On the view that the history of the patriarchs, which is earlier than the period of Moses, was an invention and not history, the opposite condition of affairs could be expected. Leaving out of consideration the unsatisfactory instances cited under V, 2, below, there is to be found also in the Book of Genesis absolutely no reference to indicate events of a later period, which would throw a doubt on the historical character of what is here reported. In every direction (e.g. in connection with theophanies and the cult worship), there is a noticeable progress to be seen in going from Genesis to Exodus, a fact which again is an important argument for the historical reliability of the contents of both books. Finally, we add the

following. Ch 14 (the Chedorlaomer and the Melchizedek episodes) has through recent archaeological researches been brilliantly confirmed as far as the names are concerned, as also in reference to the political conditions of the times, the general historical situation and the chronology. In the same way the religious conditions of Egypt, as described in Ge 12, and in the entire history of Joseph, are so faithfully pictured that it is absolutely impossible to regard these accounts as the work of imagination. These accounts must be the outcome, on the part of the author, of a personal knowledge of these things and conditions, as they are absolutely correct, even to the details of the coloring.

2. The Primitive History of Genesis 1-11:

(1) Prominence of the Religious Element.

In the primitive history as recorded in the opening chapters of Genesis we must yet emphasize, more than is done elsewhere, that the chief interest for the Christian is found in the religious and moral teachings of this account; and that these teachings remain unshaken, even when chronological, historical, archaeological, physical, geographical or philological sciences would tempt us to reach negative conclusions. It is a wise thing, from the outset, not to be too timid in this direction, and to concede considerable liberty in this matter, when we remember that it is not the purpose of the Bible to give us scientific knowledge in scientific forms, but to furnish us with religious and ethical thoughts in a language which a childlike mind, that is open to Divine things, can understand.

(2) Carefulness as Regards Divergent Results of Scientific Research.

On the other hand, it is right over against the so-called "results" of these different sciences to be very critical and skeptical, since in very many cases science retracts today what with a flourish of trumpets it declared yesterday to be a "sure" result of investigations; e.g. as far as the chronology is concerned, the natural and the historical sciences often base their computations on purely arbitrary figures, or on those which are constructed entirely upon conclusions of analogy, and are far from conclusive, if perchance the history of the earth or of mankind has not at all times developed at the same pace, i.e. has moved upward and downward, as e.g. a child in its earlier years will always learn more rapidly than at any later period of its life.

(3) Frequent Confirmation of the Bible by Science.

But finally the Holy Scriptures, the statements of which at this period are often regarded slightingly by theologians, are regarded much more highly by men of science. This is done, e.g., by such scientists as Reinke and K.E. von Baer, who declare that Moses, because of his story of the creation, was a man of unsurpassed and unsurpassable scientific thought; or when many geological facts point to such an event as the Deluge in the history of the earth. The history of languages, as a whole and in its details, also furnishes many proofs for the correctness of Ge 10, and that chapter has further been confirmed in a most surprising manner by many other discoveries (compare the existence of Babel at a period earlier than Nineveh, and the colonizing of Assur by Babel). Then facts like the following can be explained

only on the presupposition that the reports in Genesis are correct, as when a Dutchman in the 17th century built an ark after the measurements given in Genesis and found the vessel in every particular adapted to its purposes; and when today we again hear specialists who declare that the modern ocean sailing vessel is being more and more constructed according to the relative proportions of the ark.

(4) Superiority of the Bible over Heathen Mythologies.

Finally, the similarity of the Biblical and the Babylonian accounts of the creation and the Deluge, as these have been discovered by learned research (and we confine ourselves to these two most important reports)—although this similarity has been misinterpreted and declared to be hostile to the historical reliability and the originality of Ge 1 and Ge 6-9—does not prove what critics claim that it does. Even if we acknowledge that the contents of these stories were extant in Babylon long before the days of Moses, and that these facts have been drawn from this source by Israel, there yet can be no question that the value of these accounts, the fact that they are saturated with a monotheistic and ethical spirit, is found only in Israel and has been breathed into them only by Israel. For the inner value of a story does not depend upon its antiquity, but upon its spirit. But even this conception of the matter, which is shared by most theologians, cannot satisfy us. When we remember how Babylonian mythology is honeycombed by the grossest superstition and heathenism, and that our ethical feelings are often offended by it in the most terrible manner, it is really not possible to see how such a system could have had any attraction for Israel after the Spirit, and how a man who thought as a prophet could have taken over such stories. If Israel has been a pathfinder in the sphere of religion, as is acknowledged on all hands, why do the critics always talk of their borrowing from others? And then, since similar stories are found also among other nations, and as the natural sciences are anything but a unit in hostility to the Biblical narratives, all these factors can find a satisfactory explanation only on the supposition that there existed an original or primitive revelation, and that in Israel this revelation was transmitted in its greater purity, while among the other nations it was emptied of its contents or was perverted. In this way the universality of these stories can be explained, as also the inferiority in character of similar stories among the other nations.

Babylonian and Biblical Stories

The particularly close connection that exists between the Babylonian and the Biblical versions of these stories is in perfect harmony with the fact that it was from Babylon that the dispersion of mankind set in. The purity of the Biblical tradition is further attested by the fact that it reports the actual history of all mankind (see under I, 2), while the mythologies of other nations are restricted nationally and locally, i.e. the beginnings of the history of the individual nations and the beginnings of the history of mankind are identical, and the earliest history is always reported as taking place in the native land of the people reporting it. The fact that in earlier times there prevailed in Babylon too a purer knowledge of God, which, however, steadily degenerated, is proved by many data, and especially by the recently discovered fragment of a Deluge story, according to which the God who destroyed the world by the Flood and the God who delivered the one family is the same God, which is in perfect agreement with the Bible, but is in contradiction to the later Babylonian story. That in earlier times a purer conception of God prevailed, seems to be confirmed also by the experiences of the missionaries. Evolutionism, i.e. the development of a higher conception of God out of a lower, is nothing but an unproved theory, which at every step is

contrary to actual facts. Compare also my book, Die Entwicklung der Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit, 129 ff, and Schmidt, Die babylonische Religion: Gedanken uber ihre Entwicklung, a dissertation in which the fact that religion naturally degenerates is proved also as far as the Greeks, the Egyptians, the East Indians and the Chinese are concerned.

V: Origin and Authorship of Genesis.

1. Connection with Mosaic Times:

That the Book of Genesis stands in some kind of literary connection with the succeeding books of the Pentateuch is generally acknowledged. But if this is the case, then the question as to the origin and the time of the composition of this whole body of books can be decided only if we take them all into consideration. In this article we have only to consider those facts which are found in Genesis for the solution of this problem. It is self-evident that the conclusion we have reached with reference to the literary unity of the book is of great importance for this question (see under II and III above). The historical character of the book, as demonstrated under IV above, also speaks emphatically for this claim that the literary composition of the book must have taken place when the memory of these events was still trustworthy, and the impression and experiences were still fresh and had not yet faded. Such individualistic and vivid pictures of historical personages as are reported by Genesis, such a faithful adherence to the accounts of the civilization in the different countries and districts and at different times, such detailed accounts of foreign customs, conditions and historical events, could scarcely. have been possible, if the Mosaic age with its powerful new impressions, the period of the Judges, with its characteristic apostasy, or even the division of Israel into two kingdoms, with its dire effects on the external union of the people, had all passed by before these accounts were actually written down. On the other hand, the highly developed prophetic conception of these events, and the skillful plan of the book demand that the author must have been a religious and ethical personality of the first rank. And as, finally, it is scarcely credible that Moses would have failed to provide for a systematic report of the great past of the people, for which account, before this and as long as only family histories were involved, there was no need felt, and as the subsequent books of the Pentateuch, which are acknowledged in a literary way to be connected with Genesis, in many of their parts expressly declare that Moses was their author (compare EXODUS, IV), the Mosaic authorship of this book is as good as proved. This is not to deny that older sources and documents were used in the composition of the book, such as perhaps the genealogical tables or the events recorded in Ge 14, possibly, too, some referring to the history of the times before the Deluge and before Abraham. This is probable; but as all the parts of the book have been worked together into a literary unity (see under II and III above), and as such sources are not expressly mentioned, it is a hopeless task to try to describe these different sources in detail or even to separate them as independent documents, after the manner refuted under II and III above, as a theory and in its particulars. And for the age of Genesis, we can refer to the fact that the personal pronoun here is still used for both genders, masculine and feminine, which is true also of the word na‘ar ("youth"), a peculiarity which is shared also by the other books of the Pentateuch almost throughout.

2. Examination of Counter-Arguments:

(1) Possibility of Later Additions.

In itself it would be possible that from time to time some explanatory and interpreting additions could have been made to the original text, in case we find indications of a later period in some statements of the book. But that in this case these additions could not have been made by any unauthorized persons, but only officially, should, in the case of a book like Genesis, be regarded as self-evident. But in our times this fact must be emphasized all the more, as in our days the most radical ideas obtain in reference to the way in which sacred books were used in former times. And then it must be said that we cannot prove as an absolute certainty that there is a single passage in Genesis that originated in the post-Mosaic period.

(2) "Prophecy after the Event" Idea.

It is self-evident also that the fulfillment of a prophecy is not an evidence of a "prophecy after the event" (vaticinium post evenrum), altogether independently of the fact that in this case Ge 12:1-3, which is still in process of fulfillment, could not have been written down even today (compare on this matter, perhaps, Noah's prophecy (9:25 ff); or the prediction of the career of Esau (25:23; 27:40); or of Ishmael (16:10 ff; 21:18); or Jacob's blessing (Ge 49)). The last-mentioned case cannot in any way be interpreted as the product of a later time; compare the curse of Levi in 49:5-8 as compared with the honor bestowed on this tribe already in the Mosaic period (Ex 32:26-29; De 33:8-11), and in the time of the Judges (Jud 17:7-13; 1Sa 2:27 f). Zebulun, too, according to Ge 49:13 is regarded as being settled on the coast, which is not in agreement with historical reality (compare Jos 19:10-16,27). In the same way the curse on Simeon in Ge 49:5-7, which declared that his tribe should be distributed among Israel, was not fulfilled in the time when the people entered Canaan (compare Jos 19:1 and 2Ch 34:6). In Ge 49:10 "Shiloh" cannot refer to the coming of the tabernacle to Shiloh (compare Jos 18:1); for Shiloh is, on the other hand, to be interpreted personally and Messianically. As long as Shiloh was of any importance (compare 1Sa 1 ff), Judah was not in the possession of the scepter; but when this scepter did come into the control of Judah, Shiloh had long since ceased to be of any significance (compare my book, Die messianische Erwartung der vorexilischen Propheten, 360 f).

(3) Special Passages Alleged to Indicate Later Date (Ge 12:6; 13:7; 22:2; 36:31 ff; 13:18; 23:2; 14:14).

In Ge 12:6; 13:7, it is claimed that it is presupposed that at the time of the author there were no longer any Canaanites in the country, so that these verses belong to a much later period than that of Moses. But on this supposition these verses would be altogether superfluous and therefore unintelligible additions. For that in the time of Abraham the Canaanites had not yet been expelled by Israel, was a self-evident matter for every Israelite. As a matter of fact, the statements in both verses can easily be interpreted. Abraham leaves his native country to go into a strange land. When he comes to Canaan, he finds it inhabited by the Canaanites (compare 10:6,15; 9:25 ff). This could have made his faith to fail him. God, accordingly, repeats His promise at this very moment and does so with greater exactness (compare 13:7 with 13:1), and Abraham shows that God can trust his faith (13:7 f). The question whether the Canaanites no longer existed at the time the book was written, has nothing at all to do with the meaning

of these verses. The same is true of 13:7, on account of the presence of the Canaanites and of the Perizzites, which latter tribe had probably come in the meanwhile and is not yet mentioned in Ge 10, but is mentioned in 15:20, and which makes the separation of Abraham and Lot only all the more necessary.

That in Ge 22:2 the land of Moriah is mentioned is claimed by the critics to be a proof that this passage was written after the times of David and even of Solomon, because according to 2Ch 3:1 the temple stood on Mt. Moriah. But as in this latter passage one particular mountain is called Moriah, but in Abraham's time a whole country was so called, it is scarcely possible that Ge 22:2 could have been written at so late a period.

Usually, too, the list of 8 Edomite kings, who ruled before there was a king of Israel, according to Ge 36:31 ff, is cited as a proof that this part was written only after the establishment of the kingdom in Israel, although the time down to the age of Saul would be entirely too long for only eight kings, as already in the Mosaic period there were kings in Edom (Nu 20:14). Then, too, we find in the days of Solomon a hereditary kingdom in Edom (1Ki 11:14), while in Ge 36:31 ff we have to deal with an elective kingdom. Also it would be impossible to understand why this list of kings is carried down only so far and no farther, namely down to the time when there were kings in Israel. This statement can properly be interpreted only in the light of 17:6,16, where the promise is given to Abraham that kings should be found among his descendants (compare also 17:20 with 25:16); and in the light of chapter 14, where Abraham is explicitly brought into connection with kings in a number of ways (with the four kings of the East, whom he conquers; with the five kings of the Jordan valley, whom he assists; with the King's Vale (14:17), which prepared the way for the Melchizedek episode; and with this Priest-King himself, who blesses him and to whom he gives tithes (14:18 ff); with the king of Sodom, whom he rebukes (14:21 ff)). Accordingly, the statement in 36:31 is not merely a dry historical notice, but is a reference to the blessing of God, which is realized in Israel at a much later time than in the kindred tribe of Esau, and which puts the faith of Israel to a new test. As the death of the last Edomite king is not mentioned (compare 36:39 in contrast to the preceding passage and to 1Ch 1:50 f), but as detailed family data are given, we are doubtless dealing here with living contemporaries of Moses, in whose time already the Edomites possessed a kingdom (Nu 20:14; Jud 11:17), just as this was the case with Amalek (Nu 24:7), with Moab (Nu 21:26; 22:4) and Midian (Nu 31:8). And why would a later writer have mentioned neither Selah (Petra), so important in later times (compare Isa 16:1; Jud 1:36; 2Ki 14:7), nor Ezion-Geber (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17 f), among the places given in Ge 36:40 ff? In Moses' time, however, the last-mentioned place was only prairie (Nu 33:35 f).

Just as little is it an argument against the Mosaic times that Hebron is mentioned in Ge 13:18; 23:2, which city, according to Jos 14:15; 15:13, is called Kiriath-arba, a name which Genesis also is acquainted with (compare 23:2), and which in its signification of "city of Arba" points to an originally proper name. Hebron is the older name, which was resumed at a later period, after it had in the meanwhile been supplanted by the Canaanitic name, just as the name of Salem, which occurs already in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, for a period of time gave way to the name of Jebus, but was afterward resumed. That Hebron was an old city and that it existed at a period earlier than the Arba mentioned in Jos 14:15; 15:13, and from whom its later name was derived, can be concluded from Nu 13:22.

Further, the mention of Da in 14:14 does not necessarily favor the view that this chapter did not originate until after Jos 19:47. Jud 18:29, where Leshem or Laish is changed into Da (2Sa 24:6; compare 24:2 and 24:15), does make the existence of another Da probable. Since in Ge 14:2,3,7,17 so many ancient names are mentioned, and as the author is most fully informed as to the conditions of the political complexion of the old nations of that time (14:5-7), it would be incomprehensible if he should not have made use of the ancient names Laish and Leshem. However, if this Da was really meant, we should at most have to deal with a revision, such as that pointed out above. Some other less important arguments against the origin of Genesis from the Mosaic times we can here ignore. The most important argument for the Mosaic origin of the book, in addition to those mentioned under 1, will now be discussed.

VI. Significance.

1. Lays Foundation for the Whole of Revelation:

In the history of the creation the most important feature for us is the fact that the world was created out of nothing (compare Ge 1:1 and the word bara'), which guarantees the absoluteness of God and His perfect control of the entire material world; further, the creation of man, as the crown of all creation, for which all things previously created prepare, and who is to rule over them, but who—most important of all—is created after the image of God in Ge (1:26 f), and whose body has been created by the hand of God and his soul breathed into him by God (2:7). On this fact, too, in the end, is founded the possibility of man's redemption even after the Fall (5:1,3; compare Col 3:9; Eph 4:24), as also the possibility of the incarnation of Jesus Christ, who also is the image of God (Col 1:15; 2Co 4:4). Then, too, another all-important factor for us is the unity of the human race, for thereby is made possible and can be understood the fact that all men have become subject to sin and all can be the recipients of grace (Ro 5:12 ff; 1Co 15:22 f, 45 f). Also the need of redemption is brought out strongly in the Book of Genesis. Compare in connection with the Fall, the pains that shall attend the birth of a child, the cursing of the land, death (3:15 ff), which finds its first victim in Abel, and the monotonous and emphatic repetition of the formula, "and he died," in Ge 5, as characterizing the dismal fate of mankind, and which finds its expression in the rapid decrease of the length of life in the genealogies and in the ages of the patriarchs (5:1 ff; 11:10 ff; 25:7; 35:28; 47:28; 50:26; Ps 90:10), and in the irresistible and increasing power of death. By the side of this, sin at once assumes its most horrible form (Ge 3, doubt, pride, fear, boldness of Eve and Adam), and is propagated and increases; compare the murder and the despair of Cain (Ge 4:1), which is still surpassed by the defiant blasphemy of Lamech (4:23 f); and in the same way, death, which is coming more and more rapidly (see above), is a proof for this, that sin is being more and more intimately interwoven with the human race. Compare further, the corruption of the whole earth, which brings with it as a consequence the judgment of the Deluge (6:5 ff), after the period of grace extending over 120 years had fruitlessly passed by; the lack of reverence on the part of Ham (9:22); the arrogance in connection with the building of the tower of Babel (11:1 ff); the Sodomitic sin in 18:16-19:15; the daughters of Lot (19:30 ff). Still worse is it, that the elect also are not without blame. On Abraham, see IV, 1, 2b; then concerning Noah (9:21) and Lot's fearful drunkenness (19:32 ff); Isaac's and Rebekah's preference for Esau or Jacob (25:28); Jacob's deceptions of various kinds, his preference for Joseph (37:3); the horrible deeds of Simeon and Levi (34:25 ff; 49:5 ff); Reuben's incest (35:22; 49:3 f); the

cruelty of the brethren of Joseph toward him and his father (chapter 37); finally, Joseph's pride and his reporting his brethren (37:2,5 ff). In short, wherever we look, we see in Genesis already a proof for the truth of Ro 3:23, "All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God."

2. Preparation for Redemption:

By the side of this need of salvation there is to be found also the longing for salvation; compare the name of Noah (Ge 5:29), and the word of blessing from the lips of Jacob (Ge 49:18); and, further, the fact that Abraham reaches out after the promised heir in Ge 15-18, and his desire for the possession of the land (12-14; 23; 28:20 ff; 33:19 f); and especially from 47:27 on. And in harmony with this need and this longing for redemption we find above all other things the saving and the promising grace of God. He does not cause the bodily death to follow immediately upon the Fall in Ge 3 (although the beginning of the spiritual death sets in at once with the separation from God); He provides for mankind by Himself making garments for them out of skins (3:21); even the expulsion from Paradise is not merely a punishment; God fears that man might live forever if he should eat from the tree of life (3:22 ff). He sets enmity between the human race and the seed of the serpent, so that at least the possibility of a moral contest yet exists; He strengthens the good in Cain (4:7); He removes the pious Enoch (5:24); He saves Noah and his family and makes a covenant with him (8:21 ff); He gives His promise to Abraham (12:1-3) and makes a covenant with him (chapters 15; 17); He delivers Lot (19:13 ff); He is willing even to preserve Sodom at Abraham's prayer, if there are as many as 10 just men in the city (18:32); He bestows a blessing on Ishmael also (16:10 ff; 17:20; 21:13 ff), and permits Isaac to bless Esau (27:39 ff); but above all He is with Isaac, Jacob and Joseph. It is indeed true that the thought runs through Genesis that not all men are capable of receiving His grace, and that not all are drawn to the Father. Cain's sacrifice is not acceptable before God, as was Abel's; the Cainites with their advance in civilization (4:17 ff), to whom Lamech also belonged, are different from Seth (4:26; 5:1 ff), who continues the line of the elect. Finally, the godly, too, permit themselves to be deceived (6:1 ff), and Noah stands alone in his piety. After that Ham is cursed in his youngest son, Canaan (9:22; compare 10:6); but Shem is blessed to such a degree that his blessing is to extend to Japheth also; cf, further, the elimination from sacred history of Lot (19:29 ff); of Ishmael (25:12 ff), and of Esau (36:1 ff); of Sodom and Gomorrah (chapter 19); then the choice of Jacob in preference to Esau (25:19-37:1); the preference of Ephraim over Manasseh (48:17 ff); the transmission of the Messianic promises to Judah (49:10; compare my book, Messianische Erwartung, 360 f), so that at the close of Genesis we find already the hope of a personal Messiah expressed, in whom also the word (3:15) that was originally spoken to all mankind is to be entirely fulfilled, and in whom also the blessing given to Abraham shall find its significance and realization for the benefit of all mankind (12:3, and see above, 1, 2 and 3). But in the history of Abraham this fact also becomes clear, that in the end this was all grace on the part of God, and faith on the part of man; and because both grace and faith are in Genesis placed and emphasized at the very beginning of the history of mankind, and before the giving of the law (Ex 19); then this grace and faith cannot be abrogated through the latter or made ineffective. Not by works but by faith is man saved (compare Ga 3:2; Ro 4; Heb 11:8 ff; Jas 2:21 ff). But the guidance of individuals and of His people by God, the ways which He took with His elect, become clear and intelligible ultimately in the history of Joseph; and all and everything must in the end serve the good of those who are His.

LITERATURE.

Against the separation into documents we mention, of older works: Havernick, Specielle Einleitung in den Pent; Hengstenberg, Beitrage zur Einleitung, II, III; Keil, Einleitung in das Altes Testament, and his Commentary on Gen; Ewald, Die Komposition der Genesis. Of later works: Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Eerdmans, Die Komposition der Genesis; Moller, Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung. Against the evolutionary theory: Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Wiener, Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism and Wiener, Origin of the Pentateuch; Green, Unity of Book of Genesis; Moller, Die Entwicklung der alttestamentlichen Gottesidee in vorexilischer Zeit (here also further lit.). On modern archaeological researches: Orr, Problem of the Old Testament; Jeremias, Das Altes Testament im Lichte des alten Orients; Urquhart, Die neueren Entdeckungen und die Bibel (to be used with caution; the work is reliable in the facts but not careful in its conclusions and in its account of Old Testament criticism). Further, compare the histories of Israel by Kohler, Konig, Kittel, Oettli, Klostermann, Stade, Wellhausen: the Commentaries on Genesis by Keil, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Lange, Strack, Gunkel, Holzinger; the Introductions to the Old Testament by Kuenen, Strack, Baudissin, Konig, Cornill, Driver; the Biblical Theologies by Marti, Smend, Budde, Schulz, Oehler. Finally compare Sievers, Metrische Studien, II: "Die hebraische Genesis."

Wilhelm Moller

GENNAEUS; GENNEUS

ge-ne’-us, ge-ne’-us (Gennaios): Father of Apollonius, one of the Syrian generals who troubled the Jews while Lysias was governor for Antiochus Eupator (2 Macc 12:2). The description is added to distinguish the Apollonius here mentioned from several others of the same name. See APOLLONIUS. There is no need with Luther to take the name simply as an adjective "des edlen Apollonius." The name occurs elsewhere as a proper name.

GENNESARET, LAKE OF

ge-nes’-a-ret

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

GENNESARET, LAND OF

ge-nes’-a-ret he ge Gennesaret):

1. The Name:

The first syllable of the name Gennesaret is evidently the Hebrew gan, "garden"; while the second may

be a proper name. Possibly, however, the name may represent the Hebrew ganne sarim, "princely gardens." It is applied to a district on the Northwest shore of the Sea of Galilee (Mt 14:34; Mr 6:53), now known as el-Ghuweir, "little Ghor." It curves round from el-Mejdel in the South, to ‘Ain et-Tineh, or Khan Minyeh, in the North, a distance of over 3 miles, with an average breadth from the sea to the foot of the mountains of about a mile. The soil is deep, rich loam, of amazing fertility. In the South it is watered by the stream from Wady el-Chamam, the gorge that opens to the West of el-Mejdel.

2. Water:

The middle portion is supplied from ‘Ain el-Madawwerah, a copious fountain near the western edge of the plain, round which a wall has been built, to raise the level of the water; and from the perennial stream, Wady er-Rubadiyeh, which drives a mill before starting on its work of irrigation. Farther North, Wady el-‘Amud brings down much water in the rainy season. The water from ‘Ain et-Tabgha was brought round the promontory at ‘Ain et-Tineh by a conduit cut in the rock. It was used to drive certain mills, and also to refresh the neighboring land. This seems to be the fountain called "Capharnaum" by Josephus (BJ, III, x, 8). This writer extols the productiveness of the plain. He says the "soil is so fruitful that all sorts of trees can grow upon it."

3. Fertility:

The walnut, the palm, the olive and the fig, which usually require diverse conditions, flourish together here. "One may call this place the ambition of nature; .... it is a happy contention of the seasons, as if each of them claimed this country; for it not only nourishes different sorts of autumnal fruit beyond men’s expectation, but preserves them a great while." He says that it supplies grapes and figs through ten months of the year, and other fruits as they ripen together throughout the year (same place) . The fruits of Gennesaret had such high repute among the rabbis that they were not allowed in Jerusalem at the time of the feasts, lest any might be tempted to come merely for their enjoyment (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 45 f).

Centuries of neglect made a sad change in the plain. It was largely overgrown with thorn-bushes, and it yielded one of the finest crops of thistles in the country. Cultivation was confined to the Southwest part; and the rest furnished grazing ground for a tribe of nomads. Recently the German Catholics made extensive purchases, including the village of el-Mejdel. Considerable portions have also passed into the hands of Jews. The land is almost entirely cleared, and it rewards the toil of the husbandman with all its ancient generosity.

W. Ewing

GENTILES

jen’-tilz (goy, plural goyim; ethnos, "people," "nation"): Goy (or Goi) is rendered "Gentiles" in the King James Version in some 30 passages, but much more frequently "heathen," and oftener still, "nation,"

which latter is the usual rendering in the Revised Version (British and American), but it, is commonly used for a non-Israelitish people, and thus corresponds to the meaning of Gentiles." It occurs, however, in passages referring to the Israelites, as in Ge 12:2; De 32:28; Jos 3:17; 4:1; 10:13; 2Sa 7:23; Isa 1:4; Ze 2:9, but the word (‘am) is the term commonly used for the people of God. In the New Testament ethnos is the word corresponding to goy in the Old Testament and is rendered "Gentiles" by both VSS, while (laos) is the word which corresponds to ‘am. The King James Version also renders Hellenes, "Gentiles" in six passages (Joh 7:35; Ro 2:9,10; 3:9; 1Co 10:32; 12:13), but the Revised Version (British and American) renders "Greeks."

The Gentiles were far less sharply differentiated from the Israelites in Old Testament than in New Testament times. Under Old Testament regulations they were simply non-Israelites, not from the stock of Abraham, but they were not hated or despised for that reason, and were to be treated almost on a plane of equality, except certain tribes in Canaan with regard to whom there were special regulations of non-intercourse. The Gentile stranger enjoyed the hospitality of the Israelite who was commanded to love him (De 10:19), to sympathize with him, "For ye know the heart of the stranger, seeing ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Ex 23:9 the King James Version). The Kenites were treated almost as brethren, especially the children of Rechab (Jud 1:16; 5:24; Jer 35). Uriah the Hittite was a trusted warrior of David (2Sa 11); Ittai the Gittite was captain of David’s guard (2Sa 18:2); Araunah the Jebusite was a respected resident of Jerusalem. The Gentiles had the right of asylum in the cities of refuge, the same as the Israelites (Nu 35:15). They might even possess Israelite slaves (Le 25:47), and a Gentileservant must not be defrauded of his wage (De 24:15). They could inherit in Israel even as late as the exile (Eze 47:22,23). They were allowed to offer sacrifices in the temple at Jerusalem, as is distinctly affirmed by Josephus (BJ, II, xvii, 2- 4; Ant, XI, viii, 5; XIII, viii, 2; XVI, ii, 1; XVIII, v, 3; CAp, II, 5), and it is implied in the Levitical law (Le 22:25). Prayers and sacrifices were to be offered for Gentilerulers (Jer 29:7; Baruch 1:10,11; Ezr 6:10; 1 Macc 7:33; Josephus, BJ, II, x, 4). Gifts might be received from them (2 Macc 5:16; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iii, 4; XVI, vi, 4; BJ, V, xiii, 6; CAp, II, 5). But as we approach the Christian era the attitude of the Jews toward the Gentiles changes, until we find, in New Testament times, the most extreme aversion, scorn and hatred. They were regarded as unclean, with whom it was unlawful to have any friendly intercourse. They were the enemies of God and His people, to whom the knowledge of God was denied unless they became proselytes, and even then they could not, as in ancient times, be admitted to full fellowship. Jews were forbidden to counsel them, and if they asked about Divine things they were to be cursed. All children born of mixed marriages were bastards. That is what caused the Jews to be so hated by Greeks and Romans, as we have abundant evidence in the writings of Cicero, Seneca and Tacitus. Something of this is reflected in the New Testament (Joh 18:28; Ac 10:28; 11:3).

If we inquire what the reason of this change was we shall find it in the conditions of the exiled Jews, who suffered the bitterest treatment at the hands of their Gentile captors and who, after their return and establishment in Judea, were in constant conflict with neighboring tribes and especially with the Greek rulers of Syria. The fierce persecution of Antiochus IV, who attempted to blot out their religion and Hellenize the Jews, and the desperate struggle for independence, created in them a burning patriotism and zeal for their faith which culminated in the rigid exclusiveness we see in later times.

H. Porter

GENTILES, COURT OF THE

See TEMPLE.

GENTILES, ISLES OF THE

See ISLES OF THE GENTILES.

GENTLENESS

jen’-t’-l-nes (‘anah; epieikeia, chrestotes): In 2Sa 22:36 ‘anah, "to bend low," "to condescend," is translated "gentleness," "Thy gentleness hath made me great," the Revised Version, margin "or condescension"; so also Ps 18:35, where the word is ‘anwah "humility," "gentleness," or "condescension." In the New Testament epieikeia ("fairness," "moderation," in Ac 24:4 translated "clemency") is in 2Co 10:1 translated "gentleness," "the meekness and gentleness of Christ" (2 Macc 2:22 "favour," the Revised Version (British and American) "forbearance"); chrestotes, "kindness," "usefulness," is translated "gentleness" in Ga 5:22 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "kindness"; chrestos is the word translated "kind" (to the unthankful and evil, Lu 6:35), and chrestotes seems to carry in it a similar idea of active kindness.

Gentle occurs in the Old Testament only in the Revised Version (British and American) of Jer 11:19, "I was like a gentle lamb" (kebhes). In the New Testament it is the translation of epios, "mild," "gentle" (1Th 2:7; 2Ti 2:24), and of epieikes, "fitting" "proper," etc. (1Ti 3:3 the Revised Version (British and American); Tit 3:2; Jas 3:17; 1Pe 2:18); also, with article, Php 4:5 (the King James Version "moderation," the Revised Version (British and American) "forbearance"). In 2 Macc 15:12 Onias is said (the King James Version) to be "gentle (praos) in condition," the Revised Version (British and American) "in manner."

W. L. Walker

GENUBATH

ge-nu’-bath (genubhath, "theft"): Son of Hadad, the fugitive Edomite prince, born and brought up at the court of Egypt, whither Hadad had fled when David conquered Edom (1Ki 11:20). His mother was a sister of Tahpenes, queen of the Pharaoh who ruled Egypt at that time, and who belonged to the notoriously weak and uninfluential 21st dynasty.

GEOGRAPHY

je-og’-ra-fi.

See PALESTINE; TABLE OF NATIONS; WORLD.

GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE

je-ol’-o-ji, The geology of Palestine cannot be discussed intelligently without taking into consideration the surrounding regions. The accompanying map shows, with considerable freedom, the distribution of the superficial strata of Syria, Palestine and Sinai, with parts of Asia Minor, Arabia and Egypt. (Data for this map were obtained from the "Geological Map of Egypt" (1:1,000,000) and from the "Carte geologique internationale de l’Europe" (1:1,500,000).) It will be noted that Crystalline, or Archean, rocks (A) occupy extensive areas in Asia Minor, and that they are found in the South in Sinai, Western Arabia, and Eastern and Southern Egypt. Relatively small areas of Paleozoic rocks (P) adjoin the Crystalline rocks in Sinai and Arabia and East of Caesarea in Asia Minor. A notable area of Paleozoic occurs Southeast of the Dead Sea. This is also adjacent to Crystalline rocks, which could not be indicated on the map on account of their slight superficial extent. Bordering either the Crystalline or the Paleozoic rocks in Egypt, Sinai and Arabia are large areas of Nubian Sandstone (N). The Nubian Sandstone in turn is generally bounded by Upper Cretaceous limestone (C), and the last by Tertiary deposits (T). The Quaternary, or Recent, deposits (R) and also the Eruptive rocks (E) sustain no constant relations to any particular ones of the other formations. The Quaternary follows the great rivers and the seacoasts. The Eruptive rocks usually overlie the others. They occupy extensive areas in Asia Minor, Syria and Arabia.

If we concentrate our attention upon the Crystalline, Cretaceous, and Tertiary, which are the most extensive formations, we find that the Crystalline rocks are abundant in the South and in the North, that the Cretaceous are most widely spread in Palestine and Southern Syria, and the Tertiary in Northern Syria and Egypt. We may believe that the Crystalline areas of the North and South have been land since the end of the Archean age, and that what are now Syria, Palestine and most of Egypt remained sea for a long time afterward. The Paleozoic areas were lifted above the sea and added to the northern and southern land areas during or at the end of the Paleozoic era. The regions in which we find Nubian Sandstone or Upper Cretaceous limestone became land by the end of the Mesozoic era. Finally the Tertiary areas were lifted out of the sea. During the Quaternary period the Nile and the rivers of Mesopotamia have added large areas to the land surface.

1. Crystalline Rocks (A):

The Crystalline rocks consist mainly of granite and crystalline schists, frequently interrupted with dikes of porphyry, diorite and other eruptives. It will be seen by the map that the Crystalline rocks are nowhere adjacent to the Mediterranean, but that they touch the Nile at Acwan, where the river in pouring over these rocks makes the First Cataract, or rather did before the construction of the great dam. Granite quarried at Acwan could be loaded on boats and conveyed to any city on the shores of the Mediterranean, and it is the granite of Acwan of which are composed not only many of the monuments

of Egypt, but also the pillars which adorned many temples in Syria and Palestine.

2. Paleozoic Rocks (P):

The Paleozoic rocks of Sinai and Arabia are of Carboniferous age, but do not include any beds of coal. Those East of Caesarea are Devonian. Those Southeast of the Dead Sea are the oldest of all, being of Cambrian age.

3. Triassic and Jurassic Rocks (Jahwist):

Several formations which are well developed in the British Islands, are not found in Palestine, but a small Triassic area is found near the Gulf of Alexandretta, while Jurassic strata are found in the region of Hermon and in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon. The small scale of the accompanying map makes it impossible to represent accurately the extent of these rocks.

4. Nubian Sandstone (N):

This name was given by Russegger, who in the middle of the 19th century followed and studied this formation from the Sudan to Syria. Wherever the Nubian Sandstone is found in contact with the Upper Cretaceous limestone it underlies the latter conformably. In Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon and Hermon (but not farther South) it is conformably underlaid by Jurassic limestone. It follows, therefore, that its upper strata (the only ones found in the North) must be of Lower or Middle Cretaceous age. In the South, however, the Jurassic limestone is entirely absent. In Western Sinai the Nubian Sandstone rests conformably on Carboniferous limestone, and by the Dead Sea on Cambrian limestone, while at Petra and at many other places it rests unconformably on Crystalline rocks. While the consideration of the age of the Nubian Sandstone presents no difficulty in Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon and Hermon, it is a very different matter in Western Sinai, and by the Dead Sea. Sandstone is generally supposed to be formed more rapidly than most other rocks. It is, therefore, rather staggering to try to conceive of even the 2,000 ft. of sandstone at the Southeast end of the Dead Sea as having been in process of formation from the Cambrian to the Cretaceous. The Nubian Sandstone is commonly brown or reddish, but in places shows great variety of color. The temples and tombs of Petra were all carved in this rock. It is in places very friable, and in others compact and hard. The sands of the Arabian deserts have been in the main derived from it, being carried by the prevailing west winds. Where it is covered by a sheet of eruptive rock (charrah), it is protected from erosion, with the result that the land to the East is not converted into a sandy desert (Hogarth, Penetration of Arabia). It frequently includes strata of clay and shale and thin seams of coal or lignite, and must have been deposited in seas which were at the time relatively shallow.

5. Upper Cretaceous Limestone (C):

This is the principal rock of Palestine, Lebanon, and Anti-Lebanon. Many of its strata are very fossiliferous, and no doubt exists as to its age. It furnishes the best of building stone and is a source of lime. The soils formed from it are fertile, and the mountain sides have been terraced by the patient labor

of centuries.

6. Tertiary Rocks (T):

A notable Tertiary fossil is the Nummulite, which occurs in abundance in the rock of the pyramids of Gizeh and in other places. Relatively small masses of Tertiary strata (not shown on the map) are found on the coast at the mouths of the principal streams of Lebanon, showing that while the mass of Lebanon had risen from the sea by the beginning of the Tertiary, the elevation was not complete. The principal river courses had, however, already been formed, and the streams were already carrying into the sea the scourings of the rocks of early Lebanon, which were being laid down to form these Tertiary strata.

7. Quaternary and Recent Strata (R):

These consist mainly of the superficial deposits of the Nile, the Euphrates and other large streams. At various points along the coast of Syria and Palestine are extensive sand dunes. Frequently under the loose sand, or exposed, is found a sandstone which instead of being entirely siliceous, like most sandstones, is partly calcareous, containing from 15 to 25 per cent of calcium-carbonate. This is probably an aeolian formation, i.e. consolidated under the influence of the atmosphere, and not formed under the sea, like most stratified rocks. It is easily worked and is much used for building.

8. Palestine:

It may be gathered from the foregoing statements that the rocks of Palestine are mainly Cretaceous. The Jurassic limestone, which in Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon underlies the Nubian Sandstone, is absent in Palestine, but, at least in Eastern Palestine, as in Lebanon, we find the Upper Cretaceous limestone to be underlaid by the Nubian Sandstone. A striking feature of the geology of Palestine is the Jordan valley fault. At some time, probably at the beginning of the Tertiary period, when Lebanon, Anti-Lebanon, and the Judean hills were being lifted out of the sea, the earth’s crust was rent for at least several hundred miles along a line nearly North and South, or more exactly from a little West of South to a little East of North. This line runs through the Gulf of ‘Aqabah, the Wadi-‘Arabah, the Dead Sea, the Jordan valley, the Sea of Tiberias, the Chuleh, and the valley between Hermon and Anti-Lebanon on the one hand and Lebanon on the other. The resulting disturbance of the strata is most evident in the region of the Dead Sea. There is no evidence that the two walls of the fissure separated from one another, but the East wall slipped up and the West wall down for perhaps 2,000 ft, so that on the East shore of the Dead Sea and in the valleys entering the Jordan, Dead Sea, and ‘Arabah from the East, the Nubian Sandstone is exposed, underlying the Upper Cretaceous limestone, while on the West side, even down to the level of the Dead Sea, 1,290 ft. below the Mediterranean, the Nubian Sandstone is nowhere visible, although it may be presumed to exist there also below the upper limestone. (See the accompanying ideal section, after Lartet, through Judea, the Dead Sea and Moab.) The great fault and the subsidiary faults which accompany it occasioned the outpourings of igneous rock which are abundant along the line of the fault. The numerous hot springs (e.g. Tiberins, Wadi-Yarmuk, Wadi-Zarqa-Ma‘in (Callirrhoe), Wadi-ul-Chisa) may be due to subterranean streams of water coming in contact with deeply buried and still

heated masses of igneous rock.

Alfred Ely Day

GEON

ge’-on.

See GIHON (Apocrypha).

GEPHYRUN

ge-fi’-run (Gephuroun): In 2 Macc 12:13, referring to the capture by Judas of a stronghold East of Jordan, the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "And he also fell upon a certain city Gephyrun, ... it was named Gaspin." There appears to be some confusion in the text. There is nothing to indicate the relation between the two names. the King James Version renders, "He went also about to make a bridge." The name of the city in Josephus (Ant., XII, viii, 5) is EPHRON (which see).

GERA

ge’-ra (gera’," grain"): A family name of the tribe of Benjamin, hence, not necessarily a separate individual in (3) and (4) below:

(1) A son of Benjamin (Ge 46:21).

(2) According to 1Ch 8:3,5,7, son of Bela and grandson of Benjamin. The name is repeated (8:5) in the list of Bela’s sons.

(3) Father, or ancestor, of the judge Ehud (Jud 3:15).

(4) Father, or ancestor, of Shimei, the Benjamite, who cursed David when he fled from Absalom (2Sa 16:5; 19:16,18; 1Ki 2:8).

GERAH

ge’-ra (gerah, "grain" or "kernel"): A weight, the 20th part of a shekel (Ex 30:13; Le 27:25; Nu 3:47; 18:16; Eze 45:12).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

GERAR

ge’-rar (gerar, "circle," "region"; Gerara): A town in the Philistine plain South of Gaza (Ge 10:19), where both Abraham and Isaac’sojourned for a time, and where they came into contact with Abimelech, king of Gerar (Ge 20 and 26, passim). The place has not been fully identified, but the site is probably in one of the branches of Wady Sheri‘a, at a place called Um Jerrar, near the coast Southwest of Gaza and 9 miles from it (SWP, III, 389-90). The site answers fairly well to the statements of Eusebius and Jerome, Eusebius, Onomasticon, that it was 25 (Roman) miles South of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin). It is actually 30 English miles, but distances were not very accurately determined in early times. Gerar was known in the first 5 centuries AD, when it was the seat of a bishopric, and its bishop, Marcian, attended the Council of Chalcedon 451 AD, It was also the seat of a monastery.

The statements in Ge indicate that Gerar belonged to the Philistines, and we are led to infer that Abimelech was king of that people, but it is quite certain that they did not occupy this region until after the time of Abraham, in fact only a short time before the Exodus. It is probable, however, that the writer of Ge would refer to the country as it was known in his day. The town certainly existed in the Philistine period, for it is mentioned in connection with Asa, who defeated the Ethiopian host under Zerar and pursued them in their flight unto Gerar (2Ch 14:13). Besides the locality of Um Jerrar, another place in the vicinity known as Jurf el-Jerrar has been thought by some to be the site of Gerar. Jerrar in Arabic means "jars," and it is doubtful whether it represents the Hebrew Gerar. Jurf means usually "steep declivity," or "precipice," and at the place mentioned many fragments of pottery were found, but this does not necessarily indicate the site of an ancient town. The site of Gerar is discussed in Thomson’s LB, I, 196-99 (ed. 1882); Robinson’s BR, II, 43-44; PEFS, 1871, 84; 1875, 162-64; 1881, 38.

H. Porter

GERASA; GERASENES

ger’-a-sa, ger’-a-senz (Gerasa; Gerasenon):

1. Country of the Gerasenes:

The town itself is not named in Scripture, and is referred to only in the expression, "country of the Gerasenes" (Mr 5:1; Lu 8:26,37; see Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Appendix, 11). This describes the district in which Christ met and healed the demoniac from the tombs, where also took place the destruction of the swine. It was on the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, and must have been a locality where the steep edges of the Bashan plateau drop close upon the brink of the lake. This condition is fulfilled only by the district immediately South of Wady Semak, North of Qal ‘at el-Chucn. Here the slopes descend swiftly almost into the sea, and animals, once started on the downward run, could not avoid plunging into the depths. Many ancient tombs are to be seen in the face of the hills. Gerasa itself is probably represented by the ruins of Kurseh on the South side of Wady Semak, just where it opens on the seashore. The ruins of the town are not considerable; but there are remains of a

strong wall which must have surrounded the place. Traces of ancient buildings in the vicinity show that there must have been a fairly numerous population in the district.

2. History:

The great and splendid city in the Decapolis is first mentioned as taken after a siege by Alexander Janneus, 85 BC (BJ, I, iv, 8). Josephus names it as marking the eastern limit of Peraea (BJ, III, iii, 3). He calls the inhabitants Syrians, when, at the beginning of the Jewish revolt, the district round Gerasa was laid waste. The Syrians made reprisals, and took many prisoners. With these, however, the Gerasenes dealt mercifully, letting such as wished go free, and escorting them to the border (BJ, II, xviii, 1, 5). Lucius Annius, at the instance of Vespasian, sacked and burned the city, with much slaughter (BJ, IV, ix, 1). From this disaster it appears soon to have recovered, and the period of its greatest prosperity lay, probably, in the 2nd and 3nd centuries of our era. It became the seat of a bishopric, and one of its bishops attended the Council of Chalcedon. Reland (Pal, II, 806) notes certain extant coins of Gerasa, from which it is clear that in the 2nd century it was a center of the worship of Artemis. It was besieged by Baldwin II, in 1121 AD. Mention is made of the strength of the site and the mighty masonry of its walls. William of Tyre calls the city Jarras, and places it 16 miles East of Jordan (Hist, xii, 16). The distance is about 19 miles from the river. It was conquered by the Moslems in the time of Omar (Guy le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 462). The sultan of Damascus is said to have fortified it; but there is nothing to show that the Moslems occupied it for any length of time.

3. Description:

Modern Jerash lies on both banks of Wady Jerash, about 6 miles from its confluence with Wady ez-Zerqa (the Jabbok). It is almost 20 miles from Amman (Philadelphia), and 22 from Fahil (Pella). The ruins are wide and imposing and are better preserved than any others on the East of Jordan. They include several splendid temples, theaters, basilica, palaces and baths, with hippodrome and naumachia. The triumphal arch to the South of the city is almost entire. Two paved streets with double colonnades cut through the city at right angles, four massive pedestals still marking the point of intersection. An excellent account of the ruins is given in Thomson’s LB, III, 558 ff.

There is nothing above ground of older date than the 2nd and 3rd centuries of our era; but there is no reason to doubt that the Greek city of Gerasa stood on the same site. The presence of a copious spring of sweet water makes it probable that the site has been occupied from olden time; but no trace remains of any ancient city. Some would identify the place with RAMOTH-GILEAD, which see.

The site is now occupied by a colony of Circassians, and there is reason to fear that, unless something is done to preserve them, many valuable remains of antiquity will perish.

W. Ewing

GERGESENES

gur’-ge-senz, gur-ge-senz’:A false reading of "Gadarenes" retained in the King James Version of Mt 8:28.

See GADARA.

GERIZIM, MOUNT

ger’-i-zim, ge-ri’-zim (har gerizzim):

1. Scriptural References:

Named in the directions for the reading of the law (De 11:29), and in the account of that great ceremony (De 27:12; Jos 8:33 f). Mts. Ebal and Gerizim stood over against each other, and on their sides the peoples were placed, half upon one and half upon the other, while in the vale which separates the mountains stood the ark, with the Levites. Those who stood on Gerizim responded to the blessings, those on Mt. Ebal to the cursings, as these were spoken "with a loud voice" by the Levites. From a spur of Mt. Gerizim Jotham spoke his taunting parable to the men of Shechem (Jud 9:7). The name appears no more in canonical Scripture. In consequence of the dispute which arose over the marriage of Manasseh, who belonged to the high-priestly family, with a daughter of Sanballat the Horonite (Ne 13:28), a temple was built on Gerizim as a rival to that in Jerusalem (circa 432 BC). This was the beginning of the schism which lasts to the present day (Ant., XI, viii, 2, 4). See SAMARITANS. The temple was destroyed by John Hyrcanus circa 110 BC (Ant., XIII, ix, 1; BJ, I, ii, 6).

2. Description:

Mt. Gerizim, the modern Jebel et-Tur, stands on the South, Mt. Ebal on the North, of the narrow pass which cuts through the mountain range, opening a way from the sea to the Jordan. In the throat of this pass to the West, on the South of the vale, and close to the foot of Gerizim, lies the town of Nablus, the ancient Shechem. Here copious fountains rise, filling the valley with beauty and fruitfulness. The sides of the mountain are steep and rocky on East and North; on the West the ascent is more gradual, and here, by means of a system of terraces carried almost to the summit, it is cultivated with great care and success. Its height is 2,849 ft. above the level of the sea, 228 ft. lower than its northern companion.

3. Samaritan Traditions:

Abraham came through the pass and camped near Gerizim at the oak of Moreh (Ge 12:6). According to Samaritan tradition it was on this mountain that he prepared to sacrifice Isaac, and at Salem, not far distant, he met Melchizedek (Ge 14:17). The scene of Jacob’s dream is placed at Khirbet Lauzeh on the summit (Ge 28:11 f). In a little hollow West of the ridge, the Samaritans annually celebrate the Passover in accordance with the directions of the Pentateuch. This is done in the open air, their temple having long since disappeared.

4. Antiquities:

The most important remains on the mountain today are those of Justinian's fortress, built in 533 AD, to protect the church which had been erected in 475 AD. Near the center of the plateau is a bare piece of rock, on which, tradition says, the altar stood in the Samaritan temple. A cup-like hollow in it may have been used for libations. In the western wall of el-Qal'ah, Justinian's castle, there are 12 stones under which, it is said, are the stones which Israel took from the bed of the Jordan (Jos 4:20).

Gerizim was certainly "this mountain" pointed to by the woman of Samaria in her conversation with Jesus (Joh 4:20 f); the cliffs of the mountain almost overhanging the Well of Jacob.

For the reason why Gerizim was chosen for the blessing and Ebal for the cursing we are left to conjecture. The directions were fixed by one looking to the East, not, as with us, looking to the North. For one standing in the valley, therefore, Gerizim was on the right hand, "the side of good fortune" (Driver, Deuteronomy on 11:28).

Onom places Ebal and Gerizim much nearer the Jordan valley. This was doubtless to meet the difficulty raised by the long distance from Ai to Shechem. But their nearness to the "oaks of Moreh" (De 11:30) points to this locality, and this is confirmed by Josephus, who speaks of Shechem, the metropolis of the Samaritans, as "a city situated at Mt. Gerizim" (Ant., XI, viii, 6).

Andronicus, appointed governor of Gerizim by Antiochus Epiphanes, is mentioned in 2 Macc 5:23 (the King James Version "Garizim").

W. Ewing

GERON

ge'-run (Geron): Not much seems to be gained by translating with the Revised Version, margin "Geron, an Athenian," for "an old man of Athens" in 2 Macc 6:1.

GERRENIANS

ge-re'-ni-anz (heos ton Gerrenon): The name indicates the southern limit of the territory assigned by Antiochus Eupator to the government of Judas Maccabeus when he "left Hegemonides governor from Ptolemais even unto the Gerrenians" (2 Macc 13:24, the King James Version "Gerrhenians"). It is not easy to say exactly who the Gerrenians were. They were wrongly associated by Grotius with the town Gerrha, and are with more probability connected with the ancient city of Gerar, Southeast of Gaza. One manuscript reads Gerarenon, which could easily be corrupted into Gerrenon, and would place the government of Hegemonides between Ptolemais and Gerar.

J. Hutchison

GERSHOM

gur’-shom (gereshom, from garash, "to cast out"; explained, however, in Ex 2:22 and 18:3 as from gur, "For he said, I have been a sojourner in a foreign land"):

(1) Firstborn son of Moses and Zipporah. The only details of his life contained in the Pentateuch are the account of his circumcision (Ex 4:25), and his remaining under the care of Jethro, while Moses was in Egypt leading the Exodus. His descendants were numbered among the tribes of Levi (1Ch 23:14). One of them apparently was the Jonathan who officiated as priest of the idolatrous sanctuary at Dan, and whose descendants held the office until the captivity. The Massoretic Text inserts a suspended nun, "n," in the name of Moses (mosheh), causing it to be lead Manasseh, for the purpose, according to tradition, of disguising the name out of respect for the revered Lawgiver. Another descendant described as a "son" was Shebuel, a ruler over the treasuries of David.

(2) A son of Levi, so called in 1Ch 6:16,17,20,43,12,71 (Hebrew 1,2,5,28,47,56); 15:7; elsewhere GERSHON (which see).

(3) A descendant of Phinehas, the head of a father’s house, who journeyed with Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem in the reign of Artaxerxes (Ezr 8:2).

Ella Davis Isaacs

GERSHON; GERSHONITES

gur’-shon, gur’-shon-its (gereshon, written also gereshom): Firstborn of the 3 sons of Levi (Ex 6:16; Nu 3:17; 1Ch 6:1,16; 23:6). He had two sons, Libni, also known as Ladan (1Ch 23:7; 26:21), and Shimei (Ex 6:17; Nu 3:18; 1Ch 6:17,20), and consequently two groups of descendants, enumerated in the census taken in the Wilderness of Sinai (Nu 3:21) and that in the Plains of Moab (Nu 26:57). In the distribution of functions among the Levites, the Gershonites were charged with the carrying of the curtains, coverings, screens, hangings, cords and instruments of the tabernacle and the tent of meeting on the journeys in the wilderness, under the supervision of Ithamar the son of Aaron. Their function was thus more exalted than that of the Merarites, who carried the boards, and less so than that of the Kohathites, who carried the most holy utensils and symbols. The Gershonites were given two wagons with four oxen —half as many as the Merarites, according to their service (Nu 7:7). Thirteen cities were assigned to the Gershonites in Northern Palestine by Eleazar and Joshua (Jos 21:6,27-33,6:62,71-76).

Among the Gershonites who achieved distinction in later Biblical times was the family of Asaph, the singers from the time of David to the days of the Second Temple (1Ch 6:31-47; 25:1-7; 15:7,17,19; 16:5,7; 2Ch 25:15; Ezr 2:41; 3:10; Ne 11:17,22; 12:35; 1Ch 9:15). Other Gershonites named are the

heads of the fathers' houses in the days of David in connection with the dividing of the Levites into courses (1Ch 23:7-11); the superintendents of the treasuries of the house of the Lord of the same time (1Ch 26:21,22; 29:8); and, finally, Gershonites are mentioned among those who cleansed the house of the Lord in the days of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12,13).

Ella Davis Isaacs

GERSON

gur'-sun (Gerson; 1 Esdras 8:29): Called Gershom in Ezr 8:2.

GERUTH CHIMHAM

ge'-rooth kim'-ham (geruth kimham): If the reading geruth is correct, a "lodging-place" or "khan" on the highway to Egypt, may be meant (Jer 41:17). It may have been built by Chimham son of Barzillai; or it may have been named from him as owner of the land on which it stood. But probably with Josephus we should read gidhroth, "hurdles" or "sheep pens" (Ant., X, ix, 5).

GERZITES

gur'-zits (1Sa 27:8 King James Version margin).

See GIRZITES.

GESHAN

ge'-shan (geshan, "firm," "strong"): A descendant of Judah through Caleb (1Ch 2:47). The King James Version has "Gesham," but not in the original 1611 edition.

GESHEM

ge'-shem (geshem, gashmu; Gesam, "rain storm"): An Arabian, probably chief of an Arabian tribe that had either settled in Southern Palestine during the exile in Babylon, or had been settled in or near Samaria by Sargon (Ne 2:19; 6:1,2,6). He was a confederate of Sanballat and Tobiah, and strenuously opposed the building of the wall under Nehemiah. He with the others mocked at the first efforts to build the wall, and afterward repeatedly sought to entice Nehemiah to the plains of Ono. The name also occurs in the form Gashmu, perhaps an Assyrian form of the same name Geshem.

J. J. Reeve

GESHUR

ge’-shur (geshur, "bridge"): An Aramean kingdom (2Sa 15:8) of no great size which lay probably to the South of Maacah, and formed with it the western boundary of the land of Bashan (De 3:14; Jos 12:5; 13:11). The territory of these two probably corresponded roughly with modern Jaulan. It may not have reached quite to the Jordan on the West; in which case the Geshurites literally dwelt "in the midst" of Israel (Jos 13:13), since they were not expatriated by the half-tribe of Manasseh, and they retained their independence. David married Maacah, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, who became the mother of Absalom and Tamar (2Sa 3:3). To Talmai Absalom fled for safety after the murder of Amnon (2Sa 13:37 f), and thence Joab brought him back to Jerusalem (2Sa 14:23). The Geshurites and Aram are said to have taken the cities of Jair—i.e. Havvoth-jair—which lay in the land of Gilead (1Ch 2:23). It is possible that "Geshurites" should be read, with Vulgate, Syriac, etc., instead of "Ashurites" in 2Sa 2:9. The only difficulty is that Geshur was an independent kingdom, and there is nothing to show how it was brought under the sway of the son of Saul. In the catalogue of land still to be possessed in Jos 13:2, the King James Version reads "Geshuri," the Revised Version (British and American) "the Geshurites," referring evidently to a district bordering on the Philistines. Both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render the same word by "Geshurites" in 1Sa 27:8, where apparently the same territory is indicated as invaded by David. In neither passage is the text above suspicion; in 1Sa 27:8 Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus omits the name. No satisfactory explanation has been suggested.

W. Ewing

GESHURITES

gesh’-u-rits, ge-shoo’-rits (geshuri). See preceding article.

GESTURE

jes’-tur, jes’-tur: The Oriental is rich in gestures by which feelings are expressed and force added to words. Of this we have abundant illustration in the Bible. Almost every available part of the body was employed in gesture. In salutations the whole body was bowed, sometimes to the ground (Ge 18:2; 19:1; 33:7; 42:6; 33:3), falling on the face to the ground and bowing to the ground, 3 times (1Sa 20:41; Ge 23:7; 2Sa 9:8; 18:21; 1Ki 2:19); it was common also to embrace and kiss (Ex 18:7), etc., weeping for joy. Esau "fell on (Jacob’s) neck, and kissed him: and they wept" (Ge 33:4); compare Joseph and his brethren (Ge 45:14,15); David and Jonathan (1Sa 20:41), and the father of the prodigal (Lu 15:20). We have the kiss also in the story of Judas with his Master (Mt 26:49). Bowing the knee was also in Egypt an act of homage to a superior (Ge 41:43); bowing the knee and bowing down were common in prayer and worship (1Ki 19:18; 2Ch 6:13; Ezr 9:5; Isa 45:23); in prayer the head and whole body were also bowed (Ge 24:26; 2Ki 5:18; 2Ch 29:28 f). The rabbins decreed that in prayer "in bowing down, the back must be bent so low that every vertebra becomes conspicuous," and endless questions arose as to what it was lawful to do during prayer (Edersheim). We read also of prayer offered standing (1Sa 1:26; 1Ki

8:22; Mt 6:5; Mr 11:25), lifting up and spreading forth the hands (1Ki 8:22; 2Ch 6:13; Ezr 9:5; Ne 8:6; 1Ti 2:8); "lifting up the hands" was synonymous with prayer (Ps 77:2; 141:2; La 2:19; 1Ti 2:8); falling on the knees in pleading (1Ki 1:13). Reverence for the aged was expressed by rising up in their presence (Le 19:32,5:12). The hand was also laid on the mouth in token of respect (Job 29:9); in token of blessing the right hand was placed on the head (Ge 48:14; compare Ge 49:26; Pr 10:6). The hands were laid on the head of the animal to be sacrificed; on the scapegoat and sin offering as denoting the transference of sin; on the burnt offering, perhaps as representing the offerer (Le 1:4; 16:21). The hands were lifted up in blessing (Le 9:22), in solemn swearing (Ge 14:22; Ex 6:8; De 32:40), in defiance and threatening (2Sa 20:21); extended in pleading (Isa 65:2). Giving the hand or joining hands as a pledge of friendship and fidelity (2Ki 10:15; Pr 11:21) was the origin of the widespread custom of "shaking hands"; "striking hands" signified the clenching of a bargain or agreement (Pr 6:1 the Revised Version British and American)); as a solemn pledge the hand was placed under the thigh of the person to whom it was given (Ge 24:2; 47:29); plucking the hand out of the bosom was a sign of action (Ps 74:11); clapping the hands, of rejoicing (2Ki 11:12; Ps 47:1; 98:8; Isa 55:12), also of ridicule, contempt and rejoicing over one (Job 27:23; La 2:15; Na 3:19). We read of "beckoning with the hand" (Lu 5:7; Joh 13:24), preliminary to speaking (Ac 12:17; 13:16; 19:33; 21:40; 26:1, he "stretched forth his hand"); drooping of the hands indicated failure, weakness or distress (Heb 12:12; compare Isa 35:3; Ecclesiasticus 25:23); washing the hands (publicly) was a declaration of innocence, "of freedom from complicity" (De 21:6,7; Mt 27:24).

The head lifted up was a sign of arrogance or pride (Ps 83:2); of exaltation, or recovery from trouble, etc. (Jud 8:28; Ps 27:6; 110:7; Zec 1:21); to cover the head was a symbol of grief or mourning (2Sa 15:30; Es 6:12; Jer 14:3), also putting the hand on the head (2Sa 13:19; Jer 2:37), or ashes, dust or earth (Jos 7:6; 1Sa 4:12; 2Sa 12; 13:19; Es 4:1); wagging (or shaking) the head expressed contempt or malicious enjoyment (Job 16:4; Ps 64:8; Jer 18:16; La 2:15; with "hissing," compare Mt 27:39; Mr 15:29; compare Ps 22:7; 44:14; 109:25; Jer 48:27).

Uncovering the feet was a sign of grief (2Sa 15:30; Isa 20:2,4); lifting up the heel against one was a symbol of opposition (Ps 41:9; Joh 13:18); shaking the dust from the feet, of freeing from responsibility and of complete rejection (Mt 10:14; Ac 13:51; at Corinth Paul "shook out his raiment," Ac 18:6); strong joyous feeling found (as elsewhere) expression in dancing (Jud 11:34; 21:21; 1Sa 18:6; Jer 31:4,13), before Yahweh (Ex 15:20; 2Sa 6:14,16).

Shooting out the lip was an expression of contempt (Ps 22:7); to incline the ear signified attention (Ps 45:10); rending the garments expressed the sense of horror (as in the presence of disaster, blasphemy, etc.) (Nu 14:6; Jos 7:6; 1Sa 4:12; 2Sa 1:2; 13:19; 15:32; Mt 26:65; Ac 14:14); the smile indicated favor and gave confidence (Job 29:24); lifting up the eyelids was a sign of pride (Pr 30:13); Isaiah speaks also of the "outstretched necks and wanton eyes" of the haughty daughters of Zion, "walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet" (Isa 3:16). The perverse man "winketh with his eyes .... speaketh with his feet ..... maketh signs with his fingers" (Pr 6:13).

It is interesting to note the gestures ascribed in the Gospels to Jesus. The expression of His eyes is often referred to; we read how He "lifted up his eyes on his disciples" before pronouncing the Beatitudes,

indicating a loving regard for them (Lu 6:20); how He "looked upon" the young ruler and "loved him," and, with another expressive "look" (round about)—a sad look—said, "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God" (Mr 10:21,23); how He "looked up to heaven" before He blessed and brake the loaves (Mt 14:19; Mr 6:41; Lu 9:16); also before healing (Mr 7:34); how He "looked round" on His adversaries in the synagogue (Lu 6:10), "with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart" (Mr 3:5); how He "turned and looked upon Peter" so that he remembered his boasting and fall, and went out and wept bitterly (Lu 22:61); we read also how He took a little child into His arms and held him up as an example to His disciples (Mr 9:36), and how He "took (little children) in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them" (Mr 10:16); how He "stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground" when the woman accused of adultery was brought to Him, then "lifted up himself" and spake, again "stooped down, and with his finger wrote on the ground," till the woman's accusers had departed one by one, condemned and ashamed, when He again "lifted up himself" and sent the woman away (Joh 8:6); how on His way to the tomb of Lazarus, He was agitated, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "was troubled," margin "troubled himself." Meyer has "shuddered." Some translation "shook himself" (Joh 11:33).

See, further, ATTITUDES.

W. L. Walker

GET; GETTING

A great many Hebrew words are in the Old Testament translated "get," "got," etc. The word "get" has two meanings: (1) with the idea of movement, "to go," etc.; (2) with that of acquisition, "to gain," "obtain," etc.

(1) In the first sense the most frequent words are bo',"" to come, or go in" (Ge 45:17; 1Sa 22:5, etc.); yalakh "to go on" (Ge 12:1; 22:2; Ex 5:4; Jer 5:5, etc.); yaradh, "to go down" (Ge 42:2; Joe 3:13); 'alah, "to go up" (Ge 44:17; Isa 40:9; Jer 49:31, etc.). Other words are nudh, "to move off" (Jer 49:30 the King James Version; Da 4:14); nasa',"" to remove" (Nu 14:25); yatsa',"" to go out" (Ge 19:14; 31:13; Ex 11:8).

(2) In the sense of acquisition, the words most frequently translated "get," etc., are 'asah, "to do," "to make" (Ge 12:5; 31:1; De 8:17,18); qanah, "to get," "obtain" (Ge 4:1; Pr 4:5,7; Ec 2:7 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "bought"; Jer 13:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "buy"); matsa' "to find" (Nu 31:50; 2Sa 20:6); rakhash, "to acquire," "gain" (Ge 31:18; 36:6 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "gathered"; Ge 46:6).

Getting is the translation of po'al (Pr 21:6), of qinyan "obtaining" (Ge 31:18; Pr 4:7, the English Revised Version text and the American Standard Revised Version margin "all thou hast gotten"). In the New Testament "get" in the first sense is the translation of exerchomai, "to go out or forth" (Lu 13:31; Ac 7:3; 22:18); of exeimi, "to go out or forth" (Ac 27:43); of katabaino, "to go down" (Ac 10:20); hupago, "to go away or under," "Get .... behind" (Mt 16:23; Lu 4:8 the King James Version, "Get .... hence"; Mt

4:10). The only separate word translated "get" in the second sense is heurisko, "to begin to find" (usually translated "find") (Lu 9:12 the King James Version, "that they may go .... and get victuals").

For "get" the Revised Version (British and American) has "mount" (De 28:43), "buy" (Pr 17:16; Jer 13:1; 19:1); for "get you down" (Joe 3:13), "tread ye," margin "get you down"; "get" for "possess" (Lu 18:12); "get them away" for "gather themselves together" (Ps 104:22); "get us" for "apply" (Ps 90:12); "let us get grain" for "therefore we take up corn for them," and for "that we might buy corn" (Ne 5:2,3); "get you no" for "provide neither" (Mt 10:9); "getteth prudence" for "is prudent," margin "dealeth prudently" (Pr 15:5); "getteth" for "coveteth" (Hab 2:9).

W. L. Walker

GETHER

ge'-ther (gether): In Ge 10:23 named as one of the 4 sons of Aramaic In 1Ch 1:17 mentioned simply among the sons of Shem.

GETHSEMANE

geth-sem'-a-ne (Gethsemanei (for other spellings and accents see Thayer, under the word); probably from the Aramaic gath shemanim, "oil press"): Mentioned (Mt 26:36; Mr 14:32) as a place (chorion), margin "enclosed piece of ground," to which Jesus and the disciples retired after the last supper; in Joh 18:1 it is described as a "garden" (kepos), while Lu (22:40) simply says "place" (topos). From Joh 18:1 it is evident that it was across the Kidron, and from Lu 22:39, that it was on the Mount of Olives. Very possibly (Lu 21:37; 22:39) it was a spot where Jesus habitually lodged when visiting Jerusalem. The owner—whom conjecture suggests as Mary the mother of Mark—must have given Jesus and His disciples special right of entry to the spot.

Tradition, dating from the 4th century, has fixed on a place some 50 yds. East of the bridge across the Kidron as the site. In this walled-in enclosure once of greater extent, now primly laid out with garden beds, by the owners—the Franciscans—are eight old olive trees supposed to date from the time of our Lord. They are certainly old, they appeared venerable to the traveler Maundrell more than two centuries ago, but that they go back to the time claimed is impossible, for Josephus states (BJ, VI, i, 1) that Titus cut down all the trees in the neighborhood of Jerusalem at the time of the siege. Some 100 yards farther North is the "Grotto of the Agony," a cave or cistern supposed to be the spot "about a stone's cast" to which our Lord retired (Lu 22:41). The Greeks have a rival garden in the neighborhood, and a little higher up the hill is a large Russian church. The traditional site may be somewhere near the correct one, though one would think too near the public road for retirement, but the contours of the hill slopes must have so much changed their forms in the troubled times of the first and second centuries, and the loose stone walls of such enclosures are of so temporary a character, that it is impossible that the site is exact. Sentiment, repelled by the artificiality of the modern garden, tempts the visitor to look for a more suitable and less artificial spot farther up the valley. There is today a secluded olive grove with a ruined

modern olive press amid the trees a half-mile or so farther up the Kidron Valley, which must far more resemble the original Gethsemane than the orthodox site.

E. W. G. Masterman

GEUEL

gu’-el, ge-u’-el (ge’u’el, "majesty of God"): The spy from the tribe of Gad (Nu 13:15), sent by Moses to spy out the land of Canaan.

GEZER

ge’-zer (gezer): A city of great military importance in ancient times, the site of which has recently been thoroughly explored. The excavations at this spot are the most thorough and extensive of any in Palestine, and have not only done much to confirm the history of the place, as known from Biblical and other sources, but have also thrown a flood of light upon the general history, civilization and religion of Palestine in pre-Israelite and Israelite times.

1. The Discovery and Position of the Site:

The long-lost site of Gezer was discovered by M. Clermont-Ganneau in 1873, and his suggestion that the modern name for the place, Tell Jezer (or Tell el Jezereh) was a survival of the ancient name was confirmed by his further discovery of three bilingual inscriptions, in Hebrew and Greek, cut on surfaces of rock by a certain Alkios, apparently once the governor of the city; in one of them occurred the expression "the boundary of Gezer."

The natural features and the position of Tell Jezer abundantly explain the extreme importance of Gezer in ancient times. The buried remains crown a narrow hill, running from Northwest to Southeast, about 1,700 ft. long by 300 to 500 ft. broad. The approach is steep on every side, and in early times, before the accumulation around the sides of the rubbish of some millenniums, must have been much more so. The hill stands, like an outpost, projecting into the great plain, and is connected with the low hills behind it, part of the Shephelah, with but a narrow neck. At the foot of the hill runs a great high road from Egypt to Syria; to the North lies the Vale of Aijalon, across which runs the modern carriage road to Jerusalem, and up which ran the great high road, by the Beth-horons, to the platenu North of Jerusalem; to the South lies the Vale of Sorek, where stood Bethshemesh, and along which went a great highway from the country of the Philistines to the hill country of Judah. Today the Jerus-Jaffa railway, after sweeping some miles away in the plain round the whole western and southern sides of the site, passes along this open vale to plunge into the narrow defile—the Wady Isma‘in, which it follows to Jerusalem. From the summit of the Tell, a vast expanse of country is visible between the long blue line of the Mediterranean to the West, and the abrupt and lofty mountains of Judah to the East. That it has been all through history the scene of military contest is fully understood when its strategic position is appreciated; no military leader even today, if holding the highlands of Palestine against invasion, could afford to neglect such an

outpost.

2. History of Gezer:

Although the excavation of the site shows that it was occupied by a high civilization and a considerable population at an extremely early period, the first historical mention is in the list of the Palestinian cities captured by Tahutmes III (XVIIIth Dynasty, about 1500 BC). From this time it was probably under Egyptian governors (the Egyptian remains at all periods are considerable), but from the Tell el-Amarna Letters, a century or so later, we learn that Egyptian influence was then on the wane. Three of these famous clay tablets are dated from Gezer itself and are written in the name of the governor Yapachi; he was then hard pressed by the Khabiri, and he appealed for help in vain to Egypt. In other letters belonging to this series, there are references to this city. In one, a certain freebooter named Lapaya makes excuses that he had broken into the city. He "has been slandered. Is it an offense that he has entered Gazri and levied the people?" (no. CCXL, Petrie’s translation).

In the well-known "So of Triumph" of Merenptah, who is considered by many to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus, occurs the expression "Gezer is taken." (In connection with this it is interesting to notice that an ivory pectoral with the cartouche of Meren-ptah was unearthed at Gezer.)

In the time of Joshua’s invasion a certain "king of Gezer" named Horam (horam, but in Septuagint Ailam, or Elam) came to the assistance of Lachish against the Israelites, but was slain (Jos 10:33). Gezer was taken, but the Canaanites were not driven out, but remained in servitude (Jos 16:10; Jud 1:29). The city became one of the towns on the southern border of Ephraim (Jos 16:3), but was assigned to the Kohath clan of the Levites (Jos 21:21). In 2Sa 5:25 (the King James Version "Gazer") we read that David chased the Philistines after their defeat in the valley of Rephaim "from Geba until thou come to Gezer," showing that this was on the frontier of the Philistine territory; and in 1Ch 20:4 it states, "There arose war at Gezer with the Philistines; then Sibbecai the Hushathite slew Sippai, of the sons of the giant; and they were subdued." In the corresponding account in 2Sa 21:18 the scene of this event is said to be Gob, which is probably a copyist’s error—g-w-b for g-z-r. According to Josephus (Ant., VIII, vi, 1), at the commencement of Solomon’s reign Gezer was in the hands of the Philistines, which may explain 1Ki 9:16, where it is stated that a certain Pharaoh, whose daughter Solomon married, captured and burnt Gezer and gave the site to his daughter. Solomon rebuilt it (9:17). There are no further references to Gezer during the later Jewish monarchy, but there are several during the Maccabean period. Judas pursued Gorgias to "Gazara and into the plains of Idumaea and Azotis and Jamnia" (1 Macc 4:15); Bacchides, after his defeat by Jonathan, "fortified also the city of Bethsura, and Gazara, and the tower, and put forces in them and provision of victuals" (1 Macc 9:52 the King James Version); a little later Simon "camped against Gazara and besieged it round about; he made also an engine of war, and set it by, the city and battered a certain tower, and took it" (1 Macc 13:43 the King James Version), after which he purified it (1 Macc 13:47,48). From Josephus (Ant., XIII, viii, 2) we gather that Antiochus had taken Gezer from the Jews.

The governor, Alkios, who made the bilingual inscriptions, may come in about this time or a little later;

the rock inscriptions, of which half a dozen are now known, give no information regarding their date.

In the period of the Crusades this site, under the name "Mount Gisart," was a crusading fort and gave its name to a family. Here King Baldwin IV gained a victory over Saladin in 1177, and in 1191 the latter monarch camped here while conducting some fruitless negotiations with King Richard Coeur de Lion. In 1495 a skirmish occurred here between the governor of Jerusalem and certain turbulent Bedouin. The history of Gezer, as known, is thus one of battles and sieges extending over at least 3,000 years; from the archaeological remains we may infer that its history was similar for at least 1,000 years earlier.

3. History of the Excavations:

In 1904 the Palestine Exploration Fund of England obtained a "permit" for the excavation of Tell Jezer. The whole site was the private property of certain Europeans, whose agent, living much of the time on the Tell itself, was himself deeply interested in the excavations, so that unusually favorable conditions obtained for the work. Mr. (now Professor) R. A. Stewart Macalister, M.A., was sent out, and for 3 years (1904-7) he instituted an examination of the hidden remains in the mound, after a manner, till then, unexampled in Palestine exploration. His ambition was to turn over every cubic foot of soil down to the original rock, so that nothing of importance could be overlooked. As at the expiration of the original "permit" much remained unexplored, application was made to the authorities for a second one, and, at the end of 1907, Mr. Macalister embarked on a further 2 years of digging. Altogether he worked for the greater part of 5 years, except for necessary interruptions of the work due to unfavorable weather. Some two-thirds of the total accumulated debris on the mound was ransacked, and besides this, many hundreds of tombs, caves and other antiquarian remains in the neighborhood were thoroughly explored.

4. Chief Results of the Explorations:

It was found that the original bare rock surface of the hill was crowned with buried remains, in some parts 20 and 30 ft. deep, made up of the debris of all the cities which had stood on the site during three or four thousand years; on the part excavated there were no remains so late as the commencement of the Christian era, the Gezer of that time, and the crusading fort, being built on a neighboring site. The earliest inhabitants were Troglodytes living in the many caves which riddled the hill surface; they were apparently a non-Sem race, and there was some evidence that they at least knew of cremation. These, or a race soon after—the earliest Semites—enclosed the hilltop with high earth rampart faced with rough stones—the earliest "walls" going back at least before 3000 BC. At an early period—probably about 3000 BC—a race with a relatively high civilization fortified the whole hilltop with a powerful and remarkably well-built wall, 14 ft. thick, with narrow towers of short projection at intervals of 90 ft. At a point on the South side of this was unearthed a very remarkable, massive, brick gateway (all the other walls and buildings are of stone), with towers on each side still standing to the height of 16 ft., but evidently once much higher. This gate showed a strong Egyptian influence at work long before the first historic reference (XVIIIth Dynasty), for both gateway and wall to which it belonged had been ruined at an early date, the former indeed, after its destruction, was overlaid by the buildings of a city, which from its datable objects—scarabs, etc.—must have belonged to the time of Amenhotep III, i.e. as early as

1500 BC.

The later wall, built, we may conclude, soon after the ruin of the former, and therefore about 1500 BC, was also a powerful construction and must have existed considerably over a thousand years, down, indeed, till 100 BC at least, when Gezer disappears from history as a fortitled site. These walls enclosed a larger area than either of the previous ones; they show signs of destruction and repairs, and Mr. Macalister is of the opinion that some of the extensive repairs—in one place a gap of 150 ft.—and the 28 inserted towers are the work of Solomon (1Ki 9:17). This wall must have existed in use through all we know of Gezer from Bible sources. When, from the ruined remains, we reconstruct in imagination these mighty ramparts, we need not wonder that the' Hebrews, fresh from long wanderings in the wilderness, found it no easy task to capture cities so fortified as was this (Nu 13:28; De 1:28).

The foundations of a powerful building, which were found inserted in a gap in the southern walls, turned out conclusively to be the palace of Simon Maccabeus—who captured the city (1 Macc 13:43)—a graffito being found upon one of its stones running thus:

@@@

which seems to mean, "Pamphras, may he bring down (fire) on the palace of Simon."

Within the city walls the foundations of some seven or eight cities of various successive periods were found, superimposed one above the other. The city's best days appear to have been shortly before the time of Joshua; the next, perhaps, at the time of the Judges. With the period to which we should probably assign the arrival of the Hebrews, there is a great increase in the population, the hitherto inviolate environs of the "temple" being encroached upon by private dwellings: an interesting commentary on Jos 16:10.

The great "High Place" which was uncovered is one of unique interest, and its discovery has thrown a flood of light upon the religion of the early Canaanites, that religion—"the worship of Baal and Ashteroth"—which was the great rival of the purer religion of Israel. This [Ba'al] temple, or bamoth, consisted of a row of 8 matstsebhoth or rude stone pillars ranging in height from 5 ft. 5 inches to 10 ft. 9 inches (see HIGH PLACE; PILLAR), together with a curious trough which may have been a socket for the 'Asherah (see ASHERAH), or some kind of altar. The area around these pillars had a kind of rough floor of consolidated earth under which were found a number of large jars containing infant bones, considered to be the remains of infant sacrifice. In close proximity to this "temple" was a double cave, the construction of which strongly suggested that it had been arranged for the giving of oracles. This high place had been used for very many centuries; the matstsebhoth were not all of one period but had gradually been increased from one to seven, and an eighth of a more definitely sculptured form—as a simulacrum priapi—had been added some time later. In the accumulated rubbish around these pillars were found enormous numbers of small stone phallic images, together with pottery plaques of Astarte, made with rude exaggeration of the sexual organs.

See BAAL; ASHTAROTH.

Another monument of great interest—and high antiquity—was the great rock-cut tunnel. It is about 23 ft. high, and 13 ft. wide, and descends by 80 steps, 94 1/2 ft. through the solid rock, to a cave in which there is a spring. It is very similar to the great tunnel known as "Warren's tunnel and shaft" which was clearly constructed by the early Jebusites to reach from within the city's walls to the fountain of Gihon (see SILOAM; ZION). This Gezer tunnel must date at least to 2000 BC; it is evident from the nature of the accumulated debris which blocked its mouth that it was actually abandoned about 1400 BC. Its antiquity is confirmed by the fact that it was evidently excavated with flint knives.

At a much later period in history, in that of the Maccabees, the water supply of the city, in time of siege, at any rate, was largely dependent on an enormous open cistern which Mr. Macalister cleared of earth and found capable of containing 2,000,000 gallons of water. Among the smaller "finds" which throw light upon the Bible history may be mentioned two much broken, cuneiform tablets, both referring to land contracts, which, from the names of the eponyms, can be dated to 651 and 649 BC respectively. They therefore belong to the time of the last, and one of the greatest, of the Assyrian monarchs, Ahurbanipal, the "noble Osnappar" of Ezr 4:10, and they show that he was not only a great conqueror, but that in Palestine he had an organized government and that legal civil business was transacted in the language of Assyria.

The illumination of Old Testament history which the excavations of Gezer have afforded can here be only hinted at, but references to it will occur in many of the articles in other parts of this Encyclopedia.

LITERATURE.

In Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer Professor R. A. S. Macalister has described in a poplar form with illustrations some of his most remarkable discoveries; while in the Memoirs of the Excavations at Gezer (1912), published by the Palestine Exploration Fund, Professor Macalister deals with the subject exhaustively.

E. W. G. Masterman

GEZRITES

gez'-rits.

See GIRZITES.

GHOST

gost (nephesh; pneuma) :"Ghost," the middle-English word for "breath," "spirit," appears in the King

James Version as the translation of nephesh ("breath," "the breath of life," animal soul or spirit, the vital principle, hence, "life"), in two places of the Old Testament, namely, Job 11:20, "the giving up of the ghost" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), and Jer 15:9, "She hath given up the ghost"; gawa‘, "to gasp out, "expire" (die), is also several times so translated (Ge 25:8,17; 35:29; 49:33; Job 3:11; 10:18; 13:19; 14:10; La 1:19). In Apocrypha (Tobit 14:11) psuche is translated in the same way as nephesh in the Old Testament, and in 2 Macc 3:31, en eschate pnoe is rendered "give up the ghost," the Revised Version (British and American) "quite at the last gasp."

In the New Testament "to give up the ghost" is the translation of ekpneo, "to breathe out" (Mr 15:37,39; Lu 23:46; so the Revised Version (British and American)); of ekpsucho, "to breathe out," "expire" (Ac 5:5,10; 12:23); in Mt 27:50, apheken to pneuma, and in Joh 19:30, paredoken to pneuma, are rendered respectively, "yielded" and "gave up the ghost," the Revised Version (British and American) "yielded up his spirit," "gave up his spirit."

"The Holy Ghost" is also frequent in the King James Version; in the American Standard Revised Version it is invariably changed to "Holy Spirit," in the English Revised Version sometimes only, chiefly in the Gospels.

See HOLY SPIRIT; SPIRIT.

W. L. Walker

GHOST, HOLY

See HOLY SPIRIT.

GIAH

gi’-a (giach): An unidentified place on the route followed by Abner in his flight, pursued by Joab (2Sa 2:24). Septuagint renders Gai, corresponding to the Hebrew ge, "valley." The form giach may be due to corruption of the text.

GIANTS

ji’-ants The word appears in the King James Version as the translation of the Hebrew words nephilim (Ge 6:4; Nu 13:33); repha’im (De 2:11,20; 3:11,13; Jos 12:4, etc.); rapha’ (1Ch 20:4,6,8), or raphah (2Sa 21:16,18,20,22); in one instance of gibbor, literally, "mighty one" (Job 16:14).

In the first two cases the Revised Version (British and American) changes "giants" into the Hebrew words "Nephilim," nephilim, and "Rephaim," repha’im, respectively (see these words). The "Nephilim of Ge 6:4 are not to be confounded with the "mighty men" subsequently described as the offspring of the

unlawful marriages, of "the sons of God" and "the daughters of men." It is told that they overspread the earth prior to these unhallowed unions. That the word, whatever its etymology, bears the sense of men of immense stature is evident from the later passages; Nu 13:33. The same is true of the "Rephaim," as shown by the instance of Og (De 3:11; Jos 12:4). There is no doubt about the meaning of the word in the ease of the giants mentioned in 2Sa 21 and 1Ch 20.

See also ANTEDILUVIANS.

James Orr

GIANTS, VALLEY OF THE

See REPHAIM, VALLEY OF.

GIBBAR

gib’-ar (gibbar, "hero"):, In Ezr 2:20 the "children of Gibbar" are mentioned among those who returned with Zerubbabel. The parallel passage (Ne 7:25) has "children of Gibeon."

GIBBETHON

gib’-e-thon (gibbethon): A city in the territory of Da in the plain named with Eltekeh and Baalath (Jos 19:44), and assigned to the Kohathite Levites (Jos 21:23). Later we find it in the hands of the Philistines; and it was while besieging the city that Nadab was slain by Baasha (1Ki 15:27). After 25 years Omri, the general of Baasha, was here made king of the army when news reached them of Zimri s regicide (1Ki 16:15). It may possibly be identified with Kibbiah, which lies about 16 miles Southeast of Jaffa; but no certain identification is possible.

W. Ewing

GIBEA

gib’-e-a (gibh‘a’," hill"): A grandson of Caleb (1Ch 2:49). His father was Sheva, whose mother was Maacah, Caleb’s concubine (1Ch 2:48).

GIBEAH

gib’-e-a (gibh‘ah, "hill"): The Hebrew word denotes generally an eminence or hill, in distinction from har, which is used for mountain, or mountain range. It occurs, however, in two instances, as a place-name. Under GEBA (which see) we have seen that Geba, Gibeah, and Gibeon are liable to be confused. This arises from their resemblance in form and meaning.

(1) An unidentified city in the territory of Judah (Jos 15:57). It is named in the group containing Carmel, Ziph and Kain; it is therefore probably to be sought to the Southeast of Hebron. It may be one of the two villages mentioned by Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Gabathon"), Gabaa and Gabatha; in the East of the Daroma. It is probably identical with Gibeah mentioned in 2Ch 13:2.

(2) A city described as belonging to Benjamin (Jos 18:28; Jud 19:14) Gibeah of Benjamin (1Sa 13:2,15; 14:16), Gibeah of the children of Benjamin (2Sa 23:29), Gibeah of Saul (1Sa 11:4; Isa 10:29), and possibly, also, Gibeah of God (1Sa 10:5 margin); see GIBEATH, 4.

1. History:

The narrative in which it first appears is one of extraordinary and tragic interest, casting priceless light on the conditions prevailing in those days when "there was no king in Israel" (Jud 19). A Levite sojourning on the farther side of Mt. Ephraim was deserted by his concubine who returned to her father’s house in Beth-lehem-judah. Thither he went to persuade her to return. Hospitably entertained by her father, he tarried till the afternoon of the fifth day. The evening was nigh when they came over against Jebus—Jerusalem—but, rejecting his servant’s suggestion that they should lodge in this "city of a stranger"—i.e. the Jebusite—the Levite pressed on, and when they were near to Gibeah the sun set. They entered the city and sat down in the street. The laws of hospitality today do not compel the entertainment of strangers who arrive after sunset. But it may have been through disregard of all law that they were left unbefriended. An old man from Mt. Ephraim took pity on them, invited them to his house, and made himself responsible for their necessities. Then follows the horrible story of outrage upon the Levite’s concubine; the way in which he made known his wrongs to Israel; and the terrible revenge exacted from the Benjamites, who would not give up to justice the miscreants of Gibeah.

Gibeah was the home of Saul, the first king of Israel, and thither he returned after his election at Mizpah (1Sa 10:26). From Gibeah he summoned Israel to assemble for the relief of Jabesh-gilead, which was threatened by Nahash the Ammonite (1Sa 11:4). In the wars of Saul with the Philistines, Gibeah seems to have played a conspicuous part (1Sa 13:15). Here were exposed the bodies of the seven sons of Saul, slain by David’s orders, to appease the Gibeonites, furnishing the occasion for Rizpah’s pathetic vigil (2Sa 21:1). Gibeah is mentioned in the description of the Assyrian advance on Jerusalem (Isa 10:29).

2. Identification:

The site now generally accepted as that of Gibeah is on Teleil el-Ful, an artificial mound about 4 miles North of Jerusalem, a short distance East of the high road to Shechem. A little way North of Teleil el-Ful, the high road bifurcates, one branch turning eastward to Jeba‘, i.e. Geba (which should be read instead of "Gibeah" in Jud 20:31); the other continuing northward to Bethel. Not far from the parting of the ways, on the road to Jeba‘ lies erRam, corresponding to Ramah (Jud 19:13). At Gibeah, about 30 furlongs from Jerusalem, Titus encamped for the night on his advance against the city from the North Teleil el-Ful quite satisfactorily suits all the data here indicated.

The words in Jud 20:33 rendered by the King James Version "the meadows of Gibeah," the Revised Version (British and American) "Maareh-geba"—simply transliterating—and the Revised Version, margin "the meadow of Geba" (or Gibeah), by a slight emendation of the text, read "from the west of Gibeah," which is certainly correct.

W. Ewing

GIBEATH (1)

gib'e-ath (gibh'ath): This is the status constructus of the foregoing (Gibeah). It is found in several compound place-names.

(1) Gibeath-ha-araloth (gibh'ath ha'araloth). English Versions of the Bible tanslations literally, "hill of the foreskins"; but the margins suggest the proper name. Here the Israelites were circumcised after the passage of the Jordan (Jos 5:3). The place was therefore between that river and Jericho.

(2) Gibeath Phinehas (gibh'ath pinechac), the burial place of Eleazar the son of Aaron in Mt. Ephraim (Jos 24:33 the King James Version "a hill that pertained to Phinehas," the Revised Version (British and American) "the hill of Phinehas," the Revised Version, margin "Gibeah of Phinehas"). Conder would identify it with 'Awertah in the plain of Makhneh, not far from Nablus, where "the Samaritans show the tombs of Phinehas and Eleazar, Abishuah and Ithamar" (Tent Work, 41 f). The "tomb of Eleazar" is 18 ft. long, plastered all over and shaded by a splendid terebinth." Guerin places it at Jibia, 3 miles North of Qaryat el-'Anab (Judee, III, 37 f; Samarie, 106 ff). There is no certainty.

(3) Gibeath hammoreh (gibh'ath hamoreh), a hill on the North side of the valley from the camp of Gideon, beside. which lay the Midianites (Jud 7:1, English Versions of the Bible "the hill of Moreh"; the Hebrew is literally, "hill of the teacher"). It is probably identical with Jebel Duchy, which rises on the North of the Vale of Jezreel. Moore (Judges, 200) mistakenly calls the mountain Nabi Dachi. This is, of course, the name of the "prophet" whose shrine crowns the hill.

See MOREH.

(4) Gibeath ha-Elohim (gibh'ath ha-'elohim), the place where Saul, after leaving Samuel, met the company of prophets, and prophesied with them (1Sa 10:5,10). It is defined as the place "where is the garrison (or pillar) of the Philistines." This may be intended to distinguish it from GIBEAH (2), with which it is often identified. In this case it may be represented by the modern Ramallah, about 10 miles North of Jerusalem.

See also TABOR.

(5) Gibeath ha-Hachilah (1Sa 23:19; 26:1) is identical with HACHILAH (which see).

(6) Gibeath Ammah (2Sa 2:24) is identical with AMMAH (which see).

(7) Gibeath Gareb (Jer 31:39) is identical with GAREB (which see).

W. Ewing

GIBEATH (2)

(Jos 18:28).

See GIBEAH (2).

GIBEATHITE

gib’-e-ath-it.

See SHEMAAH.

GIBEON

gib’-e-un (gibh‘on): One of the royal cities of the Hivites (Jos 9:7). It was a greater city than Ai; and its inhabitants were reputed mighty men (Jos 10:2). It fell within the territory allotted to Benjamin (Jos 18:25), and was one of the cities given to the Levites (Jos 21:17).

1. The Gibeonites:

By a stratagem the Gibeonites secured for themselves and their allies in Chephirah, Beeroth and Kirjath-jearim immunity from attack by the Israelites. Terrified by the fate of Jericho and Ai, a company disguised as ambassadors from a far country, their garments and shoes worn, and their provisions moldy as from the length of their journey, went to Joshua at Gilgal, and persuaded him and the princes of Israel to make a covenant with them. Three days later the deception was discovered and the wrath of the congregation of Israel aroused. In virtue of the covenant their lives were secured; but for their duplicity Joshua cursed them, and condemned them to be bondsmen, "hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God" (Jos 9:23), "for the congregation and for the altar of the Lord" (Jos 9:27 the King James Version). This points to their employment in the sanctuary; and possibly may shed some light on the massacre of the Gibeonites by Saul (2Sa 21:1 f). The rest of the Canaanites resented the defection of the Hivites which so greatly weakened the forces for defense, and, headed by Adoni-zedek of Jerusalem, they assembled to wreak vengeance on Gibeon. The threatened city appealed to Joshua, who made a swift night march, fell suddenly upon the confederates, routed them, and "chased them by the way of the ascent of Beth-horon, and smote them to Azekah, and unto Makkedah" (Jos 10:1).

A three years' famine in the days of David was attributed to God's anger at the unexpiated crime of Saul in slaying the Gibeonites. He did this "in his zeal for .... Israel and Judah," who may have fretted at the inconvenience of having the Gibeonites among them. The latter believed that Saul's desire was to destroy them utterly. When David tried to arrange matters with them they stood upon their ancient rights, claiming life for life. They would take no rights blood money: they demanded blood from the family of the slayer of their people. This demand David could not resist, and handed over to them seven sons of Saul (2Sa 21:1).

2. The Champions:

The army of Ishbosheth under Abner, and that of David under Joab, met at the pool of Gibeon. An attempt to settle the quarrel, by means of 12 champions on either side, failed, as each man slew his fellow, and the 24 perished side by side. A "sore battle" ensued in which Abner was beaten; he was pursued by the fleet-footed Asahel, brother of Joab, whom he slew.

See HELKATH-HAZZURIM.

Possibly we should read "Gibeon" instead of "Geba" in 2Sa 5:25, as in the parallel passage, 1Ch 14:16 (HDB, under the word) From Baal-perazim David was to make a circuit and fall upon the Philistines who were encamped in the plan of Rephaim West of Jerusalem. Perhaps, however, we should read "Gibeah" in both places. Cheyne (EB, under the word) thinks the hill town of Baal-perazim may be intended.

3. Murder of Amasa:

When, after the death of Absalom and the suppression of his rebellion, Bichri raised the standard of revolt, Amasa was sent to call out the men of Judah against him. Tarrying longer than the time appointed, there was danger lest Bichri might have opportunity to strengthen his position; so David dispatched Abishai and the troops that were with him to attack Bichri at once. Joab went with this expedition. Obviously he could never be content with a second place. The force of Amasa was met at "the great stone of Gibeon." There Joab treacherously slew that unsuspecting general, and, himself assuming command, stamped out the rebellion with his accustomed thoroughness (2Sa 20:4)." The great stone" appears to have been well known, and may have possessed some religious character.

4. The Sanctuary:

Gibeon was the seat of an ancient sanctuary, called in 1Ki 3:4 "the great high place." Here, according to 2Ch 1:3, was the tabernacle made in the wilderness—but see 1Ki 8:4. It was the scene of Solomon's great sacrifice after which he slept in the sanctuary and dreamed his famous dream (1Ki 3:4; 9:2; 2Ch 1:3,13, etc.).

By "the great waters that are in Gibeon" Johanan overtook Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, and freed the captives he had taken from Mizpah (Jer 41:11). Among those who returned with Zerubbabel were 95 "children of Gibeon" (Ne 7:25; compare Ne 3:7). At Gibeon Cestius Gallus ancamped when marching against Jerusalem from Antipatris (BJ, II, xix, 1).

5. Identification and Description:

The ancient city is represented by the modern village el-Jib. It is fully 5 miles Northwest of Jerusalem, and about a mile North of Neby Samwil on a double knoll, with terraced slopes, but rocky and precipitous to the East. The village stands amid striking remains of antiquity. About a hundred paces from the village to the East is a large reservoir with a spring. Lower down, among the olives, are the remains of another and larger reservoir, which collected the overflow from the first. This is probably the "pool" of 2Sa 2:13, and "the great waters" of Jer 41:12. El-Jib stands in the midst of a rich upland plain not far South of the great pass which goes down by way of the Beth-horons into the vale of Aijalon.

W. Ewing

GIBEONITES

gib’-e-un-its. Inhabitants of GIBEON (which see).

GIBLITES

gib’-lits.

See GEBALITES.

GIDDALTI

gi-dal’-ti (giddalti, "I magnify (God)"): A son of Heman (1Ch 25:4,29), one of David’s musicians.

GIDDEL

gid’-el (giddel, "very great," "stout"):

(1) The name of the head of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2:47 = Ne 7:49 = APC 1Esdras 5:30 (here as Cathua)).

(2) The name of the head of a family of Solomon’s servants (Ezr 2:56 = Ne 7:58 = APC 1Esdras 5:33 (here Isdael)).

GIDEON

gid’-e-un (gidh‘on, "cutter down," "feller" or "hewer"):

1. His Family and Home:

Also named Jerubbaal (Jud 6:32) and Jerubbesheth (2Sa 11:21), youngest son of Joash, of the clan of Abiezer in the tribe of Manasseh. His home was at Ophrah, and his family an obscure one. He became the chief leader of Manasseh and the fifth recorded judge of Israel. The record of his life is found in Jud 6-8.

Joash was an idolater, and sacrifices to Baal were common among the entire clan. Gideon seems to have held this worship in contempt, and to have pondered deeply the causes of Israel’s reverses and the injuries wrought upon his own family by the hand of the Midianites.

2. The Midianite Oppression:

The Midianites under Zebah and Zalmunna, their two greatest chiefs, accompanied by other wild tribes of the eastern desert, had gradually encroached on the territory of Israel in Central Palestine. They came first as marauders and pillagers at the time of the harvests, but later they forcibly took possession of lands, and thus inflicted permanent injury and loss, especially upon Manasseh and Ephraim. The conflicts became so numerous, the appropriation of land so flagrant, that the matter of sustenance became a serious problem (Jud 6:4). The multitude of these desert hordes and the cruelty of their depredation rendered defense difficult, and, lacking in the split of national unity, the Israelites were driven to dens, caves and rocky strongholds for safety (Jud 6:2). After seven years of such invasion and suffering Gideon comes upon the scene.

3. The Call of Gideon:

It is probable that Gideon had already distinguished himself in resistance to the Midianites (Jud 6:12), but he now receives Divine commission to assume the leadership. Having taken his own little harvest to a secret place for threshing, that it might escape the greed of the Midianites, he is surprised while at work by a visit from the Lord in the form of an angel. However this scene (Jud 6:11) and its miraculous incidents may be interpreted, there can be no question of the divineness of Gideon’s call or that the voice which spoke to him was the voice of God. Neither the brooding over the death of his brothers at Tabor (Jud 8:18) nor the patriotic impulses dwelling within him can account for his assumption of leadership. Nor did he become leader at the demand of the people. He evidently had scarcely thought of himself as his country’s deliverer. The call not only came to him as a surprise, but found him distrustful both of himself (Jud 6:15) and of his people (Jud 6:13). It found him too without inclination for the task, and only his conviction that the command was of God persuaded him to assume leadership. This gives the note of accuracy to the essential facts of the story. Gideon’s demand for a sign (Jud 6:17) being answered, the food offered the messenger having been consumed by fire at the touch of his staff, Gideon

acknowledged the Divine commission of his visitor, and at the place of visitation built an altar to Yahweh (Jud 6:19).

4. His First Commission:

The call and first commission of Gideon are closely joined. He is at once commanded to destroy the altars of Baal set up by his father at Ophrah, to build an altar to Yahweh at the same place and thereon to offer one of his father's bullocks as a sacrifice (Jud 6:25 f). There is no reason to look on this as a second version of Gideon's call. It is rather the beginning of instruction, and is deeply significant of the accuracy of the story, in that it follows the line of all revelation to God's prophets and reformers to begin their work at home. Taking ten men, under the cover of darkness, Gideon does as commanded (Jud 6:27). The morning revealed his work and visited upon him the wrath of the people of Ophrah. They demand of Joash that he put his son to death. The answer of Joash is an ironical but valid defense of Gideon. Why should the people plead for Baal? A god should be able to plead his own cause (Jud 6:28). This defense gained for Gideon the name Jerubbaal (yerubba'al, i.e. yarebh bo ha-ba'al, "Let Baal plead," Jud 6:32 the King James Version).

The time intervening between this home scene and the actual campaign against the Midianites cannot definitely be named. It is probable that it took months for Gideon even to rally the people of his own clan. The fact is that all the subsequent events of the story are somewhat confused by what looks like a double narrative in which there are apparent but not vital differences. Without ignoring this fact it is still possible to get a connected account of what actually transpired.

5. Gideon's Army:

When the allied invaders were in camp on the plain of Jezreel, we find Gideon, having recruited the Abiezrites and sent messengers to the various tribes of Israel (Jud 6:34 f), pitching his camp near the Midianites. The location of the various camps of Gideon is difficult, as is the method of the recruiting of the tribes. For instance, Jud 6:35 seems to be in direct contradiction to 7:23, and both are considered of doubtful origin. There was evidently, however, a preliminary encampment at the place of rallying. While waiting here, Gideon further tested his commission by the dry and wet fleece (6:37 ff) and, convinced of God's purpose to save Israel by his leadership, he moves his camp to the Southeast edge of the plain of Jezreel nearby the spring of Harod. From his point of vantage here he could look down on the tents of Midian. The account of the reduction of his large army from 32,000 to 300 (7:2 ff) is generally accepted as belonging to a later tradition, Neither of the tests, however, is unnatural, and the first was not unusual. According to the account, Gideon at the Lord's command first excused all the fearful. This left him with 10,000 men. This number was reduced to 300 by a test of their method of drinking. This test can easily be seen to evidence the eagerness and courage of men for battle (Jos).

6. The Midianites' Discomfiture and Flight:

Having thus reduced the army and having the assurance that the Lord would deliver to him and his little

band the forces of Midian, Gideon, with a servant, went by night to the edge of the camp of his enemy, and there heard the telling and interpretation of a dream which greatly encouraged him and led him to strike an immediate blow (Jud 7:9). Again we find a conflict of statement between Jud 7:20 and 7:22, but the conflict is as to detail only. Dividing his men into three equal bands, Gideon arranges that with trumpets, and lights concealed in pitchers, and with the cry, "The sword of Yahweh and of Gideon!" they shall descend and charge the Midianites simultaneously from three sides. This stratagem for concealing his numbers and for terrifying the enemy succeeds, and the Midianites and their allies flee in disorder toward the Jordan (7:18 ff). The rout was complete, and the victory was intensified by the fact that in the darkness the enemy turned their swords against one another. Admitting that we have two narratives (compare 7:24; 8:3 with 8:4 ff) and that there is some difference between them in the details of the attack and the progress of the conflict, there is no need for confusion in the main line of events. One part of the fleeing enemy evidently crossed the Jordan at Succoth, being led by Zebah and Zalmunna. The superior force followed the river farther south, toward the ford of Bethbarah.

7. Death of Oreb and Zeeb

Gideon sent messengers to the men of Ephraim (7:24), probably before the first attack, asking them to intercept the Midianites, should they attempt to escape by the fords in their territory. This they did, defeating the enemy at Beth-barah and slaying the princes Oreb and Zeeb ("the Raven" and "the Wolf"). As proof of their victory and valor they brought the heads of the princes to Gideon and accused him of having discounted their bravery by not calling them earlier into the fight. But Gideon was a master of diplomacy, as well as of strategy, and won the friendship of Ephraim by magnifying their accomplishment in comparison with his own (8:1 ff).

Gideon now pursues Zebah and Zalmunna on the East side of the river. The people on that side are still in great fear of the Midianites and refuse even to feed his army. At Succoth they say to him, "Are the hands of Zebah and Zalmunna now in thy hand, that we should give bread unto thine army?" (Jud 8:6). At Penuel he meets with the same refusal (Jud 8:8). Promising to deal with Succoth and Penuel as they deserve when he is through with his present task, Gideon pushes on with his half-famished but courageous men, overtakes the Midianites, defeats them, captures Zebah and Zalmunna, and, returning, punishes, according to his promise, both Succoth and Penuel (Jud 8:7,9,13).

8. Death of Zebah and Zalmunna:

Thus was the power of the Midianites and the desert hordes broken in Canaan and a forty years’ peace came to Israel. But the two Kings of Midian must now meet their fate as defeated warriors. They had led their forces at Tabor when the brothers of Gideon perished. So Gideon commands his young son Jether to slay them as though they were not worthy of death at a warrior’s hand (Jud 8:20). The youth fearing the task, Gideon himself put them to death (Jud 8:21).

9. Gideon’s Ephod:

The people clamored to make Gideon king. He refused, being moved possibly by a desire to maintain theocracy. To this end he asks only the jewelry taken as spoil in the battles (Jud 8:24), and with it makes an ephod, probably an image of Yahweh, and places it in a house of the Lord at Ophrah. By this act it was later thought that Gideon contributed to a future idolatry of Israel. The narrative properly closes with Jud 8:28.

10. His Death:

The remaining verses containing the account of Gideon's family and death (Jud 8:30) and the record of events immediately subsequent to Gideon's death (Jud 8:33) come from other sources than the original narrators.

C. E. Schenk

GIDEONI

gid-e-o'-ni (gidh'oni): The father of Abidan who was prince of Benjamin, mentioned only in connection with the son (Nu 1:11; 2:22; 7:60,65; 10:24).

GIDOM

gi'-dom (gidh'om): The limit eastward, from Gibeah toward the wilderness, of the pursuit of Benjamin by Israel (Jud 20:45). No name suggesting this has yet been recovered. It is not mentioned elsewhere.

GIER-EAGLE

jer'-e-g'-l (racham; kuknos, in Leviticus, porphurion, in Deuteronomy): The name applied to one of the commonest of the vultures, and not an eagle at all. The word is derived from a Hebrew root, meaning "to love," and was applied to the birds because mated pairs seldom separated. These were smaller birds and inferior to the largest members of the family. They nested on a solid base, lived in pairs, and not only flocked over carrion as larger species permitted, but also ate the vilest offal of all sorts, for which reason they were protected by a death penalty by one of the Pharaohs. Because of this the birds became so frequent and daring around camps, among tent-dwellers, and in cities, that they were commonly called "Pharaoh's chickens." They are mentioned in the Bible in the lists of abominations found in Le 11:13 and De 14:12 (the King James Version "ossifrage"); De 14:17 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "vulture").

Gene Stratton-Porter

GIFT

gift (mattanah, minchah, shochadh; doron, dorea, chairisma): In Ge 25:6; Ex 28:38; Nu 18:6,7,29; Eze 20:26, etc., mattanah, "a gift," is so rendered; minchah, an offering or present, used especially of the "meat offerings," is translated "gift" (2Sa 8:2,6 the King James Version; 2Ch 26:8), in which passages "tribute" is meant, as the Revised Version (British and American); 32:23; Ps 45:12. A few other words occur singly, e.g. ‘eshkar, "a reward" (Ps 72:10); mas’eth, "lifting up" (Es 2:18); nathun is translated "gifts" (Nu 8:19; the Revised Version, margin "Hebrew nethunim, given"); nedheh, nadhan, "impure gifts" (Eze 16:33); nisse’th, "a thing lifted up" (2Sa 19:42); shochadh means "a bribe" (Ex 23:8; De 16:19; 2Ch 19:7; Pr 6:35; 17:8,23; Isa 1:23; Eze 22:12); in each instance the American Standard Revised Version has "bribe" except Pr 6:35, "gifts"; teramah, "a present" (Pr 29:4), may also mean a bribe, the King James Version "he that receiveth gifts," the Revised Version (British and American) "he that exacteth gifts," margin "imposeth tribute, Hebrew a man of offerings."

In the New Testament doron, "a present," "gift" (from didomi, "to give"), is translated "gift" (Mt 2:11; 5:23,14 bis; Mr 7:11 the King James Version; Heb 5:1; Re 11:10, etc., referring chiefly to gifts or offerings to God); dorea, "a free gift" (Joh 4:10; Ac 2:38; Ro 5:15,17; 2Co 9:15; Heb 6:4, etc., referring to the gifts of God); dorema, "a free gift" (Ro 5:16; Jas 1:17, the English Revised Version "boon"); dosis, " giving" (Jas 1:17, "every good gift," the Revised Version, margin "giving"); charisma, "grace," "favor," a benefit or good conferred, is also used of Divine gifts and favors, especially of the supernatural gifts imparted by the Holy Spirit (charismata) enumerated in Ro 12; 1Co 12; the word occurs translated "gift, gifts" (Ro 1:11), "some spiritual gift" (Ro 5:15,16, "free gift"; Ro 6:23, "The gift of God is eternal life," the Revised Version (British and American) "free gift"; 11:29; 1Co 1:7; 7:7; 2Co 1:11; 1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6; 1Pe 4:10); charis, "grace," "favor" (2Co 8:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "grace"); merismos, "distribution," "parting" (Heb 2:4, the Revised Version, margin "distributions"); anathema, "a thing devoted to God," is once (Lu 21:5) used of "the goodly gifts" (the Revised Version (British and American) "offerings") which adorned the Temple at Jerusalem.

In the Revised Version (British and American) "gift" is substituted in the text of Ge 33:11 for blessing, margin Hebrew "blessing"; "boasteth himself of his gifts falsely" (Pr 25:14) for "boasteth himself of a false gift," margin Hebrew "in a gift of falsehood"; "a parting gift" for "presents" (Mic 1:14); "Given to God" for "a gift" (Mr 7:11).

W. L. Walker

GIFT OF TONGUES

See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

GIFTS OF HEALING

See HEALING.

GIFTS, SPIRITUAL

See SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

GIHON (1)

gi’-hon (gichon; Geon): One of the four rivers of Eden (Ge 2:13). It is said to compass the Whole land of Cush (Ethiopia), probably a province East of the Tigris. The Gihon is thought by Sayce to be the Kerkha, coming down from Luristan through the province known in the cuneiform texts as Kassi, probably the Cush of the Bible.

See EDEN.

Used figuratively of wisdom in Sirach 24:27, "as Gihon (the King James Version Geon) in the days of vintage."

GIHON (2)

(gichon, gichon (in 1 K), from root gayach "to burst forth"):

(1) See preceding article.

(2) The Nile in Jer 2:18 Septuagint (Geon); in Hebrew shichor (see SHIHOR).

(3) A spring in Jerusalem, evidently sacred, and, for that reason, selected as the scene of Solomon’s coronation (1Ki 1:38). It is without doubt the spring known to the Moslems as ‘Ain Umm edition deraj ("the spring of the steps") and to the Christians as ‘Ain Sitti Miriam ("the spring of the lady Mary"), or commonly as the "Virgin’s Fount." It is the one true spring of Jerusalem, the original source of attraction to the site of the early settlers; it is situated in the Kidron valley on the East side of "Ophel," and due South of the temple area. See JERUSALEM. The water in the present day is brackish and impregnated with sewage. The spring is intermittent in character, "bursting up" at intervals: this feature may account for the name Gihon and for its sacred characters. In New Testament times it was, as it is today, credited with healing virtues. See BETHESDA. Its position is clearly defined in the Old Testament. Manasseh "built an outer wall to the city of David, on the West side of Gihon, in the valley" (= Nahal, i.e. the Kidron; 2Ch 33:14). From Gihon Hezekiah made his aqueduct (2Ch 32:30), now the Siloam tunnel.

See SILOAM.

The spring is approached by a steep descent down 30 steps, the water rising deep underground; the condition is due to the vast accumulation of rubbish—the result of the many destructions of the city—which now fills the valley bed. Originally the water ran down the open valley. The water rises from a long deep crack in the rock, partly under the lowest of the steps and to a lesser extent in the mouth of a

small cave, 11 1/2 ft. long by 5 ft. wide, into which all the water pours. The village women of Siloam obtain the water at the mouth of the cave, but when the supply is scanty they actually go under the lowest step—where there is a kind of chamber—and fill their vessels there. At the farther end of this cave is the opening leading into the aqueduct down which the water flows to emerge after many windings at the pool of Siloam. The first part of this aqueduct is older than the time of Hezekiah and led originally to the perpendicular shaft, connected with "Warren's tunnel" described elsewhere (see SILOAM; ZION).

The preeminent position of importance which Gihon held in the eyes of the earlier inhabitants of Jerusalem is shown by the extraordinary number of passages, rock cuttings, walls and aqueducts which exist all about the spring. Walls have been made at different periods to bank up the waters and direct them into the channels provided for them. Of aqueducts, besides the "Siloam aqueduct," two others have been formed. One running from the source at a considerable lower level than that of Hezekiah was followed by the present writer (see PEFS, 1902, 35-38) for 176 ft. It was very winding, following apparently the West side of the Kidron valley. It was a well-cemented channel, about 1 1/2 ft. wide and on an average of 4 1/2 ft. high, roofed in with well-cut stones. There are no certain indications of age, but in the writer's opinion it is a much later construction than Hezekiah's aqueduct, though the rock-cut part near the source may be older. It was discovered by the Siloam fellahin, because, through a fault in the dam, all the water of the "Virgin's Fount" was disappearing down this channel. A third aqueduct has recently been discovered running off at a higher level than the other two. It is a channel deeply cut in the rock with curious trough-like stones all along its floor. It appears to be made for water, but one branch of it actually slopes upward toward its end. The pottery, which is early Hebrew, shows that it is very ancient. The whole accumulated debris around the source is full of pre-Israelite and early Israelite pottery.

E. W. G. Masterman

GILALAI

gil'-a-li, gi-la'-li (gilalay): A musician in the procession at the dedication of the wall, son of a priest (Ne 12:36).

GILBOA, MOUNT

gil-bo'-a (~har hagilboa], "Mount of the Gilboa"): Unless we should read "Gilboa" for "Gilead" in Jud 7:3 (see GILEAD, 2) this mountain is mentioned in Scripture only in connection with the last conflict of Saul with the Philistines, and his disastrous defeat (1Sa 28:4; 31:1,8; 2Sa 1:6,21; 21:12; 1Ch 10:1,8). If Zer'in be identical with Jezreel—a point upon which Professor R.A.S. Macalister has recently cast some doubt—Saul must have occupied the slopes on the Northwest side of the mountain, near "the fountain which is in Jezreel" (1Sa 29:1). The Philistines attacked from the plain, and the battle went sore against the men of Israel, who broke and fled; and in the flight Jonathan, Abinadab and Malchi- shua, sons of Saul, were slain. Rather than be taken by his lifelong foes, Saul fell upon his sword and died (1Sa 31:1).

The modern name of the mountain is Jebel Faqu‘a. It rises on the eastern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, and, running from Zer‘in to the Southeast, it then sweeps southward to join the Samarian uplands. It presents an imposing appearance from the plain, but the highest point, Sheikh Burqan, is not more than 1,696 ft. above sea level. In the higher reaches the range is rugged and barren; but vegetation is plentiful on the lower slopes, especially to the West. The Kishon takes its rise on the mountain. Under the northern cliffs rises ‘Ain Jalud, possibly identical with HAROD, WELL OF, which see. In Jelbun, a village on the western declivity, there is perhaps an echo of the old name.

W. Ewing

GILEAD (1)

gil’-e-ad (ha-gil‘adh, "the Gilead"): The name is explained in Ge 31:46 ff, 51, as derived from Hebrew gal, "a cairn," and ‘edh, "witness," agreeing in meaning with the Aramaic yegharsahadhutha’. The Arabic jilead means "rough," "rugged."

(1) A city named in Ho 6:8; 12:11, possibly to be identified with Gilead near to Mizpah (Jud 10:17). If this is correct, the ancient city may be represented by the modern Jil‘ad, a ruin about 5 miles North of es-Salt.

(2) A mountain named in Jud 7:3. Gideon, ordered to reduce the number of men who were with him, commanded all who were "fearful and trembling" to "return and depart from Mt. Gilead." the Revised Version, margin reads "return and go round about from Mt. Gilead." Gideon and his army lay to the South of the plain of Jezreel on the lower slopes of Gilboa. It has been suggested (Studer, Comm., at the place) that, as the Midianites lay between the men of the northern tribes and their homes, they were told to cross the Jordan, make a detour through Gilead, and thus avoid the enemy. Possibly, however, we should read Gilboa for Gilead; or part of the mountain may have borne the name of Gilead. The last suggestion is favored by the presence of a strong spring under the northern declivity of Gilboa, nearly 2 miles from Zer‘in, possibly to be identified with the Well of Harod. In the modern name, ‘Ain Jalud, there may be an echo of the ancient Gilead.

(3) The name is applied generally to the mountain mass lying between the Yarmuk on the North, and Wady Chesban on the South; the Jordan being the boundary on the West, while on the East it marched with the desert.

1. The Land of Gilead:

Mount Gilead—literally, "Mount of the Gilead"—may refer to some particular height which we have now no means of identifying (Ge 31:23). The name Jebel Jil‘ad is still, indeed, applied to a mountain South of Nahr ez-Zerqa and North of es-Salt; but this does not meet the necessities of the passage as it stands. The same expression in De 3:12 obviously stands for the whole country. This is probably true

also in So 4:1. The name Gilead is sometimes used to denote the whole country East of the Jordan (Ge 37:25; Jos 22:9; 2Sa 2:9, etc.). Again, along with Bashan, it indicates the land East of Jordan, as distinguished from the Moab plateau (De 3:10; Jos 13:11; 2Ki 10:33).

2.Bashan:

In the North Gilead bordered upon Geshur and Maacah (Jos 13:11,13); and here the natural boundary would be formed by the deep gorge of the Yarmuk and Wady esh-Shellaleh. In pre-Israelite times the Jabbok (Nahr ez-Zerqa), which cuts the country in two, divided the kingdom of Sihon from that of Og (De 3:16; Jos 12:2). The frontiers between the tribes of Reuben, Gad and Manasseh cannot be indicated with any certainty. Probably they varied at different times (compare Jos 13:24 ff; 1Ch 5:8,9,11,16). It greatly increases the difficulty that so many of the cities named are still unidentified. But in any case it is clear that the bulk of Gilead fell to Gad, so that Gilead might stand for Gad (Jud 5:17). HAVVOTH-JAIR (which see), "the villages of Jair," lay in Gilead (Jud 10:4). The modern division of the country follows the natural features. From the Yarmuk to Nahr ez-Zerqa is the district of ‘Ajlun; and from the Zerqa to the Arnon is el-Belqa.

3. Geology:

The geological formation is the same as that of Western Palestine, but the underlying sandstone, which does not appear West of the Jordan, forms the base slopes of the chain of Moab and Gilead, and is traceable as far as the Jabbok. It is covered in part by the more recent white marls which form the curious peaks of the foothills immediately above the Jordan valley; but reaches above them to an elevation of 1,000 ft. above the Mediterranean on the South, and forms the bed of the Buqei‘a basin farther East, and 1,000 ft. higher. Above this lies the hard, impervious dolomite limestone which appears in ‘the rugged hills round’ the Jabbok and in Jebel ‘Ajlun, rising on an average 1,500 ft. above the sandstone and forming the bed of the copious springs. It also dips toward the Jordan valley, and the water from the surface of the plateau, sinking down to the surface of their formation, bursts out of the hill slopes on the West in perennial brooks. It was from the ruggedness of this hard limestone that Gilead obtained its name. Above this again is the white chalk of the desert plateau, the same as that found in Samaria and Lower Galilee, with bands of flint or chert in contorted layers, or strewn in pebbles on the surface. Where this formation is deep the country is bare and arid, supplied by cisterns and deep wells. Thus the plateau becomes desert, while the hill slopes abound in streams and springs; and for this reason Western Gilead is a fertile country, and Eastern Gilead is a wilderness (Conder, DB, under the word).

4. Mountains:

The uplands of Gilead may be described as the crumpling of the edge of the great eastern plateau ere it plunges into the Ghor. The average height of the range is about 4,000 ft. above the Jordan valley, or 3,000 ft. above the Mediterranean. The greatest height is toward the South, where it culminates in Jebel Osh‘a (3,597 ft.), to the North of es-Salt. This mountain commands a most spacious view. To the East of it lies the hollow (an old lake bottom) of el-Buqei‘a, fully 1,500 ft. lower. In the North we have Jebel

Hakart (3,408 ft.) W, of Reimun. Almost as high (3,430 ft.) is Jebei Kafkafah, about 12 miles to the Northeast. A striking point (2,700 ft.) fully 2 miles Northwest of ‘Ajlun, is crowned by Qal‘at er-Rabad, whence again a view of extraordinary extent is gained.

5. Streams and Products:

The Yarmuk and the Zerqa (see JABBOK) are the main streams, but almost every valley has its perennial brook. While not so rich as the volcanic loam in the North and in and the South, the soil of Gilead amply repays the labor of the husbandman. Of flowers the most plentiful are the phlox, the cistus and the narcissus. Hawthorn, mastic and arbutus abound, while many a glen and slope is shady with shaggy oak woods, and, in the higher reaches, with pines. The streams are fringed with oleander. The monotony of the stony plateau is broken by clumps of the hardy white broom. In the lower ground are found the tamarisk and the lotus, with many a waving cane-brake. The scenery is more beautiful and picturesque than that of any other district of Palestine. The soil is not now cultivated to any great extent; but it furnishes ample pasture for many flocks and herds (So 6:5).

The Ishmaelites from Gilead (Ge 37:25) were carrying "spicery and balm and myrrh." From old time Gilead was famed for its BALM (which see). The loT, translated "myrrh" in the above passage, was probably the gum produced by the Cistus ladaniferus, a flower which still abounds in Gilead.

6. History:

After the conquest, as we have seen, Gilead passed mainly into the hands of Gad. An Ammonite attack was repulsed by the prowess of Jephthah (Jud 11:1); and the spite of the Ephraimites was terribly punished (Jud 12:1). Gilead at first favored the cause of Ishbosheth (2Sa 2:9), but after the murder of that prince the Gileadites came with the rest of Israel to David (2Sa 5:1). By the conquest of the fortress Rabbah, which the Ammonites had continued to hold, the land passed finally under the power of David (2Sa 12:26). David fled to Mahanaim from Absalom, and that rebel prince perished in one of the forests of Gilead (2Sa 17:24; 18:6). Joab’s census included Gilead (2Sa 24:6). Solomon had two commissariat districts in Gilead (1Ki 4:13 f, 19). Before Ramoth-gilead, which he sought to win back from the Syrians who had captured it, Ahab received his death wound (1Ki 22:1). The Syrians asserted their supremacy in Gilead (2Ki 10:32 f) where Moab and Israel had contended with varying fortune (M S). At length Tiglath-pileser overran the country and transported many of the inhabitants (2Ki 15:29). This seems to have led to a reconquest of the land by heathenism, and return to Gilead was promised to Israel (Zec 10:10).

At a later time the Jewish residents in Gilead were exposed to danger from their heathen neighbors. On their behalf Judas Maccabeus invaded the country and met with striking success (1 Macc 5:9 ff). Alexander Janneus, who had subdued Gilead, was forced to yield it again to the king of Arabia (Ant., XIII, xiv, 2; BJ, I, iv, 3). During the Roman period, especially in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD, the land enjoyed great prosperity. Then were built such cities as Gadara and Gerasa, which are still imposing, even in ruins. The appearance of the Moslem armies was the signal for its decay. Attempts were made to

recover it for Christianity by Baldwin I (1118 AD) and Baldwin II (1121 AD); and the Crusaders left their mark in such strong-holds as Kal‘at er-Rabad and the castle at es-Salt. With the reassertion of Moslem supremacy a curtain falls over the history of the district; and only in comparatively recent times has it again become known to travelers. The surveys directed by the Palestine Exploration Fund, in so far as they have been carried out, are invaluable. North of the Jabbok are many villages, and a fair amount of cultivation. Es Salt is the only village of any importance in the South. It is famous for its raisins. Its spacious uplands, its wooded and well-watered valleys have been for centuries the pasture-land of the nomads.

LITERATURE.

Useful information will be found in Merrill, East of the Jordan; Oliphant, Land of Gilead; Thomson, LB; and especially in Conder, Heth and Moab, and in Memoirs of the Survey of Eastern Palestine

W. Ewing

GILEAD (2)

(gil‘adh):

(1) A son of Machir, grandson of Manasseh (Nu 26:29,30).

(2) The father of Jephthah (Jud 11:1,2).

(3) A Gadite, the son of Michael (1Ch 5:14).

GILEAD, BALM OF

See BALM OF GILEAD.

GILEAD, MOUNT

See GILEAD (2).

GILEADITES

gil’-e-ad-its:

(1) A branch of the tribe of Manasseh (Nu 26:29).

(2) Natives of the district of Gilead (Jud 10:3; 11:1, etc.).

GILGAL

gil’-gal (gilgal, "circle"; Galgala): The article is always with the name except in Jos 5:9. There are three places to which the name is attached:

(1) The first camp of Israel after crossing the Jordan (Jos 4:19; 5:9,10; 9:6; 10:7; 14:6; 15:7; De 11:30). According to Jos 15:7 it lay to the North of the valley of Achor, which formed the border between Judah and Benjamin. Here 12 memorial stones taken from the bed of the river were set up by Joshua, after the miraculous crossing of the Jordan; and here (Jos 5:5) the people were circumcised preparatory to their possession of the land, when it is said in Josh, with a play upon the word, "This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you." Whereupon the Passover was celebrated (Jos 5:10) and the manna ceased (Jos 5:12). To Gilgal the ark returned every day after having compassed the city of Jericho during its siege (Jos 6:11). Hither the Gibeonites came to make their treaty (Jos 9:3), and again (Jos 10:6) to ask aid against the Amorites. Gilgal was still the headquarters of the Israelites after the battle with the Amorites (Jos 10:15); again after Joshua’s extensive victorious campaign in the hill country of Judea extending to Kadesh-barnea and Gaza (Jos 10:15); and still later upon his return from the great battle at the Waters of Merom (Jos 14:6). At the conclusion of the conquest (Jos 18:1), the headquarters were transferred to Shiloh on the summit of the mountain ridge to the West.

Gilgal reappears frequently in subsequent history. Samuel (1Sa 7:16) made it one of the three places where he annually held circuit court, the other places being Bethel and Mizpah. The Septuagint text adds that these were holy places. The place continued as one of special resort for sacrifices (1Sa 10:8; 13:8,9,10; 15:21), while it was here that Samuel hewed Agag to pieces before the Lord (1Sa 15:33), and that Saul was both crowned (1Sa 11:14,15) and rejected as king. It was at Gilgal, also (2Sa 19:15), that the people assembled to welcome David as he returned from his exile beyond Jordan during Absalom’s rebellion. The early prophets refer to Gilgal as a center of idolatry in their day (Ho 4:15; 9:15; 12:11; Am 4:4; 5:5). Micah (6:5) represents Gilgal as at the other end of the Dead Sea from Shittim.

In 1874 Conder recognized the name Gilgal as surviving in Barker Jiljuilieh, a pool beside a tamarisk tree 3 miles East of old Jericho. The pool measures 100 ft. by 84, and is surrounded with a wall of roughly hewn stones. North of the pool Bliss discovered lines of masonry 300 yds. long, representing probably the foundations of an ancient monastery. South of the pool there are numerous mounds scattered over an area of one-third of a square mile, the largest being 50 feet in diameter, and 10 feet in height. On excavation some pottery and glass were found. These ruins are probably those of early Christian occupation, and according to Conder there is nothing against their marking the original site. Up to the Middle Ages the 12 stones of Joshua were referred to by tradition.

(2) According to 2Ki 2:1; 4:38, Elisha for a time made his headquarters at Gilgal, a place in the mountains not far from Bethel identified by Conder as Jiljilia, standing on a high hill on the North side of the Wady el-Jib. It is lower than Bethel, but the phrase in 2Ki 2:2, "they went down to Beth-el," may

refer to their initial descent into the wady. It could not have been said that they went down from Gilgal to Bethel in the Jordan valley. The place seems to be referred to in Neb 12:29 as Beth-gilgal.

(3) Gilgal of the nations: In Jos 12:23 Gilgal is mentioned as a royal city associated with Dor, evidently upon the maritime plain. Dor is identified with Tantura, while Conder identifies this Gilgal with Jiljuilieh, 30 miles South of Dor and 4 miles North of Anti-patris.

George Frederick Wright

GILOH

gi’-lo (giloh): A town in the hill country of Judah mentioned along with Jattir, Socoh, Debir, Eshtemoa, etc. (Jos 15:51). Ahithophel came from here (2Sa 15:12) and is called the Gilonite (2Sa 23:34). Driver infers from this last that the original form was Gilon, not Giloh. Probably the ruins Kb. Jala, in the hills 3 miles Northwest of Hulhul, mark the site (PEF, III, 313, Sh XXI).

GILONITE

gi’-lo-nit. See preceding article.

GIMEL

ge’-mel, gim’-el ("g"): The 3rd letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and used as such to designate the 3rd part of Ps 119; transliterated in this Encyclopedia with the dagesh as "g", and without the dagesh as "gh" (aspirated "g"). It came also to be used for the number three (3), and with the dieresis for 3,000. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

GIMZO

gim’-zo (gimzo; Gamzo): A town of Judah on the border of the Philistine plain, captured by the Philistines in the days of Ahaz (2Ch 28:18). It is the modern Jimzu, a small mud village about 3 1/2 miles Southeast of Ludd (Lydda), on the old mule road from there to Jerusalem (Robinson, BR, II, 248-49; . SWP, Il, 297).

GIN

jin (moqesh, pach): A noose of hair or wire for snaring wild birds alive. There are over half a dozen traps and net devices indicated by different terms in the Bible. The gin was of horse-hair for small birds and wire for larger ones. It is mentioned in Am 3:5: "Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no gin is set for him? shall a snare spring up from the ground, and have taken nothing at all?" Job writing in mental and physical discomfort on the ash heap included all methods mentioned in one outburst:

"For he is cast into a net by his own feet.

And he walketh upon the toils.

A gin shall take him by the heel,

And a snare shall lay hold on him,

A noose is hid for him in the ground.

And a trap for him in the way" (Job 18:8).

Gene Stratton-Porter

GINATH

gi’-nath (ginath): Father of Tibni, the unsuccessful rival of Omri (1Ki 16:21,22).

GINNETHOI; GINNETHON

gin-e-tho’-i, gin’-e-thon (the King James Version Ginnetho), (ginnethoy, and ginnethon): The head of a priestly family. Ginnethoi (Ginnetho) is found in Ne 12:4, and Ginnethon in 10:6; 12:16.

GIRDLE

gur’-d’-l.

See ARMOR; DRESS.

GIRGASHITE

gur’-ga-shit (girgashi; Gergesaios; also punctuated (?) Girgasite (Ge 10:16 the King James Version)): A son of (the land of) Canaan (Ge 10:16), and accordingly enumerated along with the Canaanite’ in the list of tribes or nationalities inhabiting that country (Ge 15:21; De 7:1; Jos 3:10; 24:11; Ne 9:8). It has been supposed that the name survived in that of "the Gergesenes," the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "the Gadarenes"), of Mt 8:28, on the East side of the Sea of Galilee; Josephus (Ant., I, vi, 2), however, states that nothing was known about it. The inscriptions of the Egyptian king, Ramses II, mention the Qarqish who sent help to the Hittites in their war with Egypt; but Qarqish was more probably in Asia Minor than in Syria. Pinches (The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records, 324) would identify the Girgashites with the Kirkishati of an Assyrian tablet; the

latter people, however, seem to have lived to the East of the Tigris, and it may be that, as in the case of the Hittites, a colony of the Qarqish, from Asia Minor, was established in Palestine.

A. H. Sayce

GIRL

gurl: Twice in the Old Testament as the rendering of yaldah (Joe 3:3; Zec 8:5), in both cases in association with boys. Same word rendered "damsel" in Ge 34:4.

See DAUGHTER; MAID, MAIDEN.

GIRZITES

gur'-zits.

See GIZRITES.

GISHPA

gish'-pa (the King James Version Gispa; gishpa'): An officer of the Nethinim (Ne 11:21). A comparison with Ezr 2:43 makes it probable that he is to be identified with Hasupha, and quite possible that this word is a corruption of Hasupha.

GITTAH-HEPHER

git-a-he'-fer (gittah chepher): the King James Version (Jos 19:13) for Gath-hepher. Gittah is correctly Gath with the Hebrew letter, he ("h") locale, meaning "toward Gath."

GITTAIM

git'-a-im (gittayim): The town to which the Beerothites tied, and where they lived as gerim, or protected strangers (2Sa 4:3). The place need not have been beyond the boundaries of Benjamin, so it may be identical with Gittaim of Ne 11:33, which was occupied by Benjamites after the exile. It is named with Hazor and Ramah; but so far the site has not been discovered.

GITTITES

git'-its (gittim, plural of gittiy): The inhabitants of Gath. They are mentioned along with the inhabitants of the other chief Philistine cities in Jos 13:3. It would seem that numbers of them emigrated to Judah,

for we find 600 of them acting as a bodyguard to David with Ittai at their head (2Sa 15:18 ff; 18:2). Obed-edom, to whom David entrusted the ark when he was frustrated in bringing it into the city of David, was a Gittite (2Sa 6:11 f; 1Ch 13:13). The Gittites seem to have been remarkable for their great stature (2Sa 21:19; 1Ch 20:5).

GITTITH

git’-ith.

See MUSIC; PSALMS.

GIVE

(nathan, yahabh, sum; didomi): "Give" is a very common word in the Old Testament. It is most frequently the translation of nathan, "to give" (Ge 1:29; 3:6; Ex 2:9; De 18,20, etc., over 800 instances); nathan is also translated "to give up" (De 23:14; Isa 43:6; Ho 11:8); of yahabh, "to give" (Ge 30:1; 1Ch 16:28 the King James Version). In Ps 55:22 we have the perfect with suffix, "Cast thy burden upon Yahweh," margin "what he hath given thee"; elsewhere it is the imperative "Give!" (the King James Version in Gen, "Go to"); sum, "to put," "place" (Nu 6:26; Pr 8:29); rum, "to lift up," "exalt" (2Ch 30:24; 35:7,8,9, "to give to"); shubh, "to cause to turn back" (Le 25:51,52; 2Ki 17:3, "to give again"); various other words are in single instances translated "give."

In the New Testament, the common word is didomi, "to give" (Mt 4:9; Joh 1:12; Re 1:1; 21:6, etc.); we have also apodidomi, "to give away (from one’s self)" (Mt 12:36; Lu 16:2; Ac 4:33; 19:40; Re 22:12); diadidomi, "to give throughout" (Re 17:13); epididomi, "to give upon or besides" (Mt 7:9,10; Joh 13:26); metadidomi, "to give a share" (Ro 12:8); paradidomi, "to give over to" (Ro 1:28; 1Co 13:3; Ga 2:20, etc.); prodidomi, "to give forth or foremost" (Ro 11:35); aponemo, "to apportion" (1Pe 3:7); doreomai, "to give as a gift" (Mr 15:45, the Revised Version (British and American) "granted"; 2Pe 1:3,4 the King James Version); martureo, "to give testimony or witness" (1 Joh 5:10); pareisphero, "to bring forward therewith" (2Pe 1:5); parecho, "to hold near by" (Col 4:1; 1Ti 6:17); kataphero, "to bear against or down" (Ac 26:10); charizomai, "to grant as a favor" (Lu 7:21; Ac 27:24; Ro 8:32; Ga 3:18; Php 2:9; Phm 1:22 the King James Version). A few other words mostly occurring singly are translated "give."

Of the many changes in the Revised Version (British and American), the following are among the most important: for "Thou hast also given me the necks of mine enemies," "Thou hast also made mine enemies turn their backs unto me" (2Sa 22:41; Ps 18:40); for "He that made him can make his sword to approach unto him" (Job 40:19), the American Standard Revised Version has "He only that made him giveth him his sword," the English Revised Version, margin "furnished"; for "hasten after another god" (Ps 16:4), the American Standard Revised Version has "give gifts for" (ERVm); for "give" (Ps 29:1,2, etc.), the American Standard Revised Version has "ascribe"; for "give myself unto wine" (Ec 2:3), "cheer my flesh with wine"; for "giveth his life" (Joh 10:11), "layeth down"; "given" is supplied

(Ac 19:2), where we read instead of "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost," "We did not so much as hear whether the Holy Spirit was given," margin "there is a Holy Spirit"; for Christ shall give thee light" (Eph 5:14), "Christ shall shine upon thee"; for "give in charge" (1Ti 5:7), "command"; for "not given to wine" (1Ti 3:3; Tit 1:7), "no brawler," margin "not quarrelsome over wine"; for "she that liveth in pleasure" (1Ti 5:6), "giveth herself to"; for "All scripture is given by inspiration of God" (2Ti 3:16), "Every scripture inspired of God," margin "Every scripture is inspired of God"; for "given to filthy lucre" (Tit 1:7), "greedy of"; in Heb 2:16, the American Standard Revised Version has "For verily not of angels doth he give help," margin "For verily not of angels doth he take hold, but he taketh hold," etc. (compare Isa 41:9; Ecclesiasticus 4:11; 8:9 (in the Greek) the English Revised Version, "not of angels doth he take hold") (the idea is that of taking hold of to lift up or help); in Ecclesiasticus 13:15 for "giving thanks to his name," the Revised Version (British and American) reads "make confession to his name"; for "giving all diligent" (2Pe 1:5), "adding."

The prominence of "give" in the Bible reminds us that God is the great Giver (Jas 1:5), and of the words of the Lord Jesus, "It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Ac 20:35), "Freely ye received, freely give" (Mt 10:8).

W. L. Walker

GIZONITE

gi’-zon-it: This gentilic name in 1Ch 11:34, "Hashem the Gizonite," is probably an error for "Gunite" (compare Nu 26:48), and the passage should be corrected, after 2Sa 23:32, into "Jashen the Gunite."

GIZRITES

giz’-rits (gizri (Kethibh); the King James Version Gezrites): Inhabitants of GEZER, (which see). The Qere reads girzi, Girzites (1Sa 27:8).

GLAD TIDINGS

ti’-dingz (euaggelizo): "Glad-tidings" occurs in the King James Version in the translation of the verb euaggelizo, "to tell good news" (Lu 1:19; 8:1; Ac 13:32; Ro 10:15); in each instance, except the last, the Revised Version (British and American) translations "good tidings." The verb is also very frequently translated in the King James Version "to preach the gospel," the original meaning of which word (god-spell) is "good news or tidings" (Mt 11:5; Lu 4:18; 7:22; 9:6; 20:1); in the first two passages the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "good tidings," margin "the gospel"; in the last two instances "the gospel" is retained, the American Revised Version, margin "good tidings"—the gospel or good tidings being the announcement of the near approach of the promised, long-looked-for salvation and kingdom of God; in Ro 1:15; 15:20; 1Co 1:17, etc., the King James Version has "the gospel," namely, that of God’s reconciliation of the world to Himself in Christ; the Revised Version (British and

American) in some passages substitutes "good tidings," or gives this in the margin; but "glad tidings" stands only in Ro 10:15.

W. L. Walker

GLASS

glas (zekhukhith; hualos):

1. History:

Glass is of great antiquity. The story of its discovery by accident, as related by Pliny (NH, xxxvi.65), is apocryphal, but it was natural for the Greeks and Romans to ascribe it to the Phoenicians, since they were the producers of the article as known to them. The Egyptian monuments have revealed to us the manufacture in a time so remote that it must have preceded that of the Phoenicians. A representation of glass-blowing on monuments of the Old Empire, as formerly supposed, is now regarded as doubtful, but undoubted examples of glazed pottery of that age exist. A fragment of blue glass has been found inscribed with the name of Antef III, of the XIth Dynasty, dating from 2000 or more BC (Davis, Ancient Egypt, 324). The oldest dated bottle, or vase, is one bearing the name of Thothmes III, 1500 or more BC, and numerous examples occur of later date. The close connection between Egypt and Syria from the time of Thothmes on must have made glass known in the latter country, and the Phoenicians, so apt in all lines of trade and manufacture, naturally seized on glass-making as a most profitable art and they became very proficient in it. The earliest glass was not very transparent, since they did not know how to free the materials used from impurities. It had a greenish or purplish tinge, and a large part of the examples we have of Phoenician glass exhibit this. But we have many examples of blue, red and yellow varieties which were purposely colored, and others quite opaque and of a whitish color, resembling porcelain (Perrot and Chipiez, Art in Ancient Phoenicia and Its Dependencies). But both they and the Egyptians made excellent transparent glass also, and decorated it with brilliant coloring on the surface (ib; Beni Hasan, Archeol. Survey of Egypt, Pt IV). Layard (Nineveh and Babylon) mentions a vase of transparent glass bearing the name of Sargon (522-505 BC), and glass was early known to the Babylonians.

2. Manufacture:

Phoenicia was the great center, and the quantities found in tombs of Syria and Palestine go to confirm the statement that this was one of the great industries of this people, to which ancient authors testify (Strabo, Geog.; Pliny, NH). Josephus refers to the sand of the Belus as that from which glass was made (BJ, II, x, 2). It seems to have been especially adapted for the purpose, but there are other places on the coast where plenty of suitable sand could be obtained. The potash required was obtained by burning certain marine and other plants, and saltpeter, or niter, was also employed. The manufacture began centuries BC on this coast, and in the 12th century AD a factory is mentioned as still being worked at Tyre, and the manufacture was later carried on at Hebron, even down to recent times (Perrot and

Chipiez).

Both the Egyptians and Phoenicians gained such proficiency in making transparent and colored glass that they imitated precious stones with such skill as to deceive the unwary. Necklaces are found composed of a mixture of real brilliants and glass imitations. Cut glass was manufactured in Egypt as early as the XVIIIth Dynasty, and diamonds were made use of in the article Glass composed of different colors in the same piece was made by placing layers of glass wire, of different colors, one above the other and then fusing them so thar they became united in a solid mass without intermingling. Colored designs on the surface were produced by tracing the patterns, while the glass was still warm and plastic, deep enough to receive the threads of colored glass which were imbedded in them. The whole was heated again sufficiently to fuse the threads and attach them to the body. The surface was then made even by perishing. By this process vessels and ornaments of very beautiful design were produced. Many of the specimens, as found, are covered by an exquisite iridescence which is due wholly to the decomposition of the surface by chemical action, from lying buried for centuries in the soil which thus acts upon it. This is often lost in handling by the scaling off of the outer surface.

Glass, in the strict sense, is rarely mentioned in Scripture, but it was certainly known to the Hebrews, and occurs in Job 28:17 (translated "crystal" in the King James Version). Bottles, cups and other vessels in glass must have been in use to some extent. The wine cup of Pr 23:31 and the bottle for tears mentioned in Ps 56:8 were most likely of glass. Tear bottles are found in great quantities in the tombs throughout the land and were undoubtedly connected with funeral rites, the mourners collecting their tears and placing them in these bottles to be buried with the dead. As mourners were hired for the purpose, the number of these bottles would indicate the extent to which the deceased was honored. These were, of course, small, some quite diminutive (see illustration), as also were the vials or pots to contain the ointment for the eyebrows and eyelashes, used to heighten the beauty of the women, which was probably a custom among the Hebrews as well as their neighbors. Rings, bracelets and anklets of glass are very common and were doubtless worn by the Hebrew women (see Isa 3:18 f). In the New Testament the Greek hualos occurs in Re 21:18,21, and the adjective derived from it hualinos in 4:6 and 15:2. In the other passages, where in the King James Version "glass" occurs, the reference is to "looking-glass," or mirror, which was not made of glass, but of bronze, and polished so as to reflect the light similar to glass. The Hebrew word for this is gillayon (Isa 3:23), or mar’ah (Ex 38:8), and the Greek esoptron (1Co 13:12; Jas 1:23; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 7:26; Sirach 12:11).

The composition of the Phoenician glass varies considerably. The analysis shows that, besides the ordinary constituents of silica, lime, lead, potash or soda, other elements are found, some being used for the purpose of coloring, such as manganese to give the purplish or violet hue, cobalt for blue, copper for red, etc. The articles illustrated above are of ordinary transparent glass with an iridescent surface, caused by decomposition, as mentioned above, indicated by the scaly appearance. Numbers 1, 4 and 5 are tear bottles, number 4 being only 1 3/4 inches in height; numbers 2 and 3 are ointment vases which were used for the ointment with which ladies were accustomed to color their eyebrows and eyelashes to enhance their beauty. This custom still prevails in the East. The small ladle by the side of the larger vase is of bronze, used in applying the ointment. This vase is double and 6 3/4 inches high, ornamented with glass wire wound upon it while plastic. The larger vases (numbers 6 and 7) are about 6 inches in height.

The hand-mirror ("looking-glass" the King James Version) is bronze, and had originally a polished surface, but is now corroded.

H. Porter

GLASS, SEA OF

(thalassa hualine; Re 4:6; 15:2): In the vision of heaven in these two apocalyptic passages a "glassy sea" is seen before the throne of God. The pure translucency of the sea is indicated in the former reference by the words, "like unto crystal"; and the fiery element that may symbolize the energy of the Divine holiness is suggested in the latter passage by the trait, "mingled with fire." On the margin of this sea—on the inner side—stood the victorious saints, with harps, singing the song of Moses and of the Lamb (Re 15:2-4). The imagery here points to a relation with the triumphal song in Ex 15, after the deliverance from Pharaoh at the Red Sea. It is not easy to define the symbolism precisely. The sea, reflecting in its crystalline depths the purity and holiness of the Divine character and administration, speaks at the same time of difficulties surmounted, victory obtained and safety assured, the after-glow of the Divine judgments by which this result has been secured still illuminating the glassy expanse that has been crossed.

James Orr

GLEANING

glen'-ing (laqat, 'alal): The custom of allowing the poor to follow the reapers in the field and glean the fallen spears of grain is strikingly illustrated in the story of Ru (Ru 2:2-23). This custom had back of it one of the early agricultural laws of the Hebrews (Le 19:9; 23:22; De 24:19-21). Breaking this law was a punishable offense. The generosity of the master of the crop determined the value of the gleanings, as the story of Ru well illustrates (Ru 2:16). A reaper could easily impose upon the master by leaving too much for the gleaners, who might be his own children. The old Levitical law no longer holds in the land, but the custom of allowing the poor to glean in the grain fields and vineyards is still practiced by generous landlords in Syria. The writer has seen the reapers, even when they exercised considerable care, drop from their hands frequent spears of wheat. When the reapers have been hirelings they have carelessly left bunches of wheat standing behind rocks or near the boundary walls. The owner usually sends one of his boy or girl helpers to glean these. If he is of a generous disposition, he allows some needy woman to follow after the reapers and benefit by their carelessness. It is the custom in some districts, after the main crop of grapes has been gathered, to remove the watchman and allow free access to the vineyards for gleaning the last grapes.

Gideon touched the local pride of the men of Ephraim when he declared that the glory of their conquest surpassed his, as the gleanings of their vineyards did the whole crop of Abiezer (Jud 8:2). Gleaned is used of a captured enemy in Jud 20:45.

Figurative: Israel, because of her wickedness, will be utterly destroyed, even to a thorough gleaning and destruction of those who first escape (Jer 6:9). The same picture of complete annihilation is given in Jer 49:9,10.

James A. Patch

GLEDE

gled (ra‘ah; gups): A member of the hawk species. It is given among the list of abominations in De 14:13, but not in the Le list (Le 11:14). The kite is substituted. The Arabs might have called one of the buzzards the glede. In England, where specimens of most of these birds appear in migration, the glede is synonymous with kite, and was given the name from glide, to emphasize a gliding motion in flight. See illustration, p. 1235.

GLISTERING

glis’-ter-ing (pukh, "dye" (spec. "stibium"), "fair colors"; stilbonta): "‘Glistering stones’ (1Ch 29:2) is better

than the ‘inlaid’ of the Revised Version (British and American); for some kind of colored, brilliant stone seems meant" (HDB, II, 182); compare Isa 54:11 Revised Version, margin. The term is employed in Mr 9:3 to denote the white, lustrous appearance of Christ’s garments at the transfiguration. It occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. For once the Divine effulgence shone through the veil of the humiliation (compare Joh 1:14).

GLITTER; GLITTERING

glit’-er, glit’-er-ing (baraq, "lightning"): The word is used in sense of "glittering" in the Old Testament with "sword," "spear" (De 32:41; Job 20:25; Eze 21:10,28; Na 3:3; Hab 3:11). In Eze 21:10 the Revised Version (British and American) changes "glitter" to "as lightning," and in De 32:41 the Revised Version, margin gives, "the lightning of my sword." In Job 39:23, where the word is different (lahabh), the Revised Version (British and American) has "flashing."

GLORIFY

glo’-ri-fi: The English word is the equivalent of a number of Hebrew and Greek words whose essential significance is discussed more fully under the word GLORY (which see). The word "glorious" in the phrases "make or render glorious" is used most frequently as a translation of verbs in the original, rather than of genuine adjectives In dealing with the verb it will be sufficient to indicate the following most important uses.

(1) Men may glorify God, that is, give to Him the worship and reverence which are His due (Isa 24:15; 25:3; Ps 22:23; Da 5:23; APC Sirach 43:30; Mt 5:16, and generally in the Synoptic Gospels and in some other passages of the New Testament).

(2) God, Yahweh (Yahweh), glorifies His people, His house, and in the New Testament, His Son, manifesting His approval of them and His interest in them, by His interposition on their behalf (Isa 55:5; Jer 30:19; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:8; Sirach 45:3; Joh 7:39, and often in the Fourth Gospel).

(3) By a usage which is practically confined to the Old Testament, Yahweh glorifies Himself, that is, secures the recognition of His honor and majesty, by His direction of the course of history, or by His interposition in history, either the history of His own people or of the world at large (Le 10:3; Isa 26:15; Eze 28:22; Hag 1:8).

Walter R. Betteridge

GLORIOUS

glo’-ri-us: The adjective "glorious" is used in the majority of cases as the translation of one of the nouns which are fully discussed in the article GLORY, and the general meaning is the same, for the glorious objects or persons have the quality which is described by the word "glory," that is, they are honorable, dignified, powerful, distinguished, splendid, beautiful or radiant. It is worthy of note that in many passages in the New Testament where the King James Version has "glorious," the Revised Version (British and American) has the noun "glory." So among others in Ro 8:21, the King James Version has "glorious liberty," the Revised Version (British and American) "liberty of the glory of the sons of God." The obsolete use of the word glorious in the sense of "boastful," "vain-glorious," "eager for glory," as it is used in Wycliffe, Tyndale and Bacon, and once or twice in Shakespeare, as in Cymbeline, I, 7, in the first speech of Imogen, "Most miserable is the desire that’s glorious," and in Gower’s Prologue to Pericles, 1,9, "The purchase of it is to make men glorious" occurs at least once in the apocryphal books, Additions to Esther 16:4 the King James Version, "but also lifted up with the glorious words of lewd persons."

Walter R. Betteridge

GLORY

glo’-ri (substantive):

I. METHOD OF TREATMENT

II. GENERAL USE OF THE TERM

1. As Applied to External Things

2. As Applied to Yahweh

III. THE USES OF KABHODH

1. Material Wealth

2. Human Dignity and Majesty

3. "My Soul": the Self

4. Self-Manifestation of God (Yahweh)

(1) Exodus 23:18 ff

(2) Isaiah 6

(3) Psalms 19:1

(4) Sinai and the Temple

(5) Ezekiel’s Visions

(6) Messianic Ideal

(7) Its Ethical Content

IV. IN THE APOCRYPHA AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. In the Apocrypha:

(1) As Applied to External Things

(2) As Applied to God

2. In the New Testament:

(1) As Applied to Men

(2) As Applied to God

(3) As Applied to the Saints

(4) As Applied to the Messianic Kingdom

3. Its Ethical Significance

LITERATURE

I. Method of Treatment.

In this article we deal, first, with a group of words, translated "glory" in the English Versions of the Bible, and in which the ideas of size, rarity, beauty and adornment are prominent, the emphasis being laid in the first instance in each case upon some external physical characteristic which attracts the attention, and makes the object described by the word significant or prominent.

These are (’addereth) perhaps to be connected with the Assyrian root ‘adaru, meaning "wide," "great"; (hadhar, hadharah), perhaps with root-meaning of "brightness"; (hodh), with essentially the same meaning of "brightness," "light"; (Tehar), Ps 89:44, translated "glory" in the King James Version, in the Revised Version (British and American) rendered "brightness"; (yeqara’), an Aramaic root meaning "rare"; (tiph’arah), with the root-meaning of "beauty "; and finally (tsebhi), perhaps on the basis of the Assyrian cabu, meaning "desire," "desirable."

Secondly, this article will discuss the most common and characteristic word for "glory" in the Old Testament, the Hebrew (kabhodh) including the special phrase "the glory of God" or "the glory of Yahweh." In dealing with the Old Testament usage, attention will also be called to the original Hebrew of the Book of Ecclesiasticus or Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, cited in this article as Sir. Thirdly, with the Greek word (doxa) in the Apocrypha and in the New Testament. The nouns kauchema, kauchesis, translated "glory" or "glorying" in the New Testament, will be dealt with in the concluding paragraphs in which the use of the word glory as a verb will briefly be discussed. It will be possible within the limits of this article to give only the main outlines of the subject as illustrated by a few of the most significant references. The lexicons and the commentaries must be consulted for the details.

II. General Use of the Term.

In the first group, as has already been stated, the ideas of beauty, majesty and splendor are prominent. And these qualities are predicated first of all, of things. David determines to make the temple which Solomon is to build "a house of fame and of glory" (1Ch 22:5).

1. As Applied to External Things:

Then, and more commonly, glory belongs to men, and especially to men of prominence, like kings. This glory may consist in wealth, power, portion, or even in the inherent majesty and dignity of character of its possessor. The reference is most frequently, however, to the external manifestations. Physical power is suggested in De 33:17, where "glory" of the King James Version is replaced by "majesty" in the Revised Version (British and American). The king's glory consists in the multitude of his people (Pr 14:28). The glory and the pomp of the rebellious people shall descend into Sheol (Isa 5:14). Here the reference is clearly to those external things upon which the people depend, and the possession of which is the ground of their confidence.

2. As Applied to Yahweh:

But chiefly glory is the possesion and characteristic of Yahweh, and is given by Him to His people or to anything which is connected with Him. In Isa 60:7 the Lord promises to glorify the house of His glory, and the meaning is clearly that He will impart to His house something of the beauty and majesty which belong to Him. Glory is one of the qualities which are distinctive of Yahweh (1Ch 29:11); and Isaiah, in one of his earliest utterances, uses the word "glory" to describe Yahweh's self-manifestation in judgment to bring to naught the pride and power of men (Isa 2:10,19,21). The use of the word in Ps 78:61 is not quite certain. The most natural interpretation would perhaps be to refer it to the ark as the symbol of the presence of Yahweh, but in view of the parallel word "strength," it is perhaps better to interpret glory as meaning power, and to suppose that the Psalmist means that Yahweh allowed His power to be temporarily obscured, and Himself to be seemingly humiliated on account of the sin of His people.

III. The Uses of Kabhodh.

The use and significance of kabhodh in the Old Testament and in Sirach: The fundamental idea of this root seems to be "weight," "heaviness," and hence in its primary uses it conveys the idea of some external, physical manifestation of dignity, preeminence or majesty. At least three uses may be distinguished: (1) It defines the wealth or other material possesions which give honor or distinction to a person; (2) the majesty, dignity, splendor or honor of a person; (3) most important of all, it describes the form in which Yahweh (Yahweh) reveals Himself or is the sign and manifestation of His presence.

1. Material Wealth:

In Ge 31:1 (margin "wealth") it describes the flocks and herds which Jacob has acquired; in Ps 49:16 f, as the parallelism indicates, it refers to the wealth of the sinner; and in Isa 10:3 it is said that in the day of desolation the heartless plunderers of the poor shall not know where to leave their ill-gotten gain. This idea is also probably to be found in Hag 2:7, where the parallelism seems to indicate that the glory with which Yahweh will fill the house is the treasure which He will bring into it. See also Sirach 9:11, where the glory of the sinner which is not to be envied is probably his wealth.

2. Human Dignity and Majesty:

It describes the majesty and dignity or honor of men due to their adornment or to their position. In Ge 45:13, Joseph bids his brethren tell their father of his glory in Egypt; according to Ex 28:40, the priestly garments are intended for the glorification of their wearers; in 1Sa 4:21 f, the loss of the ark means, for Israel, the loss of her glory, that which gave her distinction from, and preeminence over, her neighbors; in Isa 22:23 it is said that Eliakim is to be a throne of glory, i.e. the source and manifestation of the splendor and dignity of his father's house; in Job 19:9 the complaint that God has stripped him of his glory must be taken to refer to his dignity and honor. Reference may also be made to the numerous passages in which the glory of Israel and other nations describes their dignity, majesty or distinction; so we hear of the glory of Ephraim (Ho 9:11), of Moab (Isa 16:14), of Kedar (Isa 21:16). This use is quite common in Sir. Sirach 3:10 f states that the glory of man comes from the honor of his father; the possessor of wisdom shall inherit glory (4:13; 37:26); note also 4:21 with its reference to "a shame that is glory and grace," and 49:5 where the forfeited independence of Judah is described by the terms "power" and "glory."

3. "My Soul": the Self:

Closely related to this use of kabhodh to describe the majesty of men is the group of passages in which the phrase "my glory," in parallelism with nephesh, "soul," "self," or some similar expression, means the man himself in his most characteristic nature. In the blessing of Jacob (Ge 49:6) we read, "Unto their assembly, my glory, be not thou united." Other passages are Ps 4:2; 7:5; 16:9; 30:12; 57:8; 108:1 and perhaps Job 29:20. Some recent interpreters, partly because of the Septuagint rendering in Ge 49:6 (ta hepata mou), "my liver," and partly because of the Assyrian root, kabittu, meaning "temper" or "heart" (see Delitzsch, Assyrisches Handwortebuch, 317a), would read in all these passages kabhedh, literally, "liver" as in La 2:11, and interpret the figure as referring to the emotions as the expression of the self. The arguments in favor of the change are not without weight. Of course on either interpretation the language is highly figurative. It hardly seems necessary to change the reading, especially as the Septuagint renders the passages in the Psalms and in Job by doxa, the ordinary Greek rendering for kabhodh, and it does not seem improbable that in poetry the word kabhodh might be used to describe the man himself indicating that man as such is honorable and glorious, possibly because as in Ps 8:1, he is thought of as having been crowned by his Creator with glory and honor.

Before leaving this use of kabhodh it is necessary to call attention to the fact that in a few cases it is used to describe things, perhaps because these things are thought of as practically personified. The "glory of the forest" (Isa 10:18) is clearly a personification, referring to the majestic force of the Assyrians. We may probably assume a personification also in the case of the glory of Lebanon in Isa 35:2; 60:13, and the nature of the parable in Eze 31 makes it probable that personification is intended in 31:18.

4. Self-manfiestation of God (Yahweh):

But unquestionably the most important use of the word kabhodh is its employment either with the following gen. God or Yahweh, or absolutely, to describe the method or the circumstances of the self-manifestation of God. In discussing this subject we shall deal first of all with the use of the term as

connected with actual or historical manifestations of the Deity, and then with its use to describe the characteristic features of the ideal state of the future, or, otherwise stated, the Messianic kingdom.

(1) Exodus 23:18 ff.

The significance of the phrase in its earliest occurrence is by no means clear. Notwithstanding the uncertainty as to the exact documentary connection of the famous passage in Ex 33:18 ff, it seems quite certain that we may claim that this is the earliest historical reference that the Old Testament contains to the glory of Yahweh. "And he (Moses) said, Show me, I pray thee, thy glory. And he (Yahweh) said Thou canst not see my face; .... and it shall come to pass, while my glory passeth by, that I will put thee in a cleft of the rock, and will cover thee with my hand until I have passed by: and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back; but my face shall not be seen." The passage in its present form bears unmistakable evidences of the editorial hand, due perhaps, as Baentsch (Hand-kommentar zum Altes Testament, "Ex-Lev-Nu," 279) suggests, to a desire to transform the primitive, concrete, physical theophany into a revelation of the ethical glory of God, but in its basis it belongs to the Jahwist (Jahwist) and is therefore the earliest literary reference to the glory of God in the Old Testament. The glory of Yahweh is clearly a physical manifestation, a form with hands and rear parts, of which Moses is permitted to catch only a passing glimpse, but the implication is clear that he actually does see Yahweh with his physical eyes.

It seems not improbable that in its original form it was related that Moses saw the glory, i.e., the form of Yahweh, and thus that we are to find in this narrative the source for the statement in Nu 12:8, that he (Moses) will behold (or perhaps better rendering the tense as a frequentative), beholds the form of Yahweh (see also the description in Ex 24:9-11). The mention of the cloud (Ex 34:5) as the accompaniment of the manifestation of Yahweh suggests that the form of Yahweh was thought of as being outlined in cloud and flame, and that Yahweh was originally thought of as manifesting Himself in connection with meteorological or more probably volcanic phenomena.

(2) Isaiah 6.

Later the glory of Yahweh and the form of Yahweh are no longer identical terms, but the glory is still the physical manifestation of the Divine presence. This is clear from Isaiah’s account of his great inaugural vision. The prophet sees the enthroned Yahweh with His skirts filling the temple. There is no indication of what it was that he saw or how he recognized that it was Yahweh. The attendant seraphim in addition to the solemn "Holy, Holy, Holy" declare that "the whole earth is full of his glory."

Unquestionably His glory is here regarded as something visible, something, a part of which at least, Isaiah sees. The glory as such has no ethical significance except in so far as it is the method of manifestation of one who is undoubtedly an ethical being. The phraseology suggests that the skirts which fill the temple and the glory which fills the whole earth refer to the phenomena of fire and smoke. Some think that the smoke is caused by the clouds of incense that would fill the temple in connection with the sacrificial observances. But in view of Isaiah’s horror of these observances, this interpretation is

very questionable. A more probable interpretation connects the clouds and gloom with the phenomena of a great storm, and even possibly of an earthquake, for it seems highly plausible that the call of Isaiah in the year of the death of King Uzziah coincided with thee great earthquake in the days of Uzziah referred to in Zec 14:5. (It seems at least probable that the references to the darkness and light in Zec 14:6 f may have their origin in the phenomena attendant upon this earthquake. It is probable that the earthquake by which the prophecy of Amos is dated (Am 1:1) is also this same historic earthquake.) The clouds and fire attendant upon this storm or earthquake become the media by which the glory of Yahweh is made known to the youthful prophet, and this glory partly reveals and partly conceals the presence of Yahweh of which, through, and in part by means of, these phenomena, Isaiah is made so vividly conscious.

(3) Psalms 19:1.

This conception of Isaiah that the glory of Yahweh fills the earth is closely related to the thought of Ps 19:1 that "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork," the difference being that in the psalm Yahweh's glory is manifested in the ordinary rather than in the extraordinary phenomena. Parallel thoughts may be found in Ps 8:1; 57:5; 108:5; 113:4. In Ps 29:1,2,3,1, as in Isaiah, the glory of Yahweh is revealed in the extraordinary physical phenomena which the psalm describes. Glory here is a purely external, meteorological thing and is the manifestation of the presence of Yahweh, no matter whether the psalm is regarded, as it usually is, as a description of a thunderstorm, or whether with von Gall and others it is taken as a description of the phenomena which accompany the inauguration of the Messianic kingdom (see Joe 2:30 f the English Revised Version).

(4) Sinai and the Temple.

De 5:24 indicates that in theophany at the time of the giving of the law, the glory and the greatness of Yahweh. consisted in the fire and thick darkness which enveloped the mountain, and out of which Yahweh spoke to the people. Essentially the same idea is expressed in the account of the dedication of Solomon's temple (1Ki 8:10 f; 2Ch 5:14). The cloud which filled the house of Yahweh, preventing the priests from ministering, is identified with the glory of Yahweh which filled the house. It is noteworthy that in 2Ch 7:1-3 the glory of Yahweh which fills the house manifests itself in the form of the cloud of smoke from the sacrifices which were consumed by the fire coming down from heaven.

(5) Ezekiel's Visions.

Perhaps the most elaborate description of the glory of Yahweh to be found in the Old Testament is that given by Ezekiel in the various accounts of his visions. It is not easy to interpret his conception, but it seems clear that he does not identify the glory with the stormy clouds, the fire, the cherubim and the chariots. "The appearance of the likeness of the glory of Yahweh" (Eze 1:28) is not applied to all the phenomena which have been described in the preceding verses, but only to the likeness of form which looked like a man above the sapphire throne (1:26). The same idea is indicated in 9:3 which states that "the glory of the God of Israel was gone up from the cherub, whereupon it was"; that is, the glory is something peculiar to Yahweh, and is not quite identical with the phenomena which accompany it. This

is true of all his visions. The glory of Yahweh manifests itself with all the accompaniments which he describes with such richness of imagery, but the accompaniments are not the glory. For other descriptions of the glory of Yahweh in Ezekiel, see 3:12,23; 8:4; 10:4,18 ff; 11:22 f.

Very similar to this conception of Ezekiel is that given in those passages of the Pentateuch which are usually assigned to the Priestly Code. When the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron on account of the lack of food, the glory of Yahweh appeared in the cloud as they "looked toward the wilderness" (Ex 16:7,10; compare Ex 24:16). And just as in Ezekiel, the glory is distinguished from its attendant circumstances; for after the completion of the Tent of Meeting, the cloud covers the tent, and the glory of Yahweh fills the tabernacle (Ex 40:34 f; see also Le 9:6,23; Nu 14:21; 16:19,42; 20:6). The same thought is suggested in the references in Sirach 17:13; 45:3.

(6) Messianic Ideal.

These passages just cited stand on the border between the historical and the ideal descriptions of the glory of Yahweh, for whatever may be one's views as to the historical worth of P's account of the Exodus and the wilderness sojourn, all must agree in seeing in it really the program or constitution for the ideal state of the future. And in this state the distinguishing characteristic is to be the manifest presence of Yahweh in His sanctuary, and this manifestation is the glory. This is the view of Ezekiel, for whom the essential action in the establishment of the new community is the return of the glory of Yahweh to the house of Yahweh (Eze 43:2,4,5; 44:4). The same thought is expressed very clearly in Isa 4:5 f, which may be rendered on the basis of a slight rearrangement and regrouping of the original, 'And Yahweh will create over .... Mt. Zion ...., a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for over everything the glory (of Yahweh) shall be a canopy and a pavilion, and it shall serve as a shelter from the heat, and a refuge and a covert from the storm and the rain.' This translation has the advantage that it furnishes an intelligible and characteristic conclusion to the description of the Messianic age which the chapter contains. Isa 11:10, reading with the Revised Version, margin, "and his resting-place shall be glory," has the same thought, for it is clearly the glory of Yahweh that is manifested in the resting-place of the root of Jesse, and this resting-place can be none other than Mt. Zion (compare also Isa 24:23).

The Psalms and Deuteronomy-Isaiah have many passages in which this phase of the thought is brought out. For both books the restoration of the people from captivity is to be accompanied by, or, perhaps better, itself is, a revelation of the glory of Yahweh (Isa 40:5). The children of Israel have been created for the glory of Yahweh, and hence they must be restored that His glory may be made manifest (Isa 43:7). The light of the restored community is to be the glory of Yahweh (Isa 60:1 f). The presence of Yahweh brings grace and glory (Ps 84:11), and His salvation of those that fear Him causes glory to dwell in the land (Ps 85:9). To these and many similar passages in Isa and the Psalms may also be added Sirach 36:14, which refers probably to the manifestation of God in glory in the Messianic kingdom.

(7) Its Ethical Content.

But these passages make it quite evident that "glory" is not always used in the external, literally or figuratively physical sense. It comes to have an ethical significance, and this because, like the holiness with which it is associated in Isa 6, it is connected with Yahweh, who is more and more exclusively viewed as an ethical being. As holiness gradually loses its physical sense of aloofness, apartness, and comes to describe moral purity, so glory, because it is an attribute or expression of Yahweh, comes to have a moral sense. This transformation, as we have seen, is already being made in the present text of Ex 33:18,20, and the connection with holiness in Isa 6 makes it almost certain that Isaiah gave the word an ethical connotation. So the God of glory of Ps 29:3 suggests a moral quality because Yahweh is a moral being. All doubt on this matter disappears when we find the word "glory" used as the term for the essential nature of Yahweh, as we have already found it to be used of man. In Isa 42:8, "I am Yahweh, that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another," the meaning would seem to be, my essential character and power, that is, my glory, I will not share with other gods (compare also Isa 48:11). And in Isa 58:8 the glory must be taken in a figurative sense and refer to Yahweh Himself in His saving grace, who attends His people in advance and in the rear. It hardly seems possible to deny the ethical sense in Eze 39:21, where the manifestation of the glory of Yahweh comes as a result of the execution of His purposes of justice and righteousness upon His people. And in Hab 2:14, the glory of Yahweh which is to be known throughout the earth cannot be limited to any physical, external thing. It is equivalent to the righteous and just will of Yahweh. These passages are sufficient to prove the ethical significance of the word kabhodh, but it may be worth while to quote one more passage and this time from Ps 97 with its wonderful description of the blessings of the righteous rule of Yahweh. It is stated in 97:6 that "the heavens declare his righteousness, and all the peoples have seen his glory." His righteousness may include, as Kirkpatrick suggests, "His faithfulness to His people and His sovereign justice in the punishment of all," or it may refer only to the former of these qualities; but in any case, it is a moral act, and by it the peoples recognize the glory of Yahweh as the supreme moral ruler.

IV. In Apocrypha and New Testament.

"Glory" in the apocryphal books and in the New Testament is almost exclusively the translation of the Greek noun doxa. In all these writings the Old Testament usage seems to be the most important, and it seems to be the fact, if one may judge from the Septuagint and from the original Hebrew of Sir, that the Greek noun doxa, in the great majority of cases, represents the Hebrew kabhodh, so that the underlying thought is Hebrew, even though the words may be Greek

1. In the Apocrypha:

(1) As Applied to External Things.

It will be perhaps a little more convenient to deal with the usage of the Apocrypha separately, following essentially the order that has been adopted for the Old Testament discussion of kabhodh, and bearing in mind that the usage of Sir has been discussed under the Old Testament. The use of the word "glory" to describe the honor, reputation and splendor which belong to men is quite common. In this sense 1 Esdras 1:33 refers to the glory of Josiah, while in The Wisdom of Solomon 10:14 the perpetual glory given by

The Wisdom of Solomon to Joseph must be interpreted in the same way. In 2 Macc 5:16,20 glory refers to the beautification and adornment of the temple in a sense like that of tiph'arah in Isa 60:7. In Judith 15:9 "glory" is the translation of the Greek gauriama, and indicates that Judith is the pride of Israel.

(2) As Applied to God.

But the most significant use of doxa in the Apocrypha is that in which it refers to the light and splendor which are regarded as the invariable accompaniments of God. The reference may be to the historic manifestation of God in glory at Mt. Sinai, as in 2 Esdras 3:19, or to the manifestation of God in Israel, which is to be the especial characteristic of the Messianic kingdom. In 1 Esdras 5:61 songs sung to the praise of the Lord, "because his goodness and his glory are forever in all Israel," are based upon the hope that Yahweh is about to establish the Messianic kingdom among the people who have bound themselves to obey His law. In several passages in 2 Esdras the reference seems to be not to the Messianic kingdom in the historical sense, but rather to that kingdom of God which the saints are to inherit after death. This is clearly the thought in 2 Esdras 2:36 and in 7:52; also in 8:51 where the context shows clearly that the reference is to the glory of Paradise, which is the heritage of all those who are like Ezra in their devotion to Yahweh (compare also 2 Esdras 10:50).

But most frequently in the Apocrypha, in a sense which approximates that of the New Testament, the word "glory" refers to the blaze of light and splendor which is the essential expression of the holy majesty of Yahweh. The prayer of Manasseh refers to the unbearable majesty of the glory of Yahweh; while 2 Esdras 8:30, trusting in Yahweh's glory is equivalent to trusting in Yahweh Himself; and in 16:53 the oath "before God and his glory" is simply before the Lord God Himself. The same thought is expressed in Tobit 12:15; 13:14; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:25. In the So of Three Children, verses 31,33, the glory of Yahweh refers to His self-manifestation in His heavenly kingdom, and this is undoubtedly the significance in the frequently recurring doxologies, "Thine is the glory forever."

2. In the New Testament:

(1) As Applied to Men.

In the New Testament, much the same variety of usage is to be noted as in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha, and it is not easy to trace the exact relationship and order of the various meanings. The ordinary classical use of the word in the sense of "opinion," "judgment," "view," occurs in Hellenistic Greek only in 4 Macc 5:17 (18) on the authority of Thayer.

It is perhaps as convenient to follow generally the order adopted in the preceding discussion. In some places the word refers to the manifestations and insignia of rank and power, as in the familiar phrase, "Solomon in all his glory" (Mt 6:29), or the glory of the kingdoms of the world (Mt 4:8), or the glory of the kings and nations of the earth which shall be brought into the heavenly city (Re 21:24,26). Doxa also defines the praise, honor and dignity of men. This is the meaning in Joh 5:41,44, where Christ distinguishes between His accusers and Himself in that He receives not glory from men, while they

receive glory one of another (compare also Joh 7:18). In Eph 3:13, Paul declares that his tribulations for those to whom he is writing are a glory or distinction to them, while in 1Th 2:20 he declares that the Thessalonian Christians are his glory and joy.

(2) As applied to God.

Closely related to this usage is the employment of the word to ascribe honor and praise to God; see Lu 17:18, where only the stranger returned to give glory to God; or Joh 9:24, where the man who had been born blind is bidden to give glory to God; or the phrase "to the glory of God" in Ro 15:7, where the meaning is to secure the honor and praise of God among men. Similar is the use in the frequently recurring doxologies such as, "Glory to God in the highest," "to him," that is, to God, "be glory," etc.

While the foregoing meanings are frequently illustrated in the New Testament, it is undoubtedly true that the characteristic use of the word doxa in the New Testament is in the sense of brightness, brilliance, splendor; and first of all, in the literal sense, referring to the brightness of the heavenly bodies, as in 1Co 15:40 f, or to the supernatural brightness which overcame Saul of Tarsus on the road to Damascus (Ac 22:11).

(3) As Applied to the Saints.

But the most common use of the word is to describe the brilliance which is the characteristic of all persons who share in the heavenly glory. Moses, Elijah and Jesus Himself have this glory on the Mountain of Transfiguration (Lu 9:31 f). It was the same glory which gave the angel who came out of heaven power to lighten the earth (Re 18:1), and also which shone about the shepherds when the angel appeared unto them (Lu 2:9). Paul refers to this glory, when he speaks of the face of Moses as it appeared after God had spoken with him (2Co 3:7 f). And as in the case of Moses, so here, the source of this glory is God Himself, who is the God of glory (Ac 7:2, and frequently).

(4) As Applied to the Messianic Kingdom.

It is also used to describe the ideal Messianic kingdom of the future. It is applied to Christ to describe His royal majesty when He comes to set up His kingdom. So James and John ask to sit, one on His right hand and one on His left in His glory (Mr 10:37). Christ is to appear in glory with the angels (Mt 16:27 and often), for His condition in the coming age as it was before the incarnation is a condition of glory (Lu 24:26; Joh 17:5,22,24). But not merely the Messiah, but also all His followers shall share in the glory of the Messianic kingdom. This use is so common that it is scarcely necessary to illustrate it by reference. This glory is to be revealed to all Christians in the future (Ro 8:18,21; 9:23; compare also 1Co 2:7; 2Co 4:17).

3. Its Ethical Significance:

In all these cases it has a distinctly ethical signification, for it is the term which is used to describe the

essential nature, the perfection of the Deity, and is shared by others because they are made partakers of the Divine nature. So Paul refers to "the glory of the incorruptible God" (Ro 1:23; compare also Eph 1:17 f, and often). And the essential nature of Christ comes to be described in the same way. He has glory as of the only begotten of the Father (Joh 1:14); he shows His glory in the performance of miracles (Joh 2:11); and like the Father, He is the Lord of glory (1Co 2:8).

As a verb in the Old Testament the most common signification of the word "glory" is, to make one's boast in or of anything, usually of the pious glorying in Yahweh (Yahweh), but occasionally with some other reference, as in Jer 9:23 of man glorying in his riches, might or wisdom. In all these cases it represents the Hebrew hith-hallel. In Ex 8:9 the phrase, "Have thou this glory over me," is the translation of the Hebrew hith-pa'er, and means take to thyself the honor or distinction as regards me. In 2Ki 14:10 it translates the Hebrew hik-kabhedh, "honor thyself," i.e. be satisfied with the home which you have already attained.

In the Apocryphal books it means either "glorify thyself," the middle voice of the verb doxazo, as in Sirach 3:10, where the original Hebrew has hith-kabbedh, or "to exult," "boast over," as in Judith 9:7, where it represents the Greek gauroomai; or "to boast," "take pride in," where it represents, as it does usually in the New Testament, the Greek kauchaomai (Sirach 17:9; 24:1; 38:25; 39:8; 48:4, in the second and fourth of which cases it represents the Hebrew hith-pa'er).

In the New Testament the verb is used 3 times in James, and several times in the Epistles of Paul, and everywhere is used to translate the verb kauchaomai, or, in two cases in James, the same verb is compounded with the preposition kata. In all these cases the meaning is "to take pride in," "to congratulate oneself," upon anything.

In this connection attention may be called to the use of the noun "glorying," once or twice rendered "to glory," where the meaning is either the occasion or ground of glorying, or sometimes the act of glorying. The original has kauchema or kauchesis. This usage occurs in Jas 4:16; Heb 3:6, and several times in the Epistles of Paul.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the commentaries and works on Biblical theology among which, Briggs, ICC on the Psalms, Scribner, N.Y., 1906, especially the note in I, 66, 67; and Weiss, Biblical Theology of the New Testament, English translation, T. and S. Clark, Edinburgh, 1882-83, may be mentioned especially, the chief works on the subject are von Gall, Die Herrlichkeit Gottes, Giessen, 1900; and Caspari, Die Bedeutungen der Wortsippe k-b-d im Hebraeischen, Leipzig, 1908. The discussions by G. B. Gray and J. Massie in HDB, II, are valuable, and also the brief but significant article by Zenos in the Standard Bible Dictionary, Funk and Wagnalls, N.Y., 1909.

Walter R. Betteridge

GLOWING, SAND

glo’-ing, (Isa 35:11).

See MIRAGE.

GLUTTON; GLUTTONOUS

glut’-’-n, glut’-’-n-us (zalal, "to be lavish"; phagos): "Glutton" (from glut, to swallow greedily) is the translation of zolel from zalal, "to shake or pour out," "to be lavish, a squanderer." In De 21:20, "This our son .... is a glutton, and a drunkard," the word may mean a squanderer or prodigal; the English Revised Version has "a riotous liver." In Pr 23:21, "For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty" (following zole bhasar, "squanderers of flesh," the Revised Version (British and American) "gluttonous eaters of flesh"), "glutton" in the usual sense is intended; "a man gluttonous," "a gluttonous man" (the Revised Version) (phagos, "an eater," "a glutton") was a term applied to Christ in His freedom from asceticism (Mt 11:19; Lu 7:34).

The Revised Version has "idle gluttons" (margin Greek, "bellies") for "slow bellies" (Tit 1:12); "gluttonous" "gluttons," for "riotous" (Pr 23:20; 28:7).

W. L. Walker

GNASH

nash (charaq; brugmos): "Gnash" is used of grinding or striking together the teeth in rage, pain or misery of disappointment. In the Old Testament it is the translation of charak, a mimetic word, and represents for the most part rage, anger, hatred (Job 16:9, "He gnasheth upon me with his teeth," the Revised Version (British and American) "hath gnashed upon me"; Ps 35:16; 37:12; 112:10, grief; La 2:16, contempt or derision); brucho, "to gnash the teeth in rage," indicates anger, rage, Septuagint for charaq (Ac 7:54, of Stephen, "They gnashed on him with their teeth"). The several instances of brugmos, "gnashing," in the Gospels seem to express disappointment rather than anger (Mt 8:12,"there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth," the Revised Version (British and American) "the weeping and the gnashing of teeth"; Mt 13:42,50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30; Lu 13:28—a vivid representation of the misery of disappointed expectations; compare Ecclesiasticus 30:10, "lest thou shalt gnash thy teeth in the end," gomphiazo, "to have the teeth set on edge"); trizo (Mr 9:18), which means "to give out a creaking, grating sound," "to screak," is used in the New Testament (in the above instance only) to mean "to grate or gnash with the teeth," indicating the effect of a paroxysm, the Revised Version (British and American) "grindeth his teeth."

W. L. Walker

GNAT

nat (in English Versions of the Bible, only in Mt 23:24, konops. In Ex 8:16, for English Versions of the Bible "lice," one of the plagues of Egypt, kinnim, kinniym, or kinnam, we find in the Revised Version, margin "sand flies" or "fleas" (Gesenius "gnat"; Mandelkern "culex"). For kemo ken (Isa 51:6), English Versions of the Bible "in like manner," Septuagint hosper tauta, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) sicut haec, the Revised Version, margin has "like gnats" since ken, elsewhere "thus," may here be taken to be a singular of the form kinnim, which occurs in Ex 8): In the New Testament passage, the difference between the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) should be noted. "Strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel" is changed to "strain out the gnat and swallow the camel," the reference being to the inconsistency of the Jewish religious leaders in taking extraordinary pains in some things, as in the preparation of food, while leaving weightier matters unattended to.

In Isa 51:6, the suggestion of the Revised Version, margin, "They that dwell therein shall die like gnats," seems a decided improvement on the "shall die in like manner" of English Versions of the Bible, especially as ken, "thus" (see supra), is a repetition of kemo, whose meaning is practically the same, "in like manner" being the rendering in English Versions of the Bible of kemo ken.

As to the creatures, kinnim, of the Egyptian plague, there is little choice between "lice" of English Versions of the Bible and the others suggested, except as we may be influenced by the Septuagint rendering, skniphes, which may mean "gnats" or "mosquitoes."

See FLEA; LICE.

Alfred Ely Day

GNOSTICISM

nos'-ti-siz'-m:

I. GENERAL DEFINITION

II. SOURCES OF GNOSTICISM

1. Alexandrian Philosophy

2. Zoroastrianism

III. NATURE OF GNOSTICISM

Chief Points

IV. GNOSTICISM IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

1. Colossians

2. 1 Corinthians: "Knowledge" at Corinth

3. Pastoral Epistles

4. 1 John

(1) Gnostic Claims

(2) Its Loveless Nature

(3) Docetism

(4) The Antichrist

(5) Its Antinomian Side

5. "To Know the Depths," Revelation

V. THE CHRISTIAN ANTITHESIS

1. God and the World

How Did the World Originate?

2. Evil

(1) Christian Doctrine of Sin (2) Sin and the Moral Law

3. Christ and Redemption

4. Asceticism and Antinomianism

VI. HARNACK’S VIEW OF GNOSTICISM

VII. INFLUENCE AND DEVELOPMENT OF GNOSTICISM

1. Not a Heresy of the Humbler Classes

2. Cerinthus: His Teaching

3. The Gospel of John

4. Various Sects

(1) The Ophites

(2) Valentinus

(3) Basilides

(4) Saturninus

(5) Marcion

5. Relation to the Old Testament

6. The Christian Verities

7. Influence on Theology

8. Truth Underlying Docetism

VIII. MODERN GNOSTICISM

LITERATURE

Gnosticism—except perhaps in 1Ti 6:20, where Paul warns Timothy against "the gnosis, which is falsely so called"—is not directly alluded to in the New Testament. Nevertheless its leaven was actually working, as will immediately be seen, and constituted a most serious peril in the apostolic church. "That strange, obscure movement, partly intellectual, partly fanatical .... in the 2nd century spread with the swiftness of an epidemic over the church from Syria to Gaul" (Law, The Tests of Life, 26). It is therefore of high importance to gain a right conception of the nature of this potent anti-Christian influence. This is not easy. The difficulty in dealing with Gnosticism is that it was not a homogeneous system of either religion or philosophy, but embraced many widely diversified sects holding opinions drawn from a great variety of sources. "The infinitely varied shapes assumed by the systems render it almost impossible to classify them, or even to give an account of their leading ideas, which shall not be open to objection. We might as well try to classify the products of a tropical jungle, or the shapes and

hues of the sunset clouds, which change under our view as we look at them" (Orr, The Progress of Dogma, 58).

I. General Definition.

On the general definition of Gnosticism a few authorities may be cited. "Gnosticism," says Dr. Gwatkin, "may be provisionally described as a number of schools of philosophy, oriental in general character, but taking in the idea of a redemption through Christ, and further modified in different sects by a third element, which may be Judaism, Hellenism, or Christianity .... the Gnostics took over only the idea of a redemption through Christ, not the full Christian doctrine, for they made it rather a redemption of the philosophers from matter, than a redemption of mankind from sin" (Early Church History to AD 313, II, 20).

Dr. Orr writes, "Gnosticism may be described generally as the fantastic product of the blending of certain Christian ideas—particularly that of redemption through Christ—with speculation and imaginings derived from a medley of sources (Greek, Jewish, Parsic; philosophies; religions, theosophies, mysteries) in a period when the human mind was in a kind of ferment, and when opinions of every sort were jumbled together in an unimaginable welter. It involves, as the name denotes, a claim to ‘knowledge,’ knowledge of a kind of which the ordinary believer was incapable, and in the possession of which ‘salvation’ in the full sense consisted. This knowledge of which the Gnostic boasted, related to the subjects ordinarily treated of in religious philosophy; Gnosticism was a species of religious philosophy" (The Early Church, 71).

Neander has described Gnosticism as "the first notable attempt to introduce into Christianity the existing elements of mental culture, and to render it more complete on the hitherto rather neglected side of theoretical knowledge; it was an attempt of the mind of the ancient world in its yearning after knowledge, and in its dissatisfaction with the present, to bring within its grasp and to appropriate the treasures of this kind which christianity presented" (Antignostikus, Intro, 199).

Gnosticism accordingly comprehends in itself many previously existing tendencies; it is an amalgam into which quite a number of different elements have been fused. A heretical system of thought, at once subtle, speculative and elaborate, it endeavored to introduce into Christianity a so-called higher knowledge, which was grounded partly on the philosophic creed in which Greeks and Romans had taken refuge consequent on the gradual decay and breaking-up of their own religions, partly, as will be shown, on the philosophies of Plato and of Philo, and still more on the philosophies and theosophies and religions of the East, especially those of Persia and of India.

"For a long time the pagan beliefs had ceased to be taken seriously by thoughtful men and had been displaced by various creeds derived from philosophical speculation. These in themselves were abstract and unsatisfying, but had been partly vitalized by union with theosophies of the East. An attempt was made on the part of this philosophical religion to effect an alliance with Christianity. A section of the church was dissatisfied with the simplicity of the gospel, and sought to advance to something higher by

adopting the current speculations ..... The late books of the New Testament are all occupied, more or less, with this movement, which was the more dangerous as it threatened the church from within" (Professor E. Scott, The Apologetic of the New Testament, 14).

Gnosticism, though usually regarded as a heresy, was not really such: it was not the perverting of Christian truth; it came, rather, from outside. Having worked its way into the Christian church, it was then heretical. "Although it became a corrupting influence within the church, it was an alien by birth. While the church yet sojourned within the pale of Judaism, it enjoyed immunity from this plague; but as soon as it broke through these narrow bounds, it found itself in a world where the decaying religions and philosophies of the West were in acute fermentation under the influence of a new and powerful leaven from the East; while the infusion of Christianity itself into this fermenting mass only added to the bewildering multiplicity of Gnostic sects and systems it brought forth" (Law, The Tests of Life, 26).

II. Sources of Gnosticism.

Mansel (in his work on The Gnostic Heresies, 32) sums up the principal sources of Gnosticism in these three, Platonism, the Persian religion, and the Buddhism of India. To Platonism it owed much of its philosophical form and tendencies. From the Dualism of the Per religion it derived its speculations regarding the origin of evil, and much of what it taught about emanations. To Buddhism, he thinks, it owed the doctrine of the antagonism between matter and spirit, and the unreality of derived existence—the germ of Docetism. Mansel also holds that there is the possibility that Gnosticism derived certain of its features from the Kabbala (qabbalah), or secret teaching of the Jews in the two books, the Cepher yetsirah, or Book of Creation, and the Zohar, or Book of Light. An influence of Buddhism on Gnosticism, however, may safely be doubted, as there is no reason to believe that the knowledge of Buddhist doctrine had so early penetrated into the West. The Jewish works named by Mansel are really products of the Middle Ages (Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 144-45). The other sources named were really influential. We notice two—the Alexandrian philosophy and the Parsic dualism.

1. Alexandrian Philosophy:

Alexandrian philosophy endeavored to unite Greek philosophy and Hebrew religion. Philo, the great Jewish commentator of Alexandria, had tried to interpret the ancient Jewish Scriptures by the aid of the Greek philosophy, to expound the Old Testament in terms of Plato’s thought and to discover allegorical meanings where none were intended. In Philo’s teaching there is a sharp line drawn between God and the material world: with him God cannot exert any action upon the world of matter, except through intermediate agency, the Jewish angels and the heathen demons. Philo has much to say in regard to the Logos. His utterances on this subject may be compared with what is said of the attributes of "Wisdom" in chapter 8 of the Book of Prov, and also with the Logos or "Word" of the Gospel of John. With Philo, the Logos is the power of God, or the Divine reason endowed with energy, and embracing within itself all subordinate powers. The Logos is impersonal in its relations to God; and herein is one huge difference between Philo’s conception and that in the gospel. Philo teaches that the Logos is the only

firstborn of God, the chief of the angels, the viceroy of God, and representative of man.

See LOGOS.

According to Philo the creation of the universe was a gradual molding out of matter; hence, arises evil. He also teaches the preexistence of the soul, which is now imprisoned in the flesh. The wise man, therefore, will break the thralldom of the flesh, and will rise by a sort of ecstasy to the immediate vision of God. It will be seen how much of this teaching was assimilated by the various Gnostic sects.

2. Zoroastrianism:

The Zoroastrian or Persian system was based on the assumption that there existed two original and independent powers of good and evil, of light and darkness, Ormuzd (Ahura-Mazda), the wise Lord, and Ahriman (Angra-Mainyu), the wicked spirit. These powers were believed to be equal, and each supreme in his own domain. The earth, which was created by Ormuzd, became the battlefield of the two powers. Ahriman led away the first man and woman from their allegiance to Ormuzd, and so all evils result to mankind.

"In oriental (Persian) dualism," says Professor Bousset, "it is within this material world that the good and the evil powers are at war, and this world beneath the stars is by no means conceived as entirely subject to evil. Gnosticism has combined the two, the Greek opposition between spirit and matter, and the sharp Zoroastrian dualism, which, where the Greek mind conceived of a higher and a lower world, saw instead two hostile worlds standing in contrast to each other like light and darkness. And out of the combination of these two dualisms arose the teaching of Gnosticism with its thoroughgoing pessimism and its fundamental asceticism" ("Gnosticism," in Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, XII, 154).

III. Nature of Gnosticism.

"Gnosticism," says Dr. Gwatkin, "is Christianity perverted by learning and speculation" (Early Church History 73). The intellectual pride of the Gnostics refined away the gospel into a philosophy. The clue to the understanding of Gnosticism is given in the word from which it is derived—gnosis, "knowledge." Gnosticism puts knowledge in the place which can only rightly be occupied by Christian faith. To the Gnostic the great question was not the intensely practical one, "What must I do to be saved from sin?" but "What is the origin of evil?" "How is the primitive order of the universe to be restored?" In the knowledge of these and of similar questions, and in the answers given to these questions, there was redemption, as the Gnostic understood it.

"These little Gnostic sects and groups all lived in the conviction that they possessed a secret and mysterious knowledge, in no way accessible to those outside, which was not to be proved or propagated, but believed in by the initiated, and anxiously guarded as a secret. This knowledge of theirs was not based on reflection or scientific inquiry and proof, but on revelation. It was derived directly from the times of primitive Christianity, from the Saviour Himself and His disciples and friends, with whom they

claimed to be connected by a secret tradition, or else from later prophets, of whom many sects boasted. It was laid down in wonderful mystic writings, which were in the possession of the various circles.

"In short, Gnosticism in all its various sections, its form and its character, falls under the category of mystic religions, which were so characteristic of the religious life of decadent antiquity. In Gnosticism, as in the other mystic religions, we find the same contrast of the initiated and the uninitiated, the same loose organization, the same kind of petty sectarianism and mystery-mongering. All alike boast a mystic revelation and a deeply veiled wisdom" (Bousset, op. cit., 153).

Chief Points in Gnosticism:

The questions, therefore, with which Gnosticism concerned itself were those of the relation of the finite and the infinite, the origin of the world and of evil, the cause, meaning, purpose and destiny of all things, the reason of the difference in the capacities and in the lot in life of individual men, the method of salvation. The following may be regarded as the chief points in the characteristics of the Gnostic systems:

(1). A claim on the part of the initiated to a special knowledge of the truth, a tendency to regard knowledge as superior to faith, and as the special possession of the more enlightened, for ordinary Christians did not possess this secret and higher doctrine.

(2) The essential separation of matter and spirit, the former of these being essentially evil, and the source from which all evil has arisen.

(3) An attempt at the solution of the problems of creation and of the origin of evil by the conception of a Demiurge, i.e. a Creator or Artificer of the world as distinct from the Supreme Deity, and also by means of emanations extending between God and the visible universe. It should be observed that this conception merely concealed the difficulties of the problem, and did not solve them.

(4) A denial of the true humanity of Christ, a docetic Christology, (which looked upon the earthly life of Christ and especially on His sufferings on the cross as unreal.

(5) The denial of the personality of the Supreme God, and the denial also of the free will of man.

(6) The teaching, on the one hand, of asceticism as the means of attaining to spiritual communion with God, and, on the other hand, of an indifference which led directly to licentiousness.

(7) A syncretistic tendency which combined certain more or less misunderstood Christian doctrines, various elements from oriental and Jewish and other sources.

(8) The Scriptures of the Old Testament were ascribed to the Demiurge or inferior Creator of the world, who was the God of the Jews, but not the true God. Some of these characteristic ideas are more obvious

in one, and some of them in others of the Gnostic systems. The relation of these ideas to Christian facts and doctrines is dealt with more particularly below.

IV. Gnosticism in the Christian Church.

In the New Testament and the Apostolic Age.

The germ of Gnosticism in the Christian church made its appearance in the apostolic age, and is referred to by Paul in several of his epistles, notably in that to the Colossians and in the Pastoral Epistles. It is also referred to by the apostles Peter and Jude; references to it are found, besides, in the Apocalypse, the First Epistle of John and the Gospel of John.

1. Colossians:

In col a great deal is said regarding a false teaching, an insidious theosophist doctrine, the teachers of which were alienating the Christians in Colosse from the gospel, and were disseminating their speculations, which led to the worship of angels in contrast to the worship of Christ, to esoteric exclusiveness wholly opposed to the universality of the gospel, and to an asceticism injurious to Christian freedom, and derogatory to the human body as indwelt by the Holy Ghost. These tenets are identical with the more fully developed Gnosticism of the generation succeeding that of the apostles; and at the root of the Colossian false teaching there lay the same error which the Gnostic mind had no way of meeting, namely, that there could be no connection between the highest spiritual agency, that is God, and gross corporeal matter.

From this theoretical basis arose another error—that as sin is inherent in the material substance of the body, therefore the only way by which perfection can be reached is to punish the body by asceticism, so that through the infliction of pain and the mortification of the flesh the region of pure spirit may be reached, and thus man may be etherealized and become like God. This ascetic tendency is wonderfully widespread; it reappears century after century, and shows itself in many forms of religion, not merely in distorted forms of Christianity, but in the Hindu religions, in Buddhism and elsewhere. In the Epistle to the Colossians, accordingly, there are definite references to ascetic practices which were inculcated by the false teachers at Colosse. The very terms which they employed have been preserved, "Touch not," "Taste not," "Handle not." It was in this way that these teachers had "at their own hand" invented a worship different from that of the Christian faith, which endeavored to attain the deliverance of the soul by "the neglecting of the body" (Col 2:21,23 the King James Version). These Gnostic teachers showed these tendencies still more boldly when Paul wrote his First Epistle to Timothy (see below), for he describes them as "forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats" (1Ti 4:3). These ascetic practices were afterward taught by various Gnostic sects, the Encratites, the followers of Saturninus, and others.

These tendencies in the Colossian church Paul set himself to correct in his epistle. The method which he adopts is not so much to demolish error, as to establish the contrary truth, setting before the Colossians

the person and work of Christ, Christ the Creator, Christ in whom there dwells not merely some or even much of the fullness of God, but all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; Christ the God of providence, the Upholder of all things, in whom matter and all creatures and all events "consist" and have their being; Christ the Reconciler who has reconciled us unto God through the blood of the cross. In view of truths like these, Colossian error and all other forms of Gnosticism crumble into decay and vanish.

See COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

2. 1 Corinthians: "Knowledge" at Corinth:

The Epistle to the Colossians is the first of the Pauline Epistles in which distinctively Gnostic teaching is found in its attack upon the Christian faith. But from incidental notices in epistles of Paul written at an earlier period, it can be seen how congenial was the soil into which Gnostic teaching was about to fall. For even in Corinth when Paul wrote his First Epistle to the church there, there had been a claim on the part of some that they possessed "knowledge," as if others were destitute of it, a claim which the apostle refuses to admit, and meets with stern resistance. They thought themselves "wise," they were given to disputing, they professed that they "all had knowledge" (1Co 8:1), nay, they could "know all mysteries and all knowledge" (1Co 13:2); but this knowledge did not edify them, did not build them up, it only puffed them up (1Co 8:1); it did not make them sympathetic or tender-hearted toward the weak (1Co 8:7-11).

3. Pastoral Epistles:

In 1Ti 6:20,21 Paul speaks of the "knowledge (the gnosis) which is falsely so called; which some professing have erred concerning the faith." In other places in that epistle reference is made to tenets which are exactly those of Gnosticism. In 1:4 the apostle speaks of "fables and endless genealogies, which minister questionings, rather than a dispensation of God which is in faith." Philo had given a great impetus to an allegorizing interpretation of the Old Testament. His writings were well known and were popular in many of the Jewish schools. These fanciful interpretations would hinder the growth of the Christian church; and this allegorizing of Scripture, joined to the teaching of the genealogies of the eons, would leave no place for a Redeemer. In 4:3, as already noted, Paul describes ascetic practices which were regarded by their votaries as most meritorious. To abstain from marriage and from various kinds of food was the teaching of the Essenes and also of the Gnostics. This ascetic teaching was unnatural, as contrary to the constitution of the world, as that has been arranged by a holy and wise Creator, and it is also subversive of Christian liberty. Nothing can be esteemed common or unclean without throwing a reproach upon the Creator.

Antinomian Development.

But another and contrary result also followed from the principles of the sinfulness of matter and of redemption as deliverance from the flesh, namely, that there was an easier way of relief, by treating the soul and the body as separate entities which have nothing in common. Let the soul go its way on the

wings of spiritual thought, while the body may indulge its fleshly desires. For, so it was held, as body and soul are entirely distinct in their nature, the spiritual cannot be defiled by anything, however carnal and gross, that the body can do. This was the antinomian development of Gnosticism. Many traces of this are apparent in the Pastoral Epistles and in 2 Peter and Jude. The Gnostics, against whom Paul warns Timothy, were "lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, haughty, rollers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, implacable, slanderers, without self-control, fierce, no lovers of good, traitors, headstrong, puffed-up, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God; holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof" (2Ti 3:2,3,4). Such, too, is the testimony borne regarding them by Ignatius (Law, The Tests of Life, 30):("they give no heed to love, caring not for the widow, the orphan or the afflicted, neither for those who are in bonds, nor for those who are released from bonds, neither for the hungry nor the thirsty." Such persons professed that they knew God, but by their works they denied Him; they were "abominable, and disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate" (Tit 1:16). They enticed others into sins of impurity (2Ti 3:5,6). They allured others through the lusts of the flesh; and the means by which they succeeded in doing this was that they spoke great swelling words of vanity, and the end was that in their destroying of others they themselves also were surely destroyed (2Pe 2:12,18). They were ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ; they gave themselves up to the sins of the flesh, and ran riotously after error in hope of a gain in money; they were sensual men, not having the Spirit (Jude 1:4,8,11,19) The entire Epistle of Jude is directed against this antinomian and licentious development of Gnosticism, and against its terrible permission of an unholy life (see below on the Book of Revelation).

4. 1 John:

In the First Epistle of John there is a distinct polemical purpose. There is no book of the New Testament which is more purposeful in its attack of error. There is "the spirit of error" (1 Joh 4:6), opposing the Spirit of truth. "Many false prophets are gone out into the world" (1 Joh 4:1), and this from the church itself, "They went out from us, but they were not of us" (1 Joh 2:19); and these false prophets are distinctly named "the antichrist" (1 Joh 2:22) and "the liar" (same place), and "the deceiver and the antichrist" (2 Joh 1:7). This peril, against which the apostle writes, and from which he seeks to defend the church, was Gnosticism, as is proved by what is said again and again in the epistle of the characteristics of this insidious and deadly teaching.

(1) Gnostic Claims.

The Gnostic claim to knowledge throws light upon many passages in this epistle. John refers to his opponents’ using such phrases as "I know God," "I abide in Christ," "I am in the light." These lofty claims were made by persons who did not love their brethren on earth, who did not walk in Christ’s footsteps, and who were destitute of love. The apostle therefore describes these lofty claims as false, because those who made them possessed neither love nor obedience.

In contrast to these Gnostic claims—for those who made them were no other than the early Gnostics—

John shows how the Christ of history is the Christ of experience: for those to whom he is writing know Christ, who is from the beginning, and they know the Father. "We know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life" (1 Joh 5:20). This knowledge of God and communion with Him are attained, not by Gnostic speculation, but by the obedience of faith, the outcome of which is brotherly love and a life in which the Christian walks even as Christ did (1 Joh 2:6). And thus also obedience and brotherly love are the test of the profession which any man may make that he knows God. "Every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him," (1Joh 2:29); "Whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother" (1 Joh 3:10).

(2) Its Loveless Nature.

Gnosticism was distinguished by an unethical, loveless intellectualism. This seems to be the explanation of the false teaching against which this epistle is directed. The apostle describes the dry head-knowledge which left the heart and life untouched by love, and which led men, while they professed to love God, nevertheless to remain destitute of love to their fellow-men. (They did not fold their human brethren to their hearts, they were dead to the fact that where pity dwells, the love of God dwells also. In Gnosticism knowledge was in itself the supreme end and purpose of life, the sum of highest good to which a man could attain, the crown of life. The system was loveless to the core.

(3) Docetism.

Now, when the attempt was made to amalgamate these Gnostic ideas with the Christian faith, the inevitable result was Docetism. Just because God cannot have any immediate contact with matter, therefore the incarnation of Almighty God in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ is inconceivable. From this position it is, of course, only a step to deny that the incarnation and the true human life of Christ ever took place at all.

(4) The Antichrist.

The Antichrist of the First Epistle of John is docetic Gnosticism. The soul of the apostle rushes onward, with glowing zeal for the honor of his Master whom Gnosticism dishonored, to identify personally the historical Jesus with the Divine Being, "the Son of God," "the Word of Life," "the Christ." "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, even he that denieth the Father and the Son. Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father: he that confesseth the Son hath the Father also" (1 Joh 2:22,23). It should be noted that the last clause in 1 Joh 2:23, which is printed in italics in the King James Version, is restored in the Revised Version (British and American) to its rightful position in the original text. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God: and this is the spirit of the antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it cometh; and now it is in the world already" (1 Joh 4:2,3).

(5) Its Antinomian Side.

The antinomian side of Gnosticism is not so directly referred to in the First Epistle of John as Docetism is; but evidences are manifest that the apostle had it clearly before him. "Little children," he writes, "let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous: he that doeth sin is of the devil" (1 Joh 3:7,8). And these were the methods by which those deceivers endeavored to lead the members of the church astray. They alleged that sin was a thing indifferent in itself. It made no difference to the spiritual man whether he sinned with his body or not. It is for this reason that the apostle, in opposing those teachers, insists that "sin is lawlessness" (1 Joh 3:4); "All unrighteousness is sin" (1 Joh 5:17); "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin" (1 Joh 3:9); "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother" (1 Joh 3:10). The whole passage presupposes, as familiar to its readers, a doctrine of moral indifferentism, according to which the status of the ‘spiritual’ man is not to be tested by the commonplace facts of moral conduct" (The Tests of Life, 34).

See JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF.

5. "To Know the Depths": Revelation:

As time advanced, and the later books of the New Testament were written, Gnosticism assumed more of its distinctive peculiarities. "Those who had knowledge" regarded themselves as a superior order of believers. One of their phrases was "to know the depths" (Re 2:24 the King James Version), and this was valued far more highly than love and obedience. "From this language, we may, I think, infer the existence of an Ophite sect, boasting of its peculiar gnosis, before the date of the Apocalypse" (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 105). The claim of the Ophites was that they alone knew "the depths." "Yes," is the apostle’s reply to claims of this kind, "yes, the depths, but not of God, the depths of Satan"; for such is a just description of a teaching which ascribed the origin and the working of evil to God. It is in the light of Gnostic teaching of this sort that the meaning can be seen of the same apostle’s language in his First Epistle, "And this is the message which we have heard from him and announce unto you, that God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 Joh 1:5).

The Nicolaitans.

In the Epistles to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse there are other references to Gnosticism. Who the Nicolaitans were (Re 2:6,15) is not absolutely certain; but it is not unlikely that they were so called because of their having assumed the name of "Nicolaus, a proselyte of Antioch" (Ac 6:5). The first step to the reception of Gentile believers into the Christian church on an equal footing with the Jews may have been the appointment of Nicolaus as one of the first deacons, for the facts that he was a native of Antioch and a proselyte, show that he had been a heathen by birth. And it is noteworthy to find such a person appointed to office in the church at so very early a period, even before the conversion of the apostle Paul. The Nicolaitans therefore may have distorted in an antinomian sense the doctrine taught by Nicolaus, who in all probability proclaimed the liberty of the gospel, as his fellow-deacon, Stephen, did (Ac 7 throughout). But the liberty claimed by the Nicolaitans was liberty to sin. They are mentioned in the Epistle to Ephesus, and their deeds are characterized as deeds which Christ hates (Re 2:6). Their

name occurs again in the Epistle to Pergamum, and there also their doctrine is described as a doctrine which the Lord hates (Re 2:15). Their teaching was one of licentiousness—eating things sacrifical to idols, and committing fornication (Re 2:14). Again in the Epistle to Thyatira, the Gnostics are spoken of as practicing the same evil courses, and as holding a doctrine of "the depths of Satan" (Re 2:20,21,24 the King James Version)—see above. The persons mentioned in the Epistle to Philadelphia were also evidently Gnostics. They are described as being "of the synagogue of Satan" (Re 3:9).

"In the language of Jude, as in that of Peter, which it closely imitates, we may clearly discern a reference to the Gnostic sect of the Nicolaitans mentioned by name in Revelation. The comparison in all these passages, of the error condemned with that of Balaam, is decisive as to the identity of the persons intended. The other characteristics noted by Peter are also repeated by Jude—their denial of the Lord, their profligate lives, their contempt of government, and evil speaking of dignities and of things that they know not, their pollution of the feasts of charity, their great swelling words. The antinomian, no less than the ascetic side of Gnosticism, seems by this time to have fully manifested itself" (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 71).

V. The Christian Antithesis.

The principal points of contrast between Gnosticism and Christian teaching in regard to leading doctrines will now be apparent, and can be briefly summarized.

1. God and the World:

According to the Gnostics, God is thought of as the ultimate, nameless, unknowable Being, of whom they speak as the "Abyss." He is perfect, but the material world is alien to the Divine nature. How then does it come to exist at all? What is the source of its imperfections and evils?

How Did the World Originate?

The Gnostic answer is that the pleroma or fullness of the Deity (see FULLNESS) could flow out in no other way than in emanations or eons or angels, all of which are necessarily imperfect, the highest of these emanations or eons or angels being more spiritual than the grade immediately below it. Of these eons there is a gradation so numerous, that at length the lowest of them is almost wholly corporeal, the spiritual element having been gradually diminished or eliminated, until at last the world of man and of matter is reached, the abode of evil. In this way the gulf is bridged between God and the world of mankind. The highest eons approximate closely to the Divine nature, so spiritual are they and so nearly free from matter. These form the highest hierarchy of angels, and these as well as many other grades of the angelic host are to be worshipped.

In opposition to this view, Christian faith worships God as the free self-sufficient Creator, infinitely good and wise and powerful and holy, the Author of all things, and affirms creation as an incomprehensible fact revealed to faith, and which rises above the grasp of the understanding. "By faith

we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear" (Heb 11:3 the King James Version).

2. Evil:

The doctrine of evil follows directly from the above account of the relation of God to the world. According to Gnosticism the manifestation of God is possible only through self-limitation on His part, for in His essence God is the unfathomable Abyss. Through this Divine self-limitation are evolved, first, the Divine powers or attributes, which previously were hidden in the Abyss of His being. These Divine powers (the pleroma) become the principles of all further developments of life. Life continues to be unfolded in such a way that its successive grades sink farther and farther from the purity of God, the life is feebler the nearer they come to matter, with which, at length, they blend. Such, according to Gnosticism, is the origin of evil.

Whenever men are not content with acknowledging evil to be the act of their own free will, which has chosen to forsake its absolute dependence upon God; whenever they go beyond this and seek for another origin of evil, then one of two results follows. They either limit the holiness of God, and find the cause of evil in God Himself, thus annihilating all distinction between good and evil—which is Pantheism; or they limit the power of God by granting the existence of an eternal evil power beyond the control of God —which is Dualism. In avoiding Pantheism, Gnosticism accepted the dualistic solution, ascribing to evil an eternal self-subsistent nature, which is to make it absolute as God Himself is. As absolute self-subsistence can be affirmed of none but God, the eternally self-subsistent evil of Dualism must be God, which it cannot possibly be, because it is not good. Here is the self-contradiction on which Gnosticism was wrecked.

(1) The Christian Doctrine of Sin.

Directly contrary to this is the Christian doctrine, according to which evil is the refusal of the creature-will to lean absolutely and utterly on God, upon His care and love and upholding grace. Sin is that which ought not to be; it has no right to exist at all; it is defiance of God; it is moral transgression; its magnitude cannot be exaggerated. If it could, it would dethrone God. It has defied His righteousness and wisdom and holiness and even His grace. Sin therefore is dealt with by God in two ways, either by direct punishment or by redemption, in which provision is made for its removal by its being borne by the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world.

The Gnostic idea of the origin of evil follows at once from, and is inseparably involved in, their dualistic interpretation of nature. The question "What is sin?" is no mere academic or philosophical discussion, in which one opinion may be as good as another. "Everything in Christianity is connected more or less directly with the great facts of Sin and Redemption; and the plan of Redemption, which is the essence of Christianity, cannot be rightly understood until the doctrine of Sin be adequately recognized and established. Here, certainly, if anywhere, Christian theology must fight pro aris et focis" (Julius Muller, quoted in Dr. Orr’s Sin as a Problem of Today, 6).

(2) Sin and the Moral Law.

The universality of sin, its persistence, its gravity, its power to destroy and to deprave—these are facts which can hardly be exaggerated. To view sin aright, it is impossible to leave out of sight its relation to moral law, to God, and to His kingdom. Sin is the transgression of moral law; it is transgression also against a holy God, of whose character and will moral law is a transcript or reflection. "Sin is transgression against God, the substitution of the creature-will for the will of the Creator; revolt of the creature-will from God" (Sin as a Problem of Today, 7). It is the resolve of the will to make itself independent of God and to renounce His authority. Sin is self-will, false independence, freedom which ends in bondage and misery.

But in Gnosticism sin is something quite different; it is not the act and the disposition of the human will in rebellion against God; it is only a physical fact or quality inherent in the body and in matter everywhere. Redemption therefore does not consist in the work of Christ for us on the cross, and the applying of the benefits of that work by the Holy Spirit of God in the renewal of the moral nature of man. Redemption is simply each man’s efforts to secure emancipation from the flesh—from physical evil.

3. Christ and Redemption:

It is easily seen that a system of this kind had no need of Christ and leaves no place for redemption in the Christian sense of that term. Redemption in this scheme of thought is not deliverance from sin, it is not removal of guilt and renewing of the mind. It is something quite different, and consists in the restoration of the cosmic order and illumination of the mind of the select few through knowledge. Christ is not the Saviour who saves His people from their sins, and who gives them unceasingly, through union with Himself, deliverance from the power of sin. He is only one of the eons, the highest of them. He is an originated being, and not God. There is thus no place in Gnosticism either for the creation of the universe by God, or for the incarnation and work of Christ. Once grant that matter is essentially evil, and there is excluded the possibility of Christ’s having assumed a true human nature, simply for the one reason that the world and human nature are originally and necessarily evil. Thus, as already seen, we are landed in Docetism.

The Christology of the Gnostics accordingly assumed one of two types. "One class of early Gnostics separated the spiritual being Christ from the man Jesus; they supposed that the Christ entered Jesus at the time of His baptism, and left Him at the moment of His crucifixion. Thus the Christ was neither born as a man nor suffered as a man. In this way they obviated the difficulty, insuperable to the Gnostic mind, of conceiving the connection between the highest spiritual agency and gross corporeal matter, which was involved in the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation and Passion, and which Gnostics of another type more effectually set aside by the doctrine of Docetism, i.e. by assuming that the human body of our Lord was only a phantom body, and not real flesh and blood. Irenaeus represents the former class as teaching that ‘Jesus was the receptacle of the Christ,’ and that the Christ ‘descended upon Him from heaven in the form of a dove, and after He had declared to mankind the nameless Father, entered again into the

pleroma imperceptibly and invisibly.’ Here no names are given. But in another passage he ascribes precisely the same doctrine, without however naming the pleroma, to Cerinthus" (Lightfoot, Col, 264). How strenuously this doctrine was combated in apostolic circles has already been shown in speaking of John’s First Epistle.

4. Asecticism and Antinomianism:

The necessary consequence of the Gnostic theory in an ascetic morality which passed over by sure steps into antinomian license has likewise been fully illustrated in the foregoing, and need not be further enlarged on. The whole has its root in a false intellectualism, to which the gospel in its inculcation of humility, faith and dependence upon God’s Spirit for guidance into truth is, in its inmost principle, opposed.

VI. Harnack’s View of Gnosticism.

Harnack’s view of Gnosticism differs from that now given in laying the chief emphasis on its Judeo-Hellenistic side. He describes well how, when Christianity appeared, an extensive spiritualizing or allegorizing of the Old Testament had already taken place. "This spiritualizing was the result of a philosophic view of religion, and this philosophic view was the outcome of a lasting influence of Greek philosophy, and of the Greek spirit generally, upon Judaism. In consequence of this view, all facts and sayings of the Old Testament in which one could not find his way, were allegorized. Nothing was what it seemed, but was only the symbol of something invisible. The history of the Old Testament was here sublimated to a history of the emancipation of reason from passion" (History of Dogma, I, 223). This allegorical interpretation disclosed to the mature mind a wealth of relations, of hints and of intuitions from the Old Testament, which to the uninitiated was only a dry record of fact. This view of the Old Testament gave its readers a strange interest, which proceeded to transfer their ancient Jewish hopes into the world of Greek philosophy, and transformed the result into a metaphysic. When these thinkers entered the Christian church, Christian hopes and terms were added to the already existing Judaic-Greek- Alexandrian compound, and such was Gnosticism. It represented the acute secularizing or Hellenizing of Christianity. The Gnostics "are therefore those Christians, who, in a swift advance, attempted to capture Christianity for Hellenic culture, and Hellenic culture for Christianity, and who gave up the Old Testament in order to facilitate the conclusion of the covenant between the two powers and make it possible to assert the absoluteness of Christianity" (p. 227).

Harnack indeed grants that there were other elements in Gnosticism, but he strongly asserts that the Greek element was the predominating one. In this he seems to us to be in error. Laying the chief emphasis on Hellenism, he fails to give the due and preponderating place to eastern dualism. As already seen, an eastern dualistic theosophy is the chief element in Gnosticism. This eastern source is also acknowledged by Harnack, but only as if it were subsidiary to Hellenism. As he regards it, "Gnosticism was an acute Hellenizing of Christianity" (p. 230).

In regard to the fundamental philosophic doctrines of Gnosticism, the indefinable nature of the Divine

primeval Being, the sinfulness of matter, the fullness of God in eons, the Demiurge, etc., Harnack agrees generally with other writers, and adds, "All these are ideas for which we find the way prepared in the philosophy of the time, anticipated by Philo, and represented in neo-Platonism as the great final result of Greek philosophy" (p. 233).

VII. Influence and Development of Gnosticism.

Gnosticism is peculiarly the heresy of the 2nd century, and in itself a proof of the extent to which a knowledge of the Christian faith had, at that early period, penetrated in literary and philosophical circles. Though it is true that Christianity at first influenced chiefly the humbler classes, yet it was not among these persons that the various Gnostic heresies arose.

1. Not a Heresy of the Humbler Classes:

Gnosticism "was a product which did not spring up spontaneously in the minds of the mechanics and slaves and women and children, whom most, like Celsus, suppose to have formed the bulk of the Christian communities, but could only have taken its rise in minds of a more cultured and speculative cast. This, indeed, was its claim—to be a religion of gnosis (knowledge), for the more highly trained or elite. It could only exist at all, therefore, as the result of a Christian ferment which had entered these speculative circles, and was there powerfully at work. Baur rightly appreciates the situation, when he says: ‘Gnosticism gives the clearest proof that Christianity had now come to be one of the most important factors in the history of the time, and it shows especially what a mighty power of attraction the new Christian principles possessed for the highest intellectual life then to be found either in the pagan or in the Jewish world.’ Above all, these systems are a striking witness to the impression produced on the heathen mind by the great Christian idea of redemption. ‘When the Gnostic systems,’ says Neander, ‘describe the movement which was produced in the kingdom of the Demiurge by the appearance of Christ as the manifestation of a new and mighty principle which had entered the precincts of this lower world, they give us to understand how powerful was the impression which the contemplation of the life of Christ and His influence on humanity, had left on the minds of the founders of these systems, making all earlier institutions seem to them as nothing in comparison with Christianity.’ We must beware, therefore, of underestimating either the extent or the intensity of this great intellectual ferment set up by the gospel in the heart of heathenism" (Orr, Neglected Factors, etc., 196).

2. Cerinthus: His Teaching:

The earliest of the Gnostics known to us by name is Cerinthus, the antagonist of the apostle John. It seems to be beyond reasonable doubt that these two encountered each other at Ephesus. Irenaeus relates on the authority of those who heard the story from Polycarp how the apostle and Cerinthus met in the public baths in that city. When John discovered that Cerinthus was in the same building with him, he instantly left, exclaiming that he could not remain while Cerinthus, the enemy of God and of man, was there. From the accounts which have been preserved of Cerinthus and of his teaching, it can be gathered that he taught that the world was created not by the Supreme God, but by an inferior power, and that he

also taught a docetic theory of the Incarnation. Caius of Rome, a disciple of Irenaeus, records that Cerinthus held that there would be a millennium of unrestrained sensuality. Dionysius of Alexandria (circa 260 AD) more than confirms this. "Thus so far as they go, the historical data harmonize with the internal evidence of the Epistle (of John) itself, in giving the impression that the different tendencies it combats are such as were naturally combined in one consistently developed Gnostic system, and that the object of its polemic is, throughout, one and the same" (The Tests of Life, 37).

As regards the Gospel of John there is the testimony of Irenaeus, that it was written to oppose that form of Gnosticism which was taught by Cerinthus, and, before him, by the Nicolaitans. The nature of that heresy may be stated in the words of Irenaeus himself:

"A certain Cerinthus," he says, "in Asia, taught that the world was not made by the Supreme God, but by some power altogether separate and distinct from that Sovereign Power which is over the universe, and one ignorant of the God who is over all things. He taught, moreover, that Jesus was not born of a virgin (for this seemed to him to be impossible), but was the son of Joseph and Mary, born after the manner of other men; though preeminent above other men in justice and prudence and wisdom; and that after His baptism the Christ, in the form of a dove, descended upon Him from that Sovereign Power which is over all things; and that He then announced the unknown Father and wrought miracles; but that, at the end, the Christ departed again from Jesus, and that Jesus suffered and was raised from the dead, while the Christ continued impassible, as a spiritual being" (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 74).

3. The Gospel of John:

Such a passage as Joh 19:34,35 seems to refer to docetic Gnosticism, and to be a personal protest against it. After describing the piercing of Christ’s side by the soldier’s spear, and how "straightway there came out blood and water," the apostle adds, "And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true: and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe." There are many other passages which seem to be directed against Docetism, e.g. "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory)" (1:14); "Jesus therefore, being wearied with his journey, sat thus by the well" (4:6); "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and put it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing" (20:27).

Cerinthus seems to have taught that the religion of Christ was identical with undiluted Mosaism, including even circumcision and the earthly kingdom of the future. The Cerinthian theory, however, was held under various forms by its adherents, some teachers holding that the God of the Old Testament was, at the best, a subordinate angel of limited power, wisdom and goodness, and that the creation of the world was very imperfect. Others went so far as to identify the God of the Old Testament with Satan. The ethic of systems such as these was antinomian, sometimes even going the length of libertinism.

Generally, the forms under which Gnosticism appeared varied greatly in different periods. Some went farther than others from the Christian faith.

4. Various Sects:

Some communities, such as the Encratites, laid the greatest stress on the necessity for asceticism; other communities were wholly docetic; the Carpocratians taught the philosophy and communism of Plato. One of these teachers, Epiphanes, was honored as a god, and this sect crowned the image of Jesus along with those of Pythagoras, Plato and Aristotle. Further, there were impostors of all varieties: magicians, soothsayers, jugglers, deceivers and hypocrites, "who appeared using mighty words with a host of unintelligible formulas and taking up with scandalous ceremonies in order to rob men of their money" (Harnack, op. cit., 239), and even for viler purposes.

(1) The Ophites.

Gnosticism, before reaching its full development, is chiefly represented by the ophite sects or systems. These were so named from the word ophis, "serpent," to which they paid honor as the symbol of intelligence. They held that the Creator of the world was an ignorant and imperfect being, Ialdaboth, the Son of Chaos; and that it was a meritorious act when the serpent persuaded Adam and Eve to disobey him, There were several of the ophite sects, such as the Cainites, who reversed all the standards of moral judgment, choosing as their heroes the persons whom the Bible condemned, such as Cain, the men of Sodom, Esau and Korah.

(2) Valentinus.

By the time of Justin Martyr (circa 150 AD), Gnosticism had become divided into a variety of sects and schools, Valentinians, Basilideans, Saturninians and Marcionites. In the Valentinian system, Christ and the Holy Spirit were two eons. The Valentinians granted that ordinary Christians were better than the heathen, and that they might look forward to a kind of salvation; even now ordinary Christians occupied a middle position, better than the "hylic" or "psychic," but inferior to the "pneumatic" or "spiritual," as the Gnostics termed themselves.

(3) Basilides.

The Basilideans take their name from Basilides of Alexandria, a man of powerful intellect. He and his son Isidore taught this system, which was afterward considerably modified for the purpose of popular apprehension. The world is continuously evolved from a pansperma or "seed of the world," in which all things were originally potentially contained. It is ruled by two great Archons, who yet subserve the designs of the Supreme. There are no eons, but the highest "light" descends through the successive spheres till it rests on Jesus of Nazareth. The process is complete when the Divine element ("sonship") is all drawn out and restored to God; oblivion then falls on lower intelligences. Many fine sayings are attributed to Basilides, e.g. "I will say anything rather than doubt the goodness of Providence" (Orr, The Early Church, 75).

(4) Saturninus.

The Saturninians were so called from Saturninus, said to be a disciple of Menander, who in turn is said to have been a disciple of Simon Magus. The system of Saturninus is marked both by a strong dualism and by a gloomy asceticism. He is also reported to have been one of the founders of the Encratite heresy, which condemned marriage. Tatian, Justin Martyr's disciple, became a member of this Gnostic sect, holding, it is alleged, the usual theory of eons, and that there was a Demiurge, who was not the Supreme God.

(5) Marcion.

Marcion, a native of Pontus, taught in Rome circa 140-55 AD. His system differs much from ordinary Gnostic theories, except that he absolutely distinguished between the God of the Old Testament, who is regarded as merely great, harsh, rigorous, and the good God of the New Testament, who is wholly love. He also held to the usual Gnostic dualism and docetism. Marcion's system has been described as an overstrained Paulinism, as he lays the stress on faith, not on knowledge. Marcion was the author of a book called the Anthitheses, which contrasted the Old Testament with the New Testament. He also drew up a canon of Scripture, which contained only one gospel, namely, Luke in a mutilated state, and ten Epistles of Paul. Marcion was a rigorous ascetic. In the Lord's Supper he allowed only water to be used instead of wine. The Marcionites refused baptism to married persons. This sect or "church" endured for several centuries.

5. Relation to the Old Testament:

"All the Gnostic systems had one feature in common, namely, that they regarded the Old Testament and the New Testament as revelations of two different Gods, and considered the mission of Christ to proceed from a higher power than the God of the Jewish religion, who was identified with the Demiurge, or Maker of the world. But under this common assumption there was room for two very opposite estimates of the older revelation and of the God whom it reveals. Some of the Gnostic sects regarded the Demiurge as being altogether alien from and opposed to the Supreme God; others considered him merely as a subordinate power, inferior but not hostile to the Supreme God, and acting before the coming of a more perfect revelation, as his unconscious organ" (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 45). "There can be no doubt that the Gnostic propaganda was seriously hindered by the inability to organize and discipline churches, which is characteristic of all philosophic systems of religion" (Harnack, History of Dogma, I, 252). "From about 210 they ceased to be a factor of the historical development, though the church of Constantine and Theodosius was alone really able to suppress them" (ibid., 251).

6. The Christian Verities:

In contrast to Gnosticism the Christian church held fast to these great facts, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, preexistent before the Incarnation, and manifest in the flesh and crucified for us men and for our salvation; that He rose from the dead; that the Old Testament is a true revelation of the one supreme and holy God, the Creator of all things. Dualism, the eternity of matter and its inherent evil, as well as Docetism and oriental mythologies were accordingly rejected as contrary to the Christian faith.

7. Influence on Theology:

During the period of the prevalence of Gnosticism there took place the earlier developments of Christian theology. Gnosticism gave a powerful impetus to the formation of a New Testament canon of Scripture; and to the shaping of the earliest creed.

See APOSTLES' CREED.

8. Truth Underlying Docetism:

In the revulsion from Gnosticism and Docetism it should not be forgotten that there is truth to be found even amid the errors of these systems. Docetism was an over-statement of a great truth, an over-statement so large as to destroy the true humanity of our Lord. But the truth in Docetism is that the eternal Christ touches and appeals to and has a definite relationship to and actually influences every human heart; and also, that, to the Christian believer, Christ is more and does more than this; Christ dwells in the believer's heart by faith, "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (Col 1:27). "Docetism was not all folly. Rather we may regard it as one primitive form of the assertion of that mystical element which has never been wanting to Christianity from the first days until now, and we may be sure, never will be wanting to it" (Sanday, Christologies Ancient and Modern, 9).

VIII. Modern Gnosticism.

Gnosticism in its ancient form has passed away, but it is interesting to observe how its spirit reappears from time to time in modern days. Gnosticism, as already seen, is not one aspect of thought alone, but many. And in one form or another it is seen again and again. For example, the modern denial of the virgin birth of our Lord is that form of Gnosticism which taught that the man Jesus became Christ only at His baptism, when the Holy Spirit descended upon Him from heaven.

Phases of Gnostic teaching are reproduced in modern pantheistic philosophies and other forms of religious doctrine, which hold that there has been no objective atonement and no resurrection of Christ from the dead. "Basilides with his powerful speculative grasp and all-embracing evolutionary process might be termed the Hegel of the movement; Valentinus with his robe of fantasy and triple fall and redemption was its Schelling; Marcion with his severe practical bent, his doctrine of faith, and his antitheses of the just God and the good, might without straining be termed its Ritschl" (Orr, The Progress of Dogma, 59).

"Fichte said, 'There were no external realities at all, they were the mere objectivity of the subject or creations of the inward eye'; after Fichte came Schelling, and Schelling said, 'Then this creating eye is God's own eye'; and after Schelling came Hegel, and Hegel said that 'God and man are one, and God all men, and all men God, and the whole universe God eternally thinking in the process of development,' and that or something like it is Hegelianism. I feel in studying this philosophy, as Baron Humboldt says

he felt, when he experienced the first shock of an earthquake. I feel a dreadful sense of restlessness and insecurity. The ground seems to give way beneath, and the earth and the heaven to dissolve, the universe becomes a dream, a myth" (W.B. Robertson, D.D., Martin Luther, German Student Life, etc., 138).

"Philosophy," says Mansel, "striving after a first principle which shall be one and simple and unconditioned and incapable of all further analysis in thought, is naturally tempted to soar above that complex combination of attributes which is implied in our conception of personality, and in endeavoring to simplify and purify our representation of the Divine nature, ends by depriving it of every attribute which can make God the object of any religious feeling or the source of any moral obligation" (The Gnostic Heresies, 11). God is no longer the author and source of goodness and truth and moral law, but the mind is occupied with the metaphysical relation between God and the world, as absolute and relative, cause and effect, principle and consequence, and God becomes identical with the world.

It is easily seen how teaching of this sort strikes at the root of all religion and morality. The personality of God, the personality and free will of man, the existence of moral evil, the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, the redemption which He accomplished for the world, His resurrection, the whole significance of His person and His work—all is denied. This is the spirit and the meaning of Gnosticism.

Dr. Gwatkin sums up the matter thus: "Gnosticism undermined Christian monotheism by its distinction of the Creator from the Supreme, Christian morals by its opposition of the philosopher to the unlearned, Christian practice by its separation of knowledge from action; and it cut away the very basis of the gospel whenever it explained away its history. In every case it had got hold of truth on one side—the reality of evil in the world, the function of knowledge in religion, the difference between the letter and the spirit; but fragments of truth are not enough for a gospel, which is false if all truth is not summed up in Christ. Therefore, there could be no peace between the Gnostic illuminati and the Christian churches" (Early Church History, II, 68). LITERATURE.

Uhlhorn, The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism; Neander, Church History, Antignostikus; Reuss, History of Christian Theology in the Apostolic Age; Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of Paul, Colossians, Philippians; Gwatkin, Early Church History to 313 AD, II; W. Bousset, article "Gnosticism," Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition; Harnack, History of Dogma, I (English translation); Orr, Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity, Sin as a Problem of Today, The Progress of Dogma, The Early Church; Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies; Robert Law, B.D., The Tests of Life.

John Rutherfurd

GO

(halakh, yalakh, bo’, yatsa’; ago, hupago, anabaino, erchomi, aperchomai, poreuomai): "Go" ("went," etc.) occurs very frequently in the English Bible, and is the translation of a great many different Hebrew and Greek terms. As the word implies movement of all kinds, physical and mental, it has naturally many applications.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament halakh and yalakh are among the commonest words, meaning "to go" in its original sense of "to walk," but also in the most varied senses, according to the verbal conjugations, etc., the preposition attached, and the words in connection with which the terms stand; halakh and yalakh are often used figuratively (translated "to walk," etc.) for to live, to pursue a way of life, e.g. "to walk ever in his ways" (De 19:9; compare Ps 15:2; 89:30; 1Ki 2:3; 3:3, etc.); to die, "He departed (Hebrew "went") without being desired" (2Ch 21:20); bo', properly "to go in," "to enter" (e.g. Ge 7:9), is very common, and yatsa'," to go or come out," also occurs frequently; yatsa', has frequently the meaning "to go forth," e.g. Ge 8:7, "He sent forth a raven, and it went forth." Other frequent words are yaradh, "to go down" (Ge 11:7, etc.); 'alah, "to go or come up" (Ge 2:6, etc.; Isa 15:5, "go it up," the King James Version) ; used also figuratively, e.g. "to rise up or excel" "Thou excellest them all" (Pr 31:29), "to come up on the nears," to be remembered, "The former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind" (Isa 65:17; compare Jer 3:16); 'abhar, "to go or pass over," "to cross" (Ge 41:46, etc.), also used figuratively "to pass away," e.g. "as chaff that passeth away" (Isa 29:5), 'passeth by transgression' (Mic 7:18); shubh, "to go again" (Ge 43:2, etc.); saTah and cur, "to go aside," occur several times with the meaning of wrongdoing (e.g. Nu 5:12; De 28:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "turn aside"); nasa'," to remove (Ex 14:15), "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward" (Ex 14:19"removed"; Nu 2:24 etc.); 'azal (Aramaic), "to go away or about" (Ezr 4:23; Da 2:17, etc.). Many other words occur only once or twice, e.g. 'arach, "to travel" Job (34:8); 'ashar, "to go straight or right" (Pr 4:14; 9:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "walk"); darakh, "to tread" (Isa 59:8); dadhah, "to go softly" (Ps 42:4; Isa 38:15, the Revised Version, margin "as in solemn procession"); raghal, "to stir" "to move" "I taught Enhraim to go" (Ho 11:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "to walk").

The obsolete expression "go to" (derived from Tyndale) is the translation of yahabh in Ge 11:3,4,7; 38:16; Ex 1:10, "come on," the Revised Version (British and American) "come"; of bo' (2Ki 5:5 the Revised Version (British and American)), "go now"; na' (Jud 7:3; Isa 5:5; Jer 18:11, omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)).

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament anabaino is "to go up" (Mt 3:16; 5:1, etc.); erchomai, "to go on" (Mt 12:9, etc.); aperchomai, "to go off or away" (Mt 2:22; 4:24, etc.); poreuomai, "to go or pass on" (Mt 2:8,20, etc.); hupago, "to go away" (Mt 5:41; 8:32, etc.). We have also other combinations with different shades of meaning, e.g. huperbaino, "to go over or beyond" (1Th 4:6); eiserchomai, "to go into" (Mt 7:13; 15:11, etc.); proporeuomai, "to go before" (Lu 1:76; Ac 7:40), and other forms; ago (agomen), "Let us go" (Mt 26:46; Joh 14:31, etc.); age is rendered "go to" (Jas 4:13; 5:1), the Revised Version (British and American) "come."

"Go about (to)" the King James Version is the translation of zeteo, "to seek," in Joh 7:19, "Why go ye about to kill me?" the Revised Version (British and American) "Why seek ye?" and Ro 10:3; of peirazo,

"to try," "attempt" (Ac 24:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "assayed"), and of peiraomai (26:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "assayed"), of epicheireo "to lay hands on" (Ac 9:29), which remains in the English Revised Version unchanged, the American Standard Revised Version "seeking"; "to let go" is the translation of apoluo "to loose off" or "away" (Lu 14:4, etc.), "to go astray," of planao (Mt 18:12, etc.).

Various other words occurring singly are translated by forms of "go," e.g. phero, "to bear on," the King James Version "Let us go on unto perfection" (Heb 6:1, see below); epiduo, "to go in upon," "Let not the sun go down upon your Wrath" (Eph 4:26).

Among the many changes in the Revised Version (British and American) are the following: For "go," Ex 4:26, "alone"; Le 9:7, "draw near"; Nu 2:31, "set forth"; 16:46, "carry it"; Isa 11:15; 27:4, "march"; Mt 11:4; Joh 8:11, "Go your way"; Lu 17:7, "Come straightway"; 18:25, "enter in"; Joh 21:3 b, "come." "Go" is substituted for "pass" (Ex 12:12), "came" (Ex 13:4), "away" (Ex 19:24), "be put" (Le 6:12), "enter" (Job 34:23), "return" (Ec 1:7), "come" (Mic 4:2; compare Zec 14:18,19), "should be cast" (Mt 5:30); "if I go up" for "I will come up" (Ex 33:5); "make to go forth" for "bring forth" (Ps 37:6); "let them go" for "gave them up" (Ps 81:12). For the phrase, "go a whoring," the American Standard Revised Version has "play the harlot" (Ex 34:15 f, etc., "commit fornication"); for "go about even now" (De 31:21, the American Standard Revised Version), "frame this day"; for "go well" (Pr 30:29), "are stately in their march"; for "suffer us to go" (Mt 8:31), "send us" (a different text); for "not to think of men above that which is written" (1Co 4:6), "not (to go) beyond the things which are written"; for "that no man go beyond" (1Th 4:6), "transgress," margin "overreach"; for "Let us go on unto perfection" (Heb 6:1), the English Revised Version "and press," the American Standard Revised Version "Let us press on unto perfection."

W. L. Walker

GOAD

god (dorebhan, malmadh; kentron): The goad used by the Syrian farmer is usually a straight branch of oak or other strong wood from which the bark has been stripped, and which has at one end a pointed spike and at the other a flat chisel-shaped iron. The pointed end is to prod the oxen while plowing. The flattened iron at the other end is to scrape off the earth which clogs the plowshare. The ancient goad was probably similar to this instrument. It could do villainous work in the hands of an experienced fighter (Jud 3:31). If 1Sa 13:21 is correctly translated, the goads were kept sharpened by files.

Figurative: "The words of the wise are as goads" (Ec 12:11). The only reference to goads in the New Testament is the familiar passage, "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad" (Ac 26:14). It was as useless for Saul to keep on in the wrong way as for a fractious ox to attempt to leave the furrow. He would surely be brought back with a prick of the goad.

James A. Patch

GOAH; GOATH

go’-a, go’-ath (go‘ah; the King James Version; Septuagint reads ex eklekton lithon): A place named in describing the boundaries of Jerusalem as restored in the "days to come" (Jer 31:39). If Gareb is the Northeast hill, then probably Goah is to be identified with the Northwest hill, which is called by Josephus "the camp of the Assyrians" (BJ, V, vii, 3; xii, 2).

See JERUSALEM.

GOAT

got:

1. Names:

The common generic word for "goat" is ‘ez (compare Arabic ‘anz, "she-goat"; aix), used often for "she-goat" (Ge 15:9; Nu 15:27), also with gedhi, "kid," as gedhi ‘izzim, "kid of the goats" (Ge 38:17), also with sa‘ir, "he-goat," as se‘ir ‘izzim, "kid of the goats" or "he-goat," or translated simply "kids," as in 1Ki 20:27, "The children of Israel encamped before them like two little flocks of kids." Next, frequently used is sa‘ir, literally, "hairy" (compare Arabic sha‘r, "hair"; cher, "hedgehog"; Latin hircus, "goat"; hirtus, "hairy"; also German Haar; English "hair"), like ‘ez and ‘attudh used of goats for offerings. The goat which is sent into the wilderness bearing the sins of the people is sa‘ir (Le 16:7-22). The same name is used of devils (Le 17:7; 2Ch 11:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "he-goats") and of satyrs (Isa 13:21; 34:14, the Revised Version, margin "he-goats," the American Standard Revised Version "wild goats"). Compare also se‘irath ‘izzim, "a female from the flock" (Le 4:28; 5:6). The male or leader of the flock is ‘attudh; Arabic ‘atud, "yearling he-goat"; figuratively "chief ones" (Isa 14:9; compare Jer 50:8). A later word for "he-goat," used also figuratively, is tsaphir (2Ch 29:21; Ezr 8:35; Da 8:5,8,21). In Pr 30:31, one of the four things "which are stately in going" is the he-goat, tayish (Arabic tais, "he-goat"), also mentioned in Ge 30:35; 32:14 among the possessions of Laban and Jacob, and in 2Ch 17:11 among the animals given as tribute by the Arabians to Jehoshaphat. In Heb 9:12,13,19; 10:4, we have tragos, the ordinary Greek word for "goat"; in Mt 25:32,33, eriphos, and its diminutive eriphion; in Heb 11:37 derma aigeion, "goatskin," from aix (see supra). "Kid" is gedhi (compare En-gedi (1Sa 23:29), etc.), feminine gedhiyah (So 1:8), but also ‘ez, gedhi ‘izzim, se’-ir ‘izzim, se‘ir ‘izzim, se‘irath ‘izzim, bene ‘izzim, and eriphos. There remain ya‘el (1Sa 24:2; Job 39:1; Ps 104:18), English Versions of the Bible "wild goat"; ya‘alah (Pr 5:19), the King James Version "roe," the Revised Version (British and American) "doe"; ‘aqqo (De 14:5), English Versions of the Bible "wild goat"; and zemer (De 14:5), English Versions of the Bible "chamois."

2. Wild Goats:

The original of our domestic goats is believed to be the Persian wild goat or pasang, Capra aegagrus,

which inhabits some of the Greek islands, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, Afghanistan, and Northwestern India. It is called wa'l (compare Hebrew ya'el) by the Arabs, who in the North apply the same name to its near relative, the Sinaitic ibex, Capra beden. The last, doubtless the "wild goat" (ya'el) of the Bible, inhabits Southern Palestine, Arabia, Sinai, and Eastern Egypt, and within its range is uniformly called beden by the Arabs. It is thought by the writer that the "chamois" (zemer) of De 14:5 may be the Persian wild goat. The word occurs only in this passage in the list of clean animals. See CHAMOIS; DEER; ZOOLOGY. Wild goats are found only in Southern Europe, Southwestern Asia, and Northeastern Africa. They include the well-known, but now nearly extinct, Alpine ibex, steinbok, or bouquetin, the markhor, and the Himalayan ibex, which has enormous horns. The so-called Rocky Mountain goat is not properly a goat, but is an animal intermediate between goats and antelopes.

3. Domestic Goats:

Domestic goats differ greatly among themselves in the color and length of their hair, in the size and shape of their ears, and in the size and shape of their horns, which are usually larger in the males, but in some breeds may be absent in both sexes. A very constant feature in both wild and domestic goats is the bearded chin of the male. The goats of Palestine and Syria are usually black (So 4:1), though sometimes partly or entirely white or brown. Their hair is usually long, hanging down from their bodies. The horns are commonly curved outward and backward, but in one very handsome breed they extend nearly outward with slight but graceful curves, sometimes attaining a span of 2 ft. or more in the old males. The profile of the face is distinctly convex. They are herded in the largest numbers in the mountainous or hilly districts, and vie with their wild congeners in climbing into apparently impossible places. They feed not only on herbs, but also on shrubs and small trees, to which they are most destructive. They are largely responsible for the deforested condition of Judea and Lebanon. They reach up the trees to the height of a man, holding themselves nearly or quite erect, and even walk out on low branches.

4. Economy:

Apart from the ancient use in sacrifice, which still survives among Moslems, goats are most valuable animals. Their flesh is eaten, and may be had when neither mutton nor beef can be found. Their milk is drunk and made into cheese and semn, a sort of clarified butter much used in cooking. Their hair is woven into tents (So 1:5), carpets, cloaks, sacks, slings, and various camel, horse and mule trappings. Their skins are made into bottles (no'dh; Greek askos; Arabic qirbeh) for water, oil, semn, and other liquids (compare also Heb 11:37).

5. Religious and Figurative:

Just as the kid was often slaughtered for an honored guest (Jud 6:19; 13:19), so the kid or goat was frequently taken for sacrifice (Le 4:23; 9:15; 16:7; Nu 15:24; Ezr 8:35; Eze 45:23; Heb 9:12). A goat was one of the clean animals (seh 'izzim, De 14:4). In Daniel, the powerful king out of the West is typified as a goat with a single horn (8:5). One of the older goats is the leader of the flock. In some parts of the country the goatherd makes different ones leaders by turns, the leader being trained to keep near

the goat-herd and not to eat so long as he wears the bell. In Isa 14:9, ".... stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth," the word translated "chief ones" is ‘attudh, "he-goat." Again, in Jer 50:8, we have "Go forth out of the land of the Chaldeans, and be as the he-goats before the flocks." In Mt 25:32, in the scene of the last judgment, we find "He shall separate them one from another, as the shepherd separateth the sheep from the goats." It is not infrequent to find a flock including both goats and sheep grazing over the mountains, but they are usually folded separately.

Alfred Ely Day

GOATS’ HAIR

(’ez): The word for she-goat is used elliptically to mean goats’ hair, which was used in the tabernacle furnishings in the form of curtains (Ex 26:7; 36:14). Goats’ hair was probably used in the Midianite and Israelite camps in much the same way as in the Bedouin camps today (compare Nu 31:20). The tents, tent ropes and rugs are made of spun goats’ hair. The provision sacks which hold wheat, rice, etc., and the saddlebags are made of the same material. A strip of the cloth rolled up furnishes a bolster for the head while sleeping (compare 1Sa 19:13,16). Goats’ hair cloth is admirab1y suited to stand the hard usage of a frequently shifting encampment. The children of Israel appreciated its utility, even for the tabernacle, where to the modern critical eye it would have looked out of place, matched against scarlet and fine linen (Ex 25:4; 35:6,26). The fact that goats’ hair was used is good indication of the comparative crudeness of the tabernacle, when contrasted with present-day furnishings.

See also HAIR; WEAVING.

James A. Patch

GOATSKINS

got’-skinz (en aigeiois dermasin): Such skins are mentioned only once (Heb 11:37), where the wearing of goatskins, indicating extreme poverty, is referred to, by implication, as the possible lot of the faithful Christian, even as it had been of others. Ascetics of different religions, especially of the Moslem sects, are frequently seen going about Syria and Palestine today, clad in sheepskins or goatskins, a sign of their renunciation of all things worldly.

GOB

gob (gobh): A place mentioned in 2Sa 21:18 f as the scene of two of David’s battles with the Philistines. The name appears here only. In the parallel passage, 1Ch 20:4, it is called Gezer (compare Ant, VII, xii, 2). Certain texts read "Nob" for "Gob," while Syriac and Septuagint read "Gath." The latter is probably correct.

GOBLET

gob’-let (’aggan): A bowl or basin (So 7:2), the only place where the word is used. ‘Aggan is used in the plural in Ex 24:6 and Isa 22:24, and is translated "basins" and "cups." These "basins" were used to hold the blood of the sacrifices and must have been of moderate size. The "cups" were bowl-shaped vessels and belonged evidently to the smaller class of vessels used in a house.

GOD, 1

god (’Elohim, ‘El, [‘Elyon], Shadday, Yahweh; Theos):

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE GENERAL IDEA

1. The Idea in Experience and in Thought

2. Definition of the Idea

3. The Knowledge of God

4. Ethnic Ideas of God

(1) Animism

(2) Fetishism

(3) Idolatry

(4) Polytheism

(5) Henotheism

(6) Pantheism

(7) Deism

(8) Semitic Monolatry

(9) Monotheism

II. THE IDEA OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. The Course of Its Development

2. Forms of Its Manifestation

(1) The Face or Countenance of God

(2) The Voice and Word of God

(3) The Glory of God

(4) The Angel of God

(5) The Spirit of God

(6) The Name of God

(7) Occasional Forms

3. The Names of God

(1) Generic

(2) Attributive

(3) Yahweh

4. Pre-prophetic Conceptions of God

(1) Yahweh Alone Is the God of Israel

(a) His Early Worship

(b) Popular Religion

(c) Polytheistic Tendencies

(i) Coordination

(ii) Assimilation

(iii) Disintegration

(d) No Hebrew Goddesses

(e) Human Sacrifices

(2) Nature and Character of Yahweh

(a) A God of War

(b) His Relation to Nature

(3) Most Distinctive Characteristics of Yahweh

(a) Personality

(b) Law and Judgment

5. The Idea of God in the Prophetic Period

(1) Righteousness

(2) Holiness

(3) Universality

(4) Unity

(5) Creator and Lord

(6) Compassion and Love

6. The Idea of God in Post-exilic Judaism

(1) New Conditions

(2) Divine Attributes

(3) Surviving Limitations

(a) Disappearing Anthropomorphism

(b) Localization

(c) Favoritism

(d) Ceremonial Legalism

(4) Tendencies to Abstractness

(a) Transcendence

(b) Skepticism

(c) Immanence

(5) Logos, Memra', and Angels

III. THE IDEA OF GOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Dependence on the Old Testament

2. Gentile Influence

3. Absence of Theistic Proofs

4. Fatherhood of God

(1) In the Teaching of Jesus Christ

(a) Its Relation to Himself

(b) To Believers

(c) To All Men

(2) In Apostolic Teaching

(a) Father of Jesus Christ

(b) Our Father

(c) Universal Father

5. God Is King

(1) The Kingdom of God

(2) Its King

(a) God

(b) Christ

(c) Their Relation

(3) Apostolic Teaching

6. Moral Attributes

(1) Personality

(2) Love

(3) Righteousness and Holiness

7. Metaphysical Attributes

8. The Unity of God

(1) The Divinity of Christ

(2) The Holy Spirit

(3) The Church’s Problem

LITERATURE

I. Introduction to the General Idea.

1. The Idea in Experience and in Thought:

Religion gives the idea of God, theology construes and organizes its content, and philosophy establishes its relation to the whole of man's experience. The logical order of treating it might appear to be, first, to establish its truth by philosophical proofs; secondly, to develop its content into theological propositions; and finally, to observe its development and action in religion. Such has been the more usual order of treatment. But the actual history of the idea has been quite the reverse. Men had the idea of God, and it had proved a creative factor in history, long before reflection upon it issued in its systematic expression as a doctrine. Moreover, men had enunciated the doctrine before they attempted or even felt any need to define its relation to reality. And the logic of history is the truer philosophy. To arrive at the truth of any idea, man must begin with some portion of experience, define its content, relate it to the whole of experience, and so determine its degree of reality.

Religion is as universal as man, and every religion involves some idea of God. Of the various philosophical ideas of God, each has its counterpart and antecedent in some actual religion. Pantheism is the philosophy of the religious consciousness of India. Deism had prevailed for centuries as an actual attitude of men to God, in China, in Judaism and in Islam, before it found expression as a rational theory in the philosophy of the 18th century Theism is but the attempt to define in general terms the Christian conception of God, and of His relation to the world. If pluralism claims a place among the systems of philosophy, it can appeal to the religious consciousness of that large portion of mankind that has hitherto adhered to polytheism.

But all religions do not issue in speculative reconstructions of their content. It is true in a sense that all religion is an unconscious philosophy, because it is the reaction of the whole mind, including the intellect, upon the world of its experience, and, therefore, every idea of God involves some kind of an explanation of the world. But conscious reflection upon their own content emerges only in a few of the more highly developed religions. Brahmanism, Buddhism, Judaism, Islam and Christianity are the only religions that have produced great systems of thought, exhibiting their content in a speculative and rational form. The religions of Greece and Rome were unable to survive the reflective period. They produced no theology which could ally itself to a philosophy, and Greek philosophy was from the beginning to a great extent the denial and supersession of Greek religion.

Biblical literature nearly all represents the spontaneous experience of religion, and contains comparatively little reflection upon that experience. In the Old Testament it is only in Second Isaiah, in the Wisdom literature and in a few Psalms that the human mind may be seen turning back upon itself to ask the meaning of its practical feelings and beliefs. Even here nothing appears of the nature of a philosophy of Theism or of religion, no theology, no organic definition and no ideal reconstruction of the idea of God. It never occurred to any Old Testament writer to offer a proof of the existence of God, or that anyone should need it. Their concern was to bring men to a right relation with God, and they propounded right views of God only in so far as it was necessary for their practical purpose. Even the fool who "hath said in his heart, There is no God" (Ps 14:1; 53:1), and the wicked nations "that forget God" (Ps 9:17) are no theoretical atheists, but wicked and corrupt men, who, in conduct and life, neglect or reject the presence of God.

The New Testament contains more theology, more reflection upon the inward content of the idea of

God, and upon its cosmic significance; but here also, no system appears, no coherent and rounded-off doctrine, still less any philosophical construction of the idea on the basis of experience as a whole. The task of exhibiting the Biblical idea of God is, therefore, not that of setting together a number of texts, or of writing the history of a theology, but rather of interpreting the central factor in the life of the Hebrew and Christian communities.

2. Definition of the Idea:

Logically and historically the Biblical idea stands related to a number of other ideas. Attempts have been made to find a definition of so general a nature as to comprehend them all. The older theologians assumed the Christian standpoint, and put into their definitions the conclusions of Christian doctrine and philosophy. Thus, Melanchthon: "God is a spiritual essence, intelligent, eternal, true, good, pure, just, merciful, most free and of infinite power and wisdom." Thomasius more briefly defines God as "the absolute personality." These definitions take no account of the existence of lower religions and ideas of God, nor do they convey much of the concreteness and nearness of God revealed in Christ. A similar recent definition, put forward, however, avowedly of the Christian conception, is that of Professor W. N. Clarke: "God is the personal Spirit, perfectly good, who in holy love creates, sustains and orders all" (Outline of Christian Theology, 66). The rise of comparative religion has shown that "while all religions involve a conscious relation to a being called God, the Divine Being is in different religions conceived in the most different ways; as one and as many, as natural and as spiritual, as like to and manifested in almost every object in the heavens above or earth beneath, in mountains and trees, in animals and men; or, on the contrary, as being incapable of being represented by any finite image whatsoever; and, again, as the God of a family, of a nation, or of humanity" (E. Caird, Evolution of Religion, I, 62). Attempts have therefore been made to find a new kind of definition, such as would include under one category all the ideas of God possessed by the human race. A typical instance of this kind of definition is that of Professor W. Adams Brown: "A god in the religious sense is an unseen being, real or supposed, to whom an individual or a social group is united by voluntary ties of reverence and service" (Christian Theology in Outline, 30). Many similar definitions are given: "A supersensible being or beings" (Lotze, Asia Minor Fairbairn); "a higher power" (Allan Menzies); "spiritual beings" (E. B. Tylor); "a power not ourselves making for righteousness" (Matthew Arnold). This class of definition suffers from a twofold defect. It says too much to include the ideas of the lower religions, and too little to suggest those of the higher. It is not all gods that are "unseen" or "supersensible," or "making for righteousness," but all these qualities may be shared by other beings than gods, and they do not connote that which is essential in the higher ideas of God. Dr. E. Caird, looking for a definition in a germinative principle of the genesis of religion, defines God "as the unity which is presupposed in the difference of the self and not-self, and within which they act and re-act on each other" (op. cit., I, 40, 64). This principle admittedly finds its full realization only in the highest religion, and it may be doubted whether it does justice to the transcendent personality and the love of God as revealed in Jesus Christ. In the lower religions it appears only in fragmentary forms, and it can only be detected in them at all after it has been revealed in the absolute religion. Although this definition may be neither adequate nor true, its method recognizes that there can be only one true idea and definition of God, and yet that all other ideas are more or less true elements of it and approximations to it. The Biblical idea does not stand alone like an island in mid-ocean, but is rather the center of light which radiates out in other religions with varying

degrees of purity.

It is not the purpose of this article to deal with the problem of the philosophy of religion, but to give an account of the idea of God at certain stages of its development, and within a limited area of thought. The absence of a final definition will present no practical difficulty, because the denotation of the term God is clear enough; it includes everything that is or has been an object of worship; it is its connotation that remains a problem for speculation.

3. The Knowledge of God:

A third class of definition demands some attention, because it raises a new question, that of the knowledge or truth of any idea whatsoever. Herbert Spencer's definition may be taken as representative: God is the unknown and unknowable cause of the universe, "an inscrutable power manifested to us through all phenomena" (First Principles, V, 31). This means that there can be no definition of the idea of God, because we can have no idea of Him, no knowledge "in the strict sense of knowing." For the present purpose it might suffice for an answer that ideas of God actually exist; that they can be defined and are more definable, because fuller and more complex, the higher they rise in the scale of religions; that they can be gathered from the folklore and traditions of the lower races, and from the sacred books and creeds of the higher religions. But Spencer's view means that, in so far as the ideas are definable, they are not true. The more we define, the more fictitious becomes our subject-matter. While nothing is more certain than that God exists, His being is to human thought utterly mysterious and inscrutable. The variety of ideas might seem to support this view. But variety of ideas has been held of every subject that is known, as witness the progress of science. The variety proves nothing.

And the complete abstraction of thought from existence cannot be maintained. Spencer himself does not succeed in doing it. He says a great many things about the "unknowable" which implies an extensive knowledge of Him. The traditional proofs of the "existence" of God have misled the Agnostics. But existence is meaningless except for thought, and a noumenon or first cause that lies hidden in impenetrable mystery behind phenomena cannot be conceived even as a fiction. Spencer's idea of the Infinite and Absolute are contradictory and unthinkable. An Infinite that stood outside all that is known would not be infinite, and an Absolute out of all relation could not even be imagined. If there is any truth at all in the idea of the Absolute, it must be true to human experience and thought; and the true Infinite must include within itself every possible and actual perfection. In truth, every idea of God that has lived in religion refutes Agnosticism, because they all qualify and interpret experience, and the only question is as to the degree of their adequacy and truth.

A brief enumeration of the leading ideas of God that have lived in religion will serve to place the Biblical idea in its true perspective.

4. Ethnic Ideas of God:

(1) Animism:

Animism is the name of a theory which explains the lowest (and perhaps the earliest) forms of religion, and also the principle of all religion, as the belief in the universal presence of spiritual beings which "are held to affect or control the events of the material world, and man's life here and hereafter; and, it being considered that they hold intercourse with men, and receive pleasure or displeasure from human actions, the belief in their existence leads naturally, and, it might almost be said, inevitably, sooner or later, to active reverence and propitiation" (E.B. Tylor, Primitive Culture, I, 426-27). According to this view, the world is full of disembodied spirits, regarded as similar to man's soul, and any or all of these may be treated as gods.

(2) Fetishism:

Fetishism is sometimes used in a general sense for "the view that the fruits of the earth and things in general are divine, or animated by powerful spirits" (J.G. Frazer, Adonis, Attis, Osiris, 234); or it may be used in a more particular sense of the belief that spirits "take up their abode, either temporarily or permanently, in some object, ... and this object, as endowed with higher power, is then worshipped" (Tiele, Outlines of the History of Religion, 9).

(3) Idolatry:

Idolatry is a term of still more definite significance. It means that the object is at least selected, as being the permanent habitation or symbol of the deity; and, generally, it is marked by some degree of human workmanship, designed to enable it the more adequately to represent the deity. It is not to be supposed that men ever worship mere "stocks and stones," but they address their worship to objects, whether fetishes or idols, as being the abodes or images of their god. It is a natural and common idea that the spirit has a form similar to the visible object in which it dwells. Paul reflected the heathen idea accurately when he said, "We ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man" (Ac 17:29).

(4) Polytheism:

The belief in many gods, and the worship of them, is an attitude of soul compatible with Animism, Fetishism, and Idolatry, or it may be independent of them all. The term Polytheism is more usually employed to designate the worship of a limited number of well-defined deities, whether regarded as pure disembodied spirits, or as residing in the greater objects of Nature, such as planets or mountains, or as symbolized by images "graven by art and device of man." In ancient Greece or modern India the great gods are well defined, named and numerable, and it is clearly understood that, though they may be symbolized by images, they dwell apart in a spiritual realm above the rest of the world.

(5) Henotheism:

There is, however, a tendency, both in individuals and in communities, even where many gods are

believed to exist, to set one god above the others, and consequently to confine worship to that god alone. "The monotheistic tendency exists among all peoples, after they have reached a certain level of culture. There is a difference in the degree in which this tendency is emphasized, but whether we turn to Babylonia, Egypt, India, China, or Greece, there are distinct traces of a trend toward concentrating the varied manifestations of Divine powers in a single source" (Jastrow, The Study of Religion, 76). This attitude of mind has been called Henotheism or Monolatry—the worship of one God combined with the belief in the existence of many. This tendency may be governed by metaphysical, or by ethical and personal motives, either by the monistic demands of reason, or by personal attachment to one political or moral rule.

(6) Pantheism:

Where the former principle predominates, Polytheism merges into Pantheism, as is the case in India, where Brahma is not only the supreme, but the sole, being, and all other gods are but forms of his manifestation. But, in India, the vanquished gods have had a very complete revenge upon their vanquisher, for Brahma has become so abstract and remote that worship is mainly given to the other gods, who are forms of his manifestation. Monolatry has been reversed, and modern Hinduism were better described as the belief in one God accompanied by the worship of many.

(7) Deism:

The monistic tendency, by a less thorough application of it, may take the opposite turn toward Deism, and yet produce similar religious conditions. The Supreme Being, who is the ultimate reality and power of the universe, may be conceived in so vague and abstract a manner, may be so remote from the world, that it becomes a practical necessity to interpose between Him and men a number of subordinate and nearer beings as objects of worship. In ancient Greece, Necessity, in China, Tien or Heaven, were the Supreme Beings; but a multiplicity of lower gods were the actual objects of worship. The angels of Zoroastrianism, Judaism and Islam and the saints of Romanism illustrate the same tendency. Pantheism and Deism, though they have had considerable vogue as philosophical theories, have proved unstable and impossible as religions, for they have invariably reverted to some kind of polytheism and idolatry, which seems to indicate that they are false processes of the monistic tendency.

(8) Semitic Monolatry:

The monistic tendency of reason may enlist in its aid many minor causes, such as tribal isolation or national aggrandizement. It is held that many Sere tribes were monolatrists for either or both of these reasons; but the exigencies of intertribal relations in war and commerce soon neutralized their effects, and merged the tribal gods into a territorial pantheon.

(9) Monotheism:

Monotheism, ethical and personal: One further principle may combine with Monism so as to bring about

a stable Monotheism, that is the conception of God as standing in moral relations with man. Whenever man reflects upon conduct as moral, he recognizes that there can be only one moral standard and authority, and when God is identified with that moral authority, He inevitably comes to be recognized as supreme and unique. The belief in the existence of other beings called gods may survive for a while; but they are divested of all the attributes of deity when they are seen to be inferior or opposed to the God who rules in conscience. Not only are they not worshipped, but their worship by others comes to be regarded as immoral and wicked. The ethical factor in the monistic conception of God safeguards it from diverging into Pantheism or Deism and thus reverting into Polytheism. For the ethical idea of God necessarily involves His personality, His transcendence as distinct from the world and above it, and also His intimate and permanent relation with man. If He rules in conscience, He can neither be merged in dead nature or abstract being, nor be removed beyond the heavens and the angel host. A thoroughly moralized conception of God emerges first in the Old Testament where it is the prevailing type of thought.

GOD, 2

II. The Idea of God in the Old Testament.

1. Course of Its Development:

Any attempt to write the whole history of the idea of God in the Old Testament would require a preliminary study of the literary and historical character of the documents, which lies beyond the scope of this article and the province of the writer. Yet the Old Testament contains no systematic statement of the doctrine of God, or even a series of statements that need only to be collected into a consistent conception. The Old Testament is the record of a rich and varied life, extending over more than a thousand years, and the ideas that ruled and inspired that life must be largely inferred from the deeds and institutions in which it was realized; nor was it stationary or all at one level. Nothing is more obvious than that revelation in the Old Testament has been progressive, and that the idea of God it conveys has undergone a development. Certain well-marked stages of the development can be easily recognized, without entering upon any detailed criticism. There can be no serious question that the age of the Exodus, as centering around the personality of Moses, witnessed an important new departure in Hebrew religion. The most ancient traditions declare (perhaps not unanimously) that God was then first known to Israel under the personal name Yahweh (Yahweh (YHWH) is the correct form of the word, Yahweh being a composite of the consonants of Yahweh and the vowels of ‘adhonay, or lord. Yahweh is retained here as the more familiar form). The Hebrew people came to regard Him as their Deliverer from Egypt, as their war god who assured them the conquest of Canaan, and He, therefore, became their king, who ruled over their destinies in their new heritage. But the settlement of Yahweh in Canaan, like that of His people, was challenged by the native gods and their peoples. In the 9th century we see the war against Yahweh carried into His own camp, and Baal-worship attempting to set itself up within Israel. His prophets therefore assert the sole right of Yahweh to the worship of His people, and the great prophets of the 8th century base that right upon His moral transcendence. Thus they at once reveal new depths of His moral nature, and set His uniqueness and supremacy on higher grounds. During the exile and

afterward, Israel's outlook broadens by contact with the greater world, and it draws out the logical implications of ethical monotheism into a theology at once more universalistic and abstract. Three fairly well-defined periods thus emerge, corresponding to three stages in the development of the Old Testament idea of God: the pre-prophetic period governed by the Mosaic conception, the prophetic period during which ethical monotheism is firmly established, and the post-exilic period with the rise of abstract monotheism. But even in taking these large and obvious divisions, it is necessary to bear in mind the philosopher's maxim, that "things are not cut off with a hatchet." The most characteristic ideas of each period may be described within their period; but it should not be assumed that they are altogether absent from other periods; and, in particular, it should not be supposed that ideas, and the life they represent, did not exist before they emerged in the clear witness of history. Mosaism had undoubtedly its antecedents in the life of Israel; but any attempt to define them leads straight into a very morass of conjectures and hypotheses, archaeological, critical and philosophical; and any results that are thus obtained are contributions to comparative religion rather than to theology.

2. Forms of the Manifestation of God:

Religious experience must always have had an inward and subjective aspect, but it is a long and difficult process to translate the objective language of ordinary life for the uses of subjective experience. "Men look outward before they look inward." Hence, we find that men express their consciousness of God in the earliest periods in language borrowed from the visible and objective world. It does not follow that they thought of God in a sensuous way, because they speak of Him in the language of the senses, which alone was available for them. On the other hand, thought is never entirely independent of language, and the degree in which men using sensuous language may think of spiritual facts varies with different persons.

(1) The Face or Countenance of God:

The face or countenance (panim) of God is a natural expression for His presence. The place where God is seen is called Peniel, the face of God (Ge 32:30). The face of Yahweh is His people's blessing (Nu 6:25). With His face (the Revised Version (British and American) "presence") He brought Israel out of Egypt, and His face (the Revised Version (British and American) "presence") goes with them to Canaan (Ex 33:14). To be alienated from God is to be hid from His face (Ge 4:14), or God hides His face (De 31:17,18; 32:20). In contrast with this idea it is said elsewhere that man cannot see the face of God and live (Ex 33:20; compare De 5:24; Jud 6:22; 13:22). In these later passages, "face" stands for the entire being of God, as distinguished from what man may know of Him. This phrase and its cognates enshrine also that fear of God, which shrinks from His majesty even while approaching Him, which enters into all worship.

(2) The Voice and Word of God:

The voice (qol) and word (dabhar) of God are forms under which His communion with man is conceived from the earliest days to the latest. The idea ranges from that of inarticulate utterance (1Ki 19:12) to the

declaration of the entire law of conduct (De 5:22-24), to the message of the prophet (Isa 2:1; Jer 1:2), and the personification of the whole counsel and action of God (Ps 105:19; 147:18,19; Ho 6:5; Isa 40:8).

(3) The Glory of God:

The glory (kabhodh) of God is both a peculiar physical phenomenon and the manifestation of God in His works and providence. In certain passages in Exodus, ascribed to the Priestly Code, the glory is a bright light, "like devouring fire" (24:17); it fills and consecrates the tabernacle (29:43; 40:34,35); and it is reflected as beams of light in the face of Moses (34:29). In Ezekiel, it is a frequent term for the prophet's vision, a brightness like the appearance of a rainbow (1:28; 10:4; 43:2). In another place, it is identified with all the manifested goodness of God and is accompanied with the proclamation of His name (Ex 33:17-23). Two passages in Isa seem to combine under this term the idea of a physical manifestation with that of God's effectual presence in the world (3:8; 6:3). God's presence in creation and history is often expressed in the Psalms as His glory (Ps 19:1; 57:5,11; 63:2; 97:6). Many scholars hold that the idea is found in Isa in its earliest form, and that the physical meaning is quite late. It would, however, be contrary to all analogy, if such phenomena as rainbow and lightning had not first impressed-the primitive mind as manifestations of God.

See GLORY.

(4) The Angel of God:

The angel (mal'akh) of God or of Yahweh is a frequent mode of God's manifestation of Himself in human form, and for occasional purposes. It is a primitive conception, and its exact relation to God, or its likeness to man, is nowhere fixed. In many passages, it is assumed that God and His angel are the same being, and the names are used synonymously (as in Ge 16:7 ff; 22:15,16; Ex 3:2,4; Jud 2:4,5); in other passages the idea blurs into varying degrees of differentiation (Ge 18; 24:40; Ex 23:21; 33:2,3; Jud 13:8,9). But everywhere, it fully represents God as speaking or acting for the time being; and it is to be distinguished from the subordinate and intermediate beings of later angelology. Its identification with the Messiah and the Logos is only true in the sense that these later terms are more definite expressions of the idea of revelation, which the angel represented for primitive thought.

(5) The Spirit of God:

The spirit (ruach) of God in the earlier period is a form of His activity, as it moves warrior and prophet to act and to speak (Jud 6:34; 13:25; 1Sa 10:10), and it is in the prophetic period that it becomes the organ of the communication of God's thoughts to men.

See HOLY SPIRIT.

(6) The Name of God:

The name (shem) of God is the most comprehensive and frequent expression in the Old Testament for His self-manifestation, for His person as it may be known to men. The name is something visible or audible which represents God to men, and which, therefore, may be said to do His deeds, and to stand in His place, in relation to men. God reveals Himself by making known or proclaiming His name (Ex 6:3; 33:19; 34:5,6). His servants derive their authority from His name (Ex 3:13,15; 1Sa 17:45). To worship God is to call upon His name (Ge 12:8; 13:4; 21:33; 26:25; 1Ki 18:24-26), to fear it (De 28:58), to praise it (2Sa 22:50; Ps 7:17; 54:6), to glorify it (Ps 86:9). It is wickedness to take God's name in vain (Ex 20:7), or to profane and blaspheme it (Le 8:21; 24:16). God's dwelling-place is the place where He chooses "to cause his name to dwell" (2Sa 7:13; 1Ki 3:2; 5:3,1; 8:16-19; 18:32; De 12:11,21). God's name defends His people (Ps 20:1; Isa 30:27). For His name's sake He will not forsake them (1Sa 12:22), and if they perish, His name cannot remain (Jos 7:9). God is known by different names, as expressing various forms of His self-manifestation (Ge 16:13; 17:1; Ex 3:6; 34:6). The name even confers its revelation-value upon the angel (Ex 23:20-23). All God's names are, therefore, significant for the revelation of His being.

(7) Occasional Forms:

In addition to these more or less fixed forms, God also appears in a variety of exceptional or occasional forms. In Nu 12:6-8, it is said that Moses, unlike others, used to see the form (temunah) of Yahweh. Fire smoke and cloud are frequent forms or symbols of God's presence (e.g. Ge 15:17; Ex 3:2-4; 19:18; 24:17), and notably "the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night" (Ex 13:21 f). According to later ideas, the cloud rested upon the tabernacle (Ex 40:34), and in it God appeared upon the ark (Le 16:2). Extraordinary occurrences or miracles are, in the early period, frequent signs of the power of God (Ex 7 ff; 1Ki 17).

The questions of the objectivity of any or all of these forms, and of their relation to the whole Divine essence raise large problems. Old Testament thought had advanced beyond the naive identification of God with natural phenomena, but we should not read into its figurative language the metaphysical distinctions of a Greek-Christian theology.

3. The Names of God:

All the names of God were originally significant of His character, but the derivations, and therefore the original meanings, of several have been lost, and new meanings have been sought for them.

(1) Generic:

One of the oldest and most widely distributed terms for Deity known to the human race is ‘El, with its derivations ‘Elim, ‘Elohim, and ‘Eloah. Like theos, Dens and God, it is a generic term, including every member of the class deity. It may even denote a position of honor and authority among men. Moses was ‘Elohim to Pharaoh (Ex 7:1) and to Aaron (Ex 4:16; compare Jud 5:8; 1Sa 2:25; Ex 21:5,6; 22:7 ff; Ps 58:11; 82:1). It is, therefore, a general term expressing majesty and authority, and it only came to be

used as a proper name for Israel's God in the later period of abstract monotheism when the old proper name Yahweh was held to be too sacred to be uttered. The meaning of the root 'El, and the exact relation to it, and to one another, of 'Elohim and 'Eloah, lie in complete obscurity. By far the most frequent form used by Old Testament writers is the plural 'Elohiym, but they use it regularly with singular verbs and adjectives to denote a singular idea. Several explanations have been offered of this usage of a plural term to denote a singular idea—that it expresses the fullness and manifoldness of the Divine nature, or that it is a plural of majesty used in the manner of royal persons, or even that it is an early intimation of the Trinity; other cognate expressions are found in Ge 1:26; 3:22; 1Ki 22:19 f; Isa 6:8. These theories are, perhaps, too ingenious to have occurred to the early Hebrew mind, and a more likely explanation is, that they are survivals in language of a polytheistic stage of thought. In the Old Testament they signify only the general notion of Deity.

(2) Attributive:

To distinguish the God of Israel as supreme from others of the class 'Elohim, certain qualifying appellations are often added. 'El 'Elyon designates the God of Israel as the highest, the most high, among the 'Elohim (Ge 14:18-20); so do Yahweh 'Elyon (Ps 7:17) and 'Elyon alone, often in Psalms and in Isa 14:14.

'El Shadday, or Shadday alone, is a similar term which on the strength of some tradition is translated "God Almighty"; but its derivation and meaning are quite unknown. According to Ex 6:3 it was the usual name for God in patriarchal times, but other traditions in the Pentateuch seem to have no knowledge of this.

Another way of designating God was by His relation to His worshippers, as God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ge 24:12; Ex 3:6), of Shem (Ge 9:26), of the Hebrews (Ex 3:18), and of Israel (Ge 33:20).

Other names used to express the power and majesty of God are tsur, "Rock" (De 32:18; Isa 30:29), 'ªbhir (construct from 'abhir), "the Strong One" (Ge 49:24; Isa 1:24; Ps 132:2); melekh, "King"; 'adhon, "lord," and 'adhonay, "my lord" (Ex 23:17; Isa 10:16,33; Ge 18:27; Isa 6:1). Also ba'al, "proprietor" or "master," may be inferred as a designation once in use, from its appearance in such Hebrew proper names as Jerubbaal and Ishbaal. The last three names describe God as a Master to whom man stands in the relation of a servant, and they tended to fall into disuse as the necessity arose to differentiate the worship of Yahweh from that of the gods of surrounding nations.

A term of uncertain meaning is Yahweh or 'Elohim tsebha'oth, "Yahweh" or "God of hosts." In Hebrew usage "host" might mean an army of men, or the stars and the angels—which, apart or in conjunction, made up the host of heaven. God of Hosts in early times meant the war god who led the armies of Israel (1Sa 4:4; 2Sa 7:8). In 1Sa 17:45 this title stands in parallelism with "the God of the armies of Israel." So all Israel is called the host of Yahweh (Ex 12:41). In the Prophets, where the term has become a regular appellation, it stands in relation to every form of the power and majesty, physical and moral, of God (e. g. Isa 2:12; 6:3,1; 10:23,13). It stands in parallelism with Isaiah's peculiar title, the Holy One of Israel

(Isa 5:16,24). It has, therefore, been thought that it refers to the host of heaven. In the Prophets it is practically a proper name. Its original meaning may well have been forgotten or dropped, but it does not follow that a new special significance was attached to the word "hosts." The general meaning of the whole term is well expressed by the Septuagint translation, kurios pantokrator, "Lord Omnipotent."

(3) Yahweh (Yahweh).

This is the personal proper name paragraph excellence of Israel's God, even as Chemosh was that of the god of Moab, and Dagon that of the god of the Philistines. The original meaning and derivation of the word are unknown. The variety of modern theories shows that, etymologically, several derivations are possible, but that the meanings attached to any one of them have to be imported and imposed upon the word. They add nothing to our knowledge. The Hebrews themselves connected the word with hayah, "to be." In Ex 3:14 Yahweh is explained as equivalent to 'ehyeh, which is a short form of 'ehyeh 'asher 'ehyeh, translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "I am that I am." This has been supposed to mean "self-existence," and to represent God as the Absolute. Such an idea, however, would be a metaphysical abstraction, not only impossible to the time at which the name originated, but alien to the Hebrew mind at any time. And the imperfect 'ehyeh is more accurately translated "I will be what I will be," a Semitic idiom meaning, "I will be all that is necessary as the occasion will arise," a familiar Old Testament idea (compare Isa 7:4,9; Ps 23). This name was in use from the earliest historical times till after the exile. It is found in the most ancient literature. According to Ex 3:13 f, and especially 6:2,3, it was first introduced by Moses, and was the medium of a new revelation of the God of their fathers to the children of Israel. But in parts of Genesis it is represented as being in use from the earliest times. Theories that derive it from Egypt or Assyria, or that would connect it etymologically with Jove or Zeus, are supported by no evidence. We have to be content either to say that Yahweh was the tribal God of Israel from time immemorial, or to accept a theory that is practically identical with that of Exodus—that it was adopted through Moses from the Midianite tribe into which he married. The Kenites, the tribe of Midianites related to Moses, dwelt in the neighborhood of Sinai, and attached themselves to Israel (Jud 1:16; 4:11). A few passages suggest that Sinai was the original home of Yahweh (Jud 5:4,5; De 33:2). But there is no direct evidence bearing upon the origin of the worship of Yahweh: to us He is known only as the God of Israel.

4. Pre-prophetic Conceptions of Yahweh:

(1) Yahweh alone the God of Israel.

Hebrew theology consists essentially of the doctrine of Yahweh and its implications. The teachers and leaders of the people at all times worship and enjoin the worship of Yahweh alone. "It stands out as a prominent and incontrovertible fact, that down to the reign of Ahab .... no prominent man in Israel, with the doubtful exception of Solomon, known by name and held up for condemnation, worshipped any other god but Yahweh. In every national and tribal crisis, in all times of danger and of war, it is Yahweh and Yahweh alone who is invoked to give victory and deliverance" (Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures (3), 21). This is more evident in what is, without doubt, very early literature, even than in later writings (e.g.

Jud 5; De 33; 1Sa 4-6). The isolation of the desert was more favorable to the integrity of Yahweh's sole worship than the neighborhood of powerful peoples who worshipped many other gods. Yet that early religion of Yahweh can be called monotheistic only in the light of the end it realized, for in the course of its development it had to overcome many limitations.

(a) His Early Worship:

The early worship of Yahweh did not exclude belief in the existence of other gods. As other nations believed in the existence of Yahweh (1Sa 4:8; 2Ki 17:27), so Israel did not doubt the reality of other gods (Jud 11:24; Nu 21:29; Mic 4:5). This limitation involved two others: Yahweh is the God of Israel only; with them alone He makes a COVENANT (which see) (Ge 15:18; Ex 6:4,5; 2Ki 17:34,35), and their worship only He seeks (De 4:32-37; 32:9; Am 3:2). Therefore, He works, and can be worshipped only within a certain geographical area. He may have been associated with His original home in Sinai long after the settlement in Canaan (Jud 5:4; De 33:2; 1Ki 19:8,9), but gradually His home and that of His people became identical (1Sa 26:19; Ho 9:3; Isa 14:2,25). Even after the deportation of the ten tribes, Canaan remains Yahweh's land (2Ki 17:24-28). Early Israelites are, therefore, more properly described as Monolatrists or Henotheists than as Monotheists. It is characteristic of the religion of Israel (in contrast with, e.g. Greek thought) that it arrived at absolute Monotheism along the line of moral and religious experience, rather than that of rational inference. Even while they shared the common Semitic belief in the reality of other gods, Yahweh alone had for them "the value of God."

(b) Popular Religion:

It is necessary to distinguish between the teaching of the religious leaders and the belief and practice of the people generally. The presence of a higher religion never wholly excludes superstitious practices. The use of Teraphim (Ge 31:30; 1Sa 19:13,16; Ho 3:4), Ephod (Jud 18:17-20; 1Sa 23:6,9; 30:7), Urim and Thummim (1Sa 28:6; 14:40, Septuagint), for the purposes of magic and divination, to obtain oracles from Yahweh, was quite common in Israel. Necromancy was practiced early and late (1Sa 28:7 ff; Isa 8:19; De 18:10. 11). Sorcery and witchcraft were not unknown, but were condemned by the religious leaders (1Sa 28:3). The burial places of ancestors were held in great veneration (Ge 35:20; 50:13; Jos 24:30). But these facts do not prove that Hebrew religion was animistic and polytheistic, any more than similar phenomena in Christian lands would justify such an inference about Christianity.

(c) Polytheistic Tendencies:

Yet the worship of Yahweh maintained and developed its monotheistic principle only by overcoming several hostile tendencies. The Baal-worship of the Canaanites and the cults of other neighboring tribes proved a strong attraction to the mass of Israelites (Jud 2:13; 3:7; 8:33; 10:10; 1Sa 8:8; 12:10; 1Ki 11:5,33; Ho 2:5,17; Eze 20; Ex 20:5; 22:20; 34:16,17). Under the conditions of life in Canaan, the sole worship of Yahweh was in danger of modification by three tendencies, coordination, assimilation, and disintegration.

(i) Coordination:

When the people had settled down in peaceful relations with their neighbors, and began to have commercial and diplomatic transactions with them, it was inevitable that they should render their neighbor's gods some degree of reverence and worship. Courtesy and friendship demanded as much (compare 2Ki 5:18). When Solomon had contracted many foreign alliances by marriage, he was also bound to admit foreign worship into Jerusalem (1Ki 11:5). But Ahab was the first king who tried to set up the worship of Baal, side by side with that of Yahweh, as the national religion (1Ki 18:19). Elijah's stand and Jehu's revolution gave its death blow to Baal-worship and vindicated the sole right of Yahweh to Israel's allegiance. The prophet was defending the old religion and Ahab was the innovator; but the conflict and its issue brought the monotheistic principle to a new and higher level. The supreme temptation and the choice transformed what had been a natural monolatry into a conscious and moral adherence to Yahweh alone (1Ki 18:21,39).

(ii) Assimilation:

But to repudiate the name of Baal was not necessarily to be rid of the influence of Baal-worship. The ideas of the heathen religions survived in a more subtle way in the worship of Yahweh Himself. The change from the nomad life of the desert to the agricultural conditions of Canaan involved some change in religion. Yahweh, the God of flocks and wars, had to be recognized as the God of the vintage and the harvest. That this development occurred is manifest in the character of the great religious festivals. "Three times thou shalt keep a feast unto me in the year. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep .... and the feast of harvest, the first-fruits of thy labors, which thou sowest in the field: and the feast of ingathering, at the end of the year, when thou gatherest in thy labors out of the field" (Ex 23:14-16). The second and the third obviously, and the first probably, were agricultural feasts, which could have no meaning in the desert. Israel and Yahweh together took possession of Canaan. To doubt that would be to admit the claims of the Baal-worship; but to assert it also involved some danger, because it was to assert certain similarities between Yahweh and the Baalim. When those similarities were embodied in the national festivals, they loomed very large in the eyes and minds of the mass of the people (W.R. Smith, Prophets of Israel, 49-57). The danger was that Israel should regard Yahweh, like the Baals of the country, as a Nature-god, and, by local necessity, a national god, who gave His people the produce of the land and, protected them from their enemies, and in return received frown them such gifts and sacrifices as corresponded to His nature. From the appearance in Israel, and among Yahweh worshippers, of such names as Jerub-baal, Esh-baal (son of Saul) and Beeliada (son of David, 1Ch 14:7), it has been inferred that Yahweh was called Baal, and there is ample evidence that His worship was assimilated to that of the Canaanite Baalim. The bulls raised by Jeroboam (1Ki 12:26) were symbols of Yahweh, and in Judah the Canaanite worship was imitated down to the time of Asa (1Ki 14:22-24; 15:12,13). Against this tendency above all, the great prophets of the 8th century contended. Israel worshipped Yahweh as if He were one of the Baalim, and Hosea calls it Baal-worship (Ho 2:8,12,13; compare Am 2:8; Isa 1:10-15).

(iii) Disintegration:

And where Yahweh was conceived as one of the Baalim or Masters of the land, He became, like them, subject to disintegration into a number of local deities. This was probably the gravamen of Jeroboam's sin in the eyes of the "Deuteronomic" historian. In setting up separate sanctuaries, he divided the worship, and, in effect, the godhead of Yahweh. The localization and naturalization of Yahweh, as well as His assimilation to the Baals, all went together, so that we read that even in Judah the number of gods was according to its cities (Jer 2:28; 11:13). The vindication of Yahweh's moral supremacy and spiritual unity demanded, among other things, the unification of His worship in Jerusalem (2Ki 23).

(d) No Hebrew Goddesses:

In one respect the religion of Yahweh successfully resisted the influence of the heathen cults. At no time was Yahweh associated with a goddess. Although the corrupt sensual practices that formed a large part of heathen worship also entered into Israel's worship (see ASHERAH), it never penetrated so far as to modify in this respect the idea of Yahweh.

(e) Human Sacrifices:

It is a difficult question how far human sacrifices at any time found place in the worship of Yahweh. The outstanding instance is that of Jephthah's daughter, which, though not condemned, is certainly regarded as exceptional (Jud 11:30-40). Perhaps it is rightly regarded as a unique survival. Then the story of the sacrifice of Isaac, while reminiscent of an older practice, represents a more advanced view. Human sacrifice though not demanded, is not abhorrent to Yahweh (Ge 22). A further stage is represented where Ahaz' sacrifice of his son is condemned as an "abomination of the nations" (2Ki 16:3). The sacrifice of children is emphatically condemned by the prophets as a late and foreign innovation which Yahweh had not commanded (Jer 7:31; Eze 16:20). Other cases, such as the execution of the chiefs of Shittim (Nu 25:4), and of Saul's sons "before Yahweh" (2Sa 21:9), and the cherem or ban, by which whole communities were devoted to destruction (Jud 21:10; 1Sa 15), while they show a very inadequate idea of the sacredness of human life, are not sacrifices, nor were they demanded by Yahweh's worship. They were survivals of savage customs connected with tribal unity, which the higher morality of Yahweh's religion had not yet abolished.

(2) The Nature and Character of Yahweh:

The nature and character of Yahweh are manifested in His activities. The Old Testament makes no statements about the essence of God; we are left to infer it from His action in Nature and history and from His dealing with man.

(a) A God of War:

In this period, His activity is predominantly martial. As Israel's Deliverer from Egypt, "Yahweh is a man of war" (Ex 15:3). An ancient account of Israel's journey to Canaan is called "the book of the Wars of Yahweh" (Nu 21:14). By conquest in war He gave His people their land (Jud 5; 2Sa 5:24; De 33:27).

He is, therefore, more concerned with men and nations, with the moral, than with the physical world.

(b) His Relation to Nature:

Even His activity in Nature is first connected with His martial character. Earth, stars and rivers come to His battle (Jud 5:4,20,21). The forces of Nature do the bidding of Israel's Deliverer from Egypt (Ex 8-10; 14:21). He causes sun and moon to stand while He delivers up the Amorites (Jos 10:12). Later, He employs the forces of Nature to chastise His people for infidelity and sin (2Sa 24:15; 1Ki 17:1). Amos declares that His moral rule extends to other nations and that it determines their destinies. In harmony with this idea, great catastrophes like the Deluge (Ge 7) and the overthrow of the Cities of the Plain (Ge 19) are ascribed to His moral will. In the same pragmatic manner the oldest creation narrative describes Him creating man, and as much of the world as He needed (Ge 2), but as yet the idea of a universal cause had not emerged, because the idea of a universe had not been formed. He acts as one of great, but limited, power and knowledge (Ge 11:5-8; 18:20). The more universal conception of Ge 1 belongs to the same stratum of thought as Second Isa. At every stage of the Old Testament the metaphysical perfections of Yahweh follow as an inference from His ethical preeminence.

(3) The Most Distinctive Characteristic of Yahweh:

The most distinctive characteristic of Yahweh, which finally rendered Him and His religion absolutely unique, was the moral factor. In saying that Yahweh was a moral God, it is meant that He acted by free choice, in conformity with ends which He set to Himself, and which He also imposed upon His worshippers as their law of conduct.

(a) Personality:

The most essential condition of a moral nature is found in His vivid personality, which at every stage of His self-revelation shines forth with an intensity that might be called aggressive. Divine personality and spirituality are never expressly asserted or defined in the Old Testament; but nowhere in the history of religion are they more clearly asserted. The modes of their expression are, however, qualified by anthropomorphisms, by limitations, moral and physical. Yahweh's jealousy (Ex 20:5; De 5:9; 6:15), His wrath and anger (Ex 32:10-12; De 7:4) and His inviolable holiness (Ex 19:21,22; 1Sa 6:19; 2Sa 6:7) appear sometimes to be irrational and immoral; but they are the assertion of His individual nature, of His self-consciousness as He distinguishes Himself from all else, in the moral language of the time, and are the conditions of His having any moral nature whatsoever. Likewise, He dwells in a place and moves from it (Jud 5:5); men may see Him in visible form (Ex 24:10; Nu 12:8); He is always represented as having organs like those of the human body, arms, hands, feet, mouth, eyes and ears. By such sensuous and figurative language alone was it possible for a personal God to make Himself known to men.

(b) Law and Judgment:

The content of Yahweh's moral nature as revealed in the Old Testament developed with the growth of

moral ideas. Though His activity is most prominently martial, it is most permanently judicial, and is exercised through judges, priests and prophets. Torah and mishpaT, "law" and "judgment," from the time of Moses onward, stand, the one for a body of customs that should determine men's relations to one another, and the other for the decision of individual cases in accordance with those customs, and both were regarded as issuing from Yahweh. The people came to Moses "to inquire of God" when they had a matter in dispute, and he "judged between a man and his neighbor, and made them know the statutes of God, and his laws" (Ex 18:15,16). The judges appear mostly as leaders in war; but it is clear, as their name indicates, that they also gave judgments as between the people (Jud 3:10; 4:4; 10:2,3; 1Sa 7:16). The earliest literary prophets assume the existence of a law which priest and prophet had neglected to administer rightly (Ho 4:6; 8:1,12; Am 2:4). This implied that Yahweh was thought of as actuated and acting by a consistent moral principle, which He also imposed on His people. Their morality may have varied much at different periods, but there is no reason to doubt that the Decalogue, and the moral teaching it involved, emanated substantially from Moses. "He taught them that Yahveh, if a stern, and often wrathful, Deity, was also a God of justice and purity. Linking the moral life to the religious idea, he may have taught them too that murder and theft, adultery and false witness, were abhorred and forbidden by their God" (Montefiore, Hibbert Lectures3, 49). The moral teaching of the Old Testament effected the transition from the national and collective to the individual and personal relation with Yahweh. The most fundamental defect of Hebrew morality was that its application was confined within Israel itself and did little to determine the relation of the Israelites to people of other nations; and this limitation was bound up with Henotheism, the idea that Yahweh was God of Israel alone. "The consequence of this national conception of Yahweh was that there was no religious and moral bond regulating the conduct of the Hebrews with men of other nations. Conduct which between fellow-Hebrews was offensive in Yahweh's eyes was inoffensive when practiced by a Hebrew toward one who was not a Hebrew (De 23:19 f) ..... In the latter case they were governed purely by considerations of expediency. This ethical limitation is the real explanation of the 'spoiling of the Egyptians' "(Ex 11:2,3) (G. Buchanan Gray, The Divine Discipline of Israel, 46, 48).

The first line of advance in the teaching of the prophets was to expand and deepen the moral demands of Yahweh. So they removed at once the ethical and theological limitations of the earlier view. But they were conscious that they were only developing elements already latent in the character and law of Yahweh.

5. The Idea of God in the Prophetic Period:

Two conditions called forth and determined the message of the 8th-century prophets—the degradation of morality and religion at home and the growing danger to Israel and Judah from the all-victorious Assyrian. With one voice the prophets declare and condemn the moral and social iniquity of Israel and Judah (Ho 4:1; Am 4:1; Isa 1:21-23). The worship of Yahweh had been assimilated to the heathen religions around (Am 2:8; Ho 3:1; Isa 30:22). A time of prosperity had produced luxury, license and an easy security, depending upon the external bonds and ceremonies of religion. In the threatening attitude of Assyria, the prophets see the complement of Israel's unfaithfulness and sin, this the cause and that the instruments of Yahweh's anger (Isa 10:5,6).

(1) Righteousness:

These circumstances forced into first prominence the righteousness of Yahweh. It was an original attribute that had appeared even in His most martial acts (Jud 5:4; 1Sa 12:7). But the prophet's interpretation of Israel's history revealed its content on a larger scale. Yahweh was not like the gods of the heathen, bound to the purposes and fortunes of His people. Their relation was not a natural bond, but a covenant of grace which He freely bestowed upon them, and He demanded as its condition, loyalty to Himself and obedience to His law. Impending calamities were not, as the naturalistic conception implied, due to the impotence of Yahweh against the Assyrian gods (Isa 31:1), but the judgment of God, whereby He applied impartially to the conduct of His people a standard of righteousness, which He both had in Himself and declared in judgment upon them. The prophets did not at first so much transform the idea of righteousness, as assert its application as between the people and Yahweh. But in doing that they also rejected the external views of its realization. It consists not in unlimited gifts or in the costliest oblations. "What doth Yahweh require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic 6:8). And it tends to become of universal application. Yahweh will deal as a righteous judge with all nations, including Israel, and Israel as the covenant people bears the greater responsibility (Am 1-3). And a righteous judge that metes out even justice to all nations will deal similarly with individuals. The ministry of the prophets produced a vivid consciousness of the personal and individual relation of men to God. The prophets themselves were not members of a class, no order or school or profession, but men impelled by an inner and individual call of God, often against their inclination, to proclaim an unpopular message (Am 7:14,15; Isa 6; Jer 1:6-9; Eze 3:14). Jeremiah and Ezekiel in terms denounced the old idea of collective responsibility (Jer 31:29 ff; Eze 18). Thus in the prophets' application of the idea of righteousness to their time, two of the limitations adhering to the idea of God, at least in popular religion hitherto, were transcended. Yahweh's rule is no longer limited to Israel, nor concerned only with the nation as a collective whole, but He deals impartially with every individual and nation alike. Other limitations also disappear. His anger and wrath, that once appeared irrational and unjust, now become the intensity of His righteousness. Nor is it merely forensic and retributive righteousness. It is rather a moral end, a chief good, which He may realize by loving-kindness and mercy and forgiveness as much as by punishment. Hebrew thought knows no opposition between God's righteousness and His goodness, between justice and mercy. The covenant of righteousness is like the relation of husband to wife, of father to child, one of loving-kindness and everlasting love (Ho 3:1; 11:4; Isa 1:18; 30:18; Mic 7:18; Isa 43:4; 54:8; Jer 31:3 ff, 34; 9:24). The stirring events which showed Yahweh's independence of Israel revealed the fullness of grace that was always latent in His relation to His people (Ge 33:11; 2Sa 24:14). It was enshrined in the Decalogue (Ex 20:6), and proclaimed with incomparable grandeur in what may be the most ancient Mosaic tradition: "Yah, Yahweh, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger and abundant in lovingkindness and truth; keeping lovingkindness for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin" (Ex 34:6,7).

(2) Holiness:

The holiness of Yahweh in the Prophets came to have a meaning closely akin to His righteousness. As an idea more distinctly religious and more exclusively applied to God, it was subject to greater changes of meaning with the development or degradation of religion. It was applied to anything withdrawn from

common use to the service of religion—utensils, places, seasons, animals and men. Originally it was so far from the moral meaning it now has that it was used of the "sacred" prostitutes who ministered to the licentiousness of Canaanitish worship (De 23:18). Whether or not the root-idea of the word was "separateness," there is no doubt that it is applied to Yahweh in the Old Testament to express his separateness from men and his sublimity above them. It was not always a moral quality in Yahweh; for He might be unapproachable because of His mere power and terror (1Sa 6:20; Isa 8:13). But in the Prophets, and especially in Isa, it acquires a distinctly moral meaning. In his vision Isaiah hears Yahweh proclaimed as "holy, holy, holy," and he is filled with the sense of his own sin and of that of Israel (Isa 6; compare Isa 1:4; Am 2:7). But even here the term conveys more than moral perfection. Yahweh is already "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy" (Isa 57:15). It expresses the full Divinity of Yahweh in His uniqueness and self-existence (1Sa 2:2; Am 4:2; Ho 11:9). It would therefore seem to stand in antithesis to righteousness, as expressing those qualities of God, metaphysical and moral, by which He is distinguished and separated from men, while righteousness involves those moral activities and relations which man may share with God. But in the Prophets, God’s entire being is moral and His whole activity is righteous. The meanings of the terms, though not identical, coincide; God’s holiness is realized in righteousness. "God the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness" (Isa 5:16). So Isaiah’s peculiar phrase, "the Holy One of Israel," brings God in His most exalted being into a relation of knowledge and moral reciprocity with Israel.

(3) Universality:

The moralizing of righteousness and holiness universalized Deity.—From Amos downward Yahweh’s moral rule, and therefore His absolute power, were recognized as extending over all the nations surrounding Israel, and the great world-power of Assyria is but the rod of His anger and the instrument of His righteousness (Am 1-2; Isa 10:5; 13:5 ff; 19:1). Idolatrous and polytheistic worship of all kinds are condemned. The full inference of Monotheism was only a gradual process, even with the prophets. It is not clear that the 8th-century prophets all denied the existence of other gods, though Isaiah’s term for them, ‘elilim ("things of nought," "no-gods"), points in that direction. At least the monotheistic process had set in. And Yahweh’s control over other nations was not exercised merely from Israel’s point of view. The issue of the judgment upon the two great powers of Egypt and Assyria was to be their conversion to the religion of Yahweh (Isa 19:24,25; compare Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-3). Yet Hebrew universalism never went beyond the idea that all nations should find their share in Yahweh through Israel (Zec 8:23). The nations from the ends of the earth shall come to Yahweh and declare that their fathers’ gods were "lies, even vanity and things wherein there is no profit" (Jer 16:19). It is stated categorically that "Yahweh he is God in heaven above and upon the earth beneath; there is none else" (De 4:39).

(4) Unity:

The unity of God was the leading idea of Josiah’s reformation. Jerusalem was cleansed of every accretion of Baal-worship and of other heathen religions that had established themselves by the side of the worship of Yahweh (2Ki 23:4-8,10-14). The semi-heathen worship of Yahweh in many local shrines, which tended to disintegrate His unity, was swept away (2Ki 23:8,9). The reform was extended to the

Northern Kingdom (2Ki 23:15-20), so that Jerusalem should be the sole habitation of Yahweh on earth, and His worship there alone should be the symbol of unity to the whole Hebrew race.

But the monotheistic doctrine is first fully and consciously stated in Second Isa. There is no God but Yahweh: other gods are merely graven images, and their worshippers commit the absurdity of worshipping the work of their own hands (Isa 42:8; 44:8-20). Yahweh manifests His deity in His absolute sovereignty of the world, both of Nature and history. The prophet had seen the rise and fall of Assyria, the coming of Cyrus, the deportation and return of Judah's exiles, as incidents in the training of Israel for her world-mission to be "a light of the Gentiles" and Yahweh's "salvation unto the end of the earth" (Isa 42:1-7; 49:1-6). Israel's world-mission, and the ordering of historical movements to the grand final purpose of universal salvation (Isa 45:23), is the philosophy of history complementary to the doctrine of God's unity and universal sovereignty.

(5) Creator and Lord:

A further inference is that He is Creator and Lord of the physical universe. Israel's call and mission is from Yahweh who "created the heavens, and stretched them forth; he that spread abroad the earth and that which cometh out of it; he that giveth breath unto the people upon it, and spirit to them that walk therein" (Isa 42:5; compare Isa 40:12,26; 44:24; 45:18; Ge 1). All the essential factors of Monotheism are here at last exhibited, not in abstract metaphysical terms, but as practical motives of religious life. His counsel and action are His own (Isa 40:13) Nothing is hid from Him; and the future like the past is known to Him (Isa 40:27; 42:9; 44:8; 48:6). Notwithstanding His special association with the temple in Jerusalem, He is "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity"; the heaven is His throne, and no house or place can contain Him (Isa 57:15; 66:1). No force of history or Nature can withstand His purpose (Isa 41:17-20; 42:13; 43:13). He is "the First and the Last," an "Everlasting God" (Isa 40:28; 41:4; 48:12). Nothing can be likened to Him or compared with Him (Isa 46:5). As the heavens are higher than the earth, so His thoughts and ways transcend those of men (Isa 55:8,9). But anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions still abound. Eyes, mouth, ears, nostrils, hands, arms and face are His; He is a man of war (Isa 42:13; 63:1); He cries like a travailing woman (Isa 42:14), and feeds His flock like a shepherd (Isa 40:11). Thus, alone could the prophet express His full concrete Divinity.

(6) His compassion and love are expressed in a variety of ways that lead up directly to the New Testament doctrine of Divine Fatherhood. He folds Israel in His arms as a shepherd his lambs (Isa 40:11). Her scattered children are His sons and daughters whom He redeems and restores (Isa 43:5-7). In wrath for a moment He hides His face, but His mercy and kindness are everlasting (Isa 54:8). Greater than a mother's tenderness is Yahweh's love for Israel (Isa 49:15; 66:13). "It would be easy to find in the prophet proof-texts for everything which theology asserts regarding God, with the exception perhaps that He is a spirit, by which is meant that He is a particular kind of substance" (A.B. Davidson in Skinner, Isa, II, xxix). But in truth the spirituality and personality of God are more adequately expressed in the living human language of the prophet than in the dead abstractions of metaphysics.

6. Idea of God in Post-exilic Judaism:

Monotheism appears in this period as established beyond question, and in the double sense that Yahweh the God of Israel is one Being, and that beside Him there is no other God. He alone is God of all the earth, and all other beings stand at an infinite distance from Him (Ps 18:31; 24:1 ff; 115:3). The generic name God is frequently applied to Him, and the tendency appears to avoid the particular and proper name Yahweh (see especially Psalms 73-89; Job; Ecclesiastes).

(1) New Conditions.

Nothing essentially new appears, but the teaching of the prophets is developed under new influences. And what then was enforced by the few has now become the creed of the many. The teaching of the prophets had been enforced by the experiences of the exile. Israel had been punished for her sins of idolatry, and the faithful among the exiles had learned that Yahweh's rule extended over many lands and nations. The foreign influences had been more favorable to Monotheism. The gods of Canaan and even of Assyria and Babylonia had been overthrown, and their peoples had given place to the Persians, who, in the religion of Zarathushtra, had advanced nearer to a pure Monotheism than any Gentilerace had done; for although they posited two principles of being, the Good and the Evil, they worshipped only Ahura-Mazda, the Good. When Persia gave way to Greece, the more cultured Greek, the Greek who had ideas to disseminate, and who established schools at Antioch or Alexandria, was a pure Monotheist.

(2) Divine Attributes.

Although we do not yet find anything like a dogmatic account of God's attributes, the larger outlook upon the universe and the deeper reflection upon man's individual experience have produced more comprehensive and far-reaching ideas of God's being and activity. (a) Faith rests upon His eternity and unchangeablehess (Ps 90:1,2; 102:27). His omniscience and omnipresence are expressed with every possible fullness (Ps 139; Job 26:6). His almighty power is at once the confidence of piety, and the rebuke of blasphemy or frowardness (Ps 74:12-17; 104 et passim; Job 36; 37 et passim; Ecclesiasticus 16:17 ff). (b) His most exalted and comprehensive attribute is His holiness; by it He swears as by Himself (Ps 89:35); it expresses His majesty (Ps 99:3,19) and His supreme power (Ps 60:6).(c) His righteousness marks all His acts in relation to Israel and the nations around her (Ps 119:137-144; 129:4). (d) That both holiness and righteousness were conceived as moral qualities is reflected in the profound sense of sin which the pious knew (Ps 51) and revealed in the moral demands associated with them; truth, honesty and fidelity are the qualities of those who shall dwell in God's holy hill (Ps 15); purity, diligence, kindliness, honesty, humility and wisdom are the marks of the righteous man (Pr 10-11). (e) In Job and Proverbs wisdom stands forth as the preeminent quality of the ideal man, combining in itself all moral and intellectual excellences, and wisdom comes from God (Pr 2:6); it is a quality of His nature (Pr 8:22) and a mode of His activity (Pr 3:19; Ps 104:24). In the Hellenistic circles of Alexandria, wisdom was transformed into a philosophical conception, which is at once the principle of God's sell-revelation and of His creative activity. Philo identifies it with His master-conception, the Logos. "Both Logos and Wisdom mean for Him the reason and mind of God, His image impressed upon the universe, His agent of creation and providence, the mediator through which He communicates Himself to man and the world, and His law imposed upon both the moral and physical universe" (Mansfield Essays, 296). In

the Book of Wisdom it is represented as proceeding from God, "a breath of the power of God, and a clear effulgence of the glory of the Almighty .... an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness" (7:25,26). In man, it is the author of knowledge, virtue and piety, and in the world it has been the guide and arbiter of its destiny from the beginning (chapters 10-12). (f) But in the more purely Hebrew literature of this period, the moral attribute of God that comes into greatest prominence is His beneficence. Goodness and mercy, faithfulness and loving-kindness, forgiveness and redemption are His willing gifts to Israel. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so Yahweh pitieth them that fear him" (Ps 103:13; 145:8; 103:8; Ecclesiasticus 2:11). To say that God is loving and like a father goes far on the way to the doctrine that He is Love and Father, but not the whole way; for as yet His mercy and grace are manifested only in individual acts, and they are not the natural and necessary outflow of His nature. All these ideas of God meant less for the Jewish than for the Christian mind, because they were yet held subject to several limitations.

(3) Surviving Limitations.

(a) Disappearing Anthropomorphism:

We have evidence of a changed attitude toward anthropomorphisms. God no longer walks on earth, or works under human limitation. Where His eyes or ears or face or hands are spoken of, they are clearly figurative expressions. His activities are universal and invisible, and He dwells on high forevermore. Yet anthropomorphic limitations are not wholly overcome. The idea that He sleeps, though not to be taken literally, implies a defect of His power (Ps 44:23).

(b) Localization:

In the metaphysical attributes, the chief limitation was the idea that God’s dwelling-place on earth was on Mt. Zion in Jerusalem. He was no longer confined within Palestine; His throne is in heaven (Ps 11:4; 103:19), and His glory above the heavens (Ps 113:4); but

"In Judah is God known:

His name is great in Israel.

In Salem also is his tabernacle,

And his dwelling-place in Zion"

(Ps 76:1,2; 110:2; compare Ecclesiasticus 24:8 ff).

That these are no figures of speech is manifested in the yearning of the pious for the temple, and their despair in separation from it (Pss 42; 43; compare 122).

(c) Favoritism:

This involved a moral limitation, the sense of God's favoritism toward Israel, which sometimes developed into an easy self-righteousness that had no moral basis. God's action in the world was determined by His favor toward Israel, and His loving acts were confined within the bounds of a narrow nationalism. Other nations are wicked and sinners, adversaries and oppressors, upon whom God is called to execute savage vengeance (Ps 109; 137:7-9). Yet Israel did not wholly forget that it was the servant of Yahweh to proclaim His name among the nations (Ps 96:2,3). Yahweh is good to all, and His tender mercies are over all His works (Ps 145:9; Ecclesiasticus 18:13; compare Ps 104:14; Zec 14:16, and the Book of Jonah, which is a rebuke to Jewish particularism).

(d) Ceremonial Legalism:

God's holiness in the hands of the priests tended to become a material and formal quality, which fulfilled itself in established ceremonial, and His righteousness in the hands of the scribes tended to become an external law whose demands were satisfied by a mechanical obedience of works. This external conception of righteousness reacted upon the conception of God's government of the world. From the earliest times the Hebrew mind had associated suffering with the punishment of sin, and blessedness with the reward of virtue. In the post-exilic age the relation came to be thought of as one of strict correspondence between righteousness and reward and between sin and punishment. Righteousness, both in man and God, was not so much a moral state as a measurable sum of acts, in the one case, of obedience, and in the other, of reward or retribution. Conversely, every calamity and evil that befell men came to be regarded as the direct and equivalent penalty of a sin they had committed. The Book of Job is a somewhat inconclusive protest against this prevalent view.

These were the tendencies that ultimately matured into the narrow externalism of the scribes and Pharisees of our Lord's time, which had substituted for the personal knowledge and service of God a system of mechanical acts of worship and conduct.

(4) Tendencies to Abstractness:

Behind these defective ideas of God's attributes stood a more radical defect of the whole religious conception. The purification of the religion of Israel from Polytheism and idolatry, the affirmation of the unity of God and of His spirituality, required His complete separation from the manifoldness of visible existence. It was the only way, until the more adequate idea of a personal or spiritual unity, that embraced the manifold in itself, was developed. But it was an unstable conception, which tended on the one hand to empty the unity of all reality, and on the other to replace it by a new multiplicity which was not a unity. Both tendencies appear in post-exilic Judaism.

(a) Transcendence:

The first effect of distinguishing too sharply between God and all created being was to set Him above

and apart from all the world. This tendency had already appeared in Ezekiel, whose visions were rather symbols of God's presence than actual experiences of God. In Daniel even the visions appear only in dreams. The growth of the Canon of sacred literature as the final record of the law of God, and the rise of the scribes as its professional interpreters, signified that God need not, and would not, speak face to face with man again; and the stricter organization of the priesthood and its sacrificial acts in Jerusalem tended to shut men generally out from access to God, and to reduce worship into a mechanical performance. A symptom of this fact was the disuse of the personal name Yahweh and the substitution for it of more general and abstract terms like God and Lord.

(b) Skepticism:

Not only an exaggerated awe, but also an element of skepticism, entered into the disuse of the proper name, a sense of the inadequacy of any name. In the Wisdom literature, God's incomprehensibility and remoteness appear for the first time as a conscious search after Him and a difficulty to find Him (Job 16:18-21; 23:3,8,9; Pr 30:2-4). Even the doctrine of immortality developed with the sense of God's present remoteness and the hope of His future nearness (Ps 17:15; Job 19:25). But Jewish theology was no cold Epicureanism or rationalistic Deism. Men's religious experiences apprehended God more intimately than their theology professed.

(c) Immanence:

By a "happy inconsistency" (Montefiore) they affirmed His immanence both in Nature (Ps 104; The Wisdom of Solomon 8:1; 12:1,2) and in man's inner experience (Pr 15:3,11; 1Ch 28:9; 29:17,18). Yet that transcendence was the dominating thought is manifest, most of all, in the formulation of a number of mediating conceptions, which, while they connected God and the world, also revealed the gulf that separated them.

(5) Logos, Memra' and Angels:

This process of abstraction had gone farthest in Alexandria, where Jewish thought had so far assimilated Platonic philosophy, that Philo and Wisdom conceive God as pure being who could not Himself come into any contact with the material and created world. His action and revelation are therefore mediated by His Powers, His Logos and His Wisdom, which, as personified or hypostatized attributes, become His vicegerents on earth. But in Palestine, too many mediating agencies grew up between God and man. The memra', or word of God, was not unlike Philo's Logos. The deified law partly corresponded to Alexandrian Wisdom. The Messiah had already appeared in the Prophets, and now in some circles He was expected as the mediator of God's special favor to Israel. The most important and significant innovation in this connection was the doctrine of angels. It was not entirely new, and Babylonian and Persian influences may have contributed to its development; but its chief cause lay in the general scheme of thought. Angels became intermediaries of revelation (Zec 1:9,12,19; 3:1), the instruments of God's help (Da 3:28; APC 2Macc 11:6), and of His punishment (Apoc Baruch 21:23). The ancient gods of the nations became their patron angels (Da 10:13-20); but Israel's hatred of their Gentileenemies often led to

their transforming the latter's deities into demons. Incidentally a temporary solution of the problem of evil was thus found, by shifting all responsibility for evil from Yahweh to the demons. The unity and supremacy of God were maintained by the doubtful method of delegating His manifold, and especially His contradictory, activities to subordinate and partially to hostile spirits, which involved a new Polytheism. The problem of the One and the Many in ultimate reality cannot be solved by merely separating them. Hebrew Monotheism was unstable; it maintained its own truth even partially by affirming contradictories, and it contained in itself the demand for a further development. The few pluralistic phrases in the Old Testament (as Ge 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isa 6:8, and 'Elohim) are not adumbrations of the Trinity, but only philological survivals. But the Messianic hope was an open confession of the incompleteness of the Old Testament revelation of God.

GOD, 3

III. The Idea of God in the New Testament.

1. Dependence on the Old Testament:

The whole of the New Testament presupposes and rests upon the Old Testament. Jesus Christ and His disciples inherited the idea of God revealed in the Old Testament, as it survived in the purer strata of Jewish religion. So much was it to them and their contemporaries a matter of course, that it never occurred to them to proclaim or enforce the idea of God. Nor did they consciously feel the need of amending or changing it. They sought to correct some fallacious deductions made by later Judaism, and, unconsciously, they dropped the cruder anthropomorphisms and limitations of the Old Testament idea. But their point of departure was always the higher teaching of the prophets and Psalms, and their conscious endeavor in presenting God to men was to fulfill the Law and the Prophets (Mt 5:17). All the worthier ideas concerning God evolved in the Old Testament reappear in the New Testament. He is One, supreme, living, personal and spiritual, holy, righteous and merciful. His power and knowledge are all-sufficient, and He is not limited in time or place. Nor can it be said that any distinctly new attributes are ascribed to God in the New Testament. Yet there is a difference. The conception and all its factors are placed in a new relation to man and the universe, whereby their meaning is transformed, enhanced and enriched. The last trace of particularism, with its tendency to Polytheism, disappears. God can no longer bear a proper name to associate Him with Israel, or to distinguish Him from other gods, for He is the God of all the earth, who is no respecter of persons or nations. Two new elements entered men's religious thought and gradually lifted its whole content to a new plane—Jesus Christ's experience and manifestation of the Divine Fatherhood, and the growing conviction of the church that Christ Himself was God and the full and final revelation of God.

2. Gentile Influence:

Gr thought may also have influenced New Testament thought, but in a comparatively insignificant and subordinate way. Its content was not taken over bodily as was that of Hebrew thought, and it did not influence the fountain head of New Testament ideas. It did not color the mind and teaching of Jesus

Christ. It affected the form rather than matter of New Testament teaching. It appears in the clear-cut distinction between flesh and spirit, mind and body, which emerges in Paul's Epistles, and so it helped to define more accurately the spirituality of God. The idea of the Logos in John, and the kindred idea of Christ as the image of God in Paul and He, owe something to the influence of the Platonic and Stoic schools. As this is the constructive concept employed in the New Testament to define the religious significance of Christ and His essential relation to God, it modifies the idea of God itself, by introducing a distinction within the unity into its innermost meaning.

3. Absence of Theistic Proofs:

Philosophy never appears in the New Testament on its own account, but only as subservient to Christian experience. In the New Testament as in the Old Testament, the existence of God is taken for granted as the universal basis of all life and thought. Only in three passages of Paul's, addressed to heathen audiences, do we find anything approaching a natural theology, and these are concerned rather with defining the nature of God, than with proving His existence. When the people of Lystra would have worshipped Paul and Barnabas as heathen gods, the apostle protests that God is not like men, and bases His majesty upon His creatorship of all things (Ac 14:15). He urges the same argument at Athens, and appeals for its confirmation to the evidences of man's need of God which he had found in Athens itself (Ac 17:23-31). The same natural witness of the soul, face to face with the universe, is again in Romans made the ground of universal responsibility to God (Ac 1:18-21). No formal proof of God's existence is offered in the New Testament. Nor are the metaphysical attributes of God, His infinity, omnipotence and omniscience, as defined in systematic theology, at all set forth in the New Testament. The ground for these deductions is provided in the religious experience that finds God in Christ all-sufficient.

4. Fatherhood of God:

The fundamental and central idea about God in New Testament teaching is His Fatherhood, and it determines all that follows. In some sense the idea was not unknown to heathen religions. Greeks and Romans acknowledged Father Zeus or Jupiter as the creator and preserver of Nature, and as standing in some special relation to men. In the Old Testament the idea appears frequently, and has a richer content. Not only is God the creator and preserver of Israel, but He deals with her as a father with his child. "Like as a father pitieth his children, so Yahweh pitieth them that fear Him" (Ps 103:13; compare De 1:31; Jer 3:4,19; 31:20; Isa 63:16; Ho 11:1; Mal 3:17). Even His chastisements are "as a man chasteneth his son" (De 8:5; Isa 64:8). The same idea is expressed under the figure of a mother's tender care (Isa 49:15; 66:13; Ps 27:10), and it is embedded in the covenant relation. But in the Old Testament the idea does not occupy the central and determinative position it has in New Testament, and it is always limited to Israel.

(1) In the Teaching of Jesus Christ:

God is preeminently the Father. It is his customary term for the Supreme Being, and it is noteworthy that Jesus' usage has never been quite naturalized. We still say "God" where Jesus would have said "the Father." He meant that the essential nature of God, and His relation to men, is best expressed by the

attitude and relation of a father to his children; but God is Father in an infinitely higher and more perfect degree than any man. He is "good" and "perfect," the heavenly Father, in contrast with men, who, even as fathers, are evil (Mt 5:48; 7:11). What in them is an ideal imperfectly and intermittently realized, is in Him completely fulfilled. Christ thought not of the physical relation of origin and derivation, but of the personal relation of love and care which a father bestows upon his children. The former relation is indeed implied, for the Father is ever working in the world (Joh 5:17), and all things lie in His power (Lu 22:42). By His preserving power, the least as well as the greatest creature lives (Mt 6:26; 10:29). But it is not the fact of God's creative, preserving and governing power, so much as the manner of it, that Christ emphasizes. He is absolutely good in all His actions and relations (Mt 7:11; Mr 10:18). To Him men and beasts turn for all they need, and in Him they find safety, rest and peace (Mt 6:26,32; 7:11). His goodness goes forth spontaneously and alights upon all living things, even upon the unjust and His enemies (Mt 5:45). He rewards the obedient (Mt 6:1; 7:21), forgives the disobedient (Mt 6:14; compare Mt 18:35) and restores the prodigal (Lu 15:11)." Fatherhood is love, original and underived, anticipating and undeserved, forgiving and educating, communicating and drawing to his heart" (Beyschlag, New Testament Theology, I, 82). To the Father, therefore, should men pray for all good things (Mt 6:9), and He is the ideal of all perfection, to which they should seek to attain (Mt 5:48). Such is the general character of God as expressed in His Fatherhood, but it is realized in different ways by those who stand. to Him in different relations.

(a) Its Relation to Himself:

Jesus Christ knows the Father as no one else does, and is related to Him in a unique manner. The idea is central in His teaching, because the fact is fundamental in His experience. On His first personal appearance in history He declares that He must be about His Father's business (Lu 2:49), and at the last He commends His spirit into His Father's hands. Throughout His life, His filial consciousness is perfect and unbroken. "I and the Father are one" (Joh 10:30). As He knows the Father, so the Father knows and acknowledges Him. At the opening of His ministry, and again at its climax in the transfiguration, the Father bears witness to His perfect sonship (Mr 1:11; 9:7). It was a relation of mutual love and confidence, unalloyed and infinite. "The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand" (Joh 3:35; 5:20). The Father sent the Son into the world, and entrusted Him with his message and power (Mt 11:27). He gave Him those who believed in Him, to receive His word (Joh 6:37,44,45; 17:6,8). He does the works and speaks the words of the Father who sent Him (Joh 5:36; 8:18,29; 14:24). His dependence upon the Father, and His trust in Him are equally complete (Joh 11:41; 12:27 f; 17). In this perfect union of Christ. with God, unclouded by sin, unbroken by infidelity, God first became for a human life on earth all that He could and would become. Christ's filial consciousness was in fact and experience the full and final revelation of God. "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him" (Mt 11:27). Not only can we see in Christ what perfect sonship is, but in His filial consciousness the Father Himself is so completely reflected that we may know the perfect Father also. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (Joh 14:9; compare Joh 8:19). Nay, it is more than a reflection: so completely is the mind and will of Christ identified with that of the Father, that they interpenetrate, and the words and works of the Father shine out through Christ. "The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth his works. Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me" (Joh 14:10,11).

As the Father, so is the Son, for men to honor or to hate (Joh 5:23; 15:23). In the last day, when He comes to execute the judgment which the Father has entrusted to Him, He shall come in the glory of the Father (Mt 16:27; Mr 8:38; Lu 9:26). In all this Jesus is aware that His relation to the Father is unique. What in Him is original and realized, in others can only be an ideal to be gradually realized by His communication. "I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me" (Joh 14:6). He is, therefore, rightly called the "only begotten son" (Joh 3:16), and His contemporaries believed that He made Himself equal to God (Joh 5:18).

(b) To Believers:

Through Christ, His disciples and hearers, too, may know God as their Father. He speaks of "your Father," "your heavenly Father." To them as individuals, it means a personal relation; He is "thy Father" (Mt 6:4,18). Their whole conduct should be determined by the consciousness of the Father's intimate presence (Mt 6:1,4). To do His will is the ideal of life (Mt 7:21; 12:50). More explicitly, it is to act as He does, to love and forgive as He loves and forgives (Mt 5:45); and, finally, to be perfect as He is perfect (Mt 5:48). Thus do men become sons of their Father who is in heaven. Their peace and safety lay in their knowledge of His constant and all-sufficient care (Mt 6:26,32). The ultimate goal of men's relation to Christ is that through Him they should come to a relation with the Father like His relation both to the Father and to them, wherein Father, Son, and believers form a social unity (Joh 14:21; 17:23; compare Joh 17:21).

(c) To All Men:

While God's fatherhood is thus realized and revealed, originally and fully in Christ, derivatively and partially in believers, it also has significance for all men. Every man is born a child of God and heir of His kingdom (Lu 18:16). During childhood, aIl men are objects of His fatherly love and care (Mt 18:10), and it is not His will that one of them should perish (Mt 18:14). Even if they become His enemies, He still bestows His beneficence upon the evil and the unjust (Mt 5:44,45; Lu 6:35). The prodigal son may become unworthy to be called a son, but the father always remains a father. Men may become so far unfaithful that in them the fatherhood is no longer manifest and that their inner spirits own not God, but the devil, as their father (Joh 8:42-44). So their filial relation to God may be broken, but His nature and attitude are not changed. He is the Father absolutely, and as Father is He perfect (Mt 5:48). The essential and universal Divine Fatherhood finds its eternal and continual object in the only begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father. As a relation with men, it is qualified by their attitude to God; while some by faithlessness make it of no avail, others by obedience become in the reality of their experience sons of their Father in heaven.

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

(2) In Apostolic Teaching:

In the apostolic teaching , although the Fatherhood of God is not so prominently or so abundantly

exhibited as it was by Jesus Christ, it lies at the root of the whole system of salvation there presented. Paul's central doctrine of justification by faith is but the scholastic form of the parable of the Prodigal Son. John's one idea, that God is love, is but an abstract statement of His fatherhood. In complete accord with Christ's teaching, that only through Himself men know the Father and come to Him, the whole apostolic system of grace is mediated through Christ the Son of God, sent because "God so loved the world" (Joh 3:16), that through His death men might be reconciled to God (Ro 5:10; 8:3). He speaks to men through the Son who is the effulgence of His glory, and the very image of His substance (Heb 1:2,3). The central position assigned to Christ involves the central position of the Fatherhood.

As in the teaching of Jesus, so in that of the apostles, we distinguish three different relationships in which the fatherhood is realized in varying degrees:

(a) Father of Jesus Christ:

Primarily He is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Ro 15:6; 2Co 1:3). As such He is the source of every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ (Eph 1:3). Through Christ we have access unto the Father (Eph 2:18).

(b) Our Father:

He is, therefore, God our Father (Ro 1:7; 1Co 1:3). Believers are sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus (Ga 3:26). "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God" (Ro 8:14). These receive the spirit of adoption whereby they cry, Abba, Father (Ro 8:15; Ga 4:6). The figure of adoption has sometimes been understood as implying the denial of man's natural sonship and God's essential Fatherhood, but that would be pressing the figure beyond Paul's purpose.

(c) Universal Father:

The apostles' teaching, like Christ's, is that man in sin cannot possess the filial consciousness or know God as Father; but God, in His attitude to man, is always and essentially Father. In the sense of creaturehood and dependence, man in any condition is a son of God (Ac 17:28). And to speak of any other natural sonship which is not also morally realized is meaningless. From God's standpoint, man even in his sin is a possible son, in the personal and moral sense; and the whole process and power of his awakening to the realization of his sonship issues from the fatherly love of God, who sent His Son and gave the Spirit (Ro 5:5,8). He is "the Father" absolutely, "one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all. But unto each one of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ" (Eph 4:6,7).

5. God is King:

After the Divine Fatherhood, the kingdom of God (Mark and Luke) or of heaven (Matthew) is the next ruling conception in the teaching of Jesus. As the doctrine of the Fatherhood sets forth the individual

relation of men to God, that of the kingdom defines their collective and social condition, as determined by the rule of the Father.

(1) The Kingdom of God:

Christ adopted and transformed the Old Testament idea of Yahweh's rule into an inner and spiritual principle of His gospel, without, however, quite detaching it from the external and apocalyptic thought of His time. He adopts the Jewish idea in so far as it involves the enforcing of God's rule; and in the immediate future He anticipates such a reorganization of social conditions in the manifestation of God's reign over men and Nature, as will ultimately amount to a regeneration of all things in accordance with the will of God (Mr 9:1; 13:30; Mt 16:28; 19:28). But He eliminated the particularism and favoritism toward the Jews, as well as the non-moral, easy optimism as to their destiny in the kingdom, which obtained in contemporary thought. The blessings of the kingdom are moral and spiritual in their nature, and the conditions of entrance into it are moral too (Mt 8:11; 21:31,43; 23:37,38; Lu 13:29). They are humility, hunger and thirst after righteousness, and the love of mercy, purity and peace (Mt 5:3-10; 18:1,3; compare Mt 20:26-28; 25:34; 7:21; Joh 3:3; Lu 17:20,21). The king of such a kingdom is, therefore, righteous, loving and gracious toward all men; He governs by the inner communion of spirit with spirit and by the loving coordination of the will of His subjects with his own will.

(2) Its King:

But who is the king?

(a) God:

Generally in Mr and Lk, and sometimes in Matthew, it is called the kingdom of God. In several parables, the Father takes the place of king, and it is the Father that gives the kingdom (Lu 12:32). God the Father is therefore the King, and we are entitled to argue from Jesus' teaching concerning the kingdom to His idea of God. The will of God is the law of the kingdom, and the ideal of the kingdom is, therefore, the character of God.

(b) Christ:

But in some passages Christ reveals the consciousness of his own Kingship. He approves Peter's confession of his Messiahship, which involves Kingship (Mt 16:16). He speaks of a time in the immediate future when men shall see "the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Mt 16:28). As judge of all men, He designates Himself king (Mt 25:34; Lu 19:38). He accepts the title king from Pilate (Mt 27:11,12; Mr 15:2; Lu 23:3; Joh 18:37), and claims a kingdom which is not of this world (Joh 18:36). His disciples look to Him for the restoration of the kingdom (Ac 1:6). His kingdom, like that of God, is inner, moral and spiritual.

(c) Their Relation:

But there can be only one moral kingdom, and only one supreme authority in the spiritual realm. The coordination of the two kingships must be found in their relation to the Fatherhood. The two ideas are not antithetical or even independent. They may have been separate and even opposed as Christ found them, but He used them as two points of apperception in the minds of His hearers, by which He communicated to them His one idea of God, as the Father who ruled a spiritual kingdom by love and righteousness, and ordered Nature and history to fulfill His purpose of grace. Men's prayer should be that the Father's kingdom may come (Mt 6:9,10). They enter the kingdom by doing the Father's will (Mt 7:21). It is their Father's good pleasure to give them the kingdom (Lu 12:32). The Fatherhood is primary, but it carries with it authority, government, law and order, care and provision, to set up and organize a kingdom reflecting a Father's love and expressing His will.

And as Christ is the revealer and mediator of the Fatherhood, He also is the messenger and bearer of the kingdom. In his person, preaching and works, the kingdom is present to men (Mt 4:17,23; 12:28), and as its king He claims men's allegiance and obedience (Mt 11:28,29). His sonship constitutes His relation to the kingdom. As son He obeys the Father, depends upon Him, represents Him to men, and is one with Him. And in virtue of this relation, He is the messenger of the kingdom and its principle, and at the same time He shares with the Father its authority and Kingship.

(3) Apostolic Teaching:

In the apostolic writings, the emphasis upon the elements of kingship, authority, law and righteousness is greater than in the gospels. The kingdom is related to God (Col 4:11; 1Th 2:12; 2Th 1:5), and to Christ (Col 1:13; 2Ti 4:1,18; 2Pe 1:11), and to both together (Eph 5:5; compare 1Co 15:24). The phrase "the kingdom of the Son of his love" sums up the idea of the joint kingship, based upon the relation of Father and Son.

6. Moral Attributes:

The nature and character of God are summed up in the twofold relation of Father and King in which He stands to men, and any abstract statements that may be made about Him, any attributes that may be ascribed to Him, are deductions from His royal Fatherhood.

(1) Personality:

That a father and king is a person needs not to be argued, and it is almost tautology to say that a person is a spirit. Christ relates directly the spirituality of God to His Fatherhood. "The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth: for such doth the Father seek to be his worshippers. God is Spirit" (Joh 4:23,14 margin). Figurative expressions denoting the same truth are the Johannine phrases, 'God is life' (1 Joh 5:20), and "God is light" (1 Joh 1:5).

(2) Love:

Love is the most characteristic attribute of Fatherhood. It is the abstract term that most fully expresses the concrete character of God as Father. In John's theology, it is used to sum up all God's perfections in one general formula. God is love, and where no love is, there can be no knowledge of God and no realization of Him (1 Joh 4:8,16). With one exception (Lu 11:42), the phrase "the love of God" appears in the teaching of Jesus only as it is represented in the Fourth Gospel. There it expresses the bond of union and communion, issuing from God, that holds together the whole spiritual society, God, Christ and believers (Joh 10; 14:21). Christ's mission was that of revelation, rather than of interpretation, and what in person and act He represents before men as the living Father, the apostles describe as almighty and universal love. They saw and realized this love first in the Son, and especially in His sacrificial death. It is "the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Ro 8:39). "God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Ro 5:8; compare Eph 2:4). Love was fully made known in Christ's death (1 Joh 3:16). The whole process of the incarnation and death of Christ was also a sacrifice of God's and the one supreme manifestation of His nature as love (1 Joh 4:9,10; compare Joh 3:16). The love of God is His fatherly relation to Christ extended to men through Christ. By the Father's love bestowed upon us, we are called children of God (1 Joh 3:1). Love is not only an emotion of tenderness and beneficence which bestows on men the greatest gifts, but a relation to God which constitutes their entire law of life. It imposes upon men the highest moral demands, and communicates to them the moral energy by which alone they can be met. It is law and grace combined. The love of God is perfected only in those who keep the word of Jesus Christ the Righteous (1 Joh 2:5). "For this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments" (1 Joh 5:3). It is manifested especially in brotherly love (1 Joh 4:12,20). It cannot dwell with worldliness (1 Joh 2:15) or callous selfishness (1 Joh 3:17). Man derives it from God as he is made the son of God, begotten of Him (1 Joh 4:7).

(3) Righteousness and Holiness:

Righteousness and holiness were familiar ideas to Jesus and His disciples, as elements in the Divine character. They were current in the thought of their time, and they stood foremost in the Old Testament conception. They were therefore adopted in their entirety in the New Testament, but they stand in a different context. They are coordinated with and even subordinated to, the idea of love. As kingship stands to fatherhood, so righteousness and holiness stand to love.

(a) Once we find the phrase "Holy Father" spoken by Jesus (Joh 17:11; compare 1Pe 1:15,16). But generally the idea of holiness is associated with God in His activity through the Holy Spirit, which renews, enlightens, purifies and cleanses the lives of men. Every vestige of artificial, ceremonial, non-moral meaning disappears from the idea of holiness in the New Testament. The sense of separation remains only as separation from sin. So Christ as high priest is "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners" (Heb 7:26). Where it dwells, no uncleanness must be (1Co 6:19). Holiness is not a legal or abstract morality, but a life made pure and noble by the love of God shed abroad in men's hearts (Ro 5:5). "The kingdom of God is .... righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Ro 14:17).

(b) Righteousness as a quality of character is practically identical with holiness in the New Testament. It is opposed to sin (Ro 6:13,10) and iniquity (2Co 6:14). It is coupled with goodness and truth as the fruit

of the light (Eph 5:9; compare 1Ti 6:11; 2Ti 2:22). It implies a rule or standard of conduct, which in effect is one with the life of love and holiness. It is brought home to men by the conviction of the Holy Spirit (Joh 16:8). In its origin it is the righteousness of God (Mt 6:33; compare Joh 17:25). In Paul's theology, "the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe" (Ro 3:22) is the act of God, out of free grace, declaring and treating the sinner as righteous, that he thereby may become righteous, even as "we love, because he first loved us" (1 Joh 4:19). The whole character of God, then, whether we call it love, holiness or righteousness, is revealed in His work of salvation, wherein He goes forth to men in love and mercy, that they may be made citizens of His kingdom, heirs of His righteousness, and participators in His love.

7. Metaphysical Attributes:

The abstract being of God and His metaphysical attributes are implied, but not defined, in the New Testament. His infinity, omnipotence and omniscience are not enunciated in terms, but they are postulated in the whole scheme of salvation which He is carrying to completion. He is Lord of heaven and earth (Mt 11:25). The forces of Nature are at His command (Mt 5:45; 6:30). He can answer every prayer and satisfy every need (Mt 7:7-12). All things are possible to Him (Mr 10:27; 14:36). He created all things (Eph 3:9). All earthly powers are derived from Him (Ro 13:1). By His power, He raised Christ from the dead and subjected to Him "all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion" in heaven and on earth (Eph 1:20,21; compare Mt 28:18). Every power and condition of existence are subordinated to the might of His love unto His saints (Ro 8:38,39). Neither time nor place can limit Him: He is the eternal God (Ro 16:26). His knowledge is as infinite as His power; He knows what the Son and the angels know not (Mr 13:32). He knows the hearts of men (Lu 16:15) and all their needs (Mt 6:8,32). His knowledge is especially manifested in His wisdom by which He works out His purpose of salvation, "the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Eph 3:10,11). The teaching of the New Testament implies that all perfections of power, condition and being cohere in God, and are revealed in His love. They are not developed or established on metaphysical grounds, but they flow out of His perfect fatherhood. Earthly fathers do what good they can for their children, but the Heavenly Father does all things for the best for His children—"to them that love God all things work together for good"—because He is restricted by no limits of power, will or wisdom (Mt 7:11; Ro 8:28).

8. The Unity of God:

It is both assumed through the New Testament and stated categorically that God is one (Mr 12:29; Ro 3:30; Eph 4:6). No truth had sunk more deeply into the Hebrew mind by this time than the unity of God.

(1) The Divinity of Christ:

Yet it is obvious from what has been written, that Jesus Christ claimed a power, authority and position so unique that they can only be adequately described by calling Him God; and the apostolic church both in worship and in doctrine accorded Him that honor. All that they knew of God as now fully and finally

revealed was summed up in His person, "for in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (Col 2:9). If they did not call Him God, they recognized and named Him everything that God meant for them.

(2) The Holy Spirit:

Moreover, the Holy Spirit is a third term that represents a Divine person in the experience, thought and language of Christ and His disciples. In the Johannine account of Christ's teaching, it is probable that the Holy Spirit is identified with the risen Lord Himself (Joh 14:16,17; compare Joh 14:18), and Paul seems also to identify them in at least one passage: "the Lord is the Spirit" (2Co 3:17). But in other places the three names are ranged side by side as representing three distinct persons (Mt 28:19; 2Co 13:14; Eph 4:4-6).

(3) The Church's Problem:

But how does the unity of God cohere with the Divine status of the Son and the distinct subsistence of the Holy Spirit? Jesus Christ affirmed a unity between Himself and the Father (Joh 10:30), a unity, too, which might be realized in a wider sphere, where the Father, the Son and believers should form one society (Joh 17:21,23), but He reveals no category which would construe the unity of the Godhead in a manifoldness of manifestation. The experience of the first Christians as a rule found Christ so entirely sufficient to all their religious needs, so filled with all the fullness of God, that the tremendous problem which had arisen for thought did not trouble them. Paul expresses his conception of the relation of Christ to God under the figure of the image. Christ "is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation" (Col 1:15; 2Co 4:4). Another writer employs a similar metaphor. Christ is "the effulgence of (God's) glory, and the very image of his substance" (Heb 1:3). But these figures do not carry us beyond the fact, abundantly evident elsewhere, that Christ in all things represented God because He participated in His being. In the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, the doctrine of the Word is developed for the same purpose. The eternal Reason of God who was ever with Him, and of Him, issues forth as revealed thought, or spoken word, in the person of Jesus Christ, who therefore is the eternal Word of God incarnate. So far and no farther the New Testament goes. Jesus Christ is God revealed; we know nothing of God, but that which is manifest in Him. His love, holiness, righteousness and purpose of grace, ordering and guiding all things to realize the ends of His fatherly love, all this we know in and through Jesus Christ. The Holy Spirit takes of Christ's and declares it to men (Joh 16:14). The problems of the coordination of the One with the Three, of personality with the plurality of consciousness, of the Infinite with the finite, and of the Eternal God with the Word made flesh, were left over for the church to solve. The Holy Spirit was given to teach it all things and guide it into all the truth (Joh 16:13). "And lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world" (Mt 28:20).

See JESUS CHRIST; HOLY SPIRIT; TRINITY.

LITERATURE.

Harris The Philosophical Basis of Theism; God the Creator and Lord of All; Flint, Theism; Orr, The

Christian View of God and the World; E. Caird, The Evolution of Religion; James Ward, The Realm of Ends; Fairbairn, The Philosophy of the Christian Religion; W.N. Clarke, The Christian Doctrine of God; Adeney, The Christian Conception of God; Rocholl, Der Christliche Gottesbegriff ; O. Holtzmann, Der Christliche Gottesglaube, seine Vorgeschichte und Urgeschichte; G. Wobbernim, Der Christliche Gottesglaube in seinem Verhaltnis zur heutigen Philosophie und Naturwissenschaft; Kostlin, article "Gott" in See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche; R. S. Candlish, Crawford and Scott-Lidgett, books on The Fatherhood of God: Old Testament Theologies by Oehler, Schultz and Davidson; New Testament Theologies by Schmid, B. Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann and Stevens; Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus; sections in systems of Christian Doctrine by Schleiermacher, Darner, Nitzsch, Martensen, Thomasius, Hodge, etc.

T. Rees

GOD, CHILDREN OF

See CHILDREN OF GOD.

GOD, IMAGE OF

In Ge 1:26,27, the truth is declared that God created man in His own "image" (tselem), after His "likeness" (demuth). The two ideas denote the same thing—resemblance to God. The like conception of man, tacit or avowed, underlies all revelation. It is given in Ge 9:6 as the ground of the prohibition of the shedding of man’s blood; is echoed in Ps 8; is reiterated frequently in the New Testament (1Co 11:7; Eph 4:24; Col 3:10; Isa 3:9). The nature of this image of God in man is discussed in other articles—see especially ANTHROPOLOGY. It lies in the nature of the case that the "image" does not consist in bodily form; it can only reside in spiritual qualities, in man’s mental and moral attributes as a self-conscious, rational, personal agent, capable of self-determination and obedience to moral law. This gives man his position of lordship in creation, and invests his being with the sanctity of personality. The image of God, defaced, but not entirely lost through sin, is restored in yet more perfect form in the redemption of Christ. See the full discussion in the writer’s work, God’s Image in Man and Its Defacement; see also Dr. J. Laidlaw, The Bible Doctrine of Man.

James Orr

GOD, NAMES OF

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. The Phrase "His Name"

2. Classification.

II. PERSONAL NAMES OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. ‘Elohim

2. ‘El

3. ‘Eloah

4. ‘Adhon, ‘Adhonay

5. Yahweh (Yahweh)

6. Tsur (Rock)

7. Ka‘dhosh

8. Shadday

III. DESCRIPTIVE NAMES OF GOD IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. ‘Abhir

2. ‘El-’Elohe-Yisra’el

3. ‘Elyon

4. Gibbor

5. ‘El-ro’i

6. Tsaddiq

7. Qanna’

8. Yahweh Tsebha’oth

9. "I Am That I Am"

IV. New Testament NAMES OF GOD

1. God

2. Lord

3. Descriptive and Figurative Names

LITERATURE

I. Introduction:

To an extent beyond the appreciation of modern and western minds the people of Biblical times and lands valued the name of the person. They always gave to it symbolical or character meaning.

While our modern names are almost exclusively designatory, and intended merely for identification, the Biblical names were also descriptive, and often prophetic. Religious significance nearly always inhered in the name, a parent relating his child to the Deity, or declaring its consecration to the Deity, by joining the name of the Deity with the service which the child should render, or perhaps commemorating in a name the favor of God in the gracious gift of the child, e.g. Nathaniel ("gift of God"); Samuel ("heard of God"); Adonijah ("Yahweh is my Lord"), etc. It seems to us strange that at its birth, the life and character of a child should be forecast by its parents in a name; and this unique custom has been regarded by an unsympathetic criticism as evidence of the origin of such names and their attendant narratives long subsequent to the completed life itself; such names, for example, as Abraham, Sarah, etc. But that this was actually done, and that it was regarded as a matter of course, is proved by the name given to Our Lord at His birth: "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save his people" (Mt 1:21). It is not unlikely that the giving of a character name represented the parents' purpose and fidelity in the child's training, resulting necessarily in giving to the child's life that very direction, which the name indicated. A child's name, therefore, became both a prayer and a consecration, and its realization in character became often a necessary psychological effect. Great honor or dishonor was attached to a name. The Old Testament writings contain many and varied instances of this. Sometimes contempt for certain reprobate men would be most expressively indicated by a change of name, e.g. the change of Esh-baal, "man of Baal," to Ish-bosheth, "man of shame" (2Sa 2:8), and the omission of Yahweh from the name of the apostate king, Ahaz (2Ki 15:38, etc.). The name of the last king of Judah was most expressively changed by Nebuchadnezzar from Mattaniah to Zedekiah, to assure his fidelity to his overlord who made him king (2Ki 24:17).

See NAMES, PROPER.

1. The Phrase "His Name":

Since the Scriptures of the Old Testament and New Testament are essentially for purposes of revelation, and since the Hebrews laid such store by names, we should confidently expect them to make the Divine name a medium of revelation of the first importance. People accustomed by long usage to significant

character indications in their own names, necessarily would regard the names of the Deity as expressive of His nature. The very phrase "name of Yahweh," or "His name," as applied to the Deity in Biblical usage, is most interesting and suggestive, sometimes expressing comprehensively His revelation in Nature (Ps 8:1; compare 138:2); or marking the place of His worship, where men will call upon His name (De 12:5); or used as a synonym of His various attributes, e.g. faithfulness (Isa 48:9), grace (Ps 23:3), His honor (Ps 79:9), etc. "Accordingly, since the name of God denotes this God Himself as He is revealed, and as He desires to be known by His creatures, when it is said that God will make a name for Himself by His mighty deeds, or that the new world of the future shall be unto Him for a name, we can easily understand that the name of God is often synonymous with the glory of God, and that the expressions for both are combined in the utmost variety of ways, or used alternately" (Schultz, Old Testament Theology, English translation, I, 124-25; compare Ps 72:19; Isa 63:14; also Davidson, Old Testament Theol., 37-38).

2. Classification:

From the important place which the Divine name occupies in revelation, we would expect frequency of occurrence and diversity of form; and this is just that which we find to be true. The many forms or varieties of the name will be considered under the following heads:

(1) Absolute or Personal Names,

(2) Attributive, or Qualifying Names, and

(3) Names of God in the New Testament. Naturally and in course of time attributive names tend to crystallize through frequent use and devotional regard into personal names; e.g. the attributive adjective qadhosh, "holy," becomes the personal, transcendental name for Deity in Job and Isa. For fuller details of each name reference may be made to separate articles.

II. Absolute or Personal Names of God in the Old Testament:

1. ‘Elohim:

The first form of the Divine name in the Bible is ‘Elohim, ordinarily translated "God" (Ge 1:1). This is the most frequently used name in the Old Testament, as its equivalent theos, is in the New Testament, occurring in Ge alone approximately 200 t. It is one of a group of kindred words, to which belong also ‘El and ‘Eloah. (1) Its form is plural, but the construction is uniformly singular, i.e. it governs a singular verb or adjective, unless used of heathen divinities (Ps 96:5; 97:7). It is characteristic of Hebrew that extension, magnitude and dignity, as well as actual multiplicity, are expressed by the plural. It is not reasonable, therefore, to assume that plurality of form indicates primitive Semitic polytheism. On the contrary, historic Hebrew is unquestionably and uniformly monotheistic.

(2) The derivation is quite uncertain. Gesenius, Ewald and others find its origin in ‘ul, "to be strong,"

from which also are derived ‘ayil, "ram," and ‘elah, "terebinth"; it is then an expanded plural form of ‘el; others trace it to ‘alah, "to terrify," and the singular form is found in the infrequent ‘eloah, which occurs chiefly in poetical books; BDB inclines to the derivation from ‘alah, "to be strong," as the root of the three forms, ‘El, ‘Eloah and ‘Elohim, although admitting that the whole question is involved in uncertainty (for full statement see BDB, under the word ...); a somewhat fanciful suggestion is the Arabic root ‘ul, "to be in front," from which comes the meaning "leader"; and still more fanciful is the suggested connection with the preposition ‘el, signifying God as the "goal" of man’s life and aspiration. The origin must always lie in doubt, since the derivation is prehistoric, and the name, with its kindred words ‘El and ‘Eloah, is common to Semitic languages and religions and beyond the range of Hebrew records.

(3) It is the reasonable conclusion that the meaning is "might" or "power"; that it is common to Semitic language; that the form is plural to express majesty or "all-mightiness," and that it is a generic, rather than a specific personal, name for Deity, as is indicated by its application to those who represent the Deity (Jud 5:8; Ps 82:1) or who are in His presence (1Sa 28:13).

2. ‘Eloah:

The singular form of the preceding name, ‘Eloah, is confined in its use almost exclusively to poetry, or to poetic expression, being characteristic of the Book of Job, occurring oftener in that book than in all other parts of the Old Testament. It is, in fact, found in Job oftener than the elsewhere more ordinary plural ‘Elohim. For derivation and meaning see above under 1 (2). Compare also the Aramaic form, ‘elah, found frequently in Ezra and Daniel.

3. ‘El:

In the group of Semitic languages, the most common word for Deity is El (’el), represented by the Babylonian ilu and the Arabic ‘Allah. It is found throughout the Old Testament, but oftener in Job and Psalms than in all the other books. It occurs seldom in the historical books, and not at all in Lev. The same variety of derivations is attributed to it as to ELOHIM (which see), most probable of which is ‘ul, "to be strong." BDB interprets ‘ul as meaning "to be in front," from which came ‘ayil, "ram" the one in front of the flock, and ‘elah, the prominent "terebinth," deriving [’El] from ‘alah, "to be strong." It occurs in many of the more ancient names; and, like [’Elohim], it is used of pagan gods. It is frequently combined with nouns or adjectives to express the Divine name with reference to particular attributes or phases of His being, as ‘El ‘Elyon, ‘El-Ro’i, etc. (see below under III, "Attributive Names").

4. ‘Adhon, ‘Adhonay:

An attributive name, which in prehistoric Hebrew had already passed over into a generic name of God, is ‘Adhon, ‘Adhonay, the latter formed from the former, being the construct plural, ‘adhone, with the 1st person ending -ay, which has been lengthened to ay and so retained as characteristic of the proper name and distinguishing it from the possessive "my Lord." the King James Version does not distinguish, but

renders both as possessive, "my Lord" (Jud 6:15; 13:8), and as personal name (Ps 2:4); the Revised Version (British and American) also, in Ps 16:2, is in doubt, giving "my Lord," possessive, in text and "the Lord" in the margin. ‘Adhonay, as a name of Deity, emphasizes His sovereignty (Ps 2:4; Isa 7:7), and corresponds closely to Kurios of the New Testament. It is frequently combined with Yahweh (Ge 15:8; Isa 7:7, etc.) and with ‘Elohim (Ps 86:12). Its most significant service in Massoretic Text is the use of its vowels to point the unpronounceable tetragrammaton YHWH, indicating that the word "‘Adhonay" should be spoken aloud instead of "Yah-weh." This combination of vowels and consonants gives the transliteration "Yahweh," adopted by the American Standard Revised Version, while the other English Versions of the Bible, since Coverdale, represents the combination by the capitals LORD. Septuagint represents it by Kurios.

5. Yahweh (Yahweh):

The name most distinctive of God as the God of Israel is (Yahweh, a combination of the tetragrammaton (YHWH) with the vowels of ‘Adhonay, transliterated as Yehowah, but read aloud by the Hebrews ‘adhonay). While both derivation and meaning are lost to us in the uncertainties of its ante-Biblical origin, the following inferences seem to be justified by the facts:

(1) This name was common to religions other than Israel’s, according to Friedr. Delitzsch, Hommel, Winckler, and Guthe (EB, under the word), having been found in Babylonian inscriptions. Ammonite, Arabic and Egyptian names appear also to contain it (compare Davidson, Old Testament Theol., 52 f); but while, like ‘Elohim, it was common to primitive Semitic religion, it became Israel’s distinctive name for the Deity.

(2) It was, therefore, not first made known at the call of Moses (Ex 3:13-16; 6:2-8), but, being already known, was at that time given a larger revelation and interpretation: God, to be known to Israel henceforth under the name "Yahweh" and in its fuller significance, was the One sending Moses to deliver Israel; "when I shall say unto them, The God of your fathers hath sent me unto you; and they shall say to me, What is his name? what shall I say unto them? And God said .... I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE .... say .... I WILL BE hath sent me" (Ex 3:13,14 margin). The name is assumed as known in the narrative of Genesis; it also occurs in pre-Mosaic names (Ex 6:20; 1Ch 2:25; 7:8).

(3) The derivation is from the archaic chawah, "to be," better "to become," in Biblical Hebrew hayah; this archaic use of w for y appears also in derivatives of the similar chayah, "to live," e.g. chawwah in Ge 3:20.

(4) It is evident from the interpretative passages (Ex 3; 6) that the form is the fut. of the simple stem (Qal) and not future of the causative (Hiph‘il) stem in the sense "giver of life"—an idea not borne out by any of the occurrences of the word. The fanciful theory that the word is a combination of the future, present and perfect tenses of the verb, signifying "the One who will be, is, and was," is not to be taken seriously (Stier, etc., in Oehler’s Old Testament Theology, in the place cited.).

(5) The meaning may with some confidence be inferred from Origen’s transliteration, Iao, the form in Samaritan, Iabe, the form as combined in Old Testament names, and the evident signification in Ex 3 and other passages, to be that of the simple future, yahweh, "he will be." It does not express causation, nor existence in a metaphysical sense, but the covenant promise of the Divine presence, both at the immediate time and in the Messianic age of the future. And thus it became bound up with the Messianic hope, as in the phrase, "the Day of Yahweh," and consequently both it and the Septuagint translation Kurios were applied by the New Testament as titles of Christ.

(6) It is the personal name of God, as distinguished from such generic or essential names as ‘El, ‘Elohim, Shadday, etc. Characteristic of the Old Testament is its insistence on the possible knowledge of God as a person; and Yahweh is His name as a person. It is illogical, certainly, that the later Hebrews should have shrunk from its pronunciation, in view of the appropriateness of the name and of the Old Testament insistence on the personality of God, who as a person has this name. the American Standard Revised Version quite correctly adopts the transliteration "Yahweh" to emphasize its significance and purpose as a personal name of God revealed.

6. Tsur (Rock):

Five times in the "Song" of Moses (De 32:4,15,18,30,31) the word tsur, "Rock," is used as a title of God. It occurs also in the Psalms, Isa and poetical passages of other books, and also in proper names, Elizur, Zuriel, etc. Once in the King James Version (Isa 44:8) it is translated "God," but "Rock" in the American Standard Revised Version and the American Revised Version, margin. The effort to interpret this title as indicating the animistic origin of Old Testament religion is unnecessary and a pure product of the imagination. It is customary for both Old Testament and New Testament writers to use descriptive names of God: "rock," "fortress," "shield," "light," "bread," etc., and is in harmony with all the rich figurativeness of the Scriptures; the use of the article in many of the cases cited further corroborates the view that the word is intended to be a descriptive title, not the name of a Nature-deity. It presents the idea of God as steadfast: "The appellation of God as tsur, ‘rock,’ ‘safe retreat,’ in Deuteronomy refers to this" (Oehler, Old Testament Theology). It often occurs, in a most striking figure, with the pers. suffix as "my rock," "their rock," to express confidence (Ps 28:1).

7. Kadhosh:

The name (qadhosh, "holy") is found frequently in Isaiah and Psalms, and occasionally in the other prophets. It is characteristic of Isaiah, being found 32 times in that book. It occurs often in the phrase qedhosh yisra’el, "Holy One of Israel." The derivation and meaning remain in doubt, but the customary and most probable derivation is from qadhash, "to be separate," which best explains its use both of man and of the Deity. When used of God it signifies: (1) His transcendence, His separateness above all other beings, His aloneness as compared to other gods; (2) His peculiar relation to His people Israel unto whom He separated Himself, as He did not unto other nations. In the former sense Isaiah used it of His sole deity (40:25), in the latter of His peculiar and unchanging covenant-relation to Israel (43:3; 48:17), strikingly, expressed in the phrase "Holy One of Israel." Qadhosh was rather attributive than personal,

but became personal in the use of such absolute theists as Job and Isaiah. It expresses essential Deity, rather than personal revelation.

8. Shadday:

In the patriarchal literature, and in Job particularly, where it is put into the mouths of the patriarchs, this name appears sometimes in the compound ‘el shadday, sometimes alone. While its root meaning also is uncertain, the suggested derivation from shadhadh, "to destroy," "to terrify," seems most probable, signifying the God who is manifested by the terribleness of His mighty acts. "The Storm God," from shadha’," to pour out," has been suggested, but is improbable; and even more so the fanciful she, and day, meaning "who is sufficient." Its use in patriarchal days marks an advance over looser Semitic conceptions to the stricter monotheistic idea of almightiness, and is in accord with the early consciousness of Deity in race or individual as a God of awe, or even terror. Its monotheistic character is in harmony with its use in the Abrahamic times, and is further corroborated by its parallel in Septuagint and New Testament, pantokrator, "all-powerful."

III. Descriptive Names of God in the Old Testament:

It is often difficult to distinguish between the personal and the attributive names of God, the two divisions necessarily shading into each other. Some of the preceding are really attributive, made personal by usage. The following are the most prominent descriptive or attributive names.

1. ‘Abhir:

This name (’abhir), translated in English Versions of the Bible "Mighty One," is always combined with Israel or Jacob; its root is ‘abhar, "to be strong" from which is derived the word ‘ebher, "pinion," used of the strong wing of the eagle (Isa 40:31), figuratively of God in De 32:11. It occurs in Jacob’s blessing (Ge 49:24), in a prayer for the sanctuary (Ps 132:2,5), and in Isa (1:24; 49:26; 60:16), to express the assurance of the Divine strength in behalf of the oppressed in Israel (Isa 1:24), or in behalf of Israel against his oppressors; it is interesting to note that this name was first used by Jacob himself.

2. ‘El-’Elohe-Israel:

The name ‘El is combined with a number of descriptive adjectives to represent God in His various attributes; and these by usage have become names or titles of God. For the remarkable phrase ‘EL-’ELOHE-ISRAEL (Ge 33:20), see separate article

3. ‘Elyon:

This name (‘elyon, "highest") is a derivative of ‘alah, "to go up." It is used of persons or things to indicate their elevation or exaltation: of Israel, favored above other nations (De 26:19), of the aqueduct of "the upper pool" (Isa 7:3), etc. This indicates that its meaning when applied to God is the "Exalted

One," who is lifted far above all gods and men. It occurs alone (De 32:8; Ps 18:13), or in combination with other names of God, most frequently with El (Ge 14:18; Ps 78:35), but also with Yahweh (Ps 7:17; 97:9), or with Elohim (Ps 56:2 the King James Version; Ps 78:56). Its early use (Ge 14:18 f) points to a high conception of Deity, an unquestioned monotheism in the beginnings of Hebrew history.

4. Gibbor:

The ancient Hebrews were in constant struggle for their land and their liberties, a struggle most intense and patriotic in the heroic days of Saul and David, and in which there was developed a band of men whose great deeds entitled them to the honorable title "mighty men" of valor (gibborim). These were the knights of David's "Round Table." In like manner the Hebrew thought of his God as fighting for him, and easily then this title was applied to God as the Mighty Man of war, occurring in David's psalm of the Ark's Triumphant Entry (Ps 24:8), in the allegory of the Messiah-King (Ps 45:3), either alone or combined with El (Isa 9:6; Jer 32:18), and sometimes with Yahweh (Isa 42:13).

5. 'El-Ro'i:

When Hagar was fleeing from Sarah's persecutions, Yahweh spoke to her in the wilderness of Shur, words of promise and cheer. Whereupon "she called the name of Yahweh that spake unto her, Thou art El roi" (Ge 16:13 margin). In the text the word ro'i, deriv. of ra'ah, "to see," is translated "that seeth," literally, "of sight." This is the only occurrence of this title in the Old Testament.

6. Tsaddiq:

One of the covenant attributes of God, His righteousness, is spoken of so often that it passes from adjective to substantive, from attribute to name, and He is called "Righteous" (tsaddiq), or "the Righteous One." The word is never transliterated but always translated in English Versions of the Bible, although it might just as properly be considered a Divine name as 'Elyon or Qadhosh. The root tsadhaq, "to be straight" or "right," signifies fidelity to a standard, and is used of God's fidelity to His own nature and to His covenant-promise (Isa 41:10; 42:6; compare Ho 2:19); it occurs alone (Ps 34:17), with El (De 32:4), with Elohim (Ezr 9:15; Ps 7:9; 116:5), but most frequently with Yahweh (Ps 129:4, etc.). In Ex 9:27 Pharaoh, in acknowledging his sin against Yahweh, calls Him 'Yahweh the Righteous,' using the article. The suggestive combination, "Yahweh our Righteousness," is the name given to David's "righteous Branch" (Jer 23:6) and properly should be taken as a proper noun—the name of the Messiah-King.

7. Kanna:

Frequently in the Pentateuch, most often in the 3 versions of the Commandments (Ex 20:5; 34:14; De 5:9), God is given the title "Jealous" (qanna'), most specifically in the phrase "Yahweh, whose name is Jealous" (Ex 34:14). This word, however, did not bear the evil meaning now associated with it in our usage, but rather signified "righteous zeal," Yahweh's zeal for His own name or glory (compare Isa 9:7,

"the zeal of Yahweh," qin'ah; also Zec 1:14; 8:2).

8. Yahweh Tsebha'-oth:

Connected with the personal and covenant name Yahweh, there is found frequently the word Sabaoth (tsebha'oth, "hosts"). Invariably in the Old Testament it is translated "hosts" (Isa 1:9; Ps 46:7,11, etc.), but in the New Testament it is transliterated twice, both in the Greek and English (Ro 9:29; Jas 5:4). The passage in Roman is a quotation from Isa 1:9 through Septuagint, which does not translate, but transliterates the Hebrew. Origin and meaning are uncertain. It is used of heavenly bodies and earthly forces (Ge 2:1); of the army of Israel (2Sa 8:16); of the Heavenly beings (Ps 103:21; 148:2; Da 4:35). It is probable that the title is intended to include all created agencies and beings, of which Yahweh is maker and leader.

9. "I Am That I Am":

When God appeared to Moses at Sinai, commissioning him to deliver Israel; Moses, being well aware of the difficulty of impressing the people, asked by what name of God he should speak to them: "They shall say to me, What is his name?" Then "God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM .... say .... I AM hath sent me unto you" (Ex 3:14). The name of the Deity given here is similar to Yahweh except that the form is not 3rd person future, as in the usual form, but the 1st person ('ehyeh), since God is here speaking of Himself. The optional reading in the American Revised Version, margin is much to be preferred: "I WILL BE THAT I WILL BE," indicating His covenant pledge to be with and for Israel in all the ages to follow. For further explanation see above, II, 5.

IV. New Testament Names of God.

The variety of names which characterizes the Old Testament is lacking in the New Testament, where we are all but limited to two names, each of which corresponds to several in the Old Testament. The most frequent is the name "God" (Theos) occurring over 1,000 t, and corresponding to El, Elohim, etc., of the Old Testament.

1. God:

It may, as ['Elohim], be used by accommodation of heathen gods; but in its true sense it expresses essential Deity, and as expressive of such it is applied to Christ as to the Father (Joh 20:28; Ro 9:5).

2. Lord:

Five times "Lord" is a translation of despotes (Lu 2:29; Ac 4:24; 2Pe 2:1 the King James Version; Jude 1:4; Re 6:10 the King James Version). In each case there is evident emphasis on sovereignty and correspondence to the 'Adhon of the Old Testament. The most common Greek word for Lord is Kurios, representing both Yahweh and 'Adhonai of the Old Testament, and occurring upwards of 600 times. Its

use for Yahweh was in the spirit of both the Hebrew scribes, who pointed the consonants of the covenant name with the vowels of Adhonay, the title of dominion, and of the Septuagint, which rendered this combination as Kurios. Consequently quotations from the Old Testament in which Yahweh occurs are rendered by Kurios. It is applied to Christ equally with the Father and the Spirit, showing that the Messianic hopes conveyed by the name Yahweh were for New Testament writers fulfilled in Jesus Christ; and that in Him the long hoped for appearance of Yahweh was realized.

3. Descriptive and Figurative Names:

As in the Old Testament, so in the New Testament various attributive, descriptive or figurative names are found, often corresponding to those in the Old Testament. Some of these are: The "Highest" or "Most High" hupsistos), found in this sense only in Lu (1:32,35,76; 2:14, etc.), and Equivalent to ‘Elyon (see III, 3, above); "Almighty," Pantokrator (2Co 6:18; Re 1:8, etc.), corresponding to Shadday (see II, 8 above; see also ALMIGHTY); "Father," as in the Lord’s Prayer, and elsewhere (Mt 6:9; 11:25; Joh 17:25; 2Co 6:18); "King" (1Ti 1:17); "King of kings" (1Ti 6:15); "King of kings," "Lord of lords" (Re 17:14; 19:16); "Potentate" (1Ti 6:15); "Master" (Kurios, Eph 6:9; 2Pe 2:1; Re 6:10); "Shepherd," "Bishop" (1Pe 2:25).

LITERATURE.

Theology of Old Testament by various authors: Oehler, Schultz, Davidson; Delitzsch, Psychology of the Old Testament; H.P. Smith, "Theophorous Names of OT" in Old Testament and Semitic Studies; Gray, HPN; "God" in HDB and EB.

Edward Mack

GOD, SON (SONS) OF

See SONS OF GOD (OLD TESTAMENT); SONS OF GOD (NEW TESTAMENT).

GOD, STRANGE

stranj: The word "strange," as used in this connection in the Old Testament, refers to the fact that the god or gods do not belong to Israel, but are the gods which are worshipped by other families or nations. In several cases a more exact translation would give us the "gods of the stranger" or foreigner. So in Ge 35:2,4; Jos 24:2; Jud 10:16; De 31:16; 32:12, etc. In a few passages like De 32:16; Ps 44:20; 81:9; Isa 43:12, the word is an adjective, but the idea is the same: the gods are those which are worshipped by other peoples and hence are forbidden to Israel, which is under obligation to worship Yahweh alone (compare 2 Esdras 1:6).

In the New Testament the phrase occurs only once, in the account of Paul’s experiences in Athens (Ac 17:18), when some of his auditors said, "He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods" (xena

daimonia). Here the thought is clearly that by his preaching of Jesus he was regarded as introducing a new divinity, that is one who was strange or foreign to the Athenians and of whom they had never heard before. Like the Romans of this period the Athenians were doubtless interested in, and more or less favorable to, the numerous new cults which were coming to their attention as the result of the constant intercourse with the Orient. See preceding article.

Walter R. Betteridge

GOD, THE FATHER

See FATHER, GOD THE.

GOD, THE UNKNOWN

See UNKNOWN GOD.

GODDESS

god'-es ('elohim, thea): There is no separate word for "goddess" in the Old Testament. In the only instance in which the word occurs in English Versions of the Bible (1Ki 11:5,33), the gender is determined by the noun—"Ashtoreth, the god (goddess) of the Sidonians." In the New Testament the term is applied to Diana of Ephesus (Ac 19:27,35,37).

GODHEAD

god'-hed: The word "Godhead" is a simple doublet of the less frequently occurring "Godhood." Both forms stand side by side in the Ancren Riwle (about 1225 AD), and both have survived until today, though not in equally common use. They are representatives of a large class of abstract substantives, formed with the suffix "-head" or "-hood", most of which formerly occurred in both forms almost indifferently, though the majority of them survive only, or very preponderatingly (except in Scottish speech), in the form -hood. The two suffixes appear in Middle English as "-hede" and "-hod", and presuppose in the Anglo-Saxon which lies behind them a feminine "haeda" (which is not actually known) by the side of the masculine had. The Anglo-Saxon word "was originally a distinct substantive, meaning 'person, personality, sex, condition, quality, rank' "(Bradley, in A New English Dict. on a Historical Basis, under the word "-hood"), but its use as a suffix early superseded its separate employment. At first "-hede" appears to have been appropriated to adjectives, "-hod" to substantives; but, this distinction breaking down and the forms coming into indiscriminate use, "-hede" grew obsolete, and remains in common use only in one or two special forms, such as "Godhead," "maidenhead" (Bradley, as cited, under the word "-head").

The general elimination of the forms in -head has been followed by a fading consciousness, in the case

of the few surviving instances in this form, of the qualitative sense inherent in the suffix. The words accordingly show a tendency to become simple denotatives. Thus, "the Godhead" is frequently employed merely as a somewhat strong synonym of "God" although usually with more or less emphasis upon that in God which makes Him God. One of its established usages is to denote the Divine essence as such, in distinction from the three "hypostases" or "persons" which share its common possession in the doctrine of the Trinity. This usage is old: Bradley (op. cit.) is able to adduce instances from the 13th century. In this usage the word has long held the rank of a technical term, e.g. the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, 1571, Art. I: "And in the unity of this Godhead, there be three persons" (compare the Irish Articles of 1615, and the Westminster Confession, II, 3); Westminster Shorter Catechism, Q. 6: "There are three persons in the Godhead." Pursuant to the fading of the qualitative sense of the word, there has arisen a tendency, when the qualitative consciousness is vivid, to revive the obsolescent "Godhood," to take its place; and this tendency naturally shows itself especially when the contrast with humanity is expressed. Carlyle, for example (French Revolution, III, Book vi, chapter iv, section 1), speaking of the posthumous reaction against Marat, writes: "Shorter godhood had no divine man"; and Phillips Brooks (Sermons, XIII, 237) speaks of Christ bridging the gulf "between the Godhood and the manhood." "Godhood" seems, indeed, always to have had a tendency to appear in such contrasts, as if the qualitative consciousness were more active in it than in "Godhead." Thus, it seems formerly to have suggested itself almost as inevitably to designate the Divine nature of Christ, as "Godhead" did to designate the common Divine essence of the Trinity. Bradley cites instances from 1563 down. The fundamental meaning of "Godhead" is, nevertheless, no less than that of "Godhood," the state, dignity, condition, quality, of a god, or, as monotheists would say, of God. As manhood is that which makes a man a man, and childhood that which makes a child a child, so Godhead is that which makes God, God. When we ascribe Godhead to a being, therefore, we affirm that all that enters into the idea of God belongs to Him. "Godhead" is thus the Saxon equivalent of the Latin "Divinity," or, as it is now becoming more usual to say, "Deity." Like these terms it is rendered concrete by prefixing the article to it. As "the Divinity," "the Deity," so also "the Godhead" is only another way of saying "God," except that when we say "the Divinity," "the Deity," "the Godhead," we are saying "God" more abstractly and more qualitatively, that is with more emphasis, or at least with a more lively consciousness, of the constitutive qualities which make God the kind of being we call "God."

The word "Godhead" occurs in the King James Version only 3 times (Ac 17:29; Ro 1:20; Col 2:9), and oddly enough it translates in these 3 passages, 3 different, though closely related, Greek words, to theion theiotes, theotes.

To theion means "that which is Divine," concretely, or, shortly, "the Deity." Among the Greeks it was in constant use in the sense of "the Divine Being," and particularly as a general term to designate the Deity apart from reference to a particular god. It is used by Paul (Ac 17:29) in an address made to a heathen audience, and is inserted into a context in which it is flanked by the simple term "God" (ho Theos) on both sides. It is obviously deliberately chosen in order to throw up into emphasis the qualitative idea of God; and this emphasis is still further heightened by the direct contrast into which it is brought with the term "man." "Being, then, the offspring of God, we ought not to think that it is to gold or silver or stone graven by art and device of man that the Godhead is like." In an effort to bring out this qualitative emphasis, the Revised Version, margin suggests that we might substitute for "the Godhead" here the

periphrastic rendering, "that which is Divine." But this seems both clumsy and ineffective for its purpose. From the philological standpoint, "the Godhead" is very fair equivalent for to theion, differing as it does from the simple "God" precisely by its qualitative emphasis. It may be doubted, however, whether in the partial loss by "Godhead" of its qualitative force in its current usage, one of its synonyms, "the Divinity" (which is the rendering here of the Rhemish version) or "the Deity," would not better convey Paul's emphasis to modern readers.

Neither of these terms, "Divinity," "Deity," occurs anywhere in the King James Version, and "Deity" does not occur in the Revised Version (British and American) either; but the Revised Version (British and American) (following the Rhemish version) substitutes "Dignity" for "Godhead" in Ro 1:20. Of the two, "Dignity" was originally of the broader connotation; in the days of heathendom it was applicable to all grades of Divine beings. "Deity" was introduced by the Christian Fathers for the express purpose of providing a stronger word by means of which the uniqueness of the Christians' God should be emphasized. Perhaps "Divinity" retains even in its English usage something of its traditional weaker connotation, although, of course, in a monotheistic consciousness the two terms coalesce in meaning. There exists a tendency to insist, therefore, on the "Deity" of Christ, rather than his mere "Divinity," in the feeling that "Divinity" might lend itself to the notion that Christ possessed but a secondary or reduced grade of Divine quality. In Ac 17:29 Paul is not discriminating between grades of Divinity, but is preaching monotheism. In this context, then, to theion does not lump together "all that is called God or is worshipped," and declare that all that is in any sense Divine should be esteemed beyond the power of material things worthily to represent. Paul has the idea of God at its height before his mind, and having quickened his hearers' sense of God's exaltation by his elevated description of Him, he demands of them whether this Deity can be fitly represented by any art of man working in dead stuff. He uses the term to theion, rather than ho theos, not merely in courteous adoption of his hearers' own language, but because of its qualitative emphasis. On the whole, the best English translation of it would probably be "the Deity." "The Godhead" has ceased to be sufficiently qualitative: "the Godhood" is not sufficiently current: "the Divine" is not sufficiently personal: "the Divinity" is perhaps not sufficiently strong: "Deity" without the article loses too much of its personal reference to compensate for the gain in qualitativeness: "the Deity" alone seems fairly to reproduce the apostle's thought.

The Greek term in Ro 1:20 is theiotes, which again, as a term of quality, is not unfairly rendered by "Godhead." What Paul says here is that "the everlasting power and Godhead" of God "are clearly perceived by means of His works." By "Godhead" he clearly means the whole of that by which God is constituted what we mean by "God." By coupling the word with "power," Paul no doubt intimates that his mind is resting especially upon those qualities which enter most intimately into and constitute the exaltation of God; but we must beware of limiting the connotation of the term—all of God's attributes are glorious. The context shows that the thought of the apostle was moving on much the same lines as in Ac 17:29; here, too, the contrast which determines the emphasis is with "corruptible man," and along with him, with the lower creatures in general (Ro 1:23). How could man think of the Godhead under such similitudes—the Godhead, so clearly manifested in its glory by its works! The substitution for "Godhead" here of its synonym "Divinity" by the Revised Version (British and American) is doubtless due in part to a desire to give distinctive renderings to distinct terms, and in part to a wish to emphasize, more strongly than "Godhead" in its modern usage emphasizes, the qualitative implication which is so

strong in theiotes. Perhaps, however, the substitution is not altogether felicitous. "Divinity," in its contrast with "Deity," may have a certain weakness of connotation clinging to it, which would unsuit it to represent theiotes here. It is quite true that the two terms, "Divinity" and "Deity," are the representatives in Latin Patristic writers respectively of the Greek theiotes and theotes. Augustine (The City of God, VII, 1; compare X, 1) tells us that "Deity" was coined by Christian writers as a more accurate rendering of the Greek theotes than the current "Divinity." But it does not follow that because "Deity" more accurately renders theotes, therefore "Divinity" is always the best rendering of theiotes. The stress laid by the Greek Fathers on the employment of theotes to express the "Deity" of the Persons of the Trinity was in sequence to attempts which were being made to ascribe to the Son and the Spirit a reduced "Divinity"; and it was the need the Latin Fathers felt in the same interests which led them to coin "Deity" as a more accurate rendering, as they say, of theotes. Meanwhile theiotes and "Divinity" had done service in the two languages, the former as practically, and the latter as absolutely, the only term in use to express the idea of "Deity." Theotes is very rare in classical Greek, "Deity" non- existent in classical Latin. To represent theiotes uniformly by "Divinity," if any reduced connotation at all clings to "Divinity," would therefore be to represent it often very inadequately. And that is the case in the present passage. What Paul says is clearly made known by God’s works, is His everlasting power and all the other everlasting attributes which form His Godhead and constitute His glory.

It is theotes which occurs in Col 2:9. Here Paul declares that "all the fullness of the Godhead" dwells in Christ "bodily." The phrase "fullness of the Godhead" is an especially emphatic one. It means everything without exception which goes to make up the Godhead, the totality of all that enters into the conception of Godhood. All this, says Paul, dwells in Christ "bodily," that is after such a fashion as to be manifested in connection with a bodily organism. This is the distinction of Christ: in the Father and in the Spirit the whole plenitude of the Godhead dwells also, but not "bodily"; in them it is not manifested in connection with a bodily life. It is the incarnation which Paul has in mind; and he tells us that in the incarnate Son, the fullness of the Godhead dwells. The term chosen to express the Godhead here is the strongest and the most unambiguously decisive which the language affords. Theiotes may mean all that theotes can mean; on monotheistic lips it does mean just what theotes means; but theotes must mean the utmost that either term can mean. The distinction is, not that theotes refers to the essence and theiotes to the attributes; we cannot separate the essence and the attributes. Where the essence is, there the attributes are; they are merely the determinants of the essence. And where the attributes are, there the essence is; it is merely the thing, of the kind of which they are the determinants. The distinction is that theotes emphasizes that it is the highest stretch of Divinity which is in question, while theiotes might possibly be taken as referring to Deity at a lower level. It it not merely such divinity as is shared by all the gods many and lords many of the heathen world, to which "heroes" might aspire, and "demons" attain, all the plenitude of which dwells in Christ as incarnate; but that Deity which is peculiar to the high gods; or, since Paul is writing out of a monotheistic consciousness, that Deity which is the Supreme God alone. All the fullness of supreme Deity dwells in Christ bodily. There is nothing in the God who is over all which is not in Christ. Probably no better rendering of this idea is afforded by our modern English than the term "Godhead," in which the qualitative notion still lurks, though somewhat obscured behind the individualizing implication, and which in any event emphasizes precisely what Paul wishes here to assert —that all that enters into the conception of God, and makes God what we mean by the term "God," dwells in Christ, and is manifested in Him in connection with a bodily organism.

Benjamin B. Warfield

GODLESS

god’-les: This word is not found in the text of the King James Version. It is found, however, in Apocrypha (2 Macc 7:34, "O godless (the Revised Version (British and American) "unholy") man"). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes the word "godless" for the word "hypocrite" in the following passages: Job 8:13; 13:16; 15:34; 17:8; 20:5; 27:8; 34:30; 36:13; Pr 11:9; Isa 33:14. the Revised Version (British and American) does not seem to be consistent in carrying out the idea of "godless" for "hypocrite," for in Isa 9:17; 10:6; Ps 35:16 this same Hebrew word chaneph is translated "profane." The principal idea lying at the root of the word is that of pollution and profanity; a condition of not merely being without God but assuming an attitude of open and blatant opposition toward God. The godless man is not merely the atheistic, unbelieving or even irreligious, but the openly impious, wicked and profane man. Indeed it can hardly be rightly claimed that the idea of hypocrisy is involved in the meaning of the word, for the "godless" man is not the one who professes one thing and lives another, but the one who openly avows not only his disbelief in, but his open opposition to, God. Doubtless the idea of pollution and defilement is also to be included in the definition of this word; see Jer 3:9; Nu 35:33; Da 11:31.

William Evans

GODLINESS; GODLY

god’-li-nes, god’-li (eusebeia, eusebes, eusebos): In the Old Testament the word rendered "godly" in Ps 4:3; 32:6 (chacidh) is literally, "kind," then "pious" (the Revised Version, margin renders it in the former passage, "one that he favoreth"). Sometimes in both the Old Testament and the New Testament a periphrasis is employed, "of God," "according to God" (e.g. "godly sorrow," 2Co 7:10). Godliness, as denoting character and conduct determined by the principle of love or fear of God in the heart, is the summing up of genuine religion. There can be no true religion without it: only a dead "form" (2Ti 3:5). The term is a favorite one in the Pastoral Epistles. The incarnation is "the mystery of godliness" (1Ti 3:16).

James Orr

GODS

(’elohim; theoi):

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Superhuman Beings (God and Angels)

2. Judges, Rulers

3. Gods of the Nations

4. Superiority of Yahweh to Other Gods

5. Regulations Regarding the Gods of the Nations

6. Israel’s Tendency to Idolatry

II. IN THE APOCRYPHA

III. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

The Hebrew plural ‘elohim is generally known as the plural of "majesty" and is the ordinary name for God. The meaning of the plural seems to be "plenitude of powers." It denotes the fullness of those attributes of power which belonged to the Divine Being. Thus it is usually translated in the singular, "God," when referring to the God of Israel. When reference is made to the gods of the other nations the word is translated in the plural, "gods." The heathen nations usually had a plurality of gods. Among the Semites it was customary for one nation or tribe to have its own particular god. Often there were many tribes, or families, or communities, in one nation, each having a particular god. Thus, even among Semites a nation may have many gods and be polytheistic. Among the other nations, Iranian, Hamitic, etc., there were always a number of deities, sometimes a multitude. There are many references to these in the Old Testament. In a few cases where the plural is used, the singular would be better, e.g. Ge 3:5 the King James Version; Ex 32:4,8,23; Ru 1:15 the King James Version; Jud 17:5; 18:24; 1Sa 17:43. This, however, might be disputed.

I. In the Old Testament.

1. Superhuman Beings (God and Angels):

The following are the more important usages of the word in the Old Testament: The translation of Ps 8:5 is disputed. The Septuagint and the King James Version translate it "angels," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version, "God," with "angels" in the margin. The Epistle to the He has the word "angels." This seems to be more in keeping with the Old Testament ideas of the relation between God, men and angels. Ge 1:26 has the plural "us," but it is not certain to whom it refers, most probably to the angels or mighty ones which surrounded the throne of God as servants or counselors; compare Job 38:7, and see SONS OF GOD. In Ps 97:7 the expression "worship him, all ye gods," may possibly refer to the gods of the nations, but more probably to the angels or mighty ones.

2. Judges, Rulers:

Judges, rulers, are regarded "either as Divine representatives at sacred places, or as reflecting Divine majesty and power" (see BDB, under the word). Ex 21:6 might better be translated as in the margin, "the judges." These were men appointed to represent God and adjudicate on important matters of law. Septuagint has "Criterion of God." In Ex 22:8 the word is used in the same sense, and 22:9 would also be better translated "the judges"; 22:28 likewise. See also 1Sa 2:25; Ps 82:1,6, where the reference is to those who act as judges.

3. Gods of the Nations:

(1) The ancestors of Israel "beyond the River" had their gods (Jos 24:14 f). While there is no mention of idolatry before the Deluge, the ancestors and kindred of Abraham were idolaters. Ur of the Chaldees was the center for the worship of Sin, the Moon-god. Many others were worshipped in the various cities of Babylon.

See BABYLONIA.

(2) The gods of Laban and his family (Ge 31:30,32; 35:2,4) were household gods or teraphim, and were stolen by Rachel and carried off in her flight with Jacob.

See TERAPHIM.

(3) Gods of Egypt: For many centuries before the time of Abraham there had been numerous objects of worship in Egypt. Many of these were animals, birds and natural objects. Horus, the hawk, was one of the earliest of all. The cat, the bull, etc., were worshipped at times. The plagues of Egypt were specially directed against these wretched deities (Nu 33:4; Ex 12:12). Yahweh took vengeance on all the gods of Egypt. These terrible events showed that "Yahweh is greater than all gods" (Ex 18:11). He redeemed His people from the nations and its gods (2Sa 7:23). Jeremiah predicted the time when Yahweh should destroy the gods of Egypt (Jer 43:12 f; 46:25).

(4) Of the gods of the Amorites (Jud 6:10) no names are given, but they probably were the same as the gods of the Canaanites.

(5) The gods of the Canaanites were Nature-gods, and their worship was that of the productive and chiefly reproductive powers of Nature. Their service was perhaps the most immoral and degrading of all. The high places and altars of the different Baals, Ashtoreths, etc., were numerous throughout Canaan. These deities were always represented by images and Moses makes frequent reference to them with warnings against this seductive worship (De 7:25; 12:3,10,31; 13:7; 20:18; 29:18; 32:16, etc.).

See also IDOLATRY; BAAL; ASHTORETH; ASHERAH, etc.

(6) Gods of the Philis: The champion Goliath cursed David by his gods (1Sa 17:43). Perhaps it would be better rendered "god." Saul's and his son's armor was put into the house of their gods (1Ch 10:10).

See also DAGON; BAALZEBUB.

(7) The two golden calves erected by Jeroboam at Da and Bethel to keep the people from going to Jerusalem to worship are called gods (1Ki 12:28; 2Ch 13:8 f).

See CALF, GOLDEN.

(8) The gods of Damascus: Ben-hadad was accustomed to worship in the house of the god Rimmon (2Ki 5:18). No other names are mentioned, but from 2Ch 28:23 it is clear that there were many gods in Syria.

See RIMMON.

(9) Solomon's many wives worshipped their own gods, and he provided the means for their worship. Chief among these were Chemosh of Moab and Molech of Ammon (1Ki 11:2,4,8).

See CHEMOSH; MOLECH.

(10) The mixed peoples transplanted into Samaria by Sargon had their various gods and mingled their service with that of Yahweh, after being taught by a priest of Yahweh. The names of some of these gods were Succoth-benoth, Nergal, Ashima, Nibhaz, Tartak, Adrammelech (2Ki 17:29,30,31,33). See separate articles.

(11) Of the gods of Seir, which were brought to Jerusalem by Amaziah, the names are not given (2Ch 25:14).

(12) The gods of the nations conquered by Sennacherib and his fathers, namely, Hamoth, Arpad, Sepharvaim, Hena, Ivvah (2Ki 18:33-35; 19:13). Also those conquered by Sennacherib's fathers, Gozan, Haran, Rezeph, Eden or Telassar (2Ki 19:12; Isa 36:18,19,20; 2Ch 32:13 f).

(13) Gods of Moab are mentioned in Ru 1:15; 1Ki 11:1,7. Possibly Ru 1:15 should be translated "god."

See CHEMOSH.

(14) Gods of Babylon: The graven images of her gods referred to in Isa 21:9; 42:17; Bel and Nebo mentioned in Isa 46:1; other gods of silver and gold (Ezr 1:7; Da 4:8,9,18; 5:4,11,14,23).

(15) Nineveh's gods are merely referred to in Na 1:14. Sennacherib was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god when slain by his sons (2Ki 19:37).

(16) The coastlands or borders and peninsulas of the Aegean Sea had numerous idol gods, shrines and devotees. Isaiah challenges them to prove that they are gods (Isa 41:22 f).

Yahweh was "greater than all gods" (Ex 15:11; 18:11); "God of gods, and Lord of lords" (De 10:14,17); "The Mighty One" (Jos 22:22); "to be feared above all gods" (1Ch 16:25; 2Ch 2:5; Ps 96:4 f);

4. Superiority of Yahweh to Other Gods:

"King above all gods" (Ps 95:3; 97:7,9; 86:8; 135:5; 136:2; 138:1; Jer 10:11; Ze 2:11; Da 2:18,47). Jeremiah advances so far toward a pure and well-defined monotheism that he speaks of all other gods as "not gods." They have no existence to him (Jer 2:11; 5:7; 16:20). A similar position is taken in Isa 41; 43, etc.

5. Regulations Regarding the Gods of the Nations:

The laws of Moses give no uncertain sound concerning them. The Decalogue begins: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Whatever may be the exact meaning of this, it is perfectly clear that Israel was to have nothing to do with any God but Yahweh (Ex 20:3; De 5:7). No images shall be made of them (Ex 20:4,23; 34:17; Le 19:4; De 5:8 f). No mention shall be made of them (Ex 23:13; Jos 23:7). They are not to be worshipped but destroyed (Ex 23:24). They are to make no covenant with the people or their gods would be a snare to them (Ex 23:32; De 6:14; 7:4,25). A curse will follow any defection from Yahweh to them (De 11:28; 28:14 ff; 12:3,10; 13:7; 20:18; 29:17). These gods are an abomination to Yahweh (De 12:31; 20:18; 29:17; 32:37; Eze 7:20; 1Ki 11:5; 2Ki 23:13). They are to be as foreign gods to Israel (1Sa 7:3 f; Jos 24:20,23; Jud 10:16; 2Ch 14:3; 33:15).

6. Israel’s Tendency to Idolatry:

The constant tendency of Israel to go after other gods was first made manifest at Sinai (Ex 32:1,4,8,23,11; 34:15). Hosea says (11:2), "The more the prophets called them, the more they went from them." Ezekiel declares (16:3), "The Amorite was thy father, and thy mother was a Hittite," referring doubtless to the idolatrous taint in the blood of Israel. The tendency manifested itself also at Baal-peor where Israel was led into the licentious rites of the Moabites (Nu 25:2 f). Moses saw the taint in the blood, foresaw the danger and repeatedly warned them (De 17:3; 18:20; 29:26; 30:17; 31:18). Perhaps the most striking passages in De are chapters 13; 28; 30, where are pictured the consequences of going after other gods. Joshua also warns them (23:7), and the history of the period of the Judges is the story of their periodical defection from Yahweh and the punishment resulting therefrom (Jud 2:12,17,19; 5:8; 10:6 f; 1Sa 8:8). Solomon himself gave an impetus in that direction (1Ki 11:5-8). After the disruption, the religion of the Northern Kingdom became very corrupt (1Ki 14:9; 2Ch 13:8 f). The golden calves of Jeroboam opened the door for an inrush of idols and other gods. Ahab’s marriage to Jezebel threatened to wipe out Yahweh-worship and substitute Baal-worship, and, but for the powerful ministry of Elijah and Elisha, might have effected such a result. Partly checked for a time, the evil broke out in other

forms, and even the preaching of Amos and Hosea failed to turn the tide of idolatry. The result was the destruction of the kingdom (2Ki 17:7 ff; Jer 3:6-8; 1Ch 5:25). The Southern Kingdom fared better. Other gods were countenanced by Rehoboam, Abijah, Athaliah, Jehoram, Ahaz, Amon, Manasseh, Jehoiakim, etc. Reform movements were attempted by Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah, but did not wholly avail. In the reign of Manasseh the nation plunged into the worship of other gods. The ministries of Isaiah, Jeremiah, etc., availed not to stop the tide (2Ch 34:25; Jer 11:13; 5:19; 2Ki 22:17; Jer 1:16; 19:4; 7:6; 13:10; 16:11; 44:5,8). The nation was carried into exile because of its going after other gods (2Ki 22:17; De 29:25 f). The captivity had its desired effect. The Israel that returned and perpetuated the nation never again lapsed into the worship of other gods.

II. In the Apocrypha.

The Apocrypha reiterates much of the Old Testament teaching: the defection of Israel (2 Esdras 1:6); the gods of the nations (Judith 3:8; 8:18); the gods which their fathers worshipped (Judith 5:7 f); the sin of Israel (Additions to Esther 14:7). The Book of The Wisdom of Solomon refers to the "creatures which they supposed to be gods" (12:27; 13:2,3,10; 15:15). Mention is made of the gods of Babylon (Baruch 1:22; 6:6-57 passim; Bel and the Dragon 1:27).

III. In the New Testament.

The expression "gods" occurs in six places in the New Testament:

(1) Jesus, in reply to the Pharisees, who questioned His right to call Himself the son of God, quoted Ps 82:6: "I said, Ye are gods." He argues from this that if God Himself called them gods to whom the word of God came, i.e. the judges who acted as representatives of God in a judicial capacity, could not He who had been sanctified and sent into the world justly call Himself the Son of God? It was an argumentum ad hominem (Joh 10:34-37).

(2) When Paul and Barnabas preached the gospel in Lystra they healed a certain man who had been a cripple from birth. The Lycaonians, seeing the miracle, cried out in their own dialect, "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men. And they called Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercury" (Ac 14:11 f). Their ascription of deity to the apostles in such times shows their familiarity with the Greek pantheon.

(3) As Paul preached Jesus and the resurrection at Athens the people said he seemed to be a setter forth of strange gods. The conception of only one God seemed to be wholly foreign to them (Ac 17:18).

(4) In 1Co 8:5 Paul speaks of "gods many, and lords many," but the context shows that he did not believe in the existence of any god but one; "We know that no idol is anything in the world."

(5) While at Ephesus, Paul was said to have "persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they are no gods, that are made with hands" (Ac 19:26).

(6) The Galatians had been "in bondage to them that by nature are no gods" (Ga 4:8). Indirect references are also found in Ac 17:16, where Paul observed the city full of idols. Likewise in Ro 1:22 f, 25 ff. Paul refers to the numerous gods of the heathen world. These were idols, birds, four-footed beasts and creeping things. The results of this degrading worship are shown in the verse following.

See also IDOLATRY; GOD, NAMES OF.

J. J. Reeve

GODSPEED

god'-sped (chairo): "Godspeed" occurs only in 2 Joh 1:10,11 the King James Version as the translation of chairein, the infin. of chairo, and is rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "greeting." It means "rejoice," "be of good cheer," "be it well with thee"; chaire, chairete, chairein, were common forms of greeting, expressive of good-will and desire for the person's prosperity, translated in the Gospels, "Hail!" "All Hail!" (Mt 26:49; 27:29; 28:9, etc.); chairein is the Septuagint for shalom (Isa 48:22; 57:21; compare 2 Macc 1:10). "Godspeed" first appears in Tyndale's version; Wycliffe had "heil!" Rheims "God save you."

In the passage cited Christians are forbidden thus to salute false teachers who might come to them. The injunction does not imply any breach of charity, since it would not be right to wish anyone success in advocating what was believed to be false and harmful. We should be sincere in our greetings; formal courtesy must yield to truth, still courteously, however, and in the spirit of love.

W. L. Walker

GOEL

go'-el (go'el, "redeemer"): Goel is the participle of the Hebrew word gal'al ("to deliver," "to redeem") which aside from its common usage is frequently employed in connection with Hebrew law, where it is the technical term applied to a person who as the nearest relative of another is placed under certain obligations to him.

(1) If a Jew because of poverty had been obliged to sell himself to a wealthy "stranger or sojourner," it became the duty of his relatives to redeem him. Compare Le 25:47 ff and the article JUBILEE.

(2) The same duty fell upon the nearest kinsman, if his brother, being poor, had been forced to sell some of his property. Compare Le 25:23 ff; Ru 4:4 ff, and the article JUBILEE.

(3) It also devolved upon the nearest relative to marry the ú childless widow of his brother (Ru 3:13; Tobit 3:17).

(4) In Nu 5:5 ff a law is stated which demands that restitution be made to the nearest relative, and after him to the priest, if the injured party has died (Le 6:1).

(5) The law of blood-revenge (Blut-Rache) made it the sacred duty of the nearest relative to avenge the blood of his kinsman. He was called the go'el ha-dam, "the avenger of blood." This law was based upon the command given in Ge 9:5 f: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," and was carried out even if an animal had killed a man; in this case, however, the payment of a ransom was permitted (Ex 21:28). A clear distinction was made between an accidental and a deliberate murder. In both cases the murderer could find refuge at the altar of the sanctuary; if, however, the investigation revealed presumptuous manslaughter, he was taken from the altar to be put to death (Ex 21:12 ff; 1Ki 1:50; 2:28). In Nu 35:9 ff definite regulations as to the duties of the Goel are given. Six cities were to be appointed as "cities of refuge," three on each side of the Jordan. The congregation has judgment over the murderer. There must be more than one witness to convict a man. If he is found guilty, he is delivered to the Goel; if murder was committed by accident he is permitted to live within the border of the city of refuge; in case the manslayer leaves this city before the death of the high priest, the avenger of blood has a right to slay him. After the death of the high priest the murderer may return to his own city. Ransom cannot be given for the life of a murderer; no expiation can be made for a murder but by the blood of the murderer (De 19:4 ff; Jos 20; 2Sa 14:6). According to the law the children of a murderer could not be held responsible for the crime of their father (De 24:16; 2Ki 14:6), but see 2Sa 21:1 ff. The order in which the nearest relative was considered the Goel is given in Le 25:48 f: first a brother, then an uncle or an uncle's son, and after them any other near relative. This order was observed in connection with (1) above, but probably also in the other cases except (4).

For the figurative use of Goel ("redeemer") see Ps 119:154; Pr 23:11; Job 19:25; Isa 41:14. See also AVENGE; MURDER; REFUGE, CITIES OF.

Arthur L. Breslich

GOG

gog (gogh; Goug):

(1) A son of Joel, and descendant of the tribe of Reuben (1Ch 5:4).

(2) The prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal (Eze 38:2 f; 39:1-16). His territory was known as the land of Magog, and he was the chief of those northern hordes who were to make a final onslaught upon Israel while enjoying the blessings of the Messianic age. He has been identified with Gagi, ruler of Sakhi, mentioned by Ashurbanipal, but Professor Sayce thinks the Hebrew name corresponds more closely to Gyges, the Lydian king, the Gugu of the cuneiform inscriptions. According to Ezekiel's account Gog's army included in its numbers Persia, Cush, Put, Gomer or the Cimmerians, and Togarmah, from the extreme North. They are represented as a vast mixed horde from the far-off parts of the North, the limits

of the horizon, completely armed and equipped for war. They were to come upon the mountains of Israel and cover the land like a cloud. Their purpose is plunder, for the people of Israel are rich and dwell in towns and villages without walls. His coming, which had been prophesied by the seers of Israel, shall be accompanied by a theophany and great convulsions in Nature. A panic shall seize the hosts of Gog, rain, hailstones, pestilence, fire and brimstone shall consume them. Their bodies shall be food for the birds, their weapons shall serve as firewood for seven years and their bones shall be buried East of the Jordan in Hamon-gog and thus not defile the holy land. The fulfillment of this strange prophecy can never be literal. In general it seems to refer to the last and desperate attempts of a dying heathenism to overturn the true religion of Yahweh, or make capital out of it, profiting by its great advantages.

(3) In Re 20:7 Satan is let loose and goes to the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to muster his hosts for the final struggle against God. In Ezekiel the invasion of Gog occurs during the Messianic age, while in Revelation it occurs just at the close of the millennium. In Ezekiel, Gog and Magog are gathered by Yahweh for their destruction; in Re they are gathered by Satan. In both cases the number is vast, the destruction is by supernatural means, and is complete and final.

See MAGOG.

J. J. Reeve

GOIIM

goi’-yim (goyim): This word, rendered in the King James Version "nations," "heathen," "Gentiles," is commonly translated simply "nations" in the Revised Version (British and American). In Ge 14:1 where the King James Version has "Tidal, king of nations," the Revised Version (British and American) retains in the text the Hebrew "Goiim" as a proper name. Some identify with Gutium. The Hebrew word is similarly retained in Jos 12:23.

GOING; GOINGS

go’-ing, go’-ingz: Besides, occasionally, forms of the common words for "go" (see Go), for "going" and "goings," the Hebrew has ‘ashshur (’ashur, ‘ashur), "step," motsa’, totsa’oth, "goings out," "outgoings." The word "goings" is sometimes used literally, as in Nu 33:2, "Moses wrote their goings out" (Hebrew motsa’)." Going up," ma‘aleh, is in many passages rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (as in Nu 34:4; 2Sa 15:30 the King James Version) "ascent," as e.g. Jos 15:7; Jud 1:36; Ne 12:37 (the American Standard Revised Version only). In Eze 44:5, the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "egress" (way out or place of exit) for "going forth." "The goings out (place of exit; hence, boundary) of it" (Nu 34:4,5,9,12 the King James Version) occurs frequently. The verbal forms bo’, mabho’, also me‘al (Da 6:14), are used of the sunset, "the going down of the sun." Thus Jos 8:29 the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version "as soon as the sun was down."

In the New Testament, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "going out" for "gone

out" (sbennumi) (Mt 25:8); "going up" for "ascending" (Lu 19:28); "going in" for "coming in" (Ac 9:28); "going about" for "wandering" (1Ti 5:13); "seeking" for "going about" (Ro 10:3).

Metaphorically: "Goings" is used for a man's ways or conduct (Ps 17:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "steps"; Ps 40:2; Pr 14:15, etc.). In Ps 17:5 "Hold up my goings in thy paths, that my footsteps slip not" becomes in the Revised Version (British and American) "My steps have held fast to thy paths, my feet have not slipped"; Pr 5:21, "He pondereth all his goings," is in the Revised Version (British and American) "He maketh level all his paths," in "weigheth carefully"; conversely, in Ps 37:23, the Revised Version (British and American) has "goings" for "steps"; in Jas 1:11 "goings" for "ways." In the important prophetic passage, Mic 5:2, it is said of the Ruler from Bethlehem, "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting," the Revised Version (British and American) "are from of old, from everlasting," margin "from ancient days." Of God it is said in Hab 3:6 "His ways are everlasting," the Revised Version (British and American) "His goings were as of old," margin "His ways are everlasting."

W. L. Walker

GOLAN; GAULONITIS

go'-lan (golan), (Gaulanitis): Golan was a city in the territory allotted to Manasseh in Bashan, the most northerly of the three cities of refuge East of the Jordan (De 4:43; Jos 20:8); assigned with its "suburbs" to the Gershonite Levites (Jos 21:27; 1Ch 6:71). It must have been a great and important city in its day; but the site cannot now be determined with any certainty. It was known to Josephus (Ant., XIII, xv, 3). Near Golan Alexander was ambushed by Obodas, king of the Arabians; and his army, crowded together in a narrow and deep valley, was broken in pieces by the multitude of camels (BJ, I, iv, 4). This incident is located at Gadara in Ant, XIII, xiii, 5. Later, Golan was destroyed by Alexander. It had already given its name to a large district, Gaulonitis (BJ, III, iii, 1, 5; IV, i, 1). It formed the eastern boundary of Galilee. It was part of the tetrarchy of Philip (Ant., XVII, viii, 1; XVIII, iv, 6). The city was known to Eusebius as "a large village," giving its name to the surrounding country (Onomasticon, under the word Gaulon). This country must have corresponded roughly with the modern Jaulan, in which the ancient name is preserved. The boundaries of the province today are Mt. Hermon on the North, Jordan and the Sea of Galilee on the West, Wady Yarmuk on the South, and Nahr 'Allan on the East. This plateau, which in the North is about 3,000 ft. high, slopes gradually southward to a height of about 1,000 ft. It is entirely volcanic, and there are many cone-like peaks of extinct volcanoes, especially toward the North It affords good pasturage, and has long been a favorite summer grazing-ground of the nomads. Traces of ancient forests remain, but for the most part today it is treeless. To the East of the Sea of Galilee the soil is deep and rich. Splendid crops of wheat are grown here, and olives flourish in the hollows. The country is furrowed by deep valleys that carry the water southwestward into the Sea of Galilee. This region has not yet been subjected to thorough examination, but many important ruins have been found, which tell of a plentiful and prosperous population in times long past. The best description of these, and of the region generally, will be found in Schumacher's The Jaulan, and Across the Jordan. To him also we owe the excellent maps which carry us eastward to the province of el-Chauran.

Schumacher inclines to the belief that the ancient Golan may be represented by Sahm el-Jaulan, a large village fully 4 miles East of Nahr ‘Allan, and 4 miles Southeast of Tsil. The extensive ruins probably date from early in the Christian era. The buildings are of stone, many of them of Spacious dimensions, while the streets are wide and straight. The inhabitants number not more than 280. The surrounding soil is rich and well watered, bearing excellent crops. The present writer, after personal examination, corroborates Dr. Schumacher’s description. Standing in the open country, it would be seen from afar; and it was easily accessible from all directions.

W. Ewing

GOLD

gold (zahabh; chrusos):

1. Terms:

No metal has been more frequently mentioned in Old Testament writings than gold, and none has had more terms applied to it. Among these terms the one most used is zahabh. The Arabic equivalent, dhahab, is still the common name for gold throughout Palestine, Syria and Egypt. With zahabh frequently occur other words which, translated, mean "pure" (Ex 25:11), "refined" (1Ch 28:18), "finest" (1Ki 10:18), "beaten" (1Ki 10:17), "Ophir" (Ps 45:9).

Other terms occurring are: paz, "fine gold" (Job 28:17; Ps 19:10; 21:3; 119:127; Pr 8:19; So 5:11,15; Isa 13:12; La 4:2); charuts (Ps 68:13; Pr 3:14; 8:10,19; 16:16; Zec 9:3); kethem, literally, "carved out" (Job 28:16,19; 31:24; Pr 25:12; La 4:1; Da 10:5); ceghor (1Ki 6:20; 7:50; Job 28:15); betser (in the King James Version only: Job 22:24; the Revised Version (British and American) "treasure").

2. Sources:

Sources definitely mentioned in the Old Testament are: Havilah (Ge 2:11,12); Ophir (1Ki 9:28; 10:11; 22:48; 1Ch 29:4; 2Ch 8:18; 9:10; Job 22:24; 28:16; Ps 45:9; Isa 13:12); Sheba (1Ki 10:2,10; 2Ch 9:1,9; Ps 72:15; Isa 60:6; Eze 27:22; 38:13); Arabia (2Ch 9:14). We are not justified in locating any of these places too definitely. They probably all refer to some region of Arabia.

The late origin of the geological formation of Palestine and Syria precludes the possibility of gold being found in any quantities (see METALS), so that the large quantities of gold used by the children of Israel in constructing their holy places was not the product of mines in the country, but was from the spoil taken from the inhabitants of the land (Nu 31:52), or brought with them from Egypt (Ex 3:22). This gold was probably mined in Egypt or India (possibly Arabia), and brought by the great caravan routes through Arabia to Syria, or by sea in the ships of Tyre (1Ki 10:11,22; Eze 27:21,22). There is no doubt about the Egyptian sources. The old workings in the gold-bearing veins of the Egyptian desert and the

ruins of the buildings connected with the mining and refining of the precious metal still remain. This region is being reopened with the prospect of its becoming a source of part of the world's supply. It might be inferred from the extensive spoils in gold taken from the Midianites (£100,000 HDB, under the word) that their country (Northwestern Arabia) produced gold. It is more likely that the Midianites had, in turn, captured most of it from other weaker nations. The tradition that Northwestern Arabia is rich in gold still persists. Every year Moslem pilgrims, returning from Mecca by the Damascus route, bring with them specimens of what is supposed to be gold ore. They secure it from the Arabs at the stopping-places along the route. Samples analyzed by the writer have been iron pyrites only. No gold-bearing rock has yet appeared. Whether these specimens come from the mines mentioned by Burton (The Land of Midian Revisited) is a question.

3. Forms:

Gold formed a part of every household treasure (Ge 13:2; 24:35; De 8:13; 17:17; Jos 22:8; Eze 28:4). It was probably treasured (a) in the form of nuggets (Job 28:6 the Revised Version, margin), (b) in regularly or irregularly shaped slabs or bars (Nu 7:14,20,84,86; Jos 7:21,24; 2Ki 5:5), and (c) in the form of dust (Job 28:6). A specimen of yellow dust, which the owner claimed to have taken from an ancient jar, unearthed in the vicinity of the Hauran, was once brought to the writer's laboratory. On examination it was found to contain iron pyrites and metallic gold in finely divided state. It was probably part of an ancient household treasure. A common practice was to make gold into jewelry with the dual purpose of ornamentation and of treasuring it. This custom still prevails, especially among the Moslems, who do not let out their money at interest. A poor woman will save her small coins until she has enough to buy a gold bracelet. This she will wear or put away against the day of need (compare Ge 24:22,53). It was weight and not beauty which was noted in the jewels (Ex 3:22; 11:2; 12:35). Gold coinage was unknown in the early Old Testament times.

4. Uses:

(1) The use of gold as the most convenient way of treasuring wealth is mentioned above.

(2) Jewelry took many forms: armlets (Nu 31:50), bracelets (Ge 24:22), chains (Ge 41:42), crescents (Jud 8:26), crowns (2Sa 12:30; 1Ch 20:2), earrings (Ex 32:2,3; Nu 31:50; Jud 8:24,26), rings (Ge 24:22; 41:42; Jas 2:2).

(3) Making and decorating objects in connection with places of worship: In the description of the building of the ark and the tabernacle in Ex 25 ff, we read of the lavish use of gold in overlaying wood and metals, and in shaping candlesticks, dishes, spoons, flagons, bowls, snuffers, curtain clasps, hooks, etc. (one estimate of the value of gold used is £90,000; see HDB). In 1Ki 6 ff; 1Ch 28 f; 2Ch 1 ff are records of still more extensive use of gold in building the temple.

(4) Idols were made of gold (Ex 20:23; 32:4; De 7:25; 29:17; 1Ki 12:28; Ps 115:4; 135:15; Isa 30:22; Re 9:20).

(5) Gold was used for lavish display. Among the fabulous luxuries of Solomon’s court were his gold drinking-vessels (1Ki 10:21), a throne of ivory overlaid with gold (1Ki 10:18), and golden chariot trimmings (1Ch 28:18). Sacred treasure saved from votive offerings or portions dedicated from booty were principally gold (Ex 25:36; Nu 7:14,20,84,86; 31:50,52,54; Jos 6:19,24; 1Sa 6:8,11,15; 2Sa 8:11; 1Ch 18:7,10,11; 22:14,16; Mt 23:17). This treasure was the spoil most sought after by the enemy. It was paid to them as tribute (1Ki 15:15; 2Ki 12:18; 14:14; 16:8; 18:14-16; 23:33,15), or taken as plunder (2Ki 24:13; 25:15).

5. Figurative:

Gold is used to symbolize earthly riches (Job 3:15; 22:24; Isa 2:7; Mt 10:9; Ac 3:6; 20:33; Re 18:12). Finer than gold, which, physically speaking, is considered non-perishable, typifies incorruptibility (Ac 17:29; 1Pe 1:7,18; 3:3; Jas 5:3). Refining of gold is a figure for great purity or a test of (Job 23:10; Pr 17:3; Isa 1:25; Mal 3:2; 1Pe 1:7; Re 3:18). Gold was the most valuable of metals. It stood for anything of great value (Pr 3:14; 8:10,19; 16:16,22; 25:12), hence was most worthy for use in worshipping Yahweh (Ex 25 ff; Re 1:12,13,10, etc.), and the adornment of angels (Re 15:6) or saints (Ps 45:13). The head was called golden as being the most precious part of the body (So 5:11; Da 2:38; compare "the golden bowl," Ec 12:6). "The golden city" meant Babylon (Isa 14:4), as did also "the golden cup," sensuality (Jer 51:7). A crown of gold was synonymous with royal honor (Es 2:17; 6:8; Job 19:9; Re 4:4; 14:14). Wearing of gold typified lavish adornment and worldly luxury (Jer 4:30; 10:4; 1Ti 2:9; 1Pe 3:3; Re 17:4). Comparing men to gold suggested their nobility (La 4:1,2; 2Ti 2:20).

James A. Patch

GOLDEN CALF

gold’-’-n: Probably a representation of the sun in Taurus.

See ASTROLOGY, 7; CALF, GOLDEN.

GOLDEN CITY

gold’-’-n: The translation "golden city" (Isa 14:4) is an attempt to render the received text (madhhebhah), but can hardly be justified. Almost all the ancient versions read (marhebhah), a word which connotes unrest and insolence, fitting the context well.

GOLDEN NUMBER

gold’-’-n num’-ber: Used in the regulation of the ecclesiastical calendar, in the "Metonic cycle" of 19 years, which almost exactly reconciles the natural month and the solar year.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

GOLDSMITH

gold'-smith (tsreph): Goldsmiths are first mentioned in connection with the building of the tabernacle (Ex 31:4; 36:1). Later, goldsmiths' guilds are mentioned (Ne 3:8,32). The art of refining gold and shaping it into objects was probably introduced into Palestine from Phoenicia (see CRAFTS). Examples of gold work from the earliest Egyptian periods are so numerous in the museums of the world that we do not have to draw on our imaginations to appreciate the wonderful skill of the ancient goldsmiths. their designs and methods were those later used by the Jews. The goldsmiths' art was divided into

(1) the refining of the impure gold (Job 28:1; Pr 17:3; 25:4; 27:21; Isa 1:25; Mal 3:3);

(2) shaping of objects,

(a) casting idols (Nu 33:52; Ho 13:2),

(b) making graven images (2Ch 34:3,4; Jer 10:14; Na 1:14),

(c) the making of beaten or turned work (Ex 25:18),

(d) plating or overlaying (Ex 25:11; 1Ki 6:20),

(e) soldering (Isa 41:7),

(f) making of wire (Ex 28:6; 39:3).

Most of these processes are carried on in Bible lands today. In Damascus there is a goldsmiths' quarter where the refining, casting and beating of gold are still carried on, probably in much the same way as in Solomon's time. Jews are found among the goldsmiths. In Beirut, it is a Jew who is especially skilled in making refiners' pots. Daily, one can see the gold being refined, cast into lumps, beaten on an anvil, rolled between rollers into thin sheets, cut into narrow strips (wire), and wound on bobbins ready for the weaver. are houses in Damascus and Aleppo still possessing beautiful gold overlaid work on wooden walls and ceilings, the work of goldsmiths of several centuries ago. grazing-ground of the nomads. Traces of ancient forests remain, but for the most part today it is treeless. To the East of the Sea of Galilee the soil is deep and rich. Splendid crops of wheat are grown here, and olives flourish in the hollows. The country is furrowed by deep valleys that carry the water southwestward into the Sea of Galilee. This region has not yet been subjected to thorough examination, but many important ruins have been found, which tell of a plentiful and prosperous population in times long past. The best description of these, and of the region generally, will be found in Schumacher's The Jaulan, and Across the Jordan. To him also we owe the excellent maps which carry us eastward to the province of el-Chauran.

James A. Patch

GOLGOTHA

gol’-go-tha (Golgotha, from "a skull"): In three references (Mt 27:33; Mr 15:22; Joh 19:17) it is interpreted to mean kraniou topos, "the place of a skull." In Lu 23:33 the King James Version it is called "Calvary," but in the Revised Version (British and American) simply "The skull." From the New Testament we may gather that it was outside the city (Heb 13:12), but close to it (Joh 19:20), apparently near some public thoroughfare (Mt 27:39), coming from the country (Mr 15:21). was a spot visible, from some points, from afar (Mr 15:40; Lu 23:49).

1. The Name:

Four reasons have been suggested for the name Golgotha or "skull":

(1) That it was a spot where skulls were to be found lying about and probably, therefore, a public place of execution. This tradition apparently originates with Jerome (346-420 AD), who refers to (3), to condemn it, and says that "outside the city and without the gate there are places wherein the heads of condemned criminals are cut off and which have obtained the name of Calvary—that is, of the beheaded." This view has been adopted by several later writers. Against it may be urged that there is no shadow of evidence that there was any special place for Jewish executions in the 1st century, and that, if there were, the corpses could have been allowed burial (Mt 27:58; Joh 19:38), in conformity with Jewish law (De 21:23) and with normal custom (Josephus, BJ, IV, v, 2).

(2) That the name was due to the skull-like shape of the hill—a modern popular view. No early or Greek writer suggests such an idea, and there is no evidence from the Gospels that the Crucifixion occurred on a raised place at all. Indeed Epiphanius (4th century) expressly says: "There is nothing to be seen on the place resembling this name; for it is not situated upon a height that it should be called (the place) of a skull, answering to the place of the head in the human body." It is true that the tradition embodied in the name Mons Calvary appears as early as the 4th century, and is materialized in the traditional site of the Crucifixion in the church of the Holy Sepulcher, but that the hill was skull-like in form is quite a modern idea. Guthe combines (2) and (3) and considers that a natural skull-like elevation came to be considered, by some folklore ideas, to be the skull of the first man. One of the strangest ideas is that of the late General Gordon, who thought that the resemblance to a skull lay in the contours of the ground as laid down in the ordinance survey map of Jerusalem.

(3) That the name is due to an ancient pre-Christian tradition that the skull of Adam was found there. The first mention of this is by Origen (185-253 AD), who himself lived in Jerusalem 20 years. He writes: "I have received a tradition to the effect that the body of Adam, the first man, was buried upon the spot where Christ was crucified," etc. This tradition was afterward referred to by Athanasius, Epiphanius, Basil of Caesarea, Chrysostom and other later writers. The tomb and skull of Adam, still pointed out in an excavated chamber below the traditional Calvary, marks the survival of this tradition

on the spot. This is by far the most ancient explanation of the name Golgotha and, in spite of the absurdity of the original tradition about Adam, is probably the true one.

(4) The highly improbable theory that the Capitolium of AElia Capitolina (the name given by Hadrian to his new Jerusalem) stood where the Church of the Holy Sepulcher now is, and gave rise to the name Golgotha, is one which involves the idea that the site first received the name Golgotha in the 2nd century, and that all the references in the Gospels were inserted then. This is only mentioned to be dismissed as incompatible with history and common sense.

2. The Site:

With regard to the position of the site of the Crucifixion (with which is bound up the site of the Tomb) the New Testament gives us no indication whatever; indeed, by those who abandon tradition, sites have been suggested on all sides of the city—and West Two views hold the field today:

(1) that the site of the Crucifixion, or at any rate that of the Tomb itself, is included within the precincts of the Church of the Holy Sepulcher; and

(2) that a prominent, rounded, grassy hill above the so-called "Grotto of Jeremiah," Northeast of the Modern Damascus Gate, has at least a very high probability of being the true site. It is impossible here to go into the whole question, which requires minute and long elaboration, but excellent review of the whole evidence may be consulted in "Golgotha and the Holy Sepulcher," by the late Sir Charles W. Wilson, of PEF. Here only a few points can be touched upon.

(1) For the traditional view it may be said that it seems highly improbable that so sacred a spot as this, particularly the empty tomb, could have been entirely forgotten. Although it is true that Jews and Christians were driven out of Jerusalem after the second great revolt (130-33 AD), yet GentileChristians were free to return, and there was no break long enough to account for a site like this being entirely lost. Indeed there are traditions that this site was deliberately defiled by pagan buildings to annoy the Christians. Eusebius, at the time of Constantine, writes as if it were well known that a Temple of Aphrodite lay over the tomb.

He gives an account of the discovery of the spots still venerated as the Golgotha and the Tomb, and of the erection of churches in connection with them (Life of Constantine, III, 25-40). From the time of Constantine there has been no break in the reverence paid to these places. Of the earlier evidence Sir C. Wilson admits (loc. cit.) that "the tradition is so precarious and the evidence is undoubtedly so unsatisfactory as to raise serious doubts."

The topographical difficulties are dealt with in the JERUSALEM. It is difficult for the visitor to Jerusalem sufficiently to realize that the center of gravity of the city has much changed; once it was on the Hill Ophel, and the southern slopes, now bare, were in Christ’s time crammed with houses; in later times, from the 4th century, it was the Church of the Holy Sepulcher round which the city tended to

center. There is no insurmountable difficulty in believing that the site of the Crucifixion may be where tradition points out. As Sir C. Wilson says at the end of his book, "No objection urged against the sites (i. e. Golgotha and the Tomb) is of such a convincing nature that it need disturb the minds of those who accept, in all good faith, the authenticity of the places which are hallowed by the prayers of countless pilgrims since the days of Constantine" (loc. cit.).

(2) The so-called "Skull Hill" or "Green Hill" appears to have appealed first to Otto Thenius (1842), but has received its greatest support through the advocacy of the late Col. Conder and of the late Dr. Selah Merrill, U.S.A. consul at Jerusalem. The arguments for this site are mainly:

(a) its conspicuous and elevated position—a position which must impress every reverent pilgrim as strikingly suitable for an imaginary reconstruction of the scene. The very greenness of the hill—it is the first green spot in the neighborhood of the city—may influence the subconsciousness of those who have been brought up from childhood to think of the "green hill far away," as the popular hymn puts it. When, however, we consider the question historically, there is not the slightest reason to expect that the crucifixion of Jesus, one of many hundreds, should have been dramatically located in a setting so consonant with the importance with which the world has since learned to regard the event. There is no evidence whatever that the crucifixion was on a hill, much less on such a conspicuous place.

(b) The supposed resemblance to a human skull strikes many people, but it may be stated without hesitation that the most arresting points of the resemblance, the "eyeholes" and the rounded top, are not ancient; the former are due to artificial excavations going back perhaps a couple of centuries. Probably the whole formation of the hill, the sharp scarp to the South and the 10 or more feet of earth accumulated on the summit are both entirely new conditions since New Testament times.

(c) The nearness of the city walls and the great North road which make the site so appropriate today are quite different conditions from those in New Testament times. It is only if the present North wall can be proved to be on the line of the second wall that the argument holds good. On this see JERUSALEM.

(d) An argument has been based upon a supposed tradition that this spot was the Jewish place of stoning. This so-called tradition is worthless, and not a trace of it can be found outside interested circles, and even if it were the "place of stoning," it would be no argument for its being "Golgotha." To the Oriental, with his great respect for traditional sites, the church of the Holy Sepulcher, covering at once the Tomb, the Calvary, and other sacred spots, will probably always appeal as the appropriate spot: to the western tourist who wishes to visualize in the environs of Jerusalem in an appropriate setting the great world’s tragedy, such a site as this "Skull Hill" must always make the greater appeal to his imagination, and both may find religious satisfaction in their ideas; but cold reason, reviewing the pro’s and con’s, is obliged to say "not proven" to both, with perhaps an admission of the stronger case for the traditional spot.

E. W. G. Masterman

GOLIATH

go-li’-ath (golyath; Goliath):

(1) The giant of Gath, and champion of the Philistine army (1Sa 17:4-23; 21:9; 22:10; 2Sa 21:19; 1Ch 20:5). He defied the armies of Israel, challenging anyone to meet him in single combat while the two armies faced each other at Ephesdammim. He was slain by the youthful David. Goliath was almost certainly not of Philistine blood, but belonged to one of the races of giants, or aboriginal tribes, such as the Anakim, Avvim, Rephaim, etc. The Avvim had lived at Philistia, and most probably the giant was of that race. His size was most extraordinary. If a cubit was about 21 inches, he was over 11 feet in height; if about 18 inches, he was over 9 feet in height. The enormous weight of his armor would seem to require the larger cubit. This height probably included his full length in armor, helmet and all. In either case he is the largest man known to history. His sword was wielded by David to slay him and afterward carried about in his wanderings, so it could not have been excessively heavy. The story of his encounter with David is graphic, and the boasts of the two champions were perfectly in keeping with single combats in the Orient.

(2) The Goliath of 2Sa 21:19 is another person, and quite probably a son of the first Goliath. He was slain by Elhanan, one of David’s mighty men. The person mentioned in 1Ch 20:5 is called Lachmi, but this is almost certainly due to a corruption of the text. "The brother of Goliath" is the younger Goliath and probably a son of the greater Goliath, who had four sons, giants, one of them having 24 fingers and toes. See ELHANAN; LAHMI.

J. J. Reeve

GOMER (1)

go’-mer (gomer): Given in Ge 10:2 f; 1Ch 1:5 f as a son of Japheth. The name evidently designates the people called Gimirra by the Assyrians, Kimmerians by the Greeks. They were a barbaric horde of Aryans who in the 7th century BC left their abode in what is now Southern Russia and poured. through the Caucasus into Western Asia, causing serious trouble to the Assyrians and other nations. One division moved eastward toward Media, another westward, where they conquered Cappadocia and made it their special abode. They fought also in other parts of Asia Minor, conquering some portions. The Armenian name for Cappadocia, Gamir, has come from this people. In Eze 38:6 Gomer is mentioned as one of the northern nations.

George Ricker Berry

GOMER (2)

go’-mer (gomer; Gamer): Wife of Hosea. Hosea married Gomer according to Divine appointment, and this was the beginning of God’s word to him (Ho 1:3; 3:1-4). She was to be a wife of whoredom and they were to have children of whoredom. This need not mean that at the time of marriage she was thus

depraved, but she had the evil taint in her blood, had inherited immoral instincts. These soon manifested themselves, and the unfaithful, depraved wife of the prophet went deeper into sin. She seems to have left him and become the slave of her paramour (Ho 3:1). Hosea is now commanded by Yahweh to buy her back, paying the price of the ordinary slave. The prophet keeps her in confinement and without a husband for some time. This experience of the prophet was typical of Israel's unfaithfulness, of Israel's exile, and of God bringing her back after the punishment of the exile.

See HOSEA.

J. J. Reeve.

GOMORRAH

go-mor'-a ('amorah; Septuagint and New Testament Gomorra, or Gomorra; Arabic Ghamara, "to overwhelm with water"): One of the CITIES OF THE PLAIN (which see) destroyed by fire from heaven in the time of Abraham and Lot (Ge 19:23-29). It was located probably in the plain South of the Dead Sea, now covered with water. See ARABAH; CITIES OF THE PLAIN; DEAD SEA. De Saulcy, however, with others who place the Cities of the Plain at the North end of the Dead Sea, fixes upon Khumran (or Gumran), marked on the Survey Map of Palestine North of Ras Feshkeh, where there are ruins about a mile from the Dead Sea. But there is nothing to support this view except the faint resemblance of the name and the inconclusive arguments placing the Cities of the Plain at that end of the sea.

George Frederick Wright

GOOD

good (Tobh, Tubh, yaTabh; agathos, agathon, kalos, kalon): In English "good" is used in various senses, most of which are represented in the Bible.

(1) In the Old Testament the commonest word is Tobh, occurring very frequently and translated in a great variety of ways. Of the different shades of meaning, which frequently run into each other, the following may be distinguished:

(a) Possessing desirable qualities, beneficial, agreeable, e.g. "good for food" (Ge 2:9); "We will do thee good" (Nu 10:29); Who will show us any good?" (Ps 4:6); "good tidings of good" (Isa 52:7).

(b) Moral excellence, piety: "to know good and evil" (Ge 3:22); "that which is right and good" (De 6:18; 1Sa 12:23); "good and bad" (1Ki 3:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "evil"); "Depart from evil and do good" (Ps 37:27); "a good man" (Pr 12:2); compare Isa 5:20; Mic 6:8, etc.

(c) Kind, benevolent: "The men were very good unto us" (1Sa 25:15); "Give thanks unto Yahweh; for he is good" (1Ch 16:34); "the good Yahweh" (2Ch 30:18); "God is good to Israel" (Ps 73:1); "Yahweh is good to all" (Ps 145:9), etc.

(d) Serviceable, adequate, sufficient: "saw the light that it was good" (Ge 1:4; so 1:10,12 etc.); "not good that the man should be alone" (Ge 2:18); in the frequent phrase, "if it seem good" (1Ch 13:2; Es 5:4, etc.), sometimes rendered, "if it please" (Ne 2:5,7; Es 1:19, etc.).

(e) Not small or deficient (full, complete): "a good old age" (Ge 15,15; 25:8); "a good dowry" (Ge 30:20); "good ears," "years," "kine" (Ge 41:24,26,35); "good understanding" (1Sa 25:3); "good trees —"land" (2Ki 3:19,25), etc. (f) Not blemished, fair, honorable: "tender and good" (Ge 18:7); "good kids" (Ge 27:9); "good report" (1Sa 2:24; compare 2Ki 20:3; Jer 24:2); and the renderings "fair" (Ge 26:7, etc.), "beautiful" (2Sa 11:2), "pleasant" (2Ki 2:19), etc.

(g) Pleasure-giving, happy: "glad of heart" (1Ki 8:66; Es 5:9); sometimes in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) translated "merry" (Jud 16:25; 1Sa 25:36; 2Sa 13:28; Pr 15:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "cheerful"), etc.

Changes that may be noted in the Revised Version (British and American) are such as, "good" for "ready" (Isa 41:7); "I have no good beyond thee" for "My goodness extendeth not to thee" (Ps 16:2); "goodly" for "good" (Ps 45:1); "good" for "goodness" (Ps 107:9); "good" for "well" (Zec 8:15).

Tubh means something good, e.g. "the good of the land" (Ge 45:18,20; De 6:11; Job 21:16, the Revised Version (British and American) "prosperity").

YaTabh, "to do good," occurs several times, as, I will surely do thee good" (Ge 32:12); "to do good" (Le 5:4); "Make your ways and your doings good," the Revised Version (British and American) "amend" (Jer 18:11; Ze 1:12, etc.). Numerous other Hebrew words are rendered "good" in various verbal connections and otherwise, as "to bring good tidings" (2Sa 4:10; Isa 40:9, etc.); "take good heed" (De 2:4; 4:15; Jos 23:11); "make good" (Ex 21:34), etc.; "good will" (ratson, De 33:16; Mal 2:13); "what good?" the Revised Version (British and American) "what advantages?" (kishron, Ec 5:11); "good for nothing," the Revised Version (British and American) "profitable" (tsaleah, Jer 13:10), etc. In Jer 18:4, "as seemed good to the potter," the word is yahsar, which means literally, "right."

(2) In the New Testament the words most frequently translated "good" are agathos and kalos. The former, agathos, denotes good as a quality, physical or moral. Thus, "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good" (Mt 5:45); "good gifts" (Mt 7:11); "Good Master (the Revised Version (British and American) "Teacher") .... Why callest thou me good? none is good save one" (Mr 10:17 f; Lu 18:18 f; compare Mt 19:16 f); "they that have done good" (Joh 5:29). Sometimes it is equivalent to "kind" (thus Tit 2:5 the Revised Version (British and American)); to agathon is "that which is good" (Lu 6:45; Ro 7:13; 1Th 5:15; 1Pe 3:13), etc.; "that which is honest," the Revised Version (British and American) "honorable "(2Co 13:7); "meet" (Mt 15:26; Mr 7:27); "worthy," the Revised Version (British and

American) "honorable" (Jas 2:7); agathon is "a good thing," as "good things to them that ask him" (Mt 7:11); Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (Joh 1:46), etc.; agathoergeo (1Ti 6:18), and agathopoieo (Mr 3:4; Ac 14:17), etc., "to do good."

Kalos is properly, "beautiful," "pleasing," "useful," "noble," "worthy" in a moral sense, e.g. "that they may see your good works" (Mt 5:16); "She hath wrought a good work on me" (Mt 26:10; Mr 14,6); "the good shepherd" (Joh 10:11,14); "Many good works have I showed you" (Joh 10:32); "good and acceptable before God" (1Ti 5:4; the Revised Version (British and American) omits "good"); "the good fight" (2Ti 4:7); "good works" (Tit 2:7); "the good word of God" (Heb 6:5). But it is often practically equivalent to agathos, e.g. "good fruit" (Mt 3:10); "good ground" (Mt 13:23); "good seed" (Mt 13:24); but the idea of useful may underlie such expressions; to kalon is properly "that which is beautiful." It occurs in Ro 7:18,21; 1Th 5:21, "Hold fast that which is good." In Ro 7 it seems to be used interchangeably with to agathon. In Ro 5:7, "the good man" (ho agathos) is distinguished from "a righteous man" (dikaios): "For the good man some one would even dare to die" (compare Ro 7:16; Heb 5:14; Jas 4:17); kalos, "well," "pleasantly," is translated "good" (Lu 6:27; Jas 2:3); kalodidaskalos (Tit 2:3), "teachers of good things," the Revised Version (British and American) "of that which is good."

"Good" occurs in the rendering of many other Greek words and phrases, as eudokia, "good pleasure" (Eph 1:9); "good will" (Lu 2:14; Php 1:15); sumphero, "to bear together," "not good to marry" (Mt 19:10), the Revised Version (British and American) "expedient"; philagathos, "a lover of good" (Tit 1:8); chrestologia, "good words" (Ro 16:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "smooth speech," etc.).

The following changes in the Revised Version (British and American) may be noted. In Lu 2:14 for "men of good will" (eudokia) the Revised Version (British and American) reads "in whom he is well pleased," margin "good pleasure among men, Greek men of good pleasure." The meaning is "men to whom God is drawing nigh in goodwill or acceptance"; compare Lu 4:19, "the acceptable year of the Lord"; 4:43, "Preach the good tidings of the kingdom of God." In Mt 11:5; Lu 4:43; 7:22; 1Pe 1:25 and (American Standard Revised Version) Re 14:6 "the gospel" is changed into "good tidings." In Mt 18:8 f; Mr 9:43,15,47; Lu 5:39, good is substituted for "better"; on the last passage in notes "Many authorities read ‘better’ "; in 1Co 9:15 "good .... rather" for "better"; "good" is substituted in Lu 1:19; 8:1 and Ac 13:32 for "glad"; in Ac 6:3 for "honest"; in Heb 13:9 for "a good thing." In 2Th 1:11, all the good pleasure of his goodness" becomes "every desire of goodness" (m "Gr good pleasure of goodness"); in 1Ti 3:2, "good" (kosmios) becomes "orderly." There are many other instances of like changes.

See GOODNESS; GOOD, CHIEF.

W. L. Walker

GOOD, CHIEF

What this consisted in was greatly discussed in ancient philosophy. Varro enumerated 288 answers to

the question. By Plato "the good" was identified with God.

In the Old Testament while the "good" of the nation consisted in earthly well-being or prosperity (De 28 etc.), that of the individual was to be found only in God Himself (Ps 16:2 the Revised Version (British and American), "I have no good beyond thee"; Ps 41:1-5; 43:5; 73:25-28; Jer 31:33 f; Hab 3:17-19). This implied godly conduct (Mic 6:8, etc.), and led to the experience described as "blessedness" (Ps 1, etc.; Jer 17:7, etc.). It is the "Wisdom" extolled in Pr 1:20; 8:1 f (compare Ecclesiasticus 1:1 f; 5:1 f), elsewhere described as "the fear of Yahweh." That God alone can be the true "good" of man is implied in the fact that man was created in the image of God (Ge 1:27).

In the New Testament the true "good" is placed by Jesus in "the kingdom of God" (Mt 6:33; 13:44 f, etc.). This means nothing earthly merely (Mt 6:19), but heavenly and eternal. It implies the Old Testament conception that God is the true "good"; for to seek the Kingdom supremely means whole-hearted devotion to God as our heavenly Father and to His righteousness. It was also spoken of by Jesus, as sonship to the heavenly Father (Mt 5:45, etc.). This "good" is not something merely to be given to men, but must be sought after and won through taking up a right attitude toward God and our fellows, cherishing the Love that God is, and acting it out in kindness and righteousness, in resemblance to our God and Father (Mt 5:43-48; here Ge 1:27 is implied).

In some of the epistles Christ is represented as the true "good" (Php 3:8 f; Col 3:1-4,11). This is because in Him God was manifested in His Truth and Grace; in Him "the Kingdom" was present; through His cross the world is so reconciled to God that men can find acceptance and rest in Him as their "good"; Christ Himself in the Spirit is our Life; in Him we have "God with us." Having God as our "good," nothing but good, in the truest and highest sense, can come to us. Even the most seemingly adverse things are turned into good "to them that love God" (Ro 8:28).

Our true "good" is found thus in God even in this present life; but its fullness can be realized only in the eternal life beyond. Placing our "good" in God leads to such life in devotion to the "good" that God is, as tends to bring all that is best to this present world. It is men’s failure to do this that is the source of our misery (Jer 2:13, etc.). The ultimate ideal is that God shall be "all in all" (1Co 15:28).

W. L. Walker

GOODLINESS

good’-li-nes: This word is found in Isa 40:6 as the translation of checedh, commonly translated "mercy," "kindness," etc.: "All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness (beauty, charm, comeliness) thereof is as the flower of the field." The rendering is retained by the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version as appropriate in this place; checedh is frequently translated goodness.’ In Isa 40:6 Septuagint has doxa, "glory" (so also 1Pe 1:24), which also fitly expresses the idea of the passage.

GOODLY

good’-li Tobh; kalos, lampros): In the Old Testament various words are translated "goodly," the most of them occurring only once; Tobh (the common word for "good") is several times translated "goodly," chiefly in the sense of form or appearance e.g "a goodley child" (Ex 2:2); "that goodly mountain" (De 3:25); yapheh ("fair") is similarly translated in Ge 39:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "comely," and mar’oh in 2Sa 23:21. Other words, such as ‘addir imply excellence, honor, etc., e.g. Eze 17:23, "bear fruit, and be a goodly cedar"; hodh, "his goodly horse" (Zec 10:3); others imply beauty, ornament, such as peer "goodly bonnets," the Revised Version (British and American) "headtires" (Ex 39:28); shaphar ("bright," "fair"), "a goodly heritage" (Ps 16:6); once ‘El ("God of might") is employed, the Revised Version (British and American) "cedars of God," margin "goodly cedars" (Ps 80:10); renanim ("joyous soundings or shoutings") is translated in Job 39:13 "goodly wings," probably from the sound made in flying or flapping; the English Revised Version has "The wing of the ostrich rejoiceth," the American Standard Revised Version (wings) "wave proudly." For "goodly castles" (Nu 31:10) the Revised Version (British and American) has "encampments"; "goodly vessels" (2Ch 32:27) for "pleasant jewels"; "goodly" is substituted for "good" (Ps 45:1; So 1:3); "goodly things" for "all the goods" (Ge 24:10); "goodly frame," the American Standard Revised Version for "comely proportion" (Job 41:12).

In the New Testament kalos ("beautiful") is translated "goodly" in Mt 13:45, "goodly pearls" and Lu 21:5 "goodly stones"; lampros ("bright") in Jas 2:2, "goodly apparel," the Revised Version (British and American) "fine clothing," and Re 18:14, "dainty and goodly" the Revised Version (British and American) "dainty and sumptuous." In Heb 11:23, the Revised Version (British and American) ~bstitutes "goodly" for "proper."

"Goodly" occurs in Apocrypha, 1 Esdras 4:18; Judith 8:7 (horaios); 2 Macc 9:16, "goodly gifts," kallistos, the Revised Version (British and American) "goodliest."

W. L. Walker

GOODLY TREES

(peri‘ets hadhar, "the fruit (the King James Version "boughs") of goodly (= beautiful or noble) trees"): One of the four species of plants used in the Feast of Tabernacles (Le 23:40). In the Talmud (Cukkdh 35a) this is explained to be the citron (Citrus medica) known in Hebrew as ‘ethrogh. This tradition is ancient, at least as old as the Maccabees. Josephus (Ant., XIII, xiii, 5) records that Alexander Janneus, while serving at the altar during this feast, was pelted by the infuriated Jews with citrons. This fruit also figures on coins of this period. It is probable that the citron tree (Malum Persica) was imported from Babylon by Jews returning from the captivity. A citron is now carried in the synagogue by every orthodox Jew in one hand, and the lalabh (of myrtle, willow, and palm branch) in the other, on each day of the Feast of Tabernacles.

Originally the "goodly trees" had a much more generic sense, and the term is so interpreted by the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

See FEASTS AND FASTS; BOOTH.

E. W. G. Masterman

GOODMAN

good’-man (’ish; oikodespotes): The word occurs once in the Old Testament and is a translation of the ordinary word for "man," ‘ish (Pr 7:19). "The goodman is not at home," so the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but the American Standard Revised Version, more correctly, "The man is not at home"; i.e. the husband is not at home; the Geneva and Douay versions have "My husband is not at home": so Wycliffe; while the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has "There is not a man in her house." In the New Testament "goodman" is a translation of oikodespotes. This word occurs 12 times in the Synoptists, and nowhere else. the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have 3 translations of the word, the American Standard Revised Version 2. In 4 places the King James Version has "goodman" while the American Standard Revised Version has "householder" or "‘master of the house" (Mt 20:11; 24:43; Lu 12:39; 22:11). In all the other places, it is translated "householder" or "master of the house." the Revised Version (British and American) retains "goodman" in Mr 14:14 and Lu 22:11. The word liteerally means "master of the house," or "husband." The adjective is a mark of respect, and is used somewhat as our word "Mr.," an appellative of respect or civility. Relationship by marriage was distinguished by this epithet, as "good-father," "good-sister," both in England and Scotland. Later the adjective lost its distinguishing force and was swallowed up in the word.

J. J. Reeve

GOODNESS

good’-nes: This word in the Old Testament is the translation of Tobh (Ex 18:9; Ps 16:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "good"; 23:6), etc.; of Tubh (Ex 33:19; Ps 31:19; Jer 31:14; Ho 3:5), etc.; of checedh (Ex 34:6), "abundant in goodness," the English Revised Version "plenteous in mercy," the American Standard Revised Version "abundant in loving kindness"; "The goodness of God endureth continually," the Revised Version (British and American) "mercy," the American Standard Revised Version "loving kindness" (Ps 52:1), etc.

In the New Testament it is the translation of chrestotes ("usefulness," benignity); "the riches of his goodness" (Ro 2:4; 11:22, thrice); of chrestos ("useful," "benign," "kind," in Lu 6:35); "The goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance" (Ro 2:4); of agathosune (found only in the New Testament and Septuagint and writings based thereon), "full of goodness." (Ro 15:14); "gentleness, goodness, faith" (Ga 5:22); "in all goodness and righteousness and truth" (Eph 5:9); "all the good pleasure of his goodness," the Revised Version (British and American) "every desire of goodness." (2Th 1:11).

The thought of God as good and the prominence given to "good" and "goodness" are distinctive features of the Bible. In the passage quoted above from Ga 5:22, "goodness" is one of the fruits of the indwelling Spirit of God, and in that from Eph 5:9 it is described as being, along with righteousness and truth, "the fruit of the light" which Christians had been "made" in Christ. Here, as elsewhere, we are reminded that the Christian life in its truth is likeness to God, the source and perfection of all good. 2Th 1:11 regards God Himself as expressing His goodness in and through us.

See GOOD; GOOD, CHIEF.

W. L. Walker

GOODS

goodz (rekhush, Tubh; ta huparchonta): In the Old Testament rekhush ("substance") is most frequently translated "goods," as in Ge 14:11,12,16,21, etc.; Tubh is also 3 times so translated in the King James Version (Ge 24:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "goodly things," margin "all the goods"; Ne 9:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "good things"; Job 20:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "prosperity"). Other words, are ‘on (Job 20:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "wealth"); Chayil ("force," Nu 31:9; Ze 1:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "wealth"); Tobh (De 28:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "for good"; Ec 5:11); mela’khah ("work," Ex 22:8,11); nikhcin (Aramaic "riches," Ezr 6:8; 7:26); Qinyan, "getting" (Eze 38:12 f). We have ta huparchonta (literally, "the things existing") in Mt 24:47, "ruler over all his goods," the Revised Version (British and American) "all that he hath," etc. Agathos is translated "goods" in Lu 12:18 f; skeuos ("instrument") in Mt 12:29; Mr 3:27; ta sa ("the things belonging to thee") in Lu 6:30; ousia ("substance") in Lu 15:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "substance"; huparxis ("existence," "substance") in Ac 2:45; plouteo ("to be rich") in Re 3:17, the Revised Version (British and American) "have gotten riches." In the Revised Version (British and American) "goods" stands instead of "carriage" (Jud 18:21), of "stuff" (Lu 17:31), of "good" (1 Joh 3:17). "Goods" was used in the sense of "possessions" generally; frequently in this sense in Apocrypha (1 Esdras 6:32); ta huparchonta (Tobit 1:20); Ecclesiasticus 5:1, "Set not thy heart upon thy goods" (chrema), etc.

W. L. Walker

GOPHER WOOD

go’-fer wood (‘atse ghopher): The wood from which Noah’s ark was made (Ge 6:14). Gopher is a word unknown elsewhere in Hebrew or allied languages. Lagarde considered that it was connected with gophrith, meaning "brimstone," or "pitch," while others connect it with kopher, also meaning "pitch"; hence, along both lines, we reach the probability of some resinous wood, and pine, cedar, and cypress have all had their supporters. A more probable explanation is that which connects gopher with the modern Arabic kufa, a name given to the boats made of interwoven willow branches and palm leaves with a coating of bitumen outside, used today on the rivers and canals of Mesopotamia. In the Gilgames

story of the flood it is specially mentioned that Noah daubed his ark both inside and out with a kind of bitumen.

See DELUGE OF NOAH.

E. W. G. Masterman

GORE

gor (naghach): "Gore" occurs only three times in the King James Version, namely, Ex 21:28,31 bis, "if an ox gore a man or a woman," etc.; in 21:29,32,36, the King James Version has "push" (with his horn), the Revised Version (British and American) "gore." The same verb in Piel and HithpaeI is elsewhere translated "push" and "pushing" (De 33:17, "He shall push the peoples," the Revised Version, margin "gore"; 1Ki 22:11; Ps 44:5; Eze 34:21; Da 8:4; 11:40, the Revised Version (British and American) "contend," margin "Hebrew push at," as an ox pushes with his horns so should the king fight—a fitting description of warfare).

GORGEOUS; GORGEOUSLY

gor'-jus, gor'-jus-li (mikhlol; lampros): Mikhlol occurs twice in the Old Testament, translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "most gorgeously" (Eze 23:12); in Eze 38:4, the King James Version translates "all sorts" (of armor), the Revised Version (British and American) "clothed in full armor." Lampros ("shining," "bright"), is only once translated "gorgeous" (Lu 23:11); "Herod .... arrayed him in a gorgeous robe," the Revised Version (British and American) "gorgeous apparel." We have also in Lu 7:25, "They that are gorgeously appareled ([~endoxos, "splendid," "glorious") .... are in kings' courts." They were scarcely to be looked for among the prophets, or in the new community of Jesus.

W. L. Walker

GORGET

gor'-jet: Appears only once in the King James Version (1Sa 17:6), being placed in the margin as an alternative to "target (of brass)" in the description of the armor worn by Goliath of Gath. The Hebrew word thus translated (kidhon) really means a "javelin," and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version here and in 1Sa 17:45 ("Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a javelin"). See ARMOR, sec. I, 4, (3). Gorget, though so rarely used in Scripture and now displaced in our revised versions, occurs not infrequently and in various senses in English literature. In the meaning of "a piece of armor for the gorge or throat" which seems to have been in the mind of King James's translators, it is found in early English writers and down to recent times. Spenser has it in Faerie Queene, IV, iii, 12:

"His weasand-pipe it through his gorget cleft";

Scott, Marmion, V, ii:

"Their brigantines and gorgets light";

and Prescott, Ferdinand and Isabella, III, 47: "The gorget gave way and the sword entered his throat."

T. Nicol.

GORGIAS

gor’-ji-as (Gorgias): A general in the service of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 3:38; 2 Macc 8:9). Lysias, who had been left as regent during the absence of Antiochus in Persia, appointed Gorgias to take the command against Judea in 166 BC. In 1 Macc 4:1-24 is recorded a night attack by Gorgias with 5,000 foot and 1,000 horse upon the camp of Judas Maccabeus in the neighborhood of Emmaus, in which Judas was completely victorious. The victory was all the more striking as the force of Judas was considerably smaller in number and had "not armor nor swords to their minds" (1 Macc 4:6). Later on (164 BC) he held a garrison in Jamnia, and gained a victory over the forces of Joseph and Azarias who, envying the glory of Judas and Jonathan, in direct disobedience to the orders of Judas, attacked Gorgias and were defeated.

Jamnia as given in Josephus, Ant, XII, viii, 6, is probably the correct reading for Idumaea in 2 Macc 12:32. The doings of Gorgias in 2 Macc are recorded with some confusion. He was regarded with special hostility by the Jews. In 2 Macc 12:35 he is described as "the accursed man."

J. Hutchinson

GORTYNA

gor-ti’-na (Gortunai): A city in Crete, next in importance to Gnossus. It is mentioned in 1 Macc 15:23.

See CRETE.

GOSHEN (1)

go’-shen (goshen; Gesem):

1. Meaning of Name:

The region where the Hebrews dwelt in Egypt. If the Septuagint reading Gesem be correct, the word, which in its Hebrew form has no known meaning, may mean "cultivated"—comparing the Arabic root jashima, "to labor." Egyptologists have suggested a connection with the Egyptian word qas, meaning "inundated land" because Goshen was apparently the same region, called by the Greeks the "Arabian nome," which had its capital at Phakousa representing the Egyptian Pa-qas (Brugsch, Geog., I, 298), the name of a town, with the determinative for "pouring forth." Van der Hardt, indeed, more than a century ago (see Sayce, Higher Criticism, 235), supposed the two words to be connected. Dr. Naville in 1887 found the word as denoting the vicinity of Pi-sopt (now Saft el Henneh), 6 miles East of Zagazig—in the form Q-s-m. He concludes that this was the site of Phakousa, but the latter is usually placed at Tell el Faqus, about 15 miles South of ZOAN (which see), and this appears to be the situation of the "City of Arabia" which Silvia, about 385 AD, identifies with Gesse or Goshen; for she reached it in her journey from Heroopolis, through Goshen to Tathnis or Taphnis (Daphnai), and to Pelusium.

2. Situation:

It is generally agreed that Goshen was the region East of the Bubastic branch of the Nile; and in Ps 78:12,43, it seems to be clearly identified with the "field (or pastoral plain) of Zoan," which was probably also the "land of Rameses" mentioned (Ge 47:11) as possessed by Jacob's family (see RAAMSES; ZOAN). Where first mentioned (Ge 45:10), Goshen is promised by Joseph to Jacob as a land fit for flocks, and the Septuagint here reads, "Gesem of Arabia," probably referring to the Arabian nome which took its name from the "desert" which defended the East border of Egypt. In the second notice (Ge 46:28 f), the boundary of the land of Goshen, where Joseph met his father, is called in the Septuagint Heroo(n)-polis, and also (Ge 46:28) "the land of Ramesse(s)"; so that in the 3rd century BC Goshen seems to have been identified with the whole region of the Arabian nome, as far South as Heroopolis which (see PITHOM) lay in Wady Tumeilat. Goshen included pastoral lands (Ge 46:34; 47:1,4,6,27; 50:8) and was still inhabited by the Hebrews at the time of the Exodus (Ex 8:22; 9:26), after which it is unnoticed in the Old Testament. The name, however, applied to other places which were probably "cultivated" lands, including a region in the South of Palestine (Jos 10:41; 11:16), "all the country of Goshen Septuagint Gosom), even unto Gibeon," and a city of Judah (Jos 15:51) in the mountains near Beersheba. These notices seem to show that the word is not of Egyptian origin.

3. Description:

The region thus very clearly indicated was not of any great extent, having an area of only about 900 square miles, including two very different districts. The western half, immediately East of the Bubastic branch of the Nile, stretches from Zoan to Bubastis (at both of which cities records of the Hyksos ruler Apepi have been found), or a distance of about 35 miles North and South. This region is an irrigated plain which is still considered to include some of the best land in Egypt. The description of the land of Rameses (see RAAMSES), in the 14th century BC, shows its fertility; and Silvia says that the land of Goshen was 16 miles from Heroopolis, and that she traveled for two days in it "through vineyards, and balsam plantations, and orchards, and tilled fields, and gardens." The region narrows from about 15 miles near the seashore to about 10 miles between Zagazig and Tell el Kebir on the Southeast of this, a sandy and gravelly desert lies between the Nile plain and the Suez Canal, broadening southward from

near Daphnai (Tell Defeneh) to Wady Tumeilat, where it is 40 miles across East and West. South of this valley an equally waterless desert stretches to Suez, and from the Bitter Lakes on the East to the vicinity of Heliopolis (Southeast of Cairo) on the West. Thus, Wady Tumeilat, which is fertilized by the Nile waters (see PI-HAHIROTH), and contains villages and corn fields, is the only natural route for a people driving with their flocks and herds by which the vicinity of the Red Sea can be reached, the road leading from the South end of the "field of Zoan" near Bubastis, and 40 miles eastward to the "edge of the wilderness" (see ETHAM) and the head of the Bitter Lakes. This physical conformation is important in relation to the route of the Israelites (see EXODUS); and Wady Tumeilat may very possibly be intended to be included in Goshen, as the Septuagint translators supposed.

C. R. Conder

GOSHEN (2)

go’-shen (goshen):

(1) Mentioned as a country (’erets) in the South of Judah distinct from the "hill country," the Negeb and the Shephelah (Jos 10:41; 11:16). Unidentified.

(2) A town in the Southwest part of the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:51), very probably connected in some way with the district (1).

(3) See preceding article.

GOSPEL

gos’-pel (to euaggelion): The word gospel is derived from the Anglo-Saxon word which meant "the story concerning God." In the New Testament the Greek word euaggelion, means "good news." It proclaims tidings of deliverance. The word sometimes stands for the record of the life of our Lord (Mr 1:1), embracing all His teachings, as in Ac 20:24. But the word "gospel" now has a peculiar use, and describes primarily the message which Christianity announces. "Good news" is its significance. It means a gift from God. It is the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins and sonship with God restored through Christ. It means remission of sins and reconciliation with God. The gospel is not only a message of salvation, but also the instrument through which the Holy Spirit works (Ro 1:16).

The gospel differs from the law in being known entirely from revelation. It is proclaimed in all its fullness in the revelation given in the New Testament. It is also found, although obscurely, in the Old Testament. It begins with the prophecy concerning the ‘seed of the woman’ (Ge 3:15), and the promise concerning Abraham, in whom all the nations should be blessed (Ge 12:3; 15:5) and is also indicated in Ac 10:43 and in the argument in Ro 4.

In the New Testament the gospel never means simply a book, but rather the message which Christ and His apostles announced. In some places it is called "the gospel of God," as, for example, Ro 1:1; 1Th 2:2,9; 1Ti 1:11. In others it is called "the gospel of Christ" (Mr 1:1; Ro 1:16; 15:19; 1Co 9:12,18; Ga 1:7). In another it is called "the gospel of the grace of God" (Ac 20:24); in another "the gospel of peace" (Eph 6:15); in another "the gospel of your salvation" (Eph 1:13); and in yet another "the glorious gospel" (2Co 4:4 the King James Version). The gospel is Christ: He is the subject of it, the object of it, and the life of it. It was preached by Him (Mt 4:23; 11:5; Mr 1:14; Lu 4:18 margin), by the apostles (Ac 16:10; Ro 1:15; 2:16; 1Co 9:16) and by the evangelists (Ac 8:25).

We must note the clear antithesis between the law and the gospel. The distinction between the two is important because, as Luther indicates, it contains the substance of all Christian doctrine. "By the law," says he, "nothing else is meant than God’s word and command, directing what to do and what to leave undone, and requiring of us obedience of works. But the gospel is such doctrine of the word of God that neither requires our works nor commands us to do anything, but announces the offered grace of the forgiveness of sin and eternal salvation. Here we do nothing, but only receive what is offered through the word." The gospel, then, is the message of God, the teaching of Christianity, the redemption in and by Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, offered to all mankind. And as the gospel is bound up in the life of Christ, His biography and the record of His works, and the proclamation of what He has to offer, are all gathered into this single word, of which no better definition can be given than that of Melanchthon: "The gospel is the gratuitous promise of the remission of sins for Christ’s sake." To hold tenaciously that in this gospel we have a supernatural revelation is in perfect consistency with the spirit of scientific inquiry. The gospel, as the whole message and doctrine of salvation, and as chiefly efficacious for contrition, faith, justification, renewal and sanctification, deals with facts of revelation and experience.

David H. Bauslin

GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

GOSPELS OF THE CHILDHOOD

child’-hood.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

GOSPELS, SPURIOUS

spu’-ri-us.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

GOSPELS, THE SYNOPTIC

si-nop’-tik:

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Scope of This Article

2. The Gospels in Church Tradition

II. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

1. Nature of the Problem

2. Proposed Solutions

(1) Oral Gospel

(2) Mutual Use

(3) Hypothesis of Sources

(4) Other Sources

III. LITERARY ANALYSIS AND ORAL TRADITION

1. The Problem not Solely a Literary One

2. Influence of Oral Instruction

IV. ORDER OF EVENTS AND TIME OF HAPPENINGS IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

1. Range of Apostolic Witness

2. Bearing on Order

3. Time of Happenings

V. DATING OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

1. Return to Earlier Dating

2. The Material Still Older

VI. THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN ITS BEARINGS ON HISTORICITY OF THE GOSPELS

1. The Jewish and Christian Messiah

2. Originality of the Christian Conception

3. The Messianic Hope

VII. THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ITS BEARINGS ON THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

VIII. THE JESUS OF THE GOSPELS AS THINKER

1. The Ethics of Jesus

2. Jesus as Thinker

IX. THE PROBLEM OF THE GOSPELS

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

1. Scope of Article:

The present article is confined to the consideration of the relations and general features of the first 3 Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke)—ordinarily named "the Synoptic Gospels," because, in contrast with the Fourth Gospel, they present, as embodying a common tradition, the same general view of the life and teaching of Jesus during His earthly ministry, and of His death and resurrection. The Fourth Gospel, in itself and in its relation to the Synoptics, with the Johannine literature and theology generally, are treated in special articles.

See JOHN, GOSPEL OF; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, etc.

2. The Gospels in Church Tradition:

The place of the Gospels in church tradition is secure. Eusebius places the 4 Gospels among the books that were never disputed in the church (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25). It is acknowledged that by the end of the 2nd century these 4 Gospels, and none else, ascribed to the authors whose names they bear, were in universal circulation and undisputed use throughout the church, stood at the head of church catalogues and of all VSS, were freely used, not only by the Fathers of the church (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement, Origen, etc.), but by pagans and heretics, and by these also were ascribed to the disciples of Christ as their authors. Justin Martyr, in the middle of the century, freely quotes from "Memoirs of the Apostles," "which are called Gospels," "composed by the apostles and those that followed them" (1 Apol. 66-67; Dial. with Trypho, 10, 100, 103). What these Gospels were is made apparent by the Diatessaron, or Harmony of Four, of his disciple Tatian (circa 170), constructed from the 4 Gospels we possess. The first to mention Matthew and Mark by name is Papias of Hierapolis (circa 120-30; in Euseb., HE, III, 39). Dr. Sanday is disposed to carry back the extracts from Papias to about 100 AD (Fourth Gospel, 151); Dr. Moffatt likewise says, "These explanations of Matthew and Mark must have been in circulation by the end of the 1st century" (Introduction to Lit. of New Testament, 187). The gist of the testimony of Papias is: "Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though he did not record in order, that which was either said or done by Christ"; "Matthew composed the Oracles (Logia) in Hebrew (Aramaic), and each one interpreted them as he was able." Eusebius evidently took what he quotes about Matthew and Mark from Papias to refer to our present Gospels, but a problem arises as to the relation of the Aramaic "Logia" said to be composed by Matthew to our canonical Greek Gospel, which was the only Gospel of Mt known to the early Fathers. There is no ground for the supposition that the Jewish-Christian GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS (which see) was the original of the Greek Matthew; it was on the other hand derived from it. The Gnostic Marcion used a mutilated Luke. Compare further, below on dating, and for details see special articles on the respective Gospels; also BIBLE; CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

II. The Synoptic Problem.

1. Nature of the Problem:

Arising from their peculiar nature, there has always been a Synoptic problem, ever since the 3 Gospels appeared together in the Canon of the New Testament. No one could read these Gospels consecutively with attention, without being aware of the resemblances and differences in their contents. Each writer sets forth his own account without reference to the other two, and, with the partial exception of Luke (1:1-4), does not tell his readers anything about the sources of his Gospel. A problem thus arose as to the relations of the three to one another, and the problem, though it approaches a solution, is not yet solved. A history of the Synoptic problem will be found in outline in many recent works; the most elaborate and best is in Zahn’s Introduction, III. In it Zahn briefly indicates what the problem was as it presented itself to the church in the earlier centuries, and gives in detail the history of the discussion from the time of Lessing (1778) to the present day. It is not possible within the limits of this article to refer otherwise than briefly to these discussions, but it may be remarked that, as the discussion went on, large issues were raised; every attempt at solution seemed only to add to the difficulty of finding an adequate one; and at length it was seen that no more complex problem was ever set to literary criticism than that presented by the similarities and differences of the Synoptic Gospels.

2. Proposed Solutions:

Of the hypotheses which seek to account for these resemblances and differences, the following are the most important.

(1) Oral Gospel:

The hypothesis of oral tradition: This theory has rather fallen into disfavor among recent critics. Dr. Stanton, e.g., says, "The relations between the first 3 Gospels cannot be adequately explained simply by the influence of oral tradition" (Gospels as Historical Documents, II, 17; similarly Moffatt, in the work quoted 180 ff). Briefly stated, theory is this. It assumes that each of the evangelists wrote independently of the others, and derived the substance of his writing, not from written sources, but from oral narratives of sayings and doings of Jesus, which, through dint of repetition, had assumed a relatively fixed form. The teaching of the apostles, first given in Jerusalem, repeated in the catechetical schools (compare Lu 1:4, the Revised Version (British and American)), and entrusted to the trained memories of the Christian converts, is held to be sufficient to account for the phenomena of the 3 Gospels. The oral Gospel took its essential form in Palestine, and written editions of it would by and by appear in more or less complete form (Lu 1:1). The first distinguished advocate of the oral hypothesis was Gieseler (1818). It was upheld in Britain by Alford and Westcott, and is today advocated, with modifications, by Dr. A. Wright in his Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek (2nd edition, 1908).

(2) Mutual Use:

As old as Augustine, this hypothesis, which assumes the use of one of the Gospels by the other two, has been frequently advocated by scholars of repute in the history of criticism. There have been many variations of theory. Each of the 3 Gospels has been put first, each second, and each third, and each in turn has been regarded as the source of the others. In fact, all possible permutations (6 in number) have been exhausted. As the hypothesis has few advocates at the present day, it is not necessary to give a minute account of these permutations and combinations. Two of them which may be regarded as finally excluded are

(a) those which put Luke first; and

(b) those which put Mark last (the view of Augustine; in modern times, of F. Baur and the Tubingen school).

(3) Hypothesis of Sources:

This is theory which may be said to hold the field at the present time. The tendency in criticism is toward the acceptance of two main sources for the Synoptic Gospels.

(a) One source is a Gospel like, if not identical with, the canonical Gospel of Mark. As regards this 2nd Gospel there is a consensus of opinion that it is prior to the other two, and the view that the 2nd and 3rd used it as a source is described as the one solid result of literary criticism. Eminent critics of various schools of thought are agreed on this point (compare W.C. Allen, Matthew, Pref. vii; F.C. Burkitt, Gospel History and Its Transmission, 37). It has been shown that most of the contents of Mark have been embodied in the other two, that the order of events in Mark has been largely followed by Matthew and Luke, and that the departures from the style of Mark can be accounted for by the hypothesis of editorial amendment.

(b) The other source (now commonly named Q) is found first by an examination of the matter not contained in the 2nd Gospel, which is common to Matthew and Luke. While there are differences as to the extent and character of the 2nd source, there is something like general agreement as to its existence. It is not agreed as to whether this source contained narratives of events, as well as sayings, or whether it was a book of sayings alone (the former is thought to be the more probable view), nor is it agreed as to whether it contained an account of the Passion week (on the differing views of the extent of Q, see Moffatt, op. cit., 197 ff); but while disagreement exists as to these and other points, the tendency, as said, is to accept a "two-source" theory in some form as the only sufficient account of the phenomena of the Gospels.

(4) Other Sources:

To make the source-theory probable, some account must be taken of other sources beyond the two enumerated above. Both the 1st and the 3rd Gospels contain material not borrowed from these sources. There is the fore-history of Mt 1:2, which belongs to that Gospel alone, with other things likewise recorded by Mt (9:27-34; 12:22; 14:28-33; 17:24 ff, etc.). Then not only has Luke a fore-history (chapters 1; 2), but a large part of his Gospel consists of material found nowhere else (e.g. 7:11-16,36-50; 10:25 ff; parables in chapters 15; 16; 18:1-14, etc.). This Sondergut of Matthew and Luke will be more appropriately treated in the articles which deal with these Gospels respectively. Here it is sufficient to point out that the criticism of the Synoptic Gospels is not complete till it has found a probable source

(a) for what is common to them all,

(b) for what is common to any two of them, and

(c) for what is peculiar to each.

The literature on the subject is so voluminous that only a few references can be given. In addition to those named, the following works may suffice to set forth the present condition of the Synoptic problem: B. Weiss, Introduction to New Testament, and other works; Harnack, Luke the Physician, The Sayings of Jesus, The Ac of the Apostles, Date of the Ac of the Apostles and of the Synoptic Gospels (English translations); Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, and works on each of the Synoptic Gospels, especially Studies in the Synoptic Problem, edited by Dr. Sanday.

III. Literary Analysis and Oral Tradition.

1. The Problem Not Solely a Literary One:

Looked at merely as a problem of literary analysis, it is scarcely possible to advance farther than has been done in the works of Harnack, of Sanday and his co-adjutors, and of Stanton, referred to above. The work done has been of the most patient and persevering kind. No clue has been neglected, no labor has been spared, and the interrelations of the three Gospels have been almost exhaustively explored. Yet the problem remains unsolved. For it must not be forgotten that the materials of the Synoptic Gospels were in existence before they assumed a written form. Literary analysis is apt to forget this obvious fact, and to proceed by literary comparison alone. The Gospel was confessedly at first and for some years a spoken Gospel, and this fact has to be taken into account in any adequate attempt to understand the phenomena. It is not enough to say with Dr. Stanton that "the relations of the first three Gospels cannot be adequately explained simply by the influence of oral tradition"; for the question arises, Can the relations between the first three Gospels be explained simply by the results of literary analysis, be it as exhaustive and thorough as it may? Let it be granted that literary analysis has accomplished a great deal; that it has almost compelled assent to the two-source hypothesis; that it has finally made good the priority of Mk; that it has made out a probable source consisting mainly of sayings of Jesus, yet many problems remain which literary analysis cannot touch, at least has not touched. There is the problem of the order of events in the Gospels, which is so far followed by all three. How are we to account for that sequence? Is it sufficient to say, as some do, that Mark set the style of the Gospel narrative, and that the others so far followed that style? All Gospels must follow the method set by Mark, so it is affirmed. But if that is the case, how did Matthew and Luke depart from that copy by writing a fore-history? Why did they compile a genealogy? Why did they give so large a space to the sayings of Jesus, and add so much not contained in the Gospel which, on the hypothesis, set the pattern of what a Gospel ought to be? These questions cannot be answered on the hypothesis that the others simply followed a fashion set by Mark. Sometimes the 2nd Gospel is described as if it were suddenly launched on the Christian world; as if no one had ever heard of the story contained in it before Mark wrote it. From the nature of the case, it is obvious that the church had knowledge of many of the facts in the life of Christ, and was in possession of much of His teaching before any of the Gospels were written. So much is plain from the Epistles of Paul. How many facts about Jesus, and how much of His teaching may be gathered from these epistles, we do not inquire at present. But we do learn much from Paul about the historical Jesus.

2. Influence of Oral Instruction:

The Christian church in its earlier form arose out of the teaching, example and influence of the apostles at Jerusalem. It was based on apostolic testimony as to the life, character, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. That testimony told the church what Jesus had done, what He had taught, and of the belief of the apostles as to what He was, and what He continued to be. We read that the early church "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship" (Ac 2:42). The "teaching" consisted of reminiscences of the Lord, of interpretations of the facts about Jesus and of agreements between these and the Old Testament. The first instruction given to the church was oral. Of this fact

there can be no doubt. How long oral teaching continued we may not say, but it is likely that it continued as long as the apostles dwelt together at Jerusalem. To them an appeal could constantly be made. There was also the strictly catechetical teaching given to the converts, and this teaching would be given after the manner to which they had been accustomed in their earlier education. It consisted mainly in committing accurately to memory, and in repetition from memory (see CATECHIST; CATECHUMEN). There would thus be a stricter tradition, as it was taught in the catechetical classes, and a looser tradition which consisted of as much as the people could carry with them from the preaching of the apostles at the weekly assemblies. Those, besides, who were present at the day of Pentecost, and others present at the feasts at Jerusalem, who had passed under Christian influence, would carry with them on their return to their homes some knowledge of the life and death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus. It may have been a meager Gospel that these carried with them to Antioch, to Rome, or to other cities in which the diaspora dwelt. But that they did carry a Gospel with them is plain, for from their testimony arose the church at Antioch, where the Christians had without question a knowledge of the Gospel, which informed their faith and guided their action.

IV. Order of Events and Time of Happenings in the Synoptic Gospels.

1. Range of Apostolic Witness:

It is known from Ac that the main topic of the preaching of the apostles was the resurrection of the Lord. "With great power gave the apostles their witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus" (Ac 4:33). It is evident, however, that the apostolic witness would not be limited to the events of the Passion week, or to the fact of the resurrection. There would arise a thirst for information regarding the life of Jesus, what He had done, what He had said, what manner of life He had lived, and what teaching He had given. Accounts of Him and of His work would be given by the apostles, and once these accounts were given, they would continue to be given in the same form. Tell a story to a child and he will demand that it be always given in the form in which he first knew it. Hearers of a story are impatient of variations in the subsequent telling of it. Memory is very tenacious and very conservative.

2. Bearing on Order:

It is clear that the first lessons of the apostles were accounts of the Passion week, and of the resurrection. But it went backward to events and incidents in the life of Jesus, and as we read the Synoptic Gospels, we soon see that the order was dictated by the events themselves. They are grouped together for no other reason than that they happened so. Most of the incidents are hung on a geographical thread. In the 2nd Gospel, which seems to preserve most faithfully the traditional order, this is obvious to every attentive reader; but in all the 3 Gospels many of the narratives go in well-established cycles. To take only one illustration, where many might be instanced, the healing of the woman with the issue of blood is represented as occurring in the course of the walk to the house of Jairus (Mr 5:21). The only explanation is that this was the actual mode of its happening. Events happened, incidents arose, in the course of the journeys of Jesus and His disciples, words were also spoken, and in the memories of the disciples, when the journey was recalled, there arose also what had happened in the course of the

journey. In fact, as we follow the journey through Galilee, to the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, through Samaria, down the valley of the Jordan, through Jericho to Jerusalem, we find that the grouping of the material of the Gospels is determined by the facts. Most of what is recorded happened in the course of the journeys, and was borne in the memories of the disciples in the order of its happening. The order, then, is not arbitrary, nor is it the product of reflection; it is the outcome of the facts. It is true that in pursuance of their several plans, Luke sometimes, Matthew frequently, deserts the order of Mark, but it is noteworthy that they never do so together. As Professor Burkitt says, "Matthew and Luke never agree against Mark in transposing a narrative. Luke sometimes deserts the order of Mark, and Matthew often does so; but in these cases Mark is always supported by the remaining Gospel" (op. cit., 36). In Matthew, after 19:1, the events follow each other quite as in Mark.

3. Time of Happenings:

When one studies the rather kaleidoscopic political geography of Palestine in the first 40 years of our era, he will find many confirmations of the historic situation in the Synoptic Gospels. The birth of Jesus was in the time of Herod the Great, when the whole of Palestine was under one government. After the death of Herod, Palestine was under several rulers. Archelaus had possession of Judea until the year 9 AD. Galilee was under Herod Antipas until the year 37, and the tetrarchy of Philip had a distinct government of its own. About the year 40 Palestine was again under one government under Herod Agrippa. Now it is clear that the events of the Gospels happened while Herod Antipas ruled in Galilee and Peraea, and while Pilate was procurator in Judea (see CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, and JESUS CHRIST). Nor is the significance of this environment exhausted by the reference to the time. As Professor Burkitt has shown (op. cit., in his chapter entitled "Jesus in Exile"), in the itinerary recorded in Mr 5, the parts avoided are the dominions of Herod Antipas. It is said in Mr 3:6, "And the Pharisees went out, and straightway with the Herodians took counsel against him, how they might destroy him." The significance of this alliance between the Pharisees and the Herodians is well drawn out by Professor Burkitt in the work cited above. It is simply noted by Mark, and on it the evangelist makes no remark. But the conspiracy had a great effect on the work of Jesus. A little later we find Jesus no more in any of the synagogues. He devotes Himself to the training of the Twelve, and is outside of the dominions of Herod Antipas. It is not to be forgotten that during these months Jesus is an exile from His own land, and it was during that period of exile that the issue of His work became clear to Him, and from the time of the great confession at Caesarea-Philippi He began to tell His disciples of the decease that He should accomplish at Jerusalem (Mt 16:13 ff parallel).

V. Dating of the Synoptic Gospels.

1. Return to Earlier Dating:

The question as to the dates at which the Synoptic Gospels appear in a published form may more suitably be dealt with in connection with the articles on the separate Gospels. It need only be observed here that opinion is tending toward much earlier dates than were common till lately. By all but extreme writers it is now admitted that the first 3 Gospels fall well within the limits of the apostolic age. In the

Preface to his work on Luke (1906), Harnack reminded his readers that 10 years before he had told them that "in the criticism of the sources of the oldest Christianity we are in a movement backward to tradition." The dates he formerly favored were, for Mark between 65 and 70 AD, for Matthew between 70 and 75, for Luke between 78 and 23. Harnack's more recent pronouncement as to the date of Acts, which he states with all the emphasis of italics, "It seems now to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical work were written while Paul was yet alive" (Date of the Ac and the Synoptic Gospels, 124, English translation), must have a determining influence on critical opinion. If Ac were written during the lifetime of Paul (compare Ac 28:30 f), then the 3rd Gospel must have been written earlier. It is likely that Lu had all his material in hand during the imprisonment of Paul at Caesarea. If he made use of the 2nd Gospel, then Mark must have had a still earlier date, and the whole problem of the dating of the Gospels is revolutionized. The essential thing is that the 3 Gospels were probably written and published before the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). There is nothing in their contents that makes this view untenable.

2. The Material Still Older:

It is still to be remembered, however, that the materials of which the Gospels are composed existed before they were put into a written form. Every discussion must take note of that fact. The literature of the New Testament presupposes just such accounts of the life of Jesus as we find in the Synoptic Gospels, and readers of the Gospels have a right to rest on their veracity and sufficiency as accounts of Jesus, of what He was, what He said, and what He did. They are their own best witnesses.

VI. The Messianic Idea in Its Bearings on Historicity of the Gospels.

1. The Jewish and the Christian Messiah:

In a striking passage in his Das Evangelium Marci (65, 66), Wellhausen vividly sets forth the significant contrast between the Jewish and the Christian conceptions of the Messiah. We quote the words, notwithstanding the fact that Wellhausen does not regard the passage, Mr 8:31 ff, as historical. With him what is set forth there is not the figure of the historical Jesus, but a picture of the persecuted church.

"The confession of Peter, 'Thou art the Messiah,' affords," he says, "the occasion for the setting forth of what up to this time was latent. He has elicited the confession and accepted it. Nevertheless, He accepts it with a correction; a correction that follows as a matter of course. He is not the Messiah who will restore the kingdom of Israel, but another Messiah altogether. Not to set up the kingdom does He go to Jerusalem, but He goes in order to be crucified. Through sorrow and death He goes into glory, and only by this way can others also enter. The kingdom of God is no Judaistic kingdom; the kingdom is destined only for some chosen individuals, for disciples. The thought of the possibility of a metanoia of the people has wholly disappeared. Into the place of a command to repent addressed to all steps the command to follow, and that can be obeyed only by a very few. The conception of following loses now its proper forces and takes a higher meaning. It does not mean what it meant up to this time, namely, to accompany and to follow Him during His lifetime; it overflows that meaning; one is to follow Him even

unto death. The following is an imitatio possible only after His death, and this is to be attained only by a very few. One must bear his cross after Him. .... The situation of the oldest congregation and its tone is here foreshadowed by Jesus as He goes to meet his fate."

A similar passage occurs in the Einleitung, which ends with the significant sentence, "All these are noteworthy signs of the time in which He takes His standpoint" (81).

2. Originality of the Christian Conception:

Elsewhere Wellhausen admits that the sections of the Gospels following the scene at Caesarea-Philippi contain what was known as the distinctive Gospel of the apostolic church. But this Gospel owed its origin to the apostolic church itself. It is a question of the highest importance, and the answer cannot be determined by mere literary criticism: Is the Christian conception of the Messiah due to Jesus? or is it due to the reflection of the church? Which is the more probable? It is agreed, Wellhausen being witness, that the Christian conception was subversive of the Jewish outlook, that the two were in contradiction in many ways. One can understand the Christian conception, and its triumph over the Jewish among the Christian people, if it had been set forth by the Master; but it is unintelligible as a something which originated in the congregation itself. The conception of a crucified Messiah, of a suffering Saviour, was a conception which was, during the years of His earthly ministry, in the mind of Jesus alone. It was not in the minds of the disciples, until He had risen from the dead. And it was not in the minds of His contemporaries. But it was the ruling conception in the Jerusalem church as it is in the Epistles of Paul. No: the conception of the suffering Saviour was not the invention of the church, nor did it rise from her thought of her own needs; it was a gift to her from the suffering and risen Lord. Not without a great impulse, nor without a strong source of persuasion, do men displace notions which they have cherished for generations, and substitute notions which are contradictory and subversive of those fiercely and firmly held.

We take these chapters therefore as historical, and as descriptive of the historical Jesus. If we can do so, then the matter is intelligible, not otherwise. It is also to be observed in this relation that the needs of the church are new needs. There is no provision in the New Testament for the needs of the natural man. The critical view often puts the cart before the horse, and this is one illustration of the fact. The needs of the church are the creation of Christ. They are new needs, or needs only imperfectly felt by humanity before Jesus came.

3. The Messianic Hope:

Be the needs of the church as great as they may, they are not creative; they are only responsive to the higher call. Nor is it a possible hypothesis that lies at the basis of the criticism of Wellhausen and of many others. Since the time of Baur it has often been said or assumed that it was the Messianic hope that gave concreteness to Christianity; that through the prevalence of the Messianic hope, Christianity was enabled to enter on its career of victory. This is another case of the husteron proteron. It is the historical Jesus that has given concreteness and definiteness to the Messianic conceptions which were current in

His time. Because at the heart of the Christian conception there was this concrete gracious figure, and because of the commanding influence of Jesus Christ, this form of Messianism entered into human life, flourished and endured, and is with us today. Other forms of Messianism have only an antiquarian value. They may be discussed as of literary interest, but their practical significance is as nothing. No doubt Messianic categories were ransacked by the church to see if they could be used in order more fully to set forth the significance of Jesus Christ. But the essence of the matter did not lie in them but in Him, whom they had known, loved and served. It is time that a newer critical assumption should be found than the obsolete, worn-out one that the church invented the Christ. We know a little of the early church, and we know its immaturity and its limitations. We have learned something, too, of the Jews at the time of our Lord, and we note that in the Gospels their limitations have been transcended, their immaturity has been overcome, and how? By the fact of Christ. He is so great that He must be real. VII. The Old Testament in Its Bearing on the Synoptic Gospels.

It is always to be remembered that the Old Testament was the Bible of the early Christians. They accepted it as the Word of God, and as authoritative for the guidance of life and conduct. It is one thing to admit and assert this; it is another thing to say that the story of the Old Testament molded and directed the story of Jesus as it is in the Synoptic Gospels. This has been widely asserted, but without adequate proof. As a matter of fact Christianity, when it accepted the Old Testament as the word of God, interpreted it in a fashion which had not been accented before. It interpreted it in the light of Jesus Christ. Tendencies, facts, meanings, which had been in the Old Testament came into light, and the Bible of the Christians was a Bible which testified of Christ. That on which the Jews laid stress passed into the background, and that which they had neglected came into prominence. This view is set forth by Paul: "Unto this day, whenever Moses is read, a veil lieth upon their heart" (2Co 3:15). Or as it is put in Luke, "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory?" (24:25 f). In the Christian interpretation stress was laid on meanings which Jewish readers had neglected, and so the church read the Old Testament in the new light, and things formerly hidden leaped into view. So the suffering servant of Yahweh became for them the keystone of the Old Testament, and the ritual sacrifices and ceremonies of the Old Testament obtained a new meaning. The story of Israel and of its patriarchs, lawgivers, priests, kings and prophets, became full of significance for the new religion, and its psalms and prophecies were searched because they testified of Christ. This is not the place to inquire into the truth of the Christian interpretation, but the fact is undeniable. The inference is that the Old Testament did not, as it was understood by the Jews, influence the conceptions which the church had of Christ; rather the influence of Christ, His commanding personality, and His history gave a new meaning to the Old Testament, a meaning undreamed of before. The Epistle to the Hebrews might have as an alternative title, "How to find Christ in the Old Testament." So powerful was the impression made on the disciples by the personality of Jesus, by His whole demeanor, by His teaching, His life, death and resurrection, that they saw all things in the light of it. The difficulty we have in justifying the references to prophecy, in the light of historical criticism, is a testimony to the fact that the prophecy did not dictate the fact; it was the fact that dictated the accommodation of the prophecy. In this relation also, the supreme fact is the personality of Jesus.

VIII. The Jesus of the Gospels as Thinker.

1. The Ethics of Jesus:

Turning from the conception of the suffering Saviour in the Synoptics, we come to the aspect of Jesus as teacher and thinker, and here also we find abundant evidence of the historical character of the Gospel presentation. As the ethics of Jesus are treated in another article, it is sufficient to say here that the conception of the ethical man and His conduct set forth in His teaching is of unusual breadth, and when worked out in detail, yields an ideal of man in himself, and in relation to others, which transcends all other ethical teaching known to mankind. This, too, we must trace to His unique personality, and not to the reflection of the church.

2. Jesus as Thinker:

A glance may be taken at Jesus under His more general aspect as thinker. As thinker, Jesus stands alone. He speaks with authority, and whoever understands must obey. The Synoptic Gospels, in this respect, are unique. There is nothing like them in literature. Not even in the Bible is there anything to compare with them. Even in the other books of the New Testament we do not find anything like the attitude of Jesus to the common things of life. The world's literature shows no parallel to the parables of the Gospels. Here, at any rate, we are on safe ground in saying that these are not due to the reflection of the church. They have an individual stamp which accredits them as the product of one mind. But a great deal more may be said on the characteristic features of the thinking of Jesus. He is the only thinker who goes straight from the common things of daily life and daily experience into the deepest mysteries of life. The deepest thoughts which man can think are suggested to Him by what everybody sees or does. It is not easy within reasonable limits to do justice to this feature of the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus is at home amid the common things and common occupations of life, because He discerns the Father's presence in them all. What a series of pictures of the world, and of occupations of men, could be gathered from these Gospels! This feature of them was neglected until men under the teaching of poets and painters returned into sympathy with external Nature. We are only beginning to see what wealth, from this point of view, is in the Gospels. Poetic sympathy with Nature is a comparatively modern attainment, yet it is in the Gospels. Wind and weather, mountain and valley, seedtime and harvest, summer and winter, sowing and reaping, buying and selling, all are there, transfigured into higher meanings, and made vocal of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven. Other thinkers rise gradually, and by many steps, from common experience, into what they have to describe of the higher thought and wider generalizations through which they seek to interpret the mystery of life and of the universe. But this thinker needs no middle terms. He sees, e.g., a woman preparing bread for the use of the family, and in this process perceives the mystery of the kingdom of heaven. Whenever He touches on these common things, immediately they are transfigured. They become luminous with the presence of the spiritual world, and earth becomes full of heaven, and every bush is aflame with God.

We note these things because they have a close bearing on the origin and character of the Synoptic Gospels. They bear the stamp of a unique, a creative personality. Be the processes through which the materials of the Gospels have passed what they may, yet these have not obliterated nor blurred the essential characteristics of that unique personality. When the comparisons of the similarities and

differences of the Gospels have been exhausted, the problem of their origin remains, and that problem can be solved only by the recognition of a creative personality who alike by word and work was unlike any other that the world has ever seen.

IX. The Problem of the Gospels.

The Jesus of the Gospels is the Son of God. Stated in its highest form, the problem which the evangelists had in hand was how to represent a Divine being under human conditions, and to set Him forth in such a way that in that presentation there should be nothing unworthy of the Divine, and nothing inconsistent with the human conditions under which He worked and lived. This was the greatest problem ever set to literature, and how the evangelists presented and solved it is found in the Gospels. There it has been solved. Even a writer like Bousset admits: "Already for Mr is Jesus not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but the miraculous eternal Son of God, whose glory shone in the world. .... For the faith of the community, which the oldest evangelist already shares, Jesus is the miraculous Son of God, in whom men believe, whom men put wholly on the side of God" (Was wissen wir von Jesus? 54, 57). The contrast between the Jesus of the Synoptics and the Pauline and Johannine Christ, so often emphasized, thus begins to disappear. The purpose of the Synoptics, as of John, is to lead men to "believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God," that, believing, they "may have life in his name" (Joh 20:31).

LITERATURE.

Besides the works mentioned in the article, reference may be made to the following: E.A. Abbott, article "Gospels" in Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), edition 9 (with Rushbrooke), Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels, and other works; Sanday, Gospels in the 2nd Century, The Life of Christ in Recent Criticism; Sir John Hawkins, Horae Synopticae; G. Salmon, Introduction to New Testament; H. Chase, "The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism," Essay X in Cambridge Biblical Essays, edited by Dr. Swete (1905); H. L. Jackson, "The Present State of the Synop, tic Problem," Essay XIII in Cambridge Biblical Essays, edited by Dr. Swete (1909); Peake, Introduction to New Testament; A. Loisy, Les evangiles synoptiques (1907-8); J.M. Thomson, The Synoptic Gospels, Arranged in Parallel Cols. (1910; this scholarly work does for English Versions of the Bible what such works as Greswell’s Harmonia Evangelica, Rushbrooke’s Synopticon and Wright’s Synopsis have done for the Greek texts); A.A. Hobson, The Diatessaron of Tatian and the Synoptic Problem (The University of Chicago Press, 1904).

James Iverach

GOTHIC, VERSION

goth’-ik.

See VERSIONS.

GOTHOLIAS

goth-o-li’-as (Gotholias): Father of Josias, one of the sons of Elam who returned from Babylon with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:33). The name corresponds to Athaliah, the Greek Gotholias being substituted for the Hebrew guttural ‘ayin, as in Gomorrah, Gaza, etc. Taken with 2Ki 11:1, the name would seem to have been used for both men and women.

GOTHONIEL

go-tho’-ni-el (Gothoniel): The same as Othniel, father of Chabris who was one of the governors of the city of Bethulia (Judith 6:15).

GOURD

gord, goord (qiqayon): The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has hedera ("ivy"), which is impossible. Philologically qiqayon appears to be connected with kiki, which was the Egyptian name for the castor oil plant (Ricinus communis). This grows plentifully all over the Orient, and under favorable conditions may reach a height of 10 to 15 ft.; its larger leaves afford a grateful shade. The requirements of the narrative in Jon 4:6 ff are, however, much more suitably met by the "bottle gourd" (Cucurbita lagenaria), the Arab qar‘ah. This is a creeping, vinelike plant which may frequently be seen trained over the rough temporary sun-shelters erected in fields or by the roadside in Palestine and Mesopotamia.

E. W. G. Masterman

GOURD, WILD

wild (paqqu‘oth sadheh, 2Ki 4:39): The root paqa‘, means "to split" or "burst open," and on this ground these "wild gourds" have been identified with the fruit of the squirting cucumber (Ecballium elaterium). This little gourd, 1 1/2 to 2 inches long, when fully ripe falls suddenly when touched or shaken, the bitter, irritating juice is squirted to a considerable distance, and the seeds are thrown all around. It is exceedingly common in Palestine, and its familiar poisonous properties, as a drastic cathartic, made it unlikely that under any circumstances its fruit could be mistaken for any edible gourd; it is, too, in no way vinelike ("wild vine," 2Ki 4:39) in appearance; the stem is stiff and upright, and there are no tendrils. The traditional plant, Cucumis prophetarium, which grows in the desert, and has very small "gourds," has nothing really to recommend it. By far the most probable plant is the Colocynth (Citrullus colocynthis), belonging like the last two, to Natural Order, Cucurbitaceae. This view has the support of the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) It is a vinelike plant which spreads over the ground or attaches itself by its spiral tendrils to other plants. The rounded "gourds" are 3 inches or more in diameter, and contain a pulp intensely bitter and, in any but minute quantities, extremely poisonous.

E. W. G. Masterman

GOVERNMENT

guv'-ern-ment: The government of the Hebrews varied at different periods, of which we may distinguish seven:

(1) the nomadic period, from the Exodus to the entrance into Palestine;

(2) the period of transition from nomadic to civil life;

(3) the monarchy;

(4) the period of subjection to other oriental nations;

(5) the period from Ezra to the Greeks;

(6) Greek rule;

(7) Roman rule.

1. The Nomadic Period:

The government of the primitive period is that proper to nomadic tribes composed of families and clans, in no wise peculiar to the Hebrews, but shared in its essential features by the most diverse peoples at a corresponding stage of civilization. Though we might draw illustrations from many sources, the government of the Bedouins, Semitic nomads inhabiting the steppes of Arabia, affords the most instructive parallel. In the patriarchal state the family is the household (including slaves and concubines) of the father, who is its head, having power of life and death over his children (Ge 22; Jud 11:31). A clan is a collection of families under a common chieftain, chosen for his personal qualifications, such as prowess and generous hospitality. The composition of the clan was essentially shifting, subject, according to circumstances, to the loss or accession of individuals and families. Although the possession of the same grazing-grounds doubtless played a large part in determining the complexion of the clan, the fiction of descent from a common ancestor was maintained, even when kinship was established by the blood covenant. In all probability community of worship, which cemented the tribe, served as the most effective bond of union also in the clan. Vestiges of such clan cults are still to be detected (1Sa 20:5 ff; Jud 18:19). The familiar tradition of the twelve tribes must not be allowed to blind us to the evidence that the tribe also was not constant. Mention of the Kenites (Jud 1:16) and the list of tribes in the So of Deborah (Jud 5) remind us that such organizations vanished. In the readjustment incident to the change from the pastoral life of the nomad to that of the settled agricultural population of Palestine, many units were doubtless shifted from one tribe to another, and the same result may be assumed as following from the endless strife between the tribes before and during the period of the kings. The large and powerful

tribe of Judah seems to have originated comparatively late. The union of the tribes under the leadership of Moses was essentially similar to the formation of a new tribe out of a group of clans actuated by a desire to accomplish a common end. Many such temporary aggregations must have originated, only to succumb to the centrifugal forces of jealousy and conflicting interests. Even after the entrance of the Hebrews into Palestine, their history for long is that of kindred tribes, rather than that of a nation. The leadership of Moses rested on personal, not on constitutional, authority, and was rendered precarious by the claims of family and of clan, as in the case of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram (Nu 16). The authority of Moses naturally extended to the administration of justice, as well as to matters pertaining to war and religion. He appointed officers to assist him in this judicial function (Ex 18:21), but the laws according to which they rendered judgment were those of custom and usage, not those of a written code. As among the tribal chieftains, important matters were referred to the leader, who, in cases of doubt or in default of recognized custom, resorted to the lot or to the oracle.

2. The Period of Transition:

When the nomad tribes settled in Palestine to become an agricultural people, there ensued a period of unrest due to the necessity for read-justment to changed conditions. The old tribal organization, admirably adapted to the former, ill suited the new requirements. These may be summed up in the demand for the substitution of local organization, based on the rights of individuals, for the tribal government, which had regard solely to the interests of family, clan and tribe. Such readjustment did not, of course, at once ensue, but came piecemeal in answer to the gradually realized wants of the community. Nor was the development entirely from within, but was unquestionably in large measure influenced by the institutions existing among the Canaanite population, only a part of which had been expelled by the invaders. Although the tribes still clung to the fiction of descent from a common ancestor, which was embodied in the accepted genealogies with their filiation of clans into tribes and of tribes into a nation, that which henceforth passed as a "tribe" was less an aggregation of kindred units than a geographical unit or group of units. The times were turbulent, disturbed by contending elements within and by foes without the tribes. Then it was that there arose a class of chieftains of strongly marked character, called by a new name. The "judge" (shophet) was not the ruler of a nation, but the chieftain of a tribe, winning and maintaining his authority by virtue of his personal prowess. The cases of Gideon and Abimelech (Jud 8, 9) show that the authority of the "judge" was not hereditary. Agreeably to the generally changed conditions, the "elders" (zeqenim), who were formerly heads of families or kindreds, now came, possibly under the influence of the Canaanites, to be constituted an aristocratic upper class, with certain functions as administrative officers and councilors. Cities also grew and acquired importance, so that the adjacent hamlets were subordinated to them, probably even ruled from them as executive centers. In all this there is a certain similarity to the process by which, in the period just preceding the beginning of real history, Athens became the metropolis of Attica, and conventional tribes supplanted those based on kinship, while the rise of the purely local organization of the demos led speedily to the appearance of the "tyrants." The high places of clans and tribes continued to be frequented, and certain "seers" (1Sa 9:6) enjoyed considerable prestige by virtue of their peculiar relation to the tribal god.

3. The Monarchy:

While the succession of tribal chieftains and of the "judges" depended on personal qualifications, the principle of heredity is essential to the institution of monarchy, which originated in the desire to regulate the succession with a view to having an assured authoritative leadership. This principle could not, of course, be invoked in the appointment of Saul, the first king (melekh), who won this distinction in virtue of his personal prowess, supported by the powerful influence of the "seer," Samuel. His son Ishbosheth ruled two years over Israel, but lost his throne through the disaffection of his subjects (2Sa 2-4). The accession of David, king of Judah, to the throne of all Israel was likewise exceptional, owing as much to the character of the heir presumptive as to his own qualifications. Solomon, as the choice of his father David, succeeded by right of heredity with the support of the military and religious leaders. In the Southern Kingdom of Judah, heredity was henceforth observed because of its homogeneity and the consequent absence of internal discord; whereas the principle often failed in the turbulent Northern Kingdom of Israel, which was distracted by tribal jealousies. But even when not effectually operative, heredity was recognized as constituting a claim to the succession, although the popular voice, which had been supreme in the institution of the monarchy, was a power always to be reckoned with.

(1) Royal Prerogatives.

The history and functions of monarchy defined the prerogatives and duties of the king. Just as the head of the family, or the chieftain of a tribe, functioned as representative of those subject to him in matters of religion, war, and the administration of justice, so also was it with the king. In all these spheres he was supreme, exercising his authority either personally or through representatives who thus became part of the royal establishment. It is to be noted that the sacerdotal or sacral character of the king, which was merely an extension of his privileges as individual and head of a household, was not emphasized among the Hebrews to a like extent as among other oriental peoples; and the priests whom he appointed were perhaps in the first instance court chaplains, though in time they came to assume greater authority. The responsibility of the king for the public safety carried with it the obligation to guard the state treasures, to which the treasures of the temples were felt to belong; and it was his privilege to use them when necessary for defense. The levying of taxes, also, and the collection and use of revenues from various sources likewise fell of necessity to the king and his representatives.

(2) Officers.

In regard to the constitution of the king’s court under Saul and David we learn comparatively little; even touching that of Solomon we are not fully informed, although we know that it must have been far removed from the original simplicity. We may classify the known officers as follows:

(a) religious: priests (2Sa 8:17; 20:23);

(b) household: cupbearer (1Ki 10:5); master of the vestry (2Ki 10:22); master of the household (1Ki 4:6), who probably was a eunuch (1Ki 22:9; 2Ki 8:6; 9:32);

(c) state: scribe or clerk (2Sa 8:17; 20:25, etc.); recorder, or prompter (1Ki 4:3); king's counselor (2Sa 15:12); and, perhaps, the king's friend (2Sa 15:37; 16:16); overseer of taskwork (2Sa 20:24);

(d) military: commander-in-chief of the army (2Sa 8:16); commander of the king's guards (?)(2Sa 8:18; 20:23).

(3) Fiscal Institutions.

The simplicity of Saul's rule was such as to make slight demands upon the resources of the people. He lived in the manner of a tribal chieftain on his ancestral estate, receiving from his subjects voluntary gifts (1Sa 10:27; 16:20), and also, without doubt, his due share of the booty. Whether he instituted a regular tax (compare 1Sa 17:25) is not certain. With the growth and prosperity of the nation, David changed the character of the court, imitating in a measure the state of other oriental potentates. It is not clear whether he levied a regular tax, although it may be surmised that he had it in view, together with the regulation of taskwork, in ordaining the census taken in his time (2Sa 24:1). We know that he received his portion of the booty (2Sa 8:11; 12:30). The increasing luxury of Solomon's court required the imposition of additional taxes. It is probable that some income was derived from the enforced cultivation of crown lands (1Sa 8:12), although the taskwork, which became extremely burdensome and subsequently provoked the secession of the Northern Kingdom, was chiefly applied to public works. The tribute of subject peoples (1Ki 4:21) was considerable (1Ki 10:14). We now for the first time hear of taxes upon caravans and merchants, although it was in all probability a source of income even in the time of the nomad chieftains; there was also revenue from the carrying trade of his merchant fleet (1Ki 10:11,22) and from the trade in horses and chariots carried on with Egypt (1Ki 10:28). Solomon also divided his kingdom into twelve provinces commanded by prefects, who should provide victuals for the king and his household: each prefect had to make provision for a month in the year (1Ki 4:7). It does not appear whether Judah, which is not included in the list of provinces, was as a mark of special favor exempted from this tax, or whether the omission is to be otherwise explained. The seizure of the vineyard of Naboth by Ahab (1Ki 21) makes it seem not improbable that the property of persons condemned on certain charges was confiscate to the king.

(4) Administration of Justice.

The king, like the tribal chieftain of the steppes, still sat in judgment, but chiefly in matters of moment; less important cases were decided by the prefects of provinces and other officers. Under the earlier kings there was no code except the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20 Ex 22 Ex 23), but judgment was rendered on the basis of the law of custom or usage, the function of the judge being essentially that of an arbiter. For the later code see DEUTERONOMY.

(5) Religion.

The king was regarded as the natural representative of his people before God; but while he did exercise certain sacerdotal functions in person, such offices were generally performed by the priest whom he had

appointed.

(6) Secular Administration.

The authority of the king in matters of state was exercised partly by him in person, partly through his ministers, the "princes" (1Ki 4:2). Among these functions are to be classed the communication with subject and foreign princes and the direction of the taskwork, which was employed for public improvements, partly military, as in the fortification of cities, partly religious, as in the building of the temple. Local affairs had always been left largely to the tribes and their subdivisions, but, with the gradual increase of royal authority, the king sought to exercise it more and more in the conduct of the village communities. Conversely, the "elders of the people," as the (albeit aristocratic) representatives of the communes, occasionally had a voice even in larger matters of state.

4. Israel under Oriental Potentates:

The principle of local autonomy; was widely observed in the oriental states, which concerned themselves chiefly about political and military organization and about the collection of revenues. Hence, there is no occasion for surprise on finding that the Jews enjoyed a large measure of autonomy during the period of their subjection to other oriental powers and that even during the exile they resorted, in matters of dispute, to their own representatives for judgment. Under Persian rule Palestine formed part of the satrapy lying West of the Euphrates and had, for a time, its own governor.

5. After the Restoration:

Ezra and Nehemiah endeavored to introduce a new code, which, after a period of perhaps two centuries, established a dual form of government subject to the supreme authority of the suzerain power. By the new code the secular officers were subordinated to the high priest, who thus virtually assumed the position of a constitutional prince, ruling under the Law. The "prince," however, as the representative of the tribes, and the "elders of the people," as the representatives of the communes, continued to exercise a certain limited authority.

6. The Greeks:

Under the Greek rulers of Egypt and Syria the Jews continued to enjoy a large measure of autonomy, still maintaining in general the type of internal government formulated under Ezra and Nehemiah. We now hear of a council of "elders" presided over by the high priest. The latter, appointed by the kings, was recognized as ethnarch by both Ptolemies and Seleucids and held accountable for the payment of the tribute, for the exaction of which he was, of course, empowered to levy taxes. The brief period of political independence under the Hasmoneans (see ASMONEANS) did not materially alter the character compare the government, except that the high who had long been a prince in everything but in name, now openly so styled himself. The council of the "elders" survived, although with slightly diminished authority. In other respects the influence of Greek institutions made itself felt.

7. The Romans:

When Pompey terminated the reign of the Hasmoneans, the government still continued with little essential change. Following the example of the Greek kings, the Romans at Romans first appointed the high priest to the "leadership of the nation." He was soon, however, shorn for a time of his political dignity, the country being divided into five districts, each governed by its "synod"; but Caesar once more elevated the high priest to the office of ethnarch. Under Herod, the high priest and the synedrium (Sanhedrin), appointed or deposed at will as his interests seemed to require, lost much of their former prestige and power. After the death of Herod the land was again divided, and a procurator, subordinate to the governor of Syria, ruled in Judea, having practical independence in his sphere. In their internal affairs the Jews now, as under former masters, enjoyed a large measure of freedom. The high priest no longer exercising any political authority, the synedrium, of which he was a member, now gained in influence, being in fact an aristocratic council in many respects not unlike the Roman senate. It combined judicial and administrative functions, limited in the exercises of its authority only by the provision that its decisions might be reviewed by the procurator. (See GOVERNOR.) Naturally the outlying jurisdictions were organized on the same model, each with its synedrium competent in local matters. The synedrium at Jerusalem served also as a governing board for the city.

William Arthur Heidel

GOVERNOR

guv’-er-ner: The word "governor" is employed in English Versions of the Bible in rendering a great variety of Hebrew and Greek words. In certain cases strict consistency is neither observed nor possible.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the rendering of Hebrew terms account has naturally been taken of the translations offered in Septuagint, which, being the work of different hands, is both uneven in quality and inconsistent. But there are inherent difficulties which can never be entirely overcome. First and most important, there is the difficulty arising from our ignorance of many details of the government of the oriental nations to which the terms apply. Hardly less is the embarrassment occasioned by the vague employment of words in indiscriminate reference to persons of superior rank and somehow exercising authority. There is consequently much confusion in the use of titles such as "deputy," "duke," "judge," "lawgiver," "overseer" "prince" "ruler" etc. for which the student may consult the special articles.

(1) alluwph or ‘alluph, "governor" (the Revised Version (British and American) "chieftain") in Judah (Zec 9:7; 12:5 f).

(2) choqeq (Jud 5:9; 5:14, the King James Version margin"or lawgivers"). The word is variously rendered with "ruler" or "lawgiver" in English Versions of the Bible of Ge 49:10; De 33:21; Isa 33:22.

(3) moshel, participle of mashal, "to be master," "to rule" (Ge 45:26, the Revised Version (British and American) "ruler").

(4) nasi’ (2Ch 1:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "prince").

(5) caghan (Da 3:2; Jer 51:23, the Revised Version, margin "or lieutenants"; Jer 51:28,57; Eze 23:6,12,23). The same word is rendered "rulers" or "deputies" (Isa 41:25; Ezr 9:2; Ne 2:16; 5:7; 7:5; 12:40).

(6) pechah, is variously used:

(a) of the military governor of a province among the Assyrians (Isa 36:9);

(b) among the Chaldees (Eze 23:6,23; Jer 51:23,18,57);

(c) among the Persians (Es 3:12; 8:9; 9:3);

(d) of the governor-general of the province beyond the River (Euphrates) (Ezr 8:36; Ne 2:7:9);

(e) of Nehemiah as subordinate "governor in the land of Judah" under him (Ne 5:14);

(f) of Zerubbabel as "governor of Judah" (Hag 1:1,14; 2:2,21); (g) of Solomon’s governors (1Ki 10:15; 20:24 (in Syria)).

(7) paqidh (Jer 20:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "chief officer"). Elsewhere it is rendered "overseer" or "officer" (compare Ge 41:34; 2Ki 25:19; Ne 11:9,22).

(8) sar "governor of the city" (1Ki 22:26). Elsewhere commonly rendered "prince."

(9) shalliT (Ge 42:6). Elsewhere rendered "ruler" or "captain."

(10) tirshatha’ the Revised Version (British and American) "the governor," the King James Version "the Tirshatha" (Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:70).

See TIRSHATHA.

2. In the New Testament:

The word "governor" in English Versions of the Bible represents an almost equal variety of Greek words. Here again the usage is for the most part lax and untechnical; but since reference is chiefly had to

officers of the Roman imperial administration, concerning which we possess ample information, no embarrassment is thereby occasioned. The words chiefly in use for "governor" are derived from root ag-," drive," "lead":

(1) hegeomai, "lead" (Mt 2:6; of Joseph as grand vizier of Egypt, Ac 7:10).

(2) hegemon, "leader" (Mt 10:18; 1Pe 2:14; of Pilate, Mt 27:2,11,14,15,21,27; of Felix, Ac 23:24,26,33; of Festus, Ac 24:1,10; 26:30).

(3) hegemoneuo, "function as leader" (Lu 2:2; of Pilate, Lu 3:1).

To these are added terms of more specific meaning:

(4) ethnarches, "ethnarch" or "ruler of a nation" (2Co 11:32).

See GOVERNMENT, 6, 7.

(5) euthuno "direct," "guide" (Jas 3:4). Here the Revised Version (British and American) properly render it "steersman."

(6) architriklinos, "president of a banquet" (Joh 2:8 f, the American Standard Revised Version "ruler of the feast ").

(7) oikonomos, "steward," "manager of a household or estate" (Ga 4:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "stewards").

It is thus seen that in the New Testament "governor" in the political sense occurs chiefly in reference to the Roman procurators of Judea—Pilate, Felix, and Festus. See PILATE; FELIX; FESTUS. It remains for us here to speak briefly of the government of Roman provinces.

Latin provincia signifies a magistrate’s sphere of duty or authority, either

(a) judicially or legally, defining the scope of his competence, or

(b) geographically, designating the territorial limits within which he may exercise authority.

It is in the latter sense that we are now considering the word. When, in the 3rd century BC, Rome began to rule conquered lands outside Italy, each territory was set under the authority of a single magistrate, and hence came to be called a "province." Conquered territories left under the rule of native princes or kings were not so designated, although their government was practically directed by Rome. At first provinces were governed by proconsuls or proprietors (i.e. ex-consuls or ex- praetors); but with the

steady multiplication of provinces various expedients became necessary in order to provide governors of suitable rank and dignity. Thus, the number of praetors was largely augmented, and the term of possible service as governor was extended. Under Augustus the provinces were parceled out between the emperor and the senate, the former reserving for himself such as seemed to require the maintenance of a considerable armed force. In these the emperor was himself proconsul. Early in the Empire imperial provinces of a different type appear, in which the emperor, regarded as sovereign proprietor, governs by a viceroy (praefectus) or steward (procurator). In some of these, tributary kings or princes ruled with the emperor's representative—a legatus or a procurator—by their side, much as England now rules Egypt. Among the provinces so ruled were Egypt and Judea, partly, no doubt, because of their strategic position, partly because of the temper of their inhabitants.

William Arthur Heidel

GOYIM

goi'-yim.

See GOIIM.

GOZAN

go'-zan (gozan; Gozan, Codex Vaticanus, Gozar in 2Ki 17:6, Chozar in 1Ch 5:26): A place in Assyria to which Israelites were deported on the fall of Samaria (2Ki 17:6; 18:11; 1Ch 5:26). It is also mentioned in a letter of Sennacherib to Hezekiah (2Ki 19:12; Isa 37:12). The district is that named Guzana by the Assyrians, and Gauzanitis by Ptolemy, West of Nisibis, with which, in the Assyrian geographical list (WAI, II, 53, l. 43), it is mentioned as the name of a city (alu Guzana; alu Nasibina). It became an Assyrian province, and rebelled in 759 BC, but was again reduced to subjection.

See HABOR; HALAH.

James Orr

GRABA

gra'-ba.

See AGGABA.

GRACE

gras:

1. The Word Charis:

In the English New Testament the word "grace" is always a translation of (charis), a word that occurs in the Greek text something over 170 times (the reading is uncertain in places). In secular Greek of all periods it is also a very common word, and in both Biblical and secular Greek it is used with far more meanings than can be represented by any one term in English Primarily

(a) the word seems to denote pleasant external appearance, "gracefulness" "loveliness"; compare the personificaion in the Graces." Such a use is found in Lu 4:22, where ‘wondered at the charm of his words’ is a good translation; and similarly in Col 4:6.

(b) Objectively, charis may denote the impression produced by "gracefulness," as in 3 Joh 1:4 ‘greater gratification have I none than this’ (but many manuscripts read chara, "joy," here).

(c) As a mental attribute charis may be translated by "graciousness," or, when directed toward a particular person or persons, by "favor." So in Lu 2:52, "Jesus advanced .... in favor with God and men."

(d) As the complement to this, charis denotes the emotion awakened in the recipient of such favor, i.e. "gratitude." So Lu 17:9 reads literally, ‘Has he gratitude to that servant?’ In a slightly transferred sense charis designates the words or emotion in which gratitude is expressed, and so becomes "thanks" (some 10 t, Ro 6:17, etc.)’.

(e) Concretely, charis may mean the act by which graciousness is expressed, as in 1Co 16:3, where the King James Version translates by "liberality," and the Revised Version (British and American) by "bounty." These various meanings naturally tend to blend into each other, and in certain cases it is difficult to fix the precise meaning that the writer meant the word to convey, a confusion that is common to both New Testament and secular Greek And in secular Greek the word has a still larger variety of meanings that scarcely concern theologian.

2. Grace as Power:

Naturally, the various meanings of the word were simply taken over from ordinary language by the New Testament writers. And so it is quite illegitimate to try to construct on the basis of all the occurrences of the word a single doctrine that will account for all the various usages. That one word could express both "charm of speech" and "thankfulness for blessings" was doubtless felt to be a mere accident, if it was thought of at all. But none the less, the very elasticity of the word enabled it to receive still another—new and technically Christian—meaning. This seems to have originated in part by fusing together two of the ordinary significances. In the first place, as in (e) above, charis may mean "a gift." In 1Co 16:3; 2Co 8:19 it is the money given by the Corinthians to the Jerusalemites. In 2Co 9:8 it is the increase of worldly goods that God grants for charitable purposes. In 2Co 1:15 it is the benefit received by the Corinthians from a visit by Paul. In a more spiritual sense charis is the endowment for an office in the

church (Eph 4:7), more particularly for the apostolate (Ro 1:5; 12:3; 15:15; 1Co 3:10; Eph 3:2,7). So in 1Co 1:4-7 margin charis is expanded into "word and all knowledge," endowments with which the Corinthians were especially favored. In 1Pe 1:13 charis is the future heavenly blessedness that Christians are to receive; in 3:7 it is the present gift of "life." In the second place, charis is the word for God's favor, a sense of the term that is especially refined by Paul (see below). But God's favor differs from man's in that it cannot be conceived of as inactive. A favorable "thought" of God's about a man involves of necessity the reception of some blessing by that man, and "to look with favor" is one of the commonest Biblical paraphrases for "bestow a blessing." Between "God's favor" and "God's favors" there exists a relation of active power, and as charis denoted both the favor and the favors, it was the natural word for the power that connected them. This use is very clear in 1Co 15:10, where Paul says, "not I, but the grace of God which was with me" labored more abundantly than they all: grace is something that labors. So in 2Co 12:9, "My grace is sufficient for thee: for my power is made perfect in weakness"; compare 2Ti 2:1, "strengthened in the grace," and 1Pe 4:10, "stewards of the manifold grace." Evidently in this sense "grace" is almost a synonym for the Spirit (see HOLY SPIRIT), and there is little real difference between "full of the Holy Spirit" and "full of grace and power" in Ac 6:5,8, while there is a very striking parallel between Eph 4:7-13 and 1Co 12:4-11, with "gifts of grace" in the one passage, and "gifts of the Spirit" in the other. And this connection between grace and the Spirit is found definitely in the formula "Spirit of grace" in Heb 10:29 (compare Zec 12:10). And, as is well known, it is from this sense of the word that the Catholic doctrine of grace developed.

3. Grace in Justification:

This meaning of charis was obtained by expanding and combining other meanings. By the opposite process of narrowly restricting one of the meanings of the word, it came again into Christian theology as a technical term, but this time in a sense quite distinct from that just discussed. The formation of this special sense seems to have been the work of Paul. When charis is used with the meaning "favor," nothing at all is implied as to whether or not the favor is deserved. So, for instance, in the New Testament, when in Lu 2:52 it is said that "Jesus advanced .... in favor with God and men," the last possible thought is that our Lord did not deserve this favor. Compare also Lu 2:40 and Ac 2:47 and, as less clear cases, Lu 1:30; Ac 7:46; Heb 4:16; 12:15,28. But the word has abundant use in secular Greek in the sense of unmerited favor, and Paul seized on this meaning of the word to express a fundamental characteristic of Christianity. The basic passage is Ro 11:5,6, where as a definition is given, "If it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace." That the word is used in other senses could have caused no 1st-century reader to miss the meaning, which, indeed, is unmistakable. "Grace" in this sense is an attitude on God's part that proceeds entirely from within Himself, and that is conditioned in no way by anything in the objects of His favor. So in Ro 4:4. If salvation is given on the basis of what a man has done, then salvation is given by God as the payment of a debt. But when faith is reckoned for what it is not, i.e. righteousness, there is no claim on man's part, and he receives as a pure gift something that he has not earned. (It is quite true that faith involves moral effort, and so may be thought of as a sort of a "work"; it is quite true that faith does something as a preparation for receiving God's further gifts. But it simply clouds the exegetical issue to bring in these ideas here, as they certainly were not present in Paul's mind when the verses were being written.) "Grace" then, in this sense is the antinomy to "works" or to "law"; it has a special relation to the guilt of sin (Ro 5:20; 6:1), and has almost exactly the

same sense as "mercy." Indeed, "grace" here differs from "mercy" chiefly in connoting eager love as the source of the act. See JUSTIFICATION. Of course it is this sense of grace that dominates Ro 3-6, especially in thesis 3:24, while the same use is found in Ga 2:21; Eph 2:5,8; 2Ti 1:9. The same strict sense underlies Ga 1:6 and is found, less sharply formulated, in Tit 3:5-7. (Ga 5:4 is perhaps different.) Outside of Paul's writings, his definition of the word seems to be adopted in Joh 1:17; Ac 15:11; Heb 13:9, while a perversion of this definition in the direction of antinomianism is the subject of the invective in Jude 1:4. And, of course, it is from the word in this technical Pauline sense that an elaborate Protestant doctrine of grace has been developed.

4. Special Uses:

A few special uses of the word may be noted. That the special blessing of God on a particular undertaking (Ac 14:26; 15:40) should be called a "grace" needs no explanation. In Lu 6:32-34, and 1Pe 2:19,20, charis seems to be used in the sense of "that which deserves the thanks of God," i.e. a specifically Christian act as distinguished from an act of "natural morality." "Grace for grace" in Joh 1:16 is a difficult phrase, but an almost exact parallel in Philo (Poster. Cain, 43) may fix the sense as "benefit on benefit." But the tendency of the New Testament writers is to combine the various meanings the word can have, something that is particularly well illustrated in 2Co 8; 9. In these two chapters the word occurs 10 t, but in so many different senses as to suggest that Paul is consciously playing with the term. Charis is the money given to the Jerusalemites by the Corinthians (2Co 8:19), it is the increase of goods that God will grant the Corinthians (2Co 9:8), it is the disposition of the givers (2Co 8:6), it is the power of God that has wrought this disposition (2Co 8:1; 9:14), it is the act of Christ in the Incarnation (2Co 8:9; contrast the distinction between "God's grace" and "Christs act" in Heb 2:9), it is the thanks that Paul renders (2Co 9:15). That all a Christian is and all that he has is God's gift could have been stated of course without the use of any special term at all. But in these two chapters Paul has taught this truth by using for the various ideas always the same term and by referring this term to God at the beginning and the end of the section. That is, to the multiplicity of concepts there is given a unity of terminology, corresponding to the unity given the multiple aspects of life by the thought of entire dependence on God. So charis, "grace," becomes almost an equivalent for "Christianity," viewed as the religion of dependence on God through Christ. As one may think of entering Christianity, abiding in it, or falling from it, so one may speak of entering into (Ro 5:2), abiding in (Ac 13:43), or falling from (Ga 5:4) grace; compare 1Pe 5:12. So the teaching of Christianity may be summed up as word or gospel of grace (Ac 14:3; 20:24,32). So "grace be with you" closes the Epistles as a sufficient summary of all the blessings that can be wished Christian readers. At the beginning of the Epistles the words "and peace" are usually added, but this is due only to the influence of the Jewish greeting "peace be with you" (Lu 10:5, etc.), and not to any reflection on "grace" and "peace" as separate things. (It is possible that the Greek use of chairein, "rejoice," as an epistolary salutation (so in Jas 1:1) influenced the Christian use of charis. But that "grace and peace" was consciously regarded as a universalistic combination of Jewish and Gentilecustom is altogether unlikely.) The further expansion of the introductory formula by the introduction of "mercy" in 1 and 2Ti is quite without theological significance.

5. Teaching of Christ:

In the Greek Gospels, charis is used in the words of Christ only in Lu 6:32-34; 17:9. As Christ spoke in Aram, the choice of this word is due to Luke, probably under the influence of its common Christian use in his own day. And there is no word in our Lord's recorded sayings that suggests that He employed habitually any especial term to denote grace in any of its senses. But the ideas are unambiguously present. That the pardon of sins is a free act on God's part may be described as an essential in Christ's teaching, and the lesson is taught in all manner of ways. The prodigal knowing only his own wretchedness (Lu 15:20), the publican without merit to urge (Lu 18:13), the sick who need a physician (Mr 2:17), they who hunger and thirst after righteousness (Mt 5:6), these are the ones for whom God's pardon is inexhaustible. And positive blessings, be they temporal or spiritual, are to be looked for from God, with perfect trust in Him who clothes the lilies and knows how to give good gifts to His children (Mt 7:11; here Lu 11:13 has "Holy Spirit" for "gifts," doubtless a Lukan interpretation, but certainly a correct one). Indeed, it is not too much to say that Christ knows but one unpardonable sin, the sin of spiritual self-satisfaction—"That which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God" (Lu 16:15; compare Lu 17:7-10; Mt 20:1-16).

6. In the Old Testament:

There is no word in Hebrew that can represent all the meanings of charis, and in the Septuagint charis itself is used, practically, only as a translation of the Hebrew chen, "favor," this restriction of meaning being due to the desire to represent the same Hebrew word by the same Greek word as far as possible. And chen, in turn, is used chiefly only in the phrase "find favor" (Ge 6:8, etc.), whether the reference is to God or men, and without theological importance. Much nearer Paul's use of charis is ratson, "acceptance," in such passages as Isa 60:10, "In my favor have I had mercy on thee"; Ps 44:3, "not .... by their own sword .... but .... because thou wast favorable unto them." Perhaps still closer parallels can be detected in the use of checedh, "kindness," "mercy," as in Ex 20:6, etc. But, of course, a limitation of the sources for the doctrine to passages containing only certain words would be altogether unjust. The main lines seem to be these:

(1) Technically, salvation by grace in the New Testament is opposed to an Old Testament doctrine of salvation by works (Ro 4:4; 11:6), or, what is the same thing, by law (Ro 6:14; Joh 1:17); i.e men and God are thought of as parties to a contract, to be fulfilled by each independently. Most of the legislation seems to presuppose some idea of man as a quantity quite outside of God, while De 30:11-14 states explicitly that the law is not too hard nor too far off for man.

(2) Yet even this legalism is not without important modifications. The keeping of the law is man's work, but that man has the law to keep is something for which God only is to be thanked. Ps 119 is the essence of legalism, but the writer feels overwhelmed throughout by the greatness of the mercy that disclosed such statutes to men. After all, the initial (and vital!) act is God's not man's. This is stated most sharply in Eze 23:1-4—Oholibah and her sister became God's, not because of any virtue in them, but in spite of most revolting conduct. Compare De 7:7, etc.

(3) But even in the most legalistic passages, an absolute literal keeping of the law is never (not even in

such a passage as Nu 15:30,31) made a condition of salvation. The thought of transgression is at all times tempered with the thought of God's pardon. The whole sacrificial system, in so far as it is expiatory, rests on God's gracious acceptance of something in place of legal obedience, while the passages that offer God's mercy without demanding even a sacrifice (Isa 1:18; Mic 7:18-20, etc.) are countless. Indeed, in Eze 16; 20; 23, mercy is promised to a nation that is spoken of as hardly even desiring it, a most extreme instance.

(4) But a mere negative granting of pardon is a most deficient definition of the Old Testament idea of God's mercy, which delights in conferring positive benefits. The gift to Abraham of the land of Canaan, liberation from Egypt, food in the wilderness, salvation from enemies, deliverance from exile—all of Israel's history can be felt to be the record of what God did for His people through no duty or compulsion, grateful thanksgiving for such unmerited blessings filling, for instance, much of the Psalter. The hearts of men are in God's keeping, to receive from Him the impulse toward what is right (1Ch 29:18, etc.). And the promise is made that the God who has manifested Himself as a forgiving Father will in due time take hold of His children to work in them actual righteousness (Isa 1:26; 4:3,1; 32:1-8; 33:24; Jer 31:33,14; Eze 36:25,26; Zec 8; Da 9:24; Ps 51:10-12) With this promise—for the Old Testament always a matter of the future—the Old Testament teaching passes into that of the New Testament.

7. Summary:

Most of the discussions of the Biblical doctrine of grace have been faulty in narrowing the meaning of "grace" to some special sense, and then endeavoring to force this special sense on all the Biblical passages. For instance, Roman scholars, starting with the meaning of the word in (say) 2Co 12:9, have made Ro 3:24 state that men are justified by the infusion of Divine holiness into them, an interpretation that utterly ruins Paul's argument. On the other hand, Protestant extremists have tried to reverse the process and have argued that grace cannot mean anything except favor as an attitude, with results that are equally disastrous from the exegetical standpoint. And a confusion has resulted that has prevented men from seeing that most of the controversies about grace are at cross-purposes. A rigid definition is hardly possible, but still a single conception is actually present in almost every case where "grace" is found—the conception that all a Christian has or is, is centered exclusively in God and Christ, and depends utterly on God through Christ. The kingdom of heaven is reserved for those who become as little children, for those who look to their Father in loving confidence for every benefit, whether it be for the pardon so freely given, or for the strength that comes from Him who works in them both to will and to do.

LITERATURE.

All the Biblical theologies contain full discussions of the subject; for the New Testament the closest definitions are given by Bernard Weiss. But for the meaning of "grace" in any particular place the commentaries must be consulted, although the student may be warned against discussions that argue too closely from what may seem to be parallel passages.

Burton Scott Easton

GRACIOUS

gra’-shus (chanan; charis): In general, the word means "to favor," "to show kindness" to an inferior and "to be compassionate." All Old Testament passages are derived from the same root, and yet there are two evident shades of meaning derived from it. (1) As above, "favorable" or, causative, "to cause to be gracious," as "Yahweh make his face to shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee" (Nu 6:25); "And the Lord was gracious unto them" (2Ki 13:23 the King James Version); "The Lord is gracious and full of compassion" (Ps 145:8 the King James Version). (2) In a modified sense, "graceful," "winsome" or "attractive," as applied particularly to persons and things. Used thus 3 times in the Old Testament and once in the New Testament. "A gracious woman retaineth honor" (Pr 11:16 the King James Version; compare Ec 10:12; Lu 4:22).

The word is used once in the New Testament from root of Greek word chrestos, meaning "useful" as a benefit: "if ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious" (1Pe 2:3).

In the main, however, the adjective is applied in the Old Testament to Yahweh, as indicative of His favor and mercy, His long-suffering and general inclination of favor and kindness.

Walter G. Clippinger

GRAECIA

gre’-sha.

See GREECE.

GRAFT

graft (egkentrizo; the Revised Version (British and American) "graft"; the King James Version, "graff"): The word occurs 6 times in Ro 11. Paul assumed that those living about Rome were familiar with the process of grafting olive trees, for olive culture had been adopted by the Greeks and Romans in Paul’s time. The wild olive trees (Arabic colloquial, zeitun berri) are cut back, slits made on the freshly sawed branch ends, and two or three grafts from a cultivated olive (Arabic colloquial, zeitun jouwi) are inserted in such a way that the bark of the scion and of the branch coincide. The exposed ends are smeared with mud made from clay, and then bound with cloth or date straw, which is held by thongs made from the bark of young mulberry branches. The fruit thus obtained is good. Wild olives cannot be made cultivated olives by engrafting, as Paul implies (Ro 11:24), but a wild olive branch thus grafted would thrive. So Gentiles would flourish spiritually when grafted into the fullness of God’s mercy, first revealed to the world through Israel.

James A. Patch

GRAIN

gran.

See AGRICULTURE; GARNER.

GRANARY

gran’-a-ri.

See GARNER; STOREHOUSES.

GRAPES

graps.

See VINE.

GRAPES, WILD

(be’ushim, Isa 5:2,4): A word closely allied to bo’shah, Job 31:40, translated "cockle" (which see). It implies something noisome or worthless, but no particular fruit.

GRASP

grasp: The word harpagmos (Php 2:6), is rendered by the King James Version "robbery," by the Revised Version (British and American) "a prize," and by the American Standard Revised Version "a thing to be grasped." By derivation the term may denote either an act of seizing or the aim or result of the action. In the context Paul is discussing, not Christ’s opinion of His equality with God, but His amazing self-sacrifice in laying aside His equally for our sakes. He but laid it aside for us. It is better to render with the Revised Version (British and American) "a prize."

GRASS

gras:

(1) chatsir, from a root meaning "greenness"; compare Arabic Khudra, which includes grasses and green

vegetables (1Ki 18:5; 2Ki 19:26; Job 40:15; Ps 104:14, etc.). Isa 15:6 is translated in the King James Version "have," the Revised Version (British and American) "grass"; Pr 27:25, English Versions of the Bible "hay," margin "Hebrew grass"; Nu 11:5 English Versions of the Bible translates "leeks." It is a term for herbage in general.

(2) deshe', from root meaning "to sprout abundantly." Generally translated "tender grass" (Ge 1:11 f; 2Sa 23:4; Job 6:5; Isa 15:6; 66:14; Jer 14:5, etc.); translated "grass" (Job 6:5; Jer 14:5); translated "herb" (2Ki 19:26; Ps 27:2; Isa 37:27; 66:14). In Jer 50:11 we have "heifer at grass" (deshe') in the King James Version and the Revised Version, margin, but in the Revised Version (British and American) "heifer that treadeth out the grain." (dethe'), the Aramaic form, occurs in Da 4:15,23, and is translated "tender grass."

(3) chashash, probably "dry" or "cut grass"; compare Arabic chashesh, "dry fodder" or "cut grass" (Isa 5:24, the King James Version "chaff," the Revised Version (British and American) "dry grass"; Isa 33:11, English Versions of the Bible "chaff").

(4) leqesh, from root meaning "to come late," hence used in Am 7:1 for the "latter growth" of grass after mowing.

(5) yereq, literally, "green thing" (Nu 22:4, elsewhere translated "herb").

(6) 'esebh (De 11:15, etc.), generally translated "herb" (for (5) and (6) see HERB).

(7) chortos (Mt 6:30; 14:19; Mr 6:39; Lu 12:28; Joh 6:10; Jas 1:10,11; 1Pe 1:24; Re 8:7; 9:4); translated "blade" (Mt 13:26 Mr 4:28); translated "hay" (1Co 3:12).

There are 243 species of true grasses (Natural Order, Gramineae) in Palestine, but Hebrew, like modern Arabic, does not discriminate between these and other herbs which together make up herbage. Actual turf is practically unknown in Palestine, and grass seed is not artificially sown; young green barley is used in the neighborhood of towns as fresh fodder for horses and cattle. It is not the native custom to cut herbage for hay, though the writer has seen many carloads of sweet-smelling hay being carried from the land by Circassian settlers, East of the Jordan.

The "grass upon the house tops" (Ps 129:6; Isa 37:27), the growth which springs from the seeds mingled with the mud of which the roof is made, springs up quickly with the rains, but as quickly dries up before it reaches half its normal height—or not infrequently is set on fire.

Dew, rain or showers upon the grass are mentioned (De 32:6; Pr 19:12; Mic 5:7; Ps 72:6, "rain upon the mown grass," i.e. the grass eaten short by cattle).

E. W. G. Masterman

GRASSHOPPER

gras’-hop-er.

See LOCUST.

GRATE; GRATING

grat, grat’-ing (mikhbar, resheth; the King James Version Grate): This "grating of network of brass" (Ex 27:4; 38:4), called also "the net" (Ex 27:4 f), and "grating of brass" (Ex 38:4), was that reticulated casting or wrought work of bronze which, in the tabernacle system, formed an element of the altar of sacrifice. Its position is well defined: "Thou shalt put it under the ledge round the altar beneath, that the net may reach halfway up the altar" (Ex 27:5; compare Ex 38:4). The altar being a hollow box—"hollow with planks" (Ex 27:8)—3 cubits high, overlaid with brass, and presumably filled with stones, there appears to have been a ledge round about it halfway from the base, from which depended vertically this grating of bronze. On the grating were four rings through which the staves were passed by which the altar was borne (Ex 27:4,7). If the ledge was for the priests to stand on while handling the sacrifices on the altar, the grating need be thought of only as an ornamental support for the ledge. Others ascribe to it different uses.

W. Shaw Caldecott

GRAVE (1)

grav.

See BURIAL.

GRAVE (2)

(Adj.).

See GRAVITY.

GRAVE; GRAVING

grav’-ing.

See CRAFTS; ENGRAVING.

GRAVEL

grav’-el (chatsats, from root chatsats, "to divide." Kindred roots have the meaning of "to cut," "to hew," "to sharpen," hence chets, "arrow" (2Ki 13:17; Ps 64:7 and often); compare Arabic chacca, "to fall to the lot of," chiccah, "portion"): In Pr 20:17, we have:

"Bread of falsehood is sweet to a man;

But afterwards his mouth shall be filled with gravel."

And in La 3:16:

"He hath also broken my teeth with gravel stones; he

hath covered me with ashes."

The only other occurrence of the word is in Ps 77:17, where it is the equivalent of chets, "arrow" (see supra):

"The clouds poured out water;

The skies sent out a sound:

Thine arrows also went abroad."

Pr 20:17 and La 3:16 both suggest the frequent occurrence of grit in the coarse bread, the source of the grit being not necessarily the grindstone, but possibly even small stones originally mingled with the wheat and never properly separated from it.

Alfred Ely Day

GRAVITY

grav’-i-ti (semnotes): The word, meaning properly "venerableness," "sanctity," is used in 2 Macc 3:12 of the "sanctity" of the temple. In 1Ti 3:4 the writer declares that a characteristic of a bishop should be that he has "his children in subjection with all gravity." Titus is enjoined (2:7 f) in his "doctrine" (teaching) to show "uncorruptness, gravity, sound speech (Revised Version), that cannot be condemned" (compare 1Ti 3:8). In 1Ti 2:2 the same word is translated "honesty" (the Revised Version (British and American) "gravity"), "that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity." A better rendering of semnotes might be "dignity" or "dignified seriousness" (Olshausen), which quality is necessary, both on the part of parents in relation to their children, if they are to be properly trained, and on the part of

preachers and teachers, if their "doctrine" is to be worthily represented. All mere lightness of demeanor (the opposite of gravity) tells against the great trusts committed to both parents and teachers (compare 1Ti 3:11; Tit 2:2). Such "gravity" or "dignified seriousness" ought indeed to characterize Christian demeanor in general, as in 1Ti 2:2 above.

W. L. Walker

GRAY

gra.

See COLORS; HOARY.

GREASE

gres (chelebh, "fat," "suet"): The word occurs once in the metaphorical sense "prosperous," then dull, gross, brutal: "Their heart is as fat as grease" (Ps 119:70; compare Isa 6:10, and see FAT).

GREAT; GREATNESS

grat, grat'-nes: "Great" occurs very often in Scripture. The chief words so translated are gadhol, rabh; megas, polus.

(1) In the Old Testament many other terms are employed:

(a) gadhol is used to express greatness in various senses, chiefly of magnitude, including excellence, e.g. "great lights" (Ge 1:16); "the great city" (Ge 10:12); "a great nation" (Ge 12:2); "a great sight" (Ex 3:3); "Moses was very great" (Ex 11:3); "the great God" (De 10:17; Ne 1:5); "great is Yahweh" (Ps 48:1). It is sometimes translated by "mighty" (De 4:37; 7:21, "a mighty God," the Revised Version (British and American) "great"). It is also used to designate the high priest (literally, "great," Le 21:10; Zec 3:1, etc.); also to express the "elder" of a family, e.g. Ge 27:1, "Esau his eldest son," the Revised Version (British and American) "elder"; probably also of great stature: "a great man among the Anakims," the Revised Version (British and American) "the greatest" (Jos 14:15).

(b) rabh denotes, rather, quantity, number, therefore, often, "many" (Ge 21:34, etc.; Ex 2:23 the Revised Version (British and American), etc.); "abundant" (Ex 34:6, the English Revised Version "plenteous"), and similar terms; thus we have "a great people" (Jos 17:14); "His mercies are great," the Revised Version, margin "many" (2Sa 24:14; 1Ch 21:13); "Great was the company," the Revised Version (British and American) "a great host" (Ps 68:11); "great reward" (Ps 19:11); "Mine iniquity .... is great" (Ps 25:11); "exceedingly" (Ps 123:3). In the Septuagint rabh is, for the most part, translated by polus. But it is used for "great" in other senses, e.g. "the great (God)" (Pr 26:10), the Revised Version

(British and American) "as an archer," margin "master worker; Hebrew text obscure"; "a saviour, and a great one," the Revised Version (British and American) "defender," margin "or a mighty one" (Isa 19:20); "Great shall be the peace" (Isa 54:13), etc. It is sometimes translated "mighty" (Ps 89:50, the Revised Version, margin "many"; Isa 63:1).

(c) Other words thus translated are kabhedh, "heavy," e.g. "so great a people," the Revised Version (British and American) "thy great people," margin "heavy" (1Ki 3:9); me'odh, implying force, might, e. g. "with all his might" (2Ki 23:25). 'El and 'Elohim are sometimes used to express greatness. In Ps 36:6, we have "Thy righteousness is like the great ('El) mountains," the Revised Version (British and American) "mountains of God"; in Ge 30:8, "with great ('Elohim) wrestlings," the Revised Version (British and American) "mighty," margin "wrestlings of God"; and in 1Sa 14:15 "a very great ('Elohim) trembling," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding great," margin "a trembling of God."

(2)

(a) Megas denotes magnitude, in its various aspects, physical, moral, etc., e.g. "great joy" (Mt 2:10); "a great light" (Mt 4:16); "the great King" (Mt 5:35); "great in the kingdom" (Mt 5:19, etc.); "Great is thy faith" (Mt 15:28); "The greatest is charity" (love), the Revised Version, margin "greater" (1Co 13:13); "a great high priest" (Heb 4:14); "the great shepherd" (Heb 13:20); "a great voice" (Re 1:10); in Re megas is very frequent.

(b) Polus denotes properly number, multitude, e.g. "great multitudes" (Mt 4:25); "a great company" (Lu 5:29, the Revised Version (British and American) "a great multitude"; frequent in the Gospels); "great possessions" (Mr 10:22). But also "great" in the sense of magnitude, e.g. "great plainness of speech," the Revised Version (British and American) "boldness" (2Co 3:12; 7:4); "a great trial of affliction," the Revised Version (British and American) "much proof" (2Co 8:2); "great love" (Eph 2:4).

(c) Among other terms we have telikoutos, "so great" (in degree), "so great a salvation" (Heb 2:3); tosoutos, "so great" (in quantity), "so great faith" (Mt 8:10; Lu 7:9); "so great a cloud of witnesses" (Heb 12:1); hosos, "how great" (in quantity) (Mr 3:8; 5:19 f); helikos, "how great" (in degree) (Col 2:1; Jas 3:5, "how great a matter," the Revised Version (British and American) "how much wood," margin "how great a forest"); pelikos, "how great" (in degree) (Heb 7:4); posos, "how great" (in quantity) (Mt 6:23), etc.

(3) In His person and teaching, Jesus introduced into the world a new conception of greatness. It was to be found in humility and self-forgetting service: "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister (the Revised Version, margin "servant"); and whosoever would be first among you shall be your servant (the Revised Version, margin "(Greek) bond-servant"): even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mt 20:26-28; compare also Mt 18:1-4; 23:11; Php 2:5-11).

W. L. Walker

GREAVES

grevz.

See ARMOR, ARMS, IV, 4.

GRECIANS; GREEKS

gre’-shanz, greks: In the Old Testament the word "Grecians" occurs but once (Joe 3 (4):6). For references to Greece in the Old Testament see JAVAN. In the King James Version of the Old Testament Apocrypha "Grecians" and "Greeks" are used without distinction, e.g. 1 Macc 1:10; 6:2; 8:9; 2 Macc 4:15,36. Thus, in 1 Macc 1:1, Alexander the Great is spoken of as king of Greece, and in 1 Macc 1:10 the Macedonian empire is called "the kingdom of the Greeks" (basileia Hellenon). In 2 Macc 13:2 the army of Antiochus, king of Syria, is called "Grecian" (dunamis Hellenike), and in 2 Macc 6:8 the "Greek cities" (poleis Hellenides) are Macedonian colonies. Reference is made in 2 Macc 6:1 to an aged Athenian who was sent by Antiochus the king charged with the duty of Hellenizing the Jews; in 2 Macc 9:15 Antiochus vows that he will make the Jews equal to the Athenians; in 1 Macc 12-14, reference is made to negotiations of Jonathan, the high priest, with the Spartans, whom he calls brethren, seeking the renewal of a treaty of alliance and amity against the Syrians. With the spread of Greek power and influence, everything not specifically Jewish was called Greek; thus in 2 Macc 4:36; 11:2; 3 Macc 3:3,1 the "Greeks" contrasted with the Jews are simply non-Jews, so called because of the prevalence of Greek institutions and culture, and "Greek" even came to be used in the sense of "anti-Jewish" (2 Macc 4:10,15; 6:9; 11:24).

In Isa 9:12 the Septuagint reads tous Hellenas, for Pelishtim, "Philistines"; but we are not therefore justified in assuming a racial connection between the Philistines and the Greeks. Further light on the ethnography of the Mediterranean

basin may in time show that there was actually such a connection; but the rendering in question proves nothing, since "the oppressing sword" of Jer 46:16 and 50:16 is likewise rendered in the Septuagint with "the sword of the Greeks" (machaira Hellenike). In all these cases the translators were influenced by the conditions existing in their own day, and were certainly not disclosing obscure relations long forgotten and newly discovered.

In the New Testament, English Versions of the Bible attempts to distinguish between (Hellenes), which is rendered "Greeks," and (Hellenistai), which is rendered "Grecians" or "Grecian Jews," or in the Revised Version, margin "Hellenists," e.g. Ac 6:1; 9:29. These latter were Jews of the Dispersion, who spoke Greek (see HELLENISM; HELLENIST), as distinguished from Palestinian Jews; but since many of the latter also spoke Greek by preference, the distinction could in no sense be absolute. Indeed in Joh 7:35, "the Dispersion among (the Revised Version, margin, Greek "of") the Greeks," can hardly refer to

any but "Grecian Jews" (Hellenistai), although Hellenes is used, and in Joh 12:20 the "Greeks" (Hellenes) who went up to worship at the feast of the Passover were almost certainly "Grecian Jews" (Hellenistai). Thus, while English Versions of the Bible consistently renders Hellenes with "Greeks," we are not by that rendering apprised of the real character of the people so designated. This difficulty is aggravated by the fact, already noted in connection with the Old Testament Apocrypha, that, in consequence of the spread of Hellenism, the term Hellenes was applied not only to such as were of Hellenic descent, but also to all those who had appropriated the language of Greece, as the universal means of communication, and the ideals and customs collectively known as Hellenism. The latter were thus in the strict sense Hellenists, differing from the "Grecians" of English Versions of the Bible only in that they were not of Jewish descent. In other words, Hellenes (except perhaps in Joh 7:35 and 12:20, as noted above) is, in general, equivalent to ta ethne, "Gentiles" (see GENTILES). The various readings of the manuscripts (and hence the difference between the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) in 1Co 1:23 well illustrate this. There is consequently much confusion, which it is quite impossible, with our limited knowledge of the facts in particular cases, to clear up. In general, it would seem probable that where "Greeks" are comprehensively contrasted with "Jews," the reference is to "Gentiles," as in Ac 14:1; 17:4; 18:4; 19:10,17; 20:21; Ro 1:16; 10:12; 1Co 1:22-24 (the Revised Version (British and American) "Gentiles," representing ethnesin; Ga 3:28; Col 3:11. In Mr 7:26 the woman of Tyre, called "a Greek (the Revised Version, margin "Gentile") a Syrophoenician," was clearly not of Hellenic descent. Whether Titus (Ga 2:3) and the father of Timothy; (Ac 16:1,3) were in the strict sense "Greeks," we have no means of knowing. In Ro 1:14, "I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians," there is an undoubted reference to Greeks strictly so called; possibly, though by no means certainly, the "Greeks" of Ac 21:28, alluding to Trophimus the Ephesian (Ac 21:29), are to be taken in the same sense. References to the Greek language occur in Joh 19:20 (Lu 23:38 is properly omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)); Ac 21:37; Re 9:11.

In Ac 11:20 the manuscripts vary between Hellenistas, and Hellenas (the King James Version "Grecians," the Revised Version (British and American) "Greeks"), with the preponderance of authority in favor of the former; but even if one adopts the latter, it is not clear whether true Greeks or Gentiles are intended.

William Arthur Heidel

GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT

I. THE GREEK GODS

1. Greek Myths

2. Mythology Distinguished from Religion

3. Local Shrines

4. Epithets of the Gods

5. Nature of the Gods of Worship

6. Relation of Greek Gods to Nature

7. The Greater Gods of Greece

8. Nature Gods

9. Gods of Human Activities and Emotions

II. REVELATION: INSPIRATION

1. Omens

2. Divination by Sacrifice

3. Dreams

4. Oracles

III. FORMS OF WORSHIP

1. Shrines

2. Temples

3. Priests

4. Seasons of Worship: Festivals

5. Elements of Worship

6. Prayer

7. Burnt Offering, or Sacrificial Meal

8. Meaning of Sacrifice

9. Propitiatory Sacrifice

10. Purification

11. The Great Religious Festivals

12. Mysteries at Eleusis

13. Absence of Magic and Mystery

IV. THE FUTURE LIFE

1. Funeral Rites

2. Future Life in the Homeric Poems

3. Later Beliefs in Immortality

V. SIN, EXPIATION, AND THE RELIGIOUS LIFE

1. Greek Idea of Sin

2. Religious Ideals

VI. THE INFLUENCE OF GREEK RELIGION ON CHRISTIANITY

1. Greek Philosophy and Christian Theology

2. Greek Influence on Christian Liturgy

3. Greek Influence on the Sacraments

LITERATURE

I. The Greek Gods.

1. Greek Myths:

The gods of ancient Greece are well known to our western civilization through the myths which have found so large a place in our literature. In Greece itself, fancy had free play in dealing with these divine beings, and the myths were the main treasure-house from which the poet drew; the same myths and the

same gods, under different names, reappear in Rome; and Rome passed them on, a splendid heritage of imagination, to the literatures of later Europe. It is characteristic of myths that they deal with persons, not so different from men in their nature, but with more than human powers. Gods, nymphs and satyrs, noble "heroes" or evil spirits have superhuman powers in varying degree, but they remain persons with a human interest because of their human type. And, further, as men are organized in families, cities and states, so there is a tendency to organize the beings of myth into social groups, and even to bring men, heroes and gods together into one large social organism, the universe of persons.

These Greek myths, the story of Athena's birth full-armed from the brain of Zeus, of Circe's magic potion, of Poseidon's chariot on the waves, and of Apollo's shafts are familiar to us from childhood. To regard them as expressing the content of Greek religion is as natural as it is false. Very few myths have any religious meaning at all, in spite of the large part the gods play in them. A little comparison with the facts of worship serves to show that here the gods are quite different from the gods of story.

2. Mythology Distinguished from Religion:

Some of the gods hardly appear in myths, and some of the beings of myth are not worshipped; in worship, each god is for the time being the only god thought of, not a member of the hierarchy established in myth; moreover in myth the gods are treated as universal, while the gods of worship are most closely attached, each to one shrine. Along with these external differences goes the one essential difference between a being of story and an object of worship. The failure to recognize the deep meaning of Greek religion results from the superficial assumption that myths constitute a peculiar kind of theology, when in reality they teach but little, and that, indirectly, about religion proper.

3. Local Shrines:

The essential fact about the gods of Greek religion is that each god was worshipped in a unique form at one or another particular shrine by a group of worshippers more or less definite. The group might include the state, the dwellers in one locality or simply the family; whatever its limits, it included those connected with the god by a social-religious tie, and the fundamental purpose of the worship was to strengthen this tie. In a city like Athens there were hundreds of such shrines, varying in importance, each the place where one particular phase of a god was worshipped at specified times. The particular form of the god was ordinarily indicated by an epithet attached to his name, Zeus Olympios, Dionysus Eleutherios, Athena Nike. This epithet might refer to the locality of the worship (Aphrodite of the Gardens), to the center from which the worship was brought (Artemis Brauronia), to some local spirit identified with the greater god (Poseidon Erechtheus), or to the nature of the god himself (Apollo Patroos).

4. Epithets of the Gods:

Each of the many shrines in Athens had thus its unique god, its group of worshippers connected with the god, its particular form of worship and times of worship, its own officials. While the state exercised

general supervision over all the shrines, they were not organized in a hierarchy under any distinctly religious officials, but remained as independent units. Religious worship in a given city meant the aggregation of independent worships at the different local shrines.

5. Nature of the Gods of Worship:

The god of worship, then, was the god of a local shrine whose blessing and favor were sought at certain times by those who had the right to worship there. As in myth the gods were drawn after human types, that is, with human virtues and human frailties, and bodies almost human, except that they were not made to die; so in worship the gods were persons not unlike men in their nature. Worship proceeds on the assumption that gods are like human rulers, in that men honor the gods by games and processions, seek to please them by gifts, and ask them to share banquets made in their honor. Only the humanness of the gods in worship is something more subtle, more intimate than in myth. No stress is laid on human form or the vagaries of human character in the gods of worship; in form they remain spirits more or less vague, but spirits who care for men, who may be approached as a man approaches his ruler, spirits bound to man by close social ties which it is his duty and pleasure to strengthen. Zeus is father of gods and men, a father not untouched by the needs of his children; Athena cares for the city of Athens as her special pride; each family worships gods which are all but akin to the family; in the gymnasium, Apollo or Hermes is represented as the patron and ideal of the youths who exercise there; the drama is part of the service of Dionysus; in a word each form of human activity, be it work or pleasure, was a point of contact with the gods. The real forces at work in the world were first men, and secondly beings with a nature like man’s, but with powers superior to man’s; worship was the attempt to ally the gods more closely to man by social-religious ties, in order that as both worked together the ends of life might be successfully attained. This conception of the gods as higher members of society is the keynote of Greek religion. In some ethnic religions the gods seem to be evil beings whose desire for mischief man must overcome; in others they are beings to be avoided as much as possible; or again they are rulers who delight in man’s abject servitude; or again by cultivating the friendship of one god, man may hope to win blessing and avoid harm from the others. In Greece all the gods of worship were essentially friendly to man, because they were akin to him and a part of the society in which he lived.

6. Relation of Greek Gods to Nature:

The relation of the gods to Nature is not so simple as might at first appear. Within certain limits the forces of Nature were subject to the will of the gods. From the Greek point of view, however, the relation is much more intimate, in that the forces in the world, at least in so far as they affect man, are personal activities, activities that express the will of divine beings. We say that Poseidon personifies the sea, Gaia the earth, Helios the sun; and the origin of religion has been sought in man’s awe before the forces of Nature. The truer statement is that the Greek world, including the physical world, was made up of spiritual beings, not of physical forces. "The fire, as useful as it is treacherous, is the province of Hephaestus; all the dangers and changeableness of the sea are reflected in Poseidon and his followers; an Artemis is there to guide the hunter, a Demeter to make the grain sprout, a Hermes or Apollo to watch over the herds; Athena is the spirit of wisdom, Hermes of shrewdness, Ares of tumultuous war. .... In a word the Greek gods are in the world, not above the world, superior beings who embody in personal

form all the forces that enter into human life." The contrast between such a personal point of view and the mechanical view of modern science is as marked as the contrast between it and the Hebrew conception of a universe brought into being and controlled by a God quite distinct from the physical world.

7. The Greater Gods of Greece:

Of the particular gods, little need be said. The five greater gods, Zeus, Hera, Athena, Apollo and Artemis, are not closely connected with any one phenomenon of Nature or human life, though Zeus has to do with the sky, and Apollo and Artemis acquire a connection with the sun and moon. The most important worship of Zeus was at Olympia, where the pan-Hellenic games were held in his honor. Elsewhere he was worshipped mainly in connection with the weather and the changing seasons. Apparently much of his preeminence in Greek thought was due to myth. Hera was worshipped with Zeus on mountain tops, but her special place in worship was as the goddess of marriage. Athena, the maiden goddess of war and of handicrafts, was worshipped especially in Northern Greece. War dances found a place in her worship, and she was rarely represented without aegis, spear and helmet. All the arts, agriculture, handicrafts, even the art of government, were under her care. Apollo was worshipped widely as the protector of the crops, and of the shepherd’s flocks. In this aspect his festivals included purifications and rites to ward off dangers. He was also the god of music and of prophecy. At Delphi his prophetic powers won great renown, but the Pythian games with their contests in music, in rhythmic dancing, and in athletic sports were hardly less important. Artemis, in myth the chaste sister of Apollo, was worshipped as the queen of wild creatures and the mother of life in plants as well as in animals. She was the patron and the ideal of young women, as was Apollo of young men.

8. Nature Gods:

The gods most closely associated with Nature were not so important for religion. Gain, mother earth, received sacrifices occasionally as the abode of the dead. Rhea in Crete, Cybele in Asia Minor, also in origin forms of the earth mother, received more real worship; this had to do primarily with the birth of vegetation in the spring, and again with its destruction by drought and heat. Rivers were honored in many places as gods of fertility, and springs as nymphs that blessed the land and those who cultivated it. Poseidon was worshipped that he might bless fishing and trade by sea; inland he was sometimes recognized as the "father of waters," and a god of fertility; and where horses were raised, it was under the patronage of Poseidon. The heavenly bodies marked the seasons of worship, but were rarely themselves worshipped. In general, the phenomena of Nature seem to have been too concrete to rouse sentiments of worship in Greece.

9. Gods of Human Activity and Emotions:

A third class of gods, gods of human activities and emotions, were far more important for religion. Demeter, once no doubt a form of the original earth-goddess, was the goddess of the grain, worshipped widely and at many seasons by an agricultural people. Dionysus, god of souls, of the inner life, and of

inspiration by divine power, was worshipped by all who cultivated the vine or drank wine. The Attic drama was the most important development of his worship. Hermes was quite generally honored as the god of shepherds and the god of roads. As the herald, and the god of trade and gain, he found a place in the cities. Aphrodite was perhaps first the goddess of the returning life of the spring; in Greece proper she was rather the goddess of human love, of marriage and the family, the special patron of women. Ares, the Thracian god of war, was occasionally worshipped in Greece, but more commonly the god of each state was worshipped to give success in battle to his people. Hephaestus, pictured as himself a lame blacksmith working at the art which was under his protection, was worshipped now as the fire, now as the patron of cunning work in metal. Asclepius received men's prayers for relief from disease.

II. Revelation: Inspiration.

For the Greeks revelation was a knowledge of the divine will in special circumstances, and inspiration was evinced by the power to foresee the divine purpose in a particular case. There is no such thing as the revelation of the divine nature, nor any question of universal truth coming to men through an inspired teacher; men knew a god through his acts, not through any seer or prophet. But some warning in danger or some clue to the right choice in perplexity might be expected from gods so close to human need as were the Greek gods. The Homeric poems depicted the gods as appearing to men to check them, to encourage them or to direct them. In Homer also men might be guided by signs; while in later times divine guidance came either from signs or from men who were so close to the gods as to foresee something of the divine purpose.

1. Omens:

The simplest class of signs were those that occurred in Nature. In the Iliad the thunderbolt marked the presence of Zeus to favor his friends or check those whose advance he chose to stop. The Athenian assembly adjourned when rain began to fall. Portents in Nature—meteors, comets, eclipses, etc.—claimed the attention of the superstitious; but there was no science of astrology, and superstition had no great hold on the Greeks. In the Homeric poems, birds frequently denoted the will of the gods, perhaps because their place was in the sky beyond any human control, perhaps because certain birds were associated with particular gods. The presence of an eagle on the right hand (toward the East) was favorable, especially when it came in answer to prayer. At times, the act of the bird is significant, as when the eagle of Zeus kills the geese eating grain in Odysseus' hall—portent of the death of the suitors. In later Greek history there are but few references to signs from birds. The theory of these signs in Nature is very simple: all Nature but expresses the will of the gods, and when the gods wish to give men some vague hint of the future, it is necessary only to cause some event not easily explained to attract man's attention.

2. Divination by Sacrifice:

From the 5th century on, divination by means of sacrificial victims took the place ordinarily of signs such as have just been described. In the presence of the enemy or before some important undertaking,

animals were sacrificed to the gods. If they came willingly to the altar, if the inward parts, especially the liver, were sound and well shaped and of good color, if the sacrifice burned freely and without disturbing the arrangement on the altar, success might be expected. The theory was very simple: if the gods were pleased and accepted the sacrifice, their favor was assured; but if the sacrifice deviated in any way from the normal, it would not please the gods. Thus any sacrifice might have prophetic significance, while sacrifices offered before important undertakings had special meaning. The practice arose of repeating sacrifices before a battle until a favorable one was obtained, and at length, as religion began to lose its hold, the time came when a general might disregard them completely.

3. Dreams:

An important means of learning the will of the gods was through dreams, when the ordinary channels of perception were closed and the mind was free to receive impressions from the gods. The treacherousness of dreams was fully recognized, even in the Homeric poem; students of natural science came to recognize that dreams arose from natural causes; none the less they were generally regarded as a source of knowledge about the future, and gradually a science for interpreting dreams was evolved. For Pindar and for Plato the soul was more free when the body slept, and because the soul was the divine part of man’s nature it could exercise the power of divination in sleep. Many of the recorded dreams are signs which came to the mind in sleep, like the dreams of Joseph and of Pharaoh, signs that needed later interpretation.

See DIVINATION; DREAM.

Prophets and seers were not as important in Greece as among many peoples. The blind Teiresias belongs to the realm of myth, though there were great families of seers, like the Iamidae at Olympia, who were specially gifted to interpret dreams, or signs from sacrifices. Ordinarily it was the "chresmologist," the man with a collection of ancient sayings to be applied to present events, whose advice was sought in time of need; or else men turned to the great oracles of Greece.

4. Oracles:

The most important oracle was that of Apollo at Delphi. Hither came envoys of nations as well as individuals, and none went away without some answer to their questions. After preliminary sacrifices, the priestess purified herself and mounted the tripod in the temple; the question was propounded to her by a temple official, and it was his function also to put her wild ravings into hexameter verse for the person consulting the oracle. A considerable number of these answers remain to us, all, of course, somewhat vague, many of them containing shrewd advice on the question that was brought to the oracle. The honor paid to the oracle and its influence, on the whole an influence making for high ethical standards and wise statesmanship, must be recognized. The early Christian Fathers held that the Pythian priestess was inspired by an evil spirit; later critics have treated the whole institution as a clever device to deceive the people; but in view of the respect paid to the oracle through so many generations, it is hard to believe that its officials were not honest in their effort to discover and make known the will of

the god they served.

III. Forms of Worship.

1. Shrines:

It has already been pointed out that Greek religion centered about local shrines. While in early times the shrine consisted of an altar with perhaps a sacred grove, and later it might be no more than a block of stone on which offerings were laid, the more important shrines consisted of a plot of land sacred to the god, a temple or home for the god, and an altar for sacrifices. The plot of land, especially in the case of shrines outside a city, might be very large, in which case it often was used as a source of income to the shrine, being cultivated by the priests or leased under restrictions to private persons.

2. Temples:

In this precinct stood the temple, facing toward the East, so that the morning sun would flood its interior when it was opened on a festival day. With one or two exceptions, the temple was not a place of assembly for worship, but a home for the god. It contained some symbol of his presence, after the 5th century BC ordinarily an image of the god; it served as the treasure-house for gifts brought to the god; worship might be offered in it by the priests, while the people gathered at the sacrifice outside. And as a home for the god, it was adorned with all the beauty and magnificence that could be commanded. The images of the gods, the noblest creation of sculpture in the 5th and 4th centuries, were not exactly "idols"; that is, the images were not themselves worshipped, even though they were thought to embody the god in some semblance to his true form. In Greece men worshipped the gods themselves, grateful as they were to artists who showed them in what beautiful form to think of their deities.

3. Priests:

Each of these shrines was directly in the hands of one or more officials, whose duty it was to care for the shrine and to keep up its worship in due form. Occasionally the priesthood was hereditary and the office was held for life; quite as often priests were chosen for a year or a term of years; but it was exceptional when the duties of the office prevented a man from engaging in other occupations. In distinction from the priests of many other forms of religion, the Greek priest was not a sacred man set apart for the service of the gods; the office may be called sacred, but the office was distinct from the man. The result was important, in that the priests in Greece could never form a caste by themselves, nor could they claim any other powers than were conferred on them by the ritual of the shrine. Thus Greek religion remained in the possession of the people, and developed no esoteric side either in dogma or in worship.

4. Seasons of Worship: Festivals:

The seasons of worship varied with each particular shrine. While the state observed no recurring sabbath, it recognized a certain number of religious festivals as public holidays; thus at Athens the

number of religious holidays in the year was somewhat larger than our fifty-two Sundays. The tradition of each shrine determined whether worship should be offered daily or monthly or yearly, and also what were the more important seasons of worship. The principle of the sacred days was that at certain seasons the god was present in his temple expecting worship; just as it was the principle of sacred places that the temple should be located where the presence of the god had been felt and therefore might be expected again. Neither the location of the temple nor the seasons of worship were determined primarily by human convenience.

5. Elements of Worship:

The elements of worship in Greece were

(1) prayers, hymns, and votive offerings,

(2) the sacrificial meal,

(3) propitiatory sacrifice and purification, and

(4) the processions, musical contests and athletic games, which formed part of the larger festivals.

The heroes of Homer prayed to the gods at all times, now a word of prayer in danger, now more formal prayers in connection with a sacrifice; and such was doubtless the practice in later times.

6. Prayer:

In the more formal prayers, it was customary to invoke the god with various epithets, to state the petition, and to give the reason why a favorable answer might be expected—either former worship by the petitioner, or vows of future gifts, or former answers to prayer, or an appeal to the pity of the god. Sometimes a prayer reads as if it were an attempt to win divine favor by gifts; more commonly, if not always, the appeal is to a relationship between man and his god, in which man’s gifts play a very subordinate part. Thanksgiving finds small place in prayer or in sacrifice, but it was rather expressed in votive offerings. In every temple these abounded, as in certain Roman Catholic shrines today; and as is the case today they might be of value in themselves, they might have some special reference to the god, or they might refer to the human need in which the giver had found help. So far as the great public festivals are concerned, the prayer seems to have been merged with the hymn of praise in which the element of petition found a small place.

7. Burnt Offering or Sacrificial Meal:

The most common form of worship consisted of the sacrificial meal, like the meat offering or meal offering of the Hebrews. The sacrifice consisted of a domestic animal, selected in accordance with the ritual of the shrine where it was to be offered. First the animal was led to the altar, consecrated with

special rites and killed by the offerer or the priest while hymns and cries of worship were uttered by the worshippers. Then some of the inward parts were roasted and eaten by priests and worshippers. Finally the remainder of the creature was prepared, the thigh bones wrapped in fat and meat to be burned for the god, the balance of the meat to be roasted for the Worshippers; and with libations of wine the whole was consumed. The religious meaning of the act is evidently found in the analogy of a meal prepared for an honored guest.

8. Meaning of the Sacrifice:

The animal, an object valuable in itself, is devoted to this religious service; the god and his worshippers share alike this common meal; and the god is attached to his worshippers by a closer social bond, because they show their desire to honor and commune with him, while he condescends to accept the gift and to share the meal they have prepared. (Possibly the animal was once thought to have been made divine by the act of consecration, or the god was believed to be present in his flesh, but there is no evidence that such a belief existed in the 5th century BC, or later.) The simple, rational character of this worship is characteristic of Greek religion.

9. Propitiatory Sacrifice:

When men felt that the gods were displeased or in circumstances where for any reason their favor was doubtful, a different form of sacrifice was performed. A black animal was selected, and brought to a low altar of earth; the sacrifice was offered toward evening or at night, and the whole animal was consumed by fire. While in general this type of sacrifice may be called propitiatory, its form, if not its meaning, varied greatly. It might be worship to spirits of the earth whose anger was to be feared; it might be offered when an army was going into battle, or when the crops were in danger of blight, or of drought; or again it was the normal form of worship in seasons of pestilence or other trouble. Sometimes the emphasis seems to be laid on the propitiation of anger by an animal wholly devoted to the god, while at other times there is the suggestion that some evil substance is removed by the rite.

10. Purification:

The later conception is clearer in rites of purification, where, by washing, by fire, or by the blood of an animal slain for the purpose, some form of defilement is removed. In the sacrifice of a pig to Demeter for this purpose, or of a dog to Hecate, some mystic element may exist, since these animals were sacred to the respective goddesses.

These various elements of worship were combined in varying degree in the great religious festivals. These lasted from a day to a fortnight. After purification of the worshippers, which might be simple or elaborate, and some preliminary sacrifice, there was often a splendid procession followed by a great public sacrifice.

11. The Great Religious Festivals:

In the greater festivals, this was followed by athletic games and horse races in honor of the god, and sometimes by contests in music and choral dancing, or, in the festivals of Dionysus at Athens, by the performance of tragedy and comedy in theater. In all this, the religious element seems to retreat into the background, though analogies may be found in the history of Christianity. The religious mystery plays were the origin of our own drama; and as for the horse races, one may still see them performed as a religious function, for example, at Siena. The horse races and the athletic games were performed for the gods as for some visiting potentate, a means of affording them pleasure and doing them honor. The theatrical performances apparently originated in ceremonies more essentially religious, in which men acted some divine drama depicting the experiences attributed to the gods themselves.

12. Mysteries at Eleusis:

This last feature is most evident in the mysteries at Eleusis, where the experiences of Demeter and Persephone were enacted by the people with the purpose of bringing the worshippers into some more intimate connection with these goddesses, such that their blessing was assured not only for this world, but for the life after death.

13. Absence of Magic and Mystery:

In all the forms of Greek worship perhaps the most striking feature was the absence of magic or superstition, almost the absence of mystery. Men approached the gods as they would approach superior men, bringing them petitions and gifts, making great banquets for their entertainment, and performing races and games for their pleasure, although this was by no means the whole of Greek religion, a phase of religion far more highly developed in the rational atmosphere of Greek thought than among other races. As the Greek gods were superior members of the social universe, so Greek worship was for the most part social, even human, in its character.

IV. The Future Life.

1. Funeral Rites:

Greek thought of the life after death was made up of three elements which developed successively, while the earlier ones never quite lost their hold on the people in the presence of the later. The oldest and most permanent thought of the future found its expression in the worship of ancestors. Whether the body of the dead was buried or burned, the spirit was believed to survive, an insubstantial shadowy being in the likeness of the living man. And rites were performed for these shades to lay them to rest and to prevent them from injuring their survivors, if not to secure their positive blessing. As at other points in Greek religion, the rites are fairly well known, while the belief must be inferred from the rites. The rites consisted first of an elaborate funeral, including sometimes animal sacrifices and even athletic games, and secondly of gifts recurring at stated intervals, gifts of water for bathing, of wine and food, and of wreaths and flowers. The human wants and satisfaction of the spirit are thus indicated. And the purpose

is perhaps to keep the spirit alive, certainly to keep it in good humor so that it will not injure the survivors and bring on them defilement which would mean the wrath of the gods. At the same time, any contact with death demands purification before one can approach the gods in worship.

2. Future Life in the Homeric Poems:

The second element in Greek thought of the future life appears in the Homeric poems, and through the epic exerted a wide influence on later periods. Here the separateness of the souls of the dead from the human life is emphasized. Once the bodies of the dead are burned, the souls go to the realm of Hades, whence there is no return even in dreams, and where (according to one view) not even consciousness remains to them. It would seem that the highly rational view of the world in the epic, a point of view which laid stress on the greater Olympian gods, banished the belief in souls as akin to the belief in sinister and magic influences. We might almost say that the thought of the greater gods as personal rulers tended to drive out the thought of lesser and more mystic spiritual influences, and made a place for souls only as shades in the realm of Hades. Certainly the result for Greek religion was to render far less vivid any idea of a real life after death.

3. Later Beliefs in Immortality:

The third element was associated with the worship of the gods of the lower world, and in particular Demeter and Persephone. In this worship, particularly at Eleusis, the fact of life after death was assumed, a fact that the Greeks never had denied; but the reality of the future life, the persistence of human relationship after death, and the kindly rule of Persephone as Queen of Souls were vividly impressed on the worshippers. In part through the influence of the Orphic sect, the actual divinity of the soul was believed by many thinkers, a doctrine which was formulated by Plato in a manner which profoundly affected early Christian thought. If the epic emphasis on the greater gods made the souls mere shades in Hades, it was again a religious movement, namely the worship of gods like Persephone and Dionysus, which taught to some Greeks the divine reality of the soul and its hope for a blessed life in communion with the gods.

This development in Greece is the more interesting because there are indications of the same. thing in Hebrew history. In the Old Testament there are found traces of an old worship of souls, practiced by races akin to the Hebrews if not by the Hebrews themselves; this worship was brought to an end under the clarifying power of the worship of Yahweh; and finally the later prophets perceived the truth that while souls were not to be worshipped, the dead who died in the Lord did not become mere shades, but continued to live as the objects of His Divine love.

V. Sin, Expiation, and the Religious Life.

1. Greek Idea of Sin:

The ancient Hebrew religion made much of sin, and of the remedy for sin which God, in loving mercy to

His people, had provided; in Greece the thought of sin found no such place in the religious life, though of course it was not absent altogether. If sin is defined as that which causes divine displeasure and wrath, it appears in Greek thought in three forms:

(1) as the transgression of moral law,

(2) as neglect of the gods and consequent presumption, and

(3) as pollution.

The cause of sin is traced to human folly, either some passion like envy or anger or desire for gain, or to undue self-reliance which develops into presumption; and once a man has started in the wrong direction, his sin so affects judgment and will that he is all but inevitably led on into further sin. According to the simple Greek theodicy, the transgression of moral law brings its penalty, nor can any sacrifice induce the gods to intervene on behalf of the transgressor. All that expiation can accomplish is to set right the spirit of the transgressor so that he will not be led into further sin. Neglect of the gods—the second type of sin—brings its penalty in the results of divine wrath, but in this case, prompt repentance and submission to the gods may appease the wrath and therefore change its results. Pollution, the third cause of divine displeasure, often cannot be called sin; the failure to remove pollution, however, especially before one approaches the gods, is a just cause of divine anger. In general the Greek thought of sin centers about the idea of undue self-reliance and presumption, (hubris), which is the opposite of the characteristic Greek virtue, (sophrosune), namely that temperate mode of life in which everything is viewed in right proportion. Inasmuch as the Greek gods are righteous rulers, the nature of sin lies in its opposition to divine justice, not in unholiness or in the rejection of divine love.

2. Religious Ideals:

The demands of the religious life in Greece were relatively simple. To avoid acts of impiety such as are mentioned above, to perform the ordinary acts of worship regularly and punctiliously, were all that was required, though the religious man might find many opportunities for worship beyond what was expected of everyone. Little is said of the spirit of worship which underlay the outward acts. Nor does the command, "Be ye therefore holy, even as I am holy," find an echo in Greece. At the same time the fact that the gods so definitely represented human ideals of life, must have meant that in a way men aimed to make their lives conform to divine ideals. The essential feature of the religious life was the true recognition of human dependence on the gods, a dependence which showed itself in obedience to the divine rule, in trustful confidence that the gods would bless their worshippers, in resignation when misfortune came, and particularly in the belief in the loving care and protection of the divine rulers. In Greece, the religious man looked to the gods not so much for salvation from evil, as for positive blessings.

VI. The Influence of Greek Religion on Christianity.

1. Greek Philosophy and Christian Theology:

This is not the place to speak of the decadence of Greek religion, of its ameliorating influence on the Alexandrian world, or of the control it exercised over the Roman state. Its most permanent effect is found rather in Christianity. And here its shaping influence is first noted in Christian theology beginning with Paul and the Apostle John. For although Greek religion was more free from dogma or anything that could be called theology than are most religions, it furnished the religious content to the greatest philosophical systems we know; and all through the centuries the leaders of Christian thought have been trained in the religious philosophy of Plato and of Aristotle. Our Christian conceptions of the nature of God and the soul, of the relation of God to the physical universe, and of God's government of the world, have been worked out along the lines laid down by these Greek thinkers. And while the debt is primarily to Greek philosophy, it should never be forgotten that Greek philosophy formulated these conceptions out of the material which Greek religion furnished; indeed one may believe that it was the religious conceptions formulated by centuries of thoughtful worshippers which found final expression in the Greek philosophic systems.

2. Greek Influence on Christian Liturgy:

Again, the organization of the early Christian church and its form of government was quite as much Greek as it was Hebrew in origin. Here the influence of Greek religion as such was less marked; still it must be remembered that every form of Greek organization had its religious side, be it family, or school, or state; and further, that some phases of religion in Greece were quite thoroughly organized in a manner that was adapted without much difficulty to the conditions of the new religion. Moreover the thought of the Greek priest as not a sacred man, but a man appointed by the community to a sacred office, was naturally adopted by the nascent Christian communities. Even in the organization of worship, in the prayers and hymns and liturgy which gradually developed from the simplest beginnings, it is not difficult to trace the influence of what the Greek converts to Christianity had been brought up to regard as worship of the gods.

3. Greek Influence on the Sacraments:

The most striking case of the effect of the old religion on the new is found in the method of celebrating the Christian sacraments. In the 2nd century AD, the baptismal bath took place after a brief period of instruction, and at the common meal the bread and wine were blessed in commemoration of the Master. Three centuries passed and this simplicity had given way to splendid ceremony. Baptism ordinarily was performed only on the "mystic night," the night before Easter. Almost magic rites with fasting had exorcised evil from the candidate; ungirded, with loose hair and bare feet, he went down into the water, and later was anointed with oil to signify the gift of the Holy Spirit; then the candidates, dressed in white, wearing crowns, and carrying torches, proceeded to their first communion in which a mixture of honey and milk might take the place of wine. The whole ceremony had been assimilated to what Greek religion knew as an initiation, in which the baptized underwent some essential change of nature. They were said to have "put on the dress of immortality."

The Lord’s Supper was carefully limited to those who had been through this initiation, and even among these, at length, degrees of privilege arose. The ceremony came to be known as a mystery, the table as an altar, the officiating priest as a "hierarch," and the result as a blessed "vision" of sacred things by which the resurrection life was imparted. In its formal character and the interpretation of its meaning, as well as in the terms used to describe it, the effect of the Greek mysteries may be seen.

Yet during these three centuries Christianity had been waging a life-and-death struggle with the old religion. It is indeed impossible to believe that converts to Christianity should intentionally copy the forms of a worship which they had often at much cost to themselves rejected as false. The process must have been slow and quite unconscious. As the language of heathen philosophy was used in forming a Christian theology, so the conceptions and practices which had developed in Greek religion found their way into the developing Christian ritual. Much of this ritual which had no essential place in Christianity was later rejected; some still remains, the contribution of the religious life of Greece to the forms of worship in our world religion.

LITERATURE.

O. Gruppe, "Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte" in I. von Muller’s Handbuch, 1897-1906; Preller-Robert, Griechische Mythologie, I, 1894; W. H. Roscher, Ausfuhrliches Lexikon der griechischen und romishen Mythologie, 1884-; L. R. Farnell, The Cults of the Greek States, 1896-1910; L. Campbell, Religion in Greek Literature, 1898; J. Adam, The Religious Teachers of Greece, 1908; P. Stengel, "Die griechischen Kultusaltertumer," in I. von Muller’s Handbuch, 2nd edition, 1898; B.I. Wheeler, Dionysus and Immortality, 1899; E. Hatch, Greek Ideas and Usages, Their Influence upon the Christian Church, 1890; G. Anrich, Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum, 1894; E. E. G., The Makers of Hellas: A Critical Inquiry into the Philosophy and Religion of Ancient Greece, 1903; E. Caird, Evolution of Theology in Greek Philosophers, 1904; E.A. Gardner, Religion and Art in Ancient Greece, 1910; A. Fairbanks, Handbook of Greek Religion, 1910.

Arthur Fairbanks

GREECE, SONS OF

"I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and will make thee as the sword of a mighty man" (Zec 9:13). The passage doubtless refers to the captive Hebrews who are held by the Greeks. The exhortation is to insurrection against the Greeks. Although bearing a striking similarity to the passage in Joe 3:6, there is evidently no connection between the two. In the first, there was conflict between the nations; in the second, simply a reflection upon Tyre and Sidon for having sold into Greece certain Jewish captives. From a Jewish standpoint the Maccabean wars were really between Jews and Greeks.

See JAVAN; ASMONEANS.

GREECE; GRAECIA

gres, gre’-sha;

1. Name:

In the earliest times there was no single name universally and exclusively in use either of the people or of the land of Greece. In Homer, three appellations, (Achaioi), (Danaoi), (Argeioi), were with no apparent discrimination applied to all the Greeks. By the Orientals they were called Ionians. See JAVAN. The name (Hellenes), which in historical times came into general use as a collective appellation, was applied in Homer to a small tribe in Thessaly. But the corresponding name (Hellas) was not primarily a geographical term, but designated the abode of the Hellenes wherever they had their own states or cities. In the 4th century BC many felt, as did Isocrates, that even "Hellene" stood not so much for a distinction in race, as for preeminence of culture, in contrast to the despised "Barbarian." Hence, there was much dispute as touching certain peoples, as, e.g. the Epirotes, Macedonians, and even the Thessalians, whether they should be accounted Hellenes and as included in Hellas. The word (Graikoi), Latin Graeci) occurs in Aristotle, who says that it was an older name for those who were later called Hellenes. The meaning and truth of this statement are alike in doubt; but he probably refers only to the tribe inhabiting the vicinity of Dodona, in Epirus. At any rate, Graeci and Graecia owed their introduction practically to the Romans after their contact with the Greeks in the war with Pyrrhus, and in consequence they included (what "Hellenes" and "Hellas" did not) Epirus and Macedonia.

2. Location and Area:

"Hellas," as the land of the Hellenes, is used in a broad sense to include not only Greece proper, but also the islands of the Ionian and Aegean seas, the seaboard of the Hellespont, of the Pontus, and of Asia Minor, the flourishing colonial regions of Magna Grecia and Sicily, Crete, and occasionally Cyprus, Cyrene, and the scattered colonies dotting the shore of the Mediterranean, almost to the Pillars of Hercules. "Grecia," however, was used in a more restricted sense as applying to "Continuous" (or continental) Greece, which forms the southern extremity of the Balkan peninsula. While the Romans included Macedonia and Epirus, it will be well for us to limit Greece to the territory lying roughly below 40 degrees, and extending almost to 36 degrees North latitude, and ranging between 17 degrees and 23 degrees East longitude. If, as is proper, we include the immediately adjacent islands, its greatest length, from Mt. Olympus in the North to Cythera in the South, is about 280 miles; its greatest breadth, from Cephallenia in the West to Euboea in the East, is about 240 miles. The area, however, owing to the great irregularity of its contour, is far less than one might expect, amounting to about 30,000 square miles. With an area, therefore, considerably less than that of Portugal, Greece has a coastline exceeding in length that of Spain and Portugal combined. In Greece the ratio of coastline to area is 1:3 1/4, whereas that of the Iberian peninsula is 1:25.

3. Mountain Structure:

The northern boundary of Greece is formed by an irregular series of mountain chains, beginning on the West with the Acroceraunian range and ending in Mt. Olympus (now, Elymbos, 9,790 ft.) on the East. Intersecting this line, the lofty Pindus range, forming the backbone of Northern Greece, extends southward to Mt. Tymphrestus (now, Velouchi, 7,610 ft.) in Aetolia, at which point spurs radiate through Central Greece. The highest peaks are Mt. Corax (now, Vardusia, 8,180 ft.) in Aetolia, Mt. Oeta (7,060 ft.), Parnassus (now, Lyakoura, 8,070 ft.), Helicon (now, Paleo Vouno, 5,740 ft.), Cithaeron (now, Elatias, 4,630 ft.), lying on the boundary between Boeotia and Attica, Mt. Geranea (now, Makri Plaghi, 4,500 ft.), North of the Isthmus, and, in Attica, Parnes (now, Ozea, 4,640 ft.), Pentelicon (now, Mendeli, 3,640 ft.) and Hymettus (now Trelovouni, 3,370 ft.). Along the eastern coast extends a broken range of mountains, the highest peaks of which are Ossa (now, Kissavos, 6,400 ft.), Pelion (now, Plessidi, 5,310 ft.); and, in Euboea, which virtually belongs to this range, Dirphys (now, Delphi, 5,730 ft.) and Ocha (now, Elias, 4,610 ft.). Southern Greece, or the Peloponnesus, is united to Central Greece only by a narrow isthmus (now cut by a canal 4 miles long), with a minimum altitude of about 250 ft. In the northern portion, a confused mass of mountains rises to great heights in Cyllene (now, Ziria, 7,790 ft.), Erymanthus (now, Olonos, 7,300 ft), Maenalus (now, Apano Chrepa, 6,500 ft.), all in Arcadia, Panachaicus (now, Voidia, 6,320 ft.), in Achaia; and, running southward through Laconia, the two important ranges called Taygetus (now, Pentedaktylo, 7,900 ft.) and Parnon (now, Malevo, 6,430 ft.). Minor ranges jut seaward in Argolis, Laconia and Messenia.

4. Rivers and Lakes:

The rainfall in Greece is not abundant and is confined largely to late autumn and winter. Whether the present rainfall differs much in amount from that of antiquity is a matter in dispute, although it seems reasonable to assume that the progressive denudation of the mountains since the 5th century AD has entailed a corresponding loss in humidity. Even in antiquity, however, the rivers of Greece were much like the arroyos of the Southwest portion of the U.S.A., which are in winter raging mountain torrents, and in summer dry channels. Owing to the proximity of the sea to all points in Greece, the rivers are short, and the scarcity of springs makes them dependent upon the direct and immediate rainfall. Among the more considerable rivers may be enumerated, in Northern Greece, the Peneius, with its tributaries, in Thessaly; Central Greece, the Achelous and the Evenus, in Aetolia; the Spercheius, flowing between Oeta and Othrys into the Maliac Gulf; the storied, but actually insignificant, Ilyssus and Cephissus, of the Attic plain; in Southern Greece, the Alpheius, rising in Arcadia and flowing westward through Elis, and the Eurotas, which drains Laconia. Eastern Greece consists of a series of somewhat considerable basins, which become lakes in winter and are pestilent marshes in summer, except where Nature or man has afforded an outlet. The former is the case with the Peneius, which has cut a channel through the celebrated Vale of Tempe. Lake Copais, in Boeotia, affords an example of man’s activity. The Minyae, in prehistoric times, are credited with enlarging the natural outlets, and so draining the basin for a time; in recent times the same undertaking has again been brought to a successful issue. Similar basins occur at Lake Boebeis, in Thessaly, and at Lake Stymphalus, in Arcadia, besides others of less importance. Western Greece has relatively few such basins, as at Lake Pambotis, in Epirus, and at Lake Trichonis, in Aetolia. In many cases, where there is no surface outlet to these basins, subterranean channels (called by the Greeks Katavothrae) are formed in the calcareous rock, through which the waters are drained and occasionally again brought to the surface at a lower level.

5. Climate:

The climate of Greece was probably much the same in ancient times as it is today, except that it may have been more salubrious when the land was more thickly populated and better cultivated. Herodotus says that of all countries, Greece possessed the most happily tempered seasons; and Hippocrates and Aristotle commend it for the absence of extremes of heat and cold, as favorable for intelligence and energy. But owing to the inequalities of its surface, to the height of its mountains and the depth of its valleys, the climate varies greatly in different districts. In the highlands of the interior the winter is often cold and severe, the snow lying on the ground until late in the spring, while in the lowlands near the sea there is rarely any severe weather, and snow is almost unknown. The following data for Athens may be taken as a basis for comparison: humidity 41 per cent, rainfall 13,1 inches, distributed over 100 days; mean temperature, Jan. 48,2 degrees F., July 80,6 degrees F. Greece lies open to the northern winds which, during certain seasons, prevail and give a bracing quality to the air not always present in places of the same latitude.

6. Geology:

The western half of Greece, in which the mountain ranges run generally from North to South, consists of a formation of grayish and yellowish-white compact limestone, while the eastern half—Macedonia, Thessaly, Euboea, Cyllene, and the mountains from Artemision to Cape Malea and Taygetus—together with the greater part of Attica and of the Cyclades, consists of mica-schist and crystalline-granular limestone (marble) Tertiary formations occur in narrow strips on the North and Northwest slopes of the ranges in the Peloponnesus and in the valley of the Eurotas, in Boeotia and Euboea. Volcanic action is evidenced both in the parallel elevations of similar or contemporary formation, and in the earthquakes frequent in all ages, especially in Southern and Central Greece, and in the islands of the Aegean. Perennially active volcanoes are nowhere found in Greece, but new formations due to volcanic action are most clearly seen on the island of Them among the Cyclades, where they have occurred within the last half-century. The solfatara between Megara and Corinth, and the abundant hot springs at widely scattered points in Greece also bear witness to the volcanic character of the region. Many an ancient site, venerated for its sanctity in antiquity, like those of Delphi and Olympia, in their ruined temples offer mute testimony to the violence of the earthquakes; and history records repeated instances of cities engulfed by tidal waves of appalling height.

7. Topography:

Mention has already been made of the sinuous coastline of Greece, and the land has been spoken of as consisting of three divisions. Northern Greece, to which Epirus and Thessaly belong, is marked off from Central Greece by the deep indentations of the Ambracian Gulf on the West and the Maliac Gulf on the East. The Pegasean Gulf, virtually continued by Lake Boebeis, reaches far into Thessaly, and divides it from Magnesia, which lies to the eastward. The land of the Dolopians really belongs to Northern Greece. Central Greece consists of Acarnania and Aetolia on the West, and of Phocis, Boeotia and Attica (with the adjacent island of Euboea) on the East, separated by a group of lesser states, Aenis, Oetaea, Doris,

Locris and Phocis. Southern Greece is separated from Central Greece by the Corinthian and Saronic Gulfs, which almost meet at the Isthmus of Corinth, and are now, after repeated efforts, dating from the time of Julius Caesar, united by a sea-level canal. Megaris, which, by its position, belongs to Central Greece, is here, in accordance with its political affinities and predilections, classed with Corinth, the keeper of the isthmus, as belonging to Southern Greece. Facing the Corinthian Gulf, Achaia forms the northern division of the Peloponnesus, touching Elis, Arcadia and Argolis, which belt the peninsula in this order from West to East Arcadia is the only political division which does not have access to the sea, occupying as it does the great central plateau intersected by lesser ranges of varying height. The southernmost divisions, Messenia and Laconia, are deeply indented by the Messeniac and Laconic Gulfs, and Laconia is separated from the peninsula of Argolis by the Argolic Gulf, all of which head somewhat West of North of the subjacent islands, which a reasonable view must include in the boundaries of Greece, Euboea has already been mentioned; but we should add the group of great islands lying in the Ionian Sea, namely, Corcyra (now, Corfu), Leukas, Ithaca, Cephallenia (now, Cephalonia), Zacynthus (now, Zante), and Cythera (now, Cerigo), at the mouth of the Laconic Gulf, as well as Salamis and Aegina in the Saronic Gulf.

Greece was never, in ancient times, a united state, but consisted of a large number of separate states. These were essentially of two types, (a) city-states, in which a city dominated the adjacent territory whose free population constituted its citizenship, or (b) confederacies, in which neighboring cities or districts combined into political organizations which we may call federal states. These matters cannot, however, be discussed except in connection with the history of Greece, for which the reader must consult the standard works. It may be advisable here, however, to name the principal cities of Greece. Northern Greece had no great cities which developed as commercial centers. Aegina was the first to attain to special importance, then Corinth and Athens; Chalcis and Eretria, in Euboea, were for a time rich and prosperous, and Megara, in Megarid, and Argos, in Argolis, became formidable rivals of Athens. Sparta, though never a commercial center, early won and long maintained the hegemony of Greece, for a while disputed by Athens, in virtue of her power as the home of the militant Dorian aristocracy, which was disastrously defeated by the Beotians under Epaminondas, when Thebes, for a time, assumed great importance. Megalopolis, in Arcadia, enjoyed a brief prominence at the time of the Achean League, and Corcyra flourished in the 5th and 4th centuries BC. We should also not fail to mention three great centers of Greek religion: Olympia, in Elis, as the chief sanctuary of Zeus; Delphi, in Phocis, as the oracular seat of Apollo; and Eleusis, in Attica, as the pilgrim-shrine to which all Greeks resorted who would be initiated in the mysteries of Demeter and Cora. Argos also possessed a far-famed shrine of Hera, and Thermopile and Calauria were the centers at which met the councils of influential amphictyonies. Epidaurus was famous for her sanctuary of Asclepius. Delos, a little island in mid-Aegean, celebrated as a sanctuary of Apollo and as the meeting-place of a most influential amphictyony, falls without the limits of Greece proper; but Dodona, in Southern Epirus, should be mentioned as the most ancient and venerable abode of the oracle of Zeus. The Greeks, incorrigibly particularistic in politics, because of the almost insuperable barriers erected by Nature between neighboring peoples in the lofty mountain ranges, were in a measure united by their religion which, like the sea, another element making for intercourse and union, touched them at nearly every point.

For Greece in the Old Testament, see JAVAN. In the New Testament "Greece" occurs but once—Ac

20:2—where it is distinguished from Macedonia.

William Arthur Heidel

GREEK LANGUAGE

See LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GREEK VERSIONS

See SEPTUAGINT; VERSIONS.

GREEKS

See GRECIANS.

GREEN; GREENISH

gren.

See COLOR.

GREETING

gret’-ing (sha’-al; chairo, aspasmos, aspazomai):

(1) Sha’-al means "to ask," "to inquire of anyone respecting welfare," hence, "to greet." In the Old Testament the word "greet" occurs only once in the King James Version or the Revised Version (British and American), namely, in 1Sa 25:5, "Go to Nabal, and greet him in my name." But it is implied in other places where shalom ("well," "prosperity," "peace"), the common Hebrew greeting, is used; e.g. in Ge 37:4, it is said of Joseph that "his brethren could not speak peaceably unto him," i.e. could not give him the common friendly greeting of "Peace!" "Peace be to thee!" So, in Ge 43:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "He asked them of their welfare" (King James Version margin "peace"); Ex 18:7, "They asked each other of their Welfare"(king James Version, margin "peace"); 2Sa 11:7, "how Joab did, and how the people did" (the Revised Version (British and American) "fared," the King James Version margin "of the peace of"); Joab said to Amasa (2Sa 20:9), the Revised Version (British and American) "Is it well with thee, my brother?" (Hebrew "Art thou in peace, my brother?"); Boaz greeted his reapers with "Yahweh be with you," and they answered, "Yahweh bless thee" (Ru 2:4; compare Ps 129:8, "The blessing of Yahweh be upon you; we bless you in the name of Yahweh"). For the king, we have, the King James Version and the English Revised Version God save the king (m "Let the king live," the American Standard Revised Version "(Long) live the king") (1Sa 10:24, etc.); "Let my lord

king David live for ever" (1Ki 1:31; see also Ne 2:3; Da 2:4, etc.). In Ecclesiasticus 6:5 it is said "a fair-speaking tongue will increase kind greetings," the Revised Version (British and American) "multiply courtesies" (euprosegora).

(2) When Jesus sent forth His disciples to proclaim the kingdom, they were to "salute" the house they came to (Mt 10:12), saying (Lu 10:5), "Peace (eirene) be to this house!"; if it was not worthy, the blessing should return to themselves. After His resurrection He greeted His disciples saying, "Peace be unto you" (Lu 24:36; Joh 20:19,21,26); He left His "peace" with them as His parting blessing (Joh 14:27) —"not as the world giveth," in a formal way. A frequent form of greeting in the New Testament is chairo ("to rejoice," imperative and infinitive, chaire, chairete, "Joy to thee," "Joy to you," translated "Hail!" and "All hail!" Mt 26:49; 27:29; 28:9; Mr 15:18; Lu 1:28; Joh 19:3), "Rejoice!" (Php 3:1; the English Revised Version, margin "farewell"). Another word for greeting is aspasmos, "greetings in the markets" (the King James Version Mt 23:7; Mr 12:38, "salutations"; Lu 11:43, "greetings," Lu 20:46; also Lu 1:29,41,44; 1Co 16:21; Col 4:18; 2Th 3:17; in all these places the Revised Version (British and American) has "salutation").

(3) Of epistolary greetings we have examples in Ezr 4:17, "Peace" (shelam), etc.; 5:7; Da 4:1; 6:25. These are frequent in the Apoc: 1 Esdras 6:7, "to King Darius greeting" (chairo); 8:9; 1 Macc 10:18, etc.; 2 Macc 1:10, "greeting, health," etc. We have the same form in Ac 15:23; 23:26. In 3 Joh 1:14 it is, "Peace (be) unto thee. The friends salute thee." Paul opens most of his epistles with the special Christian greeting, "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" (Ro 1:7; 1Co 1:3, etc.). Also at the close, "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (1Co 16:23; 2Co 13:14, etc.). He directs greetings to be given to various persons, and sends greetings from those who are with him (Ro 16:5-23; 1Co 16:19; 2Co 13:13; Php 4:21; Col 4:10, etc.). In those cases the word is aspazomai, and the Revised Version (British and American) translates "salute," etc. (compare Jas 1:1; 1Pe 1:2; 5:14; 2Pe 1:2; 2Joh 1:3,13; Jude 1:2).

See GODSPEED; KISS.

W. L. Walker

GREYHOUND

gra'-hound.

See DOG.

GRIEF; GRIEVE

gref, grev: There are some 20 Hebrew words translated in the King James Version by "grief," "grieve," "to be grieved," etc. Among the chief are chalah, choli, yaghon, ka'ac, atsabh. They differ, partly, in their physical origin, and partly, in the nature and cause of the feeling expressed. the Revised Version

(British and American) in several instances gives effect to this.

(1) Chalah, choli express the sense of weakness, sickness, pain (e.g. Samson, in Jud 16:7,11,17, "Then shall I become weak (chalah), and be as another man"); Isa 17:11 the King James Version, "a heap in the day of grief"; Isa 53:3,1, "a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief," "He hath borne our griefs" (choli), the Revised Version, margin Hebrew "sickness, sicknesses"; 53:10, "He hath put him to grief," the Revised Version, margin "made him sick" (chalah) (translated by Dillmann and others, "to crush him incurably"; compare Mic 6:13; Na 3:19); yaghon, perhaps from the pain and weariness of toil (Ps 31:10), "For my life is spent with grief," the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrow"; "The Lord added grief to my sorrow," the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrow to my pain" (Jer 45:3); ka‘ac implies provocation, anger, irritation; thus Hannah said to Eli (the King James Version), "Out of the abundance of my complaint and my grief (the Revised Version (British and American) "provocation") have I spoken" (1Sa 1:16). Ps 6:7; 31:9, "grief"; Pr 17:25, "A foolish son is a grief to his father" (i.e. source of provocation; the same word is rendered "wrath" in 12:16, the King James Version "a fool’s wrath," the Revised Version (British and American) "vexation"; so also Pr 27:3); Job 6:2, "Oh that my grief were thoroughly weighed," the Revised Version (British and American) "Oh that my vexation were but weighed" (in 5:2 the King James Version the same word is translated "wrath," the Revised Version (British and American) "vexation"); ke’ebh, is "sorrow," "pain," properly "to hurt." It occurs in Job 2:13 "His grief (the Revised Version, margin "or pain") was very great"; also 16:6 the Revised Version (British and American), "grief"; makh’obh "sorrows," "pain," "suffering" (2Ch 6:29, the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrow"; Ps 69:26, the Revised Version, margin "or pain"; Isa 53:3, "a man of sorrows"; 53:4, "Surely he hath carried our sorrows"); marah and marar indicate "bitterness" (Ge 26:35; 49:23; 1Sa 30:6; Ru 1:13; Pr 14:10, "The heart knoweth its own bitterness, marah); puqah implies staggering, or stumbling, only in 1Sa 25:31, "This shall be no grief unto thee," the Revised Version, margin Hebrew "cause of staggering"; ra‘ (a common word for "evil") denotes an evil, a calamity, only once in the King James Version translated "grief," namely, of Jonah’s gourd, "to deliver him from his grief," the Revised Version (British and American) "from his evil case" (Jon 4:6); yara‘, "to be evil," De 15:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "Thy heart shall not be grieved when thou givest unto him" (also 1Sa 1:8; Ne 2:10; 13:8; several times translated "grievous"); charah, "to burn," "to be wroth" (e.g. Ge 4:6, "Why art thou wroth?"), is translated "grieved" in Ge 45:5, and 1Sa 15:11 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "Samuel was wroth"); the same word is often used of the kindling of anger; la’ah, "to be weary," "tired," "faint" (Pr 26:15), the King James Version "The slothful hideth his hand in his bosom, it grieveth him to bring it again to his mouth," the Revised Version (British and American) "wearieth"; also Job 4:2; atsabh, "to grieve," "to be vexed," occurs in Ge 6:6; 34:7; 45:5, etc.; Ps 78:40, "How oft did they .... grieve him in the desert." Of other words sometimes translated "grief" may be mentioned quT, "to weary of," "to loathe" (Ps 95:10), "Forty long years was I grieved with that generation"; in 119:158; 139:21, the Revised Version, margin "loathe"; chamets, implying to be bitterly or violently moved, sour (often translated "leavened"), only in Ps 73:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "For my soul was grieved," margin, Hebrew "was in a ferment."

(2) In the New Testament "grief," "grieve," etc., are infrequent. The commonest words are lupe (1Pe 2:19), the Revised Version (British and American) "griefs," elsewhere translated "sorrow"; lupeo, "to

grieve," "afflict" (Mr 10:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrowful"; Joh 21:17 "Peter was grieved"; Ro 14:15; 2Co 2:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "made sorry"; 2:5, "caused sorrow"; Eph 4:30, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God"); diaponeomai, literally, "to labor through," "to grieve self" occurs twice (Ac 4:2; 16:18 the Revised Version (British and American) "sore troubled"); stenazo, "to groan, or sigh," once only translated "grief" (Heb 13:17), the Revised Version, margin "groaning"; prosochthizo, "to be indignant," etc., twice (Heb 3:10,17, the Revised Version (British and American) "displeased"). The reference is to Ps 95:10, where the Septuagint by this Greek word translates quT (see above).

The less frequency in the New Testament of words denoting "grief" is significant. Christ came "to comfort all that mourn—to give a garland for ashes, the oil of joy for mourning, the garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness." Christians, however, cannot but feel sorrow and be moved by grief, and it is to be noted that in both the Old Testament and New Testament, God Himself is said to be susceptible to grief.

W. L. Walker

GRIEVANCE

grev'-ans (‘amal): Occurs only in the King James Version as a translation of Hab 1:3, "Why dost thou show me iniquity, and cause me to behold grievance?" (the Revised Version (British and American) "look upon perverseness"); ‘amal is also translated "perverseness" by the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in Nu 23:21, "perverseness in Israel"; Isa 10:1, the King James Version "grievousness," the Revised Version (British and American) "perverseness." In Hab 1:13, the King James Version translates the same word "iniquity" (margin "grievance"), "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil and canst not look on iniquity" (margin "grievance"), the Revised Version (British and American) "perverseness." The word means originally "toil," "labor" with sorrow, misery, etc., as the consequence, and is often so translated. It is the word in Isa 53:11, "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied."

W. L. Walker

GRIEVOUS; GRIEVOUSLY; GREIEVOUSNESS

grev'-us; grev'-us-li; grev'-us-nes: In addition to several of the words mentioned under GRIEF (which see), we have kabhedh ("heavy") 8 t, e.g. Ge 12:10, "The famine was grievous in the land," the Revised Version (British and American) "sore"; marats ("powerful"), "a grievous curse" (1Ki 2:8); cur, "to turn aside" (Jer 6:28), "grievous revolters"; qasheh, "to make sharp" (1Ki 12:4; 2Ch 10:4); tachalu'im (Jer 16:4), "They shall die grievous deaths," the Revised Version, margin "deaths of sicknesses"; ‘athaq (Ps 31:18), "which speak grievous things proudly," the Revised Version (British and American) "against the righteous insolently"; cheT, "sin" (La 1:8), "Jerus hath grievously sinned" (literally, "hath sinned a sin"); ma‘al, "trespass" (Eze 14:13), "trespassing grievously" (literally, "trespassing a trespass") the Revised

Version (British and American) "committing a trespass"; kobhedh, "weight" (Isa 21:15), "grievousness"; barus, "heavy," "grievous wolves" (Ac 20:29), "grievous charges" (Ac 25:7), "His commandments are not grievous" (1 Joh 5:3); okneros, the Revised Version (British and American) "irksome" (Php 3:1); poneros, "evil" (Re 16:2), "a grievous sore"; dusbastaktos, "grievous to be borne" (Mt 23:4; Lu 11:46); deinos, "greatly," "grievously tormented" (Mt 8:6); kakos, "badly," "grievously vexed" (Mt 15:22).

W. L. Walker

GRINDER

grin’-der.

See MILL.

GRINDING

grind’-ing.

See CRAFTS.

GRISLED; GRIZZLED

griz’-’-ld.

See COLORS.

GROAN

gron (na’aq, ‘anaq; stenazo, embrimaomai): The English word, noun and verb, is an attempt to imitate the vocal sound which is expressive of severe pain or distress, physical or mental. It is cognate with the Scottish dialect word girn, and with grin in its original obsolete sense, as used in the Anglican Prayer-book version of Ps 59:6,14, "grin like a dog and go about the city"; here "grin" is a translation of hamah, and means the sound of the nightly howling of the pariah dogs in Jerusalem and other oriental cities. It is used in the Old Testament:

(1) To denote the expression accompanying physical suffering, as in the case of the Israelites in Egypt oppressed by Pharaoh’s taskmasters (Ex 2:24; 6:5), or in Palestine under the yoke of the Canaanites (Jud 2:18, neqaqah). It is also used in Job’s description of the sufferings and wretchedness of the poor (Job 24:12) as well as in his complaint concerning his own suffering when smitten by the hand of God (Job 23:2). The Psalmist speaks of groaning when fever-stricken and remorseful, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "roaring all the day long" (Ps 32:3; 38:9; 102:5; 22:1).

(2) The expression of suffering on the part of beasts, hungry and thirsty in drought (Joe 1:18).

(3) The manifestation of mental and spiritual distress as in Ps 6:6; 102:20 (the Revised Version (British and American) "sighing").

(4) Metaphorically groaning is the despairing note of Egypt in the prophecy of her overthrow by Babylon, the sound being that uttered by a deadly wounded man (Eze 30:24; similarly in the prophecy of the Persian conquest the misery of Babylon is thus represented by Jer 51:52); and the misery of Tyre when taken by Babylon is similarly described (Eze 26:15, the King James Version "cry").

The word for "sigh" (’anachah) is closely allied, and the meanings are sufficiently akin, so that the terms seem interchangeable. A sigh is physically a sign of respiratory distress due to depressed action of the heart; sighing is consequently the indication of physical weakness or mental disquietude, as Ps 12:5; 31:10; 79:11; Isa 21:2; 24:7; 35:10; Jer 45:3.

Na’aq is the crying of persons dying or starving, as in Eze 30:24; Job 24:12. A somewhat similar word, haghah, means the complaining sound like that of the cooing of doves (Isa 59:11; Na 2:7). Nehi is the sound of lamentation of the dead (Jer 9:10; 31:15; Am 5:16).

In the New Testament "groaning" is used for the expression of mental distress. In Joh 11:33,15 the word used is part of the verb embrimaomai, which conveys the idea of deep and earnest emotion. The same word in two other passages is translated "strictly charged," and indicates the emphasis of the charge (Mt 9:30; Mr 1:43). Elsewhere "sighing" and "groaning" are renderings of words derived from the verb stenazo, as in Ro 8:23; 2Co 5:2,4; Mr 7:34; 8:12. Stephen calls the groaning of Israel in Egypt stenagmos (Ac 7:34), and the united wail of the travailing creation is expressed by Paul by the word sunstenazei (Ro 8:22). The sigh is a characteristic sign of woe in Isa 21:2; 24:7; Jer 45:3; La 14,8,11,12; Eze 9:4; 21:6 f.

Alexander Macalister

GROSS

gros (‘araphel): Used twice with "darkness" in Isa 60:2; Jer 13:16. In the New Testament the verb pachuno, "to make fat," is applied twice to "making gross" the heart (Mt 13:15; Ac 28:27).

See GREASE.

GROUND; GROUNDED

ground, ground’-ed (’adhamah, ‘erets; ge):

(1) "Ground" is in the King James Version the translation of ‘adhamah, "the soil," the ground so called from its red color, frequently also translated "earth" and "land" (Ge 2:5 f, etc.; Ex 3:5; 8:21, etc.); it is more often the translation of ‘erets, which means rather the earth, most often translated "earth" and "land" (Ge 18:2; Ps 74:7; Isa 3:26, etc.); other words are chelqah, "portion," "field" (2Sa 23:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "plot"); charish, "ploughing" (1Sa 8:12); sadheh, "a plain," "a field" (1Ch 11:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "plot of ground"); for other special words see DRY; FALLOW; PARCHED.

(2) In the New Testament the common word for "ground" is ge, "earth," "soil," "land" (Mt 13:8; Ac 7:33, "holy ground," etc.); other words are agros, "field" (Lu 14:18, "I have bought a piece of ground" the Revised Version (British and American) "field"); chorion, "spot," "place" (Joh 4:5, "parcel of ground").

(3) As past participle of "to grind," "ground" appears as the translation of riphoth, pounded grain (2Sa 17:19, the Revised Version (British and American) "bruised"); "ground" is also the translation of Tachan (Ex 32:20; Nu 11:8; De 9:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "grinding").

(4) "Ground," as the basis or foundation of anything, occurs in 1Ti 3:15 as the translation of hedraioma (from edaphos), "the pillar and ground of the truth," the Revised Version, margin "stay."

"Grounded" is used in the sense of founded, based, fixed in (Isa 30:32), "and in every place where the grounded staff shall pass, which the Lord shall lay upon him," the King James Version margin "Hebrew every passing of the rod founded," the Revised Version (British and American) "and every stroke (margin "Hebrew passing") of the appointed staff (margin "Or staff of doom (Hebrew foundation)"), which Yahweh shall lay upon him"; following, Isa 30:31, "with his rod will he (Yahweh) smite him"; Delitzsch, "every stroke of the rod of destiny which Yahweh causes to fall upon Asshur"; the word is mucadhah, from yacadh, "to place," "to found," "to appoint," "to ordain," hence, "appointed rod (of punishment)," seems the simplest rendering.

In Eph 3:17 we have "rooted and grounded in love," and in Col 1:23, "if ye continue in the faith, grounded and settled," the Revised Version (British and American) "steadfast," both themelioo, "to lay a foundation." In Ecclesiasticus 18:6 "ground" is used for the "bottom of things," but the Revised Version (British and American) has "to track them out" (exichneuo), "to trace out."

(5) Figurative uses of "ground" are as representing the heart in relation to its reception of words of truth and righteousness (Jer 4:3; Ho 10:12, "Break up your fallow ground"); to the word of the kingdom as preached by Christ (Mt 13:8,23); dry, parched, thirsty ground stands for a poor condition (Ps 107:33,15; Isa 35:7; 44:3; 53:2; Eze 19:13).

W. L. Walker

GROVE

grov:

(1) ‘asherah.

See ASHERAH.

(2) ‘eshel (Ge 21:33 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "a tamarisk tree").

See TAMARISK.

GRUDGE

gruj (naTar; stenazo, goggusmos): "Grudge" (perhaps a mimetic word, compare Greek gru) is "to grumble" or "murmur" at any person or thing, to entertain an envious or covetous feeling, to do or give anything unwillingly, etc. It occurs in the King James Version as the translation of naTar, "to keep (anger)" (Le 19:18, "Thou shalt not .... bear any grudge against the children of thy people"); in Ps 59:15, as the translation, in text, of Hebrew lun or lin, "to pass the night," "to tarry," Niphal, "to show oneself obstinate," "to murmur or complain" (of the enemies who were hunting David like dogs), "Let them wander up and down for meat, and grudge if they be not satisfied," margin "If they be not satisfied then will they stay all night," the Revised Version (British and American) "And tarry all night if they be not satisfied"; but see Ex 15:24; 16:2; Nu 14:2; Jos 9:18, etc., where the translation is "murmur"; may not the meaning be "and growl (or howl) if they be not satisfied"? "Grudge" formerly implied open expression of discontent, etc., e.g. Wyclif has in Lu 15:2, "The farisies and scribis grucchiden seiynge," etc.

In Jas 5:9, stenazo, "to groan," "to complain" (from affliction or from impatience or ill-humor), is translated "grudge," "Grudge not one against another, brethren," the Revised Version (British and American) "murmur not"; goggusmos, "a murmuring" (compare Joh 7:12 f; Ac 6:1), is rendered "grudging" (1Pe 4:9), "Use hospitality one to another without grudging," the Revised Version (British and American) "murmuring"; compare Php 2:14; me ek lupes, "not out of grief," is "without grudging" (2Co 9:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "not grudging" margin, Greek "of sorrow"); in Ecclesiasticus 10:25 we have "will not grudge" (gogguzo), the Revised Version (British and American) "murmur."

"Grudge" was frequent in the earlier VSS, but is changed in the King James Version for the most part into "murmur"; the Revised Version (British and American) completes the change, except Le 19:18, and text of 2Co 9:7.

W. L. Walker

GUARD

gard:

(1) sar ha-Tabbachim, "captain of the guard," literally, "slaughterers" (Ge 37:36; 39:1; 40:3,1; 41:10,12); rabh Tabbachim (2Ki 25:8,11,20; Jer 39:9, etc.); rabh tabbachayyah (Da 2:14); ratsim, "guard," the King James Version "footmen" (1Sa 22:17); sare ha-ratsim, "chief of the guard" the King James Version "captains of the guard" (1Ki 14:27); ta' ha-ratsim, "guard-chamber" (1Ki 14:28; compare Eze 40:21, etc., where "lodges" are "guardrooms"; see A.B. Davidson at the place).

(2) mishmar, "guard," a defense to a point of danger (Ne 4:22 f; Eze 38:7).

(3) mishma'ath, "guard" (2Sa 23:23, where the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin have "council," the body over which Benaiah was set by David and whose functions were perhaps those of consultation)

(4) spekoulator, "guard" (Mr 6:27, "a man of Herod's guard," where, as in one or two other cases, Mark, writing for Romans, simply transliterates the Latin speculator "a scout," "an executioner," as in loc.).

(5) stratopedarches, "captain of the guard" the King James Version, "captain of the praetorian guard" the Revised Version, margin, Ac 28:16. See CAPTAIN.

(6) (koustodia), "watch" the King James Version, "guard" the American Standard Revised Version and the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 27:65,66; 28:11).

1. Royal Body-Guard:

An oriental monarch's body-guard consisted of picked men attached to his person and ready to fulfill his pleasure in important and confidential concerns. At the courts of Egypt and Babylon the members of the guard were known as "slaughterers," "executioners" (Ge 37:36 King James Version margin, the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin, where Potiphar is called their captain); 2Ki 25:8, where Nebuzaradan is called their captain (King James Version margin "chief marshal"). Whether it had ever been the function of the body-guard to kill meat for the royal table there is little directly to show; that they acted as executioners can be well understood. In Israel they were known as "the footmen" (1Sa 22:17 the King James Version, the American Revised Version, margin and the Revised Version, margin "runners") who acted as royal messengers or couriers from the time of Saul onward (2Ki 10:25; 11:6); and this designation connects them with the couriers of the kings of Persia (Es 3:13,15; 8:14, where our versions render "posts," though the Hebrew is ratsim).

2. Composed of Foreigners:

The men of the royal body-guard were usually foreigners like the janissaries of oriental monarchs down to modern times, who prefer to have around their persons warriors uninfluenced by family connection with the people of the land. Rameses II had such a body-guard whose commanders ranked with the great officers of the crown (Maspero, Struggle of the Nations, 766). David's body-guard of 600, known also as the gibborim or "mighty men," consisted of Cherethites, Pelethites, and Gittites (2Sa 15:18; 20:23), and we read of Carites (2Ki 11:19), who may have been Carians or Cretans, as forming part of the guard at the coronation of King Jehoash.

3. Connection with the Temple:

That this guard had duties in connection with the temple as well as the king's house seems clear. That they were employed as slaughterers of the sacrifices before the Levites were entrusted with the office is unlikely, inasmuch as this guard is not said to have been composed of "slaughterers" but of "runners." But they accompanied King Rehoboam when he visited the temple (1Ki 14:28), and to their captains were committed the shields of brass which took the place of the shields of gold which Solomon had hung up in the temple; Jehoiada employed their captains to put Athaliah to death and to exterminate the worshippers of Baal who had fled to the temple precincts (2Ki 11:4); the temple gate leading to the palace was called "the gate of the guard" (2Ki 11:19). At this time, and for this occasion, at least, the royal body-guard were the temple guards; and when Ezekiel drew up his plans for the temple which he conceived to replace the temple destroyed by Nebuchadrezzar, the "lodges" or "little chambers" were rooms for the accommodation of the temple guard (Eze 40:7,10,21,33, etc.).

LITERATURE.

Robertson Smith, OTJC, 262, and note.

T. Nicol.

GUARDIAN

gar'-di-an.

See FAMILY; ANGEL.

GUDGODAH

gud-go'-da (gudhgodhah): A place in the wilderness journeyings (De 10:7), corresponding to Hor-haggidgad in Nu 33:32. Septuagint in each case renders (Gadgad). The site cannot now be identified; but there may be an echo of the ancient name in that of Wady Gudaghid, a confluent of Wady Jerafeh, which comes down from et Tih into the 'Arabah nearly due West of Petra. There are difficulties, however, as the consonants do not correspond.

GUEST

gest (qara’; anakeimai): Oriental customs growing out of a nomadic life demand a greater abandon and freedom with respect to the relation of host and guest than are permitted by the conventionalities of western life. A householder is expected to entertain a traveler, and in turn the traveler may accept with perfect ease the hospitality shown without any obligation to pay. See HOSPITALITY. The significance of the word is that of one who is called or invited. A certain sacredness, unknown to modern western society, was attached to the guest, so that a special apartment was set aside for the guests. See GUEST-CHAMBER. In the Old Testament only 3 times is the word itself used, with reference to the guests of Adonijah (1Ki 1:41,49), of the foolish woman (Pr 9:18), and of Yahweh (Ze 1:7). In the New Testament, 3 times (Mt 22:10 f; Lu 19:7 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "to lodge"). Though but few actual uses of the word occur, there are abounding illustrations of the guest relation in both Old Testament and New Testament. Especially is this manifest in the striking social attitudes of Jesus on occasions. Notable among these are the hospitality of Matthew (Lu 5:29); Jesus’ relation to Martha and Mary (Lu 10:38), and His entrance into the home of Zaccheus (Lu 19:1). Likewise Jesus spoke frequently of the relation which should exist between the guest and his host (see Lu 7:44-46; Mt 25:35; 10:40).

Walter G. Clippinger

GUEST-CHAMBER

gest’-cham-ber: The translation of

(1) (lishkah) (1Sa 9:22, the King James Version "parlor"), and

(2) (kataluma) (Mr 14:14 parallel Lu 22:11).

The lishkah was probably a room in which the sacrificial feasts were held. Kataluma is derived from kataluo, which means "to slacken," i.e. the ropes of the beasts of burden, and hence, "to lodge." Kataluma has accordingly often the sense of "inn," but as used in Mr and Lu it has the narrower meaning of a room in which to eat.

GUIDE

gid (’alluph, nachal, nachah; hodegos, hodegeo): "Guide" (noun) is the translation of ‘alluph, "an intimate," "a friend," the leader of a family or tribe: Ps 55:13, "a man mine equal, my guide," the Revised Version (British and American) "my companion"; Pr 2:17, "the guide of her youth," the Revised Version (British and American) "friend," margin "or guide"; Jer 3:4, "My father, thou (art) the guide of my youth," the Revised Version, margin "companion"; Mic 7:5, "Put ye not confidence in a guide," the American Standard Revised Version "in a friend," margin "confidant" (which the context shows to be

the meaning), the English Revised Version "guide," margin "familiar friend"; once of katsin, "a judge," "a military leader or commander" (compare Jos 10:24; Da 11:18); Pr 6:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "chief," margin "judge"; once nahagh, "to lead," is translated "guide" (Ps 48:14). In the New Testament hodegos, "a way-leader," is translated "guide" (Mt 23:16, "ye blind guides"; Mt 23:24; Ac 1:16; Ro 2:19); "to guide" is the translation of nachah, "to lead forth" (Job 38:32; Ps 73:24); once of ‘ashar, Piel, "to guide" or "lead straight (Pr 23:19); of ya‘ats, "to command," "to give counsel" ("I will guide thee with mine eye," the Revised Version (British and American) "I will counsel thee with mine eye upon thee," Ps 32:8); of kul, "to contain," "to sustain" (Ps 112:5, "He will guide his affairs with discretion," the Revised Version (British and American) "He shall maintain his cause in judgment"); of nahagh, "to drive," "to lead" (Ps 78:52); of hodegeo, "to show the way," "guide" (Joh 16:13, "He shall guide you into all truth," the Revised Version (British and American) "the truth"; Ac 8:31); oikodespoteo is translated "to guide the house" the Revised Version (British and American) "rule the household" (1Ti 5:14); the word means literally, to be a house-master (the head of the house).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "guide" for "lead" (Ps 25:5; Mt 15:14; Lu 6:39; Re 7:17); "a guide to" for "more excellent than" (Pr 12:26); "guided" for "brought in" (Ps 78:26); "guideth" for "maketh" (2Sa 22:33), for "leadeth" (Ps 23:3); "my heart yet guiding me," margin "holding its course," for "yet acquainting mine heart" (Ec 2:3).

"Guide-posts" is substituted for "high heaps" (Jer 31:21).

W. L. Walker

GUILE

gil (mirmah; dolos): "Guile" is twice the translation of mirmah, "fraud," "deceit" (Ps 34:13, "Keep .... thy lips from speaking guile"; PS 55:11, "deceit and guile," the Revised Version (British and American) "oppression (margin "fraud") and guile"); once of ‘ormah, "craftiness," "guile" (Ex 21:14); once of remiyah, "deception," "fraud" (Ps 32:2, "in whose spirit there is no guile"); in the New Testament of dolos, "bait," hence, generally, "fraud," "guile," "deceit"; Septuagint for mirmah (Isa 53:9, English Versions of the Bible "deceit") and for remiyah (Job 13:7, English Versions of the Bible "deceitfully"; Joh 1:47; 2Co 12:16, "Being crafty, I caught you with guile"; 1Th 2:3; 1Pe 2:1; 2:22; 3:10, quoted from Ps 34:13; Re 14:5, "In their mouth was found no guile," the Revised Version (British and American) after corrected text, "no lie").

Paul’s words in 2Co 12:16 have sometimes been quoted in justification of "guile" in religious work, etc.; but he is not describing his actual procedure; but that which the Corinthians might have attributed to him; the lips of the Christian must be kept free from all guile (Ps 34:13; 1Pe 2:1, etc.; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:5 "A holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit" (dolos), the Revised Version (British and American) "A holy spirit"). "Guile" does not appear in Apocrypha; dolos is frequently rendered "deceit."

The Revised Version (British and American) has "guile" for "subtilty" (Ge 27:35; Ac 13:10); "cover

itself with guile" for "is covered by deceit" (Pr 26:26); "with guile" for "deceitfully" (Ge 34:13); "spiritual milk which is without guile" for "sincere milk of the word," the English Revised Version, margin "reasonable," the American Revised Version, margin, Greek "belonging to the reason" (compare Ro 12:1; 1Pe 2:2); "guileless" for "harmless" (Heb 7:26).

W. L. Walker

GUILT

gilt: The Christian idea of guilt involves three elements: responsibility (Greek aitia, "cause," depending upon a man's real freedom), blameworthiness (Latin reatus culpae, depending upon a man's knowledge and purpose) and the obligation to make good through punishment or compensation (Latin reatus poenae; compare Greek opheilema, "debt," Mt 6:12). In other words, in thinking of guilt we ask the questions of cause, motive and consequence, the central idea being that of the personal blameworthiness of the sinner.

I. In the Old Testament.

1. The Ritualistic and Legalistic Conception:

Not all of this is found at once in the Old Testament. The idea of guilt corresponds to that of righteousness or holiness. When these are ritual and legal, instead of ethical and spiritual, they will determine similarly the idea of guilt. This legalistic and ritualistic conception of guilt may first be noted. Personal blameworthiness does not need to be present. "If any one sin, and do any of the things which Yahweh hath commanded not to be done; though he knew it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity" (Le 5:17). The man is guilty, not because he might or should have known; he may merely have touched unwittingly the body of an unclean beast (Le 5:2,3). The guilt is here because the law has been transgressed and must be made good (compare Le 5:15,16; 4:2,3,13,12,27; see also 5:2,3,4,17).

Moreover, the element of personal responsibility is sometimes lacking where guilt is assigned. The priest may sin "so as to bring guilt on the people" (Le 4:3). One man's wrongdoing may "cause the land to sin" (De 24:4). Israel has sinned in Achan's greed and therefore suffers. Even when the guilty man is found, his children and his very cattle must bear the guilt and punishment with him, though there is no suggestion of their participation or even knowledge (Jos 7; compare 2Sa 24). Here the full moral idea of sin and guilt is wanting because the idea of personality and personal responsibility has not come to its own. The individual is still merged here in the clan or nation.

The central idea in all this is not that of the individual, his responsibility, his motive, his blame. It is that of a rule and the transgression of it, which must be made good. For this reason we see the ú ideas of sin and guilt and punishment constantly passing over into each other. This may be seen by noting the use of the words whose common root is'-sh-m, the distinctive Hebrew term for guilt. In Le 5 to 7 in the adjective form it is rendered "guilty," in the noun as "trespass offering." In Ho 5:15 it seems to mean

punishment (see margin, "have borne their guilt," and compare Eze 6:6), while in Nu 5:7,8 the idea is that of compensation (rendered "restitution for guilt").

2. Prophetic Teaching:

With the prophets, the ideas of sin and righteousness come out more clearly as ethical and personal, and so we mark a similar advance in the conception of guilt. It is not ritual correctness that counts with God, incense and sacrifices and new moons and Sabbaths, but to cease to do evil, to learn to do well (Isa 1). Thus the motive and the inner spirit come in (Mic 6:8; Isa 57:15; 58:1-12), and guilt gains a new depth and quality. At the same time the idea of personal responsibility comes. A man is to bear his own sins. The children's teeth are not to be set on edge because the fathers have eaten sour grapes (Jer 31:29,30; Eze 18:29-32; 2Ki 14:6; compare 2Sa 24:17).

II. In the New Testament.

1. With Jesus:

Here as elsewhere Jesus came to fulfill. With Him it is the inner attitude of the soul that decides. It is the penitent publican who goes down justified, not the Pharisee with his long credit account (Lu 18:9-14). That is why His attitude is so kindly toward some notorious sinners and so stern toward some religious leaders. The Pharisees are outwardly correct, but their spirit of bigotry and pride prevents their entering the kingdom of heaven, while the penitent harlots and publicans take it by storm.

Because it is not primarily a matter of the outward deed but of the inner spirit, Jesus marks different degrees of guilt as depending upon a man's knowledge and motive (Lu 11:29-32; 12:47,48; 23:34). And yet Jesus does not lighten the sense of guilt but rather deepens it. The strength of the Old Testament thought lay in this, that it viewed all transgression as a sin against God, since all law came from Him. This religious emphasis remains with Jesus (Lu 15:21; compare Ps 51:4). But with Jesus God is far more than a giver of rules. He gives Himself. And so the guilt is the deeper because the sin is against this love and mercy and fellowship which God offers us. Jesus shows us the final depth of evil in sin. Here comes the New Testament interpretation of the cross, which shows it on the one hand as the measure of God's love in the free gift of His Son, and on the other as the measure of man's guilt whose sin wrought this and made it necessary.

2. With Paul:

Paul also recognizes differences of degree in guilt, the quality of blameworthiness which is not simply determined by looking at the outward transgression (Ac 17:30; Eph 4:18; Ro 2:9; 3:26; 5:13; 7:13). He, too, looks within to decide the question of guilt (Ro 14:23). But sin is not a matter of single acts or choices with Paul. He sees it as a power that comes to rule a man's life and that rules in the race. The question therefore arises, Does Paul think of guilt also as native, as belonging to man because man is a part of the race? Here it can merely be pointed out that Ro 5:12-21 does not necessarily involve this.

Paul is not discussing whether all men committed sin in Adam's fall, or whether all are guilty by virtue of their very place in a race that is sinful. It is not the question of guilt in fact or degree, but merely the fact that through one man men are now made righteous as before through one sin came upon them all. This no more involves native guilt as a non-ethical conception than it does the idea that the righteousness through Christ is merely forensic and non-ethical. Paul is simply passing over the other elements to assert one fact. Ro 1 suggests how Paul looked at universal sin as involving guilt because universal knowledge and choice entered in.

See also SIN.

LITERATURE.

Mueller, Christian Doctrine of Sin, I, 193-267; Schultz, Old Testament Theology; Kaehler, article "Schuld," Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche.

Harris Franklin Rall

GUILT OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

GUILTLESS

gilt'-les: The primary meaning of the Hebrew word is "to be clean." Sometimes the meaning is "freedom from blame," at other times to be "free from punishment," these two ideas running over into each other as with the word "guilt." The latter meaning seems to predominate in Ex 20:7; De 5:11; 2Sa 14:9; 1Ki 2:9. The other meaning holds in Nu 32:22; Jos 2:19; 2Sa 3:28; Mt 12:5,7.

GUILTY

gil'-ti: In addition to the general discussion under GUILT (which see), several New Testament passages demand special notice because the word "guilty" is not used in the principal sense of blameworthy, but with one of the two lesser meanings noted above which go to make up the complete idea. In 3 of these passages the King James Version renders "guilty" and the Revised Version (British and American) gives another rendering. In Mt 26:66 the King James Version, Jesus' foes declare he is "guilty of death" (enochos, "liable to"). Here "guilty" simply means the one who is legally held, and the reference is not to the blame but to the consequence. This is a true use of the word in the lower and legal sense. It does not correspond with our higher usage, and so we have it in the Revised Version (British and American) "worthy of death." So in Ro 3:19, "guilty" is changed to "under the judgment," and in Mt 23:18, to "debtor."

In Jas 2:10 and 1Co 11:27, the word "guilty" is also used in the lesser or more primitive sense, not primarily as involving blame but as involving the sinner's authorship or responsibility. This is the first element suggested in the definition of guilt given above, just as the preceding passages illustrate the third element. The man who stumbles in one point is "guilty" of the whole law. James does not refer here to the degree of blameworthiness. "Guilty of" means transgressor of, and he has transgressed the whole because the law is one. So in 1Co 11:27, those "guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord" are those who have transgressed in the matter of the body and the blood of the Lord.

Harris Franklin Rall

GULF

(chasma, "a chasm," "vent," "a gaping opening"—a great interval; from chaino, "to gape" or "yawn"): Occurs only in Lu 16:26, "Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed" (compare "afar off" in 16:23). This is very different from, though it probably reflects, the rabbinical conception of the separation between the two compartments of Hades (Sheol) by "a hand's breadth," "a wall," or even, later, "a chasm," as the parable can be given here only a figurative significance, and is of purely ethical import. The fundamental difference between the Rich Man and Lazarus lies not in their conditions but in their characters. For "besides all this" (16:26) the Revised Version, margin gives "in all these things," thus implying that the moral distinctions which exist in this life (16:25) become more pronounced ("fixed") in the next world, and the "gulf" is impassable in the sense that a change of condition will not necessarily produce a change of soul.

See also ABRAHAM'S BOSOM; HADES.

M. O. Evans

GUNI; GUNITES

gu'-ni, gu'-nits (guni):

(1) The name of a Naphtalite clan (Ge 46:24; Nu 26:48; 1Ch 7:13). In Nu 26:48 the gentilic "Gunites" is also found, having in Hebrew the same form, with the article.

(2) The head of a Gadite family (1Ch 5:15).

GUR-BAAL

gur-ba'-al (gur ba'-al): The residence of certain Arabs against whom God helped Uzziah, king of Judah (2Ch 26:7). Its mention immediately after the Philistines may have suggested the "Gerar" of the Targum. Association with the Meunim points to the East. It may be taken as certain that Jebel Neby Harun, near

Petra, has always been crowned by a sanctuary. This may have been "the dwelling place of Baal"; or, accepting Kittel's emendation (Tur ba'al), "the rock" or "mountain of Baal." The Arabs probably dwelt in the region before the days of Petra (EB, under the word)

W. Ewing

GUR; THE ASCENT, OF

gur, a-sent',(ma'-aleh ghur): The place where the servants of Jehu mortally wounded Ahaziah, king of Judah (2Ki 9:27). The ascent (the King James Version "going up") was hard by Ibleam, the site of which is identified about 1/2 mile South of Jenin.

GUTTER

gut'-er.

See HOUSE.

GYMNASIUM

jim-na'-zi-um.

See GAMES; PALAESTRA.

HA

ha (he’-ah): In Job 39:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "Aha," of the battle-horse.

See AH, AHA.

HA-HIROTH

ha-hi’-roth.

See PI-HAHIROTH.

HA-JEHUDIJAH

ha-je-hu-di’-ja (ha-yehudhiyah): Named in the genealogical list (1Ch 4:18). Possibly a proper name (Revised Version, margin), but probably "the Jewess" (Revised Version (British and American)). May be so given in order to distinguish from the Egyptian named in this verse. The King James Version translates "Jehudijah."

HAAHASHTARI

ha-a-hash’-ta-ri (ha’-achashtari, possibly a corruption of ha’-ashchuri): A descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:6). The name is probably corrupt. If the emendation suggested above is accepted, it means the Ashurites, and is a description of the preceding names.

HABAIAH; HOBAIAH

ha-ba’-ya, (cha-bhayah, chobhayah): A post-exilic priestly family which was unable to establish its pedigree. "Habaiah" is the form in Ezr 2:61; in the parallel passage (Ne 7:63), the King James Version has "Habaiah," and the Revised Version (British and American) "Hobaiah"; in the parallel passage in 1 Esdras 5:38, the form is Obdia, Codex Vaticanus, Obbeia.

HABAKKUK

ha-bak’-uk, hab’-a-kuk:

I. THE AUTHOR

1. Name

2. Life

II. THE BOOK

1. Interpretation of Habakkuk 1 and 2

2. Contents

3. Style

4. Integrity

III. THE TIME

1. Date

2. Occasion

IV. ITS TEACHING

1. Universal Supremacy of Yahweh

2. Faithfulness the Guarantee of Permanency

LITERATURE

I. The Author. 1. Name:

Habakkuk (chabhaqquq) means "embrace," or "ardent embrace." Some of the ancient rabbis, connecting the name with 2Ki 4:16, "Thou shalt embrace a son," imagined that the prophet was the son of the Shunammite woman. The Septuagint form of the name, Hambakoum; Theodotion Hambakouk, presupposes the Hebrew chabbaquq. A similar word occurs in Assyrian as the name of a garden plant.

2. Life:

Practically nothing is known of Habakkuk. The book bearing his name throws little light upon his life, and the rest of the Old Testament is silent concerning him; but numerous legends have grown up around his name. The identification of the prophet with the son of the Shunammite woman is one. Another,

connecting Isa 21:6 with Hab 2:1, makes Habakkuk the watchman set by Isaiah to watch for the fall of Babylon. One of the recensions of the Septuagint text of Bel and the Dragon declares that the story was taken "from the prophecy of Habakkuk, the son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi." This must refer to an unknown apocryphal book ascribed to our prophet. What authority there may be for calling his father Jesus we do not know. The claim that he was of the tribe of Levi may be based upon the presence of the musical note at the end of the third chapter. According to the Lives of the Prophets, ascribed, though perhaps erroneously, to Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus during the latter part of the 4th century AD, he belonged to Bethtsohar, of the tribe of Simeon. A very interesting story is found in Bel and the Dragon (33-39), according to which Habakkuk, while on his way to the field with a bowl of pottage, was taken by an angel, carried to Babylon and placed in the lions den, where Daniel ate the pottage, when Habakkuk was returned to his own place. According to the Lives, Habakkuk died two years before the return of the exiles from Babylon. All these legends have little or no historical value.

II. The Book.

1. Interpretation of Habakkuk 1 and 2:

It is necessary to consider the interpretation of Hab 1 and 2 before giving the contents of the book, as a statement of the contents of these chapters will be determined by their interpretation. The different interpretations advocated may be grouped under three heads: (1) According to the first view: Hab 1:2-4: The corruption of Judah; the oppression of the righteous Jews by the wicked Jews, which calls for the Divine manifestation in judgment against the oppressors. 1:5-11: Yahweh announces that He is about to send the Chaldeans to execute judgment. 1:12-17: The prophet is perplexed. He cannot understand how a righteous God can use these barbarians to execute judgment upon a people more righteous than they. He considers even the wicked among the Jews better than the Chaldeans. 2:1-4: Yahweh solves the perplexing problem by announcing that the exaltation of the Chaldeans will be but temporary; in the end they will meet their doom, while the righteous will live. 2:5-20: Woes against the Chaldeans.

(2) The second view finds it necessary to change the present arrangement of Hab 1:5-11; in their present position, they will not fit into the interpretation. For this reason Wellhausen and others omit these verses as a later addition; on the other hand, Giesebrecht would place them before 1:2, as the opening verses of the prophecy. The transposition would require a few other minor changes, so as to make the verses a suitable beginning and establish a smooth transition from 1:11 to 1:2. Omitting the troublesome verses, the following outline of the two chapters may be given: 1:2-4: The oppression of the righteous Jews by the wicked Chaldeans. 1:12-17: Appeal to Yahweh on behalf of the Jews against their oppressors. 2:1-4: Yahweh promises deliverance (see above). 2:5-20: Woes against the Chaldeans.

(3) The third view also finds it necessary to alter the present order of verses. Again Hab 1:5-11, in the present position, interferes with theory; therefore, these verses are given a more suitable place after 2:4. According to this interpretation the outline is as follows: 1:2-4: Oppression of the righteous Jews by the wicked Assyrians (Budde) or Egyptians (G. A. Smith). 1:12-17: Appeal to Yahweh on behalf of the oppressed against the oppressor. 2:1-4: Yahweh promises deliverance (see above). 1:5-11: The

Chaldeans will be the instrument to execute judgment upon the oppressors and to bring deliverance to the Jews. 2:5-20: Woes against the Assyrians or Egyptians.

A full discussion of these views is not possible in this article (see Eiselen, Minor Prophets, 466-68). It may be sufficient to say that on the whole the first interpretation, which requires no omission or transposition, seems to satisfy most completely the facts in the case.

2. Contents:

The contents of Hab 1 and 2 are indicated in the preceding paragraph. Hab 3 contains a lyrical passage called in the title "Prayer." The petitioner speaks for himself and the community. He remembers the mighty works of Yahweh for His people; the thought of them causes him to tremble; nevertheless, he calls for a repetition of the ancient manifestations (3:2). In majestic pictures the poet describes the wonderful appearances of Yahweh in the past (3:3-11) for His chosen people (3:12-15). The remembrance of these manifestations fills the Psalmist with fear and trembling, but also with joy and confidence in the God of his salvation (3:16-19).

3. Style:

Only the Hebrew student can get an adequate idea of the literary excellence of the Book of Habakkuk. "The literary power of Habakkuk," says Driver, "is considerable. Though his book is a brief one, it is full of force; his descriptions are graphic and powerful; thought and expression are alike poetic; he is still a master of the old classical style, terse, parallelistic, pregnant; there is no trace of the often prosaic diffusiveness which manifests itself in the writings of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. And if Hab 3 be his, he is, moreover, a lyric poet of high order; the grand imagery and the rhythmic flow of this ode will bear comparison with some of the finest productions of the Hebrew muse."

4. Integrity:

More than half of the book, including Hab 1:5-11; 2:9-20, and chapter 3 entire, has been denied to the prophet Habakkuk. If the prophecy is rightly interpreted (see above), no valid reason for rejecting 1:5-11 can be found. Hab 2:9-20 are denied to Habakkuk chiefly on two grounds:

(1) The "woes" are said to be in part, at least, unsuitable, if supposed to be addressed to the Chaldean king. This difficulty vanishes when it is borne in mind that the king is not addressed as an individual, but as representing the policy of the nation, as a personification of the nation.

(2) Some parts, especially 2:12-14, "consist largely of citations and reminiscences of other passages, including some late ones" (compare 2:12 with Mic 3:10; Hab 2:13 with Jer 51:58; Hab 2:14 with Isa 11:9; Hav 2:16b with Jer 25:15,16; Hab 2:18-20 with Isa 44:9 ff; 46:6,7; Jer 10:1-16).

Aside from the fact that the argument from literary parallels is always precarious, in this case the

resemblances are few in number and of such general character that they do not necessarily presuppose literary dependence. Habakkuk 3 is denied to the prophet even more persistently, but the arguments are by no means conclusive. The fact that the chapter belongs to the psalm literature does not prove a late date unless it is assumed, without good reasons, that no psalms originated in the preexilic period. Nor do the historical allusions, which are altogether vague, the style, the relation to other writers, and the character of the religious ideas expressed, point necessarily to a late date. The only doubtful verses are 2:16 ff, which seem to allude to a calamity other than the invasion of the Chaldeans; and Driver says, not without reason, "Had the poet been writing under the pressure of a hostile invasion, the invasion itself would naturally have been expected to form a prominent feature in this picture." Hence, while it may be impossible to prove that Habakkuk is the author of the prayer, it is equally impossible to prove the contrary; and while there are a few indications which seem to point to a situation different from that of Habakkuk, they are by no means definite enough to exclude the possibility of Habakkuk's authorship.

III. The Time.

1. Date:

The question of date is closely bound up with that of interpretation. Budde, on theory that the oppressors, threatened with destruction, are the Assyrians (see above, 3), dates the prophecy 621 to 615 BC. Granting that the Assyrians are in the mind of the prophet, the date suggested by Betteridge (AJT, 1903, 674 ff), circa 701 BC, is to be preferred; but if the Assyrians are not the oppressors, then with the Assyrians fall the dates proposed by Budde and Betteridge. If the prophecy is directed against Egypt, we are shut up to a very definite period, between 608 and 604 BC, for the Egyptian supremacy in Judah continued during these years only. If the Egyptians are not the oppressors, another date will have to be sought. If the Chaldeans are the oppressors of Judah, the prophecy must be assigned to a date subsequent to the battle of Carchemish in 605-604, for only after the defeat of the Egyptians could the Chaldeans carry out a policy of world conquest; and it was some years after that event that the Chaldeans first came into direct contact with Judah. But on this theory, Hab 1:2-4,12 ff; 2:8 ff, presupposes the lapse of a considerable period of conquest, the subduing of many nations, the cruel oppression of Judah for some length of time; therefore, Nowack is undoubtedly correct, on this theory, in bringing the prophecy down to a period subsequent to the first exile in 597, or, as he says, "in round numbers about 590 BC."

A different date must be sought if Hab 1:2-4 is interpreted as referring to the oppression of Jews by Jews, and 1:5 ff, as a threat that Yahweh will raise up the Chaldeans, already known as a nation thirsting for blood, to punish the wickedness of Judah. These verses would seem to indicate (1) that the Chaldeans had not yet come into direct contact with Judah, and (2) that they had already given exhibitions of the cruel character of their warfare. Nebuchadnezzar advanced against Judah about 600 BC; but the years since the fall of Nineveh, in 607-606, and the battle of Carchemish, in 605-604, had given abundant opportunity to the Chaldeans to reveal their true character, and to the prophet and his contemporaries to become acquainted with this cruel successor of Nineveh. On this theory, therefore, the prophetic activity of Habakkuk must be assigned to shortly before 600 BC.

2. Occasion:

If Habakkuk prophesied about 600 BC, he lived under King Jehoiakim. The pious and well-meaning Josiah had been slain in an attempt to stop the advance of Egypt against Assyria. With his death the brief era of reform came to an end. After a reign of three months Jehoahaz was deposed by Pharaoh-necoh, who placed Jehoiakim on the throne. The latter was selfish, tyrannical and godless. In a short time the deplorable conditions of Manasseh's reign returned. It was this situation that caused the prophet's first perplexity: "O Yahweh, how long shall I cry, and thou wilt not hear? I cry out unto thee of violence, and thou wilt not save" (Hab 1:2).

IV. Its Teaching.

In the Book of Hab a new type of prophecy appears. The prophets were primarily preachers and teachers of religion and ethics. They addressed themselves to their fellow-countrymen in an attempt to win them back to Yahweh and a righteous life. Not so Habakkuk. He addresses himself to Yahweh, questioning the justice or even the reality of the Divine Providence. He makes complaint to God and expostulates with Him. The prophet Habakkuk, therefore, is a forerunner of the author of the Book of Job. "As a whole, his book is the fruit of religious reflection. It exhibits the communings and questionings of his soul—representative, no doubt, of many other pious spirits of the time—with God; and records the answers which the Spirit of God taught him for his own sake and for the sake of tried souls in every age.

Habakkuk has been called the prophet of faith. He possessed a strong, living faith in Yahweh; but he, like many other pious souls, was troubled and perplexed by the apparent inequalities of life. He found it difficult to reconcile these with his lofty conception of Yahweh. Nevertheless, he does not sulk. Boldly he presents his perplexities to Yahweh, who points the way to a solution, and the prophet comes forth from his trouble with a faith stronger and more intense than ever. It is in connection with his attempts to solve the perplexing problems raised by the unpunished sins of his countrymen and the unlimited success of the Chaldeans that Habakkuk gives utterance to two sublime truths:

1. The Universal Supremacy of Yahweh:

Yahweh is interested not only in Israel. Though Habakkuk, like the other prophets, believes in a special Divine Providence over Israel, he is equally convinced that Yahweh's rule embraces the whole earth; the destinies of all the nations are in His hand. The Chaldeans are punished not merely for their sins against Judah, but for the oppression of other nations as well. Being the only God, He cannot permit the worship of other deities. Temporarily the Chaldeans may worship idols, or make might their god, they may "sacrifice unto their net," and burn incense "unto their drag," because by them "their portion is fat and their food plenteous"; but Yahweh is from everlasting, the Holy One, and He will attest His supremacy by utterly destroying the boastful conqueror with his idols.

2. Faithfulness the Guarantee of Permanency:

The second important truth is expressed in Hab 2:4: "The righteous shall live by his faith" (the American Revised Version, margin "faithfulness"). Faithfulness assures permanency. The thought expressed by the prophet is not identical with that expressed by the apostle who quotes the words (Ga 3:11); nevertheless, the former also gives expression to a truth of profound significance. "Faithfulness" is with the prophet an external thing; it signifies integrity, fidelity, steadfastness under all provocations; but this implies, in a real sense, the New Testament conception of faith as an active principle of right conduct. A living faith determines conduct; religion and ethics go hand in hand, and especially in the hour of adversity a belief in Yahweh and unflinching reliance upon Him are the strongest preservers of fidelity and integrity. Faith without works is dead; faith expresses itself in life. Habakkuk places chief emphasis upon the expressions of faith, and he does so rightly; but in doing this he also calls attention, by implication at least, to the motive power behind the external manifestations. As an expression of living faith, 3:17-19 is not surpassed in the Old Testament.

LITERATURE.

Commentaries on the Minor Prophets by Ewald, Pusey, Keil, Orelli, G. A. Smith (Expositor's Bible), Driver (New Century Bible), Eiselen; A. B. Davidson, Commentary on "Nah," "Hab," "Zeph" (Cambridge Bible); A. F. Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the Prophets; F. C. Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets; F. W. Farrar, Minor Prophets ("Men of the Bible"); Driver, LOT; HDB, article "Habakkuk"; EB, article "Habakkuk."

Frederick Carl Eiselen

HABAKKUK, THE PRAYER OF

See BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF.

HABAZINIAH

(chabhatstsinyah. Thus in the King James Version, but more correctly as in the Revised Version (British and American) HABAZZINIAH, hab-a-zi-ni'-a (Jer 35,3)): The grandfather of Jaazaniah, who was the leader of the Rechabites who were tested by Jeremiah as to their obedience to their ancestor's command with reference to wine. Their loyalty to the commands of Jonadab was effectively used by Jeremiah in an appeal to the people of Judah to obey the words of Yahweh.

HABERGEON

hab'-er-jun, ha-bur'-jun, the King James Version (tachara'): In the Revised Version (British and American), Ex 28:32; 39:23, etc., "coat of mail"; in Job 41:26, "pointed shaft," margin "coat of mail."

See ARMS, ARMOR.

HABITATION

hab-i-ta’-shun: Properly a place of sojourn or dwelling. The term in the King James Version representing some 16 Hebrew words (moshabh, ma‘-on, mishkan, naweh, etc.), and 5 Greek words, is variously changed in certain passages in the Revised Version (British and American), as Ge 49:5, "swords"; Le 13:46 "dwelling"; Job 5:24; Jer 25:30 b, 37, "fold"; Ps 89:14; 97:2, etc., "foundation"; Ps 132:5, "tabernacle"; Lu 16:9, "tabernacles," etc. Conversely, "habitation" appears in the Revised Version (British and American) for the King James Version "dwelling place" in 2Ch 30:27; Ps 79:7, "house"; Ps 83:12; 2Co 5:2, "tabernacle," Ac 7:46, etc.

See HOUSE.

James Orr

HABOR

ha’-bor (chabhor; Habor, Habior; Isidor of Charax, Aburas (Abouras), Zosias, Aboras):

1. Its Position and Course:

Is described in 2Ki 17:6; 18:11 (compare 1Ch 5:26) as "the river of Gozan." It is the Arabic Khabur, and flows in a southerly direction from several sources in the mountains of Karaj Dagh (Mons Masius), which, in the 37th parallel, flanks the valley of the Tigris on the West. The river ultimately joins the Euphrates after receiving its chief tributary, the Jaghjagha Su (Mygdonius), at Circesium (Kirkisiyeh).

2. Etymologies of Habor:

The meaning of its name is doubtful, but Delitzsch has suggested a Sumerian etymology, namely, habur, "the fish-waterway," or it may be connected with "mother Hubur’" a descriptive title of Tiamat (see MERODACH; RAHAB).

3. Historical References:

Layard found several interesting Assyrian remains in the district, including man-headed bulls bearing the name of Muses-Ninip, possibly an Assyrian governor. Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1120 BC) boasts of having killed 10 mighty elephants in Haran and on the banks of the Habor; and Assur-nacir-apli (circa 880 BC), after conquering Harsit (Harrit, Harmis), subjugated the tract around piate sa nar Habur, "the mouths of the Habor." According to 2Ki and 1 Chronicles, Shalmaneser IV and Sargon transported the exiled Israelites thither. Philological considerations exclude the identification of the Chebar of Eze 13, etc., with the Habor.

T. G. Pinches

HACALIAH

hak-a-li’-a (chakhalyah, meaning doubtful, perhaps "wait for Yahweh"; the King James Version Hachaliah): Father of Nehemiah (Ne 11; 10:1).

HACHILAH, HILL OF

ha-ki’-la, hak’-i-la, (chakhilah): A hill in the wilderness of Judah, associated with the wanderings of David. It is stated (1Sa 23:19) to be "on the South of the desert" (or Jeshimon), and (1Sa 26:1) to be "before (on the front (i.e. edge) of) the desert." It was near Ziph and Maon. The only plausible hypothesis is that it is represented by the ridge Dhahret el-Kolah in the wilderness of Ziph, toward the desert of En-gedi (PEF, III, 313, Sh XXI).

HACHMONI; HACHMONITE

hak-mo’-ni, hak’-mo-ni, or probably (chakhmoni, "wise"): The same word is rendered "Hachmoni," a proper name, in 1Ch 27:32 and "a Hachmonite" in 1Ch 11:11. The form of the Hebrew word suggests that the latter translation should be adopted in both passages, and that it describes the warrior in one case, and the companion or tutor of David’s sons in the other, as a member of a certain family—a Hachmonite of which nothing further is known. 2Sa 23:8, "Josheb-basshebeth a Tahchemonite," bears the marks of a corrupt text, and should be parallel with 1Ch 11:11 so far as the name goes, reading "Jashobeam the Hachmonite." So Klostermann, Driver, Wellhausen, Budde, etc.

George Rice Hovey

HADAD

ha’-dad:

(1) (chadhadh, "sharpness"): One of the twelve sons of Ishmael (Ge 25:15, where the King James Version, following a mistake in Hebrew text, has "Hadar"; but "Hadad" is found in parallel passage 1Ch 1:30; the Revised Version (British and American) reads "Hadad" in both places).

(2) (hadhadh): A king of Edom, son of Bedad (Ge 36:35,36 parallel 1Ch 1:46,47), "who smote Midian in the field of Moab," and whose "city was Avith."

(3) Another king of Edom, written "Hadar" in Ge 36:39 by a copyist’s mistake, but "Hadad" in the parallel passage 1Ch 1:50,51. His city was Pau or Palestine.

(4) A member of the royal family of Edom in David’s time, who as a child escaped Joab’s slaughter of the Edomites, and fled to Egypt. On David’s death he returned to Edom, where he made trouble for Solomon by stirring up the Edomites against the rule of Israel (1Ki 11:14-22,25).

(5) The supreme god of Syria, whose name is found in Scripture in the names of Syrian kings, Benhadad, Hadadezer. The god Hadad (= perhaps, "maker of loud noise") is mentioned in Assyrian inscriptions, and called on the monolith of Shalmaneser "the god of Aleppo." In the Assyrian inscriptions he is identified with the air-god Rammon or Rimmon. The union of the two names in Zec 12:11 suggests this identity, though the reference is uncertain, some regarding Hadadrimmon as the name of a place, others as the name of the god—"Hadad (is) Rimmon." The name "Hadad" is found in various other forms: Adad, Dadu, and Dadda. See A. H. Sayce in HDB under the word "Hadad."

George Rice Hovey

HADADEZER

had-ad-e’-zer (hadhadh‘ezer; so 2Sa 8; 1Ki 11:23, but hadhar‘ezer, 2Sa 10; 1Ch 18): Mentioned in connection with David’s wars of conquest (2Sa 8:3 ff; 2Sa 10:1-19; 1Ch 18:3); was king of Zobah in Syria. The exact position and size of this Syrian principality are uncertain, but it seems to have extended in David’s time southward toward Ammon and eastward to the Euphrates. When the Ammonites had put themselves in the wrong with David by the insult done to his ambassadors (2Sa 10:1-5) they summoned to their aid against the incensed king of Israel the Syrians of various adjoining principalities, among them the Syrians of Zobah under Hadadezer, the son of Rehob. The strategy of Joab, who set the force under command of Abishai his brother in array against the Ammonites, and himself attacked the Syrian allies, won for Israel a decisive victory. Not content with this result, Hadadezer gathered together another Syrian force, summoning this time also "the Syrians that were beyond the River" (2Sa 10:16), with Shobach the captain of his host at their head. On this occasion David himself took command of the Israelite forces and again defeated them near Helam, Shobach being left dead on the field. Hadadezer and his Syrian vassals, finding resistance hopeless, "made peace with Israel and served them" (2Sa 10:19). For the name Hadador Hadarezer, see BENHADAD.

LITERATURE.

Winckler, Geschichte Israels, I, 137 ff; McCurdy, HPM, 204; Maspero, The Struggle of the Nations, 731.

T. Nicol.

HADADRIMMON

ha-dad-rim’-on, had-ad-rim’-on (hadhadh rimmon): A name which occurs, along with Megiddon, in Zec 12:11. It was long thought that this was a place in the plain of Megiddo, and that the mourning referred

to was that for Josiah, slain in battle with Pharaoh-necoh (2Ki 23:29). This last, however, was certainly at Jerusalem. Jerome (Comm. on Zec) identifies Hadadrimmon with Maximianopolis, a village near Jezreel, probably Legio, the ancient Megiddo. Possibly, however, the form "Hadadrimmon" has arisen through the combination of two divine names; and the weeping may be that for Tammuz (Eze 8:14), with whom the old Semitic deity had become confused in the popular mind.

W. Ewing

HADAR

ha'-dar (Ge 36:39).

See HADAD (3).

HADAREZER

had-ar-e'-zer.

See HADADEZER.

HADASHAH

ha-da'-sha, had'-a-sha (chadhashah, "new"): A town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Zenan and Migdal-gad (Jos 15:37). According to the Mishna ('Erubhin, v. 6), it was the smallest town in Judah. It is not identified.

HADASSAH

ha-das'-a (hadhaqqah, "myrtle"): The Hebrew name (Es 2:7) formerly borne by ESTHER (which see).

HADATTAH

ha-dat'-a (chadhattah, "new"):

See HAZOR.

HADES

ha'-dez (Haides, haides, "not to be seen"): Hades, Greek originally Haidou, in genitive, "the house of Hades," then, as nominative, designation of the abode of the dead itself. The word occurs in the New

Testament in Mt 11:23 (parallel Lu 10:15); Mt 16:18; Lu 16:23; Ac 2:27,31; Re 1:18; 6:8; 20:13 f. It is also found in Textus Receptus of the New Testament 1Co 15:55, but here the correct reading (Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, the Revised Version (British and American)) is probably Thanate, "O Death," instead of Haide, "O Hades." the King James Version renders "Hades" by "hell" in all instances except 1Co 15:55, where it puts "grave" (margin "hell") in dependence on Ho 13:14. the Revised Version (British and American) everywhere has "Hades."

1. In Old Testament: Sheol:

In the Septuagint Hades is the standing equivalent for Sheol, but also translates other terms associated with death and the state after it. The Greek conception of Hades was that of a locality receiving into itself all the dead, but divided into two regions, one a place of torment, the other of blessedness. This conception should not be rashly transferred to the New Testament, for the latter stands not under the influence of Greek pagan belief, but gives a teaching and reflects a belief which model their idea of Hades upon the Old Testament through the Septuagint. The Old Testament Sheol, while formally resembling the Greek Hades in that it is the common receptacle of all the dead, differs from it, on the one hand, by the absence of a clearly defined division into two parts, and, on the other hand, by the emphasis placed on its association with death and the grave as abnormal facts following in the wake of sin. The Old Testament thus concentrates the partial light it throws on the state after death on the negative, undesirable side of the prospect apart from redemption. When in the progress of Old Testament revelation the state after death begins to assume more definite features, and becomes more sharply differentiated in dependence on the religious and moral issue of the present life this is not accomplished in the canonical writings (otherwise in the apocalyptic literature) by dividing Sheol into two compartments, but by holding forth to the righteous the promise of deliverance from Sheol, so that the latter becomes more definitely outlined as a place of evil and punishment.

2. In the New Testament: Hades:

The New Testament passages mark a distinct stage in this process, and there is, accordingly, a true basis in Scripture for the identification in a certain aspect of Sheol—Hades—with hell as reflected in the King James Version. The theory according to which Hades is still in the New Testament the undifferentiated provisional abode of all the dead until the day of judgment, with the possibility of ultimate salvation even for those of its inmates who have not been saved in this life, is neither in harmony with the above development nor borne out by the facts of New Testament usage. That dead believers abide in a local Hades cannot be proven from 1Th 4:16; 1Co 15:23, for these passages refer to the grave and the body, not to a gathering-place of the dead. On the other hand Lu 23:43; 2Co 5:6-8; Php 1:23; Re 6:9; 7:9 ff; 15:2 ff teach that the abode of believers immediately after death is with Christ and God.

3. Ac 2:27,31:

It is, of course, a different matter, when Hades, as not infrequently already the Old Testament Sheol, designates not the place of the dead but the state of death or disembodied existence. In this sense even

the soul of Jesus was in Hades according' to Peter's statement (Ac 2:27,31—on the basis of Ps 16:10). Here the abstract sense is determined by the parallel expression, "to see corruption" None the less from a comparatively early date this passage has been quoted in support of the doctrine of a local descent of Christ into Hades.

4. Re 20:13; 6:8; 1:18:

The same abstract meaning is indicated for Re 20:13. Death and Hades are here represented as delivering up the dead on the eve of the final judgment. If this is more than a poetic duplication of terms, Hades will stand for the personified state of death, Death for the personified cause of this state. The personification appears plainly from 20:14: "Death and Hades were cast into the lake of fire." In the number of these "dead" delivered up by Hades, believers are included, because, even on the chiliastic interpretation of 20:4-6, not all the saints share in the first resurrection, but only those "beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God," i.e. the martyrs. A similar personifying combination of Death and Hades occurs in Re 6:8 ("a pale horse: and he that sat upon him his name was Death; and Hades followed with him"). In Re 1:18, on the other hand, Death and Hades are represented as prisons from which Christ, in virtue of His own resurrection, has the power to deliver, a representation which again implies that in some, not necessarily local, sense believers also are kept in Hades.

5. Lu 16:23:

In distinction from these passages when the abstract meaning prevails and the local conception is in abeyance, the remaining references are more or less locally conceived. Of these Lu 16:23 is the only one which might seem to teach that recipients of salvation enter after death into Hades as a place of abode. It has been held that Hades is here the comprehensive designation of the locality where the dead reside, and is divided into two regions, "the bosom of Abraham" and the place of torment, a representation for which Jewish parallels can be quoted, aside from its resemblance to the Greek bisection of Hades. Against this view, however, it may be urged, that if "the bosom of Abraham" were conceived as one of the two divisions of Hades, the other division would have been named with equal concreteness in connection with Dives. In point of fact, the distinction is not between "the bosom of Abraham" and another place, as both included in Hades, but between "the bosom of Abraham" and Hades as antithetical and exclusive. The very form of the description of the experience of Dives: "In Hades he lifted up his eyes, being in torments," leads us to associate Hades as such with pain and punishment. The passage, therefore, does not prove that the saved are after death in Hades. In further estimating its bearing upon the problem of the local conditions of the disembodied life after death, the parabolic character of the representation must be taken into account. The parable is certainly not intended to give us topographical information about the realm of the dead, although it presupposes that there is a distinct place of abode for the righteous and wicked respectively.

6. Mt 11:23:

The two other passages where Hades occurs in the teaching of our Lord (Mt 11:23 parallel Lu 10:15;

and Mt 16:18) make a metaphorical use of the conception, which, however, is based on the local sense. In the former utterance it is predicted of Capernaum that it shall in punishment for its unbelief "go down unto Hades." As in the Old Testament Sheol is a figure for the greatest depths known (De 32:22; Isa 7:11; 57:9; Job 11:8; 26:6), this seems to be a figure for the extreme of humiliation to which that city was to be reduced in the course of history. It is true, 11:24, with its mention of the day of judgment, might seem to favor an eschatological reference to the ultimate doom of the unbelieving inhabitants, but the usual restriction of Hades to the punishment of the intermediate state (see below) is against this.

7. Mt 16:18:

In the other passage, Mt 16:18, Jesus declares that the gates of Hades shall not katischuein the church He intends to build. The verb katischuein may be rendered, "to overpower" or "to surpass." If the former be adopted, the figure implied is that of Hades as a stronghold of the power of evil or death from which warriors stream forth to assail the church as the realm of life. On the other rendering there is no reference to any conflict between Hades and the church, the point of comparison being merely the strength of the church, the gates of Hades, i.e. the realm of death, serving in common parlance as a figure of the greatest conceivable strength, because they never allow to escape what has once entered through them.

The above survey of the passages tends to show that Hades, where it is locally conceived, is not a provisional receptacle for all the dead, but plainly associated with the punishment of the wicked. Where it comes under consideration for the righteous there is nothing to indicate a local sense. On 1Pe 3:19; 4:6 (where, however, the word "Hades" does not occur), see articles ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; SPIRITS IN PRISON.

8. Not a Final State:

The element of truth in theory of the provisional character of Hades lies in this, that the New Testament never employs it in connection with the final state of punishment, as subsequent to the last judgment. For this GEHENNA (which see) and other terms are used. Dives is represented as being in Hades immediately after his death and while his brethren are still in this present life. Whether the implied differentiation between stages of punishment, depending obviously on the difference between the disembodied and reembodied state of the lost, also carries with itself a distinction between two places of punishment, in other words whether Hades and Gehenna are locally distinct, the evidence is scarcely sufficient to determine. The New Testament places the emphasis on the eschatological developments at the end, and leaves many things connected with the intermediate state in darkness.

Geerhardus Vos

HADID

ha’-did (chadhidh): A city in Benjamin (Ne 11:33 f) named with Lod and Ono (Ezr 2:33; Ne 7:37),

probably identical with Adida Septuagint Hadida) of 1 Macc 12:38; 13:13, "over against the plain," which was fortified by Simon Maccabeus. It is represented by the modern el-Chaditheh, about 3 miles Northeast of Lydda.

HADLAI

had’-li, had’-la-i (chadhlay, "resting"): An Ephraimite (2Ch 28:12), father of Amasa, who was one of the heads of the tribe in the time of Pekah, king of Israel.

HADORAM

ha-do’-ram (hadhoram):

(1) Son of Joktan and apparently 6th in descent from Noah (Ge 10:27 parallel 1Ch 1:21).

(2) Son of Tou, king of Hamath, sent by his father with presents to King David (1Ch 18:10). In 2Sa 8:9,10, written probably incorrectly "Joram," "son of Toi."

(3) Rehoboam’s superintendent of the forced labor department (2Ch 10:18), called Adoram 1Ki 12:18, a contraction of ADONIRAM (which see). He was sent by Rehoboam as messenger to Israel at the time of the revolt of the ten tribes and was stoned to death by them.

George Rice Hovey

HADRACH

ha’-drak, had’-rak (chadhrakh): "The land of Hadrach" is mentioned only once in Scripture (Zec 9:1), and there it is grouped with Damascus, Hamath, Tyre and Sidon. It may be safely identified with the "Hatarikka" of the Assyrian inscriptions, against which Assur-dan III made expeditions in his 1st (772 BC), 8th and 18th years. It also appears in inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III. They place it in the North of Lebanon.

HAGAB

ha’-gab (chaghabh, "locust"): Ancestor of some of the Nethinim who returned from the Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel and Nehemiah. The name occurs second after Hagabah in Ezr 2:46, but is omitted entirely from the parallel list of Ne 7:48.

HAGABA

ha-ga’-ba, hag’-a-ba (chaghabha’): Same as the following (Ne 7:48).

HAGABAH

ha-ga’-ba, hag’-a-ba (chaghabhah, "locust"): Like Hagab, an ancestor of some of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:45); spelled Hagaba in the parallel passage (Ne 7:48).

HAGAR

ha’-gar (haghar, "emigration," "flight"; Hagar, Agar): An Egyptian woman, the handmaid or slave of Sarai; a present, perhaps, from Pharaoh when Abram dissembled to him in Egypt (Ge 12:16). Mention is made of her in two passages (Ge 16; 21:8-21).

1. The Scornful Handmaid and Her Flight:

In the first narrative (Ge 16) it is related that Sarai, despairing at her age of having children, gave Hagar to Abram as a concubine. As Hagar was not an ordinary household slave but the peculiar property of her mistress (compare Ge 29:24,29), any offspring which she might bear to Abram would be reckoned as Sarai’s (compare Ge 30:3-9). In the prospect of becoming a mother, Hagar, forgetting her position, seems to have assumed an insolent bearing toward her childless mistress. Sarai felt keenly the contempt shown her by her handmaid, and in angry tones brought her conduct before Abram. Now that her plan was not working out smoothly, she unfairly blamed her husband for what originated with herself, and appealed to Heaven to redress her grievance. Abram refused to interfere in the domestic quarrel, and renouncing his rights over his concubine, and her claims on him, put her entirely at Sarai’s disposal. Under the harsh treatment of her mistress Hagar’s life became intolerable, and she fled into the wilderness, turning her steps naturally toward Egypt, her native land.

2. Her Vision and Return:

But the angel of Yahweh (who is here introduced for the first time as the medium of theophany) appeared to her as she was resting by a spring and commanded her to return and submit herself to her mistress, promising her an innumerable seed through her unborn son, concerning whom he uttered a striking prediction (see ISHMAEL). To the angel (who is now said to be Yahweh Himself) Hagar gave the name "Thou art a God of seeing" (the Revised Version (British and American) "that seeth"), for she said, "Have I even here (in the desert where God, whose manifestations were supposed to be confined to particular places, might not be expected to reveal Himself) looked after him that seeth me?"—the meaning being that while God saw her, it was only while the all-seeing God in the person of His angel was departing that she became conscious of His presence. The spring where the angel met with her was called in Hebrew tradition Be’er-lachay-ro’i, "the well of the living one who seeth me" (Revised Version, margin).

Obedient to the heavenly vision Hagar returned, as the narrative implies, to her mistress and gave birth

to Ishmael, Abram being then eighty-six years old.

The idea in 30:13 is not very clearly expressed. The word translated "here" generally means "hither," and there is no explanation of the "living one" in the name of the well. It has therefore been proposed to emend the Hebrew text and read "Have I even seen God, and lived after my seeing?"—an allusion to the belief that no one could "see God and live" (compare Ge 32:30; Ex 33:20). But there are difficulties in the way of accepting this emendation. The name of God, "a God of seeing," would require to be interpreted in an objective sense as "a God who is seen," and the consequent name of the well, "He that seeth me liveth," would make God, not Hagar, as in 30:13, the speaker.

3. Her Harsh Expulsion and Divine Help:

The other narrative (Ge 21:8-21) relates what occurred in connection with the weaning of Isaac. The presence and conduct of Ishmael during the family feast held on the occasion roused the anger and jealousy of Sarah who, fearing that Ishmael would share the inheritance with Isaac, peremptorily demanded the expulsion of the slave-mother and her son. But the instincts of Abraham’s fatherly heart recoiled from such a cruel course, and it was only after the revelation was made to him that the ejection of Hagar and her son would be in the line of the Divine purpose—for Isaac was his real seed, while Ishmael would be made a nation too—that he was led to forego his natural feelings and accede to Sarah’s demand. So next morning the bondwoman and her son were sent forth with the bare provision of bread and a skin of water into the wilderness of Beersheba. When the water was spent, Hagar, unable to bear the sight of her boy dying from thirst, laid him under a shrub and withdrew the distance of a bowshot to weep out her sorrow. But the angel of God, calling to her out of heaven, comforted her with the assurance that God had heard the voice of the lad and that there was a great future before him. Then her eyes were opened to discover a well of water from which she filled the skin and gave her son to drink. With God’s blessing the lad grew up amid the desert’s hardships, distinguished for his skill with the bow. He made his home in the wilderness of Paran, and his mother took a wife for him out of her own country.

4. Practical Lessons from the History:

The life and experience of Hagar teach, among other truths, the temptations incident to a new position; the foolishness of hasty action in times of trial and difficulty; the care exercised over the lonely by the all-seeing God; the Divine purpose in the life of everyone, however obscure and friendless; how God works out His gracious purposes by seemingly harsh methods; and the strength, comfort and encouragement that ever accompany the hardest experiences of His children.

5. Critical Points in the Documents:

Genesis 16 belongs to the Jahwist, J, (except 16:1a, 3,15 f which are from P), and 21:8-21 to East. From the nature of the variations in the narratives many critics hold that we have here two different accounts of the same incident. But the narratives as they stand seem to be quite distinct, the one referring to

Hagar’s flight before the birth of Ishmael, and the other to her expulsion at the weaning of Isaac. It is said, however, that Elohist (E) represents Ishmael as a child "playing" (The Revised Veersion, margin, Septuagint paizonta) with Isaac at the weaning festival, and young enough to be carried by his mother and "cast" under a shrub; while according to the Priestly Code, the Priestly Code (P), (Ge 16:16; 21:5), as a child was weaned at the age of two or three years, he would be a lad of sixteen at that time. The argument for the double narrative here does not seem conclusive. The word metsacheq (16:9) does not necessarily mean "playing" when used absolutely; it is so used in Ge 19:14, evidently in the sense of "mocking" or "jesting," and Delitzsch gives it that meaning there. Then as to 19:14, the Massoretic Text does not state that the child was put on her shoulder, although the Septuagint does; nor does "cast" (19:15) so "clearly imply" that Ishmael was an infant carried by his mother (compare Mt 15:30). It may be added that the words yeledh and na‘ar, translated "child" and "lad" respectively, determine nothing as to age, as they are each used elsewhere in both senses.

6. Allegorical Use of the Story by Paul:

In Ga 4:21 ff Paul makes an allegorical use of this episode in the history of Ishmael and Isaac to support his argument for the transitory character of the Jewish ritual and the final triumph of Christian freedom over all Judaizing tendencies. In elaborating his reference, the apostle institutes a series of contrasts. Hagar, the bondwoman, represents the old covenant which was given from Mt. Sinai; and as Ishmael was Abraham’s son after the flesh, so the Judaizing Christians, who wish to remain in bondage to the law, are Hagar’s children. On the other hand, Sarah, the freewoman, represents the new covenant instituted by Christ; and as Isaac was born to Abraham in virtue of the promise, so the Christians who have freed themselves entirely from the law of carnal ordinances and live by faith are Sarah’s children. Thus Hagar corresponds to "the Jerusalem that now is," that is, the Jewish state which is in spiritual bondage with her children; while Sarah represents "the Jerusalem that is above," "our mother" (Revised Version (British and American)), the mother of us Christians, that free spiritual city to which Christians even now belong (Php 3:20). By this allegory the apostle would warn the Galatian Christians of the danger which beset them from their Judaizing brethren, of their subjection to the covenant of works and their ultimate expulsion from the household of faith.

To us Paul’s reference does not appeal with the same force as it would do to those to whom he was writing. The incident taken by itself, indeed, does not contain any suggestion of such a hidden meaning. Yet the history of the Hebrew nation is but typical of the history of the church in all ages, and the apostle’s familiarity with rabbinical modes of interpretation may have led him to adopt this method of confirming the truth which he had already proved from the law itself.

For a discussion of the text and interpretation of Ga 4:25 a, "Now this Hagar is mount Sinai in Arabia," and an account of Philo’s allegory of Hagar and Sarah, see Lightfoot’s notes at the end of chapter iv in his Commentary on Gal.

James Crichton

HAGARENES; HAGARITES ha’-gar-enz, ha’-gar-its.

See HAGRITES.

HAGERITE

ha’-ger-it (haghri).

See HAGRITES.

HAGGADA

ha-ga’-da

See TALMUD.

HAGGAI

hag’-a-i, hag’-a-i (chaggay, an adjective formed from chagh, "feast"):

1. Name:

The word "Haggai" may mean "festal," the prophet having been born perhaps on a festival day; compare the Roman name "Festus." Hebrew proper names were sometimes formed in this manner, e.g. Barzillai, "a man of iron," from barzel, "iron." Haggai may, however, be a shortened form of Haggiah (1Ch 6:30), meaning "festival of Yahweh," as Mattenai is an abbreviation of Mattaniah (Ezr 10:33,16). In Greek Haggaios, in Latin, Aggaeus or Aggeus, sometimes Haggaeus. Haggai is the 10th in the order of the Twelve Prophets.

2. Personal History:

Little is really known of his personal history. But we do know that he lived soon after the captivity, being the first of the prophets of the Restoration. From Hag 2:3 of his prophecies it is inferred by many that he had seen the first temple, which, as we know, was destroyed in 586 BC. If so, he must have prophesied when a comparatively old man, for we know the exact date of his prophecies, 520 BC. According to Ezr 5:1; 6:14, he was a contemporary of Zechariah, and was associated with him in the work of rebuilding the temple; besides, in the Greek and Latin and Syriac VSS, his name stands with Zechariah’s at the head of certain psalms, e.g. Ps 111 (112), in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) alone; Psalms 125; 126, in the Peshitta alone; Ps 137, in the Septuagint alone; Psalms 146; 147; 148, in Septuagint and Peshitta; and Ps 145, in Septuagint, Peshitta and Vulgate; perhaps these psalms were introduced into the temple-service on their recommendation. He was a prophet of great

faith (compare 2:1-5); it is possible that he was a priest also (compare 2:10-19). Like Malachi he bears the name of "Yahweh's messenger" (Heg 1:13; compare Mal 3:1). According to Jewish tradition, he was a member of the Great Synagogue.

3. Work:

Haggai's work was intensely practical and important. Yahweh employed him to awaken the conscience and stimulate the enthusiasm of his compatriots in the rebuilding of the temple. "No prophet ever appeared at a more critical juncture in the history of the people, and, it may be added, no prophet was more successful" (Marcus Dods). Zechariah assisted him (compare Hag 1:1; Zec 1:1).

4. Period and Circumstances:

Haggai's prophecies, like Ezekiel's, are dated "in the second year of Darius" (Hag 1:1; 2:10), i.e. 520 BC. The Jews, 42,360 strong (Ezr 2:64), had returned from Babylon 16 years before (536 BC), under the leadership of Zerubbabel, the civil head of the community, and Joshua, the ecclesiastical. The generous edict of Cyrus had made return possible (compare Ezr 1:1-4). The new colonists had settled in Jerusalem and in the neighboring towns of Bethlehem, Bethel, Anathoth, Gibeon, Kiriath-jearim, and others adjacent (Ezr 2:20). Eager to reestablish the public worship of the sanctuary, they set about at once to erect the altar of burnt offering upon its old site (Ezr 3:2,3; compare Hag 2:14). Plans were also made for the immediate rebuilding of the temple, and the foundation stone was actually laid in the 2nd month of the 2nd year of the return (Ezr 3:8-10), but the work was suddenly interrupted by the jealous, half-caste, semi-pagan Samaritans, descendants of the foreign colonists introduced into Samaria in 722 BC (compare 2Ki 17:24-41), whose offer to cooperate had been refused (Ezr 4:1-5,24). For 16 years thereafter nothing was done toward rearing the superstructure (Ezr 4:5,24; 5:16); indeed, the Jews became indifferent, and began to build for themselves "ceiled houses" (Hag 1:4). (W. H. Kosters has attempted to show that there was no return under Cyrus, and that Haggai and Zechariah, who never allude to any return, but rather look upon the return as still in the future (compare Zec 2:6,7), preached to the Jews who remained in Jerusalem, never having been carried by Nebuchadnezzar into captivity in 586 BC. But this theory is opposed by too many converging lines of Scriptural statement to warrant serious credence.) With the accession of Darius Hystaspes (i.e. Darius, the son of Hystaspes), the tide turned. Darius was a true successor to Cyrus, and favored religious freedom. Through the influence of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, the people were roused from their lethargy, and the work of rebuilding was resumed with energy in 520 BC (Hag 1:14,15). The foundations were relaid (Hag 2:18). Four years later, in the 6th year of Darius, the whole structure was completed and dedicated (Ezr 6:15). Meanwhile important events were taking place in the Persian empire. On the death (of Cambyses in 522 BC, the throne had been seized by a usurper, the so-called Pseudo-Smerdis. who held it, however, for some 7 months only. He was murdered by Darius, and the latter was elevated to the throne. But this gave other ambitious pretenders cause to rebel, and many provinces revolted, among them Susiana, Media, Assyria, Armenia, Parthia, and others (compare the famous Behistun inscription). Altogether Darius fought 19 battles in putting down his rivals, and did not succeed in vanquishing all of his foes till the year after Haggai prophesied. This accounts for the prophet's repeated allusions to Yahweh's "shaking" the nations (2:6,7,21,22). Haggai seems to regard the "shaking" of the nations as the precursor of the

Messianic age. It was, therefore, important from the prophet's point of view, that Yahweh's temple should be made ready for the Messiah's advent, that it might become the religious center of the world (compare Isa 2:2-4). The exact date of Haggai's preaching was from September to December, 520 BC.

5. Analysis:

Haggai's prophecies are dated and therefore easily analyzed. They are composed of four distinct discourses, all four being delivered within 4 months' time in the year 520 BC:

(1) Hag 1, delivered on the 1st day of the 6th month (September), in which the prophet reproaches the people for their indifference to the work of rebuilding the temple, and warns them to consider their ways; assuring them that their procrastination was not due to want of means (1:4), and that God on account of their apathy was withholding the produce of the field (1:10). The effect of this appeal was that 24 days later, all the people, including Zerubbabel and Joshua, began the work of reconstruction (1:14,15).

(2) Hag 2:1-9, delivered on the 21st day of the 7th month (October), which was about one month after the work had been resumed, and containing a note of encouragement to those who felt that the new structure was destined to be so much inferior to Solomon's temple. The prophet, on the contrary, assures them that the latter glory of the new house shall eclipse that of Solomon's magnificent temple, for soon a great "shaking" on Yahweh's part among the nations will usher in the Messianic age, and the precious things of all nations will flow in to beautify it (compare Heb 12:26-28).

(3) Hag 2:10-19, delivered on the 24th day of the 9th month (December) which was exactly 3 months after the building had been resumed, and containing, like the first discourse, a rebuke to the people because of their indifference and inertia. The discourse is couched in the form of a parable (2:11-14), by means of which the prophet explains why the prayers of the people go unanswered. It is because they have so long postponed the completion of the temple; a taint of guilt vitiates everything they do, and blasting and mildew and hail, and consequently unfruitful seasons, are the result. On the other hand, if they will but press forward with the work, Yahweh will again bless them, and fruitful seasons will follow their revived zeal (2:19; compare Zec 8:9-12).

(4) Hag 2:20-23, delivered on the 24th day of the 9th month, the very same day as that on which the discourse in 2:10-19 was delivered. The sequence is immediate. For when Yahweh "shakes" the nations, He will establish Zerubbabel, the representative of the Davidic dynasty and the object of patriotic hopes. When the heathen powers are overthrown, Zerubbabel will stand unshaken as Yahweh's honored and trusted vicegerent, and as the precious signet on Yahweh's hand (compare Jer 22:24; So 8:6).

6. Message:

The most striking feature in Haggai's message is its repeated claim of Divine origin: 5 times in the 38 verses of his prophecies, he tells us that "the word of Yahweh came" unto him (Hag 1:1,3; 2:1,10,20); 4

t, also, he used the formula, "Thus saith Yahweh of hosts" (1:2,5,7; 2:11); 5 times "saith Yahweh of hosts" (1:9; 2:6,7,9,23); and 4 times simply "saith Yahweh" (1:13; 2:4,14,17). Altogether he uses the exalted phrase "Yahweh of hosts" 14 t, besides 19 repetitions of the single but ineffable name "Yahweh." The most striking sentence in all his prophecies is probably that found in 1:13, "Then spake Haggai, Yahweh's messenger in Yahweh's message unto the people." His single purpose, as we have above seen, was to encourage the building of the temple. This he seems to have regarded as essential to the purity of Israel's religion. His key-exhortation is "Consider your ways" (1:5:7; compare 2:15,18). His prophecies reflect the conditions of his age. He points to judgments as a proof of the Divine displeasure (1:9,10; 2:15-19). Unlike the earlier prophets, he does not denounce idolatry; but like his contemporary, Zechariah, and his successor, Malachi, he does lay stress on the external side of religion. Chief interest centers in the somewhat unusual parable contained in Hag 2:10-19, which teaches that holiness is not contagious, but that evil is. "The faint aroma of sanctity coming from their altar and sacrifices was too feeble to pervade the secular atmosphere of their life" (A. B. Davidson, Exile and Restoration, 82). Haggai argues that Israel's sacrifices for 16 years had been unclean in God's sight, and had brought them no blessing, because they had left the temple in ruins; and, that while a healthy man cannot give his health to another by touching him, a sick man may easily spread contagion among all those about him. The thought is suggestive. Haggai may or may not have been a priest, "but in so short a prophecy this elaborate allusion to ritual is very significant." Another very striking thought in Haggai's book is his reference to Zerubbabel as Yahweh's "servant" and "signet," whom Yahweh has "chosen" (2:23). Wellhausen regards these words as an equivalent to making Zerubbabel the Messiah; but it is enough to think that the prophet is attempting only to restore him to the honorable position from which his grandfather, Jehoiachin, in Jer 22:24, had been degraded. Thus would the prophet link Zerubbabel, the political hope of the post-exilic congregation, to the royal line of Judah. Isaiah speaks of Cyrus in similar terms without any Messianic implication (Isa 44:28; 45:1). On the other hand, the implicit Messianic import of Hag 2:7,8 is recognized on all sides.

7. Style:

Haggai's style is suited to the contents of his prophecies. While he is less poetical than his predecessors, yet parallelism is not altogether wanting in his sentence (Hag 2:8). Compared with the greater books of prophecy, his brief message has been declared "plain and unadorned," "tame and prosaic"; yet it must be acknowledged that he is not wanting in pathos when he reproves, or in force when he exhorts. Though he labors under a poverty of terms, and frequently repeats the same formulas, yet he was profoundly in earnest, and became the most successful in his purpose of all his class. He was especially fond of interrogation. At best we have only a summary, probably, of what he actually preached.

8. Criticism:

The critical questions involved in Haggai's case are not serious: Hag 2:5 a, for example, is wanting in the Septuagint; to 2:14 the Septuagint adds from Am 5:10; 5:17 is very similar to, and seems dependent on, Am 4:9; 1:7 b and 13, are rejected by some as later interpolations; while Klostermann and Marti hold that the book as a whole was not written by Haggai at all, but rather about his prophetic activity, a perfectly gratuitous assumption without any substantial proof in its favor.

LITERATURE.

Driver, New Century Bible, "The Minor Prophets," II, 1906; LOT, 1909; G. A. Smith, Expositor’s Bible, "The Twelve Prophets," II, 1898; E. B. Pusey, The Minor Prophets, II, 1878; M. Dods, "Handbooks for Bible Classes," Hag, Zec, Mal; J. Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten ubersetzt u. erklart, 1898; W. Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten ubersetzt u. erklart, 1905; K. Marti, Dodekapropheton erklart, 1904; H. G. Mitchell, ICC, 1912.

George L. Robinson

HAGGERI

hag’-e-ri.

See HAGRI.

HAGGI

hag’-i (chaggi, "festive"): The second son of Gad (Ge 46:16; Nu 26:15). The latter refers to his descendants as Haggites, of whom nothing else is known.

HAGGIAH

ha-gi’-a (chaggiyah, "feast of Yah"): Named in 1Ch 6:30 as among the descendants of Levi.

HAGGITES

hag’-its.

See HAGGI.

HAGGITH

hag’-ith (chaggith, "festal"): According to 2Sa 3:4; 1Ki 1:5,11; 2:13; 1Ch 3:2, the fifth wife of David and the mother of his fourth son, Adonijah. The latter was born in Hebron while David’s capital was there (2Sa 3:4,5).

HAGIA

ha’-gi-a.

See AGIA.

HAGIOGRAPHA

hag-i-og’-ra-fa.

See BIBLE; CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

HAGRI

hag’-ri (haghri, "wanderer"; the King James Version Haggeri): The father of Mibhar, one of the "mighty men" who rallied round David during his foreign wars. Mentioned only in 1Ch 11:38, whose parallel passage, 2Sa 23:36, gives, instead, the name "Bani the Gadite."

HAGRITES

hag’-rits (haghri’im): An Arab tribe, or confederation of tribes (1Ch 5:10,19,20 the King James Version "Hagarites"; 1Ch 27:31 the King James Version "Hagerite"; Ps 83:6 "Hagarenes"), against which the Reubenites fought in the days of Saul. In Ge 25:12-18 are recorded the descendants, "generations," of Ishmael, "whom Hagar the Egyptian Sarah’s handmaid, bare unto Abraham." Two, and possibly three, of these tribes, Jetur, Naphish and Kedemah (25:15), appear to be identical with the 3 tribes whom the Reubenites and the other Israelite tribes East of the Jordan conquered and dispossessed (1Ch 5). The correspondence of names in Ge and 1Ch leaves little doubt that "Hagrite" is a generic term roughly synonymous with "Ishmaelite," designating the irregular and shifting line of desert tribes stretching along the East and South of Palestine. Those "East of Gilead," "Jetur, Naphish and Nodah," were overcome by Reuben: "The Hagrites were delivered into their hand, and all that were with them. .... And they took away their cattle .... they dwelt in their stead until the captivity" (1Ch 5:20-22).

These along with other Arab tribes are mentioned in the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 BC). Jetur gave his name to the Itureans of Roman times, who were famed soldiers dwelling in Anti-Libanus. Compare Curtis, Commentary on Chronicles; Skinner, "Gen," ICC, in the place cited.

Edward Mack

HAI

ha’-i (ha-‘ay, "the heap"): Ge 12:8; 13:3 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) AI (which see).

HAIL (1)

hal (baradh; chalaza):

1. Its Occurrence:

Hail usually falls in the spring or summer during severe thunder storms. Hailstones are made up of alternate layers of ice and snow, and sometimes reach considerable size, causing great damage by their fall. Upward currents of air carry up raindrops already formed to the colder regions above, where they freeze, and as they again pass through layers of cloud, their bulk increases until, too heavy to be carried by the current, they fall to the ground. Hailstorms, like thunder storms, occur in narrow belts a few miles in breadth and are of short duration. Almost without exception they occur in the daytime. If they take place before the time of harvest they do great damage to grain and fruit, and in extreme cases have injured property and endangered life.

2. In Syria:

Hailstorms, while by no means common in Syria and Palestine, are not unusual and are of great severity. They occasionally take place in Egypt. Within a few years hailstones of unusual size fell in Port Said, breaking thousands of windows.

3. Biblical Instances:

(1) The plague of hail (Ex 9:23-24; Ps 78:47), which was a local storm, as they usually are, falling on the Egyptians and not striking the children of Israel in Goshen. It was of great severity. "There was hail, and fire mingled with the hail, very grievous, such as had not been in all the land of Egypt since it became a nation" (Ex 9:24). It took place in January, for the barley "was in the ear, and the flax was in bloom" (Ex 9:31), and caused great damage.

(2) After the battle with the Amorites at Gibeon, "Yahweh cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah, and they died: they were more who died with the hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword" (Jos 10:11).

4. As Punishment:

Hail is often spoken of as a means of punishing the wicked: "As a tempest of hail .... will he cast down" (Isa 28:2); "The hail shall sweep away the refuge of lies" (Isa 28:17); and as symbols of God’s anger: "I will rain .... great hailstones, fire, and brimstone" (Eze 38:22); "There shall be .... great hailstones in wrath to consume it" (Eze 13:13; compare Isa 30:30; Hag 2:17; Re 8:7; 11:19; 16:21).

5. God’s Power:

Yahweh’s power and wisdom are shown in controlling the hail: "Hast thou seen the treasuries of the hail?" (Job 38:22); "Fire and hail, snow and vapor .... fulfilling his word" (Ps 148:8).

Alfred H. Joy

HAIL (2)

hal: Interjection, found only in the Gospels as the translation of chaire, chairete, imp. of chairo, "to rejoice," is used as a greeting or salutation. The word "Hail" is Old English and was formerly an adjective, used with the verb to be, meaning "well," "sound," "hale," e.g. "Hale be thou." Wycliff has "heil" without the verb, followed by other English VSS, except that the Geneva has "God save thee," in Mt 26:49; 28:9. The word occurs in Mt 26:49; 27:29; 28:9, "all hail"; Mr 15:18; Lu 1:28; Joh 19:3.

See GODSPEED; GREETING.

HAIR

har (se‘ar, sa‘ar, Aramaic se‘ar, and their derivatives; thrix, gen. case trichos, kome):

1. Hair Fashions:

Hair was worn in different fashions by the Orientals of Biblical times, and not always in the same way among the same people in different epochs. We know this clearly from Egyptian literature and monuments, as well as from the writings of Greek authors (especially Herodotus), that the dwellers on the Nile had their heads shaved in early youth, leaving but a side lock until maturity was attained, when this mark of childhood was taken away. Priests and warriors kept their heads closely shaved; nothing but the exigencies of arduous warfare were allowed to interfere with this custom. On the other hand, the Hebrew people, like their Babylonian neighbors (Herod. i.195), affected long and well-cared-for, bushy curls of hair as emblems of manly beauty. Proofs thereof are not infrequent in the Scriptures and elsewhere. Samson’s (Jud 16:13,19) and Absalom’s (2Sa 14:26) long luxuriant hair is specially mentioned, and the Shulammite sings of the locks of her beloved which are "bushy (the Revised Version, margin "curling"), and black as a raven" (So 5:11). Josephus (Ant., VIII, vii, 3 (185)) reports that Solomon’s body-guard was distinguished by youthful beauty and "luxuriant heads of hair." In the history of Samson we read of "the seven locks of his head" (Jud 16:19). It is likely that the expression signifies the plaits of hair which are even now often worn by the young Bedouin warrior of the desert.

2. Hair in Idol Worship:

It is well known that among the surrounding heathen nations the hair of childhood or youth was often shaved and consecrated at idolatrous shrines (compare Herod. ii.65 for Egypt). Frequently this custom marked an initiatory rite into the service of a divinity (e.g. that of Orotal (Bacchus) in Arabia, Herod.

iii.8). It was therefore an abomination of the Gentiles in the eyes of the Jew, which is referred to in Le 19:27; Jer 9:26; 25:23; 49:32. The Syriac version of the latter passage renders, "Ye shall not let your hair grow long" (i.e. in order to cut it as a religious rite in honor of an idol). It is, however, probable that among the Jews, as now among many classes of Mohammedans, the periodical cropping of the hair, when it had become too cumbersome, was connected with some small festivity, when the weight of the hair was ascertained, and its weight in silver was given in charity to the poor. At least, the weighing of Absalom's hair (2Sa 14:26) may be referred to some such custom, which is not unparalleled in other countries. The use of balances in connection with the shaving-off of the hair in Eze 5:1 is certainly out of the common. See illustration, "Votive Offering," on p. 1302.

3. The Nazirite Vow:

We may also compare the shaving of the head of the Nazirite to these heathen practices, though the resemblance is merely superficial. The man who made a vow to God was responsible to Him with his whole body and being. Not even a hair was to be injured willfully during the whole period of the vow, for all belonged to God. The conclusion of the Nazirite vow was marked by sacrifices and the shaving of the head at the door of the sanctuary (Nu 6:1-21), indicative of a new beginning of life. The long untouched hair was therefore considered as the emblem of personal devotion (or devotedness) to the God of all strength. Thus it was an easy step to the thought that in the hair was the seat of strength of a Samson (Jud 16:17,20). God has numbered the very hairs of the head (Mt 10:30; Lu 12:7), which to human beings conveys the idea of the innumerableness (Ps 40:12; 69:4). What God can number, He can also protect, so that not even a hair of the head might "fall to the earth" or "perish." These phrases express complete safety (1Sa 14:45; 2Sa 14:11; 1Ki 1:52; Lu 21:18; Ac 27:34).

4. Later Fashions:

In New Testament times, especially in the Diaspora, the Jews frequently adopted the fashion of the Romans in cropping the hair closely (1Co 11:14); still the fear of being tainted by the idolatrous practice of the heathen, which is specially forbidden in Le 21:5, was so great that the side locks remained untouched and were permitted to grow ad libitum. This is still the custom among the Jews of Eastern Europe and the Orient.

See also HEAD.

5. Woman's Hair:

If Hebrew men paid much attention to their hair, it was even more so among Hebrew women. Long black tresses were the pride of the Jewish maiden and matron (So 7:5; Joh 11:2; 1Co 11:5,6,15), but many of the expressions used in connection with the "coiffures" of women do not convey to us more than a vague idea. The "locks" of the King James Version in So 4:1,3; 6:7; Isa 47:2 (tsemmah) probably do not refer to the hair, but should be translated (as does the Revised Version (British and American), which follows the Septuagint) by "veil." dallah (So 7:5), signifies the slender threads which represent the

unfinished web in the loom (compare Isa 38:12), and thence the flowing hair of women (the Revised Version (British and American) "hair"). rehaTim (the Revised Version (British and American) "tresses"), in the same verse of the So of Songs means literally the "gutters" at which the flocks were watered (compare Ge 30:38,41), and thus the long plaits of the maiden with which the lover toys and in which he is held captive. The braiding or dressing of woman's hair is expressed in 2Ki 9:30 and Judith 10:3. In New Testament times Christian women are warned against following the fashionable world in elaborate hairdressing (1Ti 2:9; 1Pe 3:3).

6. Barbers:

The care of the hair, especially the periodical cutting of the same, early necessitated the trade of the barber. The Hebrew word gallabh is found in Eze 5:1, and the plural form of the same word occurs in an inscription at Citium (Cyprus) (CIS, 1586), where the persons thus described clearly belonged to the priests or servants of a temple.

See BARBER.

7. Ointments:

Numerous were the cosmetics and ointments applied to the hair (Ec 9:8; Mt 6:17; perhaps Ru 3:3), but some, reserved for sacramental purposes, were prohibited for profane use (Ex 30:32; Ps 133:2). Such distinction we find also in Egypt, where the walls of temple laboratories were inscribed with extensive recipes of such holy oils, while the medical papyri (see especially Papyrus Ebers, plates 64-67) contain numerous ointments for the hair, the composition of some of which is ascribed to a renowned queen of antiquity. Even Greek and Roman medical authors have transmitted to us the knowledge of some such prescriptions compounded, it is said, by Queen Cleopatra VI of Egypt, the frivolous friend of Caesar and Antony (see my dissertation, Die uber die medicinischen Kenntnisse der alten Aegypter berichtenden Papyri, ere, Leipzig, 1888, 121-32). We know from Josephus (Ant., XVI, viii, 1 (233)), that Herod the Great, in his old age, dyed his hair black, a custom, however, which does not appear to be specifically Jewish, as hair-dyes as well as means for bleaching the hair were well known in Greece and Rome. It is certain that the passage Mt 5:36 would not have been spoken, had this been a common custom in the days of the Lord. A special luxury is mentioned by Josephus (Ant., VIII, vii, 3 (185)), who states that the young men who formed the body-guard of King Solomon were in the habit, on festive occasions, of sprinkling their long hair with gold-dust (psegma chrusou).

For the Jews the anointing of the head was synonymous with joy and prosperity (compare Ps 23:5; 92:10; Heb 1:9; compare also "oil of joy," Isa 61:3, and "oil of gladness," Ps 45:7). It was also, like the washing of feet, a token of hospitality (Ps 23:5; Lu 7:46).

On the contrary, it was the custom in times of personal or national affliction and mourning to wear the hair unanointed and disheveled, or to cover the head with dust and ashes (2Sa 14:2; Jos 7:6; Job 2:12), or to tear the hair or to cut it off (Ezr 9:3; Ne 13:25; Jer 7:29).

8. Symbolical Use of Word:

We have referred to the thickness of hair which supplied the Hebrew with a suitable expression for the conception "innumerable." Hair is also expressive of minuteness; thus the 700 left-handed men of Benjamin were able to "sling stones at a hairbreadth, and not miss" (Jud 20:16). Gray hairs and the hoary white of old age were highly honored by the Jews (Pr 16:31; 20:29; APC 2Macc 6:23). Besides expressing old age (Isa 46:4), they stand for wisdom (The Wisdom of Solomon 4:9 (10)). Sometimes white hair is the emblem of a glorious, if not Divine, presence (Da 7:9; APC 2Macc 15:13; Re 1:14). Calamity befalling the gray-headed was doubly terrible (Ge 42:38; 44:29). The "hair of the flesh" is said to "stand up" (Job 4:15; APC Sirach 27:14) when sudden terror or fear takes hold of a person. The symbolical language of Isa 7:20 uses the "hair of the feet" (see FEET) and "the beard" as synonymous with "the humble" and the "mighty of the people."

Camel’s hair (Mt 3:4; Mr 1:6) is mentioned in connection with the description of John the Baptist’s raiment. It represents, according to Jerome, a rough shirt worn under the coat or wrapper, though a rather soft fabric is produced in Arabia from the finer wool of the camel.

Goat’s hair was the material of a cloth used for wearing apparel and for a more or less waterproof covering of tents and bundles. It is the black tent-cloth of Kedar’ (So 1:5; Ex 26:7; 36:14). In New Testament times it was the special product of Paul’s native province, Cilicia, whence its name cilicium, and its manufacture formed the apostle’s own trade (Ac 18:3). It is also mentioned as a material for stuffing pillows (1Sa 19:13).

See also WEAVING.

H. L. E. Luering

HAIR, PLUCKING OF THE

See PUNISHMENTS.

HAKKATAN

hak’-a-tan (ha-qaTan, "the little one"): The father of Johanan, who returned with Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:12 = Akatan, APC 1Esdras 8:38).

HAKKOZ

hak’-oz (haqqots, or ha-qots, "the nimble"):

(1) A priest and chief of the 7th course of Aaron’s sons selected by David (1Ch 24:10). According to Ezr 2:61; Ne 3:4,21; 7:63, his descendants returned with Zerubbabel from the captivity. But the King James Version considers the name in Ezra and Nehemiah as having the article prefixed, hence renders "Koz."

(2) One of Judah’s descendants (1Ch 4:8).

HAKUPHA

ha-ku’-fa (chaqupha’ "incitement"). A family name of some of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (Ezr 2:51; Ne 7:53).

HALAH

ha’-la (chalach; Halae, Hallae, Chaach, for Chalach, Chala; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) Hala):

1. Many Identifications:

Mentioned in 2Ki 17:6; 18:11; 1Ch 5:26, as one of the places to which the kings of Assyria sent the exiled Israelites (see GOZAN; HABOR). Various identifications have been proposed, all of them except the last more or less improbable for philological reasons:

(1) the Assyrian Kalach (Nimrud, the Calah of Ge 10:11);

(2) the Assyrian Hilakku (Cilicia);

(3) Chalkitis in Mesopotamia (Ptol. v.18, 4), adjoining Gauzanitis (Gozan)—a good position otherwise;

(4) the Calachene of Strabo, in the North of Assyria. Equally unsuitable, also, is

(5) the Chalonitis of Pliny and Strabo, Northeast of Assyria, notwithstanding that this was apparently called Halah by the Syrians. An attractive identification was

(6) with the river Balikh (by change of "H" into "B")—compare Septuagint "in Halae and in Habor, rivers of Gozan"—but even this has to be abandoned in favor of

(7) the Assyrian Halahhu, which (except the doubling and the case-ending) is the same, letter for letter.

2. The Most Probable of Them:

It is mentioned in the W. Asia Inscr, II, plural 53, l. 35, between Arrapha (Arrapachitis) and Racappu

(Reseph). According to the tablet K. 123, where it is called mat Halahhi, "the land of Halahhu," it apparently included the towns Se-bise, Se-irrisi, Lu-ammu(ti?), and Se-Akkulani, apparently four grain-producing centers for the Assyrian government. The first quotation implies that Halah was near or in Gauzanitis, and had a chief town of the same name. Of the 8 personal names in K. 123, 5 are Assyrian, the remainder being Syrian rather than Israelite.

T. G. Pinches

HALAK, MOUNT

ha’-lak (ha-har he-chalaq): A mountain that marked the southern limit of the conquests of Joshua (Jos 11:17; 12:7). It is spoken of as the "mount Halak (literally, "the bare" or "smooth mountain") that goeth up to Seir." The latter passage locates it on the West of the Arabah. The southern boundary of the land is defined by the ascent of Akrabbim (Nu 34:4; Jos 15:3). This may with some certainty be identified with the pass known today as naqb es-Safa, "pass of the smooth rock," through which runs the road from the South to Hebron. To the Southwest opens Wady Maderah, a continuation of Waddy el-Fiqrah, in which there rises a conspicuous hill, Jebel Maderah, composed of limestone, answering well the description of a bare or smooth mountain. It is a striking feature of the landscape viewed from all sides, and may well be the mount here referred to.

See also HOR, MOUNT.

W. Ewing

HALAKHA

ha-la’-ka.

See TALMUD.

HALE; HALING

hal, hal’-ing (OE halen): "To pull" or drag, the King James Version translation of suro, "to draw or drag" (Ac 8:3, "haling men and women," the American Standard Revised Version "dragging"), and of katasuro, "to drag down" or "force along" (Lu 12:58, "lest he hale thee to the judge," the American Standard Revised Version "lest haply he drag thee unto the judge"). A more frequent modern form is "haul."

HALF

haf.

See NUMBER.

HALHUL

hal’-hul (chalchul): A city in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:58), "Halhul, Beth-zur and Gedor." It is without doubt the modern Chalchul, a village on a hill, surrounded by fine fields and vineyards, some 4 miles North of Hebron and less than a mile to the East of the modern carriage road. It is conspicuous from a considerable distance on account of its ancient mosque, Wely Nebi Yulnas, the "shrine of the Prophet Jonah"—a tradition going back at least to the 14th century. The mosque, which has a minaret or tower, is built upon a rock platform artificially leveled. In the 14th century it was stated by Isaac Chilo (a Jewish pilgrim) that the tomb of Gad the Seer (1Sa 22:5; 2Sa 24:11 f) was situated in this town. Beth-zur (Belt Sur) and Gedor (Jedur) are both near. In Josephus (BJ, IV, ix, 6) we read of an Alurus (where the Idumeans assembled), and in Jerome (OS 119 7) of a village Alula near Hebron, which both probably refer to the same place (PEF, III, 305; Sh XXI).

E. W. G. Masterman

HALI

ha’-li (chali): A town named with Helkath, Beten and Achshaph on the border of Asher (Jos 19:25). No certain identification is possible; but it may be represented by the modern Khirbet ‘Alia, circa 13 miles Northeast of Acre.

HALICARNASSUS

hal-i-kar-nas’-us (Halikarnassos): The largest and strongest city of the ancient country of Caria in Asia Minor, situated on the shore of a bay, 15 miles from the island of Cos. Its site was beautiful; its climate temperate and even; the soil of the surrounding country was unusually fertile and noted for its abundance of fig, orange, lemon, olive and almond trees. When the ancient country fell into the possession of the Persians, the kings of Caria were still permitted to rule. One of the rulers was the famous queen Artemisia who fought at the battle of Salamis. The most famous of the kings, however, was Maussollos (Mausolus), who ruled from 373 to 353 BC, and the tomb in which he was buried was long considered one of the wonders of the ancient world. Pliny describes the tomb as a circular structure, 140 ft. high, 411 ft. in circumference, and surrounded by 36 columns; it was covered with a pyramidal dome. The ancient writer Vitruvius, in his description of the city, says that the agora was along the shore; back of it was the mausoleum, and still farther away was the temple of Mars. To the right of the agora were the temples of Venus and Mercury, and to the left was the palace of Maussollos. Alexander the Great destroyed the city only after a long siege, but he was unable to take the acropolis. The city never quite recovered, yet it was later distinguished as the supposed birthplace of Herodotus and Dionysius. That a number of Jews lived there is evident from the fact, according to 1 Macc 15:23, that in the year 139 BC, a letter was written by the Roman Senate in their behalf. In the 1st century BC, a

decree was issued granting to the Jews in Halicarnassus liberty to worship "according to the Jewish laws, and to make their proseuche at the sea-side, according to the customs of their forefathers" (Josephus, Ant, XIV, x, 23).

The modern town of Budrun, which represents the ancient Halicarnassus and covers a part of its site, stands a little to the West of the castle of Peter. This castle was erected by the Knights of Rhodes in 1404 AD, partly from the ruins of the mausoleum. Lord Redcliffe, who explored the ruins in 1846, sent many of the sculptured slabs from the castle to the British Museum where they may now be seen. Sir C. Newton conducted excavations there in 1857-58, adding other sculptures to the collection in the British Museum. He discovered the foundation of the Ionic temple of Aphrodite, and the greenstone foundation of the mausoleum upon which modern Turkish houses had been built. He also opened several tombs which were outside the ancient city. The city walls, built by Maussollos about 360 BC, and defining the borders of the ancient city, are still preserved; but the ancient harbor which was protected by a mole, has now disappeared. The ruins may best be reached by boat from the island of Cos.

E. J. Banks

HALL

hol (Lu 22:55 the King James Version).

See HOUSE.

HALL, JUDGMENT

See JUDGMENT HALL; PRAETORIUM.

HALLEL

ha-lal’, hal’-el: In the fifth book of the Psalms (107-50) there are several groups of Hallelujah Psalms: 104-106; 111-113; 115-117; 135; 146-150. In the worship of the synagogue Psalms 135-136 and 146-150 were used in the daily morning service. Psalms 113-118 were called the "Egyp Hallel," and were sung at the feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, Tabernacles and Dedication. At the Passover, Psalms 113 and 114 (according to the school of Shammai only Ps 113) were sung before the feast, and Psalms 115-118 after drinking the last cup. The song used by our Lord and the disciples on the night of the betrayal (Mt 26:30), just before the departure for the Mount of Olives, probably included Psalms 115-118.

John Richard Sampey

HALLELUJAH

hal-e-loo’-ya (halela-yah, "praise ye Yah"; allelouia): The word is not a compound, like many of the Hebrew words which are composed of the abbreviated form of "Yahweh" and some other word, but has become a compound word in the Greek and other languages. Even if the Jews perhaps had become accustomed to use it as a compound, it is never written as such in the text. In some Psalms, Hallelujah is an integral part of the song (Ps 135:3), while in others it simply serves as a liturgical interjection found either at the beginning (Ps 111) or at the close (Ps 104) of the psalms or both (Ps 146). The Hallelujah Psalms are found in three groups: 104-106; 111-113; 146-150. In the first group, Hallelujah is found at the close of the psalm as a lit. interjection (106:1 is an integral part of the psalm). In the second group, Hallelujah is found at the beginning (113:9 is an integral part of the psalm depending on the adjective "joyful"). In the third group, Hallelujah is found both at the close and at the beginning of the psalms. In all other cases, (Pss 115; 116; 117) Hallelujah seems to be an integral part of the psalms. These three groups were probably taken from an older collection of psalms like the group Psalms 120-134. In the New Testament Hallelujah is found as part of the song of the heavenly host (Re 19:1). The word is preserved as a liturgical interjection by the Christian church generally.

A. L. Breslich

HALLOHESH

ha-lo’-hesh (ha-lochesh, "the whisperer," "the slanderer"): A post-exilic chief whose son Shallum assisted in repairing the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 3:12, the King James Version "Halohesh"). He was also one of the leaders who signed the national covenant (Ne 10:24 (Hebrew 25)).

HALLOW; HALLOWED

hal’-o, hal’-od, hal’-o-ed ("to render or treat as holy," Anglo-Saxon halgian, from halig, "holy"): It translates several forms of qadhash, "set apart," "devote," "consecrate," frequently rendered in the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version "consecrate," "dedicate," "holy," and especially "sanctify," closely synonymous, "hallow" perhaps containing more of the thought of reverence, sacredness, holiness. It embraces the idea of marked separateness. It is applied to persons, as the priest (Le 22:2,3); to places or buildings, as the middle of the temple court (1Ki 8:64); the tabernacle (Ex 40:9); to things, like the portion of the sacrifice set apart for the priests (Nu 18:8); to times and seasons, as the Sabbath (Jer 17:22; Eze 20:20) and the Jubilee year (Le 25:10); to God Himself (Le 22:32). Its underlying idea of the separateness of holy nature or holy use works out into several often overlapping senses: (1) To set apart, dedicate, offer, reserve, for the worship or service of God: Ex 28:38, "The holy things, which the children of Israel shall hallow in all their holy gifts"; also Le 22:3; Nu 18:29, etc.; 2Ki 12:4, "All the money the hallowed things" (the King James Version "dedicated"), etc. (2) To make holy, by selecting, setting apart, claiming, or acknowledging as His own: Ge 2:3, "God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it" (the King James Version "sanctified"); but Ex 20:11 (King James Version, the English Revised Version, the American Standard Revised Version), "hallowed." So of the temple (1Ki 9:7); of the firstborn, spared in Egypt (Nu 3:13). (3) To dedicate or consecrate by formal ceremonial, with the accompanying idea of cleansing

from sin and uncleanness: Ex 29:1, "This is the thing that thou shalt do unto them (Aaron and his sons) to hallow them, to minister unto me in the priest's office." The whole chapter is devoted to the elaborate ceremonial, consisting of ablutions, endowment in priestly robes and paraphernalia, anointing with oil, the offering of a bullock for a sin offering, and of a ram, the placing of the blood of another ram upon the right ear, right thumb, right great toe of each, the wave offering, the anointing of the holy garments, and the eating of the consecrated food, all this lasting seven days, and indicating the completeness with which they were set apart, the deep necessity of purification, and the solemnity and sacredness of the office. The tabernacle and its furniture were similarly "hallowed" by a simpler ceremony, using the anointing oil. (4) To render ritually fit for religious service, worship, or use: Le 16:19, "Hallow it (the altar with the sprinkled blood) from the uncleannesses of the children of Israel"; Nu 6:11, "The priest shall .... make atonement for him, for that he sinned by reason of the dead, and shall hallow his head that same day." (5) To hold sacred, reverence, keep holy: Jer 17:22, "But hallow ye the Sabbath day," by keeping it distinct and separate, especially (Jer 17:24,27) by refraining from unnecessary work, from burden-bearing, travel, or traffic (Ne 13:16). See Ex 20:8-11 (the Sabbath Commandment). (6) To revere, hold in awe, and reverence as holy and "separated from sinners" in majesty, power, sacredness: Le 22:32, "And ye shall not profane my holy name; but I will be hallowed among the children of Israel." Qadhash is elsewhere translated "sanctify" in this connection, meaning "to be manifested in awe-producing majesty, power, or grace": Eze 38:23, "And I will .... sanctify myself, and I will make myself known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am Yahweh"; compare Eze 28:22,23, etc.

In the New Testament "hallow" occurs only in the "Lord's Prayer," there rendering hagiazo, the Septuagint word for qadhash: Mt 6:9; Lu 11:2, "Hallowed be thy name." Hagiazo is quite frequent in the New Testament, and is always (American Standard Revised Version) rendered "sanctify," except here, and in Re 22:11, "He that is holy, let him be made holy still." To "hallow the name" includes not only the inward attitude and outward action of profound reverence and active praise, but also that personal godliness, loving obedience and aggressive Christlikeness, which reveal the presence of God in the life, which is His true earthly glory.

Philip Wendell Crannell

HALT

holt (tsala', "to limp"; cholos, "lame," "crippled"): the American Standard Revised Version in Ge 32:31 prefers "limped"; in Mic 4:6,7; Ze 3:19, "is (or was) lame"; in Lu 14:21, the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version have "lame." In 1Ki 18:21 a different word (pacach) is used in English Versions of the Bible of moral indecision: "How long halt ye between two opinions?" the American Standard Revised Version renders, "How long go ye limping between the two sides?"

HAM (1)

ham (cham; Cham):

1. The Youngest Son of Noah:

The youngest son of Noah, from whom sprang the western and southwestern nations known to the Hebrews. His name first occurs in Ge 5:32, where, as in 6:10 and elsewhere, it occupies the second place. In Ge 9:18 Ham is described as "the father of Canaan," to prepare the reader for 9:25-27, where Noah, cursing Ham for having told Shem and Japheth of his nakedness, refers to him as Canaan. On account of this, it has been suggested that "Canaan" stood originally in all the passages where the three brothers are spoken of, and that this was later changed to "Ham," except in the verses containing the curse. It seems more likely, however, that the name "Canaan" is inserted prophetically, as Noah would not desire to curse his son, but only one branch of that son’s descendants, who were later the principal adversaries of the Hebrews.

2. Ham as a Nationality:

The name given, in Ps 105:23,17; 106:22 (compare 78:51), to Egypt as a descendant of Ham, son of Noah. As Shem means "dusky," or the like, and Japheth "fair," it has been supposed that Ham meant, as is not improbable, "black." This is supported by the evidence of Hebrew and Arabic, in which the word chamam means "to be hot" and "to be black," the latter signification being derived from the former.

3. Meaning of the Word:

That Ham is connected with the native name of Egypt, Kem, or, in full pa ta’ en Kem, "the land of Egypt," in Bashmurian Coptic Kheme, is unlikely, as this form is probably of a much later date than the composition of Gen, and, moreover, as the Arabic shows, the guttural is not a true kh, but the hard breathing h, which are both represented by the Hebrew cheth.

4. The Nations Descending from Ham:

Of the nationalities regarded as descending from Ham, none can be described as really black. First on the list, as being the darkest, is Cush or Ethiopia (Ge 10:6), after which comes Mitsrayim, or Egypt, then PuT or Libyia, and Canaan last. The sons or descendants of each of these are then taken in turn, and it is noteworthy that some of them, like the Ethiopians and the Canaanites, spoke Semitic, and not Hamitic, languages—Seba (if connected with the Sabeans), Havilah (Yemen), and Sheba, whose queen visited Solomon. Professor Sayce, moreover, has pointed out that Caphtor is the original home of the Phoenicians, who spoke a Semitic language. The explanation of this probably is that other tongues were forced upon these nationalities in consequence of their migrations, or because they fell under the dominion of nationalities alien to them. The non-Sem Babylonians, described as descendants of Nimrod (Merodach), as is welI known, spoke Sumerian, and adopted Semitic Babylonian only on account of mingling with the Semites whom they found there. Another explanation is that the nationalities described as Hamitic—a parallel to those of the Semitic section—were so called because they fell under Egyptian dominion. This would make the original Hamitic race to have been Egyptian and account for Ham as a (poetical) designation of that nationality. Professor F. L. Griffith has pointed out that the

Egyptian Priapic god of Panopolis (Akhmim), sometimes called Menu, but also apparently known as Khem, may have been identified with the ancestor of the Hamitic race—he was worshipped from the coast of the Red Sea to Coptos, and must have been well known to Egypt's eastern neighbors. He regards the characteristics of Menu as being in accord with the shamelessness of Ham as recorded in Ge 9:20 ff.

See JAPHETH; SHEM; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. Pinches

HAM (2)

(ham):

(1) A place East of the Jordan named between Ashteroth-karnaim and Shaveh-kiriathaim, in which Chedorlaomer smote the Zu-zim (Ge 14:5). No name resembling this has been recovered. Septuagint reads bahem "with them," instead of beham, "in Ham." Some have thought that "Ham" may be a corruption from "Ammon"; or that it may be the ancient name of Rabbath-ammon itself.

(2) A poetical appellation of Egypt: "the land of Ham" (Ps 105:23, etc.) is the land of Jacob's sojourning, i.e. Egypt; "the tents of Ham" (Ps 78:51) are the dwellings of the Egyptians. It may be derived from the native name of Egypt, Kemi, or Khemi.

See MIZRAIM; SHEM.

W. Ewing

HAMAN

ha'-man (haman; Haman): A Persian noble and vizier of the empire under Xerxes. He was the enemy of Mordecai, the cousin of Esther. Mordecai, being a Jew, was unable to prostrate himself before the great official and to render to him the adoration which was due to him in accordance with Persian custom. Haman's wrath was so inflamed that one man's life seemed too mean a sacrifice, and he resolved that Mordecai's nation should perish with him. This was the cause of Haman's downfall and death. A ridiculous notion, which, though widely accepted, has no better foundation than a rabbinic suggestion or guess, represents him as a descendant of Agag, the king of Amalek, who was slain by Samuel. But the language of Scripture (1Sa 15:33) indicates that when Agag fell, he was the last of his house. Besides, why should his descendants, if any existed, be called Agagites and not Amalekites? Saul's posterity are in no case termed Saulites, but Benjamites or Israelites. But the basis of this theory has been swept away by recent discovery. Agag was a territory adjacent to that of Media. In an inscription found at Khorsabad, Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, says: "Thirty-four districts of Media I conquered and I added them to the domain of Assyria: I imposed upon them an annual tribute of horses. The country of

Agazi (Agag) .... I ravaged, I wasted, I burned." It may be added that the name of Haman is not Hebrew, neither is that of Hammedatha his father. "The name of Haman," writes M. Oppert, the distinguished Assyriologist, "as well as that of his father, belongs to the Medo-Persian."

John Urquhart

HAMATH

ha'-math (chamath; Hemath, Haimath; Swete also has Hemath): The word signifies a defense or citadel, and such designation was very suitable for this chief royal city of the Hittites, situated between their northern and southern capitals, Carchemish and Kadesh, on a gigantic mound beside the Orontes. In Am 6:2 it is named Great Hamath, but not necessarily to distinguish it from other places of the same name.

1. Early History:

The Hamathite is mentioned in Ge 10:18 among the sons of Canaan, but in historic times the population, as the personal names testify, seems to have been for the most part Semitic. The ideal boundary of Israel reached the territory, but not the city of Hamath (Nu 34:8; Jos 13:5; Eze 47:13-21). David entered into friendly relations with Toi, its king (2Sa 8:9), and Solomon erected store cities in the land of Hamath (2Ch 8:4). In the days of Ahab we meet with it on the cuneiform inscriptions, under the name mat hamatti, and its king Irhuleni was a party to the alliance of the Hittites with Ben-hadad of Damascus and Ahab of Israel against Shalmaneser II; but this was broken up by the battle of Qarqar in 854 BC, and Hamath became subject to Assyria. Jeroboam II attacked, partially destroyed, and held it for a short time (2Ki 14:28; Am 6:2). In 730 BC, its king Eniilu paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser, but he divided its lands among his generals, and transported 1,223 of its inhabitants to Sura on the Tigris. In 720, Sargon "rooted out the land of Hamath and dyed the skin of Ilubi'idi (or Jau-bi'idi) its king, like wool" and colonized the country with 4,300 Assyrians, among whom was Deioces the Mede. A few

years later Sennacherib also claims to have taken it (2Ki 18:34; 19:13). In Isa 11:11, mention is made of Israelites in captivity at Hamath, and Hamathites were among the colonists settled in Samaria (2Ki 17:24) by Esarhaddon in 675 BC. Their special object of worship was Ashima, which, notwithstanding various conjectures, has not been identified.

2. Later History:

The Hamathite country is mentioned in 1 Macc 12:25 in connection with the movements of Demetrius and Jonathan. The Seleucids renamed it Epiphaneia (Josephus, Ant, I, vi, 2), and by this name it was known to the Greeks and the Romans, even appearing as Paphunya in Midrash Ber Rab chapter 37. Locally, however, the ancient name never disappeared, and since the Moslem conquest it has been known as Hama. Saladin's family ruled it for a century and a half, but after the death of Abul-fida in 1331 it sank into decay.

3. Modern Condition:

The position of Hama in a fruitful plain to the East of the Nusairiyeh Mountains, on the most frequented highway between Mesopotamia and Egypt, and on the new railway, gives it again, as in ancient times, a singular significance, and it is once more rising in importance. The modern town is built in four quarters around the ancient citadel-mound, and it has a population of at least 80,000. It is now noted for its gigantic irrigating wheels. Here, too, the Hittite inscriptions were first found and designated Hamathite.

4. Entering in of Hamath:

In connection with the northern boundary of Israel, "the entering in of Hamath" is frequently mentioned (Nu 13:21; 1Ki 8:65, etc., the American Standard Revised Version "entrance"). It has been sought in the Orontes valley, between Antioch and Seleucia, and also at Wady Nahr el-Barid, leading down from Homs to the Mediterranean to the North of Tripoli. But from the point of view of Palestine, it must mean some part of the great valley of Coele-Syria (Biqa'a). It seems that instead of translating, we should read here a place-name—"Libo of Hamath"—and the presence of the ancient site of Libo (modern Leboue) 14 miles North-Northeast of Baalbek, at the head-waters of the Orontes, commanding the strategical point where the plain broadens out to the North and to the South, confirms us in this conjecture.

W. M. Christie

HAMATH-ZOBAH

ha'-math-zo'-ba (chamath tsobhah; Baisoba) :Mentioned only in 2Ch 8:3. Apart from Great Hamath no site answering to this name is known. It does not seem to be implied that Solomon took possession of Hamath itself, but rather that he "confirmed" his dominion over parts of the kingdom of Zobah, which on its fall may have been annexed by Hamath. The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus suggests a reading—Bethzobah—omitting all reference to Hamath. On the other hand, the geographical distinctions between Zobah and Hamath having passed away long before Chronicles was written, the double name may have been used to indicate generally the extent of Solomon's conquests, as also to avoid confusion with the Zobah in the Hauran (2Sa 23:36).

W. M. Christie

HAMMATH

ham'-ath (chammath, "hot spring"):

(1) "The father of the house of Rechab" (1Ch 2:55).

(2) One of the fenced cities of Naphtali, named with Zer, Rakkath and Chinnereth (Jos 19:35). It is

doubtless identical with Emmaus mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 3; BJ, IV, i, 3) as near Tiberias, on the shore of the lake of Gennesareth. It is represented by the modern el-Chammam, nearly 2 miles South of Tiberias. It was, of course, much nearer the ancient Tiberias, which lay South of the present city. The hot baths here, "useful for healing," in the time of Josephus, have maintained their reputation. In recent years, indeed, there has been a marked increase in the number of sick persons from all parts who visit the baths. The waters are esteemed specially valuable for rheumatism and skin troubles. In the large public bath the water has a temperature of over 140 degree Fahr. Parts of the ancient fortification still cling to the mountain side above the baths; and the remains of an aqueduct which brought fresh water from sources in the Southwest may be traced along the face of the slopes. Hammath is identical with Hammon (1Ch 6:76); and probably also with Hammoth-dor (Jos 21:32).

W. Ewing

HAMMEAH, THE TOWER OF

ha-me’-a, ham’-e-a (ha-me’ah (Ne 3:1); the King James Version Meah): The origin of the name is obscure; in the margin the meaning is given "Tower of the hundred"; it has been suggested that it may have been 100 cubits high or had 100 steps. It was the most important point on the walls of Jerusalem in going West from the Sheep Gate, and is mentioned along with the T. of HANANEL (which see) (Ne 3:1), and was therefore near the Northeast corner, and probably stood where the Baris and Antonia afterward were, near the Northwest corner of the charam where are today the Turkish barracks.

See JERUSALEM.

E. W. G. Masterman

HAMMEDATHA

ham-e-da’-tha (hammedhatha’): The father of Haman (Es 3:1). He is generally termed the "Agagite"; the name is of Persian etymology, signifying "given by the moon."

HAMMELECH

ham’-e-lek (ha-melekh, "the king"): Wrongly translated as a proper name in the King James Version. It should be rendered "the king," as in the American Standard Revised Version (Jer 36:26; 38:6).

HAMMER

ham’-er: The Hebrew maqqebheth, occurs in Jud 4:21, where it refers to the mallet (probably wooden) used to drive tent-pins into the ground. The same word occurs in 1Ki 6:7; Isa 44:12; Jer 10:4 as applied to a workman’s hammer. paTTish (compare Arabic, fatis), occurs in Isa 41:7; Jer 23:29; 50:23. It was

probably a blacksmith’s hammer or heavy hammer used for breaking rock. There is doubt about the rendering of Jud 5:26, where the word, halmuth, occurs. From the context, the instrument mentioned was probably not a hammer. In Ps 74:6, kelaph, is better translated "axes," not "hammers."

See TOOLS.

James A. Patch

HAMMIPHKAD, GATE OF

ha-mif’-kad (sha‘ar ha-miphqadh, "Gate of the Muster"): One of the gates of Jerusalem (Ne 3:31) not mentioned elsewhere; probably situated near the Northeast corner of the Temple area.

HAMMOLECHETH

ha-mol’-e-keth (hamolekheth, "the queen"; Septuagint Malecheth; the King James Version Hammoleketh): The daughter of Machir and sister of Gilead (1Ch 7:18).

HAMMON

ham’-on (chammon, "glowing"):

(1) A place on the seaward frontier of Asher, named with Rehob and Kanah (Jos 19:28), to be sought, therefore, not far from Tyre. The most probable identification so far suggested is with Umm el’Amud, "mother of the column" (or ‘Awamid, "columns"), at the mouth of Wady Chamul, on the shore, about 10 miles South of Tyre. An inscription found by Renan shows that the place was associated with the worship of Ba‘al Chamman (CIS, I, 8).

(2) A city in Naphtali, given to the Gershonite Levites (1Ch 6:76). It is identical with Hammath (Jos 19:35), and probably also with Hammoth-dor (Jos 21:32).

W. Ewing

HAMMOTH-DOR

ham-oth-dor’ (chammoth do’r; Emathdor, as also several corrupt forms): A fenced, Levitical city of Naphtali (Jos 19:35; 21:32); also named Hammen (1Ch 6:61 Hebrew). Probably the hammatu of the Karnak lists, and the hamatam of WAI, II, 53; certainly the Emmaus of Josephus, Ant, XVIII, ii, 3; BJ, IV, i, 3; Hamata of ‘Erubhin v. 5; Meghillah 2b, and the modern el-Hammam, 1 1/2 miles South of Tiberias. The name signifies "hot springs," and these, 4 in number, still exist. They have a temperature of 144 degree F., are salt and bitter in taste and sulfurous in smell. Considered invaluable for

rheumatism, they are crowded in June and July. This health-giving reputation is of ancient date. It is mentioned in Josephus, BJ, IV, i, 3; and a coin of Tiberias of the reign of Trajan depicts Hygeia sitting on a rock beside the springs, feeding the serpent of Aesculapius. Being used for pleasure also, they were permitted to the Jew on the Sabbath, whereas had they been used only medicinally, they would have been forbidden (Babylonian Talmud, Shab 109a; compare Mt 12:10).

W. M. Christie

HAMMUEL

ham'-u-el (chammu'el, "wrath of God"): A son of Mishma, a Simeonite, of the family of Shaul (1Ch 4:26).

HAMMURABI

cham-oo-ra'-be:

1. Etymology of His Name, with Reference to Amraphel; His Dynasty

2. The Years Following His Accession

3. Military Operations and Further Pious Works. Inauguration of His Image

4. The Capture of Rim-Sin

5. Various Works, and an Expedition to Mesopotamia

6. His Final Years

7. No Record of His Expedition to Palestine

8. The Period When It May Have Taken Place

9. Hammurabi's Greatness as a Ruler

1. Etymology of His Name with Reference to Amraphel; His Dynasty:

The name of the celebrated warrior, builder, and lawgiver, who ruled over Babylonia about 2000 BC. In accordance with the suggestion of the late Professor Eb. Schrader, he is almost universally identified with the AMRAPHEL of Ge 14:1, etc. (which see). Hammurabi was apparently not of Babylonian origin, the so-called "Dynasty of Babylon," to which he belonged, having probably come from the West.

The commonest form of the name is as above, but Hamu(m)-rabi (with mimmation) is also found. The reading with initial "b" in the second element is confirmed by the Babylonian rendering of the name as Kimta-rapastum, "my family is widespread," or the like, showing that rabi was regarded as coming from rabu, "to be great." A late letter-tablet, however (see PSBA, May, 1901, p. 191), gives the form Ammurapi, showing that the initial is not really "kh", and that the "b" of the second element had changed to "p" (compare Tiglath-pil-eser for Tukulti-abil-esar, etc.). Amraphel (for Amrapel, Amrabel, Amrabe) would therefore seem to be due to Assyrian influence, but the final "l" is difficult to explain. Professor F. Hommel has pointed out, that the Babylonian rendering, "my family is widespread," is simply due to the scribes, the first element being the name of the Arabic deity ‘Am, making ‘Ammu-rabi, "Am is great." Admitting this, it would seem to be certain that Hammurabi’s dynasty was that designated Arabian by Berosus. Its founder was apparently Sumu- abi, and Hammurabi was the fifth in descent from him. Hammurabi’s father, Sin- mubalit, and his grandfather, Abil-Sin, are the only rulers of the dynasty which have Babylonian names, all the others being apparently Arabic.

2. The Years Following His Accession:

Concerning Hammurabi’s early life nothing is recorded, but since he reigned at least 43 years, he must have been young when he came to the throne. His accession was apparently marked by some improvement in the administration of the laws, wherein, as the date-list says, he "established righteousness." After this, the earlier years of his reign were devoted to such peaceful pursuits as constructing the shrines and images of the gods, and in his 6th year he built the wall of the city of Laz. In his 7th year he took Unug (Erech) and Isin—two of the principal cities of Babylonia, implying that the Dynasty of Babylon had not held sway in all the states.

3. Military Operations and Further Pious Works. Inauguration of His Image:

While interesting himself in the all-important work of digging canals, he found time to turn his attention to the land of Yamutbalu (8th year), and in his 10th he possibly conquered, or received the homage of, the city and people (or the army) of Malgia or Malga. Next year the city Rabiku was taken by a certain Ibik-Iskur, and also, seemingly, a place called Salibu. The inauguration of the throne of Zer-panitum, and the setting up, seemingly, of some kind of royal monument, followed, and was succeeded by other religious duties—indeed, work of this nature would seem to have occupied him every year until his 21st, when he built the fortress or fortification of the city Bazu. His 22nd year is described as that of his own image as king of righteousness; and the question naturally arises, whether this was the date when he erected the great stele found at Susa in Elam, inscribed with his Code of Laws, which is now in the Louvre. Next year he seems to have fortified the city of Sippar, where, it is supposed, this monument was originally erected.

4. The Capture of Rim-Sin:

Pious works again occupied him until his 30th year, when the army of Elam is referred to, possibly indicating warlike operations, which paved the way for the great campaign of his 31st year, when, "with

the help of Anu and Enlil," he captured Yamut-balu and King Rim-Sin, the well-known ruler of Larsa. In his 32nd year he destroyed the army of Asnunna or Esnunnak.

5. Various Works, and an Expedition to Mesopotamia:

After these victories, Hammurabi would seem to have been at peace, and in his 33rd year he dug the canal Hammurabi-nuhus-nisi, "Hammurabi the abundance of the people," bringing to the fields of his subjects fertility, "according to the wish of Enlila." The restoration of the great temple at Erech came next, and was followed by the erection of a fortress, "high like a mountain," on the banks of the Tigris. He also built the fortification of Rabiku on the bank of the Tigris, implying preparations for hostilities, and it was possibly on account of this that the next year he made supplication to Tasmetum, the spouse of Nebo. The year following (his 37th), "by the command of Anu and Enlila," the fortifications of Maur and Malka were destroyed, after which the country enjoyed a twelve-month of peace. In all probability, however, this was to prepare for the expedition of his 39th year, when he subjugated Turukku, Kagmu and Subartu, a part of Mesopotamia. The length of this year-date implies that the expedition was regarded as being of importance.

6. His Final Years:

Untroubled by foreign affairs, the chief work of Hammurabi during his 40th year was the digging of the canal Tisit-Enlila, at Sippar, following this up by the restoration of the temple E-mete-ursag and a splendid temple-tower dedicated to Zagaga and Istar. The defenses of his country were apparently his last thought, for his 43rd year, which seemingly terminated his reign and his life, was devoted to strengthening the fortifications of Sippar, a work recorded at greater length in several cylinder-inscriptions found on the site.

7. No Record of an Expedition to Palestine:

Unfortunately none of the documents referring to his reign makes mention of his attack, in company with the armies of Chedorlaomer, Tidal and Arioch, upon the rebel-kings of Sodom and Gomorrah. This naturally throws doubt on the identification of Hammurabi with the Amraphel of Ge 14:1 ff. It must be remembered, however, that we do not possess a complete history either of his life or his rule. That he was a contemporary of Arioch seems undoubted, and if this be the case, Chedorlaomer and Tidal were contemporaries too. Various reasons might be adduced for the absence of references to the campaign in question—his pride may have precluded him from having a year named after an expedition—no matter how satisfactory it may have been—carried out for another power—his suzerain; or the allied armies may have suffered so severely from attacks similar to that delivered by Abraham, that the campaign became an altogether unsuitable one to date by.

8. The Period When It May Have Taken Place:

If Eri-Aku was, as Thureau-Dangin has suggested, the brother of Rim-Sin, king of Larsa (Elassar), he

must have preceded him on the throne, and, in that case, the expedition against the kings of the Plain took place before Hammurabi’s 30th year, when he claims to have defeated Rim-Sin. As the date of Rim-Sin’s accession is doubtful, the date of Eri-Aku’s (Arioch’s) death is equally so, but it possibly took place about 5 years before Rim-Sin’s defeat. The expedition in question must therefore have been undertaken during the first 25 years of Hammurabi’s reign. As Amraphel is called king of Shinar (Babylonia), the period preceding Hammurabi’s accession ought probably to be excluded.

9. Hammurabi’s Greatness as a Ruler:

Of all the kings of early Babylonia so far known, Hammurabi would seem to have been one of the greatest, and the country made good progress under his rule. His conflicts with Elam suggest that Babylonia had become strong enough to resist that warlike state, and his title of adda or "father" of Martu (= Amurru, the Amorites) and of Yamutbalu on the East implies not only that he maintained the country’s influence, but also that, during his reign, it was no longer subject to Elam. Rim-Sin and the state of Larsa, however, were not conquered until the time of Samsu-iluna, Hammurabi’s son. It is noteworthy that his Code of Laws (see 3, above) not only determined legal rights and responsibilities, but also fixed the rates of wages, thus obviating many difficulties.

See AMRAPHEL; ARIOCH; CHEDORLAOMER; TIDAL, etc.

T. G. Pinches

HAMMURABI, CODE OF

kod.

I. HISTORICAL

1. Discovery of the Code

2. Editions of the Code

3. Description of the Stone

4. History of the Stone

5. Origin and Later History of the Code

II. CONTENTS OF THE CODE

1. The Principles of Legal Process

2. Theft, Burglary, Robbery

3. Laws concerning Vassalage

4. Immovables

5. Trader and Agent

6. Taverns

7. Deposits

8. Family

9. Concerning Wounding, etc.

10. Building of Houses and Ships

11. Hiring in General, etc.

12. Slaves

III. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CODE

1. Hammurabi and Moses

2. The Code and Other Legal Systems

LITERATURE

I. Historical.

1. Discovery of the Code:

When Professor Meissner published, in 1898, some fragments of cuneiform tablets from the library of the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal (668-628 BC), he also then suggested that these pieces were parts of a copy of an old Book of Law from the time of the so-called First Babylonian Dynasty, one of the kings of which was Hammurabi (more exactly Hammurapi, circa 2100 BC). A few years later this suggestion was fully established. In December, 1901, and January, 1902, a French expedition under the leadership of M. J. de Morgan, the chief aim of which was the exploration of the old royal city Susa, found there a

diorite stone, 2,25 meters high and almost 2 meters in circumference. This stone had a relief (see below) and 44 columns of ancient Babylonian cuneiform writing graven upon it. Professor V. Scheil, O.P., the Assyriological member of the expedition, recognized at once that this stele contains the collection of laws of King Hammurabi, and published this characteristic discovery as early as 1902 in the official report of the expedition: Delegation en Perse (Tome IV, Paris).

2. Editions of the Code:

At the same time Scheil gave the first translation of the text. Since then the text has several times been published, translated and commented upon; compare especially: H. Winckler, Die Gesetze Hammurabis (= Der alte Orient, IV, Leipzig; 1st edition, 1903; 4th edition, 1906); H. Winckler, Die Gesetze Hammurabis in Umschrift und Ubersetzung, Leipzig, 1904; D.H. Muller, Die Gesetze Hammurabis und die Mosaische Gesetzgebung, Vienna, 1903; R.F. Harper, The Code of Hammurabi, Chicago, 1904; C.H. W. Johns, Babylonian and Assyrian Laws, Contracts, Letters, Edinburgh, 1904, 44 ff; T.G. Pinches, The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia, London, 1908, 487; A. Ungnad, Altorientalische Texte und Bilder zum Alten Testament, Tubingen, 1909, I, 140 ff; A. Ungnad, Keilschrifttexte der Gesetze Hammurapis, Leipzig, 1909; J. Kohler, F. Peiser and A. Ungnad, Hammurabis Gesetz, 5 volumes, Leipzig, 1904-11.

3. Description of the Stone:

The stone has the form of a column the cross-section of which is approximately an ellipse. The upper part of the face has a relief (see illustration). We see the king in supplicating attitude standing before the sun-god who sits upon a throne and is characterized by sun rays which stream out from his shoulders. As the king traced back the derivation of the Code to an inspiration of this god, we may suppose that the relief represents the moment when the king received the laws from the mouth of the god. Lower on the face of the stone are 16 columns of text, which read from top to bottom; 7 other columns were erased some time later than Hammurabi in order to make room for a new inscription. The reverse side contains 28 columns of text.

4. History of the Stone:

The stone was set up by the king, toward the end of his reign of 43 years, in the temple Esagila at Babylon, the capital of his dominion (circa 2100 BC). It was probably stolen from there by the Elamitic king Shutruk-Nakhunte, in the 12th century BC, at the time of the plundering of Babylon, and set up as a trophy of war in the Elamitic capital Susa. The same king had, it would seem, the 7 columns from the face side erased in order to engrave there an account of his own deeds, but through some unknown circumstance this latter was not accomplished. After the discovery of the stele it was brought to Paris where it now forms one of the most important possessions of the Louvre.

5. Origin and Later History of the Code:

If, however, Hammurabi was not the first legislator of Babylonia, still he was, as far as we can see, the first one who used the language of the people, i.e. the Semitic idiom. We know that nearly 1,000 years earlier a king, Urukagina, promulgated laws in Babylonia which have been lost; an ancestor of Hammurabi, Sumulael, appears also to have given laws. As we are able to recognize from the actual practice of Babylonian social life, the legislation of Hammurabi signifies nothing essentially new. Even before his time laws after the same principles were administered. His service lies before all in that he gathered together the extant laws and set them up in the Semitic language. The laws were promulgated already in the 2nd year of his reign, but the stele known to us was set up in the temple at Babylon about 30 years later. Moreover, the laws were set up in more than one copy, for in Susa fragments of another copy were found. How long the laws were in actual use it is impossible to determine. In any case, as late as the time of Ashurbanipal (see above), they used to be copied; indeed we even possess copies in neo-Babylonian characters which are later than the 7th century BC. Fortunately the duplicates contain several passages which are destroyed on the large stele in consequence of the erasure of the seven columns. Thus we are able, in spite of the gaps in the large stele, almost completely to determine the contents of the Code.

II. The Contents of the Code.

The laws themselves are preceded by an introduction which was added later, after the law had already been published about 30 years. The introduction states in the first place that already in the primeval age, when Marduk the god of Babylon was elected king of the gods, Hammurabi was predestined by the gods "to cause justice to radiate over the land, to surrender sinners and evildoers to destruction, and to take care that the strong should not oppress the weak." Hammurabi’s Code is, indeed, conceived from this standpoint.

Farther on, the king lauds his services to the principal cities of Babylonia, their temples and cults. He appears as a true server of the gods, as a protector of his people and a gracious prince to those who at first would not acknowledge his supremacy. To be sure, this introduction is not entirely free from presumption; for the king describes himself as "god of the kings" and "sun-god of Babylon "! The hopes of a Saviour, which heathen antiquity also knew, he regards as realized in his own person.

The Code itself may be divided into 12 divisions. It manifests, in no way, a very definite logical system; the sequence is often interrupted, and one recognizes that it is not so much a systematic and exhaustive work as a collection of the legal standards accumulated in the course of time. Much that we would expect to find in a Code is not even mentioned.

1. The Principles of Legal Process:

The first five paragraphs treat of some principles of legal process. In the first place false accusation is considered. The unprovable charge of sorcery is dealt with in an especially interesting manner (section symbol 2). The accused in this case has to submit to an ordeal at the hands of the River-god; nevertheless nothing is said concerning the details of this ordeal. If he is convicted by the god as guilty,

the accuser receives his house; in the opposite case, the accuser is condemned to death and the accused receives his house. The law also proceeds rigorously against false witnesses: in a process in which life is at stake, conscious perjury is punished with death (section symbol 3). Finally the king strives also for an uncorrupt body of judges; a judge who has not carried out the judgment of the court correctly has not only to pay twelve times the sum at issue, but he is also dismissed with disgrace from his office.

2. Theft, Burglary, Robbery:

The next sections (section symbol, section symbol 6-25) occupy themselves with serious theft, burglary, robbery and other crimes of a like nature. Theft from palace or temple, or the receiving and concealing of stolen property, is punished with death or a heavy fine according to the nature of what is stolen (section symbol, section symbol 6, 8). As it was a custom in Babylonia to effect every purchase in the presence of witnesses or with a written deed of sale, one understands the regulation that, in certain cases in which witnesses were not forthcoming, or a deed could not be shown, theft was assumed: the guilty person suffered death (section symbol 7). A careful procedure is prescribed for the case in which lost goods are found in the hands of another: he who, in the investigation, cannot prove his legitimate right, suffers death, just as a deceiver who tries to enrich himself through making a false accusation (section symbol, section symbol 9 ff). Kidnapping of a free child or carrying away and concealing a slave from the palace is punished with death (section symbol, section symbol 14 ff). As slavery had the greatest economic significance in Babylonia, detailed regulations concerning the seizing of runaway slaves and similar matters were given (section symbol, section symbol 17 ff). Burglary, as also robbery, is punished with death (section symbol, section symbol 21 ff). If a robber is not caught, the persons or corporations responsible for the safety of the land had to make compensation (section symbol, section symbol 22 ff). Whoever attempts to enrich himself from a building in conflagration is thrown into the fire (section symbol 25).

3. Laws concerning Vassalage:

The next paragraphs (section symbol, section symbol 26-41) control vassalage, particularly in reference to rights and duties of a military kind, concerning which we are not yet quite clear. Here also Hammurabi’s care for those of a meaner position is exhibited, since he issues rigid regulations against misuse of the power of office and punishes certain offenses of this kind even with death (section symbol 34). The crown had, in every case, authority in reference to estates in fee which a vassal could not sell, exchange or transmit to his wife or daughters (section symbol, section symbol 36 ff, 41); as a rule the sons took over the estates after the death of the father together with the accompanying rights and duties. The same was the case if, in the service of the king, the father had been lost sight of (section symbol, section symbol 28 f). The estates in fee of what we may call "lay-priestesses" (concerning whom we shall have to speak later) take a special position (section symbol 40).

4. Immovables:

A longer section (section symbol, section symbol 41 ff) is given to immovables (field, garden, house);

for the economic life of the ancient Babylonians depended first of all upon the cultivation of grain and date-palms; the legal relations of the land tenants are exactly explained (section symbol, section symbol 42 ff): neglect of his work does not liberate the tenant from his duties to his overlord. On the other hand, in cases of losses through the weather, he is so far released from his duties that of the rent not yet paid he has to pay only an amount corresponding to the quantity of the product of his tenancy (section symbol, section symbol 45 f). Also the landowner with liabilities, who suffers through failure of crops and inundation, enjoys far-reaching protection (section 48), and his business relations generally are adequately regulated (section symbol, section symbol 49 ff). As the regular irrigation of the fields was the chief condition for profitable husbandry in a land lacking rain, strong laws are made in reference to this: damage resulting from neglect has to be compensated for; indeed, whoever had not the means to do this could be sold with his family into slavery (section symbol, section symbol 53 ff). Special regulations protect the landowner from unlicensed grazing on his fields of crops (section symbol, section symbol 57 f).

The regulations concerning horticulture (section symbol, section symbol 59-66) are similar; here also the relation of the proprietor to the gardener who had to plant or to cultivate the garden is carefully considered; the same is true with respect to the business liabilities of the owner. These regulations concerning horticulture are not entirely preserved upon the stele, but, through the above-mentioned duplicates, we can restore them completely.

Our knowledge concerning the legal relations between house-owners and tenants (section symbol, section symbol 67 ff) is less, because the parts dealing with these on the stele are entirely lost and can only be partially restored from duplicates. Reference is once more made to vassalage (section 71). The relations between neighbors are also regulated, but we cannot ascertain how in detail (section symbol, section symbol 72 ff). Concerning the precise rights of tenants and landlords we are also but slightly informed (section 78).

On account of the gaps, we are not able to determine how far the regulations concerning immovables extended. In the gaps there seem to have been still other laws concerning business liabilities. The number of missing paragraphs can only approximately be determined, so that our further enumeration of the paragraphs cannot be regarded as absolutely correct.

5. Trader and Agent:

The text begins again with the treatment of the legal relations between the trader and his agents (section symbol, section symbol 100-107); these agents are a kind of officials for the trader whose business they look after. While the Code discusses their responsibilities and duties to their masters, it also protects them from unjust and deceitful ones.

6. Taverns:

The taverns of Babylonia (sections 108-11) seem very often to have been the resort of criminals. As a

rule they were in the hands of proprietresses who were made responsible for what took place on their premises (section 109). Priestesses were forbidden to visit these houses under penalty of being burned (section 110).

7. Deposits:

The next division (sections 112-26) deals especially with deposits, although some of its regulations are only indirectly therewith connected. Deceptive messengers are to be punished (section 112). The debtor is protected from violent encroachments of the creditor (section 113). Detailed regulations are given concerning imprisonment for debt (sections 114 ff). The creditor must guard himself from mistreating a person imprisoned for debt, in his house; if a child of the debtor dies through the fault of the creditor, the jus talionis is resorted to: a child of the creditor is killed (section 116). The members of a family imprisoned for debt have to be released after three years (section 117). If anyone desires to give something to another to be saved for him, he must do it in the presence of witnesses or draw up a statement of the transaction; otherwise later claims cannot be substantiated (sections 122 ff). Whoever accepts the objects is responsible for them (section 125), but is also protected from unjustified claims of his client (section 126).

8. Family:

The sections occupied with the rights of the family are very extensive (sections 127-95). Matrimony rests upon a contract (section 128) and presupposes the persistent fidelity of the wife (sections 129 ff), while the husband is not bound, in this respect, by regulations of any kind. An unfaithful wife may be thrown into the water, but the partner of her sin may also, under certain circumstances, suffer the penalty of death. Long unpreventable absence of the husband justifies the wife to marry again only when she lacks the means of support (sections 133 ff). On the part of the husband, there are no hindrances to divorce, so long as he settles any matters with his wife concerning her property, provides for the upbringing of the children and, in certain cases, gives a divorce-sum as compensation (sections 137 ff). Disorderly conduct of the wife is sufficient for the annulling of the marriage; in this case the husband may reduce the wife to the state of a slave (section 141). The wife may only annul the marriage if her husband grossly neglects his duties toward her (section 142). If a wife desires the annulling of the marriage for any other reason, she is drowned (section 143).

As a rule, polygamy is not allowed. If a barren wife gives to her husband a slave girl who bears children to him, then he may not marry another wife (section 144); otherwise he might do so (section 145). The slave given to the husband is bound to show due deference to her mistress; if she does not do this she loses her privileged position, but she may not be sold if she has borne a child to the husband (sections 146 f). Incurable disease of the wife is a ground for the marriage of another wife (sections 148 f).

Gifts of the husband to the wife may not be touched by the children at the death of the husband, but nevertheless property has to remain in the family (section 150). Debts contracted before the marriage by one side or the other are not binding for the other, if an agreement has been made to that effect (section

151 f).

Rigid laws are made against abuses in sexual life. The wife who kills her husband for the sake of a lover is impaled upon a stake (section 153). Incest is punished, according to the circumstances, with exile or death (sections 154 ff).

Breach of promise by the man without sufficient reason entails to him the loss of all presents made for the betrothed. If the father of the betrothed annuls the engagement, he must give back to the man twice the value of the presents (sections 159 ff); especially the sum paid for the wife to her father (Bab terhatu).

Matters concerning inheritance are carefully dealt with (sections 162 ff). The dowry of a wife belongs, after her death, to her children (section 162). Presents made during the lifetime are not reckoned in the dividing of the inheritance (section 165), apart from the outlay which a father has to make in the case of each of his sons, the chief portion of which is the money for a wife (section 166). Children borne from different mothers share the paternal inheritance equally (section 167).

Disinheritance of a child is permitted only in the case of serious offenses after a previous warning (sections 168 f). Illegitimate children borne from slaves have part in the inheritance only if the father has expressly acknowledged them as his children (section 170); otherwise, at the death of the father, they are released (section 171).

The chief wife, whose future needs had not been secured during the lifetime of her husband, receives from the property of the deceased husband a portion equal to that received by each child, but she has only the use of it (section 172). A widow may marry again, but then she loses all claim on the property of her first husband, in favor of his children (sections 172, 177); the children of both her marriages share her own property equally (sections 173 f).

The children from free women married to slaves are free (section 175). The master of the slave has only a claim to half of the property of the slave which he has acquired during such a marriage (sections 176 f).

Unmarried daughters mostly became priestesses or entered a religious foundation (Babylonian, malgu); they also received, very often, a sort of dowry, which, however, remained under the control of their brothers and which, on the death of the former, fell to the brothers and sisters, if their fathers had not expressly given them a free hand in this matter (sections 178 f). In cases where the father did not give such a dowry, the daughter received, from the property left, a share equal to that of the others, but only for use; those dedicated to a goddess obtained only a third of such an amount (section 180 f). The lay-priestesses of the god Marduk of Babylon enjoyed special privileges in that they had full control over any property thus acquired (section 182).

As a rule, adopted children could not be dismissed again (sections 185 ff). Parents who had given their

child to a master, who had adopted it and taught it handwork, could not claim it again (sections 188 f). Gross insubordination of certain adopted children of a lower class is severely punished by the cutting off of the tongue (section 192) or the tearing out of an eye (section 193). Deceitful wet-nurses are also severely punished (section 194). The last paragraph of this section (section 195) states the punishment for children who strike their father as the cutting off of the hand.

9. Concerning Wounding, etc.:

The next division (sections 196-227) occupies itself with wounding of all kinds, in the first place with the jus talionis: an eye for an eye, a bone for a bone, a tooth for a tooth. Persons lower in the social grade usually accepted money instead (sections 196 ff). A box on the ears inflicted by a free man upon a free man cost the former 60 shekels (section 203); in the case of one half-free, 10 shekels (section 204); but if a slave so strikes a free man, his ear is to be cut off (section 205). Unintentional wounding of the body, which proves to be fatal, is covered by a fine (sections 207 f). Anyone who strikes a pregnant free woman, so as to cause a miscarriage and the death of the woman, is punished by having his daughter killed (section 210); in the case of a half-free woman or a slave, a money compensation was sufficient (sections 212 ff). The surgeon is responsible for certain operations; if they succeed, he receives a legally determined high reward; if they fail, under certain circumstances his hand might be cut off (sections 215 ff). Certainly this law was an effective preventive against quacks! Farther on come regulations concerning the fees of surgeons (sections 221 ff) and veterinary surgeons; to a certain degree the latter are responsible for the killing of an animal under their charge (sections 224 f).

10. Building of Houses and Ships:

Later, the building of houses and ships is treated of (sections 228-40). The builder is responsible for the stability of the house built by him; if it falls down and kills the master of the house, the builder is killed; if it kills a child of the house, a child of the builder is killed (sections 229 f). For any other damages incurred, the builder is likewise responsible (sections 231 ff). The regulations for the builders of ships are similar (sections 234 ff). The man who hires a ship is answerable to the proprietor (sections 236 ff). With the busy shipping trade on the canals, special attention had to be given to prevent accidents (section 240).

11. Hiring in General, etc.:

Already in earlier sections there were regulations concerning hiring (rent) and wages. This eleventh division (sections 241-77) deals with the matter more in detail, but it also brings many things forward which are only slightly related thereto. It states tariffs for working animals (sections 242 f), and in conclusion to this makes equally clear to what extent the hirer of such an animal is responsible for harm to the animal (sections 244 ff). Special attention must be given an ox addicted to goring (sections 250 ff; see below). Care is taken that unfaithful stewards do not escape their punishment: in gross cases of breach of confidence they are punished with the cutting off of the hand or by being torn (in the manner of being tortured on a rack) by oxen (sections 253 ff). The wages for agricultural laborers are determined

(sections 257 f), and in connection with this, lesser cases of theft of field-utensils are considered and covered by a money fine (sections 259 f). The wages of a shepherd and his duties form the subject of some other paragraphs (sections 261 ff). Finally, matters having to do with hiring are mentioned: the hiring of animals for threshing (sections 268 if), of carriages (section 271), wages of laborers (section 273) and handworkers (section 274), and the hire of ships (sections 276 f).

12. Slaves:

The last division (sections 278-82) treats of slaves in so far as they are not already mentioned. The seller is responsible to the buyer that the slave does not suffer from epilepsy (section 278), and that nobody else has a claim upon him (section 279). Slaves of Babylonian origin, bought in a foreign land, must be released, if they are brought back to Babylonia and recognized by their former master (section 280). If a slave did not acknowledge his master, his ear could be cut off (section 282).

Here the laws come to an end. In spite of many regulations which seem to us cruel, they show keen sense of justice and impartiality. Thus the king, in an epilogue, rightly extols himself as a shepherd of salvation, as a helper of the oppressed, as an adviser of widows and orphans, in short, as the father of his people. In conclusion, future rulers are admonished to respect his laws, and the blessings of the gods are promised to those who do so. But upon those who might attempt to abolish the Code he calls down the curse of all the great gods, individually and collectively. With that the stele ends.

III. The Significance of the Code.

The significance of the Code has been recognized ever since its discovery; for, indeed, it is the most ancient collection of laws which we know. For judgment concerning the ancient Babylonian civilization, for the history of slavery, for the position of woman and many other questions the Code offers the most important material. The fact that law and religion are nearly always distinctly separated is worthy of special attention.

1. Hammurabi and Moses:

It is not to be wondered at that a monument of such importance demands comparison with similar monuments. In this reference the most important question is as to the relation in which the Code stands to the Law of Moses. Hammurabi was not only king of Babylonia but also of Amurru (=" land of the Amorites"), called later Palestine and Western Syria. As his successors also retained the dominion over Amurru, it is quite possible that, for a considerable time, the laws of Hammurabi were in force here also, even if perhaps in a modified form. In the time of Abraham, for example, one may consider the narratives of Sarah and Hagar (Ge 16:1), and Rachel and Bilhah (Ge 30:1), which show the same juridical principles as the Code (compare sections 144 ff; see above). Other narratives of the Old Testament indicate the same customs as the Code does for Babylonia; compare Ge 24:53, where the bridal gifts to Rebekah correspond to the Babylonian terhatu (section 159); similarly Ge 31:14 f.

Between the Code and the Law of Moses, especially in the so-called Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:22-23:33), there are indeed extraordinary parallels. We might mention here the following examples:

Ex 21:2: "If thou buy a Hebrew servant, six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing." Similarly, Code of Hammurabi, section 117: "If a man become involved in debt, and give his wife, his son or his daughter for silver or for labor, they shall serve three years in the house of their purchaser or bondmaster: in the fourth year they shall regain their freedom."

Ex 21:15: "And he that smiteth his father, or his mother, shall be surely put to death." Compare Code of Hammurabi, section 195: "If a son strike his father, his hand shall be cut off."

Ex 21:18 f: "And if men contend, and one smite the other with a stone, or with his fist, and he die not, but keep his bed; if he rise again, and walk abroad upon his staff, then shall he that smote him be quit: only he shall pay for the loss of his time, and shall cause him to be thoroughly healed." Compare Code of Hammurabi, section 206: "If a man strike another man in a noisy dispute and wound him, that man shall swear, 'I did not strike him knowingly'; and he shall pay for the physician."

Ex 21:22: "If men strive together, and hurt a woman with child, so that her fruit depart, and yet no harm follow; he shall surely be fined, according as the woman's husband shall lay upon him; and he shall pay as the judges determine." Compare Code of Hammurabi, section 209: "If a man strike a free woman and cause her fruit to depart, he shall pay ten shekels of silver for her fruit."

Ex 21:24: "Eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot." Compare Code of Hammurabi, section 196: "If a man destroy the eye of a free man, his eye shall be destroyed." section 197: "If he break the bone of a free man, his bone shall be broken." section 200: "If a man knock out the teeth of a man of the same rank, his teeth shall be knocked out."

Ex 21:28-32: "If an ox gore a man or a woman to death, the ox shall be surely stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit. But if the ox was wont to gore in time past, and it hath been testified to its owner, and he hath not kept it in, but it hath killed a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and its owner also shall be put to death. .... If the ox gore a man-servant or a maid-servant, there shall be given unto their master 30 shekels of silver, and the ox shall be stoned." Compare Code of Hammurabi, sections 250 ff: "If an ox, while going along the street, gore a man and cause his death, no claims of any kind can be made. If a man's ox be addicted to goring and have manifested to him his failing, that it is addicted to goring, and, nevertheless, he have neither blunted his horns, nor fastened up his ox; then if his ox gore a free man and cause his death, he shall give 30 shekels of silver. If it be a man's slave, he shall give 20 shekels of silver."

Ex 22:7 ff reminds one of Code of Hammurabi, sections 124 ff; Ex 22:10 ff of Code of Hammurabi, sections 244 ff and 266 f.

The resemblances between the other parts of the Pentateuch and the Code are not so striking as those

between the Code and the. Book of the Covenant; nevertheless one may compare Le 19:35 f with Code of Hammurabi, section 5; Le 20:10 with Code of Hammurabi, section 129; Le 24:19 f with Code of Hammurabi, sections 196 ff; Le 25:39 ff with Code of Hammurabi, section 117; De 19:16 ff with Code of Hammurabi, sections 3 f; De 22:22 with Code of Hammurabi, section 129; De 24:1 with Code of Hammurabi, sections 137 ff and sections 148 f; De 24:7 with Code of Hammurabi, section 14; especially De 21:15 ff, 18 ff, with Code of Hammurabi, sections 167, 168 f, where, in both cases, there is a transition from regulations concerning the property left by a man, married several times, to provisions referring to the punishment of a disobedient son, certainly a remarkable agreement in sequence.

One can hardly assert that the parallels quoted are accidental, but just as little could one say that they are directly taken from the Code; for they bear quite a definite impression due to the Israelite culture, and numerous marked divergences also exist. As we have already mentioned, the land Amurru was for a time Babylonian territory, so that Babylonian law must have found entrance there. When the Israelites came into contact with Babylonian culture, on taking possession of the land of Canaan (a part of the old Amurru), it was natural that they should employ the results of that culture as far as they found them of use for themselves. Under no circumstances may one suppose here direct quotation. Single parts of the Laws of Moses, especially the Decalogue (Ex 20), with its particularly pointed conciseness, have no parallel in Code of Hammurabi.

2. The Code and Other Legal Systems: It has also been attempted to establish relations between the Code and other legal systems. In the Talmud, especially in the fourth order of the Mishna called Neziqin (i.e. "damages"), there are many regulations which remind one of the Code. But one must bear in mind that the Jews during the exile could hardly have known the Code in detail; if there happen to be similarities, these are to be explained by the fact that many of the regulations of the Code were still retained in the later Babylonian law, and the Talmud drew upon this later Babylonian law for many regulations which seemed useful for its purposes. The connection is therefore an indirect one.

The similarities with the remains of old Arabian laws and the so-called Syrio-Roman Lawbook (5th century AD) have to be considered in the same way, though some of these agreements may have only come about accidentally.

That the similarities between Roman and Greek legal usages and the Code are only of an accidental nature may be taken as assured. This seems all the more probable, in that between the Code and other legal systems there are quite striking similarities in individual points, even though we cannot find any historical connection, e.g. the Salic law, the lawbook of the Salic Franks, compiled about 500 AD, and which is the oldest preserved Germanic legal code.

Until a whole number of lost codes, as the Old Amoritish and the neo-Bab, are known to us in detail, one must guard well against hasty conclusions. In any case it is rash to speak of direct borrowings where there may be a whole series of mediating factors.

LITERATURE.

(Concerning the questions treated of in the last paragraphs refer especially to: S. A. Cook, The Laws of Moses and Code of Hammurabi, London, 1903; J. Jeremias, Moses and Hammurabi, Leipzig, 1903; S. Oettli, Das Gesetz Hammurabis und die Thora Israels, Leipzig, 1903; H. Grimme, Das Gesetz Hammurabis und Moses, Koln, 1903; H. Fehr, Hammurapi und das Salische Recht, Bonn, 1910.

Arthur Ungnad

HAMON-GOG

ha’-mon-gog (hamon-gogh, "the multitude of Gog"): The name of the place where "Gog and all his multitude" are to be buried (Eze 39:11,15). By a change in the pointing of Eze 39:11, ha-‘abharim for ha-‘obherim, we should read "valley of Abarim" for "valley of them that pass through." In that case it would seem that the prophet thought of some ravine in the mountains East of the Dead Sea.

HAMONAH

ha-mo’-na (hamonah): The name of a city which stood apparently near HAMON-GOG (which see) (Eze 39:16).

HAMOR

ha’-mor (chamor, "an ass"; Emmor): Hamor was the father of Shechem from whom Jacob bought a piece of ground on his return from Paddan-aram for one hundred pieces of silver (Ge 33:19), and the burial place of Joseph when his body was removed from Egypt to Canaan (Jos 24:32). "The men of Hamor" were inhabitants of Shechem, and suffered a great loss under Abimelech, a prince over Israel (Jud 9:22-49). Dinah, Jacob’s daughter, was criminally treated by Hamor, who requested her to be given to him in marriage, in which plan he had the cooperation of his father, Shechem. The sons of Jacob rejected their proposition and laid a scheme by which the inhabitants of the city were circumcised, and in the hour of helplessness slew all the males, thus wreaking special vengeance upon Hamor and his father Shechem. It is mere conjecture to claim that Hamor and Dinah were personifications of early central Palestinian clans in sharp antagonism, and that the course of Simeon and Levi was really the treachery of primitive tribes. Because the word Hamor means "an ass" and Shechem "a shoulder," there is no reason for rejecting the terms as designations of individuals and considering the titles as mere tribal appellations.

Byron H. Dement

HAMRAN

ham’-ran.

See HEMDAN.

HAMUEL

ham’-u-el, ha-mu’-el.

See HAMMUEL.

HAMUL

ha’-mul (chamul, "pitied," "spared"): A son of Perez, and head of one of the clans of Judah (Ge 46:12; 1Ch 2:5; Nu 26:21). His descendants were called Hamulites.

HAMUTAL

ha-mu’-tal (chamuTal, "father-in-law" or "kinsman of the dew"): A daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, and wife of King Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah (2Ki 23:31; 24:18; Jer 52:1). In the last two references and in the Septuagint the name appears as "Hamital." Swete gives a number of variants, e.g. 2Ki 24:18: Codex Vaticanus, Mitat; Codex Alexandrinus, Amitath; Jer 52:1: Codex Vaticanus, Hameitaal; Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus Hamitaal; Codex Q Hamital.

HANAMEL

han’-a-mel (hanam’el; the King James Version Hanameel, ha-nam’el): The son of Shallum, Jeremiah’s uncle, of whom the prophet, while in prison, during the time when Jerusalem was besieged by the Chaldeans, bought a field with due formalities, in token that a time would come when house and vineyards would once more be bought in the land (Jer 32:6-15).

HANAN

ha’-nan (chanan, "gracious"):

(1) A chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:23).

(2) The youngest son of Azel, a descendant of Saul (1Ch 8:38; 9:44).

(3) One of David’s mighty men of valor (1Ch 11:43).

(4) The head of a family of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:46; Ne 7:49).

(5) An assistant of Ezra in expounding the law (Ne 8:7). Possibly the same person is referred to in Ne 10:10 (11).

(6) One of the four treasurers put in charge of the tithes by Nehemiah (Ne 13:13).

(7,8) Two who "sealed the covenant" on the eve of the restoration (Ne 10:22 (23), 26 (27)).

(9) A son of Igdaliah, "the man of God," whose sons had a chamber in the temple at Jerusalem (Jer 35:4).

Byron H. Dement

HANANEL, THE TOWER OF

ban’-an-el (chanan’el, "El (God) is gracious"; the King James Version Hananeel, ha-nan’e-el): A tower in the walls of Jerusalem adjoining (Ne 3:1; 12:39) the tower of HAMMEAH (which see). The company of Levites coming from the West passed "by the fish gate, and the tower of Hananel, and the tower of Hammeah, even unto the sheep gate" (Ne 12:39). In Jer 31:38 it is foretold "that the city shall be built to Yahweh from the tower of Hananel unto the gate of the corner"—apparently the whole stretch of North wall. In Zec 14:10 it says Jerusalem "shall dwell in her place, from Benjamin’s gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate, and from the tower of Hananel unto the king’s winepresses." These last were probably near Siloam, and the distance "from the tower of Hananel unto the king’s winepresses" describes the greatest length of the city from North to South. All the indications point to a tower, close to the tower of Hammeah, near the Northeast corner, a point of the city always requiring special fortification and later the sites successively of the Baris and of the Antonia.

See JERUSALEM.

E. W. G. Masterman

HANANI

ha-na’-ni (chanani, "gracious"):

(1) A musician and son of Heman, David’s seer, and head of one of the courses of the temple service (1Ch 25:4,25).

(2) A seer, the father of Jehu. He was cast into prison for his courage in rebuking Asa for relying on Syria (1Ki 16:1,7; 2Ch 19:2; 20:34).

(3) A priest, of the sons of Immer, who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:20).

(4) A brother or kinsman of Nehemiah who carried news of the condition of the Jews in Palestine to Susa and became one of the governors of Jerusalem (Ne 1:2; 7:2).

(5) A priest and chief musician who took part in the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 12:36).

Byron H. Dement

HANANIAH

han-a-ni’-a (chananyahu, chananyah; Ananias; also with aspirate, "Yahweh hath been gracious"): This was a common name in Israel for many centuries.

(1) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:24).

(2) A captain of Uzziah’s army (2Ch 26:11).

(3) Father of one of the princes under Jehoiakim (Jer 36:12).

(4) One of the sons of Heman and leader of the 16th division of David’s musicians (1Ch 25:4,23).

(5) Grandfather of the officer of the guard which apprehended Jeremiah on a charge of desertion (Jer 37:13).

(6) A false prophet of Gibeon, son of Azzur, who opposed Jeremiah, predicting that the yoke of Babylon would be broken in two years, and that the king, the people and the vessels of the temple would be brought back to Jerusalem. Jeremiah would be glad if it should be so, nevertheless it would not be. The question then arose, Which is right, Jeremiah or Hananiah? Jeremiah claimed that he was right because he was in accordance with all the great prophets of the past who prophesied evil and their words came true. Therefore his words are more likely to be true. The prophet of good, however, must wait to have his prophecy fulfilled before he can be accredited. Hananiah took off the yoke from Jeremiah and broke it in pieces, symbolic of the breaking of the power of Babylon. Jeremiah was seemingly beaten, retired and received a message from Yahweh that the bar of wood would become a bar of iron, and that Hananiah would die during the year because he had spoken rebellion against Yahweh (Jer 28 passim).

(7) One of Daniel’s companions in Babylon whose name was changed to Shadrach (Da 1:7,11,19).

(8) A son of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19,21).

(9) A Levite, one of the sons of Bebai, one of those who married foreign wives (Ezr 10:28; APC 1Esdras 9:29).

(10) One of the perfumers (the King James Version "apothecaries") who wrought in rebuilding the wall under Nehemiah (Ne 3:8).

(11) One who helped to repair the wall above the horse gate (Ne 3:30). This may be the same person as number 10.

(12) A governor of the castle, i.e. the birah or fortress, and by Nehemiah placed in charge of the whole city of Jerusalem, because "he was a faithful man, and feared God above many" (Ne 7:2).

(13) One of those who sealed the covenant under Nehemiah (Ne 10:23); a Levite.

(14) A priest who was present at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 12:12,41).

J. J. Reeve

HAND

(yadh, "hand"; kaph, "the hollow hand," "palm"; yamin, "the right hand"; semo'l, "the left hand"; cheir, "hand"; dexia, "the right hand"; aristera, "the left hand" (only Lu 23:33; 2Co 6:7), or euphemistically (for evil omens come from the left hand; compare Latin sinister, German linkisch, etc.); euonumos, literally, "having a good name"): The Hebrew words are used in a large variety of idiomatic expressions, part of which have passed into the Greek (through the Sepuagint) and into modern European languages (through the translations of the Bible; see Oxford Hebrew Lexicon, under the word "yadh"). We group what has to be said about the word under the following heads:

1. The Human Hand: Various Uses:

The human hand (considered physically) and, anthropopathically, the hand of God (Ge 3:22; Ps 145:16): The hand included the wrist, as Will be seen from all passages in which bracelets are mentioned as ornaments of the hand, e.g. Ge 24:22,30,47; Eze 16:11; 23:42, or where the Bible speaks of fetters on the hands (Jud 15:14, etc.). On the other hand, it cannot seem strange that occasionally the expression "hand" may be used for a part, e.g. the fingers, as in Ge 41:42, etc.. According to the lexicon talionis, justice demanded "hand for hand" (Ex 21:24; De 19:21). We enumerate the following phrases without claiming to present a complete list: "To fill the hand" (Ex 32:29 m; 1Ch 29:5 margin) means to consecrate, evidently from the filling of hands with sacrificial portions for the altar. Compare also Le 7:37; 8:22,28,29,31,33, where the sacrifice, the ram, the basket of consecration are mentioned. "To put or set the hand unto" (De 15:10; 23:20; 28:8,20), to commence to do; "to put forth the hand" (Ge 3:22; 8:9); "to stretch out the hand" (Eze 25:13,16; Ze 2:13); "to shake or wag the hand upon" (Isa 10:32; Ze 2:15; Zec 2:9), to defy. "To lay the hand upon the head" (2Sa 13:19) is an expression of sadness and mourning, as we see from Egyptian representations of scenes of mourning. Both in joy and in anger hands are "smitten together" (Nu 24:10), and people "clap their hands" at a person or over a person in spiteful triumph (Job 27:23; La 2:15; Na 3:19). "To put one's life into one's hand" is to risk one's life

(1Sa 19:5; 28:21). "To lay hands upon" is used in the sense of blessing (Mt 19:13), or is symbolical in the act of miraculous healing (Mt 9:18; Mr 8:23; Ac 28:8), or an emblem of the gift of the Holy Spirit and His endowments (Ac 8:17-19; 13:3; 1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6); but it also designates the infliction of cruelty and punishment (Ge 37:22; Le 24:14), the imposition of responsibility (Nu 8:10; De 34:9). Thus also the sins of the people were symbolically transferred upon the goat which was to be sent into the wilderness (Le 16:21). This act, rabbinical writings declare, was not so much a laying on of hands, as a vigorous pressing. "Lifting up the hand" was a gesture accompanying an oath (De 32:40) or a blessing pronounced over a multitude (Le 9:22; Lu 24:50), a prayer (Ps 119:48). "To put the hands to the mouth" is indicative of (compulsory) silence (Job 21:5; 40:4; Pr 30:32; Mic 7:16). To "slack one's hand" is synonymous with negligence and neglect (Jos 10:6), and "to hide or bury the hand in the dish" is descriptive of the slothful, who is tired even at meals (Pr 19:24; 26:15).

2. The Hand as Power:

The hand in the sense of power and authority: (compare Assyrian idu, "strength"); Jos 8:20 margin, "They had no hands (the Revised Version (British and American) "power") to flee this way or that way"; Jud 1:35, "The hand of the house of Joseph prevailed"; Ps 76:5, "None of the men of might have found their hands"; Ps 89:48 margin, "shall deliver his soul from the hand (the Revised Version (British and American) "power") of Sheol"; 2Ki 3:15, "The hand of Yahweh came upon him"; Ex 14:31 margin, "Israel saw the great hand (the Revised Version (British and American) "work") which Yahweh did upon the Egyptians"; De 34:12, "in all the mighty hand .... which Moses wrought in the sight of all Israel."

3. The Hand for the Person:

The hand used (pars pro toto) for the person: "His hand shall be against every man" (Ge 16:12). "Slay the priests of Yahweh; because their hand also is with David" (1Sa 22:17). "Jonathan went to David into the wood and strengthened his hand in God" (1Sa 23:16). In this sense penalty is exacted "from the hand" or "at the hand" of the transgressor (Ge 9:5; Eze 33:8).

4. Hand, Meaning Side:

The hand in the sense of side: "All the side (Hebrew "hand") of the river Jabbok" (De 2:37); "by the wayside" (Hebrew "by the hand of the way," 1Sa 4:13). The manuscripts have here the error yakh, for yadh; compare the Hebrew of Ps 140:5 (6) (leyadh ma'gal); "On the side (Hebrew "hand") of their oppressors there was power" (Ec 4:1); "I was by the side (Hebrew "hand") of the great river" (Da 10:4).

5. English Idiom:

Mention must also be made here of the English idiom, "at hand," frequently found in our versions of the Scriptures. In Hebrew and Greek there is no reference to the word "hand," but words designating nearness of time or place are used. The usual word in Hebrew is qarabh, "to be near," and qarobh,

"near"; in Greek eggus, "near," and the verb eggizo, "to come near." Rarely other words are used, as enesteken, "has come," the English Revised Version "is now present" (2Th 2:2), and ephesteken, "is come" (2Ti 4:6).

Frequently the words refer to the "day" or "coming of the Lord"; still it must not be forgotten that it may often refer to the nearness of God in a local sense, as in Jer 23:23, "Am I a God at hand, saith Yahweh, and not a God afar off?" and probably in Php 4:5, "The Lord is at hand," though many, perhaps most, commentators regard the expression as a version of the Aramaic maran atha (1Co 16:22). Passages such as Ps 31:20; 119:151; Mt 28:20 would, however, speak for an interpretation which lays the ictus on the abiding presence of the Lord with the believer.

NOTE.—The ancients made a careful distinction of the respective values of the two hands. This is perhaps best seen from Ge 48:13-19, where the imposition of the hands of aged Israel upon the heads of Joseph's sons seems unfair to their father, because the left hand is being placed upon the elder, the right hand upon the younger son. The very word euonumos proves the same from the Greek point of view. This word is a euphemistic synonym of aristera, and is used to avoid the unlucky omen the common word may have for the person spoken to. Thus the goats, i.e. the godless, are placed at the left hand of the great Judge, while the righteous appear at His right (Mt 25:33). We read in Ec 10:2, "A wise man's heart is at his right hand; but a fool's heart at his left," i.e. is inclined to evil. As the Jews orientated themselves by looking toward the rising of the sun (Latin oriens, the east), the left hand represented the north, and the right hand the south (1Sa 23:19,24; 2Sa 24:5). The right hand was considered the more honorable (1Ki 2:19; Ps 45:9); therefore it was given in attestation of a contract, a federation or fellowship (Ga 2:9). It is the more valuable in battle; a friend or protector will therefore take his place at the right to guard it (Ps 16:8; 73:23; 109:31; 110:5; 121:5), but the enemy will, for the same reason, try to assail it (Job 30:12; Ps 109:6; Zec 3:1). It was also the unprotected side, because the shield was carried on the left arm: hence, the point of danger and honor. The right hand is also the side of power and strength (Ps 60:5; 63:8; 108:6; 118:15,16; 110:1; Mt 22:44; Mt 20:21,23). Both hands are mentioned together in the sense of close proximity, intimate association, in Mr 10:37.

H. L. E. Luering

HAND WEAPON

hand'-wep'-un (Nu 35:18 the King James Version).

See ARMOR.

HANDBREADTH

hand'-bredth (Tephach, Tophach, 1Ki 7:26; 2Ch 4:5; Ps 39:5; Ex 25:25; 37:12; Eze 40:5,43; 43:13): A Hebrew linear measure containing 4 fingers, or digits, and equal to about 3 inches.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

HANDFUL

hand’-fool: There are five words in Hebrew used to indicate what may be held in the hand, either closed or open.

(1) chophen, chophnayim. The fist or closed hand occurs in the dual in Ex 9:8, where it signifies what can be taken in the two hands conjoined, a double handful.

(2) kaph, "hollow of the hand," the palm; an open handful (Le 9:17; 1Ki 17:12; Ec 4:6).

(3) ‘amir, "sheaf or bundle." It signifies the quantity of grain a gleaner may gather in his hand (Jer 9:22 (Hebrew 21)).

(4) qomets, "the closed handful" (Ge 41:47; Le 2:2; 5:12; 6:15 (Hebrew 6:8); Nu 5:26).

(5) sho‘al, "the hollow of the hand," or what can be held in it (1Ki 20:10; Eze 13:19). In Isa 40:12 it signifies "measure."

(6) piccah (Ps 72:16) is rendered "handful" by the King James Version, but is properly "abundance" as in the Revised Version (British and American).

H. Porter

HANDICRAFT

han’-di-kraft.

See CRAFTS.

HANDKERCHIEF

han’-ker-chif (soudarion): A loan-word from the Latin sudarium, found in plural in Ac 19:12, soudaria; compare sudor, "perspiration"; literally, "a cloth used to wipe off perspiration." Elsewhere it is rendered "napkin" (Lu 19:20; Joh 11:44; 20:7), for which see DRESS; NAPKIN.

HANDLE

han’-d’-l (kaph): The noun occurs once in So 5:5, "handles of the bolt" (the King James Version "lock").

The verb "handle" represents several Hebrew (’achaz, mashakh, taphas, etc.) and Greek (thiggano, Col 2:21; pselaphao, Lu 24:39; 1 Joh 1:1) words in the King James Version, but is also sometimes substituted in the Revised Version (British and American) for other renderings in the King James Version, as in So 3:8 for "hold"; in Lu 20:11, "handled shamefully," for "entreated shamefully"; in 2Ti 2:15, "handling aright," for "rightly dividing," etc.

HANDMAID

hand’-mad: Which appears often in the Old Testament, but seldom in the New Testament, like bondmaid, is used to translate two Hebrew words (shiphchah, and ‘amah) both of which normally mean a female slave. It is used to translate the former word in the ordinary sense of female slave in Ge 16:1; 25:12; 29:24,29; Pr 30:23; Jer 34:11,16; Joe 2:29; to translate the latter word in Ex 23:12; Jud 19:19; 2Sa 6:20. It is used as a term of humility and respectful self-depreciation in the presence of great men, prophets and kings, to translate the former word in Ru 2:13; 1Sa 1:18; 28:21; 2Sa 14:6; 2Ki 4:2,16; it translates the latter word in the same sense in Ru 3:9; 1Sa 1:16; 25:24,28,31,41; 2Sa 20:17; 1Ki 1:13,17; 3:20. It is also used to express a sense of religious humility in translating the latter word only, and appears in this sense in but three passages, 1Sa 1:11; Ps 86:16; 116:16.

In the New Testament it occurs 3 t, in a religious sense, as the translation of doule, "a female slave" (Lu 1:38,48; Ac 2:18), and twice (Ga 4:22,23) as the translation of paidiske, the King James Version "bondmaid."

William Joseph McGlothlin

HANDS; HANDS, IMPOSITION, LAYING ON OF

im-po-zish’-un (epithesis cheiron, Ac 8:18; 1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6; Heb 6:2): The act or ceremony of the imposition of hands appears in the Old Testament in various connections: in the act of blessing (Ge 48:14); in the ritual of sacrifice (hands of the offerer laid on head of victim, Ex 29:10,15,19; Le 1:4; 3:2,8,13; 4:4,24,29; 8:14; 16:21); in witness-bearing in capital offenses (Le 24:14). The tribe of Levi was set apart by solemn imposition of hands (Nu 8:10); Moses appointed Joshua to be his successor by a similar act (Nu 27:18,23; De 34:9). The idea in these cases varies with the purpose of the act. The primary idea seems to be that of conveyance or transference (compare Le 16:21), but, conjoined with this, in certain instances, are the ideas of identification and of devotion to God.

In the New Testament Jesus laid hands on the little children (Mt 19:13,15 parallel Mr 10:16) and on the sick (Mt 9:18; Mr 6:5, etc.), and the apostles laid hands on those whom they baptized that they might receive the Holy Spirit (Ac 8:17,19; 19:6), and in healing (Ac 12:17). Specially the imposition of hands was used in the setting apart of persons to a particular office or work in the church. This is noticed as taking place in the appointment of the Seven (Ac 6:6), in the sending out of Barnabas and Saul (Ac 13:3), at the ordination of Timothy (1Ti 4:14; 2Ti 1:6), but though not directly mentioned, it seems likely that it accompanied all acts of ordination of presbyters and deacons (compare 1Ti 5:22; Heb 6:2).

The presbyters could hardly convey what they had not themselves received (1Ti 1:14). Here again the fundamental idea is communication. The act of laying on of hands was accompanied by prayer (Ac 6:6; 8:15; 13:3), and the blessing sought was imparted by God Himself. No ground is afforded by this symbolical action for a sacrament of "Orders."

See SACRIFICE; MINISTRY; ORDINATION.

James Orr

HANDSTAFF

hand'-staf (maqqkel yadh): In plural in Eze 39:9, among weapons of war.

See STAFF.

HANDWRITING

hand'-rit-ing.

See WRITING; MANUSCRIPTS.

HANES

ha'-nez (chanec): Occurs only in Isa 30:4. The one question of importance concerning this place is its location. It has never been certainly identified. It was probably an Egyptian city, though even that is not certain. Pharaoh, in his selfish haste to make league with the kingdom of Judah, may have sent his ambassadors far beyond the frontier. The language of Isa, "Their ambassadors came to Hanes," certainly seems to indicate a place in the direction of Jerusalem from Tanis. This indication is also the sum of all the evidence yet available. There is no real knowledge concerning the exact location of Hanes. Opinions on the subject are little more than clever guesses. They rest almost entirely upon etymological grounds, a very precarious foundation when not supported by historical evidence. The Septuagint has, "For there are in Tanis princes, wicked messengers." Evidently knowing no such place, they tried to translate the name. The Aramaic version gives "Tahpanhes" for Hanes, which may have been founded upon exact knowledge, as we shall see.

Hanes has been thought by some commentators to be Heracleopolis Magna, Egyptian Hunensurten, abridged to Hunensu, Copt Ahnes, Hebrew Chanec, Arabic Ahneysa, the capital of the XXth Nome, or province, of ancient Egypt. It was a large city on an island between the Nile and the Bahr Yuseph, opposite the modern town of Beni Suef. The Greeks identified the ram-headed god of the place with Heracles, hence, "Heracleopolis." The most important historical notes in Egypt and the best philological arguments point to this city as Hanes. But the plain meaning of Isa 30:4 points more positively to a city

somewhere in the delta nearer to Jerusalem than Tanis (compare Naville's cogent argument, "Ahnas el Medineh," 3-4). Dumichen considered the hieroglyphic name of Tahpanhes to be Hens. Knowledge of this as a fact may have influenced the Aramaic rendering, but does not warrant the arbitrary altering of the Hebrew text.

M. G. Kyle.

HANGING

hang'-ing (talah, "to hang up," "suspend," 2Sa 21:12; De 28:66; Job 26:7; Ps 137:2; So 4:4; Ho 11:7): Generally, where the word is used in connection with punishments, it appears to have reference to the hanging of the corpse after execution. We find but two clear instances of death by hanging, i.e. strangulation—those of Ahithophel and Judas ((2Sa 17:23; Mt 27:5), and both these were eases of suicide, not of execution. The foregoing Hebrew word is clearly used for "hanging" as a mode of execution in Es 5:14; 6:4; 7:9 ff; 8:7; 9:13,14,25; but probably the "gallows" or "tree" ('ets) was a stake for the purpose of impaling the victim. It could be lowered for this purpose, then raised "fifty cubits high" to arrest the public gaze. The Greek word used in Mt 27:5 is apagchesthai, "to strangle oneself." See HDB, article "Hanging," for an exhaustive discussion.

Frank E. Hirsch

HANGINGS

hang'-ingz:

(1) In English Versions of the Bible this word in the plural represents the Hebrew qela'im, the curtains of "fine twined linen" with which the court of the tabernacle was enclosed. These were five cubits in height, and of lengths corresponding to the sides of the enclosure and the space on either side of the entrance in front, and were suspended from hooks fastened to the pillars of the court. They are described at length in Ex 27:9-15; 38:9-18. See, besides, Ex 35:17; 39:40; Nu 3:26; 4:26.

(2) In the King James Version another word, macakh (the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly "screen"), is distinguished from the preceding only by the singular, "hanging" (Ex 35:17; 38:18, etc.). It is used of the screen or portiere, embroidered in colors, that closed the entrance of the court (Ex 27:16; 35:17; 38:18; 39:40; 40:8,33; Nu 3:26; 4:26); of the screen of similar workmanship at the entrance of the tabernacle (Ex 26:36,37; 35:15; 36:37; 39:38; 40:5,28; Nu 3:25; 4:25); and once (Nu 3:31) of the tapestry veil, adorned with cherubim, at the entrance of the Holy of Holies (elsewhere, parokheth, "veil," Ex 26:31-33, etc., or parokheth ha-macakh, "veil of the screen," Ex 35:12, etc.). In Nu 3:26, the King James Version renders macakh "curtain," and in Ex 35:12; 39:34; 40:21 (compare also Nu 4:5), "covering."

(3) In 2Ki 23:7 we read of "hangings" (Hebrew "houses") which the women wove for the Asherah. If the

text is correct we are to think perhaps of tent shrines for the image of the goddess. Lucian’s reading (stolas, "robes") is preferred by some, which would have reference to the custom of bringing offerings of clothing for the images of the gods. In 1Ki 7:29 the Revised Version (British and American), "wreaths of hanging work" refers to a kind of ornamentation on the bases of the lavers. In Es 1:6, "hangings" is supplied by the translators.

Benjamin Reno Downer

HANIEL

han’-i-el.

See HANNIEL.

HANNAH

han’-a (channah, "grace," "favor"; Hanna): One of the two wives of Elkanah, an Ephraimite who lived at Ramathaim-zophim. Hannah visited Shiloh yearly with her husband to offer sacrifices, for there the tabernacle was located. She was greatly distressed because they had no children. She therefore prayed earnestly for a male child whom she promised to dedicate to the Lord from his birth. The prayer was heard, and she called her son’s name Samuel ("God hears"). When he was weaned he was carried to Shiloh to be trained by Eli, the priest (1Sa 1). Hannah became the mother of five other children, three sons and two daughters (1Sa 2:2). Her devotion in sending Samuel a little robe every year is one of the tenderest recorded instances of maternal love (1Sa 2:19). She was a prophetess of no ordinary talent, as is evident from her elevated poetic deliverance elicited by God’s answer to her prayer (1Sa 2:1-10).

Byron H. Dement

HANNATHON

han’-a-thon (channathon): A city on the northern boundary of Zebulun (Jos 19:14). It is probably identical with Kefar Hananyah, which the Mishna gives as marking the northern limit of lower Galilee (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 179). It is represented by the modern Kefr ‘Anan, about 3 miles Southeast of er-Rameh.

HANNIEL

han’-i-el (channi’el "grace of God"):

(1) The son of Ephod and a prince of Manasseh who assisted in dividing Canaan among the tribes (Nu 34:23).

(2) A son of Ulla and a prince and hero of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:39); the King James Version "Haniel."

HANOCH; HANOCHITES

ha’-nok, ha’-nok-its (chanokh, "initiation," "dedication"):

(1) A grandson of Abraham by Keturah, and an ancestral head of a clan of Midian (Ge 25:4; 1Ch 1:33, the King James Version "Henoch").

(2) The eldest son of Reuben (Ge 46:9; Ex 6:14; 1Ch 5:3).

The descendants of Hanoch were known as Hanochites (Nu 26:5).

HANUN

ha’-nun (chanun, "favored," "pitied"):

(1) A son and successor of Nahash, king of Ammon. Upon the death of Nahash, David sent sympathetic communications to Hanun, which were misinterpreted and the messengers dishonored. Because of this indignity, David waged a war against him, which caused the Ammonites to lose their independence (2Sa 10:1 ff; 1Ch 19:1).

(2) One of the six sons of Zalaph who assisted in repairing the East wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:30).

(3) One of the inhabitants of Zanoah who repaired the Valley Gate in the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:13).

Byron H. Dement

HAP; HAPLY

hap, hap’-li (miqreh, lu; mepote):

Hap (a Saxon word for "luck, chance") is the translation of miqreh, "a fortuitous chance," "a lot" (Ru 2:3, the King James Version "Her hap was to light on a part of the field belonging unto Boaz"); in 1Sa 6:9, the same word is translated "chance" (that happened); "event," in Ec 9:2,3, with "happeneth," in Ec 2:14.

Haply (from "hap") is the translation of lu, "if that" (1Sa 14:30, "if haply the people had eaten freely"); of ei ara, "if then" (Mr 11:13, "if haply he might find anything thereon"); of ei arage (Ac 17:27, "if haply

they might feel after him"); of mepote, "lest ever" "lest perhaps" etc. (Lu 14:29; Ac 5:39); of me pos, "lest in anyway" (2Co 9:4 the King James Version, "lest haply," the Revised Version (British and American) "lest by any means").

The Revised Version has "haply" for "at any time" (Mt 4:6; 5:25; 13:15; Mr 4:12; Lu 4:11; 21:34; Heb 2:1); introduces "haply" (Mt 7:6; 13:29; 15:32; 27:64; Mr 14:2; Lu 3:15; 12:58; 14:8,12; Ac 27:29; Heb 4:1); has "haply there shall be," for "lest there be" (Heb 3:12).

W. L. Walker

HAPHARAIM

haf-a'-ra'-im (chapharayim; the King James Version Haphraim, haf-ra'im, possibly "place of a moat"): A town in the territory of Issachar, named with Shunem and Anaharath (Jos 19:19). Eusebius, Onomasticon identifies it with "Affarea," and places it 6 miles North of Legio-Megiddo. This position corresponds with that of the modern el-Ferriyeh, an ancient site with remarkable tombs Northwest of el-Lejjun.

HAPPEN

hap'-'-n (qarah; sumbaino): "Happen" (from "hap"), "to fall out," "befall," etc., "come to anyone," is the translation of qarah, "to meet," etc. (1Sa 28:10, "There shall no punishment happen to thee," the Revised Version margin "guilt come upon thee"; 2Sa 1:6; Es 4:7; Ec 2:14,15; 9:11 Isa 41:22); of qara'," to meet," "cause to happen," etc. (2Sa 20:1); of hayah, "to be" (1Sa 6:9, "It was a chance that happened to us"); of nagha'," to touch," "to come to" (Ec 8:14 bis). In the New Testament it is in several instances the translation of sumbaino, "to go" or "come up together" "to happen" (Mr 10:32; Lu 24:14; Ac 3:10; 1Co 10:11; 1Pe 4:12; 2Pe 2:22); once of ginomai, "to become," "to happen" (Ro 11:25, the Revised Version (British and American), "befallen"). "Happeneth" occurs (Ec 2:15, as it happeneth to the fool" (miqreh); APC 2Esdras 10:6; Baruch 3:10 (ti estin)). The Revised Version (British and American) supplies "that happened" for "were done" (Lu 24:35).

See also CHANGE.

W. L. Walker

HAPPINESS

hap'-i-nes.

See BLESSEDNESS.

HAPPIZZEZ

hap’-i-zez (ha-pitstsets; the King James Version, Aphses): A priest on whom fell the lot for the 18th of the 24 courses which David appointed for the temple service (1Ch 24:15).

HAR-MAGEDON

har-ma-ged’-on (Harmagedon from Hebrew har meghiddo, "Mount of Megiddo"; the King James Version Armageddon): This name is found only in Re 16:16. It is described as the rallying-place of the kings of the whole world who, led by the unclean spirits issuing from the mouth of the dragon, the beast and the false prophet, assemble here for "the war of the great day of God, the Almighty." Various explanations have been suggested; but, as Nestle says (HDB, s.v), "Upon the whole, to find an allusion here to Megiddo is still the most probable explanation." In the history of Israel it had been the scene of never-to-be-forgotten battles. Here took place the fatal struggle between Josiah and Pharaoh-necoh (2Ki 23:29; 2Ch 35:22). Long before, the hosts of Israel had won glory here, in the splendid victory over Sisera and his host (Jud 5:19). These low hills around Megiddo, with their outlook over the plain of Esdraelon, have witnessed perhaps a greater number of bloody encounters than have ever stained a like area of the world’s surface. There was, therefore, a peculiar appropriateness in the choice of this as the arena of the last mighty struggle between the powers of good and evil. The choice of the hill as the battlefield has been criticized, as it is less suitable for military operations than the plain. But the thought of Gilboa and Tabor and the uplands beyond Jordan might have reminded the critics that Israel was not unaccustomed to mountain warfare. Megiddo itself was a hill-town, and the district was in part mountainous (compare Mt. Tabor, Jud 4:6,12; "the high places of the field," 5:18). It will be remembered that this is apocalypse. Har-Magedon may stand for the battlefield without indicating any particular locality. The attempt of certain scholars to connect the name with "the mount of congregation" in Isa 14:13 (Hommel, Genkel, etc.), and with Babylonian mythology, cannot be pronounced successful. Ewald (Die Johan. Schrift, II, 204) found that the Hebrew forms of "Har-Magedon" and "the great Rome" have the same numerical value—304. The historical persons alluded to in the passage do not concern us here.

W. Ewing

HARA

ha’-ra (hara’; Septuagint omits): A place named in 1Ch 5:26 along with Halah, Habor and the river of Gozan, whither the Reubenites, the Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh were carried by Tiglath-pileser. In 2Ki 17:6; 18:11, Hara is omitted, and in both, "and in the cities of the Medes" is added. Septuagint renders ore Medon, "the mountains of the Medes," which may represent Hebrew hare madhay, "mountains of Media," or, ‘are madhay, "cities of Media." The text seems to be corrupt. The second word may have fallen out in 1Ch 5:26, hare being changed to hara’.

W. Ewing

HARADAH

ha-ra’-da, har’-a-da (charadhah, "fearful"): A desert station of the Israelites between Mt. Shepher and Makheloth (Nu 33:24:25).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

HARAN (1)

ha’-ran (haran):

(1) Son of Terah, younger brother of Abraham and Nahor, and father of Lot (Ge 11:27). He had two daughters, Milcah and Iscah (Ge 11:29).

(2) A Gershonite, of the family of Shimei (1Ch 23:9).

HARAN (2)

ha’-ran (charan; Charhran): The city where Terah settled on his departure from Ur (Ge 11:31 f); whence Abram set out on his pilgrimage of faith to Canaan (Ge 12:1). It was probably "the city of Nahor" to which Abraham’s servant came to find a wife for Isaac (Ge 24:10). Hither came Jacob when he fled from Esau’s anger (Ge 27:43). Here he met his bride (Ge 29:4), and in the neighboring pastures he tended the flocks of Laban. It is one of the cities named by Rabshakeh as destroyed by the king of Assyria (2Ki 19:12; Isa 37:12). Ezekiel speaks of the merchants of Haran as trading with Tyre (27:23).

The name appears in Assyro-Babalonian as Charran, which means "road"; possibly because here the trade route from Damascus joined that from Nineveh to Carchemish. It is mentioned in the prism inscription of Tiglath-pileser I. It was a seat of the worship of Sin, the moon-god, from very ancient times. A temple was built by Shalmaneser II. Haran seems to have shared in the rebellion of Assur (763 BC, the year of the solar eclipse, June 15). The privileges then lost were restored by Sargon II. The temple, which had been destroyed, was rebuilt by Ashurbanipal, who was here crowned with the crown of Sin. Haran and the temple suffered much damage in the invasion of the Umman-Manda (the Medes). Nabuna‘id restored temple and city, adorning them on a lavish scale. Near Haran the Parthians defeated and slew Crassus (53 BC), and here Caracalla was assassinated (217 AD). In the 4th century it was the seat of a bishopric; but the cult of the moon persisted far into the Christian centuries. The chief temple was the scene of heathen worship until the 11th century, and was destroyed by the Mongols in the 13th.

The ancient city is represented by the modern Charran to the Southeast of Edessa, on the river Belias, an affluent of the Euphrates. The ruins lie on both sides of the stream, and include those of a very ancient castle, built of great basaltic blocks, with square columns, 8 ft. thick, which support an arched roof some

30 ft. in height. Remains of the old cathedral are also conspicuous. No inscriptions have yet been found here, but a fragment of an Assyrian lion has been uncovered. A well nearby is identified as that where Eliezer met Rebekah.

In Ac 7:2,4, the King James Version gives the name as Charran.

W. Ewing

HARARITE

ha'-ra-rit (ha-harari, or ha-'arari): Literally, "mountaineer," more particularly an inhabitant of the hill country of Judah. Thus used of two heroes:

(1) Shammah, the son of Agee (2Sa 23:11,33). The parallel passage, 1Ch 11:34, has "Shage" in place of "Shammah."

(2) Ahiam, the son of Sharar the Ararite" (2Sa 23:33). In 1Ch 11:35, "Sacar" for Sharar as here.

HARBONA; HARBONAH

har-bo'-na (charebhona' charebhonah): One of the seven eunuchs who served Ahasuerus and to whom was given the command to bring Queen Esther before the king (Es 1:10). It was he who suggested that Haman be hanged upon the self-same gallows that he had erected for Mordecai (Es 7:9). Jewish tradition has it that Harbona had originally been a confederate of Haman, but, upon noting the failure of the latter's plans, abandoned him. The Persian equivalent of the name means "donkey-driver."

HARBOUR

har'-ber. Used figuratively of God in Joe 3:16 the King James Version margin, (Hebrew) "place of repair, or, harbour" (the King James Version "hope," the Revised Version (British and American) "refuge").

See HAVEN; SHIPS AND BOATS, I, II, (1), II, 3.

HARD SAYINGS; HARD SENTENCES

sa'-ingz; , sen'-ten-siz: In Da 5:12 the King James Version (Aramaic 'aqiahan), the Revised Version (British and American) "dark sentences," of enigmatic utterances which preternatural wisdom was needed to interpret; in Joh 6:60 (skleros .... ho logos), of sayings (Christ's words at Capernaum about eating His flesh and drinking His blood) difficult for the natural mind to understand (compare 6:52).

HARD; HARDINESS; HARDDINESS; HARDLY

hard, har’-di-nes, hard’-nes, hard’-li (qasheh, pala’; skleros) :The senses in which hard is used may be distinguished as:

(1) "Firm," "stiff," opposite to soft: Job 41:24, yatsaq, "to be firm," "his heart .... as hard as a piece of the nether millstone," the Revised Version (British and American) "firm"; Eze 3:7, qasheh, "sharp," "hard of heart"; chazaq, "firm," "As an adamant harder than flint have I made thy forehead"; Jer 5:3, "They have made their faces harder than a rock"; Pr 21:29, ‘azaz, "to make strong," "hard," "impudent," "a wicked man hardeneth his face"; Pr 13:15 probably belongs here also where ‘ethan is translated "hard": "The way of the transgressor is hard," the English Revised Version "The way of the treacherous is rugged"; the Hebrew word means, "lasting," "firm," poet. "rocks" (the earth’s foundations, Mic 6:2), and the meaning seems to be, not that the way (path) of transgressors, or the treacherous (Delitzsch has "uncultivated"), is hard (rocky) to them, but that their way, or mode of acting, is hard, unsympathetic, unkind, "destitute of feeling in things which, as we say, would soften a stone" (Delitzsch on passage); also Mt 25:24, skleros, "stiff," "thou art a hard man"; The Wisdom of Solomon 11:4, skleros, "hard stone," the Revised Version (British and American) "flinty rock," margin "the steep rock."

(2) "Sore," "trying," "painful," qasheh (Ex 1:14, "hard service"; Deuteronomy, 26:6; 2Sa 3:39; Ps 60:3; Isa 14:3); qashah "to have it hard" (Ge 35:16,17; De 15:18); ‘athaq, "stiff" (Ps 94:4 the King James Version, "They utter and speak hard things"); skleros (Joh 6:60, "This is a hard saying"—hard to accept, hard in its nature; Ac 9:5 the King James Version; Ac 26:14; Jude 1:15, "hard speeches"; The Wisdom of Solomon 19:13).

(3) "Heavy," "pressing hard," kabhedh, "weighty" (Eze 3:5,6, "a people of a strange speech and of a hard language," the Revised Version margin (Hebrew) "deep of lip and heavy of tongue"); camakh, "to lay" (Ps 88:7, "Thy wrath lieth hard upon me").

(4) "Difficult," "hard to do," "know," etc., pala’," difficult to be done" (Ge 18:14, "Is anything too hard for Yahweh?"; Jer 32:17,27; De 17:8; 2Sa 13:2); qasheh (Ex 18:26, "hard causes"); qashah (De 1:17; 2Ki 2:10); chidhah, "something twisted," "involved," "an enigma"; compare Jud 14:14 (1Ki 10:1; 2Ch 9:1, "to prove Solomon with hard questions"); ‘ahidhan, Aramaic (Da 5:12); duskolos, literally, "difficult about food," "hard to please," hence, "difficult to accomplish" (Mr 10:24, "How hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God"); dusnoetos, "hard to be understood" (Heb 5:11; 2Pe 3:16; compare Ecclesiasticus 3:21, "things too hard for thee," chalepos).

(5) "Close," or "near to" (hard by), naghash, "to come nigh" (Jud 9:52, the American Standard Revised Version "near"); dabhaq and dabheq, "to follow hard after" (Jud 20:45; Ps 63:8, etc.); ‘etsel, "near" (1Ki 21:1); le’ummath, "over against" (Le 3:9); ‘adh, "to" "even to" (1Ch 19:4, the King James Version "hard by," the Revised Version (British and American) "even to").

Hardiness occurs in Judith 16:10 thrasos, the Revised Version (British and American) "boldness."

Hardness is the translation of mutsaq, "something poured out," "dust wetted," "running into clods" (Job 38:38), the Revised Version (British and American) "runneth into a mass"; "hardness of heart" occurs in the Gospels; in Mr 3:5, it is porosis, "hardness," "callousness"; Mt 19:8; Mr 10:5; 16:14, sklerokardia, "dryness," "stiffness of heart"; compare Ecclesiasticus 16:10; in Ro 2:5, it is sklerotes; in 2Ti 2:3 the King James Version we have, "Endure hardness, as a good soldier of Jesus Christ," the Revised Version (British and American) "Suffer hardship with me" (corrected text), margin "Take thy part in suffering hardship" (kakopatheo, "to suffer evil").

Hardly occurs in the Old Testament (Ex 13:15), "Pharaoh would hardly let us go," qashah, literally, "hardened to let us go," the Revised Version margin "hardened himself against letting us go"; "hardly bestead" (Isa 8:21) is the translation of qadshah, the American Standard Revised Version "sore distressed." In the New Testament "hardly" is the translation of duskolos, "hard to please," "difficult," meaning not scarcely or barely, but with difficulty (Mt 19:23, "A rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven," the Revised Version (British and American) "it is hard for"; Mr 10:23; Lu 18:24, "how hardly" ("with what difficulty")); of mogis, "with labor," "pain," "trouble" (Lu 9:39, "hardly departeth from him" ("painfully")); of molis "with toil and fatigue" (Ac 27:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "with difficulty"; The Wisdom of Solomon 9:16, "Hardly do we guess aright at things that are upon earth"; Ecclesiasticus 26:29, "A merchant shall hardly keep himself from wrong doing"; 29:6, "He shall hardly receive the half," in each instance the word is molis, but in the last two instances we seem to see the transition to "scarcely"; compare also Ex 13:15).

The Revised Version has "too hard" for "hidden" (De 30:11, margin "wonderful"); "hardness" for "boldness" (of face) (Ec 8:1); for "sorrow" (La 3:65); "deal hardly with me" for "make yourselves strong to me" (Job 19:3); omits "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" (Ac 9:5, corrected text); "hardship" for "trouble" (2Ti 2:9).

W. L. Walker

HARDEN

har’-d’-n (chazaq, qashah; skleruno):

(1) "Harden" occurs most frequently in the phrase "to harden the heart," or "the neck." This hardening of men’s hearts is attributed both to God and to men themselves, e.g. with reference to the hearts of Pharaoh and the Egyptians; the Hiphil of chazaq, "to make strong," is frequently used in this connection (Ex 4:21, "I will harden his heart," the Revised Version margin (Hebrew) "make strong"; Ex 7:13, "And he hardened P.’s heart," the Revised Version (British and American) "was hardened," margin (Hebrew) "was strong"; Ex 7:22; 8:19; 9:12; 10:20,27, etc.; Ex 14:17, "I will harden the hearts of the Egyptians," the Revised Version margin (Hebrew) "make strong"; compare Jos 11:20); qashah, "to be heavy," "to make hard" (Ex 7:3); kabhedh, "heavy," "slow," "hard," not easily moved (Ex 10:1, the Revised Version margin (Hebrew) "made heavy"). When the hardening is attributed to man’s own act kabhedh is

generally used (Ex 8:15, "He hardened his heart, and hearkened not," the Revised Version margin (Hebrew) "made heavy"; Ex 8:32, "Pharaoh hardened his heart" (the Revised Version margin as before); Ex 9:7,34; 1Sa 6:6 twice). The "hardening" of men's hearts by God is in the way of punishment, but it is always a consequence of their own self-hardening. In Pharaoh's case we read that "he hardened his heart" against the appeal to free the Israelites; so hardening himself, he became always more confirmed in his obstinacy, till he brought the final doom upon himself. This is how sin is made to become its own punishment. It was not confined to Pharaoh and the Egyptians nor does it belong to the past only. As Paul says (Ro 9:18),"whom he will he hardeneth" (skleruno); Ex 11:7, "The election obtained it, and the rest were hardened" (the Revised Version (British and American) and King James Version margin, poroo, "to make hard" or "callous"); a "Hardening in part hath befallen Israel" (porosis); compare Joh 12:40 (from Isa 6:10), "He hath blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart"; Isa 63:17, "O Yahweh, why dost thou make us to err from thy ways, and hardenest our heart from thy fear?" (qashach, "to harden"); compare on the other side, as expressing the human blameworthiness, Job 9:4, "Who hath hardened himself against him, and prospered?" Mr 3:5, "being grieved at the hardening of their heart;" Mr 6:52, "Their heart was hardened"; Ro 2:5, "after thy hardness and impenitent heart." In Hebrew religious thought everything was directly attributed to God, and the hardening is God's work, in His physical and ethical constitution and laws of man's nature; but it is always the consequence of human action out of harmony therewith. Other instances of skleruno are in Ac 19:9; Heb 3:8,13,15; 4:7.

(2) "Harden" in the sense of "to fortify one's self" (make one's self hard) is the translation of caladh, "to leap," "exult" (Job 6:10 the King James Version, "I would harden myself in sorrow," the Revised Version (British and American) "Let me exult in pain," margin "harden myself").

(3) In Pr 21:29 "harden" has the meaning of "boldness," "defiance" or "shamelessness" (brazen-faced); ‘azaz, Hiphil, "to strengthen one's countenance," "A wicked man hardeneth his face"; Delitzsch, "A godless man showeth boldness in his mien"; compare Pr 7:13; Ec 8:1; see also HARD.

For "harden" the Revised Version (British and American) has "stubborn" (Ex 7:14; 9:7, margin "heavy"); "hardenest" (Isa 63:17); "made stiff" (Jer 7:26; 19:15); for "is hardened" (Job 39:16, the American Standard Revised Version "dealeth hardly," and the English Revised Version margin); "at the hardening" instead of "for the hardness" (Mr 3:5); "hardening" for "blindness" (Eph 4:18).

W. L. Walker

HARDLY; HARDNESS

See HARD.

HARE

har (’arnebheth (Le 11:6; De 14:7); compare Arabic ‘arnab, "hare"): This animal is mentioned only in the lists of unclean animals in Leviticus and Deuteronomy, Where it occurs along with the camel, the

coney and the swine. The camel, the hare and the coney are unclean, ‘because they chew the cud but part not the hoof,’ the swine, "because he parteth the hoof .... but cheweth not the cud." The hare and the coney are not ruminants, but might be supposed to be from their habit of almost continually moving their jaws. Both are freely eaten by the Arabs. Although ‘arnebheth occurs only in the two places cited, there is no doubt that it is the hare. Septuagint has dasupous, "rough-footed," which, while not the commonest Greek word (lagos), refers to the remarkable fact that in hares and rabbits the soles of the feet are densely covered with hair. ‘Arnab, which is the common Arabic word for "hare," is from the same root as the Hebrew ‘arnebheth.

Le 11:4-7: verse 4, English Versions of the Bible "camel"; Septuagint ton kamelon; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) camelus; Hebrew ha-gamal. Le 11:5, English Versions of the Bible "coney"; Septuagint ton dasupoda; Vulgate, choerogryllus; Hebrew ha-shapan. Le 11:6, English Versions of the Bible "hare"; Septuagint ton choirogruillion Vulgate, lepus; Hebrew ha-arnebeth. Le 11:7, English Versions of the Bible "swine"; Septuagint ton hun; Vulgate, sus; Hebrew ha-chazir.

De 14:7: English Versions of the Bible "camel"; Septuagint ton kamelon Vulgate, camelum; Hebrew hagamal; English Versions of the Bible "hare"; Septuagint dasupoda; Vulgate, leporem; Hebrew ha’arnebeth; English Versions of the Bible "coney"; Septuagint choirogrullion; Vulgate, choerogryllum; Hebrew hashaphan.

De 14:8: English Versions of the Bible "swine"; Septuagint ton hun Vulgate, sus; Hebrew hacheziyr.

It is evident from the above and from the meanings of dasupous and chorogrullios as given in Liddell and Scott, that the order of Septuagint in Le 11:5,6 does not follow the Hebrew, but has apparently assimilated the order of that of De 14:7,8. In Ps 104:18, Septuagint has chorogrullios for shaphan; also in Pr 30:26.

Since the word "coney," which properly means "rabbit," has been applied to the hyrax, so, in America at least, the word "rabbit" is widely used for various species of hare, e.g. the gray rabbit and the jack-rabbit, both of which are hares. Hares have longer legs and ears and are swifter than rabbits. Their young are hairy and have their eyes open, while rabbits are born naked and blind. Hares are widely distributed in the Northern Hemisphere, and there is one species in South America. Rabbits are apparently native to the Western Mediterranean countries, although they have been distributed by man all over the world.

Lepus syriacus, the common hare of Syria and Palestine, differs somewhat from the European hare. Lepus judeae is cited by Tristram from Northeastern Palestine, and he also notes three other species from the extreme south.

Alfred Ely Day

HAREPH

ha’-ref (chareph, "scornful"): A chief of Judah, one of the sons of Caleb and father of Beth-gader (1Ch 2:51). A quite similar name, Hariph, occurs in Ne 7:24; 10:19, but it is probably that of another individual.

HARETH

ha’-reth (chhareth, in pause).

See HERETH.

HARHAIAH

har-ha’-ya (charhayah, "Yah protects"): A goldsmith, whose son, Uzziel, helped to repair the walls of Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (Ne 3:8).

HARHAS

har’-has (charchas, "splendor"): Grandfather of Shallum, husband of Huldah (2Ki 22:14). Name given as "Hasrah" in paralle passage (2Ch 34:22).

HARHUR

har’-hur (charchur, "free-born" or "fever"; "Hasour): One of the Nethinim whose descendants came from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:51; Ne 7:53; APC 1Esdras 5:31).

HARIM

ha’-rim (charim): A family name.

(1) A non-priestly family that returned from captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:32; Ne 7:35); mentioned among those who married foreign wives (Ezr 10:31); also mentioned among those who renewed the covenant (Ne 10:27).

(2) A priestly family returning with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:39; Ne 7:42; 12:3,15 (see REHUM)); members of this family covenanted to put away their foreign wives (Ezr 10:21; Ne 10:5). A family of this name appears as the third of the priestly courses in the days of David and Solomon (1Ch 24:8).

(3) In Ne 3:11 is mentioned Malchijah, son of Harim, one of the wall-builders. Which family is here designated is uncertain.

W. N. Stearns

HARIPH

ha’-rif (chariph, chariph): One of those who returned from exile under Zerubbabel and helped to seal the covenant under Nehemiah and Ezra (Ne 7:24; 10:19 (20)). Ezr 2:18 has "Jorah."

HARLOT

har’-lot: This name replaces in the Revised Version (British and American) "whore" of the King James Version. It stands for several words and phrases used to designate or describe the unchaste woman, married or unmarried, e.g. zonah, ‘ishshah nokhriyah, qedheshah; Septuagint and New Testament porne. porneia is used chiefly of prenuptial immorality, but the married woman guilty of sexual immorality is said to be guilty of porneia (Mt 5:32; 19:9; compare Am 7:17 Septuagint). These and cognate words are applied especially in the Old Testament to those devoted to immoral service in idol sanctuaries, or given over to a dissolute life for gain. Such a class existed among all ancient peoples, and may be traced in the history of Israel. Evidence of its existence in very early times is found (Ge 38). It grew out of conditions, sexual and social, which were universal. After the corrupting foreign influxes and influences of Solomon’s day, it developed to even fuller shamelessness, and its voluptuous songs (Isa 23:16), seductive arts (Pr 6:24), and blighting influence are vividly pictured and denounced by the prophets (Pr 7:10; 29:3; Isa 23:16; Jer 3:3; 5:7; Eze 16:25; compare De 23:17). Money was lavished upon women of this class, and the weak and unwary were taken captive by them, so that it became one of the chief concerns of the devout father in Israel to "keep (his son) from the evil woman," who "hunteth for the precious life" (Pr 6:24,26). From the title given her in Prov, a "foreign woman" (23:27), and the warnings against "the flattery of the foreigner’s tongue" (6:24; compare 1Ki 11:1; Ezr 10:2), we may infer that in later times this class was chiefly made up of strangers from without. The whole subject must be viewed in the setting of the times. Even in Israel, then, apart from breaches of marriage vows, immoral relations between the sexes were deemed venial (De 22:28 f). A man was forbidden to compel his daughter to sin (Le 19:29), to "profane (her) and make her a harlot," but she was apparently left free to take that way herself (compare Ge 38). The children of the harlot, though, were outlawed (De 23:2), and later the harlot is found under the sternest social ban (Mt 21:31,32).

The subject takes on even a darker hue when viewed in the light of the hideous conditions that prevailed in ancient Syria affecting this practice. The harlot represented more than a social peril and problem. She was a qedheshah, one of a consecrated class, and as such was the concrete expression and agent of the most insidious and powerful influence and system menacing the purity and permanence of the religion of Yahweh. This system deified the reproductive organs and forces of Nature and its devotees worshipped their idol symbols in grossly licentious rites and orgies. The temple prostitute was invested with sanctity as a member of the religious caste, as she is today in India. Men and women thus prostituted themselves in the service of their gods. The Canaanite sanctuaries were gigantic brothels, legalized under the sanctions of religion. For a time, therefore, the supreme religious question was whether such a cult should be established and allowed to naturalize itself in Israel, as it had done in

Babylon (Herodotus i.199) and in Greece (Strabo viii.6). That the appeal thus made to the baser passions of the Israelites was all too successful is sadly clear (Am 2:7; Ho 4:13). The prophets give vivid pictures of the syncretizing of the worship of Baal and Astarte with that of Yahweh and the extent to which the local sanctuaries were given over to this form of corruption. They denounced it as the height of impiety and as sure to provoke Divine judgments. Asa and Jehoshaphat undertook to purge the land of such vile abominations (1Ki 14:24; 15:12; 22:46). The Deuteronomic code required that all such "paramours" be banished, and forbade the use of their unholy gains as temple revenue (De 23:17,18. Driver's note). The Levitical law forbade a priest to take a harlot to wife (Le 21:7). and commanded that the daughter of a priest who played the harlot should be burned (Le 21:9).

See ASHTORETH; IMAGES; IDOLATRY.

It is grimly significant that the prophets denounce spiritual apostasy as "harlotry" (the King James Version "whoredom"). But it would seem that the true ethical attitude toward prostitution was unattainable so long as marriage was in the low, transitional stage mirrored in the Old Testament; though the religion of Yahweh was in a measure delivered from the threatened peril by the fiery discipline of the exile.

In New Testament times, a kindred danger beset the followers of Christ, especially in Greece and Asia Minor (Ac 15:20,29; Ro 1:24 ff; 1Co 6:9 ff; Ga 5:19). That lax views of sexual morality were widely prevalent in the generation in which Christ lived is evident both from His casual references to the subject and from His specific teaching in answer to questions concerning adultery and divorce (compare Josephus, Ant, IV, viii, 23; Vita, section 76; Sirach 7:26; 25:26; 42:9, and the Talm). The ideas of the times were debased by the prevalent polygamous customs, "it being of old permitted to the Jews to marry many wives" (Josephus, BJ, I, xxiv, 2; compare Ant, XVII, i, 2). The teaching of Jesus was in sharp contrast with the low ideals and the rabbinical teaching of the times. The controversy on this question waxed hot between the two famous rival rabbinical schools. Hillel reduced adultery to the level of the minor faults. Shammai opposed his teaching as immoral in tendency. kata pasan aitian (Mt 19:3), gives incidental evidence of the nature of the controversy. It was characteristic of the teaching of Jesus that He went to the root of the matter, making this sin to consist in "looking on a woman to lust after her." Nor did He confine Himself to the case of the married. The general character of the terms in Mt 5:28, pas ho blepon, forbids the idea that gunaika, and emoicheusen, are to be limited to post-nuptial sin with a married woman. On the other hand it is a characteristic part of the work of Jesus to rescue the erring woman from the merciless clutches of the Pharisaic tribunal, and to bring her within the pale of mercy and redemption (Mt 21:31,32). He everywhere leaned to the side of mercy in dealing with such cases, as is indicated by the traditional and doubtless true narrative found in the accepted text of the Fourth Gospel (Joh 7:53-8:11).

George B. Eager

HARLOTRY

har’-lot-ri.

See CRIMES.

HARNEPHER

har’-ne-fer, har-ne’-fer (charnepher): A member of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:36).

HARNESS

har’-nes: A word of Celtic origin meaning "armour" in the King James Version; it is the translation of shiryan, "a coat of mail" (1Ki 22:34; 2Ch 18:33); of nesheq, "arms," "weapons" (2Ch 9:24, the Revised Version (British and American) "armor"); of ‘acar "to bind" (Jer 46:4), "harness the horses," probably here, "yoke the horses"; compare 1Sa 6:7, "tie the kine to the cart" (bind them), Ge 46:29; another rendering is "put on their accoutrements"; compare APC 1Macc 6:43, "one of the beasts armed with royal harness" (thorax), the Revised Version (British and American) "breastplates"; compare APC 1Macc 3:3, "warlike harness"; APC 1Macc 6:41 (hopla), the Revised Version (British and American) "arms"; APC 2Macc 3:25, etc.; harnessed represents chamushim, "armed," "girded" (Ex 13:18, "The children of Israel went up harnessed," the Revised Version (British and American) "armed"). Tyndale, Cranmer, Geneva have "harnes" in Lu 11:22, Wycliff "armer."

W. L. Walker

HAROD, WELL OF

ha’-rod (‘en charodh, "fountain of trembling"): The fountain beside which (probably above it) Gideon and his army were encamped (Jud 7:1). Moore (Judges, in the place cited.) argues, inconclusively, that the hill Moreh must be sought near Shechem, and that the well of Harod must be some spring in the neighborhood of that city. There is no good reason to question the accuracy of the common view which places this spring at ‘Ain Jalud, on the edge of the vale of Jezreel, about 2 miles East of Zer‘in, and just under the northern cliffs of Gilboa. A copious spring of clear cold water rises in a rocky cave and flows out into a large pool, whence it drains off, in Nahr Jalud, down the vale past Beisan to the Jordan. This is probably also to be identified with the spring "which is in Jezreel," i.e. in the district, near which Saul encamped before the battle of Gilboa (1Sa 29:1). ‘Ain el-Meiyiteh, just below Zer‘in on the North, is hardly of sufficient size and importance to be a rival to ‘Ain Jalud.

See ESDRAELON.

W. Ewing

HARODITE

ha’-rod-it (charodhi): Two of David’s heroes, Shamma and Elika, are so called (2Sa 23:25). Septuagint omits the second name. In 1Ch 11:27, the first is called "Shammoth the Harorite," while the second is omitted. "Harorite" is a clerical error for "Harodite," the Hebrew letter daleth ("d") being taken for the Hebrew letter resh ("r"). Possibly Harodite may be connected with the well of HAROD (which see).

HAROEH

ha-ro’-e (ha-ro’eh, "the seer"): A Judahite (1Ch 2:52).

HARORITE

ha’-ro-rit.

See HARODITE.

HAROSHETH, OF THE GENTILES, OF THE NATIONS

ha-ro’-sheth or (charosheth ha-goyim): There is now no means of discovering what is meant by the phrase "of the nations." This is the place whence Sisera led his hosts to the Kishon against Deborah and Barak (Jud 4:13), to which the discomfited and leaderless army fled after their defeat (Jud 4:16). No site seems so well to meet the requirements of the narrative as el Charithiyeh. There are still the remains of an ancient stronghold on this great double mound, which rises on the North bank of the Kishon, in the throat of the pass leading by the base of Carmel, from the coast to Esdraelon. It effectually commands the road which here climbs the slope, and winds through the oak forest to the plain; Megiddo being some 16 miles distant. The modern also preserves a reminiscence of the ancient name. By emending the text, Cheyne would here find the name "Kadshon," to be identified with Kedesh in Galilee (EB, under the word). On any reasonable reading of the narrative this is unnecessary.

W. Ewing

HARP

harp.

See MUSIC.

HARROW

har’-o (sadhadh): Sadhadh occurs in 3 passages (Job 39:10; Isa 28:24; Ho 10:11). In the first 2 it is translated "harrow," in the last "break the clods." That this was a separate operation from plowing, and

that it was performed with an instrument drawn by animals, seems certain. As to whether it corresponded to our modern harrowing is a question. The reasons for this uncertainty are:

(1) the ancient Egyptians have left no records of its use;

(2) at the present time, in those parts of Palestine and Syria where foreign methods have not been introduced, harrowing is not commonly known, although the writer has been told that in some districts the ground is leveled after plowing with the threshing-sledge or a log drawn by oxen. Cross-plowing is resorted to for breaking up the lumpy soil, especially where the ground has been baked during the long rainless summer. Lumps not reduced in this way are further broken up with a hoe or pick. Seed is always sown before plowing, so that harrowing to cover the seed is unnecessary. See AGRICULTURE. Figuratively used of affliction, discipline, etc. (Isa 28:24).

James A. Patch

HARROWS

har’-oz (chrits): Charits has no connection with the verb translated "harrows." The context seems to indicate some form of pointed instrument (2Sa 12:31; 1Ch 20:3; see especially the Revised Version margin).

HARSHA

har’-sha (charsha’): Head of one of the families of the Nethinim (Ezr 2:52; Ne 7:54); 1 Esdras 5:32, "Charea."

HARSITH

har’-sith (charcith): One of the gates of Jerusalem (Jer 19:2 the Revised Version (British and American)); margin suggests "gate of the potsherds"; the King James Version has "east gate" and the King James Version margin "sun gate," both deriving the name from cherec, "sun." The gate opened into the valley of Hinnom.

See JERUSALEM; POTSHERD.

HART

hart.

See DEER.

HARUM

ha’-rum, har’-um (charum): A Judahite (1Ch 4:8).

HARUMAPH

ha-roo’-maf (charumaph): Father of Jedaiah who assisted in repairing the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Ne 3:10).

HARUPHITE

ha-roo’-fit (charuphi, or chariphi); In 1Ch 12:5 Shephatiah, one of the companions of David, is called a Haruphite (K) or Hariphite (Q). If the latter be the correct reading, it is connected with HARIPH or perhaps HAREPH (which see).

HARUZ

ha’-ruz (charuts): Father of Meshullemeth, the mother of Amon, king of Judah (2Ki 21:19).

HARVEST

har’-vest (qatsir; therismos): To many of us, harvest time is of little concern, because in our complex life we are far removed from the actual production of our food supplies, but for the Hebrew people, as for those in any agricultural district today, the harvest was a most important season (Ge 8:22; 45:6). Events were reckoned from harvests (Ge 30:14; Jos 3:15; Jud 15:1; Ru 1:22; 2:23; 1Sa 6:13; 2Sa 21:9; 23:13). The three principal feasts of the Jews corresponded to the three harvest seasons (Ex 23:16; 34:21,22);

(1) the feast of the Passover in April at the time of the barley harvest (compare Ru 1:22);

(2) the feast of Pentecost (7 weeks later) at the wheat harvest (Ex 34:22), and

(3) the feast of Tabernacles at the end of the year (October) during the fruit harvest.

The seasons have not changed since that time. Between the reaping of the barley in April and the wheat in June, most of the other cereals are reaped. The grapes begin to ripen in August, but the gathering in for making wine and molasses (dibs), and the storing of the dried figs and raisins, is at the end of September. Between the barley harvest in April and the wheat harvest, only a few showers fall, which are welcomed because they increase the yield of wheat (compare Am 4:7). Samuel made use of the unusual occurrence of rain during the wheat harvest to strike fear into the hearts of the people (1Sa 12:17). Such an unusual storm of excessive violence visited Syria in 1912, and did much damage to the harvests, bringing fear to the superstitious farmers, who thought some greater disaster awaited them.

From the wheat harvest until the fruit harvest no rain falls (2Sa 21:10; Jer 5:24; compare Pr 26:1). The harvesters long for cool weather during the reaping season (compare Pr 25:13).

Many definite laws were instituted regarding the harvest. Gleaning was forbidden (Le 19:9; 23:22; De 24:19) (see GLEANING). The first-fruits were required to be presented to Yahweh (Le 23:10). In Syria the Christians still celebrate ‘id er-rubb ("feast of the Lord"), at which time the owners of the vineyards bring their first bunches of grapes to the church. The children of Israel were enjoined to reap no harvest for which they had not labored (Le 25:5). In Proverbs the harvesting of ants is mentioned as a lesson for the sluggard (Pr 6:8; 10:5; 20:4).

Figurative: A destroyed harvest typified devastation or affliction (Job 5:5; Isa 16:9; 17:11; Jer 5:17; 50:16). The "time of harvest," in the Old Testament frequently meant the day of destruction (Jer 51:33; Ho 6:11; Joe 3:13). "Joy in harvest" typified great joy (Isa 9:3); "harvest of the Nile," an abundant harvest (Isa 23:3). "The harvest is past" meant that the appointed time was gone (Jer 8:20). Yahweh chose the most promising time to cut off the wicked, namely, "when there is a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest" (Isa 18:4,5). This occurrence of hot misty days just before the ripening of the grapes is still common. They are welcome because they are supposed to hasten the harvest. The Syrian farmers in some districts call it et-tabbakh el’ainib wa tin ("the fireplace of the grapes and figs").

In the Gospels, Jesus frequently refers to the harvest of souls (Mt 9:37,38 bis; Mt13:30,39; Mr 4:29; Joh 4:35). In explaining the parable of the Tares he said, "The harvest is the end of the world" (Mt 13:39; compare Re 14:15).

See also AGRICULTURE.

James A. Patch

HASADIAH

has-a-di’-a (chacadhyah, "Yah is kind"): A son of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:20). In Baruch 1:1 the Greek is Asadias.

HASENUAH

has-e-nu’-a (haccenu’ah): In the King James Version (1Ch 9:7) for HASSENUAH (which see).

HASHABIAH

hash-a-bi’-a (chashabhyah):

(1) Two Levites of the family of Merari (1Ch 6:45; 9:14).

(2) A Levite who dwelt in Jerusalem at the time of Nehemiah (Ne 11:15).

(3) A son of Jeduthun (1Ch 25:3).

(4) A Hebronite, chief of a clan of warriors who had charge of West Jordan in the interests of Yahweh and the king of Israel (1Ch 26:30).

(5) A Levite who was a "ruler" (1Ch 27:17).

(6) One of the Levite chiefs in the time of Josiah, who gave liberally toward the sacrifices (2Ch 35:9). In 1 Esdras 1:9 it is "Sabias."

(7) A Levite whom Ezra induced to return from exile with him (Ezr 8:19). 1 Esdras 8:48 has "Asebias."

(8) One of the twelve priests set apart by Ezra to take care of the gold, the silver, and the vessels of the temple on their return from exile (Ezr 8:24; APC 1Esdras 8:54, "'Assamias").

(9) Ruler of half of the district of "Keilah," who helped to repair the walls under Nehemiah (Ne 3:17), and also helped to seal the covenant (Ne 10:11; 12:24).

(10) A Levite (Ne 11:22).

(11) A priest (Ne 12:21).

J. J. Reeve

HASHABNAH

ha-shab'-na (chashabhnah): One who helped to seal the covenant under Nehemiah (Ne 10:25).

HASHABNEIAH

hash-ab-ne-i'-a (chashabhneyah; the King James Version Hashabniah, hash-ab-ni'a).

(1) Father of one of the builders of the wall (Ne 3:10).

(2) A Levite mentioned in connection with the prayer preceding the signing of the covenant (Ne 9:5); possibly identical with the Hashabiah (chashabhyah) of Ezr 8:19,24; Ne 10:11; 11:22; 12:24, or one of these.

HASHBADANA; HASHBADNANA

hash-ba-da’-na, hash-bad’-a-na (chashbaddanah): Probably a Levite. He was one of those who stood at Ezra’s left hand when he read the law, and helped the people to understand the meaning (Ne 8:4). 1 Esdras 9:44 has "Nabarias" (Nabareias).

HASHEM

ha’-shem (hashem): The "sons of Hashem" are mentioned (1Ch 11:34) among David’s mighty men. The parallel passage (2Sa 23:32) has "sons of Jashen."

HASHMONAH

hash’-mo-na (chashmonah, "fatness"): A desert camp of the Israelites between Mithkah and Moseroth (Nu 33:29,30).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

HASHUB

ha’-shub, hash’-ub.

See HASSHUB.

HASHUBAH

ha-shoo’-ba (chashubhah, "consideration"): One of the sons of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:20).

HASHUM

ha’-shum (chashum):

(1) In Ezr 2:19; Ne 7:22, "children of Hashum" are mentioned among the returning exiles. In Ezr 10:33 (compare 1 Esdras 9:33, "Asom"), members of the same family are named among those who married foreign wives.

(2) One of those who stood on Ezra’s left at the reading of the law (Ne 8:4; APC 1Esdras 9:44, "Lothasubus"). The signer of the covenant (Ne 10:18) is possibly the same.

HASIDAEANS

has-i-de’-anz (Hasidaioi, a transliteration of chacidhim, "the pious," "Puritans"): A name assumed by the orthodox Jews (1 Macc 2:42; 7:13) to distinguish them from the Hellenizing faction described in the Maccabean books as the "impious," the "lawless," the "transgressors." They held perhaps narrow but strict and seriously honest views in religion, and recognized Judas Maccabeus as their leader (2 Macc 14:6). They existed as a party before the days of the Maccabees, standing on the ancient ways, caring little for politics, and having small sympathy with merely national aspirations, except when affecting religion (1 Macc 1:63; 2 Macc 6:18 ff; Judith 12:2; Ant, XIV, iv, 3). Their cooperation with Judas went only to the length of securing the right to follow their own religious practices. When Bacchides came against Jerusalem, they were quite willing to make peace because Alcimus, "a priest of the seed of Aaron," was in his company. Him they accepted as high priest, though sixty of them soon fell by his treachery (1 Macc 7:13). Their desertion of Judas was largely the cause of his downfall.

J. Hutchinson

HASMONEANS

See ASMONEANS.

HASRAH haz’-ra, has’-ra (chacrah): Grandfather of Shallum, who was the husband of Huldah the prophetess (2Ch 34:22). In 2Ki 22:14, HARHAS (which see).

HASSENAAH

has-e-na’-a (haccena’ah): In Ne 3:3 the "sons of Hassenaah" are mentioned among the builders of the wall. Probably the same as Senaah (Ezr 2:35; Ne 7:38) with the definite article, i.e. has-Senaah. The latter, from the connection, would appear to be a place-name.

See also HASSENUAH.

HASSENUAH

has-e-nu’-a (haccenu’ah): A family name in the two lists of Benjamite inhabitants of Jerusalem (1Ch 9:7, the King James Version "Hasenuah"; Ne 11:9, "Senuah"). The name is possibly the same as HASSENAAH (which see), yet the occurrence of the singular ("son of Hassenuah") does not so well accord with the idea of a place-name.

HASSHUB

hash’-ub (chashshubh, "considerate"; the King James Version everywhere Hashub except 1Ch 9:14):

(1) A builder of the wall (Ne 3:11).

(2) Another builder of the same name (Ne 3:23).

(3) One of the signers of the covenant (Ne 10:23).

(4) A Levite chief (Ne 11:15; 1Ch 9:14). BDB makes (1) and (3) identical.

HASSOPHERETH

has-o-fe’-reth.

See SOPHERETH.

HASTE

hast (chaphaz, chush, mahar; speudo): "Haste" (from a root meaning "to pursue") implies "celerity of motion."

(1) The noun occurs as translation of mahar, "to hasten," etc. (Ex 10:16; 12:33, "in haste"); of chapaz, "to make haste" (2Ki 7:15; Ps 31:22; 116:11, "I said in my haste (the Revised Version margin "alarm"), All men are liars"); of chippazon, a "hasty flight" (Ex 12:11; De 16:3; Isa 52:12); of nachats, "to be urgent" (1Sa 21:8, "The king’s business required haste").

(2) "Haste" as a verb is transitive and intrans; instances of the transitive use are, ‘uts, "to hasten," "press" (Ex 5:13, "And the taskmasters hasted them," the Revised Version (British and American) "were urgent"); chush, "to make haste" (Isa 5:19); mahar (2Ch 24:5 twice); shaqadh, "to watch," "to fix one’s attention" on anything (Jer 1:12 the King James Version, "I will hasten my word"); mahir, "hasting" (Isa 16:5, "hasting righteousness," the Revised Version (British and American) "swift to do"). The intransitive use is more frequent and represents many different words.

Hasty also occurs in several instances (Pr 21:5; 29:20, ‘uts, etc.); in Isa 28:4, bikkur, "first-fruit," is translated "hasty fruit," the Revised Version (British and American) "first-ripe fig."

The Revised Version (British and American) has "Haste ye" for "assemble yourselves" (Joe 3:11 margin, as the King James Version); "make haste" for "speedily" (Ps 143:7); "and hasted to catch whether it were his mind" (for 1Ki 20:33 the King James Version); "and it hasteth toward the end," margin (Hebrew) "panteth," for "but at the end it shall speak" (Hab 2:3); "hastily" for "suddenly" (1Ti 5:22); for "and for this I make haste" (Job 20:2), "even by reason of my haste that is in me," margin "and by reason of this my haste is within me"; for "hasten after another god" (Ps 16:4), the American Standard Revised Version has "that give gifts for another god," the English Revised Version "exchange

the Lord for"; for "hasten hereunto" (Ec 2:25), "have enjoyment"; for "hasten hither" (1Ki 22:9), "fetch quickly"; for "and gather" (Ex 9:19), "hasten in"; for "hasteneth that he may" (Isa 51:14), "shall speedily"; for "hasteth to" (Job 9:26), "swoopeth on"; for "and hasteth" (Job 40:23), "he trembleth"; for "hasty" (Da 2:15), "urgent."

W. L. Walker

HASUPHA

ha-sa'-fa (chasupha'): Head of a family of Nethinim among the returning exiles (Ezr 2:43; Ne 7:46). Ne 7:46 the King James Version has "Hashupha," and 1 Esdras 5:29, "Asipha."

HAT

The original word (karbela', Aramaic) rendered "hat" in Da 3:21 the King James Version is very rare, appearing only here in the Old Testament. There is acknowledged difficulty in translating it, as well as the other words of the passage. "Hat" of the King James Version certainly fails to give its exact meaning. The hat as we know it, i.e. headgear distinguished from the cap or bonnet by a circular brim, was unknown to the ancient East. The nearest thing to the modern hat among the ancients was the petasus worn by the Romans when on a journey, though something like it was used on like occasions by the early Greeks. In the earlier Hebrew writings there is little concerning the headgear worn by the people. In 1Ki 20:31 we find mention of "ropes" upon the head in connection with "sackcloth" on the loins. On Egyptian monuments are found pictures of Syrians likewise with cords tied about their flowing hair. The custom, however, did not survive, or was modified, clearly because the cord alone would afford no protection against the sun, to which peasants and travelers were perilously exposed. It is likely, therefore, that for kindred reasons the later Israelites used a head-covering similar to that of the modern Bedouin. This consists of a rectangular piece of cloth called keffiyeh, which is usually folded into triangular form and placed over the head so as to let the middle part hang down over the back of the neck and protect it from the sun, while the two ends are drawn as needed under the chin and tied, or thrown back over the shoulders. A cord of wool is then used to secure it at the top. It became customary still later for Israelites to use a head-covering more like the "turban" worn by the fella-heen today. It consists in detail of a piece of cotton cloth worked into the form of a cap (takiyeh), and so worn as to protect the other headgear from being soiled by the perspiration. A felt cap, or, as among the Turks, a fez or red tarbush, is worn over this. On the top of these is wound a long piece of cotton cloth with red stripes and fringes, a flowered kerchief, or a striped keffiyeh. This protects the head from the sun, serves as a sort of purse by day, and often as a pillow by night. Some such headgear is probably meant by the "diadem" of Job 29:14 and the "hood" of Isa 3:23, Hebrew tsaniph, from tsanaph, "to roll up like a coil" (compare Isa 22:18).

George B. Eager

HATACH

ha’-tak.

See HATHACH.

HATCHET

hach’-et (kashshil): Ps 74:6 the Revised Version (British and American), "hatchet," the King James Version "axes."

See AX.

HATE; HATRED

hat, ha’-tred (verb, sane’," oftenest," saTam, Ge 27:41, etc.; noun, sin’ah; miseo): A feeling of strong antagonism and dislike, generally malevolent and prompting to injury (the opposite of love); sometimes born of moral resentment. Alike in the Old Testament and New Testament, hate of the malevolent sort is unsparingly condemned (Nu 35:20; Ps 109:5; Pr 10:12; Tit 3:3; 1 Joh 3:15), but in the Old Testament hatred of evil and evil-doers, purged of personal malice, is commended (Ps 97:10; 101:3; 139:21,22, etc.). The New Testament law softens this feeling as regards persons, bringing it under the higher law of love (Mt 5:43,14; compare Ro 12:17-21), while intensifying the hatred of evil (Jude 1:23; Re 2:6). God himself is hated by the wicked (Ex 20:5; Ps 139:21; compare Ro 8:7). Sometimes, however, the word "hate" is used hyperbolically in a relative sense to express only the strong preference of one to another. God loved Jacob, but hated Esau (Mal 1:3; Ro 9:13); father and mother are to be hated in comparison with Christ (Lu 14:26; compare Mt 10:37).

See ENMITY.

James Orr

HATHACH

ha’-thak (hathakh; Septuagint Hachrathaios): One of the chamberlains of Ahasuerus, appointed to attend on Esther (Es 4:5,6,9,10, the King James Version "Hatach"), through whom she learned from Mordecai of Haman’s plot.

HATHATH

ha’-thath (chathath, "terror"): Son of Othniel and grandson of Kenaz (1Ch 4:13).

HATIPHA

ha-ti’-fa, hat’-i-fa (chaTipha’," taken," "captive" (?)): The ancestral head of a family of Nethinim that returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:54; Ne 7:56 =" Atipha," APC 1Esdras 5:32).

HATITA

ha-ti’-ta, hat’-i-ta (chaTiTa’): Head of a family among the "children of the porters" who returned from exile (Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45; APC 1Esdras 5:28, "Ateta").

HATSI-HAMMENUCHOTH

hat-si-ham-en-u’-koth: A marginal reading in 1Ch 2:52 the King James Version. It disappears in the Revised Version (British and American), which reads in text, "half of the MENUHOTH" (which see) (Hebrew chatsi ha-menuchoth).

HATTIL

hat’-il (chaTTil): A company of servants of Solomon appearing in the post-exilic literature (Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59). Same called "Agia" in 1 Esdras 5:34.

HATTUSH

hat’-ush (chaTTush):

(1) Son of Shemaiah, a descendant of the kings of Judah, in the 5th generation from Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:22). He returned with Zerubbabel and Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:2; Ne 12:2). (There is some doubt as to whether the Hatrush of the lineage of David and the priest of the same name, mentioned in Ne 10:4 and 12:2, are one and the same.) He was one of those who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:4).

(2) Son of Hashabneiah; aided Nehemiah to repair the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 3:10).

Horace J. Wolf

HAUNT

hont, hant: The verb in Old English was simply "to resort to," "frequent"; a place of dwelling or of business was a haunt. The noun occurs in 1Sa 23:22 as the translation of reghel, "foot," "See his place where his haunt is," the Revised Version margin, Hebrew ‘foot’ "; the verb is the translation of yashabh, "to sit down," "to dwell" (Eze 26:17, "on all that haunt it," the Revised Version (British and American)

"dwelt there," margin "inhabited her"), and of halakh, "to go,"‘ or "live" (1Sa 30:31, "all the places where David himself and his men were wont to haunt").

HAURAN

ho’-ran (chawran; Septuagint Auranitis, also with aspirate):

1. Extent of Province in Ancient Times:

A province of Eastern Palestine which, in Eze 47:16,18, stretched from Da in the North to Gilead in the South, including all that lay between the Jordan and the desert. It thus covered the districts now known as el-Jedur, el-Jaulan, and el-Chauran. It corresponded roughly with the jurisdiction of the modern Turkish governor of Hauran. The Auranites of later times answered more closely to the Hauran of today.

2. Modern Hauran:

The name Chauran probably means "hollow land." Between Jebel ed-Druze (see BASHAN (MOUNT OF) on the East, and Jedua and Jaulan (see GOLAN) on the West, runs a broad vale, from Jebel el ‘Aswad in the North, to the Yarmuk in the Southwest, and the open desert in the Southeast. It is from 1,500 to 2,000 ft. above sea-level, and almost 50 miles in length, by 45 in breadth. Chauran aptly describes it. To the modern Chauran are reckoned 3 districts, clearly distinguished in local speech:

3. En-Nuqrah:

(1) En-Nuqrah, "the cavity." This district touches the desert in the Southeast, the low range of ez Zumleh on the Southwest, Jaulan on the West, el-Leja’ on the North and, Jebel ed-Druze on the East. The soil, composed of volcanic detritus, is extraordinarily rich. Here and there may be found a bank of vines; but the country is practically treeless: the characteristic product is wheat, and in its cultivation the village population is almost wholly occupied.

4. El-Leja’:

(2) El-Leja’," the asylum." This is a rocky tract lying to the North of en-Nuqrah. It is entirely volcanic, and takes, roughly, the form of a triangle, with apex in the North at el Burak, and a base of almost 20 miles in the South. For the general characteristics of this district see TRACHONITIS. Its sharply marked border, where the rocky edges fall into the surrounding plain, have suggested to some the thought that here we have chebhel ‘argobh, "the measured lot of Argob." See, however, ARGOB. There is little land capable of cultivation, and the Arabs who occupy the greater part have an evil reputation. As a refuge for the hunted and for fugitives from justice it well deserves its name.

5. El-Jebel:

(3) El-Jebel, "the mountain." This is the great volcanic range which stands on the edge of the desert, protecting the fertile reaches of el-Chauran from encroachment by the sand, known at different times as Mons Asaldamus, Jebel Chauran, and Jebel ed-Druze. This last is the name it bears today in consequence of the settlement of Druzes here, after the massacre in Mt. Lebanon in 1860. Those free-spirited people have been a thorn in the side of the Turks ever since: and whether or not the recent operations against them (January, 1911) will result in their entire, subjugation, remains to be seen. The western slopes of the mountain are well cultivated, and very fruitful; vineyards abound; and there are large reaches of shady woodlands. Calkhad, marking the eastern boundary of the land of Israel, stands on the ridge of the mountain to the South Jebel el-Kuleib in which the range culminates, reaches a height of 5,730 ft. Jebel Chauran is named in the Mishna (Rosh ha-shanah, ii.4) as one of the heights from which fire-signals were flashed, announcing the advent of the new year. For its history see BASHAN. The ruins which are so plentiful in the country date for the most part from the early Christian centuries; and probably nothing above ground is older than the Roman period. The substructions, however, and the subterranean dwellings found in different parts, e.g. at Der‘ah, may be very ancient. The latest mention of a Christian building is in an inscription found by the present writer at el-Kufr, which tells of the foundation of a church in 720 AD (PEFS, July, 1895, p. 275, Inscr number 150). A good account of Hauran and its cities is given in HGHL, XXIX, 611.

W. Ewing

HAVE

hav: "To have" is to own or possess; its various uses may be resolved into this, its proper meaning.

A few of the many changes in the Revised Version (British and American) are, for "a man that hath friends" (Pr 18:24), "maketh many friends," margin (Hebrew) "a man of friends"; for "all that I have" (Lu 15:31), "all that is mine"; for "we have peace with God" (Ro 5:1) the English Revised Version has "let us have," margin "some authorities read we have," the American Standard Revised Version as the King James Version margin "many ancient authorities read let us have"; for "what great conflict I have" (Col 2:1), "how greatly I strive"; for "will have" (Mt 9:13; 12:7), "desire"; Mt 27:43, "desireth"; for "would have" (Mr 6:19; Ac 10:10), "desired"; Ac 16:27, "was about"; 19:30, "was minded to"; 23:28 "desiring"; Heb 12:17, "desired to"; for "ye have" (Heb 10:34), the English Revised Version has "ye yourselves have," margin "ye have your ownselves," the American Standard Revised Version "ye have for yourselves," margin "many ancient authorities read, ye have your own selves for a better possession" (compare Lu 9:25; 21:19); "having heard" for "after that ye heard" (Eph 1:13); "having suffered before," for "even after that we had suffered" (1Th 2:2); "and thus, having," for "so after he had" (Heb 6:15).

W. L. Walker

HAVEN

ha’-v’-n

(1) choph (Ge 49:13, the Revised Version margin "beach"; Jud 5:17, the Revised Version margin "shore," the King James Version "seashore," the King James Version margin "port"); elsewhere "sea-shore" (De 1:7; Jos 9:1; Jer 47:7) or "sea coast" (Eze 25:16); from root chaphaph, "to wash" or "to lave"; compare Arabic chaffa, "to rub"; and chaffat, "border"; Chufuf, in Eastern Arabia;

(2) machoz (Ps 107:30);

(3) limen (Ac 27:12 bis); also Fair Havens, kaloi limenes (Ac 27:8)):

While the Greek limen is "harbor," the Hebrew Choph is primarily "shore." There is no harbor worthy of the name on the shore of Palestine South of Chaifa. Indeed there is no good natural harbor on the whole coast of Syria and Palestine. The promontories of Carmel, Beirut and Tripolis afford shelter from the prevalent southwest wind, but offer no refuge from the fury of a northern gale. On rocky shores there are inlets which will protect sail boats at most times, but the ships of the ancients were beached in rough weather, and small craft are so treated at the present time. See illustration under BITHYNIA, p. 483.

Alfred Ely Day

HAVENS, FAIR

ha’-v’-nz.

See FAIR HAVENS.

HAVILAH

hav’-i-la (chawilah; Heuila):

(1) Son of Cush (Ge 10:7; 1Ch 1:9).

(2) Son of Yoktan, descendant of Shem (Ge 10:29; 1Ch 1:23).

(3) Mentioned with Shur as one of the limits of the territory of the Ishmaelites (Ge 25:18); compare the same limits of the land of the Amalekites (1Sa 15:7), where, however, the text is doubtful. It is described (Ge 2:11,12) as bounded by the river Pishon and as being rich in gold, bdellium and "shoham-stone" (English Version of the Bible, "onyx"). The shoham-stone was perhaps the Assyrian samtu, probably the malachite or turquoise. The mention of a Cushite Havilah is explained by the fact that the Arabian tribes at an early time migrated to the coast of Africa. The context of Ge 10:7 thus favors situation on the Ethiopian shore, and the name is perhaps preserved in the kolpos Aualites and in the

tribe Abalitai on the South side of the straits of Babel-Mandeb. Or possibly a trace of the name appears in the classical Aualis, now Zeila‘ in Somaliland. But its occurrence among the Yoktanite Arabs (Ge 10:29) suggests a location in Arabia. South Arabian inscriptions mention a district of Khaulan (Chaulan), and a place of this name is found both in Tihama and Southeast of San‘a’. Again Strabo’s Chaulotaioi and Chuwaila in Bahrein point to a district on the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf. No exact identification has yet been made.

A. S. Fulton

HAVOC

hav’-ok: "Devastation," "to make havoc of" is the translation of lumainomai, "to stain," "to disgrace"; in the New Testament "to injure," "destroy" (Ac 8:3, "As for Saul he made havoc of the church," the Revised Version (British and American) "laid waste"; APC 1Macc 7:7, "what havoc," the Revised Version (British and American) "all the havock," exolothreusis, "utter destruction").

The Revised Version has "made havoc of" (portheo) for "destroyed" (Ac 9:21; Ga 1:23), for "wasted" (Ga 1:13).

HAVVAH

hav’-a (chawwah): Hebrew spelling, rendered Eve, "mother of all living," Ge 3:20 the Revised Version margin.

See EVE.

HAVVOTH-JAIR

hav-oth-ja’-ir (chawwoth ya’ir "the encampments" or "tent villages of Jair"; the King James Version Havoth-Jair, ha-voth-ja’ir): The word chawwoth occurs only in this combination (Nu 32:41; De 3:14; Jud 10:4), and is a legacy from the nomadic stage of Hebrew life. Jair had thirty sons who possessed thirty "cities," and these are identified with Havvoth-jair in Jud 10:3 ff. The district was in Gilead (10:5; Nu 32:41). In De 3:13 f, it is identified with Bashan and Argob; but in 1Ki 4:13, "the towns of Jair" are said to be in Gilead; while to him also "pertained the region of Argob, which is in Bashan, threescore great cities with walls and brazen bars." There is evident confusion here. If we follow Jud 10:3 ff, we may find a useful clue in 10:5. Kamon is named as the burial place of Jair. This probably corresponds to Kamun taken by Antiochus III, on his march from Pella to Gephrun (Polyb. v.70, 12). Schumacher (Northern ‘Ajlun, 137) found two places to the West of Irbid with the names Qamm and Qumeim (the latter a diminutive of the former) with ancient ruins. Qamm probably represents the Hebrew Qamon, so that Havvoth-jair should most likely be sought in this district, i.e. in North Gilead, between the Jordan Valley and Jebel ez-Zumleh.

W. Ewing

HAWK

hok (nets; hierax, and glaux; Latin Accipiter nisus): A bird of prey of the genus accipiter. Large hawks were numerous in Palestine. The largest were 2 ft. long, have flat heads, hooked beaks, strong talons and eyes appearing the keenest and most comprehensive of any bird. They can sail the length or breadth of the Holy Land many times a day. It is a fact worth knowing that mist and clouds interfere with the vision of birds and they hide, and hungry and silent wait for fair weather, so you will see them sailing and soaring on clear days only. These large hawks and the glede are of eagle-like nature, nesting on Carmel and on the hills of Galilee, in large trees and on mountain crags. They flock near Beersheba, and live in untold numbers in the wilderness of the Dead Sea. They build a crude nest of sticks and twigs and carry most of the food alive to their young. Of course they were among the birds of prey that swarm over the fresh offal from slaughter and sacrifice. No bird steers with its tail in flight in a more pronounced manner than the hawk. These large birds are all-the-year residents, for which reason no doubt the people distinguished them from smaller families that migrated. They knew the kite that Isaiah mentioned in predicting the fall of Edom. With them the smaller, brighter-colored kestrels, that flocked over the rocky shores of the Dead Sea and over the ruins of deserted cities, seemed to be closest in appearance to the birds we include in the general term "falcon." Their ate mice, insects and small birds, but not carrion. The abomination lists of Le 11:16 and De 14:15 each include hawks in a general term and specify several species as unfit for food. Job 39:26 reads:

"Is it by thy wisdom that the hawk soareth,

And stretcheth her wings toward the south?"

Aside from calling attention to the miraculous flight, , this might refer to migration, or to the wonderful soaring exhibitions of these birds.

See GLEDE; KITE; NIGHT HAWK; FALCON.

Gene Stratton-Porter

HAY

ha.

See GRASS.

HAZAEL

ha-za’-el, ha’-za-el, haz’-a-el (chaza’-el and chazah’-el; Hazael; Assyrian haza’ilu):

1. In Biblical History:

Comes first into Biblical history as a high officer in the service of Ben-hadad II, king of Syria (2Ki 8:7 ff; compare 1Ki 19:15 ff). He had been sent by his sick sovereign to inquire of the prophet Elisha, who was then in Damascus, whether he should recover of his sickness or not. He took with him a present "even of every good thing of Damascus, forty camels’ burden," and stood before the man of God with his master’s question of life or death. To it Elisha made the oracular response, "Go, say unto him, Thou shalt surely recover; howbeit Yahweh hath showed me that he shall surely die." Elisha looked steadfastly at Hazael and wept, explaining to the incredulous officer that he was to be the perpetrator of horrible cruelties against the children of Israel: "Their strongholds wilt thou set on fire, and their young men wilt thou slay with the sword, and wilt dash in pieces their little ones, and rip up their women with child" (2Ki 8:12). Hazael protested against the very thought of such things, but Elisha assured him that Yahweh had shown him that he was to be king of Syria. No sooner had Hazael delivered to his master the answer of the man of God than the treacherous purpose took shape in his heart to hasten Ben-hadad’s end, and "He took the coverlet, and dipped it in water, and spread it on his face, so that he died: and Hazael reigned in his stead" (2Ki 8:15). The reign which opened under such sinister auspices proved long and successful, and brought the kingdom of Syria to the zenith of its power. Hazael soon found occasion to invade Israel. It was at Ramoth-gilead, which had already been the scene of a fierce conflict between Israel and Syria when Ahab met his death, that Hazael encountered Joram, the king of Israel, with whom his kinsman, Ahaziah, king of Judah, had joined forces to retain that important fortress which had been recovered from the Syrians (2Ki 9:14,15). The final issue of the battle is not recorded, but Joram received wounds which obliged him to return across the Jordan to Jezreel, leaving the forces of Israel in command of Jehu, whose anointing by Elisha’s deputy at Ramoth-gilead, usurpation of the throne of Israel, slaughter of Joram, Ahaziah and Jezebel, and vengeance upon the whole house of Ahab are told in rapid and tragic succession by the sacred historian (2Ki 9; 10).

Whatever was the issue of this attack upon Ramoth-gilead, it was not long before Hazael laid waste the whole country East of the Jordan—"all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is by the valley of the Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan" (2Ki 10:33; compare Am 1:3). Nor did Judah escape the heavy hand of the Syrian oppressor. Marching southward through the plain of Esdraelon, and following a route along the maritime plain taken by many conquerors before and since, Hazael fought against Gath and took it, and then "set his face to go up to Jerus" (2Ki 12:17). As other kings of Judah had to do with other conquerors, Jehoash, who was now on the throne, bought off the invader with the gold and the treasures of temple and palace, and Hazael withdrew his forces from Jerusalem.

Israel, however, still suffered at the hands of Hazael and Ben-hadad, his son, and the sacred historian mentions that Hazael oppressed Israel all the days of Jehoahaz, the son of Jehu. So grievous was the oppression of the Syrians that Hazael "left not to Jehoahaz, of the people save fifty horsemen, and ten chariots, and ten thousand footmen; for the king of Syria destroyed them, and made them like the dust in threshing" (2Ki 13:1-7). Forty or fifty years later Amos, in the opening of his prophecy, recalled those

Syrian campaigns against Israel when he predicted vengeance that was to come upon Damascus. "Thus saith Yahweh .... I will send a fire into the house of Hazael, and it shall devour the palaces of Ben-hadad" (Am 1:3,4).

2. In the Monuments:

Already, however, the power of Syria had passed its meridian and had begun to decline. Events of which there is no express record in the Biblical narrative were proceeding which, ere long, made it possible for the son of Jehoahaz, Joash or Jehoash, to retrieve the honor of Israel and recover the cities that had been lost (2Ki 13:25). For the full record of these events we must turn to the Assyrian annals preserved in the monuments. We do read in the sacred history that Yahweh gave Israel "a saviour, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians" (2Ki 13:5). The annals of the Assyrian kings give us clearly and distinctly the interpretation of this enigmatic saying. The relief that came to Israel was due to the crippling of the power of Syria by the aggression of Assyria upon the lands of the West. From the Black Obelisk in the British Museum, on which Shalmaneser II (860-825 BC) has inscribed the story of the campaign he carried on during his long reign, there are instructive notices of this period of Israelite history. In the 18th year of his reign (842 BC), Shalmaneser made war against Hazael. On the Obelisk the record is short, but a longer account is given on one of the pavement slabs from Nimroud, the ancient Kalab. It is as follows: "In the 18th year of my reign for the 16th time I crossed the Euphrates. Hazael of Damascus trusted to the strength of his armies and mustered his troops in full force. Senir (Hermon), a mountain summit which is in front of Lebanon, he made his stronghold. I fought with him; his defeat I accomplished; 600 of his soldiers with weapons I laid low; 1,121 of his chariots, 470 of his horses, with his camp I took from him. To save his life, he retreated; I pursued him; in Damascus, his royal city, I shut him up. His plantations I cut down. As far as the mountains of the Hauran I marched. Cities without number I wrecked, razed, and burnt with fire. Their spoil beyond count I carried away. As far as the mountains of Baal-Rosh, which is a headland of the sea (at the mouth of the Nahr el-Kelb, Dog River), I marched; my royal likeness I there set up. At that time I received the tribute of the Syrians and Sidonians and of Yahua (Jehu) the son of Khumri (Omri)" (Ball, Light from the East, 166; Schrader, COT, 200 f). From this inscription we gather that Shalmaneser did not succeed in the capture of Damascus. But it still remained an object of ambition to Assyria, and Ramman-nirari III, the grandson of Shalmaneser, succeeded in capturing it, and reduced it to subjection. It was this monarch who was "the saviour" whom God raised up to deliver Israel from the hand of Syria. Then it became possible for Israel under Jehoash to recover the cities he had lost, but by this time Hazael had died and Ben-hadad, his son, Ben-hadad III, called Mari on the monuments, had become king in his stead (2Ki 13:24,25).

LITERATURE.

Schrader, COT, 197-208; McCurdy, HPM, I, 282 ff.

T. Nicol.

HAZAIAH

ha-za’-ya (chazayah, "Jah sees"): Among the inhabitants of Jerusalem mentioned in the list of Judahites in Ne 11:5.

HAZAR

ha’-zar (chatsar, construct of chatser, "an enclosure," "settlement," or "village"): Is frequently the first element in Hebrew place-names.

1. Hazar-addar:

Hazar-addar (Hebrew chatsar ‘addar), a place on the southern boundary of Judah (Nu 34:4), is probably identical with Hazron (Jos 15:3), which, in this case, however, is separated from Addar (the King James Version "Adar"). It seems to have lain somewhere to the Southwest of Kadesh-barnea.

2. Hazar-enan:

Hazar-enan (Hebrew chatsar ‘enan, "village of springs": enan is Aramaic; Once (Eze 47:17) it is called Enon), a place, unidentified, at the junction of the northern and eastern frontiers of the land promised to Israel (Nu 34:9 f; compare Eze 47:17; 48:1). To identify it with the sources of the Orontes seems to leave too great a gap between this and the places named to the South. Buhl (GAP, 66 f) would draw the northern boundary from Nahr el-Qasimiyeh to the foot of Hermon, and would locate Hazar-enan at Banias. The springs there lend fitness to the name; a condition absent from el-Chadr, farther east, suggested by von Kesteren. But there is no certainty.

3. Hazar-gaddah:

Hazar-gaddah (Hebrew hatsar-gaddah), a place in the territory of Judah "toward the border of Edom in the South" (Jos 15:21,27). Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Gadda") places it in the uttermost parts of the Daroma, overlooking the Dead Sea. This might point to the site of Masada, or to the remarkable ruins of Umm Bajjaq farther south (GAP, 185).

4. Hazar-hatticon:

Hazar-hatticon (the Revised Version (British and American) HAZER-HATTICON; Hebrew chatser ha-tikhon, "the middle village"), a place named on the ideal border of Israel (Eze 47:16). The context shows that it is identical with Hazar-enan, for which this is apparently another name. Possibly, however, it is due to a scribal error. 5. Hazarmaveth:

Hazarmaveth (Hebrew chatsarmaweth), the name of a son of Joktan attached to a clan or district in South Arabia (Ge 10:26; 1Ch 1:20). It is represented by the modern Chadramaut, a broad and fruitful valley running nearly parallel with the coast for about 100 miles, north of el-Yemen. The ruins and

inscriptions found by Glaser show that it was once the home of a great civilization, the capital being Sabata (Ge 10:7) (Glaser, Skizze, II, 20, 423 ff).

6. Hazar-shual:

Hazar-Shual (Hebrew chatsar shu‘al), a place in the South of Judah (Jos 15:28) assigned to Simeon (Jos 19:3; 1Ch 4:28). It was reoccupied after the exile (Ne 11:27). Sa‘weh on a hill East of Beersheba has been suggested; but there is no certainty.

7. Hazar-susah:

Hazar-susah (Hebrew chatsar cucah, Jos 19:5), Hazar-susim (Hebrew chatsar cucim, 1Ch 4:31). As it stands, the name means "station of a mare" or "of horses," and it occurs along with Beth-marcaboth, "place of chariots," which might suggest depots for trade in chariots and horses. The sites have not been identified.

W. Ewing

HAZAR-ADDAR; HAZAR-ENAN; HAZAR-GADDAH; HAZAR-HATTICON; HAZAR-MAVETH; HAZAR-SHUAL; HAZAR-SUSA; HAZAR-SUSIM

ad’-ar; e’-nan; gad’-a; hat’-i-kon; ma’-veth; shoo’-al; su’-sa; su’-sim.

See HAZAR.

HAZAZON-TAMAR

haz’-a-zan-ta’-mar (chatsatson tamar; the King James Version Hazezon Tamar): "Hazazon of the palm trees," mentioned (Ge 14:7) as a place of the Amorites, conquered, together with En-mishpat and the country of the Amalekites, by Chedorlaomer; in 2Ch 20:2 it is identified with EN-GEDI (which see); and if so, it must have been its older name. If this identification be accepted, then Hazazon may survive in the name Wady Husasah, Northwest of ‘Ain Jidy. Another suggestion, which certainly meets the needs of the narrative better, is that Hazazon-tamar is the Thamara of Eusebius, Onomasticon (85 3; 210 86), the Thamaro, of Ptol. xvi.3. The ruin Kurnub, 20 miles West-Southwest of the South end of the Dead Sea—on the road from Hebron to Elath—is supposed to mark this site.

E. W. G. Masterman

HAZEL

ha’-z’-l (Ge 30:37 the King James Version).

See ALMOND.

HAZELELPONI

haz-el-el-po’-ni.

See HAZZELELPONI.

HAZER-HATTICON; HAZARHATTICON

ha’-zer-hat’-i-kon.

See HAZAR.

HAZERIM

ha-ze’-rim, haz’-er-im (chatserim): Is rendered in the King James Version (De 2:23) as the name of a place in the Southwest of Palestine, in which dwelt the Avvim, ancient inhabitants of the land. The word means "villages," and ought to be translated as in the Revised Version (British and American). The sentence means that the Avvim dwelt in villages—not in fortified towns—before the coming of the Caphtorim, the Philistines, who destroyed them.

HAZEROTH

ha-ze’-roth, haz’-er-oth (chatseroth, "enclosures"): A camp of the Israelites, the 3rd from Sinai (Nu 11:35; 12:16; 33:17; De 1:1). It is identified with ‘Ain Chadrah ("spring of the enclosure"), 30 miles Northeast of Jebel Musa, on the way to the ‘Arabah.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

HAZEZON-TAMAR

haz’-e-zon-ta’-mar chatsatson tamar, Ge 14:7 the King James Version; chatstson tamar, 2Ch 20:2).

See HAZAZON-TAMAR.

HAZIEL

ha’-zi-el (chazi’el, "God sees"): A Levite of the sons of Shimei, of David’s time (1Ch 23:9).

HAZO

ha’-zo (chazo, fifth son of Nahor (Ge 22:22)): Possibly the eponym of a Nahorite family or clan.

HAZOR

ha’-zor (chatsor; Nasor; Codex Sinaiticus, Asor, 1 Macc 11:67):

(1) The royal city of Jabin (Jos 11:1), which, before the Israelite conquest, seems to have been the seat of a wide authority (Jos 11:11). It was taken by Joshua, who exterminated the inhabitants, and it was the only city in that region which he destroyed by fire (11:11-13). At a later time the Jabin Dynasty appears to have recovered power and restored the city (Jud 4:2). The heavy defeat of their army at the hands of Deborah and Barak led to their final downfall (Jud 4:23). It was in the territory allotted to Naphtali (Jos 19:36). Hazor was one of the cities for the fortification of which Solomon raised a levy (1Ki 9:15). Along with other cities in Galilee, it was taken by Tiglathpileser III (2Ki 15:29). In the plain of Hazor, Jonathan the Maccabee gained a great victory over Demetrius (1 Macc 11:67 ff). In Tobit 12 it is called "Asher" Septuagint Aser), and Kedesh is said to be "above" it. Josephus (Ant., V, v, 1) says that Hazor was situated over the lake, Semechonitis, which he evidently identifies with the Waters of Merom (Jos 11:13). It must clearly be sought on the heights West of el-Chuleh. Several identifications have been suggested, but no certain conclusion can be reached. Some (Wilson and Guerin) favor Tell Harreh to the Southeast of Qedes, where there are extensive ruins. Robinson thought of Tell Khureibeh, 2 1/2 miles South of Qedes, where, however, there are no ruins. We may take it as certain that the ancient name of Hazor is preserved in Merj el-Chadireh, Southwest of Qedes, and North of Wady ‘Uba, and in Jebel Chadireh, East of the Merj, although it has evidently drifted from the original site, as names have so often done in Palestine. Conder suggests a possible identification with Chazzur, farther South, "at the foot of the chain of Upper Galilee .... in position more appropriate to the use of the chariots that belonged to the king of Hazor" (HDB, under the word).

(2) A town, unidentified, in the South of Judah (Jos 15:23).

(3) A town in the South of Judah (Jos 15:25).

See KERIOTH-HEZRON.

(4) A town in Benjamin (Ne 11:33) now represented by Khirbet Chazzar, not far to the East of Neby Samwil.

(5) An unidentified place in Arabia, smitten by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 49:28,33).

W. Ewing

HAZOR-HADATTAH

ha’-zor-ha-dat’-a (Aramaic chatsor chadhattah, "New Hazor"): "An Aramaic adjective, however, in this region is so strange that the reading must be questioned" (Di). One of the "uttermost cities .... of Judah toward the border of Edom" (Jos 15:25). Eusebius and Jerome describe a "New Hazor" to the East of Ascalon, but this is too far North.

HAZZELELPONI

haz-e-lel-po’-ni (hatstselelponi): A feminine name occurring in the list of the genealogy of Judah (1Ch 4:3); probably representing a clan.

HE

ha: The fifth letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "h." It came also to be used for the number 5. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

HEAD

hed (ro’-sh, Aramaic re’sh, and in special sense gulgoleth, literally, "skull," "cut-off head" (1Ch 10:10), whence Golgotha (Mt 27:33; Mr 15:22; Joh 19:17); mera’ashah, literally, "head-rest," "pillow," "bolster" (1Ki 19:6); qodhqodh, literally, crown of the head (De 28:35; 33:16,20; 2Sa 14:25; Isa 3:17; Jer 48:45); barzel, "the head of an axe" (De 19:5, the Revised Version margin "iron"; 2Ki 6:5); lehabhah, lahebheth, "the head of a spear" (1Sa 17:7); kephale): The first-mentioned Hebrew word and its Aramaic form are found frequently in their literal as well as metaphorical sense. We may distinguish the following meanings:

1. Used of Men:

By a slight extension of meaning, "head" occasionally stands for the person itself. This is the case in all passages where evil is said to return or to be requited upon the head of a person (see below).

2. Used of Animals:

The word is also used in connection with the serpent’s head (Ge 3:15), the head of the sacrificial ram, bullock and goat (Ex 29:10,15,19; Le 4:4,24), the head of leviathan (Job 41:7, Hebrew 40:31).

3. The Head-Piece:

It is used also as representing the top or summit of a thing, as the capital of column or pillar (Ex 36:38; 38:28; 2Ch 3:15); of mountains (Ex 19:20; Nu 21:20; Jud 9:7; Am 1:2; 9:3); of a scepter (Es 5:2); of a

ladder (Ge 28:12); of a tower (Ge 11:4).

4. Beginning, Source, Origin:

As a fourth meaning the word occurs (Pr 8:23; Ec 3:11; Isa 41:4) in the sense of beginning of months (Ex 12:2), of rivers (Ge 2:10), of streets or roads (Isa 51:20; Eze 16:25; 21:21).

As a leader, prince, chief, chieftain, captain (or as an adjective, with the meaning of foremost, uppermost), originally: "he that stands at the head"; compare "God is with us at our head" (2Ch 13:12); "Knowest thou that Yahweh will take away thy master from thy head?" (2Ki 2:3); "head-stone" the Revised Version (British and American) "top stone," i.e. the upper-most stone (Zec 4:7).

5. Leader, Prince:

Israel is called the head of nations (De 28:13); "The head (capital) of Syria is Damascus, and the head (prince) of Damascus is Rezin" (Isa 7:8); "heads of their fathers' houses," i.e. elders of the clans (Ex 6:14); compare "heads of tribes" (De 1:15), also "captain," literally, head (Nu 14:4; De 1:15; 1Ch 11:42; Ne 9:17). The phrase "head and tail" (Isa 9:14; 19:15) is explained by the rabbis as meaning the nobles and the commons among the people; compare "palm-branch and rush" (Isa 9:14), "hair of the feet .... and beard" (Isa 7:20), but compare also Isa 9:15. In the New Testament we find the remarkable statement of Christ being "the head of the church" (Eph 1:22; 5:23), "head of every man" (1Co 11:3), "head of all principality and power" (Col 2:10), "head of the body, the church" (Col 1:18; compare Eph 4:15). The context of 1Co 11:3 is very instructive to a true understanding of this expression: "I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God" (compare Eph 5:23). Here, clearly, reference is had to the lordship of Christ over His church, not to the oneness of Christ and His church, while in Eph 4:16 the dependence of the church upon Christ is spoken of. These passages should not therefore be pressed to include the idea of Christ being the intellectual center, the brain of His people, from whence the members are passively governed, for to the Jewish mind the heart was the seat of the intellect, not the head.

See HEART.

6. Various Uses:

As the head is the most essential part of physical man, calamity and blessing are said to come upon the head of a person (Ge 49:26; De 33:16; Jud 9:57; 1Sa 25:39; 2Ch 6:23; Eze 9:10; 11:21; 16:43; 22:31). For this reason hands are placed upon the head of a person on which blessings are being invoked (Ge 48:14,17,18; Mt 19:15) and upon the sacrificial animal upon which sins are laid (Ex 29:15; Le 1:4; 4:29,33). Responsibility for a deed is also said to rest on the head of the doer (2Sa 1:16; 3:29; 1Ki 8:32; Ps 7:16; Ac 18:6). The Bible teaches us to return good for evil (Mt 5:44), or in the very idiomatic Hebrew style, to "heap coals of fire upon (the) head" of the adversary (Pr 25:22; Ro 12:20). This phrase is dark as to its origin, but quite clear as to its meaning and application (compare Ro 12:17,19,21). The

Jew was inclined to swear by his head (Mt 5:36), as the modern Oriental swears by his beard. The head is said to be under a vow (Nu 6:18,19; Ac 18:18; 21:23), because the Nazirite vow could readily be recognized by the head.

There are numerous idiomatic expressions connected with the head, of which we enumerate the following: "the hoary head" designates old age (see HAIR); "to round the corners of the head," etc. (Le 19:27; compare also De 14:1; Am 8:10), probably refers to the shaving of the side locks or the whole scalp among heathen nations, which was often done in idolatrous shrines or in token of initiation into the service of an idol. It was therefore forbidden to Israel, and its rigid observance gave rise to the peculiar Jewish custom of wearing long side locks (see HAIR). "Anointing the head" (Ps 23:5; 92:10; Heb 1:9) was a sign of joy and hospitality, while the "covering of the head" (2Sa 15:30; Es 6:12; Jer 14:3), "putting the hand upon the head" (2Sa 13:19) and putting earth, dust or ashes upon it (Jos 7:6; 1Sa 4:12; 2Sa 12; 13:19; La 2:10; compare Am 2:7) were expressive of sadness, grief, deep shame and mourning. In Es 7:8 Haman’s face is covered as a condemned criminal, or as one who has been utterly put to shame, and who has nothing more to say for his life.

In this connection the Pauline injunction as to the veiling of women in the public gatherings of the Christians (1Co 11:5), while men were instructed to appear bareheaded, must be mentioned. This is diametrically opposed to the Jewish custom, according to which men wore the head covered by the Tallith or prayer shawl, while women were considered sufficiently covered by their long hair (1Co 11:15). The apostle here simply commends a Greek custom for the congregation residing among Greek populations; in other words, he recommends obedience to local standards of decency and good order.

"To bruise the head" (Ge 3:15) means to injure gravely; "to smite through the head" (Ps 68:21) is synonymous with complete destruction. "To shake or wag the head" (Ps 22:7; 44:14; 64:8; Jer 18:16; 48:27; La 2:15; Mt 27:39; Mr 15:29) conveys the meaning of open derision and contempt. "To bow down the head" (Isa 58:5) indicates humility, sadness and mourning, but it may also be a mere pretense for piety. (Sirach 19:26).

H. L. E. Luering

HEADBAND

hed’-band.

See DRESS.

HEADDRESS

hed’dres.

See DRESS.

HEADSTONE

hed’-ston.

See CORNER-STONE.

HEADSTRONG

hed’-strong.

See HEADY.

HEADTIRE

hed’-tir.

See BONNET; DRESS.

HEADY

hed’i: The translation in the King James Version of propetes, "falling forward," trop. "prone," "ready to do anything," "precipitate," "headlong" (2Ti 3:4, "heady, high-minded," etc., the Revised Version (British and American) "headstrong"; in Ac 19:36, the only other place in the New Testament where propetes occurs, the King James Version has "rashly," the Revised Version (British and American) "rash"). "Headstrong signifies strong in the head or the mind, and heady, full of one’s own head" (Crabb, English Synonyms). "Heady confidence promises victory without contest" (Johnson).

HEAL

hel (rapha’; therapeuo, iaomai, diasozo): The English word is connected with the Anglo-Saxon hoelan, and is used in several senses:

(1) Lit., in its meaning of making whole or well, as in Ec 3:3. In this way it occurs in prayers for restoration to health (Nu 12:13; Ps 6:2; Jer 17:14); and also in declarations as to God’s power to restore to health (De 32:39; 2Ki 20:5-8).

(2) Metaphorically it is applied to the restoration of the soul to spiritual health and to the repair of the injuries caused by sin (Ps 41:4; Jer 30:17).

(3) The restoration and deliverance of the afflicted land is expressed by it in 2Ch 7:14; Isa 19:22.

(4) It is applied to the forgiveness of sin (Jer 3:22).

In the New Testament, therapeuo is used 10 times in describing our Lord's miracles, and is translated "heal." Iaomai is used to express spiritual healing (Mt 13:15; Lu 5:17; Joh 12:40), and also of curing bodily disease (Joh 4:47). Diasozo, meaning "to heal thoroughly," is used in Lu 7:3 the King James Version where the Revised Version (British and American) renders it "save." The act of healing is called iasis twice, in Ac 4:22,30; sozo, to save or deliver, is translated "made whole" by the Revised Version (British and American) in Mr 5:23; Lu 8:36; Ac 14:9, but is "healed" in the King James Version. Conversely "made whole" the King James Version in Mt 15:28 is replaced by "healed" in the Revised Version (British and American).

Healed is used 33 times in the Old Testament as the rendering of the same Hebrew word, and in the same variety of senses. It is also used of purification for an offense or breach of the ceremonial law (2Ch 30:20); and to express the purification of water which had caused disease (2Ki 2:21,22). Figuratively, the expression "healed slightly" (the English Revised Version "lightly") is used to describe the futile efforts of the false prophets and priests to remedy the backsliding of Israel (Jer 6:14; 8:11); here the word for "slightly" is the contemptuous term, qalal, which means despicably or insignificantly. In Eze 30:21, the word "healed" is the rendering of the feminine passive participle, rephu'ah and is better translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "apply healing medicines." In the New Testament "healed" usually occurs in connection with the miracles of our Lord and the apostles. Here it is worthy of note that Luke more frequently uses the verb iaomai than therapeuo, in the proportion of 17 to 4, while in Matthew and Mark the proportion is 4 to 8.

Healer (chabhash) occurs once in Isa 3:7; the word literally means a "wrapper up" or "bandager."

Alexander Macalister

HEALING

hel'-ing (marpe', te'alah, kehah): In the Old Testament this word is always used in its figurative sense; marpe', which literally means "a cure," is used in Jer 14:19 twice, and in Mal 4:2; te'alah, which literally means "an irrigation canal," here means something applied externally, as a plaster, in which sense it is used metaphorically in Jer 30:13; kehah occurs only in Na 3:19 the King James Version and is translated "assuagings" in the Revised Version (British and American).

In the New Testament 5 times the verb is therapeuo; once (Ac 10:38) iaomai; in the other passages it is either iama, as in 1Co 12:9-30, or iasis, as in Ac 4:22, derivatives from this verb

HEALING, GIFTS OF

(charismata iamaton): Among the "spiritual gifts" enumerated in 1Co 12:4-11,28 are included "gifts of healings." See SPIRITUAL GIFTS. The subject has risen into much prominence of recent years, and so calls for separate treatment. The points to be considered are:

(1) the New Testament facts,

(2) the nature of the gifts,

(3) their permanence in the church.

1. The New Testament Facts:

The Gospels abundantly show that the ministry of Christ Himself was one of healing no less than of teaching (compare Mr 1:14 f with 1:32-34). When He sent forth the Twelve (Mr 6:7,13) and the Seventy (Lu 10:1,9), it was not only to preach the Kingdom of God but to heal the sick. The inauthentic conclusion of Mark's Gospel, if it does not preserve words actually used by Christ Himself, bears witness at all events to the traditional belief of the early church that after His departure from the world His disciples would still possess the gift of healing. The Book of Ac furnishes plentiful evidence of the exercise of this gift by apostles and other prominent men in the primitive church (Ac 3:7 f; 5:12-16; 8:7; 19:12; 28:8 f), and the Epistle of James refers to a ministry of healing carried on by the elders of a local church acting in their collective capacity (Jas 5:14 f). But Paul in this passage speaks of "gifts of healings" (the plural "healings" apparently refers to the variety of ailments that were cured) as being distributed along with other spiritual gifts among the ordinary members of the church. There were men, it would seem, who occupied no official position in the community, and who might not otherwise be distinguished among their fellow-members, on whom this special charisma of healing had been bestowed.

2. The Nature of the Gifts:

On this subject the New Testament furnishes no direct information, but it supplies evidence from which conclusions may be drawn. We notice that the exercise of the gift is ordinarily conditional on the faith of the recipient of the blessing (Mr 6:5,6; 10:52; Ac 14:9)—faith not only in God but in the human agent (Ac 3:4 ff; 5:15; 9:17). The healer himself is a person of great faith (Mt 17:19 f), while his power of inspiring the patient with confidence points to the possession of strong, magnetic personality. The diseases cured appear for the most part to have been not organic but functional; and many of them would now be classed as nervous disorders. The conclusion from these data is that the gifts of healing to which Paul alludes were not miraculous endowments, but natural therapeutic faculties raised to their highest power by Christian faith.

Modern psychology, by its revelation of the marvels of the subliminal self or subconscious mind and the power of "suggestion," shows how it is possible for one man to lay his hand on the very springs of personal life in another, and so discloses the psychical basis of the gift of healing. The medical science

of our time, by its recognition of the dependence of the physical upon the spiritual, of the control of the bodily functions by the subconscious self, and of the physician's ability by means of suggestion, whether waking or hypnotic, to influence the subconscious soul and set free the healing powers of Nature, provides the physiological basis. And may we not add that many incontestable cases of Christian faith-cure (take as a type the well-known instance in which Luther at Weimar "tore Melanchthon," as the latter put it, "out of the very jaws of death"; see RE, XII, 520) furnish the religious basis, and prove that faith in God, working through the soul upon the body, is the mightiest of all healing influences, and that one who by his own faith and sympathy and force of personality can stir up faith in others may exercise by God's blessing the power of healing diseases?

3. Permanence of Healing Gifts in the Church:

There is abundant evidence that in the early centuries the gifts of healing were still claimed and practiced within the church (Justin, Apol. ii.6; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. ii. 32, 4; Tertullian, Apol. xxiii; Origen, Contra Celsum, vii.4). The free exercise of these gifts gradually ceased, partly, no doubt, through loss of the early faith and spirituality, but partly through the growth of an ascetic temper which ignored Christ's gospel for the body and tended to the view that pain and sickness are the indispensable ministers of His gospel for the soul. All down the history of the church, however, there have been notable personalities (e.g. Francis of Assisi, Luther, Wesley) and little societies of earnest Christians (e. g. the Waldenses, the early Moravians and Quakers) who have reasserted Christ's gospel on its physical side as a gospel for sickness no less than for sin, and claimed for the gift of healing the place Paul assigned to it among the gifts of the Spirit. In recent years the subject of Christian healing has risen into importance outside of the regularly organized churches through the activity of various faith-healing movements. That the leaders of these movements have laid hold of a truth at once Scriptural and scientific there can be little doubt, though they have usually combined it with what we regard as a mistaken hostility to the ordinary practice of medicine. It is worth remembering that with all his faith in the spiritual gift of healing and personal experience of its power, Paul chose Luke the physician as the companion of his later journeys; and worth noticing that Luke shared with the apostle the honors showered upon the missionaries by the people of Melita whom they had cured of their diseases (Ac 28:10). Upon the modern church there seems to lie the duty of reaffirming the reality and permanence of the primitive gift of healing, while relating it to the scientific practice of medicine as another power ordained of God, and its natural ally in the task of diffusing the Christian gospel of health.

LITERATURE.

Hort, Christian Ecclesia, chapter x; A.T. Schofield, Force of Mind, Unconscious Therapeutics; E. Worcester and others, Religion and Medicine; HJ, IV, 3, p. 606; The Expositor T, XVII, 349, 417.

J. C. Lambert

HEALTH

helth (shalom, yeshu‘ah, ‘arukhah; riph’uth, ‘arukhah; soteria, hugiaino): Shalom is part of the formal salutation still common in Palestine. In this sense it is used in Ge 43:28; 2Sa 20:9; the stem word means "peace," and is used in many varieties of expression relating to security, success and good bodily health. Yeshu‘ah, which specifically means deliverance or help, occurs in the refrain of Ps 42:11; 43:5, as well as in Ps 67:2; in the American Standard Revised Version it is rendered "help." Riph’uth is literally, "healing," and is found only in Pr 3:8. Marpe’ also means healing of the body, but is used in a figurative sense as of promoting soundness of mind and moral character in Pr 4:22; 12:18; 13:17; 16:24, as also in Jer 8:15, where the Revised Version (British and American) renders it "healing." ‘Arukhah is also used in the same figurative sense in Isa 58:8; Jer 8:22; 30:17; 33:6; literally means "repairing or restoring"; it is the word used of the repair of the wall of Jerusalem by Nehemiah (chapter 4).

The word "health" occurs twice in the New Testament: in Paul’s appeal to his shipmates to take food (Ac 27:34), he says it is for their soteria, literally, "safety"; so the American Standard Revised Version, the King James Version "health." The verb hugianino is used in 3 Joh 1:2, in the apostle’s salutation to Gaius.

Alexander Macalister

HEAP

hep (‘aremah, gal, nedh, tel): "Heap" appears

(1) in the simple sense of a gathering or pile, as the translation of ‘aremah, a "heap," in Ru 3:7 of grain; Ne 4:2 of stones; in 2Ch 31:6, etc., of the tithes, etc.; of chomer (boiling up), a "heap"; in Ex 8:14 of frogs; of gal, a "heap"; in Job 8:17 of stones.

(2) As indicating "ruin," "waste," gal (2Ki 19:25; Job 15:28; Isa 25:2; 37:26; Jer 9:11; 51:37); me‘i (Isa 17:1); ‘i (Ps 79:1; Jer 26:18; Mic 1:6; 3:12); tel, "mound," "hillock," "heap" (De 13:16; Jos 8:28; Jer 30:18 the King James Version; Jer 49:2).

(3) Of waters, nedh, "heap," "pile" (Ex 15:8; Jos 3:13,16; Ps 33:7; 78:13); chomer (Hab 3:15, "the heap of mighty waters," the Revised Version margin "surge").

(4) A cairn, or heap of stones (a) over the dead body of a dishonored person, gal (Jos 7:26; 8:29; 2Sa 18:17); (b) as a witness or boundary-heap (Ge 31:46 f, Gal‘edh (Galeed) in Hebrew, also mitspah, "watch tower," Yeghar-Sahadhutha’ (Jegar-sahadutha) in Aramaic, both words meaning "the heap of witness"; see Ge 31:47,49 the Revised Version (British and American)).

(5) As a way mark, tamrurim, from tamar, "to stand erect" (Jer 31:21 the King James Version, "Set thee up waymarks, make thee high heaps," the Revised Version (British and American) "guide-posts," a more likely translation).

"To heap" represents various single words: chathah, "to take," "to take hold of," with one exception, applied to fire or burning coals (Pr 25:22, "Thou writ heap coals of fire upon his head," "Thou wilt take coals of fire (and heap them) on his head"); caphah, "to add" (De 32:23); tsabhar, "to heap up" (Hab 1:10); kabhats, "to press together" (with the fingers or hand) (Hab 2:5); rabhah, "to multiply" (Eze 24:10); episoreuo, "to heap up upon" (2Ti 4:3, they "will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts"); soreuo, "to heap up" (Ro 12:20, "Thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head"); thesaurizo, "to lay up" (as treasure) (Jas 5:3 the King James Version, "Ye have heaped treasure together," the Revised Version (British and American) "laid up"); tsabhar, "to heap up," "to heap" or "store up" (Job 27:16, "silver"; Ps 39:6, "riches"; Zec 9:3, "silver,"); sum, sim "to place," "set," "put" (Job 36:13 the King James Version, "The hypocrites in heart heap up wrath," the Revised Version (British and American) "They that are godless in heart lay up anger"). In Jud 15:16 we have chamor, chamorothayim, "with the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps," the Revised Version margin "heap, two heaps"; one of Samson’s sayings; chamor means "an ass," chomer "a heap."

For "heap up words" (Job 16:4), the Revised Version (British and American) has "join together"; for "shall be a heap" (Isa 17:11), "fleeth away," margin "shall be a heap"; "heap" for "number" (Na 3:3); the English Revised Version "heap of stones" for "sling," margin as the King James Version and the American Standard Revised Version (Pr 26:8); "in one heap" for "upon a heap" (Jos 3:16); "he heapeth up (dust)" for "they shall heap" (Hab 1:10).

W. L. Walker

HEART

hart (lebh, lebhabh; kardia): The different senses in which the word occurs in the Old Testament and the New Testament may be grouped under the following heads:

1. Various Meanings:

It represents in the first place the bodily organ, and by easy transition those experiences which affect or are affected by the body. Fear, love, courage, anger, Joy, sorrow, hatred are always ascribed to the heart —especially in the Old Testament; thus courage for which usually ruach is used (Ps 27:14); joy (Ps 4:7); anger (De 19:6, "while his heart is hot," lebhabh); fear (1Sa 25:37); sorrow (Ps 13:2), etc.

Hence, naturally it came to stand for the man himself (De 7:17; "say in thine heart," Isa 14:13).

2. Heart and Personality:

As representing the man himself, it was considered to be the seat of the emotions and passions and appetites (Ge 18:5; Le 19:17; Ps 104:15), and embraced likewise the intellectual and moral faculties— though these are necessarily ascribed to the "soul" as well. This distinction is not always observed.

3. Soul and Heart:

"Soul" in Hebrew can never be rendered by "heart"; nor can "heart" be considered as a synonym for "soul." Cremer has well observed: "The Hebrew nephesh ("soul") is never translated kardia ("heart"). .... The range of the Hebrew nephesh, to which the Greek psuche alone corresponds, differs so widely from the ideas connected with psuche, that utter confusion would have ensued had psuche been employed in an unlimited degree for lebh ("heart"). The Biblical lebh never, like psuche, denotes the personal subject, nor could it do so. That which in classical Greek is ascribed to psuche (a good soul, a just soul, etc.) is in the Bible ascribed to the heart alone and cannot be otherwise" (Cremer, Lexicon, article "Kardia," 437 ff, German edition).

4. Center of Vital Action:

In the heart vital action is centered (1Ki 21:7). "Heart," except as a bodily organ, is never ascribed to animals, as is the case sometimes with nephesh and ruach (Le 17:11, nephesh; Ge 2:19; Nu 16:22; Ge 7:22, ruach). "Heart" is thus often used interchangeably with these two (Ge 41:8; Ps 86:4; 119:20); but "it never denotes the personal subject, always the personal organ."

5. Heart and Mind:

As the central organ in the body, forming a focus for its vital action, it has come to stand for the center of its moral, spiritual, intellectual life. "In particular the heart is the place in which the process of self-consciousness is carried out, in which the soul is at home with itself, and is conscious of all its doing and suffering as its own" (Oehler). Hence, it is that men of "courage" are called "men of the heart"; that the Lord is said to speak "in his heart" (Ge 8:21); that men "know in their own heart" (De 8:5); that "no one considereth in his heart' (Isa 44:19 the King James Version). "Heart" in this connection is sometimes rendered "mind," as in Nu 16:28 ("of mine own mind," Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) ex proprio corde, Septuagint ap' emautou); the foolish "is void of understanding," i.e. "heart" (Pr 6:32, where the Septuagint renders phrenon, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) cordis, Luther "der ist ein Narr"). God is represented as "searching the heart" and "trying the reins" (Jer 17:10 the King James Version). Thus, "heart" comes to stand for "conscience," for which there is no word in Hebrew, as in Job 27:6, "My heart shall not reproach me," or in 1Sa 24:5, "David's heart smote him"; compare 1Sa 25:31. From this it appears, in the words of Owen: "The heart in Scripture is variously used, sometimes for the mind and understanding, sometimes for the will, sometimes for the affections, sometimes for the conscience, sometimes for the whole soul. Generally, it denotes the whole soul of man and all the faculties of it, not absolutely, but as they are all one principle of moral operations, as they all concur in our doing of good and evil."

6. Figurative Senses:

The radical corruption of human nature is clearly taught in Scripture and brought into connection with the heart. It is "uncircumcised" (Jer 9:26; Eze 44:7; compare Ac 7:51); and "hardened" (Ex 4:21);

"wicked" (Pr 26:23); "perverse" (Pr 11:20); "godless" (Job 36:13); "deceitful and desperately wicked" (Jer 17:9 the King James Version). It defiles the whole man (Mt 15:19,20); resists, as in the case of Pharaoh, the repeated call of God (Ex 7:13). There, however, the law of God is written (Ro 2:15); there the work of grace is wrought (Ac 15:9), for the "heart" may be "renewed" by grace (Eze 36:26), because the "heart" is the seat of sin (Ge 6:5; 8:21).

7. Process of Heart Renewal:

This process of heart-renewal is indicated in various ways. It is the removal of a "stony heart" (Eze 11:19). The heart becomes "clean" (Ps 51:10); "fixed" (Ps 112:7) through "the fear" of the Lord (verse 1); "With the heart man believeth" (Ro 10:10); on the "heart" the power of God is exercised for renewal (Jer 31:33). To God the bereaved apostles pray as a knower of the heart (Ac 1:24—a word not known to classical writers, found only here in the New Testament and in Ac 15:8, kardiognostes). In the "heart" God’s Spirit dwells with might (Eph 3:16, eis ton eso anthropon); in the "heart" God’s love is poured forth (Ro 5:5). The Spirit of His son has been "sent forth into the heart" (Ga 4:6); the "earnest of the Spirit" has been given "in the heart" (2Co 1:22). In the work of grace, therefore, the heart occupies a position almost unique.

8. The Heart First:

We might also refer here to the command, on which both the Old Testament and New Testament revelation of love is based: "Thou shalt love Yahweh thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might" (De 6:5); where "heart" always takes the first place, and is the term which in the New Testament rendering remains unchanged (compare Mt 22:37; Mr 12:30,33; Lu 10:27, where "heart" always takes precedence).

9. A Term for "Deepest":

A bare reference may be made to the employment of the term for that which is innermost, hidden, deepest in anything (Ex 15:8; Jon 2:3), the very center of things. This we find in all languages. Compare Eph 3:16,17, "in the inward man," as above.

J. I. Marais

HEARTH

harth: Occurs 7 times in the King James Version: Ge 18:6; Ps 102:3; Isa 30:14; Jer 36:22,23 bis; Zec 12:6; 4 times in the Revised Version: Le 6:9; Isa 30:14; Eze 43:15,16 ("altar hearth"); compare also Isa 29:1 the Revised Version margin. It will be noted that the renderings of the two versions agree in only one passage (Isa 30:14).

(1) The hearth in case of a tent was nothing more than a depression in the ground in which fire was

kindled for cooking or for warmth. Cakes were baked, after the fashion of Ge 18:6, in the ashes or upon hot stones. In this passage, however, there is nothing in the Hebrew corresponding to the King James Version "on the hearth." In the poorer class of houses also the hearth consisted of such a depression, of varying dimensions, in the middle or in one corner of the room. There was no chimney for the smoke, which escaped as it could, or through a latticed opening for the purpose (the "chimney" of Ho 13:3). While the nature of the hearth is thus clear enough, more or less uncertainty attaches to specific terms used in the Hebrew. In Isa 30:14 the expression means simply "that which is kindled," referring to the bed of live coals. From this same verb (yaqadh, "be kindled") are formed the nouns moqedh (Ps 102:3 (Hebrew 4)) and moqkedhah (Le 6:9 (Hebrew 2)) which might, according to their formation, mean either the material kindled or the place where a fire is kindled. Hence, the various renderings, "firebrand," "hearth," etc. Moreover, in Le 6:9 (2) the termination -ah of moqedhah may be taken as the pronominal suffix, "its"; hence, the Revised Version margin "on its firewood."

(2) Two other terms have reference to heating in the better class of houses. In Jer 36:22,23 the word (’ach) means a "brazier" of burning coals, with which Jehoiakim’s "winter house" was heated. The same purpose was served by the "pan (kiyyor) of fire" of Zec 12:6 the Revised Version (British and American), apparently a wide, shallow vessel otherwise used for cooking (1Sa 2:14, English Versions of the Bible "pan"), or as a wash basin (compare Ex 30:18; 1Ki 7:38, etc., "laver").

(3) Another class of passages is referred to the signification "altar hearth," which seems to have been a term applied to the top of the altar of burnt offering. The moqedhah of Le 6:9 (2), though related by derivation to the words discussed under (1) above, belongs here (compare also Ecclesiasticus 50:12, "by the hearth of the altar," par’ eschara bomou). Again in Ezekiel’s description of the altar of the restored temple (43:15,16), he designates the top of the altar by a special term (the Revised Version margin, ariel), which is by most understood to mean "altar hearth" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). With this may be compared the symbolical name given to Jerusalem (Isa 29:1), and variously explained as "lion (or lioness) of God," or "hearth of God."

Benjamin Reno Downer

HEARTILY

har’-ti-li: Occurs (Col 3:23) as the translation of ek psuches, "out of the soul," "Whatsoever ye do, do it heartily as unto the Lord (who sees the heart and recompenses "whatsoever good thing a man does") and not unto men" (however they, your masters according to the flesh, may regard it); the Revised Version (British and American) "work heartily," margin (Greek) "from the soul."

In 2 Macc 4:37, we have "Antiochus was heartily sorry," psuchikos ("from the soul").

HEAT

het (chom, horebh, "drought," Job 30:30; Isa 4:6; 25:4; Jer 36:30; sharabh, Isa 49:10, translated in the

Revised Version margin "mirage"; zestos, "fervent," Re 3:15, therme, Ac 28:3, kauma, Re 7:16, kauson, Mt 20:12; see MIRAGE):

1. Dreaded in Palestine:

The heat of the summer is greatly dreaded in Palestine, and as a rule the people rest under cover during the middle of the day, when the sun is hottest. There is no rain from May to October, and scarcely a cloud in the sky to cool the air or to screen off the burning vertical rays of the sun. The first word of advice given to visitors to the country is to protect themselves from the sun. Even on the mountains, where the temperature of the air is lower, the sun is perhaps more fierce, owing to the lesser density of the atmosphere.

2. Causes Disease:

This continuous summer heat often causes sunstroke, and the glare causes diseases of the eye which affect a large percentage of the people of Palestine and Egypt.

3. Relief Sought:

It is to be expected that in these times of heat and drought the ideal pleasure has come to be to sit in the shade by some cool flowing fountain. In the mountains the village which has the coolest spring of water is the most desired. These considerations give renewed meaning to the passages: "as cold waters to a thirsty soul" (Pr 25:25); "He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside still waters" (Ps 23:2). What a blessing to be "under the shadow of the Almighty" (Ps 91:1), where "the sun shall not strike upon them, nor any heat" (Re 7:16)!

4. Midday Heat:

The middle of the day is often referred to as the "heat of the day" (1Sa 11:11). It made a great difference to the army whether it could win the battle before the midday heat. Saladin won the great battle at Hattin by taking advantage of this fact. It was a particular time of the day when it was the custom to rest. "They came about the heat of the day to the house of Ish-bosheth, as he took his rest at noon" (2Sa 4:5). Yahweh appeared to Abraham as "he sat in the tent door in the heat of the day" (Ge 18:1). The hardship of working throughout the day is expressed in Mt 20:12, "who have borne the burden of the day and scorching heat." Sometimes just after sunrise the contrast of the cold of night and the heat of the sun is especially noticeable. "The sun ariseth with the scorching wind" (Jas 1:11).

5. Summer Heat:

In summer the wind is usually from the Southwest, but in case it is from the South it is sure to be hot. "When ye see a south wind blowing, ye say, There will be a scorching heat" (Lu 12:55). The heat on a damp, sultry day, when the atmosphere is full of dust haze is especially oppressive, and is referred to in

Isa 25:5 as "the heat by the shade of a cloud." The heat of summer melts the snow on the mountains and causes all vegetation to dry up and wither. Ice and snow vanish in the heat thereof (Job 6:17), "Drought and heat consume the snow waters" (Job 24:19). But the "tree planted by the waters, that spreadeth out its roots by the river .... shall not fear when heat cometh, but its leaf shall be green" (Jer 17:8).

6. Figurative Uses:

The word is used often in connection with anger in the Scriptures: "hot anger" (Ex 11:8); "hot displeasure" (De 9:19); "anger of the Lord was hot against Israel" (Jud 2:14 the King James Version); "thine anger from waxing hot" (Ps 85:3 King James Version, margin); "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot" (Re 3:15).

Alfred H. Joy

HEATH

heth.

See TAMARISK.

HEATHEN

he’-th’-n, he’-then.

See GENTILES.

HEAVE OFFERING

hev of’-er-ing.

See SACRIFICE.

HEAVEN

hev’-’n.

See ASTRONOMY.

HEAVEN, HOST OF

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 1.

HEAVEN, ORDINANCES OF

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 1; II, 13.

HEAVEN, WINDOWS OF

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 4.

HEAVENLY

hev’-’n-li (ouranios, epouranios): Pertaining to heaven or the heavens. See HEAVENS. The phrase ta epourania, translated "heavenly things" in Joh 3:12; Heb 8:5; 9:23, but in Ephesians "heavenly places" (Joh 1:3,10; 2:6; 3:10; 6:12), has shades of meaning defined by the context. In Joh 3:12, in contrast with "earthly things" (i.e. such as can be brought to the test of experience), it denotes truths known only through revelation (God’s love in salvation). In Hebrews the sense is local. In Ephesians it denotes the sphere of spiritual privilege in Christ, except in 6:12, where it stands for the unseen spiritual world, in which both good and evil forces operate. It is always the sphere of the super-earthly.

James Orr

HEAVENS

hev’-’nz (shamayim; ouranoi): On the physical heavens see ASTRONOMY; WORLD. Above these, in popular conception, were the celestial heavens, the abode of God and of the hosts of angels (Ps 11:4; 103:19-21; Isa 66:1; Re 4:2; 5:11; compare Da 7:10), though it was recognized that Yahweh’s presence was not confined to any region (1Ki 8:27). Later Judaism reckoned seven heavens. The apostle Paul speaks of himself as caught up into "the third heaven," which he evidently identifies with Paradise (2Co 12:2).

See HEAVENLY.

HEAVENS, NEW (AND EARTH, NEW)

1. Eschatological Idea

2. Earliest Conceptions: Cosmic verses National Type

3. Different from Mythological Theory

4. Antiquity of Cosmical Conception

5. The Cosmical Dependent on the Ethico-Religious

6. The End Correspondent to the Beginning

7. The Cosmical Heavens: Hebrews 12:26-29

8. Palingenesis: Matthew 19:28

9. A Purified Universe

1. Eschatological Idea:

The formal conception of new heavens and a new earth occurs in Isa 65:17; 66:22; 2Pe 3:13; Re 21:1 (where "heaven," singular). The idea in substance is also found in Isa 51:16; Mt 19:28; 2Co 5:17; Heb 12:26-28. In each case the reference is eschatological, indeed the adjective "new" seems to have acquired in this and other connections a semi-technical eschatological sense. It must be remembered that the Old Testament has no single word for "universe," and that the phrase "heaven and earth" serves to supply the deficiency. The promise of a new heavens and a new earth is therefore equivalent to a promise of world renewal.

2. Earliest Conceptions: Cosmic verses National Type:

It is a debated question how old in the history of revelation this promise is. Isaiah is the prophet with whom the idea first occurs in explicit form, and that in passages which many critics would assign to the post-exilic period (the so-called Trito-Isaiah). In general, until recently, the trend of criticism has been to represent the universalistic-cosmic type of eschatology as developed out of the particularistic-national type by a gradual process of widening of the horizon of prophecy, a view which would put the emergence of the former at a comparatively late date. More recently, however, Gressmann (Der Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie, 1905) and others have endeavored to show that often even prophecies belonging to the latter type embody material and employ means of expression which presuppose acquaintance with the idea of a world-catastrophe at the end. On this view the world-eschatology would have, from ancient times, existed alongside of the more narrowly confined outlook, and would be even older than the latter. These writers further assume that the cosmic eschatology was not indigenous among the Hebrews, but of oriental (Babylonian) origin, a theory which they apply not only to the more developed system of the later apocalyptic writings, but also to its preformations in the Old Testament. The cosmic eschatology is not believed to have been the distinctive property of the great ethical prophets, but rather a commonly current mythological belief to which the prophets refer without formally endorsing it.

3. Different from Mythological Theory:

Its central thought is said to have been the belief that the end of the world-process must correspond to the beginning, that consequently the original condition of things, when heaven and earth were new, must repeat itself at some future point, and the state of paradise with its concomitants return, a belief supposed to have rested on certain astronomical observations.

4. Antiquity of Cosmical Conception

While this theory in the form presented is unproven and unacceptable, it deserves credit for having focused attention on certain phenomena in the Old Testament which clearly show that Messianic prophecy, and particularly the world-embracing scope which it assumes in some predictions, is far older than modern criticism had been willing to concede. The Old Testament from the beginning has an eschatology and puts the eschatological promise on the broadest racial basis (Ge 3). It does not first ascend from Israel to the new humanity, but at the very outset takes its point of departure in the race and from this descends to the election of Israel, always keeping the Universalistic goal in clear view. Also in the earliest accounts, already elements of a cosmical universalism find their place side by side with those of a racial kind, as when Nature is represented as sharing in the consequences of the fall of man.

5. The Cosmical Dependent on the Ethico-Religious:

As regards the antiquity of the universalistic and cosmical eschatology, therefore, the conclusions of these writers may be registered as a gain, while on the two other points of the pagan origin and the unethical character of the expectation involved, dissent from them should be expressed. According to the Old Testament, the whole idea of world-renewal is of strictly super-natural origin, and in it the cosmical follows the ethical hope. The cosmical eschatology is simply the correlate of the fundamental Biblical principle that the issues of the world-process depend on the ethico-religious developments in the history of man (compare 2Pe 3:13).

6. The End Correspondent to the Beginning:

But the end correspondent to the beginning is likewise a true Scriptural principle, which theory in question has helped to reemphasize, although there is this difference that Scripture does not look forward to a repetition of the same process, but to a restoration of the primeval harmony on a higher plane such as precludes all further disturbance. In the passages above cited, there are clear reminiscences of the account of creation (Isa 51:16, "that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth"; Isa 65:17, "I create new heavens and a new earth"; 2Pe 3:13 compared with 2Pe 3:4-6; Re 21:1 compared with the imagery of paradise throughout the chapter). Besides this, where the thought of the renewal of earth is met with in older prophecy, this is depicted in colors of the state of paradise (Isa 11:6-9; Ho 2:18-21). The "regeneration" (palingenesia) of Mt 19:28 also points back to the first genesis of the world. The ‘inhabited earth to come’ (oikoumene mellousa) of Heb 2:5 occurs at the opening of a context throughout which the account of Ge 1-3 evidently stood before the writer’s mind.

7. The Cosmical Heavens: Hebrews 12:26-29:

In the combination "new heavens and a new earth," the term "heavens" must therefore be taken in the sense imposed upon it by the story of creation, where "heavens" designates not the celestial habitation of God, but the cosmical heavens, the region of the supernal waters, sun moon and stars. The Bible nowhere suggests that there is anything abnormal or requiring renewal in God's dwelling-place (Heb 9:23 is of a different import). In Re 21, where "the new heaven and the new earth" appear, it is at the same time stated that the new Jerusalem comes down from God out of heaven (compare 21:1,2,10). In Heb 12:26-28 also the implication is that only the lower heavens are subject to renewal. The "shaking" that accompanies the new covenant and corresponds to the shaking of the law-giving at Sinai, is a shaking of "not the earth only, but also the heaven." This shaking, in its reference to heaven as well as to earth, signifies a removal of the things shaken. But from the things thus shaken and removed (including heaven), the writer distinguishes "those things which are not shaken," which are destined to remain, and these are identified with the kingdom of God. The kingdom of God, however, according to the general trend of the teaching of the epistle, has its center in the heavenly world. The words "that have been made," in 12:27, do not assign their created character as the reason why heaven and earth can be shaken, an exegesis which would involve us in the difficulty that among that which remains there is something uncreated besides God; the true construction and correct paraphrase are: "as of things that were made with the thought in the mind of God that those things which cannot be shaken may remain," i.e. already at creation God contemplated an unchangeable universe as the ultimate, higher state of things.

8. Palingenesis: Matthew 19:28:

In Mt 19:28 the term palingenesia marks the world-renewing as the renewal of an abnormal state of things. The Scripture teaching, therefore, is that around the center of God's heaven, which is not subject to deterioration or renewal, a new cosmical heaven and a new earth will be established to be the dwelling-place of the eschatological humanity. The light in which the promise thus appears reminds us that the renewed kosmos, earth as well as cosmical heavens, is destined to play a permanent (not merely provisional, on the principle of chiliasm) part in the future life of the people of God. This is in entire harmony with the prevailing Biblical representation, not only in the Old Testament but likewise in the New Testament (compare Mt 5:5; Heb 2:5), although in the Fourth Gospel and in the Pauline Epistles the emphasis is to such an extent thrown on the heaven-centered character of the future life that the role to be played in it by the renewed earth recedes into the background. Revelation, on the other hand, recognizes this element in its imagery of "the new Jerus" coming down from God out of heaven upon earth.

9. A Purified Universe:

That the new heavens and the new earth are represented as the result of a "creation" does not necessarily involve a production ex nihilo. The terms employed in 2Pe 3:6-13 seem rather to imply that the renewal will out of the old produce a purified universe, whence also the catastrophe is compared to that of the Deluge. As then the old world perished by water and the present world arose out of the flood, so in the

end-crisis "the heavens shall be dissolved by fire and the elements melt with fervent heat," to give rise to the new heaven and the new earth in which righteousness dwells. The term palingenesia (Mt 19:28) points to renewal, not to creation de novo. The Talmud also teaches that the world will pass through a process of purification, although at the same time it seems to break up the continuity between this and the coming world by the fantastic assumption that the new heavens and the new earth of Isa 65:17 were created at the close of the Hexemeron of Ge 1. This was inferred from the occurrence of the article in Isa 66:22, "the new heavens and the new earth."

Geerhardus Vos

HEAVY; HEAVINESS

hev'-i, hev'-i-nes (kabhedh, de'aghah; lupe):

1. Literal:

Heavy (heave, to lift) is used literally with respect to material things, as the translation of kobhedh, "heaviness" (Pr 27:3, "a stone is heavy"); of kabhedh, "to be weighty" (1Sa 4:18; 2Sa 14:26; La 3:7); of 'amac, "to load" (Isa 46:1 the King James Version; compare Mt 26:43; Mr 14:40; Lu 9:32, "Their eyes were heavy"); bareomai, "to be weighed down."

2. Figuratively:

It is used

(1) for what is hard to bear, oppressive, kabhedh (Ex 18:18; Nu 11:14; 1Sa 5:6,11; Ps 38:4; Isa 24:20); motah, a "yoke" (Isa 58:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "bands of the yoke"); qasheh, "sharp," "hard" (1Ki 14:6, "heavy tidings"); barus, "heavy" (Mt 23:4);

(2) for sad, sorrowful (weighed down), mar, "bitter" (Pr 31:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "bitter"); ra', "evil" (Pr 25:20); ademoneo, literally, "to be sated," "wearied," then, "to be very heavy," "dejected" (Mt 26:37, of our Lord in Gethsemane, "(he) began to be sorrowful and very heavy," the Revised Version (British and American) "sore troubled"); "ademonein denotes a kind of stupefaction and bewilderment, the intellectual powers reeling and staggering under the pressure of the ideas presented to them" (Mason, The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth); compare Mr 14:33;

(3) morose, sulky, as well as sad, car, "sullen," "sour," "angry" (1Ki 20:43; 21:4, "heavy and displeased");

(4) dull, kabhedh (Isa 6:10, "make their ears heavy"; Isa 59:1, "neither (is) his ear heavy");

(5) "tired" seems to be the meaning in Ex 17:12, "Moses' hands were heavy" (kabhedh); compare Mt 26:43 and parallels above.

Heavily is the translation of kebhedhuth, "heaviness" (Ex 14:25), meaning "with difficulty"; of qadhar, "to be black," "to be a mourner" (Ps 35:14 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "I bowed down mourning"); of kabhedh (Isa 47:6).

Heaviness has always the sense of anxiety, sorrow, grief, etc.; de'aghah, "fear," "dread," "anxious care" (Pr 12:25, "Heaviness in the heart of a man maketh it stoop," the Revised Version margin "or care"); kehah, "to be feeble," "weak" (Isa 61:3, "the spirit of heaviness"); panim, "face," "aspect" (Job 9:27 the King James Version, "I will leave off my heaviness," the Revised Version (British and American) "(sad) countenance"; compare 2 Esdras 5:16; The Wisdom of Solomon 17:4; Ecclesiasticus 25:23); ta'aniyah, from 'anah, "to groan," "to sigh" (Isa 29:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "mourning and lamentation"); tughah, "sadness," "sorrow" (Ps 119:28; Pr 10:1; 14:13); ta'anith, "affliction of one's self," "fasting" (Ezr 9:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "humiliation," margin "fasting"); katepheia, "dejection," "sorrow" (literally, "of the eyes") (Jas 4:9, "your joy (turned) to heaviness"); lupe, "grief" (Ro 9:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "great sorrow"; 2Co 2:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrow"); lupeomai (1Pe 1:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "put to grief"); for nush, "to be sick," "feeble" (Ps 69:20, the Revised Version margin "sore sick"), and ademoneo (Php 2:26 the Revised Version (British and American) "sore troubled"), the King James Version has "full of heaviness." "Heaviness," in the sense of sorrow, sadness, occurs in 2 Esdras 10:7,8,24; Tobit 2:5; lupe (Ecclesiasticus 22:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "grief"; 30:21, "Give not thy soul to heaviness," the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrow"; 1 Macc 6:4); lupeo (Ecclesiasticus 30:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "will grieve thee"; penthos (1 Macc 3:51, etc.).

The Revised Version has "heavier work" for "more work" (Ex 5:9); "heavy upon men" for "common among men" (Ec 6:1); for "were heavy loaden" (Isa 46:1), "are made a load"; for "the burden thereof is heavy" (Isa 30:27), "in thick rising smoke."

W. L. Walker

HEBER

he'-ber (chebher, "associate" or, possibly, "enchanter"; Eber): A name occurring several times in the Old Testament as the name of an individual or of a clan.

(1) A member of the tribe of Asher and son of Beraiah (Ge 46:17; Nu 26:45; 1Ch 7:31 f).

(2) A Kenite, husband of Jael, who deceptively slew Sisera, captain of the army of Jabin, a Canaanite king (Jud 4:17; 5:24). He had separated himself from the main body of the Kenites, which accounts for his tent being near Kedesh, the place of Sisera's disastrous battle (Jud 4:11).

(3) Head of a clan of Judah, and son of Mered by his Jewish, as distinguished from an Egyptian wife. He was father, or founder, of Soco (1Ch 4:18).

(4) A Benjamite, or clan or family of Elpaal belonging to Benjamin (1Ch 8:17).

(5) Heber, of our Lord’s genealogy (Lu 3:35 the King James Version), better, Eber.

So, the name "Eber," ‘ebher, in 1Ch 5:13; 8:22, is not to be confused with Heber, chebher, as in the foregoing passages.

Edward Bagby Pollard

HEBERITES

he’-ber-its (ha-chebhri): Descendants of Heber, a prominent clan of Asher, (Nu 26:45). Supposed by some to be connected with the Chabiri of the Tell el-Amarna Letters.

HEBREW LANGUAGE

See LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; ARAMAIC.

HEBREW; HEBREWESS

he’-broo, he’-broo-es (‘ibhri, feminine ‘ibhriyah; Hebraios): The earliest name for Abraham (Ge 14:13) and his descendants (Joseph, Ge 39:14,17; 40:15; 41:12; 43:32; Israelites in Egypt, Ex 1:15; 2:6,11,13; 3:18; in laws, Ex 21:2; De 15:12; in history, 1Sa 4:6,9; 13:7,19, etc.; later, Jer 34:9, "Hebrewess," 34:14; Jon 1:9; in the New Testament, Ac 6:1; 2Co 11:22; Php 3:5). The etymology of the word is disputed. It may be derived from Eber (Ge 10:21,24,25, etc.), or, as some think, from the verb ‘abhar, "to cross over" (people from across the Euphrates; compare Jos 24:2). A connection is sought by some with the apri or epri of the Egyptian monuments, and again with the Habiri of the Tell el-Amarna Letters. In Ac 6:1, the "Hebrews" are contrasted with "Hellenists," or Greek-speaking Jews. By the "Hebrew" tongue in the New Testament (Hebraisti, Joh 5:2; 19:13,17,20; 20:16) is meant ARAMAIC (which see), but also in Re 9:11; 16:16, Hebrew proper.

James Orr

HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE

he’-brooz,

I. TITLE

II. LITERARY

1. The Author’s Culture and Style

2. Letter, Epistle or Treatise?

3. A Unity or a Composite Work?

III. THE AUTHOR

1. Tradition

(1) Alexandrian: Paul

(2) African: Barnabas

(3) Rome and the West: Anonymous

2. The Witness of the Epistle Itself

(1) Paul not the Author

(2) Other Theories

(a) Luke and Clement

(b) Barnabas; Priscilla and Aquila; Philip; Aristion; Apollos

IV. DESTINATION

1. General Character of the Readers

2. Jews or Gentiles?

3. The Locality of the Readers

V. DATE

1. Terminal Dates

2. Conversion and History of the Readers

3. Doctrinal Development

4. The Fall of Jerusalem

5. Timothy

6. Two Persecutions

VI. CONTENTS

1. Summary of Contents

2. The Main Theme

3. Alexandrian Influences

4. The Christian Factor

LITERATURE

I. Title.

In the King James Version and the English Revised Version the title of this book describes it as "the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews." Modern scholarship has disputed the applicability of every word of this title. Neither does it appear in the oldest manuscripts, where we find simply "to Hebrews" (pros Hebraious). This, too, seems to have been prefixed to the original writing by a collector or copyist. It is too vague and general for the author to have used it. And there is nothing in the body of the book which affirms any part of either title. Even the shorter title was an inference from the general character of the writing. Nowhere is criticism less hampered by problems of authenticity and inspiration. No question arises, at least directly, of pseudonymity either of author or of readers, for both are anonymous. For the purpose of tracing the history and interpreting the meaning of the book, the absence of a title, or of any definite historical data, is a disadvantage. We are left to infer its historical context from a few fragments of uncertain tradition, and from such general references to historical conditions as the document itself contains. Where no date, name or well-known event is fixed, it becomes impossible to decide, among many possibilities, what known historical conditions, if any, are pre-supposed. Yet this very fact, of the book’s detachment from personal and historical incidents, renders it more self-contained, and its exegesis less dependent upon understanding the exact historical situation. But its general relation to the thought of its time must be taken into account if we are to understand it at all.

II. Literary Form.

1. The Author’s Culture and Style:

The writer was evidently a man of culture, who had a masterly command of the Greek language. The theory of Clement of Alexandria, that the work was a translation from Hebrew, was merely an inference from the supposition that it was first addressed to Hebrew-speaking Christians. It bears none of the marks of a translation. It is written in pure idiomatic Greek. The writer had an intimate knowledge of the Septuagint, and was familiar with Jewish life. He was well-read in Hellenic literally (e.g. Wisdom), and had probably made a careful study of Philo (see VI below). His argument proceeds continuously and methodically, in general, though not strict, accord with the rules of Greek rhetoric, and without the interruptions and digressions which render Paul’s arguments so hard to follow. "Where the literary skill of the author comes out is in the deft adjustment of the argumentative to the hortatory sections" (Moffatt, Introduction, 424 f). He has been classed with Lu as the most "cultured" of the early Christian writers.

2. Letter, Epistle or Treatise?:

It has been questioned whether Hebrews is rightly called a letter at all. Unlike all Paul’s letters, it opens without any personal note of address or salutation; and at the outset it sets forth, in rounded periods and in philosophical language, the central theme which is developed throughout. In this respect it resembles the Johannine writings alone in the New Testament. But as the argument proceeds, the personal note of application, exhortation and expostulation emerges more clearly (Heb 2:1; 3:1-12; 4:1,14; 5:11; 6:9; 10:9; 13:7); and it ends with greetings and salutations (Heb 13:18). The writer calls it "a word of exhortation." The verb epesteila (the Revised Version (British and American) "I have written") is the usual expression for writing a letter (Heb 13:22). Hebrews begins like an essay, proceeds like a sermon, and ends as a letter.

Deissmann, who distinguishes between a "true letter," the genuine personal message of one man to another, and an "epistle," or a treatise written in imitation of the form of a letter, but with an eye on the reading public, puts Hebrews in the latter class; nor would he "consider it anything but a literary oration —hence, not as an epistle at all—if the epesteila, and the greetings at the close, did not permit of the supposition that it had at one time opened with something of the nature of an address as well" (Bible Studies, 49-50). There is no textual or historical evidence of any opening address having ever stood as part of the text; nor does the opening section bear any mark or suggestion of fragmentariness, as if it had once followed such an address.

Yet the supposition that a greeting once stood at the beginning of our document is not so impossible as Zahn thinks (Introduction to the New Testament, II, 313 f), as a comparison with James or 1 Peter will show.

So unusual is the phenomenon of a letter without a greeting, that among the ancients, Pantaenus had offered the explanation that Paul, out of modesty, had refrained from putting his name to a letter

addressed to the Hebrews, because the Lord Himself had been apostle to them.

In recent times, Julicher and Harnack have conjectured that the author intentionally suppressed the greeting, either from motives of prudence at a time of persecution, or because it was unnecessary, since the bearer of the letter would communicate the name of the sender to the recipients.

Overbeck advanced the more revolutionary hypothesis that the letter once opened with a greeting, but from someone other than Paul; that in order to satisfy the general conditions of canonization, the non-apostolic greeting was struck out by the Alexandrians, and the personal references in Heb 13:22-25 added, in order to represent it as Pauline.

3. A Unity or a Composite Work?:

W. Wrede, starting from this theory, rejects the first part of it and adopts the second. He does not base his hypothesis on the conditions of canonization, but on an examination of the writing itself. He adopts Deissmann's rejected alternative, and argues that the main part of the book was originally not an epistle at all, but a general doctrinal treatise. Then Heb 13, and especially 13:18 ff, were added by a later hand, in order to represent the whole as a Pauline letter, and the book in its final form was made, after all, pseudonymous. The latter supposition is based upon an assumed reference to imprisonment in 13:19 (compare Phm 1:22) and upon the reference to Timothy in Heb 13:23 (compare Php 2:19); and the proof that these professed Pauline phrases are not really Pauline is found in a supposed contradiction between Heb 13:19 and 13:23. But 13:19 does not necessarily refer to imprisonment exclusively or even at all, and therefore it stands in no contradiction with 13:23 (compare Ro 1:9-13). And Timothy must have associated with many Christian leaders besides Paul. But why should anybody who wanted to represent the letter as Pauline and who scrupled not to add to it for that purpose, refrain from the obvious device of prefixing a Pauline greeting? Moreover, it is only by the most forced special pleading that it can be maintained that Heb 1-12 are a mere doctrinal treatise, devoid of all evidences of a personal relation to a circumscribed circle of readers. The period and manner of the readers' conversion are defined (2:3 f). Their present spiritual condition is described in terms of such anxiety and hope as betoken a very intimate personal relation (5:11 f; 6:9-11). Their past conflicts, temptations, endurance and triumph are recalled for their encouragement under present trials, and both past and present are defined in particular terms that point to concrete situations well known to writer and readers (10:32-36). There is, it is true, not in Hebrews the same intense and all-pervading personal note as appears in the earlier Pauline letters; the writer often loses sight of his particular audience and develops his argument in detached and abstract form. But it cannot be assumed that nothing is a letter which does not conform to the Pauline model. And the presence of long, abstract arguments does not justify the excision or explaining away of undoubted personal passages. Neither the language nor the logic of the book either demands or permits the separation of doctrinal and personal passages from one another, so as to leave for residuum a mere doctrinal treatise. Doctrinal statements lead up to personal exhortations, and personal exhortations form the transition to new arguments; they are indissolubly involved in one another; and chapter 13 presents no such exceptional. features as to justify its separation from the whole work. There is really no reason, but the unwarrantable assumption that an ancient writer must have conformed with a certain convention of letter-writing, to forbid the acceptance of Hebrews for what it appears to be—a defense of

Christianity written for the benefit of definite readers, growing more intimate and personal as the writer gathers his argument into a practical appeal to the hearts and consciences of his readers,

III. The Author.

Certain coincidences of language and thought between this epistle and that of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians justify the inference that Hebrews was known in Rome toward the end of the 1st century AD (compare Heb 11:7,31 and 1:3 ff with Clement ad Cor 9,12,36). Clement makes no explicit reference to the book or its author: the quotations are unacknowledged. But they show that Hebrews already had some authority in Rome. The same inference is supported by similarities of expression found also in the Shepherd of Hermas. The possible marks of its influence in Polycarp and Justin Martyr are too uncertain and indefinite to justify any inference. Its name does not appear in the list of New Testament writings compiled and acknowledged by Marcion, nor in that of the Muratorian Fragment. The latter definitely assigns letters by Paul to only seven churches, and so inferentially excludes Hebrews.

When the book emerges into the clear light of history toward the end of the 2nd century, the tradition as to its authorship is seen to divide into three different streams.

(1) Alexandrian: Paul

In Alexandria, it was regarded as in some sense the work of Paul. Clement tells how his teacher, apparently Pantaenus, explained why Paul does not in this letter, as in others, address his readers under his name. Out of reverence for the Lord (II, 2, above) and to avoid suspicion and prejudice, he as apostle of the Gentiles refrains from addressing himself to the Hebrews as their apostle. Clement accepts this explanation, and adds to it that the original Hebrew of Paul’s epistle had been translated into Greek by Luke. That Paul wrote in Hebrew was assumed from the tradition or inference that the letter was addressed to Aramaic-speaking Hebrews. Clement also had noticed the dissimilarity of its Greek from that of Paul’s epistles, and thought he found a resemblance to that of Acts.

Origen starts with the same tradition, but he knew, moreover, that other churches did not accept the Alexandrian view, and that they even criticized Alexandria for admitting Hebrews into the Canon. And he feels, more than Clement, that not only the language, but the forms of thought are different from those of Paul’s epistles. This he tries to explain by the hypothesis that while the ideas were Paul’s, they had been formulated and written down by some other disciple. He found traditions that named Luke and Clement of Rome, but who the actual writer was, Origen declares that "God alone knows."

The Pauline tradition persisted in Alexandria, and by the 4th century it was accepted without any of the qualifications made by Clement and Origen. It had also in the same period spread over the other eastern churches, both Greek and Syrian. But the Pauline tradition, where it is nearest the fountain-head of history, in Clement and Origen, only ascribes Hebrews to Paul in a secondary sense.

(2) African: Barnabas

In the West, the Pauline tradition failed to assert itself till the 4th century, and was not generally accepted till the 5th century. In Africa, another tradition prevailed, namely, that Barnabas was the author. This was the only other definite tradition of authorship that prevailed in antiquity. Tertullian, introducing a quotation of Heb 6:1,4-6, writes: "There is also an Epistle to the Hebrews under the name of Barnabas .... and the Epistle of Barnabas is more generally received among the churches than that apocryphal 'Shepherd' of adulterers" (De Pudicitia, 20). Tertullian is not expressing his mere personal opinion, but quoting a tradition which had so far established itself as to appear in the title of the epistle in the MS, and he betrays no consciousness of the existence of any other tradition. Zahn infers that this view prevailed in Montanist churches and may have originated in Asia. Moffatt thinks that it had also behind it "some Roman tradition" (Introduction, 437). If it was originally, or at any time, the tradition of the African churches, it gave way there to the Alexandrian view in the course of the 4th century. A Council of Hippo in 393 reckons "thirteen epistles of the apostle Paul, and one by the same to the Hebrews." A council of Carthage in 419 reckons "fourteen epistles of the apostle Paul." By such gradual stages did the Pauline tradition establish itself.

(3) Rome and the West: Anonymous

All the evidence tends to show that in Rome and the remaining churches of the West, the epistle was originally anonymous. No tradition of authorship appears before the 4th century. And Stephen Gobarus, writing in 600, says that both Irenaeus and Hippolytus denied the Pauline authorship. Photius repeats this statement as regards Hippolytus. Neither he nor Gobarus mentions any alternative view (Zahn, Intro, II, 310). The epistle was known in Rome (to Clement) toward the end of the 1st century, and if Paul's name, or any other, had been associated with it from the beginning, it is impossible that it could have been forgotten by the time of Hippolytus. The western churches had no reason for refusing to admit Hebrews into the Pauline and canonical list of books, except only that they did not believe it to be the work of Paul, or of any other apostle.

It seems therefore certain that the epistle first became generally known as an anonymous writing. Even the Alexandrian tradition implies as much, for it appears first as an explanation by Pantaenus why Paul concealed his name. The idea that Paul was the author was therefore an Alexandrian inference. The religious value of the epistle was naturally first recognized in Alexandria, and the name of Paul, the chief letter-writer of the church, at once occurred to those in search for its author. Two facts account for the ultimate acceptance of that view by the whole church. The spiritual value and authority of the book were seen to be too great to relegate it into the same class as the Shepherd or the Epistle of Barnabas. And the conception of the Canon developed into the hard-and-fast rule of apostolicity. No writing could be admitted into the Canon unless it had an apostle for its author; and when Hebrews could no longer be excluded, it followed that its apostolic authorship must be affirmed. The tradition already existing in Alexandria supplied the demand, and who but Paul, among the apostles, could have written it?

The Pauline theory prevailed together with the scheme of thought that made it necessary, from the 5th to the 16th century. The Humanists and the Reformers rejected it. But it was again revived in the 17th and 18th centuries, along with the recrudescence of scholastic ideas. It is clear, however, that tradition and

history shed no light upon the question of the authorship of Hebrews. They neither prove nor disprove the Pauline, or any other theory.

2. The Witness of the Epistle Itself:

We are therefore thrown back, in our search for the author, on such evidence as the epistle itself affords, and that is wholly inferential. It seems probable that the author was a Hellenist, a Greek-speaking Jew. He was familiar with the Scriptures of the Old Testament and with the religious ideas and worship of the Jews. He claims the inheritance of their sacred history, traditions and institutions (Heb 1:1), and dwells on them with an intimate knowledge and enthusiasm that would be improbable, though not impossible, in a proselyte, and still more in a Christian convert from heathenism. But he knew the Old Testament only in the Septuagint translation, which he follows even where it deviates from the Hebrew. He writes Greek with a purity of style and vocabulary to which the writings of Luke alone in the New Testament can be compared. His mind is imbued with that combination of Hebrew and Greek thought which is best known in the writings of Philo. His general typological mode of thinking, his use of the allegorical method, as well as the adoption of many terms that are most familiar in Alexandrian thought, all reveal the Hellenistic mind. Yet his fundamental conceptions are in full accord with the teaching of Paul and of the Johannine writings.

The central position assigned to Christ, the high estimate of His person, the saving significance of His death, the general trend of the ethical teaching, the writer’s opposition to asceticism and his esteem for the rulers and teachers of the church, all bear out the inference that he belonged to a Christian circle dominated by Pauline ideas. The author and his readers alike were not personal disciples of Jesus, but had received the gospel from those who had heard the Lord (Heb 2:3) and who were no longer living (Heb 13:7). He had lived among his readers, and had probably been their teacher and leader; he is now separated from them but he hopes soon to return to them again (Heb 13:18 f).

Is it possible to give a name to this person?

(1) Paul not the Author

Although the Pauline tradition itself proves nothing, the internal evidence is conclusive against it. We know enough about Paul to be certain that he could not have written Hebrews, and that is all that can be said with confidence on the question of authorship. The style and language, the categories of thought and the method of argument, all differ widely from those of any writings ascribed to Paul. The latter quotes the Old Testament from the Hebrew and Septuagint, but He only from Septuagint. Paul’s formula of quotation is, "It is written" or "The scripture saith"; that of Hebrews, "God," or "The Holy Spirit," or "One somewhere saith." For Paul the Old Testament is law, and stands in antithesis to the New Testament, but in Hebrews the Old Testament is covenant, and is the "shadow" of the New Covenant. Paul’s characteristic terms, "Christ Jesus," and "Our Lord Jesus Christ," are never found in Hebrews; and "Jesus Christ" only 3 times (10:10; 13:8), and "the Lord" (for Christ) only twice (2:3; 7:14)—phrases used by Paul over 600 times (Zahn). Paul’s Christology turns around the death, resurrection and

living presence of Christ in the church, that of Hebrews around His high-priestly function in heaven. Their conceptions of God differ accordingly. In Hebrews it is Judaistic-Platonistic, or (in later terminology) Deistic. The revelation of the Divine Fatherhood and the consequent immanence of God in history and in the world had not possessed the author s mind as it had Paul's. Since the present world is conceived in Hebrews as a world of "shadows," God could only intervene in it by mediators.

The experience and conception of salvation are also different in these two writers. There is no evidence in Hebrews of inward conflict and conversion and of constant personal relation with Christ, which constituted the entire spiritual life of Paul. The apostle's central doctrine, that of justification by faith, does not appear in Hebrews. Faith is less the personal, mystical relation with Christ, that it is for Paul, than a general hope which lays hold of the future to overcome the present; and salvation is accomplished by cleansing, sanctification and perfection, not by justification. While Paul's mind was not uninfluenced by Hellenistic thought, as we find it in Alexandria (as, e.g. in Col and Eph), it nowhere appears in his epistles so clearly and prominently as it does in Hebrews. Moreover, the author of Hebrews was probably a member of the community to which he writes (Heb 13:18 f), but Paul never stood in quite the relation supposed here to any church. Finally, Paul could not have written Heb 2:3, for he emphatically declares that he did not receive his gospel from the older disciples (Ga 1:12; 2:6).

The general Christian ideas on which He was in agreement with Paul were part of the heritage which the apostle had left to all the churches. The few more particular affinities of Hebrews with certain Pauline writings (e.g. Heb 2:2 parallel Ga 3:19; Heb 12:22; 3:14 parallel Ga 4:25; Heb 2:10 parallel Ro 11:36; also with Ephesians; see yon Soden, Hand-Commentar, 3) are easily explicable either as due to the author's reading of Paul's Epistles or as reminiscences of Pauline phrases that were current in the churches. But they are too few and slender to rest upon them any presumption against the arguments which disprove the Pauline tradition.

(2) Other Theories

The passage that is most conclusive against the Pauline authorship (Heb 2:3) is equally conclusive against any other apostle being the author. But almost every prominent name among the Christians of the second generation has been suggested. The epistle itself excludes Timothy (Heb 13:23), and Titus awaits his turn. Otherwise Luke, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Silas, Apollos, Priscilla and Aquila, Philip the Deacon, and Aristion have all had their champions.

(a) Luke and Clement

The first two, Luke and Clement, were brought in through their connection with Paul. Where it was recognized that a direct Pauline authorship could not be maintained, the Pauline tradition might still be retained, if the epistle could be assigned to one of the apostle's disciples. These two were fixed upon as being well-known writers. But this very fact reveals the improbability of theory. Similar arguments from language and thought to those derived from the comparison of Hebrews with the Pauline writings avail also in the comparison of Hebrews with the writings of Lu and Clement. Both these disciples of the

apostle adhere much closer to his system of thought than Hebrews does, and they reveal none of the influences of Alexandrian thought, which is predominant in Hebrews.

(b) Barnabas; Priscilla and Aquila; Philip; Aristion; Apollos

Of all the other persons suggested, so little is known that it is impossible to establish, with any convincing force, an argument for or against their authorship.

(i) Barnabas was a Levite of Cyprus (Ac 4:36), and once a companion of Paul (Ac 13:2). Another ancient writing is called "the Epistle of Barnabas," but it has no affinity with Hebrews. The coincidence of the occurrence of the word "consolation" in Barnabas' name (Ac 4:36) and in the writer's description of Hebrews (13:22) is quite irrelevant. Tertullian's tradition is the only positive argument in favor of the Barnabas theory. It has been argued against it that Barnabas, being a Levite, could not have shown the opposition to the Levitical system, and the unfamiliarity with it (Heb 7:27; 9:4), which is supposed to mark our epistle. But the author's Levitical system was derived, not from the Hebrew Old Testament, nor from the Jerusalem temple, but from Jewish tradition; and the supposed inaccuracies as to the daily sin offering (7:27), and the position of the golden altar of incense (9:4) have been traced to Jewish tradition (see Moffatt, Introduction, 438). And the writer's hostility to the Levitical system is not nearly as intense as that of Paul to Pharisaism. There is nothing that renders it intrinsically impossible that Barnabas was the author, nor is anything known of him that makes it probable; and if he was, it is a mystery why the tradition was confined to Africa.

(ii) Harnack has argued the probability of a joint authorship by Priscilla and Aquila. The interchange of "I" and "we" he explains as due to a dual authorship by persons intimately related, but such an interchange of the personal "I" and the epistolary "we" can be paralleled in the Epistles of Paul (e.g. Romans) where no question of joint authorship arises. The probable relation of the author to a church in Rome may suit Priscilla arid Aquila (compare Ro 16:5 with Heb 13:22-24), but even if this interpretation of the aforementioned passages were correct, it is possible and probable that Luke, Barnabas, Apollos, and certainly Clement, stood in a similar relation to a Roman church. Harnack, on this theory, explains the disappearance of the author's name as due to prejudice against women teachers. This is the only novel point in favor of this theory as compared with several others; and it does not explain why Aquila's name should not have been retained with the address. The evidences adduced of a feminine mind behind the epistle are highly disputable. On the other hand, a female disciple of Paul's circle would scarcely assume such authority in the church as the author of Hebrews does (13:17 f; compare 1Co 14:34 f). And nothing that is known of Priscilla and Aquila would suggest the culture and the familiarity with Alexandrian thought possessed by this writer. Ac 18:26 does not prove that they were expert and cultured teachers, but only that they knew and could repeat the salient points of Paul's early preaching. So unusual a phenomenon as this theory supposes demands more evidence to make it even probable. (But see Rendel Harris, Sidelights on New Testament Research, 148-76.)

(iii) Philip the Deacon and Aristion, "a disciple of the Lord" mentioned by Papias, are little more than names to us. No positive knowledge of either survives on which any theory can be built. It is probable

that both were personal disciples of the Lord, and they could not therefore have written Heb 2:3.

(iv) Apollos has found favor with many scholars from Luther downward. No ancient tradition supports this theory, a fact which tells heavily against it, but not conclusively, for someone must have written the letter, and his name was actually lost to early tradition, unless it were Barnabas, and that tradition too was Unknown to the vast majority of the early churches. All that is known of Apollos suits the author of Hebrews. He may have learned the gospel from "them that heard" (2:3); he was a Jew, "an Alexandrian by race, a learned (or eloquent) man," "mighty in the Scriptures," "he powerfully confuted the Jews" (Ac 18:24), and he belonged to the same Pauline circle as Timothy and Titus (1Co 16:10-12; Tit 3:13; compare Heb 13:23). The Alexandrian type of thought, the affinities with Philo, the arguments from Jewish tradition and ceremonial, the fluent style, may all have issued from "an eloquent Jew of Alexandria." But it does not follow that Apollos was the only person of this type. The author may have been a Gentile, as the purity of his Greek language and style suggests; and the combination of Greek and Hebrew thought, which the epistle reflects, and even Philo's terms, may have had a wide currency outside Alexandria, as for instance in the great cosmopolitan cities of Asia. All that can be said is that the author of Hebrews was someone generally like what is known of Apollos, but who he actually was, we must confess with Origen, "God alone knows."

IV. Destination.

The identity of the first readers of Hebrews is, if possible, more obscure than that of the author. It was written to Christians, and to a specific body or group of Christians (see I above). The title "to Hebrews" might mean properly Palestinian Jews who spoke the Hebrew language, but the fact that the epistle was written in Greek excludes that supposition. It therefore meant Christians of Jewish origin, and gives no indication of their place of residence. The title represents an early inference drawn from the contents of the document, and the tradition it embodies was unanimously accepted from the 2nd century down to the early part of the last century. Now, however, a considerable body of critics hold that the original readers were Gentiles. The question is entirely one of inference from the contents of the epistle itself.

1. General Character of the Readers:

The readers, like the writer, received the gospel first from "them that heard" (Heb 2:3), from the personal disciples of the Lord, but they were not of their number. They had witnessed "signs and wonders" and "manifold powers" and "gifts of the Holy Spirit" (Heb 2:4). Their conversion had been thorough, and their faith and Christian life had been of a high order. They had a sound knowledge of the first principles of Christ (Heb 6:1). They had become "partakers of Christ," and had need only to "hold fast the beginning of (their) confidence firm unto the end" (Heb 3:14). They had been fruitful in good works, ministering unto the saints (Heb 6:10), enduring suffering and persecution, and sympathizing with whose who were imprisoned (Heb 10:32-34). All this had been in former days which appeared now remote. Their rulers and ministers of those days are now dead (Heb 13:7). And they themselves have undergone a great change. While they should have been teachers, they have become dull of hearing, and have need again to be taught the rudiments of the first principles of the gospel (Heb 5:12), and they are

in danger of a great apostasy from the faith. They need warning against "an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God" (Heb 3:12). They are become sluggish (Heb 6:12), profane like Esau (Heb 12:16), worldly-minded (Heb 13:5). Perhaps their religion was tending toward a false asceticism and outward works (Heb 13:4,9). And now that this moral dulness and spiritual indifference had fallen upon them, they are being subjected to a new test by persecution from outside (Heb 10:36; 12:4), which renders the danger of their falling away from the faith all the more imminent. The author apparently bases his claim to warn them on the fact that he had been a teacher among them, and hoped soon to return to them (Heb 13:18 f). The same might be said perhaps of Timothy (Heb 13:23). Both author and readers had friends in Italy (Heb 13:24) who were with the author when he wrote, either in Italy saluting the readers outside, or outside, saluting the readers in Italy. In all this there is little or nothing to help to fix the destination of the letter, for it might be true at some time or other of any church.

2. Jews or Gentiles?:

The old tradition that the readers were Jews claims some more definite support from the epistle itself. The writer assumes an intimate knowledge of the Old Testament and of Jewish ceremonial on their part. The fathers of the Hebrew race are also their fathers (Heb 1:1; 3:9). The humanity that Christ assumed and redeemed is called "the seed of Abraham" (Heb 2:16). All this, however, might stand in reference to a Gentilechurch, for the early Christians, without distinction of race, regarded themselves as the true Israel and heirs of the Hebrew revelation, and of all that related to it (1Co 10:1; Ga 3:7 ff; 4:21 ff; Ro 4:11-18). Still there is force in Zahn’s argument that "Hebrews does not contain a single sentence in which it is so much as intimated that the readers became members of God’s people who descended from Abraham, and heirs of the promise given to them and their forefathers, and how they became such" (Intro to New Testament, II, 323). Zahn further finds a direct proof in Heb 13:13 that "both the readers and the author belong to the Jewish people," which he interprets as "meaning that the readers were to renounce fellowship with the Jewish people who had rejected Jesus, to confess the crucified Jesus, and to take upon themselves all the ignominy that Jesus met at the hands of his countrymen" (ibid., 324-25). But that is too large an inference to draw from a figurative expression which need not, and probably does not, mean more than an exhortation to rely on the sacrifice of Christ, rather than upon any external rules and ceremomes. Nor were the "divers and strange teachings" about marriage and meats (13:4,9) necessarily Jewish doctrines. They might be the doctrines of an incipient Gnosticism which spread widely throughout the Christian churches, both Jewish and gentile, toward the end of the 1st century. There is otherwise no evidence that the apostasy, of which the readers stood in danger, was into Judaism, but it was rather a general unbelief and "falling away from the living God" (3:12).

It is the whole argument of the epistle, rather than any special references, that produced the tradition, and supports the view, that the readers were Jews. The entire message of the epistle, the dominant claims of Christ and of the Christian faith, rests upon the supposition that the readers held Moses, Aaron, the Jewish priesthood, the old Covenant and the Levitical ritual, in the highest esteem. The author’s argument is: You will grant the Divine authority and greatness of Moses, Aaron and the Jewish institutions: Christ is greater than they; therefore you ought to be faithful to Him. He assumes an exclusively Jewish point of view in the minds of his readers as his major premise. He could scarcely do

that, if they had been Gentiles. Paul, when writing to the mixed church at Rome, relates his philosophy of the Christian revelation to both Jewish and Gentilepre-Christian revelation. Gentile Christians adopted the Jewish tradition as their own in consequence of, and secondary to, their attachment to Christianity. Even Judaizing GentileChristians, such as may be supposed to have belonged to the Galatian and Corinthian churches, adopted some parts of the Jewish law only as a supplement to Christianity, but not as its basis.

Von Soden and others have argued with much reason that these Christians were not in danger of falling back into Judaism from Christianity, but rather of falling away from all faith into unbelief and materialism, like the Israelites in the wilderness (Heb 3:7), or Esau (Heb 12:16). With all its references to Old Testament sacrifice and ceremonial, the letter contains not a single warning against reviving them, nor any indications that the readers were in danger of so doing (Hand-Commentar, 12-16). But it has been too readily assumed that these facts prove that the readers were not Jews. The pressure of Social influence and persecution rendered Jews and Jewish Christians, as well as GentileChristians, liable to apostatize to heathenism or irreligion (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:10,20; 2 Macc 4; 6; 7; Philo, De Migratione Abrahami, XVI; Mt 24:10,12; Ac 20:30; 1Co 10:7,14; 2Th 2:4; 1 Joh 2:18; 5:21; Pliny Epistle X, 96). Von Soden’s argument really cuts the other way. If the writer had been dealing with Gentile Christians who were in danger of relapsing into heathenism or of falling into religious indifference, his argument from the shadowy and temporary glories of Judaism to the perfect salvation in Christ would avail nothing, because, for such, his premises would depend upon his conclusion. But if they were Jewish Christians, even though leaning toward heathenism, his argument is well calculated to call up on its side all the dormant force of their early religious training. He is not arguing them out of a "subtle Judaism" quickened by the zeal of a propaganda (Moffatt, Introduction, 449-50), but from "drifting away" in Heb (2:1), from "neglect" (2:3), from "an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God" (3:12), from "disobedience" (4:11), from "a dulness of hearing" (5:11), but into "diligence .... that ye be not sluggish" (6:11 f), into "boldness and patience" (10:35 f), and to "lift up the hands that hang down, and the palsied knees" (12:12); and this he might well do by his appeal to their whole religious experience, both Jewish and Christian, and to the whole religious history of their race.

3. The Locality of the Readers:

The question of the locality of these "Hebrews" remains a matter for mere conjecture. Jerusalem, Alexandria, Rome, Antioch, Colosse, Ephesus, Berea, Ravenna and other places have been suggested. Tradition, since Clement of Alexandria, fixed on Jerusalem, but on the untenable ground that the letter was written to Aramaic-speaking Jews. The undisputed fact that it was written in Greek tells against Jerusalem. So does the absence of all reference to the temple ritual, and the mention of almsgiving as the chief grace of the "Hebrews" (6:10). Jerusalem received rather than gave alms. Nor is it likely that all the personal disciples of the Lord would have died out in Jerusalem (2:3). And it could not be charged against the mother church that it had produced no teachers (5:12). These points also tell with almost equal force against any Palestinian locality.

Alexandria was suggested as an alternative to Jerusalem, on the supposition that those references to Jewish ritual which did not correspond with the Jerusalem ritual (Heb 7:27; 9:4; 10:11) might refer to

the temple at Leontopolis. But the ritual system of the epistle is that of the tabernacle and of tradition, and not of any temple. The Alexandrian character of the letter has bearing on the identity of the author, but not so much on that of his readers. The erroneous idea that Paul was the author arose in Alexandria, but it would have been least likely to arise where the letter was originally sent.

Rome has lately found much favor. We first learn of the existence of the letter at Rome. The phrase "they of Italy salute you" (Heb 13:24) implies that either the writer or his readers were in Italy. It may be more natural to think of the writer, with a small group of Italian friends away from home, sending greetings to Italy, than to suppose that a greeting from Italy generally was sent to a church at a distance. It is probable that a body of Jewish Christians existed in Rome, as in other large cities of the Empire. But this view does not, as von Soden thinks, explain any coincidences between Hebrews and Romans. A Roman origin might. It could explain the use of Hebrews by Clement. But the letter might also have come to Rome by Clement's time, even though it was originally sent elsewhere. The slender arguments in favor of Rome find favor chiefly because no arguments can be adduced in favor of any other place.

V. Date.

1. Terminal Dates:

The latest date for the composition of Hebrews is clearly fixed as earlier than 96 AD by reason of its use by Clement of Rome about that time. There is no justification for the view that Hebrews shows dependence on Josephus. The earliest date cannot be so definitely fixed. The apparent dependence of Hebrews on Paul's Epistles, Galatians, 1 Corinthians and Romans, brings it beyond 50 AD.

2. Conversion and History of Readers:

But we have data in the epistle itself which require a date considerably later. The readers had been converted by personal disciples of the Lord (Heb 2:3). They did not, therefore, belong to the earliest group of Christians. But it is not necessary to suppose a long interval between the Lord's ascension and their conversion. The disciples were scattered widely from Jerusalem by the persecution that followed the death of Stephen (Ac 8:1). "We may well believe that the vigorous preaching of Stephen would set a wave in motion which would be felt even at Rome" (Sanday, Romans, xxviii). They are not, therefore, necessarily to be described as Christians of the 2nd generation in the strict chronological sense. But the letter was written a considerable time after their conversion. They have had time for great development in Heb (5:12). They have forgotten the former days after their conversion (10:32). Their early leaders are now dead (13:7). Yet the majority of the church still consists of the first converts (2:3; 10:32). And although no argument can be based upon the mention of 40 years (3:9), for it is only an incidental phrase in a quotation, yet no longer interval could lie between the founding of the church and the writing of the letter. It might be shorter. And the church may have been founded at any time from 32 to 70 AD.

3. Doctrinal Development:

The doctrinal development represented in Hebrews stands midway between the system of the later Pauline Epistles (Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians) and that of the Johannine Writings. The divers and strange teachings mentioned include only such ascetic tendencies about meat and marriage (Heb 13:4,9) as are reflected in Paul's Epistles early and late. There is no sign of the appearance of the full-blown heresies of the Ebionites, Docetists, and Gnostics, which became prevalent before the end of the 1st century. On the other hand the Logos-doctrine as the interpretation of the person of Christ (Heb 1:1-4) is more fully thought out than in Paul, but less explicit, and less assimilated with the purpose of Christianity, than in the Fourth Gospel.

4. The Fall of Jerusalem:

It has been argued that the letter must have been written before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD, because in writing to a Jewish community, and especially in dealing with Jewish ritual, the writer would have referred to that event, if it had happened. This point would be relevant, if the letter had been addressed to Jerusalem, which is highly improbable. But, at a distance, an author so utterly unconcerned with contemporary history could easily have omitted mention of even so important a fact. For in fact the author never mentions the temple or its ritual. His system is that of the tabernacle of the Old Testament and of Jewish tradition. The writer's interest is not in historical Judaism, and his omission to mention the great catastrophe does not prove that it had not occurred. The use of the present tense of the ritual does not imply its present continuance. "The present expresses the fact that so it is enjoined in the law, the past that with the founding of the New Covenant the old had been abolished" (Peake, Hebrews, 39).

5. Timothy:

A point of contact with contemporary history is found in the fact that Timothy was still living and active when Hebrews was written (13:23), but it does not carry us far. Timothy was a young man and already a disciple, when Paul visited Galatia on his 2nd journey about 46 AD (Ac 16:1). And he may have lived to the end of the century or near to it. It cannot be safely argued from the mere mention of his name alone, that Paul and his other companions were dead.

6. Two Persecutions:

Two incidents in the history of the readers are mentioned which afford further ground for a somewhat late date. Immediately after their conversion, they suffered persecution, "a great conflict of sufferings; partly, being made a gazingstock both by reproaches and afflictions; and partly, becoming partakers with them that were so used" (Heb 10:32 f). And now again, when the letter is written, they are entering upon another time of similar trial, in which they "have need of patience" (Heb 10:36), though they "have not yet resisted unto blood" (Heb 12:4). Their leaders, at least, it would appear, the writer and Timothy, have also been in prison, but one is at liberty and the other expects to be soon (Heb 13:19,23). It has been conjectured that the first persecution was that under Nero in 64 AD, and the second, that in the reign of Domitian, after 81 AD. But when it is remembered that in some part of the Empire Christians were almost always under persecution, and that the locale of these readers is very uncertain, these last criteria

do not justify any dogmatizing. It is certain that the letter was written in the second half of the 1st century. Certain general impressions, the probability that the first apostles and leaders of the church were dead, the absence of any mention of Paul, the development of Paul's theological ideas in a new medium, the disappearance of the early enthusiasm, the many and great changes that had come over the community, point strongly to the last quarter of the century. The opinions of scholars at present seem to converge about the year 80 AD or a little later.

VI. Contents.

1. Summary of Contents:

I. The Revelation of God in His Son (Heb 1-2).

1. Christ the completion of revelation (Heb 1:1-3).

2. Christ's superiority over the angels (Heb 1:4).

(1) Because lie is a Son (Heb 1:4-6).

(2) Because His reign is eternal (Heb 1:7).

3. The dangers of neglecting salvation through the Son (Heb 2:1-4).

4. The Son and humanity (Heb 2:5).

(1) The lowliness and dignity of man (Heb 2:5-8).

(2) Necessity for the Incarnation (Heb 2:9).

(a) To fulfill God's gracious purpose (Heb 2:9 f) . (b) That the Saviour and saved might be one (Heb 2:11-15).

(c) That the Saviour may sympathize with the saved (Heb 2:16).

II. The Prince of Salvation (Heb 3:1-4:13).

1. Christ as Son superior to Moses as servant (Heb 3:1-6).

2. Consequences of Israel's unbelief (Heb 3:7-11).

3. Warning the "Hebrews" against similar unbelief (Heb 3:12).

4. Exhortations to faithfulness (Heb 4:1-13).

(1) Because a rest remains for the people of God (Heb 4:1-11).

(2) Because the omniscient God is judge (Heb 4:12 f).

III. The Great High Priest (Heb 4:14-10:18).

1. Christ's priesthood the Christian's confidence (Heb 4:14-16).

2. Christ has the essential qualifications for priesthood (Heb 5:1-10).

(1) Sympathy with men (Heb 5:1-3).

(2) God's appointment (Heb 5:4-10).

3. The spiritual dulness of the Hebrews (Heb 5:11-6:12).

(1) Their lack of growth in knowledge (Heb 5:11).

(2) "Press on unto perfection" (Heb 6:1-3).

(3) The danger of falling away from Christ (Heb 6:4-8).

(4) Their past history ground for hoping better things (Heb 6:9-12).

4. God's oath the ground of Christ's priesthood and of the believer's hope (Heb 6:13).

5. Christ a priest after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 7:1).

(1) The history of Melchizedek (Heb 7:1-3).

(2) The superiority of his order over that of Aaron (Heb 7:4-10).

(3) Supersession of the Aaronic priesthood (Heb 7:11-19).

(4) Superiority of Christ's priesthood (Heb 7:20-24).

(5) Christ a priest befitting us (Heb 7:24).

6. Christ the true high priest (Heb 8:1-10:18).

(1) Because He entered the true sanctuary (Heb 8:1-5).

(2) Because He is priest of the New Covenant (Heb 8:6).

(3) A description of the old tabernacle and its services (Heb 9:1-7).

(4) Ineffectiveness of its sacrifices (Heb 9:8-10).

(5) Superiority of Christ's sacrifice (Heb 9:11-14).

(6) The Mediator of the New Covenant through His own blood (Heb 9:15).

(7) Weakness of the sacrifices of the law (Heb 10:1-5).

(8) Incarnation for the sake of sacrifice (Heb 10:6-9).

(9) The one satisfactory sacrifice (Heb 10:10-18).

IV. Practical Exhortations (Heb 10:19-13:25).

1. Draw near to God and hold fast the faith (Heb 10:19-23).

2. The responsibility of Christians and the judgment of God (Heb 10:24-31).

3. Past faithfulness a ground for present confidence (Heb 10:32).

4. The household of faith (Heb 11:1).

(1) What is faith? (Heb 11:1-3).

(2) The examples of faith (Heb 11:4-32).

(3) The triumphs of faith (Heb 11:33).

5. Run the race looking unto Jesus (Heb 12:1-3).

6. Sufferings as discipline from the Father (Heb 12:4-11).

7. The duty of helping and loving the brethren (Heb 12:12-17).

8. Comparison of the trials and privileges of Christians with those of the Israelites (Heb 12:18).

9. Various duties (Heb 13:1-17).

(1) Moral and social relations (Heb 13:1-6).

(2) Loyalty to leaders (Heb 13:7 f).

(3) Beware of Jewish heresies (Heb 13:9-4).

(4) Ecclesiastical worship and order (Heb 13:15-17).

10. Personal affairs and greetings (Heb 13:18).

(1) A request for the prayers of the church (Heb 13:18 f).

(2) A prayer for the church (Heb 13:20 f) .

(3) "Bear with the word of exhortation" (Heb 13:22).

(4) "Our brother Timothy" (Heb 13:23).

(5) Greetings (Heb 13:24).

(6) Grace (Heb 13:25).

2. The Main Theme:

The theme of the epistle is the absoluteness of the Christian religion, as based-upon the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ, the one and only mediator of salvation. The essence of Christ's preeminence is that He fully realizes in His own person the principles of revelation and reconciliation. It is made manifest in His superiority over the Jewish system of salvation, which He therefore at once supersedes and fulfils. The author's working concept is the Logos-doctrine of Philo; and the empirical data to which it is related is the religious history of Israel, as it culminates in Christianity. He makes no attempt to prove either his ideal first principles or his historical premises, and his philosophy of religion takes no account of the heathen world. The inner method of his argument is to fit Judaism and Christianity into the Logos-concept; but his actual is related to the ideal in the way of Plato's antithesis, of shadow and reality, of pattern and original, rather than in Aristotle's way of development, although the influence of the latter method may often be traced, as in the history of faith, which is carried back to the beginnings of history,

but is made perfect only in the Christian consummation (Heb 11:40). In a number of other ideas the teleological movement may be seen cutting across the categories of shadow and reality (Heb 1:3; 1:10; 4:8 f; 5:8 f; 9:12; 10:12; 12:22).

3. Alexandrian Influences:

The form of the argument may be described as either rabbinical or Alexandrian. The writer, after laying down his proposition, proceeds to prove it by quotations from the Old Testament, taken out of their context and historical connection, adapted and even changed to suit his present purpose. This practice was common to Palestinian and Alexandrian writers; as was also the use of allegory which plays a large part in Hebrews (e.g. Heb 3:7-4:11; 13:11 f). But the writer's allegorical method differs from that of the rabbis in that it is like Philo's, part of a conscious philosophy, according to which the whole of the past and present history of the world is only a shadow of the true realities which are laid up in heaven (Heb 8:5; 9:23 f; 10:1). His interest in historical facts, in Old Testament writers, in Jewish institutions and even in the historical life of Jesus, is quite subordinate to his prepossession with the eternal and heavenly realities which they, in more or less shadowy fashion, represent. That the affinities of Hebrews are Alexandrian rather than Palestinian is further proved by many philological and literary correspondences with The Wisdom of Solomon and Philo. Most of the characteristic terms and phrases of the epistle are also found in these earlier writers. It has been argued that Hebrews and Wisdom came from the same hand, and it seems certain that the author of Hebrews was familiar with both Wisdom and the writings of Philo (Plumptre in The Expositor, I, 329 ff, 409 ff; von Soden in Hand-Commentar, 5-6). In Philo the dualism of appearance and reality finds its ultimate synthesis in his master-conception of the Logos, and although this term does not appear in Hebrews in Philo's sense, the doctrine is set forth in Philonic phraseology in the opening verses (1:1-4). As Logos, Christ excels the prophets as revealer of God, is superior to the angels who Were the mediators of the old Covenant, and is more glorious than Moses as the builder of God's true tabernacle, His eternal house; He is a greater Saviour than Joshua, for He brings his own to final rest; and He supersedes the Aaronic priesthood, for while they ministered in a "holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true," under a "law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things" (Heb 9:24; 10:1), He "having come a high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands .... nor yet through the blood of goats and calves, but through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb 9:11 f).

4. The Christian Factor:

Yet it is possible to exaggerate the dependence of Hebrews on Alexandrian thought. Deeper than the allegorical interpretation of passages culled from the Septuagint, deeper than the Logos-philosophy which formed the framework of his thought, is the writer's experience and idea of the personal Christ. His central interest lies, not in the theoretical scheme which he adopts, but in the living person who, while He is the eternal reality behind all shadows, and the very image of God's essence, is also our brother who lived and suffered on earth, the author of our salvation, our "fore-runner within the veil," who "is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them" (Heb 1:1-4; 2:14 ff; 2:10; 5:7-9; 4:14-15; 6:20; 7:25). As in Paul and John,

so in Hebrews, the historical and ever-living Christ comes in as an original and creative element, which transforms the abstract philosophy of Hellenistic thought into a living system of salvation. Because of His essential and personal preeminence over the institutions and personalities of the old Covenant, Christ has founded a new Covenant, given a new revelation and proclaimed a new gospel. The writer never loses sight of the present bearing of these eternal realities on the lives of his readers. They are for their warning against apostasy, for their encouragement in the face of persecution, and for their undying hope while they ‘run the race that is set before (them), looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of .... faith (Heb 2:3; 3:12 ff; 4:1 ff; 10:28 ff; 12:1 f, 22).

LITERATURE.

(1) Commentary by A. S. Peake, Century Bible; A.B. Davidson, Bible Handbooks; Marcus Dods, Expositor’s Greek Test.; T.C. Edwards, Expositor’s Bible; F. Rendall (London, 1888); Westcott3 (1903); von Soden, Hand-Commentar; Hollmann, Die Schriften des New Testament.

(2) Introductions by Moffatt, Introduction to the Lit. of the New Testament; A. B. Bruce in HDB; von Soden in EB; Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament; H.H.B Ayles, Destination, Date, and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews; Harnack, "Probabilia, uber die Addresse und den Verfasser des Hebraerbriefes," ZNTW, I (1900); W. Wrede, Das literarische Ratsel des Hebraerbriefes (1906).

(3) Theology: Bruce, The Epistle to the Hebrews; Milligan, The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews; Menegoz, La theologie de l’epitre aux Hebreux. For fuller list, see Moffatt, in the work quoted

T. Rees

HEBREWS, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE

(Euaggelion kath’ Hebraious, to Hebraikon, to Ioudaikon; Evangelium Hebraeorum, Judeorum):

1. References in Early Church History

2. Its Character and Contents

3. Its Circulation and Language

4. Relation to Matthew

5. Time of Composition

6. Uncanonical Sayings and Incidents

7. Conclusion

LITERATURE

"The Gospel according to the Hebrews" was a work of early Christian literature to which reference is frequently made by the church Fathers in the first five centuries, and of which some twenty or more fragments, preserved in their writings, have come down to us. The book itself has long disappeared. It has, however, been the subject of many critical surmises and discussions in the course of the last century. It has been regarded as the original record of the life of Jesus, the Archimedespoint of the whole gospel history. From it Justin Martyr has been represented as deriving his knowledge of the works and words of Christ, and to it have been referred the gospel quotations found in Justin and other early writers when these deviate in any measure from the text of the canonical gospels. Recent discussions have thrown considerable light upon the problems connected with this Gospel, and a large literature has grown up around it of which the most important works will be noted below.

1. References in Early Church History:

Speaking of Papias Eusebius mentions that he has related the story of a woman who was accused of many sins before the Lord, which is contained in the "Gospel according to the Hebrews." This does not prove that Papias was acquainted with this Gospel, for he might have obtained the story, which cannot any longer be regarded as part of John’s Gospel, from oral tradition. But there is a certain significance in Eusebius’ mentioning it in this connection (Euseb., HE, III, xxxix, 16). Eusebius, speaking of Ignatius and his epp., takes notice of a saying of Jesus which he quotes (Ep. ad Smyrn, iii; compare Lu 24:39), "Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit." The saying differs materially from the saying in Luke’s Gospel, and Eusebius says he has no knowledge whence it had been taken by Ignatius. Jerome, however, twice over attributes the saying to the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," and Origen quotes it from the "Teaching of Peter." Ignatius may have got the saying from oral tradition, and we cannot, therefore, be sure that he knew this Gospel.

The first early Christian writer who is mentioned as having actually used the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" is Hegesippus, who flourished in the second half of the 2nd century. Eusebius, to whom we owe the reference, tells us that Hegesippus in his Memoirs quotes passages from "the Syriac Gospel according to the Hebrews" (Historia Ecclesiastica, IV, xxii, 7).

Irenaeus, in the last quarter of the 2nd century, says the Ebionites use only the "Gospel according to Matthew" and reject the apostle Paul, calling him an apostate from the law (Adv. Haer., i. 26, 2). There is reason to believe that there is some confusion in this statement of Irenaeus, for we have the testimony of Eusebius, Jerome and Epiphanius that it was the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" that was used by the Ebionites. With this qualification we may accept Irenaeus as a witness to this Gospel.

Clement of Alexandria early in the 3rd century quotes from it an apocryphal saying with the same formula as he employs for quotation of Holy Scripture (Strom., ii.9). Origen, Clement’s successor at

Alexandria, has one very striking quotation from the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (Comm. in Joann, ii), and Jerome says this Gospel is often used by Origen. Eusebius, in the first half of the 4th century, mentions that the Ebionites use only the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" and take small account of the others (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, xxvii, 4). He has, besides, other references to it, and in his widely known classification of Christian Scriptures into "acknowledged" "disputed," and "rejected," he mentions this Gospel which he says some have placed in the last category, although those of the Hebrews who have accepted Christ are delighted with it (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, xxv, 5). Eusebius had himself in all probability seen and handled the book in the library of his friend Pamphilus at Caesarea, where Jerome, half a century later, found it and translated it.

Epiphanius, who lived largely in Palestine, and wrote his treatise on heresies in the latter half of the 4th century, has much to say of the Ebionites, and the Nazarenes. Speaking of the Ebionites, he says they receive the "Gospel according to Matthew" to the exclusion of the others, mentioning that it alone of the New Testament books is in Hebrew speech and Hebrew characters, and is called the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" (Haer., xxx.3). He goes on to say, that their "Gospel according to Matthew," as it is named, is not complete but falsified and mutilated, "and they call it the Hebrew Gospel" (Haer., xxx. 13). The quotations which Epiphanius proceeds to make show that this Gospel diverges considerably from the canonical Gospel of Mt and may well be that according to the Hebrews. It is more likely that "the Gospel according to Matthew, very full, in Hebrew," of which Epiphanius speaks, when telling about the Nazarene, is the Hebrew "Gospel of Matthew" attested by Papias, Irenaeus, and a widespread early tradition. But as Epiphanius confesses he does not know whether it has the genealogies, it is clear he was not himself acquainted with the book.

Jerome, toward the end of the 4th century, is our chief authority for the circulation and use of the "Gospel according to the Hebrews," although his later statements on the subject do not always agree with the earlier. He was proud of being "trilinguis," acquainted with Hebrew as well as with Latin and Greek. "There is a Gospel," he says, "which the Nazarenes and Ebionites use, which I lately translated from the Hebrew tongue into Greek and which is called by many the authentic Gospel of Matthew" (Commentary on Matthew 12:13). The fact here mentioned, that he translated the work, seems to imply that this Gospel was really something different from the canonical Mt which he had in his hands. In another place, however, he writes: "Matthew .... first of all composed the Gospel of Christ in Hebrew letters and words, in Judea, for behoof of those of the circumcision who had believed, and it is not quite certain who afterward translated it into Greek. But the very Hebrew is preserved to this day in the Caesarean library, which Pamphilus the Martyr, with such care, collected. I myself was allowed the opportunity of copying it by the Nazarenes in Berea who use this volume. In which it is to be observed that the evangelist, when he uses the testimonies of the Old Testament, either in his own person, or in that of the Lord and Saviour, does not follow the authority of the Septuagint translators, but the Hebrew. Of those, the following are two examples: ‘Out of Egypt have I called my Son’ (Mt 2:15 the King James Version); and ‘He shall be called a Nazarene’ (Mt 2:23)" (De Vir. Ill., iii). It certainly looks as if in the former instance Jerome meant the Gospel according to the Hebrews, and in the latter the well-authenticated Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. At a later time, however, Jerome appears to withdraw this and to introduce a confusing or even contradictory note. His words are: "In the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was written indeed in the Chaldee-Syr (Aramaic) language, but in Hebrew characters,

which the Nazarenes use as the ‘Gospel of the Apostles,’ or as most people think ‘according to Matthew,’ which also is contained in the library at Caesarea, the narrative says" (Adv. Pelag., iii.2). As he proceeds, he quotes passages which are not in the canonical Mt. He also says: "That Gospel which is called the Gospel of the Hebrews which was latedly translated by me into Greek and Latin, and was used frequently by Origen" (Catal. Script. Eccl., "Jacobus"). Jerome’s notices of the actual Gospel were frequent, detailed and unequivocal.

Nicephorus at the beginning of the 9th century puts the Gospel according to the Hebrews in his list of disputed books of the New Testament along with the Apocalypse of John, the Apocalypse of Peter, and the Epistle of Barnabas. This list is believed to rest upon an authority of about the year 500 AD, and, in the stichometry attached, this Gospel is estimated to have occupied 2,200 lines, while the canonical Mt occupied 2,500.

Codex Lambda of the 9th century, discovered by Tischendorf, and now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, has marginal notes affixed to four passages of Matthew giving the readings of to Ioudaikon, the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews (Scrivener, Textual Criticism, I4, 160; see also Plate XI, 30, p. 131).

2. Its Character and Contents:

All that survives, and all that we are told, of this work, show that it was of the nature of a Gospel, and that it was written in the manner of the Synoptic Gospels. But it seems not to have acquired at any time ecclesiastical standing outside the very limited circles of Jewish Christians who preferred it. And it never attained canonical authority. The Muratorian Fragment has no reference to it. Irenaeus knew that the Ebionites used only the Gospel according to Matthew in Hebrew, although, as we have seen, this may be really the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but his fourfold Gospel comprises the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John, which we know. There is no reason to believe that it was the source of the quotations made by Justin from the Apomnemoneumata, or of quotations made anonymously by others of the early Fathers. Like the Synoptic Gospels, however, it contained narratives of events as well as sayings and discourses. It had an account of John the Baptist’s ministry, of the baptism of Jesus, of the call of the apostles, of the woman taken in adultery, of the Last Supper, of the denial of Peter, of appearances of Jesus after the resurrection; and it contained the Lord’s Prayer, and sayings of Jesus, like the forgiveness of injuries seventy times seven, the counsel to the rich young ruler, and others. One or two sayings have a Gnostic tinge, as when Jesus calls the Holy Spirit His mother, and is made to express His unwillingness to eat the flesh of the Passover Lamb. There are apocryphal additions, even where incidents and sayings are narrated belonging to the canonical Gospels, and there are sayings and incidents wholly apocryphal in the fragments of the Gospel which have survived. But these superfluities do not imply any serious deviation from Catholic doctrine; they only prove, as Professor Zahn says, "the earnestness of the redactor of the Gospel according to the Hebrews to enrich the only Gospel which Jewish Christians possessed up to that time from the still unexhausted source of private oral tradition" (GK, II, 717).

The very title of the work suggests that it circulated among Jewish Christians. Those Christians of Palestine to whom Jerusalem was the ecclesiastical center betook themselves, after the troubles which befell the Holy City, to the less frequented regions beyond the Jordan, and were thus cut off from the main stream of catholic Christianity.

3. Its Circulation and Language:

It was accordingly easier for the spirit of exclusiveness to assert itself among them and also for heretical tendencies to develop. The Ebionites went farthest in this direction. They denied the supernatural birth of our Lord, and insisted upon the binding character of the Law for all Christians. The Nazarenes, as all Jewish Christians were called at first, observed the ceremonial law themselves, but did not impose it upon GentileChristians. And they accepted the catholic doctrine of the person of Christ. It was among a community of these Nazarenes at Berea, the modern Aleppo, that Jerome, during a temporary residence at Chalcis in Northern Syria, found the Gospel according to the Hebrews in circulation. No fewer than 9 times does he mention that this Gospel is their one Gospel, and only once does he connect the Ebionites with them in the use of it. Epiphanius draws a clear line of distinction between the Ebionites and the Nazarenes; and we can scarcely suppose that a Gospel which satisfied the one would be wholly acceptable to the other. There is reason to believe that the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew was most to the mind of the Hebrew Christians, and that it took different forms in the hands of the sects into which the Jewish Christian church became divided. Thus the Gospel of the Nazarenes was the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which in all probability had some affinity with the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. The Gospel of the Ebionites, which seems to have been the same as the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, was something of a more divergent doctrinal tendency suited to the exclusive and heretical views of that sect. But it is not easy to reconcile the statements of Epiphanius with those of Eusebius and Jerome.

That the Hebrew tongue in which Papins says Matthew composed his Logia was the Aramaic of Palestine is generally accepted. This Aramaic was closely akin to the Syriac spoken between the Mediterranean and the Tigris. It was the same as the Chaldee of the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel, of which examples have so recently been found in the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine at Assouan. Eusebius and Jerome are emphatic and precise in recording the fact that the Gospel according to the Hebrews was not only Hebrew or Aramaic in composition, but written in the square Hebrew characters, so different from the Old Hebrew of the Moabite Stone and the Siloam inscription. That there was a Greek translation before the time of Jerome of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which was used by Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and others, is strenuously affirmed by Professor Harnack (Altchristliche Literatur, I, 6 ff) and as strenuously denied by Professor Zahn (GK, II, 648 ff). One reason why the book never attained to any ecclesiastical authority was no doubt its limited circulation in a tongue familiar, outside the circle of Jewish Christians, to only a learned few. For this reason also it is unlikely that it will ever be found, as the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd, and other works have been.

4. Relation to Matthew:

It is natural to seek for traces of special relationship between the Gospel according to the Hebrews,

circulating among communities of Jewish Christians, and the Gospel according to Matthew which grew up on the soil of Palestine, and which was originally composed in the interest of Jewish Christians, and circulated at a very early period in a Hebrew recension, soon superseded by the canonical Gospel of Matthew and now altogether lost. We have already seen that Irenaeus in all likelihood confused the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" with the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew; and that Jerome says the Gospel used by the Nazarenes was called by many the authentic Gospel of Matthew. Moreover, among the fragments that have survived, there are more which resemble Matthew's record than either of the other Synoptics. E.B. Nicholson, after a full and scholarly examination of the fragments and of the references, puts forward the hypothesis that "Matthew wrote at different times the canonical Gospel and the Gospel according to the Hebrews, or, at least, that large part of the latter which runs parallel to the former" (The Gospel according to the Hebrews, 104). The possibility of two editions of the same Gospel-writing coming from the same hand has recently received illustration from Professor. Blass' theory of two recensions of the Ac and of Luke's Gospel to explain the textual peculiarities of these books in Codex Bezae (D). This theory has received the adhesion of eminent scholars, but Nicholson has more serious differences to explain, and it cannot be said that his able argument and admirably marshaled learning have carried conviction to the minds of New Testament scholars.

5. Time of Composition:

If we could be sure that Ignatius in his Epistle to the Smyrneans derived the striking saying attributed to our Lord, "Take, handle me, and see that I am not an incorporeal spirit," from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, we should be able to fix its composition as at any rate within the 1st century. The obscurity of its origin, the primitive cast of its contents, and the respect accorded to it down into the 5th century, have disposed some scholars to assign it an origin not later than our Synoptic Gospels, and to regard it as continuing the Aramaic tradition of the earliest preaching and teaching regarding Christ. The manifestly secondary character of some of its contents seems to be against such an early origin. Professor Zahn is rather disposed to place it not earlier than 130, when, during the insurrection of Bar-cochba, the gulf that had grown up between Jews and Jewish Christians was greatly deepened, and with an exclusively Gentilechurch in Jerusalem, the Jewish Christians had lost their center and broken off into sects. The whole situation seems to him to point to a date somewhere between 130-50 AD. The data for any precise determination of the question are wanting.

6. Uncanonical Sayings and Incidents:

There is a saying which Clement of Alexandria quotes from it as Scripture: "He that wonders shall reign and he that reigns shall rest" (Strom., ii.9). Origen quotes from it a saying of Jesus, reminding us somewhat of Eze (8:3): "Just now My Mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs, and bore me away to the great mountain Thabor" (Orig., In Joann., ii; it is quoted several times both by Origen and Jerome). Jerome more than once quotes from it a saying of the Lord to His disciples: "Never be joyful except when ye look on your brother in love" (Hieron. in Eph 5:4; in Eze 18:7). In his commentary on Mt (6:11) Jerome mentions that he found in the third petition of the Lord's prayer for the difficult and unique Greek word epiousios, which he translates "supersubstantialis," the Aramaic word machar, crastinus, so that the sense would be, "Tomorrow's bread give us today." Of unrecorded incidents the

most notable is that of the appearance of the Risen Lord to James: "And when the Lord had given His linen cloth to the servant of the priest, He went to James and appeared to him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he saw Him rising from the dead. Again a little afterward the Lord says, Bring a table and bread. Immediately it is added: He took bread and blessed and brake, and afterward gave it to James the Just and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread for the Son of Man has risen from them that sleep" (Hieron., De Vir. Illustr., "Jacobus").

Jerome also tells that in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, there is the following passage: "Lo, the mother of the Lord and His brethren said unto Him: John the Baptist is baptizing for the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him. But He said to them: What sin have I committed that I should go and be baptized by him? Unless perchance this very word which I have spoken is a sin of ignorance" (Hieron., Adv. Pelag., iii.2).

7. Conclusion:

This Gospel is not to be classed with heretical Gospels like that of Marcion, nor with apocryphal Gospels like that of James or Nicodemus. It differed from the former in that it did not deviate from any essential of catholic truth in its representation of our Lord. It differed from the latter in that it narrated particulars mostly relating to our Lord’s public ministry, while they occupy themselves with matters of curiosity left unrecorded in the canonical Gospels. It differs from the canonical Gospels only in that it is more florid in style, more diffuse in the relation of incidents, and more inclined to sectional views of doctrine. Its uncanonical sayings and incidents may have come from oral tradition, and they do lend a certain interest and picturesqueness to the narrative. Its language confined it to a very limited sphere, and its sectional character prevented it from ever professing Scriptural authority or attaining to canonical rank.

See also APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

LITERATURE.

E.B. Nicholson, The Gospel according to the Hebrews (1879); R. Handmann, Das Hebrder-Evangelium: Texte u. Untersuchungen, Band V (1889); Zahn, GK, II, 642-723 (1890); Harnack, Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, I, 6 ff; II, 1, 625-51 (1897); Neutestamentliche Apocryphen (Hennecke), I, 11-21 (1904).

T. Nicol

HEBREWS, RELIGION OF THE

See ISRAEL, RELIGION OF.

HEBRON (1)

he’-brun (chebhron, "league" or "confederacy"; Chebron): One of the most ancient and important cities in Southern Palestine, now known to the Moslems as el Khalil (i.e. Khalil er Rahman, "the friend of the Merciful," i.e. of God, a favorite name for Abraham; compare Jas 2:23). The city is some 20 miles South of Jerusalem, situated in an open valley, 3,040 ft. above sea-level.

I. History of the City.

Hebron is said to have been rounded before Zoan (i.e. Tanis) in Egypt (Nu 13:22); its ancient name was Kiriath-arba, probably meaning the "Four Cities," perhaps because divided at one time into four quarters, but according to Jewish writers so called because four patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Adam were buried there. According to Jos 15:13 it was so called after Arba, the father of Anak.

1. Patriarchal Period:

Abram came and dwelt by the oaks of MAMRE (which see), "which are in Hebron" Ge (13:18); from here he went to the rescue of Lot and brought him back after the defeat of Chedorlaomer (14:13 f); here his name was changed to Abraham (17:5); to this place came the three angels with the promise of a son (18:1 f); Sarah died here (23:2), and for her sepulcher Abraham bought the cave of Machpelah (23:17); here Isaac and Jacob spent much of their lives (35:27; 37:14); from here Jacob sent Joseph to seek his brethren (37:14), and hence, Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt (46:1). In the cave of Machpelah all the patriarchs and their wives, except Rachel, were buried (49:30 f; 50:13).

2. Times of Joshua and Judges:

The spies visited Hebron and near there cut the cluster of grapes (Nu 13:22 f). HOHAM (which see), king of Hebron, was one of the five kings defeated by Joshua at Beth-horon and slain at Makkedah (Jos 10:3 f). Caleb drove out from Hebron the "three sons of Anak" (Jos 14:12; 15:14); it became one of the cities of Judah (Jos 15:54), but was set apart for the Kohathite Levites (Jos 21:10 f), and became a city of refuge (Jos 20:7). One of Samson’s exploits was the carrying of the gate of Gaza "to the top of the mountain that is before Hebron" (Jud 16:3).

3. The Days of the Monarchy:

David, when a fugitive, received kindness from the people of this city (1Sa 30:31); here Abner was treacherously slain by Joab at the gate (2Sa 3:27), and the sons of Rimmon, after their hands and feet had been cut off, were hanged "beside the pool" (2Sa 4:12). After the death of Saul, David was here anointed king (2Sa 5:3) and reigned here 7 1/2 years, until he captured Jerusalem and made that his capital (2Sa 5:5); while here, six sons were born to him (2Sa 3:2). In this city Absalom found a center for his disaffection, and repairing there under pretense of performing a vow to Yahweh, he raised the standard of revolt (2Sa 15:7 f). Josephus mistakenly places here the dream of Solomon (Ant., VIII, ii, 1)

which occurred at Gibeon (1Ki 3:4). Hebron was fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:10).

4. Later History:

Probably during the captivity Hebron came into the hands of Edom, though it appears to have been colonized by returning Jews (Ne 11:25); it was recovered from Edom by Simon Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:65; Josephus, Ant, XII, viii, 6). In the first great revolt against Rome, Simon bar-Gioras captured the city (BJ, IV, ix, 7), but it was retaken, for Vespasian, by his general Cerealis who carried it by storm, slaughtered the inhabitants and burnt it (ibid., 9).

During the Muslim period Hebron has retained its importance on account of veneration to the patriarchs, especially Abraham; for the same reason it was respected by the Crusaders who called it Castellum ad Sanctum Abraham. In 1165 it became the see of a Latin bishop, but 20 years later it fell to the victorious arms of Saladin, and it has ever since remained a fanatic Moslem center, although regarded as a holy city, alike by Moslem, Jew and Christian.

II. The Ancient Site.

Modern Hebron is a straggling town clustered round the Haram or sacred enclosure built above the traditional cave of MACHPELAH (which see); it is this sacred spot which has determined the present position of the town all through the Christian era, but it is quite evident that an exposed and indefensible situation, running along a valley, like this, could not have been that of earlier and less settled times. From many of the pilgrim narratives, we can gather that for long there had been a tradition that the original site was some distance from the modern town, and, as analogy might suggest, upon a hill. There can be little doubt that the site of the Hebron of Old Testament history is a lofty, olive-covered hill, lying to the West of the present town, known as er Rumeidy. Upon its summit are cyclopian walls and other traces of ancient occupation. In the midst are the ruins of a medieval building known as Der el-Arba‘in, the "monastery of the forty" (martyrs) about whom the Hebronites have an interesting folklore tale. In the building are shown the so-called tombs of Jesse and Ruth. Near the foot of the hill are several fine old tombs, while to the North is a large and very ancient Jewish cemetery, the graves of which are each covered with a massive monolith, 5 and 6 ft. long. At the eastern foot of the hill is a perennial spring, ‘Ain el Judeideh; the water rises in a vault, roofed by masonry and reached by steps. The environs of this hill are full of folklore associations; the summit would well repay a thorough excavation.

A mile or more to the Northwest of Hebron is the famous oak of MAMRE (which see), or "Abraham’s oak," near which the Russians have erected a hospice. It is a fine specimen of the Holm oak (Quercus coccifera), but is gradually dying. The present site appears to have been pointed out as that of Abraham’s tent since the 12th century; the earlier traditional site was at Ramet el Khalil.

See MAMRE.

III. Modern Hebron.

Modern Hebron is a city of some 20,000 inhabitants, 85 percent of whom are Moslems and the remainder mostly Jews. The city is divided into seven quarters, one of which is known as that of the "glass blowers" and another as that of the "water-skin makers." These industries, with the manufacture of pottery, are the main sources of trade. The most conspicuous building is the Haram (see MACHPELAH). In the town are two large open reservoirs the Birket el Qassasin, the "pool of the glass blowers" and Birket es Sultan, "the pool of the Sultan." This latter, which is the larger, is by tradition the site of the execution of the murderers of Ishbosheth (2Sa 4:12). The Moslem inhabitants are noted for their fanatical exclusiveness and conservatism, but this has been greatly modified in recent years through the patient and beneficent work of Dr. Paterson, of the U. F. Ch. of S. Med. Mission. The Jews, who number about 1,500, are mostly confined to a special ghetto; they have four synagogues, two Sephardic and two Ashkenazic; they are a poor and unprogressive community.

For Hebron (Jos 19:28) see EBRON.

E. W. G. Masterman

HEBRON (2)

(chebhron, "league," "association"):

(1) The third son of Kohath, son of Levi (Ex 6:18; Nu 3:19,27; 1Ch 6:2,18; 23:12,19).

(2) A son of Mareshah and descendant of Caleb (1Ch 2:42,43).

See also KORAH.

HEBRONITES

he’-brun-its (chebhroni): A family of Levites, descendants of Hebron, third son of Kohath (Nu 3:27; 26:58, etc.).

HEDGE

hej:

(1) mecukhah, "a thorn hedge," only in Mic 7:4.; mesukkah, "a hedge" (Isa 5:5); mesukhath chadheq, "a hedge of thorns" (Pr 15:19).

(2) gadher, and geherah, translated "hedges" in the Revised Version (British and American) only in Ps 89:40, elsewhere "fence." GEDERAH (which see) in the Revised Version margin is translated

"hedges" (1Ch 4:23).

(3) na‘atsuts, "thorn-hedges" (Isa 7:19).

(4) phragmos, translated "hedge" (Mt 21:33; Mr 12:1; Lu 14:23); "partition" in Eph 2:14, which is its literal meaning. In the Septuagint it is the usual equivalent of the above Hebrew words.

Loose stone walls without mortar are the usual "fences" around fields in Palestine, and this is what gadher and gedherah signify in most passages. Hedges made of cut thorn branches or thorny bushes are very common in the plains and particularly in the Jordan valley.

E. W. G. Masterman

HEDGEHOG

hej’-hog Septuagint echinos, "hedgehog," for qippodh, in Isa 14:23; 34:11; Ze 2:14, and for qippoz, in Isa 34:15).

See PORCUPINE; BITTERN; OWL; SERPENT.

HEED

hed: This word, in the sense of giving careful attention ("take heed," "give heed," etc.), represents several Hebrew and Greek words; chief among them shamar, "to watch"; blepo, "to look," horao, "to see." As opposed to thoughtlessness, disregard of God’s words, of the counsels of wisdom, of care for one’s ways, it is constantly inculcated as a duty of supreme importance in the moral and spiritual life (De 4:9,15,23; 27:9 the King James Version, etc.; Jos 22:5; 23:11; Ps 39:1; Mt 16:6; Mr 4:24; 13:33; Lu 12:15; 1Co 3:10; 8:9; 10:12; Col 4:17).

James Orr

HEEL

hel (‘aqebh): "The iniquity of my heels" (Ps 49:5 the King James Version) is a literal translation, and might be understood to indicate the Psalmist’s "false steps," errors or sins, but that meaning is very doubtful here. the Revised Version (British and American) gives "iniquity at my heels." the Revised Version margin gives a still better sense, "When the iniquity of them that would supplant me compasseth me about, even of them that trust in .... riches"—treacherous enemies ever on the watch to trip up a man’s heels (compare Ho 12:3). Of Judah it was said, "Thy heels (shall) suffer violence" (Jer 13:22) through being "made bare" (the King James Version), and thus subject to the roughness of the road as she was led captive.

Figurative:

(1) Of the partial victory of the evil power over humanity, "Thou shalt bruise (m "lie in wait for") his heel" (Ge 3:15), through constant, insidious suggestion of the satisfaction of the lower desires. Or if we regard this statement as a part of the Protevangelium, the earliest proclamation of Christ's final, and complete victory over sin, the destruction of "the serpent" ("He shall bruise thy head"), then the reference is evidently to Christ's sufferings and death, even to all that He endured in His human nature.

(2) Of the stealthy tactics of the tribe of Da in war, "An adder in the path, that biteth the horse's heels" (Ge 49:17), by which it triumphed over foes of superior strength.

(3) Of violence and brutality, "Who .... hath lifted up his heel against me" (Ps 41:9; Joh 13:18), i.e. lifted up his foot to trample upon me (compare Jos 10:24).

M. O. Evans

HEGAI; HEGE

he'-ga-i, he'-ge (heghay; Gai (Es 2:8,15), and heghe', Hege (Es 2:3)): One of the officers of the Persian king Ahasuerus; a chamberlain or eunuch (keeper of women), into whose custody the "fair young virgins" were delivered from whom the king intended to choose his queen in the place of the discredited Vashti.

HEGEMONIDES

heg-e-mon'-i-dez, hej-e-mo-ni'-dez (Hegemonides): The Syrian officer placed in command of the district extending from Ptolemais to the Gerrenians (2 Macc 13:24). It is not easy to see how in the King James Version and even in Swete's revised text the word can be taken as a mere appellative along with strategon, the two being rendered "principal officer": one of the two could certainly be omitted (Swete, 3rd ed., 1905, capitalizes Hegemonides). In the Revised Version (British and American) the word is taken as the name of some person otherwise unknown.

HEIFER

hef'-er (parah, in Nu 19 (see following article) and Ho 4:16; 'eghlah, elsewhere in the Old Testament; damalis, in Heb 9:13):for the "heifer of three years old" in the King James Version, the Revised Version margin of Isa 15:5; Jer 48:34, see EGLATH-SHELISHIYAH. A young cow (contrast BULLOCK). The 'eghlah figures specifically in religious rites only in the ceremony of De 21:1-9 for the cleansing of the land, where an unexpiated murder had been committed. This was not a sacrificial rite—the priests are witnesses only, and the animal was slain by breaking the neck—but sacrificial purity was required for the heifer. Indeed, it is commonly supposed that the rite as it now stands is a rededication of one that

formerly had been sacrificial. In the sacrifices proper the heifer could be used for a peace offering (Le 3:1), but was forbidden for the burnt (Le 1:3) or sin (Le 4:3,14) offerings. Hence, the sacrifice of 1Sa 16:2 was a peace offering. In Ge 15:9 the ceremony of the ratification of the covenant by God makes use of a heifer and a she-goat, but the reason for the use of the females is altogether obscure. Compare following article.

Figuratively: The heifer appears as representing sleekness combined with helplessness in Jer 46:20 (compare the comparison of the soldiers to ‘stalled calves’ in the next verse). In Jer 50:11; Ho 10:11, the heifer is pictured as engaged in threshing. This was particularly light work, coupled with unusually abundant food (De 25:4), so that the threshing heifer served especially well for a picture of contentment. ("Wanton" in Jer 50:11, however, is an unfortunate translation in the Revised Version (British and American).) Hosea, in contrast, predicts that the "heifers" shall be set to the hard work of plowing and breaking the sods. In Jud 14:18, Samson uses "heifer" in his riddle to refer to his wife. This, however, was not meant to convey the impression of licentiousness that it gives the modern reader.

Burton Scott Easton

HEIFER, RED

In Nu 19 a rite is described in which the ashes of a "red heifer" and of certain objects are mixed with running water to obtain the so-called "water for impurity." (Such is the correct translation of the American Standard Revised Version in Nu 19:9,13,10,21; 31:23. In these passages, the King James Version and the English Revised Version, through a misunderstanding of a rather difficult Hebrew term, have "water of separation"; Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) have, "water of sprinkling." the English Revised Version margin, "water of impurity," is right, but ambiguous.) This water was employed in the removal of the uncleanness of a person or thing that had been in contact with a dead body, and also in removing ritual defilement from booty taken in war.

1. Origin and Significance of the Rite:

The general origin of the rite is clear enough, as is the fact that this origin lies back of the official sacrificial system of Israel. For the removal of impurity, ritual as well as physical, water, preferably running water (Nu 19:17; compare Le 14:5 ff; Le 15:13), is the natural means, and is employed universally. But where the impurity was unusually great, mere water was not felt to be adequate, and various substances were mixed with it in order to increase its efficacy. So (among other things) blood is used in Le 14:6,7, and dust in Nu 5:17 (see WATER OF BITTERNESS). The use, however, of ashes in Nu 19:17 is unique in the Old Testament, although parallels from elsewhere can be adduced. So e.g. in Ovid Fasti, iv.639-40, 725, 733, in the last of these references, "The blood of a horse shall be a purification, and the ashes of calves," is remarkably close to the Old Testament. The ashes were obtained by burning the heifer completely, "her skin, and her flesh, and her blood, with her dung" (the contents of the entrails) (Nu 19:5; compare Ex 29:14). Here only in the Old Testament is blood burned for a ceremonial purpose, and here only is burning a pewliminary; elsewhere it is either a chief act or

serves to consume the remnants of a finished sacrifice—Le 4:12 and Nu 19:3 are altogether different.

The heifer is a female. For the regular sin offering for the congregation, only the male was permitted (Le 4:14), but the female was used in the purificatory ceremony of De 21:3 (a rite that has several points of similarity to that of Nu 19). An individual sin offering by one of the common people, however, required a female (Le 4:28), but probably only in order to give greater prominence to the more solemn sacrifices for which the male was reserved. A female is required again in the cases enumerated in Le 5:1-6, most of which are ritual defilements needing purification; a female was required at the purification of a leper (in addition to two males, Le 14:10), and a female, with one male, was offered when a Nazirite terminated his vows (Nu 6:14). Some connection between purification and the sacrifice of a female may be established by this list, for even in the case of the Nazirite the idea may be removal of the state of consecration. But the reason for such a connection is anything but obvious, and the various explanations that have been offered are hardly more than guesses. The most likely is that purificatory rites originated in a very primitive stage when the female was thought to be the more sacred animal on account of its greater usefulness. Of the other requirements for the heifer she must be "red," i.e. reddish brown (Nu 19:2). Likeness in color to blood is at first sight the most natural explanation, but likeness in color to ripe grain is almost equally plausible. It may be noted that certain Egyptian sacrifices also required red cattle as victims (Plutarch, De Isid. 31). The heifer is to be "without spot" ("faultless"), "wherein is no blemish," the ordinary requirement for sacrifices. (The Jewish exegetes misread this "perfectly red, wherein is no blemish," with extraordinary results; see below.) But an advance on sacrificial requirements is that she shall be one "upon which never came yoke." This requirement is found elsewhere only in De 21:3 and in 1Sa 6:7 (that the animals in this last case were finally sacrificed is, however, not in point). But in other religions this requirement was very common (compare Iliad x.293; Vergil, Georg. iv.550-51; Ovid, Fasti iv.336).

2. Use of Cedar and Hyssop:

While the heifer was being burned, "cedar-wood, and hyssop, and scarlet" (i.e. scarlet wool or thread) were cast into the flames. The same combination of objects (although differently employed) is found at the cleansing of a leper (Le 14:4), but their meaning is entirely unknown. The explanations offered are almost countless. It is quite clear that hyssop was especially prized in purifications (Ps 51:7), but the use of hyssop as a sprinkler and the use of ashes of hyssop may be quite unrelated. Hyssop and cedar were supposed to have medicinal properties (see CEDAR; HYSSOP). Or the point may be the use of aromatic woods. For a mixture of cedar and other substances in water as a purificatory medium compare Fossey, Magie Assyrienne, 285. The scarlet wool offers still greater difficulties, apart from the color, but it may be noted that scarlet wool plays a part in some of the Babylonian conjurations (Assyrian Bibl., XII, 31). But, obviously, none of this leads very far and it may all be in the wrong direction. All that can be said definitely is that Le 14:4 and Nu 19:6 show that the combination of objects was deemed to have a high purificatory value.

3. Application and Sacredness of the Ashes:

The ashes, when obtained, were used in removing the greatest of impurities. Consequently, they themselves were deemed to have an extraordinarily "consecrated" character, and they were not to be handled carelessly. Their consecration extended to the rite by which they were produced, so that every person engaged in it was rendered unclean (Nu 19:7,8,10), an excellent example of how in primitive religious thought the ideas of "holiness" and "uncleanness" blend. It was necessary to perform the whole ceremony "without the camp" (Nu 19:3), and the ashes, when prepared, were also kept without the camp (Nu 19:9), probably in order to guard against their touch defiling anyone (as well as to keep them from being defiled). When used they were mixed with running water, and the mixture was sprinkled with hyssop on the person or object to be cleansed (Nu 19:17-19). The same water was used to purify booty (Nu 31:23), and it may also be meant by the "water of expiation" in Nu 8:7.

4. Of Non-Priestly and Non-Israelitish Origin:

In addition to the similarities already pointed out between Nu 19 and De 21:1-9, the rites resemble each other also in the fact that, in both, laymen are the chief functionaries and that the priests have little to do (in De 21:1-9 they are mere passive witnesses). This suggests a non-priestly origin. The title "sin-offering" in Nu 19:9,17 (unless used in a unique sense) points to an original sacrificial meaning, although in Nu 19 the heifer is carefully kept away from the altar. Again, the correspondences with rites in other religions indicate a non-Israelitish origin. Such a ceremony may well have passed among the Israelites and have become prized by them. It contained nothing objectionable and seemed to have much of deep worth, and a few slight additions—chiefly the sprinkling (Nu 19:4; compare Le 4:6,17)—made it fit for adoption into the highest system. Some older features may have been eliminated also, but as to this, of course, there is no information. But, in any case, the ceremony is formed of separate rites that are exceedingly old and that are found in a great diversity of religions so that any elaborate symbolic interpretation of the details would seem to be without justification. The same result can be reached by comparing the countless symbolic interpretations that have been attempted in the past, for they differ hopelessly. As a matter of fact, the immense advance that has been gained in the understanding of the meaning of the Old Testament rites through the comparative study of religions has shown the futility of much that has been written on symbolism. That a Certain rite is widely practiced may merely mean that it rests on a true instinct. To be sure, the symbolism of the future will be written on broader lines and will be less pretentious in its claims, but for these very reasons it will rest on a more solid basis. At present, however, the chief task is the collection of material and its correct historical interpretation.

5. Obscurity of Later History:

The later history of the rite is altogether obscure. As no provision was made in Nu 19 for sending the ashes to different points, the purification could have been practiced only by those living near the sanctuary. Rabbinical casuistry still further complicated. matters by providing that two black or white hairs from the same follicle would disqualify the heifer (see above), and that one on whom even a cloth had been laid could not be used. In consequence, it became virtually or altogether impossible to secure a proper animal, and the Mishnic statement that only nine had ever been found (Parah, iii.5) probably means that the rite had been obsolete long before New Testament times. Still, the existence of the tractate, Parah, and the mention in Heb 9:13 show that the provisions were well remembered.

See also SACRIFICE.

LITERATURE.

Baentsch (1903), Holzinger (1903), and (especially) Grey (1903) on Nu; Kennedy in HDB; Edersheim, Temple and Ministry, chapter xviii (rabbinic traditions. Edersheim gives the best of the "typological" explanations).

Burton Scott Easton

HEIGHT; HEIGHTS

hit, The English terms represent a large number of Hebrew words (gobhah, marom, qomah, rum, etc.). A chief thing to notice is that in the Revised Version (British and American) "height" and "heights" are frequently substituted for other words in the King James Version, as "coast" (Jos 12:23), "region" (1Ki 4:11), "borders" (Jos 11:2), "countries" (Jos 17:11), "strength" (Ps 95:4), "high places" (Isa 41:18; Jer 3:2,21; 7:29; 12:12; 14:6), "high palaces" (Ps 78:69). On the other hand, for "height" in the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) has "stature" (Eze 31:5,10), "raised basement" (Eze 41:8), etc. In the New Testament we have hupsoma, prop. of space (Ro 8:39), and hupsos of measure (Eph 3:18; Re 21:16).

James Orr

HEIR

ar:

1. The Word "Heir":

In the New Testament "heir" is the invariable translation of kleronomos (15 times), the technical equivalent in Greek, and of the compound sunkleronomos, "co-heir," in Ro 8:17; Eph 3:6; Heb 11:9; 1Pe 3:7 (in Ga 4:30; Heb 1:14, contrast the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). In the Old Testament "heir" and "to be heir" both represent some form of the common verb yarash, "possess," and the particular rendition of the verb as "to be heir" is given only by the context (compare e.g. the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in Jer 49:2; Mic 1:15). Exactly the same is true of the words translated "inherit," "inheritance," which in by far the great majority of cases would have been represented better by "possess," "possession" (see INHERITANCE and OHL on ...). Consequently, when God is said, for instance, to have given Palestine to Israel as an ‘inheritance’ (Le 20:24, etc.), nothing more need be meant than ‘given as a possession.’ The Septuagint, however, for the sake of variety in its rendition of Hebrew words, used kleronomeo in many such cases

(especially Ge 15:7,8; 22:17), and thereby fixed on ‘heir’ the sense of ‘recipient of a gift from God.’ And so the word passed in this sense into New Testament Greek—Ro 4:13,14; Ga 3:29; Tit 3:7; Heb 6:17; 11:7; Jas 2:5; compare Eph 3:6; Heb 11:9; 1Pe 3:7. On the other hand, the literal meaning of the word is found in Mr 12:7 (and parallels and Ga 4:1—in the latter case being suggested by the transferred meaning in 3:29—while in Ro 8:17; Ga 4:7, the literal and transferred meanings are blended. This blending has produced the phrase "heirs of God," which, literally, is meaningless and which doubtless was formed without much deliberation, although it is perfectly clear. A similar blending has applied "heir" to Christ in Heb 1:2 (compare Ro 8:17 and perhaps Mr 12:7) as the recipient of all things in their totality. But apart from these "blended" passages, it would be a mistake to think that sonship is always consciously thought of where "heir" is mentioned, and hence, too much theological implication should not be assigned the latter word.

2. Heir in Old Testament Law:

The heirs of property in the Old Testament were normally the sons and, chief among these, the firstborn.

(1) De 21:15-17 provides that the firstborn shall inherit a "double portion," whence it would appear that all the other sons shared equally. (It should be noted that in this law the firstborn is the eldest son of the father, not of the mother as in Ex 13:2.) Uncertain, however, is what De 21:15-17 means by "wife," and the practice must have varied. In Ge 21:10 the son of the handmaid was not to be heir with Isaac, but in Ge 30:1-13 the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah are reckoned as legitimate children of Jacob. See MARRIAGE. Nor is it clear that De 21:15-17 forbids setting aside the eldest son because of his own sin—compare the case of Reuben (Ge 49:3,1; 1Ch 5:1), although the son of a regular wife (Ge 29:32). The very existence of De 21:15-17, moreover, shows that in spite of the absence of formal wills, a man could control to some extent the disposition of his property after his death and that the right of the firstborn could be set aside by the father (1Ch 26:10). That the royal dignity went by primogeniture is asserted only (in a particular case) in 2Ch 21:3, and both David (1Ki 1:11-13) and Rehoboam (2Ch 11:21-23) chose younger sons as their successors. A single payment in the father’s lifetime could be given in lieu of heritage (Ge 25:6; Lu 15:12), and it was possible for two brothers to make a bargain as to the disposition of the property after the father’s death (Ge 25:31-34).

(2) When there were sons alive, the daughters had no right of inheritance, and married daughters had no such right in any case. (Job 42:15 describes an altogether exceptional procedure.) Probably unmarried daughters passed under the charge of the firstborn, as the new head of the family, and he took the responsibility of finding them husbands. Nu 27:1-11; 36:1-12 treat of the case where there were no sons—the daughters inherited the estate, but they could marry only within the tribe, lest the tribal possessions be confused. This right of the daughters, however, is definitely stated to be a new thing, and in earlier times the property probably passed to the nearest male relatives, to whom it went in later times if there were no daughters. In extreme cases, where no other heirs could be found, the property went to the slaves (Ge 15:3; Pr 30:23, noting that the meaning of the latter verse is uncertain), but this could have happened only at the rarest intervals. A curious instance is that of 1Ch 2:34,35, where property is preserved in the family by marrying the daughter to an Egyptian slave belonging to the father; perhaps some adoption-idea underlies this.

(3) The wife had no claim on the inheritance, though the disposition made of her dowry is not explained, and it may have been returned to her. If she was childless she resorted to the Levirate marriage (De 25:5-10). If this was impracticable or was without issue she returned to her own family and might marry another husband (Ge 38:11; Le 22:13; Ru 1:8). The inferior wives (concubines) were part of the estate and went to the heir; indeed, possession of the father's concubines was proof of possession of his dignities (2Sa 16:21,22; 1Ki 2:13-25). At least, such was the custom in the time of David and Solomon, but at a later period nothing is heard of the practice.

(4) The disposition of land is a very obscure question. Nu 36:4 states explicitly that each heir had a share, but the continual splittin up of an estate through successive generations would have produced an impossible state of affairs. Possibly the land went to the eldest born as part of his portion, possibly in some cases it was held in common by the members of the family, possibly some member bought the shares of the others, possibly the practice differed at different times. But our ignorance of the facts is complete.

NOTE.—The dates assigned by different scholars to the passages cited have an important bearing on the discussion.

Burton Scott Easton

HELAH

he'-la (chel'ah): A wife of Ashhur, father of Tekoa (1Ch 4:5,7).

HELAM

he'-lam (chelam, 2Sa 10:16 f; in 16:17 with the he of locale; Septuagint Hailam): A place near which David is said to have defeated the Aramean world under Hadarezer (2Sa 10:16). Its site is unknown. Cornill and others introduce it into the text of Eze 47:16 from the Septuagint Heliam). This would place it between the territories of Damascus and Hamath, which is not unreasonable. Some scholars identify it with Aleppo, which seems too far north.

HELBAH

hel'-ba (chelbah): A place in the territory assigned to Asher (Jud 1:31). It may be identical with Mahalliba of Sennacherib's prism inscription. The site, however, has not been recovered.

HELBON

hel'-bon (chelbon; Chelbon, Chebron): A district from which Tyre received supplies of wine through the

Damascus market (Eze 27:18); universally admitted to be the modern Halbun, a village at the head of a fruitful valley of the same name among the chalk slopes on the eastern side of Anti-Lebanon, 13 miles North-Northwest of Damascus, where traces of ancient vineyard terracing still exist. Records contemporary with Eze mention mat helbunim or the land of Helbon, whence Nebuchadnezzar received wine for sacrificial purposes (Belinno Cylinder, I, 23), while karan hulbunu, or Helbonian wine, is named in Western Asiatic Inscriptions, II, 44. Strabo (xv.735) also tells that the kings of Persia esteemed it highly. The district is still famous for its grapes—the best in the country—but these are mostly made into raisins, since the population is now Moslem. Helbon must not be confounded with Chalybon (Ptol. v.15, 17), the Greek-Roman province of Haleb or Aleppo.

W. M. Christie

HELCHIAH

hel-ki’-a.

See HELKIAS.

HELDAI

hel’-da-i (chelday):

(1) A captain of the temple-service, appointed for the 12th month (1Ch 27:15). Same as Heled (cheledh) in parallel list (compare 1Ch 11:30), and is probably also to be identified with Heleb, son of Baanah the Metophathite, one of David’s heroic leaders (2Sa 23:29).

(2) One of a company of Jews who brought gifts of gold and silver from Babylon to assist the exiles under Zerubbabel (Zec 6:10).

HELEB

he’-leb chelebh, 2Sa 23:29).

See HELDAI.

HELED

he’-led (cheledh, 1Ch 11:30).

See HELDAI.

HELEK

he’-lek chelekh): Son of Gilead the Manassite (Nu 26:30; Jos 17:2). Patronymic, Helekites (Nu 26:30).

HELEM

he’-lem:

(1) helem; Septuagint Codex Vaticanus, Balaam, omitting "son," Codex Alexandrinus, huios Elam, "son of Elam" (1Ch 7:35). A great-grandson of Asher, called Hotham in 1Ch 7:32. The form "Elam" appears as the name of a Levite in 1 Esdras 8:33.

(2) chelem, "strength," regarded by Septuagint as a common noun (Zec 6:14). One of the ambassadors from the Jews of the exile to Jerusalem; probably the person called Heldai in Zec 6:10 is meant.

HELEPH

he’-lef (cheleph): A place on the southern border of Naphtali (Jos 19:33); unidentified.

HELEZ

he’-lez (chelets "vigor"; Septuagint Selles, Chelles):

(1) 2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:27; 27:10. One of David’s mighty men; according to 1Ch 27:10, he belonged to the sons of Ephraim and was at the head of the 7th course in David’s organization of the kingdom.

(2) Septuagint Chelles, 1Ch 2:39. A man of Judah of the clan of the Jerahmeelites.

HELI

he’-li (Helei for ‘eli):

(1) The father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, in Luke’s account of the genealogy of Jesus (Lu 3:23).

(2) An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:2).

HELIODORUS

he-li-o-do’-rus (Heliodoros): Treasurer of the Syrian king Seleucus IV, Philopator (187-175 BC), the immediate predecessor of Antiochus Epiphanes who carried out to its utmost extremity the Hellenizing

policy begun by Seleucus and the "sons of Tobias." Greatly in want of money to pay the tribute due to the Romans as one of the results of the victory of Scipio over Antiochus the Great at Magnesia (190 BC), Seleucus learned from Apollonius, governor of Coele-Syria (Pal) and Phoenicia, of the wealth which was reported to be stored up in the Temple at Jerusalem and commissioned Heliodorus. (2 Macc 3) to plunder the temple and to bring its contents to him. On the wealth collected in the Temple at this time, Josephus (Ant., IV, vii, 2) may be consulted. The Temple seems to have served the purposes of a bank in which the private deposits of widows and orphans were kept for greater security, and in 2 Macc 3:15-21 is narrated the panic at Jerusalem which took place when Heliodorus came with an armed guard to seize the contents of the Temple (see Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, III, 287). In spite of the protest of Onias, the high priest, Heliodorus. was proceeding to carry out his commission when, "through the Lord of Spirits and the Prince of all power," a great apparition appeared which caused him to fall down "compassed with great darkness" and speechless. When "quite at the last gasp" he was by the intercession of Onias restored to life and strength and "testified to all men the works of the great God which he had beheld with his eyes." The narrative given in 2 Macc 3 is not mentioned by any other historian, though 4 Macc refers to the plundering of the Temple and assigns the deed to Apollonius. Raffaelle used the incident in depicting, on the walls of the Vatican, the triumph of Pope Julius II over the enemies of the Pontificate.

J. Hutchison

HELIOPOLIS

he-li-op’-o-lis.

See ON.

HELKAI

hel’-ka-i, hel’-ki, hel-ka’-i (chelqay, perhaps an abbreviation for Helkiah, "Yah is my portion." Not in the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus; Codex L: Chelkias (Ne 12:15)): The head of a priestly house in the days of Joiakim.

HELKATH

hel’-kath (chelqath (Jos 19:25); chelqath (Jos 21:31); by a scribal error chuqoq (1Ch 6:75)): A town or district on the border of Asher, assigned to the Levites; unidentified.

HELKATH-HAZZURIM

hel’-kath-haz’-u-rim, -ha-zu’-rim (chelqath ha-tsurim; Meris ton epiboulon): The name as it stands means "field of the sword edges," and is applied to the scene of the conflict in which twelve champions

each from the army of Joab and that of Abner perished together, each slaying his fellow (2Sa 2:16). Some, following Septuagint, would read chelqath ha-tsodhim, "field of the crafty," i.e. "of the ambush." Thenius suggested chelqath ha-tsarim, "field of the adversaries" (see also H. P. Smith, ICC, "Samuel," 271). Probably, however, the text as it stands is correct.

W. Ewing

HELKIAS

hel-ki’-as (chilqiyah; Chelkias; the King James Version Chelcias):

(1) Father of Susanna (Susanna verses 2,29,63). According to tradition he was brother of Jeremiah, and he is identified with the priest who found the Book of the Law in the time of Josiah (2Ki 22:8).

(2) Ancestor of Baruch (Baruch 1:1).

(3) Father of Joiakim the high priest (Baruch 1:7). The name represents HILKIAH (which see).

HELL

hel (see SHEOL; HADES; GEHENNA):

1. The Word in the King James Version:

The English word, from a Teutonic root meaning "to hide" or "cover," had originally the significance of the world of the dead generally, and in this sense is used by Chaucer, Spenser, etc., and in the Creed ("He descended into hell"); compare the English Revised Version Preface. Now the word has come to mean almost exclusively the place of punishment of the lost or finally impenitent; the place of torment of the wicked. In the King James Version of the Scriptures, it is the rendering adopted in many places in the Old Testament for the Hebrew word she’ol (in 31 out of 65 occurrences of that word it is so translated), and in all places, save one (1Co 15:55) in the New Testament, for the Greek word Hades (this word occurs 11 times; in 10 of these it is translated "hell"; 1Co 15:55 reads "grave," with "hell" in the margin). In these cases the word has its older general meaning, though in Lu 16:23 (parable of Rich Man and Lazarus) it is specially connected with a place of "torment," in contrast with the "Abraham’s bosom" to which Lazarus is taken (16:22). 2. The Word in the Revised Version:

In the above cases the Revised Version (British and American) has introduced changes, replacing "hell" by "Sheol" in the passages in the Old Testament (the English Revised Version retains "hell" in Isa 14:9,15; the American Standard Revised Version makes no exception), and by "Hades" in the passages in the New Testament (see under these words).

3. Gehenna:

Besides the above uses, and more in accordance with the modern meaning, the word "hell" is used in the New Testament in the King James Version as the equivalent of Gehenna (12 t; Mt 5:22,29; 10:28, etc.). the Revised Version (British and American) in these cases puts "Gehenna" in the margin. Originally the Valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, Gehenna became among the Jews the synonym for the place of torment in the future life (the "Gehenna of fire," Mt 5:22, etc.; see GEHENNA).

4. Tartarus:

In yet one other passage in the New Testament (2Pe 2:4), "to cast down to hell" is used (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) to represent the Greek tartaroo, ("to send into Tartarus"). Here it stands for the place of punishment of the fallen angels: "spared not angels when they sinned, but cast them down to hell, and committed them to pits (or chains) of darkness" (compare Jude 1:6; but also Mt 25:41). Similar ideas are found in certain of the Jewish apocalyptic books (Book of Enoch, Book of Jubilees, Apocrypha Baruch, with apparent reference to Ge 6:1-4; compare ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT).

On theological aspect, see PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING. For literature, see references in above-named arts., and compare article "Hell" by Dr. D. S. Salmond in HDB.

James Orr

HELLENISM; HELLENIST

hel’-en-iz’-m, hel’-en-ist: Hellenism is the name we give to the manifold achievements of the Greeks in social and political institutions, in the various arts, in science and philosophy, in morals and religion. It is customary to distinguish two main periods, between which stands the striking figure of Alexander the Great, and to apply to the earlier period the adjective "Hellenic," that of "Hellenistic" to the latter. While there is abundant reason for making this distinction, it must not be considered as resting upon fortuitous changes occasioned by foreign influences. The Hellenistic age is rather the sudden unfolding of a flower whose bud was forming and maturing for centuries.

1. The Expansion of the Greek Peoples:

Before the coming of the Hellenic peoples into what we now call Greece, there existed in those lands a flourishing civilization to which we may give the name "Aegean." The explorations of archaeologists during the last few decades have brought it to light in many places on the continent, as well as on the islands of the Aegean and notably in Crete. When the Hellenic peoples came, it was not as a united nation, nor even as homogeneous tribes of a common race; though without doubt predominantly of kindred origin, it was the common possession of an Aryan speech and of similar customs and religion that marked them off from the peoples among whom they settled. When their southward movemerit

from Illyria occurred, and by what causes it was brought about, we do not know; but it can hardly have long antedated the continuance of this migration which led to the settlement of the coast districts of Asia Minor and the islands of the Aegean from about the 13th to the 10th centuries BC. In the colonization of these new territories the Hellenic peoples became conscious of their kinship, partly because the several colonies received contingents from various regions of the motherland, partly because they were in common brought into striking contrast to the alien "Barbarians" who spoke other untintelligible languages. As the older communities on the mainland and on the islands began to flourish, they felt the need, arising from various causes, for further colonization. Among these causes we may mention the poverty of the soil in Greece proper, the restricting pressure of the strong tribes of Asia Minor who prevented expansion inland, a growing disaffection with the aristocratic regime in almost all Greek states and with the operation of the law of primogeniture in land tenure, and lastly the combined lure of adventure and the prospect of trade. Thus, it came about that in the 8th and 7th centuries BC, two great movements of colonial expansion set in, one toward the Hellespont and to the shores of the Pontus, or Black Sea, beyond, the other westward toward Southern Italy, Sicily, and beyond as far as Gades in Spain. To the 7th century belongs also the colonization of Naucratis in Egypt and of Cyrene in Libya. Then followed a period of relative inactivity during the 5th century, which was marked by the desperate conflict of the Greeks with Persia in the East and with Carthage in the West, succeeded by even more disastrous conflicts among themselves. With the enforced internal peace imposed by Macedonia came the resumption of colonial and military expansion in a measure before undreamed of. In a few years the empire of Alexander embraced Thrace, Asia Minor, Egypt, and Asia eastward beyond the Indus. The easternmost regions soon fell away, but Asia Minor, Syria and Egypt long continued under Greek rule, until Rome in the 1st century BC made good her claims to sovereignty in those lands.

2. The Hellenic State:

Throughout this course of development and expansion we speak of the people as Greeks, although it is evident that even such racial homogeneity as they may have had on coming into Greece must have been greatly modified by the absorption of conquered peoples. But the strong individuality of the Hellenic population manifested itself everywhere in its civilization. In the evolution from the Homeric kingship (supported by the nobles in council, from which the commonalty was excluded, or where it was supposed at most to express assent or dissent to proposals laid before it) through oligarchic or aristocratic rule and the usurped authority of the tyrants, to the establishement of democratic government, there is nothing surprising to the man of today. That is because Greek civilization has become typical of all western civilization. In the earlier stages of this process, moreover, there is nothing strikingly at variance with the institutions of the Hebrews, at least so far as concerns the outward forms. But there existed throughout a subtle difference of spirit which made it possible, even inevitable, for the Greeks to attain to democratic institutions, whereas to the Hebrews such a development was impossible, if not unthinkable. It is difficult to define this spirit, but one may say that it was marked from the first by an inclination to permit the free development and expression of individuality subordinated to the common good; by a corresponding recognition of human limitations over against one’s fellow-man as over against Deity; by an instinctive dread of excess as inhuman and provoking the just punishment of the gods; and lastly by a sane refusal to take oneself too seriously, displaying itself in a certain good-humored irony even among men who, like Socrates and Epicurus, regarded themselves as charged with a

sublime mission, in striking contrast with the Hebrew prophets who voiced the thunders of Sinai, but never by any chance smiled at their own earnestness. Even the Macedonians did not attempt to rule Greece with despotic sway, leaving the states in general in the enjoyment of their liberties; and in the Orient, Alexander and his successors, Roman as well as Greek, secured their power and extended civilization by the foundation and encouragement of Hellenic cities in extraordinary numbers. The city-state, often confederated with other city-states, displaced the organization of tribe or clan, thus substituting a new unit and a new interest for the old; and the centers thus created radiated Hellenic influence and made for order and good government everywhere. But in accordance with the new conditions the state took on a somewhat different form. While the city preserved local autonomy, the state became monarchical; and the oriental deification of the king reinforced by the Hellenic tendency to deify the benefactors of mankind, eventuated in modes of speech and thought which powerfully influenced the Messianic hopes of the Jews.

3. Hellenic Life:

The life of the Greeks, essentially urban and dominated by political interests fostered in states in which the individual counted for much, was of a type wholly different from the oriental. Although the fiction of consanguinity was cultivated by the Hellenic city-state as by the Semitic tribe, it was more transparent in the former, particularly in the newer communities formed in historical times. There was thus a powerful stimulus to mutual tolerance and concession which, supported as it was by the strong love of personal independence and the cultivation of individuality, led to the development of liberty and the recognition of the rights of man. A healthy social life was the result for those who shared the privileges of citizenship, and also, in hardly less degree, for those resident aliens who received the protection of the state. Women also, though not so free as men, enjoyed, even at Athens where they were most limited, liberties unknown to the Orientals. In the Hellenistic age they attained a position essentially similar to that of modern Europe. There were slaves belonging both to individuals and the state, but their lot was mitigated in general by a steadily growing humanity. The amenities of life were many, and were cultivated no less in the name of religion than of art, literature, and science.

4. Hellenic Art and Letters:

As in every phase of Greek civilization, the development of art and letters was free. Indeed their supreme excellence must be attributed to the happy circumstances which suffered them to grow spontaneously from the life of the people without artificial constraints imposed from within, or overpowering influences coming from without: a fortune which no other great movement in art or letters can boast. Greek art was largely developed in the service of religion; but owing to the circumstance that both grew side by side, springing from the heart of man, their reactions were mutual, art contributing to religion quite as much as it received. The creative genius of the Hellenic people expressed itself with singular directness and simplicity in forms clearly visualized and subject to the conditions of psychologically effective grouping in space or time. Their art is marked by the observance of a just proportion and by a certain natural restraint due to the preponderance of the intellectual element over the purely sensuous. Its most characteristic product is the ideal type in which only enough individuality enters to give to the typical the concreteness of life. What has been said of art in the narrower sense

applies equally to artistic letters. The types thus created, whether in sculpture, architecture, music, drama, history, or oratory, though not regarded with superstitious reverence, commended themselves by the sheer force of inherent truth and beauty to succeeding generations, thus steadying the course of development and restraining the exuberant originality and the tendency to individualism. In the Hellenistic age, individualism gradually preponderated where the lessening power of creative genius did not lead to simple imitation.

5. Philosophy of Nature and of Conduct:

The traditional views of the Hellenic peoples touching Nature and conduct, which did not differ widely from those of other peoples in a corresponding stage of culture, maintained themselves down to the 7th century BC with comparatively little change. Along with and following the colonial expansion of Hellenism there came the awakening intellectual curiosity, or rather the shock of surprise necessary to convert attention into question. The mythology of the Greeks had contained a vague theology, without authority indeed, but satisfactory because adequate to express the national thought. Ethics there was none, morality being customary. But the extending horizon of Hellenic thought discovered that customs differed widely in various lands; indeed, it is altogether likely that the collection of strange and shocking customs which filled the quivers of the militant Sophists in the 5th century had its inception in the 6th and possibly the 7th century At any rate it furnished the fiery darts of the adversary until ethics was founded in reason by the quest of Socrates for the universal, not in conduct, but in judgment. As ethics arose out of the irreconcilable contradictions of conduct, so natural philosophy sprung from the contradictions of mythical theology and in opposition to it. There were in fact two strata of conceptions touching supernatural beings; one, growing out of a primitive animism, regarded their operations essentially from the point of view of magic, which refuses to be surprised at any result, be it never so ill-proportioned to the means employed, so long as the mysterious word was spoken or the requisite act performed; the other, sprung from a worship of Nature in her most striking phenomena, recognized an order, akin to the moral order, in her operations. When natural philosophy arose in the 6th century, it instinctively at first, then consciously, divested Nature of personality by stripping off the disguise of myth and substituting a plain and reasoned tale founded on mechanical principles. This is the spirit which pervades pre-Socratic science and philosophy. The quest of Socrates for universally valid judgments on conduct directed thought to the laws of mind, which are teleological, in contradistinction to the laws of matter, which are mechanical; and thus in effect dethroned Nature, regarded as material, by giving primacy to mind. Henceforth, Greek philosophy was destined, with relatively few and unimportant exceptions, to devote itself to the study of human conduct and to be essentially idealistic, even where the foundation, as with the Stoics, was ostensibly materialistic. More and more it became true of the Greek philosophers that they sought God, "if haply they might feel after him and find him," conscious of the essential unity of the Divine and the human, and defining philosophy as the endeavor to assimilate the soul to God.

6. Hellenic and Hellenistic Religion:

The Homeric poems present a picture of Greek life as seen by a highly cultivated aristocratic society having no sympathy with the commonalty. Hence, we are not to regard Homeric religion as the religion

of the Hellenic peoples in the Homeric age. Our first clear view of the Hellenic commoner is presented by Hesiod in the 8th century. Here we find, alongside of the worship of the Olympians, evidences of chthonian cults and abundant hints of human needs not satisfied by the well-regulated religion of the several city-states. The conventionalized monarchy of Zeus ruling over his fellow-Olympians is known to be a fiction of the poets, having just as much—no more—foundation, in fact, as the mythical overlordship of Agamemnon over the assembled princes of the Achaens; while it caught the imagination of the Greeks and dominated their literature, each city-state possessed its own shrines sacred to its own gods, who might or might not be called by the names of Olympians. Yet the great shrines which attracted Greeks from every state, such as those of Zeus at Dodona (chiefly in the period before the 7th century) and Olympia, of Apollo at Delos and Delphi, and of Hera at Argos, were the favored abodes of Olympians. Only one other should be mentioned: that of Demeter at Eleusis. Her worship was of a different character, and the great repute of her shrine dates from the 5th century. If the Zeus of Olympia was predominantly the benign god of the sky, to whom men came in joyous mood to delight him with pomp and festive gatherings, performing feats of manly prowess in the Olympic games, the Zeus of Dodona, and the Delphian Apollo, as oracular deities, were visited in times of doubt and distress. The 7th and 6th centuries mark the advent—or the coming into prominence—of deities whose appeal was to the deepest human emotions, of ecstatic enthusiasm, of fear, and of hope. Among them we must mention Dionysus, the god of teeming Nature (see DIONYSUS), and Orpheus. With their advent comes an awakening of the individual soul, whose aspiration to commune with Deity found little satisfaction in the general worship of the states. Private organizations and quasi-monastic orders, like those of the Orphics and Pythagoreans, arose and won countless adherents. Their deities found admission into older shrines, chiefly those of chthonian divinities, like that of Demeter at Eleusis, and wrought a change in the spirit and to a certain extent in the ritual of the "mysteries" practiced there. It was in these "mysteries" that the Christian Fathers, according to the mood or the need, polemic or apologetic, of the moment, saw now the propaedeutic type, now the diabolically instituted counterfeit, of the sacraments and ordinances of the church. The spirit and even the details of the observances of the "mysteries" are difficult to determine; but one must beware of accepting the hostile judgments of Christian writers who were in fact retorting upon the Greeks criticisms leveled at the church: both were blinded by partisanship and so misread the symbols.

If we thus find a true praeparatio evangelica in the Hellenistic developments of earlier Hellenic religion, there are parallel developments in the other religions which were adopted in the Hellenistic age. The older national religions of Persia and Egypt underwent a similar change, giving rise respectively to the worship of Mithra and of Isis, both destined, along with the chthonian mysteries of the Greeks, to be dangerous rivals for the conquest of the world of Christianity, itself a younger son in this prolific family of new religions. Space is wanting here for a consideration of these religious movements, the family resemblance of which with Christianity is becoming every day more apparent; but so much at least should be said, that while every candid student must admit the superiority of Christianity in moral content and adaptation to the religious nature of man, the difference in these respects was not at first sight so obvious that the successful rival might at the beginning of the contest have been confidently predicted.

See GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT.

As with other manifestations of the Hellenic spirit, so, too, in matters of religion, it was the free development of living institutions that most strikingly distinguishes the Greeks from the Hebrews. They had priests, but were never ruled by them; they possessed a literature regarded with veneration, and in certain shrines treasured sacred writings containing directions for the practice and ritual of the cults, but they were neither intended nor suffered to fix for all time the interpretation of the symbols. In the 5th and 4th centuries the leaders of Greek thought rebuked the activity of certain priests, and it was not before the period of Roman dominion that priests succeeded even in a small measure in usurping power, and sacred writings began to exercise an authority remotely comparable to that recognized among the Jews.

A most interesting question is that concerning the extent to which Greek civilization and thought had penetrated and influenced Judaism. During three centuries before the advent of Jesus, Hellenism had been a power in Syria and Judea. The earliest writings of the Hebrews showing this influence are Da and the Old Testament Apocrypha. Several books of the Apocrypha were originally written in Greek, and show strong influence of Greek thought. The Septuagint, made for the Jews of the Dispersion, early won its way to authority even in Palestine, where Aramaic had displaced Hebrew, which thus became a dead language known only to a few. New Testament quotations of the Old Testament are almost without exception taken from the Septuagint. Thus the sacred literature of the Jews was for practical purposes Greek. Though Jesus spoke Aramaic, He unquestionably knew some Greek. Yet there is no clear evidence of specifically Greek influence on this thought, the presuppositions of which are Jewish or generally those of the Hellenistic age. All the writings of the New Testament were originally composed in Greek, though their authors differed widely in the degree of proficiency in the use of the language and in acquaintance with Hellenic thought. Their debt to these sources can be profitably considered only in connection with the individual writers; but one who is acquainted with the Hebrew and Greek literature instinctively feels in reading the New Testament that the national character of the Jews, as reflected in the Old Testament, has all but vanished, remaining only as a subtle tone of moral earnestness and as an imaginative coloring, except in the simple story of the Synoptic Gospels. But for the bitterness aroused by the destruction of Jerusalem, it is probable that the Jews would have yielded completely to Hellenic influences.

William Arthur Heidel

HELM

helm.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

HELMET

hel’-met.

See ARMS, ARMOR.

HELON

hel’-on (chelon, "valorous"; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus, Chailon): The father of Eliab, the prince of the tribe of Zebulun (Nu 1:9; 2:7; 7:24,29; 10:16).

HELP

With the sense of that which brings aid, support, or deliverance, "help" (noun and vb.) represents a large variety of words in Hebrew and Greek (noun 7, verb 16). A principal Hebrew word is ‘azar, "to help," with the corresponding nouns ‘ezer, ‘ezrah; a chief Greek word is boetheo (Mt 15:25; Mr 9:22,24, etc.). True help is to be sought for in Yahweh, in whom, in the Old Testament, the believer is constantly exhorted to trust, with the renouncing of all other confidences (Ps 20:2; 33:20; 42:5; 46:1; 115:9,10,11; 121:2; Isa 41:10,13,14, etc.). In Ro 8:26 it is said, "the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity," the verb here (sunantilambanetai) having the striking meaning of to "take hold along with one." In the story of Eden, Eve is spoken of as "a help meet" for Adam (Ge 2:18,20). The idea in "meet" is not so much "suitability," though that is implied, as likeness, correspondence in nature (Vulgate, similem sibi). One like himself, as taken from him, the woman would be an aid and companion to the man in his tasks.

James Orr

HELPMEET

help’-met.

See HELP.

HELPS (1)

(antilempseis, 1Co 12:28): In classical Greek the word antilempsis means "remuneration," the hold one has on something, then perception, apprehension. But in Biblical Greek it has an altruistic meaning. Thus, it is used in the Septuagint, both in the Old Testament Scriptures and in the Apocrypha (Ps 22:19; 89:19, APC 1Esdras 8:27; 2Macc 15:7). Thus, we obtain a clue to its meaning in our text, where it has been usually understood as referring to the deacons, the following word kuberneseis, translated "governments," being explained as referring to the presbyters.

Henry E. Dosker

HELPS (2)

(boetheiai, Ac 27:17).

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

HELVE

helv (‘ets "wood," "tree"): The handle or wooden part of an ax. "The head (margin "iron") slippeth from the helve" (margin "tree," De 19:5). The marginal reading suggests that "the ax is supposed to glance off the tree it is working on."

HEM

(kraspedon): The classic instance of the use of "hem" in the New Testament is Mt 9:20 the King James Version (compare Mt 14:36), where the woman "touched the hem of his (Christ’s) garment." The reference is to the fringe or tassel with its traditional blue thread which the faithful Israelite was directed to wear on the corners of the outer garment (Nu 15:37 ff; De 22:12). Great importance came to be attached to it, the ostentatious Pharisees making it very broad or large (Mt 23:5). Here the woman clearly thought there might be peculiar virtue in touching the tassel or fringe of Jesus’ garment. Elsewhere the word is rendered BORDER (which see).

See also DRESS; FRINGES.

George B. Eager

HEMAM

he’-mam (Ge 36:22 the King James Version and the English Revised Version).

See HEMAN; HOMAM.

HEMAN

he’-man (heman, "faithful"): The name of two men in the Old Testament.

(1) A musician and seer, a Levite, son of Joe and grandson of the prophet Samuel; of the family of the Kohathites (1Ch 6:33), appointed by David as one of the leaders of the temple-singing (1Ch 15:17; 2Ch 5:12). He had 14 sons (and 3 daughters) who assisted their father in the chorus. Heman seems also to have been a man of spiritual power; is called "the king’s seer in matters of God" (1Ch 25:5; 2Ch 35:15).

(2) One of the noted wise men prior to, or about, the time of Solomon. He was one of the three sons of

Mahol (1Ki 4:31 (Hebrew 5:11)); also called a son of Zerah (1Ch 2:6).

Ps 88 is inscribed to Heman the Ezrahite, who is probably to be identified with the second son of Zerah.

Edward Babgy Pollard

HEMATH

he’-math.

See HAMMATH (1Ch 2:55).

HEMDAN hem’-dan (chemdan, "pleasant"): A descendant of Seir, the Horite (Ge 36:26). Wrongly translated "Amram" by the King James Version in 1Ch 1:41 (the Revised Version (British and American) "Hamran"), where the transcribers made an error in one vowel and one consonant, writing (chamran), instead of (chemdan).

HEMLOCK

hem’-lock.

See GALL.

HEN (1)

hen (chen, "favor"). In Zec 6:14, English Versions of the Bible reads, "And the crowns shall be to Helem .... and to Hen the son of Zephaniah." But as this person is called Josiah in Zec 6:10, the Revised Version, margin "and for the kindness of the son of Zephaniah" is probably right, but the text is uncertain.

See JOSIAH.

HEN (2)

(ornis): Mentioned in the accounts of the different disciples in describing the work of Jesus (Mt 23:37; Lu 13:34).

HENA

he’-na (hena‘; Ana): Named in 2Ki 19:13, as one of the cities destroyed by Sennacherib along with

Sepharvaim. It does not appear in a similar connection in 17:24. The text is probably corrupt. No reasonable identification has been proposed. Cheyne (Encyclopaedia Biblica, under the word) says of the phrase "Hena and Ivah" that "underlying this is a witty editorial suggestion that the existence of cities called h-n-‘ and ‘-w-h respectively has passed out of mind (compare Ps 9:6 (7)), for hena‘ we‘iwwah, clearly means ‘he has driven away and overturned’ (so Targum, Symmachus)." He would drop out h-n-‘. Hommel (Expositors Times, IX, 330) thinks that here we have divine names; Hena standing for the Arabic star-name al-han‘a, and Ivvah for al-‘awwa’u.

See IVAH.

W. Ewing

HENADAD

hen’-a-dad (chenadhadh, "favor of Hadad"; Septuagint Henaad; Henadad; Henadab; Henalab (Ezr 3:9; Ne 3:18,24; 10:9)): One of the heads of the Levites in the post-exilic community.

HENNA

hen’-a (So 1:14; 4:13): An aromatic plant.

HENOCH

he’-nok (chanokh; Henoch; in 1Ch 1:3 the King James Version the Revised Version (British and American), "Enoch"; in Ge 25:4, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "Hanoch"; 1Ch 1:33, the King James Version "Henoch," the Revised Version (British and American) "Hanoch"): The name of a Midianite, a descendant of Abram.

HEPHER

(chepher):

(1) Septuagint Hopher (Jos 12:17), a Canaanitish town mentioned between Tappuah and Aphek, unidentified.

(2) In 1Ki 4:10 a district connected with Socoh, and placed by Solomon under the direction of Benhesed of Arubboth, unidentified.

HEPHER; HEPHERITES

he’-fer, he’-fer-its (chepher, chephri):

(1) Septuagint Hopher (Nu 26:32 f; 27:1; Jos 17:2 f), the head of a family or clan of the tribe of Manasseh. The clan is called the Hepherites in Nu 26:32.

(2) Septuagint Hephal (1Ch 4:6), a man of Judah.

(3) Septuagint Hopher (1Ch 11:36), one of David’s heroes.

HEPHZIBAH

hef’-zi-ba (chephtsi-bhah, "my delight is in her"):

(1) Septuagint Hopseiba, Hapseiba, Hophsiba, the mother of Manasseh (2Ki 21:1).

(2) The new name of Zion (Isa 62:4); Septuagint translates Thelema emon, "my delight."

HERAKLES

her’-a-klez (Herakles).

See HERCULES.

HERALD

her’-ald: The word occurs once (Da 3:4) as the translation of the Aramaic word karoz (compare kerux): "Then the herald cried aloud."

See also GAMES.

HERB

hurb, urb:

(1) yaraq, "green thing" (Ex 10:15; Isa 15:6); a garden of herbs" (De 11:10; 1Ki 21:2); "(a dinner, the margin portion of) herbs" (Pr 15:17).

(2) ‘esebh; compare Arabic ‘ushb, "herbage," "grass," etc.; "herbs yielding seed" (Ge 1:11); "herbage" for food (Ge 1:30; Jer 14:6); translated "grass" (De 11:15; Am 7:2); "herbs" (Pr 27:25, etc.).

(3) deshe’, translated "herb" (2Ki 19:26; Pr 27:25; Isa 37:27; 66:14 the King James Version), but

generally GRASS (which see).

(4) chatsir, vegetation generally, but translated GRASS (which see).

(5) ‘oroth, ‘owroth (plural only), "green plants" or "herbs." In 2Ki 4:39 the Talmud interprets it to mean "colewort," but it may mean any edible herbs which had survived the drought. In Isa 26:19 the expression "dew of herbs" is in the margin translated "dew of light" which is more probable (see DEW), and the translation "heat upon herbs" (Isa 18:4 the King James Version) is in the Revised Version (British and American) translated "clear heat in sunshine."

(6) botane (Heb 6:7).

(7) lachana = yaraq (Mt 13:32).

See also BITTER HERBS.

E. W. G. Masterman

HERCULES

hur’-ku-lez (Herakles): The process of Hellenizing the Jews which began at an earlier date was greatly promoted under Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC). Jason, who supplanted his brother Onias in the office of high priest by promising Antiochus an increase of tribute, aided the movement by setting up under the king’s authority a Greek palaestra for the training of youth in Greek exercises, and by registering the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch (2 Macc 4:8 f). Certain of these Antiochians of Jerusalem Jason sent to Tyre, where games were held every five years in honor of Hercules, that is, the national Tyrian deity Melcart, identified with Baal of Old Testament history. According to Josephus (Ant., VII, v, 3) Hiram, king of Tyre in the days of Solomon, built the temple of Hercules and also of Astarte. Jason s deputies carried 300 drachmas of silver for the sacrifice of Hercules, but they were so ashamed of their commission that they "thought it not right to use the money for any sacrifice" and "on account of present circumstances it went to the equipment of the galleys" (2 Macc 4:18-20).

J. Hutchison

HERD

hurd.

See CATTLE.

HERDSMAN

hurdz’-man (boqer; the King James Version, the English Revised Version "herdman"): A cowherd (Am 7:14). The same word is used in Syria today. ro‘eh, has its equivalent in the language of Syria and Palestine (Arabic ra’i), and is a general term for any kind of a herdsman (Ge 13:7,8; 26:20; 1Sa 21:7). noqedh, occurs in one passage (Am 1:1); literally it means one who spots or marks the sheep, hence, a herdsman. Spotting the wool with different dyes is still the method of distinguishing between the sheep of different flocks. The herdsman is seldom the owner of the sheep, but a hireling.

See SHEEP; SHEEP TENDING.

James A. Patch

HERE

her, in composition:

HEREAFTER

her-aft’-er (here (this present) and after) represents Hebrew ‘achar, "hinder part," "end" (Isa 41:23), "the things that are to come hereafter" (’achor after, behind the present), with den, "this," ‘achare dhen, Aramaic (Da 2:29,45), ‘achar, "after," "behind," "last" (Eze 20:39), Greek ap’ arti, "from now" (Mt 26:64), "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven," which does not mean "at a future time" according to the more modern usage of "hereafter," but (as the Greek) "from now," the Revised Version (British and American) "henceforth"; Tyndale and the chief versions after him have "hereafter," but Wycliff has "fro hennes forth." Joh 1:51, "Hereafter ye shall see the heaven opened," etc., where "hereafter" has the same meaning; it is omitted by the Revised Version (British and American) after a corrected text (Wycliff also omits); eti, "yet," "still," "any more" "any longer" (Joh 14:30, the Revised Version (British and American) "I will no more speak much with you," Wycliff, "now I schal not"); meketi, "no more," "no longer" (Mr 11:14, "no man eat fruit of thee hereafter," the Revised Version (British and American) "henceforward"); apo tou nun, "from now" (Lu 22:69, the Revised Version (British and American) "From henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God," Wycliff "aftir this tyme"); meta tauta (Joh 13:7, "Thou shalt know (the Revised Version (British and American) "understand") hereafter," Wycliff "aftirward").

HEREBY

her-bi’, represents bezo’th, "in or by this" (Ge 42:15 "Hereby ye shall be proved"); ek toutou, "out of this" (1Joh 4:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "by this"); en touto, "in this," "by this means" (1Co 4:4; 1 Joh 2:3,1; 3:16,19,24; 4:2,13).

HEREDITY

he-red’-i-ti:

1. Physiological Heredity:

Heredity, in modern language, is the law by which living beings tend to repeat their characteristics, physiological and psychical, in their offspring, a law familiar in some form to even the most uncultured peoples. The references to it in the Bible are of various kinds.

Curiously enough, little mention is made of physiological heredity, even in so simple a form as the resemblance of a son to his father, but there are a few references, such as, e.g., those to giants with giants for sons (2Sa 21:18-22; 1Ch 20:4-8; compare Ge 6:4; Nu 13:33; De 1:28, etc.). Moreover De 28:59-61 may contain a thought of hereditary diseases (compare 2Ki 5:27). On the psychical side the data are almost equally scanty. That a son and his father may differ entirely is taken for granted and mentioned repeatedly (especially in Eze 18:5-20). Even in the case of the king, the frequent changes of dynasty prevented such a phrase as "the seed royal" (2Ki 11:1; Jer 41:1) from being taken very seriously. Yet, perhaps, the inheritance of mechanical dexterity is hinted at in Ge 4:20-22, if "father" means anything more than "teacher." But, in any case, the fact that "father" could have this metaphorical sense, together with the corresponding use of "son" in such phrases as "son of Belial" (Jud 19:22 the King James Version), "son of wickedness" (Ps 89:22), "sons of the prophets" (Am 7:14 margin, etc.), "son of the wise, ... of ancient kings" (Isa 19:11; this last phrase may be meant literally), shows that the inheritance of characteristics was a very familiar fact.

See SON.

2. Hebrew Conception of Heredity:

The question, however, is considerably complicated by the intense solidarity that the Hebrews ascribed to the family. The individual was felt to be only a link in the chain, his "personality" (very vaguely conceived) somehow continuing that of his ancestors and being continued in that of his descendants. After death the happiness (or even existence; see DEATH) of this shade in the other world depended on the preservation of a posterity in this. Hence, slaying the sons of a dead man was thought to affect him directly, and it would be a great mistake to suppose that an act such as that of 2Sa 21:1-9, etc., was simply to prevent a blood-feud. Nor was it at all in point that the children might repeat the qualities of the father, however much this may have been realized in other connections. Consequently, it is impossible to tell in many cases just how much of a modern heredity idea is present.

The most important example is the conception of the position of the nations. These are traced back to single ancestors, and in various cases the qualities of the nation are explained by those of the ancestor (Ge 9:22-27; 21:20,21; 49, etc.). The influences that determine national characteristics are evidently

thought to be hereditary, and yet not all of them are hereditary in our sense; e.g. in Ge 27, the condition of the descendants of Jacob and Esau is conceived to have been fixed by the nature of the blessings (mistakenly) pronounced by Isaac. On the other hand, Ezra (9:11,12) thinks of the danger of intermarrying with the children of a degenerate people in an entirely modern style, but in De 23:3-6 the case is not so clear. There a curse pronounced on the nations for their active hostility is more in point than moral degeneracy (however much this may be spoken of elsewhere, Nu 25:1-3, etc.), and it is on account of the curse that the taint takes ten generations to work itself out, while, in the case of Edomite or Egyptian blood, purity was attained in three. Hence, it is hard to tell just how Ex 20:5,6 was interpreted. The modern conception of the effect of heredity was surely present in part, but there must have been also ideas of the extension of the curse-bearing individuality that we should find hard to understand.

3. Abraham’s Children:

The chiefest question is that of the Israelites. Primarily they are viewed as the descendants of Abraham, blessed because he was blessed (Ge 22:15-18, etc.). This was taken by many with the utmost literalness, and physical descent from Abraham was thought to be sufficient (especially Mt 3:9; Joh 8:31-44; Ro 9:6-13), or at least necessary (especially Ezr 2:59; 9:2; Ne 7:61), for salvation. Occasionally this descent is stated to give superior qualities in other regards (Es 6:13). But a distinction between natural inheritance of Abraham’s qualities and the blessing bestowed by God’s unbounded favor and decree on his descendants must have been thoroughly recognized, otherwise the practice of proselytizing would have been impossible.

4. Heredity and the New Testament:

In the New Testament the doctrine of original sin, held already by a certain school among the Jews (2 Esdras 7:48), alone raises much question regarding heredity (compare 1Co 7:14). Otherwise the Old Testament concepts are simply reversed: where likeness of nature appears, there is (spiritual) descent (Ro 4:12; Ga 3:7, etc.). None the less, that the Israel "after the flesh" has a real spiritual privilege is stated explicitly (Ro 3:1,2; 11:26; Re 11:13).

See BLESSING; CURSE; FAMILY; SALVATION; SIN; TRADITION.

Burton Scott Easton

HEREIN

her-in’, Hebrew bezo’th, "in" or "by this" (Ge 34:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "on this condition"); en touta (Joh 4:37; 9:30; 15:8; Ac 24:16; 2Co 8:10; 1 Joh 4:10,17).

HEREOF

her-ov’, Greek haute, "this" (Mt 9:26); houtos, "this" (Heb 5:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "thereof").

HERES

he’-rez, he’-res:

(1) har-cherec, "Mount Heres" (Jud 1:34 f), a district from which the Amorites were not expelled; it is mentioned along with Aijalon and Shallbim. In Jos 19:41 f we have then two towns in association with Ir-shemesh and many authorities consider that as cherec = shemesh, i.e. the sun, and har, being perhaps a copyist’s error for ‘ir, "city," we have in Jud 1:34 a reference to Beth-shemesh, the modern ‘Ain Shems. Conder thinks that Batn Harasheh, Northeast of Aijalon, a prominent hill, may be the place referred to. Budde thinks Har-heres may be identified with the Bit-Ninib (Ninib being the fierce morning sun) of the Tell el-Amarna Letters; this place was in the district of Jerusalem.

(2) ma‘aleh he-charec, "the ascent of Heres" (Jud 8:13, the King James Version "before the sun was up"), the place from which Gideon returned to Succoth after his defeat of Zebah and Zalmunna. the Revised Version (British and American) is probably a great improvement on the King James Version, but both the text and the topography are uncertain.

(3) ‘ir ha-cherec, "City of Heres" EVm, "City of Destruction" (cherem) English Versions of the Bible, or "City of the sun" cherec) English Versions, margin. This is the name of one of the "five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Yahweh of hosts" (Isa 19:18).

See IR-HA-HERES.

E. W. G. Masterman

HERESH

he’-resh (cheresh; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus, Rharaiel; Codex Alexandrinus, Hares): A Levite (1Ch 9:15).

HERESY

her’-e-si, her’-e-si (hairesis, from verb haireo, "to choose"): The word has acquired an ecclesiastical meaning that has passed into common usage, containing elements not found in the term in the New Testament, except as implied in one passage. In classical Greek, it may be used either in a good or a bad sense, first, simply for "choice," then, "a chosen course of procedure," and afterward of various schools and tendencies. Polybius refers to those devoting themselves to the study of Greek literature as given to the Hellenike hairesis. It was used not simply for a teaching or a course followed, but also for those

devoting themselves to such pursuit, namely, a sect, or assembly of those advocating a particular doctrine or mode of life. Thus, in Acts, the word is used in the Greek, where the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "sect," "sect of the Sadducees" (Ac 5:17), "sect of the Nazarenes" (Ac 24:5). In Ac 26:5 the Pharisees are called "the straitest hairesis (sect)." The name was applied contemptuously to Christianity (Ac 24:14; 28:22). Its application, with censure, is found in 1Co 11:19 m; Ga 5:20 margin, where it is shown to interfere with that unity of faith and community of interests that belong to Christians. There being but one standard of truth, and one goal for all Christian life, any arbitrary choice varying from what was common to all believers, becomes an inconsistency and a sin to be warned against. Ellicott, on Ga 5:20, correctly defines "heresies" (King James Version, the English Revised Version) as "a more aggravated form of dichostasia" (the American Standard Revised Version "parties") "when the divisions have developed into distinct and organized parties"; so also 1Co 11:19, translated by the Revised Version (British and American) "factions." In 2Pe 2:1, the transition toward the subsequent ecclesiastical sense can be traced. The "destructive heresies" (Revised Version margin, the English Revised Version margin "sects of perdition") are those guilty of errors both of doctrine and of life very fully described throughout the entire chapter, and who, in such course, separated themselves from the fellowship of the church.

In the fixed ecclesiastical sense that it ultimately attained, it indicated not merely any doctrinal error, but "the open espousal of fundamental error" (Ellicott on Tit 3:10), or, more fully, the persistent, obstinate maintenance of an error with respect to the central doctrines of Christianity in the face of all better instruction, combined with aggressive attack upon the common faith of the church, and its defenders. Roman Catholics, regarding all professed Christians who are not in their communion as heretics, modify their doctrine on this point by distinguishing between Formal and terial Heresy, the former being unconscious and unintentional, and between different degrees of each of these classes (Cath. Encyclopedia, VII, 256 ff). For the development of the ecclesiastical meaning, see Suicer’s Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, I, 119-23.

H. E. Jacobs

HERETH, THE FOREST OF

he’-reth (ya‘-ar chareth; Septuagint polis Sareik; the King James Version Hareth): David (1Sa 22:5) was told by the prophet Gad to depart from Mizpah of Moab and go to the land of Judah, and he "came into the forest of Hereth." The Septuagint has "city" instead of forest; see also Josephus, Ant, VI, xii, 4. The village Kharas, on an ancient high road, 3 miles Southeast of Aid el ma, probably David’s stronghold ADULLAM (which see), may possibly answer to the place (PEF, III, 305, Sh XXI). "Horesh" has been suggested as an alternative reading.

E. W. G. Masterman

HERETIC; HERETICAL

her’-e-tik, her’-e-tik, he-ret’-i-kal (hairetikos): Used in Tit 3:10, must be interpreted according to the sense in which Paul employs the word "heresy" (1Co 11:19; Ga 5:20) for "parties" or "factions." According to this, the Scriptural meaning of the word is no more than "a factious man" (American Standard Revised Version), an agitator who creates divisions and makes parties. Weizsacker translates it into German ein Sektierer, "a sectarist." The nature of the offense is described in other words in 2Th 2:6,11.

HERETOFORE

her-too-for’, Hebrew temol, "yesterday," "neither heretofore, nor since" (Ex 4:10; compare Ex 5:7,8,14; Jos 3:4; Ru 2:11); ‘ethmol shilshom, "yesterday," "third day" (1Sa 4:7, "There hath not been such a thing heretofore."

HEREUNTO

her-un-too’, Greek eis touto, "unto," "with a view to this" (1Pe 2:21, "For hereunto were ye called"): "hereunto" is supplied (Ec 2:25, "Who else can hasten hereunto more than I" the Revised Version (British and American) "who can have enjoyment," margin "hasten thereto").

HEREWITH

her-with’, Hebrew ba-zo’th, bezo’th, "in," "by," or "with this" (Eze 16:29; Mal 3:10, "Prove me now herewith, saith Yahweh").

The Revised Version (British and American) has "herein" for "to do this" (Ezr 4:22); for "in these things" (Ro 14:18); "of them that have sinned heretofore" for "which have sinned already" (2Co 12:21); "hereunto" for "thereunto" (1Pe 3:9); "herewith" for "thus" (Le 16:3).

W. L. Walker

HERITAGE

her’-i-taj (nachalah, from nachal, "to give"; kleroo): That which is allotted, possession, property, portion, share, peculiar right, inheritance; applied to land transferred from the Canaanites to Israel (Ps 11:6; 136:22); to Israel, as the heritage of Yahweh (Joe 3:2, etc.). In the New Testament (Eph 1:11) applied to believers, the spiritual Israel, as God’s peculiar possession (Ellicott, Eadie).

HERMAS

hur’-mas (Hermas): An abbreviated form of several names, e.g. Hermagoras, Hermeros, Hermodorus, Hermogenes, etc.; the name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:14). Origen and

some later writers have identified him with the author of The Pastor of Hermas, but without sufficient reason. According to the Canon of Muratori, the author of The Pastor wrote when his brother Pius was bishop of Rome (140-55 AD). He speaks of himself, however, as a contemporary of Clement of Rome (chapter 4) (circa 100 AD). The name Hermas is very common, and Origen's identification is purely conjectural.

S. F. Hunter

HERMENEUTICS

hur-me-nu'-tiks.

See INTERPRETATION.

HERMES (1)

hur'-mez (Hermes): In the Revised Version margin of Ac 14:12 for "Mercury" in text (the King James Version "Mercurius").

HERMES (2)

(Hermes): The name of a Roman Christian, otherwise unknown, to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:14). "Hermes is among the commonest slave names. In the household alone probably not less than a score of persons might be counted up from the inscriptions, who bore this name at or about the time when Paul wrote" (Lightfoot, Philippians, 176).

HERMOGENES

her-moj'-e-nez (Hermogenes, literally "born of Hermes," a Greek deity, called by the Romans, "Mercury," 2Ti 1:15):

1. Where Did He "Turn Away"?:

Hermogenes was a Christian, mentioned by Paul as having, along with Phygellus and "all that are in Asia," turned away from him. It is not clear when or where the defection of those Asiatic Christians from the apostle took place, whether it was at Rome at the time of Paul's second imprisonment there, and especially on the occasion of his being brought before the emperor's supreme court, to be tried on a charge now involving the death penalty, or whether it was at some previous time in Ephesus.

2. Was It in Ephesus?:

If it was the latter, then the meaning is that Paul wishes to inform Timothy, or perhaps only to remind him, how in Ephesus, where Timothy was the presiding minister of the church, these persons, Phygellus and Hermogenes with many more, had turned away from him, that is, had refused to submit to his authority, and had rejected the Christian doctrine which he taught. This latter meaning, referring the "turning away" to some previous occasion in Ephesus, is thought by some expositors to be the probable signification, owing to the fact that the verb "they be turned away" is in the aorist tense, referring to a time long past when the apostle wrote.

3. Unlikelihood of It Being in Ephesus:

On the other hand there is no evidence that there ever was a time when "all they which are in Asia" (the King James Version) turned away from obedience to Paul. Whatever may have been the disloyalty and disobedience of individuals—and this certainly existed; see, e.g., Ac 20:29 f—yet, certainly the New Testament does not show that all that were in Asia, the Christian community as a whole, in Ephesus and Miletus and Laodicea and Hierapolis and Colosse and other places, repudiated his apostolic authority.

4. Probalility of It Being in Rome:

If the words "all they which are in Asia" refer to all the Christians from the proconsular province of Asia, who happened to be in Rome at the time of Paul’s second imprisonment there, it can easily be understood that they should turn away from him at that testing time. It is impossible to say exactly what form their desertion of the apostle assumed. Their turning away would likely be caused by fear, lest if it were known that they were friends of the prisoner in the Mamertine, they would be involved in the same imprisonment as had overtaken him, and probably also in the same death penalty.

It is altogether in favor of a reference to Rome, that what is said about Phygellus and Hermogenes and their turning away from Paul is immediately followed by a reference to Onesiphorus, and to the great kindness which he showed, when he sought the apostle but very diligently in Rome. On the whole, therefore, a reference to Rome and to the manner in which these persons, named and unnamed, from Asia, had deserted Paul, seems most probable.

See PHYGELLUS.

John Rutherfurd

HERMON

hur’-mon (chermon; Codex Vaticanus, Haermon):

1. Description:

The name of the majestic mountain in which the Anti-Lebanon range terminates to the South (De 3:8,

etc.). It reaches a height of 9,200 ft. above the sea, and extends some 16 to 20 miles from North to South. It was called Sirion by the Sidonians (De 3:9; compare Ps 29:6), and Senir by the Amorites (De 3:9). It is also identified with Sion (De 4:48). See SIRION; SENIR; SION. Sometimes it is called "Mt. Hermon" (De 3:8; Jos 11:17; 1Ch 5:23, etc.); at other times simply "Hermon" (Jos 11:3; Ps 89:12, etc.).

2. The Hermons:

Once it is called "Hermons" (chermonim). the King James Version mistakenly renders this "the Hermonites" (Ps 42:6). It must be a reference to the triple summits of the mountain. There are three distinct heads, rising near the middle of the mass, the two higher being toward the East. The eastern declivities are steep and bare; the western slopes are more gradual; and while the upper reaches are barren, the lower are well wooded; and as one descends he passes through fruitful vineyards and orchards, finally entering the rich fields below, in Wady etteim. The Aleppo pine, the oak, and the poplar are plentiful. The wolf and the leopard are still to be found on the mountain; and it is the last resort of the brown, or Syrian, bear. Snow lies long on the summits and shoulders of the mountain; and in some of the deeper hollows, especially to the North, it may be seen through most of the year.

Mt. Hermon is the source of many blessings to the land over which it so proudly lifts its splendid form. Refreshing breezes blow from its cold heights. Its snows are carried to Damascus and to the towns on the seaboard, where, mingled with the sharab, "drink," they mitigate the heat of the Syrian summer. Great reservoirs in the depths of the mountain, fed by the melting snows, find outlet in the magnificent springs at Chasbeiyeh, Tell el-Kady, and Banias, while the dew-clouds of Hermon bring a benediction wherever they are carried (Ps 133:3).

3. Sanctuaries:

Hermon marked the northern limit of Joshua’s victorious campaigns (Jos 12:1, etc.). It was part, of the dominion of Og (Jos 12:5), and with the fall of that monarch, it would naturally come under Israelite influence. Its remote and solitary heights must have attracted worshippers from the earliest times; and we cannot doubt that it was a famous sanctuary in far antiquity. Under the highest peak are the ruins of Kacr ‘Antar, which may have been an ancient sanctuary of Baal. Eusebius, Onomasticon, speaks of a temple on the summit much frequented by the surrounding peoples; and the remains of many temples of the Roman period have been found on the sides and at the base of the mountain. The sacredness of Hermon may be inferred from the allusion in Ps 89:12 (compare Enoch 6:6; and see also BAAL-HERMON).

Some have thought that the scene of the Transfiguration should be sought here; see, however, TRANSFIGURATION, MOUNT OF.

The modern name of Hermon is Jebel eth-thilj, "mount of snow," or Jebel esh-sheikh, "mount of the elder," or "of the chief."

Little Hermon, the name now often applied to the hill between Tabor and Gilboa, possibly the Hill of Moreh, on which is the sanctuary of Neby Dahy, has no Biblical authority, and dates only from the Middle Ages.

W. Ewing

HERMONITES

hur'-mon-its: In Ps 42:6 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads "Hermons."

See HERMON.

HEROD

her'-ud: The name Herod (Herodes) is a familiar one in the history of the Jews and of the early Christian church. The name itself signifies "heroic," a name not wholly applicable to the family, which was characterized by craft and knavery rather than by heroism. The fortunes of the Herodiam family are inseparably connected with the last flickerings of the flame of Judaism, as a national power, before it was forever extinguished in the great Jewish war of rebellion, 70 AD. The history of the Herodian family is not lacking in elements of greatness, but whatever these elements were and in whomsoever found, they were in every ease dimmed by the insufferable egotism which disfigured the family, root and branch. Some of the Herodian princes were undeniably talented; but these talents, wrongly used, left no marks for the good of the people of Israel. Of nearly all the kings of the house of Herod it may truly be said that at their death "they went without being desired," unmissed, unmourned. The entire family history is one of incessant brawls, suspicion, intrigue arid shocking immorality. In the baleful and waning light of the rule of the Herodians, Christ lived and died, and under it the foundations of the Christian church were laid.1Co 11:19 m; Ga 5:20 margin, where it is shown to interfere with that unity of faith and community of interests that belong to Christians. There being but one standard of truth, and one goal for all Christian life, any arbitrary choice varying from what was common to all believers, becomes an inconsistency and a sin to be warned against. Ellicott, on Ga 5:20, correctly defines "heresies" (King James Version, the English Revised Version) as "a more aggravated form of dichostasia" (the American Standard Revised Version "parties") "when the divisions have developed into distinct and organized parties"; so also 1Co 11:19, translated by the Revised Version (British and American) "factions." In 2Pe 2:1, the transition toward the subsequent ecclesiastical sense can be traced. The "destructive heresies" (Revised Version margin, the English Revised Version margin "sects of perdition") are those guilty of errors both of doctrine and of life very fully described throughout the entire chapter, and who, in such course, separated themselves from the fellowship of the church.

1. The Family Descent:

The Herodians were not of Jewish stock. Herod the Great encouraged the circulation of the legend of the

family descent from an illustrious Babylonian Jew (Ant., XIV, i, 3), but it has no historic basis. It is true the Idumeans were at that time nominal Jews, since they were subdued by John Hyrcanus in 125 BC, and embodied in the Asmonean kingdom through an enforced circumcision, but the old national antagonism remained (Ge 27:41). The Herodian family sprang from Antipas (died 78 BC), who was appointed governor of Idumaea by Alexander Janneus. His son Antipater, who succeeded him, possessed al the cunning, resourcefulness and unbridled ambition of his son Herod the Great. He had an open eye for two things—the unconquerable strength of the Roman power and the pitiable weakness of the decadent Asmonean house, and on these two factors he built the house of his hopes. He craftily chose the side of Hyrcanus II in his internecine war with Aristobulus his brother (69 BC), and induced him to seek the aid of the Romans. Together they supported the claims of Pompey and, after the latter's defeat, they availed themselves of the magnanimity of Caesar to submit to him, after the crushing defeat of Pompey at Pharsalus (48 BC). As a reward, Antipater received the procuratorship of Judea (47 BC), while his innocent dupe Hyrcanus had to satisfy himself with the high-priesthood. Antipater died by the hand of an assassin (43 BC) and left four sons, Phasael, Herod the Great, Joseph, Pheroras, and a daughter Salome. The second of these sons raised the family to its highest pinnacle of power and glory. Pheroras was nominally his co-regent ann, possessed of his father's cunning, maintained himself to the end, surviving his cruel brother, but he cuts a small figure in the family history. He, as well as his sister Salome, proved an endless source of trouble to Herod by the endless family brawls which they occasioned.

2. Herod the Great:

With a different environment and with a different character, Herod the Great might have been worthy of the surname which he now bears only as a tribute of inane flattery. What we know of him, we owe, in the main, to the exhaustive treatment of the subject by Josephus in his Antiquities and Jewish War, and from Strabo and Dio Cassius among the classics. We may subsume our little sketch of Herod's life under the heads of (1) political activity, (2) evidences of talent, and (3) character and domestic life.

(1) Political Activity.

Antipater had great ambitions for his son. Herod was only a young man when he began his career as governor of Galilee. Josephus' statement, however, that he was only "fifteen years old" (Ant., XIV, ix, 2) is evidently the mistake of some transcriber, because we are told (XVII, viii, 1) that "he continued his life till a very old age." That was 42 years later, so that Herod at this time must have been at least 25 years old. His activity and success in ridding his dominion of dangerous bands of freebooters, and his still greater success in raising the always welcome tribute-money for the Roman government, gained for him additional power at court. His advance became rapid. Antony appointed him "tetrarch" of Judea in 41 BC, and although he was forced by circumstances temporarily to leave his domain in the hands of the Parthians and of Antigonus, this, in the end, proved a blessing in disguise. In this final spasm of the dying Asmonean house, Antigonus took Jerusalem by storm, and Phasael, Herod's oldest brother, fell into his hands. The latter was governor of the city, and foreseeing his fate, he committed suicide by dashing out his brains against the walls of his prison. Antigonus incapacitated his brother Hyrcanus, who was captured at the same time, from ever holding the holy office again by cropping off his ears (Ant.,

XIV, xiii, 10). Meanwhile, Herod was at Rome, and through the favor of Antony and Augustus he obtained the crown of Judea in 37 BC. The fond ambition of his heart was now attained, although he had literally to carve out his own empire with the sword. He made quick work of the task, cut his way back into Judea and took Jerusalem by storm in 37 BC.

The first act of his reign was the extermination of the Asmonean house, to which Herod himself was related through his marriage with Mariamne, the grandchild of Hyrcanus. Antigonus was slain and with him 45 of his chief adherents. Hyrcanus was recalled from Babylon, to which he had been banished by Antigonus, but the high-priesthood was bestowed on Aristobulus, Herod's brother-in-law, who, however, soon fell a victim to the suspicion and fear of the king (Ant., XV, iii, 3). These outrages against the purest blood in Judea turned the love of Mariamne, once cherished for Herod, into a bitter hatred. The Jews, loyal to the dynasty of the Maccabees, accused Herod before the Roman court, but he was summarily acquitted by Antony. Hyrcanus, mutilated and helpless as he was, soon followed Aristobulus in the way of death, 31 BC (Ant., XV, vi, 1). When Antony, who had ever befriended Herod, was conquered by Augustus at Actium (31 BC), Herod quickly turned to the powers that were, and, by subtle flattery and timely support, won the imperial favor. The boundaries of his kingdom were now extended by Rome. And Herod proved equal to the greater task. By a decisive victory over the Arabians, he showed, as he had done in his earlier Galilean government, what manner of man he was, when aroused to action. The Arabians were wholly crushed, and submitted themselves unconditionally under the power of Herod (Ant., XV, v, 5). Afraid to leave a remnant of the Asmonean power alive, he sacrificed Mariamne his wife, the only human being he ever seems to have loved (28 BC), his mother-in-law Alexandra (Ant., XV, vii, 8), and ultimately, shortly before his death, even his own sons by Mariamne, Alexander and Aristobulus 7 BC (Ant., XVI, xi, 7). In his emulation of the habits and views of life of the Romans, he continually offended and defied his Jewish subjects, by the introduction of Roman sports and heathen temples in his dominion. His influence on the younger Jews in this regard was baneful, and slowly a distinct partly arose, partly political, partly religious, which called itself the Herodian party, Jews in outward religious forms but Gentiles in their dress and in their whole view of life. They were a bitter offense to the rest of the nation, but were associated with the Pharisees and Sadducees in their opposition to Christ (Mt 22:16; Mr 3:6; 12:13). In vain Herod tried to win over the Jews, by royal charity in time of famine, and by yielding, wherever possible, to their bitter prejudices. They saw in him only a usurper of the throne of David, maintained by the strong arm of the hated Roman oppressor. Innumerable plots were made against his life, but, with almost superhuman cunning, Herod defeated them all (Ant., XV, viii). He robbed his own people that he might give munificent gifts to the Romans; he did not even spare the grave of King David, which was held in almost idolatrous reverence by the people, but robbed it of its treasures (Ant., XVI, vii, 1). The last days of Herod were embittered by endless court intrigues and conspiracies, by an almost insane suspicion on the part of the aged king, and by increasing indications of the restlessness of the nation. Like Augustus himself, Herod was the victim of an incurable and loathsome disease. His temper became more irritable, as the malady made progress, and he made both himself and his court unutterably miserable. The picture drawn by Josephus (Ant., XVII) is lifelike and tragic in its vividness. In his last will and testament, he remained true to his life-long fawning upon the Roman power (Ant., XVII, vi, 1). So great became his suffering toward the last that he made a fruitless attempt at suicide. But, true to his character, one of the last acts of his life was an order to execute his son Antipater, who had instigated the murder of his halfbrothers,

Alexander and Aristobulus, and another order to slay, after his death, a number of nobles, who were guilty of a small outbreak at Jerusalem and who were confined in the hippodrome (Ant., XVI, vi, 5). He died in the 37th year of his reign, 34 years after he had captured Jerusalem and slain Antigonus. Josephus writes this epitaph: "A man he was of great barbarity toward all men equally, and a slave to his passions, but above the consideration of what was right. Yet was he favored by fortune as much as any man ever was, for from a private man he became a king, and though he were encompassed by ten thousand dangers, he got clear of them all and continued his life to a very old age" (Ant., XVII, viii, 1).

(2) Evidences of Talent.

The life of Herod the Great was not a fortuitous chain of favorable accidents. He was unquestionably a man of talent. In a family like that of Antipus and Antipater, talent must necessarily be hereditary, and Herod inherited it more largely than any of his brothers. His whole life exhibits in no small degree statecraft, power of organization, shrewdness. He knew men and he knew how to use them. He won the warmest friendship of Roman emperors, and had a faculty of convincing the Romans of the righteousness of his cause, in every contingency. In his own dominions he was like Ishmael, his hand against all, and the hands of all against him, and yet he maintained himself in the government for a whole generation. His Galilean governorship showed what manner of man he was, a man with iron determination and great generalship. His Judean conquest proved the same thing, as did his Arabian war. Herod was a born leader of men. Under a different environment he might have developed into a truly great man, and had his character been coordinate with his gifts, he might have done great things for the Jewish people. But by far the greatest talent of Herod was his singular architectural taste and ability. Here he reminds one of the old Egyptian Pharaohs. Against the laws of Judaism, which he pretended to obey, he built at Jerusalem a magnificent theater and an amphitheater, of which the ruins remain. The one was within the city, the other outside the walls. Thus he introduced into the ascetic sphere of the Jewish life the frivolous spirit of the Greeks and the Romans. To offset this cruel infraction of all the maxims of orthodox Judaism, he tried to placate the nation by rebuilding the temple of Zerubbabel and making it more magnificent than even Solomon’s temple had been. This work was accomplished somewhere between 19 BC and 11 or 9 BC, although the entire work was not finished till the procuratorship of Albinus, 62-64 AD (Ant., XV, xi, 5, 6; XX, ix, 7; Joh 2:20). It was so transcendently beautiful that it ranked among the world’s wonders, and Josephus does not tire of describing its glories (BJ, V, v). Even Titus sought to spare the building in the final attack on the city (BJ, VI, iv, 3). Besides this, Herod rebuilt and beautified Struto’s Tower, which he called after the emperor, Caesarea. He spent 12 years in this gigantic work, building a theater and amphitheater, and above all in achieving the apparently impossible by creating a harbor where there was none before. This was accomplished by constructing a gigantic mole far out into the sea, and so enduring was the work that the remains of it are seen today. The Romans were so appreciative of the work done by Herod that they made Caesarea the capital of the new regime, after the passing away of the Herodian power. Besides this, Herod rebuilt Samaria, to the utter disgust of the Jews, calling it Sebaste. In Jerusalem itself he built the three great towers, Antonia, Phasaelus and Mariamne, which survived even the catastrophe of the year 70 AD. All over Herod’s dominion were found the evidences of this constructive passion. Antipatris was built by him, on the site of the ancient Kapharsaba, as well as the stronghold Phasaelus near Jericho, where he was destined to see so much suffering and ultimately to die. He even reached beyond his own domain to

satisfy this building mania at Ascalon, Damascus, Tyre and Sidon, Tripoli, Ptolemais, nay even at Athens and Lacedaemon. But the universal character of these operations itself occasioned the bitterest hatred against him on the part of the narrowminded Jews.

(3) Characteristics and Domestic Life.

The personality of Herod was impressive, and he was possessed of great physical strength. His intellectual powers were far beyond the ordinary; his will was indomitable; he was possessed of great tact, when he saw fit to employ it; in the great crises of his life he was never at a loss what to do; and no one has ever accused Herod the Great of cowardice. There were in him two distinct individualities, as was the case with Nero. Two powers struggled in him for the mastery, and the lower one at last gained complete control. During the first part of his reign there were evidences of large-heartedness, of great possibilities in the man. But the bitter experiences of his life, the endless whisperings and warnings of his court, the irreconcilable spirit of the Jews, as well as the consciousness of his own wrongdoing, changed him into a Jewish Nero: a tyrant, who bathed his own house and his own people in blood. The demons of Herod's life were jealousy of power, and suspicion, its necessary companion.

He was the incarnation of brute lust, which in turn became the burden of the lives of his children. History tells of few more immoral families than the house of Herod, which by intermarriage of its members so entangled the genealogical tree as to make it a veritable puzzle. As these marriages were nearly all within the line of forbidden consanguinity, under the Jewish law, they still further embittered the people of Israel against the Herodian family. When Herod came to the throne of Judea, Phasael was dead. Joseph his younger brother had fallen in battle (Ant., XIV, xv, 10), and only Pheroras and Salome survived. The first, as we have seen, nominally shared the government with Herod, but was of little consequence and only proved a thorn in the king's flesh by his endless interference and plotting. To him were allotted the revenues of the East Jordanic territory. Salome, his sister, was ever neck-deep in the intrigues of the Herodian family, but had the cunning of a fox and succeeded in making Herod believe in her unchangeable loyalty, although the king had killed her own son-in-law and her nephew, Aristobulus, his own son. The will of Herod, made shortly before his death, is a convincing proof of his regard for his sister (Ant., XVII, viii, 1).

His domestic relations were very unhappy. Of his marriage with Doris and of her son, Antipater, he reaped only misery, the son, as stated above, ultimately falling a victim to his father's wrath, when the crown, for which he plotted, was practically within his grasp. Herod appears to have been deeply in love with Mariamne, the grandchild of Hyrcanus, in so far as he was capable of such a feeling, but his attitude toward the entire Asmonean family and his fixed determination to make an end of it changed whatever love Mariamne had for him into hatred. Ultimately she, as well as her two sons, fell victims to Herod's insane jealousy of power. Like Nero, however, in a similar situation, Herod felt the keenest remorse after her death. As his sons grew up, the family tragedy thickened, and the court of Herod became a veritable hotbed of mutual recriminations, intrigues and catastrophes. The trials and executions of his own conspiring sons were conducted with the acquiescence of the Roman power, for Herod was shrewd enough not to make a move without it. Yet so thoroughly was the condition of the Jewish court understood at Rome, that Augustus, after the death of Mariamne's sons (7 BC), is said to have

exclaimed: "I would rather be Herod's hog hus than his son huios." At the time of his death, the remaining sons were these: Herod, son of Mariamne, Simon's daughter; Archelaus and Antipas, sons of Malthace, and Herod Philip, son of Cleopatra of Jerusalem. Alexander and Aristobulus were killed, through the persistent intrigues of Antipater, the oldest son and heir presumptive to the crown, and he himself fell into the grave he had dug for his brothers.

By the final testament of Herod, as ratified by Rome, the kingdom was divided as follows: Archelaus received one-half of the kingdom, with the title of king, really "ethnarch," governing Judea, Samaria and Idumaea; Antipas was appointed "tetrarch" of Galilee and Peraea; Philip, "tetrarch" of Trachonitis, Gaulonitis and Paneas. To Salome, his intriguing sister, he bequeathed Jamnia, Ashdod and Phasaelus, together with 500,000 drachmas of coined silver. All his kindred were liberally provided for in his will, "so as to leave them all in a wealthy condition" (Ant., XVII, viii, 1). In his death he had been better to his family than in his life. He died unmourned and unbeloved by his own people, to pass into history as a name soiled by violence and blood. As the waters of Callirhoe were unable to cleanse his corrupting body, those of time were unable to wash away the stains of a tyrant's name. The only time he is mentioned in the New Testament is in Mt 2 and Lu 1. In Matthew he is associated with the wise men of the East, who came to investigate the birth of the "king of the Jews." Learning their secret, Herod found out from the "priests and scribes of the people" where the Christ was to be born and ordered the "massacre of the innocents," with which his name is perhaps more generally associated than with any other act of his life. As Herod died in 4 BC and some time elapsed between the massacre and his death (Mt 2:19), we have here a clue to the approximate fixing of the true date of Christ's birth. Another, in this same connection, is an eclipse of the moon, the only one mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XVII, vi, 4; text and note), which was seen shortly before Herod's death. This eclipse occurred on March 13, in the year of the Julian Period, 4710, therefore 4 BC.

3. Herod Antipas:

Herod Antipas was the son of Herod the Great and Malthace, a Samaritan woman. Half Idumean, half Samaritan, he had therefore not a drop of Jewish blood in his veins, and "Galilee of the Gentiles" seemed a fit dominion for such a prince. He ruled as "tetrarch" of Galilee and Peraea (Lu 3:1) from 4 BC till 39 AD. The gospel picture we have of him is far from prepossessing. He is superstitious (Mt 14:1 f), foxlike in his cunning (Lu 13:31 f) and wholly immoral. John the Baptist was brought into his life through an open rebuke of his gross immorality and defiance of the laws of Moses (Le 18:16), and paid for his courage with his life (Mt 14:10; Ant, XVIII, v, 2).

On the death of his father, although he was younger than his brother Archelaus (Ant., XVII, ix, 4 f; BJ, II, ii, 3), he contested the will of Herod, who had given to the other the major part of the dominion. Rome, however, sustained the will and assigned to him the "tetrarchy" of Galilee and Peraea, as it had been set apart for him by Herod (Ant., XVII, xi, 4). Educated at Rome with Archelaus and Philip, his half-brother, son of Mariamne, daughter of Simon, he imbibed many of the tastes and graces and far more of the vices of the Romans. His first wife was a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia. But he sent her back to her father at Petra, for the sake of Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip, whom he had met and seduced at Rome. Since the latter was the daughter of Aristobulus, his half-brother, and therefore his

niece, and at the same time the wife of another half-brother, the union between her and Antipas was doubly sinful. Aretas repaid this insult to his daughter by a destructive war (Ant., XVIII, v, 1). Herodias had a baneful influence over him and wholly dominated his life (Mt 14:3-10). He emulated the example of his father in a mania for erecting buildings and beautifying cities. Thus, he built the wall of Sepphoris and made the place his capital. He elevated Bethsaida to the rank of a city and gave it the name "Julia," after the daughter of Tiberius. Another example of this inherited or cultivated building-mania was the work he did at Betharamphtha, which he called "Julias" (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1). His influence on his subjects was morally bad (Mr 8:15). If his life was less marked by enormities than his father's, it was only so by reason of its inevitable restrictions. The last glimpse the Gospels afford of him shows him to us in the final tragedy of the life of Christ. He is then at Jerusalem. Pilate in his perplexity had sent the Saviour bound to Herod, and the utter inefficiency and flippancy of the man is revealed in the account the Gospels give us of the incident (Lu 23:7-12; Ac 4:27). It served, however, to bridge the chasm of the enmity between Herod and Pilate (Lu 23:12), both of whom were to be stripped of their power and to die in shameful exile. When Caius Caligula had become emperor and when his scheming favorite Herod Agrippa I, the bitter enemy of Antipas, had been made king in 37 AD, Herodias prevailed on Herod Antipas to accompany her to Rome to demand a similar favor. The machinations of Agrippa and the accusation of high treason preferred against him, however, proved his undoing, and he was banished to Lyons in Gaul, where he died in great misery (Ant., XVIII, vii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 6).

4. Herod Philip:

Herod Philip was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem. At the death of his father he inherited Gaulonitis, Traehonitis and Paneas (Ant., XVII, viii, 1). He was Philip apparently utterly unlike the rest of the Herodian family, retiring, dignified, moderate and just. He was also wholly free from the intriguing spirit of his brothers, and it is but fair to suppose that he inherited this totally un-Herodian character and disposition from his mother. He died in the year 34 AD, and his territory was given three years later to Agrippa I, his nephew and the son of Aristobulus, together with the tetrarchy of Lysanias (Ant., XVIII, iv, 6; XIX, v, 1).

5. Herod Archelaus:

Herod Archelaus was the oldest son of Herod the Great by Malthace, the Samaritan. He was a man of violent temper, reminding one a great deal of his father. Educated like all Archelaus the Herodian princes at Rome, he was fully familiar with the life and arbitrariness of the Roman court. In the last days of his father's life, Antipater, who evidently aimed at the extermination of all the heirs to the throne, accused him and Philip, his half-brother, of treason. Both were acquitted (Ant., XVI, iv, 4; XVII, vii, 1). By the will of his father, the greater part of the Herodian kingdom fell to his share, with the title of "ethnarch." The will was contested by his brother Antipas before the Roman court. While the matter was in abeyance, Archelaus incurred the hatred of the Jews by the forcible repression of a rebellion, in which some 3,000 people were slain. They therefore opposed his claims at Rome, but Arche1aus, in the face of all this opposition, received the Roman support (Ant., XVII, xi, 4). It is very ingeniously suggested that this episode may be the foundation of the parable of Christ, found in Lu 19:12-27. Archelaus, once

invested with the government of Judea, ruled with a hard hand, so that Judea and Samaria were both soon in a chronic state of unrest. The two nations, bitterly as they hated each other, became friends in this common crisis, and sent an embassy to Rome to complain of the conduct of Archelaus, and this time they were successful. Archelaus was warned by a dream of the coming disaster, whereupon he went at once to Rome to defend himself, but wholly in vain. His government was taken from him, his possessions were all confiscated by the Roman power and he himself was banished to Vienna in Gaul (Ant., XVII, xiii, 2, 3). He, too, displayed some of his father's taste for architecture, in the building of a royal palace at Jericho and of a village, named after himself, Archelais. He was married first to Mariamne, and after his divorce from her to Glaphyra, who had been the wife of his half-brother Alexander (Ant., XVII, xiii). The only mention made of him in the Gospels is found in Mt 2:22.

Of Herod, son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, Simon's daughter, we know nothing except that he married Herodias, the daughter of his dead halfbrother Aristobulus. He is called Philip in the New Testament (Mt 14:3), and it was from him that Antipas lured Herodias away. His later history is wholly unknown, as well as that of Herod, the brother of Philip the tetrarch, and the oldest son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra of Jerusalem.

6. Herod Agrippa I:

Two members of the Herodian family are named Agrippa. They are of the line of Aristobulus, who through Mariamne, grand-daughter of Hyrcanus, carried down the line of the Asmonean blood. And it is worthy of note that in this line, nearly extinguished by Herod through his mad jealousy and fear of the Maccabean power, the kingdom of Herod came to its greatest glory again.

Herod Agrippa I, called Agrippa by Josephus, was the son of Aristobulus and Bernice and the grandson of Herod the Great and Mariamne. Educated at Rome with Claudius (Ant., XVIII, vi, 1, 4), he was possessed of great shrewdness and tact. Returning to Judea for a little while, he came back to Rome in 37 AD. He hated his uncle Antipas and left no stone unturned to hurt his cause. His mind was far-seeing, and he cultivated, as his grandfather had done, every means that might lead to his own promotion. He, therefore, made fast friends with Caius Caligula, heir presumptive to the Roman throne, and his rather outspoken advocacy of the latter's claims led to his imprisonment by Tiberius. This proved the making of his fortune, for Caligula did not forget him, but immediately on his accession to the throne, liberated Agrippa and bestowed on him, who up to that time had been merely a private citizen, the "tetrarchies" of Philip, his uncle, and of Lysanias, with the title of king, although he did not come into the possession of the latter till two more years had gone by (Ant., XVIII, vi, 10). The foolish ambition of Herod Antipas led to his undoing, and the emperor, who had heeded the accusation of Agrippa against his uncle, bestowed on him the additional territory of Galilee and Peraea in 39 AD. Agrippa kept in close touch with the imperial government, and when, on the assassination of Caligula, the imperial crown was offered to the indifferent Claudius, it fell to the lot of Agrippa to lead the latter to accept the proffered honor. This led to further imperial favors and further extension of his territory, Judea and Samaria being added to his domain, 40 AD. The fondest dreams of Agrippa had now been realized, his father's fate was avenged and the old Herodian power had been restored to its original extent. He ruled with great munificence and was very tactful in his contact with the Jews. With this end in view, several years

before, he had moved Caligula to recall the command of erecting an imperial statue in the city of Jerusalem; and when he was forced to take sides in the struggle between Judaism and the nascent Christian sect, he did not hesitate a moment, but assumed the role of its bitter persecutor, slaying James the apostle with the sword and harrying the church whenever possible (Ac 12.). He died, in the full flush of his power, of a death, which, in its harrowing details reminds us of the fate of his grandfather (Ac 12:20-23; Ant, XIX, viii, 2). Of the four children he left (BJ, II, xi, 6), three are known to history—Herod Agrippa II, king of Calchis, Bernice of immoral celebrity, who consorted with her own brother in defiance of human and Divine law, and became a byword even among the heathen (Juv. Sat. vi. 156-60), and Drusilla, the wife of the Roman governor Felix (Ac 24:24). According to tradition the latter perished in the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 AD, together with her son Agrippa. With Herod Agrippa I, the Herodian power had virtually run its course.

7. Herod Agrippa II:

Herod Agrippa II was the son of Herod Agrippa I and Cypros. When his father died in 44 AD he was a youth of only 17 years and considered too young to assume the government of Judea. Claudius therefore placed the country under the care of a procurator. Agrippa had received a royal education in the palace of the emperor himself (Ant., XIX, ix, 2). But he had not wholly forgotten his people, as is proven by his intercession in behalf of the Jews, when they asked to be permitted to have the custody of the official highpriestly robes, till then in the hands of the Romans and to be used only on stated occasions (Ant., XX, i, 1). On the death of his uncle, Herod of Calchis, Claudius made Agrippa II "tetrarch" of the territory, 48 AD (BJ, II, xii, 1; XIV, iv; Ant, XX, v, 2). As Josephus tells us, he espoused the cause of the Jews whenever he could (Ant., XX, vi, 3). Four years later (52 AD), Claudius extended the dominion of Agrippa by giving him the old "tetrarchies" of Philip and Lysanias. Even at Calchis they had called him king; now it became his official title (Ant., XX, vii, 1). Still later (55 AD), Nero added some Galilean and Perean cities to his domain. His whole career indicates the predominating influence of the Asmonean blood, which had shown itself in his father’s career also. If the Herodian taste for architecture reveals itself here and there (Ant., XX, viii, 11; IX, iv), there is a total absence of the cold disdain wherewith the Herods in general treated their subjects. The Agrippas are Jews.

Herod Agrippa II figures in the New Testament in Ac 25:13; 26:32. Paul there calls him "king" and appeals to him as to one knowing the Scriptures. As the brother-in-law of Felix he was a favored guest on this occasion. His relation to Bernice his sister was a scandal among Jews and Gentiles alike (Ant., XX, vii, 3). In the fall of the Jewish nation, Herod Agrippa’s kingdom went down. Knowing the futility of resistance, Agrippa warned the Jews not to rebel against Rome, but in vain (BJ, II, xvi, 2-5; XVII, iv; XVIII, ix; XIX, iii). When the war began he boldly sided with Rome and fought under its banners, getting wounded by a sling-stone in the siege of Gamala (BJ, IV, i, 3). The oration by which he sought to persuade the Jews against the rebellion is a masterpiece of its kind and became historical (BJ, II, xvi). When the inevitable came and when with the Jewish nation also the kingdom of Herod Agrippa II had been destroyed, the Romans remembered his loyalty. With Bernice his sister he removed to Rome, where he became a praetor and died in the year 100 AD, at the age of 70 years, in the beginning of Trajan’s reign.

LITERATURE.

Josephus, Josephus, Antiquities and BJ; Strabo; Dio Cassius. Among all modern works on the subject, Schurer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (5 vols) is perhaps still the best.

Henry E. Dosker

HERODIANS

he-ro’-di-anz (Herodianoi): A party twice mentioned in the Gospels (Mt 22:16 parallel Mr 12:13; 3:6) as acting with the Pharisees in opposition to Jesus. They were not a religious sect, but, as the name implies, a court or political party, supporters of the dynasty of Herod. Nothing is known of them beyond what the Gospels state. Whatever their political aims, they early perceived that Christ’s pure and spiritual teaching on the kingdom of God was irreconcilable with these, and that Christ’s influence with the people was antagonistic to their interests. Hence, in Galilee, on the occasion of the healing of the man with the withered hand, they readily joined with the more powerful party of the Pharisees in plots to crush Jesus (Mr 3:6); and again, in Jerusalem, in the last week of Christ’s life, they renewed this alliance in the attempt to entrap Jesus on the question of the tribute money (Mt 22:16). The warning of Jesus to His disciples to "beware of the leaven of Herod" (Mr 8:15) may have had reference to the insidious spirit of this party.

James Orr

HERODIAS

he-ro’-di-as (Herodias): The woman who compassed the death of John the Baptist at Macherus (Mt 14:1-12; Mr 6:14-29; compare also Lu 3:19,20; 9:7-9). According to the Gospel records, Herodias had previously been married to Philip, but had deserted him for his brother Herod the tetrarch. For this Herod was reproved by John (compare Le 18:16; 20:21), and Herod, therefore, to please Herodias, bound him and cast him into prison. According to Mt 14:5 he would even then have put John to death, but "feared the multitude," which regarded John as a prophet. But Mr 6:19 f relates it was Herodias who especially desired the death of John, but that she was withstood by Herod whose conscience was not altogether dead. This latter explanation is more in harmony with the sequel. At Herod’s birthday feast, Herodias induced her daughter Salome, whose dancing had so charmed the tetrarch, to ask as her reward the head of John the Baptist on a charger. This was given her and she then brought it to her mother.

Herodias was daughter of Aristobulus, son of Herod the Great, by Mariamne, daughter of Hyrcanus. Her second husband (compare above) was Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea (circa 4-39 AD), son of Herod the Great by Malthace. Herod Antipus was thus the step-brother of Aristobulus, father of Herodias. Regarding the first husband of Herodias, to whom she bore Salome, some hold that the Gospel accounts are at variance with that of Josephus. In Mt 14:3; Mr 6:17; Lu 3:19, he is called Philip the brother of Herod (Antipus). But in Mt 14:3 and Lu 3:19 the name Philip is omitted by certain important

manuscripts. According to Josephus, he was Herod, son of Herod the Great by Mariamne daughter of Simon the high priest, and was thus a step-brother of Herod Antipas (compare Josephus, Ant, XVIII, v, 4). It is suggested in explanation of the discrepancy

(1) that Herod, son of Mariamne, bore a second name Philip, or

(2) that there is confusion in the Gospels with Heroal-Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, who was the son of Herod the Great and Cleopatra, and who was in reality the husband of Salome, daughter of Herodias (compare also A. B. Bruce, The Expositor Greek Testament., I, 381; A. C. Headlam, article "Herod" in HDB, II, 359, 360).

According to Josephus (Ant., VIII, vii, 2; XVIII, vii, 1) the ambition of Herodias proved the ruin of Herod Antipas. Being jealous of the power of Agrippa her brother, she induced Herod to demand of Caligula the title of king. This was refused through the machinations of Agrippa, and Herod was banished. But the pride of Herodias kept her still faithful to her husband in his misfortune.

C. M. Kerr

HERODION

he-ro’-di-on (Herodion; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Hrodion): A Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:11). The name seems to imply that he was a freedman of the Herods, or a member of the household of Aristobulus, the grandson of Herod the Great (Ro 16:10). Paul calls him "my kinsman," i.e. "a Jew" (see JUNIAS, 1).

HERON

her’-un (’anaphah; charadrios; Latin Ardea cinerea): Herons are mentioned only in the abomination lists of Le 11:19 (margin "ibis") and De 14:18. They are near relatives of crane, stork, ibis and bittern. These birds, blue, white or brown, swarmed in Europe and wintered around Merom, along the Jordan, at the headwaters of the Jabbok and along its marshy bed in the dry season. Herons of Southern Africa that summered in the Holy Land loved to nest on the banks of Merom, and raise their young among the bulrushes, papyrus, reeds and water grasses, although it is their usual habit to build in large trees. The white herons were small, the blue, larger, and the brown, close to the same size. The blue were 3 1/2 ft. in length, and had a 5-ft. sweep. The beak, neck and legs constituted two-thirds of the length of the body, which is small, lean and bony, taking its appearance of size from its long loose feathers. Moses no doubt forbade these birds as an article of diet, because they ate fish and in older specimens would be tough, dark and evil smelling. The very poor of our western and southeastern coast states eat them.

Gene Stratton-Porter

HESED, SON OF

he’-sed.

See BEN-HESED.

HESHBON

hesh’-bon (cheshbon; Hesebon): The royal city of Sihon king of the Amorites, taken and occupied by the Israelites under Moses (Nu 21:25 f, etc.). It lay on the southern border of Gad (Jos 13:26), and was one of the cities fortified by Reuben (Nu 32:37). It is reckoned among the cities of Gad given to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:39). In later literature (Isa 15:4; 16:8 f; Jer 48:2,34,45; 49:3) it is referred to as a city of Moab. It passed again into Jewish hands, and is mentioned by Josephus (Ant., XIII, xv, 4) as among their possessions in the country of Moab under Alexander Janneus. The city with its district called Hesebonitis, was also under the jurisdiction of Herod the Great (Ant., XV, vii, 5, where it is described as lying in the Peraea). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 20 Roman miles from the Jordan. It is represented by the modern Chesban, a ruined site in the mountains over against Jericho, about 16 miles East of the Jordan. It stands on the edge of Wady Chesban in a position of great strength, about 600 ft. above ‘Ain Chesban. The ruins, dating mainly from Roman times, spread over two hills, respectively 2,930 ft. and 2,954 ft. in height. There are remains of a temple overlooked from the West by those of a castle. There is also a large ruined reservoir; while the spring in the valley forms a succession of pools (So 7:4). The city is approached from the valley by a steep path passing through a cutting in the rock, which may have been closed by a gate (Conder, Heth and Moab, 142). On a hill to the West, el-Kurmiyeh, is a collection of dolmens and stone circles (Musil, Arabia Petrea, I, 383 ff).

W. Ewing

HESHMON

hesh’-mon (cheshmon): An unidentified place on the border of Judah toward Edom (Jos 15:27). This may have been the original home of the Hasmoneans.

HETH (1)

chath cheth: The eighth letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "ch". It came also to be used for the number 8. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

HETH (2)

heth (cheth): In Ge 23:10 the ancestor of the Hittites. As the various peoples who occupied Canaan were thought to belong to one stock, Ge 10:15 (1Ch 1:13) makes Heth the (2nd) son of Canaan. In Ge 23 the

"sons of Heth" occupy Hebron, but they were known to have come there from the north. A reference to this seems to be preserved in the order of the names in Ge 10:15,16, where Heth is placed between Sidon and the Jebusites.

See HITTITES.

HETHLON

heth’-lon (chethlon; Peshitta chethron): Name of a place associated with Zedad on the ideal northern boundary of Israel, as given in Eze 47:15 and 48:1, but not named in Nu 34:8, while the Septuagint evidently translated the text it had. In accordance with the opinion they hold as to the boundary line of Northern Israel, van Kasteren and Buhl seek to identify Hethlon with ‘Adlun on the river Qasmiyeh. Much more in harmony with the line of the other border towns given is its identification with Heitala to the Northeast of Tripoli. The "way of Hethlon" would then coincide with the Eleutherus valley, between Homs and the Mediterranean, through which the railway now runs, and to this identification the Septuagint seems to give testimony, indicating some path of "descent" from the Biqa’a.

W. M. Christie

HEWER

hu’-er (choTebh): Applies especially to a wood-worker or wood-gatherer (compare Arabic chattab, "a woodman") (Jos 9:21,23,17; 2Ch 2:10; Jer 46:22). Gathering wood, like drawing water, was a menial task. Special servants were assigned to the work (De 29:11). Joshua set the Gibeonites to hewing wood and drawing water as a punishment for their trickery, whereas were it not for the oath which the Israelites had sworn, the Gibeonites would probably have been killed.

See DRAWER OF WATER.

chatsbh, from the root "to cut" or "to carve," applies to hewers of stone in 1Ki 5:15; 2Ki 12:12; 1Ch 22:15; 2Ch 2:18.

James A. Patch

HEXATEUCH

hek’-sa-tuk:

1. Evidence for:

This word, formed on the analogy of Pentateuch, Heptateuch, etc., is used by modern writers to denote

the first six books of the Bible (i.e. the Law and Joshua) collectively. Many critics hold that these six books were composed out of the sources JEP, etc. (on which see PENTATEUCH), and only separated very much later into different works. The main grounds for this belief are:

(1) the obvious fact that Jos provides the sequel to the Pentateuch, narrating the conquest and settlement in Canaan to which the latter work looks forward, and

(2) certain material and stylistic resemblances. The composition of the respective works is considered in the articles PENTATEUCH and JOSHUA.

2. Evidence against:

Here we must glance at the evidence against theory of a Hexateuch. It is admitted that there is no trace of any such work as the Hexateuch anywhere in tradition. The Jewish Canon places the Pentateuch in a separate category from Joshua. The Samaritans went farther and adopted the Pentateuch alone. The orthography of the two works differs in certain important particulars (see E. Konig, Einleitung, 151 f, 250). Hence, a different literary history has to be postulated for the two works, even by those who adopt theory of a Hexateuch. But that theory is open to objection on other grounds. There are grave differences of opinion among its supporters as to whether all the supposed Pentateuchal documents are present in Joshua, and in any case it is held that they are quite differently worked up, the redactors having proceeded on one system in the Pentateuch and on quite another in Joshua. Arguments are given in the article PENTATEUCH to show the presence of Mosaic and pre-Mosaic elements in the Pentateuch and the unsoundness of the documentary theory in that work, and if these be correct theory of a Hexateuch necessarily falls to the ground.

For Bibliography see PENTATEUCH; JOSHUA.

Harold M. Wiener

HEZEKI

hez’-e-ki (chizqi).

See HIZKI.

HEZEKIAH (1)

hez-e-ki’-a (chizqiyah):

(1) King of Judah. See special article

(2) A son of Neariah, of the royal family of Judah (1Ch 3:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "Hizkiah").

(3) An ancestor of Zephaniah (Ze 1:1, the King James Version "Hizkiah").

(4) One of the returned exiles from Babylon (Ezr 2:16; Ne 7:21).

HEZEKIAH (2)

(chizqiyah, "Yahweh has strengthened"; also written chizqiyahu, "Yah has strengthened him"; Hezekias): One of the greatest of the kings of Judah; reigned (according to the most self-consistent chronology) from circa 715 to circa 690 BC.

Old Testament Estimate:

On the Old Testament standard of loyalty to Yahweh he is eulogized by Jesus Sirach as one of the three kings who alone did not "commit trespass" (Sirach 49:4), the other two being David and Josiah. The Chronicler represents him (2Ch 32:31) as lapsing from the wisdom of piety only by his vainglory in revealing the resources of his realm to the envoys of Merodach-baladan. In 2Ki 18:5, the earliest estimate, his special distinction, beyond all other Judean kings, before or after, was that he "trusted in Yahweh, the God of Israel." It is as the king who "clave to Yahweh" (2Ki 18:6) that the Hebrew mind sums up his royal and personal character.

I. Sources for His Life and Times.

1. Scripture Annals:

The historical accounts in 2Ki 18,20 and 2Ch 29,32 are derived in the main from the same state annals, though the latter seems also to have had the Temple archives to draw upon. For "the rest of his acts" 2Ki refers to a source then still in existence but now lost, "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah" (2Ki 20:20), and 2 Chronicles to "the vision of Isaiah the prophet the son of Amoz, in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel" (2Ch 32:32). In this last-named source (if this is the original of our Book of Isa.), besides the warnings and directions called out by the course of the history, there is a narrative section (Isa 36,39) recounting the Sennacherib crisis much as do the other histories, but incorporating also a passage of Isaianic prophecy (Isa 37:22-32) and a "writing of Hezekiah king of Judah" (Isa 38:10-20). Lastly, in Sirach 48:17-25, there is a summary of the good and wise deeds of Hezekiah, drawn from the accounts that we already have.

2. View-point and Colouring:

Of these sources the account in 2 Kings is most purely historianic, originating at a time when religious and political values, in the Hebrew mind, were inseparable. In 2Ch the religious point and coloring,

especially in its later developed ritual and legal aspects, has the decided predominance. Sirach, with the mind of a man of letters, is concerned mainly with eulogizing Hezekiah. in his "praise of famous men" (compare Sirach 44-50), of course from the devout Hebrew point of view. In the vision of Isaiah (Isa 1,39), we have the reflection of the moral and spiritual situation in Jerusalem, as realized in the fervid prophetic consciousness; and in the prophecy of his younger contemporary Micah, the state of things in the outlying country districts nearest the path of invasion, where both the iniquities of the ruling classes and the horrors of war were felt most keenly. Doubtless also many devotional echoes of these times of stress are deducible from the Psalms, so far as we can fairly identify them.

3. Side-Lights:

It is in Hezekiah's times especially that the Assyrian inscriptions become illuminating for the history of Israel; for one important thing they furnish certain fixed dates to which the chronology of the times can be adjusted. Of Sennacherib's campaign of 701, for instance, no fewer than six accounts are at present known (see G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 154, note), the most detailed being the "Taylor Cylinder," now in the British Museum, which in the main agrees, or at least is not inconsistent, with the Scripture history.

II. Events of His Reign.

1. His Heritage:

From his weak and unprincipled father Ahaz (compare 2Ch 28:16-25), Hezekiah inherited not only a disorganized realm but a grievous burden of Assyrian dominance and tribute, and the constant peril and suspense of greater encroachments from that arrogant and arbitrary power: the state of things foretold in Isa 7:20; 8:7 f. The situation was aggravated by the fact that not only the nation's weakness but its spiritual propensities had incurred it: the dominant classes were aping the sentiments, fashions and cult of the East (compare Isa 2:6-8), while the neglected common people were exposed to the corruptions of the still surviving heathenism of the land. The realm, in short, was at the spiritual nadir-point from which prophets like Isaiah and Micah were laboring to bring about the birth of a true Hebrew conscience and faith. Their task was a hard one: with a nation smear-eyed, dull-cared, fat-hearted (Isa 6:10), whose religion was a precept of men learned by rote (Isa 29:13). Clearly, from this point of view, a most difficult career was before him.

2. Religious Reform:

The sense of this unspiritual state of things furnishes the best keynote of Hezekiah's reforms in religion, which according to the Chronicler he set about as soon as he came to the throne (2Ch 29:3). It is the Chronicler who gives the fullest account of these reforms (2Ch 29-31); naturally, from his priestly point of view and access to ecclesiastical archives. Hezekiah began with the most pressing constructive need, the opening and cleansing of the Temple, which his father Ahaz had left closed and desecrated (2Ch 28:24), and went on to the reorganization of its liturgical and choral service. In connection with this work he appointed a Passover observance, which, on a scale and spirit unknown since Solomon (2Ch

30:26), he designed as a religious reunion of the devout-minded in all Israel, open not only to Jerusalem and Judah, but to all who would accept his invitation from Samaria, Galilee, and beyond the Jordan (2Ch 30:5-12,18). The immediate result of the enthusiasm engendered by this Old Home Week was a vigorous popular movement of iconoclasm against the idolatrous high places of the land. That this was no weak fanatical impulse to break something, but a touch of real spiritual quickening, seems evidenced by one incident of it: the breaking up of Moses' old brazen serpent and calling it what it had come to mean, nechushtan, "a piece of brass" (2Ki 18:4); the movement seems in fact to have had in it the sense, however crude, that old religious forms had become hurtful and effete superstitions, hindering spirituality. Nor could the movement stop with the old fetish. With it went the demolition of the high places themselves and the breaking down of the pillars (matstsebhoth) and felling of the sacred groves ('asherah), main symbols these of a debasing naturecult. This reform, on account of later reactions (see under MANASSEH), has been deemed ineffective; rather, its effects were inward and germinal; nor were they less outwardly than could reasonably be expected, before its meanings were more deepened and centralized.

3. Internal Improvements:

All this, on the king's part, was his response to the spiritual influence of Isaiah, with whose mind his own was sincerely at one. As a devout disciple in the school of prophetic ideas, he earnestly desired to maintain the prophet's insistent attitude of "quietness and confidence" (compare Isa 30:15), that is, of stedfast trust in Yahweh alone, and of abstinence from revolt and entangling alliances with foreign powers. This, however, in the stress and suspense of the times, did not preclude a quiet preparation for emergencies; and doubtless the early years of his reign were notable, not only for mild and just administration throughout his realm, but for measures looking to the fortifying and defense of the capital. His work of repairing and extending the walls and of strengthening the citadel (Millo), as mentioned in 2Ch 32:5, had probably been in progress long before the Assyrian crisis was imminent. Nor was he backward in coming to an understanding with other nations, as to the outlook for revolt against Assyria. He could not learn his lesson of faith all at once, especially with a factious court pulling the other way. He did not escape the suspicion of Sargon (died 705), who for his Egyptian leanings counted him among the "plotters of sedition" (compare COT, 100); while the increasing prosperity and strength of his realm marked him for a leading role in an eventual uprising. He weathered at least one chance of rebellion, however, in 711, probably through the strenuous exertions of Isaiah (see Isa 20:1 ff).

4. The Assyrian Crisis:

Hezekiah's opportunity to rise against Assyrian domination seems to have been taken about 704. How so pious a king came to do it in spite of Isaiah's strenuous warnings, both against opposition to Assyria and alliance with other powers, is not very clear. The present writer ventures to suggest the view that the beginning was forced or perhaps sprung upon him by his princes and nobles. In the year before, Sargon, dying, had left his throne to Sennacherib, and, as at all ancient changes of sovereignty, this was the signal for a general effort for independence on the part of subject provinces. That was also the year of Hezekiah's deadly illness (2Ki 20; Isa 38), when for a time we know not how long he would be

incapacitated for active administration of affairs. Not unlikely on his recovery he found his realm committed beyond withdrawal to an alliance with Egypt and perhaps the leadership of a coalition with Philistia; in which case personally he could only make the best of the situation. There was nothing for it but to confirm this coalition by force, which he did in his Philistine campaign mentioned in 2Ki 18:8. Meanwhile, in the same general uprising, the Chaldean Merodach-baladan, who had already been expelled from Babylon after an 11-year reign (721-710), again seized that throne; and in due time envoys from him appeared in Jerusalem, ostensibly to congratulate the king on his recovery from his illness, but really to secure his aid and alliance against Assyria (2Ki 20:12-15; Isa 39:1-4). Hezekiah, flattered by such distinguished attention from so distant and powerful a source, by revealing his resources committed what the Chronicler calls the one impious indiscretion of his life (2Ch 32:31), incurring also Isaiah's reproof and adverse prediction (2Ki 20:17 f; Isa 39:6 f). The conflict with Sennacherib was now inevitable; and Hezekiah, by turning the water supply of Jerusalem from the Gihon spring to a pool within the walls and closing it from without, put the capital in readiness to stand a siege. The faith evoked by this wise work, confirmed by the subsequent deliverance, is reflected in Ps 46. That this incurring of a hazardous war, however, with its turmoils and treacheries, and the presence of uncouth Arab mercenaries, was little to the king's desire or disposition, seems indicated in Ps 120, which with the other Songs of Degrees (Pss 120-134) may well reflect the religious faith of this period of Hezekiah's life.

5. Invasion and Deliverance:

The critical moment came in 701, when Sennacherib, who the year before had reconquered Babylon and expelled Merodach-baladan (perhaps Isa 21:1-9 refers to and this), was free to invade his rebellious provinces in the West. It was a vigorous and sweeping campaign; in which, beginning with Sidon and advancing down

through the coast lands, he speedily subdued the Philistine cities, defeating them and their southern allies (whether these were from Egypt proper or from its extension across the Sinai peninsula and Northern Arabia, Mutsri, is not quite clear) at Eltekeh; in which campaign, according to his inscription, he took 46 walled towns belonging to Judah with their spoil and deported over 200,000 of their inhabitants. This, which left Jerusalem a blockaded town (in fact he says of Hezekiah: "Himself I shut up like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem his royal city"), seems referred to in Isa 1:7-9 and predicted in Isa 6:11 f. Its immediate effect was to bring Hezekiah to terms and extort an enormous tribute (2Ki 18:14-16). When later, however, he was treacherous enough to disregard the compact thus implied (perhaps Isa 33 refers to this), and demanded the surrender of the city (2Ki 18:17-19:7; Isa 36:2-37:7), Hezekiah besought the counsel of Isaiah, who bade him refuse the demand, and predicted that Sennacherib would "hear tidings" and return to his own land; which prediction actually came to pass, and suddenly Hezekiah found himself free. A deliverance so great, and so signally vindicating the setting forth of faith, could not but produce a momentous revulsion in the nation's mind, like a new spiritual birth in which the faith of the "remnant" became a vital power in Israel; its immediate effect seems portrayed in Ps 124 and perhaps Ps 126, and its deep significance as the birth of a nation in a day seems summarized long afterward in Isa 66:7-9; compare 37:3; 2Ki 19:3.

6. The Second Summons:

A second summons to surrender, sent from Libnah by letter (2Ki 19:1 ff; Isa 37:8), is treated by the Scripture historians as a later feature of the same campaign; but recent researches seem to make it possible, nay probable, that this belonged to another campaign of Sennacherib, when Taharka of Ethiopia (Tirhakah, 2Ki 19:9; Isa 37:9) came to power in Egypt, in 691. If this was so, there is room in Hezekiah's latter years for a decade of peace and prosperity (compare Ch 32:22,23,27-30), and in Isaiah's old age for a collection and revision of his so wonderfully vindicated prophecies. The historians' evident union of two stories in one makes the new attitude with which this crisis was met, obscure; but the tone of confirmed confidence and courage seems decidedly higher. The discomfiture of Sennacherib in this case was brought about, not by a rumor of rebellions at home, but by an outbreak of plague (2Ki 19:35 f; Isa 37:36 f), which event the Scripture writers interpreted as a miracle. The prophetic sign of deliverance (2Ki 19:29; Isa 37:30) may be referred to the recovery of the devastated lands from the ravage inflicted by Sennacherib in his first campaign (compare also Ps 126:5 f).

III. His Character.

Our estimate of Hezekiah's character is most consistently made by regarding him as a disciple of Isaiah, who was earnestly minded to carry out his prophetic ideas. As, however, these were to begin with only the initial ideas of a spiritual "remnant," the king's sympathies must needs be identified at heart, not with his imperious nobles and princes, but with a minority of the common people, whose religious faith did not become a recognizable influence in the state until after 701. In the meantime his zeal for purer worship and more just domestic administration, which made him virtually king of the remnant, made him a wise and sagacious prince over the whole realm. Isaiah's glowing prophecy (32:1-8) seems to be a Messianic projection of the saner and clearer-seeing era that his domestic policy adumbrated—a time when king and nobles rule in righteousness, when man can lean on man, when things good and evil are seen as they are and called by their right names. When it came to dealing with the foreign situation, however, especially according to the Isaianic program, his task was exceedingly difficult, as it were a pioneer venture in faith. His effort to maintain an attitude of steadfast trust in Yahweh, with the devout quietism which, though really its consistency and strength looked like a supine passivity, would lead his restlessly scheming nobles to regard him as a pious weakling; and not improbably they came to deem him almost a negligible quantity, and forced his hand into diplomacies and coalitions that were not to his mind. Some such insolent attitude of theirs seems to be portrayed in Isa 28:14-22. This was rendered all the more feasible, perhaps, by the period of incapacitation that must have attended his illness, in the very midst of the nation's critical affairs. Isaiah's words (33:17 ff) may be an allusion at once to his essential kingliness, to the abeyance of its manifestation due to his disease, and to the constricted condition into which, meanwhile, the realm had fallen. This exceedingly critical episode of Hezekiah's career does not seem to have had its rights with students of the era. Considering the trials that his patient faith must have had, always at cross-purposes with his nobles (compare Ps 120:6 f); that now by reason of his sickness they had the whip hand; that his disease cut him off not only from hope of life, but from association with men and access to the sanctuary (compare Isa 38:10,11,12); that, as his son Manasseh was not born till three years within the fifteen now graciously added to his life (compare 2Ki 21:1), his illness seemed to endanger the very perpetuity of the Davidic dynasty, we have reason for regarding him as well-nigh a

martyr to the new spiritual uprising of faith which Isaiah was laboring to bring about. In the Messianic ideal which, in Isaiah's sublime conception, was rising into personal form, it fell to his lot to adumbrate the first kingly stage, the stage of committal to Yahweh's word and will and abiding the event. It was a cardinal element in that composite ideal which the Second Isaiah pushes to its ultimate in his portrayal of the servant of Yahweh; another element, the element of sacrifice, has yet to be added. Meanwhile, as with the king so with his remnant-realm, the venture of faith is like a precipitation of spiritual vitality, or, as the prophet puts it, a new birth (compare Isa 26:17 f; 37:3; 66:7 f, for the stages of it). The event of deliverance, not by men's policies but by Yahweh's miraculous hand, was the speedy vindication of such trust; and the revulsion of the next decade witnessed a confirming and solidifying of spiritual integrity in the remnant which made it a factor to be reckoned with in the trying times that succeeded (see under MANASSEH). The date of Hezekiah's death (probably not long after 690) is not certainly known; nor of the death of his mentor Isaiah (tradition puts this by martyrdom under Manasseh); but if our view of his closing years is correct, the king's death crowned a consistent character of strength and spiritual steadfastness; while the unapproachable greatness of Isaiah speaks for itself.

IV. Reflection of His Age in Literature.

1. Complication and Revival:

The sublime and mature utterances of Isaiah alone, falling in this time, are sufficient evidence that in Hezekiah's age, Israel reached its golden literary prime. Among the idealists and thinkers throughout the nation a new spiritual vigor and insight were awake. Of their fellowship was the king himself, who emulated the activity of his predecessor Solomon as patron of piety and letters. The compilation of the later Solomonic section of the Proverbs (Pr 25-29), attributed to the "men of Hezekiah," indicates the value attached to the accumulations of the so-called Wisdom literature; and it is fair to assume that these men of Hezekiah did not stop with compiling, but stamped upon the body of Proverbs as a whole that sense of it as a philosophy of life which it henceforth bears, and perhaps added the introductory section, Pr 1-9. Nor would a king so zealous for the organization and enrichment of the temple-worship (compare Isa 38:20) be indifferent to its body of sacred song. It seems certain that his was, in all the nation's history, the greatest single agency in compiling and adapting the older Davidic Psalms, and in the composition of new ones. Perhaps this union of collecting and creative work in psalmody is referred to in the mention of "the words of David, and of Asaph the seer" (2Ch 29:30). To Hezekiah himself is attributed one "writing" which is virtually a psalm, Isa 38:20. The custom through all the history of hymnology (in our own day also) of adapting older compositions to new liturgical uses makes uncertain the identification of psalms belonging specifically to this period; still, many psalms of books ii and iii, and especially those ascribed to Asaph and the sons of Korah, seem a close reflection of the spirit of the times. An interesting theory recently advanced (see THIRTLE, Old Testament Problems) that the fifteen Songs of the Steps ("Degrees" or "Ascents," Psalms 120-134) are a memorial of Hezekiah's fifteen added years, when as a sign the shadow went backward on the steps of Ahaz (2Ki 20:8-11), seems to reveal many remarkable echoes of that eventful time. Nor does it seem unlikely that with this first extensive collection of psalms the titles began to be added.

2. Of More Creative Strain:

This literary activity of Hezekiah’s time, though concerned largely with collecting and reviving the treasures of older literature, was pursued not in the cold scribal spirit, but in a fervid creative way. This may be realized in two of the psalms which the present writer ascribes to this period. Ps 49, a psalm of the sons of Korah, is concerned to make an essential tenet of Wisdom viable in song (compare Ps 49:3,4), as if one of the "men of Hezekiah" who is busy with the Solomonic counsels would popularize the spirit of his findings. Ps 78 in like manner, a Maschil of Asaph, is concerned to make the noble histories of old viable in song (78:2), especially the wilderness history when Israel received the law and beheld Yahweh’s wonders, and down to the time when Ephraim was rejected and Judah, in the person of David, was chosen to the leadership in Israel.

Such a didactic poem would not stand solitary in a period so instructed. As in Wisdom and psalmody, so in the domain of law and its attendant history, the literary activity was vigorous. This age of Hezekiah seems the likeliest time for putting into literary idiom that "book of the law" found later in the Temple (2Ki 22); which book Josiah’s reforms, carried out according to its commands, prove to have been our Book of Deuteronomy. This is not the place to discuss the Deuteronomic problem (see under JOSIAH); it is fair to note here, however, that as compared with the austere statement of the Mosaic statutes elsewhere, this book has a literary art and coloring which seem to stamp its style as that of a later age than Moses’, though its substance is Mosaic; and this age of Hezekiah seems the likeliest time to put its rewriting and adaptation. Nor did the new spirit of literary creation feed itself entirely on the past. The king’s chastening experience of illness and trial, with the steadfast faith that upbore and survived it, must have been fruitful of new ideas, especially of that tremendous conception, now just entering into thought, of the ministry of suffering. Time, of course, must be allowed for the ripening of an idea so full of involvement; and it is long before its sacrificial and atoning values come to light in such utterances as Isa 53. But such psalms as Ps 49 and Ps 73, not to mention Hezekiah’s own psalm (Isa 38), show that the problem was a living one; it was working, moreover, in connection with the growing Wisdom philosophy, toward the composition of the Book of Job, which in a masterly way both subjects the current Wisdom motives to a searching test and vindicates the intrinsic integrity of the patriarch in a discipline of most extreme trial. The life of a king whose experience had some share in clarifying the ideas of such a book was not lived in vain.

John Franklin Genung

HEZEKIAH’S SICKNESS

See DIAL OF AHAZ.

HEZEKIAH, THE MEN OF A body of men of letters to whom is ascribed the compilation of a supplementary collection of Solomonic proverbs (Pr 25:1).

See PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF, II, 5; HEZEKIAH, IV, 2.

HEZION

he’-zi-on (chezyon; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus, Azein; Codex Alexandrinus, Azael): An ancestor of Ben-hadad, king of Syria (1Ki 15:18).

HEZIR

he’-zer:

(1) (chezir; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus, Chezein; Codex Alexandrinus, Iezeir): A Levite in the time of David (1Ch 24:15).

(2) Septuagint Hezeir): A chief of the people in the time of Nehemiah (Ne 10:20).

HEZRO; HEZRAI

hez’-ro, hez’-ra-i, hez’-ri (chezro, 2Sa 23:35; 1Ch 11:37, but the Qere of 2Sa 23:35 is chezray. The ancient versions almost unanimously support the form Hezrai): A Carmelite, i.e. an inhabitant of Carmel. See CARMELITE. One of David’s thirty "mighty men."

HEZRON (1)

hez’-ron (chetsron, and chetsron; Septuagint Asron):

(1) A son of Reuben (Ge 46:9; Ex 6:14), and head of the family of the Hezronites (Nu 26:6).

(2) A son of Perez, and grandson of Judah (Ge 46:12; Nu 26:21; 1Ch 2:5,9,18,21,24,25; 4:1), a direct ancestor of David (Ru 4:18 f). He appears also in the genealogy of our Lord (Esrom) (Mt 1:3; Lu 3:33).

HEZRON (2)

(chetsron, "enclosure"): On the South boundary of Judah between "Kadesh-barnea" and "Addar" (Jos 15:3); in the parallel passage (Nu 34:4) "Hazar-addar." The two places may have been near together. Conder suggests that the name survives in Jebel Hadhireh, a mountain Northwest of Petra in the Tih.

HEZRONITES

hez’-ron-its (ha-chetsrowni and ha-chetsroni; Septuagint ho Asronei): The name of the descendants of Hezron the son of Reuben (Nu 26:6), and of the descendants of Hezron the son of Perez (Nu 26:21).

HIDDAI

hid’-a-i, hi-da’-i (hidday; Alexandrian Haththai): One of David’s thirty "mighty men" (2Sa 23:30), described as "of the brooks of Gaash." In the parallel list in 1Ch 11:32 the form of the name is "Hurai" (huray).

HIDDEKEL

hid’-e-kel (chiddeqel): One of the rivers of EDEN (which see) (Ge 2:14, the Revised Version margin "that is, Tigris"; so Septuagint Tigris), said to flow East to Assyria, usually identified with the Tigris, which rises in Armenia near Lake Van and, after flowing Southeast through 8 degrees of latitude, joins the Euphrates in Babylonia to form the Shatt el-’Arab, which runs for 100 miles through a delta which has been formed since the time of Abraham, and now enters the Persian Gulf through 2 branches. About one-third of the distance below its source, and soon after it emerges from the mountains of Kurdistan, the Tigris passes by Mosul, the site of ancient Nineveh, and, lower down at Bagdad, approaches within a few miles of the Euphrates. Here and for many miles below, since the level is lower than that of the Euphrates, numerous canals are conducted to it, irrigating the most fertile portions of Babylonia.

George Frederick Wright

HIDDEN

hid’-’n: The translation of Taman, "to hide," "to bury" (Job 3:16); of tsaphan "to conceal," "store up" (Job 15:20, "The number of years is hidden to the oppressor," the Revised Version (British and American) "even the number of years that are laid up for the oppressor," margin "and years that are numbered are laid up"; Job 24:1, "Why, seeing times are not hidden from the Almighty," the Revised Version (British and American) "Why are times not laid up by the Almighty?" margin as the King James Version with "Why is it?" prefixed; Ps 83:3, "They consulted (the Revised Version (British and American) "consult") against thy hidden ones"); of matspunim (from tsaphan), "hidden things or places" (Ob 1:6, "How are his hidden things sought up!" the Revised Version (British and American) "treasures," the American Standard Revised Version "sought out"); of pala’," to be wonderful," "difficult" (De 30:11, "This commandment .... is not hidden from thee," the Revised Version (British and American) "too hard for thee," margin "or wonderful"); of chaphas, Hithpael, "to hide one’s self" (Pr 28:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "When the wicked rise, men hide themselves," margin (Hebrew) "must be searched for"); of kruptos, "hidden," "secret" (1Pe 3:4, "the hidden man of the heart"; 1Co 4:5, krupton, "the hidden things of darkness"; 2Co 4:2, "the hidden things of dishonesty," the Revised Version (British and American) "of shame"); of apokrupto, "to hide away," trop., not to reveal or make known (1Co 2:7, "But we speak God’s wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden"; compare Eph 3:9; Col 1:26).

Among the occurrences of "hidden" in Apocrypha we have (2 Esdras 16:62), "The Spirit of Almighty God .... searcheth out all hidden things in the secrets of the earth," the Revised Version (British and

American) "He who made all things and searcheth out hidden things in hidden places"; Ecclesiasticus 42:19, "revealing the steps (the Revised Version (British and American) "traces") of hidden things," apokruphos; 42:20, "Neither any word is hidden from him," the Revised Version (British and American) "hid," ekrube).

W. L. Walker

HIEL

hi'-el (chi'el; Achiel): A Bethelite who according to 1Ki 16:34 rebuilt Jericho, and in fulfillment of a curse pronounced by Joshua (Jos 6:26) sacrificed his two sons. This seems to have been a custom prevalent among primitive peoples, the purpose being to ward off ill luck from the inhabitants, especially in a case where the destroyer had invoked a curse on him who presumed to rebuild. Numerous instances are brought to light in the excavations of Gezer (Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer, chapter x). At first the very best was claimed as a gift to the deity, e.g. one's own sons; then some less valuable member of the community. When civilization prevented human sacrifice, animals were offered instead. The story of Abraham offering Isaac may be a trace of this old custom, the tenor of the story implying that at the time of the writing of the record, the custom was coming to be in disrepute. A similar instance is the offering of his eldest son by the king of Edom to appease the deity and win success in battle (2Ki 3:27; compare Mic 6:7). Various conjectures have been made as to the identity of this king. Ewald regarded him as a man of wealth and enterprise (unternehmender reicher Mann); Cheyne following Niebuhr makes it Jehu in disguise, putting 1Ki 16:34 after 2Ki 10:33; Winckler explains as folklore.

W. N. Stearns

HIERAPOLIS

he-er-ap'-o-lis (Hierapolis, "sacred city"): As the name implies, Hierapolis was a holy city. It was situated 6 miles from Laodicea and twice that distance from Colosse, on the road from Sardis to Apamea. Though its history is not well known, it seems to have been of Lydian origin, and once bore the name of Kydrara. The Phrygian god Sabazios was worshipped there under the name Echidma, and represented by the symbol of the serpent. Other local deities were Leto and her son Lairbenos. Though called the holy city, Hierapolis was peculiarly regarded as the stronghold of Satan, for there was a Plutonium, or a hole reaching far down into the earth, from which there issued a vapor, even poisoning the birds flying above. It is supposed that upon a stool, deep in the Plutonium, a priest or priestess sat, and, when under the influence of the vapor, uttered prophecies valuable to those who sought them. Though a stronghold of Satan, Hierapolis early became a Christian city, for, according to Col 4:13, the only place where it is mentioned in the New Testament, a church was founded there through the influence of Paul while he was at Ephesus. Tradition claims that Philip was the first evangelist to preach there, and it also claims that he and his two unmarried daughters were buried there; a third who was married, was buried at Ephesus. Several of the early Christians suffered martyrdom at Hierapolis, yet

Christianity flourished, other churches were built, and during the 4th century the Christians filled the Plutonium with stones, thus giving evidence that the paganism had been entirely supplanted by the church. During the Roman period, Justinian made the city a metropolis, and it continued to exist into the Middle Ages. In the year 1190 Frederick Barbarossa fought with the Byzantines there.

The modern town is called Pambuk Kalessi, or cotton castle, not because cotton is raised in the vicinity, but because of the white deposit from the water of the calcareous springs. The springs were famous in ancient times because they were supposed to possess Divine powers. The water is tepid, impregnated with alum, but pleasant to the taste. It was used by the ancients for dyeing and medicinal purposes. The deposit of pure white brought up by the water from the springs has heaped itself over the surrounding buildings, nearly burying them, and stalactite formations, resembling icicles, hang from the ruins. The ruins, which are extensive, stand on a terrace, commanding an extensive view, and though they are partly covered by the deposit, one may still trace the city walls, the temple, several churches, the triumphal arch, the gymnasium and baths, and the most perfect theater in Asia Minor. Outside the walls are many tombs.

E. J. Banks

HIEREEL

hi-er’-e-el (Hiereel): 1 Esdras 9:21. In Ezr 8:9 the name is Jehiel.

HIEREMOTH

hi-er’-e-moth (Ieremoth):

(1) 1 Esdras 9:27 = Jeremoth (Ezr 10:26).

(2) 1 Esdras 9:30 = Jeremoth (Ezr 10:29, margin "and Ramoth").

HIERIELUS

hi-er-i-e’-lus (Iezrielos).

See JEZRIELUS.

HIERMAS

hi-ur’-mas (Hiermas): 1 Esdras 9:26, corresponding to Ramiah in Ezr 10:25.

HIGGAION

hi-ga’yon, hi-gi’-on (higgayon): The meaning of this word is uncertain. Two interpretations are possible; the one based on an allied Arabic root gives "a deep vibrating sound," the other derived from the Greek versions of Ps 9:16, where we read higgayon Celah, takes it to mean an instrumental interlude.

See PSALMS.

HIGH DAY

Is found in Ge 29:7 as a rendering of the Hebrew yom agadhol, literally, "great day." The Hebrew means the day at its height, broad daylight as contrasted with the time for getting the cattle to their sheds for the night (compare French grand jour). In Joh 19:31, "highday" renders megale hemera, literally, "great day," and refers to the Passover Sabbath—and therefore a Sabbath of special sanctity.

HIGH PLACE

1. General:

(1) "High place" is the normal translation of bamah, a word that means simply "elevation" (Jer 26:18; Eze 36:2, etc.; compare the use in Job 9:8 of the waves of the sea. For the plural as a proper noun see BAMOTH). In the King James Version of Eze 16:24,25,31,39, "high places" is the translation of ramah (the Revised Version (British and American) "lofty places"), a common word (see RAMAH) of exactly the same meaning, indistinguishable from bamah in 16:16. In three of these verses of Eze (16:24,31,39) ramah is paralleled by gabh, which again has precisely the same sense ("eminent place" in the King James Version, the English Revised Version), and the "vaulted place" of the American Standard Revised Version (English Revised Version margin) is in disregard of Hebrew parallelism. In particular, the high places are places of worship, specifically of idolatrous worship. So the title was transferred from the elevation to the sanctuary on the elevation (1Ki 11:7; 14:23; compare the burning of the "high place" in 2Ki 23:15), and so came to be used of any idolatrous shrine, whether constructed on an elevation or not (note how in 2Ki 16:4; 2Ch 28:4 the "high places" are distinguished from the "hills"). So the "high places" in the cities (2Ki 17:9; 2Ch 21:11 (Septuagint)) could have stood anywhere, while in Eze 16:16 a portable structure seems to be in point.

(2) The use of elevations for purposes of worship is so widespread as to be almost universal, and rests, probably, on motives so primitive as to evade formal analysis. If any reason is to be assigned, the best seems to be that to dwellers in hilly country the heaven appears to rest on the ridges and the sun to go forth from them—but such reasons are certainly insufficient to explain everything. Certain it is that Israel, no less than her neighbors, found special sanctity in the hills. Not only was’ Sinai the "Mount of God," but a long list can be drawn up of peaks that have a special relation to Yahweh (see MOUNT, MOUNTAIN; and for the New Testament, compare Mr 9:2; Heb 12:18-24, etc.). And the choice of a hilltop for the Temple was based on considerations other than convenience and visibility. (But bamah is not used of the Temple Mount.)

2. Description:

Archaeological research, particularly at Petra and Gezer, aided by the Old Testament notices, enables us to reconstruct these sanctuaries with tolerable fullness. The cult was not limited to the summit of the hill but took place also on the slopes, and the objects of the cult might be scattered over a considerable area. The most sacred objects were the upright stone pillars (matstsebhah), which seem to have been indispensable. (Probably the simplest "high places" were only a single upright stone.) They were regarded as the habitation of the deity, but, none the less, were usually many in number (a fact that in no way need implicate a plurality of deities). At one time they were the only altars, and even at a later period, when the altar proper was used, libations were sometimes poured on the pillars directly. The altars were of various shapes, according to their purpose (incense, whole burnt offerings, etc.), but were always accompanied by one or more pillars. Saucer-shaped depressions, into which sacrifices could be poured, are a remnant of very primitive rites (to this day in Samaria the paschal lamb is cooked in a pit). The trees of the high place, especially the "terebinths" (oaks?), were sacred, and their number could be supplemented or their absence supplied by an artificial tree or pole (’asherah, the "grove" of the King James Version). (Of course the original meaning of the pillar and asherah was not always known to the worshipper.) An amusing feature of the discoveries is that these objects were often of minute size, so that the gods could be gratified at a minimum of expense to the worshipper. Images (ephods?; the teraphim were household objects, normally) are certain, but in Palestine no remnants exist (the little Bes and Astarte figures were not idols used in worship). Other necessary features of a high place of the larger size were ample provision of water for lustral purposes, kitchens where the sacrifices could be cooked (normally by boiling), and tables for the sacrificial feasts. Normally, also, the service went on in the open air, but slight shelters were provided frequently for some of the objects. If a regular priest was attached to the high place (not always the case), his dwelling must have been a feature, unless he lived in some nearby village. Huts for those practicing incubation (sleeping in the sanctuary to obtain revelations through dreams) seem not to have been uncommon. But formal temples were very rare and "houses of the high places" in 1Ki 12:31; 13:32; 2Ki 17:29,32; 23:19 may refer only to the slighter structures just mentioned (see the comm.). In any case, however, the boundaries of the sanctuary were marked out, generally by a low stone wall, and ablutions and removal of the sandals were necessary before the worshipper could enter.

For the ritual, of course, there was no uniform rule. The gods of the different localities were different, and in Palestine a more or less thorough rededication of the high places to Yahweh had taken place. So the service might be anything from the orderly worship of Yahweh under so thoroughly an accredited leader as Samuel (1Sa 9:11-24) to the wildest orgiastic rites. That the worship at many high places was intensely licentious is certain (but it must be emphasized against the statements of many writers that there is no evidence for a specific phallic cult, and that the explorations have revealed no unmistakable phallic emblems). The gruesome cemetery for newly born infants at Gezer is only one of the proofs of the prevalence of child-sacrifice, and the evidence for human sacrifice in other forms is unfortunately only too clear.

See GEZER, and illustration on p. 1224.

3. History:

(1) The opposition to the high places had many motives. When used for the worship of other gods their objectionable character is obvious, but even the worship of Yahweh in the high places was intermixed with heathen practices (Ho 4:14, etc.). In Am 5:21-24, etc., sacrifice in the high places is denounced because it is regarded as a substitute for righteousness in exactly the same way that sacrifice in the Temple is denounced in Jer 7:21-24. Or, sacrifice in the high places may be denounced under the best of conditions, because in violation of the law of the one sanctuary (2Ch 33:17, etc.).

(2) In 1 Samuel, sacrifice outside of Jerusalem is treated as an entirely normal thing, and Samuel presides in one such case (1Sa 9:11-24). In 1Ki the practice of using high places is treated as legitimate before the construction of the Temple (1Ki 3:2-4), but after that it is condemned unequivocally. The primal sin of Northern Israel was the establishment of high places (1Ki 12:31-33; 13:2,33 f), and their continuance was a chief cause of the evils that came to pass (2Ki 17:10 f), while worship in them was a characteristic of the mongrel throng that repopulated Samaria (2Ki 17:32). So Judah sinned in building high places (1Ki 14:23), but the editor of Kings notes with obvious regret that even the pious kings (Asa, 1Ki 15:14; Jehoshaphat, 22:43; Jehoash, 2Ki 12:3; Amaziah, 14:4; Azariah, 15:4; Jotham, 15:35) did not put them away; i.e. the editor of Kings has about the point of view of De 12:8-11, according to which sacrifice was not to be restricted to Jerusalem until the country should be at peace, but afterward the restriction should be absolute. The practice had been of such long standing that Hezekiah's destruction of the high places (2Ki 18:4) could be cited by Rabshakeh as an act of apostasy from Yahweh (2Ki 18:22; 2Ch 32:12; Isa 36:7). Under Manasseh they were rebuilt, in connection with other idolatrous practices (2Ki 21:3-9). This act determined the final punishment of the nation (21:10-15), and the root-and-branch reformation of Josiah (2Ki 23) came too late. The attitude of the editor of Chronicles is still more condemnatory. He explains the sacrifice at Gibeon as justified by the presence of the Tabernacle (1Ch 16:39; 21:29; 2Ch 1:3,13), states that God-fearing northerners avoided the high places (2Ch 11:16; compare 1Ki 19:10,14), and (against Kings) credits Asa (2Ch 14:3,5) and Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:6) with their removal. (This last notice is also in contradiction with 2Ch 20:33, but 16:17a is probably meant to refer to the Northern Kingdom, despite 16:17b.) On the other hand, the construction of high places is added to the sins of Jehoram (2Ch 21:11) and of Ahaz (2Ch 28:4,5).

(3) Among the prophets, Elijah felt the destruction of the many altars of God as a terrible grief (1Ki 19:10,14). Amos and Hosea each mention the high places by name only once (Am 7:9; Ho 10:8), but both prophets have only denunciation for the sacrificial practices of the Northern Kingdom. That, however, these sacrifices were offered in the wrong place is not said. Isa has nothing to say about the high places, except in 36:7, while Mic 1:5 equates the sins of Jerusalem with those of the high places (if the text is right), but promises the exaltation of Jerusalem (4:1 f). In the references in Jer 7:31; 19:5; 32:35; Eze 6:3,1; 16:16; 20:29; 43:7, idolatry or abominable practices are in point (so probably in Jer 17:3, while Jer 48:35 and Isa 16:12 refer to non-Israelites).

(4) The interpretation of the above data and their historical import depend on the critical position taken

as to the general history of Israel's religion.

See ISRAEL, RELIGION OF; CRITICISM; DEUTERONOMY, etc.

LITERATURE.

See, especially, IDOLATRY, and also ALTAR; ASHERAH, etc. For the archaeological literature, see PALESTINE.

Burton Scott Easton

HIGH PRIEST

See PRIEST, HIGH.

HIGH THINGS

The translation of hupselos, "high," "lofty," "elevated" (Ro 12:16, "Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate," the King James Version margin "be contented with mean things," the Revised Version (British and American) "Set not your mind on high things, but condescend to (margin "Greek: be carried away with") things (margin "them") that are lowly"); high things are proud things, things regarded by the world as high.

High thing is hupsoma, "a high place," "elevation," etc. (2Co 10:5, "casting down every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God," "like a lofty tower or fortress built up proudly by the enemy"). In APC Judith 10:8; 13:4, hupsoma is rendered "exaltation."

W. L. Walker

HIGH, MOST

See GOD, NAMES OF.

HIGHEST

hi'-est ('elyon; hupsistos): The translation of 'elyon, used frequently of God and commonly translated "Most High" (Ps 18:13, "The Highest gave his voice," the Revised Version (British and American) "Most High"; Ps 87:5, "the highest himself," the Revised Version (British and American) "Most High"; Eze 41:7, "the lowest (chamber) to the highest"); of tsammereth, the foliage of a tree (as if the wool or hair of trees), "the highest branch" (Eze 17:3,12, the Revised Version (British and American) "top," "lofty top"); of ro'sh, "head," "top" (Pr 8:26, "the highest part of the dust of the world," the King James

Version margin "the chief part," the Revised Version (British and American) "the beginning of," margin "sum"); gappe marom, "on the ridges of the heights" (Pr 9:3, "the highest places of the city"); ghabhoah me‘al gabhoah, literally, "one high (powerful) who is above the high (oppressor)," is translated "he that is higher than the highest" (Ec 5:8), the Revised Version (British and American) "one higher than the high (regardeth)." In the New Testament, hupsistos (like ‘elyon) is used of God (Lu 1:32, "the Son of the Highest," Lu 1:35, "the power of the Highest," Lu 1:76, "the prophet of the Highest"; Lu 6:35, "the children of the Highest," in these places the Revised Version (British and American) has "Most High"); we have also "Hosanna in the highest" (Mt 21:9; Mr 11:10; see HOSANNA), "Glory to God in the highest" (Lu 2:14), "Glory in the highest" (Lu 19:38); protoklisia, "the first reclining-place" (at table), the chief place at meals, the middle place in each couch of the triclinium (Robinson), is rendered (Lu 14:8), "the highest room," the Revised Version (British and American) "chief seat"; "room" was introduced by Tyndale; Wycliff had "the first place"; protokathedria (protos, "first," kathedra, "seat"), "the first or chief seat," is rendered (Lu 20:46) "the highest seats," the Revised Version (British and American) "chief seats" Wycliff "the first chairs."

"The Highest" as a term for God appears (2 Esdras 4:11,34, the Revised Version (British and American) "Most High"; The Wisdom of Solomon 6:3, hupsistos; Ecclesiasticus 28:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "Most High").

See also GOD, NAMES OF.

W. L. Walker

HIGHMINDED

hi’-mind-ed: In modern usage denotes elevation of mind in a good sense, but formerly it was used to denote upliftedness in a bad sense, pride, arrogance. It is the translation of hupselophroneo, "to be highminded," "proud," "haughty" (Ro 11:20, "Be not highminded, but fear"; 1Ti 6:17, "Charge them that are rich .... that they be not highminded"); of tuphoo "to wrap in mist or smoke," trop., to wrap in conceit, to make proud, etc. (2Ti 3:4, "Traitors, heady, highminded," the Revised Version (British and American) "puffed up"; compare 1Ti 3:6; 6:4). "No one can be highminded without thinking better of himself, and worse of others, than he ought to think" (Crabb, English Synonyms).

W. L. Walker

HIGHWAY

hi’-wa.

See ROAD; WAY.

HILEN

hi-len (chilen): A city in the hill country of Judah, probably West or Southwest of Hebron, assigned with its suburbs to the Levites (1Ch 6:58 (Hebrew 43)). The form of the name in Jos 15:51; 21:15 is HOLON (which see).

HILKIAH

hil-ki’-a (chilqiyah, "Yah is my portion" or "Yah’s portion"): The name of 8 individuals in the Old Testament or 7, if the person mentioned in Ne 12:7,21 was the same who stood with Ezra at the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4). The latter appears as Ezecias (the King James Version) in 1 Esdras 9:43. Five of this name are clearly associated with the priesthood, and the others are presumably so. The etymology suggests this. Either interpretation of the name expresses the person’s claim on Yahweh or the parents’ recognition of Yahweh’s claim on him.

(1) The person mentioned above (Ne 8:4, etc.).

(2) A Levite of the sons of Merari (1Ch 6:45).

(3) Another Levite of Merari, son of Hosah (1Ch 26:11). Is he the "porter," i.e. "doorkeeper" of 1Ch 16:38?

(4) Father of the Gemariah whom Zedekiah of Judah sent to Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 29:3).

(5) The man in 2Ki 18:18 ff who is evidently more famous as the father of Eliakim, the majordomo of Hezekiah’s palace (Isa 22:20 ff; 36:3). Probably the father’s name is given in this and similar cases to distinguish between two persons of otherwise identical name.

(6) A priest of Anathoth, father of Jeremiah (Jer 1:1).

(7) The son of Shallum, and the best known of the name (1Ch 6:13). He is great-grandfather of Ezra through his son Azariah (1 Esdras 8:1; compare 1Ch 9:11; Ne 11:11). He discovered the lost Book of the Law during the repairing of the Temple (2Ki 22:4,8); became chief leader in the ensuing reformation in 621 BC (2Ki 23:4; 2Ch 34:9 ff; 35:8). He showed the recovered book to Shaphan the scribe, who, in turn, brought it to the notice of the king. At Josiah’s request he led a deputation to Huldah the prophetess to "inquire of the Lord" concerning the new situation created by the discovery. The book discovered is usually identified with the Book of Deuteronomy.

See DEUTERONOMY.

Henry Wallace

HILL, HILL COUNTRY

hil’-kun-tri: The common translation of three Hebrew words:

(1) gibh‘ah, from root meaning "to be curved," is almost always translated "hill"; it is a pecuIiarly appropriate designation for the very rounded hills of Palestine; it is never used for a range of mountains. Several times it occurs as a place-name, "Gibeah of Judah" (Jos 15:20,57); "Gibeah of Benjamin" or "Saul" (Jud 19:12-16, etc.); "Gibeah of Phinehas" (Jos 24:33 margin), etc. (see GIBEAH). Many such hills were used for idolatrous rites (1Ki 14:23; 2Ki 17:10; Jer 2:20, etc.).

(2) har, frequently translated in the King James Version "hill," is in the Revised Version (British and American) usually translated "mountain" (compare Ge 7:19; Jos 15:9; 18:15 f, and many other references), or "hillcountry." Thus we have the "hill-country of the Amorites" (De 1:7,19,20); the "hill-country of Gilead" (De 3:12); the "hill-country of Ephraim" (Jos 17:15,16,18; 19:50; 20:7, etc.); the "hill-country of Judah" (Jos 11:21; 20:7; 21:11; 2Ch 27:4, etc.; and (he oreine) Lu 1:39,65); the "hill-country of Naphtali" (Jos 20:7). For geographical descriptions see PALESTINE; COUNTRY; EPHRAIM; JUDAH, etc.

(3) ‘ophel, is translated by "hill" in 2Ki 5:24; Isa 32:14; Mic 4:8, but may possibly mean "tower" or "fort." In other passages the word occurs with the article as a place-name.

See OPHEL.

E. W. G. Masterman

HILL; MOUNT; MOUNTAIN

1. Names:

(1) The commonest word is har (also harar, and herer), which is rendered "hill," "mount" or "mountain." It occurs several hundreds of times. In a number of places the Revised Version (British and American) changes "hill" to "mountain," e.g. Ge 7:19, mountains covered by flood; Ex 24:4, Horeb; Jos 18:14, mountain before Beth-horon: Jud 16:3, mountain before Hebron; Ps 95:4, "The heights of the mountains are his also"; 121:1, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the mountains." "Hill" remains in De 11:11, "land of hills and valleys"; 1Ki 20:23, "god of the hills"; Ps 2:6, "my holy hill of Zion": 98:8, "hills sing for joy." "Mount" is changed "hill-country" in De 1:7, "hill-country of the Amorites"; Jud 12:15, "hill-country of the Amalekites"; De 3:12, "hill-country of Gilead"; but Ge 3:21, "mountain of Gilead"; and Jud 7:3, "Mount Gilead." "Hill" or "hills" is changed to "hill-country" in De 1:7; Jos 9:1; 10:40; 11:16; 17:16; 21:11. In De 1:41,43, the American Standard Revised Version changes "hill" to "hill-country," while the English Revised Version has "mountain." The reasons for these differences of treatment are not in all cases apparent.

(2) The Greek oros, is perhaps etymologically akin to har. It occurs often in the New Testament, and is usually translated "mount" or "mountain." In three places (Mt 5:14; Lu 4:29; 9:37) the King James Version has hill, which the Revised Version (British and American) retains, except in Lu 9:37, "when they were come down from the mountain" (of the transfiguration). The derivative oreinos, "hill country," occurs in Lu 1:39,65.

(3) The common Hebrew word for "hill" is gibh‘ah = Gibeah (Jud 19:12); compare Geba, gebha‘ (1Sa 13:3); Gibeon, gib‘on (Jos 9:3), from root gabha‘, "to be high"; compare Arabic qubbeh, "dome"; Latin caput; kephale.

(4) In 1Sa 9:11, the King James Version has "hill" for ma‘aleh, root ‘alah, "to ascend"; compare Arabic ‘ala’," to be high," and ‘ali, "high." Here and elsewhere the Revised Version (British and American) has "ascent."

(5) English Versions of the Bible has "hill" in Isa 5 for qeren, "horn"; compare Arabic qarn, "horn," which is also used for a mountain peak.

(6) Tur, is translated "mountain" in Da 2:35,45, but the Revised Version margin "rock" in Da 2:35. The Arabic tur, "mountain," is especially used with Sinai, jebel tur sina’.

(7) mutstsabh (Isa 29:3), is translated in the King James Version "mount" in the English Revised Version "fort," in the American Standard Revised Version "posted troops"; compare matstsabh, "garrison" (1Sa 14:1, etc.), from root natsabh, "to set"; compare Arabic nacab, "to set."

(8) colelah, from calal, "to raise," is in the King James Version and the English Revised Version "mount," the King James Version margin "engine of shot," the American Standard Revised Version "mound" (Jer 32:24; 33:4; Eze 4:2; 17; 21:22; 26:8; Da 11:15).

2. Figurative and Descriptive:

The mountains and hills of Palestine are the features of the country, and were much in the thoughts of the Biblical writers. Their general aspect is that of vast expanses of rock. As compared with better-watered regions Descriptive of the earth, the verdure is sparse and incidental. Snow remains throughout the year on Hermon and the two highest peaks of Lebanon, although in the summer it is in great isolated drifts which are not usually visible from below. In Palestine proper, there are no snow mountains. Most of the valleys are dry wadies, and the roads often follow these wadies, which are to the traveler veritable ovens. It is when he reaches a commanding height and sees the peaks and ridges stretching away one after the other, with perhaps, through some opening to the West, a gleam of the sea like molten metal, that he thinks of the vastness and enduring strength of the mountains. At sunset the rosy lights are succeeded by the cool purple shadows that gradually fade into cold gray, and the traveler is glad of the shelter of his tent. The stars come out, and there is no sound outside the camp except perhaps the cries of

jackals or the barking of some goat-herd’s dog. These mountains are apt to repel the casual traveler by their bareness. They have no great forests on their slopes. Steep and rugged peaks like those of the Alps are entirely absent. There are no snow peaks or glaciers. There are, it is true, cliffs and crags, but the general outlines are not striking. Nevertheless, these mountains and hills have a great charm for those who have come to know them. To the Biblical writers they are symbols of eternity (Ge 49:26; De 33:15; Job 15:7; Hab 3:6). They are strong and steadfast, but they too are the creation of God, and they manifest His power (Ps 18:7; 97:5; Isa 40:12; 41:15; 54:10; Jer 4:24; Na 1:5; Hab 3:6). The hills were places of heathen sacrifice (De 12:2; 1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 16:4; 17:10; Eze 6:13; Ho 4:13), and also of sacrifice to Yahweh (Ge 22:2; 31:54; Jos 8:30). Zion is the hill of the Lord (Ps 2:6; 135:21; Isa 8:18; Joe 3:21; Mic 4:2).

3. Particular Mountains:

Many proper names are associated with the mountains and hills: as Abarim, Amalekites, Ammah, Amorites, Ararat, Baalah, Baal-hermon, Bashan, Beth-el, Bether, Carmel, Chesalon, Ebal, Ephraim, Ephron, Esau, Gaash, Gareb, Geba, Gerizim, Gibeah, Gibeon, Gilboa, Gilead, Hachilah, Halak, Hebron, Heres, Hermon, Hor, Horeb, Jearim, Judah, Lebanon, Mizar, Moreh, Moriah, Naphtali, Nebo, Olives, Olivet, Paran, Perazim, Pisgah, Samaria, Seir, Senir, Sephar, Shepher, Sinai, Sion, Sirion, Tabor, Zalmon, Zemaraim, Zion. See also "mountain of the east" (Ge 10:30); "mountains of the leopards" (So 4:8); "rocks of the wild goats" (1Sa 24:2); "hill of the foreskins" (Gibeah-haaraloth) (Jos 5:3); "mountains of brass" (Zec 6:1); "hill of God" (Gibeah of God) (1Sa 10:5); "hill of Yahweh" (Ps 24:3); "mount of congregation" (Isa 14:13); see also Mt 4:8; 5:1; 14:23; 15:29; 17:1; 28:16; Lu 8:32; Ga 4:25.

Alfred Ely Day

HILLEL

hil’-el (hillel, "he greatly praised"; Septuagint Ellel): An inhabitant of Pirathon in the hill country of Ephraim, and father of Abdon, one of the judges of Israel (Jud 12:13,15).

HIN

hin (hin): A liquid measure containing 12 logs, equal to about 8 quarts.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

HIND

hind.

See DEER.

HIND OF THE MORNING, THE

The translation of Aijeleth hash-Shahar (’ayyeleth ha-shachar) in the title of Ps 22, probably the name of some wellknown song to which the psalm was intended to be sung, which possibly had reference to the early habits of the deer tribe in search of water and food, or to the flight of the hind from the hunters in early dawn; or "morning" may symbolize the deliverance from persecution and sorrow.

"The first rays of the morning sun, by which it announces its appearance before being itself visible, are compared to the fork-like antlers of a stag; and this appearance is called, Ps 22 title. ‘The hind of the morning,’ because those antler rays preceded the red of dawn, which again forms the transition to sunrise" (Delitzsch, Iris. 107).

According to Hengstenberg, the words indicate the subject-matter of the poem, the character, sufferings, and triumph of the person who is set before us. See PSALMS. For an interesting Messianic interpretation see Hood, Christmas Evans, the Preacher of Wild Wales, 92 ff.

M. O. Evans

HINGE

hinj (poth): Hinges of Jewish sacred buildings in Scripture are mentioned only in connection with Solomon’s temple. Here those for the doors, both of the oracle and of the outer temple, are said to have been of gold (1Ki 7:50). By this is probably to be understood that the pivots upon which the doors swung, and which turned in the sockets of the threshold and the lintel, were cased in gold. The proverb, "As the door turneth upon its hinges, so doth the sluggard upon his bed" (Pr 26:14), describes the ancient mode of ingress and egress into important edifices. In the British Museum are many examples of stone sockets taken from Babylonian and Assyrian palaces and temples, engraved with the name and titles of the royal builder; while in the Hauran doors of a single slab of stone with stone pivots are still found in situ. Hinges, as we understand the word, were unknown in the ancient world.

See HOUSE, II, 1.

W. Shaw Caldecott

HINNOM, VALLEY OF

hin’-om (ge hinnom, Jos 15:8; 18:16; "valley of the son of Hinnom" (ge bhen hinnom), Jos 15:8; 18:16; 2Ch 28:3; 33:6; Jer 7:31 f; 19:2,6; 32:35; "valley of the children (sons) of Hinnom" (ge bhene hinnom), 2Ki 23:10; or simply "the valley," literally, the "hollow" or "ravine" (ha-gay’), 2Ch 26:9; Ne 2:13,15; 3:13; Jer 31:40 and, perhaps also, Jer 2:23 (the above references are in the Hebrew text; there are some variations in the Septuagint)): The meaning of "Hinnom" is unknown; the expressions ben Hinnom and

bene Hinnom would suggest that it is a proper name; in Jer 7:32; 19:6 it is altered by the prophet to "valley of slaughter," and therefore some have thought the original name must have had a pleasing meaning.

1. Bible References and History:

It was near the walls of Jerusalem, "by the entry of the gate Harsith" (Jer 19:2); the Valley Gate opened into it (Ne 2:13; 3:13). The boundary between Judah and Benjamin ran along it (Jos 15:8; 18:16). It was the scene of idolatrous practices in the days of Ahaz (2Ch 28:3) and of Manasseh, who "made his children to pass through the fire in the valley of the son of Hinnom" (2Ch 33:6), but Josiah in the course of his reforms "defiled Topheth, which is in the valley of the children (margin "son") of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech" (2Ki 23:10). It was on account of these evil practices that Jeremiah (7:32; 19:6) announced the change of name. Into this valley dead bodies were probably cast to be consumed by the dogs, as is done in the Wady er-Rababi today, and fires were here kept burning to consume the rubbish of the city. Such associations led to the Ge-Hinnom (New Testament "Gehenna") becoming the "type of Hell" (Milton, Paradise Lost, i, 405).

See GEHENNA.

2. Situation:

The Valley of Hinnom has been located by different writers in each of the three great valleys of Jerusalem. In favor of the eastern or Kidron valley we have the facts that Eusebius and Jerome (Onom) place "Gehennom" under the eastern wall of Jerusalem and the Moslem geographical writers, Muqaddasi and Nasir-i-khusran, call the Kidron valley Wady Jahamum. The Jewish writer Kimchi also identifies the Valley of Jehoshaphat (i.e. the Kidron) with Hinnom. These ideas are probably due to the identification of the eastern valley, on account of its propinquity to the Temple, as the scene of the last judgment—the "Valley of Jehoshaphat" of Joe 3:2—and the consequent transference there of the scene of the punishment of the wicked, Gehenna, after the ancient geographical position of the Valley of Hinnom, had long been lost. In selecting sacred sites, from the 4th Christian century onward, no critical topographical acumen has been displayed until quite modern times. There are three amply sufficient arguments against this view: (1) the Kidron valley is always called a nachal and not a gay' (see KIDRON); (2) the "Gate of the Gai" clearly did not lie to the East of the city; (3) En-rogel, which lay at the beginning of the Valley of Hinnom and to its East (Jos 15:8; 18:16) cannot be the "Virgin's fount," the ancient Gihon (2Sa 17:17).

See GIHON.

Several distinguished modern writers have sought to identify the Tyropeon Valley (el Wad) with Hinnom, but as the Tyropeon was incorporated within the city walls before the days of Manasseh (see JERUSALEM), it is practically impossible that it could have been the scene of the sacrifice of children—a ritual which must have occurred beyond the city's limits (2Ki 23:10, etc.).

3. Wady er-Rababi:

The clearest geographical fact is found in Jos 15:8; 18:16, where we find that the boundary of Judah and Benjamin passed from En-rogel "by the valley of the son of Hinnom"; if the modern Bir Eyyub is En-rogel, as is certainly most probable, then the Wady er-Rababi, known traditionally as Hinnom, is correctly so called. It is possible that the name extended to the wide open land formed by the junction of the three valleys; indeed, some would place Tophet at this spot, but there is no need to extend the name beyond the actual gorge. The Wady er-Rababi commences in a shallow, open valley due West of the Jaffa Gate, in the center of which lies the Birket Mamilla; near the Jaffa Gate it turns South for about 1/3 of a mile, its course being dammed here to form a large pool, the Birket es Sultan. Below this it gradually curves to the East and rapidly descends between sides of bare rocky scarps, much steeper in ancient times. A little before the valley joins the wide Kidron valley lies the traditional site of AKELDAMA (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

HIP

(shoq, "leg," "limb," "hip," "shoulder"): Samson smote the Philistines "hip and thigh" (Hebrew "leg upon thigh"), which was indicative of "a great slaughter" (Jud 15:8), the bodies being hewed in pieces with such violence that they lay in bloody confusion, their limbs piled up on one another in great heaps.

See also SINEW.

HIPPOPOTAMUS

hip-o-pot’-a-mus (Job 41:1 margin).

See BEHEMOTH.

HIRAH

hi’-ra (chirah; Septuagint Eiras): A native of Adullam, and a "friend" of Judah (Ge 38:1,12). The Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) both describe him as Judah’s "shepherd."

HIRAM

hi’-ram (chiram; Septuagint Chiram, but Cheiram, in 2Sa 5:11; 1Ch 14:1): There is some confusion regarding the form of this name. In the books of Samuel and Kings the prevailing form is

"Hiram" (chiram); but in 1Ki 5:10,18 margin (Hebrew 24,32); 7:40 margin "Hirom" (chirom) is found. In Chronicles the form of the word is uniformly "Huram" (churam).

(1) A king of Tyre who lived on most friendly terms with both David and Solomon. After David had taken the stronghold of Zion, Hiram sent messengers and workmen and materials to build a palace for him at Jerusalem (2Sa 5:11; 1Ch 14:1). Solomon, on his accession to the throne, made a league with Hiram, in consequence of which Hiram furnished the new king of Israel with skilled workmen and with cedar trees and fir trees and algum trees from Lebanon for the building of the Temple. In return Solomon gave annually to Hiram large quantities of wheat and oil (1Ki 5:1 (Hebrew 15) ff; 2Ch 2:3 (Hebrew 2) ff). "At the end of twenty years, wherein Solomon had built the two houses, the house of Yahweh and the king’s house," Solomon made a present to Hiram of twenty cities in the land of Galilee. Hiram was not at all pleased with these cities and contemptuously called them "Cabul." His displeasure, however, with this gift does not seem to have disturbed the amicable relations that had hitherto existed between the two kings, for subsequently Hiram sent to the king of Israel 120 talents of gold (1Ki 9:10-14). Hiram and Solomon maintained merchant vessels on the Mediterranean and shared mutually in a profitable trade with foreign ports (1Ki 10:22). Hiram’s servants, "shipmen that had knowledge of the sea," taught the sailors of Solomon the route from Ezion-geber and Eloth to Ophir, whence large stores of gold were brought to King Solomon (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17 f).

Josephus (Apion, I, 17, 18) informs us, on the authority of the historians Dius and Menander, that Hiram was the son of Abibal, that he had a prosperous reign of 34 years, and died at the age of 53. He tells us on the same authority that Hiram and Solomon sent problems to each other to solve; that Hiram could not solve those sent him by Solomon, whereupon he paid to Solomon a large sum of money, as had at first been agreed upon. Finally, Abdemon, a man of Tyre, did solve the problems, and proposed others which Solomon was unable to explain; consequently Solomon was obliged to pay back to Hiram a vast sum of money. Josephus further states (Ant., VIII, ii, 8) that the correspondence carried on between Solomon and Hiram in regard to the building of the Temple was preserved, not only in the records of the Jews, but also in the public records of Tyre. It is also related by Phoenician historians that Hiram gave his daughter to Solomon in marriage.

(2) The name of a skillful worker in brass and other substances, whom Solomon secured from Hiram king of Tyre to do work on the Temple. His father was a brass-worker of Tyre, and his mother was a woman of the tribe of Naphtali (1Ki 7:14), "a woman of the daughters of Dan" (2Ch 2:14 (Hebrew 13); 1Ki 7:13 ff; 2Ch 2:13 f (Hebrew 12,13)).

Jesse L. Cotton

HIRCANUS

her-ka’nuz.

See HYRCANUS.

HIRE

hir: Two entirely different words are translated "hire" in the Old Testament:

(1) The most frequent one is sakhar, verb sakhar, and verbal adjective sakhir.

(a) As a verb it means "to hire" for a wage, either money or something else; in this sense it is used with regard to ordinary laborers (1Sa 2:5; 2Ch 24:12), or mercenary soldiers (2Sa 10:6; 2Ki 7:6; 1Ch 19:6; 2Ch 25:6), or a goldsmith (Isa 46:6), or a band of loose followers (Jud 9:4), or a false priest (Jud 18:4), or Balaam (De 23:4; Ne 13:2), or hostile counselors (Ezr 4:5), or false prophets (Ne 6:12 f). As a verbal adjective it refers to things (Ex 22:15; Isa 7:20)or men (Le 19:13; Jer 46:21).

(b) As a noun it denotes the wage in money, or something else, paid to workmen for their services (Ge 30:32 f; 31:8; De 24:15; 1Ki 5:6; Zec 8:10), or the rent or hire paid for a thing (Ex 22:15), or a work-beast (Zec 8:10). In Ge 30:16 Leah hires from Rachel the privilege of having Jacob with her again, and her conception and the subsequent birth of a son, she calls her hire or wage from the Lord for the gift of her slave girl to Jacob as a concubine (Ge 30:18).

(2) The other word translated hire is ‘ethnan, once ‘ethnan. It is rather a gift (from root nathan, "to give") than a wage earned by labor, and is used uniformly in a bad sense. It is the gift made to a harlot (De 23:18), or, reversing the usual custom, made by the harlot nation (Eze 16:31,41). It was also used metaphorically of the gifts made by Israelites to idols, since this was regarded as spiritual harlotry (Isa 23:17 f; Mic 1:7; compare also Ho 8:9 f).

In the English New Testament the word occurs once as a verb and 3 times as a noun as the translation of misthos, and its verbal form. In Mt 20:1,8 and Jas 5:4 it refers to the hiring of ordinary field laborers for a daily wage. In Lu 10:7 it signifies the stipend which is due the laborer in the spiritual work of the kingdom of God. It is a wage, earned by toil, as that of other laborers. The word is very significant here and absolutely negatives the idea, all too prevalent, that money received by the spiritual toiler is a gift. It is rather a wage, the reward of real toil.

William Joseph McGlothlin

HIRELING

hir’-ling (sakhir): Occurs only 6 times in the Old Testament, and uniformly means a laborer for a wage. In Job 7:1 f there is reference to the hireling’s anxiety for the close of the day. In Isa 16:14 and 21:16 the length of the years of a hireling is referred to, probably because of the accuracy with which they were determined by the employer and the employee. Malachi (3:5) speaks of the oppression of the hireling in his wages, probably by the smallness of the wage or by in some way defrauding him of part of it.

In the New Testament the word "hireling" (misthotos) occurs only in Joh 10:12 f, where his neglect of the sheep is contrasted unfavorably with the care and courage of the shepherd who owns the sheep, who leads them to pasture and lays down his life for their protection from danger and death.

William Joseph McGlothlin

HIS

hiz: Used often in the King James Version with reference to a neuter or inanimate thing, or to a lower animal (Ge 1:11, "after his kind"; Le 1:16, "pluck away his crop"; Ac 12:10, "of his own accord"; 1Co 15:38, "his own body"), etc. the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "its."

HISS

his (sharaq): "To hiss" has two applications:

(1) to call,

(2) to express contempt or scorn.

(1) It is the translation of sharaq, a mimetic word meaning to hiss or whistle, to call (bees, etc.), (a) Isa 5:26, "I will hiss unto them from the ends of the earth," the Revised Version (British and American) "hiss for them (margin "him") from the end of the earth"; 7:18, "Yahweh will hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria"; namely, Egyptians whose land was noted for flies (18:1) and Assyrians whose country was pre-eminently one of bees. Dangerous enemies are compared to bees in De 1:44; Ps 118:12 (Skinner’s Isaiah): Zec 10:8, "I will hiss for them, and gather them" (His own people, who will come at His call).

(2) More often, to hiss is to express contempt or derision (1Ki 9:8; Job 27:23; Jer 19:8, etc.). In this sense we have also frequently a hissing (2Ch 29:8; Jer 19:8; 25:9,18; 29:18; 51:37; Mic 6:16, shereqah); Jer 18:16, sheriqoth or sheruqoth; Ecclesiasticus 22:1, "Every one will hiss him (the slothful man) out in his disgrace" (eksurisso, "to hiss out"); The Wisdom of Solomon 17:9, "hissing of serpents" (surigmos).

W. L. Walker

HITHERTO

hith’-er-too (to this): Used of both place and time. It is the translation of various words and phrases:

(1) Of place, ‘adh halom (2Sa 7:18, "Thou hast brought me hitherto," the Revised Version (British and American) "thus far"; 1Ch 17:16; perhaps 1Sa 7:12, ‘adh hennah, "Hitherto hath Yahweh helped us" (in

connection with the setting up of the stone Ebenezer)) belongs to this head; hennah is properly an adverb of place; it might always be rendered "thus far."

(2) Of time, ‘adh koh, "unto this" (Ex 7:16, "Hitherto thou hast not hearkened"; Jos 17:14, "Hitherto Yahweh hath blessed me"); me’az, "from then" (2Sa 15:34, the Revised Version (British and American) "in time past"); hale’ah, "beyond," etc. (Isa 18:7, "terrible from their beginning hitherto," the Revised Version (British and American) "onward"); ‘adh kah, Aramaic (Da 7:28, the Revised Version (British and American) "here," margin "hitherto"); ‘adh hennah, "unto here" (Jud 16:13; 1Sa 1:16; Ps 71:17, etc.); achri tou deuro (Ro 1:13, "was let (the Revised Version (British and American) "hindered") hitherto"); heos arti, "until now" (Joh 5:17, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work" the Revised Version (British and American) "even until now," that is, "on the Sabbath as well as on other days’, and I do as He does"; Joh 16:24, "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask, and ye shall receive," that is "up till now"; "now ask in my name and ye shall receive"); oupo, "not yet" (1Co 3:2, "Hitherto ye were not able to bear it," the Revised Version (British and American) "not yet").

W. L. Walker

HITTITES

hit’-its (bene cheth, chittim; Chettaioi): One of the seven nations conquered by Israel in Palestine.

I. OLD TESTAMENT NOTICES

1. Enumeration of Races

2. Individuals

3. Later Mention

II. HISTORY

1. Sources

2. Chronology

3. Egyptian Invasions: XVIIIth Dynasty

4. "The Great King" 5. Egyptian Invasions: XIXth Dynasty

6. Declension of Power: Aryan Invasion

7. Second Aryan Invasion

8. Assyrian Invasions

9. Invasion by Assur-nasir-pal

10. Invasions by Shalmaneser II and Rimmonnirari III

11. Revolts and Invasions

12. Break-up of Hittite Power

13. Mongols in Syria

III. LANGUAGE

1. Mongol Race

2. Hittire and Egyptian Monuments

3. Hair and Beard

4. Hittite Dress

5. Hittite Names

6. Vocabulary of Pterium Epistles

7. Tell el-Amarna Tablet

IV. RELIGION

1. Polytheism: Names of Deities

2. Religious Symbolism

V. SCRIPT

1. Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic

2. Description of Signs

3. Interpretation of Monuments

LITERATURE

I. Old Testament Notices.

1. Enumeration of Races:

The "sons of Heth" are noticed 12 times and the Hittites 48 times in the Old Testament. In 21 cases the name Occurs in the enumeration of races, in Syria and Canaan, which are said (Ge 10:6 f) to have been akin to the early inhabitants of Chaldea and Babylon. From at least 2000 BC this population is known, from monumental records, to have been partly Semitic and partly Mongolic; and the same mixed race is represented by the Hittite records recently discovered in Cappadocia and Pontus. Thus, while the Canaanites ("lowlanders"), Amorites (probably "highlanders"), Hivites ("tribesmen") and Perizzites ("rustics") bear Semitic titles, the Hittites, Jebusites and Girgashites appear to have non-Sem names. Ezekiel (16:3,15) speaks of the Jebusites as a mixed Hittite-Amorite people.

2. Individuals:

The names of Hittites noticed in the Old Testament include several that are Semitic (Ahimelech, Judith, Bashemath, etc.), but others like Uriah and Beeri (Ge 26:34) which are probably non-Sem. Uriah appears to have married a Hebrew wife (Bathsheba), and Esau in like manner married Hittite women (Ge 26:34; 36:2). In the time of Abraham we read of Hittites as far South as Hebron (Ge 23:3 ff; 27:46), but there is no historic improbability in this at a time when the same race appears (see ZOAN) to have ruled in the Nile Delta (but see Gray in The Expositor, May, 1898, 340 f).

3. Later Mention:

In later times the "land of the Hittites" (Jos 1:4; Jud 1:26) was in Syria and near the Euphrates (see TAHTIM-HODSHI); though Uriah (2Sa 11) lived in Jerusalem, and Ahimelech (1Sa 26:6) followed David. In the time of Solomon (1Ki 10:29), the "kings of the Hittites" are mentioned with the "kings of Syria," and were still powerful a century later (2Ki 7:6). Solomon himself married Hittite wives (1Ki 11:1), and a few Hittites seem still to have been left in the South (2Ch 8:7), even in his time, if not after the captivity (Ezr 9:1; Ne 9:8).

II. History.

1. Sources:

The Hittites were known to the Assyrians as Chatti, and to the Egyptians as Kheta, and their history has

been very fully recovered from the records of the XVIIIth and XIXth Egyptian Dynasties, from the Tell el-Amarna Letters, from Assyrian annals and, quite recently, from copies of letters addressed to Babylonian rulers by the Hittite kings, discovered by Dr. H. Winckler in the ruins of Boghaz-keui ("the town of the pass"), the ancient Pterium in Pontus, East of the river Halys. The earliest known notice (King, Egypt and West Asia, 250) is in the reign of Saamsu-ditana, the last king of the first Babylonian Dynasty, about 2000 BC, when the Hittites marched on the "land of Akkad," or "highlands" North of Mesopotamia.

2. Chronology:

The chronology of the Hittites has been made clear by the notices of contemporary rulers in Babylonia, Matiene, Syria and Egypt, found by Winckler in the Hittite correspondence above noticed, and is of great importance to Bible history, because, taken in conjunction with the Tell el-Amarna Letters, with the Kassite monuments of Nippur, with the Babylonian chronicles and contemporary chronicles of Babylon and Assyria, it serves to fix the dates of the Egyptian kings of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties which were previously uncertain by nearly a century, but which may now be regarded as settled within a few years. From the Tell el-Amarna Letters it is known that Thothmes IV was contemporary with the father of Adad-nirari of Assyria (Berlin number 30), and Amenophis IV with Burna-burias of Babylon (Brit. Mss. number 2); while a letter from Chattu-sil, the Hittite contemporary of Rameses II, was addressed to Kadashman-Turgu of Babylon on the occasion of his accession. These notices serve to show that the approximate dates given by Brugsch for the Pharaohs are more correct than those proposed by Mahler; and the following table will be useful for the understanding of the history—Thothmes III being known to have reigned 54 years, Amenophis III at least 36 years, and Rameses II, 66 years or more. The approximate dates appear to be thus fixed.

3. Egyptian Invasions: XVIIIth Dynasty:

The Hyksos race having been expelled from the Delta by Aahmes, the founder of the XVIIIth (Theban) Dynasty, after 1700 BC, the great trade route through Palestine Syria was later conquered by Thothmes I, who set up a monument on the West bank of the Euphrates. The conquests of Aahmes were maintained by his successors Amenophis I and Thothmes I and II; but when Thothmes III attained his majority (about 1580 BC), a great league of Syrian tribes and of Canaanites, from Sharuhen near Gaza and "from the water of Egypt, as far as the land of Naharain" (Aram-naharaim), opposed this Pharaoh in his 22nd year, being led by the king of Kadesh—probably Kadesh on the Orontes (now Qedes, North of Riblah)—but they were defeated near Megiddo in Central Palestine; and in successive campaigns down to his 31st year, Thothmes III reconquered the Palestine plains, and all Syria to Carchemish on the Euphrates. In his 29th year, after the conquest of Tuneb (now Tennnib, West of Arpad), he mentions the tribute of the Hittites including "304 lbs in 8 rings of silver, a great piece of white precious stone, and zagu wood." They were, however, still powerful, and further wars in Syria were waged by Amenophis II, while Thothmes IV also speaks of his first "campaign against the land of the Kheta." Adad-nirari I wrote to Egypt to say that Thothmes IV had established his father (Bel-tiglat-Assur) as ruler of the land of Marchasse (probably Mer’ash in the extreme North of Syria), and to ask aid against the "king of the land of the Hittites." Against the increasing power of this race Thothmes IV and his son Amenophis III

strengthened themselves by marriage alliances with the Kassite kings of Babylon, and with the cognate rulers of Matiene, East of the Hittite lands of Syria, and Cappadocia. Dusratta of Matiene, whose sister Gilukhepa was married by Amenophis III in his 10th year, wrote subsequently to this Pharaoh to announce his own accession (Am Tab, Brit. Mus. number 9) and his defeat of the Hittites, sending a two-horse chariot and a young man and young woman as "spoils of the land of the Hittites."

4. "The Great King":

About this time (1480 BC) arose a great Hittite ruler bearing the strange name Subbiliuliuma, similar to that of Sapalulmi, chief the Hattinai, in North Syria, mentioned by Shalmaneser II in the 9th century BC. He seems to have ruled at Pterium, and calls himself "the great king, the noble king of the Hatti." He allied himself against Dusratta with Artatama, king of the Harri or North Syrians. The Syrian Hittites in Marchassi, North of the land of the Amorites, were led shortly after by Edugamma of Kinza (probably Kittiz, North of Arpad) in alliance with Aziru the Amorite, on a great raid into Phoenicia and to Bashan, South of Damascus. Thus it appears that the Amorites had only reached this region shortly before the Hebrew conquest of Bashan. Amenophis III repelled them in Phoenicia, and Subbiliuliuma descended on Kinza, having made a treaty with Egypt, and captured Edugamma and his father Suttatarra. He also conquered the land of Ikata which apparently lay East of the Euphrates and South of Carehemish. Some 30 years later, in the reign of Amenophis IV, Dusratta of Matiene was murdered, and his kingdom was attacked by the Assyrians; but Subbiliuliuma, though not a friend of Dusratta with whom he disputed the suzerainty of North Syria, sent aid to Dusratta's son Mattipiza, whom he set on his throne, giving him his own daughter as a wife. A little later (about 1440 BC) Aziru the Amorite, who had been subject to Amenophis III, submitted to this same great Hittite ruler, and was soon able to conquer the whole of Phoenicia down to Tyre. All the Egyptian conquests were thus lost in the latter part of the reign of Amenophis III, and in that of Amenophis IV. Only Gaza seems to have been retained, and Burna-burias of Babylon, writing to Amenophis IV, speaks of the Canaanite rebellion as beginning in the time of his father Kuri-galzu I (Am Tab, British Museum number 2), and of subsequent risings in his own time (Berlin number 7) which interrupted communication with Egypt. Assur-yuballidh of Assyria (Berlin number 9), writing to the same Pharaoh, states also that the relations with Assyria, which dated back even to the time of Assur-nadin-akhi (about 1550 BC), had ceased. About this earlier period Thothmes III records that he received presents from Assyria. The ruin of Egypt thus left the Hittites independent, in North Syria, about the time when—according to Old Testament chronology—Palestine was conquered by Joshua. They probably acknowledged Arandas, the successor of Subbiliuliuma, as their suzerain.

5. Egyptian Invasions: XIXth Dynasty:

The XVIIIth Dynasty was succeeded, about 1400 BC, or a little later, by the XIXth, and Rameses I appears to have been the Pharaoh who made the treaty which Mursilis, brother of Arandas, contracted with Egypt. But on the accession of Seti I, son of Rameses I, the Syrian tribes prepared to "make a stand in the country of the Harri" against the Egyptian resolution to recover the suzerainty of their country. Seti I claims to have conquered "Kadesh (on the Orontes) in the Land of the Amorites," and it is known that Mutallis, the eldest son of Mursilis, fought against Egypt. According to his younger brother Hattusil, he was tyrant, who was finally driven out by his subjects and died before the accession of Kadashman-

Turgu (about 1355 BC) in Babylon. Hattusil, the contemporary of Rameses II, then seized the throne as "great king of the Hittites" and "king of Kus" ("Cush," Ge 2:3), a term which in the Akkadian language meant "the West." In his 2nd year Rameses II advanced, after the capture of Ashkelon, as far as Beirut, and in his 5th year he advanced on Kadesh where he was opposed by a league of the natives of "the land of the Kheta, the land of Naharain, and of all the Kati" (or inhabitants of Cilicia), among which confederates the "prince of Aleppo" is specially noticed. The famous poem of Pentaur gives an exaggerated account of the victory won by Rameses II at Kadesh, over the allies, who included the people of Carchemish and of many other unknown places; for it admits that the Egyptian advance was not continued, and that peace was concluded. A second war occurred later (when the sons of Rameses II were old enough to take part), and a battle was then fought at Tuneb (Tennib) far North of Kadesh, probably about 1316 BC. The celebrated treaty between Rameses II and Chattusil was then made, in the 21st year of the first named. It was engraved on a silver tablet having on the back the image of Set (or Sutekh), the Hittite god of heaven, and was brought to Egypt by Tar-Tessubas, the Hittite envoy. The two "great kings" treated together as equals, and formed a defensive and offensive alliance, with extradition clauses which show the advanced civilization of the age. In the 34th year of his reign, Rameses II (who was then over 50 years of age) married a daughter of Chattusil, who wrote to a son of Kadashman-Turgu (probably Kadashman-burias) to inform this Kassite ruler of Babylon of the event. He states in another letter that he was allied by marriage to the father of Kadashman-Turgu, but the relations between the Kassite rulers and the Hittites were not very cordial, and complaints were made on both sides. Chattusil died before Rameses II, who ruled to extreme old age; for the latter (and his queen) wrote letters to Pudukhipa, the widow of this successful Hittite overlord. He was succeeded by Dudhalia, who calls himself "the great king" and the "son of Pudukhipa the great queen, queen of the land of the city of the Chatti."

6. Declension of Power: Aryan Invasion:

The Hittite power began now, however, to decline, in consequence of attacks from the West by hostile Aryan invaders. In the 5th year of Seti Merenptah II, son of Rameses II, these fair "peoples of the North" raided the Syrian coasts, and advanced even to Belbeis and Heliopolis in Egypt, in alliance with the Libyans West of the Delta. They were defeated, and Merenptah appears to have pursued them even to Pa-Kan’-ana near Tyre. A text of his 5th year (found by Dr. Flinders Petrie in 1896) speaks of this campaign, and says that while "Israel is spoiled" the "Hittites are quieted": for Merenptah appears to have been on good terms with them, and allowed corn to be sent in ships "to preserve the life of this people of the Chatti." Dudchalia was succeeded by his son "Arnuanta the great king," of whom a bilingual seal has been found by Dr. Winckler, in Hittite and cuneiform characters; but the confederacy of Hittite tribes which had so long resisted Egypt seems to have been broken up by these disasters and by the increasing power of Assyria.

7. Second Aryan Invasion:

A second invasion by the Aryans occurred in the reign of Rameses III (about 1200 BC) when "agitation seized the peoples of the North," and "no people stood before their arms, beginning with the people of

the Chatti, of the Kati, of Carchemish and Aradus." The invaders, including Danai (or early Greeks), came by land and sea to Egypt, but were again defeated, and Rameses III—the last of the great Pharaohs —pursued them far north, and is even supposed by Brugsch to have conquered Cyprus. Among the cities which he took he names Carchemish, and among his captives were "the miserable king of the Chatti, a living prisoner," and the "miserable king of the Amorites."

8. Assyrian Invasions:

Half a century later (1150 BC) the Assyrians began to invade Syria, and Assur-ris-isi reached Beirut; for even as early as about 1270 BC Tukulti-Ninip of Assyria had conquered the Kassites, and had set a Semitic prince on their throne in Babylon. Early in his reign (about 1130 BC) Tiglath- pileser I claims to have subdued 42 kings, marching "to the fords of the Euphrates, the land of the Chatti, and the upper sea of the setting sun"—or Mediterranean. Soldiers of the Chatti had seized the cities of Sumasti (probably Samosata), but the Assyrian conqueror made his soldiers swim the Euphrates on skin bags, and so attacked "Carchemish of the land of the Hittites." The Moschians in Cappadocia were apparently of Hittite race, and were ruled by 5 kings: for 50 years they had exacted tribute in Commagene (Northeastern Syria), and they were defeated, though placing 20,000 men in the field against Tiglath-pileser I. He advanced to Kumani (probably Comana in Cappadocia), and to Arini which was apparently the Hittite capital called Arinas (now Iranes), West of Caesarea in the same region.

9. Invasion by Assur-nacir-pal:

The power of the Hittites was thus broken by Assyria, yet they continued the struggle for more than 4 centuries afterward. After the defeat of Tiglath-pileser I by Marduk-nadin-akhi of Babylon (1128-1111 BC), there is a gap in Assyrian records, and we next hear of the Hittites in the reign of Assur-nacir-pal (883-858 BC); he entered Commagene, and took tribute from "the son of Bachian of the land of the Chatti," and from "Sangara of Carchemish in the land of the Chatti," so that it appears that the Hittites no longer acknowledged a single "great king." They were, however, still rich, judging from the spoil taken at Carchemish, which included 20 talents of silver, beads, chains, and sword scabbards of gold, 100 talents of copper, 250 talents of iron, and bronze objects from the palace representing sacred bulls, bowls, cups and censers, couches, seats, thrones, dishes, instruments of ivory and 200 slave girls, besides embroidered robes of linen and of black and purple stuffs, gems, elephants’ tusks, chariots and horses. The Assyrian advance continued to ‘Azzaz in North Syria, and to the Afrin river, in the country of the Chattinai who were no doubt Hittites, where similar spoils are noticed, with 1,000 oxen and 10,000 sheep: the pagutu, or "maces" which the Syrian kings used as scepters, and which are often represented on Hittite monuments, are specially mentioned in this record. Assur-nacir-pal reached the Mediterranean at Arvad, and received tribute from "kings of the sea coast" including those of Gebal, Sidon and Tyre. He reaped the corn of the Hittites, and from Mt. Amanus in North Syria he took logs of cedar, pine, box and cypress.

10. Invasions by Shalmaneser II and Rimmonnirari III:

His son Shalmaneser II (858-823 BC) also invaded Syria in his 1st year, and again mentions Sangara of Carchemish, with Sapalulmi of the Chattinai. In Commagene the chief of the Gamgums bore the old Hittite name Mutallis. In 856 BC Shalmaneser II attacked Mer'-ash and advanced by Dabigu (now Toipuk) to 'Azzaz. He took from the Hattinai 3 talents of gold, 100 of silver, 300 of copper, 1,000 bronze vases and 1,000 embroidered robes. He also accepted as wives a daughter of Mutallis and another Syrian princess. Two years later 120,000 Assyrians raided the same region, but the southward advance was barred by the great Syrian league which came to the aid of Irchulena, king of Hamath, who was not subdued till about 840 BC. In 836 BC the people of Tubal, and the Kati of Cappadocia and Cilicia, were again attacked. In 831 BC Qubarna, the vassal king of the Chattinai in Syria, was murdered by his subjects, and an Assyrian tartanu or general was sent to restore order. The rebels under Sapalulmi had been confederated with Sangara of Carchemish. Adad-nirari III, grandson of Shalmaneser II, was the next Assyrian conqueror: in 805 BC he attacked 'Azzaz and Arpad, but the resistance of the Syrians was feeble, and presents were sent from Tyre, Sidon, Damascus and Edom. This conqueror states that he subdued "the land of the Hittites, the land of the Amorites, to the limits of the land of Sidon," as well as Damascus, Edom and Philistia.

11. Revolts and Invasions:

But the Hittites were not as yet thoroughly subdued, and often revolted. In 738 BC Tiglath-pileser II mentions among his tributaries a chief of the Gamgums bearing the Hittite name Tarku-lara, with Pisiris of Carchemish. In 702 BC Sennacherib passed peacefully through the "land of the Chatti" on his way to Sidon: for in 717 BC Sargon had destroyed Carchemish, and had taken many of the Hittites prisoners, sending them away far east and replacing them by Babylonians. Two years later he in the same way took the Hamathites as captives to Assyria. Some of the Hittites may have fled to the South, for in 709 BC Sargon states that the king of Ashdod was deposed by "people of the Chatti plotting rebellion who despised his rule," and who set up Azuri instead.

12. Breakup of Hittite Power:

The power of the Hittites was thus entirely broken before Sennacherib's time, but they were not entirely exterminated, for, in 673 BC, Esar-haddon speaks of "twenty-two kings of the Chatti and near the sea." Hittite names occur in 712 BC (Tarchu-nazi of Meletene) and in 711 BC (Mutallis of Commagene), but after this they disappear. Yet, even in a recently found text of Nebuchadnezzar (after 600 BC), we read that "chiefs of the land of the Chattim, bordering on the Euphrates to the West, where by command of Nergal my lord I had destroyed their rule, were made to bring strong beams from the mountain of Lebanon to my city Babylon." A Hittite population seems to have survived even in Roman times in Cilicia and Cappadocia, for (as Dr. Mordtman observed) a king and his son in this region both bore the name Tarkon-dimotos in the time of Augustus, according to Dio Cassius and Tacitus; and this name recalls that of Tarku-timme, the king of Erine in Cappadocia, occurring on a monument which shows him as brought captive before an Assyrian king, while the same name also occurs on the bilingual silver boss which was the head of his scepter, inscribed in Hittite and cuneiform characters.

13. Mongols in Syria:

The power of the Mongolic race decayed gradually as that of the Semitic Assyrians increased; but even now in Syria the two races remain mingled, and Turkoman nomads still camp even as far South as the site of Kadesh on the Orontes, while a few tribes of the same stock (which entered Syria in the Middle Ages) still inhabit the plains of Sharon and Esdraelon, just as the southern Hittites dwelt among the Amorites at Jerusalem and Hebron in the days of Abraham, before they were driven north by Thothmes III.

III. Language.

1. Mongol Race:

The questions of race and language in early times, before the early stocks were mixed or decayed, cannot be dissociated, and we have abundant evidence of the racial type and characteristic dress of the Hittites. The late Dr. Birch of the British Museum pointed out the Mongol character of the Hittite type, and his opinion has been very generally adopted. In 1888 Dr. Sayce (The Hittites, 15, 101) calls them "Mongoloid," and says, "They had in fact, according to craniologists, the characteristics of a Mongoloid race." This was also the opinion of Sir W. Flower; and, if the Hittites were Mongols, it would appear probable that they spoke a Mongol dialect. It is also apparent that, in this case, they would be related to the old Mongol population of Chaldea (the people of Akkad and Sumir or "of the highlands and river valley") from whom the Semitic Babylonians derived their earliest civilization.

2. Hittite on Egyptian Monuments:

The Hittite type is represented, not only on their own monuments, but on those of the XVIIIth and XIXth Egyptian Dynasties, including a~ colored picture of the time of Rameses III. The type represented has a short head and receding forehead, a prominent and sometimes rather curved nose, a strong jaw and a hairless face. The complexion is yellow, the eyes slightly slanting, the hair of the head black, and gathered into a long pigtail behind. The physiognomy is like that of the Sumerians represented on a bas-relief at Tel-loh (Zirgul) in Chaldea, and very like that of some of the Kirghiz Mongols of the present time, and of some of the more purely Mongolic Turks. The head of Gudea at Zirgul in like manner shows (about 2800 BC) the broad cheek bones and hairless face of the Turkish type; and the language of his texts, in both grammar and vocabulary, is closely similar to pure Turkish speech.

3. Hair and Beard:

Among Mongolic peoples the beard grows only late in life, and among the Akkadians it is rarely represented—excepting in the case of gods and ancient kings. The great bas-relief found by Koldewey at Babylon, and representing a Hittite thunder-god with a long pigtail and (at the back) a Hittite inscription, is bearded, but the pigtailed heads on other Hittite monuments are usually hairless. At Iasili-Kaia—the rock shrine near Pterium—only the supreme god is bearded, and all the other male figures are beardless.

At Ibreez, in Lycaonia, the gigantic god who holds corn and grapes in his hands is bearded, and the worshipper who approaches him also has a beard, and his hair is arranged in the distinctive fashion of the Semitic Babylonians and Assyrians. This type may represent Semitic mixture, for M. Chantre discovered at Kara-eyak, in Cappadocia, tablets in Semitic Babylonian representing traders' letters perhaps as old as 2000 BC. The type of the Ibreez figures has been said to resemble that of the Armenian peasantry of today; but, although the Armenians are Aryans of the old Phrygian stock, and their language almost purely Aryan, they have mixed with the Turkish and Semitic races, and have been said even to resemble the Jews. Little reliance can be placed, therefore, on comparison with modern mixed types. The Hittite pigtail is very distinctive of a Mongolic race. It was imposed on the Chinese by the Manchus in the 17th century, but it is unknown among Aryan or Semitic peoples, though it seems to be represented on some Akkadian seals, and on a bas-relief picturing the Mongolic Susians in the 7th century BC.

4. Hittite Dress:

The costume of the Hittites on monuments seems also to indicate Mongolic origin. Kings and priests wear long robes, but warriors (and the gods at Ibreez and Babylon) wear short jerkins, and the Turkish shoe or slipper with a curled-up toe, which, however, is also worn by the Hebrew tribute bearers from Jehu on the "black obelisk" (about 840 BC) of Shalmaneser II. Hittite gods and warriors are shown as wearing a high, conical head-dress, just like that which (with addition of the Moslem turban) characterized the Turks at least as late as the 18th century. The short jerkin also appears on Akkadian seals and bas-reliefs, and, generally speaking, the Hittites (who were enemies of the Lycians, Danai and other Aryans to their west) may be held to be very clearly Mongolic in physical type and costume, while the art of their monuments is closely similar to that of the most archaic Akkadian and Babylonian sculptures of Mesopotamia. It is natural to suppose that they were a branch of the same remarkable race which civilized Chaldea, but which seems to have had its earliest home in Akkad, or the "highlands" near Ararat and Media, long before the appearance of Aryan tribes either in this region or in Ionia. The conclusion also agrees with the Old Testament statement that the Hittites were akin to the descendants of Ham in Babylonia, and not to the "fair" tribes (Japheth), including Medes, Ionians and other Aryan peoples.

5. Hittite Names:

As early as 1866 Chabas remarked that the Hittite names (of which so many have been mentioned above) were clearly not Semitic, and this has been generally allowed. Those of the Amorites, on the other hand, are Semitic, and the type represented, with brown skin, dark eyes and hair, aqui-line features and beards, agrees (as is generally allowed) in indicating a Semitic race. There are now some 60 of these Hittite names known, and they do not suggest any Aryan etymology. They are quite unlike those of the Aryan Medes (such as Baga-datta, etc.) mentioned by the Assyrians, or those of the Vannic kings whose language (as shown by recently published bilinguals in Vannic and Assyrian) seems very clearly to have been Iranian—or similar to Persian and Sanskrit—but which only occurs in the later Assyrian age. Comparisons with Armenian and Georgian (derived from the Phrygian and Scythian) also fail to show any similarity of vocabulary or of syntax, while on the other hand comparisons with the Akkadian, the

Kassite and modern Turkish at once suggest a linguistic connection which fully agrees with what has been said above of the racial type. The common element Tarku, or Tarkhan, in Hittite names suggests the Mongol dargo and the Turkish tarkhan, meaning a "tribal chief." Sil again is an Akkadian word for a "ruler," and nazi is an element in both Hittite and Kassite names.

6. Vocabulary of Pterium Epistles:

It has also been remarked that the vocabulary of the Hittite letters discovered by Chantre at Pterium recalls that of the letter written by Dusratta of Matiene to Amenophis III (Am Tab number 27, Berlin), and that Dusratta adored the Hittite god Tessupas. A careful study of the language of this letter shows that, in syntax and vocabulary alike, it must be regarded as Mongolic and as a dialect of the Akkadian group. The cases of the noun, for instance, are the same as in Akkadian and in modern Turkish. No less than 50 words and terminations are common to the language of this letter and of those discovered by M. Chantre and attributed to the Hittites whose territory immediately adjoined that of Matiene. The majority of these words occur also in Akkadian.

7. Tell el-Amarna Tablet:

But in addition to these indications we have a letter in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Berlin number 10) written by a Hittite prince, in his own tongue and in the cuneiform script. It is from (and not to, as has been wrongly supposed by Knudtzon) a chief named Tarchun-dara, and is addressed to Amenophis III, whose name stands first. In all the other letters the name of the sender always follows that of the recipient. The general meaning of this letter is clear from the known meanings of the "ideograms" used for many words; and it is also clear that the language is "agglutinative" like the Akkadian. The suffixed possessive pronouns follow the plural termination of the noun as in Akkadian, and prepositions are not used as they are in Semitic and Aryan speech; the precative form of the verb has also been recognized to be the same as used in Akkadian. The pronouns mi, "my," and ti, "thy," are to be found in many living Mongolic dialects (e.g. the Zyrianian me and te); in Akkadian also they occur as mi and zi. The letter opens with the usual salutation: "Letter to Amenophis III the great king, king of the land of Egypt (Mizzari-na), from Tarchun-dara (Tarchundara-da), king of the land of Arzapi (or Arzaa), thus. To me is prosperity. To my nobles, my hosts, my cavalry, to all that is mine in all my lands, may there be prosperity; (moreover?) may there be prosperity: to thy house, thy wives, thy sons, thy nobles, thy hosts, thy cavalry, to all that is thine in thy lands may there be prosperity." The letter continues to speak of a daughter of the Pharaoh, and of a sum of gold which is being sent in charge of an envoy named Irsappa. It concludes (as in many other instances) with a list of presents, these being sent by "the Hittite prince (Nu Chattu) from the land Igait" (perhaps the same as Ikata), and including, besides the gold, various robes, and ten chairs of ebony inlaid with ivory. As far as it can at present be understood, the language of this letter, which bears no indications of either Semitic or Aryan speech, whether in vocabulary or in syntax, strongly favors the conclusion that the native Hittite language was a dialect of that spoken by the Akkadians, the Kassites and the Minyans of Matiene, in the same age.

IV. Religion.

1. Polytheism: Names of Deities:

The Hittites like their neighbors adored many gods. Besides Set (or Sutekh), the "great ruler of heaven," and Ishtar (Ashtoreth), we also find mentioned (in Chattusil's treaty) gods and goddesses of "the hills and rivers of the land of the Chatti," "the great sea, the winds and the clouds." Tessupas was known to the Babylonians as a name of Rimmon, the god of thunder and rain. On a bilingual seal (in Hittite and cuneiform characters), now in the Ashmolean Museum, we find noticed the goddess Ischara, whose name, among the Kassites, was equivalent to Istar. The Hittite gods are represented—like those of the Assyrians—standing erect on lions. One of them (at Samala in Syria) is lion-headed like Nergal. They also believed in demons, like the Akkadians and others.

2. Religious Symbolism:

Their pantheon was thus also Mongolic, and the suggestion (by Dr. Winckler) that they adored Indian gods (Indra, Varuna), and the Persian Mithra, not only seems improbable, but is also hardly supported by the quotations from Semitic texts on which this idea is based. The sphinx is found as a Hittite emblem at Eyuk, North of Pterium, with the double-headed eagle which again, at Iasili-kaia, supports a pair of deities. It also occurs at Tel-loh as an Akkadian emblem, and was adopted by the Seljuk Turks about 1000 AD. At Eyuk we have a representation of a procession bringing goats and rams to an altar. At Iflatun-bunar the winged sun is an emblem as in Babylonia. At Mer'-ash, in Syria, the mother goddess carries her child, while an eagle perches on a harp beside her. At Carchemish the naked Ishtar is represented with wings. The religious symbolism, like the names of deities, thus suggests a close connection with the emblems and beliefs of the Kassites and Akkadians.

V Script.

1. Cuneiform and Hieroglyphic:

In the 16th century BC, and down to the 13th century, the Hittites used the cuneiform characters and the Babylonian language for correspondence abroad. On seals and and mace-heads they used their own hieroglyphics, together with the cuneiform. These emblems, which occur on archaic monuments at Hamath, Carchemish and Aleppo in Syria, as well as very frequently in Cappadocia and Pontus, and less frequently as far West as Ionia, and on the East at Babylon, are now proved to be of Hittite origin, since the discovery of the seal of Arnuanta already noticed. The suggestion that they were Hittite was first made by the late Dr. W. Wright (British and Foreign Evangelical Review, 1874). About 100 such monuments are now known, including seals from Nineveh and Cappadocia, and Hittite gold ornaments in the Ashmolean Museum; and there can be little doubt that, in cases where the texts accompany figures of the gods, they are of a votive character.

2. Description of Signs:

The script is quite distinctive, though many of the emblems are similar to those used by the Akkadians.

There are some 170 signs in all, arranged one below another in the line—as among Akkadians. The lines read alternately from right to left and from left to right, the profile emblems always facing the beginning of each line.

The interpretation of these texts is still a controversial question, but the most valuable suggestion toward their understanding is that made by the late Canon Isaac Taylor (see ALPHABET, 1883). A syllabary which was afterward used by the Greeks in Cyprus, and which is found extensively spread in Asia Minor, Egypt, Palestine, Crete, and even on later coins in Spain, was recognized by Dr. Taylor as being derived from the Hittite signs. It was deciphered by George Smith from a Cypriote-Phoenician bilingual, and appears to give the sounds applying to some 60 signs.

3. Interpretation of Monuments:

These sounds are confirmed by the short bilinguals as yet known, and they appear in some cases at least to be very clearly the monosyllabic words which apply in Akkadian to similar emblems. We have thus the bases of a comparative study, by aid of a known language and script—a method similar to that which enabled Sir H. Rawlinson to recover scientifically the lost cuneiform, or Champollion to decipher Egyptian hieroglyphics.

See also ASIA MINOR, ARCHAEOLOGY OF; PALESTINE EXPLORATION.

LITERATURE.

The Egyptian notices will be found in Brugsch's A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs, 1879, and the Assyrian in Schrader's Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, English Translation, 1885. The discoveries of Chantre are published in his Mission en Cappadoce, 1898, and those of Dr. H. Winckler in the Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft, number 35, December, 1907. The researches of Humann and Puchstein, Reisen in Kleinasien und Nordsyrien, 1890, are also valuable for this question; as is also Dr. Robert Koldewey's discovery of a Hittite monument at Babylon (Die hettische Inschrift, 1900). The recent discovery of sculpture at a site North of Samala by Professor Garstang is published in the Annals of Archaeology, I, number 4, 1908, by the University of Liverpool. These sculptures are supposed to date about 800 BC, but no accompanying inscriptions have as yet been found. The views of the present writer are detailed in his Tell Amarna Tablets, 2nd edition, 1894, and in The Hittites and Their Languages, 1898. Dr. Sayce has given an account of his researches in a small volume, The Hittites, 1888, but many discoveries by Sir C. Wilson, Mr. D.G. Hogarth, Sir W. Ramsay, and other explorers have since been published, and are scattered in various periodicals not easily accessible. The suggestions of Drs. Jensen, Hommel, and Peiser, in Germany, of comparison with Armenian, Georgian and Turkish, have not as yet produced any agreement; nor have those of Dr. Sayce, who looks to Vannic or to Gr; and further light on Hittite decipherment is still awaited. See, further, Professor Garstang's Land of the Hittites, 1910.

C. R. Conder

HIVITE

hi’-vit (chiwwni; Heuaios):

1. Name:

A son of Canaan (Ge 10:17), i.e. an inhabitant of the land of Canaan along with the Canaanite and other tribes (Ex 3:17, etc.). In the list of Canaanite peoples given in Ge 15:19-21, the Hivites are omitted in the Hebrew text, though inserted in Septuagint and S. Gesenius suggests that the name is descriptive, meaning "villagers." The difficulty of explaining it is increased by the fact that it has been confused with "Horite" in some passages of the Hebrew text. In Jos 9:7 the Septuagint reads "Horite" as also does Codex A in Ge 34:2, and in Ge 36:2 a comparison with 36:24,25 shows that "Horite" must be substituted for "Hivite."

2. Geographical Situation:

In Jud 3:3 the Hittites are described as dwelling "in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-hermon unto the entrance of Hamath," and in accordance with this the Hivite is described in Jos 11:3 as being "under Hermon in the land of Mizpeh," and in 2Sa 24:7 they are mentioned immediately after "the stronghold of Tyre." Hence, the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus) reading must be right in Ge 34:2 and Jos 9:7, which makes the inhabitants of Shechem and Gibeon Horites instead of Hivites; indeed, in Ge 48:22 the people of Shechem are called Amorite, though this was a general name for the population of Canaan in the patriarchal period. No name resembling Hivite has yet been found in the Egyptian or Babylonian inscriptions.

A. H. Sayce

HIZKI

hiz’-ki (chizqi; Septuagint Azaki; the King James Version Hezeki): A son of Elpaal, a descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 8:17).

HIZKIAH

hiz-ki’-a (chizqiyah; Septuagint Ezekia, "strength of Yah"):

(1) A son of Neariah, a descendant of David (1Ch 3:23, the King James Version "Hezekiah").

(2) An ancestor of the prophet Zephaniah (Ze 1:1). In the Revised Version (British and American) this word is here translated "Hezekiah." This name again appears in Ne 10:17 (Hebrew 18) in the form of

"Hizkijah" in the King James Version, but as "Hezekiah" in the Revised Version (British and American).

See HEZEKIAH.

HOAR-FROST; HOARY

hor’-frost.

See FROST.

HOAR; HOARY

hor, hor’-i.

See COLOR (8); HAIR.

HOBAB

ho’-bab (chobhabh, "beloved"; Septuagint Obab): This name occurs only twice (Nu 10:29; Jud 4:11). It is not certain whether it denotes the father-in-law or the brother-in-law of Moses. The direct statement of Nu 10:29 is that Hobab was "the son of Reuel" (the King James Version "Raguel"). This is probably the correct view and finds support in Ex 18:27, which tells us that some time before the departure of the Israelites from Sinai, Jethro had departed and returned to his own land. The statement of Jud 4:11 is ambiguous, and therefore does not help us out of the difficulty, but is rather itself to be interpreted in the light of the earlier statement in Nu 10:29.

Mohammedan traditions favor the view that Hobab was only another name for Jethro. But this has little weight against the statements of Scripture. However, whether father-in-law or brother-in-law to Moses, the service he rendered to the leader of the hosts of Israel was most valuable and beautiful. Hobab was an experienced sheikh of the desert whose counsel and companionship Moses desired in the unfamiliar regions through which he was to journey. His knowledge of the wilderness and of its possible dangers would enable him to be to the Israelites "instead of eyes."

The facts recorded of this man are too meager to enable us to answer all the questions that arise concerning him. A difficulty that remains unsolved is the fact that in Jud 1:16 and 4:11 he is described as a Kenite, while in Ex 3:1 and 18:1, the father-in-law of Moses is spoken of as "the priest of Midian."

Jesse L. Cotton

HOBAH

ho’-ba (chobhah): A place "on the left hand," i.e. to the North of "Damascus," to which Abraham pursued the defeated army of Chedorlaomer (Ge 14:15). It is probably identical with the modern Choba, about 60 miles Northwest of Damascus.

HOBAIAH

ho-ba’-ya (chobhayah, "whom Yahweh hides," i.e. "protects"): The head of a priestly family that returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. Because they could not trace their genealogy, they were not permitted to serve in the priestly office (Ne 7:63 f). In the Qere of this passage and in the parallel list of Ezr 2:61, this name appears in the form "Habaiah" (chabhayyah). "Obdia" is the form of the word in 1 Esdras 5:38.

HOCK

(‘aqar, "to root out"): To hamstring, i.e. to render useless by cutting the tendons of the hock (in the King James Version and the English Revised Version "hough"). "In their selfwill they hocked an ox" (Ge 49:6, the King James Version "digged down a wall"), in their destructiveness maiming those which they could not carry off: See also Jos 11:6,9; 2Sa 8:4.

HOD

hod (hodh, "majesty," "splendor"; the Septuagint’s Codex Alexadrinus, Hod; Codex Vaticanus, Oa): One of the sons of Zophah, a descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:37).

HODAIAH

ho-da’-ya.

See HODAVIAH.

HODAVIAH

hod-a-vi’-a (hodhawyah, or hodhawyahu; the Septuagint’s Codex Alexandrinus, Hodouia):

(1) One of the heads of the half-tribe of Manasseh on the East of the Jordan (1Ch 5:24).

(2) A Benjamite, the son of Hassenuah (1Ch 9:7).

(3) A Levite, who seems to have been the head of an important family in that tribe (Ezr 2:40). In Ne 7:43 the name is Hodevah (hodhewah; Qere hodheyah). Compare Ezr 3:9.

(4) A son of Elioenai, and a descendant of David (1Ch 3:24; hodhaywahu; Qere hodhawyahu, the King James Version "Hodaiah").

HODESH

ho’-desh (chodhesh, "new moon"): One of the wives of Shaharaim, a Benjamite (1Ch 8:9).

HODEVAH

ho-de’-va, ho’-de-va (hodhewah, hodheyah, "splendor of Yah"): A Levite and founder of a Levite family, seventy-four of whom returned from exile with Zerubbabel, 538 BC (Ne 7:43). the American Revised Version, margin gives as another reading "Hodeiah." In Ezr 2:40 he is called Hodaviah, of which Hodevah and Hodeiah are slight textual corruptions, and in Ezr 3:9 Judah, a name practically synonymous.

HODIAH; HODIJAH

ho-di’-a, ho-di’-ja (hodhiyah, "splendor of Yah"):

(1) A brother-in-law of Naham (1Ch 4:19), and possibly for that reason reckoned a member of the tribe of Judah. the King James Version translate "his wife" is wrong.

(2) One of the Levites who explained to the people the Law as read by Ezra (Ne 8:7) and led their prayers (Ne 9:5). He is doubtless one of the two Levites of this name who sealed the covenant of Nehemiah (Ne 10:10,13).

(3) One of the chiefs of the people who sealed the covenant of Nehemiah (Ne 10:18). J. Gray Mcallister

HOGLAH

hog’-la (choghlah, "partridge"): The third of five daughters of Zelophehad of the tribe of Manasseh (Nu 26:33). Zelophehad leaving no male heir, it was made a statute that the inheritance in such cases should pass to the daughters, if such there were, as joint heirs, on condition, however, of marriage within the tribe (Nu 27:1-11; 36:1-12; Jos 17:3 f).

HOHAM

ho’-ham (hoham, "whom Yahweh impels(?)" Gesenius): An Amorite king of Hebron and one of the five kings of the Amorites who leagued for war on Gibeon because of its treaty of peace with Joshua. The five were defeated in the decisive battle of Beth-horon, shut up in the cave at Makkedah in which they

had taken refuge, and after the battle were slain, hanged and cast into the cave (Jos 10:1-27).

HOISE

hoiz: The older form of "hoist" (Old English, hoise), to raise, to lift, and is the translation of epairo, "to lift up": "they .... hoised up the mainsail to the wind" (Ac 27:40). the Revised Version (British and American) "and hoisting up the foresail to the wind"; Wycliff has "lefte up" Tyndale "hoysed up."

HOLD

hold: In the American Standard Revised Version frequently "stronghold" (Jud 9:49; 1Sa 22:4; 24:22; 2Sa 5:17; 23:14; 1Ch 11:16; 12:16). See FORTIFICATION. In Re 18:2 for the King James Version "cage" (phulake) the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes, as in first clause, "hold," and in the margin "prison."

HOLDING

hol’-ding: Occurs with various shades of meaning:

(1) as the translation of tamakh, "to acquire," it has the sense of taking, obtaining (Isa 33:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "that shaketh his hands from taking a bribe," the English Revised Version, as the King James Version, "holding");

(2) of kul, "to hold," "contain," having the sense of containing or restraining (Jer 6:11, "I am weary with holding in");

(3) of krateo, "to receive," "observe," "maintain" (Mr 7:3, "holding the tradition of the elders"; 1Ti 1:19, echo, "holding faith and a good conscience"; 1Ti 3:9, "holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience");

(4) holding fast, cleaving to, krateo (Col 2:19, "not holding the head," the Revised Version (British and American) "holding fast"; compare Ac 3:11; Re 7:1, "holding the four winds of the earth, that no wind should blow"); antechomai, "to hold over against one’s self," "to hold fast" (Tit 1:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "holding to the faithful word");

(5) holding forth, epecho, "to hold upon, to hold out toward" (Php 2:16, "holding forth the word of life," so the Revised Version (British and American)); Lightfoot has "holding out" (as offering); others, however, render "holding fast," persevering in the Christian faith and life—connecting with being "blameless and harmless" in Php 2:15.

W. L. Walker

HOLINESS

ho’-li-nes (qadhosh, "holy," qodhesh, "holiness"; hagios, "holy"):

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT MEANING OF THE TERM

1. The Holiness of God

(1) Absoluteness and Majesty

(2) Ethical Holiness

2. Holiness of Place, Time and Object

3. Holiness of Men

(1) Ceremonial

(2) Ethical and Spiritual

II. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT: THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION

1. Applied to God

2. Applied To Christ

3. Applied To Things

4. Applied To Christians

(1) As Separate from the World

(2) As Bound to the Pursuit of an Ethical Ideal

I. In the Old Testament Meaning of the Term.

There has been much discussion as to the original meaning of the Semitic root Q-D-SH, by which the notion of holiness is expressed in the Old Testament. Some would connect it with an Assyrian word denoting purity, clearness; most modern scholars incline to the view that the primary idea is that of cutting off or separation. Etymology gives no sure verdict on the point, but the idea of separation lends

itself best to the various senses in which the word "holiness" is employed. In primitive Semitic usage "holiness" seems to have expressed nothing more than that ceremonial separation of an object from common use which the modern study of savage religions has rendered familiar under the name of taboo (W.R. Smith, Religion of the Semites, Lect iv). But within the Biblical sphere, with which alone we are immediately concerned, holiness attaches itself first of all, not to visible objects, but to the invisible Yahweh, and to places, seasons, things and human beings only in so far as they are associated with Him. And while the idea of ceremonial holiness runs through the Old Testament, the ethical significance which Christianity attributes to the term is never wholly absent, and gradually rises in the course of the revelation into more emphatic prominence.

1. The Holiness of God:

As applied to God the notion of holiness is used in the Old Testament in two distinct senses:

(1) Absoluteness and Majesty

First in the more general sense of separation from all that is human and earthly. It thus denotes the absoluteness, majesty, and awfulness of the Creator in His distinction from the creature. In this use of the word, "holiness" is little more than an equivalent general term for "Godhead," and the adjective "holy" is almost synonymous with "Divine" (compare Da 4:8,9,18; 5:11). Yahweh’s "holy arm" (Isa 52:10; Ps 98:1) is His Divine arm, and His "holy name" (Le 20:3, etc.) is His Divine name. When Hannah sings "There is none holy as Yahweh" (1Sa 2:2), the rest of the verse suggests that she is referring, not to His ethical holiness, but simply to His supreme Divinity.

(2) Ethical Holiness

But, in the next place, holiness of character in the distinct ethical sense is ascribed to God. The injunction, "Be ye holy; for I am holy" (Le 11:44; 19:2), plainly implies an ethical conception. Men cannot resemble God in His incommunicable attributes. They can reflect His likeness only along the lines of those moral qualities of righteousness and love in which true holiness consists. In the Psalmists and Prophets the Divine holiness becomes, above all, an ethical reality convicting men of sin (Isa 6:3,1) and demanding of those who would stand in His presence clean hands and a pure heart (Ps 24:3 f).

2. Holiness of Place, Time and Object:

From the holiness of God is derived that ceremonial holiness of things which is characteristic of the Old Testament religion. Whatever is connected with the worship of the holy Yahweh is itself holy. Nothing is holy in itself, but anything becomes holy by its consecration to Him. A place where He manifests His presence is holy ground (Ex 3:5). The tabernacle or temple in which His glory is revealed is a holy building (Ex 28:29; 2Ch 35:5); and all its sacrifices (Ex 29:33), ceremonial materials (30:25; Nu 5:17) and utensils (1Ki 8:4) are also holy. The Sabbath is holy because it is the Sabbath of the Lord (Ex 20:8-11). "Holiness, in short, expresses a relation, which consists negatively in separation from common use,

and positively in dedication to the service of Yahweh" (Skinner in HDB, II, 395).

3. Holiness of Men:

The holiness of men is of two kinds:

(1) Ceremonial

A ceremonial holiness, corresponding to that of impersonal objects and depending upon their relation to the outward service of Yahweh. Priests and Levites are holy because they have been "hallowed" or "sanctified" by acts of consecration (Ex 29:1; Le 8:12,30). The Nazirite is holy because he has separated himself unto the Lord (Nu 6:5). Above all, Israel, notwithstanding all its sins and shortcomings, is holy, as a nation separated from other nations for Divine purposes and uses (Ex 19:6, etc.; compare Le 20:24).

(2) Ethical and Spiritual

But out of this merely ceremonial holiness there emerges a higher holiness that is spiritual and ethical. For unlike other creatures man was made in the image of God and capable of reflecting the Divine likeness. And as God reveals Himself as ethically holy, He calls man to a holiness resembling His own (Le 19:2). In the so-called "Law of Holiness" (Le 17:1-26:46), God's demand for moral holiness is made clear; and yet the moral contents of the Law are still intermingled with ceremonial elements (Le 17:10 ff; 19:19; 21:1). In psalm and prophecy, however, a purely ethical conception comes into view—the conception of a human holiness which rests upon righteousness and truth (Ps 15:1 f) and the possession of a contrite and humble spirit (Isa 57:15). This corresponds to the knowledge of a God who, being Himself ethically holy, esteems justice, mercy and lowly piety more highly than sacrifice (Ho 6:6; Mic 6:6-8).

II. In the New Testament: The Christian Conception.

The idea of holiness is expressed here chiefly by the word hagios and its derivatives, which correspond very closely to the words of the Q-D-SH group in Hebrew, and are employed to render them in the Septuagint. The distinctive feature of the New Testament idea of holiness is that the external aspect of it has almost entirely disappeared, and the ethical meaning has become supreme. The ceremonial idea still exists in contemporary Judaism, and is typically represented by the Pharisees (Mr 7:1-13; Lu 18:11 f). But Jesus proclaimed a new view of religion and morality according to which men are cleansed or defiled, not by anything outward, but by the thoughts of their hearts (Mt 15:17-20), and God is to be worshipped neither in Samaria nor Jerusalem, but wherever men seek Him in spirit and in truth (Joh 4:21-24).

1. Applied to God:

In the New Testament the term "holy" is seldom applied to God, and except in quotations from the Old

Testament (Lu 1:49; 1Pe 1:15 f), only in the Johannine writings (Joh 17:11; Re 4:8; 6:10). But it is constantly used of the Spirit of God (Mt 1:18; Ac 1:2; Ro 5:5, etc.), who now, in contrast with Old Testament usage, becomes specifically the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost.

2. Applied to Christ:

In several passages the term is applied to Christ (Mr 1:24; Ac 3:14; 4:30, etc.), as being the very type of ethical perfection (compare Heb 7:26).

3. Applied to Things:

In keeping with the fact that things are holy in a derivative sense through their relationship to God, the word is used of Jerusalem (Mt 4:5), the Old Testament covenant (Lu 1:72), the Scriptures (Ro 1:2), the Law (Ro 7:12), the Mount of Transfiguration (2Pe 1:18), etc.

4. Applied to Christians:

But it is especially in its application to Christians that the idea of holiness meets us in the New Testament in a sense that is characteristic and distinctive. Christ's people are regularly called "saints" or holy persons, and holiness in the high ethical and spiritual meaning of the word is used to denote the appropriate quality of their life and conduct.

(1) As Separate from the World

No doubt, as applied to believers, "saints" conveys in the first place the notion of a separation from the world and a consecration to God. Just as Israel under the old covenant was a chosen race, so the Christian church in succeeding to Israel's privileges becomes a holy nation (1Pe 2:9), and the Christian individual, as one of the elect people, becomes a holy man or woman (Col 3:12). In Paul's usage all baptized persons are "saints," however far they may still be from the saintly character (compare 1Co 1:2,14 with 5:1 ff).

(2) As Bound to the Pursuit of an Ethical Ideal

But though the use of the name does not imply high ethical character as a realized fact, it always assumes it as an ideal and an obligation. It is taken for granted that the Holy Spirit has taken up His abode in the heart of every regenerate person, and that a work of positive sanctification is going on there. The New Testament leaves no room for the thought of a holiness divorced from those moral qualities which the holy God demands of those whom He has called to be His people.

See SANCTIFICATION.

LITERATURE.

Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, Lects. iii, iv; A. B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament, 145 ff; Schultz, Theology of the Old Testament, II, 167 ff; Orr, Sin as a Problem of Today, chapter iii; Sanday-Headlam, Romans, 12 ff; articles "Holiness" in HDB and "Heiligkeit Gottes im AT" in RE.

J. C. Lambert

HOLLOW

hol’-o (kaph, nabhabh): "Hollow" is the translation of kaph, "hollow" (Ge 32:25,32, "the hollow of his thigh," the hip-pan or socket, over the sciatic nerve); of nabhabh, "to be hollow" (Ex 27:8; 38:7; Jer 52:21); of sho‘-al, "hollow" (Isa 40:12, "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand?" (in handfuls; compare 1Ki 20:10; Eze 13:19)); of makhtesh, "a mortar," "socket of a tooth" (from its shape) (Jud 15:19, "God clave an (the Revised Version (British and American) "the") hollow place that is in Lehi"); of sheqa‘aruroth, probably from qa‘ar, "to sink" (Le 14:37, "the walls of the house with hollow strakes," so the English Revised Version, the American Standard Revised Version "hollow streaks," depressions); of koilotes (The Wisdom of Solomon 17:19, "the hollow mountains," the Revised Version (British and American) "hollows of the mountains"); of koiloma (2 Macc 1:19, "hollow place of a pit," the Revised Version (British and American) "hollow of a well"); of antrodes (2 Macc 2:5, "a hollow cave," the Revised Version (British and American) "a chamber in the rock," margin (Greek) "a cavernous chamber").

W. L. Walker

HOLM-TREE

hom’-tre:

(1) tirzah (Isa 44:14, the King James Version "cypress"): The name, from the root meaning (compare Arabic taraza) "to be hard," implies some very hard wood. Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) has ilex, which is Latin for holm oak, so named from its holly-like leaves (hollen in Old English =" holly"); this translation has now been adopted, but it is doubtful.

(2) prinos, Susanna verse 58. This is the ilex or holm oak. There is a play on the words prinos and prisai (literally, "saw") in verses 58 and 59 (see SUSANNA). The evergreen or holm oak is represented by two species in Palestine, Quercus ilex and Q. coccifera. The leaf of both species is somewhat like a small holly leaf, is glossy green and usually spiny. The Q. ilex is insignificant, but Q. coccifera is a magnificent tree growing to a height of 40 ft. or more, and often found in Palestine flourishing near sacred tombs, and itself not infrequently the object of superstitious veneration.

E. W. G. Masterman

HOLOFERNES

hol-o-fur’-nez (Olophernes): According to the Book of Judith, chief captain of Nebuchadnezzar, king of the Assyrians (Judith 2:4), who was commissioned to make war upon the West country and to receive from the inhabitants the usual tokens of complete submission, earth and water. The object of the expedition of Holofernes, who thus became the typical persecutor of the Jews, was to compel men everywhere to worship Nebuchadnezzar. He was slain by Judith, the heroine of the book of that name, during the siege of Bethulia. There is no notice of Holofernes except in the Book of Judith. The termination of the word would seem to indicate a Persian origin for the name. The Holofernes of Shakespeare and Rabelais is in no way connected with the deeds of the Holofernes of the Apocrypha.

J. Hutchison

HOLON

ho’-lon (cholon or chowlon):

(1) One of the towns in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:51) assigned to the Levites 21:15). In 1Ch 6:58 (Hebrew 43), it is HILEN (which see). The site may be the important ruins of Beit‘alam (see PEF, III, 313, 321, Sh XXI).

(2) Probably once an important town in the "plain," i.e. plateau, of Moab (Jer 48:21); the site is unknown.

HOLY GHOST

ho’-li gost.

See HOLY SPIRIT.

HOLY GHOST (SPIRIT), SIN AGAINST THE

See BLASPHEMY; HOLY SPIRIT, III, 1, (4).

HOLY OF HOLIES

ho’-liz (qodhesh ha-qodhashim, Ex 26:33, debhir, 1Ki 6:16, etc.; in the New Testament, hagia hagion, Heb 9:3): The name given to the innermost shrine, or adytum of the sanctuary of Yahweh.

1. In the Tabernacle:

The most holy place of the tabernacle in the wilderness (Ex 26:31-33) was a small cube of 10 cubits (15 ft.) every way. It was divided from the holy Ceiled by curtains which bore cherubic figures embroidered in blue and purple and scarlet (Ex 26:1), it contained no furniture but the Ark of the Covenant, covered by a slab of gold called the MERCY-SEAT (which see), and having within it only the two stone tables of the Law (see TABERNACLE; ARK OF THE COVENANT). Only the high priest, and he but once a year, on the great @@clothed in penitential garments, amid a cloud of incense, and with blood of sacrifice (Le 16; compare Heb 9:7).

2. In the Temple of Solomon:

The proportions of the most holy place in the first temple were the same as in the tabernacle, but the dimensions were doubled. The sacred chamber was enlarged to 20 cubits (30 ft.) each way. We now meet with the word debhir, "oracle" (1Ki 6:16, etc.), which with the exception of Ps 28:2, belonging perhaps to the same age, is met with in Scripture only in the period of Solomon’s reign. This sanctum, like its predecessor, contained but one piece of furniture—the Ark of the Covenant. It had, however, one new conspicuous feature in the two large figures of cherubim of olive wood, covered with gold, with wings stretching from wall to wall, beneath which the ark was now placed (1Ki 6:23-28; 2Ch 3:10-13; see TEMPLE).

3. In Later Times:

In Ezekiel’s temple plans, which in many things may have been those of the temple of Zerubbabel, the prophet gives 20 cubits as the length and breadth of the most holy place, showing that these figures were regarded as too sacred to undergo change (Eze 41:4). There was then no Ark of the Covenant, but Jewish tradition relates that the blood of the great Day of Atonement was sprinkled on an unhewn stone that stood in its place. In Herod’s temple, the dimensions of the two holy chambers remained the same—at least in length and breadth (see TEMPLE, HEROD’S). The holiest place continued empty. In the spoils of the temple depicted on the Arch of Titus there is no representation of the Ark of the Covenant; only of the furniture of the outer chamber or holy place.

4. Figurative:

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we are taught that the true holy of holies is the heaven into which Jesus has now entered to appear in virtue of His own sacrifice in the presence of God for us (Heb 9:11). Restriction is now removed, and the way into the holiest is made open for all His people (Heb 10:19,20).

W. Shaw Caldecott

HOLY ONE

See GOD, NAMES OF.

HOLY PLACE

(ha-qodhesh, Ex 26:33, ha-hekhal, 1Ki 6:17, etc.; he prote skene, Heb 9:6 f):

1. The Terms:

The tabernacle consisted of two divisions to which a graduated scale of holiness is attached: "The veil shall separate unto you between the holy place and the most holy" (Ex 26:33). This distinction was never abrogated. In the Epistle to the Hebrews these divisions are called the "first" and "second" tabernacles (Heb 9:6 f). The term "holy place" is not indeed confined to the outer chamber of the sanctuary; in Le 6:16, it is applied to "the court of the tent of meeting." But the other is its technical use. In Solomon's temple we have a different usage. The word hekhal, "temple," is not at first applied, as after, to the whole building, but is the designation specifically of the holy place, in distinction from the debhir, or "oracle" (compare 1Ki 6:3,5,16,17,33, etc.; so in Eze 41:1,2,4, etc.). The wider usage is later (compare 2Ki 11:10,11,13, etc.).

2. Size of the Holy Place:

The size of the holy place differed at different times. The holy place of the tabernacle was 20 cubits long by 10 broad and 10 high (30 x 15 x 15 ft.); that of Solomon's temple was twice this in length and breadth —40 by 20 cubits; but it is contended by many (Bahr, etc.) that in height it was the full internal height of the building—30 cubits; the Herodian temple has the same dimensions of length and breadth, but Josephus and Middoth give largely increased, though differing, numbers for the height (see TEMPLE, HEROD'S).

3. Contents of Holy Place:

The contents of the holy place were from the beginning ordered to be these (Ex 25:23 ff; 30:1-10): the altar of incense, a golden candlestick (in Solomon's temple increased to ten, 1Ki 7:49), and a table of showbread (likewise increased to ten, 2Ch 4:8). For the construction, position, history and uses of these objects, see TABERNACLE; TEMPLE, and articles under the several headings. This, as shown by Josephus and by the sculptures on the Arch of Titus, continued to be the furniture of the holy place till the end.

4. Symbolism:

As the outer division of the sanctuary, into which, as yet, not the people, but only their representatives in the priesthood, were admitted while yet the symbols of the people's consecrated life (prayer, light, thanksgiving) were found in it, the holy place may be said to represent the people's relation to God in the earthly life, as the holy of holies represented God's relation to the people in a perfected communion. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the holy place is not largely dwelt on as compared with the court in which

the perfect sacrifice was offered, and the holiest of all into which Christ has now entered (Christ passes "through" the tabernacle into the holiest, 9:11). It pertains, however, evidently to the earthly sphere of Christ's manifestation, even as earth is the present scene of the church's fellowship. Through earth, by the way which Christ has opened up, the believer, already in spirit, finally in fact, passes with Him into the holiest (Heb 10:19; compare Heb 9:8; see Westcott, Hebrews, 233 ff).

W. Shaw Caldecott

HOLY SPIRIT, 1

ho'-li spir'-it:

I. OLD TESTAMENT TEACHINGS AS TO THE SPIRIT

1. Meaning of the Word

2. The Spirit in Relation to the Godhead

3. The Spirit in External Nature

4. The Spirit of God In Man

5. Imparting Powers for Service

(1) Judges and Warriors

(2) Wisdom for Various Purposes

(3) In Prophecy

6. Imparting Moral Character

7. The Spirit in in the Messiah

8. Predictions of Future Outpouring of the Spirit

II. THE SPIRIT IN THE NON-CANONICAL LITERATURE

1. The Spirit in Josephus

2. The Spirit in the Pseudepigrapha

3. The Spirit in the Wisdom of Solomon

4. The Spirit in Philo

III. THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. In Relation to the Person and Work of Christ

(1) Birth of Jesus

(2) Baptism of Jesus

(3) Temptation of Jesus

(4) Public Ministry of Jesus

(5) Death and Resurrection and Pentecostal Gift

2. The Holy Spirit in the Kingdom of God

(1) Synoptic Teachings

(2) In the Writings of John

(3) In Acts

(4) In Paul’s Writings

(a) The Spirit and Jesus

(b) In Bestowing Charismatic Gifts

(c) In the Beginnings of the Christian Life

(d) In the Religious and Moral Life

(e) In the Church

(f) In the Resurrection of Believers

(5) The Holy Spirit in Other New Testament Writings

LITERATURE

The expression Spirit, or Spirit of God, or Holy Spirit, is found in the great majority of the books of the Bible. In the Old Testament the Hebrew word uniformly employed for the Spirit as referring to God's Spirit is ruach meaning "breath," "wind" or "breeze." The verb form of the word is ruach, or riach used only in the Hiphil and meaning "to breathe," "to blow." A kindred verb is rawach, meaning "to breathe" "having breathing room," "to be spacious," etc. The word always used in the New Testament for the Spirit is the Greek neuter noun pneuma, with or without the article, and for Holy Spirit, pneuma hagion, or to pneuma to hagion. In the New Testament we find also the expressions, "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of the Lord," "the Spirit of the Father," "the Spirit of Jesus," "of Christ." The word for Spirit in the Greek is from the verb pneo, "to breathe," "to blow." The corresponding word in the Latin is spiritus, meaning "spirit."

I. Old Testament Teachings as to the Spirit.

1. Meaning of the Word:

At the outset we note the significance of the term itself. From the primary meaning of the word which is "wind," as referring to Nature, arises the idea of breath in man and thence the breath, wind or Spirit of God. We have no way of tracing exactly how the minds of the Biblical writers connected the earlier literal meaning of the word with the Divine Spirit. Nearly all shades of meaning from the lowest to the highest appear in the Old Testament, and it is not difficult to conceive how the original narrower meaning was gradually expanded into the larger and wider. The following are some of the shades of Old Testament usage. From the notion of wind or breath, ruach came to signify:

(1) the principle of life itself; spirit in this sense indicated the degree of vitality: "My spirit is consumed, my days are extinct" (Job 17:1; also Jud 15:19; 1Sa 30:12);

(2) human feelings of various kinds, as anger (Jud 8:3; Pr 29:11), desire (Isa 26:9), courage (Jos 2:11);

(3) intelligence (Ex 28:3; Isa 29:24);

(4) general disposition (Ps 34:18; 5l:17; Pr 14:29; 16:18; 29:23).

No doubt the Biblical writers thought of man as made in the image of God (Ge 1:27 f), and it was easy for them to think of God as being like man. It is remarkable that their anthropomorphism did not go farther. They preserve, however, a highly spiritual conception of God as compared with that of surrounding nations. But as the human breath was an invisible part of man, and as it represented his vitality, his life and energy, it was easy to transfer the conception to God in the effort to represent His

energetic and transitive action upon man and Nature. The Spirit of God, therefore, as based upon the idea of the ruach or breath of man, originally stood for the energy or power of God (Isa 31:3; compare A. B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament, 117-18), as contrasted with the weakness of the flesh.

2. The Spirit in Relation to the Godhead:

We consider next the Spirit of God in relation to God Himself in the Old Testament. Here there are several points to be noted. The first is that there is no indication of a belief that the Spirit of God was a material particle or emanation from God. The point of view of Biblical writers is nearly always practical rather than speculative. They did not philosophize about the Divine nature. Nevertheless, they retained a very clear distinction between spirit and flesh or other material forms. Again we observe in the Old Testament both an identification of God and the Spirit of God, and also a clear distinction between them. The identification is seen in Ps 139:7 where the omni-presence of the Spirit is declared, and in Isa 63:10; Jer 31:33; Eze 36:27. In a great number of passages, however, God and the Spirit of God are not thought of as identical, as in Ge 1:2; 6:3; Ne 9:20; Ps 51:11; 104:29 f. Of course this does not mean that God and the Spirit of God were two distinct beings in the thought of Old Testament writers, but only that the Spirit had functions of His own in distinction from God. The Spirit was God in action, particularly when the action was specific, with a view to accomplishing some particular end or purpose of God. The Spirit came upon individuals for special purposes. The Spirit was thus God immanent in man and in the world. As the angel of the Lord, or angel of the Covenant in certain passages, represents both Yahweh Himself and one sent by Yahweh, so in like manner the Spirit of Yahweh was both Yahweh within or upon man, and at the same time one sent by Yahweh to man.

Do the Old Testament teachings indicate that in the view of the writers the Spirit of Yahweh was a distinct person in the Divine nature? The passage in Ge 1:26 is scarcely conclusive. The idea and importance of personality were but slowly developed in Israelite thought. Not until some of the later prophets did it receive great emphasis, and even then scarcely in the fully developed form. The statement in Ge 1:26 may be taken as the plural of majesty or as referring to the Divine council, and on this account is not conclusive for the Trinitarian view. Indeed, there are no Old Testament passages which compel us to understand the complete New Testament doctrine of the Trinity and the distinct personality of the Spirit in the New Testament sense. There are, however, numerous Old Testament passages which are in harmony with the Trinitarian conception and prepare the way for it, such as Ps 139:7; Isa 63:10; 48:16; Hag 2:5; Zec 4:6. The Spirit is grieved, vexed, etc., and in other ways is conceived of personally, but as He is God in action, God exerting power, this was the natural way for the Old Testament writers to think of the Spirit.

The question has been raised as to how the Biblical writers were able to hold the conception of the Spirit of God without violence to their monotheism. A suggested reply is that the idea of the Spirit came gradually and indirectly from the conception of subordinate gods which prevailed among some of the surrounding nations (I.F. Wood, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature, 30). But the best Israelite thought developed in opposition to, rather than in analogy with, polytheism. A more natural explanation seems to be that their simple anthropomorphism led them to conceive the Spirit of God as the breath of God parallel with the conception of man’s breath as being part of man and yet going forth from him.

3. The Spirit in External Nature:

We consider next the Spirit of God in external Nature. "And the Spirit of God moved (was brooding or hovering) upon the face of the waters" (Ge 1:2). The figure is that of a brooding or hovering bird (compare De 32:11). Here the Spirit brings order and beauty out of the primeval chaos and conducts the cosmic forces toward the goal of an ordered universe. Again in Ps 104:28-30, God sends forth His Spirit, and visible things are called into being: "Thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the ground." In Job 26:13 the beauty of the heavens is ascribed to the Spirit: "By his Spirit the heavens are garnished." In Isa 32:15 the wilderness becomes a fruitful field as the result of the outpouring of the Spirit. The Biblical writers scarcely took into their thinking the idea of second causes, certainly not in the modern scientific sense. They regarded the phenomena of Nature as the result of God’s direct action through His Spirit. At every point their conception of the Spirit saved them from pantheism on the one hand and polytheism on the other.

4. The Spirit of God in Man:

The Spirit may next be considered in imparting natural powers both physical and intellectual. In Ge 2:7 God originates man’s personal and intellectual life by breathing into his nostrils "the breath of life." In Nu 16:22 God is "the God of the spirits of all flesh." In Ex 28:3; 31:3; 35:31, wisdom for all kinds of workmanship is declared to be the gift of God. So also physical life is due to the presence of the Spirit of God (Job 27:3); . and Elihu declares (Job 33:4) that the Spirit of God made him. See also Eze 37:14 and 39:29. Thus man is regarded by the Old Testament writers, in all the parts of his being, body, mind and spirit, as the direct result of the action of the Spirit of God. In Ge 6:3 the Spirit of God "strives" with or "rules" in or is "humbled" in man in the antediluvian world. Here reference is not made to the Spirit’s activity over and above, but within the moral nature of man.

5. Imparting Powers for Service:

The greater part of the Old Testament passages which refer to the Spirit of God deal with the subject from the point of view of the covenant relations between Yahweh and Israel. And the greater portion of these, in turn, have to do with gifts and powers conferred by the Spirit for service in the ongoing of the kingdom of God. We fail to grasp the full meaning of very many statements of the Old Testament unless we keep constantly in mind the fundamental assumption of all the Old Testament, namely, the covenant relations between God and Israel. Extraordinary powers exhibited by Israelites of whatever kind were usually attributed to the Spirit. These are so numerous that our limits of space forbid an exhaustive presentation. The chief points we may notice.

(1) Judges and Warriors.

The children of Israel cried unto Yahweh and He raised up a savior for them, Othniel, the son of Kenaz: "And the Spirit of Yahweh came upon him, and he judged Israel" (Jud 3:10). So also Gideon (Jud 6:34):

"The Spirit of Yahweh came upon (literally, clothed itself with) Gideon." In Jud 11:29 "the spirit of Yahweh came upon Jephthah"; and in 13:25 "the Spirit of Yahweh began to move" Samson. In 14:6 "the Spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon him." In 1Sa 16:14 we read "the Spirit of Yahweh departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from Yahweh troubled him." In all this class of passages, the Spirit imparts special endowments of power without necessary reference to the moral character of the recipient. The end in view is not personal, merely to the agent, but concerns theocratic kingdom and implies the covenant between God and Israel. In some cases the Spirit exerts physical energy in a more direct way (2Ki 2:16; Eze 2:1 f; 3:12).

(2) Wisdom for Various Purposes.

Bezalel is filled with the Spirit of God in wisdom and in understanding to work in gold, and silver and brass, etc., in the building of the tabernacle (Ex 31:2-4; 35:31); and the Spirit of wisdom is given to others in making Aaron's garments (Ex 28:3). So also of one of the builders of Solomon's temple (1Ki 7:14; 2Ch 2:14). In these cases there seems to be a combination of the thought of natural talents and skill to which is superadded a special endowment of the Spirit. Pharaoh refers to Joseph as one in whom the Spirit of God is, as fitting him for administration and government (Ge 41:38). Joshua is qualified for leadership by the Spirit (Nu 27:18). In this and in De 34:9, Joshua is represented as possessing the Spirit through the laying on of the hands of Moses. This is an interesting Old Testament parallel to the bestowment of the Spirit by laying on of hands in the New Testament (Ac 8:17; 19:6). Daniel is represented as having wisdom to interpret dreams through the Spirit, and afterward because of the Spirit he is exalted to a position of authority and power (Da 4:8; 5:11-14; 6:3). The Spirit qualifies Zerubbabel to rebuild the temple (Zec 4:6). The Spirit was given to the people for instruction and strengthening during the wilderness wanderings (Ne 9:20), and to the elders along with Moses (Nu 11:17,25). It thus appears how very widespread were the activities of the redemptive Spirit, or the Spirit in the covenant. All these forms of the Spirit's action bore in some way upon the national life of the people, and were directed in one way or another toward theocratic ends.

(3) In Prophecy.

The most distinctive and important manifestation of the Spirit's activity in the Old Testament was in the sphere of prophecy. In the earlier period the prophet was called seer (ro'eh), and later he was called prophet (nabhi'). The word "prophet" (prophetes) means one who speaks for God. The prophets were very early differentiated from the masses of the people into a prophetic class or order, although Abraham himself was called a prophet, as were Moses and other leaders (Ge 20:7; De 18:15). The prophet was especially distinguished from others as the man who possessed the Spirit of God (Ho 9:7). The prophets ordinarily began their messages with the phrase, "thus saith Yahweh," or its equivalent. But they ascribed their messages directly also to the Spirit of God (Eze 2:2; 8:3; 11:1,24; 13:3). The case of Balaam presents some difficulties (Nu 24:2). He does not seem to have been a genuine prophet, but rather a diviner, although it is declared that the Spirit of God came upon him. Balaam serves, however, to illustrate the Old Testament point of view. The chief interest was the national or theocratic or covenant ideal, not that of the individual. The Spirit was bestowed at times upon unworthy men for the achievement of these ends. Saul presents a similar example. The prophet was God's messenger speaking

God’s message by the Spirit. His message was not his own. It came directly from God, and at times overpowered the prophet with its urgency, as in the case of Jeremiah (1:4 ff).

There are quite perceptible stages in the development of the Old Testament prophecy. In the earlier period the prophet was sometimes moved, not so much to intelligible speech, as by a sort of enthusiasm or prophetic ecstasy. In 1Sa 10 we have an example of this earlier form of prophecy, where a company with musical instruments prophesied together. To what extent this form of prophetic enthusiasm was attended by warnings and exhortations, if so attended at all, we do not know. There was more in it than in the excitement of the diviners and devotees of the surrounding nations. For the Spirit of Yahweh was its source.

In the later period we have prophecy in its highest forms in the Old Testament. The differences between earlier and later prophecy are probably due in part to the conditions. The early period required action, the later required teaching. The judges on whom the Spirit came were deliverers in a turbulent age. There was not need for, nor could the people have borne, the higher ethical and spiritual truths which came in later revelations through the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and others. See 2Sa 23:2; Eze 2:2; 8:3; 11:24; 13:3; . Mic 3:8; Ho 9:7.

A difficulty arises from statements such as the following: A lying spirit was sometimes present in the prophet (1Ki 22:21 f); Yahweh puts a spirit in the king of Assyria and turns him back to his destruction (Isa 37:7); because of sin, a lying prophet should serve the people (Mic 2:11); in Micaiah’s vision Yahweh sends a spirit to entice Ahab through lying prophets (1Ki 22:19); an evil spirit from Yahweh comes upon Saul (1Sa 16:14; 18:10; 19:9). The following considerations may be of value in explaining these passages. Yahweh was the source of things generally in Old Testament thought. Its pronounced monotheism appears in this as in so many other ways. Besides this, Old Testament writers usually spoke phenomenally. Prophecy was a particular form of manifestation with certain outward marks and signs. Whatever presented these outward marks was called prophecy, whether the message conveyed was true or false. The standard of discrimination here was not the outward signs of the prophet, but the truth or right of the message as shown by the event. As to the evil spirit from Yahweh, it may be explained in either of two ways. First, it may have referred to the evil disposition of the man upon whom God’s Spirit was acting, in which case he would resist the Spirit and his own spirit would be the evil spirit. Or the "evil spirit from Yahweh" may have referred, in the prophet’s mind, to an actual spirit of evil which Yahweh sent or permitted to enter the man. The latter is the more probable explanation, in accordance with which the prophet would conceive that Yahweh’s higher will was accomplished, even through the action of the evil spirit upon man’s spirit. Yahweh’s judicial anger against transgression would, to the prophet’s mind, justify the sending of an evil spirit by Yahweh.

6. Imparting Moral Character:

The activity of the Spirit in the Old Testament is not limited to gifts for service. Moral and spiritual character is traced to the Spirit’s operations as well. "Thy holy Spirit" (Ps 51:11); "his holy spirit" (Isa 63:10); "thy good Spirit" (Ne 9:20); "Thy Spirit is good" (Ps 143:10) are expressions pointing to the

ethical quality of the Spirit's action. "Holy" is from the verb form (qadhash), whose root meaning is doubtful, but which probably meant "to be separated" from which it comes to mean to be exalted, and this led to the conception to be Divine. And as Yahweh is morally good, the conception of "the holy (= Divine) one" came to signify the holy one in the moral sense. Thence the word was applied to the Spirit of Yahweh. Yahweh gives His good Spirit for instruction (Ne 9:20); the Spirit is called good because it teaches to do God's will (Ps 143:10); the Spirit gives the fear of the Lord (Isa 11:2-5); judgment and righteousness (Isa 32:15); devotion to the Lord (Isa 44:3-5); hearty obedience and a new heart (Eze 36:26 f); penitence and prayer (Zec 12:10). In Ps 51:11 there is an intense sense of guilt and sin coupled with the prayer, "Take not thy holy Spirit from me." Thus, we see that the Old Testament in numerous ways recognizes the Holy Spirit as the source of inward moral purity, although the thought is not so developed as in the New Testament.

7. The Spirit in the Messiah:

In both the first and the second sections of Isaiah, there are distinct references to the Spirit in connection with the Messiah, although the Messiah is conceived as the ideal King who springs from the root of David in some instances, and in others as the Suffering Servant of Yahweh. This is not the place to discuss the Messianic import of the latter group of passages which has given rise to much difference of opinion. As in the case of the ideal Davidic King which, in the prophet's mind, passes from the lower to the higher and Messianic conception, so, under the form of the Suffering Servant, the "remnant" of Israel becomes the basis for an ideal which transcends in the Messianic sense the original nucleus of the conception derived from the historic events in the history of Israel. The prophet rises in the employment of both conceptions to the thought of the Messiah who is the "anointed" of Yahweh as endued especially with the power and wisdom of the Spirit. In Isa 11:1-5 a glowing picture is given of the "shoot out of the stock of Jesse." The Spirit imparts "wisdom and understanding" and endows him with manifold gifts through the exercise of which he shall bring in the kingdom of righteousness and peace. In Isa 42:1 ff, the "servant" is in like manner endowed most richly with the gifts of the Spirit by virtue of which he shall bring forth "justice to the Gentiles." In Isa 61:1 ff occur the notable words cited by Jesus in Lu 4:18 f, beginning, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me" etc. In these passages the prophet describes elaborately and minutely the Messiah's endowment with a wide range of powers, all of which are traced to the action of God's Spirit.

8. Predictions of Future Outpouring of the Spirit:

In the later history of Israel, when the sufferings of the exile pressed heavily, there arose a tendency to idealize a past age as the era of the special blessing of the Spirit, coupled with a very marked optimism as to a future outpouring of the Spirit. In Hag 2:5 reference is made to the Mosaic period as the age of the Spirit, "when ye came out of Egypt, and my Spirit abode among you." In Isa 44:3 the Spirit is to be poured out on Jacob and his seed; and in Isa 59:20 a Redeemer is to come to Zion under the covenant of Yahweh, and the Spirit is to abide upon the people. The passage, however, which especially indicates the transition from Old Testament to New Testament times is that in Joe 2:28,32 which is cited by Peter in Ac 2:17-21. In this prophecy the bestowal of the Spirit is extended to all classes, is attended by marvelous signs and is accompanied by the gift of salvation. Looking back from the later to the earlier

period of Old Testament history, we observe a twofold tendency of teaching in relation to the Spirit. The first is from the outward gift of the Spirit for various uses toward a deepening sense of inner need of the Spirit for moral purity, and consequent emphasis upon the ethical energy of the Spirit. The second tendency is toward a sense of the futility of the merely human or theocratic national organization in and of itself to achieve the ends of Yahweh, along with a sense of the need for the Spirit of God upon the people generally, and a prediction of the universal diffusion of the Spirit.

II. The Spirit in Non-Canonical Jewish Literature.

In the Palestinian and Alexandrian literature of the Jews there are comparatively few references to the Spirit of God. The two books in which the teachings as to the Spirit are most explicit and most fully developed are of Alexandrian origin, namely, The Wisdom of Solomon and the writings of Philo.

In the Old Testament Apocrypha and in Josephus the references to the Spirit are nearly always merely echoes of a long-past age when the Spirit was active among men. In no particular is the contrast between the canonical and noncanonical literature more striking than in the teaching as to the Spirit of God. 1. The Spirit of Josephus:

Josephus has a number of references to the Holy Spirit, but nearly always they have to do with the long-past history of Israel. He refers to 22 books of the Old Testament which are of the utmost reliability. There are other books, but none "of like authority," because there has "not been an exact succession of prophets" (Josephus, Against Apion I, 8). Samuel is described as having a large place in the affairs of the kingdom because he is a prophet (Ant., VI, v, 6). God appears to Solomon in sleep and teaches him wisdom (ibid., VIII, ii); Balaam prophesies through the Spirit’s power (ibid., IV, v, 6); and Moses was such a prophet that his words were God’s words (ibid., IV, viii, 49). In Josephus we have then simply a testimony to the inspiration and power of the prophets and the books written by them, in so far as we have in him teachings regarding the Spirit of God. Even here the action of the Spirit is usually implied rather than expressed.

2. The Spirit in the Pseudepigrapha:

In the pseudepigraphic writings the Spirit of God is usually referred to as acting in the long-past history of Israel or in the future Messianic age. In the apocalyptic books, the past age of power, when the Spirit wrought mightily, becomes the ground of the hopes of the future. The past is glorified, and out of it arises the hope of a future kingdom of glory and power. Enoch says to Methuselah: "The word calls me and the Spirit is poured out upon me" (En 91:1). In 49:1-4 the Messiah has the Spirit of wisdom, understanding and might. Enoch is represented as describing his own translation. "He was carried aloft in the chariots of the Spirit" (En 70:2). In Jubilees 31:16 Isaac is represented as prophesying, and in 25:13 it is said of Rebekah that the" Holy Spirit descended into her mouth." Sometimes the action of the Spirit is closely connected with the moral life, although this is rare. "The Spirit of God rests" on the man of pure and loving heart (XII the Priestly Code (P), Benj. 8). In Simeon 4 it is declared that Joseph was a good man and that the Spirit of God rested on him. There appears at times a lament for the departed age

of prophecy (1 Macc 9:27; 14:41). The future is depicted in glowing colors. The Spirit is to come in a future judgment (XII the Priestly Code (P), Levi 18); and the spirit of holiness shall rest upon the redeemed in Paradise (Levi 18); and in Levi 2 the spirit of insight is given, and the vision of the sinful world and its salvation follows. Generally speaking, this literature is far below that of the Old Testament, both in moral tone and religious insight. Much of it seems childish, although at times we encounter noble passages. There is lacking in it the prevailing Old Testament mood which is best described as prophetic, in which the writer feels constrained by the power of God's Spirit to speak or write. The Old Testament literature thus possesses a vitality and power which accounts for the strength of its appeal to our religious consciousness.

3. The Spirit in the Wisdom of Solomon:

We note in the next place a few teachings as to the Spirit of God in Wisd. Here the ethical element in character is a condition of the Spirit's indwelling. "Into a malicious soul wisdom shall not enter: nor dwell in the body that is subject unto sin. For the holy spirit of discipline will flee deceit, and will not abide when unrighteousness cometh in" (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:4 f). This "holy spirit of discipline" is evidently God's Holy Spirit, for in 1:7 the writer proceeds to assert, "For the Spirit of the Lord filleth the world," and in 1:8,9 there is a return to the conception of unrighteousness as a hindrance to right speaking. In The Wisdom of Solomon 7:7 the Spirit of Wisdom comes in response to prayer. In 7:22-30 is an elaborate and very beautiful description of wisdom: "In her is an understanding spirit, holy, one only, manifold, subtle, lively, clear, undefiled, plain, not subject to hurt, loving the thing that is good, quick, which cannot be letted, ready to do good, kind to man, steadfast, sure," etc. "She is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God, and the image of his goodness," etc. No one can know God's counsel except by the Holy Spirit (9:17). The writer of The Wisdom of Solomon was deeply possessed of the sense of the omnipresence of the Spirit of God, as seen in 1:7 and in 12:1. In the latter passage we read: "For thine incorruptible spirit is in all things."

4. The Spirit in Philo:

In Philo we have what is almost wholly wanting in other Jewish literature, namely, analytic and reflective thought upon the work of the Spirit of God. The interest in Philo is primarily philosophic, and his teachings on the Spirit possess special interest on this account in contrast with Biblical and other extra-Biblical literature. In his Questions and Solutions, 27, 28, he explains the expression in Ge 8:1: "He brought a breath over the earth and the wind ceased." He argues that water is not diminished by wind, but only agitated and disturbed. Hence, there must be a reference to God's Spirit or breath by which the whole universe obtains security. He has a similar discussion of the point why the word "Spirit" is not used instead of "breath" in Ge in the account of man's creation, and concludes that "to breathe into" here means to "inspire," and that God by His Spirit imparted to man mental and moral life and capacity for Divine things (Allegories, xiii). In several passages Philo discusses prophecy and the prophetic office. One of the most interesting relates to the prophetic office of Moses (Life of Moses, xxiii ff). He also describes a false prophet who claims to be "inspired and possessed by the Holy Spirit" (On Those Who Offer Sacrifice, xi). In a very notable passage, Philo describes in detail his own subjective experiences under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and his language is that of the intellectual

mystic. He says that at times he found himself devoid of impulse or capacity for mental activity, when suddenly by the coming of the Spirit of God, his intellect was rendered very fruitful: "and sometimes when I have come to my work empty I have suddenly become full, ideas being, in an invisible manner, showered upon me and implanted in me from on high; so that through the influence of Divine inspiration I have become greatly excited and have known neither the place in which I was, nor those who were present, nor myself, nor what I was saying, nor what I was writing," etc. (Migrations of Abraham, vii).

In Philo, as in the non-canonical literature generally, we find little metaphysical teaching as to the Spirit and His relations to the Godhead. On this point there is no material advance over the Old Testament teaching. The agency of the Holy Spirit in shaping and maintaining the physical universe and as the source of man's capacities and powers is clearly recognized in Philo. In Philo, as in Josephus, the conception of inspiration as the complete occupation and domination of the prophet's mind by the Spirit of God, even to the extent of suspending the operation of the natural powers, comes clearly into view. This is rather in contrast with, than in conformity to, the Old Testament and New Testament conception of inspiration, in which the personality of the prophet remains intensely active while under the influence of the Spirit, except possibly in cases of vision and trance.

HOLY SPIRIT, 2

III. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.

In the New Testament there is unusual symmetry and completeness of teaching as to the work of the Spirit of God in relation to the Messiah Himself, and to the founding of the Messianic kingdom. The simplest mode of presentation will be to trace the course of the progressive activities of the Spirit, or teachings regarding these activities, as these are presented to us in the New Testament literature as we now have it, so far as the nature of the subject will permit. This will, of course, disturb to some extent the chronological order in which the New Testament books were written, since in some cases, as in John's Gospel, a very late book contains early teachings as to the Spirit.

1. In Relation to the Person and Work of Christ:

(1) Birth of Jesus.

In Mt 1:18 Mary is found with child "of the Holy Spirit" (ek pneumatos hagiou); an angel tells Joseph that that "which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit" (1:20), all of which is declared to be in fulfillment of the prophecy that a virgin shall bring forth a son whose name shall be called Immanuel (Isa 7:14). In Lu 1:35 the angel says to Mary that the Holy Spirit (pneuma hagion) shall come upon her, and the power of the Most High (dunamis Hupsistou) shall overshadow her. Here "Holy Spirit" and "power of the Most High" are parallel expressions meaning the same thing; in the one case emphasizing the Divine source and in the other the holiness of "the holy thing which is begotten" (1:35). In connection with the presentation of the babe in the temple, Simeon is described as one upon whom the Holy Spirit rested, to whom revelation was made through the Spirit and who came into the temple in the

Spirit (Lu 2:25-28). So also Anna the prophetess speaks concerning the babe, evidently in Luke's thought, under the influence of the Holy Spirit (Lu 2:36).

It is clear from the foregoing that the passages in Matthew and Luke mean to set forth, first, the supernatural origin, and secondly, the sinlessness of the babe born of Mary. The act of the Holy Spirit is regarded as creative, although the words employed signify "begotten" or "born" (gennethen, Mt 1:20; and gennomenon, Lu 1:35). There is no hint in the stories of the nativity concerning the pretemporal existence of Christ. This doctrine was developed later. Nor is there any suggestion of the immaculate conception or sinlessness of Mary, the mother of our Lord. Dr. C.A. Briggs has set forth a theory of the sinlessness of Mary somewhat different from the Roman Catholic view, to the effect that the Old Testament prophecies foretell the purification of the Davidic line, and that Mary was the culminating point in the purifying process, who thereby became sinless (Incarnation of the Lord, 230-34). This, however, is speculative and without substantial Biblical warrant. The sinlessness of Jesus was not due to the sinlessness of His mother, but to the Divine origin of His human nature, the Spirit of God.

In Heb 10:5 ff the writer makes reference to the sinless body of Christ as affording a perfect offering for sins. No direct reference is made to the birth of Jesus, but the origin of His body is ascribed to God (Heb 10:5), though not specifically to the Holy Spirit.

(2) Baptism of Jesus.

The New Testament records give us very little information regarding the growth of Jesus to manhood. In Lu 2:40 ff a picture is given of the boyhood, exceedingly brief, but full of significance. The "child grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom (m "becoming full of wisdom"): and the grace of God was upon him." Then follows the account of the visit to the temple. Evidently in all these experiences, the boy is under the influence and guidance of the Spirit. This alone would supply an adequate explanation, although Luke does not expressly name the Spirit as the source of these particular experiences. The Spirit's action is rather assumed.

Great emphasis, however, is given to the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at His baptism. Mt 3:16 declares that after His baptism "the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon him." Mr 1:10 repeats the statement in substantially equivalent terms. Lu 3:22 declares that the Spirit descended in "bodily form, as a dove" (somatiko eidei hos peristeran). In Joh 1:32,33 the Baptist testifies that he saw the Spirit descending upon Jesus as a dove out of heaven, and that it abode upon Him, and, further, that this descent of the Spirit was the mark by which he was to recognize Jesus as "he that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit."

We gather from these passages that at the baptism there was a new communication of the Spirit to Jesus in great fullness, as a special anointing for His Messianic vocation. The account declares that the dovelike appearance was seen by Jesus as well as John, which is scarcely compatible with a subjective experience merely. Of course, the dove here is to be taken as a symbol, and not as an assertion that God's Spirit assumed the form of a dove actually. Various meanings have been assigned to the symbol.

One connects it with the creative power, according to a Gentileusage; others with the speculative philosophy of Alexandrian Judaism, according to which the dove symbolized the Divine wisdom or reason. But the most natural explanation connects the symbolism of the dove with the brooding or hovering of the Spirit in Ge 13. In this new spiritual creation of humanity, as in the first physical creation, the Spirit of God is the energy through which the work is carried on. Possibly the dove, as a living organism, complete in itself, may suggest the totality and fullness of the gift of the Spirit to Jesus. At Pentecost, on the contrary, the Spirit is bestowed distributively and partially at least to individuals as such, as suggested by the cloven tongues as of fire which "sat upon each one of them" (Ac 2:3). Joh 3:34 emphasizes the fullness of the bestowal upon Jesus: "For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God: for he giveth not the Spirit by measure." In the witness of the Baptist the permanence of the anointing of Jesus is declared: "Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and abiding" (1:33).

It is probable that the connection of the bestowal of the Spirit with water baptism, as seen later in the Book of Acts, is traceable to the reception of the Spirit by Jesus at His own baptism. Baptism in the Spirit did not supersede water baptism.

The gift of the Spirit in fullness to Jesus at His baptism was no doubt His formal and public anointing for His Messianic work (Ac 10:38). The baptism of Jesus could not have the same significance with that of sinful men. For the symbolic cleansing from sin had no meaning for the sinless one. Yet as an act of formal public consecration it was appropriate to the Messiah. It brought to a close His private life and introduced Him to His public Messianic career. The conception of an anointing for public service was a familiar one in the Old Testament writings and applied to the priest (Ex 28:41; 40:13; Le 4:3,5,16; 6:20,22); to kings (1Sa 9:16; 10:1; 15:1; 16:3,13); sometimes to prophets (1Ki 19:16; compare Isa 61:1; Ps 2:2; 20:6). These anointings were with oil, and the oil came to be regarded as a symbol of the Spirit of God.

The anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit qualified Him in two particulars for His Messianic office.

(a) It was the source of His own endowments of power for the endurance of temptation, for teaching, for casting out demons, and healing the sick, for His sufferings and death, for His resurrection and ascension. The question is often raised, why Jesus, the Divine one, should have needed the Holy Spirit for His Messianic vocation. The reply is that His human nature, which was real, required the Spirit’s presence. Man, made in God’s image, is constituted in dependence upon the Spirit of God. Apart from God’s Spirit man fails of his true destiny, simply because our nature is constituted as dependent upon the indwelling Spirit of God for the performance of our true functions. Jesus as human, therefore, required the presence of God’s Spirit, notwithstanding His Divine-human consciousness.

(b) The Holy Spirit’s coming upon Jesus in fullness also qualified Him to bestow the Holy Spirit upon His disciples. John the Baptist especially predicts that it is He who shall baptize in the Holy Spirit (Mt 3:11; Mr 18; Lu 3:16; see also Joh 20:22; Ac 15$). It was especially true of the king that He was anointed for His office, and the term Messiah (mashiach, equivalent to the Greek ho Christos), meaning

the Anointed One, points to this fact.

(3) Temptation of Jesus.

The facts as to the temptation are as follows: In Mt 4:1 we are told that Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. Mr 1:12 declares in his graphic way that after the baptism "straightway the Spirit driveth (ekballei) him forth into the wilderness." Lu 4:1 more fully declares that Jesus was "full of the Holy Spirit," and that He was "led in the Spirit in the wilderness during 40 days." The impression which the narratives of the temptation give is of energetic spiritual conflict. As the Messiah confronted His life task He was subject to the ordinary conditions of other men in an evil world. Not by sheer divinity and acting from without as God, but as human also and a part of the world, He must overcome, so that while He was sinless, it was nevertheless true that the righteousness of Jesus was also an achieved righteousness. The temptations were no doubt such as were peculiar to His Messianic vocation, the misuse of power, the presumption of faith and the appeal of temporal splendor. To these He opposes the restraint of power, the poise of faith and the conception of a kingdom wholly spiritual in its origin, means and ends. Jesus is hurled, as it were, by the Spirit into this terrific conflict with the powers of evil, and His conquest, like the temptations themselves, was not final, but typical and representative. It is a mistake to suppose that the temptations of Jesus ended at the close of the forty days. Later in His ministry, He refers to the disciples as those who had been with Him in His temptations (Lu 22:28). The temptations continued throughout His life, though, of course, the wilderness temptations were the severest test of all, and the victory there contained in principle and by anticipation later victories. Comment has been made upon the absence of reference to the Holy Spirit's influence upon Jesus in certain remarkable experiences, which in the case of others would ordinarily have been traced directly to the Spirit, as in Lu 11:14 ff, etc. (compare the article by James Denney in DCG, I, 732, 734). Is it not true, however, that the point of view of the writers of the Gospels is that Jesus is always under the power of the Spirit? At His baptism, in the temptation, and at the beginning of His public ministry (Lu 4:14) very special stress is placed upon the fact. Thenceforward the Spirit's presence and action are assumed. From time to time, reference is made to the Spirit for special reasons, but the action of the Spirit in and through Jesus is always assumed.

(4) Public Ministry of Jesus.

Here we can select only a few points to illustrate a much larger truth. The writers of the Gospels, and especially Luke, conceived of the entire ministry of Jesus as under the power of the Holy Spirit. After declaring that Jesus was "full of the Holy Spirit" and that He was led about by the Spirit in the wilderness forty days in 4:1, he declares, in 4:14, that Jesus "returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee." This is followed in the next verse by a general summary of His activities: "And he taught in their synagogues, being glorified of all." Then, as if to complete his teaching as to the relation of the Spirit to Jesus, he narrates the visit to Nazareth and the citation by Jesus in the synagogue there of Isaiah's words beginning, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," with the detailed description of His Messianic activity, namely, preaching to the poor, announcement of release to the captives, recovering of sight to the blind, and to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord (Isa 61:1 f). Jesus proclaims the fulfillment of this prophecy in Himself (Lu 4:21). In Mt 12:18 ff a citation from Isa 42:1-3 is given in

connection with the miraculous healing work of Jesus. It is a passage of exquisite beauty and describes the Messiah as a quiet and unobtrusive and tender minister to human needs, possessed of irresistible power and infinite patience. Thus the highest Old Testament ideals as to the operations of the Spirit of God come to realization, especially in the public ministry of Jesus. The comprehensive terms of the description make it incontestably clear that the New Testament writers thought of the entire public life of Jesus as directed by the Spirit of God. We need only to read the evangelic records in order to fill in the details.

The miracles of Jesus were wrought through the power of the Holy Spirit. Occasionally He is seized as it were by a sense of the urgency of His work in some such way as to impress beholders with the presence of a strange power working in Him. In one case men think He is beside Himself (Mr 3:21); in another they are impressed with the authoritativeness of His teaching (Mr 1:22); in another His intense devotion to His task makes Him forget bodily needs (Joh 4:31); again men think He has a demon (Joh 8:48); at one time He is seized with a rapturous joy when the 70 return from their successful evangelistic tour, and Luke declares that at that hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit (Lu 10:21; compare Mt 11:25). This whole passage is a remarkable one, containing elements which point to the Johannine conception of Jesus, on which account Harnack is disposed to discredit it at certain points (Sayings of Jesus, 302). One of the most impressive aspects of this activity of Jesus in the Spirit is its suppressed intensity. Nowhere is there lack of self-control. Nowhere is there evidence of a coldly didactic attitude, on the one hand, or of a loose rein upon the will, on the other. Jesus is always an intensely human Master wrapped in Divine power. The miracles contrast strikingly with the miracles of the apocryphal gospels. In the latter all sorts of capricious deeds of power are ascribed to Jesus as a boy. In our Gospels, on the contrary, no miracle is wrought until after His anointing with the Spirit at baptism.

A topic of especial interest is that of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. Jesus cast out demons by the power of God’s Spirit. In Mt 12:31; Mr 3:28 f; Lu 12:10, we have the declaration that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit is an unpardonable sin. Mark particularizes the offense of the accusers of Jesus by saying that they said of Jesus, "He hath an unclean spirit." The blasphemy against the Spirit seems to have been not merely rejection of Jesus and His words, which might be due to various causes. It was rather the sin of ascribing works of Divine mercy and power-works which had all the marks of their origin in the goodness of God—to a diabolic source. The charge was that He cast out devils by Beelzebub the prince of devils. We are not to suppose that the unpardonable nature of the sin against the Holy Spirit was due to anything arbitrary in God’s arrangements regarding sin. The moral and spiritual attitude involved in the charge against Jesus was simply a hopeless one. It presupposed a warping or wrenching of the moral nature from the truth in such degree, a deep-seated malignity and insusceptibility to Divine influences so complete, that no moral nucleus remained on which the forgiving love of God might work.

See BLASPHEMY.

(5) Death, Resurrection and Pentecostal Gift.

It is not possible to give here a complete outline of the activities of Jesus in the Holy Spirit. We observe

one or two additional points as to the relations of the Holy Spirit to Him. In Heb 9:14 it is declared that Christ "through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God," and in Ro 1:4, Paul says He was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (compare also Ro 8:11).

As already noted, John the Baptist gave as a particular designation of Jesus that it was He who should baptize with the Holy Spirit, in contrast with his own baptism in water. In Joh 20:22, after the resurrection and before the ascension, Jesus breathed on the disciples and said "Receive ye the Holy Spirit." There was probably a real communication of the Spirit in this act of Jesus in anticipation of the outpouring in fullness on the day of Pentecost. In Ac 1:2 it is declared that He gave commandment through the Holy Spirit, and in 1:5 it is predicted by Him that the disciples should "be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence"; and in 1:8 it is declared, "Ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you."

It is clear from the preceding that in the thought of the New Testament writers Jesus is completely endued with the power of the. Holy Spirit. It is in large measure the Old Testament view of the Spirit; that is to say, the operation of the Spirit in and through Jesus is chiefly with a view to His official Messianic work, the charismatic Spirit imparting power rather than the Spirit for holy living merely. Yet there is a difference between the Old Testament and New Testament representations here. In the Old Testament the agency of the Spirit is made very prominent when mighty works are performed by His power. In the Gospels the view is concentrated less upon the Spirit than upon Jesus Himself, though it is always assumed that He is acting in the power of the Spirit. In the case of Jesus also, the moral quality of His words and deeds is always assumed.

2. The Holy Spirit in the Kingdom of God:

Our next topic in setting forth the New Testament teaching is the Holy Spirit in relation to the kingdom of God. Quite in harmony with the plenary endowment of Jesus, the founder of the kingdom, with the power of the Spirit, is the communication of the Spirit to the agents employed by Providence in the conduct of the affairs of the kingdom. We need, at all points, in considering the subject in the New Testament to keep in view the Old Testament background. The covenant relations between God and Israel were the presupposition of all the blessings of the Old Testament. In the New Testament there is not an identical but an analogous point of view. God is continuing His work among men. Indeed in a real sense He has begun a new work, but this new work is the fulfillment of the old. The new differs from the old in some very important respects, chiefly indeed in this, that now the national and theocratic life is wholly out of sight. Prophecy no longer deals with political questions. The power of the Spirit no longer anoints kings and judges for their duties. The action of the Spirit upon the cosmos now ceases to receive attention. In short, the kingdom of God is intensely spiritualized, and the relation of the Spirit to the individual or the church is nearly always that which is dealt with.

(1) Synoptic Teachings.

We consider briefly the synoptic teachings as to the Holy Spirit in relation to the kingdom of God. The forerunner of Jesus goes before His face in the Spirit and power of Elijah (Lu 1:17). Of Him it had been predicted that He should be filled with the Holy Spirit from His mother's womb (Lu 1:15). The Master expressly predicts that the Holy Spirit will give the needed wisdom when the disciples are delivered up. "It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit" (Mr 13:11). In Lu 12:12 it is also declared that "The Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say." Likewise in Mt 10:20, "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you." In Lu 11:13 is a beautiful saying: If we who are evil give good gifts to our children, how much more shall the "heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." This is a variation from the parallel passage in Mt (7:11), and illustrates Luke's marked emphasis upon the operations of the Spirit. In Mt 28:19, the disciples are commanded to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. This passage has been called in question, but there is not sufficient ground for its rejection. Hitherto there has been almost no hint directly of the personality of the Spirit or the Trinitarian implications in the teaching as to the Spirit. Here, however, we have a very suggestive hint toward a doctrine of the Spirit which attains more complete development later.

(2) In the Writings of John

In the Gospel of John there is a more elaborate presentation of the office and work of the Holy Spirit, particularly in Joh 14-17. Several earlier passages, however, must be noticed. The passage on the new birth in Joh 3:5 ff we notice first. The expression, "except one be born of water and the Spirit," seems to contain a reference to baptism along with the action of the Spirit of God directly on the soul. In the light of other New Testament teachings, however, we are not warranted in ascribing saving efficacy to baptism here. The "birth," in so far as it relates to baptism, is symbolic simply, not actual. The outward act is the fitting symbolic accompaniment of the spiritual regeneration by the Spirit. Symbolism and spiritual fact move on parallel lines. The entrance into the kingdom is symbolically effected by means of baptism, just as the "new birth" takes place symbolically by the same means.

In Joh 6:51 ff we have the very difficult words attributed to Jesus concerning the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood. The disciples were greatly distressed by these words, and in 6:63 Jesus insists that "it is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing." One's view of the meaning of this much-discussed passage will turn largely on his point of view in interpreting it. If he adopts the view that John is reading back into the record much that came later in the history, the inference will probably follow that Jesus is here referring to the Lord's Supper. If on the other hand it is held that John is seeking to reproduce substantially what was said, and to convey an impression of the actual situation, the reference to the Supper will not be inferred. Certainly the language fits the later teaching in the establishment of the Supper, although John omits a detailed account of the Supper. But Jesus was meeting a very real situation in the carnal spirit of the multitude which followed Him for the loaves and fishes. His deeply mystical words seem to have been intended to accomplish the result which followed, namely, the separation of the true from the false disciples. There is no necessary reference to the Lord's Supper specifically, therefore, in His words. Spiritual meat and drink, not carnal, are the true food of man. He Himself was that food, but only the spiritually susceptible would grasp His meaning. It is difficult to assign any sufficient reason why Jesus should have here referred to the Supper, or why John should have

desired to introduce such reference into the story at this stage.

In Joh 7:37 ff we have a saying of Jesus and its interpretation by John which accords with the synoptic reference to a future baptism in the Holy Spirit to be bestowed by Jesus: "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water." John adds: "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." No doubt John's Gospel is largely a reproduction of the facts and teachings of Jesus in the evangelist's own words. This passage indicates, however, that John discriminated between his own constructions of Christ's teachings and the teachings themselves, and warns us against the custom of many exegetes who broadly assume that John employed his material with slight regard for careful and correct statement, passing it through his own consciousness in such manner as to leave us his own subjective Gospel, rather than a truly historical record. The ethical implications of such a process on John's part would scarcely harmonize with his general tone and especially the teachings of his Epistles. No doubt John's Gospel contains much meaning which he could not have put into it prior to the coming of the Spirit. But what John seeks to give is the teaching of Jesus and not his own theory of Jesus.

We give next an outline of the teachings in the great Joh 14 to 17, the farewell discourse of Jesus. In 14:16 Jesus says, "I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter" (parakletos; see PARACLETE). Next Jesus describes this Comforter as one whom the world cannot receive. Disciples know Him because He abides in them. The truth of Christianity is spiritually discerned, i.e. it is discerned by the power and indwelling of the Holy Spirit. In the name of "reality," science sometimes repudiates these inner experiences as "mystical." But Christians cling to them as most real, data of experience as true and reliable as any other forms of human experience. To repudiate them would be for them to repudiate reality itself. The Father and Son shall make their abode in Christians (14:23). This is probably another form of assertion of the Spirit's presence, and not a distinct line of mystical teaching. (Compare Woods, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature, 243.) For in 14:26 the promise of the Spirit is repeated. The Father is to send the Spirit in the name of Christ, and He is to teach the disciples all things, quickening also their memories. In the New Testament generally, and especially in John's and Paul's writings, there is no sense of conflict between Father, Son and Spirit in their work in the Christian. All proceeds from the Father, through the Son, and is accomplished in the Christian by the Holy Spirit. As will appear, Christ in the believer is represented as being practically all that the Spirit does without identifying Christ with the Spirit. So far there are several notes suggesting the personality of the Holy Spirit. The designation "another Comforter," taken in connection with the description of his work, is one. The fact that He is sent or given is another. And another is seen in the specific work which the Spirit is to do. Another is the masculine pronoun employed here (ekeinos). In Joh 14:26 the function of the Spirit is indicated. He is to bring to "remembrance all that I said unto you." In 15:26 this is made even more comprehensive: "He shall bear witness of me," and yet more emphatically in 16:14, "He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you." The sphere of the Spirit's activity is the heart of the individual believer and of the church. His chief function is to illumine the teaching and glorify the person of Jesus. Joh 15:26 is the passage which has been used in support of the doctrine of the procession of the Spirit. Jesus says, "I will send" (pempso), future tense, referring to the "Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father" (ekporeuetai); present tense. The present tense here suggests

timeless action and has been taken to indicate an essential relation of the Spirit to God the Father (compare Godet, Commentary on John, in the place cited.). The hazard of such an interpretation lies chiefly in the absence of other corroborative Scriptures and in the possibility of another and simpler meaning of the word. However, the language is unusual, and the change of tense in the course of the sentence is suggestive. Perhaps it is one of the many instances where we must admit we do not know the precise import of the language of Scripture.

In Joh 16:7-15 we have a very important passage. Jesus declares to the anxious disciples that it is expedient for Him to go away, because otherwise the Spirit will not come. "He, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment" (16:8). The term translated "convict" (elegksei) involves a cognitive along with a moral process. The Spirit who deals in truth, and makes His appeal through the truth, shall convict, shall bring the mind on which He is working into a sense of self-condemnation on account of sin. The word means more than reprove, or refute, or convince. It signifies up to a certain point a moral conquest of the mind: "of sin, because they believe not on me" (16:9). Unbelief is the root sin. The revelation of God in Christ is, broadly speaking, His condemnation of all sin. The Spirit may convict of particular sins, but they will all be shown to consist essentially in the rejection of God's love and righteousness in Christ, i.e. in unbelief. "Of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more" (16:10). What does this mean? Does Jesus mean that His going to the Father will be the proof of His righteousness to those who put Him to death, or that this going to the Father will be the consummating or crowning act of His righteousness which the Spirit is to carry home to the hearts of men? Or does He mean that because He goes away the Spirit will take His place in convicting men of righteousness? The latter meaning seems implied in the words, "and ye behold me no more." Probably, however, the meanings are not mutually exclusive. "Of judgment because the prince of this world hath been judged" (16:11). In His incarnation and death the prince of this world, the usurper, is conquered and cast out.

We may sum up the teachings as to the Spirit in these four chapters as follows: He is the Spirit of truth; He guides into all truth; He brings to memory Christ's teachings; He shows things to come; He glorifies Christ; He speaks not of Himself but of Christ; He, like believers, bears witness to Christ; He enables Christians to do greater works than those of Christ; He convicts the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment; He comes because Christ goes away; He is "another Comforter"; He is to abide with disciples forever.

These teachings cover a very wide range of needs. The Holy Spirit is the subject of the entire discourse. In a sense it is the counterpart of the Sermon on the Mount. There the laws of the kingdom are expounded. Here the means of realization of all the ends of that kingdom are presented. The kingdom now becomes the kingdom of the Spirit. The historical revelation of truth in the life, death, resurrection and glorification of Jesus being completed, the Spirit of truth comes in fullness. The gospel as history is now to become the gospel as experience. The Messiah as a fact is now to become the Messiah as a life through the Spirit's action. All the elements of the Spirit's action are embraced: the charismatic for mighty works; the intellectual for guidance into truth; the moral and spiritual for producing holy lives. This discourse transfers the kingdom, so to speak, from the shoulders of the Master to those of the disciples, but the latter are empowered for their tasks by the might of the indwelling and abiding Spirit.

The method of the kingdom's growth and advance is clearly indicated as spiritual, conviction of sin, righteousness and judgment, and obedient and holy lives of Christ's disciples.

Before passing to the next topic, one remark should be made as to the Trinitarian suggestions of these chapters in John. The personality of the Spirit is clearly implied in much of the language here. It is true we have no formal teaching on the metaphysical side, no ontology in the strict sense of the word. This fact is made much of by writers who are slow to recognize the personality of the Holy Spirit in the light of the teachings of John and Paul. These writers have no difficulty, however, in asserting that the New Testament writers hold that God is a personal being (see I. F. Woods, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature, 256, 268). It must be insisted, however, that in the New Testament, as in the Old Testament, there is little metaphysics, little ontological teaching as to God. His personality is deduced from the same kind of sayings as those relating to the Spirit. From the ontological point of view, therefore, we should also have to reject the personality of God on the basis of the Biblical teachings. The Trinitarian formulations may not be correct at all points, but the New Testament warrants the Trinitarian doctrine, just as it warrants belief in the personality of God. We are not insisting on finding metaphysics in Scripture where it is absent, but we do insist upon consistency in construing the popular and practical language of Scripture as to the second and third as well as the first Person of the Trinity.

We add a few lines as to John's teachings in the Epistles and Revelation. In general they are in close harmony with the teachings in his Gospel and do not require extended treatment. The Spirit imparts assurance (1 Joh 3:24); incites to confession of Christ (1 Joh 4:2); bears witness to Christ (1 Joh 5:6 ff). In Re 1:4 the "seven Spirits" is an expression for the completeness of the Spirit. The Spirit speaks to the churches (1 Joh 2:7,11; 3:6). The seer is "in the Spirit" (1 Joh 4:2). The Spirit joins the church in the invitation of the gospel (1Joh 2:17).

(3) In Acts.

The Book of Ac contains the record of the beginning of the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit. There is at the outset the closest connection with the recorded predictions of the Holy Spirit in the Gospels. Particularly does Luke make clear the continuity of his own thought regarding the Spirit in his earlier and later writing. Jesus in the first chapter of Ac gives commandment through the Holy Spirit and predicts the reception of power as the result of the baptism in the Holy Spirit which the disciples are soon to receive.

The form of the Spirit's activities in Ac is chiefly charismatic, that is, the miraculous endowment of disciples with power or wisdom for their work in extending the Messianic kingdom. As yet the work of the Spirit within disciples as the chief sanctifying agency is not fully developed, and is later described with great fullness in Paul's writings. Some recent writers have overemphasized the contrast between the earlier and the more developed view of the Spirit with regard to the moral life. In Ac the ethical import of the Spirit's action appears at several points (see Ac 5:3,9; 7:51; 8:18 f; 13:9; 15:28). The chief interest in Ac is naturally the Spirit's agency in founding the Messianic kingdom, since here is recorded the early history of the expansion of that kingdom. The phenomenal rather than the inner moral aspects of

that great movement naturally come chiefly into view. But everywhere the ethical implications are present. Gunkel is no doubt correct in the statement that Paul's conception of the Spirit as inward and moral and acting in the daily life of the Christian opens the way for the activity of the Spirit as a historical principle in subsequent ages. After all, this is the fundamental and universal import of the Spirit (see Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, etc., 76; compare Pfleiderer, Paulinismus, 200).

We now proceed to give a brief summary of the Holy Spirit's activities as recorded in Acts, and follow this with a discussion of one or two special points. The great event is of course the outpouring or baptism of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost followed by the completion of the baptism in the Holy Spirit by the baptism of the household of Cornelius (2:1 ff; 10:17-48). Speaking with tongues, and other striking manifestations attended this baptism, as also witnessing to the gospel with power by the apostles. See BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. This outpouring is declared to be in fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, and the assertion is also made that it is the gift of the exalted Lord Jesus Christ (2:17,33). Following this baptism of the Holy Spirit the disciples are endued with miraculous power for their work. Miracles are wrought (Ac 2:43), and all necessary gifts of wisdom and Divine guidance are bestowed. A frequent form of expression describing the actors in the history is, "filled with the Holy Spirit." It is applied to Peter (4:8); to disciples (4:31); to the seven deacons (6:3); to Stephen (6:5; 7:55); to Saul who becomes Paul (13:9).

The presence of the Spirit and His immediate and direct superintendence of affairs are seen in the fact that Ananias and Sapphira are represented as lying to the Holy Spirit (Ac 5:3,9); the Jews are charged by Stephen with resisting the Holy Spirit (Ac 7:51); and Simon Magus is rebuked for attempting to purchase the Spirit with money (Ac 8:18 f).

The Holy Spirit is connected with the act of baptism, but there does not seem to be any fixed order as between the two. In Ac 9:17 the Spirit comes before baptism; and after baptism in 8:17 and 19:6. In these cases the coming of the Spirit was in connection with the laying on of hands also. But in 10:44 the Holy Spirit falls upon the hearers while Peter is speaking prior to baptism and with no laying on of hands. These instances in which the order of baptism, the laying on of hands and the gift of the Spirit seem to be a matter of indifference, are a striking indication of the non-sacramentarian character of the teaching of the Book of Acts, and indeed in the New Testament generally. Certainly no particular efficacy seems to be attached to the laying on of hands or baptism except as symbolic representations of spiritual facts. Gunkel, in his excellent work on the Holy Spirit, claims Ac 2:38 as an instance when the Spirit is bestowed during baptism (Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, etc., 7). The words of Peter, however, may refer to a reception of the Spirit subsequent to baptism, although evidently in immediate connection with it. The baptism of the Holy Spirit clearly then was not meant to supplant water baptism. Moreover, in the strict sense the baptism of the Holy Spirit was a historical event or events completed at the outset when the extension of the kingdom of God, beginning at Pentecost, began to reach out to the Gentile world.

See BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

In Ac the entire historical movement is represented by Luke as being under the direction of the Spirit. He guides Philip to the Ethiopian and then "catches away" Philip (8:29,39). He guides Peter at Joppa through the vision and then leads him to Cornelius at Caesarea (10:19 f; 11:12 f). The Spirit commands the church at Antioch to separate Saul and Barnabas for missionary work (13:2 ff). He guides the church at Jerusalem (15:28). He forbids the apostle to go to Asia (16:6 f). The Spirit enables Agabus to prophesy that Paul will be bound by the Jews at Jerusalem (21:11; compare also 20:23). The Spirit appointed the elders at Ephesus (20:28).

One or two points require notice before passing from Acts. The impression we get of the Spirit's action here very strongly suggests a Divine purpose moving on the stage of history in a large and comprehensive way. In Jesus that purpose was individualized. Here the supplementary thought of a vast historic movement is powerfully suggested. Gunkel asserts that usually the Spirit's action is not conceived by the subjects of it in terms of means (Mittel) and end (Zweck), but rather as cause (Ursache) and activity (Wirkung) (see Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, etc., 20). There is an element of truth in this, but the idea of purpose is by no means confined to the historian who later recorded the Spirit's action. The actors in the spiritual drama were everywhere conscious of the great movement of which they as individuals were a part. In some passages the existence of purpose in the Spirit's action is clearly recognized, as in His restraining of Paul at certain points and in the appointment of Saul and Barnabas as missionaries. Divine purpose is indeed implied at all points, and while the particular end in view was not always clear in a given instance, the subjects of the Spirit's working were scarcely so naive in their apprehension of the matter as to think of their experiences merely as so many extraordinary phenomena caused in a particular way.

We note next the glossolalia, or speaking with tongues, recorded in Ac 2, as well as in later chapters and in Paul's Epistles. The prevailing view at present is that "speaking with tongues" does not mean speaking actual intelligible words in a foreign language, but rather the utterance of meaningless sounds, as was customary among the heathen and as is sometimes witnessed today where religious life becomes highly emotional in its manifestation. To support this view the account in Ac 2 is questioned, and Paul's instructions in 1Co 14 are cited. Of course a man's world-view will be likely to influence his interpretation in this as in other matters. Philosophically an antisupernatural world-view makes it easy to question the glossolalia of the New Testament. Candid exegesis, however, rather requires the recognition of the presence in the apostolic church of a speaking in foreign tongues, even if alongside of it there existed (which is open to serious doubt) the other phenomenon mentioned above. Ac 2:3 ff is absolutely conclusive taken by itself, and no valid critical grounds have been found for rejecting the passage. 1Co 14 confirms this view when its most natural meaning is sought. Paul is here insisting upon the orderly conduct of worship and upon edification as the important thing. To this end he insists that they who speak with tongues pray that they may also interpret (1Co 14:5; chapter 13). It is difficult to conceive what he means by "interpret" if the speaking with tongues was a meaningless jargon of sounds uttered under emotional excitement, and nothing more. Paul's whole exposition in this chapter implies that "tongues" may be used for edification. He ranks it below prophecy simply because without an interpreter "tongues" would not edify the hearer. Paul himself spoke with tongues more than they all (1Co 14:18). It seems scarcely in keeping with Paul's character to suppose that he refers here to a merely emotional volubility in meaningless and disconnected sounds.

See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

(4) In Paul’s Writings.

The teachings of Paul on the Holy Spirit are so rich and abundant that space forbids an exhaustive presentation. In his writings the Biblical representations reach their climax. Mr. Wood says correctly that Paul grasped the idea of the unity of the Christian life. All the parts exist in a living whole and the Holy Spirit constitutes and maintains it (Wood, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature, 268). In fact a careful study of Paul’s teachings discloses three parallel lines, one relating to faith, another to Christ, and the third to the Holy Spirit. That is to say, his teachings coalesce, as it were, point by point, in reference to these three subjects. Faith is the human side of the Divine activity carried on by the Holy Spirit. Faith is therefore implied in the Spirit’s action and is the result of or response to it in its various forms. But faith is primarily and essentially faith in Jesus Christ. Hence, we find in Paul that Christ is represented as doing substantially everything that the Spirit does. Now we are not to see in this any conflicting conceptions as to Christ and the Spirit, but rather Paul’s intense feeling of the unity of the work of Christ and the Spirit. The "law" of the Spirit’s action is the revelation and glorification of Christ. In his Gospel, which came later, John, as we have seen, defined the Spirit’s function in precisely these terms. Whether or not John was influenced by Paul in the matter we need not here consider.

(a) The Spirit and Jesus

We begin with a brief reference to the connection in Paul’s thought between the Spirit and Jesus. The Holy Spirit is described as the Spirit of God’s Son (Ro 8:14 ff; Ga 4:6), as the Spirit of Christ (Ro 8:9). He who confesses Jesus does so by the Holy Spirit, and no one can say that Jesus is anathema in the Holy Spirit (1Co 12:3). Christ is called a life-giving Spirit (1Co 15:45); and in 2Co 3:17 the statement appears, "Now the Lord is the Spirit." All of this shows how completely one Paul regarded the work of Christ and the Spirit, not because they were identical in the sense in which Beyschlag has contended, but because their task and aim being identical, there was no sense of discord in Paul’s mind in explaining their activities in similar terms.

(b) In Bestowing Charismatic Gifts

The Spirit appears in Paul as in Ac imparting all kinds of charismatic gifts for the ends of the Messianic kingdom. He enumerates a long list of spiritual gifts which cannot receive separate treatment here, such as prophecy (1Th 5:19 f) ; tongues (1Co 12-14); wisdom (1Co 2:6); knowledge (1Co 12:8); power to work miracles (1Co 12:9 f); discerning of spirits (1Co 12:10); interpretation of tongues (1Co 12:10); faith (1Co 12:9); boldness in Christian testimony (2Co 3:17 f); charismata generally (1Th 1:5; 4:8, etc.). See SPIRITUAL GIFTS. In addition to the above list, Paul especially emphasizes the Spirit’s action in revealing to himself and to Christians the mind of God (1Co 2:10-12; Eph 3:5). He speaks in words taught by the Spirit (1Co 2:13). He preaches in demonstration of the Spirit and of power (1Co 2:4; 1Th 1:5).

In the above manifestations of the Spirit, as enumerated in Paul's writings, we have presented in very large measure what we have already seen in Acts, but with some additions. In 1Co 14 and elsewhere Paul gives a new view as to the charismatic gifts which was greatly needed in view of the tendency to extravagant and intemperate indulgence in emotional excitement, due to the mighty action of God's Spirit in the Corinthian church. He insists that all things be done unto edification, that spiritual growth is the true aim of all spiritual endowments. This may be regarded as the connecting link between the earlier and later New Testament teaching as to the Holy Spirit, between the charismatic and moral-religious significance of the Spirit. To the latter we now direct attention.

(c) In the Beginnings of the Christian Life

We note the Spirit in the beginnings of the Christian life. From beginning to end the Christian life is regarded by Paul as under the power of the Holy Spirit, in its inner moral and religious aspects as well as in its charismatic forms. It is a singular fact that Paul does not anywhere expressly declare that the Holy Spirit originates the Christian life. Gunkel is correct in this so far as specific and direct teaching is concerned. But Wood who asserts the contrary is also right, if regard is had to clear implications and legitimate inferences from Paul's statements (op. cit., 202). Ro 8:2 does not perhaps refer to the act of regeneration, and yet it is hard to conceive of the Christian life as thus constituted by the "law of the Spirit of life" apart from its origin through the Spirit. There are other passages which seem to imply very clearly, if they do not directly assert, that the Christian life is originated by the Holy Spirit (1Th 1:6; Ro 5:5; 8:9; 1Co 2:4; 6:11; Tit 3:5).

The Holy Spirit in the beginnings of the Christian life itself is set forth in many forms of statement. They who have the Spirit belong to Christ (Ro 8:9). We received not the Spirit of bondage but of adoption, "whereby we cry, Abba, Father" (Ro 8:15). "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God" (Ro 8:16). The Spirit is received by the hearing of faith (Ga 3:2). See also Ro 5:5; 8:2; 1Co 16:11; Ga 3:3,14; Eph 2:18. There are two or three expressions employed by Paul which express some particular aspect of the Spirit's work in believers. One of these is "first-fruits" (Ro 8:23, aparche), which means that the present possession of the Spirit by the believer is the guarantee of the full redemption which is to come, as the first-fruits were the guarantee of the full harvest. Another of these words is "earnest" (2Co 1:22; 5:5, arrabon), which also means a pledge or guarantee. Paul also speaks of the "sealing" of the Christians with the Holy Spirit of promise, as in Eph 1:13 (esphragisthete, "ye were sealed"). This refers to the seal by which a king stamped his mark of authorization or ownership upon a document.

(d) In the Religious and Moral Life

Paul gives a great variety of expressions indicating the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit in the religious and moral life of the Christian. In fact at every point that life is under the guidance and sustaining energy of the Spirit. If we live after the flesh, we die; if after the Spirit, we live (Ro 8:6). The Spirit helps the Christian to pray (Ro 8:26 f). The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit (Ro 14:17). Christians are to abound in hope through the Holy Spirit (Ro 15:13). "The

fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control" (Ga 5:22). Christians are warned to grieve not the Holy Spirit (Eph 4:30), and are urged to take the sword of the Spirit (Eph 6:17). The flesh is contrasted with the Spirit at a number of points in Paul's writings (e.g. Ro 8:5 f; Ga 5:17 ff). The Spirit in these passages probably means either the Spirit of God or man's spirit as under the influence of the Spirit of God. Flesh is a difficult word to define, as it seems to be used in several somewhat different senses. When the flesh is represented as lusting against the Spirit, however, it seems equivalent to the "carnal mind," i.e. the mind of the sinful natural man as distinct from the mind of the spiritual man. This carnal or fleshly mind is thus described because the flesh is thought of as the sphere in which the sinful impulses in large part, though not altogether (Ga 5:19), take their rise.

Paul contrasts the Spirit with the letter (2Co 3:6) and puts strong emphasis on the Spirit as the source of Christian liberty. As Gunkel points out, spirit and freedom with Paul are correlatives, like spirit and life. Freedom must needs come of the Spirit's presence because He is superior to all other authorities and powers (Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes, etc., 95). See also an excellent passage on the freedom of the Christian from statutory religious requirements in DCG, article "Holy Spirit" by Dr. James Denney, I, 739.

(e) In the Church.

Toward the end of his ministry and in his later group of epistles, Paul devoted much thought to the subject of the church, and one of his favorite figures was of the church as the body of Christ. The Holy Spirit is represented as animating this body, as communicating to it life, and directing all its affairs. As in the case of the individual believer, so also in the body of believers the Spirit is the sovereign energy which rules completely. By one Spirit all are baptized into one body and made to drink of one Spirit (1Co 12:13). All the gifts of the church, charismatic and otherwise, are from the Spirit (1Co 12:4,8-11). All spiritual gifts in the church are for edification (1Co 14:12). Prayer is to be in the Spirit (1Co 14:15). The church is to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace (Eph 4:3). Love (Col 1:8); fellowship (Php 2:1); worship (Php 3:3) are in the Spirit. The church is the habitation of the Spirit (Eph 2:22). The church is an epistle of Christ written by the Spirit (2Co 3:3). Thus the whole life of the church falls under the operation of the Holy Spirit.

(f) In the Resurrection of Believers

The Spirit also carries on His work in believers in raising the body from the dead. In Ro 8:11 Paul asserts that the present indwelling in believers of the Spirit that raised up Jesus from the dead is the guarantee of the quickening of their mortal bodies by the power of the same Spirit. See also 1Co 15:44 f; Ga 5:5.

We have thus exhibited Paul's teachings as to the Holy Spirit in some detail in order to make clear their scope and comprehensiveness. And we have not exhausted the material supplied by his writings. It will be observed that Paul nowhere elaborates a doctrine of the Spirit, as he does in a number of instances his

doctrine of the person of Christ. The references to the Spirit are in connection with other subjects usually. This, however, only serves to indicate how very fundamental the work of the Spirit was in Paul's assumptions as to the Christian life. The Spirit is the Christian life, just as Christ is that life.

The personality of the Spirit appears in Paul as in John. The benediction in 2Co 13:14 distinguishes clearly Father, Son and Spirit (compare also Eph 4:4). In many connections the Spirit is distinguished from the Son and Father, and the work of the Spirit is set forth in personal terms. It is true, references are often made to the Holy Spirit by Paul as if the Spirit were an impersonal influence, or at least without clearly personal attributes. This distinguishes his usage as to the Spirit from that as to Christ and God, who are always personal. It is a natural explanation of this fact if we hold that in the case of the impersonal references we have a survival of the current Old Testament conception of the Spirit, while in those which are personal we have the developed conception as found in both Paul and John. Personal attributes are ascribed to the Spirit in so many instances, it would seem unwarranted in us to make the earlier and lower conception determinative of the later and higher.

In Paul's writings we have the crowning factor in the Biblical doctrine of the Holy Spirit. He gathers up most of the preceding elements, and adds to them his own distinctive teaching or emphasis. Some of the earlier Old Testament elements are lacking, but all those which came earlier in the New Testament are found in Paul. The three points which Paul especially brought into full expression were first, the law of edification in the use of spiritual gifts, second, the Holy Spirit in the moral life of the believer, and third, the Holy Spirit in the church. Thus Paul enables us to make an important distinction as to the work of the Spirit in founding the kingdom of God, namely, the distinction between means and ends. Charismatic gifts of the Spirit were, after all, means to ethical ends. God's kingdom is moral in its purpose, "righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Christianity is, according to Paul, inherently and essentially supernatural. But its permanent and abiding significance is to be found, not in extraordinary phenomena in the form of "mighty works," "wonders," "tongues" and other miracles in the ordinary sense, but in the creation of a new moral order in time and eternity. The supernatural is to become normal and "natural" in human history, therefore, in the building up of this ethical kingdom on the basis of a redemption that is in and through Jesus Christ, and wrought out in all its details by the power of the Holy Spirit.

(5) The Holy Spirit in Other New Testament Writings.

There is little to add to the New Testament teaching as to the Holy Spirit. Paul and John practically cover all the aspects of His work which are presented. There are a few passages, however, we may note in concluding Our general survey. In He the Holy Spirit is referred to a number of times as inspiring the Old Testament Scriptures (Heb 3:7; 9:8; 10:15). We have already referred to the remarkable statement in Heb 9:14 to the effect that the blood of Christ was offered through the eternal Spirit. In 10:29 doing "despite unto the Spirit of grace" seems to be closely akin to the sin against the Holy Spirit in the Gospels. In Heb 4:12 there is a very remarkable description of the "word of God" in personal terms, as having all the energy and activity of an actual personal presence of the Spirit, and recalls Paul's language in Eph 6:17. In 1Pe we need only refer to 1:11 in which Peter declares that the "Spirit of Christ" was in the Old Testament prophets, pointing forward to the sufferings and glories of Christ.

LITERATURE.

I. F. Wood, The Spirit of God in Biblical Literature; article "Spiritual Gifts" in EB; Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Gelstea; Gloel, Der heilige Geist in der Heilsverkundigung des Paulus; Wendt, Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist im biblischen Sprachgebrauch; Weinel, Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister; Dickson, Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit; Smeaton, Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; Walker, The Spirit and the Incarnation; Denio, The Supreme Leader; Moberly, Administration of the Holy Spirit in the Body of Christ; Hutchings, Person and Work of the Holy Spirit; Owen, Pneumatologia; Webb, Person and Office of the Holy Spirit; Hare, The Mission of the Comforter; Candlish, The Work of the Holy Spirit; Wirgman, The Sevenfold Gifts; Heber, Personality and Offices of the Holy Spirit; Swete, The Holy Spirit in the New Testament; Moule, Veni Creator; Johnson, The Holy Spirit Then and Now; Kuyper, The Work of the Holy Spirit; Biblical Theologies of Schultz, Davidson, Weiss, Beyschlag, Stevens; list appended to the article on "Holy Spirit" in HDB and DCG; extensive bibliography in Denio's The Supreme Leader, 239 ff.

E. Y. Mullins

HOLYDAY

ho'-li-da: This word occurs twice in the King James Version, namely, Ps 42:4, "a multitude that kept (the Revised Version (British and American) "keeping") holyday," and Col 2:16. In the latter case it is a rendering of the Greek word heorte, the ordinary term for a religious festival. the Revised Version (British and American) translates "feast day." In the former instance "keeping holyday" renders choghegh. The verb means to "make a pilgrimage," or "keep a religious festival." Occasionally the idea of merrymaking prevails, as in 1Sa 30:16—"eating and drinking," and enjoying themselves merrily. The Psalmist (who was perhaps an exiled priest) remembers with poignant regret how he used to lead religious processions on festival occasions.

T. Lewis

HOMAM

ho'-mam (chomam, "destruction"): A Horite descendant of Esau (1Ch 1:39). The name appears in Ge 36:22 as "Heman."

HOME

hom (bayith, "house," maqom, "place," 'ohel, "tent" (Jud 19:9), shubh, "to cause to turn back," tawekh, tokh, "middle," "midst" (De 21:12); oikos, "house," "household," endemeo, "to be among one's people," oikos idios, "one's own proper (house)"): This term in Scripture does not stand for a single specific word

of the original, but for a variety of phrases. Most commonly it is a translation of the Hebrew bayith, Greek oikos "house," which means either the building or the persons occupying it. In Ge 43:26 "home" and "into the house" represent the same phase, "to the house" (ha-bayethah). In Ru 1:21, "hath brought me home again" means "has caused me to return." In 2Ch 25:10 "home again" means "to their place." In Ec 12:5 "long home," the Revised Version (British and American) "everlasting home," means "eternal house." In Joh 19:27 "unto his own home" means "unto his own things" (so Joh 1:11). In 2Co 5:6 (and the Revised Version (British and American) 5:8,9) "be at home" is a translation of endemeo, "to be among one's own people," as opposed to ekdemeo, "to be or live abroad."

Benjamin Reno Downer

HOME-BORN

hom'-born ('ezrach): A native-born Hebrew, as contrasted with a foreigner of different blood. The same Hebrew word is found in Le 16:29; 18:26 and elsewhere, but is translated differently. Home-born in Jer 2:14 is a translation of the phrase yelidh bayith, where it means a person free-born as contrasted with a slave.

HOMER

ho'-mer (chomer): A dry measure containing about 11 bushels. It was equal to 10 ephas.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

HOMICIDE

hom'-i-sid (rotseach): Hebrew has no word for killing or murder; rotseach is the word for manslayer. The Greek for murder is phonos. Homicide was every conscious violent action against a human being with the immediate result of death. It was always to be punished by death, being considered a crime against the image of God. Killing is definitely forbidden in the sixth commandment (Ge 9:5 f; Ex 20:13; 21:12; Le 24:17,21; Nu 35:16-21; De 19:11-13). The penalty of death was not inflicted when the killing was unintentional or unpremeditated (Ex 21:13; Nu 35:22-25; Jos 20:3-5; compare Mishna, Makkoth, xi. 5). Cities of Refuge were founded to which the manslayer could escape from the "avenger of blood." There he had to abide till after the death of the officiating high priest. If he left the city before that event, the avenger who should kill him was free from punishment (Ex 21:13; Nu 35:10-15,25-28,32; De 19:1-13; Jos 20:2). See CITIES OF REFUGE. Killing a thief who broke in during the night was not accounted murder (Ex 22:2). Unintentional killing of the pregnant woman in a fray was punished according to the lexicon talionis, i.e. the husband of the woman killed could kill the wife of the man who committed the offense without being punished (Ex 21:22 f). This was not usually carried out, but it gave the judge a standard by which to fine the offender. If a man failed to build a battlement to his house, and anyone fell over and was killed, blood-guiltiness came upon that man's house (Dr 22:8). He who killed a thief in the daytime was guilty in the same way (Ex 22:3; compare the King James Version). Where a

body was found, but the murderer was unknown, the elders of the city nearest to the place where it was found were ordered by a prescribed ceremony to declare that they were not guilty of neglecting their duties, and were therefore innocent of the man's blood (Dr 21:1-9). Two witnesses were necessary for a conviction of murder (Nu 35:30). If a slave died under chastisement, the master was to be punished according to the principle that "he that smiteth a man, so that he dieth, shall surely be put to death" (Ex 21:20; compare Ex 21:12). According to the rabbis the master was to be killed by the sword. Since in this passage the phrase "he shall die" is not used, some have supposed that punishment by death is not indicated. If the slave punished by the master died after one or two days, the master was not liable to punishment (Ex 21:21). Because of the words, "for he is his money," the rabbis held that non-Israelite slaves were meant. In ancient times the avenger of blood was himself to be the executioner of the murderer (Nu 35:19,21). According to Sanhedhrin 9:1 the murderer was to be beheaded. Nothing is said in the law about suicide.

Paul Levertoff

HONEST; HONESTY

on'-est, on'-es-ti: The word "honest" in the New Testament in the King James Version generally represents the adjective kalos, "good," "excellent," "honorable," and, with the exception of Lu 8:15, "honest and good heart," is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into the more correct "honorable" (Ro 12:17; 2Co 8:21; 13:7; Php 4:8); in 1Pe 2:12, into "seemly.' In the American Standard Revised Version "honestly" in Heb 13:18 is rendered "honorably," and in 1Th 4:12 (here euschemonos) is rendered "becomingly." The noun "honesty" occurs but once in the King James Version as the translation of semnotes (1Ti 2:2), and in the Revised Version (British and American) is more appropriately rendered "gravity."

James Orr

HONEY

hun'-i (debhash; meli): One familiar with life in Palestine will recognize in debhash the Arabic dibs, which is the usual term for a sweet syrup made by boiling down the juice of grapes, raisins, carob beans, or dates. Dibs is seldom, if ever, used as a name for honey (compare Arabic 'asal), whereas in the Old Testament debhash probably had only that meaning. The honey referred to was in most cases wild honey (De 32:13; Jud 14:8,9; 1Sa 14:25,26,29,43), although the offering of honey with the first-fruits would seem to indicate that the bees were also domesticated (2Ch 31:5). The bees constructed their honeycomb and deposited their honey in holes in the ground (1Sa 14:25); under rocks or in crevices between the rocks (De 32:13; Ps 81:16). They do the same today. When domesticated they are kept in cylindrical basket hives which are plastered on the outside with mud. The Syrian bee is an especially hardy type and a good honey producer. It is carried to Europe and America for breeding purposes.

In Old Testament times, as at present, honey was rare enough to be considered a luxury (Ge 43:11; 1Ki

14:3). Honey was used in baking sweets (Ex 16:31). It was forbidden to be offered with the meal offering (Le 2:11), perhaps because it was fermentable, but was presented with the fruit offering (2Ch 31:5). Honey was offered to David's army (2Sa 17:29). It was sometimes stored in the fields (Jer 41:8). It was also exchanged as merchandise (Eze 27:17). In New Testament times wild honey was an article of food among the lowly (Mt 3:4; Mr 1:6).

Figurative: "A land flowing with milk and honey" suggested a land filled with abundance of good things (Ex 3:8,17; Le 20:24; Nu 13:27; De 6:3; Jos 5:6; Jer 11:5; Eze 20:6,15). "A land of olive trees and honey" had the same meaning (De 8:8; 2Ki 18:32), and similarly "streams of honey and butter" (Job 20:17). Honey was a standard of sweetness (So 4:11; Eze 3:3; Re 10:9,10). It typified sumptuous fare (So 5:1; Isa 7:15,22; Eze 16:13,19). The ordinances of Yahweh were "sweeter than honey and the droppings of the honeycomb" (Ps 19:10; 119:103). "Thou didst eat .... honey" (Eze 16:13) expressed Yahweh's goodness to Jerusalem.

James A. Patch

HONORABLE

on'-er-a-b'-l (kabhedh; euschemon): In the Old Testament "honorable" is for the most part the translation of kabhedh, properly, "to be heavy," "weighty" (Ge 34:19, the Revised Version (British and American) "honored"; Nu 22:15; 1Sa 9:6; Isa 3:5, etc.); kabhodh, "weight," "heaviness," etc., occurs in Isa 5:13; hodh, "beauty," "majesty," "honor" (Ps 111:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "honor"); 'adhar, "to make honorable," "illustrious" (Isa 42:21, "magnify the law, and make it honorable," the Revised Version margin "make the teaching great and glorious"); yaqar}, "precious" (Ps 45:9); [~nasa' panim, "lifted up of face" (2Ki 5:1; Isa 3:3; 9:15); nesu phanim (Job 22:8, the Revised Version margin "he whose person is accepted"); euschemon, literally, "well fashioned," is translated Mr 15:43, the King James Version "honorable," the Revised Version (British and American) "of honorable estate"; compare Ac 13:50; 17:12; endoxos, "in glory," occurs 1Co 4:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "glory"; timios, "weighty" (Heb 13:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "had in honor"); atimos, "without weight or honor" (1Co 12:23, "less honorable"); entimos, "in honor" (Lu 14:8), "more honorable."

The Revised Version (British and American) gives for "honorable" (1Sa 9:6), "held in honor"; for "Yet shall I be glorious" (Isa 49:5), "I am honorable"; "honorable" for "honest" (Ro 12:17; 2Co 13:7; Php 4:8, margin "reverend"); for "honestly" (Heb 13:18) the American Standard Revised Version has "honorably."

In Apocrypha we have endoxos translated "honorable" (Tobit 12:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "gloriously"); endoxos (Judith 16:21), timios (The Wisdom of Solomon 4:8), doxazo (Ecclesiasticus 24:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "glorified"), doxa (29:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "honor"), etc.

W. L. Walker

HOOD

hood (zeniphoth): The ladies' "hoods" of Isa 3:23 the King James Version appear as "turbans" the Revised Version (British and American); and "mitre" of Zec 3:5 is "turban, or diadem" the English Revised Version, margin. The word is from the verb zanaph, "to wrap round." It connotes a head-covering, not a permanent article of dress.

See DRESS, sec. 5; HAT.

HOOF

hoof.

See CHEW; CLOVEN.

HOOK

hook:

(1) chakkah, is rendered "fishhook" in Job 41:1 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "hook"). the Revised Version (British and American) is correct here and should have used the same translation for the same word in Isa 19:8; Hab 1:15, instead Of retaining AV's "angle." Similarly in Am 4:2, tsinnah, and ciroth dughah, appear to be synonyms for "fishhook," although the former may mean the barb of a fisher's spear. In the New Testament "fishhook" occurs in Mt 17:27 (agkistron).

(2) The "flesh-hook." (mazlegh, mizlaghah) of Ex 27:3, etc., was probably a small pitchfork, with two or three tines.

(3) The "pruning-hook" (mazmerah), used in the culture of the vine (Isa 18:5), was a sickle-shaped knife, small enough to be made from the metal of a spear-point (Isa 2:4; Joe 3:10; Mic 4:3).

(4) waw, is the name given the supports of certain hangings of the tabernacle (Ex 26:32, etc.). Their form is entirely obscure.

(5) chach, is rendered "hook" in 2Ki 19:28 = Isa 37:29; Eze 29:4; 38:4, and Eze 19:4,9 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "chain"). A ring (compare Ex 35:22), put in the nose of a tamed beast and through which a rope is passed to lead him, is probably meant.

(6) ‘aghmon, is rendered "hook" in Job 41:2 the King James Version, but should be "a rope" of rushes or rush-fiber as in the Revised Version (British and American), or, simply, "a rush" (on which small fish are strung).

(7) choach, is "hook" in Job 41:2 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "thorn," perhaps right) and 2Ch 33:11 the Revised Version margin (text chains," Ay "thorns,"). On both verses see the commentaries

(8) shephattayim, is "hooks" in Eze 40:43 (the Revised Version margin "ledges"), but the meaning of this word is completely unknown, and "hook" is a mere guess.

Burton Scott Easton

HOOPOE

hoo’-po; -poo (dukhiphath; epops; Latin Upupa epops): One of the peculiar and famous birds of Palestine, having a curved bill and beautiful plumage. It is about the size of a thrush. Its back is a rich cinnamon color, its head golden buff with a crest of feathers of gold, banded with white and tipped with black, that gradually lengthen as they cover the head until, when folded, they lie in lines of black and white, and, when erect, each feather shows its exquisite marking. Its wings and tail are black banded with white and buff. It nests in holes and hollow trees. All ornithologists agree that it is a "nasty, filthy bird" in its feeding and breeding habits. The nest, being paid no attention by the elders, soon becomes soiled and evil smelling. The bird is mentioned only in the lists of abomination (Le 11:19; and De 14:18). One reason why Moses thought it unfit for food was on account of its habits. Quite as strong a one lay in the fact that it was one of the sacred birds of Egypt. There the belief was prevalent that it could detect water and indicate where to dig a well; that it could hear secrets and cure diseases. Its head was a part of the charms used by witches. The hoopoe was believed to have wonderful medicinal powers and was called the "Doctor Bird" by the arabs. Because it is almost the size of a hoopoe and somewhat suggestive of it in its golden plumage, the lapwing was used in the early translations of the Bible instead of hoopoe. But when it was remembered that the lapwing is a plover, its flesh and eggs especially dainty food, that it was eaten everywhere it was known, modern commentators rightly decided that the hoopoe was the bird intended by the Mosaic law. It must be put on record, however, that where no superstition attaches to the hoopoe and where its nesting habits are unknown and its feeding propensities little understood, as it passes in migration it is killed, eaten and considered delicious, especially by residents of Southern Europe.

Gene Stratton-Porter

HOPE

hop:

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Revised Version (British and American) the New Testament "hope" represents the noun elpis (52 t), and the verb elpizo (31 t). King James Version, however, renders the noun in Heb 10:23 by "faith," and for the verb gives "trust" in 18 cases (apparently without much system, e.g. in Php 2 compare 2:19 and 23; see TRUST), while in Lu 6:35 it translates apelpizo, by "hoping for nothing again" (the Revised Version (British and American) "never despairing"). But in the Old Testament there is no Hebrew word that has the exact force of "expectation of some good thing," so that in the King James Version "hope" (noun and vb.) stands for some 15 Hebrew words, nearly all of which in other places are given other translation (e.g. mibhTach, is rendered "hope" in Jer 17:17, "trust" in Ps 40:4, "confidence" in Ps 65:5). the Revised Version (British and American) has attempted to be more systematic and has, for the most part, kept "hope" for the noun tiqwah, and the verb yachal, but complete consistency was not possible (e.g. Pr 10:28; 11:23; 23:18). This lack of a specific word for hope has nothing to do with any undervaluation of the virtue among the Hebrews. For the religion of the Old Testament is of all things a religion of hope, centered in God, from whom all deliverance and blessings are confidently expected (Jer 17:17; Joe 3:16; Ps 31:24; 33:18,22; 39:7, etc.). The varieties of this hope arc countless (see ISRAEL, RELIGION OF; SALVATION, etc.), but the form most perfected and with fundamental significance for the New Testament is the firm trust that at a time appointed God, in person or through His representative (see MESSIAH), will establish a kingdom of righteousness.

2. In the New Testament:

(1) The proclamation of this coming kingdom of God was the central element in the teaching of Jesus, and the message of its near advent (Mr 1:15, etc.), with the certainty of admission to it for those who accepted His teaching (Lu 12:32, etc.), is the substance of His teaching as to hope. This teaching, though, is delivered in the language of One to whom the realities of the next world and of the future are perfectly familiar; the tone is not that of prediction so much as it is that of the statement of obvious facts. In other words, "hope" to Christ is "certainty," and the word "hope" is never on His lips (Lu 6:34 and Joh 5:45 are naturally not exceptions). For the details see KINGDOM OF GOD; FAITH; FORGIVENESS, etc. And however far He may have taught that the kingdom was present in His lifetime, none the less the full consummation of that kingdom, with Himself as Messiah, was made by Him a matter of the future (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; PAROUSIA).

(2) Hence, after the ascension the early church was left with an eschatological expectation that was primarily and almost technically the "hope" of the New Testament—"looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ" (Tit 2:13), "unto a living hope ...., unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, ... reserved in heaven for you, who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (1Pe 13-5; compare Ro 5:2; 8:20-24; 2Co 3:12; Eph 1:18-21; Col 1:5,23,17; Tit 1:2; 3:7; 1 Joh 3:2,3). The foundations of this hope were many:

(a) Primarily, of course, the promises of the Old Testament, which were the basis of Christ’s teaching.

Such are often quoted at length (Ac 2:16, etc.), while they underlie countless other passages. These promises are the "anchor of hope" that holds the soul fast (Heb 6:18-20). In part, then, the earliest Christian expectations coincided with the Jewish, and the "hope of Israel" (Ac 28:20; compare 26:6,7; Eph 2:12, and especially Ro 11:25-32) was a common ground on which Jew and Christian might meet. Still, through the confidence of forgiveness and purification given in the atonement (Heb 9:14, etc.), the Christian felt himself to have a "better hope" (Heb 7:19), which the Jew could not know.

(b) Specifically Christian, however, was the pledge given in the resurrection of Christ. This sealed His Messiahship and proved His lordship (Ro 1:4; Eph 1:18-20; 1Pe 3:21, etc.), so sending forth His followers with the certainty of victory. In addition, Christ's resurrection was felt to be the first step in the general resurrection, and hence, a proof that the consummation of all things had begun (1Co 15:23; compare Ac 23:6; 24:15; 26:6,7; 1Th 4:13,14, etc.).

(c) But more than all, devotion to Christ produced a religious experience that gave certainty to hope. "Hope putteth not to shame; because the love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us" (Ro 5:5; compare 8:16,17; 2Co 1:22; 5:5; Eph 1:14, etc., and see HOLY SPIRIT). Even visible miracles were wrought by the Spirit that were signs of the end (Ac 2:17) as well as of the individual's certainty of partaking in the final happiness (Ac 10:47; 19:6, etc.).

(3) Yet, certain though the hope might be, it was not yet attained, and the interim was an opportunity to develop faith, "the substance of the things hoped for" (Heb 11:1). Indeed, hope is simply faith directed toward the future, and no sharp distinction between faith and hope is attainable. It is easy enough to see how the King James Version felt "confession of our faith" clearer than "confession of our hope" in Heb 10:23, although the rendition of elpis by "faith" was arbitrary. So in Ro 8:20-24, "hope" is scarcely more than "faith" in this specialized aspect. In particular, in 8:24 we have as the most natural translation (compare Eph 2:5,8), "By hope we were saved" (so the King James Version, the English Revised Version, the American Revised Version margin), only a pedantic insistence on words can find in this any departure from the strictest Pauline theology (compare the essential outlook on the future of the classic example of "saving faith" in Ro 4:18-22, especially verse 18). Still, the combination is unusual, and the Greek may be rendered equally well "For hope we were saved" ("in hope" of the American Standard Revised Version is not so good); i.e. our salvation, in so far as it is past, is but to prepare us for what is to come (compare Eph 4:4; 1Pe 1:3). But this postponement of the full attainment, through developing faith, gives stedfastness (Ro 8:25; compare 1Th 1:3; 5:8; Heb 3:6; 6:11), which could be gained in no other way. On the other hand this stedfastness, produced by hope, reacts again on hope and increases it (Ro 5:4; 15:4). and so on. But no attempt is made in the New Testament to give a catalogue of the "fruits of hope," and, indeed, such lists are inevitably artificial.

(4) One passage that deserves special attention is 1Co 13:13, "Now abideth faith, hope, love, these three." "Abideth" is in contrast to "shall be done away" in 13:8,9, and the time of the abiding is consequently after the Parousia; i.e. while many gifts are for the present world only, faith, hope and love are eternal and endure in the next world. 1Co 13 is evidently a very carefully written section, and the permanence of faith and hope cannot be set down to any mere carelessness on Paul's part, but the meaning is not very clear. Probably he felt that the triad of virtues was so essentially a part of the

Christian’s character that the existence of the individual without them was unthinkable, without trying to define what the object of faith and hope would be in the glorified state. If any answer is to be given, it must be found in the doctrine that even in heaven life will not be static but will have opportunities of unlimited growth. Never will the finite soul be able to dispense entirely with faith, while at each stage the growth into the next can be anticipated through hope.

3. Practical:

Only adventist bodies can use all the New Testament promises literally, and the translation of the eschatological language into modern practical terms is not always easy. The simplest method is that already well developed in the Fourth Gospel, where the phrase "kingdom of God" is usually replaced by the words "eternal life," i.e. for a temporal relation between this world and the next is substituted a local, so that the accent is laid on the hope that awaits the individual beyond the grave. On the other hand, the cataclysmic imagery of the New Testament may be interpreted in evolutionary form. God, by sending into the world the supernatural power seen in the Christian church, is working for the race as well as for the individual, and has for His whole creation, as well as for individual souls, a goal in store. The individual has for his support the motives of the early church and, in particular, learns through the cross that even his own sins shall not disappoint him of his hope. But both of the above interpretations are needed if religion is fairly to represent the spirit of the New Testament. A pure individualism that looks only beyond the grave for its hope empties the phrase "kingdom of God" of its meaning and tends inevitably to asceticism. And, in contrast, the religion of Jesus cannot be reduced to a mere hope of ethical advance for the present world. A Christianity that loses a transcendent, eschatological hope ceases to be Christianity.

Burton Scott Easton

HOPHNI AND PHINEHAS

hof’-ni, fin’-e-as, -az (chophni, "pugilist" (?), pinechac, probably "face of brass"): Sons of Eli, priests of the sanctuary at Shiloh. Their character was wicked enough to merit the double designation "sons of Eli" and (the King James Version) "sons of Belial" (the Revised Version, margin "base men," 1Sa 2:12). Their evil practices are described (1Sa 2:12-17). Twice is Eli warned concerning them, once by an unknown prophet (1Sa 2:27) and again by the lips of the young Samuel (1Sa 3:11-18). The curse fell at the battle of Aphek (1Sa 4:1-18) at which the brothers were slain, the ark was taken and the disaster occurred which caused Eli’s death. Phinehas was father of the posthumous Ichabod, whose name marks the calamity (see ICHABOD). A remoter sequel to the prophetic warnings is seen in the deposition of Abiathar, of the house of Eli, from the priestly office (1Ki 2:26,27,35).

Henry Wallace

HOPHRA

hof’-ra.

See PHARAOH HOPHRA.

HOR, MOUNT

hor (hor ha-har; literally, "Hor, the mountain"):

1. Not Jebel Neby Harun:

(1) a tradition identifying this mountain with Jebel Neby Harun may be traced from the time of Josephus (Ant., IV, iv, 7) downward. Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. Hor) favors this identification, which has been accepted by many travelers and scholars. In HDB, while noting the fact that it has been questioned, Professor Hull devotes all the space at his disposal to a description of Jebel Neby Harun. It is now recognized, however, that this identification is impossible. Niebuhr (Reise nach Arabic, 238), Pocoke (Description of the East, I, 157), Robinson (BR, I, 185), Ewald (Hist. of Israel, II, 201, note), and others had pointed out difficulties in the way, but the careful discussion of Dr. H. Clay Trumbull (Kadesh Barnea, 127 ff) finally disposed of the claims of Jebel Neby Harun.

2. Suggested Identification:

From Nu 20:22; 33:37 we may perhaps infer that Mt. Hor, "in the edge of the land of Edom," was about a day’s journey from Kadesh. The name "Hor the mountain" suggests a prominent feature of the landscape. Aaron was buried there (Nu 20:28; De 32:50). It was therefore not in Mt. Seir (De 2:5), of which not even a foot-breadth was given to Israel. Jebel Neby Harun is certainly a prominent feature of the landscape, towering over the tumbled hills that form the western edges of the Edom plateau to a height of 4,800 ft. But it is much more than a day’s journey from Kadesh, while it is well within the boundary of Mt. Seir. The king of Arad was alarmed at the march to Mt. Hor. Had Israel marched toward Jebel Neby Harun, away to the Southeast, it could have caused him no anxiety, as he dwelt in the north.

3. Jebel Maderah:

This points to some eminence to the North or Northeast of Kadesh. A hill meeting sufficiently all these conditions is Jebel Maderah (see HALAK, MOUNT), which rises to the Northeast of ‘Ain qadis (Kadeshbarnea). It stands at the extreme Northwest boundary of the land of Edom, yet not within that boundary. Above the barrenness of the surrounding plain this "large, singular-looking, isolated chalk hill" rises "alone like a lofty citadel," "steep-sided" and "quite naked." Here the solemn transactions described in Nu 20:22 ff could have been carried out literally, "in the sight of all the congregation." While certainty is impossible, no more likely suggestion has been made.

(2) A mountain named only in Nu 34:7 f as on the North boundary of the land of Israel. No success has

attended the various attempts made to identify this particular height. Some would make it Mt. Hermon (Hull, HDB, under the word); others Jebel Akkar, an outrunner on the Northeast of Lebanon (Furrer, ZDPV, VIII, 27), and others the mountain at the "knee of" Nahr el-Qasimiyeh (van Kasteren, Rev. Biblical, 1895, 30 f). In Eze 47:15 ha-derekh, should certainly be amended to chadhrakh, a proper name, instead of "the way." Possibly then Mt. Hor should disappear from Nu 34:7 f, and we should read, with slight emendation, "From the great sea ye shall draw a line for you as far as Hadrach, and from Hadrach ...."

W. Ewing

HOR-HAGGIDGAD

hor-ha-gid'-gad (chor ha-gidhgadh): A desert camp of the Israelites between Beeroth Bene-jaakan and Jotbathah (Nu 33:32 f). In De 10:7 it is called Gudgodah.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

HORAM

ho'-ram (horam, "height"): a king of Gezer defeated by Joshua when he came to the help of Lachish, which Joshua was besieging (Jos 10:33).

HOREB

ho'-reb.

See SINAI.

HOREM

ho'-rem (chorem, "consecrated"): One of the fenced cities in the territory of Naphtali (Jos 19:38), named with Iron and Migdal-el. It may possibly be identified with the modern Hurah, which lies on a mound at the South end of Wady el-'Ain, to the West of Qedes.

HORESH

ho'-resh (choreshah, 1Sa 23:15,18, margin only; Septuagint en Te Kaine, "in the New"; English Versions of the Bible "in the wood" (ba-choreshdh), the particle "in" being combined with the article): Choresh in other passages is translated "forest" (compare 2Ch 27:4; Isa 17:9; Eze 31:3) and it is most probable that it should be so translated here.

HORI

ho’-ri (chori, "cave-dweller"):

(1) A Horite descendant of Esau (Ge 36:22; 1Ch 1:39).

(2) A Simonite, father of Shaphat, one of the twelve spies (Nu 13:5).

HORITE; HORIM

ho’-rit, ho’-rim (chori, chorim; Chorraioi): Denoted the inhabitants of Mt. Seir before its occupation by the Edomites (De 2:12). Seir is accordingly called Horite in Ge 36:20,30, where a list of his descendants is given, who afterward mixed with the invading Edomites. Esau himself married the daughter of the Horite chieftain Anah (Ge 36:25; see 36:2, where "Hivite" must be corrected into "Horite"). The "Horites" in their "Mt. Seir" were among the nations defeated by the army of Chedorlaomer in the age of Abraham (Ge 14:6). The Hebrew Horitc, however, is the Khar of the Egyptian inscriptions, a name given to the whole of Southern Palestine and Edom as well as to the adjacent sea. In accordance with this we find in the Old Testament also traces of the existence of the Horites in other parts of the country besides Mt. Seir. In Ge 34:2; Jos 9:7, the Septuagint (Cod. A) more correctly reads "Horite" instead of "Hivite" for the inhabitants of Shechem and Gibeon, and Caleb is said to be "the son of Hur, the first-born of Ephratah" or Bethlehem (1Ch 2:50; 4:4). Hor or Horite has sometimes been explained to mean "cave-dweller"; it more probably, however, denotes the "white" race. The Horites were Semites, and consequently are distinguished in De 2:12 from the tall race of Rephaim.

A. H. Sayce

HORMAH

hor’-ma (chormah): A city first mentioned in connection with the defeat of the Israelites by the Amalekites and the Canaanites, when, after the ten spies who brought an evil report of the land had died of plague, the people persisted, against the will of Moses, in going "up unto the place which Yahweh hath promised" (Nu 14:45; De 1:44). after the injury done them by the king of Arad, Israel took the city, utterly destroyed it, and called it Hormah, i, e. "accursed" (Nu 21:3). To this event probably the reference is in Jud 1:17; where Judah and Simeon are credited with the work. In Jos 12:14 it is named between Geder and Arad; in Jos 15:30 between Chesil and Ziklag, among the uttermost cities toward the border of Edom in the South; and in Jos 19:4 between Bethul and Ziklag (compare 1Ch 4:30). To it David sent a share of the spoil taken from the Amalekites who had raided Ziklag (1Sa 30:30). The city must have lain not far from Kadesh, probably to the Northeast. No name resembling Hormah has been recovered in that district. The ancient name was Zephath (Jud 1:17). It is not unlikely that in popular use this name outlived Hormah: and in some form it may survive to this day. In that case it may be represented by the modern ec-Cabaita between el-Khalaca in the North and ‘Ain Qadis in the South,

about 23 miles from the latter. If we may identify Ziklag with ‘Asluj, about 14 miles North of ec-Cabaita, the probability is heightened. Robinson (BR, III, 150) compares the name Zephath with that of Naqb ec-Cafa, to the North of Wady el-Fiqrah; but this appears to be too far—about 40 miles—from Kadesh.

W. Ewing

HORN

horn (Hebrew and Aramaic qeren; keras; for the "ram’s horn" (yobhel) of Jos 6 see MUSIC, and for the "inkhorn" of Eze 9 (qeceth) see separate article):

(1) Qeren and keras represent the English "horn" exactly, whether on the animal (Ge 22:13), or used for musical purposes (Jos 6:5; 1Ch 25:5), or for containing a liquid (1Sa 16:1,13; 1Ki 1:39), but in Eze 27:15 the horns of ivory are of course tusks and the "horns" of ebony are small (pointed?) logs. Consequently most of the usages require no explanation.

(2) Both the altar of burnt offering (Ex 27:2; 38:2; compare Eze 43:15) and the incense altar (Ex 30:2; 37:25,26; compare Re 9:13) had "horns," which are explained to be projections "of one piece with" the wooden framework and covered with the brass (or gold) that covered the altar. They formed the most sacred part of the altar and were anointed with the blood of the most solemn sacrifices (only) (Ex 30:10; Le 4:7,18,25,30,34; 16:18; compare Eze 43:20), and according to Le 8:15; 9:9, the first official sacrifices began by anointing them. Consequently cutting off the horns effectually desecrated the altar (Am 3:14), while "sin graven on them" (Jer 17:1) took all efficacy from the sacrifice. On the other hand they offered the highest sanctuary (1Ki 1:50,51; 2:28). Of their symbolism nothing whatever is said, and the eventual origin is quite obscure. "Remnants of a bull-cult" and "miniature sacred towers" have been suggested, but are wholly uncertain. A more likely origin is from an old custom of draping the altar with skins of sacrificed animals (RS, 436). That, however, the "horns" were mere conveniences for binding the sacrificial animals (Ps 118:27, a custom referred to nowhere else in the Old Testament), is most unlikely.

See ALTAR.

(3) The common figurative use of "horn" is taken from the image of battling animals (literal use in Da 8:7, etc.) to denote aggressive strength. So Zedekiah ben Chenaanah illustrates the predicted defeat of the enemies by pushing with iron horns (1Ki 22:11; 2Ch 18:10), while "horns of the wildox" (De 33:17; Ps 22:21; 92:10, the King James Version "unicorn") represent the magnitude of power, and in Zec 1:18-21 "horns" stand for power in general. In Hab 3:4 the "horns coming out of his hand" denote the potency of Yahweh’s gesture (the Revised Version (British and American) "rays" may be smoother, but is weak). So to "exalt the horn" (1Sa 2:1,10; Ps 75:4, etc.) is to clothe with strength, and to "cut off the horn" (not to be explained by Am 3:14) is to rob of power (Ps 75:10; Jer 48:25). Hence, the "horn of salvation" in 2Sa 22:3; Ps 18:2; Lu 1:69 is a means of active defense and not a place of sanctuary as in 1Ki 1:50. When, in Da 7:7-24; 8:3,8,9,20,21; Re 13:1; 17:3,7,12,16, many horns are given to the same animal,

they figure successive nations or rulers. But the seven horns in Re 5:6; 12:3 denote the completeness of the malevolent or righteous power. In Re 13:11, however, the two horns point only to the external imitation of the harmless lamb, the "horns" being mere stubs.

Burton Scott Easton

HORNET

hor'-net (tsir'ah; compare tsor'ah, "Zorah" (Jud 13:2, etc.); also compare tsara'ath, "leprosy" (Le 13:2, etc.); from tsara', "to smite"; Septuagint sphekia, literally, "wasp's nest"): Hornets are mentioned only in Ex 23:28; De 7:20; Jos 24:12. All three references are to the miraculous interposition of God in driving out before the Israelites the original inhabitants of the promised land. There has been much speculation as to whether hornets are literally meant. The following seems to throw some light on this question (Ex 23:20,27,28): "Behold, I send an angel before thee, to keep thee by the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. .... I will send my terror before thee, and will discomfit all the people to whom thou shalt come, and I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee. And I will send the hornet before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee." The "terror" of Ex 23:27 may well be considered to be typified by the "hornet" of 23:28, the care for the Israelites (23:20) being thrown into marked contrast with the confusion of their enemies. Compare Isa 7:18, where the fly and the bee symbolize the military forces of Egypt and Assyria: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that Yahweh will hiss for the fly that is in the uttermost part of the rivers of Egypt, and for the bee that is in the land of Assyria."

Hornets and wasps belong to the family Vespidae of the order Hymenoptera. Both belong to the genus Vespa, the hornets being distinguished by their large size. Both hornets and wasps are abundant in Palestine (compare Zorah, which may mean "town of hornets"). a large kind is called in Arabic debbur, which recalls the Hebrew debhorah, "bee." They sting fiercely, but not unless molested.

Alfred Ely Day

HORNS OF THE ALTAR

(qare-noth ha-mizbeach):

1. The Brazen Altar:

These projections at the four corners of the altar of burnt offering were of one piece with the altar, and were made of acacia wood overlaid with brass (Ex 27:2, "bronze"). In Ezekiel's altar-specifications their position is described as being on a level with the altar hearth (Eze 43:15). Fugitives seeking asylum might cling to the horns of the altar, as did Adonijah (1Ki 1:50), which is one proof among many that worshippers had at all times access to the neighborhood of the altar. On certain occasions, as at the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:12), and a sin offering for one of the people of the land (Le

4:30), the horns were touched with sacrificial blood.

2. The Golden Altar:

The altar of incense, standing in the outer chamber of the sanctuary, had also four horns, which were covered with gold (Ex 37:25). These were touched with blood in the case of a sin offering for a high priest, or for the whole congregation, if they had sinned unwittingly (Le 4:7,18).

See ALTAR; HORN.

W. Shaw Caldecott

HORNS, RAMS'

See MUSIC.

HORONAIM

hor-o-na'-im (~choronayim]; Aronieim; in Jeremiah Oronaim, "the two hollows"): an unidentified place in the South of Moab. It is named in Jer 48:5. Isaiah (15:5) and Jeremiah (48:3) speak of "the way to Horanaim"; and Jeremiah (48:5) of the ," descent," or "going down" of Horonaim. Mesha (MS) says he was bidden by Chemosh to "go down" and fight against Choronem. Probably, therefore, it lay on one of the roads leading down from the Moabite plateau to the Arabah. It is mentioned by Josephus as having been taken by Alexander Janneus (Ant., XIII, xv, 4). Hyrcanus promised to restore it and the rest to Aretas (XIV, i, 4). There is no indication that in early times it was ever possessed by Israel. Buhl (GAP 272 f) thinks it may be represented by some significant ruins near Wady ed-Dera'a (Wady Kerak).

W. Ewing

HORONITE

hor'-o-nit, ho'-ro-nit (ha-choroni): an appellation of Sanballat (Ne 2:10,19; 13:28), as an inhabitant of BETH-HORON (which see).

HORRIBLE

hor'-i-b'-l (sha'arur, sha'aruri): In Jer 5:30 sha'arur, "vile," "horrible," is translated "horrible," "a wonderful and horrible thing" the Revised Version margin "astonishment and horror"; also Jer 23:14; in 18:13; Ho 6:10 it is sha'aruri; in Ps 11:6 we have zil'aphah, "heat," the Revised Version (British and American) "burning wind"; in Ps 40:2 sha'on, "noise," "tumult," "He brought me up .... out of a horrible pit," the Revised Version margin "a pit of tumult" (or destruction). Horribly is the translation of sa'ar,

"to shudder," "to be whirled away," in Jer 2:12, and of sa‘ar, "fear," "trembling," in Eze 32:10; in Eze 27:35 the Revised Version (British and American) has "horribly afraid" (sa‘ar) for "sore afraid." "Horrible" occurs frequently in Apocrypha (2 Esdras 11:45; 15:28,34; The Wisdom of Solomon 3:19, "For horrible (chalepos) is the end of the unrighteous generation" the Revised Version (British and American) "grievous" etc.).

W. L. Walker

HORROR

hor’-er (’emah, pallatsuth): In Ge 15:12 ‘emah (often rendered "terror") is translated "horror," "a horror of great darkness"; pallatsuth, "trembling," "horror" (Ps 55:5; Eze 7:18); zal‘aphah, "glow," "heat" (Ps 119:53, the Revised Version (British and American) "hot indignation," margin "horror"); compare Ps 11:6; La 5:10. For "trembling" (Job 21:6) and for "fearfulness" (Isa 21:4) the Revised Version (British and American) has "horror." "Horror" does not occur in the New Testament, but in 2 Macc 3:17 we have "The man was so compassed with horror" (phrikasmos), the Revised Version (British and American) "shuddering."

HORSE

hors:

1. Names:

The common names are (1) cuc, and

(2) hippos.

(3) The word parash, "horseman," occurs often, and in several cases is translated "horse" or "warhorse" (Isa 28:28; Eze 27:14; Joe 2:4 the Revised Version, margin); also in 2Sa 16, where the "horsemen" of English Versions of the Bible is ba‘ale ha-parashim, "owners of horses"; compare Arabic faris, "horseman," and faras, "horse".

(4) The feminine form cucah, occurs in So 1:9, and is rendered as follows: Septuagint he hippos; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) equitatum; the King James Version "company of horses," the Revised Version (British and American) "steed." It is not clear why English Versions of the Bible does not have "mare."

(5) The word ‘abbirim, "strong ones," is used for horses in Jud 5:22; Jer 8:16; 47:3; 50:11 (the King James Version "bulls"). In Ps 22:12 the same word is translated "strong bulls" (of Bashan).

(6) For [~rekhesh (compare Arabic rakad, "to run"), in 1Ki 4:28; Es 8:10,14; Mic 1:13, the Revised Version (British and American) has "swift steeds," while the King James Version gives "dromedaries" in 1Ki and "mules" in Est.

(7) For kirkaroth (Isa 66:20), the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "swift beasts"; the English Revised Version margin and the American Standard Revised Version "dromedaries"; Septuagint skiddia, perhaps "covered carriages." In Es 8:10,14 we find the doubtful words

(8) ‘achashteranim, and

(9) bene ha-rammakim, which have been variously translated. the King James Version has respectively "camels" and "young dromedaries," the Revised Version (British and American) "used in the king’s service" and "bred of the stud," the Revised Version margin "mules" and "young dromedaries."

See CAMEL.

2. Origin:

The Hebrew and Egyptian names for the horse are alike akin to the Assyrian. The Jews may have obtained horses from Egypt (De 17:16), but the Canaanites before them had horses (Jos 17:16), and in looking toward the Northeast for the origin of the horse, philologists are in agreement with zoologists who consider that the plains of Central Asia, and also of Europe, were the original home of the horse. At least one species of wild horse is still found in Central Asia.

3. Uses:

The horses of the Bible are almost exclusively war-horses, or at least the property of kings and not of the common people. A doubtful reference to the use of horses in threshing grain is found in Isa 28:28. Horses are among the property which the Egyptians gave to Joseph in exchange for grain (Ge 47:17). In De 17:16 it is enjoined that the king "shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he may multiply horses." This and other injunctions failed to prevent the Jews from borrowing from the neighboring civilizations their customs, idolatries, and vices. Solomon’s horses are enumerated in 1Ki 4, and the se‘irim and tebhen of 1Ki 4:28 (5:8) are identical with the sha‘ir ("barley") and tibn ("straw") with which the arab feeds his horse today. In war, horses were ridden and were driven in chariots (Ex 14:9; Jos 11:4; 2Sa 15:1, etc.).

4. Figurative and Descriptive:

The horse is referred to figuratively chiefly in Zechariah and Revelation. A chariot and horses of fire take Elijah up to heaven (2Ki 2:11 f). In Ps 20:7; 33:17; and 76:6, the great strength of the horse is recalled as a reminder of the greater strength of God. In Jas 3:3, the small bridle by which the horse can

be managed is compared to the tongue (compare Ps 32:9). In Job 39:19-25 we have a magnificent description of a spirited war-horse.

Alfred Ely Day

HORSE GATE

See JERUSALEM.

HORSE, BLACK

(hippos melas): Symbolic of famine ("balance .... measure of wheat for a shilling," etc., Re 6:5,6; compare Zec 6:2,6).

See REVELATION OF JOHN.

HORSE, RED

(hippos purros): Symbolic of war, bloodshed ("slay one another," etc., Re 6:4; compare Zec 18; 6:2).

See REVELATION OF JOHN.

HORSE, WHITE

(hippos leukos): Symbolic of victory, conquest ("bow .... conquering and to conquer," Re 6:2; 19:11,14; compare Zec 1:8; 6:3,1).

See REVELATION OF JOHN.

HORSELEACH

hors'-lech ('aluqah; compare Arabic 'aluqah, "ghoul," and 'alaqah, "leech," from root 'aliq, "to cling"; Septuagint bdella, "leech"): The word occurs only once, in Pr 30:15, the Revised Version margin "vampire." In Arabic 'alaqah is a leech of any kind, not only a horse-leech. The Arabic 'aluqah, which, it may be noted, is almost identical with the Hebrew form, is a ghoul (Arabic ghul), an evil spirit which seeks to injure men and which preys upon the dead. The mythical vampire is similar to the ghoul. In zoology the name "vampire" is applied to a family of bats inhabiting tropical America, some, but not all, of which suck blood. In the passage cited the Arabic Bible has 'aluqah, "ghoul." If leech is meant, there can be no good reason for specifying "horseleach." At least six species of leech are known in Palestine and Syria, and doubtless others exist. They are common in streams, pools, and fountains where animals drink. They enter the mouth, attach themselves to the interior of the mouth or pharynx, and are removed

only with difficulty.

Alfred Ely Day

HORSEMAN

hors’-man.

See ARMY.

HORSES OF THE SUN

(2Ki 23:11): In connection with the sun-worship practiced by idolatrous kings in the temple at Jerusalem (2Ki 23:5; compare Eze 8:16), horses dedicated to the sun, with chariots, had been placed at the entrance of the sacred edifice. These Josiah, in his great reformation, "took away," and burned the chariots with fire. Horses sacred to the sun were common among oriental peoples (Bochart, Heiroz., I, 2, 10).

HOSAH

ho’-sa (chocah): A city on the border of Asher, in the neighborhood of Tyre (Jos 19:29). Septuagint reads Iaseiph, which might suggest identification with Kefr Yasif, to the Northeast of Acre. Possibly, however, as Sayce (HCM, 429) and Moore (Judges, 51) suggest, Hosah may represent the Assyrian Usu. Some scholars think that Usu was the Assyrian name for Palaetyrus. If "the fenced city of Tyre" were that on the island, while the city on the mainland lay at Ras el-‘Ain, 30 stadia to the South (Strabo xvi.758), this identification is not improbable.

HOSANNA

ho-zan’-a (hosanna): This Greek transliteration of a Hebrew word occurs 6 times in the Gospels as the cry of the people when our Lord entered Jerusalem as the Messiah represented by Zec (9:9), and of "the children" when He cleansed the temple (Mt 21:9 bis, 15; Mr 11:9 f; Joh 12:13). In Mt 21:9 it is "Hosanna to the son of David!" followed by "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest!"; in 21:15 it is also "Hosanna to the Son of David!"; in Mr 11:9 f it is "Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Blessed is the kingdom that cometh, the kingdom of our father David: Hosanna in the highest"; and in Joh 12:13 it is "Hosanna: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, even the King of Israel." Thus in all the evangelists it is an acclamation or ascription of praise. This has raised the question whether the supposed derivation from Ps 118:25, beginning with ‘annah YHWH hoshi‘ah nna’," Save now, pray" (which is followed (118:26) by "Blessed be he that cometh (the Revised Version margin "or entereth") in the name of Yahweh") is correct. (See Thayer, HDB; Cheyne, EB; Dalman, Words of Jesus.) Various other explanations have been suggested. Thayer remarks, "It is most natural to regard the word Hosanna, as respects its form, as

neither syncopated nor contracted, but the shorter Hiphil imperative with the appended enclitic" (hosha‘na’; compare Ps 86:2; Jer 31:7), for which there is Talmudic warrant. "As respects its force, we must for .... contextual reasons, assume that it had already lost its primary supplicatory sense and become an ejaculation of joy or shout of welcome." It is said to have been so used in this sense at the joyous Feast of Tabernacles, the 7th day of which came to be called "the Great Hosanna," or "Hosanna Day." But, while the word is certainly an ejaculation of praise and not one of supplication, the idea of salvation need not be excluded. As in Re 7:10 (compare 19:1), we have the acclamation, "Salvation unto God .... and unto the Lamb," so we might have the cry, "Salvation to the son of David"; and "Hosanna in the Highest," might be the equivalent of "Salvation unto our God!" He who was "coming in the name of the Lord" was the king who was bringing salvation from God to the people.

W. L. Walker

HOSEA

ho-ze’-a:

I. THE PROPHET

1. Name

2. Native Place

3. Date

4. Personal History (Marriage)

(1) Allegorical View

(2) Literal View

II. THE BOOK

1. Style and Scope

2. Historical Background

3. Contents and Divisions

(1) Hosea 1-3

(2) Hosea 4-14

4. Testimony to Earlier History

5. Testimony to Law

6. Affinity with Deuteronomy

LITERATURE

I. The Prophet.

1. Name:

The name (hoshea Septuagint Osee-; for other forms see note in DB), probably meaning "help," seems to have been not uncommon, being derived from the auspicious verb from which we have the frequently recurring word "salvation." It may be a contraction of a larger form of which the Divine name or its abbreviation formed a part, so as to signify "God is help," or "Help, God." according to Nu 13:8,16 that was the original name of Joshua son of Nun, till Moses gave him the longer name (compounded with the name of Yahweh) which he continued to bear (yehoshua‘), "Yahweh is salvation." The last king of the Northern Kingdom was also named Hosea (2Ki 15:30), and we find the same name borne by a chief of the tribe of Ephraim under David (1Ch 27:20) and by a chief under Nehemiah (Ne 10:23).

2. Native Place:

Although it is not directly stated in the book, there can be little doubt that he exercised his ministry in the kingdom of the Ten Tribes. Whereas his references to Judah are of a general kind, Ephraim or Samaria being sometimes mentioned in the same connection or more frequently alone, the situation implied throughout and the whole tone of the addresses agree with what we know of the Northern Kingdom at the time, and his references to places and events in that kingdom are so numerous and minute as to lead to the conclusion that he not only prophesied there, but that he was a native of that part of the country. Gilead, e.g. a district little named in the prophets, is twice mentioned in Ho (6:8; 12:11) and in such a manner as to suggest that he knew it by personal observation; and Mizpah (mentioned in 5:1) is no doubt the Mizpah in Gilead (Jud 10:17). Then we find Tabor (Ho 5:1), Shechem (Ho 6:9 the Revised Version (British and American)), Gilgal and Bethel (Ho 4:15; 9:15; 10:5,8,15; 12:11). Even Lebanon in the distant North is spoken of with a minuteness of detail which could be expected only from one very familiar with Northern Palestine (Ho 14:5-8). In a stricter sense, therefore, than amos who, though a native of Tekoah, had a prophetic mission to the North, Hosea may be called the prophet of Northern Israel, and his book, as Ewald has said, is the prophetic voice wrung from the bosom of the kingdom itself.

3. Date:

All that we are told directly as to the time when Hosea prophesied is the statement in the first verse that the word of the Lord came to him "in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and in the days of Jeroboam the son of Joash, king of Israel." It is quite evident that his ministry did not extend over the combined reigns of all these kings; for, from the beginning of the reign of Uzziah to the beginning of that of Hezekiah, according to the now usually received chronology (Kautzsch, Literature of the Old Testament, English Translation), there is a period of 52 years, and Jeroboam came to his throne a few years before the accession of Uzziah.

When we examine the book itself for more precise indications of date, we find that the prophet threatens in God's name that in "a little while" He will "avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu." Now Jeroboam was the great-grandson of Jehu, and his son Zechariah, who succeeded him, reigned only six months and was the last of the line of Jehu. We may, therefore, place the beginning of Hosea's ministry a short time before the death of Jeroboam which took place 743 BC. as to the other limit, it is to be observed that, though the downfall of "the kingdom of the house of Israel" is threatened (Ho 1:4), the catastrophe had not occurred when the prophet ceased his ministry. The date of that event is fixed in the year 722 BC, and it is said to have happened in the 6th year of King Hezekiah. This does not give too long a time for Hosea's activity, and it leaves the accuracy of the superscription unchallenged, whoever may have written it. If it is the work of a later editor, it may be that Hosea's ministry ceased before the reign of Hezekiah, though he may have lived on into that king's reign. It should be added, however, that there seems to be no reference to another event which might have been expected to find an echo in the book, namely, the conspiracy in the reign of Ahaz (735 BC) by Pekah of Israel and Rezin of Damascus against the kingdom of Judah (2Ki 16:5; Isa 7:1).

Briefly we may say that, though there is uncertainty as to the precise dates of the beginning and end of his activity, he began his work before the middle of the 8th century, and that he saw the rise and fall of several kings. He would thus be a younger contemporary of amos whose activity seems to have been confined to the reign of Jeroboam.

4. Personal History (Marriage):

Hosea is described as the son of Beeri, who is otherwise unknown. Of his personal history we are told either absolutely nothing or else a very great deal, according as we interpret chapters 1 and 3 of his book. In ancient and in modern times, opinions have been divided as to whether in these chapters we have a recital of actual facts, or the presentation of prophetic teaching in the form of parable or allegory.

(1) Allegorical View.

The Jewish interpreters as a rule took the allegorical view, and Jerome, in the early Christian church, no doubt following Origen the great allegorizer, states it at length, and sees an intimation of the view in the closing words of Hosea's book: "Who is wise, that he may understand these things? prudent, that he may know them?" (Ho 14:9).

It is a mystery, he says; for it is a scandal to think of Hosea being commanded to take an unchaste wife and without any reluctance obeying the command. It is a figure, like that of Jeremiah going to the Euphrates (when Jerusalem was closely besieged) and hiding a girdle in the bed of the river (Jer 13). So Ezekiel is commanded to represent, by means of a tile, the siege of Jerusalem, and to lie 390 days on his side to indicate the years of their iniquity (Eze 4); and there are other symbolical acts. Jerome then proceeds to apply the allegory first to Israel, which is the Gomer of chapter 1, and then to Judah, the wife in chapter 3, and finally to Christ and the church, the representations being types from beginning to end.

Calvin took the same view. Among modern commentators we find holding the allegorical view not only Hengstenberg, Havernick and Keil, but also Eichhorn, Rosenmuller and Hitzig. Reuss also (Das Altes Testament, II, 88 ff) protests against the literal interpretation as impossible, and that on no moral or reverential considerations, but entirely on exegetical grounds. He thinks it enough to say that, when the prophet calls his children "children of whoredom," he indicates quite clearly that he uses the words in a figurative sense; and he explains the allegory as follows: The prophet is the representative of Yahweh; Israel is the wife of Yahweh, but faithless to her husband, going after other gods; the children are the Israelites, who are therefore called children of whoredoms because they practice the idolatry of the nation. So they receive names which denote the consequences of their sin. In accordance with the allegory, the children are called the children of the prophet (for israel is God’s own) but this is not the main point; the essential thing is the naming of the children as they are named. In the third chapter, according to this interpretation, allegory again appears, but with a modification and for another purpose. Idolatrous Israel is again the unfaithful wife of the prophet as the representative of Yahweh. This relation can again be understood only as figurative; for, if the prophet stands for Yahweh, the marriage of Israel to the prophet cannot indicate infidelity to Yahweh. The sense is evident: the marriage still subsists; God does not give His people up, but they are for the present divorced "from bed and board"; it is a prophecy of the time when Yahweh will leave the people to their fate, till the day of reconciliation comes.

(2) Literal View.

The literal interpretation, adopted by Theodore of Mopsucstia in the ancient church, was followed, after the Reformation, by the chief theologians of the Lutheran church, and has been held, in modern times, by many leading expositors, including Delitzsch, Kurtz, Hofmann, Wellhausen, Cheyne, Robertson Smith, G. A. Smith and others. In this view, as generally held, chapters 1 and 3 go together and refer to the same person. The idea is that Hosea married a woman named Gomer, who had the three children here named. Whether it was that she was known to be a worthless woman before the marriage and that the prophet hoped to reclaim her, or that she proved faithless after the marriage, she finally left him and sank deeper and deeper into sin, until, at some future time, the prophet bought her from her paramour and brought her to his own house, keeping her secluded, however, and deprived of all the privileges of a wife. In support of this view it is urged that the details are related in so matter-of-fact a manner that they must be matters of fact. Though the children receive symbolical names (as Isaiah gave such names to his children), the meanings of these are clear and are explained, whereas the name of the wife cannot thus

be explained. Then there are details, such as the weaning of one child before the conception of another (Ho 1:8) and the precise price paid for the erring wife (Ho 3:2), which are not needed to keep up the allegory, and are not invested with symbolical meaning by the prophet. What is considered a still stronger argument is relied on by modern advocates of this view, the psychological argument that there is always a proportion between a revelation vouchsafed and the mental state of the person receiving it. Hosea dates the beginning of his prophetic work from the time of his marriage; it was the unfaithfulness of his wife that brought home to him the apostasy of Israel; and, as his heart went after his wayward wife, so the Divine love was stronger than Israel's sin; and thus through his own domestic experience he was prepared to be a prophet to his people.

The great difficulty in the way of accepting the literal interpretation lies, as Reuss has pointed out, in the statement at the beginning, that the prophet was commanded to take a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms. And the advocates of the view meet the difficulties in some way like this: The narrative as it stands is manifestly later than the events. On looking back, the prophet describes his wife as she turned out to be, not as she was at the beginning of the history. It is urged with some force that it was necessary to the analogy (even if the story is only a parable) that the wife should have been first of all chaste; for, in Hosea's representation, Israel at the time of its election in the wilderness was faithful and fell away only afterward (Ho 2:15; 9:10; 11:1). The narrative does not require us to assume that Comer was an immoral person or that she was the mother of children before her marriage. The children receive symbolic names, but these names do not reflect upon Gomer but upon Israel. Why, then, is she described as a woman of Whoredoms? It is answered that the expression 'esheth zenunim is a class-descriptive, and is different from the expression "a woman who is a harlot" ('ishshdh zonah). A Jewish interpreter quoted by Aben Ezra says: "Hosea was commanded to take a wife of whoredoms because an honest woman was not to be had. The whole people had gone astray—was an 'adulterous generation'; and she as one of them was a typical example, and the children were involved in the common declension (see Ho 4:1 f) ." The comment of Umbreit is worthy of notice: "as the covenant of Yahweh with Israel is viewed as a marriage bond, so is the prophetic bond with Israel a marriage, for he is the messenger and mediator. Therefore, if he feels an irresistible impulse to enter into the marriage-bond with Israel, he is bound to unite himself with a bride of an unchaste character. Yea, his own wife Comer is involved in the universal guilt" (Prak. Commentary uber die Propheten, Hamburg, 1844). It is considered, then, on this view, that Gomer, after her marriage, being in heart addicted to the prevailing idolatry, which we know was often associated with gross immorality (see Ho 4:13), felt the irksomeness of restraint in the prophet's house, left him and sank into open profligacy, from which (Ho 3) the prophet reclaimed her so far as to bring her back and keep her secluded in his own house.

Quite recently this view has been advocated by Riedel (Alttest. Untersuchungen, Leipzig, 1902), who endeavors to enforce it by giving a symbolic meaning to Gomer's name, Bath-Diblaim. The word is the dual (or might be pointed as a plural) of a word, debhelah, meaning a fruitcake, i.e. raisins or figs pressed together. It is the word used in the story of Hezekiah's illness (2Ki 20:7), and is found in the list of things furnished by abigail to David (1Sa 25:18). See also 1Sa 30:12; 1Ch 12:40. Another name for the same thing, ashishah, occurs in Ho 3:1, rendered in the King James Version "flagons of wine," but in the Revised Version (British and American) "cakes of raisins." It seems clear that this word, at least here, denotes fruit-cakes offered to the heathen deities, as was the custom in Jeremiah's time (Jer 7:18;

44:17). So Riedel argues that Comer may have been described as a "daughter of fruit-cakes" according to the Hebrew idiom in such expressions as "daughters of song," etc. (Ec 12:4; Pr 31:2; 2Sa 7:10; Ge 37:3, etc.).

It will be perceived that the literal interpretation as thus stated does not involve the supposition that Hosea became aware of his wife's infidelity before the birth of the second child, as Robertson Smith and G. A. Smith suppose. The names given to the children all refer to the infidelity of Israel as a people; and the renderings of Lo'-ruchamah, "she that never knew a father's love," and of Lo-'ammi, "no kin of mine," are too violent in this connection. Nor does the interpretation demand that it was first through his marriage and subsequent experience that the prophet received his call; although no doubt the experience through which he passed deepened the conviction of Israel's apostasy in his mind.

II. The Book.

1. Style and Scope:

Scarcely any book in the Old Testament is more difficult of exposition than the Book of Hosea. This does not seem to be owing to any exceptional defect in the transmitted text, but rather to the peculiarity of the style; and partly also, no doubt, to the fact that the historical situation of the prophet was one of bewildering and sudden change of a violent kind, which seems to reflect itself in the book. The style here is preeminently the man. Whatever view we may take of his personal history, it is evident that he is deeply affected by the situation in which he is placed. He is controlled by his subject, instead of controlling it. It is his heart that speaks; he is not careful to concentrate his thoughts or to mark his transitions; the sentences fall from him like the sobs of a broken heart. Mournful as Jeremiah, he does not indulge in the pleasure of melancholy as that prophet seems to do. Jeremiah broods over his sorrow, nurses it, and tells us he is weeping. Hosea does not say he is weeping, but we hear it in his broken utterances. Instead of laying out his plaint in measured form, he ejaculates it in short, sharp sentences, as the stabs of his people's sin pierce his heart.

The result is the absence of that rhythmic flow and studied parallelism which are such common features of Hebrew oratory, and are often so helpful to the expositor. His imagery, while highly poetical, is not elaborated; his figures are not so much carried out as thrown out; nor does he dwell long on the same figure. His sentences are like utterances of an oracle, and he forgets himself in identifying himself with the God in whose name he speaks—a feature which is not without significance in its bearing on the question of his personal history. The standing expression "Thus saith the Lord" ("It is the utterance of Yahweh" the Revised Version (British and American)), so characteristic of the prophetic style, very rarely occurs (only in Ho 2:13,16,21; 11:11); whereas the words that he speaks are the very words of the Lord; and without any formal indication of the fact, he passes from speaking in his own name to speaking in the name of Yahweh (see, e.g. Ho 6:4; 7:12; 8:13; 9:9,10,14-17, etc.). Never was speaker so absorbed in his theme, or more identified with Him for whom he speaks. He seems to be oblivious of his hearers, if indeed his chapters are the transcript or summary of spoken addresses. They certainly want to a great extent the directness and point which are so marked a feature of prophetic diction, so much so

that some (e.g. Reuss and Marti) suppose they are the production of one who had readers and not hearers in view.

But, though the style appears in this abrupt form, there is one clear note on divers strings sounding through the whole. The theme is twofold: the love of Yahweh, and the indifference of Israel to that love; and it would be hard to say which of the two is more vividly conceived and more forcibly expressed. Under the figures of the tenderest affection, sometimes that of the pitying, solicitous care of the parent (Ho 11:1,3,1; 14:3), but more prominently as the affection of the husband (Ho 1; 3), the Divine love is represented as ever enduring in spite of all indifference and opposition; and, on the other hand, the waywardness, unblushing faithlessness of the loved one is painted in colors so repulsive as almost to shock the moral sense, but giving thereby evidence of the painful abhorrence it had produced on the prophet's mind. Thus early does he take the sacred bond of husband and wife as the type of the Divine electing love—a similitude found elsewhere in prophetic literature, and most fully elaborated by Ezekiel (Eze 16; compare Jer 3). Hosea is the prophet of love, and not without propriety has been called the John of the Old Testament.

2. Historical Background:

For the reasons just stated, it is very difficult to give a systematic analysis of the Book of Hos. It may, however, be helpful to that end to recall the situation of the time as furnishing a historical setting for the several sections of the book.

At the commencement of the prophet's ministry, the Northern Kingdom was enjoying the prosperity and running into the excesses consequent on the victories of Jeroboam II. The glaring social corruptions of the times are exhibited and castigated by Amos, as they would most impress a stranger from the South; but Hosea, a native, as we are led suppose, of the Northern Kingdom, saw more deeply into the malady, and traced all the crime and vice of the nation to the fundamental evil of idolatry and apostasy from the true God. What he describes under the repulsive figure of whoredom was the rampant Worship of the be'alim, which had practically obscured the recognition of the sole claims to worship of the national Yahweh. This worship of the be'alim is to be distinguished from that of which we read at the earlier time of Elijah. Ahab's Tyrian wife Jezebel had introduced the worship of her native country, that of the Sidonian Baal, which amounted to the setting up of a foreign deity; and Elijah's contention that it must be a choice between Yahweh and Baal appealed to the sense of patriotism and the sentiment of national existence. The worship of the ba'als, however, was an older and more insidious form of idolatry. The worship of the Canaanite tribes, among whom the Israelites found themselves on the occupation of Palestine, was a reverence of local divinities, known by the names of the places where each had his shrine or influence. The generic name of ba'al or "lord" was applied naturally as a common word to each of these, with the addition of the name of place or potency to distinguish them. Thus we have Baal-hermon, Baal-gad, Baal-berith, etc. The insidiousness of this kind of worship is proved by its wide prevalence, especially among people at a low stage of intelligence, when the untutored mind is brought face to face with the mysterious and unseen forces of Nature. And the tenacity of the feeling is proved by the prevalence of such worship, even among people whose professed religion condemns idolatry of every kind. The veneration of local shrines among Christians of the East and in many parts of Europe is

well known; and Mohammedans make pilgrimages to the tombs of saints who, though not formally worshipped as deities, are believed to have the power to confer such benefits as the Canaanites expected from the ba‘als. The very name ba‘al, originally meaning simply lord and master, as in such expressions as "master of a house," "lord of a wife," "owner of an ox," would be misleading; for the Israelites could quite innocently call Yahweh their ba‘al or Lord, as we can see they did in the formation of proper names. We can, without much difficulty, conceive what would happen among a people like the Israelite tribes, of no high grade of religious intelligence, and with the prevailing superstitions in their blood, when they found themselves in Palestine. From a nomad and pastoral people they became, and had to become, agriculturists; the natives of the land would be their instructors, in many or in most cases the actual labor would be done by them. The Book of Jud tells us emphatically that several of the Israelite tribes "did not drive out" the native inhabitants; the northern tribes in particular, where the land was most fertile, tolerated a large native admixture. We are also told (Jud 2:7) that the people served the Lord all the days of Joshua and of the elders who outlived Joshua; and this hint of a gradual declension no doubt points to what actually took place. For a time they remembered and thought of Yahweh as the God who had done for them great things in Egypt and in the wilderness; and then, as time went on, they had to think of Him as the giver of the land in which they found themselves, with all its varied produce. But this was the very thing the Canaanites ascribed to their ba‘als. And so, imperceptibly, by naming places as the natives named them, by observing the customs which the natives followed, and celebrating the festivals of the agricultural year, they were gliding into conformity with the religion of their neighbors; for, in such a state of society, custom is more or less based on religion and passes for religion. Almost before they were aware, they were doing homage to the various ba‘als in celebrating their festival days and offering to them the produce of the ground.

Such was the condition which Hosea describes as an absence of the knowledge of God (Ho 4:1). And the consequence cannot be better described than in the words of Paul: "As they refused to have God in their knowledge, God gave them up unto a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not fitting" (Ro 1:28). Both Hosea and Amos tell us in no ambiguous terms how the devotees of the impure worship gave themselves up "to work all uncleanness with greediness" (Eph 4:19; compare Am 2:7 f; Ho 4:14); and how deeply the canker had worked into the body politic is proved by the rapid collapse and irretrievable ruin which followed soon after the strong hand of Jeroboam was removed. The 21 years that followed his death in 743 BC saw no fewer than six successive occupants of the throne, and the final disappearance of the kingdom of the ten tribes. Zechariah, his son, had reigned only six months when "Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him .... and slew him, and reigned in his stead" (2Ki 15:10). Shallum himself reigned only a month when he was in the same bloody manner removed by Menahem. After a reign of 10 years, according to 2Ki 15:17 (although the chronology here is uncertain), he was succeeded by his son Pekahiah (2Ki 15:22), and after two years Pekah "his captain" conspired against him and reigned in his stead (2Ki 15:25). This king also was assassinated, and was succeeded by Hoshea (2Ki 15:30), the last king of the ten tribes, for the kingdom came to an end in 722 BC. Hosea must have lived during a great part of those troubled times; and we may expect to hear echoes of the events in his book.

3. Contents and Divisions:

(1) Hosea 1-3.

We should naturally expect that the order of the chapters would correspond in the main with the progress of events; and there is at least a general agreement among expositors that Hosea 1-3 refer to an earlier period than those that follow. In favor of this is the reference in 1:2 to the commencement of the prophet's ministry, as also the threatening of the impending extirpation of the house of Jehu (1:4), implying that it was still in existence; and finally the hints of the abundance amounting to luxury which marked the prosperous time of Jeroboam's reign. These three chapters are to be regarded as going together; and, however they may be viewed as reflecting the prophet's personal experience, they leave no room for doubt in regard to the national apostasy that weighed so heavily on his heart. And this, in effect, is what he says: Just as the wife, espoused to a loving husband, enjoys the protection of home and owes all her provision to her husband, so Israel, chosen by Yahweh and brought by Him into a fertile land, has received all she has from Him alone. The giving of recognition to the ba'als for material prosperity was tantamount to a wife's bestowing her affection on another; the accepting of these blessings as bestowed on condition of homage rendered to the ba'als was tantamount to the receiving of hire by an abandoned woman. This being so, the prophet, speaking in God's name, declares what He will do, in a series of a thrice repeated "therefore" (2:6,9,14), marking three stages of His discipline. First of all, changing the metaphor to that of a straying heifer, the prophet in God's name declares (2:6 ff) that He will hedge up her way with thorns, so that she will not be able to reach her lovers—meaning, no doubt, that whether by drought or blight, or some national misfortune, there would be such a disturbance of the processes of Nature that the usual rites of homage to the ba'als would prove ineffectual. The people would fail to find the "law of the god of the land" (2Ki 17:26). In their perplexity they would bethink themselves, begin to doubt the power of the ba'als, and resolve to pay to Yahweh the homage they had been giving to the local gods. But this is still the same low conception of Yahweh that had led them astray. To exchange one God for another simply in the hope of enjoying material prosperity is not the service which He requires. And then comes the second "therefore" (Ho 2:9). Instead of allowing them to enjoy their corn and wine and oil on the terms of a mere lip allegiance or ritual service, Yahweh will take these away, will reduce Israel to her original poverty, causing all the mirth of her festival days to cease, and giving garments of mourning for festal attire. Her lovers will no longer own her, her own husband's hand is heavy upon her, and what remains? The third "therefore" tells us (Ho 2:14). Israel, now bereft of all, helpless, homeless, is at last convinced that, as her God could take away all, so it was from Him she had received all: she is shut up to His love and His mercy alone. And here the prophet's thoughts clothemselves in language referring to the early betrothal period of national life. A new beginning will be made, she will again lead the wilderness life of daily dependence on God, cheerfully and joyfully she will begin a new journey, out of trouble will come a new hope, and the very recollection of the past will be a pain to her. As all the associations of the name ba'al have been degrading, she shall think of her Lord in a different relation, not as the mere giver of material blessing, but as the husband and desire of her heart, the One Source of all good, as distinguished from one of many benefactors. In all this Hosea does not make it clear how he expected these changes to be brought about, nor do we detect any references to the political history of the time. He mentions no foreign enemy at this stage, or, at most, hints at war in a vague manner (Ho 2:14 f). In the second chapter the thing that is emphasized is the heavy hand of God laid on the things through which Israel had been led astray, the paralyzing of Nature's operations, so as to cut at the root of Nature-

worship; but the closing stage of the Divine discipline (Hosea 3), when Israel, like the wife kept in seclusion, neither enjoying the privileges of the lawful spouse nor able to follow after idols, seems to point to, and certainly was not reached till, the captivity when the people, on a foreign soil, could not exercise their ancestral worship, but yet were finally cured of idolatry.

The references to Judah in these chapters are not to be overlooked. Having said (Ho 1:6) that Israel would be utterly taken away (which seems to point to exile), the prophet adds that Judah would be saved from that fate, though not by warlike means. Farther down (Ho 1:11) he predicts the union of Israel and Judah under one head, and finally in Ho 3 it is said that in the latter day the children of Israel would seek the Lord their God and David their king. Many critics suppose that 1:10 f are out of place (though they cannot find a better place for them); and not a few declare that all the references to Judah must be taken as from a later hand, the usual reason for this conclusion being that the words "disturb the connection." In the case of a writer like Hosea, however, whose transitions are so sharp and sudden, we are not safe in speaking of disturbing the connection: what may to us appear abrupt, because we are not expecting it, may have flashed across the mind of the original writer; and Hosea, in forecasting the future of his people, can scarcely be debarred from having thought of the whole nation. It was Israel as a whole that was the original bride of Yahweh, and surely therefore the united Israel would be the partaker of the final glory. As a matter of fact, Judah was at the time in better case than Israel, and the old promise to the Davidic house (2Sa 7:16) was deeply cherished to the end.

(2) Hosea 4-14.

If it is admissible to consider Hosea 1-3 as one related piece (though possibly the written deposit of several addresses) it is quite otherwise with Ho 4:14. These are, in a manner, a counterpart of the history. When the strong hand of Jeroboam was relaxed, the kingdom rapidly fell to pieces; a series of military usurpers follows with bewildering rapidity; but who can tell how much political disorder and social disintegration lie behind those brief and grim notices: So and So "conspired against him and slew him and reigned in his stead"? So with these chapters. The wail of grief, the echo of violence and excess, is heard through all, but it is very difficult to assign each lament, each reproof, each denunciation to the primary occasion that called it forth. The chapters seem like the recital of the confused, hideous dream through which the nation passed till its rude awakening by the sharp shock of the Assyrian invasion and the exile that followed. The political condition of the time was one of party strife and national impotence. Sometimes Assyria or Egypt is mentioned alone (5:13; 8:9,13; 9:6; 10:6; 14:3), at other times Assyria and Egypt together (7:11; 9:3; 11:5,11; 12:1); but in such a way as to show too plainly that the spirit of self-reliance—not to speak of reliance on Yahweh—had departed from a race that was worm-eaten with social sins and rendered selfish and callous by the indulgence of every vice. These foreign powers, which figure as false refuges, are also in the view of the prophet destined to be future scourges (see 5:13; 8:9 f; 7:11; 12:1); and we know, from the Book of Ki and also from the Assyrian monuments, how much the kings of Israel at this time were at the mercy of the great conquering empires of the East. Such passages as speak of Assyria and Egypt in the same breath may point to the rival policies which were in vogue in the Northern Kingdom (as they appeared also somewhat later in Judah) of making alliances with one or other of these great rival powers. It was in fact the Egyptianizing policy of Hoshea that finally occasioned the ruin of the kingdom (2Ki 17:4). Thus it is that, in the last chapter,

when the prophet indulges in hope no more mixed with boding fear, he puts into the mouth of repentant Ephraim the words: "Assyria shall not save us; we will not ride upon horses" (Ho 14:3), thus alluding to the two foreign powers between which Israel had lost its independence.

It is not possible to give a satisfactory analysis of the chapters under consideration. They are not marked off, as certain sections of other prophetical books are, by headings or refrains, nor are the references to current events sufficiently clear to enable us to assign different parts to different times, nor, in fine, is the matter so distinctly laid out that we can arrange the book under subjects treated. Most expositors accordingly content themselves with indicating the chief topics or lines of thought, and arranging the chapters according to the tone pervading them.

Keil, e.g., would divide all these chapters into three great sections, each forming a kind of prophetical cycle, in which the three great prophetic tones of reproof, threatening, and promise, are heard in succession. His first section embraces Hosea 4 to 6:3, ending with the gracious promise: "Come, and let us return unto Yahweh," etc. The second section, 6:4 to 11:11, ends with the promise: "They shall come trembling as a bird .... and I will make them to dwell in their houses, saith Yahweh." The third section, 11:12 to 14:9, ends: "Take with you words, and return unto Yahweh," etc. Ewald's arrangement proceeds on the idea that the whole book consists of one narrative piece (chapters 1-3) and one long address (chapters 4-14), which, however, is marked off by resting points into smaller sections or addresses. The progress of thought is marked by the three great items of arraignment, punishment, and consolation. Thus: from 4:1-6:11 there is arraignment; from 6:11 to 9:9 punishment, and from 9:10-14:10 exhortation and comfort. Driver says of chapters 4-14: "These chapters consist of a series of discourses, a summary arranged probably by the prophet himself at the close of his ministry, of the prophecies delivered by him in the years following the death of Jeroboam II. Though the argument is not continuous, or systematically developed, they may be divided into three sections:

(a) chapters 4-8 in which the thought of Israel's guilt predominates;

(b) chapter 9-11:11, in which the prevailing thought is that of Israel's punishment;

(c) 11:12 through Ho 14 in which these two lines of thought are both continued (chapters 12, 13), but are followed (in chapter 14) by a glance at the brighter future which may ensue provided Israel repents."

A. B. Davidson, after mentioning the proposed analyses of Ewald and Driver, adds: "But in truth the passage is scarcely divisible; it consists of multitude of variations all executed on one theme, Israel's apostasy or unfaithfulness to her God. This unfaithfulness is a condition of the mind, a 'spirit of whoredoms,' and is revealed in all the aspects of Israel's life, though particularly in three things:

(1) the cult, which, though ostensibly service of Yahweh, is in truth worship of a being altogether different from Him;

(2) the internal political disorders, the changes of dynasty, all of which have been effected with no

thought of Yahweh in the people’s minds; and

(3) the foreign politics, the making of covenants with Egypt and Assyria, in the hope that they might heal the internal hurt of the people, instead of relying on Yahweh their God.

The three things," he adds, "are not independent; the one leads to the other. The fundamental evil is that there is no knowledge of God in the land, no true conception of Deity. He is thought of as a Nature-god, and His conception exercises no restraint on the passions or life of the people: hence, the social immoralities, and the furious struggles of rival factions, and these again lead to the appeal for foreign intervention."

Some expositors, however (e.g. Maurer, Hitzig, Delitzsch and Volck), recognizing what they consider as direct references or brief allusions to certain outstanding events in the history, perceive a chronological order in the chapters. Volck, who has tempted a full analysis on this line (PRE2) thinks that chapters 4-14 arrange themselves into 6 consecutive sections as follows:

(1) chapter 4 constitutes a section by itself, determined by the introductory words "Hear the word of Yahweh" (4:1), and a similar call at the beginning of chapter 5. He assigns this chapter to the reign of Zechariah, as a description of the low condition to which the nation had fallen, the priests, the leaders, being involved in the guilt and reproof (Ho 5:6).

(2) The second section extends from Ho 5:1 to 6:3, and is addressed directly to the priests and the royal house, who ought to have been guides but were snares. The prophet in the spirit sees Divine judgment already breaking over the devoted land (5:8). This prophecy, which Hitzig referred to the time of Zechariah, and Maurer to the reign of Pekah, is assigned by Volck to the one month’s reign of Shallum, on the ground of Ho 5:7: "Now shall a month (the King James Version and the Revised Version margin, but the Revised Version (British and American) "the new moon") devour them." It is by inference from this that Volck puts Ho 4 in the preceding reign of Zechariah.

(3) The third section, Ho 6:4-7:16, is marked off by the new beginning made at 8:1: "Set the trumpet to thy mouth." The passage which determines its date is 7:7: "All their kings are fallen," which, agreeing with Hitzig, he thinks could not have been said after the fall of one king, Zechariah, and so he assigns it to the beginning of the reign of Menahem who killed Shallum.

(4) The next halting place, giving a fourth section, is at Ho 9:9, at the end of which there is a break in the Massoretic Text, and a new subject begins. Accordingly, the section embraces 8:1 to 9:9, and Volck, agreeing with Hitzig, assigns it to the reign of Menahem, on the ground of 8:4: "They have set up kings, but not by me," referring to the support given to Menahem by the king of Assyria (2Ki 15:19).

(5) The fifth section extends from 9:10 to l1:11, and is marked by the peculiarity that the prophet three times refers to the early history of Israel (9:10; 10:1; 11:1). Identifying Shalman in 10:14 with Shalmaneser, Volck refers the section to the opening years of the reign of Hoshea, against whom (as

stated in 2Ki 17:3) Shalmaneser came up and Hoshea became his servant.

(6) Lastly there is a sixth section, extending from Ho 12:1 to the end, which looks to the future recovery of the people (13:14) and closes with words of gracious promise. This portion also Volck assigns to the reign of Hoshea, just as the ruin of Samaria was impending, and there was no prospect of any earthly hope. In this way Volck thinks that the statement in the superscription of the Book of Ho is confirmed, and that we have before us, in chronological order if not in precisely their original oral form, the utterances of the prophet during his ministry. Ewald also was strongly of opinion that the book (in its second part at least) has come down to us substantially in the form in which the prophet himself left it.

The impression one receives from this whole section is one of sadness, for the prevailing tone is one of denunciation and doom. And yet Hosea is not a prophet of despair; and, in fact, he bursts forth into hope just at the point where, humanly speaking, there is no ground of hope. But this hope is produced, not by what he sees in the condition of the people: it is enkindled and sustained by his confident faith in the unfailing love of Yahweh. And so he ends on theme on which he began, the love of God prevailing over man’s sin.

4. Testimony to Earlier History:

The references in Hosea to the earlier period of history are valuable, seeing that we know his date, and that the dates of the books recording that history are so much in dispute. These references are particularly valuable from the way in which they occur; for it is the manner of the prophet to introduce them indirectly, and allusively, without dwelling on particulars. Thus every single reference can be understood only by assuming its implications; and, taken together, they do not merely amount to a number of isolated testimonies to single events, but are rather dissevered links of a continuous chain of history. For they do not occur by way of rhetorical illustration of some theme that may be in hand, they are of the very essence of the prophet’s address. The events of the past are, in the prophet’s view, so many elements in the arraignment or threatening, or whatever it may be that is the subject of address for the moment: in a word, the whole history is regarded by him, not as a series of episodes, strung together in a collection of popular stories, but a course of Divine discipline with a moral and religious significance, and recorded or referred to for a high purpose. There is this also to be remembered: that, in referring briefly and by way of allusion to past events, the prophet is taking for granted that his hearers understand what he is referring to, and will not call in question the facts to which he alludes. This implies that the mass of the people, even in degenerate Israel, were well acquainted with such incidents or episodes as the prophet introduces into his discourses, as well as the links which were necessary to bind them into a connected whole. It is necessary to bear all this in mind in forming an estimate of the historical value of other books. It seems to be taken by many modern writers as certain that those parts of the Pentateuch (JE) which deal with the earlier history were not written till a comparatively short time before Hosea. It is plain, however, that the accounts must be of much earlier date, before they could have become, in an age when books could not have been numerous, the general possession of the national consciousness. Further, the homiletic manner in which Hosea handles these ancient stories makes one suspicious of the modern theory that a number of popular stories were supplied with didactic "frameworks" by later Deuteronomic or other "redactors," and makes it more probable that these

accounts were invested with a moral and religious meaning from the beginning. With these considerations in mind, and particularly in view of the use he makes of his references, it is interesting to note the wide range of the prophet's historical survey. If we read with the Revised Version (British and American) "Adam" for "men" (the King James Version Ho 6:7), we have a clear allusion to the Fall, implying in its connection the view which, as all admit, Hosea held of the religious history of his people as a declension and not an upward evolution. This view is more clearly brought out in the reference to the period of the exodus and the desert life (2:15; 9:10; 11:1). Equally suggestive are the allusions to the patriarchal history, as the references to Admah and' Zeboiim (11:8), and the repeated references to the weak and the strong points in the character of Jacob (12:3,12). Repeatedly he declares that Yahweh is the God of Israel "from the land of Egypt" (12:9; 13:4), alludes to the sin of Achan and the valley of Achor (2:15), asserts that God had in time past "spoken unto the prophets" (12:10), "hewed" His people by prophets (6:5), and by a prophet brought His people out of Egypt (12:13). There are also references to incidents nearer to the prophet's time, some of them not very clear (14; 5:1; 9:5:15; 10:9); and if, as seems probable, "the sin of Israel" (10:8) refers to the schism of the ten tribes, the prominence given to the Davidic kingship, which, along with the references to Judah, some critics reject on merely subjective grounds, is quite intelligible (3:5; 4:15).

5. Testimony to the Law:

We do not expect to find in a prophetic writing the same frequency of reference to the law as to the history; for it is of the essence of prophecy to appeal to history and to interpret it. Of course, the moral and social aspects of the law are as much the province of the prophet as of the priest; but the ceremonial part of the law, which was under the care of the priests, though it was designed to be the expression of the same ideas that lay at the foundation of prophecy, is mainly touched upon by the prophets when, as was too frequently the case, it ceased to express those ideas and became an offense. The words of the prophets on this subject, when fairly interpreted, are not opposed to law in any of its authorized forms, but only to its abuses; and there are expressions and allusions in Hosea, although he spoke to the Northern Kingdom, where from the time of the schism there had been a wide departure from the authorized law, which recognize its ancient existence and its Divine sanction. The much-debated passage in Ho (8:12), "Though I write for him my law in ten thousand precepts" (the Revised Version (British and American) or the Revised Version margin "I wrote for him the ten thousand things of my law"), on any understanding of the words or with any reasonable emendation of the text (for which see the comm.), points to written law, and that of considerable compass, and seems hardly consistent with the supposition that in the prophet's time the whole of the written law was confined to a few chapters in Ex, the so-called Book of the Covenant. And the very next verse (Ho 8:13), "As for the sacrifices of mine offerings, they sacrifice flesh and eat it; but Yahweh accepteth them not," is at once an acknowledgment of the Divine institution of sacrifice, and an illustration of the kind of opposition the prophets entertained to sacrificial service as it was practiced. So when it is said, "I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feasts, her new moons, and her sabbaths, and all her solemn assemblies" (Ho 2:11; compare 9:5), the reference, as the context shows, is to a deprivation of what were national distinctive privileges; and the allusions to transgressions and trespasses against the law (Ho 8:1; compare De 17:2) point in the same direction. We have a plain reference to the Feast of Tabernacles (Ho 12:9): "I will yet again make thee to dwell in tents, as in the days of the solemn feast" (compare Le 23:39-43); and there

are phrases which are either in the express language of the law-books or evident allusions to them, as "Thy people are as they that strive with the priest" (Ho 4:4; compare De 17:12); "The princes of Judah are like them that remove the landmark" (Ho 5:10; compare De 19:14); "Their sacrifices shall be unto them as the bread of mourners" (Ho 9:4; compare De 26:14); "They (the priests) feed on the sin of my people" (Ho 4:8; compare Le 6:25 f; 10:17). In one verse the prophet combines the fundamental fact in the nation's history and the fundamental principle of the law: "I am Yahweh thy God from the land of Egypt; and thou shalt know no god but me" (Ho 13:4; compare Ex 20:3).

6. Affinity with Deuteronomy:

It is, however, with the Book of De more than with any other portion of the Pentateuch that the Book of Ho shows affinity; and the resemblances here are so striking, that the critics who hold to the late date of De speak of the author of that book as "the spiritual heir of Hosea" (Driver, Commentary on Deuteronomy, Intro, xxvii), or of Hosea as "the great spiritual predecessor of the Deuteronomist" (Cheyne, Jeremiah, His Life and Times, 66). The resemblance is seen, not only in the homiletical manner in which historical events are treated, but chiefly in the great underlying principles implied or insisted upon in both books. The choice of Israel to be a peculiar people is the fundamental note in both (De 4:37; 7:6; 10:15; 14:2; 26:18; Ho 12:9; 13:4). God's tender care and fatherly discipline are central ideas in both (De 8:2,3,5,16; Ho 9:15; 11:1-4; 14:4); and, conversely, the supreme duty of love to God, or reproof of the want of it, is everywhere emphasized (De 6:5; 10:12; 11:1,13,22; 13:3; 19:9; 30:6,16,20; Ho 4:1; 6:4,6). Now, when points of resemblance are found in two different books, it is not always easy to say on merely literary grounds which has the claim to priority. But it does seem remarkable, on the one hand, that a writer so late as the time of Josiah should take his keynote from one of the very earliest of the writing prophets two centuries before him; and, on the other hand, that these so-called "prophetic ideas," so suitable to the time of 'the kindness of youth and love of espousals' (Jer 2:2), should have found no place in the mind of that "prophet" by whom the Lord brought Israel out of Egypt (Ho 12:13). The ministry of Moses was to enforce the duty of whole-hearted allegiance to the God who had made special choice of Israel and claimed them as His own. Nor was Hosea the first, as it is sometimes alleged, to represent the religious history of Israel as a defection. Moses had experience of their apostasy under the very shadow of Sinai, and all his life long had to bear with a stiff-necked and rebellious people. Then, again, if these "Deuteronomic" ideas are found so clearly expressed in Hosea, why should it be necessary to postulate a late Deuteronomist going back upon older books, and editing and supplementing them with Deuteronomic matter? If Moses sustained anything like the function which all tradition assigned to him, and if, as all confess, he was the instrument of molding the tribes into one people, those addresses contained in the Book of Deuteronomy are precisely in the tone which would be adopted by a great leader in taking farewell of the people. And, if he did so, it is quite conceivable that his words would be treasured by the God-fearing men among his followers and successors, in that unbroken line of prophetic men to whose existence both Amos and Hosea appealed, and that they should be found coming to expression at the very dawn of written prophecy. Undoubtedly these two prophets took such a view, and regarded Moses as the first and greatest Deuteronomist.

LITERATURE.

Harper, "Minor Prophets," in ICC; Keil, "Minor Prophets," in Clark's For. Theol. Library; Huxtable, "Hosea," in Speaker's Comm.; Cheyne, "Hosea," in Cambridge Bible; Pusey, Minor Prophets; Robertson Smith, Prophets of Israel; G. A. Smith, "The Book of the Twelve," in Expositor's Bible; Horton, "'Hosea," in Century Bible; Farrar, "Minor Prophets," in Men of the Bible; A. B. Davidson, article "Hosea" in HDB; Cornill, The Prophets of Israel, English translation, Chicago, 1897; Valeton, Amos en Hosea; Nowack, "Die kleinen Propheten," in Hand-Comm. z. Altes Testament; Marti, Dodekapropheton in Kurz. Hand-Comm.

James Robertson

HOSEN

ho'-z'-n.

See BREECHES.

HOSHAIAH

ho-sha'-ya (hosha'yah, "whom Yahweh helpeth"):

(1) Father of Jezaniah (probably = Azariah, so the Septuagint; compare Jer 42:1 and 43:2 with 2Ki 25:23 and note similar letters in names in Hebrew), who with other leaders antagonized the policy and counsel of Jeremiah after the fall of Jerusalem (Jer 42:1-43:7).

(2) A man, probably of Judah, who led half of the princes of Judah in procession at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:32).

HOSHAMA

hosh'-a-ma, ho-sha'-ma (hoshama', abbreviated from yehoshama', "whom Yahweh heareth"): One of the sons or descendants of Jeconiah, the captive king of Judah (1Ch 3:18).

HOSHEA

ho-she'-a (hoshea', "salvation"; Hosee, 2Ki 17:1-9):

1. A Satrap of Assyria:

Son of Elah, the 19th and last king of Israel. The time was one of social revolution and dynastic change. Of the last five kings of Israel, four had met their deaths by violence. Hoshea himself was one of these assassins (2Ki 15:30), and the nominee of Tiglath-pileser III, whose annals read, "Pekah I slew, Hoshea

I appointed over them." Though called king, Hoshea was thus really a satrap of Assyria and held his appointment only during good behavior. The realm which he administered was but the shadow of its former self. Tiglath-pileser had already carried into captivity the northern tribes of Zebulun, Naphtali, Asher and Dan; as also the two and a half tribes East of the Jordan (2Ki 15:29). Apart from those forming the kingdom of Judah, there remained only Ephraim, Issachar, and the half-tribe of Manasseh.

2. The Reduced Kingdom of Israel:

Isaiah refers to the fall of Syria in the words, "Damascus is taken away from being a city" (Isa 17:1), and to the foreign occupations of Northern Israel in the words, "He brought into contempt the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali .... by the way of the sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the nations" (Isa 9:1).

3. Hosea and Ephraim:

But Hosea is the prophet in whose writings we see most clearly the reflection of the politics of the day, and the altered condition of things in Israel. In the 2nd division of his and book, chapters 4-14, Hosea deals with a state of things which can only be subsequent to the first great deportation of Israelites, and therefore belongs to the reigns of Pekah and Hoshea. The larger part of the nation being removed, he addresses his utterances no longer to all Israel, but to Ephraim, the chief of the remaining tribes. This name he uses no less than 35 t, though not to the total exclusion of the term "Israel," as in 11:1, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him," the whole nation in such cases being meant. Of the 35 uses of "Ephraim," the first is, "Ephraim is joined to idols; let him alone" (4:17), and the last, "Ephraim shall say, What have I to do any more with idols?" (14:8), showing that, in the prophet’s estimation, the idolatrous worship of Yahweh, as associated with the golden calves of Da and Bethel, lay at the root of the nation’s calamities.

4. Hosea’s Dependent Position:

Over this shrunken and weakened kingdom—corresponding generally with the Samaritan district of the New Testament—Hoshea was placed as the viceroy of a foreign power. The first official year of his governorship was 729, though he may have been appointed a few months earlier. Tiglath-pileser III died in 727, so that three years’ tribute was probably paid to Nineveh. There was, however, a political party in Samaria, which, ground down by cruel exactions, was for making an alliance with Egypt, hoping that, in the jealousy and antipathies of the two world-powers, it might find some relief or even a measure of independence. Hosea, himself a prophet of the north, allows us to see beneath the surface of court life in Samaria. "They call unto Egypt, they go to Assyria" (Ho 7:11), and again, "They make a covenant with Assyria, and oil is carried into Egypt" (Ho 12:1). This political duplicity from which it was the king’s prime duty to save his people, probably took its origin about the time of Tiglath-pileser’s death in 727.

5. His Treasonable Action:

That event either caused or promoted the treasonable action, and the passage of large quantities of oil on the southward road was an object-lesson to be read of all men. On the accession of Shalmaneser IV—who is the Shalmaneser of the Bible (2Ki 17:3; 18:9)—Hoshea would seem to have carried, or sent, the annual tribute for 726 to the treasury at Nineveh (2Ki 17:3). The text is not clear as to who was the bearer of this tribute, but from the statement that Shalmaneser came up against him, and Hoshea became his servant, it may be presumed that the tribute for the first year after Tiglath-pileser's death was at first refused, then, when a military demonstration took place, was paid, and obedience promised. In such a case Hoshea would be required to attend at his suzerain's court and do homage to the sovereign.

6. His Final Arrest:

This is what probably took place, not without inquiry into the past. Grave suspicions were thus aroused as to the loyalty of Hoshea, and on these being confirmed by the confession or discovery that messengers had passed to "So king of Egypt," and the further withholding of the tribute (2Ki 17:4), Hoshea was arrested and shut up in prison. Here he disappears from history. Such was the ignominious end of a line of kings, not one of whom had, in all the vicissitudes of two and a quarter centuries, been in harmony with theocratic spirit, or realized that the true welfare and dignity of the state lay in the unalloyed worship of Yahweh.

7. Battle of Beth-arbel:

With Hoshea in his hands, Shalmaneser's troops marched, in the spring or summer of 725, to the completion of Assyria's work in Palestine. Isaiah has much to say in his 10th and 11th chapters on the divinely sanctioned mission of "the Assyrian" and of the ultimate fate that should befall him for his pride and cruelty in carrying out his mission. The campaign was not a bloodless one. At Beth-arbel—at present unidentified—the hostile forces met, with the result that might have been expected. "Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel in the day of battle" (Ho 10:14). The defeated army took refuge behind the walls of Samaria, and the siege began. The city was well placed for purposes of defense, being built on the summit of a lonely hill, which was Omri's reason for moving the capital from Tirzah (1Ki 16:24). It was probably during the continuance of the siege that Isaiah wrote his prophecy, "Woe to the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim," etc. (Isa 28), in which the hill of Samaria with its coronet of walls is compared to a diadem of flowers worn in a scene of revelry, which should fade and die. Micah's elegy on the fall of Samaria (chapter 1) has the same topographical note, "I will pour down the stones thereof into the valley, and I will uncover the foundations thereof" (1:6).

8. Fall of Samaria in 721:

Shalmaneser's reign was one of exactly five years, December, 727 to December, 722, and the city fell in the 1st month of his successor's reign. The history of its fall is summarized in Sargon's great Khorsabad inscription in these words, "Samaria I besieged, I captured. 27,290 of her inhabitants I carried away. 50 chariots I collected from their midst. The rest of their property I caused to be taken."

9. Hoshea’s Character:

Hoshea’s character is summed up in the qualified phrase, "He did evil in the sight of the Lord, yet not as the kings of Israel that were before him." The meaning may be that, while not a high-principled man or ofirreproachable life, he did not give to the idolatry of Bethel the official sanction and prominence which each of his 18 predecessors had done. According to Ho 10:6 the golden calf of Samaria was to be taken to Assyria, to the shame of its erstwhile worshippers.

W. Shaw Caldecott

HOSPITALITY; HOST

hos-pi-tal’-i-ti, host (philoxenia, "love of strangers," xenos, "guest," "friend"; pandocheus, "innkeeper"):

1. Among Nomads:

When the civilization of a people has advanced so far that some traveling has become necessary, but not yet so far that traveling by individuals is a usual thing, then hospitality is a virtue indispensable to the life of the people. This stage of culture was that represented in ancient Palestine and the stage whose customs are still preserved among the present-day Arabs of the desert. Hospitality is regarded as a right by the traveler, to whom it never occurs to thank his host as if for a favor. And hospitality is granted as a duty by the host, who himself may very soon be dependent on some one else’s hospitality. But none the less, both in Old Testament times and today, the granting of that right is surrounded by an etiquette that has made Arabian hospitality so justly celebrated. The traveler is made the literal master of the house during his stay; his host will perform for him the most servile offices, and will not even sit in his presence without express request. To the use of the guest is given over all that his host possesses, stopping not even short of the honor of wife or daughter. "‘ Be we not all,’ say the poor nomads, ‘guests of Ullah? Has God given unto them, God’s guest shall partake with them thereof: if they will not for God render his own, it should not go well with them’ "(Doughty, Arabia Deserta, I, 228). The host is in duty bound to defend his guest against all comers and to lay aside any personal hatred—the murderer of father is safe as the guest of the son.

2. In the Old Testament:

An exquisite example of the etiquette of hospitality is found in Ge 18:1-8. The very fact that the three strangers have passed by Abraham’s door gives him the privilege of entertaining them. When he sees them approaching he runs to beg the honor of their turning in to him, with oriental courtesy depreciates the feast that he is about to lay before them as "a morsel of bread," and stands by them while they eat. Manoah (Jud 13:15) is equally pressing although more matter-of-fact, while Jethro (Ex 2:20) sends out that the stranger may be brought in. And Job (31:32) repels the very thought that he could let the sojourner be unprovided for. The one case where a breach of hospitality receives praise is that of Jael (Jud 4-5), perhaps to be referred to degeneration of customs in the conflicts with the Canaanites or

(perhaps more plausibly) to literary-critical considerations, according to which in Jud 5 Sisera is not represented as entering Jael's tent or possibly not as actually tasting the food, a state of affairs misunderstood in Jud 4, written under later circumstances of city life. (For contrasting opinions see "Jael" in Encyclopedia Biblica and HDB.)

3. The Table-Bond:

It is well to understand that to secure the right to hospitality it is not necessary, even in modern times, for the guest to eat with his host, still less to eat salt specifically. Indeed, guests arriving after sunset and departing the next morning do not, as a rule, eat at all in the tent of the host. It is sufficient to enter the tent, to grasp a tent-pin, or even, under certain circumstances, to invoke the name of a man as host. On the other hand, the bond of hospitality is certainly strengthened by eating with one's host, or the bond may actually be created by eating food belonging to him, even by stealth or in an act of theft. Here a quite different set of motives is at work. The idea here is that of kinship arising from participation in a common sacrificial meal, and the modern Arab still terms the animal killed for his guest the dhabichah or "sacrifice" (compare HDB, II, 428). This concept finds its rather materialistic expression in theory that after the processes of digestion are completed (a time estimated as two nights and the included day), the bond lapses if it is not renewed. There seem to be various references in the Bible to some such idea of a "table-bond" (Ps 41:9, e.g.), but hardly in connection directly with hospitality. For a discussion of them see BREAD; GUEST; SACRIFICE.

4. In the City:

In the city, naturally, the exercise of hospitality was more restricted. Where travel was great, doubtless commercial provision for the travelers was made from a very early day (compare Lu 10:34 and see INN), and at all events free hospitality to all comers would have been unbearably abused. Lot in Sodom (Ge 19) is the nomad who has preserved his old ideas, although settled in the city, and who thinks of the "shadow of his roof" (19:8) as his tent. The same is true of the old man in Gibeah of Jud 19:16 ff. And the sin of Sodom and of Gibeah is not that wanderers cannot find hospitality so much as it is that they are unsafe in the streets at night. Both Lot and "the old man," however, are firm in their duty and willing to sacrifice their daughters for the safety of their guests. (Later ideas as to the position of woman should not be read back into these narratives.) However, when the city-dweller Rahab refuses to surrender her guests (Jos 2), her reason is not the breach of hospitality involved but her fear of Yahweh (Jos 2:9). When Abraham's old slave is in Nahor, and begs a night's lodging for himself and his camels, he accompanies the request with a substantial present, evidently conceived of as pay for the same (Ge 24:22 f). Such also are the modern conditions; compare Benzinger-Socin in Baedeker's Palestine(3), xxxv, who observe that "inmates" of private houses "are aware that Franks always pay, and therefore receive them gladly." None the less, in New Testament times, if not earlier, and even at present, a room was set apart in each village for the use of strangers, whose expenses were borne by the entire community. Most interpreters consider that the kataluma of Lu 2:7 was a room of this sort, but this opinion cannot be regarded as quite certain. But many of the wealthier city-dwellers still strive to attain a reputation for hospitality, a zeal that naturally was found in the ancient world as well.

5. Christ and Hospitality:

Christ’s directions to the apostles to "take nothing for their journey" (Mr 6:8, etc.) presupposes that they were sure of always finding hospitality. Indeed, it is assumed that they may even make their own choice of hosts (Mt 10:11) and may stay as long as they choose (Lu 10:7). In this case, however, the claims of the travelers to hospitality are accentuated by the fact that they are bearers of good tidings for the people, and it is in view of this latter fact that hospitality to them becomes so great a virtue—the "cup of cold water" becomes so highly meritorious because it is given "in the name of a disciple" (Mt 10:42; compare 10:41, and Mr 9:41). Rejection of hospitality to one of Christ’s "least brethren" (almost certainly to be understood as disciples) is equivalent to the rejection of Christ Himself (Mt 25:43; compare 25:35). It is not quite clear whether in Mt 10:14 and parallels, simple refusal of hospitality is the sin in point or refusal to hear the message or both.

6. First Missionaries:

In the Dispersion, the Jew who was traveling seemed always to be sure of finding entertainment from the Jews resident in whatever city he might happen to be passing through. The importance of this fact for the spread of early Christianity is incalculable. To be sure, some of the first missionaries may have been men who were able to bear their own traveling expenses or who were merchants that taught the new religion when on business tours. In the case of soldiers or slaves their opportunity to carry the gospel into new fields came often through the movements of the army or of their masters. And it was by an "infiltration" of this sort, probably, rather than by any specific missionary effort that the church of Rome, at least, was rounded. See ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE. But the ordinary missionary, whether apostle (in any sense of the word) or evangelist, would have been helpless if it had not been that he could count so confidently on the hospitality everywhere. From this fact comes one reason why Paul, for instance, could plan tours of such magnitude with such assurance: he knew that he would not have to face any problem of sustenance in a strange city (Ro 16:23).

7. In the Churches:

As the first Christian churches were founded, the exercise of hospitality took on a new aspect, especially after the breach with the Jews had begun. Not only did the traveling Christian look naturally to his brethren for hospitality, but the individual churches looked to the traveler for fostering the sense of the unity of the church throughout the world. Hospitality became a virtue indispensable to the well-being of the church—one reason for the emphasis laid on it (Ro 12:13; 16:1 f; Heb 13:2). As the organization of the churches became more perfected, the exercise of hospitality grew to be an official duty of the ministry and a reputation for hospitality was a prerequisite in some cases (1Ti 3:2; 5:10; Tit 1:8). The exercise of such hospitality must have become burdensome at times (1Pe 4:9), and as false teachers began to appear in the church a new set of problems was created in discriminating among applicants for hospitality. 2 and 3 Joh reflect some of the difficulties. For the later history of hospitality in the church interesting matter will be found in the Didache, chapters xi, xii, Apology of Aristides, chapter xv, and Lucian’s Death of Peregrinus, chapter xvi. The church certainly preferred to err by excess of the virtue.

An evaluation of the Biblical directions regarding hospitality for modern times is extremely difficult on account of the utterly changed conditions. Be it said at once, especially, that certain well-meant criticism of modern missionary methods, with their boards, organized finance, etc., on the basis of Christ's directions to the Twelve, is a woeful misapplication of Biblical teaching. The hospitality that an apostle could count on in his own day is something that the modern missionary simply cannot expect and something that it would be arrant folly for him to expect (Weinel, Die urchristliche und die heutige Mission, should be read by everyone desiring to compare modern missions with the apostolic). In general, the basis for hospitality has become so altered that the special virtue has become merged in the larger field of charitable enterprise of various sorts. The modern problem nearest related to the old virtue is the question of providing for the necessities of the indigent traveler, a distinctly minor problem, although a very real one, in the general field of social problems that the modern church has to study. In so far as the New Testament exhortations are based on missionary motives there has been again a merging into general appeals for missions, perhaps specialized occasionally as appeals for traveling expense. The "hospitality" of today, by which is meant the entertainment of friends or relatives, hardly comes within the Biblical use of the term as denoting a special virtue.

LITERATURE.

For hospitality in the church, Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity, II, chapter iv (10).

Burton Scott Easton

HOST OF HEAVEN

(tsebha' hashamayim): The expression is employed in the Old Testament to denote

(1) the stars, frequently as objects of idolatry (De 4:19; 17:3; 2Ki 17:16; 21:3,1; 23:4 f; Jer 8:2; 19:13; Ze 1:5), but also as witnesses in their number, order and splendor, to the majesty and providential rule and care of Yahweh (Isa 34:4; 40:26, "calleth them all by name"; 45:12; Jer 33:22); and

(2) the angels (1Ki 22:19; 2Ch 18:18; Ne 9:6; compare Ps 103:21).

(1) Star-worship seems to have been an enticement to Israel from the first (De 4:19; 17:3; Am 5:26; compare Ac 7:42,43), but attained special prominence in the days of the later kings of Judah. The name of Manasseh is particularly connected with it. This king built altars for "all the host of heaven" in the courts of the temple (2Ki 21:3,5). Josiah destroyed these altars, and cleansed the temple from the idolatry by putting down the priests and burning the vessels associated with it (2Ki 23:4,5,12).

(2) In the other meaning of the expression, the angels are regarded as forming Yahweh's "host" or army, and He himself is the leader of them—"Yahweh of hosts" (Isa 31:4, etc.)—though this designation has a much wider reference.

See ANGEL; ASTRONOMY; LORD OF HOSTS; compare Oehler, Theol of Old Testament, II, 270 ff (ET).

James Orr

HOSTAGE

hos’-taj.

See WAR.

HOSTS, LORD OF

hosts.

See LORD OF HOSTS.

HOTHAM; HOTHAN

ho’-tham, ho’-than (chotham, "seal"):

(1) An Asherite, son of Heber, family of Beriah (1Ch 7:32).

(2) An Aroerite, father of two of the mighty men of David (1Ch 11:44). the King James Version, following Septuagint Chothan, has, incorrectly, Hothan.

HOTHIR

ho’-thir (hothir, "abundance"): Mentioned in 1Ch 25:4,28 among the sons of Heman, and one of those set apart by David for the musical service of the house of God (compare 25:6).

HOUGH

hok.

See HOCK.

HOUR

our (sha‘atha’, she‘a’; hora): Hour as a division of the day does not occur in the Old Testament; the term she‘a’ (sha‘atha’) found in Dnl, is Aramaic, and as used there denotes a short period or point of time of no definite length (Da 3:6,15; 4:33 (Hebrew 30); 5:5). The Greek hora is commonly used in the New Testament in the same way, as "that same hour," "from that hour," etc., but it also occurs as a division of the day, as, "the third hour," "the ninth hour," etc. The Hebrews would seem to have become acquainted with this division of time through the Babylonians, but whether before the captivity we are not certain. The mention of the sun dial of Ahaz would seem to indicate some such reckoning of time during the monarchy.

See TIME.

H. Porter

HOURS OF PRAYER

The Mosaic law did not regulate the offering of prayer, but fully recognized its spontaneous character. In what manner or how far back in Jewish history the sacrificial prayer, mentioned in Lu 1:10, originated no one knows. In the days of Christ it had evidently become an institution. But ages before that, stated hours of prayer were known and religiously observed by all devout Jews. It evidently belonged to the evolutionary process of Jewish worship, in connection with the temple-ritual. Devout Jews, living at Jerusalem, went to the temple to pray (Lu 18:10; Ac 3:1). The pious Jews of the Diaspora opened their windows "toward Jerus" and prayed "toward" the place of God’s presence (1Ki 8:48; Da 6:10; Ps 5:7). The regular hours of prayer, as we may infer from Ps 55:17 and Da 6:10, were three in number. The first coincided with the morning sacrifice, at the 3rd hour of the morning, at 9 AM therefore (Ac 2:15). The second was at the 6th hour, or at noon, and may have coincided with the thanksgiving for the chief meal of the day, a religious custom apparently universally observed (Mt 15:36; Ac 27:35). The 3rd hour of prayer coincided with the evening sacrifice, at the ninth hour (Ac 3:1; 10:30). Thus every day, as belonging to God, was religiously subdivided, and regular seasons of prayer were assigned to the devout believer. Its influence on the development of the religious spirit must have been incalculable, and it undoubtedly is, at least in part, the solution of the riddle of the preservation of the Jewish faith in the cruel centuries of its bitter persecution. Mohammedanism borrowed this feature of worship from the Jews and early Christians, and made it one of the chief pillars of its faith.

Henry E. Dosker

HOUSE

hous (bayith; oikos, in classical Greek generally "an estate," oikia, oikema (literally, "habitation"), in Ac 12:1, "prison"):

I. CAVE DWELLINGS

II. STONE-BUILT AND MUD/BRICK-BUILT HOUSES

1. Details of Plan and Construction

(1) Corner-Stone

(2) Floor

(3) Gutter

(4) Door

(5) Hinge

(6) Lock and Key

(7) Threshold

(8) Hearth

(9) Window

(10) Roof

2. Houses of More than One Story

(1) Upper Chambers and Stairs

(2) Palaces and Castles

3. Internal Appearance

III. OTHER MEANINGS

LITERATURE

I. Cave Dwellings.

The earliest permanent habitations of the prehistoric inhabitants of Palestine were the natural caves which abound throughout the country. As the people increased and grouped themselves into communities, these abodes were supplemented by systems of artificial caves which, in some cases,

developed into extensive burrowings of many adjoining compartments, having in each system several entrances. These entrances were usually cut through the roof down a few steps, or simply dropped to the floor from the rock surface. The sinking was shallow and the headroom low but sufficient for the undersized troglodites who were the occupiers.

II. Stone-built and Mud/Brick-built Houses.

There are many references to the use of caves as dwellings in the Old Testament. Lot dwelt with his two daughters in cave (Ge 19:30). Elijah, fleeing from Jezebel, lodged in a cave (1Ki 19:9). The natural successor to the cave was the stone-built hut, and just as the loose field-bowlders and the stones, quarried from the caves, served their first and most vital uses in the building of defense walls, so did they later become material for the first hut. Caves, during the rainy season, were faulty dwellings, as at the time when protection was most needed, they were being flooded through the surface openings which formed their entrances. The rudest cell built of rough stones in mud and covered a with roof of brushwood and mud was at first sufficient. More elaborate plans of several apartments, entering from what may be called a living-room, followed as a matter of course, and these, huddled together, constituted the homes of the people. Mud-brick buildings (Job 4:19) of similar plan occur, and to protect this friable material from the weather, the walls were sometimes covered with a casing of stone slabs, as at Lachish. (See Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities.) Generally speaking, this rude type of building prevailed, although, in some of the larger buildings, square dressed and jointed stones were used. There is little or no sign of improvement until the period of the Hellenistic influence, and even then the improvement was slight, so far as the homes of the common people were concerned.

1. Details of Plan and Construction:

One should observe an isometric sketch and plan showing construction of a typical small house from Gezer. The house is protected and approached from the street by an open court, on one side of which is a covered way. The doors enter into a living-room from which the two very small inner private rooms, bedchambers, are reached. Builders varied the plan to suit requirements, but in the main, this plan may be taken as typical. When members of a family married, extra accommodation was required. Additions were made as well as could be arranged on the cramped site, and in consequence, plans often became such a meaningless jumble that it is impossible to identify the respective limits of adjoining houses. The forecourt was absorbed and crushed out of existence, so that in many of the plans recovered the arrangement is lost.

(1) Corner-stone:

Corner-stone (pinnah, Isa 28:16; Jer 51:26; lithos akrogoniaios, 1Pe 2:6).—In the construction of rude boulder walls, more especially on a sloping site, as can be seen today in the highlands of Scotland and Wales, a large projecting boulder was built into the lower angle-course. It tied together the return angles and was one of the few bond-stones used in the building. This most necessary support claimed chief importance and as such assumed a figurative meaning frequently used (Isa 28:16; 1Pe 2:6; see

CORNER-STONE). The importance given to the laying of a sure foundation is further emphasized by the dedication rites in common practice, evidence of which has been found on various sites in Palestine (see Excavations of Gezer). The discovery of human remains placed diagonally below the foundations of the returning angle of the house gives proof of the exercise of dedication rites both before and after the Conquest. Hiel sacrificed his firstborn to the foundations of Jericho and his youngest son to the gates thereof (1Ki 16:34). But this was in a great cause compared with a similar sacrifice to a private dwelling. The latter manifests a respect scarcely borne out by the miserable nature of the houses so dedicated. At the same time, it gives proof of the frequent collapse of structures which the winter rains made inevitable and at which superstition trembled. The fear of pending disaster to the man who failed to make his sacrifice is recorded in De 20:5: "What man is there that hath built a new house, and hath not dedicated it? let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle." See illustration, p. 550.

(2) Floor:

Floor (qarqa‘).—When houses were built on the rock outcrop, the floor was roughly leveled on the rock surface, but it is more common to find floors of beaten clay similar to the native floor of the present day. Stone slabs were sparingly used, and only appear in the houses of the great. It is unlikely that wood was much used as a flooring to houses, although Solomon used it for his temple floor (1Ki 6:15).

(3) Gutter:

Gutter (tsinnor).—The "gutter" in 2Sa 5:8 the King James Version is obviously difficult to associate with the gutter of a house, except in so far as it may have a similar meaning to the water duct or "water course" (Revised Version (British and American)) leading to the private cistern, which formed part of the plan. Remains of open channels for this purpose have been found of rough stones set in clay, sometimes leading through a silt pit into the cistern.

(4) Door:

Door (deleth, pethach; thura).—Doorways were simple, square, entering openings in the wall with a stone or wood lintel (mashqoph, Ex 12:22,23; ‘ayil, 1Ki 6:31) and a stone threshold raised slightly above the floor. It is easy to imagine the earliest wooden door as a simple movable boarded cover with back bars, fixed vertically by a movable bar slipped into sockets in the stone jambs. Doorposts (caph, Eze 41:16) appear to have been in use, but, until locks were introduced, it is difficult to imagine a reason for them. Posts, when introduced, were probably let into the stone at top and bottom, and, unlike our present door frame, had no head-piece. When no wood was used, the stone jambs of the opening constituted the doorposts. To the present day the post retains its function as commanded in De 6:9; 11:20, and in it is fitted a small case containing a parchment on which is written the exhortation to obedience.

(5) Hinge:

Hinge (poth, 1Ki 7:50; tsir, Pr 26:14).—Specimens of sill and head sockets of stone have been

discovered which suggest the use of the pivot hinge, the elongated swinging stile of the door being let into the sockets at top and bottom. A more advanced form of construction was necessary to this type of door than in the previous instance, and some little skill was required to brace it so that it would hold together. The construction of doors and windows is an interesting question, as it is in these two details that the joinery craft first claimed development. There is no indication, however, of anything of the nature of advancement, and it seems probable that there was none.

(6) Lock and key:

Lock and key ("lock," man‘ul, Ne 3:3 ff; So 5:5; "key," maphteach, Jud 3:25; figurative. Isa 22:22; kleis, Mt 16:19, etc.).—In later Hellenic times a sort of primitive lock and key appeared, similar to the Arabic type. See Excavations of Gezer, I, 197, and illustration in article KEY.

(7) Threshold:

Threshold (caph, 1Ki 14:17; Eze 40:6 ff; miphtan, 1Sa 5:4,5; Eze 9:3, etc.).—Next to the corner-stone, the threshold was specially sacred, and in many instances foundation-sacrifices have been found buried under the threshold. In later times, when the Hebrews became weaned of this unholy practice, the rite remained with the substitution of a lamp enclosed between two bowls as a symbol of the life.

See GEZER.

(8) Hearth:

Hearth (’ach, Jer 36:22,23, the Revised Version (British and American) "brazier"; kiyyor).—The references in the Old Testament and the frequent discovery of hearths make it clear that so much provision for heating had been made. It is unlikely, however, that chimneys were provided. The smoke from the wood or charcoal fuel was allowed to find its way through the door and windows and the many interstices occurring in workmanship of the worst possible description. The "chimney" referred to (Ho 13:3) is a doubtful translation. The "fire in the brazier" (Jer 36:22 the Revised Version (British and American)) which burned before the king of Judah in his "winter house" was probably of charcoal. The modern natives, during the cold season, huddle around and warm their hands at a tiny glow in much the same way as their ancient predecessors. The use of cow and camel dung for baking-oven (tannur) fires appears to have continued from the earliest time to the present day (Eze 4:15).

See also HEARTH.

(9) Window:

Window (thuris, Ac 20:9; 2Co 11:33).—It would appear that windows were often simple openings in the wall which were furnished with some method of closing, which, it may be conjectured, was somewhat the same as the primitive door previously mentioned. The window of the ark (challon, Ge 8:6), the

references in Ge 26:8; Jos 2:15, and the window from which Jezebel looked (2Ki 9:30), were presumably of the casement class. Ahaziah fell through a lattice (cebhakhah) in the same palace, and the same word is used for the "networks" (1Ki 7:41) "covering the bowls of the capitals," and in So 2:9, "through the lattice" (charakkim). It would appear, therefore, that some variety of treatment existed, and that the simple window opening with casement and the opening filled in with a lattice or grill were distinct. Windows were small, and, according to the Mishna, were kept not less than 6 ft. from floor to sill. The lattice was open, without glass filling, and in this connection there is the interesting figurative reference in Isa 54:12 the King James Version, "windows of agates," translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "pinnacles of rubies." Heaven is spoken of as having "windows" (’arubbah) for rain (Ge 7:11; 8:2; 2Ki 7:2, etc.).

(10) Roof:

Roof (gagh; stege).—These were flat. Compare "The beams of our house are cedars, and our rafters are firs" (So 1:17). To get over the difficulty of the larger spans, a common practice was to introduce a main beam (qurah) carried on the walls and strengthened by one or more intermediate posts let into stone sockets laid on the floor. Smaller timbers as joists ("rafters," rahiT) were spaced out and covered in turn with brushwood; the final covering, being of mud mixed with chopped straw, was beaten and rolled. A tiny stone roller is found on every modern native roof, and is used to roll the mud into greater solidity every year on the advent of the first rains. Similar rollers have been found among the ancient remains throughout the country; see Excavations of Gezer, I, 190; PEFS, Warren’s letters, 46. "They let him down through the tiles (keramos) with his couch into the midst before Jesus" (Lu 5:19) refers to the breaking through of a roof similar to this. The roof ("housetop," gagh; doma) was an important part of every house and was subjected to many uses. It was used for worship (2Ki 23:12; Jer 19:13; 32:29; Ze 1:5; Ac 10:9). Absalom spread his tent on the "top of the house" (2Sa 16:22). In the Feast of the Tabernacles temporary booths (cukkah) were erected on the housetops. The people, as is their habit today, gathered together on the roof as a common meeting-place on high days and holidays (Jud 16:27). The wild wranglings which can be heard in any modern native village, resulting in vile accusations and exposure of family secrets hurled from the housetops of the conflicting parties, illustrate the passage, "And what ye have spoken in the ear in the inner chambers shall be proclaimed upon the housetops" (Lu 12:3).

2. Houses of More than One Story:

(1) Upper Chambers and Stairs:

It is certain that there were upper chambers (‘aliyah; huperoon, Ac 9:37, etc.) to some of the houses. Ahaziah was fatally injured by falling from the window of his palace, and a somewhat similar fate befell his mother, Jezebel (2Ki 1:2; 9:33). The escape of the spies from the house on the wall at Jericho (Jos 2:15) and that of Paul from Damascus (2Co 11:33) give substantial evidence of window openings at a considerable height. Elijah carried the son of the widow of Zarephath "up into the chamber." The Last Supper was held in an upper chamber (Mr 14:15). Some sort of stairs (ma‘alah) of stone or wood must

have existed, and the lack of the remains of stone steps suggests that they were wood steps, probably in the form of ladders. (2) Palaces and Castles:

Palaces and castles (’armon, birah, hekhal; aule, parembole).—These were part of every city and were more elaborate in plan, raised in all probability to some considerable height. The Canaanite castle discovered by Macalister at Gezer shows a building of enormously thick walls and small rooms. Reisner has unearthed Ahab’s palace at Samaria, revealing a plan of considerable area. Solomon’s palace is detailed in 1Ki 7 (see TEMPLE). In this class may also be included the megalithic fortified residences with the beehive guard towers of an earlier date, described by Dr. Mackenzie (PEF, I) .

3. International Appearance:

Walls were plastered (Le 14:43,18), and small fragments of painted (Jer 22:14) plaster discovered from time to time show that some attempt at mural decoration was made, usually in the form of crudely painted line ornament. Walls were recessed here and there into various forms of cupboards (which see) at various levels. The smaller cuttings in the wall were probably for lamps, and in the larger and deeper recesses bedmats may have been kept and garments stored.

III. Other Meanings.

The word has often the sense of "household," and this term is frequently substituted in the Revised Version (British and American) for "house" of the King James Version (e.g. Ex 12:3; 2Ki 7:11; 10:5; 15:5; Isa 36:3; 1Co 1:11; 1Ti 5:14); in certain cases for phrases with "house" the Revised Version (British and American) has "at home". (Ac 2:46; 5:42).

See HOUSE OF GOD; HOUSEHOLD.

LITERATURE.

Macalister, Excavations at Gezer; PEFS; Sellin, Excavations at Taanach; Schumacher, Excavations at Tell Mutesellim; Bliss, Mound of Many Cities; articles in Dictionaries and Encyclopedias.

Arch. C. Dickie

HOUSE OF GOD

In Ge 28:17,22 = BETHEL (which see). In Jgs, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezr, Neh, Ps, etc. (beth ha-’elohim), a designation of the sanctuary =" house of Yahweh" (of the tabernacle, Jud 18:31; 20:18,26 the King James Version; of the temple, 1Ch 9:11; 24:5 the King James Version; 2Ch 5:14; Ps 42:4; Isa 2:3, etc.; of the 2nd temple, Ezr 5:8,15; Ne 6:10; 13:11; compare Mt 12:4). Spiritually, in the New Testament, the "house of God" (oikos theou) is the church or community of believers (1Ti 3:15; Heb 10:21; 1Pe 4:17; compare 1Co 3:9,16,17; 1Pe 2:5).

HOUSE, FATHER’S

See FATHER’S HOUSE.

HOUSE, GARDEN

See GARDEN-HOUSE.

HOUSEHOLD

hous’-hold: Three words are usually found in the Bible where the family is indicated. These three are the Hebrew word bayith and the Greek words oikia and oikos. The unit of the national life of Israel, from the very beginning, was found in the family. In the old patriarchal days each family was complete within itself, the oldest living sire being the unquestioned head of the whole, possessed of almost arbitrary powers. The house and the household are practically synonymous. God had called Abraham "that he might command his children and household after him" (Ge 18:19). The Passover-lamb was to be eaten by the "household" (Ex 12:3). The "households" of the rebels in the camp of Israel shared their doom (Nu 16:31-33; De 11:6). David’s household shares his humiliation (2Sa 15:16); the children everywhere in the Old Testament are the bearers of the sins of the fathers. Human life is not a conglomerate of individuals; the family is its center and unit.

Nor is it different in the New Testament. The curse and the blessing of the apostles are to abide on a house, according to its attitude (Mt 10:13). A divided house falls (Mr 3:25). The household believes with the head thereof (Joh 4:53; Ac 16:15,34). Thus the households became the nuclei for the early life of the church, e.g. the house of Prisca and Aquila at Rome (Ro 16:5), of Stephanas (1Co 16:15), of Onesiphorus (2Ti 1:16), etc. No wonder that the early church made so much of the family life. And in the midst of all our modern, rampant individualism, the family is still the throbbing heart of the church as well as of the nation.

Henry E. Dosker

HOUSEHOLD, CAESAR’S

See CAESAR’S HOUSEHOLD.

HOUSEHOLDER

hous’-hol-der (oikodespotes): The word occurs in Mt 13:27,52; 20:1; 21:33, for the master or owner of a "household," i.e. of servants ([@douloi). The Greek word emphasizes the authority of the master.

HOUSETOP

hous’-top.

See HOUSE.

HOW

Represents various Hebrew and Greek words, interrogative, interjectional and relative. Its different uses refer to

(1) the manner or way, e.g. Ge 44:34, "How shall I go up to my father?" (’ekh); Mt 6:28, "how they grow" (pos); 1Co 15:35, "How are the dead raised?";

(2) degree, extent, frequently, "how great" (Da 4:3, mah; Mr 5:19, hosos, "how much"); "how many" (Mt 27:13, posos); "how much" (Ac 9:13, hosos); "how much more" (Mt 7:11, posos; 1Sa 14:30, ‘aph ki); "how oft" (Ps 78:40, kammah; Mt 18:21, posakis); "how long" (Job 7:19, kammah; Mt 17:17, heos pote), etc.;

(3) the reason, wherefore, etc. (Mt 18:12; Lu 12:49, tis);

(4) means—by what means? (Joh 3:4,9, pos);

(5) cause (Joh 12:34; Ac 2:8; 4:21, pos);

(6) condition, in what state, etc. (Lu 23:55, hos; Ac 15:36, pos; Eph 6:21, tis); "how" is sometimes used to emphasize a statement or exclamation (2Sa 1:19,25,27, "How are the mighty fallen!"); "how" is also used for "that" (Ge 30:29, ‘eth ‘asher, frequently "how that"; Ex 9:29, ki most frequently, in the New Testament, hoti, Mt 12:5; 16:12,21; Ac 7:25; Ro 7:1, etc., in the King James Version).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "wherefore" for "how" (Ge 38:29, margin "how"); has "what" (Jud 13:12; 1Ki 12:6; Job 13; 1Co 14:26), omits (2Co 13:5); has "how that" (1Sa 2:22); "that" (1Ch 18:9; Lu 1:58; Ga 4:13; Jas 2:22; Re 2:2); has "that even" for "how that" (Heb 12:17);" What is this?" for "How is it that?" (Lu 16:2); omits" How is it ?"(Mr 2:16, different text); has "Do ye not yet," for "How is it that?" (Mr 8:21); "Have ye not yet" (Mr 4:40, different text); "what" for "how much" (Lu 19:15, different text); omits "how that" (Lu 7:22); "then how" (Jas 2:24); has "cannot" for "How can he" (1 Joh 4:20); omits "How hast thou" (Job 26:3), "how is" (Jer 51:41); has "how" for "the fashion which" (Ge 6:15), for "and" (Ex 18:1), for "what" (Jud 18:24; 1Sa 4:16; 1Co 7:16), for "why" (Job 19:28; 31:1; Jer 2:33; Ga 2:14), for "when" (Job 37:15), for "for" (Ps 42:4), for "but God" (Pr 21:12), for "whereunto" (Mr 4:30); for "by what means" (Lu 8:36; Joh 9:21), for "how greatly" (Php 1:8); "how that" for "because" (Eze 6:9; 1Th 1:5), for "and how" (Ac 20:20); "know how

to" for "can" (Mt 16:3); "how" for "by whom" (Am 7:2,5).

"How" in compounds gives us Howbeit (how be it). It is the translation of ‘ulam, "but," "truly," "yet" (Jud 18:29); of ‘akh, "certainly," "only" (1Sa 8:9); of ‘ephes, "moreover," etc. (2Sa 12:14); of ken, "so," "thus" (2Ch 32:31); of rak, "only," "surely" "nevertheless" (1Ki 11:13); of alla, "but," etc. (Joh 7:27; Ac 7:48; 1Co 8:7, etc.); of de, "but," etc. (Joh 6:23); of mentoi (Joh 7:13 the King James Version); many other instances.

For "howbeit," the Revised Version (British and American) has frequently "but" (2Ki 12:13, etc.), "and" (2Ch 21:20; Mr 5:19), "surely" (ERV) (Job 30:24), "now" (Joh 11:13), "yet" (2Co 11:21), "nay, did" (Heb 3:16); omits (Mt 17:21, different text); it has "howbeit" for "but" (2Ki 12:3; Lu 19:27; Joh 5:34, etc.), for "also" (Le 23:27,39), for "nevertheless" (Nu 13:28; 1Ki 22:43; Mr 14:36; Lu 13:33 the English Revised Version; Lu 18:8; 2Ti 2:19), for "notwithstanding" (Jos 22:19; Lu 10:20 the English Revised Version, "nevertheless" the American Standard Revised Version; (Php 4:14), for "nay" (Ro 7:7).

Howsoever (in what manner soever, although, however) is the translation of kol ‘asher, "all that which," etc. (Ze 3:7, "howsoever I punished them," the Revised Version (British and American) "according to all that I have appointed concerning her," margin "howsoever I have punished her"; the English Revised Version omits "have"); of raq, "only," "surely," "nevertheless" (Jud 19:20); of yehi-mah, "let be what" (2Sa 18:22,23, the Revised Version (British and American) "but come what may"); in 2Sa 24:3 "how" and "soever" are separated (kahem), "how many soever they may be," literally, "as they and as they."

W. L. Walker

HOZAI

ho’-za-i (chozay, or as it stands at the close of the verse in question, 2Ch 33:19, chozay; Septuagint ton horonton; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) "Hozai"; the King James Version the seers; the King James Version margin "Hosai"; the American Standard Revised Version "Hozia," the American Revised Version margin "the seers." Septuagint not improbably reads ha-chozim, as in 2Ch 33:18; an easy error, since there we find we-dhibhere ha-chozim, "the words of the seers," and here dibhere chozay, "the words of Hozai." Kittel, following Budde, conjectures as the original reading chozayw, "his (Manasseh’s) seers"): A historiographer of Manasseh, king of Judah. Thought by many of the Jews, incorrectly, to be the prophet Isaiah, who, as we learn from 2Ch 26:22, was historiographer of a preceding king, Uzziah. This "History of Hozai" has not come down to us. The prayer of Manasseh, mentioned in 33:12 f, 18 f and included in this history, suggested the apocryphal book, "The Prayer of Manasses," written, probably, in the 1st century BC.

See APOCRYPHA.

J. Gray McAllister

HUCKSTER

huk’-ster: A retailer of small wares, provisions, or the like; a peddler. "A huckster shall not be acquitted of sin" (Sirach 26:29). Neither a merchant nor a huckster is without sin.

HUKKOK

huk’-ok (chuqqoq): A town on the border of Naphtali named with Aznoth-tabor (Jos 19:34). It is usually identified with the village of yaquq, which stands on the West of Wady el-‘Amud, to the Northwest of Gennesaret, about 4 miles from the sea. This would fall on the boundary of Zebulun and Naphtali, between Tabor and Hannathon (Jos 19:14). The identification may be correct; but it seems too far from Tabor.

HUKOK

hu’-kok.

See HELKATH.

HUL

hul (chul): The name of one of the "sons of Aram" in the list of nations descended from Noah, but a people of uncertain identity and location (Ge 10:23; 1Ch 1:17).ew>yaquq, which stands on the West of Wady el-‘Amud, to the Northwest of Gennesaret, about 4 miles from the sea. This would fall on the boundary of Zebulun and Naphtali, between Tabor and Hannathon (Jos 19:14). The identification may be correct; but it seems too far from Tabor.

HULDAH

hul’-da (chuldah, "weasel"; Holda): A prophetess who lived in Jerusalem during the reign of Josiah. She was the wife of Shallum, keeper of the wardrobe, and resided in the "Mishneh" or second part or quarter of Jerusalem (location unknown). Cheyne says it should read, "She was sitting in the upper part of the gate of the Old City," i.e. in a public central place ready to receive any who wished to inquire of Yahweh. He gives no reason for such a change of text. The standing and reputation of Huldah in the city are attested by the fact that she was consulted when the Book of the Law was discovered. The king, high priest, counselors, etc., appealed to her rather than to Jeremiah, and her word was accepted by all as the word of Yahweh (2Ki 22:14-20; 2Ch 34:22-29).

J. J. Reeve

HUMAN SACRIFICE

See SACRIFICE, HUMAN.

HUMILIATION OF CHRIST

hu-mil-i-a'-shun (Ac 8:33; Php 2:8).

See KENOSIS; PERSON OF CHRIST.

HUMILITY

hu-mil'-i-ti (~[‘anawah]; tapeinophrosune):

(1) The noun occurs in the Old Testament only in Pr 15:33; 18:12; 22:4, but the adjective "humble" appears frequently as the translation of ‘ani, ‘anaw, shaphal, meaning also "poor," "afflicted"; the verb, as the translation of ‘anah, "to afflict," "to humble," and of kana‘, "to be or become humbled"; tsana‘, "to be lowly," occurs in Mic 6:8. For "humble" (Ps 9:12; 10:12) the Revised Version (British and American) has "poor"; Ps 10:17; 34:2; 69:32, "meek"; for "humbled" (Ps 35:13), "afflicted" (Isa 2:11; 10:33), "brought low"; for "He humbleth himself" (Isa 2:9) "is brought low," margin "humbleth himself"; Ps 10:10, "boweth down"; tapeinophrosune is translated "humility" (Col 2:18,23; 1Pe 5:5); in several other places it is translated "lowliness" and "lowliness of mind"; tapeinos is translated "humble" (Jas 4:6; 1Pe 5:5; elsewhere "lowly," etc.; 1Pe 3:8, tapeinophron), the Revised Version (British and American) "humble-minded"; tapeinoo, "to humble," occurs frequently (Mt 18:4; 23:12, etc.); tapeinosis is "humiliation" (Ac 8:33); for "vile body" (Php 3:21) the Revised Version (British and American) gives "body of our humiliation."

(2) (a) In the Old Testament as well as in the New Testament, humility is an essential characteristic of true piety, or of the man who is right with God. God humbles men in order to bring them to Himself (De 8:2,3, etc.), and it is when men humble themselves before Him that they are accepted (1Ki 21:29; 2Ch 7:14, etc.); to "walk humbly with thy God" completes the Divine requirements (Mic 6:8). In Ps 18:35 (2Sa 22:36) the quality is ascribed to God Himself, "Thy gentleness (or condescension) hath made me great." Of "him that hath his seat on high" it is said, (Hebrew) "humbleth (shaphel) himself to behold the things that are in heaven and in the earth" (Ps 113:6). It is in the humble heart that "the high and lofty One, ... whose name is Holy" dwells (Isa 57:15; compare Isa 66:2).

(b) The word tapeinophrosune is not found in classical Greek (Lightfoot); in the New Testament (with the exception of 1Pe 5:5) it is Pauline. In Greek pre-Christian writers tapeinos is, with a few exceptions in Plato and Platonic writers, used in a bad or inferior sense—as denoting something evil or unworthy. The prominence it gained in Christian thought indicates the new conception of man in relation to God, to

himself, and to his fellows, which is due to Christianity. It by no means implies slavishness or servility; nor is it inconsistent with a right estimate of oneself, one's gifts and calling of God, or with proper self-assertion when called for. But the habitual frame of mind of a child of God is that of one who feels not only that he owes all his natural gifts, etc., to God, but that he has been the object of undeserved redeeming love, and who regards himself as being not his own, but God's in Christ. He cannot exalt himself, for he knows that he has nothing of himself. The humble mind is thus at the root of all other graces and virtues. Self-exaltation spoils everything. There can be no real love without humility. "Love," said Paul, "vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up" (1Co 13:4). As Augustine said, humility is first, second and third in Christianity.

(c) Jesus not only strongly impressed His disciples with the need of humility, but was in Himself its supreme example. He described Himself as "meek and lowly (tapeinos) in heart" (Mt 11:29). The first of the Beatitudes was to "the poor in spirit" (Mt 5:3), and it was "the meek" who should "inherit the earth. Humility is the way to true greatness: he who should "humble himself as this little child" should be "the greatest in the kingdom of heaven"; "Whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted" (Mt 18:4; 23:12; Lu 14:11; 18:14). To the humble mind truth is revealed (Mt 11:25; Lu 10:21). Jesus set a touching example of humility in His washing His disciples' feet (Joh 13:1-17).

(d) Paul, therefore, makes an earnest appeal to Christians (Php 2:1-11) that they should cherish and manifest the Spirit of their Lord's humility—"in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself," and adduces the supreme example of the self-emptying (kenosis) of Christ: "Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus," etc. The rendering of heauton ekenosen (Php 2:7 the King James Version) by "he humbled himself" has given rise to the designation of the Incarnation as "the Humiliation of Christ."

(e) There is a false humility which Paul warns against, a self-sought, "voluntary humility" (Col 2:18,23). This still exists in many forms, and has to be guarded against. It is not genuine humility when we humble ourselves with the feeling that we are greater than others, but only when we do not think of self at all. It is not alone the sense of sin that should create the humble spirit: Jesus had no sin. It belongs not merely to the creature, but even to a son in relation to God. There may be much self-satisfaction where sinfulness is confessed. We may be proud of our humility. It is necessary also always to beware of "the pride that apes humility."

W. L. Walker

HUMPS

humps: Appears in Isa 30:6 in the American Standard Revised Version for "bunches" in the King James Version.

HUMTAH

hum’-ta (chumTah): An unidentified place mentioned between Aphekah and Hebron in the mountain of Judah (Jos 15:54).

HUNDRED

hun’-dred (me’-ah; hekaton).

See NUMBER.

HUNGER

hun’-ger (ra‘abh; limos (subs.), peinao (vb.):

(1) The desire for food, a physiological sensation associated with emptiness of the stomach, and dependent on some state of the mucous membrane;

(2) starvation as the effect of want of food, as Ex 16:3; Isa 49:10;

(3) to feel the craving for food as De 8:3; when used to indicate the condition due to general scarcity of food as Jer 38:9; Eze 34:29 it is replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by "famine." The word is used to express the poverty which follows idleness and sloth (Pr 19:15). The absence of this condition is given as one of the characteristics of the future state of happiness (Isa 49:10; Eze 34:29; Re 7:16). Metaphorically the passionate striving for moral and spiritual rectitude is called hungering and thirsting after righteousness (Mt 5:6); and the satisfaction of the soul which receives Christ is described as a state in which "he shall not hunger" (Joh 6:35).

On two occasions it is said of our Lord that He hungered (Mt 21:18; Lu 4:2); 9 times the old English expression "an hungred" is used, the "an" being a prefix which indicates that the condition is being continued (Mt 12:1,3; 25:35,37,42,44; Mr 2:25; Lu 6:3 the King James Version). In Mt 4:2 the King James Version, "an hungred" has been changed to "hungered" in the Revised Version (British and American). "Hard bestead and hungry" in Isa 8:21 means bested (that is, placed) in a condition of hardship, "sore distressed," the American Standard Revised Version. The word occurs in Spenser, "Thus ill bestedd and fearful more of shame" (I, i, 24). The reference of the aggravation of the sensation of hunger when one who is starving awakes from a dream of food (Isa 29:8) is graphically illustrated by the experience of the antarctic voyager (Shackleton, Heart of the Antarctic, II, 9).

Alexander Macalister

HUNTING

hunt’-ing (tsayidh): The hunting of wild animals for sport, or for the defense of men and flocks, or for food, was common in Western Asia and Egypt, especially in early times. Some of the Egyptian and Assyrian kings were great hunters in the first sense, for example Amenhotep III (1411-1375 BC "a lion-hunting and bull-baiting Pharaoh," who boasted of having slain 76 bulls in the course of one expedition, and of having killed at one time or other 102 lions; and the Assyrian conqueror, Tiglath-pileser I (circa 1100 BC), who claimed 4 wild bulls, 14 elephants and 920 lions as the trophies of his skill and courage.

1. Nimrod and His Like:

The Biblical prototype of these heroes of war and the chase is Nimrod, "a mighty hunter before Yahweh" (Ge 10:9), that is perhaps "a hunter who had no equal," a figure not yet clearly identifiable with any historical or mythical character in the Assyro-Bab monuments, but possibly the Gilgamesh of the great epic, who may be the hero represented on seals and reliefs as victorious over the lion (Skinner, "Gen," ICC, 208). We are reminded also of Samson’s exploit at Timnah (Jud 14:5 f), but this, like David’s encounter with the lion and the bear (1Sa 17:34 f) and Benaiah’s struggle with a lion in a pit on a snowy day (2Sa 23:20), was an occasional incident and scarcely comes under the category of hunting. There is no evidence that hunting for sport was ever practiced by the kings of Judah and Israel. Not until the time of Herod the Great, who had a hunting establishment and was a great hunter of boars, stags, and wild asses (Josephus, BJ, I, xxi, 13), mastering as many as 40 beasts in one day, do we find a ruler of Palestine indulging in this pastime.

2. Hunting in the Old Testament:

Hunting, however, for the two other purposes mentioned above was probably as frequent among the Israelites, even after they had ceased to be nomads, as among their neighbors. We know indeed of only two personal examples, both in the patriarchal period and both outside the direct line of Israelite descent: Esau (Ge 25:27) and Ishmael (Ge 21:20); but there are several references and many figurative allusions to the pursuit and its methods and instruments. Hunting (inclusive of following) is mentioned in the Pentateuch in the regulation about pouring out the blood and covering it with dust (Le 17:13); and there is a general reference in the proverb (Pr 12:27): "The slothful man roasteth not that which he took in hunting." The hunting of the lion is assumed in Ezekiel’s allegory of the lioness and her two whelps (Eze 19:1-9; compare Job 10:16); of the antelope or oryx (De 14:5; Isa 51:20); of the roe (Pr 6:5); of the partridge in the mountains (1Sa 26:20), and of birds in general in many passages. Hunting is probably implied in the statement about the provision of harts, gazelles and roebucks for Solomon’s kitchen (1Ki 4:23), and to some extent in the reference to the den of lions in Babylon (Da 6:7).

3. Methods of Hunters:

The weapons most frequently employed by hunters seem to have been bows and arrows. Isaac (Ge 27:3) commands Esau to take his bow and quiver and procure him venison or game (compare also Isa 7:24; Job 41:28). This method is amply illustrated by the monuments. Ashur-nazir-pal lII (885-860 BC) and Darius (circa 500 BC), for example, are depicted shooting at lions from the chariot. Use was also made

of the sword, the spear, the dart or javelin, the sling and the club (Job 41:26,28 f, where the application of these weapons to hunting is implied). The larger animals were sometimes caught in a pit. The classical reference is in Ezekiel's allegory, "He was taken in their pit" (shachath, Eze 19:4,8; compare also Isa 24:17 f; Jer 48:43 f; Ps 35:7, etc.). The details of this mode of capture as practiced at the present day, and probably in ancient times, are described by Tristram in his Natural History of the Bible (118 f). A more elaborate method is described by Maspero in Lectures historiques (285). To make the pit-capture more effective, nets were also employed: "They spread their net over him" (Eze 19:8; compare Ps 35:7). When caught, the lion was sometimes placed in a large wooden cage (Eze 19:9, cughar, the Assyrian shigaru; for the word and the thing compare SBOT, "Ezk," English, 132; Heb, 71). The lion (or any other large animal) was led about by a ring or hook (chach) inserted in the jaws or nose (2Ki 19:28 equals Isa 37:29; Eze 19:4,9; 29:4; 38:4). From wild animals the brutal Assyrians transferred the custom to their human captives, as the Israelites were well aware (2Ch 33:11 the Revised Version margin, Hebrew choach; for monumental illustrations compare SBOT, "Ezk," English, 132 f). Nets were also used for other animals such as the oryx or antelope (Isa 51:20). The Egyptian and Assyrian monuments show that dogs were employed in hunting in the ancient East, and it is not improbable that they were put to this service by the Hebrews also, but there is no clear Biblical evidence, as "greyhound" in Pr 30:31 is a questionable rendering. Josephus indeed (Ant., IV, viii, 9) mentions the hunting dog in a law ascribed to Moses, but the value of the allusion is uncertain.

4. Fowlers and Their Snares:

The hunting of birds or fowling is so often referred or alluded to that it must have been very widely practiced (compare Ps 91:3; 124:7; Pr 1:17; 6:5; Ec 9:12; Am 3:5, etc.). The only bird specifically mentioned is the partridge, said to be hunted on the mountains (1Sa 26:20). The method of hunting is supposed by Tristram (N H B, 225) to be that still prevalent—continual pursuit until the creature is struck down by sticks thrown along the ground—but the interpretation is uncertain. Birds were generally caught by snares or traps. Two passages are peculiarly instructive on this point: Job 18:8-10, where six words are used for such contrivances, represented respectively by "net," "toils," "gin," "snare," "noose," "trap "; and Am 3:5, which is important enough to be cited in full: "Can a bird fall in a snare upon the earth, where no gin is set for him? shall a snare spring up from the ground, and have taken nothing at all?" The word for "snare" in this passage (pach) probably describes a net laid on the ground, perhaps a circular net like the Egyptian bird-trap represented in the Cambridge Bible, "Amos," 157. The word for "gin," usually ira in the Revised Version (British and American) "snare" (moqesh, literally, "fowling instrument") is supposed to refer either to the bait (ibid., 158) or to the catch connected with it which causes the net to collapse (Siegfried). For a full account of Egyptian modes of following which probably illustrate ancient Palestinian methods, compare Wilkinson, Popular Account, II, 178-83. The two words (moqesh and pach) mentioned above are used figuratively in many Old Testament passages, the former repeatedly of the deadly influence of Canaanitish idolatry on Israel, as in Ex 23:33, "For if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee" (compare Ex 34:12; De 7:16; Jos 23:13). The use of the hawk in fowling, which is at- tested for Northern Syria by a bas-relief found in 1908 at Sakje-Geuzi, is not mentioned in the Old Testament, but there may perhaps be an allusion in Apocrypha (Baruch 3:17, "they that had their pastime with the fowls of the air"). A reference to the use of decoys has been found in Jer 5:27, "a cage .... full of birds," but that is a doubtful interpretation, and in the Greek of Sirach

11:30, "As a decoy partridge in a cage, so is the heart of a proud man," but the Hebrew text of the latter is less explicit.

See FOWLER.

5. Allusions in the New Testament:

The New Testament has a few figurative allusions to hunting. The words for "catch" in Mr 12:13 and Lu 11:54 (agreuo and thereuo) mean literally, "hunt." The verb "ensnare" (pagideuo) occurs in the Gospels (Mt 22:15), and the noun "snare" (pagis) is met with in 5 passages (Lu 21:34; Ro 11:9; 1Ti 3:7; 6:9; 2Ti 2:26). Another word for "snare" (brochos), which means literally, "noose" (Revised Version margin), is used in 1Co 7:35. The words for "things that cause stumbling" and "stumble" (skandalon and skandalizo) may possibly conceal in some passages an allusion to a hunter's trap or snare. Skandalon is closely allied to skandalethron, "the stick in a trap on which the bait is placed," and is used in Septuagint for moqesh. The abundant use of imagery taken from hunting in the Bible is remarkable, in view of the comparative rarity of literal references.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the works cited in the course of the article, the article "Hunting" in DB2, HDB large and small, EB, Jewish Encyclopedia; and "Jagd" in German Bible Diets. of Guthe, Riehm2, and Wiener, and in RE3.

William Taylor Smith

HUPHAM

hu'-fam (chupham, "coast-inhabitant"): One of Benjamin's sons and head of the Huphamite family (Nu 26:39).

See HUPPIM.

HUPPAH

hup'-a (chuppah, "protection"): The priest in charge of the 13th course as prescribed under David (1Ch 24:13).

HUPPIM

hup'-im (chuppim, "coast-people"): Probably a variant form of HUPHAM (which see). From the only mention made of him (Ge 46:21; 1Ch 7:12,15), his direct descent is difficult to establish.

HUR

hur (chur):

(1) A prominent official in Israel. With Aaron he held up Moses' hands during the battle against the Amalekites (Ex 17:10,12) and assisted him as judicial head of the people during Moses' stay in the mount (Ex 24:14).

(2) Grandfather of Bezalel, the head artificer in the construction of the Tabernacle (Ex 31:2; 35:30; 38:22; 2Ch 1:5). He is here assigned to the tribe of Judah, and in 1Ch is connected with the same by descent through Caleb (2:19,20,50; 4:1,4). Josephus (Ant., III, ii, 4; vi, 1) makes him identical with (1) and the husband of Miriam.

(3) One of the five kings of Midian slain along with Balaam when Israel avenged the "matter of Peor" upon this people (Nu 31:8; compare Nu 31:1,2,16). In Jos 13:21 these kings are spoken of as "chiefs (nesi'im) of Midian" and "princes (necikhim) of Sihon," king of the Amorites.

(4) According to 1Ki 4:8 the King James Version, the father of one of Solomon's twelve officers who provided food for the king's household, and whose district was the hill country of Ephraim. Here the Revised Version (British and American) has "Ben-hur," taking the Hebrew ben, "son of," as part of the proper name; and the same is true in reference to the names of four others of these officers (compare 1Ki 4:9,10,11,13).

(5) Father of Rephaiah, who was one of the builders of the wall under Nehemiah, and ruler of half the district of Jerusalem (Ne 3:9).

Benjamin Reno Downer

HURAI

hu'-ri, hu'-ra-i, hu-ra'-i (churay, "linen-weaver"): One of David's "mighty men" mentioned in 1Ch 11:32 as of the brooks of Gaash, i.e. from Mt. Gash. In the parallel 2Sa 23:30, the orthography is Hiddai.

HURAM

hu'-ram (churam, "noble-born"):

(1) Grandson of Benjamin (1Ch 8:5).

(2) King of Tyre in alliance with David and Solomon. So named in 2Ch 2:3,11,12; 8:2; 9:10,21, but

elsewhere written HIRAM (which see).

(3) The Tyrian artisan who is so named in 2Ch 2:13; 4:11,16, but elsewhere called "Hiram."

HURI

hu’-ri (churi, "linen weaver"): One of the immediate descendants of Gad, and father of Abihail, a chief man of his family (1Ch 5:14).

HURT

hurt: The term (noun and verb) represents a large number of Hebrew words, of which the chief are ra‘ (verb ra‘a‘), "evil" (Ge 26:29; 1Sa 24:9; Ps 35:4, etc.), and shebher or shebher (from shabhar), "a fracture" or "breaking" (Jer 6:14; 8:11,21; 10:19; compare Ex 22:10,14). In Greek a principal verb is adikeo, "to do injustice" (Lu 10:19; Re 2:11; 6:6, etc.); once the word "hurt" is used in the King James Version (Ac 27:10, story of Paul’s shipwreck) for hubris, "injury" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)). In the Revised Version (British and American) "hurt" sometimes takes the place of other words in the King James Version, as "sick" (Pr 23:35), "breach" (Isa 30:26), "bruise" (Jer 30:12; Na 3:19); sometimes, on the other hand, the word in the King James Version is exchanged in the Revised Version (British and American) for "evil" (Jos 24:20), "harm" (Ac 18:10), or, as above, "injury" (Ac 27:10). These references sufficiently show the meaning of the word—harm, bruise, breaking, etc. In Jeremiah (ut supra) the word is used figuratively for moral disease or corruption.

James Orr

HUSBAND

huz’-band (’ish; aner): In the Hebrew household the husband and father was the chief personage of an institution which was regarded as more than a social organism, inasmuch as the family in primitive Semitic society had a distinctively religious character and significance. It was through it that the cult of the household and tribal deities was practiced and perpetuated. The house-father, by virtue of being the family head, was priest of the household, and as such, responsible for the religious life of the family and the maintenance of the family altar. As priest he offered sacrifices to the family gods, as at first, before the centralization of worship, he did to Yahweh as the tribal or national Deity. We see this reflected in the stories of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and in the Book of Job. This goes far to explain such records as we have in Ge 31:53; 32:9, and the exceptional reverence that was paid the paternal sepulchers (1Sa 20:6). Abraham was regarded as being the father of a nation. It was customary, it would seem, to assign a "father" to every known tribe and nation (Ge 10). So the family came to play an important and constructive part in Hebrew thought and life, forming the base upon which the social structure was built, merging gradually into the wider organism of the clan or tribe, and vitally affecting at last the political and religious life of the nation itself.

The husband from the first had supreme authority over his wife, or wives, and children. In his own domain his rule was well-nigh absolute. The wife, or wives, looked up to him as their lord (Ge 18:12). He was chief (compare Arabic sheik), and to dishonor him was a crime to be punished by death (Ex 21:15,17). He was permitted to divorce his wife with little reason, and divorces were all too common (De 22:13,19,28,29; Isa 50:1; Jer 3:8; 5:8; Mal 2:16, etc.). The wife seems to have had no redress if wronged by him. Absolute faithfulness, though required of the wife, was apparently not expected or exacted of the husband, so long as he did not violate the rights of another husband. In general among Eastern people women were lightly esteemed, as in the Japhetic nations they came to be. Plato counted a state "disorganized" "where slaves are disobedient to their masters, and wives are on equality with their husbands." "Is there a human being," asks Socrates, "with whom you talk less than with your wife?" But from the first, among the Hebrews the ideal husband trained his household in the way they should go religiously, as well as instructed them in the traditions of the family, the tribe, and the nation (Ge 18:19; Ex 12:26; 13:8; De 6:7, etc.). It was due to this, in part at least, that, in spite of the discords and evils incident to polygamy, the Hebrew household was nursery of virtue and piety to an unusual degree, and became a genuine anticipation of the ideal realized later in the Christian home (1Co 7:2 ff; Eph 5:25; 1Pe 3:7).

Used figuratively of the relation (1) between Yahweh and His people (Isa 54:5; Jer 3:14; Ho 2:19 f); (2) between Christ and His church (Mt 9:15; 2Co 11:2; Eph 5:25; Re 19:7; 21:2).

George B. Eager

HUSBAND’S BROTHER

(yabham, "brother-in-law"; epigambreuo; Late Latin levir): He was required (De 25:5-10; Mt 22:24) "to perform the duty of a husband’s brother" (yibbemah); that is, if his brother, living with him on the paternal estate, died without male issue, he should take the widow to wife, and "raise up seed unto his brother," the firstborn of the new marriage inheriting the deceased brother’s estate. Refusal of the duty was possible, but entailed public ceremonial disgrace and lasting reproach. This provision for a specific case modified the general law which forbade the marriage of a sister-in-law (Le 18:16,18). It was a patriarchal custom (Ge 38; Judah and Tamar), and is alluded to in Ru 1:11-13. A related custom is found in Ru 4:1, Boaz playing; however, the part, not of levir ("brother-in-law"), but of go‘el ("redeemer"). It was at least theoretically in force in our Lord’s time (Mt 22:23-28; the question of the Sadducees concerning the resurrection). For the origin and object of this custom see FAMILY; MARRIAGE.

Philip Wendell Crannell

HUSBANDMAN; HUSBANDRY

huz’-band-man, huz’-band-ri: Husbandman, originally a "householder" or "master of the house," is now limited in its meaning to "farmer" or "tiller of the soil." In this sense it is the correct translation of the various Biblical words: ish ‘adahamah, literally, "man of the soil" (Ge 9:20); ‘ikkar, literally, "digger,"

"a farmer" (2Ch 26:10; Jer 31:24; 51:23; Am 5:16; Joe 1:11); gubh, "to dig" (2Ki 25:12); yaghabh, "to dig" (Jer 52:16); georgos, "cultivator" (Mt 21:33 ff; Joh 15:1; Jas 5:7).

See AGRICULTURE.

It is a common practice in Palestine and Syria today for a rich man to own lands in many different parts of the country. He sets farmers over these different tracts who, with the helpers, do the plowing, planting, reaping, etc.; or he lets out his lands to farmers who pay him an annual rental or return to him a certain percentage of the crop. Much of the plain of Esdraelon, for example, was until recently owned by Beirut proprietors and farmed in this way. The writer while riding on the plain near ancient Dan, was surprised to overtake an acquaintance from Beirut (3 days' journey away), who had just dismounted at one of his farms to inspect it and to receive the annual account of his farmer. The pride with which the husbandman pointed out the abundant harvest will not be forgotten. All the difficulties of the owner with his husbandmen described by Jesus are often repeated today.

Figurative: Jesus said "I am the true vine, and my father is the husbandman" (Joh 15:1). He sows, cultivates, prunes and expects fruits from His church. In the parable of the Householder (Mt 21:33), the wicked husbandmen were the Jews. The church is referred to as "God's husbandry" in 1Co 3:9 (m "tilled land").

James A. Patch

HUSHAH

hu'-sha (chushah, "haste"): Mentioned in 1Ch 4:4 as probably an individual, a Judahite, or a family name; but may possibly be a place.

HUSHAI

hut'-shi, hus'-sha-i (chushay, Chousei; Josephus, Chousi): An Archite, native of Archi or Erech(?), West of Bethel on the northern border of Benjamin and southern border of Joseph (Jos 16:2). Hushai was one of David's most faithful and wise counselors. When David was fleeing from Jerusalem and Absalom, Hushai met him, having his coat rent and earth on his head. The king persuaded him to return to Jerusalem, feign submission to Absalom, and try to defeat the counsel of Ahithophel (2Sa 15:32 f). Whatever Absalom decided on, Hushai was to send word to David through two young men, sons of the priests Zadok and Abiathar (2Sa 15:34-36). Hushai obeyed, and succeeded in persuading Absalom to adopt his counsel rather than that of Ahithophel (2Sa 16:16-17:14). He sent word to David of the nature of Ahithophel's counsel, and the king made good his escape that night across the Jordan. The result was the suicide of Ahithophel and the ultimate defeat and death of Absalom.

J. J. Reeve

HUSHAM

hu’-sham (chusham, Ge 36:34; chusham, 1Ch 1:45-46, "alert"): According to the former reference, Husham was one of the kings of Edom, and according to the latter he was "of the land of the Temanites" and (1Ch 1:35 f) descended from Esau.

HUSHATHITE

hu’-shath-it, (chushathi, "a dweller in Hushah"?): The patronymic given in two forms, but probably of the same man, Sibbeccai, one of David’s thirty heroes (2Sa 21:18; 1Ch 11:29; 20:4; 27:11), or Mebunnai as named in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:27).

HUSHIM

hu’-shim (chusim, "hasters"):

(1) Family name of the children of Da (Ge 46:23), but of form "Shuham" in Nu 26:42.

(2) The sons of Aher of the lineage of Benjamin (1Ch 7:12).

(3) One of the wives of Shaharaim, of the family of Benjamin (1Ch 8:8,11).

HUSHSHATHITE

hush’-shath-it (chushshathi). Same as HUSHATHITE (which see), except in reduplicated form (1Ch 27:11; compare 1Ch 11:29, Hebrew pronunciation).

HUSKS

husks (keratia, i.e. "little horns," Lu 15:16): These are the pods of the carob tree (Revised Version, margin), also called the locust tree (Ceratonia siliqua). This tree flourishes all over Palestine, especially on the western mountain slopes toward the sea; by the Arabs it is called kharrub. It is dioecious, has dense, dark, evergreen foliage, glossy leaves and long, curved pods, like small horns (hence, the name). These pods which are from 4 to 9 inches in length, have a leathery case containing a pulpy substance in which the beans are imbedded; this pulp is of a pleasant, sweetish flavor and has a characteristic odor, and is much loved by children. The pods are sold in the markets, both as cattle food and for the poor, who extract by boiling them a sweetish substance like molasses. The tradition that the "locusts" of Mt 3:4; Mr 1:6 were carob pods is preserved in the name given to them, "St. John’s bread," but it has little to be said for it.

E. W. G. Masterman

HUZ

huz (Ge 22:21 the King James Version).

See UZ.

HUZZAB

huz’-ab (hutstsabh, only in Na 2:7 the King James Version and the Revised Version margin): Its meaning is doubtful. According to Gesenius, it is a verb, Hoph. of tsabhabh, "flow," hence, to be rendered with preceding verse, "The palace is dissolved and made to flow down." Wordsworth made it Pual of natsabh, "fix": "The palace is dissolved, though established." Septuagint renders with the next word, he hupostasis apokaluphthe, "The foundation (or treasure) is uncovered." the King James Version, the Revised Version margin and the American Standard Revised Version text make it Hoph. of natsabh, "fix," hence, "It is decreed." Perhaps more probably, with the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) text and the American Revised Version margin, it is a name, or noun with the article (or the corruption of such a word), referring either to the Assyrian queen, or personifying Nineveh. No such queen is now known, but Assyriology may throw light. The "name" interpretation accords best with the general trend of the passage, which describes the discomfiture of a royal personage. BDB calls it "perhaps textual error." The Massoretic vocalization may be at fault.

Philip Wendell Crannell

HYACINTH

hi’-a-sinth (huakinthos): the Revised Version (British and American) uses this word in Re 9:17 for the King James Version "jacinth," with reference, not to stone, but to dark-purple color. In Re 21:20, where stone is meant, the Revised Version (British and American) translations "sapphire."

HYADES

hi’-a-dez.

See ASTROLOGY, sec. II, 4.

HYDASPES

hi-das’-pez (Hudaspes): A river mentioned in Judith 1:6 in connection with the Euphrates and Tigris, but otherwise unknown. It is possible there may be a confusion with the Hydaspes of India. Some have

conjectured an identity with the Choaspes.

HYENA

hi-e'-na (tsabhua‘ (Jer 12:9); Septuagint huaine (Jer 12:9; Ecclesiasticus 13:18); compare Arabic dab‘ or dabu‘, "hyaena"; compare tsebho‘im, Zeboim (1Sa 13:18; Ne 11:34); also compare tsibh‘on, Zibeon (Ge 36:2,14,20; 1Ch 1:38); but not tsebhoyim, Zeboiim (Ge 10:19; 14:2, etc.)): English Versions of the Bible does not contain the word "hyena," except in Ecclesiasticus 13:18, "What peace is there between the hyena and the dog? and what; peace between the rich man and the poor?" In Jer 12:9, where the Hebrew has ha-‘ayiT tsabhua‘ (the Revised Version (British and American) "a speckled bird of prey"), Septuagint has spelaion huaines, "a hyena's den," as if from a Hebrew original having me‘arah, "cave," instead of ha-‘ayiT, "bird." The root tsabha‘ may mean "to seize as prey" (compare Arabic seb‘, "lion" or "rapacious animal"), or "to dip" or "to dye" (compare Arabic cabagh, "to dye"), hence, the two translations of tsabhua‘ as "hyena" and as "speckled" (Vulgate versicolor).

The hyena of Palestine is the striped hyena (Hyaena striata) which ranges from India to North Africa. The striped, the spotted, and the brown hyenas constitute a distinct family of the order of Carnivora, having certain peculiarities of dentition and having four toes on each foot, instead of four behind and five in front, as in most of the order. The hyena is a nocturnal animal, rarely seen though fairly abundant, powerful but cowardly, a feeder on carrion and addicted to grave-robbing. The last habit in particular has won it the abhorrence of the natives of the countries which it inhabits. In the passage cited in Ecclus, it is to be noted that it is to the hyena that the rich man is compared. The jaws and teeth of the hyena are exceedingly strong and fitted for crushing bones which have resisted the efforts of dogs and jackals. Its dens are in desolate places and are littered with fragments of skeletons. "Is my heritage unto me as a speckled bird of prey?" (Jer 12:9) becomes a more striking passage if the Septuagint is followed, "Is my heritage unto me as a hyena's den?"

Shaqq-ud-Diba‘, "Cleft of the hyenas," is the name of a valley north of Wadi-ul-Qelt, and Wadi-Abu-Diba‘ (of similar meaning) is the name of an affluent of Wadi-ul-Qelt. Either of these, or possibly Wadi-ul-Qelt itself, may be the valley of Zeboim (valley of hyenas) of 1Sa 13:18.

The name of Zibeon the Horite (Ge 36:2, etc.) is more doubtfully connected with "hyena."

Alfred Ely Day

HYMENAEUS

hi-men-e'-us (Humenaios, so named from Hymen, the god of marriage, 1Ti 1:20; 2Ti 2:17): A heretical teacher in Ephesus, an opponent of the apostle Paul, who in the former reference associates him with Alexander (see ALEXANDER), and in the latter, with Philetus (see PHILETUS).

1. His Career:

It is worthy of notice that in both passages where these persons are mentioned, the name of Hymeneus occurs first, showing, perhaps, that he was the leader. In the passage in 1Ti Hymeneus is included in the "some" who had put away faith and a good conscience and who had made shipwreck concerning faith. The apostle adds that he had delivered Hymeneus and Alexander unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme.

2. His Denial of the Resurrection:

In the passage in 2 Tim, Hymeneus and Philetus are included among persons whose profane and vain babblings will increase unto more ungodliness, and whose word "will eat as doth a gangrene." The apostle declares that Hymeneus and Philetus rection are of the number of such people as those just described, and he adds that those two persons "concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." Then, for the guidance of Timothy, he goes on to say the seal upon the foundation of God is, "The Lord knoweth them that are his: and, Let every one that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." The inference intended is, that though Hymeneus and Philetus had named the name of Christ, they did not depart from iniquity. There is no doubt in regard to the identity of this Hymeneus with the person of the same name in 1 Tim. Accordingly, the facts mentioned in the two epistles must be placed together, namely, that though he had made a Christian profession by naming the name of Christ, yet he had not departed from iniquity, but by his profane teaching he proceeded unto more ungodliness, and that he had put away faith and a good conscience and had made shipwreck of faith.

The error, therefore, of Hymeneus and his two companions would amount to this: They taught that "the resurrection is past already," that there shall be no bodily resurrection at all, but that all that resurrection means is that the soul awakes from sin. This awakening from sin had already taken place with themselves, so they held, and therefore there could be no day in the future when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and shall come forth from the grave (Joh 5:28).

3. Incipient Gnosticism:

This teaching of Hymeneus had been so far successful: it had "overthrown the faith of some" (2Ti 2:18). It is impossible to define exactly the full nature of this heresy, but what Paul says regarding it makes evident that it was a form of incipient Gnosticism. This spiritualizing of the resurrection sprang from the idea of the necessarily evil nature of all material substance. This idea immediately led to the conclusion of the essentially evil nature of the human body, and that if man is to rise to his true nature, he must rid himself of the thralldom, not of sin, but of the body. This contempt for the body led to the denial of the resurrection in its literal sense; and all that Christ had taught on the subject was explained only, in an allegorical sense, of the resurrection of the soul from sin.

4. Overthrows Faith:

Teaching of this kind is described by Paul as having effects similar to the "eating" caused by a gangrene. It is deadly; it overthrows Christian faith. If not destroyed, it would corrupt the community, for if there is no literal resurrection of the dead, then, as Paul shows in 1Co 15, Christ is not raised; and if the literal resurrection of Christ is denied, Christian believers are yet in their sins, and the Christian religion is false.

5. Delivered unto Satan:

The way in which the apostle dealt with these teachers, Hymeneus and his companions, was not merely in the renewed assertion of the truth which they denied, but also by passing sentence upon these teachers —"whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme." In regard to the meaning of this sentence much difficulty of interpretation exists. Some understand it to mean simple excommunication from the church. But this seems quite inadequate to exhaust the meaning of the words employed by Paul. Others take it to signify the infliction of some bodily suffering or disease. This also is quite insufficient as an explanation. It seems that a person who was delivered unto Satan was cut off from all Christian privileges, he was "put away" from the body of Christian believers, and handed over to "the Satan," the Evil One in his most distinct personality (1Co 5:2,5,13). Compare the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5), and of Elymas (Ac 13:11).

It is important that the purpose of this terrible sentence should not be overlooked. The intention of the punishment was distinctly remedial. Both in the case of Hymenacus and Alexander, and in that of the person dealt with in 1Co 5, the intention was the attaining of an ultimate good. In 1Co it is "for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Similarly, Hymeneus and Alexander are delivered unto Satan, not for their final perdition, but that they may be taught, through this terrible discipline—for such is the signification of the word which is translated "taught"—not to blaspheme. The purpose of this discipline, that they might learn not to blaspheme, shows the dreadful length of impiety and of railing at Christian truth to which Hymeneus had gone.

6. The "Perverse Things" at Ephesus:

In the history of Hymeneus and his companions, and in their bold and anti-Christian teaching which had overthrown the faith of some, we cannot fail to see the fulfillment of what Paul had said many years previously, in his farewell address to the elders of the church in Ephesus: "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them" (Ac 20:29 f). It was in the Ephesian church that Hymeneus and Alexander and Philetus had arisen. The gangrene-like nature of their teaching has already been described.

John Rutherfurd

HYMN

him (humnos): In Col 3:16; Eph 5:19 Paul bids his readers sing "psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." Gregory of Nyssa (4th century) distinguishes these as follows: the Psalms were accompanied by instruments, the hymns were mainly vocal, and the song, ode, was a general term comprehending both. This distinction might suggest that the psalm belonged especially to the public worship of the church, while the hymn was the production, more or less spontaneous, of the individual member. The inference is, however, inconsistent with 1Co 14:26, and it is probable that in the apostolic age, at least, the terms were used indiscriminately. Of Christian psalms or hymns we have examples in the New Testament. Lu 1 and 2 contain such hymns in the songs of Mary, Zacharias and Simeon. The Apocalypse is studded with hymns or odes, many of them quite general in character, and probably borrowed or adapted from Jewish books of praise. In the Epistles of Paul, especially the later ones, fragments of hymns seem to be quoted. Lightfoot detects one in Eph 5:14, and others readily suggest themselves.

It is probable that the hymn mentioned as having been sung by Jesus and the disciples after the Passover (Mt 26:30; Mr 14:26) was the second part of the Hallel, i.e. Psalms 115-118, and the hymns of Paul and Silas were most likely also taken from the Psalter. But the practice of interpolating and altering Jewish non-canonical books, like the Psalter of Solomon and the recently discovered Odes of Solomon, shows that the early Christians adopted for devotional purposes the rich store of sacred poetry possessed by their nation. For the music to which these psalms, etc., were sung, see MUSIC; SONG.

James Millar

HYPOCRISY; HYPROCRITE

hi-pok’-ri-si, hip’-o-krit (choneph, chaneph; hupokrisis, hupokrites):

(1) "Hypocrisy" occurs only once in the Old Testament as the translation of choneph (Isa 32:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "profaneness"); chaneph, from which it is derived, means properly "to cover," "to hide," or "becloud," hence, to pollute, to be polluted or defiled, to make profane, to seduce; as a substantive it is translated "hypocrite" (Job 8:13; 13:16; 15:34; 17:8; 20:5; 27:8; 34:30; 36:13, in all which instances the Revised Version (British and American) has "godless man," "godless men," "godless"; Pr 11:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "the godless man"; Isa 9:17, the Revised Version (British and American) "profane"; Isa 33:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "the godless ones"); it is rendered "hypocritical," in Ps 35:16; Isa 10:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "profane."

(2) "Hypocrisy," "hypocrite" are frequent in the New Testament, chiefly in Christ’s discourses in the Gospels. The word hupokrisis (primarily, "an answer," "response") meant generally, in classical Greek, stageplaying, acting, the histrionic art; hence, it came to mean acting a part in life, etc. We find hupokrisis in this sense in 2 Macc 6:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "dissimulation," and hupokrinomai, "to pretend," "to feign," etc. Ecclesiasticus 1:29; 32:15; 33:2, translated "hypocrite"; 2 Macc 5:25, "pretending peace," the Revised Version (British and American) "playing the man of peace"; 6:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "to make as if." Hupokrites (literally, "an

actor") is the Septuagint for chaneph (Job 34:30; 36:13), equivalent to bad, wicked, godless, which is perhaps included in some of our Lord's uses of the words, e.g. Mt 23:27 f, "full of hypocrisy and iniquity" (compare 23:29 f; 24:51); but, in general, the meaning is acting a part, false, deceptive and deceived, formally and outwardly religious and good, but inwardly insincere and unrighteous; the hypocrite may come to deceive himself as well as others, but "the hypocrite's hope shall perish" (Job 8:13 the King James Version). On no class did our Lord pronounce such severe condemnation as on the hypocrites of His day.

"Hypocrisy" (hupokrisis) occurs in Mt 23:28; Mr 12:15; Lu 12:1; 1Ti 4:2; 1Pe 2:1 (in Ga 2:13 it is rendered "dissimulation"); "hypocrite" (hupokrites), Mt 6:2,5,16; 7:5; 15:7; 22:18; 23:13,15,23,25 ff, 29; 24:51; Mr 7:6; Lu 12:56; 13:15; in Jas 3:17, anupokritos is "without hypocrisy," so the Revised Version (British and American), Ro 12:9 ("unfeigned," 2Co 6:6; 1Ti 1:5; 2Ti 1:5; 1Pe 1:22).

W. L. Walker

HYRCANUS

her-ka'-nus (Hurkanos): "Son of Tobias, a man of great dignity," who had a large sum of money deposited in the Temple of Jerusalem when Heliodorus was sent to confiscate it in 187 BC (2 Macc 3:11 ff). Opinions differ as to the identity of this Hyrcanus. with the grandson of Tobias whose birth and history are related at considerable length by Josephus (Ant., XII, iv, 6 ff), or with another of the same name mentioned in Ant, XIII, viii, 4.

See ASMONEANS; MACCABAEUS.

HYSSOP

his'-up ('ezobh; hussspos, Ex 12:22; Le 14:4,6,4:9 ff; Nu 19:6,18; 1Ki 4:33; Ps 51:7; Joh 19:29; Heb 9:19): A plant used for ritual cleansing purposes; a humble plant springing out of the wall (1Ki 4:33), the extreme contrast to the cedar.

The common hyssop (Hyssopus officinalis) of the Natural Order Labiatae, an aromatic plant with stomatic properties, cannot be the hyssop of the Bible as it is unknown in Palestine, but allied aromatic plants of the same Natural Order have by Maimonides (Neg. xiv.6) and other Jewish writers been identified with it. Probably hyssop is identical with the Arabic zat'ar, a name applied to a group of aromatic plants of the genus marjoram and thyme. They would any of them furnish a bunch suitable for sprinkling, and they have the important recommendation that they grow everywhere, being found even in the desert. Post thinks of all varieties the Origanum maru, a special variety of marjoram which favors terrace walls and rocks, is the most probable.

The proposal (Royle, Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc., VII, 193-213) to identify the caper (Capparis spinosa) with hyssop, which has been popularized by the works of Tristram, has not much to recommend it. It is

true that the caper is very commonly seen growing out of walls all over Palestine (1Ki 4:33), but in no other respect is it suitable to the requirements of the Biblical references. The supposed similarity between the Arabic ‘acaf ("caper") and the Hebrew ‘ezobh is fanciful; the caper with its stiff, prickly stems and smooth, flat leaves would not furnish a bunch for sprinkling as serviceable as many species of zat‘ar. It has been specially urged that the hyssop suits the conditions of Joh 19:29, it being maintained that a stem of caper would make a good object on which to raise the "sponge full of vinegar" to the Saviour’s face, the equivalent of the "reed" of Mt 27:48; Mr 15:36. For such a purpose the flexible, prickly stems of the hyssop would be most unsuitable; indeed, it would be no easy matter to find one of sufficient length. It is necessary to suppose either that a bunch of hyssop accompanied the sponge with the vinegar upon the reed, or, as has been proposed by several writers (for references see article "Hyssop," EB), that hussopo is a corruption of husso, "javelin," and that the passage should read "They put a sponge full of vinegar upon a javelin."

E. W. G. Masterman

I WILL BE

See GOD, NAMES OF.

I, I AM, I AM THAT I AM

See GOD, NAMES OF.

IACIMUS

i-as’-i-mus.

See ALCIMUS.

IACUBUS

i-ak’-u-bus (’Iakoubos 1 Esdras 9:48): "Akkub" in Ne 8:7.

IADINUS

i-ad’-i-nus (Iadeinos; 1 Esdras 9:48, the King James Version Adinus): Same as Jamin of Ne 8:7.

IBHAR

ib’-har (yibhchar, "He (God) chooses"; in Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus, Ebear, in Chronicles, Codex Vaticanus, Baar; Codex Alexandrinus, Iebaar): One of David’s sons, born at Jerusalem; son of a wife and not of a concubine (1Ch 3:6; 2Sa 5:15); otherwise unknown. His name in all three lists follows Solomon’s.’ In the Peshitta, "Juchabar."

IBIS

i’-bis. In Isa 34:11, yanshoph, which is rendered "owl," apparently indicates the sacred ibis (Ibis religiosa). The Septuagint gives eibis and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) ibis; the Revised Version, margin "bittern."

See OWL.

IBLEAM

ib’-le-am (yibhle‘am); A town in the territory of Issachar which was assigned to Manasseh (Jos 17:11). This tribe, however, failed to expel the inhabitants, so the Canaanites continued to dwell in that land (Jud 1:27). It was on the route by which Ahaziah fled from Jehu. He was overtaken and mortally wounded "at the ascent of Gur, which is by Ibleam" (2Ki 9:27). The name appears as Bileam in 1Ch 6:70; and it probably corresponds to Belmen of Jth. It is now represented by the ruin of Bel‘ameh on the West of the valley through which the road to the south runs, about half a mile from Jenin. In 2Ki 15:10, where it is said that Zechariah the son of Jeroboam was slain by Shallum "before the people," this last phrase, which is awkward in the Hebrew, should be amended to read "in Bileam." Possibly "Gath-rimmon" in Jos 21:25 is a clerical error for "Ibleam."

W. Ewing

IBNEIAH

ib-ne’-ya (yibhneyah, "Yah buildeth up"): A Benjamite, son of Jeroham (1Ch 9:8).

IBNIJAH

ib-ni’-ja (yibniyah or yibhneyah, "Yah buildeth up"): A Benjamite, father of Reuel (1Ch 9:8).

IBRI

ib’-ri (ibhri, "a Hebrew"): A Merarite Levitt, son of Jaaziah (1Ch 24:27).

IBSAM

ib’-sam (yibhsam, "fragrant," the King James Version Jibsam): Descendant of Issachar, family of Tolah (1Ch 7:2).

IBZAN

ib’-zan (ibhtsan): The 10th judge of Israel. His city is given as Bethlehem (whether of Judah or Zebulun is not stated). He judged Israel 7 years, and when he died he was buried in his native place. The only personal details given about him in the Biblical narrative are that he had 30 sons and a like number of daughters. He sent all of his sons "abroad" for wives and brought husbands from "abroad" for all his daughters. The exact meaning of ha-chuts, "abroad," is mere matter of speculation, but the great social importance of the man and, possibly, alliances among tribes, are suggested in the brief narrative (Jud 12:8-10). Jewish tradition identifies Ibzan with Boaz of Bethlehem-Judah (Talmud, Babha’, Bathra’, 91a).

Ella Davis Isaacs

ICE

is (qerach): Ice is almost unknown in Palestine and Syria except on the highest mountains. At moderate heights of less than 4,000 ft. a little ice may form during the night in winter, but the warm rays of the sun melt it the next day. A great quantity of snow is packed away in caves in the mountains during the winter, and is thus preserved for use in the summer months. The word is found in the Bible in three places where it describes God’s power. "Out of whose womb came the ice? And the .... frost" (Job 38:29); "By the breath of God ice is given" (Job 37:10); "He casteth forth his ice like morsels" (Ps 147:17).

Figurative: Untrue friends are compared to streams "which are black by reason of the ice" (Job 6:16).

Alfred H. Joy

ICHABOD

ik’-a-bod, i’-ka-bod (i-kha-bhodh, "inglorious"; Codex Vaticanus, ouai barchaboth; Codex Alexandrinus, ouai chaboth, Atimos): Son of Phinehas, Eli’s son, slain at the battle of Aphek when the ark was taken. Ichabod was born after his father’s death. His mother gave him this name on her death-bed to indicate that the "glory (had) departed from Israel" (1Sa 4:19). He was thus important as a symbol, though little is recorded of him as an individual. His nephew Ahijah was one of those who tarried with Saul and the six hundred at Gibeah just before Jonathan’s brave attack upon the Philistines (1Sa 14:2 f).

Henry Wallace

ICONIUM

i-ko’-ni-um (Ikonion, also Eikonion, on inscriptions): Iconium was visited by Paul on his first and on his second missionary journey (Ac 13:51 ff; 16:2), and

if the "South Galatian theory" be correct, probably also on his third journey. His sufferings there are referred to in 2Ti 3:11.

1. Topographical Position:

The topographical position of Iconium is clearly indicated in Acts, and the evidence of Ac has been confirmed by recent research. Was Iconium in Phrygia or in Lycaonia, and in what sense can it be said

to have belonged to one ethnical division or the other? The majority of our ancient authorities (e.g. Cicero, Strabo, Pliny), writing from the point of view of Roman provincial administration, give Iconium to Lycaonia, of which geography makes it the natural capital. But Xenophon, who marched with Cyrus' expedition through Phrygia into Lycaonia, calls Iconium the last city of Phrygia. The writer of Ac 14:6 makes the same statement when he represents Paul and Barnabas as fleeing from Iconium to the cities of Lycaonia—implying that the border of Phrygia and Lycaonia passed between Iconium and Lystra, 18 miles to the South. Other ancient authorities who knew the local conditions well speak of Iconium as Phrygian until far into the Roman imperial period. At the neighboring city of Lystra (Ac 14:11), the natives used the "speech of Lycaonia." Two inscriptions in the Phrygian language found at Iconium in 1910 prove that the Phrygian language was in use there for 2 centuries after Paul's visits, and afford confirmation of the interesting topographical detail in Ac (see Jour. Hell. Stud., 1911, 189).

2. In Apostolic Period:

In the apostolic period, Iconium was one of the chief cities in the southern part of the Roman province Galatia, and it probably belonged to the "Phrygian region" mentioned in Ac 16:6. The emperor Claudius conferred on it the title Claudiconium, which appears on coins of the city and on inscriptions, and was formerly taken as a proof that Claudius raised the city to the rank of a Roman colonia. It was Hadrian who raised the city to colonial rank; this is proved by its new title, Colonia Aelia Hadriana Iconiensium, and by a recently discovered inscription, which belongs to the reign of Hadrian, and which mentions the first duumvir who was appointed in the new colonia. Iconium was still a Hellenic city, but with a strong pro-Roman bias (as proved by its title "Claudian") when Paul visited it.

3. Later History:

About 295 AD, an enlarged province, Pisidia, was formed, with Antioch as capital, and Iconium as a "sort of secondary metropolis." The Byzantine arrangement, familiar to us in the Notitiae Episcopatuum, under which Iconium was the capital of a province Lycaonia, dates from about 372 AD. Iconium, the modern Konia, has always been the main trading center of the Lycaonian Plain. Trade attracted Jews to the ancient Phrygio-Hellenic city (Ac 14:1), as it attracts Greeks and Armenians to the modern Turkish town.

4. Thekla:

Paul's experiences at Iconium form part of theme of the semi-historical legend of Thekla, on which see Professor Ramsay's Church in the Roman Empire, 380 ff.

LITERATURE.

Ramsay Historical Commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, 214 ff; Cities of Paul, 317 ff. To the literature referred to in the notes to the latter book (pp. 448 ff) add Ath. Mitth., 1905, 324 ff; Revue de Philologie, 1912, 48 ff; Journal Hellenic Studies, 1911, 188 ff.

W. M. Calder

IDALAH

id’-a-la, i-da’-la (yidh’alah): A town in the territory of Zebulun, named with Shimron and Beth-lehem (Jos 19:15). The Talmud identifies it with Churyeh (Talm Jerusalem on Megh., I, 1). This, Conder thinks, may be represented by the modern Khirbet el-Chuwara to the South of Beit Lachm.

IDBASH

id’-bash (yidhbash, "honeysweet"(?)): A man of Judah, one of the sons of the father of Etam (1Ch 4:3; Septuagint "sons of Etam").

IDDO

id’-o:

(1) (’iddo (?[~’adhadh, "to be strong"), "hap," "happy" (?), Ezr 8:17): The "chief at the place Casiphia," who provided Ezra with Levites and Nethinim, the head of the Levitical body or school, said to be one of the Nethinim or temple slaves, but perhaps an "and" has slipped out, and it should read: "his brethren and the Nethinim." 1 Esdras 8:45,46 has "Loddeus (the King James Version "Saddeus"), the captain who was in the place of the treasury," keceph meaning silver. Septuagint has "in the place of the silver (en argurio tou topou) .... to his brethren and to the treasurers."

(2) (yiddo, "beloved," or "loving," 1Ch 27:21): Son of Zechariah, and captain of the half-tribe of Manasseh in Gilead, under David.

(3) (yiddo, "beloved," or "loving," Ezr 10:43): One of those who had taken foreign wives. Another reading is Jaddai, the King James Version "Jadau." In 1 Esdras 9:35 "Edos" (the King James Version "Edes").

(4) (‘iddo’," timely," 1Ki 4:14): Father of Abinadab, Solomon’s commissary in Mahanaim in Gilead.

(5) (yiddo, "beloved," or "loving," 1Ch 6:21): A Gershomite Levite, son of Joah, called Adaiah in verse 41; ancestor of Asaph.

(6) (ye‘do (Kethibh ye‘di), or ‘iddo, "decked," "adorned"): Seer (chozeh) and prophet (nabhi), the Chronicler’s "source" for the reign of Solomon (2Ch 9:29): "The visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat"; and for the reign of Rehoboam (2Ch 12:15): "The histories of Iddo (‘iddo) the seer, after the manner of (or, "in reckoning") genealogies"; and for the reign of Abijah (2Ch 13:22):

"The commentary (midhrash) of the prophet Iddo" (‘iddo). He may have been the prophet who denounced Jeroboam (1Ki 13), who is called by Josephus and Jerome Jadon, or Jaddo. Jerome makes Iddo and Oded the same.

(7) (‘iddo, "timely," Zec 1:1): Grandfather (father, according to Ezra) of the prophet, Zechariah. See also Zec 1:7; Ezr 5:1; 6:14 (‘iddo’). In 1 Esdras 6:1, "Addo."

(8) (‘iddo’," decked," "adorned," Ne 12:4,16): A priest who went up with Zerubbabel (12:4); one of the priestly clans which went up (12:16); perhaps same as (7).

Philip Wendell Crannell

IDLE; IDLENESS

i’-d’-l, i’-d’-l-nes: Both words, adjective and noun, render different Hebrew words (from ‘atsel, "to be lazy," raphah, "to relax," and shaqaT, "to be quiet"). According to the Yahwistic narrative Pharaoh’s retort to the complaints of the Israelites was a charge of indolence (Ex 5:8,17). It was a favorite thought of Hebrew wisdom—practical philosophy of life—that indolence inevitably led to poverty and want (Pr 19:15; Ec 10:18). The "virtuous woman" was one who would not eat the "bread of idleness" (Pr 31:27). In Eze 16:49 for the King James Version "abundance of idleness," the Revised Version (British and American) has "prosperous ease." In the New Testament "idle" generally renders the Greek word argos, literally, "inactive," "useless" (Mt 20:3,6). In Lu 24:11 "idle talk" corresponds to one Greek word which means "empty gossip" or "nonsensical talk."

T. Lewis

IDOLATRY

i-dol’-a-tri (teraphim, "household idols," "idolatry"; eidololatreia): There is ever in the human mind a craving for visible forms to express religious conceptions, and this tendency does not disappear with the acceptance, or even with the constant recognition, of pure spiritual truths (see IMAGES). Idolatry originally meant the worship of idols, or the worship of false gods by means of idols, but came to mean among the Old Testament Hebrews any worship of false gods, whether by images or otherwise, and finally the worship of Yahweh through visible symbols (Ho 8:5,6; 10:5); and ultimately in the New Testament idolatry came to mean, not only the giving to any creature or human creation the honor or devotion which belonged to God alone, but the giving to any human desire a precedence over God’s will (1Co 10:14; Ga 5:20; Col 3:5; 1Pe 4:3). The neighboring gods of Phoenicia, Canaan, Moab—Baal, Melkart, Astarte, Chemosh, Moloch, etc.—were particularly attractive to Jerusalem, while the old Semitic calf-worship seriously affected the state religion of the Northern Kingdom (see GOLDEN CALF). As early as the Assyrian and Babylonian periods (8th and 7th centuries BC), various deities from the Tigris and Euphrates had intruded themselves—the worship of Tammuz becoming a little later the most popular and seductive of all (Eze 8:14)—while the worship of the sun, moon, stars and signs of

the Zodiac became so intensely fascinating that these were introduced even into the temple itself (2Ki 17:16; 21:3-7; 23:4,12; Jer 19:13; Eze 8:16; Am 5:26).

The special enticements to idolatry as offered by these various cults were found in their deification of natural forces and their appeal to primitive human desires, especially the sexual; also through associations produced by intermarriage and through the appeal to patriotism, when the help of some cruel deity was sought in time of war. Baal and Astarte worship, which was especially attractive, was closely associated with fornication and drunkenness (Am 2:7,8; compare 1Ki 14:23 f), and also appealed greatly to magic and soothsaying (e.g. Isa 2:6; 3:2; 8:19).

Sacrifices to the idols were offered by fire (Ho 4:13); libations were poured out (Isa 57:6; Jer 7:18); the first-fruits of the earth and tithes were presented (Ho 2:8); tables of food were set before them (Isa 65:11); the worshippers kissed the idols or threw them kisses (1Ki 19:18; Ho 13:2; Job 31:27); stretched out their hands in adoration (Isa 44:20); knelt or prostrated themselves before them and sometimes danced about the altar, gashing themselves with knives (1Ki 18:26,28; for a fuller summary see EB).

Even earlier than the Babylonian exile the Hebrew prophets taught that Yahweh was not only superior to all other gods, but reigned alone as God, other deities being nonentities (Le 19:4; Isa 2:8,18,20; 19:1,3; 31:7; 44:9-20). The severe satire of this period proves that the former fear of living demons supposed to inhabit the idols had disappeared. These prophets also taught that the temple, ark and sacrifices were not essential to true spiritual worship (e.g. Jer 3:16; Am 5:21-25). These prophecies produced a strong reaction against the previously popular idol-worship, though later indications of this worship are not infrequent (Eze 14:1-8; Isa 42:17). The Maccabean epoch placed national heroism plainly on the side of the one God, Yahweh; and although Greek and Egyptian idols were worshipped in Gaza and Ascalon and other half-heathen communities clear down to the 5th or 6th century of the Christian era, yet in orthodox centers like Jerusalem these were despised and repudiated utterly from the 2nd century BC onward.

See also GOLDEN CALF; GODS; IMAGES; TERAPHIM.

LITERATURE.

Wm. Wake, A Discourse concerning the Nature of Idolatry, 1688; W.R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites; E.B. Tylor, Primitive Culture; J.G. Frazer, Golden Bough (3 vols); L.R. Farnell, Evolution of Religion, 1905; Baudissin, Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte; Beathgen, Der Gott Israels u. die Gotter der Heiden, 1888.

Camden M. Cobern

IDUEL

id’-u-el (Idouelos): 1 Esdras 8:43, English versions, margin "ARIEL" (which see).

IDUMAEA; IDUMAEANS

id-u-me’-a, id-u-me’-anz.

See EDOM.

IEDDIAS

yed-i’-as, i-ed-i’-as, the King James Version Eddias (Ieddias): One who agreed to put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:26); called also "Jezeias."

IEZER; IEZERITES

i-e’-zer, i-e’-zer-its (’i‘ezer, Nu 26:30): Contracted from ABIEZER (Jos 17:2, etc.) (which see).

IGAL

i’-gal (yigh’al, "he (God) redeems"; Septuagint variously Igal, Gaal, Ieol):

(1) One of the twelve spies sent by Moses from the wilderness of Paran; son of Joseph, tribe of Issachar (Nu 13:7).

(2) One of David’s heroes, son of Nathan of Zobah (2Sa 23:36). In 1Ch 11:38 he is "Joe (yo’el), the brother of Nathan."

(3) Son of Shemaiah of the royal house of David, descendant of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:22, the King James Version "Igeal").

IGDALIAH

ig-da-li’-a (yighdalyahu, "Yah is great"): Ancestor of certain persons who had a "chamber" in the temple in Jeremiah’s time (Jer 35:4).

IGEAL

i’-ge-al, i’-je-al (yigh’al, "he (i.e. God) redeems"): A remote descendant of David (1Ch 3:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "Igal").

IGNORANCE

ig’-no-rans (sheghaghah; agnoia): "Ignorance" is the translation of sheghaghah, "wandering," "going astray" (Le 4:2, etc., "if a soul sin through ignorance," the Revised Version (British and American) "unwittingly," margin "through error"; Le 5:15; Nu 15:24 ff; compare 35:11; Jos 20:3 ff; Ec 5:6; 10:5, "an error"). In the Law sheghaghah means "innocent error," such as had to be taken with consideration in judgment (see passages referred to). "Ignorance" is also expressed by the negative lo’ with yadha‘, "to know" (Isa 56:10; 63:16; Ps 73:22); also by bi-bheli da‘ath, literally, "in want of knowledge" (De 19:4; compare De 4:12; Jos 20:5, translated "unawares," "unwittingly").

In the New Testament the words are agnoia, "absence of knowledge" (Ac 3:17; 17:30; Eph 4:18; 1Pe 1:14); agneoma, "error" (Heb 9:7, the Revised Version margin "Greek: ignorances"); agnosia, "ignorance" (1Pe 2:15), "no knowledge" (1Co 15:34 the Revised Version (British and American)); agnoeo, "to be without knowledge," "ignorant" (Ro 1:13; 10:3; 11:25, etc.), "not knowing" (Ro 2:4, etc.), "understood not" (Mr 9:32, etc.), "ignorantly" (Ac 17:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "in ignorance"; 1Ti 1:13); idiotes, translated "ignorant" (Ac 4:13), "unlearned" (1Co 14:16, the Revised Version margin "him that is without gifts," and so in 1Co 14:23,14), "rude" (2Co 11:6); agrammatos, once only in connection with idiotes (Ac 4:13, "unlearned and ignorant men"); agrammatos corresponds to modern "illiterate" (compare Joh 7:15; Ac 26:24); idiotes originally denoted "the private man" as distinguished from those with a knowledge of affairs, and took on the idea of contempt and scorn. In Philo it denoted the whole congregation of Israel as distinguished from the priests (De Vita Mosis, III 29). With Paul (1Co 14:16,23,24) it seems to denote "plain believers as distinguished from those with special spiritual gifts." In Ac 4:13 it may refer to the want of Jewish learning; certainly it does not mean ignorant in the modern sense.

Paul in Ro 1:18,32 attributes the pre-Christian ignorance of God to "the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hinder the truth in unrighteousness" (but the margin has, with the King James Version, "hold the truth, compare 1Co 7:30, Gr"); many, however (Alford, De Wette, Meyer and others), translation "hold back the truth." A willful ignorance is also referred to in Eph 4:17 f; 2Pe 3:5. But there is also a less blameworthy ignorance. Paul at Athens spoke of "times of ignorance" which God had "overlooked" (Ac 17:30); Paul says of himself that he "obtained mercy, because (he) did it (against Christ) ignorantly in unbelief" (1Ti 1:13); Peter said to the Jews (Ac 3:17) that they and their rulers rejected Christ "in ignorance" (compare 1Co 2:8); and Jesus Himself prayed for those who crucified Him: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do"; (Lu 23:34); in Heb 5:2 the necessary qualification of a high priest is that he "can bear gently with the ignorant and erring"—those who sin in ignorance or go astray (compare 9:7, "blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the errors of the people," margin "(Greek: ignorances"). Growing light, however, brings with it increasing responsibility, and the "ignorance" that may be "overlooked" at one stage of the history of men and nations may be blameworthy and even criminal at another.

W. L. Walker

IIM

i’-im (‘iyim): Same as IYIM (which see).

IJE-ABARIM

i-je-ab’-a-rim.

See IYE-ABARIM.

IJON

i’-jon (‘iyon; Septuagint in Kings has Ain, or Nain; in Chronicles Ion; Aion): A town in the territory of Naphtali, first mentioned in connection with the invasion of Ben-hadad, in the reign of Baasha. It was captured along with Da and Abel-beth-maacah (1Ki 15:20; 2Ch 16:4). It shared with these cities a similar fate at the hands of Tiglath-pileser in the reign of Pekah (2Ki 15:29). The name survives in that of Merj A‘yun, "meadow of springs," a rich, oval-shaped plain to the Northwest of Tell el Qady, where the LiTany turns sharply westward to the sea. The ancient city may be represented by Tell Dibbin, an important site to the North of the plain.

W. Ewing

IKKESH

ik’-esh (‘iqqesh, "crooked"): A Tekoite, father of Ira, one of David’s "thirty" (2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:28; 27:9).

ILAI

i’-la-i, i’-li (‘ilay): A mighty man of David (1Ch 11:29); called Zalmon in 2Sa 23:28.

ILIADUN

i-li’-a-dun, il’-i-ad-un (Eliadoun, 1 Esdras 5:58; the King James Version Eleadun): Possibly corresponding to Henadad in Ezr 3:9.

ILL; ILL-FAVORED

il, il-fa’-verd.

See EVIL-FAVOREDNESS.

ILLUMINATION

i-lu-mi-na’-shun: Heb 10:32 the King James Version, only, "the former days, in which, after ye were illuminated (the Revised Version (British and American) "enlightened"), ye endured a great fight of afflictions." The verb is photizo, rendered in 6:4 by "enlightened" and in both passages (and not elsewhere in the New Testament) being used to describe complete conversion. The verb, indeed, is used in such a technical way that Syriac versions render by "baptized," and it is not perhaps impossible that the author of He had baptism definitely in mind. (In the early church baptism is frequently described as "illumination," e.g. Justin, Apol., i.61.) But this probably would go too far; the most that can be said is that he means the state of mind of a full Christian and not that of a catechumen (compare also Baruch 4:2 the King James Version; Sirach 25:11).

Burton Scott Easton

ILLUSTRIOUS, THE

i-lus’-tri-us (thaumastos): A title of rank and merit attached to the name of Bartacus, the father of Apame (1 Esdras 4:29, the King James Version "the admirable). Instead of "the illustrious" we should possibly read "colonel" (Ant., XI, iii, 5; EB, under the word).

See BARTACUS; APAME.

ILLYRICUM

i-lir’-i-kum (Illurikon): A province of the Roman Empire, lying East and Northeast of the Adriatic Sea. In his Epistle to the Romans Paul emphasizes the extent of his missionary activities in the assertion that "from Jerusalem, and round about even unto Illyricum, I have fully preached the gospel of Christ" (15:19). An examination of this statement involves three questions: What is the force of the preposition "even unto" (mechri)? What meaning is borne by the word Illyricum? and, At what period of his missionary career did Paul reach the limit here spoken of?

1. Force of "even unto":

In Greek, as in English, the preposition "unto" may either be exclusive or inclusive. In other words, Paul may mean that he has preached throughout Macedonia as far as the Illyrian frontier, or his words may involve a journey within Illyricum itself, extending perhaps to Dyrrhachium (mod. Durazzo) on the Adriatic seaboard, which, though belonging politically to Macedonia, lay in "Greek, Illyria." But since no word is said in the Ac of any extension of Paul’s travels beyond the confines of Macedonia, and since the phrase, "I have fully preached," precludes a reference to a hurried or cursory tour in Illyricum, we should probably take the word "unto" in its exclusive sense, and understand that Paul claims to have evangelized Macedonia as far as the frontier of Illyricum.

2. Meaning of "Illyricum":

What, then, does the word "Illyricum" denote? It is sometimes used, like the Greek terms Illyris and Illyria, to signify a vast area lying between the Danube on the North and Macedonia and Thrace on the South, extending from the Adriatic and the Alps to the Black Sea, and inhabited by a number of warlike and semi-civilized tribes known to the Greeks under the general title of Illyrians (Appian, Illyr. 1; Suetonius, Tiberius, 16); it thus comprised the provinces of Illyricum (in the narrower sense), Pannonia and Moesia, which for certain financial and military purposes formed a single administrative area, together with a strip of coast land between Dalmatia and Epirus and, at a later date, Dacia. Appian (Illyr. 6) even extends the term to include Raetia and Noricum, but in this he appears to be in error. But Illyricum has also a narrower and more precise meaning, denoting a single Roman province, which varied in extent with the advance of the Roman conquest but was finally organized in 10 AD by the emperor Augustus. At first it bore the name superior provincia Illyricum or simply Illyricum; later it came to be known as Dalmatia (Tac. Annals, iv.5; Josephus, BJ, II, xvi; Dio Cassius, xlix.36, etc.). In accordance with Paul's habitual usage of such terms, together with the fact that he employs a Greek form which is a transliteration of the Latin Illyricum but does not occur in any other extant Greek writer, and the fact that he is here writing to the church at Rome, we may conclude that in Ro 15:19 Illyricum bears its more restricted meaning.

3. Relation to Rome:

The Romans waged two Illyrian wars: in 229-228 BC and in 219 BC, but no province was formed until 167, when, after the fall of the Macedonian power, Illyria received its provincial constitution (Livy, xlv.26). At this time it extended from the Drilo (modern Drin) to Dalmatia, which was gradually subjugated by Roman arms. In 59 BC Julius Caesar received as his province Illyricum and Gaul, and later Octavian and his generals, Asinius Pollio and Statilius Taurus, waged war there with such success that in 27 BC, at the partition of the provinces between Augustus and the Senate, Illyricum was regarded as wholly pacified and was assigned to the latter. Renewed disturbances led, however, to its transference to the emperor in 11 BC. Two years later the province was extended to the Danube, but in 9 AD, at the close of the 2nd Pannonian War, it was divided into two separate provinces, Pannonia and Illyricum (Dalmatia). The latter remained an imperial province, administered by a consular legatus Augusti pro praetore residing at Salonae (modern Spalato), and two legions were stationed there, at Delminium and at Burnum. One of these was removed by Nero, the other by Vespasian, and thenceforward the province was garrisoned only by auxiliary troops. It fell into three judicial circuits (conventus), that of Scardona comprising Liburnia, the northern portion of the province, while those of Salonae and Narona made up the district of Dalmatia in the narrower sense. The land was rugged and mountainous, and civilization progressed but slowly; the Romans, however, organized 5 Roman colonies within the province and a considerable number of municipia.

4. Paul's Relation to Illyricum:

The extension of Paul's preaching to the Illyrian frontier must be assigned to his 3rd missionary journey,

i.e. to his 2nd visit to Macedonia. His movements during the 1st visit (Ac 16:12-17:15) are too fully recorded to admit of our attributing it to that period, but the account in Ac 20:2 of his second tour is not only very brief, but the words, "when he had gone through those parts," suggest an extensive tour through the province, occupying, according to Ramsay, the summer and autumn of 56 AD.

See also DALMATIA.

LITERATURE.

A. M. Poinsignon, Quid praecipue apud Romanos adusque Diocletiani tempora Illyricum fuerit (Paris, 1846); Zippe, Die romische Herrschaft in Illyrien bis auf Augustus (Leipzig, 1877); H. Cons, La province romaine de Dalmatie (Paris, 1882); T. Mommsen, CIL, III, pp. 279 ff; T. Mommsen et J. Marquardt, Manuel des antiquites romaines (Fr. T), IX, 171 ff.

M. N. Tod

IMAGE

im’-aj (tselem; eikon): Its usage falls under 3 main heads.

(1) "Image" as object of idolatrous worship (translations about a dozen words, including maccekhah, "molten image" (De 9:12, etc.); matstsebhah, in the King James Version translated "image" or "pillar," in the Revised Version (British and American) always "pillar" (Ex 23:24, etc.); pecel, "graven image" (Ex 20:4, etc.); tselem, "image" (2Ki 11:18, etc.); eikon, "image" (e.g. Re 14:9));

(2) of man as made in the image of God; (3) of Christ as the image of God. Here we are concerned with the last two usages. For "image" in connection with idolatrous practices, see IDOLATRY; IMAGES; PILLAR; TERAPHIM, etc.

I. Man as Made in the Divine Image.

1. In the Old Testament:

To define man’s fundamental relation to God, the priestly writer in Ge uses two words: "image" (tselem) and "likeness" (demuth); once employing both together (Ge 1:26; compare Ge 5:3), but elsewhere one without the other, "image" only in Ge 1:27; 9:6, and "likeness" only in 5:1. The priestly writer alone in the Old Testament uses this expression to describe the nature of man, though the general meaning of the passage Ge 1:26 f is echoed in Ps 8:5-8, and the term itself reappears in Apocrypha (Sirach 17:3; The Wisdom of Solomon 2:23) and in the New Testament (see below).

The idea is important in relation to the Biblical doctrine of man, and has figured prominently in

theological discussion. The following are some of the questions that arise:

(1) Is there any distinction to be understood between "image" and "likeness"? Most of the Fathers, and some later theologians, attempt to distinguish between them.

(a) Some have referred "image" to man's bodily form, and "likeness" to his spiritual nature (Justin Martyr, Irenaeus).

(b) Others, especially the Alexandrian Fathers, understood by the "image" the mental and moral endowments native to man, and by the "likeness" the Divine perfections which man can only gradually acquire by free development and moral conflict (Clement of Alexandria and Origen), or which is conferred on man as a gift of grace.

(c) This became the basis of the later Roman Catholic distinction between the natural gifts of rationality and freedom (= the image), and the supernatural endowments of grace which God bestowed on man after He had created him (the likeness = donum superadditum). The former remained after the Fall, though in an enfeebled state; the latter was lost through sin, but restored by Christ. The early Protestants rejected this distinction, maintaining that supernatural righteousness was part of the true nature and idea of man, i.e. was included in the "image," and not merely externally superadded. Whatever truth these distinctions may or may not contain theologically, they cannot be exegetically inferred from Ge 1:26, where (as is now generally admitted) no real difference is intended.

We have here simply a "duplication of synonyms" (Driver) for the sake of emphasis. The two terms are elsewhere used interchangeably.

(2) What, then, is to be understood by the Divine image? Various answers have been given.

(a) Some of the Fathers (influenced by Philo) supposed that the "image" here = the Logos (called "the image of the invisible God" in Col 1:15), on the pattern of whom man was created. But to read the Logos doctrine into the creation narrative is to ignore the historic order of doctrinal development. (b) That it connotes physical resemblance to God (see (1), (a) above; so in the main Skinner, ICC, in the place cited.). It may be admitted that there is a secondary reference to the Divine dignity of the human body; but this does not touch the essence of the matter, inasmuch as God is not represented as having physical form.

(c) That it consists of dominion over the creatures (Socinian view; so also Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, etc.). This would involve an unwarranted narrowing of the idea. It is true that such "dominion" is closely associated with the image in Ge 1:26 (compare Ps 8:6-8). But the "image of God" must denote primarily man's relation to his Creator, rather than his relation to the creation. Man's lordship over Nature is not identical with the image, but is an effect of it.

(d) It is best to take the term as referring to the whole dignity of man, in virtue of his fundamental

affinity to God. It implies the possession by man of a free, self-conscious, rational and moral personality, like unto that of God—a nature capable of distinguishing right and wrong, of choosing the right and rejecting the wrong, and of ascending to the heights of spiritual attainment and communion with God. This involves a separation of man from the beast, and his supremacy as the culmination of the creative process.

(3) Does the term imply man's original perfection, lost through sin? The old Protestant divines maintained that the first man, before the Fall, possessed original righteousness, not only in germ but in developed form, and that this Divine image was destroyed by the Fall. Exegetically considered, this is certainly not taught by the priestly writer, who makes no mention of the Fall, assumes that the image was transmitted from father to son (compare Ge 5:1 with 5:3), and naively speaks of post-diluvian men as created in the image of God (Ge 9:6; compare 1Co 11:7; Jas 3:9). Theologically considered, the idea of the perfect holiness of primitive man is based on an abstract conception of God's work in creation, which precludes the idea of development, ignores the progressive method of the Divine government and the essential place of effort and growth in human character. It is more in harmony with modern conceptions

(a) to regard man as originally endowed with the power of right choice, rather than with a complete character given from the first; and

(b) to think of the Divine image (though seriously defaced) as continuing even in the sinful state, as man's inalienable capacity for goodness and his true destination. If the Divine image in man is a self-conscious, rational and ethical personality, it cannot be a merely accidental or transitory attribute, but is an essential constituent of his being.

2. In the New Testament:

Two features may be distinguished in the New Testament doctrine of the Divine image in man:

(1) man's first creation in Adam,

(2) his second or new creation in Christ.

As to (1), the doctrine of the Old Testament is assumed in the New Testament. Paul makes a special application of it to the question of the relation of husband and wife, which is a relation of subordination on the part of the wife, based on the fact that man alone was created immediately after the Divine image (1Co 11:7). Thus Paul, for the special purpose of his argument, confines the meaning of the image to man's lordly authority, though to infer that he regards this as exhausting its significance would be quite unwarranted. Man's affinity to God is implied, though the term "image" is not used, in Paul's sermon to the Athenians (Ac 17:28 f, man the "offspring" of God). See also Jas 3:9 (it is wrong to curse men, for they are "made after the likeness of God").

(2) More characteristic of the New Testament is the doctrine of the new creation.

(a) The redeemed man is said to be in the image of God (the Father). He is "renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col 3:10), i.e. of God the Creator, not here of Christ or the Logos (as some) (compare Eph 4:24, "after God"). Though there is here an evident reference to Ge 1:26 f, this does not imply that the new creation in Christ is identical with the original creation, but only that the two are analogous. To Paul, the spiritual man in Christ is on a higher level than the natural ("psychical") man as found in Adam (compare especially 1Co 15:44-49), in whom the Divine image consisted (as we have seen) in potential goodness, rather than in full perfection. Redemption is infinitely more than the restoration of man's primitive state.

(b) The Christian is further said to be gradually transformed into the image of the Son of God. This progressive metamorphosis involves not only moral and spiritual likeness to Christ, but also ultimately the Christian's future glory, including the glorified body, the "passing through a gradual assimilation of mind and character to an ultimate assimilation of His doxa, the absorption of the splendor of His presence" (Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 218; see Ro 8:29; 1Co 15:49; 2Co 3:18; and compare Php 3:21; 1 Joh 3:2).

II. Christ the Image of God.

In 3 important passages in English Versions of the Bible, the term "image" defines the relation of Christ to God the Father; twice in Paul: "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God" (2Co 4:4); "who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation" (Col 1:15); and once in He: "who being the effulgence of his glory, and the very image of his substance" (Col 1:3). These statements, taken in their contexts, register the highest reach of the Christology of the Epistles.

1. The Terms:

In the two Pauline passages, the word used is eikon, which was generally the Septuagint rendering of tselem (Vulgate: imago); it is derived from eiko, eoika, "to be like," "resemble," and means that which resembles an object and represents it, as a copy represents the original. In Heb 1:3 the word used is charakter, which is found here only in the New Testament, and is translated in Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) figura, the King James Version "express image," the Revised Version (British and American) "very image," the Revised Version, margin "impress." It is derived from charasso, "to engrave," and has passed through the following meanings:

(1) an engraving instrument (active sense);

(2) the engraved stamp or mark on the instrument (passive sense);

(3) the impress made by the instrument on wax or other object;

(4) hence, generally, the exact image or expression of any person or thing as corresponding to the original, the distinguishing feature, or traits by which a person or thing is known (hence, English words "character," "characteristic"). The word conveys practically the same meaning as eikon; but Westcott distinguishes them by saying that the latter "gives a complete representation, under conditions of earth, of that which it figures," while charakter "conveys representative traits only" (Westcott on Heb 1:3).

2. Meaning as Applied to Christ:

The idea here expressed is closely akin to that of the Logos doctrine in Joh (1:1-18). Like the Logos, the Image in Paul and in He is the Son of God, and is the agent of creation as well as the medium of revelation. "What a word (logos) is to the ear, namely a revelation of what is within, an image is to the eye; and thus in the expression there is only a translation, as it were, of the same fact from one sense to another" (Dorner, System of Ch. D., English translation, III, 178). As Image, Christ is the visible representation and manifestation of the invisible God, the objective expression of the Divine nature, the face of God turned as it were toward the world, the exact likeness of the Father in all things except being the Father. Thus we receive "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2Co 4:6). He is the facsimile of God.

3. To What State Does It Refer?:

Is Christ described as the Image of God in His preincarnate, His incarnate, or else His exalted state? It is best to say that different passages refer to different states, but that if we take the whole trend of New Testament teaching, Christ is seen to be essentially, and in every state, the Image of God.

(a) In Heb 1:3 the reference seems to be to the eternal, preincarnate Son, who is inherently and essentially the expression of the Divine substance. So Paul declares that He subsisted originally in the form of God (en morphe theou huparchon, Php 2:6).

(b) In Joh 1:18; 12:45; 14:9, though the term image is not used, we have the idea of the historical Jesus as a perfect revelation of the character and glory of God.

(c) In the two Pauline passages (2Co 4:4; Col 1:15), the reference is probably to the glorified, exalted Christ; not to His pre-existent Divine nature, nor to His temporal manifestation, but to His "whole Person, in the divine-human state of His present heavenly existence" (Meyer). These passages in their cumulative impressions convey the idea that the Image is an inalienable property of His personality, not to be limited to any stage of His existence.

4. Theological Implications:

Does this involve identity of essence of Father and Son, as in the Homoousion formula of the Nicene Creed? Not necessarily, for man also bears the image of God, even in his sinful state (see I above), a fact which the Arians sought to turn to their advantage. Yet in the light of the context, we must affirm of

Christ an absolutely unique kinship with God. In the Col passage, not only are vast cosmic and redemptive functions assigned to Him, but there is said to dwell in Him "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" (1:19; 2:9). In He not only is the Son the final revelation of God to men, the upholder of the universe, and the very image of the Divine nature, but also the effulgence (apaugasma) of God's glory, and therefore of one nature with Him as the ray is of one essence with the sun (1:1-3). The superiority of the Son is thus not merely one of function but of nature. On the other hand, the figure of the "image" certainly guards against any Sabellian identification of Father and Son, as if they were but modes of the one Person; for we cannot identify the pattern with its copy, nor speak of anyone as an image of himself. And, finally, we must not overlook the affinity of the Logos with man; both are the image of God, though the former in a unique sense. The Logos is at once the prototype of humanity within the Godhead, and the immanent Divine principle within humanity.

5. Relation to Pre-Christian Thought:

Both in Paul and in He we have an echo of the Jewish doctrine of Wisdom, and of Philo's doctrine of the Logos. In the Alexandrine Book of Wisdom, written probably under Stoic influence, Divine Wisdom is pictorially represented as "an effulgence (apaugasma) from everlasting light, and an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image (eikon) of His goodness" (7 26). Philo repeatedly calls the Logos or Divine world-principle the image (eikon, charakter) of God, and also describes it as an effulgence of God. But this use of current Alexandrian terminology and the superficial resemblance of ideas are no proof of conscious borrowing on the part of the apostles. There is this fundamental distinction, that Philo's Logos is not a self-conscious personality, still less a historical individual, but an allegorical hypostatizing of an abstract idea; whereas in Paul and He, as in John, the Divine archetype is actually realized in a historical person, Jesus Christ, the Son and Revealer of God.

D. Miall Edwards

IMAGE OF GOD

See GOD, IMAGE OF.

IMAGERY

im'-aj-ri (maskith, "carved figure"): Only in Eze 8:12, "every man in his chambers of imagery," i.e. dark chambers on whose walls were pictures in relief representing all kinds of reptiles and vermin, worshipped by elders of Israel. Some maintain that the cult was of foreign origin, either Egyptian (Bertholet, Commentary on Ezekiel), or Babylonian (Redpath, Westminster Commentary on Ezekiel); others that it was the revival of ancient superstitions of a totemistic kind which had survived in obscure circles in Israel (W.R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, revised edition, 357). The word here rendered "imagery" is elsewhere in the King James Version translated "image" (of stone) (Le 26:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "figured stone"), "pictures" (Nu 33:52, the Revised Version (British and American) "figured stones"; Pr 25:11, the Revised Version (British and American)

"network"); twice it means imagination, conceit, i.e. a mental picture (Ps 73:20; Pr 18:11). "Imagery" occurs once in Apocrypha (Sirach 38:27 the King James Version, eis homoiosai zographian, the Revised Version (British and American) "to preserve likeness in his portraiture").

D. Miall Edwards

IMAGES

im’-aj-iz (tselem; eikon):

1. Definition

2. Origin

3. Historical Beginnings and Early Developments

4. Bible References and Palestinian Customs

5. Most Important Technical Terms

(1) Matstsebhah ("pillar")

(2) ‘Asherah ("grove")

(3) Chamman ("sun-image")

6. Obscure Bible References

(1) Golden Calf

Jeroboam’s Calves

(2) Brazen Serpent

(3) Teraphim

(4) Image of Jealousy

(5) Chambers of Imagery

(6) ‘Ephod

LITERATURE

1. Definition:

Images, as used here, are visible representations of supposedly supernatural or divine beings or powers. They may be

(1) themselves objects of worship,

(2) pictures, embodiments or dwelling-places (temple, ark, pillar, priests) of deities worshipped,

(3) empowered instruments (amulets, charms, etc.) of object or objects worshipped,

(4) pictures or symbols of deities reverenced though not worshipped.

These images may be shapeless blocks, or symmetrically carved figures, or objects of Nature, such as animals, sun, moon, stars, etc. These visible objects may sometimes be considered, especially by the uninstructed, as deities, while by others in the small community they are thought of as instruments or symbolizations of deity. Even when they are thought of as deities, this does not exclude a sense and apprehension of a spiritual godhead, since visible corporeal beings may have invisible souls and spiritual attributes, and even the stars may be thought of as "seats of celestial spirits." An idol is usually considered as either the deity itself or his permanent tenement; a fetish is an object which has been given a magical or divine power, either because of its having been the temporary home of the deity, or because it has been formed or handled or otherwise spiritually influenced by such deity. The idol is generally communal, the fetish private; the idol is protective, the fetish is usually not for the common good. (See Jevons, Idea of Cod in Early Religions, 1910.) Relics and symbolic figures do not become "images" in the objectionable sense until reverence changes to worship. Until comparatively recent times, the Hebrews seem to have offered no religious objection to "artistic" images, as is proved not only from the description of Solomon’s temple, but also from the discoveries of the highly decorated temple of Yahweh at Syene dating from the 6th century BC, and from ruins of synagogues dating from the pre-Christian and early Christian periods (PEF, January, 1908; The Expositor, December, 1907; Expository Times, January and February, 1908). The Second Commandment was not an attack upon artists and sculptors but upon idolaters. Decoration by means of graven figures was not in ancient times condemned, though, as Josephus shows, by the time of the Seleucids all plastic art was regarded with suspicion. The brazen serpent was probably destroyed in Hezekiah’s time because it had ceased to be an ancient artistic relic and had become an object of worship (see below). So the destruction of the ark and altar and temple, which for so long a time had been the means of holy worship, became at last a prophetic hope (Isa 6:7; Jer 3:6; Am 5:25; Ho 6:6; compare Zec 14:20). While the temple is not naturally thought of as an "image," it was as truly so as any Bethel. An idol was the temple in miniature—a dwelling-place of the god. When an image became the object of worship or a means by which a false

god was worshipped, it became antagonistic to the First and Second Commandments respectively.

2. Origin:

The learned author of the article on "Image Worship" in the Encyclopedia Biblica (11th edition) disposes too easily of this question when he suggests that image-worship is "a continuance by adults of their childish games with dolls. .... Idolatrous cults repose largely on make-believe."

Compare the similar statement made from a very different standpoint by the author of Great Is Diana of the Ephesians, or the Original of Idolatry (1695): "All Superstitions are to the People but like several sports to children, which varying in their several seasons yield them pretty entertainment," etc.

No universal institution or custom is founded wholly on superstition. If it does not answer to some real human need, and "if its foundations are not laid broad and deep in the nature of things, it must perish" (J. G. Fraser, Psyche’s Task, 1909, 103; compare Salomon Reinach, Revue des etudes grecques, 1906, 324). Image-worship is too widespread and too natural to humanity, as is proved in modern centuries as well as in the cruder earlier times, to have its basis and source in any mere external and accidental circumstances. All modern research tends to corroborate our belief that this is psychological rather than ecclesiastical in its origin. It is not imposed externally; it comes from within, and naturally accompanies the organic unfoldment of the human animal in his struggle toward self-expression. This is now generally acknowledged to be true of religious feeling and instinct (see especially Rudolf Eueken, Christianity and the New Idealism, 1909, chapter i; I. King, The Development of Religion, 1910); it ought to be counted equally true of religious expression. Neither can the origin of image-worship or even of magical rites be fully explained, as Fraser thinks, by the ordinary laws of association. These associations only become significant because the devoted worshipper already has a body of beliefs and generalizations which make him attentive to the associations which seem to him religiously or magically important. (Jastrow, Aspects of Rel. Belief and Practice in Babylonia and Assyria; compare James H. Leuba, Psychological Origin and Nature of Religion, 1909; Study of Religions, 1911). So animism must be regarded as a philosophy rather than as an original religious faith, since it is based on an "explanation of phenomena rather than an attitude of mind toward the cause of these phenomena" (EB, 11th edition, article "Animism," and compare Hoffding, Philosophy of Religion, 1906, 138). In whatever ways the various image-worshipping cults arose historically—whether from a primitive demonology or from the apotheosis of natural objects, or from symbolism, or a false connection of cause with effect—in any case it had some human need behind it and human nature beneath it. The presence of the image testifies to faith in the supernatural being represented by the image and to a desire to keep the object of worship near. Prayer is easier when the worshipper can see his god or some sacred thing the god has honored (compare M. L’abbe E. Van Drival, De l’origine et des sources de l’idolatrie, Paris, 1860).

3. Historical Beginnings and Early Development:

The first man was not born with a totem-pole in his fist, nor did the earliest historic men possess images. They lacked temples and altars and ephods and idols, as they lacked the fire-stick and potter’s wheel.

Religion, which showed itself so strong in the next stage of human life, must have had very firm beginnings in the prehistoric period; but what were its external expressions we do not yet certainly know, except in the methods of burying and caring for the dead. It seems probable that primitive historic man saw in everything that moved an active soul, and that he saw in every extraordinary thing in earth or heaven the expression of a supernatural power. Yet reflective thinking began earlier than Tylor and all the older scientific anthropologists supposed. Those earlier investigators were without extended chronological data, and although ingenuity was exercised in systematizing the beliefs and customs of modern savages, it was necessarily impossible always to determine in this way which were the most primitive cults. Excavations in Babylonia, Egypt and elsewhere have enabled us for the first time to trace with some chronological certainty the religious expressions of earliest historic man. That primitive man was so stupid that he could not tell the difference between men and things, and that therefore totemism or fetishism or a low form of animism was necessarily the first expression of religious thought is a theory which can no longer be held very buoyantly in the face of the new and striking knowledge, material and religious, which is now seen to be incorporated in some of the most ancient myths of mankind. (See e.g. Winekler, Die jungsten Kampfe wider den Panbabylonismus, 1907; Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, 2 volumes, 1911.) The pan-Bab theory, which makes so much use of these texts, is not certain, but the facts upon which theory depends are clear. It is a suggestive fact that among the earliest known deities or symbols of deities mentioned in the most ancient inscriptions are to be found the sun, moon, stars and other great forces of Nature. Out of these conceptions and the mystery of life—which seems to have affected early mankind even more powerfully than ourselves—sprang the earliest known religious language, the myth, which antedated by eons our oldest written texts, since some of these myths appear fully formed in the oldest texts. Rough figures of these solar and stellar deities are found from very early times in Babylonia. So in the earliest Egyptian texts the sun appears as divine and the moon as "the bull among the stars," and rough figures of the gods were carved in human or animal form, or these are represented pictorially by diadems or horns or ostrich feathers, as far back as the IInd Dynasty, while even earlier than this stakes and pillars and heaps of stones are sacred. (See further, HDB, 5th vol, 176 ff; Erman, A Handbook of Egyptian Rel.; Steindorf, Rel. of the Ancient Egyptians, 1905.) These rude and unshaped objects do not testify, as was once supposed, to a lower form of religious development than when sculptured images are found. The shapeless fetish, which not long ago was generally accepted as the earliest form of image, really represents a more advanced stage and higher form of religious expression than the worship of a beautifully or horribly carved image. It has been generally conceded since the days of Robertson Smith that it takes at least as much imagination and reflection to see an expression of deity in imageless matter as in the carved forms. Rude objects untouched by human hand, even in the most highly developed worships, have been most prized. The earliest images were probably natural objects which, because of their peculiar shapes or functions, were thought of either as divine or as made sacred by the touch of deity. Multiplied copies of these objects would naturally be made when worshippers increased or migrations occurred. While images may have been used in the most early cults, yet the highest development of image-worship has occurred among the most civilized peoples. Both deities and idols are less numerous in the early than in the later days of a religion. This is true in India, Assyria, Babylonia, and Egypt, as all experts now agree. Idols are not found among uncivilized peoples, such as the Bushmen, Fuegians, Eskimos, etc. (See e.g. Allen Menzies, History of Rel., 1895.) Images of the gods presuppose a power of discrimination that could only be the result of reflection. The earliest idols

known among the Semites were rude stone pillars or unshapen blocks. These, as the fetish, were probably adored, not for themselves, but for the spirit that was supposed to be in them or to have touched them. Deities and idols are multiplied easily, not only by philological, geographical and social causes, but through intertribal and international associations. One thing absolutely proved by recent excavations has been the extent to which the representations of local deities have been modified by the symbolic art of surrounding nations. Babylonia, for example, was influenced by the Syro-Hittite religious art at least as much as by that of Egypt (William Hayes Ward, Cylinders and Other Ancient Oriental Seals, 1909; Clay, Amurru, 1910). Even in adjacent localities the same deity varied greatly in its pictorial representation. See PALESTINE EXPLORATION, and Revue biblique, XIV, 315-48. With the possible exception of one reign in Egypt, during which Ikhnaton refused to allow any deities to be worshipped except the sun discovered and himself, idolatry outside of the Hebrew kingdom was never made a crime against the state until the days of Constantine. Theodosius (392 AD) not only placed sacrifices and divination among the capital crimes, but placed a penalty upon anyone who entered a heathen temple.

4. Bible References and Palestinian Customs:

The dignity of the image in common thought in Bible times may be seen from the fact that man is said to have been made in God’s image (tselem; compare 1Sa 6:5; Nu 33:52), and Christ is said to be "the image of the invisible God" (eikon; compare Col 1:15 with Ro 1:23). The heathen thought of the sun and stars and idols as being images of the gods, but the Hebrews, though Yahweh’s temple was imageless, thought of normal humanity as in some true sense possessing a sacred resemblance to Deity, though early Christians taught that only Christ was the Father s "image" in unique and absolute perfection. See IMAGE. The ordinary words for "image" by a slight change came to mean vermin, carrion, false gods, no gods, carcasses, dung, etc. Heathen gods were undoubtedly accounted real beings by the early Hebrews, and the images of these enemies of Yahweh were doubtless looked upon as possessing an evil associated (?) power. In the earlier Old Testament era, images, idols, and false gods are synonymous; but as early as the 8th century BC Hebrew prophets begin to reach the lofty conception that heathen gods are non-existent, or at least practically so, when compared with the ever-living Yahweh, while the idols are "worthless things" or "non-entities" (Isa 2:8,18,20; 10:10,11; 19:1; 31:7; compare Jer 14:14; Eze 30:13; note the satiric term ‘elilim, as contrasted with the powerful ‘elohim). The many ordinary terms used by the Hebrews for an idol or image mean "copy," simulacrum, "likeness," "representation." These are often, however, so compounded as technically to express a particular form, as "graven" or "carved" image (e.g. Ex 20:4; 2Ch 33:7) of wood or stone, i.e. one cut into shape by a tool; "molten image" (e.g. Ex 32:4; Le 19:4), i.e. one cast out of melted metal (standing image) (Le 26:1 the King James Version, and see below), etc. However, a few of the Old Testament terms and modes of worship are unusual, or have a more difficult technical meaning, or have been given a new interest by new discoveries, and such deserve a more extended notice.

5. Most Important Technical Terms:

(1) Matstsebhah ("pillar"):

matstsebhah: These were upright stone pillars, often mentioned in the Old Testament, sometimes as abodes (Bethels) or symbols of deity—especially as used by the heathen—but also as votive offerings, memorial and grave stones (Ge 28:18; 31:45; 35:14,20; Jos 24:26; 1Sa 7:12). The reverence for these stones is closely connected with that found among all Semitic peoples for obelisks (Ge 33:20; 35:7), cairns (Ge 28:18; Jos 4:6), and circles (Jos 4:3,5,20). Rough stone pillars from time immemorial were used in Semitic worship (Kittel, Hist of the Hebrews, II, 84). They were thought of primitively as dwelling-places of deity, and the stones and the spots where they stood were therefore accounted sacred. From very early times the mystery of life pressed itself upon human attention, and these stones were viewed as phallic images. These images were at first rough and undifferentiated, but became later well defined as male organs. At Tell Zakariyah the end of one is sculptured to represent a human face. Some sort of phallicism underlies all early Semitic religion, the form of which is determined by the attention paid to the date palm, to the breeding of flocks, to astrology, and to social life. This phallicism did not always represent coarse thought, but sometimes a very profound spiritual conception; compare GOLDEN CALF, and note Wiedemann's statement, in HDB, V, 180 that in Egypt the gods Hu, "Taste," and Sa, "Perception," were created from the blood of the sun-god's phallus. These images of fertility and reproduction were naturally connected in Canaan with the worship of the Baals or "lords" of each locality, upon whose favor as possessor of the land fertility depended. They were also naturally associated with the cult of Astarte, the female counterpart of all the Baals (see ASTARTE). In the Old Testament the Baalim and Asherim are almost invariably classed together, although the latter were wooden posts dedicated to a particular goddess, while "Baal" was merely a title which could be given to any male Semitic deity, and sometimes even to his female associate. The matstsebhoth were set up in a "high place" (which see), attracting reverence because of its "elevation, isolation and mystery" (Vincent). Originally these pillars were not considered as idols, but were naturally erected to Yahweh (Ge 28:18; 31:45; 35:14; Ex 24:4), and even Isaiah (19:19) and Hosea (3:4) approve them, though pillars dedicated to idols must of course be destroyed (Ex 23:24; 34:13; Jer 43:13; Eze 26:11). Only in late times or by very far-sighted law-givers were the matstsebhoth erected to Yahweh condemned; but after the centralization of the Yahweh-worship in Jerusalem, these pillars were condemned, even when set up in the name of Yahweh, and the older places of worship with their indiscriminate rituals and necessary heathen affiliations were also wisely discarded (Le 26:1; De 16:22; see also GOLDEN CALF Jer 7:18; 44:17,19; but see).

(2) 'Asherah ("grove"):

'asherah: Perhaps a goddess (see ASHERAH), but as ordinarily used in the Old Testament, a sacred tree or stump of a tree planted in the earth (De 16:21) or a pole made of wood and set up near the altar (Jud 6:26; 1Ki 16:33; Isa 17:8).

It has been supposed that these were primarily symbols of a goddess Asherah or Ashtoreth (Kuenen, Baethgen), and they were certainly in primitive thought connected with the tree cult and the sacred groves so universally honored by the Semites (see especially W.R. Smith, Religion of the Semites, 169, 437; Stade, Geschichte, 160 ff; Fraser, Golden Bough, II, 56-117; John O'Neill, Night of the Gods, II, 57); but the tree of life is closely connected in texts and pictures with the human organ of generation, and there can be no doubt that there is a phallic meaning connected with this sacred stake or pole, as

with the matstsebhoth described above. See references in HDB under "Asherah," and compare Transactions of the Victoria Institute, XXXIX, 234; Winckler, Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum AT. As these wooden posts from earliest times represented the ideas of fertility and were connected with the mystery of life, they naturally became the signs and symbols in many lands of the local gods and goddesses of fertility.

Astarte was by far the most popular deity of ancient Palestine. See ASHTORETH. The figures of Astarte from the 12th to the 9th century BC, as found at Gezer, have large hips, disclosing an exaggerated idea of fecundity. In close connection with the Astarte sanctuaries in Palestine were found numberless bodies of little children, none over a week old, undoubtedly representing the sacrifice of the firstborn by these Canaanites (R.A.S. Macalister, Excavation of Gezer, 3 vols). These Asherim were erected at the most sacred Hebrew sanctuaries, at Samaria (2Ki 13:6), Bethel (2Ki 23:15), and even in the Temple of Jerusalem (2Ki 23:6). The crowning act of King Josiah’s reformation was to break down these images (2Ki 23:14). As the astrological symbol of Baal was the sun, Astarte is often thought of as the moon-goddess, but her symbol was really Venus. She was, however, sometimes called "Queen of Heaven" (Jer 7:18; 44:17,19; but see Zeitschrift fur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, VI, 123-30).

(3) Chamman ("sun-image"):

chamman, the King James Version "images," "idols"; the Revised Version (British and American) "sun-images" (Le 26:30; 2Ch 14:5; 34:4,7; Isa 17:8; 27:9; Eze 6:4,6): This worship may originally have come from Babylonia, but the reverence of the sun under the name Baal-hamman had long been common in Palestine before Joshua and the Israelites entered the country. These sun-images were probably obelisks or pillars connected with the worship of some local Baal. The chariot and horses of the sun, mentioned (2Ki 23:11) as having an honored place at the western entrance of the Jerusalem Temple, represented not a local but a foreign cult. In Babylonian temples, sacrifices were made to the sun-chariot, which seems to have had a special significance in time of war (Pinches, HDB, IV, 629; see also CHARIOTS OF THE SUN).

6. Obscure Bible References:

(1) Golden Calf and Jeroboam’s Calves:

See GOLDEN CALF.

(2) Brazen Serpent:

Brazen Serpent (Nu 21:4-9; 2Ki 4).—The serpent, because of its strange, lightning-like power of poisonous attack, its power to shed its skin, and to paralyze its prey, has been the most universally revered of all creatures. Living serpents were kept in Babylonian temples. So the cobra was the guardian of royalty in Egypt, symbolizing the kingly power of life and death. In mythology, the serpent was not always considered a bad demon, enemy of the Creator, but often appears as the emblem of wisdom,

especially in connection with health-giving and life-giving gods, such as Ea, savior of mankind from the flood, and special "god of the physicians" in Babylon; Thoth, the god of wisdom in Egypt, who healed the eye of Horus and brought Osiris to life again; Apollo, the embodiment of physical perfection, and his son, Aeseulapius, most famous giver of physical and moral health and curer of disease among the Greeks. Among the Hebrews also a seal (1500-1000 BC) shows a worshipper before a horned serpent raised on a pole (Wm. Hayes Ward). In Phoenician mythology the serpent is also connected with wisdom and long life, and it is found on the oldest Hebrew seals and on late Jewish talismans (Revue biblique internationale, July, 1908, 382-94); at Gezer, in Palestine, a small "brazen serpent" (a cobra) was found in the "cave of oracles," and in early Christian art Jesus the Lord of Life is often represented standing triumphantly upon the serpent or holding it in His fist. In the Hebrew narrative found in Nu 21, the serpent evidently appears as a well-known symbol representing the Divine ability to cure disease, being erected before the eyes of the Israelites to encourage faith and stop the plague. It was not a totem, for the totem belongs to a single family and is never set up for the veneration of other families (Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 39). Hezekiah destroyed it because it was receiving idolatrous worship (2Ki 18:4), though there is no hint that such worship was ever a part of the official temple cult (Benzinger); for if this had been done, the earlier prophets could hardly have remained silent. The above explanation seems preferable to the one formerly offered that the serpent was merely a copy of the disease-bearer, as the images offered by the Philistines were copies of the ulcers that plagued them (1Sa 6:4).

See further NEHUSHTAN.

(3) Teraphim:

Teraphim (teraphim).—These are usually considered household gods, but this does not necessarily include the idea that they were images of ancestors, though this is not improbable (Nowack, Hebrew Archaeology, II, 23; HDB, II, 190); that they were images of Yahweh is a baseless supposition (see Kautzsch, HDB, V, 643). Sometimes they appear in the house (1Sa 19:13,16); sometimes in sanctuaries (Jud 17:5; 18:14); sometimes as carried by travelers and armies (Ge 31:30; Eze 21:21). They are never directly spoken of as objects of worship (yet compare Ge 31:30), but are mentioned in connection with wizardry (2Ki 23:24), and as a means of divination (Eze 21:21; Zec 10:2), perhaps not necessarily inconsistent with Yahweh-worship (Ho 3:4). They were sometimes small and could be easily hidden (Ge 31:34); at other times larger and in some way resembling a human being (1Sa 19:13). Jewish commentators thought the teraphim were in early times mummified human heads which were represented in later centuries by rude images (Moore, Crit. and Exeg. Commentary on Jgs, 1895, 382; see especially Chwolsohn, Die Ssabier u. der Ssabismus, II, 19, 150). Customs of divination by means of such heads were not unknown. In Israel the teraphim were sometimes certainly used in consulting Yahweh (Jud 17:5; 18:14), though their use was later officially condemned (2Ki 23:24). The teraphim in the home doubtless correspond in use to the EPHOD (which see) in the sanctuary, and therefore these are frequently connected. Certain small rude images have lately been uncovered in Palestine by Bliss, at Tell el-Hesy, and by Sellin, at Tell Ta‘annuk, which are supposed to be teraphim.

(4) Image of Jealousy:

Image of jealousy (cemel).—It is not certain what this statue was which was set up by the door of the inner gate of the Jerusalem temple (Eze 8:3). It was no doubt some idol, perhaps the image of the Asherah (2Ki 21:7; 23:6), which certainly. had previously been set up in the temple and may have been there again in this day of apostasy. "Jealousy" is not the name of the idol, but it was probably called "image of jealousy" because in a peculiar manner this particular image seems to have been drawing the people from the worship of Yahweh and therefore provoking Him to jealousy.

(5) Chambers of Imagery:

Chambers of imagery (chadhre maskitho).—Does Ezekiel mean that in his heart every man in his chambers of imagery was an idol-worshipper, or does this refer to actual wall decorations in the Jerusalem Temple (Eze 8:11,12)? Most expositors take it literally. W.R. Smith has been followed almost if not quite universally in his supposition that a debased form of vermin-worship is described in the "creeping things and abominable beasts" (Eze 8:10). But while this low and ignorant worship was an ancient cult, it had been banished for centuries from respectable heathen worship, and it seems inconceivable that these Israelites who were of the highest class could have fallen to these depths, or if they had done so that the Tammuz and sun-worship should have been considered so much worse (Eze 8:13,14). To the writer it seems more probable that the references are to Egyptian or Greek mysteries which would be described by a Hebrew just as Ezekiel describes this secret chamber. It is now known that the Greek mysteries experienced a revival at exactly this era, and it was probably this revival which was making itself felt in Jerusalem, for Greek influence was at this time greatly affecting Palestine (see Duruy, Hist of Greece, II, 126-80, 374; Cobern, Commentary on Ezekiel and Daniel, 80-83, 280-82; and separate articles, CHAMBERS OF IMAGERY; IMAGERY).

(6) Ephod:

Ephod (’ephodh).—There is no doubt that this was the name of a vestment or ritual loin cloth of linen worn by common priests and temple servants and on special occasions by the king (1Sa 2:18; 22:18; 2Sa 6:14). The ephod of the high priest was an ornamental waist coat on the front of which was fastened the holy breastplate containing the pocket in which were the Urim and Thummim (Ex 28:6,30; 29:5; 39:2-5; Le 8:28).

There are several passages, however, which have convinced many scholars that another ephod is mentioned which must be an image of Yahweh (see EPHOD). The chief passages relied upon are Jud 8:26,27, where Gideon made an ephod with 1,700 shekels of gold and "set" this in Ophrah, where it became an object of worship. So in Jud 17:4; 18:14-20, 1Sa 23:6,9; 30:7, etc.Micah provides an ephod as well as an image and pillar for his sanctuary; in 1Sa 21:9 the sword of Goliath is preserved behind the ephod; while in various places the will of Yahweh is ascertained, not by putting on the ephod, but by "bringing it near" and "bearing" and "carrying" it (1Sa 23:6,9; 30:7, etc.). On the basis of these passages Kautzsch (HDB, V, 641) concludes most inconsistently that the ephod appears "exclusively as an image of Yahweh." Driver, after an examination of each text, concludes that just in one passage (Jud 8:27) the term "ephod" is certainly used of the gold casing of an image, and that therefore it may also have this

meaning in other passages (HDB, I, 725). It does not seem quite certain, however, that a ceremonial vestment heavily ornamented with gold might not have been "set" or "erected" in a holy place where later it might become an object of worship. If this had been an idolatrous image, would Hosea have deplored its loss (Ho 3:4), and would its use not have been forbidden in some Bible passage?

Kautzsch's view that the ephod meant primarily the garment used to clothe Divine image, which afterward gave its name to the image itself, is a guess unsustained by the Scriptures quoted or, I think, by any archaeological parallel. We conclude that there is no certain proof that this was an image of Yahweh, though was used ritualistically in receiving the oracles of Yahweh (compare Kuenen, Religion of Israel, I, 100; Kittel, Hist of the Hebrews, II, 42; Konig, Die Hauptprobleme, 59-63).

See also IDOLATRY; CALF, GOLDEN.

LITERATURE.

See especially W.R. Smith, Religion of the Semites; E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture; J. G. Frazer, Golden Bough (3 vols); Baethgen, Beitrage zur sem. Rel.-Gesch.; Kittel, Hist of the Hebrews; Nowack, Hebrew Arch., II; Baudissin, Studien z. sem. Rel.-Gesch. For recent excavations, L.P.H. Vincent, Canaan d'apres l'expl. recente, 1907; R.A.S. Macalister, The Excavation of Gezer (1912); William Hayes Ward, Cylinders and Other Ancient Oriental Seals, 1909.

Camden M. Cobern

IMAGINATION

i-maj-i-na'-shun (yetser, sheriruth; dianoia): "Imagination" is the translation of yetser, properly "a shaping," hence, "a thought" (Ge 6:5; 8:21; De 31:21; 1Ch 28:9; 29:18). In Isa 26:3 yetser is translated "mind" (King James Version margin "thought" or "imagination"), "whose mind is stayed on thee" (the Revised Version margin "or imagination"); in Ps 103:14 it is "frame"; of sheriruth, "obstinacy," "stubbornness" (De 29:19; Jer 3:17; 7:24; 9:14; 11:8; 13:10; 16:12; 18:12; 23:17); in Ps 81:12 the King James Version it is, "lust," margin "hardness or imaginations"; 3 times of machashebheth, "thought" or "purpose" in the King James Version (Pr 6:18; La 3:60,61); once of dianoia, "mind," "understanding" (Lu 1:51); of logismos, "reasoning" (2Co 10:5); and of dialogismos, "reasoning through" (Ro 1:21 the King James Version).

The Revised Version (British and American) gives "stubbornness" in each instance where sheriruth is in the King James Version translated "imagination"; in Pr 6:18 the American Standard Revised Version has "purposes"; the Revised Version (British and American) has "devices" (La 3:60,61) and "reasonings" (Ro 1:21), "imagination" for "conceit" (Pr 18:11), and (English Revised Version) for "device" (La 3:62).

"Imagination" is frequent in Apocrypha, e.g. Ecclesiasticus 22:18 (dianoema); 37:3 (enthumema,

"wicked imagination"); 40:2 (dialogismos, the Revised Version (British and American) "expectation").

W. L. Walker

IMAGINE

i-maj'-in (chashabh; meletao): The word most frequently translated "to imagine" in the Old Testament, only in the King James Version and the English Revised Version, not in the American Standard Revised Version, is chashabh, "to bind," "combine," "think" (Job 6:26; Ps 10:2; 21:11; 140:2; Ho 7:15; Na 1:9,11; Zec 7:10; 8:17); we have also haghah in the King James Version and the English Revised Version, but not in the American Standard Revised Version, "to meditate," "mutter," "speak" (Ps 2:1; 38:12); zamam, "to devise" (Ge 11:6 the King James Version); charash, "to grave," "devise" (Pr 12:20 the King James Version); hathath, "to break in upon," to "attack unjustly" (Ps 62:3 the King James Version); meletao, "to meditate" (Ac 4:25).

W. L. Walker

IMALCUE

i-mal-ku'-e (Imalkoue; the King James Version Simalcue): An Arabian prince to whom Alexander Balas entrusted the upbringing of his young son Antiochus. Tryphon, who had formerly been on the side of Alexander, persuaded Imalcue to set up the young Antiochus (Antiochus VI) against Demetrius, who had incurred the enmity of his men of war (1 Macc 11:39,40). Antiochus confirmed Jonathan in the high-priesthood and appointed him to be one of the king's friends (11:57). In Josephus (Ant., XIII, v, 1) the name is given as Malchus.

J. Hutchison

IMLA; IMLAH

im'-la (yimlah, "fullness"?): Father of the prophet Micaiah (1Ki 22:8,9; 2Ch 18:7,8).

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, THE

i-mak'-u-lat kon-sep'-shun:

1. Definition:

The historic designation of the Roman Catholic dogma promulgated by Pope Pius IX on December 8, 1854, in the Papal Bull entitled "Ineffabilis Deus." The term is often incorrectly applied, even by those whose intelligence should make such an error impossible, to the VIRGIN BIRTH of Christ (which see).

2. Statement of the Dogma:

The central affirmation of this proclamation, which was read in Peter’s in the presence of over two hundred bishops, is expressed in the following words: It is proclaimed "by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and in our own authority, that the doctrine which holds the blessed Virgin Mary to have been, from the first instant of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of Almighty God, in view of the merits of Christ Jesus the Saviour of Mankind, preserved free from all stain of original sin, was revealed by Cod, and is, therefore, to be firmly and constantly believed by all the faithful" (see Schaff, A History of the Creeds of Christendom, II, 211, 212).

3. Objections to the Dogma:

(1) Drawn from Specifically Protestant Principles.

Objections to the dogma are mainly two:

(a) the claim to authority upon which the proclamation rests. There is every reason to believe that one of the major motives to the entire transaction was the wish, on the part of Pius and his advisers, to make an unmistakable assertion of absolute doctrinal authority by the Roman pontiff. To Protestants of all shades of opinion there would be unbearable offense in the wording of the decree, even if assent could be given to the doctrine itself. The whole vital issue of the Reformation is involved in the use by an ecclesiastic of the words "in our own authority" in addition to the words "by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ and the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul."

(b) The tendency to Mariolatry in the entire movement. As we shall see, the ascription of Divine honors to Mary is avoided in the public statement of the dogma and in the defense of it by Roman Catholic writers, but one has but to survey the course of discussion leading up to the publication of 1854, and subsequent to it, to discover a growing tendency to lift Mary out of the realm of human beings and to endow her with Divine attributes and functions. An extended discussion of Mariolatry lies beyond the range of this article (see MARY); it is only necessary to point out the obvious connections (see Roman Catholic Dictionary and church histories, sub loc.).

(2) Drawn from Roman Catholic Principles.

It is far from the truth to suppose that there are no objections to this modern dogma save those which are specifically Protestant. From the viewpoint of the devout Roman Catholic, and for the sake of the prestige of the papacy, this particular dogma seems to have been unfortunately chosen.

(a) It Has No Basis in Scripture.

The only attempt made to provide a Scriptural argument is by using a vague and unsatisfactory parallel

between Mary and Eve before the Fall, to be found in the writings of certain church Fathers who did not hold the papal dogma but unconsciously provided a slender and most insecure basis for it (see inacanus). Most Roman Catholic writers are intelligent enough to admit that theory of inspired tradition alone can be appealed to in support of the idea. The ordinary and only tenable argument is that the ecclesiastical promulgation and acceptance of the doctrine prove its apostolic origin (see Catholic Dictionary, sub loc.).

(b) It Weakens the Authority of the Church.

It would almost seem as if the doctrines of ecclesiastical authority and particularly of papal infallibility had, in this unfortunate proclamation, reached a reductio ad obsurdum for the comfort of their foes. Notice with care the historical standing of this dogma:

(i) The acknowledged absence of all positive evidence for apostolic origin and primitive authority (see Catholic Dictionary ut supra).

(ii) The abundant positive evidence that the principal Fathers of the early church did not believe in the sinlessness of Mary (see list of names and references given by H.C. Sheldon, History of the Christian Church, sub loc.).

(iii) The uncertain and equivocal testimony per contra drawn from the early Fathers. They are practically confined to the following: Ephrem Syrus (Carmina, Hymn 27, strophe 8), where he says "Truly it is Thou and Thy mother only who are fair altogether. For in Thee there is no stain and in Thy mother no spot"; Augustine (De Natura et Gratia, cap. 26), "Two were made simple, innocent, perfectly like each other, Mary and Eve," etc. To these may be added the words of Irenaeus: "The knot of Eve’s disobedience was untied by Mary’s obedience" (Catholic Dictionary, 422). In regard to these three passages it may reasonably be contended that even if these statements necessarily implied the Immaculate Conception of Mary, which they certainly do not, they would still have to be estimated against the many weighty statements which may be brought forward on the other side.

(iv) The prolonged controversy over the doctrine. From the earliest time when the idea of Mary’s miraculous freedom from sin appears, up to the Old Catholic agreement of 1874, devout and faithful Roman Catholics have protested against the addition of this unscriptural dogma to the faith of the church. Bonaventura (Locus Theol., VII, 1) says: "All the saints who have made mention of this matter, with one mouth have asserted that the blessed Virgin was conceived in original sin." With the statement of the Old Catholic agreement we may safely sum up the ecclesiastical situation, even from the viewpoint of those who hold to the doctrinal validity of tradition. Art. X reads: "We reject the New Roman doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, as being contrary to the tradition of the first 13 centuries, according to which Christ alone is conceived without sin."

(3) Drawn from General Considerations of Christian Doctrine.

The most serious objections to this offensive and gratuitous dogma are not at all specifically Protestant but, rather, broadly Christian. It is necessary at this point to assure ourselves that we understand (as many Protestants evidently do not) just what is meant by the doctrine as a doctrine. According to the accepted Roman Catholic explanation, Mary, at the supposed stage of her conception when the soul was actually infused into the body waiting for it, received the special grace of God whereby she was delivered from all stain of original sin. The point which Protestants need especially to note is that, according to Roman Catholic ideas, this gracious act of God was performed on the basis of the foreseen merits of Christ's sacrifice. This tones down the offensiveness of the doctrine in that it does not per se imply the equality of Mary with Christ, but rather the contrary, in so far as the grace bestowed upon her was gained by anticipation from Him. Roman Catholic writers naturally emphasize this fact in recommending the doctrine to Protestant minds. None the less the offense remains. The "Immaculate Conception" necessarily implies the "immaculate life," and on the same basis of supernatural grace, else would the special miracle have occurred in vain and the fall of Adam been repeated in Mary. Hence, a full account of the doctrine would be that Mary was completely and miraculously redeemed at her conception and completely and miraculously kept from sin throughout her whole life. Apart from all questions as to the rightful place of Mary in Christian thought, this idea involves utter doctrinal confusion. It means that Mary never became a true human being and never lived a true human life. Redemption by a miraculous process begun at conception and carried on throughout the life is an utter impossibility, for the Holy Spirit does not work impersonally, and miraculous holiness which is holiness of a purely Divine character, without a free, cooperating human factor, is no human holiness at all. This dogma reads Mary out of the human family, reduces her to an image and makes her life a phantasm. Moreover, the parallels which are adduced in its support are not true parallels at all.

Our Lord's sinlessness was not mechanically guaranteed by His miraculous conception (see VIRGIN BIRTH) but was His own achievement through the Holy Spirit granted to Him and personally appropriated. The Hallowing of Children at the Font (see Catholic Dictionary, 470a), the sanctifying of those "separated from the womb" (Ga 1:15) to God's service, does not imply the miraculous guarantee of artificial sinlessness, but such a gracious influence as enables the subject freely cooperating to obtain victory over sin as a controlling principle. Actual sin and need of forgiveness is not pretermitted by such special grace.

We can only say, in conclusion, that every reason, which usually operates in a Christian mind to insure rejection of a false teaching, ought to preclude the possibility of accepting this peculiar dogma which is Scripturally baseless, historically unjustified and doctrinally unsound.

LITERATURE.

The best simple and reasonably fair-minded discussion of this dogma from the Roman Catholic viewpoint is to be found in the Catholic Dictionary already mentioned, where wide references will be found. For the Protestant view consult any authoritative church history, especially that of Professor H.C. Sheldon where copious references to Patristic literature will be found.

Louis Matthews Sweet

IMMANUEL

i-man’-u-el (‘immanu’el): The name occurs but 3 times, twice in the Old Testament (Isa 7:14; 8:8), and once in the New Testament (Mt 1:23). It is a Hebrew word signifying "God is with us." The form "Emmanuel" appears in Septuagint (Emmanouel).

1. Isaiah Rebukes Ahaz:

In 735 BC Ahaz was king of Judah. The kingdom of Israel was already tributary to Assyria (2Ki 15:19,20). Pekah, king of Israel, a bold and ambitious usurper, and Rezin, king of Syria, formed an alliance, the dual object of which was, first, to organize a resistance against Assyria, and second, to force Ahaz to cooperate in their designs against the common tyrant. In the event of Ahaz’ refusal, they planned to depose him, and to set the son of Tabeel, a choice of their own, upon the throne of David. To this end they waged war against Judah, advancing as far as Jerusalem itself, but without complete success (Isa 7:1). Ahaz, a weak king, and now panic-stricken, determined to invoke the aid of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria (2Ki 16:7). This he actually did at a later stage in the war (2Ki 6:9; 15:29). Such a course would involve the loss of national independence and the payment of a heavy tribute. At this period of crisis, Isaiah, gathering his disciples around him (Isa 8:16), is told to deliver a message to the king. Ahaz, though making a show of resistance against the coalition, is in reality neither depending upon the help of Yahweh nor upon the courage of his people. Isaiah, in an effort to calm his fears and prevent the fatal alliance with Assyria, offers him a sign. This method is specially characteristic of this prophet. Fearing to commit himself to the policy of Divine dependence, but with a pretense at religious scruples, "Neither will I tempt Yahweh," the king refuses (Isa 7:12). The prophet then chides him bitterly for his lack of faith, which, he says, not only wearies men, but God also (Isa 7:13).

2. The Sign of "Immanuel":

He then proceeds to give him a sign from God Himself, the sign of "Immanuel" (Isa 7:14). The interpretation of this sign is not clear, even apart from its New Testament application to Christ. The Hebrew word translated "virgin" in English Versions of the Bible means, more correctly, "bride," in the Old English sense of one who is about to become a wife, or is still a young wife. Ps 68:25 English Versions of the Bible gives "damsels."

Isaiah predicts that a young bride shall conceive and bear a son. The miracle of virgin-conception, therefore, is not implied. The use of the definite article before "virgin" (ha-‘almah) does not of itself indicate that the prophet had any particular young woman in his mind, as the Hebrew idiom often uses the definite article indefinitely. The fact that two other children of the prophet, like Hosea’s, bore prophetic and mysterious names, invites the conjecture that the bride referred to was his own wife. The hypothesis of some critics that a woman of the harem of Ahaz became the mother of Hezekiah, and that he was the Immanuel of the prophet’s thought is not feasible. Hezekiah was at least 9 years of age when

the prophecy was given (2Ki 16:2).

Immanuel, in the prophetic economy, evidently stands on the same level with Shear-jashub (Isa 7:3) as the embodiment of a great idea, to which Isaiah again appeals in Isa 8:8 (see ISAIAH, VII).

3. Was It a Promise or a Threat?:

The question as to whether the sign given to Ahaz was favorable or not presents many difficulties. Was it a promise of good or a threat of judgment? It is evident that the prophet had first intended an omen of deliverance and blessing (Isa 7:4,7). Did the king's lack of faith alter the nature of the sign? Isa 7:9, "If ye will not believe," etc., implies that it might have done so. The omission of 7:16, and especially the words "whose two kings thou abhorrest," greatly simplifies this theory, as "the land," singular, would more naturally refer to Judah than to Syria and Ephraim collectively. The omen would then become an easily interpreted threat, referring to the overthrow of Judah rather than that of her enemies. Immanuel should eat curdled milk and honey (7:15), devastation reducing the land from an agricultural to a pastoral one. The obscure nature of the passage as it stands suggests strongly that it has suffered from interpolation. The contrary theory that the sign was a promise and not a prediction of disaster, has much to commend it, though it necessitates greater freedom with the text. The name "Immanuel" implies the faith of the young mother of the child in the early deliverance of her country, and a rebuke to the lack of that quality in Ahaz. It is certain also that Isaiah looked for the destruction of Syria and Ephraim, and that, subsequent to the Assyrian invasion, salvation should come to Judah through the remnant that had been faithful (11:11). The fact that the prophet later gave the name of Maher-shalal-hash-baz to his new-born son, a name of good omen to his country, further strengthens this position. The omission of 7:15,17 would make the sign a prophecy of the failure of the coalition. It is plain, whichever theory be accepted, that something must be eliminated from the passage to insure a consistent reading.

4. Its Relation to the Messianic Hope:

The question now presents itself as to what was the relation of Immanuel to the Messianic prophecies. Should the emphasis be laid upon "a virgin," the son, or the name itself? For traditional interpretation the sign lay in the virgin birth, but the uncertainty of implied virginity in the Hebrew noun makes this interpretation improbable. The identification of the young mother as Zion personified, and of the "son" as the future generation, is suggested by Whitehouse and other scholars. But there is no evidence that the term 'almah was used at that time for personification. The third alternative makes Immanuel a Messiah in the wider use of the term, as anticipated by Isaiah and his contemporaries. There can be little doubt but that there existed in Judah the Messianic hope of a national saviour (2Sa 7:12). Isaiah is expecting the arrival of one whose character and work shall entitle him to the great names of 9:6. In him should dwell all the fullness of God. He was to be "of the stem of Jesse," the bringer of the Golden Age. The house of David is now beset by enemies, and its reigning representative is weak in faith. The prophet therefore announces the immediate coming of the deliverer. If he had intended the virgin-conception of Christ in the distant future, the sign of "Immanuel" would have possessed no immediate significance, nor would it have been an omen to Ahaz. With regard to the Messianic idea, Mic 5:3 ("until the time that

she who travaileth hath brought forth") is of importance as indicating the prevalent thought of the time. Recent evidence shows that even in Babylonia and Egypt there existed expectations of a divinely born and wonderful saviour. To this popular tradition the prophet probably appealed, his hearers being easily able to appreciate the force of oracular language that is to us obscure. There is much to confirm the view, therefore, that the prophecy is Messianic.

5. The Virgin Birth:

The use of the word as it relates to the virgin birth of Christ and the incarnation cannot be dealt with here (see PERSON OF CHRIST). These facts, however, may be noted. The Septuagint (which has parthenos, "virgin") and the Alexandrian Jews interpreted the passage as referring to the virgin birth and the Messianic ministry. This interpretation does not seem to have been sufficiently prominent to explain the rise of the idea of miraculous virgin conception and the large place it has occupied in Christological thought.

See VIRGIN BIRTH.

Arthur Walwyn Evans

IMMER

im’-er (’immer):

(1) A priest of David’s time (1Ch 24:14), whose descendants are mentioned in Ezr 2:37; 10:20; Ne 3:29; 7:40; 11:13.

(2) A priest of Jeremiah’s time (Jer 20:1).

(3) A place in Babylonia (Ezr 2:59; Ne 7:61).

IMMORTAL; IMMORTALITY

i-mor’-tal, im-or-tal’-i-ti (athanasia, 1Co 15:53; 1Ti 6:16, aphtharsia, literally, "incorruption," Ro 2:7; 1Co 15; 2Ti 1:10, aphthartos, literally, "incorruptible," Ro 1:23; 1Co 15:52; 1Ti 1:17):

1. Preliminary—Need of Definition and Distinction

2. Biblical Conception

I. THE NATURAL BELIEF

1. Its Origin

2. Philosophical Arguments

(1) The Soul Spiritual

Soul not Inherently Indestructible

(2) Capacities of Human Nature

(3) The Moral Argument

II. THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE—THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Starting-Point—Man’s Relation to God

Man’s Nature

2. Sin and Death

3. Grace and Redemption—The True Immortality

Deliverance from Sheol

4. Later Jewish Thought

III. THE CHRISTIAN HOPE

1. Immortality through Christ

(1) Survival of the Soul

(2) Union with Christ in Unseen World

(3) The Resurrection

(4) The Wicked Also Raised

(5) Eternal Life

2. Contrasts

LITERATURE

1. Preliminary—Need of Definition and Distinction:

In hardly any subject is it more necessary to be careful in the definition of terms and clear distinction of ideas, especially where the Biblical doctrine is concerned, than in this of "immortality." By "immortality" is frequently meant simply the survival of the soul, or spiritual part of man, after bodily death. It is the assertion of the fact that death does not end all. The soul survives. This is commonly what is meant when we speak of "a future life," "a future state," "a hereafter." Not, however, to dwell on the fact that many peoples have no clear conception of an immaterial "soul" in the modern sense (the Egyptians, e.g. distinguished several parts, the Ka, the Ba, etc., which survived death; often the surviving self is simply a ghostly resemblance of the earthly self, nourished with food, offerings, etc.), there is the more serious consideration that the state into which the surviving part is supposed to enter at death is anything but a state which can be described as "life," or worthy to be dignified with the name "immortality." It is state peculiar to "death" (see DEATH); in most cases, shadowy, inert, feeble, dependent, joyless; a state to be dreaded and shrunk from, not one to be hoped for. If, on the other hand, as in the hope of immortality among the nobler heathen, it is conceived of, as for some, a state of happiness—the clog of the body being shaken off—this yields the idea, which has passed into so much of our modern thinking, of an "immortality of the soul," of an imperishableness of the spiritual part, sometimes supposed to extend backward as well as forward; an inherent indestructibility.

2. Biblical Conception:

It will be seen as we advance, that the Biblical view is different from all of these. The soul, indeed, survives the body; but this disembodied state is never viewed as one of complete "life." For the Bible "immortality" is not merely the survival of the soul, the passing into "Sheol" or "Hades." This is not, in itself considered, "life" or happiness. The "immortality" the Bible contemplates is an immortality of the whole person—body and soul together. It implies, therefore, deliverance from the state of death. It is not a condition simply of future existence, however prolonged, but a state of blessedness, due to redemption and the possession of the "eternal life" in the soul; it includes resurrection and perfected life in both soul and body. The subject must now be considered more particularly in its different aspects.

I. The Natural Belief.

1. Its Origin:

In some sort the belief in the survival of the spirit or self at death is a practically universal phenomenon. To what is it traceable? A favorite hypothesis with anthropologists is that it has its origin in dreams or visions suggesting the continued existence of the dead (compare H. Spencer, Eccles. Instit., chapters i, xiv). Before, however, a dream can suggest the survival of the soul, there must be the idea of the soul, and of this there seems a simpler explanation in the consciousness which even the savage possesses of

something within him that thinks, feels and wills, in distinction from his bodily organs. At death this thinking, feeling something disappears, while the body remains. What more natural than to suppose that it persists in some other state apart from the body? (Compare Max Muller, Anthrop. Religion, 281.) Dreams, etc., may help this conviction, but need not create it. It is only as we assume such a deeper root for the belief that we can account for its universality and persistence. Even this, however, while an instinctive presumption, can hardly be called a proof of survival after death, and it does not yield an idea of "immortality" in any worthy sense. It is at most, as already said, a ghostly reduplication of the earthly life that is thus far reached.

2. Philosophical Arguments:

(1) The Soul Spiritual.

The more philosophical arguments that are adduced for the soul's immortality. (or survival) are not all of equal weight. The argument based on the metaphysical essence of the soul (see Plato's Phaedo) is not in these days felt to be satisfying. On the other hand, it can be maintained against the materialist on irrefragable grounds that the soul, or thinking spirit, in man is immaterial in Nature, and, where this is granted, there is, or can be, no proof that death, or physical dissolution, destroys this conscious spirit. The presumption is powerfully the other way. Cicero of old argued that death need not even be the suspension of its powers (compare Tusc. Disp. i.20); Butler reasons the matter from analogy (Anal., I, chapter i); modern scientists like J.S. Mill (Three Essays, 201) and Professor Huxley (Life and Letters, I, 217 ff; compare William James, Ingersoll Lecture) concede that immortality cannot be disproved. The denial one hears from various sides more frequently than formerly is therefore not warranted. Still possibility is not certainty, and there is nothing as yet to show that even if the soul survives death, its new state of existence has in it anything desirable.

Soul not Inherently Indestructible

It was hinted that one use which the Greeks made of the metaphysical argument was to prove the indestructibility of the soul—its immortality in the sense of having no beginning and no end. This is not the Christian doctrine. The soul has no such inherent indestructibility. It is dependent on God, as everything else is, for its continued existence. Did He withdraw His sustaining power, it would cease to exist. That it does continue to exist is not doubted, but this must be argued on other grounds.

(2) Capacities of Human Nature.

A much more apprehensible argument for immortality—more strictly, of a future state of existence—is drawn from the rich capacities and possibilities of human nature, for which the earthly life affords so brief and inadequate a sphere of exercise. It is the characteristic of spirit that it has in it an element of infinitude, and aspires to the infinite. The best the world can give can never satisfy it. It has in it the possibility of endless progress, and ever higher satisfaction. It was this consideration which led Kant, with all his theoretical skepticism, to give immortality a place among his "doctrinal beliefs" (see his

Critique of Pure Reason, Bohn’s translation, 590-91), and moved J.S. Mill to speak of it as the only hope which gave adequate scope to the human faculties and feelings, "the loftier aspirations being no longer kept down by a sense of the insignificance of human life by the disastrous feeling of ‘not worth while’ "(Three Essays, 249). Yet when these arguments are calmly weighed, they amount to no more than a proof that man is constituted for immortality; they do not afford a guarantee that this destiny might not be forfeited, or if they yield such a guarantee for the good, they hardly do so for the wicked. The belief, in their case, must depend on other considerations.

(3) The Moral Argument.

It is, as Kant also felt, when we enter the moral sphere that immortality, or the continued existence of the soul, becomes a practical certainty to the earnest mind. With moral personality is bound up the idea of moral law and moral responsibility; this, in turn, necessitates the thought of the world as a moral system, and of God as moral Ruler. The world, as we know it, is certainly a scene of moral administration—of probation, of discipline, of reward and penalty—but as obviously a scene of incomplete moral administration. The tangled condition of things in this life can satisfy no one’s sense of justice. Goodness is left to suffer; wickedness outwardly triumphs. The evil-doer’s own conscience proclaims him answerable, and points to future judgment. There is need for a final rectification of what is wrong here. But while a future state seems thus called for, this does not of itself secure eternal existence for the wicked, nor would such existence be "immortality" in the positive sense. In view of the mystery of sin, the lamp of reason grows dim. For further light we must look to revelation. II. The Biblical Doctrine—the Old Testament.

1. Starting-Point—Man’s Relation to God:

The Biblical view of immortality starts from man’s relation to God. Man, as made in the image of God (Ge 1:27), is fitted for the knowledge of God, for fellowship with Him. This implies that man is more than an animal; that he has a life which transcends time. In it already lies the pledge of immortality if man is obedient.

Man’s Nature.

With this corresponds the account given of man’s creation and original state. Man is a being composed of body and soul; both are integral parts of his personality. He was created for life, not for mortality. The warning, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Ge 2:17), implies that if man continued obedient he would live. But this is not an immortality of the soul only. It is a life in the body (compare Ge 3:22). Its type is such cases as Enoch and Elijah (Ge 5:24; 2Ki 2:11,12; compare Ps 49:15; 73:24).

2. Sin and Death:

The frustration of this original destiny of man comes through sin. Sin entails death (see DEATH). Death

in its physical aspect is a separation of soul and body—a breaking up of the unity of man's personality. In one sense, therefore, it is the destruction of the immortality which was man's original destiny. It does not, however, imply the extinction of the soul. That survives, but not in a state that can be called "life." It passes into Sheol—the sad, gloomy abode of the dead, in which there is no joy, activity, knowledge of the affairs of earth, or (in the view of Nature) remembrance of God, or praise of His goodness (on this subject, and the Hebrew belief in the future state generally, see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; DEATH; SHEOL). This is not future "life"—not "immortality."

It is the part of grace and redemption to restore immortality in the true sense. Had the world been left to develop in sin, no further hope could have come to it. The picture of Sheol would have become ever darker as the idea of retribution grew stronger; it could never become brighter.

3. Grace and Redemption—the True Immortality:

But God's grace intervened: "Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom" (Job 33:24). God's mercy breaks in on the hopelessness of man's lot. He gives to man His promises; makes His covenant with man; admits man to His fellowship (Ge 3:15; 4:4; 5:24; 6:8,9; 12:1-3; 15, etc.). In this fellowship the soul was raised again to its true life even on earth. But this held in it also a hope for the future. The promises placed in the forefront as tokens of God's favors were indeed predominatingly temporal—promises for this life—but within these (the kernel within the shell) was the supreme possession of God Himself (Ps 4:6 f; 16:2). This held in it the hope of redemption and the principle of every good.

Deliverance from Sheol.

Here we reach the core of the Old Testament hope of immortality. Such fellowship as the believer had with God could not be lost, even in Sheol; beyond that was deliverance from Sheol. In their highest moments it was this hope that sustained patriarchs, psalmists, prophets, in their outlook on the future. Doubt might cloud their minds; there might be seasons of darkness and even despair; but it was impossible in moments of strong faith to believe that God would ever really desert them. The eternal God was their dwelling-place; them were everlasting arms (De 33:27; compare Ps 90:1). Their hope of immortality, therefore, was, in principle, the hope not merely of an "immortality of the soul," but likewise of resurrection—of complete deliverance from Sheol. Thus it is clearly in the impassioned outburst of Job (19:25-27; compare 14:13 ff), and in many of the psalms. The hope always clothes itself in the form of complete deliverance from Sheol. Thus in Ps 17:14 f, the wicked have their portion "in this life," but, "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness" (the American Standard Revised Version "with beholding thy form"); and in Ps 49:14 f, the wicked are "appointed as a flock for Sheol," but "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol; for he will receive me" (same expression as that regarding Enoch, Ge 5:24; compare Ps 73:24). It will be remembered that when Jesus expounded the declaration, "I am the God of Abraham," etc., it was as a pledge of resurrection (Mt 22:31 f). The idea comes to final expression in the declaration in Da of a resurrection of the just and unjust (12:2). For further development and illustration see ESCHATOLOGY

OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

4. Later Jewish Thought:

Later Jewish thought carried out these ideas of the Old Testament to further issues. A blessed future for the righteous was now accepted, and was definitely connected with the idea of resurrection. The wicked remained in Sheol, now conceived of as a place of retribution. The Gentiles, too, shared this doom.

See ESCHATOLOGY.

III. The Christian Hope.

1. Immortality through Christ:

In full consonance with what is revealed in part in the Old Testament is the hope of immortality discovered in the New Testament. The ring of this joyful hope is heard in every part of the apostolic writings. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," says Peter, "who according to his great mercy begat us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you" (1Pe 1:3 f). Paul declares, "Our Saviour Christ Jesus, who .... brought life and immortality (incorruption) to light through the gospel" (2Ti 1:10). In Ro 2:7 he had spoken of those who "by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life." This immortality, it is seen, is part of the eternal life bestowed through Jesus on believers. It is guaranteed by Christ's own resurrection and life in glory. The nature of this hope of the gospel may now be further analyzed.

(1) Survival of the Soul.

The soul survives the body. A future state for both righteous and wicked is plainly declared by Jesus Himself. "He that believeth on me," He said to Martha, "though he die, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die" (Joh 11:25 f). To His disciples He said, "If I go and prepare a place for you, I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (Joh 14:3). Compare His words to the penitent thief: "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Lu 23:43). The survival of both righteous and wicked is implied in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lu 16:19-31). So in many other places (e.g. Mt 5:29 f; 10:28; 11:21-24; 12:41, etc.). The same is the teaching of the epistles. The doctrine of a future judgment depends on and presupposes this truth (Ro 2:5-11; 2Co 5:10, etc.).

(2) Union with Christ in Unseen World.

Death for the redeemed, though a result of sin, does not destroy the soul's relation to God and to Christ. The eternal life implanted in the soul in time blossoms in its fruition into the life and blessedness of eternity (Ro 8:10 f; Php 1:21; Col 1:27). The soul is, indeed, in an incomplete state till the resurrection.

It "waits for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Ro 8:23). But its state, though incomplete, is still a happy one. Hades has lost its gloom, and is for it a "Paradise" (Lu 23:43). It dwells in a chamber of the Father's house (Joh 14:2 f; 17:24). It is to be, even in the unclothed state ("absent from the body"), "at home with the Lord" (2Co 5:8). It is for it an object of desire to be "with Christ" in that state after death (Php 1:21). The pictures in Rev, though highly figurative, indicate a condition of great blessedness (Re 7:9-17).

(3) The Resurrection.

The fullness of the blessedness of immortality implies the resurrection. The resurrection is a cardinal article of Christ's teaching (Mt 22:29-32; Joh 5:25-29; 11:23-26). He Himself is the Lord of life, and life-giver in the resurrection (Joh 5:21,25,26; 11:25, "I am the resurrection, and the life"). The resurrection of believers is secured by His own resurrection. Jesus died; He rose again (see RESURRECTION). His resurrection carries with it the certainty of the resurrection of all His people. This is the great theme of 1Co 15. As Christ lives, they shall live also (Joh 14:19). The believers who are alive at His Parousia shall be changed (1Co 15:51; 1Th 4:17); those who are dead shall be raised first of all (1Th 4:16). The resurrection body shall be a body like to Christ's own (Php 3:21)—incorruptible, glorious, powerful, spiritual, immortal (1Co 15:42 ff, 53 f). This is not to be confused with sameness of material particles (1Co 15:37 f), yet there is the connection of a vital bond between the old body and the new. This is the hope of the believer, without which his redemption would not be complete.

(4) The Wicked Also Raised.

The wicked also are raised, not, however, to glory, but for judgment (Joh 5:29; Ac 24:15; Re 20:12-15). The same truth is implied in all passages on the last judgment. Excluded from the blessedness of the righteous, their state is described by both Jesus and His apostles as one of uttermost tribulation and anguish (e.g. Mt 25:46; Mr 9:43-50; Ro 2:8 f). This is not "immortality" or "life," though the continued existence of the soul is implied in it (see PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING; HELL; RETRIBUTION).

(5) Eternal Life.

The condition of the blessed in their state of immortality is one of unspeakable felicity of both soul and body forever. There are, indeed, degrees of glory—this is carefully and consistently taught (Mt 25:14; Lu 19:12; 1Co 3:10-15; 15:41; Php 3:10-14; 2Ti 4:7; 1Joh 2:28)—but the condition as a whole is one of perfect satisfaction, holiness and blessedness (compare Mt 13:43; 25:34; Ro 2:7,10; Ro 12:3 ff, etc.). The blessedness of this eternal state includes such elements as the following:

(1) restoration to God's image and likeness to Christ (1Co 15:49; 2Co 3:18; Eph 4:24; Col 3:10; 1 Joh 3:2);

(2) perfect holiness in the possession of God's Spirit (2Co 7:1; Php 1:6; Re 21:27; 22:4,11);

(3) the unveiled vision of God’s glory (Re 22:4; compare Ps 17:15);

(4) freedom from all sorrow, pain and death (Re 21:3 f);

(5) power of unwearied service (Re 22:3).

2. Contrasts:

The contrast between the Biblical view of immortality and that of heathenism and of the schools will now be obvious. It is not mere future existence; not a bare, abstract immortality of the soul; it is the result of redemption and of renewal by God’s spirit; it embraces the whole personality, soul and body; it is not shared by the unholy; it includes the perfection of rational, moral and spiritual blessedness, in an environment suitable to such glorified existence. As such it is the supreme prize after which every believer is called to strive (Php 3:13 f).

LITERATURE.

Ingersoll Lectures on Immortality, by Professor William James, Professor Osler, etc.; Salmond, Christian Doctrine of Immortality; Orr, Christian View of God and the World, Lects iv, v, with App. to v; works specified in the article on ESCHATOLOGY.

James Orr

IMMUTABILITY; IMMUTABLE

i-mu-ta-bil’-i-ti, i-mu’-ta-b’-l (ametathetos): Occurs in Heb 6:17,18 of the unchangeableness of the Divine counsel. It is the perfection of Yahweh that He changes not in character, will, purpose, aim (Mal 3:6; so of Christ, Heb 13:8).

See FAITHFULNESS; UNCHANGEABLE.

IMNA

im’-na (yimna‘): A descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:35).

IMNAH

im’-na (yimnah):

(1) Eldest son of Asher (Ge 46:17, the King James Version "Jimnah"; Nu 26:44, the King James Version "Jimna"; 1Ch 7:30).

(2) A Levite of Hezekiah’s time (2Ch 31:14).

IMNITES

im’-nits (yimni): Descendants of IMNAH (q.v. (1)) (Nu 26:44, the King James Version "Jimnites").

IMPART

im-part’ (metadidomi, "to share"): "They .... imparted (the King James Version "added") nothing to me" (Ga 2:6); that is, did not propose any correction or addition to my teaching. "That I may impart unto you some spiritual gift" (Ro 1:11) expresses the apostle’s hope that the Roman believers may increase in faith and love through his teaching and influence.

"To impart unto you .... our own souls" (1Th 2:8) meant to spend their utmost strength and to expose their lives in their service.

IMPEDIMENT

im-ped’-i-ment: Found in Mr 7:32, "had an impediment in his speech," as a translation of mogilalos, comparative of mogos, "toil" and lalos, "speech," i.e. one who speaks with difficulty. In the Septuagint the word is used as a translation of ‘illem, "dumb" (Isa 35:6).

IMPLEAD

im-pled’ (Ac 19:38 the King James Version, "Let them impIead one another"): "Implead" means "to sue at law," hence, the Revised Version (British and American) "Let them accuse one another." Court days are kept, let them prosecute the suit in court and not settle matters in riot. egkalein, means "to call in," "to call to account."

IMPORTABLE

im-por’-ta-b’l (dusbastaktos): An obsolete word, meaning "unbearable" (Latin: im, "not," portabilis, "bearable") found in Pr Man, "Thine angry threatening (the Revised Version (British and American) "the anger of thy threatening") toward sinners is importable"; compare Rheims version, Mt 23:4, "heavy burdens and importable"; Chaucer ("Clerk’s Tale" C.T.), "For it were importable though they wolde."

IMPORTUNITY

im-por-tu’-ni-ti: Occurs only in Lu 11:8, where it is the rendering of anaideia (Westcott-Hort, anaidia).

This Greek word implies an element of impudent insistence rising to the point of shamelessness which the English word "importunity" fails to express, thus weakening the argument of the parable, which is that if by shameless insistence a favor may be won, even from one unwilling and ungracious, still more surely will God answer the earnest prayer of His people. God’s willingness to give exceeds our ability to ask. The parable teaches by way of contrast, not by parallel.

David Foster Estes

IMPOSITION OF HANDS

im-po-zish’-un.

See HANDS, IMPOSITION (LAYING ON) OF.

IMPOSSIBLE

im-pos’-i-b’-l (verb adunateo; adjective adunatos): "To be impossible" is the translation of adunateo, "to be powerless," "impotent" (Mt 17:20; Lu 1:37, the Revised Version (British and American) "void of power") adunatos, "powerless," etc., is translated "impossible" Mt 19:26; Mr 10:27; Lu 18:27; Heb 6:4,18; 11:6; "impossible" in Heb 6:4 is in the Revised Version (British and American) transferred to 6:6); anendektos, "not to be received" or "accepted," is also translated "impossible" (Lu 17:1). In several of these passages it is affirmed that "nothing is impossible with God," but, of course, this means nothing that is consistent with the Divine nature, e.g. (as Heb 6:18) it is not possible for God to lie. So, when it is said that nothing is impossible to faith, the same limitation applies and also that of the mind or will of God for us. But much more is possible to a strong faith than a weak faith realizes, or even believes.

W. L. Walker

IMPOTENT

im’-po-tent (astheneo, adunatos): The verb signifies "to be without strength," and derivatives of it are used in Joh 5:3,7 the King James Version and Ac 4:9 to characterize the paralyzed man at Bethesda and the cripple at the Temple gate. For the same condition of the Lystra lame man the word adunatos is used, which is synonymous. In these cases it is the weakness of disease. In this sense the word is used by Shakespeare (Love’s Labor Lost, V, ii, 864; Hamlet, I, ii, 29). The impotent folk referred to in the Epistle of Jeremy (Baruch 6:28) were those weak and feeble from age and want; compare "impotent and snail-paced beggary" (Richard III, IV, iii, 53).

Alexander Macalister

IMPRISONMENT

im-priz’-’-n-ment.

See PUNISHMENTS; PRISON.

IMPURITY

im-pu’-ri-ti.

See UNCLEANNESS.

IMPUTATION

im-pu-ta’-shun:

I. MEANING AND USE OF THE TERM

II. THE THREEFOLD USE OF THE TERM IN THEOLOGY

Original Sin, Atonement, Justification

III. THE SCRIPTURAL BASIS OF THESE DOCTRINES

1. Imputation of Adam’s Sin to His Posterity

2. Imputation of the Sins of His People to Christ

3. Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ to His People

LITERATURE

I. Meaning and Use of the Term.

The word "imputation," according to the Scriptural usage, denotes an attributing of something to a person, or a charging of one with anything, or a setting of something to one’s account. This takes place sometimes in a judicial manner, so that the thing imputed becomes a ground of reward or punishment. The word is used in the King James Version a number of times to translate the Hebrew verb chashabh and the Greek verb logizomai. These words, both of which occur frequently in Scripture, and which in a number of instances mean simply "to think," express the above idea. That this is the case is clear also from the other English words used in the King James Version to translate these Hebrew and Greek words, as, for example, "to count," "to reckon," "to esteem." Thus chashabh is translated in the King

James Version by the verb "to impute" (Le 7:18; 17:4; 2Sa 19:19); by the verb "to reckon" (2Sa 4:2); by "to count" as something (Le 25:31 English versions). The verb in 1Sa 22:15 is sim. Similarly, logizomai is translated by the verb "to impute" (Ro 4:6,8,11,22,23,24; 2Co 5:19; Jas 2:23); by the verb "to count" (Ro 2:26; 4:3,5); "to account" (Ga 3:6); and by the verb "to reckon" (Ro 4:4,9,10). In the Revised Version (British and American) the word used to render logizomai is the verb "to reckon."

These synonyms of the verb "to impute" bring out the idea of reckoning or charging to one's account. It makes no difference, so far as the meaning of imputation is concerned, who it is that imputes, whether man (1Sa 22:15) or God (Ps 32:2); it makes no difference what is imputed, whether a good deed for reward (Ps 106:30 f) or a bad deed for punishment (Le 17:4); and it makes no difference whether that which is imputed is something which is personally one's own prior to the imputation, as in the case above cited, where his own good deed was imputed to Phinehas (Ps 106:30 f), or something which is not personally one's own prior to the imputation, as where Paul asks that a debt not personally his own be charged to him (Phm 1:18). In all these cases the act of imputation is simply the charging of one with something. It denotes just what we mean by our ordinary use of the term. It does not change the inward state or character of the person to whom something is imputed. When, for example, we say that we impute bad motives to anyone, we do not mean that we make such a one bad; and just so in the Scripture the phrase "to impute iniquity" does not mean to make one personally bad, but simply to lay iniquity to his charge. Hence, when God is said "to impute sin" to anyone, the meaning is that God accounts such a one to be a sinner, and consequently guilty and liable to punishment. Similarly, the non-imputation of sin means simply not to lay it to one's charge as a ground of punishment (Ps 32:2). In the same manner, when God is said "to impute righteousness" to a person, the meaning is that He judicially accounts such a one to be righteous and entitled to all the rewards of a righteous person (Ro 4:6,11).

II. The Threefold Use of the Term in Theology.

Original Sin, Atonement, Justification:

Three acts of imputation are given special prominence in the Scripture, and are implicated in the Scriptural doctrines of Original Sin, Atonement and Justification, though not usually expressed by the words chashabh and logizomai. Because, however, of its "forensic" or "judicial" meaning, and possibly through its use in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) to translate logizomai in Ro 4:8, the term "imputation" has been used in theology in a threefold sense to denote the judicial acts of God by which the guilt of Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity; by which the sins of Christ's people are imputed to Him; and by which the righteousness of Christ is imputed to His people. The act of imputation is precisely the same in each case. It is not meant that Adam's sin was personally the sin of his descendants, but that it was set to their account, so that they share its guilt and penalty. It is not meant that Christ shares personally in the sins of men, but that the guilt of his people's sin was set to his account, so that He bore its penalty. It is not meant that Christ's people are made personally holy or inwardly righteous by the imputation of His righteousness to them, but that His righteousness is set to their account, so that they are entitled to all the rewards of that perfect righteousness.

These doctrines have had a place in theology of the Christian church from the earliest Christian centuries, though the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ was first fully and clearly stated at the time of and following the Reformation. The first two of these doctrines have been the possession of the entire Christian church, while the third one of them is affirmed by both the Reformed and Lutheran branches of Protestantism.

III. The Scriptural Basis of These Doctrines.

These three doctrines have a basis in the Scripture, and underlie the Scripture doctrines of Original Sin, Atonement, and Justification.

1. Imputation of Adam's Sin to His Posterity:

The doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is implied in the account of the Fall in Ge 2 and 3, taken in connection with the subsequent history of the human race as recorded in Ge and in the rest of the Old Testament. Many ancient and modern interpreters regard this narrative as an allegorical, mythical or symbolical representation in historical form, either of a psychological fact, i.e. of something which takes place in every individual, or of certain general truths concerning sin. By some exegetes, following Kant, it has been held to depict an advance of the race in culture or ethical knowledge (Reuss; against which view compare Budde, Clemen); by others it has been regarded as a symbolical representation of certain truths concerning sin (Oehler, Schultz); by others it has been regarded as historical (Delitzsch). This latter view is the one which accords with the narrative itself. It is evidently intended as historical by its author, and is so regarded by the New Testament writers. It is, moreover, introduced to explain, not an advance of the race, but the entrance of sin into the world, and the connection of certain penal evils with sin. It does this by showing how these evils came upon Adam as a punishment for his disobedience, and the subsequent history shows that his posterity were subjected to the same evils. It is true that the threat of punishment to Adam in case of disobedience was made to him alone, and that the penalties threatened are said to have come only upon him and Eve (Ge 3:16-19). Nevertheless, it is clear from the account of the subsequent history of the race that it actually shared in the punishments inflicted upon Adam, and that this was in consequence of his sin. This implies that in Ge 2:16 f are contained the terms of a covenant in which Adam acted as the representative of the race. If, therefore, the race shares in the penalty of Adam's sin, it must also share in his guilt or the judicial obligation to suffer punishment. And this is precisely what theology of the entire Christian church has meant by saying that the guilt of Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity. This is in accordance with God's method of dealing with men in other recorded instances (Ge 19:15; Ex 20:5; De 1:37; 3:26); and the assertion of the principle of personal responsibility by Ezekiel and Jeremiah against an abuse of the principle of representative responsibility implies a recognition of the latter (Eze 18:2,4; 33:12; Jer 31:29).

The universality of sin and death is not brought into connection with the Fall of Adam by the other Old Testament writers. This is done, however, by Paul. In 1Co 15:21 f, Paul says that the death of all men has its cause in the man Adam in the same way in which the resurrection from the dead has its cause in

the man Christ. The death of all men, accordingly, is not brought about by their personal sins, but has come upon all through the disobedience of Adam. Upon what ground this takes place, Paul states in the passage Ro 5:12-21. He introduces the subject of Adam's relation to the race to illustrate his doctrine of the justification of sinners on the ground of a righteousness which is not personally their own. In order to do this he takes the truth, well known to his readers, that all men are under condemnation on account of Adam's sin. The comparison is between Adam and Christ, and the specific point of the comparison is imputed sin and imputed righteousness. Hence, in 5:12 Paul does not mean simply to affirm that as Adam sinned and consequently died, so men sin and die. Nor can he mean to say that just as God established a precedent in Adam's case that death should follow sin, so He acts upon this precedent in the case of all men because all sin, the real ground of the reign of death being the fact that all sin, and the formal ground being this precedent (B. Weiss); nor that the real ground is this precedent and the subordinate ground the fact that all sin (Hunefeld). Neither can Paul intend to say that all men are subject to death because they derive a corrupt nature from Adam (Fritzsche); nor that men are condemned to die because all have sinned (Pfleiderer). Paul's purpose is to illustrate his doctrine of the way in which men are delivered from sin and death by the way in which they are brought into condemnation. The main thought of the passage is that, just as men are condemned on account of the imputation to them of the guilt of Adam's sin, so they are justified on account of the imputation to them of the righteousness of Christ. Paul says that it was by one man that sin and death entered into the world, and it was by one man that death passed to all men, because all were implicated in the guilt of that one man's Sin (5:12). In proof of this the apostle cites the fact that death as a punishment was reigning during a period in which the only possible judicial ground of this fact must have been the imputation of the guilt of that one man's sin (5:13,14). Hence, there is a precise parallel between Adam and Christ. Just as men are condemned on account of Adam's disobedience, so they are justified on account of the obedience of Christ (5:18,19). The thought of the passage is imputed sin and imputed righteousness as the ground of condemnation and of justification respectively.

2. Imputation of the Sins of His People to Christ:

That our sins are imputed to Christ is not expressly stated in the Scripture, but is implied in those passages which affirm that Christ "bore our sins," and that our iniquities were "laid upon him" by Yahweh. To bear inquity or sin, though it may sometimes mean to bear it away or remove it, is an expression often applied in Scripture to persons charged with guilt and subjected to the punishment of their own sin (Le 5:17; 7:18; 19:8; 22:9). That the Hebrew verb nasa' has this meaning is also indicated by its being interchanged with the verb cabhal, which means "to bear as a burden" and is used to denote the bearing of the punishment of sin (Isa 53:11). In the Old Testament sacrificial system, which according to the New Testament is typical of the sacrifice of Christ, the imposition of hands on the head of the victim signified the substitution of it for the offender and the transfer of his guilt to it. This idea is brought out clearly in the case of the two goats on the great Day of Atonement (Le 16). When, therefore, the Servant of Yahweh in Isa 53 is said "to bear iniquity" (53:11), or that "the chastisement of our peace was upon him" (53:5), or that "Yahweh hath laid (literally, "caused to fall") on him the iniquity of us all" (53:6), the idea expressed is that Christ bore the punishment of our sin vicariously, its guilt having been imputed to Him. The thought of the prophecy is, as Delitzsch says, that of vicarious punishment, which implies the idea of the imputation of the guilt of our sins to Christ.

The same idea underlies these expressions when they occur in the New Testament. When Peter wishes to hold up Christ as an example of patience in suffering, he takes up the thought of Isa, and adduces the fact that Christ "his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree". (1Pe 2:24). The context indicates that Peter had the prophecy of Isa 53 in mind, so that his meaning is, not that Christ carried our sins even up to the cross, but that in His death on the cross Christ bore the punishment of our sin, its guilt having been imputed to Him. The same thought is expressed by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the contrast between the first and second advents of Christ is made to hinge upon the fact that in the first He came to be sacrificed as a sin-bearer, burdened with the guilt of the sin of others, whereas in His second coming He will appear without this burden of imputed or vicarious guilt (Heb 9:28). Paul also gives expression to the same thought when he says that Christ was "made. to be sin on our behalf" (2Co 5:21), and that He became "a curse for us" (Ga 3:13). In the former passage the idea of substitution, although not expressed by the preposition huper which indicates that Christ's work was for our benefit, is nevertheless clearly implied in the thought that Christ, whose sinlessness is emphasized in the ver, is made sin, and that we sinners become righteous in Him. Paul means that Christ was made to bear the penalty of our sin and that its guilt was imputed to Him in precisely the same way in which we sinners become the righteousness of God in Him, i.e. by the imputation of His righteousness to us. The same thought is expressed in Ga 3:13, where the statement that Christ was made a curse for us means that He was made to endure the curse or penalty of the broken law. In all these passages the underlying thought is that the guilt of our sin was imputed to Christ.

3. Imputation of the Righteousness of Christ to His People:

The righteousness upon the ground of which God justifies the ungodly is, according to Paul, witnessed to in the Old Testament (Ro 3:21). In order to obtain the blessedness which comes from a right relation to God, the pardon or non-imputation of sin is necessary, and this takes place through the "covering" of sin (Ps 32:1,2). The nature of this covering by the vicarious bearing of the penalty of sin is made clear in Isa 53. It is, moreover, the teaching of the Old Testament that the righteousness which God demands is not to be found among men (Ps 130:3; 143:2; Isa 64:6). Accordingly, the prophets speak of a righteousness which is not from man's works, but which is said to be in Yahweh or to come from Him to His people (Isa 32:16 f; 45:23 ff; 54:17; 58:8; 61:3; Jer 51:10; Ho 10:12). This idea finds its clearest expression in connection with the work of the Messiah in Jer 33:16, where Jerusalem is called "Yahweh our righteousness" because of the coming of the Messianic king, and in Jer 23:6 where the same name is given to the Messiah to express His significance for Israel. Although the idea of the imputation of righteousness is not explicitly asserted in these passages, the idea is not merely that the righteousness spoken of is recognized by Yahweh (Cremer), but that it comes from Him, so that Yahweh, through the work of the Messiah, is the source of His people's righteousness.

This idea is taken up by Paul, who makes explicit the way in which this righteousness comes to sinners, and who puts the idea of imputed righteousness at the basis of his doctrine of Justification. By the righteousness of Christ Paul means Christ's legal status, or the merit acquired by all that He did in satisfying the demands of God's law, including what has been called His active and passive obedience. Notwithstanding the fact that most of the modern expositors of Paul's doctrine have denied that he

teaches the imputation of Christ's obedience, this doctrine has a basis in the apostle's teaching. Justification leads to life and final glorification (Ro 5:18; 8:30); and Paul always conceives the obtaining of life as dependent on the fulfillment of the law. If, therefore, Christ secures life for us, it can only be in accordance with this principle. Accordingly, the apostle emphasizes the element of obedience in the death of Christ, and places this act of obedience at the basis of the sinner's justification (Ro 5:18). He also represents the obedience of the cross as the culminating point of a life of obedience on Christ's part (Php 2:8). Moreover, Paul affirms that our redemption from all the demands of the law is secured by the fact that Christ was born under law (Ga 4:4). This cannot be restricted to the fact that Christ was under the curse of the law, for He was born under law and the result of this is that we are free from all of its demands. This doctrine is also implied in the apostle's teaching that Justification is absolutely gracious, taken in connection with the fact that it leads to a complete salvation.

The importance in Paul's thought of the doctrine of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer can be seen from the fact that the question how righteousness was to be obtained occupied a central place in his religious consciousness, both before and after his conversion. The apostle's conversion by the appearance of the risen Christ determined his conception of the true way of obtaining righteousness, since the resurrection of Christ meant for Paul the condemnation of his entire past search for righteousness by works of the law.

That the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer does lie at the basis of Paul's doctrine of Justification can be further seen from the fact that Justification is absolutely free and unmerited so far as the sinner is concerned (Ro 3:24; 5:15; Ga 5:4; Tit 3:7); its object being one who is ungodly (Ro 4:5); so that it is not by works (Ro 3:20,28; Ga 2:16; 3:11; 5:4; Php 3:9); and yet that it is not a mere pardon of sin, but is a strictly "forensic" or judicial judgment, freeing the sinner from all the claims of the law, and granting him the right to eternal life. This last truth is plain because God's retributive righteousness lies at the basis of Paul's doctrine of Justification (Ro 2); is manifested in it (Ro 3:25 f); because Christ's expiatory work is its ground (Ro 3:25); and because our redemption from the curse of the law rests upon Christ's having borne it for us, and our redemption from all the demands of the law depends upon their fulfillment by Christ (Ga 3:13; 4:4). Hence, the gracious character of Justification, according to Paul, does not consist in its being merely a gracious pardon without any judicial basis (Ritschl); or in God's acceptance of a subjective righteousness produced by Him in the sinner (Tobac); or in the acceptance of faith instead of a perfect righteousness (Cremer). The gracious character of Justification consists for Paul in the fact that the righteousness on the ground of which God justifies the ungodly is a righteousness which is graciously provided by God, and which Paul contrasts with his own righteousness which comes from law works (Php 3:9). The sinner, therefore, is pardoned and accepted as a righteous person, not on account of anything in himself, but only on account of what Christ has done for him, which means that the merits of Christ's suffering and obedience are imputed to the sinner as the ground of his justification.

This truth is explicitly affirmed by Paul, who speaks of God's imputing righteousness without works, and of righteousness being imputed (Ro 4:6,11). The idea of the imputation of righteousness here is made clear by the context. The one who is declared righteous is said to be "ungodly" (Ro 4:5). Hence, he is righteous only by God's imputation of righteousness to him. This is also clear from the contrast between imputation according to grace and according to debt (Ro 4:4). He who seeks righteousness by

works would be justified as a reward for his works, in antithesis to which, imputation according to grace would be the charging one with a righteousness which he does not possess. Accordingly, at the basis of Justification there is a reckoning to the sinner of an objective righteousness. This same idea is also implied and asserted by Paul in the parallel which he draws between Adam and Christ (Ro 5:18 f). The apostle says that just as men are condemned on account of a sin not their own, so they are justified on account of a righteousness which is not their own. The idea of imputed sin and imputed righteousness, as was said, is the precise point of the parallelism between condemnation in Adam and justification in Christ. This is also the idea which underlies the apostle's contrast of the Old and New Covenants (2Co 3:9). The New Covenant is described as a "ministry of righteousness," and contrasted with the Old Covenant which is described as a "ministry of condemnation." If, therefore, this last expression does not denote a subjective condition of men under the old dispensation, but their relation to God as objects of His condemnation, righteousness must denote the opposite of this relation to the law, and must depend on God's judicial acquittal. The same truth is expressed by Paul more concretely by saying that Christ has been "made unto us righteousness from God" (1Co 1:30). Here the concrete mode of expression is chosen because Paul speaks also of Christ being our sanctification and redemption, so that an expression had to be chosen which would cover all of these ideas. One of the clearest statements concerning this objective righteousness is Php 3:9. The apostle here affirms that the righteousness which the believer in Christ obtains is directly opposite to his own righteousness. This latter comes from works of the law, whereas the former comes from God and through faith in Christ. It is, therefore, objective to man, comes to him from God, is connected with the work of Christ, and is mediated by faith in Christ.

The idea clearly stated in this last passage of a righteousness which is objective to the sinner and which comes to him from God, i.e. the idea of a new legal standing given to the believer by God, explains the meaning, in most cases, of the Pauline phrase "righteousness of God." This phrase is used by Paul 9 t: Ro 1:17; 3:5,21 f, 25 f; 10:3 (twice); 2Co 5:21. It denotes the Divine attribute of righteousness in Ro 3:5,25 f. The customary exegesis was to regard the other instances as denoting the righteousness of a sinner which comes to him from God, in accordance with Php 3:9. More recently Haering, following Kolbing in general, has interpreted all these instances as denoting God's justifying action. But this interpretation is most strained in 2Co 5:21, where we are said to "become the righteousness of God," and in Ro 10:3-6, where the righteousness of God is identified with the righteousness which comes from faith, this latter being contrasted with man's own inward righteousness. That a righteousness of man which he receives from God is here referred to, is confirmed by the fact that the reason given for the error of the Jews in seeking a righteousness from law works is the fact that the work of Christ has made an end of this method of obtaining righteousness (Ro 10:4). This righteousness, therefore, is one of which man is the possessor. The phrase, however, cannot mean a righteousness which is valid in God's sight (Luther), although this thought is elsewhere expressed by Paul (Ro 3:20; Ga 3:11). It means a righteousness which comes from God and of which He is the author. This is not, however, by making man inwardly righteous, since all the above passages show the purely objective character of this righteousness. It is the righteousness of Php 3:9; the righteousness which God imputes to the believer in Christ. Thus we "become the righteousness of God" in precisely the same sense in which Christ was "made to be sin" (2Co 5:21). Since Christ was made sin by having the guilt. of our sin imputed to Him so that He bore its penalty, Paul must mean that we "become the righteousness of God" in this same objective sense through the imputation to us of the righteousness of Christ. In the same way, in Ro 10:3,

the contrast between God’s righteousness and the Jew’s righteousness by works of the law shows that in each case righteousness denotes a legal status which comes from God by imputation. It is this same imputed righteousness which makes the gospel the power of God unto salvation (Ro 1:17), which has been revealed by the law and the prophets, which is received by faith in Christ by whose expiatory death God’s retributive righteousness has been made manifest (Ro 3:21,22,25,26), and which is represented by Peter as the object of Christian faith (2Pe 1:1).

In two passages Paul affirms that Abraham believed God and "it was imputed to him for righteousness" (Ro 4:3 the King James Version; Ga 3:6). The old Arminian theologians, and some modern exegetes (H. Cremer) assert that Paul means that Abraham’s faith was accepted by God instead of a perfect righteousness as the meritorious ground of his justification. This, however, cannot be the apostle’s meaning. It is diametrically opposed to the context where Paul introduces the case of Abraham for the very purpose of proving that he was justified without any merit on his part; it is opposed to Paul’s idea of the nature of faith which involves the renunciation of all claim to merit, and is a simple resting on Christ from whom all its saving efficacy is derived; and this interpretation is also opposed to Paul’s doctrine of the absolutely gracious character of Justification. The apostle in these passages wishes to illustrate from the case of Abraham the gracious character of Justification, and quotes the untechnical language of Ge 15:6. His meaning is simply that Abraham was justified as a believer in God, and not as one who sought righteousness by works.

See SIN; ATONEMENT; JUSTIFICATION.

LITERATURE.

Besides the Comm., see works on Old Testament Theology by Dillmann, Davidson, Oehler, Schultz; and on New Testament Theology by H. Holtzmann, B. Weiss, Schmidt; also Chemnitz, De Vocabulo Imputationis, Loc. Theol., 1594, II, 326 ff; J. Martin, The Imputation of Adam’s Sin, 1834, 20-46; Clemen, Die Christliche Lehre yon der Sande, I, 1897, 151-79; Dietzsch, Adam und Christus, 1871; Hunefeld, Ro 5:12-21, 1895; Crawford, The Doctrine of the Holy Scripture Respecting the Atonements, 1876, 33-45, 188-90. Compare also the appropriate sections in the Works on the Scripture doctrine of Justification, and especially on Paul’s doctrine of Justification, e.g. Owen, Justification, 1st American edition, 185-310; Ritschl, Die Christliche Lehre yon der Rechtfertigung und VersShnung, II2, 1882, 303-31; Bohl, Von der Rechtfertigung durch den Glauben, 1890, 115-23; Nosgen, Schriftbeweis fur die evangel. Rechfertigungslehre, 1901, 147-96; Pfleiderer, Die Paulinische Rechtfertigung, ZWT (Hilgenfeld herausg.), 1872, 161-200; Paulinism, English translation, I, 171-86; with which compare Pfleiderer’s later view of Paul’s teachings, 2nd edition, 1890, 178-89; G. Schwarz, Justitia Imputata? 1891; H. Cremer, Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre, 1900, 329-49; Tobac, Le problame de la justification dans Saint Paul, 1908, 206-25. On Paul’s doctrine of the righteousness of God, of the many monographs the following may be mentioned: Fricke, Der Paulinische Grundbegriff der erortert auf Grund v. Rom. III, 21-26, 1888; Kolbing, Studien zur Paulinische Theologie, TSK, 1895, 7-51; Haring bei Paulus, 1896.

Caspar Wistar Hodge

IMRAH

im’-ra (yimrah): A descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:36).

IMRI

im’-ri (’imri):

(1) A Judahite (1Ch 9:4).

(2) Father of Zaccur who helped to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Ne 3:2).

IN

A principal thing to notice about this preposition, which in the King James Version represents about 16 Hebrew and as many Greek words and prepositions, is that, in hundreds of cases (especially in the Old Testament, but frequently also in the New Testament) in the Revised Version (British and American) the rendering is changed to more exact forms ("to," "unto," "by," "upon," "at," "with," "among," "for," "throughout," etc.; compare e.g. Ge 6:16; 13:8; 17:7,9,12; 18:1; Ex 8:17; Le 1:9, etc.); while, nearly as often, "in" is substituted for divergent forms of the King James Version (e.g. Ge 2:14; 17:11; 31:54; 40:7; 49:17; Ex 8:14,24; Le 3:17; 4:2, etc.). The chief Greek preposition en, is frequently adhered to as "in" in the Revised Version (British and American) where the King James Version has other forms ("with," "among," etc.; compare "in" for "with" in John’s baptism, Mt 3:11, and parallel; "in the tombs" for "among the tombs," Mr 5:3). In 2Th 2:2, "shaken in mind" in the King James Version is more correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "shaken from (apo) your mind." There are numerous such instructive changes.

James Orr

IN THE LORD

(en Kurio): A favorite Pauline expression, denoting that intimate union and fellowship of the Christian with the Lord Jesus Christ which supplies the basis of all Christian relations and conduct, and the distinctive element in which the Christian life has its specific character. Compare the synonymous Pauline phrases, "in Christ," "in Christ Jesus," and the Johannine expressions, "being in Christ," "abiding in Christ." "In the Lord" denotes: (1) the motive, quality, or character of a Christian duty or virtue, as based on union with Christ, e.g. "Free to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord" (1Co 7:39), i.e. provided the marriage be consistent with the Christian life. Compare 1Co 15:58; Php 3:1; 4:1,2,4,10; Eph 6:1,10; Col 3:18, etc.; (2) the ground of Christian unity, fellowship, and brotherly salutation, e.g. Ro

16:2,8,22; 1Co 16:19; Col 4:7; (3) it is often practically synonymous with "Christian" (noun or adjective), "as Christians" or "as a Christian," e.g. "Salute them of the household of Narcissus, that are in the Lord," i.e. that are Christians (Ro 16:11); "I .... the prisoner in the Lord," i.e. the Christian prisoner (Eph 4:1); compare Ro 16:13; 1Co 9:1,2; Eph 6:21 ("faithful minister in the Lord" = faithful Christian minister); Col 4:17 (see Grimm-Thayer, Lex. of New Testament, en, I, 6).

D. Miall Edwards

INCANTATION

in-kan-ta’-shun.

See MAGIC.

INCARNATION

in-kar-na’-shun.

See PERSON OF CHRIST.

INCENSE

in’-sens (qeTorah; in Jer 44:21, qiTTer; in Mal 1:11, qaTar, "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name"; the word lebhonah, translated "incense" in several passages in Isa and Jer in the King James Version, is properly "frankincense," and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American)): The offering of incense, or burning of aromatic substances, is common in the religious ceremonies of nearly all nations (Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians, etc.), and it is natural to find it holding a prominent place in the tabernacle and temple-worship of Israel. The newer critical theory that incense was a late importation into the religion of Israel, and that the altar of incense described in Ex 30:1 ff is a post-exilian invention, rests on presuppositions which are not here admitted, and is in contradiction to the express notices of the altar of incense in 1Ki 6:20,22; 7:48; 9:25; compare 2Ch 4:19 (see discussion of the subject by Delitzsch in Luthardt’s Zeitschrift, 1880, 113 ff). In the denunciation of Eli in 1Sa 2:27 ff, the burning of incense is mentioned as one of the functions of the priesthood (2:28). The "smoke" that filled the temple in Isaiah’s vision (Isa 6:4) may be presumed to be the smoke of incense. The word keTorah itself properly denotes. "smoke." For the altar of incense see the article on that subject, and TABERNACLE and TEMPLE. The incense used in the tabernacle service—called "sweet incense" (keToreth ha-cammim, Ex 25:6, etc.)—was compounded according to a definite prescription of the perfumes, stacte, onycha, galbanum and pure frankincense (Ex 30:34 f), and incense not so compounded was rejected as "strange incense" (keTorah zarah, Ex 30:9). In the offering of incense, burning coals from the altar of burnt offering were borne in a censer and put upon the altar of incense (the "golden altar" before the oracle), then the fragrant incense was sprinkled on the fire

(compare Lu 1:9 f). Ample details of the rabbinical rules about incense may be seen in the article "Incense," in DB.

See CENSER.

Figuratively, incense was symbolical of ascending prayer. The multitude were praying while Zacharias offered incense (Lu 1:10, thumiama), and in Re 5:8; 8:3 f, the incense in the heavenly temple is connected and even identified (5:8) with "the prayers of the saints."

James Orr

INCEST

in'-sest.

See CRIMES.

INCONTINENCY

in-kon'-ti-nen-si (akrasia, "without control"): In 1Co 7:5, it evidently refers to lack of control in a particular matter, and signifies unchastity. In Mt 23:25, the Greek word is translated in both the King James Version and the American Standard Revised Version by "excess."

INCORRUPTION

in-ko-rup'-shun (aphtharsia): Occurs in 1Co 15:42,50,53,54, of the resurrection body, and is twice used in the Revised Version (British and American) for the King James Version "immortality" (Ro 2:7; 2Ti 1:10 margin).

See IMMORTALITY.

INCREASE

in'-kres, (noun), in-kres' (verb): Employed in the English Bible both as verb and as noun, and in both cases to represent a number of different words in the original. As a verb it is used in the ordinary sense of the term. As a noun it is usually used of plant life, or of the herds and flocks, to denote the fruitage or the offspring; more rarely of money, to denote the interest. As examples of the different terms translated by this word, students who read Hebrew or Greek may compare De 7:22; Pr 16:21; Job 10:16 the King James Version; Job 12:23; Nu 18:30; De 7:13; Eze 22:12 in the Old Testament, and Joh 3:30; 1Co 3:6; Col 2:19; Eph 4:16 in the New Testament.

Russell Benjamin Miller

INDIA

in’-di-a (hoddu: he Indike): The name occurs in canonical Scripture only in Es 1:1; 8:9, of the country which marked the eastern boundary of the territory of Ahasuerus. The Hebrew word comes from the name of the Indus, Hondu, and denotes, not the peninsula of Hindustan, but the country drained by that great river. This is the meaning also in 1 Esdras 3:2; Additions to Esther 3:2; 16:1. Many have thought that this country is intended by Havilah in Ge 2:11 and that the Indus is the Pishon. The drivers of the elephants (1 Macc 6:37) were doubtless natives of this land. The name in 1 Macc 8:9 is certainly an error. India never formed part of the dominions of Antiochus the Great. It may possibly be a clerical error for "Ionia," as Media is possibly a mistake for Mysia. If the Israelites in early times had no direct relations with India, many characteristic Indian products seem to have found their way into Palestinian markets by way of the Arabian and Syrian trade routes, or by means of the Red Sea fleets (1Ki 10:11,15; Eze 27:15 ff, etc.). Among these may be noted "horns of ivory and ebony," "cassia and calamus," almug (sandalwood), apes and peacocks.

W. Ewing

INDIGNITIES

in-dig’-ni-tiz.

See PUNISHMENTS.

INDITE

in-dit’:the King James Version Ps 45:1, "My heart is inditing a good matter"; the Revised Version (British and American) "My heart overfloweth with a goodly matter," is in harmony with rachash, "to bubble up"; compare Septuagint exereuxato, "to pour out." "Indite" in English is becoming obsolete. It may mean "to dictate," "to invite," "to compose." In the latter meaning it is used in the above passage.

INFANCY, GOSPEL OF THE

in’-fan-si.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

INFANT, BAPTISM

in’-fant.

See BAPTISM.

INFANTICIDE

in-fan’-ti-sid.

See CRIMES.

INFIDEL

in’-fi-del (apistos, "unbelieving," "incredulous"): the King James Version has this word twice: "What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" (2Co 6:15); "If any provide not for his own, ... is worse than an infidel" (1Ti 5:8). In both passages the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version have "unbeliever" in harmony with numerous other instances of the use of the Greek apistos. The word nowhere corresponds to the modern conception of an infidel, one who denies the existence of God, or repudiates the Christian faith; but always signifies one who has not become a believer in Christ. It was formerly so used in English, and some of the older versions have it in other passages, besides these two. It is not found in the Old Testament, but "infidelity" (incredulity) occurs in 2 Esdras 7:44 (114).

William Owen Carver

INFINITE; INFINITUDE

in’-fin-it, in-fin’-i-tud:

1. Scripture Use:

The word "infinite" occurs 3 times only in the text of the King James Version (Job 22:5; Ps 147:5; Na 3:9) and once in margin (Na 2:9). In Ps 147:5, "His understanding is infinite" it represents the Hebrew ‘en micpar, "no number"; in the other passages the Hebrew ‘en qets (Job 22:5, of iniquities) and ‘en qetseh (Na 3:9, of strength of Ethiopia and Egypt; the King James Version margin 2:9, of "spoil"), meaning "no end." the Revised Version (British and American), therefore, renders in Job 22:5, "Neither is there any end to thine iniquities," and drops the marginal reference in Na 2:9.

2. Application to God:

Ps 147:5 is thus the only passage in which the term is directly applied to God. It there correctly conveys the idea of absence of all limitation. There is nothing beyond the compass of God’s understanding; or, positively, His understanding embraces everything there is to know. Past, present and future; all things

possible and actual; the inmost thoughts and purposes of man, as well as his outward actions, lie bare to God’s knowledge (Heb 4:13; see OMNISCIENCE).

3. Infinity Universally Implied:

While, however, the term is not found, the truth that God is infinite, not only in His understanding, but in His being and all His perfections, natural and moral, is one that pervades all Scripture. It could not be otherwise, if God was unoriginated, exalted above all limits of time, space and creaturehood, and dependent only on Himself. The Biblical writers, certainly, are far from thinking in metaphysical categories, or using such terms as "self-existence," "absoluteness," "unconditioned" yet the ideas for which these terms stand were all of them attributed in their conceptions to God. They did not, e.g. conceive of God as having been born, or as having a beginning, as the Babylonian and Greek gods had, but thought of Him as the ever-existing One (Ps 90:1,2), and free Creator and Disposer of all that exists. This means that God has self-existence, and for the same reason that He is not bound by His own creation. He must be thought of as raised above all creaturely limits, that is, as infinite.

4. Anthropomorphisms:

The anthropomorphisms of the Bible, indeed, are often exceedingly naive, as when Yahweh is said to "go down" to see what is being done (Ge 11:5,7; 18:21), or to "repent" of His actions (Ge 6:6); but these representations stand in contexts which show that the authors knew God to be unlimited in time, space, knowledge and power (compare Ge 6:7, God, Creator of all; 11:8,9, universal Ruler; 18:25, universal Judge; Nu 23:19, incapable of repentance, etc.). Like anthropomorphisms are found in De and the Prophets, where it is not doubted that the higher conceptions existed. In this infinity of God is implied His unsearchableness (Job 11:7; Ps 145:3; Ro 11:33); conversely, the latter attribute implies His infinity.

5. Infinity a Perfection Not a Quantity:

This infinitude of God is displayed in all His attributes—in His eternity, omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, etc.—on which see the separate articles. As regards the proper conception of infinity, one has chiefly to guard against figuring it under too quantitative an aspect. Quantitative boundlessness is the natural symbol we employ to represent infinity, yet reflection will convince us that it is inadequate as applied to a spiritual magnitude. Infinitude in power, e.g. is not an infinite quantity of power, but the potentiality in God of accomplishing without limit everything that is possible to power. It is a perfection, not a quantity. Still more is this apparent in moral attributes like love, righteousness, truth, holiness. These attributes are not quantities (a quantity can never be truly infinite), but perfections; the infinity is qualitative, consisting in the absence of all defect or limitation in degree, not in amount.

6. Errors Based on Quantitative Conceptions:

The recollection of the fact now stated will free the mind from most of the perplexities that have been raised by metaphysical writers as to the abstract possibility of the co-existence of infinite attributes in

God (thus e.g. Mansel); the reconcilability of God's infinity with His Personality, or with the existence of a finite world; the power of the human mind to conceive infinity, etc. How, it is asked, can the idea of infinity get into our finite minds? It might as well be asked how the mind can take in the idea of the sun's distance of some 90 million miles from the earth, when the skull that holds the brain is only a few cubic inches in capacity. The idea of a mile is not a mile big, nor is the idea of infinity too large to be thought of by the mind of man. The essence of the power of thought is its capacity for the universal, and it cannot rest till it has apprehended the most universal idea of all the infinite.

James Orr

INFIRMITY

in-fur'-mi-ti (dawah, chalah, machalah; astheneia): This word is used either in the singular or plural (the latter only in the New Testament) and with somewhat varying signification.

(1) As sickness or bodily disease (Joh 5:5; Mt 8:17; Lu 5:15; 8:2; 1Ti 5:23). In the last instance the affections seem to have been dyspeptic, the discomfort of which might be relieved by alcohol, although the disease would not be cured thereby. It is probable that this condition of body produced a certain slackness in Timothy's work against which Paul several times cautions him. In Lu 7:21 the Revised Version (British and American) has "diseases," which is a better rendering of the Greek noson, used here, than the King James Version "infirmities."

(2) Imperfections or weaknesses of body (Ro 6:19; 2Co 11:30 the King James Version; 2Co 12:5,9,10 the King James Version; Ga 4:13).

(3) Moral or spiritual weaknesses and defects (Ps 77:10; Ro 8:26; 15:1; Heb 4:15; 5:2; 7:28). In this sense it is often used by the classic English writers, as in Milton's "the last infirmity of noble minds"; compare Caesar, IV, iii, 86. The infirmity which a man of resolution can keep under by his will (Pr 18:14) may be either moral or physical. In Lu 13:11 the woman's physical infirmity is ascribed to the influence of an evil spirit.

Alexander Macalister

INFLAME; ENFLAME

in-flam', en-flam' (dalaq): "To inflame" in the meaning "to excite passion" is found in Isa 5:11, "till wine inflame them." In some the King James Version passages (e.g. Isa 57:5) we find "enflaming" with the same meaning; compare the King James Version Susanna verse 8 and Sirach 28:10 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "inflame").

INFLAMMATION

in-fla-ma’-shun (dalleqeth; rhigos): Only in De 28:22, was considered by Jewish writers as "burning fever," by Septuagint as a form of ague. Both this and typhoid fever are now, and probably were, among the commonest of the diseases of Palestine. See FEVER. In Le 13:28 the King James Version has "inflammation" as the rendering of tsarebheth, which Septuagint reads charakter, and for which the proper English equivalent is "scar," as in the Revised Version (British and American).

INFLUENCES

in’-floo-ens-iz (ma‘adhannoth): This word occurs only in Job 38:31 the King James Version, "Canst thou bind the sweet influences of Pleiades?" the Revised Version (British and American) "the cluster of the Pleiades," margin "or chain, or sweet influences"; Delitzsch, Dillmann and others render "fetters," that which binds the group together; "influences," if correct, would refer to the seasons, which were believed to be regulated, so far, by the PLEIADES (which see). In The Wisdom of Solomon 7:25, it is said of Wisdom that she is "a pure influence (aporrhoia, the Revised Version (British and American) "effluence") flowing from the glory of the Almighty."

W. L. Walker

INGATHERING, FEASTS OF

in’-gath-er-ing.

See FEASTS AND FASTS; BOOTH.

INHABIT; INHABITANT

in-hab’-it, in-hab’-it-ant (yashabh, "to sit," "remain, "dwell," "inhabit" shakhen, "to settle down" "tabernacle," "dwell"; katoikeo, "to settle," "dwell"): See DWELL. The verb "to inhabit," now used only transitively, had once an intransitive meaning as well. Compare Cowper, Olney Hymns, XIV,

"Who built it, who inhabits there?"

So in 1Ch 5:9 the King James Version, "And eastward he inhabited unto the entering in of the wilderness" (but the Revised Version (British and American) "dwelt"). We have the obsolete inhabiters for "inhabitants" in Re 8:13 the King James Version (but the Revised Version (British and American) "them that dwell") and Re 12:12 the King James Version (but omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)). The rare inhabitress (feminine) is found only in Jer 10:17 margin; "the church called the inhabitress of the gardens" (Bishop Richardson).

D. Miall Edwards

INHERITANCE

in-her’-i-tans (nahalah, "something inherited," "occupancy," "heirloom," "estate," "portion"): The word is used in its widest application in the Old Testament Scriptures, referring not only to an estate received by a child from its parents, but also to the land received by the children of Israel as a gift from Yahweh. And in the figurative and poetical sense, the expression is applied to the kingdom of God as represented in the consecrated lives of His followers. In a similar sense, the Psalmist is represented as speaking of the Lord as the portion of his inheritance. In addition to the above word, the King James Version translations as inheritance, morashah, "a possession," "heritage" (De 33:4; Eze 33:24); yerushshah, "something occupied," "a patrimony," "possession" (Jud 21:17); cheleq, "smoothness," "allotment" (Ps 16:5); kleronomeo, "to inherit" (Mt 5:5, etc.); kleronomos, "heir" (Mt 21:38, etc.); kleronomia, "heirship," "patrimony, "possession"; or kleros, "an acquisition" "portion," "heritage," from kleroo, "to assign," "to allot," "to obtain an inheritance" (Mt 21:38; Lu 12:13; Ac 7:5; 20:32; 26:18; Ga 3:18; Eph 1:11,14,18; 5:5; Col 1:12; 3:24; Heb 1:4; 9:15; 11:8; 1Pe 1:4).

The Pentateuch distinguishes clearly between real and personal property, the fundamental idea regarding the former being the thought that the land is God’s, given by Him to His children, the people of Israel, and hence, cannot be alienated (Le 25:23,28). In order that there might not be any respecter of persons in the division, the lot was to determine the specific piece to be owned by each family head (Nu 26:52-56; 33:54). In case, through necessity of circumstances, a homestead was sold, the title could pass only temporarily; for in the year of Jubilee every homestead must again return to the original owner or heir (Le 25:25-34). Real estate given to the priesthood must be appraised, and could be redeemed by the payment of the appraised valuation, thus preventing the transfer of real property even in this case (Le 27:14-25). Inheritance was controlled by the following regulations:

(1) The firstborn son inherited a double portion of all the father’s possession (De 21:15-17);

(2) the daughters were entitled to an inheritance, provided there were no sons in the family (Nu 27:8);

(3) in case there were no direct heirs, the brothers or more distant kinsmen were recognized (27:9-11); in no case should an estate pass from one tribe to another.

The above points were made the subject of statutory law at the instance of the daughters of Zelophehad, the entire case being clearly set forth in Nu 27$; 36$.

Frank E. Hirsch

INIQUITY

in-ik’-wi-ti (‘awon; anomia): In the Old Testament of the 11 words translated "iniquity," by far the most common and important is ‘awon (about 215 times). Etymologically, it is customary to explain it as meaning literally "crookedness," "perverseness," i.e. evil regarded as that which is not straight or

upright, moral distortion (from ‘iwwah, "to bend," "make crooked," "pervert"). Driver, however (following Lagarde), maintains that two roots, distinct in Arabic, have been confused in Hebrew, one equals "to bend," "pervert" (as above), and the other equals "to err," "go astray"; that ‘awon is derived from the latter, and consequently expresses the idea of error, deviation from the right path, rather than that of perversion (Driver, Notes on Sam, 135 note) Whichever etymology is adopted, in actual usage it has three meanings which almost imperceptibly pass into each other:

(1) iniquity,

(2) guilt of iniquity,

(3) punishment of iniquity.

Primarily, it denotes "not an action, but the character of an action" (Oehler), and is so distinguished from "sin" (chaTTa’th). Hence, we have the expression "the iniquity of my sin" (Ps 32:5). Thus the meaning glides into that of "guilt," which might often take the place of "iniquity" as the translation of ‘awon (Ge 15:16; Ex 34:7; Jer 2:22, etc.). From "guilt" it again passes into the meaning of "punishment of guilt," just as Latin piaculum may denote both guilt and its punishment. The transition is all the easier in Hebrew because of the Hebrew sense of the intimate relation of sin and suffering, e.g. Ge 4:13, "My punishment is greater than I can bear"; which is obviously to be preferred to King James Version margin, the Revised Version, margin "Mine iniquity is greater than can be forgiven," for Cain is not so much expressing sorrow for his sin, as complaining of the severity of his punishment; compare 2Ki 7:9 (the Revised Version (British and American) "punishment," the Revised Version margin "iniquity"); Isa 5:18 (where for "iniquity" we might have "punishment of iniquity," as in Le 26:41,43, etc.); Isa 40:2 ("iniquity," the Revised Version margin "punishment"). The phrase "bear iniquity" is a standing expression for bearing its consequences, i.e. its penalty; generally of the sinner bearing the results of his own iniquity (Le 17:16; 20:17,19; Nu 14:34; Eze 44:10, etc.), but sometimes of one bearing the iniquity of another vicariously, and so taking it away (e.g. Eze 4:4 f; 18:19 f). Of special interest in the latter sense are the sufferings of the Servant of Yahweh, who shall "bear the iniquities" of the people (Isa 53:11; compare Isa 53:6).

Other words frequently translated "iniquity" are: ‘awen, literally, "worthlessness," "vanity," hence, "naughtiness," "mischief" (47 times in the King James Version, especially in the phrase "workers of iniquity," Job 4:8; Ps 5:5; 6:8; Pr 10:29, etc.); ‘awel and ‘awlah, literally, "perverseness" (De 32:4; Job 6:29 the King James Version, etc.).

In the New Testament "iniquity" stands for anomia equals properly, "the condition of one without law," "lawlessness" (so translated in 1 Joh 3:4, elsewhere "iniquity," e.g. Mt 7:23), a word which frequently stood for ‘awon in the Septuagint; and adikia, literally, "unrighteousness" (e.g. Lu 13:27).

D. Miall Edwards

INJOIN

in-join’.

See ENJOIN.

INJURIOUS

in-joo’-ri-us, in-ju’-ri-us (hubristes, "insolent"): In former usage, the word was strongly expressive of insult as well as hurtfulness. So in 1Ti 1:13. In Ro 1:30 the same adjective is translated "insolent" (the King James Version "despiteful").

INJURY

in’-ju-ri, in’-joo-ri.

See CRIMES.

INK

ink (deyo, from root meaning "slowly flowing," BDB, 188; melan, "black"): Any fluid substance used with pen or brush to form written characters. In this sense ink is mentioned once in the Hebrew Bible (Jer 36:2) and 3 times in the Greek New Testament (2Co 3:3; 2 Joh 1:12; 3 Joh 1:13), and it is implied in all references to writing on papyrus or on leather. The inference from the "blotting out" of Ex 32:33 and Nu 5:23 that the Hebrew ink was a lamp-black and gum, or some other dry ink, is confirmed by the general usage of antiquity, by the later Jewish prejudice against other inks (OTJC, 71 note) and by a Jewish receipt referring to ink-tablets (Drach, "Notice sur l’encre des Hebreux," Ann. philos. chret., 42, 45, 353). The question is, however, now being put on a wholly new basis by the study of the Elephantine Jewish documents (Meyer, Papyrusfund2, 1912, 15, 21), and above all of the Harvard Ostraca from Samaria which give actual specimens of the ink in Palestine in the time of Ahab (Harvard Theological Review, Jan. 1911, 136-43). It is likely, however, that during the long period of Bible history various inks were used. The official copy of the law in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus was, according to Josephus (Ant., XII, ii, 11), written in gold, and the vermilion and red paints and dyes mentioned in Jer 22:14; Eze 23:14, and The Wisdom of Solomon 13:14 (milto kai phukei) were probably used also for writing books or coloring incised inscriptions. See literature under WRITING; especially Krauss, Talmud, Arch. 3, 148-53; Gardthausen, Greek Palestine, 1911, I, 202-17, and his bibliographical references passim.

E. C. Richardson

INK-HORN

ink’-horn (keceth equals keseth, BDB, 903): This term "inkhorn" occurs 3 times in Eze 9 (9:2,3,11), in the phrase "writer’s inkhorn upon his loins" (or "by his side"). The word is more exactly "implement case," or "writing-case" (calamarium atramentarium, theca calamaria, theca libraria, graphiaria). This may have been the Egyptian palette (Budge, Mummy, 350-52) seen so often in the monuments of all periods, or the later form of pen-case with ink-well attached, which is a modified form adapted for ink carried in fluid form. The Egyptian palette was carried characteristically over the shoulder or under the arm, neither of which methods is strictly "upon the loins." The manner of carrying, therefore, was doubtless in the girdle, as in modern oriental usage (Benzinger, Hebrew Archaeol., 185). A good example of the pen-case and inkwell writing-case (given also in Garucci, Daremberg-Saglio, Gardthausen, etc.) is given from the original in Birt, Die Buchrolle in der Kunst, 220, and is reproduced (a) in this article, together with (b) an Egyptian palette. Whether the form of Ezekiel’s case approached the palette or the ink-well type probably depends on the question of whether dry ink or fluid ink was used in Ezekiel’s time (see INK). Compare Hieronymus at the place, and for literature, see WRITING, and especially Gardthausen, Greek Palestine, 1911, I, 193-94.

E. C. Richardson

INN

(malon; pandocheion, kataluma):

1. Earliest Night Resting-Places:

The Hebrew word malon means literally, a "night resting-place," and might be applied to any spot where caravans (Ge 42:27; 43:21 the King James Version), individuals (Ex 4:24; Jer 9:2), or even armies (Jos 4:3,8; 2Ki 19:23; Isa 10:29) encamped for the night. In the slightly altered form melunah, the same word is used of a nightwatchman’s lodge in a garden (Isa 1:8; 24:20, the King James Version "cottage"). The word in itself does not imply the presence of any building, and in the case of caravans and travelers was doubtless originally, as very often at the present day, only a convenient level bit of ground near some spring, where baggage might be unloaded, animals watered and tethered, and men rest on the bare ground. Nothing in the Old Testament suggests the occupancy of a house in such cases. The nearest approach to such an idea occurs in Jer 41:17 margin, where geruth kimham is translated "the lodging-place of Chimham," but the text is very doubtful and probably refers rather to sheepfolds. We cannot say when buildings were first used, but the need of shelter for caravans traveling in winter, and of protection in dangerous times and districts, would lead to their introduction at an early period in the history of trade.

2. Public Inns:

It is noteworthy that all the indisputable designations of "inn" come in with the Greek period. Josephus (Ant., XV, v, 1; BJ, I, xxi, 7) speaks of "Public inns" under the name of katagogal, while in the Aramaic

Jewish writings we meet with ‘ushpiza’, from Latin hospitium, and ‘akhcanya’ from the Greek xenia; the New Testament designation pandocheion has passed into the Aramaic pundheqa’ and the Arabic funduq. All these are used of public inns, and they all correspond to the modern "khan" or "caravanserai." These are to be found on the great trade routes all over the East. In their most elaborate form they have almost the strength of a fortress. They consist of a great quadrangle into which admission is gained through a broad, strong gateway. The quadrangle is enclosed on all sides by a 2-story building, the windows in the case of the lower story opening only to the interior. The upper story is reached by stairways, and has a gangway all around, giving access to the practically bare rooms which are at the disposal of travelers. 3. Their Evil Name:

There is usually a well of good water in the center of the quadrangle, and travelers as a rule bring their own food and often that of their animals (Jud 19:19) with them. There are no fixed payments, and on departure, the arranging of haqq el-khan generally means a disagreeable dispute, as the innkeepers are invariably untruthful, dishonest and oppressive. They have ever been regarded as of infamous character. The Roman laws in many places recognize this. In Mishna, Yebhamoth, xvi. 7 the word of an innkeeper was doubted, and Mishna, ‘Abbodhah Zarah, ii.4 places them in the lowest scale of degradation. The New Testament is quite clear in speaking of "Rahab the harlot" (Heb 11:31; Jas 2:25). The Targum designates her an "innkeeper," while Rashi translates zonah as "a seller of kinds of food," a meaning the word will bear. Chimchi, however, accepts both meanings. This evil repute of public inns, together with the Semitic spirit of hospitality, led the Jews and the early Christians to prefer to recommend the keeping of open house for the entertainment of strangers. In the Jewish Morning Prayers, even in our day, such action is linked with great promises, and the New Testament repeatedly (Heb 13:2; 1Pe 4:9; 3 Joh 1:5) commends hospitality. It is remarkable that both the Talmud (Shab 127a) and the New Testament (Heb 13:2) quote the same passage (Ge 18:3) in recommending it.

The best-known khans in Palestine are Khan Jubb-Yusuf, North of the Lake of Galilee, Khan et-Tujjar, under the shadow of Tabor, Khan el-Lubban (compare Jud 21:19), and Khan Chadrur, midway between Jerusalem and Jericho. This last certainly occupies the site of the inn referred to in Lu 10:34, and it is not without interest that we read in Mishna, Yebhamoth, xvi.7, of another sick man being left at that same inn. See illustration, p. 64.

4. Guest Chambers:

The Greek word kataluma, though implying a "loosing" for the night, seems rather to be connected with the idea of hospitality in a private house than in a public inn. Luke with his usual care distinguishes between this and pandocheion, and his use of the verb kataluo (Lu 9:12; 19:7) makes his meaning clear. In the Septuagint, indeed, malon is sometimes translated kataluma, and it appears in 1Sa 9:22 for lishkah, the King James Version "parlour." It is the word used of the "upper room" where the Last Supper was held (Mr 14:14; Lu 22:11, "guest-chamber"), and of the place of reception in Bethlehem where Joseph and Mary failed to find quarters (Lu 2:7). It thus corresponds to the spare or upper room in a private house or in a village, i.e. to the manzil adjoining the house of the sheikh, where travelers received hospitality and where no payment was expected, except a trifle to the caretaker. In Jerusalem such payments were made by leaving behind the earthenware vessels that had been used, and the skins

of the animals that had been slaughtered (Yoma' 12a).

5. Birth of Christ:

Judging from the word used, and the conditions implied, we are led to believe that Joseph and Mary had at first expected reception in the upper room or manzil at the house of the sheikh of Bethlehem, probably a friend and member of the house of David; that in this they were disappointed, and had to content themselves with the next best, the elevated platform alongside the interior of the stable, and on which those having the care of the animals generally slept. It being now the season when they were in the fields (Lu 2:8), the stable would be empty and clean. There then the Lord Jesus was born and laid in the safest and most convenient place, the nearest empty manger alongside of this elevated platform. Humble though the circumstances were, the family were preserved from all the annoyance and evil associations of a public khan, and all the demands of delicacy and privacy were duly met.

W. M. Christie

INNER MAN

See INWARD MAN.

INNOCENCE; INNOCENCY; INNOCENT

in'-o-sens, in'-o-sen-si, in'-o-sent (zakhu, niqqayon, chinnam, chaph, naqi; athoos): the King James Version and the American Standard Revised Version have innocency in Ge 20:5; Ps 26:6; 73:13; Da 6:22; Ho 8:5. In Daniel the Hebrew is zakhu, and the innocence expressed is the absence of the guilt of disloyalty to God. In all the other places the Hebrew is niqqayon, and the innocence expressed is the absence of pollution, Hosea having reference to the pollution of idolatry, and the other passages presenting the cleansing under the figure of washing hands. the King James Version has innocent not fewer than 40 times. In one place (1Ki 2:31) the Hebrew is chinnam, meaning "undeserved," or "without cause," and, accordingly, the American Standard Revised Version, instead of "innocent blood .... shed," has "blood .... shed without cause." In another place (Job 33:9) the Hebrew is chaph, meaning "scraped," or "polished," therefore "clean," and refers to moral purity. In all the other places the Hebrew is naqi, or its cognates, and the idea is doubtless the absence of pollution. In more than half the passages "innocent" is connected with blood, as "blood of the innocent," or simply "innocent blood." In some places there is the idea of the Divine acquittal, or forgiveness, as in Job 9:28: "I know that thou wilt not hold me innocent" (compare Job 10:14, where the same Hebrew word is used). The New Testament has "innocent" twice in connection with blood—"innocent blood," and "innocent of the blood" (Mt 27:4,24).

E. J. Forrester

INNOCENTS, MASSACRE OF THE

in’-o-sents, mas’-a-ker,

I. MEANING AND HISTORY OF THE TERM

II. ANALYSIS OF NARRATIVE WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO MOTIVE

1. Focus of Narrative—Residence at Nazareth

2. Corollaries from Above Facts

3. Marks of Historicity

I. Meaning and History of the Term.

The conventional, ecclesiastical name given to the slaughter by HEROD, I (which see) of children two years old and under in Bethlehem and its environs at the time of the birth of Christ (Mt 2:16). The accepted title for this event may be traced through Augustine to Cyprian.

Irenaeus (died 202 AD) calls these children "martyrs," and in a very beautiful passage interprets the tragedy which ended their brief lives as a gracious and tender "sending before" into His kingdom by the Lord Himself.

Cyprian (died 258 AD) says: "That it might be manifest that they who are slain for Christ’s sake are innocent, innocent infancy was put to death for his name’s sake" (Ep. lv. 6).

Augustine (born 354 AD), following Cyprian, speaks of the children, formally, as "the Innocents" (Commentary on Ps 43:5).

The ecclesiastical treatment of the incident is remarkable because of the exaggeration which was indulged in as to the extent of the massacre and the number of victims. At an early date the Greek church canonized 14,000, and afterward, by a curious misinterpretation of Re 14:1,3, the number was increased to 144,000.

According to Milman the liturgy of the Church of England retains a reminiscence of this ancient error in the use of Re 14 on Holy Innocents’ Day (see History of Christianity, I, 107, note e). This exaggeration, of which there is no hint in the New Testament, is worthy of note because the most serious general argument against the historicity of the narrative is drawn from the silence of Josephus. As in all probability there could not have been more than twenty children involved (compare Farrar, Life of Christ, I, 45, note), the incident could not have bulked very largely in the series of horrors perpetrated or planned by Herod in the last months of his life (see Farrar, The Herods, 144 f) .

II. Analysis of Narrative with Special Reference to Motive.

In estimating the value of such a narrative from the viewpoint of historicity, the first and most important step is to gauge the motive. Why was the story told? This question is not always easy to answer, but in the present instance there is a very simple and effective test at hand.

1. Focus of Narrative—Residence at Nazareth:

In Matthew's infancy section (Mt 1$; 2$) there are five quotations from the Old Testament which are set into the narrative of events. These five quotations represent the cardinal and outstanding points of interest. The quotations are placed thus:

(1) at the Virgin Birth (Mt 1:23);

(2) at the birth at Bethlehem (Mt 2:6);

(3) at the visit to Egypt (Mt 2:15);

(4) at the murder of the children (Mt 2:18);

(5) at the Nazareth residence (Mt 2:23).

It will be noticed at once as peculiar and significant that no quotation is attached to the visit of the Magi. This omission is the more noteworthy because in Nu 24:7; Ps 72:15; Isa 60:6, and numerous references to the ingathering of the Gentiles there are such beautiful and appropriate passages to link with the visit of the strangers from the far East. This peculiar omission, on the part of a writer so deeply interested in prophecy and its fulfillment and so keen to seize upon appropriate and suggestive harmonies, in a section constructed with a view to such harmonies, can be explained only on the ground that the visit of the Magi did not, in the writer's view of events, occupy a critical point of especial interest. Their visit is told, not for its own sake, but because of its connection with the murder of the children and the journey to Egypt. The murder of the children is of interest because it discloses the character of Herod and the perils surrounding the newborn Messiah. It also explains the visit to Egypt and the subsequent residence at Nazareth. The latter is evidently the objective point, because it is given a place by itself and marked by a quotation. Moreover, the one evidence of overstrain in the narrative is in the ambiguous and obscure statement by which the Old Testament is brought into relationship with the Nazareth residence. The center of interest in the entire section which is concerned with Herod and the Magi is the Nazareth residence. The story is told for the express purpose of explaining why the heir of David, who was born at Bethlehem, lived at Nazareth.

This brings the narrative of Matthew into striking relationship with that of Luke. The latter's concern is to show how it was that the Messiah who lived at Nazareth was born at Bethlehem. We have here one of the undesigned unities which bind together these two narratives which are seemingly so divergent. That

Matthew says nothing about a previous residence at Nazareth and that Luke says nothing about a forced return thither may be explained, in accordance with the balance of probabilities, on the ground, either that each evangelist was ignorant of the fact omitted by himself, or that in his condensed and rapid statement he did not see fit to mention it. In any case the harmony immeasurably outweighs the discrepancy.

2. Corollaries from Above Facts:

The fact that the focus of the entire narrative lies in the residence of Jesus at Nazareth effectually disposes of a number of current hypotheses as to its origin.

(1) The idea that it is merely legend told for the purpose of literary embellishment. The dovetailing of what would be the main item into the rest of the narrative and its subordination to secondary features cannot be explained on this hypothesis. The absence of adornment by available passages from the Old Testament alone is conclusive on this point (see Allen, "Matthew," ICC, 14, 15).

(2) The idea that the story is told for the purpose of illustrating the scope of the Messiah's influence beyond Israel. Here, again, the subordinate position assigned to the story of the Magi together with the absence of Old Testament material is conclusive. Moreover, the history of the Magi is abruptly dropped with the statement of their return home. Interest in them flags as soon as their brief connection with the movement of the history through Herod ceases. And the intensely Hebraic character of Matthew's infancy section as a whole is incidental evidence pointing in the same direction (compare remarks of the writer, Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 70 f).

(3) The idea that the story is told to emphasize the wonder-element in connection with the birth of Christ. The facts contradict this. In addition to the primary consideration, the subordinate position, there are others of great value. That the Magi were providentially guided to the feet of the Messiah is evidently the firm conviction of the narrator. The striking feature of the story is that with this belief in his mind he keeps so strictly within the limits of the natural order. In Mt 2:9 and 12 only is there apparent exception. Of these the statement in 2:9 is the only one peculiar to this part of the narrative. Two things are to be remembered concerning it: It is clear that the verse cannot be interpreted apart from a clear understanding of the whole astronomical occurrence of which it forms a part.

It is also evident that Mt 2:9 must not be interpreted apart from the context. From the viewpoint of a wonder-tale the writer makes a fatal blunder at the most critical point of his story. The popular notion that the Magi were miraculously led to the Messiah finds no support in the text. The Magi did not come to Bethlehem, but to Jerusalem, asking: "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Mt 2:9 comes after this statement and after the conclave called by Herod in which Bethlehem was specified. In view of all this it seems clear that the Magi were led, not miraculously, but in accordance with the genius of their own system, and that the Providential element lay in the striking coincidence of their visit and the birth of Jesus. The interest of the writer was not in the wonder-element, else, infallibly, he would have sharpened its outlines and expurgated all ambiguity as to the nature of the occurrence.

We may now glance at the positive evidence for the historicity of the event.

3. Marks of Historicity:

(1) The centering of the narrative upon the residence of Jesus at Nazareth. This not only brings Luke's Gospel in support of the center, but groups the story around a point of known interest to the first generation of believers. It is interesting to note that the residence in Egypt has independent backing of a sort. There are in existence two stories, one traced by Origen through Jews of his own day to earlier times, and the other in the Talmud, which connect Jesus with Egypt and attempt to account for His miracles by reference to Egyptian magic (see Plummer, "Matthew," Ex. Comm., 17,18).

(2) The fact that the story of the Magi is told so objectively and with such personal detachment. Both Jews and early Christians had strong views both as to astrology and magic in general (see Plummer, op. cit., 15), but the author of this Gospel tells the story without emphasis and without comment and from the viewpoint of the Magi. His interest is purely historical and matter-of-fact.

(3) The portrait of Herod the Great. So far as Herod is concerned the incident is usually discussed with exclusive reference to the savagery involved. By many it is affirmed that we have here a hostile and unfair portrait. This contention could hardly be sustained even if the question turned entirely upon the point of savagery. But there is far more than savagery in the incident.

(a) In the first place there is this undeniable element of inherent probability in the story. Practically all of Herod's murders, including those of his beloved wife and his sons, were perpetrated under the sway of one emotion and in obedience to a single motive. They were in practically every instance for the purpose of consolidating or perpetuating his power. He nearly destroyed his own immediate family in the half-mad jealousy that on occasion drove him to the very limits of ferocity, simply because they were accused of plotting against him. The accusations were largely false, but the suspicion doomed those accused. The murder of the Innocents was another crime of the same sort. The old king was obsessed by the fear of a claimant to his petty throne; the Messianic hope of the Jews was a perpetual secret torment, and the murder of the children, in the attempt to reach the child whose advent threatened him, was at once so original in method and so characteristic in purpose as to give an inimitable veri-similitude to the whole narrative. There are also other traits of truth.

(b) Herod's prompt discovery of the visit of the Magi and their questions is in harmony with what we know of the old ruler's watchfulness and his elaborate system of espionage.

(c) Characteristic also is the subtlety with which he deals with the whole situation. How striking and vivid, with all its rugged simplicity, is the story of the king's pretended interest in the quest of the strangers, the solemn conclave of Jewish leaders with himself in the role of earnest inquirer, his urgent request for information that he may worship also, followed by his swift anger (note that ethumothe, "was wroth," verse 16, is not used elsewhere in the New Testament) at being deceived, and the blind but terrible stroke of his questing vengeance.

All these items are so true to the man, to the atmosphere which always surrounded him, and to the historic situation, that we are forced to conclude, either that we have veracious history more or less directly received from one who was an observer of the events described, or the work of an incomparably clever romancer.

Louis Matthews Sweet

INORDINATE

in-or’-di-nat ("ill-regulated," hence, "immoderate," "excessive"; Latin in, "not," ordinatus, "set in order"): Only twice in the King James Version. In each case there is no corresponding adjective in the original, but the word was inserted by the translators as being implied in the noun. It disappears in Revised Version: Eze 23:11, "in her inordinate love" (the Revised Version (British and American) "in her doting"); aghabhah, "lust"; Col 3:5 "inordinate affection" (the Revised Version (British and American) "passion"); pathos, a word which in classical Greek may have either a good or a bad sense (any affection or emotion of the mind), but in the New Testament is used only in a bad sense (passion).

D. Miall Edwards

INQUIRE

in-kwir’ (sha’al, "to ask," "desire"; zeteo, "to seek"); A form sometimes employed with reference to the practice of divination, as where Saul "inquires of" (or "consults") the witch of Endor as to the issue of the coming battle (1Sa 28:6,7) (see DIVINATION).

In Job 10:6, "to inquire (baqash) after iniquity" signifies to bring to light and punish for it, and Job asks distractedly if God’s time is so short that He is in a hurry to find him guilty and to punish him as if He had only a man’s few days to live.

"To inquire of Yahweh" denotes the consultation of oracle, priest, prophet or Yahweh Himself, as to a certain course of action or as to necessary supplies. (Jud 20:27 the King James Version, "to ask"; 1Ki 22:5; 1Sa 9:9 (darash); 1Sa 10:22 the King James Version; 2Sa 2:1; 5:19,23; Eze 36:37).

"To inquire (baqar) in his temple" (palace) means to find out all that constant fellowship or unbroken intercourse with God can teach (Ps 27:4).

Pr 20:25 warns against rashness in making a vow and afterward considering (baqar, "to make inquiry") as to whether it can be fulfilled or how it may be eluded.

In the King James Version, the translation of several Greek words: diaginosko, "to know

thoroughly" (Ac 23:15); epizeteo, "to seek after" (Ac 19:39); suzeteo, "to seek together" (Lu 22:23); exetazo, "to search out" (Mt 10:11).

M. O. Evans

INQUISITION

in-kwi-zish’-un (darash, "to follow," "diligently inquire," "question," "search" (De 19:18; Ps 9:12), baqash, "to search out," "to strive after," "inquire" (Es 2:23)): The term refers, as indicated by these passages, first of all to a careful and diligent inquiry necessary to ascertain the truth from witnesses in a court, but may also refer to a careful examination into circumstances or conditions without official authority.

INSCRIPTION

in-skrip’-shun (verb epigrapho, "to write upon," "inscribe"): The word occurs once in English Versions of the Bible in Ac 17:23 of the altar at Athens with the inscription "To an Unknown God." On inscriptions in archaeology, see ARCHAEOLOGY; ASSYRIA; BABYLONIA, etc.

INSECTS

in’-sekts: In English Versions of the Bible, including the marginal notes, we find at least 23 names of insects or words referring to them: ant, bald locust, bee, beetle, cankerworm, caterpillar, creeping thing, cricket, crimson, flea, fly, gnat, grasshopper, honey, hornet, locust, louse, (lice), moth, palmer-worm, sandfly, scarlet-worm, silk-worm. These can be referred to about 12 insects, which, arranged systematically, are: Hymenoptera, ant, bee, hornet; Lepidoptera, clothes-moth, silk-worm; Siphonaptera, flea; Diptera, fly; Rhynchota, louse, scarletworm; Orthoptera, several kinds of grasshoppers and locusts.

The word "worm" refers not only to the scarletworm, but to various larvae of Lepidoptera, Coleoptera, and Diptera. "Creeping things" refers indefinitely to insects, reptiles, and beasts. In the list of 23 names given above honey and bee refer to one insect, as do crimson and scarlet. Sandfly has no place if "lice" be retained in Ex 8:16 ff. Bald locust, beetle, canker-worm, cricket, and palmerworm probably all denote various kinds of grasshoppers and locusts. When the translators of English Versions of the Bible had to do with two or more Hebrew words for which there was only one well-recognized English equivalent, they seem to have been content with that alone, if the two Hebrew words occurred in different passages; e.g. zebhubh, "fly" (Ec 10:1; Isa 7:18), and ‘arobh, "fly" (Ex 8:21). On the other hand, they were put to it to find equivalents for the insect names in Le 11:22; Joe 1:4, and elsewhere. For cale’am (Le 11:22) they evidently coined "bald locust," following a statement of the Talmud that it had a smooth head. For gazam and yeleq they imported "palmer-worm" and "canker-worm," two old English names of caterpillars, using "caterpillar" for chasil. The King James Version "beetle" for chargol is absolutely inappropriate, and the Revised Version (British and American) "cricket," while less objectionable, is probably also incorrect. The English language seems to lack appropriate names for different kinds of

grasshoppers and locusts, and it is difficult to suggest any names to take the places of those against which these criticisms are directed. See under the names of the respective insects. See also SCORPION and SPIDER, which are not included here because they are not strictly insects.

Alfred Ely Day

INSPIRATION, 1-7

in-spi-ra’-shun:

1. Meaning of Terms

2. Occurrences in the Bible

3. Consideration of Important Passages

(1) 2 Timothy 3:16

(2) 2 Peter 1:19-21

(3) John 10:34 f

4. Christ’s Declaration That Scripture Must Be Fulfilled

5. His Testimony That God Is Author of Scripture

6. Similar Testimony of His Immediate Followers

7. Their Identification of God and Scripture

8. The "Oracles of God"

9. The Human Element in Scripture

10. Activities of God in Giving Scripture

11. General Problem of Origin: God’s Part

12. How Human Qualities Affected Scripture. Providential Preparation

13. "Inspiration" More than Mere "Providence"

14. Witness of New Testament Writers to Divine Operation

15. "Inspiration" and "Revelation"

16. Scriptures a Divine-Human Book?

17. Scripture of the New Testament Writers Was the Old Testament

18. Inclusion of the New Testament

LITERATURE

1. Meaning of Terms:

The word "inspire" and its derivatives seem to have come into Middle English from the French, and have been employed from the first (early in the 14th century) in a considerable number of significations, physical and metaphorical, secular and religious. The derivatives have been multiplied and their applications extended during the procession of the years, until they have acquired a very wide and varied use. Underlying all their use, however, is the constant implication of an influence from without, producing in its object movements and effects beyond its native, or at least its ordinary powers. The noun "inspiration," although already in use in the 14th century, seems not to occur in any but a theological sense until late in the 16th century. The specifically theological sense of all these terms is governed, of course, by their usage in Latin theology; and this rests ultimately on their employment in the Latin Bible. In the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Latin Bible the verb inspiro (Ge 2:7; The Wisdom of Solomon 15:11; Ecclesiasticus 4:12; 2Ti 3:16; 2Pe 1:21) and the noun inspiratio (2Sa 22:16; Job 32:8; Ps 18:15; Ac 17:25) both occur 4 or 5 times in somewhat diverse applications. In the development of a theological nomenclature, however, they have acquired (along with other less frequent applications) a technical sense with reference to the Biblical writers or the Biblical books. The Biblical books are called inspired as the Divinely determined products of inspired men; the Biblical writers are called inspired as breathed into by the Holy Spirit, so that the product of their activities transcends human powers and becomes Divinely authoritative. Inspiration is, therefore, usually defined as a supernatural influence exerted on the sacred writers by the Spirit of God, by virtue of which their writings are given Divine trustworthiness.

2. Occurrences in the Bible:

Meanwhile, for English-speaking men, these terms have virtually ceased to be Biblical terms. They naturally passed from the Latin Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) into the English versions made from it (most fully into the Rheims-Douay: Job 32:8; The Wisdom of Solomon 15:11; Ecclesiasticus 4:12; 2Ti 3:16; 2Pe 1:21). But in the development of the English Bible they have found

ever-decreasing place. In the English Versions of the Bible of the Apocrypha (both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) "inspired" is retained in The Wisdom of Solomon 15:11; but in the canonical books the nominal form alone occurs in the King James Version and that only twice: Job 32:8, "But there is a spirit in man: and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding"; and 2Ti 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." the Revised Version (British and American) removes the former of these instances, substituting "breath" for "inspiration"; and alters the latter so as to read: "Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness," with a marginal alternative in the form of, "Every scripture is inspired of God and profitable," etc. The word "inspiration" thus disappears from the English Bible, and the word "inspired" is left in it only once, and then, let it be added, by a distinct and even misleading mistranslation.

For the Greek word in this passage—theopneustos—very distinctly does not mean "inspired of God." This phrase is rather the rendering of the Latin, divinitus inspirata, restored from the Wycliff ("Al Scripture of God ynspyrid is ....") and Rhemish ("All Scripture inspired of God is ....") versions of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) The Greek word does not even mean, as the King James Version translates it, "given by inspiration of God," although that rendering (inherited from, Tyndale: "All Scripture given by inspiration of God is ...." and its successors; compare Geneva: "The whole Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is ....") has at least to say for itself that it is a somewhat clumsy, perhaps, but not misleading, paraphrase of the Greek term in theological language of the day. The Greek term has, however, nothing to say of inspiring or of inspiration: it speaks only of a "spiring" or "spiration." What it says of Scripture is, not that it is "breathed into by God" or is the product of the Divine "inbreathing" into its human authors, but that it is breathed out by God, "God-breathed," the product of the creative breath of God. In a word, what is declared by this fundamental passage is simply that the Scriptures are a Divine product, without any indication of how God has operated in producing them. No term could have been chosen, however, which would have more emphatically asserted the Divine production of Scripture than that which is here employed. The "breath of God" is in Scripture just the symbol of His almighty power, the bearer of His creative word. "By the word of Yahweh," we read in the significant parallel of Ps 33:6 "were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." And it is particularly where the operations of God are energetic that this term (whether ruach, or neshamah) is employed to designate them—God’s breath is the irresistible outflow of His power. When Paul declares, then, that "every scripture" or "all scripture" is the product of the Divine breath, "is God-breathed," he asserts with as much energy as he could employ that Scripture is the product of a specifically Divine operation.

3. Consideration of Important Passages:

(1) 2 Timothy 3:16:

In the passage in which Paul makes this energetic assertion of the Divine origin of Scripture he is engaged in explaining the greatness of the advantages which Timothy had enjoyed for learning the saving truth of God. He had had good teachers; and from his very infancy he had been, by his

knowledge of the Scriptures, made wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. The expression, "sacred writings," here employed (1Ti 3:15), is a technical one, not found elsewhere in the New Testament, it is true, but occurring currently in Philo and Josephus to designate that body of authoritative books which constituted the Jewish "Law." It appears here anarthrously because it is set in contrast with the oral teaching which Timothy had enjoyed, as something still better: he had not only had good instructors, but also always "an open Bible," as we should say, in his hand. To enhance yet further the great advantage of the possession of these Sacred Scriptures the apostle adds now a sentence throwing their nature strongly up to view. They are of Divine origin and therefore of the highest value for all holy purposes.

There is room for some difference of opinion as to the exact construction of this declaration. Shall we render "Every Scripture" or "All Scripture"? Shall we render "Every (or all) Scripture is God-breathed and (therefore) profitable," or "Every (or all) Scripture, being God-breathed, is as well profitable"? No doubt both questions are interesting, but for the main matter now engaging our attention they are both indifferent. Whether Paul, looking back at the Sacred Scriptures he had just mentioned, makes the assertion he is about to add, of them distributively, of all their parts, or collectively, of their entire mass, is of no moment: to say that every part of these Sacred Scriptures is God-breathed and to say that the whole of these Sacred Scriptures is God-breathed, is, for the main matter, all one. Nor is the difference great between saying that they are in all their parts, or in their whole extent, God-breathed and therefore profitable, and saying that they are in all their parts, or in their whole extent, because God-breathed as well profitable. In both cases these Sacred Scriptures are declared to owe their value to their Divine origin; and in both cases this their Divine origin is energetically asserted of their entire fabric. On the whole, the preferable construction would seem to be, "Every Scripture, seeing that it is God-breathed, is as well profitable." In that case, what the apostle asserts is that the Sacred Scriptures, in their every several passage—for it is just "passage of Scripture" which "Scripture" in this distributive use of it signifies—is the product of the creative breath of God, and, because of this its Divine origination, is of supreme value for all holy purposes.

It is to be observed that the apostle does not stop here to tell us either what particular books enter into the collection which he calls Sacred Scriptures, or by what precise operations God has produced them. Neither of these subjects entered into the matter he had at the moment in hand. It was the value of the Scriptures, and the source of that value in their Divine origin, which he required at the moment to assert; and these things he asserts, leaving to other occasions any further facts concerning them which it might be well to emphasize. It is also to be observed that the apostle does not tell us here everything for which the Scriptures are made valuable by their Divine origination. He speaks simply to the point immediately in hand, and reminds Timothy of the value which these Scriptures, by virtue of their Divine origin, have for the "man of God." Their spiritual power, as God-breathed, is all that he had occasion here to advert to. Whatever other qualities may accrue to them from their Divine origin, he leaves to other occasions to speak of.

(2) 2 Peter 1:19-21:

What Paul tells us here about the Divine origin of the Scriptures is enforced and extended by a striking

passage in 2Pe (1:19-21). Peter is assuring his readers that what had been made known to them of "the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ" did not rest on "cunningly devised fables." He offers them the testimony of eyewitnesses of Christ's glory. And then he intimates that they have better testimony than even that of eyewitnesses. "We have," says he, "the prophetic word" (English Versions of the Bible, unhappily, "the word of prophecy"): and this, he says, is "more sure," and therefore should certainly be heeded. He refers, of course, to the Scriptures. Of what other "prophetic word" could he, over against the testimony of the eyewitnesses of Christ's "excellent glory" (the King James Version) say that "we have" it, that is, it is in our hands? And he proceeds at once to speak of it plainly as "Scriptural prophecy." You do well, he says, to pay heed to the prophetic word, because we know this first, that "every prophecy of scripture ...." It admits of more question, however, whether by this phrase he means the whole of Scripture, designated according to its character, as prophetic, that is, of Divine origin; or only that portion of Scripture which we discriminate as particularly prophetic, the immediate revelations contained in Scripture. The former is the more likely view, inasmuch as the entirety of Scripture is elsewhere conceived and spoken of as prophetic. In that case, what Peter has to say of this "every prophecy of scripture"—the exact equivalent, it will be observed, in this case of Paul's "every scripture" (2Ti 3:16)—applies to the whole of Scripture in all its parts. What he says of it is that it does not come "of private interpretation"; that is, it is not the result of human investigation into the nature of things, the product of its writers' own thinking. This is as much as to say it is of Divine gift. Accordingly, he proceeds at once to make this plain in a supporting clause which contains both the negative and the positive declaration: "For no prophecy ever came (margin: "was brought") by the will of man, but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God." In this singularly precise and pregnant statement there are several things which require to be carefully observed. There is, first of all, the emphatic denial that prophecy—that is to say, on the hypothesis upon which we are working, Scripture—owes its origin to human initiative: "No prophecy ever was brought—'came' is the word used in the English Versions of the Bible text, with 'was brought' in the Revised Version margin—by the will of man." Then, there is the equally emphatic assertion that its source lies in God: it was spoken by men, indeed, but the men who spoke it "spake from God." And a remarkable clause is here inserted, and thrown forward in the sentence that stress may fall on it, which tells us how it could be that men, in speaking, should speak not from themselves, but from God: it was "as borne"—it is the same word which was rendered "was brought" above, and might possibly be rendered "brought" here—"by the Holy Spirit" that they spoke. Speaking thus under the determining influence of the Holy Spirit, the things they spoke were not from themselves, but from God.

Here is as direct an assertion of the Divine origin of Scripture as that of 2Ti 3:16. But there is more here than a simple assertion of the Divine origin of Scripture. We are advanced somewhat in our understanding of how God has produced the Scriptures. It was through the instrumentality of men who "spake from him." More specifically, it was through an operation of the Holy Ghost on these men which is described as "bearing" them. The term here used is a very specific one. It is not to be confounded with guiding, or directing, or controlling, or even-leading in the full sense of that word. It goes beyond all such terms, in assigning the effect produced specifically to the active agent. What is "borne" is taken up by the "bearer," and conveyed by the "bearer's" power, not its own, to the "bearer's" goal, not its own. The men who spoke from God are here declared, therefore, to have been taken up by the Holy Spirit and brought by His power to the goal of His choosing. The things which they spoke under this operation of

the Spirit were therefore His things, not theirs. And that is the reason which is assigned why "the prophetic word" is so sure. Though spoken through the instrumentality of men, it is, by virtue of the fact that these men spoke "as borne by the Holy Spirit," an immediately Divine word. It will be observed that the proximate stress is laid here, not on the spiritual value of Scripture (though that, too, is seen in the background), but on the Divine trustworthiness of Scripture. Because this is the way every prophecy of Scripture "has been brought," it affords a more sure basis of confidence than even the testimony of human eyewitnesses. Of course, if we do not understand by "the prophetic word" here the entirety of Scripture described, according to its character, as revelation, but only that element in Scripture which we call specifically prophecy, then it is directly only of that element in Scripture that these great declarations are made. In any event, however, they are made of the prophetic element in Scripture as written, which was the only form in which the readers of this Epistle possessed it, and which is the thing specifically intimated in the phrase "every prophecy of scripture." These great declarations are made, therefore, at least of large tracts of Scripture; and if the entirety of Scripture is intended by the phrase "the prophetic word," they are made of the whole of Scripture.

(3) John 10:34 f:

How far the supreme trustworthiness of Scripture, thus asserted, extends may be conveyed to us by a passage in one of our Lord’s discourses recorded by John (Joh 10:34-35). The Jews, offended by Jesus’ "making himself God," were in the act to stone Him, when He defended Himself thus: "Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods? If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the Scripture cannot be broken), say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified (margin "consecrated") and sent unto the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" It may be thought that this defense is inadequate. It certainly is incomplete: Jesus made Himself God (Joh 10:33) in a far higher sense than that in which "Ye are gods" was said of those "unto whom the word of God came": He had just declared in unmistakable terms, "I and the Father are one." But it was quite sufficient for the immediate end in view—to repel the technical charge of blasphemy based on His making Himself God: it is not blasphemy to call one God in any sense in which he may fitly receive that designation; and certainly if it is not blasphemy to call such men as those spoken of in the passage of Scripture adduced gods, because of their official functions, it cannot be blasphemy to call Him God whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world. The point for us to note, however, is merely that Jesus’ defense takes the form of an appeal to Scripture; and it is important to observe how He makes this appeal. In the first place, He adduces the Scriptures as law: "Is it not written in your law?" He demands. The passage of Scripture which He adduces is not written in that portion of Scripture which was more specifically called "the Law," that is to say, the Pentateuch; nor in any portion of Scripture of formally legal contents. It is written in the Book of Pss; and in a particular psalm which is as far as possible from presenting the external characteristics of legal enactment (Ps 82:6). When Jesus adduces this passage, then, as written in the "law" of the Jews, He does it, not because it stands in this psalm, but because it is a part of Scripture at large. In other words, He here ascribes legal authority to the entirety of Scripture, in accordance with a conception common enough among the Jews (compare Joh 12:34), and finding expression in the New Testament occasionally, both on the lips of Jesus Himself, and in the writings of the apostles. Thus, on a later occasion (Joh 15:25), Jesus declares that it is written in the "law" of the Jews, "They hated me without a cause," a clause found in Ps 35:19. And Paul assigns passages both

from the Psalms and from Isa to "the Law" (1Co 14:21; Ro 3:19), and can write such a sentence as this (Ga 4:21 f) :"Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written ...." quoting from the narrative of Gen. We have seen that the entirety of Scripture was conceived as "prophecy"; we now see that the entirety of Scripture was also conceived as "law": these three terms, the law, prophecy, Scripture, were indeed, materially, strict synonyms, as our present passage itself advises us, by varying the formula of adduction in contiguous verses from "law" to "scripture." And what is thus implied in the manner in which Scripture is adduced, is immediately afterward spoken out in the most explicit language, because it forms an essential element in Our Lord's defense. It might have been enough to say simply, "Is it not written in your law?" But our Lord, determined to drive His appeal to Scripture home, sharpens the point to the utmost by adding with the highest emphasis: "and the scripture cannot be broken." This is the reason why it is worth while to appeal to what is "written in the law," because "the scripture cannot be broken." The word "broken" here is the common one for breaking the law, or the Sabbath, or the like (Joh 5:18; 7:23; Mt 5:19), and the meaning of the declaration is that it is impossible for the Scripture to be annulled, its authority to be withstood, or denied. The movement of thought is to the effect that, because it is impossible for the Scripture—the term is perfectly general and witnesses to the unitary character of Scripture (it is all, for the purpose in hand, of a piece)—to be withstood, therefore this particular Scripture which is cited must be taken as of irrefragable authority. What we have here is, therefore, the strongest possible assertion of the indefectible authority of Scripture; precisely what is true of Scripture is that it "cannot be broken." Now, what is the particular thing in Scripture, for the confirmation of which the indefectible authority of Scripture is thus invoked? It is one of its most casual clauses—more than that, the very form of its expression in one of its most casual clauses. This means, of course, that in the Savior's view the indefectible authority of Scripture attaches to the very form of expression of its most casual clauses. It belongs to Scripture through and through, down to its most minute particulars, that it is of indefectible authority.

It is sometimes suggested, it is true, that our Lord's argument here is an argumentum ad hominem, and that His words, therefore, express not His own view of the authority of Scripture, but that of His Jewish opponents. It will scarcely be denied that there is a vein of satire running through our Lord's defense: that the Jews so readily allowed that corrupt judges might properly be called "gods," but could not endure that He whom the Father had consecrated and sent into the world should call Himself Son of God, was a somewhat pungent fact to throw up into such a high light. But the argument from Scripture is not ad hominem but e concessu; Scripture was common ground with Jesus and His opponents. If proof were needed for so obvious a fact, it would be supplied by the circumstance that this is not an isolated but a representative passage. The conception of Scripture thrown up into such clear view here supplies the ground of all Jesus' appeals to Scripture, and of all the appeals of the New Testament writers as well. Everywhere, to Him and to them alike, an appeal to Scripture is an appeal to an indefectible authority whose determination is final; both He and they make their appeal indifferently to every part of Scripture, to every element in Scripture, to its most incidental clauses as well as to its most fundamental principles, and to the very form of its expression. This attitude toward Scripture as an authoritative document is, indeed, already intimated by their constant designation of it by the name of Scripture, the Scriptures, that is "the Document," by way of eminence; and by their customary citation of it with the simple formula, "It is written." What is written in this document admits so little of questioning that its authoritativeness required no asserting, but might safely be taken for granted. Both modes of expression belong to the

constantly illustrated habitudes of our Lord's speech. The first words He is recorded as uttering after His manifestation to Israel were an appeal to the unquestionable authority of Scripture; to Satan's temptations He opposed no other weapon than the final "It is written"! (Mt 4:4,7,10; Lu 4:4,8). And among the last words which He spoke to His disciples before He was received up was a rebuke to them for not understanding that all things "which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and psalms" concerning Him—that is (Lu 24:45) in the entire "Scriptures"—"must needs be" (very emphatic) "fulfilled" (Lu 24:44). "Thus it is written," says He (Lu 24:46), as rendering all doubt absurd. For, as He had explained earlier upon the same day (Lu 24:25), it argues only that one is "foolish and slow of heart" if he does not "believe in" (if his faith does not rest securely on, as on a firm foundation) "all" (without limit of subject-matter here) "that the prophets" (explained in Lu 24:27 as equivalent to "all the scriptures") "have spoken."

4. Christ's Declaration That Scripture Must Be Fulfilled:

The necessity of the fulfillment of all that is written in Scripture, which is so strongly asserted in these last instructions to His disciples, is frequently adverted to by our Lord. He repeatedly explains of occurrences occasionally happening that they have come to pass "that the scripture might be fulfilled" (Mr 14:49; Joh 13:18; 17:12; compare Joh 12:14; Mr 9:12,13). On the basis of Scriptural declarations, therefore, He announces with confidence that given events will certainly occur: "All ye shall be offended (literally, "scandalized") in me this night: for it is written ...."(Mt 26:31; Mr 14:27; compare Lu 20:17). Although holding at His command ample means of escape, He bows before on-coming calamities, for, He asks, how otherwise "should the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" (Mt 26:54). It is not merely the two disciples with whom He talked on the way to Emmaus (Lu 24:25) whom He rebukes for not trusting themselves more perfectly to the teaching of Scripture. "Ye search the scriptures," he says to the Jews, in the classical passage (Joh 5:39), "because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me; and ye will not come to me, that ye may have life!" These words surely were spoken more in sorrow than in scorn: there is no blame implied either for searching the Scriptures or for thinking that eternal life is to be found in Scripture; approval rather. What the Jews are blamed for is that they read with a veil lying upon their hearts which He would fain take away (2Co 3:15 f). "Ye search the scriptures"—that is right: and "even you" (emphatic) "think to have eternal life in them"—that is right, too. But "it is these very Scriptures" (very emphatic) "which are bearing witness" (continuous process) "of me; and" (here is the marvel!) "ye will not come to me and have life!"—that you may, that is, reach the very end you have so properly in view in searching the Scriptures. Their failure is due, not to the Scriptures but to themselves, who read the Scriptures to such little purpose.

5. His Testimony That God Is Author of Scripture:

Quite similarly our Lord often finds occasion to express wonder at the little effect to which Scripture had been read, not because it had been looked into too curiously, but because it had not been looked into earnestly enough, with sufficiently simple and robust trust in its every declaration. "Have ye not read even this scripture?" He demands, as He adduces Ps 118 to show that the rejection of the Messiah was already intimated in Scripture (Mr 12:10; Mt 21:42 varies the expression to the equivalent: "Did ye

never read in the scriptures?"). And when the indignant Jews came to Him complaining of the Hosannas with which the children in the Temple were acclaiming Him, and demanding, "Hearest thou what these are saying?" He met them (Mt 21:16) merely with, "Yea: did ye never read, Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou has perfected praise?" The underlying thought of these passages is spoken out when He intimates that the source of all error in Divine things is just ignorance of the Scriptures: "Ye do err," He declares to His questioners, on an important occasion, "not knowing the scriptures" (Mt 22:29); or, as it is put, perhaps more forcibly, in interrogative form, in its parallel in another Gospel: "Is it not for this cause that ye err, that ye know not the scriptures?" (Mr 12:24). Clearly, he who rightly knows the Scriptures does not err. The confidence with which Jesus rested on Scripture, in its every declaration, is further illustrated in a passage like Mt 19:4. Certain Pharisees had come to Him with a question on divorce and He met them thus: "Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh? .... What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." The point to be noted is the explicit reference of Ge 2:24 to God as its author: "He who made them .... said"; "what therefore God hath joined together." Yet this passage does not give us a saying of God's recorded in Scripture, but just the word of Scripture itself, and can be treated as a declaration of God's only on the hypothesis that all Scripture is a declaration of God's. The parallel in Mr (10:5 ff) just as truly, though not as explicitly, assigns the passage to God as its author, citing it as authoritative law and speaking of its enactment as an act of God's. And it is interesting to observe in passing that Paul, having occasion to quote the same passage (1Co 6:16), also explicitly quotes it as a Divine word: "For, The twain, saith he, shall become one flesh"—the "he" here, in accordance with a usage to be noted later, meaning just "God."

Thus clear is it that Jesus' occasional adduction of Scripture as an authoritative document rests on an ascription of it to God as its author. His testimony is that whatever stands written in Scripture is a word of God. Nor can we evacuate this testimony of its force on the plea that it represents Jesus only in the days of His flesh, when He may be supposed to have reflected merely the opinions of His day and generation. The view of Scripture He announces was, no doubt, the view of His day and generation as well as His own view. But there is no reason to doubt that it was held by Him, not because it was the current view, but because, in His Divine-human knowledge, He knew it to be true; for, even in His humiliation, He is the faithful and true witness. And in any event we should bear in mind that this was the view of the resurrected as well as of the humiliated Christ. It was after He had suffered and had risen again in the power of His Divine life that He pronounced those foolish and slow of heart who do not believe all that stands written in all the Scriptures (Lu 24:25); and that He laid down the simple "Thus it is written" as the sufficient ground of confident belief (Lu 24:46). Nor can we explain away Jesus' testimony to the Divine trustworthiness of Scripture by interpreting it as not His own, but that of His followers, placed on His lips in their reports of His words. Not only is it too constant, minute, intimate and in part incidental, and therefore, as it were, hidden, to admit of this interpretation; but it so pervades all our channels of information concerning Jesus' teaching as to make it certain that it comes actually from Him. It belongs not only to the Jesus of our evangelical records but as well to the Jesus of the earlier sources which underlie our evangelical records, as anyone may assure himself by observing the instances in which Jesus adduces the Scriptures as Divinely authoritative that are recorded in more than one of the Gospels (e.g. "It is written," Mt 4:4,7,10 (Lu 4:4,8,10); Mt 11:10; (Lu 7:27); Mt 21:13 (Lu

19:46; Mr 11:17); Mt 26:31 (Mr 14:21); "the scripture" or "the scriptures," Mt 19:4 (Mr 10:9); Mt 21:42 (Mr 12:10; Lu 20:17); Mt 22:29 (Mr 12:24; Lu 20:37); Mt 26:56 (Mr 14:49; Lu 24:44)). These passages alone would suffice to make clear to us the testimony of Jesus to Scripture as in all its parts and declarations Divinely authoritative.

6. Similar Testimony of His Immediate Followers

The attempt to attribute the testimony of Jesus to His followers has in its favor only the undeniable fact that the testimony of the writers of the New Testament is to precisely the same effect as His. They, too, cursorily Apostles speak of Scripture by that pregnant name and adduce it with the simple "It is written," with the implication that whatever stands written in it is Divinely authoritative. As Jesus' official life begins with this "It is written" (Mt 4:4), so the evangelical proclamation begins with an "Even as it is written" (Mr 1:2); and as Jesus sought the justification of His work in a solemn "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day" (Lu 24:46), so the apostles solemnly justified the Gospel which they preached, detail after detail, by appeal to the Scriptures, "That Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures" and "That he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (1Co 15:3,4; compare Ac 8:35; 17:3; 26:22, and also Ro 1:17; 3:4,10; 4:17; 11:26; 14:11; 1Co 1:19; 2:9; 3:19; 15:45; Ga 3:10,13; 4:22,27). Wherever they carried the gospel it was as a gospel resting on Scripture that they proclaimed it (Ac 17:2; 18:24,28); and they encouraged themselves to test its truth by the Scriptures (Ac 17:11). The holiness of life they inculcated, they based on Scriptural requirement (1Pe 1:16), and they commended the royal law of love which they taught by Scriptural sanction (Jas 2:8). Every detail of duty was supported by them by an appeal to Scripture (Ac 23:5; Ro 12:19). The circumstances of their lives and the events occasionally occurring about them are referred to Scripture for their significance (Ro 2:26; 8:36; 9:33; 11:8; 15:9,21; 2Co 4:13). As our Lord declared that whatever was written in Scripture must needs be fulfilled (Mt 26:54; Lu 22:37; 24:44), so His followers explained one of the most startling facts which had occurred in their experience by pointing out that "it was needful that the scripture should be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit spake before by the mouth of David" (Ac 1:16). Here the ground of this constant appeal to Scripture, so that it is enough that a thing "is contained in scripture" (1Pe 2:6) for it to be of indefectible authority, is plainly enough declared: Scripture must needs be fulfilled, for what is contained in it is the declaration of the Holy Ghost through the human author. What Scripture says, God says; and accordingly we read such remarkable declarations as these: "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, For this very purpose did I raise thee up" (Ro 9:17); "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the gospel beforehand unto Abraham, ... In thee shall all the nations be blessed" (Ga 3:8). These are not instances of simple personification of Scripture, which is itself a sufficiently remarkable usage (Mr 15:28; Joh 7:38,42; 19:37; Ro 4:3; 10:11; 11:2; Ga 4:30; 1Ti 5:18; Jas 2:23; 4:5 f), vocal with the conviction expressed by James (4:5) that Scripture cannot speak in vain. They indicate a certain confusion in current speech between "Scripture" and "God," the outgrowth of a deep-seated conviction that the word of Scripture is the word of God. It was not "Scripture" that spoke to Pharaoh, or gave his great promise to Abraham, but God. But "Scripture" and "God" lay so close together in the minds of the writers of the New Testament that they could naturally speak of "Scripture" doing what Scripture records God as doing. It was, however, even more natural to them to speak casually of God saying what the Scriptures say; and accordingly we meet with forms of speech such as these: "Wherefore, even as the

Holy Spirit saith, Today if ye shall hear His voice," etc. (Heb 3:7, quoting Ps 95:7); "Thou art God .... who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said, Why did the heathen rage," etc. (Ac 4:25 the King James Version, quoting Ps 2:1); "He that raised him from the dead .... hath spoken on this wise, I will give you .... because he saith also in another (place) ...."(Ac 13:34, quoting Isa 55:3 and Ps 16:10), and the like. The words put into God's mouth in each case are not words of God recorded in the Scriptures, but just Scripture words in themselves. When we take the two classes of passages together, in the one of which the Scriptures are spoken of as God, while in the other God is spoken of as if He were the Scriptures, we may perceive how close the identification of the two was in the minds of the writers of the New Testament.

7. Their Identification of God and Scripture:

This identification is strikingly observable in certain catenae of quotations, in which there are brought together a number of passages of Scripture closely connected with one another. The first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews supplies an example. We may begin with Heb 1:5:"for unto which of the angels said he"—the subject being necessarily "God"—"at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee?"—the citation being from Ps 2:7 and very appropriate in the mouth of God—"and again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?"—from 2Sa 7:14, again a declaration of God's own —"And when he again bringeth in the firstborn into the world he saith, And let all the angels of God worship him"—from De 32:43, Septuagint, or Ps 97:7, in neither of which is God the speaker—"And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire"—from Ps 104:4, where again God is not the speaker but is spoken of in the third person—"but of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, etc."—from Ps 45:6,7 where again God is not the speaker, but is addressed—"And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning," etc.—from Ps 102:25-27, where again God is not the speaker but is addressed—"But of which of the angels hath he said at any time, Sit thou on my right hand?" etc.—from Ps 110:1, in which God is the speaker. Here we have passages in which God is the speaker and passages in which God is not the speaker, but is addressed or spoken of, indiscriminately assigned to God, because they all have it in common that they are words of Scripture, and as words of Scripture are words of God. Similarly in Ro 15:9 ff we have a series of citations the first of which is introduced by "as it is written," and the next two by "again he saith," and "again," and the last by "and again, Isaiah saith," the first being from Ps 18:49; the second from De 32:43; the third from Ps 117:1; and the last from Isa 11:10. Only the last (the only one here assigned to the human author) is a word of God in the text of the Old Testament.

INSPIRATION, 8-18

8. The "Oracles of God":

This view of the Scriptures as a compact mass of words of God occasioned the formation of a designation for them by which this their character was explicitly expressed. This designation is "the sacred oracles," "the oracles of God." It occurs with extraordinary frequency in Philo, who very commonly refers to Scripture as "the sacred oracles" and cites its several passages as each an "oracle."

Sharing, as they do, Philo's conception of the Scriptures as, in all their parts, a word of God, the New Testament writers naturally also speak of them under this designation. The classical passage is Ro 3:2 (compare Heb 5:12; Ac 7:38). Here Paul begins an enumeration of the advantages which belonged to the chosen people above other nations; and, after declaring these advantages to have been great and numerous, he places first among them all their possession of the Scriptures: "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what is the profit of circumcision? Much every way: first of all, that they were entrusted with the oracles of God." That by "the oracles of God" here are meant just the Holy Scriptures in their entirety, conceived as a direct Divine revelation, and not any portions of them, or elements in them more especially thought of as revelatory, is perfectly clear from the wide contemporary use of this designation in this sense by Philo, and is put beyond question by the presence in the New Testament of habitudes of speech which rest on and grow out of the conception of Scripture embodied in this term. From the point of view of this designation, Scripture is thought of as the living voice of God speaking in all its parts directly to the reader; and, accordingly, it is cited by some such formula as "it is said," and this mode of citing Scripture duly occurs as an alternative to "it is written" (Lu 4:12 replacing "it is written" in Matthew; Heb 3:15; compare Ro 4:18). It is due also to this point of view that Scripture is cited, not as what God or the Holy Spirit "said," but what He "says," the present tense emphasizing the living voice of God speaking in Scriptures to the individual soul (Heb 3:7; Ac 13:35; Heb 1:7,8,10; Ro 15:10). And especially there is due to it the peculiar usage by which Scripture is cited by the simple "saith, without expressed subject, the subject being too well understood, when Scripture is adduced, to require stating; for who could be the speaker of the words of Scripture but God only (Ro 15:10; 1Co 6:16; 2Co 6:2; Ga 3:16; Eph 4:8; 5:14)? The analogies of this pregnant subjectless "saith" are very widespread. It was with it that the ancient Pythagoreans and Platonists and the medieval Aristotelians adduced each their master's teaching; it was with it that, in certain circles, the judgments of Hadrian's great jurist Salvius Julianus were cited; African stylists were even accustomed to refer by it to Sallust, their great model. There is a tendency, cropping out occasionally, in the Old Testament, to omit the name of God as superfluous, when He, as the great logical subject always in mind, would be easily understood (compare Job 20:23; 21:17; Ps 114:2; La 4:22). So, too, when the New Testament writers quoted Scripture there was no need to say whose word it was: that lay beyond question in every mind. This usage, accordingly, is a specially striking intimation of the vivid sense which the New Testament writers had of the Divine origin of the Scriptures, and means that in citing them they were acutely conscious that they were citing immediate words of God. How completely the Scriptures were to them just the word of God may be illustrated by a passage like Ga 3:16: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." We have seen our Lord hanging an argument on the very words of Scripture (Joh 10:34); elsewhere His reasoning depends on the particular tense (Mt 22:32) or word (Mt 22:43) used in Scripture. Here Paul's argument rests similarly on a grammatical form. No doubt. it is the grammatical form of the word which God is recorded as having spoken to Abraham that is in question. But Paul knows what grammatical form God employed in speaking to Abraham only as the Scriptures have transmitted it to him; and, as we have seen, in citing the words of God and the words of Scripture he was not accustomed to make any distinction between them. It is probably the Scriptural word as a Scriptural word, therefore, which he has here in mind: though, of course, it is possible that what he here witnesses to is rather the detailed trustworthiness of the Scriptural record than its direct divinity—if we can separate two things which apparently were not separated in Paul's mind. This much we can at least say without straining, that the designation of Scripture as "scripture" and its citation by the formula, "It is

written," attest primarily its indefectible authority; the designation of it as "oracles" and the adduction of it by the formula, "It says," attest primarily its immediate divinity. Its authority rests on its divinity and its divinity expresses itself in its trustworthiness; and the New Testament writers in all their use of it treat it as what they declare it to be—a God-breathed document, which, because God-breathed, is through and through trustworthy in all its assertions, authoritative in all its declarations, and down to its last particular, the very word of God, His "oracles."

9. The Human Element in Scripture:

That the Scriptures are throughout a Divine book, created by the Divine energy and speaking in their every part with Divine authority directly to the heart of the readers, is the fundamental fact concerning Scripture them which is witnessed by Christ and the sacred writers to whom we owe the New Testament. But the strength and constancy with which they bear witness to this primary fact do not prevent their recognizing by the side of it that the Scriptures have come into being by the agency of men. It would be inexact to say that they recognize a human element in Scripture: they do not parcel Scripture out, assigning portions of it, or elements in it, respectively to God and man. In their view the whole of Scripture in all its parts and in all its elements, down to the least minutiae, in form of expression as well as in substance of teaching, is from God; but the whole of it has been given by God through the instrumentality of men. There is, therefore, in their view, not, indeed, a human element or ingredient in Scripture, and much less human divisions or sections of Scripture, but a human side or aspect to Scripture; and they do not fail to give full recognition to this human side or aspect. In one of the primary passages which has already been before us, their conception is given, if somewhat broad and very succinct, yet clear expression. No ‘prophecy,’ Peter tells us (2Pe 1:21), ‘ever came by the will of man; but as borne by the Holy Ghost, men spake from God.’ Here the whole initiative is assigned to God, and such complete control of the human agents that the product is truly God’s work. The men who speak in this "prophecy of scripture" speak not of themselves or out of themselves, but from "God": they speak only as they are "borne by the Holy Ghost." But it is they, after all, who speak. Scripture is the product of man, but only of man speaking from God and under such a control of the Holy Spirit as that in their speaking they are "borne" by Him. The conception obviously is that the Scriptures have been given by the instrumentality of men; and this conception finds repeated incidental expression throughout the New Testament.

It is this conception, for example, which is expressed when our Lord, quoting Ps 110, declares of its words that "David himself said in the Holy Spirit" (Mr 12:36). There is a certain emphasis here on the words being David’s own words, which is due to the requirements of the argument our Lord was conducting, but which none the less sincerely represents our Lord’s conception of their origin. They are David’s own words which we find in Ps 110, therefore; but they are David’s own words, spoken not of his own motion merely, but "in the Holy Spirit," that is to say—we could not better paraphrase it—"as borne by the Holy Spirit." In other words, they are "God-breathed" words and therefore authoritative in a sense above what any words of David, not spoken in the Holy Spirit, could possibly be. Generalizing the matter, we may say that the words of Scripture are conceived by our Lord and the New Testament writers as the words of their human authors when speaking "in the Holy Spirit," that is to say, by His initiative and under His controlling direction. The conception finds even more precise expression,

perhaps, in such a statement as we find—it is Peter who is speaking and it is again a psalm which is cited —in Ac 1:16, "The Holy Spirit spake by the mouth of David." Here the Holy Spirit is adduced, of course, as the real author of what is said (and hence, Peter's certainty that what is said will be fulfilled); but David's mouth is expressly designated as the instrument (it is the instrumental preposition that is used) by means of which the Holy Spirit speaks the Scripture in question. He does not speak save through David's mouth. Accordingly, in Ac 4:25, 'the Lord that made the heaven and earth,' acting by His Holy Spirit, is declared to have spoken another psalm 'through the mouth of .... David,' His "servant"; and in Mt 13:35 still another psalm is adduced as "spoken through the prophet" (compare Mt 2:5). In the very act of energetically asserting the Divine origin of Scripture the human instrumentality through which it is given is constantly recognized. The New Testament writers have, therefore, no difficulty in assigning Scripture to its human authors, or in discovering in Scripture traits due to its human authorship. They freely quote it by such simple formulas as these: "Moses saith" (Ro 10:19); "Moses said" (Mt 22:24; Mr 10; Ac 3:22); "Moses writeth" (Ro 10:5); "Moses wrote" (Mr 12:19; Lu 20:28); "Isaiah .... saith" (Ro 10:20); "Isaiah said" (Joh 12:39); "Isaiah crieth" (Ro 9:27); "Isaiah hath said before" (Ro 9:29); "said Isaiah the prophet" (Joh 1:23); "did Isaiah prophesy" (Mr 7:6; Mt 15:7); "David saith" (Lu 20:42; Ac 2:25; Ro 11:9); "David said" (Mr 12:36). It is to be noted that when thus Scripture is adduced by the names of its human authors, it is a matter of complete indifference whether the words adduced are comments of these authors or direct words of God recorded by them. As the plainest words of the human authors are assigned to God as their real author, so the most express words of God, repeated by the Scriptural writers, are cited by the names of these human writers (Mt 15:7; Mr 7:6; Ro 10:5 19,20; compare Mr 7:10 from the Decalogue). To say that "Moses" or "David says," is evidently thus only a way of saying that "Scripture says," which is the same as to say that "God says." Such modes of citing Scripture, accordingly, carry us little beyond merely connecting the name, or perhaps we may say the individuality, of the several writers with the portions of Scripture given through each. How it was given through them is left meanwhile, if not without suggestion, yet without specific explanation. We seem safe only in inferring this much: that the gift of Scripture through its human authors took place by a process much more intimate than can be expressed by the term "dictation," and that it took place in a process in which the control of the Holy Spirit was too complete and pervasive to permit the human qualities of the secondary authors in any way to condition the purity of the product as the word of God. The Scriptures, in other words, are conceived by the writers of the New Testament as through and through God's book, in every part expressive of His mind, given through men after a fashion which does no violence to their nature as men, and constitutes the book also men's book as well as God's, in every part expressive of the mind of its human authors.

10. Activities of God in Giving Scripture:

If we attempt to get behind this broad statement and to obtain a more detailed conception of the activities by which God has given the Scriptures, we are thrown back upon somewhat general representations, supported by the analogy of the modes Scripture of God's working in other spheres of His operation. It is very desirable that we should free ourselves at the outset from influences arising from the current employment of the term "inspiration" to designate this process. This term is not a Biblical term and its etymological implications are not perfectly accordant with the Biblical conception of the modes of the Divine operation in giving the Scriptures. The Biblical writers do not conceive of the

Scriptures as a human product breathed into by the Divine Spirit, and thus heightened in its qualities or endowed with new qualities; but as a Divine product produced through the instrumentality of men. They do not conceive of these men, by whose instrumentality Scripture is produced, as working upon their own initiative, though energized by God to greater effort and higher achievement, but as moved by the Divine initiative and borne by the irresistible power of the Spirit of God along ways of His choosing to ends of His appointment. The difference between the two conceptions may not appear great when the mind is fixed exclusively upon the nature of the resulting product. But they are differing conceptions, and look at the production of Scripture from distinct points of view—the human and the Divine; and the involved mental attitudes toward the origin of Scripture are very diverse. The term "inspiration" is too firmly fixed, in both theological and popular usage, as the technical designation of the action of God in giving the Scriptures, to be replaced; and we may be thankful that its native implications lie as close as they do to the Biblical conceptions. Meanwhile, however, it may be justly insisted that it shall receive its definition from the representations of Scripture, and not be permitted to impose upon our thought ideas of the origin of Scripture derived from an analysis of its own implications, etymological or historical. The Scriptural conception of the relation of the Divine Spirit to the human authors in the production of Scripture is better expressed by the figure of "bearing" than by the figure of "inbreathing"; and when our Biblical writers speak of the action of the Spirit of God in this relation as a breathing, they represent it as a "breathing out" of the Scriptures by the Spirit, and not a "breathing into" the Scriptures by Him.

11. General Problem of Origin: God’s Part:

So soon, however, as we seriously endeavor to form for ourselves a clear conception of the precise nature of the Divine action in this "breathing out" of the Scriptures—this "bearing" of the writers of the Scriptures to their appointed goal of the production of a book of Divine trustworthiness and indefectible authority—we become acutely aware of a more deeply lying and much wider problem, apart from which this one of inspiration, technically so called, cannot be profitably considered. This is the general problem of the origin of the Scriptures and the part of God in all that complex of processes by the interaction of which these books, which we call the sacred Scriptures, with all their peculiarities, and all their qualities of whatever sort, have been brought into being. For, of course, these books were not produced suddenly, by some miraculous act—handed down complete out of heaven, as the phrase goes; but, like all other products of time, are the ultimate effect of many processes cooperating through long periods. There is to be considered, for instance, the preparation of the material which forms the subject-matter of these books: in a sacred history, say, for example, to be narrated; or in a religious experience which may serve as a norm for record; or in a logical elaboration of the contents of revelation which may be placed at the service of God’s people; or in the progressive revelation of Divine truth itself, supplying their culminating contents. And there is the preparation of the men to write these books to be considered, a preparation physical, intellectual, spiritual, which must have attended them throughout their whole lives, and, indeed, must have had its beginning in their remote ancestors, and the effect of which was to bring the right men to the right places at the right times, with the right endowments, impulses, acquirements, to write just the books which were designed for them. When "inspiration," technically so called, is superinduced on lines of preparation like these, it takes on quite a different aspect from that which it bears when it is thought of as an isolated action of the Divine Spirit operating out of all relation to historical processes. Representations are sometimes made as if, when God wished to produce sacred

books which would incorporate His will—a series of letters like those of Paul, for example—He was reduced to the necessity of going down to earth and painfully scrutinizing the men He found there, seeking anxiously for the one who, on the whole, promised best for His purpose; and then violently forcing the material He wished expressed through him, against his natural bent, and with as little loss from his recalcitrant characteristics as possible. Of course, nothing of the sort took place. If God wished to give His people a series of letters like Paul's, He prepared a Paul to write them, and the Paul He brought to the task was a Paul who spontaneously would write just such letters.

12. How Human Qualities Affected Scripture. Providential Preparation:

If we bear this in mind, we shall know what estimate to place upon the common representation to the effect that the human characteristics of the writers must, and in point of fact do, condition and qualify the writings produced by them, the implication being that, therefore, we cannot get from mark a pure word of God. As light that passes through the colored glass of a cathedral window, we are told, is light from heaven, but is stained by the tints of the glass through which it passes; so any word of God which is passed through the mind and soul of a man must come out discolored by the personality through which it is given, and just to that degree ceases to be the pure word of God. But what if this personality has itself been formed by God into precisely the personality it is, for the express purpose of communicating to the word given through it just the coloring which it gives it? What if the colors of the stained-glass window have been designed by the architect for the express purpose of giving to the light that floods the cathedral precisely the tone and quality it receives from them? What if the word of God that comes to His people is framed by God into the word of God it is, precisely by means of the qualities of the men formed by Him for the purpose, through which it is given? When we think of God the Lord giving by His Spirit a body of authoritative Scriptures to His people, we must remember that He is the God of providence and of grace as well as of revelation and inspiration, and that He holds all the lines of preparation as fully under His direction as He does the specific operation which we call technically, in the narrow sense, by the name of "inspiration." The production of the Scriptures is, in point of fact, a long process, in the course of which numerous and very varied Divine activities are involved, providential, gracious, miraculous, all of which must be taken into account in any attempt to explain the relation of God to the production of Scripture. When they are all taken into account we can no longer wonder that the resultant Scriptures are constantly spoken of as the pure word of God. We wonder, rather, that an additional operation of God—what we call specifically "inspiration," in its technical sense—was thought necessary. Consider, for example, how a piece of sacred history—say the Book of Chronicles, or the great historical work, Gospel and Acts, of Luke—is brought to the writing. There is first of all the preparation of the history to be written: God the Lord leads the sequence of occurrences through the development He has designed for them that they may convey their lessons to His people: a "teleological" or "etiological" character is inherent in the very course of events. Then He prepares a man, by birth, training, experience, gifts of grace, and, if need be, of revelation, capable of appreciating this historical development and eager to search it out, thrilling in all his being with its lessons and bent upon making them clear and effective to others. When, then, by His providence, God sets this man to work on the writing of this history, will there not be spontaneously written by him the history which it was Divinely intended should be written? Or consider how a psalmist would be prepared to put into moving verse a piece of normative religious experience: how he would be born with just the right quality of

religious sensibility, of parents through whom he should receive just the right hereditary bent, and from whom he should get precisely the right religious example and training, in circumstances of life in which his religious tendencies should be developed precisely on right lines; how he would be brought through just the right experiences to quicken in him the precise emotions he would be called upon to express, and finally would be placed in precisely the exigencies which would call out their expression. Or consider the providential preparation of a writer of a didactic epistle—by means of which he should be given the intellectual breadth and acuteness, and be trained in habitudes of reasoning, and placed in the situations which would call out precisely the argumentative presentation of Christian truth which was required of him. When we give due place in our thoughts to the universality of the providential government of God, to the minuteness and completeness of its sway, and to its invariable efficacy, we may be inclined to ask what is needed beyond this mere providential government to secure the production of sacred books which should be in every detail absolutely accordant with the Divine will.

13. "Inspiration" More than Mere "Providence":

The answer is, Nothing is needed beyond mere providence to secure such books—provided only that it does not lie in the Divine purpose that these books should possess qualities which rise above the powers of men to produce, even under the most complete Divine guidance. For providence is guidance; and guidance can bring one only so far as his own power can carry him. If heights are to be scaled above man’s native power to achieve, then something more than guidance, however effective, is necessary. This is the reason for the superinduction, at the end of the long process of the production of Scripture, of the additional Divine operation which we call technically "inspiration." By it, the Spirit of God, flowing confluently in with the providentially and graciously determined work of men, spontaneously producing under the Divine directions the writings appointed to them, gives the product a Divine quality unattainable by human powers alone. Thus, these books become not merely the word of godly men, but the immediate word of God Himself, speaking directly as such to the minds and hearts of every reader. The value of "inspiration" emerges, thus, as twofold. It gives to the books written under its "bearing" a quality which is truly superhuman; a trustworthiness, an authority, a searchingness, a profundity, a profitableness which is altogether Divine. And it speaks this Divine word immediately to each reader’s heart and conscience; so that he does not require to make his way to God, painfully, perhaps even uncertainly, through the words of His servants, the human instruments in writing the Scriptures, but can listen directly to the Divine voice itself speaking immediately in the Scriptural word to him.

14. Witness of New Testament Writers to Divine Operation:

That the writers of the New Testament themselves conceive the Scriptures to have been produced thus by Divine operations extending through the increasing ages and involving a multitude of varied activities, can be made clear by simply attending to the occasional references they make to this or that step in the process. It lies, for example, on the face of their expositions, that they of New Testament looked upon the Biblical history as teleological. Not only do they tell us that to "whatsoever things were written afore-time were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope" (Ro 15:4; compare Ro 4:23,14); they speak also of the course of the historical events themselves as guided for our benefit: "Now these things happened unto them by way of

example"—in a typical fashion, in such a way that, as they occurred, a typical character, or predictive reference impressed itself upon them; that is to say, briefly, the history occurred as it did in order to bear a message to us—"and they were written for our admonition, upon whom the ends of the ages are come" (1Co 10:11; compare 1Co 10:6). Accordingly, it has become a commonplace of Biblical exposition that "the history of redemption itself is a typically progressive one" (Kuper), and is "in a manner impregnated with the prophetic element," so as to form a "part of a great plan which stretches from the fall of man to the first consummation of all things in glory; and, in so far as it reveals the mind of God toward man, carries a respect to the future not less than to the present" (P. Fairbairn). It lies equally on the face of the New Testament allusions to the subject that its writers understood that the preparation of men to become vehicles of God's message to man was not of yesterday, but had its beginnings in the very origin of their being. The call by which Paul, for example, was made an apostle of Jesus Christ was sudden and apparently without antecedents; but it is precisely this Paul who reckons this call as only one step in a long process, the beginnings of which antedated his own existence: "But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me" (Ga 1:15,16; compare Jer 1:5; Isa 49:1,5). The recognition by the writers of the New Testament of the experiences of God's grace, which had been vouchsafed to them as an integral element in their fitting to be the bearers of His gospel to others, finds such pervasive expression that the only difficulty is to select from the mass the most illustrative passages. Such a statement as Paul gives in the opening verses of 2Co is thoroughly typical. There he represents that he has been afflicted and comforted to the end that he might "be able to comfort them that are in any affliction, through the comfort wherewith" he had himself been "comforted of God." For, he explains, Whether we are afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer" (2Co 1:4-6). It is beyond question, therefore, that the New Testament writers, when they declare the Scriptures to be the product of the Divine breath, and explain this as meaning that the writers of these Scriptures wrote them only as borne by the Holy Spirit in such a fashion that they spoke, not out of themselves, but "from God," are thinking of this operation of the Spirit only as the final act of God in the production of the Scriptures, superinduced upon a long series of processes, providential, gracious, miraculous, by which the matter of Scripture had been prepared for writing, and the men for writing it, and the writing of it had been actually brought to pass. It is this final act in the production of Scripture which is technically called "inspiration"; and inspiration is thus brought before us as, in the minds of the writers of the New Testament, that particular operation of God in the production of Scripture which takes effect at the very point of the writing of Scripture—understanding the term "writing" here as inclusive of all the processes of the actual composition of Scripture, the investigation of documents, the collection of facts, the excogitation of conclusions, the adaptation of exhortations as means to ends and the like—with the effect of giving to the resultant Scripture a specifically supernatural character, and constituting it a Divine, as well as human, book. Obviously the mode of operation of this Divine activity moving to this result is conceived, in full accord with the analogy of the Divine operations in other spheres of its activity, in providence and in grace alike, as confluent with the human activities operative in the case; as, in a word, of the nature of what has come to be known as "immanent action."

15. "Inspiration" and "Revelation":

It will not escape observation that thus "inspiration" is made a mode of "revelation." We are often exhorted, to be sure, to distinguish sharply between "inspiration" and "revelation"; and the exhortation is just when "revelation" is taken in one of its narrower senses, of, say, an external manifestation of God, or of an immediate communication from God in words. But "inspiration" does not differ from "revelation" in these narrowed senses as genus from genus, but as a species of one genus differs from another. That operation of God which we call "inspiration," that is to say, that operation of the Spirit of God by which He "bears" men in the process of composing Scripture, so that they write, not of themselves, but "from God," is one of the modes in which God makes known to men His being, His will, His operations, His purposes. It is as distinctly a mode of revelation as any mode of revelation can be, and therefore it performs the same office which all revelation performs, that is to say, in the express words of Paul, it makes men wise, and makes them wise unto salvation. All "special" or "supernatural" revelation (which is redemptive in its very idea, and occupies a place as a substantial element in God's redemptive processes) has precisely this for its end; and Scripture, as a mode of the redemptive revelation of God, finds its fundamental purpose just in this: if the "inspiration" by which Scripture is produced renders it trustworthy and authoritative, it renders it trustworthy and authoritative only that it may the better serve to make men wise unto salvation. Scripture is conceived, from the point of view of the writers of the New Testament, not merely as the record of revelations, but as itself a part of the redemptive revelation of God; not merely as the record of the redemptive acts by which God is saving the world, but as itself one of these redemptive acts, having its own part to play in the great work of establishing and building up the kingdom of God. What gives it a place among the redemptive acts of God is its Divine origination, taken in its widest sense, as inclusive of all the Divine operations, providential, gracious and expressly supernatural, by which it has been made just what it is—a body of writings able to make wise unto salvation, and profitable for making the man of God perfect. What gives it its place among the modes of revelation is, however, specifically the culminating one of these Divine operations, which we call "inspiration"; that is to say, the action of the Spirit of God in so "bearing" its human authors in their work of producing Scripture, as that in these Scriptures they speak, not out of themselves, but "from God." It is this act by virtue of which the Scriptures may properly be called "God-breathed."

16. Scriptures a Divine-Human Book?:

It has been customary among a certain school of writers to speak of the Scriptures, because thus "inspired," as a Divine-human book, and to appeal to the analogy of Our Lord's Divine-human personality to explain their peculiar qualities as such. The expression calls attention to an important fact, and the analogy holds good a certain distance. There are human and Divine sides to Scripture, and, as we cursorily examine it, we may perceive in it, alternately, traits which suggest now the one, now the other factor in its origin. But the analogy with our Lord' s Divine-human personality may easily be pressed beyond reason. There is no hypostatic union between the Divine and the human in Scripture; we cannot parallel the "inscripturation" of the Holy Spirit and the incarnation of the Son of God. The Scriptures are merely the product of Divine and human forces working together to produce a product in the production of which the human forces work under the initiation and prevalent direction of the Divine: the person of our Lord unites in itself Divine and human natures, each of which retains its distinctness while operating only in relation to the other. Between such diverse things there can exist only a remote analogy; and, in

point of fact, the analogy in the present instance amounts to no more than that in both cases Divine and human factors are involved, though very differently. In the one they unite to constitute a Divine-human person, in the other they cooperate to perform a Divine-human work. Even so distant an analogy may enable us, however, to recognize that as, in the case of our Lord's person, the human nature remains truly human while yet it can never fall into sin or error because it can never act out of relation with the Divine nature into conjunction with which it has been brought; so in the case of the production of Scripture by the conjoint action of human and Divine factors, the human factors have acted as human factors and have left their mark on the product as such, and yet cannot have fallen into that error which we say it is human to fall into, because they have not acted apart from the Divine factors, by themselves, but only under their unerring guidance.

17. Scripture of New Testament Writers Was the Old Testament:

The New Testament testimony is to the Divine origin and qualities of "Scripture"; and "Scripture" to the writers of the New Testament was fundamentally, of course, the Old Testament. In the primary passage, in which we are told that "every" or "all Scripture" is "God breathed," the direct reference is to the "sacred writings" which Timothy had had in knowledge since his infancy, and these were, of course, just the sacred books of the Jews (2Ti 3:16). What is explicit here is implicit in all the allusions to inspired Scriptures in the New Testament. Accordingly, it is frequently said that our entire testimony to the inspiration of Scripture concerns the Old Testament alone. In many ways, however, this is overstated. Our present concern is not with the extent of "Scripture" but with the nature of "Scripture"; and we cannot present here the considerations which justify extending to the New Testament the inspiration which the New Testament writers attribute to the Old Testament. It will not be out of place, however, to point out simply that the New Testament writers obviously themselves made this extension. They do not for an instant imagine themselves, as ministers of a new covenant, less in possession of the Spirit of God than the ministers of the old covenant: they freely recognize, indeed, that they have no sufficiency of themselves, but they know that God has made them sufficient (2Co 3:5,6). They prosecute their work of proclaiming the gospel, therefore, in full confidence that they speak "by the Holy Spirit" (1Pe 1:12), to whom they attribute both the matter and form of their teaching (1Co 2:13). They, therefore, speak with the utmost assurance of their teaching (Ga 1:7,8); and they issue commands with the completest authority (1Th 4:2,14; 2Th 3:6,12), making it, indeed, the test of whether one has the Spirit that he should recognize what they demand as commandments of God (1Co 14:37). It would be strange, indeed, if these high claims were made for their oral teaching and commandments exclusively. In point of fact, they are made explicitly also for their written injunctions. It was "the things" which Paul was "writing," the recognition of which as commands of the Lord, he makes the test of a Spirit-led man (1Co 14:37). It is his "word by this epistle," obedience to which he makes the condition of Christian communion (2Th 3:14). There seems involved in such an attitude toward their own teaching, oral and written, a claim on the part of the New Testament writers to something very much like the "inspiration"which they attribute to the writers of the Old Testament.

18. Inclusion of New Testament:

And all doubt is dispelled when we observe the New Testament writers placing the writings of one

another in the same category of "Scripture" with the books of the Old Testament. The same Paul who, in 2Ti 3:16, declared that ‘every’ or ‘all scripture is God-breathed’ had already written in 1Ti 5:18: "For the scripture saith, Thou shall not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn (grain). And, The laborer is worthy of his hire." The first clause here is derived from Deuteronomy and the second from the Gospel of Luke, though both are cited as together constituting, or better, forming part of the "Scripture" which Paul adduces as so authoritative as by its mere citation to end all strife. Who shall say that, in the declaration of the later epistle that "all" or "every" Scripture is God-breathed, Paul did not have Luke, and, along with Luke, whatever other new books he classed with the old under the name of Scripture, in the back of his mind, along with those old books which Timothy had had in his hands from infancy? And the same Peter who declared that every "prophecy of scripture" was the product of men who spoke "from God," being ‘borne’ by the Holy Spirit (2Pe 1:21), in this same epistle (2Pe 3:16), places Paul’s Epistles in the category of Scripture along with whatever other books deserve that name. For Paul, says he, wrote these epistles, not out of his own wisdom, but "according to the wisdom given to him," and though there are some things in them hard to be understood, yet it is only the ignorant and unsteadfast" who wrest these difficult passages—as what else could be expected of men who wrest "also the other Scriptures" (obviously the Old Testament is meant)—"unto their own destruction"? Is it possible to say that Peter could not have had these epistles of Paul also lurking somewhere in the back of his mind, along with "the other scriptures," when he told his readers that every "prophecy of scripture" owes its origin to the prevailing operation of the Holy Ghost? What must be understood in estimating the testimony of the New Testament writers to the inspiration of Scripture is that "Scripture" stood in their minds as the title of a unitary body of books, throughout the gift of God through His Spirit to His people; but that this body of writings was at the same time understood to be a growing aggregate, so that what is said of it applies to the new books which were being added to it as the Spirit gave them, as fully as to the old books which had come down to them from their hoary past. It is a mere matter of detail to determine precisely what new books were thus included by them in the category "Scripture." They tell us some of them themselves. Those who received them from their hands tell us of others. And when we put the two bodies of testimony together we find that they constitute just our New Testament. It is no pressure of the witness of the writers of the New Testament to the inspiration of the Scripture, therefore, to look upon it as covering the entire body of "Scriptures," the new books which they were themselves adding to this aggregate, as well as the old books which they had received as Scripture from the fathers. Whatever can lay claim by just right to the appellation of "Scripture," as employed in its eminent sense by those writers, can by the same just right lay claim to the "inspiration" which they ascribe to this "Scripture."

LITERATURE.

J. Gerhard, Loci Theolog., Locus I; F. Turretin, Instit. Theol., Locus II; B. de Moor, Commentary in J. Marckii Comp., cap. ii; C. Hodge, Syst. Theol., New York, 1871, I, 151-86; Henry B. Smith, The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, New York, 1855, new edition, Cincinnati, 1891; A. Kuyper, Encyclopedia der heilige Godgeleerdheid, 1888-89, II, 347 ff, English translation; Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology, New York, 1898, 341-563; also De Schrift her woord Gods, Tiel, 1870; H. Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatiek2, Kampen, 1906, I, 406-527; R. Haldane, The Verbal Inspiration of the Scriptures Established, Edinburgh, 1830; J. T. Beck, Einleitung in das System der christlichen Lehre, Stuttgart, 1838, 2nd edition, 1870; A. G. Rudelbach, "Die Lehre yon der Inspiration der heil. Schrift,"

Zeitschrift fur die gesammte Lutherische Theologie und Kirche, 1840, 1, 1841, 1, 1842, 1; S. R. L. Gaussen, Theopneustie ou inspiration pleniere des saintes ecritures2, Paris, 1842, English translation by E. N. Kirk, New York, 1842; also Theopneustia; the Plenary Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, David Scott's translation, reedited and revised by B. W. Carr, with a preface by C. H. Spurgeon, London, 1888; William Lee, The Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, Donellan Lecture, 1852, New York, 1857; James Bannerman, Inspiration: the Infallible Truth and Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, Edinburgh, 1865; F. L. Patton, The Inspiration of the Scriptures, Philadelphia, 1869 (reviewing Lee and Bannerman); Charles Elliott, A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, Edinburgh, 1877; A. A. Hodge and B. B. Warfield, "Inspiration," Presbyterian Review, April, 1881, also tract, Philadelphia, 1881; R. Watts, The Rule of Faith and the Doctrine of Inspiration, Edinburgh, 1885; A. Cave, The Inspiration of the O T Inductively Considered, London, 1888; B. Manly, The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration, New York, 1888; W. Rohnert, Die Inspiration der heiligen Schrift und ihre Bestreiter, Leipzig, 1889; A. W. Dieckhoff, Die Inspiration und Irrthumlosigkeit der heiligen Schrift, Leipzig, 1891; J. Wichelhaus, Die Lehre der heiligen Schrift, Stuttgart, 1892; J. Macgregor, The Revelation and the Record, Edinburgh, 1893; J. Urquhart, The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures, London, 1895; C. Pesch, De Inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae, Freiburg, 1906; James Orr, Revelation and Inspiration, London, 1910.

Benjamin B. Warfield

INSTANT; INSTANTLY

in'-stant, in'-stant-li: Derivative from Latin instare. Found in English with various meanings from the 15th century to the present time.

Instant is used once in Isa 29:5 in the sense of immediate time; elsewhere in the sense of urgent, pressing; Lu 23:23, where "were instant" is the King James Version translation of the verb epekeinto; Ro 12:12, where it is involved in the verb proskartereo; compare Ac 6:4. In 2Ti 4:2 it stands for the expressive verb epistethi, "stand to."

Instantly (urgently, steadfastly) is the King James Version rendering of two different Greek phrases, spoudaios, found in Lu 7:4; and en ekteneia, in Ac 26:7. In both cases the American Standard Revised Version renders "earnestly."

Russell Benjamin Miller

INSTRUCTION

in-struk'-shun.

See CATECHIST; EDUCATION; SCHOOL.

INSTRUMENT

in’-stroo-ment (keli; in Greek plural hopla, Ro 6:13): The word in the Old Testament is used for utensils for service, chiefly in connection with the sanctuary (compare Ex 25:9; Nu 4:12,26,32; 1Ki 19:21; 1Ch 9:29; 2Ch 4:16, the King James Version); for weapons of war (1Sa 8:12; 1Ch 12:33,17, etc.); notably for musical instruments. See MUSIC. The members of the body are described by Paul (Ro 6:13) as "instruments" to be used in the service of righteousness, as before they were in the service of unrighteousness.

INSTRUMENTS OF MUSIC

(shalishim): Thus, the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version (1Sa 18:6), the Revised Version margin "triangles" or "three-stringed instruments."

See MUSIC.

INSURRECTION

in-su-rek’-shun: The word in Ps 64:2 the King James Version is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into "tumult"; in Ezr 4:19 (verb) it represents the Aramaic nesa’, to "lift up oneself." In the New Testament stasis, is rendered "insurrection" in Mr 15:7 the King James Version (where compare the verb "made insurrection"), but in Lu 23:19,25 "sedition." the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "insurrection" throughout; also in Ac 24:5 "insurrections" for the King James Version "sedition."

INTEGRITY

in-teg’-ri-ti (tom, tummah): The translation of tom, "simplicity," "soundness," "completeness," rendered also "upright," "perfection." Its original sense appears in the phrase letom (1Ki 22:34; 2Ch 18:33), "A certain man drew his bow at a venture" margin "Hebrew, in his simplicity" (compare 2Sa 15:11, "in their simplicity"). It is translated "integrity" (Ge 20:5,6; 1Ki 9:4; Ps 7:8; 25:21; 26:1,11; 41:12; 78:72; Pr 19:1; 20:7), in all which places it seems to carry the meaning of simplicity, or sincerity of heart and intention, truthfulness, uprightness. In the plural (tummim) it is one of the words on the breastplate of the high priest (Ex 28:30; De 33:8; Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:65), one of the sacred lots, indicating, perhaps, "innocence" or "integrity" Septuagint aletheia). See URIM AND THUMMIM. Another word translated "integrity" is tummah, from tamam, "to complete," "be upright," "perfect," only in Job 2:3,1; 27:5; 31:6; Pr 11:3.

The word "integrity" does not occur in the New Testament, but its equivalents may be seen in "sincerity," "truth," the "pure heart," the "single eye," etc. In the above sense of simplicity of intention it is equivalent to being honest, sincere, genuine, and is fundamental to true character.

W. L. Walker

INTELLIGENCE

in-tel’-i-gens (bin): Occurs only once in the King James Version as the translation of bin, "to discriminate" (frequently translated "to understand"), in Da 11:30 the King James Version, "(he shall) have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant," the Revised Version (British and American) renders "have regard unto them." "Intelligence" occurs in 2 Macc 3:9 the King James Version, in the sense of information (so the Revised Version (British and American)).

INTEND; INTENT

in-tend’, in-tent’:Early English words derived from Latin and used in the King James Version, sometimes in the Revised Version (British and American), to translate a number of different expressions of the original.

Intend is sometimes used in English in the literal sense of Latin intendere, "to stretch," but in the English Bible it is used only of the direction of the mind toward an object. Sometimes it is used of mere design (mello), Ac 5:35 the King James Version; Ac 20:13; or of desired action (thelo), Lu 14:28 the King James Version; again of a fixed purpose (boulomai), Ac 5:28; 12:4; or, finally, of a declared intention (’amar), Jos 22:33 the King James Version; 2Ch 28:13 the King James Version.

Intent is used only of purpose, and is the translation sometimes of a conjunction (lebha‘abhur), 2Sa 17:14; (lema‘an), 2Ki 10:19; (hina), Eph 3:10; sometimes of an infinitive of purpose, 1Co 10:6; or of a preposition with pronoun (eis touto), Ac 9:21, and sometimes of a substantive (logo), Ac 10:29. This variety of original expressions represented in the English by single terms is an interesting illustration of the extent of interpretation embodied in our English Bible.

Russell Benjamin Miller

INTER-TESTAMENTAL, HISTORY AND LITERATURE

in-ter-tes-ta-men’-tal. See BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS.

INTERCESSION

in-ter-sesh’-un (pagha‘, "to make intercession"; originally "to strike upon," or "against"; then in a good sense, "to assail anyone with petitions," "to urge," and when on behalf of another, "to intercede" (Ru 1:16; Jer 7:16; 27:18; Job 21:15; Ge 23:8; Isa 53:12; Jer 36:25). A similar idea is found in enteuxis, used as "petition," and in the New Testament "intercession." The English word is derived from Latin

intercedo, "to come between," which strangely has the somewhat opposed meanings of "obstruct" and "to interpose on behalf of" a person, and finally "to intercede." The growth of meaning in this word in the various languages is highly suggestive. In the Greek New Testament we find the word in 1Ti 2:1; 4:5; entugchano, is also found in Ro 8:26-34):

Etymology and Meaning of Term

I. MAN’S INTERCESSION FOR HIS FELLOW-MAN

1. Patriarchal Examples

2. Intercessions of Moses

3. The Progress of Religion, Seen in Moses’ Intercessions

4. Intercessory Prayer in Israel’s Later History

5. The Rise of Official Intercession

6. Samuel as an Intercessor in His Functions as Judge, Priest and Prophet

7. Intercession in the Poetic Books

8. The Books of Wisdom

9. The Prophets’ Succession to Moses and Samuel

10. The Priest and Intercession

11. Intercession in the Gospels

12. Intercessory Prayers of the Church

13. Intercession Found in the Epistles

II. INTERCESSION PERFECTED IN CHRIST’S OFFICE AND IN THE CHURCH

III. INTERCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT

Etymology and Meaning of Term:

The meaning of the word is determined by its use in 1Ti 2:1, "I exhort, therefore, first of all, that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all and men"; where the different kinds of prayers appear to be distinguished. Considerable discussion has arisen on the exact meaning of these words. Augustine refers them to the liturgy of the Eucharist. This seems to be importing the significance of the various parts of the ceremony as observed at a time much later than the date of the passage in question. "Supplications" and "prayers" refer to general and specific petitions; "intercessions" will then have the meaning of a request concerning others.

Intercession is prayer on behalf of another, and naturally arises from the instinct of the human heart—not merely prompted by affection and interest, but recognizing that God’s relation to man is not merely individual, but social. Religion thus involves man’s relations to his fellow-man, just as in man’s social position intercession with one on behalf of another is a common incident, becoming, in the development of society, the function of appointed officials; as in legal and courtly procedure, so in religion, the spontaneous and affectionate prayer to God on behalf of another grows into the regular and orderly service of a duly appointed priesthood. Intercession is thus to be regarded:

(1) as the spontaneous act of man for his fellowman;

(2) the official act of developed sacerdotalism;

(3) the perfecting of the natural movement of humanity, and the typified function of priesthood in the intercession of Christ and the Holy Spirit.

I. Man’s Intercession for His Fellow-Man.

1. Patriarchal Examples:

Many such prayers are recorded in Scripture. The sacrificial act of Noah may have been partly of this nature, for it is followed by a promise of God on behalf of the race and the earth at large (Ge 8:20-22). Such also is Abraham’s prayer for Ishmael (Ge 17:18); Abraham’s prayer for Sodom (Ge 18:23-33); Abraham for Abimelech (Ge 20:17). Jacob’s blessing of Joseph’s sons is of the nature of intercession (Ge 48:8-22). His dying blessing of his sons is hardly to be regarded as intercessory; it is, rather, declarative, although in the case of Joseph it approaches intercession. The absence of distinct intercessory prayer from Abraham to Moses is to be observed, and shows how intensely personal and individual the religious consciousness was still in its undeveloped quality. In Moses, however, the social element finds a further development, and is interesting as taking up the spirit of the Father of the Faithful. Moses is the creator of the national spirit. He lifts religion from its somewhat selfish character in the patriarchal life to the higher and wider plane of a national and racial fellowship.

2. Intercessions of Moses:

The progressive character of the Divine leading of man is found thus in the development of the

intercessory spirit, e.g. Moses' prayer for the removal of plagues (Ex 15:25 f); for water at Rephidim (Ex 17:4); for victory over Amalek (Ex 17:8-16); prayer for the people after the golden calf (Ex 32:11-14,21-34; 33:12 f); after the renewal of the tables of stone (Ex 34:9); at the setting forth and stopping of the Ark (Nu 10:35 f); after the burning at Taberah (Nu 11:2); for the healing of Miriam's leprosy (Nu 12:13); after the return of the spies (Nu 14:13-19); after the destruction by serpents (Nu 21:7); for direction in the case of the daughters of Zelophehad (Nu 27:5); for a successor (Nu 27:15); recital of his prayer for the people for their entrance into Canaan (De 3:23 f); recital of his prayer for the people after the worship of the golden calf (De 9:18); recital of prayers for the rebellious people (De 9:25-29); a command to him who pays his third-year tithes to offer prayer for the nation (De 26:15); Moses' final blessing of the tribes (De 33).

3. The Progress of Religion, Seen in Moses' Intercessions:

This extensive series of the intercessory prayers of Moses forms a striking illustration of the growth of religion, represented by the founder of the national life of Israel. It is the history of an official, but it is also the history of a leader whose heart was filled with the intensest patriotism and regard for his fellows. None of these prayers are perfunctory. They are the vivid and passionate utterances of a man full of Divine enthusiasm and human affection. They are real prayers wrung from a great and devout soul on occasions of deep and critical importance. Apart from their importance in the history of Israel, they are a noble record of a great leader of men and servant of God.

4. Intercessory Prayer in Israel's Later History:

In the history of Joshua we find only the prayer for the people after the sin of Achan (Jos 7:6-9), although the communications from God to Joshua are numerous. A faint intercessory note may be heard in Deborah's song (Jud 5:31) though it is almost silenced by the stern and warlike tone of the poem. Gideon's prayer History of seems to reecho something of the words of Moses (Jud 6:13), and accords with the national and religious spirit of the great leader who helped in the formation of the religious life of his people (see Jud 6:24), notwithstanding the evident lower plane on which he stood (Jud 8:27), which may account partially for the apostasy after his death (Jud 8:33 f). Manoah's prayers (Jud 13) may be noted.

5. The Rise of Official Intercession:

(The satisfaction of Micah at securing a priest for his house, and the subsequent story, belong rather to the history of official intercession (Jud 18; see below), as also the inquiry of the people through Phinehas at Shiloh (Jud 20:27 f), and the people's mourning and prayer (Jud 21:2 f).)

6. Samuel as an Intercessor in His Functions as Judge, Priest and Prophet:

Samuel is the real successor of Moses, and in connection with his life intercession again appears more distinct and effective. Hannah's song, though chiefly of thankfulness, is not without the intercessory

spirit (1Sa 2:1-11). So also of Samuel's prayer at Mizpeh (1Sa 7:5), and the recognition by the people of Samuel's place (1Sa 7:8 f; see also 1Sa 8:6,21; 10:17-25; 12:19) (for the custom of inquiring of the Lord through a seer see 1Sa 9:6-10); Samuel's prayer for Saul (1Sa 15:11); Saul's failure to secure inquiry of God, even through intercession (1Sa 28:6); Saul's final appeal through the witch of Endor (1Sa 28:7-20); David's prayer to God (2Sa 7:18); David's Judge, prayer for deliverance of the people from pestilence (2Sa 24:17); Solomon's prayer for wisdom to govern the people (1Ki 3:5-15); Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (1Ki 8:12-61); Jeroboam's appeal to the man of God to pray for the healing of his hand (1Ki 13:6); Elijah's prayer for the widow's son (1Ki 17:20); Elijah's prayer for rain (1Ki 18:42); Elisha's prayer for the widow's son (2Ki 4:33); Elisha's prayer for the opening of the young man's eyes (2Ki 6:17); Hezekiah's appeal to Isaiah (2Ki 19:4); Hezekiah's prayer (2Ki 19:14-19); Josiah's command for prayer concerning the "book that is found" (2Ki 22:13). In Ch we find David's prayer for his house (1Ch 17:16-27); David's prayer for deliverance from the plague (1Ch 21:17); David's prayer for the people and for Solomon at the offering of gifts for the temple (1Ch 29:10-19); Solomon's prayer at the consecration of the temple (2Ch 6:1-42); Asa's prayer (2Ch 14:11); Jehoshaphat's prayer (2Ch 20:5-13); Hezekiah's prayer for the people who had not prepared to eat the Passover (2Ch 30:18); Josiah's command for prayer concerning the book (2Ch 34:21). In the Prophets we note Ezra's prayer (Ezr 9:5-15); Nehemiah's prayer (Ne 1:5-11); the prayer of the Levites for the nation (Ne 9:4-38).

7. Intercession in the Poetic Books:

The poetic books furnish a few examples of intercessory prayer: Job's intercession for his children (Job 1:5); Job's regret at the absence of intercession (Job 16:21); the Lord's command that Job should pray for his friends (Job 42:8). It is remarkable that the references to the Poetic intercession in the Psalms are few; but it must not be forgotten that the psalm is generally a lyrical expression of an intense subjective condition. This does not seem in the consciousness of Israel to have reached an altruistic development. The Psalms express very powerfully the sense of obligation to God, consciousness of sin, indignation against the sin of others. Occasionally the patriotic spirit leads to prayer for Israel; but only rarely does any deep sense of interest in the welfare of others appear to possess the hearts of Israel's singers. In Ps 2:12 there is a hint of the intercessory office of the Son, which reflects, perhaps, the growth of the Messianic spirit in the mind of Israel; Ps 20 is intercessional; it is the prayer of a people for their king. In Ps 25:22 we find a prayer for the redemption of Israel, as in Ps 28:9. In Ps 35:13 the Psalmist refers to his intercession for others. But the "prayer returned into mine own bosom," and the final issue of the prayer becomes rather denunciatory than intercessional. The penitence of Ps 51 rises into a note of prayer for the city (51:18). Sometimes (Ps 60, and perhaps Ps 67), the prayer is not individual but for the community, though even there it is hardly intercession. A common necessity makes common prayer. In Ps 69 there is the recognition of the injury that folly and sin may do to others, and a kind of compensatory note of intercession is heard. Ps 72 is regarded by some as the royal father's prayer for his son and successor, but the reading of the title adopted by the Revised Version (British and American) takes even this psalm from the category of intercession. In Asaph's Masehil (Ps 74), intercession is more distinct; it is a prayer for the sanctuary and the people in their desolation and calamity. Asaph appears to have caught something of the spirit of Moses, as in Ps 79 he again prays for the deliverance of Jerusalem; while a faint echo of the intercessory plea for the nation is heard in Ethan's psalm (Ps 89). It

sounds faintly in Ps 106. In Ps 122 we seem to breathe a larger and more liberal spirit. It contains the appeal to pray for the peace of Jerusalem (122:6), as if the later thought of Israel had begun to expand beyond the mere limits of personal penitence, or desire for deliverance, or denunciation of the enemy. In one of the Songs of Degrees (Ps 125), there is the somewhat severely ethical prayer: "Do good, O Yahweh, unto those that are good." The yearning for the salvation of man as man has not yet been born. The Christ must come before the fullness of Divine love is shed abroad in the hearts even of the pious. This comparative absence of intercessory prayer from the service-book of Israel, and its collected expressions of spiritual experience, is instructive. We find continued references to those who needed prayer; but for the most part these references are descriptive of their wickedness, or denunciatory of their hostility to the Psalmist. The Book of Psalms is thus a striking commentary on the growth of Israel's spiritual life. Intense as it is in its perception of God and His claim on human righteousness, it is only when the supreme revelation of Divine love and the regard for universal man has appeared in the person of our Lord that the large and loving spirit which intercession signifies is found in the experience and expressions of the pious.

8. The Books of Wisdom:

In the Wisdom books there is little, if any, reference to intercession. But they deal rather with ethical character, and often on a merely providential and utilitarian basis. It is noticeable that the only reference to pleading a cause is said to be by the Lord Himself as against the injustice of man (Pr 22:23): "Yahweh will plead their (the poor's) cause." Action on behalf of others does not appear to have been very highly regarded by the current ethics of the Israelite. A kind of negative helpfulness is indicated in Pr 24:28: "Be not a witness against thy neighbor without cause"; and it is significant that the office of advocate was not known among the Jews until they had come under the authority of Rome, when, not knowing the forms of Roman law, they were obliged to secure the aid of a Roman lawyer before the courts. Such practitioners were found in the provinces (Cic. pro Coelio c. 30); Tertullus (Ac 24:1) was such an advocate.

9. The Prophets' Succession of Moses and Samuel:

In the prophetical books the note of intercession reappears. The prophet, though primarily a messenger from God to man, has also something of the character of the intercessor (see Isaiah's call, Isa 6). Isa 25$; 26$ exhibit the intercessory characteristics. The request of Hezekiah for the prayers of Isaiah (Isa 37:4), and the answer of the Lord implied in 37:6, recall the constantly recurring service of Moses to the people. Hezekiah himself becomes an intercessor (37:14-21). In Jer 4:10 intercession is mingled with the words of the messenger. The sin of the people hinders such prayers as were offered on their behalf (Jer 7:16; compare Jer 11:14; 14:11). Intercessory prayers are found in Jer 10:23 ff; 14:7 ff, 19-22. The message of Zedekiah requesting Jeremiah's help is perhaps an instance of seer-inquiry as much as intercession (Jer 21:1 f; compare 1Sa 9:19). In Jer 42:4, the prophet consents to the request of Johanan to seek the Lord on behalf of the people. The Book of La is naturally conceived in a more constantly recurring spirit of intercession. In the prophecies Jeremiah has been the messenger of God to the people. But, after the catastrophe, in his sorrow he appeals to God for mercy upon them (La 2:20; 5:1,19). Ezekiel in the same way is rather the seer of visions and the prophetic representative of God. Yet at

times he appeals to God for the people (Eze 9:8; 11:13). In Da we find the intercession of his three friends sought for in order to secure the revelation of the king's dream (Da 2:17); and Daniel's prayer for Jerusalem and her people (Da 9:16-19).

In the Minor Prophets intercession rarely appears; even in the graphic pictures of Jonah, though the work itself shows the enlarging of the conception of God's relation to humanity outside of Israel, the prophet himself exhibits no tenderness and utters no pleas for the city against which he had been sent to prophesy, and receives the implied rebuke from the Lord for his want of sympathy, caring more for the perished gourd than for the vast population of Nineveh, whom the Lord, however, pitied and spared (Jon 4). Even the sublime prayer of Hab 3 has only a suggestion of intercession. Zec 6:13 relieves the general severity of the prophetic message, consisting of the threatenings of judgment, by the gleam of the promise of a royal priest whose office was partially that of an intercessor, though the picture is darkened by the character of the priesthood and the people, whose services had been selfish, without mercy and compassion (Zec 7:4,7). Now the spirit of tenderness, the larger nature, the loving heart, are to be restored to Israel (Zec 8:16-23). Other nations than Israel will share in the mercy of God. In Mal 2:7 we find the priest rebuked for the loss of his intercessory character.

10. The Priest and Intercession:

How far intercession was regarded as a special duty of the priesthood it is not very easy to determine. The priestly office itself was undoubtedly intercessory. In the Priest and offering of the sacrifice even for the individual, and certainly in the national functions, both of the regular and the occasional ceremonies, the priest represented the individual or the community. In Joe 2:17 the priests are distinctly bidden to "weep between the porch and the altar, and let them say, Spare thy people, O Yahweh." Mal 1:9 appeals to them for intercession to God, and the graphic scene in 1 Macc 7:33-38 shows the priests interceding on behalf of the people against Nicanor.

11. Intercession in the Gospels:

In the New Testament, all prayer necessarily takes a new form from its relation to our Lord, and in this intercessory prayer shares. At the outset, Christ teaches prayer on behalf of those "which despitefully use you" (Mt 5:44 the King James Version). How completely does this change the entire spirit of prayer! We breathe a new atmosphere of the higher revelation of love. The Lord's Prayer (Mt 6:9-13) is of this character. Its initial word is social, domestic; prayer is the address of children to the Father. Even though some of the petitions are not original, yet their place in the prayer, and the general tone of the Master's teaching, exhibit the social and altruistic spirit, not so pervasive of the older dispensation. "Thy kingdom come" leads the Order of petitions, with its essentially intercessory character. The forgiveness of others, which is the measure and plea of our own forgiveness, brings even those who have wronged us upon the same plane as ourselves, and if the plea be genuine, how can we refuse to pray for them? And if for our enemies, then surely for our friends. In Mt 7:11 f, the good things sought of the Father are to be interpreted as among those that if we desire from others we should do to them. And from this spirit the intercessory prayer cannot be absent. We find the spirit of intercession in the pleas of those who sought

Christ's help for their friends, which He was always so quick to recognize: the centurion for his servant (Mt 8:13); the friends of the paralytic (Mt 9:2-6), where the miracle was wrought on the ground of the friends' faith. Of a similar character are the requests of the woman for her child and the Lord's response (Mt 15:28); of the man for his lunatic son (Mt 17:14-21). There is the suggestion of the intercessory spirit in the law of trespass, specifically followed by the promise of the answer to the prayer of the two or three, agreed and in fellowship (Mt 18:15-20), with the immediately attached precepts of forgiveness (Mt 18:21-35). A remarkable instance of intercession is recorded in Mt 20:20-23, where the mother of Zebedee's sons makes a request on behalf of her children; the added expression, "worshipping him," raises the occasion into one of intercessory prayer. our Lord's rebuke is not to the prayer, but to its lack of wisdom.

It is needless to review the cases in the other Gospels. But the statement of Mr 6:5 f, that Christ could not perform mighty works because of unbelief, sheds a flood of light upon one of the important conditions of successful intercession, when contrasted with the healing conditioned by the faith of others than the healed. One of the most distinct examples of intercessory prayer is that of the Lord's intercession for Peter (Lu 22:31 f), and for those who crucified Him (Lu 23:34). The place of intercession in the work of Christ is seen clearly in our Lord's intercessory prayer (see INTERCESSION OF CHRIST), where it is commanded by definite precept and promise of acceptance. The promise of the answer to prayer in the name of Christ is very definite (Joh 16:24). Christ's high-priestly prayer is the sublimest height of prayer to God and is intercessory throughout (Joh 17); Joh 16:26 does not, as some have held, deny His intercession for His disciples; it only throws open the approach to God Himself.

12. Intercessory Prayers of the Church:

Ac introduces us to the working of the fresh elements which Christ gave to life. Hence, the prayers of the church become Christian prayers, involving the wider outlook on others and on the world at large which Christianity has bestowed on men. The prayer of the assembled believers upon the liberation of the apostles breathes this spirit (Ac 4:24-30). The consecrating prayer for the seven was probably intercessory (Ac 6:6; compare Ac 1:24). How pathetic is the plea of Stephen for his murderers (Ac 7:60)! How natural is intercession (Ac 8:24)! Peter at Joppa (Ac 9:40); the church making prayer without ceasing for Peter (Ac 12:5,12); the prayer for Barnabas and Saul at Antioch (Ac 13:3); Paul and Barnabas praying for the churches (Ac 14:23); the church at Antioch commending Paul and Silas to the grace of God (Ac 15:40); Paul and the elders of Ephesus (Ac 20:36), are all examples, more or less defined, of intercessory prayer.

13. Intercession Found in the Epistles:

In the Epistles we may expect to find intercession more distinctly filled with the relation of prayer through Christ. Paul gives us many examples in his Epistles: for the Romans (Ro 1:9); the Spirit's interceding (8:27); Paul's prayer for his race (10:1); his request for prayers (15:30); the help that he found from the prayer of his friends (2Co 1:11); prayer for the Corinthian church (2Co 13:7); for the Ephesians (Eph 1:16-23; 3:14-21; see also Eph 6:18; Php 1:3-11,19; Col 1:3,9; 4:3; 1Th 1:2; 5:23,15;

2Th 1:2); a definite command that intercession be made for all men and for kings and those in authority (1Ti 2:1,2); his prayer for Timothy (2Ti 1:3); for Philemon (1:4); and prayer to be offered for the sick by the elders of the church (Jas 5:14-18 see also Heb 13:18-21; 1Joh 5:14).

II. Intercession Perfected in Christ's Office and in the Church.

This review of the intercession of the Scriptures prepares us for the development of a specific office of intercession, perfectly realized in Christ. We have seen Moses complying with the people's request to represent them before God. In a large and generous spirit the leader of Israel intercedes with God for his nation. It was natural that this striking example of intercessory prayer should be followed by other leaders, and that the gradually developed system of religious worship should furnish the conception of the priest, and especially the high priest, as the intercessor for those who came to the sacrifice. This was particularly the significance of the great Day of Atonement, when after offering for himself, the high priest offered the sacrifice for the whole people. This official act, however, does not do away with the intercessory character of prayer as offered by men. We have seen how it runs through the whole history of Israel. But it is found much more distinctly in the Christian life and apparently in the practice of the Christian assembly itself. Paul continually refers to his own intercessory prayers, and seeks for a similar service on his own behalf from those to whom he writes. Intercession is thus based upon the natural tendency of the heart filled by love and a deep sympathetic sense of relation to others. Christ's intercessory prayer is the highest example and pattern of this form of prayer. His intercessions for His disciples, for His crucifiers, are recorded, and the sacred record rises to the supreme height in the prayer of Joh 17. In this prayer the following characteristics are to be found:

(1) It is based upon the intimate relation of Jesus to the Father. This gives to such prayer its justification; may it be said, its right.

(2) It follows the completest fulfillment of duty. It is not the mere expression of desire, even for others. It is the crown of effort on their behalf. He has revealed God to His disciples. He has given to them God's words; therefore He prays for them (Joh 17:6,7-9).

(3) It recognizes the Divine, unbroken relation to the object of the prayer: "I am no more in the world, and these are in the world, and I come to Thee. Holy Father, keep," etc. (17:11).

(4) The supreme end of the prayer is salvation from the evil of the world (17:15).

(5) The wide sweep of the prayer and its chief objects—unity with God, and the presence with Christ, and the indwelling of the Divine love. The prayer is a model for all intercessory prayer.

See, further, INTERCESSION OF CHRIST; PRAYERS OF CHRIST; OFFICES OF CHRIST.

III. Intercession of the Holy Spirit.

In connection with the subject of intercession, there arises a most interesting question as to whether the Holy Spirit is not presented in Scriptures as an intercessor. The text in which the doctrine seems to be taught is that of Ro 8:26 f: "In like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." By far the larger number of expositors have understood by the Spirit, the Holy Spirit. The older commentators, in general, refer to the Holy Spirit. Tholuck, Ewald, Philippi, Meyer, most of the American theologians and English commentators, as Shedd, Alford, Jowett, Wordsworth, interpret it in the same way. Lange and Olshausen refer it to the human spirit. Undoubtedly, the "groanings" have led to the denial of the reference to the Holy Spirit. But the very form of the word translated "helpeth" indicates cooperation, and this must be of something other than the spirit of man himself. The undoubted difficulties of the passage, which are strongly urged by Lange (see Lange's Commentary on Ro 8:26), must be acknowledged. At the same time the statement seems to be very clear and definite. An explanation has been given that the Holy Spirit is here referred to as dwelling in us, and thus making intercession. The Divine Spirit is said to be a Spirit of supplication (Zec 12:10). The distinction which is made between the intercession of Christ in heaven in His priestly office and that of the Holy Spirit interceding within the souls of believers, referred to by Shedd (see Commentary on Romans), must be carefully used, for if pressed to its extreme it would lead to the materialization and localization of the Divine nature. Moreover, may not the intercession of our Lord be regarded as being partially exemplified in that of the Spirit whom He has declared to be His agent and representative? If Christ dwells in believers by His Spirit, His intercession, especially if subjective in and with their spirits, may properly be described as the intercession of the Holy Ghost.

L. D. Bevan

INTERCESSION OF CHRIST

The general conception of our Lord's mediatorial office is specially summed up in His intercession in which He appears in His high-priestly office, and also as interceding with the Father on behalf of that humanity whose cause He had espoused.

1. Christ's Intercession Viewed in Its Priestly Aspect:

The function of priesthood as developed under Judaism involved the position of mediation between man and God. The priest represented man, and on man's behalf approached God; thus he offered sacrifice, interceded and gave to the offerer whom he represented the benediction and expression of the Divine acceptance. (For the various forms of these offerings, see special articles.) As in sacrifice, so in the work of Christ, we find the proprietary rights of the offerer in the sacrifice. For man, Christ as one with man, and yet in His own personal right, offers Himself (see Ro 5; and compare Ga 4:5 with Heb 2:11). There was also the transfer of guilt and its conditions, typically by laying the hand on the head of the animal, which then bore the sins of the offerer and was presented to God by the priest. The acknowledgment of sin and the surrender to God is completely fulfilled in Christ's offering of Himself, and His death

(compare Le 3:2,8,13; 16:21; with Isa 53:6; 2Co 5:21). our Lord’s intercessory quality in the sacrifice of Himself is not only indicated by the imputation of guilt to Him as representing the sinner, but also in the victory of His life over death, which is then given to man in God’s acceptance of His representative and substitute.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the intercessory character of our Lord’s high-priestly office is transferred to the heavenly condition and work of Christ, where the relation of Christ’s work to man’s condition is regarded as being still continued in the heavenly place (see Heb 9:11-28). This entrance into heaven is once for all, and in the person of the high priest the way is open to the very presence of God. From one point of view (Heb 10:12) the priestly service of the Lord was concluded and gathered up into His kingly office (Heb 10:13,14-18). But from another point of view, we ourselves are bidden to enter into the Holiest Place; as if in union with Christ we too become a kingly priesthood (Heb 10:19-22; and compare 1Pe 2:9).

It must not be forgotten, however, that this right of entrance into the most Holy Place is one that depends entirely upon our vital union with Christ, He appears in heaven for us and we with Him, and in this sense He fulfills the second duty of His high-priestly office as intercessor, with the added conception drawn from the legal advocacy of the Roman court. The term translated "Advocate" in 1 Joh 2:2 is parakletos, which in Joh 14:16 is translated "Comforter." The word is of familiar use in Greek for the legal advocate or patronus who appeared on behalf of his client. Thus, in the double sense of priestly and legal representative, our Lord is our intercessor in Heaven.

Of the modes in which Christ carries out His intercessory office, we can have no knowledge except so far as we may fairly deduce them from the phraseology and suggested ideas of Scripture. As high priest, it may surely be right for us to aid our weak faith by assuring ourselves that our Lord pleads for us, while at the same time we must be careful not to deprave our thought concerning the glorified Lord by the metaphors and analogies of earthly relationship.

The intercessory work of Christ may thus be represented: He represents man before God in His perfect nature, His exalted office and His completed work. The Scripture word for this is (Heb 9:24) "to appear before the face of God for us." There is also an active intercession. This is the office of our Lord as advocate or parakletos. That this conveys some relation to the aid which one who has broken the law receives from an advocate cannot be overlooked, and we find Christ’s intercession in this aspect brought into connection with the texts which refer to justification and its allied ideas (see Ro 8:34; 1 Joh 2:1).

2. Christ’s Intercessory Work from the Standpoint of Prayer:

In PRAYERS OF CHRIST (which see), the intercessory character of many of our Lord’s prayers, and especially that of Joh 17, is considered. And it has been impossible for Christian thought to divest itself of the idea that the heavenly intercession of Christ is of the order of prayer. It is impossible for us to know; and even if Christ now prays to the Father, it can be in no way analogous to earthly prayers. The thought of some portion of Christendom distinctly combined prayer in the heavenly work of the Lord.

There is danger in extreme views. Scriptural expressions must not be driven too far, and, on the other hand, they must not be emptied of all their contents. Modern Protestant teaching has, in its protest against a merely physical conception of our Lord's state and occupation in heaven, almost sublimed reality from His intercessory work. In Lutheran teaching the intercession of our Lord was said to be "vocal," "verbal" and "oral." It has been well remarked that such forms of prayer require flesh and blood, and naturally the teachers of the Reformed churches, for the most part, have contented themselves (as for example Hodge, Syst. Theol., II, 593) with the declaration that "the intercession of Christ includes: (1) His appearing before God in our behalf, as the sacrifice for our sins, as our high priest, on the ground of whose work we receive the remission of our sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, and all needed good; (2) defense against the sentence of the law and the charges of Satan, who is the great accuser; (3) His offering Himself as our surety, not only that the demands of justice shall be shown to be satisfied, but that His people shall be obedient and faithful; (4) the oblation of the persons of the redeemed, sanctifying their prayers, and all their services, rendering them acceptable to God, through the savor of his own merits."

Even this expression of the elements which constitute the intercession of the Lord, cautious and spiritual as it is in its application to Christian thought and worship, must be carefully guarded from a too complete and materialistic use. Without this care, worship and devout thought may become degraded and fall into the mechanical forms by which our Lord's position of intercessor has been reduced to very little more than an imaginative and spectacular process which goes on in some heavenly place. It must not be forgotten that the metaphorical and symbolic origin of the ideas which constitute Christ's intercession is always in danger of dominating and materializing the spiritual reality of His intercessional office.

L. D. Bevan

INTEREST

in'-ter-est (neshekh, mashsha'; tokos): The Hebrew word neshekh is from a root which means "to bite"; thus interest is "something bitten off." The other word, mashsa', means "lending on interest." The Greek term is from the root tikto, "to produce" or "beget," hence, interest is something begotten or produced by money. The Hebrew words are usually translated "usury," but this meant the same as interest, all interest being reckoned as usury.

Long before Abraham's time money had been loaned at a fixed rate of interest in Babylonia and almost certainly in Egypt. The Code of Hammurabi gives regulations regarding the lending and borrowing of money, the usual interest being 20 percent. Sometimes it was only 11 2/3 and 13 1/3, as shown by contract tablets. In one case, if the loan was not paid in two months, 18 per cent interest would be charged. Corn (grain), dates, onions, etc., were loaned at interest. Thus Moses and Israel would be familiar with commercial loans and interest. In Israel there was no system of credit or commercial loans in Moses' time and after. A poor man borrowed because he was poor. The law of Moses (Ex 22:25) forbade loaning at interest. There was to be no creditor and no taker of interest among them (Le

25:36,37). De permits them to lend on interest to a foreigner (De 23:19,20), but not to a brother Israelite. That this was considered the proper thing in Israel for centuries is seen in Ps 15:5, while Pr 28:8 implies that it was an unusual thing, interest being generally exacted and profit made. Ezekiel condemns it as a heinous sin (Eze 18:8,13,17) and holds up the ideal of righteousness as not taking interest (22:12). Isa 24:2 implies that it was a business in that age, the lender and borrower being social types. Jeremiah implies that there was not always the best feeling between lenders and borrowers (15:10). According to Ne 5:7,10, rich Jews were lending to others and exacting heavy interest. Nehemiah condemns such conduct and forbids its continuance, citing himself as an example of lending without interest. The lenders restored 1 percent of that exacted.

In the New Testament, references to interest occur in the parable of the Pounds (Lu 19:23) and of the Talents (Mt 25:27). Here the men were expected to put their master's money out at interest, and condemnation followed the failure to do so. Thus the principle of receiving interest is not condemned in the Old Testament, only it was not to be taken from a brother Israelite. In the New Testament it is distinctly encouraged.

See also USURY.

J. J. Reeve

INTERMEDDLE

in-ter-med'-'-l ('arabh, "to mix up (self) with something," "mingle in," "share," "take interest in"): The word occurs only once (Pr 14:10) in a passage descriptive of "the ultimate solitude of each man's soul at all times." "The heart knoweth its own bitterness."

"Nor even the tenderest heart, and next our own, Knows half the reasons why we smile and sigh."

(Compare 1Ki 8:38.) Something there is in every sorrow which no one else can share. "And a stranger doth not intermeddle with its joy," not necessarily in an interfering or any offensive way, but simply does not share or take any interest in the other's joy.

For "intermeddleth with" (Pr 18:1 the King James Version), the Revised Version (British and American) gives "rageth against" (margin "quarrelleth with").

M. O. Evans

INTERMEDIATE, STATE

in-ter-me'-di-at.

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTERPRETATION

in-tur-pre-ta’-shun:

1. General Principles:

Is a generic term and may refer to any work of literature. Referred specifically to the sacred Scriptures, the science of interpretation is generally known as hermeneutics, while the practical application of the principles of this science is exegesis. In nearly all cases, interpretation has in mind the thoughts of another, and then, further, these thoughts expressed in another language than that of the interpreter. In this sense it is used in Biblical research. A person has interpreted the thoughts of another when he has in his own mind a correct reproduction or photograph of the thought as it was conceived in the mind of the original writer or speaker. It is accordingly a purely reproductive process, involving no originality of thought on the part of the interpreter. If the latter adds anything of his own it is eisegesis and not exegesis. The moment the Bible student has in his own mind what was in the mind of the author or authors of the Biblical books when these were written, he has interpreted the thought of the Scriptures.

The interpretation of any specimen of literature will depend on the character of the work under consideration. A piece of poetry and a chapter of history will not be interpreted according to the same principles or rules. Particular rules that are legitimate in the explanation of a work of fiction would be entirely out of place in dealing with a record of facts. Accordingly, the rules of the correct interpretation of the Scriptures will depend upon the character of these writings themselves, and the principles which an interpreter will employ in his interpretation of the Scriptures will be in harmony with his ideas of what the Scriptures are as to origin, character, history, etc. In the nature of the case the dogmatical stand of the interpreter will materially influence his hermeneutics and exegesis. In the legitimate sense of the term, every interpreter of the Bible is "prejudiced," i.e. is guided by certain principles which he holds antecedently to his work of interpretation. If the modern advanced critic is right in maintaining that the Biblical books do not differ in kind or character from the religious books of other ancient peoples, such as the Indians or the Persians, then the same principles that he applies in the case of the Rig Veda or the Zend Avesta he will employ also in his exposition of the Scriptures. If, on the other hand, the Bible is for him a unique collection of writings, Divinely inspired and a revelation from the source of all truth, the Bible student will hesitate long before accepting contradictions, errors, mistakes, etc., in the Scriptures.

2. Special Principles:

The Scriptures are a Divine and human product combined. That the holy men of God wrote as they were moved by the Spirit is the claim of the Scriptures themselves. Just where the line of demarcation is to be drawn between the human and the Divine factors in the production of the sacred Scriptures materially affects the principles of interpreting these writings (see INSPIRATION). That the human factor was sufficiently potent to shape the form of thought in the Scriptures is evident on all hands. Paul does not

write as Peter does, nor John as James; the individuality of the writer of the different books appears not only in the style, choice of words, etc., but in the whole form of thought also. There are such things as a Pauline, a Johannine and a Petrine type of Christian thought, although there is only one body of Christian truth underlying all types. Insofar as the Bible is exactly like other books, it must be interpreted as we do other works of literature. The Scriptures are written in Hebrew and in Greek, and the principles of forms and of syntax that would apply to the explanation of other works written in these languages and under these circumstances must be applied to the Old Testament and New Testament also. Again, the Bible is written for men, and its thoughts are those of mankind and not of angels or creatures of a different or higher spiritual or intellectual character; and accordingly there is no specifically Biblical logic, or rhetoric, or grammar. The laws of thought and of the interpretation of thought in these matters pertain to the Bible as they do to other writings.

But in regard to the material contents of the Scriptures, matters are different and the principles of interpretation must be different. God is the author of the Scriptures which He has given through human agencies. Hence, the contents of the Scriptures, to a great extent, must be far above the ordinary concepts of the human mind. When John declares that God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to redeem it, the interpreter does not do justice to the writer if he finds in the word "God" only the general philosophical conception of the Deity and not that God who is our Father through Christ; for it was the latter thought that was in the mind of the writer when he penned these words. Thus, too, it is a false interpretation to find in "Our Father" anything but this specifically Biblical conception of God, nor is it possible for anybody but a believing Christian to utter this prayer (Mt 6:9) in the sense which Christ, who taught it to His disciples, intended.

Again, the example of Christ and His disciples in their treatment of the Old Testament teaches the principle that the ipse dixit of a Scriptural passage is to be interpreted as decisive as to its meaning. In the about 400 citations from the Old Testament found in the New Testament, there is not one in which the mere "It is written" is not regarded as settling its meaning. Whatever may be a Bible student’s theory of inspiration, the teachings and the examples of interpretation found in the Scriptures are in perfect. harmony in this matter.

These latter facts, too, show that in the interpretation of the Scriptures principles must be applied that are not applicable in the explanation of other books. As God is the author of the Scriptures He may have had, and, as a matter of fact, in certain cases did have in mind more than the human agents through whom He spoke did themselves understand. The fact that, in the New Testament, persons like Aaron and David, institutions like the law, the sacrificial system, the priesthood and the like, are interpreted as typical of persons and things under the New Covenant shows that the true significance, e.g. of the Levitical system, can be found only when studied in the light of the New Testament fulfillment.

Again, the principle of parallelism, not for illustrative but for argumentative purposes, is a rule that can, in the nature of the case, be applied to the interpretation of the Scriptures alone and not elsewhere. As the Scriptures represent one body of truth, though in a kaleidoscopic variety of forms, a statement on a particular subject in one place can be accepted as in harmony with a statement on the same subject elsewhere. In short, in all of those characteristics in which the Scriptures are unlike other literary

productions, the principles of interpretation of the Scriptures must also be unlike those employed in other cases.

3. Historical Data:

Owing chiefly to the dogmatical basis of hermeneutics as a science, there has been a great divergence of views in the history of the church as to the proper methods of interpretation. It is one of the characteristic and instructive features of the New Testament writers that they absolutely refrain from the allegorical method of interpretation current in those times, particularly in the writings of Philo. Not even Ga 4:22, correctly understood, is an exception, since this, if an allegorical interpretation at all, is an argumentum ad hominem. The sober and grammatical method of interpretation in the New Testament writers stands out, too, in bold and creditable contrast to that of the early Christian exegetes, even of Origen. Only the Syrian fathers seemed to be an exception to the fantasies of the allegorical methods. The Middle Ages produced nothing new in this sphere; but the Reformation, with its formal principle that the Bible and the Bible alone is the rule of faith and life, made the correct grammatical interpretation of the Scriptures practically a matter of necessity. In modern times, not at all prolific in scientific discussions of hermeneutical principles and practices, the exegetical methods of different interpreters are chiefly controlled by their views as to the origin and character of the Scriptural books, particularly in regard to their inspiration.

LITERATURE.

Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics, New York, 1884. Here the literature is fully given, as also in Weidner’s Theological Encyclopedia, I, 266 ff.

G. H. Schodde

INTERPRETATION OF TONGUES

See TONGUES, INTERPRETATION OF.

INTERROGATION

in-ter-o-ga’-shun (eperotema): This word is not found at all in the King James Version, and once only in the American Standard Revised Version (1Pe 3:21), where it replaces the word "answer" of the King James Version. This change according to Alford and Bengel is correct. "The interrogation of a good conscience" may refer to the question asked of a convert before baptism (compare Ac 8:37), or the appeal of the convert to God (compare 1 Joh 3:20-21). The opportunity to do this was given in baptism.

INTREAT; INTREATY; (ENTREAT)

in-tret’, in-tret’-i: The two forms are derived from the same verb. In 1611 the spelling was indifferently "intreat" or "entreat." In editions of the King James Version since 1760 "intreat" is used in the sense of "to beg"; "entreat" in the sense of "deal with." As examples of "intreat" see Ex 8:8, "Intreat the Lord" (tsa‘aq); Ru 1:16, "Intreat me not to leave thee" (pagha‘); 2Co 8:4, "praying us with much entreaty" paraklesis). In Ge 25:21 "intreat" is used to indicate the success of a petition. For entreat see Ge 12:16, "He entreated Abraham well"; Ac 27:3, "And Julius courteously entreated Paul" (philanthropos chresamenos, literally, "to use in a philanthropic way"); compare also Jas 3:17, where eupeithes, literally, "easily persuaded," is translated "easy to be entreated."

The Revised Version changes all passages of the King James Version where "intreat" is found to "entreat," with the exception of those mentioned below. The meaning of "entreat" is "to ask," "to beseech," "to supplicate": Job 19:17 reads "and my supplication to the children" (hannothi, the King James Version "though I entreated for the children," the Revised Version, margin "I make supplication"). Jer 15:11 reads, "I will cause the enemy to make supplication" (hiphga’ti), instead, the King James Version "I will cause the enemy to entreat" (the Revised Version margin "I will intercede for thee with the enemy"). 1Ti 5:1 changes the King James Version "intreat" to "exhort." Php 4:3 renders the King James Version "entreat" by "beseech."

Russell Benjamin Miller

INWARD MAN

in’-werd: A Pauline term, nearly identical with the "hidden man of the heart" (1Pe 3:4). The Greek original, 5 ho eso (also esothen) anthropos (Ro 7:22) is lexigraphically defined "the internal man," i.e. "soul," "conscience." It is the immaterial part of man—mind, spirit—in distinction from the "outward man" which "perishes" (2Co 4:16 the King James Version). As the seat of spiritual influences it is the sphere in which the Holy Spirit does His renewing and saving work (Eph 3:16). The term "inward man" cannot be used interchangeably with "the new man," for it may still be "corrupt," and subject to "vanity" and "alienated from the life of God." Briefly stated, it is mind, soul, spirit—God’s image in man—man’s higher nature, intellectual, moral, and spiritual.

Dwight M. Pratt

INWARD PART

A symbolic expression in the Old Testament represented by three Hebrew words: chedher, "chamber," hence, inmost bowels or breast; tuchoth, "the reins"; qerebh, "midst," "middle," hence, heart. Once in the New Testament (esothen, "from within," Lu 11:39). The viscera (heart, liver, kidneys) were supposed by the ancients to be the seat of the mind, feelings, affections: the highest organs of the psyche, "the soul." The term includes the intellect ("wisdom in the inward parts," Job 38:36); the moral nature ("inward part is very wickedness," Ps 5:9); the spiritual ("my law in their inward parts," Jer 31:33). Its adverbial equivalent in Biblical use is "inwardly." INWARD MAN (which see) is identical in meaning.

Dwight M. Pratt

IOB

yob (yobh; the King James Version Job): Third son of Issachar (Ge 46:13). In parallel passages (Nu 26:24; 1Ch 7:1) the name is Jashub (yashubh), which the versions in Ge also support as the correct form.

IPHDEIAH

if-de’-ya (yiphdeyah, "Yah redeems"; the King James Version Iphedeiah): A descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 8:25).

IPHTAH

if’-ta (yiphtach; the King James Version Jiphtah): An unidentified town in the Shephelah of Judah, named with Libnab, Ether and Ashan (Jos 15:43).

IPHTAH-EL

if’-ta-el (yiphtach-’el; the King James Version Jiphtah-el): The valley of Iphtah-el lay on the North border of Zebulun (Jos 19:14,27). Northwest of the plain of el-Battauf stands a steep hill, connected only by a low saddle with the hills on the North. The name Tell Jefat suggests the Jotapata of Josephus (BJ, III, vi, i; vii, i, etc.), and the place answers well to his description. It probably corresponds to the ancient Iphtah-el. In that case the valley is most probably that which begins at Tell Jefat, passes round the South of Jebel Kaukab, and, as Wady ‘Abellin, opens on the plain of Acre.

W. Ewing

IR

ir (‘ir): A descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 7:12), called Iri in 1Ch 7:7.

IR-HA-HERES

ir-ha-he’-rez (‘ir haherec, according to the Massoretic Text, Aquila, Theodotion, Septuagint, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); according to some Hebrew manuscripts, Symmachus, and the Vulgate, ‘ir ha-cherec): A city of Egypt referred to in Isa 19:18. Jewish quarrels concerning the temple which Onias built in Egypt have most probably been responsible for the altering of the texts of some of the early manuscripts, and it is not now possible to determine absolutely which have been altered and which accord with the original. This difference in manuscripts

gives rise to different opinions among authorities here to be noted. Most of the discussion of this name arises from this uncertainty and is hence rather profitless.

The starting-point of any proper discussion of Ir-ha-h is that the words are by Isaiah and that they are prophecy, predictive prophecy. They belong to that portion of the prophecies of Isaiah which by nearly all critics is allowed to the great prophet. Nothing but unfounded speculation or an unwillingness to admit that there is any predictive prophecy can call in question Isaiah's authorship of these words. Then the sense of the passage in which these words occur imperatively demands that they be accounted predictive prophecy. Isaiah plainly refers to the future, "shall be called"; and makes a definite statement concerning what shall take place in the future (19:18-24). The reality of predictive prophecy may be discussed by those so inclined, but that the intention of the author here was to utter predictive prophecy does not seem to be open to question. For the verification of this prediction by its fulfillment in history we shall inquire concerning:

(1) the times intended: "that day";

(2) the "five cities";

(3) "Ir-ha-heres."

1. The Times Intended: "That Day":

The prophet gives a fairly specific description of "that day." It was at least to begin when "there shall be five cities in the land of Egypt that speak the language of Canaan, and swear to Yahweh of hosts" (Isa 19:18), and "In that day shall there be an altar to Yahweh in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to Yahweh" (Isa 19:19). There was to be also some inroad made upon the heathenism of Egypt by the message of the Lord (Isa 19:21 f), and about that time a deliverer should arise in Egypt (Isa 19:20), and all this should take place before the power of the land of Assyria should pass away (Isa 19:23 f) .

2. The "Five Cities":

The first historical fulfillment of these words is found at the period when Onias built his imitation of the Temple of Jerusalem at the place called by the Greeks Leontopolis (Tell el-Yehudiyeh), and the worship of Yahweh was set up at Elephantine, and the Jews were a great power at Alexandria and at Tahpanhes. While any of these latter three might have contained the "pillar," the "altar" would thus be either at Leontopolis or the other one of the "five cities" which cannot be named with much probability. The great deliverer would seem to be Alexander. Some think that the conversion of the Egyptians indicated in Isa 19:21,22 is furthered, though still not completed, in the Christian invasion of the 1st century, and again in the success of modern Christian missions in Egypt.

3. "Ir-ha-heres":

It will be seen that it does not follow from what has been said that Leontopolis was Ir-ha-h as some seem to think. It is not said by the prophet that the place where was the "altar" was called Ir-ha-h, even if it were certain that the altar was at Leontopolis. Nevertheless, Leontopolis may be Ir-ha-h. The problem is not in the first place the identification of the name, but the determination of which one of the "five cities" was destroyed. The expression "shall be called the city of destruction" seems clearly to indicate that Ir-ha-h is not a name at all, but merely a descriptive appellation of that city which should "be destroyed." It still remains to inquire whether or not this was an independent appellation, or whether, more probably, it bore some relation to the name of that city at the time at which the prophet wrote, a play upon the sound, or the significance of the name or both of these, either through resemblance or contrast. If Gesenius is right, as he seems to be, in the opinion that "in the idiom of Isa Ir-ha-h means simply ‘the city that shall be destroyed,’ " then the original problem of finding which one of the cities was destroyed seems to be the whole problem. Still, in the highly-wrought language of Isaiah and according to the genius of the Hebrew tongue, there is probably a play upon words. It is here that the consideration of the name itself properly comes in and probably guides us rightly. Speculation, by Gesenius, Duhm, Cheyne and others, has proposed various different readings of this name, some of them requiring two or three changes in the text to bring it to its present state. Speculation can always propose readings. On was sometimes called "Heres" and meant "house of the sun," which would be both translated and transliterated into Hebrew ha-cherec and might have ‘ir ("city") prefixed. Naville, through his study of the great Harris papyrus, believed that the old Egyptian city which later was called Leontopolis (Tell el-Yehudiyeh) was immediately connected with On and called "House of Ra," also "House of the Sun." Thus, this name might be both transliterated and translated into the Hebrew ha-cherec and have ‘ir prefixed. The difference between this expression and "Ir-ha-h" which Isaiah used is only the difference between "h" and "ch." So that Ir-ha-h is most probably a predictive prophecy concerning the disaster that was to overtake one of the "five cities," with a play upon the name of the city, and that city is either On, the later Heliopolis, or the ancient sacred city about 4 miles to the North of On, where Onias was to build his temple and which later became Leontopolis (Tellel-Yehudiyeh). No more positive identification of Ir-ha-h is yet possible.

M. G. Kyle

IR-NAHASH

ur-na’-hash, ir-na’-hash (‘ir nachash): A town of Judah of which Tehinnah is called the "father," probably meaning "founder" (1Ch 4:12). English Versions of the Bible margin suggests the translation "city of Nahash."

IR-SHEMESH

ur-she’-mesh, ir-she’-mesh (‘ir shemesh, "city of the sun").

See BETH-SHEMESH; HERES.

IRA

i’-ra (‘ira’; Eiras):

(1) A person referred to in 2Sa 20:26 as "priest" (so the Revised Version (British and American) correctly; the King James Version "a chief ruler," the American Standard Revised Version "chief minister") unto David. The translation of the Revised Version (British and American) is the only possible one; but, according to the text, Ira was "a Jairite," and thus of the tribe of Manasseh (Nu 32:41) and not eligible to the priesthood. On the basis of the Peshitta some would correct "Jairite" of 2Sa 20:26 into "Jattirite," referring to Jattir, a priestly city within the territory of Judah (Jos 21:14). Others point to 2Sa 8:18 margin, "David’s sons were priests," as an indication that in David’s time some non-Levites were permitted to serve—in some sense—as priests.

(2) An "Ithrite," or (with a different pointing of the text) a "Jattirite," one of David’s "thirty" (2Sa 23:38 parallel 1Ch 11:40); possibly identical with (1).

(3) Another of David’s "thirty," son of Ikkesh of Tekoa (2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:28) and a captain of the temple guard (1Ch 27:9).

F. K. Farr

IRAD

i’-rad (‘iradh; Septuagint Gaidad): Grandson of Cain and son of Enoch (Ge 4:18).

IRAM

i’-ram (‘iram; Septuagint variously in Gen): A "chief" of Edom (Ge 36:43 parallel 1Ch 1:54).

IRI

i’-ri (‘iri).

See IR; URIAS.

IRIJAH

i-ri’-ja (yir’iyayh, "Yah sees"): A captain at the gate of Benjamin in Jerusalem, who arrested Jeremiah the prophet on suspicion of intending to desert to the Chaldeans (Jer 37:13,14).

IRON (1)

i’-urn (barzel; sideros): It is generally believed that the art of separating iron from its ores and making it into useful forms was not known much earlier than 1000 BC, and that the making of brass (bronze) antedates it by many centuries, in spite of the frequent Biblical references where brass and iron occur together. This conjecture is based upon the fact that no specimen of worked iron has been found whose antiquity can be vouched for. The want of such instruments, however, can be attributed to the ease with which iron corrodes. Evidence that iron was used is found, for example, in the hieroglyphics of the tomb of Rameses III, where the blades of some of the weapons are painted blue while others are painted red, a distinction believed to be due to the fact that some were made of iron or steel and some of brass. No satisfactory proof has yet been presented that the marvelous sculpturing on the hard Egyptian granite was done with tempered bronze. It seems more likely that steel tools were used. After the discovery of iron, it was evidently a long time in replacing bronze. This was probably due to the difficulties in smelting it. An old mountaineer once described to the writer the process of iron smelting as it was carried on in Mt. Lebanon in past centuries. As a boy he had watched his father, who was a smelter, operate one of the last furnaces to be fired. For each firing, many cords of wood, especially green oak branches, were used, and several days of strenuous pumping at the eight bellows was necessary to supply the air blast. As a result a small lump of wrought iron was removed from the bottom of the furnace after cooling. The iron thus won was carried to Damascus where it was made into steel by workers who kept their methods secret. This process, which has not been worked now for years, was undoubtedly the same as was used by the ancients. It is not at all unlikely that the Lebanon iron, transformed into steel, was what was referred to as "northern iron" in Jer 15:12 (the King James Version). In many districts the piles of slag from the ancient furnaces are still evident.

Aside from the limited supply of iron ore in Mt. Lebanon (compare De 8:9), probably no iron was found in Syria and Palestine. It was brought from Tarshish (Eze 27:12) and Vedan and Jayan (Eze 27:19), and probably Egypt (De 4:20).

The first mention of iron made in the Bible is in Ge 4:22, where Tubal-Cain is mentioned as "the forger of every cutting instrument of brass and iron." It is likely that the Jews learned the art of metallurgy from the Phoenicians (2Ch 2:14) (see CRAFTS). Iron was used in Biblical times much as it is today. For a description of a smith at work see Ecclesiasticus 38:28. Huge city gates, overlaid with strips of iron (Ps 107:16; Isa 45:2), held in place by crude square-headed nails (1Ch 22:3), are still a familiar sight in the larger cities of Palestine and Syria (Ac 12:10). Threshing instruments were made of iron (Am 1:3); so also harrows (2Sa 12:31), axes (ib; 2Ki 6:6; see Ax), branding irons (1Ti 4:2), and other tools (1Ki 6:7). There were iron weapons (Nu 35:16; Job 20:24), armor (2Sa 23:7), horns (1Ki 22:11), fetters (Ps 105:18), chariots (Jos 17:16), yokes (Jer 28:14), breastplates (Re 9:9), pens (chisels) (Job 19:24; Jer 17:1), sheets or plates (Eze 4:3), gods (Da 5:4), weights (1Sa 17:7), bedsteads (De 3:11). Iron was used extensively in building the temple.

See METALS.

Figurative: "The iron furnace" is used metaphorically for affliction, chastisement (De 4:20; Eze 22:18-22). Iron is also employed figuratively to represent barrenness (De 28:23), slavery ("yoke of iron," De 28:48), strength ("bars of iron," Job 40:18), severity ("rod of iron," Ps 2:9), captivity (Ps 107:10), obstinacy ("iron sinew," Isa 48:4), fortitude ("iron pillar," Jer 1:18), moral deterioration (Jer 6:28), political strength (Da 2:33), destructive power ("iron teeth," Da 7:7); the certainty with which a real enemy will ever show his hatred is as the rust returning upon iron (Ecclesiasticus 12:10 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "brass"); great obstacles ("walls of iron," 2 Macc 11:9).

James A. Patch

IRON (2)

i'-ron (yir'on): One of the fenced cities in the territory of Naphtali, named with Migdal-el and En-hazor (Jos 19:38). It is represented by the modern Yarun, a village with the ruins of a synagogue, at one time used as a monastery, fully 6 miles West of Qedes.

IRPEEL

ur'-pe-el, ir'-pe-el (yirpe'el): An unidentified city in Benjamin (Jos 18:27). It may possibly be represented by Rafat, a ruin to the North of el-Jib, the ancient Gibeon.

IRREVERENCE

i-rev'-er-ens.

See CRIME, CRIMES.

IRRIGATION

ir-i-ga'-shun: No equivalent for this word is found in Biblical writings, although the use of irrigation for maintaining vegetable life is frequently implied (Ec 2:5,6; Isa 58:11). To one familiar with the methods of irrigation practiced in Palestine, Syria and Egypt, the passage, "where thou sowedst thy seed, and wateredst it with thy foot, as a garden of herbs" (De 11:10), is easily explained. The water is brought in channels to the gardens, where it is distributed in turn to the different square plots bounded by banks of earth, or along the rows of growing vegetables planted on the sides of the trenches. In stony soil the breach in the canal leading to a particular plot is opened and closed with a hoe. Any obstruction in the trench is similarly removed, while in the soft, loamy soil of the coastal plain or in the Nile valley these operations can be done with the foot; a practice still commonly seen.

The remains of the great irrigation works of the ancient Egyptians and Babylonians leave no doubt as to

the extent to which they used water to redeem the deserts. In Palestine and Syria there was less need (De 10:7; 11:11) for irrigation. Here there is an annual fall of from 30 to 40 inches, coming principally during the winter. This is sufficient for the main crops. The summer supply of vegetables, as well as the fruit and mulberry trees, requires irrigation. Hardly a drop of many mountain streams is allowed to reach the sea, but is used to water the gardens of the mountain terraces and plains. This supply is now being supplemented by the introduction of thousands of pumps and oil engines for raising the water of the wells sufficiently to run it through the irrigation canals. Where a spring is small, its supply is gathered into a birket, or cistern, and then drawn off through a large outlet into the trenches, sometimes several days being required to fill the cistern. In Ec 2:6, Solomon is made to say, "I made me pools of water, to water therefrom the forest." This passage helps to explain the uses of the so-called Pools of Solomon, South of Jerusalem. In this same district are traces of the ancient terraces which were probably watered from these pools.

See AGRICULTURE; GARDEN.

James A. Patch

IRU

i’-roo (‘iru): Eldest son of Caleb (1Ch 4:15); probably to be read Ir, the syllable "-u" being the conjunction "and" belonging to the following word.

ISAAC

i’-zak:oIT- (Cs:hebrewIt+‘iruIT-/ CS): Eldest son of Caleb (1Ch 4:15); probably to be read Ir, the syllable "-u" being the conjunction "and" belonging to the following word.

I. NAME

1. Root, Forms, Analogues

2. Implication

II. FAMILY AND KINDRED

1. Birth and Place in the Family

2. Relation to the Religious Birthright

3. Significance of Marriage

III. STORY OF LIFE

1. Previous to Marriage

2. Subsequent to Marriage

IV. BIBLICAL REFERENCES

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the New Testament

V. VIEWS OTHER THAN THE HISTORICAL

I. Name.

1. Root, Forms and Analogues:

This name has the double spelling, yitschaq, and yitschaq (Isaak), corresponding to the two forms in which appears the root meaning "to laugh"—a root that runs through nearly all the Semitic languages. In Hebrew both tsachaq and sachaq have their cognate nouns, and signify, in the simple stem, "to laugh," in the intensive stem, "to jest, play, dance, fondle," and the like. The noun yitshar, meaning "fresh oil," from a root tsahar ("to be bright, conspicuous"), proves that nouns can be built on precisely the model of yitschaq, which would in that case signify "the laughing one," or something similar. Yet Barth (Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen, 154, b and c) maintains that all proper names beginning with yodh prefixed to the root are really pure imperfects, i.e. verbal forms with some subject to be understood if not actually present. Hence, Isaac would mean "laughs": either indefinite, "one laughs," or "he laughs," namely, the one understood as the subject. There are some 50 Hebrew names that have a similar form with no accompanying subject. Of these sometimes the meaning of the root is quite obscure, sometimes it is appropriate to any supposable subject. Each is a problem by itself; for the interpretation of any one of them there is little help to be gained from a comparison with the others.

2. Implication:

What subject, then, is to be understood with this imperfect verb yitschaq? Or is no definite subject to be supplied?

(1) ‘El, God, may be supplied: "God laughs." Such an expression might be understood of the Divine benevolence, or of the fearful laughter of scorn for His enemies (Ps 2:4), or, euphemistically, of the Divine wrath, the "terrible glance," as of Moloch, etc. (so Meyer, Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstdmme, 255).

(2) Some human person: "he laughs." So, for example, he himself, namely, the child who receives the name; or, the father; or, the brother (not the mother, which would require titschaq). In the light now of these possibilities we turn to the narratives of Isaac’s birth and career and find the following subjects suggested:

(a) father, Ge 17:17;

(b) indefinite, "one laughs" (not "she laughs," see above), Ge 18:12-15; 21:6; (c) brother, Ge 21:9; (d) himself, Ge 26:8. Of these passages the last two show the verb in the intensive stem in the signification of

(c) "mock" (?), and

(d) "dally."

We find this same verb in these senses in Ge 19:14 and 39:14,17, in the stories of Lot and of Joseph, and it is possible that here also in the story of Isaac it has no more connection with the name Isaac than it has there with the names Lot and Joseph. However, this may be, there is obviously one interpretation of the name Isaac, which, required in two of the passages, is equally appropriate in them all, namely, that with the indefinite subect, "one laughs." Consideration of the sources to which these passages are respectively assigned by the documentary hypothesis tends only to confirm this result.

II. Family and Kindred.

The two things in Isaac’s life that are deemed worthy of extensive treatment in the sacred narrative are his birth and his marriage. His significance, in fact, centers in his transmission of what went before him to what came after him. Hence, his position in his father’s family, his relation to its greatest treasure, the religious birthright, and his marriage with Rebekah are the subjects that require special notice in this connection.

1. Birth and Place in the Family:

The birth of Isaac is represented as peculiar in these respects: the age of his parents, the purity of his lineage, the special Divine promises accompanying. What in Abraham’s life is signalized by the Divine "call" in the from his father’s house, and what in Jacob’s life is brought about by a series of providential interpositions, seems in Isaac’s case to become his by his birth. His mother, who is not merely of the same stock as Abraham but actually his half-sister, is the legal wife. As her issue Isaac is qualified by the laws of inheritance recognized in their native land to become his father’s heir. But Ishmael, according to those laws, has a similarly valid claim (see ABRAHAM, iv, 2), and it is only by express command that Abraham is led to abandon what was apparently both custom and personal preference, to "cast out the bondwoman and her son," and to acquiesce in the arrangement that "in Isaac shall thy seed be called."

2. Relation to the Religious Birthright:

But the birthright of Isaac was of infinitely more importance than the birthright in the family of any other wealthy man of that day. All that limitless blessing with which Abraham set forth under God's leadership was promised not only to him but to his "seed"; it was limitless in time as well as in scope. To inherit it was of more consequence to Isaac than to inherit any number of servants, flocks or wells of his father's acquisition. A sense of these relative values seems to have been a part of Isaac's spiritual endowment, and this, more than anything else related of him, makes him an attractive figure on the pages of Gen.

3. Significance of Marriage:

The raising up of a "seed" to be the bearers of these promises was the prime concern of Isaac's life. Not by intermarriage with the Canaanites among whom he lived, but by marriage with one of his own people, in whom as much as in himself should be visibly embodied the separateness of the chosen family of God—thus primarily was Isaac to pass on to a generation as pure as his own the heritage of the Divine blessing. Rebekah enters the tent of Isaac as truly the chosen of God as was Abraham himself.

III. Story of Life.

Previous to his marriage Isaac's life is a part of the story of Abraham; after his marriage it merges into that of his children. It is convenient, therefore, to make his marriage the dividing-line in the narrative of his career.

1. Previous to Marriage:

A child whose coming was heralded by such signal marks of Divine favor as was Isaac's would be, even apart from other special considerations, a welcome and honored member of the patriarchal household. The covenant-sign of circumcision (which Isaac was the first to receive at the prescribed age of 8 days), the great feast at his weaning, and the disinheritance of Ishmael in his favor, are all of them indications of the unique position that this child held, and prepare the reader to appreciate the depth of feeling involved in the sacrifice of Isaac, the story of which follows thereupon. The age of Isaac at the time of this event is not stated, but the fact that he is able to carry the wood of the offering shows that he had probably attained his full growth. The single question he asks his father and his otherwise unbroken silence combine to exhibit him in a favorable light, as thoughtful, docile and trustful. The Divine interposition to save the lad thus devoted to God constitutes him afresh the bearer of the covenant-promise and justifies its explicit renewal on this occasion. From this point onward the biographer of Isaac evidently has his marriage in view, for the two items that preceded the long 24th chaper, in which Rebekah's choice and coming are rehearsed, are, first, the brief genealogical paragraph that informs the reader of the development of Nahor's family just as far as to Rebekah, and second, the chapter that tells of Sarah's death and burial—an event clearly associated in the minds of all with the marriage of Isaac

(see Ge 24:3,16,67). Divine interest in the choice of her who should be the mother of the promised seed is evident in every line of the chapter that dramatizes the betrothal of Isaac and Rebekah. Their first meeting is described at its close with the tender interest in such a scene natural to every descendant of the pair, and Issac is sketched as a man of a meditative turn (Ge 24:63) and an affectionate heart (Ge 24:67).

2. Subsequent to Marriage:

The dismissal of the sons of Abraham's concubines to the "East-country" is associated with the statement that Isaac inherited all that Abraham had; yet it has been remarked that, besides supplying them with gifts, Abraham was doing them a further kindness in thus emancipating them from continued subjection to Isaac, the future head of the clan. After Abraham's death we are expressly informed that God "blessed Isaac his son" in fulfillment of previous promise. The section entitled "the toledhoth (generations) of Isaac" extends from Ge 25:19 to 35:29. At the opening of it Isaac is dwelling at Beer-lahai-roi (25:11), then at Gerar (26:1,6) and "the valley of Gerar" (26:17), then at Beer-sheba (26:23; 28:10), all localities in the Negeb or "South-country." But after the long narrative of the fortunes of Jacob and his family, occupying many years, we find Isaac at its close living where his father Abraham had lived, at Hebron.

For 20 years Isaac and Rebekah remained childless; it was only upon the entreaty of Isaac that God granted them their twin sons. A famine was the usual signal for emigration to Egypt (compare Ge 12:10; 42:2); and Isaac also appears to have been on his way thither for the same cause, when, at Gerar, he is forbidden by God to proceed, and occasion is found therein to renew to him the covenant-promise of his inheritance: land, posterity, honor and the Divine presence (Ge 26:1-4).

But Isaac had also received from his father traditions of another sort; he too did not hesitate to say to the men of Gerar that his wife was his sister, with the same intent to save his own life, but without the same justification in fact, as in the case of Abraham's earlier stratagem. Yet even the discovery by the king of Gerar of this duplicity, and repeated quarrels about water in that dry country, did not suffice to endanger Isaac's status with the settled inhabitants, for his large household and great resources made him a valuable friend and a dangerous enemy.

The favoritism which Isaac showed for one son and Rebekah for the other culminated in the painful scene when the paternal blessing was by guile obtained for Jacob, and in the subsequent enforced absence of Jacob from his parental home. Esau, too, afforded no comfort to his father and mother, and ere long he also withdrew from his father's clan. The subsequent reconciliation of the brothers permitted them to unite at length in paying the last honors to Isaac on his decease. Isaac was buried at Hebron where his parents had been buried (Ge 49:31), and where' his place of sepulture is still honored.

IV. Biblical References.

There is a great contrast between Abraham and Jacob on the one hand, and Isaac on the other, with

respect to their prominence in the literature of the nation that traced to them its descent. To be sure, when the patriarchs as a group are to be named, Isaac takes his place in the stereotyped formula of "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," or "Israel" (so 23 times in the Old Testament, 7 times in the New Testament).

1. In the Old Testament:

But apart from this formula Isaac is referred to in the Old Testament only as follows. During the lifetime of Jacob the names of Abraham and Isaac are repeatedly linked in the same way as are all three subsequently: they form for that age the dynasty of the covenant. But several times Jacob calls Yahweh the God (or, the Fear; see infra) of Isaac, because Isaac is his own immediate predecessor in this chain of the faithful. Isaac is called the "gift" of God to Abraham, in the farewell address of Joshua, just as Jacob and Esau are called God's "gifts" to Isaac (Jos 24:3 f; compare Koran, Sura 6 84). The "house of Isaac" is used by Amos as a parallel expression for "Israel," and "the high places of Isaac" for "the sanctuaries of Israel" (Am 7:16,9), in the same way as "Jacob" is often used elsewhere Septuagint in Am 7:16 reads "Jacob"). Other references to Isaac are simply as to his father's son or his children's father.

2. In the New Testament:

He fares better in the New Testament. For, besides the genealogical references, Isaac's significance as the first to receive circumcision on the 8th day is remembered (Ac 7:8); his position as first of the elect seed is set forth (Ro 9:7); his begetting of two sons so unlike in their relation to the promise as were Esau and Jacob is remarked (Ro 9:10); the facts of his being heir to the promise, a child of old age, and, though but one, the father of an innumerable progeny, are emphasized in Heb (11:9-12), which also discovers the deeper significance of his sacrifice and restoration to his father (11:17-19; compare Jas 2:21); and in the same context is noticed the faith in God implied in Isaac's blessing of his sons. But Isaac receives more attention than anywhere else in that famous passage in Ga (4:21-31), in which Paul uses Isaac and his mother as allegorical representations of Christians who are justified by faith in the promise of God, and are the free-born heirs of all the spiritual inheritance implied in that promise. Even Isaac's persecution by Ishmael has its counterpart in the attitude of the enemies of Paul's gospel toward him and his doctrines and converts.

V. Views Other than the Historical.

Philo, the chief allegorizer of Scriptural narratives, has little to say of Isaac, whom he calls "the self-instructed nature." But modern critics have dissolved his personality by representing him as the personification of an ethnic group. "All Israel," writes Wellhausen (Prol., 6th edition, 316), "is grouped with the people of Edom under the old name Isaac (Am 7:9,16) .... the material here is not mythical (as in Ge 1-11) but national." And just as Israel plus Edom had little or no significance in national customs or political events, when compared on the one hand with Israel alone (= Jacob), and with Israel plus Edom plus Moab and Ammon (= Abraham) on the other hand; so likewise the figure of Isaac is colorless and his story brief, as compared with the striking figures of Jacob on the one hand and of Abraham on

the other hand, and the circumstantial stories of their lives.

Other scholars will have none of this national view, because they believe Isaac to be the name of an ancient deity, the local numen of Beersheba. Stark, whom others have followed, proposes to interpret the phrase translated "the Fear of Isaac" in Ge 31:42,53 as the name of this god used by his worshippers, the Terror Isaac, Isaac the terrible god. For the sense of Isaac in that case see above under I, 2, (1). Meyer (loc. cit.) defends the transfer of the name from a god to the hero of a myth, by comparing the sacrifice of Isaac ("the only story in which Isaac plays an independent role"!) with the Greek myth of Iphigenia's sacrifice (Hesiod, Euripides, etc.), in which the by-name of a goddess (Iphigenia) identified with Artemis has passed to the intended victim rescued by Artemis from death.

The most recent critical utterances reject both the foregoing views of Isaac as in conflict with the data of Gen. Thus Gunkel (Schriften des Altes Testament, 5te Lieferung, 1910, 41) writes: "Quite clearly the names of Abraham, Isaac, and all the patriarchal women are not tribal names. .... The interpretation of the figures of Ge as nations furnishes by no means a general key." And again: "Against the entire assumption that the principal patriarchal figures are originally gods, is above all to be noted that the names Jacob and Abraham are proved by the Babylonian to be personal names in current use, and at the same time that the sagas about them can in no wise be understood as echoes of original myths. Even Winckler's more than bold attempt to explain these sagas as original calendar-myths must be pronounced a complete failure." Yet Gunkel and those who share his position are careful to distinguish their own view from that of the "apologetes," and to concede no more than the bare fact that there doubtless were once upon a time persons named Abraham Isaac, etc. For these critics Isaac is simply a name about which have crystallized cycles of folk-stories, that have their parallels in other lands and languages, but have received with a Hebrew name also a local coloring and significance on the lips of successive Hebrew story-tellers, saga-builders and finally collectors and editors; "Everyone who knows the history of sagas is sure that the saga is not able to preserve through the course of so many centuries, a true picture" of the patriarchs.

See also ABRAHAM, end.

J. Oscar Boyd

ISAAC, TESTAMENT OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ISAIAH, 1-7

i-za'-ya, i-zi'-a:

1. Name

2. Personal History

3. Call

4. Literary Genius and Style

5. Traditions concerning His Martyrdom

6. Period

7. Analysis and Contents

8. Isaiah’s Prophecies Chronologically Arranged

9. The Critical Problem

(1) The History of Criticism

(2) The Disintegration of "Deutero-Isaiah"

(3) Recent Views

(4) The Present State of the Question

(5) Reasons for Dissecting the Book

(6) Arguments for One Isaiah

(a) The Circle of Ideas

(b) The Literary Style

(c) Historical References

(d) The Predictire Element

(e) Cyrus a Subject of Prediction

LITERATURE

Of all Israel’s celebrated prophets, Isaiah is the king. The writings which bear his name are among the profoundest in all literature. One great theme—salvation by faith—stamps them all. Isaiah is the Paul of the Old Testament.

1. Name:

In Hebrew yesha‘yahu, and yesha‘yah; Greek Esaias; Latin Esaias and Isaias. His name was symbolic of his message. Like "Joshua," it means "Yahweh saves," or "Yahweh is salvation," or "salvation of Yahweh."

2. Personal History:

Isaiah was the son of Amoz (not Amos). He seems to have belonged to a family of some rank, as may be inferred from his easy access to the king (Isa 7:3), and his close intimacy with the priest (Isa 8:2). Tradition says he was the cousin of King Uzziah. He lived in Jerusalem and became court preacher. He was married and had two sons: Shear-jashub, his name signifying "a remnant shall return" (Isa 7:3), and Maher-shalal-hash-baz, "hasting to the spoil, hurrying to the prey," symbolic of Assyria’s mad lust of conquest (Isa 8:3). Jewish tradition, based upon a false interpretation of Isa 7:14, declares he was twice married.

3. Call:

In the year that King Uzziah died, Isaiah, apparently while worshipping in the temple, received a call to the prophetic office (Isa 6). He responded with noteworthy alacrity, and accepted his commission, though he knew from the outset that his task was to be one of fruitless warning and exhortation (6:9-13). Having been reared in Jerusalem, he was well fitted to become the political and religious counselor of the nation, but the experience which prepared him most for his important work was the vision of the majestic and thrice-holy God which he saw in the temple in the death-year of King Uzziah. There is no good reason for doubting that this was his inaugural vision, though some regard it as a vision which came to him after years of experience in preaching and as intended to deepen his spirituality. While this is the only explicit "vision" Isaiah saw, yet his entire book, from first to last, is, as the title (11) suggests, a "vision." His horizon, both political and spiritual, was practically unbounded. In a very true sense, as Delitzsch says, he was "the universal prophet of Israel."

4. Literary Genius and Style:

For versatility of expression and brilliancy of imagery Isaiah had no superior, not even a rival. His style marks the climax of Hebrew literary article Both his periods and Genius and descriptions are most finished and sublime. He is a perfect artist in words. Beauty and strength are characteristic of his entire book. Epigrams and metaphors, particularly of flood, storm and sound (1:13; 5:18,22; 8:8; 10:22; 28:17,20; 30:28,30), interrogation and dialogue (6:8; 10:8,9), antithesis and alliteration (1:18; 3:24; 17:10,12), hyperbole and parable (2:7; 5:1-7; 28:23-29), even paranomasia, or play upon words (5:7;

7:9), characterize Isaiah's book as the great masterpiece of Hebrew literature. He is also famous for his richness of vocabulary and synonyms. For example, Ezekiel uses 1,535 words; Jeremiah, 1,653; the Psalmists 2,170; while Isaiah uses 2,186. Isaiah was also an orator: Jerome likened him to Demosthenes; and a poet: he frequently elaborates his messages in rhythmic or poetic style (12:1-6; 25:1-5; 26:1-12; 38:10-20; 42:1-4; 49:1-9; 50:4-9; 52:13-53:12; 60-62; 66:5-24); and in several instances slips into elegiac rhythm, e.g. in 37:22-29 there is a fine taunting poem on Sennacherib, and in 14:4-23 another on the king of Babylon. As Driver observes, "Isaiah's poetical genius is superb."

5. Traditions concerning His Martyrdom:

Nothing definite or historical is known concerning the prophet's end. Toward the close of the 2nd century AD, however, there was a tradition to the effect that he suffered martyrdom in the heathen reaction which occurred under King Manasseh, because of certain speeches concerning God and the Holy City which his contemporaries alleged were contrary to the law. Indeed the Jewish Mishna explicitly states that Manasseh slew him. Justin Martyr also (150 AD), in his controversial dialogue with the Jew Trypho, reproaches the Jews with this accusation, "whom ye sawed asunder with a wooden saw"; this tradition is further confirmed by a Jewish Apocalypse of the 2nd century AD, entitled, The Ascension of Isaiah, and by Epiphanius in his so-called Lives of the Prophets. It is barely possible that there is an allusion to his martyrdom in Heb 11:37, which reads, "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder," but this is by no means certain. In any case Isaiah probably survived the great catastrophe of the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC, and possibly also the death of Hezekiah in 699 BC; for in 2Ch 32:32 it is stated that Isaiah wrote a biography of King Hezekiah. If so, his prophetic activity extended over a period of more than 40 years. Dr. G. A. Smith extends it to "more than 50" (Jerusalem, II, 180; compare Whitehouse, "Isaiah," New Century Bible, I, 72).

6. Period:

According to the title of his book (11), Isaiah prophesied during the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz and Hezekiah, kings of Judah. He dates his inaugural vision (6:1) in Uzziah's death-year, which was approximately 740 BC. This marks, therefore, the beginning of his prophetic ministry. And we know that he was still active as late as the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC. Hence, the minimum period of his activity as a prophet was from 740 to 701 BC. As a young man Isaiah witnessed the rapid development of Judah into a strong commercial and military state; for under Uzziah Judah attained a degree of prosperity and strength never before enjoyed since the days of Solomon. Walls, towers, fortifications, a large standing army, a port for commerce on the Red Sea, increased inland trade, tribute from the Ammonites, success in war with the Philistines and the Arabians—all these became Judah's during Uzziah's long and prosperous reign of 52 years. But along with power and wealth came also avarice, oppression, religious formality and corruption. The temple revenues indeed were greatly increased, but religion and life were too frequently dissociated; the nation's progress was altogether material. During the reign of Jotham (740-736 BC), who for several years was probably associated with his father as co-regent, a new power began to appear over the eastern horizon. The Assyrians, with whom Ahab had come in contact at the battle of Karkar in 854 BC, and to whom Jehu had paid tribute in 842 BC, began to manifest anew their characteristic lust of conquest. Tiglathpileser III, who is called

"Pul" in 2Ki 15:19 and reigned over Assyria from 745 to 727 BC, turned his attention westward, and in 738 BC reduced Arpad, Calno, Carchemish, Hamath and Damascus, causing them to pay tribute. His presence in the West led Pekah, king of North Israel, and Rezin, king of Damascus, to form an alliance in order to resist further encroachment on the part of Assyria. When Ahaz refused to join their confederacy they resolved to dethrone him and set in his stead the son of Tabeel upon the throne of David (2Ki 16:5; Isa 7:6). The struggle which ensued is commonly known as the Syro-Ephraimitic war (734 BC)—one of the great events in Isaiah's period. Ahaz in panic sent to Tiglath-pileser for help (2Ki 16:7), who of course responded with alacrity. The result was that the great Assyrian warrior sacked Gaza and carried all of Galilee and Gilead into captivity (734) and finally took Damascus (732 BC). Ahaz was forced to pay dearly for his protection and Judah was brought very low (2Ki 15:29; 16:7-9; 2Ch 28:19; Isa 7:1). The religious as well as the political effect of Ahaz' policy was decidedly baneful. To please Tiglath-pileser, Ahaz went to Damascus to join in the celebration of his victories, and while there saw a Syrian altar, a pattern of which he sent to Jerusalem and had a copy set up in the temple in place of the brazen altar of Solomon. Thus Ahaz, with all the influence of a king, introduced idolatry into Jerusalem, even causing his sons to pass through the fire (2Ki 16:10-16; 2Ch 28:3).

Hezekiah succeeded Ahaz, beginning to rule at the age of 25 and reigning 29 years (727-699 BC). Isaiah was at least 15 years his senior. The young king inherited from his father a heavy burden. The splendor of Uzziah's and Jotham's reigns was rapidly fading before the ever-menacing and avaricious Assyrians. Hezekiah began his reign with reformation. "He removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah" (2Ki 18:4,22). He even invited the surviving remnant of North Israel to join in celebrating the Passover (2Ch 30:1). But Israel's end was drawing near. Hoshea, the vacillating puppet-king of North Israel (730-722 BC), encouraged by Egypt, refused longer to pay Assyria his annual tribute (2Ki 17:4); whereupon Shalmaneser IV, who had succeeded Tiglath-pileser, promptly appeared before the gates of Samaria in 724 BC, and for 3 weary years besieged the city (2Ki 17:5). Finally, the city was captured by Sargon II, who succeeded Shalmaneser IV in 722 BC, and 27,292 of Israel's choicest people (according to Sargon's own description) were deported to Assyria, and colonists were brought from Babylon and other adjacent districts and placed in the cities of Samaria (2Ki 17:6,24). Thus the kingdom of North Israel passed into oblivion, and Judah was left ever after quite exposed to the direct ravages, political and religious, of her Assyrio-Babylonian neighbors. In fact Judah herself barely escaped destruction by promising heavy tribute. This was the second great political crisis during Isaiah's ministry. Other crises were soon to follow. One was the desperate illness of King Hezekiah, who faced assured death in 714 BC. Being childless, he was seriously concerned for the future of the Davidic dynasty. He resorted to prayer, however, and God graciously extended his life 15 years (2Ki 20; Isa 38). His illness occurred during the period of Babylon's independence under Merodach-baladan, the ever-ambitious, irresistible and uncompromising enemy of Assyria, who for 12 years (721-709 BC) maintained independent supremacy over Babylon. Taking advantage of Hezekiah's wonderful cure, Merodach seized the opportunity of sending an embassy to Jerusalem to congratulate him on his recovery (712 BC), and at the same time probably sought to form an alliance with Judah to resist Assyrian supremacy (2Ki 20:12 ff; Isa 39). Nothing, however, came of the alliance, for the following year Sargon's army reappeared in Philistia in order to discipline Ashdod for conspiracy with the king of Egypt (711 BC). The greatest crisis was yet to come. Its story is as follows: Judah and her neighbors groaned more and more under the heavy exactions of Assyria. Accordingly, when Sargon was

assassinated and Sennacherib came to the throne in 705 BC, rebellion broke out on all sides. Merodach-baladan, who had been expelled by Sargon in 709 BC, again took Babylon and held it for at least six months in 703 BC. Hezekiah, who was encouraged by Egypt and all Philistia, except Padi of Ekron, the puppet-king of Sargon, refused longer to pay Assyria tribute (2Ki 18:7). Meanwhile a strong pro-Egyptian party had sprung up in Jerusalem. In view of all these circumstances, Sennacherib in 701 BC marched westward with a vast army, sweeping everything before him. Tyre was invested though not taken; on the other hand, Joppa, Eltekeh, Ekron, Ashkelon, Ammon, Moab, and Edom all promptly yielded to his demands. Hezekiah was panic stricken and hastened to bring rich tribute, stripping even the temple and the palace of their treasures to do so (2Ki 18:13-16). But Sennacherib was not satisfied. He overran Judah, capturing, as he tells us in his inscription, 46 walled towns and smaller villages without number, carrying 200,150 of Judah's population into captivity to Assyria, and demanding as tribute 800 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold, in all, over $1,500,000; he took also, he claims, Hezekiah's daughters and palace women, seized his male and female singers, and carried away enormous spoil. But the end was not yet. Sennacherib himself, with the bulk of the army, halted in Philistia to reduce Lachish; thence he sent a strong detachment under his commander-in-chief, the Rabshakeh, to besiege Jerusalem (2Ki 18:17-19:8; Isa 36:2-37:8). As he describes this blockade in his own inscription: "I shut up Hezekiah in Jerusalem like a bird in a cage." The Rabshakeh, however, failed to capture the city and returned to Sennacherib, who meanwhile had completely conquered Lachish, and was now warring against Libnab. A second expedition against Jerusalem was planned, but hearing that Tirhakah (at that time the commander-in-chief of Egypt's forces and only afterward "king of Ethiopia") was approaching, Sennacherib was forced to content himself with sending messengers with a letter to Hezekiah, demanding immediate surrender of the city (2Ki 19:9 ff; Isa 37:9). Hezekiah, however, through Isaiah's influence held out; and in due time, though Sennacherib disposed of Tirhakah's army without difficulty, his immense host in some mysterious way—by plague or otherwise—was suddenly smitten, and the great Assyrian conqueror was forced to return to Nineveh; possibly because Merodach-baladan had again appeared in Babylonia. Sennacherib never again returned to Palestine, so far as we know, during the subsequent 20 years of his reign, though he did make an independent expedition into North Arabia (691-689 BC). This invasion of Judah by Sennacherib in 701 BC was the great political event in Isaiah's ministry. Had it not been for the prophet's statesmanship, Jerusalem might have capitulated. As it was, only a small, insignificantly small, remnant of Judah's population escaped. Isaiah had at this time been preaching 40 years. How much longer he labored is not known.

7. Analysis and Contents:

There are six general divisions of the book:

(1) Isa 1-12, prophecies concerning Judah and Jerusalem, closing with promises of restoration and a psalm of thanksgiving;

(2) Isa 13-23, oracles of judgment and salvation, for the most part concerning those foreign nations whose fortunes affected Judah and Jerusalem;

(3) Isa 24-27, Yahweh’s world-judgment in the redemption of Israel;

(4) Isa 28-35, a cycle of prophetic warnings against alliance with Egypt, closing with a prophecy concerning Edom and a promise of Israel’s ransom;

(5) Isa 36-39, history, prophecy and song intermingled; serving both as an appendix to Isa 1-35, and as an introduction to Isa 40-66;

(6) Isa 40-66, prophecies of comfort and salvation, and also of the future glory awaiting Israel.

By examining in detail these several divisions we can trace better the prophet’s thought. Thus, Isa 1-12 unfold Judah’s social sins (Isa 1-6), and her political entanglements (Isa 7-12); Isa 1 is an introduction, in which the prophet strikes the chief notes of his entire book: namely, thoughtlessness (1:2-9), formalism in worship (1:10-17), pardon (1:18-23) and judgment (1:24-31). Isa 2-4 contain three distinct pictures of Zion:

(a) her exaltation (2:2-4),

(b) her present idolatry (2:5-4:1), and (c) her eventual purification (4:2-6).

Isa 5 contains an arraignment of Judah and Jerusalem, composed of three parts:

(a) a parable of Yahweh’s vineyard (5:1-7);

(b) a series of six woes pronounced against insatiable greed (5:8-10), dissipation (5:11-17), daring defiance against Yahweh (5:18,19), confusion of moral distinctions (5:20), political self-conceit (5:21), and misdirected heroism (5:22,23); and

(c) an announcement of imminent judgment. The Assyrian is on the way and there will be no escape (5:24-30). Isa 6 recounts the prophet’s inaugural vision and commission. It is really an apologetic, standing as it does after the prophet’s denunciations of his contemporaries. When they tacitly object to his message of threatening and disaster, he is able to reply that, having pronounced "woe" upon himself in the year that King Uzziah died, he had the authority to pronounce woe upon them (6:5). Plainly Isaiah tells them that Judah’s sins are well-nigh hopeless. They are becoming spiritually insensible. They have eyes but they cannot see. Only judgment can, avail: "the righteous judgment of a forgotten God" awaits them. A "holy seed," however, still existed in Israel’s stock (6:13).

Coming to Isa 7-12, Isaiah appears in the role of a practical statesman. He warns Ahaz against political entanglements with Assyria. The section 7:1-9:7 is a prophecy of Immanuel, history and prediction being intermingled.

They describe the Syro-Ephraimitic uprising in 736 BC, when Pekah of North Israel and Rezin of

Damascus, in attempting to defend themselves against the Assyrians, demanded that Ahaz of Jerusalem should become their ally. But Ahaz preferred the friendship of Assyria, and refused to enter into alliance with them. And in order to defend himself, he applied to Assyria for assistance, sending ambassadors with many precious treasures, both royal and sacred, to bribe Tiglath-pileser. It was at this juncture that Isaiah, at Yahweh's bidding, expostulates with Ahaz concerning the fatal step he is about to take, and as a practical statesman warns Ahaz, "the king of No-Faith," that the only path of safety lies in loyalty to Yahweh and keeping clear of foreign alliances; that "God is with us" for salvation; and that no "conspiracy" can possibly be successful unless God too is against us. When, however, the prophet's message of promise and salvation finds no welcome, he commits it to his disciples, bound up and sealed for future use; assuring his hearers that unto them a child is born and unto them a son is given, in whose day the empire of David will be established upon a basis of justice and righteousness. The Messianic scion is the ground of the prophet's hope; which hope, though unprecedented, he thus early in his ministry commits, written and sealed, to his inner circle of "disciples."

See, further, IMMANUEL.

The section Isa 9:8-10:4 contains an announcement to North Israel of accumulated wrath and impending ruin, with a refrain (9:12,17,21; 10:4). Here, in an artistic poem composed of four strophes, the prophet describes the great calamities which Yahweh has sent down upon North Israel but which have gone unheeded: foreign invasion (9:8-12), defeat in battle (9:13-17), anarchy (9:18-21), and impending captivity (10:1-4). Yet Yahweh's judgments have gone unheeded: "For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still." Divine discipline has failed; only judgment remains.

In Isa 10:5-34, Assyria is declared to be an instrument of Yahweh, the rod of Yahweh's anger. Isa 11-12 predict Israel's return from exile, including a vision of the Messiah's reign of ideal peace. For Isaiah's vision of the nation's future reached far beyond mere exile. To him the downfall of Assyria was the signal for the commencement of a new era in Israel's history. Assyria has no future, her downfall is fatal; Judah has a future, her calamities are only disciplinary. An Ideal Prince will be raised up in whose advent all Nature will rejoice, even dumb animals (11:1-10). A second great exodus will take place, for the Lord will set His hand again "the second time" to recover the remnant of His people "from the four corners of the earth" (11:11,12). In that day, "Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (11:13). On the contrary, the reunited nation, redeemed and occupying their rightful territory (11:14-16), shall sing a hymn of thanksgiving, proclaiming the salvation of Yahweh to all the earth (Isa 12).

Isaiah 13-23 contain oracles of judgment and salvation, for the most part concerning those foreign nations whose fortunes affected Judah and Jerusalem. They are grouped together by the editor, as similar foreign oracles are in Jer 46-51 and Eze 25-32. Isaiah's horizon was world-wide. First among the foreign prophecies stands the oracle concerning Babylon (Isa 13:1-14:23), in which he predicts the utter destruction of the city (Isa 13:2-22), and sings a dirge or taunt-song over her fallen king (Isa 14:4-23). The king alluded to is almost beyond doubt an Assyrian (not a Babylonian) monarch of the 8th century; the brief prophecy immediately following in Isa 14:24-27 concerning Assyria tacitly confirms this

interpretation. Another brief oracle concerning Babylon (21:1-10) describes the city's fall as imminent. Both oracles stand or fall together as genuine prophecies of Isaiah. Both seem to have been written in Jerusalem (13:2; 21:9,10). It cannot be said that either is absolutely unrelated in thought and language to Isaiah's age (14:13; 21:2); each foretells the doom to fall on Babylon (13:19; 21:9) at the hands of the Medes (13:17; 21:2); and each describes the Israelites as already in exile—but not necessarily all Israel.

The section Isa 14:24-27 tells of the certain destruction of the Assyrian.

The passage Isa 14:28-32 is an oracle concerning Philistia.

Isaiah 15-16 are ancient oracles against Moab, whose dirgelike meter resembles that of Isa 13-14. It is composed of two separate prophecies belonging to two different periods in Isaiah's ministry (16:13,14). The three points of particular interest in the oracle are:

(1) the prophet's tender sympathy for Moab in her affliction (15:5; 16:11). Isaiah mingles his own tears with those of the Moabites. As Delitzsch says, "There is no prophecy in the Book of Isaiah in which the heart of the prophet is so painfully moved by what his spirit beholds and his mouth must prophecy."

(2) Moab's pathetic appeal for shelter from her foes; particularly the ground on which she urges it, namely, the Messianic hope that the Davidic dynasty shall always stand and be able to repulse its foes (16:5). The prophecy is an echo of 9:5-7.

(3) The promise that a remnant of Moab, though small, shall be saved (16:14). Wearied of prayer to Chemosh in his high places, the prophet predicts that Moab will seek the living God (16:12).

The passage Isa 17:1-11 is an oracle concerning Damascus and North Israel, in which Isaiah predicts the fate of the two allies—Syria and Ephraim—in the Syro-Ephraimitic war of 734 BC, with a promise that only a scanty remnant will survive (17:6). In 17:12-14, the prophet boldly announces the complete annihilation of Judah's unnamed foes—the Assyrians.

Isaiah 18 describes Ethiopia as in great excitement, sending ambassadors hither and thither—possibly all the way to Jerusalem—ostensibly seeking aid in making preparations for war. Assyria had already taken Damascus (732 BC) and Samaria (722 BC), and consequently Egypt and Ethiopia were in fear of invasion. Isaiah bids the ambassadors to return home and quietly watch Yahweh thwart Assyria's self-confident attempt to subjugate Judah; and he adds that when the Ethiopians have seen God's hand in the coming deliverance of Judah and Jerusalem (701 BC), they will bring a present to Yahweh to His abode in Mount Zion.

Isaiah 19, which is an oracle concerning Egypt, contains both a threat (19:1-17) and a promise (19:18-25), and is one of Isaiah's most remarkable foreign messages. Egypt is smitten and thereby led to abandon her idols for the worship of Yahweh (19:19-22). Still more remarkable, it is prophesied that in that day Egypt and Assyria will join with Judah in a triple alliance of common worship to Yahweh and

of blessing to others (19:23-25). Isaiah's missionary outlook here is wonderful!

Isaiah 20 describes Sargon's march against Egypt and Ethiopia, containing a brief symbolic prediction of Assyria's victory over Egypt and Ethiopia. By donning a captive's garb for three years, Isaiah attempts to teach the citizens of Jerusalem that the siege of Ashdod was but a means to an end in Sargon's plan of campaign, and that it was sheer folly for the Egyptian party in Jerusalem, who were ever urging reliance upon Egypt, to look in that direction for help. Isaiah 21:11,12 is a brief oracle concerning Seir or Edom, "the only gentle utterance in the Old Testament upon Israel's hereditary foe." Edom is in great anxiety. The prophet's answer is disappointing, though its tone is sympathetic. Isaiah 21:13 ff is a brief oracle concerning Arabia. It contains a sympathetic appeal to the Temanites to give bread and water to the caravans of Dedan, who have been driven by war from their usual route of travel.

Isaiah 22 is concerning the foreign temper within theocracy. It is composed of two parts:

(1) an oracle "of the valley of vision," i.e. Jerusalem (22:1-14); and

(2) a philippic against Shebna, the comptroller of the palace. Isaiah pauses, as it were, in his series of warnings to foreign nations to rebuke the foreign temper of the frivolous inhabitants of Jerusalem, and in particular Shebna, a high official in the government.

The reckless and God-ignoring citizens of the capital are pictured as indulging themselves in hilarious eating and drinking, when the enemy is at that very moment standing before the gates of the city. Shebna, on the other hand, seems to have been an ostentatious foreigner, perhaps a Syrian by birth, quite possibly one of the Egyptian party, whose policy was antagonistic to that of Isaiah and the king. Isaiah's prediction of Shebna's fall was evidently fulfilled (36:3; 37:2).

Isaiah 23 is concerning Tyre. In this oracle Isaiah predicts that Tyre shall be laid waste (23:1), her commercial glory humbled (23:9), her colonies become independent of her (23:10), and she herself forgotten for "seventy years" (23:15); but "after the end of seventy years," her trade will revive, her business prosperity will return, and she will dedicate her gains in merchandise as holy to Yahweh (23:18).

The third great section of the Book of Isaiah embraces Isa 24-27, which tell of Yahweh's world-judgment, issuing in the redemption of Israel. These prophecies stand closely related to Isa 13-23. They express the same tender emotion as that already observed in 15:5; 16:11, and sum up as in one grand finale the prophet's oracles to Israel's neighbors. For religious importance they stand second to none in the Book of Isaiah, teaching the necessity of Divine discipline and the glorious redemption awaiting the faithful in Israel. They are a spiritual commentary on the great Assyrian crisis of the 8th century; they are messages of salvation intended, not for declamation, but for meditation, and were probably addressed more particularly to the prophet's inner circle of "disciples" (8:16). These chapters partake of the nature of apocalypse. Strictly speaking, however, they are prophecy, not apocalypse. No one ascends into heaven or talks with an angel, as in Da 7 and Re 4. They are apocalypse only in the sense that

certain things are predicted as sure to come to pass. Isaiah was fond of this kind of prophecy. He frequently lifts his reader out of the sphere of mere history to paint pictures of the far-off, distant future (2:2-4; 4:2-6; 11:6-16; 30:27-33).

In Isa 24 the prophet announces a general judgment of the earth (i.e. the land of Judah), and of "the city" (collective, for Judah's towns), after which will dawn a better day (24:1-15). The prophet fancies he hears songs of deliverance, but alas! they are premature; more judgment must follow. In Isa 25 the prophet transports himself to the period after the Assyrian catastrophe and, identifying himself with the redeemed, puts into their mouths songs of praise and thanksgiving for their deliverance. Isa 25:6-8 describe Yahweh's bountiful banquet on Mount Zion to all nations, who, in keeping with 2:2-4, come up to Jerusalem, to celebrate "a feast of fat things," rich and marrowy. While the people are present at the banquet, Yahweh graciously removes their spiritual blindness so that they behold Him as the true dispenser of life and grace. He also abolishes violent death, that is to say, war (compare 2:4) and its sad accompaniment, "tears," so that "the earth" (i.e. the land of Judah) is no longer the battlefield of the nations, but the blessed abode of the redeemed, living in peace and happiness. The prophet's aim is not political but religious.

In Isa 26:1-19 Judah sings a song over Jerusalem, the impregnable city of God. The prophet, taking again his stand with the redeemed remnant of the nation, vividly portrays their thankful trust in Yahweh, who has been unto them a veritable "Rock of Ages" (26:4 margin). With hope he joyfully exclaims, Let Yahweh's dead ones live! Let Israel's dead bodies arise! Yahweh will bring life from the dead! (26:19). This is the first clear statement of the resurrection in the Old Testament. But it is national and restricted to Israel (compare 26:14), and is merely Isaiah's method of expressing a hope of the return of Israel's faithful ones from captivity (compare Ho 6:2; Eze 37:1-14; Da 12:2).

In Isa 26:20-27:13 the prophet shows that Israel's chastisements are salutary. He begins by exhorting his own people, his disciples, to continue a little longer in the solitude of prayer, till God's wrath has shattered the world-powers (26:20-27:1). He next predicts that the true vineyard of Yahweh will henceforth be safely guarded against the briars and thorns of foreign invasion (27:2-6). And then, after showing that Yahweh's chastisements of Israel were light compared with His judgments upon other nations (27:7-11), he promises that if Israel will only repent, Yahweh will spare no pains to gather "one by one" the remnant of His people from Assyria and Egypt (compare 11:11); and together they shall once more worship Yahweh in the holy mountain at Jerusalem (27:12,13).

The prophet's fundamental standpoint in Isa 24-27 is the same as that of 2:2-4 and Isa 13-23. Yet the prophet not infrequently throws himself forward into the remote future, oscillating backward and forward between his own times and those of Israel's restoration. It is especially noteworthy how he sustains himself in a long and continued transportation of himself to the period of Israel's redemption. He even studies to identify himself with the new Israel which will emerge out of the present chaos of political events. His visions of Israel's redemption carry him in ecstasy far away into the remote future, to a time when the nation's sufferings are all over; so that when he writes down what he saw in vision he describes it as a discipline that is past. For example, in 25:1-8 the prophet, transported to the end of time, celebrates in song what he saw, and describes how the fall of the world-empire is followed by the

conversion of the heathen. In 26:8,9 he looks back into the past from the standpoint of the redeemed in the last days, and tells how Israel longingly waited for the manifestation of God's righteousness which has now taken place, while in 27:7-9 he places himself in the midst of the nation's sufferings, in full view of their glorious future, and portrays how Yahweh's dealings with Israel have not been the punishment of wrath, but the discipline of love. This kind of apocalypse, or prophecy, indeed, was to be expected from the very beginning of the group of prophecies, which are introduced with the word "Behold!" Such a manner of introduction is peculiar to Isaiah, and of itself leads us to expect a message which is unique.

The practical religious value of these prophecies to Isaiah's own age would be very great. In a period of war and repeated foreign invasion, when but few men were left in the land (Isa 24:6,13; 26:18), and Judah's cities were laid waste and desolate (Isa 24:10,12; 25:2; 26:5; 27:10), and music and gladness were wanting (Isa 24:8), when the nation still clung to their idols (Isa 27:9) and the Assyrians' work of destruction was still incomplete, other calamities being sure to follow (Isa 24:16), it would certainly be comforting to know that forgiveness was still possible (Isa 27:9), that Yahweh was still the keeper of His vineyard (Isa 27:3,4), that His judgments were to last but for a little moment (Isa 26:20), and that though His people should be scattered, He would soon carefully gather them "one by one" (Isa 27:12,13), and that in company with other nations they would feast together on Mt. Zion as Yahweh's guests (Isa 25:6,7,10), and that Jerusalem should henceforth become the center of life and religion to all nations (Isa 24:23; 25:6; 27:13). Such faith in Yahweh, such exhortations and such songs and confessions of the redeemed, seen in vision, would be a source of rich spiritual comfort to the few suffering saints in Judah and Jerusalem, and a guiding star to the faithful disciples of the prophet's most inner circle.

Isaiah 28-35 contain a cycle of prophetic warnings against alliance with Egypt, closing with a prophecy concerning Edom and a promise of Israel's ransom. As in 5:8-23, the prophet indulges in a series of six woes:

(1) Woe to drunken, scoffing politicians (Isa 28). This is one of the great chapters of Isaiah's book. In the opening section (28:1-6) the prophet points in warning to the proud drunkards of Ephraim whose crown (Samaria) is rapidly fading. He next turns to the scoffing politicians of Jerusalem, rebuking especially the bibulous priests who stumble in judgment, and the staggering prophets who err in vision (28:7-22); closing with a most instructive parable from agriculture, teaching that God's judgments are not arbitrary; that as the husbandman does not plow and harrow his fields the whole year round, so God will not punish His people forever; and as the husbandman does not thresh all kinds of grain with equal severity, no more will God discipline His people beyond their deserts (28:23-29).

(2) Woe to formalists in religion (Isa 29:1-14). Isaiah's second woe is pronounced upon Ariel, the altar-hearth of God, i.e. Jerusalem, the sacrificial center of Israel's worship. David had first inaugurated the true worship of Yahweh in Zion. But now Zion's worship has become wholly conventional, formal, and therefore insincere; it is learned by rote (29:13; compare 1:10-15; Mic 6:6-8). Therefore, says Isaiah, Yahweh is forced to do an extraordinary work among them, in order to bring them back to a true knowledge of Himself (Isa 29:14).

(3) Woe to those who hide their plans from God (Isa 29:15-24). What their plans are, which they are devising in secret, the prophet does not yet disclose; but he doubtless alludes to their intrigues with the Egyptians and their purpose to break faith with the Assyrians, to whom they were bound by treaty to pay annual tribute. Isaiah bravely remonstrates with them for supposing that any policy will succeed which excludes the counsel and wisdom of the Holy One. They are but clay; He is the potter. At this point, though somewhat abruptly, Isaiah turns his face toward the Messianic future. In a very little while, he says, Lebanon, which is now overrun by Assyria's army, shall become a fruitful field, and the blind and deaf and spiritually weak shall rejoice in the Holy One of Israel.

(4) Woe to the pro-Egyptian party (Isa 30). Isaiah's fourth woe is directed against the rebellious politicians who stubbornly, and now openly, advocate making a league with Egypt. They have at length succeeded apparently in winning over the king to their side, and an embassy is already on its way to Egypt, bearing across the desert of the exodus rich treasures with which to purchase the friendship of their former oppressors. Isaiah now condemns what he can no longer prevent. Egypt is a Rahab "sitstill," i.e. a mythological sea-monster, menacing in mien but laggard in action. When the crisis comes, she will sit still, causing Israel only shame and confusion.

(5) Woe to those who trust in horses and chariots (Isa 31-32). Isaiah's fifth woe is a still more vehement denunciation of those who trust in Egypt's horses and chariots, and disregard the Holy One of Israel. Those who do so forget that the Egyptians are but men and their horses flesh, and that mere flesh cannot avail in a conflict with spirit. Eventually Yahweh means to deliver Jerusalem, if the children of Israel will but turn from their idolatries to Him; and in that day, Assyria will be vanquished. A new era will dawn upon Judah. Society will be regenerated. The renovation will begin at the top. Conscience also will be sharpened, and moral distinctions will no longer be confused (32:1-8). As Delitzsch puts it, "The aristocracy of birth and wealth will be replaced by an aristocracy of character." The careless and indifferent women, too, in that day will no longer menace the social welfare of the state (32:9-14); with the outpouring of Yahweh's spirit an ideal commonwealth will emerge, in which social righteousness, peace, plenty and security will abound (32:15-20).

(6) Woe to the Assyrian destroyer (Isa 33). Isaiah's last woe is directed against the treacherous spoiler himself, who has already laid waste the cities of Judah, and is now beginning to lay siege to Jerusalem (701 BC). The prophet prays, and while he prays, behold! the mighty hosts of the Assyrians are routed and the long-besieged but now triumphant inhabitants of Jerusalem rush out like locusts upon the spoil which the vanishing adversary has been forced to leave behind. The destroyer's plan to reduce Jerusalem has come to naught. The whole earth beholds the spectacle of Assyria's defeat and is filled with awe and amazement at the mighty work of Yahweh. Only the righteous may henceforth dwell in Jerusalem. their eyes shall behold the Messiah-king in his beauty, reigning no longer like Hezekiah over a limited and restricted territory, but over a land unbounded, whose inhabitants enjoy Yahweh's peace and protection, and are free from all sin, and therefore from all sickness (33:17-24). With this beautiful picture of the Messianic future, the prophet's woes find an appropriate conclusion. Isaiah never pronounced a woe without adding a corresponding promise.

In Isa 34-35, the prophet utters a fierce cry for justice against "all the nations," but against Edom in particular. His tone is that of judgment. Edom is guilty of high crimes against Zion (34:8 f), therefore she is doomed to destruction. On the other hand, the scattered ones of Israel shall return from exile and "obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away" (Isa 35).

Isaiah 36-39 contain history, prophecy and song intermingled. These chapters serve both as an appendix to Isa 1-35 and as an introduction to Isa 40-66. In them three important historical events are narrated, in which Isaiah was a prominent factor:

(1) the double attempt of Sennacherib to obtain possession of Jerusalem (Isa 36-37);

(2) Hezekiah's sickness and recovery (Isa 38);

(3) the embassy of Merodach-baladan (Isa 39).

With certain important omissions and insertions these chapters are duplicated almost verbatim in 2Ki 18:13-20:19. They are introduced with the chronological note, "Now it came to pass in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah." Various attempts have been made to solve the mystery of this date; for, if the author is alluding to the siege of 701 BC, difficulty arises, because that event occurred not in Hezekiah's "14th" but 26th year, according to the Biblical chronology of his life; or, if with some we date Hezekiah's accession to the throne of Judah as 720 BC, then the siege of 701 BC occurred, as is evident, in Hezekiah's 19th year. It is barely possible of course that "the 14th year of king Hezekiah" was the 14th of the "15 years" which were added to his life, but more probably it alludes to the 14th of his reign. On the whole it is better to take the phrase as a general chronological caption for the entire section, with special reference to Isa 38, which tells of Hezekiah's sickness, which actually fell in his 14th year (714 BC), and which, coupled with Sargon's expected presence at Ashdod, was the great personal crisis of the king's life.

Sennacherib made two attempts in 701 BC to reduce Jerusalem: one from Lachish with an army headed by the Rabshakeh (Isa 36:2-37:8), and another from Libnah with a threat conveyed by messengers (Isa 37:9). The brief section contained in 2Ki 18:14-16 is omitted from between verses 1 and 2 of Isa 36, because it was not the prophet's aim at this time to recount the nation's humiliation. Isaiah's last "word" concerning Assyria (Isa 37:21-35) is one of the prophet's grandest predictions. It is composed of three parts:

(1) a taunt-song, in elegiac rhythm, on the inevitable humiliation of Sennacherib (Isa 37:22-29);

(2) a short poem in different rhythm, directed to Hezekiah, in order to encourage his faith (Isa 37:30-32);

(3) a definite prediction, in less elevated style, of the sure deliverance of Jerusalem (Isa 37:33-35). Isaiah's prediction was literally fulfilled.

The section Isa 38:9-20 contains Hezekiah’s So of Thanksgiving, in which he celebrates his recovery from some mortal sickness. It is a beautiful plaintive "writing"; omitted altogether by the author of the Book of Kings (compare 2Ki 20). Hezekiah was sick in 714 BC. Two years later Merodach-baladan, the veteran arch-enemy of Assyria, having heard of his wonderful recovery, sent letters and a present to congratulate him. Doubtless, also, political motives prompted the recalcitrant Babylonian. But be that as it may, Hezekiah was greatly flattered by the visit of Merodach-baladan’s envoys, and, in a moment of weakness, showed them all his royal treasures. This was an inexcusable blunder, as the sight of his many precious possessions would naturally excite Babylonian cupidity to possess Jerusalem. Isaiah not only solemnly condemned the king’s conduct, but he announced with more than ordinary insight that the days were coming when all the accumulated resources of Jerusalem would be carried away to Babylon (39:3-6; compare Mic 4:10). This final prediction of judgment is the most marvelous of all Isaiah’s minatory utterances, because he distinctly asserts that, not the Assyrians, who were then at the height of their power, but the Babylonians, shall be the instruments of the Divine vengeance in consummating the destruction of Jerusalem. There is absolutely no reason for doubting the genuineness of this prediction. In it, indeed, we have a prophetic basis for Isa 40-66, which follow.

Coming now to Isa 40-66, we have prophecies of comfort, salvation, and of the future glory awaiting Israel. These chapters naturally fall into three sections:

(1) Isa 40-48, announcing deliverance from captivity through Cyrus;

(2) Isa 49-57, describing the sufferings of the "Servant" of Yahweh, this section ending like the former with the refrain, "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked" (57:21; compare 48:22);

(3) Isa 58-66, announcing the final abolition of all national distinctions and the future glory of the people of God. Isaiah 60 is the characteristic chapter of this section, as Isa 53 is of the second, and Isa 40 of the first.

Entering into greater detail, the first section (Isa 40-48) demonstrates the deity of Yahweh through His unique power to predict. The basis of the comfort which the prophet announces is Israel’s incomparable God (Isa 40). Israel’s all-powerful Yahweh in comparison with other gods is incomparable. In the prologue (Isa 40:1-11) he hears the four voices:

(1) of grace (Isa 40:1,2);

(2) of prophecy (Isa 40:3-5);

(3) of faith (Isa 40:6-8), and

(4) of evangelism (Isa 40:9-11).

Then, after exalting the unique character of Israel’s all-but-forgotten God (Isa 40:12-26), he exhorts

them not to suppose that Yahweh is ignorant of, or indifferent to, Israel's misery. Israel must wait for salvation. They are clamoring for deliverance prematurely. Only wait, he repeats; for with such a God, Israel has no reason to despond (Isa 40:27-31).

In Isa 41 he declares that the supreme proof of Yahweh's sole deity is His power to predict. He inquires, "Who hath raised up one from the east?" Though the hero is left unnamed, Cyrus is doubtless in the prophet's mind (compare 44:28; 45:1). He is not, however, already appearing upon the horizon of history as some fancy, but rather predicted as sure to come. The verb tenses which express completed action are perfects of certainty, and are used in precisely the same manner as those in 3:8; 5:13; 21:9. The answer to the inquiry is, "I, Yahweh, the first, and with the last, I am he" (41:4). Israel is Yahweh's servant. The dialogue continues; but it is no longer between Yahweh and the nations, as in Isa 41:1-7, but between Yahweh and the idols (41:21-29). Addressing the dumb idols, Yahweh is represented as saying, Predict something, if you are real deities. As for myself, I am going to raise up a hero from the north who will subdue all who oppose him. And I announce my purpose now in advance "from the beginning," "beforetime," before there is the slightest ground for thinking that such a hero exists or ever will exist (41:26), in order that the future may verify my prediction, and prove my sole deity. I, Yahweh, alone know the future. In 41:25-29, the prophet even projects himself into the future and speaks from the standpoint of the fulfillment of his prediction. This, as we saw above, was a characteristic of Isaiah in Isa 24-27.

In Isa 42:1-43:13 the prophet announces also a spiritual agent of redemption, namely, Yahweh's "Servant." Not only a temporal agent (Cyrus) shall be raised up to mediate Israel's redemption, which is the first step in the process of the universal salvation contemplated, but a spiritual factor. Yahweh's "Servant" shall be employed in bringing the good tidings of salvation to the exiles and to the Gentiles also. In 42:1-9 the prophet describes this ideal figure and the work he will execute. The glorious future evokes a brief hymn of thanksgiving for the redemption which the prophet beholds in prospect (42:10-17). Israel has long been blind and deaf to Yahweh's instructions (41:18,19), but now Yahweh is determined to redeem them even at the cost of the most opulent nations of the world, that they may publish His law to all peoples (42:18-43:13).

In Isa 13:14-44:23 forgiveness is made the pledge of deliverance. Yahweh's determination to redeem Israel is all of grace. Salvation is a gift. Yahweh has blotted out their transgressions for His own sake (43:25). "This passage," Dillmann observes, "marks the highest point of grace in the Old Testament." Gods of wood and stone are nonentities. Those who manufacture idols are blind and dull of heart, and are "feeding on ashes." The section 44:9-20 is a most remorseless exposure of the folly of idolatry.

In Isa 44:24-45:25 the prophet at length names the hero of Israel's salvation and describes his mission. He is Cyrus. He shall build Jerusalem and lay the foundations of the temple (44:28); he shall also subdue nations and let the exiles go free (45:1,13). He speaks of Cyrus in the most extraordinary, almost extravagant terms. He is Yahweh's "shepherd" (44:28), he is also Yahweh's "anointed," i.e. Messiah (45:1), "the man of my counsel" (46:11), whom Yahweh has called by name, and surnamed without his ever knowing Him (45:3,1); the one "whom Yahweh loveth" (48:14), whose right hand Yahweh upholdeth (45:1), and who will perform all Yahweh's pleasure (44:28); though but "a ravenous bird

from the east (46: 11). The vividness with which the prophet speaks of Cyrus leads some to suppose that the latter is already upon the horizon. This, however, is a mistake. Scarcely would a contemporary have spoken in such terms of the real Cyrus of 538 BC. The prophet regards him (i.e. the Cyrus of his own prediction, not the Cyrus of history) as the fulfillment of predictions spoken long before. That is to say, in one and the same context, Cyrus is both predicted and treated as a proof that prediction is being fulfilled (44:24-28; 45:21). Such a phenomenon in prophecy can best be explained by supposing that the prophet projected himself into the future from an earlier age. Most extraordinary of all, in 45:14-17, the prophet soars in imagination until he sees, as a result of Cyrus' victories, the conquered nations renouncing their idols, and attracted to Yahweh as the Saviour of all mankind (45:22). On any theory of origin, the predictive element in these prophecies is written large.

Isaiah 46-47 describe further the distinctive work of Cyrus, though Cyrus himself is but once referred to. Particular emphasis is laid on the complete collapse of the Babylonian religion; the prophet being apparently more concerned with the humiliation of Babylon's idols than with the fall of the city itself. Of course the destruction of the city would imply the defeat of her gods, as also the emancipation of Israel. But here again all is in the future; in fact Yahweh's incomparable superiority and unique deity are proven by His power to predict "the end from the beginning" and bring His prediction to pass (46:10,11).

Isaiah 47 is a dirge over the downfall of the imperial city, strongly resembling the taunt-song over the king of Babylon in 14:4-21.

Isaiah 48 is a hortatory summary and recapitulation of the argument contained in Isa 40-47, the prophet again emphasizing the following points:

(1) Yahweh's unique power to predict;

(2) that salvation is of grace;

(3) that Cyrus' advent will be the crowning proof of Yahweh's abiding presence among His people;

(4) that God's chastisements were only disciplinary; and

(5) that even now there is hope, if they will but accept of Yahweh's proffered salvation. Alas! that there is no peace or salvation for the godless (48:20-22). Thus ends the first division of Isaiah's remarkable "vision" of Israel's deliverance from captivity through Cyrus.

The second section (Isa 49-57) deals with the spiritual agent of salvation, Yahweh's suffering "Servant." With Isa 49 the prophet leaves off attempting further to prove the sole deity of Yahweh by means of prediction, and drops entirely his description of Cyrus' victories and the overthrow of Babylon, in order to set forth in greater detail the character and mission of the suffering "Servant" of Yahweh. Already, in Isa 40-48, he had alluded several times to this unique and somewhat enigmatical personage, speaking of

him both collectively and as an individual (41:8-10; 42:1-9,18-22; 43:10; 44:1-5,21-28; 45:4; 48:20-22); but now he defines with greater precision both his prophetic and priestly functions, his equipment for his task, his sufferings and humiliation, and also his final exaltation. Altogether in these prophecies he mentions the "Servant" some 20 t. But there are four distinctively so-called "Servant-Songs" in which the prophet seems to rise above the collective masses of all Israel to at least a personification of the pious within Israel, or better, to a unique Person embodying within himself all that is best in the Israel within Israel. They are the following:

(1) 42:1-9, a poem descriptive of the Servant's gentle manner and world-wide mission;

(2) 49:1-13, describing the Servant's mission and spiritual success;

(3) 50:4-11, the Servant's soliloquy concerning His perfection through suffering; and

(4) 52:13-53:12, the Servant's vicarious suffering and ultimate exaltation.

In this last of the four "Servant-Songs" we reach the climax of the prophet's inspired symphony, the acme of Hebrew Messianic hope. The profoundest thoughts in the Old Testament revelation are to be found in this section. It is a vindication of the "Servant," so clear and so true, and wrought out with such pathos and potency, that it holds first place among Messianic predictions. Polycarp called it "the golden passional of the Old Testament." It has been realized in Jesus Christ.

Isaiah 58-66 describe the future glory of the people of God. Having described in Isa 40-48 the temporal agent of Israel's salvation, Cyrus, and in Isa 49-57 the spiritual agent of their salvation, the "Servant" of Yahweh, the prophet proceeds in this last section to define the conditions on which salvation may be enjoyed. He begins, as before, with a double imperative, "Cry aloud, spare not" (compare 40:1; 49:1).

In Isa 58 he discusses true fasting and faithful Sabbath observance.

In Isa 59 he beseeches Israel to forsake their sins. It is their sins, he urges, which have hidden Yahweh's face and retarded the nation's salvation. In 59:9 ff the prophet identifies himself with the people and leads them in their devotions. Yahweh is grieved over Israel's forlorn condition, and, seeing their helplessness, He arms himself like a warrior to interfere judicially (59:15-19). Israel shall be redeemed. With them as the nucleus of a new nation, Yahweh will enter anew into covenant relation, and put His Spirit upon them, which will abide with them henceforth and forever (59:20-21).

Isaiah 60-61 describe the future blessedness of Zion. The long-looked-for "light" (compare 59:9) begins to dawn: "Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of Yahweh is risen upon thee" (60:1). The prophet pauses at this point to paint a picture of the redeemed community. As in 2:3,4, the Gentiles are seen flocking to Zion, which becomes the mistress of the nations. Foreigners build her walls, and her gates are kept open continually without fear of siege. The Gentiles acknowledge that Zion is the spiritual center of the world. Even Israel's oppressors regard her as "the city of Yahweh," as "an eternal

excellency," in which Yahweh sits as its everlasting light (60:10-22).

In Isa 61, which Drummond has called "the program of Christianity," the "Servant" of Yahweh is again introduced, though anonymously, as the herald of salvation (61:1-3). The gospel monologue of the "Servant" is followed by a promise of the restoration and blessedness of Jerusalem (61:4-11). Thus the prophecy moves steadily forward toward its goal in Jesus Christ (compare Lu 4:18-21).

In Isa 62:1-63:6 Zion's salvation is described as drawing near. The nations will be spectators of the great event. A new name which will better symbolize her true character shall be given to Zion, namely, Hephzibah, "My delight is in her"; for Jerusalem shall no more be called desolate. On the other hand, Zion's enemies will all be vanquished. In a brief poem of peculiar dramatic beauty (63:1-6), the prophet portrays Yahweh's vengeance, as a victorious warrior, upon all those who retard Israel's deliverance. Edom in particular was Israel's insatiate foe. Hence, the prophet represents Yahweh's judgment of the nations as taking place on Edom's unhallowed soil. Yahweh, whose mighty arm has wrought salvation, returns as victor, having slain all of Israel's foes.

In Isa 63:7-64:12, Yahweh's "servants" resort to prayer. They appeal to Yahweh as the Begetter and Father of the nations (63:16; 64:8). With this thought of the fatherhood of God imbedded in his language, Isaiah had opened his very first oracle to Judah and Jerusalem (compare 1:2). As the prayer proceeds, the language becomes increasingly tumultuous. The people are thrown into despair because Yahweh seems to have abandoned them altogether (63:19). They recognize that the condition of Jerusalem is desperate. "Our holy and our beautiful house, where our fathers praised thee, is burned with fire; and all our pleasant places are laid waste" (64:11). Such language, however, is the language of fervent prayer and must not be taken with rigid literalness, as 63:18 and 3:8 plainly show.

Finally, in Isa 65-66, Yahweh answers His people's supplications, distinguishing sharply between His own "servants" and Israel's apostates. Only His chosen "seed" shall be delivered (65:9). Those who have obdurately provoked Yahweh by sacrificing in gardens (65:3; 66:17), offering libations to Fortune and Destiny (65:11), sitting among the graves to obtain oracles from the dead, and, like the Egyptians, eating swine's flesh and broth of abominable things which were supposed to possess magical properties, lodging in vaults or crypts in which heathen mysteries were celebrated (65:4), and at the same time fancying that by celebrating such heathen mysteries they are holier than others and thereby disqualified to discharge the ordinary duties of life (65:5)—such Yahweh designs to punish, measuring their work into their bosom and destroying them utterly with the sword (65:7,12). On the other hand, the "servants" of Yahweh Shall inherit His holy mountains. They shall rejoice and sing for joy of heart, and bless themselves in the God of Amen, i.e. in the God of Truth (65:9,14,16). Yahweh will create new heavens and a new earth, men will live and grow old like the patriarchs; they will possess houses and vineyards and enjoy them; for an era of idyllic peace will be ushered in with the coming of the Messianic age, in which even the natures of wild animals will be changed and the most rapacious of wild animals will live together in harmony (65:17-25). Religion will become spiritual and decentralized, mystic cults will disappear, incredulous scoffers will be silenced. Zion's population will be marvelously multiplied, and the people will be comforted and rejoice (66:1-14). Furthermore, all nations will flock to Zion to behold Yahweh's glory, and from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, all flesh will

come up to worship in Jerusalem (66:15-23).

It is evident that the Book of Isaiah closes, practically as it begins, with a polemic against false worship, and the alternate reward of the righteous and punishment of the wicked. The only essential difference between the prophet's earlier and later oracles is this: Isaiah, in his riper years, on the basis of nearly half a century's experience as a preacher, paints a much brighter eschatological picture than was possible in his early ministry. His picture of the Messianic age not only transcends those of his contemporaries in the 8th century BC, but he penetrates regions beyond the spiritual horizon of any and all Old Testament seers. Such language as that contained in Isa 66:1,2, in particular, anticipates the great principle enunciated by Jesus in Joh 4:24, namely, that "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth." To attempt to date such oracles as these on the basis of internal evidence is an absolute impossibility. Humanly speaking, one age could have produced such revelations quite as easily as another. But no age could have produced them apart from the Divine spirit.

ISAIAH, 8-9

8. Isaiah's Prophecies Chronologically Arranged:

The editorial arrangement of Isaiah's prophecies is very suggestive. In the main they stand in chronological order. That is to say, all the dates mentioned are in strict historical sequence; e.g. Isa 6:1, "In the year that king Uzziah died" (740 BC); 7:1, "In the days of Ahaz" (736 ff BC); 14:28, "In the year that king Ahaz died" (727 BC); 20:1, "In the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him" (711 BC); 36:1, "In the 14th year of king Hezekiah" (701 BC). These points are all in strict chronological order. Taken in groups, also, Isaiah's great individual messages are likewise arranged in true historical sequence; thus, Isa 1-6 for the most part belong to the last years of Jotham's reign (740-736 BC); Isa 7-12 to the period of the Syro-Ephraimitic war (734 BC); Isa 20, to the year of Sargon's siege of Ashdod (711 BC); Isa 28-32, to the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib (701 BC); while the distinctively promissory portions (Isa 40-66), as is natural, conclude the collection. In several minor instances, however, there are notable departures from a rigid chronological order. For example, Isa 6, which describes the prophet's initial call to preach, follows the rebukes and denunciations of Isa 1-5; but this is probably due to its being used by the prophet as an apologetic. Again, the oracles against foreign nations in Isa 13-23 belong to various dates, being grouped together, in part, at least, because of their subject-matter. Likewise, Isa 38-39, which give an account of Hezekiah's sickness and Merodach-baladan's embassy to him upon his recovery (714-712 BC), chronologically precede Isa 36-37, which describe Sennacherib's investment of Jerusalem (701 BC). This chiastic order, however, in the last instance, is due probably to the desire to make Isa 36-37 (about Sennacherib, king of Assyria) an appropriate conclusion to Isa 1-35 (which say much about Assyria), and, on the other hand, to make Isa 38-39 (about Merodach-baladan of Babylon) a suitable introduction to Isa 40-66 (which speak of Babylon).

The attempt to date Isaiah's individual messages on the basis of internal criteria alone, is a well-nigh impossible task; and yet no other kind of evidence is available. Often passages stand side by side which

point in opposite directions; in fact, certain sections seem to be composed of various fragments dating from different periods, as though prophecies widely separated from each other in time had been fused together. In such cases much weight should be given to those features which point to an early origin, because of the predominatingly predictive character of Isaiah's writings.

Isaiah always had an eye upon the future. His semi-historical and biographical prophecies are naturally the easiest to date; on the other hand, the form of his Messianic and eschatological discourses is largely due to his own personal temper and psychology, rather than to the historical circumstances of the time. The following is a table of Isaiah's prophecies chronologically arranged:

The prophet's standpoint in Isa 40-66 is that of Isaiah himself. For if Isaiah, before 734 BC, in passages confessedly his own, could describe Judah's cities as already "burned with fire," Zion as deserted as "a booth in a vineyard" (1:7,8), Jerusalem as "ruined," Judah as "fallen" (3:8), and Yahweh's people as already "gone into captivity" (5:13), surely after all the destruction and devastation wrought on Judah by Assyria in the years 722, 720, 711, and 701 BC, the same prophet with the same poetic license could declare that the temple had been "trodden down" (63:18) and "burned with fire," and all Judah's pleasant places "laid waste" (64:11); and, in perfect keeping with his former promises, could add that "they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations" (61:4; compare 44:26; 58:12).

Or again, if Isaiah the son of Amoz could comfort Jerusalem with promises of protection when the Assyrian (734 BC) should come like an overflowing river (8:9,10; 10:24,25); and conceive a beautiful parable of comfort like that contained in 28:23-29; and insert among his warnings and exhortations of the gloomy year 702 BC so many precious promises of a brighter future which was sure to follow Sennacherib's invasion (29:17-24; 30:29-33; 31:8,9); and, in the very midst of the siege of 701 BC, conceive of such marvelous Messianic visions as those in 33:17-24 with which to dispel the dismay of his compatriots, surely the same prophet might be conceived of as seizing the opportunity to comfort those in Zion who survived the great catastrophe of 701 BC. The prophet who had done the one was prepared to do the other.

There was one circumstance of the prophet's position after 701 BC which was new, and which is too often overlooked, a circumstance which he could not have employed to anything like the same degree as an argument in enforcing his message prior to the Assyrian's overthrow and the deliverance of Jerusalem. It was this: the fulfillment of former predictions as proof of Yahweh's deity. From such passages we obtain an idea of the prophet's true historical position (Isa 42:9; 44:8; 45:21; 46:10; 48:3). Old predictions have already been fulfilled (Isa 6:11-13; 29:8; 30:31; 31:8; 37:7,30), on the basis of which the prophet ventures to predict new and even more astounding things concerning the overthrow of Babylon by Cyrus, and Israel's deliverance through him from their captors (Isa 43:6). Isaiah's book is signally full of predictions (Isa 7:8,10 ff; 8:4,8; 9:11,12; 10:26 ff; 14:24-27; 16:14; 17:9,12-14; 20:4-6; 21:16; 22:19 ff; 23:15; 38:5), some of which, written down and sealed, were evidently committed by the prophet to his inner circle of disciples to be used and verified by them in subsequent crises (Isa 8:16). Failure to recognize this element in Isaiah's book is fatal to a true interpretation of the prophet's real message.

9. The Critical Problem:

"For about twenty-five centuries" as A. B. Davidson observes (Old Testament Prophecy, 1903, 244), "no one dreamed of doubting that Isaiah the son of Amoz was the author of every part of the book that goes under his name; and those who still maintain the unity of authorship are accustomed to point, with satisfaction, to the unanimity of the Christian church on the matter, till a few German scholars arose, about a century ago, and called in question the unity of this book." Tradition is unanimous in favor of the unity of the book.

(1) The History of Criticism.

The critical disintegration of the book began with Koppe, who in 1780 first doubted the genuineness of Isa 50. Nine years later Doederlein suspected the whole of Isa 40-66. He was followed by Rosenmueller, who was the first to deny to Isaiah the prophecy against Babylon in 13:1-14:23. Eichhorn, at the beginning of the last century, further eliminated the oracle against Tyre in Isa 23, and he, with Gesenius and Ewald, also denied the Isaianic origin of Isa 24-27. Gesenius also ascribed to some unknown prophet Isa 15 and 16. Rosenmueller then went farther, and pronounced against Isa 34 and 35, and not long afterward (1840) Ewald questioned Isa 12 and 33. Thus by the middle of the 19th century some 37 or 38 chapters were rejected as no part of Isaiah’s actual writings. In 1879-80, the celebrated Leipzig professor, Franz Delitzsch, who for years previous had defended the genuineness of the entire book, finally yielded to the modern critical position, and in the new edition of his commentary published in 1889, interpreted Isa 40-66, though with considerable hesitation, as coming from the close of the period of Babylonian exile. About the same time (1888-90), Drs. Driver and G.A. Smith gave popular impetus to similar views in Great Britain. Since 1890, the criticism of Isaiah has been even more trenchant and microscopic than before. Duhm, Stade, Guthe, Hackmann, Cornill and Marti on the Continent, and Cheyne, Whitehouse, Box, Glazebrook, Kennett, Gray, Peake, and others in Great Britain and America have questioned portions which hitherto were supposed to be genuine.

(2) The Disintegration of "Deutero-Isaiah."

Even the unity of Isa 40-66, which were supposed to be the work of the "Second" or "Deutero-Isaiah," is now given up. What prior to 1890 was supposed to be the unique product of some celebrated but anonymous seer who lived in Babylonia about 550 BC is today commonly divided and subdivided and in large part distributed among various writers from Cyrus to Simon (538-164 BC). At first it was thought sufficient to separate Isa 63-66 as a later addition to "Deutero-Isaiah’s" prophecies; but more recently it has become the fashion to distinguish between Isa 40-55, which are claimed to have been written by "Deutero-Isaiah" in Babylonia about 549-538 BC, and Isa 56-66, which are now alleged to have been composed by a "Trito-Isaiah" about 460-445 BC.

(3) Recent Views.

Among the latest to investigate the problem is Professor R.H. Kennett of Cambridge, English, who, in

his Schweich Lectures (The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology, 1910, 84 ff), sums up the results of investigations as follows:

(a) all of Isa 3; 5; 6; 7; 20 and 31, and large portions of Isa 1; 2; 4; 8; 9; 10; 14; 17; 22 and 23, may be assigned to Isaiah, the son of Amoz;

(b) all of Isa 13; 40 and 47, and large portions of Isa 14; 21; 41; 43; 44; 45; 46 and 48, may be assigned to the time of Cyrus;

(c) all of Isa 15; 36; 37 and 39, and portions of Isa 16 and 38, may be assigned to the period between Nebuchadnezzar and Alexander the Great, but cannot be dated precisely;

(d) the passage 23:1-14 may be assigned to the time of Alexander the Great;

(e) all of Isa 11; 12; 19; 24-27; 29; 30; 32-35; 42; 49-66; and portions of Isa 1; 2; 4; 8; 9; 10; 16; 17; 18; 23; 41; 44; 45; 48 may be assigned to the 2nd century BC (167-140 BC).

Professor C. F. Kent, also (Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, 1910, 27 ff), makes the following critical observations on Isa 40-66. He says: "The prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah .... afford by far the best approach for the study of the difficult problems presented by Isa 40-66. Isaiah 56-66 are generally recognized as post-exilic. .... In Isa 56 and the following chapters there are repeated references to the temple and its service, indicating that it had already been restored. Moreover, these references are not confined to the latter part of the book. .... The fact, on the one hand, that there are few, if any, allusions to contemporary events in these chapters, and on the other hand, that little or nothing is known of the condition and hopes of the Jews during this period (the closing years of the Babylonian exile) makes the dating of these prophecies possible, although far from certain. .... Also, the assumption that the author of these chapters lived in the Babylonian exile is not supported by a close examination of the prophecies themselves. Possibly their author was one of the few who, like Zerubbabel, had been born in Babylon and later returned to Palestine. He was also dealing with such broad and universal problems that he gives few indications of his date and place of abode; but all the evidence that is found points to Jerusalem as the place where he lived and wrote. .... The prophet's interest and point of view center throughout in Jerusalem, and he shows himself far more familiar with conditions in Palestine than in distant Babylon. Most of his illustrations are drawn from the agricultural life of Palestine. His vocabulary is also that of a man dwelling in Palestine, and in this respect is in marked contrast with the synonyms employed by Ezekiel, the prophet of the Babylonian exile."

That is to say, two of the most recent investigators of the Book of Isaiah reach conclusions quite at variance with the opinions advocated in 1890, when Delitzsch so reluctantly allowed that Isa 40-66 may have sprung from the period of Babylonian exile. Now, it is found that these last 27 chapters were written after the exile, most probably in Palestine, rather than in Babylonia as originally claimed, and are no longer considered addressed primarily to the suffering exiles in captivity as was formerly urged.

(4) The Present State of the Question.

The present state of the Isaiah question is, to say the least, confusing. Those who deny the integrity of the book may be divided into two groups, which we may call moderates and radicals. Among the moderates may be included Drs. Driver, G.A. Smith, Skinner, Kirkpatrick, Koenig, A.B. Davidson, Barnes and Whitehouse. These all practically agree that the following chapters and verses are not Isaiah's: 11:10-16; 12; 13:1-14:23; 15:1-16:12; 21:1-10; 24-27; 34-35; 36-39; 40-66. That is to say, some 44 chapters out of the whole number, 66, were not written by Isaiah; or, approximately 800 out of 1,292 verses are not genuine. Among the radicals are Drs. Cheyne, Duhm, Hackmann, Guthe, Marti, Kennett and Gray. These all reject approximately 1,030 verses out of the total 1,292, retaining the following only as the genuine product of Isaiah and his age: 1:2-26; 29-31; 2:6-19; 3:1,5,8,9,12-17; 4:1; 5:1-14,17-29; 6; 7:1-8,22; 9:8-10:9; 10:13,14,27-32; 17:1-14; 18; 20; 22:1-22; 28:1-4,7-22; 29:1-6,9,10,13-15; 30:1-17; 31:1-4. That is, only about 262 verses out of the total 1,292 are allowed to be genuine. This is, we believe, a fair statement of the Isaiah-question as it exists in the hands of divisive critics today.

On the other hand there have been those who have defended and who still defend the essential unity of Isaiah's entire book, e.g. Strachey (1874), Nagelsbach (1877), Bredenkamp (1887), Douglas (1895), W. H. Cobb (1883-1908), W.H. Green (1892), Vos (1898-99), Thirtle (1907), Margoliouth (1910) and O.T. Allis (1912).

(5) Reasons for Dissecting the Book.

The fundamental axiom of criticism is the dictum that a prophet always spoke out of a definite historical situation to the present needs of the people among whom he lived, and that a definite historical situation shall be pointed out for each prophecy. This fundamental postulate, which on the whole is reasonable and perfectly legitimate if not overworked, underlies all modern criticism of Old Testament prophecy. It is not possible, however, always to trace a mere snatch of sermonic discourse to a definite historical situation apart from its context. Moreover, the prophets often spoke consciously, not only to their own generation, but also to the generations to come. Isaiah in particular commanded, "Bind thou up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples" (8:16); that is, preserve my teachings for the future. Again in 30:8, he says, "Now go, ... inscribe it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever." And also in 42:23, "Who is there among you that will give ear to this? that will hearken and hear for the time to come?"

Certain false presuppositions often govern critics in their disintegration of the book. Only a few examples need be given by way of illustration:

(a) According to some, "the conversion of the heathen" lay quite beyond the horizon of any 8th-century prophet; consequently, Isa 2:2-4 and all similar passages which foretell the conversion of those outside the chosen people are to be relegated to an age subsequent to Isaiah.

(b) To others, "the picture of universal peace" in Isa 11:1-9 is a symptom of late date, and therefore this section and all kindred ones must be deleted.

(c) To others, the thought of "universal judgment" upon "the whole earth" in 14:26 and elsewhere quite transcends Isaiah's range of thought.

(d) To others still, the apocalyptic character of Isa 24-27 represents a phase of Hebrew thought which prevailed in Israel only after Ezekiel.

(e) Even to those who are considered moderates "the poetic character" of a passage like Isa 12, and the references to a "return" from captivity, as in 11:11-16, and the promises and consolations such as are found in Isa 33 are cited as grounds for assigning these and similar passages to a much later age. Radicals deny in toto the existence of all Messianic passages among Isaiah's own predictions, relegating all Messianic hope to a much later age.

But to deny to the Isaiah of the 8th century all catholicity of grace, all universalism of salvation or judgment, every highly developed Messianic ideal, every rich note of promise and comfort, all sublime faith in the sacrosanct character of Zion, as some do, is unwarrantably to create a new Isaiah of greatly reduced proportions, a mere preacher of righteousness, a statesman of not very optimistic vein, and the exponent of a cold ethical religion without the warmth and glow of the messages which are actually ascribed to the prophet of the 8th century.

As a last resort, certain critics have appealed to 2Ch 36:22,23 as external evidence that Isa 40-66 existed as a separate collection in the Chronicler's age. But the evidence obtained from this source is so doubtful that it is well-nigh valueless. For it is not the prediction of Isaiah concerning Cyrus to which the Chronicler points as Jeremiah's, but the "70 years" of Babylonian supremacy spoken of in 2Ch 36:21, which Jeremiah actually did predict (compare Jer 25:11; 29:10). On the other hand, Isa 40-66 were certainly ascribed to Isaiah as early as 180 BC, for Jesus Ben-Sirach, the author of Ecclesiasticus, speaks of Isaiah as the prophet who "saw by an excellent spirit that which should come to pass at the last, and comforted them that mourned in Zion" (Ecclesiasticus 48:20 ff; compare Isa 40:1 ff). Furthermore, there is absolutely no proof that Isa 1-39, or Isa 40-66, or any other section of Isaiah's prophecies ever existed by themselves as an independent collection; nor is there any substantial ground for supposing that the promissory and Messianic portions have been systematically interpolated by editors long subsequent to Isaiah's own time. The earlier prophets presumably did more than merely threaten.

(6) Arguments for One Isaiah.

It is as unreasonable to expect to be able to prove the unity of Isaiah as to suppose that it has been disproved. Internal evidence is indecisive in either case. There are arguments, however, which corroborate a belief that there was but one Isaiah. Here are some of those which might be introduced:

(a) The Circle of Ideas:

The circle of ideas, which are strikingly the same throughout the entire book: For example, take the characteristic name for God, which is almost peculiar to Isaiah, "the Holy One of Israel." This title for Yahweh occurs in the Book of Isaiah a total of 25 times, and only 6 times elsewhere in the Old Testament, one of which is a parallel passage in Kings. This unique epithet, "the Holy One of Israel," interlocks all the various portions with one another and stamps them with the personal imprimatur of him who saw the vision of the majestic God seated upon His throne, high and lifted up, and heard the angelic choirs singing: "Holy, holy, holy, is Yahweh of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory" (6:3). The presence of this Divine title in all the different sections of the book is of more value in identifying Isaiah as the author of all these prophecies than though his name had been inserted at the beginning of every chapter, for the reason that his theology—his conception of God as the Holy One—is woven into the very fiber and texture of the whole book. It occurs 12 times in Isa 1-39, and 13 times in Isa 40-66; and it is simply unscientific to say that the various alleged authors of the disputed portions all employed the same title through imitation (compare 1:4; 5:19,24; 10:20; 12:6; 17:7; 29:19; 30:11,12,15; 31:1; 37:23; also 41:14,16,20; 43:3,14; 45:11; 47:4; 48:17; 49:7; 54:5; 55:5; 60:9,14; elsewhere, only in 2Ki 19:22; Ps 71:22; 78:41; 89:18; Jer 50:29; 51:5).

Another unique idea which occurs with considerable repetition in the Book of Isaiah is the thought of a "highway" (compare 11:16; 35:8; 40:3; 43:19; 49:11; 57:14; 62:10). Another characteristic idea is that of a "remnant" (compare 1:9; 10:20,21,22; 11:11,16; 14:22,30; 15:9; 16:14; 17:3; 21:17; 28:5; 37:31; 46:3; compare 65:8,9). Another striking trait of the book is the position occupied by "Zion" in the prophet's thoughts (compare 2:3; 4:5; 18:7; 24:23; 28:16; 29:8; 30:19; 31:9; 33:5,20; 34:8; 46:13; 49:14; 51:3,16; 52:1; 59:20; 60:14; 62:1,11; 66:8). Still another is the oft-repeated expression, "pangs of a woman in travail" (compare 13:8; 21:3; 26:17,18; 42:14; 54:1; 66:7). These, and many others less distinctive, psychologically stamp the book with an individuality which it is difficult to account for, if it be broken up into countless fragments and distributed, as some do, over the centuries.

(b) The Literary Style:

As negative evidence, literary style is not a very safe argument; for, as Professor McCurdy says, "In the case of a writer of Isaiah's environments, style is not a sure criterion of authorship" (History, Prophecy and the Monuments, II, 317, note). Yet it is certainly remarkable that the clause "for the mouth of Yahweh hath spoken it" should be found 3 times in the Book of Isaiah, and nowhere else in the Old Testament (compare 1:20; 40:5; 58:14). And it is noteworthy that the phrase, "streams of water," should occur twice in Isaiah and nowhere else (compare 30:25; 44:4 in the Hebrew). And very peculiar is the tendency on the prophet's part to emphatic reduplication (compare 2:7,8; 6:3; 8:9; 24:16,23; 40:1; 43:11,25; 48:15; 51:12; 57:19; 62:10). In fact, it is not extravagant to say that Isaiah's style differs widely from that of every other Old Testament prophet, and is as far removed as possible from that of Ezekiel and the post-exilic prophets.

(c) Historical References:

Take, for example, first, the prophet's constant reference to Judah and Jerusalem, his country and its

capital (Isa 1:7-9; 3:8; 24:19; 25:2; 40:2,9; 62:4); likewise, to the temple and its ritual of worship and sacrifice. In Isa 1:11-15, when all was prosperous, the prophet complained that the people were profuse and formal in their ceremonies and sacrifices; in 43:23,14, on the contrary, when the country had been overrun by the Assyrian and Sennacherib had besieged the city, the prophet reminds them that they had not brought to Yahweh the sheep of their burnt offerings, nor honored Him with their sacrifices; while in 66:1-3,6,20, not only is the existence of the Temple and the observance of the ritual presupposed, but those are sentenced who place their trust in the material temple, and the outward ceremonials of temple-worship. As for the "exile," the prophet's attitude to it throughout is that of both anticipation and realization. Thus, in 57:1, judgment is only threatened, not yet inflicted: "The righteous is taken away from the evil to come." That is to say, the exile is described as still future. On the other hand, in 3:8, "Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen," which seems to describe the exile as in the past; yet, as everybody admits, these are the words of Isaiah of the 8th century. In 11:11,12, the prophet says, "The Lord will set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people. .... from the four corners of the earth." To interpret such a statement literally and mechanically without regard to 8th-century conditions, or to Isaiah's manifest attitude to the exile, leads to confusion. No prophet realized so keenly or described so vividly the destiny of the Hebrews.

(d) The Predictive Element:

This is the strongest proof of the unity of the Book of Isaiah. Prediction is the very essence of prophecy (compare De 18:22); Isaiah was preeminently a prophet of the future. With unparalleled suddenness, he repeatedly leaps from despair to hope, from threat to promise, and from the actual to the ideal. What Professor Kent says of "Deutero-Isaiah" may with equal justice be said of Isaiah himself: "While in touch with his own age, the great unknown prophet lives in the atmosphere of the past and the future" (Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets, 28). Isaiah spoke to his own age, but he also addressed himself to the ages to follow. His verb tenses are characteristically futures and prophetic perfects. Of his book A.B. Davidson's words are particularly true: "If any prophetic book be examined .... it will appear that the ethical and religious teaching is always secondary, and that the essential thing in the book or discourse is the prophet's outlook into the future" (HDB, article "Prophecy and Prophets," IV, 119).

Isaiah was exceptionally given to predicting: thus (a) before the Syro-Ephraimitic war (734 BC), he predicted that within 65 years Ephraim should be broken to pieces (7:8); and that before the child Maher-shalal-hash-baz should have knowledge to cry, "My father," or "My mother," the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria should be carried away (8:4; compare 7:16). These are, however, but two of numerous predictions, as shown above, among his earlier prophecies (compare 1:27,28; 2:2-4; 6:13; 10:20-23; 11:6-16; 17:14).

(i) Shortly before the downfall of Samaria in 722 BC, Isaiah predicted that Tyre should be forgotten 70 years, and that after the end of 70 years her merchandise should be holiness to Yahweh (23:15,18).

(ii) In like manner prior to the siege of Ashdod in 711 BC, he proclaimed that within 3 years Moab

should be brought into contempt (Isa 16:l4), and that within a year all the glory of Kedar should fail (Isa 21:16).

(iii) And not long prior to the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC, he predicted that in an instant, suddenly, a multitude of Jerusalem's foes should be as dust (Isa 29:5); that yet a very little while and Lebanon should be turned into a fruitful field (Isa 29:17); and that Assyria should be dismayed and fall by the sword, but not of men (Isa 30:17,31; 31:8). And more, that for days beyond a year, the careless women of Jerusalem should be troubled (Isa 32:10,16-20); and that the righteous in Zion should see Jerusalem a quiet habitation, and return and come with singing (Isa 33:17 ff; 35:4,10); but that Sennacherib, on the contrary, should hear tidings and return without shooting an arrow into the city (Isa 37:7,26-29,33-35).

In like manner, also, after the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib in 701 BC was over, the prophet seems to have continued to predict; and, in order to demonstrate to the suffering and unbelieving remnant about him the deity of Yahweh and the folly of idolatry, pointed to the predictions which he had already made in the earlier years of his ministry, and to the fact that they had been fulfilled. Thus, he says, "Who hath declared it from the beginning, that we may know? and beforetime, that we may say, He is right?" (Isa 41:21-23,16); "Behold, the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare; before they spring forth I tell you of them" (Isa 42:9,23); "Who among them can declare this, and show us former things (i.e. things to come in the immediate future)? .... I have declared, and I have saved, and I have showed" (Isa 43:9,12); "Who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it ....? And the things that are coming, and that shall come to pass, let them (the idols) declare. .... Have I not declared unto thee of old, and showed it? And ye are my witnesses. .... That saith of Cyrus, He is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure, even saying of Jerusalem, She shall be built; and of the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (Isa 44:7,8,27,28); "It is I, Yahweh, who call thee by thy name, even the God of Israel. .... I have called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. .... Ask me of the things that are to come. .... I have raised him (Cyrus) up in righteousness, and .... he shall build my city, and he shall let my exiles go free" (45:3,4,11,13); "Declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times things that are not yet done; .... calling a ravenous bird (Cyrus) from the east, the man of my counsel from a far country; yea, I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass" (Isa 46:10,11); "I have declared the former things from of old, ... and I showed them: suddenly I did them, and they came to pass. .... I have declared it .... from of old; before it came to pass I showed it thee; lest thou shouldest say, Mine idol hath done them" (Isa 48:3,5); "I have showed thee new things from

this time, even hidden things. .... Yea, from of old thine ear was not opened. .... Who among them hath declared these things? .... I, even I, have spoken; yea, I have called him; .... from the beginning I have not spoken in secret" (Isa 48:6-8,14-16). Such predictions are explicit and emphatic.

(e) Cyrus a Subject of Prediction:

From all the above-mentioned explicit and oft-repeated predictions one thing is obvious, namely, that great emphasis is laid by the prophet on prediction throughout the entire Book of Isaiah. And it must be

further allowed that "Cyrus" is represented by the author as predicted, from any point of view. The only question is, Does the prophet emphasize the fact that he himself is predicting the coming of Cyrus? or that former predictions concerning Cyrus are now, as the prophet writes, coming to pass before his readers' eyes? Canon Cheyne's remark upon this point is instructive. He says: "The editor, who doubtless held the later Jewish theory of prophecy, may have inferred from a number of passages, especially Isa 41:26; 48:3,1.14, that the first appearance of Cyrus had been predicted by an ancient prophet, and observing certain Isaianic elements in the phraseology of these chapters, may have identified the prophet with Isaiah" (Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, 238).

Dr. G.A. Smith likewise allows that Cyrus is the fulfillment of former predictions.

He says: "Nor is it possible to argue, as some have tried to do, that the prophet is predicting these things as if they had already happened. For as part of argument for the unique divinity of the God of Israel, Cyrus, 'alive and irresistible,' and already accredited with success, is pointed out as the unmistakable proof that former prophecies of a deliverance for Israel are already coming to pass. Cyrus, in short, is not presented as a prediction, but as a proof that a prediction is being fulfilled" (HDB, article "Isaiah," 493). And further he says: "The chief claim, therefore, which Isa 40 ff make for the God of Israel is His power to direct the history of the world in conformity to a long-predicted and faithfully followed purpose. This claim starts from the proof that Yahweh has long before predicted events now happening or about to happen, with Cyrus as their center. But this is much more than a proof of isolated predictions, though these imply omniscience. It is a declaration of the unity of history sweeping to the high ends which have been already revealed to Israel—an exposition, in short, of the Omnipotence, Consistence, and Faithfulness of the Providence of the One True God" (ibid., 496).

It is obvious, therefore, in any case, whether these chapters are early or late, that Cyrus is the subject of prediction. It really makes little difference at which end of history one takes his stand, whether in the 8th century BC with Isaiah, or in the 6th century BC with "Deutero-Isaiah." Cyrus, to the author of these chapters, is the subject of prediction. In other words, whether indeed the author is really predicting Cyrus in advance of all apparent fulfillment, or Cyrus is the fulfillment of some ancient prediction by another, does not alter the fact that Cyrus was the subject of prediction on the part of somebody. Accordingly, as was stated at the outset, the whole question is, which does the prophet emphasize, (a) the fact that he himself is predicting? or, (b) that former predictions by someone else are now before his eyes coming to pass? The truth is, the prophet seems to live in the atmosphere of the past and the future as well as in the present, all of which are equally vivid to his prophetic mind. This is a peculiar characteristic of Isaiah. It is seen in the account he gives of his inaugural vision (Isa 6), of which Delitzsch remarks that it is "like a prediction in the process of being fulfilled." The same is true of Isa 24-27. There the prophet repeatedly projects himself into the future, and speaks from the standpoint of the fulfillment of his predictions. It is especially true of Isa 40-48. At one time the prophet emphasizes the fact that he is predicting, and a little later he describes his predictions as coming to pass. When, accordingly, a decision is made as to when the author predicted Cyrus, it is more natural to suppose that he was doing so long before Cyrus' actual appearance. This, in fact, is in keeping with the test of true prophecy contained in De 18:22: "When a prophet speaketh in the name of Yahweh, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Yahweh hath not spoken; the prophet hath spoken it

presumptuously, thou shalt not be afraid of him." Besides, there is a similar explicit prediction in the Old Testament, namely, that of King Josiah, who was foretold by name two centuries before he came (1Ki 13:2; compare 2Ki 23:15,16).

Dr. W. H. Cobb in the Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1901, 79, pleads for a "shrinkage of Cyrus," because Cyrus figures only in Isa 40-48, and is then dismissed. Dr. Thirtle, on the other hand, argues that the name "Cyrus" is a mere appellative, being originally not Koresh (Cyrus), but choresh ("workman," "artificer," "imagebreaker"), and that 44:27,28 is a gloss (compare Old Testament Problems, 244-64). But in opposition to these views the present writer prefers to write Cyrus large, and to allow frankly that he is the subject of extraordinary prediction. For the very point of the author's argument is, that he is predicting events which Yahweh alone is capable of foretelling or bringing to pass; in other words, that prescience is the proof of Yahweh's deity. Isaiah lived in an age when Yahweh's secrets were first revealed privately unto His servants the prophets (compare Am 3:7). Political conditions were unsettled and kaleidoscopic, and there was every incentive to predict. That Isaiah actually uttered wonderful predictions. is attested, furthermore, both by Jesus Ben-Sirach in Ecclesiasticus 48:20-25 (written circa 180 BC), and by Josephus in his Ant, XI, i, 1, 2 (dating from circa 100 AD); and these are ancient traditions worthy of credence.

Recently, Mr. Oswald T. Allis, after a thorough and exhaustive critical investigation of "the numerico-climactic structure" of the poem in Isa 44:24-28, concludes that "the most striking and significant features of the poem favor the view that while the utterance was significant in and of itself, it was chiefly significant in view of the exceptional circumstance under which it was spoken, i.e. in view of its early date. The chronological arrangement of the poem assigns the Restoration and Cyrus to the future. The perspective of the poem, together with the abrupt change of person in the 2nd strophe, argues that the future is a remote future. And finally the carefully constructed double climax attaches a significance to the definiteness of the utterance which is most easily accounted for if this future was so remote that a definite disclosure concerning it would be of extraordinary importance." And he further alleges that "it is impossible, if justice is done to the plain declarations of Scripture, to limit the prophetic horizon of the prophet Isaiah to the preexilic period and that .... when the form of the poem is recognized, there is every reason to assign it to a pre-exilic prophet, to Isaiah, since the form of the poem is admirably calculated to emphasize the fact that Cyrus and the Restoration belong to a distant future, and to make it clear that it is just because of this fact that the definitehess of the prophecy, the mention of Cyrus by name, is so remarkable and of such unique significance" (Biblical and Theological Studies, by the members of the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, Centennial Volume, 1912, 628-29).

After all, why should men object to prediction on so large a scale? Unless there is definiteness about any given prediction, and unless it transcends ordinary prognostication, there is no especial value in it. Should it be objected, however, that prediction of so minute a character is "abhorrent to reason," the answer is already at hand; it may be abhorrent to reason, but it is a handmaid to faith. Faith has to do with the future, even as prediction has to do with the future; and the Old Testament is preeminently a book which encourages faith. There is really no valid objection to the prediction of Cyrus. For the one outstanding differentiating characteristic of Israel's religion is predictive prophecy. The Hebrews certainly predicted the coming of a Messiah. Indeed, the Hebrews were the only people of antiquity

whose "Golden Age" lay in the future rather than in the past. Accordingly, to predict the coming of a Cyrus as the human agent of Israel's salvation is but the reverse side of the same prophet's picture of the Divine agent, namely, the obedient, Suffering Servant of Yahweh, who would redeem Israel from its sin. Deny to Isaiah the son of Amoz the prediction concerning Cyrus, and it is but logical to go farther and to deny to him the Messianic hope which is usually associated with his name. Deny to Isaiah the son of Amoz the predictions concerning a return from captivity, and the prophecies of his book are robbed of their essential character and unique perspective. Emasculate those portions of the Book of Isaiah which unveil the future, and they are reduced to a mere vaticinium ex eventu, and their religious value as Divine oracles is largely lost.

LITERATURE.

So much has been written on Isaiah's prophecies that only a selected list can be given here:

I. Commentaries on Isaiah:

Owen C. Whitehouse, The New Century Bible, 2 volumes, 1905; J. Skinner, The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, 2 volumes, 1896-98; W.E. Barnes, The Churchman's Bible, 2 volumes, 1901-3; G. A. Smith, The Expositor's Bible, 2 volumes, 1888-90; Franz Delitzsch, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 2 volumes, 1892; (C. von Orelli, Clark's Foreign Theological Library, 1895; T.K. Cheyne, The Prophecies of Isaiah, 2 volumes, 1892; G.W. Wade, Westminster Commentaries, 1911; G.H. Box, The Book of Isaiah, 1909; G.B. Gray, International Critical Commentary, I, chapters i-xxvii, 1912; II, chapters xxviii-lxvi, by G.B. Gray and A.S. Peake; J.E. McFadyen, "Book of the Prophecies of Isaiah" (The Bible for Home and School), 1910; G. Campbell Morgan, The Analyzed Bible, 2 volumes, 1910; Alexander Maclaren, Expositions of Holy Scripture, 2 volumes, 1906; H.G. Mitchell, Isaiah: A Study of chapters 1-12, 1897; Nagelsbach in Lange's Bibelwerk, English edition, 1878; J.A. Alexander, 1865; H. Ewald, English edition, 1876-81; John Calvin, English edition, 1850; R. Lowth, 1778; Vitringa, 1732; W. Gesenius, 1820-21; F. Hitzig, 1833; C.J. Bredenkamp, 1887; A. Dillmann, 1890, as revised by Kittel, 1898; B. Duhm, in Nowack's Handkommentar zum Altes Testament, 1892; K. Marti, 1900; A. Condamin (Roman Catholic), 1905.

II. Introduction and Criticism:

S.R. Driver, Isaiah, His Life and Times, in "The Men of the Bible Series," 1888; T.K. Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah, 1895; W.R. Smith, The Prophets of Israel, 2nd edition, 1896; A.F. Kirkpatrick, The Doctrine of the Prophets, 1892; J.W. Thirtle, Old Testament Problems, 1907; W.E. Barnes, An Examination of Isaiah 24-27, 1891; G. Douglas, Isaiah One and His Book One, 1895; J. Kennedy, A Popular Argument for the Unity of Isaiah, 1891; E. Koenig, The Exiles' Book of Consolation, 1899; G.C. Workman, The Servant of Yahweh, 1907; M.G. Glazebrook, Studies in the Book of Isaiah, 1910; R.H. Kennett, The Composition of the Book of Isaiah in the Light of History and Archaeology, 1910; R.R. Ottley, Isaiah according to the Septuagint, 1904; Hackmann, Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia, 1893; J. Meinhold, Die Jesajaerzahlungen, Jesaja 36-39, 1898; O.T. Allis,

"The Transcendence of Yahweh, God of Israel, Isa 44:24-28," in Biblical and Theological Studies, Princeton's Centennial Commemoration Volume, 1912, 579634; J. Hastings, The Great Texts of the Bible, 1910; C.S. Robinson, The Gospel in Isaiah, 1895; E. Sievers, Metrische Studien, 1901; G.L. Robinson, The Book of Isaiah, 1910; H. Guthe, Das Zukunfisbild des Jesaia, 1885; Feldmann, Der Knecht Gottes, 1907; W. Urwick, The Servant of Yahweh, 1877; K. Cramer, The Historical Background of Isa 56-66, 1905; A.B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, 1903.

III. Articles in Journals and Dictionaries:

W.H Cobb in Journal of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1891, II; 1895, I and II; 1898, I; 1901, I; 1908, I; F. Brown, JBL, 1890, I; W. H. Cobb, in the BS, 1882; G. A. Smith, article "Isaiah" in HDB, 1899; T. K. Cheyne, in the EB, 1901, and in the Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, 1910; Jas. Robertson, in the Illustrated Bible Dict., 1908; E. Koenig, in the Standard Bible Dict., 1909; A. Klostermann and J. A. Kelso, in The New Sch-Herz, 1910; A. Klostermann in the See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, 1900; G. Vos, Presbyterian and Reformed Review, 1898; D.S. Margoliouth, in The Temple Dictionary, 1910; C.A. Briggs, article "Analysis of Isa 40-62" in Harper Memorial Volume.

George L. Robinson

ISAIAH, ASCENSION OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ISCAH

iz'-ka, is'-ka (yickah): Daughter of Haran and sister of Milcah the wife of Nahor (Ge 11:29). Tradition identifies her with Sarai, Abram's wife; but without sufficient reason.

ISCARIOT

is-kar'-i-ot.

See JUDAS ISCARIOT.

ISDAEL

is'-da-el (Isdael): In 1 Esdras 5:33; called "Giddel" in Ezr 2:56.

ISH

(’ish): In the following Hebrew proper names, a prefix meaning "man of," or, collectively, "men of": Ish-bosheth, Ishhod, Ish-tob (but the Revised Version (British and American) correctly "the men of Tob").

See also ESHBAAL; ESHBAN; ISCARIOT.

ISH-BOSHETH

ish-bo’-sheth (ish-bosheth, "man of shame"‘ Iesbosthe): Called ‘eshba‘al, "man of Baal" (1Ch 8:33), and yishwi, "man of Yahweh" (?), perhaps for ‘isheyo (1Sa 14:49). Compare ESHBAAL and ISHVI (the King James Version "Ishui"). We probably have the right meaning of the name in Eshbaal and Ishvi, the words Baal and Yahweh being frequently interchanged. The change to Ish-bosheth, "man of shame," in 2 Samuel, where the story of his shameful murder is related, may be better explained as reference to this (see MEPHIBOSHETH, whose name was also changed from Merib-baal for similar reasons), than to find here a suggestion of Baal-worship, but see HPN, 121, where the change is explained as a correction of the scribes, in consequence of prophetic protests.

One of the sons of Saul (1Ch 8:33; 9:39; 1Sa 14:49) who, when his father and brothers were slain in the battle of Gilboa (1Sa 31:1), was proclaimed king over Israel by Abner, the captain of Saul’s host, at Mahanaim (2Sa 2:8). Ishbosheth was 40 years old at this time and reigned over Israel 2 years (2Sa 2:10). Judah, however, proclaimed David its king. The consequence was war (2Sa 2:12). The house of David prevailed against the house of Saul (2Sa 3:1), but the war did not come to a close until Abner, angry on account of the rebuke he suffered from Ish-Bosheth for his unlawful intimacy with Rizpah, Saul’s concubine, joined David (2Sa 3:6). David’s condition to return to him Michal, his wife before peace could be made, was fulfilled by Ish-Bosheth (2Sa 3:14 f), but it was not until after Abner’s death that Ish-Bosheth seems to have given up hopes of retaining his power (2Sa 4:1). The shameful murder of Ish-Bosheth by his own captains is recorded in 2Sa 4:5 ff. David punished the murderers who had expected reward and buried Ish-Bosheth in the grave of Abner at Hebron (2Sa 4:12 f).

Arthur L. Breslich

ISH-SECHEL

ish’-se-kel (’ish sekhel, "man of discretion"): Ezra, at one time in need of ministers for the house of God, sent "unto Iddo the chief at the place Casiphia." "And according to the good hand of our God upon us they brought us a man of discretion (m "Ish-sechel"), of the sons of Mahli, the son of Levi, the son of Israel" (Ezr 8:18). This is the only reference to Ish-sechel.

ISH-TOB

ish’-tob (’ish Tobh, the American Standard Revised Version "the men of Tob"): A place in Palestine, probably a small kingdom, large enough, however, to supply at least 12,000 men of valor to the children

of Ammorn in their struggle against Joab, David’s general (2Sa 10:6,8).

See ISH.

ISHBAAL

ish’-ba-al.

See ISH-BOSHETH.

ISHBAH

ish’-ba (yishbach): A member of the tribe of Judah, father of Eshtemoa (1Ch 4:17).

ISHBAK

ish’-bak (yishbaq): A name in the list of sons of Abraham by Keturah (Ge 25:2 parallel 1Ch 1:32). These names probably represent tribes; the tribe of Ishbak has not been certainly identified.

ISHBI-BENOB

ish-bi-be’-nob (yishbi bhenobh): One of the four "born to the giant in Gath" who were slain by David and his men (2Sa 21:15-22). Ishbi-benob was slain by Abishai, and David’s life saved by the act (21:16,17).

ISHHOD

ish’-hod (’ishehodh, "man of majesty"): A man of the tribe of Manasseh (1Ch 7:18, the King James Version "Ishod").

ISHI (1)

ish’-i (yish‘i, "salutary"):

(1) A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:31); the genealogy may denote his membership by blood, or only by adoption, in the tribe of Judah.

(2) A Judahite (1Ch 4:20).

(3) A Simeonite, whose sons led 500 of their tribe against the Amalekites in Mt. Seir (1Ch 4:42).

(4) One of the chiefs of Manasseh East of the Jordan (1Ch 5:24).

ISHI (2)

ish’-i, i’-shi (’ishi, "my husband"; Septuagint ho aner mou): The name symbolic of Yahweh’s relation to Israel which Hosea (2:16) declares shall be used when Baali, "my lord," has become hateful on account of its associations with the worship of the Baals.

ISHIAH

i-shi’-ya.

See ISSHIAH.

ISHIJAH

i-shi’-ja.

See ISSHIJAH.

ISHMA

ish’-ma (yishma’, from the root yasham, "to lie waste," therefore meaning "desolate"): A brother of Jezreel and Idbash, "the sons of the father of Etam" (1Ch 4:3). They were brothers of Hazzelelponi.

ISHMAEL (1)

ish’-ma-el (yishma‘e’l, "God heareth," or "God may," "shall hear"; Ismael):

(1) The son of Abraham by Hagar, the Egyptian slave of his wife Sarah. The circumstances connected with his birth reveal what seems to us to be a very strange practice. It was customary among ancient peoples to correct the natural defect of barrenness by substituting a slave woman. In our narrative, this is shown to be authorized and brought about by the legitimate wife with the understanding that the offspring of such a union should be regarded as her own: "It may be that I shall obtain children by her," literally, "that I shall be builded by her" (Ge 16:2).

1. Birth:

The hopes of Sarah were realized, for Hagar gave birth to a son, and yet the outcome was not fully pleasing to Abraham’s wife; there was one serious drawback. As soon as Hagar "saw that she had

conceived," her behavior toward her mistress underwent a radical change; she was "despised in her eyes." But for the intervention of the angel of Yahweh, the boy might have been born in Egypt. For, being dealt with hardly (or humbled) by Sarah, the handmaid fled toward that country. On her way she was told by the angel to return to her mistress and submit herself "under her hands." She obeyed, and the child who was to be as "a wild ass among men" was born when his father was 86 years old (Ge 16:7-16).

2. Circumcision:

At the age of 13 years the boy was circumcised (Ge 17:25) in accordance with the Divine command received by Abraham: "Every male among you shall be circumcised" (Ge 17:10). Thus young Ishmael was made a party to the covenant into which God had entered with the lad's father. The fact that both Abraham and his son were circumcised the same day (Ge 17:26) undoubtedly adds to the importance of Ishmael's partaking of the holy rite. He was certainly made to understand how much his father loved him and how deeply he was concerned about his spiritual welfare. We may even assume that there was a time when Abraham looked upon Ishmael as the promised seed. His error was made clear to him when God promised him the birth of a son by Sarah. At first this seemed to be incredible, Abraham being 100 years of age and Sarah 90. And yet, how could he disbelieve the word of God? His cherished, though mistaken, belief about Ishmael, his doubts regarding the possibility of Sarah's motherhood, and the first faint glimmer of the real meaning of God's promise, all these thoughts found their expression in the fervid wish: "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" (Ge 17:18). Gradually the truth dawned upon the patriarch that God s thoughts are not the thoughts of men, neither their ways His ways. But we have no reason to believe that this entire changing of the mental attitude of Abraham toward Ishmael reacted unfavorably on his future treatment of this son "born of the flesh" (compare Ge 21:11). If there were troubles in store for the boy likened by the angel of Yahweh to a wild ass, it was, in the main, the youngster's own fault.

3. Banishment:

When Isaac was weaned, Ishmael was about 16 years of age. The weaning was made an occasion for great celebration. But it seems the pleasure of the day was marred by the objectionable behavior of Ishmael. "And Sarah saw the son of Hagar the Egyptian .... mocking" (Ge 21:9). Her jealous motherly love had quickened her sense of observation and her faculty of reading the character of children. We do not know exactly what the word used in the Hebrew for "mocking" really means. The Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) render the passage: "When Sarah saw the son of Hagar .... playing with Isaac," and Paul followed a later tradition when he says: "He that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit" (Ga 4:29). Lightfoot (in his notes to the Epistle to the Galatians) says: "At all events the word seems to mean mocking, jeering." At any rate, the fact remains that Sarah objected to the bringing up of the son of promise together with the "mocker," and so both mother and son were banished from the tents of Abraham.

Now there came a most critical time in the life of young Ishmael. Only some bread and a bottle of water were "put on the shoulder" of Hagar by Abraham when he expelled her with her son. Aimlessly, as it

seems, the two walked about in the wilderness of Beersheba. The water was soon spent, and with it went all hope and energy. The boy, being faint with thirst and tired out by his constant walking in the fierce heat of the sun, seemed to be dying. So his mother put him rapidly down in the shade of some plant. (We do not share the opinion of some writers that the narrative of Ge 21:8 ff represented Ishmael as a little boy whom his mother had carried about and finally flung in the shade of some shrub. Even if this passage is taken from a different source, it is certainly not in conflict with the rest as to the age of Ishmael.) After this last act of motherly love—what else could she do to help the boy?—she retired to a place at some distance and resignedly expected the death of her son and perhaps her own.

For the 2nd time in her life, she had a marvelous experience. "God heard the voice of the lad" and comforted the unhappy mother most wonderfully. Through His angel He renewed His former promise regarding her son, and then He showed her a well of water. The lad's life was saved and, growing up, he became in time an archer. He lived in the wilderness of Paran and was married by his mother to an Egyptian wife (Ge 21:21).

4. His Children:

When Abraham died, his exiled son returned to assist his brother to bury their father (Ge 25:9). In the same chapter we find the names of Ishmael's 12 sons (25:12 ff) and a brief report of his death at the age of 137 years (25:17). According to Ge 28:9 he also had a daughter, Mahalath, whom Esau took for his wife; in Ge 36:3 her name is given as Basemath.

5. Descendants:

The character of Ishmael and his descendants (Arabian nomads or Bedouins) is very accurately and vividly depicted by the angel of Yahweh: "He shall be as a wild ass among men; his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him" (Ge 16:12). These nomads are, indeed, roaming the wilds of the desert, jealous of their independence, quarrelsome and adventurous. We may well think of their progenitor as of a proud, undaunted and rugged son of the desert, the very counterpart of the poor boy lying half dead from fatigue and exposure under the shrub in the wilderness of Beersheba.

6. In the New Testament:

The person and the history of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, "born after the flesh," is of special interest to the student of the New Testament because Paul uses him, in the Epistle to the Galatians, as a type of those Jews who cling to the paternal religion in such a manner as to be unable to discern the transient character of the Old Testament institutions, and especially those of the Mosaic law. By doing so they could not be made to see the true meaning of the law, and instead of embracing the grace of God as the only means of fulfilling the law, they most bitterly fought the central doctrine of Christianity and even persecuted its advocates. Like Ishmael, they were born of Hagar, the handmaid or slave woman; like him, they were Abraham's sons only "after the flesh," and their ultimate fate is foreshadowed in the casting out of Hagar and her son. They could not expect to maintain the connection with the true Israel,

and even in case they should acclaim Christ their Messiah they were not to be the leaders of the church or the expounders of its teachings (Ga 4:21-28).

(2) The son of Nethaniah (Jer 40:8-41:18; compare 2Ki 25:23-25). It is a dreary story of jealousy and treachery which Jeremiah has recorded in chapters 40, 41 of his book. After the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of the better class of Jewish citizens, it was necessary to provide for some sort of a government in the depopulated country. Public order had to be restored and maintained; the crops of the fields were endangered and had to be taken care of. It was thus only common political prudence that dictated to the king of Babylon the setting up of a governor for the remnant of Judah. He chose Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, for the difficult position. The new officer selected for his place of residence the city of Mizpah, where he was soon joined by Jeremiah. All the captains of the Jewish country forces came to Mizpah with their men and put themselves under Gedaliah's orders (Jer 40:13). Ishmael the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama "of the seed royal" (2Ki 25:25) was among their number—all of which must have been rather gratifying to the new governor. But he was destined to be cruelly disappointed. A traitor was among the captains that had gathered around him. Yet the governor might have prevented his dastardly scheme. Johnnan, the son of Kareah, and other loyal captains warned him of the treachery of Ishmael, telling him he was induced by Baalis, the Ammonite king, to assassinate the governor. But the governor's faith in Ishmael was not to be shaken; he even looked upon Johanan's report as false and calumnious (Jer 40:16).

About 2 months after the destruction of Jerusalem, Ishmael was ready to strike the mortal blow. With 10 men he came to Mizpah, and there, at a banquet given in his honor, he killed Gedaliah and all the Jews and Chaldeans that were with him. He succeeded in keeping the matter secret, for, 2 days after the horrible deed, he persuaded a party of 80 pious Jews to enter the city and killed all but 10 of them, throwing their bodies into a pit. These men were coming from the ruins of the Temple with the offerings which they had intended to leave at Jerusalem. Now they had found out, to their great distraction, that the city was laid waste and the Temple destroyed. So they passed by Mizpah, their beards shaven, their clothes rent, and with cuts about their persons (Jer 41:5). We may, indeed, ask indignantly, Why this new atrocity? The answer may be found in the fact that Ishmael did not kill all of the men. He spared 10 of them because they promised him some hidden treasures. This shows his motive. He was a desperate man and just then carrying out a desperate undertaking. He killed those peaceful citizens because of their money, and money he needed to realize his plans. They were those of a traitor to his country, inasmuch as he intended to deport the inhabitants of Mizpah to the land of his high confederate, the king of the Ammonites. Among the captives were Jeremiah and the daughters of the Jewish king. But his efforts came to naught. When Johnnan and the other captains were told of Ishmael's unheard-of actions, they immediately pursued the desperate adventurer and overtook him by the "great waters that are in Gibeon." Unfortunately, they failed to capture Ishmael; for he managed to escape with eight men to the Ammonites.

See, further, GEDALIAH.

(3) A descendant of Benjamin and the son of Azel (1Ch 8:38; compare 9:44).

(4) The father of Zebadiah who was "the ruler of the house of Judah, in all the king's (Jehoshaphat, 2Ch 19:8) matters" (2Ch 19:11).

(5) The son of Jehohanan, and a "captain of hundreds," who lived at the time of Jehoiada and Joash (2Ch 23:1).

(6) One of the sons of Pashhur the priest. He was one of those men who had married foreign women and were compelled to "put away their wives" (Ezr 10:22).

William Baur

ISHMAEL (2)

(Ismael):

(1) the King James Version "Ismael" (Judith 2:23), the son of Abraham by Hagar.

(2) 1 Esdras 9:22 (King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Ismael"), corresponding to Ishmael in Ezr 10:22. See preceding article.

ISHMAELITES

ish'-ma-el-its (yishme'e'lim): The supposed descendants of Ishmael, the son of Abraham and Hagar, whom Abraham sent away from him after the birth of Isaac (Ge 21:14-21). The sons of Ishmael are given in Ge 25:13,14; they were twelve in number and gave rise to as many tribes, but the term Ishmaelite has a broader signification, as appears from Ge 37:28. 36, where it is identified with Midianite. From Ge 16:12 it may be inferred that it was applied to the Bedouin of the desert region East of the Jordan generally, for the character there assigned to Ishmael, "His hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him," fits the habits of Bedouin in all ages. Such was the character of the Midianites as described in Jud 7, who are again identified with the Ishmaelites (8:24). These references show that the Ishmaelites were not confined to the descendants of the son of Abraham and Hagar, but refer to the desert tribes in general, like "the children of the east" (Jud 7:12).

H. Porter

ISHMAIAH

ish-ma'-ya (yishma'yah, "Yah is hearing"):

(1) A man of Gibeon, chief of David's 30 great warriors, who came to him at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4, the King James Version "Ismaiah").

(2) Chief of the armed contingent of the tribe of Zebulun, which served David in the monthly order of the tribes (1Ch 27:19).

ISHMEELITES

ish’-me-el-its (yishme‘e’li).

See ISHMAELITES.

ISHMERAI

ish’-me-ri (yishmeray, from shamar, meaning "to hedge about," i.e. "to guard," and therefore a "guard," "protector"): A descendant of Benjamin, son of Epaal, resident of Jerusalem, one of the "heads of fathers’ houses throughout their generations, chief men" (1Ch 8:18).

ISHOD

i’-shod, ish’-od (‘ishehodh): the King James Version 1Ch 7:18 for ISHHOD (which see).

ISHPAH

ish’-pa (yishpah, "firm," "strong"): A man of the tribe of Benjamin, of the house of Beriah (1Ch 8:16).

ISHPAN

ish’-pan (yishpan, literally, "he will hide"): Descendant of Benjamin, son of Shashak, one of "the chief men, heads of fathers’ houses"; lived at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:22).

ISHUAH; ISUAH

ish’-u-a, is’-u-a (yishwah, literally, "he will level").

See ISHUAI; ISHVAH; ISHVI.

ISHUAI, ISHUI

ish’-u-i, ish’-u-i (yishwi "level").

See ISHVI.

ISHVAH

ish’-va (yishwah, "even," "level"; the King James Version Ishuah and Isuah): Second son of Asher (Ge 46:17; 1Ch 7:30). As only the families of his brothers Ishvi, etc., are mentioned in Nu 26:44, the supposition is that he left no issue.

ISHVI

ish’-vi (yishwi, "equal"):

(1) The third son of Asher (Ge 46:17; 1Ch 7:30), and founder of the family of the Ishvites (Nu 26:44, the King James Version "Jesuites"), the King James Version "Isui," "Jesui," and "Ishui."

(2) The name is also found among the sons of Saul (1Sa 14:49), the King James Version "Ishui."

ISLAND; ISLE

i’-land, il

(1) ‘i, "island" or "isle"; the American Standard Revised Version has "coast" or "coast-land" in Isa 20:6; 23:2,6; the Revised Version margin has "coast-lands" in Ge 10:5; Isa 11:11; 24:15; 59:18; Jer 25:22; Eze 39:6; Da 11:18; Ze 2:11; the Revised Version margin has "sea-coast" in Jer 47:4.

(2) plural ‘iyim, the King James Version "wild beasts of the islands," the Revised Version (British and American) "wolves," the Revised Version margin "howling creatures" (Isa 13:22; 34:14; Jer 50:39).

(3) nesion, "small island" (Ac 27:16)

(4) nesos, "island" (Ac 13:6; 27:26; 28:1,7,9,11; Re 1:9; 6:14; 16:20):

Except as noted above, ‘i in the Revised Version (British and American) is translated "isle" or "island." ARVAD (which see), a Phoenician island-city North of Tripoli, Syria, is mentioned in Ge 10:18; 1Ch 1:16; Eze 27:8,11. This and Tyre were the only important islands on the coast, both of them very small. We find references to Kittim or Chittim, Cyprus (Ge 10:4; Nu 24:24; 1Ch 1:7; Isa 23:1,12; Jer 2:10; Eze 27:6; Da 11:30); to Elisha, perhaps Carthage (Ge 10:4; 1Ch 1:7; Eze 27:7); to "isles of the nations" (Ge 10:5; Ze 2:11); to "isles of the sea" (Es 10:1; 11:11; 24:15; Eze 26:18); to "Tarshish and the isles" (Ps 72:10; compare Isa 66:19); to "isle (the Revised Version margin "sea-coast") of Caphtor" (Jer 47:4). Communication with these islands or distant coasts is kept up by the Tyrians (Eze 27:3,15). The Jews were not a maritime people, and in early times their geographical knowledge was very limited. Of 32 Old Testament passages referring to "island" or "isle," 25 are in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. In the

New Testament, besides the passages noted above, and Patmos (Re 1:9), various islands are mentioned by name in connection with the voyages of Paul, e.g. Cyprus, Crete, Lesbos, Samos, Samothrace, Chios, Melita, Sicily (Syracuse, Ac 28:12). "Jackals" is a perfectly possible translation of ‘iyim (the King James Version "wild beasts of the islands," the Revised Version (British and American) "wolves," the Revised Version margin "howling creatures").

See COAST; GEOGRAPHY; JACKAL; WOLF.

Alfred Ely Day

ISLES OF THE GENTILES

(Ge 10:5): the American Standard Revised Version "isles (margin "coast-lands") of the nations," said of the territories of the sons of Japheth. The reference is to the coasts of the Western Mediterranean, with their islands (compare "isles of the sea," Es 10:1; Eze 26:18, etc.).

See TABLE OF NATIONS.

ISMACHIAH

is-ma-ki’-a (yicmakhyahu, "Yah will sustain"): One of the "overseers under the hand of Conaniah and Shimei his brother, by the appointment of Hezekiah the king, and Azariah the ruler of the house of God" (2Ch 31:13).

ISMAEL

is’-ma-el.

See ISHMAEL.

ISMAERUS

is-ma-e’-rus (Ismaeros): the King James Version "Omaerus" (1 Esdras 9:34), corresponding to Amram in Ezr 10:34.

ISMAIAH

is-ma’-ya.

See ISHMAIAH.

ISPAH

is’-pa.

See ISHPAH.

ISRAEL

iz’-ra-el.

See JACOB.

ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, 1

INTRODUCTORY

1. Sources

(1) The Old Testament

(2) Josephus

(3) The Monuments

2. Religious Character of the History

I. ORIGINS OF ISRAEL IN PRE-MOSAIC TIMES

1. Original Home

2. Ethnographical Origin

3. Patriarchal Origins and History

(1) Patriarchal Conditions—Genesis 14

(2) Ideas of God

(3) Descent into Egypt

II. NATIONALITY UNDER MOSES

1. Israel in Egypt

(1) Chronology

(2) Moses

2. Historical Character of the Exodus (1) Egyptian Version of the Exodus

(2) Geographical Matters

(3) The Wilderness Sojourn

(4) Entrance into Canaan

III. PERIOD OF THE JUDGES

1. General Character of Period

2. The Different Judges

3. Chronology of the Period

4. Loose Organization of the People

IV. THE KINGDOM: ISRAEL—JUDAH

1. Samuel

2. The Kingdom of Saul

3. David

4. Solomon

5. Division of the Kingdom

6. Sources of the History of the Kingdom

7. Chronological Matters

V. PERIOD OF THE SEPARATED KINGDOMS

1. Contrasts and Vicissitudes of the Kingdoms

2. The Successive Reigns

3. The Literary Prophets

VI. TIME OF THE BABYLONIAN EXILE

1. Influence of the Exile

2. Daniel

3. Elephantine Papyri

VII. RETURN FROM THE EXILE AND THE RESTORATION

1. Career of Cyrus

2. First Return under Zerubbabel

(1) Building of the Temple

(2) Haggai and Zechariah

3. Ezra and Nehemiah

Malachi

VIII. THE JEWS UNDER ALEXANDER AND HIS SUCCESSORS

1. Spread of Hellenism

2. The Hasmoneans

IX. THE ROMANS

1. Division of Territory

2. Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans

Later Insurrection of Bar-Cochba

3. Spiritual Life of Period

Appearance of Jesus Christ

LITERATURE

Introductory.

1. Sources:

The chief and best source from which we can learn who this people was and what was its history is the Bible itself, especially the Old Testament, which tells us the story of this people from its earliest beginnings.

(1) The Old Testament.

The origins of Israel are narrated in Genesis; the establishment of theocracy, in the other books of the Pentateuch; the entrance into Canaan, in the Book of Joshua; the period preceding the kings, in the Book of Judges; the establishment of the monarchy and its development, in the Books of Samuel, and the opening chapters of the Books of Kings, which latter report also the division into two kingdoms and the history of these down to their overthrow. The Books of Chronicles contain, parallel with the books already mentioned, a survey of the historical development from Adam down to the Babylonian captivity, but confine this account to theocratical center of this history and its sphere. Connected with Chronicles are found the small Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which probably originally constituted a part of Chronicles, but which pass over the Exile and begin at once with the story of the Return. Then, too, these two books contain only certain episodes in the history of the Return, which were of importance for the restoration of the Jewish theocracy, so that the story found in them is anything but complete. With the 5th century BC the Biblical narrative closes entirely. For the succeeding centuries we have nothing but some scattered data; but for the 2nd pre-Christian century we have a new source in the Books of the Maccabees, which give a connected account of the struggles and the rule of the Asmoneans, which reach, however, only from 174 to 135 BC.

The historical value of the Old Testament books is all the greater the nearer the narrator or his sources stand in point of time to the events that are recorded; e.g. the contents of the Books of Kings have in general greater value as historical sources than what is reported in the Books of Chronicles, written at a much later period. Yet it is possible that a later chronicler could have made use of old sources which earlier narrators had failed to employ. This is the actual state of affairs in connection with a considerable

number of matters reported by the Biblical chroniclers, which supplement the exceedingly meager extracts furnished by the author of the Books of Kings. Then, further, the books of the prophets possess an extraordinary value as historical sources for the special reason that they furnish illustrations of the historical situation and events from the lips of contemporaries. As an example we can refer to the externally flourishing condition of the kingdom of Judah under King Uzziah, concerning which the Books of Kings report practically nothing, but of which Chronicles give details which are confirmed by the testimony of Isaiah.

(2) Josephus.

A connected account of the history of Israel has been furnished by Flavius Josephus. His work entitled Jewish Antiquities, however, as far as trustworthiness is concerned, is again considerably inferior to the Books of Chronicles, since the later traditions of the Jews to a still greater extent influenced his account. Only in those cases in which he could make use of foreign older sources, such as the Egyptian Manetho or Phoenician authors, does he furnish us with valuable material. Then for the last few centuries preceding his age, he fills out a certain want. Especially is he the best authority for the events which he himself passed through and which he reports in his work on the Jewish Wars, even if he is not free from certain personal prejudices (see JOSEPHUS). For the customs and usages of the later Jewish times the traditions deposited in the Talmud are also to be considered. Much less than to Josephus can any historical value be credited to the Alexandrian Jew, Philo. The foreign authors, e.g. the Greek and the Latin historians, contain data only for the story of the nations surrounding Israel, but not for the early history of Israel itself.

(3) The Monuments.

On the other hand, the early history of Israel has been wonderfully enriched in recent times through the testimonies of the monuments. In Palestine itself the finds in historical data and monuments have been, up to the present time, rather meager. Yet the excavations on the sites of ancient Taanach, Megiddo, Jericho, Gezer and Samaria have brought important material to light, and we have reasons to look for further archaeological and literary finds, which may throw a clear light on many points that have remained dark and uncertain. Also in lands round about Palestine, important documents (the Moabite Stone; Phoenician inscriptions) have already been found. Especially have the discovery and interpretation of the monuments found in Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia very materially advanced our knowledge of the history of Israel. Not only has the connection of the history of this people with universal history been clearly illuminated by these finds, but the history of Israel itself has gained in tangible reality. In some detail matters, traditional ideas have given way to clearer conceptions; e.g. the chronology of the Old Testament, through Assyriological research, has been set on a safer foundation. But all in all, these archaeological discoveries have confirmed the confidence that has been placed in the Biblical historical sources.

2. Religious Character of the History:

It is true that the rules applied to profane history cannot, without modification, be applied to the historical writings of the Hebrews. The Biblical narrators are concerned about something more than the preservation of historical facts and data. Just as little is it their purpose to glorify their people or their rulers, as this is done on the memorial tablets of the Egyptian the Assyrian, and the Babylonian kings. Looked at merely from the standpoint of profane history, there are many omissions in the Old Testament historical books that are found objectionable. Sometimes whole periods are passed over or treated very briefly. Then, too, the political pragmatism, the secular connection in the movements of the nations and historical events, are often scarcely mentioned. The standpoint of the writer is the religious. This appears in the fact that this history begins with the creation of the world and reports primitive traditions concerning the origin of mankind and their earliest history in the light of the revelation of the God of Israel, and that it makes this national history a member in the general historical development of mankind. Nor was this first done by the author of the Pentateuch in its present shape. Already the different documentary sources found combined in the Pentateuch, namely E (Elohist), J (Jahwist) and P (Priestly Code), depict the history of Israel according to the plan which the Creator of the world had with this people. Also, when they narrate the national vicissitudes of Israel, the writers are concerned chiefly to exhibit clearly the providential guidance of God. They give special prominence to those events in which the hand of God manifests itself, and describe with full detail the lives of those agents of whom Yahweh made use in order to guide His people, such as Moses, Samuel, David, Solomon and others. But it is not the glory of these men themselves that the writers aim to describe, but rather their importance for the spiritual and religious greatness of Israel. Let us note in this connection only the extreme brevity with which the politically successful wars of David are reported in 2 Samuel; and how fragmentary are the notices in which the author of the Books of Kings reports the reigns of the different kings; and how briefly he refers for all the other details of these kings to books that, unfortunately, have been lost for us. But, on the other hand, how full are the details when the Bible gives us its account of the early history of a Samuel or of a David, in which the providential guidance and protection of Yahweh appear in such a tangible form; or when it describes the building of the temple by Solomon, so epoch-making for the religious history of Israel, or the activity of such leading prophets as Elijah and Elisha. Much less the deeds of man than the deeds of God in the midst of His people constitute theme of the narrators. These facts explain, too, the phenomenal impartiality, otherwise unknown in ancient literatures, with which the weaknesses and the faults of the ancestors and kings of Israel are reported by the Biblical writers, even in the case of their most revered kings, or with which even the most disgraceful defeats of the people are narrated.

It cannot indeed be denied that this religious and fundamental characteristic is not found to the same degree in all the books and sources. The oldest narratives concerning Jacob, Joseph, the Judges, David and others reveal a naive and childlike naturalness, while in the Books of Chronicles only those things have been admitted which are in harmony with the regular cult. The stories of a Samson, Jephthah, Abimelech, Barak, and others impress us often as the myths or stories of old heroes, such as we find in the traditions of other nations. But the author of the Book of Judges, who wrote the introduction to the work, describes the whole story from the standpoint of edification. And when closely examined, it is found that the religious element is not lacking, even in the primitive and naive Old Testament narrative. This factor was, from the outset, a unique characteristic of the people and its history. To this factor Israel owed its individuality and existence as a separate people among the nations. But in course of time it

became more and more conscious of its mission of being the people of Yahweh on earth, and it learned to understand its entire history from this viewpoint. Accordingly, any account of Israel's history must pay special attention to its religious development. For the significance of this history lies for us in this, that it constitutes the preparation for the highest revelation in Christ Jesus. In its innermost heart and kernel it is the history of the redemption of mankind. This it is that gives to this history its phenomenal character. The persons and the events that constitute this history must not be measured by the standards of everyday life. If in this history we find the providential activities of the living God operative in a unique way, this need not strike us as strange, since also the full fruit of this historical development, namely the appearance of Jesus Christ, transcends by far the ordinary course of human history. On the other hand, this history of Israel is not to be regarded as a purely isolated factor. Modern researches have shown how intimately this history was interwoven with that of other nations. Already, between the religious forms of the Old Testament and those of other Semitic peoples, there have been found many relations. Religious expressions and forms of worship among the Israelites often show in language and in cult a similarity to those of the ancient Canaanites, the Phoenicians, the Syrians, the Babylonians, and the Egyptians. But it is a mistake to believe that the history and the religion of Israel are merely an offspring of the Babylonian. As the Israelites clung tenaciously to their national life, even when they were surrounded by powerful nations, or were even scattered among these nations, as in the Exile, thus too their religion, at least in its official representatives, has been able at all times to preserve a very high originality and independence under the influence of the Divine Spirit, who had filled it.

I. Origins of Israel in Pre-Mosaic Times.

1. Original Home:

The Israelites knew at all times that Canaan was not their original home, but that their ancestors had immigrated into this land. What was their earlier and earliest home? Tradition states that they immigrated from Haran in the upper Euphrates valley. But it is claimed that they came to Haran from Ur of the Chaldees, i.e. from a city in Southern Babylonia, now called Mugheir. This city of Ur, now well known from Babylonian inscriptions, was certainly not the original home of the ancestors of Israel. They rather belonged to a purely Semitic tribe, which had found its way from Northern Arabia into these districts. A striking confirmation of this view is found in a mural picture on the rock-tombs of Benihassan in Upper Egypt. The foreigners, of whom pictures are here given (from the time of the XIIth Dynasty), called Amu, namely Bedouins from Northern Arabia or from the Sinai peninsula, show such indisputable Jewish physiognomies that they must have been closely related to the stock of Abraham. Then, too, the leader of the caravan, Ebsha'a (Abishua), has a name formed just like that of Abraham. When, in later times, Moses fled to the country of the Midianites, he doubtless was welcomed by such tribal relatives.

2. Ethnographical Origin:

The Israelites at all times laid stress on their ethnographical connection with other nations. They knew that they were intimately related to a group of peoples who have the name of Hebrews. But they traced

their origin still farther back to the tribal founder, Shem. Linguistics and ethnology confirm, in general, the closer connection between the Semitic tribes mentioned in Ge 10:21 ff. Undeniable is this connection in the cases of Assur, Aram, and the different Arabian tribes. A narrower group of Semites is called Hebrews. This term is used in Ge in a wider sense of the word than is the case in later times, when it was employed as a synonym for Israel. According to its etymology, the word signified "those beyond," those who live on the other side of the river or have come over from the other side. The river meant is not the Jordan, but the Euphrates. About the same time that the ancestors of Israel were immigrating into Canaan and Egypt, other tribes also emigrated westward and were called, by the Canaanites and by the Egyptians, ‘ibhrim. This term is identical with Chabiri, found in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, in which complaint is made about the inroads of such tribes. The Israelites cannot have been meant here, but related tribes are. Possibly the Egyptian Apriu is the same word.

3. Patriarchal Origins and History:

The Israelites declared that they were descended from a particular family. On account of the patriarchal characcter of their old tribal life, it is not a matter of doubt that, as a fact, the tribe did grow out of a single family. The tribal father, Abraham, was without a doubt the head of the small tribe, which through its large family of children developed into different tribes. Only we must not forget that such a tribe could rapidly be enlarged by receiving into it also serfs and clients (compare Ge 14:14). These last-mentioned also regarded the head of the tribe as their father and considered themselves as his "sons," without really being his descendants. Possibly the tribe that immigrated first to Haran and from there to Canaan was already more numerous than would seem to be the case according to tradition, which takes into consideration only the leading personalities. Secondly, we must remember that the Israelites, because of their patriarchal life, had become accustomed to clothe all the relations of nations to nations in the scheme of the family. In this way such genealogies of nations as are found in Ge 10 and 11 originated. Here peoples, cities and countries have also been placed in the genealogies, without the author himself thinking of individual persons in this connection, who had borne the names, e.g. of Mizraim (Egypt), Gush (Ethiopia), etc., and were actually sons of Ham. The purpose of the genealogy in this form is to express only the closer or more remote relationship or connection to a group of nations. Ge 25:1 ff also is a telling example, showing how independently these groups are united. A new wife (Keturah) does not at this place fit into the family history of Abraham. But the writer still wants to make mention of an Arabian group, which was also related to Israel by blood, but in fact stood more distant from the Israelites than did the Ishmaelites. Out of this systematic further development of the living tradition, however, one difficulty arises. It is not in all places easy, indeed not always possible, to draw the line between what is reliable tradition and what is a freer continuation. But it is a misinterpretation of the historical situation, when the entire history of the patriarchs is declared to be incredible, and when in such sharply defined personalities as Abraham, Jacob, Joseph, and others, only personifications of tribes are found, the later history of which tribes is said to be embodied in the lives of these men; e.g. the name Abraham cannot have been the impersonal name of a tribe or of a god. It is found as the name of a person on old Babylonian tablets (Abu ramu); but originally in the nomadic tribe was doubtless pronounced ‘abhi ram, i.e. "My father (God) is exalted." The same is true of the name Jacob (really Jakob-el); compare Joseph (Joseph-el), Ishmael, and others, which find their analogies in old Arabian names.

(1) Patriarchal Conditions—Genesis 14.

Further, the conditions of life which are presupposed in the history of the Patriarchs are in perfect agreement with those which from the Tell el-Amarna Letters we learn existed in Canaan. While formerly it was maintained that it would have been impossible for a single tribe to force its way into Canaan at that time when the country was thickly populated, it is now known that at that very time when the ancestors of the Israelites entered, similar tribes also found their way into the land, sometimes in a peaceable way, sometimes by force. Egypt for the time being had control of the land, but its supremacy was at no place very strong. And the ‘ibhrim, as did others who forced their way into the country, caused the inhabitants much trouble. Especially does Ge 14, the only episode in which a piece of universal history finds its way into the story of the tribal ancestors, turn out to be a document of great value, which reflects beautifully the condition of affairs in Asia. Such expeditions for conquest in the direction of the Mediterranean lands were undertaken at an early period by Babylonian rulers, Sargon I of Akkad and his son Naram Sin. The latter undertook an expedition to the land of Magan along the exact way of the expedition described in Ge 14, this taking place in the days of Amraphel, i.e. Hammurabi. The fact that the latter was himself under an Elamitic superior is in perfect agreement with the story of the inscriptions, according to which the famous Hammurabi of Babylon had first freed himself from the supremacy of Elam. The fact that Hammurabi, according to accepted chronology, ruled shortly after the year 2000 BC, is also in agreement with Biblical chronology, which places Abraham in this very time. These expeditions into the country Martu, as the Babylonians call Syria, had for their purpose chiefly to secure booty and to levy tribute. That the allied kings themselves took part in this expedition is not probable. These were punitive expeditions undertaken with a small force.

Genesis 14 seems to be a translation of an old cuneiform tablet. As a rule the stories of the patriarchal age for a long time were handed down orally, and naturally were modified to a certain extent. Then, too, scholars have long since discovered different sources, out of which the story in its present form has been compiled. This fact explains some irregularities in the story: e.g. the chronological data of the document the Priestly Code (P), which arranges its contents systematically, do not always harmonize with the order of events as reported by the other two leading documents, the Elohist (E) and the Jahwist (Jahwist), the first of which is perhaps the Ephraimitic and the second the Judaic version of the story. But, under all circumstances, much greater than the difference are the agreements of the sources. They contain the same picture of this period, which certainly has not been modified to glorify the participants. It is easily seen that the situation of the fathers, when they were strangers in the land, was anything but comfortable. A poetical or perfectly fictitious popular account would have told altogether different deeds of heroism of the founder of the people. The weaknesses and the faults of the fathers and mothers in the patriarchal families are not passed over in silence. But the fact that Yahweh, whom they trusted at all times, helped them through and did not suffer them to be destroyed, but in them laid the foundation for the future of His people, is the golden cord that runs through the whole history. And in this the difference between the individual characters finds a sharp expression; e.g. Abraham’s magnanimity and tender feeling of honor in reference to his advantage in worldly matters find their expression in narratives which are ascribed to altogether different sources, as Ge 13:8 ff (Jahwist); 14:22 ff (special source); 23:7 ff (P). In what an altogether different way Jacob insists upon his advantage! This

consistency in the way in which the different characters are portrayed must awaken confidence in the historical character of the narratives. Then, too, the harmony with Egyptian manners and customs in the story of Joseph, even in its minutest details, as these have been emphasized particularly by the Egyptologist Ebers, speaks for this historical trustworthiness.

(2) Ideas of God.

Further, the conception of God as held by these fathers was still of a primitive character, but it contains the elements of the later religious development (see ISRAEL, RELIGION OF).

(3) Descent into Egypt.

During a long period of famine the sons of Jacob, through Divine providence, which made use of Joseph as an instrument, found refuge in Egypt, in the marshes of which country along the lower Nile Semitic tribes had not seldom had their temporary abodes. The land of Coshen in the Northeast part of the Delta, Ed. Naville (The Shrine of Saft-el-Henneh and the Land of Goshen, London, 1887) has shown to be the region about Phakusa (Saft-el-Henneh). These regions had at that time not yet been made a part of the strictly organized and governed country of Egypt, and could accordingly still be left to such nomadic tribes. For the sons of Jacob were still wandering shepherds, even if they did, here and there, after the manner of such tribes, change to agricultural pursuits (Ge 26:12). If, as is probable, at that time a dynasty of Semitic Hyksos was ruling in lower Egypt, it is all the more easily understood that kindred tribes of this character were fond of settling along these border districts. On account of the fertility of the amply watered districts, men and animals could increase rapidly, and the virile tribe could, in the course of a few centuries, grow into a powerful nation. One portion of the tribes pastured their flocks back and forth on the prairies; another builded houses for themselves among the Egyptians and engaged in agricultural pursuits and in gardening (Nu 11:5). Egyptian arts and trades also found their way among this people, as also doubtless the art of writing, at least in the case of certain individuals. In this way their sojourning in this country became a fruitful factor in the education of the people. This stay explains in part the fact that the Israelites at all times were more receptive of culture and were more capable than their kinsmen, the Edomites, Ammonites and Moabites, and others in this respect. Moses, like Joseph, had learned all the mysteries of Egyptian wisdom. On the other hand, the sojourn in this old, civilized country was a danger to the religion of the people of Israel. According to the testimony of Jos 24:14; Eze 20:7 ff; 23:8,19, they adopted many heathen customs from their neighbors. It was salutary for them, that the memory of this sojourn was embittered for them by hard oppression.

II. Nationality under Moses.

1. Israel in Egypt:

It is reported in Ex 18 that a new Pharaoh ascended the throne, who knew nothing of Joseph. This doubtless means that a new dynasty came into power, which adopted a new policy in the treatment of the Semitic neighbors. The expulsion of the Hyksos had preceded this, and the opposition to the Semitics

had become more acute. The new government developed a strong tendency to expansion in the direction of the Northeast. Under these circumstances it is not surprising that the laws of the empire were vigorously enforced in these border districts and that an end was made to the liberties of the unwelcome shepherd tribes. This led to constantly increasing measures of severity. In this way the people became more and more unhappy and finally were forced to immigrate.

(1) Chronology.

It is still the current conviction that the Pharaoh of the oppression was Rameses II, a king who was extraordinarily ambitious of building, whose long reign is by Eduard Meyer placed as late as 1310 to 1244 BC. His son Merenptah would then be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. But on this supposition, Biblical chronology not only becomes involved in serious difficulties, since then the time of the Judges must be cut down to unduly small proportions, but certain definite data also speak in favor of an earlier date for the Exodus of Israel. Merenptah boasts in an inscription that on an expedition to Syria he destroyed the men of Israel (which name occurs here for the first time on an Egyptian monument). And even the father of Rameses II, namely Seti, mentions Asher among those whom he conquered in Northern Palestine, that is, in the district afterward occupied by this tribe. These data justify the view that the Exodus already took place in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty, a thing in itself probable, since the energetic rulers of this dynasty naturally have inaugurated a new method of treating this province. The oppression of Israel would then, perhaps, be the work of Thethroes III (according to Meyer, 1501-1447 BC), and the Exodus would take place under his successor, Amenophis II. In harmony with this is the claim of Manetho, who declares that the "Lepers," in whom we recognize the Israelites (see below), were expelled by King Amenophis.

The length of the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, according to Ge 15:13 (P), was in round numbers 400 years; more exactly, according to Ex 12:40 f (P), 430 years. But the last-mentioned passage in Septuagint reads, "the sojourn of the sons of Jacob, when they lived in Egypt and in the land of Canaan." (The same reading is found in the Samaritan text, only that the land of Canaan precedes that of Egypt.) Since, according to this source (P), the Patriarchs lived 215 years in Canaan, the sojourn in Egypt would be reduced also 215 years. This is the way in which the synagogue reckons (compare Ga 3:17), as also Josephus (Ant., II, xv, 2). In favor of this shorter period appeal is made to the genealogical lists, which, however, because they are incomplete, cannot decide the matter. In favor of a longer duration of this sojourn we can appeal, not only to Ge 15:13 Septuagint has the same!), but also to the large number of those who left Egypt according to Nu 1 and 26 (P), even if the number of 600,000 men there mentioned, which would presuppose a nation of about two million souls, is based on a later calculation and gives us an impossible conception of the Exodus.

(2) Moses.

While no account has been preserved concerning the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, the history of the Exodus itself, which signifies the birth of Israel as a nation, is fully reported. In this crisis Moses is the prophetical mediator through whom the wonderful deed of God is accomplished. All the deeds of God,

when interpreted by this prophet, become revelations for the people. Moses himself had no other authority or power than that which was secured for him through his office as the organ of God. He was the human instrument to bring about the synthesis between Israel and Yahweh for all times. He had, in doing this, indeed proclaimed the old God of the fathers, but under the new, or at any rate hitherto to the people unknown, name of Yahweh, which is a characteristic mark of the Mosaic revelations to such an extent, that the more accurate narrators (E and P) begin to make use of this name only from this period of time on. In the name of this absolute sovereign, God, Moses claims liberty for Israel, since this people was Yahweh's firstborn (Ex 4:22). The contest which Moses carries on in the name of this God with Pharaoh becomes more and more a struggle between this God and the gods of Egypt, whose earthly representative Pharaoh is. The plagues which come over Egypt are all founded on the natural conditions of the country, but they occur in such extraordinary strength and rapidity at Moses' prediction, and even appear at his command, that they convince the people, and finally Pharaoh himself, of the omnipotence of this God on the soil of this country. In the same way the act of deliverance at the Red Sea can be explained as the cooperation of natural causes, namely wind and tide. But the fact that these elementary. forces, just at this critical time, proved so serviceable to the people of God and destructive to their enemies, shows unmistakably the miraculous activity of God. This the Israelites experienced still further on the journey through the desert, when they were entirely dependent on Divine leadership and care. The outcome of these experiences, and at the same time its grandest demonstration, was the conclusion of the covenant at Mt. Sinai. From this time on Yahweh was Israel's God and Israel was the people of Yahweh. This God claimed to be the only and absolute ruler over the tribes that were now inwardly united into one nation. From this resulted as a matter of course, that Moses as the recognized organ of this God was not only the authority, who was to decide in all disputes concerning right, but also the one from whom a new and complete order of legal enactments proceeded. Moses became the lawgiver of Israel.

Even if the history of the origin of the Old Testament covenant is unique in character, it is nevertheless profitable to take note of an analogy which is found in a related people and which is adapted to make much in Israel's history clearer. Mohammed also, after he had at the critical point of his career persuaded his followers to migrate from their homes, soon after, in Medina, concluded a covenant, according to which he, as the recognized speaker of Allah (God), claimed for himself the right to decide in all disputes. He, too, in his capacity as the prophet of God, was consulted as an infallible authority in all questions pertaining to the cult, the civil and the criminal laws, as also in matters pertaining to politics and to war. And his decisions and judgments, uttered in the name of Allah, were written down and afterward collected. This Koran, too, became the basis of sacred law. And by causing the hitherto divided and antagonistic tribes to subject themselves to Allah, Mohammed united these his followers into a religious communion and in this way, too, into a national body. Mohammed has indeed copied the prophecy of earlier times, but the work of Moses was original in character and truly inspired by God.

2. Historical Character of the Exodus:

The historical character of the exodus out of Egypt cannot be a matter of doubt, though some suspect that the entire nation did not take part in the march through the Red Sea, but that certain tribes had before this already migrated toward the East. We must not forget that the song of victory in Ex 15 does not mention a word about Pharaoh's being himself destroyed in going through the Sea. It is only the late

Ps 136:15 that presupposes this as a certainty. That an entire nation cannot emigrate in a single night cannot be maintained in view of the fact that the inhabitants of the same Wady-Tumilat, through which Israel marched, so late as the last century, emigrated in a single night and for similar reasons (compare Sayce, Monuments, 249).

(1) Egyptian Version of the Exodus.

The fact that the Egyptian monuments report nothing of this episode, so disgraceful to that people, is a matter of course, in view of the official character of these accounts and of their policy of passing over in absolute silence all disagreeable facts. And yet in the popular tradition of the people, which Manetho has handed down, there has been preserved some evidence of this event. It is indeed true that what this author reports about the Hyksos (see above) does not belong here, as this people is not, as Josephus thinks, identical with the Israelites. However (Apion, I, xxvi, 5 ff), he narrates a story which may easily be the tradition concerning the exodus of the children of Israel as changed by popular use. King Amenophis, we are told, wanted to see the gods. A seer, who bore the same name, promised that his wish would be gratified under the condition that the country would be cleansed of lepers and all others that were unclean; and it is said that he accordingly drove 80,000 such persons into the stone quarries East of the Nile. As the seer was afraid that these measures would be displeasing to the gods and bring upon the land a subjection of 13 years to the supremacy of foreigners, he gave up to these lepers the former city of the Hyksos, Avaris by name. Here they appointed a priest by the name of Osarsiph, later called Moses, as their chief, who gave them a special body of laws and in these did not spare the sacred animals. He also carried on war against the Egyptians, the Hyksos helping him, and he even governed Egypt for 13 years, after which he and his followers were driven out into Syria. Similar stories are found in Chaeromon, Lysimachus, and others (Apion, I, xxxii, 36; compare Tacitus, History, verses 3-5). When we remember that it is nonsense to permit lepers to work in stone quarries and that the Egyptians also otherwise call the Semites Aatu, i.e. "plague," then this story must be regarded as referring to such a non-Egyptian nation. Hecataeus of Abdera has a report of this matter which is much more like the Biblical story, to the effect, namely, that a plague which had broken out in Egypt led the people to believe that the gods were angry at the Egyptians because they had neglected the religious cult; for which reason they expelled all foreigners. A part of these is said to have migrated under the leadership of Moses to Judea and there to have founded the city of Jerusalem (compare Diodorus Siculus xl.3; compare xxxvi.1).

(2) Geographical Matters.

The Red Sea, through which the Israelites went under the leadership of Moses, is without a doubt the northern extension of this body of water, which in former times reached farther inland than the present Gulf of Suez; compare Edouard Naville, The Store-City of Pithom and the Route of the Exodus, 1885; and The Route of the Exodus, 1891. This savant is entitled to the credit of having identified the station Sukkoth on the basis of the monuments; it is the modern Tell-Mashuta and identical with Pithom, which was the name of the sanctuary at that place. Later the city was called Heroopoils. The route accordingly went through the modern Wadi-Tumilat to the modern Bitter Sea, North of Suez. It is a more difficult task to trace the route geographically on the other side of the Sea. For it is a question whether "the

Mountain of Yahweh," which formed the goal of the journey, is to be located on the Sinai peninsula, or in the land of the Edomites, or even on the western coast of Arabia. A.H. Sayce and others reject the traditional location of Sinai on the peninsula named after this mountain, and declare that the Israelites marched directly eastward toward the Gulf of Akaba. The reasons for this are found in the work of Sayce, The Verdict of the Monuments, 263 ff. But even if on this supposition a number of difficulties fall away, there nevertheless are many arguments in favor of the traditional location of Sinai, especially the grandeur of the chain itself, for which a rival worth mentioning has not been discovered in the land of the Edomites or in Northwestern Arabia. The Sinai traveler, E. H. Palmer, has also shown how splendidly the surroundings of the Sinai chain, especially the Jebel Musa with the Ras Sufsafeh, is adapted for the purpose of concluding a covenant.

(3) The Wilderness Sojourn.

The duration of the sojourn in the "desert" is everywhere (as in Am 5:25) given as 40 years. In harmony with this is the fact that only a few of those who had come out of Egypt lived to enter Canaan. The greater part of these 40 years the Israelites seem to have spent at Kadesh. At any rate, there was a sanctuary at that place, at which Moses administered justice, while the different tribes probably were scattered over the prairies and over the tillable districts. The central sanctuary, which Moses established, was the Tabernacle, which contained the Ark of the Covenant, the sanctissimum. This sacred ark with the cherubim above it represents the throne of God, who is thought to be enthroned above the cherubim. The ark itself is, as it were, His footstool. As in Egyptian sanctuaries not infrequently the most sacred laws are deposited beneath the feet of the statue of the gods, thus the sacred fundamental laws of God (the Decalogue), on two tablets, were deposited in this ark. This Ark of the Covenant presupposes an invisible God, who cannot be represented by any image. The other laws and ordinances of Moses covered the entire public and private legislation, given whenever the need for these made it necessary to determine such matters. In giving these laws Moses connected his system with the old traditional principles already current among the tribes. This fact is confirmed by the legal Code of Hammurabi, which contains remarkable parallels, especially to Ex 20-23:19. But Moses has elevated the old traditional laws of the tribes and has given them a more humane character. By putting every enactment in the light of the religion of Yahweh, and by eliminating everything not in harmony with this religion, he has raised the people spiritually and morally to a higher plane.

Among the people, the undercurrents of superstition and of immorality were indeed still strong. At the outset Moses had much to contend with in the opposition of the badly mixed mass of the people. And the fact that he was able for the period of 40 years to hold the leadership of this stubborn people without military force is a phenomenal work, which shows at all hands the wonderful cooperation of Yahweh Himself. However, he did not indeed succeed in raising the entire people to the plane of his knowledge of God and of his faith in God. This generation had to die in the wilderness, because it lacked the sanctified courage to take possession of the land of promise. But the foundation had been laid for theocracy, which must not in any way be identified with a hierarchy.

(4) Entrance into Canaan.

It was Joshua, the successor of Moses, who was enabled to finish the work and to take possession of the land. Not far from Jericho he led the people over the Jordan and captured this city, which had been considered impregnable. After that, with his national army, he conquered the Canaanitish inhabitants in several decisive battles, near Gibeon and at the waters of Merom, and then went back and encamped at Gilgal on the Jordan. After this he advanced with his tribe of Ephraim into the heart of the land, while the southern tribes on their part forced their way into the districts assigned to them. Without reasons this account has been attacked as unreliable, and critics have thought that originally the different tribes, at their own initiative, either peaceably or by force, had occupied their land. But it is entirely natural to suppose that the inhabitants of the country who had allied themselves to resist this occupation by Israel, had first to be made submissive through several decisive defeats, before they would permit the entrance of the tribes of Israel, which entrance accordingly often took place without a serious struggle. That the occupation of the land was not complete is shown in detail in Jud 1. Also in those districts in which Israel had gained the upper hand, they generally did not wage the war of annihilation that Moses had commanded, but were content with making the Canaanites, by the side of whom they settled, bondsmen and subjects. This relation could, in later time, easily be reversed, especially in those cases in which the original inhabitants of the country were in the majority. Then, too, it must be remembered that the latter enjoyed a higher state of civilization than the Israelites. It was accordingly an easy matter for the Israelites to adopt the customs and the ideas of the Canaanites. But if this were done, their religion was also endangered. Together with the sacred "holy places" (bamoth) of the original inhabitants, the altars and the sanctuaries there found also came into possession of the Israelites. Among these there were some that had been sacred to the ancestors of Israel, and with which old memories were associated. As a consequence, it readily occurred that Israel appropriated also old symbols and religious ceremonies, and even the Baals and the Astartes themselves, however little this could be united in principle with the service of Yahweh. But if the Israelites lost their unique religion, then their connection with the kindred tribes and their national independence were soon matters of history. They were readily absorbed by the Canaanites.

ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, 2

III. Period of the Judges.

1. General Character of Period:

In such a period of weakened national and religious life, it could easily happen that Israel would again lose the supremacy that it had won by the sword. It was possible that the Canaanites could again bring into their power larger parts of the land. Also energetic and pushing nomadic tribes, such as the Ammonites, the Moabites, or other warlike peoples, such as the Philistines, could bring the country under subjection, as actually did occur in the period of the Judges. The Book of Judges reports a number of such instances of the subjection of Israel, which did not extend over the whole land, and in part occurred in different sections of the country at the same time. Judah and Simeon, the two tribes in the south, as a rule took no part in these contests, and had their own battles to fight; and the same is true of the tribes East of the Jordan, among whom Northern Manasseh and Ephraim were in closest alliance.

After a longer or shorter period of oppression, there followed in each case a revival of the national spirit against such oppression. And in all these cases the popular hero who became the liberator appealed to the religious consciousness that formed a bond of union between all the Israelirish tribes and their common God Yahweh. In however wild a manner the youthful vigor of the people may have found its expression on these occasions, they are nevertheless conscious of the fact that they are waging a holy war, which in every case also ended with the victory over the heathen spirit and false worship that had found their way into Israel. The most precious historical monument from these times is the song of Deborah (Jud 5), which, like a mirror, reflects faithfully the conditions of affairs, and the thoughts of that age.

Judges 17-21 belong to the beginning of this period. The first of these old stories narrates the emigration of a large portion of the tribe of Da to the extreme north of the country and the origin of idolatry in that region (Jud 17$; 18$). But the second story, too, both in form and contents, is, at least in part, very old and its historical value is amply protected against the attacks of modern critics by Ho 9:9; 10:9. This story reports a holy war of revenge against the tribe of Benjamin, which was unwilling to render satisfaction for a nefarious crime that had been committed at Gibeah in its territory. In the feeling of close solidarity and of high responsibility which appears in connection with the punishment of this crime, we still see the influence of the periods of Moses and Joshua.

2. The Different Judges:

First it is narrated of a king of Aram-naharaim that he had oppressed Israel for a period of 8 years (Jud 3:8). This probably means a king of the Mitanni (Sayce, Monuments, 297, 304), who at that time were trying to force their way through Canaan into Egypt. It was Othniel, the Kenazite, belonging to a tribe that was related to Judah, who delivered Israel. A second liberator was the Benjamite Ehud, who delivered the southeastern portion of the country from the servitude of Eglon, the king of the Moabites, by putting the latter to death (Jud 3:12). On a greater scale was the decisive battle against the Canaanitish kings in the north, when these had formed an alliance and had subjected Israel for a period of 20 years. At the appeal of Deborah, Barak conquered Sisera, the hostile king and leader of a mighty army of chariots, in the plain of Kishon (Jud 4; 5). In the same region the battle of Gideon was fought with the plundering Bedouin swarms of the Midianites, who had repeatedly oppressed Israel (Jud 6-8). Abimelech, an unworthy son of the God-fearing hero, after the death of his father, had established a local kingdom in Shechem, which stood for only a short time and came to a disgraceful end. Little more than the names are known to us of Tola, of the tribe of Issachar, and of Jair, in Gilead (Jud 10:1). More fully is the story of Jephthah told, who delivered the country from the Ammonites coming from the east (Jud 11), with which was also connected a struggle with the jealous Ephraimites (Jud 12); and still more fully are the details reported of the personal contests of the Nazirite Samson, belonging to the tribe of Dan, against the Philistines making their inroads from the south, and who for many years proved to be the most dangerous enemies of Israel.

All these heroes, and a few others not so well known, are called judges, and it is regularly reported how long each of these "judged" Israel. They were not officials in the usual sense of the term, but were liberators of the people, who, at the inspiration of Yahweh, gave the signal for a holy war. After the

victory they, as men of Yahweh, then enjoyed distinction, at least in their own tribes; and in so far as it was through their doing that the people had been freed, they were the highest authorities in political, legal, and probably, too, in religious questions. They are called judges in conscious contradistinction from the kingly power, which in Israel was recognized as the exclusive prerogative of Yahweh, so that Gideon declined it as improper when the people wanted to make him king (Jud 8:22 f). The people recognized the Spirit of Yahweh in the fierce energy which came over these men and impelled them to arouse their people out of their disgraceful lethargy. For this reason, too, they could afterward be trusted in making their judicial decisions in harmony with the mind and the Spirit of God, as this had been done already by the prophetess Deborah in the time of oppression. Yet, at least in the case of Samson (notwithstanding Jud 16:31), it is not probable that he ever was engaged in the administration of justice. It is not even reported of him that he fought at the head of the people, but he carried on his contests with the Philistines in behalf of himself individually, even if, as one consecrated of God, he were a witness for the power of God.

3. Chronology of the Period:

The chronology of the period of the Judges exhibits some peculiar difficulties. If we add together the data that are given in succession in the Book of Judges, we get from Jud 3:8-16:31, 4:10 years altogether. But this number is too large to make it harmonize with the 480 years mentioned in 1Ki 6:1. Jewish tradition (e.g. Cedher ‘Olam) accordingly does not include the years of oppression in this sum, but makes them a part of the period of the individual judges. In this way about 111 years are eliminated. But evidently the redactor of the Book of Judges did not share this view. Modern critics are of the opinion that the writer has dovetailed two chronological methods, one of which counted on the basis of periods of forty years each, while the other was more exact and contained odd numbers. In this way we can shorten this period as does the Cedher ‘Olam. At any rate, it is justifiable, and is suggested by Jud 10:7, to regard the oppression by the Ammonites (10:8 ff) and the oppression by the Philistines (13:1 ff) as contemporaneous. And other events, too, which in the course of the narrative are related as following each other, may have taken place at the same time or in a somewhat different sequence, as the author used different sources for the different events. But for this very reason his story deserves to be credited as historical. Such characters as Deborah, Jephthah, Ehud, Gideon, Abimelech and Samson are described as tangible historical realities. Even if, in the case of the last-mentioned, oral tradition has added decorative details to the figure, yet Samson cannot possibly be a mere mythological character, but must have been a national hero characteristic of this period, in whom are represented the abundance of physical and mental peculiarities characteristic of the youthful nation, as also their good-natured indifference and carelessness over against their treacherous enemies.

4. Loose Organization of the People:

The lack of a central political power made itself felt all the more in the period of the Judges, since, because of the scattered condition of the people in the country that had been so minutely parceled out, and because of the weakening of the religious enthusiasm of the preceding age, the deeper unity of heart and mind was absent. It is indeed incorrect to imagine that at this time there was a total lack of governmental authority. A patriarchal organization had been in force from the beginning. The father of

the family was the lawful head of those belonging to him: and a larger clan was again subject to an "elder," with far-reaching rights in the administration of law, but also with the duty to protect his subordinates, and in case of want to support them. Unfortunately we are nowhere informed how these elders were chosen or whether their offices were hereditary. Only a very few passages, such as Isa 3:6 f, throw a certain light on the subject. This institution of the elders Moses had already found established and had developed farther (Ex 18:13). It was retained in all the periods of Israel's history. When the people began to live together in larger centers, as a natural consequence bodies of such city elders were established. The tribes, too, had "elders" at their head. But for a united action of the whole nation this arrangement did not suffice; and especially in the case of war the people of Israel felt that they were at a disadvantage compared with their enemies, who had kings to lead them. For this reason the desire for a king steadily grew in Israel. The dictators of the period of the Judges satisfied their needs only for the time being.

IV. The Kingdom: Israel-Judah.

In the time when the Israelites were oppressed by the Philistines the need of a king was especially felt. As Samson had come to his death in servitude, the people themselves thus, at the close of this period of glorious victories, were under the supremacy of a warlike race, which had only in recent times settled on the western coast of Palestine, and from this base was forcing its conquests into the heart of the country.

1. Samuel:

After the most disastrous defeats, during which even the Ark of the Covenant was lost, there arose for the people, indeed, a father and a deliverer in the person of Samuel, who saved them during the most critical period. What his activity meant for the uplift of the people cannot be estimated too highly. He was, above all, during peace the faithful watchman of the most sacred possessions of Israel, a prophet such as the people had not seen since the days of Moses; and he doubtless was the founder of those colonies of prophetical disciples who were in later times so influential in the development of a theocratical spirit in Israel. He guarded the whole nation also with all his power, by giving to them laws and cultivating piety in the land.

2. The Kingdom of Saul:

But as Samuel, too, became old and the people concluded for good reasons that his rule would have no worthy successors, their voice could no longer be silenced, and they demanded a king. Samuel tried in vain to persuade the people to desist from their demand, which to him seemed to be an evidence of distrust in the providence of Yahweh, but was himself compelled, by inspiration of God, to submit to their wishes and anoint the new king, whom Yahweh pointed out to him. It is indeed maintained by the critics that there are several accounts extant in Samuel concerning the selection of Saul to the kingdom, and that these accounts differ in this, that the one regards the kingdom as a blessing and the other as a curse. The first view, which is said to be the older, is claimed to be found in 1Sa 9:1-10,16, and 11; while the second is said to be in 1Sa 8; 10:17-27; 11:12-14. Whatever may be the facts in regard to these

sources, this is beyond any doubt, that Samuel, the last real theocratic leader, established the kingdom. But just as little can the fact be doubted, that he took this step with inner reluctance, since in his eyes this innovation meant the discarding of the ideals of the people to which he himself had remained true during his lifetime. The demand of the people was the outgrowth of worldly motives, but Yahweh brought it about, that the "Anointed of Yah" signified an advance in the history of the kingdom of God.

Saul himself, at first, in a vigorous and efficient manner, solved the immediate problems and overcame the enemies of his people. But he soon began to conceive of his kingdom after the manner of heathen kingdoms and did not subject himself to Yahweh and His appointed representative. There soon arose an open conflict between him and Samuel; and the fact that the Spirit of God had departed from him appears in his melancholy state of mind, which urged him on to constantly increasing deeds of violence. That under these circumstances God’s blessing also departed from him is proved by the collapse of his life’s work in his final failures against the Philistines.

3. David:

In contrast with this, David, his successor, the greatest king that Israel ever had, had a correct conception of this royal office, and even in his most brilliant successes did not forget that he was called to rule only as "the servant of Yahweh" (by which name he, next to Moses, is called most often in the Bible). As a gifted ruler, he strengthened his kingdom from within, which, considering the heterogeneous character of the people, was not an easy matter, and extended it without by overpowering jealous neighbors. In this way it was he who became the real founder of a powerful kingdom. The conquest of Jerusalem and its selection as the capital city also are an evidence of his political wisdom. It is indeed true that he, too, had his personal failings and that he made many mistakes, which caused him political troubles, even down to his old age. But his humility at all times made him strong enough again to subject himself to the hand of Yahweh, and this humility was based on the attitude of his spirit toward Yahweh, which shows itself in his Psalms. In this way he really came to be a connecting link between God and his people, and upon this foundation the prophets built further, who prophesied a still closer union of the two under a son of David.

While Saul was a Benjamite, David was of the tribe of Judah, and was for a short time the king of this tribe in Hebron, before the other tribes, becoming tired of the misrule of a descendant of Saul, also voluntarily chose him as their king. He soon after this established as the center of his new kingdom the city of Jerusalem, which really was situated on the territory that had been assigned to Benjamin; and he also set this city apart as the religious center of the people by transferring the Ark of the Covenant to this place. In this way David, through his wisdom and his popular bravery, succeeded in uniting the tribes more firmly under his supremacy, and especially did he bring the tribe of Judah, which down to this time had been more for itself, into closer connection with the others. Israel under David became a prominent kingdom. This position of power was, as a matter of fact, distasteful to their neighbors round about. The Philistines tried to destroy the ambitious kingdom, but were themselves repeatedly and definitely overpowered. But other neighboring people, too, who, notwithstanding the fact that David did not assume an offensive attitude toward them, assumed a hostile attitude toward him, came to feel his superiority. Particularly severe and tedious was the war against the allied Ammonites and Syrians; and

although the Edomites, too, regarded this as a favorable time for attacking Israel, this struggle also ended in a complete triumph for David. The surrounding countries became subject to him from the Mediterranean Sea to Hamath (2Sa 8:9), and from the territory of the Lebanon, the inhabitants of which assumed a friendly attitude, to the borders of Egypt, which also recognized the new rule.

4. Solomon:

Solomon, the son of David, developed inwardly the powerful kingdom which he had inherited. To his father he seemed to be the right man for this because of his peaceful temperament and his high mental abilities. He justified the hopes placed in him. Out of love to Yahweh he built the temple on Mt. Zion, regulated the affairs of state and the administration of justice, and by commercial treaties with the Phoenicians (King Hiram) brought about great prosperity in the land. His was the "golden" period in Israel. The culture and civilization, too, of the people were materially advanced by Solomon as he widened their horizon and introduced the literature of Proverbs, which had up to this time been more extensively cultivated by the neighboring people (Edom, Arabia, Egypt). He even developed this literature into a higher type. On the other hand, the brilliant reign of Solomon brought serious dangers to the new kingdom. His liberal-mindedness in the treatment of his foreign wives, in permitting them to retain their heathen worship, probably because he thought that in the end it was the same Divinity which these women worshipped under different form, endangered theocracy with its serious cult and its strict morality. Through this conduct the king necessarily forfeited the sympathy of the most pious Israelites. At the same time, his love for magnificent structures surpassed the measure which was regarded as correct for the "Anointed of Yahweh." Then, too, his efforts, in themselves justifiable, to establish a more perfect organization of the monarchy, produced a great deal of dissatisfaction. Solomon did not understand, as did his father, how to respect the inherited liberty-loving tendencies of his people. The heavy services and taxation, to which the people were compelled to submit, were deeply felt, most of all by the Ephraimites, who at times had exhibited a jealous spirit, and could not forget their lost hegemony.

5. Division of the Kingdom:

So long, indeed, as the wise Solomon and his advisers were at the helm, the various rebellious tendencies could not make themselves felt. But after his death the catastrophe came. His son, Rehoboam, at the Diet in Shechem, at which the Ephraimites placed before him a kind of capitulation before his coronation, showed that he did not at all understand the situation. His domineering attitude brought things to a head, and he must have been glad that at least the tribe of Judah remained faithful to him. The northern tribes chose for their king Jeroboam (I), who before this had already taken part in rebellious agitations, as the kingdom had been predicted to him by the prophet Ahijah (1Ki 11:2). Israel was torn into two parts.

6. Sources of the History of the Kingdom:

With this rupture the powerful kingdom established by David had reached its end. In regard to this flourishing period in Israel’s history we are, on the whole, well informed through the sources. Especially

in 2Sa 9-20 and 1Ki 2; 3, we have a narrator who must have been a contemporary of the events recorded. Klostermann surmises that this may have been Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok (2Sa 15:27); while Duhm, Budde, Sellin and others believe it to have been the priest Abiathar. Less unity is in evidence in the first Book of Sam, containing the history of the youth of David, which evidently was often described. The Books of Chronicles have only secondary value for the life of David. These books narrate in full detail the story of the preparations made by David for the erection of the temple and of his organization of the Levites. In regard to the reign of Solomon, the Books of Kings report more fully. Concerning the later kings, they generally give only meager extracts from more complete sources, which excerpts, however, have been shown to be reliable. The interest which the narrator has in telling his story is the religious. Especially does he carefully note the fact as to the relation of the different kings to the cult. Special sources have been used in compiling the detailed stories of the great prophets Elijah and Elisha, which are inserted in the history of the two kingdoms. On the other hand, the Books of Ch pass over entirely all reference to the work of the prophets of the Northern Kingdom, as they ignore the entire history of the Ephraimitic kingdom since the interest of these books is centered on the sanctuary in Jerusalem. Also in the case of the Judean history, the much older Books of Ki deserve the precedence. Yet we owe to the writer of Ch a number of contributions to this history, especially where he has made a fuller use of the sources than has been done by the author of the Books of Kings. The suspicion that everything which Chronicles contains, beyond what is to be found in Kings, is unhistorical, has turned out to be groundless. Thus, e.g., it would be impossible to understand the earlier prophecies of Isaiah under Jotham at all, if it did not appear from Chronicles to what prosperity and influence the people of Jerusalem had by that time again attained. For it is only Chronicles that give us an account of the flourishing reign of his predecessor Uzziah, who is treated but briefly in Kings.

7. Chronological Matters:

The chronology of the earlier portions of the period of the Kings is dependent on the date of the division of the kingdom. This date can be decided on the basis of the careful chronological data of the Books of K, which do not indeed agree in all particulars, but are to be adjusted by the Assyrian chronology. If we, with Kamphausen, Oettli and Kittel, regard the year 937 BC as the time of the division of the kingdom, then Solomon ruled from 977 to 937; David, from 1017 to 977. The length of the reign of Saul is not known, as the text of 1Sa 13:1 is defective. It is very probable that we can credit him with about twenty years, according to Josephus (Ant., X, viii, 4), i.e. from about 1037-1017. In this case David transferred the seat of government to Jerusalem about the year 1010, and the completion of the erection of the temple of Solomon took place in 966. But this basal date of 937 is not accepted as correct by all scholars. Klostermann places the date of the rupture of the kingdom in the year 978; Koehler, in 973. For later chronological data, Assyrian sources are an important factor. The Assyrians were accustomed to call each year after the name of an official (limu), and eponym lists are extant for 228 years. In these reference is made to an eclipse of the sun, which astronomically has been settled as having taken place on July 15, 763. We have in this list then the period from 893 to 666. On this basis, it is made possible to determine the exact dates of the different military expeditions of the Assyrian rulers and their conflicts with the kings of Judah and Israel, on the presupposition, however, that the Assyrian inscriptions here used really speak of these kings, which in a number of cases is denied. Valuable help for determining the chronology of this period is the fall of Samaria in the year 722 and the expedition of Sennacherib against

Jerusalem in 701, and then the fall of Jerusalem in 587 and 586. The distribution of the years between these dates to the individual kings is in places doubtful, as the numbers in the text are possibly corrupt, and in the synchronistic data of the Books of Ki mistakes may have been made.

ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, 3

V. Period of the Separated Kingdoms.

1. Contrasts and Vicissitudes of the Kingdoms:

The two separated kingdoms differed materially. The kingdom of Ephraim was the more powerful of the two. It embraced, according to an inaccurate usage of situdes of the words, 10 tribes; and to this the kingdom the vassals, such as Moab, as a rule remained subject, until they emancipated themselves. But, on the other hand, this Northern Kingdom was less firm spiritually. Even the resident city of the king changed frequently, until Omri founded the city of Samaria, which was well adapted for this purpose. The dynasties, too, were only of short duration. It occurred but rarely that one family was able to maintain its supremacy on the throne through several generations. A revolutionary character remained fixed in this kingdom and became its permanent weakness. On the other hand, the smaller and often overpowered kingdom of Judah, which faithfully adhered to the royal line of David, passed through dangerous crises and had many unworthy rulers. But the legitimate royal house, which had been selected by Yahweh, constituted spiritually a firm bond, which kept the people united, as is seen, e.g., by a glance at the addresses of Isaiah, who is thoroughly filled with the conviction of the importance of the house of David, no matter how unworthy the king who happened to rule might appear to him. In a religious respect, also, the arbitrary break with Zion proved to be fatal for the Northern Kingdom.

2. The Successive Reigns:

Jeroboam.

It is true that faithful prophets of Yahweh, such as the Abijah of Shiloh mentioned above, and Shemaiah (1Ki 12:22), proclaimed that the fateful division of the kingdom was a Divinely intended judgment from Yahweh. But they soon were compelled to reach the conclusion that Jeroboam did not regard himself as a servant of Yahweh, but as a sovereign who, through his own power and through the favor of the people, had secured the rule, and hence, could arbitrarily decide all matters in reference to the cult and the sacred sanctuaries of the people. According to his own will, and for political reasons, he established the new national sanctuary at Bethel, and another at Dan. At both shrines he caused Yahweh to be worshipped under the image of a calf, which was to constitute a paganizing opposition to the Ark of the Covenant on Mt. Zion, even if it was the idea that Yahweh, the God of the Covenant, was to be worshipped in these new images. In doing this, the king followed ancient national customs, which had broken with the purity of the Mosaic religion (concerning imageworship in Da we have beard before. See GOLDEN CALF). His sojourn in Egypt, too, where he had lived as a fugitive, had doubtless furnished the king incentives in this direction. He created a priesthood that was submissive to his wishes,

and disregarded the opposition of the few prophets who protested against the policy of the king. His successors, too, walked "in the ways of Jeroboam." The independent prophets, however, did not die out, but, rather, prophecy developed its greatest activity in this very Northern Kingdom. As a rule, in its work it stood in opposition to the government, but at times it succeeded in gaining the recognition of the rulers.

Omri.

The earliest times of the divided kingdoms are, from a political point of view, characterized by the fact that the kingdoms on the Euphrates and the Tigris, namely Assyria and Babylon, still had enough to do with themselves, and did not yet make any inroads into the Mediterranean lands; but, rather, it was the Syrians who first caused a good deal of trouble to the Northern Kingdom. Jeroboam did not succeed in rounding a dynasty. Already his son Nadab was eliminated by a usurper Baasha. The latter's son too, Elah, was murdered, after a reign of two years. It was not, however, his murderer Zimri, or Tibni, who strove to secure the kingdom. for himself, but Omri who became king (1Ki 16), and who also attained to such prominence abroad that the cuneiform inscriptions for a long time after call Israel "the land of Omri." His ability as a ruler was seen in the fact that the establishment of Samaria as the capital city was his work. The inscription on the Mesha stone reports that he also established the sovereignty of Israel vigorously on the east side of the Jordan.

Ahab.

His son Ahab, too, was an energetic and brave ruler, who succeeded in gaining a number of victories over the Syrians, who were now beginning to assume the offensive in a determined manner. Then, too, he was politic enough to win over to his interests the kingdom of Judah, with which his predecessors had lived in almost constant warfare. In this policy he succeeded, because the noble and large-hearted king Jehoshaphat was more receptive to such fraternal relations than was good for him. An expedition jointly undertaken by these two kings against Syria brought Jehoshaphat into extreme danger and ended with the death of Ahab.

Ahab's fate was his wife Jezebel, the daughter of the Phoenician king Ethbaal (Ithobal, according to Josephus, Ant, VIII, xiii, 2 and Apion, I, 18), who had been a priest of Astarte. This intermarriage with a fanatical heathen family brought untold and endless misfortune over all Israel. This bold and scheming woman planned nothing less than the overthrow of the religion of Yahweh, and the substitution for it of the Baal and the Astarte cult. As a first step she succeeded in having the king tolerate this religion. The leading temple in the new resident city, Samaria, was dedicated to the Baal cult. Already this introduction of a strange and lascivious ethnic religion was a great danger to the religion and the morals of the people. Hosts of Baal priests, ecstatic dervishes, traversed the country. Soon the queen undertook to persecute the faithful worshippers of Yahweh. The fact that these men protested against the tolerance of this foreign false religion was interpreted as disobedience on their part to the king. Many faithful prophets were put to death. At this critical period, when the existence of the religion of Yahweh was at stake, the prophet Elijah, the Tishbite, appeared on the stage, and through a bitter struggle reestablished

the worship of Yahweh. However, the fateful influence that this woman exerted was thereby not yet destroyed. It extended to Judah also.

Rehoboam.

In the kingdom of Judah, apart from the apostasy of different tribes, which left him only the vigorous tribe of Judah and portions of Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, and Levi, Rehoboam experienced also other calamities, namely, a destructive invasion and tribute imposition by King Shishak of Egypt (Egyptian Sheshonk, founder of the XXIId Dynasty; 1Ki 14:25 f; compare 2Ch 12:2 ff). While under Solomon the relations of Israel to the Egyptian court had in the beginning been very friendly, this was changed when a new dynasty came to the throne. After Jeroboam had failed in his first revolutionary project, he had found refuge at the court of Shishak (1Ki 11:40). It is possible that Jeroboam made the Egyptian king lustful for the treasures of Jerusalem. The Egyptians did not, as a matter of fact, stop at the Ephraimitic boundaries, but in part also invaded the territory of Jeroboam; but their chief objective was Jerusalem, from which they carried away the treasures that had been gathered by Solomon. On the temple wall of Karnak this Pharaoh has inscribed the story of this victory and booty. From the names of the cities found in this inscription, we learn that this expedition extended as far as Megiddo and Taanach.

Abijah.

Rehoboam was succeeded by his son Abijah, or Abijahu, according to Chronicles (the Abijam of Kings is hardly correct). He ruled only 3 years. But even during this short reign he was compelled to engage in a severe struggle with Jeroboam (1Ki 15:6; see details in 2Ch 13).

Asa.

In every respect the reign of the God-fearing Asa, who sought to destroy the heathenism that had found its way into the cult, was more fortunate. He also experienced Yahweh’s wonderful help when the Cushite Zerah made an incursion into his land (2Ch 14:8), i.e. probably Osorkon I, who, however, did not belong to an Ethiopian dynasty. Possibly he is called an Ethiopian because he came into the country with Nubian troops. Less honorable was his conduct in the conflict with Baasha. When he was sorely pressed by the latter he bought, through the payment of a large tribute, the assistance of the Syrian king, Ben-hadad I, who up to this time had been an ally of Baasha. This bribing of foreigners to fight against their own covenant people, which was afterward often repeated, was rebuked by a bold prophet in the presence of the pious king, but the prophet was compelled to suffer abuse for his open testimony (2Ch 16:7).

Jehoshaphat.

A much more noble conduct characterized the dealings of Jehoshaphat in relation to the Northern Kingdom. His fault was that he entered too fully into the selfish offers of friendship made by Ahab. The worst step was that, in order to confirm his covenant, he took for his son Jehoram as wife, Athaliah, the

daughter of Jezebel. Jehoshaphat was a chivalrous ally, who also joined Ahab's son, Jehoram, in a dangerous war against the Moabites; as this people under their king Mesha had made themselves free from Israel and had taken the offensive against them. For the inner affairs of the kingdom his reign was more fortunate. He was a Godfearing and an energetic prince, who did much to elevate the people in a material and a religious way and perfected its political organization. Nor did he fail to secure some noteworthy successes. However, the fact that the warning words of the prophets who rebuked him because of his alliance with the half-heathenish house of Omri were not the fanatical exaggerations of pessimistic seers, appears at once after his death.

Jehoram.

His son Jehoram, after the manner of oriental despots, at once caused his brothers to be put to death, of which doubtless his wife Athaliah was the cause. This woman transplanted the policy of Jezebel to Judah, and was scheming for the downfall of the house of David and its sanctuary. Under Jehoram the power of Judah accordingly began to sink rapidly. Edom became independent. The Philistines and the Arabians sacked Jerusalem. Even the royal princes, with the exception of Ahaziah, the youngest son of Athaliah, were expelled. When the latter ascended the throne she had the absolute power in her hands.

Jehu.

During this time the judgment over the house of Omri was fast approaching. The avenger came in the person of the impetuous Jehu, who had been anointed king by one of the disciples of Elisha in the camp of Ramoth in Gilead. According to 1Ki 19:16, the order had already been given to Elijah to raise this man to the throne; but the compliance with this command appears to have been delayed. As soon as Jehu became aware that he was entrusted with this mission, he hastened to Jezreel, where Ahaziah, king of Judah, was just paying a visit to Jehoram, and slew them both. With heartless severity he extended this slaughter, not only to all the members of the house of Omri, together with Jezebel, but also to those numerous members of the Davidic royal house who fell into his hands. He likewise destroyed the adherents of Baal, whom he had invited to their death in their sanctuary at Samaria. Deserved as this judgment upon the house of Jeroboam was (2Ki 10:30), which Jehu, according to higher command, carried out, he did this in an unholy mind and with hardness and ambitious purpose. The puritanical Rechabites had sanctioned his action; but as more and more the true character of Jehu began to reveal itself, he lost the sympathies of the pious, and Hosea announced to his house the vengeance for his bloody crimes at Jezreel (Ho 1:4).

The Assyrians.

In Jehu's reign occurred the inroads toward the West on the part of the Assyrians. This people already in the time of Ahab, under their king, Shalmaneser II, had forced their way as far as Karkar on the Orontes, and had there fought a battle in 854 with the Syrians and their allies, among whom Ahab is also mentioned, with 2,000 chariots and 10,000 soldiers. If this is really Ahab, the king of Israel, which is denied by some, then he, at that time, fought against Assyria in conjunction with the Syrians, who

otherwise had been so bitterly attacked by him. The Assyrians boast of this victory, but seem to have won it at a heavy price, as they did not press on farther westward. When in 842 Shalmaneser came a second time, Jehu was certainly not among the allies of the Syrians. The Assyrians do not seem, on this occasion, to have been opposed by so powerful a league, and were able to attack the Syrians whom they conquered at Saniru (Hermon, Anti-Lebanon) in a much more determined manner. They laid siege to Damascus and laid waste the surrounding country. The Hauran and Bashan were made a desert. In their march of victory they pressed forward as far as the Mediterranean. Phoenicia and other countries brought tribute. Among these nations Shalmaneser expressly mentions Jahua ("Jehu, the son of Omri" (!)), who was compelled to deliver up gold and silver bars and other valuable possessions. But this expensive homage on the part of Jehu did not help much. Shalmaneser came only once more (839) into this neighborhood. After this the Assyrians did not appear again for a period of 35 years. All the more vigorously did the Syrians and other neighboring people make onslaughts on Israel. How fearfully they devasted Israel appears from Am 1.

Jehoahaz.

Under his son Jehoahaz the weakness of Israel became still greater. In his helplessness, the Lord finally sent him a deliverer (2Ki 13:3). This deliverer was none other than the Assyrian king, Adad-nirari III (812-783), who, through a military incursion, had secured anew his supremacy over Western Asia, and had besieged the king of Damascus and had forced him to pay an immense tribute. In this way Israel, which had voluntarily rendered submission to him, was relieved of its embarrassment by the weakening of Syria.

Jehoash, the son of Jehoahaz, experienced more favorable conditions. He also conquered Amaziah, the king of Judah; and his son, Jeroboam II, even succeeded in restoring the old boundaries of the kingdom, as the prophet Jonah had predicted (2Ki 14:24). His reign was the last flourishing period of the kingdom of Ephraim.

See, further, ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Athaliah.

The kingdom of Judah, in the meanwhile, had passed through severe crises. The most severe was caused by that Athaliah, who, after the murder of her son Ahaziah by Jehu, had secured absolute control in Jerusalem, and had abused this power in order to root out the family of David. Only one son of the king, Joash, escaped with his life. He, a boy of one year, was hidden in the temple by a relative, where the high priest Jehoiada, who belonged to the party opposed to the heathen-minded queen, concealed him for a period of 6 years. When the boy was 7 years old Jehoiada, at a well-timed moment, proclaimed him king. His elevation to the throne, in connection with which event the terrible Athaliah was put to death, introduced at the same time an energetic reaction against the heathendom that had found its way even into Judah, and which the queen had in every way favored. Joash was predestined to be a theocratic king. And, in reality, in the beginning of his reign of 40 years, he went hand in hand with the priests and

the prophets of Yahweh. After Jehoiada's death, however, he tolerated idolatrous worship among the princes (2Ch 24:17), and by doing so came into conflict with the faithful prophet Zechariah, the son of his benefactor Jehoiada, who rebuked him for his wrong, and was even stoned. A just punishment for this guilt was recognized in the misfortune which overtook the king and his country. The Syrian king, Hazael, when he was engaged in an expedition against Gath, also took possession of Jerusalem and made it pay tribute, after having apparently inflicted a severe defeat on the people of Judah, on which occasion many princes fell in the battle and Joash himself was severely wounded. Toward the end of his reign there was also much dissatisfaction among his subjects, and some of his courtiers finally murdered him (2Ki 12:20 f).

Amaziah.

However, his son Amaziah, who now ascended the throne, punished the murderers. The king was successful in war against the Edomites. This made him bold. He ventured to meet Joash, the king of Israel, in battle and was defeated and captured. The people of Judah suffered the deepest humiliation. A large portion of the walls of Jerusalem was torn down (2Ki 14:11). Amaziah did not feel himself safe even in his own capital city, because of the dissatisfaction of his own subjects, and he fled to Lachish. Here he was murdered. So deep had Judah fallen, while Jeroboam II succeeded in raising his kingdom to an unthought-of power.

Uzziah.

But for Judah a turn for the better soon set in under Uzziah, the same as Azariah in Kings, the son of Amaziah, who enjoyed a long and prosperous reign. 3. The Literary Prophets:

Prosperous as Israel outwardly appeared to be during the reigns of these two kings, Jeroboam II and Uzziah, the religious and moral conditions of the people were just as little satisfactory. This is the testimony Prophets of the prophets Amos and Hosea, as also of Isaiah and Micah, who not much later began their active ministry in Judah. It is indeed true that these were not the first prophets to put into written form some of their prophetic utterances. The prophecies of Obadiah and Joe are by many put at an earlier date, namely Obadiah under Jehoram in Judah, and Joe under Joash in Judah. At any rate, the discourses of the prophets from this time on constitute an important contemporaneous historical source. They illustrate especially the spiritual condition of the nation. Throughout these writings complaints are made concerning the heathen superstitions and the godless cult of the people, and especially the corruption in the administration of the laws, oppression of the poor and the helpless by the rich and the powerful, and pride and luxury of all kinds. In all these things the prophets see a terrible apostasy on Israel's part. But also the foreign policy of the different kings, who sought help, now of the one and then of the other of the world-powers (Egypt, Assyria), and tried to buy the favor of these nations, the prophets regarded as adultery with foreign nations and as infidelity toward Yahweh. As a punishment they announced, since all other misfortunes sent upon them had been of no avail, an invasion through a conqueror, whom Amos and Hosea always indicate shall be Assyria, and also deportations of the people into a heathen land, and an end of the Jewish state. Improbable as these threats may have seemed to the

self-satisfied inhabitants of Samaria, they were speedily realized.

Successors of Jeroboam II

After the death of Jeroboam, the strength of the Northern Kingdom collapsed. His son Zechariah was able to maintain the throne for only 6 months, and his murderer Shallum only one month. The general Menahem, who put him out of the way, maintained himself as king for 10 years, but only by paying a heavy tribute to the Assyrian ruler Pul, i.e. Tiglath-pileser III, who ruled from 745-727 (compare 2Ki 15:19 f).

Pekah.

His son Pekahiah, on the other hand, soon fell by the hands of the murderer Pekah (2Ki 15:25), who allied himself with Syria against Judah. The latter, however, invited the Assyrians to come into the country; and these, entering in the year 734 BC, put an end to the reign of this usurper, although he was actually put to death as late as 730 BC.

Hoshea.

The last king of the Northern Kingdom, Hoshea (730-722 BC), had the Assyrians to thank for his throne; but he did not keep his fidelity as a vassal very long. As soon as Tiglath-pileser was dead, he tried to throw off the Assyrian yoke. But his successor Shalmaneser IV (727-723 BC), who already in the first year of his reign had again subdued the rebellious king Elulaios of Syria, soon compelled Hoshea also to submit to his authority. Two years later Hoshea again joined a conspiracy with the Phoenicians against Assyria, in which they even counted on the help of the Egyptian king, who in the Bible is called So or Seve (Egyptian name is Shabaka). Now the Assyrians lost all patience. They at once came with their armies. Hoshea seems to have voluntarily submitted to the power of the Great King, who then made him a captive. The people, however, continued the struggle. Samaria, the capital city, was besieged, but did not fall until the 3rd year (722 BC) into the hands of the enemy. Shalmaneser, in the meanwhile, had died and Sargon II had become his successor. The city was indeed not destroyed, but a large portion of the inhabitants, especially the leaders, were deported and transplanted to Northern Mesopotamia and to Media. Sargon states that the number of deported Israelites was 27,290. Prominent persons from other cities were also doubtless to be included in those deported. On the other hand, the Assyrian king settled Babylonian and Syrian prisoners of war in Samaria (721 BC), and in the year 715 BC, Arabs also. But the country, to a great extent, continued in a state of desolation, so that Esar-haddon (680-668 BC) and Ashurbanipal (667-626 BC) sent new colonists there, the last-mentioned sending them from Babylonia, Persia and Media (compare 2Ki 17:24 ff). In these verses the Babylonian city of Cuthah is several times mentioned, on account of which city the Jews afterward called the Samaritans Cuthites. This report also makes mention of the religious syncretism, which of necessity resulted from the mixture of the people. But we must be careful not to place at too small figures the number of Israelites who remained in the country. It is a great exaggeration when it is claimed, as it is by Friedrich Delitzsch, that the great bulk of the inhabitants of the country of Samaria, or even of Galilee, was from this time on Babylonian.

Uzziah and Jotham.

The kingdom of Judah, however, outlived the danger from Assyria. As King Uzziah later in his life suffered from leprosy, he had Jotham as a co-regent during this period. The earliest discourses of Isaiah, which belong to this period (Isa 2-4; 5), show that in Jerusalem the people were at that time still enjoying the fruits and prosperity of a long period of peace. But immediately after the death of Jotham, when the youthful Ahaz began to rule, the onslaught of the allied Syrians and Ephraimites took place under Rezin, or better Rezon, and Pekah. This alliance purposed to put an end to the Davidic reign in Jerusalem, probably for the purpose of making this people, too, a member of the league against the dangerous Assyrians. The good-sized army of Judah seems to have fallen a victim to the superior power of the allies before the situation described in Isa 7 could be realized, in which the siege of the city is described as already imminent. The Edomites also at that time advanced against Judah. Elath, the harbor city on the Red Sea, from which Uzziah, too, as had been done by Solomon long before, sent out trading vessels, at that time came into their power. For 2Ki 16:6 probably speaks of Edom and not of Aram (compare 2Ch 28:17). In his anxiety, Ahaz, notwithstanding the advice of Isaiah to the contrary, then appealed to the king of Assyria, and the latter actually put in his appearance in 734 BC and overcame the power of Syria and Ephraim, as we have seen above. However, the intervention of this world-power brought no benefit to Judah. Without this disgraceful appeal to a heathen ruler, Yahweh, according to the promise of Isaiah, would have protected Jerusalem, if Ahaz had only believed. And the Assyrians did not prevent the Philistines and the Edomites from falling upon Judah. The Assyrians themselves soon came to be the greatest danger threatening Judah. Ahaz, however, was an unstable character in religious affairs, and he copied heathen forms of worship, and even sacrificed his son to the angry sun-god, in order to gain his favor. The tribute that the people had to pay to Assyria was already a heavy burden on this little kingdom.

Hezekiah.

His noble and God-fearing son, Hezekiah (724-696 BC), was also compelled to suffer from the consequences of this misgovernment. The temptation was great to enter into an alliance with his neighbors and the Egyptians, so strong in cavalry, for the purpose of ridding Judah of the burdensome yoke of the Assyrians. In vain did Isaiah warn against such unworthy self-help. At the advice of the ministers of Hezekiah, and because of the trust put in Egypt, the tribute was finally refused to the Assyrians. Hezekiah also sought to establish closer connections with Merodachbaladan, the king of Babylon and the enemy of the Assyrians, when the latter, after a dangerous sickness of the king, had sent messengers to Jerusalem in order to congratulate him on the restoration of his health. This story, found in 2Ki 20, belongs chronologically before 2Ki 18:13 ff, and, more accurately, in the 14th year of Hezekiah mentioned in 18:13. However, the expedition of Sennacherib which is mistakenly placed in that year, took place several years later: according to the Assyrian monuments, in the year 701 BC.

Sennacherib.

In the year 702 BC Sennacherib, with a powerful army, marched over the Lebanon and subdued the

rebellious Phoenicians, and marched along the seacoast to Philistia. The inhabitants of Ekron had sent their king, Padi, who sympathized with the Assyrians, to Hezekiah. Sennacherib came to punish Ekron and Ascalon. But he was particularly anxious to overpower Judah, which country his troops devastated and depopulated. Now Hezekiah recognized his danger, and offered to submit to Sennacherib. The latter accepted his submission conditionally on the payment of a burdensome tribute, which Hezekiah delivered faithfully (2Ki 18:14-16). Then Sennacherib was no longer satisfied with the tribute alone, but sent troops who were to despoil Jerusalem. Isaiah, who surely had not sanctioned the falling away from the Assyrian supremacy and had prophesied that the inhabitants of Jerusalem would suffer a severe punishment, from that moment, when the conqueror had maliciously broken his word, spoke words of comfort and advised against giving up the city, no matter how desperate the situation seemed to be (Isa 37:1). The city was then not given up, and Sennacherib, on account of a number of things that occurred, and finally because of a pestilence which broke out in his army, was compelled to retreat. He did not return to Jerusalem, and later met his death by violent hands. This deliverance of Jerusalem through the miraculous providence of God was the greatest triumph of the prophet Isaiah. Within his kingdom Hezekiah ruled successfully. He also purified the cult from the heathen influences that had forced their way into it, and was a predecessor of Josiah in the abolition of the sacrifices on the high places, which had been corrupted by these influences.

Manasseh.

Unfortunately, his son Manasseh was little worthy of succeeding him. He, in every way, favored the idolatry which all along had been growing secretly. He inaugurated bloody persecutions of the faithful prophets of Yahweh. According to a tradition, which it must be confessed is not supported by undoubted testimony, Isaiah also, now an old man, became a victim of these persecutions. Images and altars were openly erected to Baal and Astarte. Even in the temple-house on Mt. Zion, an image of Astarte was standing. As a result of this ethnic cult, immorality and sensuality found their way among the people. At the same time the terrible service of Moloch, in the valley of Hinnom, demanded the sacrifice of children, and even a son of the king was given over to this worship. The Book of Chronicles, indeed, tells the story of a terrible affliction that Manasseh suffered, namely that an Assyrian general dragged him in chains to Babylon for having violated his promises to them, but that he was soon released. This is not at all incredible. He seems to have taken part in a rebellion, which the brother of the Assyrian king, who was also vice-king in Babylon, had inaugurated. This sad experience may have forced Manasseh to a certain kind of repentance, at least, so that he desisted from his worst sacrileges. But his son Amon continued the old ways of his father, until after a brief reign he was put to death.

Josiah.

Much more promising was his young son Josiah, who now, only 8 years old, came to the throne. It is quite possible that, in view of such frequent changes in the disposition of the successors to the throne, his mother may have had great influence on his character. Concerning Josiah, see 2Ki 22:1 ff. With increasing clearness and consistency, he proceeded to the work of religious reformation. A special impetus to this was given by the finding of an old law book in the temple, the publication of which for the first time revealed the fearful apostasy of the times. The finding of this book in the temple, as

narrated in 2Ki 22:3 ff, took place in connection with the restoration of that building on a larger scale, which at that time had been undertaken. And very probably Edouard Naville is right in believing, on the basis of Egyptian analogies, that this document had been imbedded in the foundation walls of the building. Whether this had been done already in the days of Solomon is not determined by this fact. From the orders of Josiah we can conclude that the book which was found was Deuteronomy, which lays special stress on the fact that there shall be a central place for the cult, and also contains such threats as those must have been which frightened Josiah. But under no circumstances was Deuteronomy a lawbook that had first been written at this time, or a fabrication of the priest Hilkiah and his helpers. It would rather have been possible that the discovered old law was rewritten in changed form after its discovery and had been adapted to the language of the times. The people were obliged to obey the newly-discovered law and were instructed in it.

Jeremiah.

The prophet Jeremiah also, who a few years before this had been called to the prophetic office, according to certain data in the text, participated in this proclamation of the law of the covenant throughout the land. This change for the better did not change the tendency of his prophetic discourses, from what these had been from the beginning. He continued to be the accuser and the prophet of judgment, who declared that the destruction of the city and of the temple was near at hand. He looked too deeply into the inner corruption of his people to be misled by the external transformation that was the result of a command of the ruler. And only too soon did the course of events justify his prediction. With the person of the God-fearing Josiah, the devotion of the people to the law was also buried and the old curse everywhere broke out again.

The Chaldeans.

In a formal way Jeremiah was probably influenced by the incursions of the Scythians, which occurred during his youth, and who about this time marched from the plain of Jezreel toward Egypt (compare Herodotus i.103 ff); which event also made a gloomy impression on his contemporary Ezekiel, as appears from his vision of Gog in the land of Magog. However, we are not to suppose that Jeremiah, when describing the enemy coming from the north, whom he saw from the time of his call to the prophetic office, meant merely this band of freebooters. The prophet had in mind a world-power after the type of the Assyrians, who always came from the north into Canaan. The Assyrians indeed were in process of disintegration, and Nineveh fell under the attacks of the Medes and the Persians in the year 607-606 BC. The heir of the Assyrian power was not Egypt, which was also striving for universal supremacy, but was the Babylonian, or rather, more accurately, the Chaldean dynasty of Nabopolassar, whose son Nebuchadnezzar had overpowered the Egyptians at Carchemish in 605 BC. From this time on Jeremiah had pointed out the Chaldeans and Nebuchadnezzar, who soon afterward became their king, as the agents to carry out the judgment on Jerusalem.

Already a few years before this Judah’s good star had gone down on the horizon. When Pharaoh-necho II came to Palestine by the sea route, in order to march northeast through the plain of Jezreel, to give the

final and fatal blow to the sinking kingdom of the Assyrians, King Josiah opposed him on the plain of Megiddo, probably because of his obligations as a vassal to the king of Assyria. In the battle of Megiddo (609 BC), Josiah was mortally wounded. No greater calamity could have befallen Judah than the death of this king, who was deeply mourned by all well-meaning people, and who was the last of the house of David that was a credit to it.

The Successors of Josiah.

By popular election the choice now fell on Jehoahaz, a younger son of Josiah, called by Jeremiah (22:11) Shallum. But he found no favor with Necho, who took him prisoner in his camp at Riblah and carried him to Egypt (2Ki 23:30). The Egyptian king himself selected Jehoiakim, hitherto called Eliakim, an older son of Josiah, who had been ignored by the people, to be king in Jerusalem, a prince untrue to Yahweh, conceited, luxury-loving and hard-hearted, who, in addition, through his perfidious policy, brought calamity upon the land. He formed a conspiracy against Nebuchadnezzar, to whom he had begun to pay tribute in the 5th year of his reign, and in this way brought it about that the Syrians, the Moabites and the Ammonites, who had taken sides with the Assyrians, devastated the land of Judah, and that finally the king of Babylon himself came to Jerusalem to take revenge. It is not clear what was the end of this king. According to 2Ch 36:6, compared with 2Ki 24:6, he seems to have died while yet in Jerusalem, and after he had already fallen into the hands of his enemies. His son Jehoiachin did not experience a much better fate. After ruling three months he was taken to Babylon, where he was a prisoner for 37 years, until he was pardoned (2Ki 24:8 ff; 25:27). Together with Jehoiachin, the best portion of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, about 10,000 men, especially the smiths and the builders, were deported.

Zedekiah, the Last King of Judah.

Once more the Babylonians set up a king in Jerusalem in the person of Zedekiah, an uncle of Jehoiachin, and accordingly a son of Josiah, called Mattaniah, who afterward was called Zedekiah. He governed for twelve years (597-586 BC), and by his life, morally and religiously corrupt, sealed the fate of the house and of the kingdom of David. The better class among the leading and prominent people had been banished. As a result, the courtiers of the king urged him to try once again some treacherous schemes against the Babylonian rulers and to join Egypt in a conspiracy against them. However earnestly Jeremiah and Ezekiel warned against this policy, Zedekiah nevertheless constantly yielded to his evil advisers and to the warlike patriotic party, who were determined to win back in battle the independence of the country. While he at first, through an embassy, had assured the Great King of his loyalty (Jer 29:3), and still in the 4th year of his reign had personally visited in Babylon as a mark of his fidelity (Jer 51:59), he was induced in the 9th year of his reign to make an alliance with the Egyptians against the Babylonians and to refuse to render obedience to the latter. Nebuchadnezzar soon came and surrounded the city. At the announcement that an Egyptian army was approaching, the siege was again raised for a short time. But the hope placed by Zedekiah on his ally failed him. The Babylonians began again to starve out the city. After a siege of 18 months, resistance proved futile. The king tried secretly to break through the circle of besiegers, but in doing so was taken prisoner, was blinded by the Babylonian king and taken to Babylon. The majority of the prominent men and state officials, who were taken to the

encampment of the conqueror in Riblah, were put to death. The conquered city of Jerusalem, especially its walls and towers, together with the temple, were totally destroyed. Nearly all the inhabitants who could be captured after the slaughter were dragged into captivity, and only people of the lower classes were left behind in order to cultivate the land (2Ki 25:11). Gedaliah, a noble-minded aristocrat, was appointed governor of the city, and took up his residence in Mizpah. At this place it seemed that a new kernel of the people was being gathered. Jeremiah also went there. However, after two months this good beginning came to an end. Gedaliah was slain by Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, an anti-Chaldaean, a fanatical and revengeful descendant of the house of David. The murderer acted in cooperation with certain Ammonitish associates and fled to the king of Ammon. The Jews in later times considered the murder of Gedaliah as an especially great national calamity, and fasted on the anniversary of this crime. And as the people also feared the revenge of the Babylonians, many migrated to Egypt, compelling Jeremiah, now an old man, to accompany them, although he prophesied to them that no good would come of this scheme. They first stayed at the border city Tahpanhes, near Pelusium, and then scattered over Upper and Lower Egypt.

VI. Time of the Babylonian Exile.

1. Influence of the Exile:

The inhabitants of Judah, who had been deported by Nebuchadnezzar at different times, were settled by him in Babylonia, e.g. at the river Chebar (Eze 1:1), near the city of Nippur. From Hilprecht's excavations of this city, it has been learned that this river, or branch of the Euphrates Influence river, is to be found at this place, and of the is not to be confounded with the river Chaboras. In the same way, the many contract-tablets with Jewish names which have been found at Nippur, show that a large Jewish colony lived at that place. Of the fate of these banished Jews for a period of 50 years, we hear almost nothing. But it is possible to learn what their condition was in exile from the Book of Ezekiel and the 2nd part of Isaiah. Land was assigned to them here, and they were permitted to build houses for themselves (Jer 29:5), and could travel around this district without restraint. They were not prisoners in the narrow sense of the word. They soon, through diligence and skill in trade, attained to considerable wealth, so that most of them, after the lapse of half a century, were perfectly satisfied and felt no desire to return home. For the spiritual development of the people the exile proved to be a period of great importance. In the first place, they were separated from their native soil, and in this way from many temptations of heathenism and idolatry, and the like. The terrible judgment that had come over Jerusalem had proved that the prophets had been right, who had for a long time, but in vain, preached genuine repentance. This did not prove to be without fruit (of Zec 1:6). While living in the heathen land, they naturally became acquainted with heathendom in a more crass form. But even if many of the Jews were defiled by it, in general the relations of the Israelites toward the idol-worshipping Babylonians were antagonistic, and they became all the more zealous in the observance of those religious rites which could be practiced in a foreign land, such as rest on the Sabbath day, the use of meats, circumcision, and others. But with marked zeal the people turned to the spiritual storehouse of their traditions, namely their sacred literature. They collected the laws, the history, the hymns, and treasured them. It was also a noteworthy progress that such prophets as Ezekiel, Jeremiah and Daniel received prophetic visions while on heathen soil. The people also learned that the heathen, in the midst of whom they lived, became

receptive of the higher truths of Israel's religion. Especially does the 2nd part of Isaiah, chapters 40-66, show that they began to understand the missionary calling of Israel among the nations of the world.

2. Daniel:

The Book of Da reports how a God-fearing and law-abiding Jew, through his prophecies, attained to prominent positions of influence at the courts of different rulers. From the Book of Ezekiel we learn that the prophets and the elders cared for the spiritual wants of the people, and that they held meetings, at which indeed it was not permitted to offer sacrifices, but at which the word of Yahweh was proclaimed. Here we find the beginnings of what afterward was the synagogue-system.

3. Elephantine Papyri:

A remarkable picture of the Jewish diaspora in Upper Egypt is furnished by recently discovered papyri at Elephantine. From these it appears that in the 6th century BC, not only a large and flourishing Jewish colony was to be found at this place, but also that they had erected here a fine temple to Yahweh where they brought their sacrifices to which they had been accustomed at home. In an Aramaic letter, still preserved and dating from the year 411 BC, and which is addressed to the governor Bagohi, in Judea, these Jews complain that their temple in Yeb (Elephantine, near Syene) had been destroyed in the same year. It also states that this temple had been spared on one occasion by Cambyses, who was in Egypt from 525 to 521 BC. The answer of Bagohi also has been preserved, and he directs that the temple is to be built again and that meal offerings and incense are again to be introduced. Probably intentionally, mention in this letter is made only of the unbloody sacrifices, while in the first letter burnt sacrifices also are named. The sacrifices of animals by the Jews would probably have aroused too much the anger of the devotees of the divine ram, which was worshipped at Syene. Up to the present time we knew only of the much later temple of the high priest Onias IV at Leontopolis (160 BC). Compare Josephus, Ant, XII, iii, 1-3; BJ, VII, x, 2, 3.

VII. Return from the Exile and the Restoration.

1. Career of Cyrus:

In the meanwhile there was a new re-adjustment of political supremacy among the world-powers. The Persian king, Koresh (Cyrus), first made himself free from the supremacy of Media which, after the capture of the city Ecbatana, became a part of his own kingdom (549 BC). At that time Nabonidus was the king in Babylon (555-538 BC), who was not displeased at the collapse of the kingdom of the Medes, but soon learned that the new ruler turned out to be a greater danger to himself, as Cyrus subjugated, one after the other, the smaller kingdoms in the north. But Nabonidus was too unwarlike to meet Cyrus. He confined himself to sending his son with an army to the northern boundaries of his kingdom. On the other hand, the king of the Lydians, Croesus, who was related by marriage to King Astyages, who had been subdued by Cyrus, began a war with Cyrus, after he had formed an alliance with Egypt and Sparta. In the year 546 BC, he crossed the river Halys. Cyrus approached from the Tigris, and in doing so

already entered Babylonian territory, conquered Croesus, took his capital city Sardis, and put an end to the kingdom of Lydia. The pious Israelites in captivity, under the tutelage of Deutero-Isaiah, watched these events with the greatest of interest. For the prophet taught them from the beginning to see in this king "the deliverer," who was the instrument of Yahweh for the return of the Israelites out of captivity, and of whom the prophets had predicted. And this expectation was fulfilled with remarkable rapidity. The victorious and aggressive king of Persia could now no longer be permanently checked, even by the Babylonians. It was in vain that King Nabonidus had caused the images of the gods from many of his cities to be taken to Babylon, in order to make the capital city invincible. This city opened its doors to the Persian commander Ugbaru (Gobryas) in 538 BC, and a few months later Cyrus himself entered the city. This king, however, was mild and conciliatory in his treatment of the people and the city. He did not destroy the city, but commanded only that a portion of the walls should be razed. However, the city gradually, in the course of time, became ruins.

Cyrus also won the good will and favor of the subjugated nations by respecting their religions. He returned to their shrines the idols of Nabonidus, that had been taken away. But he was particularly considerate of the Jews, who doubtless had complained to him of their fate and had made known to him their prophecies regarding him as the coming deliverer.

2. First Return under Zerubbable:

In the very first year of his reign over Babylon he issued an edict (2Ch 36:22 f; Ezr 1:1) that permitted the Jews to return home, with the command that they should again erect their temple. For this purpose he directed that the temple-vessels, which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away with him, should be returned to them, and commanded that those Israelites who voluntarily remained in Babylon should contribute money for the restoration of the temple. At the head of those to be returned stood Sheshbazzar, who is probably identical with Zerubbabel, although this is denied by some scholars; and also the high priest, Joshua, a grandson of the high priest, Seraiah, who had been put to death by Nebuchadnezzar. They were accompanied by only a small part of those in exile, that is by 42,360 men and women and children, male and female servants, especially from the tribes of Judah, Benjamin and Levi, but of the last-mentioned tribes more priests than other Levites. After several months they safely arrived in Palestine, probably 537 BC. Some of them settled down in Jerusalem, and others in surrounding cities and villages. They erected the altar for burnt sacrifices, so that they were again able in the 7th month to sacrifice on it.

(1) Building the temple.

The cornerstone of the temple was also solemnly laid at that time in the 2nd year of the Return (Ezr 3:8).

(2) Haggai and Zechariah.

But the erection of the temple must have been interrupted in a short time, since it was not until the 2nd year of Darius (520 BC), at the urgent appeal of the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, that the work of

building was energetically prosecuted. For this reason many scholars deny this cornerstone-laying in the year 536 BC. However, it still remains thinkable that several attempts were made at this work, since the young colony had many difficulties to contend with. Then, too, the memoirs of Ezra and Nehemiah, which have been worked over by the author of Chronicles, report the history of these times only in parts. The historical value of these literary sources has been confirmed by those Aramaic papyri found in Upper Egypt.

3. Ezra and Nehemiah:

In the year 516 BC, after 4 years of building, the temple was completed and dedicated. After this we have no information for a period of 58 years. Then we learn that Ezra, the scribe, in the 7th year of Artaxerxes I (458 BC), came with a new caravan of about 1,500 men with women and children from Babylon to the Holy Land. He had secured from the king the command to establish again in the land of the Jews the law, in which he was a prominent expert, and he tried to do this by earnest admonitions and instructive discourses addressed to the people. The acme of the activity of Ezra was the meeting of the people described in Ne 8-10 on the Feast of the Tabernacles, on which occasion the entire nation solemnly came under obligation to observe the law. According to the present position of these chapters this act took place in 444 BC; but it is probable that it happened before the arrival of Nehemiah, whose name would accordingly have to be eliminated in 8:9. This pericope would then belong to the memoirs of Ezra and not to those of Nehemiah. After some years there came to help Ezra in his work, Nehemiah, a pious Jew, who was a cupbearer to the king, and at his own request was granted leave of absence in order to help the city of Jerusalem, which he had heard was in dire straits. Its walls were in ruins, as the neighboring nations had been able to hinder their rebuilding, and even those walls of the city that had been hastily restored, had again been pulled down. Nehemiah came in the year 445-444 BC from Shushan to Jerusalem and at once went energetically to work at rebuilding the walls. Notwithstanding all oppositions and intrigues of malicious neighbors, the work was successfully brought to a close.

The hostile agitations, in so far as they were not caused by widespread envy and hatred of the Jews among the neighboring peoples, had a religious ground. Those who returned, as the people of Yahweh, held themselves aloof from the peoples living round about them, especially from the mixed peoples of Samaria. Samaria was the breeding-place for this hostility against Jerusalem. The governor at that place, Sanballat, was the head of this hostile league. The Jews had declined to permit the Samaritans to cooperate in the erection of the temple and would have no religious communion with them. The Samaritans had taken serious offense at this, and they accordingly did all they could to prevent the building of the walls in Jerusalem, which would be a hindrance to their having access to the temple. But Nehemiah’s trust in God and his energy overcame this obstacle. The policy of exclusiveness, which Ezra and Nehemiah on this occasion and at other times followed out, evinces a more narrow mind than the preexilic prophets had shown. In the refusal of intermarriage with the people living around them they went beyond the Mosaic law, for they even demanded that those marriages, which the Israelites had already contracted with foreign women, should be dissolved. But this exclusiveness was the outcome of legal conscientiousness, and at this period it was probably necessary for the selfpreservation of the people of Yahweh.

Malachi.

From the prophecies of Malachi, who was almost a contemporary of the two mentioned, it can be seen that the marriages with the foreign women had also brought with them a loosening of even the most sacred family ties (Mal 2:14 f). After an absence of 12 years, Nehemiah again returned to Shushan to the court; and when he later returned to Jerusalem he was compelled once more to inaugurate a stringent policy against the lawlessness which was violating the sanctity of the temple and of the Sabbath commandment. He also expelled a certain Manasseh, a grandson of the high priest, who had married a daughter of Sanballat. This Manasseh, according to Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 2), erected the sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim, and established the priesthood at that place. This is no doubt correct. These accounts of Josephus are often combined without cause with the times of Alexander the Great, although they transpired about 110 years earlier.

The history of the Jews in the last decades of the Persian rule is little known. Under Artaxerxes III (Ochus), they were compelled to suffer much, when they took part in a rebellion of the Phoenicians and Cyprians. Many Jews were at that time banished to Hyrcania on the southern coast of the Caspian Sea. The Persian general, Bagoses, came to Jerusalem and forced his way even into the temple (Josephus, Ant, XI, vii, 1). He undertook to install as high priest, in the place of John (Jochanan), his brother Joshua (Jesus). The latter, however, was slain by the former in the temple. For the first time the office of the high priest appears as more of a political position, something that it never was in the preexilic times, and according to the law was not to be.

VIII. The Jews under Alexander and His Successors.

1. Spread of Hellenism:

As the Jews were then tired of the rule of the priests, they were not dissatisfied with the victorious career of Alexander the Great. He appears to have assumed a friendly attitude toward them, even if the story reported by Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 4) is scarcely historical. The successors of Alexander were also, as a rule, tolerant in religious matters. But for political and geographical reasons, Palestine suffered severely in these times, as it lay between Syria and Egypt, and was an object of attack on the part of both the leading ruling families in this period, the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Syria. At the same time Hellenism, which had been so powerfully advanced by Alexander as a factor of civilization and culture, penetrated the land of Israel also. Greek culture and language spread soon in Palestine and in many places was supreme. The more strict adherents of Judaism recognized in this a danger to the Mosaic order of life and religion, and all the more zealously they now adhered to the traditional ordinances. These were called the chacidhim, or the Pious (Hasidaioi, 1 Macc 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc 14:6). The world-transforming Hellenistic type of thought spread especially among the aristocrats and the politically prominent, and even found adherents among the priests, while the chacidhim belonged to the less conspicuous ranks of the people.

2. The Hasmoneans:

A struggle for life and death was caused between these two tendencies by the Syrian king, Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), into whose hands the sovereignty of Palestine had fallen. He undertook nothing less than to root out the hated Jewish religion. In the year 168 BC he commanded that the temple of Yahweh in Jerusalem should be dedicated to the Olympian Jupiter and forbade most stringently the observance of the Sabbath and circumcision. A large portion of the people did not resist his oppression, but adapted themselves to this tyrannical heathendom. Others suffered and died as martyrs. Finally in the year 167 BC a priest, Mattathias, gave the signal for a determined resistance, at the head of which stood his brave sons, the Hasmoneans, or Maccabees. First his son Judas undertook the leadership of the faithful. He succeeded in freeing Jerusalem from the Syriansú He restored the temple on Mt. Zion. The temple was dedicated anew and was given over to the old cult. After a number of victorious campaigns, Judas Maccabeus died the death of a hero in 161 BC. His brother, Jonathan, who took his place at the head of the movement, tried to secure the independence of the land rather through deliberate planning than through military power. He assumed, in addition to his secular power, also the high-priestly dignity. After his death by violence in 143 BC, he was succeeded by his brother Simon as the bearer of this double honor. The Hasmoneans, however, rapidly became worldly minded and lost the sympathies of the chasidhim. The son of Simon, John Hyrcanus (135-106 BC), broke entirely with the Pious, and his family, after his death, came to an end in disgraceful struggles for power. The rule of the land fell into the hands of Herod, a tyrant of Idumean origin, who was supported by the Romans. From 37 BC he was the recognized king of Judah.

See ASMONEANS; MACCABEES.

IX. The Romans.

1. Division of Territory:

After the death of Herod (4 BC), the kingdom, according to his last will, was to be divided among his three sons. Archelaus received Judea; Antipas, Galilee and Peraea; Philip, the border lands in the north. However, Archelaus was soon deposed by the Romans (6 AD), and Judea was made a part of the province of Syria, but was put under a special Roman procurator, who resided in Caesarea. These procurators (of whom the best known was Pontius Pilate, 26-36 AD), had no other object than to plunder the land and the people.

2. Destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans:

In this way a conflict was gradually generated between the people and their oppressors, which ended with the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 AD. As early as 40 AD this rupture almost took place, when the Syrian legate Petronius, at the command of Caligula, undertook to place a statue of the emperor in the temple of Jerusalem. On this occasion King Agrippa I, who was again ruling the whole territory of Herod, succeeded in adjusting the conflict. His son Agrippa II was given a much smaller kingdom (40-100 AD). He, too, sought to prevent the people from undertaking a struggle with the Romans, but in vain. By his unscrupulous treatment of the people, the procurator Gessius Florus drove

the Jews into an insurrection. The party of the Zealots gained the upper hand. Florus was compelled to leave Jerusalem (66 AD). Even the good-sized army which Cestius Gallus commanded could not get control of the city, but was completely overpowered by the Jews on its retreat at Bethhoron. Now the entire country rose in rebellion. The Romans, under the leadership of Vespasian, advanced with considerable power and first conquered Galilee, then under Josephus (67 AD). In Jerusalem, in the meanwhile, different parties of the Jews were still fighting each other. Titus, the son of Vespasian, took the chief command after Vespasian had already conquered the East Jordan country and the western coast, but had hastened to Rome in order to become emperor. Titus completely surrounded the city a few days before the Passover festival in the year 70. On the northern side the Romans first broke through the first and newest city wall, and after that the second. The third offered a longer resistance, and at the same time famine wrought havoc in Jerusalem. At last the battle raged about the temple, during which this structure went up in flames. According to the full description by Josephus (BJ, VI, iv, 3 ff), Titus tried to prevent the destruction of the temple; according to Sulpicius Severus (Chron. II, 20), however, this destruction was just what he wanted. A few fortified places yet maintained themselves after the fall of Jerusalem, e.g. Macherus in the East Jordan country, but they could not hold out very long.

Later Insurrection of Bar-Cochba.

Once again the natural ambition for independence burst out in the insurrection of Bar-Cochba (132-35 AD). Pious teachers of the law, especially Rabbi Akiba, had enkindled this fire, in order to rid the country of the rule of the Gentiles. However, notwithstanding some temporary successes, this insurrection was hopeless. Both the city and the country were desolated by the enraged Romans still more fearfully, and were depopulated still more than in 70. From that time Jerusalem was lost to the Jews. They lived on without a country of their own, without any political organization, without a sanctuary, in the Diaspora among the nations.

3. Spiritual Life of the Period:

The spiritual and religious life of the Jews during the period preceding the dissolution of the state was determined particularly by the legalistic character of their ideals and their opposition to Hellenism. Their religion had become formalistic to a great extent since their return from the exile. The greatest emphasis was laid on obedience to the traditional ordinances, and these latter were chiefly expositions of ceremonial usurpers.

Appearance of Jesus Christ.

The crown of the history of Israel-Judah was the appearance of Jesus Christ. Looked at superficially, it may indeed appear as though His person and His life had but little affected the development of the national history of Israel. However, more closely viewed, we shall see that this entire history has its goal in Him and finds its realization in Him. After full fruit had developed out of this stock, the latter withered and died. He was to be the bearer of salvation for all mankind.

LITERATURE.

The earliest historian of Israel was the Jew, Flavius Josephus, in the 1st Christian century. His example found few followers in the early church, and we mention only the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus. The subject is handled theologically by Augustine in his De Civitate Dei. It was only in the 17th century that a keen interest was awakened in this subject. Compare especially James Usher, Annales Veteris et Novi Testamenti, London, 1605; J.B. Bousset, Discours sur l'histoire universelie, Paris, 1681; Humphrey Prideaux, The Old and the New Testament Connected in the History of the Jews and Neighboring Nations, 2 volumes, London, 1716; S. Shukford, The Sacred and Profane History of the World Connected, London, 1727, this work treating the subject apologetically against the Deists. Compare also J. Saurin, Discours historiques, Amsterdam, 1720. Cocceius and his school systematized this history on the basis of their theological tenets, e.g. Gurtler, Systema theol. prophetica, Frankfurt, 1724. More systematic is the work of Vitringa, Hypothesis historiae et chronologiae sacrae, Frankfurt, 1708. The Lutheran church furnished the excellent work of Franz Budde, Historia Eccles. Veteris Testamenti, Jena, 1715. In the 18th century, Bengel's school furnished some good histories of Israel, such as M.F. Roos's Einleitung in die bibl. Geschichte, 1700. More popular is the work of J.J. Hess. The best Catholic work from this time is J. Jahn's Archaeologie, 1802; while the Rationalistic period furnished Lorenz Bauer's Geschichte der hebr. Nation, 1800. In the 19th century the rationalistic and the conservative tendencies run parallel, and a new impulse was given to the study of this history by the phenomenal archaeological finds in Egypt and in Assyria and Babylon. Critical reconstruction of Israel's history characterizes the works of Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, Wellhausen. Other works of prominence are the Geschichte des Volkes Gottes, by Ewald; Kurtz, Geschichte des alten Bundes (these are translated); Hitzig, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, with critical tendency. The work of August Koehler, Lehrbuch der biblischen Geschichte, Altes Testament, is positive, while Wellhausen's Geschichte Israels is a classic of the advanced school. Other works mostly critical are the histories of Renan, Kuenen, Stade, Winckler, Piepenbring, Cornill, Guthe, Cheyne, and others. Kittel's Geschichte der Hebreier (translated) is more moderate in tone. For the New Testament the richest storehouse is Schurer's Geschichte des judischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (translated); Hausrath's Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte is also good. From the Jewish standpoint this history has been treated by S. Friediander, Geschichte des Israel-Volkes; and J.M. Jost, Geschichte der Israelitch; Moritz Raphall, Post-biblical History of the Jews from the Close of the Old Testament till the Destruction of the Second Temple, in the Year 70.

Among English works may be especially mentioned Milman's History of the Jews and Stanley's Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, with smaller works by Ottley and others.

American works on the subject from the critical point of view are a History of the Hebrew People, by Kent, and a History of the Jewish People by Kent and Riggs in the "Historical Series for Bible Students," published by Messrs. Scribner. Compare also McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Monuments; Toy, Judaism and Christianity; H.P. Smith, Old Testament History.

C. von Orelli

ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF

I. THE FIRST PERIOD

1. The Two Kingdoms

2. The Ist Dynasty

3. The IInd Dynasty

4. Civil War

II. PERIOD OF THE SYRIAN WARS

1. The IIIrd Dynasty

2. World-Politics

3. Battle of Karkar

4. Loss of Territory

5. Reform of Religion

6. Revolution

7. The IVth Dynasty

8. Renewed Prosperity

9. Anarchy

III. DECLINE AND FALL

1. Loss of Independence

2. Decline

3. Extinction

4. Summary

LITERATURE

I. The First Period.

1. The Two Kingdoms:

The circumstances leading up to the foundation of the Northern Kingdom of Israel, or the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes, have been detailed under the heading KINGDOM OF JUDAH. From a secular point of view it would be more natural to regard the latter as an offshoot from the former, rather than the converse. But not only is the kingdom of Judah of paramount importance in respect of both religion and literature, but its government also was in the hands of a single dynasty, whereas that of the Northern Kingdom changed hands no less than 8 times, during the two and a half centuries of its existence. Moreover, the Southern Kingdom lasted about twice as long as the other.

2. The Ist Dynasty:

No sooner had Jeroboam I been elected the first ruler of the newly founded state than he set about managing its affairs with the energy for which he was distinguished (1Ki 11:28). To complete the disruption he established a sanctuary in opposition to that of Jerusalem (Ho 8:14), with its own order of priests (2Ch 11:14; 13:9), and founded two capital cities, Shechem on the West and Penuel on the East of the Jordan (1Ki 12:25). Peace seems to have been maintained between the rival governments during the 17 years' reign of Rehoboam, but on the accession of his son Abijah war broke out (1Ki 15:6,7; 2Ch 13:3 if). Shortly afterward Jeroboam died and was succeeded by his son Nadab, who was a year later assassinated, and the Ist Dynasty came to an end, after an existence of 23 years, being limited, in fact, to a single reign.

3. The IInd Dynasty:

The turn of the tribe of Issachar came next. They had not yet given a ruler to Israel; they could claim none of the judges, but they had taken their part at the assembling of the tribes under Deborah and Barak of Naphtali. Baasha began his reign of 24 years by extirpating the house of his predecessor (1Ki 15:29), just as the 'Abbasids annihilated the Umeiyads. The capital was now Tirzah (1Ki 14:17; So 6:4), a site not yet identified. His Judean contemporary was ASA (which see), who, like his father Abijah, called in the aid of the Syrians against the Northern Kingdom. Baasha was unequal to the double contest and was forced to evacuate the ground he had gained. His son Elah was assassinated after a reign of a year, as he himself had assassinated the son of the founder of the preceding dynasty, and his entire family and adherents were massacred (1Ki 16:11).

4. Civil War:

The name of the assassin was Zimri, an officer of the charioteers, of unknown origin and tribe. But the kingship was always elective, and the army chose Omri, the commander-in-chief, who besieged and took Tirzah, Zimri setting the palace on fire by his own hand and perishing in the flames. A second pretender, Tibni, a name found in Phoenician and Assyrian, of unknown origin, sprang up. He was quickly disposed of, and security of government was reestablished.

II. Period of the Syrian Wars.

1. The IIId Dynasty:

The founder of the new dynasty was Omri. By this time the Northern Kingdom was so much a united whole that the distinctions of tribe were forgotten. We do not know to what tribe Omri and his successors belonged. With Omri the political sphere of action of Israel became wider than it had been before, and its internal affairs more settled. His civil code was in force long after his dynasty was extinct, and was adopted in the Southern Kingdom (Mic 6:16). The capital city, the site of which he chose, has remained a place of human habitation till the present day. Within the last few years, remains of his building have been recovered, showing a great advance in that art from those believed to go back to Rehoboam and Solomon. He was, however, unfortunate in his relations with Syria, having lost some towns and been forced to grant certain trading concessions to his northern neighbors (1Ki 20:34). But he was so great a king that long after his death the Kingdom of the Ten Tribes was known to the Assyrians as "the house of Omri."

2. World-Politics:

Contemporarily with this dynasty, there occurred a revival of the Phoenician power, which exerted a powerful influence upon the Israelite kings and people, and at the same time the Assyrians once more began to interfere with Syrian politics. The Northern Kingdom now began to play a part in the game of world-politics. There was peace with Judah, and alliance with Phoenicia was cemented by the marriage of Ahab, it seems after his father’s death, with Jezebel, the daughter of Ethbaal (1Ki 16:31). This led to the erection of a temple in Samaria in which the Tyrian Baal was worshipped, while side by side with it the worship of Yahweh was carried on as before. It seems as if the people had fallen back from the pure monotheism of Moses and David into what is known as henotheism. Against this relapse Elijah protested with final success. Ahab was a wise and skillful soldier, without rashness, but also without decision. He defeated a Syrian coalition in two campaigns (1Ki 20) and imposed on Ben-hadad the same conditions which the latter had imposed on Omri. With the close of the reign of Asa in Judah, war ceased between the two Israelite kingdoms and the two kings for the first time became friends and fought side by side (1Ki 22). In the reign of Ahab we note the beginning of decay in the state in regard to personal liberty and equal justice. The tragedy of Naboth’s vineyard would not have happened but for the influence of Tyrian ideas, any more than in the case of the famous windmill which stands by the palace of Sans Souci at Potsdam. A further improvement in the art of building took place in this reign. The palace of Ahab, which has recently been recovered by the excavations carded on by the Harvard University Expedition under Dr. G.A. Reisner, shows a marked advance in fineness of workmanship

upon that of Omri.

3. Battle of Karkar:

The object of Ben-hadad's attack upon Ahab seems to have been to compel him to join a league founded to resist the encroachments of Assyria upon the countries bordering upon the Mediterranean. The confederates, who were led by Ben-hadad, and of whom Ahab was one, were defeated by Shalmaneser II in the battle of Karkar. The date is known from the inscriptions to have been the year 854-853. It is the first quite certain date in Hebrew history, and from it the earlier dates must be reckoned by working backward. Ahab seems to have seized the moment of Syria's weakness to exact by force the fulfillment of their agreement on the part of Ben-hadad (1Ki 22).

4. Losses of Territory:

On the other hand, the king of Moab, Mesha, appears to have turned the same disaster to account by throwing off his allegiance to Israel, which dated from the time of David, but had apparently lapsed until it was enforced anew by Omri (MS, ll. 4 ff, but l. 8 makes Omri's reign plus half Ahabs = 40 years). Ahab's son and successor Jehoram (omitting Ahaziah, who is chiefly notable as a devotee of Baal-zebub, the god of Ekron), with the aid of Jehoshaphat and his vassal, the king of Edom, attempted to recover his rights, but in vain (2Ki 3). It may have been in consequence of the failure of this expedition that the Syrians again besieged Samaria and reduced it to great straits (2Ki 6:24; 7), but the date is uncertain. Jehoram replied with a counter-attack upon the East of the Jordan.

5. Reform of Religion:

It was no doubt owing to his connection with the king of Judah that Jehoram so far modified the worship and ritual as to remove the worst innovations which had come to prevail in the Northern Kingdom (2Ki 3:1-3). But these half-measures did not satisfy the demands of the time, and in the revolution which followed both he and his dynasty were swept away. The dynasty had lasted, according to the Biblical account, less than half a century.

6. Revolution:

The religious reformation, or rather revolution, which swept away almost entirely both royal houses, bears a good deal of resemblance to the Wahhabi rising in Arabia at the beginning of the 18th century. It took its origin from prophetism (1Ki 19:16), and was supported by the Rechabite Jonadab. The object of the movement headed by Jehu was nominally to revenge the prophets of Yahweh put to death by order of Jezebel, but in reality it was much wider and aimed at nothing less than rooting out the Baal-worship altogether, and enforcing a return to the primitive faith and worship. Just as the Wahhabis went back to Mohammed's doctrine, as contained in the Koran and the Tradition, and as the Rechabites preserved the simplicity of the early desert life, so Jehu went back to the state of things as they were at the foundation of the Northern Kingdom under Jeroboam I.

7. IVth Dynasty:

Jehu’s reforms were carried out to the letter, and the whole dynasty of Omri, which was responsible for the innovations, was annihilated like its predecessors. The religious fervor, however, soon subsided, and Jehu’s reign ended in disaster. Hazael, whose armies had been exterminated by the forces of Assyria, turned his attention to the eastern territory of Israel. In the turbulent land of Gilead, the home of Elijah, disappointed in its hopes of Jehu, he quickly established his supremacy (2Ki 10:32). Jehu also appreciated the significance of the victories of Assyria, and was wise enough to send tribute to Shalmaneser II. This was in the year 842. Under his son and successor Jehoahaz the fortunes of Israel continued to decline, until Hazael imposed upon it the most humiliating conditions (Am 1:3-5; 2Ki 13:1).

8. Renewed Prosperity:

Toward the end of the reign of Jehoahaz, however, the tide began to turn, under the leadership of a military genius whose name has not been recorded (2Ki 13:5); and the improvement continued, after the death of Hazael, under his son Jehoash (Joash), who even besieged and plundered Jerusalem (2Ki 14:8). But it was not until the long reign of Jeroboam II, son of Jehoash, that the frontiers of Israel, were, for the first time since the beginning of the kingdom, restored to their ideal limits. Even Damascus and Hamath were subdued (2Ki 14:28). But the prosperity was superficial. Jeroboam II stood at the head of a military oligarchy, who crushed the great mass of the people under them. The tribune of the plebs at this time was Amos of Tekoa. His Cassandra-like utterances soon fulfilled themselves. The dynasty, which had been founded in blood and had lasted some 90 years, on the accesssion of Jeroboam’s son Zachariah gave place to 12 years of anarchy.

9. Anarchy:

Zachariah was almost immediately assassinated by Shallum, who within a month was in turn assassinated by Menahem, a soldier of the tribe of Gad, stationed in Tirzah, to avenge the death of his master. The low social condition of Israel at this time is depicted in the pages of Hos. The atrocities perpetrated by the soldiers of Menahem are mentioned by Josephus (Ant., IX, xi, 1).

III. Decline and Fall.

1. Loss of Independence:

Meantime Pul or Pulu had founded the second Assyrian empire under the name of Tiglath-pileser III. Before conquering Babylonia, he broke the Independ power of the Hittites in the West, and made himself master of the routes leading to the Phoenician seaports. As the eclipse of the Assyrian power had allowed the expansion of Israel under Jeroboam II, so its revival now crushed the independence of the nation forever. Menahem bought stability for his throne by the payment of an immense bribe of 1,000

talents of silver, or $2,000,000, reckoning the silver talent at $2,000. The money was raised by means of an assessment of 50 talents each upon all the men of known wealth. The payment of this tribute is mentioned on the Assyrian monuments, the date being 738.

2. Decline:

Menahem reigned 10 years. His son Pekahiah was, soon after his accession, assassinated by one of his own captains, Pekah, son of Remaliah, who established himself, with the help of some Gileadites, as king. He formed an alliance with Rezin of Damascus against Israel, defeating Ahaz in two pitched battles, taking numerous captives, and even reaching the walls of Jerusalem. The result was disastrous to both allies. Ahaz called in the aid of the Assyrians. Tiglath-pileser put an end to the kingdom of Damascus, and deported the inhabitants of Northern and Eastern Palestine. The kingdom of Israel was reduced to the dimensions of the later province of Samaria. Pekah himself was assassinated by Hoshea, who became king under the tutelage of the Assyrian overlord. The depopulated provinces were filled with colonists from the conquered countries of the East. The year is 734 BC.

3. Extinction:

Hoshea was never an independent king, but the mere vassal of Assyria. He was foolish enough to withhold the annual tribute, and to turn to Egypt for succor. Meanwhile, Tiglath-pileser III had been succeeded by Shalmaneser IV. This king laid siege to Samaria, but died during the siege. The city was taken by his successor Sargon, who had seized the throne, toward the end of the year 722.

4. Summary:

The Northern Kingdom had lasted 240 years, which fall into three periods of about 80 years each, the middle period being the period of the Syrian wars. As it was fully formed when it broke off from the Southern Kingdom, its history shows no development or evolution, but is made up of undulations of prosperity and of decline. It was at its best immediately after its foundation, and again under Jeroboam II. It was strong under Baasha, Omri and Ahab, but generally weak under the other kings. Every change of dynasty meant a period of anarchy, when the country was at the mercy of every invader. The fortunes of Israel depended entirely on those of Assyria. When Assyria was weak, Israel was strong. Given the advance of Assyria, the destruction of Israel was certain. This was necessary and was clearly foreseen by Hosea (9:3, etc.). The wonder is that the little state, surrounded by such powerful neighbors, lasted as long as it did.

See, further, ISRAEL, HISTORY OF, V.

LITERATURE.

The most important works are Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (English Translation by Martineau and Glover); Wellhausen, Geschichte Israels; Derenbourg, Essai sur l’histoire .... de la Palestine; and

there are many more. Ewald is best known to English readers through the medium of Dean Stanley's Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. See further under CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; ISRAEL, and articles on individual kings. Thomas Hunter Weir

ISRAEL, RELIGION OF, 1

I. INTRODUCTION: HISTORICAL CONSIDERATION OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

II. HISTORICAL OUTLINE

1. Pre-Mosaic Religion of the Ancestors of Israel

(1) The Traditional View

(2) The Modern View

(3) A Higher Conception of the Deity; 'ilu, 'el

(4) Totemism, Animism, etc.

(5) Conception of God

(6) Cult

2. The Mosaic Covenant with Yahweh

(1) The Covenant-Idea

(2) The Covenant-God, Yahweh

(3) Monotheism of Moses

(4) Impossibility of Representing Yahweh by an Image

(5) Ethical Character of the God of Moses

(6) The Theocracy

(7) The Mosaic Cult

3. The Religion of Israel before the 8th Century BC

(1) Decay of Religion in Canaan

(2) The Theocratic Kingdom

(3) Religious Ideals of the Psalms from the Time of David

(4) Wisdom Literature from the Time of Solomon

(5) The Sanctuary on Mt. Zion

(6) The Religion of the Kingdom of Ephraim

(7) Elijah and Elisha

4. Development of the Religion of Israel from the 8th Century BC to the Exile

(1) The Writing Prophets

(2) Their Opposition to the Cult

(3) Their Preaching of the Judgment

(4) Their Messianic Promises

(5) Reformations

(6) Destruction of Jerusalem

5. The Babylonian Exile

(1) Spiritual Purification through the Exile

(2) Relations to the Gentile World

6. Religion of the Post-exilic Period

(1) Life under the Law

(2) Hellenism

(3) Pharisees and Sadducees

(4) Essenes

(5) Positive Connections between Judaism and Hellenism

(6) Apocalyptic Literature

III. CONCLUSION: CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL

1. The Living God

2. The Relation of Man to This God

LITERATURE

I. Introduction: Historical Consideration of the Religion of Israel

In former times it was the rule to draw out of the Old Testament its religious contents only for dogmatic purposes, without making any distinction between the different books. These writings were all regarded as the documents of the Divine revelation which had been given to this people alone and not to others. At the present time the first inquiry in the study of these books deals historically with the religious development of the Israelites. This religion was not of a strictly uniform nature, but is characterized by a development and a growth, and in the centuries which are covered by the Old Testament books it has passed through many changes. Then, too, in the different periods of this development there were various religious trends among the people and very different degrees in the extent of their religious knowledge. The common people were at times still entangled in crude heathen ideas, while the bearers of a higher Divine light ranked vastly above them. And even in those times, when these enlightened teachers secured full recognition, there occurred relapses into lower forms of religion on the part of the masses, especially because the influence of the nations surrounding Israel at all times made itself felt in the religious life and thoughts of the latter. And even when the correct teachings were accepted by the people, a malformation of the entire religion could readily occur through a petrifaction of the religious life. It is the business of the science of the history of religion to furnish a correct picture of this development, which in this article can be done only in the form of a sketch.

One of the recent results of the science of the history of religion is the knowledge that the religion of Israel itself, and not merely the corruptions of this religion, stood in a much closer connection with other religions than had in former times been supposed. The wealth of new data from the history of oriental nations lately secured has shown that it is not correct to regard the religion of Israel as an isolated phenomenon, but that considerable light is thrown upon it from analogous facts from surrounding regions. Of especial importance in this respect is the study of Assyrian and Bah antiquities, with their

rich and illustrative monuments, and, by the side of these, also those of Egypt; and, further, although these are indeed much smaller in number, the inscriptions and monuments of a number of peoples situated much nearer to Israel and ethnologically more closely connected with them, such as the Moabites, Arameans, Arabians, Canaanites, Phoenicians, and others. For later times, Parsiism is an especially important factor.

These antiquities have shown that between the religion of Israel and the religions of these nations there existed such close connections that a relationship between them cannot be denied. It is indeed true that these similarities are mostly of a formal nature, but they nevertheless point to similar conceptions of the Divine Being and of the relation of man to this Being. We find such connecting links in the cult, in the traditions concerning the creation of the world, concerning the earliest history of man kind, etc.; further, in the conception of what is legally right and of the customs of life; in the ideas concerning death and the world beyond; concerning the souls of men and the supernatural spiritual world, and elsewhere. These analogies and related connections have appeared so pronounced to some savants, especially Assyriologists, that they are willing to find in the religion of the Israelites and Jews only a reflection of the Babylonian, or of what they call the "religion of the ancient Orient." But over against this claim, a closer and deeper investigation shows that a higher world of thought and ideals at all times permeates the Israelite religion and gives to it a unique character and a Divine truth, which is lacking in all other religions and which made Israel’s religion capable of becoming the basis of that highest Divine revelation which through Christ came forth from it. We will here briefly sketch the progress of the development of this religion, and then formulate a summary of those characteristics which distinguish it from the other religions.

II. Historical Outline.

1. Pre-Mosaic Religion of the Ancestors of Israel:

(1) The Traditional View.

The sources for this period are meager. Yet what has been reported concerning the religion of the period of the Patriarchs is enough to give us a picture of their conception of the Deity. And this picture is more deserving of acceptance than is the representation of the matter by the traditional dogmatics of the church and also that of those modern scholars who are under the spell of the evolutionary idea, and who undertake to prove in the Biblical history of Israel the complete development from the lowest type of fetishism and animism to the heights of ethical monotheism. The views of the old church teachers were to the effect that the doctrine concerning the one true God had been communicated by God to Adam in its purity and perfection, and by him had been handed through an unbroken chain of true confessors of the faith (Seth, Noah, etc.), down to Abraham. But this view does not find confirmation in the Biblical record. On the contrary, in Jos 24:2,15, it is even expressly stated of the ancestors of Abraham that they had worshipped strange gods in Chaldea. And the ancestors of the people, Abraham, Jacob, and others, do not appear on the stage of history with teachable creed, but themselves first learn to know gradually, in the school of life, the God whom they serve, after He has made Himself known to them in

extraordinary manifestations. Abraham does not yet know that Yahweh does not demand any human sacrifices. Jacob still has the narrow view, that the place where he has slept is the entrance portal to heaven (Ge 28:16,17). Omnipresence and omniscience are not yet attributes which they associate with their idea of the Divinity. They still stand on a simple-minded and primitive stage, as far as their knowledge of the living God is concerned.

(2) The Modern View.

Over against this, modern scholars describe pre-Mosaic Israel as yet entirely entangled in Semitic heathen ideas, and even regard the religion of the people in general, in the post-Mosaic period down to the 8th century BC, as little better than this, since in their opinion the Yahweh-religion had not thoroughly permeated the ranks of the common people, and had practically remained the possession of the men, while the women had continued to cultivate the ancient customs and views. W. R. Smith and Wellhausen have pointed to customs and ideas of the pre-Islamic Arabs, and S.I. Curtiss to such in the modern life of oriental tribes, which are claimed to have been the property of the most ancient Semitic heathen tribes, and these scholars use these as the key for the ancient Israelite rites and customs. But even if much light is thrown from these sources on the forms of life and cult as depicted by the Scriptures, much caution must be exercised in the use made of this material. In the first place, neither those Arabs of the 6th century AD, nor their successors of today, can be regarded as "primitive Semites." In the second place, it is a question, even if in the earliest period of Israel such customs are actually found, what they really signified for the tribe of Abraham. We are here not speaking of a prehistoric religion, but of the religion of that tribe that came originally from Ur of the Chaldees, and migrated first by way of Haran to Canaan, and then to Egypt. In this tribe such primitive customs, perhaps, had long been spiritualized. For these Hebrews cannot be regarded as being as uncivilized as are the New Zealanders, or the Indians of North America, or those Bedouins who have never left the desert; for they had lived in Babylonia for a long period, even if, while there, they had withdrawn themselves as much as possible from the more cultured life of the cities. The patriarchs were in touch with the civilization of the Babylonians. We do not, indeed, want to lay special stress on the fact that they lived in Ur and in Haran, two cities of the moon-god, the worship of which divinity shows monotheistic tendencies. But the history of the family of Abraham, e.g. his relation to Sarah and Hagar, shows indisputable influence of Babylonian legal ideas. Probably, too, the traditions concerning the beginnings of history, such as the Creation, the Deluge, and the like, were brought from Babylon to Canaan by the tribe of Abraham.

(3) A Higher Conception of the Deity; ‘ilu, ‘el.

But this tribe had come to Babylonia from Northern Arabia. It is a very important fact that the oldest Arabian inscriptions, namely the Minaean and the Sabean, lead us to conclude that these tribes entertained a relatively high conception of the Deity, as has been shown by Professor Fritz Hommel. The oldest Arabian proper names are not found combined with names of all kinds of gods, but with the simple ‘ilu, ‘el, or God, or with ‘ili, "my God." Then, too, God is often circumscribed by the nouns expressing relationship, such as ‘abhi, "my father," or ‘achi, "my brother," or ‘ammi, "my uncle," and others, which express an intimate relationship between man and his God. Corresponding to these are also the old Semitic proper names in Canaan, as also the name Abraham, i.e. ‘Abhiram, "my father is

exalted," or Ishmael, and many others. We accordingly must believe that the ancestors of Abraham immigrated into Babylon with a comparatively highly developed religion and with a uniform conception of God. Here their faith may have been unfavorably influenced, and it is not impossible that the religious disagreement between the patriarch and his neighbors may have been a reason for his migration. Abraham himself is regarded by the Canaanites as a "friend of God," who stands in an intimate relationship with his God, and he is accordingly to be regarded, not merely as a secular, but also as a religious tribal head, an Imam, a prophetical personality.

(4) Totemism; Animism, etc.

Still less is it correct to ascribe to this tribe the lowest religious stage possible, namely that of fetishism or of totemism (worship of demons or worship of animals) and the like. Some think they find evidences of the worship of animals in Israel. The fact that some Israelites were regarded as descendants of Leah ("wild cow"(?)), others of Rachel ("mother sheep"), is claimed to refer to the fact that these animals were totems of the tribe, i.e. were worshipped as ancestors. But for this claim there is no scintilla of proof. These names of women, especially in the case of a nomadic tribe, can be explained in a much more simple way. The calves that appear in later times as images of Yahweh are just as little a proof for the claim that calves were worshipped by the ancestors of Israel as divinities. We read nothing of such an image before the sojourn in Egypt, and after that time this image was always regarded symbolically. The fact, again, that from the days of Moses, and without a doubt earlier than this, certain animals were not allowed to be eaten, does not justify the conclusion which Professor B. Stade and others have drawn from it, namely, that these animals were in olden times regarded as divine (tabu), and for that reason were not permitted to be eaten, and only afterward were avoided as "unclean." The list of unclean animals in Le 11 and De 14 speaks for an altogether different reason for regarding them as unclean. It is not at all thinkable that these many, and as a rule unclean and low class of animals, were at one time accorded divine honor, while the higher and cleaner class had been excluded from this distinction. We have accordingly no reason for finding animal worship here. On the other hand, it is self-evident, in the case of such an old nomadic tribe, that man stood in a more familiar relationship to his animals, and for this reason the slaughter of these was a more significant matter than was afterward the case. This was done only on extraordinary occasions, and it readily was accorded a religious consecration.

See also TOTEMISM.

The idea is also emphatically to be rejected, that in the pre-Mosaic period mere animism prevailed in Israel—the worship of spirits and of demons. It has been tried in vain to show that in the most primitive period of Israel’s religion the worship of ancestors occupied a prominent place. As Professor Emil Kautzsch has emphasized, the arguments which have been drawn from the mourning customs of the Israelites in favor of this claim (as this is done by F. Schwally, Das Leben nach dem Tode, nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel und des Judentums, Giessen, 1892) are altogether inadequate, as is also the appeal to the marriage with a deceased wife’s sister, as though the purpose of the institution was to secure for the deceased who had died without issue somebody who would attend to his worship. Because of the strongly developed mundane character of the religious life in Israel, it is natural that it was regarded as a calamity if there was no issue who kept alive the memory of the departed in the tribe. But

even if the argument from the mourning customs of Israel were more convincing than is actually the case, and that gifts, such as food, oil, and the like, were placed in the tomb of the departed, as was often done by the Canaanites, yet this would be in the ancient Israelite religion a matter of subordinate importance, which could readily be explained on the ground of natural feelings. It could never be made to appear plausible that all religions had grown out of such a cult. If the teraphim are to be regarded as having been originally images of ancestors, which is quite plausible, then they would indeed represent a continuous ancestral cult, as the people evidently kept these images in their houses in order to attract to themselves blessings, to avert misfortunes and to secure oracles. But these dolls, modeled after the form of human beings, already in the period of the Patriarchs were regarded as a foreign element and in contradiction to the more earnest religious sentiments (compare Ge 31:19; 35:2,4).

That Israel, like all ancient peoples, did at one time pass through an "animistic" stage of religious development could best be proved, if at all, from their conception of the soul. Among the purifications those are especially necessary which are demanded by the presence of a dead body in the same room with the living, as the living are defiled by the soul of the deceased in leaving the body (Nu 19:14). Even the uncovered vessels are defiled by his soul-substance (Nu 19:15). This, however, is a biological conception, which has nothing to do with the conception of the Deity.

Or are those perhaps right, who think that the primitive Israelites had accepted animism in this sense, that they did not as yet worship any actual divinities, but only a multitude of spirits or demons, be these ghosts of departed human beings or the spirits of Nature, local numina? In favor of this last-mentioned view, appeal is made to this fact, that in the ancient Semitic world local divinities with very circumscribed spheres of power are very often to be met with, especially at springs, trees, oases, at which a demon or divinity is regarded as having his abode, who is described as the ba‘al or master in this place; compare such local names as Baal-tamar, Baal-hermon, and others. Such local spirits would then be the ‘elohim, out of which would grow more mighty divinities of whole cities and countries. To these it would be necessary yet to add those spirits which were worshipped by individual tribes, partly spirits of ancestors, who also could have grown into higher divinities, while the rest of the mass of deities, good and bad, had to content themselves with a lower rank.

As against this, we must above all consider the fact that in ancient Israel the demons played a very subordinate role. The contrast in this regard with Babylonia is phenomenal. It is probably the case that at all periods in Israel there existed a belief in unclean spirits, who perhaps lived in the desert (compare the se‘irim), or in the demoniacs, and could otherwise, too, do much harm. But they are not described as having much influence on man’s life. How few indications of such a view can be found and how little most of these indications prove we can see in the work of H. Duhm, Die bosch Geister im Altes Testament, Tubingen, 1906. After the Babylonian exile, and still more after the longer sojourn of the Israelites in Babylon, their imagination was to a much greater degree than before saturated by the faith in spirits. Then the closer study of such Semitic be‘alim teaches us that they were not originally conceived in such a narrow sense. They are very often of a solar nature, celestial powers who have their abode at a particular place, and there produce fertility, but in this special function represent a general power of Nature. The same is the case with the tribal divinities. These are by no means merely the personifications of the small power of a particular tribe, but claim to be absolute beings, which shows

that they are regarded as higher divinities which the tribe has appropriated and adapted to its own political ideas. We accordingly have no right to think that such a divinity was to be regarded as really confined to a particular hill, or even to a certain stone or tree where it was worshipped. The rock or stone or tree divinities of the ancient Arabs are celestial powers, who have only taken their abode at these places, even if popular superstition did actually identify them with such stones or trees.

It is therefore a misconception of the actual state of affairs when the conclusion is drawn that stone-worship is meant when Jacob erects a stone monument, the matstsebhah at Bethel, and anoints it with oil, and when this is understood to be a low type of fetishism. Stones are to the present day, for the wandering tribes, the signs by which important localities, especially sacred places, are designated. The symbolical significance of such stones may be quite different, as also the relation which a divinity is thought to sustain to such a stone monument. For this reason, too, the judgment of the Bible concerning such objects is quite different. Only then, when they are symbols of idolatry, as the chammanim, i.e representations of the sun-god, ba‘al chamman, are they everywhere rejected in the Old Testament. In the same way a mighty tree, especially if it is found near a spring of water, is in the Orient, by its very nature, a proof of the life-producing God. Such a tree naturally suggests that it is a place where divine life can be felt. Trees that have been made sacred by manifestations of the divinities or have been consecrated by the memory of a great personality, especially the oak, the terebinth, the palm, were regarded as favorite places beneath which the divinity was sought. Only in that case, as was indeed common in Canaan, when the unhallowed powers of Nature were here adored, was this custom reprehensible in the eyes of the prophets. The ‘asherim, too, are of a decidedly heathen character, as these trunks of trees were symbols of the goddess Ashera. Further, it was a favorite custom to worship the divinities on the high places, for the reason that they were regarded as in or attached to the heavens. Only because of the heathen worship which was practiced on these bamoth were they, in later times, so hateful to the prophets.

(5) Conception of God.

In answer to the question, what ideas the patriarchs, the pre-Mosaic leaders of the people of Israel, entertained concerning God, attention must first of all be drawn to the fact that God spoke to some of these personally, be this in one form of manifestation or in another. These men heard the word of God with their own ears, and that, too, in the most important moments of their lives. In the case of Abraham, these revelations are fundamental for him and for his people. The prophetic factor, which goes through the entire history of Israel and constitutes the life-principle that fills its religion and causes its further development, is at the very first beginnings the source whence the knowledge of God is taken. This presupposes a personal God; and, as a matter of fact, a fixed personality is demanded by the character of such a God. His "I" impresses itself upon man with absolute power and demands his service entirely. This "I" constantly remains the same, and everywhere evinces the same power, be this in Haran or in Canaan or in Egypt, and whether it manifests itself to Abraham or to Isaac or to Jacob. This oneness is not formulated as a didactic proposition, but as a living reality: only this God existed for His adherents. These appeal to Him at all times with equal success. The manifestations of this God may be of a different kind at different times. He is even entertained, on one occasion, as a personal guest by His friend Abraham, together with two companions (Ge 18:1). On another occasion (Ge 15:17) Abraham

beholds Him in symbolical form as a burning and fiery furnace (probably to be regarded as similar to the movable altar discovered by Sellin in Taanach). But these are to be regarded as special favors shown by God. In general it was the rule that God could not be seen without the beholder suffering death. Then, too, the conviction is very old, that what man sees in the case of such theophanies cannot have been God Himself, but that He had manifested Himself through a subordinate agent, an angel (this is particularly the case in the document E in Genesis). This angel, however, has no significance in himself, but is only the creature-veil, out of which God Himself speaks in the first person. In the most elementary manner this formal limitation of God appears in Ge 11:5, where He goes to the trouble of descending from heaven in order to look at something on earth; and in 18:21, when He desires to go to Sodom personally, in order to convince Himself that what He has intended to send upon this city is also the right thing. It is indeed possible to find in the first instance some traits of irony, and possibly in the second case the epic details may have added something. However, God is no longer spoken of in such a human way in the post-Mosaic times. This shows that the document J (Jahwist) at this place contains material that is very old. All the more is it to be noted what exalted conceptions of God prevail already in these narratives. He dwells in heaven (11:5; 19:24), something that has without reason been claimed not to have been the idea entertained in the older period. He is the God of the world, who exercises supremacy over all the nations. He rules with justice, checks pride, avenges injustice, and that, too, not only in a summary manner on whole countries, but also in such a way that He takes into consideration every individual and saves the one just man out of the midst of the mass of sinners (18:25; 19). In short, He is already the true God, although yet incompletely and primitively grasped in His attributes.

This God, ruling with omnipotent power in Nature and history, has entered into a special relationship with the tribe of Abraham. He has become the Covenant-God of the patriarch, according to the testimony of the old document J in Ge 15. We accordingly find here already the consciousness that that God who rules over the world has entered into a special relationship with one small nation or tribe. This fact appears also in this, that Abram (Ge 14) acknowledges the highest God of the priest-king Melchizedek (Ge 14:20) as his God, as the founder of heaven and of earth, and identifies Him with his own Covenant-God Yahweh.

(6) Cult.

As far as the cult is concerned, it can be stated that at this period it was still of simple, but solemn and dignified character. The people preferred to worship their God at such places where He had manifested Himself, usually on high place, on which an altar had been erected. There were no images of the Divinity extant. As the word mizbeach, "altar," shows, the sacrifices were usually bloody. Human sacrifice had already in the days of Abraham been overcome by the substitution of an animal, although in olden times it may have been practiced, perhaps, as the sacrifice of the firstborn; and in later times, too, through the influence of the example of heathen nations, it may have found its way into Israel now and then. Both larger and smaller animals were sacrificed, as also fowls. The idea that prevailed in this connection was that God, too, enjoyed the food which served man as his sustenance, although God, in a finer way, experienced as a pleasure only the scent of the sacrifices, as this ascended in the flame and the smoke (Ge 8:21). But the main thing was the blood as the substratum of the soul. The fruits of the field, especially the first-fruits, were also offered. Of liquid offerings, it is probable that in primitive times

water was often brought, as this was often a costly possession; and in Canaan, oil, which the inhabitants of this country employed extensively in their sacrifices (Jud 9:9, something that is confirmed also by recent excavations); also wine (Jud 9:13). As the ancient burnt or whole sacrifices (Ge 8:20) give expression to reverence, thankfulness, the prayer for protection or the granting of certain favors, the people from the very beginning also instituted sacrificial feasts, which gave expression to the covenant with God, the communion with the Covenant-God. In this act the sacrifice was divided between God and those who sacrificed. The latter ate and drank joyously before God after the parts dedicated to Him had been sacrificed, and especially after the blood had been poured around the altar. The idea that this was the original form of the sacrifice and that gift-sacrifices were introduced only at a later period when agriculture had been introduced is not confirmed by historical evidences. That man felt himself impelled, by bringing to his God gifts of the best things he possessed, to express his dependence and gratitude, is too natural not to have been from the beginning a favorite expression of religious feeling. In connection with the sacrifices the name of God was solemnly called upon. J even says that this was the name Yahweh (Ge 4:25), while E (Elohist) and P (Priestly Code) tell us that this name came into use only through Moses.

According to P (Ge 17:10), circumcision was already introduced by Abraham in his tribe as the sign of the covenant. There are good reasons why the introduction of this custom is not like that of so many other ceremonies attributed to Moses. The custom was without doubt of an older origin. From whatever source it may have been derived in its earlier ethnological stage, for the Israelites circumcision is an act of purification and of consecration for connection with the congregation of Yahweh. A special priesthood, however, did not yet exist in this period, as the head of the family and of the tribe exercised the priestly functions and rights (compare Ge 35:1 ff), although the peoples inhabiting Canaan at that time had priests (Ge 14:18).

2. The Mosaic Covenant with Yahweh:

(1) The Covenant-Idea.

Israel claims that its existence as a nation and its special relation to Yahweh begins with its exodus from Egypt and with the conclusion of the covenant at Mt. Sinai (compare Am 3:2; 9:7). As the preparation for this relation goes back to one individual, namely, Abraham, thus it is Moses through whom God delivered His people from bondage and received them into His covenant (see concerning Moses as a prophet and mediator of the covenant, ISRAEL, HISTORY OF). It is a matter of the highest significance for the religion of Israel that the relation of this people to Yahweh was not one which existed by the nature of things, as was the case with the other oriental tribal and national religions, but that it was the outgrowth of a historical event, in which their God had united Himself with them. The conception of a covenant, upon which Yahweh entered as a matter of free choice and will, and to which the people voluntarily gave their assent, is not an idea of later date in the religious history of Israel, which grew out of the prophetic thoughts of the 8th and 7th centuries BC, as has been claimed, but is found, as has been made prominent by Professor French Giesebrecht (Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes, 1900), already in the oldest accounts of the conclusion of the covenant (E, J), and must be ascribed to the Mosaic age. This includes the fact, too, that this covenant, which unites Yahweh with Israel, could not

be of an indissoluble character, but that the covenant was based on certain conditions. The superficial opinion of the people might often cause them to forget this. But the prophets could, in later times, base their proclamations on this fact. Further, the thought is made very prominent that this covenant imposed ethical duties. While the divinities of other nations, Egyptian Babylonian, Phoenician, demanded primarily that their devotees should erect temples in their honor and should bring them an abundance of sacrifices, in Israel the exalted and ethical commandment is found in the forefront. The covenant relation to the God of Israel can legitimately be found only where the relation to one's fellow-man is normal and God-pleasing (Decalogue).

(2) The Covenant-God, Yahweh.

The special revelation which Moses received is characterized by the word Yahweh (Yahweh) as a name for God. This name, according to the well-authenticated report of Ex 6:3 (P), which is supported also by E, had not been "known" to the fathers. This does not necessarily mean that nothing had been known of this name. Babylonian prayers often speak of an "unknown god," and in doing this refer to a god with whom those who prayed had not stood in personal relation. The God of the fathers appeared to Moses, but under a name which was not familiar to the fathers nor was recognized by them. In agreement with this is the fact that only from the time of Moses proper names compounded with some abbreviation of Yahweh, such as Yah, Yahu, Yeho, are found, but soon after this they became very common. Accordingly, it would be possible that such names were in scattered cases found also before the days of Moses among the tribes of Israel, and it is not impossible that this name was familiar to other nations. The Midianites especially, who lived originally at Mt. Sinai, have been mentioned in this connection, and also the Kenites (Stade, Budde), some scholars appealing for this claim to the influence which, according to Ex 18, Jethro had on the institutions of Moses. However, the matters mentioned here refer only to legal procedure (compare 18:14 ff). We nowhere hear that Moses took over the Yahweh-worship from this tribe. On the contrary, Jethro begins only at this time (Ex 18:11) to worship Yahweh, the God of Moses, and the common sacrificial meal, according to 18:12, did not take place in the presence of Yahweh, but, accommodating it to the guest, in the presence of Elohim. Then we nowhere hear that the Kenites, who lived together with the Israelites, ever had any special prominence in the service of Yahweh, as was the case, e.g., with the Median Magi, who had charge of the priesthood among the Persians, or with the Etruscans among the Romans, who examined the entrails. Yet the Kenites would necessarily have enjoyed special authority in the Yahweh-cultus, if their tribal God had become the national God of Israel. The only thing that can be cited in favor of an Arabian origin of the name of Yahweh is the Arabic word-form, hawah, for hayah. On the other hand, a number of facts indicate that Ja or Jau as a name for God was common in Syria, Philistia and Babylonia; compare Joram, son of the king of Hamath (2Sa 8:10), and Jaubidi, the king of this city, who was removed by Sargon. In these cases, however, Israelite influences may have been felt. Friedrich Delitzsch claims to have discovered the names Jahve-ilu and Jahum-ilu on inscriptions as early as the times of Hammurabi. But his readings are sharply attacked. However this may be, the name God as proclaimed by Moses was not only something new for Israel, but was also announced by him (possibly also with a new pronunciation, Yahweh instead of Yahu) with a new signification. At any rate, the explanation in Ex 3:14 (E), "I AM THAT I AM," for doubting which we have no valid reasons, indicates a depth in the conception of God which far surpasses the current conceptions of the Syrian and the Babylonian pantheon. It would,

perhaps, be easier to find analogous thoughts in Egyptian speculations. But this absolute God of Moses is not the idea of speculative priests, but is a popular God who claims to control all public as well as private life.

(3) Monotheism of Moses.

Attempts have been made to deny the monotheistic character of this God, and some have thought that the term "monolatry" would suffice to express this stage in man's knowledge of God, since the existence of other gods was not denied, but rather was presupposed (compare passages like Ex 15:11), and it was only forbidden to worship any god in addition to Yahweh (Ex 20:3). However, this distinction is fundamental, and separates, in kind, the religion of Moses from that of the surrounding nations. For among these latter, the worship of more than one divine being at the same time was the rule. The gods of the Phoeniclans, the Arameans, and the Babylonians are, like those of the Egyptians, beings that spontaneously increase in number. They are divided into male and female groups of two, while in Hebrew there is not even a word extant for goddess, and the idea of a female companion-being to Yahweh is an impossibility. Then, too, it is characteristic of the ethnic god that he is multiplied into many be'alim, and does not feel it as a limitation or restriction when kindred divinities are associated with him. However, the Yahweh of Moses does not suffer another being at His side, for the very reason that He claims to be the absolute God. Passages like Ex 15:11, too, purpose chiefly only to express His unique character; but if He is without any equals among the gods, then He is the only one who can claim to be God; and it is in the end only the logical dogmatic formulation of the faces in the case when we are told in Deuteronomy, "Yahweh he is God; there is none else besides him" (4:35,39; 6:4; compare Ps 18:32). This does not exclude the fact that also in later times, when monotheism had been intelligently accepted, mention is still made of the gods of the heathen as of real powers (compare, e.g. Jer 49:1). This was rather the empirical method of expression, which found its objective basis in the fact that the heathen world was still in possession of some real spiritual power. Most of all, the popular faith or the superstition of the people could often regard the gods of the other nations as ruling in the same way as Yahweh did in Israel (compare, e.g. 2Ch 28:23). But the idea that the faithful worshippers of Yahweh after the days of Moses ever recognized as equal and of the same rank with their own God the gods of the heathen must be most emphatically denied, as also the claim that these Israelites assigned to Yahweh only restricted powers over a small territory. This surely would have been in flat contradiction to the well-known history of the Mosaic period, in which Yahweh had demonstrated His superiority over the famous gods of Egypt in so glorious a manner. Compare on this point James Robertson, Early Religion, 4th edition, 297 ff (against Stade).

(4) Impossibility of Representing Yahweh by an Image.

The 2nd principle which the Mosaic Decalogue establishes is that Yahweh cannot be represented by any image. In this doctrine, too, there is a conscious contrast to the nations round about Israel (in addition to Ex 20:4, compare De 5:8; also Ex 24:17). That in the last-mentioned passage only molten images are forbidden, while those hewn of stone or made of wood might be permitted, is an arbitrary claim, which is already refuted by the fact that the Mosaic sanctuary did not contain any image of Yahweh. The Ark of the Covenant was indeed a visible symbol of the presence of God, but it is a kind of throne of Him

who sits enthroned invisibly above the cherubim, as has been shown above, and accordingly does not admit of any representation of God by means of an image. This continued to be the case in connection with the central sanctuary, with the exception of such aberrations as are already found in Ex 32 and which are regarded as a violation of the Covenant, also at the time when the sanctuary was stationed at Shiloh. The fact that at certain local cults Yahweh-images were worshipped is to be attributed to the influence of heathen surroundings (compare on this point J. Robertson, loc. cit., 215 ff).

(5) Ethical Character of the God of Moses.

A further attribute of the God of Moses, which exalts Him far above the ethnic divinities of the surrounding peoples, is His ethical character. This appears in the fact that His principles inculcate fundamental ethical duties and His agents are chiefly occupied with the administration of legal justice. Moses himself became the lawgiver of Israel. The spirit of this legislation is deeply ethical. Only we must not forget that Moses cannot have originated these ordinances and laws and created them as something absolutely new, but that he was compelled to build on the basis of the accepted legal customs of the people. But he purified these legal usages, which he found in use among the people, through the spirit of his knowledge of God, protected as much as possible the poor, the weak, the enslaved, and elevated the female sex, as is shown by a comparison with related Babylonian laws (Code of Hammurabi). Then, too, we must not forget that the people were comparatively uneducated, and especially that a number of crude classes had joined themselves to the people at that time, who had to be stringently handled if their corrupt customs were not to infect the whole nation. The humane and philanthropic spirit of the Mosaic legislation appears particularly pronounced in Deuteronomy, which, however, represents a later reproduction of the Mosaic system, but is entirely the outcome of Mosaic principles. Most embarrassing for our Christian feeling is the hardness of the Mosaic ordinances in reference to the heathen Canaanites, who were mercilessly to be rooted out (De 7:2; 20:16 f). Here there prevails a conception of God, which is found also among the Moabites, whose King Mesha, on his famous monument, boasts that he had slain all the inhabitants of the city of Kiriath-jearim as "a spectacle to Chemosh, the god of Moab." According to De 7:2 ff, the explanation of this hardness is to be found in the fact that such a treatment was regarded as a Divine judgment upon the worshippers of idols, and served at the same time as a preventive against the infection of idolatry.

(6) The Theocracy.

The vital principle of the organization which Moses gave to his people, Josephus (Apion, II, 16) has aptly called a theocracy, because the lawgiver has subordinated all relations of life to the government of his God. It is entirely incorrect when Wellhausen denies that there is a difference between theocracy and hierarchy. Not the priesthood, but Yahweh alone, is to rule all things in Israel, and Yahweh had many other organs or agents besides the priests, especially the prophets, who not rarely, as the representatives of the sovereign God, sharply opposed themselves to the priests. The theocratical principle, however, finds its expression in this, that public and private life, civil and criminal law, military and political matters were all controlled by religious principles.

(7) The Mosaic Cult.

As a matter of course, Moses also arranged the cult. He created a holy shrine, the tabernacle, which contained the Ark of the Covenant, and in its general arrangements became the model of the sanctuary or temple built in later times. He appointed sacred seasons, in doing which he connected these with previously customary festival days, but he gave sharper directions concerning the Sabbath and gave to the old festival of spring a new historical significance as the Passover. Moses further appointed for this sanctuary a priestly family, and at the same time ordained that the tribe to which this family belonged should assume the guardianship of the sanctuary. The lines separating the rights of the priests and of the Levites have often been changed since his time, but the fundamental distinctions in this respect go back to Moses. In the same way Moses has also, as a matter of course, put the sacred rites, the celebrations of the sacrifices, the religious institutions and ceremonies, into forms suitable to that God whom he proclaimed. This does not mean that all the priestly laws, as they are now found recorded in the Pentateuch, were word for word dictated by him. The priests were empowered to pronounce Torah, i.e. Divine instruction, on this subject, and did this in accordance with the directions received through Moses. Most of these instructions were at first handed down orally, until they were put into written form in a large collection. But in the priestly ordinances, too, there is no lack of traces to show that these date from the period of Moses and must at an early time have been put into written form.

ISRAEL, RELIGION OF, 2

3. The Religion of Israel before the 8th Century BC:

(1) Decay of Religion in Canaan.

Upon the intense religious feeling produced by the exodus from Egypt and the events at Mt. Sinai, there followed a relapse, in connection with which it appears that in this Mosaic generation the cruder tendencies were still too pronounced to endure the great trial of faith demanded by the conquest of the land of Canaan. In the same way, the heroic struggles of Joshua, carried on under the directions of Yahweh and resulting in the conquest of the country, were followed by a reaction. The zeal for battle weakened; the work of conquest was left unfinished; the people arranged to make themselves at home in the land before it had really been won; peace was concluded with the inhabitants. This decay of theocratic zeal and the occupation of the land by the side of and among the Canaanites had a direful influence on the Yahweh-religion as it had been taught the people by Moses. The people adopted the sanctuaries of the country as their own, instead of rooting them out entirely. They took part in the festivals of their neighbors and adopted their customs of worship, including those that were baneful. The local Baals, in whose honor harvest and autumn festivals were celebrated as thanksgiving for their having given the products of the earth, were in many places worshipped by the Israelites. The possibility of interpreting the name Baal in both a good and bad sense favored the excuse that in doing this the people were honoring Yahweh, whom in olden times they also unhesitatingly called their Baal, as their Lord and the master of the land and of the people. By the side of the Yahweh-altars they placed the Asherah, the sacred tree, really as a symbol of the goddess of this name; and the stone pillars

(chammanim), which the original inhabitants had erected near their sanctuaries, were also held in honor, while the heathen ideas associated with them thereby found their way into the religious consciousness of the people. Sorcery, necromancy, and similar superstitions crept in. And since, even as it was, a good deal of superstition had continued to survive among the people, there came into existence, in the period of the Judges, a type of popular religion that was tinged by a pronounced heathenism and had but little in common with theocratical principles of Moses, although the people had no intention of discarding the God of Moses. Characteristic of this religious syncretism during the time of the Judges was the rise of the worship of images dedicated to Yahweh in Da (Jud 17$; 18$) and probably also at Ophrah (Jud 8:27), as also human sacrifices (Jud 11).

(2) The Theocratic Kingdom.

But during this period pronounced reactions to the true worship of Yahweh were not lacking. The heroes who appeared on the arena as liberators from the yoke of the oppressors recalled the people to Yahweh, as was done likewise by the prophets and prophetesses. Samuel, the greatest among this class, was at the same time a prophet and reformer. He again brought the people together and tried to free them from the contamination of heathenism, in accordance with the

Mosaic ordinances, and at the same time prepared for a new future by the establishment of colonies of prophets and by the establishment of the kingdom. This latter innovation seemed to be at variance with the principles of a strict theocracy. It is the merit of Samuel that he created theocratic kingdom, by which the anointed of Yahweh himself was to become an important agent of the supreme rule of Yahweh. It is indeed true that the first king, Saul, did not realize this ideal, but his successor, David, appreciated it all the more. And even if David was far from realizing the ideal of a theocratic king, he nevertheless continued to be the model which prophecy tried to attain, namely, a king who was personally and most intimately connected with Yahweh, and who, as the servant of Yahweh, was to realize entirely in his own person the mission of the people to become the servants of Yahweh, and was thus to furnish the guaranty for the harmony between Israel and their God, and bring rich and unalloyed blessings upon the land.

(3) Religious Ideals of the Psalms from the Time of David.

In this way the covenant-relation became a personal one through "the anointed one of Yahweh." In general, religion in Israel became more personal in character in the days of the earlier kings. Before this time the collective relation to God prevailed. Only as a member of the tribe or of the nation was the individual connected with Yahweh, which fact does not exclude the idea that this God, for the very reason that He rules according to ethical principles, also regards the individual and grants him His special protection and requites to him good or evil according to his deeds. The Hebrew hymns or "psalms," which David originated, give evidence of a more intimate association of the individual with his God.

The very oldest of these psalms, a number of which point to David as their author, are not liturgical

congregational hymns, but were originally individual prayer-songs, which emanated from personal experiences, but were, in later times, employed for congregational use. The prejudice, that only in later times such expressions of personal piety could be expected, is refuted by analogous cases among other nations, especially by the much more ancient penitential and petitionary prayers of the Babylonians, in which, as a rule, the wants of the individual and not those of the nation constitute the contents. These Babylonian penitential prayers show that among this people, too, the feeling of guilt as the cause of misfortune was very vivid, and that they regarded repentance and confession as necessary in order to secure the forgiveness of the gods. However, the more exalted character of the Israelite conception of God appears in a most pronounced way in this comparison, since the Babylonian feels his way in an uncertain manner in order to discover what god or goddess he may have offended, and not rarely tries to draw out the sympathy of the one divinity over against the wrath of another. But much more can this difference be seen in this, that the heathen singer is concerned only to get rid of the evil or the misfortune that oppresses him. The communion with his god whose favor he seeks to regain is in itself of no value for him. In David's case the matter is altogether different, as he knows that he is bound to Yahweh by a covenant of love (Ps 18:2), and his heart delights in this communion, more than it does in all earthly possessions (Ps 4:8); and this is even more so in the case of the author of Ps 73:25-26. Such words would, for good reasons, be unthinkable in the case of a Babylonian psalmist.

In the times of those earliest kings of Israel, which, externally, constituted the most flourishing period in their history, unless tradition is entirely at fault, the spiritual world of thought also was enriched by the Wisdom literature of the Proverbs, the earliest examples of which date back to Solomon.

(4) Wisdom Literature from the Time of Solomon. This chokhmah, or Wisdom literature, is marked by the peculiarity that it ignores the special providential guidance of Israel and their extraordinary relation to their God, and confines itself more to the general revelation of God in Nature and in the history of mankind, but in doing this regards the fear of God as the beginning of wisdom, and at all times has the practical purpose of exhorting to a moral and God-pleasing life. The idea that this cosmopolitan tendency is to be attributed to Greek influences, and accordingly betrays a later period as the time of its origin, is to be rejected, as far as Proverbs and Job are concerned. The many passages in Pr that speak of conduct over against the king show a pre-exilic origin. The universalistic character of this literature must be explained on other grounds. It resulted from this, that this proverb-wisdom is not the sole, exclusive property of Israel and was not first cultivated among them, but was derived from abroad. The Edomites were especially conspicuous in this respect, as the Book of Job shows, in which the Israelite author introduces as speakers masters of this art from this tribe and others adjoining it. We can also compare the superscriptions in Pr 30:1; 31:1, in which groups of proverbs from Arabian principalities are introduced. Accordingly, this wisdom was regarded as a common possession of Israel and of their neighbors. This is probably the reason why the authors of this class of literature refrain from national reference and reminiscences. That the liberal-minded Solomon was the one to introduce this proverb-wisdom, or at any rate cultivated it with special favor, is in itself probable, and is confirmed by the fact that the Queen of Sheba (South Arabia) came to Jerusalem in order to listen to his wisdom. But this also presupposes that in her country a similar class of wisdom was cultivated. This was also the case in Egypt in very early antiquity, and in Egyptian literature we have collections of proverbs that remind us of the proverbs of Solomon (compare Transactions of the Third International Congress of the History of

Religions, Oxford, 1908, I, 284 ff; see WISDOM).

(5) The Sanctuary on Mt. Zion.

The kingdom of David and of Solomon not only externally marks the highest development of the history of Israel, but intellectually, too, prepared the soil out of which henceforth the religious life of the nation drew its sustenance. It was especially under David a significant matter, that at this time the higher spiritual powers were in harmony with the political. This found its expression in the Divine election of David and his seed, which was confirmed by prophetical testament (2Sa 7). Hand in hand with this went the selection of Mt. Zion as the dwelling-place of Yahweh. David, from the beginning, was desirous of establishing here theocratical center of the people, as he had shown by transferring the Ark of the Covenant to Jerusalem. In the same way Solomon, by the erection of the Temple, sought to strengthen and suitably equip this central seat. As a matter of course, the sacred shrines throughout the land did not thereby at once lose their significance. But the erection of the sanctuary in Jerusalem was not at all intended to establish a "royal chapel" for the king, as Wellhausen has termed this structure, but it claimed the inheritance of the tabernacle in Shiloh, and the prophets sanctioned this claim.

(6) The Religion of the Kingdom of Ephraim.

The division of the kingdom after the death of Solomon which, as it was, had not been too large, proved politically disastrous. It also entailed a retrogression in religious matters. The centralizing tendencies of the preceding reigns were thwarted. Jeroboam erected other sacred shrines; especially did he make Bethel a "king’s sanctuary" (Am 7:13). At the same time he encouraged religious syncretism. It is true that the gold-covered images of heifers (by the prophets, in derision, called "calves") were intended only to represent the Covenant-God Yahweh. However, this representation in the form of images, an idea which the king no doubt had brought back with him from his sojourn in Egypt, was a concession to the corrupt religious instincts in the nation, and gave to the Ephraimitic worship an inferior character in comparison with the service in the Temple in Jerusalem, where no images were to be found. But in other respects, too, the arbitrary conduct of the king in the arrangement of the cults proved to be a potent factor in the Northern Kingdom from the beginning. The opposition of independent prophets was suppressed with all power. Nevertheless, the prophetic agitation continued to be a potent spiritual factor, which the kings themselves could not afford to ignore.

This proved to be the case particularly when the dynasty of Omri, who established a new capital city, Samaria, openly favored the introduction of Phoenician idolatry. Ahab’s wife, Jezebel, even succeeded in having a magnificent temple erected in the new capital to her native Baal, and in crushing the opposition of the prophets who were faithful to Yahweh. It now became a question of life and death, so far as the religion of Yahweh was concerned. The struggle involved not only certain old heathen customs in the religion of the masses, dating back to the occupation of Canaan, but it was the case of an invasion of a foreign and heathen god, with a clearly defined purpose. His voluptuous worship was not at all in harmony with the serious character of the Mosaic religion, and it seriously menaced, in a people naturally inclined to sensuality, the rule of the stringent and holy God of Mt. Sinai. The tricky and

energetic queen was already certain that she had attained her purpose, when an opponent arose in the person of Elijah, who put all her efforts to naught.

(7) Elijah and Elisha.

In his struggle with the priests of Baal, who deported themselves after the manner of modern dervishes, we notice particularly the exalted and dignified conception of God in 1Ki 18. When in this chapter Yahweh and Baal are contrasted, the idea of Elijah is by no means that these gods have in their own territory the same rights as Yahweh in Canaan and Israel. Elijah mocks this Baal because he is no God at all (18:21), and the whole worship of the priests convinces him that they are not serving a real and true God, but only the product of their imagination (18:27). This is monotheism, and certainly not of a kind that has only recently been acquired and been first set up by Elijah, but one that came down from the days of Moses. Elijah proves himself to be a witness and an advocate of the God of Sinai, who has been betrayed in a treacherous manner. The fact that he inflicts a dire and fateful punishment on the idolatrous priests of Baal is also in perfect agreement with the old, stringent, Mosaic, legal code. Only such severity could atone for the fearful crime against the God of the country and of the covenant, and could save the people from apostasy. However, theophany at Mt. Sinai (1Ki 19:11) shows clearly that not His external and fearful power, but His calm and deep character was felt by Elijah to be the distinguishing mark of his God. His successor, Elisha, after the storm had cleared the religious atmosphere in the country, in the performance of his prophetic duties was able again to show forth more emphatically the fatherly care and the helpful, healing love of his God.

In general, the political retrogression of the nation and the opposition of those in power, which the prophets and the faithful worshippers of Yahweh in later times were compelled to experience often enough, served greatly to intensify and to spiritualize their religion. The unfortunate situation of the present, and the weaknesses and failures in the actual state of theocracy, directed their eyes to the future. The people began to study the wonderful ways of God in dealing with His people, and they began to look to the end of these dealings. A proof of this is found in the comprehensive accounts contained in the old history of the covenant-people as recorded in the Pentateuchal documents E and J, which were composed during this period. Whether these extend beyond and later than the period of Joshua or not, can remain an open question. In any case, there existed written accounts also concerning the times of the Judges, and concerning the history of Samuel, David and Solomon, which in part were written down soon after the events they record, and which, because of their phenomenal impartiality, point to an exceptionally high prophetic watchtower from which the ways of God with His people were observed.

4. Development of the Religion of Israel from the 8th Century BC to the Exile:

(1) The Writing Prophets.

The spiritual development of the deeper Israelite religion was the business of the prophets. At the latest, from the 8th century BC, and probably from the middle of the 9th, we have in written form their utterances and discourses. Larger collections of such prophecies were certainly left by Amos and Hosea.

These prophets stood entirely on the basis of the revelations which by Moses had been made the foundation of Israel's religion. But in contrast to the superficial and mistaken idea of the covenant of Yahweh entertained by their contemporaries, these prophets make clear the true intentions of this covenant, and at the same time, through their new inspiration, advance the religious knowledge of the people.

(2) Their Opposition to the Cult.

This appears particularly in their rejection of the external and unspiritual cult of their age. Over against the false worship of God, which thinks to satisfy God by the offering of sacrifices, they proclaim the true worship, which consists above all things in the fulfillment of the duties of the law and of love toward their fellow-men. They denounce as a violation of the covenant not only idolatry, the worship of strange gods, and the heathen symbols and customs which, in the course of time, had crept into the service of Yahweh, but they declare also that the religion which is based solely on the offering of sacrifices is worthless, since God, who is in no way dependent on any services rendered by men, does not care for such sacrifices, but is concerned about this, that His commands be observed, and that these consist above all things in righteousness, uprightness in the dealings of man with man, and in mercy on the poor, the weak, the defenseless, who cannot secure justice for themselves. (Compare e.g., 1Sa 15:22; Ho 6:6; Isa 1:11 ff; Jer 7:21 ff, and other passages equally pointed. See on this subject, J. Robertson, Early Religion, etc., 440 ff.) Such a transfer of the center of religion from the cult to practical ethical life has no analogy whatever in other Semitic and ancient religions. Yet it is not something absolutely new, but is a principle that has developed out of the foundation laid by Moses, while it is in most pronounced contrast to the common religious sentiments of mankind. The prophetic utterances that condemn the unthinking and the unconsecrated cult must not be misunderstood, as though Isaiah, Jeremiah and others had been modern spiritualists, who rejected all external forms of worship. In this case they would have ceased to be members of their own people and children of their own times. What they absolutely reject is only the false trust put in an opus operatum, i.e. a mechanical performance of religious rites, which had been substituted for the real and heartfelt exercise of religion. Then, too, we are not justified in drawing from passages such as Jer 7:22 the conclusion that at this time there did not yet exist in written form a Mosaic sacrificial code. Such a code is found even in the Book of the Covenant, recognized by critics as an older Pentateuch document (Ex 20$; 21$; 22$; 23$; 34$), and the fact that the Sabbath commandment is found in the Decalogue does not prevent Isaiah from writing what he has penned in 1:13,14. That at this period, already, there were extant many written ordinances is demanded by Ho 8:12, and the connection shows that cult ordinances are meant. We must accordingly take the prophet's method of expression into consideration, which delights in absolute contrasts in cases where we would speak relatively. But this is not intended to weaken the boldness of the prophetic thoughts, which purpose to express sharp opposition to the religious ideas current at that time.

(3) Their Preaching of the Judgment.

The conception of God and Divine things on the part of the prophets was the logical development of the revelations in the days of Moses, and after that time, concerning the nature and the activity of God. The God of the prophets is entirely a personal and living God, i.e. He enters into the life of man. His holiness

is exaltation above Nature and the most pronounced antagonism to all things unclean, to sin. Sin is severely dealt with by God, especially, as has already been mentioned, the sin of showing no love and no mercy to one's neighbor. Because they are saturated with this conviction of the absolute holiness of God, the preexilic prophets proclaim to their people more than anything else the judgment which shall bring with it the dissolution of both kingdoms and the destruction of Samaria and of Jerusalem, together with its temple. First, its destruction is proclaimed to the Northern Kingdom; later on to the Southern. In doing this, these inspired men testify that Yahweh is not inseparably bound to His people. Rather He Himself calls the destroyer to come, since all the nations of the world are at His command.

(4) Their Messianic Promises.

However, the prophets never conclude purely negatively, but they always see on the horizon some rays of hope, which promise to a "remnant" of the people better times. A "day of Yahweh" is coming, when He will make His final settlement with the nations, after they have carried out His judgment on His people. Then, after the destruction of the Gentileworld, He will establish His rule over the world. This fundamental thought, which appears again and again with constantly increasing clearness, often takes the form that a future king out of the house of David, in whom the idea of the "anointed of Yahweh" has been perfectly realized, will first establish in Judah-Israel a pure rule of God, and then also gain the supremacy of the world. Some critics have claimed that all of these Messianic and eschatological predictions date from the postexilic period. In recent years a reaction against this view has set in, based on the belief that in Egypt and Babylonia also similar expectations are found at an early period. These promises, when they are more clearly examined, are found to be so intimately connected with the other prophecies of Isaiah, Hosea, and others, that to separate them would be an act of violence. In their most magnificent character, these pictures of the future are found in Isaiah, while in Jeremiah their realization and spiritualization have progressed farther.

(5) Reformations.

While the prophets are characterized by higher religious ideas and ideals, the religion of the masses was still strongly honeycombed with cruder and even heathen elements. Yet there were not totally wanting among the common people those who listened to these prophetic teachers. And especially in Judea there were times when, favored by pious kings, this stricter and purer party obtained the upper hand. This was particularly the case under the kings Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah. During the reigns of these kings the cult was reformed. Hezekiah and Josiah attacked particularly the local sanctuaries and their heathen worship (called bamoth), and concentrated the sacrificial cult in Jerusalem. In doing this they were guided by the faithful priests and prophets and by the ancient Mosaic directions. Josiah, who, more thoroughly than others, fought against the disintegration of the Yahweh-cultus, found his best help in the newly-discovered Book of the Law (Deuteronomy). That the sacrifices should be made at one place had been, as we saw, an old Mosaic arrangement. However, Moses had foreseen that local altars would be erected at places where special revelations had been received from Yahweh (Ex 20:24-25). In this way the numerous altars at Bethel, on Carmel, and elsewhere could claim a certain justification, only they were not entitled to the same rank as the central sanctuary, where the Ark of the Covenant stood and where the sons of Aaron performed their priestly functions. Deuteronomy demands more stringently that

all real sacrificial acts shall be transferred to this central point. This rule Josiah carried out strictly. The suppression of the current sacrifices on high places by the fall of the Northern Kingdom aided in effecting the collapse of such shrines, while the sanctuary in Jerusalem, because it was delivered from the attack of the Assyrians, won a still greater recognition.

(6) Destruction of Jerusalem.

However, immediately after the death of Josiah, the apostasy from Yahweh again set in. The people thought that they had been deserted by Him, and they now more than before sought refuge in an appeal to a mixture of gods derived from Babylonia, Egypt, Persia and elsewhere. Eze 8 and 9 describe this syncretism which made itself felt even in the temple-house in Jerusalem. The people were incapable of being made better and were ripe for destruction. The temple, too, which it was thought by many could not be taken, was doomed to be destroyed from its very foundations.

5. The Babylonian Exile:

(1) Spiritual Purification through the Exile.

A mighty change in the religion of Israel was occasioned by the deportation of the wealthier and better educated Jews to Babylon and their sojourn there for a period of about 50 years, and by the still longer stay of a large portion of the exiles in this country. The nation was thus cut off from the roots of the native heathendom in Palestine and also from the external organization of theocracy. This brought about a purification and a spiritualization, which proved to be a great benefit for later times, when the political manifestation of their religious life had ceased, and the personal element came more into the foreground. Jeremiah and Ezekiel emphasize, each in his own way, the value of this religion for the individual. A spiritual communion came into being during the Exile, which found its bond of union in the word of Yahweh, and which insisted on serving God without a temple and external sacrificial cult (which, however, was still found among the exiles in Egypt). Separated from their homes, they collected all the more diligently the sacred memories and traditions, to which Ezekiel’s plans for the temple belong. Their sacred literature, the Torah or Law, the prophetical books, the historical writings, the Psalms, and other literature were collected, and in this way preparations were made for the following period.

(2) Relations to the Gentile World.

The most earnest classes of Jews, at least, absolutely declined to have anything to do with the Babylonian religion and worship. They saw here the worship of images in its most repulsive and sensual form, and they also learned its absolute impotency when the haughty Chaldean empire was overthrown. Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40:1-66:24) shows that the Israelites now become more conscious than ever of the great value of their own religion with its Creator of heaven and earth over against this variegated Pantheon of changeable gods in forms of wood and metal images. From this time on, the glory of the Creator of the universe and His revelation in the works of Nature were lauded and magnified with a new zeal and more emphatically than ever before. This same prophet, however, proclaims also the new fact

of the mission-call of Israel among the nations of the world. This people, he declares, is to become the instrument of Yahweh to make the Gentiles His spiritual subjects. But as this people in its present condition is little fit for this great service, he sees with his prophetic eye a perfect "Servant of Yahweh," who carries out this mission, a personal, visible "Servant of Yahweh," who establishes the rule of God upon earth, by becoming, in the first place, for Israel a second Moses and Joshua, but who then, too, wins over the heathen nations by this message. He accordingly takes the place of the prophesied future Son of David. However, He is not a personal ruler, but carries out His work through mere spiritual power and in lowliness and weakness. Indeed, His suffering and death become the atonement to wipe out the guilt of His people (Isa 53). We can see in this further development of the deepening and spiritualization of the eschatological hopes how strongly the unaccustomed misfortunes and surroundings of the exiles had influenced them. Notwithstanding all their antagonism to the aberrations of the heathen world, the Israelites yet learned that among the Gentiles there was also some receptivity for the higher truths. The worshippers of Yahweh felt themselves more akin to the Persians than to the Babylonians, as the former served without images a god which was conceived as one and as an exalted divine being. Thoughts taken from Parsiism are also found in the later literature of Israel, although it is not the case that the idea of Satan was first taken from this source. The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead for the judgment also can be gained from Old Testament premises. However, the religion of the Babylonians was not without influence on that of the Jews. It is indeed out of the question that it was only during the Exile that the Jews took over the accounts of the Creation and the Deluge and others similar to the Babylonian, as these are found in Ge 1-11. But the development of the angelology shows the evidences of later Babylonian and Persian influences. And especially does demonology play a more important role in post-exilic times than ever before, particularly about the beginnings of the Christian era. Magic art, too, entered largely into the faith of later Judaism, and it can be shown that both of these came from Babylonian sources.

6. Religion of the Post-exilic Period:

(1) Life under the Law.

The people which returned from the Exile was a purified congregation of Yahweh, willing to serve Him. They aimed to re-establish theocracy. This latter had not, indeed, because of the loss of the political independence of the people, the same importance as formerly, but the religious cult and the religious life of the people were all the more stringently observed. The post-exilic period is characterized by religious legalism. The people were exceedingly zealous in observing the old ordinances, and tried to find righteousness in the correctness with which the Mosaic law was observed, as this was now demanded by the teachers of this law. The prophet of the Exile, Ezekiel, had taken the lead in this particular, and had laid great emphasis on the formal ordinances, although in connection with this he also insisted upon real moral earnestness. But it was an easy matter that in the course of time an external work-righteousness and petrifaction of true religion should arise. Yet the later prophets, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi, even if they do ascribe a greater importance to external matters than the preexilic prophets did, show that they are the spiritual heirs of these earlier seers. They teach a healthy ethical and sanctifying type of practical religion and continue to proclaim the hopes for an expansion and spiritualization of the Kingdom of God. The leaders of these times, Zerubbabel, Ezra, Nehemiah, show a pronouncedly

antagonistic attitude toward the neighboring nations and also toward those inhabitants of the country who did not live under the law. However, their intolerance, especially toward the Samaritans, can be readily understood from the principle of the self-preservation of the people of Yahweh. The law came to be the subject of the most careful study, and the teachers of the law collected, even to the minutest details, the oral traditions with reference to its meaning and to the proper observance of the different demands, so that already before the time of Christ they were in possession of an extensive tradition, which was afterward put down in written form in the Mishna. The writing of history was also carefully cultivated. The Books of Chronicles show from what viewpoint they described the past; the temple and the cult were the center of interest. In the same way the psalm-poetry, especially the temple-song, flourished again. These later hymns are pretty and regular, but no longer show the bold spirit of the older psalms. In many cases, older songs are made use of in these later hymns in a new way. Of the proverb-literature of the later post-exilic times, the The Wisdom of Solomon of Jesus Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus, is an instructive example. Notwithstanding its great similarity to the old Proverbs, the prevailing and leading points of view have become different in character. The conception of Wisdom has assumed a specifically Jewish and theocratic character.

(2) Hellenism.

But the Jewish exclusiveness found a dangerous opponent, especially from the days of Alexander the Great, in the new Hellenism. Hellenistic language, culture, customs and world ideas overwhelmed Palestine also. While the Pious (chacidhim) all the more anxiously fortified themselves behind their ordinances, the worldly-minded gave themselves up fully to the influence that came from without. In the first half of the 2nd century BC there arose, as a consequence, a bloody struggle against the inroads of this heathendom, when Antiochus Epiphanes undertook to suppress the religion of the Jews, and when the Asmoneans began their holy war against him.

(3) Pharisees and Sadducees.

But within the people of Israel itself there were found two parties, one strict and the other lax in the observance of the law. The leaders of the former were the highly popular Pharisees, who, according to their name, were the "Separatists," separated from the common and lawless masses. They tried to surpass each other in their zeal for the traditional ordinances and pious observances. However, among them it was also possible to find real piety, although in the New Testament records, where they are described as taking a hostile attitude toward the higher and the highest form of Divine revelation, they appear at their worst. Their rivals, the Sadducees, were less fanatical in their observance of the demands of the law and more willing to compromise with the spirit of the times. To this party belonged many of the more prominent priests. But this party evinced less real religious life than did the Pharisees.

(4) Essenes.

Then, too, in the time of Jesus, there were not lacking indications of the influence of foreign religions, as is apparent in the case of the Essenes. This party advocated dualistic ideas, as these are later found

among the Mandeans.

(5) Positive Connections between Judaism and Hellenism.

In Alexandria a friendly exchange of ideas between Hellenism and Judaism was brought about. Here the Old Testament was translated into the Greek. This translation, known as the Septuagint (Septuagint), shows as yet but few signs of the Greek spirit; rather, a pronounced influence of legal and ritualistic Judaism. On the other hand, apologetical opposition to Hellenism appears to a more marked degree, among others, in the apocryphal work known as "Wisdom of Solomon," in which we find a positive defense of wisdom as the principle of revelation over against the Epicurean world wisdom of Hellenism. In doing this, the book leans on Platonism and Stoicism. The chokhmah, or wisdom of the old Jewish literature, has been Hellenized. Philo goes still farther in adapting Judaism to Greek taste and to humanism. A more liberal conception of inspiration also appears in the reception of contemporaneous literary products into the Old Testament Canon, even of some books which had originally been written in the Greek language. The means observed in adapting national Hebraism to Hellenistic universalism was the allegorical method of interpretation, which Philo practiced extensively and which then passed over to the Christian church Fathers of the Alexandrian school. This school constitutes the opposite extreme to the rabbinical, which clung most tenaciously to the letter of the sacred texts.

(6) Apocalyptic Literature.

A unique phenomenon at the close of the Biblical and in the earliest post-Biblical period is, finally, the APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE (which see). Since the days of the Maccabees we find the custom in certain Jewish circles, by using the old prophecies and adapting them to the events of the times, of drawing up a systematic picture of the future. The authorship of these writings was usually ascribed to one of the ancient saints, e.g. to Enoch, or Abraham, or Moses, or Elijah, or Solomon, or Baruch, or Ezra, or others. The model of these Apocalypses is the Book of Dnl, which, on the basis of older visions, in the times of the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes, pictures, in grand simplicity, the development of the history of the world down to the final triumph of the Kingdom of God over the kingdoms of the world.

III. Conclusion: Characteristic Features of the Religion of Israel.

When we consider this whole development, it cannot be denied that the religion of Israel passed through many changes. It grew and purified and spiritualized itself out of its own inherent strength; but it also suffered many relapses, when hindering and corrupting influence gained the upper hand. But it received from without not only degenerating influences, but also much that inspired and developed its growth. Its original and native strength also shows itself in this, that without losing its real character it was able to appropriate to itself elements of truth from without and assimilate these.

1. The Living God:

If we ask what the specific and unique character of this religion was, by which it was distinguished from all other religions of antiquity, and by reason of which it alone was capable of producing from itself the highest revelation in Christ, it must be answered that its uniqueness lies, most of all, in its conception of God and of Divine things, and of God's relation to the world. The term "monotheism" but inadequately expresses this peculiarity; for monotheistic tendencies are found also in other nations, and in Israel monotheism often shows itself in a strongly corrupted form. The advantage of Israel lies in its close contact with the living God. From the beginning of Israel's history a strictly personal God gave testimony of Himself to different personalities with a decision which demanded absolute submission; and, in addition, this was a holy God, who elevated mankind above Nature and above themselves, a God who stood in the most absolute contrast to all that was impure or sinful, but at the same time was wonderful in His grace and His mercy to the sinner. This direct revelation of God to specially chosen bearers of the Divine truth goes through the entire history of Israel. Through this factor this religion was being constantly purified and unfolded further. The Israelites learned to conceive God in a more spiritual, correct, and universal manner, the more they advanced in experience and culture. But this God did not thereby become a mere abstract being, separated from mankind, as was the case with so many nations. He always continued to be a living God who takes an active part in the lives of men. We need notice only those prophets who describe the greatness of God in the grandest way, such as Hosea, Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah, who depict also the personal life of God in the boldest way through anthropomorphisms.

2. The Relation of Man to This God:

In agreement with this, too, we find that this religion demands the personal subjection of men to God. As was the case with all the religions of antiquity, that of the Old Testament, of Man to too, was originally rather a tribal and a national religion than one of the individual. This brought with it the demand for the external observance of the tribal customs in the name of religion. However, the traditional customs and legal ordinances had already been sifted and purified by Moses. And, as a matter of necessity, in a religion of such a pronounced personal nature, the personal relation of the individual to God must become more and more a matter of importance. This idea became deeper and more spiritual in the course of time and developed into a pure love for God. It did not prevent this religion from becoming petrified, even during the Exile, when the doctrines and the cult were most correctly observed. But the vital kernels found embedded in the revelation of God constantly proved their power of rejuvenation. And at that very time when the petrified legalism of Pharisaism attained its most pronounced development, the most perfect fruit of this religion came forth from the old stem of the history of Israel, namely Christ, who unfolded Judaism and converted it into the religion of salvation for the entire world.

LITERATURE.

Of the literature on the religion of Israel we may yet make particular mention of the following: The textbooks on Old Testament Theology by Oehler, 1891 (also the English translation), of Dillmann, 1895. The Kuenen-Wellhausen school is represented by Kuenen, De Godsdienst van Israel, 1869 (also the English translation); Stade, Biblische Theologie des A T, 1905; Marti, Theologie des A T, 1903; Smend, Lehrbuch der A T Religionsgeschichte, 1899; compare also the works of Robertson Smith, especially his lectures on The Religion of the Semites. Against this radical school, see, in addition to the work of

Dillmann, James Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 1893. On the subject of Semitism in general, S.I. Curtiss, Ursemitische Religion im Volksleben des heutigen Orients, 1903 (also the English translation); Baethgen, Beltrage zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte, 1880; M.J. Lagrange, Etudes sur les religions semitiques, 1905. The relation of Israel to the Assyrian and Babylonian religions is discussed by Hugo Winckler in several works; compare also Fritz Hommel, Alttestamentliche Ueberlieferungen, 1897 (also the English translation); Sayce, The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments, 1895; Alfred Jerermias, Das A Tim Lichte des alten Orients, 1906; a good brief summary is found in Sellin, Die A T Religion im Rahmen der andern Altorientalischen, 1908. Full details are given in Kautzsch, "Religion of Israel," in HDB, extra vol, 1904. For the last centuries before Christ see particularly, Schurer, Geschichte des judischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 1907 (also English Translation). The modern Jewish standpoint is represented by Montefiore, Lectures on the Origin and Growth of Religion as Illustrated by the History of the Ancient Hebrews, 1892.

C. von Orelli

ISRAELITE; ISRAELITISH

iz’-ra-el-it, iz’-rael-it-ish: Belonging to the tribes of ISRAEL (which see). Occurs 4 times in the New Testament: of Nathanael (Joh 1:47); used by Paul (Ro 9:4; 11:1; 2Co 11:22).

ISSACHAR

is’-a-kar (yissa(se)khar; Septuagint, Swete Issachar; Tischendorf, Issachar, so also in the New Testament, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek):

(1) The 9th son of Jacob, the 5th borne to him by Leah (Ge 30:17 f).

1. The Name:

His birth is in this passage connected with the strange story of Reuben and his mandrakes, and the name given him is apparently conceived as derived from ‘ish sakhar, "a hired workman." There is a play upon the name in this sense in Ge 49:15, "He bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant under taskwork." Wellhausen (Textder Buch. Sam., 95) thinks that the second element of the name may denote a deity; and Sokar, an Egyptian god, has been suggested. The name in that case would mean "worshipper of Sokar." Practically nothing is preserved of the personal history of this patriarch beyond his share in the common actions of the sons of Jacob. Four sons were born to him before Jacob’s family removed to Egypt (Ge 46:13). In that land he died and was buried.

2. The Tribe:

At Sinai the tribe numbered 54,000 men of war over 20 years of age (Nu 1:29). At the end of the

wanderings the numbers had grown to 64,300 (Nu 26:25). In the days of David, the Chronicler puts the figures at 87,000 (1Ch 7:5). See NUMBERS. The place of Issachar in the desert-march was with the standard of the tribe of Judah (along with Zebulun) on the East side of the tabernacle (Nu 2:5), this group forming the van of the host (Nu 10:14 f). The rabbis say that this standard was of 3 colors, sardine, topaz and carbuncle, on which were inscribed the names of the 3 tribes, bearing the figure of a lion's whelp (Tg, pseudo. Jon. on Nu 2:3). The captain of the tribe was Nethanel ben-Zuar (Nu 1:8, etc.). Later this place was held by Igal ben-Joseph, the tribal representative among the spies (Nu 13:7). The prince chosen from Issachar to assist in the division of the land was Paltiel ben-Azzan (Nu 34:26). The position of Issachar at the strange ceremony near Shechem was on Mt. Gerizim, "to bless the people" (De 27:12).

3. The Tribal Territory:

Sixteen cities of Issachar are mentioned in Jos 19:17 ff, but the only indications of boundaries are Tabor in the North and Jordan in the East. We gather elsewhere that the territory of this tribe marched on the North with Zebulun and Naphtali (19:11,33); on the West with Manasseh and possibly Asher (17:10); and on the South with Manasseh (17:11). It does not seem to have had any point of contact with the sea. The portion of Issachar, therefore, included the plain of Esdraelon, Tabor, the hill of Moreh, and the slopes East to the Jordan. The fortresses along the South edge of the plain were held by Manasseh. Tola, a man of Issachar, held Shamir, a stronghold in Mt. Ephraim (Jud 10:1). To Manasseh was given Beth-shean with her "towns" (Jos 17:11). No reliable line can be drawn for the South border. The district thus indicated was small; but it embraced some of the most fruitful land in Palestine. By the very riches of the soil Issachar was tempted. "He saw a resting-place that it was good, and the land that it was pleasant; and he bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant under taskwork" (Ge 49:15). "The mountain" in De 33:19 may possibly be Tabor, on which, most likely, there was an ancient sanctuary and place of pilgrimage. This would certainly be associated with a market, in which Issachar and Zebulun, the adjoining tribes, would be able to enrich themselves by trade with the pilgrims from afar. Issachar took part in the battle with Sisera (Jud 5:15). To Israel Issachar gave one judge, Tola (Jud 10:1), and two kings, Baasha and his son (1Ki 15:27, etc.).

4. Men of Issachar:

Of the 200 "heads" of the men of Issachar who came to David at Hebron it is said that they were "men that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do" (1Ch 12:32). According to the Targum, this meant that they knew how to ascertain the periods of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, the dates of solemn feasts, and could interpret the signs of the times. A company from Issachar came to the celebration of the Passover when it was restored by Hezekiah (2Ch 30:18). Issachar has a portion assigned to him in Ezekiel's ideal division of the land (Eze 48:25); and he appears also in the list in Re (7:7).

(2) A Korahite doorkeeper, the 7th son of Obededom (1Ch 26:5).

W. Ewing

ISSHIAH

is-shi’-a (yishshiyahu, "Yah exists"; the King James Version Ishiah):

(1) Mentioned among David’s heroes, a greatgrandson of Tola (1Ch 7:3).

(2) Mentioned among the men who came to David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:6; the King James Version "Jesiah").

(3) A member of the priesthood of the house of Rehabiah (1Ch 24:21; the King James Version "Jesiah").

(4) Another Levitical priest of the house of Uzziel (1Ch 23:20; 24:25).

ISSHIJAH

is-shi’-ja (yishshiyah, "Yah lends"; the King James Version Ishijah): A man of the household of Harim, named among those who, at Ezra’s command, were induced to put away their "strange wives" (Ezr 10:31). Also called "Aseas" (1 Esdras 9:32).

ISSUE

ish’-u:

(1) (moledheth, tse’etsa’im; sperma, "seed"): Offspring, descendants (Ge 48:6; Isa 22:24; Mt 22:25 the King James Version).

(2) (zirmah; yatsa’ (verb); rhusis): A gushing of fluid (semen, Eze 23:20; water, 47:8; blood, Lu 8:43). See next article.

ISSUE (OF BLOOD)

(zobh, zubh; rhusis, haimorrhoos): When used as a description of a bodily affection the word signifies:

(1) A discharge, the consequence of uncleanness and sin (Le 15:2 ff; Nu 5:2). As such it was one of the judgments which were to afflict the family of Joab (2Sa 3:29);

(2) a hemorrhage, either natural (Le 12:7, where the word used is maqor, literally, a "fountain"), or the consequence of disease (Mt 9:20; Mr 5:25; Lu 8:43).

ISSUES

ish’-uz (tots’-oth, literally, "outgoings"):

(1) Ways of escape (Ps 68:20 the King James Version);

(2) free moral choices (Pr 4:23).

ISTALCURUS

is-tal-ku’-rus (Istalkouros): 1 Esdras 8:40, corresponding to Zabbud in Ezr 8:14. In Swete’s text the name is Istakalkos.

ISUAH

is’-u-a. See ISHVAH.

ISUI

is’-u-i.

See ISHVI.

ISVAH

is’-va.

See ISHVAH.

ITALA, VERSION

it’-a-la.

See LATIN VERSION, THE OLD; VULGATE.

ITALIAN BAND

i-tal’-yan.

See BAND.

ITALY

it’-a-li (Italia): At first confined as a name to the extreme southern part of the Italian peninsula in the region now called Calabria, whence its application was gradually extended. In Greek usage of the 5th century BC, the name was applied to the coasts as far as Metapontum and Posidonia, being synonymous with Oenotria. The Oenotrians are represented as having assumed the name of Italians (Itali) from a legendary ruler Italus (Dionysius, i.12,35; Vergil, Aen. i.533). The extension of Roman authority seems to have given this name an ever-widening application, since it was used to designate their allies generally. As early as the time of Polybius the name Italy was sometimes employed as an appellation for all the country between the two seas (Tyrrhenian and Adriatic) and from the foot of the Alps to the Sicilian Straits (Polyb. i.6; ii.14; iii.39,54), although Cisalpine Gaul was not placed on a footing of complete equality with the peninsula as regards administration until shortly after the death of Julius Caesar. From the time of Augustus the term was used in practically its modern sense (Nissen, Italische Landeskunde, I, 57-87).

The name Italy occurs 3 times in the New Testament: Ac 18:2, Aquila "lately come from Italy," because of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius; Ac 27:1, the decision that Paul be sent to Italy; Heb 13:24, salutation from those "of Italy." The adjective form is found in the appellation, "Italian band" (cobors Italica, Ac 10:1).

The history of ancient Italy, in so far as it falls within the scope of the present work, is treated under ROME (which see).

George H. Allen

ITCH

(charec; psora): Only in De 28:27, where it probably refers to the parasitic skin disease of that name which is very common in Palestine. It is due to a small mite, Sarcoptes scabiei, which makes burrows in the skin and sometimes causes extensive crusts or scabs, attended with a severe itching. It is very easily communicated from person to person by contact, and can be cured only by destruction of the parasite. This disease disqualified its victims for the priesthood (Le 21:20).

ITHAI

ith’-a-i.

See ITTAI.

ITHAMAR

ith’-a-mar (’ithamar, "land" or "island of palms": Gesenius; or "father of Tamar," ‘i, being perhaps for ‘abhi: Cook in Encyclopedia Biblica—though both derivations are uncertain): The 4th son of Aaron (Ex 6:23; 28:1; 1Ch 6:3), Eleazar being the 3rd son, Nadab and Abihu the 1st and 2nd sons. While Nadab and Abihu were prematurely cut off for offering strange fire before the Lord (Le 10:1,2; Nu 3:4; 26:61), and Eleazar was appointed chief of the tribe of Levi (Ex 6:23,25) and ultimately succeeded Aaron (Ex 28:1), Ithamar was made the treasurer of the offerings for the Tabernacle (Ex 38:21), and superintendent of the Gershonites and Merarites in the service of the Tabernacle (Nu 4:28,33). In the time of Eli the high-priesthood had come to be in his family, but how, and whether before Eli’s day or first in Eli’s person, is not told and need not be conjectured. W. R. Smith in Encyclopedia Biblica (art. "Eli"), on the strength of 1Sa 2:27,28, holds that the priesthood was originally in Eli’s line; but the words "the house of thy father" do not necessarily mean only the house of Ithamar, but may, and most probably do, refer to Aaron and his descendants, of whom Ithamar was one. Nor does the cutting off of Eli’s family from the priesthood and the setting in their place of "a faithful priest," who should do everything according to Yahweh’s will and walk before Yahweh’s anointed forever, find its complete fulfillment in the deposition of Abiathar or Ahimelech, his son, and the installation of Zadok in the time of Solomon (1Ki 2:35; 1Ch 29:22; see ZADOK). A descendant of Ithamar, Daniel by name, is mentioned among the exiles who returned from Babylon (Ezr 8:2).

T. Whitelaw

ITHIEL

ith’-i-el (’ithi’el, "God is"):

(1) A son of Jeshaiah of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned among the inhabitants of Jerusalem in Nehemiah’s day (Ne 11:7).

(2) The name is perhaps also found in the oracle of Agur (Pr 30:1).

See ITHIEL AND UCAL.

ITHIEL AND UCAL

(’ithi’el we’ukhal): Names of the two men to whom Agur the son of Jakeh spoke his words (Pr 30:1). The purport of introducing these persons is strange and obscure; the margin proposes therefore, by the use of a different pointing, to read the verse, "The man said, I have wearied myself, O God, I have wearied myself, O God, and am consumed," thus doing away with the proper names; a reading which corresponds not inaptly with the tone of the succeeding verses.

See AGUR; PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF, II, 6.

John Franklin Genung

ITHLAH ith’-la (yithlah; the King James Version Jetblah): An unidentified town in the territory of Dan, named with Aijalon and Elon (Jos 19:42).

ITHMAH

ith’-ma (yithmah, "purity"): A citizen of the country of the Moabites, David’s deadly enemies, yet mentioned as one of the king’s heroes (1Ch 11:46).

ITHNAN

ith’-nan (yithnan): A town in the South of Judah mentioned along with Hazor and Ziph (Jos 15:23), apparently the "Ethnan" of Jerome (Onom 118 13). Not identified.

ITHRA

ith’-ra (yithra’," abundance"): The father of Amasa, commanding general in the rebel army of Absalom. It seems that his mother was Abigail, a sister or half-sister of King David (1Ch 2:17). She is called the sister of Zeruiah, Joab’s mother (2Sa 17:25). In this same passage Ithra is called an "Israelite," but in 1Ch 2:17; 1Ki 2:5,32, we read: "Jether the Ishmaelite."

ITHRAN

ith’-ran (yithran, "excellent"):

(1) A descendant of Seir the Horite, son of Dishon (Ge 36:26; 1Ch 1:41).

(2) One of the sons of Zophah of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:37).

ITHREAM

ith’-re-am (yithre‘am, "residue of the people"): The 6th son born to David at Hebron. His mother’s name was Eglah (2Sa 3:5; 1Ch 3:3).

ITHRITE

ith’-rit (yithri, "excellence," "preeminence"): A family in Israel, whose home was Kiriath-jearim (1Ch

2:53). Among the 37 heroes of David, two are mentioned who belonged to this family, Ira and Gareb (2Sa 23:38; 1Ch 11:40).

ITTAH-KAZIN

it-a-ka'-zin ('ittah qatsin): Jos 19:13 the King James Version for Eth-kazin. Ittah is correctly Eth with He locale, meaning "toward Eth."

ITTAI

it'-a-i, it'-i ('ittay, 'ithay):

(1) A Gittite or native of Gath, one of David's chief captains and most faithful friends during the rebellion of Absalom (2Sa 15:11-22; 18:2,4,12). The narrative reveals David's chivalrous and unselfish spirit in time of trouble, as well as the most self-sacrificing loyalty on the part of Ittai. He seems to have but recently left his native city and joined David's army through personal attachment to the king. David rapidly promoted him. Hearing of Absalom's rebellion and approach to Jerusalem, he flees with David. The latter remonstrates, urges him to go back and join Absalom, as he is a foreigner and in exile. His interests are in the capital and with the king; there is no reason why he should be a fugitive and perhaps suffer the loss of everything; it would be better for him, with his band of men, to put himself and them at the service of Absalom, the new king. "Mercy and truth be with thee," says David in his magnanimity. Ittai, with a double oath, absolutely refuses to go back, but will stand by David until the last. Remonstrance being useless, the monarch orders him across the river, doubtless glad that he had such a doughty warrior and faithful friend by his side. On mustering his hosts to meet Absalom, David makes Ittai a chief captain with the intrepid Joab and Abishai. He doubtless did his part in the battle, and as nothing more is said of him it is possible that he fell in the fight.

(2) A Benjamite, one of David's 30 mighty men (2Sa 23:29; 1Ch 11:31, "Ithai").

J. J. Reeve

ITURAEA

it-u-re'-a (Itouraia):

1. The Word an Adjective:

The term occurs only once in Scripture, in the definition of Philip's territory: tes Itouraias kai Trachonitidos choras, which the King James Version renders: "of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis," and Revised Version: "the region of Ituraea and Trachonitis" (Lu 3:1). Sir W.M. Ramsay has given reasons for the belief that this word was certainly never used as a noun by any writer before

the time of Eusebius (Expos, 1894, IX, 51 ff, 143 ff, 288 ff). It must be taken as an adjective indicating the country occupied by the Itureans.

2. The Itureans:

The descent of the Itureans must probably be traced to Jetur, son of Ishmael (Ge 25:15), whose progeny were clearly numbered among the Arabian nomads. According to Eupolemus (circa 150 BC), quoted by Eusebius (Praep. Evang. IX, 30), they were associated with the Nabateans, Moabites and Ammonites against whom David warred on the East of the Jordan. They are often mentioned by Latin writers; their skill in archery seems greatly to have impressed the Romans. They were skillful archers (Caesar, Bell. Afr. 20); a lawless (Strabo, xvi.2,10) and predatory people (Cicero, Philipp. ii.112). In the Latin inscriptions Iturean soldiers have Syrian names (HJP, I, ii, 326). They would therefore be the most northerly of the confederates opposed to David (supra), and their country may naturally be sought in the neighborhood of Mt. Hermon.

3. Indications of Their Territory:

There is nothing to show when they moved from the desert to this district. Aristobulus made war against the Itureans, compelled many of them to be circumcised, and added a great part of their territory to Judea, 140 BC (Ant., XIII, xi, 3). Dio Cassius calls Lysanias "king of the Itureans" (xlix.32), and from him Zenodorus leased land which included Ulatha and Paneas, 25 BC. The capital of Lysanias was Chalcis, and he ruled over the land from Damascus to the sea. Josephus speaks of Soemus as a tetrarch in Lebanon (Vita, 11); while Tacitus calls him governor of the Itureans (Ann. xii.23). The country of Zenodorus, lying between Trachonitis and Galilee, and including Paneas and Ulatha, Augustus bestowed on Herod, 20 BC (Ant., XV, x, 3). In defining the tetrarchy of Philip, Josephus names Batanea, Trachonitis and Auranitis, but says nothing of the Itureans (Ant., XVII, xi, 4; BJ, II, vi, 3). Paneas and Ulatha were doubtless included, and this may have been Iturean territory (HJP, I, ii, 333). It seems probable, therefore, that the Itureans dwelt mainly in the mountains, and in the broad valley of Coele-Syria; but they may also have occupied the district to the Southeast of Hermon, the modern Jedur. It is not possible to define more closely the Iturean country; indeed it is not clear whether Luke intended to indicate two separate parts of the dominion of Philip, or used names which to some extent overlapped.

It has been suggested that the name Jedur may be derived from the Hebrew yeTur, and so be equivalent to Ituraea. But the derivation is impossible.

W. Ewing

IVAH

i’-va.

See IVVAH.

IVORY

i’-vo-ri (1) shen, "tooth" (translated "ivory," 1Ki 10:18; 22:39; 2Ch 9:17; Ps 45:8; So 5:14; 7:4; Eze 27:6,15; Am 3:15; 6:4);

(2) shenhabbim; Septuagint odontes elephdntinoi, "elephants’ teeth" (1Ki 10:22; 2Ch 9:21);

(3) elephantinos, "of ivory" (Re 18:12)):

Shen occurs often, meaning "tooth" of man or beast. In the passages cited it is translated in English Versions of the Bible "ivory" (of "crag," 1Sa 14:4,5; "cliff," Job 39:28 twice; "flesh-hook of three teeth," 1Sa 2:13). Shenhabbim is thought to be a contracted form of shen ha-’ibbim, i.e. ha, the article, and ‘ibbim, plural of ‘ibbah or ‘ibba’; compare Egyptian ab, ebu, "elephant," and compare Latin ebur, "ivory" (see Liddell and Scott, under the word elephas). On the other hand, it may be a question whether -bim is not a singular form connected with the Arabic fil, "elephant." If the word for "elephant" is not contained in shenhabbim, it occurs nowhere in the Hebrew Bible.

Ivory was probably obtained, as now, mainly from the African elephant. It was rare and expensive. It is mentioned in connection with the magnificence of Solomon (1Ki 10:18,22), being brought by the ships of Tarshish (2Ch 9:17,21). An "ivory house" of Ahab is mentioned in 1Ki 22:39. It is mentioned among the luxuries of Israel in the denunciations of Amos (3:15; 6:4). It occurs in the figurative language of Ps 45:8; So 5:14; 7:4. It is used for ornamentation of the ships of the Tyrians (Eze 27:6), who obtain it with ebony through the men of Dedan (27:15). It is among the merchandise of Babylon (Re 18:12).

We do not learn of the use of elephants in war until a few centuries before the Christian era. In 1 Macc 8:6, there is a reference to the defeat of Antiochus the Great, "having an hundred and twenty elephants," by Scipio Africanus in 190 BC. 1 Macc 1:17 speaks of the invasion of Egypt by Antiochus Epiphanes with an army in which there were elephants. 1 Macc 6:28-47 has a detailed account of a battle between Antiochus Eupator and Judas Maccabeus at Bethsura (Beth-zur). There were 32 elephants. Upon the "beasts" theria) there were "strong towers of wood"; "There were also upon every one two and thirty strong men, that fought upon them, beside the Indian that ruled him."

In Job 40:15, the King James Version margin has for "behemoth," "the elephant, as some think."

Alfred Ely Day

IVORY, TOWER OF

(mighdal hashen): In So 7:4 the neck of the Shulammite is compared in whiteness and stateliness to a (or the) tower of ivory. The definite article may suggest that the comparison is with some actual tower in or

near Jerusalem; but more probably the language is simply a figure.

IVVAH

iv’-a (‘iwwah; Aba (= Ava), Aua, 2Ki 18:34, Oudou, 2Ki 19:13, apparently due to a misreading): The name is wanting in the Massoretic Text and Septuagint of Isa 36:19.

Ivvah was a city apparently conquered by the Assyrians, and is mentioned by them, in the verses quoted, with Hamath and Arpad, Sepharvaim and Hena. It has been assimilated with the Avva of 2Ki 17:24 as one of the places whence Sargon brought captives to Samaria, and identified with Hit on the Euphrates, between Anah and Ramadieh, but this seems improbable, as is also the suggestion that it is Emma, the modern ‘Imm, between Antioch and Aleppo. Hommel (Expository Times, April, 1898, 330) upholds the view that Hena and Ivvah, or, as he prefers to read, Avvah, are not places at all, but the names of the two chief gods of Hamath, Arpad and Sepharvaim. This would be consistent with 2Ki 18:34; but 19:13: "Where is the king .... of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and Ivvah?" and 17:31, where the gods of Sepharvaim are stated to be Adrammelech and Anammelech, raise serious difficulties. In all probability, the identification of Ivvah depends upon the correct localization of the twofold Sepharvaim, of which Hena and Ivvah may have been the names. The identification of Sepharvaim with the Babylonian Sip(p)ar is now practically abandoned.

See SEPHARVAIM.

T. G. Pinches

IVY

i’-vi (kissos): The only mention of the word in all the sacred writings is in 2 Macc 6:7 in connection with the oppression of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes: "On the day of the king’s birth every month they were brought by bitter constraint to eat of the sacrifices; and when the feast of Bacchus (Dionysus) was kept, the Jews were compelled to go in procession to Dionysus, carrying ivy," this plant (Hedera helix) being sacred to the Greek god of wine and of the culture of the vine (compare Eur. Bacchae, passim). It was of ivy or of pine that the "corruptible crown" of the famous Isthmian games was made (1Co 9:25).

J. Hutchison

IYAR

e-yar’.

See IYYAR.

IYE-ABARIM

i-ye-ab’-a-rim (‘iye ha-‘abharim, "the heaps of the Abarim"; the King James Version Ije-abarim; in Nu 21:11 the Septuagint reads Codex Vaticanus, Chalglei): A place in the journeyings of Israel named after Oboth, said to be "in the wilderness which is before Moab, toward the sunrising" (Nu 21:11), "in the border of Moab" (Nu 33:44). The indications of position here given are not sufficient to guide to any identification, and, so far, nothing has been discovered in the district to help us. Called simply "Iyim" (the King James Version "Iim") in Nu 33:45.

IYIM

i’-yim (iyim, "heaps"—the form of which, ‘iye, is the construct):

(1) A short form of the name Iye-abarim (Nu 33:45).

(2) A town in the territory of Judah (Jos 15:29; English Versions of the Bible wrongly "Iim"). It lay in the extreme South, "toward the border of Edom." It is not identified.

IYYAR

e-yar’ (iyar; Iar): The 2nd month of the Jewish year, corresponding to May. It is not mentioned in the Bible.

See CALENDAR.

IZEHAR

iz’-e-har, i’-ze-har (Nu 3:19 the King James Version).

See IZHAR.

IZHAR

iz’-har (yitshar, "the shining one"):

(1) The father of Korah (Nu 16:1), descended from a Kohathite Levite of this name, whose descendants formed a family, in the tribe of Levi (Ex 6:18,21; Nu 3:19,27; 1Ch 6:18,38).

(2) A descendant of Judah, whose mother’s name was Helah. the American Revised Version margin gives the name Zohar (1Ch 4:7).

IZHARITES

iz’-har-its (yitshari): The descendants of Izhar, son of Kohath, and grandson of Levi (Nu 3:19,27). In David’s reign some of these were "over the treasures of the house of Yahweh" (1Ch 26:23), others "were for the outward business over Israel, for officers and judges" (ibid., 26:29).

IZLIAH; JEZLIAH

iz-li’-a (yizli’ah, "Yah delivers"; the King James Version): A son of Elpaal, of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:18).

IZRAHIAH

iz-ra-hi’-a (yizrachyah, "Yah appears, or shines"):

(1) A descendant of Issachar, grandson of Tola, only son of Uzzi (1Ch 7:3).

(2) The leader of the singing at the purification of the people, on the occasion of Nehemiah’s reformation; here rendered "Jezrahiah" (Ne 12:42).

IZRAHITE

iz’-ra-hit (yizrach, "rising, shining"): Shamhuth, the captain of the 5th monthly course (1Ch 27:8), is called an "Izrahite." The name may be derived from the town or family of Izrah, but more likely is a corruption of the word "Zerahite," descendant of Zerah of Judah.

IZRI

iz’-ri (yitsri, "creator," "former"): A man of the "sons of Jeduthun," leader of the fourth band of musicians, who served in the sanctuary (1Ch 25:11). Identical with Zeri (25:3).

IZZIAH

iz-i’-a (yizziyah, "Yah unites"; the King James Version Jeziah): One of the faithful Jews who put away their foreign wives. He belonged to the family of Parosh (Ezr 10:25; 1 Esdras 9:26, "Ieddias").

JAAKAN

ja’-a-kan.

See BEEROTH BENE-JAAKAN.

JAAKOBAH

ja-a-ko’-ba, ja-ak’-o-ba (ya‘aqobhah, for meaning compare JACOB, I, 1, 2): 1Ch 4:36, a Simeonite prince.

JAALA; JAALAH

ja’-a-la, ja-a’-la (ya‘ala’, meaning unknown, Ne 7:58) and (ya‘alah, "mountain goat" (?), Ezr 2:56): The name of a family of returned exiles, "children of Solomon’s servants" =" Jeeli" in 1 Esdras 5:33.

JAALAM

ja’-a-lam: the King James Version for JALAM (which see).

JAANAI

ja’-a-ni: the King James Version for JANAI (which see).

JAAR

ja’-ar (ya‘ar, "forest" or "wood"): Is only once taken as a proper name (Ps 132:6 the Revised Version margin), "We found it in the field of Jaar." It may be a shortened form of the name Kiriath-jearim, where the ark had rested 20 years.

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

JAARE-OREGIM

ja’-a-re-or’-e-jim, -or’e-gim (ya‘are’oreghim): In 2Sa 21:19, given as the name of a Bethlehemite, father of Elhanan, who is said to have slain Goliath the Gittite (compare 1Sa 17). The name is not likely to be a man’s name; the second part means "weavers" and occurs also as the last word of the verse in the

Massoretic Text, so it is probably a scribal error here due to repetition. The first part is taken to be

(1) an error for ya‘ir (see JAIR), which is to be read in the parallel section in 1Ch 20:5;

(2) in 2Sa 23:24 Elhanan is the son of Dodo, also a Bethlehemite, and Klostermann would read here Dodai as the name of Elhanan’s father.

David Francis Roberts

JAARESHIAH

ja-ar-e-shi’-a (ya‘areshyah, meaning unknown): In 1Ch 8:27, a Benjamite, "son" of Jeroham. The King James Version has "Jaresiah."

JAASAI; JAASAU

ja’-a-si, ja’-a-so.

See JAASU.

JAASIEL

ja-a’-si-el (ya‘asi’el, "God makes" (?)): In 1Ch 11:47, a Mezobaite, one of "the mighty men of the armies," and probably =" Jaasiel" of 1Ch 27:21, "the son of Abner," and a Benjamite tribal prince of David’s. the King James Version "Jasiel."

JAASU; JASSAI; JAASAU

ja’-a-su (the Revised Version (British and American) and Kethibh, ya‘asu, meaning uncertain); (the Revised Version margin and Qere, ya‘asay), (the King James Version): In Ezr 10:37, one of those who had married foreign wives. Septuagint translates the consonantal text as a verb, kai epoiesan, "and they did." 1 Esdras 9:34 has "Eliasis."

JAAZANIAH

ja-az-a-ni’-a (ya’azanyahu, in 2Ki 25:23; Eze 8:11; ya’azanyah, in Jer 35:3; Eze 11:1, "Yah hears"):

(1) In 2Ki 25:23, "son of the Maacathite," and one of the Judean "captains of the forces" who joined Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor appointed by Nebuchadrezzar over Judah, at Mizpah. He is the "Jezaniah" of Jer 40:8; 42:1. Though not mentioned by name, he was presumably one of those captains

who joined Johnnan in his attack on Ishmael after the latter had slain Gedaliah (Jer 41:11-18). He is also the same as Azariah of Jer 43:2, a name read by the Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus in 42:1 also. Jer 43:5 relates how Johnnan and his allies, Jaazaniah (= Azariah) among them, left Judah with the remnant, and took up their abode in Egypt.

(2) In Jer 35:3, son of Jeremiah (not the prophet), and a chief of the Rechabite clansmen from whose "staunch adherence to the precepts of their ancestor" Jeremiah "points a lesson for his own countrymen" (Driver, Jeremiah, 215).

(3) In Eze 8:11, son of Shaphan, and one of the seventy men of the ciders of Israel whom Ezekiel saw in a vision of Jerusalem offering incense to idols.

(4) In Eze 11:1, son of Azzur, and one of the 25 men whom Ezekiel saw in his vision of Jerusalem, at the East door of the Lord's house, and against whose iniquity he was commanded to prophesy (11:1-13).

David Francis Roberts

JAAZER

ja'-a-zer (ya'azer).

See JAZER.

JAAZIAH

ja-a-zi'-a (ya'aziyahu, "Yah strengthens"): In 1Ch 24:26,27, a Levite, "son" of Merari. But the Massoretic Text is corrupt. The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus reads (Ozeid), which some take to suggest Uzziah (compare 27:25); see Curtis, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, 274-75; See Kittel, at the place.

JAAZIEL

ja-a'-zi-el (ya'azi'el, "God strengthens"): In 1Ch 15:18, a Levite, one of the musicians appointed to play upon instruments at the bringing up of the ark by David. Kittel and Curtis, following the Septuagint (Ozeiel), read "Uzziel," the name they adopt for Aziel in 15:20, and for Jeiel in 16:5.

JABAL

ja'-bal (yabhal, meaning uncertain): In Ge 4:20, a son of Lamech by Adah. He is called 'the father of those who dwell in tents and (with) herds.' So Gunkel, Gen3, 52, who says that the corresponding word in Arabic means "the herdsman who tends the camels." Skinner, Gen, 120, says that both Jabal and Jubal

suggest yobhel, which in Phoenician and Hebrew "means primarily ‘ram,’ then ‘ram’s horn’ as a musical instrument, and finally ‘joyous music’ (in the designation of the year of Jubilee)." See also Skinner, Gen, 103, on the supposed connection in meaning with Abel.

David Francis Roberts

JABBOK

jab’-ok (yabboq, "luxuriant river"): A stream in Eastern Palestine first named in the history of Jacob, as crossed by the patriarch on his return from Paddan-aram, after leaving Mahanaim (Ge 32:22). On the bank of this river he had his strange conflict with an unknown antagonist. The Jabbok was the northern boundary of the territory of Sihon the Amorite (Nu 21:24). It is also named as the border of Ammon (De 3:16). It is now called Nahr ez-Zerqa, "river of blue," referring to the clear blue color of its water. It rises near to ‘Amman—Rabbath Ammon—and makes a wide circuit, flowing first to the East, then to the Northwest, until it is joined by the stream from Wady Jerash, at which point it turns westward, and flows, with many windings, to the Jordan, the confluence being just North of ed-Damiyeh. It drains a wider area than any other stream East of the Jordan, except the Yarmuk. The bed of the river is in a deep gorge with steep, and in many places precipitous, banks. It is a great cleft, cutting the land of Gilead in two. It is lined along its course by a luxuriant growth of oleander which, in season, lights up the valley with brilliant color. The length of the stream, taking no account of its innumerable windings, is about 60 miles. The mouth of the river has changed its position from time to time. In the lower reaches the vegetation is tropical. The river is fordable at many points, save when in full flood. The particular ford referred to in Ge 32 cannot now be identified.

W. Ewing

JABESH

ja’-besh (yabhesh): A short form of JABESH-GILEAD (which see).

JABESH-GILEAD

ja’-besh-gil’-e-ad (yabhesh gil‘adh; or simply yabhish, "dry"): A city East of the Jordan, in the deliverance of which from Nahash the Ammonite Saul’s military prowess was first displayed (1Sa 11:1). At an earlier time the inhabitants failed to share with their brethren in taking vengeance upon Benjamin. This laxity was terribly punished, only 400 virgins being spared alive, who afterward became wives to the Benjamites (Jud 21). The gratitude of the inhabitants to Saul was affectingly proved after the disaster to that monarch on Gilboa (1Sa 31). David, hearing of their deed, sent an approving message, and sought to win their loyalty to himself (2Sa 2:4). Robinson (Biblical Researches, III, 39) thought it might be represented by ed-Deir, about 6 miles from Pella (Fachil), on the southern bank of Wady Yabis. The distance from Pella agrees with the statement of Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v.). Others (Oliphant, Land of Gilead, 277 f; Merrill, East of Jordan, 430, etc.) would identify it with the ruins of

Meriamin, about 3 miles Southeast of Pella, on the North of Wady Yabis. The site remains in doubt; but the ancient name still lingers in that of the valley, the stream from which enters the Jordan fully 9 miles Southeast of Beisan.

W. Ewing

JABEZ

ja’-bez (ya‘bets, "sorrow" ("height)):

(1) Place: An unidentified town probably in the territory of Judah, occupied by scribes (1Ch 2:55). For an ingenious reconstruction of the passage see EB, under the word

(2) Person: The head of a family of Judah, noted for his "honorable" character, though "his mother bare him with sorrow" (1Ch 4:9,10), ya‘bets being interpreted as if it stood for ya‘tsebh, "he causes pain." The same play upon words recurs in his prayer, "that it be not to my sorrow!" His request was granted, "and the sorrow implied by his ominous name was averted by prayer" (Dummelow, in the place cited.).

JABIN

ja’-bin (yabhin, "one who is intelligent," "discerning." The word may have been a hereditary royal title among the northern Canaanites. Compare the familiar usage of par‘oh melekh mitsrayim):

(1) "The king of Hazor," the leading city in Northern Palestine, who led an alliance against Joshua. He was defeated at the waters of Merom, his city was taken and he was slain (Jos 11:1-9).

(2) "The king of Canaan, that reigned (or had reigned) in Hazor." It is not clear whether he dwelt in Hazor or Harosheth, the home of Sisera, the captain of his host at the time of the story narrated in Jgs. He oppressed Israel in the days preceding the victory of Deborah and Barak. To the Israelites he must have been but a shadowy figure as compared with his powerful captain, Sisera, for the song makes no mention of him and there is nothing to indicate that he even took part in the battle that freed Israel (Jud 4:2,7,17,23,24 bis; Ps 83:9,10).

Ella Davis Isaacs

JABNEEL; JABNEH

jab’-ne-el, jab’-ne (yabhne’el, "God is builder"; Septuagint Lebna, Swete reads Lemna; the Apocrypha has Iamnia, Iamneia):

(1) A town on the northern border of the land assigned to Judah, near the western sea, mentioned in

connection with Ekron (Jos 15:11). The place is now represented by the modern village of Yebna which stands upon a hill a little to the South of the Nahr Rubin, about 12 or 13 miles South of Jaffa, on the road from there to Askelon, and about 4 miles from the sea. It had a port, now called Mina Rubin, a short distance South of the mouth of the river, some remains of which still exist. Its harbor was superior to that of Jaffa (PEFS, 1875, 167-68). It does not occur in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament except in the passage mentioned, but it appears under the form "Jabneh" (yabhneh) in 2Ch 26:6, as is evident from the mention of Gath and Ashdod in connection with it. The Septuagint reads Gemna (Jabneh) where the Hebrew reads wa-yammah, "even unto the sea," in Jos 15:46, where Ekron and Ashdod and other cities and villages are mentioned as belonging to Judah's inheritance. Josephus (Ant., V, i, 22) assigns it to the tribe of Dan. We have no mention of its being captured by Joshua or occupied by Judah until the reign of Uzziah who captured it and demolished its wall, in connection with his war upon the Philistines (2Ch 26:6). The position of Jabneel was strong and was the scene of many contests, both in the period of the monarchy and that of the Maccabees. It is mentioned frequently in the account of the wars of the latter with the Syrians. It was garrisoned by the Seleucid kings, and served as a base for raiding the territory of Judah. When Judas Maccabeus defeated Gorgias and the Syrians he pursued them to the plains of Jabneel, but did not take the fortress (1 Macc 4:15). Gorgias was there attacked by the Jewish generals Joseph and Azarias, contrary to Judas' orders, who were repulsed with loss (1 Macc 5:56-60; Josephus, Ant, XII, viii, 6). Apollonius occupied it for King Demetrius (1 Macc 10:69); and Cendebeus for Antiochus, and from there harassed the Jews (1 Macc 15:40). Judas burned the port and navy of Jabneel (2 Macc 12:8-9). It was taken by Simon in 142 BC (Josephus, Ant, XIII, vi, 7; BJ, I, ii, 2), together with Gazara and Joppa, but was restored to its inhabitants by Pompey in 62 BC (Ant., XIV, iv, 4), and was rebuilt by Gabinius in 57 BC (BJ, I, viii, 4). It was restored to the Jews by Augustus in 30 AD. Herod gave it to his sister Salome and she bequeathed it to Julia, the wife of Augustus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 1). The town and region were prosperous in Roman times, and when Jerusalem was besieged by Titus the Sanhedrin removed to Jabneel, and it afterward became the seat of a great rabbinical school (Milman, History of the Jews, II, 411-12), but was suppressed in the persecution under Hadrian. Antonius allowed it to be revived, but it was again suppressed because of hostile language on the part of the rabbis (ibid., 451-52). The Crusaders built there the castle of Ibelin, supposing it to be the site of Gath. It was occupied by the Saracens, and various inscriptions in Arabic of the 13th and 14th centuries have been found there (SWP, II, 441-42).

(2) A town of Naphtali mentioned in Jos 19:33, and supposed to be the site of the modern Yemma, Southwest of the sea of Galilee (SWP, I, 365). It is the Kefr Yama of the Talmud

H. Porter

JACAN

ja'-kan (ya'kan, meaning not known; the King James Version, Jachan): A chief of a family descended from Gad (1Ch 5:13).

JACHIN

ja’-kin (yakhin, "he will establish"):

(1) The 4th son of Simeon (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15; Nu 26:12). In 1Ch 4:24 his name is given as "Jarib" (compare the King James Version margin, the Revised Version margin). "Jachinites," the patronymic of the family, occurs in Nu 26:12.

(2) Head of the 21st course of priests in the time of David (1Ch 24:17). It is used as a family name in 1Ch 9:10, and as such also in Ne 11:10, where some of the course are included in the list of those who, having returned from Babylon, willingly accepted the decision of the lot, and abandoned their rural retreats to become citizens and guardians of Jerusalem (Ne 11:1 f).

James Crichton

JACHIN AND BOAZ

ja’-kin (yakhin, "he shall establish"; bo‘az, "in it is strength," 1Ki 7:15-22; 2Ki 25:16,17; 2Ch 3:15-17; Jer 52:17): These were the names of the two bronze pillars that stood before the temple of Solomon. They were not used in supporting the building; their appearance, therefore, must have been solely due to moral and symbolic reasons. What these are it is not easy to say. The pillars were not altar pillars with hearths at their top, as supposed by W.R. Smith (Religion of the Semites, 191, 468); rather they were "pillars of witness," as was the pillar that witnessed the contract between Jacob and Laban (Ge 31:52). At difficulty arises about the height of the pillars. The writers in Kings and Jeremiah affirm that the pillars before the porch were 18 cubits high apiece (1Ki 7:15; Jer 52:21), while the Chronicler states that they were 35 cubits (2Ch 3:15). Various methods have been suggested of reconciling this discrepancy, but it is more probable that there is a corruption in the Chronicler’s number. On the contruction of the pillars and their capitals, see TEMPLE. At the final capture of Jerusalem they were broken up and the metal of which they were composed was sent to Babylon (2Ki 25:13,16). In Ezekiel’s ideal temple the two pillars are represented by pillars of wood (Eze 40:49).

W. Shaw Caldecott

JACIMUS

ja’-si-mus (Ant., XII, ix, 3).

See ALCIMUS.

JACINTH

ja’-sinth.

See HYACINTH; STONES, PRECIOUS.

JACKAL

jak’-ol:

(1) tannim, "jackals," the King James Version "dragons"; compare Arabic tinan, "wolf"; and compare tannin, Arab tinnin, "sea monster" or "monster" the English Revised Version "dragon" (Job 7:12; Ps 74:13; 148:7; Isa 27:1; 51:9; Jer 51:34), "serpent" (Ex 7:9,10,12; De 32:33; Ps 91:13), the King James Version "whale" (Ge 1:21; Job 7:12); but tannin, "jackals," the King James Version "sea monsters" (La 4:3), "jackal’s well," the King James Version "dragon well" (Ne 2:13), and tannim, "monster," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "dragon" (Eze 29:3; 32:2).

(2) ‘iyim, "wolves," the King James Version "wild beasts of the islands"; compare ‘i, plural iyim, "island"; also ‘ayyah, "a cry," ‘awah, "to cry," "to howl"; Arabic ‘auwa’," to bark" (of dogs, wolves, or jackals); ‘ibn ‘awa’, colloquially wawi, "jackal."

(3) tsiyim, "wild beasts of the desert."

(4) ‘ochim, "doleful creatures."

"Jackals" occurs as a translation of tannim, the King James Version "dragons," in Job 30:29; Ps 44:19; Isa 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer 9:11; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37; of the feminine plural form tannoth in Mal 1:3, and of tannin in Ne 2:13 and La 4:3. Tannim is variously referred to a root meaning "to howl," and to a root meaning "to stretch out" trop. "to run swiftly, i.e. with outstretched neck and limb extended" (Gesenius). Either derivation would suit "wolf" equally as well as "jackal." The expression in Jer 10:22, "to make the cities of Judah a desolation, a dwelling-place of jackals," seems, however, especially appropriate of jackals. The same is true of Isa 34:13; Jer 9:11; 49:33, and 51:37.

The jackal (from Persian shaghal), Canis aureus, is found about the Mediterranean except in Western Europe. It ranges southward to Abyssinia, and eastward, in Southern Asia, to farther India. It is smaller than a large dog, has a moderately bushy tail, and is reddish brown with dark shadings above. It is cowardly and nocturnal. Like the fox, it is destructive to poultry, grapes, and vegetables, but is less fastidious, and readily devours the remains of others’ feasts. Jackals generally go about in small companies. Their peculiar howl may frequently be heard in the evening and at any time in the night. It begins with a high-pitched, long-drawn-out cry. This is repeated two or three times, each time in a higher key than before. Finally there are several short, loud, yelping barks. Often when one raises the cry others join in. Jackals are not infrequently confounded with foxes. They breed freely with dogs.

While tannim is the only word translated "jackal" in English Versions of the Bible, the words ‘iyim, tsiyim, and ‘ochim deserve attention. They, as well as tannim, evidently refer to wild creatures inhabiting desert places, but it is difficult to say for what animal each of the words stands. All four

(together with benoth ya‘anah and se‘irim) are found in Isa 13:21,22: "But wild beasts of the desert (tsiyim) shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures (’ochim); and ostriches (benoth ya‘anah) shall dwell there, and wild goats (se‘irim) shall dance there. And wolves (’iyim) shall cry in their castles, and jackals (tannim) in the pleasant palaces."

In the King James Version ‘iyim (Isa 13:22; 34:14; Jer 50:39) is translated "wild beasts of the islands" (compare ‘iyim, "islands"). the King James Version margin has merely the transliteration iim, the Revised Version (British and American) "wolves," the Revised Version margin "howling creatures." Gesenius suggests the jackal, which is certainly a howler. While the wolf has a blood-curdling howl, it is much more rarely heard than the jackal.

Tsiyim (Ps 72:9; 74:14; Isa 13:21; 23:13; 34:14; Jer 50:39) has been considered akin to tsiyah, "drought" (compare ‘erets tsiyah, "a dry land" (Ps 63:1)), and is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) as follows: Ps 72:9, "they that dwell in the wilderness"; 74:14, "the people inhabiting the wilderness"; Isa 23:13, "them that dwell in the wilderness," the Revised Version margin "the beasts of the wilderness"; Isa 13:21; 34:14; Jer 50:39, "wild beasts of the desert." There would be some difficulty in referring tsiyim in Ps 72:9 to beasts rather than to men, but that is not the case in Ps 74:14 and Isa 23:13. "Wild cats" have been suggested.

‘Ochim, "doleful creatures," perhaps onomatopoetic, occurs only in Isa 13:21. The translation "owls" has been suggested, and is not unsuitable to the context.

It is not impossible that tannim and ‘iyim may be different names of the jackals. ‘Iyim, tsiyim, and tannim occur together also in Isa 34:13,14, and ‘iyim and tsiyim in Jer 50:39. Their similarity in sound may have much to do with their collocation. The recognized word for "wolf," ze’ebh (compare Arabic dhi’b), occurs 7 times in the Old Testament.

See DRAGON; WOLF; ZOOLOGY.

Alfred Ely Day

JACKAL’S WELL

(‘en ha-tannin; Septuagint has pege ton sukon, "fountain of the figs"; the King James Version dragon well): A well or spring in the valley of Hinnom between the "Gate of the Gai" and the Dung Gate (Ne 2:13). No such source exists in the Wady er Rababi (see HINNOM, VALLEY OF) today, although it is very probable that a well sunk to the rock in the lower parts of this valley might strike a certain amount of water trickling down the valley-bottom. G.A. Smith suggests (Jerusalem, I, chapter iv) that this source may have arisen as the result of an earthquake, hence, the name "dragon," and have subsequently disappeared; but it is at least as likely that it received its name from the jackals which haunted this valley, as the pariah dogs do today, to consume the dead bodies which were thrown there.

See HINNOM, VALLEY OF; JACKAL.

E. W. G. Masterman

JACOB (1)

ja’-kub:

I. NAME

1. Form and Distribution

2. Etymology and Associations

II. HIS PLACE IN THE PATRIARCHAL SUCCESSION

1. As the Son of Isaac and Rebekah

2. As the Brother of Esau

3. As the Father of the Twelve

III. BIOGRAPHY

1. With Isaac in Canaan

2. To Aram and Back

3. In Canaan Again

4. Last Years in Egypt

IV. CHARACTER AND BELIEFS

1. Natural Qualities

2. Stages of Development

3. Attitude toward the Promise

4. How Far a "Type" of Israel

V. REFERENCES OUTSIDE OF GENESIS

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the New Testament

VI. MODERN INTERPRETATIONS OF JACOB

1. Personification of the Hebrew Nation

2. God and Demi-God

3. Character of Fiction

I. Name.

1. Form and Distribution:

ya‘aqobh (5 times ya‘aqowbh); Iakob, is in form a verb in the Qal imperfect, 3rd masculine singular. Like some 50 other Hebrew names of this same form, it has no subject for the verb expressed. But there are a number of independent indications that Jacob belongs to that large class of names consisting of a verb with some Divine name or title (in this case ‘El) as the subject, from which the common abbreviated form is derived by omitting the subject.

(a) In Babylonian documents of the period of the Patriarchs, there occur such personal names as Ja-ku-bi, Ja-ku-ub-ilu (the former doubtless an abbreviation of the latter), and Aq-bu-u (compare Aq-bi-a-hu), according to Hilprecht a syncopated form for A-qu(?)-bu(-u), like Aq-bi-ili alongside of A-qa-bi-ili; all of which may be associated with the same root ‘aqabh, as appears in Jacob (see H. Ranke, Early Babylonian Personal Names, 1905, with annotations by Professor Hilprecht as editor, especially pp. 67, 113, 98 and 4).

(b) In the list of places in Palestine conquered by the Pharaoh Thutmose III appears a certain J’qb’r, which in Egyptian characters represents the Semitic letters ya‘aqobh-’el, and which therefore seems to show that in the earlier half of the 15th century BC (so Petrie, Breasted) there was a place (not a tribe; see W. M. Muller, Asien und Europa, 162 ff) in Central Palestine that bore a name in some way connected with "Jacob." Moreover, a Pharaoh of the Hyksos period bears a name that looks like ya‘aqobh-’el (Spiegelberg, Orientalische Literaturzeitung, VII, 130).

(c) In the Jewish tractate Pirqe Abhoth, iii.l, we read of a Jew named ‘Aqabhyah, which is a name

composed of the same verbal root as that in Jacob, together with the Divine name Yahu (i.e. Yahweh) in its common abbreviated form. It should be noted that the personal names ‘Aqqubh and Ya‘aqobhah (accent on the penult) also occur in the Old Testament, the former borne by no less than 4 different persons; also that in the Palmyrene inscriptions we find a person named ‘ath‘aqobh, a name in which this same verb ‘aqabh is preceded by the name of the god ‘Ate, just as in ‘Aqabhyah it is followed by the name Yahu.

2. Etymology and Associations:

Such being the form and distribution of the name, it remains to inquire: What do we know of its etymology and what were the associations it conveyed to the Hebrew ear?

The verb in all its usages is capable of deduction, by simple association of ideas, from the noun "heel." "To heel" might mean:

(a) "to take hold of by the heel" (so probably Ho 12:3; compare Ge 27:36);

(b) "to follow with evil intent," "to supplant" or in general "to deceive" (so Ge 27:36; Jer 9:4, where the parallel, "go about with slanders," is interesting because the word so translated is akin to the noun "foot," as "supplant" is to "heel");

(c) "to follow with good intent," whether as a slave (compare our English "to heel," of a dog) for service, or as a guard for protection, hence, "to guard" (so in Ethiopic), "to keep guard over", and thus "to restrain" (so Job 37:4);

(d) "to follow," "to succeed," "to take the place of another" (so Arabic, and the Hebrew noun ‘eqebh, "consequence," "recompense," whether of reward or punishment).

Among these four significations, which most commends itself as the original intent in the use of this verb to form a proper name? The answer to this question depends upon the degree of strength with which the Divine name was felt to be the subject of the verb As Jacob-el, the simplest interpretation of the name is undoubtedly, as Baethgen urges (Beitrage zur sem. Religionsgeschichte, 158), "God rewardeth" ((d) above), like Nathanael, "God hath given," etc. But we have already seen that centuries before the time when Jacob is said to have been born, this name was shortened by dropping the Divine subject; and in this shortened form it would be more likely to call up in the minds of all Semites who used it, associations with the primary, physical notion of its root ((a) above). Hence, there is no ground to deny that even in the patriarchal period, this familiar personal name Jacob lay ready at hand—a name ready made, as it were—for this child, in view of the peculiar circumstances of its birth; we may say, indeed, one could not escape the use of it. (A parallel case, perhaps, is Ge 38:28,30, Zerah; compare Zerahiah.) The associations of this root in everyday use in Jacob’s family to mean "to supplant" led to the fresh realization of its appropriateness to his character and conduct when he was grown ((b) above). This construction does not interfere with a connection between the patriarch Jacob and the "Jacob-els"

referred to above (under 1, (b)), should that connection on other grounds appear probable. Such a longer form was perhaps for every "Jacob" an alternative form of his name, and under certain circumstances may have been used by or of even the patriarch Jacob.

II. Place in the Patriarchal Succession.

1. As the Son of Isaac and Rebekah:

In the dynasty of the "heirs of the promise," Jacob takes his place, first, as the successor of Isaac. In Isaac's life the most significant single fact had been his marriage with Rebekah instead of with a woman of Canaan. Jacob therefore represents the first generation of those who are determinately separate from their environment. Abraham and his household were immigrants in Canaan; Jacob and Esau were natives of Canaan in the second generation, yet had not a drop of Canaanitish blood in their veins. Their birth was delayed till 20 years after the marriage of their parents. Rebekah's barrenness had certainly the same effect, and probably the same purpose, as that of Sarah: it drove Isaac to Divine aid, demanded of him as it had of Abraham that "faith and patience" through which they "inherited the promises" (Heb 6:12), and made the children of this pair also the evident gift of God's grace, so that Isaac was the better able "by faith" to "bless Jacob and Esau even concerning things to come" (Heb 11:20).

2. As the Brother of Esau:

These twin brothers therefore share thus far the same relation to their parents and to what their parents transmit to them. But here the likeness ceases. "Being not yet born, neither having done anything good or bad, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said unto (Rebecca), The elder shall serve the younger" (Ro 9:11,12). In the Genesis-narrative, without any doctrinal assertions either adduced to explain it, or deduced from it, the fact is nevertheless made as clear as it is in Malachi or Romans, that Esau is rejected, and Jacob is chosen as a link in the chain of inheritance that receives and transmits the promise.

3. As Father of the Twelve:

With Jacob the last person is reached who, for his own generation, thus sums up in a single individual "the seed" of promise. He becomes the father of 12 sons, who are the progenitors of the tribes of the "peculiar people." It is for this reason that this people bears his name, and not that of his father Isaac or that of his grandfather Abraham. The "children of Israel," the "house of Jacob," are the totality of the seed of the promise. The Edomites too are children of Isaac. Ishmaelites equally with Israelites boast of descent from Abraham. But the twelve tribes that called themselves "Israel" were all descendants of Jacob, and were the only descendants of Jacob on the agnatic principle of family-constitution.

III. Biography.

The life of a wanderer (De 26:5 the Revised Version, margin) such as Jacob was, may often be best

divided on the geographical principle. Jacob’s career falls into the four distinct periods: that of his residence with Isaac in Canaan, that of his residence with Laban in Aram, that of his independent life in Canaan and that of his migration to Egypt.

1. With Isaac in Canaan:

Jacob’s birth was remarkable in respect of

(a) its delay for 20 years as noted above,

(b) that condition of his mother which led to the Divine oracle concerning his future greatness and supremacy, and

(c) the unusual phenomenon that gave him his name: "he holds by the heel" (see above, I, 2).

Unlike his twin brother, Jacob seems to have been free from any physical peculiarities; his smoothness (Ge 27:11) is only predicated of him in contrast to Esau’s hairiness. These brothers, as they developed, grew apart in tastes and habits. Jacob, like his father in his quiet manner of life and (for that reason perhaps) the companion and favorite of his mother, found early the opportunity to obtain Esau’s sworn renunciation of his right of primogeniture, by taking advantage of his habits, his impulsiveness and his fundamental indifference to the higher things of the family, the things of the future (Ge 25:32). It was not until long afterward that the companion scene to this first "supplanting" (Ge 27:36) was enacted. Both sons meanwhile are to be thought of simply as members of Isaac’s following, during all the period of his successive sojourns in Gerar, the Valley of Gerar and Beersheba (Ge 26). Within this period, when the brothers were 40 years of age, occurred Esau’s marriage with two Hittite women. Jacob, remembering his own mother’s origin, bided his time to find the woman who should be the mother of his children. The question whether she should be brought to him, as Rebekah was to Isaac, or he should go to find her, was settled at last by a family feud that only his absence could heal. This feud was occasioned by the fraud that Jacob at Rebekah’s behest practiced upon his father and brother, when these two were minded to nullify the clearly revealed purpose of the oracle (Ge 25:23) and the sanctions of a solemn oath (Ge 25:33). Isaac’s partiality for Esau arose perhaps as much from Esau’s resemblance to the active, impulsive nature of his mother, as from the sensual gratification afforded Isaac by the savory dishes his son’s hunting supplied. At any rate, this partiality defeated itself because it overreached itself. The wife, who had learned to be eyes and ears for a husband’s failing senses, detected the secret scheme, counterplotted with as much skill as unscrupulousness, and while she obtained the paternal blessing for her favorite son, fell nevertheless under the painful necessity of choosing between losing him through his brother’s revenge or losing him by absence from home. She chose, of course, the latter alternative, and herself brought about Jacob’s departure, by pleading to Isaac the necessity for obtaining a woman as Jacob’s wife of a sort different from the Canaanitish women that Esau had married. Thus ends the first portion of Jacob’s life.

2. To Aram and Back:

It is no young man that sets out thus to escape a brother's vengeance, and perhaps to find a wife at length among his mother's kindred. It was long before this that Esau at the age of forty had married the Hittite women (compare Ge 26:34 with 27:46). Yet to one who had hitherto spent his life subordinate to his father, indulged by his mother, in awe of a brother's physical superiority, and "dwelling in tents, a quiet (domestic) man" (Ge 25:27), this journey of 500 or 600 miles, with no one to guide, counsel or defend, was as new an experience as if he had really been the stripling that he is sometimes represented to have been. All the most significant chapters in life awaited him: self-determination, love, marriage, fatherhood, domestic provision and administration, adjustment of his relations with men, and above all a personal and independent religious experience.

Of these things, all were to come to him in the 20 years of absence from Canaan, and the last was to come first; for the dream of Jacob at Beth-el was of course but the opening scene in the long drama of God's direct dealing with Jacob. Yet it was the determinative scene, for God in His latest and fullest manifestation to Jacob was just "the God of Beth-el" (Ge 35:7; 48:3; 49:24).

With the arrival at Haran came love at once, though not for 7 years the consummation of that love. Its strength is naively indicated by the writer in two ways: impliedly in the sudden output of physical power at the well-side (Ge 29:10), and expressly in the patient years of toil for Rachel's sake, which "seemed unto him but a few days for the love he had to her" (Ge 29:20). Jacob is not primarily to be blamed for the polygamy that brought trouble into his home-life and sowed the seeds of division and jealousy in the nation of the future. Although much of Israel's history can be summed up in the rivalry of Leah and Rachel—Judah and Joseph—yet it was not Jacob's choice but Laban's fraud that introduced this cause of schism. At the end of his 7 years' labor Jacob received as wife not Rachel but Leah, on the belated plea that to give the younger daughter before the elder was not the custom of the country. This was the first of the "ten times" that Laban "changed the wages" of Jacob (Ge 31:7,41). Rachel became Jacob's wife 7 days after Leah, and for this second wife he "served 7 other years." During these 7 years were born most of the sons and daughters (Ge 37:35) that formed the actual family, the nucleus of that large caravan that Jacob took back with him to Canaan. Dinah is the only daughter named; Ge 30:21 is obviously in preparation for the story of Ge 34 (see especially 34:31). Four sons of Leah were the oldest: Reuben, with the right of primogeniture, Simeon, Levi and Judah. Next came the 4 sons of Bilhah and Zilpah, the personal slaves of the two wives (compare ABRAHAM, iv, 2); the two pairs of sons were probably of about the same age (compare order in Ge 49). Leah's 5th and 6th sons were separated by an interval of uncertain length from her older group. And Joseph, the youngest son born in Haran, was Rachel's first child, equally beloved by his mother, and by his father for her sake (33:2; compare 44:20), as well as because he was the youngest of the eleven (37:3).

Jacob's years of service for his wives were followed by 6 years of service rendered for a stipulated wage. Laban's cunning in limiting the amount of this wage in a variety of ways was matched by Jacob's cunning in devising means to overreach his uncle, so that the penniless wanderer of 20 years before becomes the wealthy proprietor of countless cattle and of the hosts of slaves necessary for their care (Ge 32:10). At the same time the apology of Jacob for his conduct during this entire period of residence in Haran is spirited (Ge 31:36-42); it is apparently unanswerable by Laban (Ge 31:43); and it is confirmed,

both by the evident concurrence of Leah and Rachel (Ge 31:14-16), and by indications in the narrative that the justice (not merely the partiality) of God gave to each party his due recompense: to Jacob the rich returns of skillful, patient industry; to Laban rebuke and warning (Ge 31:5-13,24,29,42).

The manner of Jacob's departure from Haran was determined by the strained relations between his uncle and himself. His motive in going, however, is represented as being fundamentally the desire to terminate an absence from his father's country that had already grown too long (Ge 31:30; compare Ge 30:25)—a desire which in fact presented itself to him in the form of a revelation of God's own purpose and command (Ge 31:3). Unhappily, his clear record was stained by the act of another than himself, who nevertheless, as a member of his family, entailed thus upon him the burden of responsibility. Rachel, like Laban her father, was devoted to the superstition that manifested itself in the keeping and consulting of teraphim, a custom which, whether more nearly akin to fetishism, totemism, or ancestor-worship, was felt to be incompatible with the worship of the one true God. (Note that the "teraphim" of Ge 31:19,34 f are the same as the "gods" of 31:30,32 and, apparently, of 35:2,4.) This theft furnished Laban with a pretext for pursuit. What he meant to do he probably knew but imperfectly himself. Coercion of some sort he would doubtless have brought to bear upon Jacob and his caravan, had he not recognized in a dream the God whom Jacob worshipped, and heard Him utter a word of warning against the use of violence. Laban failed to find his stolen gods, for his daughter was as crafty and ready-witted as he. The whole adventure ended in a formal reconciliation, with the usual sacrificial and memorial token (Ge 31:43-55).

After Laban, Esau. One danger is no sooner escaped than a worse threatens. Yet between them lies the pledge of Divine presence and protection in the vision of God's host at Mahanaim: just a simple statement, with none of the fanciful detail that popular story-telling loves, but the sober record of a tradition to which the supernatural was matter of fact. Even the longer passage that preserves the occurrence at Peniel is conceived in the same spirit. What the revelation of the host of God had not sufficed to teach this faithless, anxious, scheming patriarch, that God sought to teach him in the night-struggle, with its ineffaceable physical memorial of a human impotence that can compass no more than to cling to Divine omnipotence (Ge 32:22-32). The devices of crafty Jacob to disarm an offended and supposedly implacable brother proved as useless as that bootless wrestling of the night before; Esau's peculiar disposition was not of Jacob's making, but of God's, and to it alone Jacob owed his safety. The practical wisdom of Jacob dictated his insistence upon bringing to a speedy termination the proposed association with his changeable brother, amid the difficulties of a journey that could not be shared by such divergent social and racial elements as Esau's armed host and Jacob's caravan, without discontent on the one side and disaster on the other. The brothers part, not to meet again until they meet to bury their father at Hebron (Ge 35:29).

3. In Canaan Again:

Before Jacob's arrival in the South of Canaan where his father yet lived and where his own youth had been spent, he passed through a period of wandering in Central Palestine, somewhat similar to that narrated of his grandfather Abraham. To any such nomad, wandering slowly from Aram toward Egypt, a period of residence in the region of Mt. Ephraim was a natural chapter in his book of travels. Jacob's

longer stops, recorded for us, were

(1) at Succoth, East of the Jordan near Peniel,

(2) at Shechem and

(3) at Beth-el.

Nothing worthy of record occurred at Succoth, but the stay at Shechem was eventful. Genesis 34, which tells the story of Dinah's seduction and her brother's revenge, throws as much light upon the relations of Jacob and the Canaanites, as does chapter 14 or chapter 23 upon Abraham's relations, or chapter 26 upon Isaac's relations, with such settled inhabitants of the land. There is a strange blending of moral and immoral elements in Jacob and his family as portrayed in this contretemps. There is the persistent tradition of separateness from the Canaanites bequeathed from Abraham's day (chapter 24), together with a growing family consciousness and sense of superiority (34:7,14,31). And at the same time there is indifference to their unique moral station among the environing tribes, shown in Dinah's social relations with them (34:1), in the treachery and cruelty of Simeon and Levi (34:25-29), and in Jacob's greater concern for the security of his possessions than for the preservation of his good name (verse 30).

It was this concern for the safety of the family and its wealth that achieved the end which dread of social absorption would apparently never have achieved—the termination of a long residence where there was moral danger for all. For a second time Jacob had fairly to be driven to Beth-el. Safety from his foes was again a gift of God (Ge 35:5), and in a renewal of the old forgotten ideals of consecration (Ge 35:2-8), he and all his following move from the painful associations of Shechem to the hallowed associations of Beth-el. Here were renewed the various phases of all God's earlier communications to this patriarch and to his fathers before him. The new name of Israel, hitherto so ill deserved, is henceforth to find realization in his life; his fathers' God is to be his God; his seed is to inherit the land of promise, and is to be no mean tribe, but a group of peoples with kings to rule over them like the nations round about (Ge 35:9-12). No wonder that Jacob here raises anew his monument of stone—emblem of the "Stone of Israel" (Ge 49:24)—and stamps forever, by this public act, upon ancient Luz (Ge 35:6), the name of Beth-el which he had privately given it years before (Ge 28:19).

Losses and griefs characterized the family life of the patriarch at this period. The death of his mother's Syrian nurse at Beth-el (Ge 35:8; compare Ge 24:59) was followed by the death of his beloved wife Rachel at Ephrath (Ge 35:19; 48:7) in bringing forth the youngest of his 12 sons, Benjamin. At about the same time the eldest of the 12, Reuben, forfeited the honor of his station in the family by an act that showed all too clearly the effect of recent association with Canaanites (Ge 35:22). Finally, death claimed Jacob's aged father, whose latest years had been robbed of the companionship, not only of this son, but also of the son whom his partiality had all but made a fratricide; at Isaac's grave in Hebron the ill-matched brothers met once more, thenceforth to go their separate ways, both in their personal careers and in their descendants' history (Ge 35:29).

Jacob now is by right of patriarchal custom head of all the family. He too takes up his residence at Hebron (Ge 37:14), and the story of the family fortunes is now pursued under the new title of "the generations of Jacob" (Ge 37:2). True, most of this story revolves about Joseph, the youngest of the family save Benjamin; yet the occurrence of passages like Ge 38, devoted exclusively to Judah's affairs, or 46:8-27, the enumeration of Jacob's entire family through its secondary ramifications, or Ge 49, the blessing of Jacob on all his sons—all these prove that Jacob, not Joseph, is the true center of the narrative until his death. As long as he lives he is the real head of his house, and not merely a superannuated veteran like Isaac. Not only Joseph, the boy of 17 (37:2), but also the self-willed elder sons, even a score of years later, come and go at his bidding (Ge 42$; 43$; 44$; 45$). Joseph's dearest thought, as it is his first thought, is for his aged father (43:7,27; 44:19; and especially 45:3,9,13,23, and 46:29).

4. Last Years in Egypt:

It is this devotion of Joseph that results in Jacob's migration to Egypt. What honors there Joseph can show his father he shows him: he presents him to Pharaoh, who for Joseph's sake receives him with dignity, and assigns him a home and sustenance for himself and all his people as honored guests of the land of Egypt (Ge 47:7-12). Yet in Beersheba, while en route to Egypt, Jacob had obtained a greater honor than this reception by Pharaoh. He had found there, as ready to respond to his sacrifices as ever to those of his fathers, the God of his father Isaac, and had received the gracious assurance of Divine guidance in this momentous journey, fraught with so vast a significance for the future nation and the world (Ge 46:1-4): God Himself would go with him into Egypt and give him, not merely the gratification of once more embracing his long-lost son, but the fulfillment of the covenant-promise (Ge 15:13-16) that he and his were not turning their backs upon Canaan forever. Though 130 years of age when he stood before Pharaoh, Jacob felt his days to have been "few" as well as "evil," in comparison with those of his fathers (Ge 47:9). And in fact he had yet 17 years to live in Goshen (Ge 47:28).

These last days are passed over without record, save of the growth and prosperity of the family. But at their close came the impartation of the ancestral blessings, with the last will of the dying patriarch. After adopting Joseph's sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, as his own, Jacob blesses them, preferring the younger to the elder as he himself had once been preferred to Esau, and assigns to Joseph the "double portion" of the firstborn—that "preeminence" which he denies to Reuben (Ge 48:22; 49:4). In poetry that combines with the warm emotion and glowing imagery of its style and the unsurpassed elevation of its diction, a lyrical fervor of religious sentiment which demands for its author a personality that had passed through just such course of tuition as Jacob had experienced, the last words of Jacob, in Ge 49, mark a turning-point in the history of the people of God. This is a translation of biography into prophecy. On the assumption that it is genuine, we may confidently aver that it was simply unforgetable by those who heard it. Its auditors were its theme. Their descendants were its fulfillment. Neither the one class nor the other could ever let it pass out of memory.

It was "by faith," we are well reminded, that Jacob "blessed" and "worshipped" "when he was dying" (Heb 11:21). For he held to the promises of God, and even in the hour of dissolution looked for the fulfillment of the covenant, according to which Canaan should belong to him and to his seed after

him. He therefore set Joseph an example, by "giving commandment concerning his bones," that they might rest in the burial-place of Abraham and Isaac near Hebron. To the accomplishment of this mission Joseph and all his brethren addressed themselves after their father's decease and the 70 days of official mourning. Followed by a "very great company" of the notables of Egypt, including royal officials and representatives of the royal family, this Hebrew tribe carried up to sepulture in the land of promise the embalmed body of the patriarch from whom henceforth they were to take their tribal name, lamented him according to custom for 7 days, and then returned to their temporary home in Egypt, till their children should at length be "called" thence to become God's son" (Ho 11:1) and inherit His promises to their father Jacob.

IV. Character and Beliefs.

In the course of this account of Jacob's career the inward as well as the outward fortunes of the man have somewhat appeared. Yet a more comprehensive view of the kind of man he was will not be superfluous at this point. With what disposition was he endowed—the natural nucleus for acquired characteristics and habits? Through what stages did he pass in the development of his beliefs and his character? In particular, what attitude did he maintain toward the most significant thing in his life, the promise of God to his house? And lastly, what resemblances may be traced in Israel the man to Israel the nation, of such sort that the one may be regarded as "typical" of the other? These matters deserve more than a passing notice.

1. Natural Qualities:

From his father, Jacob inherited that domesticity and affectionate attachment to his home circle which appears in his life from beginning to end. He inherited shrewdness, initiative and resourcefulness from Rebekah—qualities which she shared apparently with her brother Laban and all his family. The conspicuous ethical faults of Abraham and Isaac alike are want of candor and want of courage. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the same failings in Jacob. Deceit and cowardice are visible again and again in the impartial record of his life. Both spring from unbelief. They belong to the natural man. God's transformation of this man was wrought by faith—by awakening and nourishing in him a simple trust in the truth and power of the Divine word. For Jacob was not at any time in his career indifferent to the things of the spirit, the things unseen and belonging to the future. Unlike Esau, he was not callous to the touch of God. Whether through inheritance, or as a fruit of early teaching, he had as the inestimable treasure, the true capital of his spiritual career, a firm conviction of the value of what God had promised, and a supreme ambition to obtain it for himself and his children. But against the Divine plan for the attainment of this goal by faith, there worked in Jacob constantly his natural qualities, the non-moral as well as the immoral qualities, that urged him to save himself and his fortunes by "works"—by sagacity, cunning, compromise, pertinacity—anything and everything that would anticipate God's accomplishing His purpose in His own time and His own way. In short, "the end justifies the means" is the program that, more than all others, finds illustration and rebuke in the character of Jacob.

2. Stages of Development:

Starting with such a combination of natural endowments, social, practical, ethical, Jacob passed through a course of Divine tuition, which, by building upon some of them, repressing others and transfiguring the remainder, issued in the triumph of grace over nature, in the transformation of a Jacob into an Israel. This tuition has been well analyzed by a recent writer (Thomas, Genesis, III, 204 f) into the school of sorrow, the school of providence and the school of grace. Under the head of sorrow, it is not difficult to recall many experiences in the career just reviewed: long exile; disappointment; sinful passions of greed, anger, lust and envy in others, of which Jacob was the victim; perplexity; and, again and again, bereavement of those he held most dear.

But besides these sorrows, God's providence dealt with him in ways most remarkable, and perhaps more instructive for the study of such Divine dealings than in the case of any other character in the Old Testament. By alternate giving and withholding, by danger here and deliverance there, by good and evil report, now by failure of "best laid schemes" and now by success with seemingly inadequate means, God developed in him the habit—not native to him as it seems to have been in part to Abraham and to Joseph, —of reliance on Divine power and guidance, of accepting the Divine will, of realizing the Divine nearness and faithfulness.

And lastly, there are those admirably graded lessons in the grace of God, that were imparted in the series of Divine appearances to the patriarch, at Beth-el, at Haran, at Peniel, at Beth-el again and at Beersheba. For if the substance of these Divine revelations be compared, it will be found that all are alike in the assurance (1) that God is with him to bless; (2) that the changes of his life are ordained of God and are for his ultimate good; and (3) that he is the heir of the ancestral promises.

It will further be found that they may be arranged in a variety of ways, according as one or another of the revelations be viewed as the climax. Thus (1), agreeing with the chronological order, the appearance at Beersheba may well be regarded as the climax of them all. Abraham had gone to Egypt to escape a famine (Ge 12:10), but he went without revelation, and returned with bitter experience of his error. Isaac essayed to go to Egypt for the same cause (Ge 26:1 f), and was prevented by revelation. Jacob now goes to Egypt, but he goes with the express approval of the God of his fathers, and with the explicit assurance that the same Divine providence which ordained this removal (Ge 50:20) will see that it does not frustrate any of the promises of God. This was a crisis in the history of the "Kingdom of God" on a paragraph with events like the Exodus, the Exile, or the Return.

(2) In its significance for his personal history, the first of these revelations was unique. Beth-el witnessed Jacob's choice, evidently for the first time, of his fathers' God as his God. And though we find Jacob later tolerating idolatry in his household and compromising his religious testimony by sin, we never find a hint of his own unfaithfulness to this first and final religious choice. This is further confirmed by the attachment of his later revelations to this primary one, as though this lent them the significance of continuity, and made possible the unity of his religious experience. So at Haran it was the "God of Beth-el" who directed his return (Ge 31:13); at Shechem it was to Beth-el that he was directed, in order that he might at length fulfill his Beth-el vow, by erecting there an altar to the God who had there appeared to him (Ge 35:1); and at Beth-el finally the promise of former years was renewed to him

who was henceforth to be Israel (Ge 35:9-15).

(3) Though thus punctuated with the supernatural, the only striking bit of the marvelous in all this biography is the night scene at Peniel. And this too may justly be claimed as a climax in Jacob's development. There he first received his new name, and though he deserved it as little in many scenes thereafter as he had deserved it before, yet the same could be said of many a man who has "seen the face of God," but has yet to grasp, like Jacob, the lesson that the way to overcome is through the helpless but clinging importunity of faith.

(4) Rather than in any of the other scenes, however, it was at Beth-el the second time that the patriarch reached the topmost rung on the ladder of development. As already noticed, the substance of all the earlier revelations is here renewed and combined. It is no wonder that after this solemn theophany we find Jacob, like Moses later, 'enduring as seeing him who is invisible' (Heb 11:27), and "waiting for the salvation" (Ge 49:18) of a God 'who is not ashamed of him, to be called his God' (Heb 11:16), but is repeatedly called "the God of Jacob."

Finally, such a comparison of these revelations to Jacob reveals a variety in the way God makes Himself known. In the first revelation, naturally, the effort is made chiefly to impress upon its recipient the identity of the revealing God with the God of his fathers. And it has been remarked already that in the later revelations the same care is taken to identify the Revealer with the One who gave that first revelation, or else to identify Him, as then, with the God of the fathers. Yet, in addition to this, there is a richness and suitability in the Divine names revealed, which a mechanical theory of literary sources not only leaves unexplained but fails even to recognize. At Beth-el first it is Yahweh, the personal name of this God, the God of his fathers, who enters into a new personal relation with Jacob; now, of all times in his career, he needs to know God by the differential mark that distinguishes Him absolutely from other gods, that there may never be confusion as to Yahweh's identity. But this matter is settled for Jacob once for all. Thenceforth one of the ordinary terms for deity, with or without an attributive adjunct, serves to lift the patriarch's soul into communication with his Divine Interlocutor. The most general word of all in the Semitic tongues for deity is 'El, the word used in the revelations to Jacob at Haran in Ge (31:13), at Shechem (35:1), at Beth-el the second time (35:11) and at Beersheba (46:3). But it is never used alone. Like Allah in the Arabic language (= the God), so 'El with the definite article before it serves to designate in Hebrew a particular divinity, not deity in general. Or else 'El without the article is made definite by some genitive phrase that supplies the necessary identification: so in Jacob's case, El-beth-el (35:7; compare 31:13) or El-Elohe-Israel (33:20). Or, lastly, there is added to 'El some determining title, with the force of an adjective, as Shaddai (translated "Almighty") in 35:11 (compare 43:3). In clear distinction from this word, 'El, with its archaic or poetic flavor, is the common Hebrew word for God, 'Elohim. But while 'Elohim is used regularly by the narrator of the Jacob-stories in speaking, or in letting his actors speak, of Jacob's God, who to the monotheistic writer is of course the God and his own God, he never puts this word thus absolutely into the mouth of the revealing Deity. Jacob can say, when he awakes from his dream, "This is the house of 'Elohim," but God says to him in the dream, "I am the God ('Elohim) of thy father" (28:17,13). At Mahanaim Jacob says, "This is the host of 'Elohim" (32:2), but at Beersheba God says to Jacob, "I am .... the God ('Elohim) of thy father" (46:3). Such are the distinctions maintained in the use of these words, all of them used of the same God, yet chosen in each

case to fit the circumstances of speaker, hearer and situation.

The only passage in the story of Jacob that might appear to be an exception does in fact but prove the rule. At Peniel the angel of God explains the new name of Israel by saying, "Thou hast striven with God (’Elohim) and with men, and hast prevailed." Here the contrast with "men" proves that ‘Elohim without the article is just the right expression, even on the lips of Deity: neither Deity nor humanity has prevailed against Jacob (Ge 32:28).

Throughout the entire story of Jacob, therefore, his relations with Yahweh his God, after they were once established (Ge 28:13-16), are narrated in terms that emphasize the Divinity of Him who had thus entered into covenant-relationship with him: His Divinity—that is to say, those attributes in which His Divinity manifested itself in His dealings with Jacob.

3. Attitude toward the Promise:

From the foregoing, two things appear with respect to Jacob’s attitude toward the promise of God. First, with all his faults and vices he yet was spiritually sensitive; he responded to the approaches of his God concerning things of a value wholly spiritual—future good, moral and spiritual blessings. And second, he was capable of progress in these matters; that is, his reaction to the Divine tuition would appear, if charted, as a series of elevations, separated one from another, to be sure, by low levels and deep declines, yet each one higher than the last, and all taken collectively lifting the whole average up and up, till in the end faith has triumphed over sight, the future over present good, a yet unpossessed but Divinely promised Canaan over all the comfort and honors of Egypt, and the aged patriarch lives only to "wait for Yahweh’s salvation" (Ge 49:18).

The contrast of Jacob with Esau furnishes perhaps the best means of grasping the significance of these two facts for an estimate of Jacob’s attitude toward the promise. For in the first place, Esau, who possessed so much that Jacob lacked—directness, manliness, a sort of bonhomie, that made him superficially more attractive than his brother—Esau shows nowhere any real "sense" for things spiritual. The author of Hebrews has caught the man in the flash of a single word, "profane" bebelos)—of course, in the older, broader, etymological meaning of the term. Esau’s desires dwelt in the world of the non-sacred; they did not aspire to that world of nearness to God, where one must ‘put off the shoes from off his feet, because the place whereon he stands is holy ground.’ And in the second place, there is no sign of growth in Esau. What we see him in his father’s encampment, that we see him to the end—so far as appears from the laconic story. With the virtues as well as the vices of the man who lives for the present—forgiving when strong enough to revenge, condescending when flattered, proud of power and independent of parental control or family tradition—Esau is as impartially depicted by the sacred historian as if the writer had been an Edomite instead of an Israelite: the sketch is evidently true to life, both from its objectivity and from its coherence.

Now what Esau was, Jacob was not. His fault in connection with the promises of God, the family tradition, the ancestral blessing, lay not in despising them, but in seeking them in immoral ways. Good

was his aim; but he was ready to "do evil that good might come." He was always tempted to be his own Providence, and God's training was clearly directed, both by providential leadings and by gracious disclosures, to this corresponding purpose: to enlighten Jacob as to the nature of the promise; to assure him that it was his by grace; to awaken personal faith in its Divine Giver; and to supplement his "faith" by that "patience" without which none can "inherit the promises." The faith that accepts was to issue at length in the faith that waits.

4. How Far a "Type" of Israel:

A nation was to take its name from Jacob-Israel, and there are some passages of Scripture where it is uncertain whether the name designates the nation or its ancestor. In their respective relations to God and to the world of men and nations, there is a true sense in which the father was a "type" of the children. It is probably only a play of fancy that would discover a parallel in their respective careers, between the successive stages of life in the father's home (Canaan), life in exile, a return, and a second exile. But it is not fanciful to note the resemblance between Jacob's character and that of his descendants. With few exceptions the qualities mentioned above (IV, 2) will be found, mutatis mutandis, to be equally applicable to the nation of Israel. And even that curriculum in which the patriarch learned of God may be viewed as a type of the school in which the Hebrew people—not all of them, nor even the mass, but the "remnant" who approximated to the ideal Israel of the prophets, the "servant of Yahweh"—were taught the lessons of faith and patience, of renunciation and consecration, that appear with growing clearness on the pages of Isaiah, of Habakkuk, of Jeremiah, of Malachi. This is apparently Hosea's point of view in Ho 12:2-4,12.

A word of caution, however, is needed at this point. There are limits to this equation. Even critics who regard Jacob under his title of Israel as merely the eponymous hero, created by legend to be the forefather of the nation (compare below, VI, 1), must confess that Jacob as Jacob is no such neutral creature, dressed only in the colors of his children's racial qualities. There is a large residuum in Jacob, after all parallelisms have been traced, that refuses to fit the lines of Hebrew national character or history, and his typical relation in fact lies chiefly in the direction of the covenant-inheritance, after the fashion of Malachi's allusion (Mal 1:2), interpreted by Paul (Ro 9:10-13).

V. References Outside of Genesis.

Under his two names this personage Jacob or Israel is more frequently mentioned than any other in the whole of sacred history. Yet in the vast majority of cases the nation descended from him is intended by the name, which in the form of "Jacob" or "Israel" contains not the slightest, and in the form "children of Israel," "house of Jacob" and the like, only the slightest, if any, allusion to the patriarch himself. But there still remain many passages in both Testaments where the Jacob or Israel of Ge is clearly alluded to.

1. In the Old Testament:

There is a considerable group of passages that refer to him as the last of the patriarchal triumvirate—

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob: so particularly of Yahweh as the "God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," and of the covenant-oath as having been "sworn unto Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." And naturally the nation that is known by his name is frequently called by some phrase, equivalent to the formal bene yisra'el, yet through its unusualness lending more significance to the idea of their derivation from him: so "seed of Jacob" and (frequently) "house of Jacob (Israel)." But there are a few Old Testament passages outside of Ge in which so much of Jacob's history has been preserved, that from these allusions alone a fair notion might have been gathered concerning the Hebrews' tradition of their common ancestor, even if all the story in Ge had been lost. These passages are: Jos 24:3,4,32; Ps 105:10-23; Ho 12:2-4,12; Mal 1:2 f. Besides these, there are other allusions, scattered a word here and a sentence there, from all of which together we learn as follows. God gave to Isaac twin sons, Esau and Jacob, the latter at birth taking the former by the heel. God elected Jacob to be the recipient of the covenant-promise made to his father Isaac and to his grandfather Abraham; and this choice involved the rejection of Esau. Yahweh appeared to Jacob at Beth-el and told him the land of Canaan was to be his and his seed's after him forever. Circumstances not explained caused Jacob to flee from his home in Canaan to Aram, where he served as a shepherd to obtain a wife as his wage. He became the father of 12 sons. He strove with the angel of God and prevailed amid earnest supplication. His name was by Yahweh Himself changed to Israel. Under Divine protection as God's chosen one and representative, his life was that of a wanderer from place to place; once only he bought a piece of land, for a hundred pieces, near Shechem, from Hamor, the father of Shechem. A famine drove him down to Egypt, but not without providential preparation for the reception there of himself and all his family, through the remarkable fortunes of his son Joseph, sold, exiled, imprisoned, delivered, and exalted to a position where he could dispose of rulers and nations. In Egypt the children of Jacob multiplied rapidly, and at his death he made the sons of Joseph the heirs of the only portion of Canaanitish soil that he had acquired.

From this it appears, first, that not much that is essential in the biography of Jacob would have perished though Genesis had been lost; and, second, that the sum of the incidental allusions outside Ge resemble the total impression of the narratives in Genesis—in other words, that the Biblical tradition is self-consistent. And it runs back to a date (Hosea, 8th century BC) little farther removed from the events recounted than the length of time that separates our own day from the Norman conquest, or the Fall of Constantinople from the Hegira, or Jesus Christ from Solomon.

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament also there are, besides the references to Jacob simply as the father of his nation, several passages that recall events in his life or traits of his character. These are: Joh 4:5,6,12; Ac 7:12,14-16; Ro 9:10-13; Heb 11:9,20 f. In the conversation between Jesus and the Samaritan woman it appears that the Samaritans cherished the association of Jacob with the ground he bought near Shechem, and with the well he dug while sojourning there with his sons and his flocks; they prided themselves on its transmission to them through Joseph, not to the hated Jews through Judah, and magnified themselves in magnifying Jacob's "greatness" and calling him "our father." Stephen's speech, as Luke reports it, includes in its rapid historical flight a hint or two about Jacob beyond the bare fact of his place in the tribal genealogy. Moved by the famine prevailing in Egypt and Canaan, Jacob twice dispatches his sons to buy grain in Egypt, and the second time Joseph is made known to his brothers, and his race becomes

manifest to Pharaoh. At Joseph's behest, Jacob and all the family remove to Egypt. There all remain until their death, but the "fathers" (Joseph and his brethren; compare Jerome, Epistola cviii, edition Migne) are buried in the family possession near Shechem. (Here emerges one of those divergences from the Old Testament tradition that are a notable feature of Stephen's speech, and that have furnished occasion for much speculation upon their origin, value and implications. See commentaries on Acts.) Paul's interest in Jacob appears in connection with his discussion of Divine election, where he calls attention to the oracle of Ge 25:23 and to the use already made of the passage by Malachi (1:2 f), and reminds his readers that this choice of Jacob and rejection of Esau was made by God even before these twin sons of Isaac and Rebecca were born. Finally, the author of He, when charting the heroes of faith, focuses his glass for a moment upon Jacob: first, as sharing with Abraham and Isaac the promise of God and the life of unworldly, expectant faith (Heb 11:9); and second, as receiving from Isaac, and at his death transmitting to his grandsons, blessings that had value only for one who worships and believes a God with power over "things to come" (Heb 11:20 f).

VI. Modern Interpretations of Jacob.

For those who see in the patriarchal narratives anything—myth, legend, saga—rather than true biography, there is, of course, a different interpretation of the characters and events portrayed in the familiar Genesis-stories, and a different value placed upon the stories themselves.

Apart from the allegorizing treatment accorded them by Philo the Jew and early Christian writers of like mind (see specimen in ABRAHAM), these views belong to modern criticism. To critics who make Hebrew history begin with the settlement of Canaan by the nomad Israelites fresh from the desert, even the Mosaic age and the Egyptian residence are totally unhistorical—much more so these tales of a pre-Mosaic patriarchal age. Yet even those writers who admit the broad outlines of a residence of the tribes in Egypt, an exodus of some sort, and a founder of the nation named Moses, are for the most part skeptical of this cycle of family figures and fortunes in a remote age, with its nomads wandering between Mesopotamia and Canaan. and to and fro in Canaan, its circumstantial acquaintance with the names and relationships of each individual through those 4 long patriarchal generations, and its obvious foreshadowing of much that the later tribes were on this same soil to act out centuries later. This, we are told, is not history. Whatever else it may be, it is not a reliable account of such memorable events as compel their own immortality in the memories and through the written records of mankind.

1. Personification of the Hebrew Nation:

The commonest view held, collectively of the entire narrative, specifically of Jacob, is that which sees here the precipitate from a pure solution of the national character and fortunes. Wellhausen, e.g., says (Prolegomena(6), 316): "The material here is not mythical, but national; therefore clearer (namely, than in Ge 1-11) and in a certain sense historical. To be sure there is no historical knowledge to be gained here about the patriarchs, but only about the time in which the stories concerning them arose in the people of Israel; this later time with its inward and outward characteristics is here unintentionally projected into the gray antiquity and mirrored therein like a glorified phantasm ....(p. 318). Jacob is

more realistically drawn than the other two (Abraham and Isaac)." In section IV, 4, above, we observed that, while many of Jacob's personal qualities prefigured the qualities of the later Hebrew people, there were some others that did not at all fit this equation. Wellhausen himself remarks this, in regard to the contrast between warlike Israel and the peaceful ancestors they invented for themselves. In his attempt to account for this contrast, he can only urge that a nation condemned to eternal wars would naturally look back upon, as well as forward to, a golden age of peace. (An alternative explanation he states, only to reject.) He fails to observe that this plea does not in the least alter the fact—his plea is indeed but a restatement of the fact—that this phenomenon is absolutely at variance with his hypothesis of how these stories of Jacob and the rest came to be what they are (see Meyer, Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstamme, 250 ff).

2. God and Demi-God:

This general view, which when carried to its extreme implications (as by Steuernagel, Die Einwanderung der israelitischen Stamme in Kanaan, 1901) comes perilously near the reductio ad absurdum that is its own refutation, has been rejected by that whole group of critics, who, following Noldeke, see in Jacob, as in so many others of the patriarchs, an original deity (myth), first abased to the grade of a hero (heroic legend), and at last degraded to the level of a clown (tales of jest or marvel). Adherents of this trend of interpretation differ widely among themselves as to details, but Jacob is generally regarded as a Canaanitish deity, whose local shrine was at Shechem, Beth-el or Peniel, and whose cult was taken over by the Hebrews, their own object of worship being substituted for him, and the outstanding features of his personality being made over into a hero that Israel appropriated as their national ancestor, even to the extent of giving him the secondary name of Israel. Stade attempted a combination of this "mythical" view with the "national" view in the interest of his theory of primitive animism, by making the patriarch a "mythological figure revered as an eponymous hero." This theory, in any form, requires the assumption, which there is nothing to support, that Jacob (or Jacob-el) is a name originally belonging to a deity and framed to fit his supposed character. At first, then, it meant "'El deceives" or "'El recompenses" (so B. Luther, ZATW, 1901, 60 ff; compare also the same writer, as well as Meyer himself, in the latter's Israeliten, etc., 109 ff, 271 ff). Meyer proposes the monstrosity of a nominal sentence with the translation, "' He deceives' is 'El." Thus, the first element of the name Jacob came to be felt as the name itself (=" Jacob is God"), and it was launched upon its course of evolution into the human personage that Genesis knows. It suffices to say with regard to all this, that in addition to its being inherently improbable—not to say, unproved—it goes directly in the face of the archaeological evidence adduced under I, 1, above. The simple fact that Jacob(-el) was a personal name for men, of everyday occurrence in the 2nd-3rd millenniums BC, is quite enough to overthrow this whole hypothesis; for, as Luther himself remarks (op. cit., 65), the above evolution of the name is essential to the "mythical" theory: "when this alteration took place cannot be told; yet it has to be postulated, since otherwise it remains inexplicable, how personal names could arise out of these formations (like Jacob-el) by rejection of the 'El."

3. Character of Fiction:

The inadequacy of the two theories hitherto advanced to account for the facts of Genesis being thus

evident, Gunkel and others have explicitly rejected them and enunciated a third theory, which may be called the saga-theory. According to Gunkel, "to understand the persons of Genesis as nations is by no means a general key to their interpretation"; and, "against the whole assumption that the principal patriarchal figures are originally gods is this fact first and foremost, that the names Jacob and Abraham are shown by the Babylonian to be customary personal names, and furthermore that the tales about them cannot be understood at all as echoes of original myths." In place of these discredited views Gunkel (compare also Gressmann, ZATW, 1910, 1 ff) makes of Jacob simply a character in the stories (marvelous, humorous, pathetic and the like) current in ancient Israel, especially on the lips of the professional story-teller. Whereas much of the material in these stories came to the Hebrews from the Babylonians, Canaanites or Egyptians, Jacob himself is declared to have belonged to the old Hebrew saga, with its flavor of nomadic desert life and sheep-raising. "The original Jacob may be the sly shepherd Jacob, who fools the hunter Esau; another tale, of the deceit of a father-in-law by his son-in-law, was added to it—the more naturally because both are shepherds; a third cycle, about an old man that loves his youngest son, was transferred to this figure, and that youngest son received the name of Joseph at a time when Jacob was identified with Israel's assumed ancestor 'Israel.' Thus our result is, that the most important patriarchs are creations of fiction" (Schriften des Altes Testament, 5te Lieferung, 42).

It is so obvious that this new attitude toward the patriarchs lends itself to a more sympathetic criticism of the narrative of Genesis, that critics who adopt it are at pains to deny any intention on their part of rehabilitating Jacob and others as historical figures. "Saga," we are told, "is not capable of preserving through so many centuries a picture" of the real character or deeds of its heroes, even supposing that persons bearing these names once actually lived; and we are reminded of the contrast between the Etzel of saga and the Attila of history, the Dietrich of saga and the Theodoric of history. But as against this we need to note, first, that the long and involved course of development through which, ex hypothesi, these stories have passed before reaching their final stage (the Jahwist document (Jahwist), 9th century BC; Gunkel, op. cit., 8, 46) involves a very high antiquity for the earlier stages, and thus reduces to a narrow strip of time those "so many centuries" that are supposed to separate the actual Jacob from the Jacob of saga (compare ABRAHAM, vii, 4); and second, that the presuppositions as to the origin, nature and value of saga with which this school of criticism operates are, for the most part, only an elaborate statement of the undisputed major premise in a syllogism, of which the minor premise is: the Genesis-stories are saga. Against this last proposition, however, there lie many weighty considerations, that are by no means counterbalanced by those resemblances of a general sort which any student of comparative literature can easily discern (see also Baethgen, op. cit., 158).

James Oscar Boyd

JACOB (2)

(ya'aqobh; Iakob):

(1) The patriarch (see preceding article).

(2) The father of Joseph the husband of Mary (Mt 1:15,16).

(3) Patronymic denoting the Israelites (Isa 10:21; 14:1; Jer 10:16).

JACOB'S WELL

(pege tou Iakob):

1. Position of Well:

In Joh 4:3 ff we read that our Lord "left Judea, and departed again into Galilee. And he must needs pass through Samaria. So he cometh to a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph: and Jacob's well was there." When Jacob came to Shechem on his return from Paddanaram he encamped "before," i.e. East of the city, and bought the land on which he had spread his tent (Ge 33:18 f). This is doubtless the "portion" (Hebrew shekhem) spoken of in Ge 48:22; although there it is said to have been taken with sword and bow from the Amorites. Where the pass of Shechem opens to the East, near the northern edge of the valley, lies the traditional tomb of Joseph. On the other side of the vale, close to the base of Gerizim, is the well universally known as Bir Ya'qub, "the well of Jacob." The position meets perfectly the requirements of the narrative. The main road from the South splits a little to the East, one arm leading westward through the pass, the other going more directly to the North. It is probable that these paths follow pretty closely the ancient tracks; and both would be frequented in Jesus' day. Which of them He took we cannot tell; but, in any case, this well lay in the fork between them, and could be approached with equal ease from either.

See SYCHAR.

2. Why Dug:

In the chapter quoted, it is said that Jacob dug the well (Ge 48:12). The Old Testament says nothing of this. With the copious springs at 'Ain 'Askar and BalaTa, one might ask why a well should have been dug here at all. We must remember that in the East, very strict laws have always governed the use of water, especially when there were large herds to be considered. The purchase of land here may not have secured for Jacob such supplies as he required. There was danger of strife between rival herdsmen. The patriarch, therefore, may have dug the well in the interests of peace, and also to preserve his own independence.

3. Consensus of Tradition:

Jew, Samaritan, Moslem and Christian agree in associating this well with the patriarch Jacob. This creates a strong presumption in favor of the tradition: and there is no good reason to doubt its truth. Standing at the brink of the well, over-shadowed by the giant bulk of Gerizim, one feels how naturally it

would be spoken of as "this mountain."

4. Description:

For long the well was unprotected, opening among the ruins of a vaulted chamber some feet below the surface of the ground. Major Anderson describes it (Recovery of Jerusalem, 465) as having "a narrow opening, just wide enough to allow the body of a man to pass through with arms uplifted, and this narrow neck, which is about 4 ft. long, opens into the well itself, which is cylindrically shaped, and about 7 ft. 6 inches in diameter. The mouth and upper part of the well are built of masonry, and the well appears to have been sunk through a mixture of alluvial soil and limestone fragments, till a compact bed of mountain limestone was reached, having horizontal strata which could be easily worked; and the interior of the well presents the appearance of having been lined throughout with rough masonry." The depth was doubtless much greater in ancient times; but much rubbish has fallen into it, and now it is not more than 75 ft. deep. It is fed by no spring, nor is the water conducted to it along the surface, as to a cistern. Its supplies depend entirely upon rainfall and percolation. Possibly, therefore, the water may never have approached the brim. The woman says "the well is deep." Pege, "spring," does not, therefore, strictly apply to it, but rather "tank" or "reservoir," phrear, the word actually used in verses 11 f. The modern inhabitants of Nablus highly esteem the "light" water of the well as compared with the "heavy" or "hard" water of the neighboring springs. It usually lasts till about the end of May; then the well is dry till the return of the rain. Its contents, therefore, differ from the "living" water of the perennial spring.

From the narratives of the pilgrims we learn that at different times churches have been built over the well. The Moslems probably demolished the last of them after the overthrow of the Crusaders in 1187. A description of the ruins with drawings, as they were 30 years ago, is given in PEF, II, 174, etc. A stone found in 1881 may have been the original cover of the well. It measures 3 ft. 9 inches X 2 ft. 7 inches X 1 ft. 6 in. The aperture in the center is 13 in. in diameter; and in its sides are grooves worn by the ropes used in drawing up the water (PEFS, 1881, 212 ff).

5. Present Condition:

Some years ago the plot of ground containing the well was purchased by the authorities of the Greek church, and it has been surrounded by a wall. A chapel has been built over the well, and a large church building has also been erected beside it.

W. Ewing

JACOB, TESTAMENT OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

JACUBUS

ja-ku’-bus (Iakoubos; Codex Vaticanus reads Iarsouboos): In 1 Esdras 9:48 =" Akkub" in Ne 8:7, a Levite who helped in the exposition of the law.

JADA

ja’-da (yadha‘, "the knowing one"): Son of Onam and grandson of Jerahmeel by his wife Atarah (1Ch 2:26,28,32).

JADAU

ja’-do, ja-da’-u (yiddo, Kethibh; yadday, Qere the King James Version; but the Revised Version (British and American) IDDO): In Ezr 10:43, one of those who had married foreign wives. the Revised Version margin has "Jaddai" (=" Edos," 1 Esdras 9:35).

See IDDO.

JADDAI

jad’-i, jad’-a-i.

See IDDO; JADAU.

JADDUA

jad’-u-a, ja-du’-a (yaddua‘, "known"):

(1) One of the "chiefs of the people" who with Nehemiah sealed the covenant, thus signifying their voluntary acceptance of the law and their solemn promise to submit to its yoke (Ne 10:21 (Hebrew 22)).

(2) Son of Jonathan or Johanan, and great-grandson of Eliashib, the high priest in Nehemiah’s time (Ne 12:11,22). He is the last of the high priests mentioned in the Old Testament, and held office during the reign of Darius the Persian, i.e. Darius III Codomannus, the last king of Persia (336-332 BC), who was overthrown by Alexander the Great. It is doubtless to him that Josephus refers in his romantic account of Alexander’s entrance into Jerusalem (Ant., XI, viii, 4 f; vii, 2; viii, 7).

James Crichton

JADDUS

jad’-us (Codex Vaticanus, Iaddous; Codex Alexandrinus, Ioddous): the King James Version has

"Addus" = Barzillai (Ezr 2:61; Ne 7:63). Jaddus was removed from the office of the priesthood because he could not prove his right to it after the return to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:38). He is called Barzillai in the. Old Testament, because he married Augia, the daughter of Zorzelleus (Barzillai the Gileadite, in the Old Testament). Compare BARZILLAI.

JADON

ja'-don (yadhon, perhaps "he will judge" or "plead"): One who helped to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem in company with the men of Gibeon and of Mizpah (Ne 3:7). He is called the "Meronothite," and another Meronothite is referred to in 1Ch 27:30, but there is no mention of a place Meronoth. Jadon is the name given by Josephus (Ant., VIII, viii, 5; ix, 1) to "the man of God" from Judah who confronted Jeroboam as he burned incense at the altar in Bethel, and who was afterward deceived by the lie of the old prophet (1Ki 13). Josephus may probably have meant Iddo the seer, whose visions concerning Jeroboam (2Ch 9:29) led to his being identified in Jewish tradition with "the man of God", from Judah.

James Crichton

JAEL

ja'-el (ya'el, "a wild or mountain goat," as in Ps 104:18; Iael): The wife of Heber the Kenite and the slayer of Sisera (Jud 4:17-22; 5:2-31). Jael emerges from obscurity by this single deed, and by the kindest construction can hardly be said to have reached an enviable fame. The history of this event is clear. For years Jabin the king of Canaan had oppressed Israel. For twenty years the Israelites had been subject to him, and, in largest measure, the instrument of their subjugation had been Sisera, the king's general, the "man of the iron chariots." Deborah, a prophetess of Israel, by her passion for freedom, had roused the tribes of Israel to do battle against Sisera. They defeated him at "Taanach by the waters of Megiddo," but Sisera sought in flight to save himself. He came to the "oaks of the wanderers," where the tribe of Heber lived. Here he sought, and was probably invited, to take shelter in the tent of Jael (Jud 4:17-18). There are two accounts of the subsequent events—one a prose narrative (Jud 4:19-22), the other a poetic one, found in Deborah's song of triumph (Jud 5:24-27). The two accounts are as nearly in agreement as could be expected, considering their difference in form.

It is evident that the tribe of Heber was regarded by both parties to the struggle as being neutral. They were descendants of Jethro, and hence, had the confidence of the Israelites. Though they had suffered somewhat at the hands of the Canaanites they had made a formal contract of peace with Jabin. Naturally Sisera could turn to the tents of Heber in Kedesh-naphtali with some confidence. The current laws of hospitality gave an added element of safety. Whether Jael met Sisera and urged him to enter her tent and rest (Jud 4:18), or only invited him after his appeal for refuge, the fact remains that he was her guest, was in the sanctuary of her home, and protected by the laws of hospitality: She gave him milk to drink, a mantle for covering, and apparently acquiesced in his request that she should stand guard at the tent and deny his presence to any pursuers. When sleep came to the wearied fugitive she took a "tent-pin, and took a hammer in her hand, and went softly unto him, and smote the pin into his temples" (Jud 4:21),

and having murdered him, goes forth to meet Barak the Israelite general and claims the credit for her deed. Some critics suggest that Sisera was not asleep when murdered, and thus try to convert Jael's treachery into strategy. But to kill your guest while he is drinking the milk of hospitality is little less culpable than to murder him while asleep. There is no evidence that Sisera offered Jael any insult or violence, and but little probability that she acted under any spiritual or Divine suggestion. It is really impossible to justify Jael's act, though it is not impossible to understand it or properly to appreciate Deborah's approval of the act as found in Jud 5:24. The motive of Jael may have been a mixed one. She may have been a sympathizer with Israel and with the religion of Israel. But the narrative scarcely warrants the interpretation that she felt herself as one called to render "stern justice on an enemy of God" (Expositor's Bible). Jael was unquestionably prudential. Sisera was in flight and Barak in pursuit. Probably her sympathy was with Barak, but certainly reflection would show her that it would not be wisdom to permit Barak to find Sisera in her tent. She knew, too, that death would be Sisera's portion should he be captured—therefore she would kill him and thus cement a friendship with the conqueror.

As to Deborah's praise of Jael (Jud 5:24), there is no call to think that in her hour of triumph she was either capable of or intending to appraise the moral quality of Jael's deed. Her country's enemy was dead and that too at the hand of a woman. The woman who would kill Sisera must be the friend of Israel. Deborah had no question of the propriety of meting out death to a defeated persecutor. Her times were not such as to raise this question. The method of his death mattered little to her, for all the laws of peace were abrogated in the times of war. Therefore Jael was blessed among women by all who loved Israel. Whether Deborah thought her also to be worthy of the blessing of God we may not tell. At any rate there is no need for us to try to justify the treachery of Jael in order to explain the words of Deborah.

C. E. Schenk

JAGUR

ja'-gur (yaghur): An unidentified town on the Edomite frontier of Judah in the South (Jos 15:21).

JAH

ja.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

JAHATH

ja'-hath (yachath, perhaps for yachteh, yachatheh, "he (God) will snatch up"):

(1) Son of Reaiah, son of Shobal, a descendant of Judah, and father of Ahumai and Lahad, the families of the Zorathites (1Ch 4:2).

(2) A frequent name for a descendant of Levi:

(a) Son of Libni, son of Gershom, the eldest son of Levi (1Ch 6:20,43 (Hebrew 6:5,28), where "son of Libni" is omitted).

(b) Son of Shimei, son of Gershom (1Ch 23:10 f).

(c) One of the "sons" of Shelomoth, a descendant of Izhar, son of Kohath, the second son of Levi (1Ch 24:22).

(d) A descendant of Merari, the third son of Levi, and an overseer in the repairing of the temple in the reign of Josiah (2Ch 34:12).

James Crichton

JAHAZ

ja'-haz (yahats, Isa 16:4; Jer 48:34, yahatsah, or yahtsah, Nu 21:23; De 2:32; Jos 13:18; 21:36, the King James Version "Jahazah"; Jud 11:20; Jer 48:21; 1Ch 6:78, "Jahzah"): This is the place where in a great battle Israel overwhelmed Sihon king of the Amorites, and then took possession of all his territory (Nu 21:23, etc.). It is named along with Beth-baal-meon and Kedemoth (Jos 13:18), with Kedemoth (Jos 21:37) pointing to a position in the Southeast of the Amorite territory. It was given to Reuben by Moses, and was one of the cities in the portion of that tribe assigned to the Merarite Levites. Mesha (MS, ll. 18 if) says that the king of Israel dwelt in Jahaz when at war with him. Mesha drove him out, and the city passed into the hands of Moab. It is referred to as a city of Moab in Isa 15:4; Jer 48:21,34. Cheyne thinks that either Jahaz or Kedemoth must be represented today by the important ruins of Umm er-Recac, about 2 1/2 hours North of Dibon toward the desert (EB, under the word). No certain identification is possible.

W. Ewing

JAHAZIAH

ja-ha-zi'-a: the King James Version for JAHZEIAH (which see).

JAHAZIEL

ja-ha'-zi-el (yachazi'el, "God sees"):

(1) In 1Ch 12:4 (Hebrew 5), one of David's recruits at Ziklag, a Benjamite or maybe a Judean.

(2) In 1Ch 16:6, one of two priests appointed by David to sound trumpets before the ark on its journey to Jerusalem. The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, read "Uzziel."

(3) In 1Ch 23:19; 24:23, a Levite, "son" of Hebron, a Kohathite. Kittel, following the Septuagint, reads "Uzziel."

(4) In 2Ch 20:14, an Asaphite, son of Zechariah. He encouraged King Jehoshaphat of Judah and his subjects to fight against the Moabite and Ammonite invaders.

(5) In Ezr 8:5, an ancestor of one of the families of the Restoration. Read probably "of the sons of Zattu, Sheconiah the son of Jahaziel," following 1 Esdras 8:32 (= Jezelus).

David Francis Roberts

JAHDAI

ja'-da-i, ja'-di (yahday, "Yah leads" (?); Baer reads yehday): In 1Ch 2:47, where six sons of Jahdai are mentioned. "The name has been taken as that of another wife or concubine of Caleb; more probably Jahdai is a descendant of Caleb, whose name, in the original connection, has fallen from the text" (Curtis, Chronicles, 96).

JAHDIEL

ja'-di-el (yachdi'el, "God gives joy"): In 1Ch 5:24, head of a Manassite family.

JAHDO

ja'-do (yachdo, meaning uncertain; Kittel suggests yachday = Jahdai): In 1Ch 5:14, a Gileadite.

JAHLEEL

ja'-le-el (yachle'el, "wait for God!"): In Ge 46:14; Nu 26:26, a "son" (i.e. clan) of Zebulun.

JAHLEELITES, THE

ja'-le-el-its (hayachle'eli, coll. with article): In Nu 26:26, the descendants of the clan of Jahleel.

JAHMAI

ja'-ma-i, ja'-mi (yachmay, perhaps = yachmeyah, "may Yahweh protect!"): In 1Ch 7:2, head of a clan of

Issachar.

JAHWEH

ya’-we.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

JAHZAH

ja’-za.

See JAHAZ.

JAHZEEL AND JAHZIEL

ja’-ze-el (yachtse’el, "God divides," "apportions"): In Ge 46:24; Nu 26:48; and 23 manuscripts in 1Ch 7:13; (yachatsi’el, same meaning as above): 1Ch 7:13, a "son" (clan) of Naphtali.

JAHZEELITES, THE

ja’-ze-el-its (hayachtse’eli, coll. with article): In Nu 26:48, descendants of the clan of Jahzeel.

JAHZEIAH

ja-ze’-ya, ja’-ze-ya (yachzeyah, "Yah sees"): In Ezr 10:15, son of Tikvah, and a contemporary of Ezra. It is disputed whether he and Jonathan opposed or supported Ezra in the matter of prosecuting those who had married foreign wives = Ezekias, 1 Esdras 9:14, or Ezias.

See JONATHAN, 9.

Two translations of the Hebrew phrase (‘amadh ‘al-zo’th) are given:

(1) "stood over this matter," i.e. supported Ezra; so the King James Version ("were employed in this matter"), and so Septuagint, 1 Esdras 9:14, the Revised Version margin. This is supported by 9:4, "Let now our princes be appointed for all the assembly," where the same phrase is found.

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) "stood up against this matter," so BDB, Gesenius, Bertheau, Stade.

Both translations can be supported by parallels in Hebrew. The context is better suited by the former rendering.

David Francis Roberts

JAHZERAH

ja’-ze-ra, ja-ze’-ra (yachzerah, meaning unknown): In 1Ch 9:12, an ancestor of Maasai and apparently =" Ahzai" of Ne 11:13.

JAHZIEL

ja’-zi-el.

See JAHZEEL AND JAHZIEL.

JAILOR

jal’-er.

See PRISON.

JAIR

ja’-er:

(1) Jair (ya’ir, "he enlightens" or "one giving light"):

(a) Son, i.e. descendant of Manasseh (Nu 32:41; De 3:14; Jos 13:30; 1Ki 4:13; 1Ch 2:22 f). According to 1Ch 2:21 f he was the son of ScRub, son of Hezron, a descendant of Judah, who married the daughter of Machir, son of Manasseh. He was thus descended both from Judah and Manasseh. At the time of the conquest he distinguished himself by taking the tent-villages HAVVOTH-JAIR (which see). The accounts of his exploit are difficult to harmonize (see ICC on above passages). Some would identify him with the Jair of Jud 10:3, holding that Manasseh’s settlement in Northern Gilead and Bashan took place, not before Israel’s passage of the Jordan, but after the settlement of the tribe on the West. For a criticism of this view see HGHL, 577, note

(b) One of the judges. He is said to have had 30 sons, who rode on 30 ass colts, and who had as many cities, known as Havvoth-jair (Jud 10:3,4). One tradition identifies (a) and (b). Others reconcile the two narratives by interpreting the word "son" in a non-literal sense.

(c) The father of Mordecai (Es 2:5). In the Apocrypha (Additions to Esther 11:2) his name is given as "Jairus" (Iaeiros).

(2) Jair (Qere: ya‘ir, "he arouses"; Kethibh: ya‘ur; a different name from (1) above): The father of Elhanan, the giant-slayer (1Ch 20:5). In the parallel passage (2Sa 21:19) his name is given as "Jaare-oregim," but the text should be corrected to Jair, "oregim" (’oreghim) having crept in from the line below through a copyist’s error.

James Crichton

JAIRITE

ja’-er-it (ya’iri, "of Jair"): In 2Sa 20:26, Ira the Jairite is "chief minister unto David." He was a descendant of Jair who was a Manassite (Nu 32:41, etc.) and whose territory was in Gilead. Septuagint, Lucian, and Syriac suggest yattiri, "Jattirite," i.e. a native of Jattir mentioned in 1Sa 30:27 as one of the towns friendly to David when he was in Ziklag. It is not improbable that a native of Jattir would be given such a post by David.

See IRA, and compare 2Sa 23:38.

JAIRUS (1)

ja’-i-rus, ja-i’-rus (Iaeiros; 1 Esdras 5:31; Additions to Esther 11:2).

See AIRUS; JAIR.

JAIRUS (2)

ja’-i-rus, ja-i’-rus (Iaeiros): A ruler in a synagogue near Capernaum whose only daughter, aged about 12 years, was raised from the dead by Jesus (Mt 9:18-26; Mr 5:22-43; Lu 8:41-56). The accounts of the miracle are substantially the same, but vary in detail. According to Mark and Luke the arrival of Jairus in Capernaum fell immediately after the return of Jesus from Gadara, but according to Matthew the sequence of events was that Jesus had returned to Capernaum, had called Matthew, had joined the feast of the publicans, and had just finished His discourse on fasting when Jairus came to Him. Matthew and Mark both testify to the great faith of Jairus, who besought of Jesus that He should but lay His hand upon the maid and she should live. According to Matthew she was already dead when Jairus came to Capernaum; according to the others she was on the point of death; but all agree as to her death before the arrival of Jesus and His followers at her abode. Matthew implies that Jesus alone was present at the actual raising; Mark and Luke state that Peter, James, John and the parents were also there. The healing of the woman with the issue of blood by Jesus on the way is given by all.

C. M. Kerr

JAKAN

ja’-kan (ya‘aqan).

See JAAKAN.

JAKEH

ja’-ke (yaqeh, perhaps from Arabic root meaning "carefully religious"; yaqe’, as if from qi’): The father of Agur, the author of the sayings recorded in Pr 30:1. Nothing is known of either Jakeh or Agur. The immediate connection in the Hebrew text of ha-massa’," the prophecy" or "burden" (the King James Version "even the prophecy," the Revised Version (British and American) "the oracle") with ne’um, "oracle" (the King James Version "spake," the Revised Version (British and American) "saith") is quite exceptional, while the verse is unintelligible and the text, as the Septuagint shows, is evidently corrupt. The best emendation is that which changes ha-massa’," the prophecy," into ha-massa’i, "the Massaite," or into mimmassa’," of Massa" (Revised Version margin), Massa being the name of the country of an Ishmaelite tribe (compare Ge 25:14; 1Ch 1:30; Pr 31:1 the Revised Version margin).

See AGUR.

James Crichton

JAKIM

ja’-kim (yaqim, "he (God) lifteth Up"; compare ELIAKIM):

(1) A Benjamite, a son of Shimei (1Ch 8:19).

(2) A priest, the head of the 12th of the 24 courses into which the priests were divided (1Ch 24:12).

JALAM

ja’-lam (ya‘lam, according to BDB following Septuagint Ieglom, in Gen, from ‘alam, meaning "to conceal"; according to Gunkel, Gen3, 390, from ya‘el, "mountain-goat"; see HPN, 90, note 5; King James Version Jaalam): In Ge 36:5,14,18; 1Ch 1:35, a son of Esau, mentioned as the 2nd son by Oholibamah; probably an Edomite clan.

JALON

ja’-lon (yalon, meaning unknown): In 1Ch 4:17, a son of Ezrah, a Judahite.

JAMBRES

jam’-brez.

See JANNES AND JAMBRES.

JAMBRI

jam’-bri (hoi huioi Iambrein; 1 Macc 9:36-41): The sons of Jambri are said to have come out of Medeba (originally Med’ba), a city of the Moabites, and subsequently a possession of the Amorites, and to have carried off John, the brother of Jonathan, who succeeded Judas Maccabeus as leader of the Jews. The Israelites got possession of the place and assigned it to the tribe of Reuben. No mention is made elsewhere of the Jambri. In Josephus (Ant., XIII, i, 2) they are called "sons of Amaraeus."

JAMES

jamz (Iacobos): English form of Jacob, and the name of 3 New Testament men of note:

(1) The Son of Zebedee, one of the Twelve Apostles (ho tou Zebedaiou):

A) The Son of Zebedee:

I. In the New Testament.

1. Family Relations, etc.:

To the Synoptists alone are we indebted for any account of this James. He was the son of Zebedee and the brother of John (Mt 4:21; Mr 1:19; Lu 5:10). As the Synoptists generally place the name of James before that of John, and allude to the latter as "the brother of James," it is inferred that James was the elder of the two brothers. His mother’s name was probably Salome, the sister of the mother of Jesus (compare Mt 27:56; Mr 15:40; Joh 19:25), but this is disputed by some (compare BRETHREN OF THE LORD). James was a fisherman by trade, and worked along with his father and brother (Mt 4:21). According to Lk, these were partners with Simon (5:10), and this is also implied in Mr (1:19). As they owned several boats and employed hired servants (Lu 5:11; Mr 1:20), the establishment they possessed must have been considerable.

2. First Call:

The call to James to follow Christ (Mt 4:18-22; Mr 1:16-20; Lu 5:1-11) was given by Jesus as He was

walking by the sea of Galilee (Mt 4:18). There He saw "James the son of Zebedee, and John his brother, in the boat with Zebedee their father, mending their nets; and he called them. And they straightway left the boat and their father, and followed him" (Mt 4:21,22). The account of Luke varies in part from those of Matthew and Mark, and contains the additional detail of the miraculous draught of fishes, at which James and John also were amazed. This version of Luke is regarded by some as an amalgamation of the earlier accounts with Joh 21:1-8.

3. Probation and Ordination:

As the above incident took place after the imprisonment of John the Baptist, when Jesus had departed into Galilee (Mt 4:12; Mr 1:14), and as there is no mention of James among those who received the preliminary call recorded by John (compare Joh 1:35-51; 3:24, and compare ANDREW), it is probable that while Peter and Andrew made the pilgrimage to Bethany, James and the other partners remained in Galilee to carry on the business of their trade. Yet, on the return of Peter and Andrew, the inquiries of James must have been eager concerning what they had seen and heard. His mind and imagination became filled with their glowing accounts of the newly found "Lamb of God" (Joh 1:36) and of the preaching of John the Baptist, until he inwardly dedicated his life to Jesus and only awaited an opportunity to declare his allegiance openly. By this is the apparently abrupt nature of the call, as recorded by the Synoptists, to be explained. After a period of companionship and probationership with his Master, when he is mentioned as being present at the healing of Simon’s wife’s mother at Capernaum (Mr 1:29-31), he was ordained one of the Twelve Apostles (Mt 10:2; Mr 3:17; Lu 6:14; Ac 1:13).

4. Apostleship:

From this time onward he occupied a prominent place among the apostles, and, along with Peter and John, became the special confidant of Jesus. These three alone of the apostles were present at the raising of Jairus’ daughter (Mr 5:37; Lu 8:51), at the Transfiguration (Mr 17:1-8; Mr 9:2-8; Lu 9:28-36), and at the Agony in the Garden of Gethsemane (Mt 26:36-46; Mr 14:32-42). Shortly after the Transfiguration, when Jesus, having "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem" (Lu 9:51), was passing through Samaria, the ire of James and John was kindled by the ill reception accorded to Him by the populace (Lu 9:53). They therefore asked of Jesus, "Lord, wilt thou that we bid fire to come down from heaven, and consume them?" (Lu 9:54). "But he turned, and rebuked them" (Lu 9:55). It was probably this hotheaded impetuosity and fanaticism that won for them the surname "Boanerges, which is, Sons of thunder," bestowed on them when they were ordained to the Twelve (Mr 3:17). Yet upon this last occasion, there was some excuse for their action. The impression left by the Transfiguration was still deep upon them, and they felt strongly that their Lord, whom they had lately beheld "in his glory" with "countenance altered" and "glistering raiment," should be subjected to such indignities by the Samaritans. Upon the occasion of Jesus’ last journey to Jerusalem (Mr 10:32), the two brothers gave expression to this presumptuous impetuosity in a more selfish manner (Mr 10:35-45). Presuming on their intimacy with Jesus, they made the request of him, "Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand, in thy glory" (Mr 10:37). In the account of Matthew (20:20-28), the words are put in the

mouth of their mother. The request drew forth the rebuke of Jesus (Mr 10:38), and moved the ten with indignation (Mr 10:40); but by the words of their Lord peace was again restored (Mr 10:42-45). After the arrival of Jesus in Jerusalem, when He "sat on the mount of Olives over against the temple," James was one of the four who put the question to Him concerning the last things (Mr 13:3,1). He was also present when the risen Jesus appeared for the 3rd time to the disciples and the miraculous draught of fishes was made at the sea of Tiberias (Joh 21:1-14).

5. Death:

James was the first martyr among the apostles, being slain by King Herod Agrippa I about 44 AD, shortly before Herod's own death. The vehemence and fanaticism which were characteristic of James had made him to be feared and hated among the Jewish enemies of the Christians, and therefore when "Herod the king put forth his hands to afflict certain of the church .... he killed James the brother of John with the sword" (Ac 12:1,2). Thus did James fulfill the prophecy of our Lord that he too should drink of the cup of his Master (Mr 10:39).

II. In Apocryphal Literature.

According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 49), "Zebedee was of the house of Levi, and his wife of the house of Judah. Now, because the father of James loved him greatly he counted him among the family of his father Levi, and similarly because the mother of John loved him greatly, she counted him among the family of her father Judah. And they were surnamed 'Children of Thunder,' for they were of both the priestly house and of the royal house." The Ac of John, a heretical work of the 2nd century, referred to by Clement of Alexandria in his Hypotyposis and also by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25), gives an account of the call of James and his presence at the Transfiguration, similar in part to that of the Gospels, but giving fantastic details concerning the supernatural nature of Christ's body, and how its appearances brought confusion to James and other disciples (compare Itennecke, Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 423-59). The Ac of James in India (compare Budge, II, 295-303) tells of the missionary journey of James and Peter to India, of the appearance of Christ to them in the form of a beautiful young man, of their healing a blind man, and of their imprisonment, miraculous release, and their conversion of the people. According to the Martyrdom of James (Budge, II, 304-8), James preached to the 12 tribes scattered abroad, and persuaded them to give their first-fruits to the church instead of to Herod. The accounts of his trial and death are similar to that in Ac 12:1-2.

(1) James is the patron saint of Spain. The legend of his preaching there, of his death in Judea, of the transportation of his body under the guidance of angels to Iria and of the part that his miraculous appearances played in the history of Spain, is given in Mrs. Jameson's Sacred and Legendary Art, I, 230-41.

(2) James the son of Alpheus (ho tou Alphaiou; for etymology, etc., of James, see above): One of the Twelve Apostles (Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13). By Matthew and Mark he is coupled with

Thaddaeus, and by Luke and Ac with Simon Zelotes. As Matthew or Levi is also called the son of Alpheus (compare Mt 9:9; Mr 2:14), it is possible that he and James were brothers. According to the Genealogies of the Apostles (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50), James was of the house of Gad. The Martyrdom of James, the son of Alpheus (compare Budge, ib, 264-66) records that James was stoned by the Jews for preaching Christ, and was "buried by the Sanctuary In Jerusalem."

This James is generally identified with James the Little or the Less, the brother of Joses and son of Mary (Mt 27:56; Mr 15:40). In Joh 19:25 this Mary is called the wife of Cleophas (the King James Version) or Clopas (Revised Version), who is thus in turn identified with Alpheus. There is evidence in apocryphal literature of a Simon, a son of Clopas, who was also one of the disciples (compare NATHANAEL). If this be the same as Simon Zelotes, it would explain why he and James (i.e. as being brothers) were coupled together in the apostolic lists of Luke and Acts. Some have applied the phrase "his mother’s sister" in Joh 19:25 to Mary the wife of Clopas, instead of to a separate person, and have thus attempted to identify James the son of Alpheus with James the brother of our Lord. For a further discussion of the problem, see BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

(3) James, "the Lord’s brother" (ho adelphos tou Kuriou):he Less, the brother of Joses and son of Mary (Mt 27:56; Mr 15:40). In Joh 19:25 this Mary is called the wife of Cleophas (the King James Version) or Clopas (Revised Version), who is thus in turn identified with Alpheus. There is evidence in apocryphal literature of a Simon, a son of Clopas, who was also one of the disciples (compare NATHANAEL). If this be the same as Simon Zelotes, it would explain why he and James (i.e. as being brothers) were coupled together in the apostolic lists of Luke and Acts. Some have applied the phrase "his mother’s sister" in Joh 19:25 to Mary the wife of Clopas, instead of to a separate person, and have thus attempted to identify James the son of Alpheus with James the brother of our Lord. For a further discussion of the problem, see BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

B) James, "The Lord’s Brother":

I. New Testament References.

1. In the Gospels:

This James is mentioned by name only twice in the Gospels, i.e. when, on the visit of Jesus to Nazareth, the countrymen of our Lord referred in contemptuous terms to His earthly kindred, in order to disparage His preaching (Mt 13:55; Mr 6:3). As James was one of "his brethren," he was probably among the group of Christ’s relatives who sought to interview Him during His tour through Galilee with the Twelve (Mt 12:46). By the same reasoning, he accompanied Jesus on His journey to Capernaum (Joh 2:12), and joined in attempting to persuade Him to depart from Galilee for Judea on the eve of the Feast of Tabernacles (Joh 7:3). At this feast James was present (Joh 7:10), but was at this time a non-believer in Jesus (compare Joh 7:5, "Even his brethren did not believe on him").

2. In the Epistles:

Yet the seeds of conversion were being sown within him, for, after the crucifixion, he remained in Jerusalem with his mother and brethren, and formed one of that earliest band of believers who "with one accord continued stedfastly in prayer" (Ac 1:14). While there, he probably took part in the election of Matthias to the vacant apostleship (Ac 1:15-25). James was one of the earliest witnesses to the resurrection, for, after the risen Lord had manifested Himself to the five hundred, "he was seen of James" (1Co 15:7 the King James Version). By this his growing belief and prayerful expectancy received confirmation. About 37 or 38 AD, James, "the Lord's brother" (Ga 1:19), was still in Jerusalem, and had an interview there for the first time with Paul, when the latter returned from his 3 years' sojourn in Damascus to visit Cephas, or Peter (Ga 1:18,19; compare Ac 9:26). In several other passages the name of James is coupled with that of Peter. Thus, when Peter escaped from prison (about 44 AD), he gave instructions to those in the house of John Mark that they should immediately inform "James and the brethren" of the manner of his escape (Ac 12:17). By the time of the Jerusalem convention, i.e. about 51 AD (compare Ga 2:1), James had reached the position of first overseer in the church (compare Ac 15:13,19). Previous to this date, during Paul's ministry at Antioch, he had dispatched certain men thither to further the mission, and the teaching of these had caused dissension among the newly converted Christians and their leaders (Ac 15:1,2; Ga 2:12). The conduct of Peter, over whom James seems to have had considerable influence, was the principal matter of contention (compare Ga 2:11 if). However, at the Jerusalem convention the dispute was amicably settled, and the pillars of the church, James, John and Cephas, gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship (Ga 2:9). The speech of James on this occasion (Ac 15:13-29), his sympathy with the religious needs of the Gentileworld (Ac 15:17), his desire that formalism should raise no barrier to their moral and spiritual advancement (Ac 15:19,20,28,29), and his large-hearted tributes to the "beloved Barnabas and Paul" (Ac 15:25,26), indicate that James was a leader in whom the church was blessed, a leader who loved peace more than faction, the spirit more than the law, and who perceived that religious communities with different forms of observance might still live and work together in common allegiance to Christ. Once more (58 AD), James was head of the council at Jerusalem when Paul made report of his labors, this time of his 3rd missionary Journey (Ac 21:17). At this meeting Paul was admonished for exceeding the orders he had received at the first council, in that he had endeavored to persuade the converted Jews also to neglect circumcision (Ac 21:21), and was commanded to join in the vow of purification (Ac 21:23-26). There is no Scriptural account of the death of James From 1Co 9:5 it has been inferred that he was married. This is, however, only a conjecture, as the passage refers to those who "lead about a sister, a wife" (the King James Version), while, so far as we know, James remained throughout his life in Jerusalem.

This James has been regarded as the author of the Epistle of James, "a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ"; compare JAMES, EPISTLE OF. Also, for details concerning his relationship to Christ, compare BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

II. References in Apocryphal Literature.

James figures in one of the miraculous events recorded in the Gnostic "Gospel of the Infancy, by Thomas the Israelite philosopher," being cured of a snake-bite by the infant Jesus (compare Hennecke,

Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 73). According to the Gospel of the Hebrews (compare ib, 11-21), James had also partaken of the cup of the Lord, and refused to eat till he had seen the risen Lord. Christ acknowledged this tribute by appearing to James first. In the Ac of Peter (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 475), it is stated that "three days after the ascension of our Lord into heaven, James, whom our Lord called his ‘brother in the flesh,’ consecrated the Offering and we all drew nigh to partake thereof: and when ten days had passed after the ascension of our Lord, we all assembled in the holy fortress of Zion, and we stood up to say the prayer of sanctification, and we made supplication unto God and besought Him with humility, and James also entreated Him concerning the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Offering." The Preaching of James the Just (compare Budge, II, 78-81) tells of the appointment of James to the bishopric of Jerusalem, of his preaching, healing of the sick and casting out of devils there. This is confirmed by the evidence of Clement of Alexandria (Euseb., HE, II, 1). In the Martyrdom of James the Just (compare Budge, II, 82-89), it is stated that J., "the youngest of the sons of Joseph," alienated, by his preaching, Piobsata from her husband Ananus, the governor of Jerusalem. Ananus therefore inflamed the Jews against James, and they hurled him down from off the pinnacle of the temple. Hegesippus, quoted by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 23), and Josephus (Ant., XX, ix, 1), testify to the general truth of this. It is thus probable that James was martyred about 62 or 63 AD.

Besides the epistle which bears his name, James was also the reputed author of the Protevangelium Jacobi, a work which originated in the 2nd century and received later additions (compare Henn, NA, 47-63; also JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY).

C. M. Kerr

JAMES, EPISTLE OF

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE

1. Jewish

2. Authoritative

3. Practical

II. AUTHOR OF THE EPISTLE

III. STYLE OF THE EPISTLE

1. Plainness

2. Good Greek

3. Vividness

4. Duadiplosis

5. Figures of Speech

6. Unlikeness to Paul

7. Likeness to Jesus

IV. DATE OF THE EPISTLE

V. HISTORY OF THE EPISTLE

VI. MESSAGE OF THE EPISTLE TO OUR TIMES

1. To the Pietist

2. To the Sociologist

3. To the Student of the Life and Character of Jesus

LITERATURE

I. Characteristics of the Epistle.

1. Jewish:

The Epistle of James is the most Jewish writing in the New Testament. The Gospel according to Matthew was written for the Jews. The Epistle to the Hebrews is addressed explicitly to them. The Apocalypse is full of the spirit of the Old Testament. The Epistle of Jude is Jewish too. Yet all of these books have more of the distinctively Christian element in them than we can find in the Epistle of James. If we eliminate two or three passages containing references to Christ, the whole epistle might find its place iust as properly in the Canon of the Old Testament as in that of the New Testament, as far as its substance of doctrine and contents is concerned. That could not be said Of any other book in the New Testament. There is no mention of the incarnation or of the resurrection., the two fundamental facts of the Christian faith. The word "gospel" does not occur in the epistle There is no suggestion that the Messiah has appeared and no presentation of the possibility of redemption through Him. The teaching throughout is that of a lofty morality which aims at the fulfillment of the requirements of the Mosaic law. It is not strange therefore that Spitta and others have thought that we have in the Epistle of James a treatise written by an unconverted Jew which has been adapted to Christian use by the interpolation of

the two phrases containing the name of Christ in 1:1 and 2:1. Spitta thinks that this can be the only explanation of the fact that we have here an epistle practically ignoring the life and work of Jesus and every distinctively Christian doctrine, and without a trace of any of the great controversies in the early Christian church or any of the specific features of its propaganda. This judgment is a superficial one, and rests upon superficial indications rather than any appreciation of the underlying spirit and principles of the book. The spirit of Christ is here, and there is no need to label it. The principles of this epistle are the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. There are more parallels to that Sermon in this epistle than can be found anywhere else in the New Testament in the same space. The epistle represents the idealization of Jewish legalism under the transforming influence of the Christian motive and life. It is not a theological discussion. It is an ethical appeal. It has to do with the outward life for the most part, and the life it pictures is that of a Jew informed with the spirit of Christ. The spirit is invisible in the epistle as in the individual man. It is the body which appears and the outward life with which that body has to do. The body of the epistle is Jewish, and the outward life to which it exhorts is that of a profoundly pious Jew. The Jews familiar with the Old Testament would read this epistle and find its language and tone that to which they were accustomed in their sacred books. James is evidently written by a Jew for Jews. It is Jewish in character throughout. This is apparent in the following particulars:

(1) The epistle is addressed to the 12 tribes which are of the Dispersion (11). The Jews were scattered abroad through the ancient world. From Babylon to Rome, wherever any community of them might be gathered for commercial or social purposes, these exhortations could be carried and read. Probably the epistle was circulated most widely in Syria and Asia Minor, but it may have gone out to the ends of the earth. Here and there in the ghettos of the Roman Empire, groups of the Jewish exiles would gather and listen while one of their number read this letter from home. All of its terms and its allusions would recall familiar home scenes.

(2) Their meeting-place is called "your synagogue" (2:2).

(3) Abraham is mentioned as "our father" (2:21).

(4) God is given the Old Testament name, "the Lord of Sabaoth" (5:4).

(5) The law is not to be spoken against nor judged, but reverently and loyally obeyed. It is a royal law to which every loyal Jew will be subject. It is a law of liberty, to be freely obeyed (2:8-12; 4:11).

(6) The sins of the flesh are not inveighed against in the epistle, but those sins to which the Jews were more conspicuously liable, such as the love of money and the distinction which money may bring (2:2-4), worldliness and pride (4:4-6), impatience and murmuring (5:7-11), and other sins of the temper and tongue (3:1-12; 4:11,12).

(7) The illustrations of faithfulness and patience and prayer are found in Old Testament characters, in Abraham (2:21), Rahab (2:25), Job (Jas 5:11), and Elijah (Jas 5:17,18). The whole atmosphere of the epistle is Jewish.

2. Authoritative:

The writer of this epistle speaks as one having authority. He is not on his defense, as Paul so often is. There is no trace of apology in his presentation of the truth. His official position must have been recognized and unquestioned. He is as sure of his standing with his readers as he is of the absoluteness of his message.

No Old Testament lawgiver or prophet was more certain that he spoke the word of the Lord. He has the vehemence of Elijah and the assured meekness of Moses. He has been called "the Amos of the New Testament," and there are paragraphs which recall the very expressions used by Amos and which are full of the same fiery eloquence and prophetic fervor. Both fill their writings with metaphors drawn from the sky and the sea, from natural objects and domestic experiences. Both seem to be countrybred and to be in sympathy with simplicity and poverty. Both inveigh against the luxury and the cruelty of the idle rich, and both abhor the ceremonial and the ritual which are substituted for individual righteousness. Malachi was not the last of the prophets. John the Baptist was not the last prophet of the Old Dispensation. The writer of this epistle stands at the end of that prophetic line, and he is greater than John the Baptist or any who have preceded him because he stands within the borders of the kingdom of Christ. He speaks with authority, as a messenger of God. He belongs to the goodly fellowship of the prophets and of the apostles. He has the authority of both. There are 54 imperatives in the 108 verses of this epistle.

3. Practical:

The epistle is interested in conduct more than in creed. It has very little formulated theology, less than any other epistle in the New Testament; but it insists upon practical morality throughout. It begins and it closes with an exhortation to patience and prayer. It preaches a gospel of good works, based upon love to God and love to man. It demands liberty, equality, fraternity for all. It enjoins humility and justice and peace. It prescribes singleness of purpose and stedfastness of soul. It requires obedience to the law, control of the passions, and control of the tongue. Its ideal is to be found in a good life, characterized by the meekness of wisdom. The writer of the epistle has caught the spirit of the ancient prophets, but the lessons that he teaches are taken, for the most part, from the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. His direct quotations are from the Pentateuch and the Book of Proverbs; but it has been estimated that there are 10 allusions to the Book of Proverbs, 6 to the Book of Job, 5 to the Book of Wisdom, and 15 to the Book of Ecclesiasticus. This Wisdom literature furnishes the staple of his meditation and the substance of his teaching. He has little or nothing to say about the great doctrines of the Christian church.

He has much to say about the wisdom that cometh down from above and is pure, peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, without hypocrisy (Jas 3:15-17). The whole epistle shows that the author had stored his mind with the rich treasure of the ancient wisdom, and his material, while offered as his own, is both old and new. The form is largely that of the Wisdom literature of the Jews. It has more parallels with Jesus the son of Sirach than with any writer of the sacred books.

The substance of its exhortation, however, is to be found in the Synoptics and more particularly in the Sermon on the Mount. Its wisdom is the wisdom of Jesus the son of Joseph, who is the Christ.

These are the three outstanding characteristics of this epistle In form and on the surface it is the most Jewish and least Christian of the writings in the New Testament. Its Christianity is latent and not apparent. Yet it is the most authoritative in its tone of any of the epistles in the New Testament, unless it be those of the apostle John. John must have occupied a position of undisputed primacy in the Christian church after the death of all the other apostles, when he wrote his epistles. It is noteworthy that the writer of this epistle assumes a tone of like authority with that of John. John was the apostle of love, Paul of faith, and Peter of hope. This writer is the apostle of good works, the apostle of the wisdom which manifests itself in peace and purity, mercy and morality, and in obedience to the royal law, the law of liberty. In its union of Jewish form, authoritative tone, and insistence upon practical morality, the epistle is unique among the New Testament books.

II. Author of the Epistle.

The address of the epistle states that the writer is "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ" (Jas 1:1). The tradition of the church has identified this James with the brother of our Lord. Clement of Alexandria says that Peter and James and John, who were the three apostles most honored of the Lord, chose James, the Lord’s brother, to be the bishop of Jerusalem after the Lord’s ascension (Euscb., HE, II, 1). This tradition agrees well with all the notices of James in the New Testament books. After the death of James the brother of John, Peter was thrown into prison, and having been miraculously released, he asked that the news be sent to James and to the brethren (Ac 12:17). This James is evidently in authority in the church at this time. In the apostolical conference held at Jerusalem, after Peter and Paul and Barnabas had spoken, this same James sums up the whole discussion, and his decision is adopted by the assembly and formulated in a letter which has some very striking parallels in its phraseology to this epistle (Ac 15:6-29). When Paul came to Jerusalem for the last time he reported his work to James and all the elders present with him (Ac 21:18). In the Epistle to the Galatians Paul says that at the time of one of his visits to Jerusalem he saw none of the apostles save Peter and James the Lord’s brother (Ga 1:18,19). At another visit he received the right hand of fellowship from James and Cephas and John (Ga 2:9). At a later time certain who came from James to Antioch led Peter into backsliding from his former position of tolerance of the Gentiles as equals in the Christian church (Ga 2:12).

All of these references would lead us to suppose that James stood in a position of supreme authority in the mother-church at Jerusalem, the oldest church of Christendom. He presides in the assemblies of the church. He speaks the final and authoritative word. Peter and Paul defer to him. Paul mentions his name before that of Peter and John. When he was exalted to this leadership we do not know, but all indications seem to point to the fact that at a very early period James was the recognized executive authority in the church at Jerusalem, which was the church of Pentecost and the church of the apostles. All Jews looked to Jerusalem as the chief seat of their worship and the central authority of their religion. All Christian Jews would look to Jerusalem as the primitive source of their organization and faith, and the head of the

church at Jerusalem would be recognized by them as their chief authority. The authoritative tone of this epistle comports well with this position of primacy ascribed to James.

All tradition agrees in describing James as a Hebrew of the Hebrews, a man of the most rigid and ascetic morality, faithful in his observance of all the ritual regulations of the Jewish faith. Hegesippus tells us that he was holy from his mother's womb. He drank no wine nor strong drink. He ate no flesh. He alone was permitted to enter with the priests into the holy place, and he was found there frequently upon his knees begging forgiveness for the people, and his knees became hard like those of a camel in consequence of his constantly bending them in his worship of God and asking forgiveness for the people (Euseb., HE, II, 23). He was called James the Just. All had confidence in his sincerity and integrity, and many were persuaded by him to believe on the Christ. This Jew, faithful in the observance of all that the Jews held sacred, and more devoted to the temple-worship than the most pious among them, was a good choice for the head of the Christian church. The blood of David flowed in his veins. He had all the Jew's pride in the special privileges of the chosen race. The Jews respected him and the Christians revered him. No man among them commanded the esteem of the entire population as much as he.

Josephus (Ant., XX, ix) tells us that Ananus the high priest had James stoned to death, and that the most equitable of the citizens immediately rose in revolt against such a lawless procedure, and Ananus was deposed after only three months' rule. This testimony of Josephus simply substantiates all that we know from other sources concerning the high standing of James in the whole community. Hegesippus says that James was first thrown from a pinnacle of the temple, and then they stoned him because he was not killed by the fall, and he was finally beaten over the head with a fuller's club; and then he adds significantly, "Immediately Vespasian besieged them" (Euscb., HE, II, 23). There would seem to have been quite a widespread conviction among both the Christians and the Jews that the afflictions which fell upon the holy city and the chosen people in the following years were in part a visitation because of the great crime of the murder of this just man. We can understand how a man with this reputation and character would write an epistle so Jewish in form and substance and so insistent in its demands for a practical morality as is the Epistle of James. All the characteristics of the epistle seem explicable on the supposition of authorship by James the brother of the Lord. We accept the church tradition without hesitation.

III. The Style of the Epistle.

1. Plainness:

The sentence construction is simple and straightforward. It reminds us of the English of Bunyan and DeFoe. There is usually no good reason for misunderstanding anything James says. He puts his truth plainly, and the words he uses have no hidden or mystical meanings. His thought is transparent as his life.

2. Good Greek:

It is somewhat surprising to find that the Greek of the Epistle of James is better than that of the other New Testament writers, with the single exception of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Of course this may be due to the fact that James had the services of an amanuensis who was a Greek scholar, or that his own manuscript was revised by such a man; but, although unexpected, it is not impossible that James himself may have been capable of writing such Greek as this.

It is not the good Greek of the classics, and it is not the poor and provincial Greek of Paul. There is more care for literary form than in the uncouth periods Of the Gentile apostle, and the vocabulary would seem to indicate an acquaintance with the literary as well as the commercial and the conversational Greek "Galilee was studded with Greek towns, and it was certainly in the power of any Galilean to gain a knowledge of Greek .... We may reasonably suppose that our author would not have scrupled to avail himself of the opportunities within his reach, so as to master the Greek language, and learn something of Greek philosophy. This would be natural, even if we think of James as impelled only by a desire to gain wisdom and knowledge for himself; but if we think of him also as the principal teacher of the Jewish believers, many of whom were Hellenists, instructed in the wisdom of Alexandria, then the natural bent would take the shape of duty: he would be a student of Greek in order that he might be a more effective instructor to his own people" (Mayor, The Epistle of James, ccxxxvi). The Greek of the epistle is the studied Greek of one who was not a native to it, but who had familiarized himself with its literature. James could have done so and the epistle may be proof that he did.

3. Vividness:

James is never content to talk in abstractions. He always sets a picture before his own eyes and those of his readers. He has the dramatic instinct. He has the secret of sustained interest. He is not discussing things in general but things in particular. He is an artist and believes in concrete realities. At the same time he has a touch of poetry in him, and a fine sense of the analogies running through all Nature and all life. The doubting man is like the sea spume (1:6). The rich man fades away in his goings, even as the beauty of the flower falls and perishes (1:11). The synagogue scene with its distinction between the rich and the poor is set before us with the clear-cut impressiveness of a cameo (2:1-4). The Pecksniffian philanthropist, who seems to think that men can be fed not by bread alone but by the words that proceed magnificently from his mouth, is pilloried here for all time (2:15,16). The untamable tongue that is set on fire of hell is put in the full blaze of its world of iniquity, and the damage it does is shown to be like that of a forest fire (3:1-12). The picture of the wisdom that comes from above with its sevenfold excellences of purity, peaceableness, gentleness, mercy, fruitfulness, impartiality, sincerity, is worthy to hang in the gallery of the world’s masterpieces (3:17). The vaunting tradesmen, whose lives are like vanishing vapor, stand there before the eyes of all in Jerusalem (4:13-16). The rich, whose luxuries he describes even while he denounces their cruelties and prophesies their coming day of slaughter, are the rich who walk the streets of his own city (5:1-6). His short sentences go like shots straight to the mark. We feel the impact and the impress of them. There is an energy behind them and a reality in them that makes them live in our thought. His abrupt questions are like the quick interrogations of a cross-examining lawyer (2:4-7,14,16; 3:11,12; 4:1,4,5,12,14). His proverbs have the intensity of the accumulated and compressed wisdom of the ages. They are irreducible minimums. They are memorable sayings, treasured in the speech of the world ever since his day.

4. Duadiplosis:

Sometimes James adds sentence to sentence with the repetition of some leading word or phrase (1:1-6,19-24; 3:2-8). It is the painful style of one who is not altogether at home with the language which he has chosen as the vehicle of his thought. It is the method by which a discussion could be continued indefinitely. Nothing but the vividness of the imagery and the intensity of the thought saves James from fatal monotony in the use of this device.

5. Figures of Speech:

James has a keen eye for illustrations. He is not blind to the beauties and wonders of Nature. He sees what is happening on every hand, and he is quick to catch any homiletical suggestion it may hold. Does he stand by the seashore? The surge that is driven by the wind and tossed reminds him of the man who is unstable in all his ways, because he has no anchorage of faith, and his convictions are like driftwood on a sea of doubt (1:6). Then he notices that the great ships are turned about by a small rudder, and he thinks how the tongue is a small member, but it accomplishes great things (3:4,5). Does he walk under the sunlight and rejoice in it as the source of so many good and perfect gifts? He sees in it an image of the goodness of God that is never eclipsed and never exhausted, unvarying for evermore (1:17). He uses the natural phenomena of the land in which he lives to make his meaning plain at every turn: the flower of the field that passes away (1:10,11), the forest fire that sweeps the mountain side and like a living torch lights up the whole land (3:5), the sweet and salt springs (3:11), the fig trees and the olive trees and the vines (3:12), the seed-sowing and the fruit-bearing (3:18), the morning mist immediately lost to view (4:14), the early and the latter rain for which the husbandman waiteth patiently (5:7).

There is more of the appreciation of Nature in this one short epistle of Jas than in all the epistles of Paul put together. Human life was more interesting to Paul than natural scenery. However, James is interested in human life just as profoundly as Paul. He is constantly endowing inanimate things with living qualities. He represents sin as a harlot, conceiving and bringing forth death (1:15). The word of truth has a like power and conceives and brings forth those who live to God’s praise (1:18). Pleasures are like joyful hosts of enemies in a tournament, who deck themselves bravely and ride forth with singing and laughter, but whose mission is to wage war and to kill (4:1,2). The laborers may be dumb in the presence of the rich because of their dependence and their fear, but their wages, fraudulently withheld, have a tongue, and cry out to high heaven for vengeance (5:4). What is friendship with the world? It is adultery, James says (4:4). The rust of unjust riches testifies against those who have accumulated them, and then turns upon them and eats their flesh like fire (5:3). James observed the man who glanced at himself in the mirror in the morning, and saw that his face was not clean, and who went away and thought no more about it for that whole day, and he found in him an illustration of the one who heard the word and did not do it (1:23,14). The epistle is full of these rhetorical figures, and they prove that James was something of a poet at heart, even as Jesus was. He writes in prose, but there is a marked rhythm in all of his speech. He has an ear for harmony as he has an eye for beauty everywhere.

6. Unlikeness to Paul:

The Pauline epistles begin with salutations and close with benedictions. They are filled with autobiographical touches and personal messages. None of these things appear here. The epistle begins and ends with all abruptness. It has an address, but no thanksgiving. There are no personal messages and no indications of any intimate personal relationship between the author and his readers. They are his "beloved brethren." He knows their needs and their sins, but he may never have seen their faces or visited their homes. The epistle is more like a prophet’s appeal to a nation than a personal letter.

7. Likeness to Jesus:

Both the substance of the teaching and the method of its presentation remind us of the discourses of Jesus. James says less about the Master than any other writer in the New Testament, but his speech is more like that of the Master than the speech of any one of them. There are at least ten parallels to the Sermon on the Mount in this short epistle, and for almost everything that James has to say we can recall some statement of Jesus which might have suggested it. When the parallels fail at any point, we are inclined to suspect that James may be repeating some unrecorded utterance of our Lord. He seems absolutely faithful to his memory of his brother’s teaching. He is the servant of Jesus in all his exhortation and persuasion.

Did the Master shock His disciples’ faith by the loftiness of the Christian ideal He set before them in His great sermon, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt 5:48)? James sets the same high standard in the very forefront of his ep.: "Let patience have its perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, lacking in nothing" (1:4). Did the Master say, "Ask, and it shall be given you" (Mt 7:7)? James says, "If any of you lacketh wisdom, let him ask of God ....; and it shall be given him" (1:5). Did the Master add a condition to His sweeping promise to prayer and say, "Whosoever .... shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he faith cometh to pass; he shall have it" (Mr 11:23)? James hastens to add the same condition, "Let him ask in faith, nothing doubting: for he that doubteth is like the surge of the sea driven by the wind and tossed" (1:6). Did the Master close the great sermon with His parable of the Wise Man and the Foolish Man, saying, "Every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them, shall be likened unto a wise man. And every one that heareth these words of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man" (Mt 7:24,26)? James is much concerned about wisdom, and therefore he exhorts his readers, "Be ye doers of the word, and not hearers only, deluding your own selves" (1:22). Had the Master declared, "If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them" (Joh 13:17)? James echoes the thought when he says, "A doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing" (1:25). Did the Master say to the disciples, "Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God" (Lu 6:20)? James has the same sympathy with the poor, and he says, "Hearken, my beloved brethren; did not God choose them that are poor as to the world to be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him?" (2:5). Did the Master inveigh against the rich, and say, "Woe unto you that are rich! for ye have received your consolation. Woe unto you, ye that are full now! for ye shall hunger. Woe unto you, ye that laugh now! for ye shall mourn and weep" (Lu 6:24,25)? James bursts forth into the same invective and prophesies the same sad reversal of fortune, "Come now, ye rich, weep and howl for your miseries that are coming upon you" (5:1). "Cleanse your

hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded. Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness" (4:8,9). Had Jesus said, "Judge not, that ye be not judged" (Mt 7:1)? James repeats the exhortation, "Speak not one against another, brethren. He that .... judgeth his brother .... judgeth the law: .... but who art thou that judgest thy neighbor?" (4:11,12). Had Jesus said, "Whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted" (Mt 23:12)? We find the very words in James, "Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall exalt you" (4:10). Had Jesus said, "I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet. .... But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one" (Mt 5:34-37)? Here in James we come upon the exact parallel: "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay; that ye fall not under judgment" (5:12). We remember how the Master began the Sermon on the Mount with the declaration that even those who mourned and were persecuted and reviled and reproached were blessed, in spite of all their suffering and trial. Then we notice that James begins his epistle with the same paradoxical putting of the Christian faith, "Count it all joy, my brethren, when ye fall into manifold trials" (1:12, the American Revised Version margin). We remember how Jesus proceeded in His sermon to set forth the spiritual significance and the assured permanence of the law; and we notice that James treats the law with the same respect and puts upon it the same high value. He calls it "the perfect law" (1:25), "the royal law" (2:8), the "law of liberty" (2:12). We remember what Jesus said about forgiving others in order that we ourselves may be forgiven; and we know where James got his authority for saying, "Judgment is without mercy to him that hath showed no mercy" (2:13). We remember all that the Master said about good trees and corrupt trees being known by their fruits, "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" (Mt 7:16-20). Then in the Epistle of James we find a like question, "Can a fig tree, my brethren, yield olives, or a vine figs?" (3:12). We remember that the Master said, "Know ye that he is nigh, even at the doors" (Mt 24:33). We are not surprised to find the statement here in James, "Behold, the judge standeth before the doors" (5:9). These reminiscences of the sayings of the Master meet us on every page. It may be that there are many more of them than we are able to identify. Their number is sufficiently large, however, to show us that James is steeped in the truths taught by Jesus, and not only their substance but their phraseology constantly reminds us of Him.

IV. Date of the Epistle.

There are those who think that the Epistle of James is the oldest epistle in the New Testament. Among those who favor an early date are Mayor, Plumptre, Alford, Stanley, Renan, Weiss, Zahn, Beyschlag, Neander, Schneckenburger, Thiersch, and Dods.

The reasons assigned for this conclusion are: (1) the general Judaic tone of the ep., which seems to antedate admission of the Gentiles in any alarming numbers into the church; but since the epistle is addressed only to Jews, why should the Gentiles be mentioned in it, whatever its date? and (2) the fact that Paul and Peter are supposed to have quoted from James in their writing; but this matter of quotation is always an uncertain one, and it has been ably argued that the quotation has been the other way about.

Others think that the epistle was written toward the close of James’s life. Among these are Kern,

Wiesinger, Schmidt, Bruckner, Wordsworth, and Farrar.

These argue

(1) that the epistle gives evidence of a considerable lapse of time in the history of the church, sufficient to allow of a declension from the spiritual fervor of Pentecost and the establishment of distinctions among the brethren; but any of the sins mentioned in the epistle in all probability could have been found in the church in any decade of its history.

(2) James has a position of established authority, and those to whom he writes are not recent converts but members in long standing; but the position of James may have been established from a very early date, and in an encyclical of this sort we could not expect any indication of shorter or longer membership in the church. Doubtless some of those addressed were recent converts, while others may have been members for many years.

(3) There are references to persecutions and trials which fit the later rather than the earlier date; but all that is said on this subject might be suitable in any period of the presidency of James at Jerusalem.

(4) There are indications of a long and disappointing delay in the Second Coming of the Lord in the repeated exhortation to patience in waiting for it; but on the other hand James says, "The coming of the Lord is at hand," and "The judge standeth before the doors" (5:7-9). The same passage is cited in proof of a belief that the immediate appearance of the Lord was expected, as in the earliest period of the church, and in proof that there had been a disappointment of this earlier belief and that it had been succeeded by a feeling that there was need of patience in waiting for the coming so long delayed.

It seems clear to us that there are no decisive proofs in favor of any definite date for the epistle. It must have been written before the martyrdom of James in the year 63 AD, and at some time during his presidency over the church at Jerusalem; but there is nothing to warrant us in coming to any more definite conclusion than that Davidson, Hilgenfeld, Baur, Zeller, Hausrath, von Soden, Julicher, Harnack, Bacon and others date the epistle variously in the post-Pauline period, 69-70 to 140-50 AD. The arguments for any of these dates fall far short of proof, rest largely if not wholly upon conjectures and presuppositions, and of course are inconsistent with any belief in the authorship by James.

V. History of the Epistle.

Eusebius classed Jas among those whose authenticity was disputed by some. "James is said to be the author of the first of the so-called Catholic Epistles. But it is to be observed that it is disputed; at least, not many of the ancients have mentioned it, as is the case likewise with the epistle that bears the name of Jude, which is also one of the seven so-called Catholic Epistles. Nevertheless, we know that these also, with the rest, have been read publicly in most churches" (Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 23). Eusebius himself, however, quotes Jas 4:11 as Scripture and Jas 5:13 as spoken by the holy apostle. Personally he does not seem disposed to question the genuineness of the epistle. There are parallels in phraseology

which make it possible that the epistle is quoted in Clement of Rome in the 1st century, and in Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, the Epistle to Diognetus, Irenaeus, and Hermas in the 2nd century. It is omitted in the canonical list of the Muratorian Fragment and was not included in the Old Latin version. Origen seems to be the first writer to quote the epistle explicitly as Scripture and to assert that it was written by James the brother of the Lord. It appears in the Peshitta version and seems to have been generally recognized in the East. Cyril of Jerusalem, Gregory of Nazianzus, Ephraem of Edessa, Didymus of Alexandria, received it as canonical. The 3rd Council of Carthage in 397 AD finally settled its status for the Western church, and from that date in both the East and the West its canonicity was unquestioned until the time of the Reformation.

Erasmus and Cajetan revived the old doubts concerning it. Luther thought it contradicted Paul and therefore banished it to the appendix of his Bible. "James," he says, "has aimed to refute those who relied on faith without works, and is too weak for his task in mind, understanding, and words, mutilates the Scriptures, and thus directly contradicts Paul and all Scriptures, seeking to accomplish by enforcing the law what the apostles successfully effect by love. Therefore, I will not place his Epistle in my Bible among the proper leadingbooks" (Werke, XIV, 148). He declared that it was a downright strawy epistle, as compared with such as those to the Romans and to the Galatians, and it had no real evangelical character. This judgment of Luther is a very hasty and regrettable one. The modern church has refused to accept it, and it is generally conceded now that Paul and James are in perfect agreement with each other, though their presentation of the same truth from opposite points of view brings them into apparent contradiction. Paul says, "By grace have ye been saved through faith .... not of works, that no man should glory" (Eph 2:8,9). "We reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law" (Ro 3:28). James says, "Faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself" (2:17). "Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not only by faith (2:24). With these passages before him Luther said, "Many have toiled to reconcile Paul with James .... but to no purpose, for they are contrary, ‘Faith justifies’;‘ Faith does not justify’; I will pledge my life that no one can reconcile those propositions; and if he succeeds he may call me a fool" (Colloquia, II, 202).

It would be difficult to prove Luther a fool if Paul and James were using these words, faith, works, and justification, in the same sense, or even if each were writing with full consciousness of what the other had written. They both use Abraham for an example, James of justification by works, and Paul of justification by faith. How can that be possible? The faith meant by James is the faith of a dead orthodoxy, an intellectual assent to the dogmas of the church which does not result in any practical righteousness in life, such a faith as the demons have when they believe in the being of God and simply tremble before Him. The faith meant by Paul is intellectual and moral and spiritual, affects the whole man, and leads him into conscious and vital union and communion with God. It is not the faith of demons; it is the faith that redeems. Again, the works meant by Paul are the works of a dead legalism, the works done under a sense of compulsion or from a feeling of duty, the works done in obedience to a law which is a taskmaster, the works of a slave and not of a son. These dead works, he declares, can never give life. The works meant by James are the works of a believer, the fruit of the faith and love born in every believer’s heart and manifest in every believer’s life. The possession of faith will insure this evidence in his daily conduct and conversation; and without this evidence the mere profession of faith will not save him. The justification meant by Paul is the initial justification of the Christian life. No

doing of meritorious deeds will make a man worthy of salvation. He comes into the kingdom, not on the basis of merit but on the basis of grace. The sinner is converted not by doing anything, but by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ. He approaches the threshold of the kingdom and he finds that he has no coin that is current there. He cannot buy his way in by good works; he must accept salvation by faith, as the gift of God's free grace. The justification meant by James is the justification of any after-moment in the Christian life, and the final justification before the judgment throne. Good works are inevitable in the Christian life. There can be no assurance of salvation without them.

Paul is looking at the root; James is looking at the fruit. Paul is talking about the beginning of the Christian life; James is talking about its continuance and consummation. With Paul, the works he renounces precede faith and are dead works. With James, the faith he denounces is apart from works and is a dead faith.

Paul believes in the works of godliness just as much as James. He prays that God may establish the Thessalonians in every good work (2Th 2:17). He writes to the Corinthians that "God is able to make all grace abound unto" them; that they, "having always all sufficiency in everything, may abound unto every good work" (2Co 9:8). He declares to the Ephesians that "we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them" (Eph 2:10). He makes a formal statement of his faith in Romans: God "will render to every man according to his works: to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life: but unto them that are factious, and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek" (Ro 2:6-10). This is the final justification discussed by James, and it is just as clearly a judgment by works with Paul as with him.

On the other hand James believes in saving faith as well as Paul. He begins with the statement that the proving of our faith works patience and brings perfection (1:3,1). He declares that the prayer of faith will bring the coveted wisdom (1:6). He describes the Christian profession as a holding

"the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory" (2:1). He says that the poor as to the world are rich in faith, and therefore heirs to the kingdom (2:5). He quotes the passage from Genesis, "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness" (2:23), and he explicitly asserts that Abraham's "faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect" (2:22). The faith mentioned in all these passages is the faith of the professing Christian; it is not the faith which the sinner exercises in accepting salvation. James and Paul are at one in declaring that faith and works must go hand in hand in the Christian life, and that in the Christian's experience both faith without works is dead and works without faith are dead works. They both believe in faith working through love as that which alone will avail in Christ Jesus (Ga 5:6). Fundamentally they agree. Superficially they seem to contradict each other. That is because they are talking about different things and using the same terms with different meanings for those terms in mind.

VI. Message of the Epistle to Our Times.

1. To the Pietist:

There are those who talk holiness and are hypocrites; those who make profession of perfect love and yet cannot live peaceably with their brethren; those who are full of pious phraseology but fail in practical philanthropy. This epistle was written for them. It may not give them much comfort, but it ought to give them much profit. The mysticism that contents itself with pious frames and phrases and comes short in actual sacrifice and devoted service will find its antidote here. The antinomianism that professes great confidence in free grace, but does not recognize the necessity for corresponding purity of life, needs to ponder the practical wisdom of this epistle. The quietists who are satisfied to sit and sing themselves away to everlasting bliss ought to read this epistle until they catch its bugle note of inspiration to present activity and continuous good deeds. All who are long on theory and short on practice ought to steep themselves in the spirit of James; and since there are such people in every community and in every age, the message of the epistle will never grow old.

2. To the Sociologist:

The sociological problems are to the front today. The old prophets were social reformers, and James is most like them in the New Testament. Much that he says is applicable to present-day conditions. He lays down the right principles for practical philanthropy, and the proper relationships between master and man, and between man and man. If the teachings of this epistle were put into practice throughout the church it would mean the revitalization of Christianity. It would prove that the Christian religion was practical and workable, and it would go far to establish the final brotherhood of man in the service of God.

3. To the Student of the Life and Character of Jesus:

The life of our Lord is the most important life in the history of the race. It will always be a subject of the deepest interest and study. Modern research has penetrated every contributory realm for any added light upon the heredity and the environment of Jesus. The people and the land, archaeology and contemporary history, have been cultivated intensively and extensively for any modicum of knowledge they might add to our store of information concerning the Christ. We suggest that there is a field here to which sufficient attention has not yet been given. James was the brother of the Lord. His epistle tells us much about himself. On the supposition that he did not exhort others to be what he would not furnish them an example in being, we read in this epistle his own character writ large. He was like his brother in so many things. As we study the life and character of James we come to know more about the life and character of Jesus.

Jesus and James had the same mother. From her they had a common inheritance. As far as they reproduced their mother’s characteristics they were alike. They had the same home training. As far as the father in that home could succeed in putting the impress of his own personality upon the boys, they

would be alike. It is noticeable in this connection that Joseph is said in the Gospel to have been "a just man" (Mt 1:19 the King James Version), and that James came to be known through all the early church as James the Just, and that in his epistle he gives this title to his brother, Jesus, when he says of the unrighteous rich of Jerusalem, "Ye have condemned and killed the just" man (5:6 the King James Version). Joseph was just, and James was just, and Jesus was just. The brothers were alike, and they were like the father in this respect. The two brothers seem to think alike and talk alike to a most remarkable degree. They represent the same home surroundings and human environment, the same religious training and inherited characteristics. Surely, then, all that we learn concerning James will help us the better to understand Jesus.

They are alike in their poetical insight and their practical wisdom. They are both fond of figurative speech, and it seems always natural and unforced. The discourses of Jesus are filled with birds and flowers and winds and clouds and all the sights and sounds of rural life in Palestine. The writings of James abound in reference to the field flowers and the meadow grass and the salt fountains and the burning wind and the early and the latter rain. They are alike in mental attitude and in spiritual alertness. They have much in common in the material equipment of their thought. James was well versed in the apocryphal literature. May we not reasonably conclude that Jesus was just as familiar with these books as he? James seems to have acquired a comparative mastery of the Greek language and to have had some acquaintance with the Greek philosophy. Would not Jesus have been as well furnished in these lines as he?

What was the character of James? All tradition testifies to his personal purity and persistent devotion, commanding the reverence and the respect of all who knew him. As we trace the various elements of his character manifesting themselves in his anxieties and exhortations in this epistle, we find rising before us the image of Jesus as well as the portrait of James. He is a single-minded man, steadfast in faith and patient in trials. He is slow to wrath, but very quick to detect any sins of speech and hypocrisy of life. He is full of humility, but ready to champion the cause of the oppressed and the poor. He hates all insincerity and he loves wisdom, and he believes in prayer and practices it in reference to both temporal and spiritual good. He believes in absolute equality in the house of God. He is opposed to anything that will establish any distinctions between brethren in their place of worship. He believes in practical philanthropy. He believes that the right sort of religion will lead a man to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world. A pure religion in his estimation will mean a pure man. He believes that we ought to practice all that we preach.

As we study these characteristics and opinions of the younger brother, does not the image of his and our Elder Brother grow ever clearer before our eyes?

LITERATURE.

Works on Introduction: by Zahn, Weiss, Julicher, Salmon, Dods, Bacon, Bennett and Adeney; MacClymont, The New Testament and Its Writers; Farrar, The Messages of the Books, and Early Days of Christianity; Fraser, Lectures on the Bible; Godet, Biblical Studies. Works on the Apostolic Age:

McGiffert, Schaff, Hausrath, Weizsacker. Commentaries: Mayor, Hort, Beyschlag, Dale, Huther, Plummer, Plumptre, Stier.

Doremus Almy Hayes

JAMES, PROTEVANGELIUM OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

JAMIN

ja’-min (yamin, "right hand"):

(1) In Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15; Nu 26:12; 1Ch 4:24, a "son" (clan) of Simeon.

(2) In 1Ch 2:27, a Judahite, "son" of Ram and grandson of Jerahmeel.

(3) In Ne 8:7, a Levite (?), one of those who "caused the people to understand" the Torah when Ezra enforced it =" Iadinus" in 1 Esdras 9:48.

JAMINITES

ja’-min-its (ha-yamini, coll. with article): In Nu 26:12, descendants of Jamin ((1) above).

JAMLECH

jam’-lek (yamlekh, "may he (God) cause to reign"): A "prince" or chief of the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:34). If 4:41 refers to the preceding list, he lived in the time of Hezekiah.

JAMNIA

jam’-ni-a.

See JABNEEL.

JAMNITES

jam’-nits (Iamnitai): The inhabitants (2 Macc 12:9) of Jamnia, the ancient Jabneel, a town on the northern border of Judah near the sea. Its port and navy were burned by Judas Maccabeus (loc. cit.).

JANAI

ja’-na-i, ja’-ni (ya‘nay, "he answers"; as to whether final "y" is the third radical (letter), or may be taken as equivalent to the Divine name Yah, see HPN, 149-51): A chief of a family descended from Gad (1Ch 5:12, the King James Version "Jaanai").

JANGLING

jan’-gling (mataiologia, "vain discourse" "babbling"): This word is not found in the American Standard Revised Version; once only in the King James Version (1Ti 1:6). The American Standard Revised Version has "vain talking," instead of "vain jangling," and evidently means proud, self-conceited talking against what God has revealed and against God Himself.

JANIM

ja’-nim (yanim; the King James Version Janum): A place in the Hebron uplands named with Eshan and Beth-tappuah (Jos 15:53); unidentified.

JANNAI

jan’-a-i (Iannai, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek; Ianna, Textus Receptus of the New Testament; the King James Version Janna); An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy, the 5th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lu 3:24).

JANNES AND JAMBRES

jan’-ez, jam’-brez (Iannes kai Iambres, 2Ti 3:8):

1. Egyptian Magicians:

These are the names of two magicians in ancient Egypt, who withstood Moses before Pharaoh. This is the only place where the names occur in the New Testament, and they are not mentioned in the Old Testament at all. In Ex 7:11,22 Egyptian magicians are spoken of, who were called upon by Pharaoh to oppose Moses and Aaron: "Then Pharaoh also called for the wise men and the sorcerers: and they also, the magicians of Egypt, did in like manner with their enchantments." Jannes and Jambres were evidently two of the persons referred to in this passage. It should be observed that the word translated here "magicians" occurs also in Ge 41:8 in connection with Pharaoh’s dreams: Pharaoh "sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof." the Revised Version margin reads for "magicians" "or sacred scribes." The Hebrew word is charTummim, and means sacred scribes who were skilled in the sacred writing, that is in the hieroglyphics; they were a variety of Egyptian priests. Jannes and Jambres were doubtless members of one or other of the various classes spoken of in the passages in

Exodus and Genesis, the wise men, the sorcerers, and the magicians or sacred scribes.

2. Mentioned by Pliny and Others:

Jannes and Jambres, one or both, are also mentioned by Pliny (23-79 AD), by Apuleius (circa 130 AD), both of whom speak of Moses and Jannes as famous magicians of antiquity. The Pythagorean philosopher Numenius (2nd century AD) speaks of Jannes and Jambres as Egyptian hierogrammateis, or sacred scribes.

3. Traditions:

There are many curious Jewish traditions regarding Jannes and Jambres. These traditions, which are found in the Targum and elsewhere, are full of contradictions and impossibilities and anachronisms. They are to the effect that Jannes and Jambres were sons of Balaam, the soothsayer of Pethor. Notwithstanding this impossibility in the matter of date, they were said to have withstood Moses 40 years previously at the court of Pharaoh, to whom it was also said, they so interpreted a dream of that king, as to foretell the birth of Moses and cause the oppression of the Israelites. They are also said to have become proselytes, and it is added that they left Egypt at the Exodus, among the mixed multitude. They are reported to have instigated Aaron to make the golden calf. The traditions of their death are also given in a varying fashion. They were said to have been drowned in the Red Sea, or to have been put to death after the making of the golden calf, or during the slaughter connected with the name of Phinehas.

4. Origen’s Statement:

According to Origen (Comm. on Mt 27:8) there was an apocryphal book—not yet rediscovered—called "The Book of Jannes and Jambres." Origen’s statement is that in 2Ti 3:8 Paul is quoting from that book.

5. Derivation:

In the Targumic literature "Mambres" occurs as a variant reading instead of "Jambres." It is thought that Jambres is derived from an Aramaic root, meaning "to oppose," the participle of which would be Mambres. The meaning of either form is "he who opposes." Jannes is perhaps a corruption of Ioannes or Iohannes (John).

John Rutherfurd

JANNES AND JAMBRES, BOOK OF

An apocryphal work condemned by Pope Gelasius.

See preceding article, JANNES AND JAMBRES.

JANOAH

ja-no’-a (yanoach, "resting-place"):

(1) A place named on the eastern boundary of Ephraim (Jos 16:6 f; the King James Version "Janohah"). Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Jano") places it in Akrabattine, 12 Roman miles East of Neapolis (Nablus). This points definitely to Khirbet Yanun. On a hill near by, the Moslems show the Maqam of Neby Nun, the father of Joshua.

(2) A town in the uplands of Naphtali, mentioned as having been captured and depopulated by Tiglathpileser. It is named with Abel-beth-maacah and Kedesh (2Ki 15:29). It may be identical with Yanuch, a village about 6 miles East of Tyre.

W. Ewing

JANUM

ja’-num (Qere, yanum, Kethibh yanim).

See JANIM.

JAPHETH (1)

ja’-feth (yepheth; yapheth; Iapheth):

1. Etymologies of Japheth:

This name, in Ge 9:27, seems to be explained by the phrase "may God make wide (yapht, the American Standard Revised Version "enlarge") for Japheth," where yapht and Japheth are represented by the same consonants, but with different vowel-points. The root of yapht is pathach, "to make wide." This etymology, however, is not universally accepted, as the word-play is so obvious, and the association of Japheth with Shem ("dark") and Ham ("black") suggests a name on similar lines—either gentilic, or descriptive of race. Japheth has therefore been explained as meaning "fair," from yaphah, the non-Sem and non-Hamitic races known to the Jews being all more or less whiteskinned. The Targum of Onkelos agrees with the English Versions of the Bible, but that of Jonathan has "God shall beautify Japheth," as though from yaphah.

2. His Descendants:

The immediate descendants of Japheth were seven in number, and are represented by the nations designated Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Mesech, and Tiras; or, roughly, the Armenians,

Lydians, Medes, Greeks, Tibarenians, and Moschians, the last, Tiras, remaining still obscure. The sons of Gomer (Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah) were all settled in the West Asian tract; while the sons of Javan (Elisah, Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim or Rodanim) occupied the Mediterranean coast and the adjacent islands.

3. His Place among the Sons of Noah:

In Ge 9:27, as in other passages, Japheth occupies the 3rd place in the enumeration of the sons of Noah, but he is really regarded as the 2nd son, Ham being the youngest. In the genealogical table, however (Ge 10:1), the descendants of Japheth are given first, and those of Shem last, in order to set forth Semitic affinities at greater length. Though this would seem to indicate that the fair races were the least known to the Jews, it implies that the latter were well disposed toward them, for Japheth was (ultimately) to dwell in the tents of Shem, and therefore to take part in Shem's spiritual privileges.

4. Japheth and Iapetos:

It seems unlikely that the Greek giant-hero, Iapetos, father of Prometheus, who was regarded by the Greeks as the father of the human race, has any connection with the Hebrew Japheth. The original of the Hebrew record probably belongs to a date too early to admit borrowing from the Greek, and if the name had been borrowed by the Greeks from the Hebrews, a nearer form might be expected.

See SHEM; HAM; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. Pinches

JAPHETH (2)

ja'-feth (Iapheth): A region mentioned only in Judith 2:25, where no particulars are given which may lead to its identification. Holofernes "came unto the borders of Japheth, which were toward the south, over against Arabia."

JAPHIA (1)

ja-fi'-a, jaf'-i-a (yaphia', perhaps "tall"; compare Arabic; Iephtha):

(1) King of Lachish, one of the 5 "kings of the Amorites" who allied themselves together in an expedition against Gibeon on account of its treaty with the Israelites (Jos 10:3-5). After their discomfiture by Joshua in the battle of Beth-horon (10:10), "one of the most important in the history of the world" (Stanley), they fled and hid themselves in the cave at Makkedah (10:16). As Joshua passed, he was informed of this, but, unwilling to delay his pursuit of the fugitives, he ordered great stones to be rolled unto the mouth of the cave, leaving a guard in charge (10:17 f). On the completion of his victory,

Joshua returned to Makkedah and commanded the Israelites to bring forth the imprisoned kings, and summoned the chiefs of his army to plant their feet upon their necks. Then he put them to death; and after he had hung their bodies on 5 trees, he ordered the Israelites in the evening to take them down and cast them into the cave (10:22-27).

(2) Septuagint Iephies, Iaphie): One of the sons of David who were born to him at Jerusalem (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 3:7; 14:6).

James Crichton

JAPHIA (2)

ja-fi'-a, jaf'-i-a (yaphia'): A town on the southern boundary of Zebulun named with Chisloth-tabor and Daberath (Jos 19:12). It is represented by the modern Yafa, about 1 1/2 miles Southwest of Nazareth, near the foot of the hills. It was one of the places fortified by Josephus (Vita, 45; BJ, II, xx, 6).

JAPHLET

jaf'-let (yaphleT, "he escapes"(?)): In 1Ch 7:32,33, a "son" of Heber, an Asherite.

JAPHLETI

jaf'-le-ti, jaf-le'-ti: the King James Version in Jos 16:3, where Hebrew is ha-yaphleTi, "the Japhletites," the Revised Version (British and American), a clan said to border on the territory of Joseph, but not mentioned elsewhere.

JAPHO

ja'-fo: the King James Version and the American Revised Version margin in Jos 19:46 for JOPPA (which see).

JAR

jar.

See BARREL.

JARAH

ja'-ra (ya'rah, "honey-comb" (?)): A descendant of King Saul (1Ch 9:42); but the Septuagint's Codices

Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, have Iada = ya‘dah, a name found in Septuagint of 1Ch 8:36, where Massoretic Text has yeho‘addah, Jehoaddah. Some Hebrew manuscripts have ya‘dah in 9:42, and it should probably be accepted as the correct reading there, for ya‘dah = Jehoaddah yeho‘addah, linguistically; compare Jonathan and Jehonathan, etc.

JAREB

ja’-reb, jar’-eb (yarebh, "let him contend"; Septuagint Iareim):

1. Obscurity of the Name:

Is mentioned twice in Ho (5:13; 10:6) as an Assyrian king who received tribute from Israel. We do not, however, know of an Assyrian king of that name, or of such a place as is indicated by "the king of Jareb" (5:13 King James Version, margin). Sayce (HCM, 417) thinks Jareb may possibly be the earlier name of Sargon who took Samaria in 722 BC, as the passages in which it appears seem to relate to the last struggles of the Northern Kingdom. This conjecture he bases on the probability that the successor of Shalmaneser IV, following the example of other usurpers of the Assyrian throne before him, assumed the name of Sargon. Those who hold that Hosea’s prophecies are probably not later than 734 BC reject this view.

2. Meaning of the Word:

If we take the Hebrew text in Ho 5:13 as it stands (melekh yarebh), Jareb cannot be regarded as the name of a person, owing to the absence of the article before melekh, "king," which is always inserted in such a case. It is probably an epithet or nickname applied to the Assyrian king, as is suggested by the Revised Version margin ("a king that should contend") and the King James Version margin ("the king that should plead"), being derived from the ribh, "to strive." The rendering would then be "King Combat," "King Contentious," indicating Assyria’s general hostility to Israel and the futility of applying for help to that quarter against the will of Yahweh. Some suggest that for melekh yarebh we should read malki rabh (i being the old nominative termination), or melekh rabh, "Great King," a title frequently applied to Assyrian monarchs. Others, following the Septuagint, would read melekh ram, "High King."

3. Historical Reference:

The historical reference, if it be to any recorded incident, may be to the attempt of Menahem, king of Israel in 738 BC, to gain over the Assyrians by a large subsidy to Pul, who assumed the name of Tiglath-pileser (2Ki 15:19). In this case, as both Epraim and Judah are mentioned in the protasis, we should have to suppose that Ephraim made application on behalf of both kingdoms. If "Judah" be inserted before "sent" to complete the parallel, then the clause would be interpreted of Ahaz, king of Judah, who offered a heavy bribe to Tiglath-pileser to help him to withstand the combined attack of Rezin of Syria and Pekah of Israel (2Ki 16:7 f). But perhaps there may be no particular allusions in the two clauses of the apodosis, but only a reference to a general tendency on the part of both kingdoms to seek Assyrian aid.

4. Other Views:

Cheyne would make a violent change in the verse. He would substitute "Israel" for "Judah" as warranted by Ho 12:2, insert "Israel" before "sent," change ‘Ashshur,"assyria," into mitstsur, the North Arabian land of Mucri, "references to which underlie many passages in the Old Testament," and for melekh yarebh, he would read melekh ‘arabhi, "king of Arabia." For other views see ICC.

James Crichton

JARED

ja’-red (yeredh, "descent"; pausal form, yaredh, in Ge 5:15; 1Ch 1:2, hence, English Versions of the Bible "Jared" for "Jered"; Iared): In Ge 5:15-20; 1Ch 1:2; Lu 3:37, son of Mahalaleel and father of Enoch. The King James Version has "Jered" in 1Ch 1:2.

The name is supposed by Budde to denote a degeneration of the human race, the first five generations being righteous, their successors not, except Enoch and Noah. The name has been identified with that of Irad (iradh), Ge 4:18. See Skinner, Gen, 117, 129, 131.

JARESIAH

jar-e-si’-a: the King James Version for JAARESHIAH (which see).

JARHA

jar’-ha (yarcha‘, meaning unknown): An Egyptian slave of Shesham, about Eli’s time (compare HPN, 235), who married his master’s daughter, and became the founder of a house of the Jerahmeelites (1Ch 2:34).

JARIB

ja’-rib, jar’-ib (yaribh, "he contends," or "takes (our) part," or "conducts (our) case"):

(1) In 1Ch 4:24, a "son" (clan) of Simeon =" Jachin" of Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15; Nu 26:12.

(2)in Ezr 8:16, one of the "chief men" for whom Ezra sent, and dispatched by him to Casiphia to fetch ministers for God’s house =" Joribus" (1 Esdras 8:44).

(3) In Ezr 10:18, a priest who had married a foreign wife =" Joribus" (1 Esdras 9:19).

JARIMOTH

jar’-i-moth (Iarimoth): 1 Esdras 9:28; called "Jeremoth" in Ezr 10:27.

JARMUTH

jar’-muth (yarmuth:

(1) A city of the Canaanites in the Shephelah (Jos 15:35) of Judah whose "king," Piram, joined the league of the "five kings" against Joshua (Jos 10:3-5), was defeated at Gibeon and slain at Makkedah (10:23). One of the 31 "kings" defeated in Joshua’ s campaign (Jos 12:11). In Jos 15:35 it is mentioned in conjunction with Adullam, Socoh and Azekah, and in Ne 11:29 with Zorah, Zanoah and Adullam. Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica) suggests that the "Maroth" of Mic 1:12 may be a copyist’s error for Jarmuth. In Eusebius, Onomasticon (OS2 132 31; 266 38) mention is made of a Iermochos, or Jermucha, 10 Roman miles Northeast of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin), The site of this once important place is Khirbet el Yarmuk, a ruin, with many old walls and cisterns, on the top of a hill 1,465 ft. above sealevel. It is nearly 2 miles Northwest of Belt Nattif, from which it is visible, and 8 1/2 miles, as measured on map, N.N.E. of Belt Jibrin. Compare PEF, III, 128, Sh XVIII.

(2) A city of Issachar belonging to the "children of Gershon, of the families of the Levites" (Jos 21:29); in the duplicate list in 1Ch 6:73 we have Ramoth, while in the Septuagint version of Jos 21:29 we have, in different VSS, Rhemmath or Iermoth. In Jos 19:21 "Remeth" occurs (in Hebrew) in the lists of cities of Issachar; in the Septuagint Rhemmas or Rhamath. The name was probably "Remeth" or "Ramoth," but the place has never been identified with any certainty.

See RAMOTH.

E. W. G. Masterman

JAROAH

ja-ro’-a (yaroach, meaning unknown): A Gadite chief (1Ch 5:14). But the text is doubtful; see Curtis, Chronicles, 124.

JASAELUS; JASAEL

jas-a-e’-lus , ja’-sa-el (Iasaelos; Codex Vaticanus, Asaelos; the King James Version (1 Esdras 9:30)): Called "Sheal" in Ezr 10:29.

JASHAR, BOOK OF

ja’-shar, jash’-ar (cepher ha-yashar; the King James Version Book of Jasher, margin "the book of the upright"): The title of an ancient Hebrew national song-book (literally, "book of the righteous one") from which two quotations are made in the Old Testament:

(1) Jos 10:12-14, the command of Joshua to the sun and moon, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon. .... Is not this written in the book of Jashar?" (see BETH-HORON; Septuagint in this place omits the reference to Jashar); and

(2) 2Sa 1:8 ff, "the song of the bow," or lament of David over Saul and Jonathan.

(3) Some conjecture a third extract in 1Ki 8:12, "Then spake Solomon, Yahweh hath said that he would dwell in the thick darkness." The words of Yahweh are quoted by Septuagint in 8:53 as "written in the book of the song" (en biblio tes odes), and it is pointed out that the words "the song" (in Hebrew ha-shir) might easily be a corruption of ha-yashar. A similar confusion ("song" for "righteous") may explain the fact that the Peshitta Syriac of Joshua has for a title "the book of praises or hymns." The book evidently was a well-known one, and may have been a gradual collection of religious and national songs. It is conjectured that it may have included the So of Deborah (Jud 5), and older pieces now found in the Pentateuch (e.g. Ge 4:23,14; 9:25-27; 27:27-29); this, however, is uncertain. On the curious theories and speculations of the rabbis and others about the book (that it was the Book of the Law, of Genesis, etc.), with the fantastic reconstructive theory of Dr. Donaldson in his Jasbar, see the full article in HDB.

James Orr

JASHEN

ja’-shen, jash’-en (yashen, "asleep"(?)): Seemingly the father of some of David s thirty valiant men (2Sa 23:32 f). The Massoretic Text reads "Eliahba the Shaalbonite, the sons of Jashen, Jonathan, Shammah the Hararite, ... " 1Ch 11:33 f has Eliahba the Shaalbonite, the sons of Hashem the Gizonite, Jonathan the son of Shagee the Hararite .... " It is clear that "sons of" are a dittography of the last three consonants of the previous word. Septuagint, Lucian in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles has ho Gouni, "the Gunite," for "the Gizonite," perhaps correctly (compare Ge 46:24; Nu 26:48 for "Guni," "Gunite"). So 2Sa 23:32 may be corrected thus: "Eliahba the Shaalbonite, Jashen the Gunite, Jonathan the son of Shammah the Hararite." Jashen then becomes one of the thirty =" Hashem" of 1Ch 11:34.

David Francis Roberts

JASHER, BOOK OF

ja’-sher, jash’-er: the King James Version for JASHAR (which see), and see BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF.

JASHOBEAM

ja-sho’-be-am (yashobh‘am, probably "people will return"; see discussion of names compounded with ‘am, in HPN, 41-59): Jashobeam is mentioned in three passages (1Ch 11:11; 12:6 (Hebrew 7); 27:2 f), but opinions vary as to the number of persons erred to. In 1Ch 11:11 he is called "the son of a Hachmonite" (reference unknown) and "the chief of the three" ("three," the best reading; the Revised Version (British and American) "thirty"; the King James Version, the Revised Version margin "captains"), mighty men of David. He is said to have slain 300 (800 in 2Sa 23:8) at one time, i.e. one after another.

The gibborim, or heroes, numbered 600 and were divided into bands of 200 each and subdivided into smaller bands of 20 each, with a captain for each company large and small. Jashobeam had command of the first of the three bands of 200 (see Ewald, HI, III , 140 f; Stanley, HJC, II, 78). From the indefiniteness of the description, "three of the thirty chief," he can hardly be regarded as one of the three mighty men who broke through the ranks of the Philistines, and brought water from the well of Bethlehem to David on the hill-fortress of Adullam (1Ch 11:15-17), and the fact that "the thirty" have not yet been mentioned would seem to indicate that this story is not in its proper place. But "Jashobe am" here (1Ch 11:11) is probably an error for "Ishbaal," the reading of many of the manuscripts of the Septuagint (HPN, 46, note).

In the parallel passage (2Sa 23:8) he is called "Joshebbasshebeth, a Tahchemonite." This verse, however, is probably corrupt (Revised Version margin), and the text should be corrected in accordance with Ch to "Ishbaal, the Hachmonite." In 1Ch 27:2 f Jashobeam is said to have been "the son of Zabdiel," of the family of Perez, and the commander-in-chief of the division of David’s army which did duty the first month. The army consisted of 12 divisions of 24,000 each, each division serving a month in turn. In 1Ch 12:6 (Hebrew 7) Jashobeam is mentioned among those who joined David at Ziklag in the time of Saul, and is described as a Korahite, probably one belonging to a family of Judah (compare 2:43).

James Crichton

JASHUB

ja’-shub, jash’-ub (yashubh; yashibh, in Chronicles, but Qere, yashubh, "he returns"):

(1) In Nu 26:24; 1Ch 7:1, a "son" (clan) of Issachar. Ge 46:13 has incorrectly Iob, but Septuagint Jashub.

(2) In Ezr 10:29, one of those who had married foreign wives =" Jasubus" in 1 Esdras 9:30.

(3) In Isa 7:3, part of the name SHEAR-JASHUB (which see).

JASHUBI-LEHEM

ja-shoo-bi-le’-hem (yashubhi-lechem): A name in 1Ch 4:22 where commentators insert beth, between the two words and translate "(and) returned to Bethlehem."

JASHUBITES, THE

ja’-shub-its, jash’-ub-its (ha-yashubhi, coll. with article): In Nu 16:24, descendants of JASHUB (q.v. (1)).

JASIEL

ja’-si-el, jas’-i-el (ya‘asi’el, "God is maker," 1Ch 11:47 the King James Version).

See JAASIEL.

JASON (1)

ja’-sun (Iason): A common name among the Hellenizing Jews who used it for Jesus or Joshua, probably connecting it with the Greek verb iashthai ("to heal").

(1) Son of Eleazar, sent (161 BC) by Judas Maccabeus with other deputies to Rome "to make a league of amity and confederacy" (1 Macc 8:17; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6), and perhaps to be identified with (2).

(2) The father of Antipater who went as ambassador of Jonathan to Rome in 144 BC (1 Macc 12:16; 14:22; Ant, XIII, v, 8).

(3) Jason of Cyrene, a Jewish historian, who is known only from what is told of him in 2 Macc 2:19-23. 2 Macc is in fact simply an abridgment in one book of the 5 books written by Jason on the Jewish wars of liberation. He must have written after 162 BC, as his books include the wars under Antiochus Eupator.

(4) Jason the high priest, second son of Simon II and brother of Onias III. The change of name from Jesus (Josephus, Ant, XII, v) was part of the Hellenizing policy favored by Antiochus Epiphanes from whom he purchased the high-priesthood by a large bribe, thus excluding his elder brother from the office (2 Macc 4:7-26). He did everything in his power to introduce Greek customs and Greek life among the Jews. He established a gymnasium in Jerusalem, so that even the priests neglected the altars and the sacrifices, and hastened to be partakers of the "unlawful allowance" in the palaestra. The writer of 2 Macc calls him "that ungodly wretch" and "vile" Jason. He even sent deputies from Jerusalem to Tyre to take part in the worship of Hercules; but what he sent for sacrifices, the deputies expended on the "equipment of galleys." After 3 years of this Hellenizing work he was supplanted in 172 BC in the favor of Antiochus by Menelaus who gave a large bribe for the high priest’s office. Jason took refuge with the Ammonites; on hearing that Antiochus was dead he tried with some success to drive out Menelaus, but

ultimately failed (2 Macc 5:5 ff). He took refuge with the Ammonites again, and then with Aretas, the Arabian, and finally with the Lacedaemonians, where he hoped for protection "as being connected by race," and there "perished-miserably in a strange land."

(5) A name mentioned in Ac 17:5-9 and in Ro 16:21. See following article.

J. Hutchison

JASON (2)

ja'-sun (Iason): A Greek name assumed by Jews who bore the Hebrew name Joshua. This name is mentioned twice in the New Testament. (See also preceding article.)

(1) Jason was the host of Paul during his stay in Thessalonica, and, during the uproar organized by the Jews, who were moved to jealousy by the success of Paul and Silas, he and several other "brethren" were severely handled by the mob. When the mob failed to find Paul and Silas, they dragged Jason and "certain brethren" before the politarchs, accusing Jason of treason in receiving into his house those who said "There is another king, one Jesus." The magistrates, being troubled, took security from them, and let them go.

There are various explanations of the purpose of this security. "By this expression it is most probably meant that a sum of money was deposited with the magistrates, and that the Christian community of the place made themselves responsible that no attempt should be made against the supremacy of Rome, and that peace should be maintained in Thessalonica itself" (Conybeare and Howson, Paul). Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler) thinks that the security was given to prevent Paul from returning to Thessalonica and that Paul refers to this in 1Th 2:18.

The immediate departure of Paul and Silas seems to show the security was given that the strangers would leave the city and remain absent (Ac 17:5-9).

(2) Jason is one of the companions of Paul who unite with him in sending greetings to the Roman Christians (Ro 16:21). He is probably the same person as (1). Paul calls him a kinsman, which means a Jew (compare Ro 9:3; 16:11,21).

S. F. Hunter

JASPER; JASPIS

jas'-per, jas'-pis.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

JASUBUS

ja-su’-bus (Iasoubos): An Israelite who in the time of Ezra had to put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:30); called "Jashub" in Ezr 10:29.

JATAL

ja’-tal (1 Esdras 5:28).

See ATAR.

JATHAN

ja’-than (Iathan; Nathan): For "Jonathas" in the King James Version, which is the Latin form for the Hebrew "Jonathan." Jonathan was brother of Ananias and "son of that great Sammaias" (Tobit 5:13).

JATHBATH

jath’-bath.

See JOTBATHAH.

JATHNIEL

jath’-ni-el (yathni’el, "God lives"): Fourth "son" of Meshelemiah, a Korahite (1Ch 26:2).

JATTIR

jat’-er (yattir, and yattir): A town in the hill country of Judah, mentioned in conjunction with Shamir and Socoh (Jos 15:48); one of the cities given to the "children of Aaron the priest" (Jos 21:14; 1Ch 6:57). David after his victory over the Amalekites sent a present of the spoil from Ziklag "to them that were in Jattir" (1Sa 30:27).

It is now Khirbet ‘Attir, an important ruin, in the extreme South of the hill country, 5 miles Southeast of edh Dhariyeh and 20 miles Southeast of Belt Jibrin. This must Correspond to the "very large village Jethira" which is mentioned in Eusebius, Onomasticon (119 27; 133 3; 134 24, etc.) as 20 miles Southeast of Eleutheropolis (i.e. Beit Jibrin). The site is full of caves. See PEF, III, 408, Sh XXV.

E. W. G. Masterman

JAVAN

ja’-van (yawan, meaning unknown):

(1) In Ge 10:2,4 = 1Ch 1:5,7 Septuagint Iouan); Isa 66:19; Eze 27:13 Septuagint Hellas, Greece); Da 8:21 m; 10:20; 11:2; Zec 9:13; Joe 3:6 (Hebrew 4:6) Septuagint hoi Hellenes, i.e. "Greeks"), "son" of Japheth, and "father" of Elisha, Tars, Kittim, and Rodarim, i.e. Rhodes (incorrectly "Dodanim" in Ge 10:4). Javan is the Greek Iaon or Ia(v)on, and in Ge and 1Ch = the Ionian Greeks of Asia Minor, probably here = Cyprus. The reference in Eze 27:13 (from which that in Isa 66:19 is copied) is the country personified. In Joe the plural yewanim, is found. In Da the name is extended to the Greeks generally. Corroboration of the name is found in Assyrian (Schrader, editor, Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, II, 43). "The Persian Yauna occurs in the same double reference from the time of Darius; compare Aesch. Persian., 176, 562" (Skinner, Gen, 198). In Egyptian the word is said to be yevan-(n)a; in the Tell el-Amarna Letters Yivana is mentioned as being in the land of Tyre. See HDB, II, 552b.

(2) Place (Eze 27:19); the name is missing in Septuagint.

David Francis Roberts

JAVELIN

jav’-lin, jav’-e-lin.

See ARMOR; ARMS.

JAW; JAWBONE; JAW TEETH

jo, jo’-bon (lechi, "cheek (bone)," "jaw (bone)"): In Job 41:2, the Revised Version (British and American) gives "pierce his jaw through with a hook" for the King James Version "bore his jaw through with a thorn" (see HOOK; LEVIATHAN). Ps 22:15, "My tongue cleaveth to my jaws (malqoach)," is descriptive of the effect of a fever or physical torture, a dryness and a horrible clamminess. Malqochayim is an ancient dual form meaning the two jaws, and, metaphorically, malqoach indicates that which is caught between the jaws, booty, prey, including captives (Nu 31:11,26,32; Isa 49:24 f).

Figurative:

(1) Of the power of the wicked, with a reference to Divine restraint and discipline: "I brake the jaws (Hebrew "great teeth") of the unrighteous" (Job 29:17; Pr 30:14); compare Ps 58:6, "Break out the great teeth (malta‘oth, "jaw teeth") of the young lions, O Yahweh." Let the wicked be deprived of their ability for evil; let them at least be disabled from mischief. Septuagint reads "God shall break," etc. (Compare Edmund Prys’s Metrical Paraphrase of the Psalms, in the place cited.) "A bridle .... in the jaws of the

peoples" (Isa 30:28; compare 2Ki 19:28) is descriptive of the ultimate check of the Assyrian power at Jerusalem, "as when a bridle or lasso is thrown upon the jaws of a wild animal when you wish to catch and tame him" (G.A. Smith Isa, I, 235). Compare Eze 29:4 (concerning Pharaoh); 38:4 (concerning Gog), "I will put hooks in (into) thy jaws."

(2) Of human labor and trials, with a reference to the Divine gentleness: "I was to them as they that lift up the yoke on their jaws" (Ho 11:4), or ‘take the yoke off their jaws,’ as the humane driver eased the yoke with his hands or ‘lifted it forward from neck to the jaws’; or it may perhaps refer to the removal of the yoke in the evening, when work is over.

Jawbone (Jud 15:15).

See RAMATH-LEHI.

M. O. Evans

JAZER

ja’-zer (ya‘zer or ya‘zeyr; Septuagint Iazen in Codex Alexandrinus; Iazer): In some cases, e.g. Nu 21:32, the King James Version reads "Jaazer." This was a city of the Amorites East of the Jordan taken, along with its towns, by Moses, and occupied by the tribe of Gad (Nu 21:32; 32:35). The country was very fertile, and its spacious pasture-lands attracted the flock-masters of Gad (Nu 32:1), the southern border of whose territory it marked (Jos 13:25). It was assigned to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:39; 1Ch 6:81). The place was reached by Joab when taking the census (2Sa 24:5). In the 40th year of King David mighty men of valor were found here to whom he entrusted the oversight in Reuben and Gad "for every matter pertaining to God, and run the affairs of the king" (1Ch 26:32 f). The fruitfulness of the country is alluded to in Isa 16:8 f; Jer 48:32. (Note: "Sea of" Jazer in this verse has arisen through accidental repetition of yam, "sea," from the preceding clause.) The city was taken from the Ammonites by Judas Maccabeus, and burned (1 Macc 5:7,8; Ant, XII, viii, 1).

Onomasticon places Jazer 10 Roman miles West of Philadelphia (‘Amman), and about 15 miles from Heshbon, where a great stream rises, which flows into the Jordan. Many would identify it with Khirbet Car, on the South of Wady Cir, about 5 miles West of ‘Amman. The perennial stream from Wady Cir reaches the Jordan by Wady el-Kefrein. Cheyne (EB, under the word) suggests Yajuz on Wady Zorby, tributary of the Jabbok, with extensive Roman remains. It lies a little way to the East of el Jubeihat ("Jogbehah," Nu 32:35). It is situated, however, to the North and not to the West of ‘Amman, where Eusebius, Onomasticon, places it. Neither identification is certain.

W. Ewing

JAZIZ

ja’-ziz (yaziz, meaning uncertain): The Hagrite who was over David’s flocks (1Ch 27:30 (Hebrew 31)).

JEALOUSY

jel’-us-i (qin’ah; zelos): Doubtless, the root idea of both the Greek and the Hob translated "jealousy" is "warmth," "heat." Both are used in a good and a bad sense—to represent right and wrong passion.

When jealousy is attributed to God, the word is used in a good sense. The language is, of course, anthropomorphic; and it is based upon the feeling in a husband of exclusive right in his wife. God is conceived as having wedded Israel to Himself, and as claiming, therefore, exclusive devotion. Disloyalty on the part of Israel is represented as adultery, and as provoking God to jealousy. See, e.g., De 32:16,21; 1Ki 14:22; Ps 78:58; Eze 8:3; 16:38,42; 23:25; 36:5; 38:19.

When jealousy is attributed to men, the sense is sometimes good, and sometimes bad. In the good sense, it refers to an ardent concern for God’s honor. See, e.g., Nu 25:11 (compare 1Ki 19:10; 2Ki 10:16); 2Co 11:2 (compare Ro 10:2). In the bad sense it is found in Ac 7:9; Ro 13:13; 1Co 3:3; 2Co 12:20; Jas 3:14,16.

The "law of jealousy" is given in Nu 5:11-31. It provided that, when a man suspected his wife of conjugal infidelity, an offering should be brought to the priest, and the question of her guilt or innocence should be subjected to a test there carefully prescribed. The test was intended to be an appeal to God to decide the question at issue.

See ADULTERY; SACRIFICE.

E. J. Forrester

JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF

See IMAGES.

JEALOUSY, WATER OF

See ADULTERY, (2).

JEARIM, MOUNT

je’-a-rim, je-a’-rim (har-ye‘arim): A mountain by the side of which passed the border of Judah (Jos 15:10). It is mentioned here only, and is identical with CHESALON (which see).

JEATHERAI; JEATERAI

je-ath’-e-ri, jeat’-e-ri (Revised Version (British and American)), (the King James Version) (ye’atheray, meaning unknown): A descendant of Gershom, "son" of Levi (1Ch 6:21 (Hebrew 6)), and probably an ancestor of Asaph (so commentators); in 6:39-43 the corresponding name is "Ei." The difference in the Hebrew words is not great.

JEBERECHIAH

je-ber-e-ki’-a (yebherekhyahu, "Yah blesses"): The father of the Zechariah whom Isaiah (8:2) took as a witness of his prophecy against Syria and Ephraim (circa 734 BC).

JEBUS

je’-bus (yebhuc; Iebous): In Jud 19:10,11, "Jebus (the same is Jerusalem)"; 1Ch 11:4,5, "Jerusalem (the same is Jebus)." It was once thought that this was the first name of Jerusalem, as indeed might be suggested by the Biblical references, but it is now known from the Tell el-Amarna Letters that Urusalem was a name used centuries before the time of David (see JERUSALEM, I). It would appear probable that the name "Jebus" was evolved by the Hebrews as an alternate name, and possibly they may have imagined an earlier name, for Jerusalem from JEBUSITE (which see), the name of the local tribe who owned the district in the first centuries of Israel’s occupation of Canaan.

E. W. G. Masterman

JEBUS; JEBUSI; JEBUSITE

je’-bus, jeb’-u-si, jeb’-u-zit (yebhuc, ha-yebhuci): "Jebus" is an old name for Jerusalem (Jud 19:10,11; 1Ch 4:5 parallel 2Sa 5:6-9, "the same is Jerus"; see preceding article). "Jebusi" (literally, "Jebusite") is also used as a name for the city in the King James Version (Jos 18:16,28; compare Jos 15:8); the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "Jebusite" (see JERUSALEM). "Jebusites," for the people (in the King James Version Ge 15:21; Ex 3:8,17, etc.), does not occur in Hebrew in the plural; hence, in the Revised Version (British and American) is always rendered in the singular, "Jebusite." The "Jebusite" is said in Ge 10:16; 1Ch 1:14 to be the 3rd son of Canaan, i.e. of the country of Canaan. Elsewhere he represents a tribe separate from the Canaanites. He stands between Heth and the Amorite (compare Nu 13:29; Jos 11:3; Eze 16:3,15). In the lists of the peoples inhabiting Palestine the "Jebusite" is always placed last, a fact indicative, probably, of their smaller number.

To what race the Jebusites belonged is doubtful. Their name does not seem Semitic, and they do not make their appearance till after the patriarchal period.

The original name of Jerusalem was Babylonian, Uru-Salim, "the city of Salim," shortened into Salem in

Ge 14:18 and in the inscriptions of the Egyptian kings Ramses II and Ramses III. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1400 BC) Jerusalem is still known as Uru-Salim, and its king bears a Hittite name, implying that it was at the time in the possession of the Hittites. His enemies, however, were closing around him, and one of the tablets shows that the city was eventually captured and its king slain. These enemies would seem to have been the Jebusites, since it is after this period that the name "Jebus" makes its appearance for the first time in the Old Testament (Jud 19:10,11).

The Jebusite king at the time of the conquest was Adoni-zedek, who met his death at Beth-boron (Jos 10:1 ; in Jos 10:5 the word "Amorite" is used in its Babylonian sense to denote the inhabitants of Canaan generally). The Jebusites were a mountain tribe (Nu 13:29; Jos 11:3). Their capital "Jebus" was taken by the men of Judah and burned with fire (Jud 18), but they regained possession of, and held, the fortress till the time of David (2Sa 5:6).

When Jerusalem was taken by David, the lives and property of its Jebusite inhabitants were spared, and they continued to inhabit the temple-hill, David and his followers settling in the new City of David on Mt. Zion (Jos 15:8,63; Jud 1:21; 19:11). And as Araunah is called "king" (2Sa 24:23), we may conclude that their last ruler also had been lowed to live. His name is non-Sem, and the various spellings of it (compare 1Ch 21:15, "Ornan") indicate that the Hebrew writers had some difficulty in pronouncing it. The Jebusites seem ultimately to have blended with the Israelite population.

James Orr

JECAMIAH

jek-a-mi’-a: the King James Version for JEKAMIAH (which see).

JECHILIAH

jek-i-li’-a (yekhilyah). See JECHOLIAH; Kethibh and 2Ch 26:3 the Revised Version (British and American), where Qere is yekholyah =" Jecoliah" (the King James Version).

JECHOLIAH

jek-o-li’-a (yekholyahu; 2Ki 15:2 the King James Version = yekholyah, Qere in 2Ch 26:3, "Yah is able" or "Yah has been able"): The mother of King Uzziah (Azariah) of Judah. The Revised Version (British and American) has "Jecoliah" in 2Ki and so the King James Version in 2 Ch.

JECHONIAS

jek-o-ni’-as (Iechonias, the King James Version; Greek form of "Jechoniah," the Revised Version (British and American)):

(1) The altered form of Jehoiachin (Additions to Esther 11:4; Baruch 1:3,9; Mt 1:11,12). The last but one of the kings of Judah.

(2) The son of Zeelus (1 Esdras 8:92), called "Shecaniah" in Ezr 10:2.

JECOLIAH

jek-o-li’-a: 2Ki 15:2; 2Ch 26:3 the King James Version; see JECHILIAH; JECHOLIAH.

JECONIAH

jek-o-ni’-a.

See JEHOIACHIN.

JECONIAS

jek-o-ni-as (Iechonias):

(1) One of the chiliarchs who made great gifts of sheep and calves at the Passover of Josiah (1 Esdras 1:9); called "Conaniah" in 2Ch 35:9.

(2) One reading makes Jeconias (not Joachaz) son of Josiah in 1 Esdras 1:34 margin.

JEDAIAH

je-da’-ya, je-di’-a:

(1) (yedha‘yah, "Yah knows"):

(a) A priest in Jerusalem (1Ch 9:10; 24:7).

(b) Ezr 2:36 = Ne 7:39, where "children of Jedaiah" are mentioned =" Jeddu" in 1 Esdras 5:24.

(c) Jedaiah is among "the priests and the Levites" that returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 11:10; 12:6,19).

(d) Another priest of the same name (Ne 12:7,21).

(e) One of the exiles whom Zechariah was commanded to send with silver and gold to Jerusalem.

Septuagint does not take the word as a proper name (Zec 6:10,14)

(2) (yedhayah, "Yah throws" (?)):

(a) Father of a Simeonite prince (1Ch 4:37).

(b) One of the repairers of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:10).

David Francis Roberts

JEDDU

jed’-oo (Ieddou): Called JEDAIAH (which see 1, (b)) in canonical books (1 Esdras 5:24).

JEDEUS

je-de’-us (Iedaios): Called ADAIAH (which see) in Ezr 10:29 (1 Esdras 9:30).

JEDIAEL

je-di’-a-el (yedhi‘a’-el, "God makes known" (?)):

(1) A "son" of Benjamin or probably of Zebulun (1Ch 7:6,10,11). See Curtis, Chronicles, 145-49, who suggests emending the name to yachle’el, Jahleel, in agreement with Ge 46:24.

(2) One of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:45), probably = the Manassite who deserted to David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20 (Hebrew 21)).

(3) A Korahite doorkeeper in David’s reign (1Ch 26:2).

JEDIDAH

je-di’-da (yedhidhah, "beloved"): Mother of King Josiah of Judah, daughter of Adaiah of Bozkath (2Ki 22:1).

JEDIDIAH

jed-i-di’-a (yedhidh-yah, "the beloved of Yah"): The name conferred by God through Nathan upon Solomon at his birth (2Sa 12:25).

JEDUTHUN

je-du’-thun.

See ASAPH.

JEELI

je-e’-li (Ieieli: Called "Jaalah" in Ezr 2:56 and "Jaala" in Ne 7:58 (1 Esdras 5:33).

JEELUS

je-e’-lus (Ieelos): Called "Jehiel" in Ezr 10:2 (1 Esdras 8:92).

JEEZER

je-e’-zer (the King James Version) (’i‘ezer; the Revised Version (British and American) IEZER): The name of a elan of Gilead (Nu 26:30), but read la-’abhi‘ezer, i.e. "of Abiezer" (compare Jos 17:2).

See ABIEZER.

JEEZERITES

je-e’-zer-its.

See ABIEZER.

JEGAR-SAHA-DUTHA

je-gar-sa-ha-du’-tha (yeghar sahadhutha’; Septuagint Bounos marturei, "(the) mound witnesses"): The name given by the Aramean, Laban, to the "cairn of witness," called by Jacob GALEED (which see) (Ge 31:47). The rest of the second part of this name appears again in Job 16:19, where sahadhi, should be rendered with the Revised Version (British and American), "he that voucheth for me," i.e. "my witness."

JEHALLELEL; JEHALELEEL

je-hal’-e-lel (Revised Version (British and American)), je-ha-le’-le-el (the King James Version) (yehallel’el, "he shall praise God"):

(1) A Judahite (1Ch 4:16).

(2) A Levite, a descendant of Merari (2Ch 29:12).

JEHDEIAH

je-de’-ya, ja’-de-ya (yechdeyahu, "may Yahweh give joy!"):

(1) A Levite, head of the family of Shubael (1Ch 24:20).

(2) An officer of David "over the asses" (1Ch 27:30).

JEHEZKEL; JEHEZEKEL

je-hez’-kel (Revised Version (British and American)), je-hez’-e-kel (the King James Version) (yechezqe’l "God strengthens"):

(1) A priest of David’s time (1Ch 24:16).

(2) Jehezkel in Eze 1:3 King James Version margin, for EZEKIEL (which see).

JEHIAH

je-hi’-a (yechiyah, "may Yahweh live!"): Keeper of the ark with Obed-edom (1Ch 15:24), but in verse 18 the name is ye‘i’el, JEIEL (which see)

JEHIEL; JEHIELI

je-hi’-el, je-hi’-e-li (yechi’el, "may God live!"):

(1) A Levite, one of the musicians appointed to play upon instruments at the bringing up of the ark by David (1Ch 15:18,20; 16:5); (yechi’eli): A patronymic of this name (1Ch 26:21,22), but Curtis (Chronicles, 286-87) reads "Jehiel (1Ch 26:21) and he is brethren Zetham and Joel" (1Ch 26:22); compare 1Ch 23:8, where the three seem to be brothers. See (2) above.

(2) A Gershonite, head of a Levitical house (1Ch 23:8; 29:8).

(3) Son of a Hachmonite; he was "with the king’s (David’s) sons," i.e. their tutor (1Ch 27:32).

(4) A son of King Jehoshaphat (2Ch 21:2).

(5) In 2Ch 29:14 the King James Version, where Qere is yechu'el, the Revised Version (British and American) "Jehuel," a Hermanite Levite who took part in cleansing the temple in Hezekiah's reign.

(6) An overseer in Hezekiah's reign (2Ch 31:13).

(7) One of the three "rulers" of the temple in Hezekiah's reign (2Ch 35:8).

(8) Father of Obadiah, a returned exile (Ezr 8:9) =" Jezelus" of 1 Esdras 8:35.

(9) Father of Shecaniah (Ezr 10:2) =" Jeelus" of 1 Esdras 8:92. He was a "son" of Elam, and so probably the same as "Jehiel" in Ezr 10:26, one of those who had married foreign wives =" Jezrielus" of 1 Esdras 9:27.

(10) A "son" of Harim, and one of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:21) =" Hiereel" of 1 Esdras 9:21.

(11) The King James Version in 1Ch 9:35 = JEIEL (q.v. (2)).

(12) The King James Version in 1Ch 11:44 = JEIEL (q.v. (3)).

David Francis Roberts

JEHIZKIAH

je-hiz-ki'-a (yechizqiyahu, "Yah strengthens"): One of the Ephraimite chiefs (2Ch 28:12) who with Obed are said to have opposed the enslavement of the Judahites taken captive by Pekah in his war against Ahaz (circa 734 BC).

JEHOADDAH; JEHOADAH

je-ho-ad'-a (Revised Version (British and American)), je-ho'-a-da (the King James Version) (yeho'addah, "Yah has deposed" or "numbered"): A descendant of King Saul (1Ch 8:36), called "Jarah" in 1Ch 9:42, where the Septuagint has Iada = ya'dah.

See JARAH.

JEHOADDAN

je-ho-ad'-an (yeho'addan, meaning unknown): In 2Ch 25:1; and Qere, the King James Version in 2Ki 14:2, where Kethibh and the Revised Version (British and American) are "Jehoaddin" (yeho'addin), the mother of King Amaziah of Judah.

JEHOADDIN

je-ho-ad’-in.

See JEHOADDAN.

JEHOAHAZ

je-ho’-a-haz, je-ho-a’-haz (yeho’achaz, "Yah has grasped"; Ioachas; 2Ki 13:1-9):

(1) Son of Jehu, and 11th king of Israel. He is stated to have reigned 17 years.

1. Chronology of Reign:

Josephus was already aware (Ant., IX, viii, 5) of the chronological difficulty involved in the cross-references in 2Ki 13:1 and 10, the former of which states that Jehoahaz began to reign in the 23rd year of Jehoash of Jerusalem, and reigned 17 years; while the latter gives him a successor in Jehoash’s 37th year, or 14 years later. Josephus alters the figure of 13:1 to 21; and, to meet the same difficulty, the Septuagint (Aldine edition) changes 37 to 39 in 13:10. The difficulty may be met by supposing that Jehoahaz was associated with his father Jehu for several years in the government of the country before the death of the latter, and that these years were counted as a part of his reign. This view has in its favor the fact that Jehu was an old man when he died, and may have been incapacitated for the full discharge of administrative duties before the end came. The accession of Jehoahaz as sole ruler may be dated about 825 BC.

2. Low Condition of the Kingdom:

When Jehoahaz came to the throne, he found a discouraged and humiliated people. The territory beyond Jordan, embracing 2 1/2 tribes, or one-fourth of the whole kingdom, had been lost in warfare with the Syrian king, Hazael (2Ki 10:32,33). A heavy annual subsidy was still payable to Assyria, as by his father Jehu. The neighboring kingdom of Judah was still unfriendly to any member of the house of Jehu. Elisha the prophet, though then in the zenith of his influence, does not seem to have done anything toward the stability of Jehu’s throne.

3. Israel and Syria:

Specially did Israel suffer during this reign from the continuance of the hostility of Damascus (2Ki 13:3,4,22). Hazael had been selected, together with Jehu, as the instrument by which the idolatry of Israel was to be punished (1Ki 19:16). Later the instruments of vengeance fell out. On Jehu’s death, the pressure from the east on Hazael was greatly relieved. The great conqueror, Shalmaneser II, had died,

and his son Samsi-Ramman IV had to meet a revolt within the empire, and was busy with expeditions against Babylon and Media during the 12 years of his reign (824-812 BC). During these years, the kingdoms of the seaboard of the Mediterranean were unmolested. They coincide with the years of Jehoahaz, and explain the freedom which Hazael had to harass the dominions of that king.

4. The Elisha Episodes:

Particulars of the several campaigns in which the troops of Damascus harassed Israel are not given. The life of Elisha extended through the 3 reigns of Jehoram (12 years), Jehu (28 years) and Jehoahaz (12 or 13 years), into the reign of Joash (2Ki 13:1). It is therefore probable that in the memorabilia of his life in 2Ki 4-8, now one and now another king of Israel should figure, and that some of the episodes there recorded belong to the reign of Jehoahaz. There are evidences that strict chronological order is not observed in the narrative of Elisha, e.g. Gehazi appears in waiting on the king of Israel in 8:5, after the account of his leprosy in 5:27. The terrible siege of Samaria in 2Ki 7 is generally referred to the reign of Jehoram; but no atmosphere is so suitable to it as that of the reign of Jehoahaz, in one of the later years of whom it may have occurred. The statement in 13:7 that "the king of Syria destroyed them, and made them like the dust in threshing," and the statistics there given of the depleted army of Jehoahaz, would correspond with the state of things that siege implies. In this case the Ben-hadad of 2Ki 6:24 would be the son of Hazael (13:3).

5. His Idolatry:

Jehoahaz, like his father, maintained the calf-worship in Bethel and Dan, and revived also the cult of the Asherah, a form of Canaanitish idolatry introduced by Ahab (1Ki 16:33). It centered round a sacred tree or pole, and was probably connected with phallic worship (compare 1 K 15:13, where Maacah, mother of Asa, is said to have "made an abominable image for an Asherah" in Jerusalem).

6. Partial Reform:

The close of this dark reign, however, is brightened by a partial reform. In his distress, we are told, "Jehoahaz besought Yahweh, and Yahweh hearkened unto him" (2Ki 13:4). If the siege of Samaria in 2Ki 6 belongs to his reign, we might connect this with his wearing "sackcloth within upon his flesh" (6:30)—an act of humiliation only accidentally discovered by the rending of his garments. 2Ki 6:5 goes on to say that "Yahweh gave Israel a saviour, so that they went out from under the hand of the Syrians." The "saviour" may refer to Joash, under whom the deliverance began (13:25), or to Jeroboam II, of whom it is declared that by him God "saved" Israel (14:27). Others take it to refer to Ramman-nirari III, king of Assyria, whose conquest of Damascus made possible the victories of these kings.

See JEHOASH.

W. Shaw Caldecott

(2) A king of Judah, son and successor of Josiah; reigned three months and was deposed, 608 BC. Called "Shallum" in Jer 22:11; compare 1Ch 3:15. The story of his reign is told in 2Ki 23:30-35, and in a briefer account in 2Ch 36:1-3. The historian o 2 Kings characterizes his reign as evil; 2Ch passes no verdict upon him. On the death of his father in battle, which threw the realm into confusion, he, though a younger son (compare 2Ki 23:31 with 23:36; 1Ch 3:15 makes him the fourth son of Josiah), was raised to the throne by "the people of the land," the same who had secured the accession to his father; see under JOSIAH. Perhaps, as upholders of the sterling old Davidic idea, which his father had carried out so well, they saw in him a better hope for its integrity than in his elder brother Jehoiakim (Eliakim), whose tyrannical tendencies may already have been too apparent. The prophets also seem to have set store by him, if we may judge by the sympathetic mentions of him in Jer 22:11 and Eze 1:3,4. His career was too short, however, to make any marked impression on the history of Judah.

Josiah’s ill-advised meddling with the designs of Pharaoh-necoh (see under JOSIAH) had had, in fact, the ill effect of plunging Judah again into the vortex of oriental politics, from which it had long been comparatively free. The Egyptian king immediately concluded that so presumptuous a state must not be left in his rear unpunished. Arrived at Riblah on his Mesopotamian expedition, he put Jehoahaz in bonds, and later carried him prisoner to Egypt, where he died; raised his brother Jehoiakim to the throne as a vassal king; and imposed on the realm a fine of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold. So the fortunes of the Judean state, so soon after Josiah’s good reign, began their melancholy change for the worse.

John Franklin Genung

(3) In 2Ch 21:17; 25:23 = AHAZIAH, king of Judah (which see) (2Ki 8:25 ff; 2Ch 22:1).

JEHOASH; JOASH

je-ho’-ash, the uncontracted form of (yeho’ash, yo’ash, "Yahweh has bestowed"; compare 2Ki 11:2,21; 12:1,19; 2Ch 24:1, etc.; Ioas):

(1) The 9th king of Judah; son of Ahaziah and Zibiah, a woman of Beersheba (2Ki 11-12; 2Ch 22:10-24:27). Jehoash was 7 years old at his accession, and reigned 40 years. His accession may be placed in 852 BC. Some include in the years of his reign the 6 years of Athaliah’s usurpation.

I. Ninth King of Judah

1. His Early Preservation:

When, on Athaliah’s usurpation of the throne, she massacred the royal princes, Jehoash was saved from her unnatural fury by the action of his aunt Jehosheba, the wife of Jehoiada, the high priest (2Ki 11:1,2; 2Ch 22:10,11). During 6 years he was concealed in the house of Jehoiada, which adjoined the temple; hence, is said to have been "hid in the house of Yahweh"—a perfectly legitimate use of the phrase

according to the idiom of the time.

2. The Counter-Revolution:

During these formative years of Jehoash's early life, he was under the moral and spiritual influence of Jehoiada—a man of lofty character and devout spirit. At the end of 6 years, a counter-revolution was planned by Jehoiada, and was successfully carried out on a Sabbath, at one of the great festivals. The accounts of this revolution in Kings and Chronicles supplement each other, but though the Levitical interest of the Chronicler is apparent in the details to which he gives prominence, the narratives do not necessarily collide, as has often been represented. The event was prepared for by the young king being privately exhibited to the 5 captains of the "executioners" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Carites") and "runners" (2Ki 11:4; 2Ch 23:1). These entered into covenant with Jehoiada, and, by his direction, summoned the Levites from Judah (2Ch 23:2), and made the necessary arrangements for guarding the palace and the person of the king. In these dispositions both the royal body-guard and the Levites seem to have had their parts. Jehoash next appears standing on a platform in front of the temple, the law of the testimony in his hand and the crown upon his head. Amid acclamations, he is anointed king. Athaliah, rushing on the scene with cries of "treason" (see ATHALIAH), is driven forth and slain. A new covenant is made between Yahweh and the king and people, and, at the conclusion of the ceremony, a great procession is formed, and the king is conducted with honor to the royal house (2Ki 11:19; 2Ch 23:20). Thus auspiciously did the new reign begin.

3. Repair of the Temple:

Grown to manhood (compare the age of his son Amaziah, 2Ki 14:25), Jehoash married two wives, and by them had sons and daughters (2Ch 24:3). His great concern at this period, however, was the repair of the temple—the "house of Yahweh"—which in the reign of Athaliah had been broken up in many places, plundered, and allowed to become dilapidated (2Ki 12:5,12; 2Ch 24:7). To meet the expense of its restoration, the king gave orders that all moneys coming into the temple, whether dues or voluntary offerings, should be appropriated for this purpose (2Ki 12:4), and from the account in Chronicles would seem to have contemplated a revival of the half-shekel tax appointed by Moses for the construction of the tabernacle (2Ch 24:5,6; compare Ex 30:11-16; 38:25). To enforce this impost would have involved a new census, and the memory of the judgments which attended David's former attempt of this kind may well have had a deterrent effect on Jehoiada and the priesthood. "The Levites hastened it not," it is declared (2Ch 24:5).

4. A New Expedient:

Time passed, and in the 23rd year of the king's reign (his 30th year), it was found that the breaches of the house had still not been repaired. A new plan was adopted. It was arranged that a chest with a hole bored in its lid should be set up on the right side of the altar in the temple-court, under the care of two persons, one the king's scribe, the other an officer of the high priest, and that the people should be invited to bring voluntarily their half-shekel tax or other offerings, and put it in this box (2Ki 12:9; 2Ch

24:8,9). Gifts from worshippers who did not visit the altar were received by priests at the gate, and brought to the box. The expedient proved brilliantly successful. The people cheerfully responded, large sums were contributed, the money was honestly expended, and the temple was thoroughly renovated. There remained even a surplus, with which gold and silver vessels were made, or replaced, for the use of the temple. Jehoiada's long and useful life seems to have closed soon after.

5. The King's Declension:

With the death of this good man, it soon became evident that the strongest pillar of the state was removed. It is recorded that "Jehoash did that which was right in the eyes of Yahweh all his days wherein Jehoiada the priest instructed him" (2Ki 12:2), but after Jehoiada had been honorably interred in the sepulchers of the kings (2Ch 24:16), a sad declension became manifest. The princes of Judah came to Jehoash and expressed their wish for greater freedom in worship than had been permitted them by the aged priest. With weak complaisance, the king "hearkened unto them" (2Ch 24:17). Soon idols and Asherahs began to be set up in Jerusalem and the other cities of Judah. Unnamed prophets raised their protests in vain. The high priest Zechariah, a worthy son of Jehoiada, testified in his place that as the nation had forsaken Yahweh, he also would forsake it, and that disaster would follow (2Ch 24:20). Wrathful at the rebuke, the king gave orders that Zechariah should be stoned with stones in the temple-court (2Ch 24:21). This was done, and the act of sacrilege, murder, and ingratitude was perpetrated to which Jesus seems to refer in Mt 23:35; Lu 11:51 ("son of Barachiah" in the former passage is probably an early copyist's gloss through confusion with the prophet Zechariah).

6. Calamities and Assassination:

The high priest's dying words, "Yahweh look upon it, and require it," soon found an answer. Within a year of Zechariah's death, the armies of Hazael, the Syrian king, were ravaging and laying waste Judah. The city of Gath fell, and a battle, the place of which is not given, placed Jerusalem at the mercy of the foe (2Ki 12:17; 2Ch 24:23,24). To save the capital from the indignity of foreign occupation, Jehoash, then in dire sickness, collected all the hallowed things of the temple, and all the gold of the palace, and sent them to Hazael (2Ki 12:17,18). This failure of his policy, in both church and state, excited such popular feeling against Jehoash, that a conspiracy was formed to assassinate him. His physical sufferings won for him no sympathy, and two of his own officers slew him, while asleep, in the fortress of Millo, where he was paying a visit (2Ki 12:20). He was buried in the city of David, but not in the royal sepulchers, as Jehoiada had been (2Ch 24:25).

Jehoash is mentioned as the father of Amaziah (2Ki 14:1; 2Ch 25:25). His contemporaries in Israel were Jehoahaz (2Ki 13:1) and Jehoash (2Ki 13:10).

(2) The son of Jehoahaz, and 12th king of Israel (2Ki 13:10-25; 14:8-16; 2Ch 25:17-24).

II. Twelveth King of Israel

1. Accession and Reign:

Jehoash reigned for 16 years. His accession may be placed in 813 BC. There were almost simultaneous changes in the sovereignties of Judah and of Assyria—Amazih succeeding to the throne of Judah in the 2nd year of Jehoash, and Ramman-nirari III coming to the throne of Assyria in 811 BC—which had important effects on the history of Israel in this reign.

2. Elisha and Jehoash:

During the three previous reigns, for half a century, Elisha had been the prophet of Yahweh to Israel. He was now aged and on his deathbed. Hearing of his illness, the young king came to Dothan, where the prophet was, and had a touching interview with him. His affectionate exclamation, "My father, my father, the chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof" (2Ki 13:14; compare 2:12), casts a pleasing light upon his character. On his lips the words had another meaning than they bore when used by Elish himself at Elijah's translation. Then they referred to the "appearance" which parted Elisha from his master; now they referred to the great service rendered by the prophet to the kingdom. Not only had Elisha repeatedly saved the armies of Israel from the ambushes prepared for them by the Syrians (2Ki 6:8-23), but he had given assurance of the relief of the capital when it was at its worst extremity (2Ki 6:24). To Jehoash, Elisha's presence was indeed in place of chariots and horse. The truth was anew demonstrated by the promise which the dying prophet now made to him. Directing Jehoash in the symbolical action of the shooting of certain arrows, he predicted three victories over the Syrians—the first at Aphek, now Fik, on the East of the Lake of Galilee—and more would have been granted, had the faith of the king risen to the opportunity then afforded him (2Ki 6:15-19).

3. Assyria and Damascus:

An interesting light is thrown by the annals of Assyria on the circumstances which may have made these victories of Jehoash possible. Ramman-nirari III, who succeeded to the throne in 811 BC, made an expedition against Damascus, Edom and Philistia, in his account of which he says: "I shut up the king (of Syria) in his chief city, Damascus. .... He clasped my feet, and gave himself up. .... His countless wealth and goods I seized in Damascus." With the Syrian power thus broken during the remainder of this ruler's reign of 27 years, it may be understood how Jehoash should be able to recover, as it is stated he did, the cities which Ben-hadad had taken from his father Jehoahaz (2Ki 13:25). Schrader and others see in this Assyrian ruler the "saviour" of Israel alluded to in 2Ki 13:5; more usually the reference is taken to be to Jehoash himself, and to Jeroboam II (compare 2Ki 14:27).

4. War With Judah:

The epitome of Jehoash's reign is very brief, but the favorable impression formed of him from the acts of Elisha is strengthened by another gained from the history of Amaziah of Judah (2Ki 14:8-16; 2Ch 25:17-24). For the purpose of a southern campaign Amaziah had hired a large contingent of troops from Samaria. Being sent back unemployed, these mercenaries committed ravages on their way home, for

which, apparently, no redress was given. On the first challenge of the king of Judah, Jehoash magnanimously refused the call to arms, but on Amaziah persisting, the peace established nearly 80 years before by Jehoshaphat (1Ki 22:44) was broken at the battle of Beth-shemesh, in which Amaziah was defeated and captured. Jerusalem opened its gates to the victor, and was despoiled of all its treasure, both of palace and temple. A portion of the wall was broken down, and hostages for future behavior were taken to Samaria (2Ki 14:13,14).

5. Character:

Jehoash did not long survive his crowning victory, but left a resuscitated state, and laid the foundation for a subsequent rule which raised Israel to the zenith of its power. Josephus gives Jehoash a high character for godliness, but, like each of his predecessors, he followed in the footsteps of Jeroboam I in permitting, if not encouraging, the worship of the golden calves. Hence, his conduct is pronounced "evil" by the historian (2Ki 13:11). He was succeeded by his son Jeroboam II.

W. Shaw Caldecott

JEHOHANAN

je-ho-ha’-nan (yehochanan, "Yahweh is (or has been) gracious"):

(1) A Korahite doorkeeper in David’s reign, "son" of Meshelemiah (1Ch 26:3). Septuagint, Luc, has "Jehonathan."

(2) One of the five captains over King Jehoshaphat’s army (2Ch 17:15), probably father of Ishmael, "son of Jehohanan" (2Ch 23:1).

(3) Ezr 10:6 (the King James Version has "Johnnan") =" Johanan" of Ne 12:22,23 =" Jonathan" of Ne 12:11, "son" of Eliashib (Ezr 10:6; but "grandson" in Ne 12:11). He was high priest in Ezra’s time =" Jonas" in 1 Esdras 9:1 (the King James Version "Joanan").

(4) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:28) =" Joannes" the Revised Version (British and American), "Johannes" the King James Version (1 Esdras 9:29).

(5) Son of Tobiah, the Ammonite, Nehemiah’s opponent (Ne 6:18, the King James Version "Johanan").

(6) Head of the priestly family of Amariah (Ne 12:13).

(7) A priest present at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 12:42).

(8) The name in the Hebrew of 2Ch 28:12.

See JOHANAN, (7).

David Francis Roberts

JEHOIACHIN

je-hoi’-a-kin (yehoyakhin, "Yahweh will uphold"; called also "Jeconiah" in 1Ch 3:16; Jer 24:1; yekhonyah, "Yahweh will be steadfast," and "Coniah" in Jer 22:24,28; konyahu, "Yahweh has upheld him"; ‘Ioakeim): A king of Judah; son and successor of Jehoiakim; reigned three months and surrendered to Nebuchadnezzar; was carried to Babylon, where, after being there 37 years a prisoner, he died.

1. Sources:

The story of his reign is told in 2Ki 24:8-16, and more briefly in 2Ch 36:9-10. Then, after the reign of his successor Zedekiah and the final deportation are narrated, the account of his release from prison 37 years afterward and the honor done him is given as the final paragraph of 2Ki (25:27-30). The same thing is told at the end of the Book of Jer (52:31-34). Neither for this reign nor for the succeeding is there the usual reference to state annals; these seem to have been discontinued after Jehoiakim. In Jer 22:24-30 there is a final pronouncement on this king, not so much upon the man as upon his inevitable fate, and a prediction that no descendant of his shall ever have prosperous rule in Judah.

2. His Reign:

Of the brief reign of Jehoiachin there is little to tell. It was rather a historic landmark than a reign; but its year, 597 BC, was important as the date of the first deportation of Jewish captives to Babylon (unless we except the company of hostages carried away in Jehoiakim’s 3rd (4th) year, Da 1:1-7). His coming to the throne was just at or near the time when Nebuchadnezzar’s servants were besieging Jerusalem; and when the Chaldean king’s arrival in person to superintend the siege made apparent the futility of resistance, Jehoiachin surrendered to him, with all the royal household and the court. He was carried prisoner to Babylon, and with him ten thousand captives, comprising all the better and sturdier element of the people from prince to craftsman, leaving only the poorer sort to constitute the body of the nation under his successor Zedekiah. With the prisoners were carried away also the most valuable treasures of the temple and the royal palace.

3. The Two Elements:

Ever since Isaiah fostered the birth and education of a spiritually-minded remnant, for him the vital hope of Israel, the growth and influence of this element in the nation has been discernible, as well in the persecution it has roused (see under MANASSEH), as in its fiber of sound progress. It is as if a sober sanity of reflection were curing the people of their empty idolatries. The feeling is well expressed in

such a passage as Hab 2:18-20. Hitherto, however, the power of this spiritual Israel has been latent, or at best mingled and pervasive among the various occupations and interests of the people. The surrender of Jehoiachin brings about a segmentation of Israel on an unheard-of principle: not the high and low in wealth or social position, but the weight and worth of all classes on the one side, who are marked for deportation, and the refuse element of all classes on the other, who are left at home. With which element of this strange sifting Jeremiah's prophetic hopes are identified appears in his parable of the Good and Bad Figs (Jer 24), in which he predicts spiritual integrity and upbuilding to the captives, and to the home-staying remainder, shame and calamity. Later on, he writes to the exiles in Babylon, advising them to make themselves at home and be good citizens (Jer 29:1-10). As for the hapless king, "this man Coniah," who is to be their captive chief in a strange land, Jeremiah speaks of him in a strain in which the stern sense of Yahweh's inexorable purpose is mingled with tender sympathy as he predicts that this man shall never have a descendant on David's throne (Jer 22:24-30). It is as if he said, All as Yahweh has ordained, but—the pity of it!

4. Thirty-seven Years Later:

In the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's successor, perhaps by testamentary edict of Nebuchadnezzar himself, a strange thing occurred. Jehoiachin, who seems to have been a kind of hostage prisoner for his people, was released from prison, honored above all the other kings in similar case, and thenceforth to the end of his life had his portion at the royal table (2Ki 25:27-30; Jer 52:31-34). This act of clemency may have been due to some such good influence at court as is described in the Book of Daniel; but also it was a tribute to the good conduct of that better element of the people of which he was hostage and representative. It was the last event of Judean royalty; and suggestive for the glimpse it seems to afford of a people whom the Second Isaiah could address as redeemed and forgiven, and of a king taken from durance and judgment (compare Isa 53:8), whose career makes strangely vivid the things that are said of the mysterious "Servant of Yahweh."

John Franklin Genung

JEHOIADA

je-hoi'-a-da (yehoyadha', "Yahweh knows"; Iodae):

(1) Father of Benaiah, the captain of David's body-guard (2Sa 8:18; 20:23; 23:20,22; 1Ki 1:8, etc.). Jehoiada was "the son of a valiant man of Kabzeel" (2Sa 23:20), but commentators read with Septuagint and Ewald, "Benaiah (the son of Jehoiada) a man of valor." Kabzeel was a town belonging to Judah on the border of Edom in the South (Jos 15:21). In 1Ch 27:5, we read "Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada the priest, chief," the Revised Version (British and American), but the Revised Version margin has "chief minister" wrongly. Yet Jehoiada is nowhere else called a priest or even a Levite, though in 1Ch 12:27 (Hebrew, verse 28) a Jehoiada is mentioned as a military "leader of the house of Aaron," who came to David to Hebron with other members of the house of Levi. In 1Ch 27:34 there is named among David's counselors, "Jehoiada the son. of Benaiah," where some commentators would read with two

manuscripts, "Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada" though Curtis, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, 295, keeps the Massoretic Text.

(2) Priest in the reigns of Ahaziah, Queen Athaliah, and Jehoash (Joash) of Judah (2Ki 11:4-12:16 (Hebrew 17) = 2Ch 23:1-24:14; 2Ch 22:11; 24:14-16,17-20,22,25). In 2Ki 12:10 (Hebrew, verse 11) he is called "high priest," and is the first to be given that title, but as the priest lived in the temple, there is no meaning in saying that he "came up," so commentators omit the words, "and the chief priest." According to 2Ch 22:11, he had married Jehoshabeath (= Jehosheba), the daughter of the king, i.e. Jehoram.

1. Jehoiada and the Revolt against Athaliah:

(a) The account in 2Ch 23:1-21 differs in many respects from that in 2Ki 11:4-20, but even the latter has its problems, and Stade (ZATW, 1885, 280 ff) pointed out two sources in it. This view is accepted by many. A reader is struck at once by the double reference to the death of Athaliah (2Ki 11:16,20), and the construction of the Hebrew for "making a covenant" is different in 2Ki 11:4 from that in 11:17. Stade holds that there is one narrative in 11:4-12,18b-20 and another in 11:13-18a.

In the first, Jehoiada makes an agreement with the captains of the foreign body-guard, and arranges that both the incoming and outgoing temple-guard shall be kept in the temple at the time when the guard should be changed on the Sabbath, and also that th e young prince, Jehoash, who had been kept in hiding, shall be proclaimed. The captains do this, and the prince is crowned and proclaimed (2Ki 11:4-12). Then officers are set up in the temple, and Jehoash is taken to the royal palace and enthroned. The revolt proves popular with the people of Jerusalem and those of the district, and Athaliah is slain in the palace.

But there are difficulties in this narrative, though the above gives the trend of events; 2Ki 11:5 refers to a third of the guard who "came in on the sabbath," and 11:7 to two companies who "go forth on the sabbath"; the Hebrew is, "they that enter the sabbath" and "they that go out of the sabbath." 2Ki 11:9 makes clear the connection between 11:5 and 7. But 11:6 introduces a difficulty: it seems to denote a division of those who "enter" into three divisions, i.e. the two in 11:6 and one in 11:5. If 11:6 be omitted, as is proposed by many, this difficulty vanishes. But there still remains the question of the change of guards. Commentators say that "they who enter the sabbath" are those who leave the temple and enter their quarters at the beginning of the Sabbath, presumably, while "those who go out" are those who leave their quarters to mount guard. This is not impossible as an explanation of the Hebrew. It is further believed that the guard at the temple on the Sabbath was double that on other days. The other explanation, held by older commentators is that on the Sabbath the guard was only half its usual size; this gives another meaning to the Hebrew phrases. On the other hand, it may be held that the revolt took place at the close of the Sabbath, and that the double-sized guard was kept by Jehoiada even after the usual-sized one had come to take their place. It should be added that Wellhausen proposed to read (tse‘adhoth), "armlets" (compare Isa 3:19), for (‘edhuth), "testimony," in 2Ki 11:12; and in 11:19 the words "and all the people of the land" are held to be an addition.

(b) The 2nd narrative (2Ki 11:13-18 a) begins suddenly. Presumably, its earlier part was identical with the earlier part of the 1st narrative, unless 2Ki 11:6 was a part originally of this 2nd account. Athaliah hears the noise of the people (11:13, where "the guard" is a gloss and so to be omitted), and comes to the temple, where she witnesses the revolt and cries, "Treason! treason!" Jehoiada orders her to be put forth (omit "between the ranks" in 11:15), so that she should not be slain in the temple, and she is murdered at one of the palace entrances (11:16, where the Revised Version (British and American), following Septuagint of 2Ch 23:15, translates the first sentence wrongly: it should be "So they laid hands on her"). Jehoiada then makes the king and the people enter into a solemn covenant to be Yahweh's people, and the result is the destruction of the temple of Baal, and the death of Mattan, its priest (1Ki 11:17,18 a). This 2nd narrative gives a religious significance to the revolt, but it is incomplete. The other narrative presents a very natural course of events, for it was absolutely necessary for Jehoiada to secure the allegiance of the royal foreign body-guard.

(c) The account in 2Ch 23:1-21, though following that of 2Ki in the main, differs from it considerably. The guard is here composed of Levites; it does not mention the foreign body-guard, and relates how the revolt was planned with the Levites of the cities of Judah—a method which would have become known to Athaliah and for which she would have made preparations, no doubt. Ch makes it a wholly religious movement, while 2 Kings gives two points of view. The value of the Chronicler's account depends largely on one's estimate of the Books of Chronicles and one's views as to the development of the Jewish priestly system. A. Van Hoonacker, Lesacerdoce levitique dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hebreux, 93-100, defends the account in 2 Chronicles.

2. Jehoiada and the Restoration of the Temple:

The part which Jehoiada played in the restoration of the temple buildings is described in 2Ki 11:21-12:16 (Hebrew 12:1-17) parallel 2Ch 24:1-14. Here again the narratives of 2Ki and 2Ch differ to a large extent.

(a) According to 2 Kings,

(i) the priests are commanded by Jehoash to devote the dues or free-will offerings of the people to repairing the breaches in the temple. They fail to do so, and

(ii) Jehoiada is summoned by the king and rebuked. Then

(iii) a new regulation is put into force: the offerings, except the guilt offerings and sin offerings, are no longer to be given to the priests, but to be put into a chest provided in the temple for the purpose.

(iv) The money got in this way is devoted to repairing the temple, but

(v) none of it is used to provide temple vessels.

(b) Chronicles, on the other hand,

(i) relates that the priests and Levites are commanded to go through Judah to collect the necessary money. They "hastened it not." Then

(ii) Jehoiada is summoned to account for this disobedience, and

(iii) a chest is put outside the temple to receive the tax commanded by Moses.

(iv) This the people pay willingly, and the temple is repaired. There is such a surplus that

(v) there is money also to provide vessels for the temple.

It is at least questionable whether the additions in 2 Chronicles are trustworthy; the contradictions against 2 Kings are clear, and the latter gives the more likely narrative, although Van Hoonackcr (op. cit., 10114) defends the former.

According to 2Ch 24:15, Jehoiada lived to be 130 years old, and was buried among the kings—a unique distinction.

(3) The King James Version in Ne 3:6 = JOIADA (which see).

(4) There is a Jehoiada, the priest mentioned in Jer 29:26, in whose stead Zephaniah was declared priest by Shemaiah in a letter.

Giesebrecht takes him to be the same as the priest of Athaliah's time (see (2) above), but Duhm says that nothing is known of him. In any case, Zephaniah could not have been the direct successor of the well-known Jehoiada, and so the reference can scarcely be to him if it is to have any meaning.

David Francis Roberts

JEHOIAKIM

je-hoi'-a-kim (yehoyaqim, "Yahweh will establish"; Ioakeim): The name given him by Pharaoh-necoh, who raised him to the throne as vassal king in place of his brother Jehoahaz, is changed from Eliakim ('elyaqim, "God will establish"). The change compounds the name, after the royal Judean custom, with that of Yahweh; it may also imply that Necoh claims Yahweh's authorization for his act, as in a similar way Sennacherib had claimed it for his invasion of Judah (2Ki 18:25). He has represented the campaign with which Josiah interfered as undertaken by Divine command ('El, 2Ch 35:21); this episode of it merely translates the authorization, rather arrogantly, into the conquered nation's dialect.

A king of Judah, elder (half-) brother and successor of Jehoahaz; reigned 11 years from 608 BC.

I. Sources for His Life and Time.

1. Annalistic:

The circumstances of his accession and raising of the indemnity to Pharaoh-necoh, followed by a brief resume of his reign, are narrated in 2Ki 23:34-24:6. The naming of the source for "the rest of his acts" (24:5) is the last reference we have to "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah." The account in 2Ch 36:5-8, though briefer still, mentions Nebuchadnezzar's looting of the temple at some uncertain date in his reign. Neither account has any good to say of Jehoiakim; to the writer of 2 Kings, however, his ill fortunes are due to Yahweh's retributive justice for the sins of Manasseh; while to the Chronicler the sum of his acts, apparently connected with the desecration of the sanctuary, is characterized as "the abominations which he did." For "the rest of his acts" we are referred, also for the last time, to the "book of the kings of Israel and Judah."

2. Prophetic:

For the moral and spiritual chaos of the time, and for prophecies and incidents throwing much light on the king's character, Jeremiah has a number of extended passages, not, however, in consecutive order.

The main ones clearly identifiable with this reign are: 2Ki 22:13-19, inveighing against the king's tyrannies and predicting his ignominious death; 2 Kings 26, dated in the beginning of his reign and again predicting (as had been predicted before in 7:2-15) the destruction of the temple; 2 Kings 25, dated in his 4th year and predicting the conquest of Judah and surrounding nations by Nebuchadnezzar; 2 Kings 36, dated in the 4th and 5th years, and telling the story of the roll of prophecy which the king destroyed; 2 Kings 45, an appendix from the 4th year, reassuring Baruch the scribe, in terms of the larger prophetic scale, for his dismay at what he had to write; 2 Kings 46, also an appendix, a reminiscence of the year of Carchemish, containing the oracle then pronounced against Egypt, and giving words of the larger comfort to Judah. The Book of the prophet Habakkuk, written in this reign, gives expression to the prophetic feeling of doubt and dismay at the unrequited ravages of the Chaldeans against a people more righteous than they, with a sense of the value of steadfast faith and of Yahweh's world-movement and purpose which explains the seeming enormity.

II. Character and Events of His Reign.

1. The Epoch:

The reign of Jehoiakim is not so significant for any personal impress of his upon his time as for the fact that it fell in one of the most momentous epochs of ancient history. By the fall of Nineveh in 606 to the assault of Nebuchadnezzar, then crown prince of the rising Babylonian empire, Assyria, "the rod of (Yahweh's) anger" (Isa 10:5), ended its arrogant and inveterate sway over the nations. Nebuehadnezzar,

coming soon after to the Chaldean throne, followed up his victory by a vigorous campaign against Pharaoh-necoh, whom we have seen at the end of Josiah's reign (see under JOSIAH) advancing toward the Euphrates in his attempt to secure Egyptian dominion over Syria and Mesopotamia. The encounter took place in 605 at Carehemish on the northern Euphrates, where Necoh was defeated and driven back to the borders of his own land, never more to renew his aggressions (2Ki 24:7). The dominating world-empire was now in the hands of the Chaldeans, "that bitter and hasty nation" (Hab 1:6); the first stage of the movement by which the world's civilization was passing from Semitic to Aryan control. With this world-movement Israel's destiny was henceforth to be intimately involved; the prophets were already dimly aware of it, and were shaping their warnings and promises, as by a Divine instinct, to that end. It was on this larger scale of things that they worked; it had all along been their endeavor, and continued with increasing clearness and fervor, to develop in Israel a conscience and stamina which should be a leavening power for good in the coming great era (compare Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-3).

2. The King's Perverse Character:

Of all these prophetic meanings, however, neither the king nor the ruling classes had the faintest realization; they saw only the political exigencies of the moment. Nor did the king himself, in any patriotic way, rise even to the immediate occasion. As to policy, he was an unprincipled opportunist: vassal to Necoh to whom he owed his throne, until Necoh himself was defeated; enforced vassal to Nebuchadnezzar for 3 years along with the other petty kings of Western Asia; then rebelling against the latt er as soon as he thought he could make anything by it. As to responsibility of administration, he had simply the temper of a despotic self-indulgent Oriental. He raised the immense fine that Necoh imposed upon him by a direct taxation, which he farmed out to unscrupulous officials. He indulged himself with erecting costly royal buildings, employing for the purpose enforced and unpaid labor (Jer 22:13-17); while all just interests of his oppressed subjects went wholly unregarded. As to religion, he let matters go on as they had been under Manasseh, probably introducing also the still more strange and heathenish rites from Egypt and the East of which we see the effects in Eze 8:5-17. And meanwhile the reformed temple-worship which Josiah had introduced seems to have become a mere formal and perfunctory matter, to which, if we may judge by his conspicuous absence from fast and festal occasions (e.g. Jer 26; 36), the king paid no attention. His impious act of cutting up and burning Jeremiah's roll (Jer 36:23), as also his vindictive pursuit and murder of Uriah for prophesying in the spirit of Jeremiah (26:20-23), reveal his antipathy to any word that does not prophesy "smooth things" (compare Isa 30:10), and in fact a downright perversity to the name and w ill of Yahweh.

3. The Prophetic Attitude:

With the onset of the Chaldean power, prophecy, as represented in the great seers whose words remain to us, reached a crisis which only time and the consistent sense of its Iarger issues could enable it to weather. Isaiah, in his time, had stood for the inviolability of Zion, and a miraculous deliverance had vindicated his sublime faith. But with Jeremiah, conditions had changed. The idea thus engendered, that the temple was bound to stand and with it Jerusalem, an idea confirmed by Josiah's centralizing reforms, had become a superstition and a presumption (compare Jer 7:4); and Jeremiah had reached the conviction that it, with its wooden rites and glaring abuses, must go: that nothing short of a clean sweep

of the old religious fetishes could cure the inveterate unspirituality of the nation. This conviction of his must needs seem to many like an inconsistency—to set prophecy against itself. And when the Chaldean appeared on the scene, his counsel of submission and prediction of captivity would seem a double inconsistency; not only a traversing of a tested prophecy, but treason to the state. This was the situation that he had to encounter; and for it he gave his tender feelings, his liberty, his life. It is in this reign of Jehoiakim that, for the sake of Yahweh's word and purpose, he is engulfed in the deep tragedy of his career. And in this he must be virtually alone. Habakkuk is indeed with him in sympathy; but his vision is not so clear; he must weather disheartening doubts, and" cherish the faith of the righteous (Hab 2:4), and wait until the vision of Yahweh's secret purpose clears (Hab 2:1-3). If the prophets themselves are thus having such an equivocal crisis, we can imagine how forlorn is the plight of Yahweh's "remnant," who are dependent on prophetic faith and courage to guide them through the depths. The humble nucleus of the true Israel, which is some day to be the nation's redeeming element, is undergoing a stern seasoning.

4. Harassing and Death:

After Syria fell into Nebuchadnezzar's power, he seems to have established his headquarters for some years at Riblah; and after Jehoiada attempted to revolt from his authority, he sent against him guerrilla bands from the neighboring nations, and detachments from his Chaldean garrisons, who harassed him with raids and depredations. In 2Ch 36:6,7, it is related that Nebuchadnezzar carried some of the vessels of the temple to Babylon and bound the king in fetters to carry him also to Babylon—the latter purpose apparently not carried out. This was in Jehoiada's 4th year. In Da 1:1,2, though ascribed to Jehoiakim's 3rd year, this same event is related as the result of a siege of Jerusalem. It is ambiguously intimated also that the king was deported; and among "the seed royal and of the nobles" who were of the company were Daniel and his three companions (Da 1:3,6). The manner of Jehoiakim's death is obscure. It is merely said (2Ki 24:6) that he "slept with his fathers"; but Josephus (Ant., X, vi, 3) perhaps assuming that Jeremiah's prediction (Jer 22:19) was fulfilled, states that Nebuchadnezzar slew him and cast his body outside the walls unburied.

John Franklin Genung

JEHOIARIB

je-hoi'-a-rib (yehoyaribh, "Yahweh pleads" or "contends"): A priest in Jerusalem (1Ch 9:10); the name occurs again in 1Ch 24:7 as the name of a family among. the 24 courses of priests = the family Joiarib (yoyaribh, same meaning as above, Ne 1:2,6), the head of which is Matrenai in Ne 12:19. In Ne 11:10 we should probably read ""Jedaiah and Joiarib" for "Jedaiah the son of Joiarib" (compare 1Ch 9:10). Jehoiarib = Joarib in 1 Macc 2:1.

JEHONADAB

je-hon'-a-dab (yehonadhabh, either "Yahweh is noble" or "liberal," or "Yahweh has impelled") =

Jonadab (yonadhabh, same meaning):

(1) Jehonadab in the Hebrew of 2Sa 13:5; but Jonadab in English Versions of the Bible, and in Hebrew and English Versions of the Bible of 13:3,12,35; son of Shimeah, King David's brother. He was friendly with Amnon his cousin, and is said to be "a very shrewd (the Revised Version (British and American) "subtle") man." He planned to get Tamar to wait upon Amnon. Two years after, when Absalom had murdered Amnon, and David had heard that all the king's sons were assassinated, Jehonadab assured him that only Amnon was killed; and his reassuring tone is justified (2Sa 13:35); possibly he knew of Absalom's intentions. Septuagint, Lucian, has "Jonathan" in 2Sa 13:3 ff; and in 2Sa 21:21 parallel 1Ch 20:7, there is mentioned a son of Shimei (=" Shimca," 1Ch 2:7 =" Shammah," 1Sa 16:9), whose name is Jonathan.

See JONATHAN, (4).

(2) Jehonadab in 2Ki 10:15,23; in Hebrew of Jer 35:8,14,16,18 = Jonadab in Jer 35:6,10,19, and English Versions of the Bible of 35:8,14,16,18, "son" of Rechab, of the Kenite clan (1Ch 2:55). Jehonadab is described in 2Ki 10 as an ally of Jehu in the olition of Baal-worship in Samaria. Jehu met him after slaying the son of Ahab (10:15); the second part of the verse should probably be translated "And he greeted him and said to him, Is thy heart upright (with me) as my heart is with thee? And Jehonadab answered, Yes. Then spake Jehu (so the Septuagint), If so, give me thy hand. In Jer 35 (where English Versions of the Bible has Jonadab throughout), he is called the "father" of the Rechabites, who derived from him their ordinances for their nomadic life and abstention from wine.

See RECHAB, RECHABITES.

David Francis Roberts

JEHONATHAN

je-hon'-a-than (yehonathan, "Yahweh has given"): The name is the same as Jonathan: the Hebrew has the two forms for the same person sometimes; sometimes only one is found. See JONATHAN. The form "Jehonathan" occurs as follows in English Versions of the Bible:

(1) A Levite who took part in teaching the Torah in the cities of Judah under Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:8 English Versions of the Bible and Hebrew).

(2) Head of the priestly family of Shemaiah (Ne 12:18 English Versions of the Bible and Hebrew).

(3) the King James Version and Hebrew in 1Ch 27:25; see JONATHAN, (7).

JEHORAM; JORAM

je-ho’-ram, written also in the abbreviated form, (yehoram, yoram, "Yahweh is high"; the Revised Version (British and American) retains "Joram" for Hebrew yehoram in 2Ki 9:15-24):

(1) Ninth king of Israel (2Ki 1:17-9:28), son of Ahab and Jezebel, successor to his brother Ahaziah, who died childless. He began to reign 853 BC, and reigned 12 years (2Ki 3:1; 8:16).

The statement in 2Ki 1:17, "the second year of Jehoram," follows a system of chronology common to the Lucian group of manuscripts, in which the 1st year of Jehoshaphat falls in the 11th year of Omri; the 24th year of Jehoshaphat in the 1st year of Ahaziah; and the 1st year of Jehoram in the 2nd year of Jehoram of Judah. The double chronology (2Ki 1:17 and 2Ki 3:1) is due to the intention of the compiler of Kings to refer all the acts of Elisha to the reign of Jehoram, thus dislocating the order of events in that reign. Elisha, however, survived Jehoram many years, and it is possible that some of the events are to be referred to subsequent reigns.

I. Ninth King of Israel

1. His Religious Policy:

It is difficult to estimate the religious character of Jehoram. Apparently the fierce fanaticism of Jezebel and the boldness of Ahab reappear in the son in the form of duplicity and superstition. The attempt of Jezebel to substitute Baal for Yahweh had failed. The people were on the side of Yahweh. Otherwise Jehu could not have carried out his bloody reform. All the worshippers of Baal in the land could be gathered into one temple of Baal (2Ki 10:18). Evidently Jehoram feared the people. Accordingly he posed as a reformer by putting away the pillar of Baal (2Ki 3:2), while secretly he worshipped Baal (2Ki 3:13 a). Nevertheless, when he got into straits, he expected to receive the help of Yahweh (2Ki 3:13 b). He had not learned that a dual nature is as impossible as a union of Baal and Yahweh.

2. The Moabite War:

Immediately upon his accession, Jehoram came into conflict with Mesha, king of Moab (2Ki 3:4). The account of the conflict is of special interest because of the supplementary information concerning Mesha furnished by the Moabite Stone. There we learn (ll. 1-8) that Moab became tributary to Israel in the days of Omri, and remained so for forty years, but that it rebelled in the days of Ahab. This probably brings us to the statement in 2Ki 3:4 ff that Mesha "rendered unto the king of Israel the wool f a hundred thousand lambs, and of a hundred thousand rams," and that "when Ahab was dead, ... the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel." The victories of Mesha, glorified by the Moabite Stone, possibly took place before the events of 2Ki 3:4 ff. Accordingly, Jehoram resolved to recover the allegiance of the Moabites. He called to his aid the ally of his father, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and the latter’s vassal, the king of Edom. Jehoram was entertained at Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant, IX, ii i, 1). The allies marched against Moab by the longer route, around the southern end of the Dead Sea, indicating that Moab was fortified against attack from the West, and that Israel was weak in the East Jordan country. After the allies had been miraculousl y delivered from perishing for lack of water, they devastated the

land and sacked the cities, and finally they succeeded in shutting up Mesha in Kir-hareseth. Driven to despair, Mesha offered his eldest son upon the wall as a burnt offering to Chemosh. This seems to have caused the tide to turn, for "there was great wrath against Israel," and the allies returned to their own land, apparently having failed to secure a lasting advantage.

3. The Conflicts with Syria:

Assuming that 2Ki 4-8 belong to the reign of Jehoram, it appears that the Syrians made frequent incursions into the land of Israel, perhaps more in the nature of plundering robber bands than invasions by a regular army (2Ki 6). Finally, however, Ben-had in person invaded the country and besieged Samaria. The inhabitants were reduced to horrible straits by famine, when the oppressors took sudden flight and Israel was saved. In the years 849, 848, and 845, Shalmaneser II invaded Syria. It is probable that during this period Jehoram recovered Ramoth-gilead, which had fallen to Syria under Ahab. Hazael succeeded Ben-hadad as ruler of Syria, and his first act, after having murdered his predecessor, was to regain Ramoth-gilead. In the defense of the city, Jehoram, who was assisted by his nephew, Ahaziah, was wounded, and returned to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds.

4. The Conspiracy of Jehu:

Jehoram left the army at Ramoth-gilead under the command of Jehu, a popular captain of the host. While Jehoram was at Jezreel, Elisha sent a prophet to anoint Jehu as king of Israel. Jehu had been a witness of the dramatic scene when Elijah hurled the curse of Yahweh at Ahab for his crime against Naboth. Jehu at once found in himself the instrument to bring the curse to fulfillment. Accordingly, he conspired his crime against Jehoram With a company of horsemen he proceeded to Jezreel, where Ahaziah was visiting his sick uncle, Jehoram. Jehoram suspected treachery, and, in company with Ahaziah, he rode out to meet Jehu. On his question, "Is it peace, Jehu?" he received a brutal reply that no longer left him in doubt as to the intention of the conspirator. As Jehoram turned to flee, Jehu drew his bow and shot him in the back so that the arrow pierced his heart. His dead body was thrown into the plat of ground that had belonged to Naboth.

(2) King of Judah, son of Jehoshaphat (2Ki 8:16-24; 2Ch 21:1-20), he began to rule about 849 and reigned 8 years. With reference to the chronological difficulty introduced by 2Ki 1:17, see (1) above.

II. King of Judah

1. His Marriage:

In the beginning of the reigns of Ahab and Jehoshaphat, an attempt was made to end the old feud between Israel and Judah. At the suggestion of Ahab, the two kingdoms, for the first time, joined forces against the common foe from the North, the Syrians. To seal the alliance, Athaliah, daughter of Jezebel and Ahab, was married to Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat. Thus Jehoram was brother-in-law to (1) above. No doubt this was considered as a master stroke of conciliatory policy by the parties interested.

However, it proved disastrous for Judah. Beyond a doubt, the unholy zeal of Jezebel included the Baalizing of Judah as well as of Israel. This marriage was a step in that direction.

2. His Idolatry:

"A man shall leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife." Jehoram did so. "He walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, as did the house of Ahab" (2Ki 8:18). According to 2Ch 21:11,13, Jehoram not only accepted the religion of Athaliah, but he became a persecutor, compelling the inhabitants of Jerusalem and of the land to become apostates.

3. The Letter of Elijah:

Because of his gross idolatry and his wickedness, he is said (2Ch 21:12) to have received a denunciatory letter from the prophet Elijah, which, however, had no effect on him. But this leads to a chronological difficulty. Was Elijah still alive? The inference from 2Ki 3:11 is that he was not. Then, too, the Chronicler otherwise never mentions Elijah. Oettli is of the opinion that one should either read "Elisha" for "Elijah," or else consider the letter to have been the conception of a later writer, who felt that Elijah must have taken note of the wickedness of Jehoram and his wife, Athaliah, daughter of Ahab. In the latter event, the letter might be called a haggadic Midrash.

4. His Character:

A man’s religion cannot be divorced from his character. Baalism had in it the elements of tyranny and civic unrighteousness. In keeping with his religion, and in true oriental fashion, Jehoram began his reign by murdering his brothers, and other princes of the land, to whom Jehoshaphat had given valuable gifts and responsible positions. The only event belonging to his reign recorded in Kings is the revolt of Edom.

5. The Revolt of Edom:

Edom was subdued by David, and, probably with the exception of a temporary revolt under Solomon (1Ki 11:14), it had remained subject to the united kingdom or to Judah until the revolt under Jehoram The text is somewhat obscure, but both accounts indicate that the expedition of Jehoram against Edom ended in failure. In the account we are told that at the same time Libnah revolted.

6. The Raid into Judah:

Perhaps the revolt of Libnah should be taken in connection with the invasion of the Philistines and of the Arabians, mentioned in 2Ch 21. Libnah was located on the south-western border of Judah. Since it was a border city, it is possible that the compiler of Kings considered it as belonging to Philistia. In the account in Chronicles, Jehoram is represented as having lost all his possessions and all his family, save Jehoahaz, the youngest of his sons, when the town was sacked and the palace plundered by the invading force of Philistines and Arabians. The account appears to be based upon reliable sources.

7. His Death:

In his last days, he was afflicted with a frightful disease in the bowels. His death was unregretted, and his burial without honor. Contrast, however, 2Ki 8:24 with 2Ch 21:20. Ahaziah, also called Jehoahaz, his younger son, then became king in his stead.

S. K. Mosiman

JEHOSHABEATH

je-ho-shab'-e-ath (yehoshabh'ath, "Yahweh is an oath"): In 2Ch 22:11 = JEHOSHEBA (which see) Compare 2Ki 11:2.

JEHOSHAPHAT (1)

je-hosh'-a-fat (yehoshaphaT, "Yahweh has judged"):

(1) King of Judah. See separate article.

(2) Son of Ahilud. He was recorder under David (2Sa 8:16; 20:24; 1Ch 18:15) and Solomon (1Ki 4:3).

(3) Son of Paruah, and Solomon's overseer in Issachar to provide victuals for the royal household for one month of the year (1Ki 4:17).

(4) Son of Nimshi, and father of Jehu, king of Northern Israel (2Ki 9:2,14). His name is omitted in 9:20 and 1Ki 19:16, where Jehu is called "son of Nimshi."

(5) the King James Version (but not Hebrew) in 1Ch 15:24; the Revised Version (British and American) correctly JOSHAPHAT (which see).

David Francis Roberts

JEHOSHAPHAT (2)

je-hosh'-a-fat (yehoshaphaT, "Yahweh judges"): The 4th king of Judah, son of Asa. His mother was Azubah, the daughter of Shilhi, of whom nothing further is known. He was 35 years of age at his accession, and reigned 25 years, circa 873-849 BC. Th e history of his reign is contained in 1Ki 22:41-50 and in 2Ch 17:1-21:1. The narrative in 1Ki 22:1-35 a and in 2Ki 3:4 ff belongs to the history of the Northern Kingdom. The absence from Ki of the details contained in 2 Chronicles affords no presumpt against their truth. Neither do high numbers, embellished statements, and the coloring of the writer's

own age destroy the historical perspective.

1. His Religious Policy:

The reign of Jehoshaphat appears to have been one of unusual religious activity. It was, however, characterized not so much by striking religious measures as it was by the religious spirit that pervaded every act of the king, who sought the favor of Yahweh in every detail of his life (2Ch 17:3,4). He evidently felt that a nation's character is determined by its religion. Accordingly, he made it his duty to purify the national worship. The "sodomites," i.e. those who practiced immorality in the worsh ip of Yahweh in the temple precincts, were banished from the land (1Ki 22:46). The Asherim were taken out of Judah (2Ch 17:6; 19:3), and "the people from Beer-sheba to the hill-country of Ephraim were brought back unto Yahweh, the God of their fathers" (2Ch 19:4). Because of his zeal for Yahweh, Jehoshaphat is rewarded with power and "riches and honor in abundance" (2Ch 17:5).

2. His System of Public Instruction:

Believing that religion and morals, the civilization, suffer from ignorance, Jehoshaphat introduced a system of public instruction for the whole land (2Ch 17:7). He appointed a commission, composed of princes, Levites and priests, to go from city to city to instruct the people. Their instruction was to be based on the one true foundation of sound morals and healthy religious life, "the book of the law of Yahweh" (2Ch 17:7-9).

3. His Judicial Institutions:

Next in importance to Jehoshaphat's system of public instruction, was his provision for the better administration of justice. He appointed judges to preside over courts of common pleas, which he established in all the fortified cities of Judah. In addition to these local courts, two courts of appeal, an ecclesiastical and a civil court, were established at Jerusalem to be presided over by priests, Levites, and leading nobles as judges. At the head of the ecclesiastical court of appeal was the high priest, and a layman, "the ruler of the house of Judah," headed the civil court of appeal (2Ch 19:4-11). The insistence that a judge was to be in character like Yahweh, with whom there is "no iniquity .... nor respect of persons, nor taking of bribes" (2Ch 19:7), is worthy of note.

4. His Military Defenses:

According to 2Ch 17:2, Jehoshaphat began his reign with defensive measures against Israel. Furthermore, he built castles and cities of store in the land of Judah, "and he had many works," probably military supplies, "in the cities of Judah" (17:13). He appears to have had a large standing army, including cavalry (1Ki 22:4; 2Ch 17:14). However, the numbers in 2Ch 17:14 ff seem to be impossibly high.

5. His Foreign Policy:

Godliness and security at home were followed by respect and peace abroad. The fact that the Philistines and the Arabians brought tribute (2Ch 17:11), and that Edom had no king (1Ki 22:47), but a deputy instead, who possibly was appointed by Jehoshaphat, would indicate that he held the suzerainty over the nations and tribes bordering Judah on the South and West Holding the suzerainty over the weaker nations, and being allied with the stronger, Jehoshaphat secured the peace for the greater part of his reign (1Ch 17:10) that fostered the internal development of the kingdom.

6. His Alliance with Ahab:

In contrast to the former kings of Judah, Jehoshaphat saw greater benefit in an alliance with Israel than in civil war. Accordingly, the old feud between the two kingdoms (1Ki 14:30; 15:6) was dropped, and Jehoshaphat made peace with Israel (1Ki 22:44). The political union was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, to Athaliah, daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. Shortly after the marriage, Jehoshaphat joined Ahab in a campaign against Syria (2Ch 18:1-3). In view of the subordinate position that Jehoshaphat seems to take in the campaign (1Ki 22:4,30), and in view of the military service rendered to Jehoram (2Ki 3:4), Judah seems to have become a dependency of Israel. Nevertheless, the union may have contributed to the welfare and prospity of Judah, and it may have enabled Jehoshaphat to hold the suzerainty over the neighboring nations. However, the final outcome of the alliance with the house of Omri was disastrous for Judah. The introduction into Judah of Baalism more than counterbalanced any political and material advantage gained, and in the succeeding reigns it indirectly led to the almost total extinction of the royal family of Judah (2Ki 11:1).

7. His Alliance with Jehoram:

In spite of the denunciation of the prophet Jehu for his expedition with Ahab, thus "help(ing) the wicked" (2Ch 19:2), Jehoshaphat entered into a similar alliance with Jehoram of Israel (2Ki 3:4). On the invitation of Jehoram to join him in an expedition against Moab, Jehoshaphat was ready with the same set speech of acceptance as in the case of Ahab (2Ki 3:7; compare 1Ki 22:4). For the details of the expedition see JEHORAM, (1).

8. Victory over the Moabites and Ammonites:

The Chronicler has given us a very remarkable account of a victory gained by Jehoshaphat over the Moabites and Ammonites. No doubt he made use of a current historical Midrash. Many find the historical basis of the Midrash in the events recorded in 2Ki 3:4 ff. However, the localities are different, and there a defeat is recorded, while in this case we have a victory. The story in outline bears the stamp of probability. 1Ki 22:45 seems to suggest wars of Jehoshaphat that are not mentioned in Kings. The tribes mentioned in the account are represented as trying to make permanent settlement in Judah (2Ch 20:11). In their advance through the South of Judah, they were doubtless harassed by the shepherd population of the country. Jehoshaphat, according to his custom, sought the help of Yahweh. The invading forces fell to quarreling among themselves (2Ch 20:23), and destroyed one another. The spoil

was great because the invaders had brought all their goods with them, expecting to remain in the land.

9. Destruction of Jehoshaphat's Fleet:

The destruction of Jehoshaphat's fleet is recorded in 1Ki 22:48,49 and in 2Ch 20:35-37. However, the two accounts are quite different. According to Kings, Jehoshaphat built ships of Tarshish to sail to Ophir for gold, but the vessels were wrecked at zion-geber. Thereupon Ahaziah offered to assist Jehoshaphat with seamen, but Jehoshaphat refused to enter into the alliance. According to Chronicles the alliance had been formed, and together they built ships at Ezion-geber, which were destroyed because Jehoshaphat had made an alliance with the wicked king of Israel. In view of Jehoshaphat's other alliances, the Chronicler may be in the right. Chronicles, however, misunderstood the term "ships of Tarshish."

10. His Death:

Jehoshaphat died at the age of 60. Josephus says (Ant., IX, iii, 2) that he was buried in a magnificent manner, for he had imitated the actions of David. The kingdom was left to Jehoram, who inaugurated the beginning of his reign by causing the massacre of his brethren.

S. K. Mosiman

JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF

(‘emeq yehoshaphaT); the latter word means "Yahweh judgeth," and ‘emeq, "wide," "open valley"; Septuagint he koilas Iosaphat): The name is used in Joe 3:2,12 of the scene of Judgment: "Let the nations bestir themselves, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I sit to judge all the nations round about" (Joe 3:12). "The valley of decision" (or "sharp judgment") is another name the prophet gives to this spot (Joe 3:14). Some have identified it with the valley (‘emeq) of BERACAH (which see) of 2Ch 20:26, where King Jehoshaphat obtained a great victory, but this is improbable.

Since the 4th century AD the KIDRON (which see) valley has been named the Valley of Jehoshaphat. The tradition is now strongest among the Moslems who point out the exact scene of the Judgment; the Bridge As Sirat, dividing heaven and hell, is to stretch across this valley from the Charam area to the Mount of Olives. It is, however, the ambition of every pious Jew to be buried on the slopes of this valley, to be at hand at the resurrection. This, too, was an ordinary place for Jewish graves in preexilic times (2Ki 23:6, etc.). The valley today, especially that part adjacent to the temple, is crowded with Moslem and Jewish graves. A worthless tradition indicates the tomb of Jehoshaphat himself close to the so-called "Pillar of Absalom." Se KING'S VALE. There is not the slightest reason for believing that this is the spot referred to by Joel—indeed he may have spoken of an ideal spot only. The valley of the Kidron is a nachal ("ravine"), not an ‘emeq ("broad valley"). It is impos sible not to suspect that there is some connection between the name Jehoshaphat and the name of a village near the head of this valley—Shaphat; perhaps at one time it was Wady Shaphat, which name would readily suggest the traditional one.

See GEHENNA.

E. W. G. Masterman

JEHOSHEBA

je-hosh’-e-ba, je-ho-she’-ba (yehoshebha‘, "Yahweh is an oath"): Called "Jehoshabeath" in 2Ch 22:11; daughter of Jehoram king of Judah, possibly by a wife other than Athaliah (2Ki 11:2). According to 2Ch 22:11, she was the wife of Jehoiada, the priest. She hid Jehoash, the young son of King Ahaziah, and so saved his life from Queen Athaliah.

JEHOSHUA

je-hosh’-u-a (yehoshua‘, "Yahweh is deliverance," or "is opulence"): The usual Hebrew form of the name "Joshua"; it occurs in the King James Version of Nu 13:16 (the American Standard Revised Version "Hoshea"); and in some editions of the King James Version in 1Ch 7:27, where others have the form "Jehoshuah" (h being wrongly added at the end).

See JOSHUA.

JEHOVAH

je-ho’-va, je-ho’-va.

See GOD, NAMES OF, II, 5.

JEHOVAH, SERVANT OF

See SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

JEHOVAH-JIREH

je-ho’-va-ji’-re (yahweh yir’-eh, "Yahweh sees"): The name given by Abraham to the place where he had sacrificed a ram provided by God, instead of his son Isaac (Ge 22:14). The meaning plainly is that the Lord sees and provides for the necessities of His servants. There is an allusion to Ge 22:8 where Abraham says, "God will provide himself (the Revised Version, margin "will see for himself") the lamb for a burnt offering." The verse (22:14 the King James Version) goes on to connect the incident with the popular proverb, "In the mount of the Lord it shall be seen" (the Revised Version (British and American) "provided"), the Revised Version margin suggests "he shall be seen." "The mount of Yahweh" in other places denotes the temple hill at Jerusalem (Ps 24:3; Isa 2:3, etc.). With changes of the punctuation very

different readings have been suggested. According to Swete's text: "And Abraham called the name of that place (the) 'Lord saw' (aorist) in order that they may say today: 'In the mountain (the) Lord was seen'"(aorist). Septuagint reads, "In the mountain Yahweh seeth," or "will see." If there is merely a verbal connection between the clauses we should most naturally read, "In the mount of Yahweh one is seen (appears)," i.e. men, people, appear—the reference being to the custom of visiting the temple at pilgrimages (Driver, HDB, under the word). But if the connection of the proverb with the name "Yahweh-jireh" depends on the double sense of the word "see," then the best explanation may be, Yahweh sees the needs of those who come to worship before Him on Zion, and there "is seen," i.e. reveals Himself to them by answering their prayers and supplying their wants. His "seeing," in other words, takes practical effect in a "being seen" (ibid.).

W. Ewing

JEHOVAH-NISSI

je-ho'-va nis'-i (yahweh nicci, "Yahweh is my banner"): So Moses named the altar which he reared to signalize the defeat of the Amalekites by Israel under Joshua, at Rephidim (Ex 17:15). Septuagint translates "the Lord my refuge," deriving nicci from nuc, "to flee." Targum Onkelos reads, "Moses built an altar and worshipped on it before Yahweh, who had wrought for him miracles" (niccin). The suggestion is that the people should rally round God as an army gathers round its standard. He it is who leads them to victory.

JEHOVAH-SHALOM

je-ho'-va sha'-lom (yahweb shalom, "Yahweh is peace"): This was the name given by Gideon to the altar he built at Ophra, in allusion to the word spoken to him by the Lord, "Peace be unto thee" (Jud 6:24). It is equivalent to "Yahweh is well disposed."

JEHOVAH-SHAMMAH

je-ho'-va sham'-a (yahweh shammah, "Yahweh is there"): The name to be given to the new Jerusalem, restored and glorified, as seen in the vision of Eze (48:35 margin; compare Re 21:3). Yahweh returns to the temple which He had forsaken, and from that time forward the fact of supreme importance is that He is there, dwelling in the midst of His people.

JEHOVAH-TSIDKENU (TSIDKENU)

je-ho'-va tsid-ke'-nu, tsid'-ke-nu (yahweh tsidhqenu, "Yahweh (is) our righteousness"): The symbolic name given

(1) to the king who is to reign over the restored Israel (Jer 23:6);

(2) to the state or capital (Jer 33:16).

JEHOZABAD

je-hoz’-a-bad (yehozabhadh, "Yahweh has bestowed"):

(1) A servant of King Jehoash of Judah. According to 2Ki 12:21 (22), he was a son of Shomer, but 2Ch 24:26 makes him "son of Shimrith the Moabitess."

(2) A Korahite doorkeeper, son of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:4).

(3) A Benjamite, one of King Jehoshaphat’s warriors (2Ch 17:18).

JEHOZADAK

je-hoz’-a-dak (yehotsadhaq, "Yahweh is righteous"): Priest at the time of the captivity under Nebuchadrezzar (1Ch 6:14,15. He was the father of Joshua (Jeshua) the priest (Hag 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zec 6:11). the King James Version has Josedech in Hag and Zec. Same as "Jozadak" (yotsadhaq, same meaning) in Ezr 3:2,8; 5:2; 10:18; Ne 12:26; and =" Josedek" (King James Version "Josedec") of 1 Esdras 5:5,48,56; 6:2; 9:19; Sirach 49:12.

JEHU

je’-hu (yehu; meaning uncertain, perhaps "Yahweh is he"; 1Ki 19:16,17; 2Ki 9; 10; Eiou): Son of Jehoshaphat, and descendant of Nimshi, hence, commonly called "the son of Nimshi"; 10th king of Israel, and founder of its IVth Dynasty. Jehu reign for 28 years. His accession may be reckoned at circa 752 BC (some date a few years later).

1. Officer of Ahab:

A soldier of fortune, Jehu appears first as an officer in the body-guard of Ahab. To himself we owe the information that he was present at the judicial murder of Naboth, and that Naboth’s sons were put to death with their father (2Ki 9:26). He was in attendance when Ahab drove from Samaria to inspect his new possession in Jezreel, and was witness of the dramatic encounter at the vineyard between the king and the prophet Elijah (compare 1Ki 21:16 ff). Years after, Jehu reminded Bidkar, his captain (literally, "thirdsman," in chariot), of the doom they had there heard pronounced upon Ahab and his house (2Ki 9:25). It was in fulfillment of this doom that Jehu at that time ordered the body of the slain Jehoram to be thrown into the enclosure which had once been Naboth’s (2Ki 9:26). Ahab’s temporary repentance averted the punishment from himself for a few years (1Ki 21:27-29), but the blow fell at the battle of Ramoth-gilead, and Jehu would not be unmindful of the prophet’s words as he beheld the dogs licking Ahab’s blood as they washed his chariot "by the pool of Samaria" (1Ki 22:38).

2. Jehoram at Ramoth-gilead and Jezreel:

A different fate awaited Ahab's two sons. The elder, Ahaziah, died, after a short reign, from the effects of an accident (2Ki 1). He was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who toward the close of his reign of 12 years (2Ki 3:1) determined on an attempt to recover Ramoth-gilead, where his father had been fatally stricken, from Hazael, of Syria. Ramoth-gilead was taken (2Ki 9:14), but in the attack the Israelite king was severely wounded, and was taken to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds (2Ki 9:15). The city meanwhile was left in charge of Jehu and his fellow-captains. At Jezreel he was visited by Ahaziah, of Judah, who had taken part with him in the war (2Ki 8:28,29; 9:16).

3. The Anointing of Jehu:

The time was now ripe for the execution of the predicted vengeance on the house of Ahab, and to Elisha the prophet, the successor of Elijah, it fell to take the decisive step which precipitated the crisis. Hazael and Jehu had already been named to Elijah as the persons who were to execute the Divine judgment, the one as king of Syria, the other as king of Israel (1Ki 19:15-17). Elijah was doubtless aware of this commission, which it was now his part, as respected Jehu, to fulfill. A messenger was hastily dispatched to Ramoth-gilead, with instructions to seek out Jehu, take him apart, anoint him king of Israel in Yahweh's name, and charge him with the task of utterly destroying the house of Ahab in punishment for the righteous blood shed by Ahab and Jezebel. The messenger was then to flee. This was done, and Jehu, the sacred oil poured on his head, found himself alone with this appalling trust committed to him (2Ki 9:1-10).

4. The Revolution—Death of Jehoram:

Events now moved rapidly. Jehu's companions were naturally eager to know what had happened, and on learning that Jehu had been anointed king, they at once improvised a throne by throwing their garments on the top of some steps, blew the trumpet, and proclaimed, "Jehu is king." Not a moment was lost. No one was permitted to leave the city to carry forth tidings, and Jehu himself, with characteristic impetuosity, set out, with a small body of horsemen, in his chariot to Jezreel. Bidkar was there as charioteer (2Ki 9:25). As they came within sight of the city, a watchman reported their advance, and messengers were sent to inquire as to their errand. These were ordered to fall into the rear. This conduct awakened suspicion, and Jehoram and Ahaziah—who was still with his invalided kinsman—ordered their chariots, and proceeded in person to meet Jehu. The companies met at the ill-omened field of Naboth, and there the first stroke of vengeance fell. The anxious query, "Is it peace?" was answered by a storm of denunciation from Jehu, and on Jehoram turning to flee, an arrow from Jehu's powerful bow shot him through the heart, and he sank dead in his chariot. Ahaziah likewise was pursued, and smitten "at the ascent of Gur, which is by Ibleam." He died at Megiddo, and was taken to Jerusalem for burial in the sepulcher of the kings (2Ki 9:11-28). A somewhat variant account of Ahaziah's death is given in 2Ch 22:9. It is possible that Jehu came to Megiddo or its neighborhood, and had to do with his end there.

5. Death of Jezebel:

The slaughter of Jehoram was at once followed by that of the chief instigator of all the crimes for which the house of Ahab suffered—the queen-mother Jezebel. Hot from the pursuit of Ahaziah, Jehu pressed on Jezreel. Jezebel, now an aged woman, but still defiant, had painted and attired herself, and, looking from her window, met him as he drove into the palace court, with the insulting question, "Is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master's murderer?" (compare 1Ki 16:9-12). Jehu's answer was an appeal for aid from those within. Two or three eunuchs of the palace gave signs of their concurrence. These, at Jehu's bidding, threw Jezebel down into the courtyard, where, lying in her blood, she was trodden under foot by the chariot horses. When, a little later, her remains were sought for burial, she was found to have been almost wholly devoured by the dogs—a lurid commentary on Elijah's earlier threatening, which was now recalled (2Ki 9:30-37). Jehu was an intrepid minister of judgment, but the pitiless zeal, needless cruelty, and, afterward, deceit, with which he executed his mission, withdraw our sympathy from him, as it did that of a later prophet (Ho 1:4).

6. Slaughter of Ahab's Descendants:

The next acts of Jehu reveal yet more clearly his thoroughness of purpose and promptitude of action, while they afford fresh exhibitions of his ruthlessness and unscrupulousness of spirit. Samaria was the capital of the kingdom, and headquarters of the Baal-worship introduced by Jezebel, though it is recorded of Jehoram that he had removed, at least temporarily, an obelisk of Baal which his father had set up (2Ki 3:2; compare 10:26). The city was still held for the house of Ahab, and 70 of Ahab's "son"—to be taken here in the large sense of male descendants—resided in it (2Ki 10:1,6). Jehu here adopted a bold and astute policy. He sent letters to Samaria challenging those in authority to set up one of their master's sons as king, and fight for the city and the kingdom. The governors knew well that they could make no effective resistance to Jehu, and at once humbly tendered their submission. Jehu, in a second message, bade them prove their sincerity by delivering to him the heads of the 70 princes of Ahab's house in baskets. This they did, by their act irrevocably committing themselves to Jehu's cause (2Ki 10:9). The ghastly relics were piled up in two heaps at the gate of Jezreel—a horrible object lesson to any still inclined to hesitate in their allegiance. Friends and partisans of the royal house shared the fate of its members (2Ki 10:11).

7. Slaughter of Ahaziah's Brethren:

Apart from the faultiness in the agent's motive, the deeds now recounted fell within the letter of Jehu's commission. As much cannot be said of the deeds of blood that follow. Jehu had killed Ahaziah, king of Judah. Now, on his way to Samaria, he met a company of 42 persons, described as "brethren of Ahaziah"—evidently blood-relations of various degrees, as Ahaziah's own brethren had been earlier slain by the Arabians (2Ch 21:17; 22:1)—and, on learning who they were, and of their purpose to visit their kinsfolk at Jezreel, gave orders that they be slain on the spot, and their bodies ignominiously thrown into the pit (or "cistern") of the shearing-house where he had encountered them. It was a cruel excess for which no sufficient justification can be pleaded (2Ki 10:12-14).

8. Massacre of the Worshippers of Baal:

Still less can the craft and violence be condoned by which, when he reached Samaria, Jehu evinced his "zeal for Yahweh" (2Ki 10:16) in the extirpation of the worshippers of Baal. Jehu had secured on his side the support of a notable man—Jehonadab the son of Rechab (2Ki 10:15,16; compare Jer 35:6-19)—and his entrance into Samaria was signalized by further slaying of all adherents of Ahab. Then, doubtless to the amazement of many, Jehu proclaimed himself an enthusiastic follower of Baal. A great festival was organized, to which all prophets, worshippers, and priests of Baal were invited from every part of Israel. Jehu himself took the leading part in the sacrifice (2Ki 10:25). Vestments were distributed to distinguish the true worshippers of Baal from others. Then when all were safely gathered into "the house of Baal," the gates were closed, and 80 soldiers were sent in to massacre the whole deluded company in cold blood. None escaped. The temple of Baal was broken up. Thus, indeed, "Jehu destroyed Baal out of Israel" (2Ki 10:28), but at what a frightful cost of falsehood and treacherous dealing! (2Ki 10:18-28).

9. Wars with Hazael:

The history of Jehu in the Bible is chiefly the history of his revolution as now narrated. His reign itself is summed up in a few verses, chiefly occupied with the attacks made by Hazael, king of Syria, on the trans-Jordanic territories of Israel (2Ki 10:32,33). These districts were overrun, and remained lost to Israel till the reign of Jehu’s great-grandson, Jeroboam II (2Ki 14:28).

10. Assyrian Notices:

It is in another direction, namely, to the annals of Assyria, we have to look for any further information we possess on the reign of Jehu In these annals, fortunately, some interesting notices are preserved. In 854 BC was fought the great battle of Qarqar (a place between Aleppo and Hamath), when Shalmaneser II, king of Assyria, defeated a powerful combination formed against him (Damascus, Hamath, Philistia Ammon, etc.). Among the allies on this occasion is mentioned "Ahabbu of Sir’-ilaa," who took the third place with 2,000 chariots and 10,000 footmen. There is a difficulty in supposing Ahab to have been still reigning as late as 854, and Wellhausen, Kamphausen and others have suggested that Ahab’s name has been confused with that of his successor Jehoram in the Assyrian annals. Kittel, in his History of the Hebrews (II, 233, English translation) is disposed to accept this view. G. Smith, in his Assyrian Eponym Canon (179), is of the opinion that the tribute lists were often carelessly compiled and in error as to names. The point of interest is that from this time Israel was evidently a tributary of Assyria.

11. Tribute of Jehu:

With this accord the further notices of Israel in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II, two in number. Both belong to the year 842 BC and relate to Jehu. On Shalmaneser’s Black Obelisk is a pictorial representation of "the tribute of Jehu, son of Omri." An ambassador kneels before the conqueror, and presents his gifts. They include silver, gold, a gold cup, gold vessels, a golden ladle, lead, a staff for the

king’s hand, scepters. An allusion to the same event occurs in the annals of Shalmaneser’s campaign against Hazael of Syria in this year. "At that time I received the tribute of the Tyrians, Sidonians, of Jehu, son of Omri."

There are some indications that in his latter years, which were clouded with misfortune, Jehu associated with himself his son Jehoahaz in the government (compare 2Ki 13:1,10, where Jehoahaz comes to the throne in the 23rd, and dies in the 37th year of Jehoash of Judah—14 years—yet has a total reign of 17 years). Jehu is not mentioned in Chronicles, except incidentally in connection with the death of Ahaziah (2Ch 22:9), and as the grandfather of Jehoash (2Ch 25:17).

The character of Jehu is apparent from the acts recorded of him. His energy, determination, promptitude, and zeal fitted him for the work he had to do. It was rough work, and was executed with relentless thoroughness. Probably gentler measures would have failed to eradicate Baal-worship from Israel. His impetuosity was evinced in his furious driving (2Ki 9:20). He was bold, daring, unscrupulous, and masterful and astute in his policy. But one seeks in vain in his character for any touch of magnanimity, or of the finer qualities of the ruler. His "zeal for Yahweh" was too largely a cloak for merely worldly ambition. The bloodshed in which his rule was rounded early provoked a reaction, and his closing years were dark with trouble. He is specially condemned for tolerating the worship of the golden calves (2Ki 10:29-31). Nevertheless the throne was secured to his dynasty for four generations (2Ki 10:30; compare 15:12).

W. Shaw Caldecott

JEHUBBAH

je-hub’-a (yechubbah, meaning unknown): A descendant of Asher, mentioned in 1Ch 7:34, where Qere is wechubbah, "and Hubbah," but Kethibh is yachbah; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus follows the Qere.

JEHUCAL

je-hu’-kal (yechukhal, probably meaning "Yahweh is able"): A courtier sent by King Zedekiah to Jeremiah to ask the prophet to pray for the king and the people (Jer 37:3). Most versions except Septuagint, with Jer 38:1, have "Jucal" (yukhal, same meaning).

JEHUD

je’-hud (yehudh): A town in the lot of Da named between Baalath and Bene-berak (Jos 19:45). The only possible identification seems to be with el-Yehudiyeh, which lies about 8 miles East of Jaffa.

JEHUDI

je-hu’-di (yehudhi, properly "a Jew"): An officer of King Jehoiakim (Jer 36:14,21,23). He was sent by the princes to summon Baruch to read the roll containing Jeremiah’s prophecies to them; he afterward read them to the king, who destroyed them. His name is noteworthy, as also is that of his grandfather Cushi (i.e. "Ethiopian"), and the two are said to point to a foreign origin.

JEHUDIJAH

je-hu-di’-ja (1Ch 4:18 the King James Version).

See HA-JEHUDIJAH.

JEHUEL

je-hu’-el (Kethibh yechu’el; but Qere yechi’-el, i.e. "Jehiel" the King James Version, in 2Ch 29:14): A Levite.

See JEHIEL, (5).

JEHUSH

je’-hush (1Ch 8:39).

See JEUSH, (3).

JEIEL

je-i’-el (ye‘i’el, meaning unknown):

(1) A Reubenite (1Ch 5:7).

(2) In 1Ch 8:29, added in the Revised Version (British and American) from 9:35, where Kethibh is "Jeuel," an ancestor of King Saul; the King James Version "Jehiel."

(3) One of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:44). the King James Version is "Jehiel"; Kethibh is "Jeuel."

(4) A Levite, keeper of the ark with Obed-edom (1Ch 15:18,21; 16:5; 2Ch 20:14), called "Jehiah" in 1Ch 15:24.

(5) A Levite (1Ch 16:5) =" Jaaziel" of 1Ch 15:18 (which see).

(6) A scribe under King Uzziah (2Ch 26:11).

(7) A chief of the Levites, present at King Josiah’s great Passover feast (2Ch 35:9).

(8) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:43) =" Juel" in 1 Esdras 9:35.

(9) the King James Version in 2Ch 29:14; see JEHIEL, (5).

(10) the King James Version in Ezr 8:13; see JEUEL, (3).

David Francis Roberts

JEKABZEL

je-kab’-ze-el (yeqabhtse’el, "God gathers"; Ne 11:25).

See KABZEEL.

JEKAMEAM

jek-a-me’-am, je-kam’-e-am (yeqam‘-am probably "may kinsman establish"): Head of a Levitical house (1Ch 23:19; 24:23). The meaning of the name depends upon that of (‘am) in compound names; see H P N, 46, 51 ff.

JEKAMIAH

jek-am-mi’-a (yeqamyah, "may Yahweh establish"):

(1) A Judahite, son of Shallum (1Ch 2:41).

(2) A son of King Jeconiah (Jehoiachin); in the King James Version "Jecamiah" (1Ch 3:18).

JEKUTHIEL

je-ku’-thi-el (yeqthi’el meaning doubtful): A Judahite (1Ch 4:18). The meaning may be "preservation of God" or perhaps the same as yoqthe’el, "Joktheel," the name of a place in Jos 15:38; 2Ki 14:7.

JEMIMAH

je-mi’-ma (yemimah, perhaps a diminutive meaning "little dove"): The first daughter of Job (42:14),

born after his restoration from affliction.

JEMNAAN

jem’-na-an (Iemnaan): A city on the coast of Palestine; mentioned among those affected by the expedition of Holofernes (Judith 2:28; 3:1 ff). The name is used for Jabniel, generally called "Jamnia" by the Greek writers.

JEMUEL

je-mu’-el (yemu’el, meaning unknown): A "son" of Simeon (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15) =" Nemuel" in Nu 26:12; 1Ch 4:24.

The Syriac version has "Jemuel" in the 4 passages, but Gray (H P N, 307, note 6) thinks "Jemuel" is more probably a correction in Ge than "Nemuel" in Numbers.

JEOPARD; JEOPARDY

jep’-ard, jep’-ar-di: The Eng, word referred originally to a game where the chances were even (from OFr. jeu parti); transferred thence to designate any great risk. In the New Testament, represented by the Greek verb kinduneuo (Lu 8:23; 1Co 15:30). In the Old Testament (Jud 5:18) for a Hebrew idiom, "despise the soul," i.e. they placed a small value upon their lives (Vulgate "offered their souls to death"); for elliptical expression, "went with their lives," in 2Sa 23:17 m.

JEPHTHAH

jef’-tha (yiphtach, "opened," or "opener," probably signifying "Yahweh will open"; Iephthae; used as the name of a place, as in Jos 15:43; 19:14; of a man, Jud 10:6-12:7): Ninth judge of the Israelites. His antecedents are obscure. Assuming Gilead to be the actual name of his father, his mother was a harlot. He was driven from home on account of his illegitimacy, and went to the land of Tobit in Eastern Syria (Jud 11:2,3). Here he and his followers lived the life of freebooters.

The Israelites beyond the Jordan being in danger of an invasion by the Ammonites, Jephthah was invited by the elders of Gilead to be their leader (Jud 11:5,6). Remembering how they had expelled him from their territory and his heritage, Jephthah demanded of them that in the event of success in the struggle with the Ammonites, he was to be continued as leader. This condition being accepted he returned to Gilead (Jud 11:7-11). The account of the diplomacy used by Jephthah to prevent the Ammonites from invading Gilead is possibly an interpolation, and is thought by many interpreters to be a compilation from Nu 20-21. It is of great interest, however, not only because of the fairness of the argument used (Jud 11:12-28), but also by virtue of the fact that it contains a history of the journey of the Israelites from Lower Egypt to the banks of the Jordan. This history is distinguished from that of the Pentateuch chiefly

by the things omitted. If diplomacy was tried, it failed to dissuade the Ammonites from seeking to invade Israel. Jephthah prepared for battle, but before taking the field paused at Mizpeh of Gilead, and registered a vow that if he were successful in battle, he would offer as a burnt offering to Yahweh whatsoever should first come from his doors to greet him upon his return (Jud 11:29-31). The battle is fought, Jephthah is the victor, and now his vow returns to him with anguish and sorrow. Returning to his home, the first to greet him is his daughter and only child. The father's sorrow and the courage of the daughter are the only bright lights on this sordid, cruel conception of God and of the nature of sacrifice. That the sacrifice was made seems certain from the narrative, although some critics choose to substitute for the actual death of the maiden the setting the girl apart for a life of perpetual virginity. The Israelite laws concerning sacrifices and the language used in Jud 11:39 are the chief arguments for the latter interpretation. The entire narrative, however, will hardly bear this construction (11:34-40).

Jephthah was judge in Israel for 6 years, but appears only once more in the Scripture narrative. The men of Ephraim, offended because they had had no share in the victory over the Ammonites, made war upon Gilead, but were put to rout by the forces under Jephthah (Jud 12:1-6).

C. E. Schenk

JEPHUNNEH

je-fun'-e (yephunneh, meaning uncertain):

(1) Father of Caleb (Nu 13:6; 14:6,30, etc.).

According to Nu 13:6, he was of the tribe of Judah; according to 32:12; Jos 14:6, a Kenizzite; the Kenizzites were incorporated in Judah (compare 1Ch 4:13-15).

(2) A son of Jether, an Asherite (1Ch 7:38).

JERAH

je'-ra (yerach): A son of Joktan (Ge 10:26 parallel 1Ch 1:20). No district Jerah has been discovered. However, Yurakh in Yemen and Yarach in Hijaz are places named by the Arabic geographers. The fact that the word in Hebrew means "moon" has led to the following suggestions: the Banu Hilal ("sons of the new moon") in the North of Yemen; Ghubb el-Qamar ("the bay of the moon"), Jebel el-Qamar ("the mountains of the moon") in Eastern Chadramant. But in Southern Arabia worship of the moon has caused the word to bulk largely in place-names.

JERAHMEEL; JERAHMEELITES

je-ra'-me-el, je-ra'-me-el-its (yerachme'el, "may God have compassion!"):

(1) In 1Ch 2:9,25,26,27,33,42, he is described as the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah by Tamar his daughter-in-law (Ge 38). In 1Sa 27:10 is mentioned the neghebh of the (ha-yerach-me'eli, a collective noun), the Revised Version (British and American) "the South of the Jerahmeelites." The latter is a tribal name in use probably before the proper name, above; their cities are mentioned in 1Sa 30:29. Cheyne has radical views on Jerahmeel. See EB, under the word; also T. Witton Davies in Review of Theology and Philosophy, III, 689-708 (May, 1908); and Cheyne's replies in Hibbert Journal, VII, 132-51 (October, 1908), and Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah.

(2) A Merarite Levite, son of Kish (1Ch 24:29).

(3) "The king's son," the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version margin (Jer 36:26). the Revised Version margin, the King James Version have "son of Hammelech," taking the word ha-melek as a proper name. He was "probably a royal prince, one who had a king among his ancestors but not necessarily son of the ruling king; so 38:6; 1Ki 22:26 b; especially Ze 1:8 written at a time when the reigning king, Josiah, could not have had a grown-up 'son' "(Driver, Jeremiah, 224, note e). Jerahmeel was with two others commanded by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch.

David Francis Roberts

JERECHU; JERECHUS

jer'-e-ku, jer'-e-kus the King James Version (1 Esdras 5:22).

See JERICHO.

JERED

je'-red (yeredh, "descent"): A Judahite, father of Gedor (1Ch 4:18).

See also JARED.

JEREMAI

jer'-e-mi, jer-e-ma'-i (yeremay, meaning unknown): One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:33).

See JEREMIAS (1 Esdras 9:34).

JEREMIAH (1)

jer-e-mi’-a

(a) yirmeyahu, or

(b) shorter form, yirmeyah, both differently explained as "Yah establishes (so Giesebrecht), whom Yahweh casts," i.e. possibly, as Gesenius suggests, "appoints" (A. B. Davidson in HDB, II, 569a), and "Yahweh looseneth" (the womb); see BDB:

The form (b) is used of Jeremiah the prophet only in Jer 27:1; 28:5,6,10,11,12 b, 15; 29:1; Ezr 1:1; Da 9:2, while the other is found 116 times in Jeremiah alone. In 1 Esdras 1:28,32,47,57; 2 Esdras 2:18, English Versions of the Bible has "Jeremy," so the King James Version in 2 Macc 2:1,5,7; Mt 2:17; 27:9; in Mt 16:14, the King James Version has "Jeremias," but the Revised Version (British and American) in 2 Maccabees and Matthew has "Jeremiah."

(1) The prophet. See special article. Of the following, (2), (3) and (4) have form (a) above; the others the form (b).

(2) Father of Hamutal (Hamital), the mother of King Jehoahaz and King Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:31; 24:18 parallel Jer 52:1).

(3) A Rechabite (Jer 35:3).

(4) In 1Ch 12:13 (Hebrew 14), a Gadite.

(5) In 1Ch 12:10 (Hebrew 11), a Gadite.

(6) In 1Ch 12:4 (Hebrew 5), a Benjamite(?) or Judean. (4), (5) and (6) all joined David at Ziklag.

(7) Head of a Manassite family (1Ch 5:24).

(8) A priest who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:2), probably the same as he of 12:34 who took part in the procession at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem.

(9) A priest who went to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel from exile and became head of a priestly family of that name (Ne 12:1).

David Francis Roberts

JEREMIAH (2)

jer-e-mi’-a:

1. Name and Person

2. Life of Jeremiah

3. The Personal Character of Jeremiah

4. The Prophecies of Jeremiah

5. The Book of Jeremiah

6. Authenticity and Integrity of the Book

7. Relation to the Septuagint (Septuagint)

LITERATURE

1. Name and Person:

The name of one of the greatest prophets of Israel. The Hebrew yirmeyahu, abbreviated to yirmeyah, signifies either "Yahweh hurls" or "Yahweh founds." Septuagint reads Iermias, and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Jeremias. As this name also occurs not infrequently, the prophet is called "the son of Hilkiah" (Jer 1:1), who is, however, not the high priest mentioned in 2Ki 22 and 23, as it is merely stated that he was "of the priests that were in Anathoth" in the land of Benjamin In Anathoth, now Anata, a small village 3 miles Northeast of Jerusalem, lived a class of priests who belonged to a side line, not to the line of Zadok (compare 1Ki 2:26).

2. Life of Jeremiah:

Jeremiah was called by the Lord to the office of a prophet while still a youth (1:6) about 20 years of age, in the 13th year of King Josiah (1:2; 25:3), in the year 627 BC, and was active in this capacity from this time on to the destruction of Jerusalem, 586 BC, under kings Josiah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah. Even after the fall of the capital city he prophesied in Egypt at least for several years, so that his work extended over a period of about 50 years in all. At first he probably lived in Anathoth, and put in his appearance publicly in Jerusalem only on the occasion of the great festivals; later he lived in Jerusalem, and was there during the terrible times of the siege and the destruction of the city.

Although King Josiah was God-fearing and willing to serve Yahweh, and soon inaugurated his reformation according to the law of Yahweh (in the 18th year of his reign), yet Jeremiah, at the time when he was called to the prophetic office, was not left in doubt of the fact that the catastrophe of the judgment of God over the city would soon come (1:11 ff); and when, after a few years, the Book of the Law was found in the temple (2Ki 22 and 23), Jeremiah preached "the words of this covenant" to the

people in the town and throughout the land (11:1-8; 17:19-27), and exhorted to obedience to the Divine command; but in doing this then and afterward he became the object of much hostility, especially in his native city, Anathoth. Even his own brethren or near relatives entered into a conspiracy against him by declaring that he was a dangerous fanatic (12:6). However, the condition of Jeremiah under this pious king was the most happy in his career, and he lamented the latter's untimely death in sad lyrics, which the author of Chronicles was able to use (2Ch 35:25), but which have not come down to our times.

Much more unfavorable was the prophet's condition after the death of Josiah. Jehoahaz-Shallum, who ruled only 3 months, received the announcement of his sentence from Jeremiah (22:10 ff). Jehoiakim (609-598 BC) in turn favored the heathen worship, and oppressed the people through his love of luxury and by the erection of grand structures (Jer 22:13). In addition, his politics were treacherous. He conspired with Egypt against his superior, Nebuchadnezzar. Epoch- making was the 4th year of Jehoiakim , in which, in the battle of Carchemish, the Chaldeans gained the upper hand in Hither Asia, as Jeremiah had predicted (46:1-12). Under Jehoiakim Jeremiah delivered his great temple discourse (Jer 7-9; 10:17-25). The priests for this reason determined to have the prophet put to death (Jer 26). However, influential elders interceded for him, and the princes yet showed some justice. He was, however, abused by the authorities at the appeal of the priests (Jer 20). According to 36:1 ff, he was no longer permitted to enter the place of the temple. For this reason the Lord commanded him to collect his prophecies in a bookroll, and to have them read to the people by his faithful pupil Baruch (Jer 36; compare Jer 45). The book fell into the hands of the king, who burned it. However, Jeremiah dictated the book a second time to Baruch, together with new additions.

Jehoiachin or Coniah (Jer 22:24), the son of Jehoiakim, after a reign of 3 months, was taken into captivity to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, together with a large number of his nobles and the best part of the people (Jer 24:1; 29:2), as the prophet had predicted (Jer 22:20-30). But conditions did not improve under Zedekiah (597-586 BC). This king was indeed not as hostile to Jeremiah as Jehoiakim had been; but all the more hostile were the princes and the generals, who were now in command after the better class of these had been deported to Babylon. They continually planned rebellion against Babylon, while Jeremiah was compelled to oppose and put to naught every patriotic agitation of this kind. Finally, the Babylonian army came in order to punish the faithles s vassal who had again entered into an alliance with Egypt. Jeremiah earnestly advised submission, but the king was too weak and too cowardly as against his nobles. A long siege resulted, which caused the direst sufferings in the life of Jeremiah. The commanders threw him into a vile prison, charging him with being a traitor (37:11 ff). The king, who consulted him secretly, released him from prison, and put him into the "court of the guard" (37:17 ff), where he could move around freely, and could agai n prophesy. Now that the judgment had come, he could again speak of the hopeful future (Jer 32; 33). Also Jer 30 and 31, probably, were spoken about this time. But as he continued to preach submission to the people, those in authority cast him into a slimy cistern, from which the pity of a courtier, Ebed-melech, delivered him (39:15-18). He again returned to the court of the guard, where he remained until Jerusalem was taken.

After the capture of the city, Jeremiah was treated with great consideration by the Babylonians, who knew that he had spoken in favor of their government (39:11 ff; 40:1 ff). They gave him the choice of going to Babylon or of remaining in his native lan d. He decided for the latter, and went to the governor

Gedaliah, at Mizpah, a man worthy of all confidence. But when this man, after a short time, was murdered by conscienceless opponents, the Jews who had been left in Palestine, becoming alarmed and fearing the vengeance of the Chaldeans, determined to emigrate to Egypt. Jeremiah advised against this most earnestly, and threatened the vengeance of Yahweh, if the people should insist upon their undertaking (42:1 ff). But they insisted and even compelled the aged prophet to go with them (43:1 ff). Their first goal was Tahpanhes (Daphne), a town in Lower Egypt. At this place he still continued to preach the word of God to his fellow-Israelites; compare the latest of his preserved discourses in 43:8-13, as also the sermon in Jer 44, delivered at a somewhat later time but yet before 570 BC. At that time Jeremiah must have been from 70 to 80 years old. He probably died soon after this in Egypt. The church Fathers report that he was stoned to death at Daphne by the Jews (Jerome, Adv. Jovin, ii, 37; Tertullian, Contra Gnost., viii; Pseudepiphan. De Proph., chapter viii; Dorotheus, 146; Isidorus, Ort. et Obit. Patr., chapter xxxviii). However, this report is not well founded. The same is the case with the rabbinical tradition, according to which he, in company with Baruch, was taken from Egypt to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, and died there (Cedher ‘Olam Rabba’ 26).

3. The Personal Character of Jeremiah:

The Book of Jeremiah gives us not only a fuller account of the life and career of its author than do the books of the other prophets, but we also learn more about his own inner and personal life and feelings than we do of Isaiah or any other prophet. From this source we learn that he was, by nature, gentle and tender in his feelings, and sympathetic. A decided contrast to this is found in the hard and unmerciful judgment which it was his mission to announce. God made him strong and firm and immovable like iron for his mission (1:18; 15:20). This contrast between his naturally warm personal feelings and his strict Divine mission not rarely appears in the heart-utterances found in his prophecies. At first he rejoiced when God spoke to him (15:16); but soon these words of God were to his heart a source of pain and of suffering (15:17 ff). He would have preferred not to utter them; and then they burned in his breast as a fire (20:7 ff; 23:9). He personally stood in need of love, and yet was not permitted to marry (16:1 f). He was compelled to forego the pleasures of youth (15:17). He loved his people as nobody else, and yet was always compelled to prophesy evil for it, and seemed to be the enemy of his nation. This often caused him to despair. The enmity to which he fell a victim, on account of his declaration of nothing but the truth, he deeply felt; see his complaints (9:1 ff; 12:5 f; 15:10; 17:14-18; 18:23, and often). In this sad antagonism between his heart and the commands of the Lord, he would perhaps wish that God had not spoken to him; he even cursed the day of his birth (15:10; 20:14-18; compare Job 3:1 ff). Such complaints are to be carefully distinguished from that which the Lord through His Spirit communicated to the prophet. God rebukes him for these complaints, and demands of him to repent and to trust and obey Him (Jer 15:19). This discipline makes him all the more unconquerable. Even his bitter denunciations of his enemies (Jer 11:20 ff; 15:15; 17:18; 18:21-23) originated in part in his passionate and deep nature, and show how great is the difference between him and that perfect Sufferer, who prayed even for His deadly enemies. But Jeremiah was nevertheless a type of that Suffering Saviour, more than any of the Old Testament saints. He, as a priest, prayed for his people, until God forbade him to do so (7:16; 11:14; 14:11; 18:20). He was compelled more than all the others to suffer through the anger of God, which was to afflict his people. The people themselves also felt that he meant well to them. A proof of this is seen in the fact that the rebellious people, who always did the contrary of what

he had commanded them, forced him, the unwelcome prophet of God, to go along with them, to Egypt, because they felt that he was their good genius.

4. The Prophecies of Jeremiah:

What Jeremiah was to preach was the judgment upon Judah. As the reason for this judgment Jeremiah everywhere mentioned the apostasy from Yahweh, the idolatry, which was practiced on bamoth, or the "high places" by Judah, as this had been done by Israel. Many heathenish abuses had found their way into the life of the people. Outspoken heathenism had been introduced by such men as King Manasseh, even the sacrifice of children to the honor of Baal-Molech in the valley of Hinnom (7:31; 19:5; 32:35), and the worship of "the queen of heaven" (7:18; 44:19). It is true that the reformation of Josiah swept away the worst of these abominations. But an inner return to Yahweh did not result from this reformation. For the reason that the improvement had been more on the surface and outward, and was done to please the king, Jeremiah charges up to his people all their previous sins, and the guilt of the present generation was yet added to this (16:11 f). Together with religious insincerity went the moral corruption of the people, such as dishonesty, injustice, oppression of the helpless, slander, and the like. Compare the accusations found in 5:1 ff, 7 f, 26 ff; 6:7,13; 7:5 f, 9; 9:2,6,8; 17:9 ff; 21:12; 22:13 ff; 23:10; 29:23, etc. Especially to the spiritual leaders, the priests and prophets, are these things charged up.

The judgment which is to come in the near future, as a punishment for the sins of the people, is from the outset declared to be the conquest of the country through an enemy from abroad. In this way the heated caldron with the face from the North, in the vision containing the call of the prophet (Jer 1:13), is to be understood. This power in the North is not named until the 4th year of Jehoiakim (Jer 25), where Nebuchadnezzar is definitely designated as the conqueror. It is often thought, that, in the earlier years of his career, Jeremiah had in mind the Scythians when he spoke of the enemies from the North, especially in Jer 4-6. The Scythians (according to Herodotus i.103 ff) had, probably a few years before Jeremiah’s call to the prophetic office, taken possession of Media, then marched through Asia Minor, and even forced their way as far as Egypt. They crossed through Canaan, passing by on their march from East to West, near Beth-shean (Scythopolis). The ravages of this fierce people probably influenced the language used by Jeremiah in his prophecies (compare 4:11 ff; 5:15 ff; 6:3 ff, 22 ff). But it is unthinkable that Jeremiah expected nothing more than a plundering and a booty-seeking expedition of the Scythian nomad hordes. Chariots, such as are described in 4:13, the Scythians did not possess. Moreover, it must not be forgotten that Jeremiah from the outset speaks of a deportation of his people to this foreign land (3:18; 5:19), while an exile of Israel in the country of the Scythians was out of the question. At all events from the 4th year of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah regards the Chaldeans as the enemy who, according to his former announcement, would come from the North It is possible that it was only in the course of time that he reached a clear conviction as to what nation was meant by the revelation from God. But, upon further reflection, he must have felt almost certain on this subject, especially as Isaiah (39:6), Micah (4:10), and, soon after these, Habakkuk had named Babylon as the power that was to carry out the judgment upon Israel. Other prophets, too, regard the Babylonians as belonging to the northern group of nations (compare Zec 6:8), because they always came from the North, and because they were the legal successors of the Assyrians.

In contrast to optimistic prophets, who had hoped to remedy matters in Israel (Jer 6:14), Jeremiah from the beginning predicted the destruction of the city and of the sanctuary, as also the end of the Jewish nation and the exile of the people through these enemies from abroad. According to 25:11; 29:10, the Babylonian supremacy (not exactly the exile) was to continue for 70 years; and after this, deliverance should come. Promises to this effect are found only now and then in the earlier years of the prophet (3:14 ff; 12:14 ff; 16:14 f). However, during the time of the siege and afterward, such predictions are more frequent (compare 23:1 ff; 24:6 f; 47:2-7; and in the "Book of Comfort," chapters 30-33).

What characterizes this prophet is the spiritual inwardness of his religion; the external theocracy he delivers up to destruction, because its forms were not animated by God-fearing sentiments. External circumcision is of no value without inner purity of heart. The external temple will be destroyed, because it has become the hiding-place of sinners. External sacrifices have no value, because those who offer them are lacking in spirituality, and this is displeasing to God. The law is abused and misinterpreted (Jer 8:8); the words of the prophets as a rule do not come from God. Even the Ark of the Covenant is eventually to make way for a glorious presence of the Lord. The law is to be written in the hearts of men (Jer 31:31). The glories of the Messianic times the prophet does not describe in detail but their spiritual character he repeatedly describes in the words "Yahweh our righteousness" (Jer 23:6; 33:16). However, we must not over-estimate the idealism of Jeremiah. He believed in a realistic restoration of theocracy to a form, just as the other prophets (compare Jer 31-32, 38-40).

As far as the form of his prophetic utterances is concerned, Jeremiah is of a poetical nature; but he was not only a poet. He often speaks in the meter of an elegy; but he is not bound by this, and readily passes over into other forms of rhythms and also at times into prosaic speech, when the contents of his discourses require it. The somewhat monotonous and elegiac tone, which is in harmony with his sad message to the people, gives way to more lively and varied forms of expression, when the prophet speaks of other and foreign nations. In doing this he often makes use of the utterances of earlier prophets.

5. The Book of Jeremiah:

The first composition of the book is reported in Jer 36:1 ff. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim, at the command of Yahweh, he dictated all of the prophecies he had spoken down to this time to his pupil Baruch, who wrote them on a roll. After the destruction of this book-roll by the king, he would not be stopped from reproducing the contents again and making additions to it (Jer 36:32). In this we have the origin of the present Book of Jeremiah. This book, however, not only received further additions, but has also been modified. While the discourses may originally have been arranged chronologically, and these reached only down to the 4th year of King Jehoiakim, we find in the book, as it is now, as early as Jer 21:1 ff; 23:1 ff; 26:1 ff, discourses from the times of Zedekiah. However, the 2nd edition (Jer 36:28) contained, no doubt, Jer 25, with those addresses directed against the heathen nations extant at that time. The lack of order, from a chronological point of view, in the present book, is attributable also to the fact that historical accounts or appendices concerning the career of Jeremiah were added to the book in later times, e.g. Jer 26; 35; 36 and others; and in these additions are also found older discourses of the

prophet. Beginning with Jer 37, the story of the prophet during the siege of Jerusalem and after the destruction of the city is reported, and in connection with this are his words and discourses belonging to this period.

It is a question whether these pieces, which are more narrative in character, and which are the product of a contemporary, probably Baruch, at one time constituted a book by themselves, out of which they were later taken and incorporated in the book of the prophet, or whether they were inserted by Baruch. In favor of the first view, it may be urged that they are not always found at their proper places chronologically; e.g. Jer 26 is a part of the temple discourse in Jer 7-9. However, this "Book of Baruch," which is claimed by some critics to have existed as a separate book beside that of Jeremiah, would not furnish a connected biography, and does not seem to have been written for biographical purposes. It contains introductions to certain words and speeches of the prophet and statements of what the consequences of these had been. Thus it is more probable that Baruch, at a later time, made supplementary additions to the original book, which the prophet had dictated without any personal data. But in this work the prophet himself may have cooperated. At places, perhaps, the dictation of the prophet ends in a narrative of Baruch (Jer 19:14-20:6), or vice versa. Baruch seems to have written a historical introduction, and then Jeremiah dictated the prophecy (27:1; 18:1; 32:1 ff, and others). Of course, the portions of the book which came from the pen of Baruch are to be regarded as an authentic account.

6. Authenticity and Integrity of the Book:

However, critics have denied to Jeremiah and his pupil certain sections of the present book, and they claim that these belong to a later date. Among these is 10:1-16, containing a warning to those in the exile against idolatry (and related to Isa 40 ff) which, it is claimed, could not possibly in this form and fullness be the work of Jeremiah. Also 17:19-27 is without reason denied to Jeremiah, upon the ground that he could not have thought of emphasizing the Sabbath law. He was, however, no modern idealist, but respected also the Divine ordinances (compare 11:1-8). Then Jer 25 is rejected by some, while others attack especially 25:12-14 and 25:27-38; but in both cases without reason. On the other hand, we admit that 25:25 and also 25:13 f are later additions. The words, "all that is written in this book, which Jeremiah hath prophesied against all the nations," are probably a superscription, which has found its way into the text. In 25:26 the words, "and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them," are likewise considered spurious. Sheshach is rightly regarded here, as in 51:41, as a cipher for "Babel," but the use of ‘At-bash (a cipher in which the order of the letters of the Hebrew alphabet is reversed, taw (t) for ‘aleph (’), shin (sh) for beth (b), etc., hence, SHeSHaKH = BaBHeL, see the commentaries) does not prove spuriousness. The sentence is not found in the Septuagint. The attacks made on Jer 30 and 31 are of little moment. Jer 33:14-26 is not found in the Septuagint, and its contents, too, belong to the passages in Jeremiah that are most vigorously attacked. Critics regard Jeremiah as too spiritual to have perpetuated the Levitical priesthood. In Jer 39:1,2,4-10 are evidently additions that do not belong to this place. The remaining portion can stand. Among the discourses against the nations, Jer 46-51, those in 46:1-12, spoken immediately preceding the battle of Carchemish, cannot be shown to be unauthentic; even 46:13-28 are also genuine. The fact, however, is that the text has suffered very much. Nor are there any satisfactory reasons against the prophecy in Jer 47-49, if we assume that Jeremiah reasserted some

of his utterances against the heathen nations that did not seem to have been entirely fulfilled. Jer 50 and 51, the discourses against Babylon, have the distinct impress of Jeremiah. This impression is stronger than the doubts, which, however, are not without weight. The events in 51:59 ff, which are not to be called into question, presuppose longer addresses of Jeremiah against Babylon. The possibility, however, remains that the editing of these utterances as found in the present book dates from the time after 586 BC. That any influence of Deutero-Isaiah or later authors can be traced in Jeremiah cannot be shown with any certainty. Jer 52 was written neither by Jeremiah nor for his book, but is taken from the Books of Kings, and is found there almost verbatim (2Ki 24; 25).

7. Relation to the Septuagint (Septuagint):

A special problem is furnished by the relation of the text of Jeremiah to the Alexandrian version of the Seventy (Septuagint). Not only does the Hebrew form of the book differ from the Greek materially, much more than this is the case in other books of the Old Testament, but the arrangement, too, is a different one. The oracle concerning the heathen nations (Jer 46-51) is in the Septuagint found in the middle of Jer 25, and that, too, in an altogether different order (namely, 49:35 ff, 46; 50; 51; 47:1-7; 49:7-22; 49:1-5,28-33,13-27; 48). In addition, the readings throughout the book in many cases are divergent, the text in the Septuagint being in general shorter and more compact. The Greek text has about 2,700 Hebrew words less than the authentic Hebrew text, and is thus about one-eighth shorter.

As far as the insertion of the addresses against the heathen nations in Jer 29 is concerned, the Greek order is certainly not more original than is the Hebrew. It rather tears apart, awkwardly, what is united in Jer 25, and has probably been caused by a misunderstanding. The words of 25:13 were regarded as a hint that here the discourses against the heathen were to follow. Then, too, the order of these discourses in the Greek text is less natural than the one in Hebrew. In regard to the readings of the text, it has been thought that the text of the Septuagint deserves the preference on account of its brevity, and that the Hebrew text had been increased by additions. However, in general, the Greek version is very free, and often is done without an understanding of the subject; and there are reasons to believe that the translator shortened the text, when he thought the style of Jeremiah too heavy. Then, too, where he met with repetitions, he probably would omit; or did so when he found trouble with the matter or the language. This does not deny that his translation in many places may be correct, and that additions may have been made to the Hebrew text.

LITERATURE.

Calvin, Praelectiones in Librum Prophetiae Jer et Thren, Geneva, 1653; Sebastian Schmidt, Commentarii in libr. prophet. Jeremiah, Argent, 1685. Modern commentary by Hitzig, Ewald, Graf, Nagelsbach, Keil; also Cheyne (Pulpit Comm.), Peake, Duhm, and von Orelli.

C. von Orelli

JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF

See JEREMY, THE EPISTLE OF.

JEREMIAH, THE LAMENTATIONS OF

See LAMENTATIONS.

JEREMIAS

jer-e-mi’-as (Ieremias):

(1) Named among the sons of Baani as one of those who had married foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:34). In Ezr 10:33 we find, "Jeremai" among the sons of Hashum. In 1 Esdras it should come in 9:33 before Manasses.

(2) See JEREMIAH (general article).

JEREMIEL

jer-e-mi’-el (Latin Hieremihel, al. Jeremiel, "El hurls" or "El appoints"): the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) in 2 Esdras 4:36 for the King James Version "Uriel." He is here called the "archangel" who answers the questions raised by the souls of the righteous dead. He is perhaps identical with Ramiel of Apocrypha Baruch or Remiel of Eth Enoch.

JEREMOTH

jer’-e-moth

(a) yeremoth and

(b) yeremowth,

(c) yerimowth, meaning unknown:

Of the following (1) has form (b), (5) the form (c), the rest (a).

(1) In 1Ch 7:8 (the King James Version "Jerimoth"), and

(2) In 1Ch 8:14, Benjamites. Compare JEROHAM, (2).

(3) In 1Ch 23:23, and (4) in 1Ch 25:22 =" Jerimoth," 24:30; heads of Levitical houses.

(5) A Naphtalite, one of David’s tribal princes (1Ch 27:19); the King James Version "Jerimoth."

(6) (7) (8) Men who had married foreign wives. In Ezr 10:26 (=" Hieremoth," 1 Esdras 9:27); Ezr 10:27 (=" Jarimoth," 1 Esdras 9:28); Ezr 10:29 (=" Hieremoth," 1 Esdras 9:30); the Qere of the last is weramoth, "and Ramoth"; so the Revised Version margin, the King James Version.

David Francis Roberts

JEREMY

jer’-e-mi.

See JEREMIAH (general article).

JEREMY, THE EPISTLE OF

jer’-e-mi, (Epistole Ieremiou):

1. Name

2. Canonicity and Position

3. Contents

4. Original Language

5. Authorship, Date and Aim

6. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

1. Name:

In manuscripts Vaticanus and Alexandrinus the title is simply "An Epistle of Jeremiah." But in Codex Vaticanus, etc., there is a superscription introducing the letter: "Copy of a letter which Jeremiah sent to the captives about to be led to Babylon by (Peshitta adds Nebuchadnezzar) the king of the Babylonians, to make known to them what had been commanded him by God." What follows is a satirical exposure of the folly of idolatry, and not a letter. The idea of introducing this as a letter from Jeremiah was probably

suggested by Jer 29:1 ff.

2. Canonicity and Position:

The early Greek Fathers were on the whole favorably disposed toward this tract, reckoning it to be a part of the Canon. It is therefore included in the lists of Canonical writings of Origen, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem and Athanasius, and it was so authoritatively recognized by the Council of Laodicea (360 AD).

In most Greek manuscripts of the Septuagint (Codices Alexandrinus and Vaticanus. March, Chisl, in the Syriac Hexateuch), it follows Lamentations as an independent piece, closing the supposed writings of Jeremiah. In the bestknown printed of the Septuagint (Tischendorf, Swete, etc.), the order is Jeremiah, Baruch, Lain, Epistle of Jeremy. In Fritzsche, Lib. Apocrypha VT Graece, Epistle Jeremiah stands between Baruch and Tobit. But in Latin manuscripts, including those of the Vulgate, it is appended to Baruch, of which it forms chapter 6, though it really has nothing to do with that book. This last is the case with Protestant editions (English versions of the Bible, etc.) of the Apocrypha, a more intelligible arrangement, since Jeremiah and Lamentations do not occur in the Apocrypha, and the Biblical Baruch was Jeremiah's amanuensis.

3. Contents:

In the so-called letter (see 1, above) the author shows the absurdity and wickedness of heathen worship. The Jews, for their sins, will be removed to Babylon, where they will remain 7 generations. In that land they will be tempted to worship the gods o f the people. The writer's aim is ostensibly to warn them beforehand by showing how helpless and useless the idols worshipped are, and how immoral as well as silly the rites of the Bah religion are. For similar polemics against idolatry, see Isa 44:9-19 (which in its earnestness resembles the Epistle Jeremiah closely); Jer 10:3-9; Ps 115:4-8; 135:15-18; The Wisdom of Solomon 13:10-19; 15:13-17.

4. Original Language:

That the Epistle Jeremiah was composed in Greek is the opinion of practically all scholars. There are no marks of translation; the Greek is on the whole good, and abounds in such rhetorical terms as characterized the Greek of Northern Egypt about the be ginning of our era. There is no trace of a Hebrew original, though Origen has been mistakenly understood to say there was one in his day (see Schurer, GJV4, III, 467 f). Romanist writers defend a Hebrew original, and point to some Hebraisms (verse 44 and the use of the fut. for the past), but these can be matched in admittedly Hellenistic Greek writings.

5. Authorship, Date and Aim:

The writer was almost certainly a resident in Alexandria toward the close of the last century BC. The

Greek of the book, the references to Egyptian religion (verse 19, where the Feast of Lights at Sais—Herod. ii.62—is referred to), and the allusion to the Epistle Jeremiah in 2 Macc 2:2, denied by Schurer, etc., make the above conclusion very probable. The author had in mind the dangers to the religion of his fellow-countrymen presented by the fascinating forms of idolatry existing at Alexandria. Certainly Jeremiah is not the author, for the book was written in Greek and never formed part of the Hebrew Canon. Besides, the treatment is far below the level of the genuine writings of that prophet.

6. Text and Versions:

(1) The Greek.

This epistle occurs in the principal manuscripts of the Septuagint uncials (Codices Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, Q, Gamma, contain 7b-24a, etc.) and cursives (except 70, 96, 229).

(2) The Syriac.

P follows the Greek, but very freely. The Syriac H follows the text of Codex Vaticanus closely, often at the expense of Syriac idioms.

(3) The Latin.

The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is made direct from the Greek. There is a different Latin version published by Sabatier in his Biblical Sacr. Latin Versiones Antiquas, II, 734 ff. It is freer than the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

(4) The Arabic.

There are also Arabic (following A), Coptic (ed Quatremere, 1810), and Ethiopic (ed Dillmann, 1894) versions.

LITERATURE.

See under APOCRYPHA for commentary and various editions. But note in addition to the literature mentioned the article the following: Reusch, Erklar. des B. Baruch, 1853; Daubanton, "Het Apok boek Epistole Ieremiou," Theol. Studien, 1888, 126-38.

T. Witton Davies

JERIAH

je-ri’-a (yeriyahu, "founded of Yahweh"): In 1Ch 23:19; 24:23 =" Jerijah" (yeriyah), 26:31, head of a

Levitical house: called chief of the Hebronites in 24:23 (compare 24:30).

JERIBAI

jer’-i-bi, jer-i-ba’-i (yeribhay, meaning uncertain): One of David’s mighty men of the armies (1Ch 11:46); one of the names not found in the list in 2Sa 23:24-29 a.

JERICHO

jer’-i-ko (the word occurs in two forms. In the Pentateuch, in 2Ki 25:5 and in Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles it is written yerecho; yericho, elsewhere): In 1Ki 16:34 the final Hebrew letter is he (h), instead of waw (w). The termination waw (w) thought to preserve the peculiarities of the old Canaanite. dialect. In the Septuagint we have the indeclinable form, Iericho (Swete has the form Iereicho as well), both with and without the feminine article; in the New Testament Iereicho, once with the feminine article The Arabic is er-Riha. According to De 32:49 it stood opposite Nebo, while in 34:3 it is called a city grove of palm trees. It was surrounded with a wall (Jos 2:15), and provided with a gate which was closed at night (Jos 2:5), an d was ruled over by a king. When captured, vessels of brass and iron, large quantities of silver and gold, and "a goodly Babylonish garment" were found in it (Jos 7:21). It was on the western side of the Jordan, not far from the camp of Israel at Shittim, before crossing the river (Jos 2:1). The city was on the "plains" (Jos 4:13), but so close to "the mountain" on the West (probably the cliffs of Quarantania, the traditional scene of Christ’s temptation) that it was within easy reach of the spies, protected by Rahab. It was in the lot of Benjamin (Jos 18:21), the border of which ascended to the "slope (English versions of the Bible "side") of Jeremiah on the North" (Jos 18:12). Authorities are generally agreed in locating the ancient city at Tel es-Sultan, a mile and a half Northwest of modern Jericho. Here there is a mound 1,200 ft. long and 50 ft. in height supporting 4 smaller mounds, the highest of which is 90 ft. above the base of the main mound.

The geological situation (see JORDAN VALLEY) sheds great light upon the capture of the city by Joshua (Jos 6). If the city was built as we suppose it to have been, upon the unconsolidated sedimentary deposits which accumulated to a great depth in the Jordan valley during the enlargement of the Dead Sea, which took place in Pleistocene (or glacial) times, the sudden falling of the walls becomes easily credible to anyone who believes in the personality of God and in His power either to foreknow the future or to direct at His will the secondary causes with which man has to deal in Nature. The narrative does not state that the blowing of the rams’ horns of themselves effected the falling of the walls. It was simply said that at a specified juncture on the 7th day the walls would fall, and that they actually fell at that juncture. The miracle may, therefore, be regarded as either that of prophecy, in which the Creator by foretelling the course of things to Joshua, secured the junction of Divine and human activities which constitutes a true miracle, or we may regard the movements which brought down the walls to be the result of direct Divine action, such as is exerted by man when be produces an explosion of dynamite at a particular time and place. The phenomena are just such as occurred in the earthquake of San Francisco in 1906, where, according to the report of the scientific commission appointed by the state, "the most violent destruction of buildings was on the made ground. This ground seems to have behaved during the

earthquake very much in the same way as jelly in a bowl, or as a semi-liquid in a tank." Santa Rosa, situated on the valley floor, "underlain to a considerable depth by loose or slightly coherent geological formations, ... 20 miles from the rift, was the most severely shaken town in the state and suffered the greatest disaster relatively to its population and extent" (Report, 13 and 15). Thus an earthquake, such as is easily provided for along the margin of this great Jordan crevasse, would produce exactly the phenomena here described, and its occurrence at the time and place foretold to Joshua constitutes it a miracle of the first magnitude.

Notwithstanding the curse pronounced in Jos 6:26 the King James Version, prophesying that whosoever should rebuild the city "he shall lay the foundations thereof in his firstborn," it was rebuilt (1Ki 16:34) by Hiel the Bethelite in the days of Ahab. The curse was literally fulfilled. Still David's messengers are said to have "tarried at Jericho" in his day (2Sa 10:5; 1Ch 19:5). In Elisha's time (2Ki 2:5) there was a school of prophets there, while several other references to the city occur in the Old Testament and the Apocrypha (2Ch 28:15, where it is called "the city of palmtrees"; 2Ki 25:5; Jer 39:5; Ezr 2:34; Ne 3:2; 7:36; 1 Macc 9:50). Josephus describes it and the fertile plain surrounding it, in glowing terms. In the time of Christ, it was an important place yielding a large revenue to the royal family. But the city which Herod rebuilt was on a higher elevation, at the base of the western mountain, probably at Beit Jubr, where there are the ruins of a small fort. Jericho was the place of rendezvous for Galilean pilgrims desiring to avoid Samaria, both in going to and in departing from Jerusalem, and it has been visited at all times by thousands of pilgrims, who go down from Jerusalem to bathe in the Jordan. The road leading from Jerusalem to Jericho is still infested by robbers who hide in the rocky caverns adjoining it, and appear without warning from the tributary gorges of the wadies which dissect the mountain wall. At the present time Jericho and the region about is occupied only by a few hundred miserable inhabitants, deteriorated by the torrid climate which prevails at the low level about the head of the Dead Sea. But the present barrenness of the region is largely due to the destruction of the aqueducts which formerly distributed over the plain the waters brought down through the wadies which descend from the mountains of Judea. The ruins of many of these are silent witnesses of the cause of its decay. Twelve aqueducts at various levels formerly branched from the Wady Kelt, irrigating the plain both North and South. Remains of Roman masonry are found in these. In the Middle Ages they were so repaired that an abundance and variety of crops were raised, including wheat, barley, millet, figs, grapes and sugar cane.

See further PALESTINE EXPLORATION.

George Frederick Wright

JERIEL

je'-ri-el, jer'-i-el (yeri'el, "founded of God"; compare JERIAH): A chief of Issachar (1Ch 7:2).

JERIJAH

je-ri'-ja (1Ch 26:31).

See JERIAH.

JERIMOTH

jer’-i-moth (see JEREMOTH, (c)):

(1) A Benjamite (1Ch 7:7).

(2) A Benjamite who joined David at Ziklag, or perhaps a Judean (1Ch 12:5 (Hebrew 6)).

(3) In 1Ch 24:30 = JEREMOTH, (4) (which see).

(4) A Levite musician in David’s time (1Ch 25:4).

(5) Son of David and father of Mahalath, Rehoboam’s wife (2Ch 11:18). He is not mentioned (2Sa 3:2-5; 5:14-16; 1Ch 3:1-9; 14:4-7) among the sons of David’s wives, so Curtis (Ch, 369) thinks that he was either the son of a concubine, or possibly the name is a corruption of "Ithream" (yithre‘am, 1Ch 3:3).

(6) A Levite overseer in Hezekiah’s time (2Ch 31:13).

David Francis Roberts

JERIOTH

jer’-i-oth, jer’-i-oth (yeri‘oth, "(tent-) curtains"): In 1Ch 2:18, where Massoretic Text is corrupt, Kittel in his commentary and in Biblical Hebrew reads "Caleb begat (children) of Azubah his wife, Jerioth." Wellhausen (De Gent. et Fam. Jud., 33) reads, "Caleb begat (children) of Azubah his wife, the daughter of Jerioth." According to English Versions of the Bible, Caleb had two wives, but the context does not bear this out. J. H. Michaelis regarded Jerioth as another name for Azubah. See Curtis, Commentary on Chronicles, 92.

JEROBOAM

jer-o-bo’-am (yarobh‘am; Septuagint Hieroboam, usually assumed to have been derived from riyb and ‘am, and signifying "the people contend," or, "he pleads the people’s cause"): The name was borne by two kings of Israel.

(1) Jeroboam I, son of Nebat, an Ephraimite, and of Zeruah, a widow (1Ki 11:26-40; 12-14:20). He was the first king of Israel after the disruption of the kingdom, and he reigned 22 years (937-915 BC).

I. Jeroboam I

1. Sources:

The history of Jeroboam is contained in 1Ki 11:26-40; 12:1-14:20; 2Ch 10:1-11:4; 11:14-16; 12:15; 13:3-20, and in an insertion in the Septuagint after 1Ki 12:24 (a-z). This insertion covers about the same ground as the Massoretic Text, and the Septuagint elsewhere, with some additions and variations. The fact that it calls Jeroboam's mother a porne (harlot), and his wife the Egyptian princess Ano (compare 1Ki 11); that Jeroboam is punished by the death of his son before he has done any wrong; that the episode with the prophet's mantle does not occur until the meeting at Shechem; that Jeroboam is not proclaimed king at all—all this proves the passage inferior to the Massoretic Text. No doubt it is a fragment of some historical work, which, after the manner of the later Midrash, has combined history and tradition, making rather free use of the historical kernel.

2. His Rise and Revolt:

Jeroboam, as a highly gifted and valorous young Ephraimite, comes to the notice of Solomon early in his reign (1Ki 11:28; compare 9:15,24). Having noticed his ability, the king made him overseer of the fortifications and public work at Jerusalem, and placed him over the levy from the house of Joseph. The fact that the latter term may stand for the whole of the ten tribes (compare Am 5:6; 6:6; Ob 1:18) indicates the importance of the position, which, however, he used to plot against the king. No doubt he had the support of the people in his designs. Prejudices of long standing (2Sa 19:40 f; 20 f) were augmented when Israelite interests were made subservient to Judah and to the king, while enforced labor and burdensome taxation filled the people's hearts h bitterness and jealousy. Jeroboam, the son of a widow, would be the first to feel the gall of oppression and to give voice to the suffering of the people. In addition, he had the approval of the prophet Ahijah of the old sanctuary of Shiloh, who, by tearing his new mantle into twelve pieces and giving ten of them to Jeroboam, informed him that he was to become king of the ten tribes. Josephus says (Ant., VIII, vii, 8) that Jeroboam was elevated by the words of the prophet, "and being a young man of warm temper, and ambitious of greatness, he could not be quiet," but tried to get the government into his hands at once. For the time, the plot failed, and Jeroboam fled to Egypt where he was received and kindly treated by Shishak, the successor to the father-in-law of Solomon.

3. The Revolt of the Ten Tribes:

The genial and imposing personality of Solomon had been able to stem the tide of discontent excited by his oppressive regime, which at his death burst all restraints. Nevertheless, the northern tribes, at a popular assembly held at Shechem, solemnly promised to serve Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, who had already been proclaimed king at Jerusalem, on condition that he would lighten the burdens that so unjustly rested upon them. Instead of receiving the magna charta which they expected, the king, in a spirit of despotism, gave them a rough answer, and Josephus says "the people were struck by his words, as it were, by an iron hammer" (Ant., VIII, viii, 3). But despotism lost the day. The rough answer of the

king was met by the Marseillaise of the people:

"What portion have we in David?

Neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse:

To your tents. O Israel:

Now see to thine own house, David" (1Ki 12:16).

Seeing the turn affairs had taken, but still unwilling to make any concessions, Rehoboam sent Adoram, who had been over the levy for many years (1Ki 5:14; 12:18), and who no doubt had quelled dissatisfaction before, to force the people to submission, possibly by the very methods he had threatened to employ (1Ki 12:14). However, the attempt failed. The aged Adoram was stoned to death, while Rehoboam was obliged to flee ignominiously back to Jerusalem, king only of Judah (1Ki 12:20). Thus, the great work of David for a united kingdom was shattered by inferiors, who put personal ambitions above great ideals.

4. The Election:

As soon as Jeroboam heard that Solomon was dead, he returned from his forced exile in Egypt and took up his residence in his native town, Zeredah, in the hill country of Ephraim Septuagint 1Ki 12:20 ff). The northern tribes, having rejected the house of David, now turned to the leader, and perhaps instigator of the revolution. Jeroboam was sent for and raised to the throne by the choice and approval of the popular assembly. Divinely set apart for his task, and having the approval of the people, Jeroboam nevertheless failed to rise to the greatness of his opportunities, and his kingdom degenerated into a mere military monarchy, never stronger than the ruler who chanced to occupy the throne. In trying to avoid the Scylla that threatened its freedom and faith (1Ki 11:33), the nation steered into the Charybdis of revolution and anarchy in which it finally perished.

5. Political Events:

Immediately upon his accession, Jeroboam fortified Shechem, the largest city in Central Israel, and made it his capital. Later he fortified Penuel in the East Jordan country. According to 1Ki 14:17, Tirzah was the capital during the latter part of his reign. About Jeroboam’s external relations very little is known beyond the fact that there was war between him and Rehoboam constantly (1Ki 14:30). In 2Ch 13:2-20 we read of an inglorious war with Abijah of Judah. When Shishak invaded Judah (1Ki 14:25 f), he did not spare Israel, as appears from his inscription on the temple at Karnak, where a list of the towns captured by him is given. These belong to Northern Israel as well as to Judah, showing that Shishak exacted tribute there, even if he used violence only in Judah. The fact that Jeroboam successfully managed a revolution but failed to establish a dynasty shows that his strength lay in the power of his personality more than in the soundness of his principles.

6. His Religious Policy:

Despite the success of the revolution politically, Jeroboam descried in the halo surrounding the temple and its ritual a danger which threatened the permanency of his kingdom. He justifiably dreaded a reaction in favor of the house of David, should the people make repeated religious pilgrimages to Jerusalem after the first passion of the rebellion had spent itself. He therefore resolved to establish national sanctuaries in Israel. Accordingly, he fixed on Bethel, which from time immemorial was one of the chief sanctuaries of the land (Ge 28:19; 35:1; Ho 12:4), and Dan, also a holy place since the conquest, as the chief centers of worship for Israel. Jeroboam now made "two calves of gold" as symbols of the strength and creative power of Yahweh, and set them up in the sanctuaries at Bethel and Dan, where altars and other sacred objects already existed. It appears that many of the priests still in the land were opposed to his image-worship (2Ch 11:13). Accordingly, he found it necessary to institute a new, non-Levitical priesthood (1Ki 13:33). A new and popular festival on the model of the feasts at Jerusalem was also established. Jeroboam’s policy might have been considered as a clever political move, had it not contained the dangerous ppeal to the lower instincts of the masses, that led them into the immoralities of heathenism and hastened the destruction of the nation. Jeroboam sacrificed the higher interests of religion to politics. This was the "sin of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, wherewith he made Israel to sin" (1Ki 12:30; 16:26).

7. Hostility of the Prophets:

It may be that many of the prophets sanctioned Jeroboam’s religious policy. Whatever the attitude of the majority may have been, there was no doubt a party who strenuously opposed the image-worship.

(1) The Anonymous Prophet.

On the very day on which Jeroboam inaugurated the worship at the sanctuary at Bethel "a man of God out of Judah" appeared at Bethel and publicly denounced the service. The import of his message was that the royal altar should some day be desecrated by a ruler from the house of David. The prophet was saved from the wrath of the king only by a miracle. "The altar also was rent, and the ashes poured out from the altar." This narrative of 1Ki 13 is usually assumed to belong to a later time, but whatever the date of compilation, the general historicity of the account is little affected by it.

(2) The Prophet Ahijah.

At a later date, when Jeroboam had realized his ambition, but not the ideal which the prophet had set before him, Ahijah predicted the consequences of his evil policy. Jeroboam’s eldest son had fallen sick. He thought of Ahijah, now old and blind, and sent the queen in disguise to learn the issue of the sickness. The prophet bade her to announce to Jeroboam that the house of Jeroboam should be extirpated root and branch; that the people whom he had seduced to idolatry should be uprooted from the land and transported beyond the river; and, severest of all, that her son should die.

8. His Death:

Jeroboam died, in the 22nd year of his reign, having "bequeathed to posterity the reputation of an apostate and a succession of endless revolutions."

S. K. Mosiman

(2) Jeroboam II (2Ki 14:23-29), son of Joash and 13th king of Israel; 4th sovereign of the dynasty of Jehu. He reigned 41 years. His accession may be placed circa 798 BC (some date lower).

II. Jeroboam II

1. His Warlike Policy:

Jeroboam came into power on the crest of the wave of prosperity that followed the crushing of the supremacy of Damascus by his father. By his great victory at Aphek, followed by others, Joash had regained the territory lost to Israel in the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz (2Ki 13:17,25). This satisfied Joash, or his death prevented further hostilities. Jeroboam, however, then a young man, resolved on a war of retaliation against Damascus, and on further conquests. The condition of the eastern world favored his projects, for Assyria was at the time engaged, under Shalmaneser III and Assurdan III, in a life-and-death struggle with Armenia. Syria being weakened, Jeroboam determined on a bold attempt to conquer and annex the whole kingdom of which Damascus was the capital. The steps of the campaign by which this was accomplished are unknown to us. The result only is recorded, that not only the intermediate territory fell into Jeroboam’s hands, but that Damascus itself was captured (2Ki 14:28). Hamath was taken, and thus were restored the eastern boundaries of the kingdom, as they were in the time of David (1Ch 13:5). From the time of Joshua "the entrance of Hamath" (Jos 13:5), a narrow pass leading into the valley of the Lebanons, had been the accepted northern boundary of the promised land. This involved the subjection of Moab and Ammon, probably already tributaries of Damascus.

2. New Social Conditions:

Jeroboam’s long reign of over 40 years gave time for the collected tribute of this greatly increased territory to flow into the coffers of Samaria, and the exactions would be ruthlessly enforced. The prophet Amos, a contemporary of Jeroboam in his later years, dwells on the cruelties inflicted on the trans-Jordanic tribes by Hazael, who "threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron" (Am 1:3). All this would be remembered now, and wealth to which the Northern Kingdom had been unaccustomed flowed in to its treasuries. The hovels of unburned brick in which the citizens had lived were replaced by "houses of hewn stone" (Am 5:11). The ivory house which Ahab built in Samaria (1Ki 22:39; decorations only are meant) was imitated, and there were many "great houses" (Am 3:15). The sovereign had both a winter and a summer palace. The description of a banqueting scene within one of these palatial abodes is lifelike in its portraiture. The guests stretched themselves upon the silken cushions of the couches, eating the flesh of lambs and stall-fed calves, drinking wine from huge bowls, singing idle

songs to the sound of viols, themselves perfumed and anointed with oil (Am 6:4-6). Meanwhile, they were not grieved for the affliction of Joseph, and cared nothing for the wrongdoing of which the country was full. Side by side with this luxury, the poor of the land were in the utmost distress. A case in which a man was sold into slavery for the price of a pair of shoes seems to have come to the prophet's knowledge, and is twice referred to by him (Am 2:6; 8:6).

3. Growth of Ceremonial Worship:

With all this, and as part of the social organization, religion of a kind flourished. Ritual took the place of righteousness; and in a memorable passage, Amos denounces the substitution of the one for the other (Am 5:21). The worship took place in the sanctuaries of the golden calves, where the votaries prostrated themselves before the altar clothed in garments taken in cruel pledge, and drank sacrificial wine bought with the money of those who were fined for non-attendance there (Am 2:8). There we are subsidiary temples and altars at Gilgal and Beersheba (Am 4:4; 5:5; 8:14). Both of these places had associations with the early history of the nation, and would be attended by worshippers from Judah as well as from Israel.

4. Mission to Amos:

Toward the close of his reign, it would appear that Jeroboam had determined upon adding greater splendor and dignity to the central shrine, in correspondence with the increased wealth of the nation. Amos, about the same time, received a commission to go to Bethel and testify against the whole proceedings there. He was to pronounce that these sanctuaries should be laid waste, and that Yahweh would raise the sword against the house of Jeroboam. (Am 7:9). On hearing his denunciation, made probably as he stood beside the altar, Amaziah, the priest of Bethel, sent a messenger to the king at Samaria, to tell him of the "conspiracy" of Amos, and that the land was not able to bear all his words. The messenger bore the report that Amos had declared "Jeroboam shall die by the sword," which Amos had not done. When the messenger had gone, priest and prophet had a heated controversy, and new threatenings were uttered (Am 7:10-17).

5. Prophecy of Jonah:

The large extension of territory acquired for Israel by Jeroboam is declared to have been the realization of a prophecy uttered earlier by Jonah, the son of Amittai (2Ki 14:25)—the same whose mission to Nineveh forms the subject of the Book of Jonah (1:1). It is also indicated that the relief which had now come was the only alternative to the utter extinction of Israel. But Yahweh sent Israel a "saviour" (2Ki 13:5), associated by some with the Assyrian king Ramman-nirari III, who crushed Damascus, an left Syria an easy prey, first to Jehoash, then to Jeroboam. (see JEHOASH), but whom the historian seems to connect with Jeroboam himself (2Ki 14:26,27).

Jeroboam was succeeded on his death by his weak son Zechariah (2Ki 14:29).

W. Shaw Caldecott

JEROHAM

je-ro’-ham (yerocham, "may he be compassionate!"):

(1) An Ephraimite, the father of Elkanah, and grandfather of Samuel (1Sa 1:1; 1Ch 6:27,34 (Hebrew 12,19)): Jerahmeel is the name in Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, in 1 Samuel and in Septuagint, L and manuscripts, in 1 Chronicles.

(2) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:27), apparently = JEREMOTH, (2) (compare 8:14), and probably the same as he of 1Ch 9:8.

(3) Ancestor of a priest in Jerusalem (1Ch 9:12 = Ne 11:12).

(4) A man of Gedor, father of two of David’s Benjamite recruits at Ziklag, though Gedor might be a town in Southern Judah (1Ch 12:7 (Hebrew 8)).

(5) Father of Azarel, David’s tribal chief over Da (1Ch 27:22).

(6) Father of Azariah, one of the captains who supported Jehoiada in overthrowing Queen Athaliah (2Ch 23:1).

David Francis Roberts

JERUBBAAL

jer-u-ba’-al, je-rub’-a-al (yerubba‘al, "let Baal contend"): The name given to Gideon by his father, Joash, and the people in recognition of his destruction of the altar of Baal at Ophrah (Jud 6:32). For this name the form "Jerubbesheth" (2Sa 1:21) was substituted after the analogy of "Ishbosheth" and "Mephibosheth," in which bosheth, the Hebrew word for "shame," displaced the word ba‘al, no doubt because the name resembled one given in honor of Baal.

See GIDEON.

JERUBBESHETH

jer-ub-be’-sheth, je-rub’-e-sheth (yerubbesheth, see JERUBBAAL, for meaning): It is found once (2Sa 11:21) for JERUBBAAL.

The word bosheth, "shameful thing," was substituted by later editors of the text for ba‘al, "lord," in the

text of Jer 3:24; Ho 9:10; in 2Sa 2:8, etc., we find Ish-bosheth = Eshbaal (Ishbaal) in 1Ch 8:33; 9:39. The reason for this was reluctant to pronounce the word Ba‘al, which had by their time been associated with Canaanitic forms of worship. In 2Sa 11:21 Septuagint, Lucian, has "Jeroboal," which Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, has corrupted to "Jeroboam." Compare MERIB-BAAL; MEPHIBOSHETH; and see Ginsburg, New Massoretico-Critical Text of the Hebrew Bible, Intro, 400 ff. For a New Testament case compare Ro 11:4 and see Sanday and Headlam at the place.

See JERUBBAAL.

David Francis Roberts

JERUEL

je-roo’-el, jer’-oo-el (yeru’el, "founded by El"): Jahaziel prophesied that King Jehoshaphat should meet the hordes of Moabites and Ammonites, after they had come up by the "ascent of Ziz," "at the end of the valley (i.e. wady), before the wilderness of Jeruel" (2Ch 20:16). The particular part of the wilderness intended, is unknown. Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica) thinks this may be an error for the Jezreel of Judah, mentioned in Jos 15:56, etc.

See JEZREEL.

JERUSALEM, 1

je-roo’-sa-lem:

I. THE NAME

1. In Cuneiform

2. In Hebrew

3. In Greek and Latin

4. The Meaning of Jerusalem

5. Other Names

II. GEOLOGY, CLIMATE AND SPRINGS

1. Geology

2. Climate and Rainfall

3. The Natural Springs

III. THE NATURAL SITE

1. The Mountains Around

2. The Valleys

3. The Hills

IV. GENERAL TOPOGRAPHY OF JERUSALEM

1. Description of Josephus

2. Summary of the Names of the Five Hills

3. The Akra

4. The Lower City

5. City of David and Zion

V. EXCAVATIONS AND ANTIQUITIES

1. Robinson

2. Wilson, and the Palestine Exploration Fund (1865)

3. Warren and Conder

4. Maudslay

5. Schick

6. Clermont-Ganneau

7. Bliss and Dickie

8. Jerusalem Archaeological Societies

VI. THE CITY'S WALLS AND GATES

1. The Existing Walls

2. Wilson's Theory

3. The Existing Gates

4. Buried Remains of Earlier Walls

5. The Great Dam of the Tyropoeon

6. Ruins of Ancient Gates

7. Josephus' Description of the Walls

8. First Wall

9. Second Wall

10. Third Wall

11. Date of Second Wall

12. Nehemiah's Account of the Walls

13. Valley Gate

14. Dung Gate

15. Fountain Gate

16. Water Gate

17. Horse Gate

18. Sheep Gate

19. Fish Gate

20. The "Old Gate"

21. Gate of Ephraim

22. Tower of the Furnaces

23. The Gate of Benjamin

24. Upper Gate of the Temple

25. The Earlier Walls

VII. ANTIQUARIAN REMAINS CONNECTED WITH THE WATER SUPPLY

1. Gihon: The Natural Spring

2. The Aqueduct of the Canaanites

3. Warren’s Shaft

4. Hezekiah’s "Siloam" Aqueduct

5. Other Aqueducts at Gihon

6. Bir Eyyub

7. Varieties of Cisterns

8. Birket Israel

9. Pool of Bethesda

10. The Twin Pools

11. Birket Chammam el BaTrak

12. Birket Mamilla

13. Birket es Sultan

14. "Solomon’s Pools"

15. Low-Level Aqueduct

16. High-Level Aqueduct

17. Dates of Construction of these Aqueducts

VIII. TOMBS, ANTIQUARIAN REMAINS AND ECCLESIASTICAL SITES

1. "The Tombs of the Kings"

2. "Herod’s Tomb"

3. "Absalom’s Tomb"

4. The "Egyptian Tomb"

5. The "Garden Tomb"

6. Tomb of "Simon the Just"

7. Other Antiquities

8. Ecclesiastical Sites

IX. HISTORY

1. Tell el-Amarna Correspondence

2. Joshua’s Conquest

3. Site of the Jebusite City

4. David

5. Expansion of the City

6. Solomon

7. Solomon’s City Wall

8. The Disruption (933 BC)

9. Invasion of Shishak (928 BC)

10. City Plundered by Arabs

11. Hazael King of Syria Bought Off (797 BC)

12. Capture of the City by Jehoash of Israel

13. Uzziah’s Refortification (779-740 BC)

14. Ahaz Allies with Assyria (736-728 BC)

15. Hezekiah’s Great Works

16. Hezekiah’s Religious Reforms

17. Manasseh’s Alliance with Assyria

18. His Repair of the Walls

19. Josiah and Religious Reforms (640-609 BC)

20. Jeremiah Prophesies the Approaching Doom

21. Nebuchadnezzar Twice Takes Jerusalem (586 BC)

22. Cyrus and the First Return (538 BC)

23. Nehemiah Rebuilds the Walls

24. Bagohi Governor

25. Alexander the Great

26. The Ptolemaic Rule

27. Antiochus the Great

28. Hellenization of the City under Antiochus Epiphanes

29. Capture of the City (170 BC)

30. Capture of 168 BC

31. Attempted Suppression of Judaism

32. The Maccabean Rebellion

33. The Dedication of the Temple (165 BC)

34. Defeat of Judas and Capture of the City

35. Judas' Death (161 BC)

36. Jonathan's Restorations

37. Surrender of City to Antiochus Sidetes (134 BC)

38. Hasmonean Buildings

39. Rome's Intervention

40. Pompey Takes the City by Storm

41. Julius Caesar Appoints Antipater Procurator (47 BC)

42. Parthian Invasion

43. Reign of Herod the Great (37-4 BC)

44. Herod's Great Buildings

45. Herod Archelaus (4 BC-6 AD)

46. Pontius Pilate

47. King Agrippa

48. Rising against Florus and Defeat of Gallus

49. The City Besieged by Titus (70 AD)

50. Party Divisions within the Besieged Walls

51. Capture and Utter Destruction of the City

52. Rebellion of Bar-Cochba

53. Hadrian Builds Ella Capitolina

54. Constantine Builds the Church of the Anastasis

55. The Empress Eudoxia Rebuilds the Walls

56. Justinian

57. Chosroes II Captures the City

58. Heracleus Enters It in Triumph

59. Clemency of Omar

60. The Seljuk Turks and Their Cruelties

61. Crusaders Capture the City in 1099

62. The Kharizimians

63. Ottoman Turks Obtain the City (1517 AD)

X. MODERN JERUSALEM

1. Jews and "Zionism"

2. Christian Buildings and Institutions

LITERATURE I. The Name.

1. In Cuneiform:

The earliest mention of Jerusalem is in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (1450 BC), where it appears in the form Uru-sa-lim; allied with this we have Ur-sa-li-immu on the Assyrian monuments of the 8th century BC.

The most ancient Biblical form is yerushalem, shortened in Ps 76:2 (compare Ge 14:18) to Salem, but in Massoretic Text we have it vocalized yerushalaim. In Jer 26:18; Es 2:6; 2Ch 25:1; 32:9 we have yerushalayim, a form which occurs on the Jewish coins of the Revolt and also in Jewish literature; it is commonly used by modern Talmudic Jews.

2. In Hebrew:

The form Hebrew with the ending -aim or -ayim is interpreted by some as being a dual, referring to the upper and lower Jerusalem, but such forms occur in other names as implying special solemnity; such a pronunciation is both local and late.

3. In Greek and Latin:

In the Septuagint we get (Ierousalem), constantly reflecting the earliest and the common Hebrew pronunciation, the initial letter being probably unaspirated; soon, however, we meet with (Hierousalem) —with the aspirate—the common form in Josep hus, and (Hierosoluma) in Macc (Books II through IV), and in Strabo. This last form has been carried over into the Latin writers, Cicero, Pliny, Tacitus and Suetonius. It was replaced in official use for some centuries by Hadrian’s Aelia Capitolina, which occurs as late as Jerome, but it again comes into common use in the documents of the Crusades, while Solyma occurs at various periods as a poetic abbreviation.

In the New Testament we have (Hierousalem), particularly in the writings of Luke and Paul, and (ta Hierosoluma) elsewhere. The King James Version of 1611 has Ierosalem in the Old Testament and Hierusalem in the New Testament. The form Jerusalem first occurs in French writings of the 12th century.

4. The Meaning of Jerusalem:

With regard to the meaning of the original name there is no concurrence of opinion. The oldest known form, Uru-sa-lim, has been considered by many to mean either the "City of Peace" or the "City of (the god) Salem," but other interpreters, considering the name as of Hebrew origin, interpret it as the "possession of peace" or "foundation of peace." It is one of the ironies of history that a city which in all its long history has seen so little peace and for whose possession such rivers of blood have been shed should have such a possible meaning for its name.

5. Other Names:

Other names for the city occur. For the name Jebus see JESUS. In Isa 29:1, occurs the name ‘ari’el probably "the hearth of God," and in 1:26 the "city of righteousness." In Ps 72:16; Jer 32:24 f; Eze 7:23, we have the term ha‘ir, "the city" in contrast to "the land." A whole group of names is connected with the idea of the sanctity of the site; ‘ir ha-qodhesh, the "holy city" occurs in Isa 48:2; 52:1; Ne 11:1, and yerushalayim ha-qedhoshah, "Jerusalem the holy" is inscribed on Simon’s coins. In Mt 4:5; 27:53 we have he hagia polis, "the holy city," and in Philo, Hieropolis, with the same meaning.

In Arabic the common name is Beit el Maqdis, "the holy house," or el Muqaddas, "the holy," or the common name, used by the Moslems everywhere today, el Quds, a shortened form of el Quds esh Sheref, "the noble sanctuary."

Non-Moslems usually use the Arabic form Yerusalem.

II. Geology, Climate, and Springs.

1. Geology:

The geology of the site and environs of Jerusalem is comparatively simple, when studied in connection with that of the land of Palestine as a whole (see GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE). The outstanding feature is that the rocks consist entirely of various forms of limestone, with strata containing flints; there are no primary rocks, no sandstone (such as comes to the surface on the East of the Jordan) and no volcanic rocks. The lime stone formations are in regular strata dipping toward the Southeast, with an angle of about 10 degrees.

On the high hills overlooking Jerusalem on the East, Southeast and Southwest there still remain strata of considerable thickness of those chalky limestones of the post-Tertiary period which crown so many hilltops of Palestine, and once covered the whole land. On the "Mount of Olives," for example, occurs a layer of conglomerate limestone known as Nari, or "firestone," and another thicker deposit, known as Ka‘kuli, of which two distinct strata can be distinguished. In these layers, especially the latter, occur pockets containing marl or haur, and in both there are bands of flint.

Over the actual city’s site all this has been denuded long ages ago. Here we have three layers of limestone of varying density very clearly distinguished by all the native builders and masons:

(1) Mizzeh helu, literally, "sweet mizzeh," a hard, reddish-grey layer capable of polish, and reaching in places to a depth of 70 ft. or more. The "holy rock" in the temple-area belongs to this layer, and much of the ancient building stone was of this nature.

(2) Below this is the Melekeh or "royal" layer, which, though not very thick—35 ft. or so—has been of great importance in the history of the city. This rock is peculiar in that when first exposed to the air it is often so soft that it can be cut with a knife, but under the influence of the atmosphere it hardens to make a stone of considerable durability, useful for ordinary buildings. The great importance of this layer,

however, lies in the fact that in it have been excavated the hundreds of caverns, cisterns, tombs and aqueducts which honeycomb the city’s site.

(3) Under the Melekeh is a Cenomanian limestone of great durability, known as Mizzeh Yehudeh, or "Jewish mizzeh." It is a highly valued building stone, though hard to work. Geologically it is distinguished from Mizzeh helu by its containing ammonites. Characteristically, it is a yellowish-grey stone, sometimes slightly reddish. A variety of a distinctly reddish appearance, known as Mizzeh ahmar, or "red mizzeh," makes a very ornamental stone for columns, tombstones, etc.; it takes a high polish and is sometimes locally known as "marble."

This deep layer, which underlies the whole city, comes to the surface in the Kidron valley, and its impermeability is probably the explanation of the appearance there of the one true spring, the "Virgin’s Fount." The water over the site and environs of Jerusalem percolates with ease the upper layer, but is conducted to the surface by this hard layer; the comparatively superficial source of the water of this spring accounts for the poorness of its quality.

2. Climate and Rainfall:

The broad features of the climate of Jerusalem have probably remained the same throughout history, although there is plenty of evidence that there have been cycles of greater and lesser abundance of rain. The almost countless cisterns belonging to all ages upon the site and the long and complicated conduits for bringing water from a distance, testify that over the greater part of history the rainfall must have been, as at present, only seasonal.

As a whole, the climate of Jerusalem may be considered healthy. The common diseases should be largely preventable—under an enlightened government; even the malaria which is so prevalent is to a large extent an importation from the low-lying country, and could be stopped at once, were efficient means taken for destroying the carriers of infection, the abundant Anopheles mosquitoes. On account of its altitude and its exposed position, almost upon the watershed, wind, rain and cold are all more excessive than in the maritime plains or the Jordan valley. Although the winter’s cold is severely felt, on account of its coinciding with the days of heaviest rainfall (compare Ezr 10:9), and also because of the dwellings and clothes of the inhabitants being suited for enduring heat more than cold, the actual lowest cold recorded is only 25 degrees F., and frost occurs only on perhaps a dozen nights in an average year. During the rainless summer months the mean temperature rises steadily until August, when it reaches 73,1 degrees F., but the days of greatest heat, with temperature over 100 degrees F. in the shade at times, occur commonly in September. In midsummer the cool northwest breezes, which generally blow during the afternoons and early night, do much to make life healthy. The most unpleasant days occur in May and from the middle of September until the end of October, when the dry southeast winds—the sirocco—blow hot and stifling from over the deserts, carrying with them at times fine dust sufficient in quantity to produce a marked haze in the atmosphere. At such times all vegetation droops, and most human beings, especially residents not brought up under such conditions, suffer more or less from depression and physical discomfort; malarial, "sandfly," and other fevers are apt to be peculiarly prevalent. "At that time

shall it be said .... to Jerusalem, A hot wind from the bare heights in the wilderness toward the daughter of my people, not to winnow, nor to cleanse" (Jer 4:11).

During the late summer—except at spells of sirocco—heavy "dews" occur at night, and at the end of September or beginning of October the "former" rains fall—not uncommonly in tropical downpours accompanied by thunder. After this there is frequently a dry spell of several weeks, and then the winter's rain falls in December, January and February. In some seasons an abundant rainfall in March gives peculiar satisfaction to the inhabitants by filling up the cisterns late in the season and by producing an abundant harvest. The average rainfall is about 26 inches, the maximum recorded in the city being 42,95 inches in the season 1877-78, and the minimum being 12,5 inches in 1869-70. An abundant rainfall is not only important for storage, for replenishment of the springs and for the crops, but as the city's sewage largely accumulates in the very primitive drains all through the dry season, it requires a considerable force of water to remove it. Snow falls heavily in some seasons, causing considerable destruction to the badly built roofs and to the trees; in the winter of 1910-11 a fall of 9 inches occurred.

3. The Natural Springs:

There is only one actual spring in the Jerusalem area, and even to this some authorities would deny the name of true spring on account of the comparatively shallow source of its origin; this is the intermittent spring known today as 'Ain Umm edition deraj (literally, "spring of the mother of the steps"), called by the native Christians 'Ain Sitti Miriam (the "spring of the Lady Mary"), and by Europeans commonly called "The Virgin's Fount." All the archaeological evidence points to this as the original source of attraction of earliest occupants of the site; in the Old Testament this spring is known as GIHON (which see). The water arises in the actual bottom, though apparent west side, of the Kidron valley some 300 yards due South of the south wall of the Charam. The approach to the spring is down two flights of steps, an upper of 16 leading to a small level platform, covered by a modern arch, and a lower, narrower flight of 14 steps, which ends at the mouth of a small cave. The water has its actual source in a long cleft (perhaps 16 ft. long) running East and West in the rocky bottom of the Kidron valley, now many feet below the present surface. The western or higher end of the cleft is at the very entrance of the cave, but most of the water gushes forth from the lower and wider part which lies underneath the steps. When the water is scanty, the women of Siloam creep down into the cavity under the steps and fill their water-skins there; at such times no water at all finds its way into the cave. At the far end of the cave is the opening of that system of ancient tunnel-aqueducts which is described in VI, below. This spring is "intermittent," the water rising rapidly and gushing forth with considerable force, several times in the 24 hours after the rainy season, and only once or twice in the dry. This "intermittent" condition of springs is not uncommon in Palestine, and is explained by the accumulation of the underground water in certain cavities or cracks in the rock, which together make up a reservoir which empties itself by siphon action. Where the accumulated water reaches the bend of the siphon, the overflow commences and continues to run until the reservoir is emptied. Such a phenomenon is naturally attributed to supernatural agency by the ignorant—in this case, among the modern fellahin, to a dragon—and natives, specially Jews, visit the source, even today, at times of its overflow, for healing. Whether this intermittent condition of the fountain is very ancient it is impossible to say, but, as Jerome (Comm. in Esa, 86) speaks of it, it was probably present in New Testament times, and if so we have a strong argument for finding here the

"Pool of Bethesda."

See BETHESDA.

In ancient times all the water flowed down the open, rocky valley, but at an early period a wall was constructed to bank up the water and convert the source into a pool. Without such an arrangement no water could find its way into the cave and the tunnels. The tunnels, described below (VI), were constructed for the purpose

(1) of reaching the water supply from within the city walls, and

(2) of preventing the enemies of the Jews from getting at the water (2Ch 32:4).

The water of this source, though used for all purposes by the people of Siloam, is brackish to the taste, and contains a considerable percentage of sewage; it is quite unfit for drinking. This condition is doubtless due to the wide distribution of sewage, both intentionally (for irrigation of the gardens) and unintentionally (through leaking sewers, etc.), over the soil overlying the rocks from which the water flows. In earlier times the water was certainly purer, and it is probable, too, that the fountain was more copious, as now hundreds of cisterns imprison the waters which once found their way through the soil to the deep sources of the spring.

The waters of the Virgin’s Fount find their way through the Siloam tunnel and out at ‘Ain Silwan (the "spring" of Siloam), into the Pool of Siloam, and from this source descend into the Kidron valley to water the numerous vegetable gardens belonging to the village of Siloam (see SILOAM).

The second source of water in Jerusalem is the deep well known as Bir Eyyub, "Job’s well," which is situated a little below the point where the Kidron valley and Hinnom meet. In all probability it derives its modern name from a legend in the Koran (Sura 38 5,40-41) which narrates that God commanded Job to stamp with his foot, whereupon a spring miraculously burst up. The well, which had been quite lost sight of, was rediscovered by the Crusaders in 1184 AD, and was by them cleaned out. It is 125 ft. deep. The supply of water in this well is practically inexhaustible, although the quality is no better than that of the "Virgin’s Fount"; after several days of heavy rain the water overflows underground and bursts out a few yards lower down the valley as a little stream. It continues to run for a few days after a heavy fall of rain is over, and this "flowing Kidron" is a great source of attraction to the native residents of Jerusalem, who pour forth from the city to enjoy the rare sight of running water. Somewhere in the neighborhood of Bir Eyyub must have lain ‘En-Rogel, but if that were once an actual spring, its source is now buried under the great mass of rubbish accumulated here (see EN-ROGEL).

Nearly 600 yards South of Bir Eyyub is a small gravelly basin where, when the Bir Eyyub overflows, a small spring called ‘Ain el Lozeh (the "spring of the almond") bursts forth. It is not a true spring, but is due to some of the water of Job’s well which finds its way along an ancient rock-cut aqueduct on the west side of the Wady en Nar, bursting up here.

The only other possible site of a spring in the Jerusalem area is the Chammam esh Shefa, "the bath of healing." This is an underground rock-basin in the Tyropeon valley, within the city walls, in which water collects by percolation through the debris of the city. Though once a reservoir with probably rock-cut channels conducting water to it, it is now a deep well with arches erected over it at various periods, as the rubbish of the city gradually accumulated through the centuries. There is no evidence whatever of there being any natural fountain, and the water is, in the dry season, practically pure sewage, though used in a neighboring Turkish bath.

G.A. Smith thinks that the JACKAL'S WELL (which see) mentioned by Nehemiah (2:13), which must have been situated in the Valley of Hinnom, may possibly have been a temporary spring arising there for a few years in consequence of an earthquake, but it is extremely likely that any well sunk then would tap water flowing a long the bed of the valley. There is no such "spring" or "well" there today.

III. The Natural Site.

Modern Jerusalem occupies a situation defined geographically as 31 degrees 46 feet 45 inches North latitude., by 35 degrees 13 feet 25 inches East longitude. It lies in the midst of a bare and rocky plateau, the environs being one of the most stony and least fruitful districts in the habitable parts of Palestine, with shallow, gray or reddish soil and many outcrops of bare limestone. Like all the hill slopes with a southeasterly aspect, it is so thoroughly exposed to the full blaze of the summer sun that in its natural condition the site would be more or less barren. Today, however, as a result of diligent cultivation and frequent watering, a considerable growth of trees and shrubs has been produced in the rapidly extending suburbs. The only fruit tree which reaches perfection around Jerusalem is the olive.

1. The Mountains Around:

The site of Jerusalem is shut in by a rough triangle of higher mountain ridges: to the West runs the main ridge, or water parting, of Judea, which here makes a sweep to the westward. From this ridge a spur runs Southeast and East, culminating due East of the city in the MOUNT OF OLIVES (which see), nearly 2,700 ft. above sea-level and about 300 ft. above the mean level of the ancient city. Another spur, known as Jebel Deir abu Tor, 2,550 ft. high, runs East from the plateau of el Buqei'a and lies Southwest of the city; it is the traditional "Hill of Evil Counsel." The city site is thus dominated on all sides by these higher ranges—"the mountains (that) are round about Jerus" (Ps 125:2)—so that while on the one hand the ancient city was hidden, at any considerable distance, from any direction except the Southeast, it is only through this open gap toward the desert and the mountains of Moab that any wide outlook is obtainable. This strange vision of wilderness and distant mountain wall—often of exquisite loveliness in the light of the setting sun—must all through the ages have been the most familiar and the most potent of scenic influences to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

2. The Valleys:

Within the enfolding hills the city's proper site is demarked by two main valleys. That on the West and Southwest commences in a hollow occupied by the Moslem cemetery around the pool Birket Mamilla. The valley runs due East toward the modern Jaffa Gate, and there bends South, being known in this upper part of its course as the Wady el Mes. In this southern course it is traversed by a great dam, along which the modern Bethlehem road runs, which converts a large area of the valley bed into a great pool, the Birket es Sultan. Below this the valley—under the name of Wady er Rabadi—bends Southeast, then East, and finally Southeast again, until near Bir Eyyub it joins the western valley to form the Wady en Nar, 670 ft. below its origin. This valley has been very generally identified as the Valley of Hinnom (see HINNOM, VALLEY OF.)

The eastern valley takes a wider sweep. Commencing high up in the plateau to the North of the city, near the great water-parting, it descends as a wide and open valley in a southeasterly direction until, where it is crossed by the Great North Road, being here known as Wady el Joz (the "Valley of the Walnuts"), it turns more directly East. It gradually curves to the South, and as it runs East of the city walls, it receives the name of Wady Sitti Miriam (the "Valley of the Lady Mary"). Below the Southeast corner of the temple-area, near the traditional "Tomb of Absalom," the valley rapidly deepens and takes a direction slightly to the West of South. It passes the "Virgin's Fount," and a quarter of a mile lower it is joined by el Wad from the North, and a little farther on by the Wady er Rababi from the West. South of Bir Eyyub, the valley formed by their union is continued under the name of Wady en Nar to the Dead Sea. This western valley is that commonly known as the Brook Kidron, or, more shortly, the "Brook" (hachal), or ravine (see KIDRON), but named from the 5th century onward by Christians the Valley of Jehoshaphat (see JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF). The rocky tongue of land enclosed between these deep ravines, an area, roughly speaking, a little over one mile long by half a mile wide, is further subdivided into a number of distinct hills by some shallower valleys. The most prominent of these—indeed the only one noticeable to the superficial observer today—is the great central valley known to modern times by the single name el Wad, "the valley." It commences in a slight depression of the ground a little North of the modern "Damascus Gate," and after entering the city at this gate it rapidly deepens—a fact largely disguised today by the great accumulation of rubbish in its course. It traverses the city with the Charam to its east, and the Christian and Moslem quarters on rapidly rising ground to its west. Its course is observed near the Babylonian es Silseleh, where it is crossed by an ancient causeway, but farther South the valley reappears, having the walls of the Charam (near the "wailing place" and "Robinson's arch") on the East, and steep cliffs crossed by houses of the Jewish quarter on the West. It leaves the city at the "Dung Gate," and passes with an open curve to the East, until it reaches the Pool of Siloam, below' which it merges in the Wady Sitti Miriam. This is the course of the main valley, but a branch of great importance in the ancient topography of the city starts some 50 yards to the West of the modern Jaffa Gate and runs down the Suwaikat Allun generally known to travelers as "David's Street," and thus easterly, along the Tarik bab es Silseleh, until it merges in the main valley. The main valley is usually considered to be the Tyropeon, or "Cheesemongers' Valley" of Josephus, but some writers have attempted to confine the name especially to this western arm of it.

Another interior valley, which is known rather by the rock contours, than by surface observations, being largely filled up today, cuts diagonally across the Northeast corner of the modern city. It has no modern name, though it is sometimes called "St. Anne's Valley." It arises in the plateau near "Herod's Gate,"

known as es Sahra, and entering the city about 100 yards to the East of that gate, runs South-Southeast., and leaves the city between the Northeast angle of the Charam and the Golden Gate, joining the Kidron valley farther Southeast. The Birket Israel runs across the width of this valley, which had far more influence in determining the ancient topography of the city than has been popularly recognized. There is an artificially made valley between the Charam and the buildings to its north, and there is thought by many to be a valley between the Southeast hill, commonly called "Ophel" and the temple-area. Such, then, are the valleys, great and small, by which the historic hills on which the city stood are defined. All of them, particularly in their southern parts, were considerably deeper in ancient times, and in places the accumulated debris is 80 ft. or more. All of them were originally torrent beds, dry except immediately after heavy rain. The only perennial outflow of water is the scanty and intermittent stream which overflows from the Pool of Siloam, and is used to irrigate the gardens in the Wady Sitti Miriam.

3. The Hills:

The East and West valleys isolate a roughly quadrilateral tongue of land running from Northwest-West to South-Southeast, and tilted so as to face Southeast. This tongue is further subdivided by el Wad into two long ridges, which merge into each other in the plateau to the North. The western ridge has its actual origin considerably North of the modern wall, being part of the high ground lying between the modern Jaffa road to the West, and the commencement of the Kidron valley to the East. Within the city walls it rises as high as 2,581 ft. near the northwestern corner. It is divided by the west branch of the Tyropeon valley into two parts: a northern part—the northwestern hill—on which is situated today the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the greater part of the "Christian quarter" of the city, and a southern hill—the southwestern—which is connected with the northwestern hill by but a narrow saddle—50 yards wide—near the Jaffa Gate. This hill sustains the citadel (the so-called "Tower of David"), the barracks and the Armenian quarter within the walls, and the Coenaculum and adjacent buildings outside the walls. This hill is from 2,500 to 2,350 ft. high along its summit, but drops rapidly on its southwestern, southern and southeastern sides. In its central part it falls much more gently toward the eastern hill across the now largely filled valley el Wad.

The eastern ridge may be reckoned as beginning at the rocky hill el-Edhemiyeh—popularly known as Gordon’s Calvary—but the wide trench made here by quarrying somewhat obscures this fact. The ridge may for convenience be regarded as presenting three parts, the northeastern, central or central-eastern, and southeastern summits. The northeastern hill within the modern wall supports the Moslem quarter, and rises in places to a height of over 2,500 ft.; it narrows to a mere neck near the "Ecce Homo" arch, where it is joined to the barracks, on the site of the ancient Antonia. Under the present surface it is here separated from the temple summit by a deep rocky trench.

The central, or central-eastern, summit is that appearing as es Sakhra, the sacred temple rock, which is 2,404 ft. high. This is the highest point from which the ground rapidly falls East, West, and South, but the natural contours of the adjacent ground are much obscured by the great substructures which have been made to sustain the temple platform.

The sloping, southeastern, hill, South of the temple area appears today, at any rate, to have a steady fall of from 2,350 ft. just South of the Charam southern wall to a little over 2,100 ft. near the Pool of Siloam. It is a narrow ridge running in a somewhat curved direction, with a summit near 200 ft. above the Kidron and 100 ft. above the bed of the Tyropeon. In length it is not more than 600 yards, in width, at its widest, only 150 yards, but its chief feature, its natural strength, is today greatly obscured on account of the rubbish which slopes down its sides and largely fills up its surrounding valleys. In earlier times, at least three of its sides were protected by deep valleys, and probably on quite two-thirds of its circumference its summit was surrounded by natural rocky scarps. According to Professor Guthe, this hill is divided from the higher ground to the North by a depression 12 ft. deep and 30-50 yards wide, but this has not been confirmed by other observers. The city covering so hilly a site as this must ever have consisted, as it does today, of houses terraced on steep slopes' with stairways for streets.

JERUSALEM, 2

IV. General Topography of Jerusalem.

From the foregoing description of the "natural site," it will be seen that we have to deal with 5 natural subdivisions or hills, two on the western and three on the eastern ridges.

1. Description of Josephus:

In discussing the topography it is useful to commence with the description of Josephus, wherein he gives to these 5 areas the names common in his day (BJ, V, iv, 1,2). He says: "The city was built upon two hills which are opposite to one another and have a valley to divide them asunder .... Now the Valley of the Cheesemongers, as it was called, and was that which distinguished the hill of the upper city from that of the lower, extended as far as Siloam" (ibid., V, iv, 1). Here we get the first prominent physical feature, the bisection of the city-site into two main hills. Farther on, however, in the same passage—one, it must be admitted, of some obscurity—Josephus distinguishes 5 distinct regions:

(1) The Upper City or Upper Market Place:

(The hill) "which sustains the upper city is much higher and in length more direct. Accordingly, it was called the citadel (phrourion) of King David .... but it is by us called the Upper Market Place." This is without dispute the southwestern hill.

(2) Akra and Lower City:

"The other hill, which was called Akra, and sustains the lower city, was double-curved" (amphikurtos). The description can apply only to the semicircular shape of the southeastern hill, as viewed from the "upper city." These names, "Akra" and "Lower City," are, with reservations, therefore, to be applied to the southeastern hill.

(3) The Temple Hill:

Josephus' description here is curious, on account of its indefiniteness, but there can be no question as to which hill he intends. He writes: "Over against this is a third hill, but naturally lower than the Akra and parted formerly from the other by a fiat valley. However, in those times when the Hasmoneans reigned, they did away with this valley, wishing to connect the city with the temple; and cutting down the summit of the Akra, they made it lower, so that the temple might be visible over it." Comparison with other passages shows that this "third hill" is the central-eastern—the "Temple Hill."

(4) Bezetha:

"It was Agrippa who encompassed the parts added to the old city with this wall (i.e. the third wall) which had been all naked before; for as the city grew more populous, it gradually crept beyond its old limits, and those parts of it that stood northward of the Temple, and joined that hill to the city, made it considerably larger, and occasioned that hill which is in number the fourth, and is called 'Bezetha,' to be inhabited also. It lies over against the tower Antonia, but is divided from it by a deep valley, which was dug on purpose. .... This new-built part of the city was called 'Bezetha' in our language, which, if interpreted in the Greek language, may be called the 'New City.' " This is clearly the northeastern hill.

(5) The Northern Quarter of the City:

From the account of the walls given by Josephus, it is evident that the northern part of his "first wall" ran along the northern edge of the southwestern hill; the second wall enclosed the inhabited part of the northwestern hill. Thus Josephus writes: "The second wall took its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath in the first wall, and enclosing, the northern quarter only reached to the Antonia." This area is not described as a separate hill, as the inhabited area, except on the South, was defined by no natural valleys, and besides covering the northwestern hill, must have extended into the Tyropeon valley.

2. Summary of the Names of the Five Hills:

Here then we have Josephus' names for these five districts:

(1) Southwestern Hill:

Southwestern Hill, "Upper City" and "Upper Market Place"; also the Summary Phrourion, or "fortress of David." From the 4th century AD, this hill has also been known as "Zion," and on it today is the so-called "Tower of David," built on the foundations of two of Herod's great towers.

(2) Northwestern Hill:

"The northern quarter of the city." This district does not appear to have had any other name in Old

Testament or New Testament, though some of the older authorities would place the "Akra" here (see infra). Today it is the "Christian quarter" of Jerusalem, which centers round the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

(3) Northeastern Hill:

"Bezetha" or "New City," even now a somewhat sparsely inhabited area, has no name in Biblical literature.

(4) Central-eastern Hill:

The "third hill" of Josephus, clearly the site of the Temple which, as Josephus says (BJ, V, v), "was built upon a strong hill." In earlier times it was the "threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite." On the question whether it has any claims to be the Moriah of Ge 22:2, as it is called in 2Ch 3:1, see MORIAH. The temple hill is also in many of the Hebrew writings called Zion, on which point see ZION.

(5) Southeastern Hill:

This Josephus calls "Akra" and "Lower City," but while on the one hand these names require some elucidation, there are other names which have at one period or another come to be applied to this hill, namely, "City of David," "Zion" and "Ophel." These names for this hill we shall now deal with in order.

3. The Akra:

In spite of the very definite description of Josephus, there has been considerable difference of opinion regarding the situation of the "Akra." Various parts of the northwestern, the northeastern, the southeastern hills, and even the central-eastern itself, have been suggested by earlier authorities, but instead of considering the various arguments, now largely out of date, for other proposed sites, it will be better to deal with the positive arguments for the southeastern hill. Josephus states that in his day the term "Akra" was applied to the southeastern hill, but in references to the earlier history it is clear that the Akra was not a whole hill, but a definite fortress (akra =" fortress").

(1) It was situated on the site, or on part of the site, which was considered in the days of the Maccabees to have been the "City of David." Antiochus Epiphanes (168 BC), after destroying Jerusalem, "fortitled the city of David with a great and strong wall, with strong towers and it became unto them an Akra" (1 Macc 1:33-36). The formidable fortress—known henceforth as "the Akra"—became a constant menace to the Jews, until at length, in 142 BC, it was captured by Simon, who not only razed the whole fortress, but, according to Josephus (Ant., XIII, vi, 7; B J, V, iv, 1), actually cut down the hill on which it stood. He says that "they all, labouring zealously, demolished the hill, and ceasing not from the work night and day for three whole years, brought it to a level and even slope, so that the Temple became the highest of all after the Akra and the hill upon which it was built had been removed" (Ant., XIII, vi, 7). The fact that at the time of Josephus this hill was evidently lower than the temple hill is in itself sufficient argument

against any theory which would place the Akra on the northwestern or southwestern hills.

(2) The Akra was close to the temple (1 Macc 13:52), and from its walls the garrison could actually overlook it (1 Macc 14:36). Before the hill was cut down it obscured the temple site (same place) .

(3) It is identified by Josephus as forming part, at least, of the lower city, which (see below) bordered upon the temple (compare BJ, I, i, 4; V, iv, 1; vi, 1).

(4) The Septuagint identifies the Akra with Millo (2Sa 5:9; 1Ki 9:15-24; 2Ch 32:5).

Allowing that the original Akra of the Syrians was on the southeastern hill, it is still a matter of some difficulty to determine whereabouts it stood, especially as, if the statements of Josephus are correct, the natural configuration of the ground has been greatly altered. The most prominent point upon the southeastern hill, in the neighborhood of Gihon, appears to have been occupied by the Jebusite fortress of ZION (which see), but the site of the Akra can hardly be identical with this, for this became the "City of David," and here were the venerated tombs of David and the Judean kings, which must have been destroyed if this hill was, as Josephus states, cut down. On this and other grounds we must look for a site farther north. Sir Charles Watson (PEFS, 1906, 1907) has produced strong topographical and literary arguments for placing it where the al Aqsa mosque is today; other writers are more inclined to put it farther south, somewhere in the neighborhood of the massive tower discovered by Warren on the "Ophel" wall (see MILLO). If the account of Josephus, written two centuries after the events, is to be taken as literal, then Watson’s view is the more probable.

4. The Lower City:

Josephus, as we have seen, identified the Akra of his day with the Lower City. This latter is not a name occurring in the Bible because, as will be shown, the Old Testament name for this part was "City of David." That by Lower City Josephus means the southeastern hill is shown by many facts. It is actually the lowest part of the city, as compared with the "Upper City," Temple Hill and the Bezetha; it is, as Josephus describes, separated from the Upper City by a deep valley—the Tyropeon; this southeastern hill is "double-curved," as Josephus describes, and lastly several passages in his writings show that the Lower City was associated with the Temple on the one end and the Pool of Siloam at the other (compare Ant, XIV, xvi, 2; BJ, II, xvii, 5; IV, ix, 12; VI, vi, 3; vii, 2).

In the wider sense the "Lower City" must have included, not only the section of the city covering the southeastern hill up to the temple precincts, where were the palaces (BJ, V, vi, 1; VI, vi, 3), and the homes of the well-to-do, but also that in the valley of the Tyropeon from Siloam up to the "Council House," which was near the northern "first wall" (compare BJ, V, iv, 2), a part doubtless inhabited by the poorest.

5. City of David and Zion:

It is clear (2Sa 5:7; 1Ch 11:5) that the citadel "Zion" of the Jebusites became the "City of David," or as G. A. Smith calls it, "David's Burg," after its capture by the Hebrews. The arguments for placing "Zion" on the southeastern hill are given elsewhere (see ZION), but a few acts relevant especially to the "City of David" may be mentioned here: the capture of the Jebusite city by means of the gutter (2Sa 5:8), which is most reasonably explained as "Warren's Shaft" (see VII); the references to David's halt on his flight (2Sa 15:23), and his sending Solomon to Gihon to be crowned (1Ki 1:33), and the common expression "up," used in describing the transference of the Ark from the City of David to the Temple Hill (1Ki 8:1; 2Ch 5:2; compare 1Ki 9:24), are all consistent with this view. More convincing are the references to Hezekiah's aqueduct which brought the waters of Gihon "down on the west side of the city of David" (2Ch 32:30); the mention of the City of David as adjacent to the Pool of Shelah (or Shiloah; compare Isa 8:6), and the "king's garden" in Ne 3:15, and the position of the Fountain Gate in this passage and Ne 12:37; and the statement that Manasseh built "an outer wall to the City of David, on the west side of Gihon" in the nachal, i.e. the Kidron valley (2Ch 33:14).

The name appears to have had a wider significance as the city grew. Originally "City of David" was only the name of the Jebusite fort, but later it became equivalent to the whole southeastern hill. In the same way, Akra was originally the name of the Syrian fort, but the name became extended to the whole southeastern hill. Josephus looks upon "City of David" and "Akra" as synonymous, and applies to both the name "Lower City." For the names Ophel and Ophlas see OPHEL.

V. Excavations and Antiquities.

During the last hundred years explorations and excavations of a succession of engineers and archaeologists have furnished an enormous mass of observations for the understanding of the condition of ancient Jerusalem. Some of the more important are as follows: In 1833 Messrs. Bonorni, Catherwood and Arundale made a first thorough survey of the Charam (temple-area), a work which was the foundation of all subsequent maps for over a quarter of a century.

1. Robinson:

In 1838, and again in 1852, the famous American traveler and divine, E. Robinson, D.D., visited the land as the representative of an American society, and made a series of brilliant topographical investigations of profound importance to all students of the Holy Land, even today.

In 1849 Jerusalem was surveyed by Lieuts. Aldrich and Symonds of the Royal Engineers, and the data acquired were used for a map constructed by Van de Vilde and published by T. Tobler.

In 1857 an American, J.T. Barclay, published another map of Jerusalem and its environs "from actual and minute survey made on the spot."

In 1860-1863 De Vogue in the course of some elaborate researches in Syria explored the site of the sanctuary.

2. Wilson and the Palestine Exploration Fund (1865):

In 1864-65 a committee was formed in London to consider the sanitary condition of Jerusalem, especially with a view to furnishing the city with a satisfactory water-supply, and Lady Burdett-Coutts gave 500 pounds toward a proper survey of Jerusalem and its environs as a preliminary step. Captain (later Lieutenant-General Sir Charles) Wilson, R.E., was lent by the Ordnance Survey Department of Great Britain for the purpose. The results of this survey, and of certain tentative excavations and observations made at the same time, were so encouraging that in 1865 "The Palestine Exploration Fund" was constituted, "for the purpose of investigating the archaeology, geography, geology, and natural history of the Holy Land."

3. Warren and Conder:

During 1867-70 Captain (later Lieutenant-General Sir Charles) Warren, R.E., carried out a series of most exciting and original excavations all over the site of Jerusalem, especially around the Charam. During 1872-75 Lieutenant (later Lieutenant-Colonel) Conder, R.E., in the course of the great survey of Western Palestine, made further contributions to our knowledge of the Holy City.

4. Maudslay:

In 1875 Mr. Henry Maudslay, taking advantage of the occasion of the rebuilding of "Bishop Gobat's Boys' School," made a careful examination of the remarkable rock cuttings which are now more or less incorporated into the school buildings, and made considerable excavations, the results being described in PEFS (April, 1875).

In 1881 Professor Guthe made a series of important excavations on the southeastern hill, commonly called "Ophel," and also near the Pool of Siloam; his reports were published in ZDPV, 1882.

5. Schick:

The same year (1881), the famous Siloam inscription was discovered and was first reported by Herr Baurath Schick, a resident in Jerusalem who from 1866 until his death in 1901 made a long series of observations of the highest importance on the topography of Jerusalem. He had unique opportunities for scientifically examining the buildings in the Charam, and the results of his study of the details of that locality are incorporated in his wonderful Temple model. He also made a detailed report of the ancient aqueducts of the city. Most important of all were the records he so patiently and faithfully kept of the rock levels in all parts of the city's site whenever the digging of foundations for buildings or other excavations gave access to the rock. His contributions to the PEF and ZDPV run into hundreds of articles.

6. Clermont-Ganneau:

M. Clermont-Ganneau, who was resident in Jerusalem in the French consular service, made for many years, from 1880 onward, a large number of acute observations on the archaeology of Jerusalem and its environs, many of which were published by the PEF. Another name honored in connection with the careful study of the topography of Jerusalem over somewhat the same period is that of Selah Merrill, D. D., for many years U.S. consul in Jerusalem.

7. Bliss and Dickie:

In 1894-97 the Palestine Exploration Fund conducted an elaborate series of excavations with a view to determining in particular the course of the ancient southern walls under the direction of Mr. T.J. Bliss (son of Daniel Bliss, D.D., then president of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut), assisted by Mr. A.C. Dickie as architect. After picking up the buried foundations of walls at the southeastern corner where "Maudslay's scarp" was exposed in the Protestant cemetery, Bliss and Dickie followed them all the way to the Pool of Siloam, across the Tyropeon and on to "Ophel"—and also in other directions. Discoveries of great interest were also made in the neighborhood of the Pool of Siloam (see SILOAM).

Following upon these excavations a number of private investigations have been made by the Augustinians in a large estate they have acquired on the East side of the traditional hill of Zion.

In 1909-1911 a party of Englishmen, under Captain the Honorable M. Parker, made a number of explorations with very elaborate tunnels upon the hill of Ophel, immediately above the Virgin's Fount. In the course of their work, they cleaned out the whole Siloam aqueduct, finding some new passages; they reconstructed the Siloam Pool, and they completed Warren's previous investigation in the neighborhood of what has been known as "Warren's Shaft."

8. Jerusalem Archaeological Societies:

There are several societies constantly engaged in observing new facts connected with the topography of ancient Jerusalem, notably the School of Archaeology connected with the University of Stephens, under the Dominicans; the American School of Archaeology; the German School of Biblical Archaeology under Professor Dalman, and the Palestine Exploration Fund.

VI. The City's Walls and Gates.

1. The Existing Walls:

Although the existing walls of Jerusalem go back in their present form to but the days of Suleiman the Magnificent, circa 1542 AD, their study is an essential preliminary to the understanding of the ancient walls. The total circuit of the modern walls is 4,326 yards, or nearly 2 1/8 miles, their average height is 35 ft., and they have altogether 35 towers and 8 gates—one of which is walled up. They make a rough square, with the four sides facing the cardinal points of the compass. The masonry is of various kinds,

and on every side there are evidences that the present walls are a patchwork of many periods. The northern wall, from near the northwestern angle to some distance East of the "Damascus Gate," lies parallel with, though somewhat inside of, an ancient fosse, and it and the gate itself evidently follow ancient lines. The eastern and western walls, following as they do a general direction along the edges of deep valleys, must be more or less along the course of earlier walls. The eastern wall, from a little south of Stephen's Gate to the southeastern angle, contains many ancient courses, and the general line is at least as old as the time of Herod the Great; the stretch of western wall from the so-called "Tower of David" to the southwestern corner is certainly along an ancient line and has persisted through very many centuries. This line of wall was allowed to remain undestroyed when Titus leveled the remainder. At the northwestern angle are some remains known as Kala'at Jalud ("Goliath's castle"), which, though largely medieval, contain a rocky core and some masonry of Herodian times, which are commonly accepted as the relics of the lofty tower Psephinus.

2. Wilson's Theory:

The course of the southern wall has long been a difficulty; it is certainly not the line of wall before Titus; it has none of the natural advantages of the western and eastern walls, and there are no traces of any great rock fosse, such as is to be found on the north. The eastern end is largely built upon the lower courses of Herod's southern wall for his enlarged temple-platform, and in it are still to be found walled up the triple, single and double gates which lead up to the Temple. The irregular line followed by the remainder of this wall has not until recent times received any explanation. Sir Charles Wilson (Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre) suggests the probable explanation that the line of wall from the southwestern to the "Zion Gate" was determined by the legionary camp which stood on the part of the city now covered by the barracks and the Armenian quarter. Allowing that the remains of the first wall on the North and West were utilized for this fortified camp (from 70-132 AD), and supposing the camp to have occupied the area of 50 acres, as was the case with various European Roman camps, whose remains are known, the southern camp wall would have run along the line of the existing southern walls. This line of fortification having been thus selected appears to have been followed through the greater part of the succeeding centuries down to modern times. The line connecting the two extremities of the southern wall, thus determined by the temple-platform and legionary camp, respectively, was probably that first followed by the southern wall of Hadrian's city AElia.

3. The Existing Gate:

Of the 8 existing city gates, on the west side there is but one, Babylonian el Khulil (the "Gate of Hebron"), commonly known to travelers as the Jaffa Gate. It is probably the site of several earlier gates. On the North there are 3 gates, Babylonian Abd'ul Kamid (named after the sultan who made it) or the "New Gate"; Babylonian el 'amud ("Gate of the Columns"), now commonly called the "Damascus Gate," but more in ancient times known as "St. Stephen's Gate," and clearly, from the existing remains, the site of an earlier gateway; and, still farther east, the Babylonian es Sahirah ("Gate of the Plain"), or "Herod's Gate." On the east side the only open gate is the Babylonian el 'Asbat ("Gate of the Tribes"), commonly called by native Christians, Babylonian Sitti Miriam ("Gate of the Lady Mary"), but in European guide-books called "St. Stephen's Gate." A little farther South, near the northeastern corner of

the Charam, is the great walled-up Byzantine Gate, known as Babylonian edition Dahariyeh ("Gate of the Conqueror"), but to Europeans as the "Golden Gate." This structure has been variously ascribed to Justinian and Heraclius, but there are massive blocks which belong to a more ancient structure, and early Christian tradition places the "Beautiful Gate" of the Temple here. In the southern wall are two city gates; one, insignificant and mean, occupies the center of el Wad and is known as Babylonian el Mugharibeh ("Gate of the Moors"), and to Europeans as the "Dung Gate"; the other, which is on the crown of the western hill, traditional Zion, is the important Babylonian Nebi Daoud ("Gate of the Prophet David"), or the "Zion Gate."

All these gates assumed their present form at the time of the reconstruction of the walls by Suleiman the Magnificent, but the more important ones occupy the sites of earlier gates. Their names have varied very much even since the times of the Crusaders. The multiplicity of names for these various gates—they all have two or three today—and their frequent changes are worth noticing in connection with the fact that in the Old Testament history some of the gates appear to have had two or more names.

As has been mentioned, the course of the present southern wall is the result of Roman reconstruction of the city since the time of Titus. To Warren, Guthe, Maudslay and Bliss we owe a great deal of certain knowledge of its more ancient course. These explorers have shown that in all the pre-Roman period (and at least one period since) the continuation southward of the western and eastern ridges, as well as the wide valley between—an area now but sparsely inhabited—was the site of at once the most crowded life, and the most stirring scenes in the Hebrew history of the city. The sanctity of the Holy Sepulchre has caused the city life to center itself more and more around that sanctuary, thereby greatly confusing the ancient topography for many centuries.

4. Buried Remains of Earlier Walls:

(1) Warren’s excavations revealed: (a) a massive masonry wall 46 ft. East of the Golden Gate, which curved toward the West at its northern end, following the ancient rock contours at this spot. It is probable that this was the eastern wall of the city in pre-Herodian times. Unfortunately the existence of a large Moslem cemetery outside the eastern wall of the Charam precludes the possibility of any more excavations in this neighborhood. (b) More important remains in the southeastern hill, commonly known as "Ophel." Here commencing at the southeastern angle of the Charam, Warren uncovered a wall 14 1/2 ft. thick running South for 90 ft. and then Southwest along the edge of the hill for 700 ft. This wall, which shows at least two periods of construction, abuts on the sanctuary wall with a straight joint. Along its course were found 4 small towers with a projection of 6 ft. and a face from 22 to 28 ft. broad, and a great corner tower projecting 41 1/2 ft. from the wall and with a face 80 ft. broad. The face of this great tower consists of stones one to two ft. high and 2 or 3 ft. long; it is founded upon rock and stands to the height of 66 ft. Warren considers that this may be ha-mighdal ha-yotse’ or "tower that standeth out" of Ne 3:25.

(2) In 1881 Professor Guthe picked up fragmentary traces of this city-wall farther south, and in the excavations of Captain Parker (1910-1911) further fragments of massive walls and a very ancient gate

have been found.

(3) Maudslay's excavations were on the southwestern hill, on the site occupied by "Bishop Gobat's School" for boys, and in the adjoining Anglo-German cemetery. The school is built over a great mass of scarped rock 45 ft. square, which rises to a height of 20 ft. from a platform which surrounds it and with which it is connected by a rock-cut stairway; upon this massive foundation must have stood a great tower at what was in ancient times the southwestern corner of the city. From this point a scarp facing westward was traced for 100 ft. northward toward the modern southwestern angle of the walls, while a rock scarp, in places 40 ft. high on the outer or southern side and at least 14 ft. on the inner face, was followed for 250 ft. eastward until it reached another great rock projection with a face of 43 ft. Although no stones were found in situ, it is evident that such great rock cuttings must have supported a wall and tower of extraordinary strength, and hundreds of massive squared stones belonging to this wall are now incorporated in neighboring buildings.

(4) Bliss and Dickie's work commenced at the southeastern extremity of Maudslay's scarp, where was the above-mentioned massive projection for a tower, and here were found several courses of masonry still in situ. This tower appears to have been the point of divergence of two distinct lines of wall, one of which ran in a direction Northeast, skirting the edge of the southeastern hill, and probably joined the line of the modern walls at the ruined masonry tower known as Burj el Kebrit, and another running Southeast down toward the Pool of Siloam, along the edge of the Wady er Rababi (Hinnom). The former of these walls cannot be very ancient, because of the occurrence of late Byzantine moldings in its foundations. The coenaculum was included in the city somewhere about 435-450 AD (see IX, 55), and also in the 14th century. Bliss considers it probable that this is the wall built in 1239 By Frederick II, and it is certainly that depicted in the map of Marino Sanuto (1321 AD). Although these masonry remains are thus comparatively late, there were some reasons for thinking that at a much earlier date a wall took a similar direction along the edge of the southwestern hill; and it is an attractive theory, though unsupported by any very definite archaeological evidence, that the wall of Solomon took also this general line. The wall running Southeast from the tower, along the edge of the gorge of Hinnom, is historically of much greater importance. Bliss's investigations showed that here were remains belonging to several periods, covering altogether considerably over a millennium. The upper line of wall was of fine masonry, with stones 1 ft. by 3 ft. in size, beautifully jointed and finely dressed; in some places this wall was founded upon the remains of the lower wall, in others a layer of debris intervened. It is impossible that this upper wall can be pre-Roman, and Bliss ascribes it to the Empress Eudoxia (see IX, 55). The lower wall rested upon the rock and showed at least 3 periods of construction. In the earliest the stones had broad margins and were carefully jointed, without mortar. This may have been the work of Solomon or one of the early kings of Judah. The later remains are evidently of the nature of repairs, and include the work of the later Judean kings, and of Nehemiah and of all the wall-repairers, down to the destruction in 70 AD. At somewhat irregular intervals along the wall were towers of very similar projection and breadth to those found on Warren's wall on the southeastern hill. The wall foundations were traced—except for an interval where they passed under a Jewish cemetery—all the way to the mouth of the Tyropeon valley. The upper wall disappeared (the stones having been all removed for later buildings) before the Jewish cemetery was reached.

5. The Great Dam of the Tyropeon:

During most periods, if not indeed in all, the wall was carried across the mouth of the Tyropeon valley upon a great dam of which the massive foundations still exist under the ground, some 50 ft. to the East of the slighter dam which today supports the Birket el Kamra (see SILOAM). This ancient dam evidently once supported a pool in the mouth of the Tyropeon, and it showed evidences of having undergone buttressing and other changes and repairs. Although it is clear that during the greater part of Jewish history, before and after the captivity, the southern wall of Jerusalem crossed upon this dam, there were remains of walls found which tended to show that at one period, at any rate, the wall circled round the two Siloam pools, leaving them outside the fortifications.

6. Ruins of Ancient Gates:

In the stretch of wall from "Maudslay's Scarp" to the Tyropeon valley remains of 2 city gates were found, and doubtful indications of 2 others. The ruins of the first of these gates are now included in the new extension of the Anglo-German cemetery. The gate had door sills, with sockets, of 4 periods superimposed upon each other; the width of the entrance was 8 ft. 10 inches during the earliest, and 8 ft. at the latest period. The character of the masonry tended to show that the gate belonged to the upper wall, which is apparently entirely of the Christian era. If this is so, this cannot be the "Gate of the Gai" of Ne 3:13, although the earlier gate may have occupied this site. Bliss suggests as a probable position for this gate an interval between the two contiguous towers IV and V, a little farther to the East.

Another gate was a small one, 4 ft. 10 inches wide, marked only by the cuttings in the rock for the door sockets. It lay a little to the West of the city gate next to be described, and both from its position and its insignificance, it does not appear to have been an entrance to the city; it may, as Bliss suggests, have given access to a tower, now destroyed.

The second great city gateway was found some 200 ft. South of the Birket el Kamra, close to the southeastern angle of the ancient wall. The existing remains are bonded into walls of the earlier period, but the three superimposed door sills, with their sockets—to be seen uncovered today in situ—mark three distinct periods of long duration. The gate gave access to the great main street running down the Tyropeon, underneath which ran a great rock-cut drain, which probably traversed the whole central valley of the city. During the last two periods of the gate's use, a tower was erected—at the exact southeastern angle—to protect the entrance. The earliest remains here probably belong to the Jewish kings, and it is very probable that we have here the gate called by Ne (3:13) the "Dung Gate." Bliss considered that it might be the "Fountain Gate" (Ne 3:15), which, however, was probably more to the East, although Bliss could find no remains of it surviving. The repairs and alterations here have been so extensive that its disappearance is in no way surprising. The Fountain Gate is almost certainly identical with the "Gate between the Two Walls," through which Zedekiah and his men of war fled (2Ki 25:4; Jer 39:4; 52:7).

7. Josephus' Description of the Walls:

The most definite account of the old walls is that of Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, iv, 1, 2), and though it referred primarily to the existing walls of his day, it is a convenient one for commencing the historical survey. He describes three walls. The first wall "began on the North, at the tower called Hippicus, and extended as far as the Xistus, and then Joining at the Council House, ended at the western cloister of the temple." On the course of this section of the wall there is no dispute. The tower Hippicus was close to the present Jaffa Gate, and the wall ran from here almost due West to the temple-area along the southern edge of the western arm of the Tyropeon (see III, 2, above). It is probable that the Karet edition Dawayeh, a street running nearly parallel with the neighboring "David Street," but high up above it, lies above the foundations of this wall.

8. First Wall:

It must have crossed the main Tyropeon near the Tarik bab es Silsilel, and joined the western cloisters close to where the Mechkemeh, the present "Council House," is situated.

Josephus traces the southern course of the first wall thus: "It began at the same place (i.e. Hippicus), and extended through a place called Bethso to the gate of the Essenes; and after that it went southward, having its bending above the fountain Siloam, when it also bends again toward the East at Solomon’s Pool, and reaches as far as a certain place which they called ‘Ophlas,’ where it was joined to the eastern cloister of the temple." Although the main course of this wall has now been followed with pick and shovel, several points are still uncertain. Bethso is not known, but must have been close to the southwestern angle, which, as we have seen, was situated where "Bishop Gobat’s School" is today. It is very probably identical with the "Tower of the Furnaces" of Ne 3:11, while the "Gate of the Essenes" must have been near, if not identical with, the "Gate of the Gai" of 3:13. The description of Josephus certainly seems to imply that the mouth of the Siloam aqueduct ("fountain of Siloam") and the pools were both outside the fortification. We have seen from these indications in the underground remains that this was the case at one period. Solomon’s Pool is very probably represented by the modern Birket el Khamra. It is clear that the wall from here to the southeastern angle of the temple-platform followed the edge of the southeastern hill, and coincided farther north with the old wall excavated by Warren. As will be shown below, this first wall was the main fortification of the city from the time of the kings of Judah onward. In the time of Josephus, this first wall had 60 towers.

9. Second Wall:

The Second Wall of Josephus "took its beginning from that gate which they called ‘Gennath,’ which belonged to the first wall: it only encompassed the northern quarter of the city and reached as far as the tower Antonia" (same place). In no part of Jerusalem topography has there been more disagreement than upon this wall, both as regards its curve and as regards its date of origin. Unfortunately, we have no idea at all where the "Gate Gennath" was. The Tower Antonia we know. The line must have passed in a curved or zigzag direction from some unknown point on the first wall, i.e. between the Jaffa Gate and the Charam to the Antonia. A considerable number of authorities in the past and a few careful students today would identify the general course of this wall with that of the modern northern wall. The greatest

objections to this view are that no really satisfactory alternative course has been laid down for the third wall (see below), and that it must have run far North of the Antonia, a course which does not seem to agree with the description of Josephus, which states that the wall "went up" to the Antonia. On the other hand, no certain remains of any city wall within the present north wall have ever been found; fragments have been reported by various observers (e.g. the piece referred to as forming the eastern wall of the so-called "Pool of Hezekiah"; see VII, ii, below), but in an area so frequently desolated and rebuilt upon—where the demand for squared stones must always have been great—it is probable that the traces, if surviving at all, are very scanty. This is the case with the south wall excavated by Bliss (see VI), and that neighborhood has for many centuries been unbuilt upon. It is quite probable that the area included within the second wall may have been quite small, merely the buildings which clustered along the sides of the Tyropeon. Its 40 towers may have been small and built close together, because the position was, from the military aspect, weak. It must be remembered that it was the unsatisfactory state of the second wall which necessitated a third wall. There is no absolute reason why it may not have excluded the greater part of the northwestern hill—and with it the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre—but there is no proof that it did. The date of the second wall is unknown (see below).

10. Third Wall:

This third wall, which was commenced after the time of Christ by Herod Agrippa I, is described in more detail by Josephus. It was begun upon an elaborate plan, but was not finished in its original design because Agrippa feared Claudius Caesar, "lest he should suspect that so strong a wall was built in order to make some innovation in public affairs" (Jewish Wars, V, iv, 2). It, however, at the time of the siege, was of a breadth of over 18 ft., and a height of 40 ft., and had 90 massive towers. Josephus describes it as beginning at the tower Hippicus (near the Jaffa Gate), "where it reached as far as the north quarter of the city, and the tower Psephinus." This mighty tower, 135 ft. high, was at the northwestern corner and overlooked the whole city. From it, according to Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, vi, 3), there was a view of Arabia (Moab) at sunrising, and also of "the utmost limits of the Hebrew possessions at the Sea westward." From this corner the wall turned eastward until it came over against the monuments of Helene of Adiabene, a statement, however, which must be read in connection with another passage (Ant., XX, iv, 3), where it says that this tomb "was distant no more than 3 furlongs from the city of Jerusalem." The wall then "extended to a very great length" and passed by the sepulchral caverns of the kings—which may well be the so-called "Solomon’s Quarries," and it then bent at the "Tower of the Corner," at a monument which is called the Monument of the Fuller (not identified), and joined to the old wall at the Kidron valley.

The commonly accepted theory is that a great part of this line of wall is that pursued by the modern north wall, and Kal‘at el Jalud, or rather the foundation of it, that marks the site of Psephinus. The Damascus Gate is certainly on the line of some earlier gate. The "Tower of the Corner" was probably about where the modern Herod’s Gate is, or a little more to the East, and the course of the wall was from here very probably along the southern edge of the "St. Anne’s Valley," joining on to the Northeast corner of the Charam a little South of the present Stephen’s Gate. This course of the wall fits in well with the description of Josephus. If the so-called "Tombs of the Kings" are really those of Queen Helena of Adiabene and her family, then the distance given as 3 furlongs is not as far out as the distance to the

modern wall; the distance is actually 3 1/2 furlongs.

Others, following the learned Dr. Robinson, find it impossible to believe that the total circuit of the walls was so small, and would carry the third wall considerably farther north, making the general line of the modern north wall coincide with the second wall of Josephus. The supporters of this view point to the description of the extensive view from Psephinus, and contend that this presupposed a site on still higher ground, e.g. where the present Russian buildings now are. They also claim that the statement that the wall came "over against" the monument of Queen Helena certainly should mean very much nearer that monument than the present walls. Dr. Robinson and others who have followed him have pointed to various fragments which they claim to have been pieces of the missing wall. The present writer, after very many years' residence in Jerusalem, watching the buildings which in the last 25 years have sprung up over the area across which this line of wall is claimed to have run, has never seen a trace of wall foundations or of fosse which was in the very least convincing; while on the other hand this area now being rapidly covered by the modern suburb of Jerusalem presents almost everywhere below the surface virgin rock. There is no evidence of any more buildings than occasional scattered Roman villas, with mosaic floors. The present writer has rather unwillingly come to the opinion that the city walls were never farther north than the line they follow today. With respect to the objection raised that there could not possibly have been room enough between the two walls for the "Camp of the Assyrians," where Titus pitched his camp (Jewish Wars, V, vii, 3), any probable line for the second wall would leave a mean of 1,000 ft. between the two walls, and in several directions considerably more. The probable position of the "Camp of the Assyrians" would, according to this view, be in the high ground (the northwestern hill) now occupied by the Christian quarter of the modern city. The question of what the population of Jerusalem was at this period is discussed in IX, 49, below. For the other great buildings of the city at this period, see also IX, 43-44, below.

11. Date of Second Wall:

Taking then the walls of Jerusalem as described by Josephus, we may work backward and see how the walls ran in earlier periods. The third wall does not concern us any more, as it was built after the Crucifixion. With respect to the second wall, there is a great deal of difference of opinion regarding its origin. Some consider, like Sir Charles Watson, that it does not go back earlier than the Hasmoneans; whereas others (e.g. G.A. Smith), because of the expression in 2Ch 32:5 that Hezekiah, after repairing the wall, raised "another wall without," think that this wall goes back as far as this monarch. The evidence is inconclusive, but the most probable view seems to be that the "first wall," as described by Josephus, was the only circuit of wall from the kings of Judah down to the 2nd century BC, and perhaps later.

12. Nehemiah's Account of the Walls:

The most complete Scriptural description we have of the walls and gates of Jerusalem is that given by Nehemiah. His account is valuable, not only as a record of what he did, but of what had been the state of the walls before the exile. It is perfectly clear that considerable traces of the old walls and gates

remained, and that his one endeavor was to restore what had been before—even though it produced a city enclosure much larger than necessary at his time. The relevant passages are Ne 2:13-15, the account of his night ride; 3:1-32, the description of the rebuilding; and 12:31-39, the routes of the two processions at the dedication.

13. Valley Gate:

In the first account we learn that Nehemiah went out by night by the VALLEY GATE (which see), or Gate of the Gai, a gate (that is, opening) into the Gai Hinnom, and probably at or near the gate discovered by Bliss in what is now part of the Anglo-German cemetery; he passed from it to the Dung Gate, and from here viewed the walls of the city.

14. Dung Gate:

This, with considerable assurance, may be located at the ruined foundations of a gate discovered by Bliss at the southeastern corner of the city. The line of wall clearly followed the south edge of the southwestern hill from the Anglo-German cemetery to this point. He then proceeded to the Fountain Gate, the site of which has not been recovered, but, as there must have been water running out here (as today) from the mouth of the Siloam tunnel, is very appropriately named here.

15. Fountain Gate:

Near by was the KING’S POOL (which see), probably the pool—now deeply buried—which is today represented by the Birket el Kamra. Here Nehemiah apparently thought of turning into the city, "but there was no place for the beast that was under me to pass" (2:14), so he went up by the Nachal (Kidron), viewed the walls from there, and then retraced his steps to the Valley Gate. There is another possibility, and that is that the King’s Pool was the pool (which certainly existed) at Gihon, in which case the Fountain Gate may also have been in that neighborhood.

All the archaeological evidence is in favor of the wall having crossed the mouth of the Tyropeon by the great dam at this time, and the propinquity of this structure to the Fountain Gate is seen in Ne 3:15, where we read that Shallum built the Fountain Gate "and covered it, and set up the doors thereof .... and the bars thereof, and the wall of the pool of Shelah (see SILOAM) by the KING’S GARDEN (which see), even unto the stairs that go down from the city of David." All these localities were close together at the mouth of el Wad.

Passing from here we can follow the circuit of the city from the accounts of the rebuilding of the walls in Ne 3:15 f. The wall from here was carried "over against the sepulchres of David," which we know to have stood in the original "City of David" above Gihon, past "the pool that was made," and "the house of the Gibborim" (mighty men)—both unknown sites. It is clear that the wall is being carried along the edge of the southeastern hill toward the temple. We read of two angles in the wall—both needed by the geographical conditions—the high priest’s house, of "the tower that standeth out" (supposed to have

been unearthed by Warren), and the wall of the OPHEL (which see).

16. Water Gate:

There is also mention of a Water Gate in this position, which is just where one would expect a road to lead from the temple-area down to Gihon. From the great number of companies engaged in building, it may be inferred that all along this stretch of wall from the Tyropeon to the temple, the destruction of the walls had been specially great.

17. Horse Gate:

Proceeding North, we come to the Horse Gate. This was close to the entry to the king's house (2Ki 11:16; 2Ch 23:15; Jer 31:40). The expression used, "above" the Horse Gate, may imply that the gate itself may have been uninjured; it may have been a kind of rock-cut passage or tunnel. It cannot have been far from the present southeastern angle of the city. Thence "repaired the priests, every one over against his own house"—the houses of these people being to the East of the temple. Then comes the Gate of Hammiphkad (see HAMMIPHKAD, GATE OF), the ascent (or "upper chamber," margin) of the corner, and finally the SHEEP GATE (which see), which was repaired by the goldsmiths and merchants.

18. Sheep Gate:

This last gate was the point from which the circuit of the repairs was traced. The references, Ne 3:1,31; 12:39, clearly show that it was at the eastern extremity of the north wall.

The details of the gates and buildings in the north wall as described by Nehemiah, are difficult, and certainty is impossible; this side must always necessarily have been the weak side for defense because it was protected by no, or at best by very little, natural valley. As has been said, we cannot be certain whether Nehemiah is describing a wall which on its western two-thirds corresponded with the first or the second wall of Josephus. Taking the first theory as probable, we may plan it as follows: West of the Sheep Gate two towers are mentioned (Ne 3:1; 12:39). Of these HANANEL (which see) was more easterly than HAMMEAH (which see), and, too, it would appear from Zec 14:10 to have been the most northerly point of the city. Probably then two towers occupied the important hill where afterward stood the fortress Baris and, later, the Antonia. At the Hammeah tower the wall would descend into the Tyropeon to join the eastern extremity of the first wall where in the time of Josephus stood the Council House (BJ, V, iv, 2).

19. Fish Gate:

It is generally considered that the FISH GATE (which see) (Ne 3:3; 12:39; Ze 1:10; 2Ch 33:14) stood across the Tyropeon in much the same way as the modern Damascus Gate does now, only considerably farther South. It was probably so called because here the men of Tyre sold their fish (Ne 13:16). It is very probably identical with the "Middle Gate" of Jer 39:3. With this region are associated the

MISHNEH (which see) or "second quarter" (Ze 1:10 margin) and the MAKTESH (which see) or "mortar" (Ze 1:11).

20. "Old Gate":

The next gate westward, after apparently a considerable interval, is translated in English Versions of the Bible the "OLD GATE" (which see), but is more correctly the "Gate of the old ...."; what the word thus qualified is, is doubtful. Ne 3:6 margin suggests "old city" or "old wall," whereas Mitchell (Wall of Jerusalem according to the Book of Neh) proposes "old pool," taking the pool in question to be the so-called "Pool of Hezekiah." According to the view here accepted, that the account of Nehemiah refers only to the first wall, the expression "old wall would be peculiarly suitable, as here must have been some part of that first wall which went back unaltered to the time of Solomon. The western wall to the extent of 400 cubits had been rebuilt after its destruction by Jehoash, king of Israel (see IX, 12, below), and Manasseh had repaired all the wall from Gihon round North and then West to the Fish Gate. This gate has also been identified with the Sha‘ar ha-Pinnah, or "Corner Gate," of 2Ki 14:13; 2Ch 25:23; Jer 31:38; Zec 14:10, and with the Sha‘ar ha-Ri’shon, or "First Gate," of Zec 14:10, which is identified as the same as the Corner Gate; indeed ri’shon ("first") is probably a textual error for yashan ("old"). If this is so, this "Gate of the Old" or "Corner Gate" must have stood near the northwestern corner of the city, somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate.

21. Gate of Ephraim:

The next gate mentioned is the Gate of Ephraim (Ne 12:39), which, according to 2Ki 14:13; 2Ch 25:23, was 400 cubits or 600 ft. from the Corner Gate. This must have been somewhere on the western wall; it is scarcely possible to believe, as some writers would suggest, that there could have been no single gate between the Corner Gate near the northwestern corner and the Valley Gate on the southern wall.

22. Tower of the Furnaces:

The "Broad Wall" appears to correspond to the southern stretch of the western wall as far as the "Tower of the Furnaces" or ovens, which was probably the extremely important corner tower now incorporated in "Bishop Gobat’s School." This circuit of the walls satisfies fairly well all the conditions; the difficulties are chiefly on the North and West. It is a problem how the Gate of Ephraim comes to be omitted in the account of the repairs, but G.A. Smith suggests that it may be indicated by the expression, "throne of the governor beyond the river" (Ne 3:7). See, however, Mitchell (loc. cit.). If theory be accepted that the second wall already existed, the Corner Gate and the Fish Gate will have to be placed farther north.

23. The Gate of Benjamin:

In Old Testament as in later times, some of the gates appear to have received different names at various times. Thus the Sheep Gate, at the northeastern angle, appears to be identical with the Gate of Benjamin

or Upper Gate of Benjamin (Jer 20:2; 37:13; 38:7); the prophet was going, apparently, the nearest way to his home in Anathoth. In Zec 14:10 the breadth of the city is indicated, where the prophet writes, "She shall be lifted up, and shall dwell in her place, from Benjamin's gate unto the place of the first gate, unto the corner gate."

24. Upper Gate of the Temple:

The Upper Gate of the Temple (2Ki 15:35; 2Ch 27:3; compare 2Ch 23:20; Eze 9:2) is probably another name for the same gate. It must be remembered the gates were, as excavations have shown us, reduced to a minimum in fortified sites: they were sources of weakness.

The general outline of the walls and gates thus followed is in the main that existing from Nehemiah back until the early Judean monarchy, and possibly to Solomon.

25. The Earlier Walls:

Of the various destructions and repairs which occurred during the time of the monarchy, a sufficient account is given in IX below, on the history. Solomon was probably the first to enclose the northwestern hill within the walls, and to him usually is ascribed all the northern and western stretch of the "First Wall"; whether his wall ran down to the mouth of the Tyropeon, or only skirted the summit of the northwestern hill is uncertain, but the latter view is probable. David was protected by the powerful fortifications of the Jebusites, which probably enclosed only the southeastern hill; he added to the defenses the fortress MILLO (which see). It is quite possible that the original Jebusite city had but one gate, on the North (2Sa 15:2), but the city must have overflowed its narrow limits during David's reign and have needed an extended and powerful defense, such as Solomon made, to secure the capital. For the varied history and situation of the walls in the post-Biblical period, see IX ("History"), below.

JERUSALEM, 3

VII. Antiquarian Remains Connected with the Water-Supply.

In a city like Jerusalem, where the problem of a water-supply must always have been one of the greatest, it is only natural that some of the most ancient and important works should have centered round it. The three sources of supply have been

(1) springs,

(2) cisterns,

(3) aqueducts.

1. Gihon: The Natural Spring:

(1) The natural springs have been described in II, 3; but connected with them, and especially with the city's greatest and most venerated source, the Gihon, there are certain antiquarian remains of great interest.

(a) The "Virgin's Fount," ancient Gihon, arises, as has been described (II, 3), in a rocky cleft in the Kidron valley bottom; under natural conditions the water would run along the valley bed, now deeply buried under debris of the ancient city, and doubtless when the earliest settlers made their dwellings in the caves (which have been excavated) on the sides of the valley near the spring, they and their flocks lived on the banks of a stream of running water in a sequestered valley among waterless hills. From, however, a comparatively early period—at the least 2000 BC—efforts were made to retain some of the water, and a solid stone dam was built which converted the sources into a pool of considerable depth. Either then, or somewhat later, excavations were made in the cliffs overhanging the pool, whereby some at least of these waters were conducted, by means of a tunnel, into the heart of the southeastern hill, "Ophel," so that the source could be reached from within the city walls. There are today two systems of tunnels which are usually classed as one under the name of the "Siloam aqueduct," but the two systems are probably many centuries apart in age.

2. The Aqueduct of the Canaanites:

The older tunnel begins in a cave near the source and then runs westward for a distance of 67 ft.; at the inner end of the tunnel there is a perpendicular shaft which ascends for over 40 ft. and opens into a lofty rock-cut passage which runs, with a slight lateral curvature, to the North, in the direction of the surface. The upper end has been partially destroyed, and the roof, which had fallen in, was long ago partially restored by a masonry arch. At this part of the passage the floor is abruptly interrupted across its whole width by a deep chasm which Warren partially excavated, but which Parker has since conclusively shown to end blindly. It is clear that this great gallery, which is 8 to 9 ft. wide, and in places as high or higher, was constructed (a natural cavern possibly utilized in the process) to enable the inhabitants of the walled-in city above it to reach the spring. It is in fact a similar work to the great water-passage at GEZER (which see), which commenced in a rock-cut pit 26 ft. deep and descended with steps, to a depth of 94 ft. 6 inches below the level of the rock surface; the sloping passage was 23 ft. high and 13 ft. broad. This passage which could be dated with certainty as before 1500 BC, and almost certainly as early as 2000 BC, was cut out with flint knives and apparently was made entirely to reach a great underground source of water.

3. Warren's Shaft:

The discovery of this Gezer well-passage has thrown a flood of light upon the "Warren's Shaft" in Jerusalem, which would appear to have been made for an exactly similar purpose. The chasm mentioned before may have been an effort to reach the source from a higher point, or it may have been made, or later adapted, to prevent ingress by means of the system of tunnels into the city. This passage is in all

probability the "watercourse" (tsinnor) of 2Sa 5:8 up which, apparently, Joab and his men (1Ch 11:6) secretly made their way; they must have waded through the water at the source, ascended the perpendicular shaft (a feat performed in 1910 by some British officers without any assistance from ladders), and then made their way into the heart of the city along the great tunnel. Judging by the similar Gezer water tunnel, this great work may not only have existed in David's time, but may have been constructed as much as 1,000 years before.

4. Hezekiah's "Siloam" Aqueduct:

The true Siloam tunnel is a considerably later work. It branches off from the older aqueduct at a point 67 ft. from the entrance, and after running an exceedingly winding course of 1,682 ft., it empties itself into the Pool of Siloam (total length 1,749 ft.). The whole canal is rock cut; it is 2 to 3 ft. wide, and varies in height from 16 ft. at the south end to 4 ft. 6 inches at the lowest point, near the middle. The condition of this tunnel has recently been greatly changed through Captain Parker's party having cleared out the accumulated silt of centuries; before this, parts of the channel could be traversed only with the greatest difficulty and discomfort. The primitive nature of this construction is shown by the many false passages made, and also by the extensive curves which greatly add to its length. This latter may also be partly due to the workmen following lines of soft strata. M. Clermont-Ganneau and others have thought that one or more of the great curves may have been made deliberately to avoid the tombs of the kings of Judah. The method of construction of the tunnel is narrated in the Siloam Inscription (see SILOAM). It was begun simultaneously from each end, and the two parties met in the middle. It is a remarkable thing that there is a difference of level of only one foot at each end; but the lofty height of the southern end is probably due to a lowering of the floor here after the junction was effected. It is practically certain that this great work is that referred to in 2Ki 20:20: "Now the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and all his might, and how he made the pool, and the conduit, and brought water into the city, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?" And in 2Ch 32:30: "This same Hezekiah also stopped the upper spring of the waters of Gihon, and brought them straight down on the west side of the city of David."

5. Other Aqueducts at Gihon:

In addition to these two conduits, which have a direct Scriptural interest, there are remains of at least two other aqueducts which take their origin at the Virgin's Fount—one a channel deeply cut in rock along the western sides of the Kidron valley, found by Captain Parker, and the other a built channel, lined with very good cement, which takes its rise at a lower level than any of the other conduits close to the before-mentioned rocky cleft from which the water rises, and runs in a very winding direction along the western side of the Kidron. This the present writer has described in PEFS, 1902. One of these, perhaps more probably the former, may be the conduit which is referred to as Shiloah (shiloach), or "conducted" (Isa 8:6), before the construction of Hezekiah s work (see SILOAM).

There are other caves and rock-cut channels around the ancient Gihon which cannot fully be described here, but which abundantly confirm the sanctity of the site.

6. Bir Eyyub:

(b) Bir Eyyub has a depth of 125 ft.; the water collects at the bottom in a large rock-hewn chamber, and it is clear that it has been deepened at some period, because at the depth of 113 ft. there is a collecting chamber which is now replaced by the deeper one. Various rock-cut passages or staircases were found by Warren in the neighborhood of this well.

7. Varieties of Cisterns:

(2) The cisterns and tanks.—Every ancient site in the hill country of Palestine is riddled with cisterns for the storage of rain water. In Jerusalem for very many centuries the private resident has depended largely upon the water collected from the roof of his house for all domestic purposes. Such cisterns lie either under or alongside the dwelling. Many of the earliest of these excavations are bottle-shaped, with a comparatively narrow mouth cut through the hard Mizzeh and a large rounded excavation made in the underlying Melekeh (see II, 1 above). Other ancient cisterns are cavities hewn in the rock, of irregular shape, with a roof of harder rock and often several openings. The later forms are vaulted over, and are either cut in the rock or sometimes partially built in the superlying rubbish.

For more public purposes large cisterns were made in the Charam, or temple-area. Some 3 dozen are known and planned; the largest is calculated to contain 3,000,000 gallons. Such structures were made largely for the religious ritual, but, as we shall see, they have been supplied by other sources than the rainfall. In many parts of the city open tanks have been constructed, such a tank being known in Arabic as a birkeh, or, followed by a vowel, birket. With most of these there is considerable doubt as to their date of construction, but probably none of them, in their present form at any rate, antedates the Roman period.

8. Birket Israel:

Within the city walls the largest reservoir is the Birket Israel which extends from the northeastern angle of the Charam westward for 360 ft. It is 125 ft. wide and was originally 80 ft. deep, but has in recent years been largely filled up by the city’s refuse. The eastern and western ends of this pool are partially rock-cut and partly masonry, the masonry of the former being a great dam 45 ft. thick, the lower part of which is continuous with the ancient eastern wall of the temple-area. The sides of the pool are entirely masonry because this reservoir is built across the width of the valley referred to before (III, 2) as "St. Anne’s Valley." Other parts of this valley are filled with debris to the depth of 100 ft. The original bottom of the reservoir is covered with a layer of about 19 inches of very hard concrete and cement. There was a great conduit at the eastern end of the pool built of massive stones, and connected with the pool by a perforated stone with three round holes 5 1/2 inches in diameter. The position of this outlet shows that all water over a depth of 22 ft. must have flowed away. Some authorities consider this pool to have been pre-exilic. By early Christian pilgrims it was identified as the "Sheep Pool" of Joh 5:2, and at a later period, until quite recent times, it was supposed to have been the Pool of Bethesda.

9. Pool of Bethesda:

The discovery, a few years ago, of the long-lost Piscina in the neighborhood of the "Church of Anne," which was without doubt the Pool of Bethesda of the 5th century AD, has caused this identification to be abandoned.

See BETHESDA.

10. The Twin Pools:

To the West of the Birket Israel are the "twin pools" which extend under the roadway in the neighborhood of the "Ecce Homo" arch. The western one is 165 ft. by 20 ft. and the eastern 127 ft. by 20 ft. M. Clermont-Ganneau considers them to be identical with the Pool Struthius of Josephus (BJ, V, xi, 4), but others, considering that they are actually made in the fosse of the Antonia, give them a later date of origin. In connection with these pools a great aqueduct was discovered in 1871, 2 1/2-3 ft. wide and in places 12 ft. high, running from the neighborhood of the Damascus Gate—but destroyed farther north—and from the pools another aqueduct runs in the direction of the Charam.

11. Birket Hammam el Batrak:

On the northwestern hill, between the Jaffa Gate and the Church of the Sepulchre there is a large open reservoir, known to the modern inhabitants of the city as Birket Kammam el Batrak, "the Pool of the Patriarch's Bath." It is 240 ft. long (North to South), 144 ft. broad and 19-24 ft. deep. The cement lining of the bottom is cracked and practically useless. The eastern wall of this pool is particularly massive, and forms the base of the remarkably level street Karet en Nasara, or "Christian Street"; it is a not improbable theory that this is actually a fragment of the long-sought "second" wall. If so, the pool, which is proved to have once extended 60 ft. farther north, may have been constructed originally as part of the fosse. On the other hand, this pool appears to have been the Amygdalon Pool, or "Pool of the Tower" (berekhath ha-mighdalin), mentioned by Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, xi, 4), which was the scene of the activities of the 10th legion, and this seems inconsistent with the previous theory, as the events described seem to imply that the second wall ran outside the pool. The popular travelers' name, "Pool of Hezekiah," given to this reservoir is due to theory, now quite discredited, that this is the pool referred to in 2Ki 20:20, "He made the pool, and the conduit, and brought water into the city." Other earlier topographists have identified it as the "upper pool" of Isa 7:3; 36:2.

12. Birket Mamilla:

The Birket Kammam el Batrak is supplied with water from the Birket Mamilla, about 1/2 mile to the West. This large pool, 293 ft. long by 193 ft. broad and 19 1/2 ft. deep, lies in the midst of a large Moslem cemetery at the head of the Wady Mes, the first beginning of the Wady er Rababi (Hinnom). The aqueduct which connects the two pools springs from the eastern end of the Birket Mamilla, runs a somewhat winding course and enters the city near the Jaffa Gate. The aqueduct is in bad repair, and the

water it carries, chiefly during heavy rain, is filthy. In the Middle Ages it was supposed that this was the "Upper Pool of Gihon" (see GIHON), but this and likewise the "highway of the FULLER'S FIELD" (which see) are now located elsewhere. Wilson and others have suggested that it is the "Serpent's Pool" of Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, iii, 2). Titus leveled "all the places from Scopus to Herod's monument which adjoins the pool called that of the Serpent." Like many such identifications, there is not very much to be said for or against it; it is probable that the pool existed at the time of the siege. It is likely that this is the Beth Memel of the Talmud (the Babylonian Talmud, 'Erubin 51 b; Sanhedrin 24 a; Bere'shith Rabba' 51).

13. Birket es Sultan:

The Birket es Sultan is a large pool—or, more strictly speaking, enclosure—555 ft. North and South by 220 ft. East and West. It is bounded on the West and North by a great curve of the low-level aqueduct as it passes along and then across the Wady er Rababi. The southern side consists of a massive dam across the valley over which the Bethlehem carriage road runs. The name may signify either the "great" pool or be connected with the fact that it was reconstructed in the 16th century by the sultan Suleiman ibn Selim, as is recorded on an inscription upon a wayside fountain upon the southern wall. This pool is registered in the cartulary of the Holy Sepulchre as the Lacus Germani, after the name of a knight of Germanus, who built or renovated the pool in 1176 AD. Probably a great part of the pool is a catchment area, and the true reservoir is the rock-cut birkeh at the southern end, which has recently been cleaned out. It is extremely difficult to believe that under any conditions any large proportion of the whole area could ever have even been filled. Today the reservoir at the lower end holds, after the rainy season, some 10 or 12 ft. of very dirty water, chiefly the street drainage of the Jaffa road, while the upper two-thirds of the enclosure is used as a cattle market on Fridays. The water is now used for sprinkling the dusty roads in dry seasons.

The Pool of Siloam and the now dry Birket el Kamra are described under SILOAM (which see).

There are other tanks of considerable size in and around the city, e.g. the Birket Sitti Miriam, near "St. Stephen's Gate," an uncemented pool in the Wady Joz, connected with which there is a rockcut aqueduct and others, but they are not of sufficient historical importance to merit description here.

14. "Solomon's Pools":

(3) The conduits bringing water to the city from a distance are called the "high-level" and "low-level" aqueducts respectively, because they reached the city at different levels—the former probably somewhere near the present Jaffa Gate, the latter at the temple-platform.

15. Low-Level Aqueduct:

The low-level aqueduct which, though out of repair, can still be followed along its whole course, conveyed water from three great pools in the Wady 'Artas, 7 miles South of Jerusalem. They are usually

called "Solomon's pools," in reference perhaps partly to Ec 2:6: "I made me pools o water, to water therefrom the forest where trees were reared," but as any mighty work in Palestine is apt to be referred to the wise king of Israel, much stress cannot be laid on the name. These three storage reservoirs are constructed across the breadth of the valley, the lowest and largest being 582 ft. long by 177 ft. broad and, at the lowest end, 50 ft. deep. Although the overflow waters of 'Ain es Saleh, commonly known as the "sealed fountain" (compare So 4:12), reach the pools, the chief function was probably to collect the flood waters from the winter rains, and the water was passed from tank to tank after purification. There are in all four springs in this valley which supply the aqueduct which still conveys water to Bethlehem, where it passes through the hill by means of a tunnel and then, after running, winding along the sides of the hill, it enters another tunnel now converted into a storage tank for Jerusalem; from this it runs along the mountain sides and along the southern slopes of the site of Jerusalem to the Charam. The total length of this aqueduct is nearly 12 miles, but at a later date the supply was increased by the construction of a long extension of the conduit for a further 28 miles to Wady 'Arrub on the road to Hebron, another 5 miles directly South of the pools. Here, too, there is a reservoir, the Birket el 'Arrub, for the collection of the flood-water, and also several small springs, which are conducted in a number of underground rock-cut channels to the aqueduct. The total length of the low-level aqueduct is about 40 miles, and the fall in level from Birket el 'Arrub (2,645 ft. above sea-level) at its far end to el Kas, the termination in the Charam Jerusalem (2,410 ft. above sea-level), is 235 ft.

16. High-Level Aqueduct:

The high-level aqueduct commences in a remarkable chain of wells connected with a tunnel, about 4 miles long, in the Wady Biar, "the Valley of Wells." Upward of 50 wells along the valley bottom supplied each its quotient; the water thence passed through a pool where the solid matter settled, and traversed a tunnel 1,700 ft. long into the 'Artas valley. Here, where its level was 150 ft. above that of the low-level aqueduct, the conduit received the waters of the "sealed fountain," and finally "delivered them in Jerusalem at a level of about 20 ft. above that of the Jaffa Gate" (Wilson). The most remarkable feature of this conduit is the inverted siphon of perforated limestone blocks, forming a stone tube 15 inches in diameter, which carried the water across the valley near Rachel's Tomb.

17. Dates of Construction of These Aqueducts:

On a number of these blocks, Latin inscriptions with the names of centurions of the time of Severus (195 AD) have been found, and this has led many to fix a date to this great work. So good an authority as Wilson, however, considers that these inscriptions may refer to repairs, and that the work is more probably Herodian. Unless the accounts of Josephus (Jewish Wars, V, iv, 4; II, xvii, 9) are exaggerated, Herod must have had some means of bringing abundant running water into the city at the level obtained by this conduit. The late Dr. Schick even suggested a date as early as Hyrcanus (135-125 BC). With regard to the low-level aqueduct, we have two definite data. First Josephus (Ant., XVIII, iii, 2) states that Pontius Pilate "undertook to bring a current of water to Jerusalem, and did it with the sacred money, and derived the origin of the stream from the distance of 200 furlongs," over 22 miles; in Jewish Wars, II, ix, 4 he is said to have brought the water "from 400 furlongs"—probably a copyist's error. But these references must either be to restorations or to the extension from Wady 'Arrub to Wady 'Artas (28

miles), for the low-level aqueduct from the pools to Jerusalem is certainly the same construction as the aqueduct from these pools to the "Frank Mountain," the Herodium, and that, according to the definite statements of Josephus (Ant., XV, ix, 4; BJ, I, xxi, 10), was made by Herod the Great. On the whole the usual view is that the high-level aqueduct was the work of Severus, the low-level that of Herod, with an extension southward by Pontius Pilate.

Jerus still benefits somewhat from the low-level aqueduct which is in repair as far as Bethlehem, though all that reaches the city comes only through a solitary 4-inch pipe. The high-level aqueduct is hopelessly destroyed and can be traced only in places; the wells of Wady Biar are choked and useless, and the long winding aqueduct to Wady ‘Arrub is quite broken.

VIII. Tombs, Antiquarian Remains and Ecclesiastical Sites.

1. The "Tombs of the Kings":

Needless to say all the known ancient tombs in the Jerusalem area have been rifled of their contents long ago. The so-called Tombs of the Kings in the Wady el Joz are actually the monument of Queen Helena of Adiabene, a convert to Judaism (circa 48 AD). Josephus (Ant., XX, iv, 3) states that her bones, with those of members of her family, were buried "at the pyramids," which were 3 in number and distant from Jerusalem 3 furlongs. A Hebrew inscription upon a sarcophagus found here by De Saulcy ran: (tsarah malkethah), "Queen Sarah," possibly the Jewish name of Queen Helena.

2. "Herod’s Tomb":

On the western side of the Wady el Mes (the higher part of Hinnom), is a very interesting Greek tomb containing beautifully carved sarcophagi. These are commonly known as "Herod’s Tombs" (although Herod the Great was buried on the Herodium), and, according to Schick, one of the sarcophagi may have belonged to Mariamne, Herod’s wife. A more probable theory is that this is the tomb of the high priest Ananias (Jewish Wars, V, xii, 2).

3. "Absalom’s Tomb":

On the eastern side of the Kidron, near the southeastern angle of the Charam, are 3 conspicuous tombs. The most northerly, Tantur Fer‘on, generally called "Absalom’s Tomb," is a Greek-Jewish tomb of the Hasmonean period, and, according to Conder, possibly the tomb of Alexander Janneus (HDB, article "Jerusalem"). S. of this is the traditional "Grotto of James," which we know by a square Hebrew inscription over the pillars to be the family tomb of certain members of the priestly family (1Ch 24:15), of the Beni Hazir. It may belong to the century before Christ.

The adjoining traditional tomb of Zachariah is a monolithic monument cut out of the living rock, 16 ft. square and 30 ft. high. It has square pilasters at the corners, Ionic pillars between, and a pyramidal top. Its origin is unknown; its traditional name is due to our Lord’s word in Mt 23:35; Lu 11:51 (see

ZACHARIAH).

4. The "Egyptian Tomb":

A little farther down the valley of the Kidron, at the commencement of the village of Siloam, is another rock-cut tomb, the so-called Egyptian Tomb, or according to some, "the tomb of Solomon's Egyptian wife." It is a monolith 18 ft. square and 11 ft. high, and the interior has at one time been used as a chapel. It is now Russian property. It probably belongs to much the same period as the three before-mentioned tombs, and, like them, shows strong Egyptian influence.

The so-called "Tombs of the Judges" belong to the Roman period, as do the scores of similar excavations in the same valley. The "Tombs of the Prophets" on the western slopes of the Mount of Olives are now considered to belong to the 4th or 5th Christian century.

Near the knoll over Jeremiah's Grotto, to the West and Northwest, are a great number of tombs, mostly Christian. The more northerly members of the group are now included in the property of the Dominicans attached to the Church of Stephen, but one, the southernmost, has attracted a great deal of attention because it was supposed by the late General Gordon to be the tomb of Christ.

5. The "Garden Tomb":

In its condition when found it was without doubt, like its neighbors, a Christian tomb of about the 5th century, and it was full of skeletons. Whether it may originally have been a Jewish tomb is unproved; it certainly could not have been recognized as a site of any sanctity until General Gordon promulgated his theory (see PEFS, 1892, 120-24; see also GOLGOTHA).

6. Tomb of "Simon the Just":

The Jews greatly venerate a tomb on the eastern side of the Wady el Joz, not far South of the great North Road; they consider it to be the tomb of Simon the Just, but it is in all probability not a Jewish tomb at all.

7. Other Antiquities:

Only passing mention can here be made of certain remains of interest connected with the exterior walls of the Charam. The foundation walls of the temple-platform are built, specially upon the East, South and West, of magnificent blocks of smooth, drafted masonry with an average height of 3 1/2 ft. One line, known as the "master course," runs for 600 ft. westward from the southeastern angle, with blocks 7 ft. high. Near the southeastern angle at the foundation itself, certain of the blocks were found by the Palestine Exploration Fund engineers to be marked with Phoenician characters, which it was supposed by many at the time of their discovery indicated their Solomonic origin. It is now generally held that these "masons' marks" may just as well have been used in the time of Herod the Great, and on other

grounds it is held that all this magnificent masonry is due to the vast reconstruction of the Temple which this great monarch initiated (see TEMPLE). In the western wall of the Charam, between the southwestern corner and the "Jewish wailing place," lies "Robinson's Arch." It is the spring of an arch 50 ft. wide, projecting from the temple-wall; the bridge arising from it had a span of 50 ft., and the pier on the farther side was discovered by Warren. Under the bridge ran a contemporary paved Roman street, and beneath the unbroken pavement was found, lying inside a rock aqueduct, a voussoir of an older bridge. This bridge connected the temple-enclosure with the upper city in the days of the Hasmonean kings. It was broken down in 63 BC by the Jews in anticipation of the attack of Pompey (Antiquities, XIV, iv, 2; BJ, I, vii, 2), but was rebuilt by Herod in 19 BC (Jewish Wars, VI, viii, 1; vi, 2), and finally destroyed in 70 AD.

Nearly 600 ft. farther North, along this western temple-wall is Wilson's Arch, which lies under the surface within the causeway which crosses the Tyropeon to the Babylonian es Silseleh of the Charam; although not itself very ancient there are here, deeper down, arches belonging to the Herodian causeway which here approached the temple-platform.

8. Ecclesiastical Sites:

With regard to the common ecclesiastical sites visited by pious pilgrims little need be said here. The congeries of churches that is included under that name of Church of the Holy Sepulchre includes a great many minor sites of the scenes of the Passion which have no serious claims. Besides the Holy Sepulchre itself—which, apart from its situation, cannot be proved or disproved, as it has actually been destroyed—the only important site is that of "Mount Calvary." All that can be said is that if the Sepulchre is genuine, then the site may be also; it is today the hollowed-out shell of a rocky knoll encased in marble and other stones and riddled with chapels.

See GOLGOTHA.

The coenaculum, close to the Moslem "Tomb of David" (a site which has no serious claims), has been upheld by Professor Sanday (Sacred Sites of the Gospels) as one which has a very strong tradition in its favor. The most important evidence is that of Epiphanias, who states that when Hadrian visited Jerusalem in 130, one of the few buildings left standing was "the little Church of God, on the site where the disciples, returning after the Ascension of the Saviour from Olivet, had gone up to the Upper room, for there it had been built, that is to say in the quarter of Zion." In connection with this spot there has been pointed out from early Christian times the site of the House of Caiaphas and the site of the death of the Virgin Mary—the Dormitio Sanctae Virginis. It is in consequence of this latter tradition that the German Roman Catholics have now erected here their magnificent new church of the Dormition. A rival line of traditions locates the tomb of the Virgin in the Kidron valley near Gethsemane, where there is a remarkable underground chapel belonging to the Greeks.

JERUSALEM, 4

IX. History.

Pre-Israelite period.—The beginnings of Jerusalem are long before recorded history: at various points in the neighborhood, e.g. at el Bukei‘a to the Southwest, and at the northern extremity of the Mount of Olives to the Northeast, were very large settlements of Paleolithic man, long before the dawn of history, as is proved by the enormous quantities of Celts scattered over the surface. It is certain that the city’s site itself was occupied many centuries before David, and it is a traditional view that the city called SALEM (which see) (Ge 14:18), over which Melchizedek was king, was identical with Jerusalem.

1. Tell el-Amarna Correspondence:

The first certain reference to this city is about 1450 BC, when the name Ur-u-salem occurs in several letters belonging to the Tell el-Amarna Letters correspondence. In 7 of these letters occurs the name Abd Khiba, and it is clear that this man was "king," or governor of the city, as the representative of Pharaoh of Egypt. In this correspondence Abd Khiba represents himself as hard pressed to uphold the rights of his suzerain against the hostile forces which threaten to overwhelm him. Incidentally we may gather that the place was then a fortified city, guarded partly by mercenary Egyptian troops, and there are reasons for thinking that then ruler of Egypt, Amenhotep IV, had made it a sanctuary of his god Aten—the sun-disc. Some territory, possibly extending as far west as Ajalon, seems to have been under the jurisdiction of the governor. Professor Sayce has stated that Abd Khiba was probably a Hittite chief, but this is doubtful. The correspondence closes abruptly, leaving us in uncertainty with regard to the fate of the writer, but we know that the domination of Egypt over Palestine suffered an eclipse about this time.

2. Joshua’s Conquest:

At the time of Joshua’s invasion of Canaan, ADONI-ZEDEK (which see) is mentioned (Jos 10:1-27) as king of Jerusalem; he united with the kings of Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon to fight against the Gibeonites who had made peace with Joshua; the 5 kings were defeated and, being captured in hiding at the cave Makkedah, were all slain. Another king, ADONIBEZEK (which see) (whom some identify with Adoni-zedek), was defeated by Judah after the death of Joshua, and after being mutilated was brought to Jerusalem and died there (Jud 1:1-7), after which it is recorded (Jud 1:8) that Judah "fought against Jerusalem, and took it .... and set the city on fire." But it is clear that the city remained in the hands of the "Jebusites" for some years more (Jud 1:21; 19:11), although it was theoretically reckoned on the southern border of Benjamin (Jos 15:8; 18:16,28). David, after he had reigned 7 1/2 years at Hebron, determined to make the place his capital and, about 1000 BC, captured the city.

3. Site of the Jebusite City:

Up to this event it is probable that Jerusalem was like other contemporary fortified sites, a comparatively small place encircled with powerful walls, with but one or perhaps two gates; it is very generally admitted that this city occupied the ridge to the South of the temple long incorrectly called "Ophel," and that its walls stood upon steep rocky scarps above the Kidron valley on the one side, and the Tyropeon

on the other. We have every reason to believe that the great system of tunnels, known as "Warren's Shaft" (see VII, 3, above) existed all through this period.

4. David:

The account of the capture of Jerusalem by David is obscure, but it seems a probable explanation of a difficult passage (2Sa 5:6-9) if we conclude that the Jebusites, relying upon the extraordinary strength of their position, challenged David: "Thou shalt not come in hither, but the blind and the lame shall turn thee away" (2Sa 5:6 margin), and that David directed his followers to go up the "watercourse" and smite the "lame and the blind"—a term he in his turn applies mockingly to the Jebusites. "And Joab the son of Zeruiah went up first, and was made chief" (1Ch 11:6). It seems at least probable that David's men captured the city through a surprise attack up the great tunnels (see VII, 3, above). David having captured the stronghold "Zion," renamed it the "City of David" and took up his residence there; he added to the strength of the fortifications "round about from the MILLO (which see) and onward"; with the assistance of Phoenician workmen supplied by Hiram, king of Tyre, he built himself "a house of cedar" (2Sa 5:11; compare 7:2). The ark of Yahweh was brought from the house of Obed-edom and lodged in a tent (2Sa 6:17) in the "city of David" (compare 1Ki 8:1). The threshing-floor of Araunah (2Sa 24:18), or Ornan (1Ch 21:15), the Jebusite, was later purchased as the future site of the temple.

5. Expansion of the City:

The Jerusalem which David captured was small and compact, but there are indications that during his reign it must have increased considerably by the growth of suburbs outside the Jebusite walls. The population must have been increased from several sources. The influx of David's followers doubtless caused many of the older inhabitants to be crowded out of the walled area. There appear to have been a large garrison (2Sa 15:18; 20:7), many officials and priests and their families (2Sa 8:16-18; 20:23-26; 23:8), and the various members of David's own family and their relatives (2Sa 5:13-16; 14:24,28; 1Ki 1:5,53, etc.). It is impossible to suppose that all these were crowded into so narrow an area, while the incidental mention that Absalom lived two whole years in Jerusalem without seeing the king's face implies suburbs (2Sa 14:24,28). The new dwellings could probably extend northward toward the site of the future temple and northwestward into and up the Tyropeon valley along the great north road. It is improbable that they could have occupied much of the western hill.

6. Solomon:

With the accession of Solomon, the increased magnificence of the court, the foreign wives and their establishments, the new officials and the great number of work people brought to the city for Solomon's great buildings must necessarily have enormously swelled the resident population, while the recorded buildings of the city, the temple, the king's house, the House of the Daughter of Pharaoh, the House of the Forest of Lebanon, the Throne Hall and the Pillared Hall (1Ki 7:1-8) must have altered the whole aspect of the site. In consequence of these new buildings, the sanctuary together with the houses of the common folk, a new wall for the city was necessary, and we have a statement twice made that Solomon

built "the wall of Jerusalem round about" (1Ki 3:1; 9:15); it is also recorded that he built Millo (1Ki 9:15,24; 11:27), and that "he repaired the breach of the city of David his father" (1Ki 11:27). The question of the Millo is discussed elsewhere (see MILLO); the "breach" referred to may have been the connecting wall needed to include the Millo within the complete circle of fortifications, or else some part of David's fortification which his death had left incomplete.

7. Solomon's City Wall:

As regards the "Wall of Jerus" which Solomon built, it is practically certain that it was, on the North and West, that described by Josephus as the First Wall (see VI, 7 above). The vast rock-cut scarps at the southwestern corner testify to the massiveness of the building. Whether the whole of the southwestern hill was included is matter of doubt. Inasmuch as there are indications at Bliss's tower (see VI, 4th above) of an ancient wall running northeasterly, and enclosing the summit of the southwestern hill, it would appear highly probable that Solomon's wall followed that line; in this case this wall must have crossed the Tyropeon at somewhat the line of the existing southern wall, and then have run southeasterly to join the western wall of the old city of the Jebusites. The temple and palace buildings were all enclosed in a wall of finished masonry which made it a fortified place by itself—as it appears to have been through Hebrew history—and these walls, where external to the rest of the city, formed part of the whole circle of fortification.

Although Solomon built so magnificent a house for Yahweh, he erected in the neighborhood shrines to other local gods (1Ki 11:7,8), a lapse ascribed largely to the influence of his foreign wives and consequent foreign alliances.

8. The Disruption (933 BC):

The disruption of the kingdom must have been a severe blow to Jerusalem, which was left the capital, no longer of a united state, but of a petty tribe. The resources which were at the command of Solomon for the building up of the city were suddenly cut off by Jeroboam's avowed policy, while the long state of war which existed between the two peoples—a state lasting 60 years (1Ki 14:30; 15:6,16; 22:44)—must have been very injurious to the growth of commerce and the arts of peace.

9. Invasion of Shishak (928 BC):

In the 5th year of Rehoboam (928), Shishak (Sheshonq) king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem (1Ki 14:25) and took "the fenced cities of Judah" (2Ch 12:4 the King James Version). It has been commonly supposed that he besieged and captured Jerusalem itself, but as there is no account of the destruction of fortifications and as the name of this city has not been deciphered upon the Egyptian records of this campaign, it is at least as probable, and is as consistent with the Scriptural references, that Shishak was bought off with "the treasures of the house of Yahweh, and the treasures of the king's house" and "all the shields of gold which Solomon had made" (1Ki 14:26).

10. City Plundered by Arabs:

It is clear that by the reign of Jehoshaphat the city had again largely recovered its importance (compare 1Ki 22), but in his son Jehoram's reign (849-842 BC) Judah was invaded and the royal house was pillaged by Philistines and Arabs (2Ch 21:16-17). Ahaziah (842 BC), Jehoram's son, came to grief while visiting his maternal relative at Jezreel, and after being wounded in his chariot near Ibleam, and expiring at Megiddo, his body was carried to Jerusalem and there buried (2Ki 9:27-28). Jerusalem was now the scene of the dramatic events which center round the usurpation and death of Queen Athaliah (2Ki 11:16; 2Ch 23:15) and the coronation and reforms of her grandson Joash (2Ki 12:1-16; 2Ch 24:1-14).

11. Hazael King of Syria Bought Off (797 BC):

After the death of the good priest Jehoiada, it is recorded (2Ch 24:15) that the king was led astray by the princes of Judah and forsook the house of Yahweh, as a consequence of which the Syrians under Hazael came against Judah and Jerusalem, slew the princes and spoiled the land, Joash giving him much treasure from both palace and temple (2Ki 12:17,18; 2Ch 24:23). Finally Joash was assassinated (2Ki 12:20,21; 2Ch 24:25) "at the house of Millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla."

12. Capture of the City of Jehoash of Israel:

During the reign of Amaziah (797-729 BC), the murdered king's son, a victory over Edom appears to have so elated the king that he wantonly challenged Jehoash of Israel to battle (2Ki 14:8 f). The two armies met at Beth-shemesh, and Judah was defeated and "fled every man to his tent." Jerusalem was unable to offer any resistance to the victors, and Jehoash "brake down the wall of Jerusalem from the gate of Ephraim unto the corner gate, 400 cubits" and then returned to Samaria, loaded with plunder and hostages (2Ki 14:14). Fifteen years later, Amaziah was assassinated at Lachish whither he had fled from a conspiracy; nevertheless they brought his body upon horses, and he was buried in Jerusalem.

13. Uzziah's Refortification (779-740 BC):

Doubtless it was a remembrance of the humiliation which his father had undergone which made Uzziah (Azariah) strengthen his position. He subdued the Philistines and the Arabs in Gur, and put the Ammonites to tribute (2Ch 26:7,8). He "built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate, and at the valley gate, and at the turnings (Septuagint) of the walls, and fortified them" (2Ch 26:9). He is also described as having made in Jerusalem "engines, invented by skillful men, to be on the towers and upon the battlements, wherewith to shoot arrows and great stones" (2Ch 26:15). The city during its long peace with its northern neighbors appears to have recovered something of her prosperity in the days of Solomon. During his reign the city was visited by a great earthquake (Zec 14:4; Am 1:1; compare Isa 9:10; 29:6; Am 4:11; 8:8). Jotham, his son, built the upper gate of the house of Yahweh" (2Ki 15:35; 2Ch 27:3), probably the same as the "upper gate of Benjamin" (Jer 20:2). He also built much on the wall of Ophel—probably the ancient fortress of Zion on the southeastern hill (2Ch 27:3); see OPHEL.

14. Ahaz Allies with Assyria (736-728 BC):

His son Ahaz was soon to have cause to be thankful for his father's and grandfather's work in fortifying the city, for now its walls were successful in defense against the kings of Syria and Israel (2Ki 16:5,6); but Ahaz, feeling the weakness of his little kingdom, bought with silver and gold from the house of Yahweh the alliance of Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria. He met the king at Damascus and paid him a compliment by having an altar similar to his made for his own ritual in the temple (2Ki 16:10-12). His reign is darkened by a record of heathen practices, and specially by his making "his son to pass through the fire"—as a human sacrifice in, apparently, the Valley of Hinnom (1Ki 16:3-4; compare 2Ch 28:3).

15. Hezekiah's Great Works:

Hezekiah (727-699 BC), his son, succeeded to the kingdom at a time of surpassing danger. Samaria, and with it the last of Israel's kingdom, had fallen. Assyria had with difficulty been bought off, the people were largely apostate, yet Jerusalem was never so great and so inviolate to prophetic eyes (Isa 7:4; 8:8,10; 10:28; 14:25-32, etc.). Early in his reign, the uprising of the Chaldean Merodach-baladan against Assyria relieved Judah of her greatest danger, and Hezekiah entered into friendly relations with this new king of Babylon, showing his messengers all his treasures (Isa 39:1,2). At this time or soon after, Hezekiah appears to have undertaken great works in fitting his capital for the troubled times which lay before him. He sealed the waters of Gihon and brought them within the city to prevent the kings of Assyria from getting access to them (2Ki 20:20; 2Ch 32:4,30).

See SILOAM.

It is certain, if their tunnel was to be of any use, the southwestern hill must have been entirely enclosed, and it is at least highly probable that in the account (2Ch 32:5), he "built up all the wall that was broken down, and built towers thereon (margin), and the other wall without," the last phrase may refer to the stretch of wall along the edge of the southwestern hill to Siloam. On the other hand, if that was the work of Solomon, "the other wall" may have been the great buttressed dam, with a wall across it which closed the mouth of the Tyropeon, which was an essential part of his scheme of preventing a besieging army from getting access to water. He also strengthened MILLO (which see), on the southeastern hill. Secure in these fortifications, which made Jerusalem one of the strongest walled cities in Western Asia, Hezekiah, assisted, as we learn from Sennacherib's descriptions, by Arab mercenaries, was able to buy off the great Assyrian king and to keep his city inviolate (2Ki 18:13-16). A second threatened attack on the city appears to be referred to in 2Ki 19:9-37.

16. His Religious Reforms:

Hezekiah undertook reforms. "He removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah: and he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made and .... he called it Nehushtan," i.e. a piece of brass (2Ki 18:4).

Manasseh succeeded his father when but 12, and reigned 55 years (698-643) in Jerusalem (2Ki 21:1). He was tributary to Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, as we know from their inscriptions; in one of the latter's he is referred to as king "of the city of Judah." The king of Assyria who, it is said (2Ch 33:11; compare Ant, X, iii, 2), carried Manasseh in chains to Babylon, was probably Ashurbanipal. How thoroughly the country was permeated by Assyrian influence is witnessed by the two cuneiform tablets recently found at Gezer belonging to this Assyrian monarch's reign (PEFS, 1905, 206, etc.).

17. Manasseh's Alliance with Assyria:

The same influence, extending to the religious sphere, is seen in the record (2Ki 21:5) that Manasseh "built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of Yahweh." There are other references to the idolatrous practices introduced by this king (compare Jer 7:18; 2Ki 23:5,11,12, etc.). He also filled Jerusalem from one end to the other with the innocent blood of martyrs faithful to Yahweh (2Ki 21:16; compare Jer 19:4). Probably during this long reign of external peace the population of the city much increased, particularly by the influx of foreigners from less isolated regions.

18. His Repair of the Walls:

Of this king's improvements to the fortifications of Jerusalem we have the statement (2Ch 33:14), "He built an outer wall to the city of David, on the west side of Gihon in the valley, even to the entrance at the fish gate." This must have been a new or rebuilt wall for the whole eastern side of the city. He also compassed about the OPHEL (which see) and raised it to a very great height.

Manasseh was the first of the Judahic kings to be buried away from the royal tombs. He was buried (as was his son Amon) "in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza" (2Ki 21:18). These may be the tombs referred to (Eze 43:7-9) as too near the temple precincts.

19. Josiah and Religious Reforms (640-609 BC):

In the reign of Josiah was found the "Book of the Law," and the king in consequence instituted radical reforms (2Ki 22; 23). Kidron smoked with the burnings of the Asherah and of the vessels of Baal, and Topheth in the Valley of Hinnom was defiled. At length after a reign of 31 years (2Ki 23:29,30), Josiah, in endeavoring to intercept Pharaoh-necoh from combining with the king of Babylon, was defeated and slain at Megiddo and was buried "in his own sepulchre" in Jerusalem—probably in the same locality where his father and grandfather lay buried. Jehoahaz, after a reign of but 3 months, was carried captive (2Ki 23:34) by Necoh to Egypt, where he died—and apparently was buried among strangers (Jer 22:10-12). His brother Eliakim, renamed Jehoiakim, succeeded. In the 4th year of his reign, Egypt was defeated at Carchemish by the Babylonians, and as a consequence Jehoiakim had to change from subjection to Egypt to that of Babylon.

20. Jeremiah Prophesies the Approaching Doom:

During this time Jeremiah was actively foretelling in streets and courts of Jerusalem (5:1, etc.) the approaching ruin of the city, messages which were received with contempt and anger by the king and court (Jer 36:23). In consequence of his revolt against Babylon, bands of Chaldeans, Syrians, Moabites and Ammonites came against him (2Ki 24:2), and his death was inglorious (2Ki 24:6; Jer 22:18,19).

21. Nebuchadnezzar Twice Takes Jerusalem (586 BC):

His son Jehoiachin, who succeeded him, went out with all his household and surrendered to the approaching Nebuchadnezzar (597), and was carried to Babylon where he passed more than 37 years (2Ki 25:27-30). Jerusalem was despoiled of all its treasures and all its important inhabitants. The king of Babylon's nominee, Zedekiah, after 11 years rebelled against him, and consequently Jerusalem was besieged for a year and a half until "famine was sore in the city." On the 9th of Ab all the men of war "fled by night by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king's garden," i.e. near the mouth of the Tyropeon, and the king "went by the way of the Arabah," but was overtaken and captured "in the plains of Jericho." A terrible punishment followed his faithlessness to Babylon (2Ki 25:1-7). The city and the temple were despoiled and burnt; the walls of Jerusalem were broken down, and none but the poorest of the land "to be vinedressers and husbandmen" were left behind (2Ki 25:8 f; 2Ch 36:17 f). It is probable that the ark was removed also at this time.

22. Cyrus and the First Return (538 BC):

With the destruction of their city, the hopes of the best elements in Judah turned with longing to the thought of her restoration. It is possible that some of the remnant left in the land may have kept up some semblance of the worship of Yahweh at the temple-site. At length, however, when in 538 Cyrus the Persian became master of the Babylonian empire, among many acts of a similar nature for the shrines of Assyrian and Babylonian gods, he gave permission to Jews to return to rebuild the house of Yahweh (Ezr 1:1 f). Over 40,000 (Ezr 1; 2) under Sheshbazzar, prince of Judah (Ezr 1:8,11), governor of a province, returned, bringing with them the sacred vessels of the temple. The daily sacrifices were renewed and the feasts and fasts restored (Ezr 3:3-7), and later the foundations of the restored temple were laid (Ezr 3:10; 5:16), but on account of the opposition of the people of the land and the Samaritans, the building was not completed until 20 years later (Ezr 6:15).

23. Nehemiah Rebuilds the Walls:

The graphic description of the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem in 445 by Nehemiah gives us the fullest account we have of these fortifications at any ancient period. It is clear that Nehemiah set himself to restore the walls, as far as possible, in their condition before the exile. The work was done hurriedly and under conditions of danger, half the workers being armed with swords, spears and bows to protect the others, and every workman was a soldier (Ne 4:13,16-21). The rebuilding took 52 days, but could not have been done at all had not much of the material lain to hand in the piles of ruined masonry. Doubtless the haste and limited resources resulted in a wall far weaker than that Nebuchadnezzar destroyed 142 years previously, but it followed the same outline and had the same general structure.

24. Bagohi Governor:

For the next 100 years we have scarcely any historical knowledge of Jerusalem. A glimpse is afforded by the papyri of Elephantine where we read of a Jewish community in Upper Egypt petitioning Bagohi, the governor of Judea, for permission to rebuild their own temple to Yahweh in Egypt; incidentally they mention that they had already sent an unsuccessful petition to Johanan the high priest and his colleagues in Jerusalem. In another document we gather that this petition to the Persian governor was granted. These documents must date about 411-407 BC. Later, probably about 350, we have somewhat ambiguous references to the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of numbers of Jews in the time of Artaxerxes (III) Ochus (358-337 BC).

With the battle of Issus and Alexander's Palestinian campaign (circa 332 BC), we are upon surer historical ground, though the details of the account (Ant., XI, viii, 4) of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem itself are considered of doubtful authenticity.

25. Alexander the Great:

After his death (323 BC), Palestine suffered much from its position, between the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Seleucids of Antioch. Each became in turn its suzerain, and indeed at one time the tribute appears to have been divided between them (Ant., XII, iv, 1).

26. The Ptolemaic Rule:

In 321 Ptolemy Soter invaded Palestine, and, it is said (Ant., XII, i, 1), captured Jerusalem by a ruse, entering the city on the Sabbath as if anxious to offer sacrifice. He carried away many of his Jewish prisoners to Egypt and settled them there. In the struggles between the contending monarchies, although Palestine suffered, the capital itself, on account of its isolated position, remained undisturbed, under the suzerainty of Egypt. In 217 BC, Ptolemy (IV) Philopator, after his victory over Antiochus III at Raphia, visited the temple at Jerusalem and offered sacrifices; he is reported (3 Macc 1) to have entered the "Holy of Holies." The comparative prosperity of the city during the Egyptian domination is witnessed to by Hecataeus of Abdera, who is quoted by Jos; he even puts the population of the city at 120,000, which is probably an exaggeration.

27. Antiochus the Great:

At length in 198, Antiochus the Great having conquered Coele-Syria in the epoch-making battle at Banias, the Jews of their own accord went over to him and supplied his army with plentiful provisions; they assisted him in besieging the Egyptian garrison in the AKRA (which see) (Ant., XII, iii, 3). Josephus produces letters in which Antiochus records his gratification at the reception given him by the Jews and grants them various privileges (same place) . We have an account of the prosperity of the city about this time (190-180 BC) by Jesus ben Sira in the Book of Ecclus; it is a city of crowded life and manifold activities. He refers in glowing terms to the great high priest, Simon ben Onias (226-199 BC),

who (Ecclesiasticus 50:1-4) had repaired and fortified the temple and strengthened the walls against a siege. The letter of Aristeas, dated probably at the close of this great man's life (circa 200 BC), gives a similar picture. It is here stated that the compass of the city was 40 stadia. The very considerable prosperity and religious liberty which the Jews had enjoyed under the Egyptians were soon menaced under the new ruler; the taxes were increased, and very soon fidelity to the tenets of Judaism came to be regarded as treachery to the Seleucid rule.

28. Hellenization of the City under Antiochus Epiphanes:

Under Antiochus Epiphanes the Hellenization of the nation grew apace (2 Macc 4:9-12; Ant, XII, v, 1); at the request of the Hellenizing party a "place of exercise" was erected in Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:14; 2 Macc 4:7 f). The Gymnasium was built and was soon thronged by young priests; the Greek hat—the petasos—became the fashionable headdress in Jerusalem. The Hellenistic party, which was composed of the aristocracy, was so loud in its professed devotion to the king's wishes that it is not to be wondered at that Antiochus, who, on a visit to the city, had been received with rapturous greetings, came to think that the poor and pious who resisted him from religious motives were largely infected with leanings toward his enemies in Egypt. The actual open rupture began when tidings reached Antiochus, after a victorious though politically barren campaign in Egypt, that Jerusalem had risen in his rear on behalf of the house of Ptolemy. Jason, the renegade high priest, who had been hiding across the Jordan, had, on the false report of the death of Antiochus, suddenly returned and re-possessed himself of the city. Only the Akra remained to Syria, and this was crowded with Menelaus and those of his followers who had escaped the sword of Jason.

29. Capture of the City (170 BC):

Antiochus lost no time; he hastened (170 BC) against Jerusalem with a great army, captured the city, massacred the people and despoiled the temple (1 Macc 1:20-24; Ant, XII, v, 3). Two years later Antiochus, balked by Rome in Egypt (Polyb. xxix. 27; Livy xlv. 12), appears to have determined that in Jerusalem, at any rate, he would have no sympathizers with Egypt.

30. Capture of 168 BC:

He sent his chief collector of tribute (1 Macc 1:29), who attacked the city with strong force and, by means of stratagem, entered it (1 Macc 1:30). After he had despoiled it, he set it on fire and pulled down both dwellings and walls. He massacred the men, and many of the women and children he sold as slaves (1 Macc 1:31-35; 2 Macc 5:24).

31. Attempted Suppression of Judaism:

He sacrificed swine (or at least a sow) upon the holy altar, and caused the high priest himself—a Greek in all his sympathies—to partake of the impure sacrificial feasts; he tried by barbarous cruelties to suppress the ritual of circumcision (Ant., XII, v, 4). In everything he endeavored, in conjunction with the

strong Hellenizing party, to organize Jerusalem as a Greek city, and to secure his position he built a strong wall, and a great tower for the Akra, and, having furnished it well with armor and victuals, he left a strong garrison (1 Macc 1:33-35). But the Syrians had overreached themselves this time, and the reaction against persecution and attempted religious suppression produced the great uprising of the Maccabeans.

32. The Maccabean Rebellion:

The defeat and retirement of the Syrian commander Lysias, followed by the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, led to an entire reversal of policy on the part of the Council of the boy-king, Antiochus V. A general amnesty was granted, with leave to restore the temple-worship in its ancestral forms. The following year (165 BC) Judas Maccabeus found "the sanctuary desolate, and the altar profaned, the gates burned up, and shrubs growing in the courts as in a forest . . . . and the priests' chambers pulled down" (1 Macc 4:38).

33. The Dedication of the Temple (165 BC):

He at once saw to the reconstruction of the altar and restored the temple-services, an event celebrated ever after as the "Feast of the Dedication," or chanukkah (1 Macc 4:52-59; 2 Macc 10:1-11; Ant, XII, vii, 7; compare Joh 10:22). Judas also "builded up Mt. Zion," i.e. the temple-hill, making it a fortress with "high walls and strong towers round about," and set a garrison in it (1 Macc 4:41-61).

34. Defeat of Judas and Capture of the City:

The Hellenizing party suffered in the reaction, and the Syrian garrison in the Akra, Syria's one hold on Judea, was closely invested, but though Judas had defeated three Syrian armies in the open, he could not expel this garrison. In 163 BC a great Syrian army, with a camel corps and many elephants, came to the relief of the hard-pressed garrison. Lysias, accompanied by the boy-king himself (Antiochus V), approached the city from the South via BETH-ZUR (which see). At Beth-zachariah the Jews were defeated, and Judas' brother Eleazar was slain, and Jerusalem was soon captured. The fort on Mt. Zion which surrounded the sanctuary was surrendered by treaty, but when the king saw its strength he broke his oath and destroyed the fortifications (1 Macc 6:62). But even in this desperate state Judas and his followers were saved. A certain pretender, Philip, raised a rebellion in a distant part of the empire, and Lysias was obliged to patch up a truce with the nationalist Jews more favorable to Judas than before his defeat; the garrison in the Akra remained, however, to remind the Jews that they were not independent. In 161 BC another Syrian general, Nicanor, was sent against Judas, but he was at first won over to friendship and when, later, at the instigation of the Hellenistic party, he was compelled to attack Judas, he did so with hastily raised levies and was defeated at Adasa, a little North of Jerusalem. Judas was, however, not long suffered to celebrate his triumph. A month later Bacchides appeared before Jerusalem, and in April, 161, Judas was slain in battle with him at Berea.

35. His Death (161 BC):

Both the city and the land were re-garrisoned by Syrians; nevertheless, by 152, Jonathan, Judas' brother, who was residing at Michmash, was virtual ruler of the land, and by astute negotiation between Demetrius and Alexander, the rival claimants to the throne of Antioch, Jonathan gained more than any of his family had ever done. He was appointed high priest and strategos, or deputy for the king, in Judea. He repaired the city and restored the temple-fortress with squared stones (1 Macc 10:10-11).

36. Jonathan's Restorations:

He made the walls higher and built up a great part of the eastern wall which had been destroyed and "repaired which was called Caphenatha" (1 Macc 12:36-37; Ant, XIII, v, ii); he also made a great mound between the Akra and the city to isolate the Syrian garrison (same place) .

37. Surrender of City to Antiochus Sidetes (134 BC):

Simon, who succeeded Jonathan, finally captured the Akra in 139, and, according to Josephus (Ant., XIII, vi, 7), not only destroyed it, but partially leveled the very hill on which it stood (see, however, 1 Macc 14:36,37). John Hyrcanus, 5 years later (134 BC), was besieged in Jerusalem by Antiochus Sidetes in the 4th year of his reign; during the siege the Syrian king raised 100 towers each 3 stories high against the northern wall—possibly these may subsequently have been used for the foundations of the second wall. Antiochus was finally bought off by the giving of hostages and by heavy tribute, which Hyrcanus is said to have obtained by opening the sepulcher of David. Nevertheless the king "broke down the fortifications that encompassed the city" (Ant., XIII, viii, 2-4).

38. Hasmonean Buildings:

During the more prosperous days of the Hasmonean rulers, several important buildings were erected. There was a great palace on the western (southwestern) hill overlooking the temple (Ant., XX, viii, 11), and connected with it at one time by means of a bridge across the Tyropeon, and on the northern side of the temple a citadel—which may (see VIII, 7 above) have been the successor of one here in pre-exilic times—known as the Baris; this, later on, Herod enlarged into the Antonia (Ant., XV, xi, 4; BJ, V, v, 8).

39. Rome's Intervention:

In consequence of the quarrel of the later Hasmonean princes, further troubles fell upon the city. In 65 BC, Hyrcanus II, under the instigation of Antipas the Idumean, rebelled against his brother Aristobulus, to whom he had recently surrendered his claim to sovereignty. With the assistance of Aretas, king of the Nabateans, he besieged Aristobulus in the temple. The Roman general Scaurus, however, by order of Pompey, compelled Aretas to retire, and then lent his assistance to Aristobulus, who overcame his brother (Ant., XIV, ii, 1-3). Two years later (63 BC) Pompey, having been met by the ambassadors of both parties, bearing presents, as well as of the Pharisees, came himself to compose the quarrel of the rival factions, and, being shut out of the city, took it by storm.

40. Pompey Takes the City by Storm:

He entered the "Holy of Holies," but left the temple treasures unharmed. The walls of the city were demolished; Hyrcanus II was reinstated high priest, but Aristobulus was carried a prisoner to Rome, and the city became tributary to the Roman Empire (Ant., XIV, iv, 1-4; BJ, I, vii, 1-7). The Syrian proconsul, M. Lucinius Crassus, going upon his expedition against the Parthians in 55 BC, carried off from the temple the money which Pompey had left (Ant., XIV, vii, 1).

41. Julius Caesar Appoints Antipater Procurator (47 BC):

In 47 BC Antipater, who for 10 years had been gaining power as a self-appointed adviser to the weak Hyrcanus, was made a Roman citizen and appointed procurator in return for very material services which he had been able to render to Julius Caesar in Egypt (Ant., XIV, viii, 1, 3, 5); at the same time Caesar granted to Hyrcanus permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem besides other privileges (Ant., XIV, x, 5). Antipater made his eldest son, Phaselus, governor of Jerusalem, and committed Galilee to the care of his able younger son, Herod.

42. Parthian Invasion:

In 40 BC Herod succeeded his father as procurator of Judea by order of the Roman Senate, but the same year the Parthians under Pacorus and Barzapharnes captured and plundered Jerusalem (Ant., XIV, xiii, 3,1) and re-established Antigonus (Jewish Wars, I, xiii, 13). Herod removed his family and treasures to Massada and, having been appointed king of Judea by Antony, returned, after various adventures, in 37 BC. Assisted by Sosius, the Roman proconsul, he took Jerusalem by storm after a 5 months siege; by the promise of liberal reward he restrained the soldiers from sacking the city (Ant., XIV, xvi, 2-3).

43. Reign of Herod the Great (37-4 BC):

During the reign of this great monarch Jerusalem assumed a magnificence surpassing that of all other ages. In 24 BC the king built his vast palace in the upper city on the southwestern hill, near where today are the Turkish barracks and the Armenian Quarter. He rebuilt the fortress to the North of the temple—the ancient Baris—on a great scale with 4 lofty corner towers, and renamed it the Antonia in honor of his patron. He celebrated games in a new theater, and constructed a hippodrome (Jewish Wars, II, iii, 1) or amphitheater (Antiquities, XV, viii, 1).

44. Herod’s Great Buildings:

He must necessarily have strengthened and repaired the walls, but such work was outshone by the 4 great towers which he erected, Hippicus, Pharsel and Mariamne, near the present Jaffa Gate—the foundations of the first two Great are supposed to be incorporated in the present so-called "Tower of David"—and the lofty octagonal tower, Psephinus, farther to the Northwest. The development of Herod’s plans for the reconstruction of the temple was commenced in 19 BC, but they were not

completed till 64 AD (Joh 2:20; Mt 24:1,2; Lu 21:5,6). The sanctuary itself was built by 1,000 specially trained priests within a space of 18 months (11-10 BC). The conception was magnificent, and resulted in a mass of buildings of size and beauty far surpassing anything that had stood there before. Practically all the remains of the foundations of the temple-enclosure now surviving in connection with the Charam belong to this period. In 4 BC—the year of the Nativity—occurred the disturbances following upon the destruction of the Golden Eagle which Herod had erected over the great gate of the temple, and shortly afterward Herod died, having previously shut up many of the leading Jews in the hippodrome with orders that they should be slain when he passed away (Jewish Wars, I, xxxiii, 6). The accession of Archelaus was signalized by Passover riots which ended in the death of 3,000, an after-result of the affair of the Golden Eagle.

45. Herod Archelaus (4 BC-6 AD):

Thinking that order had been restored, Archelaus set out for Rome to have his title confirmed. During his absence Sabinus, the Roman procurator, by mismanagement and greed, raised the city about his ears, and the next Passover was celebrated by a massacre, street fighting and open robbery. Varus, the governor of Syria, who had hastened to the help of his subordinate, suppressed the rebellion with ruthless severity and crucified 2,000 Jews. Archelaus returned shortly afterward as ethnarch, an office which he retained until his exile in 6 AD. During the procuratorship of Coponius (6-10 AD) another Passover riot occurred in consequence of the aggravating conduct of some Samaritans.

46. Pontius Pilate:

During the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate (26-37 AD) there were several disturbances, culminating in a riot consequent upon his taking some of the "corban" or sacred offerings of the temple for the construction of an aqueduct (Ant., XVIII, iii, 2)—probably part at least of the "lowlevel aqueduct" (see VII, 15, above). Herod Agrippa I enclosed the suburbs, which had grown up North of the second wall and of the temple, by what Josephus calls the "Third Wall" (see V, above).

47. King Agrippa:

His son, King Agrippa, built—about 56 AD—a large addition to the old Hasmonean palace, from which he could overlook the temple area. This act was a cause of offense to the Jews who built a wall on the western boundary of the Inner Court to shut off his view. In the quarrel which ensued the Jews were successful in gaining the support of Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 11). In 64 AD the long rebuilding of the temple-courts, which had been begun in 19 BC, was concluded. The 18,000 workmen thrown out of employment appear to have been given "unemployed work" in "paving the city with white stone" (Ant., XX, ix, 6-7).

48. Rising against Florus and Defeat of Gallus:

Finally the long-smoldering discontent of the Jews against the Romans burst forth into open rebellion

under the criminal incompetence of Gessius Florus, 66 AD (Ant., XX, xi, 1). Palaces and public buildings were fired by the angered multitude, and after but two days' siege, the Antonia itself was captured, set on fire and its garrison slain (Jewish Wars, II, xvii, 6-7). Cestius Gallus, hastening from Syria, was soon engaged in a siege of the city. The third wall was captured and the suburb BEZETHA (which see) burnt, but, when about to renew the attack upon the second wall, Gallus appears to have been seized with panic, and his partial withdrawal developed into an inglorious retreat in which he was pursued by the Jews down the pass to the Beth-horons as far as Antipatris (Jewish Wars, II, xix).

49. The City Besieged by Titus (70 AD):

This victory cost the Jews dearly in the long run, as it led to the campaign of Vespasian and the eventual crushing of all their national hopes. Vespasian commenced the conquest in the north, and advanced by slow and certain steps. Being recalled to Rome as emperor in the midst of the war, the work of besieging and capturing the city itself fell to his son Titus. None of the many calamities which had happened to the city are to be compared with this terrible siege. In none had the city been so magnificent, its fortifications so powerful, its population so crowded. It was Passover time, but, in addition to the crowds assembled for this event, vast numbers had hurried there, flying from the advancing Roman army. The loss of life was enormous; refugees to Titus gave 600,000 as the number dead (Jewish Wars, V, xiii, 7), but this seems incredible. The total population today within the walls cannot be more than 20,000, and the total population of modern Jerusalem, which covers a far greater area than that of those days, cannot at the most liberal estimate exceed 80,000. Three times this, or, say, a quarter of a million, seems to be the utmost that is credible, and many would place the numbers at far less.

50. Party Divisions within the Besieged Walls:

The siege commenced on the 14th of Nisan, 70 AD, and ended on the 8th of Elul, a total of 134 days. The city was distracted by internal feuds. Simon held the upper and lower cities; John of Gischala, the temple and "Ophel"; the Idumeans, introduced by the Zealots, fought only Walls for themselves, until they relieved the city of their terrors. Yet another party, too weak to make its counsels felt, was for peace with Rome, a policy which, if taken in time, would have found in Titus a spirit of reason and mercy. The miseries of the siege and the destruction of life and property were at least as much the work of the Jews themselves as of their conquerors. On the 15th day of the siege the third wall (Agrippa's), which had been but hastily finished upon the approach of the Romans, was captured; the second wall was finally taken on the 24th day; on the 72nd day the Antonia fell, and 12 days later the daily sacrifice ceased. On the 105th day—the ominous 9th of Ab—the temple and the lower city were burnt, and the last day found the whole city in flames.

51. Capture and Utter Destruction of the City:

Only the three great towers of Herod, Hippicus, Pharsel and Mariamne, with the western walls, were spared to protect the camp of the Xth Legion which was left to guard the site, and "in order to demonstrate to posterity what kind of city it was and how well fortified"; the rest of the city was dug up

to its foundations (Jewish Wars, VII, i, 1).

52. Rebellion of Bar-Cochba:

For 60 years after its capture silence reigns over Jerusalem. We know that the site continued to be garrisoned, but it was not to any extent rebuilt. In 130 AD it was visited by Hadrian, who found but few buildings standing. Two years later (132-35 AD) occurred the last great rebellion of the Jews in the uprising of Bar-Cocha ("son of a star"), who was encouraged by the rabbi Akiba. With the suppression of this last effort for freedom by Julius Severus, the remaining traces of Judaism were stamped out, and it is even said (the Jerusalem Talmud, Ta'anith 4) that the very site of the temple was plowed up by T. Annius Rufus; An altar of Jupiter was placed upon the temple-site, and Jews were excluded from Jerusalem on pain of death.

53. Hadrian Builds AElia Capitolina:

In 138 Hadrian rebuilt the city, giving it the name AElia Capitolina. The line of the Southern wall of AElia was probably determined by the southern fortification of the great Roman legionary camp on the western (southwestern) hill, and it is probable that it was the general line of the existing southern wall. At any rate, we know that the area occupied by the coenaculum and the traditional "Tomb of David" was outside the walls in the 4th century. An equestrian statue of Hadrian was placed on the site of the "Holy of Holies" (Jerome, Commentary on Isa 2:8; Mt 24:15). An inscription now existing in the southern wall of the temple-area, in which occurs the name of Hadrian, may have belonged to this monument, while a stone head, discovered in the neighborhood of Jerusalem some 40 years ago, may have belonged to the statue. Either Hadrian himself, or one of the Antonine emperors, erected a temple of Venus on the northwestern hill, where subsequently was built the Church of the Holy Sepulchre (Euseb., Life of Constantine, III, 36). The habit of pilgrimage to the holy sites, which appears to have had its roots far back in the 2nd century (see Turner, Journal of Theological Studies, I, 551, quoted by Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 75-76), seems to have increasingly flourished in the next two centuries; beyond this we know little of the city.

54. Constantine Builds the Church of the Anastasis:

In 333 AD, by order of Constantine, the new church of the Anastasis, marking the supposed site of the Holy Sepulchre, was begun. The traditions regarding this site and the Holy Cross alleged to have been found there, are recorded some time after the events and are of doubtful veracity. The building must have been magnificent, and covered a considerably larger area than that of the existing church. In 362 Julian is said to have attempted to rebuild the temple, but the work was interrupted by an explosion. The story is doubtful.

At some uncertain date before 450 the coenaculum and "Church of the Holy Zion" were incorporated within the walls. This is the condition depicted in the Madeba Mosaic and also that described by Eucherius who, writing between 345-50 AD, states that the circuit of the walls "now receives within

itself Mt. Zion, which was once outside, and which, lying on the southern side, overhangs the city like a citadel." It is possible this was the work of the emperor Valentinian who is known to have done some reconstruction of the walls.

55. The Empress Eudoxia Rebuilds the Walls:

In 450 the empress Eudoxia, the widow of Theodosius II, took up her residence in Jerusalem and rebuilt the walls upon their ancient lines, bringing the whole of the southwestern hill, as well as the Pool of Siloam, within the circuit (Evagarius, Hist. Eccles., I, 22). At any rate, this inclusion of the pool existed in the walls described by Antoninus Martyr in 560 AD, and it is confirmed by Bliss's work (see above VI, 4). She also built the church of Stephen, that at the Pool of Siloam and others.

56. Justinian:

The emperor Justinian, who was perhaps the greatest of the Christian builders, erected the great Church of Mary, the remains of which are now considered by some authorities to be incorporated in the el Aqsa Mosque; he built also a "Church of Sophia" in the "Pretorian," i.e. on the site of the Antonia (see, however, PRAETORIUM), and a hospital to the West of the temple. The site of the temple itself appears to have remained in ruins down to the 7th century.

57. Chosroes II Captures the City:

In 614 Palestine was conquered by the Persian Chosroes II, and the Jerusalem churches, including that of the Holy Sepulchre, were destroyed, an event which did much to prepare the way for the Moslem architects of half a century later, who freely used the columns of these ruined churches in the building of the "Dome of the Rock."

58. Heracleus Enters It in Triumph:

In 629 Heracleus, having meanwhile made peace with the successor of Chosroes II, reached Jerusalem in triumph, bearing back the captured fragment of the cross. He entered the city through the "Golden Gate," which indeed is believed by many to have reached its present form through his restorations. The triumph of Christendom was but short. Seven years earlier had occurred the historic flight of Mohammed from Mecca (the Hegira), and in 637 the victorious followers of the Prophet appeared in the Holy City. After a short siege, it capitulated, but the khalif Omar treated the Christians with generous mercy.

59. Clemency of Omar:

The Christian sites were spared, but upon the temple-site, which up to this had apparently been occupied by no important Christian building but was of peculiar sanctity to the Moslems through Mohammed's alleged visions there, a wooden mosque was erected, capable of accommodating 3,000 worshippers.

This was replaced in 691 AD by the magnificent Kubbet es Sakah], or "Dome of the Rock," built by ‘Abd’ul Malek, the 10th khalif. For some centuries the relations of the Christians and Moslems appear to have been friendly: the historian el Muqaddasi, writing in 985, describes the Christians and Jews as having the upper hand in Jerusalem. In 969 Palestine passed into the power of the Egyptian dynasty, and in 1010 her ruler, the mad Hakim, burnt many of the churches, which, however, were restored in a poor way.

60. The Seljuk Turks and Their Cruelties:

In 1077 Isar el Atsis, a leader of the Seljuk Turks conquered Palestine from the North, drove out the Egyptians and massacred 3,000 of the inhabitants of Jerusalem. The cruelty of the Turks—in contrast, be it noted, with the conduct of the Arab Moslems—was the immediate cause of the Crusades. In 1098 the city was retaken by the Egyptian Arabs, and the following year was again captured after a 40 days’ seige by the soldiers of the First Crusade, and Godfrey de Bouillon became the first king. Great building activity marked the next 80 peaceful years of Latin rule: numbers of churches were built, but, until toward the end of this period, the walls were neglected.

61. Crusaders Capture the City in 1099:

In 1177 they were repaired, but 10 years later failed to resist the arms of the victorious Saladin. The city surrendered, but City the inhabitants were spared. In 1192 Saladin repaired the walls, but in 1219 they were dismantled by orders of the sultan of Damascus. In 1229 the emperor Frederick II of Germany obtained the Holy City by treaty, on condition that he did not restore the fortifications, a stipulation which, being broken by the inhabitants 10 years later, brought down upon them the vengeance of the emir of Kerak. Nevertheless, in 1243 the city was again restored to the Christians unconditionally.

62. The Kharizimians:

The following year, however, the Kharizimian Tartars—a wild, savage horde from Central Asia—burst into Palestine, carrying destruction before them; they seized Jerusalem, massacred the people, and rifled the tombs of the Latin kings. Three years later they were ejected from Palestine by the Egyptians who in their turn retained it until, in 1517, they were conquered by the Ottoman Turks, who still hold it. The greatest of their sultans, Suleiman the Magnificent, built the present walls in 1542.

63. Ottoman Turks Obtain the City (1517 AD):

In 1832 Mohammed Ali with his Egyptian forces came and captured the city, but 2 years later the fellahin rose against his rule and for a time actually gained possession of the city, except the citadel, making their entrance through the main drain. The besieged citadel was relieved by the arrival of Ibrahim Pasha from Egypt with reinforcements. The city and land were restored to the Ottoman Turks by the Great Powers in 1840.

X. Modern Jerusalem.

1. Jews and "Zionism":

The modern city of Jerusalem has about 75,000 inhabitants, of whom over two-thirds are Jews. Until about 50 years ago the city was confined within its 16th-century walls, the doors of its gates locked every night, and even here there were considerable areas unoccupied. Since then, and particularly during the last 25 years, there has been a rapid growth of suburbs to the North, Northwest, and West of the old city. This has been largely due to the steady stream of immigrant Jews from every part of the world, particularly from Russia, Romania, Yemin, Persia, Bokhara, the Caucasus, and from all parts of the Turkish empire. This influx of Jews, a large proportion of whom are extremely poor, has led to settlements or "colonies" of various classes of Jews being erected all over the plateau to the North—an area never built upon before—but also on other sides of the city. With the exception of the Bokhara Colony, which has some fine buildings and occupies a lofty and salubrious situation, most of the settlements are mean cottages or ugly almshouses. With the exception of a couple of hospitals, there is no Jewish public building of any architectural pretensions. The "Zionist" movement, which has drawn so many Jews to Jerusalem, cannot be called a success, as far as this city is concerned, as the settlers and their children as a rule either steadily deteriorate physically and morally—from constant attacks of malaria, combined with pauperism and want of work—or, in the case of the energetic and enlightened, they emigrate—to America especially; this emigration has been much stimulated of late by the new law whereby Jews and Christians must now, like Moslems, do military service.

The foreign Christian population represents all nations and all sects; the Roman church is rapidly surpassing all other sects or religions in the importance of their buildings. The Russians are well represented by their extensive enclosure, which includes a large cathedral, a hospital, extensive hospice in several blocks, and a handsome residence for the consul-general, and by the churches and other buildings on the Mount of Olives. The Germans have a successful colony belonging to the "Temple" sect to the West of Jerusalem near the railway station, and are worthily represented by several handsome buildings, e.g. the Protestant "Church of the Redeemer," built on the site and on the ground plan of a fine church belonging to the Knights of John, the new (Roman Catholic) Church of the Dormition on "Mount Zion," with an adjoining Benedictine convent, a very handsome Roman Catholic hospice outside the Damascus Gate, the Kaiserin Augusta Victoria Sanatorium on the Mount of Olives, and a Protestant Johanniter Hospice in the city, a large general hospital and a leper hospital, a consulate and two large schools. In influence, both secular and religious, the Germans have rapidly gained ground in the last 2 decades. British influence has much diminished, relatively.

2. Christian Buildings and Institutions:

The British Ophthalmic Hospital, belonging to the "Order of the Knights of John," the English Mission Hospital, belonging to the London Jews Society, the Bishop Gobat’s School and English College connected with the Church Missionary Society, 3 Anglican churches, of which the handsome George’s Collegiate Church adjoins the residence of the Anglican bishop, and a few small schools comprise the

extent of public buildings connected with British societies. France and the Roman Catholic church are worthily represented by the Dominican monastery and seminary connected with the handsome church of Stephen—rebuilt on the plan of an old Christian church—by the Ratisbon (Jesuit) Schools, the Hospital of Louis, the hospice and Church of Augustine, and the monastery and seminary of the "white fathers" or Freres de la mission algerienne, whose headquarters center round the beautifully restored Church of Anne. Not far from here are the convent and school of the Saeurs de Sion, at the Ecce Homo Church. Also inside the walls near the New Gate is the residence of the Latin Patriarch—a cardinal of the Church of Rome—with a church, the school of the Freres de la doctrine chretienne, and the schools, hospital and convent of the Franciscans, who are recognized among their co-religionists as the "parish priests" in the city, having been established there longer than the numerous other orders.

All the various nationalities are under their respective consuls and enjoy extra-territorial rights. Besides the Turkish post-office, which is very inefficiently managed, the Austrians, Germans, French, Russians and Italians all have post-offices open to all, with special "Levant" stamps. The American mail is delivered at the French post-office. There are four chief banks, French, German, Ottoman and Anglo-Palestinian (Jewish). As may be supposed, on account of the demand for land for Jewish settlements or for Christian schools or convents, the price of such property has risen enormously. Unfortunately in recent years all owners of land—and Moslems have not been slow to copy the foreigners—have taken to enclosing their property with high and unsightly walls, greatly spoiling both the walks around the city and the prospects from many points of view. The increased development of carriage traffic has led to considerable dust in the dry season, and mud in winter, as the roads are metaled with very soft limestone. The Jerus-Jaffa Railway (a French company), 54 miles long, which was opened in 1892, has steadily increased its traffic year by year, and is now a very paying concern. There is no real municipal water-supply, and no public sewers for the new suburbs—though the old city is drained by a leaking, ill-constructed medieval sewer, which opens just below the Jewish settlement in the Kidron and runs down the Wady en Nauru. A water-supply, new Sewers, electric trams and electric lights for the streets, are all much-talked-of improvements. There are numerous hotels, besides extensive accommodations in the religious hospices, and no less than 15 hospitals and asylums.

LITERATURE.

This is enormous, but of very unequal value and much of it out of date. For all purposes the best book of reference is Jerusalem from the Earliest Times to AD 70, 2 volumes, by Principal G.A. Smith. It contains references to all the literature. To this book and to its author it is impossible for the present writer adequately to express his indebtedness, and no attempt at acknowledgment in detail has been made in this article. In supplement of the above, Jerusalem, by Dr. Selah Merrill, and Jerusalem in Bible Times, by Professor Lewis B. Paton, will be found useful. The latter is a condensed account, especially valuable for its illustrations and its copious references. Of the articles in the recent Bible Dictionaries on Jerusalem, that by Conder in HDB is perhaps the most valuable. Of guide-books, Baedeker’s Guide to Palestine and Syria (1911), by Socin and Benzinger, and Barnabe Meistermann’s (R.C.) New Guide to the Holy Land (1909), will be found useful; also Hanauer’s Walks about Jerusalem.

On Geology, Climate and Water-Supply:

Hull’s "Memoir on Physical Geography and Geology of Arabian Petrea, Palestine, and Adjoining Districts," PEF; and Blankenhorn," Geology of the Nearer Environs of Jerusalem," ZDPV, 1905; Chaplin, "Climate of Jerusalem," PEFS, 1883; Glaisher, "Meteorol. Observations in Palestine," special pamphlet of the Palestine Exploration Fund; Hilderscheid, "Die Niederschlagsverhaltnisse Palestine in alter u. neuer Zeit," ZDPV (1902); Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation (1911); Andrew Watt, "Climate in Hebron," etc., Journal of the Scottish Meteorological Society (1900-11); Schick, "Die Wasserversorgung der Stadt Jerusalem," ZDPV, 1878; Wilson "Water Supply of Jerusalem," Proceedings of the Victoria Institute, 1906; Masterman, in Biblical World, 1905.

On Archaeology and Topography:

PEF, volume on Jerusalem, with accompanying maps and plans; Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches, I, 1899 (PEF); William, Holy City (1849); Robinson, Biblical Researches (1856); Wilson, Recovery of Jerusalem (1871); Warren Underground Jerusalem (1876); Vincent, Underground Jerusalem (1911); Guthe, "Ausgrabungen in Jerusalem," ZDPV, V; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations in Jerusalem (1894-97); Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels (1903); Mitchell, "The Wall of Jerusalem according to the Book of Neh," JBL (1903); Wilson, Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre (1906); Kuemmel, Materialien z. Topographie des alten Jerusalem; also numerous reports in the PEFS; Zeitschrift des deutschen Palestine Vereins; and the Revue biblique.

On History:

Besides Bible, Apocrypha, works of Josephus, and History of Tacitus: Besant and Palmer, History of Jerusalem; Conder, Judas Maccabeus and Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems (1890); C.F. Kent, Biblical Geography and History (1911). Bevan, Jerusalem under the High-Priests; Watson, The Story of Jerusalem.

E. W. G. Masterman

JERUSALEM, NEW

(Hierousalem kaine): This name occurs in Re 21:2 (21:10, "holy city"). The conception is based on prophecies which predict a glorious future to Jerusalem after the judgment (Isa 52:1). In Revelation, however, it is not descriptive of any actual locality on earth, but allegorically depicts the final state of the church ("the bride," "the wife of the Lamb," Re 21:2,9), when the new heaven and the new earth shall have come into being. The picture is drawn from a twofold point of view: the new Jerusalem is a restoration of Paradise (Re 21:6; 22:1,2,14); it is also the ideal of theocracy realized (Re 21:3,12,14,22). The latter viewpoint explains the peculiar representation that the city descends "out of heaven from God" (Re 21:2,10), which characterizes it as, on the one hand, a product of God’s supernatural workmanship, and as, on the other hand, the culmination of the historic process of redemption. In other New Testament passages, where theocratic point of view is less prominent, the antitypical Jerusalem

appears as having its seat in heaven instead of, as here, coming down from heaven to earth (compare Ga 4:26; Heb 11:10; 12:22).

See also REVELATION OF JOHN.

Geerhardus Vos

JERUSHA

je-roo’-sha (yerusha’," taken possession of," i.e. "married"): In 2Ki 15:33 =" Jerushah" (yerushah, same meaning) of 2Ch 27:1, the mother of King Jotham of Judah. Zadok was her father’s name; he may be the priest of 1Ch 6:12 (Hebrew 5:38).

JESHAIAH

je-sha’-ya, je-shi’-a

(a) yesha‘yahu;

(b) yesha‘yah, "deliverance of Yah"; (2) (3) below have form (a), the others form (b):

(1) Son of Hananiah, and grandson of Zerubbabel, according to 1Ch 3:21, the King James Version "Jesaiah."

But commentators follow Hebrew (and the Revised Version margin) in the first part of the verse, and Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac in the second part, thus reading, "And the son of Hananiah (was) Pelatiah, and Jeshaiah (was) his son, and Arnan his son," etc., thus making Jeshaiah a grandson of Hananiah.

(2) A "son" of Jeduthun, and like him a temple musician; head of the family of that name (1Ch 25:3,15).

(3) A Levite, ancestor of Shelemoth, one of David’s treasurers (1Ch 26:25).

(4) A descendant of Elam; he went with Ezra from Babylon to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:7) =" Jesias" (Revised Version), "Josias" (the King James Version), 1 Esdras 8:33.

(5) A descendant of Merari and a contemporary of Ezra (Ezr 8:19) =" Osaias" of 1 Esdras 8:48.

(6) A Benjamite (Ne 11:7), the King James Version "Jesaiah."

David Francis Roberts

JESHANAH

jesh’-a-na, je-sha’-na (yeshanah): A town named with Bethel and Ephron among the places taken by Abijah from Jeroboam (2Ch 13:19). Most scholars are agreed that the same name should be read instead of ha-shen, in 1Sa 7:12. It is probably identical with the Isanas, of Josephus (Ant., XIV, xv, 12). It is represented by the modern ‘Ain Sinia, 3 1/4 miles North of Bethel, with a spring and interesting ancient remains.

JESHARELAH

jesh-a-re’-la (yesar’elah, meaning doubtful): One of the (or probably a family of) Levitical musicians (1Ch 25:14), called "Asharelah" in verse 2. The names should be written "Asarelah" and "Jesarelah."

JESHEBEAB

je-sheb’-e-ab (yeshebh’abh, meaning uncertain): A Levite of the 14th course (1Ch 24:13). Kittel and Gray (HPN, 24) read with Septuagint, A, "Ishbaal"; the name is omitted in Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus) and the change in Massoretic Text as well as the omission in Septuagint may be due to the word ba‘al forming part of the name. Compare JERUBBESHETH.

JESHER

je’-sher (yesher, or yesher, "uprightness"): A son of Caleb (1Ch 2:18).

JESHIMON

je-she’-mon, jesh’-i-mon (ha-yeshimon, "the desert," and in the Revised Version (British and American) so translated but in the King James Version, Nu 21:20; 23:28; 1Sa 23:19,24; 26:1,3, "Jeshimon" as a place-name. In Numbers, the Septuagint reads he eremos, "the desert"; in 1 Samuel, the Septuagint reads Iessaimon): In these passages probably two districts are referred to:

(1) The "desert" North of the Dead Sea, which was overlooked from Pisgah (Nu 21:20; 23:28). This is the bare and sterile land, saturated with salt, lying on each side of the Jordan North of the Dead Sea, where for miles practically no vegetable life can exist.

(2) The sterile plateau West of the steep cliffs bordering the western shores of the Dead Sea. Here between the lower slopes of the Judean hills, where thousands of Bedouin live and herd their flocks, and the more fertile borders of the sea with their oases (‘Ain Feshkhah, ‘Ain Jidy, etc.), is a broad strip of utterly waterless land, the soft chalky hills of which are, for all but a few short weeks, destitute of practically any vegetation. The Hill of Hachilah was on the edge of this desert (1Sa 23:19; 26:1,3), and the Arabah was to its south (1Sa 23:24). It is possible that the references in Numbers may also apply to

this region.

The word "Jeshimon" (yeshimon) is often used as a common noun in referring to the desert of Sinai (De 32:10; Ps 78:40; 106:14; Isa 43:19, etc.), and except in the first two of these references, when we have "wilderness," it is always translated "desert." Although used in 7 passages in poetical parallelism to midhbar, translated "wilderness," it really means a much more hopeless place; in a midhbar animals can be pastured, but a yeshimon is a desolate waste.

E. W. G. Masterman

JESHISHAI

je-shish'-a-i (yeshishay, "aged"): A Gadite chief (and family?) (1Ch 5:14).

JESHOHAIAH

jesh-o-ha'-ya, jesh-o-hi'-a (yeshochayah, meaning unknown): A prince in Simeon (1Ch 4:36).

JESHUA

jesh'-u-a, je-shu'-a (yeshua'): A place occupied by the children of Judah after their return from captivity (Ne 11:26), evidently, from the places named with it, in the extreme South of Judah. It may correspond with the Shema of Jos 15:26, and possibly to the Sheba of 19:2. The site may be Khirbet Sa'weh, a ruin upon a prominent hill, Tell es Sa'weh, 12 miles East-Northeast of Beersheba. The hill is surrounded by a wall of large blocks of stone. PEF, III, 409-10, Sh XXV.

JESHUA; JESHUAH

jesh'-u-a, je-shu'-a (yeshua', "Yahweh is deliverance" or "opulence"; compare JOSHUA):

(1) the King James Version "Jeshuah," head of the 9th course of priests, and possibly of "the house of Jeshua" (1Ch 24:11; Ezr 2:36; Ne 7:39).

(2) A Levite of Hezekiah's time (2Ch 31:15).

(3) Son of Jozadak = Joshua the high priest (Ezr 2:2; 3:2,8; 4:3; 5:2; 10:18; Ne 7:7; 12:1,7,10,26); see JOSHUA (4) =" Jesus" (1 Esdras 5:48 and Sirach 49:12).

(4) A man of Pahath-moab, some of whose descendants returned from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:6; Ne 7:11) =" Jesus" (1 Esdras 58).

(5) Head of a Levitical house which had oversight of the workmen in the temple (Ezr 2:40; 3:9; Ne 7:43). He is mentioned again in Ne 8:7 as taking part in explaining the Torah to the people, in Ne 9:4 f (compare 12:8) as leading in the worship, and in 10:9 (Hebrew 10) as sealing the covenant; this Jeshua is called son of Azaniah (Ne 10:9). To these references should be added probably Ne 12:24, where commentators read, "Jeshua, Binnui, Kadmiel" for "Jeshua the son of Kadmiel." Perhaps Jozabad (Ezr 8:33) is a "son" of this same Jeshua; compare Ezr 8:33 = 1 Esdras 8:63, where the King James Version is "Jesu," the Revised Version (British and American) "Jesus." He is the same as Jessue (the King James Version), Jesus (Revised Version) (1 Esdras 5:26).

(6) Father of Ezer, a repairer of the wall (Ne 3:19).

(7) JOSHUA, son of Nun (Ne 8:17) (which see).

David Francis Roberts

JESHURUN

je-shu’-run, jesh’-u-run (yeshurun, "upright one," De 32:15; 33:5,26; Isa 44:2): Septuagint translates it "the beloved one" egapemenos, the perfect participle passive of agapao), and in Isa 44:2 adds "Israel"; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has dilectus in De 32:15, elsewhere rectissimus; Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion have "upright." For the form, Duhm compares zebhulun, Zebulun.

(1) The name used to be explained as a diminutive form, a pet name, and some, e.g. Cornill, Schultz (Old Testament Theology, English translation, II, 29, note 12) still explain it so, "the righteous little people." But there is no evidence that the ending -un had a diminutive force.

(2) Most moderns take it as a poetical or ideal title of Israel, derived from yashar, "upright"; it is held to contain a tacit reference to the word Israel (yisra’el), of which the first three consonants are almost the same as those of "Jeshurun"; in Nu 23:10 the term "the righteous ones" (yesharim) is supposed to contain a similar reference. Most commentators compare also "the Book of Jashar," and it has been held that "Jashar" is similarly a name by which Israel is called.

See JASHAR.

Following Bacher (ZATW, 1885, 161 ff), commentators hold that in Isaiah this new name, a coinage due to the author of Second Isaiah and adopted in Deuteronomy, stands in contrast to Jacob, "the supplanter," as his name was explained by the Hebrews (compare Ho 12:2-4). Israel is here given a new name, "the upright, pious one," and with the new name goes new chance in life, to live up to its meaning. Driver (Deuteronomy, 361) says that in De 32:15 "where the context is of declension from its ideal (it is) applied reproachfully. ‘Nomen Recti pro Israele ponens, ironice eos perstringit qui a rectitudine defecerant’ (Calv.). Elsewhere it is used as a title of honor." the King James Version has "Jesurun" in Isa 44:2.

David Francis Roberts

JESIAH

je-si’-a (1Ch 23:20 the King James Version).

See ISSHIAH.

JESIAS

je-si’-as (Iesias; the King James Version Josias (1 Esdras 8:33)): Corresponding to Jeshaiah, son of Athaliah (Ezr 8:7).

JESIMIEL

je-sim’-i-el (yesimi’el, "God establishes"): A prince of Simeon (1Ch 4:36).

JESSE

jes’-e (yishay, meaning doubtful; according to Gesenius it =" wealthy"; Olshausen, Gram., sections 277 f, conjectures yesh yah, "Yahweh exists"; Wellhausen (1Sa 14:49) explains it as ‘abhishay (see ABISHAI); Iessai; Ru 4:17,22; 1Sa 16; 17; 20; 22; 25:10; 2Sa 20:1; 23:1; 1Ki 12:16; 1Ch 10:14; 12:18; Ps 72:20; Isa 11:1,10 (= Ro 15:12)); Mt 1:5,6; Ac 13:22): Son of Obed, grandson of Boaz, and father of King David. The grouping of the references to Jesse in 1Sa is bound up with that of the grouping of the whole narrative of David and Saul. See SAMUEL, BOOKS OF. There seem to be three main veins in the narrative, so far as Jesse is concerned.

(1) In 1Sa 16:1-13, where Jesse is called the Bethlehemite. Samuel is sent to seek among Jesse’s sons successor to Saul.

Both Samuel and Jesse fail to discern at first Yahweh’s choice, Samuel thinking that it would be the eldest son (1Sa 16:6), while Jesse had not thought it worth while to call the youngest to the feast (1Sa 16:11).

(2) (a) In 1Sa 16:14-23, Saul is mentally disturbed, and is advised to get a harpist. David "the son of Jesse the Bethlehemite" is recommended by a courtier, and Saul sends to Jesse for David.

"And Jesse took ten loaves (so emend and translate, and not as the Revised Version (British and American), "an ass laden with bread"), and a (skin) bottle of wine, and a kid, and sent them" to Saul as a present with David, who becomes a courtier of Saul’s with his father’s consent.

(b) The next mention of Jesse is in three contemptuous references by Saul to David as "the son of Jesse" in 1Sa 20:27,30,31, part of the quarrel-scene between Saul and Jonathan. (But it is not quite certain if 1Sa 20 belongs to the same source as 16:14-23.) In answer to the first reference, Jonathan calls his friend "David," and Saul repeats the phrase "the son of Jesse," abusing Jonathan personally (1Sa 20:30, where the meaning is uncertain). The reference to David as "the son of Jesse" here and in the following verse is contemptuous, not because of any reproach that might attach itself to Jesse, but, as Budde remarks, because "an upstart is always contemptuously referred to under his father's name" in courts and society. History repeats itself!

(c) Further references of a like kind are in the passage, 1Sa 22:6-23, namely, in 22:7,8,13 by Saul, and repeated by Doeg in 22:9.

(d) The final one of this group is in 1Sa 25:10, where Nabal sarcastically asks "Who is David ? and who is the son of Jesse?"

(3) The parts of 1Sa 17-18:5 which are omitted by Septuagint B, i.e. 17:12-31,41,48b, 50,55-18:6a. Here Jesse is mentioned as "an Ephrathite of Beth-lehem-judah" (17:12, not "that" Ephrathite, which is a grammatically impossible translation of the Massoretic Text), Ephrath or Ephrathah being another name for Bethlehem, or rather for the district. He is further said to have eight sons (17:12), of whom the three eldest had followed Saul to the war (17:13).

Jesse sends David, the shepherd, to his brothers with provisions (1Sa 17:17). Afterward David, on being brought to Saul and asked who he is, answers, "I am the son of thy servant Jesse the Bethlehemite" (1Sa 17:58). Jesse is also described (1Sa 17:12) as being "in the days of Saul an old man, advanced in years" (so emend and translate, not as the Revised Version (British and American), "stricken in years among men"). The mention of his having 8 sons in 1Sa 17:12 is not in agreement with 1Ch 2:13-15, which gives only 7 sons with two sisters, but where Syriac gives 8, adding, from 27:18, Elihu which Massoretic Text has there probably by corruption (Curtis, Chronicles, 88). 1Sa 16:10 should be translated" and Jesse made his 7 sons to pass before Samuel" (not as the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version, "seven of his sons"). Budde (Kurz. Hand-Komm., "Samuel," 114) holds 1Sa 16:1-13 to be a late Midrash, and (ibid., 123 f) omits

(a) "that" in 17:12;

(b) also "and he had 8 sons" as due to a wrong inference from 16:10;

(c) the names of the 3 eldest in 17:13;

(d) 17:14b; he then changes 17:15a, and reads thus: (12) "Now David was the son of an Ephrathite of Bethlehem-Judah, whose name was Jesse who was ....(years) old at the time of Saul. (13) And the 3 eldest sons of Jesse had marched with Saul to the war, (14) and David was the youngest, (15) and David

had remained to feed his father’s sheep at Bethlehem. (16) Now the Philistines came," etc.

According to all these narratives in 1 Samuel, whether all 3 be entirely independent of one another or not, Jesse had land in Bethlehem, probably outside the town wall, like Boaz (see BOAZ) his grandfather (Ru 4:17). In 1Sa 22:3,1 David entrusts his father and mother to the care of the king of Moab, but from 20:29 some have inferred that Jesse was dead (although most critics assign 22:3 at any rate to the same stratum as chapter 20).

Jonathan tells Saul that David wanted to attend a family sacrificial feast at Bethlehem (1Sa 20:29). Massoretic Text reads, "And he, my brother, has commanded me," whereas we should probably read with Septuagint, "and my brethren have commanded me," i.e. the members of the clan, as we have farther on in the verse, "Let me get away, I pray thee, and see my brethren." As to Jesse’s daughters, see ABIGAIL; NAHASH.

(4) Of the other references to Jesse, the most noteworthy is that in Isa 11:1: "There shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit," i.e. out of Jesse’s roots (compare Re 5:5). "Why Jesse and not David?" asks Duhm; and he answers, "Because the Messiah will be a second David, rather than a descendant of David." Marti explains it to mean that he will be, not from David, but from a collateral line of descent. Duhm’s explanation suggests a parallelism between David and Christ, of whom the former may be treated as a type similar to Aaron and Melchizedek in He. Saul might pour contempt upon "the son of Jesse," but Isaiah has given Jesse here a name above all Hebrew names, and thus does Providence mock "society."

See also ROOT OF JESSE.

David Francis Roberts

JESTING

jest’-ing: Used from Tyndale down as the translation of eutrapelia (Eph 5:4). Aristotle uses the original in his Ethics iv.14 as an equivalent of "quick-witted," from its root meaning "something easily turned," adding that, since the majority of people love excessive jesting, the word is apt to be degraded. This is the case here, where it clearly has a flavor of the coarse or licentious.

JESUI

jes’-u-i.

See ISHVI.

JESUITES

jes’-u-its.

See ISHVI.

JESURUN

je-su’-run, jes’-u-run.

See JESHURUN.

JESUS

je’-zus (Iesous, for yehoshua‘):

(1) Joshua, son of Nun (the King James Version Ac 7:45; Heb 4:8; compare 1 Macc 2:55; 2 Esdras 7:37).

(2) (3) High priest and Levite.

See JESHUA, 2, 5.

(4) Son of Sirach.

See SIRACH.

(5) An ancestor of Jesus (Lu 3:29, the King James Version "Jose").

(6) (7) See the next three articles.

JESUS CHRIST, 1 OUTLINE

je’-zus krist (Iesous Christos):

I. THE NAMES

II. ORDER OF TREATMENT

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

I. THE SOURCES

1. In General

2. Denial of Existence of Jesus

3. Extra-Christian Notices

4. The Gospels

(1) The Synoptics

(2) The Fourth Gospel

II. THE PREPARATION

1. Both Gentile and Jewish

2. Old Testament Preparation

3. Post-exilic Preparation

III. THE OUTWARD SITUATION

1. The Land

Its Divisions

2. Political Situation

Changes in Territory

3. The Religious Sects

(1) The Scribes

(2) The Pharisees

(3) The Sadducees

(4) The Essenes

IV. THE CHRONOLOGY

1. Date of the Birth of Jesus

2. Date of His Baptism

3. Length of Ministry

4. Date of Christ’s Death

PART II. THE PROBLEMS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

I. THE MIRACLES

1. The "Modern" Attitude

2. Supernatural in the Gospels

II. THE MESSIAHSHIP

1. Reserve of Jesus and Modern Criticism

2. A Growing Revelation

III. KINGDOM AND APOCALYPSE

1. The Kingdom—Present or Future?

2. Apocalyptic Beliefs

IV. THE CHARACTER AND CLAIMS

1. Denial of Christ’s Moral Perfection

2. Sinlessness and the Messianic Claim

PART III. COURSE OF THE EARTHLY LIFE OF JESUS

1. Divisions of the History

2. Not a Complete "Life"

A. FROM THE NATIVITY TO THE BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION

I. THE NATIVITY

1. Hidden Piety in Judaism

2. Birth of the Baptist

3. The Annunciation and Its Results

4. The Birth at Bethlehem

(1) The Census of Quirinius

(2) Jesus Born

5. The Incidents of the Infancy

(1) The Visit of the Shepherds

(2) The Circumcision and Presentation in the Temple

(3) Visit of the Magi

6. Flight to Egypt and Return to Nazareth

7. Questions and Objections

(1) The Virgin Birth

(2) The Genealogies

II. THE YEARS OF SILENCE—THE TWELFTH YEAR

1. The Human Development

2. Jesus in the Temple

IlI. THE FORERUNNER AND THE BAPTISM

1. The Preaching of John

The Coming Christ

2. Jesus Is Baptized

IV. THE TEMPTATION

1. Temptation Follows Baptism

2. Nature of the Temptation

3. Stages of the Temptation

Its Typical Character

B. THE EARLY JUDAEAN MINISTRY

I. THE TESTIMONIES OF THE BAPTIST

1. The Synoptics and John

2. Threefold Witness of the Baptist

II. THE FIRST DISCIPLES

1. Spiritual Accretion

2. "Son of Man" and "Son of God"

III. THE FIRST EVENTS

1. The First Miracle

2. The First Passover, and Cleansing of the Temple

3. The Visit of Nicodemus

4. Jesus and John

IV. JOURNEY TO GALILEE—THE WOMAN OF SAMARIA

1. Withdrawal to Galilee

2. The Living Water

3. The True Worship

4. Work and Its Reward

C. THE GALILEAN MINISTRY AND VISITS TO THE FEASTS

1. The Scene

2. The Time

First Period—From the Beginning of the Ministry in Galilee till the Mission of the Twelve

I. OPENING INCIDENTS

1. Healing of Nobleman’s Son

2. The Visit to Nazareth

3. Call of the Four Disciples

4. At Capernaum

a) Christ’s Teaching

b) The Demoniac in the Synagogue

Demon-Possession: Its Reality

c) Peter’s Wife’s Mother

d) The Eventful Evening

II. FROM THE FIRST GALILEAN CIRCUIT TILL THE CHOICE OF THE APOSTLES

1. The First Circuit

2. Capernaum Incidents

    a) Cure of the Paralytic

    b) Call and Feast of Matthew

3. The Unnamed Jerusalem Feast

    a) The Healing at Bethesda

    b) Son and Father

    c) The Threefold Witness

4. Sabbath Controversies

    a) Plucking of the Ears of Grain

    b) The Man with the Withered Hand

    c) Withdrawal to the Sea

5. The Choosing of the Twelve

    a) The Apostolic Function

    b) The Lists

    c) The Men

III. FROM THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT WILL THE PARABLES OF THE KINGDOM—A SECOND CIRCUIT

1. The Sermon on the Mount

    a) The Blessings

    b) True Righteousness—the Old and the New Law

c) Religion and Hypocrisy—True and False Motive

d) The True Good and Cure for Care

e) Relation to the World's Evil—the Conclusion

2. Intervening Incidents

a) Healing of the Centurion's Servant

b) The Widow of Nain's Son Raised

c) Embassy of John's Disciples—Christ and His Generation

d) The First Anointing—the Woman who Was a Sinner

3. Second Galilean Circuit—Events at Capernaum

a) Galilee Revisited

b) Cure of Demoniac—Discourse on Blasphemy

The Sign of Jonah

c) Christ's Mother and Brethren

4. Teaching in Parables

Parables of the Kingdom

IV. FROM THE CROSSING TO GADARA TO THE MISSION OF THE TWELVE—A THIRD CIRCUIT

1. Crossing of the Lake—Stilling of the Storm

a) Aspirants for Discipleship

b) The Storm Calmed

2. The Gadarene (Gerasene) Demoniac

3. Jairus' Daughter Raised—Woman with Issue of Blood

a) Jairus' Appeal and Its Result

b) The Afflicted Woman Cured

4. Incidents of Third Circuit

5. The Twelve Sent Forth—Discourse of Jesus

a) The Commission

b) Counsels and Warnings

Second Period—After the Mission of the Twelve till the Departure from Galilee

I. FROM THE DEATH OF THE BAPTIST TILL THE DISCOURSE ON THE BREAD OF LIFE

1. The Murder of the Baptist and Herod's Alarms

2. The Feeding of the Five Thousand

3. Walking on the Sea

4. Gennesaret—Discourse on the Bread of Life

Peter's First Confession

II. FROM DISPUTES WITH THE PHARISEES TILL THE TRANSFIGURATION

1. Jesus and Tradition—Outward and Inward Purity

2. Retirement to Tyre and Sidon—the Syrophoenician Woman

3. At Decapolis—New Miracles

a) The Deaf Man

b) Feeding of the Four Thousand

4. Leaven of the Pharisees, etc.—Cure of Blind Man

5. At Caesarea Philippi—the Great Confession—First Announcement of Passion

6. The Transfiguration—the Epileptic Boy

III. FROM PRIVATE JOURNEY THROUGH GALILEE TILL RETURN FROM THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES

1. Galilee and Capernaum

a) Second Announcement of the Passion

b) The Temple Tax

c) Discourse on Greatness and Forgiveness

(1) Greatness in Humility

(2) Tolerance

(3) The Erring Brother

(4) Parable of Unmerciful Servant

2. The Feast of Tabernacles—Discourses, etc.

a) The Private Journey—Divided Opinions

b) Christ’s Self-Witness

c) The Woman Taken in Adultery

d) The Cure of the Blind Man.

e) The Good Shepherd

Chronological Note

D. LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM—JESUS IN PERAEA

I. FROM LEAVING GALILEE TILL THE FEAST OF THE DEDICATION

1. Rejected by Samaria

2. Mission of the Seventy

3. The Lawyer’s Question—Parable of Good Samaritan

4. Discourses, Parables, and Miracles

    a) Original to Luke

    b) The Infirm Woman—the Dropsied Man

    c) Parable of the Great Supper

    d) Counting the Cost

5. Martha and Mary

6. Feast of the Dedication

II. FROM THE ABODE AT BETHABARA TILL THE RAISING OF LAZARUS

1. Parables of Lost Sheep, Lost Piece of Silver and Prodigal Son

2. Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus

3. The Summons to Bethany—Raising of Lazarus

III. FROM THE RETIREMENT TO EPHRAIM TILL THE ARRIVAL AT BETHANY

1. Retreat to Ephraim

2. The Journey Resumed

3. Cure of the Lepers

4. Pharisaic Questionings

a) Divorce

b) Coming of the Kingdom

c) Parable of the Unjust Judge

5. The Spirit of the Kingdom

a) Parable of Pharisee and Publican

b) Blessing of the Babies

c) The Rich Young Ruler

6. Third Announcement of the Passion

7. The Rewards of the Kingdom

a) Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard

b) The Sons of Zebedee

8. Jesus at Jericho

a) The Cure of Bartimeus

b) Zaccheus the Publican

c) Parable of the Pounds

Arrival at Bethany

E. THE PASSION WEEK—BETRAYAL, TRIAL, AND CRUCIFIXION

I. THE EVENTS PRECEDING THE LAST SUPPER

1. The Chronology

2. The Anointing at Bethany

3. The Entry into Jerusalem

Jesus Weeping over Jerusalem—Return to Bethany

4. Cursing of the Fig Tree—Second Cleansing of the Temple

Were There Two Cleansings?

5. The Eventful Tuesday

a) The Demand for Authority—Parables

The Two Sons—the Wicked Husbandmen—the Marriage of the King's Son

b) Ensnaring Questions, etc.

(1) Tribute to Caesar—the Resurrection—the Great Commandment

(2) David's Son and Lord

c) The Great Denunciation

d) The Widow's Offering

e) The Visit of the Greeks

f) Discourse on the Last Things

g) Parables of Ten Virgins, Talents and Last Judgment

6. A Day of Retirement

7. An Atmosphere of Plotting—Judas and the Priests

II. FROM THE LAST SUPPER TILL THE CROSS

1. The Chronology

2. The Last Supper

a) The Preparation

b) Dispute about Precedence—Washing of the Disciples’ Feet—Departure of Judas

c) The Lord’s Supper

d) The Last Discourses—Intercessory Prayer

e) The Departure and Warning

3. Gethsemane—the Betrayal and Arrest

a) Agony in the Garden

b) Betrayal by Judas—Jesus Arrested

4. Trial before the Sanhedrin

Legal and Historical Aspects

a) Before Annas and Caiaphas—the Unjust Judgment

b) The Threefold Denial

c) Remorse and Suicide of Judas

5. Trial before Pilate

a) The Attitude of the Accusers

b) The Attitude of Pilate

(1) Jesus Sent to Herod

(2) "Not This Man, but Barabbas"

(3) "Ecce Homo"

(4) A Last Appeal—Pilate Yields

c) The Attitude of Jesus

III. THE CRUCIFIXION AND BURIAL

1. The Crucifixion

a) On the Way

b) Between the Thieves—the Superscription—the Seamless Robe

c) The Mocking—the Penitent Thief—Jesus and His Mother

d) The Great Darkness—the Cry of Desertion

e) Last Words and Death of Jesus

f) The Spear-Thrust—Earthquake and Rending of the Veil

2. The Burial

a) The New Tomb

b) The Guard of Soldiers

F. THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

The Resurrection a Fundamental Fact

1. The Resurrection

a) The Easter Morning—the Open Tomb

(1) The Angel and the Keepers

(2) Visit of the Women

(3) The Angelic Message

b) Visit of Peter and John—Appearance to Mary

Report to the Disciples—Incredulity

c) Other Easter-Day Appearances (Emmaus, Jerusalem)

d) The Second Appearance to the Eleven—the Doubt of Thomas

e) The Galilean Appearances

(1) At the Sea of Tiberias—the Draught of Fish—Peter’s Restoration

(2) On the Mountain—the Great Commission—Baptism

f) Appearance to James

g) The Last Meeting

2. The Ascension

PART IV. EPILOGUE: THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING

1. After the Ascension

2. Revelation through the Spirit

3. Gospels and Epistles

4. Fact of Christ’s Lordship

5. Significance of Christ’s Person

6. Significance of the Cross and Resurrection

7. Hope of the Advent

JESUS CHRIST, 2

LITERATURE

Jesus Christ: The Founder of the Christian religion; the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world; the Lord and Head of the Christian church.

I. The Names.

1. Jesus:

(Iesous) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew "Joshua" (yehoshua‘), meaning "Yahweh is salvation." It stands therefore in the Septuagint and Apocrypha for "Joshua," and in Ac 7:45 and Heb 4:8 likewise represents the Old Testament Joshua; hence, in the Revised Version (British and American) is in these passages rendered "Joshua." In Mt 1:21 the name as commanded by the angel to be given to the son of Mary, "for it is he that shall save his people from their sins" (see below on "Nativity"). It is the personal name of the Lord in the Gospels and the Acts, but generally in the Epistles appears in combination with "Christ" or other appellative (alone in Ro 3:26; 4:24; 1Co 12:3; 2Co 11:4; Php 2:10; 1Th 4:14; Heb 7:22; 10:19, etc.).

2. Christ:

(Christos) is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew "Messiah" (mashiach; compare in the New Testament, Joh 1:41; 4:25, "Messiah"), meaning "anointed" (see MESSIAH). It designates Jesus as the fulfiller of the Messianic hopes of the Old Testament and of the Jewish people. It will be seen below that Jesus Himself made this claim. After the resurrection it became the current title for Jesus in the apostolic church. Most frequently in the Epistles He is called "Jesus Christ," sometimes "Christ Jesus" (Ro 8:1,2,39; 1Co 1:2,30; 4:15; Eph 1:1; Php 1:1; Col 1:4,28 the King James Version; 1Th 2:14, etc.), often "Christ" alone (Ro 1:16 the King James Version; Ro 5:6,8; 6:4,8,9; 8:10, etc.). In this case "Christ" has acquired the force of a proper name. Very frequently the term is associated with "Lord" (kurios)—"the (or "our") Lord Jesus Christ" (Ac 11:17; 15:11 the King James Version; Ac 16:31 the King James Version; Ac 20:21; 28:31; Ro 1:7; 5:1,11; 13:14; 1Co 16:23, etc.).

II. Order of Treatment.

In studying, as it is proposed to do in this article, the earthly history of Jesus and His place in the faith of the apostolic church, it will be convenient to pursue the following order:

First, as introductory to the whole study, certain questions relating to the sources of our knowledge of Jesus, and to the preparation for, and circumstances of, His historical appearance, invite careful attention (Part I).

Next, still as preliminary to the proper narrative of the life of Jesus, it is desirable to consider certain problems arising out of the presentation of that life in the Gospels with which modern thought is more specially concerned, as determining the attitude in which the narratives are approached. Such are the problems of the miracles, the Messiahship, the sinless character and supernatural claims of Jesus (Part II).

The way is then open for treatment in order of the actual events of Christ’s life and ministry, so far as recorded. These fall into many stages, from His nativity and baptism till His death, resurrection and ascension (Part III).

A final division will deal with Jesus as the exalted Lord in the aspects in which He is presented in the teaching of the Epistles and remaining writings of the New Testament (Part IV).

PART I. INTRODUCTORY

I. The Sources.

1. In General:

The principal, and practically the only sources for our knowledge of Jesus Christ are the four Canonical Gospels—distinction being made in these between the first three (Synoptic) Gospels, and the Gospel of John. Nothing, either in the few notices of Christ in non-Christian authors, or in the references in the other books of the New Testament, or in later Christian literature, adds to the information which the Gospels already supply. The so-called apocryphal Gospels are worthless as authorities (see under the word); the few additional sayings of Christ (compare Ac 20:35) found in outside writings are of doubtful genuineness (compare a collection of these in Westcott's Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, Appendix C; see also LOGIA).

2. Denial of Existence of Jesus:

It marks the excess to which skepticism has gone that writers are found in recent years who deny the very existence of Jesus Christ (Kalthoff, Das Christus-Problem, and Die Entstehung des Christenthums; Jensen, Das Gilgamesch-Epos, I; Drews, Die Christusmythe; compare on Kalthoff, Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, English translation, 313 ff; Jensen is reviewed in the writer's The Resurrection of Jesus, chapter ix). The extravagance of such skepticism is its sufficient refutation.

3. Extra-Christian Notices:

Of notices outside the Christian circles the following may be referred to.

(1) Josephus.

There is the famous passage in Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iii, 3, commencing, "Now there was about this time, Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man," etc. It is not unlikely that Josephus had some reference to Jesus, but most agree that the passage in question, if not entirely spurious, has been the subject of Christian interpolation (on the lit. and different views, see Schurer, Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Div II, volume II, 143 ff; in support of interpolation, Edersheim on "Josephus," in Dictionary of Christ. Biography).

(2) Tacitus.

The Roman historian, Tacitus, in a well-known passage relating to the persecution of Nero (Ann. xv.44), tells how the Christians, already "a great multitude" (ingens multitudo), derived their name "from one Christus, who was executed in the reign of Tiberius by the procurator of Judea, Pontius Pilate."

(3) Suetonius also, in his account of Claudius, speaks of the Jews as expelled from Rome for the raising of tumults at the instigation of one "Chrestus" (impulsore Chresto), plainly a mistake for "Christus." The incident is doubtless that referred to in Ac 18:2. 4. The Gospels:

The four Gospels, then, with their rich contents, remain as our primary sources for the knowledge of the earthly life of Jesus.

(1) The Synoptics.

It may be taken for granted as the result of the best criticism that the first three Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke) all fall well within the apostolic age (compare Harnack, Altchr. Lit., Pref; see GOSPELS). The favorite theory at present of the relations of these Gospels is, that Mr is an independent Gospel, resting on the teaching of Peter; that Mt and Lu have as sources the Gospel of Mr and a collection of discourses, probably attributable to the apostle Matthew (now commonly called Q) ; and that Lu has a third, well-authenticated source (Lu 1:1-4) peculiar to himself. The present writer is disposed to allow more independence to the evangelists in the embodying of a tradition common to all; in any case, the sources named are of unexceptionable authority, and furnish a strong guaranty for the reliability of the narratives. The supreme guaranty of their trustworthiness, however, is found in the narratives themselves; for who in that (or any) age could imagine a figure so unique and perfect as that of Jesus, or invent the incomparable sayings and parables that proceeded from His lips? Much of Christ’s teaching is high as heaven above the minds of men still.

(2) The Fourth Gospel.

The Fourth Gospel stands apart from the Synoptics in dealing mainly with another set of incidents (the Jerusalem ministry), and discourses of a more private and intimate kind than those belonging to the Galilean teaching. Its aim, too, is doctrinal—to show that Jesus is "the Son of God," and its style and mode of conception are very different from those of the Synoptic Gospels. Its contents touch their narratives in only a few points (as in Joh 6:4-21). Where they do, the resemblance is manifest. It is obvious that the reminiscences which the Gospel contains have been long brooded over by the apostle, and that a certain interpretative element blends with his narration of incidents and discourses. This, however, does not warrant us in throwing doubt, with so many, on the genuineness of the Gospel, for which the external evidence is exceptionally strong (compare Sanday, The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel; Drummond, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel; and see JOHN, GOSPEL OF). The Gospel is accepted here as a genuine record of the sayings and doings of Jesus which it narrates.

II. The Preparation.

1. Both Gentile and Jewish:

In the Gospels and throughout the New Testament Jesus appears as the goal of Old Testament revelation, and the point to which all providential developments tended. He came, Paul says, in "the fullness of the time" (Ga 4:4). It has often been shown how, politically, intellectually, morally, everything in the Greco-Roman world was ready for such a universal religion as Jesus brought into it (compare Baur's Hist of the Church in the First Three Cents., English translation, chapter i). The preparation in Israel is seen alike in God's revelations to, and dealings with, the chosen people in the patriarchal, Mosaic, monarchical and prophetic periods, and in the developments of the Jewish mind in the centuries immediately before Christ.

2. Old Testament Preparation:

As special lines in the Old Testament preparation may be noted the ideas of the Messianic king, a ruler of David's house, whose reign would be righteous, perpetual, universal (compare Isa 7:13-9:7; 32:1,2; Jer 33:15,16; Ps 2:1-10, etc.); of a Righteous Sufferer (Ps 22, etc.), whose sufferings are in Isa 53 declared to have an expiatory and redeeming character; and of a Messianic kingdom, which, breaking the bounds of nationalism, would extend through the whole earth and embrace all peoples (compare Isa 60; Ps 87; Da 2:44; 7:27, etc.). The kingdom, at the same time, is now conceived of under a more spiritual aspect. Its chief blessings are forgiveness and righteousness.

3. Post-exilian Preparation:

The age succeeding the return from exile witnessed a manifold preparation for the advent of Christ. Here may be observed the decentralization of the Jewish religious ideals through the rise of synagogue worship and the widespread dispersion of the race; the contact with Hellenic culture (as in Philo); but especially the marked sharpening of Messianic expectations. Some of these were of a crude apocalyptic character (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT); many were political and revolutionary; but some were of a purer and more spiritual kind (compare Lu 2:25,38). To these purer elements Jesus attached Himself in His preaching of the kingdom and of Himself as its Lord. Even in the Gentileworld, it is told, there was an expectation of a great One who about this time would come from Judea (Tacitus, History v.13; Suet. Vespas. 4).

III. The Outward Situation.

1. The Land:

Of all lands Palestine was the most fitted to be the scene of the culminating revelation of God's grace in the person and work of Jesus Christ, as before it was fitted to be the abode of the people chosen to receive and preserve the revelations that prepared the way for that final manifestation. At once central and secluded—at the junction of the three great continents of the Old World, Asia, Africa and Europe—the highway of nations in war and commerce—touching mighty powers on every hand, Egypt, Syria,

Assyria, kingdoms of Asia Minor, as formerly more ancient empires, Hittite and Babylonian, now in contact with Greece and Rome, yet singularly enclosed by mountain, desert, Jordan gorge, and Great Sea, from ready entrance of foreign influences, Palestine has a place of its own in the history of revelation, which only a Divine wisdom can have given it (compare Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, Part II, chapter ii; G.A. Smith, Hist. Geog. of the Holy Land, Book I, chapters i, ii; Lange, Life of Christ, I, 246 ff).

Its Divisions.

Palestine, in the Roman period, was divided into four well-defined provinces or districts—Judaea, with Jerusalem as its center, in the South, the strong-hold of Jewish conservatism; Samaria, in the middle, peopled from Assyrian times by mixed settlers (2Ki 17:24-34), preponderatingly heathen in origin, yet now professing the Jewish religion, claiming Jewish descent (compare Joh 4:12), possessing a copy of the law (Sam Pentateuch), and a temple of their own at Gerizim (the original temple, built by Manasseh, circa 409 BC, was destroyed by John Hyrcanus, 109 BC); Galilee—"Galilee of the Gentiles" (Mt 4:15; compare Isa 9:1)—in the North, the chief scene of Christ's ministry, freer and more cosmopolitan in spirit, through a large infusion of Gentile population, and contact with traders, etc., of varied nationalities: these in Western Palestine, while on the East, "beyond Jordan," was Peraea, divided up into Peraea proper, Batanea, Gaulonitis, Ituraea, Trachonitis, Decapolis, etc. (compare Mt 4:25; 19:1; Lu 3:1). The feeling of bitterness between Jews and Samaritans was intense (Joh 4:9). The language of the people throughout was ARAMAIC (which see), but a knowledge of the Greek tongue was widely diffused, especially in the North, where intercourse with Greek-speaking peoples was habitual (the New Testament writings are in Greek). Jesus doubtless used the native dialect in His ordinary teaching, but it is highly probable that He also knew Greek, and was acquainted with Old Testament Scriptures in that language (the Septuagint). In this case He may have sometimes used it in His preaching (compare Roberts, Discussions on the Gospels).

2. Political Situation:

The miserable story of the vicissitudes of the Jewish people in the century succeeding the great persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabean revolt—a story made up of faction, intrigue, wars, murders, massacres, of growing degeneracy of rulers and nation, of repeated sackings of Jerusalem and terrible slaughters—till Herod, the Idumean, misnamed "the Great," ascended the throne by favor of the Romans (37 BC), must be read in the books relating to the period (Ewald, History of Israel, V; Milman, Hist of Jews; Schurer, History of the Jewish People in Time of Christ, Div I, Vol I; Stanley, Jewish Church, III, etc.). Rome's power, first invited by Judas Maccabeus (161 BC), was finally established by Pompey's capture of Jerusalem (63 BC). Herod's way to the throne was tracked by crime and bloodshed, and murder of those most nearly related to him marked every step in his advance. His taste for splendid buildings—palace, temple (Mt 24:1; Joh 2:20), fortresses, cities (Sebaste, Caesarea, etc.)—and lavish magnificence of his royal estate and administration, could not conceal the hideousness of his crafty, unscrupulous selfishness, his cold-blooded cruelty, his tyrannous oppression of his subjects. "Better be Herod's hog (hus) than his son (huios)," was the comment of Augustus, when he heard of the dying king's unnatural doings.

Changes in Territory.

At the time of Christ's birth, the whole of Palestine was united under Herod's rule, but on Herod's death, after a long reign of 37 (or, counting from his actual accession, 34) years, his dominions were, in accordance with his will, confirmed by Rome, divided. Judea and Samaria (a few towns excepted) fell to his son Archelaus (Mt 2:22), with the title of "ethnarch"; Galilee and Perea were given to Herod Antipas, another son, with the title of "tetrarch" (Mt 14:1; Lu 3:1,19; 23:7; Ac 13:1); Herod Philip, a third son, received Iturea, Trachonitis, and other parts of the northern trans-Jordanic territory, likewise as "tetrarch" (Lu 3:1; compare Mt 14:3; Mr 6:17). A few years later, the tyranny of Archelaus provoked an appeal of his subjects to Augustus, and Archelaus, summoned to Rome, was banished to Gaul (7 AD). Thereafter Judea, with Samaria, was governed by a Roman procurator, under the oversight of the prefect of Syria.

3. The Religious Sects:

In the religious situation the chief fact of interest is the place occupied and prominent part played by the religious sects—the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and (though unmentioned in the Gospels, these had an important influence on the early history of the church) the Essenes. The rise and characteristics of these sects can here only be alluded to (see special articles).

(1) The Scribes.

From the days of Ezra zealous attention had been given to the study of the law, and an order of men had arisen—the "scribes"—whose special business it was to guard, develop and expound the law. Through their labors, scrupulous observance of the law, and, with it, of the innumerable regulations intended to preserve the law, and apply it in detail to conduct (the so-called "tradition of the elders," Mt 15:2 ff), became the ideal of righteousness. The sects first appear in the Maccabean age. The Maccabean conflict reveals the existence of a party known as the "Assidaeans" (Hebrew chacidhim), or "pious" ones, opposed to the lax Hellenizing tendencies of the times, and staunch observers of the law. These in the beginning gave brave support to Judas Maccabeus, and doubtless then embraced the best elements of the nation.

(2) The Pharisees.

From them, by a process of deterioration too natural in such cases, developed the party of legalists known in the Gospels as the "Pharisees" ("separated"), on which Christ's sternest rebukes fell for their self-righteousness, ostentation, pride and lack of sympathy and charity (Mt 6:2 ff; 23; Lu 18:9-14). They gloried in an excessive scrupulosity in the observance of the externals of the law, even in trivialities. To them the multitude that knew not the law were "accursed" (Joh 7:49). To this party the great body of the scribes and rabbis belonged, and its powerful influence was eagerly sought by contending factions in the state.

(3) The Sadducees.

Alongside of the Pharisees were the "Sadducees" (probably from "Zadok")—rather a political and aristocratic clique than a religious sect, into whose possession the honors of the high-priesthood and other influential offices hereditarily passed. They are first met with by name under John Hyrcanus (135-106 BC). The Sadducees received only the law of Moses, interpreted it in a literal, secularistic spirit, rejected the Pharisaic traditions and believed in neither resurrection, angel nor spirit (Ac 23:8). Usually in rivalry with the Pharisees, they are found combining with these to destroy Jesus (Mt 26:3-5,57).

(4) The Essenes.

The third party, the "Essenes," differed from both (some derive also from the Assideans) in living in fraternities apart from the general community, chiefly in the desert of Engedi, on the Northwest shore of the Dead Sea, though some were found also in villages and towns; in rejecting animal sacrifices, etc., sending only gifts of incense to the temple; in practicing celibacy and community of goods; in the wearing of white garments; in certain customs (as greeting the sunrise with prayers) suggestive of oriental influence. They forbade slavery, war, oaths, were given to occult studies, had secret doctrines and books, etc. As remarked, they do not appear in the Gospel, but on account of certain resemblances, some have sought to establish a connection between them and John the Baptist and Jesus. In reality, however, nothing could be more opposed than Essenism to the essential ideas and spirit of Christ’s teaching (compare Schurer, as above, Div. II, Vol. II, 188 ff; Kuenen, Hibbert Lects on National Religions and Universal Religions, 199-208; Lightfoot, Colossians, 114-79).

IV. The Chronology.

The leading chronological questions connected with the life of Jesus are discussed in detail elsewhere (CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; QUIRINIUS, etc.); here it is sufficient to indicate the general scheme of dating adopted in the present article, and some of the grounds on which it is preferred. The chief questions relate to the dates of the birth and baptism of Jesus, the duration of the ministry and the date of the crucifixion.

1. Date of the Birth of Jesus:

Though challenged by some (Caspari, Bosanquet, Conder, etc., put it as late as 1 BC) the usual date for the death of Herod the Great, March, 4 BC (year of Rome 750), may be assumed as correct (for grounds of this dating, see Schurer, op. cit., Div. I, Vol. I, 464-67). The birth of Jesus was before, and apparently not very long before, this event (Mt 2). It may therefore be placed with probability in the latter part of the previous year (5 BC), the ordinary dating of the commencement of the Christian era being thus, as is generally recognized, four years too late. There is no certainty as to the month or day of the birth. The Christmas date, December 25, is first met with in the West in the 4th century (the eastern date was January 6), and was then possibly borrowed from a pagan festival. December, in the winter season,

seems unlikely, as unsuitable for the pasturing of flocks (Lu 2:8), though this objection is perhaps not decisive (Andrews, Conder). A more probable date is a couple of months earlier. The synchronism with Quirinius (Lu 2:2) is considered in connection with the nativity. The earlier datings of 6, 7, or even 8 BC, suggested by Ramsay, Mackinlay and others, on grounds of the assumed Roman census, astronomical phenomena, etc., appear to leave too long an interval before the death of Herod, and conflict with other data, as Lu 3:1 (see below).

2. Date of Baptism:

John is said by Luke to have begun to preach and baptize "in the fifteenth year of Tiberius" (Lu 3:1), and Jesus "was about thirty years of age" (Lu 3:23) when He was baptized by John, and entered on His ministry. If the 15th year of Tiberius is dated, as seems most likely, from his association with Augustus as colleague in the government, 765 AUC, or 12 AD (Tacitus, Annals i.3; Suetonius on Augustus, 97), and if Jesus may be supposed to have been baptized about 6 months after John commenced his work, these data combine in bringing us to the year 780 AUC, or 27 AD, as the year of our Lord's baptism, in agreement with our former conclusion as to the date of His birth in 5 BC. To place the birth earlier is to make Jesus 32 or 33 years of age at His baptism—an unwarrantable extension of the "about." In accord with this is the statement in Joh 2:20 that the temple had been 46 years in building (it began in 20-19 BC) at the time of Christ's first Passover; therefore in 780 AUC, or 27-AD (compare Schurer, op. cit., Div. I, Vol. I, 410).

3. Length of Ministry:

The determination of the precise duration of our Lord's ministry involves more doubtful elements. Setting aside, as too arbitrary, schemes which would, with some of the early Fathers, compress the whole ministry into little over a single year (Browne, Hort, etc.)—a view which involves without authority the rejection of the mention of the Passover in Joh 6:4—there remains the choice between a two years' and a three years' ministry. Both have able advocates (Turner in article "Chronology," and Sanday in article "Jesus Christ," in H D B, advocate the two years' scheme; Farrar, Ramsay, D. Smith, etc., adhere to the three years' scheme). An important point is the view taken of the unnamed "feast" in Joh 5:1. John has already named a Passover—Christ's first—in 2:13,23; another, which Jesus did not attend, is named in 6:4; the final Passover, at which He was crucified, appears in all the evangelists. If the "feast" of Joh 5:1 (the article is probably to be omitted) is also, as some think, a Passover, then John has four Passovers, and a three years' ministry becomes necessary. It is claimed, however, that in this case the "feast" would almost certainly have been named. It still does not follow, even if a minor feast—say Purim—is intended, that we are shut up to a two years' ministry. Mr. Turner certainly goes beyond his evidence in affirming that "while two years must, not more than two years can, be allowed for the interval from Joh 2:13,23 to Joh 11:55." The two years' scheme involves, as will be seen on consideration of details, a serious overcrowding and arbitrary transposition of incidents, which speak to the need of longer time. We shall assume that the ministry lasted for three years, reserving reasons till the narrative is examined.

4. Date of Christ’s Death:

On the hypothesis now accepted, the crucifixion of Jesus took place at the Passover of 30 AD. On the two years’ scheme it would fall a year earlier. On both sides it is agreed that it occurred on the Friday of the week of the Passover, but it is disputed whether this Friday was the 14th or the 15th day of the month. The Gospel of John is pleaded for the former date, the Synoptics for the latter. The question will be considered in connection with the time of the Last Supper. Meanwhile it is to be observed that, if the 15th is the correct date, there seems reason to believe that the 15th of Nisan fell on a Friday in the year just named, 783 AUG, or 30 AD. We accept this provisionally as the date of the crucifixion.

JESUS CHRIST, 3

PART II. THE PROBLEMS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

I. The Miracles.

1. The "Modern" Attitude:

Everyone is aware that the presence of miracle in the Gospels is a chief ground of the rejection of its history by the representatives of the "modern" school. It is not questioned that it is a super-natural person whose picture is presented in the Gospels. There is no real difference between the Synoptics and John in this respect. "Even the oldest Gospel," writes Bousset, "is written from the standpoint of faith; already for Mark, Jesus is not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but the miraculous eternal Son of God, whose glory shone in the world" (Was wissen wir von Jesus? 54, 57). But the same writer, interpreting the "modern" spirit, declares that no account embracing supernatural events can be accepted as historical. "The main characteristic of this modern mode of thinking," he says, "rests upon the determination to try to explain everything that takes place in the world by natural causes, or—to express it in another form—it rests on the determined assertion of universal laws to which all phenomena, natural and spiritual, are subject" (What Is Religion? English translation, 283).

2. Supernatural in the Gospels:

With such an assumption it is clear that the Gospels are condemned before they are read. Not only is Jesus there a supernatural person, but He is presented as super-natural in natural in character, in works, in claims (see below); He performs miracles; He has a supernatural birth, and a supernatural resurrection. All this is swept away. It may be allowed that He had remarkable gifts of healing, but these are in the class of "faithcures" (thus Harnack), and not truly supernatural. When one seeks the justification for this selfconfident dogmatism, it is difficult to discover it, except on the ground of a pantheistic or monistic theory of the universe which excludes the personal God of Christianity. If God is the Author and Sustainer of the natural system, which He rules for moral ends, it is impossible to see why, for high ends of revelation and redemption, a supernatural economy should not be engrafted on the natural, achieving ends which could not otherwise be attained. This does not of course touch the

question of evidence for any particular miracle, which must be judged of from its connection with the person of the worker, and the character of the apostolic witnesses. The well-meant effort to explain all miracles through the action of unknown natural laws—which is what Dr. Sanday calls "making both ends meet" (Life of Christ in Recent Research, 302)—breaks down in the presence of such miracles as the instantaneous cleansing of the leper, restoration of sight to the blind, the raising of the dead, acts which plainly imply an exercise of creative power. In such a life as Christ's, transcendence of the ordinary powers of Nature is surely to be looked for.

II. The Messiahship.

1. Reserve of Jesus and Modern Criticism:

A difficulty has been found in the fact that in all the Gospels Jesus knew Himself to be the Messiah at least from the time of His baptism, yet did not, even to His disciples, unreservedly announce Himself as such till after Peter's great confession at Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13). On this seeming secrecy the bold hypothesis has been built that Jesus in reality never made the claim to Messiahship, and that the passages which imply the contrary in Mark (the original Gospel) are unhistorical (Wrede; compare on this and other theories, Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus, English translation; Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research). So extreme an opinion is rejected by most; but modern critics vie with each other in the freedom with which they treat the testimony of the evangelists on this subject. Baldensperger, e.g., supposes that Jesus did not attain full certainty on His Messiahship till near the time of Peter's confession, and arbitrarily transposes the earlier sections in which the title "Son of Man" occurs till after that event (Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, 2nd edition, 246). Bousset thinks that Jesus adopted the Messianic role as the only one open to Him, but bore it as a "burden" (compare his Jesus). Schweitzer connects it with apocalyptic ideas of a wildly fantastic character (op. cit., chapter xix).

2. A Growing Revelation:

There is, however, no need for supposing that Peter's confession marks the first dawn of this knowledge in the minds of the apostles. Rather was it the exalted expression of a faith already present, which had long been maturing. The baptism and temptation, with the use of the title "Son of Man," the tone of authority in His teaching, His miracles, and many special incidents, show, as clearly as do the discourses in John, that Jesus was from the beginning fully conscious of His vocation, and His reserve in the use of the title sprang, not from any doubt in His own mind as to His right to it, but from His desire to avoid false associations till the true nature of His Messiahship should be revealed. The Messiahship was in process of self-revelation throughout to those who had eyes to see it (compare Joh 6:66-71). What it involved will be seen later.

III. Kingdom and Apocalypse.

1. The Kingdom—Present or Future?:

Connected with the Messiahship is the idea of the "Kingdom of God" or "of heaven," which some in modern times would interpret in a purely eschatological sense, in the light of Jewish apocalyptic conceptions (Johannes Weiss, Schweitzer, etc.). The kingdom is not a thing of the present, but wholly a thing of the future, to be introduced by convulsions of Nature and the Parousia of the Son of Man. The language of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy kingdom come," is quoted in support of this contention, but the next petition should guard against so violent an inference. "Thy will be done," Jesus teaches His disciples to pray, "as in heaven, so on earth" (Mt 6:10). The kingdom is the reign of God in human hearts and lives in this world as well as in the next. It would not be wrong to define it as consisting essentially in the supremacy of God's will in human hearts and human affairs, and in every department of these affairs. As Jesus describes the kingdom, it has, in the plain meaning of His words, a present being on earth, though its perfection is in eternity. The parables in Mt 13 and elsewhere exhibit it as founded by the sowing of the word of truth (Sower), as a mingling of good and evil elements (Tares), as growing from small beginnings to large proportions (Mustard Seed), as gradually leavening humanity (Leaven), as of priceless value (Treasure; Pearl; compare Mt 6:33); as terminating in a judgment (Tares, Dragnet); as perfected in the world to come (Mt 13:43). It was a kingdom spiritual in nature (Lu 17:20,21), universal in range (Mt 8:11; 21:43, etc.), developing from a principle of life within (Mr 4:26-29), and issuing in victory over all opposition (Mt 21:44).

2. Apocalyptic Beliefs:

It is difficult to pronounce on the extent to which Jesus was acquainted with current apocalyptic beliefs, or allowed these to color the imagery of parts of His teachings. These beliefs certainly did not furnish the substance of His teaching, and it may be doubted whether they more than superficially affected even its form. Jewish apocalyptic knew nothing of a death and resurrection of the Messiah and of His return in glory to bring in an everlasting kingdom. What Jesus taught on these subjects sprang from His own Messianic consciousness, with the certainty He had of His triumph over death and His exaltation to the right hand of God. It was in Old Testament prophecy, not in late Jewish apocalypse, that His thoughts of the future triumph of His kingdom were grounded, and from the vivid imagery of the prophets He borrowed most of the clothing of these thoughts. Isa 53 e.g., predicts not only the rejection and death of the Servant of Yahweh (53:3,1-9,12), but the prolongation of His days and His victorious reign (53:10-12). Dnl, not the Book of En, is the source of the title, "Son of Man," and of the imagery of coming on the clouds of heaven (Da 7:13). The ideas of resurrection, etc., have their ground in the Old Testament (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). With the extravagant, unspiritual forms into which these conceptions were thrown in the Jewish apocalyptic books His teaching had nothing in common. The new apocalyptic school represented by Schweitzer reduces the history of Jesus to folly, fanaticism and hopeless disillusionment.

IV. The Character and Claims.

1. Denial of Christ's Moral Perfection:

Where the Gospels present us in Jesus with the image of a flawless character—in the words of the writer

to the Hebrews, "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners" (Heb 7:26)—modern criticism is driven by an inexorable necessity to deprive Jesus of His sinless perfection, and to impute to Him the error, frailty, and moral infirmity that belong to ordinary mortals. In Schweitzer's portraiture (compare op. cit.), He is an apocalyptic enthusiastic, ruled by illusory ideals, deceiving Himself and others as to who He was, and as to the impending end of the world. Those who show a more adequate appreciation of Christ's spiritual greatness are still prevented by their humanitarian estimate of His person and their denial of the supernatural in history from recognizing the possibility of His sinlessness. It may confidently be said that there is hardly a single writer of the modern school who grants Christ's moral perfection. To do so would be to admit a miracle in humanity, and we have heard that miracle is by the highest rational necessity excluded. This, however, is precisely the point on which the modern so-called "historical-critical" mode of presentation most obviously breaks down. The ideal of perfect holiness in the Gospels which has fascinated the conscience of Christendom for 18 centuries, and attests itself anew to every candid reader, is not thus lightly to be got rid of, or explained away as the invention of a church gathered out (without the help of the ideal) promiscuously from Jews and Gentiles. It was not the church —least of all such a church—that created Christ, but Christ that created the church.

(1) The Sinlessness Assured.

The sinlessness of Jesus is a datum in the Gospels. Over against a sinful world He stands as a Saviour who is Himself without sin. His is the one life in humanity in which is presented a perfect knowledge and unbroken fellowship with the Father, undeviating obedience to His will, unswerving devotion under the severest strain of temptation and suffering to the highest ideal of goodness. The ethical ideal was never raised to so absolute a height as it is in the teaching of Jesus, and the miracle is that, high as it is in its unsullied purity, the character of Jesus corresponds with it, and realizes it. Word and life for once in history perfectly agree. Jesus, with the keenest sensitiveness to sin in thought and feeling as in deed, is conscious of no sin in Himself, confesses no sin, disclaims the presence of it, speaks and acts continually on the assumption that He is without it. Those who knew Him best declared Him to be without sin (1Pe 2:22; 1Joh 3:5; compare 2Co 5:21). The Gospels must be rent in pieces before this image of a perfect holiness can be effaced from them.

(2) What This Implies.

How is this phenomenon of a sinless personality in Jesus to be explained? It is itself a miracle, and can only be made credible by a creative miracle in Christ's origin. It may be argued that a Virgin Birth does not of itself secure sinlessness, but it will hardly be disputed that at least a sinless personality implies miracle in its production. It is precisely because of this that the modern spirit feels bound to reject it. In the Gospels it is not the Virgin Birth by itself which is invoked to explain Christ's sinlessness, but the supernatural conception by the Holy Spirit (Lu 1:35). It is because of this conception that the birth is a virgin one. No explanation of the supernatural element in Christ's Person is more rational or credible (see below on "Nativity").

2. Sinlessness and the Messianic Claim:

If Jesus from the first was conscious of Himself as without sin and if, as the converse of this, He knew Himself as standing in an unbroken filial fellowship with the Father, He must early have become conscious of His special vocation, and learnt to distinguish Himself from others as one called to bless and save them. Here is the true germ of His Messianic consciousness, from which everything subsequently is unfolded. He stood in a rapport with the Father which opened His spirit to a full, clear revelation of the Father's will regarding Himself, His mission, the kingdom He came to found, His sufferings as the means of salvation to the world, the glory that awaited Him when His earthly work was done. In the light of this revelation He read the Old Testament Scriptures and saw His course there made plain. When the hour had come He went to John for baptism, and His brief, eventful ministry, which should end in the cross, began. This is the reading of events which introduces consistency and purpose into the life of Jesus, and it is this we mean to follow in the sketch now to be given.

JESUS CHRIST, 4A

PART III. COURSE OF THE EARTHLY LIFE OF JESUS

1. Divisions of the History:

The wonderful story of the life of the world's Redeemer which we are now to endeavor to trace falls naturally into several divisions:

A. From the Nativity to the Baptism and Temptation.

B. The Early Judean Ministry.

C. The Galilean Ministry and Visits to the Feasts.

D. The Last Journey to Jerusalem.

E. The Passion Week—Betrayal, Trial, and Crucifixion.

F. The Resurrection and Ascension.

2. Not a Complete "Life":

To avoid misconception, it is important to remember, that, rich as are the narratives of the Gospels, materials do not exist for a complete biography or "Life" of Jesus. There is a gap, broken only by a single incident, from His infancy till His 30th year; there are cycles of events out of myriads left unrecorded (Joh 21:25); there are sayings, parables, longer discourses, connected with particular occasions; there are general summaries of periods of activity comprised in a few verses. The evangelists, too, present their materials each from his own standpoint—Matthew from theocratic, Mark from that of

Christ's practical activity, Luke from the universalistic and human-sympathetic, John from the Divine. In reproducing the history respect must be had to this focusing from distinct points of view.

A. FROM THE NATIVITY TO THE BAPTISM AND TEMPTATION

I. The Nativity.

1. Hidden Piety in Judaism: Old Testament prophecy expired with the promise on its lips, "Behold, I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, will suddenly come to his temple; and the messenger of the covenant, whom ye desire, behold, he cometh, saith Yahweh of hosts" (Mal 3:1). In the years immediately before Christ's birth the air was tremulous with the sense of impending great events. The fortunes of the Jewish people were at their lowest ebb. Pharisaic formalism, Sadducean unbelief, fanatical Zealotry, Herodian sycophantism, Roman oppression, seemed to have crushed out the last sparks of spiritual religion. Yet in numerous quiet circles in Judea, and even in remote Galilee, little godly bands still nourished their souls on the promises, looking for "the consolation of Israel" and "redemption of Jerusalem" (Lu 2:25,38). Glimpses of these are vouchsafed in Zacharias and Elisabeth, in Simeon, in Anna, in Joseph and Mary (Lu 1; 2; Mt 1:18). It was in hearts in these circles that the stirrings of the prophetic spirit began to make themselves felt anew, preparing for the Advent (compare Lu 2:27,36).

2. Birth of the Baptist:

(Luke 1)

In the last days of Herod—perhaps in the year 748 of Rome, or 6 BC—the aged priest Zacharias, of the course of Abijah (1Ch 24:10; compare Schurer, Div. II, Vol. I, 219 ff), was ministering in the temple at the altar of incense at the hour of evening prayer. Scholars have reckoned, if on somewhat precarious grounds, that the ministry of the order to which Zacharias belonged fell in this year in the month of April or in early October (compare Andrews, Life of our Lord). Now a wonderful thing happened. Zacharias and his wife Elisabeth, noted for their blameless piety, were up to this time childless. On this evening an angel, appearing at the side of the altar of incense, announced to Zacharias that a son should be born to them, in whom should be realized the prediction of Malachi of one coming in the spirit and power of Elijah to prepare the way of the Lord (compare Mal 4:5,6). His name was to be called John. Zacharias hesitated to believe, and was stricken with dumbness till the promise should be fulfilled. It happened as the angel had foretold, and at the circumcision and naming of his son his tongue was again loosed. Zacharias, filled with the Spirit, poured forth his soul in a hymn of praise—the Benedictus (Lu 1:5-25,57-80; compare JOHN THE BAPTIST).

3. The Annunciation and Its Results:

(Lu 1:26-56; Mt 1:18-25)

Meanwhile yet stranger things were happening in the little village of Nazareth, in Galilee (now enNacirah). There resided a young maiden of purest character, named Mary, betrothed to a carpenter of the village (compare Mt 13:55), called Joseph, who, although in so humble a station, was of the lineage of David (compare Isa 11:1). Mary, most probably, was likewise of Davidic descent (Lu 1:32; on the genealogies, see below). The fables relating to the parentage and youth of Mary in the Apocryphal Gospels may safely be discarded. To this maiden, three months before the birth of the Baptist, the same angelic visitant (Gabriel) appeared, hailing her as "highly favored" of God, and announcing to her that, through the power of the Holy Spirit, she should become the mother of the Saviour. The words "Blessed art thou among women," in the King James Version of Lu 1:28 are omitted by the Revised Version (British and American), though found below (1:42) in Elisabeth's salutation. They give, in any case, no support to Mariolatry, stating simply the fact that Mary was more honored than any other woman of the race in being chosen to be the mother of the Lord.

(1) The Amazing Message.

The announcement itself was of the most amazing import. Mary herself was staggered at the thought that, as a virgin, she should become a mother (Lu 1:34). Still more surprising were the statements made as to the Son she was to bear. Conceived of the Holy Spirit (Lu 1:35; Mt 1:18), He would be great, and would be called "the Son of the Most High" (Lu 1:32)—"the Son of God" (Lu 1:35); there would be given to Him the throne of His father David, and His reign would be eternal (Lu 1:32,33; compare Isa 9:6,7); He would be "holy" from the womb (Lu 1:35). His name was to be called Jesus (Lu 1:31; compare Mt 1:21), denoting Him as Saviour. The holiness of Jesus is here put in connection with His miraculous conception, and surely rightly. In no case in the history of mankind has natural generation issued in a being who is sinless, not to say superhuman. The fact that Jesus, even in His human nature, was supernaturally begotten—was "Son of God"—does not exclude the higher and eternal Sonship according to the Divine nature (Joh 1:18). The incarnation of such a Divine Being as Paul and John depict, itself implies miracle in human origin. On the whole message being declared to her, Mary accepted what was told her in meek humility (Lu 1:38).

(2) The Visit to Elisabeth.

With the announcement to herself there was given to Mary an indication of what had befallen her kinswoman Elisabeth, and Mary's first act, on recovering from her astonishment, was to go in haste to the home of Elisabeth in the hill country of Judea (Lu 1:39). Very naturally she did not rashly forestall God's action in speaking to Joseph of what had occurred, but waited in quietness and faith till God should reveal in His own way what He had done. The meeting of the two holy women was the occasion of a new outburst of prophetic inspiration. Elisabeth, moved by the Spirit, greeted Mary in exalted language as the mother of the Lord (Lu 1:42-45)—a confirmation to Mary of the message she had received; Mary, on her part, broke forth in rhythmical utterance, "My soul doth magnify the Lord," etc. (Lu 1:46-56). Her hymn—the sublime Magnificat—is to be compared with Hannah's (1Sa 2:1-11), which furnishes the model of it. Mary abode with Elisabeth about three months, then returned to her own house. (3) Joseph's Perplexity.

Here a new trial awaited her. Mary’s condition of motherhood could not long be concealed, and when Joseph first became aware of it, the shock to a man so just (Mt 1:19) would be terrible in its severity. The disappearance of Joseph from the later gospel history suggests that he was a good deal older than his betrothed, and it is possible that, while strict, upright and conscientious, his disposition was not as strong on the side of sympathy as so delicate a case required. It is going too far to say with Lange, "He encountered the modest, but unshakably firm Virgin with decided doubt; the first Ebionite"; but so long as he had no support beyond Mary’s word, his mind was in a state of agonized perplexity. His first thought was to give Mary a private "bill of divorcement" to avoid scandal (Mt 1:19). Happily, his doubts were soon set at rest by a Divine intimation, and he hesitated no longer to take Mary to be his wife (Mt 1:24). Luke’s Gospel, which confines itself to the story of Mary, says nothing of this episode; Matthew’s narrative, which bears evidence of having come from Joseph himself, supplies the lack by showing how Joseph came to have the confidence in Mary which enabled him to take her to wife, and become sponsor for her child. The trial, doubtless, while it lasted, was not less severe for Mary than for Joseph—a prelude of that sword which was to "pierce through (her) own soul" (Lu 2:35). There is no reason to believe that Joseph and Mary did not subsequently live in the usual relations of wedlock, and that children were not born to them (compare Mt 13:55,56, etc.).

4. The Birth at Bethlehem:

(Matthew 2:1; Luke 2:1-7)

Matthew gives no indication of where the events narrated in his first chapter took place, first mentioning Nazareth on the occasion of the return of the holy family from Egypt (2:23). In 2:1 he transports us to Bethlehem as the city of Christ’s birth. It is left to Luke to give an account of the circumstances which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem—thus fulfilling prophecy (Mic 5:2; Mt 2:5,6)—at this critical hour, and to record the lowly manner of Christ’s birth there.

(1) The Census of Quirinius.

The emperor Augustus had given orders for a general enrollment throughout the empire (the fact of periodical enrollments in the empire is well established by Professor W.M. Ramsay in his Was Christ Born at Bethlehem?), and this is stated to have been given effect to in Judea when Quirinius was governor of Syria (Lu 2:1,2). The difficulties connected with the enrollment or census here mentioned are discussed in the article QUIRINIUS. It is known that Quirinius did conduct a census in Judea in 6 AD (compare Ac 5:37), but the census at Christ’s birth is distinguished from this by Luke as "the first enrollment." The difficulty was largely removed when it was ascertained, as it has been to the satisfaction of most scholars, that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria—first, after Herod’s death, 4-1 BC, and again in 6-11 AD. The probability is that the census was begun under Varus, the immediate predecessor of Quirinius—or even earlier under Saturninus—but was delayed in its application to Judea, then under Herod’s jurisdiction, and was completed by Quirinius, with whose name it is officially connected. That the enrollment was made by each one going to his own city (verse 3) is explained by the fact that the census was not made according to the Roman method, but, as befitted a dependent kingdom,

in accordance with Jewish usages (compare Ramsay).

(2) Jesus Born.

It must be left undecided whether the journey of Mary to Bethlehem with Joseph was required for any purpose of registration, or sprang simply from her unwillingness to be separated from Joseph in so trying a situation. To Bethlehem, in any case, possibly by Divine monition, she came, and there, in the ancestral city of David, in circumstances the lowliest conceivable, brought forth her marvelous child. In unadorned language—very different from the embellishments of apocryphal story—Luke narrates how, when the travelers arrived, no room was found for them in the "inn"—the ordinary eastern khan or caravanserai, a square enclosure, with an open court for cattle, and a raised recess round the walls for shelter of visitors—and how, when her babe was born, Mary wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger. The wearied pair having, according to Luke, been crowded out of, and not merely within, the inn, there is every probability that the birth took place, not, as some suppose, in the courtyard of the inn, but, as the oldest tradition asserts (Justin Martyr, Dialogue with Trypho, 78), in a cave in the neighborhood, used for similar purposes of lodgment and housing of cattle. High authorities look favorably on the "cave of the nativity" still shown, with its inscription, Hic de virgine Maria Jesus Christus natus est, as marking the sacred spot. In such incredibly mean surroundings was "the only begotten of the Father" ushered into the world He came to redeem. How true the apostle’s word that He "emptied" Himself (Php 2:7)! A problem lies in the very circumstances of the entrance into time of such a One, which only the thought of a voluntary humiliation for saving ends can solve.

5. The Incidents of the Infancy:

(Luke 2:8-39; Matthew 2:1-12)

Born, however, though Jesus was, in a low condition, the Father did not leave Him totally without witness to His Sonship. There were rifts in the clouds through which cidents of the hidden glory streamed. The scenes in the narratives of the Infancy exhibit a strange commingling of the glorious and the lowly.

(1) The Visit of the Shepherds.

To shepherds watching their flocks by night in the fields near Bethlehem the first disclosure was made. The season, one would infer, could hardly have been winter, though it is stated that there is frequently an interval of dry weather in Judea between the middle of December and the middle of February, when such a keeping of flocks would be possible (Andrews). The angel world is not far removed from us, and as angels preannounced the birth of Christ, so, when He actually came into the world (compare Heb 1:6), angels of God made the night vocal with their songs. First, an angel appearing in the midst of the Divine glory—the "Shekinah"—announced to the sorely alarmed shepherds the birth of a "Saviour who was Christ the Lord" at Bethlehem; then a whole chorus of the heavenly host broke in with the refrain, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men in whom He is well pleased" (literally,

"men of good pleasure")—since, the Christmas hymn of the generations (Lu 2:1-14). The shepherds, guided as to how to recognize the babe (Lu 2:12), went at once, and found it to be ever, as they had been told. Thence they hastened to spread abroad the tidings—the first believers, the first worshippers, the first preachers (Lu 2:15-20). Mary cherished the sayings in the stillness of her heart.

(2) The Circumcision and Presentation in the Temple.

Jewish law required that on the 8th day the male child should be circumcised, and on the same day He received His name (compare Lu 1:59-63). Jesus, though entirely pure, underwent the rite which denoted the putting off of fleshly sin (Col 2:11), and became bound, as a true Israelite, to render obedience to every Divine commandment. The name "Jesus" was then given Him (Lu 2:21). On the 40th day came the ceremony of presentation in the temple at Jerusalem, when Mary had to offer for her purifying (Le 12; Mary's was the humbler offering of the poor, "a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons" (Le 12:8; Lu 2:24)), and when the first-born son had to be redeemed with 5 shekels of the sanctuary (Nu 18:15,16; about $3.60). The observance was an additional token that Christ—personally sinless—did not shrink from full identification with our race in the responsibilities of its sinful condition. Ere it was completed, however, the ceremony was lifted to a Diviner level, and a new attestation was given of the dignity of the child of Mary, by the action and inspired utterances of the holy Simeon and the aged prophetess Anna. To Simeon, a righteous and devout man, "looking for the consolation of Israel," it had been revealed that he should not die till he had seen the Lord's Christ, and, led by the Spirit into the temple at the very time when Jesus was being presented, he recognized in Him the One for whom he had waited, and, taking Him in his arms, gave utterance to the beautiful words of the Nunc Dimittis—"Now lettest thou thy servant depart, Lord," etc. (Lu 2:25-32). He told also how this child was set for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and how, through Him, a sword should pierce through Mary's own soul (Lu 2:34,35). Entering at the same hour, the prophetess Anna—now in extreme old age (over 100; a constant frequenter of the temple, Lu 2:37—confirmed his words, and spoke of Him to all who, like herself, looked "for the redemption of Jerusalem."

(3) Visit of the Magi.

It seems to have been after the presentation in the temple that the incident took place recorded by Matthew of the visit of the Magi. The Magi, a learned class belonging originally to Chaldea or Persia (see MAGI), had, in course of time, greatly degenerated (compare Simon Magus, Ac 8:9), but those who now came to seek Christ from the distant East were of a nobler order. They appeared in Jerusalem inquiring, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" and declaring that they had seen His star in the East, and had come to worship Him (Mt 2:2). Observers of the nightly sky, any significant appearance in the heavens would at once attract their attention. Many (Kepler, Ideler, etc.; compare Ramsay, op. cit., 215 ff) are disposed to connect this "star" with a remarkable conjunction—or series of conjunctions—of planets in 7-6 BC, in which case it is possible that two years may have elapsed (compare the inquiry of Herod and his subsequent action, Mt 2:7,16) from their observation of the sign. On the other hand, the fact of the star reappearing and seeming to stand over a house in Bethlehem (Mt 2:9) rather points to a distinct phenomenon (compare BETHLEHEM, STAR OF). The inquiry of the Magi at once awakened Herod's alarm; accordingly, having ascertained from the scribes that the Christ should be born at

Bethlehem (Mic 5:2), he summoned the Magi, questioned them as to when exactly the star appeared, then sent them to Bethlehem to search out the young child, hypocritically pretending that he also wished to worship Him (Mt 2:7,8). Herod had faith enough to believe the Scriptures, yet was foolish enough to think that he could thwart God's purpose. Guided by the star, which anew appeared, the wise men came to Bethlehem, offered their gifts, and afterward, warned by God, returned by another road, without reporting to Herod. It is a striking picture—Herod the king, and Christ the King; Christ a power even in His cradle, inspiring terror, attracting homage! The faith of these sages, unrepelled by the lowly surroundings of the child they had discovered, worshipping, and laying at His feet their gold, frankincense and myrrh, is a splendid anticipation of the victories Christ was yet to win among the wisest as well as the humblest of our race. Herod, finding himself, as he thought, befooled by the Magi, avenged himself by ordering a massacre of all the male children of two years old, and under, in Bethlehem and its neighborhood (Mt 2:16-19). This slaughter, if not recorded elsewhere (compare however, Macrobius, quoted by Ramsay, op. cit., 219), is entirely in keeping with the cruelty of Herod's disposition. Meanwhile, Joseph and Mary had been withdrawn from the scene of danger (Mt 2:17 connects the mourning of the Bethlehem mothers with Rachel's weeping, Jer 31:15).

6. Flight to Egypt and Return to Nazareth:

(Matthew 2:13-15,19-23)

The safety of Mary and her threatened child was provided for by a Divine warning to retire for a time to Egypt (mark the recurring expression, "the young child and his mother"—the young child taking the lead, Mt 2:11,13,14,20,21), whither, accordingly, they were conducted by Joseph (Mt 2:14). The sojourn was not a long one. Herod's death brought permission to return, but as Archelaus, Herod's son (the worst of them), reigned in Judea in his father's stead (not king, but "ethnarch"), Joseph was directed to withdraw to Galilee; hence it came about that he and Mary, with the babe, found themselves again in Nazareth, where Luke anew takes up the story (Lu 2:39), the thread of which had been broken by the incidents in Matthew. Matthew sees in the return from Egypt a refulfilling of the experiences of Israel (Ho 11:1), and in the settling in Nazareth a connection with the Old Testament prophecies of Christ's lowly estate (Isa 11:1, netser, "branch"; Zec 3:8; 6:12, etc.).

7. Questions and Objections:

The objections to the credibility of the narratives of the Virgin Birth have already partly been adverted to. (See further the articles on MARY; VIRGIN BIRTH; and the writer's volume, The Virgin Birth of Christ.)

(1) The Virgin Birth.

The narratives in Matthew and Luke are attested by all manuscripts and versions genuine parts of their respective Gospels, and as coming to us in their integrity. The narrative of Luke is generally recognized as resting on an Aramaic basis, which, from its diction and the primitive character of its conceptions,

belongs to the earliest age. While in Luke's narrative everything is presented from the standpoint of Mary, in Matthew it is Joseph who is in the forefront, suggesting that the virgin mother is the source of information in the one case, and Joseph himself in the other. The narratives are complementary, not contradictory. That Mark and John do not contain narratives of the Virgin Birth cannot be wondered at, when it is remembered that Mark's Gospel begins of purpose with the Baptism of John, and that the Fourth Gospel aims at setting forth the Divine descent, not the circumstances of the earthly nativity. "The Word became flesh" (Joh 1:14)—everything is already implied in that. Neither can it be objected to that Paul does not in his letters or public preaching base upon so essentially private a fact as the miraculous conception—at a time, too, when Mary probably still lived. With the exception of the narrowest sect of the Jewish Ebionites and some of the Gnostic sects, the Virgin Birth was universally accepted in the early church.

(2) The Genealogies

(Matthew 1:1-17; Luke 3:23-28)

Difficulty is felt with the genealogies in Matthew and Luke (one descending, the other ascending), which, while both professing to trace the descent of Jesus from David and Abraham (Luke from Adam), yet go entirely apart in the pedigree after David. See on this the article GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST. A favorite view is that Matthew exhibits the legal, Luke the natural descent of Jesus. There is plausibility in the supposition that though, in form, a genealogy of Joseph, Luke's is really the genealogy of Mary. It was not customary, it is true, to make out pedigrees of females, but the case here was clearly exceptional, and the passing of Joseph into the family of his father-in-law Heli would enable the list to be made out in his name. Celsus, in the 2nd century, appears thus to have understood it when he derides the notion that through so lowly a woman as the carpenter's wife, Jesus should trace His lineage up to the first man (Origen, Contra Celsus, ii.32; Origen's reply proceeds on the same assumption. Compare article on" Genealogies" in Kitto, II).

II. The Years of Silence—the Twelfth Year.

1. The Human Development:

(Luke 2:40,52)

With the exception of one fragment of incident—that of the visit to Jerusalem and the Temple in His 12th year—the Canonical Gospels are silent as to the history of Jesus from the return to Nazareth till His baptism by John. This long period, which the Apocryphal Gospels crowd with silly fables (see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS), the inspired records leave to be regarded as being what it was—a period of quiet development of mind and body, of outward uneventfulness, of silent garnering of experience in the midst of the Nazareth surroundings. Jesus "grew, and waxed strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him .... advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men" (Lu 2:40,52). The incarnation was a true acceptance of humanity, with all its sinless limitations of growth and

development. Not a hint is offered of that omniscience or omnipotence which theology has not infrequently imputed to Jesus even as child and boy. His schooling was probably that of the ordinary village child (He could read, Lu 4:17 ff, and write, Joh 8:6-8); He wrought at the carpenter's bench (compare Mr 6:3; Justin Martyr, following tradition, speaks of Him as making "plows and yokes," Dial., 88). His gentleness and grace of character endeared Him to all who knew Him (Lu 2:52). No stain of sin clouded His vision of Divine things. His after-history shows that His mind was nourished on the Scriptures; nor, as He pondered psalms and prophets, could His soul remain unvisited by presentiments, growing to convictions, that He was the One in whom their predictions were destined to be realized.

2. Jesus in the Temple:

(Luke 2:41-50)

Every year, as was the custom of the Jews, Joseph and Mary went, with their friends and neighbors, in companies, to Jerusalem to the Passover. When Jesus was 12 years old, it would seem that, for the first time, He was permitted to accompany them. It would be to Him a strange and thrilling experience. Everything He saw—the hallowed sites, the motley crowd, the service of the temple, the very shocks His moral consciousness would receive from contact with abounding scandals—would intensify His feeling of His own unique relation to the Father. Every relationship was for the time suspended and merged to His thought in this higher one. It was His Father's city whose streets He trod; His Father's house He visited for prayer; His Father's ordinance the crowds were assembled to observe; His Father's name, too, they were dishonoring by their formalism and hypocrisy. It is this exalted mood of the boy Jesus which explains the scene that follows—the only one rescued from oblivion in this interval of growth and preparation. When the time came for the busy caravan to return to Nazareth, Jesus, acting, doubtless, from highest impulse, "tarried behind" (verse 43). In the large company His absence was not at first missed, but when, at the evening halting-place, it became known that He was not with them, His mother and Joseph returned in deep distress to Jerusalem. Three days elapsed before they found Him in the place where naturally they should have looked first—His Father's house. There, in one of the halls or chambers where the rabbis were wont to teach, they discovered Him seated "in the midst," at the feet of the men of learning, hearing them discourse, asking questions, as pupils were permitted to do, and giving answers which awakened astonishment by their penetration and wisdom (Lu 2:46,47). Those who heard Him may well have thought that before them was one of the great rabbis of the future! Mary, much surprised, asked in remonstrance, "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us?" evoking from Jesus the memorable reply, "How is it that ye sought me? knew ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" or "about my Father's business?" the King James Version (Lu 2:48,49). Here was the revelation of a selfconsciousness that Mary might have been prepared for in Jesus, but perhaps, in the common intercourse of life, was tending to lose sight of. The lesson was not unneeded. Yet, once it had been given, Jesus went back with Joseph and Mary to Nazareth, and "was subject unto them"; and Mary did not forget the teaching of the incident (Lu 2:51).

III. The Forerunner and the Baptism.

1. The Preaching of John:

(Matthew 3:1-12; Mark 1:1-8; Luke 3:1-18)

Time passed, and when Jesus was nearing His 30th year, Judea was agitated by the message of a stern preacher of righteousness who had appeared in the wilderness by the Jordan, proclaiming the imminent approach of the kingdom of heaven, summoning to repentance, and baptizing those who confessed their sins. Tiberius had succeeded Augustus on the imperial throne; Judea, with Samaria, was now a Roman province, under the procurator Pontius Pilate; the rest of Palestine was divided between the tetrarchs Herod (Galilee) and Philip (the eastern parts). The Baptist thus appeared at the time when the land had lost the last vestige of self-government, was politically divided, and was in great ecclesiastical confusion. Nurtured in the deserts (Lu 1:80), John's very appearance was a protest against the luxury and self-seeking of the age. He had been a Nazarite from his birth; he fed on the simplest products of nature—locusts and wild honey; his coarse garb of camel's hair and leathern girdle was a return to the dress of Elijah (2Ki 1:8), in whose spirit and power he appeared (Lu 1:17) (see JOHN THE BAPTIST).

The Coming Christ.

John's preaching of the kingdom was unlike that of any of the revolutionaries of his age. It was a kingdom which could be entered only through moral preparation. It availed nothing for the Jew simply that he was a son of Abraham. The Messiah was at hand. He (John) was but a voice in the wilderness sent to prepare the way for that Greater than himself. The work of the Christ would be one of judgment and of mercy. He would lay the axe at the root of the tree—would winnow the chaff from the wheat—yet would baptize with the Holy Spirit (Mt 3:10-12; Lu 3:15-17). Those who professed acceptance of his message, with its condition of repentance, John baptized with water at the Jordan or in its neighborhood (compare Mt 3:6; Joh 1:28; 3:23).

2. Jesus Is Baptized:

(Matthew 3:13-17; Mark 1:9-11; Luke 3:21,22)

John's startling words made a profound impression. All classes from every part of the land, including Pharisees and Sadducees (Mt 3:7), came to his baptism. John was not deceived. He saw how little change of heart underlay it all. The Regenerator had not yet come. But one day there appeared before him One whom he intuitively recognized as different from all the rest—as, indeed, the Christ whose coming it was his to herald. John, up to this time, does not seem to have personally known Jesus (compare Joh 1:31). He must, however, have heard of Him; he had, besides, received a sign by which the Messiah should be recognized (Joh 1:33); and now, when Jesus presented Himself, Divinely pure in aspect, asking baptism at his hands, the conviction was instantaneously flashed on his mind, that this was He. But how should he, a sinful man, baptize this Holy One? "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" (Mt 3:14). The question is one which forces itself upon ourselves—How should Jesus seek or receive a "baptism of repentance"? Jesus Himself puts it on the ground of meetness.

"Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Mt 3:15). The Head was content to enter by the same gateway as the members to His specific vocation in the service of the kingdom. In submitting to the baptism, He formally identified Himself with the expectation of the kingdom and with its ethical demands; separated Himself from the evil of His nation, doubtless with confession of its sins; and devoted Himself to His life-task in bringing in the Messianic salvation. The significance of the rite as marking His consecration to, and entrance upon, His Messianic career, is seen in what follows. As He ascended from the water, while still "praying" (Lu 3:21), the heavens were opened, the Spirit of God descended like a dove upon Him, and a voice from heaven declared: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mt 3:16,17). It is needless to inquire whether anyone besides John (compare Joh 1:33) and Jesus (Mt 3:16; Mr 1:10) received this vision or heard these words; it was for them, not for others, the vision was primarily intended. To Christ's consecration of Himself to His calling, there was now added the spiritual equipment necessary for the doing of His work. He went forward with the seal of the Father's acknowledgment upon Him.

IV. The Temptation.

1. Temptation Follows Baptism:

(Matthew 4:1-11; Mark 1:13,14; Luke 4:1-13)

On the narrative of the baptism in the first three Gospels there follows at once the account of the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness. The psychological naturalness of the incident is generally acknowledged. The baptism of Jesus was a crisis in His experience. He had been plenished by the Spirit for His work; the heavens had been opened to Him, and His mind was agitated by new thoughts and emotions; He was conscious of the possession of new powers. There was need for a period of retirement, of still reflection, of coming to a complete understanding with Himself as to the meaning of the task to which He stood committed, the methods He should employ, the attitude He should take up toward popular hopes and expectations. He would wish to be alone. The Spirit of God led Him (Mt 4:1; Mr 1:12; Lu 4:1) whither His own spirit also impelled. It is with a touch of similar motive that Buddhist legend makes Buddha to be tempted by the evil spirit Mara after he has attained enlightenment.

2. Nature of the Temptation:

The scene of the temptation was the wilderness of Judea. Jesus was there 40 days, during which, it is told, He neither ate nor drank (compare the fasts of Moses and Elijah, Ex 24:18; 34:28; De 9:18; 1Ki 19:8). Mark adds, "He was with the wild beasts" (verse 13). The period was probably one of intense self-concentration. During the whole of it He endured temptations of Satan (Mr 1:13); but the special assaults came at the end (Mt 4:2 ff; Lu 4:2). We assume here a real tempter and real temptations—the question of diabolic agency being considered after. This, however, does not settle the form of the temptations. The struggle was probably an inward one. It can hardly be supposed that Jesus was literally transported by the devil to a pinnacle of the temple, then to a high mountain, then, presumably, back again to the wilderness. The narrative must have come from Jesus Himself, and embodies an ideal or parabolic

element. "The history of the temptation," Lange says, "Jesus afterwards communicated to His disciples in the form of a real narrative, clothed in symbolical language" (Commentary on Matthew, 83, English translation).

3. Stages of the Temptation:

The stages of the temptation were three—each in its own way a trial of the spirit of obedience.

(1) The first temptation was to distrust. Jesus, after His long fast, was hungry. He had become conscious also of supernatural powers. The point on which the temptation laid hold was His sense of hunger—the most over-mastering of appetites. "If thou art the Son of God, command that these stones become bread." The design was to excite distrustful and rebellious thoughts, and lead Jesus to use the powers entrusted to Him in an unlawful way, for private and selfish ends. The temptation was promptly met by a quotation from Scripture: "Man shall not live by bread alone," etc. (Mt 4:4; Lu 4:4; compare De 8:3). If Jesus was in this position, it was His Father who had brought Him there for purposes of trial. Man has a higher life than can be sustained on bread; a life, found in depending on God’s word, and obeying it at whatever cost.

(2) The second temptation (in Luke the third) was to presumption. Jesus is borne in spirit (compare Eze 40:1,2) to a pinnacle of the temple. From this dizzy elevation He is invited to cast Himself down, relying on the Divine promise: "He shall give His angels charge over thee," etc. (compare Ps 91:11,12). In this way an easy demonstration of His Messiahship would be given to the crowds below. The temptation was to overstep those bounds of humility and dependence which were imposed on Him as Son; to play with signs and wonders in His work as Messiah. But again the tempter is foiled by the word: "Thou shalt not make trial of (try experiments with, propose tests, put to the proof) the Lord thy God" (Mt 4:7; Lu 4:12; compare De 6:16).

(3) The third temptation (Luke’s second) was to worldly sovereignty, gained by some small concession to Satan. From some lofty elevation—no place on a geographical map—the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them are flashed before Christ’s mind, and all are offered to Him on condition of one little act of homage to the tempter. It was the temptation to choose the easier path by some slight pandering to falsehood, and Jesus definitely repelled it by the saying: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve" (Mt 4:10; Lu 4:8). Jesus had chosen His path. The Father’s way of the cross would be adhered to.

Its Typical Character.

The stages of the temptation typify the whole round of Satanic assault on man through body, mind, and spirit (Lu 4:13; compare 1Joh 2:16), and the whole round of Messianic temptation. Jesus was constantly being tempted

(a) to spare Himself;

(b) to gratify the Jewish signseekers;

(c) to gain power by sacrifice of the right.

In principle the victory was gained over all at the commencement. His way was henceforth clear.

JESUS CHRIST, 4B

B. THE EARLY JUDAEAN MINISTRY

I. The Testimonies of the Baptist.

1. The Synoptics and John:

While the Synoptics pass immediately from the temptation of Jesus to the ministry in Galilee the imprisonment of the Baptist (Mt 4:12; Mr 1:14,15; Lu 4:14), the Fourth Gospel furnishes the account, full of interest, of the earlier ministry of Jesus in Judea while the Baptist was still at liberty.

2. Threefold Witness of the Baptist:

(John 1:19-37)

The Baptist had announced Christ's coming; had baptized Him when He appeared; it was now his privilege to testify to Him as having come, and to introduce to Jesus His first disciples.

a) First Testimony—Jesus and Popular Messianic Expectation:

(John 1:19-28)

John's work had assumed proportions which made it impossible for the ecclesiastical authorities any longer to ignore it (compare Lu 3:15). A deputation consisting of priests and Levites was accordingly sent to John, where he was baptizing at Bethany beyond Jordan, to put to him categorical questions about his mission. Who was he? And by what authority did—he baptize? Was he the Christ? or Elijah? or the expected prophet? (compare Joh 6:14; 7:4; Mt 16:14). To these questions John gave distinct and straightforward replies. He was not the Christ, not Elijah, not the prophet. His answers grow briefer every time, "I am not the Christ"; "I am not"; "No." Who was he then? The answer was emphatic. He was but a "voice" (compare Isa 40:3)—a preparer of the way of the Lord. In their midst already stood One—not necessarily in the crowd at that moment—with whose greatness his was not to be compared (Joh 1:26,27). John utterly effaces himself before Christ.

b) Second Testimony—Christ and the Sin of the World:

(John 1:29-34)

The day after the interview with the Jerusalem deputies, John saw Jesus coming to him—probably fresh from the temptation—and bore a second and wonderful testimony to His Messiahship. Identifying Jesus with the subject of his former testimonies, and stating the ground of his knowledge in the sign God had given him (1:30-34), he said, "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (1:29). The words are rich in suggestion regarding the character of Jesus, and the nature, universality and efficacy of His work (compare 1 Joh 3:5). The "Lamb" may point specifically to the description of the vicariously Suffering Servant of Yahweh in Isa 53:11.

c) Third Testimony—Christ and the Duty of the Disciple:

(John 1:35-37)

The third testimony was borne "again on the morrow," when John was standing with two of his disciples (one Andrew, 1:40, the other doubtless the evangelist himself). Pointing to Jesus, the Baptist repeated his former words, "Behold, the Lamb of God." While the words are the same, the design was different. In the first "behold" the idea is the recognition of Christ; in the second there is a call to duty—a hint to follow Jesus. On this hint the disciples immediately acted (1:37). It is next to be seen how this earliest "following" of Jesus grew.

II. The First Disciples.

1. Spiritual Accretion:

(John 1:37-51)

John’s narrative shows that Jesus gathered His disciples, less by a series of distinct calls, than by a process of spiritual accretion. Men were led to Him, then accepted by Him. This process of selection left Jesus at the close of the second day with five real and true followers. The history confutes the idea that it was first toward the close of His ministry that Jesus became known to His disciples as the Messiah. In all the Gospels it was as the Christ that the Baptist introduced Jesus; it was as the Christ that the first disciples accepted and confessed Him (Joh 1:41,45,49).

a) Andrew and John—Discipleship as the Fruit of Spiritual Converse:

(John 1:37-40)

The first of the group were Andrew and John—the unnamed disciple of Joh 1:40. These followed Jesus in consequence of their Master’s testimony. It was, however, the few hours’ converse they had with

Jesus in His own abode that actually decided them. To Christ's question, "What seek ye?" their answer was practically "Thyself." "The mention of the time—the 10th hour, i.e. 10 AM—is one of the small traits that mark John. He is here looking back on the date of his own spiritual birth" (Westcott).

b) Simon Peter—Discipleship a Result of Personal Testimony:

(John 1:41,42)

John and Andrew had no sooner found Christ for themselves ("We have found the Messiah," Joh 1:41) than they hastened to tell others of their discovery. Andrew at once sought out Simon, his brother, and brought him to Jesus; so, later, Philip sought Nathanael (Joh 1:45). Christ's unerring eye read at once the quality of the man whom Andrew introduced to Him. "Thou art Simon the son of John: thou shalt be called Cephas"—"Rock" or "Stone" (1:42). Mt 16:18, therefore, is not the original bestowal of this name, but the confirmation of it. The name is the equivalent of "Peter" (Petros), and was given to Simon, not with any official connotation, but because of the strength and clearness of his convictions. His general steadfastness is not disproved by His one unhappy failure. (Was it thus the apostle acquired the name "Peter"?)

c) Philip—the Result of Scriptural Evidence:

(John 1:43,14)

The fourth disciple, Philip, was called by Jesus Himself, when about to depart for Galilee (Joh 1:43). Friendship may have had its influence on Philip (like the foregoing, he also was from Bethsaida of Galilee, Joh 1:44), but that which chiefly decided him was the correspondence of what he found in Jesus with the prophetic testimonies (Joh 1:45).

d) Nathanael—Discipleship an Effect of Heart-Searching Power:

(John 1:45-51)

Philip sought Nathanael (of Cana of Galilee, Joh 21:2)—the same probably as Bartholomew the Apostle—and told him he had found Him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets had written (Joh 1:45). Nathanael doubted, on the ground that the Messiah was not likely to have His origin in an obscure place like Nazareth (Joh 1:46; compare Joh 7:52). Philip's wise answer was, "Come and see"; and when Nathanael came, the Lord met him with a word which speedily rid him of his hesitations. First, Jesus attested His seeker's sincerity ("Behold, an Israelite indeed," etc., Joh 1:47); then, on Nathanael expressing surprise, revealed to him His knowledge of a recent secret act of meditation or devotion ("when thou wast under the fig tree," etc., Joh 1:48). The sign was sufficient to convince Nathanael that he was in the presence of a superhuman, nay a Divine, Being, therefore, the Christ—"Son of God .... King of Israel" (Joh 1:49). Jesus met his faith with further self-disclosure. Nathanael had believed on comparatively slight evidence; he would see greater things: heavens opened, and the angels of God

ascending and descending upon the Son of Man (Joh 1:51). The allusion is to Jacob's vision (Ge 28:10-22)—a Scripture which had possibly been theme of Philip's meditation in his privacy. Jesus puts Himself in place of that mystic ladder as the medium of reopened communication between heaven and earth.

2. "Son of Man" and "Son of God":

The name "Son of Man"—a favorite designation of Jesus for Himself—appears here for the first time in the Gospels. It is disputed whether it was a current Messianic title (see SON OF MAN), but at least it had this force on the lips of Jesus Himself, denoting Him as the possessor of a true humanity, and as standing in a representative relation to mankind universally. It is probably borrowed from Da 7:13 and appears in the Book of Enoch (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE). The higher title, "Son of God," given to Jesus by Nathanael, could not, of course, as yet carry with it the transcendental associations of John's Prologue (Joh 1:1,14,18), but it evidently conveyed an idea of superhuman dignity and unique relation to God, such as the better class of minds would seem to have attributed to the Messiah (compare Joh 5:18; 10:33 ff; Mt 26:63).

III. The First Events.

An interval of a few weeks is occupied by a visit of Jesus to Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:1) and a brief sojourn in Capernaum (Joh 2:12); after which Jesus returned to Jerusalem to the Passover as the most appropriate place for His public manifestation of Himself as Messiah (Joh 2:13). The notes of time in John suggest that the Passover (beginning of April, 27 AD) took place about three months after the baptism by John (compare 1:43; 2:1,12).

1. The First Miracle:

(Joh 2:1-11)

Prior to His public manifestation, a more private unfolding of Christ's glory was granted to the disciples at the marriage feast of Cana of Galilee (compare Joh 2:11). The marriage was doubtless that of some relative of the family, and the presence of Jesus at the feast, with His mother, brethren and disciples (as Joseph no more appears, it may be concluded that he was dead), is significant as showing that His religion is not one of antagonism to natural relations. The marriage festivities lasted seven days, and toward the close the wine provided for the guests gave out. Mary interposed with an indirect suggestion that Jesus might supply the want. Christ's reply, literally, "Woman, what is that to thee and to me?" (Joh 2:4), is not intended to convey the least tinge of reproof (compare Westcott, in the place cited.), but intimates to Mary that His actions were henceforth to be guided by a rule other than hers (compare Lu 2:51). This, however, as Mary saw (Joh 2:5), did not preclude an answer to her desire. Six waterpots of stone stood near, and Jesus ordered these to be filled with water (the quantity was large; about 50 gallons); then when the water was drawn off it was found changed into a nobler element—a wine purer and better than could have been obtained from any natural vintage. The ruler of the feast, in ignorance of

its origin, expressed surprise at its quality (Joh 2:10). The miracle was symbolical—a "sign" (Joh 2:11)—and may be contrasted with the first miracle of Moses—turning the water into blood (Ex 7:20). It points to the contrast between the old dispensation and the new, and to the work of Christ as a transforming, enriching and glorifying of the natural, through Divine grace and power.

After a brief stay at Capernaum (Joh 2:12), Jesus went up to Jerusalem to keep the Passover. There it was His design formally to manifest Himself. Other "signs" He wrought at the feast, leading many to believe on Him—not, however, with a deep or enduring faith (Joh 2:23-25)—but the special act by which He signalized His appearance was His public cleansing of the temple from the irreligious trafficking with which it had come to be associated.

2. The First Passover, and Cleansing of the Temple:

(John 2:13-25)

A like incident is related by the Synoptics at the close of Christ's ministry (Mt 21:12,13; Mr 11:15-18; Lu 19:45,46), and it is a question whether the act was actually repeated, or whether the other evangelists, who do not narrate the events of the early ministry, simply record it out of its chronological order. In any case, the act was a fitting inauguration of the Lord's work. A regular market was held in the outer court of the temple. Here the animals needed for sacrifice could be purchased, foreign money exchanged, and the doves, which were the offerings of the poor, be obtained. It was a busy, tumultuous, noisy and unholy scene, and the "zeal" of Jesus burned within Him—had doubtless often done so before—as He witnessed it. Arming Himself with a scourge of cords, less as a weapon of offense, than as a symbol of authority, He descended with resistless energy upon the wrangling throng, drove out the dealers and the cattle, overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and commanded the doves to be taken away. Let them not profane His Father's house (Joh 2:14-16). No one seems to have opposed. All felt that a prophet was among them, and could not resist the overpowering authority with which He spake and acted. By and by, when their courage revived, they asked Him for a "sign" in evidence of His right to do such things. Jesus gave them no sign such as they demanded, but uttered an enigmatic word, and left them to reflect on it, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Joh 2:19). The authenticity of the saying is sufficiently vouched for by the perverted use made of it at Christ's trial (Mt 26:61 parallel). It is a word based on the foresight which Christ had that the conflict now commencing was to end in His rejection and death. "The true way to destroy the Temple, in the eyes of Jesus, was to slay the Messiah. .... If it is in the person of the Messiah that the Temple is laid in ruins, it is in His person it shall be raised again" (Godet). The disciples, after the resurrection, saw the meaning of the word (Joh 2:22).

3. The Visit of Nicodemus:

(John 3:1-12)

As a sequel to these stirring events Jesus had a nocturnal visitor in the person of Nicodemus—a

Pharisee, a ruler of the Jews, a "teacher of Israel" (Joh 3:10), apparently no longer young (Joh 3:4). His coming by night argues, besides some fear of man, a constitutional timidity of disposition (compare Joh 19:39); but the interesting thing is that he did come, showing that he had been really impressed by Christ's words and works. One recognizes in him a man of candor and uprightness of spirit, yet without adequate apprehensions of Christ Himself, and of the nature of Christ's kingdom. Jesus he was prepared to acknowledge as a Divinely-commissioned teacher—one whose mission was accredited by miracle (Joh 3:2). He was interested in the kingdom, but, as a morally living man, had no doubt of his fitness to enter into it. Jesus had but to teach and he would understand.

(1) The New Birth.

Jesus in His reply laid His finger at once on the defective point in His visitor's relation to Himself and to His kingdom: "Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (Joh 3:3); "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (Joh 3:5). Nicodemus was staggered at this demand for a spiritual new birth. There is reason to believe that proselytes were baptized on being received into the Jewish church, and their baptism was called a "new birth." Nicodemus would therefore be familiar with the expression, but could not see that it had any applicability to him. Jesus teaches him, on the other hand, that he also needs a new birth, and this, not through water only, but through the Spirit. The change was mysterious, yet plainly manifest in its effects (Joh 3:7,8). If Nicodemus did not understand these "earthly things"—the evidence of which lay all around him—how should he understand "heavenly things," the things pertaining to salvation?

(2) "Heavenly Things."

These "heavenly things" Jesus now proceeds to unfold to Nicodemus: "As Moses lifted up the serpent," etc. (Joh 3:14). The "lifting up" is a prophecy of the cross (compare 12:32-34). The brazen serpent is the symbol of sin conquered and destroyed by the death of Christ. What follows in Joh 3:16-21 is probably the evangelist's expansion of this theme—God's love the source of salvation (Joh 3:16), God's purpose not the world's condemnation, but its salvation (Joh 3:17,18) the self-judgment of sin (Joh 3:19).

4. Jesus and John:

(John 3:22-36)

Retiring from Jerusalem, Jesus commenced a ministry in Judea (Joh 3:22). It lasted apparently about 6 months. The earlier Gospels pass over it. This is accounted for by the fact that the ministry in Judea was still preparatory. Jesus had publicly asserted His Messianic authority. A little space is now allowed to test the result. Meanwhile Jesus descends again to the work of prophetic preparation. His ministry at this stage is hardly distinguishable from John's. He summons to the baptism of repentance. His disciples, not Himself, administer the rite (Joh 3:23; 4:2); hence the sort of rivalry that sprang up between His baptism and that of the forerunner (Joh 3:22-26). John was baptizing at the time at Aenon, on the western side of the Jordan; Jesus somewhere in the neighborhood. Soon the greater teacher began to eclipse the less.

"All men came to Him" (3:26). John's reply showed how pure his mind was from the narrow, grudging spirit which characterized his followers. To him it was no grievance, but the fulfillment of his joy, that men should be flocking to Jesus. He was not the Bridegroom, but the friend of the Bridegroom. They themselves had heard him testify, "I am not the Christ." It lay in the nature of things that Jesus must increase; he must decrease (3:27-30). Explanatory words follow (3:31-36).

IV. Journey to Galilee—the Woman of Samaria.

1. Withdrawal to Galilee:

Toward the close of this Judean ministry the Baptist appears to have been cast into prison for his faithfulness in reproving Herod Antipas for taking his brother Philip's wife (compare Joh 3:24; Mt 14:3-5 parallel). It seems most natural to connect the departure to Galilee in Joh 4:3 with that narrated in Mt 3:13 parallel, though some think the imprisonment of the Baptist did not take place till later. The motive which Joh gives was the hostility of the Pharisees, but it was the imprisonment of the Baptist which led Jesus to commence, at the time He did, an independent ministry. The direct road to Galilee lay through Samaria; hence the memorable encounter with the woman at that place.

2. The Living Water:

Jesus, being wearied, paused to rest Himself at Jacob's well, near a town called Sychar, now 'Askar. It was about the sixth hour—or 6 o'clock in the evening. The time of year is determined by Joh 4:35 to be "four months" before harvest, i.e. December (there is no reason for not taking this literally). It suits the evening hour that the woman of Samaria came out to draw water. (Some, on a different reckoning, take the hour to be noon.) Jesus opened the conversation by asking from the woman a draught from her pitcher. The proverbial hatred between Jews and Samaritans filled the woman with surprise that Jesus should thus address Himself to her. Still greater was her surprise when, as the conversation proceeded, Jesus announced Himself as the giver of a water of which, if a man drank, he should never thirst again (Joh 4:13,14). Only gradually did His meaning penetrate her mind, "Sir, give me this water," etc. (Joh 4:15). The request of Jesus that she would call her husband led to the discovery that Jesus knew all the secrets of her life. She was before a prophet (Joh 4:19). As in the case iof Nathanael, the heart-searching power of Christ's word convinced her of His Divine claim.

3. The True Worship:

The conversation next turned upon the right place of worship. The Samaritans had a temple of their own on Mount Gerizim; the Jews, on the other hand, held to the exclusive validity of the temple at Jerusalem. Which was right? Jesus in His reply, while pronouncing for the Jews as the custodians of God's salvation (Joh 4:22), makes it plain that distinction of places is no longer a matter of any practical importance. A change was imminent which would substitute a universal religion for one of special times and places (Joh 4:20). He enunciates the great principle of the new dispensation that God is a Spirit, and they who worship Him must do so in spirit and in truth. Finally, when she spoke of the Messiah, Jesus

made Himself definitely known to her as the Christ. To this poor Samaritan woman, with her receptive heart, He unveils Himself more plainly than He had done to priests and rulers (Joh 4:26).

4. Work at Its Reward:

The woman went home and became an evangelist to her people, with notable results (Joh 4:28,39). Jesus abode with them two days and confirmed the impression made by her testimony (Joh 4:40-42). Meanwhile, He impressed on His disciples the need of earnest sowing and reaping in the service of the Kingdom, assuring them of unfailing reward for both sower and reaper (Joh 4:35-38). He Himself was their Great Example (Joh 4:34).

JESUS CHRIST, 4C1

C. THE GALILEAN MINISTRY AND VISITS TO THE FEASTS

1. The Scene:

Galilee was divided into upper Galilee and lower Galilee. It has already been remarked that upper Galilee was inhabited by a mixed population—hence called "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Mt 4:15). The highroads of commerce ran through it. It was "the way of the sea" (the King James Version)—a scene of constant traffic. The people were rude, ignorant, and superstitious, and were densely crowded together in towns and villages. About 160 BC there were only a few Jews in the midst of a large heathen population; but by the time of Christ the Jewish element had greatly increased. The busiest portion of this busy district was round the Sea of Galilee, at the Northeast corner of which stood Capernaum—wealthy and cosmopolitan. In Nazareth, indeed, Jesus met with a disappointing reception (Lu 4:16-30; Mt 13:54-57; compare Joh 4:43-45); yet in Galilee generally He found a freer spirit and greater receptiveness than among the stricter traditionalists of Judea.

2. The Time:

It is assumed here that Jesus returned to Galilee in December, 27 AD, and that His ministry there lasted till late in 29 AD (see "Chronology" above). On the two years' scheme of the public ministry, the Passover of Joh 6:4 has to be taken as the second in Christ's ministry—therefore as occurring at an interval of only 3 or 4 months after the return. This seems impossible in view of the crowding of events it involves in so short a time—opening incidents, stay in Capernaum (Mt 4:13), three circuits in "all Galilee" (Mt 4:23-25 parallel; Lu 8:1-4; Mt 9:35-38; Mr 6:6), lesser journeys and excursions (Sermon on Mount: Gadara); and the dislocations it necessitates, e.g. the plucking of ears of corn (about Passover time) must be placed after the feeding of the 5,000, etc. It is simpler to adhere to the three years' scheme.

A division of the Galilean ministry may then fitly be made into two periods—one preceding, the other succeeding the Mission of the Twelve in Mt 10 parallel. One reason for this division is that after the

Mission of the Twelve the order of events is the same in the first three evangelists till the final departure from Galilee.

First Period—From the Beginning of the Ministry in Galilee till the Mission of the Twelve

I. Opening Incidents.

1. Healing of Nobleman's Son:

(Joh 4:43-54)

From sympathetic Samaria (Joh 4:39), Jesus had journeyed to unsympathetic Galilee, and first to Cana, where His first miracle had been wrought. The reports of His miracles in Judea had come before Him (Joh 4:45), and it was mainly His reputation as a miracle-worker which led a nobleman—a courtier or officer at Herod's court—to seek Him at Cana on behalf of his son, who was near to death. Jesus rebuked the sign-seeking spirit (Joh 4:48), but, on the fervent appeal being repeated, He bade the nobleman go his way: his son lived. The man's prayer had been, "Come down"; but he had faith to receive the word of Jesus (Joh 4:50), and on his way home received tidings of his son's recovery. The nobleman, with his whole household, was won for Jesus (Joh 4:53). This is noted as the second of Christ's Galilean miracles (Joh 4:54).

2. The Visit to Nazareth:

(Matthew 4:13; Luke 4:16-30)

A very different reception awaited Him at Nazareth,"his own country," to which He next came. We can scarcely take the incident recorded in Lu 4:16-30 to be the same as that in Mt 13:54-58, though Matthew's habit of grouping makes this not impossible. The Sabbath had come, and on His entering the synagogue, as was His wont, the repute He had won led to His being asked to read. The Scripture He selected (or which came in the order of the day) was Isa 61:1 ff (the fact that Jesus was able to read from the synagogue-roll is interesting as bearing on His knowledge of Hebrew), and from this He proceeded to amaze His hearers by declaring that this Scripture was now fulfilled in their ears (Lu 4:21). The "words of grace" he uttered are not given, but it can be understood that, following the prophet's guidance, He would hold Himself forth as the predicted "Servant of Yahweh," sent to bring salvation to the poor, the bound, the broken-hearted, and for this purpose endowed with the fullness of the Spirit. The idea of the passage in Isa is that of the year of jubilee, when debts were canceled, inheritances restored, and slaves set free, and Jesus told them He had come to inaugurate that "acceptable year of the Lord." At first He was listened to with admiration, then, as the magnitude of the claims He was making became apparent to His audience, a very different spirit took possession of them. 'Who was this that spoke thus?' 'Was it not Joseph's son?' (Lu 4:22). They were disappointed, too, that Jesus showed no disposition to gratify them by working before them any of the miracles of which they had heard so much (Lu 4:23). Jesus saw the gathering storm, but met it resolutely. He told His hearers He had not expected

any better reception, and in reply to their reproach that He had wrought miracles elsewhere, but had wrought none among them, quoted examples of prophets who had done the same thing (Elijah, Elisha, Lu 4:24-28). This completed the exasperation of the Nazarenes, who, springing forward, dragged Him to the brow of the hill on which their city was built, and would have thrown Him down, had something in the aspect of Jesus not restrained them. With one of those looks we read of occasionally in the Gospels, He seems to have overawed His townsmen, and, passing in safety through their midst, left the place (Lu 4:28-30).

3. Call of the Four Disciples:

(Matthew 4:17-22; Mark 1:16-22; Luke 5:1-11)

After leaving Nazareth Jesus made His way to Capernaum (probably Tell Hum), which thereafter seems to have been His headquarters. He "dwelt" there (Mt 4:13). It is called in Mt 9:1, "his own city." Before teaching in Capernaum self, however, He appears to have opened His ministry by evangelizing along the shores of the Sea of Galilee (Mt 4:18; Mr 1:16; Lu 5:1), and there, at Bethsaida (on topographical questions, see special articles), He took His first step in gathering His chosen disciples more closely around Him. Hitherto, though attached to His person and cause, the pairs of fisher brothers, Simon and Andrew, James and John—these last the "sons of Zebedee"—had not been in constant attendance upon Him. Since the return from Jerusalem, they had gone back to their ordinary avocations. The four were "partners" (Lu 5:10). They had "hired servants" (Mr 1:20); therefore were moderately well off. The time had now come when they were to leave "all," and follow Jesus entirely.

a) The Draught of Fishes:

(Luke 5:1-9)

Luke alone records the striking miracle which led to the call. Jesus had been teaching the multitude from a boat borrowed from Simon, and now at the close He bade Simon put out into the deep, and let down his nets. Peter told Jesus they had toiled all night in vain, but he would obey His word. The result was an immense draught of fishes, so that the nets were breaking, and the other company had to be called upon for help. Both boats were filled and in danger of sinking. Peter’s cry in so wonderful a presence was, "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord."

b) "Fishers of Men":

The miracle gave Jesus opportunity for the word He wished to speak. It is here that Mt and Mr take up the story. The boats had been brought to shore when, first to Simon and Andrew, afterward to James and John (engaged in "mending their nets," Mt 4:21; Mr 1:19), the call was given:"Come ye after me, and I will make you fishers of men." At once all was left—boats, nets, friends—and they followed Him. Their experience taught them to have large expectations from Christ.

4. At Capernaum:

(Matthew 4:13; Luke 4:31)

Jesus is now found in Capernaum. An early Sabbath—perhaps the first of His stated residence in the city—was marked by notable events. The Sabbath found Jesus as usual in the synagogue—now as teacher. The manner of His teaching is specially noticed: "He taught them as having authority, and not as the scribes" (Mr 1:22). The scribes gave forth nothing of their own.

a) Christ's Teaching:

(Mark 1:22,27; Luke 4:32)

They but repeated the dicta of the great authorities of the past. It was a surprise to the people to find in Jesus One whose wisdom, like waters from a clear fountain, came fresh and sparkling from His own lips. The authority also with which Jesus spoke commanded attention. He sought support in the opinion of no others, but gave forth His statements with firmness, decision, dignity and emphasis.

b) The Demoniac in the Synagogue:

(Mark 1:23-27; Luke 4:33-37)

While Jesus was teaching an extraordinary incident occurred. A man in the assembly, described as possessed by "an unclean spirit" (Mr 1:23; Lu 4:33) broke forth in cries, addressing Jesus by name ("Jesus, thou Nazarene"), speaking of Him as "the Holy One of God," and asking "What have we to do with thee? Art thou come to destroy us?" The diseased consciousness of the sufferer bore a truer testimony to Christ's dignity, holiness and power than most of those present could have given, and instinctively, but truly, construed His coming as meaning destruction to the empire of the demons. At Christ's word, after a terrible paroxysm, from which, however, the man escaped unhurt (Lu 4:35), the demon was cast out. More than ever the people were "amazed" at the word which had such power (Mr 1:27).

Demon-Possession: Its Reality.

This is the place to say a word on this terrible form of malady—demon-possession—met with so often in the Gospels. Was it a reality? Or a hallucination? Did Jesus believe in it? It is difficult to read the Gospels, and not answer the last question in the affirmative. Was Jesus, then, mistaken? This also it is hard to believe. If there is one subject on which Jesus might be expected to have clear vision—on which we might trust His insight—it was His relation to the spiritual world with which He stood in so close rapport. Was He likely then to be mistaken when He spoke so earnestly, so profoundly, so frequently, of its hidden forces of evil? There is in itself no improbability—rather analogy suggests the highest probability—of realms of spiritual existence outside our sensible ken. That evil should enter this

spiritual world, and that human life should be deeply implicated with that evil—that its forces should have a mind and will organizing and directing them—are not beliefs to be dismissed with scorn. The presence of such beliefs in the time of Christ is commonly attributed to Babylonian, Persian or other foreign influences. It may be questioned, however, whether the main cause was not something far more real—an actual and permitted "hour and the power of darkness" (Lu 22:53) in the kingdom of evil, discovering itself in manifestations in the bodies and souls of men, that could be traced only to a supernatural cause (see DEMONIAC). (The present writer discusses the subject in an article in the Sunday School Times for June 4, 1910. It would be presumptuous even to say that the instance in the Gospels have no modern parallels. See a striking paper in Good, Words, edited by Dr. Norman MacLeod, for 1867, on "The English Demoniac.") It should be noted that all diseases are not, as is sometimes affirmed, traced to demonic influence. The distinction between other diseases and demonic possession is clearly maintained (compare Mt 4:24; 10:1; 11:5, etc.). Insanity, epilepsy, blindness, dumbness, etc., were frequent accompaniments of possession, but they are not identified with it.

c) Peter’s Wife’s Mother:

(Matthew 8:14,15; Mark 1:29-31; Luke 4:38,39)

Jesus, on leaving the synagogue, entered the house of Peter. In Mark it is called "the house of Simon and Andrew" (1:29). Peter was married (compare 1Co 9:5), and apparently his mother-in-law and brother lived with him in Capernaum. It was an anxious time in the household, for the mother-in-law lay "sick of a fever"—"a great fever," as Luke the physician calls it. Taking her by the hand, Jesus rebuked the fever, which instantaneously left her. The miracle, indeed, was a double one, for not only was the fever stayed, but strength was at once restored. "She rose up and ministered unto them" (Lu 4:39).

d) The Eventful Evening:

(Matthew 8:16; Mark 1:32-34; Luke 4:40,41)

The day’s labors were not yet done; were, indeed, scarce begun. The news of what had taken place quickly spread, and soon the extraordinary spectacle was presented of ‘the whole city’ gathered at the door of the dwelling, bringing their sick of every kind to be healed. Demoniacs were there, crying and being rebuked, but multitudes of others as well. The Lord’s compassion was unbounded. He rejected none. He labored unweariedly till every one was healed. His sympathy was individual: "He laid his hands on every one of them" (Lu 4:40).

II. From First Galilean Circuit till the Choice of the Apostles.

1. The First Circuit:

(Mark 1:35-45; Luke 4:42-44; compare Matthew 4:23-25)

The chronological order in this section is to be sought in Mark and Luke; Matthew groups for didactic purposes. The morning after that eventful Sabbath evening in Capernaum, Jesus took steps for a systematic visitation of the towns and villages of Galilee.

The task He set before Himself was prepared for by early, prolonged, solitary prayer (Mr 1:35; many instances show that Christ's life was steeped in prayer). His disciples followed Him, and reported that the multitudes sought Him. Jesus intimated to them His intention of passing to the next towns, and forthwith commenced a tour of preaching and healing "throughout all Galilee."

a) Its Scope:

Even if the expression "all Galilee" is used with some latitude, it indicates a work of very extensive compass. It was a work likewise methodically conducted (compare Mr 6:6: "went round about the villages," literally, "in a circle"). Galilee at this time was extraordinarily populous (compare Josephus, Wars of the Jews, III, iii, 2), and the time occupied by the circuit must have been considerable. Matthew's condensed picture (Mt 4:23-25) shows that Christ's activity during this period was incredibly great. He stirred the province to its depths. His preaching and miracles drew enormous crowds after Him. This tide of popularity afterward turned, but much of the seed sown may have produced fruit at a later day.

b) Cure of the Leper:

(Matthew 8:2-4; Mark 1:40-45; Luke 5:12-16)

The one incident recorded which seems to have belonged to this tour was a sufficiently typical one. While Jesus was in a certain city a man "full of leprosy" (Lu 5:12) came and threw himself down before Him, seeking to be healed. The man did not even ask Jesus to heal him, but expressed his faith, "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." The man's apparent want of importunity was the very essence of his importunity. Jesus, moved by his earnestness, touched him, and the man was made whole on the spot. The leper was enjoined to keep silence—Jesus did not wish to pass for a mere miracle-worker—and bade the man show himself to the priests and offer the appointed sacrifices (note Christ's respect for the legal institutions). The leper failed to keep Christ's charge, and published his cure abroad, no doubt much to his own spiritual detriment, and also to the hindrance of Christ's work (Mr 1:45).

2. Capernaum Incidents:

His circuit ended, Jesus returned to Capernaum (Mr 2:1; literally, "after days"). Here again His fame at once drew multitudes to see and hear Him. Among them were now persons of more unfriendly spirit. Pharisees and doctors, learning of the new rabbi, had come out of "every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem" (Lu 5:17), to hear and judge of Him for themselves. The chief incidents of this visit are the two now to be noted.

a) Cure of the Paralytic:

(Matthew 9:2-8; Mark 2:1-12; Luke 5:17-26)

In a chamber crowded till there was no standing room, even round the door, Jesus wrought the cure upon the paralytic man. The scene was a dramatic one. From Christ's words "son," literally, "child" (Mr 2:5), we infer that the paralytic was young, but his disablement seems to have been complete. It was no easy matter, with the doorways blocked, to get the man brought to Jesus, but his four bearers (Mr 2:3) were not easily daunted. They climbed the fiat roof, and, removing part of the covering above where Jesus was, let down the man into the midst. Jesus, pleased with the inventiveness and perseverance of their faith, responded to their wish. But, first, that the spiritual and temporal might be set in their right relations, and the attitude of His hearers be tested, He spoke the higher words: "Son, thy sins are forgiven" (Mr 2:5). At once the temper of the scribes was revealed. Here was manifest evasion. Anyone could say, "Thy sins are forgiven." Worse, it was blasphemy, for "who can forgive sins but one, even God?" (Mr 2:7). Unconsciously they were conceding to Christ the Divine dignity He claimed. Jesus perceives at once the thoughts of the cavilers, and proceeds to expose their malice. Accepting their own test, He proves His right to say, "Thy sins are forgiven," by now saying to the palsied man, "Take up thy bed and walk" (Mr 2:9,11). At once the man arose, took his bed, and went forth whole. The multitude were "amazed" and "glorified God" (Mr 2:12).

b) Call and Feast of Matthew:

(Matthew 9:9-13; Mark 2:13-17; Luke 5:27-32)

The call of Matthew apparently took place shortly after the cure of the paralytic man. The feast was possibly later (compare the connection with the appeal of Jairus, Mt 9:18), but the call and the feast are best taken together, as they are in all the three narratives.

(1) The Call.

Matthew is called "Levi" by Luke, and "Levi, the son of Alpheus" by Mark. By occupation he was a "publican" (Lu 5:27), collector of custom-dues in Capernaum, an important center of traffic. There is no reason to suppose that Matthew was not a man of thorough uprightness, though naturally the class to which he belonged was held in great odium by the Jews. Passing the place of toll on His way to or from the lake-side, Jesus called Matthew to follow Him. The publican must by this time have seen and heard much of Jesus, and could not but keenly feel His grace in calling one whom men despised. Without an instant's delay, he left all, and followed Jesus. From publican, Matthew became apostle, then evangelist.

(2) The Feast.

Then, or after, in the joy of his heart, Matthew made a feast for Jesus. To this feast he invited many of his own class—"publicans and sinners" (Mt 9:10). Scribes and Pharisees were loud in their

remonstrances to the disciples at what seemed to them an outrage on all propriety. Narrow hearts cannot understand the breadth of grace. Christ's reply was conclusive: "They that are whole have no need of a physician, but they that are sick," etc. (Mr 2:17, etc.).

(3) Fasting and Joy.

Another line of objection was encountered from disciples of the Baptist. They, like the Pharisees, "fasted oft" (Mt 9:14), and they took exception to the unconstrained way in which Jesus and His disciples entered into social life. Jesus defends His disciples by adopting a metaphor of John's own (Joh 3:29), and speaking of Himself as the heavenly bridegroom (Mr 2:19). Joy was natural while the bridegroom was with them; then, with a sad forecast of the end, He alludes to days of mourning when the bridegroom should be taken away (Mr 2:20). A deeper answer follows. The spirit of His gospel is a free, spontaneous, joyful spirit, and cannot be confined within the old forms. To attempt to confine His religion within the outworn forms of Judaism would be like putting a patch of undressed cloth on an old garment, or pouring new wine into old wineskins. The garment would be rent; the wineskins would burst (Mr 2:21,22 parallel). The new spirit must make forms of its own.

3. The Unnamed Jerusalem Feast:

(John 5)

At this point is probably to, be introduced the visit to Jerusalem to attend "a feast," or, according to another reading, "the feast' of the Jews, recorded in Joh 5. The feast may, if the article is admitted, have been the Passover (April), though in that case one would expect it to be named; it may have been Purim (March), only this is not a feast Jesus might be thought eager to attend; it may even have been Pentecost (June). In this last case it would succeed the Sabbath controversies to be mentioned later. Fortunately, the determination of the actual feast has little bearing on the teaching of the chapter.

a) The Healing at Bethesda:

(John 5:1-16)

Bethesda ("house of mercy") was the name given to a pool, fed by an intermittent spring, possessing healing properties, which was situated by the sheep-gate (not "market," the King James Version), i.e. near the temple, on the East Porches were erected to accommodate the invalids who desired to make trial of the waters (the mention of the angel, Joh 5:4, with part of 5:3, is a later gloss, and is justly omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)). On one of these porches lay an impotent man. His infirmity was of long standing—38 years. Hope deferred was making his heart sick, for he had no friend, when the waters were troubled, to put him into the pool. Others invariably got down before him. Jesus took pity on this man. He asked him if he would be made whole; then by a word of power healed him. The cure was instantaneous (John 5:8,9). It was the Sabbath day, and as the man, at Christ's command, took up his bed to go, he was challenged as doing that which was unlawful. The healed man, however,

rightly perceived that He who was able to work so great a cure had authority to say what should and should not be done on the Sabbath. Meeting the man after in the temple, Jesus bade him "sin no more"—a hint, perhaps, that his previous infirmity was a result of sinful conduct (John 5:14).

b) Son and Father:

(John 5:17-29)

Jesus Himself was now challenged by the authorities for breaking the Sabbath. Their strait, artificial rules would not permit even of acts of mercy on the Sabbath. This led, on the part of Jesus, to a momentous assertion of His Divine dignity. He first justified Himself by the example of His Father, who works continually in the upholding and government of the universe (Joh 5:17)—the Sabbath is a rest from earthly labors, for Divine, heavenly labor (Westcott)—then, when this increased the offense by its suggestion of "equality" with the Father, so that His life was threatened (Joh 5:18), He spoke yet more explicitly of His unique relationship to the Father, and of the Divine prerogatives it conferred upon Him. The Jews were right: if Jesus were not a Divine Person, the claims He made would be blasphemous. Not only was He admitted to intimacy with the Divine counsel (Joh 5:20,21; compare Mt 11:27), but to Him, He averred, was committed the Divine power of giving life (Joh 5:21,26), of judgment (Joh 5:22,27), of resurrection—spiritual resurrection now (Joh 5:24,25), resurrection at the last day (Joh 5:28,29). It was the Father’s will that the Son should be honored even as Himself (Joh 5:23).

c) The Threefold Witness:

(John 5:30-47)

These stupendous claims are not made without adequate attestation. Jesus cites a threefold witness:

(1) the witness of the Baptist, whose testimony they had been willing for a time to receive (Joh 5:33,15);

(2) the witness of the Father, who by Christ’s works supported His witness to Himself (Joh 5:36-38);

(3) the witness of the Scriptures, for these, if read with spiritual discernment, would have led to Him (Joh 5:39,45-47). Moses, whom they trusted, would condemn them. Their rejection of Jesus was due, not to want of light, but to the state of the heart: "I know you, that ye have not the love of God in yourselves" (Joh 5:42); "How can ye believe," etc. (Joh 5:44).

4. Sabbath Controversies:

Shortly after His return to Galilee, if the order of events has been rightly apprehended, Jesus became involved in new disputes with the Pharisees about Sabbath-keeping. Possibly we hear in these the echoes of the charges brought against Him at the feast in Judea. Christ’s conduct, and the principles involved in His replies, throw valuable light on the Sabbath institution.

a) Plucking of the Ears of Grain: (Matthew 12:1-8; Mark 2:23-28; Luke 6:1-5)

The first dispute was occasioned by the action of the disciples in plucking ears of grain and rubbing them in their hands as they passed through the grainfields on a Sabbath (the note of time "second-first," in Lu 6:1 the King James Version, is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American). In any case the ripened grain points to a time shortly after the Passover). The law permitted this liberty (De 23:25), but Pharisaic rigor construed it into an offense to do the act on the Sabbath (for specimens of the minute, trivial and vexatious rules by which the Pharisees converted the Sabbath into a day of wretched constraint, see Farrar's Life of Christ, Edersheim's Jesus the Messiah, and similar works). Jesus, in defending His disciples, first quotes Old Testament precedents (David and the showbread, an act done apparently on the Sabbath, 1Sa 21:6; the priests' service on the Sabbath—"One greater than the temple" was there, Mt 12:6), in illustration of the truth that necessity overrides positive enactment; next, falls back on the broad principle of the design of the Sabbath as made for man—for his highest physical, mental, moral and spiritual well-being: "The sabbath was made for man," etc. (Mr 2:27). The claims of mercy are paramount. The end is not to be sacrificed to the means. The Son of Man, therefore, asserts lordship over the Sabbath (Mr 2:28 parallel).

b) The Man with the Withered Hand:

(Matthew 12:10-14; Mark 3:1-6; Luke 6:6-11)

The second collision took place on "another sabbath" (Lu 6:6) in the synagogue. There was present a man with a withered hand. The Pharisees themselves, on this occasion, eager to entrap Jesus, seem to have provoked the conflict by a question, "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?" (Mt 12:10). Jesus met them by an appeal to their own practice in permitting the rescue of a sheep that had fallen into a pit on the Sabbath day (Mt 12:11,12), then, bidding the man stand forth~, retorted the question on themselves, "Is it lawful on the sabbath day to do good, or to do harm? to save a life, or to kill?" (Mr 3:4)—an allusion to their murderous intents. On no reply being made, looking on them with holy indignation, Jesus ordered the man to stretch forth his hand, and it was at once perfectly restored. The effect was only to inflame to "madness" (Lu 6:11) the minds of His adversaries, and Pharisees and Herodians (the court-party of Herod) took counsel to destroy Him (Mr 3:6 parallel).

c) Withdrawal to the Sea:

(Matthew 12:15-21; Mark 3:7-9)

Jesus, leaving this scene of unprofitable conflict, quietly withdrew with His disciples to the shore, and there continued His work of teaching and healing. People from all the neighboring districts flocked to His ministry. He taught them from a little boat (Mr 3:9), and healed their sick. Mt sees in this a fulfillment of the oracle which is to be found in Isa 42:1-4.

5. The Choosing of the Twelve:

(Matthew 10:1-4; Mark 3:13-19; Luke 6:12-16; Ac 1:13)

The work of Jesus was growing on His hands, and friends and enemies were rapidly taking sides. The time accordingly had come for selecting and attaching to His person a definite number of followers—not simply disciples—who might be prepared to carry on His work after His departure. This He did in the choice of twelve apostles. The choice was made in early morning, on the Mount of Beatitudes, after a night spent wholly in prayer (Lu 6:12).

a) The Apostolic Function:

"Apostle" means "one sent." On the special function of the apostle it is sufficient to say here that those thus set apart were chosen for the special end of being Christ's witnesses and accredited ambassadors to the world, able from personal knowledge to bear testimony to what Christ had been, said and done—to the facts of His life, death and resurrection (compare Ac 1:22,23; 2:22-32; 3:15; 10:39; 1Co 15:3-15, etc.); but, further, as instructed by Him, and endowed with His Spirit (compare Lu 12:12; Joh 14:16,17,26, etc.), of being the depositories of His truth, sharers of His authority (compare Mt 10:1; Mr 3:15), messengers of His gospel (compare 2Co 5:18-21), and His instruments in laying broad and strong the foundations of His church (compare Eph 2:20; 3:5). So responsible a calling was never, before or after, given to mortal men.

b) The Lists:

Four lists of the apostles are given—in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Ac (1:13, omitting Judas). The names are given alike in all, except that "Judas, the son (or brother) of James" (Lu 6:16; Ac 1:13) is called by Mt Lebbaeus, "and by Mr Thaddaeus." The latter names are cognate in meaning and all denote the same person. "Bartholomew'"(son of Tolmai) is probably the Nathanael of Joh 1:47 (compare 21:2). The epithet "Cananaean" (Mt 10:4; Mr 3:18) marks "Simon" as then or previously a member of the party of the Zealots (Lu 6:15). In all the lists Peter, through his gifts of leadership, stands first; Judas Iscariot, the betrayer, stands last. There is a tendency to arrangement in pairs: Peter and Andrew; James and John; Philip and Bartholomew; Thomas and Matthew; lastly, James, the son of Alpheus, Judas, son or brother of James, Simonthe Zealot and Judas Iscariot. The list contains two pairs of brothers (three, if "brother" be read with Judas), and at least one pair of friends (Philip and Nathanael).

c) The Men:

All the apostles were men from the humbler ranks, yet not illiterate, and mostly comfortably circumstanced. All were Galileans, except the betrayer, whose name "Iscariot" i.e. "man of Kerioth," marks him as a Judean. Of some of the apostles we know a good deal; of others very little; yet we are warranted in speaking of them all, Judas excepted, as men of honest minds, and sincere piety. The band held within it a number of men of strongly contrasted types of character. Allusion need only be made to

the impetuous Peter, the contemplative John, the matter-of-fact Philip, the cautious Thomas, the zealous Simon, the conservative Matthew, the administrative Judas. The last-named—Iscariot—is the dark problem of the apostolate. We have express testimony that Jesus knew him from the beginning (Joh 6:64). Yet He chose him. The character of Judas, when Jesus received him, was doubtless undeveloped. He could not himself suspect the dark possibilities that slept in it. His association with the apostles, in itself considered, was for his good. His peculiar gift was, for the time, of service. In choosing him, Jesus must be viewed as acting for, and under the direction of, the Father (Joh 5:19; 17:12). See special articles on the several apostles.

III. From the Sermon on the Mount till the Parables of the Kingdom—a Second Circuit.

1. The Sermon on the Mount:

The choice of the apostles inaugurates a new period of Christ's activity. Its first most precious fruit was the delivery to the apostles and the multitudes who thronged Him as He came down from the mountain (Lu 6:17) of that great manifesto of His kingdom popularly known as the Sermon on the Mount. The hill is identified by Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, 368) and others with that known as "the Horns of Hattin," where "the level place" at the top, from which Christ would come down from one of the higher horns, exactly suits the conditions of the narrative. The sick being healed, Jesus seated Himself a little higher up, His disciples near Him, and addressed the assembly (compare Mt 7:28,29). The season of the year is shown by the mention of the "lilies" to be the summer.

Its Scope.

His words were weighty. His aim was at the outset to set forth in terms that were unmistakable the principles, aims and dispositions of His kingdom; to expound its laws; to exhibit its righteousness, both positively, and in contrast with Pharisaic formalism and hypocrisy. Only the leading ideas can be indicated here (see BEATITUDES; SERMON ON THE MOUNT; ETHICS OF JESUS). Matthew, as is his wont, groups material part of which is found in other connections in Luke, but it is well to study the whole in the well-ordered form in which it appears in the First Gospel.

a) The Blessings:

(Matthew 5:1-6; Luke 6:20-26)

In marked contrast with the lawgiving of Sinai, Christ's first words are those of blessing. Passing at once to the dispositions of the heart, He shows on what inner conditions the blessings of the kingdom depend. His beatitudes (poverty of spirit, mourning, meekness, hunger and thirst after righteousness, etc.) reverse all the world's standards of judgment on such matters. In the possession of these graces consists true godliness of character; through them the heirs of the kingdom become the salt of the earth, the light of the world. The obligation rests on them to let their light shine (compare Mr 4:21-23; Lu 8:16; 11:33).

b) True Righteousness—the Old and the New Law:

(Matthew 5:17-48; Luke 6:27-36)

Jesus defines His relation to the old law—not a Destroyer, but a Fulfiller—and proceeds to exhibit the nature of the true righteousness in contrast to Pharisaic literality and formalism. Through adherence to the latter they killed the spirit of the law. With an absolute authority—"But I say unto you"—Jesus leads everything back from the outward letter to the state of the heart. Illustrations are taken from murder, adultery, swearing, retaliation, hatred of enemies, and a spiritual expansion is given to every precept. The sinful thought or desire holds in it the essence of transgression. The world's standards are again reversed in the demands for nonresistance to injuries, love of enemies and requital of good for evil.

c) Religion and Hypocrisy—True and False Motive:

(Matthew 6:1-18; compare Luke 11:1-8)

Pursuing the contrast between the true righteousness and that of the scribes and Pharisees, Jesus next draws attention to motive in religion. The Pharisees erred not simply in having regard only to the letter of the Law, but in acting in morals and religion from a false motive. He had furnished the antidote to their literalism; He now assails their ostentation and hypocrisy. Illustrations are taken from almsgiving, prayer and fasting, and in connection with prayer the Lord's Prayer is given as a model (Luke introduces this in another context, Lu 11:1-4).

d) The True Good and Cure for Care:

(Matthew 6:19-34; compare Luke 11:34-36; 12:22-34)

The true motive in religious acts is to please God; the same motive should guide us in the choice of what is to be our supreme good. Earthly treasure is not to be put above heavenly. The kingdom of God and His righteousness are to be first in our desires. The eye is to be single. The true cure for worldly anxiety is then found in trust of the heavenly Father. His children are more to God than fowls and flowers, for whom His care in Nature is so conspicuously manifest. Seeking first the kingdom they have a pledge—no higher conceivable—that all else they need will be granted along with it (this section on trust, again, Luke places differently, 12:22-34).

e) Relation to the World's Evil—the Conclusion:

(Matthew 7:1-29; Luke 6:37-49; compare 11:9-13):

Jesus finally proceeds to speak of the relation of the disciple to the evil of the world. That evil has been considered in its hostile attitude to the disciple (Mt 5:38); the question is now as to the disciple s free relations toward it. Jesus inculcates the duties of the disciple's bearing himself wisely toward evil—with

charity, with caution, with prayer, in the spirit of ever doing as one would be done by—and of being on his guard against it. The temptation is great to follow the worldly crowd, to be misled by false teachers, to put profession for practice. Against these perils the disciple is energetically warned. True religion will ever be known by its fruits. The discourse closes with the powerful similitude of the wise and foolish builders. Again, as on an earlier occasion, Christ's auditors were astonished at His teaching, and at the authority with which He spoke (Mt 7:28,29).

2. Intervening Incidents: A series of remarkable incidents are next to be noticed.

a) Healing of the Centurion's Servant:

(Matthew 8:1,5-13; Luke 7:1-10)

(1) The healing of the centurion's servant apparently took place on the same day as the delivery of the Sermon on the Mount (Lu 7:1,2). It had been a day of manifold and exhausting labors for Jesus. A walk of perhaps 7 miles brought Him back to Capernaum, the crowds accompanying. Yet no sooner, on His return, does He hear a new appeal for help than His love Replies,"i will come and heal him." The suppliant was a Roman centurion—one who had endeared himself to the Jews (Lu 7:5)—and the request was for the healing of a favorite servant, paralyzed and tortured with pain. First, a deputation sought Christ's good offices, then, when Jesus was on the way, a second message came, awakening even Christ's astonishment by the magnitude of its faith. The centurion felt he was not worthy that Jesus should come under his roof, but let Jesus speak the word only, and his servant would be healed. "I have not found so great faith," Jesus said, "no, not in Israel." The word was spoken, and, on the return of the messengers, the servant was found healed.

b) The Widow of Nain's Son Raised:

(Luke 7:11-17)

The exciting events of this day gathered so great a crowd round the house where Jesus was as left Him no leisure even to eat, and His friends, made anxious for His health, sought to restrain Him (Mr 3:20,21). It was probably to escape from this local excitement that Jesus, "soon afterwards," is found at the little town of Nain, a few miles Southeast of Nazareth. A great multitude still followed Him. Here, as He entered the city, occurred the most wonderful of the works He had yet wrought. A young man—the only son of a widowed mother—was being carried out for burial. Jesus, in compassion, stopped the mournful procession, and, in the calm certainty of His word being obeyed, bade the young man arise. On the instant life returned, and Jesus gave the son back to his mother. The amazement of the people was tenfold intensified. They felt that the old days had come back: that God had visited His people.

It was apparently during the journey or circuit which embraced this visit to Nain, and as the result of the fame it brought to Jesus (Lu 7:17,18; note the allusion to the dead being raised in Christ's reply to John), that the embassy was sent from the Baptist in prison to ask of Jesus whether He was indeed He who

should come, or would they look for another.

c) Embassy of John’s Disciples—Christ and His Generation:

(Matthew 11:2-30; Luke 7:18-35)

It was a strange question on the lips of the forerunner, but is probably to be interpreted as the expression of perplexity rather than of actual doubt. There seems no question but that John’s mind had been thrown into serious difficulty by the reports which had reached him of the work of Jesus. Things were not turning out as he expected. It was the peaceful, merciful character of Christ’s work which stumbled John. The gloom of his prison wrought with his disappointment, and led him to send this message for the satisfaction of himself and his disciples.

(1) Christ’s Answer to John.

If doubt there was, Jesus treated it tenderly. He did not answer directly, but bade the two disciples who had been sent go back and tell John the things they had seen and heard—the blind receiving their sight, the lame walking, the deaf cured, the dead raised, the Gospel preached. Little doubt the Messiah had come when works like these—the very works predicted by the prophets (Isa 35:5,6)—were being done. Blessed were those who did not find occasion of stumbling in Him. Jesus, however, did more. By his embassy John had put himself in a somewhat false position before the multitude. But Jesus would not have His faithful follower misjudged. His was no fickle spirit. Jesus nobly vindicated him as a prophet and more than a prophet; yea, a man than whom a greater had not lived. Yet, even as the new dispensation was higher than the old, one "but little" in the kingdom of heaven—one sharing Christ’s humble, loving, self-denying disposition—was greater even than John (Mt 11:11).

(2) A Perverse People—Christ’s Grace.

The implied contrast between Himself and John led Jesus further to denounce the perverse spirit of His own generation. The Pharisees and lawyers (Lu 7:30) had rejected John; they were as little pleased with Him. Their behavior was like children objecting to one game because it was merry, and to another because it was sad. The flood of outward popularity did not deceive Jesus. The cities in which His greatest works were wrought—Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum—remained impenitent at heart. The heavier would be their judgment; worse even than that on Tyre and Sidon, or on Sodom itself. Over against their unbelief Jesus reasserts His dignity and declares His grace (Mt 11:25-30). All authority was His; He alone knew and could reveal the Father (no claims in John are higher). Let the heavy laden come to Him, and He would give them rest (parts of these passages appear in another connection in Lu 10:12-21).

d) The First Anointing—the Woman Who Was a Sinner:

(Luke 7:36-50)

Yet another beautiful incident connected with this journey is preserved by Lk—the anointing of Jesus in Simon's house by a woman who was a sinner. In Nain or some other city visited by Him, Jesus was invited to dine with a Pharisee named Simon. His reception was a cold one (Lu 7:44-46). During the meal, a woman of the city, an outcast from respectable society—one, however, as the story implies, whose heart Jesus had reached, and who, filled with sorrow, love, shame, penitence, had turned from her life of sin, entered the chamber. There, bathing Christ's feet with her tears, wiping them with her tresses, and imprinting on them fervent kisses, she anointed them with a precious ointment she had brought with her. Simon was scandalized. Jesus could not be a right-thinking man, much less a prophet, or He would have rebuked this misbehavior from such a person. Jesus met the thought of Simon's heart by speaking to him the parable of the Two Debtors (Lu 7:41,42). Of two men who had been freely forgiven, one 500, the other 50 shillings, which would love his creditor most? Simon gave the obvious answer, and the contrast between his own reception of Jesus and the woman's passionate love was immediately pointed out. Her greater love was due to the greater forgiveness; though, had Simon only seen it, he perhaps needed forgiveness even more than she.

3. Second Galilean Circuit—Events at Capernaum:

(Luke 8:1-4,19-21; Matthew 12:22-50; Mark 3:22-35 compare Luke 11:14-36)

Her faith saved her and she was dismissed in peace. But again the question arose, "Who is this that even forgiveth sins?" Luke introduces here (Lu 8:1-4) a second Galilean circuit of Jesus, after the return from which a new series of exciting incidents took place at Capernaum.

a) Galilee Revisited:

(Luke 8:1-4)

The circuit was an extensive one—"went about through cities and villages (literally, "according to city and village"), preaching." During this journey Jesus was attended by the Twelve, and by devoted women (Mary Magdalene, Joanna, wife of Herod's steward, Susanna, and others), who ministered to Him of their substance (Lu 8:2,3). At the close of this circuit Jesus returned to Capernaum.

b) Cure of Demoniac—Discourse on Blasphemy:

Jesus, no doubt, wrought numerous miracles on demoniacs (compare Lu 8:1,2; out of Mary Magdalene He is said to have cast 7 demons—perhaps a form of speech to indicate the severity of the possession). The demoniac now brought to Jesus was blind and dumb. Jesus cured him, with the double result that the people were filled with amazement: "Can this be the son of David?" (Mt 12:23), while the Pharisees blasphemed, alleging that Jesus cast out demons by the help of Beelzebub (Greek, Beelzeboul), the prince of the demons (see under the word). A quite similar incident is narrated in Mt 9:32-34; and Lu gives the discourse that follows in a later connection (11:14 ff). The accusation may well have been

repeated more than once. Jesus, in reply, points out, first, the absurdity of supposing Satan to be engaged in warring against his own kingdom (Mt 18:25 parallel; here was plainly a stronger than Satan); then utters the momentous word about blasphemy against the Holy Spirit. All other blasphemies—even that against the Son of Man (Mt 12:32)—may be forgiven, for they may proceed from ignorance and misconception; but deliberate, perverse rejection of the light, and attributing to Satan what was manifestly of God, was a sin which, when matured—and the Pharisees came perilously near committing it—admitted of no forgiveness, either in this world or the next, for the very capacity for truth in the soul was by such sin destroyed. Mr has the strong phrase, "is guilty of an eternal sin" (3:29). Pertinent words follow as to the root of good and evil in character (Mt 12:33-37).

See BLASPHEMY.

The Sign of Jonah.

Out of this discourse arose the usual Jewish demand for a "sign" (Mt 12:38; compare Lu 11:29-32), which Jesus met by declaring that no sign would be given but the sign of the prophet Jonah—an allusion to His future resurrection. He reiterates His warning to the people of His generation for their rejection of greater light than had been enjoyed by the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba.

Two incidents, not dissimilar in character, interrupted this discourse—one the cry of a woman in the audience (if the time be the same, Lu 11:27,28), "Blessed is the womb that bare thee," etc., to which Jesus replied, "Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it"; the other, a message that His mother and brethren (doubtless anxious for His safety) desired to speak with Him.

c) Christ’s Mother and Brethen:

To this, stretching out His hand toward His disciples, Jesus answered, "Behold, my mother and my brethren" (Mr 3:34), etc. Kinship in the spiritual kingdom consists in fidelity to the will of God, not in ties of earthly relationship.

4. Teaching in Parables:

(Matthew 13:1-52; Mark 4:1-34; Luke 8:4-15; 13:18-21)

On the same day on which the preceding discourses were delivered, Jesus, seeing the multitudes, passed to the shore, and entering a boat, inaugurated a new method in His public. teaching. This was the speaking in parables. Similitude, metaphor, always entered into the teaching of Jesus (compare Mt 7:24-27), and parable has once been met with (Lu 7:41,42); now parable is systematically employed as a means of imparting and illustrating important truths, while yet veiling them from those whose minds were hostile and unreceptive (Mr 4:10-12; Lu 8:9,10). The parable thus at once reveals and conceals. The motive of this partially veiled teaching was the growing hostility of the Pharisees. In its nature the parable (from a verb signifying "to place side by side") is a representation in some form of earthly

analogy of truths relating to Divine and eternal things (see PARABLE). The parables of the kingdom brought together in Mt 13 form an invaluable series, though not all were spoken in public (compare Mt 13:36-52), and some may belong to a later occasion (compare Lu 13:18-21). Mr adds the parable of the Seed Growing Secretly (4:26-29). Of three of the parables (the Sower, the Tares, the Dragnet), Jesus Himself gives the interpretation.

Parables of the Kingdom.

In series the parables at once mirror the origin, mixed character and development of the kingdom in its present imperfect earthly condition, and the perfection which awaits it after the crisis at the end. In the parable of the Sower is represented the origin of the kingdom in the good seed of the word, and the varied soils on which that seed falls; in the Seed Growing Secretly, the law of orderly growth in the kingdom; in the parable of the Tares, the mixed character of the subjects of the kingdom; in those of the Mustard Seed and Leaven, the progress of the kingdom—external growth, internal tramsformative effect; in those of the Treasure and Pearl the finding and worth of the kingdom; in that of the Dragnet the consummation of the kingdom. Jesus compares His disciples, if they understand these things, to householders bringing out of their treasure "things new and old" (Mt 13:52).

IV. From the Crossing to Gadara to the Mission of the Twelve—a Third Circuit.

1. Crossing of the Lake—Stilling of the Storm:

(Matthew 8:18-27; Mark 4:35-41; Luke 8:22-25; compare 9:57-62)

It was on the evening of the day on which He spoke the parables—though the chronology of the incident seems unknown to Lu (8:22)—that Jesus bade His disciples cross over to the other side of the lake. At this juncture He was accosted by an aspirant for discipleship. Matthew gives two cases of aspirants; Luke (but in a different connection, 9:57-62), three. Luke’s connection (departure from Galilee) is perhaps preferable for the second and third; but the three may be considered together.

The three aspirants may be distinguished as,

(a) The forward disciple: he who in an atmosphere of enthusiasm offered himself under impulse, without counting the cost. The zeal of this would-be follower Jesus cheeks with the pathetic words, "The foxes have holes," etc. (Mt 8:20; Lu 9:58).

(b) The procrastinating disciple. The first candidate needed repression; the second needs impulsion.

a) Aspirants for Disciplineship:

He would follow Jesus, but first let him bury his father. There had come a crisis, however, when the Lord’s claim was paramount: "Leave the dead to bury their own dead" (Mt 8:22). There are at times

higher claims than mere natural relationships, to which, in themselves, Jesus was the last to be indifferent. (c) The wavering disciple. The third disciple is again one who offers himself, but his heart was too evidently still with the things at home. Jesus, again, lays His finger on the weak spot, "No man, having put his hand to the plow, and looking back," etc. (Lu 9:62). As mentioned, the latter two cases tally better with a final departure from Galilee than with a temporary crossing of the lake.

b) The Storm Calmed:

The inland lake was exposed to violent and sudden tempests. One of these broke on the disciples' boat as they sailed across. Everyone's life seemed in jeopardy. Jesus, meanwhile, in calmest repose, was asleep on a cushion in the stern (Mr 4:38). The disciples woke Him almost rudely: "Teacher, carest thou not that we perish?" Jesus at once arose, and, reproving their want of faith, rebuked wind and waves ("Peace, be still"). Immediately there was a great calm. It was a new revelation to the disciples of the majesty of their Master. "Who then is this, that even the wind and the sea obey him?"

2. The Gadarene (Gerasene) Demoniac:

(Matthew 8:28-34; Mark 5:1-20; Luke 8:26-39)

The lake being crossed, Jesus and His disciples came into the country of the Gadarenes (Matthew), or Gerasenes (Mark, Luke)—Gadara being the capital of the district (on the topography, compare Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, 380-81). From the lake shore rises a mountain in which are ancient tombs. Here Jesus was met by a demoniac (Matthew mentions two demoniacs: M. Henry's quaint comment is, "If there were two, there was one." Possibly one was the fiercer of the two, the other figuring only as his companion). The man, as described, was a raving maniac of the worst type (Mr 5:3-5), dwelling in the tombs, wearing no clothes (Lu 8:27), of supernatural strength, wounding himself, shrieking, etc. Really possessed by "an unclean spirit," his consciousness was as if he were indwelt by a "legion" of demons, and from that consciousness he addressed Jesus as the Son of God come for their tormenting. In what follows it is difficult to distinguish what belongs to the broken, incoherent consciousness of the man, and the spirit or spirits who spake through him. In the question, "What is thy name?" (Mr 5:9) Jesus evidently seeks to arouse the victim's shattered soul to some sense of its own individuality. On Jesus commanding the unclean spirit to leave the man, the request was made that the demons might be permitted to enter a herd of swine feeding near. The reason of Christ's permission, with its result in the destruction of the herd ("rushed down the steep into the sea") need not be too closely scrutinized. It may have had an aspect of judgment on the (possibly) Jewish holders of the swine; or it may have had reference to the victim of the possession, as enabling him to realize his deliverance. Whatever the difficulties of the narrative, none of the rationalistic explanations afford any sensible relief from them. The object of the miracle may be to exclude rationalistic explanations, by giving a manifest attestation of the reality of the demon influence. When the people of the city came they found the man fully restored —"clothed and in his right mind." Yet, with fatal shortsightedness, they besought Jesus to depart from their borders. The man was sent home to declare to his friends the great things the Lord had done to him.

3. Jairus' Daughter Raised—Woman with Issue of Blood:

(Matthew 9:18-26; Mark 5:21-43; Luke 8:40-56)

Repelled by the Gerasenes, Jesus received a warm welcome on His return to Capernaum on the western shore (Mr 5:21). It was probably at this point that Matthew gave the feast formerly referred to.

It was in connection with this feast, Matthew himself informs us (9:18), that Jairus, one of the rulers of the synagogue, made his appeal for help. His little daughter, about 12 years old (Lu 8:42), was at the point of death; indeed, while Jesus was coming, she died. The ruler's faith, though real, was not equal to the centurion's, who believed that Jesus could heal without being present.

a) Jairus' Appeal and Its Result:

Jesus came, and having expelled the professional mourners, in sacred privacy, only the father and mother, with Peter, James and John being permitted to enter the death-chamber, raised the girl to life. It is the second miracle on record of the raising from the dead.

b) The Afflicted Woman Cured:

On the way to the ruler's house occurred another wonder—a miracle within a miracle. A poor woman, whose case was a specially distressing one, alike as regards the nature of her malady, the length of its continuance, and the fruitlessness of her application to the physicians, crept up to Jesus, confident that if she could but touch the border of His garment, she would be healed. The woman was ignorant; her faith was blended with superstition; but Jesus, reading the heart, gave her the benefit she desired. It was His will, however, that, for her own good, the woman thus cured should not obtain the blessing by stealth. He therefore brought her to open confession, and cheered her by His commendatory word.

4. Incidents of Third Circuit:

(Matthew 9:27-38; 13:53-58; Mark 6:1-6)

At this point begins apparently a new evangelistic tour (Mt 9:35; Mr 6:6), extending methodically to "all the cities and villages." To it belong in the narratives the healing of two blind men (compare the case of Bartimeus, recorded later); the cure of a demoniac who was dumb—a similar case to that in Mt 12:22; and a second rejection at Nazareth (Matthew, Mark). The incident is similar to that in Lu 4:16-30, and shows, if the events are different, that the people's hearts were unchanged. Of this circuit Matthew gives an affecting summary (9:35-38), emphasizing the Lord's compassion, and His yearning for more laborers to reap the abundant harvest.

5. The Twelve Sent Forth—Discourse of Jesus:

(Matthew 10; Mark 6:7-13; Luke 9:1-6; compare Luke 10:2-24; 12:2-12, etc.)

Partly with a view to the needs of the rapidly growing work and the training of the apostles, and partly as a witness to Israel (Mt 10:6,23), Jesus deemed it expedient to send the Twelve on an independent mission. The discourse in Mt attached to this event seems, as frequently, to be a compilation. Parts of it are given by Luke in connection with the mission of the Seventy (Lu 10:1 ; the directions were doubtless similar in both cases); parts on other occasions (Lu 12:2-12; 21:12-17, etc.; compare Mr 13:9-13).

The Twelve were sent out two by two. Their work was to be a copy of the Master's—to preach the gospel and to heal the sick. To this end they were endowed with authority over unclean spirits, and over all manner of sickness. They were to go forth free from all encumbrances—no money, no scrip, no changes of raiment, no staff (save that in their hand, Mr 6:8), sandals only on their feet, etc.

a) The Commission:

They were to rely for support on those to whom they preached. They were for the present to confine their ministry to Israel. The saying in Mt 10:23, "Ye shall not have gone through the cities of Israel, till the Son of man be come," apparently has reference to the judgment on the nation, not to the final coming (compare 16:28).

b) Counsels and Warnings:

The mission of the Twelve was the first step of Christianity as an aggressive force in society. Jesus speaks of it, accordingly, in the light of the whole future that was to come out of it. He warns His apostles faithfully of the dangers that awaited them; exhorts them to prudence and circumspection ("wise as serpents," etc.); holds out to them Divine promises for consolation; directs them when persecuted in one place to flee to another; points out to them from His own case that such persecutions were only to be expected. He assures them of a coming day of revelation; bids them at once fear and trust God; impresses on them the duty of courage in confession; inculcates in them supreme love to Himself. That love would be tested in the dearest relations, In itself peace, the gospel would be the innocent occasion of strife, enmity and division among men. Those who receive Christ's disciples will not fail of their reward.

When Christ had ended His discourse He proceeded with His own evangelistic work, leaving the disciples to inaugurate theirs (Mt 11:1).

JESUS CHRIST, 4C2

Second Period—After the Mission of the Twelve till the Departure from Galilee

I. From the Death of the Baptist till the Discourse on Bread of Life.

1. The Murder of the Baptist and Herod's Alarms:

(Matthew 14:1-12; Mark 6:14-29; Luke 9:7-9; compare 3:18-20)

Shortly before the events now to be narrated, John the Baptist had been foully murdered in his prison by Herod Antipas at the instigation of Herodias, whose unlawful marriage with Herod John had unsparingly condemned. Josephus gives as the place of the Baptist's imprisonment the fortress of Macherus, near the Dead Sea (Ant., XVIII, v, 2); or John may have been removed to Galilee. Herod would ere this have killed John, but was restrained by fear of the people (Mt 14:5). The hate of Herodias, however, did not slumber. Her relentless will contrasts with the vacillation of Herod, as Lady Macbeth in Shakspeare contrasts with Macbeth. A birthday feast gave her the opening she sought for. Her daughter Saleme, pleasing Herod by her dancing, obtained from him a promise on oath to give her whatever she asked. Prompted by Herodias, she boldly demanded John the Baptist's head. The weak king was shocked, but, for his oath's sake, granted her what she craved. The story tells how the Baptist's disciples reverently buried the remains of their master, and went and told Jesus. Herod's conscience did not let him rest. When rumors reached him of a wonderful teacher and miracle-worker in Galilee, he leaped at once to the conclusion that it was John risen from the dead. Herod cannot have heard much of Jesus before. An evil conscience makes men cowards.

Another Passover drew near (Joh 6:4), but Jesus did not on this occasion go up to the feast.

Returning from their mission, the apostles reported to Jesus what they had said and done (Lu 9:10); Jesus had also heard of the Baptist's fate, and of Herod's fears, and now proposed to His disciples a retirement to a desert place across the lake, near Bethsaida (on the topography, compare Stanley, op. cit., 375, 381).

2. The Feeding of the Five Thousand:

(Matthew 14:13-21; Mark 6:30-44; Luke 9:10-17; John 6:1-14)

As it proved, however, the multitudes had observed their departure, and, running round the shore, were at the place before them (Mr 6:33). The purpose of rest was frustrated, but Jesus did not complain. He pitied the shepherdless state of the people, and went out to teach and heal them. The day wore on, and the disciples suggested that the fasting multitude should disperse, and seek victuals in the nearest towns and villages. This Jesus, who had already proved Philip by asking how the people should be fed (Joh 6:5), would not permit. With the scanty provision at command—5 loaves and 2 fishes—He fed the whole multitude. By His blessing the food was multiplied till all were satisfied, and 12 baskets of fragments, carefully collected, remained over. It was astupendous act of creative power, no rationalizing of which can reduce it to natural dimensions.

3. Walking on the Sea:

(Matthew 14:22-33; Mark 6:45-52; John 6:15-21)

The enthusiasm created by this miracle was intense (Joh 6:14). Matthew and Mark relate (Luke here falls for a time out of the Synopsis) that Jesus hurriedly constrained His disciples to enter into their boat and recross the lake—this though a storm was gathering—while He Himself remained in the mountain alone in prayer. John gives the key to this action in the statement that the people were about to take Him by force and make Him a king (6:15). Three hours after midnight found the disciples still in the midst of the lake, "distressed in rowing" (Mr 6:48), deeply anxious because Jesus was not, as on a former occasion, with them. At last, at the darkest hour of their extremity, Jesus was seen approaching in a way unlooked-for—walking on the water. Every new experience of Jesus was a surprise to the disciples. They were at first terrified, thinking they saw a spirit, but straightway the well-known voice was heard, "Be of good cheer: it is I; be not afraid." In the rebound of his feelings the impulsive Peter asked Jesus to permit him to come to Him on the water (Matthew). Jesus said "Come," and for the first moment or two Peter did walk on the water; then, as he realized his unwonted situation, his faith failed, and he began to sink. Jesus, with gentle chiding, caught him, and assisted him back into the boat. Once again the sea was calmed, and the disciples watch found themselves safely at land. To their adoring minds the miracle of the loaves was eclipsed by this new marvel (Mr 6:52).

4. Gennesaret—Discourse on the Bread of Life:

(Matthew 14:34-36; Mark 6:53-56; John 6:22-71)

On the return to Gennesaret the sick from all quarters were brought to Jesus—the commencement apparently of a new, more general ministry of healing (Mr 6:56). Meanwhile—here we depend on John—the people on the other side of the lake, when they found that Jesus was gone, took boats hastily, and came over to Capernaum. They found Jesus apparently in the synagogue (6:59). In reply to their query, "Rabbi, when camest thou hither?" Jesus first rebuked the motive which led them to follow Him—not because they had seen in His miracles "signs" of higher blessings, but because they had eaten of the loaves and were filled (6:26)—then spoke to them His great discourse on the bread from heaven. "Work," He said, "for the food which abideth unto eternal life, which the Son of man shall give unto you" (6:27). When asked to authenticate His claims by a sign from heaven like the manna, He replied that the manna also (given not by Moses but by God) was but typical bread, and surprised them by declaring that He Himself was the true bread of life from heaven (6:35,51). The bread was Christ's flesh, given for the life of the world; His flesh and blood must be eaten and drunk (a spiritual appropriation through faith, 6:63), if men were to have eternal life. Jesus of set purpose had put His doctrine in a strong, testing manner. The time had come when His hearers must make their choice between a spiritual acceptance of Him and a break with Him altogether. What He had said strongly offended them, both on account of the claims implied (6:42), and on account of the doctrine taught, which, they were plainly told, they could not receive because of their carnality of heart (6:43,44,61-64). Many, therefore, went back and walked no more with Him (6:60,61,66); but their defection only evoked from the chosen Twelve a yet more confident confession of their faith. "Would ye also go away?"

Peter’s First Confession.

Peter, as usual, spoke for the rest: "Lord, to whom shall we go? .... We have believed and know that thou art the Holy One of God" (Joh 6:69). Here, and not first at Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:16), is Peter’s brave confession of his Master’s Messiahship. Twelve thus confessed Him, but even of this select circle Jesus was compelled to say, "One of you (Judas) is a devil" (Joh 6:70,71).

II. From Disputes with the Pharisees till the Transfiguration.

The discourse in Capernaum seems to mark a turning-point in the Lord’s ministry in Galilee. Soon after we find Him ceasing from public teaching, and devoting Himself to the instruction of His apostles (Mt 15:21; Mr 7:24, etc.).

1. Jesus and Tradition—Outward and Inward Purity:

(Matthew 15:1-20; Mark 7:1-23)

Meanwhile, that Christ’s work in Galilee was attracting the attention of the central authorities, is shown by the fact that scribes and Pharisees came up from Jerusalem to watch Him. They speedily found ground of complaint against Him in His unconventional ways and His total disregard of the traditions of the elders. They specially blamed Him for allowing His disciples to eat bread with "common," i.e. unwashen hands. Here was a point on which the Pharisees laid great stress (Mr 7:3,4). Ceremonial ablutions (washing "diligently," Greek "with the fist"; "baptizings" of person and things) formed a large part of their religion. These washings were part of the "oral tradition" said to have been delivered to Moses, and transmitted by a succession of elders. Jesus set all this ceremonialism aside. It was part of the "hypocrisy" of the Pharisees (Mr 7:6). When questioned regarding it, He drew a sharp distinction between God’s commandment in the Scriptures and man’s tradition, and accused the Pharisees (instancing "Corban" (which see), in support, Mr 7:10-12) of making "void" the former through the latter. This led to the wider question of wherein real defilement consisted. Christ’s rational position here is that it did not consist in anything outward, as in meats, but consisted in what came from within the man: as Jesus explained afterward, in the outcome of his heart or moral life: "Out of the heart of men evil thoughts proceed," etc. (Mr 7:20-23). Christ’s saying was in effect the abrogation of the old ceremonial distinctions, as Mark notes: "making all meats clean" (Mr 7:19). The Pharisees, naturally, were deeply offended at His sayings, but Jesus was unmoved. Every plant not of the Father’s planting must be rooted up (Mr 7:13).

2. Retirement to Tyre and Sidon—the Syrophoenician Woman:

(Matthew 15:21-28; Mark 7:24-30)

From this point Jesus appears, in order to escape notice, to have made journeys privately from place to place. His first retreat was to the borders, or neighborhood, of Tyre and Sidon. From Mr 7:31 it is to be

inferred that He entered the heathen territory. He could not, however, be hid (Mr 7:24). It was not long ere, in the house into which He had entered, there reached Him the cry of human distress. A woman came to Him, a Greek (or Gentile, Greek-speaking), but Syrophoenician by race. Her "little daughter" was grievously afflicted with an evil spirit. Flinging herself at His feet, and addressing Him as "Son of David," she besought His mercy for her child. At first Jesus seemed—yet only seemed—to repel her, speaking of Himself as sent only to the lost sheep of Israel, and of the unmeetness of giving the children's loaf to the dogs (the Greek softens the expression, "the little dogs"). With a beautiful urgency which won for her the boon she sought, the woman seized on the word as an argument in her favor. "Even the dogs under the table eat of the children's crumbs." The child at Jesus' word was restored.

3. At Decapolis—New Miracles:

(Matthew 15:29-39; Mark 7:31-37; 8:1-10)

Christ's second retreat was to Decapolis—the district of the ten cities—East of the Jordan. Here also He was soon discovered, and followed by the multitude. Sufferers were brought to Him, whom He cured (Mt 15:30). Later, He fed the crowds.

The miracle of the deaf man is attested only by Mk. The patient was doubly afflicted, being deaf, and having an impediment in his speech. The cure presents several peculiarities—its privacy (Mt 15:33); the actions of Jesus in putting his fingers into his ears, etc. (a mode of speech by signs to the deaf man); His "sign," accompanied with prayer, doubtless accasioned by something in the man's look; the word Ephphatha (Mt 15:34)—"Be opened."

a) The Deaf Man:

(Mark 7:32-37)

The charge to those present not to blazon the deed abroad was disregarded. Jesus desired no cheap popularity.

b) Feeding of Four Thousand:

(Matthew 15:32-39; Mark 8:1-9)

The next miracle closely resembles the feeding of the Five Thousand at Bethsaida, but the place and numbers are different; 4,000 instead of 5,000; 7 loaves and a few fishes, instead of 5 loaves and 2 fishes; 7 baskets of fragments instead of 12 (Mark's term denotes a larger basket). There is no reason for doubting the distinction of the incidents (compare Mt 16:9,10; Mr 8:19,20).

4. Leaven of the Pharisees, etc.—Cure of Blind Man:

(Matthew 16:1-12; Mark 8:11-26)

Returning to the plain of Gennesaret (Magdala, Mt 15:39 the King James Version; parts of Dalmanutha, Mr 8:10), Jesus soon found Himself assailed by His old adversaries. Pharisees and Sadducees were now united. They came "trying" Jesus, and asking from Him a "sign from heaven"—some signal Divine manifestation. "Sighing deeply" (Mark) at their caviling spirit, Jesus repeated His word about the sign of Jonah. The times in which they lived were full of signs, if they, so proficient in weather signs, could only see them. To be rid of such questioners, Jesus anew took boat to Bethsaida. On the way He warned His disciples against the leaven of the spirit they had just encountered. The disciples misunderstood, thinking that Jesus referred to their forgetfulness in not taking bread (Mark states in his graphic way that they had only one loaf). The leaven Christ referred to, in fact, represented three spirits:

(1) the Pharisaic leaven—formalism and hypocrisy;

(2) the Sadducean leaven—rationalistic skepticism;

(3) the Herodian leaven (Mr 8:15)—political expediency and temporizing.

Arrived at Bethsaida, a miracle was wrought on a blind man resembling in some of its features the cure of the deaf man at Decapolis. In both cases Jesus took the patients apart; in both physical means were used—the spittle ("spit on his eyes," Mr 8:23); in both there was strict injunction not to noise the cure abroad. Another peculiarity was the gradualness of the cure. It is probable that the man had not been blind from his birth, else he could hardly have recognized men or trees at the first opening. It needed that Jesus should lay His hands on Him before he saw all things clearly.

5. At Caesarea Philippi—The Great Confession—First Announcement of Passion:

(Matthew 16:13-28; Mark 8:27-30; Luke 9:18-27)

The next retirement of Jesus with His disciples was to the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi, near the source of the Jordan. This was the northernmost point of His journeyings. Here, "on the geographical frontier between Judaism and heathenism" (Liddon), our Lord put the momentous question which called forth Peter’s historical confession.

(1) The Voices of the Age and the External Truth.

The question put to the Twelve in this remote region was: "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" "Son of man," as already said, was the familiar name given by Jesus to Himself, to which a Messianic significance might or might not be attached, according to the prepossessions of His hearers. First the changeful voices of the age were recited to Jesus: "Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah," etc. Next, in answer to the further question: "But who say ye that I am ?" there rang out from Peter, in the name of all, the unchanging truth about Jesus: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." In clearness,

boldness, decision, Peter’s faith had attained a height not reached before. The confession embodies two truths:

(1) the Divinity,

(2) the Messiahship, of the Son of man.

Jesus did honor to the confession of His apostle. Not flesh and blood, but the Father, had revealed the truth to him. Here at length was "rock" on which He could build a church. Reverting to Peter’s original name, Simon Bar-Jonah, Jesus declared, with a play on the name "Peter" (petros, "rock," "piece of rock") He had before given him (Joh 1:42), that on this "rock" (petra), He would build His church, and the gates of Hades (hostile evil powers) would not prevail against it (Mt 16:18). The papacy has reared an unwarrantable structure of pretensions on this passage in supposing the "rock" to be Peter personally and his successors in the see of Rome (none such existed; Peter was not bishop of Rome). It is not Peter the individual, but Peter the confessing apostle—Peter as representative of all—that Christ names "rock"; that which constituted him a foundation was the truth he had confessed (compare Eph 2:20). This is the first New Testament mention of a "church" (ekklesia). The Christian church, therefore, is founded

(1) on the truth of Christ’s Divine Sonship;

(2) on the truth of His Messiah-ship, or of His being the anointed prophet, priest and king of the new age.

A society of believers confessing these truths is a church; no society which denies these truths deserves the name. To this confessing community Jesus, still addressing Peter as representing the apostolate (compare Mt 18:18), gives authority to bind and loose—to admit and to exclude. Jesus, it is noted, bade His disciples tell no man of these things (Mt 16:20; Mr 8:30; Lu 9:21).

(2) The Cross and the Disciple.

The confession of Peter prepared the way for an advance in Christ’s teaching. From that time, Matthew notes, Jesus began to speak plainly of His approaching sufferings and death (16:21). There are in all three solemn announcements of the Passion (Mt 16:21-23; 17:22,23; 20:17-19 parallel). Jesus foresaw, and clearly foretold, what would befall Him at Jerusalem. He would be killed by the authorities, but on the third day would rise again. On the first announcement, following His confession, Peter took it upon him to expostulate with Jesus: "Be it far from thee, Lord," etc. (Mt 16:22), an action which brought upon him the stern rebuke of Jesus: "Get thee behind me, Satan," etc. (Mt 16:23). The Rock-man, in his fall to the maxims of a worldly expediency, is now identified with Satan, the tempter. This principle, that duty is only to be done when personal risk is not entailed, Jesus not only repudiates for Himself, but bids His disciples repudiate it also. The disciple, Jesus says, must be prepared to deny himself, and take up his cross. The cross is the symbol of anything distressing or painful to bear. There is a saving of life which

is a losing of it, and what shall a man be profited if he gain the whole world, and forfeit his (true, higher) life? As, however, Jesus had spoken, not only of dying, but of rising again, so now He encourages His disciples by announcing His future coming in glory to render to every man according to His deeds. That final coming might be distant (compare Mt 24:36); but (so it seems most natural to interpret the saying Mt 16:28 parallel) there were those living who would see the nearer pledge of that, in Christ's coming in the triumphs and successes of His kingdom (compare Mr 9:1; Lu 9:27; Mt 26:64).

6. The Transfiguration—the Epileptic Boy:

(Matthew 17:1-20; Mark 9:2-29; Luke 9:28-43)

About eight days after the announcement of His passion by Jesus, took place the glorious event of the transfiguration. Jesus had spoken of His future glory, and here was pledge of it. In strange contrast with the scene of glory on the summit of the mountain was the painful sight which met Jesus and His three companions when they descended again to to the plain.

a) The Glory of the Only Begotten:

Tradition connects the scene of the transfiguration with Mount Tabor, but it more probably took place on one of the spurs of Mount Hermon. Jesus had ascended the mountain with Peter, James and John, for prayer. It was while He was praying the wonderful change happened. For once the veiled glory of the only begotten from the Father (Joh 1:14) was permitted to burst forth, suffusing His person and garments, and changing them into a dazzling brightness. His face did shine as the sun; His raiment became white as light ("as snow," the King James Version, Mark). Heavenly visitants, recognized from their converse as Moses and Elijah, appeared with Him and spoke of His decease (Luke). A voice from an enveloping cloud attested: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Little wonder the disciples were afraid, or that Peter in his confusion should stammer out: "It is good for us to be here: if thou wilt, I will make here three tabernacles (booths)." This, however, was not permitted. Earth is not heaven. Glimpses of heavenly glory are given, not to wean from duty on earth, but to prepare for the trials connected therewith.

b) Faith's Entreaty and Its Answer:

The spectacle that met the eyes of Jesus and the chosen three as they descended was distressing in the extreme. A man had brought his epileptic boy—a sore sufferer and dumb—to the disciples to see if they could cast out the evil spirit that possessed him, but they were not able. Their failure, as Jesus showed, was failure of faith; none the less did their discomfiture afford a handle to the gainsayers, who were not slow to take advantage of it (Mr 9:14). The man's appeal was now to Jesus, "If thou canst do anything," etc. (Mr 9:22). The reply of Jesus shifted the "canst" to the right quarter, "If thou canst (believe)" (Mr 9: 23). Such little faith as the man had revived under Christ's word: "I believe; help thou mine unbelief." The multitude pressing around, there was no call for further delay. With one energetic word Jesus expelled the unclean spirit (Mr 9:25). The first effect of Christ's approach had been to induce a violent

paroxysm (Mr 9:20); now the spirit terribly convulsed the frame it was compelled to relinquish. Jesus, taking the boy's hand, raised him up, and he was found well. The lesson drawn to the disciples was the omnipotence of faith (Mt 17:19,20) and power of prayer (Mr 9:28,29).

III. From Private Journey through Galilee till Return from the Feast of Tabernacles.

1. Galilee and Capernaum:

Soon after the last-mentioned events Jesus passed privately through Galilee (Mr 9:30), returning later to Capernaum. During the Galilean journey Jesus made to His disciples His 2nd announcement of His approaching sufferings and death, accompanied as before by the assurance of His resurrection. The disciples still could not take in the meaning of His words, though what He said made them "exceeding sorry" (Mt 17:23).

a) Second Announcement of Passion:

(Matthew 17:22,23; Mark 9:30-33; Luke 9:44,45)

The return to Capernaum was marked by an incident which raised the question of Christ's relation to temple institutions. The collectors of tribute for the temple inquired of Peter: "Doth not your teacher pay the half-shekel?" (Greek didrachma, or double drachm, worth about 32 cents or is. 4d.).

b) The Temple Tax:

(Matthew 17:24-27)

The origin of this tax was in the half-shekel of atonement-money of Ex 30:11-16, which, though a special contribution, was made the basis of later assessment (2Ch 24:4-10; in Nehemiah's time the amount was one-third of a shekel, Ne 10:32), and its object was the upkeep of the temple worship (Schurer). The usual time of payment was March, but Jesus had probably been absent and the inquiry was not made for some months later. Peter, hasty as usual, probably reasoning from Christ's ordinary respect for temple ordinances, answered at once that He did pay the tax. It had not occurred to him that Jesus might have something to say on it, if formally challenged. Occasion therefore was taken by Jesus gently to reprove Peter. Peter had but recently acknowledged Jesus to be the Son of God. Do kings of the earth take tribute of their own sons? The half-shekel was suitable to the subject-relation, but not to the relation of a son. Nevertheless, lest occasion of stumbling be given, Jesus could well waive this right, as, in His humbled condition, He had waived so many more. Peter was ordered to cast his hook into the sea, and Jesus foretold that the fish he would bring up would have in its mouth the necessary coin (Greek, stater, about 64 cents or 2s. 8d.). The tax was paid, yet in such a way as to show that the payment of it was an act of condescension of the king's Son.

c) Discourse on Greatness and Forgiveness:

(Matthew 18:1-35; Mark 9:33-50; Luke 9:46-50)

On the way to Capernaum a dispute had arisen among the disciples as to who should be greatest in the Messianic kingdom about to be set up. The fact of such disputing showed how largely even their minds were yet dominated by worldly, sensuous ideas of the kingdom. Now, in the house (Mr 9:33), Jesus takes occasion to check their spirit of ambitious rivalry, and to inculcate much-needed lessons on greatness and kindred matters.

(1) Greatness in Humility.

First, by the example of a little child, Jesus teaches that humility is the root-disposition of His kingdom. It alone admits to the kingdom, and conducts to honor in it. He is greatest who humbles himself most (Mt 18:4), and is the servant of all (Mr 9:35). He warns against slighting the "little ones," or causing them to stumble, and uses language of terrible severity against those guilty of this sin.

(2) Tolerance.

The mention of receiving little ones in Christ’s name led John to remark that he had seen one casting out demons in Christ’s name, and had forbidden him, because he was not of their company. "Forbid him not," Jesus said, "for there is no man who shall do a mighty work in my name, and be able quickly to speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is for us" (Mr 9:39,40).

(3) The Erring Brother.

The subject of offenses leads to the question of sins committed by one Christian brother against another. Here Christ inculcates kindness and forbearance; only if private representations and the good offices of brethren fail, is the matter to be brought before the church; if the brother repents he is to be unstintedly forgiven ("seventy times seven," Mt 18:22). If the church is compelled to interpose, its decisions are valid (under condition, however, of prayer and Christ’s presence, Mt 18:18-20).

(4) Parable of the Unmerciful Servant.

To enforce the lesson of forgiveness Jesus speaks the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:23-35). Himself forgiven much, this servant refuses to forgive his fellow a much smaller debt. His lord visits him with severest punishment. Only as we forgive others can we look for forgiveness.

2. The Feast of Tabernacles—Discourses, etc.:

(John 7-10:21)

The Gospel of John leaves a blank of many months between chapters 6 and 7, covered only by the

statement, "After these things, Jesus walked in Galilee" (7:1). In this year of His ministry Jesus had gone neither to the feast of the Passover nor to Pentecost. The Feast of Tabernacles was now at hand (October). To this Jesus went up, and Joh preserves for us a full record of His appearance, discourses and doings there.

a) The Private Journey—Divided Opinions:

(John 7:1-10)

The brethren of Jesus, still unpersuaded of His claims (Joh 7:5), had urged Jesus to go up with them to the feast. "Go up," in their sense, included a public manifestation of Himself as the Messiah. Jesus replied that His time for this had not yet come. Afterward He went up quietly, and in the midst of the feast appeared in the temple as a teacher. The comments made about Jesus at the feast before His arrival vividly reflect the divided state of opinion regarding Him. "He is a good man," thought some. "Not so," said others, "but He leadeth the multitude astray." His teaching evoked yet keener division. While some said, "Thou hast a demon" (Joh 7:20), others argued, "When the Christ shall come, will he do more signs?" etc. (Joh 7:31). Some declared, "This is of a truth the prophet," or "This is the Christ"; others objected that the Christ was to come out of Bethlehem, not Galilee (Joh 7:40-42). Yet no one dared to take the step of molesting Him.

b) Christ’s Self-Witness:

(John 7:14-52)

Christ’s wisdom and use of the Scriptures excited surprise. Jesus met this surprise by stating that His knowledge was from the Father, and with reference to the division of opinion about Him laid down the principle that knowledge of the truth was the result of the obedient will: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God" (Joh 7:17). It was objected that they knew who Jesus was, and whence He came. In a sense, Jesus replied, this was true; in a deeper sense, it was not. He came from the Father, whom they knew not (Joh 7:28,29). The last and great day of the feast—the eighth (Nu 29:35)—brought with it a new self-attestation. Jesus stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me .... from within him shall flow rivers of living water" (Joh 7:37,38). The words are understood to have reference to the ceremony of pouring out a libation of water at this feast—the libation, in turn, commemorating the gift of water at the striking of the rock. The evangelist interprets the saying of the Spirit which believers should receive. Meanwhile, the chief priests and Pharisees had sent officers to apprehend Jesus (Joh 7:32), but they returned without Him. "Why did ye not bring him?" The reply was confounding, "Never man so spake" (Joh 7:45,46). The retort was the poor one, "Are ye also led astray?" In vain did Nicodemus, who was present, try to put in a moderating word (Joh 7:50,51). It was clear to what issue hate like this was tending.

c) The Woman Taken in Adultery:

(John 8)

The discourses at the feast are at this point interrupted by the episode of the woman taken in adultery (Joh 8:1-11), which, by general consent, does not belong to the original text of the Gospel. It is probably, however, an authentic incident, and illustrates, on the one hand, the eagerness of the official classes to find an accusation against Jesus, and, on the other, the Saviour's dignity and wisdom in foiling such attempts, His spirit of mercy and the action of conscience in the accusers. In His continued teaching, Jesus put forth even higher claims than in the foregoing discourse. As He had applied to Himself the water from the rock, so now He applied to Himself the symbolic meaning of the two great candelabra, which were lighted in the temple court during the feast and bore reference to the pillar of cloud and fire. "I am the light of the world," said Jesus (Joh 8:12). Only a Divine being could put forth such a claim as that. The Jews objected that they had only His witness to Himself. Jesus replied that no other could bear adequate witness of Him, for He alone knew whence He came and whither He went (Joh 8:14). But the Father also had borne witness of Him (Joh 8:18). This discourse, delivered in the "treasury" of the temple (Joh 8:20), was soon followed by another, no man yet daring to touch Him. This time Jesus warns the Jews of the fate their unbelief would entail upon them: "Ye shall die in your sins" (Joh 8:24). Addressing Himself next specially to the Jews who believed in Him, He urged them to continuance in His word as the condition of true freedom. Resentment was again aroused at the suggestion that the Jews, Abraham's seed, were not free. Jesus made clear that the real bondage was that of sin; only the Son could make spiritually free (Joh 8:34-36). Descent from Abraham meant nothing, if the spirit was of the devil (Joh 8:39-41). A new conflict was provoked by the saying, "If a man keep my word, he shall never see death" (Joh 8:51). Did Jesus make Himself greater than Abraham? The controversy that ensued resulted in the sublime utterance, "Before Abraham was born, I am" (Joh 8:58). The Jews would have stoned Him, but Jesus eluded them, and departed.

d) The Cure of the Blind Man:

(John 9)

The Feast of Tabernacles was past, but Jesus was still in Jerusalem. Passing by on a Sabbath (Joh 9:14), He saw a blind man, a beggar (John 9:8), well known to have been blind from his birth. The narrative of the cure and examination of this blind man is adduced by Paley as bearing in its inimitable circumstantiality every mark of personal knowledge on the part of the historian. The man, cured in strange but symbolic fashion by the anointing of his eyes with clay (thereby apparently sealing them more firmly), then washing in the Pool of Siloam, became an object of immediate interest, and every effort was made by the Pharisees to shake his testimony as to the miracle that had been wrought. The man, however, held to his story, and his parents could only corroborate the fact that their son had been born blind, and now saw. The Pharisees themselves were divided, some reasoning that Jesus could not be of God because He had broken the Sabbath—the old charge; others, Nicodemus-like, standing on the fact that a man who was a sinner could not do such signs (Joh 9:15,16). The healed man applied the logic of common-sense: "If this man were not from God, he could do nothing" (Joh 9:33). The Pharisees, impotent to deny the wonder, could only cast him out of the synagogue. Jesus found him, and brought him to full confession of faith in Himself (Joh 9:35-38).

e) The Good Shepherd:

(John 10:1-21)

Yet another address of Jesus is on record arising out of this incident. In continuation of His reply to the question of the Pharisees in John (9:40), "Are we also blind?" Jesus spoke to them His discourse on the Good Shepherd. Flocks in eastern countries are gathered at night into an enclosure surrounded by a wall or palisade. This is the "fold," which is under the care of a "porter," who opens the closely barred door to the shepherds in the morning. As contrasted with the legitimate shepherds, the false shepherds "enter not by the door," but climb over some other way. The allusion is to priests, scribes, Pharisees and generally to all, in any age, who claim an authority within the church unsanctioned by God (Godet). Jesus now gathers up the truth in its relation to Himself as the Supreme Shepherd. From His fundamental relation to the church, He is not only the Shepherd, but the Door (10:7-14). To those who enter by Him there is given security, liberty, provision (10:9). In his capacity as Shepherd Christ is preeminently all that a faithful shepherd ought to be. The highest proof of His love is that, as the Good Shepherd, He lays down His life for the sheep (10:11,15,17). This laying down of His life is not an accident, but is His free, voluntary act (10:17,18). Again there was division among the Jews because of these remarkable sayings (10:19-21).

Chronological Note.

Though John does not mention the fact, there is little doubt that, after this visit to Jerusalem, Jesus returned to Galilee, and at no long interval from His return, took His final departure southward. The chronology of this closing period in Galilee is somewhat uncertain. Some would place the visit to the Feast of Tabernacles before the withdrawal to Caesarea Philippi, or even earlier (compare Andrews, Life of our Lord, etc.); but the order adopted above appears preferable.

JESUS CHRIST, 4D

D. LAST JOURNEY TO JERUSALEM—JESUS IN PERAEA

Departure from Galilee:

An interval of two months elapses between John 10:21 and 22—from the Feast of Tabernacles (October) till the Feast of the Dedication (December). This period witnessed the final withdrawal of Jesus from Galilee. Probably while yet in Galilee He sent forth the seventy disciples to prepare His way in the cities to which He should come (Lu 10:1). Repulsed on the borders of Samaria (Lu 9:51-53), He passed over into Peraea ("beyond Jordan"), where he exercised a considerable ministry. The record of this period, till the entry into Jerusalem, belongs in great part to Luke, who seems to have had a rich special source relating to it (9:51-19:27). The discourses in Luke embrace many passages and sections found in other connections in Matthew, and it is difficult, often, to determine their proper chronological place, if, as

doubtless sometimes happened, portions were not repeated.

I. From Leaving Galilee till the Feast of the Dedication.

1. Rejected by Samaria:

(Luke 9:51-55)

Conscious that He went to suffer and die, Jesus steadfastly set His face to go to Jerusalem. His route was first by Samaria—an opportunity of grace to that people—but here, at a border village, the messengers He sent before Him, probably also He Himself on His arrival, were repulsed, because of His obvious intention to go to Jerusalem (Lu 9:53). James and John wished to imitate Elijah in calling down fire from heaven on the rejecters, but Jesus rebuked them for their thought (the Revised Version (British and American) omits the reference to Elijah, and subsequent clauses, Lu 9:55,56).

2. Mission of the Seventy:

(Luke 10:1-20)

In the present connection Luke inserts the incidents of the three aspirants formerly considered (9:57-62; compare p. 1645). It was suggested that the second and third cases may belong to this period.

A new and significant step was now taken by Jesus in the sending out of 70 disciples, who should go before Him, two by two, to announce His coming in the cities and villages He was about to visit. The number sent indicates how large a following Jesus had now acquired. (Some see a symbolical meaning in the number 70, but it is difficult to show what it is.) The directions given to the messengers are similar to those formerly given to the Twelve (Lu 9:1-5; compare Mt 10); a passage also found in Matthew in a different connection (11:21-24) is incorporated in this discourse, or had originally its place in it (11:13-15). In this mission Jesus no longer made any secret of His Messianic character. The messengers were to proclaim that the kingdom of God was come nigh to them in connection with His impending visit (Lu 10:9). The mission implies that a definite route was marked out by Jesus for Himself (compare Lu 13:22), but this would be subject to modification according to the reception of His emissaries (Lu 10:10,11,16). The circuit need not have occupied a long time with so many engaged in it. The results show that it aroused strong interest. Later the disciples returned elated with their success, emphasizing their victory over the demons (Lu 10:17). Jesus bade them rejoice rather that their names were written in heaven (Lu 10:20). Again a passage is inserted (Lu 10:21,22) found earlier in Mt 11:25-27; compare also Lu 10:23,24, with Mt 13:16,17.

3. The Lawyer’s Question—Parable of Good Samaritan:

(Luke 10:25-37)

Jesus had now passed "beyond the Jordan," i.e. into Peraea, and vast crowds waited on His teaching (compare Mt 19:1 f; Mr 10:1; Lu 12:1). At one place a lawyer put what he meant to be a testing question, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus referred him to the great commandments of love to God and one's neighbor, eliciting the further query, "And who is my neighbor?" In reply Jesus spoke to him the immortal parable of the Good Samaritan, and asked who proved neighbor to him who fell among the robbers. The lawyer could give but one answer, "He that showed mercy on him." "Go," said Jesus, "and do thou likewise."

The incident of Martha and Mary, which Luke inserts here (Lu 10:38-42), comes in better later, when Jesus was nearer Bethany.

4. Discourses, Parables, and Miracles:

(Luke 11-14)

At this place Luke brings together a variety of discourses, warnings and exhortations, great parts of which have already been noticed in earlier contexts. It does not follow that Luke has not, in many cases, preserved the original connection. This is probably the case with the Lord's Prayer (Lu 11:1-4), and with portions of what Matthew includes in the Sermon on the Mount (e.g. 11:9-13,13-36; 12:22-34; compare Lu 13:24-27 with Mt 7:13,14,22,23), and in other discourses (e.g. Lu 11:42-52 = Mt 23:23-36; Lu 12:2-12 = Mt 10:26-33; Lu 12:42-48 = Mt 24:45-51; Lu 13:18-21, parables of Mustard Seed and Leaven = Mt 13:31,32, etc.).

a) Original to Luke:

Of matter original to Luke in these chapters may be noted such passages as that on the Friend at Midnight (11:5-8), the incident of the man who wished Jesus to bid his brother divide his inheritance with him, to whom Jesus spoke the parable of the Rich Fool (12:13-21), the parable of the Barren Fig Tree, called forth by the disposition to regard certain Galileans whom Pilate had slain in a tumult at the temple, and eighteen on whom the tower of Siloam had fallen, as sinners above others (13:1-9: "Nay," said Jesus, "but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish"), and most of the teaching in Luke 14, referred to below. In 11:37,38, we have the mention of a Pharisee inviting Jesus to dine, and of his astonishment at the Lord's neglect of the customary ablutions before eating. Luke 11:53 gives a glimpse of the fury to which the scribes and Pharisees were aroused by the severity of Christ's denunciations. They "began to press upon him vehemently .... laying wait for him, to catch something out of his mouth." In 13:31 ff it is told how the Pharisees sought to frighten Jesus from the district by telling Him that Herod would fain kill Him. Jesus bade them tell that "fox" that His work would go on uninterruptedly in the brief space that remained ("day" used enigmatically) till He was "perfected" (13:32). The woe on Jerusalem (13:34,35) is given by Matthew in the discourse in chapter 23.

b) The Infirm Woman—the Dropsied Man:

Of the miracles in this section, the casting out of the demon that was mute (Lu 11:14) is evidently the same incident as that already noted in Mt 12:22 ff. Two other miracles are connected with the old accusation of Sabbath breaking. One was the healing in a synagogue on the Sabbath day of a woman bowed down for 18 years with "a spirit of infirmity" (Lu 13:10-17); the other was the cure on the Sabbath of a man afflicted with dropsy at a feast in the house of a ruler of the Pharisees to which Jesus had been invited (Lu 14:1-6). The motive of the Pharisee's invitation, as in most such cases, was hostile (Lu 14:1). In both instances Jesus met the objection in the same way, by appealing to their own acts of humanity to their animals on the Sabbath (Lu 13:15,16; 14:5).

c) Parable of the Great Supper:

This feast at the Pharisee's house had an interesting sequel in the discourse it led Jesus to utter against vainglory in feasting, and on the spirit of love which would prompt to the table being spread for the helpless and destitute rather than for the selfish enjoyment of the select few, closing, in answer to a pious ejaculation of one of the guests, with the parable of the Great Supper (Lu 14:7-24). The parable, with its climax in the invitation to bring in the poor, and maimed, and blind, and those from the highways and hedges, was a commentary on the counsels He had just been giving, but it had its deeper lesson in picturing the rejection by the Jews of the invitation to the feast God had made for them in His kingdom, and the call that would be given to the Gentiles to take their place.

d) Counting the Cost:

The injunctions to the multitudes as to the sacrifice and cross-bearing involved in discipleship are pointed by the examples of a man building a tower, and a king going to war, who count the cost before entering on their enterprises (Lu 14:25-35).

5. Martha and Mary:

At or about this time—perhaps before the incidents in Lu 14—Jesus paid the visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedication described in Joh 10:22-39. This seems the fitting place for the introduction of the episode of Martha and Mary which Luke narrates a little earlier (10:38-42). The "village" into which Jesus entered was no doubt Bethany (Joh 11:1). The picture given by Luke of the contrasted dispositions of the two sisters—Martha active and "serving" (compare Joh 12:2), Mary retiring and contemplative—entirely corresponds with that in John. Martha busied herself with preparations for the meal; Mary sat at Jesus' feet, and heard His word. To Martha's complaint, as if her sister were idling, Jesus gave the memorable answer, "One thing is needful: for Mary hath chosen the good part," etc. (Lu 10:42).

6. Feast of the Dedication:

(John 10:22-39)

The Feast of the Dedication, held in December, was in commemoration of the cleansing of the temple and restoration of its worship after its profanation by Antiochus Epiphanes (164 BC). Great excitement was occasioned by the appearance of Jesus at this feast, and some asked, "How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly." Jesus said He had told them, and His works attested His claim, but they were not of His true flock, and would not believe. To His own sheep He gave eternal life. The Jews anew wished to stone Him for claiming to be God. Jesus replied that even the law called the judges of Israel "gods" (Ps 82:6, "I said, Ye are gods, and all of you sons of the Most High") how could it then be blasphemy for Him whom the Father had sanctified and sent into the world to say of Himself, "I am the Son of God"? The Jews sought to take Him, but He passed from their midst.

II. From the Abode at Bethabara till the Raising of Lazarus.

After leaving Jerusalem Jesus went beyond Jordan again to the place where John at first baptized (Joh 10:40; compare Joh 1:28, called in the King James Version "Bethabara," in the Revised Version (British and American) "Bethany," distinct from the Bethany of John 11). There He "abode," implying a prolonged stay, and many resorted to Him. This spot, sacred to Jesus by His own baptism, may be regarded now as His headquarters from which excursions would be made to places in the neighborhood. Several of the incidents recorded by Luke are probably connected with this sojourn. 1. Parables of Lost Sheep, Lost Piece of Silver, Prodigal Son:

(Luke 15)

The stronger the opposition of scribes and Pharisees to Jesus became, the more by natural affinity did the classes regarded as outcast feel drawn to Him. He did not repel them, as the Pharisees did, but ate and drank with them. Publicans and sinners gathered to His teaching, and He associated with them. The complaining was great: "This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them." The defense of Jesus was in parables, and the Pharisees' reproach may be thanked for three of the most beautiful parables Jesus ever spoke—the Lost Sheep (compare Mt 18:12-14), the Lost Piece of Silver, and the Prodigal Son (Luke 15). Why does the shepherd rejoice more over the one lost sheep brought back than over the ninety-nine that have not gone astray? Why does the woman rejoice more over the recovery of her lost drachma than over all the coins safe in her keeping? Why does the father rejoice more over the prodigal son come back in rags and penitence from the far country than over the obedient but austere brother that had never left the home? The stories were gateways into the inmost heart of God. There is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth more than over ninetynine just persons that need no repentance (Lu 15:7).

2. Parables of the Unjust Steward and the Rich Man and Lazarus:

(Luke 16)

Two other parables, interspersed by discourses (in part again met with in other connections, compare Lu 16:13 with Mt 6:24; Lu 16:16 with Mt 11:12; Lu 16:18 with Mt 5:32; 19:9, etc.), were spoken at this time—that of the Unjust Steward (Lu 16:1-9) and that of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Lu 16:19-31). The

dishonest steward, about to be dismissed, utilized his opportunities, still dishonestly, to make friends of his master's creditors; let the "children of light" better his example by righteously using mammon to make friends for themselves, who shall receive them into everlasting habitations. The rich man, pampered in luxury, let the afflicted Lazarus starve at his gate. At death—in Hades—the positions are reversed: the rich man is in torment, stripped of all he had enjoyed; the poor man is at rest in Abraham's bosom, compensated for all he suffered. It is character, not outward estate, that determines destiny. The unmerciful are doomed. Even a messenger from the unseen world will not save men, if they hear not Moses and the prophets (Lu 16:31).

In this connection Luke (17:1-10) places exhortations to the disciples on occasions of stumbling, forgiveness, the power of faith, renunciation of merit ("We are unprofitable servants"), some of which are found elsewhere (compare Mt 18:6,7,15,21, etc.).

3. The Summons to Bethany—Raising of Lazarus:

(John 11)

While Jesus was in the trans-Jordanic Bethabara, or Bethany, or in its neighborhood, a message came to Him from the house of Martha and Mary in the Judean Bethany (on the Mount of Olives, about 2 miles East from Jerusalem), that His friend Lazarus ("he whom thou lovest") was sick. The conduct of Jesus seemed strange, for He abode still two days where He was (Joh 11:6). As the sequel showed, this was only for the end of a yet more wonderful manifestation of His power and love, to the glory of God (Joh 11:4). Meanwhile Lazarus died, and was buried. When Jesus announced His intention of going into Judea, the disciples sought hard to dissuade Him (Joh 11:8); but Jesus was not moved by the fears they suggested. He reached Bethany (a distance of between 20 and 30 miles) on the fourth day after the burial of Lazarus (Joh 11:17), and was met on the outskirts by Martha, and afterward by Mary, both plunged in deepest sorrow. Both breathed the same plaint: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died" (Joh 11:21,32). To Martha Jesus gave the pledge, "Thy brother shall rise again," strengthening the faith she already had expressed in Him (Joh 11:22) by announcing Himself as "the resurrection, and the life" (Joh 11:25,26); at Mary's words He was deeply moved, and asked to be taken to the tomb. Here, it is recorded, "Jesus wept" (Joh 11:35), the only other instance of His weeping in the Gospels being as He looked on lost Jerusalem (Lu 19:41). The proof of love was manifest, but some, as usual, suggested blame that this miracle-worker had not prevented His friend's death (Joh 11:37). Arrived at the rock-tomb, Jesus, still groaning in Himself, caused the stone at its mouth to be removed, and, after prayer, spoke with a loud voice, "Lazarus, come forth" (Joh 11:43). The spirit returned, and the man who had been dead came forth bound with his grave-clothes. He was released and restored to his sisters.

Even this mighty deed did not alter the mind of the Pharisees, who held a council, and decided, on the advice of Caiaphas (Joh 11:50), that for the safety of the nation it was "expedient" that this man should die.

The circumstantiality of this beautiful narrative speaks irresistibly for its historical truth, and the

objections raised by critical writers center really in their aversion to the miraculous as such.

III. From the Retirement to Ephraim till the Arrival at Bethany.

1. Retreat to Ephraim:

(John 11:54-57)

The hostility of the ruling classes was now so pronounced that, in the few weeks that remained till Jesus should go up to the Passover, He deemed it advisable to abide in privacy at a city called Ephraim (situation uncertain). That He was in secrecy during this period is implied in the statement (Joh 11:57) that if anyone knew where He was, he was to inform the chief priests and Pharisees. The retirement would be for Jesus a period of preparation for the ordeal before Him, as the wilderness had been for the commencement of His ministry.

2. The Journey Resumed:

On His leaving this retreat to resume His advance to Jerusalem the narratives again become rich in incident and teaching.

3. Cure of the Lepers:

(Luke 17:11-19)

It is not easy to define the route which brought Jesus again to the border line between Samaria and Galilee (Lu 17:11), but, in traversing this region, He was met by ten lepers, who besought Him for a cure. Jesus bade them go and show themselves to the priests, and on the way they were cleansed. Only one of the ten, and he a Samaritan, returned to give thanks and glorify God. Gratitude appeared in the unlikely quarter.

4. Pharisaic Questionings:

At some point in this journey the Pharisees sought to entrap Jesus on the question of divorce.

a) Divorce:

(Matthew 19:3-12; Mark 10:1-12) Was it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? (Mt 19:3). Jesus in reply admitted the permission to divorce given by Moses (Mr 10:3-5), but declared that this was for the hardness of their hearts, and went back to the original institution of marriage in which the two so joined were declared to be "one flesh." Only one cause is admissible as a ground of separation and remarriage (Mt 19:9; compare Mt 5:31,32; Mark has not even the exception, which is probably,

however, implied). Comments follow to the disciples in Mt on the subject of continence (Mt 19:10-12).

See DIVORCE.

b) Coming of the Kingdom:

(Luke 17:20-37)

Another question asked by the Pharisees of Jesus was as to when the kingdom of God should come. The expectation excited by His own ministry and claims was that it was near; when should it appear? Rebuking their worldly ideas, Jesus warned them that the kingdom did not come "with observation"—was not a "Lo, there! Lo, here!"; it was "within" them, or "in their midst," though they did not perceive it. In the last decisive coming of the Son of Man there would be no dubiety as to His presence (Lu 17:24,25). He adds exhortations as to the suddenness of His coming, and the separations that would ensue (Lu 17:26-37), which Mt gives as part of the great discourse on the Last Things in chapter 24.

c) Parable of the Unjust Judge:

(Luke 18:1-8)

In close connection with the foregoing, as furnishing the ground for the certainty that this day of the Son of Man would come, Jesus spoke the parable of the Unjust Judge. This judge, though heedless of the claims of right, yet yielded to the widow’s importunity, and granted her justice against her adversary. How much more surely will the righteous, long-suffering God avenge His own elect, who cry unto Him day and night (Lu 18:7,8)! Yet men, in that supreme hour, will almost have lost faith in His coming (Lu 18:8).

A series of sayings and incidents at this time throw light upon the spirit of the kingdom.

5. The Spirit of the Kingdom:

The spirit of self-righteousness is rebuked and humble penitence as the condition of acceptance is enforced in the parable of the Pharisee and Publican.

a) Parable of Pharisee and Publican:

(Luke 18:9-14)

The Pharisee posing in his self-complacency at his fastings and tithes, and thanking God for his superiority to others, is set in vivid contrast to the abased publican, standing afar off, and able only to say, "God, be thou merciful to me a sinner" (Lu 18:13). Yet it was he who went down to his house

"justified" (Lu 18:14).

b) Blessing of the Babies:

(Matthew 19:13-15; Mark 10:13-16; Luke 18:15-17)

A similar lesson is inculcated in the beautiful incident of the blessing of the babes. The disciples rebuked the mothers for bringing their little ones, but Jesus, "moved with indignation" (Mark), received and blessed the babes, declaring that to such (to them and those of like spirit) belonged the kingdom of heaven. "Suffer the little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me," etc.

c) The Rich Young Ruler:

(Matthew 19:16-30; Mark 10:17-31; Luke 18:18-30)

A third illustration—this time of the peril of covetousness—is afforded by the incident of the rich young ruler. This amiable, blameless, and evidently sincere young man ("Jesus looking upon him loved him," Mr 10:21) knelt, and addressing Jesus as "Good Teacher," asked what he must do to inherit eternal life. Jesus first declined the term "good," in the easy, conventional sense in which it was applied, then referred the ruler to the commandments as the standard of doing. All these, however, the young man averred he had observed from his youth up. He did not know himself. Jesus saw the secret hold his riches had upon his soul, and revealed it by the searching word, "If thou wouldest be perfect, go, sell that which thou hast," etc. (Mt 19:21; compare Mark, "One thing thou lackest," etc.). This was enough. The young man could not yield up his "great possessions," and went away sorrowing. Jesus bases on his refusal earnest warnings against the love of riches, and points out, in answer to a question of Peter, that loss for His sake in this life is met with overwhelmingly great compensations in the life to come.

6. Third Announcement of the Passion:

(Matthew 20:17-19; Mark 10:32-34; 18:31-33)

Not unconnected with the foregoing teachings is the third solemn announcement to the disciples, so hard to be persuaded that the kingdom was not immediately to be set up in glory, of His approaching sufferings and death, followed by resurrection. The disciples had been "amazed" and "afraid" (Mk) at something strange in the aspect and walk of Jesus as they Lu were on the way, going to Jerusalem (compare Lu 9:51). His words gave the explanation. With them should be taken what is said in a succeeding incident of His baptism of suffering (Mr 10:38,39; compare Lu 12:50).

7. The Rewards of the Kingdom:

The spirit of the kingdom and sacrifice for the kingdom have already been associated with the idea of reward, but the principles underlying this reward are now made the subject of special teaching.

First by the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard the lesson is inculcated that reward in the kingdom is not according to any legal rule, but is governed by a Divine equity, in accordance with which the last may often be equal to, or take precedence of, the first.

a) Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard:

(Matthew 20:1-17)

The laborers were hired at different hours, yet all at the end received the same wage. The murmuring at the generosity of the householder of those who had worked longest betrayed a defectiveness of spirit which may explain why they were not more highly rewarded. In strictness, the kingdom is a gift of grace, in the sum total of its blessings one and the same to all.

b) The Sons of Zebedee:

(Matthew 20:20-28; Mark 10:35-45)

Still there are distinctions of honor in God’s kingdom, but these are not arbitrarily made. This is the lesson of the reply of Jesus to the plea of the mother of the sons of Zebedee, James and John, with, apparently, the concurrence of the apostles themselves, that they might sit one on the right hand and the other on the left hand in His kingdom. It was a bold and ambitious request, and naturally moved the indignation of the other apostles. Still it had its ground in a certain nobility of spirit. For when Jesus asked if they were able to drink of His cup and be baptized with His baptism, they answered, "We are able." Jesus told them they should share that lot of suffering, but to sit on His right hand and on His left were not favors that could be arbitrarily bestowed, but would be given to those for whom it had been prepared of His Father—the preparation having regard to character and fitness, of which the Father alone was judge. Jesus went on to rebuke the spirit which led one to seek prominence over another, and laid down the essential law, "Whosoever would become great among you shall be your minister," enforcing it by His own never-to-be-forgotten example, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom, for many" (Mt 20:28; Mr 10:45).

8. Jesus at Jericho:

Accompanied by a great throng, possibly of pilgrims to the feast, Jesus drew near to the influential city of Jericho, in the Jordan valley, about 17 miles distant from Jerusalem. Here two notable incidents marked His progress.

a) The Cure of Bartimeus:

(Matthew 20:29-34; Mark 10:46-82; Luke 18:35-43)

As they approached the city (Luke) (Matthew and Mark place the incident as they "went out") a blind beggar, Bartimeus, hearing that "Jesus the Nazarene" (Mark) passed by, loudly called on Him as the "Son of David" to have mercy on him. The multitude would have restrained the man, but their rebukes only made him the more urgent in his cries. Jesus stopped in His way, called the blind man to Him, then, when he came, renewing his appeal, healed him. The cry of the beggar shows that the Davidic descent, if not the Messiahship, of Jesus was now known. Matthew varies from the other evangelists in speaking of "two blind men," while Matthew and Mark, as noted, make the cure take place on leaving, not on entering the city. Not improbably there are two healings, one on entering Jericho, the other on going from the city, and Matthew, after his fashion, groups them together (Luke's language is really indefinite; literally, "as they were near to Jericho").

b) Zaccheus the Publican:

(Luke 19:1-10)

The entrance of Jesus into Jericho was signalized by a yet more striking incident. The chief collector of revenue in the city was Zaccheus, rich, but held in opprobrium ("a sinner") because of his occupation. Being little of stature, Zaccheus had climbed into the branches of a sycomore tree to see Jesus as He passed. To his amazement, and that of the crowd, Jesus stopped on His way, and called Zaccheus by name to hasten to come down, for that day He must abide at his house. Zaccheus joyfully received Him, and, moved to a complete change in his views of duty, declared his purpose of giving half his goods to the poor, and of restoring fourfold anything he might have taken by false accusation. It was a revolution in the man's soul, wrought by love. "Today," Jesus testified, "is salvation come to this house ..... For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost."

c) Parable of the Pounds:

(Luke 19:11-27)

The expectations of the multitude that the kingdom of God should immediately appear led Jesus to speak the parable of the Pounds, forewarning them that the consummation they looked for might be longer delayed than they thought, and impressing on them the need of loyalty, faithfulness and diligence, if that day, when it came, was not to prove disastrous to them. The nobleman went into a "far country" to receive a kingdom, and his ten servants were to trade with as many pounds (each = 100 drachmas) in his absence. On his return the faithful servants were rewarded in proportion to their diligence; the faithless one lost what he had; the rebellious citizens were destroyed. Thus Jesus fore-shadowed the doom that would overtake those. who were plotting against Him, and checked hopes that disregarded the moral conditions of honor in His kingdom.

Arrival at Bethany.

From Jericho Jesus moved on to Bethany, the abode of Lazarus and his sisters. To His halt here before

His public entrance into Jerusalem the next events belong.

JESUS CHRIST, 4E1

E. THE PASSION WEEK—BETRAYAL, TRIAL AND CRUCIFIXION

Importance of the Last Events:

We reach now the closing week and last solemn events of the earthly life of Jesus. The importance attached to this part of their narratives is seen by the space the evangelists devote to it. Of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark fully one-third is devoted to the events of the Passion Week and their sequel in the resurrection; Luke has several chapters; John gives half his Gospel to the same period. It is obvious that in the minds of the evangelists the crucifixion of Jesus is the pivot of their whole narrative—the denouement to which everything tends from the first.

I. The Events Preceding the Last Super.

1. The Chronology:

The arrival in Bethany is placed by John "six days before the Passover" (12:1). Assuming that the public entry into Jerusalem took place on the Sunday, and that the 14th of Nisan fell on the following Thursday, this would lead to the arrival being placed on the Friday or Saturday preceding, according to the mode of reckoning. It is in the highest degree unlikely that Jesus would journey from Jericho on the Jewish Sabbath; hence He may be supposed to have arrived on the Friday evening. The supper at which the anointing by Mary took place would be on the Saturday (Sabbath) evening. Matthew and Mark connect it with events two days before the Passover (Mt 26:2; Mr 14:1), but parenthetically, in a way which leaves the other order open.

2. The Anointing at Bethany:

(Matthew 26:6-13; Mark 14:3-9; John 12:1-9)

This beautiful deed occurred at a supper given in honor of Jesus at the house of one Simon, a leper (Matthew and Mark)—probably cured by Jesus—at which Martha, Mary and Lazarus were guests. Martha aided in serving (Joh 12:2). In the course of the meal, or at its close, Mary brought a costly box of nard (valued by Judas at "300 shillings," about $50, or 10 pounds; compare the American Revised Version margin on Joh 6:7), and with the perfume anointed the head (Matthew, Mark) and feet (John) of Jesus, wiping His feet with her hair (Matthew and Mark, though not mentioning the "feet," speak of the "body" of Jesus). Indignation, instigated by Judas (John), was at once awakened at what was deemed wanton waste. How much better had the money been given to the poor! Jesus vindicated Mary in her loving act—a prophetic anointing for His burial—and declared that wherever His gospel went, it would be spoken of for a memorial of her. It is the hearts from which such acts come that are the true friends of

the poor. The chief priests were only the further exasperated at what was happening, and at the interest shown in Lazarus, and plotted to put Lazarus also to death (Joh 12:10).

3. The Entry into Jerusalem:

(Matthew 21:1-11; Mark 11:1-11; Luke 19:29-44; John 12:12-19)

On the day following—Palm Sunday—Jesus made His public entry as Messiah into Jerusalem. All the evangelists narrate this event. The Mount of Olives had to be crossed from Bethany, and Jesus sent two disciples to an adjacent village—probably Bethphage (this seems to have been also the name of a district)—where an ass and its colt would be found tied. These they were to bring to Him, Jesus assuring them of the permission of the owners. Garments were thrown over the colt, and Jesus seated Himself on it. In this humble fashion (as Mt and Joh note, in fulfillment of prophecy, Zec 9:9), He proceeded to Jerusalem, from which a multitude, bearing palm branches, had already come out to meet Him (John). Throngs accompanied Him, going before and after; these, spreading their garments, and strewing branches in the way, hailed Him with hosannas as the Son of David, the King of Israel, who came in the name of the Lord. Very different were the feelings in the breasts of the Pharisees. "Behold," they said, "how ye prevail nothing; lo, the world is gone after him" (Joh 12:19). They bade Jesus rebuke His disciples, but Jesus replied that if they were silent, the very stones would cry out (Lu 19:40).

Jesus Weeping over Jerusalem—Return to Bethany.

One incident in this progress to Jerusalem is related only by Lu 19:41-44. As at a bend in the road Jerusalem became suddenly visible, Jesus paused and wept over the city, so blind to its day of visitation, and so near to its awful doom. Not His own sufferings, but the thought of Jerusalem’s guilt and woes, filled Him with anguish. On reaching the city, Mark’s testimony is explicit that He did no more than enter the temple, and ‘look round on all things’ (Mr 11:11). Then eventide having come, He returned to Bethany with the Twelve.

4. Cursing of the Fig Tree—Second Cleansing of Temple:

(Matthew 21:12-22; Mark 11:12-26; Luke 19:45-48)

The morning of Monday found Jesus and His disciples again on their way to the city. Possibly the early hours had been spent by Jesus in solitary prayer, and, as they went, it is recorded that "he hungered." A fig tree from which, from its foliage, fruit might have been expected, stood invitingly by the wayside, but when Jesus approached it, it was found to have nothing but leaves—a striking symbol of the outwardly religious, but spiritually barren Jewish community. And in this sense Jesus used it in pronouncing on it the word of doom, "No man eat fruit from thee henceforward for ever" (Mark). Next morning (Tuesday), as the disciples passed, the tree was found withered from the roots. Matthew combines the events of the cursing and the withering, placing both on the second day, but Mark more accurately distinguishes them. Jesus used the surprise of the disciples as the occasion of a lesson on the

omnipotence of faith, with added counsels on prayer.

Were There Two Cleansings?

Pursuing His journey on the first morning, Jesus reached the temple, and there, as His first act, is stated by Mt and Mr to have cleansed the temple of the traders. It is a diffcult question whether this is a second cleansing, or the same act as that recorded by John at the beginning of the ministry (Joh 2:13-22; see above), and here narrated out of its chronological order. The acts are at least quite similar in character and significance. In favor of a second cleansing is the anger of the priests and scribes (Mr 11:18; Lu 19:47), and their demand next day for His authority. No other incidents are recorded of this visit to the temple, except the healing of certain blind and lame, and the praises of the children, "Hosanna to the son of David"—an echo of the previous day's proceedings (Mt 21:14-16). In the evening He went back to Bethany.

5. The Eventful Tuesday:

Far different is it with the third day of these visits of Jesus to the temple—the Tuesday of the Passion Week. This is crowded with parables, discourses, incidents, so numerous, impressive, tragical, as to oppress the mind in seeking to grasp how one short day could embrace them all. It was the last day of the appearance of Jesus in the temple (Joh 12:36), and marks His final break with the authorities of the nation, on whom His words of denunciation (Mt 23) fell with overwhelming force. The thread of the day's proceedings may thus be briefly traced.

a) The Demand for Authority—Parables:

(Matthew 21:23-22:14; Mark 11:27-12:12; Luke 20:1-18)

On His first appearance in the temple on the Tuesday morning, Jesus was met by a demand from the chief priests, scribes and elders (representatives of the Sanhedrin), for the authority by which He acted as He did. Jesus met them by a counterquestion, "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or from men?" The dilemma was obvious. If John was Divinely accredited, why did they not accept his testimony to Jesus? Yet they feared to say his mission was of men, for John was universally esteemed a prophet. They could therefore only lamely reply: "We cannot tell" (the King James Version). Matters had now come to an issue, and Jesus, reverting to the method of parable, set forth plainly their sin and its results to themselves and others.

The Two Sons—the Wicked Husbandmen—the Marriage of the King's Son.

The parables spoken on this occasion were: that of the Two Sons, one who said "I go not," but afterward repented and went, the other who said, "I go, sir," but went not—pointing the moral that the publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of God before the self-righteous leaders who rejected the preaching of John (Mt 21:28-32); that of the Wicked Husbandmen, who slew the servants, and finally the son, sent to

them, and were at length themselves destroyed, the vineyard being given to others—a prophecy of the transferring of the kingdom to the Gentiles (Matthew, Mark, Luke); and that of the Marriage of the King's Son (Mt 22:2-14), akin to that of the Great Supper in Lu 14:16-24 in its gathering in of the outcasts to take the place of those who had been bidden, but distinguished from it by the feature of the wedding garment, the lack of which meant being thrust into the outer darkness. The Pharisees easily perceived that these parables were spoken of them (Mt 21:45; Mr 12:12; Lu 20:19), and were correspondingly enraged, yet dared not touch Jesus for fear of the people.

b) Ensnaring Questions, etc.:

(Matthew 22:1-46; Mark 12:13-37; Luke 20:19-44)

The attempt was next made on the part of the Pharisees, Herodians and Sadducees—now joined in a common cause—to ensnare Jesus by captious and compromising questions. These attempts He met with a wisdom and dignity which foiled His adversaries, while He showed a ready appreciation of a candid spirit when it presented itself, and turned the point against His opponents by putting a question on the Davidic sonship of the Messiah.

(1) Tribute to Caesar—the Resurrection—the Great Commandment.

First the Pharisees with the Herodians sought to entrap Him by raising the question of the lawfulness of tribute to Caesar. By causing them to produce a denarius bearing Caesar's image and superscription, Jesus obtained from them a recognition of their acceptance of Caesar's authority, and bade them render Caesar's things to Caesar, and God's to God. The Sadducees next tried Him with the puzzle of the wife who had seven husbands, leading up to denial of the resurrection; but Jesus met them by showing that marriage relations have no place in the resurrection life, and by pointing to the implication of a future life in God's word to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham," etc. God "is not the God of the dead, but of the living," a fact which carried with it all the weight of resurrection, as needed for the completion of the personal life. The candid scribe, who came last with His question as to which commandment was first of all, had a different reception. Jesus met Him kindly, satisfied him with His answer, and pronounced him "not far from the kingdom of God" (Mr 12:34).

(2) David's Son and Lord.

The adversaries were silenced, but Jesus now put to them His own question. If David in Ps 110 could say "Yahweh saith unto my lord, Sit thou on my right hand," etc., how was this reconcilable with the Christ being David's son? The question was based on the acceptance of the oracle as spoken by David, or one of his house, of the Messiah, and was intended to suggest the higher nature of Christ as one with God in a Divine sovereignty. David's son was also David's Lord.

c) The Great Denunciation:

(Matthew 23; Mark 12:38-40; Luke 20:45-47; compare Luke 11:39-52)

At this point, in audience of the multitudes and of His disciples in the temple, Jesus delivered that tremendous indictment of the scribes and Pharisees, with denunciations of woes upon them for their hypocrisy and iniquity of conduct, recorded most fully in Mt 23. A more tremendous denunciation of a class was never uttered. While conceding to the scribes and Pharisees any authority they lawfully possessed (23:2,3), Jesus specially dwelt on their divorce of practice from precept. They said and did not (23:3). He denounced their perversion of the right, their tyranny, their ostentation, their keeping back others from the kingdom, their zeal in securing proselytes, only to make them, when gained, worse than themselves, their immoral casuistry, their scruples about trifles, while neglecting essentials, their exaltation of the outward at the expense of the inward, their building the tombs of the prophets, while harboring the spirit of those that killed the prophets. He declared them to be foul and corrupt to the last degree: ‘sons of Gehenna’ (23:15,33). So awful a condition meant ripeness for doom. On them, through that law of retribution which binds generation with generation in guilt and penalty, would come all the righteous blood shed since the days of Abel (the allusion to "Zachariah son of Barachiah," 23:35, is unmistakably to 2Ch 24:21—this being the last book in the Hebrew Canon—but "Barachiah" seems a confusion with Zec 1:1, perhaps through a copyist’s gloss or error). At the close indignation melts into tenderness in the affecting plaint over Jerusalem—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, ... how often would I have gathered thy children together," etc. (Mt 23:37-39)—words found in Luke in an earlier context (13:34,35), but assuredly also appropriate here. For other parts of the discourse found earlier, compare Lu 11:39-52. All seems to have been gathered up afresh in this final accusation. It can be imagined that the anger of the Pharisees was fierce at such words, yet they did not venture openly to touch Him.

d) The Widow’s Offering:

(Mark 12:41-44; Luke 21:1-4)

Before finally leaving the temple, Jesus seems to have passed from the outer court into the women’s court, and there to have sat down near the receptacles provided for the gifts of the worshippers. Many who were wealthy cast of their gold and silver into the treasury, but the eye of Jesus singled out one poor widow who, creeping up, cast in two mites (Greek lepta, the smallest of coins), which made up but a farthing. It was little, but it was her all, and Jesus immortalized her poor offering by declaring that, out of her want, she had given more than the wealthlest there. Gifts were measured in His sight by the willingness that prompted them, and by the sacrifice they entailed.

e) The Visit of the Greeks:

(John 12:20-36)

It is perhaps to this crowded day, though some place it earlier in the week (on Sunday or Monday), that the incident should be referred of the request of certain Greeks to see Jesus, as related in Joh 12:20 ff. Who these Greeks were, or whence they came, is unknown, but they were evidently proselytes to the

Jewish faith, and men of a sincere spirit. Their request was made through Philip of Bethsaida, and Philip and Andrew conveyed it to Jesus. It is not said whether their wish was granted, but we can hardly doubt that it was. Jesus evidently saw in the incident a prelude of that glory that should accrue to Himself through all men being drawn to Him (Joh 12:23,32). But He saw as clearly that this "glorifying" could only be through His death (Joh 12:24,33), and He universalized it into a law of His Kingdom that, as a grain of wheat must fall into the earth and die if it is to be multiplied, so only through sacrifice can any life be made truly fruitful (Joh 12:24,25). The thought of death, however, always brought trouble to the soul of Jesus (Joh 12:27), and a voice from the Father was given to comfort Him. The multitude thought it thundered, and failed to apprehend the meaning of the voice, or His own words about being "lifted up" (Joh 12:29,34).

f) Discourse on the Last Things:

(Matthew 24; Mark 13; Luke 21:5-36)

Jesus had now bidden farewell to the temple. As He was going out, His disciples—or one of them (Mark)—called His attention to the magnificence of the buildings of the temple, eliciting from Him the startling reply that not one stone should be left upon another that should not be thrown down. Later in the evening, when seated on the Mount of Olives on their return journey, in view of the temple, Andrew, James and John (Mark) asked Him privately when these things should be, and what would be the signs of their fulfillment. In Matthew the question is put more precisely, "When shall these things be? And what shall be the sign of thy coming (parousia), and of the end of the world?" (or "consummation of the age"). It is in answer to these complex questions that Jesus spoke His great discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem and His final coming, some of the strands in which it is difficult now to disentangle. In the extended report in Mt 24 certain passages appear which are given elsewhere by Luke (compare Lu 17:20-37). It may tend to clearness if a distinction be observed between the nearer event of the destruction of Jerusalem—also in its way a coming of the Son of Man—and the more remote event of the final parousia. The former, to which Mt 24:15-28 more specially belong, seems referred to by the "these things" in 24:34, which, it is declared, shall be fulfilled in that generation. Of the final parousia, on the other hand, it is declared in 24:36 that "of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only" (compare Mr 13:32). The difficulty occasioned by the immediately of Mt 24:29 is relieved by recalling the absence of perspective and grouping of future events in all apocalyptic prophecy—the consummation ever rising as the background of the immediate experience which is its prelude. The discourse then divides itself into a general part (Mt 24:4-14), delineating the character of the entire period till the consummation (false Christs and prophets, wars, tribulations, apostasies, preaching of the gospel to all nations, etc.); a special part relating to the impending destruction of the city, with appropriate warnings (Mt 24:15-28); and a closing part (Mt 24:32-51) relating mainly to the final parousia, but not without reference to preceding events in the extension of Christ’s kingdom, and ingathering of His elect (Mt 24:30,31). Warning is given of the suddenness of the coming of the Son of Man, and the need of being prepared for it (Mt 24:37-51). The whole is a massive prophecy, resting on Christ’s consciousness that His death would be, not the defeat of His mission, but the opening up of the way to His final glorification and triumph.

g) Parables of Ten Virgins, Talents and Last Judgment:

(Matthew 25)

To this great discourse on the solemnities of the end, Jesus, still addressing His disciples, added three memorable parables of instruction and warning (Mt 25)—the first, that of the Ten Virgins, picturing, under the figure of virgins who went to meet the bridegroom with insufficient provision of oil for their lamps, the danger of being taken unawares in waiting for the Son of Man; the second, that of the Talents, akin to the parable in Luke of the Pounds (19:11-27), emphasizing the need of diligence in the Lord's absence; the third, that of the Sheep and Goats, or Last Judgment, showing how the last division will be made according as discipleship is evinced by loving deeds done to those in need on earth—such deeds being owned by Christ the King as done to Himself. Love is thus declared to be the ultimate law in Christ's kingdom (compare 1Co 13); the loveless spirit is reprobated. "These shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life" (Mt 25:46).

6. A Day of Retirement:

(compare John 12:36)

Lu 21:37,38 might suggest that Jesus taught in the temple every day till the Thursday of the Passover; if, however, the denunciation took place, as nearly all agree, on Tuesday, an exception must be made of the Wednesday, which Jesus probably spent in retirement in Bethany in preparation of spirit for His last great conflict (others arrange differently, and put some of the preceding events in this day). The summary in Joh 12:36-43 connects the blindness of mind of the Pharisees with Isaiah's vision (Isa 6:10), and with the prophecy of the rejected Servant (Isa 53:1).

7. An Atmosphere of Plotting—Judas and the Priests:

(Matthew 26:1-5,14-16; Mark 14:1,2,10,11; Luke 22:1-6)

The plot for the destruction of Jesus was meanwhile maturing. Two days before the Passover (Tuesday evening), Jesus forewarned the disciples of His approaching betrayal and crucifixion (Mt 26:2); and probably at that very hour a secret meeting of the chief priests and elders was being held in the court of the house of the high priest, Caiaphas (Matthew), to consult as to the means of putting Him to death. Their resolve was that it should not be done on the feast day, lest there should be a tumult; but the appearance of Judas, who since the anointing had seemingly meditated this step, speedily changed their plans. For the paltry sum of 30 pieces of silver (shekels of the sanctuary, less than $20 or 4 pounds; the price of a slave, Ex 21:32; compare Zec 11:12), the recreant disciple, perhaps persuading himself that he was really forcing Jesus to an exercise of His Messianic power, agreed to betray his Lord. The covenant of infamy was made, and the traitor now only waited his opportunity to carry out his project.

II. From the Last Supper till the Cross.

1. The Chronology:

A question of admitted difficulty arises in the comparison of the Synoptics and John as to the dates of the Last Supper and of the crucifixion. The Synoptics seem clearly to place the Last Supper on the evening of the 14th of Nisan (in Jewish reckoning, the beginning of the 15th), and to identify it with the ordinary paschal meal (Mt 26:17-19). The crucifixion then took place on the 15th. John, on the contrary, seems to place the supper on the day before the Passover (13:1), and the crucifixion on the 14th, when the Passover had not yet been eaten (18:28; 19:14). Many, on this ground, affirm an irreconcilable discrepancy between John and the Synoptics, some (e.g. Meyer, Farrar, less decisively Sanday) preferring Jn; others (Strauss, Baur, Schmiedel, etc.) using the fact to discredit Jn. By those who accept both accounts, various modes of reconciliation are proposed. A favorite opinion (early church writers; many moderns, as Godet, Westcott, Farrar) is that Jesus, in view of His death, anticipated the Passover, and ate His parting meal with His disciples on the evening of the 13th; others (e.g. Tholuck, Luthardt, Edersheim, Andrews, D. Smith), adhering to the Synoptics, take the view, here shared, that the apparent discrepancy is accounted for by a somewhat freer usage of terms in John. Details of the discussion must be sought in the works on the subject. The case for the anticipatory view is well given in Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, 339 ff; and in Farrar, Life of Christ, Excur. X; a good statement of that for the Synoptics may be seen in Andrews, Life of our Lord; compare Tholuck, Commentary on John, on 13:1; Luthardt, Commentary on John, on 13:1; 18:28; D. Smith, Days of His Flesh, App. II. The language of the Synoptists ("the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover," Mr 14:12) leaves no doubt that they intended to identify the Last Supper with the regular Passover, and it is hardly conceivable that they could be mistaken on so vital a point of the apostolic tradition. This also was the view of the churches of Asia Minor, where John himself latterly resided. On the other hand, the phrase to "eat the passover" in Joh 18:28 may very well, in John’s usage, refer to participation in the special sacrifices which formed a chief feature of the proceedings on the 15th. The allusion in Joh 13:1 need mean no more than that, the Passover now impending, Jesus, loving His disciples to the end, gave them a special token of that love during the meal that ensued. The "preparation of the passover" in Joh 19:14,31 most naturally refers to the preparation for the Sabbath of the Passover week, alluded to also by the Synoptics (Mt 27:62; Mr 15:42; Lu 23:54). The objections based on rabbinical regulations about the Sabbath are convincingly met by Tholuck (see also Andrews). We assume, therefore, that our Lord ate the Passover with His disciples at the usual time—the evening of the 14th of Nisan (i.e. the beginning of the 15th).

2. The Last Supper:

(Matthew 26:17-35; Mark 14:12-31; Luke 22:7-38; John 13; compare 1Co 11:23-25)

In the scene in the upper chamber, at the observance of the Last Supper, we enter the holy of holies of this part of the Lord’s history. It is difficult, in combining the narratives, to be sure of the order of all the

particulars, but the main events are clear. They may be exhibited as follows:

a) The Preparation:

On "the first day of unleavened bread"—Thursday, 14th of Nisan—Jesus bade two of His disciples (Luke names Peter and John) make the needful preparations for the observance of the Passover. This included the sacrificing of the lamb at the temple, and the securing of a guest-chamber. Jesus bade the disciples follow a man whom they would meet bearing a pitcher, and at the house where he stopped they would find one willing to receive them. The master of the house, doubtless a disciple, at once gave them "a large upper room furnished and ready" (Mark); there they made ready.

b) Dispute about Precedence—Washing of the Disciples' Feet—Departure of Judas:

Evening being come, Jesus and the Twelve assembled, and took their places for the meal. We gather from Joh 13:23 that John reclined next to Jesus (on the right), and the sequel shows that Judas and Peter were near on the other side. It was probably this arrangement that gave rise to the unseemly strife for precedence among the disciples narratedin Lu 22:24-30. The spirit thus displayed Jesus rebuked, as He had more than once had occasion to do (compare Mr 9:33-37); then (for here may be inserted the beautiful incident in Joh 13:1 ff), rising from the table, He gave them an amazing illustration of His own precept, "He that is chief (let him become) as he that doth serve ..... I am in the midst of you as he that serveth" (Lu 22:26,27), in divesting Himself of His garments, girding Himself with a towel, and performing the act of a servant in washing His disciples' feet. Peter's exclamation must have expressed the feelings of all: "Lord, dost thou wash my feet?" The act of the Divine Master was a wonderful lesson in humility, but Jesus used it also as a parable of something higher. "If I wash thee not (i.e. if thou art not cleansed by the receiving of my word and spirit, which this washing symbolizes), thou hast no part with me"; then on Peter's further impulsive protest, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head," the word: "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit" (i.e. sanctification of the inner man is once for all, but there is need for cleansing from the sins of the daily walk). Resuming His place at the table, He bade them imitate the example He had just given them.

Is it I?

An ominous word had accompanied the reply to Peter, "Ye are not all clean" (Joh 13:10,11). As the supper proceeded, the meaning of this was made plain. Judas, who had already sold his Master, was at the table with the rest. He had permitted Jesus to wash his feet, and remained unmoved by that surpassing act of condescending love. Jesus was "troubled in spirit" and now openly declared, "One of you shall betray me" (the Greek word means literally, "deliver up": compare Lu 22:4,6, and the Revised Version margin throughout). It was an astounding announcement to the disciples, and from one and another came the trembling question, "Lord, is it I?" Jesus answered that it was one of those dipping his hand with Him in the dish (Mark), and spoke of the woe that would overtake the betrayer ("Good were it for that man if he had not been born"). John, at a sign from Peter, asked more definitely, "Who is it?" (John). Jesus said, but to John only, it was he to whom He would give a sop, and the sop was given

to Judas. The traitor even yet sought to mask his treachery by the words, "Is it I, Rabbi?" and Jesus replied, though still not aloud, "Thou hast said" (Matthew); then, as Satanic passion stirred the breast of Judas, He added, "What thou doest, do quickly" (John). Judas at once rose and went out—into the night (Joh 13:30). The disciples, not comprehending his abrupt departure, thought some errand had been given him for the feast or for the poor. Jesus was relieved by his departure and spoke of the glory coming to Himself and to His Father, and of love as the mark of true discipleship (Joh 13:31-35).

c) The Lord's Supper:

The forms of the observance of the Passover by the Jews are given elsewhere (see PASSOVER). Luke alone of the New Testament writers speaks of 2 cups (22:17,20); in Jewish practice 4 cups were used. The "Western" text, Codex Bezae (D), omits Luke's 2nd cup, from which some (compare Sanday, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)) infer duplication, but this is not necessary. Luke's 1st cup (Lu 22:17) may be that with which the paschal supper opened; the 2nd cup—that mentioned by all the writers—was probably the 3rd Jewish cup, known as "the cup of blessing" (compare 1Co 10:16). Some, however, as Meyer, make it the 4th cup. It is implied in Matthew, Mark, John, that by this time Judas had gone. Left thus with His own, the essentials of the paschal meal being complete, Jesus proceeded, by taking and distributing bread and wine, associating them with His body and blood, soon to be offered in death upon the cross, to institute that sacred rite in which, through all ages since (though its simplicity has often been sadly obscured) His love and sacrifice have been commemorated by His church. There are variations of phrase in the different accounts, but in the essentials of the sacramental institution there is entire agreement. Taking bread, after thanks to God, Jesus broke it, and gave it to the disciples with the words, "This is my body"; the cup, in like manner, after thanksgiving, He gave them with the words, "This is my blood of the covenant (in Luke and Paul, "the new covenant in my blood") which is poured out for many" (Matthew adds, "unto remission of sins"). Luke and Paul add what is implied in the others: "This do in remembrance of me" (Lu 22:19; 1Co 11:24). Nothing could more plainly designate the bread and wine as holy symbols of the Lord's body and blood, offered in death for man's redemption, and sealing in His blood a new covenant with God; nor, so long as the rite is observed in its Divine simplicity, as Jesus instituted it, will it be possible to expunge from His death the character of a redeeming sacrifice. In touching words Jesus intimated that He would no more drink of the fruit of the vine till He drank it new with them in their Father's Kingdom (on the doctrinal aspects, see EUCHARIST; SACRAMENTS; LORD'S SUPPER).

d) The Last Discourses—Intercessory Prayer:

The Supper was over, and parting was imminent, but Jesus did not leave the holy chamber till He had poured out His inmost heart in those tender, consolatory, profoundly spiritual addresses which the beloved disciple has preserved for us in John 14; 15; and 16, followed by the wonderful closing intercessory prayer of John 17. He was leaving them, but their hearts were not to be disquieted, for they would see Him again (14:18; 16:16 ff), and if, ere long, He would part with them again in visible form, it was only outwardly He would be separated from them, for He would send them the Holy Spirit, the Paraclete, who would take His place, to guide them into all truth, and bring all things to their remembrance that He had said to them (14:16,17; 15:26; 16:7-14). If He went away, it was to prepare a

place for them, and He would come again to receive them to Himself in His Father's house (14:1-3); let them meanwhile show their love to Him by keeping His commandments (14:15,23,14). In the Spirit He Himself and the Father would dwell in the souls that loved Him (14:21-23). The intimacy of their union with Him would be like that of branches in the vine; only by abiding in Him could they bring forth fruit (15:1 ff). They would have tribulations (15:18 ff; 16:1,2), but as His dying bequest He left them His own peace (14:27); that would sustain their hearts in all trial (16:33). With many such promises did He comfort them in view of the terrible ordeal through which they were soon to pass; then, addressing His Father, He prayed for their holy keeping, and their final admission to His glory (17:9-18,24).

These solemn discourses finished, Jesus and His disciples sang a hymn (the "Hallel") and departed to go to the Mount of Olives. Comparing the evangelists, one would infer that the conversation in which Jesus foretold the denial of Peter at least commenced before they left the chamber (Lu 22:31 ; John connects it, probably through relation of subject, with the exposure of Judas, Joh 13:36-38); but it seems to have continued on the way (Matthew, Mark).

e) The Departure and Warning:

Jesus had spoken of their being "offended" in Him that night. In his exaltation of spirit, Peter declared that though all should be offended in Him, he would never be offended. Jesus, who had already warned Peter that Satan sought to have him, that he might sift him as wheat (Lu 22:31; but "I made supplication for thee," etc.), now told him that before the cock should crow, he would thrice deny Him. Peter stoutly maintained that he would die rather than be guilty of so base an act—so little did he or the others (Mt 26:35; Mr 14:31) know themselves! The enigmatic words in Lu 22:36 about taking scrip and sword point metaphorically to the need, in the times that were coming upon them, of every lawful means of provision and self-defence; the succeeding words show that "sword" is not intended to be taken literally (22:38).

3. Gethsemane—the Betrayal and Arrest:

(Matthew 26:36-56; Mark 14:32-53; Luke 22:39-53; John 18:1-12)

Descending to the valley, Jesus and His disciples, crossing the brook Kidron ("of the cedars"), entered the "garden" (John) known as Gethsemane ("oil-press"), at the foot of the Mount of Olives. Here took place the agony, which is the proper commencement of the Passion, the betrayal by Judas and the arrest of Jesus.

During the evening the thoughts of Jesus had been occupied mainly with His disciples; now that the hour had come when the things predicted concerning Him should have fulfillment (Lu 22:37 "your hour, and the power of darkness," Lu 22:53), it was inevitable that mind and spirit should concentrate on the awful bodily and mental sufferings that lay before Him.

a) Agony in the Garden:

It was not the thought of physical suffering alone—from that also the pure and sensitive humanity of Jesus shrank with natural horror—but death to Him, the Holy One and Prince of Life, had an indescribably hateful character as a hostile power in humanity, due to the judgment of God on sin, and now descending upon Him through the workings of the vilest of human passions in the religious heads of His nation. What anguish to such an One, filled with love and the desire to save, to feel Himself rejected, betrayed, deserted, doomed to a malefactor's cross—alone, yet not alone, for the Father was with Him! (Joh 16:32). The burden on His spirit when He reached Gethsemane was already, as the language used shows, all but unendurable—"amazed," "sore troubled," "My soul is exceeding sorrowful even unto death" (Mark). There, bidding the other disciples wait, He took with Him Peter, and James, and John, and withdrew into the recesses of the garden. Leaving these also a little behind, He sank on the ground in solitary "agony" (Luke), and "with strong crying and tears" (Heb 5:7), poured out His soul in earnest supplication to His Father. "Let this cup pass away from me"—it could not be, but thus the revulsion of His nature was expressed—"howbeit not what I will, but what thou wilt." The passage in Lu (22:44), "His sweat became as it were great drops of blood," etc., though omitted in certain manuscripts, doubtless preserves a genuine trait. Returning to the three, He found them overpowered with sleep: even the support of their wakeful sympathy was denied Him! "Watch and pray," He gently admonished them, "that ye enter not into temptation." A second and third time the same thing happened—wrestling with God on His part, sleep on theirs, till, with Divine strengthening (Lu 22:41), victory was attained, and calm restored. "Sleep on now," He said to His disciples (the crisis is past; your help can avail no more): "Arise, let us be going" (the future has to be faced; the betrayer is at hand. See the remarkable sermon of F.W. Robertson, II, sermon 22).

b) Betrayal by Judas—Jesus Arrested:

The crisis had indeed arrived. Through the darkness, even as Jesus spoke, was seen flashing the light of torches and lanterns, revealing a mingled company of armed men—Roman soldiers, temple officers (John), others—sent by the chief priests, scribes and elders, to apprehend Jesus. Their guide was Judas. It had been found impracticable to lay hands on Jesus in public, but Judas knew this retreat (Joh 18:2), and had arranged, by an act of dastardly treachery, to enable them to effect the capture in privacy. The sign was to be a kiss. With an affectation of friendship, only possible to one into whose heart the devil had truly entered (Lu 22:3; Joh 13:27), Judas advanced, and hailing Jesus as "'Master," effusively kissed Him (Mt 26:49; Mr 14:45 margin). Jesus had asked, "Betrayest thou the Son of man with a kiss?" (Luke); now He said, "Friend, do that for which thou art come" (Matthew). The soldiers essayed to take Jesus, but on their first approach, driven back as by a supernatural power, they fell to the ground (Jn). A proof thus given of the voluntariness of His surrender (compare Mt 26:53: "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father," etc.), Jesus, remarking only on the iniquity of secret violence when every day they had opportunity to take Him in the temple, submitted to be seized and bound. At this point Peter, with characteristic impetuosity, remembering, perhaps, his pledge to die, if need be, with Jesus, drew a sword, and cut off the right ear of the high priest's servant, Malchus (John gives the names). If he thought his deed justified by what Jesus had earlier said about "swords" (Lu 22:36,38), he was speedily undeceived by Jesus' rebuke (Joh 18:11), and by His healing of the ear (Luke; the last miracle of Jesus before His death). How little this flicker of impulsive boldness meant is shown by the general panic that

immediately followed. "All the disciples," it is related, "left him, and fled" (Matthew, Mark). Mr tells of a young man who had come upon the scene with only a linen cloth cast about his naked body, and who fled, leaving the cloth behind (14:51,52). Not improbably the young man was Mark himself.

4. Trial before the Sanhedrin:

(Matthew 26:57-75; 27:1-10; Mark 14:53-72; 15:1; Luke 22:54-71; John 18:12-27; compare Ac 1:18,19):

It would be about midnight when Jesus was arrested, and He was at once hurried to the house of Caiaphas, the high priest, where in expectation of the capture, a company of chief priests, scribes and elders—members of the Sanhedrin—were already assembled. Here the first stage in the trial of Jesus took place.

The legal and constitutional questions connected with the trial of Jesus are considered in the article on JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF; see also Dr. Taylor Innes, The Trial of Jesus Christ; on the powers of the Sanhedrin, see SANHEDRIN, and compare Schurer, Jewish People, etc., II, 1, pp. 163 ff. There seems little doubt that, while certain judicial forms were observed, the trial was illegal in nearly every particular. The arrest itself was arbitrary, as not rounded on any formal accusation (the Sanhedrin, however, seems to have arrogated to itself powers of this kind; compare Ac 4:1 ff); but the night session, lack of definite charge, search for testimony, interrogation of accused, haste in condemnation, were unquestionably in flagrant violation of the established rules of Jewish judicial procedure in such cases. It is to be remembered that the death of Jesus had already been decided on by the heads of the Sanhedrin, so that the trial was wholly a means to a foregone conclusion. On the historical side, certain difficulties arise. Joh seems to make the first interrogation of Jesus take place before Annas, father-in-law to Caiaphas (on Annas, see below; though deposed 15 years before, he retained, in reality, all the dignity and influence of the high-priesthood; compare Lu 3:2; Ac 4:6); after which He is sent to Caiaphas (Joh 18:13,14,19-24). The narrative is simplified if either

(1) Joh 18:19-23 are regarded as a preliminary interrogatory by Annas till matters were prepared for the arraignment before Caiaphas; or

(2) 18:24 is taken as retrospective (in the sense of "had sent," as in the King James Version), and the interrogation is included in the trial by Caiaphas (compare 18:19: "the high priest").

Annas and Caiaphas may be presumed from the account of Peter’s denials to have occupied the same official residence; else Annas was present on this night to be in readiness for the trial. The frequently occurring term "chief priests" denotes the high priests, with those who had formerly held this rank, and members of their families (compare Schurer, op. cit., 203 ff). They formed, with the scribes, the most important element in the Sanhedrin.

a) Before Annas and Caiaphas—the Unjust Judgment:

First Jesus was led before Annas, then by him, after a brief interview, was transferred, still bound, to Caiaphas. Annas had been deposed, as above noticed, much earlier (15 AD), but still retained the name and through his sons and relations, as long as he lived, exercised much of the authority of high priest. Like all those holding this high office, he and Caiaphas were Sadducees. Annas—if he is the questioner in Joh 18:19-23—asked Jesus concerning His disciples and His teaching. Such interrogation was unlawful, the duty of the accuser, in Jewish law, being to produce witnesses; properly, therefore, Jesus referred him to His public teaching in the temple, and bade him ask those who heard Him there. An officer standing by struck Jesus with his hand for so speaking: an indignity which Jesus endured with meek remonstrance (18:22,23).

(1) An Illegal Session.

Meanwhile a company of the Sanhedrin had assembled (23 sufficed for a quorum), and Jesus was brought before this tribunal, which was presided over by Caiaphas. A hurried search had been made for witnesses (this, like the night session, was illegal), but even the suborned testimony thus obtained ("false witnesses") was found useless for the purpose of establishing, constructively or directly, a charge of blasphemy against Jesus. At length two witnesses were produced who gave a garbled version of the early saying of Jesus (Joh 2:19) about destroying the temple and rebuilding it in three days. To speak against the temple might be construed as speaking against God (compare Mt 23:16,21; Ac 6:13,14), but here too the witnesses broke down through lack of agreement. At all costs, however, must Jesus be condemned: the unprecedented course therefore was taken of seeking a conviction from the mouth of the accused Himself. Rising from his seat, the high priest adjured Jesus by the living God to tell them whether He was the Christ, the Son of God (in Mark, "Son of the Blessed"). In using this title, Caiaphas had evidently in view, as in Joh 5:18; 10:33, a claim to equality with God. The supreme moment had come, and Jesus did not falter in His reply: "Thou hast said." Then, identifying Himself with the Son of Man in Daniel’s vision (Da 7:13,14), He solemnly added, "Henceforth (from His resurrection on) ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven." It was enough. Without even the pretense of inquiry into the truth or falsehood of the claim, the high priest rent his garments, exclaiming, "He hath spoken blasphemy," and by assent of all Jesus was adjudged worthy of death. Abuse and insult followed. The minions of the Sanhedrin were permitted to spit on the condemned One, smite Him, blindfold and mock Him, saying, "Prophesy unto us, thou Christ: who is he that struck thee?" Then, with further blows, He was led away (Mt 26:68).

(2) A Morning Confirmation.

To give color of judicial sanction to these tumultuous and wholly irregular night proceedings, a more formal meeting of the Sanhedrin was convened as soon as day had dawned (Mt 27:1; Mr 15:1; Lu 22:66-71). Probably the irregularities were held to be excused by the urgency of the occasion and the solemnities of the feast. Jesus was again brought forward; new questions were put which He declined to answer. Possibly a new avowal of His Messiahship was made (more probably Luke includes in this scene, the only one he records, some of the particulars of the earlier proceedings). The judgment of the past night was confirmed.

b) The Threefold Denial:

While this greatest moral tragedy of the trial and condemnation of Jesus was in process, a lesser, but still awful, tragedy in the history of a soul was being enacted in the court of the same building (from this the chamber in which the Sanhedrin sat was visible), in the threefold denial of his Master by the apostle Peter. Peter, who had followed "afar off" (Luke), had gained access to the court through an unnamed disciple, whom it is easy to identify with John (Joh 18:15). As he stood warming himself at a fire which had been kindled, the maid who had admitted them (John), gazing attentively at Peter, said boldly, "Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilean" (Mt 26:69). Unnerved, and affrighted by his surroundings, Peter took the readiest mode of escape in denial. "I know him not." His heart must have sunk within him as he framed the words, and the crowing of a cock at the moment (Mark—perhaps an hour after midnight), reminding him of his Master's warning, completed his discomfiture. Guiltily he withdrew to the porch, only a little after to be accosted by another (the maid had spoken to her neighbors, Mark), with the same charge. More afraid than ever, he declared again, "I know not this man," and, seeing he was not believed, strengthened the denial with an oath. Yet a third time, an hour later, a bystander (or several, Mark), this time founding on his Galilean speech, pronounced, "Of a truth thou art one of them." Peter, to clear himself, cursed and swore, anew disclaiming knowledge of his Lord. To this depth had the boastful apostle fallen—as low, it might seem, as Judas! But there was a difference. As Peter spoke the cock again crew—the cockcrow which gives its form to three of the narratives (Mark alone mentions the double cockcrowing). At the same instant, either from within, or as He was being led forth, Jesus turned and looked on His erring disciple. That look—so full of pity, sorrow, reproach—could never be forgotten! Its effect was instantaneous: "Peter went out, and wept bitterly."

c) Remorse and Suicide of Judas:

Peter's heartfelt repentance has its counterfoil in the remorse of Judas, which, bitter as it also was, cannot receive the nobler name. First, Judas sought to return the 30 shekels paid him as the price of blood ("I betrayed innocent blood"); then, when callously rebuffed by the priests and elders, he flung down the accursed money in the sanctuary, and went and hanged himself. Matthew and Ac seem to follow slightly divergent traditions as to his end and the purchase of the potter's field. The underlying facts probably are that the priests applied the money, which they could not put into the treasury (Matthew), to the purchase of the field, where, either before or after the purchase, Judas destroyed himself (Acts: falling and bursting asunder), assigning it as a place to bury strangers in. Its connection with Judas is attested by its name, "Akeldama," "the field of blood."

The Jews might condemn, but they had no power to execute sentence of death (Joh 18:31). This power had been taken from them by the Romans, and was now vested in the Roman governor. The procurator of Judea was Pontius Pilate, a man hated by the Jews for his ruthless tyranny (see PILATE), yet, as the Gospels show him, not without a sense of right, but vacillating and weak-willed in face of mob clamor, and risk to his own interests.

5. Trial before Pilate:

(Matthew 27:2,11-31; Mark 15:1-20; Luke 23:1-25; John 18:28-40; 19:1-16)

His residence in Jerusalem ("Praetorium," the English Revised Version "palace") was probably Herod's former palace (thus Schurer, G.A. Smith, etc.), on the tesselated pavement (Joh 19:13) in the semicircular front of which was placed the tribunal (bema) from which judgments were delivered. It was to this place Jesus was now brought. The events took place when it was "early" (Joh 18:28), probably between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. (compare Joh 19:14, Roman camputation).

a) The Attitude of the Accusers:

Jesus was taken within the Pretorium, but His accusers were too scrupulous about defilement at the Passover festival (Joh 18:28) to enter the building. Pilate therefore came out to hear their accusation. They would fain have had him endorse their condemnation without further inquiry, but this he would not do. They would not have it that it was a simple question of their law, yet had to justify their demand for a death sentence (Joh 18:31). They based, therefore, on the alleged revolutionary character of Christ's teaching, His forbidding to pay tribute to Caesar (a false charge), His claim to be a king (Lu 23:2,5), to all which charges Jesus answered not a word (Mr 15:3,5). At a later stage, after Pilate, who knew very well that no mere sedition against the Roman power had called forth all this passion (witness the choice of Barabbas), had repeatedly declared that he found no crime in Jesus (Mr 15:14; Lu 23:4,14,22; Joh 18:38; 19:4,6), the real spring of their action was laid bare: "We have a law, and by that law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God" (Joh 19:7). When it was seen how this declaration made Pilate only the more unwilling to yield to their rage, return was made to the political motive, now in the form of personal threat: "If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar's friend" (Joh 19:12). This was Pilate's weak point, and the Jews knew it. The clamor grew ever louder, "Crucify him, crucify him." Hate of Jesus and national degradation could go no farther than in the cry, "We have no king but Caesar" (Joh 19:15).

b) The Attitude of Pilate:

Pilate was from the first impressed with the innocence of Jesus, and was sincerely anxious, as his actions showed, to save Him from the terrible and ignominious death His implacable enemies were bent on inflicting upon Him. His crime was that, as Roman judge, he finally, against his own convictions, through fear of a charge of disloyalty to Caesar, yielded up to torture and death One whom he had pronounced guiltless, to gratify the brutal passions of a mob. By Pilate's own admissions, Christ's death was, not a punishment for any crime, but a judicial murder. First, through private examination, Pilate satisfied himself that the kingship Jesus claimed ("Thou sayest") carried with it no danger to the throne of Caesar. Jesus was a king indeed, but His kingdom was not of this world; was not, like earthly kingdoms, supported by violence; was founded on the truth, and gathered its subjects from those that received the truth (Joh 18:36,37). The indifference to the name of truth which the jaded mind of Pilate confessed ("What is truth?") could not hide from him the nobility of soul of the Holy One who stood before him. He declared publicly, "I find no fault in this man," and thereafter sought means of saving

Him, at least of shifting the responsibility of His condemnation from himself to others.

(1) Jesus Sent to Herod.

Hearing in the clamor round the judgment seat that Jesus was a Galilean, and remembering that Herod Antipas, who had jurisdiction in that region, was in the city, Pilate's first expedient was to send Jesus to Herod, to be examined by him (Lu 23:6-11). This act of courtesy had the effect of making Herod and Pilate, who had been at enmity, again friends (Lu 23:12); otherwise it failed of its object. Herod was pleased enough to see One he had so often heard about—even thought in his flippancy that a miracle might be done by Him—but when Jesus, in presence of "that fox" (Lu 13:32), refused to open His mouth in answer to the accusations heaped upon Him, Herod, with his soldiers, turned the matter into jest, by clothing Jesus in gorgeous apparel, and sending Him back as a mock-king to Pilate.

(2) "Not This Man, but Barabbas."

Pilate's next thought was to release Jesus in pursuance of a Jewish custom of setting free a prisoner at the feast, and to this end, having again protested that no fault had been found in Him, offered the people the choice between Jesus and a notorious robber and murderer called Barabbas, then in prison. Just then, as he sat on the judgment seat, a message from his wife regarding a dream she had ("Have thou nothing to do with that righteous man," Mt 27:19) must strongly have influenced his superstitious mind. Pilate could hardly have conceived that the multitude would prefer a murderer to One so good and pure; but, instigated by the priests, they perpetrated even this infamy, shouting for the release of Barabbas and the crucifixion of Jesus.

(3) "Ecce Homo."

Pilate's weakness now began to reveal itself. He proposed to "chastise" (scourge) Jesus—why "chastise," if He was innocent?—then release Him. But this compromise, as was to be anticipated, only whetted the eagerness for blood, and the cries grew ever louder, "Crucify him." Pilate, however, as if yielding to the storm, did deliver Jesus to be scourged (scourging—a fearful infliction—preceded crucifixion), the cruelty being aggravated by the maltreatment of the soldiers, who, outstripping former mockeries, put on His head a crown of thorns, arrayed Him in a purple robe, and rained blows upon His bleeding face and form. It seems to have been a design of Pilate to awake pity, for once again he brought Jesus forth, and in this affecting guise, with new attestation of His innocence, presented Him to the people in the words, "Behold, the man!" (Joh 19:5). How hideous the mockery, at once to declare of such an one, "I find no crime in him," and to exhibit Him to the crowd thus shamefully abused! No pity dwelt in these hearts, however, and the shouts became still angrier, "Crucify him."

(4) A Last Appeal—Pilate Yields.

The words of the leaders, "He made himself the Son of God," spoken as a reason for putting Jesus to death (Joh 19:7), struck a new fear into the heart of Pilate. It led him again to enter the Pretorium, and

inquire of this strange prisoner, unlike any he had ever seen, "Whence art thou?" Jesus was silent. "Knowest thou not," asked Pilate, "that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?" Jesus answered only that he, Pilate, had no power over Him at all save what was given him of God; the greater therefore was the crime of those who had subjected Him to this abuse of Divinely given power. Again Pilate went out and sought to release Him, but was met by the fierce cries that foreboded complaint to Caesar (Joh 19:12). A tumult seemed imminent, and Pilate succumbed. Here probably (though possibly after the choice of Barabbas) is to be placed the washing of his hands by Pilate—a vain disclaiming of his responsibility—recorded in Mt 27:24, and the awful answer of the people, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (27:25). Pilate now ascends the judgment seat, and, fully conscious of the iniquity of his procedure, pronounces the formal sentence which dooms Jesus to the cross. The trial over, Jesus is led again into the Pretorium, where the cruel mockery of the soldiers is resumed in intensified form. The Holy One, thorn-crowned, clad in purple, a reed thrust into His hand, is placed at the mercy of the whole band, who bow the knee in ridicule before Him ("Hail, King of the Jews"), spit upon Him in contempt, smite Him on the head with the reed (Matthew, Mark). Then, stripped of the robe, His own garments are put on Him, in preparation for the end.

c) The Attitude of Jesus:

In all this hideous scene of cruelty, injustice, and undeserved suffering, the conspicuous feature in the bearing of Jesus is the absolute calmness, dignity and meekness with which He endures the heaviest wrongs and insults put upon Him. The picture in Isa 53:7,8 is startling in its fidelity: "When he was afflicted he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before its shearers is mute, so he opened not his mouth. By oppression and judgment he was taken away," etc. There is no return of the perturbation of Gethsemane. As if the strength won there had raised Him into a peace that nothing could shake, He passed through the frightful physical exhaustion, mental strain, agony of scourging, suffering from wounds and blows, of that terrible night and morning, with unbroken fortitude and unembittered spirit. Not a word of complaint passes His lips; He makes no reply to accusations; when reviled, He reviles not again; He takes all with submission, as part of the cup the Father has given Him to drink. It is a spectacle to move the stoniest heart. Well to remember that it is the world’s sin, in which all share, that mingled the bitter draught!

III. The Crucifixion and Burial.

1. The Crucifixion:

(Matthew 27:31-56; Mark 15:20-41; Luke 23:26-49; John 19:16-37)

Crucifixion was the form of punishment reserved by the Romans for slaves, foreigners and the vilest criminals, and could not be inflicted on a Roman citizen. With its prolonged and excruciating torture, it was the most agonizing and ignominious death which the cruelty of a cruel age could devise. Jewish law knew nothing of it (the ‘hanging on a tree’ of De 21:22,23, was after death; compare Ga 3:13), yet to it the Jewish leaders hounded Pilate on to doom their Messiah. The cross was no doubt of the usual Roman

shape (see CROSS). The site of Golgotha, "the place of a skull" (in Luke "Calvary," the Latinized form), is quite uncertain. It may have been a slight mound resembling a skull (thus Meyer, Luthardt, Godet, etc.), but this is not known. It is only plain that it was outside the wall, in the immediate vicinity of the city (see note below on sepulcher). The time of the crucifixion was about 9 a.m. (Mr 15:25). The day (Friday) was the "preparation" for the Sabbath of the Passover week (Matthew, Mark, Luke; compare Joh 19:14,31).

a) On the Way:

It was part of the torment of the victim of this horrible sentence that he had to bear his own cross (according to some only the patibulum, or transverse beam) to the place of execution. As Jesus, staggering, possibly fainting, under this burden, passed out of the gate, a stranger coming from the country, Simon, a man of Cyrene, was laid hold of, and compelled to carry the cross (such an one would not be punctilious about rabbinical rules of travel, especially as it was not the regular Sabbath). Jesus, however, was not wholly unpitied. In the crowd following Him were some women of Jerusalem, who bewailed and lamented Him. The Lord, turning, bade these weep, not for Him, but for themselves and for their children. "If they do these things in the green tree, what shall be done in the dry?" (Lu 23:27-31).

b) Between the Thieves—the Superscription—the Seamless Robe:

Golgotha being reached, the crucifixion at once took place under the care of a centurion and a quaternion of soldiers. With ruthless blows, hands and feet were nailed to the wood, then the cross was reared (the perpendicular part may, as some think, have first been placed in position). As if to emphasize, from Pilate’s point of view, the irony of the proceedings, two robbers were crucified with Jesus, on right and left, an undesigned fulfillment of prophecy (Isa 53:12). It was doubtless when being raised upon the cross that Jesus uttered the touching prayer—His 1st word on the cross (its genuineness need not be questioned, though some ancient manuscripts omit)—"Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (Luke). Above His head, according to custom, was placed a tablet with His accusation, written in three languages, Hebrew, Greek and Latin. The chief priests took offense at the form, "This is the King of the Jews," and wished the words changed to, "He said, I am King," etc., but Pilate curtly dismissed their complaint: "What I have written I have written" (John). Whether Jesus still wore the crown of thorns is doubtful. The garments of the Crucified were divided among the soldiers, but for His inner garment, woven without seam, they cast lots (compare Ps 22:18). A draught of wine mingled with an opiate (gall or myrrh), intended to dull the senses, was offered, but refused.

c) The Mocking—the Penitent Thief—Jesus and His Mother:

The triumph of Christ’s enemies now seemed complete, and their glee was correspondingly unrestrained. Their victim’s helplessness was to them a disproof of His claims. Railing, and wagging their heads, they taunted Him, "If thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross"; "He saved others; himself he cannot save." At first the robbers who were crucified with Him (possibly only one)

joined in this reproach, but ere long there was a change. The breast of one of the malefactors opened to the impression of the holiness and meekness of Jesus, and faith took the place of scorn. He rebuked his neighbor for reviling One who had "done nothing amiss"; then, addressing Jesus, he prayed: "Jesus, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom." The reply of Jesus—His 2nd word on the cross—surpassed what even the penitent in these strange circumstances could have anticipated "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (Luke). A not less touching incident followed—perhaps preceded—this rescue of a soul in its last extremity. Standing near the cross was a group of holy women, one of them the mother of Jesus Himself (Joh 19:25 Mary the mother of Jesus, Mary's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas—some identify the two latter—Mary Magdalene). Mary, whose anguish of spirit may be imagined, was supported by the disciple John. Beholding them—His 3rd word from the cross—Jesus tenderly commended His mother to the care of John; to Mary, "Woman, behold, thy son"; to John, "Beho1d, thy mother." From that time Mary dwelt with John.

Three hours passed, and at noon mocking was hushed in presence of a startling natural change. The sun's light failed (Luke), and a deep darkness, lasting for 3 hours, settled over the land. The darkness was preternatural in its time and occasion, whatever natural agencies may have been concerned in it. The earthquake a little later (Matthew) would be due to the same causes. It was as if Nature veiled itself, and shuddered at the enormity of the crime which was being perpetrated.

d) The Great Darkness—the Cry of Desertion:

But the outer gloom was only the symbol of a yet more awful darkness that, toward the close of this period, overspread the soul of Jesus Himself. Who shall fathom the depths of agony that lay in that awful cry—the 4th from the cross—that burst loudly from the lips of Jesus, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani"—"My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me" (or, "Why didst thou forsake me?")—words borrowed from Ps 22:1! It was before remarked that death was not a natural event to Jesus, but ever had in it to His mind its significance as a judgment of God on sin. Here it was not simply death that He experienced in its most cruel form, but death bereft of the sensible comforts of the Father's presence. What explanation of that mystery can be found which does not take into account with Isa 53 (compare Joh 1:29) His character as Sin-Bearer, even as the unbroken trust with which in His loneliness He clings to God ("My God") may be felt to have in it the element of atonement? On this, however, the present is not the place to dwell.

e) Last Words and Death of Jesus:

The end was now very near. The victim of crucifixion sometimes lingered on in his agony for days; but the unexampled strain of body and mind which Jesus had undergone since the preceding day brought an earlier termination to His sufferings. Light was returning, and with it peace; and in the consciousness that all things were now finished (Joh 19:28), Jesus spoke again—the 5th word—"I thirst" (John). A sponge filled with vinegar was raised on a reed to His lips, while some who had heard His earlier words ("Eli, Eli," etc.), and thought He called for Elijah, said, "Let us see whether Elijah cometh to save him" (Matthew). With a last effort, Jesus cried aloud—6th and memorable word—"It is finished," then,

in a final utterance—the 7th—commended His spirit to God: "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit" (Luke). Following on this word, bowing His head, He surrendered Himself to death. It will be seen that of the 7 words spoken from the cross, 3 are preserved by Luke alone (1st, 2nd, 7th), 3 by John alone (3rd, 5th, 6th), while the 4th cry ("Eli, Eli," etc.) occurs only in the first 2 evangelists (Matthew and Mark, however, speak of Jesus "crying with a loud voice" at the close).

f) The Spear Thrust—Earthquake and Rending of the Veil:

Jesus had died; the malefactors still lived. It was now 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and it was desired that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the approaching Sabbath. Permission was therefore obtained from Pilate for the soldiers to break the legs of the crucified (crurifragium), and so hasten death. When it was discovered that Jesus was already dead, a soldier, possibly to make sure, pierced His side with a spear, and John, who was present, notices as a special fact that "there came out blood and water" (19:34). Whether this means, as Stroud and others have contended, that Jesus literally died of rupture of the heart, or what other physiological explanation may be given of the phenomenon, to which the apostle elsewhere attaches a symbolical significance (1 Joh 5:6), need not be here discussed (see BLOOD AND WATER). This, however, was not the only startling and symbolically significant fact attending the death of Jesus. A great darkness had preluded the death; now, at the hour of His termination, the veil of the temple (i.e. of the inner shrine) was rent from top to bottom—surely a sign that the way into the holiest of all was now opened for mankind (Heb 9:8,12)—and a great earthquake shook the city and rent the rocks. Mt connects with this the statement that from the tombs thus opened "many bodies of the saints .... were raised; and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many" (27:52,53). There is nothing in itself improbable, though none of the other evangelists mention it, in such an early demonstration being given of what the Lord's death and resurrection meant for believers. In other ways the power of the cross was revealed. A dying robber had been won to penitence; now the centurion who commanded the soldiers was brought to the avowal, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Matthew, Mark; in Luke, "a righteous man"). The mood of the crowd, too, was changed since the morning; they "returned, smiting their breasts" (Lu 23:48). "Afar off," speechless with sorrow, stood the women who had followed Jesus from Galilee, with other friends and disciples. The evangelists name Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James and Joses, Salome (Mark), and Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward (Luke).

2. The Burial:

(Matthew 27:57-66; compare 28:11-15; Mark 15:42-47; Luke 23:50-56; John 19:38-42)

Jesus had conquered hearts on His cross; now His death reveals friends from the wealthier classes, hitherto kept back by fear (Joh 19:38,39), who charge themselves with His honorable burial. One was Joseph of Arimathea, a just man, "looking for the kingdom of God," of whom the interesting fact is recorded that, though a member of the Sanhedrin, "he had not consented to their counsel and deed" (Luke); the other was Nicodemus, he who came to Jesus by night (Joh 3:1,2; 19:39), mentioned again only in Joh 7:50-52, where, also as a member of the Sanhedrin, he puts in a word for Jesus.

a) The New Tomb:

Joseph of Arimathea takes the lead. "Having dared," as Mr says (15:43, Gr), he begged the body of Jesus from Pilate, and having obtained it, bought linen cloth wherein to wrap it, and reverently buried it in a new rock-tomb of his own (Matthew, Mark), "where never man had yet lain" (Luke). John furnishes the further particulars that the tomb was in a "garden," near where Jesus was crucified (19:41,42). He tells also of the munificence of Nicodemus, who brought as much as 100 pounds (about 75 lbs. avoir.) of spices—"a mixture of myrrh and aloes" (19:39), with which to enwrap the body of Jesus. This is not to be thought of as an "anointing": rather, the spices formed a powder strewn between the folds of the linen bandages (compare Luthardt, Commentary on Joh 19:40). The body, thus prepared, was then placed in the tomb, and a great stone rolled to tile entrance. The burial was of necessity a very hurried one, which the holy women who witnessed it—Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses are specially mentioned (Matthew, Mark)—purposed to supplement by an anointing when the Sabbath was past (compare Lu 23:56).

b) The Guard of Soldiers:

Though Jesus was dead, the chief priests and Pharisees were far from easy in their minds about Him. Mysterious words of His had been quoted about His building of the temple in three days; possibly Judas had told something. about His sayings regarding His death and rising again on the 3rd day; in any case, His body was in the hands of His disciples, and they might remove it, and create the persuasion that He had risen. With this plea they went to Pilate, and asked from him a watch of soldiers to guard the tomb. To make assurance doubly sure, they sealed the tomb with the official seal. The result of their efforts was only, under Providence, to provide new evidence of the reality of the resurrection!

The uncertainty attaching to the site of Golgotha attaches also to the site of Joseph’s rock-tomb. Opinion is about equally divided in favor of, and against, the traditional site, where the Church of the Holy Sepulchre now stands. A principal ground of uncertainty is whether that site originally lay within or without the second wall of the city (compare Stanley, Sinai and Palestine, 457 ff; G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 576; a good conspectus of the different opinions, with the authorities, is given in Andrews, Part VII).

JESUS CHRIST, 4F F. THE RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION

The Resurrection a Fundamental Fact:

The resurrection of Jesus, with its completion in the ascension, setting the seal of the Father’s acceptance on His finished work on earth, and marking the decisive change from His state of humiliation to that of exaltation, may be called in a true sense the corner stone of Christianity (compare 1Co 15:14,17). It was on the preaching of Christ crucified and risen that the Christian church was founded (e. g. Ac 2:32-36; 1Co 15:3,4). Professor Harnack would distinguish between "the Easter faith" (that Jesus lives with God) and "the Easter message," but the church never had any Easter faith apart from the Easter message. The subversion of the fact of the resurrection is therefore a first task to which unbelief

addresses itself. The modern spirit rules it out a priori as miraculous. The historical fact is denied, and innumerable theories (imposture, theories of swoon, of hallucination, mythical theories, spiritualistic theories, etc.) are invented to explain the belief. None of these theories can stand calm examination (see the writer's work, The Resurrection of Jesus). The objections are but small dust of the balance compared with the strength of the evidence for the fact. From the standpoint of faith, the resurrection of Jesus is the most credible of events. If Jesus was indeed such an One as the gospel history declares Him to be, it was impossible that death should hold Him (Ac 2:24). The resurrection, in turn, confirms His claim to be the Son of God (Ro 1:4).

1. The Resurrection:

(Matthew 28; Mark 16; Luke 24; John 20; 21; 1 Corinthians 15:3-8)

With the narratives of the resurrection are here included as inseparably connected, those of the appearances of Jesus in Jerusalem and Galilee. The accounts will show that, while the body of Jesus was a true body, identical with that which suffered on the cross (it could be seen, touched, handled), it exhibited attributes which showed that Jesus had entered, even bodily, on a new phase of existence, in which some at least of the ordinary limitations of body were transcended. Its condition in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension was an intermediate one—no longer simply natural, yet not fully entered into the state of glorification. "I am not yet ascended .... I ascend" (Joh 20:17); in these two parts of the one saying the mystery of the resurrection body is comprised.

a) The Easter Morning—the Open Tomb:

The main facts in the resurrection narratives stand out clearly. "According to all the Gospels," the arch-skeptic Strauss concedes, "Jesus, after having been buried on the Friday evening, and lain during the Sabbath in the grave, came out of it restored to life at daybreak on Sunday" (New Life of Jesus, I, 397, English translations). Discrepancies are alleged in detail as to the time, number, and names of the women, number of angels, etc.; but most of these vanish on careful examination. The Synoptics group their material, while Joh gives a more detailed account of particular events.

(1) The Angel and the Keepers.

No eye beheld the actual resurrection, which took place in the early morning, while it was still dark. Matthew records that there was "a great earthquake," and tells of the descent of an angel of the Lord, who rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. Before his dazzling aspect the keepers became as dead men, and afterward fled. The chief priests bribed them to conceal the facts, and say the body had been stolen (Mt 28:2-4,11-15).

(2) Visit of the Women.

The first intimation of the resurrection to the disciples was the discovery of the empty tomb by the

women who had come at early dawn (Mt 28:1; Mr 16:2; Lu 24:1; Joh 20:1) with spices, prepared to anoint the body of Jesus (Mr 16:1; compare Lu 23:56). Apparently ignorant of the guard, the women were concerned on their way as to who should roll away the stone from the door of the tomb (Mr 16:3), and were much surprised to find the stone rolled away, and the tomb open. There is no need for supposing that the women mentioned all came together. It is much more probable that they came in different groups or companies—perhaps Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, or these with Salome, first (Matthew, Mark; compare the "we" of Joh 20:2); then Joanna and other members of the Galilean band (Luke). (On the appearance of Jesus to Mary, see below.)

(3) The Angelic Message.

As the women stood, perplexed and affrighted, at the tomb, they received a vision of angels (Matthew and Mark speak only of one angel; Luke and John mention two; all allude to the dazzling brightness), who announced to them that Jesus had risen ("He is not here; for he is risen; .... come, see the place where the Lord lay"), and bade them tell His disciples that He went before them to Galilee, where they should see Him (Matthew, Mark; Luke, who does not record the Galilean appearances, omits this part, and recalls the words spoken by Jesus in Galilee, concerning His death and resurrection; compare Mt 16:21). The women departed with "trembling and astonishment" (Mark), yet "with great joy" (Matthew). Here the original Mr breaks off (Mr 16:8), the remaining verses being an appendix. But it is granted that Mark must originally have contained an account of the report to the disciples, and of an appearance of Jesus in Galilee.

b) Visit of Peter and John—Appearance to Mary:

(John; compare Mark 16:9,10; Luke 24:12,24)

The narrative in John enlarges in important respects those of the Synoptics. From it we learn that Mary Magdalene (no companion is named, but one at least is implied in the "we" of 20:2), concluding from the empty tomb that the body of Jesus had been removed, at once ran to carry the news to Peter and John ("They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and we know not where they have laid him"). These apostles lost no time in hastening to the spot. John, who arrived first, stooping down, saw the linen cloths lying, while Peter, entering, beheld also the napkin for the head rolled up in a place by itself. After John likewise had entered ("He saw, and believed"), they returned to their home. Meanwhile Mary had come back disconsolate to the tomb, where, looking in, she, like the other women, had a vision of two angels. It was then that Jesus addressed her, "Why weepest thou?" At first she thought it was the gardener, but on Jesus tenderly naming her, "Mary," she recognized who it was, and, with the exclamation, "Rabboni" ("Teacher"), would have clasped Him, but He forbade: "Touch me not," etc. (Joh 20:17, margin "Take not hold on me"), i.e. "Do not wait, but hasten to tell my disciples that I am risen, and ascend to my Father" (the ascension-life had already begun, altering earlier relations).

Report to the Disciples—Incredulity.

The appearance of Jesus to the other women (Mt 28:9,10) is referred to below. It is probable that, on the way back, Mary Magdalene rejoined her sisters, and that the errand to the disciples—or such of them as could be found—was undertaken together. Their report was received with incredulity (Lu 24:11; compare Mr 16:11). The visit of Peter referred to in Lu 24:12 is doubtless that recorded more precisely in John.

c) Other Easter-Day Appearances (Emmaus, Jerusalem):

Ten appearances of Jesus altogether after His resurrection are recorded, or are referred to; of these five were on the day of resurrection. They are the following:

(1) The first is the appearance to Mary Magdalene above described.

(2) The second is an appearance to the women as they returned from the tomb, recorded in Mt 28:9,10. Jesus met them, saying, "All hail," and as they took hold of His feet and worshipped Him, He renewed the commission they had received for the disciples. Some regard this as only a generalization of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, but it seems distinct.

(3) An appearance to Peter, attested by both Lu 24:34 and Paul (1Co 15:5). This must have been early in the day, probably soon after Peter's visit to the tomb. No particulars are given of this interview, so marked an act of grace of the risen Lord to His repentant apostle. The news of it occasioned much excitement among the disciples (Lu 24:34).

(4) The fourth was an appearance to two disciples on their way from Jerusalem to Emmaus—a village about two hours distant (Lu 24:12-35; Mr 16:12,13). They were conversing on the sad events of the last few days, and on the strange tidings of the women's vision of angels, when Jesus overtook them, and entered into conversation with them. At first they did not recognize Him—a token, as in Mary's case, of change in His appearance—though their hearts burned within them as He opened to them the Scriptures about Christ's sufferings and glory. As the day was closing, Jesus abode with them to the evening meal; then, as He blessed and brake the bread, "Their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight" (Lu 24:30,31). They hastily rose, and returned to the company of disciples at Jerusalem. According to Mr 16:13, their testimony, like that of the women, was not at first believed.

(5) The fifth appearance was that to "the eleven," with others, in the evening—an appearance recorded by Luke (24:36 ff), and John (20:19-23), and alluded to by Paul (1Co 15:5). The disciples from Emmaus had just come in, and found the company thrilling with excitement at the news that the Lord had appeared to Simon (Luke). The doors were closed for fear of the Jews, when suddenly Jesus appeared in their midst with the salutation, "Peace be unto you" (Luke, John; doubt is unnecessarily cast on Lu 24:36,40, by their absence from some Western texts). The disciples were affrighted; they thought they had seen a spirit (Luke); "disbelieved for joy" (Lu 24:41). To remove their fears, Jesus showed them His hands and His feet (in Jn, His side), and ate before them (Luke). He then breathed on them, saying, "Receive ye the Holy Spirit," and renewed the commission formerly given to remit and retain sins (John;

compare Mt 18:17,18). The breathing was anticipative of the later affusion of the Spirit at Pentecost (compare Joh 7:39; Ac 2$); the authority delegated depends for its validity on the possession of that Spirit, and its exercise according to the mind of Christ (compare e.g. 1Co 5:3). The incident strikingly illustrates at once the reality of Christ's risen body, and the changed conditions under which that body now existed.

d) The Second Appearance to the Eleven—the Doubt of Thomas:

Eight days after this first appearance—i.e. the next Sunday evening—a second appearance of Jesus to the apostles took place in the same chamber and under like conditions ("the doors being shut"). The peculiar feature of this second meeting was the removal of the doubt of Thomas who, it is related, had not been present on the former occasion. Thomas, devoted (compare Joh 11:16), but of naturally questioning temperament (Joh 14:5), refused to believe on the mere report of others that the Lord had risen, and demanded indubitable sensible evidence for himself. Jesus, at the second appearance, after salutation as before, graciously gave the doubting apostle the evidence he asked: "Reach hither thy finger, and see my hands," etc. (Joh 20:27), though, as the event proved, the sign was not needed. The faith and love of the erst-while doubter leaped forth at once in adoring confession: "My Lord and my God." It was well; but Jesus reminded him that the highest faith is not that which waits on the evidence of sense ("Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed," Joh 20:29).

e) The Galilean Appearances:

The scene now shifts for the time to Galilee. Jesus had appointed to meet with His disciples in Galilee (Mt 26:32; Mr 16:7; compare Mr 14:28). Prior, however, to this meeting—that recorded in Mt 28:16-20, probably to be identified with the appearance "to above five hundred brethren at once" mentioned by Paul (1Co 15:6)—there is another appearance of Jesus to seven disciples at the Lake of Galilee, of which the story is preserved in Joh 21:1-23.

(1) At the Sea of Tiberias—the Draught of Fishes—Peter's Restoration.

The chapter which narrates this appearance of Jesus at the Lake of Galilee ("Sea of Tiberias") is a supplement to the Gospel, but is so evidently Johannine in character that it may safely be accepted as from the pen of the beloved disciple (thus Lightfoot, Meyer, Godet, Alford, etc.). The appearance itself is described as the third to the disciples (Joh 21:14), i.e. the third to the apostles collectively, and in Jn's record seven disciples are stated to have been present, of whom five are named—Peter, Thomas, Nathaniel (probably to be identified with Bartholomew), and the sons of Zebedee, James and John. The disciples had spent the night in fishing without result. In the morning Jesus—yet unrecognized—appeared on the beach, and bade them cast down their net on the right side of the boat. The draught of fishes which they took revealed to John the presence of the Master. "It is the Lord," he said to Peter, who at once flung himself into the lake to go to Jesus. On landing, the disciples found a fire of coals, with fish placed on it, and bread; and Jesus Himself, after more fish had been brought, distributed the food, and, it seems implied, Himself shared in the meal. Still a certain awe—another indication of a

mysterious change in Christ's appearance—restrained the disciples from asking openly, "Who art thou?" (Joh 21:12). It was not long, however ("when they had broken their fast"), before Jesus sufficiently disclosed Himself in the touching episode of the restoration of Peter (the three-fold question, "Lovest thou me?" answering to the three-fold denial, met by Peter's heartfelt, "Yea, Lord; thou knowest that I love thee," with the words of reinstatement, "Feed my lambs," "Feed my sheep"). In another way, Jesus foretold that Peter would have the opportunity of taking back his denial in the death by which he should glorify God (Joh 21:18,19; tradition says he was crucified head-downward). Curious inquiries were set aside, and attention recalled to duty, "Follow thou me" (Joh 21:22).

(2) On the Mountain—the Great Commission—Baptism.

Though only the eleven apostles are named in Matthew's account (Mt 28:16), the fact of an 'appointment' for a definite time and place ("the mountain"), and the terms in which the message was given to the "disciples," suggests a collective gathering such as is implied in Paul's "above five hundred brethren at once" (1Co 15:6). The company being assembled, Jesus appeared; still, at first, with that element of mystery in His appearance, which led some to doubt (Mt 28:17). Such doubt would speedily vanish when the Lord, announcing Himself as clothed with all authority in heaven and earth, gave to the apostles the supreme commission to "make disciples of all the nations" (Mt 28:18-20; compare Mr 16:15, "Go ye into all tho world" etc.). Discipleship was to be shown by baptism "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (one name, yet threefold), and was to be followed by instruction in Christ's commands. Behind the commission, world-wide in its scope, and binding on every age, stands the word of never-failing encouragement, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Doubts of the genuineness of these august utterances go as a rule with doubt of the resurrection itself.

It will be noticed that the Lord's Supper and Baptism are the only sacraments instituted by Jesus in His church.

f) Appearance to James:

Paul records, as subsequent to the above, an appearance of Jesus to James, known as "the Lord's brother" (1Co 15:7; compare Ga 1:19). No particulars are given of this appearance, which may have occurred either in Galilee or Jerusalem. James, so far as known, was not a believer in Jesus before the crucifixion (compare Joh 7:3); after the ascension he and the other brethren of Jesus are found in the company of the disciples (Ac 1:14), and he became afterward a chief "pillar" of the church at Jerusalem (Ga 1:19; 2:9). This appearance may have marked the turning-point.

g) The Last Meeting:

The final appearance of Jesus to the apostles (1Co 15:7) is that which Luke in the closing verses of his Gospel (Lu 24:44-53), and in Ac 1:3-12, brings into direct relation with the ascension. In the Gospel Luke proceeds without a break from the first appearance of Jesus to "the eleven" to His last words about

"the promise of my Father"; but Ac 1 shows that a period of 40 days really elapsed during which Jesus repeatedly "appeared" to those whom He had chosen. This last meeting of Jesus with His apostles was mainly occupied with the Lord's exposition of the prophetic Scriptures (Lu 24:44-46), with renewed commands to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins in His name, "beginning from Jerusalem" (Lu 24:47,48; compare Ac 1:8), and with the injunction to tarry in Jerusalem till the Spirit should be given (Lu 24:49; compare Ac 1:4,5). Then He led them forth to Olivet, "over against Bethany," and, while blessing them, "was carried up into heaven" (Lu 24:50,51; compare Ac 1:10,12).

2. The Ascension:

(Luke 24:50-53; Ac 1:6-14; compare Mark 16:19)

Jesus had declared, "I ascend unto my Father" (Joh 20:17), and Luke in Ac 1 narrates the circumstances of that departure. Jesus might simply have "vanished" from the sight of His disciples, as on previous occasions, but it was His will to leave them in a way which would visibly mark the final close of His association with them. They are found, as in the Gospel, "assembled" with Him at Jerusalem, where His final instructions are given. Then the scene insensibly changes to Olivet, where the ascension is located (Ac 1:12). The disciples inquire regarding the restoration of the kingdom to Israel (even yet their minds are held in these temporal conceptions), but Jesus tells them that it is not for them to know times and seasons, which the Father had set within His own authority (Ac 1:7). Far more important was it for them to know that within the next days they should receive power from the Holy Spirit to be witnesses for Him to the uttermost part of the earth (Ac 1:8). Even as He spake, He was taken up, and a cloud received Him out of their sight (Ac 1:9). Then, as the apostles stood gazing upward, two heavenly messengers appeared, who comforted them with the assurance that in like manner as they had seen Jesus ascend into heaven, so also would He come again. For that return the church still prays and waits (compare Re 22:20).

See, further, ASCENSION.

Retracing their steps to Jerusalem, the apostles joined the larger company of disciples in the "upper room" where their meetings seem to have been habitually held, and there, with one accord, to the number of about 120 (Ac 1:15), they all continued steadfastly in prayer till "the promise of the Father" (Lu 24:49; Ac 1:4) was, at Pentecost, bestowed upon them.

JESUS CHRIST, 5

PART IV. EPILOGUE: THE APOSTOLIC TEACHING

1. After the Ascension:

The earthly life of Jesus is finished. With His resurrection and ascension a new age begins. Yet the work of Christ continues. As Luke expressively phrases it in Ac 1:1,2, the Gospels are but the records of "all

that Jesus began both to do and to teach, until the day in which he was received up." It is beyond the scope of this article to trace the succeeding developments of Christ's activity through His church and by His Spirit; in order, however, to bring the subject to a proper close, it is necessary to glance, even if briefly, at the light thrown back by the Spirit's teachings, after the ascension, on the significance of the earthly life itself, and at the enlargement of the apostles' conceptions about Christ, consequent on this, as seen in the Epistles and the Apocalypse.

2. Revelation through the Spirit:

It was the promise of Jesus that, after His departure, the Spirit would be given to His disciples, to teach them all things, and bring to their remembrance all that He had said to them (Joh 14:26). It was not a new revelation they were to receive, but illumination and guidance of their minds into the meaning of what they had received already (Joh 16:13-15). This promise of the Spirit was fulfilled at Pentecost (Ac 2). Only a few personal manifestations of Jesus (Ac 7:55,56; 22:17,18; 23:11) are recorded after that event—the two chief being the appearance to Paul on the way to Damascus (1Co 15:8; compare Ac 9:3 , etc.), and the appearance in vision to John in Patmos (Re 1:10). The rest was internal revelation (compare Ga 1:12,16; Eph 1:17; 3:3-5). The immense advance in enlargement and clearness of view—aided, no doubt, by Christ's parting instructions (Lu 24:44-48; Ac 1:2)—is already apparent in Peter's discourses at Pentecost; but it is not to be supposed that much room was not left for after-growth in knowledge, and deepened insight into the connection of truths. Peter, e.g., had to be instructed as to the admission of the Gentiles (Ac 10:11); the apostles had much gradually to learn as to the relations of the law (compare Ac 15; 21:20 ff; Ga 2, etc.); Paul received revelations vastly widening the doctrinal horizon; both John and Paul show progressive apprehension in the truth about Christ.

3. Gospels and Epistles:

It is therefore a question of much interest how the apostolic conceptions thus gained stand related to the picture of Jesus we have been studying in the Gospels. It is the contention of the so-called "historical" (anti-supernaturalistic) school of the day that the two pictures do not correspond. The transcendental Christ of Paul and John has little in common, it is affirmed, with the Man of Nazareth of the Synoptic Gospels. Theories of the "origins of Christianity" are concocted proceeding on this assumption (compare Pfleiderer, Weizsacker, Bousset, Wernle, etc.). Such speculations ignore the first conditions of the problem in not accepting the self-testimony of Jesus as to who He was, and the ends of His mission into the world. When Jesus is taken at His own valuation, and the great fact of His resurrection is admitted, the alleged contradictions between the "Jesus of history" and the "Christ of faith" largely disappear.

4. Fact of Christ's Lordship:

It is forgotten how great a change in the center of gravity in the conception of Christ's person and work was necessarily involved in the facts of Christ's death, resurrection and exaltation to the right hand of power. The life is not ignored—far from it. Its influence breathes in every page, e.g. of Paul's epistles.

But the weakness, the limitations, the self-suppression—what Paul in Php 2:7 calls the "emptying"—of that earthly life have now been left behind; the rejected and crucified One has now been vindicated, exalted, has entered into His glory. This is the burden of Peter's first address at Pentecost: "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Ac 2:36). Could anything look quite the same after that? The change is seen in the growing substitution of the name "Christ" for "Jesus" (see at beginning of article), and in the habitual speaking of Jesus as "Lord."

5. Significance of Christ's Person:

With belief in the lordship of Jesus went necessarily an enlarged conception of the significance of His person. The elements were all there in what the disciples had seen and known of Jesus while on earth (Joh 1:14; 1 Joh 1:1-3), but His exaltation not only threw back light upon His claims while on earth—confirmed, interpreted, completed them—but likewise showed the ultimate ground of these claims in the full Divine dignity of His person. He who was raised to the throne of Divine dominion; who was worshipped with honors due to God only; who was joined, with Father and with Holy Spirit as, coordinately, the source of grace and blessing, must in the fullest sense be Divine. There is not such a thing as honorary Godhead. In this is already contained in substance everything taught about Jesus in the epistles: His preexistence (the Lord's own words had suggested this, Joh 8:58; 17:5, etc.), His share in Divine attributes (eternity, etc.), in Divine works (creation, etc., 1Co 8:6; Col 1:16,17; Heb 1:2; Re 1:8; 3:14, etc.), in Divine worship (Php 2:9-11; Re 5:11,12, etc.), in Divine names and titles (Heb 1:8, etc.). It is an extension of the same conception when Jesus is represented as the end of creation—the "Head" in whom all things are finally to be summed up (Eph 1:10; compare Heb 2:6-9). These high views of the person of Christ in the Epistles are everywhere assumed to be the possession of the readers.

Jesus had furnished His disciples with the means of understanding His death as a necessity of His Messianic vocation, endured for the salvation of the world; but it was the resurrection and exaltation which shed light on the utmost meaning of this also. Jesus died, but it was for sins. He was a propitiation for the sin of the world (Ro 3:25; 1 Joh 2:2; 4:10). He was 'made sin' for us (2Co 5:21).

6. Significance of the Cross and Resurrection:

The strain of Isa 53 runs through the New Testament teaching on this theme (compare 1Pe 1:19; 2:22-25, etc.). Jesus' own word "ransom" is reproduced by Paul (1Ti 2:6). The song of the redeemed is, "Thou didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe," etc. (Re 5:9). Is it wonderful, in view of this, that in the apostolic writings—not in Paul only, but in Pet, in Jn, in He, and Rev, equally—the cross should assume the decisive importance it does? Paul only works out more fully in relation to the law and the sinner's justification a truth shared by all. He himself declares it to be the common doctrine of the churches (1Co 15:3,4).

7. Hope of the Advent:

The newer tendency is to read an apocalyptic character into nearly all the teaching of Jesus (compare

Schweitzer, Quest of the Historical Jesus). This is an exaggeration, but that Jesus taught His disciples to look for His coming again, and connected with that coming the perfection of His kingdom, is plain to every reader of the Gospels. It will not be denied that the apostolic church retained this feature of the teaching of Jesus. In accordance with the promise in Ac 1:11, it looked for the glorious reappearing of its Lord. The Epistles are full of this hope. Even Joh gives it prominence (1Joh 2:28; 3:2). In looking for the parousia as something immediately at hand, the early believers went even beyond what had been revealed, and Paul had to rebuke harmful tendencies in this direction (2Th 2). The hope might be cherished that the coming would not long be delayed, but in face of the express declarations of Jesus that no one, not the angels, not even the Son, knew of that day and hour (Mt 24:36; Mr 13:32), and that the Father had set these things in His own authority (Ac 1:7; compare also such intimations as in Mt 13:30; 24:14; 25:19; 28:19; Lu 19:11, etc.), none could affirm this with certainty. Time has proved—proved it even in the apostolic age (2Pe 3:3,4)—that the Advent was not so near as many thought. In part, perhaps, the church itself may be to blame for the delay. Still to faith the Advent remains the great fixed event of the future, the event which overshadows all others—in that sense is ever near—the polestar of the church's confidence that righteousness shall triumph, the dead shall be raised, sin shall be judged and the kingdom of God shall come.

LITERATURE.

The literature on the life and teaching of Jesus is so voluminous, and represents such diverse standpoints, that it would be unprofitable to furnish an extended catalogue of it. It may be seen prefixed to any of the larger books. On the skeptical and rationalistic side the best account of the literature will be found in Schweitzer's book, From Reimarus to Wrede (English translation, Quest of the Historical Jesus). Of modern believing works may be specially named those of Lange, Weiss, Ellicott Edersheim, Farrar, D. Smith. Dr. Sanday's book, The Life of Christ in Recent Research, surveys a large part of the field, and is preparatory to an extended Life from Dr. Sanday's own pen. His article in HDB has justly attracted much attention. Schurer's Hist of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (ET, 5 volumes; a new German edition has been published) is the best authority on the external conditions. The works on New Testament Biblical theology (Reuss, Weiss, Schmid, Stevens, etc.) deal with the teaching of Jesus; see also Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus (ET). Works and articles on the Chronology, on Harmony of the Gospels, on geography and topography (compare especially Stanley, G.A. Smith) are legion. A good, comprehensive book on these topics is Andrews, Life of our Lord (revised edition). The present writer has published works on The Virgin Birth of Christ and The Resurrection of Jesus. On the relations of gospel and epistle, see J. Denney, Jesus and the Gospel.

See also the various articles in this Encyclopedia, on GOSPELS; PERSON OF CHRIST; ETHICS OF JESUS; VIRGIN BIRTH; JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF; RESURRECTION; ASCENSION; PHARISEES; SADDUCEES; HEROD; JERUSALEM, etc.

James Orr

JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF

1. Jewish and Roman Law

2. Difficulties of the Subject

3. Illustrations of Difficulties

I. THE ARREST

1. Preparatory Steps

2. The Arrest in the Garden

3. Taken to the City

II. THE JEWISH TRIAL

1. The Jewish Law

2. The Mishna

3. Criminal Trials

4. The Trial of Jesus

5. The Preliminary Examination

6. The Night Trial

7. False Witnesses

8. A Browbeating Judge

9. The Morning Session

10. Powers of the Sanhedrin

11. Condemnation for Blasphemy

12. Summary

III. THE ROMAN TRIAL

1. Taken before Pilate

2. Roman Law and Procedure

3. Full Trial Not Desired

4. Final Accusation

5. Examination, Defence and Acquittal

6. Fresh Accusations

7. Reference to Herod

8. Jesus or Barabbas

9. Behold the Man!

10. Pilate Succumbs to Threats

11. Pilate Washes His Hands

12. The Sentence

13. Review

This subject is of special interest, not only on account of its inherent importance, but more particularly on account of its immediately preceding, and leading directly up to what is the greatest tragedy in human history, the crucifixion of our Lord. It has also the added interest of being the only proceeding on record in which the two great legal systems of antiquity, the Jewish and the Roman, which have most largely influenced modern legislation and jurisprudence, each played a most important part.

1. Jewish and Roman Law:

The coexistence of these two systems in Judea, and their joint action in bringing about the tremendous results in question, were made possible by the generous policy pursued by Rome in allowing conquered nations to retain their ancient laws, institutions and usages, in so far as they were compatible with Roman sovereignty and supremacy. Not only so, but, in a large degree, they permitted these laws to be administered by the officials of the subject peoples. This privilege was not granted absolutely, but was

permitted only so long as it was not abused. It might be withdrawn at any time, and the instances in which this was, done were by no means rare.

Of the matters considered in this article, the arrest of Jesus and the proceedings before Annas, Caiaphas and the Sanhedrin took place professedly under Jewish law; the proceedings before Pilate and the reference to Herod, under Roman law.

2. Difficulties of the Subject:

It is very difficult to construct from the materials in the four Gospels a satisfactory continuous record of the arrest, and of what may be called the twofold trial of Jesus. The Gospels were written from different viewpoints, and for different purposes, each of the writers selecting such particulars as seemed to him to be of special importance for the particular object he had in view. Their reports are all very brief, and the proper chronological order of the various events recorded in different Gospels must, in many eases, be largely a matter of conjecture. The difficulty is increased by the great irregularities and the tumultuous character of the proceedings; by our imperfect knowledge of the topography of Jerusalem at this time (29 AD); also by the fact that the reports are given mainly in popular and not in technical language; and when the latter form is used, the technical terms have had to be translated into Greek, either from the Hebrew or from the Latin.

3. Illustrations of Difficulties:

For instance, opinions are divided as to where Pilate resided when in Jerusalem, whether in the magnificent palace built by Herod the Great, or in the castle of Antonia; as to where was the palace occupied by Herod Antipas during the Passover; whether Annas and Caiaphas occupied different portions of the same palace, or whether they lived in adjoining or different residences; whether the preliminary examination of Jesus, recorded by John, was before Annas or Caiaphas, and as to other similar matters. It is very satisfactory, however, to know that, although it is sometimes difficult to decide exactly as to the best way of harmonizing the different accounts, yet there is nothing irreconcilable or contradictory in them, and that there is no material point in the history of the very important proceedings falling within the scope of this article which is seriously affected by any of these debatable matters.

For a clear historical statement of the events of the concluding day in the life of our Lord before His crucifixion, see the article on JESUS CHRIST. The present article will endeavor to consider the matters relating to His arrest and trial from a legal and constitutional point of view.

I. The Arrest.

During the last year of the ministry of Jesus, the hostility of the Jews to Him had greatly increased, and some six months before they finally succeeded in accomplishing their purpose, they had definitely resolved to make away with Him. At the Feast of Tabernacles they sent officers (the temple-guards) to take Him while He was teaching in the temple (Joh 7:32); but these, after listening to His words,

returned without having made the attempt, giving as a reason that "never man so spake" (Joh 7:46).

After His raising of Lazarus, their determination to kill Him was greatly intensified. A special meeting of the council was held to consider the matter. There Caiaphas, the high priest, strongly advocated such a step on national grounds, and on the ground of expediency, quoting in support of his advice, in a cold-blooded and cynical manner, the Jewish adage that it was expedient that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not. Their plans to this end were frustrated, for the time being, by Jesus withdrawing Himself to the border of the wilderness, where He remained with His disciples (Joh 11:47-54).

On His return to Bethany and Jerusalem, six days before the Passover, they were deterred from carrying out their design on account of His manifest popularity with the people, as evidenced by His triumphal entry into Jerusalem on the first day of the Passover week (Palm Sunday), and by the crowds who thronged around Him, and listened to His teachings in the temple, and who enjoyed the discomfiture of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians, as they successively sought to entangle Him in His talk.

Two days before the Passover, at a council meeting held in the palace of Caiaphas, they planned to accomplish their purpose by subtlety, but "not during the feast, lest a tumult arise among the people" (Mt 26:3-5; Mr 14:1,2). While they were in this state of perplexity, to their great relief Judas came to them and agreed to betray his Master for money (Mt 26:14-16; Mr 14:10,11).

1. Preparatory Steps:

This time they determined not to rely solely upon their own temple-guards or officers to execute their warrant or order of arrest, fearing that these officials, being Jews, might again be fascinated by the strange influence which Jesus exercised over His countrymen, or that His followers might offer resistance. They therefore applied to Pilate, the Roman procurator (governor), for the assistance of a band of Roman soldiers. He granted them a cohort (Greek: speira, 400 to 600 men) from the legion then quartered in the castle of Antonia, which adjoined and overlooked the temple-area. The final arrangements as to these would probably be completed while Judas was at the supper room. It has been suggested that the whole cohort would not go, but only a selection from them. However, it is said that Judas "received the band (cohort) of soldiers" (Joh 18:3), and that they were under the command of a chief captain (Greek: chiliarch, Latin tribune, Joh 18:12). If there had not been more than 100 soldiers, they would not have been under the command of a captain, but the chief officer would have been a centurion. The amazing popularity of Jesus, as shown by His triumphal entry into the city, may have led the authorities to make such ample provision against any possible attempt at rescue.

The Garden of Gethsemane, in which Judas knew that Jesus would be found that night, was well known to him (Joh 18:2); and he also knew the time he would be likely to find his Master there. Thither at the proper hour he led the band of soldiers, the temple officers and others, and also some of the chief priests and elders themselves; the whole being described as "a great multitude with swords and staves" (Mt 26:47). Although the Easter full moon would be shining brightly, they also carried "lanterns and

torches" (Joh 18:3), in order to make certain that Jesus should not escape or fail to be recognized in the deep shade of the olive trees in the garden.

2. The Arrest in the Garden:

On their arrival at the garden, Jesus came forward to meet them, and the traitor Judas gave them the appointed signal by kissing Him. As the order or warrant was a Jewish one, the temple officers would probably be in front, the soldiers supporting them as reserves. On Jesus announcing to the leaders that He was the one they sought, what the chief priests had feared actually occurred. There was something in the words or bearing of Jesus which awed the temple officers; they were panic-stricken, went backward, and fell to the ground. On their rallying, the impetuous Peter drew his sword, and cut off the ear of one of them, Malchus, the servant of the high priest (Joh 18:6-10).

On this evidence of resistance the Roman captain and soldiers came forward, and with the assistance of the Jewish officers bound Jesus. Under the Jewish law this was not lawful before condemnation, save in exceptional cases where resistance was either offered or apprehended.

Even in this trying hour the concern of Jesus was more for others than for Himself, as witness His miracle in healing the ear of Malchus, and His request that His disciples might be allowed their liberty (Joh 18:8). Notwithstanding His efforts, His followers were panic-stricken, probably on account of the vigorous action of the officers and soldiers after the assault by Peter, "and they all left him and fled" (Mr 14:50).

It is worthy of note that Jesus had no word of blame or censure for the Roman officers or soldiers who were only doing their sworn duty in supporting the civil authorities; but His pungent words of reproach for not having attempted His arrest while He was teaching openly in the temple were reserved for "the chief priests, and captains of the temple, and elders" (Lu 22:52), who had shown their inordinate zeal and hostility by taking the unusual, and for those who were to sit as judges on the case, the improper and illegal course of accompanying the officers, and themselves taking part in the arrest.

3. Taken to the City:

The whole body departed with their prisoner for the city. From the first three Gospels one might infer that they went directly to the palace of Caiaphas, the high priest. In the Fourth Gospel, however, we are told that they took him first to Annas (Joh 18:13).

Why they did so we are not informed, the only statement made being that he was the father-in-law of Caiaphas (Joh 18:13). He had been the high priest from 7 AD to 15 AD, when he was deposed by Valerius Gratus, the Roman procurator. He was still the most influential member of the Sanhedrin, and, being of an aggressive disposition, it may be that it was he who had given instructions as to the arrest, and that they thought it their duty to report first to him.

Annas, however, sent Jesus bound to Caiaphas (Joh 18:24). Having delivered over their prisoner, the Roman soldiers would proceed to their quarters in the castle, the temple officials retaining Jesus in their charge.

Meanwhile, the members of the Sanhedrin were assembling at the palace of the high priest, and the preliminary steps toward the first or Jewish trial were being taken.

II. The Jewish Trial.

1. The Jewish Law:

It is the just boast of those countries whose jurisprudence had its origin in the common law of England, that their system of criminal law is rounded upon the humane maxims that everyone is presumed to be innocent until he is proved to be guilty, and that no one is bound to criminate himself. But the Jewish law went even farther in the safeguards which it placed around an accused person. In the Pentateuch it is provided that one witness shall not be sufficient to convict any man of even a minor offense. "One witness shall not rise up against a man for any iniquity, or for any sin, in any sin that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established" (De 19:15).

2. The Mishna:

These principles of the Mosaic law were elaborated and extended in the system which grew up after the return from Babylon. It was begun by the men of the Great Synagogue, and was afterward completed by the Sanhedrin which succeeded them. Up to the time of our Lord, and for the first two centuries of the Christian era, their rules remained largely in an oral or unwritten form, until they were compiled or codified in the Mishna by Rabbi Judah and his associates and successors in the early part of the 3rd century. It is generally conceded by both Jewish and Christian writers that the main provisions, therein found for the protection of accused persons, had been long incorporated in the oral law and were recognized as a part of it in the time of Annas and Caiaphas.

3. Criminal Trials:

The provisions relating to criminal trials, and especially to those in which the offense was punishable by death, were very stringent and were all framed in the interest of the accused. Among them were the following: The trial must be begun by day, and if not completed before night it must be adjourned and resumed by day; the quorum of judges in capital cases was 23, that being the quorum of the Grand Council; a verdict of acquittal, which required only a majority of one, might be rendered on the same day as the trial was completed; any other verdict could only be rendered on a subsequent day and required a majority of at least two; no prisoner could be convicted on his own evidence; it was the duty of a judge to see that the interests of the accused were fully protected.

The modern practice of an information or complaint and a preliminary investigation before a magistrate

was wholly unknown to the Jewish law and foreign to its genius. The examination of the witnesses in open court was in reality the beginning of a Jewish trial, and the crime for which the accused was tried, and the sole charge he had to meet, was that which was disclosed by the evidence of the witnesses.

4. The Trial of Jesus:

Let us see how far the foregoing principles and rules were followed and observed in the proceedings before the high priest in the present instance. The first step taken in the trial was the private examination of Jesus by the high priest, which is recorded only in Joh 18:19-23. Opinions differ as to whether this examination was conducted by Annas at his residence before he sent Jesus to Caiaphas (Joh 18:24), or by the latter after Jesus had been delivered up to him.

Caiaphas was actually the high priest at the time, and had been for some years. Annas had been deposed from the office about 14 years previously by the Roman procurator; but he was still accorded the title (Ac 4:6). Many of the Jews did not concede the right of the procurator to depose him, and looked upon him as still the rightful high priest. He is also said to have been at this time the vice-president of the Sanhedrin. The arguments as to which of them is called the high priest by John in this passage are based largely upon two different renderings of Joh 18:24. In the King James Version the verse reads "Now Annas had sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest," a reading based upon the Textus Receptus of the New Testament which implies that Jesus had been sent to Caiaphas before the examination. On the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American), following the Greek text adopted by Nestle and others, reads, "Annas therefore sent him bound unto Caiaphas the high priest," implying that Annas sent him to Caiaphas on account of what had taken place in the examination.

However, it is not material which of these two leading members of the Sanhedrin conducted the examination. The same may also be said as to the controversy regarding the residence of Annas at the time, whether it was in some part of the official palace of the high priest or elsewhere. The important matters are the fact, the time, and the manner of the examination by one or other of these leading members of the council, not the precise place where, or the particular person by whom, it was conducted.

5. The Preliminary Examination:

The high priest (whether Annas or Caiaphas) proceeded to interrogate Jesus concerning His disciples and His doctrine (Joh 18:19). Such a proceeding formed no part of a regular Jewish trial, and was, moreover, not taken in good faith; but with a view to entrapping Jesus into admissions that might be used against Him at the approaching trial before the council. It appears to have been in the nature of a private examination, conducted probably while the members of the council were assembling. The dignified and appropriate answer of Jesus pointedly brought before the judge the irregularity he was committing, and was a reminder that His trial should begin with the examination of the witnesses: "'I spake openly to the world; I ever taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing. Why askest thou me? Ask them which heard me, what I have

said unto them: behold, they know what I said" (Joh 18:20,21 the King James Version). The reply to this was a blow from one of the officers, an outrageous proceeding which appears to have passed unrebuked by the judge, and it was left to Jesus Himself to make the appropriate protest.

6. The Night Trial:

The next proceeding was the trial before the council in the palace of Caiaphas, attended at least by the quorum of 23. This was an illegal meeting, since a capital trial, as we have seen, could not either be begun or proceeded with at night. Some of the chief priests and elders, as previously stated, had been guilty of the highly improper act for judges, of taking part in and directing the arrest of Jesus. Now, "the chief priests and the whole council" spent the time intervening between the arrest and the commencement of the trial in something even worse: they "sought false witness against Jesus, that they might put him to death" (Mt 26:59). This, no doubt, only means that they then collected their false witnesses and instructed them as to the testimony they should give. For weeks, ever since the raising of Lazarus, they had been preparing for such a trial, as we read: "So from that day forth they took counsel that they might put him to death" (Joh 11:53).

Caiaphas, as high priest and president of the Sanhedrin, presided at the meeting of the council. The oath administered to witnesses in a Jewish court was an extremely solemn invocation, and it makes one shudder to think of the high priest pronouncing these words to perjured witnesses, known by him to have been procured by the judges before him in the manner stated.

7. False Witnesses:

But even this did not avail. Although "many bare false witness against him," yet on account of their having been imperfectly tutored by their instructors, or for other cause, "their witness agreed not together" (Mr 14:56), and even these prejudiced and partial judges could not find the concurring testimony of two witnesses required by their law (De 19:15).

The nearest approach to the necessary concurrence came at last from two witnesses, who gave a distorted report of a figurative and enigmatic statement made by Jesus in the temple during His early ministry: "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up" (Joh 2:19). The explanation is given: "He spake of the temple of his body" (Joh 2:21). The testimony of the two witnesses is reported with but slight variations in the two first Gospels as follows: "This man said, I am able to destroy the temple of God, and to build it in three days" (Mt 26:61); and "We heard him say, I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and in three days I will build another made without hands" (Mr 14:58). Whether these slightly different statements represent the discrepancies in their testimony, or on account of some other variations or contradictions, the judges reluctantly decided that "not even so did their witness agree together" (Mr 14:59).

8. A Browbeating Judge:

Caiaphas, having exhausted his list of witnesses, and seeing the prosecution on which he had set his heart in danger of breaking down for the lack of legal evidence, adopted a blustering tone, and said to Jesus, "Answerest thou nothing? what is it which these witness against thee? But Jesus held his peace" (Mt 26:62,63), relying on the fact that the prosecution had utterly failed on account of the lack of agreement of two witnesses on any of the charges. As a final and desperate resort, Caiaphas had recourse to a bold strategic move to draw from Jesus an admission or confession on which he might base a condemnation, similar to the attempt which failed at the preliminary examination; but this time fortifying his appeal by a solemn adjuration in the name of the Deity. He said to Jesus: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou art the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Mt 26:63,64). Caiaphas, although knowing that under the law Jesus could not be convicted on His own answers or admissions, thereupon in a tragic manner "rent his garments, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy: what further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? They answered and said, He is worthy of death (Mt 26:65,66).

The night session then broke up to meet again after daybreak in order to ratify the decision just come to, and to give a semblance of legality to the trial and verdict. The closing scene was one of disorder, in which they spat in their prisoner’s face and buffeted him (Mt 26:67,68; Lu 22:63-65).

9. The Morning Session:

The following morning, "as soon as it was day," the council reassembled in the same place, and Jesus was led into their presence (Lu 22:66). There were probably a number of the council present who had not attended the night session. For the benefit of these, and perhaps to give an appearance of legality to the proceeding, the high priest began the trial anew, but not with the examination of witnesses which had proved such a failure at the night session. He proceeded at once to ask substantially the same questions as had finally brought out from Jesus the night before the answer which he had declared to be blasphemy, and upon which the council had "condemned him to be worthy of death" (Mr 14:64). The meeting is mentioned in all the Gospels, the details of the examination are related by Luke alone. When asked whether He was the Christ, He replied, "If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (Lu 22:67-69). This answer not being sufficient to found a verdict of blasphemy upon, they all cried out, "Art thou then the Son of God?" To this He gave an affirmative answer, "Ye say that I am. And they said, What further need have we of witness? for we ourselves have heard from his own mouth" (Lu 22:70,71).

10. Powers of the Sanhedrin:

It will be observed that neither at the night nor at the morning session was there any sentence pronounced upon Jesus by the high priest. There was on each occasion only what would be equivalent to a verdict of guilty found by a jury under our modern criminal practice, but no sentence passed upon the

prisoner by the presiding judge. When Judea lost the last vestige of its independence and became a Roman province (6 AD), the Sanhedrin ceased to have the right to inflict Capital punishment or to administer the law of life and death. This jurisdiction was thenceforth transferred to the Roman procurator. The Sanhedrin submitted very reluctantly to this curtailment of its powers. A few years later it exercised it illegally and in a very riotous manner in the case of Stephen (Ac 7:58). Annas, however, of all men, had good reason not to violate this law, as his having done so during the absence of the procurator was the cause of his being deposed from the office of high priest by Valerius Gratus (15 AD).

The proceedings may have been taken before the high priest in the hope that Pilate might be induced to accept the verdict of the Sanhedrin as conclusive that Jesus had been guilty of an offense punishable by death under the Jewish law.

11. Condemnation for Blasphemy:

Now what was the precise crime or crimes for which Jesus was tried at these two sittings of the council? The first impression would probably be that there was no connection between the charge of destroying the temple and building another in three days, and His claiming to be the Son of God. And yet they were closely allied in the Jewish mind. The Jewish nation being a pure theocracy, the overthrow of the temple, the abode of the Divine Sovereign, would mean the overthrow of Divine institutions, and be an act of treason against the Deity. The profession of ability to build another temple in three days would be construed as a claim to the possession of supernatural power and, consequently, blasphemy. As to the other claim which He Himself made and confessed to the council, namely, that He was the Christ, the Son of God, none of them would have any hesitation in concurring in the verdict of the high priest that it was rank blasphemy, when made by one whom they regarded simply as a Galilean peasant.

12. Summary:

To sum up: The Jewish trial of our Lord was absolutely illegal, the court which condemned Him being without jurisdiction to try a capital offense, which blasphemy was under the Jewish law. Even if there had been jurisdiction, it would have been irregular, as the judges had rendered themselves incompetent to try the case, having been guilty of the violation of the spirit of the law that required judges to be unprejudiced and impartial, and carefully to guard the interests of the accused. Even the letter of the law had been violated in a number of important respects. Among these may be mentioned:

(1) some of the judges taking part in and directing the arrest;

(2) the examination before the trial and the attempt to obtain admissions;

(3) endeavors of the judges to procure the testimony of false witnesses;

(4) commencing and continuing the trial at night;

(5) examining and adjuring the accused in order to extort admissions from Him;

(6) rendering a verdict of guilty at the close of the night session, without allowing a day to intervene;

(7) holding the morning session on a feast day, and rendering a verdict at its close; and

(8) rendering both verdicts without any legal evidence.

III. The Roman Trial.

Early on the morning of Friday of the Passover week, as we have already seen, "the chief priests with the elders and scribes, and the whole council" held a consultation (Mark), in the palace of the high priest; and after the examination of Jesus and their verdict that He was guilty of blasphemy, they took counsel against Him "to put him to death" (Mt), this being, in their judgment, the proper punishment for the offense of which they had pronounced Him guilty.

1. Taken before Pilate:

For the reasons already mentioned, they came to the conclusion that it would be necessary to invoke the aid of the Roman power in carrying out this sentence. They thereupon bound Jesus, and led Him away and delivered Him up to Pilate, who at this time probably occupied, while in Jerusalem, the magnificent palace built by Herod the Great. Jesus was taken into the judgment hall of the palace or Pretorium; His accusers, unwilling to defile themselves by entering into a heathen house and thereby rendering themselves unfit to eat the Passover, remained outside upon the marble pavement.

2. Roman Law and Procedure:

The proceedings thus begun were conducted under a system entirely different from that which we have thus far been considering, both in its nature and its administration. The Jewish law was apart of the religion, and in its growth and development was administered in important cases by a large body of trained men, who were obliged to follow strictly a well-defined procedure. The Roman law, on the other hand, had its origin and growth under the stern and manly virtues and the love of justice which characterized republican Rome, and it still jealously guarded the rights and privileges of Roman citizens, even in a conquered province. Striking illustrations of this truth are found in the life of Paul (see Ac 16:35-39; 22:24-29; 25:10-12). The lives and fortunes of the natives in an imperial province like Judea may be said to have been almost completely at the mercy of the Roman procurator or governor, who was responsible to his imperial master alone, and not even to the Roman senate. Pilate therefore was well within the mark when, at a later stage of the trial, being irritated at Jesus remaining silent when questioned by him, he petulantly exclaimed: "Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to release thee, and have power to crucify thee?" (Joh 19:10). While, however, the procurator was not compelled in such cases to adhere strictly to the prescribed procedure, and had a wide discretion, he was not allowed to violate or depart from the established principles of the law.

On this occasion, Pilate, respecting the scruples of the chief priests about entering the palace, went outside at their request, apparently leaving Jesus in the Pretorium. He asked them the usual formal question, put at the opening of a Roman trial: "What accusation bring ye against this man?

3. Full Trial Not Desired:

They answered and said unto him, If he were not an evil-doer, we should not have delivered him up unto thee" (Joh 18:29 f the King James Version). Pilate could see at once that this was a mere attempt to evade the direct question he had asked, and was not such an accusation as disclosed any offense known to the Roman law. Affecting to treat it with disdain, and as something known only to their own law, he said, "Take him yourselves, and judge him according to your law. The Jews said unto him, It is not lawful for us to put any man to death" (Joh 18:31).

4. Final Accusation:

Perceiving that Pilate would not gratify their desire to have Jesus condemned on the verdict which they had rendered, or for an offense against their own law only, "they began to accuse him, saying, We found this man perverting our nation, and forbidding to give tribute to Caesar, and saying that he himself is Christ a king" (Lu 23:2). This was an accusation containing three charges, much like a modern indictment containing three counts. Pilate appears to have been satisfied that there was nothing in the first two of these charges; but the third was too serious to be ignored, especially as it was a direct charge of majestas or treason, the greatest crime known to the Roman law, and as to which the reigning emperor, Tiberius, and his then favorite, Sejanus, were particularly sensitive and jealous. The charges in this case were merely oral, but it would appear to have been in the discretion of the procurator to receive them in this form in the case of one who was not a Roman citizen.

5. Examination, Defence and Acquittal:

The accusers having been heard, Pilate returned to the Pretorium to examine Jesus regarding the last and serious accusation. The Four Gospels give in the same words the question put to him by Pilate, "Art thou the King of the Jews?" The first three record only the final affirmative answer, "Thou sayest," which if it stood alone might have been taken as a plea of guilty; but John gives the intervening discussion which explains the matter fully. He tells us that Jesus did not answer the question directly, but asked Pilate, "Sayest thou this of thyself, or did others tell it thee concerning me?" (Joh 18:34) (apparently not having been outside when the charges were made). On being told that it came from the chief priests, He went on to explain that His kingdom was not of this world, but was a spiritual kingdom. Being again asked if He was a king, He replied in effect, that He was a king in that sense, and that His subjects were those who were of the truth and heard His voice (Joh 18:35-37). Pilate, being satisfied with His explanation, "went out again unto the Jews," and apparently having taken Jesus with him, he mounted his judgment seat or movable tribunal, which had been placed upon the tesselated pavement, and pronounced his verdict, "I find in him no fault at all" (Joh 18:38 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and

American) "I find no crime in him").

6. Fresh Accusations:

According to the Roman law, this verdict of acquittal should have ended the trial and at once secured the discharge of Jesus; but instead it brought a volley of fresh accusations to which Jesus made no reply. Pilate hesitated, and hearing a charge that Jesus had begun His treasonable teaching in Galilee, the thought occurred to him that he might escape from his dilemma by sending Jesus for trial to Herod Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee, who was then in Jerusalem for the feast, which he accordingly did (Lu 23:7).

7. Reference to Herod:

Herod had long been desirous to see Jesus—"hoped to see some miracle done by him," and "questioned him in many words; but he answered him nothing." The chief priests and scribes, who had followed him from the Pretorium to the Maccabean palace, which Herod was then occupying, "stood, vehemently accusing" Jesus (Lu 23:8-10). "That fox," however, as Jesus had called him (Lu 13:32), was too astute to intermeddle in a trial for treason, which was a dangerous proceeding, and possibly he was aware that Pilate had already acquitted Him; in which case a retrial by him would be illegal. He and his soldiers, probably irritated at the refusal of Jesus to give him any answer, mocked Him, and arraying Him in a gorgeous robe, no doubt in ridicule of His claim to be a king, sent Him back to Pilate. This reference to Herod in reality formed no effective part of the trial of Jesus, as Herod declined the jurisdiction, although Pilate sought to make use of it in his subsequent discussion with the chief priests. The only result was that Herod was flattered by the courtesy of Pilate, the enmity between them ceased, and they were made friends (Lu 23:11,12,15).

8. Jesus or Barabbas:

On their return, Pilate resumed his place on the judgment seat outside. What followed, however, properly formed no part of the legal trial, as it was a mere travesty upon law as well as upon justice. Pilate resolved to make another attempt to secure the consent of the Jews to the release of Jesus. To this end he summoned not only the chief priests and the rulers, but "the people" as well (Lu 23:13), and after mentioning the failure to prove any of the charges made against Jesus, he reminded them of the custom of releasing at the feast a prisoner selected by them, and offering as a compromise to chastise or scourge Jesus before releasing Him. At this point Pilate’s anxiety to release Jesus was still further increased by the message he received from his wife concerning her disturbing dream about Jesus and warning him to "have .... nothing to do with that righteous man" (Mt 27:19). Meanwhile, the chief priests and elders were busily engaged in canvassing the multitude to ask for the release of Barabbas, the notable robber, and destroy Jesus (Mt 27:20). When Pilate urged them to release Jesus, they cried out all together, "Away with this man, and release unto us Barabbas"; and upon a further appeal on behalf of Jesus they cried, "Crucify, crucify him." A third attempt on his part met with no better result (Lu 23:18-23).

9. Behold the Man!:

The Fourth Gospel alone records a final attempt on the part of Pilate to save Jesus. He scourged Him, it has been suggested, with a view to satisfying their desire for His punishment, and afterward appealing to their pity. He allowed his soldiers to repeat what they had seen done at Herod's palace, and place a crown of thorns upon His head, array Him in a purple robe, and render mock homage to Him as king of the Jews. Pilate went out to the Jews with Jesus thus arrayed and bleeding. Again declaring that he found no fault in Him, he presented Him, saying, "Behold, the man!" This was met by the former cry, "Crucify him, crucify him." Pilate replied, "Take him yourselves .... for I find no crime in him." The Jews referred him to their law by which He deserved death because He made Himself the Son of God. This alarmed Pilate's superstitious fears, who by this time appears to have wholly lost control of himself. He took Jesus into the palace and said to Him, "Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no answer." Irritated at His silence, Pilate reminded Him of his absolute power over Him. The mysterious answer of Jesus as to the source of power still further alarmed him, and he made new efforts to secure His discharge (Joh 19:1-9).

10. Pilate Succumbs to Threats:

The Jews were well aware that Pilate was arbitrary and cruel, but they had also found that he was very sensitive as to anything that might injuriously affect his official position or his standing with his master, the emperor. As a last resort they shouted to him, "If thou release this man, thou art not Caesar's friend: every one that maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar" (Joh 19:12). The prospect of a charge of his aiding and abetting such a crime as treason, in addition to the other charges that a guilty conscience told him might be brought against him, proved too much for the vacillating procurator. He brought Jesus out, and sat down again upon the judgment seat placed upon the pavement. He made one more appeal, "Shall I crucify your King?" The chief priests gave the hypocritical answer, "We have no king but Caesar" (Joh 19:15). Pilate finally succumbed to their threats and clamor; but took his revenge by placing upon the cross the superscription that was so galling to them, "THE KING OF THE JEWS."

11. Pilate Washes His Hands:

Then occurred the closing scene of the tragedy, recorded only in the First Gospel, when Pilate washed his hands before the multitude (a Jewish custom), saying to them, "I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man; see ye to it." The reply was that dreadful imprecation, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (Mt 27:24,25).

12. The Sentence:

Pilate resumes his place upon the judgment seat, the fatal sentence at last falls from his lips, and Jesus is delivered up to be crucified.

Now, how far were these proceedings in accordance with the Roman law under which they purported to have been taken and conducted? In the first place, Pilate, as procurator, was the proper officer to try the

charges brought against Jesus.

13. Review:

In the next place he acted quite properly in declining to entertain a charge which disclosed no offense known to the Roman law, or to pass a sentence based on the verdict of the Sanhedrin for an alleged violation of the Jewish law. He appears to have acted in accordance with the law, and indeed in a judicial and praiseworthy manner in the trial and disposition of the threefold indictment for treason (unless it be a fact that Jesus was not present when these accusations were brought against Him outside the Pretorium, which would be merely an irregularity, as they were made known to him later inside). Pilate's initial mistake, which led to all the others, was in not discharging Jesus at once, when he had pronounced the verdict of acquittal.

All the subsequent proceedings were contrary to both the letter and the spirit of the law. Although Pilate took his place upon the judgment seat, his acts, properly speaking, were not those of a judge, and had no legal force or value; but were rather the futile attempts of a weak and vacillating politician to appease an angry mob thirsting for the blood of an innocent countryman. The carrying out of a sentence imposed in such circumstances, and under such conditions, may not inaptly be described as a judicial murder.

John James Maclaren

JESUS JUSTUS

je'-zus jus'-tus Iesous ho legomenos Ioustos, "Jesus that is called Justus," Col 4:11):

1. A Jew by Birth:

One of three friends of Paul—the others being Aristarchus and Mark—whom he associates with himself in sending salutations from Rome to the church at Colosse. Jesus Justus is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament, and there is nothing more known about him than is given in this passage in Colossians, namely, that he was by birth a Jew—"of the circumcision"—that he had been converted to Christ, and that he was one of the inner circle of intimate friends and associates of the apostle during his first Roman captivity.

2. He Remains True to Paul:

The words also contain the information that at a stage in Paul's imprisonment, when the welcome extended to him by the Christians in Rome on his arrival there had lost its first warmth, and when in consequence, probably, of their fear of persecution, most of them had proved untrue and were holding aloof from him, J. J. and his two friends remained faithful. It would be pressing this passage unduly to make it mean that out of the large number—hundreds, or perhaps even one or two thousands—who composed the membership of the church in Rome at this time, and who within the next few years proved

their loyalty to Christ by their stedfastness unto death in the Neronic persecution, all fell away from their affectionate allegiance to Paul at this difficult time. The words cannot be made to signify more than that it was the Jewish section of the church in Rome which acted in this unworthy manner—only temporarily, it is to be hoped. But among these Jewish Christians, to such dimensions had this defection grown that Aristarchus, Mark and J. J. alone were the apostle's fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God. These three alone, at that particular time—from among the Jewish Christians—were helping him in the work of the gospel in Rome. That this defection refers to the Jewish section of the church and not to the converts from among the Gentiles, is evident from many considerations. It seems to be proved, for example by verse 14 of the same chapter (i.e. Col 4:14), as well as by Phm 1:24, in both of which passages Paul names Demas and Luke as his fellow-laborers; and Luke was not a Jew by birth. But in the general failure of the Christians in Rome in their conduct toward Paul, it is with much affection and pathos that he writes concerning Aristarchus, Mark, and J. J., "These only are my fellow-workers unto the kingdom of God, men that have been a comfort unto me."

John Rutherfurd

JESUS, GENEALOGY OF

See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

JETHER

je'-ther (yether, "abundance"):

(1) Ex 4:18 the Revised Version margin, King James Version, margin.

See JETHRO.

(2) Gideon's eldest son (Jud 8:20), who was called upon by his father to slay Zebah and Zalmunnah, but "feared, because he was yet a youth." The narrative there (Jud 8:4) should be connected with that of Jud 6:34, where Gideon is followed by his clan, and not with that of Jud 7, where he has 300 picked men. The captives would be taken to Orpah, Gideon's home, and slain there.

(3) Father of Amasa (1Ki 2:5,32); he was an Ishmaelite according to 1Ch 2:17 =" Ithra, the Israelite" of 2Sa 17:25, where "the Ishmaelite" should be read for "the Israelite."

(4) A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:32 twice).

(5) A Judahite (1Ch 4:17).

(6) A man of Asher (1Ch 7:38) =" Ithran" of 1Ch 7:37.

David Francis Roberts

JETHETH

je’-theth (yetheth, meaning unknown): a chief (or clan) of Edom (Ge 36:40 parallel 1Ch 1:51), but probably a mistake for "Jether" =" Ithran" (Ge 36:26).

JETHLAH

jeth’-la (yithlah).

See ITHLAH.

JETHRO

jeth’-ro, je’-thro (yithro, "excellence," Ex 3:1; 4:18 b; 18:1-12 (in 4:18a, probably a textual error, yether, "Iether," the King James Version margin, the Revised Version margin); Septuagint always Iothor): The priest of Midian and father-in-law (chothen) of Moses.

1. His Relation to Reuel and Hobab:

It is not easy to determine the relation of Jethro to Reuel and Hobab. If we identify Jethro with Reuel as in Ex 2:18; 3:1 (and in Ant, III, iii; V, ii, 3), we must connect "Moses’ father-in-law" in Nu 10:29 immediately with "Reuel" (the King James Version "Raguel"), and make Hobab the brother-in-law of Moses. But while it is possible that chothen may be used in the wider sense of a wife’s relative, it is nowhere translated "brother-in-law" except in Jud 1:16; 4:11 ("father-in-law," the King James Version, the Revised Version margin). If we insert, as Ewald suggests (HI, II, 25), "Jethro son of" before "Reuel" in Ex 2:18 (compare the Septuagint, verse 16, where the name "Jethro" is given), we would then identify Jethro with Hobab, the son of Reuel, in Nu 10:29, taking "Moses’ father-in-law" to refer back to Hobab. Against this identification, however, it is stated that Jethro went away into his own country without any effort on the part of Moses to detain him (Ex 18:27), whereas Hobab, though at first he refused to remain with the Israelites, seems to have yielded to the pleadings of Moses to become their guide to Canaan (Nu 10:29-32; Jud 1:16, where Kittel reads "Hobab the Kenite"; Jud 4:11). It may be noted that while the father-in-law of Moses is spoken of as a "Midianite" in Exodus, he is called A"kenite" in Jud 1:16; 4:11. From this Ewald infers that the Midianites were at that time intimately blended with the Amalekites, to which tribe the Kenites belonged (HI, II, 44).

2. His Hearty Reception of Moses:

When Moses fled from Egypt he found refuge in Midian, where he received a hearty welcome into the household of Jethro on account of the courtesy and kindness he had shown to the priest’s 7 daughters in

helping them to water their flock. This friendship resulted in Jethro giving Moses his daughter, Zipporah, to wife (Ex 2:15-21). After Moses had been for about 40 years in the service of his father-in-law, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in the burning bush as he was keeping the flock at Horeb, commanding him to return to Egypt and deliver his enslaved brethren out of the hands of Pharaoh (Ex 3:1). With Jethro's consent Moses left Midian to carry out the Divine commission (Ex 4:18).

3. His Visit to Moses in the Wilderness:

When tidings reached Midian of "all that God had done for Moses, and for Israel" in delivering them from Egyptian bondage, Jethro, with a natural pride in the achievements of his relative, set out on a visit to Moses, taking Zipporah and her two sons with him (Ex 18:1-12). On learning of his father-in-law's arrival at the "mount of God," Moses went out to meet him, and after a cordial exchange of courtesies they retired to Moses' tent, where a pleasant interview took place between them. We are told of the interest Jethro felt in all the particulars of the great deliverance, how he "rejoiced for all the goodness which Yahweh had done to Israel," and how the conviction was wrought within him that Yahweh was "greater than all gods; yea, in the thing wherein they dealt proudly against them" (Ex 18:11). In this condition so expressed there is evidently a reference to the element by which the Egyptians thought in their high-handed pursuit they would be able to bring back Israel into bondage, but by which they were themselves overthrown.

It is worth noting that in the religious service in which Jethro and Moses afterward engaged, when Jethro, as priest, offered a burnt offering, and Aaron with all the elders of Israel partook of the sacrificial feast, prominence was given to Jethro over Aaron, and thus a priesthood was recognized beyond the limits of Israel.

4. His Wise Counsel:

This visit of Jethro to Moses had important consequences for the future government of Israel (Ex 18:13-27). The priest of Midian became concerned about his son-in-law when he saw him occupied from morning to night in deciding the disputes that had arisen among the people. The labor this entailed, Jethro said, was far too heavy a burden for one man to bear. Moses himself would soon be worn out, and the people, too, would become weary and dissatisfied, owing to the inability of one judge to overtake all the eases that were brought before him. Jethro, therefore, urged Moses to make use of the talents of others and adopt a plan of gradation of judges who would dispose of all eases of minor importance, leaving only the most difficult for him to settle by a direct appeal to the will of God. Moses, recognizing the wisdom of his father-in-law's advice, readily acted upon his suggestion and appointed "able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens." Thereafter, Jethro returned to his own country.

5. His Character and Influence:

The story of Jethro reveals him as a man of singular attractiveness and strength, in whom a kind,

considerate disposition, a deeply religious spirit, and a wise judgment all met in happy combination. And this ancient priest of Midian made Israel and all nations his debtors when he taught the distinction between the legislative and the judicial function, and the importance of securing that all law be the expression of the Divine will, and that its application be entrusted only to men of ability, piety, integrity and truth (Ex 18:21).

James Crichton

JETUR

je'-tur (yeTur, meaning uncertain): a "son" of Ishmael (Ge 25:15 parallel 1Ch 1:31); against this clan the two and a half tribes warred (1Ch 5:18 f); they are the Itureans of New Testament times.

See ITURAEA.

JEUEL

je-u'-el ju'-el (ye'-u'-el, meaning unknown):

(1) A man of Judah (1Ch 9:6); the name is not found in the parallel of Ne 11:24. (2) A Levite, the King James Version "Jeiel" (2Ch 29:13).

(3) A companion of Ezra, the King James Version "Jeiel" (Ezr 8:13).

(4) The name occurs also as Kethibh in 1Ch 9:35; 2Ch 26:11.

See JEIEL, (2), (6).

JEUSH

je'-ush (ye'ush, probably "he protects," "he comes to help"; see HPN, 109; Kethibh is ye'ish, in Ge 36:5,14; 1Ch 7:10):

(1) A "son" of Esau (Ge 36:5,14,18; 1Ch 1:35). "The name is thought by some to be identical with that, of an Arabian lion-god Yagut ...., meaning 'helper,' whose antiquity is vouched for by inscriptions of Thamud" (Skinner, Gen, 432).

(2) A Benjamite (1Ch 7:10), but probably a Zebulunite. See Curtis, Chronicles, 145 ff.

(3) A descendant of King Saul, the King James Version "Jehush" (1Ch 8:39).

(4) A Gershonite Levite (1Ch 23:10,11).

(5) A son of King Rehoboam (2Ch 11:19).

David Francis Roberts

JEUZ

je’-uz ye‘-uts "he counsels"): The eponym of a Benjamite family (1Ch 8:10).

JEW, JEWESS, JEWISH

ju, joo, ju’-ish, joo’-ish (yehudhi plural yehudhim; Ioudaioi; feminine adjective yehudhith; Ioudaikos): "Jew" denotes originally an inhabitant of Judah (2Ki 16:6 applies to the two tribes of the Southern Kingdom), but later the meaning was extended to embrace all descendants of Abraham. In the Old Testament the word occurs a few times in the singular. (Es 2:5; 3:4, etc.; Jer 34:9; Zec 8:23); very frequently in the plural in Ezra and Nehemiah, Esther, and in Jeremiah and Daniel. The adjective in the Old Testament applies only to the "Jews’ language" or speech (2Ki 18:26,28 parallel Ne 13:24; Isa 36:11,13). "Jews" (always plural) is the familiar term for Israelites in the Gospels (especially in John), Acts, Epistles, etc. "Jewess" occurs in 1Ch 4:18; Ac 16:1; 24:24. In Tit 1:14 a warning is given against "Jewish fables" (in Greek the adjective is found also in Ga 2:14). The "Jews’ religion" (Ioudaismos) is referred to in Ga 1:13,14. On the "Jews’ language,"see LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; on the "Jews’ religion," see ISRAEL, RELIGION OF.

James Orr

JEWEL

ju’-el, joo’-el: An ornament of gold, silver or of precious stones in the form of armlet, bracelet, anklet, nose-ring, etc. Oriental dress yields itself freely to such adornment, to which there are many allusions in Scripture. a frequent term in Hebrew is keli ("utensil," "vessel"), coupled with mention of "gold" or "silver" or both (Ge 24:53; Ex 3:22; 11:2; 12:35; 35:22; 1Sa 6:8,15, etc.; the Revised Version (British and American) in 2Ch 32:27 translations "vessels"). In So 1:10, where the King James Version has "rows (of jewels)," the Revised Version (British and American) has "plaits (of hair)"; in So 7:1, the word is from a root chalah, meaning "to adorn." In 3 instances in the King James Version "jewel" represents the Hebrew nezem (Pr 11:22; Isa 3:21; Eze 16:12); the American Standard Revised Version changes Pr 11:22 to "ring" Septuagint here =" earring"), and both the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version have "ring" in Eze 16:12. The familiar phrase in Mal 3:17, "in that day when I make up my jewels," becomes in the English Revised Version, "in the day that I do make, even a peculiar treasure" (margin "or, wherein I do make a peculiar treasure"), and in the American Standard Revised Version, "even mine own possession, in the day that I make" (margin "or, do this").

See, further, ORNAMENT; DRESS; STONES, PRECIOUS.

James Orr

JEWRY

ju’-ri, joo’-ri: In Da 5:13 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "Judah"; in the New Testament, in two places in the King James Version, Lu 23:5; Joh 7:1, where the Revised Version (British and American) has correctly "Judaea" (Ioudaia) (which see).

JEWS

juz, jooz.

See JEW.

JEZANIAH

jez-a-ni’-a (yezanyahu, probably "Yahweh hears"; compare JAAZANIAH): In Jer 40:8, and also 42:1 where Septuagint has "Azariah," as in 43:2 (see Driver, Jer) = JAAZANIAH, (1) (which see).

JEZEBEL

jez’-e-bel ‘izebhel, "unexalted," "unhusbanded" (?); Iezabel; see BDB; 1Ki 16:31; 18:4,13,19; 19:1,2; 21:5 ff; 2Ki 9:7 ff, 30 ff; Re 2:20): Daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Zidonians, i.e. Phoenicians, and queen of Ahab, king of Northern Israel. Ahab (circa 874-853 BC) carried out a policy, which his father had perhaps started, of making alliances with other states. The alliance with the Phoenicians was cemented by his marriage with Jezebel, and he subsequently gave his daughter Athaliah in marriage to Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. His own union with Jezebel is regarded as a sin in 1Ki 16:31, where the Massoretic Text is difficult, being generally understood as a question. The Septuagint translations: "and it was not enough that he should walk in the sins of Jeroboam ben Nebat, he also took to wife Jezebel," etc. The Hebrew can be pointed to mean, "And it was the lightest thing for him to walk in the sins of Jeroboam ben Nebat, he also took to wife Jezebel, and went and served Baal and worshipped him," i.e. all the other sins were light as compared with the marriage with Jezebel and the serving of Baal (compare Mic 6:16). Is this a justifiable view to take of the marriage? One answer would be that Ahab made a wise alliance; that Baal-worship was not non-Hebrew, that Ahab named his children not alter Baal but after Yahweh (compare Ahaziah, Jehoram, Athaliah), and that he consulted the prophets of Yahweh (compare 1Ki 22:6); further, that he only did what Solomon had done on a much larger scale; it may be added too that Ahab was in favor of religious toleration, and that Elijah and not the king is the persecutor. What then can be said for the unfavorable Verdict of the Hebrew historians? That verdict is based on the results and effects of the marriage, on the life and character of

Jezebel, and in that life two main incidents demand attention.

1. Persecution of Yahweh’s Prophets:

This is not described; it is only referred to in 1Ki 18:4, "when Jezebel cut off the prophets of Yahweh"; and this shows the history of the time to be incompletely related. In 1Ki 18:19 we are further told that "450 prophets of Baal ate at her table" (commentators regard the reference to "400 prophets of the Asherah" as an addition). In 1Ki 19:1 Ahab tells Jezebel of the slaughter of the prophets of Baal by Elijah, and then Jezebel (19:2) sends a messenger to Elijah to threaten his life. This leads to the prophet’s flight, an object which Jezebel had in view, perhaps, for she would hardly dare to murder Elijah himself. 2Ki 9:7 regards the massacre of Ahab’s family as a punishment for the persecution of the prophets by Jezebel

2. Jezebel’s Plot Against Naboth (1Ki 21):

Ahab expresses a desire to possess the vineyard neighboring upon his palace in Jezreel, owned by Naboth, who refuses to part with the family inheritance though offered either its money value or a better vineyard in exchange. Ahab is depressed at this, and Jezebel, upon finding the cause of his melancholy feelings, asks him sarcastically if he is not king, suggesting that as king his wishes should be immediately granted by his subjects. She thereupon plots to secure him Naboth’s vineyard. Jezebel sends letters sealed in Ahab’s name to the elders of Naboth’s township, and bids them arrange a public fast and make Naboth "sit at the head of the people" (Revised Version margin), a phrase taken by some to mean that he is to be arraigned, while it is explained by others as meaning that Naboth is to be given the chief place. Two witnesses—a sufficient number for that purpose—are to be brought to accuse Naboth of blasphemy and treason. This is done, and Naboth is found guilty, and stoned to death. The property is confiscated, and falls to the king (1Ki 21:1-16). Elijah hears of this, and is sent to threaten Ahab with Divine vengeance; dogs shall lick his dead body (1Ki 21:19). But in 1Ki 21:20-23 this prophecy is made, not concerning Ahab but against Jezebel, and 21:25 attributes the sins of Ahab to her influence over him.

The prophecy is fulfilled in 2Ki 9:30-37. Ahaziah and Jehoram had succeeded their father Ahab; the one reigned for 2 years (1Ki 22:51), the other 12 years (2Ki 3:1). Jehu heads a revolt against the house of Ahab, and one day comes to Jezreel. Jezebel had "painted her eyes, and attired her head," and sees Jehu coming. She greets him sarcastically as his master’s murderer. according to Massoretic Text, Jehu asks, "Who is on my side? who?" but the text is emended by Klostermann, following Septuagint in the main, "Who art thou that thou shouldest find fault with me?" i.e. thou art but a murderess thyself. She is then thrown down and the horses tread upon her (reading "they trod" for "he trod" in 2Ki 9:33). When search is afterward made for her remains, they are found terribly mutilated. Thus was the prophecy fulfilled. (Some commentaries hold that Naboth’s vineyard and Ahab’s garden were in Samaria, and Naboth a Jezreelite. The words, "which was in Jezreel," of 1Ki 21:1 are wanting in Septuagint, which has "And Naboth had a vineyard by the threshing-floor of Ahab king of Samaria." But compare 1Ki 18:45; 21:23; 2Ki 8:29; 9:10,15 ff, 30 ff.)

See AHAB; JEHU.

3. Jezebel’s Character:

The character of Jezebel is seen revived in that of her daughter, Athaliah of Judah (2Ki 11); there is no doubt that Jezebel was a powerful personality. She brought the worship of the Phoenician Baal and Astarte with her into Hebrew life, and indirectly introduced it into Judah as well as into the Northern Kingdom. In judging her connection with this propagation, we should bear in mind that she is not a queen of the 20th century; she must be judged in company with other queens famous in history. Her religious attitude and zeal might profitably be compared with that of Mary, queen of Scots. It must also be remembered that the introduction of any religious change is often resented when it comes from a foreign queen, and is apt to be misunderstood, e.g. the attitude of Greece to the proposal of Queen Olga have an authorized edition of the Bible in modern Greek.

On the other hand, although much may be said that would be favorable to Jezebel from the religious standpoint, the balance is heavy against her when we remember her successful plot against Naboth. It is not perhaps blameworthy in her that she upheld the religion of her native land, although the natural thing would have been to follow that of her adopted land (compare Ru 1:16 f). The superiority of Yahweh-worship was not as clear then as it is to us today. It may also be held that Baal-worship was not unknown in Hebrew life (compare Jud 6:25 f), that Baal of Canaan had become incorporated with Yahweh of Sinai, and that there were pagan elements in the worship of the latter. But against all this it must be clear that the Baal whom Jezebel attempted to introduce was the Phoenician Baal, pure and simple; he was another god, or rather in him was presented an idea of God very different from Yahweh. And further, "in Phoenicia, where wealth and luxury had been enjoyed on a scale unknown to either Israel or the Canaanites of the interior, there was a refinement, if one may so speak, and at the same time a prodigality of vicious indulgences, connected with the worship of Baal and Astarte to which Israel had hitherto been a stranger ..... It was like a cancer eating into the vitals or a head and heart sickness resulting in total decay (Isa 1:6). In Israel, moral deterioration meant political as well as spiritual death. The weal of the nation lay in fidelity to Yahweh alone, and in His pure worship" (HPM, section symbol 213).

The verdict of the Hebrew historian is thus substantiated. Jezebel is an example—an extreme one no doubt—of the bad influence of a highly developed civilization forcing itself with all its sins upon a community less highly civilized, but possessed of nobler moral and religious conceptions. She has parallels both in family and in national life. For a parallel to Elijah’s attitude toward Jezebel compare the words of Carlyle about Knox in On Heroes and Hero-Worship, IV, especially the section, "We blame Knox for his intolerance," etc.

In Re 2:20, we read of Iezabel, "the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess"; not "thy wife" (i. e. the wife of the bishop) the Revised Version margin, but as Moffat (Expositor’s Greek Testament) aptly renders, "that Jezebel of a woman alleging herself a prophetess." Some members of the church at Thyatira "under the sway of an influential woman refused to separate from the local guilds where moral

interests, though not ostensibly defied, were often seriously compromised ..... Her lax principles or tendencies made for a connection with foreign and compromising associations which evidently exerted a dangerous influence upon some weaker Christians in the city." Her followers "prided themselves upon their enlightened liberalism (Re 2:24)." Moffat rejects both the view of Schurer (Theol. Abhandlungen, 39 f), that she is to be identified with the Chaldean Sibyl at Thyatira, and also that of Selwyn making her the wife of the local asiarch. "It was not the cults but the trade guilds that formed the problem at Thyatira." See also Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, section symbol 73, note 7; AHAB; BAAL; ELIJAH.

David Francis Roberts

JEZELUS

je-ze’-lus, jez’-e-lus (Iezelos):

(1) In 1 Esdras 8:32; called "Jahaziel" in Ezr 8:5.

(2) In 1 Esdras 8:35; called "Jehiel" in Ezr 8:9.

JEZER

je’-zer (yecher, "form" or "purpose"): A "son" of Naphtali (Ge 46:24; Nu 26:49; 1Ch 7:13).

JEZERITES, THE

je’-zer-its, (ha-yitsri (collective with article)): Descendants of "Jezer" (Nu 26:49).

JEZIAH

je-zi’-a.

See IZZIAH.

JEZIEL

je’-zi-el, je-zi’-el (Kethibh is yezu’el, or yezo’el; Qere yezi’el =" God gathers," perhaps): One of David’s Benjamite recruits at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3).

JEZLIAH

jez-lia.

See IZLIAH.

JEZOAR

je-zo’-ar.

See IZHAR.

JEZRAHIAH

jez-ra-hi’-a.

See IZRAHIAH.

JEZREEL

jez’-re-el, jez’-rel (yizre‘e’l, "God soweth"):

(1) A city on the border of the territory of Issachar (Jos 19:18).

1. Territory:

It is named with Chesulloth and Shunem (modern Iksal and Solam). It remained loyal to the house of Saul, and is mentioned as part of the kingdom over which Abner set Ishbosheth (2Sa 2:9). From Jezreel came the tidings of Saul and Jonathan’s death on Gilboa, which brought disaster to Mephibosheth (2Sa 4:4). The city plays no important part in the history till the time of Ahab. Attracted, doubtless, by the fine position and natural charms of the place, he made it one of his royal residences, building here a palace (1Ki 21:1). This was evidently on the eastern wall; and the gate by which Jehu entered was overlooked by the quarters of Queen Jezebel (2Ki 9:30 f). The royal favor naturally enhanced the dignity of the city, and "elders" and "nobles" of Jezreel are mentioned (1Ki 21:8, etc.). Under the influence of Jezebel, an institution for the worship of Baal was founded here, from which, probably, the men were drawn who figured in the memorable contest with Elijah on Carmel (2Ki 10:11). "The tower in Jezreel" was part of the defenses of the city. It commanded a view of the approach up the valley from Beth-shean —the way followed by the hordes of the East, who, from time immemorial, came westward for the rich pasture of the plain (2Ki 9:17). It was necessary also to keep constant watch, as the district East of the Jordan was always more unsettled than that on the West; and danger thence might appear at any moment. The garden of Naboth seems to have lain to the East of the city (2Ki 9:21), near the royal domain, to which Ahab desired to add it as a garden of herbs (1Ki 21:1). See NABOTH. This was the scene of the tragic meetings between Elijah and Ahab (1Ki 21:17), and between Jehu and Joram and

Ahaziah (2Ki 9:21). Joram had returned to Jezreel from Ramoth-gilead to be healed of his wounds (2Ki 9:15). By the gateway the dogs devoured Jezebel's body (2Ki 9:31). Naboth had been stoned to death outside the city (1Ki 21:13). Josephus lays the scene by the fountain of Jezreel, and here, he says, the dogs licked the blood washed from the chariot of Ahab (Ant., VIII, xv, 6). This accords with 1Ki 21:19; but 22:38 points to the pool at Samaria.

2. Identification:

The site of Jezreel must be sought in a position where a tower would command a view of the road coming up the valley from Beth-shean. It has long been the custom to identify it with the modern village, Zer'in, on the northwestern spur of Gilboa. This meets the above condition; and it also agrees with the indications in Eusebius, Onomasticon as lying between Legio (Lejjun) and Scythopolis (Beisan). Recently, however, Professor A.R.S. Macalister made a series of excavations here, and failed to find any evidence of ancient Israelite occupation. This casts doubt upon the identification, and further excavation is necessary before any certain conclusion can be reached. For the "fountain which is in Jezreel," see HAROD, WELL OF.

(2) An unidentified town in the uplands of Judah (Jos 15:56), the home of Ahinoam (1Sa 27:3, etc.).

W. Ewing

JEZREEL, VALE OF

See ESDRAELON, PLAIN OF.

JEZREELITE

jez'-re-el-it, jez'-rel-it ha-yizre'e'li): applied to Naboth, a native of Jezreel (1) (1Ki 21:1, etc.).

JEZREELITESS

jez'-re-el-it-es, jez'-rel-it-es (yizre'e'lith, "of Jezreel," feminine): Applied to Ahinoam, one of David's first two wives, a native of Jezreel in Judah (1Sa 27:3; 30:5; 2Sa 2:2; 3:2; 1Ch 3:1).

JEZRIELUS

jez-ri-e'-lus (Iezrielos; the King James Version Hierielus; 1 Esdras 9:27): Corresponding to "Jehiel" in Ezr 10:26.

JIBSAM

jib’-sam.

See IBSAM.

JIDLAPH

jid’-laf (yidhlaph perhaps "he weeps"): A "son" of Nahor (Ge 22:22).

JIMNA, JIMNAH

jim’-na (yimnah, perhaps equals "good fortune"): A "son" of Asher (Ge 46:17, the King James Version "Jimnah"; Nu 26:44, the King James Version "Jimna"), whereas the Revised Version (British and American) has IMNAH (which see).

JIMNITES, THE

jim’-nits, (same as "Jimna," only collective with the definite article; Nu 26:44 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "Imnites"): Descendants of Jimna or Imna.

JIPHTAH

jif’-ta (yiphtach).

See IPHTAH.

JIPHTHAHEL

jif’-tha-el.

See IPHTAH-EL.

JOAB

jo’-ab (yo’-abh, "Yahweh is father"; Ioab):

(1) Son of Zeruiah, David’s sister. He was "captain of the host" (compare 2Sa 19:13) under David.

1. Joab and Abner:

(a) Joab is first introduced in the narrative of the war with Abner, who supported the claims of

Ishbosheth to the throne against those of David (2Sa 2:8-3:1). The two armies met, and on Abner's suggestion a tournament took place between 12 men from each side; a general engagement follows, and in this Joab's army is victorious. Asahel, Joab's brother, is killed in his pursuit of Abner, but the latter's army is sorely pressed, and he appeals to Joab for a cessation of hostilities. Joab calls a halt, but declares that he would not cease had Abner not made his plea.

(b) 2Sa 3:12-29. Abner visits David at Hebron, and makes an alliance with David. He then leaves the town, apparently under royal protection. Joab is absent at the time, but returns immediately after Abner's departure, and expostulates with David for not avenging Asahel's death, and at the same time attributes a bad motive to Abner's visit. He sends a message, no doubt in the form of a royal command, for Abner to return; the chief does so, is taken aside "into the midst of the gate" (or as Septuagint and commentators read, "into the side of the gate," 2Sa 3:27), and slain there by Joab. David proclaims his own innocence in the matter, commands Joab as well as the people to mourn publicly for the dead hero (2Sa 3:31), composes a lament for Abner, and pronounces a curse upon Joab and his descendants (2Sa 3:30 is regarded as an editorial note, and commentators change 2Sa 3:39).

2. The Ammonite War: Death of Uriah:

(a) 2Sa 10:1-14; 1Ch 19:1-15. David sends ambassadors with his good wishes to Hanun on his ascending the throne of the Ammonites; these are ill-treated, and war follows, David's troops being commanded by Joab. On finding himself placed between the Ammonites on the one hand, and their Syrian allies on the other, he divides his army, and himself leads one division against the Syrians, leaving Abishai, his brother, to fight the Ammonites; the defeat of the Syrians is followed by the rout of the ammonites.

(b) 2Sa 10:15-19; 1Ch 19:16-19 describes a second war between Hadarezer and David. Joab is not mentioned here.

(c) 2Sa 11:1 narrates the resumption of the war against the Ammonites; Joab is in command, and the town of Rabbah is besieged. Here occurs the account of David's sin with Bathsheba, omitted by Chronicles. David gets Joab to send Uriah, her husband, to Jerusalem, and when he refuses to break the soldier's vow (11:6-13), Joab is used to procure Uriah's death in the siege, and the general then sends news of it to David (11:14-27). After capturing the 'water-city' of Rabbah, Joab sends for David to complete the capture and lead the triumph himself (12:26-29).

3. Joab and Absalom:

(a) The next scene depicts Joab attempting and succeeding in his attempt to get Absalom restored to royal favor. He has noticed that "the king's heart is toward Absalom" (2Sa 14:1), and so arranges for "a wise woman" of Tekoa to bring a supposed complaint of her own before the king, and then rebuke him for his treatment of Absalom. The plan succeeds. David sees Joab's hand in it, and gives him permission to bring Absalom to Jerusalem. But the rebel has to remain in his own house, and is not allowed to see

his father (2Sa 14:1-24).

(b) Absalom attempts to secure Joab's intercession for a complete restoration to his father's confidence. Joab turns a deaf ear to the request until his field is put on fire by Absalom's command. He then sees Absalom, and gets David to receive his prodigal son back into the royal home (2Sa 14:28-33).

(c) Absalom revolts, and makes Amasa, another nephew of David, general instead of Joab (2Sa 17:24 f). David flees to Mahanaim, followed by Absalom. Joab is given a third of the army, the other divisions being led by Abishai and Ittai. He is informed that Absalom has been caught in a tree (or thicket), and expostulates with the informer for not having killed him. Although he is reminded of David's tender plea that Absalom be kindly dealt with, he dispatches the rebel himself, and afterward calls for a general halt of the army. When David gives vent to his feelings of grief, he is sternly rebuked by Joab, and the rebuke has its effect (2Sa 17-19:8).

4. Joab and Amasa:

2Sa 19:8 b-15. On David's return to Jerusalem, Amasa is made "captain of the host" instead of Joab (19:13). Then Sheba revolts, Amasa loses time in making preparation for quelling it, and Abishai is bidden by David to take the field (20:6). The Syriac version reads "Joab" for "Abishai" in this verse, and some commentators follow it, but Septuagint supports Massoretic Text. Joab seems to have accompanied Abishai; and when Amasa meets them at Gibeon, Joab, on pretense of kissing his rival, kills him. He then assumes command, is followed by Amasa's men, and arranges with a woman of Abel beth-maacah to deliver to him Sheba's head. The revolt is then at an end.

5. Joab's Death:

Joab subsequently opposed David's suggestion of a census, but eventually carried it out (2Sa 24:1-9; 1Ch 21:1-6), yet 1Ch 21:6 and 27:24 relate that he did not carry it out fully. He was one of Adonijah's supporters in his claim to the throne (1Ki 1:7,19,41). For this he had to pay the penalty with his life, being slain at the altar in the "Tent of Yahweh" (1Ki 2:28-34) by Benaiah, who acted upon Solomon's orders. His murderer became his successor as head of the army. 1Ki 2:5 makes David advise Solomon not to forget that Joab slew Abner and Amasa, and 1Ki 11:14-22 contains a reference to the dread of his name in Edom. 1Ch 11:6 makes him win his spurs first at the capture of Jerusalem, but 2Sa 2; 3 are previous in time to this event (compare 2Sa 5:6-10), and 1Ch 11:8 makes him repair the city, while 1Ch 26:28 refers to a dedication of armor by him.

6. Joab's Character:

In summing up Joab's character, we must remember the stirring times in which he lived. That he was a most able general, there is no doubt. He was, however, very jealous of his position, and this accounts for Amasa's murder, if not partially for that of Abner too: if he was afraid that Abner would supplant him, that fear may be held to be justified, for Amasa, who had not been too loyal to David did take Joab's

place for a time. But blood revenge for Asahel's death was perhaps the chief cause. Yet even when judged in the light of those rough times, and in the light of eastern life, the murder of Abner was a foul, treacherous deed (see Trumbull, Studies in Oriental Social Life, 129-31).

Joab opposed the census probably because it was an innovation. His rebuke of David's great grief over Absalom's death can only be characterized as just; he is the stern warrior who, after being once merciful and forgiving, will not again spare a deceitful rebel; and yet David shows how a father's conduct toward a prodigal, rebellious son is not regulated by stern justice. Joab's unswerving loyalty to David leads one to believe that no disloyalty was meant by his support of Adonijah, who was really the rightful heir to the throne. But their plans were defeated by those of the harem, and Joab had to pay the price with his life.

Taken as a whole, his life, as depicted in the very reliable narrative of 2Sa and 1 Ki, may be said to be as characteristic of the times as that of David himself, with a truly Homeric ring about it. He was a great man, great in military prowess and also in personal revenge, in his loyalty to the king as well as in his stern rebuke of his royal master. He was the greatest of David's generals, and the latter's success and glory owed much to this noblest of that noble trio whom Zeruiah bore.

(2) A Judahite, father or founder of Ge-harashim (1Ch 4:14, "valley of craftsmen" the Revised Version margin).

See GE-HARASHIM.

(3) A family of returned exiles (Ezr 2:6 parallel Ne 7:11; Ezr 8:9; RAPC 1Es 8:35).

(4) See ATROTH-BETH-JOAB.

David Francis Roberts

JOACHAZ

jo'-a-kaz (Iochaz, Iechonias): Son of Josiah (1 Esdras 1:34). In Mt 1:11 "Jechoniah" is the reading.

JOACIM

jo'-a-sim.

See JOAKIM.

JOADANUS

jo-a-da’-nus (Ioadanos: In 1 Esdras 9:19, apparently, through some corruption; the same as Gedaliah, a son of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, in Ezr 10:18.

JOAH

jo’-a (yo’ach, "Yahweh is brother"):

(1) Son of Asaph and recorder under King Hezekiah (2Ki 18:18,26; Isa 36:3,11,22); he was one of the 3 officers sent by the king to speak to the Assyrian envoys at the siege of Jerusalem (circa 701 BC).

(2) In 1Ch 6:21 (Hebrew 6); 2Ch 29:12, a Levite (son of Zimmah) =" Ethan" of 1Ch 6:42 (Hebrew 27).

(3) a son of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:4).

(4) Son of Joahaz and recorder under King Josiah (2Ch 34:8).

JOAHAZ

jo’-a-haz (yo’-achaz, "Yahweh has grasped" =" Jehoahaz"):

(1) Father of JOAH (4) (2Ch 34:8).

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) and Hebrew in 2Ki 14:1 for Jehoahaz, king of Israel.

See JEHOAHAZ.

(3) the Revised Version (British and American) and Hebrew in 2Ch 36:2,4 for JEHOAHAZ, king of Judah (which see).

JOAKIM

jo’-a-kim (Ioakeim; the King James Version Joacim):

(1) Jehoiakim, king of Judah and Jerusalem (1 Esdras 1:37-39; Baruch 1:3).

(2) Jehoiachin, son of (1) (1 Esdras 1:43).

(3) Son of Jeshua (1 Esdras 5:5), called by mistake son of Zerubbabel; in Ne 12:10,26 his name occurs as in 1 Esdras, among the priests and Levitea who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel.

(4) High priest of Jerusalem in the time of Baruch (Baruch 1:7).

(5) High priest in Jerusalem in the days of Judith who, along with "the ancients of the children of Israel," welcomed the heroine back to the city after the death of Holofernes (Judith 4). He cannot be identified with any of the high priests in the lists given in 1 Chronicles or in Josephus, Ant, X, viii, 6. The word means "the Lord hath set up." It is probably symbolical, and tends with other names occurring in the narrative to establish the supposition that the book was a work of imagination composed to support the faith of the Jews in times of stress and difficulty.

(6) The husband of Susanna (Susanna verses 1 ff), perhaps here also a symbolical name.

J. Hutchison

JOANAN

jo-a’-nan (Westcott-Hort, Greek New Testament, Ioanan; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Ioanna; the King James Version, Joanna):

(1) A grandson of Zerubbabel in the genealogy of Jesus according to Luke (3:27).

(2) The son of Eliasib (1 Esdras 9:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Jonas").

JOANNA

jo-an’-a (Ioana, or Ioanna): The wife of Chuzas, Herod’s steward. She was one of the "women who had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities" which "ministered unto him (King James Version, i.e. Jesus, or "them" the Revised Version (British and American), i.e. Jesus and His disciples) of their substance," on the occasion of Jesus’ tour through Galilee (Lu 8:2,3). Along with other women she accompanied Jesus on His last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and was present when His body was laid in the sepulcher (Lu 23:55). She was thus among those who prepared spices and ointments, who found the grave empty, and who "told these things unto the apostles" (Lu 23:56-24:10).

C. M. Kerr

JOANNES

jo-an’-es, jo-an’-ez (Ioannes; the King James Version, Johannes):

(1) Son of Acatan (1 Esdras 8:38), called also "Johanan" in Ezr 8:12.

(2) Son of Bebai (1 Esdras 9:29), called "Jehohanan" in Ezr 10:28.

JOARIB

jo’-a-rib (Ioarib; the King James Version Jarib): Ancestor of Mattathias (1 Macc 14:29), given as "Joarib" in the King James Version of 1 Macc 2:1; he was chief of the first of the 24 courses of priests in the reign of David. Varieties of the name are Jarib, Joarib, and Jehoiarib (1Ch 24:7).

JOASH (1)

jo’-ash (yo’ash, "Yahweh is strong" or "Yahweh has bestowed"; Ioas):

(1) Father of Gideon, of the clan of Abiezer and the tribe Manasseh (Jud 6:11,29,30,31; 7:14; 8:13,19,32). Gideon declares (Jud 6:15) that the family is the poorest in Manasseh, words similar to those of Saul (1Sa 9:21), and not to be taken too literally. Joash would be a man of standing and wealth, for Gideon was able to command 10 servants to destroy the altar and the Asherah (Jud 6:27,34), and also to summon the whole clan to follow him. Further, the altar that Joash had was that used by the community (Jud 6:28), so that he would be the priest, not only of his own family qua paterfamilias, but also of the community in virtue of his position as chief. When Gideon destroyed the altar and the Asherah or sacred pillar by it, Joash refused to deliver his son to death, declaring that Baal, if he was a god, should avenge himself (compare Elijah in 1Ki 18).

(2) Called "the king’s son" (1Ki 22:26; 2Ch 18:25; compare Jer 36:26; 38:6), or, less probably, "the son of Hammelech," the Revised Version margin; perhaps a son of Ahab. Micaiah the prophet was handed over to his custody and that of Amon by Ahab.

(3) A Judahite, descendant of Shelah (1Ch 4:22).

(4) A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag. Commentators read here, "Joash the son of Shemaiah (or Jehoshamai), the Gibeathite" (1Ch 12:3).

(5) In 2Ki 11:2, etc. = Jehoash, king of Judah.

(6) In 2Ki 13:9, etc. = Jehoash, king of Northern Israel.

David Francis Roberts

JOASH (2)

(yo‘ash, "Yahweh has aided"):

(1) A Benjamite, or, more probably, a Zebulunite (1Ch 7:8).

(2) One of David’s officers; Joash was "over the cellars of oil" (1Ch 27:28).

JOATHAM

jo’-a-tham (Ioatham): the King James Version for the Revised Version (British and American) "Jotham" (Mt 1:9).

See JOTHAM (the king).

JOB

job (’iyobh, meaning of name doubtful; some conjecturing "object of enmity," others "he who turns," etc., to God; both uncertain guesses; Iob): The titular hero of the Book of Job, represented as a wealthy and pious land-holder who lived in patriarchal times, or at least conditions, in the land of Uz, on the borders of Idumea. Outside of the Book of Job he is mentioned by Ezekiel (Eze 14:14,20) as one of 3 great personages whose representative righteousness would presumably avail, if that of any individuals could, to redeem the nation; the other two being Noah, an ancient patriarch, and Daniel, a contemporary of the prophet. It is difficult to determine whether Job was an actual personage or not. If known through legend, it must have been on account of some such experience as is narrated in the book, an experience unique enough to have become a potent household word; still, the power and influence of it is due to the masterly vigor and exposition of the story. It was the Job of literature, rather than the Job of legend, who lived in the hearts of men; a character so commanding that, albeit fictitious, it could be referred to as real, just as we refer to Hamlet or Othello. It is not the way of Hebrew writers, however, to evolve literary heroes from pure imagination; they crave an authentic basis of fact. It is probable that such a basis, in its essential outlines, existed under the story of Job. It is not necessary to suppose, however, that the legend or the name was known to Israel from ancient times. Job is introduced (Job 1:1) as if he had not been known before. The writer, who throughout the book shows a wide acquaintance with the world, doubtless found the legend somewhere, and drew its meanings together for an undying message to his and all times.

John Franklin Genung

JOB, BOOK OF

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Place in the Canon

2. Rank and Readers

II. THE LITERARY FRAMEWORK

1. Setting of Time, Place and Scene

2. Characters and Personality

3. Form and Style

III. THE COURSE OF THE STORY

A) To Job’s Blessing and Curse

1. His "Autumn Days"

2. The Wager in Heaven

3. The Silent Friends

4. Whose Way Is Hid

B) To Job’s Ultimatum of Protest

1. The Veiled Impeachment

2. Wisdom Insipid, Friends Doubtful

3. Crookedness of the Order of Things

4. No Mediation in Sight

C) To Job’s Ultimatum of Faith

1. Detecting the Friends’ False Note

2. Staking Everything on Integrity

3. "If a Man Die"

4. The Surviving Next of Kin

D) To Job’s Verdict on Things as They Are

1. Climax and Subsidence of the Friends’ Charge

2. The Real Cause of Job’s Dismay

3. Manhood in the Ore

4. Job Reads His Indictment

E) The Denouement

1. The Self-constituted Interpreter

2. The Whirlwind and the Voice

3. The Thing That Is Right

4. The Restored Situation

IV. THE PROBLEM AND THE PURPOSE

1. Beyond the Didactic Tether

2. What Comes of Limiting the Purpose

3. The Book’s Own Import of Purpose

4. Problem of the Intrinsic Man

V. CONSIDERATIONS OF AGE AND SETTING

1. Shadowy Contacts with History

2. Place in Biblical Literature

3. Parallels and Echoes

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

1. Place in the Canon:

The greatest production of the Hebrew Wisdom literature, and one of the supreme literary creations of the world. Its place in the Hebrew Canon corresponds to the high estimation in which it was held; it stands in the 3rd section, the "writings" (kethubhim) or Hagiographa, next after the two great anthologies Psalms and Proverbs; apparently put thus near the head of the list for weighty reading and meditation. In the Greek Canon (which ours follows), it is put with the poetical books, standing at their head. It is one of 3 Scripture books, the others being Psalms and Proverbs, for which the later Hebrew scholars (the Massoretes) employed a special system of punctuation to mark its poetic character.

2. Rank and Readers:

The Book of Job was not one of the books designated for public reading in the synagogues, as were the Pentateuch and the Prophets, or for occasional reading at feast seasons, as were the 5 megilloth or rolls. It was rather a book for private reading, and one whose subject-matter would appeal especially to the more cultivated and thoughtful classes. Doubtless it was all the more intimately valued for this detachment from sanctuary associations; it was, like Proverbs, a people’s book; and especially among the cultivators of Wisdom it must have been from its first publication a cherished classic. At any rate, the patriarch Job (though whether from the legend or from the finished book is not clear; see JOB) is mentioned as a well-known national type by Eze 14:14,20; and James, writing to Jewish Christians (5:11), refers to the character of patriarch as familiar to his readers. It was as one of the great classic stories of their literature, rather than as embodying a ritual or prophetic standard, that it was so universally known and cherished.

II. The Literary Framework.

In view of the numerous critical questions by which the interpretation of the book has been beclouded—questions of later alterations, additions, corruptions, dislocations—it may be well to say at the outset that what is here proposed is to consider the Book of Job as we have it before us today, in its latest and presumably definitive edition. It will be time enough to remove excrescences when a fair view of the book as it is, with its literary values and relations, makes us sure that there are such; see III, below. Meanwhile, as a book that has reached a stage so fixed and finished that at any rate modern tinkering cannot materially change it, we may consider what its literary framework does to justify itself. And first of all, we may note that preeminently among Scripture books it bears the matured literary stamp; both in style and structure it is a work, not only of spiritual edification, but of finished literary article This may best be realized, perhaps, by taking it, as from the beginning it purports to be, as a continuously maintained story, with the consistent elements of plot, character scheme, and narrative movement which we naturally associate with a work of the narrator’s article

1. Setting of Time, Place and Scene:

The story of the Book of Job is laid in the far-off patriarchal age, such a time as we find elsewhere represented only in the Book of Genesis; a time long before the Israelite state, with its religious, social and political organization, existed. Its place is "the land of Uz," a little-known region Southeast of Palestine, on the borders of Edom; a place remote from the ways of thinking peculiar to Israelite lawgivers, priests and prophets. Its scene is in the free open country, among mountains, wadies, pasture-lands, and rural towns, where the relations of man and man are more elemental and primitive, and where the things of God are more intimately apprehended than in the complex affairs of city and state. It is easy to see what the writer gains by such a choice of setting. The patriarchal conditions, wherein the family is the social and communal unit, enable him to portray worship and conduct in their primal elements: religious rites of the simplest nature, with the family head the unchallenged priest and intercessor (compare Job 1:4,5; 42:8), and without the austere exactions of sanctuary or temple; to represent God, as in the old folk-stories, as communicating with men in audible voice and in tempest; and to give to the patriarch or sheikh a function of counsel and succor in the community analogous to that of the later wise man or sage (compare Job 29). The place outside the bounds of Palestine enables him to give an international or rather intercommunal tissue to his thought, as befits the character of the wisdom with which he is dealing, a strain of truth which Israel could and did share with neighbor nations. This is made further evident by the fact that in the discourses of the book, the designation of God is not Yahweh (with one exception, Job 12:9), but ‘Elohim or ‘Eloah or Shaddai, appellatives rather than names, common to the Semitic peoples. The whole archaic scene serves to detach the story from complex conditions of civilization, and enables the writer to deal with the inherent and intrinsic elements of manhood.

2. Characters and Personality:

All the characters of the story, Job included, are from non-Palestinian regions. The chief spokes-man of the friends, Eliphaz, who is from Teman, is perhaps intended to represent a type of the standard and orthodox wisdom of the day; Teman, and Edom in general being famed for wisdom (Jer 49:7; Obadiah 1:8,9). The characters of the friends, while representing in general a remarkable uniformity of tenet, are quite aptly individualized: Eliphaz as a venerable and devout sage who, with his eminent penetrativeness of insight, combines a yearning compassion; Bildad more as a scholar versed in the derived lore of tradition; and Zophar more impetuous and dogmatic, with the dogmatist’s vein of intolerance. In Elihu, the young Aramean who speaks after the others, the writer seems endeavoring to portray a young man’s positiveness and absoluteness of conviction, and with it a self-conceit that quite outruns his ability. The Satan of the Prologue, who makes the wager with Yahweh, is masterfully individualized, not as the malignant tempter and enemy of mankind, but as a spirit compact of impudent skepticism, who can appreciate no motive beyond self-advantage. Even the wife of Job, with her peremptory disposition to make his affliction a personal issue with God, is not without an authentic touch of the elemental feminine. But high above them all is the character of Job himself, which, with all its stormy alternations of mood, range of assertion and remonstrance and growth of new conviction, remains absolutely consistent with itself. Nor can we leave unmentioned what is perhaps the hardest achievement of all, the sublime venture of giving the very words of God, in such a way that He speaks no word out of character nor measures His thought according to the standards of men.

3. Form and Style:

The Prologue, Job 1 and 2, a few verses at the beginning of chapter 32 (verses 1-6a), and the Epilogue (42:7-17) are written in narrative prose. The rest of the book (except the short sentences introducing the speakers) is in poetry; a poetic tissue conforming to the type of the later mashal (see under PROVERB), which, in continuous series of couplets, is admirably adapted alike to imaginative sublimity and impassioned address. Beginning with Job's curse of his day (Job 3), Job and his three friends answer each other back and forth in three rounds of speeches, complete except that, for reasons which the subject makes apparent, Zophar, the third friend, fails to speak the third time. After the friends are thus put to silence, Job speaks three times in succession (Job 26:1-31:40), and then "the words of Job are ended." At this point (Job 32) a fourth speaker, Elihu, hitherto unmentioned, is introduced and speaks four times, when he abruptly ceases in terror at an approaching whirlwind (37:24). Yahweh speaks from the whirlwind, two speeches, each of which Job answers briefly (40:3-5; 42:1-6), or rather declines to answer. Such, which we may summarize in Prologue (Job 1; 2), Body of Discussion (3-42:6), and Epilogue (42:7-17), is the literary framework of the book. The substance of the book is in a way dramatic; it cannot, however, be called so truly a drama as a kind of forum of debate; its movement is too rigid for dramatic action, and it lacks besides the give-and-take of dialogue. In a book of mine published some years ago I ventured to call it "the Epic of the Inner Life," epic not so much in the technical sense, as in recognition of an underlying epos which for fundamental significance may be compared to the story underlying the Prometheus Bound of Aeschylus. It will not do, however, to make too much of either of these forms as designating the Book of Job; either term has to be accommodated almost out of recognition, because the Hebrew literary forms were not conceived according to the Greek categories from which our terms "epic" and "dramatic" are derived. A greater limitation on our appreciation of its form, I think, is imposed by those who regard it as a mixture of forms. It is too generally divided between narrative and didactic debate. To the Hebrew mind it was all a continuous narrative, in which the poetic discussion, though overweighting the current of visualized action, had nevertheless the movement and value of real events. It is in this light, rather than in the didactic, that we may most profitably regard it.

III. The Course of the Story.

To divide the story of Job into 42 parts, according to the 42 numbered chapters, is in the last degree arbitrary. Nothing comes of it except convenience in reading for those who wish to take their Job in little detached bits. The chapter division was no part of the original, and a very insignificant step in the later apprehension of the original. To divide according to the speeches of the interlocutors is better; it helps us realize how the conflict of views brought the various phases of the thought to expression; but this too, with its tempting, three-times-three, turns out to be merely a framework; it corresponds only imperfectly with the true inwardness of the story's movement; it is rather a scheme than a continuity. We are to bear in mind that this Book of Job is fundamentally the inner experience of one man, as he rises from the depths of spiritual gloom and doubt to a majestic table-land of new insight and faith; the other characters are but ancillary, helps and foils, whose function is subordinate and relative. Hence, mindful of this inwardness of Job's experience, I have ventured to trace the story in 5 main stages, naming them according to the landing-stage attained in each.

A) To Job’s Blessing and Curse:

1. His "Autumn Days":

The story begins (Job 1:1-5) with a brief description of Job as he was before his trial began; the elements of his life, outer and inner, on which is to be raised the question of motive. A prosperous landholder of the land of Uz, distinguished far and wide as the greatest (i.e. richest) of the sons of the East, his inner character corresponds: to all appearance nothing lacking, a man "perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and turned away from evil." The typical Hebrew blessings of life were his to the full: wealth, honor, health, family. He is evidently set before us as the perfect example of the validity of the established Wisdom-tenet, that righteousness and Wisdom are identical (see under PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF), and that this is manifest in its visible rewards. This period of his life Job describes afterward by retrospect as his "autumn days," when the friendship or intimacy (coah) of God was over his tent (see 29:4, and the whole chapter). Nor are we left without a glimpse into his heart: his constant attitude of worship, and his tender solicitude lest, in their enjoyment of the pleasures of life, his sons may have been disloyal to God (Job 1:4,5). It is easy to see that not Job alone, but Wisdom as embodied in Job, is postulated here for its supreme test.

2. The Wager in Heaven:

Nor is the test delayed, or its ground ambiguous when it comes. Satan proposes it. Two scenes are given (Job 1:6-12; 2:1-6) from the court of God, wherever that is; for they are overheard by the reader, not seen, and of course neither Job nor any inhabitant of earth is aware of them. In these scenes the sons of God, the spirits who rejoiced over creation (38:7), are come together to render report, and Satan, uninvited, enters among them. He is a wandering spirit, unanchored to any allegiance, who roams through the earth, prying and criticizing. There is nothing, it would seem, in which he cannot find some flaw or discount. To Yahweh’s question if he has considered Job, the man perfect and upright, he makes no denial of the fact, but raises the issue of motive: "Doth Job fear God for nought?" and urges that Job’s integrity is after all only a transparent bargain, a paying investment with only reward in view. It is virtually an arraignment both of God’s order and of the essential human character: of God’s order in connecting righteousness so intimately with gain; and of the essential human character, virtually denying that there is such a thing as disinterested, intrinsic human virtue. The sneer strikes deep, and Job, the perfect embodiment of human virtue, is its designated victim. Satan proposes a wager, to the issue of which Yahweh commits Himself. The trial of Job is carried out in two stages: first against his property and family, with the stipulation that it is not to touch him; and then, this failing to detach him from his allegiance, against his person in sore disease, with the stipulation that his life is to be spared. Yahweh acknowledges that for once He is consenting to an injustice (2:3), and Satan, liar that he is, uses instrumentalities that men have ascribed to God alone: the first time, tempest and lightning (as well as murderous foray), the second time, the black leprosy, a fell disease, loathsome and deadly, which, in men’s minds meant the immediate punitive stroke of God. The evil is as absolute as was the reward; a complete reversal of the order in which men’s wisdom had come to trust. But in the immediate result, Yahweh’s faith in His noblest creature is vindicated. Urged by his wife in his extremity to "curse God

and die," Job remains true to his allegiance; and in his staunch utterance, "Yahweh gave, and Yahweh hath taken away; blessed be the name of Yahweh," Job, as the writer puts it, ‘sinned not, nor attributed aught unbeseeming (tiphalah, literally, "tasteless") to God.’ Such is the first onset of Job’s affliction and its result. It remains to be seen what the long issue, days and months of wretchedness, will bring forth.

3. The Silent Friends:

We are now to imagine the lapse of some time, perhaps several months (compare Job 7:3), during which Job suffers alone, an outcast from house and society, on a leper’s ash-heap. Meanwhile three friends of his who have heard of his affliction make an appointment together and come from distant regions to give him sympathy and comfort (2:11-13). On arriving, however, they find things different from what they had expected; perhaps the ominous nature of his disease has developed since they started. What they find is a man wretched and outcast, with a disease (elephantiasis) which to them can mean nothing but the immediate vengeance of God. The awful sight gives them pause. Instead of condoling with him, they sit silent and dismayed, and for seven days and nights no word is spoken (compare Isa 53:3). What they were debating with themselves during that time is betrayed by the after-course of the story. How can they bless one whom God has stamped with His curse? To do so would be taking sides with the wicked. Is it not rather their duty to side with God, and be safe, and let sympathy go? By this introduction of the friends and their averted attitude, the writer with consummate skill brings a new element into the story, the element of the Wisdom-philosophy; and time will show whether as a theoretical thing, cold and intellectual, it will retain or repress the natural outwelling of human friendship. And this silence is ominous.

4. Whose Way Is Hid:

The man who, in the first onset of trial, blessed Yahweh and set himself to bear in silence now opens his mouth to curse. His curse is directed, not against Yahweh nor against the order of things, but against the day of his birth. It is a day that has ceased to have meaning or worth for him. The day stands for life, for his individual life, a life that in the order of things should carry out the personal promise and fruitage for which it had been bestowed. And his quarrel with it is that he has lost its clue. Satan unknown to him has sneered because Yahweh had hedged him round with protection and favor (Job 1:10); but his complaint is that all this is removed without cause, and God has hedged him round with darkness. His way is hid (Job 3:23). Why then was life given at all? In all this, it will be noted, he raises no train of introspection to account for his condition; he assumes no sinfulness, nor even natural human depravity; the opposite rather, for a baffling element of his case is his shrinking sensitiveness against evil and disloyalty (compare Job 3:25,26, in which the tenses should be past, with 1:5; see also 6:30; 16:17). His plight has become sharply, poignantly objective; his inner self has no part in it. Thus in this opening speech he strikes the keynote of the real, against which the friends’ theories rage and in the end wreck themselves.

B) To Job’s Ultimatum of Protest:

1. The Veiled Impeachment:

With all the gentle regret of having to urge a disagreeable truth the friends, beginning with Eliphaz the wisest and most venerable, enter upon their theory of the case. Eliphaz covers virtually the whole ground; the others come in mainly to echo or emphasize. He veils his reproof in general and implicatory terms, the seasoned terms of wisdom in which Job himself is expert (4:3-5); reminds him that no righteous man perishes, but that men reap what they sow (4:7,8); adduces a vision that he had had which revealed to him that man, by the very fact of being mortal, is impure and iniquitous (4:17-19); implies that Job's turbulence of mind precludes him from similar revelations, and jeopardizes his soul (5:1,2); advises him to commit his case to God, with the implication, however, that it is a case needing correction rather than justification, and that the result in view is restored comfort and prosperity. As Job answers with a more passionate and detailed portrayal of his wrong, Bildad, following, abandons the indirect impeachment and attributes the children's death to their sin (8:4), saying also that if Job were pure and upright he might supplicate and regain God's favor (8:5,6). He then goes on to draw a lesson from the traditional Wisdom lore, to the effect that sure destruction awaits the wicked and sure felicity the righteous (Job 8:11-22). On Job's following this with his most positive arraignment of God's order and claim for light, Zophar replies with impetuous heat, averring that Job's punishment is less than he deserves (Job 11:6), and reproving him for his presumption in trying to find the secret of God (Job 11:7-12). All three of the friends, with increasing emphasis, end their admonitions in much the same way; promising Job reinstatement in God's favor, but always with the veiled implication that he must own to iniquity and entreat as a sinner.

2. Wisdom Insipid, Friends Doubtful:

To the general maxims of Wisdom urged against him, with which he is already familiar (compare Job 13:2), Job's objection is not that they are untrue, but that they are insipid (Job 6:6,7); they have lost their application to the case. Yet it is pain to him to think that the words of the Holy One should fail; he longs to die rather than deny them (Job 6:9,10). One poignant element of his sorrow is that the intuitive sense (tushiyah; see under PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF) is driven away from him; see Job 6:13. He is irritated by the insinuating way in which the friends beg the question of his guilt; longs for forthright and sincere words (6:25). It is this quality of their speech, in fact, which adds the bitterest drop to his cup; his friends, on whom he had counted for support, are deceitful like a dried-up brook (6:15-20); he feels, in his sick sensitiveness, that they are not sympathizing with him but using him for their cold, calculating purposes (6:27). Thus is introduced one of the most potent motives of the story, the motive of friendship; much will come of it when from the fallible friendships of earth he conquers his way by faith to a friendship in the unseen (compare 16:19; 19:27).

3. Crookedness of the Order of things:

With the sense that the old theories have become stale and pointless, though his discernment of the evil of things is undulled by sin (Job 6:30), Job arrives at an extremely poignant realization of the hardness and crookedness of the world-order, the result both of what the friends are saying and of what he has always held in common with them. It is the view that is forced upon him by the sense that he is unjustly dealt with by a God who renders no reasons, who on the score of justice vouchsafes to man neither

insight nor recourse, and whose severity is out of all proportion to man's sense of worth (7:17) or right (9:17) or claim as a creature of His hand (10:8-14). Job 9, which contains Job's direct address to this arbitrary Being, is one of the most tremendous, not to say audacious conceptions in literature; in which a mortal on the threshold of death takes upon himself to read God a lesson in godlikeness. In this part of the story Job reaches his ultimatum of protest; a protest amazingly sincere, but not blasphemous when we realize that it is made in the interest of the Godlike.

4. No Mediation in Sight:

The great lack which Job feels in his arraignment of God is the lack of mediation between Creator and creature, the Oppressor and His victim. There is no umpire between them, who might lay his hand upon both, so that the wronged one might have voice in the matter (9:32-35). The two things that an umpire might do: to remove God's afflicting hand, and to prevent God's terror from unmanning His victim (see 13:20-22, as compared with the passage just cited), are the great need to restore normal and reciprocal relations with Him whose demand of righteousness is so inexorable. This umpire or advocate idea, thus propounded negatively, will grow to a sublime positive conviction in the next stage of Job's spiritual progress (16:19; 19:25-27).)

C) To Job's Ultimatum of Faith: 1. Detecting the Friends' False Note:

As the friends finish their first round of speeches, in which a remote and arbitrary God is urged upon him as everything, and man so corrupt and blind that he cannot but be a worm and culprit (compare Job 25:4-6), Job's eyes, which hitherto have seen with theirs, are suddenly opened. His first complaint of their professed friendship was that it was fallible; instead of sticking to him when he needed them most (Job 6:14), and in spite of his bewilderment (Job 6:26), they were making it virtually an article of traffic (Job 6:27), as if it were a thing for their gain. It was not sincere, not intrinsic to their nature, but an expedient. And now all at once he penetrates to its motive. They are deserting him in order to curry favor with God. That motive has prevented them from seeing true; they see only their theoretical God, and are respecting His person instead of responding to the inner dictate of truth and integrity. To his honest heart this is monstrous; they ought to be afraid of taking falseness for God (JOb 13:3-12). Nor does his inference stop with thus detecting their false note. If they are "forgers of lies" in this respect, what of all their words of wisdom? they have been giving him "proverbs of ashes" (Job 13:12); the note of false implication is in them all. From this point therefore he pays little attention to what they say; lets them go on to grossly exaggerated statement of their tenet, while he opens a new way of faith for himself, developing the germs of insight that have come to him.

2. Staking All on Integrity:

Having cut loose from all countenancing of the friends' self-interested motives, Job now, with the desperate sense of taking his life in his hand and abandoning hope, resolves that come what will he will maintain his ways to God's face. This, as he believes, is not only the one course for his integrity, but his one plea of salvation, for no false one shall appear before him. How tremendous the meaning of this

resolve, we can think when we reflect how he has just taken God in hand to amend His supposed iniquitous order of things; and that he is now, without mediator, pleading the privilege that a mediator would secure (13:20,21; see 8, above) and urging a hearing on his own charges. The whole reach of his sublime faith is involved in this.

3. "If a Man Die":

In two directions his faith is reaching out; in both negatively at first. One, the belief in an Advocate, has already been broached, and is germinating from negative to positive. The other, the question of life after death, rises here in the same tentative way: using first the analogy of the tree which sprouts again after it is cut down (Job 14:7-9), and from it inquiring, ‘If a man die—might he live again?’ and dwelling in fervid imagination on the ideal solution which a survival of death would bring (Job 14:13-17), but returning to his reluctant negative, from the analogy of drying waters (Job 14:11) and the slow wearing down of mountains (Job 14:18,19). As yet he can treat the idea only as a fancy; not yet a hope or a grounded conviction.

4. The Surviving Next of Kin:

The conviction comes by a nobler way than fancy, by the way of his personal sense of the just and God-like order. The friends in their second round of speeches have begun their lurid portrayals of the wicked man’s awful fate; but until all have spoken again he is concerned with a far more momentous matter. Dismissing these for the present as an academic exercise composed in cold blood (Job 16:4,5), and evincing a heart hid from understanding (Job 17:4), Job goes on to recount in the most bitter terms he has yet used the flagrancy of his wrong as something that calls out for expiation like the blood of Cain (16:18), and breaks out with the conviction that his witness and voucher who will hear his prayer for mediation is on high (16:19-21). Then after Bildad in a spiteful retort has matched his complaint with a description of the calamities of the wicked (an augmented echo of Eliphaz), and he has pathetically bewailed the treachery of earthly friends (19:13,14,21,22), he mounts, as it were, at a bound to the sublime ultimatum of his faith in an utterance which he would fain see engraved on the rock forever (19:23-29). "I know that my Redeemer liveth," he exclaims; literally, my Go’el (go’ali), or next of kin, the person whose business in the old Hebrew idea was to maintain the rights of an innocent wronged one and avenge his blood. He does not recede from the idea that his wrong is from God (compare 19:6,21); but over his dust stands his next of kin, and as the result of this one’s intercession Job, in his own integral person, shall see God no more a stranger. So confident is he that he solemnly warns the friends who have falsely impeached him that it is they, not he, who are in peril (19:28,29; compare 13:10,11).

D) To Job’s Verdict on Things as They Are:

1. Climax and Subsidence of the Friends’ Charge:

That in this conviction of a living Redeemer Job’s faith has reached firm and final ground is evident from the fact that he does not recur to his old doubts at all. They are settled, and settled right. But now,

leaving them, he can attend to what the friends have been saying. Zophar, the third speaker, following, presses to vehement, extreme their iterated portrayal of the wicked man's terrific woes; it seems the design of the writer to make them outdo themselves in frantic overstatement of their thesis. As Zophar ceases, and Job has thus, as it were, drawn all their fire, Job refutes them squarely, as we shall presently see. Meanwhile, in the course of his extended refutation, the friends begin a third round of speeches. Eliphaz, who has already taken alarm at the tendency of Job's words, as those of a depraved skeptic and ruinous to devotion (15:4-6), now in the interests of his orthodoxy brings in his bill of particulars. It is the kind of theoretical cant that has had large prevalence in dogmatic religion, but in Job's case atrociously false. He accuses Job of the most heartless cruelties and frauds (22:5-11), and of taking occasion to indulge in secret wickedness when God was not looking (22:12-14); to this it is that he attributes the spiritual darkness with which Job is encompassed. Then in a beautiful exhortation—beautiful when we forget its unreal condition (22:23)—he ends by holding open to Job The way of reinstatement and peace. This is the last word of the friends that has any weight. Bildad follows Job's next speech indeed very briefly (Job 25), giving a last feeble echo of their doctrine of total depravity; a reply which Job ridicules and carries on in a kind of parody (Job 26). Zophar does not speak a third time at all. He has nothing to say. And this silence of his is the writer's way of making the friends' theory subside ingloriously.

2. The Real Cause of Job's Dismay:

The idea that Job has a defensible cause or sees farther than they is wholly lost on the friends; to them he is simply a wicked man tormented by the consciousness of guilt, and they attribute the tumult of his thoughts to a wrath, or vexation, which blinds and imperils his soul (compare 5:2; 18:4). That is not the cause of his dismay at all, nor is it merely that his personal fate is inscrutable (compare 23:17 margin). He is confounded rather, even to horror, because the probable facts of the world-order prove the utter falsity of all that they allege. Leaving his case, the righteous man's, out of the account, he sees the wicked just as prosperous, just as secure, just as honored in life and death, as the righteous (21:5-15,29-33). The friends ought to see so plain a fact as well as he (21:29). To all outward appearance there is absolutely no diversity of fate between righteous and wicked (21:23-26). The friends' cut-and-dried Wisdom-doctrine and their thrifty haste to justify God (compare 13:7,8) have landed them in a lie; the truth is that God has left His times mysterious to men (24:1). They may as well own to the full the baffling fact of the impunity of wickedness; the whole of Job 24 is taken up with details of it. Wisdom, with its rigid law of reward and punishment, has failed to penetrate the secret. A hard regime of justice, work and wage, conduct and desert, does not sound the deep truth of God's dealings, either with righteous or wicked. What then? Shall Wisdom go, or shall it rise to a higher level of outlook and insight?

3. Manhood in the Ore:

In some such dim inquiry as this, it would seem, Job goes on from where his friends sit silenced to figure some positive solution of things as they are. He begins with himself and his steadfastly held integrity, sealing his utterance by the solemn Hebrew oath (27:2-6), and as solemnly disavowing all part or sympathy with the wicked (27:7; compare 21:16). He has already found a meaning in his own

searching experience; he is being tried for a sublime assay, in which all that is permanent and precious in him shall come out as gold (23:10). But this thought of manhood in the ore is no monopoly of his; it may hold for all. What then of the wicked? In a passage which some have deemed the lost third speech of Zophar (27:8-23), and which, indeed, recounts what all the friends have seen (27:12), he sets forth the case of the wicked in its true light. The gist of it is that the wicked have not the joy of God (27:10), or the peace of a permanent hope. It is in much the same tone as the friends' diatribes, but with a distinct advance from outward disaster toward tendency and futility. The ore is not being purged for a noble assay; and this will work their woe. Then finally, in the celebrated Job 28, comes up the summary of wisdom itself. That remains, after all this testing of motive, a thing intact and elemental; and man's part in it is just what Job's life has been, to fear God and shun evil (28:28).

4. Job Reads His Indictment:

As the crowning pronouncement on things as they are, Job in his final and longest speech, describes in a beautiful retrospect his past life, from his "autumn days" when the friendship of God was over his tent and he was a counselor and benefactor among men (Job 29), through this contrasted time of his wretchedness and curse-betraying disease, when the most degraded despise him (Job 30), until now as he draws consciously near the grave, he recounts in solemn review the principles and virtues that have guided his conduct—a noble summary of the highest Hebrew ideals of character (Job 31). This he calls, in sublime irony, the indictment which his Adversary has written; and like a prince, bearing it upon his shoulder and binding it to him like a crown, he is ready to take it with him beyond the bourn to the presence of his Judge. With this tremendous proposal, sanctioned Hebrew-fashion by a final curse if it prove false, the words of Job are ended.

E) The Denoucement:

The friends are silenced, not enlightened. They have clung to their hard thesis to the stubborn end; postulating enough overt crime on Job's part to kill him (Job 22:5-9), and clinching their hypothesis with their theory of innate depravity (Job 4:18,19; 15:14,15; 25:4-6) and spiritual hebetude (Job 5:2; 15:26,27; 22:10,11); but toward Job's higher level of honest integrity and exploring faith they have not advanced one inch; and here they lie, fossilized dogmatists, fixed and inveterate in their odium theologicum—a far cry from the friendship that came from afar to condole and console. Job, on the other hand, staking all on the issue of his integrity, has held on his way in sturdy consistency (compare 17:9), and stood his ground before the enigma of things as they are. Both parties have said their say; the story is evidently ready for its denouement. Job, too, is ready for the determining word, though it would seem he expects it to be spoken only in some unseen tribunal; the friends rather savagely wish that God would speak and reprove Job for his presumption (compare 11:5,11). But how shall the solution be brought about in this land of Uz where all may see? And above all, how shall it affect the parties concerned? A skillfully told story should not leave this out.

1. The Self-constituted Interpreter:

For this determining pronouncement the writer has chosen to have both parties definitely represented, apparently at their best. So, instead of proceeding at once to the summons from the whirlwind, he introduces here a new character, Elihu, a young man, who has listened with growing impatience to the fruitless discussion, and now must set both parties right or burst (Job 32:19). It is like the infusion of young blood into a theodicy too arrogant in its antiquity (compare Job 8:8-10; 15:10,18; 12:12 margin, or better as question). This character of Elihu is conceived in a spirit of satire, not without a dash of grim humor. His self-confidence, not to say conceit, is strongly accentuated (Job 32:11-22); he assumes the umpire function for which Job has pleaded (33:6,7; compare 9:33-35; 13:20-22); and is sure he represents the perfect in knowledge (36:2-4; 37:16). He speaks four times, addressing himself alternately to Job and the friends. His words, though designedly diffuse, are not without wisdom and beauty; he makes less of Job's deep-seated iniquity than do the friends, but blames him for speaking in the wicked man's idiom (34:7-9,36,37), and warns him against inclining more to iniquity than submission (36:21); but his positive contribution to the discussion is the view he holds of the chastening influence of dreams and visions (33:14-18; compare 7:13-15), and of the pains of disease (33:19-28), especially if the sufferer has an "angel (messenger) interpreter" to reveal its meaning, such a one perhaps as Elihu feels himself to be. As he proceeds in his speech, his words indicate that a storm is rising; and so long as it is distant he employs it to descant on the wonders of God in Nature, wonders which to him mean little more than arbitrary marvels of power; but as it approaches nearer and shows exceptional phenomena as of a theophany, his words become incoherent, and he breaks off with an abject attempt to disclaim his pretensions. Such is the effect, with him, of the near presence of God. It overwhelms, paralyzes, stops the presumptuous currents of life.

2. The Whirlwind and the Voice:

The writer of the book has not committed the literary fatuity of describing the whirlwind, except as Elihu has seen its oncoming, first with conceit of knowledge, then with wild access of terror—a description in which his essentially vapid personality is reflected. For the readers the significance of the whirlwind is in the Voice it encloses, the thing it says. And here the writer has undertaken the most tremendous task ever attempted by the human imagination: to make the Almighty speak, and speak in character. And one fatuity at least he has escaped; he has not made God bandy arguments with men, or piece together the shifting premises of logic. The whole of the two discourses from the whirlwind is descriptive; a recounting of observable phenomena of created nature, from the great elemental things, earth and sea and light and star and storm, to the varied wonders of animal nature—all things in which the questing mind of man may share, laying hold in his degree on its meaning or mystery. Thus, as a sheer literary personation, it fails at no point of the Godlike. It begins with a peremptory dismissal of Elihu: "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?" (Job 38:2). Then Job is bidden gird up his loins like a strong man, and listen and answer. The fact that Job alone, of all the company, can stand, as it were, on common terms with God is premonitory of the outcome. Of the two Divine discourses, the first (Job 38; 39) emphasizes more especially the unsearchable wisdom of creation; and the lesson it brings home to Job is that a being who is great enough—or presumptuous enough—to criticize and censure is great enough to resolve his own criticism (40:2). To this, of course, Job has no answer; he has presented his plea, which he neither adds to nor takes back (40:3-5). Resuming, then, the Voice in the second discourse (40:6-41:34) goes on to describe two great beasts, as

it were, elemental monsters of Nature: Behemoth—probably the hippopotamus—vast in resisting and overcoming power, yet unaware of it, and easily subduable by man; and Leviathan—probably the crocodile—a wonder of beautiful adaptedness to its function in Nature, yet utterly malignant, unsubduable, untamable. And the lesson brought home to Job by this strange distribution of creative power is that he, who has called in question God's right to work as He does, had better undertake to lower human pride and "tread down the wicked where they stand" (40:12), thus demonstrating his ability to save himself and manage mankind (40:14). By this illuminating thought Job's trenchancy of demand is utterly melted away into contrition and penitence (42:1-6); but one inspiring effect is his, the thing indeed which he has persistently sought (compare 23:3): God is no more a hearsay, such as the friends have defended and his Wisdom has speculated about; his eye sees Him here on earth, and in his still unremoved affliction, no stranger, but a wise and communable Friend, just as his confident faith had pictured he would, in some embodied sphere beyond suffering (19:27).

3. The Thing That Is Right:

Two of the parties in the story have met the august theophany, and it has wrought its effect on them according to the spirit of the man. The self-constituted interpreter, Elihu, has collapsed as suddenly as he swelled up and exhibited himself. The man of integrity, Job, has reached the beatific goal of his quest. What now of the friends who came from far to confirm their Wisdom, and who were so sure they were defending the mind of God? they are not left without a sufficing word, addressed straight to their spokesman Eliphaz (Job 42:7); but their way to light is through the man whose honesty they outraged. Eliphaz' closing words had promised mediatorial power to Job if he would return from iniquity and acquaint himself with God (22:30); Job is now the mediator, though he has held consistently to the terms they reprobated. And the Divine verdict on them is: "Ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath" (42:7). These are the words of the Being who acknowledged that in permitting this whole trial He was 'swallowing Job up causelessly' (2:3). Job's honest and immensely revelatory words, anger, remonstrance, bold arraignment of God's way and all, were "the thing that is right." There is no more tremendous Divine pronouncement in all Scripture than this.

4. The Restored Situation:

Here certain myopic students of the Book of Job think the story should end. It offends them, apparently, to see Satan's work undone; if they had had the making of the story they would have left Job still suffering, as if disinterested virtue could not be its own reward without it. The author, at least the final author, evidently did not think so; in the ideals and sanctions that prevailed in his age he knew better what he was about. It is not my business to cut the book to modern pattern, but to note what is there. Job is restored to health, to double his former wealth, to family and honor and a ripe old age. These were what the friends predicted for him on condition of his owning to guilt and calling injustice desert; but in no word of his has he intimated that worldly reinstatement was his wish or his object, the contrary rather. And what he sought he obtained, in richer measure than he sought; obtained it still in suffering, and on earth, "in the place where may see" (compare 34:26 margin). It is no discount to the value of this, nor on the other hand is it an essential addition, to express it not only in spiritual terms, but in terms current among men. And one fundamental thing this restored situation shows, or at least takes for

granted, namely, that the quarrel has not been with Wisdom itself, its essence or its sanctions, but only with its encroaching false motive. Deepened, not invaded, its Newtonian law that it is well with the righteous, ill with the wicked, remains intact, an external sanction to live by, in spite of temporal exceptions. A spiritual principle of great significance, too, seems to be indicated, as it were, furtively, in the words, "And Yahweh turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends." He had stood on his integrity demanding his right, and became a self-loathing penitent; out of dust and ashes he prayed for his friends, and became again such a power in health and wealth as he had been in his "autumn days."

IV. The Problem and the Purpose.

1. Beyond the Didactic Tether:

If the foregoing section has rightly shown that the main thrust and interest of the Book of Job lies not in its debate but in its narrative, we have therein the best clue to its problem and its purpose. The sublime self-portrayal of a man who held fast his integrity against God and man and death and darkness tells its own story and teaches its own lesson, beyond the power of didactic propositions or deductions to compass. The book is not a sermon but a vital, throbbing uprising of the human spirit. It is warm with the life of sound manhood; the inner life with its hopes, its doubts, its convictions, its supreme affiance; to impose on this any tether of didacticism is to chili its spirit and make it dogmatic and academic. The reading of its problem which mainly holds the field today is expressed in the question, "Why does God afflict the righteous?" and so the book is resolved into a theodicy, a justification of God’s ways with man. Well the friends of Job do their best to make their interpretation a theodicy, even outraging palpable fact to do it; they monopolize the didactic element of the poem; but their chief contention is that God does not afflict the righteous but the wicked, and that Job is a flagrant case in point who adds rebellion to his sin (compare 34:37). Job does not know why God afflicts the righteous; he only knows that it is a grievous fact, which to him seems utterly un-Godlike. God knows, undoubtedly, but He does not tell. Yet all the while an answer to the question is shaping itself in personality, in intrinsic manhood, in the sturdy truth and loyalty of Job’s spirit. So, going beyond the didactic tether, we may say that in a deeper sense God is justified after all; if such a result of desperate trial is possible in man, it is worth all the rigor of the experiment. But it is as truly an anthropodicy (excuse the word!) as a theodicy; it puts the essential man on a plane above all that Satan can prove by his lying sneers of self-interest, or the friends’ poisoning of the wells by their theory of natural depravity. It comes back after all to the story of Job; he lives the answer to the problem, his personality is the teaching.

2. What Comes of Limiting the Purpose:

It is from this point of view that we can best judge of the critical attacks that have been made on the structure and coherence of the Book of Job. The book has suffered its full share of negative disintegration at the hands of the critics; mostly subjective it seems to me, coming from a too restricted view of its problem and purpose, or from lack of that long patient induction which will not be content until it sees all the elements of its creative idea in fitting order and proportion. To limit the purpose to

the issue of a debated theodicy, is to put some parts in precarious tenure; accordingly, there are those to whom the Epilogue seems a superfluity, the Prologue an afterthought, Job 28 a fugitive poem put in to fill up—not to go on to still more radical excisions. On the score of regularity of structure, too, this limitation of design has had equally grave results. Elihu has perhaps fared the worst. He must go, the critics almost universally say, because forsooth he was not formally introduced in the Prologue; and naturally enough, as soon as he has received notice to quit, the language which in one view fits him so dramatically to his part begins to bristle with Aramaisms (‘of the kindred of Ram,’ 32:2) and strange locutions, the alleged marks of a later bungling hand. Then, further, Zophar must needs round out the mechanical three-times-three of structure by coming up the third time; accordingly, Job is levied upon to contribute some of his words (27:13-23) to help him out. I need not go into further detail. The foregoing section has done something, I hope, to justify my conviction that the book has a homogeneous design and structure just as it is. Whatever its vicissitudes since the first draft was made, it may turn out after all that the last edition is the best.

3. The Book’s Own Import of Purpose:

We are not left in the dark as to the large purpose of the Book of Job, if we will follow its own indications consistently. Satan’s question at the beginning, "Doth Job fear God for nought?" sets us on the track of it. To give that question a Godlike and not a Satanic answer, to prove in the person of Job That man has it in him to make his life an unbought loyalty to the Divine, is a purpose large enough to include many subsidiary purposes. But behind this appears, on the part of the author, a purpose which relates his story intimately to the intellectual tendencies of his day. The book embodies, especially in theories of the friends, a searching epitome of the status to which the wisdom philosophy of his time had arrived. That philosophy was a nobly founded theory of life; Job himself had been and continued (compare 28:28) thoroughly at one with it. Soundly identified with righteousness and piety, Wisdom had in religious idiom defined the elements of right and wrong living, and had in no uncertain terms fixed its sanctions of reward and penalty. But from a warm, pulsating life it had become an orthodoxy. Its rigid world had room for only two classes of men: the righteous, bound for the sure rewards of life; the wicked, bound for sure failure and destruction. It brooked no real exception to this austere law of being. But two grave evils were invading its system. One was its hard blindness to facts, or, what is as bad, its determination at all hazards to explain them away. From the psalms of the period (compare e.g. Psalms 37; 49; 73) we can see how the evident happiness and prosperity of the wicked was troubling devout minds. The other was that under this prevailing philosophy life was becoming too cold-blooded and calculable a thing, a virtual feeder of self-interest. The doubt lay very near whether conduct so sanctioned was a thing intrinsic and sincere or a thing bought and sold. This equivocal state of things could not long endure. Sooner or later Satan’s question of motive must stab it to the heart; and we may be sure that to the author of the book the impulse to ask the question was not all Satanic. The interests of true wisdom, no less than of skepticism, demanded that the question of inner motive be raised and solved. Nay, Yahweh Himself, whom Satan mocked as abettor of the situation, was on trial. Have we not material here, then, for a sublime purpose, a mighty epic of test and trial and victory? Out of it, not Job alone, but Wisdom must emerge purified, enlightened, spiritualized.

4. Problem of the Intrinsic Man:

So much for the purpose of the book. The problem corresponds to it. If we take it as the baffling problem of suffering, or more specifically why God afflicts the righteous, the sufficing answer is, Job is why. To give such essential integrity as his its ultimate proof and occasion is worth the injustice and the unmerited pain. In other words, the problem is more deeply concerned with man's intrinsic nature than with God's mysterious dealings. When God created man in His own image, did He endow him most fundamentally with the spirit of commercialism, or with the spirit of unbought loyalty to the Godlike? And when created man was made fallible and mortal, did that mean an inescapable inherent depravity, or was the potency of noblest manhood still left at the center of his being? Here again Job is the embodied answer. The friends, veritable Calvinists before Calvin, urge depravity; they would exalt God by making man His utter contrast. But Job's stedfast integrity proves that man, one man at least, is at heart sound and true. And if one man, then the potency of soundness exists in manhood. The book is indeed a theodicy; but still more truly it is a boldly maintained anthropodicy, a vindication of the intrinsic worth of man.

V. Considerations of Age and Setting.

1. Shadowy Contacts with History:

The questions who was the personal author of the Book of Job, and what was its age, are at best only a matter of conjecture; and my revised conjecture, arrived at since I wrote my Epic of the Inner Life, must go for what it is worth. It seems to me much better to regard a story so homogeneous and interrelated as in the main the composition of one mind than to distribute it, as some critics do, among various authors, supplementers, and editors. As to its age, there is so little identifiable contact with political or ecclesiastical history that its composition has been ascribed to many periods, from the time of Abraham to late in post-exilic times. The fact that its scene is laid in the patriarchal past and in a land outside of Palestine indicates the author's design to dissociate it from contemporary events and conditions; such contact with these as exist, therefore, must be read between the lines. The book does not hold with full consistency to patriarchal conditions. Job's friends appeal with the complacency of wisdom-prospered men to the ancient tenure of the land (15:19); and yet, as Job complains, the heartless greed of the landholding class in removing landmarks and oppressing the poor (24:2-12) connotes the prevalence of such outrages as were denounced by Isaiah and Micah before the Assyrian crisis. Such evils would not decrease under Manasseh and Jehoiakim, and might well be portrayed in reminiscence by an exilic writer. On the top of this consideration may be cited the most definite reference to a historical event that the book contains: the passage Job 12:17-25, which vividly describes, by an eyewitness ("Lo, mine eye hath seen all this," 13:1), a wholesale deportation and humiliation of eminent persons, just like that told of Jehoiachin and his court in 2Ki 24:13-15. To my mind this is illuminative for the age of the book. It seems to have been written by one who saw the Chaldean deportation of 587 BC. May I be suffered to carry the suggestion a step farther? It will be remembered that the chief personage of that deportation was for 37 years a state prisoner in Babylon, at the end of which time he was "taken from durance and judgment" (compare Isa 53:8 the King James Version) and lived thenceforth honored with kings (2Ki 25:27-30 = Jer 52:31-34). I take him to have been the original of the individualized Servant of Yahweh described and describing himself in Second Isa. In one of his self-descriptions he says that Yahweh has

given him "the tongue of them that are taught" (Isa 50:4); in another that Yahweh has made his "mouth like a sharp sword" and himself "a polished shaft" (Isa 49:2). What he said or wrote is of course unidentifiable; but it is certain that in some cultural way he was a hidden power for good to his people. What if this Book of Job were a prison-made book, like Pilgrim's Progress and Don Quixote, but as much greater as the experience that underlay it was more momentous? I do not see but this suggestion is as probable as any that have been made; and some expressions of the book become thereby very striking, as for instance, the reference to prisoners (3:18,19), to the servant longing for release (7:2), the general sense of being despised, the several references to Job as "my servant Job" (1:8; 2:3; 42:7,8), the description of his restoration as a turned captivity, and his successful intercession for the friends (42:10; compare Isa 53:12). I would merely suggest the idea, however, not press it.

2. Place in Biblical Literature:

If the Book of Job is a product of the time of Jehoiachin's imprisonment, it is in worthy and congenial literary company. Isaiah, fostering the faith of a new-born spiritual "remnant," had gathered the elements of that sublime vision (Isa 1:1) of Israel's mission among the nations which a later hand was even now, four generations after, working to supplement and finish, in a prophecy (Isa 40:1-66:24) which, as all recognize, constitutes the closest parallel in spirited idea to our book. Seers, priests and singers had long busied themselves with the literary treasures of the past; drawing out of dusty archives and putting into popular idiom the ancient laws and counsels of Moses (Deuteronomy; see under JOSIAH); Collecting and adapting the old Davidic psalms and composing new ones, as Hezekiah's reorganization of the worship required. Ezekiel was at Tel Abib planning for the reconstruction of the temple, and perhaps by his use of the name "Job" veiling a cryptic reference (Eze 14:14,20). The affiliations of the Book of Job, however, were more specifically, with the wisdom literature; and long before this the "men of Hezekiah" (Pr 25:1) had gathered their aftermath of the Solomonic proverbs, to supplement the maxims which had been the educative pabulum of the people (see under PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF). It was with the care and principle of this diffused instruction, now the most popular vein of literature, that the Book of Job concerned itself. That had become apparent as soon as the maxims were coordinated in an anthology, and an introduction to the collection had been composed, extolling Wisdom as the guide and savior of life. To a spiritually-minded thinker with the Hebrew genius for religion the motivation of Wisdom must sooner or later come. With its values should be apprehended also its unguarded points and tendencies. It was exposed to the one-sided drift of all popular things. In an age when revision and deeper insight were the literary order of the day, Wisdom would come in with the other strains of literature for purification and maturing; and there was not wanting an experience, the basis of an almost unbelievable report (compare Isa 53:1) to give depth and poignancy to Job's personal story of suffering and integrity.

3. Parallels and Echoes:

In the amazing sureness and vigor. of its message the Book of Job stands out unique and alone; but it is by no means without its lesser parallels in faith and doubt, above which it rises like a mountain above its retinue of foothills. Mention has been made above of a number of Psalms (e.g. 37; 49; 73) which with different degrees of assurance witness to the struggle of faith with the problem of the rampant and

successful wicked. Ps 49, one of the psalms of the sons of Korah, is especially noteworthy, because it expressly employs the popular mashal, that is, the Wisdom vehicle, to convey a corrective lesson about unblest riches, drawing a conclusion not unlike that of Job 27:8-23, though in milder tone. Not less noteworthy also is the note of suffering and its mysteriousness which pervades many of the psalms, especially of Asaph and Heman; Psalms 88 and 102 might both have been composed with special reference to Hezekiah's sickness and set beside his psalm in Isa 38, but also they are so fully in the tone of Job's complaint, especially Ps 88, that Professor Godet, not unplausibly, conjectures that the Book of Job was written by its author Heman. Hezekiah's deadly sickness itself (Isa 38), which was of a leprous nature, banishing him from the house of God, and which was miraculously healed—an experience regarding which Hezekiah's own writing (Isa 38:10-20) is strikingly in the key of Job's complaint—furnishes the nearest parallel to, or adumbration of, Job's affliction; but also in the accounts of the Servant of Yahweh there are hints of a similar stroke of God's judgment (compare Isa 52:14; 53:3). The passage Job 7:17,18 has been called "a bitter parody" of Ps 8:4; it may be so, but the conditions are in utter contrast, and nothing can be concluded as to which is original and which echo. As to expression, the most remarkable parallel to Job, perhaps, is the passage Jer 20:14-18, in which, like Job, the prophet Jeremiah curses the day of his birth. This curse in Job would naturally be remembered by all readers as one of the most characteristic features of the book; and in like manner the curse in Jer may have stood out in the memory of his disciples, of whom the writer of Job may have been one, and figure in a similar literary situation. Ezekiel's naming of Job along with Noah and Daniel (Eze 14:14,20), as a type of atoning righteousness, is doubly remarkable if the writer of Job was a contemporary; he may have taken the name from a well-known legend, and there may have underlain it a double meaning, known to an inner circle, referring cryptically to one whose real name it might be impolitic to pronounce. Whenever written, the outline and meaning of Job's momentous experience must have won speedily to a permanent place in the universal Hebrew memory; so that centuries afterward James could write to the twelve tribes scattered abroad (5:11), "Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen the end of the Lord."

LITERATURE.

A.B. Davidson, "The Book or Job" (Cambridge Bible for Schools), 1884; A.S. Peake, "Job" (New Century Bible), 1905; S.R. Driver, The Book of Job in the Revised Version, 1906; J. T. Marshall, The Book of Job, 1904; J.F. Genung, . Epic of the Inner Life, 1891; G.G. Bradley, Lectures on Job in Westminster Abbey, 1887; F.C. Cook in The Speaker's Commentary, 1882. Among German writers, A. Dillmann, Hiob erklart, 1891; K. Budde, Das Buch Hiob ubersetzt und erklart, 1896 (see The Expositor T, VIII, iii); B. Duhm, Das Buch Hiob erklart, 1897; G. Beer, Der text des Buches Hiob untersucht, 1897; Gibson, "The Book of Job" (Oxford Commentaries), 1899.

John Franklin Genung

JOB, TESTAMENT OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

JOBAB

jo’-bab (yobhabh, perhaps "howling"; Iobab):

(1) "Son" of Joktan (Ge 10:29; 1Ch 1:23).

See TABLE OF NATIONS.

(2) An Edomite king (Ge 36:33,14; 1Ch 1:44,45).

(3) King of Madon (Jos 11:1).

(4) 1Ch 8:9; and (5) 1Ch 8:18, Benjamites.

The name is confused with that of Job in Septuagint of Job 42:17.

JOCHEBED

jok’-e-bed (yokhebhedh, "Yahweh is glory"): Daughter of Levi, wife of Amram and mother of Moses (Ex 6:20; Nu 26:59). According to Ex 6:20, she was a sister of Kohath, Amram’s father.

JOD

jod "y": Yodh, the tenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet.

See ALPHABET; JOT; YODH.

JODA

jo’-da (Westcott-Hort, Greek New Testament, Ioda; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Iouda):

(1) A Levite, whose sons were "over the works of the Lord," corresponding to Sudias (1 Esdras 5:26), Hodaviah (Ezr 2:40), Judah (Ezr 3:9), Hodevah (Ne 7:43).

(2) An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:26, the King James Version "Juda").

JOED

jo’-ed (yo‘edh, "Yahweh is witness"): A "son" of Benjamin (Ne 11:7), wanting in 1Ch 9:7.

JOEL (1)

jo’-el (yo’el, popularly interpreted as "Yahweh is God"; but see HPN, 153; BDB, 222a):

(1) The firstborn of Samuel (1Sa 8:2; 1Ch 6:33), and supplied in the Revised Version (British and American) of 1Ch 6:28, correctly).

(2) A Simeonite prince (1Ch 4:35). (3) A Reubenite chief (1Ch 5:4,8).

(4) A Gadite chief, perhaps the same as (3) (1Ch 5:12). He might be the chief of "a family or clan whose members might be reckoned as belonging to either or both of the tribes" (Curtis, Chronicles, 122).

(5) A Levite ancestor of Samuel (1Ch 6:36), called "Shaul" in 6:24 (Hebrew 9)).

(6) A chief of Issachar (1Ch 7:3).

(7) One of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:38), brother of Nathan. 2Sa 23:36 has "Igal son of Nathan," and the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus has "son" in 1 Chronicles, a reading which Curtis adopts.

See IGAL.

(8) A Levite (1Ch 15:7,11,17), probably the Joe of 1Ch 23:8 and 26:22.

(9) David’s tribal chief over half of Manasseh (1Ch 27:20).

(10) A Levite of Hezekiah’s time (2Ch 29:12).

(11) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:43) =" Juel" of 1 Esdras 9:35.

(12) A Benjamite "overseer" in Jerusalem (Ne 11:9).

(13) Ioel, the prophet (Joe 1:1; Ac 2:16). See following article.

David Francis Roberts

JOEL (2)

(yo’el; Ioel):

I. THE PROPHET

II. THE BOOK

1. Literary Form

2. Outline of Contents

3. Interpretation

(1) Literal

(2) Allegorical

4. Indications of Date

(1) Place in the Canon

(2) Language and Style

(3) Quotations

(4) The Situation

(a) Political

(b) Religious

(c) Ritualistic

(5) Foreign Nations Mentioned or Omitted

(6) Some Notable Expressions

5. View of Professor Merx

6. Connections with the New Testament LITERATURE

I. The Prophet.

The Book of Joe stands second in the collection of the twelve Prophets in the Hebrew Canon. The name (yo’el), meaning "Yahweh is God," seems to have been common, as we find a dozen other persons

bearing it at various periods of the Biblical history. Beyond the fact that he was the son of Pethuel, there is no intimation in the book as to his native place, date, or personal history; nor is he mentioned in any other part of the Old Testament; so that any information on these points must be matter of inference, and the consideration of them must follow some examination of the book itself.

II. The Book.

1. Literary Form:

This takes largely the form of addresses, the occasion and scope of which have to be gathered from the contents. There is no narrative, properly so called, except at one place (Joe 2:18), "Then was Yahweh jealous for his land," etc., and even there the narrative form is not continued. Yet, though the earlier portions at least may be the transcript of actual addresses in which the speaker had his audience before him, this would not apply to the later portions, in which also the direct address is still maintained (e.g. Joe 3:11, "Haste ye, and come, all ye nations round about"). This form of direct address is, indeed, characteristic of the style throughout (e.g. Joe 2:21; 3:4,9,13). There is this also to be said of its literary character, that "the style of Joe is bright and flowing," his "imagery and language are fine" (Driver, LOT); "his book is a description, clear, well arranged, and carried out with taste and vivacity, of the present distress and of the ideal future. Joe may be reckoned among the classics of Hebrew literature. The need of a commentary for details, as is the case with Amos and Hosea, is here hardly felt" (Reuss, Das Altes Testament).

2. Outline of Contents:

The book in the original consists of 4 chapters, which, however, are in our version reduced to 3, by making the portion which constitutes chapter 3 in the Hebrew the concluding portion (3:28-32) of chapter 2. The book begins in gloom, and its close is bright. Up to Joe 2:18 there is some great trouble or a succession of troubles culminating at 2:28-32 (Joe 3 in Hebrew). And the concluding portion, Joe 3 (Joe 4 in Hebrew), in which the prophet projects his view into futurity, begins with judgment but ends with final blessedness. There is a progression in the thought, rising from the solid, sorely smitten earth to a region ethereal, and the stages of advance are marked by sudden, sharp calls (1:2,14; 3:9), or by the blasts of the trumpet which prelude the shifting scenes (2:1,15).

Joe 1 begins with an address, sharp and peremptory, in which the oldest inhabitant is appealed to whether such a calamity as the present has ever been experienced, and all are called to take note so that the record of it may be handed down to remotest posterity. The land has suffered from a succession of disasters, the greatest that could befall an agricultural country, drought and locusts. The two are in fact inextricably connected, and the features of both are mixed up in the description of their effects. The extent of the disaster is vividly depicted by the singling out of the classes on whom the calamity has fallen, the drinkers of wine, the priests,

the vine-dressers, the husbandmen; and, toward the close of the chapter, the lower animals are

pathetically introduced as making their mute appeal to heaven for succor (1:18-20). Specially to be noted is the manner in which the priests are introduced (1:9), and how with them is associated the climax of the affliction. The prophet had just said "my land" (1:6), "my vine" and "my fig-tree" (1:7); and, though many modern expositors take the pronoun as referring to the nation or people, it would appear more appropriate, since the people is objectively addressed, to regard the prophet as identifying himself with the God in whose name he is speaking. And then the transition to Joe 1:8 becomes intelligible, in which certainly the land is personified as a female: "Lament like a virgin girded with sackcloth for the husband of her youth." The underlying idea seems to be the conception of the land as Yahweh's and of Yahweh as the ba'al "lord," or husband of people and land. This is the idea so much in evidence in the Book of Hosea, and so much perverted by the people whom he addressed, who ascribed their corn (grain) and wine and oil to the Canaanite Baals. The idea in its purer form is found in the "land Beulah," "married land" (Isa 62:4,5). If it was this that was in Joel's mind, the mention of the priests comes naturally. The products of the land were Yahweh's gifts, and the acknowledgment of His lordship was made by offerings of the produce laid on His altar. But if nothing was given, nothing could be offered; the "cutting off" of the meal and drink offerings was the mark of the widowhood and destitution of the land. Hence, the pathetic longing (Joe 2:14) that at least so much may be left as to assure the famished land that the supreme calamity, the loss of God, has not fallen. Thus the visitation is set in a religious light: the graphic description is more than a poetic picture. It is the Lord's land that is wasted; hence, the summons (Joe 1:14) to "cry unto Yahweh," and in the verses that follow the supplication by man and beast for deliverance.

Joe 2 up to verse 17 seems to go over the same ground as Joe 1, and it has also two parts parallel respectively to two parts of that chapter: 2:1-11 is parallel to 1:2-12, and 2:12-17 to 1:13-20. The former part in both cases is chiefly descriptive of the calamity, while the latter part is more hortatory. Yet there is an advance; for, whereas in 1:2-12 the attention is fixed on the devastation, in 2:1-11 it is the devastator, the locust, that is particularly described; also, in 2:12-17 the tone is more intensely religious: "Rend your heart, and not your garments" (2:13). Finally it is to be noted that it is at the close of this portion that we get the first reference to external nations: "Give not thy heritage to reproach, that the nations should use a byword against them: wherefore should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?" (2:17 margin). If the view given above of 1:6-8 be correct, this is merely an expansion of the germinal idea there involved. And so it becomes a pivot on which the succeeding portion turns: "Then was Yahweh jealous for his land, and had pity on his people" (2:18).

There is a sharp turn at Joe 2:18, marked by the sudden variation of the verbal forms. Just as in Am 7:10, in the midst of the prophet's discourse, we come upon the narration, "Then Amaziah the priest of Beth-el sent to Jeroboam," etc., so here we have obviously to take the narrative to be the sequence of the foregoing address, or, more properly speaking, we have to infer that what Joe had counseled had been done. The fast had been sanctified, the solemn assembly had been called, all classes or their representatives had been gathered to the house of the Lord, the supplication had been made, and "then was Yahweh jealous for his land, and had pity on his people." In point of fact, as the Hebrew student will perceive, all the verbs from 2:15 may be read, with a change of the points, as simple perfects, with the exception of the verbs for "weep" and "say" in 2:17, which might be descriptive imperfects. But no doubt the imperative forms are to be read, expressing as they do more graphically the doing of the thing

prescribed. And, this sharp turn having been made, it will be noticed how the discourse proceeds on a higher gradient, forming a counterpart to the preceding context. Step by step, in inverse order, we pass the former points, beginning opposite what was last the "reproach among the nations" (2:19; compare 2:7), passing the destruction of the great army (2:20; compare 2:1-11), then touching upon the various kinds of vegetation affected (2:21-24; compare 1:12,10, etc.), and ending with the reversal of the fourfold devastation with which the prophet began (2:25; compare 1:4). So that what at the outset was announced as a calamity unprecedented and unparalleled, now becomes a deliverance as enduring as God’s presence with His people is forever assured.

Up to this point there has been an observable sequence and connection, so that, while the prophet has steadily progressed upward, we can look down from the point reached and see the whole course that has been traversed. But now in Joe 2:28-32 (Joe 3 in Hebrews) he passes abruptly to what "shall come to pass afterward." And yet no doubt there was a connection of thought in his mind, of which we obtain suggestions in the new features of the description. There is "the sound of abundance of rain" (1Ki 18:41) in this pouring out of the Spirit upon all flesh; in the sons and daughters, old men and young, servants and handmaidens, we seem to recognize the representative gathering of Joe 2:15 f, those engaged in the priestly function of, supplication here endued with prophetic gifts, "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Ex 19:6), all the Lord’s people become prophets (Nu 11:29). Again we see the sky overcast and sun and moon darkened before the great and terrible day of the Lord, as if the prophet had said: There shall be greater things than these; a new era is coming in which God’s hand will be laid more heavily upon the world, and His people will be quickened to a clearer vision of His working. The "day of Yahweh" has yet to come in a fuller sense than the locust plague suggested, and there will be a more effective deliverance than from drought and dearth; but then as now there will be found safety in Mt. Zion and Jerusalem. This, however, implies some danger with which Jerusalem has been threatened; a "remnant," an "escaped" portion involves a disaster or crisis out of which new life comes. And so the prophet goes on in Joe 3 (Joe 4 in Hebrews), still speaking of "those days" and "that time," to tell us of the greater deliverance from the greater trouble to which he has been alluding. There is nothing in the antecedent chapters to indicate what "that time" and "those days" are, or what the prophet means by bringing again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. These are questions of interpretation. In the meantime, we may note the general features of the scene now set before us. A great assize is to be held in the valley of Jehoshaphat, in which "all nations" there assembled by Divine summons will be judged for offenses against God’s people and heritage (3:1-8). And again, just as in Joe 1; 2 the prophet exhibited the plague of locusts in two pictures, so here in 3:9-21 the picture of the great assize is transformed into a bloody picture in the same valley, not so much of battle as of slaughter, a treading of the wine-press. There is a confused multitude in "the valley of decision"; sun and moon are darkened, and the stars withdraw their shining; the "day of Yahweh" has finally come; and, when the din is silenced and clear light again falls upon the scene, all is peace and prosperity, the last of the enemies destroyed, and the Lord dwelleth in Zion.

3. Interpretation:

(1) Literal.

Thus the book forms a fairly intelligible and connected whole when we read in the literal sense of the language. That is to say: a time of continued drought combined with an unprecedented visitation of locusts gives occasion to the prophet to call his people to the recognition of the Divine hand and to earnest supplication that the threatened ruin of people and land may be averted. The removal of the calamity is interpreted as a mark of restored Divine favor and an assurance of prosperity based on God's unchangeable purpose of good to His people. But these great doings of Nature's God suggest yet greater deeds of Israel's God of a more spiritual kind, the outpouring, like copious showers, of Divine blessing, so that the whole community would be set on a higher level of spiritual apprehension. And thus the prophet is led on to speak of the "last things." Judah and Jerusalem, highly distinguished and signally protected, are bound up with a world-wide purpose; Israel, in a word, cannot be conceived apart from non-Israel. And as non-Israel had in the past been an opposing power, in the great "day of Yahweh," wrong should be at last righted, the nations judged, and Israel and Israel's God be glorified. No doubt the interpretation is not without difficulties. We may not be able to detect the motives of the sudden transitions, or to say how much of the purport of the latter part was in the prophet's mind when he was engaged on the former part. And the description of the locust is so highly poetical that there is a temptation to see in it a reference to a great invading army.

(2) Allegorical.

These considerations, combined with the undoubted eschatological strain of the closing part of the book, led early commentators (and they have had followers in modern times) to an allegorical interpretation of the locust, and to regard the whole book as pointing forward to future history. Thus, in Jerome's time, the 4 names of the locust in 1:4 were supposed to designate

(1) the Assyrians and Babylonians,

(2) the Medes and Persians,

(3) the Macedonians and Antiochus Epiphanes, and

(4) the Romans.

But, apart from the consideration that the analogy of prophecy would lead us to look for some actual situation or occurrence of his time as the starting-point of Joel's discourse, a close observation and acquaintance with the habits of the locust confirm the prophet's description, albeit highly figurative and poetical, as minutely accurate in all its details. It is to be observed that, though spoken of as an army (and at the present day the Oriental calls the locust the "army of God"), there is no mention of bloodshed. The designation "the northern one," which has been considered inappropriate because the locust comes from the parched plain of the eastern interior, need not cause perplexity; for the Hebrew, while it has names for the 4 cardinal points of the compass, has none for the intermediate points: Judea might be visited by locusts coming from the Northeast, or, coming from the East, they might strike the country at a point to the North of Palestine and travel southward. So the wind which destroys the locust

(Joe 2:20) would be a northwesterly wind, driving the forepart into the Dead Sea and the hinder part into the Mediterranean.

4. Indications of Date:

The Book of Joe has been assigned by different authorities to very various dates, ranging over 4 or 5 centuries; but, as will appear in the sequel, it comes to be a question whether the book is very early or very late, in fact, whether Joe is perhaps the very earliest or the very last or among the last of the writing prophets. This diversity of opinion is due to the fact that there are no direct indications of date in the book itself, and that such indirect indications as it affords are held to be capable of explanation on the one view or the other. It will be noticed also that, to add to the uncertainty, many of the arguments adduced are of a negative kind, i.e. consideration of what the prophet does not mention or refer to, and the argument from silence is notoriously precarious. It will, therefore, be convenient to specify the indications available, and to note the arguments drawn from them in support of the respective dates.

(1) Place in the Canon.

An argument for a very early date is based upon the place of the book in the, collection of the "twelve" minor prophets.

It stands, in the Hebrew Bible, between Hosea and Amos, who are usually spoken of as the earliest "writing prophets." It is true that, in the Septuagint collection, the order is different, namely, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah; which may indicate that as early as the time of the formation of the Canon of the Prophets there was uncertainty as to the place of Joel, Obadiah, and Jon, which contain no direct indication of their dates. But, seeing that there has evidently been a regard to some chronological order, the books being arranged according to the Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian periods, it cannot be without significance that Joe has found a place so high up in the collection. The three indisputably post-exilian books stand together at the end. If Joe is late, it must be as late as the latest of these, possibly a great deal later. But if that is so, there was the greater likelihood of its date being known to the collectors. It would be a very hazardous assumption that prophetical books were not read or copied from the time of their first composition till the time they were gathered into a Canon. And, if they were so read and copied, surely the people who handled them took some interest in preserving the knowledge of their origin and authorship.

In this connection, attention is directed to the resemblances to the Book of Am before which Joe stands. These are regarded by Reuss as favoring the early date. That large and beautiful passage with which the Book of Amos opens dwells upon the thought that the threatenings, which had formerly been uttered against the nations, are about to receive their fulfillment, and that Yahweh could not take back His word. Now it is just such a threatening that fills the last part of the Book of Joel. Indeed Amos begins his book with the very phrase in which Joel opens his closing address, "Yahweh will roar from Zion, and utter his voice from Jerus" (Am 1:2; Joe 3:16). At the end of Amos also the happy fertility of Canaan is described in similar terms to those in Joel (Am 9:13; Joe 3:18). Reuss, moreover, draws attention to the remarkable

expression found in Joel, and also, though in modified terms, in two Prophets of the Assyrian period: "Beat your plowshares into swords, and your pruning-hooks into spears," says Joe (3:10), whereas we have the oracle in Isa 2:4 and Mic 4:3, "They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks"; and it is suggested that, if these were current phrases, they were more likely to have been coined in the form employed by Joe in earlier and less settled times, when sudden alarms of war called the peaceful husbandman to the defense of his fields and flocks. Further, it is pointed out that Amos reproaches the people of his day for impenitence, although Yahweh had given them "cleanness of teeth" and "want of bread" and had "withholden the rain .... when there were yet three months to the harvest," and smitten them with blasting and mildew and the palmer worm (Am 4:6-9); and all this is the more striking because Joe represents the distress of his day as unprecedented in magnitude.

To all this, advocates of the late date reply that we cannot determine the date of a book by its place in the Canon; for that the collectors were guided by other considerations. As to the resemblances to Amos, it may have been on the strength of these very resemblances that the Book of Joel, bearing no date in itself, was placed beside that of Amos. Moreover, it is maintained, as we shall see presently, that Joe has resemblances to other prophets, some of them confessedly of late date, proving that he was acquainted with writings of a very late time.

(2) Language and Style.

Another argument for an early date is based upon the purity of the language and character of the style. The book is written in what may be described as classical Hebrew, and shows no trace of decadence of language. It is no doubt true that "the style is the man," as is strikingly illustrated in the very different styles of Amos and Hosea, who were practically contemporaneous; so that arguments of this kind are precarious. Still, it is to be noted, that though there is nothing archaic in the style of Joel, neither is there anything archaic in the style of Amos, who would, by the exclusion of Joel, be our earliest example of written prophecy.

The advocates of the very late date reply that the style of Joe is too good to be archaic; and that his admittedly classic style is to be explained by the supposition that, living at a late time, he was a diligent student of earlier prophetic literature, and molded his style upon the classical.

(3) Quotations.

Here, therefore, must be mentioned an argument much relied on by the advocates of a very late date. It is said that there are so many resemblances in thought and expression to other Old Testament books that it is incredible that so many writers posterior to the early date claimed for Joe should have quoted from this little book or expanded thoughts contained in it. A very elaborate comparison of Joe with late writers has been made by Holzinger in ZATW, 1889, 89-131; his line of argument being that, while resemblances to undoubtedly early writers may be explained as the work of a writer in the Renaissance imitating older models, the resemblances to others known to be late, such as Jeremiah, Ezekiel, II Isaiah, Psalms, Nehemiah, Chronicles, etc., cannot be so explained if Joe is taken to be early. The principal

passages in question are given in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, "Book of Joel," by Professor Driver, who also takes the view that Joe is late.

The list is not, perhaps, so formidable as its length would imply. Both writers confess that from several of the passages no conclusion of any value can be drawn, and that there is always a difficulty in determining priority when similarities in diction are found. Many of the expressions quoted look as if they might have been commonplaces of the prophetical literature; and, if it was possible for a very late writer to quote from so many antecedent writings, it was as possible and much easier for a number of late writers to go back to the very earliest prophets, especially if their words were memorable and germinal. We have heard of the man who objected to Shakespeare because he was full of quotations; and there is perhaps not a line of Gray's "Elegy" that has not been quoted somewhere, while some of his lines have become household words. But the strongest objection to this argument is this: if Joe had the minute acquaintance with antecedent writers and followed them so closely as is implied, he not only varies from them in essential particulars, but falls below them, as we shall see, in his anticipations of the future.

(4) The Situation.

We have now to look at features of a more concrete and tangible character, which promise to give more positive results. It is maintained by the advocates of the late date that the situation and immediate outlook of the prophet are not only consistent with the late date but preclude any preexilian date altogether. The elements of the situation are these: Whereas all the prophets before the downfall of Samaria (722 BC), and even Jeremiah and Ezekiel, mention the Northern Kingdom, it is not once named or referred to in Joel; for the occurrence of the name "Israel" in 2:27; 3:2,16 cannot support this sense. Judah and Jerusalem fill our prophet's actual horizon (2:1,32; 3:6,16 f.20); no king is mentioned or implied, but the elders with the priests seem to be the prominent and ruling class. Further, the temple and its worship are central (1:14; 2:15 f) and so important that the cutting off of the meal offering and drink offering is tantamount to national ruin (1:9,13,16; 2:14). Again, there is no mention of the prevailing sins of preexilian times, the high places with their corrupt worship, or indeed of any specific sin for which the people were to humble themselves, while fasting and putting on sackcloth seem to have a special virtue. All the circumstances, it is held, conform exactly to the time of the post-exilian temple and to no other time. The Northern Kingdom was no more, there was no king in Jerusalem, the temple was the center and rallying-point of national life, its ritual the pledge and guarantee of God's presence and favor; the period of legalism had set in. It is confidently averred that at no period prior to the regime inaugurated by Ezra and Nehemiah was there such a conjunction of circumstances.

(a) Political:

In reply, it is urged in favor of the early date that there was a period in preexilian time when such a situation existed, namely, the early years of the reign of Joash, when that prince was still an infant; for Jehoiada the priest acted practically as regent after the death of Athaliah, 836 BC (2Ki 11:1-17). This would sufficiently account for the absence of mention of a king in the book. At such a time the

priesthood must have held a prominent position, and the temple would overshadow the palace in importance. The omission of the Northern Kingdom may be accounted for by the fact that at that time the two kingdoms were on friendly terms; for the two royal houses were connected by marriage, and the kingdoms were in alliance (2Ki 3:6 ff; 8:28). Or the omission may have no more significance than the fact that Joe was concerned with an immediate and near present distress and had no occasion to mention the Northern Kingdom. To show how unsafe it is to draw conclusions from such silence, it may be observed that throughout the first 5 chapters of Isa, larger in bulk than the whole Book of Joel, only Judah and Jerusalem are mentioned; and, even if it should be maintained that a part or the whole of these chapters dates from after the deportation of the ten tribes, still it is noteworthy that, when the prophet could have made as good use of a reference to the event as Jeremiah and Ezekiel, he does not do so.

(b) Religious:

The fact that there is no mention of specific national sins, and particularly of the worship of the high places, of which preexilian prophets have so much to say, is made much of by advocates of the late date, Dr. A.B. Davidson, e.g., declaring it to be "doubtful whether such a state of things existed at any time prior to the restoration from exile" (Expos, March, 1888); but perhaps this argument proves too much. If we are to deduce the state of religion in Joel's day from, what he does not say on the subject, it may be doubted whether at any time, either before or after the exile, such a condition prevailed. The post-exilian prophets certainly knew of sins in their time, sins, too, which restrained the rain and blasted the wine and oil and corn (Hag 1:11). For all that Joe says on the subject, the condition of things implied is as consistent with the time of Jehoiada as with that of Nehemiah. And what shall we say of Isaiah's positive description of the condition of Jerusalem before his time: "the faithful city .... she that was full of justice! righteousness lodged in her" (Isa 1:21)? When was that? So also his promise: "I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counselors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called The city of righteousness, a faithful town" (Isa 1:26). Higher praise could scarcely be bestowed, and there is nothing in the Book of Joe to imply that he assumed so much.

(c) Ritualistic:

Too much has been made of the references to ritual, as if they necessarily implied a post-exilian date. It is not legitimate here to assume that the idea of centralization of worship originated in Josiah's days, and that the priestly legislation is post-exilic. The mention of "old men" or "elders" is no such indication. Wellhausen himself maintains that the expression everywhere in Joe means nothing more than "old men"; and, even if it had an official connotation, the official elders are an old tribal institution in Israel. It may be noted here again that in the first 5 chapters of Isa elders also are mentioned, and more indubitably in an official sense, although the time was that of the monarchy (Isa 3:2,14). And as to the sanctity of the temple, it will hardly be denied that in the time of Jehoiada the Jerusalem temple was a place of far more importance than any supposed local shrine, and especially when there was a call to a united national supplication (see 2Ki 11). In point of fact the alleged references to ritual are very few and in most general terms. The "fast" is not denoted by the phrases in the legal codes, and was evidently on the footing of such observances as are common and instinctive at all times and among all persons (Jud 20:26; 1Sa 7:6; 2Sa 1:12; Jon 3:5). And where in any law-code are priests enjoined to lie all night

in sackcloth (Joe 1:13)? Or what prescription in any code requires young and old, bridegroom and bride, to press together into the temple (Joe 2:16)? And why should not any or all of these things have been done in face of a sudden emergency threatening the ruin of an agricultural people? Moreover, Joel, so far from ascribing virtue to these outward marks of humiliation in a legalistic spirit, immediately after mentioning them says: "Rend your heart, and not your garments, and turn unto Yahweh your God" (Joe 2:13).

The only ritual references are to the meal offering and the drink offering (Joe 1:9,13; 2:14), and these were not characteristically post-exilian. Indeed, they may be regarded as primitive forms of offering, the produce of the ground without which, among an agricultural people, we can hardly imagine a system of offerings to exist. They are both ancient. Amos regards the meal offering as well known (Am 5:22,25), and Isaiah uses the word "vain oblations" in speaking of its abuse (Isa 1:13). And though the noun for drink offering is not mentioned in the older prophets, Hosea knows the related verb and the act of pouring out wine to the Lord (Ho 9:4), and it may be asked whether it is likely that the people performed the act and had no name for the offering itself. Moreover, in an undisputed passage (2Ki 16:13,15), both offerings are mentioned in the time of Ahaz. As for the contention that our prophet regards these offerings of so much importance that the cessation of them would be fatal, if our interpretation of Joe 1:8 f above be correct, the earlier date would be much more appropriate. It was not because the offering threatened to cease, but because the thing offered threatened to be cut off, that Joe was so perturbed. The popular view as to the relation of Yahweh to His land was ancient, and had a foundation of truth; and in fact Hosea’s teaching would fitly follow and complete that of Joel. Finally it is to be said that Joel’s fine forecast of the outpouring of the Spirit, and of the universal extension of prophetic activity is as far removed as possible from the "legalistic" tendency that set in after the exile. And if the argument from silence is of any force at all, it is surely a very remarkable thing that in a book of post-exilian times, there should be no mention of prince or governor, or even of high priest.

(5) Foreign Nations Mentioned or Omitted.

Allusions to foreign nations, or the absence of allusion, would obviously promise to afford indications of the time of the prophet; and yet here also the allusions have been adduced in support of either of the divergent dates. The facts here are as follows: In the first two chapters, where the prophet, as is generally understood, is speaking of his own time and its pressing distress, there is no mention of any foreign nation, not even the kingdom of the ten tribes. The only expression which has been taken to be significant in this connection is the word translated "the northern" army (Joe 2:20), which some refer to the Assyrians, while others explain it of a northern army in late or apocalyptic time. In Joe 3, however, when the prophet is speaking of "those days" and "that time" in the future, when the Lord "shall bring back the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem," there is to be a gathering of "all nations" in the valley of Jehoshaphat (3:1 f); and later on "all the nations" are summoned to appear in the same valley for judgment (3:11 f). "Tyre, and Sidon, and all the regions of Philistia" are specially reproached (3:4) because they have carried into their temples the sacred treasures, and have sold the children of Judah and Jerusalem unto the "sons of the Grecians" (3:6); in recompense for which their sons and daughters are to be sold into the hand of the children of Judah, to be sold by them to "the men of Sheba, to a nation far off" (3:8). Finally, at the close (3:19 f), "Egypt shall be a desolation, and Edom shall be a desolate

wilderness, for the violence done to the children of Judah, because they have shed innocent blood in their land."

It is acknowledged that, on either hypothesis, there are difficulties in accounting for the presence or absence of names of foreign nations in this presentation. Those who advocate the late date point with confidence to the silence as to the kingdom of the ten tribes, or to the kingdom of Damascus, which, on their hypothesis, had passed away, and the equally significant silence as to Assyria, which had long ago been superseded by the Babylonian and Pets empires of the East. As to the mention of Tyre and Sidon and the coasts of Philistia (Joe 3:4-6), Driver says: "The particular occasion referred to by Joe must remain uncertain: but the Phoenicians continued to act as slave-dealers long after the age of Amos: and the notice of Javan (Greece) suits better a later time, when Syrian slaves were in request in Greece" (Cambridge Bible, "Joel," 17). The same writer says on Jole 3:19: "There is so little that is specific in what is said in this verse with reference to either Egypt or Edom, that both countries are probably named (at a time when the Assyrians and Chaldeans had alike ceased to be formidable to Judah) as typical examples of countries hostile to the Jews." It is pointed out, moreover, that the enmity of Edom was particularly manifest at a late period when Jerusalem was destroyed by the Chaldeans, and that this was remembered and resented long afterward (Ob 1:10-16; Eze 25:12 ff; 35$; Ps 137:7).

On the hypothesis of the early date, it is urged that there was no occasion to refer to the Northern Kingdom. If it was friendly, the inclusive name of Israel for the whole people was sufficient to denote this, and that it was not hostile in the early days of Joash has already been pointed out. As to Damascus, it was not till the last years of the reign of Joash that Hazael showed hostility to Jerusalem (2Ki 12:17 f); and danger from Assyria had not yet emerged, and appears only faintly in Am (Am 3:11; 6:14). Then it is pointed out that history records how, in the reign of Jehoram, the grandfather of Joash, "Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah, and made a king over themselves" (2Ki 8:20; 2Ch 21:8), and the historian adds that the revolt continued "unto this day." It may well have been that in such a revolt the resident Judeans in the land of Edom suffered the violence referred to in Joe 3:19. Moreover, the Chronicler mentions that, in the same reign, "Yahweh stirred up against Jehoram the spirit of the Philistines, and of the Arabians that are beside the Ethiopians: and they came up against Judah, and brake into it, and carried away all the substance that was found in the king’s house, and his sons also, and his wives," etc. (2Ch 21:16 f). This might be what is referred to in Joe 3:4-6. If the royal family were carried away there would most probably be a deportation of other prisoners, who, taken by the seaboard Philistines, would, through the great maritime power of the day, be sold to the distant Greeks. And here it is pointed out that Amos singles out the very nations mentioned by Joel: Philistines, Tyre and Sidon and Edom, and reproaches them with offenses such as Joe specifies (Am 1:6-12). And then, it is added, if the book is as late as Nehemiah, why is nothing said of Samaritans, Moabites, and Ammonites, who showed such marked hostility in his days (Ne 2:19; 4:7; 6:1)? For Ezekiel also, from whom it is supposed Joe derived his reference to the Edomites, mentions also Moabites and Ammonites as hostile to Israel (Eze 25:1-11). And so far were Tyre and Sidon from being hostile in the days of Nehemiah that we read of similar arrangements being made with them, as in the time of Solomon, for the supply of materials for the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 3:7). And why is not a word said of the Babylonians, at whose hands Israel had suffered so much? So strongly, indeed, are these objections felt by Reuss, that he declares that, should the view of the late origin come to be finally accepted as the more

probable, he would decide for a date after the Persian domination, i.e. subsequent to 332 BC. For, he says, the names of peoples introduced at the end of the book, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Philistines, Edomites, must surely in some way have had an actual significance for the author, who cannot out of caprice have passed over Syrians, Assyrians, Chaldeans, and Persians. Accordingly, if we are to have nothing to do with the pre-Assyrian period, we must come down to the late Seleucidan and Ptolemean dynasties, by whose hostile collisions Judea was certainly involved in severe trouble. But then, how are we to account for the position of Joe so high up in the collection of prophetical writers? For, on this supposition, we should expect his book to stand in the third division of the Canon.

(6) Some Notable Expressions.

There remain to be noticed some significant expressions which have a bearing on the question of date and, at first sight, seem to indicate a late origin. And yet there is a difficulty. For there is no doubt that our familiarity with the details of the great downfall of the Jewish state leads us to think of the destruction of Jerusalem when we read of the captivity or scattering of the people. There is, however, a saying in the Talmud that a greater distress makes a lesser one forgotten; and the question is whether there may not have been national experiences at an earlier time to which such expressions might be applicable: or, in other words, how early such phrases were coined and became current.

(a) "Bring Back the Captivity":

There is, first of all, uncertainty as to the origin of the phrase "bring back the captivity." Some connect the word "captivity" (shebhuth, shebhith) with the verb "to take captive" (shabhah), while others make it the cognate noun of the verb "to return" (shubh), with which it stands connected in the phrase "bring back the captivity of Judah and Jerus" (Joe 3:1). In the former case the reference would be to the return of captives taken in war, or the return of exiles from captivity; and that view has led to the translation in our version. On the latter view, the expression would mean the restoration of prosperity, of which use we have an undoubted example in the words: "Yahweh turned the captivity of Job" (Job 42:10). We can conceive either of the views to have been the original, and either to be quite early. A main feature of early warfare was the carrying away of prisoners, and the return of such captives was equivalent to a restoration of prosperity. Or again, the relief from any illness or trouble might be expressed by saying that there was a restoration, as e.g. in Scotland a sick person is said to have "got the turn." As to the significance of the phrase in Joel, it is pointed out by the advocates of the early date that, in Nehemiah’s time, the exile was at an end, and the captivity "brought back" (Ps 126). On the other side it is said that, though the new order was set up at Jerusalem, there still remained many Israelites in foreign lands, and Joel, not satisfied with the meager community in Palestine, looked forward to a fuller restoration; or otherwise, that the words are used in the wider and more general sense of restored prosperity. That the phrase was in early use, and in the sense of bringing back captives, is seen in Am 9:14 and Ho 6:11. And it may be observed that the phraseology used by Am to denote going into captivity (Am 1:5,15; 5:5,27; 7:17) is employed by the Jews to denote the Babylonian captivity, and is even used by modern Jews to express the present dispersion. And yet Amos speaks of an "entire captivity" of people in his day (Am 1:6,9 margin).

(b) "Parted My Land":

Then again, the expression "parted my land" (Joe 3:2) does not seem very applicable to the breaking up of the state, for the land was not parted but absorbed in the great eastern empires; nor does Joe single out Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians, by whom, if by any, a post-exilian parting of the land was effected. The expression would more fitly apply to such movements as the revolt of Edom and Libnah (2Ki 8:22), and the successive losses of territory by which the great dominion of David and Solomon was reduced. This process, described as "cutting Israel short" (literally, "cutting off the ends," 2Ki 10:32 the King James Version) is recorded as having begun in the time of Jehu, before the reign of Joash, when outlying parts of territory were smitten by Hazael of Damascus; and Joel, speaking in God's name, may have used the expression "my land" as referring to the whole country.

(c) "Scattered among the Nations":

Whether the expression "scattered among the nations" (Joe 3:2) would be applicable to the Israelite inhabitants of such conquered territories or to those sold into slavery (Joe 3:6) may be disputed. The expression certainly suggests rather the dispersion following the downfall of the state. And yet it is noteworthy that, if so, Joe is the only prophet who uses in that sense the verb here employed, a very strange thing if he followed and borrowed from them all; for, both in Jer and Ezk, as well as in Deuteronomy, other verbs are used. Jeremiah indeed uses the verb in comparing Israel to a scattered (or isolated) sheep which the lions have driven away (50:17); but the only other passage in which the word is plainly used of Israel being dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of Persia is Es 3:8.

(d) "Reproach of the Nations":

Then there is the passage: "Give not thy heritage to reproach, that the nations should rule over them" (or "use a byword against them"): "wherefore should they say among the peoples, Where is their God?" (Joe 2:17,19; compare margin). Here it is to be noted that the idea involved is certainly much older than the time of the exile. In the time of Hezekiah, the ambassadors of Sennacherib delivered their taunting message, which is described as reproaching the living God (2Ki 19:4). It was the method of ancient warfare, as is seen in the boasting of Goliath; for it is the same word that is used in that narrative, though rendered in our version "defy" (1Sa 17:10,25 f, 36). And, if we read between the lines of the historical books, we shall see how common was this habit of "defying" or "reproaching," and how sensitive the people were to it (e.g. 1Ki 20:2 f, 5 f, 13,18). All this is anterior to the earliest possible date of Joel, and proves that, at an early time, there was a consciousness in Israel that the fortunes of the people were bound up with the honor of the national God. It is not to be overlooked that it is in the early part of the book, when he is concerned with the drought and locust, that Joe uses this expression.

(e) "Strangers Passing Through":

Toward the close of the book it is predicted that, in the time of final glory, strangers shall no longer pass through Jerusalem (Joe 3:17). This again would certainly be applicable to a late time, after the land had

suffered many hostile invasions. Yet it can well be understood how a prophet at a very early period, thinking of the glorification of Zion, should imagine a state in which no "stranger" or foreigner should have a footing on the sacred soil, and Israel should dwell in solitary and preeminent exclusiveness. If so, the idea again is of a more primitive kind than the late date would suggest, especially if we postulate a prophet who had deeply studied earlier prophets, to whom Jerusalem of the future was the religious metropolis of the world, and Zion the place to which all nations would flow (Isa 2:3; 56:7).

(f) "Day of Yahweh":

A word must be said, in conclusion, in regard to the "day of Yahweh" which figures so prominently in the Book of Joel. In whatever sense it may originally have been employed, whether betokening weal or woe, the expression was an ancient one; for Amos refers to it as current in his day (5:18); and almost all the prophets refer to it in one way or another (Am 5:18-20; Isa 2:12; 13:6,9; 34:8; Jer 46:10; La 2:22; Eze 30:3; Ob 1:15; Ze 1:8,18; 2:2,3; Zec 14:1; Mal 4:5). So far as it bears upon the date of Joe the question is: How does his usage compare with those of the other prophets? We find that he uses the expression twice in connection with the visitation of the locust (1:15; 2:1), once after speaking of the outpouring of the Spirit (2:31), and once again near the close of the book (3:14). Now, in regard to the earliest occurrences, it will be perceived that Joe is on a lower plane than succeeding prophets. He associates the approach of the day of the Lord with a heavy visitation upon material nature, precisely as the simple Oriental of the present day, on the occurrence of an eclipse, or at a visitation of locust or pestilence, begins to talk of the end of the world. And, though the point of view is shifted, and the horizon wider, at the close, it is to be remarked that the highest point attained is the conception of the day of the Lord as the deliverance and glorification of Israel: there is not a hint of that day being a time of testing and sifting of Israel itself, as in Amos and elsewhere (Am 5:18-20; Isa 2:12). In fact, so far is he from going beyond the other prophets in his conception, that we may say Joe leaves the matter at the point where Amos takes it up.

5. View of Professor Merx:

In view of all these perplexing questions, Professor Ad. Merx had some reason for describing the Book of Joe as the "sorrow’s child" (Schmerzenskind) of Old Testament exegesis; and he published in 1879 a work, Die Prophetic des Joe und ihre Ausleger von den aeltesten Zeiten bis zu den Reformatoren, in which, besides giving a history of the interpretation, he combated the method hitherto employed, and put forth a novel view of his own. Concluding, on the grounds usually maintained by the advocates of the late date, that Joe is post-exilian, he makes a comparison of the book with preceding prophetical literature, in order to show that Joe derived his ideas from a study of it, and especially that he followed step by step the prophecies of Ezekiel. Now in Ezekiel’s outlook, the overflowing of Judea by the northern people, Gog, plays an important part (Eze 38:2,3,16,18; 39:11), and this explains Joel’s reference in 2:20.

As to the precise date: not only is the second temple standing but the city is surrounded by a wall (Joe 2:9); and this brings us down to the government of Nehemiah, after 445 BC; and the book of Nehemiah

shows that other prophets besides Malachi lived and found acceptance in those days (Ne 6:7,14). The circumstances were these. Not only the exile, but the restoration, is a thing of the past. We are to think of Jerusalem and Judah in the narrowest sense: the elders and all the inhabitants of the land are addressed, a sort of senatus populusque Romanus, and with them are the priests presiding over an orderly ritual service at the temple. Judah is unaffected by political movements; the conflict with the Samaritans has died down; Judah is leading a quiet life, of which nothing is recorded because there is nothing to record; and the people of the ten tribes have practically disappeared, being swallowed up among the heathen: This undisturbed period is employed in literary labor, as may be inferred from the well-known notice regarding Nehemiah's collection of books (2 Macc 2:13 f), and from the production of such works as Esther, Jonah, Qoheleth, Malachi, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, etc. The making of books (Ec 12:12) had not come to an end.

But now, if the older prophets were seriously studied (compare Da 9:2), what impression would they make on the mind of a man like Joel? Was the daily life that followed the time of Nehemiah in any degree a fulfillment of the hopes of a Deutero-Isaiah, a Jeremiah, an Ezekiel, a Zechariah? Could a member of the restored community contemplate without painful feelings the lamentable condition of existence under the Persian government, the limitation of the people to a narrow territory, the separation from those still in the Dispersion, the irritation of the worship of the half-heathen Samaritans, the mixed marriages and general low condition, as contrasted with the glowing pictures of the prophets who had spoken of the last days? Such a contradiction between prophecy and event must have disturbed the minds of the more thoughtful; and so, while some said, "It is vain to serve God" (Mal 3:14), "They that feared Yahweh spake one with another" (Mal 3:16), waiting in hope, believing that the present restoration could not be the true and final bringing back of the captivity.

To relieve his mind, Joe will write a book, the result of his study; and it must depict the full and final consummation. Living as he did, however, in quiet times, he had not, like earlier prophets, a historical situation to start from. Here, according to Merx, the genius of Joe comes into play. Seeking for a type of the end of the world, which was to be the antitype, he found one in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt in the distant past. Just as at that great crisis the people were rescued from bondage and brought into a wide and fertile land, so in the end Yahweh would subdue all Israel's enemies and place them in a noble land, uncontaminated by strangers, while He Himself would be enthroned in majesty on Zion. But just as that deliverance was ushered in by plagues, so also will be the "great day of Yahweh"; and as a signal type of the wholesale destruction of Israel's enemies, he seizes upon the plague of locusts and models his introduction upon Ex 10:4 ff. Joe had, no doubt, seen many a visitation of locusts; but what we have before us in Joe 1 and 2 is not actual description but idealized picture, the groundwork of his eschatology.

Accordingly, in the view of Merx, the whole Book of Joe is one piece. There is no historical transition at 2:10; in fact, there is no historical element in it at all. The end of the book being apocalyptical, the beginning, which forms with it a unity, must also relate to no event in Joel's days, but moves likewise in the period at the close of time. The people addressed are not the men of Joel's day, but those who shall be alive when "that day" is imminent: in a word, the reader is at 1:2 lifted into the air and placed at the beginning of the final judgment, at the moment when the apocalyptic locusts appear as heralds of the

day.

Merx's view may be taken as an extreme and somewhat fanciful statement of the case for a late post-exilian date; and it does not seem to have found acceptance by the critics who start from a historical basis. Merx himself is fully aware that it is a revival of the allegorical and typical interpretation which had its vogue in earlier stages of exposition. But he defends himself on the ground that it was not the ancients who imposed the allegorical interpretation upon Scripture, but the original writers who were the first typologists and allegorists, as is notably seen in later books like Ezekiel and Daniel. Whatever opinion may be held on that subject, we must at least recognize the strongly marked eschatology of the book. But this does not of necessity imply a late date. It is no doubt true that the fully developed eschatology, as we see it in the apocalyptic literature of the extra-canonical books, came in after the cessation of prophecy proper. Yet prophecy, in its earliest phases, contemplated the distant future, and had its support in such an outlook. Professor A.B. Davidson has said: "Isaiah is the creator of the eschatology of the Old Testament and of Christianity, and it comes from his hand in a form so perfect that his successors can hardly add a single touch to it" (Expository Times, V, 297). The ancient oracle, found both in Isa and Mic (Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-5), testifies to the triumphant and far-reaching hope of the older seers; and, before Isaiah's time, both Amos (9:11-15) and Hosea (14:4-8) have their outlook to the final future. The remarkable thing about Joel, which makes the determination of his date so difficult, is that he seems now to go beyond and now to fall short of other prophets. If he is later than Ezekiel and Jeremiah, he has nothing to say of the inclusion of Gentiles in the inheritance of Israel, but contemplates the final destruction of all Israel's enemies. If he is a contemporary of Malachi or later, he is less legalistic than that prophet; and whereas in Malachi we see the beginning of the fading away of prophecy, Joe looks for the time when the Spirit shall be poured out on all flesh, and the sons and daughters shall prophesy (2:28).

6. Connection with the New Testament:

It is this last element in the prophecy of Joe that links his book particularly with the New Testament, for Peter quoted Joel's words in this passage as fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, when the Spirit was poured forth on the assembled multitude (Ac 2:16). Yet, even as the Old Testament prophets one after another caught up the idea, unfolding and expanding it, so the New Testament writers see the approach of the day of the Lord in their own time (1Th 5:2; 2Pe 3:10); for that day is always coming, always near, though still in the future. Paul saw the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain, as Joe did, and the pouring out of the Spirit at Pentecost was part of, and also more than, the effusion seen by Joe What Joe said he said truly, though he could not say all. For "that day" has grown in significance as the ages have rolled on; men have seen its approach in the various commotions and upheavals of the world, depicting its features in the colors of the changing times, now praying for it, now dreading its approach; and how far from precision are our thoughts in regard to it still! Yet, early or late, unerring is the sure word of prophecy in its essential burden. The concrete historical situations crumble away and leave the eternal truth as fresh as ever: "Yahweh reigneth; let the earth rejoice" (Ps 97:1); it is the hopeful burden of Old Testament prophecy, for "righteousness and justice are the foundation of thy throne" (Ps 89:14).

LITERATURE

(Besides that cited above).—Credner, Der Proph. Joe ubersetzt u. erklart (1831); Wuensche, Die Weissagungen des Proph. Joe ubersetzt u. erklart (1872); the commentary on the Minor Prophets by Pusey, Orelli, Keil, Wellhausen, G.A. Smith; Meyrick in Speaker's Commentary; Nowack, in Handkommentar zum Altes Testament; Marti, in Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Altes Testament.

James Robertson

JOELAH

jo-e'-la (yo'e'lah, perhaps = yo'elah, "may he avail!"): One of David's recruits at Ziklag (1Ch 12:7 (Hebrew 8)); a Benjamite or perhaps a Judean (see Curtis, Chronicles, 195 f).

JOEZER

jo-e'-zer (yo'ezer, "Yahweh is help"): One of David's Benjamite recruits at Ziklag, though perhaps a Judean (1Ch 12:6 (Hebrew 7)).

JOGBEHAH

jog'-be-ha (yoghbechah): A city in Gilead assigned to Gad and fortified by that tribe (Nu 32:35). It lay on the line along which Gideon chased the Midianites (Jud 8:11), and the indication there leaves no doubt that it is represented today by Ajbeihat. The name attaches to 3 groups of ruins which date from Roman times. The position is about 7 miles Northwest of 'Amman, and about midway between that city and the town of es-SalT. It stands 3,468 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean.

LITERATURE.

Oliphant, Land of Gilead, 232; Baedeker-Socin, Palestine.

JOGLI

jog'-li (yoghli, perhaps =" led into exile"): Father of Bukki, a Danite chief (Nu 34:22).

JOHA

jo'-ha (yocha, meaning unknown, but perhaps = yo'ach "Joah"; see HPN, 283, note 4):

(1) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:16).

(2) One of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:45).

JOHANAN

jo-ha’-nan (yochanan, "Yahweh has been gracious"; Ioanan; compare JEHOHANAN):

(1) Son of Kareah, and one of "the captains of the forces who were in the fields" (i.e. probably guerrilla bands), who allied with Gedaliah, governor of Judah, after the fall of Jerusalem, 586 BC (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:7-43:7). He warned Gedaliah of the plot of Ishmael ben Nethaniah, who was instigated by the Ammonite king Baalis, to murder the governor; but the latter refused to believe him nor would he grant Johanan permission to slay Ishmael (Jer 40:8-16). After Ishmael had murdered Gedaliah and also 70 northern pilgrims, Johanan went in pursuit. He was joined by the unwilling followers of Ishmael, but the murderer escaped. Thereupon Johanan settled at Geruth-Chimham near Bethlehem (Jer 41). As Ishmael’s plan was to take the remnant to the land of Ammon, so that of Johanan and his fellow-chiefs was to go to Egypt. They consulted the Divine oracle through Jeremiah, and received the answer that they should remain in Judah (Jer 42). But the prophet was accused of giving false counsel and of being influenced by Baruch. The chiefs then resolved to go to Egypt, and forced Jeremiah and Baruch to accompany them (Jer 43).

(2) The eldest son of King Josiah (1Ch 3:15), apparently =" Jehoahaz" (2Ki 23:30-33).

(3) Son of Elioenai, and a Davidic post-exilic prince (1Ch 3:24).

(4) Father of the Azariah who was priest in Solomon’s time (1Ch 6:9,10; (Hebrew 5:35,36)).

(5) A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag, but perhaps a Judean (1Ch 12:4 (Hebrew 5)).

(6) A Gadite recruit of David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:12 (Hebrew 13)).

(7) Hebrew has "Jehohanan," an Ephraimite chief (2Ch 28:12).

(8) A returned exile (Ezr 8:12) =" Joannes" (1 Esdras 8:38, the King James Version "Johannes").

(9) Ne 12:22,23 = JEHOHANAN, (3).

David Francis Roberts

JOHANNES

jo-han’-es, jo-han’-ez.

See JOANNES.

JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, 1

jo-han’-in, -in:

I. THE ANTECEDENTS

1. Personality of Writer

2. Earlier New Testament Writings

3. Christian Experience and Teaching of History

4. Widening Contact with Gentile World

5. The Odes of Solomon

6. Antagonism to Gnostic Speculation

II. THE DIVINE NATURE

1. God Is Spirit

2. God Is Life

3. God Is Light

4. Ethical Attributes

God Is Righteous

5. God Is Love

(1) The Love of God

(a) Primarily a Disposition

(b) Embodied in Christ’s Self-Sacrifice

(c) Love in Redemption

(2) Love Is God’s Nature

III. THE INCARNATION

1. Historical Antecedents of the Logos-Doctrine

2. The Logos-Doctrine in John

3. The Incarnation as Delineated in the Fourth Gospel

4. The Incarnation in the First Epistle

5. Practical Implications of the Incarnation

IV. THE HOLY SPIRIT

1. The Work of the Spirit—in the Fourth Gospel

Perpetuates, but also Intensifies the Consciousness of Christ

2. In the First Epistle

(1) A Divine Teacher

(2) Other Aspects

3. The Person of the Spirit

His Deity Implied

V. DOCTRINE OF SIN AND PROPITIATION

1. Sin

2. Propitiation

(1) In the Gospel

(2) In the Epistle

(3) One with New Testament Teaching

VI. ETERNAL LIFE

1. Ethical Rather than Eschatological

2. Metaphysical Aspect

Reply to Criticism

3. Development of Doctrine

(1) Source in God

(2) Mediated by Christ

(3) Through the Spirit

(4) The Divine "Begetting"

(5) The "Children of God"

(6) The Divine Abiding

VII. HUMAN NATURE AND ITS REGENERATION

1. The World

2. Two Classes in the Human Race

VIII. THE CHURCH AND SACRAMENTS

1. The Church

2. The Sacraments

(1) Baptism

(2) The Lord’s Supper

IX. ESCHATOLOGY

1. Type of Thought Idealistic

2. Yet History Not Ignored

3. Nor Eschatology

4. Eschatological Ideas

(1) Eternal Life

(2) Antichrist

(3) Resurrection

(4) Judgment

(5) The Parousia

(a) A "Manifestation"

(b) Relation to Believers

LITERATURE

The materials for the following sketch of the Johannine theology are necessarily drawn from the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles, chiefly the First Epistle, of John. The question of authorship is not here considered (see articles on the GOSPEL and on the JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF). These writings, whether by the same or by different authors, are equally saturated with that spiritual and theological atmosphere, equally characterized by that type of thought which we call Johannine, and which presents an interpretation of Christianity scarcely less distinctive and original than Paulinism. Where there are differences in the point of view, these will be indicated.

I. The Antecedents.

1. Personality of Writer:

To attempt a full account of the historical sources and antecedents of the Johannine theology is beyond the scope of the present article; but they may be briefly indicated. Much must be attributed to the personality of the great anonymous writer to whom we directly owe this latest development of New

Testament thought. Only a thinker of first rank among the idealists and mystics, a mind of the Platonic order, moving instinctively in the world of supersensuous realities, absorbed in the passion for the infinite, possessing in a superlative degree the gift of spiritual intuition, could under any conditions have evolved a system of thought having the special characteristics of this theology.

2. Earlier New Testament Writings:

Yet with all his originality the builder has raised his structure upon the foundation already laid in the teaching represented by the earlier New Testament writings. The synoptic tradition, though freshly interpreted, is presupposed. At certain points there is a strong affinity with the Epistle to the Hebrews. In the main, however, the Johannine doctrine may be said to be a natural and inevitable development of Paulinism—the conclusion to which the earlier writer's mind is visibly moving in e.g. the Epistle to the Colossians.

3. Christian Experience and Teaching of History:

Among the influences which have stimulated and guided this development, the first place belongs to the natural growth of Christian experience and the teaching of history. In the closing decades of the 1st century, Christianity was compelled by the force of events to liberate itself more completely from the husk of Jewish Messianism in which its Divine seed had first been deposited. The faith of the first Christian generation in the Messiahship of Jesus and the triumph of His cause had expressed itself (necessarily so, under the historical conditions) in vivid expectation of His Second Coming. He was only waiting behind the clouds, and would speedily return to the earth for the restitution of all things (Ac 3:21). But after the fall of Jerusalem this primitive apocalypticism became, with the passing years, more and more discredited; and the Christian faith had either to interpret itself afresh, both to its own consciousness and to the world, or confess itself "such stuff as dreams are made of." It would be difficult to overestimate the service which the Johannine theology must have rendered in this hazardous transition by transferring the emphasis of Christian faith from the apocalyptic to 'the spiritual, and leading the church to a profounder realization of its essential and inalienable resources in the new spiritual life it possessed through the ever-living Christ. Eternal life was not merely a future felicity, but a present possession; the most real coming of Christ, His coming in the Spirit. The Kingdom of God is here: the eternal is now. Such was the great message of John to his age, and to all ages.

4. Widening Contact with Gentile World:

In another direction, the widening contact of Christianity with the Gentileworld had stimulated the development of doctrine. A disentanglement from Jewish nationalism, more complete than even Paul had accomplished, had become a necessity. If Christianity was to find a home and a sphere of conquest in the Greek-Roman world—to recreate European thought and civilization—the person of Christ must be interpreted as having a vastly larger significance than that of the Jewish Messiah. That this necessity hastened the process of thought which reached its goal in the Loges-doctrine of John cannot well be doubted. The way had so far been prepared by Philo and the Jewish-Alexandrian school. And while it is

probably mere coincidence that Ephesus, with which the activity of John's later years is associated by universal tradition, was also the city of Heraclitus, who, 500 years earlier, had used the term Logos to express the idea of an eternal and universal Reason, immanent in the world, there is as little room as there can be motive for questioning that in the Johannine theology Christian thought has been influenced and fertilized at certain points by contact with Hellenism.

5. The Odes of Solomon:

On the other hand it is possible that this influence has been overrated. Fresh material for the investigation of the sources and connections of the Johannine theology is furnished by the recent discovery of the Odes of Solomon (J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Odes and Psalms of Solomon, Cambridge, 1909; AdoIf Harnack, Ein judisch-christliches Psalmbuch aus dem ersten Jahrhundert, Leipzig, 1910). This collection of religious poems is regarded by its discoverer, Rendel Harris, as the work of a writer who, while not a Jew, was a member of a community of Christians who were for the most part of Jewish extraction and beliefs. But though the Odes in their present form contain distinctly Christian elements (references, e.g. to the Son, the Incarnation, the Virgin Birth, the Passion, the Descensus ad inferos), Harnack's closer analysis tends to the conclusion that in their original form they were purely Jewish, and that they have been adapted to Christian use by a process of interpolation. For the original work Harnack gives as a possible date the beginning of the Christian era, the Christian redaction falling within the 1st century. Harnack recognizes a possibility that the redactor may have been acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. The religious feeling of the writer is throughout individual and mystical, rather than nationalistic and Messianic. The characteristic atmosphere is strongly Johannine (we may quote in, illustration only the noble sentence from the 12th ode: "The dwelling-place of the Word is man; and its truth is Love"). The Odes have, in common with the Johannine writings, such leading conceptions as "grace," "believing," "knowledge," "truth," "light," "living water," "life" (for a full exhibition of the parallelisms, see article by R.H. Strachan, The Expository Times, October, 1910). Harnack asserts deliberately (p. 99) that in the Odes we possess "the presuppositions of the Johannine theology, apart from the historical Jesus Christ, and without any Messianic doctrine." More recent criticism of the Odes, however, has resulted in great diversity of view regarding their origin. They have been assigned to Gnosticism, and on the contrary to Montanism; and again are described (Bernard) as Christian baptismal hymns. In view of this division of critical opinion, all that can be said in the meantime is that the Odes testify to a collateral mystical development, the recognition of which necessitates a revision of the estimates which have been made regarding the extent to which the Johannine theology is indebted to Hellenistic philosophy.

6. Antagonism to Gnostic Speculation:

One other factor in this theological development remains to be mentioned—antagonism to Gnostic speculation. In the Gospel this has left not a few traces, in the way both of statement and omission; in the 1st Epistle scarcely any other danger to the faith and life of the church is apprehended than the spreading influence of Gnostic tenets (see JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF). John himself has been charged with Gnostic tendencies; but the truth rather is that to him Gnosticism must have been the more hateful and have seemed the more dangerous because its conceptions were at some points the caricature of his own. In it he saw the real Antichrist, the "spirit of error," giving fatally misleading solutions of those

problems which the human mind can never leave alone, but regarding which the one true light is the historic Christ. Gnosticism had lost all historical sense, all touch with reality. It moved in a world of sheer mythology and speculation; history became allegory; the incarnate Christ a phantasm. John took his stand only the more firmly upon historical fact, insisted the more strenuously upon the verified physical reality of the Incarnation. In many of its adherents Gnosticism had lost almost completely the moral sense; John the more vehemently asserts the inviolable moral purity of the Divine nature and of the regenerate life which is derived from it. Gnostic dualism had set God infinitely far from men as transcendent Being; John brings God infinitely near to men as Love; and sweeps away the whole complicated mythology of Gnostic emanations, eons and archons, by his doctrine of the Logos, coeternal and coequal with the Father, incarnate in Jesus, through whom humanity is made to participate in the very life of God—the life of all love, purity and truth.

II. The Divine Nature.

1. God Is Spirit:

One of the glories of the Johannine theology is its doctrine of God, its delineation of the Divine nature. This is given in a series of intuitional affirmations which, though the manner of statement indicates no attempt at correlation, unite to form a complete organic conception. The first of these affirmations defines what is the Divine order of being: God is Spirit (Joh 4:24). The central significance of this inexhaustible saying is defined by the context. The old local worships, whether at Jerusalem or Samaria, had implied some special local mode of Divine presence; and this naturally suggested, if it did not necessitate, the idea of some kind of materiality in the Divine nature. But God is spirit; and true worship must be an intercourse of spirit with spirit, having relation to no local or material, but only to moral conditions. Thus the concept of the Divine spirituality is both moral and metaphysical. The religious relation to God, as it exists for Christian faith, rests upon the fact that the Supreme Being is essentially moral, but also omnipresent and omniscient—the Divine Spirit whose will and percipiency act immediately and simultaneously at every point of existence. Such a Being we utterly lack the power to comprehend. But only such a Being can be God, can satisfy our religious need—a Being of whom we are assured that nothing that is in us, good or evil, true or false, and nothing that concerns us, past, present or future, is hid from His immediate vision or barred against the all-pervading operation of His will. To realize that God is such a Being is to be assured that He can be worshipped with no mechanical ritual or formal observance: they that worship Him must worship Him "in spirit and in truth."

2. God Is Life:

God, who is spirit, is further conceived as Life, Light, Righteousness and Love. Righteousness and Love are the primary ethical quailties of the Divine nature; Life the energy by which they act; Light the self-revelation in which they are manifested throughout the spiritual universe. God is Life. He is the ultimate eternal Reality. He was "in the beginning" (Joh 1:1), or "from the beginning" (1Joh 1:1; 2:13). These statements are made of the Logos, therefore a fortiori of God. But the Divine nature is not mere abstract being, infinite and eternal; it is being filled with that inscrutable elemental energy which we call Life. In

God this energy of life is self-originating and self-sustaining ("The Father hath life in himself," Joh 5:26), and is the source of all life (Joh 1:3,4, the Revised Version (British and American) margin). For every finite being life is union with God according to its capacity.

But the lower potencies of the creative Life do not come within the scope of the Johannine theology. The term is restricted in usage to its highest ethical significance, as denoting that life of perfect, holy love which is "the eternal life," the possession of which in fellowship with God is the chief end for which every spiritual nature exists. The elements present in the conception of the Divine life are these:

(1) The ethical: the life God lives is one of absolute righteousness (1Joh 2:29), and perfect love (1Joh 4:9).

(2) The metaphysical: the Divine life is nothing else than the Divine nature itself regarded dynamically, as the ground and source of all its own activities, the animating principle or energy which makes Divine righteousness and love to be not mere abstractions but active realities.

(3) In Johannine thought the Divine life is especially an energy of self-reproduction. It is this by inherent moral necessity. Love cannot but seek to beget love, and righteousness to beget righteousness, in all beings capable of them. With John this generative activity of the Divine nature holds a place of unique prominence. It is this that constitutes the Fatherhood of God. Eternally the Father imparts Himself to the Son (Joh 5:26), the Word whose life from the beginning consisted in His relation to the Father (1Joh 1:2). To men eternal life is communicated as the result of a Divine begetting (Joh 1:13; 3:5; 1Joh 2:29; 3:9; 4:7, etc.) by which they become "children of God" (Joh 1:12; 1Joh 3:1, etc.).

(4) But God is not only the transcendent final source, He is also the immanent source of life. This is clearly implied in all those passages, too numerous to be quoted, which speak of God’s abiding in us and our abiding in Him. Life is maintained only through a continuous vitalizing union with Him, as of the branches with the vine (Joh 5:1-6). It must be observed, however, that John nowhere merges the idea of God in that of life. God is personal; life is impersonal. The eternal life is the element common to the personality of God, of the Loges, and of those who are the "children of God." Any pantheistic manner of thinking is as foreign to John as to every other Biblical writer.

3. God Is Light:

God is not life only; He is light also (1Joh 1:5). That God is life means that He is and is self-imparting; that He is light means that the Divine nature is by inward necessity self-revealing.

(1) As the essential property of light is to shine, so God by His very nature of righteousness and love is necessitated to reveal Himself as being what He is, so as to become the Truth (he aletheia), the object of spiritual perception (ginoskein), and the source of spiritual illumination to every being capable of receiving the revelation. "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." In God there is nothing that hides, nothing that is hidden. The Divine character is utterly transparent—goodness without a shadow of

evil.

(2) This self-revelation of God is given in its perfect form in Jesus, the incarnate Word, who is the light of men (Joh 1:4), the light of the world (Joh 8:12; 9:5), the true light (Joh 1:9; 1 Joh 2:8).

(3) It is in their illumination by this Divine light that there exists, even for the sinful, a medium of moral fellowship with God. We can "come to the light" (Joh 3:19-21) and "walk in the light" (1Joh 1:7). In the translucent atmosphere of the true light, we, even while morally imperfect and impure, may come to have a common view of spiritual facts with God (1Joh 1:8-10; 2:9,10). This is the basis of a spiritual religion, and distinguishes Christianity from all irrational superstitions and unethical ritualisms.

4. Ethical Attributes:

In Gnostic speculation the Divine nature was conceived as the ultimate spiritual essence, in eternal separation from all that is material and mutable. But while John also, as we have seen, conceives it in this way, with him the conception is primarily and intensely ethical. The Divine nature, the communication of which is life and the revelation of which is light, has, as its two great attributes, Righteousness and Love; and with his whole soul John labors to stamp on the minds of men that only in righteousness and love can they walk in the light and have fellowship in the life of God. It is characteristic of John’s intuitional fashion of thought that there is no effort to correlate these two aspects of the ethical perfection of God; but, broadly, it may be said that they are respectively the negative and the positive. Love is the sum of all that is positively right; righteousness the antithesis of all that is wrong, in character and conduct.

God Is Righteous.

(1) That such righteousness—antagonism to all sin—belongs to, or rather is, the moral nature of God, and that this lies at the basis of Christian ethics is categorically affirmed. "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him" (1Joh 2:29). (2) This righteousness which belongs to the inward character of God extends necessarily to all His actions: "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins" (1Joh 1:9). When on the ground of Christ’s propitiation God forgives those who by confessing their sins make forgiveness possible, He acts righteously; and because He acts righteously, He acts also faithfully, that is, self-consistently. He does not "deny himself" (2Ti 2:13), but does what is in accordance with His own unchangeable character. (3) God’s righteousness is related imperatively to the whole moral activity of His creatures, rendering sin inadmissible in them—inadmissible de jure in all, de facto in all who are "begotten of him." This John maintains with unexampled vigor (compare 1Joh 2:29; 3:6,8-10; 5:18). It is true, however, that in its doctrine of Divine righteousness the Johannine theology makes no notable contribution to the sum of New Testament thought, but simply restates in peculiarly forceful fashion the conception of it which pervades the whole Biblical revelation.

5. God Is Love:

(1) The Love of God.

It is far otherwise with the next of the great affirmations which constitute its doctrine of God: God is Love. Here Gospel and Epistle rise to the summit of all revelation, and for the first time clearly and fully enunciate that truth which is the innermost secret of existence.

(a) Primarily a Disposition:

Love is primarily a disposition, a moral quality of the will. What this quality is is indicated by the fact that the typical object of love in human relation is invariably our "brother." It is the disposition to act toward others as it is natural for those to do who have all interests in common and who realize that the full self-existence of each can be attained only in a larger corporate existence. It is the mysterious power by which egoism and altruism meet and coalesce, the power to live not only for another but in another, to realize one's own fullest life in the fulfillment of other lives. It is self-communication which is also self-assertion.

(b) Embodied in Christ's Self-Sacrifice:

In history love has its one perfect embodiment in the self-sacrifice of Christ. "Hereby know we love (i.e. perceive what love is), because he laid down his life for us" (1Joh 3:16). The world had never been without love; but till Jesus Christ came and laid down His life for the men that hated and mocked and slew him, it had not known what love in its greatness and purity could be.

(c) Love in Redemption:

But here history is the invisible translated into the visible. The self-sacrifice of Christ in laying down His life for us is the manifestation (1Joh 4:9), under the conditions of time and sense, of the love of God, eternal and invisible. In the closely related parallel passages (Joh 3:16; 1 Joh 4:9,10) this is declared with matchless simplicity of statement. The Divine love is manifested in the magnitude of its gift—"his Son, his only begotten" (elsewhere the title is only "the Son" or "his Son" or "the Son of God"). Other gifts are only tokens of God's love; in Christ its all is bestowed (compare Ro 8:32; Ge 22:12). The love of God is manifested further in the purpose of its gift—"that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life." It is the self-determination of God, not only to rescue men from what is the sum and finality of all evils, but to impart the supreme and eternal good. But again, the love of God is manifested in the means by which this purpose is achieved. His son is sent as "the propitiation for our sins." God shrinks not from the uttermost cost of redemption; but in the person of His Son humbles Himself and suffers unto blood that He may take upon Himself the load of human guilt and shame. And the last element in the full conception of Divine love is its objects: "God so loved the world"; "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us." Its ineffable mystery reveals itself in its absolute spontaneity, its self-origination. Its fires are self-kindled; it shines forth in its purest splendors upon the unattractive and unworthy. Such is the conception John sets before us. In this entirely spontaneous, self-determined devotion of God to sinful men; this Divine passion to rescue them from sin, the supreme

evil, and to impart to them eternal life, the supreme good; in this, which is evoked not by their worthiness but by their need, and goes to the uttermost length of sacrifice in bearing the uttermost burden of their sin and its inevitable consequences; in this, which is forever revealed in the mission of Jesus Christ, God's only begotten Son, is love.

(2) Love Is God's Nature.

And God is love (1Joh 4:8,16).

(a) God is love essentially. Love is not one of God's moral attributes, but that from which they all proceed, and in which they all unite. The spring of all His actions is love.

(b) Therefore also His love is universal. In a special sense He loves those who are spiritually His children (Joh 14:23); but His undivided and essential love is given also to the whole world (Joh 3:16; 1 Joh 2:2). That is John's great truth. He does not attempt to reconcile with it other apparently conflicting truths in his theological scheme; possibly he was not conscious of any need to do so. But of this he is sure—God is love. That fact must, in ways we cannot yet discern, include all other facts.

(c) The love of God is eternal and unchangeable; for it does not depend on any merit or reciprocation in its object, but overflows from its own infinite fullness. We may refuse to it the inlet into our life which it seeks (Joh 3:19; 5:40); we may so identify ourselves with evil as to turn it into an antagonistic force. But as our goodness did not call it forth, neither can our evil cause it to cease.

(d) If love is an essential, the essential attribute of God, it follows that we cannot ultimately conceive of God as a single simple personality. It is at this point that the fuller Johannine conception of multiple personality in the Godhead becomes most helpful, enabling us to think of the Divine life in itself not as an eternal solitude of self-contemplation and self-love, but as a life of fellowship (Joh 1:1; 1 Joh 1:2). The Godhead is filled with love. "The Father loveth the Son" (Joh 3:35); and the prayer of the Son for His followers is "that the love wherewith thou lovedst me may be in them" (Joh 17:26). The eternal giving and receiving of Divine love between the Father and the Son is, in the Johannine theology, an essential element of the Divine nature.

III. The Incarnation.

The 2nd great contribution of the Johannine writings to the development of Christian theology is their doctrine of Christ—the latest and most deliberate effort within New Testament times to relate intellectually the church's faith in Jesus to its faith in God. In these writings the superhuman personality of Jesus is expressed by three titles which are used as practically synonymous—"the Christ," "the Son" ("Son of God," "only begotten Son of God"), the "Word" (Logos). The last alone is distinctively Johannine.

1. Historical Antecedents of the Logos-Doctrine:

Historically, the Logos-doctrine of John has undoubted links of connection with certain speculative developments both of Greek and Hebrew thought. The Heraclitean use of the term "Logos" (see above, I) to express the idea of an eternal and all-embracing Reason immanent in the world was continued, while the conception was further elaborated, by the Stoics. On the other hand, the later developments of Hebrew thought show an increasing tendency to personify the self-revealing activity of God under such conceptions as the Angel, Glory, or Name of Yahweh, to attach a peculiar significance to the "Word" (me'mera') by which He created the heaven and the earth, and to describe "Wisdom" (Job, Proverbs) in something more than a figurative sense as His agent and coworker. These approximations of Greek pantheism and Hebrew monotheism were more verbal than real; and, naturally, Philo's attempt in his doctrine of the Logos to combine philosophies so radically divergent was less successful than it was courageous. How far, and whether directly or indirectly, John is indebted to Philo and his school, are questions to which widely different answers have been given; but some obligation, probably indirect, cannot reasonably be denied. It is evident, indeed, that both the idea and the term "Logos" were current in the Christian circles for which his Gospel and First Epistle were immediately written; in both its familiarity is assumed. Yet the Johannine doctrine has little in common with Philo's except the name; and it is just in its most essential features that it is most original and distinct.

As the Old Testament begins with the affirmation, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," so the Fourth Gospel begins with the similar affirmation, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" (Joh 1:1). The Word was the medium of Divine action in creation (Joh 1:3).

2. The Logos-Doctrine in John:

In the Word was life, not merely self-existing but self-imparting, so that it became the light of men (Joh 1:4)—the true light, which, coming into the world, lighteth every man (Joh 1:9). And finally it is declared that this Divine Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, so that "we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (Joh 1:14). Here faith in Jesus as Divine has been traced back to, and grounded in, a duality within the Godhead itself. In the twofold mode of the Divine existence, it is seen that there is God who is just God (so to say), God in Himself; and there is God-with-God, God who is God's other self, God going forth from Himself in thought and action. The first without the second would be essence without manifestation, mind without utterance, light without effulgence, life without life-giving, fatherhood without sonship. It is seen that within the Divine Being there is one through whom, as there is also one from whom, all Divine energy goes forth. Above all it is seen that there is a Divine mode of existence in which it is inherently possible and natural for God to be immediately related to created being and even to become incarnate in humanity, as there is also a mode of Divine existence which cannot be immediately communicated or revealed to created life. Thus the Johannine doctrine is: first, that the Logos is personal and Divine, having a ground of personal being within the Divine nature (pros ton Theon, "in relation to God"); and, second, that the Logos became flesh, was and is incarnate in the historical Jesus.

3. The Incarnation as Delineated in the Fourth Gospel:

In the Gospel the term "Logos" does not recur after the opening verses; yet thesis of the Prologue, so far from being irrelevant, dominates the entire biographical presentation. The creative and cosmic significance of the Logos-Christ is naturally in the background; but it may be said of the Gospel that "the Word became flesh" is its text, and all the rest—miracle, incident, discourse—is comment. On the one hand, the reality of the "becoming flesh" is emphasized (e.g. Joh 4:6; 11:35; 19:1,2,3,17,28,34,38-40; 20:20,27). On the other hand, the human vesture only reveals the Divine glory within. On earth, Jesus is still "the Son of man, who is in heaven" (Joh 3:13); the perfect revelation of the Father (Joh 14:9); the light of the world (Joh 8:12); the way, the truth and the life (Joh 14:6); the resurrection (Joh 11:26); the final judge (Joh 5:22) and Saviour (Joh 4:42; 6:40) of men; the supreme moral authority (Joh 13:34; 14:15,21); the hearer of prayer (Joh 14:13,14); the giver of the Spirit (Joh 7:38,39; 16:7; 20:22); endowed with all the prerogatives of God (Joh 5:23; 10:30,36-38).

4. The Incarnation in the First Epistle:

In the 1 John the central thesis is the complete, personal, and permanent identity of the historical Jesus with the Divine Being who is the Word of Life (1:1), the Christ (4:2), the Son of God (5:5). This is maintained in a vigorous polemic against certain heretical teachers whom the writer calls "antichrists," who in docetic fashion denied that Jesus is the Christ (2:22), or, more definitely, the "Christ come in the flesh" (4:3), and who asserted that He "came" by water only and not by blood also (5:6; see JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF). Against this doctrine of a merely apparent or temporary association of Jesus with the Christ John bears vehement testimony. "Who is the liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?" (1Joh 2:22). ‘Every spirit that confesseth Jesus as Christ come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God’ (1Joh 4:2,3). "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is he that came by water and blood, even Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood" (1Joh 5:5,6). These passages all promulgate the same truth in substantially the same way. Without ceasing to be what He is, the Christ, the Son of God, has become Jesus; and Jesus, without ceasing to be truly human, is the Son of God. As to the manner of the incarnation—by what process of self-emptying or by what conjunction of Divine-human attributes the eternal Son became Jesus—the Johannine writings, like the New Testament everywhere, are silent. They proclaim Jesus Christ as human and Divine; but the distinguishing of what in Him was human and what Divine, or whether the one is distinct from the other, this they do not even consider. Gnosticism drew such a distinction; John does not. His one truth is that Jesus is the Son of God and the Son of God is Jesus, and that in Him the life of God was manifested (1Joh 1:2) and is given (1Joh 5:11) to men.

5. Practical Implications of the Incarnation:

In this truth, viewed in its practical consequences, John sees the core of the church’s faith and the root and safeguard of its life. (a) This alone secures and guarantees the Christian revelation of God; with its denial that revelation is canceled. "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father" (1Joh 2:23). (b) Above all, it is only in the life and death of Jesus, the incarnate Son, that we possess a valid

revelation of God’s self-sacrificing love. "Herein was the love of God manifested in us, that God hath sent his .... Son into the world that we might live through him" (1Joh 4:9). With the denial of this the Christian ethic is drained of its very life-blood. There was no merely external and accidental connection between Docetism and the moral indifferentism of the Gnostic. The natural result of making man’s salvation easy, so to say, for God, was to make it easy for man also—salvation by creed without conduct (1Joh 2:4,6; 3:7), knowledge without love (1Joh 4:8), or love that paid its debts with goodly phrases and empty words (1Joh 3:17,18). A docetic Christ meant docetic Christianity. (c) Finally, John sees in the incarnation the only possibility of a Divine redemption. It was not for a word or a formula he was concerned, but for the raising of humanity to Divine life through the God-man. The ultimate significance of the incarnation of the Son is that in Him the eternal life of God has flowed into our humanity and become a fountain of regenerative power to as many as receive Him (Joh 1:12). "He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God hath not the life" (1Joh 5:12). This is the center of the Johannine Gospel—a Divine-human Christ, who stands in a unique, vital relation to men, reproducing in them His own character and experiences as the vine reproduces itself in the branches, doing that, the mysterious reality of which is only expressed, not explained, when it is said that He is our "life" (Joh 14:19,20; 15:5).

IV. The Holy Spirit.

1. The Work of the Spirit—in the Fourth Gospel:

In one direction the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is uniquely developed in the Johannine writings. The conception of the Spirit as the agent of Work of the Christ’s presence with and activity in the church is presented with a fullness and clearness unequaled in the New Testament. The departing Christ promises to His friends a new presence, different from His own in that it was to be not a bodily but a spiritual presence, and yet really His own—a presence in which all and more than all the effects of His bodily presence would be perpetuated (Joh 14:18; 16:22). In truth, it was expedient for them that He should go away, in order that this other Paraclete should come (Joh 16:7). In the body His presence with His followers had been local and intermittent; in the Spirit He would come to take up His abode with them forever (Joh 14:16). Formerly He had been still external to them, but now was not only to dwell with them, but to be in them (Joh 14:17). Instead of the external voice of their Teacher addressing to them the words of eternal life, they should possess the very Spirit of truth (Joh 14:17), a well-spring of illumination from within, giving them an "understanding" to know Him that is true (1Joh 5:20); and instead of His visible example before their eyes, an inward community of life with Him like that of the vine and the branches. The complete, vital, permanent union of Christ and His people, which had been prevented by the necessary limitations of a local, corporeal state of existence, would be attained, when for this there was substituted the direct action of spirit upon spirit.

Perpetuates, but also Intensifies the Consciousness of Christ.

Thus the function of the Spirit which is chiefly emphasized in the Johannine writings is that by which He perpetuates but also intensifies, enlightens, and educates the consciousness of Christ in the church

and in the Christian life. In this respect His nature is the opposite of that of the Logos, the self-revealing God. The Holy Spirit never reveals Himself to human consciousness; He reveals the Son and the Father through the Son. His operations are wholly secret and inscrutable, known only by their result (Joh 3:8). He is the silent inward monitor and remembrancer of the disciples (Joh 14:20); the illuminator, the revealer of Christ (Joh 16:14); a spirit of witness who both Himself bears witness concerning Christ to His people and makes of them ready and joyful witness-bearers (Joh 15:26,27); a guide by whom a steady growth in knowledge is secured, leading gradually on to the full truth of Christ (Joh 16:12,13); a spirit of conviction working in men an immediate certainty of the truth regarding sin and righteousness, and the Divine judgment which marks their eternal antagonism (Joh 16:8-11).

2. In the First Epistle:

In the Epistle we find the promise of the Gospel accomplished in actual experience. There is no reference to the manifold charismata of the first age, the prophetic afflatus excepted (1Joh 4:1). But whether through the prophetic "medium" or the normal Christian consciousness, the function of the Spirit is always to "teach" or to "witness" concerning Christ. This is finely brought out in the parallelism of 1Joh 5:6: "This (Jesus Christ) is he that came" (once for all fulfilling the Messiah’s mission); "It is the Spirit that beareth witness" (ever authenticating its Divine origin, interpreting its purpose and applying its results). The specific testimony the Spirit bears to Christ is defined (1Joh 4:2,3). "Hereby know ye the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God: and every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God."

(1) A Divine Teacher.

The gift of the Spirit is an "anointing from the Holy One" (1Joh 2:20); and the result of this "anointing" is that "ye know all things" (or that "ye all have knowledge"; the reading is doubtful), and "need not that any one teach you" (1Joh 2:27). The apostle’s comfort concerning his readers, encompassed as they are by the snares of Antichrist, is that they have a Divine Teacher, who continually enlightens their understanding, strengthens their convictions and ministers to them an invincible assurance of the truth of the Gospel. "The anointing abideth in you .... and teacheth you concerning all things." The spirit is not a source of independent revelation, but makes the revelation of Christ effectual. The truth is placed beyond all reach of controversy and passes into absolute knowledge: "Ye know all things." It may be added that the history of Christianity furnishes an always growing verification of this Johannine doctrine of a living power of witness and enlightenment present in the church, by which, notwithstanding the constant hindrance of human imperfection, the development of the Christian faith has been steadily advanced, its forgotten or neglected factors brought to remembrance. Old truths have been presented in new aspects and filled with fresh life, and all has been brought to pass with marvelous adaptation to the church’s needs and in proportion to its receptivity.

(2) Other Aspects.

In other directions the doctrine of the Spirit is less developed. The agency of the Spirit in regeneration is

repeatedly and emphatically declared in a single passage (Joh 3:5-8), but is nowhere else referred to either in the Gospel or the First Epistle. More remarkable still, neither in Gospel nor Epistle is the Holy Spirit once spoken of as the Divine agent in sanctification. There is no passage resembling that in which Paul speaks of the ethical "fruit of the Spirit" (Ga 5:22,23). The Spirit is the Spirit of truth, the revealer, the inspirer of faith, but is never spoken of as the Spirit of love or holiness. If those who are begotten of God cannot sin, it is not because God's Spirit, but because "his seed," abideth in them (1Joh 3:9). The explanation of this peculiarity (which has been little observed) in the Johannine theology may be that the Spirit's work of revealing Christ is regarded as all-inclusive. Thus enabling Christ's disciples to abide in Him as the branch in the vine, He secures also their bringing forth "much fruit" in all Christlikeness of character and conduct.

2. The Person of the Spirit:

Passing now from the work to the Person, we observe that in the Fourth Gospel the attribution of personality to the Spirit reaches the acme of distinctness. He is "another Paraclete" (Joh 14:16 margin), personal as Christ Himself is personal; and all the functions ascribed to Him—to remind, to teach, to testify, to guide, to convict—are such as are possible only to a personal agent. Nor is it otherwise in the First Epistle. The expressions in it which have been alleged (Pfleiderer and others) as inconsistent with personality (the "anointing," 1Joh 2:20; "He hath given us of his Spirit," 4:13) require no such interpretation. The "anointing" denotes the Spirit, not in His essence or agency, but as the gift of the Holy One with which He anoints believers (compare Joh 7:38,39); and the expression "He hath given us of his Spirit" (as if the Spirit were a divisible entity) is no more incompatible with personality than is the saying "to Him whom he hath sent ...., God giveth not the Spirit by measure" (Joh 3:34), or than our speaking of Christians as having more or less of the Spirit.

His Deity Implied.

The essential Deity of the Spirit is nowhere explicitly asserted, but is necessarily implied in His relation both to Christ and to the church as the "other Paraclete." There is not, however, the same theological development as is achieved regarding the Logos. The Divinity of Christ is grounded in an essential duality of being within the Godhead itself; but there is no similar effort to trace back the threefoldness in the revelation of God, as Father, Son and Spirit, to an essential threefoldness in the Divine nature. The fact is that both historically and logically the doctrine of the Spirit as the third person in the Godhead depends upon that of the Divine Son as the second. It was through its living experience of the Divine in Christ that the church first developed its thought of God beyond the simple monotheism of the Old Testament; but having advanced to the conception of a twofold Godhead, in which there is Fatherhood and Sonship, it was bound to enlarge it still further to that of a threefold Godhead—Father, Son and Spirit. The Son and the Spirit were equally manifestations of God in redemption, and must equally stand in essential relation to the Divine existence.

V. Doctrine of Sin and Propitiation.

This theme is not elaborated. It is characteristic of the Johannine writings that salvation is looked at from the terminus ad quem rather than from the terminus a quo. The infinite good, eternal life, is more in view than the infinite evil, sin. It seems safe to say that the author of these writings at no time had that intense experience of bondage to the law of sin and of death which so colors Paul's presentation of the gospel. It was, moreover, no part of his plan to expound the doctrine of propitiation; nor had he any original contribution to make on this head to the sum of New Testament thought. But it is a quite unwarrantable criticism which denies that the saving work of Christ, in the Johannine conception, consists in deliverance from sin.

1. Sin:

It is true that Christ not only takes away the sin of the world (Joh 1:29), but also draws it forth in its utmost intensity and guilt. All sin culminates in the rejection of Christ (Joh 15:22); the Spirit convicts men of sin because they "believe not" on Him (Joh 16:9). "Every one that committeth sin is the bondservant of sin" (Joh 8:34); but what reveals the true character of this bondage is that in the presence of the light, men "loved the darkness" (Joh 3:19). That the malign quality and power of evil are fully revealed only in the presence of perfect goodness, that the brighter is the light, the darker is the shade of guilt created by its rejection—all this John teaches; but such teaching is by no means peculiar to him, and to infer from it that "to his mind sin in itself involves no moral culpability" is nothing more than a way-ward paradox.

In the Epistle the guilt of sin as constituting an objective disability to fellowship with God is strongly emphasized. "If We say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves" (1Joh 1:8). The phrase "to have sin" is peculiar to John, and specifically denotes the culpability of the agent (compare Joh 9:41; 15:22,24; 19:11). Sin is essentially that which needs God's forgiveness (1Joh 1:9; 2:1,2); and to this end an intercessor and a propitiation have been provided. Such culpability is universal: "If we say that we have not sinned, we"—not only deceive ourselves—"we make him a liar" (1Joh 1:10).

A second passage (1Joh 3:4-9) emphasizes the ethical quality of sin—its antagonism to the nature of God and of the children of God. The word which defines the constitutive principle of sin is "lawlessness" (1Joh 3:4). Sin is fundamentally the denial of the absoluteness of moral obligation, the repudiation of the eternal law upon which all moral life is based. In other words, to sin is to assert one's own will as the rule of action against the absolutely good will of God. But again, the Epistle gives the warning that "all unrighteousness is sin" (1Joh 5:17). Everything that is not right is wrong, Every morally inferior course of action, however venial it may appear, is sin and contains the elements of positive guilt. The perplexing topic of "sin unto death" demands too special treatment to be dealt with here.

2. Propitiation:

(1) In the Gospel.

The paucity of reference in the Fourth Gospel to the propitiating aspect of Christ's redemptive work has been seized upon as proof that, though the writer did not consciously reject the orthodox doctrine, it was really alien to his system. But such a criticism might be directed with almost equal force against the Synoptics. It was no part of John's plan, as has been said, to expound a doctrine of propitiation; yet his frontispiece to the ministry of Jesus is "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world"; and, as Dr. Inge has pointed out, the same type of the Paschal Lamb underlies the whole narrative of the Passion. In the high-priestly prayer our Lord expressly represents Himself as the covenant-sacrifice which consecrates His disciples as the people of God (Joh 17:19); while the Synoptic "ransom for many" is paralleled by the interpretation of Christ's death as effectual "for the nation; and not for the nation only, but that he might also gather together into one the children of God that are scattered abroad" (Joh 11:51,52; compare 1Joh 2:2).

(2) In the Epistle.

In the Epistle the doctrinal statement is much more explicit. The fact of propitiation is placed in the forefront. The passage which immediately follows the Prologue (1Joh 1:6-2:2) introduces a group of ideas—propitiation, blood, forgiveness, cleansing—which are taken directly from the sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and are expressed, indeed, in technical Levitical terms. The mode of action by which Christ accomplished and still accomplishes His mission as the Saviour of the world is: "He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world" (1Joh 2:2). Propitiation has its ultimate source in the moral nature of God. It is no device for inducing a reluctant Deity to forgive; it is the way by which the Father brings back His sinning children to Himself. In John's conception it is the supreme act of God's supreme attribute, love. "Herein is love" (1Joh 4:10). Yet it is a real work of propitiation in which this love goes forth for man's salvation—a work, that is, which expiates the guilt of sin, which restores sinful offenders to God by rendering their sin null and inoperative as a barrier to fellowship with Him. This propitiatory virtue is regarded as concentrated in the "blood of Jesus his Son" (1Joh 1:7), that is to say, in the Divine-human life offered to God in the sacrifice of the cross. This, if we walk in the light as He is in the light, "cleanseth us from all sin"—removes from us the stain of our guilt, and makes us clean in God's sight. In virtue of this, Christ is the penitent sinner's advocate (paraclete-helper) with the Father (1Joh 2:1). The words "with the Father" are highly significant. Even the Father's love can urge nothing in apology for sin, nothing that avails to absolve from its guilt. But there is one who can urge on our behalf what is at once the strongest condemnation of our sin and plea for its remission—Himself, "Jesus Christ the righteous" (1Joh 2:1). "And he (Himself) is the propitiation for our sins." John does not speak of Christ as "making propitiation"; He, Himself, in virtue of all He is—Jesus Christ, in whom the Divine ideal of humanity is consummated, in whom the Father sees His own essential righteousness revealed, Jesus Christ the Righteous—is both propitiation and intercession. The two acts are not only united in one person, but constitute the one reconciling work by which there is abiding fellowship between God and His sinning people.

(3) One with New Testament Teaching.

In this statement of the doctrine of propitiation, memorable as it is, there is nothing notably original. It tacitly presupposes, as New Testament teaching everywhere does, that God, in bestowing the sovereign

grace of pardon and sonship, must deal truthfully and adequately with sin as a violation of the moral order; and with John, as with other New Testament writers, the necessity and efficacy of sacrifice as the means by which this is accomplished are simply axiomatic. His great contribution to Christian thought is the vision of the cross in the heart of the eternal love. How suggestive are these two statements when placed side by side! "Herein is love .... that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins" (1Joh 4:10); and "Hereby know we love (recognize what it is), because he laid down his life for us" (1Joh 3:16). God's sending His Son and Christ's laying down His life are moral equivalents. The sacrifice of Christ is the sacrifice of God. John's doctrine of propitiation follows as a moral necessity from his doctrine of God. If God is love, nothing is more inevitably true than that He suffers on account of human sin; and to deny Him the power to help and save men by bearing their burden would be to deny to Him love's highest prerogative.

JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, 2

VI. Eternal Life.

The development of the conception of eternal life must be set along with the doctrine of the moral nature of God and the doctrine of the incarnation as one of the greatest contributions of the Johannine theology to New Testament thought. With this conception the Gospel begins (Joh 1:4) and ends (Joh 20:31); and, in like manner, the Epistle (1Joh 1:2; 5:20). The designation most frequently employed is simply "the life" (he zoe); 17 times in the Gospel and 6 times in the First Epistle it is described qualitatively as "eternal"; but the adjective brings out only what is implicit in the noun. In harmony with the universal Biblical conception, John regards life as the summum bonum, in which the reality of fellowship with God consists, which therefore fulfills the highest idea of being—"perfect truth in perfect action" (Westcott). Christ Himself is "the life" (Joh 14:6), its only bestower and unfailing source (Joh 14:19). He came that we might have it abundantly (Joh 10:10).

1. Ethical Rather than Eschatological:

But this conception is uniquely developed in two directions. While the eschatological element is not lost, it is absorbed in the ethical. The ideas of duration and futurity, which are properly and originally expressed by the adjective "eternal" (aionios = belonging to an eon—specifically to "the coming eon"), become secondary to that of timeless moral quality. Always life is regarded as a present possession rather than as future felicity (e.g. Joh 3:36; 20:31; 1 Joh 3:14,15; 5:12). For John the question whether it is possible to make the best of both worlds is meaningless. Eternal life is the best, the Divine, kind of life, whether in this world or another. It is the kind of life that has its perfect manifestation in Christ (1Joh 1:2; 5:11). To possess that nature which produces thoughts and motives and desires, words and deeds like His, is to have eternal life.

2. Metaphysical Aspect:

Metaphysically the conception undergoes a development which is equally remarkable, though in the

judgment of many, of more questionable value. It has already been seen (see above, II) that life is conceived as the animating principle or essence of the Divine nature, the inward energy of which all its activities are the manifold outgoing. And this conception is carried through with strict consistency. The spiritual life in men, which is "begotten of God," is the vital essence, the mystic principle which is manifested in all the capacities and activities of Christian personality. It does not consist in, and still less is it a result following, repentance, faith, obedience or love; it is that of which they are the fruits and the evidences. Thus instead of "This do, and thou shalt live" (Lu 10:28), John says, conversely, "Every one also, that doeth righteousness is (= has been) begotten of" God (1Joh 2:29); instead of "The just shall live by faith" (Ro 1:17, the King James Version), "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is (= has been) begotten of God" (1Joh 5:1). The human activity is the result and proof of Divine life already imparted, not the condition or means of its attainment. In the Johannine conception life is cause, not effect; not phenomenon, but essence; not the complex whole of the qualities, activities and experiences of the spiritual man, but that which makes them possible—the inscrutable, Divinely communicated principle (Joh 3:8) in which the capacity for them is given and by which also it is realized.

Reply to Criticism.

This Johannine conception of life is vigorously criticized as importing into the interpretation of Christian experience principles and modes of thought borrowed from Greek philosophy. But the tendency to infer causes from effects and to reason from phenomena to essence is not peculiar to Greek philosophy; it is native to the human intellect. The Johannine conception of spiritual life is closely analogous to the common conception of physical life. We do not conceive that a man lives because he breathes and feels and acts; we think and we say that he does these things because he lives, because there is in him that mystic principle we call life. Only to the thinker trained in the logic of empiricism is it possible to define life solely by its phenomena, as e.g. "the continuous adjustment of internal to external relations" (Spencer). The ordinary mind instinctively passes behind the phenomena to entity of which they are the manifestation. The Johannine conception, moreover, lies in the natural line of development for New Testament thought. It is implicit in that whole strain of our Lord’s synoptic teaching which regards doing as only the outcome of being, and which is emphasized in such utterances as "Either make the tree good, and its fruit good; or make the tree corrupt, and its fruit corrupt: for the tree is known by its fruit" (Mt 12:33); as also in the whole Pauline doctrine of the new creation and the mystical indwelling of Christ in the members of His body. And while it is no doubt true that the Johannine conception of life was immediately influenced by contact with Hellenism, it is one which was sure, sooner or later, to emerge in Christian theology.

3. Development of Doctrine:

(1) Source in God.

In the development of the doctrine we note the following points. (a) The sole and absolute source of life is God, the Father, revealed in Christ. "The Father hath life in himself" (Joh 5:26). He is the "living Father" by whom the Son lives (Joh 6:57); the "true God, and eternal life" (1Joh 5:20). Eternal life is

nothing else than the immanence of God in moral beings created after His likeness; the Divine nature reproducing itself in human nature; the energy of the Spirit of God in the spiritual nature of man. This is its ultimate definition.

(2) Mediated by Christ.

Of this life Christ is the sole mediator (Joh 6:33,17; 11:25; 14:6). The witness is that "God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in his Son" (1Joh 5:11). This mediation is grounded in the relation, eternally subsisting within the Godhead, of the Loges to the Father. The life manifested and seen in the historic Christ (1Joh 1:1) is "the life, the eternal life," which existed in relation to the Father (1Joh 1:2). By the incarnation of the Son the eternal life in its Divine fullness has become incorporate with humanity, a permanent source of regenerative power to "as many as received him" (Joh 1:12). It is His own relation to the Father that He reproduces in men (Joh 17:23).

(3) Through the Spirit.

In the communication of this life the Spirit is the one direct agent (Joh 3:5-8; see above, under IV).

(4) The Divine "Begetting."

The act of Divine self-communication is constantly and exclusively expressed by the word "beget" (gennao—Joh 1:13; 3:3,5-8; 1Joh 2:29; 3:9, etc.). The word is of far-reaching significance. It implies not only that life has its ultimate origin in God, but that its communication is directly and solely His act. In how literal a sense the Divine begetting is to be understood appears very strikingly in 1Joh 3:9: "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin; because his seed abideth in him." The unique expression "his seed" signifies the new life-principle which is the formative element of the "children of God." This abides in him who has received it. It stamps its own character upon his life and determines its whole development.

(5) The "Children of God."

Those who are "begotten of God" are ipso facto "children of God" (tekna theou, Joh 1:12; 11:52; 1 Joh 3:1,2,10; 5:2). The term connotes primarily the direct communication of the Father’s own nature; and secondarily the fact that the nature thus communicated has not as yet reached its full stature, but contains the promise of a future glorious development. We are now children of God, but what it fully is to be children of God is not yet made manifest (1Joh 3:2). Participation in this life creates a family fellowship (koinonia) at once human and Divine. Those who are begotten of God and walk in the light have "fellowship one with another" (1Joh 1:7). They are "brethren" and are knit together by the instincts (1Joh 5:1) and the duties of mutual love (Joh 13:34; 15:12; 1 Joh 3:16; 4:11) and of mutual watchfulness and intercession (1Joh 5:16).

On the Divine side they have fellowship "with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1Joh 1:3). In

this Divine fellowship the life "begotten" is nourished and sustained; and no term is more characteristic of the Johannine vocabulary, alike in Gospel and Epistles, than the word "abide" (menein), by which this is expressed. There is, however, a noticeable difference in the modes of statement. In the Epistle, the formulas almost exclusively employed are these: "God abides in us," "We abide in God," "God abides in us and we in him." In the Gospel the reciprocal indwelling is that of Christ and His disciples (Joh 15:4-10), which has its Divine counterpart in that of the Father and the Son (Joh 14:10; 17:23; 15:10). This diversity is consistent with the different points of view occupied in the two documents. The Gospel is christocentric; the Epistle, theocentric. In the one is given the concrete presentment of the incarnate Son; in the other the immediate intuition of the Divine nature revealed in Him. While the theme common to both is the "Word of life," the special theme of the Gospel is the Word who reveals and imparts the life; in the Epistle it is the life revealed and imparted by the Word, and the thought of the indwelling Christ is naturally carried up to the ultimate truth of the indwelling God.

(6) The Divine Abiding.

The vitalizing union by which the Divine life is sustained in those who are begotten of God consists in two reciprocal activities, not separable and not identical—God’s (or Christ’s) abiding in us and our abiding in Him. As in the similitude of the vine and the branches (Joh 15:1-10), the life imparted is dependent for its sustenance and growth upon a continuous influx from the parent source: as it is the sap of the vine that vitalizes the branches, producing leaf and blossom and fruit, so does the life of God support and foster in His children its own energies of love and truth and purity. But to this end the abiding of God in us has as its necessary counterpart our abiding in Him. We can respond to the Divine influence or reject it; open or obstruct the channels through which the Divine life flows into ours (Joh 15:6,7,10; 8:31). Hence, abiding in God is a subject of instruction and exhortation (Joh 15:4; 1Joh 2:27 f); and here the idea of persistent and stedfast purpose which belongs to the word menein comes clearly into view. As the abiding of God in us is the persistent and purposeful action by which the Divine nature influences ours, so our abiding in God is the persistent and purposeful submission of ourselves to that influence. The means of doing this are stedfast loyalty to the truth as it is revealed in Christ and announced in the apostolic Gospel (Joh 8:31; 15:7; 1Joh 2:27), keeping God’s commandments (Joh 14:23; 15:10; 1 Joh 3:24), and loving one another (1Joh 4:12,16). Thus only is the channel of communication kept clear between the source and the receptacle of life.

VII. Human Nature and Its Regeneration.

The necessity of regeneration is fundamental to the whole theological scheme (Joh 3:3,5,7). Life which consists in union with God does not belong to man as he is naturally constituted: those who know that they have eternal life know that it is theirs because they have "passed out of death into life" (1Joh 3:14; Joh 5:24).

1. The World:

The unregenerate state of human nature is specially connected with the Johannine conception of the

"world" (kosmos). This term has a peculiar elasticity of application; and Westcott's definition—"the order of finite being, regarded as apart from God"—may be taken as expressing the widest idea that underlies John's use of the word. When the kosmos is material, it signifies

(1) the existing terrestrial creation (Joh 1:10; 13:1; 16:28), especially as contrasted with the sphere of the heavenly and eternal. When it refers to humanity, it is either

(2) the totality of mankind as needing redemption and as the object of God's redeeming love (Joh 3:16; 1 Joh 2:2; 4:14), or

(3) the mass of unbelieving men, hostile to Christ and resisting salvation (e.g. Joh 15:18). Of the world in this sense it is said that it has no perception of the true nature of God and the Divine glory of Christ (Joh 1:10; 17:25; 1 Joh 3:1); that it hates the children of God (Joh 15:18,19; 17:14; 1 Joh 3:13); that the spirit of Antichrist dwells in it (1Joh 4:3,4); that to it belong the false prophets and their adherents (1Joh 4:1,5); that it is under the dominion of the wicked one (Joh 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 1 Joh 5:19); that the constituents of its life are "the lust of the flesh and the lust of the eyes and the vainglory of life" (1Joh 2:16); that it passeth away (1Joh 2:17); that Christ has conquered it (Joh 16:33), and that "whatsoever is begotten of God" conquers it (1Joh 5:4) by the power of faith in Him (1Joh 5:5).

Thus the "world" (in this darker significance) is composed of those who still love the darkness rather than the light (Joh 3:19), who, when Christ is presented to them, obstinately retain their blindness and enmity. Nevertheless, the "world" is not beyond the possibility of salvation. The Holy Spirit, acting in the Christian community, will convince the world with regard to sin and righteousness and judgment (Joh 16:8); and the evidence of the unity of Divine fellowship among Christ's disciples will lead it to believe in His Divine mission (Joh 17:23).

2. Two Classes in the Human Race:

Thus, it is true that John teaches "a distinction of two great classes in the human race—those who are from above and those who are from beneath—children of light and children of darkness." But that he teaches this in any Gnostic or semignostic fashion is an assertion for which there is no real basis. He distinguishes between those who love the light and those who love the darkness rather than the light, between those who "receive" Christ and those who "will not" come unto Him that they may have life. This distinction, however, he traces to nothing in the natural constitution of the two classes, but solely to the regenerating act of God (Joh 1:13; 6:44). His doctrine of regeneration is, in fact, his solution of the problem created by the actual existence of those two classes among men—a problem which is forced upon every thoughtful Christian mind by the diverse and opposite results of evangelism. It is this that lies behind such utterances as these: "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (Joh 18:37); "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice .... and they follow me" (Joh 10:26,27); "Every one that hath heard from the Father, cometh unto me. No man can come unto me except it be given unto him of the Father" (Joh 6:45,65). In these and all similar passages, belief or unbelief in Christ, when He is presented, depends upon antecedent spiritual predisposition (John's

equivalent to the Pauline predestination). There exists in certain persons what is lacking in others, a power of spiritual vision by which Christ is recognized, a capacity and a predisposition to receive Him. But this predisposition is not (any more than Paul's predestination) theirs by gift of nature. John refuses to find its source in human personality (Joh 1:13; 1 Joh 5:1). The children of God are not a superior species of the genus homo. They are men who have passed from death into life, and who have done so because they are begotten of God. John's doctrine is thus the antithesis of Gnosticism. The Gnostic distinction of two classes in the human race glorified men; its proper and inevitable fruit was spiritual pride. The effect of John's doctrine is to humble man and glorify God, to satisfy the innermost Christian consciousness that not even for their appropriation of God's gift in Christ can believers take credit to themselves; that in nothing can the human spirit do more than respond to the Divine, and that, in the last analysis, this power itself is of God. Regeneration in the Johannine sense is not to be identified with conversion. It is the communication of that vision of truth and that capacity for new moral activity which issue in conversion. The doctrine of regeneration contained in the Johannine writings is the fullest recognition in the New Testament that all the conscious experiences and activities of the Christian life are the result of God's own inscrutable work of begetting in the depths of human personality, and of renewing and replenishing there, the energies of the Divine.

VIII. The Church and Sacraments.

1. The Church:

While the word "church" is not found, the idea lies near the base of the Johannine theology. The Divine life communicated to men creates a Divine brotherhood, a "fellowship" which is with the Father and "with his Son Jesus Christ" (1Joh 1:3) and also "one with another" (1Joh 1:7)—a fellowship which is consecrated by the self-consecration of Jesus (Joh 17:19), in which men are cleansed from all sin by His blood (1Joh 1:7), and which is maintained by His intercessory action as the Paraclete with the Father (1Joh 2:1). This fellowship is realized in the actual Christian community and there only; but it is essentially inward and spiritual, not mechanically ecclesiastical, In the visible community spurious elements may intrude themselves, as is proved when schism unmasks those who, though they have belonged to the external organization, have never been partakers of its real life (1Joh 2:19). Only among those who walk in the light of God does true fellowship exist (1Joh 1:7).

2. The Sacraments:

From the doctrine of the Divine nature as life and light one might a priori infer the possibilities of a Johannine view of the sacraments. It is evident that there is room in the Johannine system of thought for a genuinely sacramental mode of Divine action—the employment of definite external acts, not as symbols only, but as real media of Divine communication. On the other hand, the truth that God is not life only but light also—self-revealing as well as self-imparting—would necessarily exclude any magical ex opere operato theory by which spiritual efficacy is attributed either to the physical elements in themselves or to the physical act of participation. And (though there is little or no explicit statement) such is the type of doctrine we actually find. With regard to all sacramental rites the universal principle

applies: ‘It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing’ (Joh 6:63).

(1) Baptism.

Yet baptism is the physical counterpart of the Spirit’s work in regeneration, and great importance is attached to it as the means of admission to the new life of the kingdom (Joh 3:5).

(2) The Lord’s Supper.

The omission of all reference to the institution of the Lord’s Supper (the incident of the feet-washing and the proclamation of the new commandment taking its place in the Gospel-narrative) is thought to indicate that John was conscious of a tendency to attach a superstitious value to the outward observance, and desired emphatically to subordinate this to what was spiritual and essential. The omission, to whatever motive it may have been due, is counter-balanced by the sacramental discourse (Joh 6). While the language of this discourse is not to be interpreted in a technically eucharistic sense, its purpose, or one of its purposes, undoubtedly, is to set forth the significance of the Lord’s Supper in the largest light. Christ gives to men the bread of life, which is His own flesh and of which men must eat that they may live (Joh 6:50-55). "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood abideth in me and I in him." This eating and drinking is essentially of the Spirit. It signifies a derivation of life analogous to that of the Son Himself from the Father. "As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me" (Joh 6:57). To "eat the flesh" of the Son of Man is to receive spiritual nourishment from Him, to live by His life. Yet there is nothing in John’s way of thinking to exclude a real sacramental efficiency. "The act which is nothing when it is performed ignorantly and mechanically is of sovereign value to those who have apprehended its true meaning. The material elements represent the flesh and blood of Christ—His Divine Person given for the life of the world. He is present in them, not merely by way of symbol, but actually; but there must be something in the recipient corresponding to the spiritual reality which is conveyed through the gift. The outward act of participation must be accompanied with belief in Christ and a true insight into the nature of His work and a will to know and serve Him. The sacrament becomes operative as the bread of life through this receptive spirit on the part of those who observe it" (Scott, The Fourth Gospel, 127-28).

IX. Eschatology.

1. Type of Thought Idealistic:

The type of mind revealed in the Johannine writings is one that instinctively leans to the ideal and the spiritual in its contemplation of life, grasping what is of universal significance and dwelling upon events only as they are the embodiment of eternal principles. Where this fashion of thought is so strongly developed, the eschatological, like the historical, becomes secondary.

2. Yet History Not Ignored:

In John there is but one life—the eternal; and there is but one world—the world of the ideal, which is also the only real. Yet he is not an idealist, pure and simple. For him events are not merely symbols; history is not allegory. The incarnation is a historical fact, the Parousia a future event. His thought does not move in a world of mere abstractions, a world in which nothing ever happens. His true distinction as a thinker lies in the success with which he unites the two strains of thought, the historical and the ideal. The word which may be said to express his conception of history is "manifestation" (compare Joh 2:11; 9:3; but especially 1Joh 1:2; 2:19,28; 3:2,5,8; 4:9). The incarnation is only the manifestation of ‘what was from the beginning’ (1Joh 1:1,2); the mission of Christ, the manifestation of the love eternally latent in the depths of the Divine nature (1Joh 4:9). The successive events of history are the emergence into visibility of what already exists. In them the potential becomes actual.

3. Nor Eschatology:

Thus John has an eschatology, as well as a history. He profoundly spiritualizes. He reaches down through the pictorial representations of the traditional apocalyptic, and inquires what essential principle each of these embodies. Then he discovers that this principle is already universally and inevitably in operation; and this, the present spiritual reality, becomes for him the primary thought. Judgment means essentially the sifting and separation, the classification of men according to their spiritual affinities. But every day men are thus classifying themselves by their attitude toward Christ; this, the true judgment of the world, is already present fact. So also the coming and presence of Christ must always be essentially a spiritual fact, and as such it is already a present fact. There is, in the deepest significance of the word, a perpetual coming of Christ in Christian experience. This, however, does not prevent John from firmly holding the certainty of a fuller manifestation of these facts in the future, when tendencies shall have reached a final culmination, and principles which are now apprehended only by faith will be revealed in all the visible magnitude of their consequences.

4. Eschatological Ideas:

We shall now briefly survey the Johannine presentation of the chief eschatological ideas.

(1) Eternal life.

It has already been said that the most distinctive feature in the conception of eternal life is that it is not a future immortal felicity so much as a present spiritual state. The category of duration recedes before that of moral quality. Yet it has its own stupendous importance. In triumphant contrast with the poor ephemeralities of the worldly life, he that doeth the will of God "abideth for ever" (1Joh 2:17); and the complete realization of the life eternal is still in the future (Joh 4:36; 6:27; 12:25).

(2) Antichrist.

The view of Antichrist is strikingly characteristic. Tacitly setting aside the lurid figure of popular traditions, John grasps the essential fact that is expressed by the name and idea of Antichrist (= one who

in the guise of Christ opposes Christ), and finds its fulfillment in the false teaching which substituted for the Christ of the gospel the fantastic product of Gnostic imagination (1Joh 4:3). But in this he reads the sign that the world's day has reached its last hour (1Joh 2:18).

(3) Resurrection.

While the Fourth Gospel so carefully records the proofs of Christ's resurrection, noticeably little (in the Epistle, nothing) is made of the thought of a future resurrection from the dead. For the Christian, the death of the body is a mere incident. "Whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die" (Joh 11:26; compare Joh 8:51). Regeneration—union with Christ—is the true resurrection (Joh 6:50,51,58). And yet, again, the eschatological idea is not lost. Side by side with the essential truth the supplementary and interpretative truth is given its right place. "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day" (Joh 6:54 the King James Version). If Christ says "I am the life: whosoever liveth and believeth on me shall never die," He also says "I am the resurrection: he that believeth on me, though he die, yet shall he live" (Joh 11:25).

(4) Judgment.

As has already been said, John regards judgment as essentially a present fact of life. Christ does not pass judgment upon men—that is not the purpose of His coming (Joh 3:17; 12:47). Yet Christ is always of necessity judging men—compelling them to pass judgment upon themselves. For judgment He is come into the world (Joh 9:39). By their attitude toward Him men involuntarily but inevitably classify themselves, reveal what spirit they are of, and automatically register themselves as being or as not being "of the truth" (Joh 18:37). Judgment is not the assigning of a character from without, but the revelation of a character from within. And this is not future, but present. "He that believeth not hath been judged .... because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of of God" (Joh 3:18). Yet the apostle indubitably looks forward to a future Day of Judgment (Joh 12:48; 1 Joh 4:17). Nor is this simply an "unconscious concession to orthodoxy." The judgment to come will be the full manifestation of the judgment that now is, that is to say, of the principles according to which men are in reality approved or condemned already. What this present judgment, the classification of men by their relation to Christ, ultimately signifies, is not at all realized by the "world," is not fully realized even in Christian faith. There must be a day when all self-deception shall cease and all reality shall be manifested.

(5) The Parousia.

In like manner the conception of the Parousia is primarily spiritual. The substitution in the Fourth Gospel of the Supper Discourse (Joh 14-16) for the apocalyptic chapters in the Synoptics is of the utmost significance. It is not a Christ coming on the clouds of heaven that is presented, but a Christ who has come and is ever coming to dwell in closest fellowship with His people (see above under IV). Yet John by no means discards belief in the Parousia as a historical event of the future. If Christ's abiding-place is in those that love Him and keep His word, there is also a Father's House in which there are many abiding-places, whither He goes to prepare a place for them and whence He will come again to

receive them unto Himself (Joh 14:2,3). Still more is this emphasized in the Epistle. The command "Love not the world" is sharpened by the assurance that the world is on the verge, aye, in the process of dissolution (1Joh 2:17). The exhortation to "abide in him" is enforced by the dread of being put to shame at His impending advent (1Joh 2:28). The hope of being made partakers in His manifested glory is the consummation of all that is implied in our being now children of God (1Joh 3:2,3).

(a) A "Manifestation":

But this future crisis will be only the manifestation of the existing reality (1Joh 3:2). The Parousia will, no more than the incarnation, be the advent of a strange Presence in the world. It will be, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, the outshining of a latent glory; not the arrival of one who is absent, but the self-revealing of one who is present. As to the manner of Christ's appearing, the Epistle is silent. As to its significance, we are left in no doubt. It is a historical event; occurring once for all; the consummation of all Divine purpose that has governed human existence; the final crisis in the history of the church, of the world, and of every man.

(b) Relation to Believers:

Especially for the children of God, it will be a coming unto salvation. "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is" (1Joh 3:2). Here the Johannine idea of "manifestation" is strikingly employed. "What we shall be" will be essentially what we are—children of God. No new element will be added to the regenerate nature. All is there that ever will be there. But the epoch of full development is not yet. Only when Christ—the Christ who is already in the world—shall be manifested, then also the children of God who are in the world will be manifested as being what they are. They also will have come to their Mount of Transfiguration. As eternal life here is mediated through this first manifestation (1Joh 1:2), so eternal life hereafter will be mediated through this second and final manifestation. "We know that we shall be like him, because we shall see him as he is." It is true that here according to our capacity we behold Him as He is (Joh 1:14); but perception, now dim and wavering, will then be intense and vivid. The vision of the future is in some sense corporeal as well as spiritual. Sense and faith will coincide. It will then have ceased to be expedient that Christ should go away in order that the Spirit of truth may come. We shall possess in the same experience the privilege of the original eyewitnesses of the incarnate life and the inward ministry of the Spirit. And seeing Him as He is, we shall be like Him. Vision will beget likeness, and likeness again give clearness to vision. And as the vision is in some unconjecturable fashion corporeal as well as spiritual, so also is the assimilation (compare Php 3:21). The very idea of the spiritual body is that it perfectly corresponds to the character to which it belongs. The outward man will take the mold of the inward man, and will share with it its perfected likeness to the glorified manhood of Jesus Christ. Such is the farthest view opened to our hope by the Johannine eschatology; and it is that which, of all others, has been most entrancing to the imagination and stimulating to the aspiration of the children of God.

LITERATURE.

The following works may be mentioned as treating specially of the Theology: B. Weiss, Der Johannische Lehrbegriff, Berlin, 1862; O. Holtzmann, Das Johannes-Evangelium untersucht und erklart, Darmstadt, 1887; Beyschlag, Neutestamentliche Theologie, Halle, 1896; Pfleiderer, Das Urchristentum, Berlin, 1902, English translation, Williams and Norgate, London; E. Haupt, Der erste Brief des Johannes, Colberg, 1869, English translation, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh; Grill, Untersuchungen uber die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums, Tubingen, 1902; G.B. Stevens, The Johannine Theology, New York, 1894; id., The Theology of the New Testament, 1899, also The Christian Doctrine of Salvation, 1905, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh; O. Cone, The Gospel and Its Earliest Interpretations, New York, 1893; Scott, The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology, T. and T. Clark, 1906; Law, The Tests of Life: A Study of the First Epistle of John (dealing specially with the Theology), Edinburgh and New York, 1909; Denney, Jesus and the Gospel, New York, 1909; Judge, Cambridge Biblical Essays, Macmillan, 1910.

R. Law

JOHN (1)

jon (Ioannes): The name of several persons mentioned in the Apocrypha:

(1) Father of Mattathias, grandfather of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers (1 Macc 2:1).

(2) Eldest son of Mattathias, surnamed GADDIS (which see).

(3) Father of Eupolemus, one of the envoys sent to Rome by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 8:17; 2 Macc 4:11).

(4) John Hyrcanus, "a valiant man," son of Simon, and nephew of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 13:53; 16:1).

See ASMONEANS; MACCABEES.

(5) One of the envoys sent to treat with Lysias (2 Macc 11:17).

J. Hutchison

JOHN (2)

(Ioannes): The name of 4 persons:

(1) JOHN THE BAPTIST (which see).

(2) The apostle, the son of Zebedee, and brother of James (see JOHN, THE APOSTLE).

(3) A relative of Annas the high priest, who sat in the Sanhedrin when Peter and John were tried (Ac 4:6). Lightfoot supposes him to be the Jochanan ben Zacchai of the Talmud, who, however, did not belong to the family of the high priest. Nothing is really known of him.

(4) JOHN MARK (which see).

(5) Father of Simon Peter (Joh 1:42; 21:15,17, margin "Greek Joanes: called in Mt 16:17, Jonah").

S. F. Hunter

JOHN MARK

See MARK, JOHN.

JOHN THE BAPTIST

(Ioanes):

I. SOURCES

II. PARENTAGE

III. EARLY LIFE

IV. MINISTRY

1. The Scene

2. His First Appearance

3. His Dress and Manner

4. His Message

5. His Severity

V. BAPTISM

1. Significance

(1) Lustrations Required by the Levitical Law

(2) Anticipation of Messianic Lustrations Foretold by the Prophets

(3) Proselyte Baptism

2. Baptism of Jesus

VI. IMPRISONMENT AND DEATH

1. The Time

2. The Occasion

VII. JOHN AND HIS DISCIPLES

1. The Inner Circle

2. Their Training

3. Their Fidelity

VIII. JOHN AND JESUS

1. John’s Relation to Jesus

2. Jesus’ Estimate of John

LITERATURE

I. Sources.

The sources of first-hand information concerning the life and work of John the Baptist are limited to the New Testament and Josephus Luke and Matthew give the fuller notices, and these are in substantial agreement. The Fourth Gospel deals chiefly with the witness after the baptism. In his single notice (Ant., XVIII, v, 2), Josephus makes an interesting reference to the cause of John’s imprisonment. See VI, 2, below.

II. Parentage.

John was of priestly descent. His mother, Elisabeth, was of the daughters of Aaron, while his father, Zacharias, was a priest of the course of Abija, and did service in the temple at Jerusalem. It is said of them that "they were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless" (Lu 1:6). This priestly ancestry is in interesting contrast with his prophetic mission.

III. Early Life.

We infer from Luke's account that John was born about six months before the birth of Jesus. Of the place we know only that it was a city of the hill country of Judah. Our definite information concerning his youth is summed up in the angelic prophecy, "Many shall rejoice at his birth. For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and he shall drink no wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb" (Lu 1:14-16), and in Luke's brief statement, "And the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (Lu 1:80). The character and spiritual insight of the parents shown in the incidents recorded are ample evidence that his training was a fitting preparation for his great mission.

IV. Ministry.

1. The Scene:

The scene of the Baptist's ministry was partly in the wilderness of Southern Judea and partly in the Jordan valley. Two locations are mentioned, Bethany or Bethabara (Joh 1:28), and Aenon near Salim (Joh 3:23). Neither of these places can be positively identified. We may infer from Joh 3:2 that he also spent some time in Peraea beyond the Jordan.

2. His First Appearance:

The unusual array of dates with which Luke marks the beginning of John's ministry (Lu 3:1,2) reveals his sense of the importance of the event as at once the beginning of his prophetic work and of the new dispensation. His first public appearance is assigned to the 15th year of Tiberius, probably 26 or 27 AD, for the first Passover attended by Jesus can hardly have been later than 27 AD (Joh 2:20).

3. His Dress and Manner:

John's dress and habits were strikingly suggestive of Elijah, the old prophet of national judgment. His desert habits have led some to connect him with that strange company of Jews known as the Essenes. There is, however, little foundation for such a connection other than his ascetic habits and the fact that the chief settlement of this sect was near the home of his youth. It was natural that he should continue the manner of his youthful life in the desert, and it is not improbable that he intentionally copied his great prophetic model. It was fitting that the one who called men to repentance and the beginning of a self-denying life should show renunciation and self-denial in his own life. But there is no evidence in his

teaching that he required such asceticism of those who accepted his baptism.

4. His Message:

The fundamental note in the message of John was the announcement of the near approach of the Messianic age. But while he announced himself as the herald voice preparing the way of the Lord, and because of this the expectant multitudes crowded to hear his word, his view of the nature of the kingdom was probably quite at variance with that of his hearers. Instead of the expected day of deliverance from the foreign oppressor, it was to be a day of judgment for Israel. It meant good for the penitent, but destruction for the ungodly. "He will gather his wheat into the garner, but the chaff he will burn up with .... fire" (Mt 3:12). "The axe also lieth at the root of the trees: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire" (Lu 3:9). Yet this idea was perhaps not entirely unfamiliar. That the delay in the Messiah's coming was due to the sinfulness of the people and their lack of repentance, was a commonplace in the message of their teachers (Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I, 169).

The call to repentance was then a natural message of preparation for such a time of judgment. But to John repentance was a very real and radical thing. It meant a complete change of heart and life. "Bring forth .... fruits worthy of repentance" (Lu 3:8). What these fruits were he made clear in his answers to the inquiring multitudes and the publicans and soldiers (Lu 3:10-14). It is noticeable that there is no reference to the usual ceremonies of the law or to a change of occupation. Do good; be honest; refrain from extortion; be content with wages.

5. His Severity:

John used such violence in addressing the Pharisees and Sadducees doubtless to startle them from their self-complacency. How hopelessly they were blinded by their sense of security as the children of Abraham, and by their confidence in the merits of the law, is attested by the fact that these parties resisted the teachings of both John and Jesus to the very end.

With what vigor and fearlessness the Baptist pressed his demand for righteousness is shown by his stern reproof of the sin of Herod and Herodias, which led to his imprisonment and finally to his death.

V. Baptism.

1. Significance:

The symbolic rite of baptism was such an essential part of the work of John that it not only gave him his distinctive title of "the Baptist" (ho baptistes), but also caused his message to be styled "preaching the baptism of repentance." That a special virtue was ascribed to this rite, and that it was regarded as a necessary part of the preparation for the coming of the Messiah, are shown by its important place in John's preaching, and by the eagerness with which it was sought by the multitudes. Its significance may

best be understood by giving attention to its historical antecedents, for while John gave the rite new significance, it certainly appealed to ideas already familiar to the Jews.

(1) Lustrations Required by the Levitical Law.

The divers washings required by the law (Le 11-15) have, without doubt, arcligious import. This is shown by the requirement of sacrifices in connection with the cleansing, especially the sin offering (Le 14:8,9,19,20; compare Mr 1:44; Lu 2:22). The designation of John's baptism by the word baptizein, which by New Testament times was used of ceremonial purification, also indicates some historical connection (compare Sirach 34:25).

(2) Anticipation of Messianic Lustrations Foretold by Prophets.

John understood that his baptism was a preparation for the Messianic baptism anticipated by the prophets, who saw that for a true cleansing the nation must wait until God should open in Israel a fountain for cleansing (Zec 13:1), and should sprinkle His people with clean water and give them a new heart and a new spirit (Eze 36:25,26; Jer 33:8). His baptism was at once a preparation and a promise of the spiritual cleansing which the Messiah would bestow. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me .... shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire" (Mt 3:11 margin).

(3) Proselyte Baptism.

According to the teaching of later Judaism, a stranger who desired to be adopted into the family of Israel was required, along with circumcision, to receive the rite of baptism as a means of cleansing from the ceremonial uncleanness attributed to him as a Gentile. While it is not possible to prove the priority of this practice of proselyte baptism to the baptism of John, there can be no doubt of the fact, for it is inconceivable, in view of Jewish prejudice, that it would be borrowed from John or after this time.

While it seems clear that in the use of the rite of baptism John was influenced by the Jewish customs of ceremonial washings and proselyte baptism, his baptism differed very essentially from these. The Levitical washings restored an unclean person to his former condition, but baptism was a preparation for a new condition. On the other hand, proselyte baptism was administered only to Gentiles, while John required baptism of all Jews. At the same time his baptism was very different from Christian baptism, as he himself declared (Lu 3:16). His was a baptism of water only; a preparation for the baptism "in the Spirit" which was to follow. It is also to be observed that it was a rite complete in itself, and that it was offered to the nation as a preparation for a specific event, the advent of the Messiah.

We may say, then, that as a "baptism of repentance" it meant a renunciation of the past life; as a cleansing it symbolized the forgiveness of sins (Mr 1:4), and as preparation it implied a promise of loyalty to the kingdom of the Messiah. We have no reason to believe that Jesus experienced any sense of sin or felt any need of repentance or forgiveness; but as a Divinely appointed preparation for the

Messianic kingdom His submission to it was appropriate.

2. Baptism of Jesus:

While the multitudes flocked to the Jordan, Jesus came also to be baptized with the rest. "John would have hindered him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? But Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Mt 3:13-15). Wherein was this act a fulfillment of righteousness? We cannot believe that Jesus felt any need of repentance or change of life. May we not regard it rather as an identification of Himself with His people in the formal consecration of His life to the work of the kingdom?

VI. Imprisonment and Death.

1. The Time:

Neither the exact time of John's imprisonment nor the period of time between his imprisonment and his death can be determined. On the occasion of the unnamed feast of Joh 5:1, Jesus refers to John's witness as already past. At least, then, his arrest, if not his death, must have taken place prior to that incident, i.e. before the second Passover of Jesus' ministry.

2. The Occasion:

According to the Gospel accounts, John was imprisoned because of his reproof of Herod's marriage with Herodias, the wife of his brother Philip (Lu 3:19,20; compare Mt 14:3,1; Mr 6:17,18). Josephus says (Ant., XVIII, v, 2) that Herod was influenced to put John to death by the "fear lest his great influence over the people might put it in his power or inclination to raise a rebellion. Accordingly, he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus, and was there put to death." This account of Josephus does not necessarily conflict with the tragic story of the Gospels. If Herod desired to punish or destroy him for the reasons assigned by the evangelists, he would doubtless wish to offer as the public reason some political charge, and the one named by Josephus would be near at hand.

VII. John and His Disciples.

1. The Inner Circle:

Frequent reference is made in the Gospel narrative to the disciples of John. As the multitudes crowded to his baptism, it was natural that he should gather about him an inner circle of men who should receive special instruction in the meaning of his work, and should aid him in the work of baptism, which must have soon increased beyond his power to perform alone. It was in the formation of this inner circle of immediate followers that he prepared a sure foundation for the work of the Messiah; for it was from this inner group that the disciples of Jesus were mainly drawn, and that with his consent and through his witness to the superior worth of the latter, and the temporary character of his own mission (Joh 1:29-44).

2. Their Training:

Concerning the substance of their training, we know from the disciples of Jesus (Lu 11:1) that it included forms of prayer, and from his own disciples (Mt 9:14) we learn that frequent fastings were observed. We may be sure also that he taught them much concerning the Messiah and His work.

3. Their Fidelity:

There is abundant evidence of the great fidelity of these disciples to their master. This may be observed in their concern at the over-shadowing popularity of Jesus (Joh 3:26); in their loyalty to him in his imprisonment and in their reverent treatment of his body after his death (Mr 6:29). That John's work was extensive and his influence lasting is shown by the fact that 20 years afterward Paul found in far-off Ephesus certain disciples, including Apollos, the learned Alexandrian Jew, who knew no other baptism than that of John (Ac 19:1-7).

VIII. John and Jesus.

1. John's Relation to Jesus:

John assumed from the first the role of a herald preparing the way for the approaching Messianic age. He clearly regarded his work as Divinely appointed (Joh 1:33), but was well aware of his subordinate relation to the Messiah (Mr 1:7) and of the temporary character of his mission (Joh 3:30). The Baptist's work was twofold. In his preaching he warned the nation of the true character of the new kingdom as a reign of righteousness, and by his call to repentance and baptism he prepared at least a few hearts for a sympathetic response to the call and teaching of Jesus. He also formally announced and bore frequent personal testimony to Jesus as the Messiah.

There is no necessary discrepancy between the synoptic account and that of the Fourth Gospel in reference to the progress of John's knowledge of the Messianic character of Jesus. According to Mt 3:14, John is represented as declining at first to baptize Jesus because he was conscious of His superiority, while in Joh 1:29-34 he is represented as claiming not to have known Jesus until He was manifested by the heavenly sign. The latter may mean only that He was not known to him definitely as the Messiah until the promised sign was given.

The message which John sent to Jesus from prison seems strange to some in view of the signal testimonies which he had previously borne to His character. This need not indicate that he had lost faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, but rather a perplexity at the course of events. The inquiry may have been in the interest of the faith of his disciples or his own relief from misgivings due to Jesus' delay in assuming the expected Messianic authority. John evidently held the prophetic view of a temporal Messianic kingdom, and some readjustment of view was necessary.

2. Jesus’ Estimate of John:

Jesus was no less frank in His appreciation of John. If praise may be measured by the worth of the one by whose lips it is spoken, then no man ever received such praise as he who was called by Jesus a shining light (Joh 5:35), more than a prophet (Mt 11:9), and of whom He said, "Among them that are born of women there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist" (Mt 11:11). If, on the other hand, He rated him as less than the least in the kingdom of heaven, this was a limitation of circumstances, not of worth.

Jesus paid high tribute to the Divine character and worth of John’s baptism; first, by submitting to it Himself as a step in the fulfillment of all righteousness; later, by repeated utterance, especially in associating it with the birth of the Spirit as a necessary condition of inheriting eternal life (Joh 3:5); and, finally, in adopting baptism as a symbol of Christian discipleship.

LITERATURE.

The relative sections in the Gospel Commentaries, in the Lives of Christ, and the articles on John the Baptist in the several Bible dictionaries. There are a number of monographs which treat more minutely of details: W.C. Duncan, The Life, Character and Ac of John the Baptist, New York, 1853; Erich Haupt, Johannes der Taufer, Gutersloh, 1874; H. Kohler, Johannes der Taufer, Halle, 1884; R.C. Houghton, John the Baptist: His Life and Work, New York, 1889; H.R. Reynolds, John the Baptist, London, 1890; J. Feather, John the Baptist, Edinburgh, 1894; George Matheson in Representative Men of the New Testament, 24-66, Edinburgh, 1905; T. Innitzer, Johannes der Taufer, Vienna, 1908; A.T. Robertson, John the Loyal, New York, 1911.

Russell Benjamin Miller

JOHN, GOSPEL OF

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Scope of Gospel

2. State of Opinion as to Date of Appearance, etc.

II. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE fOR THE FOURTH GOSPEL

1. At the End of 2nd Century

2. Irenaeus—Theophilus

3. Middle of 2nd Century

4. Ignatius, etc.

5. John the Presbyter

6. Summary

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL: INTERNAL EVIDENCE

1. General Lines of Attack and Defence

2. Unwarrantable Critical Presuppositions

3. Real Aim of Gospel—Results

(1) Relation to Synoptics

(2) Time Occupied in the Gospel

(3) A Personal Record

(4) Reminiscences of an Eyewitness

(5) Reminiscence Illustrated

(6) Conclusions

IV. PROGRESS AND DEVELOPMENT IN THE GOSPEL

1. The Presentation of Jesus in the Gospel

(1) Alleged Absence of Development in Character of Jesus

(2) Alleged "Autonomy" of Jesus

(3) "Inconceivability" of Logos-Presentation

2. The Logos-Doctrine of the Prologue

3. Growth of Faith and Development of Unbelief

(1) Early Confessions

(2) Growth of Faith in the Disciples

(3) Gradual Disclosure of Messiahship: Growth of Unbelief

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

1. Scope of Gospel:

The Fourth Gospel has a form peculiar to itself, as well as a characteristic style and attitude, which mark it as a unique document among the books of the New Testament.

(1) There is a prologue, consisting of Joh 1:1-18, of which something will be said later on.

(2) There is a series of scenes and discourses from the life of Jesus, descriptive of Himself and His work, and marking the gradual development of faith and unbelief in His hearers and in the nation (1:19-12:50).

(3) There is a more detailed account of the closing events of the Passion Week—of His farewell intercourse with His disciples (Joh 13-17), of His arrest, trials, crucifixion, death, and burial (Joh 18-19).

(4) There are the resurrection, and the manifestations of the risen Lord to His disciples on the resurrection day, and on another occasion eight days after (20:1-29). This is followed by a paragraph which describes the purpose of the Gospel, and the reason why it was written (Joh 20:30,31).

(5) Finally, there is a supplementary chapter (21), which has all the characteristic marks of the Gospel as a whole, and which probably, therefore, proceeds from the same pen (thus Lightfoot, Meyer, Alford, etc.; some, as Zahn, prefer to take the chapter as the work of a disciple of John). The concluding verses (21:24,25) read: "This is the disciple that beareth witness of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his witness is true. And there are also many other things which Jesus did," etc. "We know that his witness is true" seems to be a testimony on the part of those who knew as to the identity of the disciple, and the trustworthiness of his witness. Nor has this earliest testimony been discredited by the attacks made on it, and the natural meaning has been vindicated by many competent writers. The present tense, "beareth witness," indicates that the " disciple" who wrote the Gospel was still alive when the testimony was given.

2. State of Opinion as to Date of Appearance, etc.:

As to the time of the appearance of the Johannine literature, apart from the question as to the authorship of these writings, there is now a growing consensus of opinion that it arose at the end of the 1st century, or at the beginning of the 2nd century. This is held by those who assign the authorship, not to any individual writer, but to a school at Ephesus, who partly worked up traditional material, and elaborated it into the form which the Johannine writings now have; by those also, as Spitta, who disintegrate the Gospel into a Grundschrift and a Bearbeitung (compare his Das Johannes-Evangelium als Quelle der Geschichte Jesu, 1910). Whether the Gospel is looked on as a compilation of a school of theologians, or as the outcome of an editor who utilizes traditional material, or as the final outcome of theological evolution of certain Pauline conceptions, with few exceptions the appearance of the Johannine writings is dated early in the 2nd century. One of the most distinguished of these exceptions is Schmiedel; another is the late Professor Pfleiderer. One may respect Pfleiderer in the region of philosophical inquiry, but in criticism he is a negligible quantity. And the writings of Schmiedel on the Johannine question are rapidly passing into the same category.

Thus, the appearance of the Johannine writings at the end of the 1st century may safely be accepted as a sound historical conclusion. Slowly the critics who assigned their appearance to the middle of the 2nd century, or later, have retraced their steps, and assign the emergence of the Johannine writings to the time mentioned. This does not, of course, settle the questions of the authorship, composition and trustworthiness of the Gospel, which must be determined on their merits, on the grounds of external, and still more of internal, evidence, but it does clear the way for a proper discussion of them, and gives us a terminus which must set a limit to all further speculation on matters of this kind.

II. External Evidence for the Fourth Gospel.

Only an outline of the external evidence for the Fourth Gospel, which concerns both date and authorship, can be given in this article. Fuller information may be sought in the Intros to the Commentaries on the Gospel, by Godet, Westcott, Luthardt, Meyer; in Ezra Abbot’s The Fourth Gospel and Its Authorship; in Zahn’s Introduction to the New Testament, III; in Sanday’s The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel; in Drummond’s The Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. All these and many others defend the Johannine authorship. On the other side, reference may be made to the author of Supernatural Religion, of which many editions have appeared. Among recent works, Moffatt’s Introduction to the New Testament, and B.W. Bacon’s Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate, may be mentioned as denying the Johannine authorship.

1. At End of 2nd Century:

The external evidence is as follows. At the end of the 2nd century, the Christian church was in possession of four Gospels, which were used as sacred books, read in churches in public worship, held in honor as authoritative, and treated as part of a Canon of Scripture (see GOSPELS). One of these was the Fourth Gospel, universally ascribed to the apostle John as its author. We have the evidence on this point of Irenaeus, of Tertullian, of Clement of Alexandria, a little later of Origen. Clement is witness for the belief and practice of the church in Egypt and its neighborhood; Tertullian for the church in Africa;

and Irenaeus, who was brought up in Asia Minor, was a teacher at Rome, and was bishop of Lyons in Gaul, for the churches in these lands. The belief was so unquestioned, that Irenaeus could give reasons for it which would of themselves have convinced no one who had not already had the conviction which the reasons were meant to sustain. To discount the evidence of Irenaeus, Tertullian and Clement on the ground of the desire to find apostolic authorship for their sacred books, is not argument but mere assertion. There may have been such a tendency, but in the case of the four Gospels there is no proof that there was necessity for this at the end of the 2nd century. For there is evidence of the belief in the apostolic authorship of two Gospels by apostles, and of two by companions of the apostles, as an existing fact in the churches long before the end of the 2nd century.

2. Irenaeus—Theophilus:

The importance of the testimony of Irenaeus is measured by the efforts which have been made to invalidate his witness. But these attempts fail in the presence of his historical position, and of the means at his command to ascertain the belief of the churches. There are many links of connection between Irenaeus and the apostolic age. There is specially his connection with Polycarp. He himself describes that relationship in his letter to Florinus, a fellow-disciple of Polycarp, who had lapsed into Gnosticism, in which he says, "I remember the events of that time more clearly than those of recent years. For what boys learn, growing with their mind, becomes joined with it; so that I am able to describe the very place in which the blessed Polycarp sat as he discoursed, and his goings out and comings in, and the manner of his life, and his physical appearance and his discourses to the people, and the accounts which he gave of his intercourse with John and the others who had seen the Lord" (Euseb., HE, V, 20: McGiffert’s translation). We cannot say what was the age of Irenaeus at that time, but he was of sufficient age to receive the impressions which, after many years, he recorded. Polycarp was martyred in 155 AD, and he had been a Christian for 86 years when he was martyred. Thus there was only one link between Irenaeus and the apostolic age. Another link was constituted by his association with Pothinus, his predecessor in Lyons. Pothinus was a very old man when he was martyred, and had in his possession the traditions of the church of Gaul. Thus, Irenaeus, through these and others, had the opportunity of knowing the belief of the churches, and what he records is not only his own personal testimony, but the universal tradition of the church.

With Irenaeus should be adduced the apologist Theophilus (circa 170), the earliest writer to mention John by name as the author of the Gospel. In prefacing a quotation from the commencement of the prologue, he says, "This is what we learn from the sacred writings, and from all men animated by the Spirit, amongst whom John says" (Ad Autol., ii.22). Theophilus is further stated by Jerome to have composed a Harmony of the four Gospels (De Viris Illustr., 25).

3. Middle of 2nd Century:

From Irenaeus and Theophilus we ascend nearer to the middle of the 2nd century, and here we encounter the Diatessaron of Tatian, on which much need not be said. The Diatessaron is likewise a Harmony of the four Gospels, and this Harmony dates not later than 170. It begins with the 1st verse of the Fourth

Gospel, and ends with the last verse of the appendix to the Gospel. Tatian was a pupil of Justin Martyr, and that fact alone renders it probable that the "Memoirs of the Apostles," which Justin quotes so often, were those which his pupil afterward combined in the Diatessaron. That Justin knew the Fourth Gospel seems clear, though we cannot argue the question here. If he did, it follows that it was in existence about the year 130.

4. Ignatius, etc.:

But there is evidence that helps us to trace the influence of the Fourth Gospel back to the year 110. "The first clear traces of the Fourth Gospel upon the thought and language of the church are found in the Epistles of Ignatius (circa 110 AD). How unmistakable these traces are is shown by the fact that not infrequently this dependence of Ignatius upon John has been used as an argument against the genuineness of the Ignatian letters" (Zahn, Introduction, III, 176). This argument may now be safely used since the Epistles have been vindicated as historical documents by Lightfoot and by Zahn. If the Ignatian Epistles are saturated with the tone and spirit of the Johannine writings, that goes to show that this mode of thought and expression was prevalent in the church of the time of Ignatius. Thus at the beginning of the 2nd century, that distinctive mode of thought and speech which we call Johannine had an existence.

A further line of evidence in favor of the Gospel, which need only be referred to, lies in the use made of it by the Gnostics. That the Gospel was used by the Valentinians and Basilides has been shown by Dr. Drummond (op. cit., 265-343).

5. John the Presbyter:

To estimate aright the force of the above evidence, it is to be remembered that, as already observed, there were many disciples of the John of Ephesus, to whom the Johannine writings were ascribed, living far on in the 2nd century—bishops like Papias and Polycarp, the presbyters" so often mentioned by Irenaeus—forming a chain connecting the time of the origin of the Gospel with the latter half of the century. Here arises the question, recently so largely canvassed, as to the identity of "the presbyter John" in the well-known fragment of Papias preserved by Euseb. (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39). Were there, as most, with Eusebius, understand, two Johns—apostle and presbyter (compare e.g. Godet)—or was there only one? If only one, was he the son of Zebedee? On these points wide difference of opinion prevails. Harnack holds that the presbyter was not the son of Zebedee; Sanday is doubtful; Moffatt believes that the presbyter was the only John at Ephesus. Zahn and Dom J. Chapman (John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel, 1911) think also that there was only one John at Ephesus, but he was the son of Zebedee. It is hardly necessary to discuss the question here, for the tradition is explicit which connected the Gospel with the apostle John during the latter part of his residence in Ephesus—a residence which there is no sufficient ground for disputing (see JOHN, THE APOSTLE).

6. Summary:

On a fair consideration of the external evidence, therefore, we find that it is unusually strong. It is very seldom the case that conclusive proof of the existence and influence of a writing can be brought so near to the time of its publication as in the case of the Fourth Gospel. The date of its publication is at the end of the 1st century, or at the latest in the beginning of the 2nd. Traces of its influence are found in the Epistles of Ignatius. The 1st Epistle of John is quoted in the Epistle of Polycarp (chapter 7). The thought and style of the Gospel had influenced Justin Martyr. It is one of the four interwoven in the Diatessaron of Tatian. It was quoted, commented on, and interpreted by the Gnostics. In truth the external evidence for the early date and Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel is as great both in extent and variety as it is for any book of the New Testament, and far greater than any that we possess for any work of classical antiquity.

The history of the controversy on the Johannine authorship is not here entered into. Apart from the obscure sect of the Alogi (who attributed the Gospel to Cerinthus!) in the 2nd century, no voice was heard in challenge of the authorship of John till the close of the 17th century, and serious assault did not begin till the 19th century (Bretschneider, 1820, Strauss, 1835, Weisse, 1838, Baur and his school, 1844 and after, Keim, 1865, etc.). The attacks were vigorously repelled by other scholars (Olshausen, Tholuck, Neander, Ebrard, Bleek, etc.). Some adopted, in various forms and degrees, the hypothesis of an apostolic basis for the Gospel, regarded as the work of a later hand (Weizsacker, Renan, etc.). From this point the controversy has proceeded with an increasing dogmatism on the side of the opponents of the genuineness and trustworthiness of the Gospel, but not less firmness on the part of its defenders. The present state of opinion is indicated in the text.

III. Characteristics of the Gospel: Internal Evidence.

1. General Lines of Attack and Defence:

The external evidence for the Fourth Gospel is criticized, but it is chiefly on internal grounds that the opposition to the Johannine authorship and historical trustworthiness of the Gospel is based. Stress is laid on the broad contrast which admittedly exists in style, character and plan, between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics; on its supposed philosophical dress (the Logos-doctrine); on alleged errors and contradictions; on the absence of progress in the narrative, etc. The defense of the Gospel is usually conducted by pointing out the different aims of the Gospel, rebutting exaggerations in the above objections, and showing that in a multitude of ways the author of the Gospel reveals his identity with the apostle John. He was, e.g., a Jew, a Palestinian Jew, one familiar with the topography of Jerusalem, etc., an apostle, an eyewitness, the disciple whom Jesus loved (13:23; 20:2; 21:7,20). The attestation in 21:24 of those who knew the author in his lifetime is of the greatest weight in this connection. Instead of following these familiar lines of argument (for which see Godet, Luthardt, Westcott, Ez. Abbot, Drummond, etc., in works cited), a confirmation is here sought on the lines of a fresh comprehensive study.

2. Unwarrantable Critical Presuppositions:

The study of the Johannine writings in general, and of the Fourth Gospel in particular, has been approached in many ways and from various points of view. One of the most common of these ways, in recent works, is that which assumes that here we have the product of Christian reflection on the facts disclosed in the other Gospels, and that these facts have been modified by the experience of the church, and reflect the consciousness of the church at the end of the 1st century or the beginning of the 2nd century. By this time, it is assumed that the church, now mainly a Gentilechurch, has been greatly influenced by Greek-Roman culture, that she has been reflecting on the wonder of her own history, and has so modified the original tradition as to assimilate it to the new environment. In the Fourth Gospel, it is said, we have the highest and most elaborate presentation of the outcome of the process. Starting with Paul and his influence, Professor B.W. Bacon traces for us the whole process until a school of theologians at Ephesus produced the Johannine writings, and the consciousness of the church was satisfied with the completeness of the new presentation of Christianity (compare his Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate). Hellenistic ideas in Hebrew form, the facts of the Gospel so transformed as to be acceptable to the Hellenistic mind—this is what scholars of this class find in the Fourth Gospel.

Others again come to the Gospel with the presupposition that it is intended to present to the reader a complete view of the life of Jesus, that it is intended to supplement and to correct the statements of the Synoptics and to present Christ in such a form as to meet the new needs of the church at the beginning of the 2nd century. Others find a polemical aim in the Gospel. Weizsacker, e.g. finds a strong polemic aim against the Jews. He says, "There are the objections raised by the Jews against the church after its secession has been consummated, and after the development of the person of its Christ has passed through its most essential stages. It is not a controversy of the lifetime, but that of the school carried back into the history of the life" (Apostolic Age, II, 222). One would have expected that a statement so forcibly put would have been supported by some evidence; that we might have some historical evidence regarding a controversy between Jew and church beyond what we have in the Fourth Gospel itself. But nothing is offered by Weizsacker except the dictum that these are controversial topics carried on in the school, and that they are anachronisms as they stand. As it happens, we know from the Dial. between Justin Martyr and Trypho what were the topics discussed between Jew and Christian in the middle of the 2nd century, and it is sufficient to say that these topics, as reported by Justin, mainly regarded the interpretation of the Old Testament, and are not those which are discussed in the Fourth Gospel.

Perhaps the most surprising of all the presuppositions with regard to the Fourth Gospel is that which lays great stress on the supposition that the book was largely intended to vindicate a Christian doctrine of the sacraments which flourished at the beginning of the 2nd century. According to this presupposition, the Fourth Gospel set forth a doctrine of the sacraments which placed them in a unique position as a means of salvation. While scarcely contending that the doctrine of the sacraments held by the church of the 2nd century had reached that stage of development which meets us in the medieval church, it is, according to this view, far on the way toward that goal afterward reached. We do not dwell on this view, for the exegesis that finds sacramentarianism in the Fourth Gospel is hopeless. That Gospel does not put the sacraments in the place of Christ. Finally, we do not find the contention of those who affirm that the Fourth Gospel was written with a view of making the gospel of Jesus more acceptable to the Gentiles any more satisfactory. As a matter of fact, the Gospel which was most acceptable to the Gentiles was the Gospel according to Mt. It is more frequently quoted than any other. In the writings of the early church,

it is quoted as often as all the other Gospels put together. The Fourth Gospel did not come into prominence in the Christian church until the rise of the Christological controversies in the 3rd century.

3. Real Aim of Gospel—Results:

When, after dwelling on these ways of approaching the Fourth Gospel, and reading the demands made on the Gospel by those who approach it with these presuppositions and demands, we turn to the Gospel itself, and ask regarding its aim and purpose, we find a simple answer. The writer of it expressly says: "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (Joh 20:30,31). Pursuing this clue, and putting away all the presuppositions which bulk so largely in introductions, exegeses, histories of the apostolic and sub-apostolic ages, one meets with many surprises.

(1) Relation to Synoptics.

In relation to the Synoptics, the differences are great, but more surprising is the fact that the points of contact between these Gospels and the Fourth Gospel are so few. The critics to whom reference has been made are unanimous that the writer or the school who compiled the Johannine writings was indebted to the Synoptics for almost all the facts embodied in the Fourth Gospel. Apart, however, from the Passion Week, only two points of contact are found so obvious that they cannot be doubted, namely, the feeding of the 5,000, and the walking on the sea (Joh 6:4-21). The healing of the child of the royal officer (Joh 4:46-53) can scarcely be identified with the healing of the centurion’s servant (Mt, Lk); but even if the identification were allowed, this is all we have in the Fourth Gospel of the events of the ministry in Galilee. There is a ministry in Galilee, but the earlier ministry in Judea and in Galilee began before John was cast into prison (3:24), and it has no parallel in the Synoptics. In fact, the Fourth Gospel assumes the existence of the other three, and does not anew convey the knowledge which can be gathered from them. It takes its own way, makes its own selections, and sets these forth from its own point of view. It has its own principle of selection: that plainly indicated in the passage already quoted. The scenes depicted, the works done, the words spoken, and the reflections made by the writer, are all directed toward the aim of enabling the readers to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. In the writer’s view this would issue in their obtaining life in His name.

(2) Time Occupied in the Gospel.

Accepting this principle for our guidance, we turn to the Gospel, and the first thing that strikes the reader is the small amount of the real time filled up, or occupied, by the scenes described in the Gospel. We take the night of the betrayal, and the day of the crucifixion. The things done and the words spoken on that day, from one sunset to another, occupy no fewer than 7 chapters of the Gospel (John 13-19). Apart from the supplementary chapter (21), there are 20 chapters in the Gospel, containing 697 vs, and these 7 chapters have 257 verses. More than one-third of the whole given to the ministry is thus occupied with the events of one day.

Again, according to Ac 1:3, there was a ministry of the risen Lord which lasted for 40 days, and of all that happened during those days John records only what happened on the day of the resurrection, and on another day 8 days after (John 20). The incidents recorded in the other Gospels fall into the background, are taken for granted, and only the signs done on these two days are recorded here. They are recorded because they are of significance for the purpose he has in hand, of inducing belief in the truth that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. If we continue to follow the clue thus afforded, we shall be surprised at the fewness of the days on which anything was transacted. As we read the story of the Fourth Gospel, there are many indications of the passing of time, and many precise statements of date. We learn from the Gospel that the ministry of Jesus probably lasted for 3 years. We gather this from the number of the feasts which He attended at Jerusalem. We have notes of time spent in journeys, but no account of anything that happened during them. The days on which anything was done or anything said are very few. We are told precisely that "six days before the passover Jesus came to Bethany, where Lazarus was" (12:1 ff), and with regard to these 6 days we are told only of the supper and the anointing of the feet of Jesus by Mary, of the entry into Jerusalem, the visit of the Greeks, and of the impression which that visit made on Jesus. We have also the reflections of the evangelist on the unbelief of the Jews, but nothing further. We know that many other things did happen on these days, but they are not recorded in this Gospel. Apart from the two days during which Jesus dwelt in the place where he was, of which days nothing is recorded, the time occupied with the raising of Lazarus is the story of one day (John 11). So it is also with the healing of the blind man. The healing is done one day, and the controversy regarding the significance of that healing is all that is recorded of another day (John 9). What is recorded in John 10 is the story of two days. The story of the 7th and 8th chapters, interrupted by the episode of the woman taken in adultery, which does not belong to the Gospel, is the story of not more than two days. The story of the feeding of the 5,000 and of the subsequent discourse (John 6) is the story of two days. It is not necessary to enter into fuller detail. Yet the writer, as remarked, is very exact in his notes of time. He notes the days, the number of days on which anything was done, or when anything was said. We make these remarks, which will be obvious to every reader who attends to them, mainly for the purpose of showing that the Gospel on the face of it does not intend to, at least does not, set forth a complete account of the life and work of Jesus. It gives at the utmost an account of 20 days out of the 1,000 days of our Lord’s ministry. This is of itself sufficient to set aside the idea of those who deal with the Fourth Gospel as if it were meant to set aside, to supplement, or to correct, the accounts in the Synoptics. Plainly it was not written with that purpose.

(3) A Personal Record.

Obviously the book professes to be reminiscences of one who had personal experience of the ministry which he describes. The personal note is in evidence all through the book. It is present even in the prologue, for in that verse in which he describes the great fact of the incarnation he uses the personal note, "We beheld his glory" (Joh 1:14). This might be taken as the keynote of the Gospel. In all the scenes set forth in the Gospel the writer believes that in them Jesus manifested forth His glory and deepened the faith of His disciples. If we were to ask him, when did he behold the glory of the incarnate Word, the answer would be, in all these scenes which are described in the Gospel. If we read the Gospel from this point of view, we find that the writer had a different conception of the glory of the incarnate

Word from that which his critics ascribe to him. He sees a glory of the Word in the fact that He was wearied with His journey (Joh 4:6), that He made clay of the spittle and anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay (Joh 9:6), that He wept at the grave of Lazarus (Joh 11:35), that He groaned in the spirit and was troubled (Joh 11:38), and that He could sorrow with a sorrow unspeakable, as He did after the interview with the Greeks (Joh 12:27). For he records all these things, and evidently thinks them quite consistent with the glory of the incarnate Word. A fair exegesis does not explain these things away, but must take them as of the essence of the manifested glory of the Word.

The Gospel then is professedly reminiscences of an eyewitness, of one who was personally present at all the scenes which he describes. No doubt the reminiscences often pass into reflections on the meaning and significance of what he describes. He often pauses to remark that the disciples, and he himself among them, did not understand at the time the meaning of some saying, or the significance of some deed, of Jesus (Joh 2:22; 12:16, etc.). At other times we can hardly distinguish between the words of the Master and the reflections of the disciple. But in other writings we often meet with the same phenomenon. In the Epistle to the Galatians, e.g., Paul writes what he had said to Peter at Antioch: "If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?" (Ga 2:14). Shortly after, he passes into reflections on the situation, and it is impossible to ascertain where the direct speech ends and the reflections begin. So it is in the Fourth Gospel. It is impossible in many instances to say where the words of Jesus end and the reflections of the writer begin. So it is, e.g., with his record of the witness of the Baptist in John 3. The record of the Baptist’s words may end with the sentence, "He must increase, but I must decrease" (3:30), and the rest may be the reflections of the writer on the situation.

(4) Reminiscences of an Eyewitness.

The phenomena of the Gospel are thus, apparently at least, reminiscences of an eyewitness, with his reflections on the meaning of what he has experienced. He was present at the scenes which he describes. He was present on the night on which the Master was betrayed; he was present in the hall of the high priest; he was present at the cross, and bears testimony to the reality of the death of Jesus (Joh 18:15; 19:35). As we read the Gospel we note the stress he lays on "witness." The term frequently occurs (Joh 1:7,8,19; 3:11,26,33; 5:31; 12:17; 21:24, etc.), and is used to set forth the verified facts of experience. In these testimonies we have an unusual combination of elevated thought and minute observation. At one time the evangelist soars aloft into a spiritual world, and moves with ease among the richest and highest elements of spiritual experience. Using common words, he yet reads into them the deepest meanings regarding man, the world, and God which have ever entered into the mind of man. Sublime mysticism and open-eyed practical sense meet in his wonderful writings. Above all, we are impressed with his sense of the supreme value of the historical. All his spiritual meanings have a historical basis. This is as apparent in the 1st Epistle as it is in the Gospel, and in the Gospel it is conspicuous. While his main interest is to focus the minds of his readers on Jesus, His work and His word, yet unconsciously he has written his own spiritual biography. We gradually become aware, as we read ourselves sympathetically into the spirit of the Gospel, that we are following the line of a great spiritual awakening, and are tracing the growth of faith and love in the life of the writer, until they become the overmastering tone of his whole life. On the one hand, the book is a grand objective revelation of a unique life, the story of the self-

revelation of the Son of God, of the revelation of the Father in Jesus Christ, moving onward to its consummation through the contrasted developments of faith and unbelief on the part of them who received Him, and on the part of them who received Him not. On the other hand, it has a subjective unity in the heart of the writer, as it tells of how faith began, of how faith made progress, until he came to the knowledge of the Son of God. We can enter into the various crises through which he passed, through which, as they successively passed, he won the assurance which he so calmly expresses; and these supply him with the key by means of which he is able to unlock the mystery of the relations of Jesus to the world. The victory of faith which he sets forth was first won in his own soul. This also is included in the significant phrase, "We beheld his glory" (Joh 1:14).

(5) Reminiscence Illustrated.

The Gospel receives powerful confirmation from reflection on the nature of reminiscence generally. A law of reminiscence is that, when we recall anything, or any occurrence, we recall it in its wholeness, with all the accessories of its accompaniments. As we tell it to others, we have to make a selection of that only which is needful to convey our meaning. Inartistic natures do not make a selection; they pour out everything that arises in the memory (compare Dame Quickly in Shakespeare). The finer qualities of reminiscence are abundantly illustrated in the Fourth Gospel, and furnish an independent proof that it is from the pen of an eyewitness. It is possible within reasonable limits to give only a few examples. Observe first the exact notes of time in John 1 and the special notes of character in each of the 6 disciples whom Jesus met on the first 4 days of His ministry. Mark the peculiar graphic note that Nathaniel was under the fig tree (1:50). Pass on to notice the 6 water-pots of stone set at Cana after the manner of the Jews' purifying (2:6). We might refer in this connection to the geographical remarks frequently made in the course of the narrative, indicative of an intimate knowledge of Palestine, and to the numerous allusions to Jewish laws, customs, beliefs, religious ceremonies, usually admitted now to be accurate, and illustrative of familiar knowledge on the part of the writer. Our main object, however, is to call attention to those incidental things which have no symbolical significance, but are set down because, as the main happening was recalled, these arose with it. He again sees the "lad" with the 5 barley loaves and 2 fishes (6:9); remembers that Mary sat still in the house, when the active Martha went forth to meet the Lord as He approached Bethany (11:20); recalls the appearance of Lazarus as he came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes (11:44). He has a vivid picture before him as he recalls the washing of the disciples' feet (13:1-15), and the various attitudes and remarks of the disciples during the whole of that eventful night. He still sees the attitude of the soldiers who came to arrest Jesus (18:3-8), the flashing of Peter's sword (18:10), the share of Nicodemus in the burying of Jesus, and the kinds and weights of the spices brought by him for the embalming of the body (19:38-40). He tells of the careful folding of the linen cloths, and where they were placed in the empty tomb (20:4-8). These are only some of those vivid touches due to reminiscence which none but an eyewitness could safely make. Looking back on the past, the evangelist recalls the various scenes and words of the Lord in their wholeness as they happened, and he chooses those living touches which bear the mark of reality to all readers.

(6) Conclusions.

These touches of vivid reality warrant the conclusion that the writer in this Gospel is depicting scenes in

a real life, and is not drawing on his imagination. Looking back on his own spiritual history, he remembered with special vividness those words and works of Christ which determined his own life, and led him on to the full assurance of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God. The Gospel can be understood from this point of view: it does not seem to us that it can be understood from any other, without ignoring all the phenomena of the kind now indicated. When the Gospel is approached from this point of view, set forth by itself, one can afford to neglect many of the elaborate discussions which have arisen regarding the possible displacement of certain ehs (Spitta, etc.). Much, e.g., has been made of the sudden transference of the scene from Galilee to Judea as we pass from John 4 to John 5, and the equally sudden transference back to Galilee (6:1). Many suggestions have been made, but they all proceed on the supposition that the reminiscences were meant to be continuous, which it has been seen is not the ease. While it is very likely that there is a sequence in the writer's thought, yet this need not compel us to think of displacements. Taken as they are in the Gospel, the selected proofs, whether they occur in Judea or in Galilee, in all instances indicate progress. They illustrate the manifested glory of Jesus, on the one hand, and the growth of faith and the development of unbelief on the other. This, however, opens up a separate line of objection and inquiry to which attention must now be given.

IV. Progress and Development in the Gospel.

It is an objection often urged against the view of the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel that in it there is no progress, no development, no crisis, nothing, e.g., to correspond with the significance of the confession of Peter at Caesarea Philippi. (Mt 16:13-17 parallel). This is held to be true alike of the character of Jesus, which, under the influence of the Logos-doctrine of the prologue, exhibits no development from first to last, and of the attitude of the disciples, whose faith in Jesus as the Christ is likewise represented as complete from the beginning. In reality the opposite is the case. In the course of the Gospel, as already said, the glory of the Lord is ever more completely manifested, and the disciples attain to a deeper faith, while the unbelief of those who reject Him becomes more fixed, until it is absolute. This will appear clearly on nearer examination.

1. The Presentation of Jesus in the Gospel:

The objection from the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel takes different forms, which it is desirable to consider separately.

(1) Alleged Absence of Development in the Character of Jesus.

It is affirmed, first, that there is no development in the character of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, none of those indications such as we have in the Synoptics of widening horizons, no recognition of the fact that the meaning, purpose and issue of His calling became clearer to Him as the days passed by. To this assertion there are two answers. The first is, that in a series of scenes from the activity of Jesus, selected for the definite purpose set forth in the Gospel, there is no need to demand a continuous history of His ministry. Selection is made precisely of those scenes which set forth His insight into human character and motive, His power of sympathetic healing, His command over Nature, and His supreme authority

over man and the world. The other remark is, that even in the Fourth Gospel there are hints of a crisis in the ministry of our Lord, during which He came to a clearer recognition of the fuller meaning of His mission (e.g. the visit of the Greeks, John 12). It will be seen further, below, that it is not true in this Gospel, any more than in the Synoptics, that Jesus is represented as publicly proclaiming Himself as the Messiah from the first.

(2) Alleged "Autonomy" of Jesus.

Akin to the above is the objection to the historicity of the Gospel that in it Jesus is represented as always directing His own course, maintaining an attitude of aloofness to men, refusing to be influenced by them. This, it is held, results from the dominance of the Logos-idea in the prologue. The reply is that there is really no essential difference between the attitude of Jesus in these respects in the Synoptics and in Jn. In all alike He maintains an attitude of authority. In the Synoptics He can say, "I say unto you" (Mt 5:22,28,32, etc.). In them also He claims to be the teacher of absolute truth, the Saviour, the Ruler, the Judge, of men. In this regard there is no new claim made in the Fourth Gospel: "No one cometh unto the Father, but by me" (Joh 14:6). But He had said, "Come unto me .... and I will give you rest" (Mt 11:28). A claim to authority over men is thus common to all the Gospels. In all of them, too, in the Fourth no less than in the others, there is on the part of Jesus loyalty, submission, subordination to the Father. In fact this is more conspicuous in the Fourth Gospel than in the Synoptics: "The Father is greater than I" (Joh 14:28). The words He speaks are the Father’s words; the works He does are the Father’s (Joh 5:19,20; 7:16,18, etc.): "This commandment received I from my Father" (Joh 10:18). In all the Gospels it is one consistent, gracious Figure who appears.

(3) "Inconceivability" of Logos-Presentation.

A further objection, which aims at showing that this Gospel could not be the work of "a primitive apostle," may be noticed, partly from the eminence of him who makes it, and partly from the interest of the objection itself. In his work on The Apostolic Age, Weizsacker says, "It is a puzzle that the beloved disciple of the Gospel, he who reclined at table next to Jesus, should have come to regard and represent his whole former experience as a life with the incarnate Logos of God. It is impossible to imagine any power of faith and philosophy so great as thus to obliterate the recollection of a real life and to substitute for it this marvelous picture of a Divine being. We can understand that Paul, who had not known Jesus, who had not come into contact with the man. should have been opposed to the tradition of the eyewitnesses, the idea of the heavenly man, and that he should have substituted the Christ who was spirit for His earthly manifestation, pronouncing the latter to be positively a stage above which faith must rise. For a primitive apostle it is inconceivable. The question is decided here and finally here" (II, 211). It is easy to say, "For a primitive apostle it is inconceivable," yet we know that a primitive apostle believed that Jesus rose from the dead, that He was exalted a Prince and Saviour, that He was seated at the right hand of God, that He was Lord of all (Ac 2:22-36). If we grant that the primitive church believed these things, it cannot be fairly said that the further step taken in the Fourth Gospel is inconceivable. In truth, the objection of Weizsacker is not taken against the Fourth Gospel; it is equally effective against Christianity in general. If Jesus be what He is said to be in the Synoptic Gospels, and if He be what the primitive church held Him to be, the leading conception of the Fourth Gospel is credible and

conceivable. If Christianity is credible, the Fourth Gospel adds nothing to the difficulty of faith; rather it gives an additional ground for a rational faith.

2. The Logos-Doctrine of the Prologue:

It is proper at this point that a little more should be said on the Logos-doctrine itself, in its bearing on the presentation of Christ in this Gospel (for the philosophical and historical aspects of the doctrine, see LOGOS). Obviously the great interest of the author of the reminiscences and reflections in the Fourth Gospel is in the personal life of the Master whom he had known so intimately. To him this real historical life was everything. On it he brooded, on it he meditated, and he strove to make the significance of it ever more real to himself first, and to others afterward. How shall he make the reality of that life apparent to all? What were the relationships of that person to God, to man, and to the world? What Jesus really was, and what were His relations to God, to man, and to the world, John endeavors to make known in the prologue. This real person whom he had known, revered, loved, was something more than was apparent to the eyes of an ordinary observer; more even than had been apparent to His disciples. How shall this be set forth? From the Gospel it is evident that the historical person is first, and the attempt to set forth the meaning of the person is second. The prologue is an attempt to find language to set forth fitly the glory of the person. The Logos-doctrine does not descend on the historic person as a garment from without; it is an endeavor to describe what John had grown to recognize as the essential meaning of the person of Jesus. It is not a speculative theory we have here, not an endeavor to think out a theory of the world or of God; it is an attempt to find suitable language for what the writer recognizes to be a great fact. We need not, therefore, seek an explanation of John’s Logos-doctrine in the speculation of Heraclitus, in theories of the Stoics, even in the eclecticism of Philo. The interests of these men are far removed from the atmosphere of the Fourth Gospel. They desired a theory of the universe; John sought to set forth the significance of a personal historical life. In the prologue he set forth that life, and he chose a word which he filled up with concreter meaning, a meaning which included the deepest teaching of the Old Testament, and the highest thought of his contemporaries. The teaching of Paul, especially in the epistles of the captivity, approaches very closely to that of the Fourth Gospel. Thus it is not a right method to bring the Logos-doctrine to the interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, and to look at all the phenomena of the Gospel as mere illustrations of that doctrine. The right method is the reverse. The Logos-doctrine has no concreteness, no living reality, taken apart from the personal life which was manifested to the apostle. The prologue represents what John had come to see as to the meaning of the personality he had historically known. He sets it forth once for all in the prologue, and never once in the Gospel does he refer to it again. We can understand that Logos-doctrine when we look at it in the light of those manifestations recorded in’ the Gospel, manifestations which enabled John to behold His glory; we cannot understand the manifestations if we look at them merely as illustrations of an abstract philosophical theorem. In brief, the Fourth Gospel is concrete, not abstract; it is not the evolution or the demonstration of a theory, but the attempt to set forth a concrete personality, and to find fitting words to express the significance of that personality as John had grown to see it.

3. Growth of Faith and Development of Unbelief:

As it is with the character of Jesus, so it is with the alleged absence of development in the faith of the

disciples. Careful inquiry shows this objection also to be unfounded.

(1) Early Confessions.

Here again, it is said, we see the end from the beginning. In John 1 Jesus is twice greeted as the Messiah (1:41,45), and twice described as the Son of God (1:34,49). The Baptist at this early stage points to Him as "the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (1:29). Reference is made to the case of Nicodemus (3:1 ff), to the Samaritans (4:41 f), and other incidents of the same kind, with the view of proving that at this early stage of the ministry of our Lord such confessions are unlikely, and even impossible. It is to be noticed, however, that the confessions in these cases are represented as the outcome of special manifestations on the part of Jesus to the persons who make them. And the manifestations are such as to justify the psychological possibility of the confession. It is so in the case of Nathaniel. Nor is the objection to the testimony of John the Baptist of a kind which admits of no answer. For the Baptist, according to the Synoptics, had found his own credentials in Isa 40. There he found himself and his mission, and described himself, as we find it in the Fourth Gospel, "I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of the Lord, as said Isaiah the prophet" (Joh 1:23; compare Mt 3:3; Mr 1:2,3). We find also that when John "heard in the prison the works of the Christ," and "sent by his disciples and said unto him, Art thou he that cometh, or look we for another?" (Mt 11:2), the answer of Jesus was a reference to a passage in Isa 61. According to Jesus these were the true signs of the Messianic kingdom. Is there any reason why we should not say that, as John found his own credentials in Isa 40, he would also have found the character and signs of the Coming One in the description of the suffering servant in Isa 53? If he did so, what more simple than that he should describe the Coming One as the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world? In His answer to John, Jesus simply asks him to read farther on in that prophesy which had already meant so much for him.

(2) Growth of Faith in the Disciples.

Apart from what may be made of these early confessions, it may fairly be said that there are many signs of a growth of faith on the part of the disciples. Carrying with us the fact that each of these confessions had its ground in a particular manifestation of the glory of Christ, we go on to passages which prove how imperfect was the faith of the disciples. It is to be remembered also that John has only one word to describe all the phases of faith, from the slightest impression up to whole-hearted conviction and thorough surrender. We may refer to the careful and exhaustive treatment of the meanings of the word "believing" by E. A. Abbott in his work, Johannine Vocabulary. In the Fourth Gospel the verb is always used, and never the noun. As the word is used, it denotes the impression made, whether that impression is slight and transient, or deep and abiding. Successive steps of acceptance are seen as the disciples advance to complete and absolute faith.

As we read the Gospel, we perceive that Jesus did test and try the faith of His disciples, and made His deeds and His words both tests of faith, and a means for its growth. As the result of the words on the bread of life, we find that many of His disciples said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (Joh 6:60), and on account of the difficulty of His words, "Many of his disciples went back, and walked no

more with him" (Joh 6:66). On His appeal to those who did not go away it is found that the difficulty became really an opportunity to them for a larger faith (Joh 6:68,69). The incidents and events of the night of the betrayal, and the conversations on that night, prove how incomplete were the faith and confidence of the disciples; how far they were from a full understanding of the Master's purpose. Nor is it until after the resurrection, and the gladness of seeing their risen Lord in the upper room, that faith obtained a complete victory, and attained to full possession of itself.

(3) Gradual Disclosure of Messiahship: Growth of Unbelief.

On the other side, there is as manifestly an evolution of unbelief from the passing doubt of. the moment on to the complete disbelief in Jesus, and utter rejection of Him.

It is only fair here to the Gospel to observe that the confessions to which we have already referred are on the part of individuals who came into special relationship with Jesus. Such is the case with regard to Nathaniel, Nicodemus, the woman of Samaria and the Samaritan people, and the writer places the reader in that close relationship so that he who reads may believe. But such close relationship to Jesus is only the lot of a few in this Gospel. It is not true, as already remarked, that in this Gospel Jesus is represented as definitely proclaiming Himself as the Messiah. There is something of the same reserve here as there is in the Synoptics. He did not assert His claim; He left it to be inferred. His brethren hint that He ought to put His claims really to the test (Joh 7:3 f). An account of the doubts and speculations regarding Him is given in John 7. The people hesitate, and inquire, and speculate, Is He a good man, or a deceiver? (7:12) Had He really a mission from God? (7:14 ff)—all of which goes to prove that only certain individuals had such intimate knowledge of Him as to lead to acceptance. In John 10 we read, "And it was the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem: it was winter; and Jesus was walking in the temple in Solomon's porch. The Jews therefore came round about him, and said unto him, How long dost thou hold us in suspense? If thou art the Christ, tell us plainly" (10:22-24). "It is very clear," as Dr. Sanday says, "that no sharply defined issue was set before the people. They are left to draw their own conclusions; and they draw them as well as they can by the help of such criteria as they have. But there is no entweder .... oder ....—either Messiah or not Messiah—peremptorily propounded by Jesus Himself" (The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel, 164). The sum of the matter as regards the development of unbelief is given by the evangelist in the words: "Though he had done so many signs before them, yet they believed not on him" (12:37). On the other hand, the culmination of faith is seen in the word of the Lord to Thomas: "Because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (20:29).

LITERATURE.

Besides Comms. and other works mentioned in the article, with valuable articles on the Gospel in Dicts. and Encs, the following may be consulted: M. Dods, common. "Fourth Gospel" in Expositor's Greek Testament; Julicher, Eintleitung in das NT6 (1906, English Translation); E. A. Abbott, Johannine Vocabulary (1905), and Johannine Grammar (1906); H. J. Holtzmann, Evangelium, Briefe und Offenbarung des Johannes, besorgt von W. Bauer (1908); Essays on Some Biblical Questions of the Day by Members of the University of Cambridge, edited by Dr. Swete (1909), Essay IX, "The Theology of

the Fourth Gospel," by W.H. Inge, and Essay X, "The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel," by C.E. Brooke; Schmiedel, The Johannine Writings (English translation, 1908); J. Armitage Robinson, The Historical Character of John's Gospel (1908); Askwith, The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel (1910); Ezra Abbot, External Evidence of the Fourth Gospel, edited by J.H. Thayer (1891); Lowrie, The Doctrine of John (1899).

James Iverach

JOHN, THE APOSTLE

Sources of the Life of John:

The sources for the life of the apostle John are of various kinds, and of different degrees of trustworthiness. There are the references in the Synoptic Gospels, which may be used simply and easily without any preliminary critical inquiry into their worth as sources; for these Gospels contain the common tradition of the early church, and for the present purpose may be accepted as trustworthy. Further, there are the statements in Ac and in Galatians, which we may use without discussion as a source for the life of John. There is next the universal tradition of the 2nd century, which we may use, if we can show that the John of Ephesus, who bulks so largely in the Christian literature of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, is identical with the son of Zebedee. Further, on the supposition that the son of Zebedee is the author of the Johannine writings of the New Testament, there is another source of unequaled value for the estimate of the life and character of the son of Zebedee in these writings. Finally, there is the considerable volume of tradition which gathered around the name of John of Ephesus, of which, picturesque and interesting though the traditions be, only sparing use can be made.

I. Witness of the New Testament.

Addressing ourselves first to the Synoptic Gospels, to Ac and to Galatians, we ask, What, from these sources, can we know of the apostle John? A glance only need be taken at the Johannine writings, more fully discussed elsewhere in relation to their author.

1. The Synoptic Gospels:

That John was one of the two sons of Zebedee, that he became one of the disciples of Jesus, that at His call he forsook all and followed Jesus, and was thereafter continuously with Jesus to the end, are facts familiar to every reader of the Synoptic Gospels. The call was given to John and to his brother James at the Sea of Galilee, while in a boat with their father Zebedee, "mending their nets" (Mt 4:21,22, and parallel passages). "Come ye after me," said Jesus, "and I will make you to become fishers of men" (Mr 1:17; on the earlier call in Judea, Joh 1:35 , see below). That Zebedee was a man of considerable wealth may be inferred from the fact that he had "hired servants" with him (Mr 1:20), and that his wife was one of those women who ministered of their substance to Jesus and His disciples (Mt 27:55,56). Comparison of the latter passage with Mr 15:40,41 identifies the wife of Zebedee, John's mother, with Salome, and it

seems a fair inference from Joh 19:25, though all do not accept it, that Mary, the mother of Jesus, and Salome, the wife of Zebedee, were sisters. On this view, James and John were cousins of Jesus, and were also related to the family of John the Baptist. The name of John appears in all the lists of the apostles given in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 10:2 and parallels). While his name appears rarely in a position by itself, he is still one of the most prominent of the disciples. With Peter and James he is present at the raising of the daughter of Jairus (Mr 5:37; Lu 8:51). These three were also present at the transfiguration (Mt 17; Mr 9; Lu 9). They were nearest to the Lord at the agony of Gethsemane. In all these cases nothing characteristic of John is to be noted. He is simply present as one of the three, and therefore one of the most intimate of the disciples. But there is something characteristic in an incident recorded by Luke (9:54), in which James and John are represented as wishing to call down fire on a Sam village, which had refused them hospitality. From this can be inferred something of the earnestness, zeal, and enthusiasm of the brothers, and of their high sense of what was due to their Master. Peter, James, John, and Andrew are the four who asked Jesus about the prophecies He had uttered: "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign when these things are all about to be accomplished?" (Mr 13:4). Then there is the request of their mother as to the place she desired for her sons in the coming kingdom (Mr 10:35). To Peter and John was entrusted the task of preparation for the keeping of the Passover (Lu 22:8). Once John stands alone, and asks what we may consider a characteristic question: "Teacher, we saw one casting out demons in thy name; and we forbade him, because he followed not us" (Mr 9:38; Lu 9:49). From these notices we see that John was in the front rank of the disciples, and we see also that he was so far conscious of the position he held, and of the intimate connection he had with the Master. We note further that John was a young man of fiery zeal, and of a tendency toward intolerance and exclusiveness. The zeal and the intolerance are in evidence in the desire to call down fire upon the Samaritan village, and the tendency toward exclusiveness is manifested in the request of his mother as to the place her sons were to occupy in the kingdom. They desire to have the highest positions. These tendencies were not encouraged by Jesus. They were rebuked by Him once and again, but the tendencies reveal the men. In harmony with these notices of character and temperament is the name given to the brothers by Jesus, "Boanerges," "Sons of thunder" (Mr 3:17), which, whatever else may be meant by it, means strength, unexpectedness, and zeal approaching to methods of violence.

2. Ac and Galatians:

John is found in company with Peter in the opening scenes in Acts. He is with Peter while the man at the gate was healed (3:1 ff). He is with Peter on the mission to Samaria (8:14 ff). He is with Peter and James, the Lord’s brother, at the interview with Paul recorded in Ga 2, and the three are described by Paul as the pillar apostles (2:9). This interview is of importance because it proves that John had survived his brother James, whose death is recorded in Ac 12; at all events that John and James were not killed by the Jews at the same time, as some now contend that they were. This contention is considered below.

3. The Johannine Writings: Gospel and Revelation:

Much is to be learned of the apostle John from the Fourth Gospel, assuming the Gospel to have been written by him. We learn from it that he was a disciple of John the Baptist (1:35), that he was one of the

first six disciples called by Jesus in His early ministry in Judea (1:37-51), and that he was present at all the scenes which he describes in the Gospel. We find later that he had a home in Jerusalem, and was acquainted with many there. To that home he took Mary, the mother of Jesus, whom the dying Saviour entrusted to his care (19:26,27). Much more also we learn of him and of his history, for the Gospel is a spiritual biography, a record of the growth of faith on the part of the writer, and of the way in which his eyes were opened to see the glory of the Lord, until faith seems to have become vision. He was in the inner circle of the disciples, indeed, nearest of all to Jesus, "the disciple whom Jesus loved" (13:23; 19:26; 20:2; 21:7,20), and, because of that love, became the apostle of love (see, further, JOHN, GOSPEL OF; JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY).

The Book of Revelation, likewise traditionally ascribed to John, bears important witness to the apostle's banishment in later life to the isle of Patmos in the Aegean (1:9). There he received the visions recorded in the book. The banishment probably took place in the reign of Domitian (see REVELATION), with whose practice it was entirely in consonance (on the severity of such exile, compare Sir W.M. Ramsay, Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, chapter viii). The testimony is of high importance in its bearing on the disputed question of John's residence in Asia, a point now to be discussed.

II. Alleged Early Martyrdom of John: Criticism of Evidence.

1. Recent Denial of John's Residence in Ephesus:

The consentient testimony of the church of the 2nd century is that the later years of John were spent at Ephesus, where he wrote his Gospel, and gathered round him many disciples (see the evidence drawn out in detail in Godet, Commentary on Gospel of John, 43 ff; compare also Lightfoot, "The School of Ephesus," in Essays on the Work Entitled "Supernatural Religion"). Before, however, we can use the traditions connected with this residence at Ephesus, it is needful to inquire into the statement alleged to be made by Papias that John, the son of Zebedee, was killed by the Jews at an early date. It is plain, that, if this statement is correct, the apostle could not be the author of the Johannine writings in the New Testament, universally dated near the end of the 1st century.

2. Grounds of Denial:

The evidence for the statement that John was early killed by the Jews is thus summed up by Dr. Moffatt: "The evidence for the early martyrdom of John the son of Zebedee is, in fact, threefold: (a) a prophecy of Jesus preserved in Mr 10:39 = Mt 20:23, (b) the witness of Papias, and (c) the calendars of the church" (Intro to Lit. of New Testament, 602). Our limits do not admit of an exhaustive examination of this so-called evidence, but, happily, an exhaustive examination is not needed.

(a) The first head proceeds on an assumption which is not warranted, namely, that a prophecy of Jesus would not be allowed to stand, if it were not evidently fulfilled. In the present instance, a literal fulfillment of the prophecy ("The cup that I drink ye shall drink," etc.) is out of the question, for there is no hint that either James or John was crucified. We must therefore fall back on the primary meaning of

martyrdom, and recognize a fulfillment of the prophecy in the sufferings John endured and the testimony he bore for the Master’s sake (thus Origen, etc.).

(b) Dr. Moffatt lays great stress on what he calls the testimony of Papias. But the alleged testimony of Papias is not found in any early authority, and then occurs in writers not of any great value from the point of view of critical investigation. It is found in a passage of Georgius Hamartolus (9th century), and is held to be corroborated by a fragment of an epitome (7th or 8th century) of the Chronicle of Philip Sidetes (5th century), a thoroughly untrustworthy writer. The passage from Georgius may be seen in convenient form in Lightfoot’s Apostolic Fathers, 513-19. It tells that John survived to the time of Nerva, quotes a saying of Papias that he was killed by the Jews, states that this was in fulfillment of the prophecy of Jesus above referred to, and goes on to say, "So the learned Origen affirms in his interpretation of Matthew’s Gospel, that John was martyred, declaring that he had learnt the last from the successors of the apostles" (Lightfoot, op. cit., 531). Fortunately, the statement of Origen can be tested, and it by no means, as Moffatt admits (op. cit., 604), bears out the meaning attached to it. Origen is of opinion that the prophecy of Jesus was sufficiently fulfilled by the fact of John’s banishment to Patmos and his sufferings there. This, according to him, is what tradition taught and what the prophecy meant. From the whole statement of Georgius, which expressly declares that John survived till the time of Nerva, nothing can be inferred in support of the so-called quotation from Papias. It is to be remembered that the writings of Papias were known to Irenaeus and to Eusebius, and it is inconceivable that, if such a statement was to be found in these, they would have ignored it, and have given currency to a statement contradictory to it. No stress, therefore, can be laid on the alleged quotation. We do not know its context, nor is there anything in the literature of the first 3 centuries corroborative of it. In the citation in the epitome of Philip, Papias is made to speak of "John the divine" (ho theologos). This title is not applied to John till the close of the 4th century.

(c) As regards the 3rd line of evidence instanced by Dr. Moffatt—church calendars, in which James and John are commemorated together as martyrs—it is even more worthless than the other two. On the nature and origin of these martyrologies, Dr. J. Drummond may be quoted: "They were constructed in process of time out of local calendars. At some period in the 2nd half of the 5th century, a martyrology was formed by welding together a number of provincial calendars, Roman, Italian, Spanish, and Gallic, into what was in effect a general martyrology of Western Europe. At Nicomedia, about the year 350, a similar eastern martyrology was formed out of the local calendars, and this was translated with curtailments into Syriac at Edessa about the year 400. It is a copy of this, made in 411, which is now in the British Museum" (Inquiry into Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, 232). If this is a true account of the rise and origin of martyrologies we need not be surprised that Sir W. M. Ramsay speaks as follows: "That James and John, who were not slain at the same time, should be commemorated together, is the flimsiest conceivable evidence that John was killed early in Jerusalem. The bracketing together of the memory of apostles who had some historical connection in life, but none in death, must be regarded as the worst side, historically speaking, of the martyrologies" (The First Christian Century, 49, note).

III. The Ephesian Traditions.

1. John the Apostle, and John the Presbyter:

Thus the early traditions of the churches are available for the life of John the son of Zebedee. But there still remain many blank spaces in that life. After the reference to the pillar apostles in Gal, silence falls on the life of John, and we know nothing of his life and activity until we read of his banishment to Patmos, and meet with those references to the old man at Ephesus, which occur in the Christian literature of the 2nd century. One point of interest relates to the (genuine) quotation from Papias, preserved by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39), regarding a "Presbyter John," a disciple of the Lord, who was one of his living authorities. Were there two Johns at Ephesus? Or was there only one? Or, if there was only one, was he John the Evangelist, or only John the Presbyter? Here there is every possible variety of opinion. Many hold that there were two, and many that there was only one. Many who hold that there was only one, hold that the one was John the son of Zebedee; others hold, with equal assurance, that he was a distinct person. Obviously, it is impossible to discuss the question adequately here. After due consideration, we lean to the conclusion that there was only one John at Ephesus, and he the son of Zebedee. For the proof of this, impossible within our limits, we refer to the learned argument of John Chapman, in his work John the Presbyter and the Fourth Gospel (1911).

2. Characteristic Traditions:

Into the traditions which cluster round John in Ephesus it is not necessary to enter in detail (compare Godet, op. cit., 57 ff). According to the tradition universally accepted in the church, John survived till the time of Trajan (98 AD). Striking and characteristic things are told of him in harmony with the touches we find in the Synoptic Gospels. The story of his rushing forth from the bath when Cerinthus, the heretic, entered it (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., iii.3, 4) recalls the characteristics of him whom Jesus called "son of thunder." The same tone of exclusiveness, modified by larger experience, is found in the 1st Epistle, which so frequently and so decisively discriminates between those who believe in Jesus and those who do not.

IV. The Character of John.

The general character of this great apostle is already sufficiently apparent. While we recall the illustrative facts found in the Synoptics, that James and John were the two who wished to call down fire from heaven on the inhospitable village, that John was one of those who desired one of the chief places in the kingdom, that he it was who forbade the man to cast out demons in the name of Jesus because he followed not with them, we do not forget that on each of these occasions he was corrected and rebuked by the Master, and he was not the kind of man who could not profit by the rebuke of Jesus. So that vehemence of disposition was held in check, and, while still in existence, was under control, and allowed to have vent only on occasions when it was permissible, and even necessary. So in his writings, and in the reflections in the Gospel, we note the vehemence displayed, but now directed only against those who refused to believe in, and to acknowledge, Jesus.

"A quiet and thoughtful temperament is by no means inconsistent with a certain vehemence, when, on

occasions, the pent-up fire flashes forth; indeed, the very violence of feeling may help to foster an habitual quietude, lest word or deed should betray too deep an emotion. Then it is not without significance that, in the three narratives which are cited from the Gospels to prove the overbearing temper of John, we are expressly told that Jesus corrected him. Are we to suppose that these rebukes made no impression? Is it not more likely that they sank deep into his heart, and that the agony of beholding his Master's crucifixion made them ineffaceable? Then, if not before, began that long development which changed the youthful son of thunder into the aged apostle of love" (Drummond, op. cit, 410, 411).

But love itself has its side of vehemence, and the intensity of love toward a person or a cause may be measured by the intensity of aversion and of hatred toward their contradictories. There are many reflections in the Gospel and in the Epistles which display this energy of hatred toward the work of the devil, and toward those dispositions which are under the influence of the father of lies. We simply notice these, for they prove that the fervent youth who was devoted to his Master carried with him to the end the same disposition which was characteristic of him from the beginning.

LITERATURE.

In addition to books mentioned in article, see the list of works appended to article on JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

James Iverach

JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF, PART 1-3

I. GENERAL CHARACTER

1. A True Letter

2. Subject-Matter

3. Characteristics of the Writer

4. Style and Diction

II. POLEMICAL AIM

1. Gnosticism

2. Docetism

3. Antinomianism

4. Cerinthus

III. STRUCTURE AND SUMMARY

1. The Prologue, 1 John 1:1-4

2. First Cycle, 1 John 1:5-2:28

The Christian Life as Fellowship with God (Walking in the Light) Tested by Righteousness, Love and Belief

(a) Paragraph A, 1 John 1:8-2:6

(b) Paragraph B, 1 John 2:7-17

(i) Positively

(ii) Negatively

(c) Paragraph C, 1 John 2:18-28

3. Second Cycle, 1 John 2:29-4:6

Divine Sonship Tested by Righteousness, Love and Belief

(a) Paragraph A, 1 John 2:29-3:10a

(b) Paragraph B, 1 John 3:10b-24b

(c) Paragraph C, 1 John 3:24b through 4:6

4. Third Cycle, 1 John 4:7-5:21

Closer Correlation of Righteousness, Love and Belief

(a) Section I, 1 John 4:7-5:3a

(i) Paragraph A, 1 John 4:7-12

(ii) Paragraph B, 1 John 4:13-16

(iii) Paragraph C, 1 John 4:17-5:3a

(b) Section II, 1 John 5:3b-21

(i) Paragraph A, 1 John 5:3b-12

(ii) Paragraph B, 1 John 5:13-21

IV. CANONICITY AND AUTHORSHIP

1. Traditional View

2. Critical Views

3. Internal Evidence

V. RELATIONSHIP TO THE FOURTH GOSPEL

1. Common Characteristics

2. Coincidences of Vocabulary

3. Divergences of Vocabulary

4. Arguments against Unity of Authorship

5. Conclusion

6. Question of Priority

LITERATURE

Among the 7 New Testament epistles which from ancient times have been called "catholic" (universal) there is a smaller group of three in which the style alike of thought and language points to a common authorship, and which are traditionally associated with the name of the apostle John. Of these, again, the first differs widely from the other two in respect not only of intrinsic importance, but of its early reception in the church and unquestioned canonicity.

THE FIRST EPISTLE

I. General Character.

1. A True Letter:

Not only is the Epistle an anonymous writing; one of its unique features among the books of the New Testament is that it does not contain a single proper name (except our Lord's), or a single definite allusion, personal, historical, or geographical. It is a composition, however, which a person calling himself "I" sends to certain other persons whom he calls "you," and is, in form at least, a letter. The criticism which has denied that it is more than formally so is unwarranted. It does not fall under either of Deissmann's categories—the true letter, intended only for the perusal of the person or persons to whom it is addressed, and the epistle, written with literary art and with an eye to the public. But it does possess that character of the New Testament epistles in general which is well described by Sir William Ramsay (Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia, 24): "They spring from the heart of the writer and speak direct to the heart of the readers. They were often called forth by some special crisis in the history of the persons addressed, so that they rise out of the actual situation in which the writer conceives the readers to be placed; they express the writer's keen and living sympathy with and participation in the fortunes of the whole class addressed, and are not affected by any thought of a wider public. .... On the other hand, the letters of this class express general principles of life and conduct, religion and ethics, applicable to a wider range of circumstances than those which called them forth; and they appeal as emphatically and intimately to all Christians in all time as they did to those addressed in the first instance." The 1st Epistle of John could not be more exactly characterized than by these words. Though its main features are didactic and controversial, the personal note is frequently struck, and with much tenderness and depth of feeling. Under special stress of emotion, the writer's paternal love, sympathy and solicitude break out in the affectionate appellation, "little children," or, yet more endearingly, "my little children." Elsewhere the prefatory "beloved" shows how deeply he is stirred by the sublimity of his theme and the sense of its supreme importance to his readers. He shows himself intimately acquainted with their religious environment (1Joh 2:19; 4:1), dangers (1Joh 2:26; 3:7; 5:21), attainments (1Joh 2:12-14,21), achievements (1Joh 4:4) and needs (1Joh 3:19; 5:13). Further, the Epistle is addressed primarily to the circle of those among whom the author has habitually exercised his ministry as evangelist and teacher. He has been wont to announce to them the things concerning the Word of Life (1Joh 1:1,2), that they might have fellowship with him (1Joh 1:3), and now, that his (or their) joy may be full, he writes these things unto them (1Joh 1:4). He writes as light shines. Love makes the task a necessity, but also a delight.

2. Subject-Matter:

There is no New Testament writing which is throughout more vigorously controversial: for the satisfactory interpretation of the Epistle as a whole, recognition of the polemical aim that pervades it is indispensable. But it is true also that there is no such writing in which the presentation of the truth more widely overflows the limits of the immediate occasion. The writer so constantly lifts up against the error he combats, the simple, sublime and satisfying facts and principles of the Christian revelation, so lifts up

every question at issue into the light of eternal truth, that the Epistle pursues its course through the ages, bringing to the church of God the vision and the inspiration of the Divine. The influence of the immediate polemical purpose, however, is manifest, not only in the contents of the Epistle, but in its limitations as well. In a sense it may be said that the field of thought is a narrow one. God is seen exclusively as the Father of Spirits, the Light and Life of the universe of souls. His creatorship and government of the world, the providential aspects and agencies of salvation, the joys and sorrows, hopes and fears that spring from the terrestrial conditions and changes of human life, their disciplinary purpose and effect—to all this the Epistle contains no reference. The themes are exclusively theological and ethical. The writer's immediate interest is confined to that region in which the Divine and human vitally and directly meet—to that in God which is communicable to man, to that in man by which he is capax Dei. The Divine nature as life and light, and love and righteousness; the Incarnation of this Divine nature in Jesus, with its presuppositions and consequences, metaphysical and ethical; the imparting of this Divine nature to men by regeneration; the antithesis to it—sin—and its removal by propitiation; the work of the Holy Spirit; the Christian life, the mutual indwelling of God and man, as tested by its beliefs, its antagonism to sin, its inevitable debt of love—such are the fundamental themes to which every idea in the Epistle is directly related. The topics, if few, are supremely great; and the limitations of the field of vision are more than compensated by the profundity and intensity of spiritual perception.

3. Characteristics of the Writer:

The Epistle is in a sense impersonal to the last degree, offering a strange contrast to that frankness of self-revelation which gives such charm to Paul's letters; yet few writings so clearly reveal the deepest characteristics of the writer. We feel in it the high serenity of a mind that lives in constant fellowship with the greatest thoughts and is nourished at the eternal fountain-head; but also the fervent indignation and vehement recoil of such a mind in contact with what is false and evil. It has been truly called "the most passionate" book in the New Testament. Popular instinct has not erred in giving to its author the title, "Apostle of Love." Of the various themes which are so wonderfully intertwined in it, that to which it most of all owes its unfading charm and imperishable value is love. It rises to its sublimest height, to the apex of all revelation, in those passages in which its author is so divinely inspired to write of the eternal life, in God and man, as love.

But it is an inveterate misconception which regards him solely as the exponent of love. Equally he reveals himself as one whose mind is dominated by the sense of truth. There are no words more characteristic of him than "true" (alethinos, denoting that which both ideally and really corresponds to the name it bears) and "the truth" (aletheia, the reality of things sub specie aeternitatis). To him Christianity is not only a principle of ethics, or even a way of salvation; it is both of them, because it is primarily the truth, the one true disclosure of the realities of the spiritual and eternal world. Thus it is that his thought so constantly develops itself by antithesis. Each conception has its fundamental opposite: light, darkness; life, death; love, hate; truth, falsehood; the Father, the world; God, the devil. There is no shading, no gradation in the picture. No sentence is more characteristic of the writer than this: "Ye know that no lie is of the truth" (1Joh 2:21 margin). But again, his sense of these radical antagonisms is essentially moral, rather than intellectual. It seems impossible that any writing could display a more impassioned sense, than this Epistle does, of the tremendous imperative of righteousness,

a more rigorous intolerance of all sin (1Joh 2:4; 3:4,8,9,10). The absolute antagonism and incompatibility between the Christian life and sin of whatsoever kind or degree is maintained with a vehemence of utterance that verges at times upon the paradoxical (1Joh 3:9; 5:18). So long as the church lays up this Epistle in its heart, it can never lack a moral tonic of wholesome severity.

4. Style and Diction:

The style is closely, though perhaps unconsciously, molded upon the Hebrew model, and especially upon the parallelistic forms of the Wisdom literature. One has only to read the Epistle with an attentive ear to perceive that, though using another language, the writer had in his own car, all the time, the swing and cadences of Hebrew verse. The diction is inartificial and unadorned. Not a simile, not a metaphor (except the most fundamental, like "walking in the light") occurs. The limitations in the range of ideas are matched by those of vocabulary and by the unvarying simplicity of syntactical form. Yet limited and austere as the literary medium is, the writer handles its resources often with consummate skill. The crystalline simplicity of the style perfectly expresses the simple profundity of the thought. Great spiritual intuitions shine like stars in sentences of clear-cut gnomic terseness. Historical (1Joh 1:1) and theological (1Joh 1:2; 4:2) statements are made with exquisite precision. The frequent reiteration of nearly the same thoughts in nearly the same language, though always with variation and enrichment, gives a cumulative effect which is singularly impressive. Such passages as 1Joh 2:14-17, with its calm challenge to the arrogant materialism of the world—"And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever"—or the closing verses of the Epistle, with their thrice-repeated triumphant "we know" and their last word of tender, urgent admonition, have a solemn magnificence of effect which nothing but such simplicity of language, carrying such weight of thought, could produce. If it has been true of any writer that "le style est l’homme," it is true of the author of this Epistle.

II. Polemical Aim.

The polemical intention of the Epistle has been universally recognized; but there has been diversity of opinion as to its actual object. By the older commentators, generally, this was found in the perilous state of the church or churches addressed, which had left their first love and lapsed into Laodicean lukewarmness. But the Epistle gives no sign of this, and it contains many passages that are inconsistent with it (1Joh 2:13,14,20,21,27; 4:4; 5:18-20). The danger which immediately threatens the church is from without, not from within. There is a "spirit of error" (1Joh 4:6) abroad in the world. From the church itself (1Joh 2:18), many "false prophets" have gone forth (1Joh 4:1), corrupters of the gospel, veritable antichrists (1Joh 2:18). And it may be asserted as beyond question that the peril against which the Epistle was intended to arm the church was the spreading influence of some form of Gnosticism.

1. Gnosticism:

The pretensions of Gnosticism to a higher esoteric knowledge of Divine things seems to be clearly referred to in several passages. In 1Joh 2:4,6,9, e.g. one might suppose that they are almost verbally

quoted ("He that saith"; "I know Him"; "I abide in Him"; "I am in the light"). When we observe, moreover, the prominence given throughout to the idea of knowledge and the special significance of some of these passages, the conviction grows that the writer's purpose is not only to refute the false, but to exhibit apostolic Christianity, believed and lived, as the true Gnosis—the Divine reality of which Gnosticism was but a fantastic caricature. The confidence he has concerning his readers is that they "know him who is from the beginning," that they "know the Father" (2:13). "Every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God" (4:7); and the final note upon which the Epistle closes is: "We know him that is true, and we are in him that is true" (5:20). The knowledge of the ultimate Reality, the Being who is the eternal life, is for Christian and Gnostic alike the goal of aspiration.

But it is against two closely related developments of Gnostic tendency, a docetic view of the incarnation, and an antinomian view of morals, that the Epistle is specifically directed. Both of these sprang naturally from the dualism which was the fundamental and formative principle of Gnosticism in all its many forms. According to the dualistic conception of existence, the moral schism of which we are conscious in experience is original, eternal, inherent in the nature of beings. There are two independent and antagonistic principles of being from which severally come all the good and all the evil that exist. The source and the seat of evil were found in the material element, in the body with its senses and appetites, and in its sensuous earthly environment; and it was held inconceivable that the Divine nature should have immediate contact with the material side of existence, or influence upon it.

2. Docetism:

To such a view of the universe Christianity could be adjusted only by a docetic interpretation of the Person of Christ. A real incarnation was unthinkable. The Divine could enter into no actual union with a corporeal organism. The human nature of Christ and the incidents of His earthly career were more or less an illusion. And it is with this docetic subversion of the truth of the incarnation that the "antichrists" are specially identified (1Joh 2:22,23; 4:2,3), and against it that John directs with wholehearted fervor his central thesis—the complete, permanent, personal identification of the historical Jesus with the Divine Being who is the Word of Life (1Joh 1:1), the Christ (1Joh 4:2) and the Son of God (1Joh 5:5): "Jesus is the Christ come in the flesh." In Joh 5:6 there is a still more definite reference to the special form which Gnostic Christology assumed in the teaching of Cerinthus and his school. According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.26, 1) this Cerinthus, who was John's prime antagonist in Ephesus, taught that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and was distinguished from other men only by superiority in justice, prudence and wisdom; that at His baptism the heavenly Christ descended upon Him in the form of a dove; that on the eve of His Passion, the Christ again left Jesus, so that Jesus died and rose again, but the Christ, being spiritual, did not suffer. That is to say, that, in the language of the Epistle, the Christ "came by water," but not, as John strenuously affirms, "by water and blood .... not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood" (1Joh 5:6). He who was baptized of John in Jordan, and He whose life-blood was shed on Calvary, is the same Jesus and the same Christ, the same Son of God eternally.

3. Antinomianism:

A further consequence of the dualistic interpretation of existence is that sin, in the Christian meaning of sin, disappears. It is no longer a moral opposition (anomia), in the human personality, to good; it is a physical principle inherent in all nonspiritual being. Not the soul, but the flesh is its organ; and redemption consists, not in the renewal of the moral nature, but in its emancipation from the flesh. Thus it is no mere general contingency, but a definite tendency that is contemplated in the repeated warning: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. .... If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us" (1Joh 1:8,10).

With the nobler and more earnest spirits the practical corollary of this irreconcilable dualism in human nature was the ascetic life; but to others the same principle readily suggested an opposite method of achieving the soul's deliverance from the yoke of the material—an attitude of moral indifference toward the deeds of the body. Let the duality of nature be boldly reduced to practice. Let body and spirit be regarded as separate entities, each obeying its own laws and acting according to its own nature, without mutual interference; the spiritual nature could not be involved in, nor affected by, the deeds of the flesh. Vehement opposition to this deadly doctrine is prominent in the Epistle—in such utterances as "Sin is lawlessness" (1Joh 3:4) and its converse "All unrighteousness is sin" (1Joh 5:17), but especially in the stringent emphasis laid upon actual conduct, "doing" righteousness or "doing" sin. The false spiritualism which regards the contemplation of heavenly things as of far superior importance to the requirements of commonplace morality is sternly reprobated: "Little children, let no man lead you astray: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous" (1Joh 3:7); and the converse application of the same doctrine, that the mere "doing" of sin is of little or no moment to the "spiritual" man, is met with the trenchant declaration, "He that doeth sin is of the devil" (1Joh 3:8). The whole passage (1Joh 2:29-3:10) presupposes, as familiar to its readers, a doctrine of moral indifferentism according to which the status of the spiritual man is not to be tested by the commonplace facts of moral conduct. It is only as a passionate contradiction of this hateful tenet that the paradoxical language of 1Joh 3:6,9 and 5:18 can be understood.

To the same polemical necessity is due the uniquely reiterated emphasis which the Epistle lays upon brotherly love, and the almost fierce tone in which the new commandment is promulgated. To the Gnostic, knowledge was the sum of attainment. "They give no heed to love," says Ignatius, "caring not for the widow, the orphan or the afflicted, neither for those who are in bonds nor for those who are released from bonds, neither for the hungry nor the thirsty." That a religion which banished or neglected love should call itself Christian or claim affinity with Christianity excites John's hottest indignation; against it he lifts up his supreme truth, God is love, with its immediate consequence that to be without love is to be without capacity for knowing God (1Joh 4:7,8). The assumption of a lofty mystical piety apart from dutiful conduct in the ordinary relations of life is ruthlessly underlined as the vaunt of a self-deceiver (1Joh 4:20); and the crucial test by which we may assure our self-accusing hearts that we are "of the truth" is love "not in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and truth" (1Joh 3:18).

The question is raised whether the polemic of the Epistle is directed against the same persons throughout or whether in its two branches, the Christological and the ethical, it has different objects of attack. The latter view is maintained on the ground that no charge of libertine teaching or conduct is brought against the "antichrists," and there is no proof that docetism in Asia Minor lay open to such a charge. But the

other view has greater probability. The Epistle suggests nothing else than that the same spirit of error which is assailing the faith of the church (1Joh 4:6) is also a peril to the moral integrity of its life (1Joh 3:7). And if there is no proof that docetism in Asia Minor was also antinomian, there is no proof that it was not. The probability is that it was. Docetism and the emancipation of the flesh were both natural fruits of the dualistic theory of life.

4. Cerinthus:

The name, which unvarying tradition associates with the Epistle, as John's chief antagonist in Ephesus, is that of Cerinthus. Unfortunately the accounts which have come down to us of Cerinthus and his teaching are fragmentary and confused, and those of his character, though unambiguous, come only from his opponents. But it is certain that he held a docetic view of the incarnation, and, according to the only accounts we possess, his character was that of a voluptuary. So far as they go, the historical data harmonize with the internal evidence of the Epistle itself in giving the impression that the different tendencies it combats are such as would be naturally evolved in the thought and practice of those who held, as Cerinthus did, that the material creation, and even the moral law, had its origin, not in the Supreme God, but in an inferior power.

III. Structure and Summary.

In the judgment of many critics, the Epistle possesses nothing that can be called an articulate structure of thought, its aphoristic method admitting of no logical development; and this estimate has a large measure of support in the fact that there is no New Testament writing regarding the plan of which there has been greater variety of opinion. The present writer believes, nevertheless, that it is erroneous, and that, in its own unique way, the Epistle is a finely articulated composition. The word that best describes the author's mode of thinking is "spiral." The course of thought does not move from point to point in a straight line. It is like a winding staircase—always revolving around the same center, always recurring to the same topics, but at a higher level.

Carefully following the topical order, one finds, e.g., a paragraph (1Joh 2:3-6) insisting upon practical righteousness as a guaranty of the Christian life; then one finds this treated a second time in 1Joh 2:29-3:10 a; and yet again in 5:3 and 5:18. Similarly, we find a paragraph on the necessity of love in 2:7-11, and again in 3:10b-20, and yet again in 4:7-13, and also in 4:17-5:2. So also, a paragraph concerning the necessity of holding the true belief in the incarnate Son of God in 2:18-28, in 4:1-6, and the same subject recurring in 4:13-16 and 5:4-12. And we shall observe that everywhere these indispensable characteristics of the Christian life are applied as tests; that in effect the Epistle is an apparatus of tests, its definite object being to furnish its readers with the necessary criteria by which they may sift the false from the true, and satisfy themselves of their being "begotten of God." "These things have I written unto you, that ye may know that ye have eternal life" (5:13). These fundamental tests of the Christian life—doing righteousness, loving one another, believing that Jesus is the Christ come in the flesh—are the connecting themes that bind together the whole structure of the Epistle. Thus, if we divide the Epistle into 3 main sections, the first ending at 2:28, the second at 4:6, the result is that in the first and second of

these sections we find precisely the same topics coming in precisely the same order; while in the third section (4:7-5:21), though the sequence is somewhat different, the thought-material is exactly the same. The leading themes, the tests of righteousness, love, and belief, are all present; and they alone are present. There is, therefore, a natural division of the Epistle into these three main sections, or, as they might be descriptively called, "cycles," in each of which the same fundamental themes appear. On this basis we shall now give a brief analysis of its structure and summary of its contents.

1. The Prologue, 1 John 1:1-4:

The writer announces the source of the Christian revelation—the historical manifestation of the eternal Divine life in Jesus Christ—and declares himself a personal witness of the facts in which this manifestation has been given. Here, at the outset, he hoists the flag under which he fights. The incarnation is not seeming or temporary, but real. That which was from the beginning—"the eternal life, which was with the Father"—is identical with "that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled."

2. First Cycle, 1 John 1:5-2:28:

The Christian life, as fellowship with God (walking in the Light) tested by righteousness, love and belief. —The basis of the whole section is the announcement: "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1Joh 1:5). What God is at once determines the condition of fellowship with Him; and this, therefore, is set forth: first, negatively (1Joh 1:6): "if we say that we have fellowship with him and walk in the darkness"; then, positively (1Joh 1:7): "if we walk in the light, as he is in the light." What, then, is it to walk in the light, and what to walk in darkness? The answer is given in what follows.

(a) Paragraph A, 1 John 1:8-2:6:

(Walking in the Light tested by righteousness): First, in confession of sin (1Joh 1:8-2:2), then in actual obedience (1Joh 2:3-6). The first fact upon which the light of God impinges in human life is sin; and the first test of walking in the light is the recognition and confession of this fact. Such confession is the first step into fellowship with God, because it brings us under the cleansing power of the blood of Jesus, His Son (1Joh 1:7), and makes His intercession available for us (1Joh 2:1). But the light not only reveals sin; its greater function is to reveal duty; and to walk in the light is to keep God’s commandments (1Joh 2:3), His word (1Joh 2:5), and to walk even as Christ walked (1Joh 2:6).

(b) Paragraph B, 1 John 2:7-17:

(Walking in the Light tested by love):

(i) Positively:

The old-new commandment (1Joh 2:7-11). Love is the commandment which is "old," because familiar

to the readers of the Epistle from their first acquaintance with the rudiments of Christianity (1Joh 2:7); but also "new," because ever fresh and living to those who have fellowship with Christ in the true light which is now shining for them (1Joh 2:8). On the contrary, "He that saith he is in the light and hateth his brother, is in the darkness" (1Joh 2:9). The antithesis is then repeated with variation and enrichment of thought (1Joh 2:10,11). (Then follows a parenthetical address to the readers (1Joh 2:12-14). This being treated as a parenthesis, the unity of the paragraph at once becomes apparent.)

(ii) Negatively:

If walking in the light has its guaranty in loving one's "brother," it is tested no less by not loving "the world." One cannot at the same time participate in the life of God and in a moral life which is governed by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the vain-glory of the world.

(c) Paragraph C, 1 John 2:18-28:

(Walking in the Light tested by belief): The light of God not only reveals sin and duty, the children of God (our "brother") and "the world" in their true character; it also reveals Jesus in His true character, as the Christ, the incarnate Son of God. And all that calls itself Christianity is to be tested by its reception or rejection of that truth. In this paragraph light and darkness are not expressly referred to; but the continuity of thought with the preceding paragraphs is unmistakable. Throughout this first division of the Epistle the point of view is that of fellowship with God, through receiving and acting according to the light which His self-revelation sheds upon all things in the spiritual realm. Unreal Christianity in every form is comprehensively a "lie." It may be the antinomian "lie" of him who says he has no sin (1Joh 1:8) yet is indifferent to keeping God's commandments (1Joh 2:4), the lie of lovelessness (1Joh 2:9), or the lie of Antichrist, who, claiming spiritual enlightenment, yet denies that Jesus is the Christ (1Joh 2:22).

3. Second Cycle, 1 John 2:29-4:6:

Divine Sonship Tested by Righteousness, Love and Belief.

The first main division of the Epistle began with the assertion of what God is as self-revealing—light. He becomes to us the light in which we behold our sin, our duty, our brother, the world, Jesus the Christ; and only in acknowledging and loyally acting out the truth thus revealed can we have fellowship with God. This second division, on the other hand, begins with the assertion of what the Divine nature is in itself, and thence deduces the essential characteristics of those who are "begotten of God."

(a) Paragraph A, 1 John 2:29-3:10a:

(Divine sonship tested by righteousness): This test is inevitable. "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one also that doeth righteousness is begotten of him" (1Joh 2:29). But this new idea, "Begotten of God," arrests for a time its orderly development. The writer is carried away by wonder and

thanksgiving at the thought that sinful man should be brought into such a relation as this to God. "Behold what manner of love!" he exclaims. This leads him to contemplate, further, the present concealment of the glory of God's children, and the splendor of its future manifestation (1Joh 3:1,2). Then the thought that the fulfillment of this hope is necessarily conditioned by present endeavor after moral likeness to Christ (1Joh 3:3) leads back to the main theme, that the life of Divine sonship is by necessity of nature one of absolute antagonism to all sin. This necessity is exhibited (1) in the light of the moral authority of God—sin is lawlessness (1Joh 3:4); (2) in the light of Christ's character, in which there is no sin, and of the purpose of His mission, which is to take away sin (1Joh 3:5-7); (3) in the light of the diabolic origin of sin (1Joh 3:8); (4) in the light of the God-begotten quality of the Christian life (1Joh 3:9). Finally, in this is declared to be the manifest distinction between the children of God and the children of the devil (1Joh 3:10).

(b) Paragraph B, 1 John 3:10b-24a:

(Divine sonship tested by love): This test is inevitable (1Joh 3:10, 11). The thought is then developed pictorially instead of dialectically. Cain is the prototype of hate (1Joh 3:12). Cain's spirit is reproduced in the world (1Joh 3:13). Love is the sign of having passed from death into life (1Joh 3:14 a); the absence of it, the sign of abiding in death (1Joh 3:14,15). In glorious contrast to the sinister figure of Cain, who sacrifices his brother's life to his morbid self-love, is the figure of Christ, who sacrificed His own life in love to us His brethren (1Joh 3:16 a); whence the inevitable inference that our life, if one with His, must obey the same law (1Joh 3:16). Genuine love consists not in words, but in deeds (1Joh 3:17,18); and from the evidence of such love alone can we rightly possess confidence toward God (1Joh 3:19,20) in prayer (1Joh 3:22). Then follows recapitulation (1Joh 3:23,14 b), combining, under the category of "commandment," love and also belief on His Son Jesus Christ. Thus a transition is made to Paragraph C.

(c) Paragraph C, 1 John 3:24b through 4:6:

(Divine sonship tested by belief): This test is inevitable (1Joh 3:24). "We know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he gave us"; and the Spirit "which he gave us" is the Spirit that "confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh" (1Joh 4:2). On the contrary, the Spirit that confesseth not Jesus is the spirit of Antichrist (1Joh 4:3) Then follows a characterization of those who receive the true and of those who receive the false teaching (1Joh 4:4-6).

4. Third Cycle, 1 John 4:7-5:21:

Closer Correlation of Righteousness, Love and Belief.

In this closing part, the Epistle rises to its loftiest heights; but the logical analysis of it is more difficult. It may be divided into two main sections dealing respectively with love and belief.

(a) SECTION I, 1 John 4:7-5:3a.

(i) Paragraph A, 1 John 4:7-12:

This paragraph grounds more deeply than before the test of love. Love is indispensable, because God is love (1Joh 4:7,8). The proof that God is love is the mission of Christ (1Joh 4:9); which is also the absolute revelation of what love, truly so called, is (1Joh 4:10). But this love of God imposes upon us an unescapable obligation to love one another (1Joh 4:11); and only from the fulfillment of this can we obtain the assurance that "God abideth in us" (1Joh 4:12).

(ii) Paragraph B, 1 John 4:13-16:

This paragraph strives to show the inner relation between Christian belief and Christian love. The true belief is indispensable as a guaranty of Christian life, because the Spirit of God is its author (1Joh 4:13). The true belief is that "Jesus is the Son of God" (1Joh 4:14,15). In this is found the vital ground of Christian love (1Joh 4:16).

(iii) Paragraph C, 1 John 4:17-5:3a:

Here the subject is the effect, motives and manifestations of brotherly love. The effect is confidence toward God (1Joh 4:17,18); the motives: (1) God’s love to us (1Joh 4:19); (2) that the only possible response to this is to love our brother (1Joh 4:20); (3) that this is Christ’s commandment (1Joh 4:21); (4) that it is the natural instinct of spiritual kinship (1Joh 5:1). But true love is inseparable from righteousness. We truly love the children of God only when we love God, and we love God only when we keep His commandments (1Joh 5:2,3 a).

(b) SECTION II, 1 John 5:3b-21.

(i) Paragraph A, 1 John 5:3b-12:

Righteousness is possible only through belief. It is our faith that makes the commandments "not grievous" because it overcomes the world (1Joh 5:3 b, 4). Then follows a restatement of the contents of the true belief, specially directed against the Cerinthian heresy (1Joh 5:5,6); then an exposition of the "witness" upon which this belief rests (1Joh 5:7-10); then a reiterated declaration of its being the test and guaranty of possessing eternal life (1Joh 5:11,12).

(ii) Paragraph B, 1 John 5:13-21:

This closing paragraph sets forth the great triumphant certainties of Christian belief: its certainty of eternal life (1Joh 5:13), and of prevailing in prayer (1Joh 5:14,15). Then the writer guards himself by citing an instance in which such certainty is unattainable—prayer for those that sin unto death—and reminds his readers that all unrighteousness, though not sin unto death, is sin (1Joh 5:16,17). He then resumes the great certainties of Christian belief: the certainty that the Christian life stands always and

everywhere for righteousness, absolute antagonism to all sin (1Joh 5:18); the certainty of the moral gulf between it and the life of the world (1Joh 5:19); its certainty of itself, of the facts on which it rests, and the supernatural power which has given perception of these facts (1Joh 5:20). With an abrupt, affectionate call to those who know the true God to beware of yielding their trust and dependence to "idols," the Epistle ends.

JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF, PART 4-9

IV. Canonicity and Authorship.

1. Traditional View:

As to the reception of the Epistle in the church, it is needless to cite any later witness than Eusebius (circa 325), who classes it among the books (homologoumena) whose canonical rank was undisputed. It is quoted by Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (247-265), by the Muratorian Canon, Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and Irenaeus. Papias (who is described by Irenaeus as a "hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp") is stated by Eusebius to have "used some testimonies from John's former epistle"; and Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians (circa 115) contains an almost verbal reproduction of 1 Joh 4:3. Reminiscences of it are traced in Athenagoras (circa 180), the Epistle to Diognetus, the Epistle of Barnabas, more distinctly in Justin (Dial. 123) and in the Didache; but it is possible that the earliest of these indicate the currency of Johannine expressions in certain Christian circles rather than acquaintance with the Epistle itself. The evidence, however, is indisputable that this Epistle, one of the latest of the New Testament books, took immediately and permanently an unchallenged position as a writing of inspired authority. It is no material qualification of this statement to add that, in common with the other Johannine writings, it was rejected, for dogmatic reasons, by Marcion and the so-called Alogi; and that, like all the catholic epistles, it was unknown to the Canon of the ancient Syrian church, and is stated to have been "abrogated" by Theodore (Bishop of Mopsuestia, 393-428 AD).

2. Critical Views:

The verdict of tradition is equally unanimous that the Fourth Gospel and the First Epistle are both the legacy of the apostle John in his old age to the church. All the Fathers already mentioned as quoting the Epistle (excepting Polycarp, but including Irenaeus) quote it as the work of John; and, until the end of the 16th century, this opinion was held as unquestionable. The first of modern scholars to challenge it was Joseph Scaliger (1540-1609), who rejected the entire trio of Johannine Epistles as unapostolic; and in later times a dual authorship of the Gospel and the First Epistle has been maintained by Baur, H.J. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, von Soden, and others; although on this particular point other adherents of the critical school like Julicher, Wrede and Wernle, accept the traditional view.

3. Internal Evidence:

Thus two questions are raised: first, what light does the Epistle shed upon the personality of its own author? And second, whether or not, the Gospel and the Epistle are from the same hand. Now, while the Epistle furnishes no clue by which we can identify the writer, it enables us very distinctly to class him. His relation to his readers, as we have seen, is intimate. The absence of explicit reference to either writer or readers only shows how intimate it was. For the writer to declare his identity was superfluous. Thought, language, tone—all were too familiar to be mistaken. The Epistle bore its author's signature in every line. His position toward his readers was, moreover, authoritative. As has already been said, the natural interpretation of 1 Joh 1:2,3 is that the relation between them was that of teacher and taught. (By this fact we may account for the enigmatic brevity of such a passage as that on the "three witnesses." The writer intended only to recall fuller oral expositions formerly given of the same topics.) The writer is at any rate a person of so distinctive eminence and recognized authority that it is not necessary to remind the readers either who he is or by what circumstances he is compelled now to address them through the medium of writing; their knowledge of both facts is taken for granted. And all this agrees with the traditional account of John's relation to the churches of Asia Minor in the last decades of the 1st century.

Further, the writer claims to be one of the original witnesses of the facts of the incarnate life: "That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us" (1 Joh 1:1-3). To understand the "Word of life" here as the gospel (Westcott, Rothe, Haupt) seems to the present writer frankly impossible; and not less so theories by which the words "what we have heard, what we have seen with our eyes," etc., are regarded as utterances of the "faith-mysticism" or the "collective testimony" of the early church. It is difficult to imagine words more studiously adapted to convey the impression that the writer is one of the original, first-hand witnesses of Christ's life and resurrection ("that what we beheld, and our hands handled"; compare Lu 24:39). At furthest, the use of such language is otherwise compatible with veracity only on the supposition that the writer was recognized by the church as so closely identified with the original witnesses that he could speak of their testimony as virtually his own. But, apart from the presumption that he cannot have been one of the actual disciples of Jesus, there is really nothing to be said for this supposition. So far as the internal evidence is concerned, the ancient and unbroken tradition which assigns it to the apostle John must be regarded as holding the field, unless, indeed, the traditional authorship is disproved by arguments of the most convincing kind. Whether the arguments brought against the apostolic authorship of the Johannine writings as a whole possess this character is too large a question to be investigated here. Yet the kernel of it lies in small compass. It is whether room can be found within the 1st century for so advanced a stage of theological development as is reached in the Johannine writings, and whether this development can be conceivably attributed to one of Our Lord's original disciples. To neither of these questions, as it appears to the present writer, is a dogmatically negative answer warranted. If within a period comparatively so brief, Christian thought had already passed through the earlier and later Pauline developments, and through such a development as we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews, there is no obvious reason why it may not have attained to the Johannine, within the lifetime of the last survivor of the apostles. Nor, when we consider the nature of the

intellectual influences, within and without the church, by which the apostle John was surrounded, if, as tradition says, he lived on to a green old age in Ephesus, is there any obvious reason why he may not have been the chief instrument of that development.

V. Relationship to the Fourth Gospel.

1. Common Characteristics:

The further question remains as to the internal evidence the Epistle supplies regarding its relation to the Fourth Gospel. Prima facie, the case for identity of authorship is overwhelmingly strong. The two writings are equally saturated with that spiritual and theological atmosphere; they are equally characterized by that type of thought which we call Johannine and which presents an interpretation of Christianity not less original and distinctive than Paulinism. Both exhibit the same mental and moral habit of viewing every subject with an eye that stedfastly beholds radical antagonisms and is blind to approximations. There is in both the same strongly Hebrew style of composition; the same development of ideas by parallelism or antithesis; the same repetition of keywords like "begotten of God," "abiding," "keeping his commandments"; the same monotonous simplicity in the construction of sentences, with avoidance of relative clauses and singular parsimony in the use of connecting particles; the same apparently tautological habit of resuming consideration of a subject from a slightly different point of view; the same restricted range of vocabulary, which, moreover, is identical to an extent unparalleled in two independent writings.

2. Coincidences of Vocabulary:

The evidence for these statements cannot be presented here in full; but the following are some of the words and phrases characteristic of both and not found elsewhere in the New Testament—the Word, joy fulfilled, to see (or behold) and bear witness, to do the truth, to have sin, Paraclete, to keep the word (of God or Christ), to abide (in God or in Christ), the true light, new commandment, little children (teknia), children (paidia), to abide for ever, begotten of God, to purify one’s self, to do sin, to take away sins, works of the devil, to pass from death into life, murderer, to lay down one’s life, to be of the truth, to give commandment, to hear (= to hear approvingly), no man hath beheld God at any time, knowing and believing, Saviour of the world, water and blood, to overcome the world, to receive witness, to give eternal life, to have eternal life (in present sense), to believe in the name. The following are some of the terms common to both, which are found very rarely elsewhere in the New Testament: Beginning (= past eternity), to be manifested (9 times in each), to bear witness (6 times in the Epistle, 33 times in the Gospel, once only in Matthew, once in Luke, not at all in Mark), light (metaphorical), walk (metaphorical), to lead astray, to know (God, Christ, or Spirit, 8 times in the Epistle, 10 times in the Gospel), true (alethinos), to confess Jesus (elsewhere only in Ro 10:9), children of God, to destroy (lauein, elsewhere only in 2 Pet), the spirit of truth, to send (apostellein, of mission of Christ), only begotten son, to have the witness (elsewhere only in Apocrypha), to hear (= to answer prayer).

3. Divergences of Vocabulary:

On the other hand, the divergences of vocabulary are not more numerous than might be expected in two writings by the same author but of different literary form. The rather notable difference in the choice and use of particles is accounted for by the fact that dialogue and narrative, of which the Gospel is largely composed, are foreign to the Epistle. The discrepancy, when closely examined, sometimes turns out to be a point of real similarity. Thus the particle oun occurs nearly 200 times in the Gospel, not at all in the Epistle. But in the Gospel it is used only in narrative, no occurrence of it being found, e.g. in John 14-16.

Of the words and phrases contained in the Epistle, but not in the Gospel, the great majority are accounted for by the fact that they are used in connection with topics which are not dealt with in the Gospel. Apart from these, the following may be noted, the most important being italicized: Word of life, fellowship, to confess sins (nowhere else in the New Testament), to cleanse from sin, propitiation (hilasmos, nowhere else in the New Testament), perfected or perfect love, last hour, Antichrist, anointing, to give of the spirit, to have (Father, Son) boldness (Godward), Parousia, lawlessness, seed (of God), come in the flesh, God is love, Day, of Judgment, belief (pistis), to make God a liar, understanding. As regards style and diction, therefore, it seems impossible to conceive of two independent literary productions having a more intimate affinity. The relation between them in this respect is far closer than that between the Ac of the Apostles and the Third Gospel, or even any two of Paul’s Epistles, except those to the Ephesians and the Colossians.

4. Arguments against Unity of Authorship:

Arguments for a dual authorship are based chiefly on certain theological emphasis and developments in the Epistle, which are absent from the Gospel; and invariably these arguments have been pressed with complete disregard of the fact that the one writing purports, at least, to be a Gospel, the other, an utterance of the writer in propria persona. If, for example, it is urged that the words "He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins" have a more Pauline ring than any utterance of the Fourth Gospel, or that the conceptions in the Epistle of propitiation, intercession, and cleansing, are presented in a more explicit and technical form than in the Gospel, it is a fair reply to ask, Why not? Is it to be accepted as a canon of criticism that the writer of that Gospel must necessarily have put all his own theological expressions into the mouth of Him whose teaching he proposed to report? Much is made of the assertion that in the matter of the last things the Epistle recedes from the idealism of the Gospel, placing itself more nearly in line with the traditional apocalyptic eschatology. Whereas the Gospel speaks of Christ’s bodily departure as the necessary condition of His coming again in the Spirit to make His permanent abode with His disciples (Joh 16:7), the writer of the Epistle thinks of a visible Parousia as nigh at hand (1Joh 2:28); and whereas the Gospel conceives of judgment as a present spiritual fact (Joh 3:18,19), the Epistle clings to the "popular" idea of a Judgment Day. But it ought to be noted that in the Epistle, as compared with the Gospel, the eschatological perspective is foreshortened. The author writes under the conviction that "the world is passing away" and that the "last hour" of its day has come (1 Joh 2:17,18). And it is an unwarrantable assumption that he must, if he wrote the Gospel, have been guilty of the manifest anachronism of importing this conviction into it also. Apart from this the fundamental similarities between the eschatology of the Epistle and that of the Gospel are far more striking than the differences. In both, eternal life is conceived of as a present and not merely a future possession. In both,

Christ's presence is an abiding reality—"Our fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 Joh 1:3). If the Gospel speaks of the revelation of Christ as bringing present and inevitable "judgment" into the world, the Epistle is saturated with the same thought. If, on the other hand, the Epistle speaks of a visible future Parousia, this is plainly implied in Joh 5:28,29. If the Epistle makes a single reference to the Day of Judgment (1 Joh 4:17), the Gospel has 6 passages which speak of the "last day," and in these the "last day" is explicitly the day of resurrection (Joh 11:24) and of judgment (Joh 12:48). In the two writings different features of the eschatological picture may be made more or less conspicuous; but there is no such diversity as to warrant the hypothesis of a separate authorship. Again, it is urged that in the Epistle the conception of the Logos is modified in the direction of conformity to traditional doctrine. The conception of the personal, preexistent Logos, who "in the beginning was," and "was with God," and "was God" (Joh 1:1) was new, it is said, and, because of its Gnostic tinge, suspect; and was therefore avoided and becomes in the Epistle the depersonalized "Word of life" (1 Joh 1:1). But why should the "Word of life" necessarily signify anything less personal than the phraseology of the Gospel? The phraseology in both cases is exactly adapted to its purpose. In the Gospel, "in the beginning was the Word .... and the Word became flesh" is right, because it sums up the contents of the Gospel, announces its subject, the history of the Incarnate Logos. In the Epistle, the "Word of life" is right, because theme is to be the life, not as to its historical manifestation in Jesus, but as to its essential characteristics, whether in God or in man.

5. Conclusion:

Other arguments of a similar kind which have been put forward need not be considered. On the whole, it seems clear that, while there are between the Gospel and the Epistle differences of emphasis, perspective and point of view, these cannot be held as at all counterbalancing, on the question of authorship, the unique similarity of the two writings in style and vocabulary and in the whole matter and manner of thought, together with the testimony of a tradition which is ancient, unanimous and unbroken.

6. Question of Priority:

Regarding the question of priority as between the two writings, the only certainty is that the Epistle presupposes its readers' acquaintance with the substance of the Gospel (otherwise such expressions as "Word of life," "new commandment" would have been unintelligible); but that does not imply its subsequentness to the composition of the Gospel in literary form. By Lightfoot and others it is supposed to have been written simultaneously with the Gospel, and dispatched along with it as a covering letter to its original readers. In view, however, of the independence and first-rate importance of the Epistle, it is difficult to think of it as having originated in this way; and by the majority of scholars it is regarded as later than the Gospel and separated from it by an appreciable interval. That it was written with a "mediating" purpose (Pfleiderer), to "popularize" the ideas of the Gospel (Weizsacker), or to correct and tone down what in it was obnoxious to the feeling of the church, and at the same time to add certain links of connection (such as propitiation, Paraclete, Parousia) with the traditional type of doctrine, or to emphasize these where they existed (Holtzmann), is a theory which rests on an extremely slender basis; theory that it was written as a protest against Gnostic appropriation of the Fourth Gospel itself (Julicher) has no tangible basis at all.

That there was an appreciable interval between the two writings is probable enough. Gnostic tendencies have meanwhile hardened into more definite form. Many, false prophets have gone out into the world. The "antichrists" have declared themselves. The time has come for the evangelist to focus the rays of his Gospel upon the malignant growth which is acutely endangering the life of the church.

LITERATURE.

Commentaries are numerous and excellent. The most important are those by Calvin, Lucke, Ebrard, Haupt (of fine insight but grievous verbosity), Huther (specially valuable for its conspectus of all earlier exegesis), Westcott (a magazine of materials for the student of the Epistle), Alexander (in the Speaker's Commentary), Rothe (original, beautiful, profound), B. Weiss, H.J. Holtzmann, Plummer (in Cambridge Greek New Testament—scholarly and very serviceable); Brooke (in International Critical Commentary, excellent). Among the numerous expositions of the Epistle are those by Neander, Candlish, Maurice, Alexander (Expositor's Bible), Watson, J.M. Gibbon (Eternal Life), Findlay (Fellowship in the Life Eternal), Law (The Tests of Life—combined exposition and commentary); among books on Introduction, those by Weiss, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Julicher, Zahn, Salmon, Gloag, Peake; and, among books of other kinds, the relevant sections in Beyschlag, New Testament Theology; Pfleiderer, Urchristenthum; Harhack, Geschichte clef altchristl. Litteratur; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity; McGiffert, History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age; Stevens, Johannine Theology and Theology of the New Testament; articles by Salmond in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); by Schmiedel in Encyclopedia Biblica, and by Haring in Theologische Abhandlungen, Carl von Weizsacker .... gewidmet. In German, the fullest investigation of the relationship of the Epistle to the Fourth Gospel will be found in a series of articles by H.J. Holtzmann in the Jahrbucher fur protestantische Theologie (1882-83); in English, in Brooke's commentary in Law, Tests of Life, 339-63. See also Drummond, Character and Authorship of the Fourth Gospel, chapter iii.

THE SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES

1. Canonicity and Authorship:

It is not surprising that these brief and fugitive Epistles are among the New Testament writings which have had the hardest struggle for canonical recognition. One is probably, the other certainly, a private letter; and neither the same reason nor the same opportunity for their circulation existed, as in the case of church letters. The 2nd Epistle contains little that is distinctive; the 3rd Epistle is occupied with a vexatious episode in the internal history of a single congregation. Both are written by a person who designates himself simply as "the Presbyter"; and the names of the person (or church) to which the one is addressed and of the church with whose affairs the other is concerned are alike unknown. The fact, therefore, that, in spite of such obstacles, these letters did become widely known and eventually attained to canonical rank is proof of a general conviction of the soundness of the tradition which assigned them to the apostle John.

Like all the catholic epistles, they were unknown to the early Syrian church; when 1 John, 1 Peter and James were received into its Canon, they were still excluded, nor are they found even in printed editions of the Syriac New Testament till 1630. They were not acknowledged by the school of Antioch. Jerome distinguishes their authorship from that of the 1st Epistle. They are classed among the disputed books by Eusebius, who indicates that it was questioned whether they belonged to the evangelist or "possibly to another of the same name as he." Origen remarks that "not all affirm them to be genuine"; and, as late as the middle of the 4th century, the effort to introduce them in the Latin church met with opposition in Africa (Zahn).

On the other hand, we find recognition of their Johannine authorship at an early date, in Gaul (Irenaeus); Rome (Muratorian Canon, where, however, the reading is corrupt, and it is doubtful whether their authorship is ascribed or denied to the apostle John); Alexandria (Clement, who is reputed by Eusebius to have commented upon them, and who in his extant works speaks of John’s "larger epistle," implying the existence of one or more minor epistles); Africa (Cyprian reports that 2 John was appealed to at the Synod of Carthage, 256 AD). Dionysius, Origen’s disciple and successor, speaks of John’s calling himself in them "the Presbyter." Eusebius, though conscientiously placing them among the antilegomena, elsewhere writes in a way which indicates that he himself did not share the doubt of their authenticity.

The internal evidence confirms the ultimate decision of the early church regarding these letters. Quite evidently the 2nd Epistle must have been written by the author of the 1st, or was an arrant and apparently purposeless piece of plagiarism The 3rd Epistle is inevitably associated with the 2nd by the superscription, "‘the Presbyter," and by other links of thought and phraseology.

2. The Presbyter:

The mention of this title opens up a wide question. The famous extract from Papias (Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39) vouches for the existence, among those who were or had been his contemporaries, of a certain "Presbyter" John (see JOHN, GOSPEL OF, II, 5). Jerome, moreover, speaks of the two smaller Epistles as, in contrast with the 1st, ascribed to the Presbyter (De Vir. Illustr., ix); Eusebius inclines to ascribe to him the Book of Revelation; and modern critics, like Weizsacker and Harnack, have improved upon the hint by finding in this shadowy personage the author of the Fourth Gospel. Into this far-reaching controversy, we cannot here enter. It may be noted, however, that whether, in the confusedly written passage referred to, Papias really intends to distinguish between John the Apostle and John the Presbyter is a point still in debate; and that Eusebius (Evangelica Demonstratio, III, 5) does not regard the title "Presbyter" as inapplicable to John, but observes that in his Epistles he "either makes no mention of himself or calls himself presbyter, nowhere apostle or evangelist." Dionysius, too, remarks that "in the 2nd and 3rd Epistles ascribed to him, he writes anonymously, as the Presbyter." These Fathers, both exceptionally learned men and presumably well acquainted with primitive usage, saw nothing anomalous, although they did see something characteristic, in the fact, or supposed fact, that an apostle should designate himself by the lowlier and vaguer title. In the very sentence from Papias already referred to, the apostles are called "presbyters"; not to say that in the New Testament itself we have an instance of an apostle’s so styling himself (1Pe 5:1).

To sum up, it is evident that no one desiring falsely to secure apostolic prestige for his productions would have written under so indistinctive a title; also, that these brief and very occasional letters could never have won their way to general recognition and canonical rank unless through general conviction of their Johannine authorship—the very history of these Epistles proving that the early church did not arrive at a decision upon such matters without satisfying itself of the trustworthiness of the tradition upon which a claim to canonicity was rounded; finally, the internal evidence testifies to an authorship identical with that of the 1st Epistle, so that the evidence cited regarding this is available also for those. These letters, along with Paul's to Philemon, are the only extant remains of a private apostolic correspondence which must have included many such, and for this reason, apart from their intrinsic worth, possess an interest, material and biographical, peculiar to themselves. We proceed to consider the two Epistles separately, and since an interesting question arises as to whether the 2nd is that referred to in 3 Joh 1:9, it will be convenient to reverse the canonical order in dealing with them.

The Third Epistle.

This brief note gives a uniquely authentic and intimate glimpse of some aspects of church life as it existed in Asia Minor (this may be taken as certain) somewhere about the end of the 1st century. It concerns a certain episode in the history of one of the churches under the writer's supervision, and incidentally furnishes character-sketches of two of its members, the large-hearted and hospitable Gaius, to whom it is written (and whom it is merely fanciful to identify with any other Gaius mentioned in the New Testament), and the loquacious, overbearing Diotrephes; also of the faithful Demetrius, by whose hand probably the letter is sent. The story which may be gathered from the Epistle seems to be as follows. A band of itinerant teachers had been sent out, by the Presbyter's authority, no doubt, and furnished by him with letters of commendation to the various churches, and among others to that of which Gaius and Diotrephes were members. Diotrephes, however, whether through jealousy for the rights of the local community or for some personal reason, not only declined to receive the itinerant teachers, but exerted his authority to impose the same course of action upon the church as a whole, even to the

length of threatening with excommunication (3 Joh 1:10) those who took a different view of their duty. Gaius alone had not been intimidated, but had welcomed to his home the repulsed and disheartened teachers, who when they returned (to Ephesus, probably) had testified to the church of his courageous and large-hearted behavior (3 Joh 1:6). A 2nd time, apparently, the teachers are now sent forth (3 Joh 1:6), with Demetrius as their leader, who brings this letter to Gaius, commending his past conduct (3 Joh 1:5) and encouraging him to persevere in it (3 Joh 1:6). The Presbyter adds that he has dispatched a letter to the church also (3 Joh 1:9); but evidently he has little hope that it will be effectual in overcoming the headstrong opposition of Diotrephes; for he promises that he will speedily pay a personal visit to the church, when he will depose Diotrephes from his pride of place and bring him to account for his scornful "prating" and overbearing conduct (3 Joh 1:10). So far as appears, the cause of friction was purely personal or administrative. There is no hint of heretical tendency in Diotrephes and his party. Pride of place is his sin, an inflated sense of his own importance and a violent jealousy for what he regarded as his own prerogative, which no doubt he identified with the autonomy of the local

congregation.

The Second Epistle.

The letter is addressed to "the elect lady" (better, to "the lady Electa"). Its tone throughout is peculiarly affectionate; there is a warmer rush of emotion, especially in the opening verses, than is characteristic of John's usual reserve. But in these verses the keynote of the Epistle is struck—truth. The writer testifies his love for his correspondent and her children "in truth"; this love is shared by all who "know the truth" (2 Joh 1:1), and it is "for the truth's sake which abideth in us, and it shall be with us for ever" (2 Joh 1:2). What follows (2 Joh 1:4-9) is in effect an epitome of the 1st Epistle. After declaring his joy at finding certain of her children "walking in truth," he proceeds to expound, quite in the style of the 1st Epistle, what "walking in truth" is. It is to love one another (2 Joh 1:5; compare 1 Joh 2:7-11); but this love is manifested in keeping God's commandments (2 Joh 1:6 a; compare 1 Joh 5:2,3); and no less in stedfast adherence to the genuine doctrine of the Gospel (compare 1 Joh 3:23). "For many deceivers are gone forth into the world, even they that confess not that Jesus Christ cometh in the flesh" (2 Joh 1:7; compare 1 Joh 4:1-3). Then follows an exhortation to stedfastness (2 Joh 1:8), and a warning that whoever in the name of progress departs from this teaching "hath not God," while he who abides in it "hath both the Father and the Son" (2 Joh 1:9; compare 1 Joh 2:23,14). This leads up to the immediately practical point, a warning to extend no hospitality and show no friendliness to the false teachers (2 Joh 1:10,11); and the Epistle closes with the hope of a speedy and joyful meeting "face to face" of the writer and his correspondent, to whom he conveys greetings from the children of her "elect sister." Whether the "elect lady," or "lady Electa" of his letter is a real person or the personification of a church is a point which has been debated from ancient times and is still unsolved. The solution has been found, it is true, if we can accept the hypothesis (put forward by Zahn and Schmiedel and adopted by Findlay) that this is the letter referred to in 3 Joh 1:9. It is urged on behalf of this supposition that the two Epistles are curiously identical in phraseology. In both the writer begins by describing his correspondent as one whom "I love in truth"; in both he uses a distinctive phrase (echaren lian), 2 Joh 1:4, "I rejoice greatly," not found elsewhere in the New Testament to declare his joy at finding "thy (my) children walking in the truth"; and in both he concludes by saying that he has "many things to write," but that, looking forward to an early interview "face to face," he will not commit these further thoughts to "paper and ink." It is argued that "none but a chancery clerk could have clung so closely to his epistolary formulas" in two private letters written at different periods. But the force of this argument largely vanishes when we look at the formulas in question. If a modern writer may conclude hundreds of friendly letters by subscribing himself "yours sincerely," or something equivalent, why may not the Presbyter have commenced these two and many similar letters by assuring his correspondents that he sincerely loved them? And again, one in his official position must often have had occasion to say that he hoped soon to pay a personal visit, in view of which, writing at greater length was unnecessary. Even if the likeness in phraseology makes it probable that the two letters were written simultaneously, this by no means proves that the one was written to Gaius, the other to the church of which Gaius and Diotrephes were members. Zahn calculates that 2 John would occupy 32 lines, and 3 John not quite 31 lines of ancient writing, and infers that the author used two pages of papyrus of the same size for both letters; but why we are to identify 2 John with the letter mentioned in 3 John because both happen to fill the same size of note paper is not quite clear.

On the other hand, the difficulties in the way of this attractive hypothesis are too substantial to be set aside. The two Epistles belong to entirely different situations. Both deal with the subject of hospitality; but the one forbids hospitality to the wrong kind of guests, and says nothing about the right kind, the other enjoins hospitality to the right kind and says nothing about the wrong kind. In the one the writer shows himself alarmed about the spread of heresy, in the other, about the insubordination of a self-important official. Is it conceivable that the Presbyter should send at the same time a letter to Gaius in which he promises that he will speedily come with a rod for Diotrephes (who had carried the church along with him), and another to the church in which that recalcitrant person was the leading spirit, in which he expresses the hope that when he comes and speaks face to face their "joy may be made full"—a letter, moreover, in which the real point at issue is not once touched upon? Such a procedure is scarcely imaginable.

We are still left, then, with the question What kind of entity, church or individual, is entitled "the lady Electa"? (See ELECT LADY, where reasons are given for preferring this translation.) The address of the letter is certainly much more suggestive of an individual than of a church. After all that has been so persuasively argued, notably by Dr. Findlay (Fellowship in the Life Eternal, chapter iii), from the symbolizing of the church as the Bride of Christ, it remains very hard for the present writer to suppose that, in the superscription of a letter and without any hint of symbolism, anyone could address a particular Christian community as "the elect lady" or the "lady elect." On the other hand, the difficulties urged against the personal interpretation are not so grave as sometimes represented. The statement, "I have found certain of thy children walking in truth," does not imply that others of them were not doing so, but emphasizes what had come under the writer’s personal observation. Nor can we pronounce the elevated and didactic love of the letter more suitable to a church than to an individual without taking into account the character, position and mutual relations of the correspondents. The person (if it was a person) addressed was evidently a Christian matron of high social standing—one able in a special degree to dispense hospitality, and of wide influence, one beloved of "all them that know the truth," whose words would be listened to and whose example would be imitated. And, in view of the ominous spreading of the leaven of Antichrist, it is not difficult to suppose that the Presbyter should write to such a person in such a strain. Nor does there seem to be anything especially odd in the fact of the children of a private family sending their respects to their aunt through the apostle John (Findlay). If he was intimate with that family, and in their immediate vicinity at the time of writing, it appears a natural thing for them to have done. Possibly Dr. Harris’ "exploded" prehistoric countess of Huntington" is not so far astray as a modern equivalent of the lady Electa.

LITERATURE.

On the 2nd and 3rd Epistles see Commentaries: Lucke, Huther, Ebrard, Holtzmann, Baumgarten, Westcott, Plummer, Bennett, Brooke; Expositions: Findlay, Fellowship in the Life Eternal; S. Cox, The Private Letters of Paul and John; J.M. Gibbon, The Eternal Life.

R. Law

JOHN, THE REVELATION OF

See REVELATION OF JOHN.

JOIADA

joi’-a-da (yoyadha‘, "Yahweh knows"; compare JEHOIADA):

(1) A repairer of the Jerusalem walls (Ne 3:6); the King James Version "Jehoiada."

(2) Son of Eliashib the high priest (Ne 12:10,11,22; 13:28).

JOIAKIM

joi’-a-kim (yoyaqim, "Yahweh raises up"; compare JEHOIAKIM; JOKIM): Son of Jeshua and father of Eliashib, the high priest (Ne 12:10,12,26).

JOIARIB

joi’-a-rib (yoyaribh, "Yahweh pleads" or "contends"; compare JEHOIARIB):

(1) A "teacher" of Ezra’s time (Ezr 8:16).

(2) A Judahite (Ne 11:5).

(3) In Ne 11:10; 12:6,19 = JEHOIARIB (which see).

JOIN

join: Of the New Testament words, kollao, literally, "glue," "weld together," and its compounds, designate the closest form of personal union, as in Lu 15:15; 1Co 6:16; Eph 5:31. In the words of institution of marriage, suzeugnumi is used (Mt 19:6; Mr 10:9, literally, "yoke together"; compare Ge 2:24).

JOKDEAM

jok’-de-am (yoqedhe‘am): An unidentified city of Judah, named with Maon, Carmel and Ziph (Jos 15:56). It probably lay to the South of Hebron.

JOKIM

jo’-kim (yoqim, "Yahweh raises up"; compare JEHOIAKIM; JOIAKIM): A Judahite, descendant of Shelah (1Ch 4:22).

JOKMEAM

jok’-me-am (yoqme‘am): A town in Mt. Ephraim assigned to the Kohathite Levites (1Ch 6:68), named along with Gezer and Beth-horon. Its place is taken by Kibzaim in Jos 21:22 (in Septuagint here the name is omitted). It is mentioned again in 1Ki 4:12 (the King James Version wrongly "Jokneam"), where it seems to indicate some position to the East of Ephraim. So far no identification is possible.

JOKNEAM

jok’-ne-am (yoqne‘am): A royal city of the Canaanites taken by Joshua and described as "in Carmel" (Jos 12:22), in the territory of Zebulun, and allotted to the Merarite Levites (21:34). The border of Zebulun "reached to the brook that is before Jokneam" (19:11). In 1Ki 4:12 the name appears in the King James Version where, with the Revised Version (British and American), we should read "Jokmeam." Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 6 Roman miles from Lejio (Lejjun) on the way to Ptolemais (Acre). This points to Tell Kaimun, a striking mound on the eastern slope of Mt. Carmel. To the East of it runs the "torrent bed" of the Kishon. It stands about 300 ft. above the valley to the North of it, and the sides are steep. It is crowned by the ruins of an 18th-century fortress. A little lower down are the remains of a small chapel. There are fine springs at the foot (PEFM, II, 69 f). In Judith 7:3 it appears as "Cyamon" (Kuamon). It is the "Mons Cain" of the Middle Ages. "In the Samaritan Book of Judges it is noticed as the scene of a conflict between the Hebrews and the Giants; and Joshua is said to have been shut up here in magic walls of brass, till on sending a dove to the Hebrew king of Gilead, he was rescued" (Conder, HDB, under the word).

W. Ewing

JOKSHAN

jok’-shan (yoqshan, meaning unknown): Son of Abraham and Keturah (Ge 25:2,3 parallel 1Ch 1:32). Tuch suggested that yoqshan = yoqTan (Ge 10:25-29); see HDB, under the word; Skinner, Gen, 350.

JOKTAN

jok’-tan (yoqTan, meaning unknown): "Son" of Eber, and "father" of 13 tribes (Ge 10:25,26,29; 1Ch 1:19,20,23).

JOKTHEEL

jok’-the-el, jok’-thel (yoqethe’el) :

(1) A city in the Shephelah of Judah named between Mizpeh and Lachish (Jos 15:38); unidentified.

(2) A city in Edom formerly called Sela, taken by Amaziah after the battle in the Valley of Salt, and by him called Joktheel (2Ki 14:7).

See SELA.

JONA

jo’-na.

See JONAH; JONAS.

JONADAB

jon’-a-dab.

See JEHONADAB.

JONAH

jo’-na (yonah, "dove"; ‘Ionas):

(1) According to 2Ki 14:25, Jonah, the son of Amittai, of Gath-hepher, a prophet and servant of Yahweh, predicted the restoration of the land of Israel to its ancient boundaries through the efforts of Jeroboam II. The prophet lived and labored either in the early part of the reign of Jeroboam (790-750 BC), or during the preceding generation. He may with great probability be placed at 800-780 BC. His early ministry must have made him popular in Israel; for he prophesied of victory and expansion of territory. His native village of Gath-hepher was located in the territory of Zebulun (Jos 19:13).

(2) According to the book bearing his name, Jonah the son of Amittai received a command to preach to Nineveh; but he fled in the opposite direction to escape from the task of proclaiming Yahweh’s message to the great heathen city; was arrested by a storm, and at his own request was hurled into the sea, where he was swallowed by a great fish, remaining alive in the belly of the fish for three days. When on his release from the body of the fish the command to go to Nineveh was renewed, Jonah obeyed and announced the overthrow of the wicked city. When the men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of the prophet, God repented of the evil He had threatened to bring upon them. Jonah was grieved that the oppressing city should be spared, and waited in the vicinity to see what would be the final outcome. An intense patriot, Jonah wished for the destruction of the people that threatened to swallow up Israel. He

thought that Yahweh was too merciful to the heathen oppressors. By the lesson of the gourd he was taught the value of the heathen in the sight of Yahweh.

It is the fashion now in scholarly circles to treat the Book of Jonah as fiction. The story is said to be an allegory or a parable or a symbolic narrative. Why then did the author fasten upon a true and worthy prophet of Yahweh the stigma of rebellion and narrowness? On theory that the narrative is an allegory, J. Kennedy well says that "the man who wrote it was guilty of a gratuitous insult to the memory of a prophet, and could not have been inspired by the prophet's Master thus to dishonor a faithful servant."

(3) our Lord referred on two different occasions to the sign of Jonah the prophet (Mt 12:38-41; Lu 11:29-32; Mt 16:4). He speaks of Jonah's experience in the belly of the fish as parallel with His own approaching entombment for three days, and cites the repentance of the Ninevites as a rebuke to the unbelieving men of his own generation. Our Lord thus speaks both of the physical miracle of the preservation of Jonah in the body of the fish and of the moral miracle of the repentance of the Ninevites, and without the slightest hint that He regarded the story as an allegory.

John Richard Sampey

JONAH, THE BOOK OF

This little roll of four short chapters has given rise to almost as much discussion and difference of opinion as the first four chapters of Genesis. It would be presumptuous to think that one could, in a brief article, speak the final word on the questions in debate.

I. Contents of the Book.

The story is too well known to need retelling. Moreover, it would be difficult to give the events in fewer words than the author employs in his classic narrative. One event grows out of another, so that the interest of the reader never flags.

1. Jonah Disobedient, Jonah 1:1-3:

When the call came to Jonah to preach in Nineveh, he fled in the opposite direction, hoping thus to escape from his unpleasant task. He was afraid that the merciful God would forgive the oppressing heathen city, if it should repent at his preaching. Jonah was a narrow-minded patriot, who feared that Assyria would one day swallow up his own little nation; and so he wished to do nothing that might lead to the preservation of wicked Nineveh. Jonah was willing to prophesy to Israel; he at first flatly refused to become a foreign missionary.

2. Jonah Punished, Jonah 1:4-16:

The vessel in which the prophet had taken passage was arrested by a great storm. The heathen sailors

inferred that some god must be angry with some person on board, and cast lots to discover the culprit. When the lot fell upon Jonah, he made a complete confession, and bravely suggested that they cast him overboard. The heathen mariners rowed desperately to get back to land, but made no progress against the storm. They then prayed Yahweh not to bring innocent blood upon them, and cast Jonah into the sea. As the storm promptly subsided, the heathen sailors offered a sacrifice to Yahweh and made vows. In this part of the story the mariners give an example of the capacity of the Gentiles to perform noble deeds and to offer acceptable worship to Yahweh.

3. Jonah Miraculously Preserved, Jonah 1:17-2:10:

Yahweh prepared a great fish to swallow Jonah and to bear him in his body for three days and nights. Surprised to find himself alive and conscious in the body of the fish, the prophet prayed to his God. Already by faith he speaks of his danger as a past experience. The God who had saved him from drowning in the depths of the sea will yet permit him once more to worship with loud thanksgiving. At the command of Yahweh the fish vomits out Jonah upon the dry land. The almost inevitable grotesqueness of this part of the story is one of the strongest arguments against the view that the Book of Jon is literal history and not a work of the imagination.

4. Jonah’s Ministry in Nineveh, Jonah 3:1-4:

Upon the renewal of the command to go to Nineveh, Jonah obeyed, and marching through the streets of the great city, he cried, "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown!" His message was so brief that he may well have spoken it in good Assyrian. If the story of his deliverance from the sea preceded him, or was made known through the prophet himself, the effect of the prophetic message was thereby greatly heightened.

5. The Ninevites Repent, Jonah 3:5-10:

The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, the entire city uniting in fasting and prayer. So great was the anxiety of the people that even the lower animals were clothed in sackcloth. The men of Nineveh turned from deeds of violence ("their evil way") to seek the forgiveness of an angry God. Yahweh decided to spare the city.

6. A Narrow Prophet versus the Merciful God, Jonah 4:1-11:

Jonah breaks out into loud and bitter complaint when he learns that Nineveh is to be spared. He decides to encamp near the city to see what will become of it. He hopes it may yet be overthrown. Through a gourd vine Yahweh teaches the prophet a great lesson. If such a mean and perishable plant could come to have real value in the eyes of the sullen prophet, what estimate ought to be put on the lives of the thousands of innocent children and helpless cattle in the great city of Nineveh? These were dearer to the God of heaven than Jonah’s protecting vine could possibly be to him.

II. The Aim of the Book.

The main purpose of the writer was to enlarge the sympathies of Israel and lead the chosen people to undertake the great missionary task of proclaiming the truth to the heathen world. Other lessons may be learned from the subordinate parts of the narrative, but this is the central truth of the Book of Jonah. Kent well expresses the author's main message: "In his wonderful picture of God's love for all mankind, and of the Divine readiness to pardon and to save even the ignorant heathen, if they but repent according to their light, he has anticipated the teaching of the parable of the Prodigal Son, and laid the foundation for some of the broadest faith and the noblest missionary activity of the present generation" (Sermons, Epistles, etc., 420).

III. Is the Book History? 1. What Did our Lord Teach?:

Most of the early interpreters so understood it, and some excellent scholars still hold this view. If Jesus thought of the story as history and so taught, that fact alone would settle the question for the devout believer. On two, possibly three, different occasions He referred to Jonah (Mt 12:38-41; 16:4; Lu 11:29-32). It is significant that Jesus brought the two great miracles of the Book of Jon into relation with Himself and His preaching. As Jonah was three days and three nights in the body of the fish, so should the Son of Man be three days in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh repented at the preaching of Jonah, while the contemporaries of Jesus for the most part rejected His message. It is the fashion now among advanced critics to treat Mt 12:40 as an addition to the words of Jesus, though there is no manuscript evidence in favor of regarding the verse as an interpolation. G.A. Smith, among recent scholars, holds the view that Jesus did not mean to teach the historicity of Jonah's experience in the fish.

"Christ is using an illustration: it matters not whether that illustration be drawn from the realms of fact or of poetry" (BTP, II, 508). In a footnote Dr. Smith says: "Suppose we tell slothful people that theirs will be the fate of the man who buried his talent, is this to commit us to the belief that the personages of Christ's parables actually existed? Or take the homiletic use of Shakespeare's dramas—'as Macbeth did,' or 'as Hamlet said.' Does it commit us to the historical reality of Macbeth or Hamlet? Any preacher among us would resent being bound by such an inference. And if we resent this for ourselves, how chary we should be about seeking to bind our Lord by it."

Notwithstanding Principal Smith's skillful presentation of his case, we still think that our Lord regarded the miracles of the fish and the repentance of the Ninevites as actual events. Orelli puts the matter judiciously: "It is not, indeed, proved with conclusive necessity that, if the resurrection of Jesus was a physical fact, Jonah's abode in the fish's belly must also be just as historical. On this point also the saying, 'A greater than Jonah is here,' holds good. But, on the other hand, how arbitrary it is to assert, with Reuss, that Jesus regarded Jonah's history as a parable! On the contrary, Jesus saw in it a sign, a powerful evidence of the same Divine power which showed itself also in His dying in order to live again and triumph in the world. Whoever, therefore, feels the religious greatness of the book, and accepts as authoritative the attitude taken to its historical import by the Son of God Himself, will be led to accept a great act of the God who brings down to Hades and brings up again, as an actual experience of Jonah in

his flight from his Lord" (The Twelve Minor Prophets, 172, 3).

2. Modern Critical Views:

Most modern critical scholars since Kleinert (1868) and Bloch (1875) have regarded the Book of Jonah as a work of the imagination. Some prefer to call it an allegory, others a parable, others a prose poem, others a didactic story, others a midrash, others a symbolical book. Keil, Pusey, Delitzsch, Orelli, J. Kennedy and others have contended for the historical character of the narrative. A few treat it as a legend containing a kernel of fact. Cheyne and a few other scholars assert that in the symbolic narrative are imbedded mythical clements. The trend of critical opinion, even in evangelical circles, has of late been toward the symbolical interpretation. Radical critics boldly set aside the teaching of Jesus as erroneous, while the more evangelical take refuge either in the doctrine of the Kenosis (Php 2:5-8), or in the principle of accommodation. The last explanation might commend itself to the devout student, namely, that Jesus did not think it worth while to correct the views of his contemporaries, had our Lord not spoken more than once of the sign of Jonah, and in such detail as to indicate His acceptance of the entire narrative with its two great miracles.

IV. Authorship and Date.

The old view that Jonah was the author is still held by some scholars, though most moderns place the book in the late exilic or post-exilic times. A few Aramaic words occur in the Hebrew text. The question in debate is whether the language of Israel in the days of Jeroboam II had taken over words from the Aramaic. There had certainly been a century of close political and commercial contact between Israel and the Arameans of Damascus, so that it would not be surprising to meet with Aramaic words in a prophet of Samaria. Hosea, in the generation following Jonah, betrays little evidence of Aramaic influence in his style and vocabulary. Of course, the personal equation is a factor that ought not to be overlooked. If the author was a Judean, we should probably have to think of the post-exilic period, when Aramaic began to displace Hebrew as the vernacular of the Jews. The Book of Jonah is anonymous, and we really do not know who the author was or when he lived. The view that Jonah wrote the story of his own disobedience and his debate with the merciful God has not been made wholly untenable.

V. The Unity of the Book.

Nachtigal (1799) contended that there were three different authors of widely different periods. Kleinert (1868) held that two parallel narratives had been woven together in Jonah 3 and 4. Kaufmann Kohler (1879) contended that there were a considerable number of glosses and interpolations besides some transpositions of material. W. Bohme, in 1887, advanced the most radical theory of the composition of the roll. He partitioned the story among two authors, and two redactors or supplementers. A few additional glosses were charged to later hands. Even radical critics treat Bohme’s theory as one of the curiosities of criticism. Winckler (AOF, II, 260 ff) tried to improve the story by a few transpositions. Hans Schmidt (1905) subjects the roll of Jonah to a searching criticism, and concludes that a good many changes have been made from religious motives. Budde follows Winckler and Schmidt both in

transposing and in omitting some material. Sievers (1905) and Erbt (1907) tried to make of the Book of Jon a poem; but they do not agree as to the meter. Sievers regards the roll as a unit, while Erbt contends for two main sources besides the prayer in Jonah 2. Bewer, in ICC (1912), is far more conservative in both textual and literary criticism, recognizing but few glosses in our present text and arguing for the unity of the story apart from the insertion of the psalm in Jonah 2. Nearly all recent critics assign Jonah's prayer to a writer other than the author of the narrative about Jonah, but opinions vary widely as to the manner in which the psalm found its way into the Book of Jon. Bewer holds that it was probably put on the margin by a reader and afterward crept into the text, the copyist inserting it after 2:2, though it would more naturally follow 2:11. Bewer remarks: "The literary connections with various post-exilic psalms argue for a post-exilic date of the psalm. But how early or how late in the post-exilic period it belongs we cannot tell. The Hebrew is pure and no Aramaic influence is apparent." It is evident, then, that the presence or absence of Aramaic influence does not alone settle the question of the date of the document. Geography and the personal equation may be more important than the question of date. Bewer recognizes the fact that the psalm in Jon is not a mere cento of quotations from the Psalms. "The phrases it has in common with other psalms," writes Professor Bewer, "were the common property of the religious language of the author's day" (p. 24). Those who still believe that David wrote many of the psalms find no difficulty in believing that a prophet of 780 BC could have drawn upon his knowledge of the Psalter in a prayer of thanksgiving to Yahweh.

LITERATURE.

Among commentaries covering the twelve Minor Prophets, see especially Pusey (1861), Keil (English translation, 1880), von Orelli (English translation, 1893), Wellhausen (1898), G.A. Smith (1898). Among special commentaries on Jonah, consult Kleinert, in Lange (English translation, 1875); Perowne, in Cambridge Bible (1897); Bewer in ICC (1912). See also C. H. H. Wright, Biblical Essays (1886); H. C. Trumbull, "Jonah in Nineveh," JBL, XI (1892); J. Kennedy, Book of Jon (1895); Konig in HDB; Cheyne in EB. For more elaborate bibliography see Bewer in ICC, 25-27.

John Richard Sampey

JONAM

jo'-nam (Ionam, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek; Ionan, Textus Receptus of the New Testament; the King James Version Jonan): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke's genealogy (Lu 3:30).

JONAN

jo'-nan.

See JONAM.

JONAS (1)

jo’-nas (Ionas; the King James Version, Jonan):

(1) Son of Eliasib (1 Esdras 9:1).

(2) Corresponds in 1 Esdras 9:23 to "Eliezer" in Ezr 10:23.

(3) The prophet Jonah (2 Esdras 1:39; Tobit 14:4,8).

JONAS (2)

jo’-nas (yonah, or yochanan; Iona):

(1) The name given in Mt 12:39-41; 16:4; Lu 11:29-32 the King James Version to the Old Testament prophet Jonah (the Revised Version (British and American) renders "Jonah").

See JONAH.

(2) (Ioanes): The name given in Joh 21:15,16 the King James Version to the father of the apostle Simon Peter. Nothing further is known of him, except the different forms of his name. In Joh 1:42 the King James Version he is called Jona (compare also Mt 16:17 the King James Version). In Joh 1:42; 21:15,16 the Revised Version (British and American) he is called John, with the marginal note "Gr Joanes." In Mt 16:17 the Revised Version (British and American) Simon Peter is called Simon Bar-Jonah.

Jonas may be a contraction for Joanes (Keim). It has also been suggested that the father of Simon may have had a double name, Jona-Johannes (compare F. H. Chase in HDB, article "John, father of Simon Peter").

C. M. Kerr

JONATH ELEM REHOKIM

jo’-nath e’-lem re-ho’-kim (yonath ‘elem rechoqim) (Ps 56, title): "The silent dove of the far ones" (i.e. either of far-off lands, or among aliens), or "The dove of the distant terebinths," in either case indicating the tune to the melody of which the psalm was to be sung.

See PSALMS; SONG.

JONATHAN (1)

jon’-a-than (yehonathan, yonathan, "Yahweh has given"; Ionathan; compare JEHONATHAN):

(1) (Hebrew yehonathan): The young "Levite" of Judges 17; 18 referred to by name in 18:30, where he is called "the son of Gershom, the son of Moses," and where the King James Version has "Manasseh" for Moses, following the Massoretic Text in which the letter nun of Manasseh is "suspended."

Rashi states the reason thus: "Because of the honor of Moses was the nun written so as to alter the name." The original word was Moses, but it was thought undesirable that a descendant of his should have anything to do with images; and so Jonathan was made to have affinity (metaphorically) with Manasseh. See GB, Intro, 335-38.

Jonathan was a Levitical Judahite of Beth-lehem-judah, who came to the house of Micah, in the hill country of Ephraim, and hired himself as a priest in Micah’s sanctuary (Jud 17:1-13). The Danites sent 5 men north to spy for new territory, and on their way the spies came to the house of Micah, where they found Jonathan and consulted the oracle through him (Jud 18:1-5). Having received a favorable answer, they set out and came to Laish, and on their return south they advised that an expedition be sent thither (Jud 18:6-10). Their clansmen accordingly sent out a band of warriors who on their way passed by Micah’s house. The spies informed their comrades of the ephod and teraphim and images there, and they seized them, inducing Jonathan at the same time to accompany them as their priest (Jud 18:11-20). At Laish he founded a priesthood which was thus descended from Moses (Jud 18:30).

It has been held that there are two sources in the narrative in Judges 17; 18 (see Moore, Judges, 365-72). The section is important because of the light it throws on life and religion in early Israel. The "Levites" were not all of one tribe (see Moore, op. cit., 383-84); there were priests who claimed descent from Moses as well as Aaronite priests; and images were common in early Hebrew worship (compare Ge 31:30 ff; Jud 8:27; 1Sa 19:13).

(2) Son of King Saul. See separate article.

(3) (Hebrew yehonathan, yonathan, 2Sa 15:27,36; 17:17,20; 1Ki 1:42,43): Son of Abiathar the priest. He acted with Ahimaaz as courier to inform David of events at Jerusalem during Absalom’s revolt. It was he who also brought to Adonijah the news of Solomon’s accession.

(4) (Hebrew yehonathan, 2Sa 21:21 parallel 1Ch 20:7): Son of Shimei or Shimea, David’s brother; he is said to be the slayer of Goliath.

See JEHONADAB (1).

(5) (2Sa 23:32, Hebrew yehonathan = 1Ch 11:34, Hebrew yonathan): One of David’s mighty men.

See JASHEN.

(6) (Hebrew yonathan, 1Ch 2:32,33): A Jerahmeelite.

(7) (Hebrew yehonathan, and so 1Ch 27:25 the King James Version): Son of Uzziah, and one of David’s treasurers.

(8) (Hebrew yehonathan, 1Ch 27:32): A dodh of David, the Revised Version (British and American) "uncle," the Revised Version margin "brother’s son"; if he was David’s nephew, he will be the same as (4) above. He "was a counselor" to David, and "a man of understanding, and a scribe."

(9) (Hebrew yonathan, Ezr 8:6; 1 Esdras 8:32): Father of Ebed, a returned exile.

(10) (Hebrew yonathan, Ezr 10:15; 1 Esdras 9:14): One who either supported (Revised Version (British and American)) or opposed (Revised Version margin, the King James Version) Ezra in the matter of foreign marriages; see JAHZEIAH.

(11) (Hebrew yonathan, Ne 12:11): A priest, descendant of Jeshua (Joshua) =" Johanan" (Ne 12:22,23); see JEHOHANAN, (3).

(12) (Hebrew yonathan, Ne 12:14): A priest.

(13) (Hebrew yonathan, Ne 12:35): A priest, father of Zechariah.

(14) (Hebrew yehonathan, Jer 37:15,20; 38:26): A scribe in whose house Jeremiah was imprisoned.

(15) (Hebrew yonathan, Jer 40:8): Son of Kareah; a Judahite captain who joined Gedaliah after the fall of Jerusalem.

(16) (Ionathes, 1 Macc 2:5; 9-13; and Inathan 2 Macc 8:22; Swete reads Ionathes): The Maccabee surnamed Apphus in 1 Macc 2:5, son of Mattathias.

(17) Son of Absalom (1 Macc 13:11). He was sent by Simon the Maccabee to capture Joppa (compare 1 Macc 11:70, where there is mentioned a Mattathias, son of Absalom).

(18) A priest who led in prayer at the first sacrifice after the return from exile (2 Macc 1:23).

David Francis Roberts

JONATHAN (2)

(yehonathan; also yonathan, "Yahweh has given"; Ionathan): The eldest son of Saul, the first king of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin.

1. Three Periods:

The life of Jonathan, as far as we are told about him, falls naturally into 3 periods.

(1) First Period.

He comes on the scene as the right hand and lieutenant of his father in his early struggles to beat off the hostile tribes, especially the Ammonites (1Sa 11), who beset the territory of Israel on all sides. As soon as Saul had gained his first decisive victory, the people rallied to him in great numbers, so that he was able to count upon 3,000 men whenever they took the field. These were divided into two small armies, Saul retaining 2,000 and making Michmash his headquarters, the rest being stationed at Gibeah under Jonathan, some 5 miles distant as the crow flies. Jonathan thus commanded the base, while his father led the fighting force. This position of comparative inactivity does not appear to have been much to the taste of Jonathan. Midway between the two camps was a Philistine outpost at Geba, facing Michmash across the pass of that name, a valley with steep sides, now the Wady Suweinit. Saul does not seem to have felt himself strong enough to commence hostilities against the Philistines, and took means to increase the forces at his disposal. The Philistines no sooner heard that the Israelites had cast off their yoke (1Sa 13:3 b: for "Let the Hebrews hear," read "The Hebrews have revolted," after the Septuagint), than they came out in great numbers (1Sa 13:5). They seem to have compelled Saul to evacuate Michmash, which they occupied, Saul falling back on Gibeah (1Sa 13:16) and Gilgal with a greatly reduced following (1Sa 13:3,4 a seems to be a summary anticipation, in Hebrew style, of the events detailed in 1Sa 14). In spite of this, Jonathan, accompanied only by his armor-bearer, surprised the Philistine outpost at Geba (1Sa 14:5, "Gibeah" should be "Geba"), which was killed to a man. This feat precipitated a general engagement, in which the Israelites, whose only weapons appear to have been their farming implements (1Sa 13:20), Saul and Jonathan alone being armed with iron swords and spears, routed their enemies. The completeness of the victory was impaired by the superstitious action of Saul in refusing to allow the people to eat until the day was over (1Sa 14:24). As this order was unwittingly broken by Jonathan, Saul wished to have him executed; but this the people refused to allow, as they clearly recognized that the credit of the victory was due to the energetic action of Jonathan in striking before the enemy had time to concentrate. (In the Hebrew text there is some confusion between Gibeah and Geba; compare 1Sa 10:5 margin and 13:3.)

(2) Second Period.

The 2nd period of the life of Jonathan is that of his friendship for David. The narrative is too well known to need recapitulating, and the simple tale would only be spoiled by telling it in other words. Jonathan’s devotion to David was such that he not only took his part against his father, Saul (1Sa 18; 19), but was willing to surrender to him his undoubted claim to become Saul’s successor (1Sa 20). Their last meeting took place in the "desert" of Ziph, to the South of Hebron, some time after David had been driven into outlawry (1Sa 23:16-18).

(3) Third Period.

The 3rd phase of Jonathan's life is that of the exile of David, when Saul was directing his energies to combat what he no doubt considered the rebellion of the son of Jesse. During this civil war, if that can be called war in which one of the two sides refuses to take the offensive against the other, Jonathan remained entirely passive. He could not take part in proceedings which were directed against his friend whom he believed to be destined to occupy the place which he himself should in the ordinary course of events have filled. We therefore hear no more of Jonathan until the encroachments of the Philistines once more compelled Saul to leave the pursuit of the lesser enemy in order to defend himself against the greater. Saul's last campaign against the Philistines was short and decisive: it ended in the defeat of Gilboa and the death of himself and his sons. The men of Jabesh-gilead, out of gratitude for Saul's rescue of their town at the beginning of his reign, crossed over to Beth-shan, on the walls of which town the Philistines had hung in chains the bodies of Saul and Jonathan, and took them down under cover of darkness and carried them to Jabesh. There they burned the bodies after the manner of the primitive inhabitants of the land, and buried the bones.

2. His Character:

If we may judge from the little which has been handed down to us concerning him, Jonathan must have been one of the finest spirits that ever lived. His character is, as far as our knowledge goes, nearly perfect. He was athletic and brave (1Sa 14:13; 2Sa 1:22,23).

3. Military Qualities:

He could keep his plans secret when secrecy was necessary in order to carry them to a successful issue (1Sa 14:1), and could decide on what course of action to follow and act upon it on the instant. His attack upon the Philistine garrison at Geba (or Gibeah, if we adopt the reading of the Septuagint and Targum of 1Sa 13:3; compare 10:5) was delivered at the right moment, and was as wise as it was daring. If he had a fault, from a military point of view, it may have been an inability to follow up an advantage. The pursuit of the Philistines on the occasion referred to ended with nightfall. In this respect, however, he perhaps cannot be censured with justice, as he never had an entirely free hand.

4. Filial Piety:

Jonathan's independence and capacity for acting on his own responsibility were combined with devotion to his father. While holding his own opinion and taking his own course, he conformed as far as possible to his father's views and wishes. While convinced of the high deserts of David, he sought by all means to mitigate Saul's hatred toward him, and up to a certain point he succeeded (1Sa 19:6). Filial duty could not have been more severely tested than was that of Jonathan, but his conduct toward both his father and his friend is above criticism. Only on one occasion did his anger get the better of him (1Sa 20:34) under gross provocation, Saul having impugned the honor of Jonathan's mother (1Sa 20:30, Septuagint) Ahinoam (1Sa 14:50), and attempted his life. The estrangement was momentary; Saul and Jonathan were undivided in life and in death (2Sa 1:23 to be so read).

5. Friendship for David:

But it is as the befriender of David that Jonathan will always be remembered. He is the type of the very perfect friend, as well as of the chivalrous knight, for all time. His devotion to David was altogether human; had it been dictated by a superstitious belief in David's destiny as the future ruler of his people (1Sa 23:17), that belief would have been shared by Saul, which was not the case (1Sa 20:31). In disinterestedness and willingness to efface his own claims and give up his own titles the conduct of Jonathan is unsurpassed, and presents a pleasing contrast to some of the characters with whom we meet in the Bible. In this respect he resembles 'Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of Muhammad, who was the bravest of the brave, save when fighting in his own cause, and who had no ambition to fill the highest posts. So Jonathan preferred to serve rather than to command (1Sa 23:17). Jonathan and David stand for the highest ideal of Hebrew friendship, as do Damon and Pythias in Greek literature.

6. Inspired Affection:

We may be sure that Jonathan won the affection of the people. His squire was ready to follow him anywhere (1Sa 14:7). David's devotion to him seems to have been sincere, although it unfortunately coincided with his own self-interest. Jonathan appears to have inspired as great an affection as he himself felt (1Sa 20:41; 2Sa 1:26). His quarrel with his father was largely due to the solicitude of the latter for his son's interests (1Sa 18:29; 20:31).

7. His Descendants:

Jonathan's sons were, in common with his brother's, killed in the wars. One alone—Meribbaal (Mephibosheth)—survived. Jonathan's posterity through him lasted several generations. A table of them is given in 1Ch 8:33 ff parallel 9:40 ff (compare 2Sa 9:12). They were famous soldiers and were, like their ancestors, distinguished in the use of the bow (1Ch 8:40).

Thomas Hunter Weir

JONATHAS

jon'-a-thas (Swete reads Iathan, in Codex Vaticanus; Nathan, in Codex Sinaticus): The Latin form of the common name "Jonathan" (Tobit 5:13). See JATHAN. It is sometimes represented as Nathan.

JOPPA

jop'-a (yapho, yapho'; Ioppe): In Jos 19:46 the King James Version called "Japho," a city in the territory allotted to Dan; but there is nothing to show that in pre-exilic times it ever passed into Israelite hands.

1. Ancient Notices:

"The gate of Joppa" is mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (214, 32 f; compare 178, 20), as guarded by an Egyptian officer for Amenhotep IV. It was conquered by Thothmes III, and old Egyptian records speak of the excellence of its gardens and fruit trees. Sennacherib claims to have taken Jonathas after a siege (Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, 2, 93). To Jonathas, the Chronicler tells us, the cedars of Lebanon were brought in floats for transportation to Jerusalem by the workmen of the king of Tyre (2Ch 2:16).

2. Biblical References:

The city does not appear in the history as Philistine, so we may, perhaps, infer that it was held by the Phoenicians, the great seamen of those days. It was doubtless a Phoenician ship that Jonah found here, bound for Tarshish, when he fled from the presence of the Lord (Jon 1:3). In Ezra's time, again, cedars were brought here for the buildings in Jerusalem (Ezr 3:7). Having been brought by messengers from Lydda to Jonathas, Peter here raised the dead Dorcas to life (Ac 9:36 f). On the roof of Simon's house by the sea, the famous vision was vouchsafed to this apostle, from which he learned that the gospel was designed for Jew and Gentile alike (Ac 10:1 ff; 11:5).

3. History from Maccabean Times:

The men of Joppa, having treacherously drowned some 200 Jews, Judas Maccabeus fell upon the town "and set the haven on fire by night, and burned the boats, and put to the sword those that had fled thither" (2 Macc 12:3 ff). Jonathan took the city, in which Apollonius had placed a garrison (1 Macc 11:47 ff). It was not easy to hold, and some years later it was captured again by Simon, who garrisoned the place, completed the harbor and raised the fortifications (1 Macc 12:36 f; 13:11; 14:5-34). It is recorded as part of Simon's glory that he took it "for a haven, and made it an entrance for the isles of the sea," the Jews thus possessing for the first time a seaport through which commerce might be fully developed. It was taken by Pompey and joined to the province of Syria (Ant., XIV, iv, 4; BJ, I, vii, 7). Caesar restored it to the Jews under Hyrcanus (Ant., XIV, x, 6). It was among the cities given by Antony to Cleopatra (XV, iv, 1). Caesar added it to the kingdom of Herod (vii. 3; BJ, I, xx, 3), and at his death it passed to Archelaus (Ant., XVII, xi, 4; BJ, II, vi, 3). At his deposition it was attached to the Roman province. The inhabitants were now zealous Jews, and in the Roman wars it suffered heavily. After a massacre by Cestius Gallus, in which 8,400 of the people perished, it was left desolate. Thus it became a resort of the enemies of Rome, who turned pirates, and preyed upon the shipping in the neighboring waters. The place was promptly captured and destroyed by Vespasian. The people took to their boats, but a terrific storm burst upon them, dashing their frail craft to pieces on the rocks, so that vast numbers perished (BJ, III, ix, 2-4). At a later time it was the seat of a bishopric. During the Crusades it had a checkered history, being taken, now by the Christians, now by the Moslems. It was captured by the French under Kleber in 1799. It was fortified by the English, and afterward extended by the Turks (Baedeker, Palestine, 130).

4. Description:

The modern Yafa is built on a rocky mound 116 ft. high, at the edge of the sea. A reef of rocks runs parallel to the shore a short distance out. It may be rounded in calm weather by lighter vessels, and it affords a certain amount of protection. There is a gap in the reef through which the boats pass that meet the steamers calling here. In time of storm the passage is dangerous. On one of these rocks Perseus is said to have rescued the chained Andromeda from the dragon. Yafa is a prosperous town, profiting much by the annual streams of pilgrims who pass through it on their way to visit the holy places in Palestine. A good trade is done with Egypt, Syria and Constantinople. Soap, sesame, wheat and oranges are the chief exports. The famous gardens and orange groves of Jaffa form one of the main sights of interest. The Christians and the Moslems have rival traditions as to the site of the house of Simon the tanner. The remains of the house of Tabitha are also pointed out. From Jaffa to Jerusalem the first railway in Palestine was built.

W. Ewing

JORAH

jo’-ra (yorah meaning uncertain, perhaps "harvest-born"): A family which returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:18) =" Chariph" of Ne 7:24 =" Arsiphurith" (the King James Version "Arzephurith") of 1 Esdras 5:16.

JORAI

jo’-ra-i (yoray, "whom Yahweh teaches"): A Gadite chief, but possibly the name of a clan (1Ch 5:13).

JORAM

jo’-ram (yoram, "Yahweh is exalted"; compare JEHORAM):

(1) Son of Toi (or Tou, according to Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus, and 1Ch 18:9,10), sent by his father to greet David (2Sa 8:10) =" Hadoram" (1Ch 18:9,10) a form preferred by commentators in 2Sa also.

(2) Same as Jehoram, king of Judah (2Ki 8:21-24; 11:2; 1Ch 3:11; Mt 1:8 Ioram).

(3) Same as Jehoram, king of Northern Israel (2Ki 8:29; compare 2Ki 9:15 the Revised Version margin).

(4) (In form yoram): A Levite (1Ch 26:25).

(5) (Ioram, 1 Esdras 1:9) =" Jozabad" (2Ch 35:9); see JOZABAD (4).

JORDAN

jor’-dan (yarden, "flowing downward"; ‘Iordanes):

1. Source:

The Jordan river proper begins at the junction of four streams (the Bareighit, the Hasbany, the Leddan, and the Banias), in the upper part of the plain of Lake Huleh. The Bareighit receives its supply of water from the hills on the West, which separate the valley from the river Litany, and is the least important of the four. The Hasbany is the longest of the four (40 miles), issuing from a great fountain at the western foot of Mt. Hermon near Hasbeiya, 1,700 ft. above the sea, and descends 1,500 ft. in its course to the plain. The Leddan is the largest of the four streams, issuing in several fountains at the foot of the mound Tell el-kady (Dan, or Laish) at an elevation of 505 ft. above the sea. The Banias issues from a celebrated fountain near the town of Banias, which is identified as the Caesarea Philippi associated with the transfiguration. The ancient name was Paneas, originating from a grotto consecrated to the god Pan. At this place Herod erected a temple of white marble dedicated to Augustus Caesar. This is probably the Baal-gad of Jos 11:17 and 12:7. Its altitude is 1,100 ft. above tide, and the stream falls about 600 ft. in the 5 miles of its course to the head of the Jordan.

2. Lake Huleh:

The valley of Lake Huleh, through which the Jordan wends its way, is about 20 miles long and 5 miles wide, bordered on either side by hills and mountains attaining elevations of 3,000 ft. After flowing 4 or 5 miles through a fertile plain, the Jordan enters a morass of marshy land which nearly fills the valley, with the exception of 1 or 2 miles between it and the base of the mountains upon the western side. This morass is almost impenetrable by reason of bushes and papyrus reeds, which in places also render navigation of the channel difficult even with a canoe. Lake Huleh, into which the river here expands, is but 7 ft. above tide, and is slowly contracting its size by reason of the accumulation of the decaying vegetation of the surrounding morass, and of the sediment brought in by the river and three tributary mountain torrents. Its continued existence is evidence of the limited period through which present conditions have been maintained. It will not be many thousand years before it will be entirely filled and the morass be changed into a fertile plain. When the spies visited the region, the lake must have been much larger than it is now.

At the southern end of Lake Huleh, the valley narrows up to a width of a few hundred yards, and the river begins its descent into levels below the Mediterranean. The river is here only about 60 ft. broad, and in less than 9 miles descends 689 ft. through a narrow rocky gorge, where it meets the delta which it has deposited at the head of the Sea of Galilee, and slowly winds its way to meet its waters. Throughout this delta the river is easily fordable during a great part of the year.

3. Sea of Galilee:

The Sea of Galilee occupies an expansion of the Jordan valley 12 miles long and from 3 to 6 miles wide. The hills, reaching, in general, 1,200 or 1,500 ft. above the lake, come down close to its margin on every side. On the East and South they are mainly of volcanic origin, and to some extent of the same character

on the Northwest side above Tiberias. In the time of Christ the mouth of the river may have been a half-mile or more farther up the delta than now.

4. The Yarmuk:

As all the sediment of the upper Jordan settles in the vicinity of the delta near Capernaum, a stream of pellucid water issues from the southern end of the lake, at the modern town of Kerak. Before it reaches the Dead Sea, however, it becomes overloaded with sediment. From Kerak the opening of the valley is grand in the extreme. A great plain on the East stretches to the hills of Decapolis, and to the South, as far as the eye can reach, through the Ghor which descends to the Dead Sea, bordered by mountain walls on either side. Four or five miles below, it is joined on the East by the Yarmuk, the ancient Hieromax the largest of all its tributaries. The debris brought down by this stream has formed a fertile delta terrace 3 or 4 miles in diameter, which now, as in ancient times, is an attractive place for herdsmen and agriculturists. The valley of the Yarmuk now furnishes a natural grade for the Acre and Damascus Railroad, as it did for the caravan routes of early times. The town of Gadara lies upon an elevation just South of the Yarmuk and 4 or 5 miles East of the Jordan.

Ten miles below the lake, the river is joined on the West by Wddy el-Bireh, which descends from the vicinity of Nazareth, between Mt. Tabor and Endor, and furnishes a natural entrance from the Jordan to Central Galilee. An aqueduct here still furnishes water for the upper terrace of the Ghor. Wddy el-Arab, with a small perennial stream, comes in here also from the East.

5. El-Ghor:

Twenty miles below Lake Galilee the river is joined by the important Wady el-Jalud, which descends through the valley of Jezreel between Mt. Gilboa and the range of the Little Hermon (the hill Moreh of Jud 7:1). This valley leads up from the Jordan to the valley of Esdrelon and thence to Nazareth, and furnished the usual route for Jews going from Jerusalem to Nazareth when they wished to avoid the Samaritans. This route naturally takes one past Beisan (Bethshean), where the bodies of Saul and Jonathan were exposed by the Philistines, and past Shunem and Nain. There is a marked expansion of the Ghor opposite Beisan, constituting an important agricultural district. The town of Pella, to which the Christians fled at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, lies upon the East side of the Ghor; while Jabesh-gilead, where the bodies of Saul and Jonathan were finally taken by their friends and cremated, is a little farther up the slope of Gilead. Twenty miles farther down, the Ghor, on the East, is joined by Wady Zerka (the brook Jabbok), the second largest tributary, separating Ammon from Gilead, its upper tributaries flowing past Ammon, Mizpeh, and Ramoth-gilead. It was down this valley that Jacob descended to Succoth.

A few miles below, the Wady Farah, whose head is at Sychar between Mts. Ebal and Gerizim, descends from the West, furnishing the natural route for Jacob’s entrance to the promised land.

At Damieh (probably the Adam of Jos 3:16), the Ghor is narrowed up by the projection, from the West,

of the mountain ridge terminating in Kurn Surtubeh, which rises abruptly to a height of 2,000 ft. above the river.

The section of the Ghor between Damieh and the Dead Sea is of a pretty uniform width of 10 to 12 miles and is of a much more uniform level than the upper portions, but its fertility is interfered with by the lack of water and the difficulty of irrigation. From the vicinity of Jericho, an old Roman road follows up the Wady Nawaimeh, which furnished Joshua a natural line of approach to Ai, while through the Wady el-Kelt is opened the natural road to Jerusalem. Both Ai and the Mount of Olives are visible from this point of the Ghor.

6. The Zor:

In a direct line it is only 70 miles from Lake Galilee to the Dead Sea, and this is the total length of the lower plain (the Zor); but so numerous are the windings of the river across the flood plain from one bluff to the other that the length of the river is fully 200 miles. Col. Lynch reported the occurrence of 27 rapids, which wholly interrupted navigation, and many others which rendered it difficult. The major part of the descent below Lake Galilee takes place before reaching Damieh, 1,140 ft. below the Mediterranean. While the bluffs of the Ghor upon either side of the Zor, are nearly continuous and uniform below Damieh, above this point they are much dissected by the erosion of tributary streams. Still, nearly everywhere, an extended view brings to light the original uniform level of the sedimentary deposits formed when the valley was filled with water to a height of 650 ft. (see ARABAH; DEAD SEA).

The river itself averages about 100 ft. in width when confined strictly within its channel, but in the early spring months the flood plain of the Zor is completely overflowed, bringing into its thickets a great amount of driftwood which increases the difficulty of penetrating it, and temporarily drives out ferocious animals to infest the neighboring country.

7. The Fords of Jordan:

According to Conder, there are no less than 60 fording-places between Lake Galilee and the Dead Sea. For the most part it will be seen that these occur at rapids, or over bars deposited by the streams which descend from one side or the other, as, for example, below the mouths of the Yarmuk, Jabbok, Jalud and Kelt. These fords are, however, impassable during the high water of the winter and spring months. Until the occupation by the Romans, no bridges were built; but they and their successors erected them at various places, notably below the mouth of the Yarmuk, and the Jabbok, and nearly opposite Jericho.

Notwithstanding the great number of fords where it is possible to cross at low water, those which were so related to the lines of travel as to be of much avail were few. Beginning near the mouth of the Jordan and proceeding northward, there was a ford at el-Henu leading directly from Jericho to the highlands Northeast of the Dead Sea. Two or three miles farther to the North is the ford of the pilgrims, best known of all, at the mouth of Wady Kelt. A few miles farther up the river on the road leading from

Jericho to es-Salt, near the mouth of the Wady Nimrin, there is now a bridge where the dependence was formerly upon the ford. Just below the mouth of the Wady Zerka (Jabbok) is the ford of Damieh, where the road from Shechem comes down to the river. A bridge was at one time built over the river at this point; but owing to a change in the course of the stream this is now over a dry water-course. The next important crossing-place is at the opening of the valley of Jezreel coming in from the West, where probably the Bethabara of the New Testament should be located. Upon this ford a number of caravan routes from East to West converge. The next important crossing-place is at el-Mujamia, 2 or 3 miles below the mouth of the Yarmuk. Here, also, there was a Roman bridge. There are also some traces of an ancient bridge remaining just below the exit of the river from Lake Galilee, where there was a ford of special importance to the people residing on the shores of this lake who could not afford to cross in boats. Between Lake Galilee and Lake Huleh, an easy ford leads across the delta of the stream a little above its junction with the lake; while 2 or 3 miles below Lake Huleh is found "the bridge of Jacob’s daughters" on the line of one of the principal routes between Damascus and Galilee. Above Lake Huleh the various tributaries are easily crossed at several places, though a bridge is required to cross the Bareighit near its mouth, and another on the Hasbany on the main road from Caesarea Philippi to Sidon, at el-Ghagar.

George Frederick Wright

JORDAN VALLEY

1. Physical Peculiarities:

As more fully detailed elsewhere (see ARABAH; DEAD SEA; GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE), the Jordan valley in its lower portion occupies a remarkable depression in the earth’s surface, reaching its greatest depth in the Dead Sea, the surface of which is 1,300 ft., the bottom 2,600 ft. below tide level, the portion of the basin below the level of the sea being about 100 miles in length and from 10 to 15 miles in breadth at base, and from two to three times that distance between the bordering summits of the mountains and plateaus on either side. In the early prehistoric period, corresponding with the Glacial epoch, this depression was filled with water to a height of 1,400 ft. (see references above) which gradually disappeared by evaporation as present climatic conditions came on. At an elevation of approximately 650 ft. above the Dead Sea, very extensive sedimentary deposits were made, which, while appearing only in fragments along the shores of the Dead Sea, are continuous over the bottom of the valley (the so-called Ghor), farther North. These deposits are from 100 to 200 ft. thick, consisting of material which was brought down into the valley by the tributary mountain streams descending from each side, while the water stood at this higher level. Naturally these deposits slope gradually from the sides of the valley toward the center, the coarser material of the deposits being nearer the sides, and the amount of sediment being much increased opposite the mouths of the larger streams. The deposit was at first continuous over the entire Ghor, or valley, but has since been much dissected by the Jordan river and its tributaries. The Jordan itself has eroded a channel through the soft sediment, 100 ft. more or less deep, from Lake Galilee to the Dead Sea, a distance in a straight line of about 70 miles. At first this channel was narrow, but it has been constantly enlarged by the stream as it has meandered from side to

side, undercutting the banks so that they cave into the river and are washed down to fill up the Dead Sea, a process which is especially familiar to residents upon the banks of the Mississippi and Missouri rivers. This narrow gorge is called the Zor, and will hereafter be referred to under this name. The Zor at present averages about 1/2 mile wide, the most of which is occupied by a flood plain extending from the banks of the river to the foot of the sedimentary bluffs on either side. This flood plain is so overgrown with brush and reeds that it is practically impenetrable, except by wild beasts, which, according to Scriptural references, have infested it from earliest times, among which may be mentioned the lion, the tiger, the wild boar. During the spring months, when the snows are melting from Mt. Hermon and cloudbursts are sending sudden torrents of water down the river courses from the plateau of Gilead and the mountains of Samaria, the Jordan "overflows all its banks," i.e. covers this flood plain and drives out the beasts to infest the neighborhood for a short time.

The surface of this old lake bed has also been much dissected by the tributary streams which come in from either side, they having cut channels across the Ghor down to a depth corresponding to that of the Zor. As a consequence the roads leading up the valley find it necessary to hug the base of the mountains on either side to avoid the abrupt descent into the channels of the tributary streams, which are deepest near their mouths. Another natural consequence of these physical peculiarities is that agriculture cannot be carried on except as water to irrigate the level surfaces of the Ghor is carried out from the higher levels of the perennial streams. There are many remains of such aqueducts for irrigation constructed in early times. These are now almost all in ruins and unused. Merrill, however, estimates that 200 square miles of the Jordan valley, over which the surface is as level as a prairie, and as free from stones, could be irrigated at the present time and made as fruitful as the valley of the Nile. But from time immemorial settled agriculture in the Ghor has been rendered precarious by the incursions of the nomadic tribes, who periodically come down from the desert regions on the East.

2. Descriptions:

Two descriptions (the first from my own journal) of the general views obtained of the Jordan valley from adjoining elevated points will give vividness to our conceptions of this remarkable depression.

"It was the middle of December when, after wading all day across the southern flanks of Mt. Hermon, through snow knee-deep for our horses, we descended below the clouds and the snow to the brink of the eastern mountain wall overlooking the upper valley of the Jordan. It was a sight ever to be remembered, with the glistering peak of Mt. Hermon to our right, and the jagged walls of the borders of Naphtali stretching across the horizon on the West, only a few miles away, while between and at our feet were the green fields of the upper Jordan valley, through which ran the silver thread of the river, broadening out into the expanded waters of Lake Merom. Over the plain could dimly be seen the black tents of the Arabs, and the husbandmen plowing the fields for an early harvest. No wonder the spies were impressed with the attractiveness and fertility of the region." This of the upper Jordan valley.

Dr. Merrill gives the following description of the view of the lower Jordan valley from the summit of Kurn Surtabeh, March 23: "Jebel esh Sheikh (Mt. Hermon) was covered with snow, and so was the

Lebanon range farther to the West and North. Lake Merom and the volcanic peaks on the plain to the East of it and South of Hermon were distinctly seen, likewise the Sea of Galilee, the hills about Safed, the hills West of Tiberias and the slope from their summit, which inclines toward Mt. Tabor; also Gamala and Gadara, all the range of Jebel ‘Ajlun or hills of Gilead, Kulat er Rubad, Jebel Meisera and Jebel Osha, the mountains of Moab, and the Dead Sea. But the mere naming of different points that can be seen gives no adequate idea of the extent and magnificence of the prospect which one enjoys from the top of this strange landmark. Hills to the West obstruct the view in that direction, and to the East nothing can be seen beyond the highest part of the Moab and Gilead ranges, but it is the north-and-south sweep which makes the prospect a glorious one. No language can picture correctly the Jordan valley, the winding stream, the jungles on its banks, the strange Ghor with its white, ragged sides, the vast plain of the valley, through and in the middle of which the lower Ghor (the Zor) is sunk, the dense green oases formed here and there by some mountain stream, and the still, lifeless sea, as bright and motionless as molten lead, lying far to the South, ending the great valley and touching the mountains on either side! This is an outline merely, but I cannot summon to my aid words which will describe it more accurately. The Jordan valley or Ghor, in front of Surtabeh, is about 8 miles wide, and looks like a vast plain. The lower Ghor (Zor) is the ragged channel cut down along the middle of the large one. This distinction of the upper and lower Ghor is by no means so strikingly defined above the mouth of the Zerka as it is below that point, and all the way thence to the Dead Sea."

3. Division into Eight Sections:

Considered in detail the valley may be divided, as Conder suggests, into 8 sections. "First the portion between Banias and the Huleh, where it is some 5 miles broad, with steep cliffs some 2,000 ft. high on either side and a broad marsh between. Secondly, from the Huleh to the Sea of Galilee, where the stream runs close to the eastern hills, and about 4 miles from the base of those on the West, which rise toward the high Safed mountains, more than 3,500 ft. above the lake. Thirdly, for 13 miles from the South end of the Sea of Galilee to the neighborhood of Beisan. Here the valley is only 1 1/2 miles broad West of the river, and about 3 on the East, the steep cliffs of the plateau of Kaukab el Hawa on the West reaching an altitude of 1,800 ft. above the stream.

"South of Beisan is the 4th district, with a plain West of Jordan, 12 miles long and 6 miles broad, the line of hills on the East being straight, and the foot of the mountains on this side about 2 miles from the river. In the neighborhood of Beisan, the cross-section of the plain shows 3 levels: that of the shelf on which Beisan stands, about 300 ft. below sea-level; that of the Ghor itself, some 400 ft. lower, reached by an almost precipitous descent; and that of the Zor, or narrow trench, from a half to a quarter of a mile wide, and about 150 ft. lower still. The higher shelf extends westward to the foot of Gilboa; it dies away on the South, but on the North it gradually rises into the plateau of Kaukab and to the western table-land above the sea of Galilee, 1,800 ft. above Jordan.

"After leaving the Beisan plain, the river passes through a narrow valley 12 miles long and 2 or 3 miles wide, with a raised table-land to the West, having a level averaging about 500 ft. above the sea. The Beisan plain is full of springs of fresh water, some of which are thermal, but a large current of salt warm water flows down Wady Maleh, at the northern extremity of this 5th district.

"In the 6th district, the Damieh region, the valley again opens to a width of about 3 miles on the West, and 5 on the East of J. The great block of the Kurn Surtubeh here stands out like a bastion, on the West, 2,400 ft. above the river. Passing this mountain, the 7th district is entered—a broad valley extending from near Fusail to ‘Osh el Ghurab, North of Jericho. In this region the Ghor itself is 5 miles broad, West of the river, and rather more on the East. The lower trench or Zor is also wider here and more distinctly separated from the Ghor. A curious geographical feature of this region was also discovered by the Survey party. The great affluents of the Far’ah and ‘Aujeh do not flow straight to Jordan, but turn South about a mile West of it, and each runs, for about 6 miles, nearly parallel with the river; thus the mouth of the Far’ah is actually to be found just where that of the next valley is shown on most maps.

"The 8th and last district is that of the plain of Jericho, which, with the corresponding basin (Ghor-es-Seiseban) East of Jordan, measures over 8 miles North and South, and more than 14 across, with Jordan about in the middle. The Zor is here about a mile wide, and some 200 ft. below the broad plain of the Ghor."

4. Climate Fauna and Flora:

Owing to its depression below sea-level the climate of the lower Jordan valley is even more than tropical. In the summer months thermometer scarcely falls below 100 degrees F., even in the night; but during the winter months, though the days are hot, thermometer frequently goes down to 40 degrees in the night time.

The fauna of this part of the Jordan valley and about the Dead Sea is said by Tristram (SWP, "Fauna and Flora") to be identical with that now existing in Ethiopia. Of the mammalia characteristic of this general region, 34 are Ethiopian and 16 Indian, though there is now no possible connection with either Ethiopia or India. The fish of the Jordan show close affinity to many species of the Nile and of the lakes and rivers of tropical Africa. Many species of birds, also, now confined to the lower basin and the Dead Sea, are related to Ethiopian and Indian species.

The flora is equally interesting. Out of 162 species of plants found at the Southwest corner of the Dead Sea, 135 species are African in their affinity. In the marshes of Lake Huleh, many acres are covered with the papyrus plant, which became extinct in Egypt long ago, and is now found in Africa only in the Upper Nile beyond the 7th degree of North latitude. The most common trees and plants of the Jordan valley are the castor-oil plant and the oleander, flourishing especially about Jericho, several varieties of the acacia tree, the caper plant, the Dead Sea apple (Solanum Sodomaeum) the oser tree of the Arabs, tamarisks, Agnus casti (a flowering bamboo), Balanites Aegyptiaca (supposed to be the balm of Gilead), Populus Euphratica (a plant found all over Central Asia but not West of the Jordan), and many tropical plants, among which may be mentioned Zygophyllum coccineum, Boerhavia, Indigofera, several Astragali, Cassias, Gymnocarpum, and Nitraria.

George Frederick Wright

JORIBUS

jor’i-bus (Ioribos; the King James Version, Joribas):

(1) In 1 Esdras 8:44, called "Jarib" in Ezr 8:16.

(2) In 1 Esdras 9:19, called "Jarib" in Ezr 10:18.

JORIM

jor’-rim (Ioreim from yehoram, yoram): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:29).

JORKEAM

jor’-ke-am (yorqe‘am; the King James Version Jorkoam): This is probably to be taken as the name of a town, the "father" or "founder" of which was Raham (1Ch 2:44). It may be identical with "Jokdeam" of Jos 15:56.

JOSABAD

jos’-a-bad.

See JOZABAD.

JOSABDUS

jo-sab’-dus (Iosabdos, 1 Esdras 8:63; probably identical with Iozabados, in 9:23): The same as Jozabad of Ezr 8:33; 10:23 (which see).

JOSAPHAT

jos’-a-fat (Iosaphat, the King James Version in Mt 1:8 for JEHOSHAPHAT (which see)): A king of Judah, mentioned in Matthew’s genealogy of Christ.

JOSAPHIAS

jos-a-fi’-as (Iosaphias, 1 Esdras 8:36): Called "Josephiah" in Ezr 8:10.

JOSE

jo’-se (Iose): the King James Version form for "Jesus" (Iesous) in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:29), the Revised Version (British and American) Greek

JOSECH

jo’-sek (Iosech, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek; Ioseph, Textus Receptus of the New Testament; the King James Version, Joseph): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:26).

JOSEDECH; JOSEDEK

jos’-e-dek, jos’e-dek (Iosedek): Father of Jeshua (1 Esdras 5:5). In Hag 1:1 the Revised Version (British and American), the relationship is described as "Joshua the son of JEHOZADAK (which see), the high priest."

JOSEPH (1)

jo’-zef (yoceph; Ioseph):

1. In the Old Testament:

(1) The 11th son of Jacob and 1st of Rachel (see separate article).

(2) The father of Igal of Issachar, one of the 12 spies (Nu 13:7).

(3) A son of Asaph (1Ch 25:2,9).

(4) A man of the sons of Bani, who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:42).

(5) A priest of the family of Shebaniah in the days of Joiakim (Ne 12:14).

2. In the Apocrypha:

(1) Son of Zacharias, defeated by Gorgias circa 164 BC (1 Macc 5:18,56,60).

(2) Called a brother of Judas Maccabeus in 2 Macc 8:22, probably by mistake for John.

(3) Great-grandfather of Judith (Judith 8:1).

3. In the New Testament:

(1) The husband of Mary, the mother of Jesus (see special article).

(2, 3) The name of 3 ancestors of Jesus according to the King James Version (Lu 3:24,26,30); the name of two according to the Revised Version (British and American), which reads "Josech" in Lu 3:26.

(4) A Jew of Arimathea in whose sepulcher Jesus was buried (Mt 27:57, etc.; see article).

(5) One of the brethren of Jesus, according to the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 13:55, the King James Version "Joses"). the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) both have "Joses" in Mt 27:56; Mr 6:3; 15:40,47.

(6) Joseph Barsabbas (Ac 1:23; see article).

(7) Joseph, surnamed Barnabas (Ac 4:36, the King James Version "Joses"; see BARNABAS).

S. F. Hunter

JOSEPH (2)

jo'-zef (yoceph, "He will add"; Septuagint Ioseph). The narrative (Ge 30:23,14) indicates not so much a double etymology as the course of Rachel's thoughts. The use of 'acaph, "He takes away," suggested to her mind by its form in the future, yoceph, "He will add," "And she called his name Joseph, saying, Yahweh add to me another son"):

I. THE JOSEPH STORY, A LITERARY QUESTION

1. An Independent Original or an Adaptation?

2. A Monograph or a Compilation?

(1) An Analytical Theory Resolving It into a Mere Compilation

(2) A Narrative Full of Gems

(3) The Argument from Chronology Supporting It as a Monograph

II. THE STORY OF JOSEPH, A BIOGRAPHY

1. A Bedouin Prince in Canaan

2. A Bedouin Slave in Egypt

3. The Bedouin Slave Becomes Again the Bedouin Prince

4. The Prime Minister

5. The Patriarch

LITERATURE

The eleventh son of Jacob. The Biblical narrative concerning Joseph presents two subjects for consideration, the Joseph story, a literary question, and the story of Joseph, a biography. It is of the first importance to consider these questions in this order.

Cheyne in Encyclopedia Biblica reaches such conclusions concerning the Joseph story that the story of Joseph is mutilated almost beyond recognition as a biography at all. Driver in HDB holds that the Joseph story was "in all probability only committed to writing 700-800 years" later than the time to which Joseph is attributed, points out that Joseph's name was also the name of a tribe, and concludes that "the first of these facts at once destroys all guarantee that we possess in the Joseph narrative a literal record of the facts," and that "the second fact raises the further question whether the figure of Joseph, in part or even as a whole, is a reflection of the history and characteristics of the tribe projected upon the past in the individual form." But he draws back from this view and thinks it "more probable that there was an actual person Joseph, afterward .... rightly or wrongly regarded as the ancestor of the tribe .... who underwent substantially the experience recounted of him in Genesis." In the presence of such critical notions concerning the literature in which the narrative of Joseph is embodied, it is clear that until we have reached some conclusions concerning the Joseph story, we cannot be sure that there is any real story of Joseph to relate.

I. The Joseph Story, a Literary Question.

1. An Independent Original or an Adaptation?:

This literary problem will be solved, if satisfactory answers may be found to two questions: Is it an independent original or an adaptation? Suitable material for such an adaptation as would produce a Joseph story has been sought at either end of the line of history: Joseph the progenitor and Joseph the tribe. The only contestant for the claim of being an early original of which the Joseph story might be an adaptation is the nasty "Tale of Two Brothers" (RP, series I, volume II, 137-46). This story in its essential elements much resembles the Joseph story. But such events as it records are common: why not such stories?

What evidence does this "Tale of Two Brothers" afford that the Joseph story is not an independent original? Are we to suppose that because many French romances involve the demi-monde, there was therefore no Madame de Pompadour? Are court scandals so unheard of that ancient Egypt cannot afford

two? And why impugn the genuineness of the Joseph story because the "Tale of Two Brothers" resembles it? Is anyone so ethereal in his passions as not to know by instinct that the essential elements of such scandal are always the same? The difference in the narrative is chiefly in the telling. At this latter point the Joseph story and the "Tale of Two Brothers" bear no resemblance whatever.

If the chaste beauty of the Biblical story be observed, and then one turn to the "Tale of Two Brothers" with sufficient knowledge of the Egyptian tongue to perceive the coarseness and the stench of it, there can be no question that the Joseph story is independent of such a literary source. To those who thus sense both stories, the claim of the "Tale of Two Brothers" to be the original of the Joseph story cannot stand for a moment. If we turn from Joseph the progenitor to Joseph the tribe, still less will the claim that the story is an adaptation bear careful examination. The perfect naturalness of the story, the utter absence from its multitudinous details of any hint of figurative language, such as personification always furnishes, and the absolutely accurate reflection in the story of the Egypt of Joseph’s day, as revealed by the many discoveries of which people of 700-800 years later could not know, mark this theory of the reflection of tribal history and characteristics as pure speculation. And besides, where in all the history of literature has it been proven that a tribe has been thus successfully thrown back upon the screen of antiquity in the "individual form"? Similar mistakes concerning Menes and Minos and the heroes of Troy are a warning to us. Speculation is legitimate, so long as it does not cut loose from known facts, but gives no one the right to suppose the existence in unknown history of something never certainly found in known history. So much for the first question.

2. A Monograph or a Compilation?:

Is it a monograph or a compilation? The author of a monograph may make large use of literary materials, and the editor of a compilation may introduce much editorial comment. Thus, superficially, these different kinds of composition may much resemble each other, yet they are, in essential character, very different the one from the other. A compilation is an artificial body, an automaton; a monograph is a natural body with a living soul in it. This story has oriental peculiarities of repetition and pleonastic expression, and these things have been made much of in order to break up the story; to the reader not seeking grounds of partition, it is one of the most unbroken, simply natural and unaffected pieces of narrative literature in the world. If it stood alone or belonged to some later portion of Scripture, it may well be doubted that it would ever have been touched by the scalpel of the literary dissector. But it belongs to the Pentateuch. There are manifest evidences all over the Pentateuch of the use by the author of material, either documentary or of that paradoxical unwritten literature which the ancients handed down almost without the change of a word for centuries.

(1) An Analytical Theory Resolving It into a Mere Compilation.

An analytical theory has been applied to the Pentateuch as a whole, to resolve it into a mere compilation. Once the principles of this theory are acknowledged, and allowed sway there, the Joseph story cannot be left untouched, but becomes a necessary sacrifice to the system. A sight of the lifeless, ghastly fragments of the living, moving Joseph story which the analysis leaves behind (compare EB, article "Joseph")

proclaims that analysis to have been murder. There was a life in the story which has been ruthlessly taken, and that living soul marked the narrative as a monograph.

(2) A Narrative Full of Gems.

Where else is to be found such a compilation? Here is one of the most brilliant pieces of literature in the world, a narrative full of gems:

(a) the account of the presentation of the brothers in the presence of Joseph when he was obliged to go out to weep (Ge 43:26-34), and

(b) the scene between the terrified brothers of Joseph and the steward of his house (Ge 44:6-13),

(c) Judah’s speech (Ge 44:18-34),

(d) the touching close of the revelation of Joseph to his brothers at last (Ge 45:1-15).

The soul of the whole story breathes through all of these. Where in all literature, ancient or modern, is to be found a mere compilation that is a great piece of literature? So far removed is this story from the characteristics of a compilation, that we may challenge the world of literature to produce another monograph in narrative literature that surpasses it.

(3) The Argument from Chronology Supporting It as a Monograph

Then the dates of Egyptian names and events in this narrative strongly favor its origin so early as to be out of the reach of the compilers. That attempts at identification in Egyptian of names written in Hebrew, presenting as they do the peculiar difficulties of two alphabets of imperfectly known phonetic values and uncertain equivalency of one in terms of the other, should give rise to differences of opinion, is to be expected. The Egyptian equivalents of Zaphenath-paneah and Asenath have been diligently sought, and several identifications have been, suggested (Brugsch, Egypt under the Pharaohs, 122; Budge, History of Egypt, V, 126-27). That which is most exact phonetically and yields the most suitable and natural meaning for Zaphenath-paneah is by Lieblein (PSBA, 1898, 204-8). It is formed like four of the names of Hyksos kings before the time of Joseph, and means "the one who furnishes the nourishment of life," i.e. the steward of the realm. The name Asenath is found from the XIth Dynasty on to the XVIIIth. Potiphar is mentioned as an Egyptian. Why not of course an Egyptian? The narrative also points distinctly to conditions obtaining under the Hyksos kings. When the people were like to perish for want of food they promised Joseph in return for help that they would be "servants of Pharaoh" (Ge 47:18-25). This suggests a previous antagonism to the government, such as the Hyksos kings had long to contend with in Egypt. But the revolution which drove out the Hyksos labored so effectually to eradicate every trace of the hated foreigners that it is with the utmost difficulty that modern Egyptological research has wrested from the past some small items of information concerning them. Is it credible that the editor of scraps, which were themselves not written down until some 700-800 years later, should

have been able to produce such a life-story fitting into the peculiar conditions of the times of the Hyksos? Considered as an independent literary problem on its own merits, aside from any entangling necessities of the analytical theory of the Pentateuch, the Joseph story must certainly stand as a monograph from some time within distinct memory of the events it records. If the Joseph story be an independent original and a monograph, then there is in reality to be considered the story of Joseph.

II. The Story of Joseph, a Biography.

It is unnecessary to recount here all the events of the life of Joseph, a story so incomparably told in the Biblical narrative. It will be sufficient to touch only the salient points where controversy has raged, or at which archaeology has furnished special illumination. The story of Joseph begins the tenth and last natural division of Ge in these words: "The generations of Jacob" (Ge 37:2). Up to this point the unvarying method of Ge is to place at the head of each division the announcement "the generations of" one of the patriarchs, followed immediately by a brief outline of the discarded line of descent, and then to give in detail the account of the chosen line.

There is to be now no longer any discarded line of descent. All the sons of Jacob are of the chosen people, the depository of the revelation of redemption. So this division of Ge begins at once with the chosen line, and sets in the very foreground that narrative which in that generation is most vital in the story of redemption, this story of Joseph beginning with the words, "Joseph, being seventeen years old, was feeding the flock with his brethren" (Ge 37:2). Joseph had been born in Haran, the firstborn of the beloved Rachel, who died at the birth of her second son Benjamin. A motherless lad among the sons of other mothers felt the jealousies of the situation, and the experience became a temptation. The "evil report" of his brethren was thus naturally carried to his father, and quite as naturally stirred up those family jealousies which set his feet in the path of his great career (Ge 37:2-4). In that career he appears as a Bedouin prince in Canaan.

1. A Bedouin Prince in Canaan:

The patriarchs of those times were all sheiks or princes of those semi-nomadic rovers who by the peculiar social and civil customs of that land were tolerated then as they are to this day under the Turkish government in the midst of farms and settled land tenure. Jacob favored Rachel and her children. He put them hindermost at the dangerous meeting with Esau, and now he puts on Joseph a coat of many colors (Ge 37:3). The appearance of such a coat a little earlier in the decoration of the tombs of Benichassan among Palestinian ambassadors to Egypt probably indicates that this garment was in some sense ceremonial, a token of rank. In any case Joseph, the son of Jacob, was a Bedouin prince. Did the father by this coat indicate his intention to give him the precedence and the succession as chieftain of the tribe? It is difficult otherwise to account for the insane jealousy of the older brethren (Ge 37:4). According to the critical partition of the story, Joseph’s dreams may be explained away as mere reflections or adaptations of the later history of Joseph (compare PENTATEUCH). In a real biography the striking providential significance of the dreams appears at once. They cannot be real without in some sense being prophetic. On the other hand they cannot be other than real without vitiating the whole story

as a truthful narrative, for they led immediately to the great tragedy; a Bedouin prince of Canaan becomes a Bedouin slave in Egypt.

2. A Bedouin Slave in Egypt:

The plot to put Joseph out of the way, the substitution of slavery for death, and the ghastly device for deceiving Jacob (Ge 37:18-36) are perfectly natural steps in the course of crime when once the brothers had set out upon it. The counterplot of Reuben to deliver Joseph reflects equally his own goodness and the dangerous character of the other brothers to whom he did not dare make a direct protest.

Critical discussion of "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites" and "Medanites" presents some interesting things and many clever speculations which may well be considered on their own merits by those interested in ethnology and etymologies. Many opinions advanced may prove to be correct. But let it be noted that they arc for the most part pure speculation. Almost nothing is known of the interrelation of the trans-Jordanic tribes in that age other than the few hints in the Bible. And who can say what manner of persons might be found in a caravan which had wandered about no one knows where, or how long, to pick up trade before it turned into the northern caravan route? Until archaeology supplies more facts it is folly to attach much importance to such speculations (Kyle, The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism, 221).

In the slave market in Egypt, Joseph was bought by Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, "an Egyptian." The significant mention of this fact fits exactly into a place among the recovered hints of the history of those times, which make the court then to be not Egyptian at all, but composed of foreigners, the dynasty of Hyksos kings among whom an "Egyptian" was so unexpected as to have his nationality mentioned.

Joseph’s native nobility of character, the pious training he had received in his father’s house, and the favor of God with him gave him such prosperity that his master entrusted all the affairs of his household to him, and when the greatest of temptations assails him he comes off victorious (Genesis 39). There is strong ground for the suspicion that Potiphar did not fully believe the accusation of his wife against Joseph. The fact that Joseph was not immediately put to death is very significant. Potiphar could hardly do less than shut him up for the sake of appearances, and perhaps to take temptation away from his wife without seeming to suspect her. It is noticeable also that Joseph’s character soon triumphed in prison. Then the same Providence that superintended his dreams is leading so as to bring him before the king (Genesis 40; 41).

3. The Bedouin Slave Becomes Again the Bedouin Prince:

The events of the immediately preceding history prepared Joseph’s day: the Hyksos kings on the throne, those Bedouin princes, "shepherd kings" (Petrie, Hyksos and Israelite Cities), the enmity of the Egyptians against this foreign dynasty so that they accounted every shepherd an "abomination" (Ge 46:34), the friendly relation thus created between Palestinian tribes and Egypt, the princely character of Joseph, for among princes a prince is a prince however small his principality, and last of all the manifest

favor of God toward Joseph, and the evident understanding by the Pharaohs of Semitic religion, perhaps even sympathy with it (Ge 41:39). All these constitute one of the most majestic, Godlike movements of Providence revealed to us in the word of God, or evident anywhere in history. The same Providence that presided over the boy prince in his father's house came again to the slave prince in the Egyptian prison. The interpretation of the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker of Pharaoh (Ge 40-41:1-24) brought him at last through much delay and selfish forgetfulness to the notice of the king, and another dream in which the same cunning hand of Providence is plainly seen (Genesis 41) is the means of bringing Joseph to stand in the royal presence. The stuff that dreams are made of interests scarcely less than the Providence that was superintending over them. As the harvest fields of the semi-nomadic Bedouin in Palestine, and the household routine of Egypt in the dreams of the chief butler and the chief baker, so now the industrial interests and the religious forms of the nation appear in the dreams of Pharaoh. The "seven kine" of the goddess Hathor supplies the number of the cows, and the doubling of the symbolism in the cattle and the grain points to the two great sources of Egypt's welfare. The Providence that had shaped and guided the whole course of Joseph from the Palestinian home was consummated when, with the words, "Inasmuch as thou art a man in whom is the spirit of God," Pharaoh lifted up the Bedouin slave to be again the Bedouin prince and made him the prime minister.

4. The Prime Minister:

The history of "kings' favorites" is too well known for the elevation of Joseph to be in itself incredible. Such things are especially likely to take place among the unlimited monarchies of the Orient. The late empress of China had been a Chinese slave girl. The investiture of Joseph was thoroughly Egyptian—the "collar," the signet "ring," the "chariot" and the outrunners who cried before him "Abrech." The exact meaning of this word has never been certainly ascertained, but its general import may be seen illustrated to this day wherever in the East royalty rides out. The policy adopted by the prime minister was far-reaching, wise, even adroit (Ge 41:25-36). It is impossible to say whether or not it was wholly just, for we cannot know whether the corn of the years of plenty which the government laid up was bought or taken as a taxlevy. The policy involved some despotic power, but Joseph proved a magnanimous despot. The deep and subtle statesmanship in Joseph's plan does not fully appear until the outcome. It was probably through the policy of Joseph, the prime minister, that the Hyksos finally gained the power over the people and the mastery of the land.

Great famines have not been common in Egypt, but are not unknown. The only one which corresponds well to the Bible account is that one recorded in the inscription of Baba at el Kab, translated by Brugsch. Some scarcely justifiable attempts have been made to discredit Brugsch in his account of that inscription. The monument still remains and is easily visited, but the inscription is so mutilated that it presents many difficulties. The severity of the famine, the length of its duration, the preparation by the government, the distribution to the people, the success of the efforts for relief and even the time of the famine, as far as it can be determined, correspond well to the Bible account (Brugsch, Egypt under the Pharaohs, chapter vi). The way in which such famines in Egypt come about has been explained by a movement of the sudd, a sedgelike growth in the Nile, so as to clog the upper river (Wright, Scientific Confirmations, 70-79).

Joseph’s brethren came "with those that came," i.e. with the food caravans. The account does not imply that the prime minister presided in person at the selling of grain, but only that he knew of the coming of his brethren and met them at the market place. The watchfulness of the government against "spies," by the careful guarding of the entrances to the land, may well have furnished him with such information. Once possessed with it, all the rest of the story of the interviews follows naturally (compare traditions of Joseph, Jewish Encyclopedia).

The long testing of the brethren with the attendant delay in the relief of the father Jacob and the family (Genesis 42-45) has been the subject of much discussion, and most ingenious arguments for the justification of Joseph. All this seems unnecessary. Joseph was not perfect, and there is no claim of perfection made for him in the Bible. Two things are sufficient to be noted here: one that Joseph was ruler as well as brother, with the habits of a ruler of almost unrestrained power and authority and burdened with the necessity for protection and the obligation to mete out justice; the other that the deliberateness, the vexatious delays, the subtle diplomacy and playing with great issues are thoroughly oriental. It may be also that the perplexities of great minds make them liable to such vagaries. The career of Lincoln furnishes some curious parallels in the parleying with cases long after the great president’s mind was fully made up and action taken.

The time of these events and the identification of Joseph in Egypt are most vexed questions not conclusively settled. Toffteen quite confidently presents in a most recent identification of Joseph much evidence to which one would like to give full credence (Toffteen, The Historical Exodus). But aside from the fact that he claims two exodi, two Josephs, two Aarons, two lawgivers called Moses, and two givings of the law, a case of critical doublets more astounding than any heretofore claimed in the Pentateuch, the evidence itself which he adduces is very far from conclusive. It is doubtful if the texts will bear the translation he gives them, especially the proper names. The claims of Rameses II, that he built Pithom, . compared with the stele of 400 years, which he says he erected in the 400th year of King Nubti, seems to put Joseph about the time of the Hyksos king. This is the most that can be said now. The burial of Jacob is in exact accord with Egyptian customs. The wealth of the Israelites who retained their possessions and were fed by the crown, in contrast with the poverty of the Egyptians who sold everything, prepares the way for the wonderful growth and influence of Israel, and the fear which the Egyptians at last had of them. "And Joseph died, being 110 years old," an ideal old age in the Egyptian mind. The reputed burial place of Joseph at Shechem still awaits examination.

5. The Patriarch:

Joseph stands out among the patriarchs in some respects with preeminence. His nobility of character, his purity of heart and life, his magnanimity as a ruler and brother Patriarch make him, more than any other of the Old Testament characters, an illustration of that type of man which Christ was to give to the world in perfection. Joseph is not in the list of persons distinctly referred to in Scripture as types of Christ—the only perfectly safe criterion—but none more fully illustrates the life and work of the Saviour. He wrought salvation for those who betrayed and rejected him, he went down into humiliation as the way to his exaltation, he forgave those who, at least in spirit, put him to death, and to him as to the Saviour, all must come for relief, or perish.

LITERATURE. Commentaries on Genesis; for rabbinical literature, compare Seligsohn in Jewish Encyclopedia, some very interesting and curious traditions; Ebers, Egypten und die Bucher Moses; "The Tale of Two Brothers," RP, series I, volume II, 13746; Wilkinson-Birch, The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians; Erman, Life in Ancient Egypt.

M. G. Kyle

JOSEPH BARNABAS

See BARNABAS.

JOSEPH BARSABBAS

bar-sab’-as Barsabbas, or Barsabas; the King James Version Barsabas, bar’-sa-bas; for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see general article on JOSEPH): Joseph Barsabbas was surnamed Justus (Ac 1:23). Barsabbas was probably a patronymic, i.e. son of Sabba or Seba. Other interpretations given are "son of an oath," "son of an old man," "son of conversion," "son of quiet." It is likely that the "Judas called Barsabbas" of Ac 15:22 was his brother. Ewald considers that both names refer to the same person, but this is improbable.

Joseph was one of those who accompanied the apostles "all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us" (Ac 1:21,22). At the meeting of the brethren under the presidency of Peter in Jerusalem shortly after the crucifixion, he was, therefore, proposed along with Matthias as a suitable candidate for the place in the apostleship left vacant by the treachery and death of Judas Iscariot; but was unsuccessful (Ac 1:15-26).

According to Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, I, 12), Joseph was one of the 70 (Lu 10:1), and Papias records the oral tradition that he drank a cup of poison without harm (compare Mr 16:18). The Ac of Paul, a work belonging to the 2nd century and first mentioned by Origen, relates that Barsabbas, Justus the Flatfoot and others were imprisoned by Nero for protesting their faith in Christ, but that upon a vision of the newly martyred Paul appearing to the emperor, he ordered their immediate release.

C. M. Kerr

JOSEPH OF ARIMATHAEA

(A Arimathaias; for etymology, etc., of Joseph, see general article on JOSEPH): Joseph of Arimathea—a place the locality of which is doubtful, but lying probably to the Northwest of Jerusalem—was a "rich man" (Mt 27:57), "a councilor of honorable estate," or member of the Sanhedrin (Mr 15:43; Lu 23:50),

"a good and righteous man .... who was looking for the kingdom of God" (Lu 23:50; Mr 15:43), and "himself was Jesus' disciple" (Mt 27:57; Joh 19:38). Although he kept his discipleship secret "for fear of the Jews" (Joh 19:38), he was yet faithful to his allegiance in that he absented himself from the meeting which found Jesus guilty of death (compare Lu 23:51; Mr 14:64). But the condemnation of his Lord awakened the courage and revealed the true faith of Joseph. On the evening after the crucifixion he went "boldly" to Pilate and begged the body of Jesus. There is a fine touch in that he himself took down the body from the cross. With the assistance of Nicodemus he wound it in fine linen with spices (compare Mt 27:57, Joseph was a "rich man") and brought it to the new sepulcher in the garden near the place of His crucifixion. There they "laid him in a tomb that was hewn in stone, where never man had yet lain" and 'rolled a stone against the door of the tomb' (compare Mt 27:57-60; Mr 15:42-46; Lu 23:50-53; Joh 19:38-42). In this was held to be the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isa 53:9.

The Gospel of Peter, written probably in Syria about the middle of the 2nd century, gives a slightly different account. According to this Joseph, "the friend of Pilate and the Lord," was present at the trial of Jesus, and immediately upon its conclusion besought of Pilate that he might have the body for burial. This was granted, and after the crucifixion the Jews handed the body over to Joseph (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 27-30). Legends of a later origin record that Joseph was sent by Philip from Gaul to Britain along with 11 other disciples in 63 AD, and built an oratory at Glastonbury (compare PHILIP, the Apostle), that he brought the Holy Grail to England, and that he freed Ireland from snakes.

C. M. Kerr

JOSEPH'S DREAM

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 6; JOSEPH.

JOSEPH, HUSBAND OF MARY

1. References in New Testament:

(For etymology, etc., of Joseph, see JOSEPH): Joseph, the carpenter (Mt 13:55), was a "just man" (Mt 1:19 the King James Version), who belonged to Nazareth (Lu 2:4). He was of Davidic descent (Mt 1:20; Lu 2:4), the son of Heli (Lu 3:23) or Jacob (Mt 1:16), the husband of Mary (Mt 1:16), and the supposed father of Jesus (Mt 13:55; Lu 3:23; 4:22; Joh 1:45; 6:42).

(1) Before the Nativity.

The Gospels of Matthew and Mark alone give any detailed reference to Joseph and the birth of Jesus, and their accounts vary in part. Luke begins with the Annunciation to Mary at Nazareth (Lu 1:26-38). Overwhelmed with the tidings, Mary departed "with haste" "into the hill country, ... into a city of Judah," to seek communion with Elisabeth, with whom she had been coupled in the Annunciation by the

angel Gabriel (Lu 1:39-55). After abiding with her about three months she returned "unto her own house" (Lu 1:56 the King James Version). The events recorded in Mt 1:18-24 probably took place in the interval between this return and the birth of Jesus. During Mary's visit to Elisabeth, Joseph had likely remained in Nazareth. The abrupt and probably unexplained departure of his espoused wife for Judah (compare the phrase "with haste"), and her condition on her return, had caused him great mental distress (Mt 1:18-20). Though his indignation was tempered with mercy, he was minded to put her away "privily," but the visitation of the angel in his sleep relieved him from his dilemma, and he was reconciled to his wife (Mt 1:24). The narrative is then continued by Luke. While Joseph and Mary still abode in Nazareth, "there went out a decree from Caesar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled" (Lu 2:1). "And all went to enroll themselves, every one to his own city" (Lu 2:3). Being of the house and lineage of David, Joseph went up with Mary, who was "great with child," from Galilee, "out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem" (Lu 2:4,5), and there Jesus was born (Lu 2:7; compare Mt 2:1).

(2) After the Nativity.

(a) Luke's Account:

The two accounts now diverge considerably. According to Lk, the Holy Family remained for a time at Bethlehem and were there visited by the shepherds (Lu 2:8-20). After a sojourn of 40 days for the purification (compare Lu 2:21,22; Le 12), Joseph departed with his wife for Jerusalem "to present" the infant Jesus "to the Lord" and to offer up sacrifice according to the ancient law (Lu 2:24). There he was present at the prophesying of Simeon and Anna concerning Jesus, and received the blessing of the former (Lu 2:34). After "they had accomplished all things according to the law of the Lord, they returned into Galilee, to their own city Nazareth" (Lu 2:39). Every year, at the Passover, they made this journey to Jerusalem (Lu 2:41). The care and solicitude of Joseph and Mary for the boy Jesus and their grief at His temporary loss aye also recorded (Lu 2:45,48,51). There is evidence that, though Mary "kept all these things in her heart," Joseph at least had no understanding then of the Divine nature of the charge committed to his care (Lu 2:50).

(b) Matthew's Account:

But according to Matthew it was from the Wise Men of the East that Jesus received homage at Bethlehem (Mt 2:1-11). There is no further mention of the dedicatory journey to Jerusalem, or of the return to Nazareth. Instead, it is stated that on the departure of the Wise Men from Bethlehem, Joseph was warned in a dream of the impending wrath of Herod, and escaped with his wife and the infant Jesus into Egypt (Mt 2:13,14). Upon the death of Herod, an angel appeared to Joseph, and he returned to the land of Israel (Mt 2:19-21). His original intention was to settle once more in Judea, but on learning that Archelaus, the son of Herod, was ruler there, "he withdrew into the parts of Galilee, and came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth" (Mt 2:22,23).

(c) The Proper Sequence of the Two Narratives:

The narrative of Mt would thus imply that the Holy Family had no connection with Nazareth previous to their return from Egypt. It has, however, been suggested by Ramsay that Mt merely reports what was common knowledge, and that Lk, while quite cognizant of this, supplemented it in his own Gospel with details known only to the Holy Family, and in part to the mother alone (compare Sir W. Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 78-79). A comparison of the two Gospel narratives makes it clear that the visitation of the Wise Men fell on a later date than that of the shepherds. The latter took place immediately after the Nativity (compare Lu 2:11,15,16, "is born .... this day," "let us now go," "and they came with haste"). On the other hand, when the Wise Men came to Jerusalem, Christ was already born (compare Mt 2:1). Time was required for this journey to Jerusalem and the consultation of Herod with the chief priests (Mt 2:4); and during this interval the events recorded in Lu 2:8-39 had taken place. That there was sufficient time for this is attested also by the fact that Herod’s decree was directed against children up to two years of age (Mt 2:16). Thus it was after the return of the Holy Family to Nazareth, and on a further visit to Bethlehem, implied by Mt but not recorded by Lk, that the infant Jesus received the adoration of the Wise Men. Jesus being born in 6 BC, this took place in 5 BC, and as Herod died in 4 BC, Joseph may have missed only one of the Passovers (compare Lu 2:41) by his flight into Egypt. (For a full discussion, compare Ramsay, op. cit.) As no mention is made of Joseph in the later parts of the Gospels where the Holy Family is referred to (compare Mt 12:46; Lu 8:19), it is commonly supposed that he died before the commencement of the public ministry of Christ.

2. Character:

If a type is to be sought in the character of Joseph, it is that of a simple, honest, hard-working, God-fearing man, who was possessed of large sympathies and a warm heart. Strict in the observance of Jewish law and custom, he was yet ready when occasion arose to make these subservient to the greater law of the Spirit. Too practical to possess any deep insight into the Divine mysteries or eternal significance of events which came within his knowledge (compare Lu 2:50), he was quick to make answer to what he perceived to be the direct call of God (compare Mt 1:24). Originally a "just man" (the King James Version), the natural clemency within his heart prevailed over mere justice, and by the promptings of the Holy Spirit that clemency was transferred into a strong and enduring love (compare Mt 1:24). Joseph is known to us only as a dim figure in the background of the Gospel narratives, yet his whole-hearted reconciliation to Mary, even in the face of possible slanderings by his neighbors, his complete self-sacrifice, when he left all and fled into Egypt to save the infant Jesus, are indicative that he was not unworthy to fulfill the great trust which was imposed upon him by the Eternal Father.

3. References in Apocryphal Literature:

The Gospel of the Infancy according to James, a work composed originally in the 2nd century, but with later additions (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 47-63), gives a detailed account of the marriage of the aged Joseph with Mary, of their journey to Bethlehem, and of the birth of Jesus. A similar gospel, reputed to be by Thomas the philosopher, of later origin and Gnostic tendency (compare Hennecke, 63-73), narrates several fantastic, miraculous happenings in the domestic life of the Holy Family, and the dealings of Joseph with the teachers of the youthful Jesus. Other legends, from Syriac or

Egyptian sources, also dealing with the Infancy, in which Joseph figures, are extant. The chief is The History of Joseph the Carpenter (compare Hennecke, Handbuch der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen, 95-105). This contains an account of the death and burial of Joseph at the age of 110, and of the entreaties of Mary to Christ to save him. Its aim was to show forth Christ as the Saviour, even at the last hour, and the rightful manner of Christian death. Joseph has received a high place in the Calendar of the Roman Catholic Saints, his feast being celebrated on March 19.

C. M. Kerr

JOSEPH, PRAYER OF

An Old Testament pseudepigraph, number 3 in the Stichometry of Nicephorus (Westcott, Canon of the New Testament(7), 571), with the length given as 1,100 lines, and number 5 in the List of Sixty Books (Westcott, 568). The work is lost, and the only quotations are in Origen (In Joan., ii.25, English in Ante-Nicene Fathers, IX, 341; In Gen., iii.9, 12). Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are said to have been created before every work, but Jacob-Israel is the greatest, "the firstborn of every living creature," the "first minister in God’s presence," greater than the angel with whom he wrestled. The purport may be anti-Christian, the patriarchs exalted in place of Christ; compare, perhaps, Enoch 71 (but not so in Charles’ 1912 text), but Origen’s favorable opinion of the book proves that the polemic could not have been very direct.

LITERATURE.

GJV, 4th edition, III, 359-60; Dillmann in PRE, 2nd edition, XII, 362; compare Beer in 3rd edition, XVI, 256; Fabricius, Codex pseudep. Vet. Test., I, 761-71.

Burton Scott Easton

JOSEPH, THE CARPENTER, GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

JOSEPHUS

jo-se’-fus (Iosephos; Codex Vaticanus reads Phosepos): In 1 Esdras 9:34, corresponding to "Joseph" in Ezr 10:42.

JOSEPHUS; FLAVIUS

jo-se’-fus, fla’-vi-us:

1. Early Life and Beliefs:

Was born at Jerusalem 37-38 AD, and died at Rome early in the 2nd century, when is not known precisely. His father and mother belonged to families of the priestly aristocracy; consequently he received an excellent education, becoming familiar, not only with Jewish, but with Hellenistic, culture. When 16 years old he resorted to one Banus, an ESSENES, (which see), in the desert of Engedi, with whom he remained for 3 years, absorbing occult lore, and practicing the ascetic life. It might have been expected from his social position that, on his return to Jerusalem, he would join the SADDUCEES (which see); but, his Essene experience having indoctrinated him with ceremonialism, he preferred to become a Pharisee (see PHARISEES). He evidently believed, too, that the Pharisees were akin to the Stoics, who were then influential in the Hellenistic world. During his absence in the desert, the misgovernment of the Roman procurators at Jerusalem had grown apace. And the ineptitudes and injustices of Felix, Albanus and Florus were succeeded by anarchy under Annas, the high priest (62). Accordingly, the Zealots (see ZEALOTS) plotted against Roman rule. Rebellion simmered, and many of the disaffected were transported to Rome to be dealt with there. Among these were several priests, whom Josephus knew. About the year 64, he went to Rome to plead for them, met shipwreck on the voyage, was rescued with a few survivors and was brought to port at Puteoli. Here he met Alityrus, a Jewish actor, who happened to be in the good graces of Poppea, Nero’s consort. The empress, a Jewish proselyte, espoused his cause at Rome, and showed him many favors. At the capital, he also discerned the power of the Romans and, in all probability, grew convinced of the hopelessness of armed revolt. On his return to Jerusalem, he found his people set upon insurrection, and was forced, possibly against his better judgment, to make common cause with them. The first part of his public career is concerned with the great struggle that now began.

2. Public Career:

When war broke out, Josephus was appointed governor of Galilee, the province where the Roman attack would first fall. He had no military fitness for command, but the influence of his friends and the exigencies of politics thrust the office upon him. The Zealots soon found that he did not carry out the necessary preparations with thoroughness, and they tried to compass his removal. But he was too influential, too good a politician also, to be undermined. Surrounded by enemies among his own folk, who even attempted to assassinate him, he encountered several dangerous experiences, and, at length, flying from the Romans, was beleaguered with his army in Jotopata, near the Lake of Gennesaret, in May, 67 AD. The Jews withstood the siege for 47 days with splendid courage, till Titus, assaulting under cover of a mist, stormed the stronghold and massacred the weary defenders. Josephus escaped to a cave where, with his usual adroitness, he saved himself from death at the hands of his companions. The Romans soon discovered his hiding-place, and haled him before Vespasian, the commander-in-chief. Josephus worked upon the superstitions of the general, and so ingratiated himself that Vespasian took him to Alexandria in his train. Having been liberated by his captor, he adopted the family name of the Flavians, according to Roman custom. Returning to Palestine with Titus, he proceeded to mediate between the Romans and the Jews, earning the suspicion of the former, the hatred of the latter. His wonted diplomacy preserved him from anything more serious than a wound, and he was an eyewitness of the terrible events that marked the last days of Jerusalem. Then he accompanied Titus to Rome for the

TRIUMPH (which see). Here he lived the remainder of his days, in high favor with the ruling house, and relieved from all anxiety about worldly goods by lavish imperial patronage. He was thus enabled to devote himself to literary pursuits.

3. Works:

The works of Josephus render him one of the most valuable authorities for the student of New Testament times. They are as follows:

(1) Concerning the Jewish War, written before 79; we have the Greek translation of this history by the author; there are 7 books: I, the period from Antiochus Epiphanes (175 BC) to Herod the Great (4 BC); II, from 4 BC to 66 AD, covering the early events of the War; III, occurrences in Galilee in 67 AD; IV, the course of the War till the siege of Jerusalem; V and VI, the investment and fall of Jerusalem; VII, the aftermath of the rebellion. While this work is not written with the objective accuracy of scientific history, it is credible on the whole, except where it concerns the role played by the author.

(2) The Antiquities of the Jews, written not later than 94 AD. In this Josephus purports to relate the entire history of his race, from the beginning till the War of 66 AD. The 20 books fall naturally into 5 divisions, thus:

(a) I-X, from prehistoric times till the Captivity, in other words, the period related in the Old Testament substantially;

(b) XI, the age of Cyrus;

(c) XII-XIV, the beginnings of the Hellenistic period, from Alexander the Great, including the Maccabean revolt, till the accession of Herod the Great;

(d) XV-XVII, the reign of Herod;

(e) XVIII-XX, from Herod’s death till the War of 66.

While it cannot be called an apology for the Jews, this work betrays the author’s consciousness of the disfavor with which his people were viewed throughout the Roman Empire. Josephus does what he can to disabuse the Greek-Roman educated classes, although he shows curious obliquity to the grandeur of Hebrew religion. All in all, the work is disappointing; but it contains many details and sidelights of first importance to investigators.

(3) The treatise called, since Jerome, Against Apion, is Josephus’ most inspiring performance. The older title, Concerning the High Antiquity of the Jews, tells us what it contains—a defense of Hebrew religion against the libels of heathendom. It is in two books. The vituperation with which Josephus visits Apion is unimportant in comparison with the defense of Mosaic religion and the criticism of paganism. Here

the author’s character is seen at its best; the air of Worldly Wiseman has been dropped, and he approaches enthusiasm.

(4) His last work is the Vita or Autobiography, a misleading title. It is an echo of old days in Galilee, directed against the traductions of an associate, Justus of Tiberias. We have Josephus at his worst here. He so colors the narrative as to convey a totally wrong impression of the part he played during the great crisis. In extenuation, it may be said that his relations with the imperial court rendered it difficult, perhaps impossible, for him to pursue another course.

LITERATURE.

W.D. Morrison, The Jews under Roman Rule (London, 1890); E. Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Div. I, Vol. I (Edinburgh, 1890); A. Hausrath, History of New Testament Times, IV, div VII, chapter ii (London, 1895); H. Graetz, History of the Jews from the Earliest Times to the Present Day, II, chapter x (London, 1891); article "Josephus" in Jewish Encyclopedia, Translations by Whiston (many editions), and of The War of the Jews, by Traill and Taylor (London, 1862).

R. M. Wenley

JOSES

jo’-sez, jo’-zez (Ioses): (1) One of the brethren of Jesus (Mr 6:3; in Mt 13:55 the Greek is "Joseph," and the Revised Version (British and American) so renders).

(2) A son of Mary, perhaps identical with (1) (Mt 27:56; Mr 15:40,47).

See BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

(3) A name of Barnabas (Ac 4:36 the King James Version, where again Greek and the Revised Version (British and American) have "Joseph").

See BARNABAS.

JOSHAH

jo’-sha (yoshah, "Yahweh’s gift"): A descendant of Simeon, chief in his family (1Ch 4:34,38).

JOSHAPHAT

josh’-a-fat (yoshaphaT, "Yahweh has judged"; compare JEHOSHAPHAT):

(1) One of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:43), a "Mithnite," but not included in the list of 2Sa 23.

(2) A priest and trumpeter of David’s time (1Ch 15:24), the King James Version "Jehoshaphat."

JOSHAVIAH

josh-a-vi’-a (yoshawyah, allied form to JOSHAH (which see)): Son of Elnaam, one of the band of braves who served David (1Ch 11:46), omitted from the list of 2Sa 23, which is less complete and differs in detail.

JOSHBEKASHAH

josh-be-ka’-sha, josh-be-kash’-a (yoshbeqashah, "son" of Heman; 1Ch 25:4,24): The last 8 or 9 names in per 4 are taken by commentators to be not names but the words of a prayer. See OTJ C2, 143, note; Curtis, Chron, 278, 280; SBOT.

JOSHEB-BASSHEBETH

jo-sheb-ba-she’-beth (yoshebh ba-shebheth): This proper name in the Revised Version (British and American) takes the place of the translation "that sat in the seat" in the King James Version (2Sa 23:8). The phrase so rendered is meaningless. The text has evidently suffered corruption. There can be no doubt that a proper name is intended. This, according to the parallel passage in 1Ch 11:11, should be Jashobeam. Some scholars think that this also is a corruption, and by a process of emendation arrive at "Eshbaal" as the correct name (Driver, Hebrew Text of S; SBOT, at the place).

JOSHIBIAH

josh-i-bi’-a (yoshibhyah, "Yahweh sets," or "causes to dwell"; the King James Version Josibiah): A Simeonite (1Ch 4:35).

JOSHUA (1)

josh’-u-a

(a) yehoshua‘,

(b) yehoshua‘, "Yahweh is deliverance" or "opulence"; compare JESHUA; Iesous:

(1) Joshua the son of Nun; the name has the Hebrew form

(a) above in De 3:21; Jud 2:7; elsewhere the form

(b), except in Ne 8:17, where it is of the form yeshua‘ (See JESHUA); compare also Nu 13:8,16; De 32:44. See following article.

(2) In 1Sa 6:14,18 (form (b)), the Bethshemite in whose field stood the kine that brought the ark from the Philistines.

(3) In 2Ki 23:8 (form (b)), governor of Jerusalem in the time of Josiah.

(4) The high priest at Jerusalem after the return. See separate article.

S. F. Hunter

JOSHUA (2)

I. FORM AND SIGNIFICANCE OF NAME

II. HISTORY OF THE LIFE OF JOSHUA

1. First Appearance

2. The Minister of Moses

3. One of the Spies

4. The Head of the People

(1) His First Act—Sending of the Spies

(2) Crossing of the Jordan

(3) Capture of Jericho

(4) Conquest of Ai and Bethel

(5) Reading of the Law on Mt. Ebal

(6) The Gibeonites

(7) Conquest of the South

(8) Northern Conquests

(9) Allotment of Territory

(10) Cities of Refuge

(11) Final Address and Death

III. SOURCES OF HISTORY

IV. CHARACTER AND WORK OF JOSHUA

I. Form and Significance of Name.

The name Joshua, a contracted form of Jehoshua (yehoshua‘), which also appears in the form Jeshua (yeshua‘, Ne 8:17), signifies "Yahweh is deliverance" or "salvation," and is formed on the analogy of many Israelite names, as Jehoiakim (yehoyaqim), "Yahweh exalteth," Jehohanan (yehochanan), "Yahweh is gracious," Elishua or Elisha (’elishua‘, elisha‘), "God is deliverance," Elizur (’elitsur), "God is a rock," etc. In the narrative of the mission of the spies in Nu 13, the name is given as Hoshea (hoshea‘, 13:8,16; compare De 32:44), which is changed by Moses to Joshua (Nu 13:16). In the passage in Deuteronomy, however, the earlier form of the name is regarded by Dr. Driver (Commentary in the place cited.) as an erroneous reading.

The Greek form of the name is Jesus (Iesous, Ac 7:45; Heb 4:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "Joshua," but the King James Version "Jesus" in both passages), and this form appears even in the passages cited above from Nehemiah and Deuteronomy. In Nu 13:8,16, however, Septuagint has Hause. The name occurs in later Jewish history, e.g. as that of the owner of the field in which the ark rested after its return from the land of the Philistines (1Sa 6:14,18), and appears to have become especially frequent after the exile (Ezr 2:40; Zec 3:1 ab, etc.). It is also found (Jeshua) with a local signification as the name of one of the "villages" in Southern Judea, where the repatriated Jews dwelt after their return from Babylon (Ne 11:26).

II. History of the Life of Joshua.

The narrative of the life of Joshua, the son of Nun, is naturally divided into two parts, in which he held entirely different positions with regard to the people of Israel, and discharged different duties. In the earlier period he is the servant and minister of Moses, loyal to his leader, and one of his most trusted and valiant captains. After the death of Moses he himself succeeds to the leadership of the Israelite host, and conducts them to a settlement in the Promised Land. The service of the earlier years of his life is a preparation and equipment for the office and responsibility that devolved upon him in the later period.

1. First Appearance:

The first appearance of Joshua in the history is at Rephidim, on the way from the wilderness of Sin to Horeb. Neither the exact site of Rephidim nor the meaning of the name can be determined; the Israelites, however, apparently came to Rephidim before they approached the rich oasis of Feiran, for at the former place "there was no water for the people to drink" (Ex 17:1). The fact that the host encamped there seems to assume the existence of wells; either, therefore, these were found to be dry, or they failed before the wants of the great host were satisfied. The Amalekites, wandering desert tribes, claimed the ownership of the wells, and, resenting the Israelite intrusion, swooped down upon them to drive them away and to enrich themselves with the spoil of their possessions. Under the command of Joshua, the Israelites won a complete victory in a battle that seems to have been prolonged until sunset; the fortunes of the battle varying with the uplifting or falling of Moses' hands, which were accordingly supported by Aaron and Hur throughout the day (Ex 17:11). A curse and sentence of extermination pronounced against Amalek were formally written down and communicated to Joshua, apparently that, as the future leader of Israel, he might have it in charge to provide for their fulfillment.

It is evident also that at this period Joshua was no young and untried warrior. Although no indication of his previous history is given, his name is introduced into the narrative as of a man well known, who is sufficiently in the confidence of Moses to be given the chief command in the first conflict in which the Israelites had been engaged since leaving Egypt. The result justified the choice. And if, during the march, he had held the position of military commander and organizer under Moses, as the narrative seems to imply, to him was due in the first instance the remarkable change, by which within the brief space of a month the undisciplined crowd of serfs who had fled from Egypt became a force sufficiently resolute and compact to repel the onset of the Amalekite hordes.

2. The Minister of Moses:

In all the arrangements for the erection and service of the tabernacle, Joshua the warrior naturally has no place. He is briefly named (Ex 24:13) as the minister of Moses, accompanying him apparently to the foot of the mount of God, but remaining behind with the elders and Aaron and Hur, when Moses commenced the ascent. A similar brief mention is in Ex 32:17, where he has rejoined Moses on the return of the latter from the mount with the two tables of the testimony, and is unaware of the outbreak of the people and their idolatrous worship of the molten calf in the camp; compare 33:11, where again he is found in the closest attendance upon his leader and chief. No further reference is made to Joshua during the stay of the Israelites at Sinai, or their subsequent journeyings, until they found themselves at Kadesh-barnea on the southern border of the Promised Land (Nu 13). His name is once mentioned, however, in an earlier chapter of the same book (Nu 11:28), when the tidings are brought to Moses that two men in the camp of Israel, Eldad and Medad, had been inspired to prophesy. There he is described in harmony with the previous statements of his position, as Moses' minister from his youth. Jealous of his leader's prerogative and honor, he would have the irregular prophesying stopped, but is himself checked by Moses, who rejoices that the, spirit of God should rest thus upon any of the Lord's people.

3. One of the Spies:

Of the 12 men, one from each tribe, sent forward by Moses from Kadesh to ascertain the character of the people and land before him, two only, Hoshea the Ephraimite, whose name is significantly changed to Joshua (Nu 13:8,16), and Caleb the Judahite, bring back a report encouraging the Israelites to proceed. The account of the mission of the spies is repeated substantially in De 1:22-46. There, however, the suggestion that spies should be commissioned to examine and report upon the land comes in the first instance from the people themselves. In the record of Numbers they are chosen and sent by Moses under Divine direction (13:1 f). The two representations are not incompatible, still less contradictory. The former describes in an altogether natural manner the human initiative, probable enough in the circumstances in which the Israelites found themselves; the latter is the Divine control and direction, behind and above the affairs of men. The instructions given to the spies (13:17 ff) evidently contemplated a hasty survey of the entire region of the Negeb or southern borderland of Palestine up to and including the hill country of Judea; the time allowed, 40 days (13:25), was too brief to accomplish more, hardly long enough for this purpose alone. They were, moreover, not only to ascertain the character of the towns and their inhabitants, the quality and products of the soil, but to bring back with them specimens of the fruits (13:20). An indication of the season of the year is given in the added clause that "the time was the time of first-ripe grapes." The usual months of the vintage are September and October (compare Le 23:39); in the warm and sheltered valleys, however, in the neighborhood of Hebron, grapes may sometimes be gathered in August or even as early as July. The valley from which the fruits, grapes, figs and pomegranates were brought was known as the valley of Eshcol, or the "cluster" (Nu 13:23 f; 32:9; De 1:24).

No hesitating or doubtful account is given by all the spies of the fertility and attractiveness of the country; but in view of the strength of its cities and inhabitants only Joshua and Caleb are confident of the ability of the Israelites to take possession of it. Their reports and exhortations, however, are overborne by the timidity and dissuasion of the others, who so entirely alarm the people that they refuse to essay the conquest of the land, desiring to return into Egypt (Nu 14:3 f), and attempt to stone Joshua and Caleb (Nu 14:10). These two alone, therefore, were exempted from the sentence of exclusion from the Promised Land (Nu 14:24,30,38; 26:65; 32:12; De 1:25). The remainder of the spies perished at once by a special visitation (Nu 14:36); and the people were condemned to a 40-year exile in the wilderness, a year for each day that the spies had been in Palestine, until all the men of that generation "from twenty years old and upward" were dead (Nu 14:29; 26:64 f; 32:11). An abortive attempt was made to invade the land in defiance of the prohibition of Yahweh, and ended in failure and disastrous defeat (Nu 32:40 ff; De 1:41 ff; compare 21:1-3).

Upon the events of the next 38 or 40 years in the life of Israel an almost unbroken silence falls. The wanderers in the wilderness have no history. Some few events, however, that are recorded without note of time, the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and the breaking out of the plague because of the people’s murmuring, and probably others (Nu 15:32-36; 16 f), appear to belong to this period. In none of them does Joshua take an active part, nor is his name mentioned in connection with the campaigns against Sihon and Og on the East of the Jordan. When the census of the people is taken in the plains of

Moab opposite Jericho, Joshua and Caleb with Moses himself are found to be the only survivors of the host that 40 years previously came out of Egypt (Nu 26:63). As the time of the death of the great leader and lawgiver drew near, he was commissioned formally to appoint Joshua as his successor and to hand over to him and to Eleazar the priest the duty of finally apportioning the conquered territory among the several tribes (Nu 27:18 ff; 32:28; 34:17; compare De 1:38; 3:28; 31:3,7,23; 34:9). Some of these passages anticipate the direct Divine commission and encouragement recorded in Jos (1:1,5 ff) and given to him after the death of Moses.

4. The Head of the People:

The history of Joshua in his new capacity as supreme head and leader of the people in several instances recapitulates as it were the history of his greater forerunner. It was not Head unnatural that it should be so; and the similarity of recorded events affords no real ground for doubt with regard to the reliability of the tradition concerned. The position in which Israel now found itself on the East of the Jordan was in some respects not unlike that which confronted Moses at Kadesh-barnea or before the crossing of the Red Sea. Joshua, however, was faced with a problem much less difficult, and in the war-tried and disciplined host at his command he possessed an instrument immensely more suitable and powerful for carrying out his purpose.

(1) His First Act—Sending of the Spies.

His first act was to send spies from Shittim to ascertain the character of the country immediately opposite on the West of the Jordan, and especially the position and strength of Jericho, the frontier and fortified city which first stands in the way of an invader from the East who proposes to cross the river by the fords near its mouth (Jos 2:2). In Jericho the spies owed their lives to the quick inventiveness of Rahab (compare Heb 11:31), who concealed them on the roof of her house from the emissaries of the king; and returning to Joshua, they reported the prospects of an easy victory and conquest (Jos 2:23 f).

There were doubtless special reasons which induced Joshua to essay the crossing of the Jordan at the lower fords opposite Jericho. Higher up the river a probably easier crossing-place led directly into Central Palestine, a district in which apparently his advance would not have been obstructed by fortified cities such as confronted him farther south; which therefore would seem to offer the advantages of an open and ready entrance into the heart of the country. His decision was probably influenced by a desire to possess himself of a fortified base at Jericho and in the neighboring cities. The favorable report of the spies also proved that there would be no great difficulty in carrying out this plan.

(2) Crossing of the Jordan.

The actual crossing of the river is narrated in Joshua 3; 4. The city of Jericho was built in a plain from 12 to 14 miles wide formed by the recession of the hills that border the valley of the Jordan from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, and stood at the mouth of the valley of Achor (7:24,26; 15:7). The modern village of Eriha is built at a short distance Southeast of the ancient site, and Gilgal lay half-way to the

river. At the latter place the fixed camp was established after the taking of Jericho, and Gilgal formed for some considerable time the base of operations, where the women and children remained in safety while the men were absent on their warlike expeditions. There also the tabernacle was erected, as the symbol and center of national life, and there apparently it remained until the time came for the removal to Shiloh (18:1).

Within the plain the stream has excavated a tortuous bed to a depth of 200 ft. below the surface, varying from an eighth of a mile to a mile in breadth. In ordinary seasons the waters are confined to a small portion of the channel, which is then crossed opposite Jericho by two fords where the depth does not exceed 2 or 3 ft. When the river is low it may be crossed elsewhere. In times of flood, however, the water rises and fills the entire channel from bank to bank, so that the fords become impracticable. It is expressly stated that it was at such a time of flood that the Israelites approached the river, at the "time of harvest," or in the early spring (Jos 3:15). The priests were directed to carry the ark to the brink of the river, the waters of which, as soon as their feet touched them, would be cut off, and a dry passage afforded. The narrative therefore is not to be understood as though it indicated that a wall of water stood on the right and left of the people as they crossed; the entire breadth of the river bed was exposed by the failure of the waters from above.

See JORDAN.

An interesting parallel to the drying up of the Jordan before Joshua is recorded by an Arabic historian of the Middle Ages, who writes to explain a natural but extraordinary occurrence, without any thought of the miraculous or any apparent knowledge of the passage of the Israelites. During the years 1266-67 AD, a Mohammedan sultan named Beybars was engaged in building a bridge over the Jordan near Damieh, a place which some have identified with the city Adam (Jos 3:16); but the force of the waters repeatedly carried away and destroyed his work. On one night, however, in December of the latter year, the river ceased entirely to flow. The opportunity was seized, and an army of workmen so strengthened the bridge that it resisted the flood which came down upon it the next day, and stood firm. It was found that at some distance up the river, where the valley was narrow, the banks had been undermined by the running water and had fallen in, thus completely damming back the stream. It seems not improbable that it was by agency of this character that a passage was secured for the Israelites; even as 40 years earlier a "strong east wind" had been employed to drive back the waters of the Red Sea before Moses.

At the command of Joshua, under Divine direction, the safe crossing of the Jordan was commemorated by the erection at Gilgal of 12 stones (4:3-9,20 ff), one for each of the tribes of Israel, taken from the bed of the river. In Jos 4:9 it is stated that 12 stones were set up in the midst of the river. The statement is probably a misunderstanding, and a mere confusion of the tradition. It is not likely that there would be a double commemoration, or an erection of stones in a place where they would never be seen. At Gilgal also the supply of manna ceased, when the natural resources of the country became available (5:12). The date of the passage is given as the 10th day of the 1st month (4:19); and on the 14th day the Passover was kept at Gilgal in the plains of Jericho (5:10). For the 2nd time, also, at the crisis of the first entrance into the land, Joshua was encouraged for his work by a vision and Divine promise of assistance and direction (5:13-15).

(3) Capture of Jericho.

The narrative that follows, of the taking of Jericho, illustrates, as would naturally be expected in the case of a city so situated the effeminate and unwarlike character of its inhabitants. There was apparently little or no fighting, while for a whole week Joshua with priests and people paraded before the walls. A brief reference (6:1) seems to indicate that the citizens were quickly driven to take refuge behind their fortifications. Twice seven times the city was compassed, with the ark of the covenant borne in solemn procession, and at the 7th circuit on the 7th day, while the people shouted, the wall of the city fell "in its place" (6:20 margin), and Jericho was taken by assault. Only Rahab and her household were spared. All the treasure was devoted to the service of the Lord, but the city itself was burnt, and a solemn curse pronounced upon the site and upon the man who should venture to rebuild its walls (6:26). The curse was braved, whether deliberately or not, by a citizen of Bethel in the time of King Ahab; and the disasters foretold fell upon him in the loss of his children (1Ki 16:34). Thenceforward Jericho appears to have been continuously inhabited. There was a settlement of the sons of the prophets there in Elisha’s day (2Ki 2:5,15). The natural fertility of the site won for it the name of the city of palm trees (De 34:3; Jud 1:16; 3:13).

From the plains of Jericho two valleys lead up into the central hill country in directions Northwest and Southwest respectively. These form the two entrances or passes, by which the higher land is approached from the East. Along these lines, therefore, the invasion of the land was planned and carried out. The main advance under Joshua himself took place by the northernmost of the valleys, while the immediate southern invasion was entrusted to Caleb and the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, the supreme control remaining always in the hands of Joshua (compare Jos 14; 15; Jud 1). This seems on the whole to be the better way of explaining the narratives in general, which in detail present many difficulties.

(4) Conquest of Ai and Bethel.

At the head of the northern pass stood the city of Luz or Bethel (Ge 28:19; Jos 18:13; Jud 1:23). Ai lay close at hand, and was encountered by the invaders before reaching Bethel; its exact site, however, is undetermined. The two towns were in close alliance (compare Jos 8:17), and the defeat and destruction of the one was quickly followed by the similar fate that overtook the other. Before Ai, the advance guard of the Israelites, a small party detached on the advice of the spies sent forward by Joshua from Jericho, suffered defeat and were driven back in confusion (7:2 ff). The disaster was due to the failure to obey the command to "devote" the whole spoil of Jericho, and to theft by one of the people of treasure which belonged rightfully to Yahweh (7:11). When the culprit Achan had been discovered and punished, a renewed attempt upon Ai, made with larger forces and more skillful dispositions, was crowned with success. The city was taken by a stratagem and destroyed by fire, its king being hanged outside the city gate (8:28 f). Unlike Jericho, it seems never to have been restored. Bethel also was captured, through the treachery apparently of one of its own citizens, and its inhabitants were put to the sword (Jud 1:24 f).

(5) Reading of the Law on Mt. Ebal.

Of further campaigns undertaken by Joshua for the subjugation of Central Palestine no account has been preserved. It is possible, therefore, that the conquest of this part of the country was accomplished without further fighting (see JOSHUA, BOOK OF). In the list of the cities (Jos 12:7-24) whose kings were vanquished by Joshua, there are no names of towns that can be certainly identified as situated here; the greater part evidently belong to the north or south. The only record remaining is that of the formal erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal in the presence of all the people and the solemn reading of the law in their hearing (8:30-35). It is expressly noted that all this was done in accordance with the directions of Moses (compare De 11:29; 27:2-8,11 ff). It would further appear probable that this ceremony really took place at the close of the conquest, when all the land was subdued, and is narrated here by anticipation.

(6) The Gibeonites.

The immediate effect of the Israelite victories under Joshua was very great. Especially were the Hivite inhabitants of Gibeon struck with fear (9:3 ff) lest the same fate should overtake them that had come upon the peoples of Jericho and Ai. With Gibeon, 3 other cities were confederate, namely, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kiriath-jearim, or the "city of groves" (9:17). Gibeon, however, was the chief, and acted in the name of the others. It is usually identified with the modern village or township of el-Jib, 7 or 8 miles North by West of Jerusalem; and all four lay clustered around the head of the pass or valley of Aijalon, which led down from the plateau westward to the foothills of the Shephelah, toward the plain and the sea. Gibeon held therefore a position of natural strength and importance, the key to one of the few practicable routes from the west into the highlands of Judea, equally essential to be occupied as a defensive position against the incursions of the dwellers in the plains, and as affording to an army from the east a safe and protected road down from the mountains.

By a stratagem which threw Joshua and the leaders of Israel off their guard, representing themselves as jaded and wayworn travelers from a distance, the Gibeonites succeeded in making a compact with Israel, which assured their own lives and safety. They affirmed that they had heard of the Israelite victories beyond Jordan, and also of the gift to them by Yahweh of the whole land (Jos 9:9 f, 24). Joshua and the princes were deceived and entered too readily into covenant with them, a covenant and promise that was scrupulously observed when on the 3rd day of traveling the Israelites reached their cities and found them to be close at hand (9:16 ff). While, however, their lives were preserved, the men of Gibeon were reduced to the position of menial servants, "hewers of wood and drawers of water"; and the writer adds, it is thus "unto this day" (9:21,27).

See GIBEON.

The treaty of peace with the Gibeonites and the indignation thereby aroused among the neighboring kings, who naturally regarded the independent action of the men of Gibeon as treachery toward themselves, gave rise to one of the most formidable coalitions and one of the most dramatic incidents of the whole war. The king of Jerusalem, Adoni-zedek ("the Lord of righteousness" or "the Lord is righteousness," Jos 10:1; compare Melchizedek, "the king of righteousness," Ge 14:18; in Jud 1:5 ff the name appears as Adoni-bezek, and so Septuagint reads here), with the 4 kings of Hebron, Jarmuth,

Lachish and Eglon (Jos 10:3), formed a plan to destroy Gibeon in revenge, and the Gibeonites sent hastily for assistance to Joshua, who had returned with his army to Gilgal. The Israelites made a forced march from Gilgal, came upon the allied kings near Gibeon, and attacked and defeated them with great slaughter. The routed army fled westward "by the way of the ascent to Beth-horon" (Jos 10:10), and in the pass was overtaken by a violent hailstorm, by which more perished than had fallen beneath the swords of the Israelites (Jos 10:11). The 5 kings were shut up in a cave at Makkedah, in which they had taken refuge, whence they were subsequently brought forth and put to death. The actual pursuit, however, was not stayed until the remnant had found temporary security behind the walls of their fortified cities (Jos 10:16). The victory of Israel was commemorated by Joshua in a song of which some words are preserved (Jos 10:12 f).

See BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF.

(7) Conquest of the South.

With almost severe simplicity it is further recorded how the confederate cities in turn were captured by Joshua and utterly destroyed (10:28-39). And the account is closed by a summary statement of the conquest of the entire country from Kadesh-barnea in the extreme south as far as Gibeon, after which the people returned to their camp at Gilgal (10:40-43).

(8) Northern Conquests.

A hostile coalition of northern rulers had finally to be met and defeated before the occupation and pacification of the land could be said to be complete. Jabin, king of Hazor, the "fort," was at the head of an alliance of northern kings who gathered together to oppose Israel in the neighborhood of the waters of Merom (Jos 11:1). Hazor has been doubtfully identified with the modern Jebel Hadireh, some 5 miles West of the lake. No details of the fighting that ensued are given. The victory, however, of the Israelites was decisive, although chariots and horses were employed against them apparently for the first time on Canaanite soil. The pursuit was maintained as far as Sidon, and Misrephoth-maim, perhaps the "boilings" or "tumults of the waters," the later Zarephath on the coast South of the former city (Jos 11:8; compare 13:6); and the valley of Mizpeh must have been one of the many wadies leading down to the Phoenician coast land. The cities were taken, and their inhabitants put to the sword; but Hazor alone appears to have been burnt to the ground (Jos 11:11). That the royal city recovered itself later is clear from the fact that a king of Hazor was among the oppressors of Israel in the days of the Judges (Jud 4). For the time being, however, the fruit of these victories was a widespread and much-needed peace. "The land had rest from war" (Jos 11:23).

(9) Allotment of Territory.

Thus the work of conquest, as far as it was effected under Joshua’s command, was now ended; but much yet remained to be done that was left over for future generations. The ideal limits of Israel’s possession, as set forth by Yahweh in promise to Moses, from the Shihor or Brook of Egypt (compare 1Ch 13:5) to

Lebanon and the entering in of Hamath (Nu 34), had not been and indeed never were reached. In view, however, of Joshua's age (Jos 13:1), it was necessary that an allotment of their inheritance West of the Jordan should at once be made to the remaining tribes. Reuben, Gad and half the tribe of Manasseh had been already provided for by Moses in Eastern Palestine (Jos 13:15-32). Joshua 14-21 accordingly contain a detailed account of the arrangements made by the Israelite leader for the settlement of the land and trace the boundaries of the several tribal possessions. The actual division appears to have been made on two separate occasions, and possibly from two distinct centers. Provision was first made for Judah and the children of Joseph; and between the northern border of the former tribe, recorded in detail in 15:5-11, and the inheritance of the sons of Joseph, a tract of land for the present left unassigned was later given to the tribes of Benjamin and Dan. An extra portion also was promised by Joshua to the descendants of Joseph on the ground of their numbers and strength (17:14 ff).

For the 7 tribes that were yet without defined inheritance a rough survey of the land appears to have been made, and the unallotted districts were divided into 7 portions, for which lots were then cast at Shiloh in the presence of the assembled tribes (Joshua 18; 19). The express mention of Shiloh here (Jos 18:1,10) suggests that the previous division was carried out at some other place, and if so, probably at Gilgal, the earlier resting-place of the ark and the tabernacle. No definite statement, however, to that effect is made. Benjamin's portion was assigned between the territories of Judah and the children of Joseph (Jos 18:11). Simeon received his inheritance out of the land given to Judah, a part on the south being taken away on the ground that the whole was too great for a single tribe (Jos 19:1-9). Zebulun, Issachar, Asher, and Naphtali were established in the north (Jos 19:10-39). And Da was settled on the seacoast by Joppa, with additional territory in the extreme north, of which they apparently took independent and forcible possession, beyond the inheritance of the other tribes (Jos 19:40-48; compare Jud 18:27-29).

(10) Cities of Refuge.

Finally the 6 cities of refuge were appointed, 3 on each side of the Jordan, and the 48 cities of the Levites taken out of the territories of the several tribes (Joshua 20; 21; compare Nu 35; De 4:41-43). The two and a half tribes whose inheritance lay in Eastern Palestine were then dismissed, their promise of assistance to their brethren having been fulfilled (Joshua 22); and an altar was erected by them on the right bank of the Jordan whose purpose is explained to be to serve as a standing witness to the common origin of all the tribes, and to frustrate any future attempt to cut off those on the East from the brotherhood of Israel.

(11) Final Address and Death.

In a closing assembly of the Israelites at Shechem, Joshua delivered to the people his final charge, as Moses had done before his death, reminding them of their own wonderful history, and of the promises and claims of God, and exhorting them to faithful and loyal obedience in His service (23; 24). A stone also was set up under the oak in the sacred precinct of Yahweh, to be a memorial of the renewed covenant between God and His people (24:26 f). Then at the age of 110 the second great leader of Israel

died, and was laid to his rest within his own inheritance in Timnath-serah (24:29,30; in Jud 2:9, Timnath-heres), in the hill country of Ephraim. The site of his grave is unknown. Tradition has placed it at Kefr Haris, 9 miles South of Nablus or Shechem. But the localizing by tradition of the burying-place of hero or saint is often little more than accidental, nor can any reliance be placed upon it in this instance.

III. Sources of History. That the narratives concerning the life and work of Joshua rest in the main upon basis of tradition can hardly be doubted. How far the details have been modified, or a different coloring imparted in the course of a long transmission, it is impossible to determine. There is a remarkable similarity or parallelism between many of the leading events of Joshua's life as ruler and captain of Israel and the experiences of his predecessor Moses, which, apart from any literary criticism, suggests that the narratives have been drawn from the same general source, and subjected to the same conditions of environment and transmission. Thus both are called to and strengthened for their work by a special Divine revelation, Moses at Horeb in the burning bush, Joshua at Jericho. Both lead the people across the bed of waters miraculously driven back to afford them passage. And both at no long interval after the passage win a notable victory over their adversaries—a victory ascribed in each case to direct Divine intervention on their behalf, although in different ways. At the close of their life-work, moreover, both Moses and Joshua deliver stirring addresses of appeal and warning to the assembled Israelites; and both are laid in nameless graves. These all, however, are occurrences perfectly natural and indeed inevitable in the position in which each found himself. Nor do they afford adequate ground for the supposition that the achievements of the greater leader have been duplicated, or by mistake attributed to the less. To cross the Jordan and to defeat the Canaanite confederacy were as essential to the progress of Israel as the passage of the Red Sea and the breaking up of the gathering of Amalekite clans; and no true or sufficient history could have evaded the narration of these events. The position of Israel also on the East of the Jordan about to undertake the invasion and conquest of the Promised Land as imperatively demanded a specially qualified captain and guide, a mastermind to control the work, as did the oppressed people in Egypt or the wanderers in the desert. That Joshua was not so great a man as his predecessor the entire narrative testifies. Moses, however, must of necessity have had a successor to take up his unfinished work and to carry it to completion.

IV. Character and Work of Joshua.

As to the personal character of Joshua, there is little to be inferred from the narrative of his campaigns. In this respect indeed they are singularly colorless. In early life his loyalty to Moses was conspicuous and unswerving. As his successor, he seems to have faithfully acted upon his principles, and in the direction of the Israelite campaigns to have proved himself a brave and competent general, as wise in counsel as he was strong in fight. The putting to death of captives and the handing over to the sword of the inhabitants of hostile cities, which the historian so often records as the consequence of his victories, must evidently be judged by the customs of the times, and have perhaps lost nothing in the narration. They do not in any case justify the attribution to Joshua of an especially inhumane disposition, or a delight in slaughter for its own sake. After the death of Moses he would appear to have been reluctant to undertake the onerous position and duty assigned to him through mistrust of his own ability and lack of self-confidence, and needed more than once to be encouraged in his work and assured of Divine support. In the language of his closing discourse there is apparent a foresight and appreciation of the character

and tendencies of the people who had followed him, which is hardly inferior to that of Moses himself.

In a real sense also his work was left unfinished at his death. The settlement of Canaan by the tribes of Israel within the appointed and promised limits was never more than partial. The new colonists failed to enjoy that absolute and undisturbed possession of the land to which they had looked forward; witness the unrest of the period of the Judges, prolonged and perpetuated through monarchical times. For all this, however, the blame cannot justly be laid to the account of Joshua. Many causes undoubtedly concurred to an issue which was fatal to the future unity and happiness and prosperity of Israel. The chief cause, as Joshua warned them would be the case, was the persistent idolatry of the people themselves, their neglect of duty, and disregard of the commands and claims of their God.

A. S. Geden

JOSHUA (3)

Son of Jehozadak (Hag 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zec 3:1,3,6,8,9; 6:11 form (b)) and high priest in Jerusalem, called "Jeshua" in Ezra-Nehemiah. His father was among the captives at the fall of Jerusalem in 586 BC, and also his grandfather Seraiah, who was put to death at Riblah (2Ki 25:18 ff; 1Ch 6:15).

Joshua appears in Ezr 3:2 with Zerubbabel at the head of the returned exiles and as leader in the work of building an altar and reestablishing sacrificial worship (538 or 537 BC). Ezr 3:8 tells of their laying the foundation of the temple, and in 4:1 ff the two heads of the community refuse to allow the Samaritans to cooperate in the building operations, with the result that the would-be helpers became active opponents of the work. Building then ceased until Haggai and Zechariah in 520 (Ezr 5; Hag 1:1-11) exhort the community to restart work, and the two leaders take the lead (Hag 1:12-15). The following are, in chronological order, the prophetic utterances in which Joshua is spoken of:

(1) Hag 1:1-11;

(2) Hag 2:1-9;

(3) Zec 1:1-6;

(4) Hag 2:10-19;

(5) Hag 2:20-23;

(6) the visions of Zec 1:7-6:8 together with

(7) the undated utterance of Zec 6:9-15.

1. The Vision of Zechariah 3:1-10:

Two of these call for special attention. First, the vision of a trial in which Joshua is prosecuted before the angel of Yahweh by Satan (ha-saTan, "the adversary"), who is, according to one view, "not the spirit of evil who appears in later Jewish writings; he is only the officer of justice whose business is to see that the case against criminals is properly presented" in the heavenly court of justice (H.P. Smith, Old Testament History, 356); while others regard him as the enemy of God's people (compare Orelli, Minor Prophets, English translation, 327). We are not told what the charge against Joshua is: some hold him to be tried as in some way a representative of the people or the priesthood, and his filthy garments as symbolical of sin; while others explain the garments as put on to excite the court's pity. The adversary is rebuked by "the angel of Yahweh" (read at beginning of Zec 3:2, "and the angel of Yahweh said," etc.), and Joshua is acquitted. He is then ordered to be stripped of his old clothes and to be arrayed in "rich apparel" (Zec 3:4), while a "clean turban" (American Standard Revised Version margin) is to be put on his head. Conditional upon his walking in God's ways, he is promised the government of the temple and "free access" to God, being placed among the servants of the "angel of Yahweh." Joshua and his companions "are men that are a sign" (Zec 3:8), i.e. a guaranty of the coming of the Messiah; there is set before Joshua a stone which is to be inscribed upon, and the iniquity of the land will be removed, an event to be followed by peace and plenty (Zec 3:9 f).

In Zec 3:4 ff Nowack and Wellhausen (with the Septuagint mostly) read, "And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him (i.e. his servants) thus: Take the filthy garments from off him, and clothe him with rich apparel, (5) and set a clean turban upon his head. So they set a clean turban upon his head and clothed him with clean garments. And the angel of Yahweh stood up, (6) and solemnly exhorted Joshua," etc. They also omit the first "for" in Zec 3:8 as a dittography.

Different interpretations are given of the vision:

(1) Some claim to see here a contest between the civil and religious powers as represented by Zerubbabel and Joshua respectively (Zec 6:13), and that Zechariah decides for the supremacy of the latter. The Messiah-King is indeed in Jerusalem in the person of Zerubbabel, though as yet uncrowned; but Joshua is to be supreme (see G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 303; H.P. Smith, Old Testament History, 356 f). This explanation is dependent to a large extent upon Zec 6:9-15, and is not supported by 3:8. It is difficult to explain 3:2 on this view, for Zerubbabel could also be described as a "brand plucked out of the fire." What the vision says is that the vindication of Joshua is a sign for the coming of Yahweh's "servant, the Branch," a title that is not given to Joshua (compare Zec 3:7).

(2) Others maintain that the garments are symbolical of the sins of the predecessors of Joshua, who is tried for their offenses and himself regarded as being unworthy of the office because he had been brought up in a foreign and heathen land (so Keil, Orelli).

(3) Hitzig, followed by Nowack (Kleine Propheten, 325), holds that the idea which lies at the basis of the vision is that Satan is responsible for the ills which the community had suffered (compare Job 1; 2).

The people had begun to think that their offerings were not acceptable to God and that He would not have pity upon them. There was a feeling among the most pious ones that God’s righteousness would not allow of their restoration to their former glory. This conflict between righteousness and mercy is decided by silencing the accuser and vindicating Joshua.

It is difficult to decide which view, if any, is correct. "The brand plucked out of the fire" seems to point to God’s recognizing that the community, or perhaps the priestly succession, had almost been exterminated by the exile. It reminds us of the oak of which, after its felling, the stump remaineth (Isa 6:13), and may perhaps point to God’s pity being excited for the community. The people, attacked by their enemies and represented by. Joshua, are to be restored to their old glory: that act being symbolized by the clothing of Joshua in clean raiment; and that symbolical act (compare Isa 8:18) is a sign, a guaranty, of the coming of the Messiah-King. The ritualistic tone of Malachi will then follow naturally after the high place given here to the high priest. It is noteworthy that the promise of Zec 3:7 is conditional.

One more point remains, namely, the meaning of the stone in Zec 3:9. It has been differently explained as a jewel in the new king’s crown (Nowack); a foundation stone of the temple, which, however, was already laid (Hitzig); the chief stone of 4:7 (Ewald, Steiner); the Messiah Himself (Keil); the stone in the high priest’s breastplate (Bredenkamp), and the stone which served as an altar (Orelli). Commentators tend to regard the words "upon one stone are seven eyes" as a parenthetical addition characteristic of the author of Zec 9 ff.

2. Joshua’s Crown, Zechariah 6:9-15:

The utterance of Zec 6:9-15 presents to us some more exiles coming from Babylon with silver and gold apparently for the temple. According to the present text, Zechariah is commanded to see that this is used to make a crown for Joshua who is to be a priest-king. This is taken to mean that he is to be given the crown that had been meant for Zerubbabel. But commentators hold that the text has been altered: that the context demands the crowning of Zerubbabel—the Branch of Davidic descent. This view is supported by Zec 6:13, "And the counsel of peace shall be between them both"; and therefore the last clause of 6:11 is omitted. Wellhausen keeps 6:9 and 10, and then reads: "(11) Yea, take of them silver and gold and make a crown, (12) and say to them: Thus saith Yahweh of hosts, saying, Behold the man whose name is the Branch, from whose root there will be a sprout, (13) and he will build the Temple of Yahweh, and he will obtain glory and sit and rule upon his throne. And Joshua will be a priest on his right hand, and there will be friendly peace between them both. (14) The crown shall be," etc.; Zec 6:15 is incomplete.

It will be objected that this does away with the idea of a priest-king, an idea found also in Ps 110. But it seems fairly certain that Ps 110 (see Kirkpatrick, The Book of Psalms) does not refer to Joshua, the point there being that the king referred to was a priest, although not descended from Aaron, being a priest after the order of Melchizedek, while here the point is, if the present text be correct, that a priest is crowned king. What became of Zerubbabel after this is not known. See Ed. Meyer, Der Papyrusfund

von Elephantine2, 70 ff, 86 ff. Joshua is called Jesus in Sirach 49:12.

See ZERUBBABEL; HAGGAI; ZECHARIAH.

David Francis Roberts

JOSHUA, BOOK OF

I. TITLE AND AUTHORSHIP

II. CONTENTS

1. Invasion and Conquest of Western Palestine

2. Allotment of the Country to the Tribes of Israel

II. HISTORICAL CHARACTER AND CHRONOLOGY

1. The Book of Joshua as History

2. Chronology

IV. SOURCES OF THE WRITTEN NARRATIVE

V. RELATION TO THE BOOK OF JUDGES

1. Parallel Narratives

2. Omissions in the History

VI. PLACE OF JOSH IN THE HED CANON

VII. GREEK AND OTHER ANCIENT VERSIONS

1. The Greek

2. Other Ancient Versions

VIII. RELIGIOUS PURPOSE AND TEACHING

LITERATURE

I. Title and Authorship.

The name Joshua signifies "Yahweh is deliverance" or "salvation" (see JOSHUA). The Greek form of the name is Jesus (Iesous, Ac 7:45; Heb 4:8). In later Jewish history the name appears to have become popular, and is even found with a local significance, as the designation of a small town in Southern Palestine (yeshua‘], Ne 11:26). The use of the title by the Jews to denote the Book of Joshua did not imply a belief that the book was actually written or dictated by him; or even that the narratives themselves were in substance derived from him, and owed their authenticity and reliability to his sanction and control. In the earliest Jewish literature the association of a name with a book was not intended in any case to indicate authorship. And the Book of Joshua is no exception to the rule that such early writings, especially when their contents are of a historical nature, are usually anonymous. The title is intended to describe, not authorship, but theme; and to represent that the life and deeds of Joshua form the main subject with which the book is concerned.

II. Contents.

With regard to the contents of Joshua, it will be found to consist of two well-marked divisions, in the first of which (Joshua 1-2) are narrated the invasion and gradual conquest under the command of Joshua of the land on the West of the Jordan; while the 2nd part describes in detail the allotment of the country to the several tribes with the boundaries of their territories, and concludes with a brief notice of the death and burial of Joshua himself.

1. Invasion and Conquest of Western Palestine:

Joshua 1: Renewal of the Divine promise to Joshua and exhortation to fearlessness and courage (1:1-9); directions to the people to prepare for the passage of the river, and a reminder to the eastern tribes (Reuben, Gad, and half and Manasseh) of the condition under which they held their possession beyond Jordan; the renewal by these tribes of their pledge of loyalty to Moses’ successor (1:10-18).

Joshua 2: The sending of the two spies from Shittim and their escape from Jericho through the stratagem of Rahab.

Joshua 3: The passage of Jordan by the people over against Jericho, the priests bearing the ark, and standing in the dry bed of the river until all the people had crossed over.

Joshua 4: Erection of 12 memorial stones on the other side of Jordan, where the people encamped after the passage of the river (4:1-14); the priests with the Ark of the Covenant ascend in their turn from out of the river-bed, and the waters return into their wonted course (4:15-24).

Joshua 5: Alarm excited among the kings on the West of Jordan by the news of the successful crossing

of the river (5:1); circumcision of the people at Gilgal (5:2-9); celebration of the Passover at Gilgal in the plains of Jericho (5:10,11); cessation of the supply of the manna (5:12); appearance to Joshua of the captain of the Lord's host (5:13-15).

Joshua 6: Directions given to Joshua for the siege and taking of Jericho (6:1-5); capture of the city, which is destroyed by fire, Rahab and her household alone being saved (6:6-25); a curse is pronounced on the man who rebuilds Jericho (6:26).

Joshua 7: The crime and punishment of Achan, who stole for himself part of the spoil of the captured city (7:1,16-26); incidentally his sin is the cause of a disastrous defeat before Ai (7:2-12).

Joshua 8: The taking of Ai by a stratagem, destruction of the city, and death of its king (8:1-29); erection of an altar on Mt. Ebal, and reading of the Law before the assembled people (8:30-35).

Joshua 9: Gathering of the peoples of Palestine to oppose Joshua (9:1-2); a covenant of peace made with the Gibeonites, who represent themselves as strangers from a far country (9:3-26); they are, however, reduced to a condition of servitude (9:27).

Joshua 10: Combination of 5 kings of the Amorites to punish the inhabitants of Gibeon for their defection, and defeat and rout of the kings by Joshua at Beth-horon (10:1-14); return of the Israelites to Gilgal (10:15); capture and death by hanging of the 5 kings at Makkedah (10:16-27); taking and destruction of Makkedah (10:28), Libnah (10:29,30), Lachish (10:31,32), Gezer (10:33), Eglon (10:34,35), Hebron (10:36,37), Debir (10:38,39), and summarily all the land, defined as from Kadesh-barnea unto Gaza, and as far North as Gibeon (10:40-42); return to Gilgal (10:43).

Joshua 11: Defeat of Jabin, king of Hazor, and allied kings at the waters of Merom (11:1-9); destruction of Hazor (11:10-15); reiterated summary of Joshua's conquests (11:16-23).

Joshua 12: Final summary of the Israelite conquests in Canaan, of Sihon and Og on the East of the Jordan under the leadership of Moses (12:1-6); of 31 kings and their cities on the West of the river under Joshua (12:7-24).

2. Allotment of the Country to the Tribes of Israel:

Joshua 13: Command to Joshua to allot the land on the West of the Jordan, even that which was still unsubdued, to the nine and a half tribes (13:1-7); recapitulation of the inheritance given by Moses on the East of the river (13:8-13,32); the border of Reuben (13:15-23), of Gad (13:24-28), of the half-tribe of Manasseh (13:29-31); the tribe of Levi alone received no the landed inheritance (13:14,33).

Joshua 14: Renewed statement of the principle on which the division of the land had been made (14:1-5); Hebron given to Caleb for his inheritance (14:6-15).

Joshua 15. The inheritance of Judah, and the boundaries of his territory (15:1-20), including that of Caleb (15:13-19); enumeration of the cities of Judah (15:21-63).

Joshua 16: Inheritance of the sons of Joseph (16:1-4); the border of Ephraim (16:5-10).

Joshua 17: Inheritance of Manasseh and the border of the half-tribe on the West of the Jordan (17:1-13); complaint of the sons of Joseph of the insufficiency of their inheritance, and grant to them by Joshua of an extension of territory (17:14-18).

Joshua 18: The land yet unsubdued divided by lot into 7 portions for the remaining 7 tribes (18:1-10); inheritance of the sons of Benjamin and the border of their territory (18:11-20); enumeration of their cities (18:21-28).

Joshua 19: Inheritance of Simeon and his border (19:1-9); of Zebulun and his border (19:10-16); of Issachar and his border (19:17-23); of Asher and his border (19:24-31); of Naphtali and his border (19:32-39); and of Da and his border (19:40-48); inheritance of Joshua (19:49,50); concluding statement (19:51).

Joshua 20: Cities of Refuge appointed, three on each side of the Jordan.

Joshua 21: 48 cities with their suburbs given to the Levites out of the territories of the several tribes (21:1-41); the people had rest in the land, their enemies being subdued, according to the Divine promise (21:43-45).

Joshua 22: Dismissal of the eastern tribes to their inheritance, their duty to their brethren having been fulfilled (22:1-9); the erection by them of a great altar by the side of the Jordan aroused the suspicion of the western tribes, who feared that they intended to separate themselves from the common cause (22:10-20); their reply that the altar is to serve the purpose of a witness between themselves and their brethren (22:21-34).

Joshua 23: Joshua’s address of encouragement and warning to the people.

Joshua 24: Second address of Joshua, recalling to the people their history, and the Divine interventions on their behalf (24:1-23); the people’s pledge of loyalty to the Lord, and formal covenant in Shechem (24:24,25); the book of the law of God is committed to writing, and a stone is erected as a permanent memorial (24:26-28); death and burial of Joshua (24:29-31); burial in Shechem of the bones of Joseph, brought from Egypt (24:32); death and burial of Eleazar, son of Aaron (24:33).

III. Historical Character and Chronology.

1. The Book of Joshua as History:

As a historical narrative, therefore, detailing the steps taken to secure the conquest and possession of Canaan, Joshua is incomplete and is marked by many omissions, and in some instances at least includes phrases or expressions which seem to imply the existence of parallel or even divergent accounts of the same event, e.g. in the passage of the Jordan and the erection of memorial stones (Joshua 3; 4), the summary of the conquests of Joshua (10:40-43; 11:16-23), or the references to Moses' victories over the Amorite kings on the East of the Jordan.

This last fact suggests, what is in itself sufficiently probable, that the writer or compiler of the book made use of previously existing records or narratives, not necessarily in every instance written, but probably also oral and traditional, upon which he relied and out of which by means of excerpts with modifications and omissions, the resultant history was composed. The incomplete and defective character of the book therefore, considered merely as a history of the conquest of Western Palestine and its allotment among the new settlers, would seem to indicate that the "sources" available for the writer's use were fragmentary also in their nature, and did not present a complete view either of the life of Joshua or of the experiences of Israel while under his direction.

2. Chronology:

Within the limits of the book itself, moreover, notifications of chronological sequence, or of the length of time occupied in the various campaigns, are almost entirely wanting. Almost the only references to date or period are the statements that Joshua himself was 110 years old at the time of his death (24:29), and that his wars lasted "a long time" (11:18; compare 23:1). Caleb also, the son of Jephunneh, companion of Joshua in the mission of the spies from Kadesh-barnea, describes himself as 85 years old, when he receives Hebron as his inheritance (14:10; compare 15:13 ff); the inference would be, assuming 40 years for the wanderings in the desert, that 5 years had then elapsed since the passage of the Jordan "on the tenth day of the first month" (4:19). No indication, however, is given of the chronological relation of this event to the rest of the history; and 5 years would be too short a period for the conquest of Palestine, if it is to be understood that the whole was carried out in consecutive campaigns under the immediate command of Joshua himself. On the other hand, "very much land" remained still unsubdued at his death (13:1). Christian tradition seems to have assumed that Joshua was about the same age as Caleb, although no definite statement to that effect is made in the book itself; and that, therefore, a quarter of a century, more or less, elapsed between the settlement of the latter at Hebron and Joshua's death (14:10; 24:29). The entire period from the crossing of the Jordan would then be reckoned at from 28 to 30 years.

IV. Sources of the Written Narrative.

The attempt to define the "sources" of Joshua as it now exists, and to disentangle them one from another, presents considerably more difficulty than is to be encountered for the most part in the Pentateuch. The distinguishing criteria upon which scholars rely and which have led serious students of the book to conclude that there may be traced here also the use of the same "documents" or "documentary sources" as are to be found in the Pentateuch, are essentially the same. Existing and traditional accounts,

however, have been used apparently with greater freedom, and the writer has allowed himself a fuller liberty of adaptation and combination, while the personal element has been permitted wider scope in molding the resultant form which the composition should take. For the most part, therefore, the broad line of distinction between the various "sources" which have been utilized may easily be discerned on the ground of their characteristic traits, in style, vocabulary or general conception; in regard to detail, however, the precise point at which one "source" has been abandoned for another, or the writer himself has supplied deficiencies and bridged over gaps, there is frequent uncertainty, and the evidence available is insufficient to justify an absolute conclusion. The fusion of material has been more complete than in the 5 books of the law, perhaps because the latter were hedged about with a more reverential regard for the letter, and at an earlier period attained the standing of canonicity.

A detailed analysis of the sources as they have been distinguished and related to one another by scholars is here unnecessary. A complete discussion of the subject will be found in Dr. Driver’s LOT6, 105 ff, in other Introductions, or in the Commentaries on Joshua. Not seldom in the ultimate detail the distinctions are precarious, and there are differences of opinion among scholars themselves as to the precise limit or limits of the use made of any given source, or at what point the dividing line should be drawn. It is only in a broad and general sense that in Joshua especially the literary theory of the use of "documents," as generally understood and as interpreted in the case of the Pentateuch, can be shown to be well founded. In itself, however, such a theory is eminently reasonable, and is both in harmony with the general usage and methods of ancient composition, and affords ground for additional confidence in the good faith and reliability of the narrative as a whole.

V. Relation to the Book of Judges.

1. Parallel Narratives:

A comparison moreover of the history recorded in Joshua with the brief parallel account in Judges furnishes ground for believing that a detailed or chronological narrative was not contemplated by the writer or writers themselves. The introductory verses of Judges (1:1-2:5) are in part a summary of incidents recorded in Joshua, and in part supply new details or present a different view of the whole. The original notices that are added relate almost entirely to the invasion and conquest of Southern Palestine by the united or allied tribes of Judah and Simeon and the destruction of Bethel by the "house of Joseph." The action of the remaining tribes is narrated in a few words, the brief record closing in each case with reference to the condition of servitude to which the original inhabitants of the land were reduced. And the general scheme of the invasion as there represented is apparently that of a series of disconnected raids or campaigns undertaken by the several tribes independently, each having for its object the subjection of the territory assigned to the individual tribe. A general and comprehensive plan of conquest under the supreme leadership of Joshua appears to be entirely wanting. In detail, however, the only real inconsistency between the two narratives would appear to be that in Jud (1:21) the failure to expel the Jebusites from Jerusalem is laid to the account of the Benjamites, while in Jos 15:63 it is charged against the children of Judah. The difficulties in the way of the formation of a clear conception of the incidents attending the capture of Jerusalem are perhaps insuperable upon any hypothesis; and the variation of the tribal name in the two texts may be no more than a copyist’s error.

2. Omissions in the History:

A perhaps more striking omission in both narratives is the absence of any reference to the conquest of Central Palestine. The narrative of the overthrow of Bethel and Ai (Jos 6:1-8:29) is followed immediately by the record of the building of an altar on Mt. Ebal and the recitation of the Law before the people of Israel assembled in front of Mts. Ebal and Gerizim (Jos 8:30). Joshua then turns aside to defeat at Beth-horon the combination of the Amorite kings, and completes the conquest of the southern country as far south as Kadesh-barnea (10:41). Immediately thereafter he is engaged in overthrowing a confederacy in the far north (11:1-15), a work which clearly could not have been undertaken or successfully accomplished, unless the central region had been already subdued; but of its reduction no account is given. It has been supposed that the silence of the narrator is an indication that at the period of the invasion this district was in the occupation of tribes friendly or even related to the Israelite clans; and in support of the conjecture reference has been made to the mention of Israel on the stele of Merenptah, the Egyptian ruler in whose reign, according to the most probable view, the exodus took place. In this record the nation or a part thereof is regarded as already settled in Palestine at a date earlier by half a century than their appearance under Moses and Joshua on the borders of the Promised Land. The explanation is possible, but perhaps hardly probable. The defects of the historical record are irremediable at this distance of time, and it must be acknowledged that with the available material no complete and consistent narrative of the events of the Israelite conquest of Palestine can be constructed.

VI. Place of Joshua in the Hebrew Canon.

In the Hebrew Canon Joshua is the first in order of the prophetical books, and the first of the group of 4, namely, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, which form the "Earlier Prophets" (nebhi’im ri’shonim). These books, the contents of which are history, not prophecy in the ordinary sense of the term, were assigned by the Jews to the 2nd division of their sacred Canon, and found a place by the side of the great writings of the "Later Prophets" (nebhi’im ‘acharonim). This position was given to them in part perhaps because they were believed to have been written or composed by prophets, but mainly because Jewish history was regarded as in purpose and intent "prophetic," being directed and presided over by Yahweh Himself, and conveying direct spiritual instruction and example. The Canon of the Law, moreover, was already closed; and however patent and striking might be the resemblance of Joshua in style and method of composition to the books of the Pentateuch, it was impossible to admit it therein, or to give a place within the Torah, a group of writings which were regarded as of Mosaic authorship, to a narrative of events which occurred after Moses’ death. Later criticism reviewed and reversed the verdict as to the true character of the book. In every Canon except the Hebrew, its historical nature was recognized, and the work was classified accordingly. Modern criticism has gone further, and, with increasing consciousness of its close literary relationship to the books of the Law, has united it with them in a Hexateuch, or even under the more comprehensive title of Octateuch combines together the books of Jud and Ru with the preceding six on the ground of similarity of origin and style. VII. Greek and Other Ancient Versions.

1. The Greek:

In the ancient versions of Joshua there is not much that is of interest. The Greek translation bears witness to a Hebrew original differing little from the Massoretic Text. In their renderings, however, and general treatment of the Hebrew text, the translators seem to have felt themselves at liberty to take up a position of greater independence and freedom than in dealing with the 5 books of the Law. Probably also the rendering of Joshua into Greek is not to be ascribed to the same authors as the translation of the Pentateuch. While faithful to the Hebrew, it is less constantly and exactly literal, and contains many slight variations, the most important of which are found in the last 6 chapters.

Joshua 19: The Septuagint transposes 19:47,48, and, omitting the first clause of 19:47, refers the whole to the sons of Judah, without mention of Dan; it further adds 19:47a, 48a on the relation between the Amorites and Ephraim, and the Amorites and the Danites respectively. With 19:47a compare 16:10 and Jud 1:29, and with 19:48a compare 19:47 (Hebrew) and Jud 1:34.

Joshua 20:4-6 inclusive are omitted in B, except a clause from 20:6; A, however, inserts them in full. Compare Driver, LOT6, 112, who, on the ground of their Deuteronomic tone, regards it as probable that the verses are an addition to the Priestly Code (P), and therefore did not form part of the original text as used by the Greek translators.

Joshua 21:36,37, which give the names of the Levitical cities in Judah, are omitted in the Hebrew printed text although found in many Hebrew manuscripts. Four verses also are added after 21:42, the first three of which repeat 19:50 f, and the last is a reminiscence of 5:3.

Joshua 24:29 f which narrate the death and burial of Joshua are placed in the Greek text after 24:31; and a verse is inserted after 24:30 recording that the stone knives used for the purposes of the circumcision (5:2 ff) were buried with Joshua in his tomb (compare 21:42). After 24:33 also two new verses appear, apparently a miscellany from Jud 2:6,11-15; 3:7,12,14, with a statement of the death and burial of Phinehas, son and successor of Eleazar, of the idolatrous worship by the children of Israel of Astarte and Ashtaroth, and the oppression under Eglon, king of Moab.

2. Other Ancient Versions:

The other VSS, with the exception of Jerome’s translation from the Hebrew, are secondary, derived mediately through the Greek. The Old Latin is contained in a manuscript at Lyons, Cod. Lugdunensis, which is referred to the 6th century. Of the Coptic version only small portions are extant; they have been published by G. Maspero, Memoires de la mission archeologique frantsaise, tom. VI, fasc. 1, le Caire, 1892, and elsewhere. A Sam translation also is known, for parts of which at least an early origin and an independent derivation from the Hebrew have been claimed. The ancient character of the version, however, is contested, and it has been shown that the arguments on which reliance was placed are insufficient to justify the conclusions drawn. The translation appears to be in reality of quite recent date, and to have been made originally from the Arabic, perhaps in part compared with and corrected by the

Massoretic Text. The subject was fully and conclusively discussed by Dr. Yehuda of Berlin, at the Oriental Congress in the summer of 1908, and in a separate pamphlet subsequently published. It was even stated that the author of the version was still living, and his name was given. Dr. Gaster, the original discoverer of the Sam MS, in various articles and letters maintains his contention that the translation is really antique, and therefore of great value, but he has failed to convince scholars. (See M. Gaster in JRAS (1908), 795 ff, 1148 ff; E. N. Adler, ib, 1143 ff. The text of the manuscript was published by Dr. Caster in ZDMG (1908), 209 ff, and a specimen chapter with English rendering and notes in PSBA, XXXI (1909), 115 ff, 149 ff.)

VIII. Religious Purpose and Teaching. As a whole, then, Joshua is dominated by the same religious and hortatory purpose as the earlier writings of the Pentateuch; and in this respect as well as in authorship and structure the classification which assigns to it a place by the side of the 5 books of Moses and gives to the whole the title of Hexateuch is not unjustified. The author or authors had in view not merely the narration of incident, nor the record of events in the past history of their people of which they judged it desirable that a correct account should be preserved, but they endeavored in all to subserve a practical and religious aim. The history is not for its own sake, or for the sake of the literal facts which it enshrines, but for the sake of the moral and spiritual lessons which may be elucidated therein, and enforced from its teaching. The Divine leading in history is the first thought with the writer. And the record of Israel’s past presents itself as of interest to him, not because it is a record of events that actually happened, but because he sees in it the ever-present guidance and overruling determination of God, and would draw from it instruction and warning for the men of his own time and for those that come after him. Not the history itself, but the meaning and interpretation of the history are of value. Its importance lies in the illustrations it affords of the controlling working of a Divine Ruler who is faithful to His promises, loving righteousness and hating iniquity, and swaying the destinies of men in truth. Thus the selection of materials, and the form and arrangement of the book are determined by a definite aim: to set forth and enforce moral lessons, and to exhibit Israel’s past as the working out of a Divine purpose which has chosen the nation to be the recipient of the Divine favor, and the instrument for the carrying forward of His purposes upon earth.

LITERATURE.

A Complete bibliography of the literature up to date will be found in the dictionaries, under the word "Joshua," DB2, 1893, HDB, II, 1899, EB, II, 1901; compare W. H. Bennett, "The Book of Josh," in SBOT, Leipzig, 1895; W.G. Blaikie, "Joshua," in Expositor’s Bible, 1893; A. Dillmann, Nu, De u. Josua2, Leipzig, 1886; H. Holzinger, "Das Buch Josua," in Kurzer Hand-Comm. zum A T, Tubingen, 1901; C. Steuernagel, "Josua," in Nowack’s Handcommentar zum Altes Testament, 1899; S. Oettli, "Deuteronomy, Josua u. Richter," in Kurzgef. Komm, Munchen, 1893; W.J. Deane, Joshua, His Life and Times, in "Men of the Bible Series," London.

A. S. Geden

JOSIAH

jo-si’-a (yo’shiyahu, "Yahweh supports him"; Ioseias; the King James Version Josias (which see)):

I. SOURCES FOR HIS LIFE AND TIMES

1. Annalistic

2. Prophetic

3. Memorial

II. TRAITS OF HIS REIGN

1. Situation at the Beginning

2. Finding of the Law

3. The Great Reform

4. Disaster at Megiddo

The name given 6 years before the death of his grandfather Manasseh resumes the Judaic custom, suspended in the case of that king and Amon, of compounding royal names with that of Yahweh; perhaps a hint of the time, when, according to the Chronicler, Manasseh realized Yahweh’s claim on his realm (2Ch 33:12,13). One of the most eminent of the kings of Judah; came to the throne at 8 years of age and reigned circa 637-608 BC.

I. Sources for His Life and Times.

1. Annalistic:

The earliest history is dispassionate in tone, betraying its prophetic feeling, however, in its acknowledgment of Yahweh’s wrath, still menacing in spite of Josiah’s unique piety (2Ki 23:26,27). For "the rest of his acts" (to which the rather bald account of his death is relegated as a kind of appendix), it refers to "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah." In the later history (2Ch 34; 35), written from the developed ecclesiastical point of view, he is considerably idealized: the festal and ceremonial aspects of his reform are more fully detailed, and the story of his campaign and death is more sympathetically told in the sense of it as a great national calamity.

2. Prophetic:

For the spiritual atmosphere of his time and the prophetic consciousness of a day of wrath impending,

the prophet Zephaniah is illuminating, especially for the first half of the reign. Jeremiah, born at about the same time as Josiah, began prophesying in the 13th year of the reign (Jer 1:2). His intimate connection with state affairs, however, belongs to succeeding reigns; but some prophecies of his, notably those revealing his attitude toward the temple misuse (7:1-15) and toward the Deuteronomic reform (11:1-13), throw much light on the prevailing conditions. Nahum, writing near the end of the reign, and from an outlying village, is less concerned with home affairs than with the approaching end of Nineveh (fell 606 BC).

3. Memorial:

In Jesus Sirach's Praise of Famous Men there is a passage (Sirach 49:1-4), wholly eulogistic of Josiah, on the score that "in the days of wicked men he made godliness to prevail"; and along with David and Hezekiah he is one of the three who alone did not "commit trespass." Jeremiah's lamentation for. Josiah, mentioned in 2Ch 35:25, is not preserved to us; instead there is only an allusion (Jer 22:10), naming his successor Shallum (Jehoahaz) as a fitter subject. The lamentations which became "an ordinance in Israel" (2Ch 35:25) are not to be referred to the Scripture book of that name; which has no hint of Josiah, unless La 4:20 be so construed.

II. Traits of His Reign.

1. Situation at the Beginning:

Until his 18th year 2 Kings gives no events of Josiah's reign; 2 Chronicles, however, relates that in his 8th year (at 16 years of age) he "began to seek after the God of David his father," and that in the 12th year he began the purgation of Judah and Jerusalem. The Chronicler may be mistaken in putting the completion of this work before the finding of the law (2Ch 34:8), but of his disposition and of his beginning without documentary warrant on a work which Hezekiah had attempted before him, there is no reason to doubt. And indeed various influences were working together to make his procedure natural. The staunch loyalty to the Davidic house, as emphasized by the popular movement which seated him (see under AMON), would in itself be an influence to turn his mind to the God of David his father. Manasseh's all-embracing idolatry had indeed reduced his aristocracy to a people "settled on their lees, that say in their heart, Yahweh will not do good, neither will he do evil" (Ze 1:12); but these represented merely the inertia, not the intelligence, of the people. Over against them is to be reckoned the spiritually-minded "remnant" with which since Isaiah the prophets had been working; a remnant now seasoned by persecution, and already committed to the virtue of meekness (Ze 2:3) and the willing acceptance of affliction as their appointed lot, as against the arrogance of the "proudly exulting ones" (Ze 3:11-13). To such courage and hope the redeeming element of Israel had grown in the midst of a blatant infidelity and worldliness. Nor were they so unconnected with the established order as formerly. The ministers of the temple-service, if not subjected to persecution, had been ranked on a level with devotees of other cults, and so had a common cause which would work to unite the sympathies of priests and prophets in one loyalty to Yahweh. All this is adduced as indicating how the better elements of the nation were ripening for a forward step in enlightened religious progress.

2. Finding of the Law:

The providential moment arrived when in the 18th year of his reign Josiah sent Shaphan the scribe to the temple to arrange with Hilkiah the high priest for the prescribed temple repairs. On giving his account of the funds for that purpose, Hilkiah also delivered to Shaphan a book which he had found in the "house of Yahweh," that is, in the temple proper; which book, when Shaphan read therefrom to the king, caused the latter to rend his robe in dismay and consternation. It was a book in which were commands of Yahweh that had long been unknown or disregarded, and along with these, fearful curses to follow the infraction of them. Such a discovery could not be treated lightly, as one might spurn a prophet or priest; nay, it immediately called the authority of the prophet into requisition. The king sent a deputation to Huldah the prophetess for her verdict on the book; and she, whether aware of its contents or not, assured him that the curses were valid, and that for impieties against which the prophets continually warned, all the woes written in the book were impending. One of the most voluminous discussions of Biblical scholarship has centered round the question what this book was, what its origin, and how it came there in the temple. The Chronicler says roundly it was "the book of the law of Yahweh by the hand of Moses." That it was from the nation’s great first prophet and lawgiver was the implicit belief of the king and all his contemporaries. There can be little doubt, judging from the nature of the reforms it elicited and the fact that the curses it contained are still extant, that this "book of the law" was virtually identical with our Book of Deuteronomy. But is this the work of Moses, or the product of a later literary activity? In answer, it is fair to say that it is so true to the soundest interpretation of the spirit and power of Moses that there need be no hesitation in calling it genuinely Mosaic, whatever adaptations and supplementations its laws received after his time. Its highly developed style, however, and its imperfect conformity to the nomadic conditions of Moses’ time, make so remote an origin of its present form very doubtful. It comes to us written with the matured skill of Israel’s literary prime, in a time too when, as we know (see under HEZEKIAH), men of letters were keenly interested in rescuing and putting to present use the literary treasures of their past. As to how it came to be left in the temple at a time so much before its discovery that none questioned its being what it purported to be, each scholar must answer for himself. Some have conjectured that it may have been a product of Solomon’s time, and deposited, according to immemorial custom in temple-building, in the foundation of Solomon’s temple, where it was found when certain ruins made repairs necessary. To the present writer it seems likelier that it was one of the literary products of Hezekiah’s time, compiled from scattered statutes, precedents, and customs long in the keeping—or neglect—of priests and judges, put into the attractive form of oratory, and left for its providential moment.

See further, DEUTERONOMY; WRITING.

3. The Great Reform:

Josiah’s immediate procedure was to call to the temple a representative assemblage—elders, prophets, priests, populace—and to read to them this "book of the covenant" (2Ki 23:2). Then he made a solemn covenant before Yahweh to obey it, and all the people stood to the covenant. So, perhaps for the first time, the people of Judah and Jerusalem had for their guidance not only the case decisions of judges and

priests, nor only the emergency warnings and predictions of prophets, but a written and accessible document, covering in a large and liberal way the duties of their civic, social and religious life. One of the most momentous productions of all history, the book became the constitution of the Jewish race; nor were its noble provisions superseded when, centuries later, the tethers of race were broken and a Christian civilization came into its heritage. But the book that was destined to have so large a significance in all coming history had its immediate significance too, and never had this been so pressing. Josiah's consternation arose from the sense of how much of the nation's obvious duty had been left undone and unregarded. First of all, they had through heedless years and ages drifted into a medley of religious ideas and customs which had accumulated until all this lumber of Manasseh's idolatry was upon them. Hezekiah had tried to clear away some of its most crude and superstitious elements (see under HEZEKIAH), but he was handicapped by the lack of its clear issue and objective, which now this book supplied. Zephaniah too was showing what Yahweh's will was (Ze 1:2-6); there must be a clean sweep of the debasing and obscuring cults, and the purgation must be done to stay. So Josiah's first reforming step was to break up the high places, the numerous centers of the evil, to destroy the symbols and utensils of the idolatrous shrines and rites, and to defile them past resuscitation. His zeal did not stop with Jerusalem and Judah; he went on to Bethel, which had been the chief sanctuary of the now defunct Northern Kingdom, and in his work here was recognized the fulfillment of an old prophecy dating from the time of its first king (2Ki 23:17; compare 1Ki 13:1,2). This necessitated the concentration of public worship in the temple at Jerusalem, and in De was found the warrant for this, in the prescript, natural to Moses' point of view, that the worship of Israel must have a single center as it had in the wilderness. From this negative procedure he went on to the positive measure of reviving the festival services inseparable from a religion requiring pilgrimage, instituting a grand Passover on a scale unheard of since the time of the Judges (2Ki 23:21,22), a feature of his reform on which the Chronicler dwells with peculiar zest (2Ch 35:1-15). Thus both in the idolatries they must abolish and in the organized worship that they must maintain, the people were committed to a definite and documented issue; this it was which made Josiah's reform so momentous. That the reform seemed after Josiah's untimely death to have been merely outward, is what might reasonably be expected from the inveteracy of the unspirituality that it must encounter. Jeremiah had small faith in its saving power against the stubborn perversity of the people (Jer 11:1-14); and the historian of 2 Kings intimates that more than the piety of a zealous king was needed to turn away the stern decree of Yahweh's anger (2Ki 23:26,27). In spite of all hardness and apostasy, however, the nation that had once "stood to the covenant" of Deuteronomy could never again be at heart the nation it was before.

4. Disaster at Megiddo:

Ardent and pious as he was, there seems to have been a lack of balance in Josiah's character. His extreme dismay and dread of the curse pronounced on the realm's neglect of the law seems to have been followed, after his great reform had seemed to set things right, by an excess of confidence in Yahweh's restored favor which went beyond sound wisdom, and amounted to presumption. The power of Assyria was weakening, and Pharaoh-necoh of Egypt, ambitious to secure control of Mesopotamia, started on the campaign in which he was eventually to suffer defeat at Carchemish. Josiah, whose reforming zeal had already achieved success in Northern Israel, apparently cherished inordinate dreams of invincibility in Yahweh's name, and went forth with a little army to withstand the Egyptian monarch on his march

through the northern provinces. At the first onset he was killed, and his expedition came to nothing. In his untimely death the fervid hopes of the pious received a set-back which was long lamented as one of the cardinal disasters of Israel. It was a sore calamity, but also a stern education. Israel must learn not only the enthusiasm but also the prudence and wisdom of its new-found faith.

(2) A contemporary of Zechariah (Zec 6:10), at whose house in Jerusalem the prophet met some returned Jews from Babylon.

John Franklin Genung

JOSIAS

jo-si'-as (Textus Receptus, Iosias; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Ioseias) :

(1) Greek form in the King James Version of Josiah (Mt 1:10,11; compare 1 Esdras 1; Baruch 1:8), king of Judah.

(2) In 1 Esdras 8:33 the King James Version for JESIAS (which see).

JOSIBIAH jos-i-bi'-a. See JOSHIBIAH.

JOSIPHIAH

jos-i-fi'-a (yociphyah, "Yah adds"): Found in Ezr 8:10, where Massoretic Text is "and of the sons of .... Shelomith the son of Josiphiah." With the help of Septuagint A and 1 Esdras 8:36, the name "Bani" (which is the same in the unpointed text as "the sons of" and was omitted through haplography) can be supplied above before "Shelomith." Josiphia is thus the father of Shelomith, one of Ezra's companions. 1 Esdras 8:36 has "Josaphias."

JOT

jot: "Jot" (Revised Version, later editions of the King James Version) is a corruption of iote (early editions of the King James Version, Geneva, Rheims, Bishops'—pronounced i-o'te), an English transliteration of iota, the 9th letter of the Greek alphabet (Mt 5:18 parallel). "Iota," in turn, is the nearest Greek equivalent for the Hebrew yodh ("y"), the smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet, in New Testament times being little larger than an English accent ('). The tittle (which see) is the smallest part of a letter (not part of a y, however). Consequently, thinking of the law as written out, the sense of Mt 5:17, is: "From this code, so written, not the smallest letter nor part of a letter—not an 'i' nor the crossing of a 't'—shall be erased until all things come to pass." (For the meaning, see LAW.) The reference is to the synagogue rolls, which were written in Hebrew, so that the passage has no bearing on the language used by Christ. For the form of the "jot," compare the tables in HDB, article "Alphabet,"

more fully in Chwolson, . Corp. Inscr. Hebrew. (1882).

See TITTLE.

Burton Scott Easton

JOTAPATA

jo-tap’-a-ta (BJ, III, iii, 7).

See JOTBATHAH.

JOTBAH

jot’-ba (yoTbah, "pleasantness"): The home of Meshullemeth, the mother of King Amon, daughter of Haruz (2Ki 21:19). It may be the same as JOTBATHAH (which see).

JOTBATHAH

jot’-ba-tha (yoTbathah): A desert camp of the Israelites between Hor-hagidgad and Abronah (Nu 33:33,34; De 10:7). It was "a land of brooks of water" (De 10:7). Site is unknown.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

JOTHAM

jo’-tham (yotham, "Yahweh is perfect"; Ioatham):

(1) The youngest son of Gideon-Jerubbaal, the sole survivor of the massacre of his seventy brothers by Abimelech (Jud 9:5), and (by Jud 8:22) the legitimate ruler of Shechem after their death. Recognizing, however, that he is powerless to assert his claim, Jotham delivers from the summit of Gerizim his famous fable (Jud 9:7-15), applies it to the situation in hand, and then flees for his life to Beer (Jud 9:21). Nothing more is told of him, but the downfall of Abimelech is referred in part to his "curse" (Jud 9:57). The fable tells of the kingship of the trees which, after having been declined by all useful plants, was finally offered to the bramble. The latter, inflated by its unexpected dignity, pompously offers its "shade’ to its faithful subjects, while threatening all traitors with punishment (brambles carry forest fires), quite in the manner of an oriental monarch on assuming the throne. Having thus parodied the relationship of the worthless Abimelech to the Shechemites, Jotham ironically wishes both parties joy of their bargain, which will end in destruction for all concerned. Otherwise the connection between the fable and its application is loose, for, while the fable depicts the kingship as refused by all properly qualified persons, in the application the Shechemites are upbraided for their treachery and their murder

of the rightful heirs. In fact, the fable taken by itself would seem rather to be a protest against kings as a class (compare 1Sa 8:10-18; 12:19, etc.); so it is possible that either the fable or its application has become expanded in transmission. Or an older fable may have been used for the sake of a single salient point, for nothing is more common than such an imperfect reapplication of fables, allegories and parables.

Burton Scott Easton

(2) Twelfth king of Judah, son of Uzziah and Jerusha, daughter of Zadok (2Ki 15:32-38; 2Ch 27:1-9).

1. Accession and Regency:

Jotham was 25 years of age at the time of his father's attack of leprosy, and was at once called upon to take the administration of the kingdom (2Ki 15:5; 2Ch 26:21). In doing this he not only judged the people of the land by presiding at the administration of justice, but also was over the household of the king, showing how complete was the isolation of his father. He was thus king in all but name, and is invariably spoken of as reigning in Jerusalem. His reign lasted for 16 years (2Ki 15:33; 2Ch 27:1), 759-744 (others put later). While the father loved husbandry and had much cattle (2Ch 26:10)—external affairs with which he could occupy himself in his retirement—to the son fell the sterner duties and heavier responsibilities of the state.

2. The War with Ammon:

The relation between father and son is well brought out in the Chronicler's account of the Ammonite war. In 2Ch 26:8 we are told that "the Ammonites gave tribute (the King James Version "gifts") to Uzziah," such gifts being compulsory, and of the nature of tribute. In 2Ch 27:5 we are told that the actual conquest of Ammon was made by Jotham, and that for 3 successive years he compelled them to pay an annual subsidy of 100 talents of silver and 10,000 "cors" each of wheat and barley (the cor (Hebrew kor) was about 10 bushels). The campaign on the East of the Jordan was the only one in which Jotham took part, but as the state suffered no loss of territory during his regency, the external provinces must have been strongly held and well governed.

3. Jotham's Building Operations:

It is probable that before attempting to win any extension of territory, Jotham had spent some years in completing the unfinished building schemes in which his father was engaged at the time of his affliction. Like him, he became an enthusiastic builder (2Ch 27:3,4). He is recorded to have built towers, castles and cities, and specifically to have completed the Ophel wall in Jerusalem, which is still standing to the South of the Haram area. But the crowning architectural glory of his reign was the completion of the temple court by erecting, or setting up, "the upper gate of the house of Yahweh" (2Ch 27:3; 2Ki 15:35). This particular gate was the entrance to, and exit from, the upper or new court of the temple, which had been begun so long ago as the time of Asa (compare the writer's Solomon's Temple, Part II, chapter

viii). Its situation is perfectly known, as it bore the same name and place in the Herodian temple as in each of its predecessors. It stood facing the South, and was on higher ground than any other of the temple gates. Hence, its name. It gave entrance to that upper court of the temple, mentioned in Jer 36:10, where it is spoken of as "the new gate of Yahweh's house." As Jeremiah began his ministry about a century after Jotham's death, Jeremiah's use of the name commemorates the fact that the gate was not built till long after the other parts of the structure.

4. The Syrian League:

During Jotham's regency, a formidable combination of the Northern Kingdom and the Syrian state, with Damascus as capital, began to show signs of hostility to Judah. For 4 years before Jotham's death, Pekah occupied the throne of Samaria. The Assyrian king, Tiglath-pileser III, was then pushing his arms westward, and a Syrian league was formed to oppose them. Jotham may have refused to join this league. The political situation at his death is thus described: "In those days Yahweh began to send against Judah Rezin the king of Syria, and Pekah the son of Remaliah" (2Ki 15:37).

5. Condition of Judah:

Jotham's character is represented in a moderately favorable light, it being put to his credit that he did not enter the temple (2Ch 27:2). The wisdom and vigor of his administration, and of his policy for the defense of the country, are recognized. It was owing to his completion of his father's plans for the protection of Jerusalem, and of the building of country fortresses, that Hezekiah, a few years afterward, was able to show so stout a resistance to Sennacherib. But within the state itself corruption and oppression were rife. The great prophets, Isaiah, Hosea and Micah, exercised their ministries in Jotham's days, and in their pages we have graphic picture of the moral condition of the time. Isa does not name Jotham, except in the title (Isa 1:1; compare 7:1), but Isaiah 1-5 of his book were probably written in this reign. Hosea's writings go back to the last years of Jeroboam II, who died the year Jotham came to the throne. Micah's evidence is valuable, telling us that Omri had formulated and published rules for the cult of the Zidonian Baal, and that these "statutes" were kept by some of the citizens of Samaria, and, possibly, of Jerusalem (Mic 6:16).

Jotham's name appears in the royal genealogical list of 1Ch 3:12, and in the genealogy of Jesus (Mt 1:9).

(3) A Calebite (1Ch 2:47 the King James Version).

W. Shaw Caldecott

JOURNEY

jur'-ni.

See DAY’S JOURNEY; SABBATH DAY’S JOURNEY.

JOY

joi (simchah; chara):

1. Terms:

The idea of joy is expressed in the Old Testament by a wealth of synonymous terms that cannot easily be differentiated. The commonest is simchah (1Sa 18:6, etc.), variously translated in English Versions of the Bible "joy," "gladness," "mirth"; from sameah, properly "to be bright," "to shine" (Pr 13:9, "The light of the righteous rejoiceth," literally, "is bright"), but generally used figuratively "to rejoice," "be glad" (Le 23:40 and very frequent).

Other nouns are masos and sason, both from sus, properly "to spring," "leap," hence, "exult," "rejoice"; rinnah, "shouting." "joy"; gil, from verb gil or gul, "to go in a circle," hence, "be excited" (dancing round for joy), "rejoice." In the New Testament, far the commonest are chara, "joy," chairo, "to rejoice" (compare charis, "grace"). But we have also agalliasis, which expresses "exuberant joy," "exultation" (not used in classical Greek, but often in the Septuagint; in the New Testament, Lu 1:14,44; Ac 2:46; Jude 1:24; Heb 1:9), and the corresponding verb agalliaoo (-aomai), "to exult," "rejoice exceedingly" (Mt 5:12, etc.). In English Versions of the Bible we have sometimes "to joy" (now obsolete as a verb), used in an intransitive sense =" to rejoice" (Hab 3:18; 2Co 7:13, etc.).

2. In the Old Testament:

Besides joy in a general sense, as the response of the mind to any pleasurable event or state (1Ki 1:40; Es 8:17, etc.), joy as a religious emotion is very frequently referred to in the Old Testament. Religion is conceived of as touching the deepest springs of emotion, including the feeling of exultant gladness which often finds outward expression in such actions as leaping, shouting, and singing. Joy is repeatedly shown to be the natural outcome of fellowship with God. "In thy presence is fullness of joy; in thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Ps 16:11; compare 16:8,9). God is at once the source (Ps 4:7; 51:12) and the object (Ps 35:9; Isa 29:19) of religious joy. The phrase "rejoice (be glad) in Yahweh" and similar. expressions are of frequent occurrence (e.g. Ps 97:12; 149:2; Isa 61:10; Zec 10:7). Many aspects of the Divine character call forth this emotion, such as His lovingkindness (Ps 21:6,7; 31:7), His salvation (Ps 21:1; Isa 25:9; Hab 3:18), His laws and statutes (Ps 12; 119 passim), His judgments (Ps 48:11), His words of comfort in dark days (Jer 15:15,16). The fundamental fact of the sovereignty of God, of the equity of the Divine government of the world, gives to the pious a joyous sense of security in life (Ps 93:1 f; 96:10; 97:1) which breaks forth into songs of praises in which even inanimate Nature is poetically called upon to join (Ps 96:11-13; 98:4-9). In the case of those who held such views of God, it was natural that the service of God should elicit a joyous spirit ("I will offer in his tabernacle sacrifices of joy," Ps 27:6; compare 1Ch 29:9), a spirit which is abundantly manifest in the jubilant shouting with which religious festivities were celebrated, and the trumpet-sound which accompanied certain sacrifices

(2Sa 6:15; Ps 33:1-3; Nu 10:10; 2Ch 29:27), and especially in psalms of praise, thanksgiving and adoration (Psalms 47; 81; 100, etc.). "Rejoice before Yahweh your God" is an oft-repeated phrase in De with reference to the sacrificial feast (e.g. 12:12). But joy is a Divine, as well as a human, emotion; for God Himself is represented in the Old Testament, not as a rigid, impassible Being, but as susceptible to pleasure and pain. God may be conceived of as "rejoicing in his works" (Ps 104:31; compare Ge 1:31), and over His people "for good" (De 30:9). "He will rejoice over thee (Zion) with joy; he will rest in his love; he will joy over thee with singing" (Ze 3:17). Such noble and vivid anthropomorphisms are a nearer approach to the truth than the abstract doctrine of the impassibility of God which, owing to Platonic influences, dominated theology of the early Christian centuries.

3. In the New Testament:

The element of joy in religion is still more prominent in the New Testament. It is the appropriate response of the believer to the "good tidings of great joy" which constitute the gospel (Lu 2:10). In the four Gospels, especially Luke, this element is conspicuous. It is seen in the canticles of Lu 1 and 2. It is both exemplified in the life and character, and set forth in the teaching of Jesus. There are many intimations that, in spite of the profound elements of grief and tragedy in His life, His habitual demeanor was gladsome and joyous, certainly not gloomy or ascetic: such as, His description of Himself as bridegroom, in defense of His disciples for not fasting (Mr 2:18-20); the fact that He came "eating and drinking," giving occasion to the charge that He was "a gluttonous man and a winebibber" (Mt 11:19); His "rejoicing in the Holy Spirit" (Lu 10:21); the fact that His presence was found to be congenial at social festivities (Mr 14:3; Lu 14:1; Joh 12:1), and at the wedding in Cana (Joh 2:1); His mention of "my joy" (Joh 15:11; 17:13). His teaching with reference to His followers harmonizes with this. The Christian virtues confer on those who attain them not only beatitude, a calm and composed state of felicity (Mt 5:3-11), but also a more exuberant state of joy, which is in sharp contrast to the "sad countenance" of the hypocrites (Mt 6:16) ("Rejoice, and be exceeding glad", Mt 5:12). This spirit is reflected in many of the parables. The discovery of the true treasure of life brings joy (Mt 13:44). The three parables in Lu 15 reveal the joy of the Divine heart itself at the repentance of sinners (see especially 15:5-7,9,10,22-24,32). The parable of the Talents lays stress on the "joy of the Lord" which is the reward of faithfulness (Mt 25:21,23). Jesus confers on His followers not only peace (Joh 14:27; 16:33), but participation in His own fullness of joy (Joh 15:11; 16:24; 17:13), a joy which is permanent, in contrast to the sorrow which is transient (Joh 16:22). In the dark days of disappointment that succeeded the crucifixion, the joy of the disciples passed under a cloud, but at the resurrection (Lu 24:41) and still more on the day of Pentecost it emerged into light, and afterward remained a marked characteristic of the early church (Ac 2:46 f; 8:39; 13:52; 15:3). Paul speaks of joy as one of the fruits of the spirit (Ga 5:22) and of "joy in the Holy Spirit" as an essential mark of the kingdom of God (Ro 14:17). This joy is associated with faith (Php 1:25), hope (Ro 5:2; 12:12), brotherly fellowship and sympathy (Ro 12:15; 2Co 7:13; Php 2:1 f). To rejoice in the Lord is enjoined as a Christian duty (Php 3:1; 4:4; compare 2:17 f; 1Th 5:16). In Christ, the Christian "rejoices with joy unspeakable and full of glory" (1Pe 1:8), in spite of his temporary afflictions (1Pe 1:6). Christian joy is no mere gaiety that knows no gloom, but is the result of the triumph of faith over adverse and trying circumstances, which, instead of hindering, actually enhance it (Ac 5:41; Ro 5:3 f; Jas 1:2,12; 5:11; 1Pe 4:13; compare Mt 5:11,12). Even our Lord Himself "for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising

shame" (Heb 12:2).

D. Miall Edwards

JOZABAD

joz’-a-bad (yozabhadh, "Yahweh has bestowed"):

(1) A Gederathite, and one of David’s recruits at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4 (Hebrew 5)). He is named with the Benjamites, but possibly he was a native of the town Gedara in Southern Judah. See Curtis, Chronicles, 196.

(2), (3) Two Manassite captains who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20 (Hebrew 21)).

(4) A Levite overseer in Hezekiah’s time (2Ch 31:13); may be the ancestor of the chief of the priests in 2Ch 35:9 =" Joram" of 1 Esdras 1:9.

(5) A Levite (Ezr 8:33), mentioned again probably in Ezr 10:23; Ne 8:7; 11:16. The name in 1 Esdras 8:63 (= Ezr 8:33) is "Josabdus" (the King James Version "Josabad").

(6) A priest who had married a foreign wife Ezr 10:22) =" Ocidelus" of 1 Esdras 9:22.

JOZABDUS

jo-zab’-dus (Iozabdos):

(1) Son of Jeshua the Levite (1 Esdras 8:63), called "Jozabad" in Ezr 8:33.

(2) Son of Bebai (1 Esdras 9:29), called "Zabbai" in Ezr 10:28.

JOZACAR

joz’-a-kar, jo-za’-kar (yozakhar, "Yahweh has remembered"; the King James Version Jozachar): Servant and murderer (with Jehozabad)of Joash, king of Judah (2Ki 12:21 (Hebrew 22)); called "Zabad" in 2Ch 24:26. Many manuscripts have "Jozabad" in 2 Kings.

JOZADAK

joz’-a-dak.

See JEHOZADAK.

JUBAL

joo'-bal (yubhal; for meaning see JABAL): Son of Lamech by Adah, and inventor of musical instruments (Ge 4:21).

JUBILEE YEAR

(shenath ha-yobhel; etos tes apheseos; annus jubilaeus, "year of jubilee" (Le 25:13), or simply ha-yobhel, "the jubilee" (Le 25:28; compare Nu 36:4), the King James Version and the English Revised Version Jubile): The Hebrew word yobhel stands for qeren ha-yobhel, meaning the horn of a ram. Now, such a horn can be made into a trumpet, and thus the word yobhel came to be used as a synonym of trumpet. According to Le 25:9 a loud trumpet should proclaim liberty throughout the country on the 10th day of the 7th month (the Day of Atonement), after the lapse of 7 sabbaths of years = 49 years. In this manner, every 50th year was to be announced as a jubilee year. All real property should automatically revert to its original owner (Le 25:10; compare 25:13), and those who, compelled by poverty, had sold themselves as slaves to their brothers, should regain their liberty (Le 25:10; compare 25:39).

In addition to this, the Jubilee Year was to be observed after the manner of the sabbatic year, i.e. there should be neither sowing nor reaping nor pruning of vines, and everybody was expected to live on what the fields and the vineyards produced "of themselves," and no attempt should be made at storing up the products of the land (Le 25:11 f). Thus there are three distinct factors constituting the essential features of the Jubilee Year: personal liberty, restitution of property, and what we might call the simple life.

1. Personal Liberty:

The 50th year was to be a time in which liberty should be proclaimed to all the inhabitants of the country. We should, indeed, diminish the import of this institution if we should apply it only to those who were to be freed from the bonds of physical servitude. Undoubtedly, they must have been the foremost in realizing its beneficial effects. But the law was intended to benefit all, the masters as well as the servants. They should never lose sight of their being brothers and citizens of theocratic kingdom. They owed their life to God and were subject to His sovereign will. Only through loyalty to Him were they free and could ever hope to be free and independent of all other masters.

2. Restitution of Property:

The institution of the Jubilee Year should become the means of fixing the price of real property (Le 25:15 f; compare 25:25-28); moreover, it should exclude the possibility of selling any piece of land permanently (Le 25:23), the next verse furnishing the motive: "The land is mine: for ye are strangers and sojourners with me." The same rule was to be applied to dwelling-houses outside of the walled cities (Le 25:31), and also to the houses owned by Levites, although they were built within walled cities (Le

25:32).

In the same manner the price of Hebrew slaves was to vary according to the proximity of the Jubilee Year (Le 25:47-54). This passage deals with the enslaving of a Hebrew by a foreigner living among the Jews; it goes without saying that the same rule would hold good in the case of a Hebrew selling himself to one of his own people. In Le 27:17-25 we find a similar arrangement respecting such lands that were "sanctified unto Yahweh." In all these cases the original owner was at liberty to redeem his property at any time, or have it redeemed by some of his nearest relatives (25:25-27,29,48 ff; 27:19).

The crowning feature, though, was the full restitution of all real property in the Jubilee Year. The primary object of this regulation was, of course, the reversion of all hereditary property to the family which originally possessed it, and the reestablishment of the original arrangement regarding the division of the land. But that was not all; for this legal disposition and regulation of external matters was closely connected with the high calling of the Jewish people. It was a part of the Divine plan looking forward to the salvation of mankind. "The deepest meaning of it (the Jubilee Year) is to be found in the apokatastasis tes basileias tou theou, i.e. in the restoring of all that which in the course of time was perverted by man’s sin, in the removing of all slavery of sin, in the establishing of the true liberty of the children of God, and in the delivering of the creation from the bondage of corruption to which it was subjected on account of man’s depravity" (Ro 8:19)(compare Keil, Manual of Biblical Archaeology). In the Year of Jubilee a great future era of Yahweh’s favor is foreshadowed, that period which, according to Isa 61:1-3, shall be ushered in to all those that labor and are heavy laden, by Him who was anointed by the spirit of the Lord Yahweh.

3. The Simple Life:

The Jubilee Year, being the crowning point of all sabbatical institutions, gave the finishing touch as it were to the whole cycle of sabbatic days, months and years. It is, therefore, quite appropriate that it should be a year of rest for the land like the preceding sabbatic year (Le 25:11 f). It follows, of course, that in this instance there were two years, one after the other, in which there should be no sowing or systematic ingathering. This seems to be clear from Le 25:18-22: "And ye shall sow the eighth year, and eat of the fruits, the old store; until the ninth year, until its fruits come in, ye shall eat the old store." Thus in the 7th and 8th years the people were to live on what the fields had produced in the 6th year and whatever grew spontaneously. This shows the reason why we may say that one of the factors constituting the Jubilee Year was the "simple life." They could not help but live simply for two consecutive years. Nobody can deny that this afforded ample opportunity to develop the habit of living within very limited means. And again we see that this external part of the matter did not fully come up to the intention of the Lawgiver. It was not the simple life as such that He had in view, but rather the laying down of its moral and religious foundations. In this connection we must again refer to Le 25:18-22, "What shall we eat the seventh year?" The answer is very simple and yet of surpassing grandeur: "Then I will command my blessing upon you," etc. Nothing was expected of the people but faith in Yahweh and confidence in His power, which was not to be shaken by any doubtful reflection. And right here we have found the root of the simple life: no life without the true God, and no simplicity of life without true faith in Him. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of

God" (Mt 4:4; compare De 8:3).

We may well ask: Did the Jewish people ever observe the Jubilee Year? There is no reason why they should not have observed it in pre-exilic times (compare Lotz in The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, X, under the word "Sabbatical Year" and "Year of Jubilee"). Perhaps they signally failed in it, and if so, we should not be surprised at all. Not that the institution in itself was cumbered with any obstacles that could not have been overcome; but what is more common than unbelief and unwillingness to trust absolutely in Yahweh? Or, was it observed in post-exilic times? Here, too, we are in the dark. There is, indeed, a tradition according to which the Jubilee Year has never been observed—neither in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah nor at any later period. The truth of this seems to be corroborated by the silence of Josephus, who, while referring quite frequently to the sabbatic year, never once mentions the Year of Jubilee.

William Baur

JUBILEE, CYCLE OF THE

joo’-bi-le, ju’-bi-le.

See Luni-solar cycle, under ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

JUBILEES, BOOK OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

JUCAL

joo’-kal.

See JEHUCAL.

JUDA

joo’-da: Lu 1:39 the King James Version, see JUTTAH; Lu 3:26, see JODA; 3:30, see JUDAS.

JUDAEA

joo-de’-a, ju-de’-a (Ioudaia): The "land of the Jews," the Greco-Roman equivalent of Judah. As most of the Israelites returning from the captivity belonged to the tribe of Judah, they came to be called Jews and their land Judea. In Tobit 1:18 the name is applied to the old kingdom of Judah. For a general

description of the physical geography and early history of this region see JUDAH. The limits of this district varied greatly, extending as the Jewish population increased, but in many periods with very indefinite boundaries.

Under the Persian empire, Judea (or Judah) was a district administered by a governor who, like Zerubbabel (Hag 1:14; 2:2), was probably usually a Jew. Even as late as Judas Maccabeus, Hebron and its surroundings—the very heart of old Judah was under the domination of the Edomites, whom, however, Judas conquered (1 Macc 5:65); in the time of his brother Jonathan (145 BC), three tetrarchies of Samaria, Aphaerema, Lydda and Ramathaim, were added to Judea (1 Macc 10:30,38; 11:34); in some passages it is referred to at this time as the "land of Judah" (Iouda) (1 Macc 10:30,33,37). The land was then roughly limited by what may be called the "natural boundaries of Judah" (see JUDAH).

Strabo (xvi.11, 21) extends the name Judea to include practically all Palestine; as does Lu (4:44 m; 23:5; Ac 2:9; 10:37, etc.). In several New Testament references (Mt 4:25; Mr 1:5; 3:7; Lu 5:17; Joh 3:22; Ac 1:8), Judea is contrasted with its capital Jerusalem. The country bordering on the shores of the Dead Sea for some miles inland was known as the Wilderness of Judea (see JUDAH; JESHIMON) (Mt 3:1), or "the wilderness" (Mr 1:4; Lu 3:2); here John the Baptist appeared as a preacher. According to Mt 19:1 (but compare Mr 10:1, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "Judaea and beyond Jordan"), some cities beyond Jordan belonged to Judea. That this was an actual fact we know from Ptolemy (v.16,9) and Josephus (Ant., XII, iv, 11).

According to Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 5), Judea extended from Anuath-Borkaeos (i.e. Khan Berkit near Khan es Saweh, close to the most northerly frontier of Judah as described in JUDAH (which see)) to the village Jordan, possibly Tell ‘Arad, near Arabia in the South. Its breadth was from Joppa in the West to Jordan in the East. The seacoast also as far north as Ptolemais (‘Akka), except Jamnia, Joppa and (according to the Talm) Caesarea, belonged to this province.

After the death of Herod the Great, Archelaus received Judea, Samaria and Idumea as his ethnarchy, but on his deposition Judea was absorbed into the Roman province of Syria, the procurator of which lived at Caesarea.

Of later history it is only necessary to notice that in the 5th century Judea became part of the land known as Palaestina Prima; that at the time of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem (12th century) all the hill country of Judah from Sinjil to Tekoa was the royal domain, while the southern section to Beersheba belonged to the Seigneur de Abraham (i.e. of Hebron); and lastly that a district, the rough equivalent of the kingdom of Judah, though larger, and of the Judea described by Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 5), though slightly smaller, forms today the Mutaserraflic of el Kuds, an administrative area where more than in any spot in the world the problem of the "land of the Jews" is today increasingly acute.

E. W. G. Masterman

JUDAEA, WILDERNESS OF

(Mt 3:1).

See JUDAEA.

JUDAH (1)

joo’-da (yehudhah, "praised"):

(1) 4th son of Jacob by Leah (see separate article).

(2) An ancestor of Kadmiel, one of those who had the oversight of the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 3:9). He is the same as Hodaviah (Ezr 2:40), and Hodevah (Ne 7:43).

(3) A Levite who had taken a strange wife (Ezr, 10:23).

(4) A Levite who came up with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:8).

(5) A priest and musician who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:36); (3), (4) and (5) may be the same person.

(6) A Benjamite, the son of Hassenuah, who was second over the city of Jerusalem in the days of Nehemiah (Ne 11:9).

(7) One of the princes of Judah who took part in the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:34).

S. F. Hunter

JUDAH (2)

(yehudah; in Ge 29:35 Codex Vaticanus, Ioudan; Codex Alexandrinus, Iouda; elsewhere Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, Ioudas):

1. Jacob’s Son:

The 4th son born to Jacob by Leah in Paddan-aram (Ge 29:35, etc.). Of this patriarch’s life only scanty details remain to us. He turned his brethren from their purpose to slay Joseph, persuading them to sell him to the Midianites at Dothan (Ge 37:26). A dark stain is left upon his memory by the disgraceful story told in Genesis 38. Reuben forfeited the rights of primogeniture by an act of infamy; Simeon and Levi, who came next in order, were passed over because of their cruel and treacherous conduct at Shechem; to Judah, therefore, were assigned the honors and responsibilities of the firstborn (34; 35:22;

49:5 ff). On the occasion of their first visit to Egypt, Reuben acted as spokesman for his brethren (42:22,37). Then the leadership passed to Judah (43:3, etc.). The sons of Joseph evidently looked askance upon Judah's promotion, and their own claims to hegemony were backed by considerable resources (49:22 ff). The rivalry between the two tribes, thus early visible, culminated in the disruption of the kingdom. To Judah, the "lion's whelp," a prolonged dominion was assured (49:9 ff).

2. Tribe of Judah:

The tribe of Judah, of which the patriarch was the name-father, at the first census in the wilderness numbered 74,600 fighting men; at Sinai the number "from 20 years old and upward" was 76,500 (Nu 1:27; 26:22; see NUMBERS). The standard of the camp of Judah, with which were also the tribes of Zebulun and Issachar, was to the East of the tabernacle "toward the sunrising," the prince of Judah being Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (Nu 2:3). Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, represented Judah among the spies (Nu 13:6); he also was told off to assist at the future allocation of the tribal portions (Nu 34:19).

3. Territory:

The land assigned to Judah lay in the South of Palestine (see JUDAH, TERRITORY OF), comprising part of the mountain, the Shephelah, and the maritime plain. The information given of its conquest is meager and cannot be arranged in a self-consistent story. In Jos 11:21 ff, the conquest is ascribed to Joshua. Caleb is described as conquering at least a portion in Jos 14:12; 15:13 ff; while in Jud 1 the tribes of Judah and Simeon play a conspicuous part; and the latter found a settlement in the South within the territory of Judah The tribal organization seems to have been maintained after the occupation of the land, and Judah was so loosely related to the northern tribes that it was not expected to help them against Sisera. Deborah has no reproaches for absent Judah. It is remarkable that no judge over Israel (except Othniel, Jud 3:9-11) arose from the tribe of Judah. The first king of all Israel was chosen from the tribe of Benjamin. This made acquiescence on the part of Judah easier than it would have been had Saul sprung from the ancient rival, Ephraim. But the dignity of Judah was fully vindicated by the splendid reigns of David and Solomon, in lineal descent from whom the Saviour of the world should come. The further history of the tribe is merged in that of Israel.

W. Ewing

JUDAH AT (UPON) THE JORDAN

(yehudhah ha-yarden): A place marking the eastern limit of the territory of Naphtali (Jos 19:34). It is generally thought among scholars that the text is corrupt; but no very probable emendation has been suggested. Thomson (L B, II, 466) proposes to identify it with Seiyid Jehuda, a small white-domed sanctuary about 3 miles to the Southeast of Tell el-Qady.

JUDAH, KINGDOM OF

I. CANAAN BEFORE THE MONARCHY

1. The Coming of the Semites

2. The Canaanites

3. The Israelite Confederacy

4. Migration into Canaan

5. The Bond of Union

6. Early Rulers

7. The Judges

8. Hereditary Kings

II. THE FIRST THREE KINGS

1. The Benjamite King

2. Rachel and Leah Tribes

3. The Disruption

III. THE DUAL MONARCHY

1. War between Two Kingdoms

2. First Reform of Religion

3. Two Kingdoms at Peace

4. Two Kingdoms Contrasted

5. Revolution in the Northern Kingdom

6. Effect on the Southern Kingdom

7. Davidic House at Lowest Ebb

8. Begins to Recover

9. Reviving Fortunes

10. Monarchy Still Elective

11. Government by Regents

12. Period of Great Prosperity

13. Rise of Priestly Caste

14. Advent of Assyria

15. Judah a Protectorate

16. Cosmopolitan Tendencies

IV. PERIOD OF DECLINE

1. Judah Independent

2. Reform of Religion

3. Egypt and Judah

4. Traffic in Horses

5. Reaction under Manasseh

6. Triumph of Reform Party

7. Babylonia and Judah

8. End of Assyrian Empire

9. After Scythian Invasion

10. Judah Again Dependent

11. Prophets Lose Influence

12. The Deportations

13. Summary

I. Canaan before the Monarchy.

1. The Coming of the Semites:

Some 4,000 years BC the land on either side of the valley of the Jordan was peopled by a race who, to whatever stock they belonged, were not Semites. It was not until about the year 2500 BC that the tide of Sere immigration began to flow from North Arabia into the countries watered by the Jordan and the Euphrates. One of the first waves in this human tide consisted of the Phoenicians who settled in the Northwest, on the seashore; they were closely followed by other Canaan tribes who occupied the country which long bore their name.

2. The Canaanites:

The Canaanites are known to us chiefly from the famous letters found at Tell Amarna in Egypt which describe the political state of the country during the years 1415-1360 BC—the years of the reigns of Amenophis III and IV. Canaan was at this time slipping out of the hands of Egypt. The native princes were in revolt: tribute was withheld; and but few Egyptian garrisons remained. Meantime a fresh tide of invasion was hurling its waves against the eastern frontiers of the land. The newcomers were, like their predecessors, Semitic Bedouin from the Syrian desert. Among them the Tell el-Amarna Lettersname the Chabiri, who are, no doubt, the people known to us as the Hebrews.

3. The Israelite Confederacy:

The Hebrews are so named by those of other nationality after one of their remoter ancestors (Ge 10:24), or because they had come from beyond (‘ebher) the Jordan or the Euphrates. Of themselves they spoke collectively as Israel. Israel was a name assumed by the eponymous hero of the nation whose real name was Jacob. Similarly the Arabian prophet belonged to the tribe called from its ancestor Koraish, whose name was Fihr. The people of Israel were a complex of some 12 or 13 tribes. These 12 tribes were divided into two main sections, one section tracing its descent from Leah, one of Jacob’s wives, and the other section tracing its descent from Rachel, his other wife. The names of the tribes which claimed to be descended from Leah were Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Zebulun, and, indirectly, Gad and Asher; those which claimed to be descended from Rachel were Joseph, which was divided into two clans; Ephraim and Manasseh, Benjamin, and, indirectly, Da and Naphtali. The rivalry between these two great divisions runs all through the national history of the Hebrews, and was only brought to an end by the annihilation of one of the opposing factions (Isa 11:13). But not only was the Israelite nation a

combination of many clans; it was united also to other tribes which could not claim descent, from Israel or Jacob. Such tribes were the Kenites and the Calebites. Toward such the pure Israelite tribes formed a sort of aristocracy, very much as, to change the parallel, the tribe of Koraish did among the Arabs. It was rarely that a commander was appointed from the allied tribes, at least in the earlier years of the national life.

4. Migration into Canaan:

We find exactly the same state of things obtaining in the history of the Arabian conquests. All through that history there runs the rivalry between the South Arabian tribes descended from Kahtan (the Hebrew Joktan, Ge 10:25, etc.) and the northern or Ishmaelite tribes of Modar. It is often stated that the Old Testament contains two separate and irreconcilable accounts of the conquest of Canaan by the Israelites. According to the Book of Joshua, it is said the invasion was a movement of the whole people of Israel under the leadership of Joshua; according to the Book of Judges, it consisted of a series of expeditions made by individual tribes each on its own account (Jud 1:2,10, etc.). But again, in the history of the Arabs we find precisely the same apparent discrepancy. For Persia, Syria and Egypt were conquered by the Arabs as a whole; but at the same time no tribe lost its individuality; each tribe made expeditions on its own account, and turned its arms against rival tribes even in the enemy's country. On the confines of China in the East and in Spain on the West, the arms of the Yemen's tribes were employed in the destruction of those of Modar as fiercely as ever they had been within Arabia itself.

5. The Bond of Union:

The bond which united the Israelite tribes, as well as those of Kayin (the eponym of the Kenites) and Caleb, was that of the common worship of Yahweh. As Mohammed united all the tribes of Arabia into one whole by the doctrine of monotheism, so did Moses the Israelite tribes by giving them a common object of worship. And the sherifs or descendants of 'Ali today occupy a position very like what the Levites and the descendants of Aaron must have maintained in Israel. In order to keep the Israelite nation pure, intermarriage with the inhabitants of the invaded country was forbidden, though the prohibition was not observed (Jud 3:5 f). So too, the Arab women were not permitted to marry non-Arabs during the first years of conquest.

6. Early Rulers:

It is customary to date the beginning of monarchy in Israel from Saul the son of Kish, but in point of fact many early leaders were kings in fact if not in name. Moses and Joshua may be compared with Mohammed and his caliph (properly khalifa) or "successor," Abu Bekr. Their word was law; they reigned supreme over a united nation. Moreover, the word "king" (melekh) often means, both in Hebrew and Arabic, nothing more than governor of a town, or local resident. There was more than one "king" of Midinn (Jud 8:12). Balak seems to have been only a king of Moab (Nu 22:4).

7. The Judges:

Before the monarchy proper, the people of Israel formed, in theory, a theocracy, as did also the Arabs under the caliphs. In reality they were ruled by temporary kings called judges (shopheT, the Carthaginian sufes). Their office was not hereditary, though there were exceptions (compare Jud 9). On the other hand, the government of the Northern Kingdom of Israel was practically an elective monarchy, so rarely were there more than two of the same dynasty. The judge again was usually appointed in order to meet some special crises, and theoretically ideal state of things was one in which there was no visible head of the state—a republic without a president. These intervals, however, always ended in disaster, and the appointment of another judge. The first king also was elected to cope with a specially serious crisis. The main distinction between judge and king was that the former, less than the latter, obscured the fact of the true King, upon the recognition of whom alone the continued existence of the nation depended. The rulers then became the "elders" or sheikhs of the tribes, and as these did not act in unison, the nation lost its solidarity and became an easy prey to any invader.

8. Hereditary Kings:

During the period of the Judges a new factor entered into the disturbed politics of Canaan. This was an invader who came not from the eastern and southern deserts, but from the western sea. Driven out of Crete by invaders from the mainland, the last remnants of the race of Minos found refuge on the shores of the country which ever after took from them the name it still bears—Philistin or Palestine. At the same time the Ammonites and Midianites were pressing into the country from the East (1Sa 11). Caught between these two opposing forces, the tribes of Israel were threatened with destruction. It was felt that the temporary sovereignty of the judge was no longer equal to the situation. The supreme authority must be permanent. It was thus the monarchy was founded. Three motives are given by tradition as leading up to this step. The pretext alleged by the elders or sheikhs is the worthlessness and incapacity of Samuel’s sons, who he intended should succeed him (1Sa 8). The immediate cause was the double pressure from the Philistines (1Sa 9:16) and the Ammonite king (1Sa 12:12). The real reason was that the system of government by elective kings or judges had proved a failure and had completely broken down. The times called for a hereditary monarchy.

II. The First Three Kings.

1. The Benjamite King:

The most warlike of the clans of Israel shortly before this had been that of Benjamin—one of the Rachel tribes. The national sanctuary, with the ark and the grandson of Aaron as priest, was at Bethel in their territory. Moreover, they had defeated the combined forces of the other tribes in two pitched battles. They had at last been defeated and almost exterminated, but they had recovered much of their strength and prestige (Jud 20; 1Sa 4:12). From this tribe the first king was chosen (see SAUL). He, however, proved unequal to his task. After some years spent in war with the Philistines and in repressing supposed disloyalty at home, he was defeated and killed.

Meantime, one of the less-known clans was coming to the front. The territory of the tribe of Judah lay in

the South. After its occupation (compare Jud 1:2,3), the tribe of Judah appears to have settled down to the care of its flocks and herds. It is not mentioned in the So of Deborah. None of the judges belonged to it, unless Ibzan, who seems to have been of little account (Jud 12:8 f). Under the leadership of DAVID (which see), this tribe now came to the front, and proved in the end to be endowed with by far the greatest vitality of all the tribes. It outlived them all, and survives to this day.

2. Rachel and Leah Tribes:

The Rachel tribes, led by Benjamin and Ephraim (2Sa 2; 3), resisted for some time the hegemony of Judah, but were obliged in the end to submit. Under David Israel became again a united whole. By making Jerusalem his capital on the borders of Judah and Benjamin, he did much to insure the continuance of this union (compare 1Ch 9:3). The union, however, was only on the surface. By playing off the Rachel tribes, Benjamin and Ephraim, against the rest, Absalom was able to bring the whole structure to the ground (2Sa 15), the tribe to which Saul belonged being especially disloyal (2Sa 16:5). Nor was this the only occasion on which the smoldering enmity between the two houses burst out into flame (2Sa 20). As soon as the strong hand of David was removed, disaffection showed itself in several quarters (1Ki 11:14), and especially the aspiration of the tribe of Ephraim, after independence was fomented by the prophets (1Ki 11:26). Egypt afforded a convenient asylum for the disaffected until opportunity should ripen. They had not long to wait.

3. The Disruption:

Solomon was succeeded by Rehoboam, who found it politic to hold a coronation ceremony at Shechem as well, presumably, as at Jerusalem. The malcontents found themselves strong enough to dictate terms. These Rehoboam rejected, and the northern tribes at once threw off their allegiance to the dynasty of David. The disruption thus created in the Israelite nation was never again healed. The secession was like that of the Moors in Spain from the ‘Abbhsid caliphs. Henceforth "Israel," except in the Chronicler, denotes the Northern Kingdom only. In that writer, who does not recognize the kingdom of the ten tribes, it means Judah. It is usual at the present day to recognize in the Northern Kingdom the true Israelite kingdom. Certainly in point of extent of territory and in resources it was far the greater of the two. But as regards intellectual power and influence, even down to the present day, not to mention continuity of dynasty, the smaller kingdom is by far the more important. It is, therefore, treated here as the true representative of the nation. Lying, as it did, in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem, the tribe of Benjamin could hardly do otherwise than throw in its lot with that of Judah Bethel, which became one of the religious capitals of the Northern Kingdom, although nominally within their territory, in fact belonged to Ephraim (Jud 1:22). With this union of opposing interests may be compared that of the ‘Alids and ‘Abbhsids, both belonging to the house of Mohammed and both aspirants to the caliphate, against the house of Umeiya.

III. The Dual Monarchy.

1. War between Two Kingdoms:

Rehoboam made no decisive attempt to bring back the recalcitrant tribes to their allegiance (1Ki 12:21), though the two countries made raids, one upon the other (1Ki 14:30). For his own security he built numerous fortresses, the remains of some of which have, it is probable, been recovered within recent years (2Ch 11:5). These excited the suspicion of Shishak of Egypt, who invaded the country and reduced it to vassalage (1Ki 14:25). Under Rehoboam's son Abijah, actual war broke out between the two kingdoms (1Ki 15:6 as corrected in 15:7; 2Ch 13). The war was continued during the long reign of his son Asa, whose opponent, Baasha, built a fort some 6 miles North of Jerusalem in order to cut off that city from communication with the North Asa confessed his weakness by appealing for help to Ben-hadad of Damascus. The end justified the means. The fort was demolished.

2. First Reform of Religion:

The reign of Asa is also remarkable for the first of those reformations of worship which recur at intervals throughout the history of the Southern Kingdom. The high places Reform of were not yet, however, considered illegitimate (1Ki 15:14; but compare 2Ch 14:5). He also, like his grandfather, was a builder of castles, and with a similar, though more fortunate, result (2Ch 14:6,9). Asa's old age and illness helped to bring to the rival kingdoms a peace which lasted beyond his own reign (1Ki 15:23).

3. Two Kingdoms at Peace:

An effect of this peace is seen in the expanding foreign trade of the country under his successor Jehoshaphat. He rebuilt the navy as in the days of Solomon, but a storm ruined the enterprise (1Ki 22:48 f). During this reign the two kingdoms came nearer being united than they had done since the disruption. This was no doubt largely due to the Northern Kingdom having been greatly weakened by the wars with Syria and Assyria, and having given up the idea of annexing the smaller country. Moreover, Jehoshaphat had married his son Joram (Jehoram) to Ahab's daughter Athaliah. From a religious point of view, the two states reacted upon one another. Jehoram of Israel inaugurated a reformation of worship in the Northern Kingdom, and at the same time that of Judah was brought into line with the practice of the sister kingdom (2Ki 8:18). The peace, from a political point of view, did much to strengthen both countries, and enabled them to render mutual assistance against the common foe.

4. Two Kingdoms Contrasted:

Up to the death of Jehoram of Israel, which synchronized with that of Joram and Ahaziah of Judah, 6 kings had reigned in Judah Of these the first 4 died in their beds and were buried in their own mausoleum. During the same period of about 90 years there were in Israel 9 kings divided into 4 dynasties. The second king of the Ist Dynasty was immediately assassinated and the entire family annihilated. Precisely the same fate overtook the IId Dynasty. Then followed a civil war in which two pretenders were killed, one perishing by his own hand. The IIIrd Dynasty lasted longer than the first two and counted 4 kings. Of these one was defeated and killed in battle and another assassinated. The fate of the kings of Israel is very like that of the middle and later 'Abbasid caliphs. The murder of his brothers by the Judean Jehoram, a proceeding once regular with the sultans of Turkey, must also be put down to

the influence of his Israelite wife.

5. Revolution in the Northern Kingdom:

It was obvious that a crisis was impending. Edom and Libnah had thrown off their allegiance, and the Philistines had attacked and plundered Jerusalem, even the king's sons being taken prisoners, with the exception of the youngest (2Ch 21:16). Moreover, the two kingdoms had become so closely united, not only by intermarriage, but also in religion and politics, that they must stand and fall together. The hurricane which swept away the northern dynasty also carried off the members of the southern royal house more nearly connected with Ahab, and the fury of the queen-mother Athaliah made the destruction complete (2Ki 11:1).

6. Effect on the Southern Kingdom:

For 6 years the daughter of Ahab held sway in Jerusalem. The only woman who sat on the throne of David was a daughter of the hated Ahab. In her uniqueness, she thus holds a place similar to that of Shejered-Durr among the Memluk sultans of Egypt. The character of her reign is not described, but it can easily be imagined. She came to her inevitable end 6 years later.

7. Davidic House at Lowest Ebb:

Successive massacres had reduced the descendants of David until only one representative was left. Jehoram, the last king but one, had murdered all his brothers (2Ch 21:4); the Arab marauders had killed his sons except the youngest (2Ch 22:1; compare 21:17). The youngest, Ahaziah, after the death of his father, was, with 42 of his "brethren," executed by Jehu (2Ki 10:14). Finally, Athaliah "destroyed all the seed royal." The entente with the Northern Kingdom had brought the Davidic dynasty to the brink of extinction.

8. Begins to Recover:

But just as 'Abd er-Rahman escaped from the slaughter of the Umeiyads to found a new dynasty in Spain, so the Davidic dynasty made a fresh start under Joash. The church had saved the state, and naturally the years that followed were years in which the religious factor bulked large. The temple of Baal which Athaliah had built and supported was wrecked, the idols broken, and the priest killed. A fund was inaugurated for the repair of the national temple. The religious enthusiasm, however, quickly cooled. The priests were found to be diverting the fund for the restoration of the temple to their own uses. A precisely similar diversion of public funds occurred in connection with the Qarawiyin mosque in Fez under the Almoravids in the 12th century. The reign which had begun with so much promise ended in clouds and darkness (2Ki 12:17 ff; 2Ch 24:17 ff; Mt 23:35), and Joash was the first of the Judean kings to be assassinated by his own people (2Ki 12:20 f).

9. Reviving Fortunes:

By a curious coincidence, a new king ascended the throne of Syria, of Israel and of Judah about the same time. The death of Hazael, and accession of Ben-hadad III led to a revival in the fortunes of both of the Israelite kingdoms. The act of clemency with which Amaziah commenced his reign (2Ki 14:5,6; De 24:16) presents a pleasing contrast to the moral code which had come to prevail in the sister kingdom; and the story of his hiring mercenaries from the Ephraimite kingdom (2Ch 25:5-10) sheds a curious light on the relations subsisting between the two countries, and even on those times generally. It is still more curious to find him, some time after, sending, without provocation, a challenge to Jehoash; and the capture and release of Amaziah evinces some rudimentary ideas of chivalry (2Ki 14:8). The chief event of the reign was the reconquest of Edom and taking of Petra (2Ki 14:7).

10. Monarchy Still Elective:

The principle of the election of kings by the people was in force in Judah, although it seemed to be in abeyance since the people were content to limit their choice to the Davidic line. But it was exercised when occasion required. Joash had been chosen by the populace, and it was they who, when the public discontent culminated in the assassination of Amaziah, chose his 16-year-old son Uzziah (or Azariah) to succeed him.

11. Government by Regents:

The minority of the king involved something equivalent to a regency. As Jehoiada at first carried on the government for Joash, so Uzziah was at first under the tutelage of Zechariah (2Ch 26:5), and the latter part of his reign was covered by the regency of his son Jotham. It is obvious that with the unstable dynasties of the north, such government by deputy would have been impracticable.

12. Period of Great Prosperity:

The reign of Uzziah (2Ch 26) was one of the most glorious in the annals of the Judean kingdom. The Philistines and southern Arabs, who had been so powerful in the reign of Jehoram, were subdued, and other Bedouin were held in check. The frontiers were strengthened with numerous castles. Now that Edom was again annexed, the Red Sea trade was resumed. Irrigation was attended to, and the agricultural resources of the country were developed. Uzziah also established a standing army, properly equipped and trained. Artillery, in the shape of catapults and other siege engines, was manufactured. It is obvious that in this reign we have advanced far beyond the earlier and ruder times.

13. Rise of Priestly Caste:

In this and the preceding reigns, we notice also how the priests are becoming a distinct and powerful caste. Zadok and Abiathar were no more than the domestic chaplains of David. The kings might at pleasure discharge the functions of the priest. But the all-powerful position of Jehoiada seems to have given the order new life; and in the latter part of the reign of Uzziah, king and priest come into conflict,

and the king comes off second-best (2Ch 26:16).

14. Advent of Assyria:

Uzziah is the first king of Judah to be mentioned in the Assyrian annals. He was fighting against "Pul" in the years 742-740. The advent of the great eastern power upon the scene of Judean politics could end but in one way—as it was soon to do with Israel also. The reign of Jotham may be passed over as it coincided almost entirely with that of his father. But in the following reign we find Judah already paying tribute to Assyria in the year of the fall of Damascus and the conquest of the East-Jordan land, the year 734.

15. Judah a Protectorate:

During the regency of Jotham, the effeminacy and luxury of the Northern Kingdom had already begun to infect the Southern (Mic 1:9; 6:16), and under the irresolute Ahaz the declension went on rapidly. This rapprochement in morals and customs did not prevent Israel under Pekah joining with Rezin of Syria against Judah, with no less an object than to subvert the dynasty by placing an Aramean on the throne (Isa 7:6). What the result might have been, had not Isaiah taken the reins out of Ahaz' hands, it is impossible to say. As it was, Judah felt the strain of the conflict for many a year. The country was invaded from other points, and many towns were lost, some of which were never recovered (2Ch 28:17). In despair Ahaz placed himself and his country under the protection of Assyria (2Ki 16:7).

16. Cosmopolitan Tendencies:

It was a part of the cosmopolitan tendencies of the time that the worship became tarnished with foreign innovations (2Ki 16:10). The temple for the first time in its history was closed (2Ch 28:24). Altars of Baal were set up in all the open spaces of Jerusalem, each representing some urban god (Jer 11:13). About the closing of the temple Isaiah would not be greatly concerned. Perhaps it was his suggestion (compare Isa 1). The priests who were supreme in the preceding reigns had lost their influence: their place had been taken by the prophets. The introduction of Baalism, however, was no doubt due to Ahaz alone.

IV. Period of Decline.

1. Judah Independent:

The following reign—that of Hezekiah—was, perhaps as a result of the disappearance of the Northern Kingdom, a period of reformation. Isaiah is now supreme, and the history of the times will be found in his biography. It must have been with a sigh of relief that Hezekiah saw the Northern Kingdom disappear forever from the scene. The relations of the two countries had been too uniformly hostile to make that event anything but an omen for good. It was no doubt due to Isaiah that Hezekiah sought to recover the old independence of his country. Their patriotism went near to be their own undoing.

Sennacherib invaded Palestine, and Hezekiah found himself shorn of everything that was outside the walls of Jerusalem. Isaiah’s patriotism rose to the occasion; the invading armies melted away as by a miracle; Judah was once more free (2Ki 18:13).

2. Reform of Religion:

A curious result of Sennacherib’s invasion was the disappearance of the high places—local shrines where Levitical priests officiated in opposition to those of the temple. When the Judean territories were limited to the city, these of necessity vanished, and, when the siege was over, they were not restored. They were henceforward regarded as illegal. It is generally held by scholars that this reform occurred later under Josiah, on the discovery of the "Book of the Law" by Hilkiah in the temple (2Ki 22:8), and that this book was Deuteronomy. The high places, however, are not mentioned in the law book of Deuteronomy. The reform was probably the work of Isaiah, and due to considerations of morals.

3. Egypt and Judah:

The Judeans had always had a friendly feeling toward Egypt. When the great eastern power became threatening, it was to Egypt they turned for safety. Recent excavation has shown that the influence of Egypt upon the life and manners of Palestine was very great, and that that of Assyria and Babylonia was comparatively slight, and generally confined to the North. In the reign of Hezekiah a powerful party proposed an alliance with Egypt with the view of check-mating the designs of Assyria (2Ki 17:4; Isa 30:2,3; 31:1). Hezekiah followed Isaiah’s advice in rejecting all alliances.

4. Traffic in Horses:

The commercial and other ties which bound Palestine to Egypt were much stronger than those between Palestine and the East. One of the most considerable of these was the trade in horses. This traffic had been begun by Solomon (1Ki 10:28 f). The chief seat of the trade in Palestine was Lachish (Mic 1:13). In their nomadic state the Israelites had used camels and donkeys, and the use of the horse was looked upon with suspicion by the prophets (De 17:16; Zec 9:10). When the horse is spoken of in the Old Testament, it is as the chief weapon of the enemies of the nation (Ex 15:1; Jud 5:22, etc.).

5. Reaction under Manasseh:

On the death of Hezekiah, the nation reverted to the culture and manners of the time of Ahaz and even went farther than he in corrupt practices. Especially at this time human sacrifice became common in Israel (Mic 6:7). The influence for good of the prophets had gone (2Ki 21). There is a curious story in 2Ch 33:11 f that Manasseh was taken captive by the Assyrians, and, after spending some time in captivity in Babylon, reformed and was restored to his throne. His son, however, undid these reforms, and public discontent grew to such an extent that he was assassinated (2Ki 21:19).

6. Triumph of Reform Party:

Once more the tide turned in the direction of reform, and on this occasion it rose higher than ever before. The reformation under Josiah was never again wholly undone. The enthusiasm of the iconoclasts carried them far beyond the frontiers of Judah (2Ch 34:6), for on this occasion they were backed up by the newly found "Book of the Law." All boded well for a prosperous reign, but unforeseen disasters came from without. The Scythian invasion swept over Southwestern Asia (Jer 1:14-16; 6:1, etc.). The storm passed, and hope rose higher than before, for the power of Assyria had been shattered forever.

7. Babylonia and Judah:

Already in 722, when Sargon seized the throne on the death of Shalmaneser, Babylonia had revolted, and crowned Marduk-baladan king (Isa 39:1). Hezekiah received a deputation from Babylonia (2Ki 20:12), no doubt in the hope of freeing himself from the Assyrian danger by such an alliance. The revolt of Merodach-baladan was maintained for 12 years; then it was suppressed. There was, however, a second revolt of Babylonia on the accession of Sennacherib, Sargon’s son, in 705, which went on till 691, and the events referred to in 2Ki 20 may have happened at this time, for Hezekiah’s reign seems to have ended prosperously.

8. End of Assyrian Empire:

Sennacherib was assassinated in 681 (Isa 37:38) and was succeeded by his son Esar-haddon, who rebuilt Babylon, razed to the ground by his father, and under whom the province remained quiet. In 674 hostilities with Egypt broke out, and that country was overrun, and TIRHAKAH (which see) was expelled in 670. Two years later, however, occurred the revolt of Egypt and the death of Esar-haddon. Assur-bani-pal succeeded, and Egypt regained her independence in 660. The revolt of Babylonia, the incursion of the Scythians (Jer 1:14) and the death of Assur-bani-pal followed. Two more kings sat on the throne of Assyria, and then Nineveh was taken by the combined Scythians (Mandor) and Babylonians (Herod. i.74; Nah; Ze 2:13-15; Hab 1:5 f).

9. After Scythian Invasion:

The Scythian tempest passed quickly, and when it was over the Assyrian peril was no more. Pharaoh-necoh seized the opportunity to avenge the injuries of his country by the invasion of the erstwhile Assyrian territories. Josiah, pursuing the policy of alliance with Babylonia inaugurated by Hezekiah, endeavored to arrest his progress. He was defeated and mortally wounded at Megiddo (Zec 12:11).

10. Judah Again Dependent:

By the foolhardy action of Josiah, Judah lost its independence. The people, indeed, elected Jehoahaz (Shallum) king, but he was immediately deposed and carried to Egypt by the Pharaoh (Jer 22:10 ff; Eze 19:3 f), who appointed Jehoiakim (Eliakim) as vassal-king. After the defeat of the Pharaoh at Carchemish, the old Hittite stronghold, by Nebuchadrezzar, Jehoiakim submitted, and Judah became a

dependency of Babylon. There must have been some return of prosperity, for Jehoiakim is denounced for his luxury and extravagance and oppressive taxation (Jer 22:13), but the country was raided by the neighboring Bedouin (2Ki 24:2), and Jehoiakim came to an untimely end (Jer 22:19).

11. Prophets Lose Influence:

The prophets were no longer, as under Hezekiah, all-powerful in the state. The influence of Jeremiah was no doubt great, but the majority was against him. His program was both unpopular in itself and it had the fatal defect of being diametrically opposed to that of Isaiah, the patriot-politician (if such there be), who had saved the state from shipwreck. Isaiah had preached reliance upon the national God and through it the political independence of the nation. It was the sad duty of Jeremiah to advise the surrender of the national independence to the newly risen power of Babylon. (Jer 21:4,9; 38:2, etc.). Isaiah had held that the Holy City was impregnable (2Ki 19:32); Jeremiah was sure that it would be taken by the Chaldeans (Jer 32:24,43). Events proved that each prophet was right for the time in which he lived.

12. The Deportations:

Jehoiakim was the only Judean king who was a vassal first to one overlord and then to another. Judah took a step downward in his reign. It was under him also that the first deportation of the Judeans occurred (Da 1:1-17). He was succeeded by his son Jehoiachin who, on account of a rebellion which closed the reign of his father, was ere long deported, along with the best of the nation (Jer 22:24 ff; Eze 19:5). A 3rd son of Josiah, Mattaniah, was set on the throne under the title of Zedekiah. Against the advice of Jeremiah, this, the last king of Judah, declared himself independent of Babylon, and threw in his lot with Egypt under Pharaoh Hophra (Apries), thus breaking his oath of fealty (Eze 17:15). On the advance of the Chaldeans, Judah was deserted by her allies, the Edomites and Philistines (see JOB, BOOK OF), and soon only Lachish (Tell el-Hesy), Azekah (probably Tell Zakarua) and Jerusalem remained in the hands of Zedekiah. The siege of the city lasted two years. It was taken on the fatal 9th of Ab in the year 586. Zedekiah’s family was put to the sword, and he himself was taken to Babylon. Egypt shared the fate of Judah, with whom she had been often so closely connected, and Hophra was the last of the Pharaohs.

13. Summary:

The kingdom of Judah had lasted 480 years, counting from its commencement, exactly twice as long as the kingdom of Israel, counting from the disruption. No doubt this longer mary existence was due in the first place to the religious faith of the people. This is clear from the fact that the national religion not only survived the extinction of the nation, but spread far beyond its original territories and has endured down to the present day. But there were also circumstances which conspired to foster the growth of the nation in its earliest and most critical period. One of these was the comparative isolation and remoteness of the country. Neither the kingdom of Israel nor that of Judah is for a moment to be compared to those of Egypt and Assyria. Even the combined kingdom under David and Solomon hardly deserves that

comparison; and separate, the Northern Kingdom would be about the size of New Hampshire and the Southern Kingdom about that of Connecticut. The smaller kingdom survived the larger because it happened to be slightly farther removed from the danger zone. Even had the two kingdoms held together, it is impossible that they could have withstood the expansion of Assyria and Babylonia on the one side and of Egypt on the other. The Egyptian party in Judean politics in the times of Isaiah and Jeremiah were so far in the right, that, if Judah could have maintained her independence in alliance with Egypt, these two countries combined might have withstood the power of Assyria or Babylon. But it is because this ancient race, tracing its descent from remote antiquity, preserved its religious, at the expense of its national independence, that its literature continues to mold much of the thought of Europe and America today.

See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Thomas Hunter Weir

JUDAH, TERRITORY OF

(yehudhah):

I. GEOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. The Natural Boundaries

2. The Natural Divisions of Judah

(1) The Maritime Plain

(2) The Shephelah

(3) The Hill Country of Judah

II. THE TRIBE OF JUDAH AND ITS TERRITORY

III. THE BOUNDARIES OF THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH

LITERATURE

I. Geographical Data.

Although the physical conformation of Western Palestine divides this land into very definite areas running longitudinally North and South, yet all through history there has been a recognition of a further

—and politically more important—division into 3 areas running transversely, known in New Testament times as Galilee, Samaria and Judea. These districts are differentiated to some extent by distinctive physical features which have in no small degree influenced the history of their inhabitants.

1. The Natural Boundaries:

The southernmost of these regions possesses on 3 sides very definite natural boundaries: to the West the Mediterranean, to the East the Dead Sea, and the Jordan, and to the South 60 miles, North to South, of practically trackless desert, a frontier as secure as sea or mountain range. On the North no such marked "scientific frontier" exists, and on this the one really accessible side, history bears witness that the frontier has been pushed backward and forward. The most ideal natural northern frontier, which only became the actual one comparatively late in Hebrew times (see JUDAEA), is that which passes from the river ‘Aujeh in the West, up the Wady Deir Baldt, by the wide and deep Wady Ishar to ‘Akrabbeh and thence East to the Jordan. A second natural frontier commences at the same line on the West, but after following the Wady Deir Baldt, branches off southward along the Wady Nimr (now traversed by the modern carriage road from Jerusalem to Nablus), crosses the water-parting close to the lofty Tell Ashur and runs successively down the Wady Sanieh and the Wady ‘Aujeh and by the eastern river ‘Aujeh to the Jordan. This division-line is one conformable to the physical features, because north of it the table-lands of "Judea" give place to the more broken mountain groups of "Samaria." Another less natural, though much more historic, frontier is that which traverses the Vale of Ajalon, follows the Beth-horon pass, and, after crossing the central plateau near el Jib (Gibeon) and er Ram (Ramah of Benjamin), runs down the deep and rugged Wady SuweiniT, between Jeba‘ (Geba) and Mukhmas (Michmash), to Jericho and the Jordan. It was along this line that the great frontier fortresses, Bethel, Gibeon, Ramah, Adasa, Geba and Michmash, were erected. Such, on the North, South, East, and West, were the natural boundaries of the southern third of Palestine; yet in all history the land thus enclosed scarcely ever formed a homogeneous whole.

2. The Natural Divisions of Judah:

Within these boundaries lay four very different types of land—the maritime plain, the "lowland" or Shephelah, the "hill country" and, included usually with the last, the desert or Jeshimon.

(1) The Maritime Plain:

The maritime plain, the "land Judah of the Philis" (1Sa 6:1; 27:1; 2Ki 8:2; Ze 2:5), was ideally though never actually, the territory of Judah (compare Jos 15:45-47); it may have been included, as it is by some modern writers, as part of the Shephelah, but this is not the usual use of the word. It is a great stretch of level plain or rolling downs of very fertile soil, capable of supporting a thriving population and cities of considerable size, especially near the seacoast.

(2) The Shephelah:

The Shephelah (shephelah), or "lowland" of Judah (De 1:7; Jos 9:1; 11:2,16; 15:33-44; 1Ki 10:27; 1Ch 27:28; Jer 17:26).—In these references the word is variously rendered in the King James Version, usually as "vale" or "valley," sometimes, as in the last two, as "plain." In the Revised Version (British and American) the usual rendering is "lowland." In 1 Macc 12:38, the King James Version has "Shephela" and the Revised Version (British and American) "plain country." The word "Shephelah" appears to survive in the Arabic Sifla about Beit Jebrin.

This is a very important region in the history of Judah. It is a district consisting mainly of rounded hills, 500-800 ft. high, with fertile open valleys full of corn fields; caves abound, and there are abundant evidences of a once crowded population. Situated as it is between the "hill country" and the maritime plain, it was the scene of frequent skirmishes between the Hebrews and the Philistines; Judah failed to hold it against the Philistines who kept it during most of their history. The Shephelah is somewhat sharply divided off from the central mountain mass by a remarkable series of valleys running North and South. Commencing at the Vale of Ajalon and passing South, we have in succession the Wady el Ghurab and, after crossing the Wady es Siwan, the Wady en Najil, the Wady es Sunt (Elah) and the Wady es Cur. It is noticeable that the western extremity of the most historic northern frontier of ancient Judah—that limited by the Vale of Ajalon in the West—appears to have been determined by the presence of this natural feature. North of this the hills of Samaria flatten out to the plain without any such intervening valleys.

(3) The Hill Country of Judah:

The hill country of Judah is by far the most characteristic part of that tribe’s possessions; it was on account of the shelter of these mountain fastnesses that this people managed to hold their own against their neighbors and hide away from the conquering armies of Assyria and Egypt. No other section of the country was so secluded and protected by her natural borders. It was the environment of these bare hills and rugged valleys which did much to form the character and influence the literature of the Jews. The hill country is an area well defined, about 35 miles long and some 15 broad, and is protected on three sides by natural frontiers of great strength; on the North alone it has no "scientific frontier." On the South lay the Negeb, and beyond that the almost waterless wilderness, a barrier consisting of a series of stony hills running East and West, difficult for a caravan and almost impracticable for an army. On the West the hills rise sharply from those valleys which delimit them from the Shephelah, but they are pierced by a series of steep and rugged defiles which wind upward to the central table-land. At the northwestern corner the Bethhoron pass—part of the northern frontier line—runs upward from the wide Vale of Ajalon; this route, the most historic of all, has been associated with a succession of defeats inflicted by those holding the higher ground (see BETH-HORON). South of this is the Wady ‘Ali, up which runs the modern carriage road to Jerusalem, and still farther South lies the winding rocky defile, up part of which the railway from Jaffa is laid, the Wady es Surar. A more important valley, because of its width and easier gradient, is the great Vale of Elah (Wady es Cunt), to guard the highest parts of which (now the Wady es Cur) was built the powerful fortress of Beth-zur (2Ch 11:7, etc.), which Josephus (Ant., XIII, v, 6) describes as "the strongest place in all Judea (see BETH-ZUR). Up this pass the Syrians successfully with the aid of elephants (Ant., XII, ix, 4) invaded Judea. The eastern frontier of the hill country is one of extraordinary natural strength. Firstly, there were the Jordan and the Dead Sea;

then along all but the northernmost part of the eastern frontier lay a long line of semi-precipitous cliffs, in places over 1,000 ft. high, absolutely unscalable and pierced at long intervals by passes all steep and dangerous. Within this again came a wide area of waterless and barren desert, the Wilderness of Judah (or Judea) known in English Versions of the Bible as JESHIMON (which see). To the northeasterly part of the frontier, where the ascent from the Jericho plain to the mountains presents no special difficulty in gradation, the waterless condition of the Jeshimon greatly restricted the possible routes for an enemy. The natural position for the first line of defense was the fortified city of Jericho, but as a frontier fortress she failed from the days of Joshua onward (see JERICHO). From Jericho four roads pass upward to the plateau of Judah; unlike the corresponding passes on the western frontier, they do not traverse any definite line of valley, but in many places run actually along the ridges.

These roads are:

(a) The earliest historically, though now the least frequented, is the most northerly, which passes westward at the back of ancient Jericho (near ‘Ain es Sultan) and ascends by Michmash and Ai to Bethel;

(b) the route traversed by the modern Jerus-Jericho road;

(c) the more natural route which enters the hills by Wady Joreif Ghusal and runs by Nebi Musa joining the line of the modern carriage road a mile or so after passing the deserted ruin of the Saracenic Khan el Ahmar. Here runs the road for the thousands of pilgrims who visit the shrine of Nebi Musa in the spring.

(d) The most natural pass of all is by way of Wady el Kuneiterah, across the open plateau of el Bukeia’ and over the shoulder of Jebel el Muntar to Bethlehem.

From ‘Ain Feshkhah a very steep road, probably ancient, ascends to join this last route in el Bukeia‘, From Engedi (‘Ain Jidy) a steep ascent—almost a stairway—winds abruptly to the plateau above, whence a road passes northwesterly by the Wady Hucaceh past Tekoa to Bethlehem and Jerusalem, and another branch goes west to Hebron and Juttah.

Somewhere along these routes must have lain the "Ascent of Ziz" and the "Wilderness of Jeruel," the scene of the events of 2Ch 20. The hill country of Judah is distinguished from other parts of Palestine by certain physical characteristics. Its central part is a long plateau—or really series of plateaus-running North and South, very stony and barren and supplied with but scanty springs: "dew" is less plentiful than in the north; several of the elevated plains, e.g. about Bethlehem, Beit Jala and Hebron, are well suited to the growth of corn and olive trees; in the sheltered valleys and on the terraced hillsides to the West of the water-parting, vines, olives, figs and other fruit trees flourish exceedingly. There is evidence everywhere that cultivation was far more highly developed in ancient times; on most of the hill slopes to the West traces of ancient terraces can still be seen (see BOTANY). This district in many parts, especially on its eastern slopes, is preeminently a pastoral land, and flocks of sheep and goats abound, invading in the spring even the desert itself. This last is ever in evidence, visible from the environs of all

Judah’s greater cities and doubtless profoundly influencing the lives and thoughts of their inhabitants.

The altitude attained in this "hill country" is usually below 3,000 ft. in the north (e.g. Ramallah, 2,850 ft., Nebi Samwil, 2,935 ft.), but is higher near Hebron, where we get 3,545 ft. at Ramet el Khulil. Many would limit the term "hill country of Judea" to the higher hills centering around Hebron, but this is unnecessary. Jerusalem is situated near a lower and more expanded part of the plateau, while the higher hills to its north, are, like that city itself, in the territory of Benjamin.

II. The Tribe of Judah and Its Territory.

In Nu 26:19-22, when the tribes of the Hebrews are enumerated "in the plains of Moab by the Jordan at Jericho" (Nu 26:3), Judah is described as made up of the families of the Shelanites, the Perezites, the Zerahites, the Hezronites and the Hamulites. "These are the families of Judah according to those that were numbered of them," a total of 76,500 (Nu 26:22). In Jud 1:16 we read that the Kenites united with the tribe of Judah, and from other references (Jos 14:6-15; 15:13-19; Jud 1:12-15,20) we learn that the two Kenizzite clans of Caleb and Othniel also were absorbed; and it is clear from 1Sa 27:10; 30:29 that the Jerahmeelites—closely connected with the Calebites (compare 1Ch 2:42)—also formed a part of the tribe of Judah. The Kenizzites and Jerahmeelites were probably of Edomite origin (Ge 36:11; compare 1Ch 2:42), and this large admixture of foreign blood may partly account for the comparative isolation of Judah from the other tribes (e.g. she is not mentioned in Jud 5).

The territory of the tribe of Judas is described ideally in Jos 15, but it never really extended over the maritime plain to the West. The natural frontiers to the West and East have already been described as the frontiers of the "hill country"; to the South the boundary is described as going "even to the wilderness of Zin southward, at the uttermost part of the south," i.e. of the Negeb (15:1), and (15:3) as far south as Kadesh-barnea, i.e. the oasis of ‘Ain Kadis, 50 miles South of Beersheba, far in the desert; the position of the "Ascent of Akrabbim," i.e. of scorpions, is not known. The "Brook of Egypt" is generally accepted to be the Wady el ‘Arish. The fact is, the actual frontier shaded off imperceptibly into the desert —varying perhaps with the possibilities of agriculture and depending therefore upon the rainfall. The cities mentioned on the boundaries, whose sites are now lost, probably roughly marked the edge of the habitable area (see NEGEB).

The northern boundary which separated the land of Judah from that of Benjamin requires brief mention. The various localities mentioned in Jos 15:5-12 are dealt with in separate articles, but, omitting the very doubtful, the following, which are generally accepted, will show the general direction of the boundary line: The border went from the mouth of the Jordan to Beth-hoglah (‘Ain Hajlah), and from the Valley of Achor (Wady Kelt) by the ascent of Adummin (Tala ‘at edition Dumm) to the waters of Enoch Shemesh (probably ‘Ain Haud), Enoch Rogel (Bir Eyyub), and the Valley of Hinnom (Wady er Rababi). The line then crossed the Vale of Rephaim (el Bukeia’) to the waters of Nephtoah (Lifta), Kiriath-jearim (Kuryet el ‘Enab), Chesalon (Kesla), Beth-shemesh (‘Ain Shems), Ekron (‘Akir), and Jabneel (Yebnah), "and the goings out of the border were at the sea." According to the above line, Jerusalem lay entirely within the bounds of Benjamin, though, according to a tradition recorded in the Talmud, the site of the

altar was in a piece of land belonging to Judah. The above frontier line can be followed on any modern map of Palestine, and if it does not in many parts describe a natural frontier, it must be remembered that the frontiers of village and town possessions in modern Palestine are extremely arbitrary, and though undetermined by any natural limits such as streams or mountain summits, they persist from generation to generation, and this too during periods—not long past—when there was constant warfare between different clans.

The territory of Judah was small; even had it included all within its ideal boundaries, it would have been no more than 2,000 square miles; actually it was nearer 1,300 square miles, of which nearly half was desert.

III. The Boundaries of the Kingdom of Judah.

These were very circumscribed. In 2Ch 11:5-12 there is a list of the cities—chiefly those on the frontier —which Rehoboam fortified. On the East were Bethlehem, Etam and Tekoa; and on the West and Southwest were Beth-zur, Soco, Adullam, Gath, Mareshah, Ziph, Adoraim, Lachish, Azekah, Zorah, Aijalon and Hebron. The sites of the great majority of these are known, and they are all upon the borders of the Shephelah or the hill country. It will be seen too that the military preparation then made was against an attack from the West. In the 5th year of the reign of Rehoboam the expected attack came, and Shishak (Sheshenq I) of Egypt swept over the land and not only conquered all Judah and Jerusalem, but, according to the reading of some authorities in the account of this campaign given in the great temple of Karnak, he handed over to Jeroboam of Israel certain strongholds of Judah.

The usual northern frontier between the two Hebrew kingdoms appears to have been the southernmost of the three natural lines described in I above, namely by the Valley of Ajalon on the West and the Gorge of Michmash (Wady SuweiniT) on the East. Along the central plateau the frontier varied. Bethel (1Ki 12:29; 2Ki 10:29; Am 3:14; 4:4; 7:10,13; Ho 10:15) belonged to Israel, though once it fell to Judah when Abijah took it and with it Jeshanah (‘Ain Sinia) and Ephron (probably et Taiyibeh) (2Ch 13:19). Geba (Jeba‘), just to the South of the Wady Suweinit, was on the northern frontier of Judah, hence, instead of the old term "from Da to Beer-sheba" we read now of "from Geba to Beersheba" (2Ki 23:8). Baasha, king of Israel, went South and fortified Ramah (er Ram, but 4 miles from Jerusalem) against Judah (1Ki 15:17), but Asa stopped his work, removed the fortifications and with the materials strengthened his own frontier at Geba and Mizpah (1Ki 15:21,22). In the Jordan valley Jericho was held by Israel (1Ki 16:34; 2Ki 2:4).

After the Northern Kingdom fell, the frontier of Judah appears to have extended a little farther North, and Bethel (2Ki 23:15-19) and Jericho (to judge from Ezr 2:34; Ne 3:2; 7:36) also became part of the kingdom of Judah. For the further history of this district see JUDAEA.

LITERATURE.

See especially H G H L, chapters viii-xv; P E F, III, and Saunders, Introduction to the Survey of Western

Palestine.

E. W. G. Masterman

JUDAISM

joo’-da-iz’-m.

See ISRAEL, RELIGION OF.

JUDAS

joo’-das (Ioudas; Greek form of Hebrew "Judah"):

(1) A Levite mentioned in 1 Esdras 9:23 = JUDAH (3).

(2) Judas Maccabeus, 3rd son of Mattathias (1 Macc 2:4).

See MACCABEES.

(3) Judas, son of Chalphi, a Jewish officer who supported Jonathan bravely at the battle of Hazor (1 Macc 11:70; Ant, XIII, v, 7).

(4) A person of good position in Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (2 Macc 1:10); he has been identified with Judas Maccabeus and also with an Essene prophet (Ant., XIII, xi, 2; BJ, III, 5).

(5) Son of Simon the Maccabee, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1 Macc 16:2). He was wounded in the battle which he fought along with his brother against Cendebeus (1 Macc 16:1 ff; Ant, XIII, vii, 3), and was murdered by Ptolemy the usurper, his brother-in-law, at Dok (1 Macc 16:11 ff).

J. Hutchinson

JUDAS BARSABBAS

bar-sab-’as (Ioudas Barsabbas): Judas was, with Silas, a delegate from the church in Jerusalem to the GentileChristians of Antioch, Syria and Cilicia. They were appointed to convey the letter containing the decision of "the apostles and the elders, with the whole church" regarding the attitude to be taken by GentileChristians toward the Mosaic law, and also to explain "the same things by word of mouth." They accompanied Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and, "being themselves also prophets," i.e. preachers, they not only handed over the epistle but stayed some time in the city preaching and teaching. They seem to have gone no farther than Antioch, for "they were dismissed in peace from the brethren unto those that

had sent them forth," and it was Paul and Silas who some time afterward strengthened the churches in Syria and Cilicia (Ac 15:40,41).

According to Ac 15:34 the King James Version, Judas returned to Jerusalem without Silas, who remained at Antioch and afterward became Paul's companion (Ac 15:40). The oldest manuscripts, however, omit Ac 15:34, and it is therefore omitted from the Revised Version (British and American). It was probably a marginal note to explain Ac 15:40, and in time it crept into the text. Judas and Silas are called "chief men among the brethren" (15:22), probably elders, and "prophets" (15:32).

Barsabbas being a patronymic, Judas was probably the brother of Joseph Barsabbas. He cannot be identified with any other Judas, e.g. "Judas not Iscariot" (Joh 14:22). We hear no more of Judas after his return to Jerusalem (Ac 15:22).

S. F. Hunter

JUDAS ISCARIOT

is-kar'-i-ot (Ioudas Iskariotes, i.e. 'ish qeriyoth, "Judas, man of Kerioth"): One of the twelve apostles and the betrayer of Jesus; for etymology, etc., see JUDAS.

I. Life.

Judas was, as his second name indicates, a native of Kerioth or Karioth. The exact locality of Kerioth (compare Jos 15:25) is doubtful, but it lay probably to the South of Judea, being identified with the ruins of el Karjetein (compare A. Plummer, article "Judas Iscariot" in HDB).

1. Name and Early History:

He was the son of Simon (Joh 13:2) or Simon Iscariot (Joh 6:71; 13:26), the meaning of Iscariot explaining why it was applied to his father also. The first Scriptural reference to Judas is his election to the apostleship (compare Mt 10:4; Mr 3:19; Lu 6:16). He may have been present at the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (compare Joh 1:28), but more probably he first met Jesus during the return of the latter through Judea with His followers (compare Joh 3:22). According to the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles (see SIMON THE CANAANITE), Judas was among those who received the call at the Sea of Tiberias (compare Mt 4:18-22).

2. Before the Betrayal:

For any definite allusion to Judas during the interval lying between his call and the events immediately preceding the betrayal, we are indebted to John alone. These allusions are made with the manifest purpose of showing forth the nefarious character of Judas from the beginning; and in their sequence there is a gradual development and growing clearness in the manner in which Jesus makes prophecy

regarding his future betrayer. Thus, after the discourse on the Bread of Life in the synagogue of Capernaum (Joh 6:26-59), when many of the disciples deserted Jesus (Joh 6:66) and Peter protested the allegiance of the apostles (Joh 6:69), Jesus answered, "Did not I choose you the twelve, and one of you is a devil" (Joh 6:70). Then follows John's commentary, "Now he spake of Judas the son of Simon Iscariot, for he it was that should betray him, being one of the twelve" (Joh 6:71), implying that Judas was already known to Jesus as being in spirit one of those who "went back, arid walked no more with him" (Joh 6:66). But the situation, however disquieting it must have been to the ambitious designs which probably actuated Judas in his acceptance of the apostleship (compare below), was not sufficiently critical to call for immediate desertion on his part. Instead, he lulled his fears of exposure by the fact that he was not mentioned by name, and continued ostensibly one of the faithful. Personal motives of a sordid nature had also influence in causing him to remain. Appointed keeper of the purse, he disregarded the warnings of Jesus concerning greed and hypocrisy (compare Mt 6:20; Lu 12:1-3) and appropriated the funds to his own use. As a cloak to his avarice, he pretended to be zealous in their administration, and therefore, at the anointing of Jesus' feet by Mary, he asked "Why was not this ointment sold for 300 shillings, and given to the poor? Now this he said, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the bag took away what was put therein" (Joh 12:5,6; compare also Mt 26:7-13; Mr 14:3-8).

3. The Betrayal:

Yet, although by this craftiness Judas concealed for a time his true nature from the rest of the disciples, and fomented any discontent that might arise among them (compare Mr 14:4), he now felt that his present source of income could not long remain secure. The pregnant words of his Master regarding the day of his burial (compare Mt 26:12; Mr 14:8; Joh 12:7) revealed to His betrayer that Jesus already knew well the evil powers that were at work against Him; and it is significant that, according to Mt and Mk, who alone of the synoptists mention the anointing, Judas departed immediately afterward and made his compact with the chief priests (compare Mt 26:14,15; Mr 14:10,11; compare also Lu 22:3-6). But his absence was only temporary. He was present at the washing of the disciples' feet, there to be differentiated once more by Jesus from the rest of the Twelve (compare "Ye are clean, but not all" and "He that eateth my bread lifted up his heel against me," Joh 13:10,18), but again without being named. It seemed as if Jesus wished to give Judas every opportunity, even at this late hour, of repenting and making his confession. For the last time, when they had sat down to eat, Jesus appealed him thus with the words, "One of you shall betray me" (Mt 26:21; Mr 14:18; Lu 22:21; Joh 13:21). And at the end, in answer to the anxious queries of His disciples, "Is it I?" He indicated his betrayer, not by name, but by a sign: "He it is, for whom I shall dip the sop, and give it him" (Joh 13:26). Immediately upon its reception, Judas left the supper room; the opportunity which he sought for was come (compare Joh 13:30; Mt 26:16). There is some doubt as to whether he actually received the eucharistic bread and wine previous to his departure or not, but most modern commentators hold that he did not. On his departure, Judas made his way to the high priests and their followers, and coming upon Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane, he betrayed his Master with a kiss (Mt 26:47-50; Mr 14:43,44; Lu 22:47; Joh 18:2-5).

4. His Death:

After the betrayal, Mk, Lu and Joh are silent as regards Judas, and the accounts given in Mt and Ac of his remorse and death vary in detail. According to Mt, the actual condemnation of Jesus awakened Judas' sense of guilt, and becoming still more despondent at his repulse by the chief priests and elders, "he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary, and departed; and he went away and hanged himself." With the money the chief priests purchased the potter's field, afterward called "the field of blood," and in this way was fulfilled the prophecy of Zechariah (11:12-14) ascribed by Matthew to Jeremiah (Mt 27:3-10). The account given in Ac 1:16-20 is much shorter. It mentions neither Judas' repentance nor the chief priests, but simply states that Judas "obtained a field with the reward of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out" (1:18). The author of Ac finds in this the fulfillment of the prophecy in Ps 69:25. The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) rendering, "When he had hanged himself, he burst asunder," suggests a means of reconciling the two accounts.

According to a legendary account mentioned by Papias, the death of Judas was due to elephantiasis (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 5). A so-called "Gospel of Judas" was in use among the Gnostic sect of the Cainites.

II. Character and Theories.

1. Joined the Apostles to Betray Jesus:

Much discussion and controversy have centered, not only around the discrepancies of the Gospel narratives of Judas, but also around his character and the problems connected with it. That the betrayer of Jesus should also be one of the chosen Twelve has given opportunity for the attacks of the foes of Christianity from the earliest times (compare Orig., Con. Cel., ii.12); and the difficulty of finding any proper solution has proved so great that some have been induced to regard Judas as merely a personification of the spirit of Judaism. The acceptance of this view would, however, invalidate the historical value of much of the Scriptural writings. Other theories are put forward in explanation, namely, that Judas joined the apostolic band with the definite intention of betraying Jesus. The aim of this intention has again received two different interpretations, both of which seek to elevate the character of Judas and to free him from the charge of sordid motives and cowardly treachery. According to one, Judas was a strong patriot, who saw in Jesus the foe of his race and its ancient creed, and therefore betrayed Him in the interests of his country. This view is, however, irreconcilable with the rejection of Judas by the chief priests (compare Mt 27:3-10). According to the other, Judas regarded himself as a true servant of Christianity, who assumed the role of traitor to precipitate the action of the Messiah and induce Him to manifest His miraculous powers by calling down the angels of God from heaven to help Him (compare Mt 26:53). His suicide was further due to his disappointment at the failure of Jesus to fulfill his expectations. This theory found favor in ancient times with the Cainites (compare above), and in modern days with De Quincey and Bishop Whately. But the terms and manner of denunciation employed by Jesus in regard to Judas (compare also Joh 17:12) render this view also untenable.

2. Foreordained to Be a Traitor:

Another view is that Judas was foreordained to be the traitor: that Jesus was conscious from the first that He was to suffer death on the cross, and chose Judas because He knew that he should betray Him and thus fulfill the Divine decrees (compare Mt 26:54). Those holding this view base their arguments on the omniscience of Jesus implied in Joh 2:24, Jesus "knew all men"; Joh 6:64, "Jesus knew from the beginning who should betray him," and Joh 18:4, "knowing all the things that were coming upon him." Yet to take those texts literally would mean too rigid application of the doctrine of predestination. It would treat Judas as a mere instrument, as a means and not an end in the hands of a higher power: it would render meaningless the appeals and reproaches made to him by Jesus and deny any real existence of that personal responsibility and sense of guilt which it was our Lord's very purpose to awaken and stimulate in the hearts of His hearers. John himself wrote after the event, but in the words of our Lord there was, as we have seen, a growing clearness in the manner in which He foretold His betrayal. The omniscience of Jesus was greater than that of a mere clairvoyant who claimed to foretell the exact course of future events. It was the omniscience of one who knew on the one hand the ways of His Eternal Father among men, and who, on the other, penetrated into the deepest recesses of human character and beheld there all its secret feelings and motives and tendencies.

3. Betrayal the Result of Gradual Development:

Although a full discussion of the character of Judas would of necessity involve those ultimate problems of Free Will and Original Sin (Westcott) which no theology can adequately solve, theory which regards the betrayal as the result of a gradual development within the soul of Judas seems the most practical. It is significant that Judas alone among the disciples was of southern extraction; and the differences in temperament and social outlook, together with the petty prejudices to which these generally give rise, may explain in part, though they do not justify, his after treachery—that lack of inner sympathy which existed between Judas and the rest of the apostles. He undoubtedly possessed certain business ability, and was therefore appointed keeper of the purse. But his heart could not have been clean, even from the first, as he administered even his primary charge dishonestly. The cancer of this greed spread from the material to the spiritual. To none of the disciples did the fading of the dream of an earthly kingdom of pomp and glory bring greater disappointment than to Judas. The cords of love by which Jesus gradually drew the hearts of the other disciples to Himself, the teaching by which He uplifted their souls above all earthly things, were as chafing bonds to the selfishness of Judas. And from his fettered greed and disappointed ambition sprang jealousy and spite and hatred. It was the hatred, not of a strong, but of an essentially weak man. Instead of making an open breach with his Lord, he remained ostensibly one of His followers: and this continued contact with a goodness to which he would not yield (compare Swete on Mr 14:10), and his brooding over the rebukes of his Master, gave ready entrance for "Satan into his soul." But if he "knew the good and did not do it" (compare Joh 13:17), so also he was weak in the carrying out of his nefarious designs. It was this hesitancy, rather than a fiendish cunning, which induced him to remain till the last moment in the supper room, and which prompted the remark of Jesus "What thou doest, do quickly" (Joh 13:27). Of piece with this weak-mindedness was his attempt to cast the blame upon the chief priests and elders (compare Mt 27:3,4). He sought to set himself right, not with the innocent Jesus whom he had betrayed, but with the accomplices in his crime; and because that world which his selfishness had made his god failed him at the last, he went and hanged himself. It was the

tragic end of one who espoused a great cause in the spirit of speculation and selfish ambition, and who weighed not the dread consequences to which those impure motives might lead him (compare also Bruce, Training of the Twelve; Latham, Pastor Pastorum; Stalker, Trial and Death of Jesus Christ).

C. M. Kerr

JUDAS ISCARIOT, GOSPEL OF

A "Gospel of Judas" is mentioned by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.31), Epiphanius (Haer., xxxviii.1), Theodoret, etc., as current in the Gnostic sect of the Cainites, to whom Judas was a hero. It must have been in existence in the 2nd century, but no quotation is given from it (see Baring-Gould, Lost and Hostile Gospels, III, chapter v).

JUDAS MACCABAEUS

See MACCABAEUS.

JUDAS OF DAMASCUS

See JUDAS, (6).

JUDAS OF GALILEE

(ho Galilaios): Mentioned in Ac 5:37 as the leader of an insurrection occasioned by the census of Quirinius in 7 AD (see QUIRINIUS). He, and those who obeyed him, it is said, perished in that revolt. Josephus also repeatedly mentions Judas by this same name, "the Galilean," and speaks of his revolt (Ant., XVIII, i, 6; XX, v, 2; BJ, II, viii, 1; xviii, 8; VII, viii, 1), but in Ant, XVIII, i, names him a Gaulonite, of the city of Gamala. As Gamala was in Gaulonitis, not far from the eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, it may be regarded as belonging to that province. The party of Judas seems to have been identified with the Zealots.

James Oar

JUDAS OF JAMES

(Ioudas Iakobou): One of the twelve apostles (Lu 6:16; Ac 1:13; for etymology, etc., see JUDAS). the King James Version has the reading "brother of James," and the Revised Version (British and American) reads "son of James." The latter is to be preferred. In Joh 14:22 he is described as "Judas (not Iscariot)." The name corresponds with the "Thaddaeus" or "Lebbaeus whose surname was Thaddaeus" of Mt 10:3 the King James Version and Mr 3:18 (compare THADDAEUS). The identification of Thaddaeus with Judas is generally accepted, though Ewald and others hold that they were different persons, that

Thaddeus died during Christ's lifetime, and that Judas was chosen in his place (compare Bruce, Training of the Twelve, 34). If the Revised Version (British and American) is accepted as the correct rendering of Lu 6:16 and Ac 1:13, this Judas cannot be identified either with the Juda (Mr 6:3 the King James Version), Judas (Mr 6:3 the Revised Version (British and American)), or Judas (Mt 13:55), the brother of Jesus; or with the Judas (Jude 1:1 the Revised Version margin) or Jude (Jude 1:1 the King James Version), the brother of James, whether these two latter Judases are to be regarded as the same or not. The only incident recorded of Judas of James is in Joh 14:22, where during Christ's address to the disciples after the last supper he put the question, "Lord, what is come to pass that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?"

C. M. Kerr

JUDAS, JUDA

(1) The name of an ancestor of Jesus (Lu 3:30). In the King James Version it occurs also in Lu 3:26, but the Revised Version (British and American) has "Joda" (Westcott-Hort, Ioda).

(2) Judas Iscariot (see separate article).

(3) One of the brothers of Jesus (Mt 13:55; Mr 6:3).

See JUDE.

(4) An apostle, "not Iscariot" (Joh 14:22). He is generally identified with Lebbaeus (Mt 10:3) and Thaddeus (Mr 3:18). See LEBBAEUS; THADDAEUS. He is called JUDAS OF JAMES (which see) (Lu 6:16; Ac 1:13), which means "the son of James" not (the King James Version) "the brother of James."

(5) A Galilean who stirred up rebellion "in the days of the enrollment" (Ac 5:37).

See JUDAS OF GALILEE.

(6) One with whom Paul lodged in Damascus, whose house was in "the street which is called Straight" (Ac 9:11). Nothing further is known of him. A house is pointed out as his, in a lane off the Straight Street.

(7) Judas Barsabbas (Ac 15:22,27,32; see separate article).

S. F. Hunter

JUDAS, NOT ISCARIOT

(Ioudas ouch ho Iskariotes): One of the Twelve Apostles (Joh 14:22).

See JUDAS OF JAMES; LEBBAEUS; THADDAEUS.

JUDAS, THE LORD'S BROTHER

See JUDE.

JUDDAH jud'-a.

See JUTTAH.

JUDE

jood (Ioudas): Brother of the Lord, and author of the Epistle of Jude.

See JUDAS OF JAMES and following article.

JUDE, THE EPISTLE OF

The Writer

I. JUDE'S POSITION IN THE CANON

II. THE OCCASION OF ITS COMPOSITION

III. DESCRIPTION OF THE LIBERTINES AND APOSTATES

IV. RELATION OF JUDE TO THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

1. Resemblances

2. Differences

3. Further Contrasts

4. Summary

5. Evidence of Priority of Peter

6. Corroborative References

V. DATE OF THE EPISTLE

VI. THE LIBERTINES OF JUDE’S EPISTLE

LITERATURE

The Writer:

The writer of this short epistle calls himself Jude or Judas (Ioudas. His name was a common one among the Jews: there were few others of more frequent use. Two among the apostles bore it, namely, Judas, mentioned in Joh 14:22 (compare Lu 6:16), and Judas Iscariot. Jude describes himself as "a servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James" (Jude 1:1). The James here mentioned is no doubt the person who is called "the Lord’s brother" (Ga 1:19), the writer of the epistle that bears his name. Neither of the two was an apostle. The opening sentence of Jude simply affirms that the writer is a "servant of Jesus Christ." This, if anywhere, should be the appropriate place for the mention of his apostleship, if he were an apostle. The appellation "servant of Jesus Christ" "is never thus barely used in an address of an epistle to designate an apostle" (Alford). Php 1:1 has a similar expression, "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ," but "the designation common to two persons necessarily sinks to the rank of the inferior one." In other instances "servant" is associated with "apostle" (Ro 1:1; Tit 1:1). Jude 1:17,18 speaks of the "apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; that they said to you"—language which an apostle would hardly use of his fellow-apostles.

In Mr 6:3 are found the names of those of whom Jesus is said to be the brother, namely, James and Joses, and Judas and Simon. It is quite generally held by writers that the James and Judas here mentioned are the two whose epistles are found in the New Testament. It is noteworthy, however, that neither of them hints at his relationship with Jesus; their unaffected humility kept them silent. Jude mentions that he is the "brother of James," perhaps to give authority and weight to his words, for James was far more distinguished and influential than he. The inference seems legitimate that Jude addresses Christians among whom James was highly esteemed, or, if no longer living, among whom his memory was sacredly revered, and accordingly it is altogether probable that Jude writes to the same class of readers as James—Jewish Christians. James writes to the "Twelve Tribes of the Dispersion." Jude likewise addresses a wide circle of believers, namely, the "called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ" (1:1). While he does not designate a special and distinct class, yet as James’s "brother," as belonging to the family of Joseph, and as in some true sense related to the Lord Jesus Himself, it seems probable, if not certain, that his Epistle was intended for Christian Hebrews who stood in urgent need of such testimony and appeal as Jude offers.

I. Jude’s Position in the Canon.

It is now and for a long while has been an assured one. Its rank, though not altogether that of 1 Peter and

1 John, is high, for centuries indeed undoubted. Almost from the beginning of the Christian era men every way qualified to speak with authority on the question of genuineness and authenticity endorsed it as entitled to a place in the New Testament Scriptures. Origen repeatedly quotes it, in one place describing it as an "ep. of but few lines, but full of powerful words of heavenly grace" (Matt., tom. X, 17). But Origen knew that it was not universally received. Clement of Alexandria "gave concise expositions of all the canonical Scriptures, not omitting the disputed books—the Epistle of Jude and the other Catholic epp." (quoted by Westcott, Canaanite, 322-23 and Salmon, Intro, 493). Tertullian (Cult. Fem. i.3) in striving to establish the authority of the Book of Enoch urges as a crowning argument that it is quoted by "the apostle Jude." "We may infer that, Jude's Ep, ; was an unquestioned part of Tertullian's Canon. Athanasius inserted it in his list of New Testament books, but Eusebius placed it among the disputed books in his classification. The Canon of Muratori includes Jude among the books of Scripture, though it omits the Epistles of James, Peter and Hebrews. This is one of the earliest documents containing a list of the New Testament books now known. By the great majority of writers the date of the fragment is given as circa 170 AD, as it claims to have been written not long after Pius was bishop of Rome, and the latest date of Pius is 142-57 AD. The words of the document are, "The Shepherd was written very recently in our own time by Hermas, while his brother Pius sat in the chair of the Church of Rome." Twenty or twenty-five years would probably satisfy the period indicated by the words, "written very recently in our own time," which would fix the date of the fragment at circa 170 AD. Salmon, however, strongly inclines to a later date, namely, circa 200-210 AD, as does Zahn.

Zahn (Introduction to the New Testament, II, 259, English Translation), and Professor Chase (H D B) are of the decided opinion that the Didache, ii. 7: "Thou shalt not hate anyone, but some thou shalt rebuke, and for some thou shalt pray, and some thou shalt love above thine own soul (or life)," is rounded on Jude 1:22. Dr. Philip Schaff dates the Didache between 90-100 AD. L'Abbe E. Jacquier (La doctrine des Douze Apotres, 1891) is persuaded that the famous document was written not later than 80 AD. It appears, therefore, more than probable that the Epistle of Jude was known and referred to as Scripture some time before the end of the 1st century. From the survey we have thus rapidly taken of the field in which the Epistle circulated, we may conclude that in Palestine, at Alexandria, in North Africa, and at Rome, it was received as the veritable letter of Jude, "the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James."

The chief reason why it was rejected by some and regarded with suspicion by others in primitive times is its quotation from the apocryphal Book of Enoch, so Jerome informs us (Vir. Ill., 4). It is possible that Jude had in mind another spurious writing, namely, the Assumption of Moses, when he spoke of the contention of Michael the archangel with the devil about the body of Moses (1:9). This, however, is not quite certain, for the date assigned to that writing is circa 44 AD, and although Jude might have seen and read it, yet its composition is so near his own day that it could hardly have exerted much influence on his mind. Besides, the brevity of the Epistle and its dealing with a special class of errorists would limit to a certain extent its circulation among Christians. All this serves to explain its refusal by some and the absence of reference to it by others.

II. The Occasion of Its Composition.

Jude, after his brief introduction (1:1,2), explains very definitely why he writes as he does. He indicates distinctly his anxiety on behalf of the saints (1:3): "Beloved, while I was giving all diligence to write unto you of our common salvation, I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." He had received very distressing knowledge of the serious state into which the Christian brotherhood was rapidly drifting, and he must as a faithful servant of Jesus Christ exhort them to steadfastness and warn them of their danger. He had in mind to write them a doctrinal work on the salvation common to all Christians. Perhaps he contemplated the composition of a book or treatise that would have discussed the great subject in an exhaustive manner. But in face of the perils that threatened, of the evils already present in the community, his purpose was indefinitely postponed. We are not told how he became acquainted with the dangers which beset his fellow-believers, but the conjecture is probably correct that it was by means of his journeys as an evangelist. At any rate, he was thoroughly conversant with the evils in the churches, and he deals with them as befitted the enormities that were practiced and the ruin that impended.

The address of the Epistle is remarkable for the affection Jude expresses for these saints. Obviously they are distinct from the libertines of whom he speaks with such solemn condemnation. They were the faithful who kept aloof from the ungodly that surrounded them, and who held fast to the truth they had been taught. Jude describes them as those "that are called, beloved in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ: Mercy unto you and peace and love be multiplied." At the close of the Epistle he commends them "unto him that is able to guard you from stumbling, and to set you before the presence of his glory without blemish in exceeding joy." A separated and devoted band they certainly were, a noble and trustworthy company of believers for whose well-being Jude was supremely anxious.

III. Description of the Libertines and Apostates.

It is needful to gaze with steady vision on the portrait Jude furnishes of these depraved foes, if we are to appreciate in any measure the force of his language and the corruption already wrought in the brotherhood. Some of their foul teachings and their vicious practices, not all, are here set down.

1. Surreptitious Foes.

"For there are certain men crept in privily .... ungodly men" (Jude 1:4). They are enemies who feign to be friends, and hence, in reality are spies and traitors; like a stealthy beast of prey they creep into the company of the godly, actuated by evil intent.

2. Perverters of Grace and Deniers of Christ.

"Turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ" (Jude 1:4). They are those who by a vile perverseness turn the grace and the liberty of the Gospel into a means for gratifying their unholy passions, and who in doctrine and life repudiate their Master and Lord.

3. Censorious and Arrogant Detractors.

"In their dreamings defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion, and rail at dignities" (Jude 1:8). Destitute of true reverence, they rail at the holiest and best things, and sit in judgment on all rule and all authority. They have the proud tongue of the lawless: "Our lips are our own: who Is lord over us?" (Ps 12:4).

4. Ignorant Calumniators and Brutish Sensualists.

"These rail at whatsoever things they know not: and what they understand naturally, like the creatures without reason, in these things are they destroyed" (Jude 1:10). What they do not know, as something lofty and noble, they deride and denounce; what they know is that which ministers to their disordered appetites and their debased tastes.

5. Hypocrites and Deceivers.

"These are they who are hidden rocks in your love-feasts when they feast with you, shepherds that without fear feed themselves; clouds without water .... autumn trees without fruit .... wild waves of the sea .... wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness hath been reserved forever" (Jude 1:12,13). A most graphic picture of the insincerity, the depravity, and the doom of these insolents! And yet they are found in the bosom of the Christian body, even sitting with the saints at their love-feasts!

6. Grumblers, Fault-finders, Pleasure-seekers, Boasters, Parasites.

"These are murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts .... showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage" (Jude 1:16). They impeach Divine wisdom, are the foes of peace and quietness, boast of their capacities to manage things, and yet they can be servile, even sycophants, when thereby advantage is secured.

7. Schismatics and Sensualists.

"These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude 1:19). It was characteristic of the false teachers and mockers who had invaded the Christian church that they drew lines of demarcation between themselves and others, or between different classes of believers, which the Holy Spirit did not warrant, but which was the product of their own crafty and wicked wills. There seems to be a hint in these words of incipient Gnosticism, that fatal heresy that boasted of a recondite knowledge, a deep mystery which only the initiated possessed, of which the great mass of Christians were ignorant. Jude brands the pretension as the offspring of their own sensuality, not at all of God’s Spirit.

Such is the forbidding portrait drawn of the libertines in the Epistle. But Jude adds other and even darker features. He furnishes a number of examples of apostates and of apostasy which disclose even more strikingly the spirit and the doom of them that pervert the truth, that deny the Lord Jesus Christ, and that

mock at the things of God. These all mark a fatal degeneracy, a "falling away," which bodes nothing but evil and judgment. Against the corrupters and skeptics Jude writes with a vehemence that in the New Testament is without a parallel. Matters must have come to a dreadful pass when the Spirit of God is compelled to use such stern and awful language.

IV. Relation of Jude to the Second Epistle of Peter.

1. Resemblances:

The relation is confined to 2Pe 2-3:4. A large portion of Peter's Epistle, namely, 2 Peter 1 and 3:5-18, bears no resemblance to Jude, at least no more than does Jas or 1 Pet. Between the sections of 2Pe indicated above and Jude the parallelism is close, both as to the subjects treated and the historical illustrations introduced, and the language itself to some considerable extent is common to both. All readers must be impressed with the similarity. Accordingly, it is very generally held by interpreters that one of the writers copied from the other. There is not entire agreement as to which of the two epistles is the older, that is, whether Peter copied from Jude, or Jude from Peter. Perhaps a majority favor the former of the two alternatives, though some of the very latest and most learned of those who write on Introductions to the New Testament hold strongly to the view that Jude copied from 2 Pet. Reference is made particularly to Deuteronomy. Theodore v. Zahn, whose magnificent work on Introduction has been but recently translated into English, and who argues convincingly that Jude copied from 2 Pet.

2. Differences:

However, it must be admitted that there are in the two epistles as pronounced differences and divergences as there are resemblances. If one of the two did actually copy from the other, he was careful to add, subtract, and change what he found in his "source" as best suited his purpose. A servile copyist he certainly was not. He maintained his independence throughout, as an exact comparison of the one with the other will demonstrate.

If we bring them into close proximity, following the example of Professor Lumby in the "Bible Comm." (Intro to 2 Pet), we shall discover a marked difference between the two pictures drawn by the writers. We cannot fail to perceive how much darker and more sinister is that of Jude. The evil, alarming certainly in Peter, becomes appalling in Jude. Subjoined are proofs of the fact above stated:

2 Peter 2:1

But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers ....

Jude 1:4 For there are certain men crept in privily ....

2 Peter 2:1

who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them ....

Jude 1:4

.... ungodly men, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.

2 Peter 2:3

And in covetousness shall they with feigned words make merchandise of you ....

Jude 1:16

.... murmerers, complainers, walking after their own lusts (and their mouth speaketh great swelling words), showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage.

These contrasts and comparisons between the two epistles prove

(1) that in Jude the false teachers are worse, more virulent than in Peter, and

(2) that in Peter the whole description is predictive, whereas in Jude the deplorable condition is actually present.

If 2Pe is dependent on Jude, if the apostle cited from Jude, how explain the strong predictive element in his opening verses (2Pe 2:1-3)? If as Peter-wrote he had lying before him Jude's letter, which represents the corrupters as already within the Christian community and doing their deadly work, his repeated use of the future tense is absolutely inexplicable. Assuming, however, that he wrote prior to Jude, his predictions become perfectly intelligible. No doubt the virus was working when he wrote, but it was latent, undeveloped; far worse would appear; but when Jude wrote the poison was widely diffused, as 1:12,19 clearly show. The very life of the churches was endangered.

2 Peter 2:4,5

For if God spared not the angels when they sinned .... and spared not the ancient world, but preserved Noah with seven others ....

Jude 1:5,6

.... The Lord, having saved a people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them .... and angels that .... left their proper habitation ....

3. Further Contrasts:

Peter speaks of the angels that sinned, Jude of their apostasy. Peter makes prominent the salvation of Noah and his family when the flood overwhelmed the world of the ungodly, while Jude tells of those who, delivered from bondage, afterward were destroyed because of their unbelief. He speaks of no rescue; we know of but two who survived the judgments of the wilderness and who entered the Land of Promise, Caleb and Joshua. Peter mentions the fate of the guilty cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, but he is careful to remind us of the deliverance of righteous Lot, while Jude makes prominent their nameless crimes and consigns them to "the punishment of eternal fire," but he is silent on the rescue of Lot. Manifestly Jude's illustrations are darker and more hopeless than Peter's.

Peter instances Balsam as an example of one who loved the hire of wrongdoing and who was rebuked for his transgression. But Jude cites three notable instances in the Old Testament to indicate how far in apostasy and rebellion the libertines had gone. Three words mark their course, rising into a climax, "way" "error" "gainsay." They went in the way of Cain, i.e. in the way of self-will, of hate, and the spirit of murder. Moreover, they "ran riotously in the error of Balsam for hire." The words denote an activity of viciousness that enlisted all their eagerness and all their might. Balaam's error was one that led into error, one that seduced others into the commission of the like sins. The reference seems to be to the whole career of this heathen prophet, and includes his betrayal of the Israelites through the women of Moab (Nu 31:16). Balsam is the prototype of Jude's libertines, both in his covetousness and his seductive counsel. Furthermore, they "perished in the gainsaying of Korah." This man with 250 followers rebelled against the Divinely appointed leaders and rulers of Israel, Moses and Aaron, and sought to share their authority in Israel, if not to displace them altogether. Comparable with these rebels in ancient Israel are the treacherous and malignant foes whom Jude so vigorously denounces.

Peter speaks of them as "daring, self-willed, they tremble not to rail at dignities: whereas angels, though greater in might and power, bring not a railing judgment against them before the Lord" (Jude 1:10,11). Jude is more specific: These dreamers "defile the flesh, and set at nought dominion, and rail at dignities." They repudiate all authority, despise every form of lordship, and revile those in positions of power. He cites the contention of Michael the archangel with the devil about the body of Moses, and yet this loftiest of the heavenly spirits brought no railing judgment against the adversary. Jude's description is more vivid and definite: he describes an advanced stage of apostasy.

Very noteworthy is Jude 1:22,23. He here turns again to the loyal and stedfast believers whom he addresses at the beginning of his letter, and he gives them directions how they are to deal with those who were ensnared by the wily foes. (The text in 1:22 is somewhat uncertain, but the revision is followed.) There were some who were "in doubt." They were those who had been fascinated by the new teaching, and although not captured by it, they were engaged in its study, were drawn toward it and almost ready to yield. On these the faithful were to have mercy, were to convince them of their danger, show them the enormities to which the false system inevitably leads, and so win them back to Christ's allegiance. As if Jude said, Deal with the wavering in love and fidelity; but rescue them if possible.

There were others whose peril was greater: "And some save, snatching them out of the fire." These were identified with the wicked, were scorched by the fires of destruction and hence, almost beyond reach of rescue; but if possible they are to be saved, however seethed and blackened. Others still there were who were in worse state than the preceding, who were polluted and smirched by the foul contamination of the guilty seducers, and such were to be saved, and the rescuers were to fear lest they should be soiled by contact with the horrible defilement. This is Jude's tremendous summary of the shameful work and frightful evils wrought in the bosom of the church by the libertines. He discloses in these trenchant verses how deeply sunk in sin the false teachers were, and how awful the ruin they had wrought. The description is quite unparalleled in 2 Pet. The shadings in Jude are darker and deeper than those in 2 Pet.

4. Summary:

The comparison between the two writings warrants, we believe, the following conclusions:

(1) that Peter and Jude have in view the same corrupt parties;

(2) that Peter paints them as godless and extremely dangerous, though not yet at their worst; while Jude sets them forth as depraved and as lawless as they can well be;

(3) that Peter's is the older writing and that Jude was acquainted with what the apostle had written.

Stronger evidence than any yet produced of Peter's priority is now to be submitted, and here we avail ourselves in part of Zahn's array of evidence.

5. Evidence of Priority of Peter:

Jude asserts with great positiveness that (1:4) certain men had crept in privily into the Christian fold, "even they who were of old written of beforehand unto this condemnation, ungodly men." Obviously Jude is here speaking of the enemies whom he afterward goes on to describe and denounce in his Epistle. He distinctly affirms that these foes had been of old written of and beforehand designated unto "this condemnation." He clearly has in mind an authoritative writing that spoke of the identical parties Jude himself deals with. He does not tell us whose writing it is that contains the "condemnation" of the errorists; he only declares that there is such a Scripture existing and that he is acquainted with it. Now, to what writing does he refer? Not to any Old Testament prophecy, for none can be found that answers to the words. Nor yet to the prediction of Enoch (1:14,15), for it speaks of the advent of the Lord in judgment at the last day, whereas Jude applies his reference to the ungodly who were then present in the Christian assemblies, corrupting the churches with their wicked teaching and practices. "In 2Pe 2-3:4, we have a prophecy which exactly suits, namely, the announcement that false teachers whose theory and practice exactly correspond to those godless bearers of the Christian name in Jude will appear among a certain group of Jewish Christian churches" (Zahn). Peter's account of them is so particular that Jude would encounter no difficulty in identifying them. He is furnished by the apostle with such characteristics of them, with such illustrations and even words and phrases that he has only to place the

description alongside of the reality to see how completely they match.

It may be objected that the words, "were of old written of beforehand," denote a long period, longer than that which elapsed between the two epistles. But the objection is groundless. The original term for "of old" (palai) sometimes indicates but a brief space of time, e.g. Mr 15:44 (according to the text of Weymouth and Nestle, and the Revised Version (British and American)) relates that Pilate asked the centurion if Jesus had been "any while" (palai) dead, which limits the term to a few hours. In 2Co 12:19 the word occurs, and there it must be restricted to Paul's self-defense which occupies the part of the Epistle preceding, and hence, does not extend beyond a day or two. Probably some years lie between the composition of these two epp., ample time to justify Jude's use of the word if he is referring to 2Pe 2-3:4, as we certainly believe he is.

6. Corroborative References:

This interpretation of Jude 1:4 is confirmed by Jude 1:17,18. These verses are intimately connected with 2Pe 3:2-4. Jude's readers are told to keep in remembrance the words spoken by the apostles of Christ, namely, "In the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts." Peter writes, "that in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts." The resemblance of the one passage to the other is very close, indeed, they are almost identical. Both urge their readers to remember what had been said by the apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ, and both speak of the immoral scoffers who would invade or had invaded the Christian brotherhood. But Peter distinctly asserts that these mockers shall appear in the last days. His words are, "Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts." Jude writes that "in the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts." The phrases, "the last days," and "the last time," denote our age, the dispensation in which we live, as Heb 1:2 proves. Peter puts the appearance of the scoffers in the future, whereas Jude, after quoting the words, significantly adds, "These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit." He means, of course the mockers just mentioned, and he affirms they are now present. With Peter they are yet to come when he wrote, but with Jude the prediction is already fulfilled, so far as the scoffers are concerned. Therefore Jude's writing is subsequent to Peter's, and if there be copying on the part of either, it is Jude who copies.

Peter mentions "your apostles," including himself in the phrase, but Jude does not employ the plural pronoun, for he was not of the apostolic body. But why the plural, "apostles"? Because at least one other apostle had spoken of the perilous times which were coming on the church of God. Paul unites his testimony with that of Peter, and writes, "But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come" (2Ti 3:1-5). His prediction is near akin to that of Peter; it belongs apparently to the same historic time and to the same perilous class of evil-doers and corrupters. In 2Pe 3:15 the apostle lovingly and tenderly speaks of his "brother Paul," and says suggestively that in his Epistle he speaks of these things—no doubt about the scoffers of the last days among the rest. He certainly seems to have Paul in mind when he penned the words. "Knowing this first, that in the last days mockers shall come."

Here, then, is positive ground for the reference in Jude 1:4 to a writing concerning those who had crept

into the fold and who were of old doomed to this condemnation, with which writing his readers were acquainted; they had it in the writing of the apostles Peter and Paul both, and so were forewarned as to the impending danger. Jude's Epistle is subsequent to Peter's.

V. Date of the Epistle.

There is little or no agreement as to the year, yet the majority of writers hold that it belongs to the latter half of the 1st century. Zahn assigns it to 70-75 AD; Lumby, circa 80 AD; Salmon, before the reign of Domitian (81 AD); Sieffert, shortly. prior to Domitian; Chase, not later than 80 AD, probably within a year or two of the Pastoral Epistles. Zahn strongly insists on 64 AD as the date of Peter's death. If the 2nd Epistle bearing his name is authentic, the apostle could not possibly have copied from Jude, for Jude's letter was not in existence when he died. Even on the supposition that he suffered death 65-66 AD, there could have been no copying done save by Jude, for it is almost demonstrable that Jude was written after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD. If 2 Peter is pseudonymous and written about the middle of the 2nd century, as some confidently affirm, it has no right to a place in the Canon nor any legitimate relation to Jude. If genuine, it antedates Jude.

VI. The Libertines of Jude's Epistle.

Their character is very forcibly exhibited, but no information is given us of their origin or to what particular region they belonged. They bore the Christian name, were of the loosest morals, and were guilty of shameful excesses. Their influence seems to have been widespread and powerful, else Jude would not denounce them in such severe language. Their guilty departure from the truth must not be confounded with the Gnosticism of the 2nd century, though it tended strongly in that direction; it was a 1st-century defection. Were they newly risen sensualists, without predecessors? To some extent their forerunners had already appeared. Sensuality in some of its greaser forms disgraced the church at Corinth (1Co 5:1-13; 6:13-20). In the common meals of this congregation which ended in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, they indulged in revelry and gluttony, some of them even being intoxicated (1Co 11:17-22). Participation in a heathen festival exposed the Christians to the danger of sharing in idolatry, and yet some of the Corinthians were addicted to it (1Co 8; 10:14-32). In reading of the state of things in the church at Colosse, one perceives how fatal certain views and practices there would soon become if suffered to grow (Col 2:16-23; 3:5-11). Twenty years after the probable date of Jude, in some of the churches of Asia Minor, wicked parties flourished and dominated Christian assemblies that were closely allied in teaching and conduct with the ungodly of Jude. The Nicolaitans, and the "woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess; and she teacheth and seduceth my servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols" (Re 2:20) belong to the same company of libertines as those of Jude. It should be no surprise to us with these examples before us, that according to Jude there were found in the bosom of the Christian community moral delinquents and shameless profligates whose conduct shocks our sense of propriety and decency, for the like evils, though not so flagrant, troubled the churches in Paul's lifetime.

Jude brands them as enemies and apostates. He pronounces their doom in the words of Enoch: "Behold,

the Lord came with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment upon all" (Jude 1:14,15). It is generally believed that this prophecy of Enoch is quoted by Jude from the apocryphal Book of Enoch. Granting such quotation, that fact does not warrant us to affirm that he endorsed the book. Paul cites from three Greek poets: from Aratus (Ac 17:28), from Menander (1Co 15:33; see Earle, Euripides, "Medea," Intro, 30, where this is attributed to Euripides), and from Epimenides (Tit 1:12). Does anyone imagine that Paul endorses all that these poets wrote? To the quotation from Epimenides the apostle adds, "This testimony is true" (Tit 1:13), but no one imagines he means to say the whole poem is true. So Jude cites a passage from a non-canonical book, not because he accepts the whole book as true, but this particular prediction he receives as from God. Whence the writer of Enoch derived it is unknown. It may have been cherished and transmitted from generation to generation, or in some other way faithfully preserved, but at any rate Jude accepted it as authentic. Paul quotes a saying of the Lord Jesus (Ac 20:35) not recorded in the Gospels, but whence he derived it is unknown. As much may be said of this of Enoch which Jude receives as true.

LITERATURE.

Zahn, Introduction to New Testament; Salmon, Introduction to New Testament; Westcott, Canon of New Testament; Purves, Apostolic Age; Alford, Greek Test.; Plumptre, Commentary, "Cambridge Bible Series"; Lillie, Commentary on 1 and 2 Pet; Bigg, ICC; Vincent, Word Studies.

William G. Moorehead

JUDEA

joo-de’-a: In Ezr 5:8 for "Judah"; thus the Revised Version (British and American). In the New Testament the form is JUDAEA (which see).

JUDGE

juj (shopheT; New Testament dikastes, krites): In the early patriarchal times the heads of families and the elders of the tribes were the judges (compare Ge 38:24), and their authority was based on custom. In the wilderness Moses alone was the judge until Jethro suggested a scheme of devolution. On his advice Moses divided the people into groups of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens, and over each group a wise and good man was set as a judge. Thereafter only the most important cases were brought before Moses (Ex 18:13-26; De 1:9-17). This arrangement ceased to be practicable when the children of Israel settled down in Canaan. Although David took counsel with the heads of thousands and hundreds (1Ch 13:1), it need not be assumed that this was a continuation of the plan adopted by Moses. Probably the local courts were not organized till the time of David. In the days of the Judges justice was ministered by those who had risen by wisdom or valor to that rank (Jud 4:5). An organized circuit court was established by Samuel, who judged cases himself, and also made his sons judges (1Sa 7:16; 8:1). After the monarchy was instituted, the king tried all cases, when requested to do so by the wronged person, in the palace gate (1Ki 7:7; Pr 20:8). There was no public prosecutor (2Sa 14:4; 15:2-6; 1Ch 18:14; 1Ki

3:16; 2Ki 15:5). Under David and Solomon there were probably local courts (1Ch 23:4; 26:29). Jehoshaphat organized a high court of justice (2Ch 19:8). The prophets often complain bitterly that the purity of justice is corrupted by bribery and false witness (Isa 1:23; 5:23; 10:1; Am 5:12; 6:12; Mic 3:11; 7:3; Pr 6:19; 12:17; 18:5). Even kings sometimes pronounced unjust sentences, especially in criminal cases (1Sa 22:6-19; 1Ki 22:26; 2Ki 21:16; Jer 36:26). An evil king could also bend local courts to do his will, as may be gathered from the case of Naboth's vineyard (1Ki 21:1-13).

The first duty of a judge was to execute absolute justice, showing the same impartiality to rich and poor, to Jew and foreigner. He was forbidden to accept bribes or to wrest the judgment of the poor (Ex 23:6-8; De 16:19). He must not let himself be swayed by popular opinion, or unduly favor the poor (Ex 23:2,3).

The court was open to the public (Ex 18:13; Ru 4:1,2). Each party presented his view of the case to the judge (De 1:16; 25:1). Possibly the accused appeared in court clad in mourning (Zec 3:3). The accuser stood on the right hand of the accused (Zec 3:1; Ps 109:6). Sentence was pronounced after the hearing of the case, and the judgment carried out (Jos 7:24,25). The only evidence considered by the court was that given by the witnesses. In criminal cases, not less than two witnesses were necessary (De 19:15; Nu 35:30; De 17:6; compare Mt 18:16; 2Co 13:1; 1Ti 5:19). In cases other than criminal the oath (see OATH) was applied (Ex 22:11; compare Heb 6:16). The lot was sometimes appealed to (Jos 7:14-18), especially in private disputes (Pr 18:18), but this was exceptional. When the law was not quite definite, recourse was had to the Divine oracle (Le 24:12; Nu 15:34).

Paul Levertoff

JUDGES, BOOK OF

juj'-iz, :

1. Title

2. Place in the Canon

3. Contents

(1) Introductory, Judges 1-2:5

(2) Central and Main Portion, Judges 2:6-16

(3) An Appendix, Judges 17-21

4. Chronology

5. Authorship and Sources

6. Relation to Preceding Books

7. Relation to Septuagint and Other versions

8. Religious Purpose and Value

LITERATURE

1. Title:

The English name of the Book of Jud is a translation of the Hebrew title (shopheTim), which is reproduced in the Greek Kritai, and the Latin Liber Judicum. In the list of the canonical books of the Old Testament given by Origen (apud Euseb., HE, VI, 25) the name is transliterated Saphateim, which represents rather "judgments" (shephatim; krimata) than "judges." A passage also is quoted from Philo (De Confus. Linguarum, 26), which indicates that he recognized the same form of the name; compare the Greek title of "Kingdoms" (Basileiai) for the four books of Samuel and Kings.

2. Place in the Canon:

In the order of the Hebrew Canon the Book of Judges invariably occupies the 7th place, following immediately upon Joshua and preceding Samuel and Kings. With these it formed the group of the four "earlier prophets" (nebhi’im ri’shonim), the first moiety of the 2nd great division of the Hebrew Scriptures. As such the Book of Jud was classified and regarded as "prophetical," equally with the other historical books, on the ground of the religious and spiritual teaching which its history conveyed. In the rearrangement of the books, which was undertaken for the purposes of the Greek translation and Canon, Jud maintained its position as 7th in order from the beginning, but the short historical Book of Ru was removed from the place which it held among the Rolls (meghilloth) in the 3rd division of the Jewish Canon, and attached to Jud as a kind of appendix, probably because the narrative was understood to presuppose the same conditions and to have reference to the same period of time. The Greek order was followed in all later VSS, and has maintained itself in modern Bibles. Origen (loc. cit.) even states, probably by a mere misunderstanding, that Jud and Ru were comprehended by the Jews under the one title Saphateim.

3. Contents:

The Book of Jud consists of 3 main parts or divisions, which are readily distinguished.

(1) Introductory, Judges 1-2:5.

A brief summary and recapitulation of the events of the conquest of Western Palestine, for the most part

parallel to the narrative of Joshua, but with a few additional details and some divergences from the earlier account, in particular emphasizing (Jud 1:27-36) the general failure of the Israelites to expel completely the original inhabitants of the land, which is described as a violation of their covenant with Yahweh (Jud 2:1-3), entailing upon them suffering and permanent weakness. The introductory verse (Jud 1:1), which refers to the death of Joshua as having already taken place, seems to be intended as a general indication of the historical period of the book as a whole; for some at least of the events narrated in Jud 1-2:5 took place during Joshua's lifetime.

(2) The Central and Main Portion, Judges 2:6-16.

A series of narratives of 12 "judges," each of whom in turn, by his devotion and prowess, was enabled to deliver Israel from thralldom and oppression, and for a longer or shorter term ruled over the people whom he had thus saved from their enemies. Each successive repentance on the part of the people, however, and their deliverance are followed, on the death of the judge, by renewed apostasy, which entails upon them renewed misery and servitude, from which they are again rescued when in response to their prayer the Lord "raises up" for them another judge and deliverer. Thus the entire history is set as it were in a recurrent framework of moral and religious teaching and warning; and the lesson is enforced that it is the sin of the people, their abandonment of Yahweh and persistent idolatry, which entails upon them calamity, from which the Divine longsuffering and forbearance alone makes for them a way of escape.

(a) Judges 2:6-3:6:

A second brief introduction, conceived entirely in the spirit of the following narratives, which seems to attach itself to the close of the Book of Joshua, and in part repeats almost verbally the account there given of the death and burial of Israel's leader (Jud 2:6-9 parallel Jos 24:28-31), and proceeds to describe the condition of the land and people in the succeeding generation, ascribing their misfortunes to their idolatry and repeated neglect of the warnings and commands of the judges; closing with an enumeration of the peoples left in the land, whose presence was to be the test of Israel's willingness to obey Yahweh and at the same time to prevent the nation from sinking into a condition of lethargy and ease.

(b) Judges 3:7-3:11:

Judgeship of Othniel who delivered Israel from the hand of Cushan-rishathaim.

(c) Judges 3:12-30:

Victory of Ehud over the Moabites, to whom the Israelites had been in servitude 18 years. Ehud slew their king Eglon, and won for the nation a long period of tranquillity.

(d) Judges 3:31:

In a few brief words Shamgar is named as the deliverer of Israel from the Philistines. The title of "judge" is not accorded to him, nor is he said to have exercised authority in any way. It is doubtful, therefore, whether the writer intended him to be regarded as one of the judges.

(e) Judges 4; 5:

Victory of Deborah and Barak over Jabin the Canaanite king, and death of Sisera, captain of his army, at the hands of Jael, the wife of Kenite chief; followed by a So of Triumph, descriptive and commemorative of the event.

(f) Judges 6-8:

A 7-year oppression at the hands of the Midianites, which is described as peculiarly severe, so that the land became desolate on account of the perpetual raids to which it was subject. After a period of hesitation and delay, Gideon defeats the combined forces of the Midianites and Amalekites and the "children of the east," i.e. the wandering Bedouin bands from the eastern deserts, in the valley of Jezreel. The locality and course of the battle are traced by the sacred writer, but it is not possible to follow his account in detail because of our inability to identify the places named. After the victory, Gideon is formally offered the position of ruler for himself and his descendants, but refuses; nevertheless, he seems to have exercised a measure of restraining influence over the people until his death, although he himself and his family apparently through covetousness fell away from their faithfulness to Yahweh (Jud 8:27,33).

(g) Judges 9:

Episode of Abimelech, son of Gideon by a concubine, who by the murder of all but one of his brethren, the legitimate sons of Gideon, secured the throne at Shechem for himself, and for 3 years ruled Israel. After successfully stamping out a revolt at Shechem against his authority, he is himself killed when engaged in the siege of the citadel or tower of Thebez by a stone thrown by woman.

(h) (i) Judges 10:1-5:

Tola and Jair are briefly named as successive judges of Israel for 23 and 22 years respectively.

(j) Judges 10:6-12:7:

Oppression of Israel for 18 years by the Philistines and Ammonites. The national deliverance is effected by Jephthah, who is described as an illegitimate son of Gilead who had been on that account driven out from his home and had become the captain of a band of outlaws. Jephthah stipulates with the elders of Gilead that if he undertakes to do battle on their behalf with the Ammonites, he is afterward to be recognized as their ruler; and in accordance with the agreement, when the victory has been won, he

becomes judge over Israel (Jud 11:9 f; 12:7).

See JEPHTHAH.

(k) (l) (m) Judges 12:8-15:

Three of the so-called "minor" judges, Ibzan, Elon and Abdon, judged Israel in succession for 7, 10 and 8 years respectively. As they are not said to have delivered the nation from any calamity or oppression, it is perhaps to be understood that the whole period was a time of rest and tranquillity.

(n) Judges 13-16:

The history of Samson (see separate article).

(3) An Appendix, Judges 17-21.

The final section, in the nature of an appendix, consisting of two narratives, independent apparently of the main portion of the book and of one another. They contain no indication of date, except the statement 4 times repeated that "in those days there was no king in Israel" Jud 6; 18:1; 19:1; 21:25). The natural inference is that the narratives were committed to writing in the days of the monarchy; but the events themselves were understood by the compiler or historian to have taken place during the period of the Judges, or at least anterior to the establishment of the kingdom. The lawless state of society, the violence and disorder among the tribes, would suggest the same conclusion. No name of a judge appears, however, and there is no direct reference to the office or to any central or controlling authority. Josephus also seems to have known them in reverse order, and in a position preceding the histories of the judges themselves, and not at the close of the book (Ant., V, ii, 8-12; iii, 1; see E. Konig in HDB, II, 810). Even if the present form of the narratives is thus late, there can be little doubt that they contain elements of considerable antiquity.

(a) Judges 17-18:

The episode of Micah the Ephraimite and the young Levite who is consecrated as priest in his house. A war party, however, of the tribe of Da during a migration northward, by threats and promises induced the Levite to accompany them, taking with him the priestly ephod, the household goods of his patron, and a costly image which Micah had caused to be made. These Micah in vain endeavors to recover from the Danites. The latter sack and burn Laish in the extreme North of Palestine, rebuilding the city on the same site and renaming it "Dan." There they set up the image which they had stolen, and establish a rival priesthood and worship, which is said to have endured "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (18:31).

(b) Judges 19-21:

Outrage of the Benjamites of Gibeah against the concubine of a Levite lodging for a night in the city on his way from Bethlehem to the hill country of Ephraim. The united tribes, after twice suffering defeat at the hands of the men of Benjamin, exact full vengeance; the tribe of Benjamin is almost annihilated, and their cities, including Gibeah, are destroyed. In order that the tribe may not utterly perish, peace is declared with the 600 survivors, and they are provided with wives by stratagem and force, the Israelites having taken a solemn vow not to permit intermarriage between their own daughters and the members of the guilty tribe.

4. Chronology:

The period covered by the history of the Book of Jud extends from the death of Joshua to the death of Samson, and adds perhaps a later reference in Jud 18:31, "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (compare 1Sa 1:3). It is, however, difficult, perhaps impossible, to compute in years the length of time that the writer had in mind. That he proceeded upon a fixed chronological basis, supplied probably by tradition but modified or arranged on a systematic principle, seems evident. The difficulty may be due in part to the corruption which the figures have suffered in the course of the transmission of the text. In 1Ki 6:1 an inclusive total of 480 years is given as the period from the Exodus to the building of the Temple in the 4th year of the reign of Solomon. This total, however, includes the 40 years' wandering in the desert, the time occupied in the conquest and settlement of the Promised Land, and an uncertain period after the death of Joshua, referred to in the Book of Jud itself (2:10), until the older generation that had taken part in the invasion had passed away. There is also to be reckoned the 40 years' judgeship of Eli (1Sa 4:18), the unknown length of the judgeship of Samuel (Jud 7:15), the years of the reign of Saul (compare 1Sa 13:1, where, however, no statement is made as to the length of his reign), the 40 years during which David was king (1Ki 2:11), and the 4 years of Solomon before the building of the Temple. The recurrence of the number 40 is already noticeable; but if for the unknown periods under and after Joshua, of Samuel and of Saul, 50 or 60 years be allowed—a moderate estimate—there would remain from the total of 480 years a period of 300 years in round numbers for the duration of the times of the Judges. It may be doubted whether the writer conceived of the period of unsettlement and distress, of alternate oppression and peace, as lasting for so long a time.

The chronological data contained in the Book of Judges itself are as follows:

A total of 410 years, or, if the years of foreign oppression and of the usurpation of Abimelech are omitted, of 296.

It has been supposed that in some instances the rule of the several judges was contemporaneous, not successive, and that therefore the total period during which the judges ruled should be reduced accordingly. In itself this is sufficiently probable. It is evident, however, that this thought was not in the mind of the writer, for in each case he describes the rule of the judge as over "Israel" with no indication that "Israel" is to be understood in a partial and limited signification. His words must therefore be interpreted in their natural sense, that in his own belief the rulers whose deeds he related exercised control in the order named over the entire nation. Almost certainly, however, he did not intend to include

in his scheme the years of oppression or the 3 years of Abimelech's rule. If these be deducted, the resultant number (296) is very near the total which the statement in 1Ki 6:1 suggests.

No stress, however, must be laid upon this fact. The repeated occurrence of the number 40, with its double and half, can hardly be accidental. The same fact was noted above in connection with earlier and later rulers in Israel. It suggests that there is present an element of artificiality and conscious arrangement in the scheme of chronology, which makes it impossible to rely upon it as it stands for any definite or reliable historical conclusion.

5. Authorship and Sources:

Within the Book of Jud itself no author is named, nor is any indication given of the writer or writers who are responsible for the form in which the book appears; and it would seem evident, also, that the 3 parts or divisions of which the book is composed are on a different footing as regards the sources from which they are drawn. The Talmudic tradition which names Samuel as the author can hardly be seriously regarded. The historical introduction presents a form of the traditional narrative of the conquest of Palestine which is parallel to but not identical with that contained in the Book of Joshua. Brief and disconnected as it is, it is of the greatest value as a historical authority, and contains elements which in origin, if not in their present form, are of considerable antiquity. The main portion of the book, comprising the narratives of the judges, is based upon oral or written traditions of a local and perhaps a tribal character, the value of which it is difficult to estimate, but which undoubtedly in some instances have been more carefully preserved than in others. In particular, around the story of Samson there seem to have gathered elements derived from the folklore and the wonder-loving spirit of the countryside; and the exploits of a national hero have been enhanced and surrounded with a glamor of romance as the story of them has passed from lip to lip among a people who themselves or their forefathers owed so much to his prowess. Of this central part of Jud the So of Deborah (Judges 5) is the most ancient, and bears every mark of being a contemporary record of a remarkable conflict and victory. The text is often difficult, almost unintelligible, and has so greatly suffered in the course of transmission as in some passages to be beyond repair. As a whole the song is an eloquent and impassioned ode of triumph, ascribing to Yahweh the great deliverance which has been wrought for His people over their foes.

The narratives of Jgs, moreover, are set in a framework of chronology and of ethical comment and teaching, which are probably independent of one another. The moral exhortations and the lessons drawn from hardships and sufferings, which the people of Israel incur as the consequence of their idolatry and sin, are conceived entirely in the spirit of Deuteronomy, and even in the letter and form bear a considerable resemblance to the writings of that book. In the judgment of some scholars, therefore, they are to be ascribed to the same author or authors. Of this, however, there is no proof. It is possible, but perhaps hardly probable. They certainly belong to the same school of thought, of clear-sighted doctrine, of reverent piety, and of jealous concern for the honor of Yahweh. With the system of chronology, the figures and dates, the ethical commentary and inferences would seem to have no direct relation. The former is perhaps a later addition, based in part at least upon tradition, and applied to existing accounts, in order to give them their definite place and succession in the historical record. Finally, the three strands of traditional narrative, moral comment, and chronological framework were woven into one whole by a

compiler or reviser who completed the book in the form in which it now exists. Concerning the absolute dates, however, at which these processes took place very little can be determined.

The two concluding episodes are distinct, both in form and character, from the rest of the book. They do not relate the life or deeds of a judge, nor do they, explicitly at least, convey any moral teaching or warning. They are also mutually independent. It would seem therefore that they are to be regarded as accounts of national events or experiences, preserved by tradition, which, because they were understood to have reference to the period of the Judges, were included in this book. The internal nature of the narratives themselves would suggest that they belong rather to the earlier than the later part of the time during which the judges held rule; and their ancient character is similarly attested. There is no clue, however, to the actual date of their composition, or to the time or circumstances under which they were incorporated in the Book of Jgs.

6. Relation to Preceding Books:

The discussion of the relation of the Book of Jud to the generally recognized sources of the Pentateuch and to Joshua has been in part anticipated in the previous paragraph. In the earliest introductory section of the book, and in some of the histories of the judges, especially in that of Gideon (Judges 6-8), it is not difficult to distinguish two threads of narrative, which have been combined together in the account as it now stands; and by some scholars these are identified with the Jahwist (Jahwist) and the Elohist (E) in the Pentateuch. The conclusion, however, is precarious and uncertain, for the characteristic marks of the Pentateuch "sources" are in great measure absent. There is more to be said for the view that regards the introduction (Jud 1-2:5), with its verbal parallels to Joshua as derived ultimately from the history of JE, from which, however, very much has been omitted, and the remainder adapted and abbreviated. Even this moderate conclusion cannot be regarded as definitely established. The later author or compiler was in possession of ancient documents or traditions, of which he made use in his composite narrative, but whether these were parts of the same historical accounts that are present in the books of Moses and in Joshua must be regarded as undetermined. There is no trace, moreover, in Jud of extracts from the writing or school of P; nor do the two concluding episodes of the book (Judges 17-21) present any features which would suggest an identification with any of the leading "sources" of the Pentateuch.

The moral and religious teaching, on the other hand, which makes the varied national experiences in the times of the Judges a vehicle for ethical instruction and warning, is certainly derived from the same school as Deuteronomy, and reproduces the whole tone and spirit of that book. There is no evidence, however, to identify the writer or reviser who thus turned to spiritual profit the lessons of the age of the Judges with the author of Deuteronomy itself, but he was animated by the same principles, and endeavored in the same way to expound the same great truths of religion and the Providence of God.

7. Relation to Septuagint and Other Versions:

There are two early Greek translations of the Book of Jgs, which seem to be on the whole independent of one another. These are represented by the two great uncial manuscripts, B (Codex Vaticanus) and A

(Codex Alexandrinus). With the former is associated a group of cursive manuscripts and the Sahidic or Upper Egyptian version. It is therefore probable that the translation is of Egyptian origin, and by some it has been identified with that of Hesychius. It has been shown, moreover, that in this book, and probably elsewhere, the ancient character of the text of B is not always maintained, but in parts at least betrays a later origin. The other version is contained in AV and the majority of the uncial and cursive manuscripts of the Greek texts, and, while certainly a real and independent translation from the original, is thought by some to show acquaintance with the version of B. There is, however, no definite evidence that B's translation is really older. Some of the cursives which agree in general with A form sub-groups; thus the recension of Lucian is believed to be represented by a small number of cursives, the text of which is printed by Lagarde (Librorum VT Canonicorum, Pars Prior, 1883), and is substantially identical with that in the "Complutensian Polyglot" (see G. F. Moore, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges, Edinburgh, 1895, xliii ff). It is probable that the true original text of the Septuagint is not represented completely either by the one or the other version, but that it partially underlies both, and may be traced in the conflicting readings which must be judged each on its own merits.

Of the other principal versions, the Old Latin and the Hexaplar Syriac, together with the Armenian and the Ethiopic, attach themselves to a sub-group of the manuscripts associated with A. The Bohairic version of the Book of Jud has not hitherto been published, but, like the rest of the Old Testament, its text would no doubt be found to agree substantially with B. Jerome's translation follows closely the Massoretic Text, and is independent of both Greek VSS; and the Peshitta also is a direct rendering from the Hebrew.

8. Religious Purpose and Value:

Thus the main purpose of the Book of Judges in the form in which it has been preserved in the Old Testament is not to record Israel's past for its own sake, or to place before the writer's contemporaries a historical narrative of the achievements of their great men and rulers, but to use these events and the national experiences of adversity as a text from which to educe religious warning and instruction. With the author or authors spiritual edification is the first interest, and the facts or details of the history, worthy of faithful records, because it is the history of God's people, find their chief value in that they are and were designed to be admonitory, exhibiting the Divine judgments upon idolatry and sin, and conveying the lesson that disobedience and rebellion, a hard and defiant spirit that was forgetful of Yahweh, could not fail to entail the same disastrous consequences. The author is preeminently a preacher of righteousness to his fellow-countrymen, and to this aim all other elements in the book, whether chronological or historical, are secondary and subordinate. In his narrative he sets down the whole truth, so far as it has become known to him through tradition or written document, however discreditable it may be to his nation. There is no ground for believing that he either extenuates on the one hand, or on the other paints in darker colors than the record of the transgressions of the people deserved. Neither he nor they are to be judged by the standards of the 20th century, with its accumulated wealth of spiritual experience and long training in the principles of righteousness and truth. But he holds and asserts a lofty view of the character of Yahweh, of the immutability of His wrath against obstinate transgression and of the certainty of its punishment, and yet of the Divine pitifulness and mercy to the man or nation that turns to Him with a penitent heart. The Jews were not mistaken when they counted

the Book of Jud among the Prophets. It is prophecy, more than history, because it exhibits and enforces the permanent lessons of the righteousness and justice and loving-kindness of God.

LITERATURE.

A complete bibliography of the literature up to date will be found in the Dicts. under the word "Judges," D B2, 1893; HDB, II, 1899; EB, II, 1901; compare G. F. Moore, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jgs, Edinburgh, 1895; SBOT, Leipzig, 1900; R. A. Watson, "Jgs" and "Ruth," in Expositor’s Bible, 1889; G. W. Thatcher, "Jgs" and "Ruth," in Century Bible; S. Oettli, "Das Deuteronomium und die Bucher Josua und Richter," in Kurzgefasster Kommentar, Munchen, 1893; K. Budde, "Das Buch der Richter," in Kurzer HandKommentar zum Altes Testament, Tubingen, 1897; W. Nowack, "Richter," in Hand-kommentar zum Altes Testament, 1900.

A. S. Geden

JUDGES, PERIOD OF

I. SOURCES

II. CHRONOLOGY

III. GENERAL POLITICAL SITUATION

1. The Canaanites

2. Foes Without

IV. MAIN EVENTS

1. Struggles of Individual Tribes

2. Civil Strife

3. The Six Invasions

4. Need of Central Government

V. RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

VI. THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION

LITERATURE

I. Sources.

Our chief sources of information are the Book of Jud and 1Sa 1-12. The material contained in these is not all of the same age. The oldest part, by common consent, is the So of Deborah (Jud 5). It is a contemporaneous document. The prose narratives, however, are also early, and are generally regarded as presenting a faithful picture of the times with which they deal. The Book of Ruth, which also refers to this period, is probably in its present form a later composition, but there is no adequate ground for denying to it historical basis (Konig, Einleitung, 286 ff; Kent, Student's Old Testament, I, 310 f).

II. Chronology.

The period of the Judges extends from the death of Joshua to the establishment of the monarchy. How long a time elapsed between these limits is a matter of wide difference of opinion. The chronological data in the Book of Jgs, i.e. omitting Eli and Samuel, make a total of 410 years. But this is inconsistent with 1Ki 6:1, where the whole period from the Exodus to the 4th year of Solomon is reckoned at 480 years. Various attempts have been made to harmonize these divergent figures, e.g. by eliminating the 70 years attributed to the Minor Judges (10:1-5; 12:7-15), by not counting the 71 years of foreign domination, and by theory that some of the judges were contemporaneous. It is probable that the 480 years of 1Ki 6:1 was a round number and did not rest on exact records. Indeed, it is doubtful if there was any fixed calendar in Israel before the time of the monarchy. The only way then to determine the length of the period of the Judges is from the date of the Exodus. The common view is that the Exodus took place during or just after the reign of Merenptah in the latter half of the 13th century BC. This, however, leaves hardly more than 150 years to the period of the Judges, for Saul's reign fell in the 2nd half of the 11th century BC. Hence, some, to whom this seems too short, assign the Exodus to the reign of Amenophis II, about 1450 BC. This harmonizes with the 480 years of 1Ki 6:1, and is supported by other considerations (POT, 422-24). Still others have connected the Exodus with the expulsion of the Hyksos about 1580 BC (G.A. Reisner); and this would fit in very well with the chronological data in the Book of Jgs. The objection to the last two views is that they require a rather long period of subjection of the Israelites in Canaan to Egypt, of which there is no trace in the Book of Judges.

See, further, JUDGES, BOOK OF, IV.

III. General Political Situation.

The death of Joshua left much land yet to be possessed by the Israelites.

1. The Canaanites:

The different tribes had received their respective allotments (Jud 1:3), but the actual possession of the territory assigned each still lay in the future and was only gradually achieved. The Canaanites remained

in the land, and were for a time a serious menace to the power of Israel. They retained possession of the plains and many of the fortified cities, e.g. Gezer, Harheres, Aijalon, Shaalhim, and Jerusalem on the northern border of Judah (Jud 1:21,29,35), and Bethshean, Ibleam, Taanach, Megiddo, and Dot along the northern border of Manasseh (Jud 1:27,28).

2. Foes Without:

Besides these foes within Canaan, the Israelites had enemies from without to contend with, namely, the Moabites, Midianites, Ammonites, and Philistines. The danger from each of these quarters, except that from the Philistines, was successfully warded off. The conflicts in which the Israelites were thus involved were all more or less local in character. In no case did all the tribes act together, though the duty of such united action is clearly taught in the So of Deborah, at least so far as the 10 northern tribes are concerned. The omission of Judah and Simeon from this ancient song is strange, but may not be so significant as is sometimes supposed. The judges, who were raised up to meet the various emergencies, seem to have exercised jurisdiction only over limited areas. In general the different tribes and clans acted independently of each other. Local home rule prevailed. "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jud 17:6).

That Canaan was not during this period subdued and kept in subjection by one of the great world-powers, Egypt or Babylonia, is to be regarded as providential (HPM, I, 214 f). Such subjection would have made impossible the development of a free national and religious life in Israel. The Cushan-rishathaim of Jud 3:7-10 was more likely a king of Edom than of Mesopotamia (Paton, Early History of Syria and Palestine, 161-62).

IV. Main Events.

1. Struggles of Individual Tribes:

Much of what took place during this period is unrecorded. Of the struggles through which the individual tribes passed before they succeeded in establishing themselves in the land, little is known. One interesting episode is preserved for us in Jud 17$; 18$. A considerable portion of the tribe of Dan, hard pressed by the Amorites (Jud 1:34 f), migrated from their allotted home West of Judah to Laish in the distant north, where they put the inhabitants to the sword, burnt the city and then rebuilt it under the name of Dan. This took place early in the period of the Judges, apparently during the first generation after the conquest (Jud 18:30).

2. Civil Strife:

At about the same time also (Jud 20:28) seems to have occurred the war with Benjamin (Jud 19-21), which grew out of an outrage perpetrated at Gibeah and the refusal of the Benjamites to surrender the guilty parties for punishment. The historicity of this war has been called in question, but it seems to be attested by Ho 9:9; 10:9. And that civil strife in Israel was not otherwise unknown during this period is

clear from the experiences of Gideon (Jud 8:1-3) and Jephthah (Jud 12:1-6), not to mention those of Abimelech (Jud 9). It is a current theory that the tribes of Simeon and Levi early in this period suffered a serious reverse (Ge 49:5-7), and that a reflection of this event is to be found in Ge 34; but the data are too uncertain to warrant any confidence in this view.

3. The Six Invasions:

Six wars with other nations are recorded as taking place in this period, and each called forth its judge or judges. Othniel delivered the Israelites from the Mesopotamians or Edomites (Jud 3:7-11), Ehud from the Moabites (Jud 3:12-30), Deborah and Barak from the Canaanites (Judges 4; 5), Gideon from the Midianites (Judges 6-8), and Jephthah from the Ammonites (Jud 10:6-12,17). In the strife with the Philistines, which was not terminated during this period, Samson (Judges 13-16), Eli (1Sa 4-6), and Samuel (1Sa 7:3-14; 9:16) figure. Of these six wars those which brought Othniel, Ehud and Jephthah to the front were less serious and significant than the other three. The conflicts with the Canaanites, Midianites and Philistines mark distinct stages in the history of the period.

After the first successes of the Israelites in Canaan a period of weakness and disintegration set in. The Canaanites, who still held the fortified cities in the plain of Esdraelon, banded themselves together and terrorized the region round about. The Hebrews fled from their villages to the caves and dens. None had the heart to offer resistance (Jud 5:6,8). It seemed as though they were about to be subdued by the people they had a short time before dispossessed. Then it was that Deborah appeared on the scene. With her passionate appeals in the name of Yahweh she awakened a new sense of national unity, rallied the discouraged forces of the nation and administered a final crushing defeat upon the Canaanites in the plain of Megiddo.

But the flame thus kindled after a time went out. New enemies came from without. The Midianites invaded the land year after year, robbing it of its produce (Jud 6:1,3). This evil was suddenly put an end to by the bold stroke of Gideon, whose victory was long treasured in the public memory (Isa 9:4; 10:26; Ps 83:9-12). But the people, at least of Manasseh and perhaps also of Ephraim, now realized that it was no longer safe to depend upon such temporary leadership. They needed a permanent organization to ward off the dangers that beset them. They therefore offered the kingship to Gideon. He formally declined it (Jud 8:22,23), but still set up a government at Ophrah which the people looked upon as hereditary (Jud 9:2). He was succeeded by his son Abimelech, who, after slaying all but one of his 70 brothers, assumed the title of king. The new kingdom, however, was of short duration. It ended after three years with the ignominious death of the king.

4. Need of Central Government:

A great danger was needed before the people of Israel could be welded into unity and made to see the necessity of a strong central government. This came eventually from the Philistines, who twice defeated the Israelites in battle, captured the ark, and overran a large part of the country (1Sa 4-6). In the face of such a foe as this it was clear that only a strong and permanent leadership of the whole people would

suffice (1Sa 9:15; 10:1); and thus the rule of the Judges gave way to the monarchy.

V. Religious Conditions.

The Hebrew mind to which Moses addressed himself was not a tabula rasa, and the Palestinian world into which the Israelites entered was not an intellectual blank. Formative influences had for ages been at work on the Hebrew mind, and Palestine had long been inhabited by people with fixed institutions, customs and ideas. When then Israel settled in Canaan, they had both a heathen inheritance and a heathen environment to contend with. It should therefore occasion no surprise to find during this period such lapses from the purity of the Mosaic faith as appear in the ephod of Gideon (Jud 8:24-27), the images of Micah (Judges 17-18), and the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter (Jud 11:34-40). In the transition from a nomadic to an agricultural life it was inevitable that the Hebrews with their native heathen proclivities would adopt many of the crude and even immoral religious customs and beliefs of the people among whom they settled. But the purer Mosaic faith still had its representatives. The worship of the central sanctuary at Shiloh remained imageless. Leaders like Deborah and Samuel revived the spirit of Moses. And there can hardly be a doubt that in many a quiet home a true and earnest piety was cultivated like that in the home of Elimelech and Naomi.

VI. Theological Interpretation.

The Biblical historian was not content simply to narrate events. What concerned him most was the meaning lying back of them. And this meaning he was interested in, not for its own sake, but because of its application to the people of his own day. Hence, intermingled with the narratives of the period of the Judges are to be found religious interpretations of the events recorded and exhortations based upon them. The fundamental lesson thus inculcated is the same as that continually insisted upon by the prophets. The Divine government of the world is based upon justice. Disobedience to the moral law and disloyalty to Yahweh means, therefore, to Israel suffering and disaster. All the oppressions of the period of the Judges arose in this way. Relief and deliverance came only when the people turned unto Yahweh. This religious pragmatism, as it is called, does not lie on the surface of the events, so that a naturalistic historian might see it. But it is a correlate of the ethical monotheism of the prophets, and constitutes the one element in the Old Testament which makes the study of Israel's history supremely worth while.

LITERATURE.

Josephus, Ant, V, ii-vi, 5; Ottley, Short History of the Hebrews, 101-24; Kittel, History of the Hebrews, II, 60 f, 2nd German edition, II, 52-135.

Albert Cornelius Knudson

JUDGING JUDGMENT

juj'-ing, juj'-ment: Often in the Old Testament for "to act as a magistrate" (Ex 18:13; De 1:16; 16:18,

etc.), justice being administered generally by "elders" (Ex 18:13-27), or "kings" (1Sa 8:20) or "priests" (De 18:15); applied to God as the Supreme Judge (Ps 9:7,8; 10:18; 96:13; Mic 4:3, etc.; Ps 7:8 "Yahweh ministereth judgment," vividly describes a court scene, with Yahweh as Judge).

Often in the New Testament, ethically, for

(1) "to decide," "give a verdict," "declare an opinion" (Greek krino);

(2) "to investigate," "scrutinize" (Greek anakrino);

(3) "to discriminate," "distinguish" (Greek diakrino).

For (1), see Lu 7:43; Ac 15:19;

for (2) see 1Co 2:15; 4:3;

for (3)see 1Co 11:31; 14:29 m.

Used also forensically in Lu 22:30; Ac 25:10; and applied to God in Joh 5:22; Heb 10:30. The judgments of God are the expression of His justice, the formal declarations of His judgments, whether embodied in words (De 5:1 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "statutes"), or deeds (Ex 6:6; Re 16:7), or in decisions that are yet to be published (Ps 36:6). Man’s consciousness of guilt inevitably associates God’s judgments as declarations of the Divine justice, with his own condemnation, i.e. he knows that a strict exercise of justice means his condemnation, and thus "judgment" and "condemnation" become in his mind synonymous (Ro 5:16); hence, the prayer of Ps 143:2, "Enter not into judgment"; also, Joh 6:29, "the resurrection of judgment" (the King James Version "damnation"); 1Co 11:29, "eateth and drinketh judgment" (the King James Version "damnation").

H. E. Jacobs

JUDGMENT HALL

juj’-ment hol (to praitorion, "Then led they Jesus .... unto the hall of judgment .... and they themselves went not into the judgment hall" (Joh 18:28 the King James Version); "Then Pilate entered into the judgment hall again" (Joh 18:33 the King James Version); "(Pilate) went again into the judgment hall" (Joh 19:9); "He commanded him to be kept in Herod’s judgment hall" (Ac 23:35)):

"Judgment hall" is one of the ways in which the King James Version translates praitorion, which it elsewhere renders "Praetorium" (Mr 15:16); "the common hall" (Mt 27:27). In this passage the English Revised Version renders it "palace"; in Joh 18:33; 19:9; Ac 23:35, "palace" is also given by the English Revised Version; in Php 1:13, the King James Version renders, "palace," while the Revised Version

(British and American) gives "the praetorian guard." Praitorion accordingly is translated in all these ways, "Praetorium," "the common hall," "the judgment hall," "the palace," "the praetorian guard." In the passages In the Gospels, the American Standard Revised Version renders uniformly "Praetorium."

The word originally meant the headquarters in the Roman camp, the space where the general's tent stood, with the camp altar; the tent of the commander-in-chief. It next came to mean the military council, meeting in the general's tent. Then it came to be applied to the palace in which the Roman governor or procurator of a province resided. In Jerusalem it was the magnificent palace which Herod the Great had built for himself, and which the Roman procurators seem to have occupied when they came from Caesarea to Jerusalem to transact public business.

Praitorion in Php 1:13 has been variously rendered, "the camp of the praetorian soldiers," "the praetorian guard," etc. For what is now believed to be its true meaning, see PRAETORIUM.

John Rutherfurd

JUDGMENT SEAT

(bema, "a raised place," "platform," "tribune," Mt 27:19; Joh 19:13; see GABBATHA; Ac 12:21 margin (text "throne"); 18:12,16 ff; 25:6,17): In Greek law courts, one bema was provided for the accuser, another for the accused; but in the New Testament the word designates the official scat of a judge, usually of the Roman governor; also of the emperor (Ac 25:10); then of God (Ro 14:10), of Christ (2Co 5:10). The word kriterion, "a tribunal," "bench of judges" (Jas 2:6) occurs also in 1Co 6:2-4, and is there translated in the Revised Version margin by "tribunals."

See also JUDGE.

JUDGMENT, DAY OF

See JUDGMENT, LAST.

JUDGMENT, LAST

1. A Transcendental Doctrine:

In Christian theology the Last Judgment is an act in which God interposes directly into human history, brings the course of this world to a final close, determines the eternal fate of human beings, and places them in surroundings spiritually adapted to their final condition. The concept is purely transcendental, and is to be distinguished from the hope that God will interfere in the history of this world to determine it undeviatingly toward good. The transcendental doctrine is possible only when an exalted idea of God has been attained, although it may afterward be united with crasser theories, as in certain naive

conceptions of Christianity at the present day.

2. The Doctrine in the Religion of Israel:

In the religion of Israel, the doctrine of the Last Judgment arose from "transcendentalizing" the concept of the "Day of the Lord." Just as hope of immortality replaced desire for length of days on earth, just the as for "the rejuvenation of Palestine" was substituted "an eternal abode in a new earth," so the ideal of a military victory over Israel's enemies expanded into God's solemn condemnation of evil. The concept thus strictly defined is hardly to be sought in the Old Testament, but Da 12:1-3 may contain it. The first unequivocal assertion would appear to be in Enoch 91:17, where the final state is contrasted with a preceding reign of earthly happiness. (If there has been no redaction in the latter part of this section, its date is prior to 165 BC.) Hereafter the idea is so prevalent in the Jewish writings that detailed reference is needless. But it is by no means universal. Writings touched with Greek thought (En 108; 4 Macc; Philo) are content with an individual judgment at death. A unique theory is that of the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (Levi 18:8-14, e.g.), where the world grows into final blessedness without catastrophe. But much more common is the persistence of the non-transcendental ideas, ingrained as they were in the thought of the people (even in Philo; compare his prophecy of national earthly glory in Excr 9). This type of thought was so tenacious that it held its own alongside of the transcendental, and both points of view were accepted by more than one writer. Then the earthly happiness precedes the heavenly (as in Enoch 91), and there are two judgments, one by the Messiah and the other by God (2 Esdras 7; Syriac Baruch 30). So in Revelation 19 where Christ overcomes the enemies in battle-symbolism and establishes the Millennium, while the Last Judgment is held by God (20:11 ff). Otherwise the Messiah is never the judge except in the Parables of Enoch, where He appears as God's vicar uniformly (in 47:3 God fixes the time of judgment only). Possibly in The Wisdom of Solomon 4:16; 5:1 men share in the judgment-act but otherwise they (and angels) appear only as "assessors" or as executors of the sentence. In The Wisdom of Solomon 3:8, "judging" is used in the Old Testament sense of "rule" (Jud 3:10, etc.), as is the case in Mt 19:28 parallel Lu 22:30; 1Co 6:2,3 (in the last case with the word in two senses). Further studies in the variation of the (rather conventionally fixed) details of the judgment will interest the special student only.

For discussions of the relevant Biblical passages, see DAY OF THE LORD; ESCHATOLOGY; PAROUSIA. The doctrine has real religious value, for it insists on a culmination in the evolution (or degeneration!) of the race as well as of the individual. So it is contrasted with the pessimism of natural science, which points only toward the gradual extinction of humanity through the cooling of the sun.

LITERATURE.

The variations of the concept are treated, fully only in Volz, Judische Eschatologie. For general literature see ESCHATOLOGY; PAROUSIA.

Burton Scott Easton

JUDICIAL BLINDNESS

joo-dish’-al.

See BLINDNESS, JUDICIAL.

JUDICIAL COURTS

See COURTS, JUDICIAL.

JUDICIAL HARDENING

See HARDEN.

JUDITH

joo’-dith (for etymology, see next article):

(1) A wife of Esau, daughter of Beeri the Hittite (Ge 26:34).

(2) The heroine of the Book of Judith in Apocrypha—a pious, wealthy, courageous, and patriotic widow who delivered Jerusalem and her countrymen from the assault of Holofernes, the general of Nebuchadnezzar who had arranged the expedition which aimed at making Nebuchadnezzar the object of universal human worship.

The 8th and following chapters of the book describe her actions which resulted in the cutting off of the head of Holofernes, the rout of the Assyrian army, and the deliverance of the Jews.

See JUDITH, BOOK OF.

JUDITH, BOOK OF

I. NAME

II. CANONICITY

III. CONTENTS

IV. FACT OR FICTION?

V. DATE

1. Probably during the Maccabean Age

2. Other Opinions

(1) Invasion of Pompey

(2) Insurrection under Bar Cochba

VI. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE

VII. VERSIONS

1. Greek

2. Syriac

3. Latin

4. Hebrew

LITERATURE

I. Name.

This apocryphal book is called after the name of its principal character Judith (yehudhith], "a Jewess"; Ioudith, Ioudeth). The name occurs in Ge 26:34 and the corresponding masculine form (yehudhi, "a Jew") in Jer 36:14,21,23 (name of a scribe). In other great crises in Hebrew history women have played a great part (compare Deborah, Jud 5, and Esther). The Books of Ruth, Esther, Judith and Susannah are the only ones in the Bible (including the Apocrypha) called by the names of women, these women being the principal characters in each case.

II. Canonicity.

Though a tale of Jewish patriotism written originally in Hebrew, this book was never admitted into the Hebrew Canon, and the same applies to the Book of Tobit. But both Judith and Tobit were recognized as canonical by the Council of Carthage (397 AD) and by the Council of Trent (1545 AD). Though, however, all Romanists include these books in their Bible (the Vulgate), Protestant versions of the Bible, with very few exceptions, exclude the whole of the Apocrypha (see APOCRYPHA). In the Septuagint and Vulgate, Tobit and Judith (in that order) follow Nehemiah and precede Esther. In the English

Versions of the Bible of the Apocrypha, which unfortunately for its understanding stands alone, 1 Esdras, 2 Esdras, Tobit and Judith occupy the first place and in the order named. In his translation of the Apocrypha, Luther, for some unexplained reason, puts Judith at the head of the apocryphal books, Wisdom taking the next place.

III. Contents.

The book opens with an account of the immense power of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Assyria, whose capital was Nineveh. (In the days of the real Nebuchadnezzar, Assyria had ceased to be, and its capital was destroyed.) He calls upon the peoples living in the western country, including Palestine, to help him to subdue a rival king whose power he feared—Arphaxad, king of the Medes (otherwise quite unknown). But as they refused the help he demanded, he first conquered his rival, annexing his territory, and then sent his general Holofernes to subdue the western nations and to punish them for their defiance of his authority. The Assyrian general marched at the head of an army 132,000 strong and soon took possession of the lands North and East of Palestine, demolishing their idols and sanctuaries that Nebuchadnezzar alone might be worshipped as god (Judith 1-3). He now directed his forces against the Jews who had recently returned from exile and newly rebuilt and rededicated their temple. Having heard of the ruin of other temples caused by the invading foe, the Jews became greatly alarmed for the safety of their own, and fortified the mountains and villages in the south, providing themselves with food to meet their needs in the event of war. At the urgent request of Joakim ("Eliakim" in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and Peshitta), the inhabitants of Bethulia (so the Latin, English, and other VSS, but Betuloua is more correct according to the Greek) and of Betomestham (both places otherwise unknown) defended the adjoining mountain passes which commanded the way to Jerusalem. Holofernes at once laid siege to Bethulia, and by cutting off the water supply aimed at starving the people to submission. But he knows little of the people he is seeking to conquer, and asks the chiefs who are with him who and what these Jews are. Achior, the Ammonite chief, gives an account of the Israelites,

cluding that when faithful to their God they were invincible, but that when they disobeyed Him they were easily overcome. Achior is for this saying expelled and handed over to the Jews. After holding out for some days, the besieged people insisted that Onias their governor should surrender. This he promises to do if no relief comes in the course of five days. A rich, devout and beautiful widow called Judith (daughter of Merari, of the tribe of Simeon (Jth 8:1)), hearing of these things, rebukes the murmurers for their lack of faith and exhorts them to trust in God. As Onias abides by his promise to the people, she resolves to attempt another mode of deliverance. She obtains consent to leave the fortress in the dead of night, accompanied by her maidservant, in order to join the Assyrian camp. First of all she prays earnestly for guidance and success; then doffing her mourning garb, she puts on her most gorgeous attire together with jewels and other ornaments. She takes with her food allowed by Jewish law, that she might have no necessity to eat the forbidden meats of the Gentiles. Passing through the gates, she soon reaches the Assyrians. First of all, the soldiers on watch take her captive, but on her assuring them that she is a fugitive from the Hebrews and desires to put Holofernes in the way of achieving a cheap and easy victory over her fellow-countrymen, she is warmly welcomed and made much of. She reiterates to Holofernes the doctrine taught by Achior that these Jews can easily be conquered when they break the

laws of their Deity, and she knows the necessities of their situation would lead them to eat food prohibited in their sacred laws, and when this takes place she informs him that he might at once attack them. Holofernes listens, applauds, and is at once captured by her personal charms. He agrees to her proposal and consents that she and her maid should be allowed each night to say their prayers out in the valley near the Hebrew fortress. On the 4th night after her arrival, Holofernes arranges a banquet to which only his household servants and the two Jewesses are invited. When all is over, by a preconcerted plan the Assyrian general and the beautiful Jewish widow are left alone. He, however, is dead drunk and heavily asleep. With his own scimitar she cuts off his head, calls her maid who puts it into the provision bag, and together they leave the camp as if for their usual prayers and join their Hebrew compatriots, still frantic about the immediate future. But the sight of the head of their arch foe puts new heart into them, and next day they march upon the enemy now in panic at what had happened, and win an easy victory. Judith became ever after a heroine in Jewish romance and poetry, a Hebrew Joan of Arc, and the tale of the deliverance she wrought for her people has been told in many languages. For later and shorter forms of the tale see VII, 4 (Hebrew Midrashes).

IV. Fact or Fiction?

The majority of theologians down to the 19th century regarded the story of Judith as pure history; but with the exception of O. Wolf (1861) and yon Gumpach, Protestant scholars in recent times are practically agreed that the Book of Judith is a historical novel with a purpose similar to Daniel, Esther and Tobit. Schurer classes it with "parenetic narratives" (paranetische Erzahlung). The Hebrew novel is perhaps the earliest of all novels, but it is always a didactic novel written to enforce some principle or principles. Roman Catholic scholars defend the literal historicity of the book, though they allow that the proper names are more or less disguised. But the book abounds with anachronisms, inconsistencies and impossibilities, and was evidently written for the lesson it teaches: obey God and trust Him, and all will be well. The author had no intention to teach history. Torrey, however, goes too far when he says (see Jewish Encyclopedia, "Book of Judith") that the writer aimed at nothing more than to write a tale that would amuse. A tone of religious fervor and of intense patriotism runs through the narrative, and no opportunity of enforcing the claims of the Jewish law is lost. Note especially what is taught in the speeches of Achior (Jth 5:12-21) and Judith (8:17-24; compare 11:10), that, trusting in God and keeping His commandments, the nation is invulnerable.

According to the narrative Nebuchadnezzar has been for 12 years king of Assyria and has his capital at Nineveh, though we know he never was or could be king of Assyria. He became king of Babylon in 604 BC, upon the death of his father Nabopolassar, who in 608 had destroyed Assyria. The Jews had but recently returned from exile (Jth 4:3; 5:19), but were independent, and Holofernes knew nothing about them (Jth 5:3). Nebuchadnezzar died in 561 BC and the Jews returned under Cyrus in 538. Bethulia to which Holofernes lay siege was otherwise quite unknown: it is probably a disguised form of Beth ‘Elohim or Beth ‘Eloah, "house of God," and means the place where God is with His people. The detailed description of the site is but part of the writer’s art; it was the place which every army must pass on its way to Jerusalem. As a matter of fact, there is no such position in Palestine, and least of all Shechem, which Torrey identified with Bethulia. We know nothing besides what Judith 1 tells us of "Arphaxad who reigned over the Medes in Ecbatana"; on the contrary, in every other mention of the

name it stands for a country or a race (see Ge 10:22,24; 11:10-13).

V. Date.

1. Probably during the Maccabean Age:

It is evident that this religious romance was prompted by some severe persecution in which the faith of the Jews was sorely tried, and the writer's dominant aim is identical with that of the author of Daniel, namely, to encourage those suffering for their religion by giving instances of Divine deliverance in the darkest hour. "Only trust and keep the law; then deliverance will unfailingly come"—that is the teaching. Judith might well have been written during the persecution of the Maccabean age, as was almost certainly the Book of Daniel. We have in this book that zeal for orthodox Judaism which marked the age of the Maccabees, and the same strong belief that the war in which the nation was engaged was a holy one. The high priest is head of the state (see Jth 4:6), as suiting a period when the religious interest is uppermost and politics are merged in religion, though some say wrongly that John Hyrcanus (135-106 BC) was the first to combine priestly and princely dignities. We have another support for a Maccabean date in the fact that Onias was high priest during the siege of Bethulia (Jth 4:6), the name being suggested almost certainly by Onias III, who became high priest in 195 (or 198) BC, and who died in 171 after consistently opposing the Hellenizing policy of the Syrians and their Jewish allies.

That the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes (175-164 BC) supply as good a background for this book as any other event in Jewish history is the least that can be said; but one may not be dogmatic on the matter, as similar conditions recurred in the nation's history, and there is no external or internal evidence that fixes the date definitely. The following scholars decide for a date in the Maccabean age: Fritzsche, Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Schurer, Ball, Cornill and Lohr. The author was certainly a resident in Palestine, as his local knowledge and interests show; and from his punctilious regard for the law one may judge that he belonged to the Hasidean (chacidhim) party. Since he so often mentions Dothan (Greek Dothae, Dothaim) (Jth 3:9; 4:6; 7:3,18; 8:3), it is probable that he belonged to that neighborhood. Though, however, the author wrote in the time of the Maccabees, he seems to set his history in a framework that is some 200 years earlier, as Noldeke (Die alttest. Lit., 1868, 96; Aufsatze zur persischen Geschichte, 1887, 78) and Schurer (GJV, III, 323 ff) show. In 350 BC, Artaxerxes Ochus (361-338 BC) invaded Phoenicia and Egypt, his chief generals being Holofernes (Jth 2:4, etc.) and Bagoas (Jth 12:11), both of whom are in Judith officials of King Nebuchadnezzar and take part in the expedition against the Jews. This was intended probably to disarm the criticism of enemies who might resent any writing in which they were painted in unfavorable colors.

2. Other Opinions:

(1) Invasion of Pompey.

That it was the invasion of Pompey which gave rise to the book is the opinion held by Gaster. If this were so, Judith and the Psalms of Solomon arose under the pressure of the same circumstances (see Ryle

and James, The Psalms of Solomon, XL, and J. Rendel Harris, The Odes and Psalms of Solomon, XIII) But in the Psalms of Solomon the supreme ruler is a king (17:22), not a high priest (Judith 4:6). Besides, anyone who reads the Psalm of Solomon and Judith will feel that in the former he has to do with a different and later age.

(2) Insurrection under Bar Cochba.

Hitzig (who held that the insurrection under Bar Cochba, 132 AD, is the event referred to), Volkmar and Graetz date this book in the days of the emperor Trajan (or Hadrian?). Volkmar gives himself much trouble in his attempt to prove that the campaigns of Nebuchadnezzar stand really for those of Trajan. But it is a sufficient refutation of this opinion that the book is quoted by Clement of Rome (55), who died in 100 AD, and whose reference to the book shows that it was regarded in his day as authoritative and even as canonical, so that it must have been written long before.

VI. Original Language.

That a Hebrew or (less likely) an Aramaic original once existed is the opinion of almost all modern scholars, and the evidence for this seems conclusive. There are many Hebraisms in the book, e.g. en tais hemerais ("in the days of," Jth 1:7, and 9 t besides); the frequent use of sphodra, in the sense of the Hebrew me'odh, and even its repetition (also a Hebraism, Jth 4:8); compare epi polu sphodra (Jth 5:18) and plethos polu sphodra (Jth 2:17). Note further the following: "Let not thy eye spare" etc. (Jth 2:11; compare Eze 5:11, etc.); "as I live" (in an oath, Jth 2:12); "God of heaven" (Jth 5:8; 11:17); "son of man," parallel with "man," and in the same sense (Jth 8:16); "and it came to pass when she had ceased crying," etc. (Jth 10:1); "the priests who serve in Jerusalem before the face of our God" (Jth 11:13). In Jth 16:3 we have the words: "For a god that shatters battle is (the) Lord." Now "Lord" without the article can be only the Hebrew "Yahweh," read always 'adhonay, "Lord." But the phrase, "to shatter battle," is not good Greek or good sense. The Hebrew words shabhath ("to rest"; compare shabbath, "Sabbath") and shabhar ("to break") are written much alike, and in the original Hebrew we must have had the causative form of the first vb.: "A God that makes war cease is (the) Lord" (see Ps 46:9). Moreover, the Hebrew idiom which strengthens a finite verb by placing a cognate (absolute) infinitive before it is represented in the Greek of this book in the usual form in which it occurs in the Septuagint (and in Welsh), namely, a participle followed by a finite verb (see Jth 2:13). The present writer has noted other examples, but is prevented by lack of space from adding them here. That the original book was Hebrew and not Aramaic is made extremely likely by the fact that the above examples of Hebrew idiom are peculiar to this language. Note especially the idiom, "and it came to pass that," etc. (Jth 2:4), with the implied "waw consecutive," and what is said above about Jth 11:13, where the senseless Greek arose through the confusion of two similarly written Hebrew (not Aramaic) words. There are cases also of mistakes in the Greek text due to wrong translation from the Hebrew, as in Jth 1:8 (where for "nations" read "cities" or "mountains"); Jth 2:2 (where for "concluded," Hebrew wa-yekhal, read "revealed," wa-ye-ghal); Jth 3:1,9,10 (see Fritzsche, under the word), etc.

VII. Versions.

1. Greek:

The Greek text appears in three forms:

(1) that of the principal Greek uncials (A, B, agreeing closely), which is followed in printed editions of the Septuagint (Septuagint);

(2) that of codices 19, 108 (Lucian's text), an evident revision of (1);

(3) codex 58 which closely resembles (2) and with which the Old Latin and Peshitta agree in most points.

2. Syriac:

There are two extant Syriac VSS, both of them dependent on the Greek text (3) noted above. The Peshitta is given in Walton's Polyglot and in a critically revised form in Lagarde, Lib. Vet. Test Apocrypha Syriac, 104-26. The so-called Hexaplar Syriac text was made by Paul of Tella in the 6th century

3. Latin:

(1) The Old Latin seems to have been made from the Greek text, codex 58 (see above).

(2) Jerome made his Latin version (with which the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is identical) from a lost Chaldee version. That this last is not the original text of the book is certain, because neither Origen nor his Jewish teachers knew anything of a Hebrew or Aramaic text of Judith.

4. Hebrew;

Several late Hebrew versions of the book have been found, no one of them with strong claims to be considered the original text, though Caster (see EB, II, col 2,642) does make such a claim for the manuscript found, edited and translated by him (see PSBA, XVI, 156-63). The Heb midrashes were made to be read in Jewish homes and vary according to the circumstances of their origin. But they agree in these points: Proper names are often omitted. Jerusalem is the scene of action, the wars being those of the Maccabees. Judith is a Jewish maiden and daughter of Ahitah, according to the Gaster MS, and she belongs apparently to the Maccabean family. It is Nicanor who is beheaded, the occasion being the Feast of Dedication; in the Gaster manuscript it is the king who is killed. Translations of these midrashes may be seen in Jellinck, Beth Hammidrash, I, 130-41; II, 12 f; Lepsius, Zeitschr. fur wiss. Theologie, 1867, 337 ff; Ball, Speaker's Apocrypha, I, 25 ff; Scholz, Comm.2, Anhange I and II; Gaster, in the work quoted Gaster argues that the much shorter form of the tale in his manuscript is older than the longer version. But if a writer were to expand a short story, he would hardly be likely to invent several proper

names and to change others. It is probable that Judith came to be represented as a pure maiden (a virgin) under the influence of the low conception of marriage fostered in the medieval Christian church.

LITERATURE.

For the editions of the Greek text and for commentaries on the Apocrypha, see under APOCRYPHA. But on Judith note in particular the commentaries by Fritzsche and Ball, the latter containing elaborate bibliography. But the following must in addition be mentioned: Scholz, Commentar uber das Buch Judith und uber Bel und Drache, 1896; a 2nd edition has appeared; A.S. Weissmann, Das Buch Judith historisch-kritisch beleuchtet, Wien, 1891; Schurer, GJV4, III, 230-37, with full bibliography; compare HJP, II, iii, 32-37; Pentin, The Apocrypha in English Lit., Judith, 1908; and the relevant articles in the Bible dicts., especially that by F. C. Porter in HDB.

T. Witton Davies

JUEL

joo’-el ((1) Iouna; (2) Iouel:

(1) 1 Esdras 9:34 =" Uel" in Ezr 10:34.

(2) 1 Esdras 9:35 =" Joel" in Ezr 10:43.

JUGGLERY

jug’-ler-i goetia: The word occurs once in 2 Macc 12:24 the Revised Version margin (the King James Version "craft," the Revised Version (British and American) "crafty guile").

JUICE

joos, jus: The word occurs once in So 8:2 (translation of ‘acic, the Revised Version margin "sweet wine"), and once in the Revised Version margin of Job 6:6, where for "the white of an egg" margin reads, "the juice of purslain." Septuagint has rhemasin kenois, "empty words."

JULIA

joo’-li-a (Ioulia): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings, the wife or sister of Philologus with whose name hers is coupled (Ro 16:15). The name points to member of the imperial household.

JULIUS

joo’-li-us (Ioulios): The centurion of the Augustan cohort under whose charge Paul was sent a prisoner to Rome (Ac 27:1,3).

See ARMY, ROMAN; AUGUSTAN BAND.

JUMPING

jum’-ping.

See GAMES.

JUNIAS; JUNlA

joo’-ni-as or joo’-ni-a (Iounias, Iounia): One to whom, with Andronicus, greetings are sent by Paul at the close of his letter to the Romans (Ro 16:7). The name may be masculine, Junias, a contraction of Junianus, or feminine Junia; it is Iounian, the accus. form, that is given. In all probability this is the masc., Junias. Paul defines the two as

(1) "my kinsmen,"

(2) "my fellow-prisoners,"

(3) "who are of note among the apostles," and

(4) "who also have been in Christ before me."

(1) They were Jews. Paul calls the Jews "my brethren," "my kinsmen according to the flesh" (Ro 9:3). Because Prisca and Aquila, a Jew and Jewess, are not designated as kinsfolk, Conybeare and Howson suppose "the epithet to denote that the persons mentioned were of the tribe of Benjamin."

(2) They had been companions of Paul in some unrecorded imprisonment. The phrase denotes more than the fact that they, like Paul, had suffered imprisonment for the sake of Christ.

(3) This may mean

(a) that they were well known to the apostolic circle (so Gifford and Weiss), or

(b) distinguished as apostles. The latter is probably correct, "apostle" being used in a wide sense (compare 1Co 15:7).

The prophetic ministry of the early church consisted of apostles, prophets and teachers (1Co 12:28; Eph 4:11), the apostles being missionaries in the modern sense (see Lindsay, Church and Ministry, chapter iii). Some apostles were missionaries sent out by particular churches (Ac 13:2,3; 2Co 8:23; Php 2:25).

(4) They were among the first converts, "early disciples" like Mnason of Cyprus (Ac 21:16).

S. F. Hunter

JUNIPER

joo'-ni-per (rothem; rhathmen, 1Ki 19:4 f, margin "broom"; Ps 120:4, m "broom"; Job 30:4 translated "broom"): This is quite certainly the Arabic ratam (Retama retem, Natural Order, Leguminosae), a variety of broom which is one of the most characteristic shrubs of the deserts of Southern Palestine and southward to Egypt. Though the shade it affords is but scanty, in the absence of other shrubs it is frequently used by desert travelers as a refuge from the sun's scorching rays (compare 1Ki 19:4). The root yields good charcoal, giving out much heat (Ps 120:4). For people to be reduced to chew it for nourishment betokens the lowest depth of starvation (Job 30:4). Indeed so hopeless is this root as a source of food that many commentators believe that the accepted text is in error, and by altering a single letter, substituting the Hebrew letter, cheth, ("ch") for he ("h"), they get a reading, which has been adopted in the Revised Version margin, "to warm them" instead of "their meat," which certainly is much more probable.

E. W. G. Masterman

JUPITER

joo'-pi-ter, ju'-pi-ter (Zeus): "Jupiter" is mentioned in 2 Macc 6:2; Ac 14:12,13, with "Zeus" in the Revised Version margin in all cases. In addition the Greek stem appears in diopetous, in Ac 19:35, English Versions of the Bible "which fell down from Jupiter"; but the word means "from the clear sky" (compare "from heaven" in the Revised Version margin). "Jupiter" was considered the Latin equivalent of the Greek "Zeus," the highest god in the developed Greek pantheon, and Zeus in turn, in accord with the syncretism of the period, was identified with countless deities in the local cults of Asia Minor and elsewhere. So in Ac 14:12,13, "Zeus" and "Hermes" are local deities that had been renamed. On the other hand, the Zeus of 2 Macc 6:2 is the genuine Greek deity, who had been adopted as a special patron by Antiochus Epiphanes and to whose temple in Athens Antiochus had contributed largely. The title "Olympius" (2 Macc 6:2) is derived from the early worship on Mt. Olympus, but had come to be thought one of the god's highest appellations; Xenios, "protector of strangers," was a title in a cult particularly popular with travelers.

See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION, and Smith, HGHL, 333-34.

Burton Scott Easton

JUPITER AND MERCURY

See ASTROLOGY, sec. III, 1; MERCURY; JUPITER.

JURISDICTION

joo-ris-dik’-shun (exousia): The word exousia is well known in New Testament Greek. It is derived from the word exesti, and suggests the absence of any hindrance to an act. It contains the idea of right and might (Cremer). In the New Testament it means right, authority, capability (Ro 9:21); power, strength (Mt 9:8); right and might (Joh 5:27). Thus it gets the meaning of the powers of the magistrate, which it bears in later Greek (Tit 3:1; Ro 13:1-3). And in this sense it is used in Lu 23:7, where it is translated "jurisdiction."

JUSHAB-HESED

joo’-shab-he’-sed (yushabh checedh, "loving-kindness is returned"): Son of Zerubbabel. The name is probably symbolical (1Ch 3:20); compare SHEAR-JASHUB.

JUSTICE

jus’-tis (tsedhaqah; tsedheq; dikaiosune): The original Hebrew and Greek words are the same as those rendered "righteousness." This is the common rendering, and in about half the cases where we have "just" and "justice" in the King James Version, the American Standard Revised Version has changed to "righteous" and "righteousness." It must be constantly borne in mind that the two ideas are essentially the same.

See RIGHTEOUSNESS.

1. Human Justice:

Justice had primarily to do with conduct in relation to others, especially with regard to the rights of others. It is applied to business, where just weights and measures are demanded (Le 19:35,36; De 25:13-16; Am 8:5; Pr 11:1; 16:11; Eze 45:9,10). It is demanded in courts, where the rights of rich and poor, Israelite and sojourner, are equally to be regarded. Neither station nor bribe nor popular clamor shall influence judge or witness. "Justice, justice shalt thou follow" (De 16:20; compare De 16:18-20; Ex 23:1-3,6-9). In general this justice is contrasted with that wickedness which "feared not God, and regarded not man" (Lu 18:2).

In a larger sense justice is not only giving to others their rights, but involves the active duty of establishing their rights. So Israel waits upon God’s justice or cries out: "The justice due to me (literally,

"my justice") is passed away from my God" (Isa 40:27). Yahweh is to show her to be in the right as over against the nations. Justice here becomes mercy. To "seek justice" means to "relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow" (Isa 1:17; compare Isa 11:4; Jer 22:15,16; Ps 82:2-4). The same idea appears in De 24:12,13; Ps 37:21,26; 112:4-6, where the translation is "righteous" instead of "just."

In this conception of justice the full meaning of the New Testament is not yet reached. It does not mean sinlessness or moral perfection. Job knows the sin in his heart (Job 13:23,26; 7:21), and yet speaks of himself as a just or righteous man (12:4; 13:18). The Psalmist confidently depends upon the righteousness of God though he knows that no man is righteous in God's sight (Ps 143:1,2; compare Ps 7:8; 18:20-24). It is not a lack of humility or dependence upon God when the Psalmist asks to be judged according to his righteousness. In relation to God, the just, or righteous, man is the one who holds to God and trusts in Him (Ps 33:18-22). This is not the later Judaistic legalism with its merit and reward, where God's justice is simply a matter of giving each man what he has earned.

The word "justice" does not occur in the New Testament, and in most cases where we find "just" in the King James Version it is changed to "righteous" in the American Standard Revised Version. The idea of justice or righteousness (remembering that these are essentially the same) becomes more spiritual and ethical in the New Testament. It is a matter of character, and God's own spirit is the standard (1 Joh 3:7; Mt 5:48). The mere give-and-take justice is not enough. We are to be merciful, and that to all. The ideal is righteousness, not rights. As Holtzmann says, "The keynote of the Sermon on the Mount is justitia and not jus."

2. Justice of God:

God's justice, or righteousness, is founded in His essential nature. But, just as with man, it is not something abstract, but is seen in His relation to the world. It is His kingship establishing and maintaining the right. It appears as retributive justice, "that reaction of His holy will, as grounded in His eternal being, against evil wherever found." He cannot be indifferent to good and evil (Hab 1:13). The great prophets, Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea, all insist upon Yahweh's demand for righteousness.

But this is not the main aspect of God's justice. Theology has been wont to set forth God's justice as the fundamental fact in His nature with which we must reconcile His mercy as best we may, the two being conceived as in conflict. As a matter of fact, the Scriptures most often conceive God's justice, or righteousness, as the action of His mercy. Just as with man justice means the relief of the oppressed and needy, so God's justice is His kingly power engaged on behalf of men, and justice and mercy are constantly joined together. He is "a just God and a Saviour" (Isa 45:21). "I bring near my righteousness (or "justice") .... and my salvation shall not tarry" (Isa 46:13; compare Ps 51:14; 103:17; 71:15; 116:5; Isa 51:5,6). The "righteous acts of Yahweh" mean His deeds of deliverance (Jud 5:11). And so Israel sings of the justice, or judgments, or righteousness of Yahweh (they are the same), and proclaims her trust in these (Ps 7:17; 35:23,24,28; 36:6; 140:12,13; 50:5,6; 94:14,15; 103:6; 143:1).

The New Testament, too, does not lack the idea of retributive justice. The Son of Man "shall render unto every man according to his deeds" (Mt 16:27; compare Mt 25:14-46; Lu 12:45-48; Ro 2:2-16; 6:23; 2Co 5:10; Col 3:24,25; 2Th 1:8,9; Heb 2:2,3; 10:26-31). But God's justice is far more than this. The idea of merit and reward is really superseded by a higher viewpoint in the teaching of Jesus. He speaks, indeed, of recompense, but it is the Father and not the judge that gives this (Mt 6:1,4,6,18). And it is no mere justice of earth, because the reward transcends all merit (Mt 24:46,47; Mr 10:30; Lu 12:37). This is grace not desert (Lu 17:10). And the parable of Mt 20:1-15 gives at length the deathblow to the whole Judaistic scheme of merit and reward.

And God's justice is not merely gracious, but redemptive. It not simply apportions rights, it establishes righteousness. Thus, just as in the Old Testament, the judge is the Saviour. The difference is simply here: in the Old Testament the salvation was more national and temporal, here it is personal and spiritual. But mercy is opposed to justice no more here than in the Old Testament. It is by the forgiveness of sins that God establishes righteousness, and this is the supreme task of justice. Thus it is that God is at the same time "just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus" (Ro 3:26). "He is faithful and righteous (or "just"; see the King James Version) to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness" (1 Joh 1:9).

LITERATURE.

See Comm., and Biblical Theologies under "Justice" and "Righteousness," and especially Cremer, Biblical-Theol. Lex. of New Testament Greek

Harris Franklin Rall

JUSTIFICATION

jus-ti-fi-ka'-shun (tsedheq, verb tsadheq; Septuagint and New Testament dikaioma, dikaiosis, verb dikaioo, "justification" "to justify," in a legal sense, the declaring just or righteous. In Biblical literature, dikaioun, without denying the real righteousness of a person, is used invariably or almost invariably in a declarative or forensic sense. See Simon, HDB, II, 826; Thayer, Grimm, and Cremer under the respective words):

I. THE WRITINGS OF PAUL

1. Universality of Sin

2. Perfection of the Law of God

3. Life, Work and Death of the Atoning Saviour

(1) Paul's Own Experience

(2) The Resurrection Connected with the Death

(3) Faith, Not Works, the Means of Justification

(4) Baptism Also Eliminated

(5) Elements of Justification

(a) Forgiveness of Sins

(b) Declaring or Approving as Righteous

(6) Justification Has to Do with the Individual

II. THE OTHER NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS

1. The Synoptic Gospels

2. John’s Writings

3. 1 Peter and Hebrews

4. Epistle of James

III. THE OLD TESTAMENT

IV. LATER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

1. Apostolic and Early Church Fathers

2. Council of Trent

3. Luther

4. Schleiermacher

5. Meaning and Message to the Modern Man

LITERATURE

I. The Writings of Paul.

1. The Universality of Sin:

In this article reference will first be made to the writings of Paul, where justification receives its classic expression, and from there as a center, the other New Testament writers, and finally the Old Testament, will be drawn in. According to Paul, justification rests on the following presuppositions:

The universality of sin. All men are not only born in sin (Eph 2:3), but they have committed many actual transgressions, which render them liable to condemnation. Paul proves this by an appeal to the Old Testament witnesses (Ro 3:9), as well as by universal experience, both of the heathen (Ro 1:18-32) and Jews (Ro 2:17-28; 3:9).

2. Perfection of the Law of God:

The perfection of the Law of God and the necessity of its perfect observance, if justification is to come by it (Ro 3:10). The modern notion of God as a good-natured, more or less nonchalant ruler, to whom perfect holiness is not inexorable, was not that of Paul. If one had indeed kept the law, God could not hold him guilty (Ro 2:13), but such an obedience never existed. Paul had no trouble with the law as such. Those who have tried to find a difference here between Galatians and Romans have failed. The reminder that the law was ordained by angels (Ga 3:19) does not mean that it was not also given by God. It might be reckoned in a sense among the elements of the world (kosmos, Ga 4:3), as it is an essential part of an ordered universe, but that does not at all mean that it is not also holy, right and good (Ro 7:12). It was added, of course, on account of transgressions (Ga 3:19), for it is only a world of intelligent, free spirits capable of sin which needs it, and its high and beautiful sanctions make the sin seem all the more sinful (Ro 7:13).

3. Life, Work and Death of the Atoning Savior:

It was fundamental in Paul’s thinking that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures (1Co 15:3). In due season He died for the ungodly (Ro 5:6); while we were yet sinners He died for us (Ro 5:8); we are justified in His blood (Ro 5:9), and it is through Him that we are saved from the wrath (Ro 5:9). While we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of His Son (Ro 5:10), being justified freely by His grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus whom God set forth as a propitiation (Ro 3:24,25). There is no reconciliation, no justification, except through and by and for Christ.

(1) Paul’s Own Experience.

Paul’s own experience cannot be left out of the account. He lived through the doctrine, as well as found it through illumination of the Spirit in the Old Testament. It was not that he had only outwardly kept the law. He had been jealous for it, and had been blameless in every requirement of its righteousness (Php

3:6). What was borne in upon him was how little such blamelessness could stand before the absolute standard of God. Just how far he was shaken with doubts of this kind we cannot say with certainty; but it seems impossible to conceive the Damascus conversion scene in the case of such an upright man and strenuous zealot without supposing a psychological preparation, without supposing doubts as to whether his fulfilling of the law enabled him to stand before God. Now, for a Pharisaically educated man like himself, there was no way of overcoming these doubts but in a renewed struggle for his own righteousness shown in the fiery zeal of his Damascus journey, pressing on even in the blazing light of noonday. This conversion broke down his philosophy of life, his Lebensgewissheit, his assurance of salvation through works of the law done never so conscientiously and perfectly. The revelation of the glorified Christ, with the assurance that He, the God-sent Messiah, was the very one whom he was persecuting, destroyed his dependence on his own righteousness, a righteousness which had led him to such shocking consequences. Although this was for him an individual experience, yet it had universal applications. It showed him that there was an inherent weakness in the law through flesh, that is, through the whole physical, psychical and spiritual nature of man considered as sinful, as working only on this lower plane, and that the law needed bracing and illuminating by the Son, who, though sent in the likeness of the flesh of sin, yet (as an offering) for sin condemned sin and cast it out (Ro 8:3), to the end that the law might be fulfilled in those who through Him walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit (Ro 8:4). That was the glory of the new righteousness thus revealed. If the law had been able to do that, to give life, Christ need not have come, righteousness would have been by the law (Ga 3:21). But the facts show that the law was not thus able, neither the law written on the heart given to all, nor the law given to Moses (Ro 1:18-3:19). Therefore every mouth is stopped, and all flesh is silent before God. On the ground of law-keeping, what the modern man would call morality, our hope of salvation has been shattered. The law has spoken its judgment against us (Ga 3:10). It cannot therefore lead us to righteousness and life, nor was that its supreme intention: it was a pedagogue or tutor ("paidagogos") to lead us to Christ that we might be justified by faith (Ga 3:24; see Ihmels in RE3, 16, 483-84). What made Paul to differ from his companions in the faith was that his own bitter experience under the revelation of Christ had led him to these facts.

(2) The Resurrection Connected with the Death.

It was remarked above that the ground of justification according to Paul is the work of Christ. This means especially. His death as a sacrifice, in which, as Ritschl well says (Rechtfertigung und Versohnung, 3. Aufl., 1899, II 157), the apostles saw exercised the whole power of His redemption. But that death cannot be separated from His resurrection, which first awakened them to a knowledge of its decisive worth for salvation, as well as finally confirmed their faith in Jesus as the Son of God. "The objective salvation," says Ritschl (p. 158), "which was connected with the sacrificial death of Christ and which continued on for the church, was made secure by this, that it was asserted also as an attribute of the resurrected one," who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification (Ro 4:25). But this last expression is not to be interpreted with literal preciseness, as though Paul intended to distinguish between the forgiveness of sins as brought about by the death, and justification, by the resurrection, for both forgiveness and justification are identified in Ro 4:6-8. It was the resurrection which gave Christians their assurance concerning Christ (Ac 17:31); by that resurrection He has been exalted to the right hand of God, where He maketh intercession for His people (Ro 8:34), which

mediatorship is founded upon His death—the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (Re 13:8 ; compare Greek text).

B. Weiss well says: "It was by the certainty of the exaltation of Christ to Messianic sovereignty brought about by the resurrection that Paul attained to faith in the saving significance of His death, and not conversely. Accordingly, the assurance that God cannot condemn us is owing primarily to the death of Christ, but still more to His resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand (Ro 8:34), inasmuch as these first prove that His death was the death of the mediator of salvation, who has redeemed us from condemnation. .... The objective atonement was accomplished by the death of Christ, but the appropriation of it in justification is possible only if we believe in the saving significance of His death, and we can attain to faith in that only as it is sealed by the resurrection" (Biblical Theology of the New Testament, I, 436-37).

(3) Faith, Not Works, the Means of Justification.

The means or condition of justification is faith (Ro 3:22,25,26,28, etc.) which rests upon the pure grace of God and is itself, therefore, His gift (Eph 2:8). This making faith the only instrument of justification is not arbitrary, but because, being the receptive attitude of the soul, it is in the nature of the case the only avenue through which Divine blessing can come. The gifts of God are not against the laws of the soul which He has made, but rather are in and through those laws. Faith is the hand outstretched to the Divine Giver, who, though He sends rain without our consent, does not give salvation except through an appropriate spiritual response. This faith is not simply belief in historical facts, though this is presupposed as to the atoning death (Ro 3:25), and the resurrection (Ro 10:9) of Jesus, but is a real heart reception of the gift (Ro 10:10), and is therefore able to bring peace in our relation to God (Ro 5:1). The object of this faith is Jesus Christ (Ro 3:22, etc.), through whom only comes the gift of righteousness and the reigning in life (Ro 5:17), not Mary, not angels, not doctrine, not the church, but Jesus only. This, to be sure, does not exclude God the Father as an object of faith, as the redeeming act of Christ is itself the work of God (2Co 5:19), whose love expressed itself toward us in this way (Ro 5:8). Faith in the only one God is always presupposed (1Co 8:6), but it was the apostolic custom rather to refer repentance to God and faith to Christ (Ac 20:21). But the oneness of God the Father and Christ the Son in a work of salvation is the best guaranty of the Divinity of the latter, both as an objective fact and as an inner experience of the Christian.

The justification being by faith, it is not by works or by love, or by both in one. It cannot be by the former, because they are lacking either in time or amount or quality, nor could they be accepted in any case until they spring from a heart renewed, for which faith is the necessary presupposition. It cannot be by the latter, for it exists only where the Spirit has shed it abroad in the heart (Ro 5:5), the indispensable prerequisite for receiving which is faith. This does not mean that the crown of Christianity is not love, for it is (1Co 13:13); it means only that the root is faith. Nor can love be foisted in as a partial condition of justification on the strength of the word often quoted for that purpose, "faith working through love" (Ga 5:6). The apostle is speaking here only of those who are already "in Christ," and he says that over against the Galatian believers bringing in a lot of legal observances, the only availing thing is not circumcision or its lack, but faith energizing through love. Here the interest is, as Ritschl says (II, 343),

in the kingdom of God, but justification proper has reference to the sinner in relation to God and Christ. See the excellent remarks of Bruce, Paul's Conception of Christianity, 1894, 226-27. At the same time this text reveals the tremendous ethical religious force abiding in faith, according to Paul. It reminds us of the great sentence of Luther in his preface to the Epistles to the Romans, where he says: "Faith is a Divine work within us which changes and renews us in God according to Joh 1:13, 'who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' This destroys the old Adam and makes new creatures of us in heart, will, disposition, and all our powers. Oh, faith is a living, active, jealous, mighty thing, inasmuch as it cannot possibly remain unproductive of good works" (Werke, Erl. Ausg., 63, 124-25).

(4) Baptism also Eliminated.

Not only are good works and love removed as conditions or means of justification of the sinner, but baptism is also eliminated. According to Paul, it is the office of baptism not to justify, but to cleanse, that is, symbolically to set forth and seal the washing away of sin and the entrance into the new life by a dramatic act of burial, which for the subject and all witnesses would mark a never-to-be-forgotten era in the history of the believer. "Baptism," says Weiss (I, 454), "presupposes faith in Him as the one whom the church designates as Lord, and also binds to adherence to Him which excludes every dependence upon any other, inasmuch as He has acquired a claim upon their devotion by the saving deed of His self-surrender on the cross." So important was baptism in the religious atmosphere at that time that hyperbolical expressions were used to express its cleansing and illuminating office, but these need not mislead us. We must interpret them according to the fundamental conceptions of Christianity as a religion of the Spirit, not of magic nor of material media. Baptism pointed to a complete parting with the old life by previous renewal through faith in Christ, which renewal baptism in its turn sealed and announced in a climax of self-dedication to him, and this, while symbolically and in contemporary parlance of both Jew and Gentile called a new birth, was probably often actually so in the psychological experience of the baptized. But while justification is often attributed to faith, it is never to baptism.

(5) Elements of Justification.

What are the elements of this justification? There are two:

(a) Forgiveness of Sins

Forgiveness of sins (Ro 4:5-8; compare Ac 13:38,39). With this are connected peace and reconciliation (Ro 5:1,9,10; compare Ro 10:11).

(b) The Declaring or Approving as Righteous

The declaring or approving as righteous or just (Ro 3:21-30; 4:2-9,22; 5:1,9-11,16-21, etc.). C.F. Schmid is perfectly right when he says that Paul (and James) always uses dikaioun in the sense of esteeming and pronouncing and treating as righteous, both according to the measure of the law (Ro 2:13; 3:20) and also

according to grace (Biblical Theology of the New Testament, 1870, 497). The word is a forensic one, and Godet goes so far as to say that the word is never used in all Greek literature for making righteous (Commentary on Romans, English translation, I, 157, American edition, 95). This is shown further by the fact that it is the ungodly who are justified (Ro 4:5), and that the justification is a reckoning or imputation (logizesthai) of righteousness (Ro 4:6,22), not an infusing or making righteous. The contrast of "to justify" is not "to be a sinner" but is "to accuse" or "to condemn" (Ro 8:33,14), and the, contrast of "justification" is "condemnation" (Ro 5:18). Besides, it is not the infusing of a new life, of a new holiness, which is counted for righteousness, but it is faith which is so counted (Ro 4:5; Php 3:9). That upon which God looks when He justifies is not the righteousness He has imparted or is to impart, but the atonement He has made in Christ. It is one of the truest paradoxes of Christianity that unless a righteous life follows, there has been no justification, while the justification itself is for the sake of Christ alone through faith alone. It is a "status, rather than a character," says Stevens (The Pauline Theology, 1892, 265); "it bears the stamp of a legal rather than of an ethical conception," and he refers to the elaborate and convincing proof of the forensic character of Paul's doctrine of justification," in Morison, Exposition of Romans, chapter III, 163-200. An interesting illustration of how further study may correct a wrong impression is given by Lipsius, who, in his Die Paulinische Rechfertigungslehre, 1853, maintained that righteousness or justification meant not "exclusively an objectively given external relation to God, but always at the same time a real inner condition of righteousness" (p. 10), whereas in his Lehrbuch der evangelisch-protestantischen Dogmatik, 1876, 3. Aufl., 1893, he makes the righteousness of God properly an "objective gift of grace, not simply in the sense in which the Old Testament just one judged his position of salvation as a gift of grace, but as a righteousness specially reckoned and adjudicated by way of grace and acknowledged before the judgment (or court, Gericht) of God (Ro 4:6; compare Ro 4:1-8,11; 3:23; Ga 3:6). This is always the meaning of dikaioun, dikaiousthai, or dikaiosis in Paul. It consists in the not-reckoning of sins," etc. (p. 658). Of course justification is only a part of the process of salvation, which includes regeneration and sanctification, but these are one thing and justification is another.

(6) Justification Has to Do with the Individual.

Finally it is asked whether justification in Paul's mind has to do with the individual believer or with the society or Christian congregation. Ritschl (II, 217 f) and Sanday-Headlam (The Epistle to the Rom, 122-23) say the latter; Weiss (I, 442), the former. It is indeed true that Paul refers to the church as purchased with Christ's blood (Ac 20:28, or God's blood, according to the two oldest manuscripts and ancient authorities; compare Eph 5:25), and he uses the pronoun "we" as those who have received redemption, etc. (Col 1:14; Eph 2:18); but it is evident on the other hand that faith is an individual matter, a thing first between man and his God, and only after a man has been united to Christ by faith can he enter into a spiritual fellowship with fellow-believers. Therefore the subject of justification must be in the first place the individual, and only in the second place and by consequence the society. Besides, those justified are not the cleansed and sanctified members of churches, but the ungodly (Ro 4:5).

As to the argument from baptism urged by Sanday-Headlam, it must be said that Paul always conceives of baptism as taking place in the Christian community with believers and for believers, that that for and to which they are baptized is not justification, but the death and resurrection of Christ (Ro 6:3,4), and

that the righteousness of God has been manifested not through baptism but through faith in Jesus Christ unto all that believe (Ro 3:22), being justified freely, not through baptism, but through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Ro 3:24). With Paul baptism has always a mystical significance as symbolizing and externally actualizing union with the death of the Lord, and would be both impossible and impertinent in the case of those not already believers in Christ and thus inwardly united to His society.

II. The Other New Testament Writings.

So much for Paul. Let us now take a glance at the other New Testament books. It is a commonplace of theology that is called "modern" or "critical," that Paul and not Jesus is the founder of Christianity as we know it, that the doctrines of the Divinity of Christ, atonement, justification, etc., are Paul's work, and not his Master's. There is truth in this. It was part of the humiliation of Christ as well as His pedagogical method to live, teach and act under the conditions of His time and country, on the background of Palestine of 30 AD; and it was specially His method to do His work and not His disciples', to live a life of love and light, to die for the sins of the world, and then go back to the Father that the Holy Spirit might come and lead His followers into all truth. A full statement of the doctrines of Christianity on His part would have been premature (Joh 16:12), would have been pedagogically unwise, if not worthless. First the blade, then the ear, then the full grain in the ear (Mr 4:28). It would also have been spiritually and philosophically impossible, for Christianity was not a set of teachings by Christ—but a religion springing out of His life, death, resurrection, ascension, intercession, mediatorial activity in history through the Spirit who works in His disciples and on the world through and by that life, death, etc. The only question is whether the apostles were true to the spirit and content of His teachings in its moral and religious outlines. And especially in this matter of justification, a teaching by Christ is not to be looked for, because it is the very peculiarity of it that its middle point is the exalted Lord, who has become the mediator of salvation by His death and resurrection. Did the Pauline doctrine fit into the concrete situation made by the facts of Christ mentioned above, and was it the necessary consequence of His self-witness? Let us look into the Synoptic Gospels.

1. The Snyoptic Gospels:

So far is it from being true, as Harnack says (What Is Christianity? 2nd edition, revised, New York, 1901, 68), that the "whole of Jesus' message may be reduced to these two heads: God as Father, and the human soul so ennobled that it can and does unite with Him," that an essential part of His message is omitted, namely, that salvation is bound up in His (Christ's) own person. (The reader is asked to verify the references for himself, as space will not allow quotation.) See Mt 10:37-39; 16:24-27. Confession of Him (not simply of the Father) determines acknowledgment above (Mt 10:32), where judgment is rendered according to our attitude to Him in His unfortunate ones Mt 25:35 ff). No sooner was His person rightly estimated than He began to unfold the necessity of His death and resurrection (Mt 16:21). The evening before that death occurred, He brings out its significance, perpetuates the lesson in the institution of the Supper (Mr 14:24), and reenforces it after His resurrection (Lu 24:26). Paul himself could hardly have expressed the fact of the atonement through Christ's death more decisively than Mt 20:28; 26:28. With this foundation, could the Christian doctrine of salvation take any other course than that it actually did take? Instead of referring men to the Father, Christ forgives sins Himself (Mt 9:2-6),

and He reckons all men as needing this forgiveness (Mt 6:12). While the time had not arrived for the Pauline doctrine of righteousness, Jesus prepared the way for it, negatively, in demanding a humble sense of sin (Mt 5:3), inner fitness and perfection (Mt 5:6,8,20,48), and positively in requiring recourse to Him by those who felt the burden of their sins (Mt 11:28), to Him who was the rest-giver, and not simply to God the Father, a passage of which Ro 5:1 is an echo. For it was specially to those to whom, as to the awakened Paul, the law brought condemnation that He came, came to heal and to save (Mr 2:17; Mt 9:13; Lu 15:7). It was for sinners and to sinners that He came (Lu 15:2; 7:39; 19:7; Mt 11:19), just as Paul understood; and the way for their salvation was not better law-keeping, but trusting prayer in the confession of sin (Lu 18:13), really equivalent to faith, the humble heart and a hunger for righteousness =(faith). See Mt 5:3,6. He who brings most of himself, of his own pride and works, is the least likely to obtain the kingdom of heaven (Mt 18:3,1; Mr 10:14). Not only entrance, but the final reward itself is of grace (Mt 19:30; 20:1-16), a parable in the true spirit of Paul, and in anticipation of whose message was the promise of Paradise to the penitent robber (Lu 23:43). At the very beginning the message sounded out, "Repent ye, and believe in the gospel" (Mr 1:15), the gospel which was summed up in Christ, who would gather the people, not directly to God the Father, but to Himself (Mt 23:37). All this means justification through that faith in Himself, in His Divine-human manifestation (Mt 16:13-16), of which faith He expresses Himself with anxiety in Lu 18:8, and the presence of which he greeted with joy in Mt 8:10. Ihmels is right therefore in holding (RE3, XVI, 490) that Paul’s proclamation was continuous with the self-witness of Jesus, which conversely pointed as a consequence to the witness of Paul.

2. John’s Writings:

Justification by faith is not more implicit in John’s Gospel than in the first three; it is only more explicit (Joh 3:14-16). Eternal life is the blessing secured, but this of course is only possible to one not under condemnation (Joh 3:36). The new Sonship of God came also in the wake of the same faith (Joh 1:12). The Epistles of John vary from Paul in word rather than in substance. The atoning work of Jesus is still in the background; walking in the light is not conceivable in those under condemnation and without faith; and the confession of sins that leads to forgiveness seems only another name for the justification that brings peace (1 Joh 1:9,10; compare 2:1,2). Everything is, as with Paul (Eph 2:7; Tit 3:4), led back to the love of God (1 Joh 3:1), who sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins (1 Joh 4:10).

3. 1 Peter and Hebrews:

Seeberg’s point that the "Pauline doctrine of justification is not found in any other New Testament writer" (History of Doctrine, I, 48) is true when you emphasize the word "doctrine." Paul gave it full scientific treatment, the others presuppose the fact, but do not unfold the doctrine. Peter’s "Repent ye, and be baptized .... in the name of Jesus Christ" (Ac 2:38) is meaningless unless faith were exercised in Christ. It is He in whom, though we see Him not, yet believing, we rejoice greatly with joy unspeakable (1Pe 1:8), receiving the end of our faith, the salvation of our souls (1Pe 1:9). It is only, however, through the precious blood as of a lamb without blemish, even that of Christ (1Pe 1:19), and is only through Him that we are believers in God (1Pe 1:21). The familiar expression, "Come to Jesus," which simply means have faith in Jesus for justification and salvation, goes back to Peter (1Pe 2:4). The Epistle to the

Hebrews has other interests to look after, but it does not deny faith, but rather exhorts us to draw near with a true heart in fullness of faith (10:22), which it lays at the foundation of all true religion, thinking and achievement (Hebrews 11). The writer can give no better exhortation than to look unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith (12:2), an exhortation in the true spirit of Paul, whose gospel of faith for justification is also summed up in 4:16.

4. Epistle of James:

We come lastly to the core of the matter in regard to New Testament representations of justification—the famous passage in Jas 2:14-26, which at first sight seems a direct blow at Paul. Here we are met by the interesting question of the date of James. As we cannot enter into this (see JAMES, EPISTLE OF), what we say must be independent of this question. A careful look at this vigorous and most valuable letter (valuable in its own place, which is not that of Paul's letters, in comparison with which it is a "right strawy epistle," as Luther truthfully said (Erl. Ausg., 63, 115; see also pp. 156-57), in saying which he did not mean to reject it as useless (straw has most important uses), but as giving the doctrine of salvation, for which we must look to Paul) will show us that contradiction on the part of James to Paul is apparent and not real.

(1) In this section James uses the word faith simply for intellectual belief in God, and especially in the unity of God (2:19; see also context), whereas Paul uses it for a saving trust in Christ. As Feine well says (Theol. d. New Testament, Leipzig, 2 1911, 660-63), for Paul faith is the appropriation of the life-power of the heavenly Christ. Therefore he knows no faith which does not bring forth good works corresponding to it. What does not come from faith is sin. For James faith is subordination of man to the heavenly Christ (2:1), or it is theoretic acknowledgment of one God (2:19). Justification is for James a speaking just of him who is righteous, an analytical judgment. (Feine also says that James did not understand Paul, but he did not fight him. It was left to Luther through his deep religious experience first to understand Paul's doctrine of justification.)

(2) James uses the word "works" as meaning practical morality, going back behind legalism, behind Pharisaism, to the position of the Old Testament prophets, whereas Paul uses the word as meritorious action deserving reward.

(3) When James is thinking of a deeper view, faith stands central in Christianity (1:3,6; 2:1; 5:15).

(4) Paul also on his part is as anxious as James vitally to connect Christianity and good works through faith (1Th 1:3; Ga 5:6; 1Co 13:2; Ro 2:6,7; see Mayor, The Epistle of Jas, 1892, lxxxviii ff; Franks, in DCG, I, 919-20; Findlay in HDB, 1-vol edition, 511).

(5) The whole argument of James is bent on preserving a real practical Christianity that is not content with words merely (2:15-16), but shows itself in deeds. He is not trying to show, as Paul, how men get rid of their guilt and become Christians, but how they prove the reality of their profession after they receive the faith. He is not only writing to Christians, as of course Paul was, but he was writing to them

as Christians ("my brethren," 2:14), as already justified and standing on the "faith of our Lord Jesus Christ" (2:1), whereas Paul was thinking of men, Gentile and Jew, shivering in their guilt before the Eternal Justice, and asking, How can we get peace with God? "There is not," says Beyschlag (New Testament Theology, Edinburgh, 1895, I, 367-68), "an objective conflict between the Pauline and Jacobean doctrines; both forms of teaching exist peacefully beside each other. James thought of justification in the simple and most natural sense of justificatio justi, as the Divine recognition of an actually righteous man, and he thought of it as the final judgment of God upon a man who is to stand in the last judgment and become a partaker of the final soteria ('salvation'). Paul also demands as a requisite for this last judgment and the final soteria right works, the love that fulfills the law and the perfected sanctification, but he (except in Ro 2:13) does not apply the expression dikaiousthai ('to be justified') to the final judgment of God, which recognizes this righteousness of life as actual. He applies it rather to that first sentence of God with which He graciously receives the believing sinner returning to Him, and takes him into fellowship with Himself." Beyschlag rightly insists that James undoubtedly taught with the first apostles that whoever believes in Christ and is baptized receives the forgiveness of sins (Ac 2:38; 3:19; 10:43), and that he would not have contested the Pauline idea of justification by grace on account of faith, insisting only that works must follow. Theologically, the chief if not the only difference is that James has not yet made the cross of Christ the center of his point of view, while the atonement was fundamental with all Paul's thinking.

See, further, JAMES, EPISTLE OF.

III. The Old Testament.

A word in conclusion as to the Old Testament. All the New Testament writers built on the Old Testament. That there should be a cleft or contradiction between the Old Testament and what we call the New Testament would have been to them inconceivable. But they realized that that was the early dawn, while they lived in the light of day. Abraham believed in Yahweh; and He reckoned it to him for righteousness (Ge 15:6; Ro 4:3). Who does not keep all parts of the law all the time is condemned (De 27:26 Septuagint; Ga 3:10; compare Ps 14; 143:2; Ro 3:20; see 3:9-20, and the references to the Old Testament in the American Standard Revised Version). The prophets insisted upon the practical works of righteousness—"What doth Yahweh require of thee, but to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God?" (Mic 6:8). No religious attitude or services could take the place of uprightness of life. This does not mean that the Old Testament writers understood that men were justified simply by their good deeds, for it was always believed that underneath all was the mercy and lovingkindness of God, whose forgiving grace was toward the broken and contrite spirit, the iniquities of whom were to be carried by the Servant of Yahweh, who shall justify many (Ps 103:8-13; 85:10; Isa 57:15; 53:11, and many other passages). IV. Later Development of the Doctrine.

1. Apostolic and Early Church Fathers:

A brief statement now on the development of the doctrine in the Christian church. It is humiliating to confess that the witness immediately after the apostles (the apostolic Fathers) did not reach the serene

heights of Paul, or even the lower levels of his brethren. There are passages which remind one of him, but one feels at once that the atmosphere is different. Christianity is conceived as a new law rather than as a gospel of the grace of God. We cannot go into the reasons for this: suffice it to say that in GentileChristendom the presuppositions for that gospel failed, and the New Testament writings were not yet in the consciousness of the church to the extent that they dominated her thinking. The fine passage in Clement of Rome (97 AD, chapter xxxii: "They all therefore (i.e. Abraham and other early saints) were glorified and magnified, not through themselves or their own works or the righteous doings which they wrought, but through His (God's) will. And so we, having been called through His will in Christ Jesus, are not justified through ourselves or through our own wisdom or understanding or piety or works which we wrought in holiness of heart, but through faith, whereby the Almighty God justified all men that ever have been from the beginning; to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen.") is not at all on a paragraph with his whole Epistle, as he coordinates faith with other virtues in chapter xxxv, makes hospitality and godliness the saving virtues for Lot in chapter xi, couples hospitality and faith together as equal for Rahab in chapter xii, and represents forgiveness of sins through keeping commandments and love in chapter l. Ignatius (about 110-15 AD) speaks in one place about Jesus Christ dying for us, that believing on His death we might escape death (Tral. 2), but with him the real saving things are love, concord, obedience to bishops, and the indwelling God = Christ, though he has also the excellent passage: "None of these things is hidden from you if ye be perfect in your faith and love toward Jesus Christ, for these things are the beginning and end of life—faith is the beginning and love the end, and the two being found in unit are God, while all things else follow in their train unto true nobility" (Eph 1:4). The so-called Barnabas (date uncertain) puts the death of Christ Jesus at the foundation of salvation, which is expressed by the remission of sins through His blood (Eph 5), the kingdom of Jesus being on the cross, so that they who set their hope on Him shall live forever (Eph 6), while at the time even believers are not yet justified (Eph 4), for which finally a whole series of works of light must be done and works of darkness avoided (Eph 1:9). The Shepherd of Hermas and the Ancient Homily = 2 Clem are even more moralistic, where with whatever praise of faith we have the beginning of merit. The same legalistic tone sounds through that invaluable little roll found by Bryennios in 1873 and first published by him in Constantinople in December, 1883, The Teaching (Didache) of the Twelve Apostles. That Catholic trend went forward till it is almost full-fledged as early as Tertullian (fl. 200 AD) and Cyprian (250 AD). See a full statement in my Cyprian, 1906, 146 ff. And thus it continued until—as far as our outline is concerned—it struck Augustine, bishop of Hippo (396 ff), who in a masterly and living way united, so far as they could be united, the Pauline thoughts of sin, grace, and justification with the regular Catholic legalism. His book, De Spiritu et Litera (412 AD), was largely after Paul's own heart, and the Reformers hailed it with joy. But the Catholic elements he still kept, as for instance, that in justification a good concupiscence and a good-will are infused, that justification grows, that our merits must be taken into the account even though they are God's merits, that the faith which justifies is a faith which works by love, that faith is the holding true what God (and the church) says, though occasionally a deeper view of faith is seen, and that works are emphasized, as in De fide et operibus, in a Catholic fashion. With profound and thoroughly Christian thoughts, Augustine had not so worked himself clear of his Catholic inheritance that he could reproduce Paul purely. He made a bridge by which we could go either back to Paul or forward to Aquinas. As Harnack well says, Augustine experienced, on the one hand, the last revival in the ancient church of the principle that "faith alone saves," and, on the other, he silenced that principle for a thousand years. The very Catholic theologian who stood nearest to that principle

overcame it (Zeitschrift f. Theol. u. Kirche, 1891, 177). His misunderstanding of Paul's "faith that worketh through love" had momentous consequences.

2. Council of Trent:

Those consequences are best seen in the decrees of the Council of Trent (Session 6, 1547), to which we now turn, and which are the definite and final crystallization of the medieval development, so far as that development was Catholic.

(1) Justification is a translation from a natural state to a state of grace. With this works prevenient grace, awakening and assisting, and with this in his man cooperates and prepares himself for justification. This cooperation has the merit of congruity, though the first call comes before any merit.

(2) Faith is an element in justification. "Receiving faith by hearing, they of free will draw near to God, believing those things to be true which have been Divinely revealed and promised." Faith as a living trust in a personal Saviour for salvation is lacking. Among the truths believed is the mercy of God and that He wishes to justify the sinner in Christ.

(3) This faith begets love to Christ and hatred to sin, which are elements also of the justifying process.

(4) Now follows justification itself, "which is not a bare remission of sins, but also sanctification and renewal of the inner man through the voluntary reception of grace and of gifts."

(5) But this renewal must take place through baptism, which, to the prepared adult, both gives and seals all the graces of salvation, forgiveness, cleansing, faith, hope and love.

(6) Justification is preserved by obeying the commandments and by good works, which also increase it.

(7) In case it is lost—and it can be lost, not by venial, but by mortal sin and by unbelief—it can be regained by the sacrament of penance.

(8) To get it, to keep or regain it, it is also necessary to believe the doctrines as thus laid down and to be laid down by this Council (see the decrees in any edition, or in Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums, 2. Aufl., 206-16, or in Buckley's or in Waterworth's translations, and for an admirable and objective summary see Seeberg, History of Doctrine, II, 433-38).

3. Luther:

Recent researches in Luther's early writings have shown that almost from the beginning of his earnest study of religious questions, he mounted up to Paul's view of justification by faith alone (Loofs, DG, 4. Aufl., 1906, 696-98). Faith is the trust in the mercy of God through Christ, and justification is the declaring righteous for His sake, which is followed by a real making righteous. From the beginning to

the end of his life as a religious teacher these are the elements of his doctrine. Speaking of 1513-15, Loofs says (p. 697): "Upon these equations (to justify = to forgive, grace = mercy of the non-imputing God, faith = trust in His mercy) as the regulators of his religious self-judgment, Luther's piety rests, and corresponding to them his view of Christianity, and even later" (than 1513-15); and he adds that "to reckon as righteous" (reputari justum) must not be understood with Luther as an opposition "to make righteous," for his "to be justified without merits" in the sense of "to forgive" (absolvi) is at the same time the beginning of a new life: remissio peccati .... ipsa resurrectio. "His constantly and firmly held view, even more deeply understood later than in 1513-15, that 'to be justified without merit' =' to be resurrected (to be born again)' =' to be sanctified' is a pregnant formulation of his Christianity." So much being said, it is not necessary to draw out Luther's doctrine further, who in this respect "rediscovered Christianity as a religion," but it will suffice to refer to the Histories of Doctrine (Seeberg gives a full and brilliant exposition), to Kostlin, Luthers Theologie, 2. Aufl., 1901 (see Index under the word "Rechtfertigung," and I, 349), and especially to Thieme, Die sittliche Triebkraft des Glaubens: eine Untersuchung zu Luthers Theologie, 1895, 103-314.

From Luther and the other reformers the New Testament doctrine went over to the Protestant churches without essential modification, and has remained their nominal testimony until the present. A classic expression of it, which may be taken as representing evangelical Christendom, is the 11th of the 39 Articles of Religion of the Church of England: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by faith, and not for our own works or deservings: wherefore that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort; as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification." It is true that at one time Wesley's opponents accused him of departing from this doctrine, especially on account of his famous Minute of 1770, but this was due to a radical misunderstanding of that Minute, for to the last he held staunchly Paul's doctrine (for proof see my article in Lutheran Quarterly, April, 1906, 171-75).

4. Schleiermacher:

A new point of view was brought into modern theology by Schleiermacher, who starts from the fundamental fact of Christian experience that we have redemption and reconciliation with Christ, which fact becomes ours by union with Christ through faith. This union brings justification with other blessings, but justification is not considered as even in thought a separate act based on Christ's death, but as part of a great whole of salvation, historically realized step by step in Christ. The trend of his teaching is to break down the distinction between justification and regeneration, as they are simply different aspects of union with Christ.

Ritschl carried forward this thought by emphasizing the grace of the heavenly Father mediated in the first instance through the Son to the Christian community, "to which God imputes the position toward him of Christ its founder," and in the second instance to individuals "as by faith in the Gospel they attach themselves to this community. Faith is simply obedience to God and trust in the revelation of his grace in Christ." This brings sinners into fellowship with God which means eternal life, which is here and now realized, as the Fourth Gospel points out, in lordship over the world (compare Franks in DCG, I, 922-

23). The judicial or forensic aspect of justification so thoroughly in-wrought in Paul's thought is denied by Ritschl. "In whatsoever way we view the matter," he says, "the attitude of God in the act of justification cannot be conceived as that of a judge" (Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation, English translation, 1900, 90). W.N. Clarke agrees with Schleiermacher in eliminating justification as a separate element in the work of salvation, and harks back to the Catholic view in making it dependent on the new life and subsequent to it (Christian Theology, 407-8). No book has had as much influence in destroying the New Testament conception of justification among English-speaking readers as that of J. H. Newman, Lectures on Justification, 1838, 3rd edition, 1874, which contains some of the finest passages in religious literature (pp. 270-73, 302, 338-39), but which was so sympathetic to the Catholic view that the author had nothing essential to retract when he joined Rome in 1845. "Whether we say we are justified by faith, or by works, or by sacraments, all these but mean this one doctrine that we are justified by grace which is given through sacraments, impetrated by faith, manifested in works" (p. 303).

5. Meaning and Message to the Modern Man:

Lastly, has the New Testament conception of justification by faith any message to the modern man, or is it, as Lagarde held, dead in the Protestant churches, something which went overboard with the old doctrine of the Trinity and of Atonement? After an able historical, survey, Holl concludes (Die Rechtfertigungslehre im Licht der Geschichte d. Protestantismus, Tubingen, 1906, 40-42) that there are two principles thoroughly congenial to modern thought which favor this doctrine, namely, that of the sanctity and importance of personality, the "I" that stands face to face with God, responsible to Him alone; and second, the restoration of the Reformation-thought of an all-working God. Whoever feels the pressure of these two principles, for him the question of justification becomes a living one. "The standard on which he must measure himself is the Absolute God, and who can stand in this judgment? Not simply on account of single acts, but with his 'I' and even with his good-willing. For that is just the curse which rests upon a man that his 'I' is the thing with which alone he wills and can seek God, and that it is this very 'I' which by its willfulness, vanity and self-love poisons all his willing. Accordingly, it remains true, what the Reformers said, that man is entirely corrupt, and that he can do no otherwise than to despair when the majesty of God dawns upon him" (p. 41). There is, then, no other solution than the venture of faith that the same God who crushes our self-deceit lifts up with His sovereign grace, that we live through Him and before Him. Luther is right that religiously we can find no hold except on the Divine act of grace, which through faith in the Divine love and power working in us and for us ever makes us new in Christ. To give up the doctrine of justification, says Holl rightly (p. 42), is to give up conscious personal religion. Holl writes as a liberal, and he quotes a stronger liberal still, Treitschke, as saying that in the 19th century it was the orthodox preachers who proclaimed this doctrine, who built better than the liberals. Nor, says Holl in another book (Was hat die Rechtfertigungslehre dem modernen Menschen zu sagen? Tubingen, 1907, 26), can anyone who has experienced justification as an inner transformation be misled into moral unconcern. A moral ideal becomes his, much stronger and more compelling than worldly ethics. The new attitude toward God constituted by justification impels to an unending movement in the service of God and man. The doctrine has not had its day. It is a part of the eternal gospel. As long as sinful man has to do with an all-holy God, the experience of Paul, Luther and Wesley becomes in a sense normative for the race.

LITERATURE.

Besides the books mentioned in the text, the following on justification itself may be consulted (those marked with a star are Protestant, those with a dagger are Catholic or High Church Anglican): Goodwin, new edition, with preface by Wesley, 1807; Junkins, 1839; Hare, new edition, 1839 (1st edition with preface by Jackson, 1817); Kerwick, t 1841; Heurtley, 1846 (Bampton Lectures for 1845); McIlvaine, 1861, 3rd edition, 1868 (Righteousness of Faith, important); Buchanan, 1867 (important); Body, 1870; Bunyan, new edition, 1873; Harkey, 1875; Davies, 1878; Sadler, 1888; and Holden, 1901. Besides these, Laurence, Bampton Lectures for 1804, sermon 6; Drummond, Apostolic Teaching and Christ's Teaching (see index); Schlatter, New Testament Theology, 2 volumes, 1909-10; the various systematic Theologies; Theologies of the New Testament, and Commentaries may be consulted; also Menegoz, Die Rechtfertigungslehre nach Paulus und nach Jakobus, 1903; Kuhl, Die Stellung des Jakobusbriefes z. alttest. Gesetz u. z. Paulinischen Rechtfertigungslehre, 1905.

John Alfred Faulkner

JUSTLE

jus'-l (shaqaq): The word occurs once in Na 2:4 (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), where the American Standard Revised Version has "rush to and fro."

JUSTUS

jus'-tus (Ioustos): There are three of this name mentioned in the New Testament.

(1) It was the Roman surname of JOSEPH BARSABBAS (which see) (Ac 1:23).

(2) A Corinthian proselyte (sebomenos ton Theon), whose house adjoined the synagogue and who received Paul when the Jews opposed him (Ac 18:7). He was probably a Roman citizen, one of the colonies, and so he would be of assistance to the apostle in his work among the better class of Corinth. There is some disagreement among manuscripts regarding the name. Textus Receptus of the New Testament gives "Justus" alone. the Revised Version (British and American) following Codex Sinaiticus, Codex E, Vulgate, Bohairic, Armenian, gives "Titus Justus"; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Tischendorf, Codex Vaticanus, Codex Bezae, give "Titius Justus"; Cheyne (EB, under the word "Justus") thinks these forms a corruption of "Tertius Justus," and that the bearer of the name was the "Tertius" of Ro 16:22. Paul still continued his lodgings with Aquila and Priscilla, but made the house of Justus his own synagogue.

(3) A Jew, Jesus Justus, mentioned with Mark and Aristarchus by Paul in his letters to the Colossians (Col 4:11), is a fellow-worker and one that had been a comfort unto him.

S. F. Hunter

JUTTAH; JUTAH

jut’-a, joo’-ta (yuTTah, Jos 21:16; Septuagint Tanu; and in Jos 15:55 the King James Version, Septuagint Itan, A, Ietta); ju’-ta (~yaTah], Jos 15:55): A town in the hill country of Judah, mentioned with Maon, Carmel and Ziph; a Levitical city (Jos 21:16). In some versions of Septuagint it occurs (Iota) in 1Ch 6:57. In the Eusebius, Onomasticon (266 49; 133 10) a large village called "Juttah" is described as 18 Roman miles from Eleutheropolis. This agrees with the position of YuTTa, a large and prosperous Moslem village, 3,740 ft. above sea-level, 5 1/3 miles South of Hebron and 15 1/2 miles from Beit Jebrin (Eleutheropolis). There are many rock-cut tombs and ancient winepresses all around the village.

Reland (Pal, 870) suggested (and many others have followed him) that the ... polis Iouda, translated "city of Judah," in Lu 1:39, should be polis Iouta, "the city Yuta." The translation "city of Judah" is suspicious, because Iouda is without the article, which is usually put before the name of a district; the interchange of "t" and "d" is a very common one. Dr. Paterson, resident many years in Hebron, states that there is a local Moslem tradition in the district that Yutta was the home of John the Baptist. For YuTTa see PEF, III, 310, Sh XXI.

E. W. G. Masterman

KAB

kab (qabh, "something hollowed out," 2Ki 6:25; the King James Version Cab): A Hebrew dry measure and liquid measure equal to about 2 quarts.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

KABZEEL

kab’-ze-el, kab’-zel (kabhtse’el "(whom) God collects"): One of the "uttermost cities" of Judah toward the border of Edom in the South (Negeb) (Jos 15:21). It was the native place of Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, one of David’s mighty men (2Sa 23:20; 1Ch 11:22). "Jekabzeel and the villages thereof," one of the places re-inhabited by the men of Judah (Ne 11:25), appears to be the same place. The site is unknown.

KADESH ka’-desh (qadhesh; Kades, Ps 29:8; Judith 1:9).

See KADESH-BARNEA.

KADESH IN GALILEE

See KEDESH, 3.

KADESH ON THE ORONTES

o-ron’-tez (in Massoretic Text of 2Sa 24:6, under the corrupt form tachtim chodhshi, which should be corrected from the Septuagint (Luc.) reading: eis ten genitive Chettieim Kades, "to the land of the Hittites unto Kadesh," into ‘erets ha-chittim qadheshah. Ewald and others, fixing the northern ideal boundary of Israel at the sources of the Jordan, would read "Hermon" for chodhshi, but the conjectures of Thenius and Hitzig of a reference to the northern Kadesh are fully confirmed by the reading given): Kadesh was the southern capital of the Hittites, and was situated on the upper waters of the Orontes, 80 miles North of Damascus. It is now represented by a large mound 5 miles South of what, till the Middle Ages, was called the Lake of Kades, but now the Lake of Homs. Here Thothmes III of Egypt (flourished circa 1650 BC), after the battle of Megiddo, met and received hostages from the Assyrians, and here too Rameses II defeated Hatesar, king of the Hittites (circa 1320 BC), and concluded with him a treaty, which was formally inscribed on a disk of silver. The incidents of the battle are depicted on the walls of the Ramesseum, and an Egyptian epic records the heroic deeds of Rameses. Under the name Kadytis, it is mentioned as being taken by Pharaoh-necoh (Herodotus ii.159) in 609 BC. In the only Bible reference (2Sa 24:6), it is named as the northern limit of the census made by David.

W. M. Christie

KADESH-BARNEA

ka’-desh-bar’-ne-a (qadhesh barnea‘; Kades): Mentioned 10 times; called also "Kadesh" simply. The name perhaps means "the holy place of the desert of wandering." There are references to Kadesh in early history. At En-mishpat ("the same is Kadesh") Chedorlaomer and his allies smote the Amalekite and Amorite. Abraham dwelt near Kadesh, and it was at Beer-lahai-roi between Kadesh and Bered that the Angel of Yahweh appeared to Hagar (Ge 14:7; 16:14; 20:1). It was an important camp of the Israelites during their wanderings, and seems to have been their headquarters for 38 years (De 1:2; 2:14; Judith 5:14). There the returning spies found the camp (Nu 13:26); there Miriam died and was buried (Nu 20:1); from thence messengers were sent to the king of Edom (Nu 20:14; Jud 11:16). There the people rebelled because of the want of water, and Moses brought water from the rock (Nu 20:2); it was called therefore Meribath—or Meriboth-Kadesh (Nu 27:14; Eze 47:19; 48:28). It was situated in the wilderness of Zin (Nu 20:1; 33:36,37) in the hill country of the Amorites (De 1:19), 11 days’ journey from Horeb, by the way of Mt. Seir (De 1:2), "in the uttermost" of the border of Edom (Nu 20:16), and on the southern border, probably the Southeast corner, of Judah (Eze 47:19; compare Judith 19). See Cobern, Homiletic Review, April and May, 1914.

S. F. Hunter

KADMIEL

kad’-mi-el (qadhmi’el, "before God," "priest"(?); "Cadmiel" in parallel lists in 1 Esdras 5:26,58 the King James Version; omitted in Septuagint Codex Vaticanus; Codex Alexandrinus reads kai Kadmielon): A Levite (Ezr 2:40; Ne 7:43), founder of a family whose descendants returned from captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:1; Ne 7:43; 12:1,8). He is named among those who praise God for the return (Ne 9:4,5; 12:24); was of those who "set forward" the work of the Lord’s house (Ezr 3:9; 1 Esdras 5:26,58), and is again mentioned with those who "seal" the new Return Covenant (Ne 10:28) after the re-establishment of worship (Ne 10:1,9).

KADMONITE

kad’-mon-it (qadhmoni; Kedmonaioi, signifies "the Easterner," or, less probably, "one of the ancient race"): The Kadmonites are mentioned in Ge 15:19 along with the Kenites and Kenizzites of Edom, and are doubtless the same as "the children of the east," whose wisdom was celebrated (1Ki 4:30). qedhemah, "the East," was a son of Ishmael (Ge 25:15; compare Ge 25:6). In an Egyptian story describing the adventures of a political refugee who fled from Egypt in the time of the XIIth Dynasty, it is said that he found a refuge in Canaan in the land of Kaduma or Kedem.

A. H. Sayce

KAIN (1)

kan (ha-qayin; the King James Version Cain): A town in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:57). There is, too, apparently a reference to this place in Nu 24:21,22:

"And he looked on the Kenite, and took up his parable, and said,

Strong is thy dwelling-place,

And thy nest is set in the rock.

Nevertheless Kain shall be wasted,

Until Asshur shall carry thee away captive."

This place has been very doubtfully identified as the ruin Yukin, a place on a lofty hill Southeast of Hebron, overlooking the wilderness of Judah; the tomb of Cain is shown there. See PEF, III, 312, Sh XXI.

E. W. G. Masterman

KAIN (2)

(qayin): A clan name, the King James Version "the Kenite" (Nu 24:22; Jud 4:11). In the first passage the Revised Version (British and American) has "Kain" and margin "the Kenites"; in the second, the Revised Version (British and American) has "the Kenite" in text and margin "Kain." Compare preceding article.

KALLAI

kal'-a-i, kal'-i (qallay, qal, "swift"): A priest among those who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:1). He represented the family of Sallai (Ne 12:20).

KAMON

ka'-mon (qamon; the King James Version Camon): The place where Jair was buffed (Jud 10:3-5). It is possibly represented either by Kamm or Kumeim, ruins which lie about 6 and 7 miles respectively to the South-Southeast of Umm Keis. See further HAVVOTH-JAIR. The ruins of Kamm, about 200 yds. square, crown a small elevation, and point to an important place in the past. There are large rock-hewn cisterns to the South. Among the ruins of Kumein, which are not considerable, a few mud huts are built,

occupied today by about 200 souls (Schumacher, Northern ‘Ajlun, 137).

KANAH

ka’-na (qanah, "reeds"):

(1) The name of a "brook," i.e. wady, or "torrent bed," which formed part of the boundary between Ephraim and Manasseh (Jos 16:8; 17:9). The border of Ephraim went out westward from Tappuah to the brook Kanah, ending at the sea; the border of Manasseh from Tappuah, which belonged to Ephraim, "went down unto the brook of Kanah, southward of the brook." There seems no good reason to doubt the identification of "the brook Kanah" with the modern Wady Kanah. The transition from the heavy "q" to the lighter "k" is easy, so the phonetic difficulty is not serious. The stream rises in the Southwest of Shechem, flows through Wady Ishkar, and, joining the ‘Aujeh, reaches the sea not far to the North of Jaffa. Guerin, influenced, apparently, by the masses of reeds of various kinds which fill the river, argues in favor of Nahr el-Fallq, to the North of Arsuf. He identifies it with Nahr el-Kasab, "river of reeds," mentioned by Beha ed-Din, the Moslem historian. But this last must be identified with Nahr el-Mafjir, 13 miles farther North, too far North for "the brook Kanah."

(2) A town on the northern boundary of Asher (Jos 19:28), probably identical with the village of Qana, about 7 miles Southeast of Tyre (SWP, I, 51, 64, Sh I).

W. Ewing

KAPH

kaf "k": The 11th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "k", with daghesh, and "kh" (= German ch) without daghesh. It came also to be used for the number 20. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

KAREAH

ka-re’-a (qareach, "bald head"): The father of Johanan and Jonathan, who after the fall of Jerusalem joined Gedaliah at Mizpah (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:8).

KARIATHIARIUS

ka-ri-ath-i-a’-ri-us (Kariathiarios; Codex Vaticanus reads Kartatheiareios; the King James Version, Kiriathiarim (1 Esdras 5:19))= Kiriath-jearim in Ne 7:29.

KARKA

kar’-ka (ha-qarqa‘ah—with the article and locale; the King James Version Karkaa): A place in the South of Judah, between Addar and Wady el-‘Arish (Jos 15:3). Eusebius, Onomasticon speaks of a village in Judah lying toward the wilderness, named Akarka. It cannot now be identified. The name means "the pavement,"‘ or "ground."

KARKOR

kar’-kor (qarqor): An unidentified place where Gideon surprised and overwhelmed the remnants of the army of Zeba and Zalmunnah (Jud 8:10). It probably corresponds to Qarkar mentioned by Shalmaneser II, S. of Hamath (KB, I, 173).

KARTAH

kar’-ta (qartah): A city in the territory of Zebulun, assigned to the Levites (Jos 21:34). It is not identified. Possibly it is a variant of KATTATH, or of KARTAN (which see).

KARTAN

kar’-tan (qartan): A city in the territory of Naphtali, given to the Gershonite Levites (Jos 21:32). It is called Kiriathaim in 1Ch 6:76. Kartan may be a contraction of this. Cheyne (EB, under the word) suggests that both names may be corruptions from "Chinnereth." Neither is mentioned in Jos 19:32,38, in the list of Naphtalite cities, while Chinnereth is.

KATTATH

kat’-ath (qaTTath): A city in the territory of Zebulun, named with Iphtah-el, Nahalel, and Shimron (Jos 19:15), perhaps to be identified with Kitron (Jud 1:30), from which Zebulun did not expel the Canaanites; and with Kartah (Jos 21:34), which was given to the Merarite Levites. The Babylonian Talmud (Meg. 6a) identifies Kattath with Sepphoris, the modern Seffuriyeh (but see Neubauer, Geographie du Talmud, 191). The Jerusalem Talmud takes it as identical with Ketunith, Kuteineh, to the West of Esdraelon. It should probably, however, be sought near to Shimron, the modern Semuniyeh.

W. Ewing

KEDAR

ke’-dar (qedhar; Kedar): Second in order of the sons of Ishmael (Ge 25:13 parallel 1Ch 1:29). The name occurs as typical of a distant eastern country in opposition to the lands of the Mediterranean (Jer 2:10). The author of Second Isa introduces this tribe in company with Nebaioth, and both are represented as owners of flocks (Isa 60:7). Evidence of their nomadic habits appears in Jer 49:28,29, where they are classed among the Bene-Qedhem, and mention is made of their flocks, camels, tents, curtains and

furniture. They are spoken of (Isa 42:11) as dwelling in chatserim ("villages"), from which it would appear that they were a somewhat settled tribe, corresponding to the Arabic chadariya or "town-dwellers," as distinct from wabariya or "nomads." Ezekiel (27:21) gives another hint of their pastoral nature where, in his detailed picture of the wealth of Tyre, Kedar and Arabia provide the Tyrians with lambs, rams and goats. The fame of the tribe is further reflected in Isa 21:16,17 (the only allusion to their might in war), and in the figurative references to their tents (Ps 120:5; So 1:5). In this last passage where the tents are made symbolic of dark beauty, the word qadhar ("to be black") may have been in the writer's mind.

The settlements of Kedar were probably in the Northwest of Arabia, not far from the borders of Palestine. Assyrian inscriptions have thrown light upon the history of the tribe. There Kedar is mentioned along with the Arabs and Nebaioth, which decides its identity with Kedar of the Old Testament, and there is found also an account of the conflicts between the tribe and King Assurbanipal (see Margoliouth in HDB).

Of the Ishmaelite tribes, Kedar must have been one of the most important, and thus in later times the name came to be applied to all the wild tribes of the desert. It is through Kedar (Arabic, keidar) that Muslim genealogists trace the descent of Mohammed from Ishmael.

A. S. Fulton

KEDEMAH

ked'-e-ma, ke-de'-ma (qedhemah, "eastward"): Son of Ishmael (Ge 25:16), head of a clan (1Ch 1:31).

See KADMONITE.

KEDEMOTH ked'-e-moth, ke-de'-moth (qedhemoth, "eastern parts"): From the wilderness to which this town gave its name, Moses sent messengers to Sihon, king of the Amorites in Heshbon (De 2:26). It was given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben (Jos 13:18), and assigned to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:37; 1Ch 6:79). It must probably be sought on the upper course of the Arnon. Buhl (GAP, 268) suggests that it may be identified with Umm er-Resas.

See JAHAZ.

KEDESH (1)

ke'-desh (qedhesh; Kades):

(1) One of the "uttermost cities" of Judah "toward the border of Edom in the South" (Jos 15:23). Possibly it is to be identified with KADESH-BARNEA (which see); otherwise it is strange that this

latter should be omitted from the list. Dillmann would identify it with Kadus, to the South of Hebron, mentioned by Muqaddasi.

(2) A town in the territory of Issachar, given to the Gershonite Levites (1Ch 6:72). In the list of Joshua (21:28) its place is taken by KISHION (which see). Conder suggests identification with Tell Abu Qades, near Megiddo.

(3) Kedesh-naphtali, the famous city of refuge in the uplands of Naphtali. It is called "Kedesh," simply, in Jos 12:22, etc.; Kedesh-naphtali in Jud 4:6; Tobit 1:2; Kedesh in Galilee in Jos 20:7, etc. It was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (1Ch 6:76). From the name "holy," we gather that it was a sanctuary from old time. It was therefore a place of asylum, and only preserved its ancient character in this respect when chosen as one of the cities of refuge. It was the home of Barak, and here his host assembled. When the Assyrians invaded the land under Tiglath-pileser, it was among the first cities to be captured, and its inhabitants were deported (2Ki 15:29). Near Kedesh was fought the great battle between Jonathan the Maccabee and Demetrius (1 Macc 11:63 ff). Josephus says that in his time it belonged to the Tyrians, lying between their land and that of Galilee (Ant., XIII, v, 6; B J, II, xviii, 1; IV, ii, 3, etc.). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 20 miles from Tyre, near to Paneas. It is represented by the modern village of Kedes, which lies on the plateau to the West of el-Chuleh. It crowns a tell which runs out in a low ridge into the little plain to the West. Near the fountain, which rises under the ridge to the North, are the most interesting of the ancient remains. There are many fine sarcophagi, some of them being used as watering-troughs. From its lofty situation, Kedesh commanded a spacious view over a richly varied landscape, With smiling cornfields, and hills clothed with oak and terebinth.

W. Ewing

KEDESH (2)

(1 Macc 11:63,73, Codex Alexandrinus, Kedes; the King James Version Cades): Scene of a battle between Judas Maccabeus and the forces of Demetrius.

See KEDESH-NAPHTALI, under KEDESH, 3.

KEDESH-NAPHTALI

ke’-desh-naf’-ta-li.

See KEDESH, 3.

KEEPER; KEEPERS

kep’-er, (mostly from shamar; phulax): The word is used of keepers of sheep, vineyards, doors, prisons

(in Ge 39:21 ff, car; compare Ac 5:23), etc. In Ec 12:3, "The keepers of the house shall tremble," the allusion is to the decay of bodily powers, the "keepers" being specially the arms, which had become feeble through age.

KEHELATHAH

ke-he-la'-tha, ke-hel'-a-tha (qehlathah, "gathering," "assembly"): A desert camp of the Israelites between Rissah and Mt. Shepher (Nu 33:22,23). Situation is unknown.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

KEILAH

ke-i'-la (qe'ilah; Keeilam):

(1) A city of the Shephelah mentioned (Jos 15:44) along with Nezib, Aehzib and Mareshah. Among those who repaired the walls of Jerusalem was "Hashabiah, the ruler of half the district of Keilah, for his district. After him repaired their brethren, Bavvai the son of Henadad, the ruler of half the district of Keilah" (Ne 3:17,18).

1. David and Keilah:

It is, however, from the story of the wandering of David that we have most information regarding this place. It was a city with gates and bars (1Sa 23:7). The Philistines came against it and commenced robbing the threshing-floors. David, after twice inquiring of Yahweh, went down with his 600 men (1Sa 23:13) and "fought with the Philistines, and brought away their cattle, and slew them with great slaughter." Saul hearing that David and his men were within a fortified town "summoned all the people to war, to go down to Keilah, to besiege David and his men" (1Sa 23:8). Then David asked Abiathar the priest to bring him an ephod, and he inquired of Yahweh whether, if Saul came, the men of Keilah would surrender him to save that city; hearing from Yahweh, "They will deliver thee up," he and all his men escaped from Keilah and went into the wilderness. The reputed strength of Keilah is confirmed by its mention in 5 tablets in the Tell el-Amarna Letters under the name of Kilts (qilti, Petrie) with Gedor, Gath, Rabbah and Gezer.

2. Identification:

Although other identifications were proposed by the older topographers, there is now a general consensus of opinion that the site of this city is Khurbet Kila (Josephus, Ant, VI, xiii, 1, in his account of David's adventure calls the place "Killa"). It is a hill covered with ruins in the higher part of Wady es Sur, 1,575 ft. above sea-level, whose terraced sides are covered with grainfields. The Eusebius, Onomasticon (Latin text) states that it was 8 miles from Eleutheropolis, which is about the distance of Khurbet Kila from Beit Jibrin. Beit Nusib (Nezib) is a couple of miles away, and Tell Sandahannah

(Mareshah) but 7 miles to the West (Jos 15:44). An early Christian tradition states that the prophet Habakkuk was buried at Keilah.

(2) The Garmite (which see), 1Ch 4:19; see PEF, 314, Sh XXI.

E. W. G. Masterman

KELAIAH

ke-la’-ya, ke-li’-a (qelayah, "swift for Yah"[?]; Kolios; Codex Vaticanus, Konos): One of the priests who had "foreign wives" (Ezr 10:23, also "Kelita"). In parallel list of 1 Esdras 9:23, he again has a double name—"Colius" and "Calitas." A "Kelita" is named as helping Ezra at the expounding of the law (Ne 8:7; compare RAPC 1Es 9:48, "Calitas"), and also among the signatories of the covenant (Ne 10:9; for nature of covenant see Ne 10:28). They may not, however, be the same person.

KELITA

kel’-i-ta, ke-li’-ta (qeliTa’ "dwarf").

See KELAIAH.

KEMUEL

kem’-u-el, ke-mu’-el (qemu’el, "God’s mound"):

(1) Nephew of Abraham (Ge 22:21), father of Aram, whom Ewald identifies with Ram of Job 32:2; but compare Ge 10:22, where Aram is described as one of the children of Shem. They may not be the same person.

(2) Prince of Ephraim, one of the land commissioners who divided Canaan (Nu 34:24).

(3) A Levite, father of Hashabiah, one of the tribal princes of David’s time, a ruler among the Levites (1Ch 27:17).

KENAN

ke’-nan (qenan; Kainan) :A son of Enosh, the son of Seth (Ge 5:9,10,12,13,14; 1Ch 1:2). the King James Version form (except in 1Ch 1:2), is "Cainan."

KENATH

ke’-nath (qenath; Kaath kaanath, in Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus): A city in Bashan, taken along with its "daughters," i.e. "villages" from the Amorites by Nobah who gave it his own name (Nu 32:42). It was recaptured by Geshur and Aram (1Ch 2:23). It is probably identical with the modern Kanawat, which is built on the site, and largely from the materials of an ancient city. It lies about 16 miles to the North of Bosra eski Sham, the Bostra of the Romans, on both sides of Wady Kanawat, where, descending from the slopes of Jebel ed-Druze, it plunges over a precipice, forming a picturesque waterfall. On the plateau above the modern village, there is a striking collection of Roman and Christian remains, the shapely forms of many columns lending distinction to the scene. One large building is associated with the name of the patriarch Job—Maqam Ayyub. The position commands a spacious and interesting view over the whole of the Chauran. The identification has been rejected by Socin (Baedeker, Pal3, 207), but his reasons are not given. Moore (Judges, 222) also rejects it, but for reasons that are not convincing.

W. Ewing

KENAZ; KENEZ

ke’-naz, ke’-nez (qenaz "hunting"):

(1) A "duke" of Edom, grandson of Esau (Ge 36:11,15,42; 1Ch 1:36,53).

(2) Father of Othniel (Jos 15:17; Jud 1:13; 3:9,11; 1Ch 4:13).

(3) The unidentified qenaz of 1Ch 4:15, who appears to be a descendant of (2). There is, however, some difficulty with the passage here.

KENEZITE

ke’-nez-it (qenizzi; Kenezaios): the King James Version in Ge 15:19 and the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly, spell "Kenizzite." The Kenezites were the clan whose name-father was KENAZ (which see). Their land, along with that of their Canaanite tribes, was promised to Abram (Ge 15:19). To this clan belonged Jephunneh, the father of Caleb (Nu 32:12; Jos 14:6,14). It had evidently been absorbed by the tribe of Judah. If the Kenezites went down with Jacob into Egypt, they may have become identified with his family there.

KENITES

ke’-nits (ha-qeni, haqeni; in Nu 24:22 and Jud 4:11, qayin; of hoi Kenaioi, hoi Kinaioi): A tribe of nomads named in association with various other peoples. They are first mentioned along with the Kadmonites and Kenizzites among the peoples whose land was promised to Abram (Ge 15:19). Balaam, seeing them from the heights of Moab; puns upon their name, which resembles the Hebrew ken, "a

nest," prophesying their destruction although their nest was "set in the rock"—possibly a reference to Sela, the city. Moses' father-in-law, Jethro, is called "the priest of Midian" in Ex 3:1; 18:1; but in Jud 1:16 he is described as a Kenite, showing a close relation between the Kenites and Midian. At the time of Sisera's overthrow, Heber, a Kenite, at "peace" with Jabin, king of Hazor, pitched his tent far North of his ancestral seats (Jud 4:17). There were Kenites dwelling among the Amalekites in the time of Saul (1Sa 15:6). They were spared because they had "showed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt." David, in his answer to Achish, links the Kenites with the inhabitants of the South of Judah (1Sa 27:10). Among the ancestors of the tribe of Judah, the Chronicler includes the Kenite Hammath, the father of the Rechabites (1Ch 2:55). These last continued to live in tents, practicing the ancient nomadic customs (Jer 35:6).ichly varied landscape, With smiling cornfields, and hills clothed with oak and terebinth.

The word qeni in Aramaic means "smith." Professor Sayce thinks they may really have been a tribe of smiths, resembling "the gipsies of modern Europe, as well as the traveling tinkers or blacksmiths of the Middle Ages" (HDB, under the word). This would account for their relations with the different peoples, among whom they would reside in pursuit of their calling.

In Josephus they appear as Kenetides, and in Ant, IV, vii, 3 he calls them "the race of the Shechemites."

W. Ewing

KENIZZITE

ken'-i-zit.

See KENEZITE.

KENOSIS

ke-no'-sis: The word "kenosis" (kenosis) has entered theological language from Php 2:7, where in the sentence he "emptied himself" the Greek verb is ekenosen. "Kenosis," then, the corresponding noun, has become a technical term for the humiliation of the Son in the incarnation, but in recent years has acquired a still more technical sense, i.e. of the Son's emptying Himself of certain attributes, especially of omniscience.

1. The New Testament:

(1) The theological question involved was one about as far as possible from the minds of the Christians of the apostolic age and apparently one that never occurred to Paul. For in Php 2:7 the only "emptying" in point is that of the (external) change from the "form of God" to the "form of a servant." Elsewhere in the New Testament it is usually taken as a matter of course that Christ's knowledge was far higher than that of other men (Joh 2:24 is the clearest example). But passages that imply a limitation of that

knowledge do exist and are of various classes. Of not much importance are the entirely incidental references to the authorship of Old Testament passages where the traditional authorship is considered erroneous, as no other method of quotation would have been possible. Somewhat different are the references to the nearness of the Parousia (especially Mt 10:23; 24:29). But with these it is always a question how far the exact phraseology has been framed by the evangelists and, apart from this, how far Christ may not have been consciously using current imagery for the impending spiritual revolution, although knowing that the details would be quite different (see PAROUSIA). Limitation of knowledge may perhaps be deduced from the fact that Christ could be amazed (Mt 8:10, etc.), that He could be really tempted (especially Heb 4:15), or that He possessed faith (Heb 12:2; see commentary). More explicitly Christ is said to have learned in Lu 2:52; Heb 5:8. And, finally, in Mr 13:32 parallel Mt 24:36, Christ states categorically that He is ignorant of the exact time of the Parousia.

(2) An older exegesis felt only the last of these passages as a real difficulty. A distinction constructed between knowledge naturally possessed and knowledge gained by experience (i.e. although the child Jesus knew the alphabet naturally, He was obliged to learn it by experience) covered most of the others. For Mr 13:32 a variety of explanations were offered. The passage was translated "neither the Son, except the Father know it," a translation that can be borne by the Greek. But it simply transfers the difficulty by speaking of the Father’s knowledge as hypothetical, and is an impossible translation of Mt 24:36, where the word "only" is added. The explanations that assume that Christ knew the day but had no commission to reveal it are most unsatisfactory, for they place insincere words in His mouth; "It is not for you to know the day" would have been inevitable form of the saying (Ac 1:7).

2. Dogmatic:

(1) Yet the attempt so to misinterpret the verses is not the outcome of a barren dogmatic prejudice, but results from a dread lest real injury be done to the fundamentals of Christian consciousness. Not only does the mind of the Christian revolt from seeing in Christ anything less than true God, but it revolts from finding in Him two centers of personality—Christ was One. But as omniscience is an essential attribute of God, it is an essential attribute of the incarnate Son. So does not any limitation of Christ’s human knowledge tend to vitiate a sound doctrine of the incarnation? Certainly, to say with the upholders of the kenosis in its "classical" form that the Son, by an exercise of His will, determined to be ignorant as man, is not helpful, as the abandonment by God of one of His own essential attributes would be the preposterous corollary.

(2) Yet the Biblical data are explicit, and an explanation of some kind must be found. And the solution seems to lie in an ambiguous use of the word "knowledge," as applied to Christ as God and as man. When we speak of a man’s knowledge in the sense discussed in the kenotic doctrine, we mean the totality of facts present in his intellect, and by his ignorance we mean the absence of a fact or of facts from that intellect. Now in the older discussions of the subject, this intellectual knowledge was tacitly assumed (mystical theology apart) to be the only knowledge worthy of the name, and so it was at the same time also assumed that God’s knowledge is intellectual also—"God geometrizes." Under this assumption God’s knowledge is essentially of the same kind as man’s, differing from man’s only in its

purity and extent. And this assumption is made in all discussions that speak of the knowledge of the Son as God illuminating His mind as man.

(3) Modern critical epistemology has, however, taught man a sharp lesson in humility by demonstrating that the intellect is by no means the perfect instrument that it has been assumed to be. And the faults are by no means faults due to lack of instruction, evil desires, etc., but are resident in the intellect itself, and inseparable from it' as an intellect. Certain recent writers (Bergson, most notably) have even built up a case of great strength for regarding the intellect as a mere product of utilitarian development, with the defects resulting naturally from such an evolution. More especially does this restriction of the intellect seem to be true in religious knowledge, even if the contentions of Kant and (espescially) Ritschl be not fully admitted. Certain it is, in any case, that even human knowledge is something far wider than intellectual knowledge, for there are many things that we know that we never could have learned through the intellect, and, apparently, many elements of our knowledge are almost or quite incapable of translation into intellectual termsú Omniscience, then, is by no means intellectual omniscience, and it is not to be reached by any mere process of expansion of an intellect. An "omniscient intellect" is a contradiction in termsú

(4) In other words, God's omniscience is not merely human intellectual knowledge raised to the infinite power, but something of an entirely different quality, hardly conceivable to human thought—as different from human intellectual knowledge as the Divine omnipotence is different from muscular strength. Consequently, the passage of this knowledge into a human intellect is impossible, and the problem of the incarnation should be stated: What effect did Divine omniscience in the person have on the conscious intellect of the manhood? There is so little help from the past to be gained in answering this question, that it must remain open at present—if, indeed, it is ever capable of a full answer. But that ignorance in the intellect of the manhood is fully consistent with omniscience in the person seems to be not merely a safe answer to the question as stated, but an inevitable answer if the true humanity of Christ is to be maintained at all.

LITERATURE.

Sanday's Christology and Personality, 1911, and La Zouche, The Person of Christ in Modern Thought, 1912, are among the latest discussions of the subject, with very full references to the modern literature.

Burton Scott Easton

KERAS

ke'-ras (Kiras): In 1 Esdras 5:29, the head of a family of temple-servants, called "Keroz" in Ezr 2:44; Ne 7:47.

KERCHIEF

ker’-chif (micpachoth; epibolaia): Occurs only in Eze 13:18,21, in a passage which refers to some species of divination. Their exact shape or use is unknown. They were apparently long veils or coverings put over the heads of those consulting the false prophetesses and reaching down to the feet, for they were for "persons of every stature."

KEREN-HAPPUCH

ker’-en-hap’-uk, ke’-ren-hap’-uk (qeren happukh, "horn of antimony," i.e. beautifier; Septuagint Amaltheias keras): The 3rd daughter of Job (Job 42:14), born after his restoration from affliction. Antimony, producing a brilliant black, was used among the Orientals for coloring the edges of the eyelids, making the eyes large and lustrousú Hence, the suggestiveness of this name of an article of the ladies’ toilet, a little horn or receptacle for the eye-paint.

KERIOTH

ke’-ri-oth, -oth (qeriyoth):

(1) A city of Moab, named with Beth-meon and Bozrah (Jer 48:24,41). Here was a sanctuary of Chemosh, to which Mesha says (M S, l. 13) he dragged "the altar hearths of Davdoh." It may possibly be represented by the modern Kuraiat, between Diban and ‘Attarus. Some (e.g. Driver on Am 2:2) think it may be only another name for Ar-Moab. Buhl (GAP, 270) would identify it with Kir of Moab (Kerak). No certainty is yet possible.

(2) A city of Judah (Jos 15:25; the Revised Version (British and American) KERIOTH-HEZRON (which see)), possibly the modern el-Kuryatain, to the Northeast of Tell ‘Arad.

W. Ewing

KERIOTH-HEZRON

ke’-ri-oth-hez’-ron (qeriyoth chetsron; Jos 15:25 says, "The same is Hazor"; the King James Version "Kerioth and Hezron which is Hazor"): One of the cities in the "south" of Judah. Robinson (BR, II, 101) identifies it with the ruined site of Kuryatain, 4 1/2 miles North of Tell ‘Arad. It has been suggested that Kerioth was the birth place of JUDAS ISCARIOT (which see). Compare KERIOTH, 2.

KERNEL

kur’-nel (chartsannim, English Versions of the Bible "kernels"; Septuagint reads stemphullon used by Aristophanes as olives from which oil has been pressed, later, in same, of raisin pulp): Mentioned in Nu 6:4 along with zagh, translated "husks." This translates, "kernels" or "grape stones," is from the Targum and Talmud, but is doubtful, and it may be the word should be translated "sour grapes."

KEROS

ke’-ros (qeroc, "fortress"(?)): One of the Nethinim (Ezr 2:44; Ne 7:47), an order appointed to the liturgical offices of the temple.

See NETHINIM.

KESIL

ke’-zil (Orion).

See ASTRONOMY.

KESITAH

kes’-i-ta, ke-se’-ta (qesiTah).

See PIECE OF MONEY.

KETAB

ke’-tab (Ketab): Ancestor of a family of Nethinim (1 Esdras 5:30).

KETTLE

ket’-’l: In English Versions of the Bible only in 1Sa 2:14 for dudh, "a vessel for cooking." The same word in 2Ch 35:13 is rendered "caldrons," and in Job 41:20 (Hebrew 12), "pot." Ps 81:6 (Hebrew 7) (the King James Version "pots") belongs rather to another signification of the word (the Revised Version (British and American) "basket," for carrying clay or bricks).

KETURAH

ke-tu’-ra, ke-too’-ra (qeTurah; Chettoura, "incense"): The second wife of Abraham (Ge 25:1; 1Ch 1:32 f). According to the Biblical tradition, he contracted this second marriage after the death of Sarah (compare Ge 23), and very likely after the marriage of Isaac (compare Ge 24). It is not improbable that, as some writers have suggested, this change in the life of his son prompted Abraham to remarry in order to overcome the feeling of lonesomeness caused by Isaac’s entering the state of matrimony.

1Ch 1:32 (and also Ge 25:6) shows us that Keturah was not considered to be of the same dignity as

Sarah who, indeed, was the mother of the son of promise, and, for obvious reasons, the sons of Abraham’s concubines were separated from Isaac. She was the mother of 6 sons representing Arab tribes South and East of Palestine (Ge 25:1-6), so that through the offspring of Keturah Abraham became "the father of many nations."

William Baur

KEY

ke (maphteach, an "opener"; compare kleis, "that which shuts"): Made of wood, usually with nails which fitted into corresponding holes in the lock, or rather bolt (Jud 3:25). Same is rendered "opening" in 1Ch 9:27.

See HOUSE.

Figurative: Used figuratively for power, since the key was sometimes worn on the shoulder as a sign of official authority (Isa 22-22). In the New Testament it is used several times thus figuratively: of Peter: "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 16:19); of Christ, in Revelation, having the "keys of death and of Hades" (Re 1:18), also having "the key of David" (Re 3:7). An angel was given "the key of the pit of the abyss" (Re 9:1; 20:1). our Lord accused the teachers of the law of His day of taking away "the key of knowledge" from men, that is, locking the doors of truth against them (Lu 11:52; compare Mt 23:13).

Edward Bagby Pollard

KEYS, POWER OF THE

kez

I. THE PROBLEMS INVOLVED

1. The Keys; and the Binding and Loosing

2. Meaning of the Statements

3. How Peter Is Related to These Powers

4. Is the Primary Idea that of Position and Authority?

II. VIEWS MAINTAINED

1. Agent of the Power

2. Nature of the Power

3. Scope of the Power

III. DATA FOR DECIDING THE QUESTIONS INVOLVED

1. Passages Employing the Terms "Key," "Binding and Loosing"

2. Related Passages

3. Examples of Exercise of This Power

IV. CONCLUSION

1. Nature of the Power

2. Agent of the Power

3. Scope of the Power

There is no more stubbornly contested conception in Christian terminology. The thought connects itself immediately with Mt 16:19, but it is hardly correct to say that it originates there, for the controversy is one that grows out of the conflict of forces inherent in the institutional development of religion and of society. It must have arisen, in any event, if there had been no such word as that in Mt 16:19, although not in the same terms as it is now found. Since the Reformation it has been recognized, by Catholic and Protestant, that on the interpretation of this passage depends the authority of the Church of Rome and its exclusive claims, so far as their foundation in Scripture is concerned; while on the other hand there is involved the "validity" of the "sacraments," "ordinances" and "orders" of Protestantism and the very hope of salvation of Protestants.

I. The Problems Involved.

1. The Keys; and the Binding and Loosing:

The crucial passage has two declarations, commonly spoken of as promises to Peter: to him Christ will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; whatsoever he shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, while whatsoever he shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. How are the facts of having committed to him the keys and the function of binding and loosing related? Are they two forms of one declaration? Is the first general, and the second a specific sphere of its application?

Both statements are made in figurative terms. That of the keys is supposed to be drawn from the duties of the chief steward of a house, or establishment. The idea of the keys of a city turned over to some distinguished person is advanced, but is hardly to be considered. We need, then, to know the functions of the chief steward and how they apply to the kingdom of heaven, and to Peter as its steward.

2. Meaning of the Statements:

What was Peter to bind and loose, men or things, persons or teachings? Numerous examples could be cited of the use of these terms to signify forbidding (binding) and permitting (loosing) conduct as legitimate under the law of the Old Testament (Lightfoot, McClintock and Strong, Schaff-Herzog, Hastings, etc.). The strict school of Shammai bound many things loosed by the laxer school of Hillel (Broadus, Matthew). Is this conclusive that Jesus is here giving Peter authority for "laying down the law for his fellow-disciples," "authority to say what the law of God allows, and what it forbids," "the power of legislation for the church"? (Compare Mason in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), IV, 30.)

3. How Peter Is Related to These Powers:

Ecclesiastical contentions turn especially on Peter’s relation to these words of Jesus. Do they signify powers and "privileges" conferred on Peter, exclusively or representatively? Are they official or personal? Do they belong to other apostles, and to other officers besides apostles? Can the powers be exercised by individuals or by the church alone? If any besides Peter have these powers, do they pass to them from Peter, and how?

4. Is the Primary Idea That of Position and Authority?:

What seems to the writer a fundamental question here is either passed over very lightly or entirely omitted in the discussions of this subject. Did Jesus mean by these words to confer on Peter, or on anyone to whom they may apply, authority, or obligation; privilege, or responsibility? Does He promise position, or does He impose duty? These alternatives are not necessarily exclusive, but the interpretation of the thought will be determined in no small measure by where the stress is laid.

II. Views Maintained.

1. Agent of the Power:

The possibilities have been exhausted in the interpretations and applications advocated. It is not possible to classify on lines of the creeds, except very generally, for there is little uniformity of view existing within the various communions.

(1) Generally speaking, the Roman Catholic church gives to Peter a unique position. Her theologians also agree that all the powers and privileges of Peter descend to his successors in the vicarate of Christ.

When the question is raised of the extension of these prerogatives beyond Peter and the popes, all sorts of views are held, concerning both the fact and the method of that extension.

(2) Among Protestants there is general agreement that the church is the agent of this power, but there is not uniformity as to the nature of the authority or the manner of its exercise.

(3) Some think that Peter has no peculiar relation to the keys; that these words were spoken to him only as the first who gave expression to that conception and experience, on the basis of which Jesus commits the keys of the kingdom to any believer in Him as the Christ of God.

We may summarize the more important views as to Peter thus:

(a) the power committed to him alone and exercised,

(i) at Pentecost, or

(ii) at Pentecost, Caesarea and other places;

(b) the power committed to Peter and to the other apostles, including Paul, discharged by them, and descended to no others;

(c) the power conferred on Peter officially and on his official successors;

(d) the power conferred on Peter and the other apostles and to such as hold their place in the church;

(e) that the power belongs to Peter as representative of the church, and so to the church to be exercised

(i) by the officials of the church,

(ii) by the officials and those to whom they commit it,

(iii) by all priests and persons allowed to represent the church, de facto,

(iv) by the church in its councils, or other formal and official decisions,

(v) by the church in less formal way than (iv),

(vi) by all members the church as representing it without specific commission;

(f) that it belongs to the Christian as such, and so is imposed upon, or offered to, all Christians.

2. Nature of the Power:

There is general—not absolute—agreement that the holder of the keys is to admit men into the kingdom. It is not agreed that the holder of the keys may, or can, determine who are members of the kingdom. Both sides are-taken. Some think that the power is that of announcing authoritatively the conditions of entrance, while others insist that the holder of the keys also determines what individuals have accepted the conditions.

3. Scope of the Power:

(1) There is strong support for the view that the primary function of the keys lies in determining the teaching of the kingdom, maintaining purity of doctrine. Emphasis is laid on the use of the neuter, "whatsoever"—not "whomsoever"—with the binding and loosing. This would lead, however, to the secondary and implied function of declaring who had or had not accepted the teaching of the kingdom.

(2) In the Roman Catholic church we find insistence on distinguishing between the general authority of the keys in all affairs of the church and religion, and the binding and loosing which they specifically apply to absolution. Only on this last are Catholics in full agreement. That the church administers salvation is held by Roman and Greek Catholics and by not a few Protestants, although Protestants do not, as a rule, claim exclusive power in salvation as do the others. Absolution is held to be a general (derived) priestly function, while the authority of the keys resides in the pope alone.

(3) Eminent Catholic authorities admit that the Fathers generally understood the keys to signify the power of forgiving sins, and that they seldom make any reference to the supremacy of Peter. But they claim that rarely the Fathers do take "Christ’s promise in the fuller meaning of the gift of authority over the church." Suarez was the first to develop the doctrine that it conferred on Peter and his successors authority in its widest sense, administrative and legislative.

(4) The extension of the authority of the keys to include civil matters is a contention of the Roman church, shared in modified form by some Protestants. Indeed the relation of ecclesiastical to civil authority must be said still to be awaiting clear definition in Protestantism. Macedo (De Clavibus Petri) claims theologians of the church for the civil authority of the keys. Joyce in the Catholic Encyclopedia affirms that he is unable to verify this claim, but, on the contrary, finds that the opponents of the extension of the authority of the church to civil matters use Mt 16:19 in support of their position on the ground that to Peter were committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, not of the kingdoms of this world.

III. Data for Deciding the Questions Involved.

1. Passages Employing the Terms "Key," "Binding and Loosing":

We must first examine the Scriptures employing the terms we seek to define.

(1) Mt 16:19, the crucial passage, is part of paragraph over which there is no end of controversy. The incident at Caesarea Philippi was understood then and afterward to mark an epoch in the life and teaching of Jesus. Having elicited Peter's confession, Jesus pronounces a benediction on him because his insight represented a Divinely mediated experience of fundamental significance in His own plan and mission. Jesus goes on to say: "And I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter ("a stone"), and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Mt 16:18). The controversy rages about "Peter" (petros) and the "rock" (petra), "gates of Hades," and "prevail against it." Are the church to be built on the rock and the kingdom whose keys are to be given to Peter the same? Such a shifting of figure is not conclusive against the thought. Perhaps the church is the organic form of the kingdom, its personal content and expression on earth at any given time. This church exists wherever men consciously accept and are included in the kingdom. The kingdom will always embrace influences, institutions, individuals, not be reckoned in any organized or visible church. The church has never had—in the nature of the case can never have—one complete organization including all the organized life of the kingdom, or even of the church. Any claims to this are contradicted by facts obvious at every moment of history. The change in figure from Mt 16:18 to 16:19 is not conclusive against supposing the church to be built in him. But it seems far better to understand that Peter is the first stone in the building, while the foundation is that vital experience in which Peter came to know Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God. On this is erected the church, out of those living stones (lithoi zontes, 1Pe 2:4) that know and confess Jesus the Christ. The transition is thus easy to giving Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the reason for giving them to him rather than to any other may be found in the fact that he is now the first so to enter into the kingdom as to be fitted for church functions.

It is not needful to determine, for our purpose, the exact meaning of "gates of Hades" and their not prevailing against the church (compare various commentaries). It is clear that the church is to persist in the life of the world and so the kingdom will not lack organized and aggressive expression. Nor does the relation of binding and loosing depend at all upon the critical question of reading or omitting "and" between the two parts of the verse. The conviction could hardly be escaped that the latter function is intimately related to the former, and is either directly or indirectly involved within it.

(2) The plural "keys," occurs elsewhere only in Re 1:18, where the Christ represents Himself as holding the keys of death and of Hades. The word "Hades" might connect this with Mt 16:19. The immediate occasion for the statement is that He who was dead, is alive; He has not only overcome death in His own person but has conquered it and its realm, so that they can no more have power except as subject to Him, since He holds their keys. Men on earth will either fall under the power of death and Hades or they must enter the kingdom of heaven. If the living Christ has the keys of the kingdom in the hands of Peter, or other friends, and holds the keys of its enemies in His own hands, the work will go on with success. It is not certain that the two passages can properly be so closely connected, but they thus afford just the assurance that is contained for the churches in Revelation.

(3) In Re 3:7 Christ appears in the character, "he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key (singular) of David, he that openeth and none can shut, and that shutteth and none openeth." The idea is not restricted but indicates mastery over all things in the Messianic kingdom, its own operations and all

forms of opposition. In the next verse, as a specific instance, He has set before the church at Philadelphia an open door (opportunity and progress) which none can shut. Compare as to this Eph 1:22.

(4) It seems to be taken for granted that Jesus, in Mt 16:19, had direct reference to Isa 22:22, yet the passage is not Messianic except in a general sense and on the assumption that the power of Yahweh over the nations in the Old Testament is wielded by the Christ in the New Testament (see JEHOVAH; LORD). Eliakim is to have absolute power, holding the key of the house of David. The use of the words "open" and "shut," as well as the general conception, connects the passage rather with Re 3:7.

(5) Re 9:1; 20:1 are to be taken together. "The key of the pit of the abyss" in the hands of the angel or angels signifies, in these specific circumstances, the same power as that indicated in 1:18.

(6) In Lu 11:52 Jesus pronounces a woe upon the "lawyers" who had "taken away the key of knowledge" from the people, neither entering in nor allowing those about to go in, to enter. The knowledge of God and Divine things was in the control, in great measure, of these scribes. This connects the figure directly with the idea of Mt 16:19, and the connection is emphasized by comparing Mt 23:2 f; and is made definite by the word of Jesus in Mt 13:52 with which is to be compared Lu 12:42, where it would not be allowable, to suppose that Jesus meant to limit the idea of "the faithful and wise steward" to Peter. This passage with the references seems to be highly important for our subject.

2. Related Passages:

Light is to be drawn from several passages that do not use the exact terms of Mt 16:19, but that deal with the same general ideas.

(1) Mt 18:18 places the responsibility for binding and loosing on all disciples (18:1), and the reason is explained in the assured presence of the Christ Himself in any company of two or three who have come together in prayer touching any matter in His name, i.e. as His representatives. The immediate reference is to matters of discipline in the effort to rescue any "brother" from sin. The passage is to be taken of sin generally, for the reading "against thee" (18:15) is to be rejected, in spite of both revised versions The reference of binding and loosing here to the man is conclusive against limiting the idea in 16:19 to teaching (compare also Lu 17:1 ff). It is also to be noted that the responsibility is placed upon the individual Christian to cooperate with others when necessary.

(2) Mt 9:8 shows that the multitude recognized that God had given power on earth to pronounce forgiveness of sins, and apparently they do not limit this power to the Divine Person, for they do not yet know Him as such.

(3) Jas 5:14 ff recognizes the value of elders, and probably of others also, in securing the forgiveness of them that have sinned.

(4) What one must regard as the proper starting-point for studying this subject is Joh 20:21 ff. Appearing

to ten of the apostles and to others on the first night after the resurrection, Jesus says: "As the Father sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Whose soever sins ye forgive, they are forgiven unto them; whose soever ye retain, they are retained." By comparing this with the corresponding account in Lu 24 we see that Jesus is directing that they shall carry on His work (see also Joh 14:12-14; 15:15,16), that He teaches them at length of the nature of His work as seen in the Old Testament, and that the method of their work is to be preaching repentance and remission of sins in His name among all nations. Significant for our purpose are the presence of others than the apostles, the gift of the Holy Spirit, His own self-projection in His messengers, and the solemn statement that the sins of men will be retained or forgiven as it is done through these followers.

3. Examples of Excercise of This Power:

(1) It is remarkable that there is no distinct reference to this authority of the keys in the records of the work of the apostles and others in the New Testament. Their consciousness seems most of all to have been dominated by the fact that they were witnesses of Jesus, and this corresponds exactly with the point of emphasis in all the various forms and occasions of the giving of the commission (see Ac 2:32; 3:15; 4:33; 5:32; 10:39,41; 13:31; 1Pe 5:1; compare Carver, Missions in the Plan of the Ages). It is said of Paul and Barnabas (Ac 14:27) that after their first missionary journey they rehearsed to the church at Antioch "all things that God had done with them, and that he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles." At Pentecost and at other times Peter was the chief speaker, and so opened the door of the kingdom. Referring to his preaching to Cornelius and his friends, Peter reminds the saints in the conference at Jerusalem (Ac 15) that God made choice among them, that by his mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of God and believe, but this was said by way of conciliating the Jewish party and not as claiming any priority in authority. It was Philip, the deacon-evangelist, who first preached to the Samaritans (Ac 8), and some "men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also, preaching the Lord Jesus" (Ac 11:20), the first example of "opening a door of faith" to full heathen. Peter appears in the Jerusalem conference with no authority above that of other apostles and elders. By reference to Ga 2 we see that Paul was here only as a matter of prudence and fraternity, not recognizing any authority to legislate for his churches or his ministry. The decision there reached is promulgated as that of the brethren as a body, loosing all the law of Moses save four matters that were "necessary" on account of fundamental morals and of the universal presence of Jews in every city (Ac 15:20 f, 28 f). In the sense of teaching Christian conduct all Paul’s letters are examples of binding and loosing.

(2) As to binding and loosing sins Peter speaks in the cases of Ananias and Sapphira (Ac 5), Simon Magus (Ac 8), and in deciding upon the baptism of Cornelius and his household (Ac 10:48). Paul speaks with equal boldness in the judgment of Elymas (Ac 13:10), where we are told that he was under the Spirit; passes upon the faith of a dozen men at Ephesus, and requires their new baptism after instruction (Ac 19:3-7); commands the church at Corinth to turn over to Satan the incestuous man (1Co 5:5; compare 1Ti 1:20), and later urges the man’s restoration to loving fellowship, declaring that he has been forgiven (2Co 2:5). Obscure men like Philip (Ac 8) and Ananias of Damascus in the case of Paul himself (Ac 9) exercised the same sort of judgment as to the forgiveness and reception of men into the fellowship.

IV. Conclusion.

1. Nature of the Power:

We sum up what seems to be the teaching of Scripture. We conclude that the power is not a special privilege and extraordinary authority, but a responsibility entrusted by Jesus Christ as the method of extending His work. There is in it nothing magical, mysterious, or arbitrary; not ecclesiastical or official, but spiritual and primarily personal. The keys of the kingdom of heaven are first of all the gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ. By this means men are admitted into the kingdom. The fully attested method of using the keys is that of witnessing personally to an experience of Jesus Christ. He was conferring power for saving and not for barring from salvation. Let it be borne in mind always that Jesus was offering Peter not power but duty, not privilege but responsibility. Neither of these terms, "power" and "privilege," that have come to be associated with the gift of the keys occurs with that gift in the words of the Master. The keys are primarily for admitting to the kingdom of heaven, not for barring from the church.

2. Agent of the Power:

The holder of the keys is any man with that experience that called forth from Jesus the assurance that Peter should have the keys. Such a man will be in fellowship and cooperation with like men, in a church, and the Spirit of Jesus will be present in them, so that their decisions and their testimony will be His as well as theirs. There is a corporate, or church, agency, therefore, and the man who would ignore that lacks the experience or the Spirit needful for the use of the keys. Yet the church is never to overshadow or exclude the individual responsibility and authority.

3. Scope of the Power:

It is to be understood that the keys of the kingdom of heaven confer no political authority or power, save that of holy and redemptive influence. The kingdom of Jesus is not of this world. Its power is spiritual and is to be exercised always primarily in the saving of men. Men do not need to be locked out of the kingdom. They are out, and too contented to remain so. It does happen that evil men seek to take possession of the kingdom for evil ends, and then it is that the authority rests in spiritual men to exclude. Men that are to be brought into the kingdom of heaven are now in sin, and where the duty of releasing them is not discharged by Christians, the sinners are left bound in their sins.

There is also involved of necessity the duty of declaring not only the conditions of entrance into the kingdom, but the courses of conduct appropriate to the kingdom. It is thus that binding and loosing in teaching devolve upon the holders of the keys. To that extent, and in that sense, alone, is there the power of "legislating" within the kingdom. This is only interpreting and applying the principles that are given us in the Scriptures.

See further ABSOLUTION; IMPOSITION OF HANDS; PETER; ROCK.

William Owen Carver

KEZIAH

ke-zi’-a (qetsi‘ah, "cassia"; Kasia, Codex Alexandrinus, Kassia): The 2nd daughter of Job (Job 42:14), born after his restoration from affliction. The word "cassia" became a feminine name from the fragrance of the flower.

KEZIZ

ke’-ziz (qetsits).

See EMEK-KEZIZ.

KHAN

kan, kan.

See INN.

KIBROTH-HATTAAVAH

kib-roth-ha-ta’-a-va, kib-roth (qibhroth ha-ta’awah "the graves of greed"): A desert camp of the Israelites, one day’s journey from the wilderness of Sinai. There the people lusted for flesh to eat, and, a great number of quails being sent, a plague resulted; hence, the name (Nu 11:34; 33:16; De 9:22).

KIBZAIM

kib-za’-im, kib’-za-im See JOKMEAM.

KICK

(laktizo): In the famous vision on the road to Damascus the unseen voice said to Saul: "Why persecutest thou me? It is hard for thee to kick against the goad" (Ac 9:4 f; 26:14). The words are omitted from the best manuscripts in Ac 9:4. This was a familiar proverb in both Greek and Latin literature, and refers to the severer goading received by an ox which kicks back at the goad used to guide or urge him on. The words seem to mean that Paul’s paroxysm of persecution was a painful as well as profitless resistance to the pricks of conscience by which God was leading him into the light.

KID

(1) gedhi (Ex 23:19, etc.);

(2) feminine gedhiyah (Isa 11:6, etc.);

(3) gedhi ‘izzim, English Versions of the Bible "kid," literally, "kid of the goats," the King James Version margin (Jud 6:19, etc.);

(4) ‘ez, literally, "goat" (De 14:21; 1Ki 20:27); .

(5) se‘ir ‘izzim, the King James Version "kid of the goats," the Revised Version (British and American) "he-goat" (Ge 37:31; Le 9:3, etc.);

(6) eriphos (Lu 15:29).

See GOAT.

KIDNAPPING (MANSTEALING)

kid’-nap-ing The term itself occurs only in the New Testament andrapodistes =" manstealer") in 1Ti 1:10. The crime was directly forbidden in the Hebrew law (Ex 21:16; De 24:7), and was made punishable with death.

KIDNEYS

kid’-niz (always in the plural: kelayoth; nephroi; Latin renes, whence the English "reins"): "Reins" and "kidneys" are synonyms, but the King James Version undertook a distinction by using the former word in the figurative, the latter in the literal passages. the English Revised Version has followed the King James Version exactly, but the American Standard Revised Version has retained "reins" only in Job 16:13; La 3:13; Re 2:23, elsewhere substituting "heart," except in Ps 139:13, where "inward parts" is used. the King James Version and the English Revised Version also have "reins" for chalatsayim, in Isa 11:5 (the American Standard Revised Version "loins"). The physiological function of the kidneys is not referred to in the Bible, but has been introduced (quite wrongly) by the King James Version margin to Le 15:2; 22:4.

(1) The kidneys owe their importance in the Bible partly to the fact that they are imbedded in fat, and fat of such purity that fat of the kidneys was a proverbial term for surpassing excellence (De 32:14 margin). For the visceral fat was the part of the animal best adapted for sacrificial burning, and hence, came to be deemed peculiarly sacred (Le 7:22-25; 1Sa 2:16). Accordingly, the kidneys with the fat surrounding them were burned in every sacrifice in which the entire animal was not consumed, whether in peace (Le

3:4,10,15; 9:19), sin (Ex 29:13; Le 4:9; 8:16; 9:10), or trespass, (Le 7:4) offerings; compare the "ram of consecration" (Ex 29:22; Le 8:25). So in Isa 34:6, "fat of the kidneys of rams" is chosen as a typical sacrificial term to parallel "blood of lambs and goats."

(2) The position of the kidneys in the body makes them particularly inaccessible, and in cutting up an animal they are the last organs to be reached. Consequently, they were a natural symbol for the most hidden part of a man (Ps 139:13), and in Job 16:13 to "cleave the reins asunder" is to effect the total destruction of the individual (compare Job 19:27; La 3:13). This hidden location, coupled with the sacred sacrificial use, caused the kidneys to be thought of as the seat of the innermost moral (and emotional) impulses. So the reins instruct (Ps 16:7) or are "pricked" (Ps 73:21), and God can be said to be far from the reins of sinners (Jer 12:2). In all of these passages "conscience" gives the exact meaning. So the reins rejoice (Pr 23:16), cause torment (2 Esdras 5:34), or tremble in wrath (1 Macc 2:24). And to "know" or "try the reins" (usually joined with "the heart") is an essential power of God's, denoting His complete knowledge of the nature of every human being (Ps 7:9; 26:2; Jer 11:20; 17:10; 20:12; RAPC Wis 1:6; Re 2:23). See FAT; PSYCHOLOGY; SACRIFICE. Compare RS2, 379-80, and for Greek sacrificial parallels Journal of Philology, XIX (1890), 46. The anatomical relations are well exhibited in the plate in Sacred Books of the Old Testament, "Leviticus."

Burton Scott Easton

KIDRON

kid'-ron (Kedron; the King James Version Cedron): A place which, in obedience to Antiochus Sidetes, Cendebaeus fortified (1 Macc 15:39 ff), to which, when defeated, he fled, hotly pursued by John and Judas, sons of Simon the Maccabee, who burned the city (1 Macc 16:4 ff). It is named along with Jamnia (Yebna) and Azotus (Esdud). It is possibly identical with Katrah], a village about 3 miles Southwest of 'Aqir (Ekron).

KIDRON, THE BROOK

(nachal qidhron; in Joh 18:1 (the King James Version Cedron), ho cheimarrhous ton Kedron, according to the Revised Version margin, the last two words are to be considered as meaning "of the cedars." The Hebrew word has been very generally accepted as from qadhar, "to become black," but it is an attractive suggestion (Cheyne) that it may be a phonetic variation of gidderon, "a spot for enclosures for cattle," of which latter there must have been many around the now buried caves which lay at the base of the cliffs around the spring Gihon):

1. Wady Sitti Miriam:

The Nachal Qidhron is the valley known today as the Wady Sitti Miriam, which lies between the eastern walls of Jerusalem and the Mount of Olives. It commences in the plateau to the North of the city, and after making a wide sweep Southeast, under the name Wady el Joz ("Valley of the Walnuts"), passes

South until level with the southeastern corner of the temple-area where its bed is spanned by an old bridge; here the bottom of the valley, 40 ft. beneath the present surface level, is 400 ft. below the temple-platform. From this point it narrows and deepens gradually, bending slightly West of South, and, after receiving the Tyropoeon valley, joins a little farther Southwest with the Valley of Hinnom to form the Wady en Nar which winds on through the "wilderness of Judea" to the Dead Sea. Where the three valleys run together is a large open space filled with gardens (the KING'S GARDEN, which see), which are kept irrigated all the year round by means of the overflow waters from the 'Ain Silwan (see SILOAM). It is where the Hinnom valley runs into the Kidron that some would locate TOPHETH (which see). Except at the irrigated gardens, the ravine is a dry valley containing water only during and immediately after heavy rain, but in ancient times the rocky bottom—now buried beneath many feet of rich soil—must have contained a little stream from Gihon for at least some hundreds of yards. This was the "brook that flowed through the midst of the land" (2Ch 32:4). The length of the valley from its head to Bir Eyyub is 2 3/4 miles.

2. Traditions:

Since the 4th century AD, this valley has been known as the Valley of Jehoshaphat (see JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF), and from quite early times it was a favorite situation for interments (2Ki 23:4,6,12; 2Ch 34:4,5); it is by Moslem and Jewish tradition the scene of the last judgment, and was known to the Moslems in the Middle Ages as Wady Jehannum; see GEHENNA. It is probable that the "graves of the common people," where King Jehoiakim cast the body of the prophet Uriah, were here (Jer 26:23), and it has been suggested, with less probability, that here too may have been the scene of Ezekiel's vision of the "valley of dry bones" (Eze 37; compare Jer 31:40).

3. The Fields of Kidron:

The Fields of Kidron (2Ki 23:4), though generally identified with the open, lower part of this valley, where it is joined by the Tyropoeon valley, may more probably have been in the upper part where the wide expanded valley receives the name Wady el Joz; this part is actually on the road to Bethel.

4. Historical Associations:

The most dramatic scene associated with the Kidron is that recorded in connection with its earliest Scriptural mention (2Sa 15:23), when David, flying before his rebellious son Absalom, here stood on the Jerusalem side of the valley while all his adherents passed over. "And all the country wept with a loud voice, and all the people passed over: the king also himself passed over the brook Kidron .... toward the way of the wilderness." The passing over this brook appears to have been viewed as the solemn abandonment of the Jerusalem territory (compare 1Ki 2:37). In 1Ki 15:13; 2Ch 15:16, we read that Asa burnt at the brook Kidron "an abominable image for an Asherab" which Maacah, his mother, had set up. In the reforms of Hezekiah, "all the uncleanness that they found in the temple of Yahweh" was carried by the Levites to the brook Kidron (2Ch 29:16); "All the altars for incense took they away, and cast them into the brook Kidron" (2Ch 30:14). This locality was again used in the reforms of Josiah when the

king "brought out the Asherah from the house of Yahweh, without Jerusalem, unto the brook Kidron, and burned it at the brook Kidron, and beat it to dust, and cast the dust thereof upon the graves of the common people" (2Ki 23:6). The same treatment was given to the vessels made for Baal, the Asherah and the host of heaven (2Ki 23:4), and the two idolatrous altars of Manasseh (2Ki 23:12). Josephus (Ant., IX, vii, 3) states that Athaliah was slain in the valley of Kidron, but this does not quite tally with the account (2Ki 11:16). It was a valley associated with graves and the ashes of abominations, but it was prophesied that it should be "holy unto Yahweh" (Jer 31:40). Twice it is mentioned simply as "the valley," nachal (2Ch 33:14; Ne 2:15). Very different from these earlier scenes is the last Scriptural reference (Joh 18:1), when Jesus "went forth with his disciples over the brook Kidron" for His last hours of spiritual struggle and prayer before the turmoil of the end.

E. W. G. Masterman

KILAN

ki’-lan (Kilan; the King James Version Ceilan): Mentioned with Azetas in 1 Esdras 5:15; their sons returned among the exiles with Zerubbabel. The names do not appear in the lists of Ezra and Nehemiah.

KIMAH

ki’-ma (Pleiades).

See ASTRONOMY.

KIN

See KINDRED.

KIN, NEXT OF

See KINSMAN.

KINAH

ki’-na (qinah): An unidentified town on the southern boundary of Judah, toward Edom (Jos 15:22). The word qinah means "elegy," "dirge," "lament for the dead." The name, however, may have been derived from the Kenites, qeniy, who had settlements in the South (1Sa 27:10, etc.).

KINDNESS

kind’-nes (checedh; chrestotes): "Kindness" in the Old Testament is (with one exception) the translation of checedh, "kindness," "favor," "mercy," etc., used chiefly of man but also of God (Ge 20:13; 40:14; 1Sa 15:6; 20:14,15; 2Sa 9:3; Ne 9:17; Ps 141:5; Isa 54:8,10, etc.); Tobh, "good," is once so translated (2Sa 2:6). In the New Testament chrestotes, "usefulness," "beneficence," is rendered "kindness" 4 t in the King James Version (2Co 6:6; Eph 2:7; Col 3:12; Tit 3:4, and in Ga 5:22 the Revised Version (British and American)); see GENTLENESS; GOODNESS. Philanthropia, "love of mankind," is translated "kindness" Ac 28:2), and philadelphia, "love of the brotherhood" (2Pe 1:7, the English Revised Version "love of the brethren," the American Revised Version margin "Gr, love of the brethren").

For "kindness" (Ps 31:21) the Revised Version (British and American) has "lovingkindness," and the American Standard Revised Version in other places where the reference is to God; for "shew," "shewed kindness" (Jos 2:12) "deal," "dealt kindly"; for "The desire of man is his kindness" (Pr 19:22) the American Standard Revised Version has "That which maketh a man to be desired is his kindness," the English Revised Version "The desire of man is (the measure of) his kindness," like the American Standard Revised Version in m; for "merciful kindness" (Ps 117:2) the American Standard Revised Version has "lovingkindness," the English Revised Version "mercy "; both have "lovingkindness" (Ps 119:76); for "of great kindness" (Ne 9:17; Joe 2:13; Jon 4:2) the American Standard Revised Version has "abundant in lovingkindness," the English Revised Version "plenteous in mercy"; the Revised Version (British and American) has "kindness" for "mercy" (Ge 39:21); for "pity" (Job 6:14); for "goodness" (Pr 20:6); "favor and kindness" the American Standard Revised Version, for "grace and favor" (Es 2:17).

See LOVINGKINDNESS; MERCY.

KINDRED

kin’-dred: Several words are rendered "kindred" in the King James Version. ‘ach, "brother," was used loosely among Hebrews for a member of the same tribe or family, a relative; and is once translated "kindred" (1Ch 12:29 the King James Version). Once also somewhat loosely as the translation of modha‘ath, literally, "acquaintance" (Ru 3:2; compare same root in 2:1, rendered "kinsman"); once, for the, figurative expression, "men of thy redemption" (ge’ullah, referring to the law of the redemption of land by kinsmen, Le 25:25). The two most common words for kindred are: (1) moledheth, "related by birth" (Ge 12:1; 24:4,7; 31:3,13; 32:9; 43:7; Nu 10:30; Es 2:10,20; 8:6); (2) mishpachah, "family" (Ge 24:38,40,41; Jos 6:23; Ru 2:3; 1Ch 16:28; Job 32:2; Ps 22:27; 96:7).

In the New Testament (several times), genos, "kindred by birth," so, of same family, tribe or race (Ac 4:6; 7:13,19 the Revised Version (British and American) "race"); so also suggeneia (Lu 1:61; Ac 7:3,14). In the King James Version phule, "tribe," rendered "kindred" (Re 1:7; 5:9; 7:9; 11:9; 13:7; 14:6), but better "tribe" as in the Revised Version (British and American). patria, rendered "kindred" in Ac 3:25, is better "families," as in the Revised Version (British and American).

Edward Bagby Pollard

KINE

kin:

(1) ‘alaphim, plural of ‘eleph, "ox," or "cow," the American Standard Revised Version "cattle," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "kine" (De 7:13; 28:4,18,51);

(2) baqar, "ox" or "cow," the American Standard Revised Version "herd," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "kine" (De 32:14; 2Sa 17:29);

(3) paroth plural of parah, "young cow" or "heifer," the Revised Version (British and American) "kine" in Ge 41:2-27; 1Sa 6:7-14; Am 4:1; in Ge 32:15, the American Standard Revised Version has "cows."

See CATTLE; COW.

KING OF THE JEWS

The title applied in mockery of Jesus, and put by Pilate on His cross (Mt 27:29,37 parallel Mr 15:26, etc.).

See JESUS CHRIST; KING, CHRIST AS.

KING’S DALE

See DALE, KING’S.

KING’S GARDEN

gan-ha-melekh): In Ne 3:15, mention is made of "the pool of Shelah by the king’s garden"; in 2Ki 25:4; Jer 52:7, "All the men of war fled by night by the way of the gate between the two walls, which was by the king’s garden"; see also Jer 39:4. The "king’s winepresses" (Zec 14:10), which must have been to the extreme South of the city, were clearly in this neighborhood. The references all point to the one situation in Jerusalem where it is possible for gardens to flourish all the year round, namely, the part of the Kidron valley below the Tyropoeon which is watered by the overflow from the Pool of Siloam (see SILOAM). Here the vegetable gardens of the peasants of Siloam present an aspect of green freshness unknown elsewhere in Jerusalem.

E. W. G. Masterman

KING’S MOTHER

The queen-dowager occupied a very important position at the court of the kings of Israel, e.g. Bathsheba (1Ki 2:19); Maacah (1Ki 15:13); Athaliah (2Ch 22:2); and Nehushta (2Ki 24:8; Jer 13:18).

See QUEEN; QUEEN MOTHER.

KING’S POOL

berekhath hamelekh): This is possibly the Pool of Siloam (Ne 2:14), and may have been so named as being near to the "king’s garden."

KING’S VALE

(‘emeq ha-melekh; Septuagint in Ge reads to pedion ("the plain") basileos, in 2 Sam, he koilas ("valley") tou basileos; the King James Version King’s Dale): The place where the king of Sodom met Abram (Ge 14:17), and the situation of Absalom’s monument (2Sa 18:18). It was identical with the Vale of Shaveh, and was evidently near Salem, the city of Melchizedek (Ge 14:17). If SALEM (which see) is Jerusalem, then Absalom’s pillar was also near that city, Josephus writes (Ant., VII, x, 3), "Absalom had erected for himself a marble pillar in the king’s dale, two furlongs (stadia) from Jerusalem, which he named Absalom’s Hand." In all probability this "pillar" was a rough upright stone—a matstsebhah—but its site is lost. The traditional Greek-Egyptian tomb of perhaps 100-200 years BC which has been hewn out of the rock on the eastern side of the Kidron valley is manifestly misnamed "Absalom’s pillar," and the Kidron ravine (nachal) cannot be the King’s Vale (‘emeq).

E. W. G. Masterman

KING, CHRIST AS

I. THE REALITY OF CHRIST’S KINGSHIP

1. The Old Testament Foreshadowings

In the Psalms and Prophets

2. The Gospel Presentation

(1) Christ’s Claim to Be King

(2) Christ’s Acceptance of the Title

(3) Christ Charged and Condemned as King

(4) The Witness of the Resurrection and of Apostolic Preaching

(5) The Testimony of the Epistles and Apocalypse

II. CHRIST'S TITLE TO KINGSHIP

1. By Birth

2. By Divine Appointment

3. By Conquest

4. By the Free Choice of His People

III. THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S KINGSHIP

1. Spiritual

2. Universal

(1) Kingdom of Grace, of Power

(2) Kingdom of Glory

3. Eternal

I. The Reality of Christ's Kingship.

There can be no question but that Christ is set before us in Scripture as a king. The very title Christ or "Messiah" suggests kingship, for though the priest is spoken of as "anointed," and full elucidation of the title as applied to Jesus must take account of His threefold office of prophet, priest and king, yet generally in the Old Testament it is the king to whom the epithet is applied.

1. The Old Testament Foreshadowings:

We may briefly note some of the Old Testament predictions of Christ as king. The first prediction which represents the Christ as having dominion is that of Jacob concerning the tribe Of Judah: "Until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obedience of the peoples be" (Ge 49:10); then kingly dignity and dominion are suggested by the star and scepter in Balaam's prophecy (Nu 24:15-17). As yet, however, Israel has

no king but God, but when afterward a king is given and the people become familiar with the idea, the prophecies all more or less have a regal tint, and the coming one is preeminently the coming king.

In the Psalms and Prophets

We can only indicate a few of the many royal predictions, but these will readily suggest others. In Ps 2 the voice of Yahweh is heard above all the tumult of earth, declaring, "Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." So in Psalms 24; 45; 72; 89 and 110 we have special foreshadowings of the Messianic king. The babe that Isaiah sees born of a virgin is also the "Prince of Peace" (Isa 9:6,7), of the increase of whose government there shall be no end, and as the prophet gazes on him he joyfully exclaims: "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness" (Isa 32:1). Jeremiah, the prophet of woe, catches bright glimpses of his coming Lord, and with rapture intensified by the surrounding sorrow cries: "Behold, the days come, saith Yahweh, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land" (23:5). Ezekiel, dwelling amid his wheels, sees in the course of Providence many revolutions, but they are all to bring about the dominion of Christ: "I will overturn, overturn, overturn .... until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him" (21:27). Daniel sees the rise and progress, the decline and fall of many mighty empires, but beyond all he sees the Son of man inheriting an everlasting kingdom (7:13). Hosea sees the repentant people of Israel in the latter days seeking Yahweh their God, and David (the greater David) their king (3:5). Micah sees the everlasting Ruler coming out of Bethlehem clad in the strength and majesty of Yahweh, who shall "be great unto the ends of the earth" (5:4). Zechariah, exulting in His near approach, cries: "Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy king cometh unto thee" (9:9), and he follows His varied course through gloom and through glory, until the strong conviction is born in his heart and expressed in the glowing words: "Yahweh shall be King over all the earth" (14:9). The more extreme higher critics would, of course, deny that these are direct predictions of Jesus Christ, but most, if not all, would admit that they are ideal representations which were only fully realized in Jesus of Nazareth.

2. The Gospel Presentation:

The Gospels present Christ as king. Matthew, tracing His genealogy, gives special prominence to His royal lineage as son of David. He tells of the visit of the Magi who inquire for the newborn king of the Jews, and the scribes answer Herod’s question by showing from Micah’s prophecy that the Christ to be born in Bethlehem would be a "governor," and would rule, "be shepherd of my people Israel" (Mt 2:5,6). Luke’s account of the Nativity contains the angel’s declaration that the child to be born and named Jesus would occupy the throne of David and reign over the house of Jacob forever (Lu 1:32,33). In John’s account of the beginning of Christ’s ministry, one of His early disciples, Nathanael, hails Him as "King of Israel" (Joh 1:49), and Jesus does not repudiate the title. If Mark has no such definite word, he nevertheless describes the message with which Jesus opens His ministry as the "gospel" of "the kingdom of God" (1:14,15). The people nurtured in the prophetical teaching expect the coming one to be a king, and when Jesus seems to answer to their ideal of the Messiah, they propose taking Him by force and making Him king (Joh 6:15).

(1) Christ’s Claim to Be King

Christ Himself claimed to be king. In claiming to be the Messiah He tacitly claimed kingship, but there are specific indications of the claim besides. In all His teaching of the kingdom it is implied, for though He usually calls it the "kingdom of God" or "of heaven," yet it is plain that He is the administrator of its affairs. He assumes to Himself the highest place in it. Admission into the kingdom or exclusion from it depends upon men’s attitude toward Him. In His explanation of the parable of the Tares, He distinctly speaks of His kingdom, identifying it with the kingdom of God. "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity. .... Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Mt 13:41-43). He speaks of some seeing "the Son of man coming in his kingdom" (Mt 16:28), of the regeneration, "when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory" (Mt 19:28), of Himself under the guise of a nobleman who goes "into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom," and does receive it (Lu 19:12-15).

(2) Christ’s Acceptance of the Title

When the mother of John and James comes asking that her two sons may occupy the chief places of honor in His kingdom, He does not deny that He is a king and has a kingdom, while indicating that the places on His right and left hand are already determined by the appointment of the Father (Mt 20:21-23). He deliberately takes steps to fulfill the prediction of Zec: "Behold, thy king cometh," and He accepts, approves and justifies the hosannas and the homage of the multitude (Mt 21:1-16; Mr 11; Lu 19; Joh 12). In His great picture of the coming judgment (Mt 25), the Son of man sits upon the throne of His glory, and it is as "the king" that He blesses and condemns. The dying thief prays, "Remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom" (Lu 23:42), and Jesus gives His royal response which implies full acceptance of the position.

(3) Christ Charged and Condemned as King

His claim throughout had been so definite that His enemies make this the basis of their charge against Him before Pilate, that He said that "he himself is Christ a king," and when Pilate asks, "Art thou the King?" He answers, "Thou sayest," which was equivalent to "yes" (Lu 23:2,3). In the fuller account of John, Jesus speaks to Pilate of "my kingdom," and says "Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end have I been born" (Joh 18:37). His claim is perpetuated in the superscription of the cross in the three languages: "This is the King of the Jews," and although the priests wished it to be altered so as to detract from His claim, they yet affirm the fact of that claim when they say: "Write not, The King of the Jews; but, that he said, I am King of the Jews" (Joh 19:21). The curtain of His earthly life falls upon the king in seeming failure; the taunt of the multitude, "Let the Christ, the King of Israel, now come down from the cross" (Mr 15:32), meets with no response, and the title on the cross seems a solemn mockery, like the elaborate, cruel jest of the brutal soldiers clothing Him with purple, crowning Him with thorns and hailing Him King of the Jews.

(4) The Witness of the Resurrection and of Apostolic Preaching.

But the resurrection throws new light upon the scene, and fully vindicates His claims, and the sermon of Peter on the day of Pentecost proclaims the fact that the crucified one occupies the throne. "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Ac 2:36). The early preaching of the apostles, as recorded in the Acts, emphasizes His lordship, His kingship; these men were preachers in the literal sense—heralds of the king.

(5) The Testimony of the Epistles and Apocalypse.

We need not consider in detail the testimony of the Epistles. The fact that Christ is king is everywhere implied and not infrequently asserted. He is "Lord of both the dead and the living" (Ro 14:9). He is risen "to rule over the Gentiles" (Ro 15:12). "He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet" (1Co 15:25). He is at the right hand of God "above all rule, and authority," etc. (Eph 1:20-22). Evil men have no "inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God" (Eph 5:5), and believers are "translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love" (Col 1:13). He has been given the name that is above every name "that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow," etc. (Php 2:9-11). Those who suffer with Christ are to "reign with him" (2Ti 2:12), at "his appearing and his kingdom" (2Ti 4:1), and He will save them "unto his heavenly kingdom" (2Ti 4:18); "the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2Pe 1:11). Of the Son it is said: "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever" (Heb 1:8), and He is a King-Priest "after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb 7:17). In the Apocalypse, appropriately, the predominant aspect of Christ is that of a king. He is the "ruler of the kings of the earth" (Re 1:5), "King of the ages" (Re 15:3), "King of kings" (Re 17:14; 19:16), "and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Re 11:15). The reality of Christ’s kingship is thus placed beyond all doubt.

II. Christ’s Title to Kingship.

1. By Birth:

After the analogy of earthly kingships it might be said that Jesus Christ is a king by birth. He was born a king. His mother, like His reputed father, "was of the house and family of David" (Lu 2:4). The angel in nouncing His birth declares that He will occupy the throne of His father David. The Pharisees have no hesitation in affirming that the Christ would be Son of David (Mt 22:45; Mr 12:35; Lu 20:41). Frequently in life He was hailed as "Son of David," and after His ascension, Peter declares that the promise God had made to David that "of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne" (Ac 2:30) was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth; while Paul declares that the gospel of God was "concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Ro 1:3). So that on the human side He had the title to kingship as son of David, while on the Divine side as Son of God He had also the right to the throne.

2. By Divine Appointment:

David was king by Divine choice and appointment, and this was the ideal in the case of his successors. The figment of "Divine right"—by virtue of which modern kings have claimed to rule—was, in the first instance, a reminiscence of the Biblical ideal. But the ideal is realized in Christ. Of the coming Messianic King, Yahweh said: "Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion" (Ps 2:6), and the great proclamation of Pentecost was an echo of that decree: "Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified" (Ac 2:36), while the apostle declares that "God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name" (Php 2:9), and again and again the great Old Testament word of Yahweh is applied to Christ: "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet" (Heb 1:13).

3. By Conquest:

Often in the olden times kingship was acquired by conquest, by superior prowess. According to one etymology of our word "king," it means the "able man," "the one who can," and everyone remembers Carlyle's fine passage thereon. In the highest sense, this is true of Christ, who establishes His sway over men's hearts by His matchless prowess, the power of His infinite love and the charm of His perfect character.

4. By the Free Choice of His People:

Except in the most autocratic form of kingship, some place has been given to the suffrage of the people, and the other phases of the title have been confirmed and ratified by the voice of the people as they cry, "God save the king!" and no king is well established on the throne if he is not supported by the free homage of his subjects. Christ as king wins the love of His people, and they gladly acknowledge His sway. They are of one heart to make Him king.

III. The Nature of Christ's Kingship.

We know that the Jews expected a material kingdom, marked by earthly pomp and state; a kingdom on the lines of the Davidic or Solomonic kingdom, and others since have made the same mistake.

1. Spiritual:

The Scriptures plainly declare, Christ Himself clearly taught, that His kingship was spiritual. "My kingdom," said He, "is not of this world" (Joh 18:36), and all the representations given of it are all consistent with this declaration. Some have emphasized the preposition ek here, as if that made a difference in the conception: "My kingdom is not of this world." Granted that the preposition indicates origin, it still leaves the statement an assertion of the spirituality of the kingdom, for if it is not from this kosmos, from this earthly state of things, it must be from the other world—not the earthly but the heavenly; not the material but the spiritual. The whole context shows that origin here includes character, for Christ adds, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews." Because it is of an unworldly origin, it is not to be propagated by, worldly means,

and the non-use of worldly means declares it to be of an unworldly character. So that to assert that Christ means that His kingdom was not to arise out of this world, but to come down from heaven, is not at all to deny, but rather, indeed, to declare its essential spirituality, its unworldliness, its otherworldliness.

Throughout the New Testament, spirituality appears as the prevailing characteristic of Christ's reign. Earthly kingdoms are based upon material power, the power of the sword, the power of wealth, etc., but the basal factor of Christ's kingdom is righteousness (Mt 5:20; 6:33; Ro 14:17; Heb 1:8, etc.). The ruling principle in earthly kingdoms is selfish or sectional or national aggrandizement; in the kingdom of Christ it is truth. Christ is king of truth. "Art thou a king then?" said Pilate. "I am," said Christ (for that is the force of "thou sayest that I am a king"). "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth," and He adds, "Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice" (Joh 18:37). Elsewhere He says: "I am the .... truth" (Joh 14:6), and at the head of the armies of heaven He still wears the title "Faithful and True" (Re 19:11); but if righteousness and truth occupy such a prominent place in His kingdom, it follows that it must be distinguished by its spirituality. His immediate subjects are spiritual men and women; its laws are spiritual; its work is spiritual; all the forces emanating from it, operating through it, centering in it, are spiritual.

2. Universal:

The Jewish idea of the Messiah's reign was a narrow national one. For them it meant the glorification of the sons of Abraham, the supremacy of Judaism over all forms of faith and all systems of philosophy; the subjection to Jewish sway of the haughty Roman, the cultured Greek and the rude barbarian. The Messiah was to be a greater king than David or Solomon, but still a king after the same sort; much as the limits of the kingdom might extend, it would be but an extension on Jewish lines; others might be admitted to a share in its privileges, but they would have to become naturalized Jews, or occupy a very subordinate place. The prophetic ideal, however, was a universal kingdom, and that was the conception endorsed and emphasized by Christ. (For the prophetic ideal such passages may be noted as Psalms 2; 22; 72; Isa 11:10; Da 7:13,14, etc.) Of course, the predictions have a Jewish coloring, and people who did not apprehend the spirituality might well construe this amiss; but, closely examined, it will be found that the prophets indicate that men's position in the coming kingdom is to be determined by their relation to the king, and in that we get the preparation for the full New Testament ideal. The note of universality is very marked in the teaching of Christ. All barriers are to be broken down, and Jews and Gentiles are to share alike in the privileges of the new order. "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 8:11), and stranger still to the Jewish ear: "The sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness" (Mt 8:12). In the parables of the kingdom (Mt 13), the field, in which is sown the good seed of the kingdom, is the world, and the various other figures give the same idea of unlimited extent. The same thought is suggested by the declaration, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold" (Joh 10:16), also by the confident affirmation: "I, if I be lifted up, from the earth, will draw all men unto myself" (Joh 12:32), and so with many other statements of the Gospels.

The terms of the commission are enough to show the universal sovereignty which Christ claims over men: "Go ye therefore," He says, as possessing all authority in heaven and on earth, "and make disciples

of all the nations" (Mt 28:19), coupled with the royal assurance, "Ye shall be my witnesses .... unto the uttermost part of the earth" (Ac 1:8). The Book of Ac shows, in the carrying out of the commission, the actual widening of the borders of Christ's kingdom to include believers of all tions. Peter is taught, and announces clearly, the great truth that Gentiles are to be received upon the same terms as the Jews. But through Paul as the apostle of the Gentiles this glorious truth is most fully and jubilantly made known. In the dogmatic teaching of his Epistles he shows that all barriers are broken down, the middle wall of the fence between Jew and Gentile no longer exists. Those who were aliens and strangers are now made nigh in Christ, and "are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God" (Eph 2:19). That household, that commonwealth, is, in Pauline language, equivalent to the kingdom, and in the same epistle, he describes the same privileged position as being an "inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God" (Eph 5:5). The Saviour's kingdom cannot be bounded by earthly limits, and all attempts to map it out according to human rules imply a failure to recognize the true Scriptural idea of its universality.

(1) Kingdom of Grace, of Power.

Most of what we have said applies to that phase of Christ's kingdom which is generally called his kingdom of grace; there is another phase called the kingdom of power. Christ is in a special sense king in Zion, king in His church—that is universal in conception and destined to be so in reality—but He is also king of the universe. He is "head over all things"; Eph 1:22; Col 1:18, and other passages clearly intimate this. He rules over all. He does so not simply as God, but as God-man, as mediator. It is as mediator that He has the name above every name; it is as mediator that He sits upon the throne of universal power.

(2) Kingdom of Glory.

There is also the phase of the kingdom of glory. Christ's reign now is truly glorious. The essential spirituality of it implies its glory, for as the spiritual far surpasses the material in value, so the glory of the spiritual far transcends the glory of the material. The glory of worldly pomp, of physical force, of human prowess or genius, must ever pale before the glory of righteousness, truth, spirituality. But Christ's kingdom is glorious in another sense; it is a heavenly kingdom. It is the kingdom of grace into which saved sinners now enter, but it is also the kingdom of heavenly glory, and in it the glorified saints have a place. Entrance into the kingdom of grace in this earthly state secures entrance into the kingdom of glory. Rightly does the church confess: "Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ." The kingdom is yet to assume an externally glorious form. That is connected with the appearing of Christ (2Ti 4:1), the glory that shall be revealed, the heavenly kingdom. The kingdom in that stage cannot be entered by flesh and blood (1Co 15:50), man in his mortality—but the resurrection change will give the fitness, when in the fullest sense the kingdom of this world shall have "become the kingdom of our Lord, , and of his Christ" (Re 11:15).

3. Eternal:

It would be easy to multiply quotations in proof of this. The great passage in Da 7 emphatically declares it. The echo of this is heard in the angel's announcement: "He shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end" (Lu 1:33). The reign of 1,000 years which so greatly occupies the thoughts of so many brethren, whatever we may decide as to its nature, is but an episode in the reign of Christ. He is reigning now, He shall reign forever. Re 11:15, above quoted, is often cited as applying to the millennium, but it goes on to say "and he shall reign (not for 1,000 years simply, but) for ever and ever." So, many of the glowing predictions of the Old Testament, which are often assigned to the millennium, indicate no limit, but deal with the enduring and eternal.

The difficult passage in 1Co 15:24-28 must be interpreted in the light of those declarations concerning the eternity of Christ's reign. It is evidently as mediator that He delivers up the kingdom to the Father. The dispensation of mediator comes to an end. All has been done according to the purpose of redemption. All the ransomed are finally gathered home. He sees of the travail of His soul and is satisfied. Obdurate enemies are subdued. God's glory has been fully vindicated. The Son becoming subject to the Father, God governs directly and is all in all. But the Son in some sense still reigns and through Him God's glory will ever shine, while the kingdom eternally rests upon redemption. We may summarize by saying that Christ is king of truth, king of salvation (Mt 21:5; Zec 9:9); king of grace; king of peace (Lu 19:38; Heb 7:2); king of righteousness (Heb 1:8; 7:2); king of glory (Mt 25:31-34); king eternal; king of saints, king of the ages; king of kings (Re 19:16). "Upon his head are many diadems" (Re 19:12).

See also CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

Archibald M'caig

KING; KINGDOM

king'-dum:

I. KING

1. Etymology and Definition

2. Earliest Kings

3. Biblical Signification of the Title

II. KINGDOM

1. Israel's Theocracy

2. Period of Judges

3. Establishment of the Monarchy

4. Appointment of King

5. Authority of the King

6. Duties of the King

7. The Symbols of Royal Dignity

8. Maintenance and Establishment

(1) Income

(2) The Royal Court

9. Short Character Sketch of Israel’s Kingdom

LITERATURE

I. King.

1. Etymology and Definition:

The Hebrew word for king is melekh; its denominative malakh, "to reign" "to be king." The word is apparently derived from the mlkh which denotes: (1) in the Arabic (the verb and the noun) it means "to possess," "to reign," inasmuch as the possessor is also "lord" and "ruler"; (2) in the Aramaic melekh), and Assyrian "counsel," and in the Syrian "to consult"; compare Latin, consul.

If, as has been suggested, the root idea of "king" is "counsellor" and not "ruler," then the rise of the kingly office and power would be due to intellectual superiority rather than to physical prowess. And since the first form of monarchy known was that of a "city-state," the office of king may have evolved from that of the chief "elder" or intellectual head of the clan.

2. Earliest Kings:

The first king of whom we read in the Bible was Nimrod (Ge 10:8-10), who was supposedly the founder of the Babylonian empire. Historical research regarding the kings of Babylonia and Egypt corroborates this Biblical statement in so far as the ancestry of these kings is traced back to the earliest times of

antiquity. According to Isa 19:11, it was the pride of the Egyptian princes that they could trace their lineage to most ancient kings. The Canaanites and Philistines had kings as early as the times of Abraham (Ge 14:2; 20:2). Thus also the Edomites, who were related to Israel (Ge 36:31), the Moabites, and the Midianites had kings (Nu 22:4; 31:8) earlier than the Israelites.

In Ge 14:18 we read of Melchizedek, who was a priest, and king of Salem. At first the extent of the dominion of kings was often very limited, as appears from 70 of them being conquered by Adonibezek (Jud 1:7), 31 by Joshua (Jos 12:7), and 32 being subject to Ben-hadad (1Ki 20:1).

3. Biblical Signification of the Title:

The earliest Biblical usage of this title "king," in consonance with the general oriental practice, denotes an absolute monarch who exercises unchecked control over his subjects. In this sense the title is applied to Yahweh, and to human rulers. No constitutional obligations were laid upon the ruler nor were any restrictions put upon his arbitrary authority. His good or bad conduct depended upon his own free will.

The title "king" was applied also to dependent kings. In the New Testament it is used even for the head of a province (Re 17:12). To distinguish him from the smaller and dependent kings, the king of Assyria bore the title "king of kings."

II. Kingdom.

The notable fact that Israel attained to the degree of a kingdom rather late, as compared with the other Semitic nations, does not imply that Israel, before the establishment of the monarchy, had not arrived at the stage of constitutional government, or that the idea of a kingdom had no room in the original plan of the founder of the Hebrew nation. For a satisfactory explanation we must take cognizance of the unique place that Israel held among the Semitic peoples.

1. Israel’s Theocracy:

It is universally recognized that Israel was a singular community. From the beginning of its existence as a nation it bore the character of a religious and moral community, a theocratic commonwealth, having Yahweh Himself as the Head and Ruler. The theocracy is not to be mistaken for a hierarchy, nor can it strictly be identified with any existent form of political organization. It was rather something over and above, and therefore independent of the political organization. It did not supersede the tribal organization of Israel, but it supplied the centralizing power, constituting Israel a nation. In lieu of a strong political center, the unifying bond of a common allegiance to Yahweh, i.e. the common faith in Him, the God of Israel, kept the tribes together. The consciousness that Yahweh was Israel’s king was deeply rooted, was a national feeling, and the inspiration of a true patriotism (Ex 15:18; 19:6; Jud 5). Yahweh’s kingship is evinced by the laws He gave to Israel, by the fact that justice was administered in His name (Ex 22:28), and by His leading and siding Israel in its wars (Ex 14:14; 15:3; Nu 21:14; 1Sa 18:17; 25:28). This decentralized system which characterized the early government of Israel politically,

in spite of some great disadvantages, proved advantageous for Israel on the whole and served a great providential purpose. It safeguarded the individual liberties and rights of the Israelites. When later the monarchy was established, they enjoyed a degree of local freedom and self-control that was unknown in the rest of the Semitic world; there was home rule for every community, which admitted the untrammeled cultivation of their inherited religious and social institutions.

From the political point of view Israel, through the absence of a strong central government, was at a great disadvantage, making almost impossible its development into a world-empire. But this barrier to a policy of self-aggrandizement was a decided blessing from the viewpoint of Israel's providential mission to the world. It made possible the transmission of the pure religion entrusted to it, to later generations of men without destructive contamination from the ungodly forces with which Israel would inevitably have come into closer contact, had it not been for its self-contained character, resulting from the fashion of a state it was providentially molded into. Only as the small and insignificant nation that it was, could Israel perform its mission as "the depository and perpetuating agency of truths vital to the welfare of humanity." Thus its religion was the central authority of this nation, supplying the lack of a centralized government. Herein lay Israel's uniqueness and greatness, and also the secret of its strength as a nation, as long as the loyalty and devotion to Yahweh lasted. Under the leadership of Moses and Joshua who, though they exercised a royal authority, acted merely as representatives of Yahweh, the influence of religion of which these leaders were a personal embodiment was still so strong as to keep the tribes united for common action. But when, after the removal of these strong leaders, Israel no longer had a standing representative of Yahweh, those changes took place which eventually necessitated the establishment of the monarchy.

2. Period of Judges:

In the absence of a special representative of Yahweh, His will as Israel's King was divined by the use of the holy lot in the hand of the highest priest. But the lot would not supply the place of a strong personal leader. Besides, many of the Israelites came under the deteriorating influence of the Canaanite worship and began to adopt heathenish customs. The sense of religious unity weakened, the tribes became disunited and ceased to act in common, and as a result they were conquered by their foes. Yahweh came to their assistance by sending them leaders, who released the regions where they lived from foreign attacks. But these leaders were not the strong religious personalities that Moses and Joshua had been; besides, they had no official authority, and their rule was only temporary and local. It was now that the need of a centralized political government was felt, and the only type of permanent organization of which the age was cognizant was the kingship. The crown was offered to Gideon, but he declined it, saying: "Yahweh shall rule over you" (Jud 8:22,23). The attempt of his son, Abimelech, to establish a kingship over Shechem and the adjacent country, after the Canaanitic fashion, was abortive.

The general political condition of this period is briefly and pertinently described by the oft-recurring statement in Judges: "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes."

3. Establishment of the Monarchy:

Not until the time of Samuel was a formal kingdom established over Israel. An attempt to ameliorate conditions by a union of civil and religious functions in the hands of Eli, the priest, had failed through the degeneracy of his sons. Similarly the hopes of Israel in a hereditary judgeship had been disappointed through the corruption of the sons of Samuel. The Philistines were threatening the independence and hope of Israel. Its very existence as a distinct race, and consequently the future of Yahweh's religion, imperatively demanded a king. Considering that it was the moral decline of the nation that had created the necessity for a monarchy, and moreover that the people's desire for a king originated from a purely national and not from a religious motive, the unwillingness of Samuel, at first, to comply with the demand for a king is not surprising. Even Yahweh declared: "They have not rejected thee but they have rejected me," etc. Instead of recognizing that they themselves were responsible for the failures of the past, they blamed the form of government they had, and put all their hopes upon a king. That it was not the monarchy as such that was objectionable to Yahweh and His prophet is evidenced by the fact that to the patriarchs the promise had been given: "Kings shall come out of thy loins" (Ge 17:6; 35:11). In view of this Moses had made provision for a kingship (De 17:14-20). According to the Mosaic charter for the kingship, the monarchy when established must be brought into consonance with the fact that Yahweh was Israel's king. Of this fact Israel had lost sight when it requested a kingship like that of the neighboring peoples. Samuel's gloomy prognostications were perfectly justified in view of such a kingship as they desired, which would inevitably tend to selfish despotism (1Sa 8:11 f). therefore God directs Samuel to give them a king—since the introduction of a kingship typifying the kingship of Christ lay within the plan of His economy—not according to their desire, but in accordance with the instructions of the law concerning kings (De 17:14-20), in order to safeguard their liberties and prevent the forfeiture of their mission.

4. Appointment of King:

According to the Law of Moses Yahweh was to choose the king of israel, who was to be His representative. The choice of Yahweh in the case of Saul is implied by the anointing of Saul by Samuel and through the confirmation of this choice by the holy lot (1Sa 10:1-20). This method of choosing the king did not exclude the people altogether, since Saul was publicly presented to them, and acknowledged as king (1Sa 10:24). The participation of the people in the choice of their king is more pronounced in the case of David, who, having been designated as Yahweh's choice by being anointed by Samuel, was anointed again by the elders of Israel before he actually became king (2Sa 2:4).

The anointing itself signified the consecration to an office in theocracy. The custom of anointing kings was an old one, and by no means peculiar to Israel (Jud 9:8,15). The hereditary kingship began with David. Usually the firstborn succeeded to the throne, but not necessarily. The king might choose as his successor from among his sons the one whom he thought best qualified.

5. Authority of the King:

The king of Israel was not a constitutional monarch in the modern sense, nor was he an autocrat in the oriental sense. He was responsible to Yahweh, who had chosen him and whose vicegerent and servant he was. Furthermore, his authority was more or less limited on the religious side by the prophets, the representatives of Yahweh, and in the political sphere by the "elders," the representatives of the people, though as king he stood above all. Rightly conceived, his kingship in relation to Yahweh, who was Israel's true king, implied that he was Yahweh's servant and His earthly substitute. In relation to his subjects his kingship demanded of him, according to the Law, "that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren" (De 17:20).

6. Duties of the King:

In a summary way the king was held responsible for all Israel as the Lord's people. His main duty was to defend it against its enemies, and for this reason it devolved upon him to raise and maintain a standing army; and it was expected of him that he be its leader in case of war (1Sa 8:20). In respect to the judiciary the king was a kind of supreme court, or court of final appeal, and as such, as in the days of Solomon, might be approached by his most humble subjects (2Sa 15:2; 1Ki 3:16). Legislative functions he had none and was himself under the law (1Ki 21:4; De 17:19). The king was also in a way the summus episcopus in Israel. His very kingship was of an entirely religious character and implied a unity of the heavenly and earthly rule over Israel through him who as Yahweh's substitute sat "upon the throne of the kingdom of Yahweh over Israel" (1Ch 17:14; 28:5; 29:23), who was "Yahweh's anointed" (1Sa 24:10; 26:9; 2Sa 1:14), and also bore the title of "son of Yahweh" and "the first-born," the same as Israel did (Ex 4:22; Ho 11:1; 2Sa 7:14; Ps 89:27; 2:7). Thus a place of honor was assigned to the king in the temple (2Ki 11:4; 23:3; Eze 46:1,2); besides, he officiated at the national sacrifices (especially mentioned of David and Solomon). He prayed for his people and blessed them in the name of Yahweh (2Sa 6:18; 24:25; 1Ki 3:4,8; 8:14,55,62; 9:25). Apparently it was the king's right to appoint and dismiss the chief priests at the sanctuaries, though in his choice he was doubtless restricted to the Aaronites (1Ch 16:37,39; 2Sa 8:17; 1Ki 2:27,35). The priesthood was under the king's supervision to such an extent that he might concern himself about its organization and duties (1Ch 15:16,23,24; 16:4-6), and that he was responsible for the purity of the cult and the maintenance of the order of worship. In general he was to watch over the religious life and conduct of his people, to eradicate the high places and every form of idolatry in the land (2Ki 18:4). Eze 45:22 demands of the prince that he shall provide at the Passover a bullock for a sin offering for all the people.

7. The Symbols of Royal Dignity:

The marks of royal dignity, besides the beautiful robes in which the king was attired (1Ki 22:10), were:

(1) the diadem nezer) and the crown (aTarah, 2Sa 1:10; 2Ki 11:12; 2Sa 12:30), the headtire;

(2) the scepter (shebheT), originally a long, straight staff, the primitive sign of dominion and authority (Ge 49:10; Nu 24:17; Isa 14:5; Jer 48:17; Ps 2:9; 45:7). Saul had a spear (1Sa 18:10; 22:6);

(3) the throne (kicce', 1Ki 10:18-20), the symbol of majesty. Israel's kings also had a palace (1Ki 7:1-12; 22:39; Jer 22:14), a royal harem (2Sa 16:21), and a bodyguard (2Sa 8:18; 15:18).

8. Maintenance and Establishment:

(1) Income.

(a) According to the custom of the times presents were expected of the subjects (1Sa 10:27; 16:20) and of foreigners (2Sa 8:2; 1Ki 5:1 ff; 10:25; 2Ch 32:23), and these often took the form of an annual tribute.

(b) In time of war the king would lay claim to his share of the booty (2Sa 8:11; 12:30; 1Ch 26:27).

(c) Various forms of taxes were in vogue, as a part of the produce of the land (1Ki 9:11; 1Sa 17:25), forced labor of the Canaanites (1Ki 9:20; 2Ch 2:16) and also of the Israelites (1Ki 5:13; 11:28; 12:4), the first growth of the pasture lands (Am 7:1), toll collected from caravans (1Ki 10:15).

(d) Subdued nations had to pay a heavy tribute (2Ki 3:4).

(e) The royal domain often comprised extensive possessions (1Ch 27:25-31).

(2) The Royal Court.

The highest office was that of the princes (1Ki 4:2), who were the king's advisers or counselors. In 2Ki 25:19 and Jer 52:25 they are called "they that saw the king's face" (compare also 1Ki 12:6, "stood before Solomon"). The following officers of King David are mentioned: the captain of the host (commander-in-chief), the captain of the Cherethites and the Pelethites (bodyguard), the recorder (chronicler and reminder), the scribe (secretary of state), the overseer of the forced labor, the chief ministers or priests (confidants of the king, usually selected from the royal family) (2Sa 8:16-18; 20:23-26).

During the reign of Solomon other officers were added as follows: the overseer over the twelve men "who provided victuals for the king and his household" (1Ki 4:5,7), the officer over the household (1Ki 4:6; 18:3) (steward, the head of the palace who had "the key" in his possession, Isa 22:22); the king's friend (1Ki 4:5; 1Ch 27:33) is probably the same as the king's servant mentioned among the high officials in 2Ki 22:12. It is not stated what his duties were. Minor officials are servants, cupbearer (1Ki 10:5), keeper of the wardrobe (2Ki 22:14; 10:22), eunuchs (chamberlains, not mentioned before the division of the kingdom) (1Ki 22:9; 2Ki 8:6).

9. Short Character Sketch of Israel's Kingdom:

No higher conceptions of a good king have ever been given to the world than those which are presented in the representations of kingship in the Old Testament, both actual and ideal. Though Samuel's characterization of the kingship was borne out in the example of a great number of kings of Israel, the

Divine ideal of a true king came as near to its realization in the case of one king of Israel, at least, as possibly nowhere else, namely, in the case of David. Therefore King David appears as the type of that king in whom the Divine ideal of a Yahweh-king was to find its perfect realization; toward whose reign the kingship in Israel tended. The history of the kingship in Israel after David is, indeed, characterized by that desire for political aggrandizement which had prompted the establishment of the monarchy, which was contrary to Israel's Divine mission as the peculiar people of the Yahweh-king. When Israel's kingdom terminated in the Bah exile, it became evident that the continued existence of the nation was possible even without a monarchical form of government. Though a kingdom was established again under the Maccabees, as a result of the attempt of Antiochus to extinguish Israel's religion, this kingdom was neither as perfectly national nor as truly religious in its character as the Davidic. It soon became dependent on Rome. The kingship of Herod was entirely alien to the true Israelite conception.

It remains to be said only that the final attempt of Israel in its revolt against the Roman Empire, to establish the old monarchy, resulted in its downfall as a nation, because it would not learn the lesson that the future of a nation does not depend upon political greatness, but upon the fulfillment of its Divine mission.

LITERATURE.

J.P. McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Monuments; Riehm, Handwiirterbuch des bibl. Alterrums; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); Kinzler, Bibl. Altes Testament.

S. D. Press

KINGDOM OF GOD (OF HEAVEN), THE

(he basileia ton ouranon; he basileia tou theou):

I. MEANING AND ORIGIN OF THE TERM

1. Place in the Gospels

2. "Kingdom of Heaven" and "Kingdom of God"

3. Relation to the Old Testament (Daniel, etc.)

II. ITS USE BY JESUS—CONTRAST WITH JEWISH CONCEPTIONS

1. Current Jewish Opinions

2. Relation of Jesus to Same

3. Growing Divergence and Contrast

4. Prophetic Character of the "Temptation"

5. Modern "Futuristic" Hypothesis (J. Weiss, Schweitzer)

6. Weakness of This View

7. Positive Conceptions of Jesus

III. THE IDEA IN HISTORY

1. Apostolic and Post-apostolic Age

2. Early Christian Centuries

3. Reformation Period

4. Later Ideas

IV. PLACE IN THEOLOGY

1. Danger of Exaggeration

2. Elements of Living Power in Idea

LITERATURE

The "kingdom of God" is one of the most remarkable ideas and phrases of all time, having begun to be used very near the beginnings of history and continuing in force down to the present day.

I. Meaning and Origin of the Term

1. Place in the Gospels:

Its use by Jesus is by far its most interesting aspect; for, in the Synoptists, at least, it is His watchword, or a comprehensive term for the whole of His teaching. Of this the ordinary reader of Scripture may hardly be aware, but it becomes evident and significant to the student. Thus, in Mt 4:23, the commencement of the ministry is described in these words, "And Jesus went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of

disease and all manner of sickness among the people"; and, somewhat later, in Lu 8:1, the expansion of His activity is described in the following terms, "And it came to pass soon afterwards, that he went about through cities and villages, preaching and bringing the good tidings of the kingdom of God, and with him the twelve." When the Twelve are sent forth by themselves, the purpose of their mission is, in Lu 9:2, given in these words, "And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick." In Mt 13:11, the parables, which formed so large and prominent a portion of His teaching, are denominated collectively "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven"; and it will be remembered how many of these commence with the phrase, "The kingdom of heaven is like."

2. "Kingdom of Heaven" and "Kingdom of God":

In these quotations, and in others which might easily be adduced, it will be observed that the phrases "the kingdom," "the kingdom of God," "the kingdom of heaven" are used interchangeably. The last of the three, "the kingdom of heaven," is confined to the First Gospel, which does not, however, always make use of it; and it is not certain what may have been the reason for the substitution. The simplest explanation would be that heaven is a name for God, as, in the parable of the Prodigal Son, the penitent says, "I have sinned against heaven," and we ourselves might say, "Heaven forbid!" It is not, however, improbable that the true meaning has to be learned from two petitions of the Lord’s Prayer, the one of which is epexegetic of the other, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven." Here the disciples are instructed to pray that the kingdom of God may come, but this is equivalent to the petition that the will of God may be done on earth; Jesus is, however, aware of a region in the universe where the will of God is at present being perfectly and universally done, and, for reasons not difficult to surmise, He elevates thither the minds and hearts of those who pray. The kingdom of heaven would thus be so entitled because it is already realized there, and is, through prayer and effort, to be transferred thence to this earth.

3. Relation to the Old Testament (Daniel, etc.):

Although, however, the phrase held this master position in the teaching of Jesus, it was not of His invention. It was employed before Him by John the Baptist, of whom we read, in Mt 3:1 f, "And in those days cometh John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Indeed, the phrase is far older; for, on glancing toward the Old Testament, we come at once, in Da 2:44, to a passage where the young prophet, explaining to the monarch the image of gold, silver, iron and clay, which, in his dream, he had seen shattered by "a stone cut out without hands," interprets it as a succession of world-kingdoms, destined to be destroyed by "a kingdom of God," which shall last forever; and, in his famous vision of the "son of man" in 7:14, it is said, "There was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed."

These passages in Daniel form undoubtedly the proximate source of the phrase; yet the idea which it represents mounts far higher. From the first the Jewish state was governed by laws believed to be

derived directly from heaven; and, when the people demanded a king, that they might be like other nations, they were reproached for desiring any king but God Himself. With this sublime conception the actual monarchy was only a compromise, the reigning monarch passing for Yahweh's representative on earth. In David, the man after God's own heart, the compromise was not unsatisfactory; in Solomon it was still tolerable; but in the majority of the kings of both Judah and Israel it was a dismal and disastrous failure. No wonder that the pious sighed and prayed that Yahweh might take to Himself His great power and reign, or that the prophets predicted the coming of a ruler who would be far nearer to God than the actual kings and of whose reign there would be no end. Even when the political kingdom perished and the people were carried away into Babylon, the intelligent and truly religious among them did not cease to cherish the old hope, and the very aspect of the worldpowers then and subsequently menacing them only widened their conceptions of what that kingdom must be which could overcome them all. The return from Babylon seemed a miraculous confirmation of their faith, and it looked as if the day long prayed for were about to dawn. Alas, it proved a day of small things. The era of the Maccabees was only a transitory gleam; in the person of Herod the Great a usurper occupied the throne; and the eagles of the Romans were hovering on the horizon. Still Messianic hopes flourished, and Messianic language filled the mouths of the people.

II. Its Use by Jesus—Contrast with Jewish Conceptions.

1. Current Jewish Opinions:

Schurer, in his History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ (II, 11, 126 ff), has drawn up a kind of Messianic creed, in no fewer than eleven articles, which he believes was extensively diffused at this period. The Sadducees, indeed, had no participation in these dreams, as they would have called them, being absorbed in money-making and courtiership; but the Pharisees cherished them, and the Zealots received their name from the ardor with which they embraced them. The true custodians, however, of these conceptions were the Prosdechomenoi, as they have been called, from what is said of them in the New Testament, that they "waited for the kingdom of God." To this class belonged such men as Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea (Lu 23:51), but it is in the beginning of the Gospel of Luke that we are introduced to its most numerous representatives, in the groups surrounding the infant Baptist and the infant Saviour (Lu 2:25,38); and the truest and amplest expression of their sentiments must be sought in the inspired hymns which rose from them on this occasion. The center of their aspirations, as there depicted, is a kingdom of God—not, however, of worldly splendor and force, but of righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit; beginning in humility, and passing to exaltation only through the dark valley of contrition.

2. Relation of Jesus to Same:

Such was the circle in which both the Baptist and Jesus were reared and it was out of this atmosphere that the conception of the kingdom of God came into their minds. It has frequently been said that, in making use of this term, Jesus accommodated Himself to the opinions and language of His fellow-countrymen; and there is truth in this, because, in order to secure a footing on the solid earth of history,

He had to connect His own activity with the world in which He found Himself. Yet the idea was native to His home and His race, and therefore to Himself; and it is not improbable that He may at first have been unaware of the wide difference between His own thoughts on the subject and those of His contemporaries.

3. Growing Divergence and Contrast:

When, however, He began, in the course of His ministry, to speak of the kingdom of God, it soon became manifest that by Him and by His contemporaries it was used in different senses; and this contrast went on increasing until there was a great gulf fixed between Him and them. The difference cannot better be expressed than by saying, as is done by B. Weiss, that He and they laid the accent on different halves of the phrase, they emphasizing "the kingdom" and He "of God." They were thinking of the expulsion of the Romans, of a Jewish king and court, and of a world-wide dominion going forth from Mt. Zion; He was thinking of righteousness, holiness and peace, of the doing of the will of God on earth as it is done in heaven. So earthly and fantastic were the expectations of the Jewish multitude that He had to escape from their hands when they tried to take Him by force and make Him a king. The authorities never acknowledged the pretensions of One who seemed to them a religious dreamer, and, as they clung to their own conceptions, they grew more and more bitter against One who was turning the most cherished hopes of a nation into ridicule, besides threatening to bring down on them the heavy hand of the Roman. And at last they settled the controversy between Him and them by nailing Him to a tree.

4. Prophetic Character of the "Temptation":

At one time Jesus had felt the glamor of the popular Messianic ideas, and at all times He must have been under temptation to accommodate His own ideas to the prejudices of those on whose favor His success seemed to be dependent. The struggle of His mind and will with such solicitations is embodied in what is called the Temptation in the Wilderness (Mt 4:1-11). There He was tempted to accept the dominion of the world at the price of compromise with evil; to be a bread-king, giving panem et circenes; and to curry favor with the multitude by some display, like springing from the pinnacle of the temple. The incidents of this scene look like representative samples of a long experience; but they are placed before the commencement of His public activity in order to show that He had already overcome them; and throughout His ministry He may be said to have been continually declaring, as He did in so many words at its close, that His kingdom was not of this world.

5. Modern "Futuristic" Hypothesis (J. Weiss, Schweitzer):

It is very strange that, in spite of this, He should be believed, even by Christian scholars, to have held a purely futuristic and apocalyptic view of the kingdom Himself. He was all the time expecting, it is said, that the heavens would open and the kingdom descend from heaven to earth, a pure and perfect work of God. This is exactly what was expected by the Jewish multitude, as is stated in Lu 19:11; and it is precisely what the authorities believed Him to be anticipating. The controversy between Him and them

was as to whether Yahweh would intervene on His behalf or not; and, when no intervention took place, they believed they were justified in condemning Him. The premises being conceded, it is difficult to deny the force of their argument. If Jesus was all the time looking out for an appearance from heaven which never arrived, what better was He than a dreamer of the ghetto?

6. Weakness of This View:

It was by Johannes Weiss that this hypothesis was started in recent times; and it has been worked out by Schweitzer as the final issue of modern speculation on the life of Christ (see his The Quest of the Historical Jesus). But in opposition to it can be quoted not a few sayings of Jesus which indicate that, in His view, the kingdom of God had already begun and was making progress during His earthly ministry, and that it was destined to make progress not by catastrophic and apocalyptic interference with the course of Providence, but, as the grain grows—first the blade, then the ear, after that the full grain in the ear (Mr 4:26-29). Of such sayings the most remarkable is Lu 17:20 f, "And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo, here! or, There! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you." "Observation," in this quotation, is an astronomical term, denoting exactly such a manifestation in the physical heavens as Jesus is assumed to have been looking for; so that He denies in so many words the expectation attributed to Him by those representatives of modern scholarship.

7. Positive Conceptions of Jesus:

In the nature of the case the kingdom must have been growing from stage to stage during His earthly ministry. He Himself was there, embodying the kingdom in His person; and the circle gathered around Him partook of the blessings of the kingdom. This circle might have grown large enough to be coextensive with the country; and, therefore, Jesus retained the consciousness of being the Messiah, and offered Himself in this character to His fellow-countrymen by the triumphal entry into Jerusalem. But the citizens of the kingdom had to enter it one by one, not in a body, as the Jews were expecting. Strait was the gate; it was the narrow gate of repentance. Jesus began by repeating the initial word of the teaching of His forerunner; and He had too much reason to continue repeating it, as the hypocrisy and worldliness of Pharisees and Sadducees called for denunciation from His lips. To the frailties of the publicans and sinners, on the contrary, He showed a strange mildness; but this was because He knew the way of bringing such sinners to His feet to confess their sins themselves. To the penitent He granted pardon, claiming that the Son of man had power on earth to forgive sins. Then followed the exposition of righteousness, of which the Sermon on the Mount is a perfect specimen. Yet it commences with another watchword—that of blessedness, the ingredients of which are set forth in all their comprehensiveness. In the same way, in other passages, He promises "rest" "peace" and the like; and again and again, where He might be expected to employ the term "kingdom of God," He substitutes "life" or "eternal life." Such were the blessings He had come into the world to bestow; and the most comprehensive designation for them all was "the kingdom of God."

It is true, there was always imperfection attaching to the kingdom as realized in His lifetime, because He

Himself was not yet made perfect. Steadily, from the commencement of the last stage of His career, He began to speak of His own dying and rising again. To those nearest Him such language was at the time a total mystery; but the day came when His apostles were able to speak of His death and ascension as the crown and glory of His whole career. When His life seemed to be plunging over the precipice, its course was so diverted by the providence of God that, by dying, He became the Redeemer of mankind and, by missing the throne of the Jews, attained to that of the universe, becoming King of kings and Lord of lords.

III. The Idea in History.

1. Apostolic and Post-apostolic Age:

After the death of Jesus, there soon ensued the destruction of the Jewish state; and then Christianity went forth among the nations, where to have spoken of it as a kingdom of God would have unnecessarily provoked hostility and called forth the accusation of treason against the powers that be. Hence, it made use of other names and let "the kingdom of God" drop. This had commenced even in Holy Scripture, where, in the later books, there is a growing infrequency in the use of the term. This may be alleged as proof that Jesus was being forgotten; but it may only prove that Christianity was then too much alive to be trammeled with words and phrases, even those of the Master, being able at every stage to find new language to express its new experience.

2. Early Christian Centuries:

In the early Christian centuries, "the kingdom of God" was used to designate heaven itself, in which from the first the development of the kingdom was to issue; this, in fact, being not infrequently the meaning of the phrase even in the mouth of Jesus. The Alexandrian thinkers brought back the phrase to designate the rule of God in the conscience of men. Augustine’s great work bears a title, De Civitate Dei, which is a translation of our phrase; and to him the kingdom of God was the church, while the world outside of the church was the kingdom of Satan. From the time of Charlemagne there were in the world, side by side, two powers, that of the emperor and that of the pope; and the history of the Middle Ages is the account of the conflict of these two for predominance, each pretending to struggle in the name of God. The approaching termination of this conflict may be seen in Wycliffe’s great work De Dominio Divino, this title also being a translation of our phrase.

3. Reformation Period:

During the struggles of the Reformation the battles of the faith were fought out under other watchwords; and it was rather amongsuch sectaries as the Baptists, that names like Fifth Monarchy and Rule of the Saints betrayed recollection of the evangelic phraseology; but how near, then and subsequently, the expression of men’s thoughts about authority in church and state came to the language of the Gospels could easily be demonstrated, for example, from the Confessions and Books of Discipline of the Scottish church.

4. Later Ideas:

The very phrase, "the kingdom of God," reappeared at the close of the Reformation period among the Pietists of Germany, who, as their multiplying benevolent and missionary activities overflowed the narrow boundaries of the church, as it was then understood, spoke of themselves as working for the kingdom of God, and found this more to their taste than working for the church. The vague and humanitarian aspirations of Rationalism sometimes assumed to themselves the same title; but it was by Ritschl and his followers that the phrase was brought back into the very heart of theology. In the system of Ritschl there are two poles—the love of God and the kingdom of God. The love of God enfolds within itself God's purpose for the world, to be realized in time; and this progressive realization is the kingdom of God. It fulfils itself especially in the faithful discharge of the duties of everyone's daily vocation and in the recognition that in the course of Providence all things are working together for good to them that love God.

IV. Place in Theology.

1. Danger of Exageration:

There are those to whom it appears self-evident that what was the leading phrase in the teaching of Jesus must always be the master-word in theology; while others think this to be a return from the spirit to the letter. Even Jesus, it may be claimed, had this phrase imposed upon Him quite as much as He chose it for Himself; and to impose it now on theology would be to entangle the movements of Christian thought with the cerements of the dead.

2. Elements of Living Power in Idea:

This is an interesting controversy, on both sides of which much might be said. But in the phrase "the kingdom of God" there are elements of living power which can never pass away.

(1) It expresses the social Power inside of Christianity. A kingdom implies multitude and variety, and, though religion begins with the individual, it must aim at brotherhood, organization and expansion.

(2) It expresses loyalty. However much kings and kingdoms may fail to touch the imagination in an age of the world when many countries have become or are becoming republican, the strength to conquer and to endure will always have to be derived from contact with personalities. God is the king of the kingdom of God, and the Son of God is His vicegerent; and without the love of God the Father and the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ no progress can be made with the Christianization of the world.

(3) It keeps alive the truth, suggested by Jesus in the Lord's Prayer, that the doing of the will of God on earth is the one thing needful. This is the true end of all authority in both church and state, and behind all efforts thus directed there is at work the potency of heaven.

(4) It reminds all generations of men that their true home and destiny is heaven. In not a few of our Lord's own sayings, as has been remarked, our phrase is obviously only a name for heaven; and, while His aim was that the kingdom should be established on earth, He always promised to those aiding in its establishment in this world that their efforts would be rewarded in the world to come. The constant recognition of a spiritual and eternal world is one of the unfailing marks of genuine Christianity.

LITERATURE.

See the works on New Testament Theology by Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Feine, Schlatter, Weinel, Stevens, Sheldon; and on the Teaching of Jesus by Wendt, Dalman, Bruce; Candlish, The Kingdom of God; Robertson, Regnum Dei; Stalker, The Ethic of Jesus.

James Stalker

KINGDOM OF ISRAEL

See ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

KINGDOM OF JUDAH

See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

KINGS' SEPULCHRES

(2Ch 21:20).

See JERUSALEM, VIII.

KINGS, BOOKS OF

I. TITLE

II. SCOPE

III. CHARACTER OF BOOKS AND POSITION IN THE HEBREW CANON

1. Purpose

2. Character of Data

IV. HISTORICAL VALUE

1. Treatment of Historical Data

2. Chronology

3. Value of Assyrian Records

4. Plan

V. COMPOSITION

1. Nature of the Books

2. Sources

3. Kent’s Scheme

4. The Jahwist (Jahwist) and the Elohist (E)

VI. DATE

LITERATURE

I. Title.

The Hebrew title reads, melakhim, "kings," the division into books being based on the Septuagint where the Books of Kings are numbered 3rd and 4th, the Books of Kingdoms (Basileion), the Books of Samuel being numbered respectively 1st and 2nd. The separation in the Hebrew into 2 Books of Kings dates to the rabbinic Bible of Daniel Bomberg (Venice, 1516-17), who adds in a footnote, "Here the non-Jews (i. e. Christians) begin the 4th Book of Kings." The Hebrew Canon treats the 2 Books of Samuel as one book, and the 2 Books of Kings as one. Hence, both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) read incorrectly, "The First Book of Kings," even the use of the article being superfluous.gs (stadia) from Jerusalem, which he named Absalom’s Hand." In all probability this "pillar" was a rough upright stone—a matstsebhah—but its site is lost. The traditional Greek-Egyptian tomb of perhaps 100-200 years BC which has been hewn out of the rock on the eastern side of the Kidron valley is manifestly misnamed "Absalom’s pillar," and the Kidron ravine (nachal) cannot be the King’s Vale (‘emeq).

II. Scope.

The Books of Kings contain 47 chapters (I, 22 chs; II, 25 chs), and cover the period from the conspiracy of Adonijah and the accession of Solomon (975 BC) to the liberation of Jehoiachin after the beginning of the Exile (561 BC). The subject-matter may be grouped under certain heads, as the last days of David (1Ki 1-2:11); Solomon and his times (1Ki 2:12-11:43); the Northern Kingdom to the coming of Assyria (1Ki 12:16-2Ki 17:41) (937-722 BC), including 9 dynastic changes; the Southern Kingdom to the coming of Babylon (1Ki 12:1-2Ki 25:21, the annals of the two kingdoms being given as parallel records until the fall of Israel) (937-586 BC), during which time but one dynasty, that of David, occupied the throne; the period of exile to 561 BC (2Ki 25:22-30). A simpler outline, that of Driver, would be:

(1) Solomon and his times (1Ki 1-11);

(2) Israel and Judah to the fall of Israel (1Ki 12-2Ki 17); Judah to the fall of Jerusalem (586 BC), and the captivity to the liberation of Jehoiachin (561 BC) (2Ki 18-25).

"Above all, there are three features in the history, which, in the mind of the author, are of prime importance as shown by the prominence he gives them in his narrative.

(1) The dynasty of David is invested with peculiar dignity. This had two aspects. It pointed back to the Divine election of the nation in the past, and gave the guaranty of indefinite national perpetuity in the future. The promise of the ‘sure mercies of David’ was a powerful uniting influence in the Exile.

(2) The Temple and its service, for which the writer had such special regard, contributed greatly to the phase of national character of subsequent times. With all the drawbacks and defacements of pure worship here was the stated regular performance of sacred rites, the development and regulation of priestly order and ritual law, which stamped themselves so firmly on later Judaism.

(3) Above all, this was the period of bloom of Old Testament prophecy. Though more is said of men like Elijah and Elisha, who have left no written words, we must not forget the desires of pre-exilic prophets, whose writings have come down to us—men who, against the opposition of rulers and the indifference of the people, testified to the moral foundation on which the nation was constituted, vindicated Divine righteousness, rebuked sin, and held up the ideal to which the nation was called."—Robertson, Temple B D, 369 f.

III. Character of Books and Position in Hebrew Canon.

The Books of Kings contain much historical material, yet the historical is not their primary purpose. What in our English Bibles pass for historical books are in the Hebrew Canon prophetic books, the Books of Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 Kings and 2 Kings being classed as the "Earlier Prophets."

1. Purpose:

The chief aim of these books is didactic, the imparting of great moral lessons backed up by well-known illustrations from the nation's history and from the lives of its heroes and leaders. Accordingly, we have here a sort of historical archipelago, more continuous than in the Pentateuch, yet requiring much bridging over and conjecture in the details.

2. Character of Data:

The historical matter includes, in the case of the kings of Israel, the length of the reign and the death; in the case of the kings of Judah there are included also the age at the date of accession, the name of the mother, and mention of the burial. The beginnings of the reigns in each case are dated from a point in the reign of the contemporary ruler, e.g. 1Ki 15:1: "Now in the 18th year of king Jeroboam the son of Nebat began Abijam to reign over Judah."

IV. Historical Value.

1. Treatment of Historical Data:

These books contain a large amount of authentic data, and, along with the other books of this group which constitute a contemporaneous narrative, Joshua, Judges, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, must be accorded high rank among ancient documents. To be sure the ethical and religious value is first and highest, nevertheless the historical facts must be reckoned at their true worth. Discrepancies and contradictions are to be explained by the subordination of historical details to the moral and religious purpose of the books, and to the diversity of sources whence these data are taken, that is, the compilers and editors of the Books of Kings as they now stand were working not for a consistent, continuous historical narrative, but for a great ethical and religious treatise. The historical material is only incidental and introduced by way of illustration and confirmation. For the oriental mind these historical examples rather than the rigor of modern logic constitute the unanswerable argument.

2. Chronology:

There cannot be as much said relative to the chronological value of the books. Thus, e.g., there is a question as to the date of the close of Ahaz' reign. According to 2Ki 18:10, Samaria fell in the 6th year of Hezekiah's reign. The kings who followed Hezekiah aggregate 110 years; 586 plus 110 plus 29 (Hezekiah, 2Ki 18:2) = 725. But in 2Ki 18:13 we learn that Sennacherib's invasion came in the 14th year of Hezekiah's reign. Then 701 plus 14 = 715. With this last agrees the account of Hezekiah's sickness (2Ki 20). In explanation of 2Ki 18:13, however, it is urged by some that the writer has subtracted the 15 years of 2Ki 20:6 from the 29 years of Hezekiah's reign. Again, e.g. in 1Ki 6:1, we learn that Solomon began to build the temple 480 years "after the children of Israel were come out of the Land of Egypt" Septuagint here reads 440 years). This would make between Moses and David 12 generations of 40 years each. But counting the Exodus in the reign of Merenptah, 1225-1215 BC, and the beginning of the erection of the temple 975 BC, or after, we could not make out more than (1225-975) 250 years. Further, if the total length of reigns in Israel and Judah as recorded in the parallel

accounts of Kings be added for the two kingdoms, the two amounts do not agree. And, again, it is not certain whether in their annals the Hebrews predated or post-dated the reigns of their kings, i.e. whether the year of a king's death was counted his last year and the first year of his successor's reign, or whether the following year was counted the first year of the succeeding king (compare Curtis in H D B, I, 400, 1, f; Marti in E B, I, coll. 777 ff).

3. Value of Assyrian Records:

The Babylonians and Assyrians were more skilled and more careful chronologers, and it is by reference to their accounts of the same or of contemporary events that a sure footing is found. Hence, the value of such monuments as those of Shalmaneser IV and Sennacherib—and here mention should be made also of the Moabite Stone.

4. Plan:

The plan of the books is prevailingly chronological, although at times the material is arranged in groups (e.g. 2Ki 2:1-8:15, the Elisha stories).

V. Composition.

1. Nature of the Books:

The Books of Kings are of the nature of a compilation. The compiler has furnished a framework into which he has arranged the historical matter drawn from other sources. There are chronological data, citations of authorities, judgments on the character and deeds of the several rulers, and moral and religious teachings drawn from the attitude of the rulers in matters of religion, especially toward heathen cults. The point of view is that of the prophets of the national party as one against foreign influence. "Both in point of view and in phraseology the compiler shows himself to be strongly influenced by Deuteronomy." (The principal editor is styled RD, i.e. Deuteronomic Redactor.) The Deuteronomic law was the touchstone, and by his loyalty to, or apostasy from, that standard, each king stands approved or condemned. This influence also appears in passages where the editor takes liberties in the expansion and adaptation of material. There is marked recurrence of phrases occurring elsewhere chiefly or even wholly in Deuteronomy, or in books showing Deuteronomic influence (Burney in H D B, II, 859 f). In 2Ki 17 we have a test of the nation on the same standards; compare also 1Ki 2:3 f; 9:1-9; 2Ki 14:6; De 24:16.

2. Sources:

In numerous instances the sources are indicated, as "the book of the acts of Solomon" (1Ki 11:41), "the chronicles of the kings of Judah" (1Ki 14:29), "the chronicles of the kings of Israel" (1Ki 15:31). A score or more of these sources are mentioned by title in the several books of the Old Testament. Thus "the history of Samuel the seer," "the history of Nathan the prophet." "the history of Gad the seer" (1Ch

29:29); "the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite," "the visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat" (2Ch 9:29; compare 2Ch 12:15; 13:22; 20:34; 32:32). Thus the "book of the kings of Israel" is mentioned 17 times (for all kings except Jehoram and Hoshea); the "book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah" is mentioned 15 times (for all except Ahaziah, Athaliah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah). Whether the compiler had recourse to the archives themselves or to a work based on the archives is still a question.

3. Kent's Scheme:

Kent, Student's Old Testament (II, chart, and pp. ix-xxvi), gives the following scheme for showing the sources:

(1) Early stories about the Ark (circa 950 BC or earlier), Saul stories and David stories (950-900 BC) were united (circa 850 BC) to make early Judean Saul and David stories. With these last were combined (circa 600 BC) popular Judean David stories (circa 700 BC) later Ephraimite Samuel narratives (circa 650 BC), and very late popular prophetic traditions (650-600 BC) in a first edition of the Books of Samuel.

(2) Annals of Solomon (circa 950 BC), early temple records (950-900 BC), were united (circa 800 BC) with popular Solomon traditions (850-800 BC) in a "Book of the Ac of Solomon." A Jeroboam history (900-850 BC), an Ahab history (circa 800 BC), and a Jehu history (circa 750 BC) were united with the annals of Israel (after 950 to circa 700 BC) in the "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (700 or after). Early Ephraimite Elisha narratives (800-750 BC), influenced by a Samaria cycle of Elisha stories (750-700 BC) and a Gilgal cycle of Elisha stories (700-650 BC), were joined about 600 BC with the "Book of the Ac of Solomon" and the "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" in a "first edition of the Books of Kings."

(3) The first edition of Samuel, the first edition of Kings and Isaiah stories (before 550 BC) were united (circa 550 BC) in a final revision of Samuel and Kings.

(4) From "annals of Judah" (before 900 to 650 BC or after), temple records (before 850 to after 650 BC), and a Hezekiah history (circa 650 BC), was drawn material for the "Chronicles of the kings of Judah" (circa 600 BC).

(5) From this last work and the final revision of Samuel and Kings was taken material for a "Midhrash of the Book of the kings of Israel and Judah" (circa 300 BC), and from this work, the final revision of Samuel and Kings, and a possible temple history (after 400)—itself from the final revision of Samuel and Kings—came the Books of Chronciles (circa 250 BC).

4. The Jahwist (Jahwist) and the Elohist (E):

The distinctions between the great documents of the Pentateuch do not appear so clearly here. The

summary, "epitome") is the work of a Jewish redactor; the longer narratives (e.g. 1Ki 17-2Ki 8; 13:14-21) "are written in a bright and chaste Hebrew style, though some of them exhibit slight peculiarities of diction, due, doubtless (in part), to their North Israelite origin" (E). The writers of these narratives are thought to have been prophets, in most cases from the Northern Kingdom.

VI. Date.

There are numerous data bearing on the date of Kings, and indications of different dates appear in the books. The closing verses bring down the history to the 37th year of the Captivity (2Ki 25:27); yet the author, incorporating his materials, was apparently not careful to adjust the dates to his own time, as in 1Ki 8:8; 12:19; 2Ki 8:22; 16:6, which refer to conditions that passed away with the Exile. The work was probably composed before the fall of Jerusalem (586 BC), and was revised during or shortly after the Exile, and also supplemented by the addition of the account of the downfall of the Judean kingdom. There are traces of a post-exilic hand, as, e.g., the mention of "the cities of Samaria" (1Ki 13:32), implying that Samaria was a province, which was not the case until after the Exile. The existence of altars over the land (1Ki 19:10), and the sanctuary at Carmel, were illegal according to the Deuteronomic law, as also was the advice given to Elisha (2Ki 3:19) to cut down the fruit trees in time of war; (De 20:19).

LITERATURE.

K. Budde, Das Buch der Richter, Mohr, Leipzig; John Skinner, "Kings," in New Century Bible, Frowde, New York; C.F. Burney, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Kings, Clarendon Press, Oxford; 1903; R. Kittel, Die Bucher der Konige, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, Leipzig, 1900; I. Benzinger, Die Bucher der Konige, Mohr, 1899; C.F. Kent, Student’s Old Testament, Scribner, 1905; S.R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, Scribner, new revised edition, 1910; J.E. McFadyen, Introduction to the Old Testament, Armstrong, New York, 1906; Carl H. Cornill, Einleitung in die kanonischen Bucher Altes Testament, Mohr, 6th edition, 1908; A. F. Kirkpatrick, The Divine Library of the Old Testament, Macmillan, 1891.

Wallace N. Stearns

KINSFOLK

kinz’-fok.

See KINDRED.

KINSMAN; KINSWOMAN

kinz’-man, kinz’-woom-an: Most frequently of the go’-el, the one who had a right to "redeem"; referring to the custom of avenging the blood of a slain kinsman; hence, a blood relative (Nu 5:8; Ru 2:20; 3:9,12;

4:1,3,6,8,14; compare "performing the part of a kinsman," Ru 3:13); in Ru 2:1, better rendered "acquaintance." Also qarobh, one near, rendered "kinsman" (Ps 38:11); probably better, "neighbor." Once, she’-er, "flesh kin," rendered "kinsman" (Nu 27:11; compare Le 18:6; 25:49; 20:19; 21:2, rendered "kin"). suggenes, "of same race" (compare suggebeia, "kindred"), used of blood relationship of varying degrees of nearness (Lu 14:12; Joh 18:26; Ac 10:24; Ro 9:3; 16:7,11,21). Rendered "kin" in Mr 6:4.

Kinswoman:

she’er, "kin by blood," or "by flesh" (compare above; also Le 18:12 f; also compare 18:6, "near of kin" the King James Version); also same root, ferm. form, sha’-arah (Le 18:17), is thy "kinswoman." In Pr 7:4, "Call understanding thy kinswoman" might be more accurately rendered, "thy familiar friend," the Revised Version margin (from modha‘, "acquaintance"); compare similar rendering of modha‘ath, under KINDRED. Lu 1:36 the Revised Version (British and American), "kinswoman" (suggenis), the King James Version "cousin" (suggenes); same is rendered "kinsfolk" (Lu 1:58 the Revised Version (British and American)).

Edward Bagby Pollard

KIR

kur, kir (kir):

1. Meaning:

The meaning of Kir is "inclosure" or "walled place," and it is therefore doubtful whether it is a place-name in the true sense of the word. In 2Ki 16:9 it is mentioned as the place whither Tiglath-pileser IV carried the Syrian (Aramean) captives which he deported from Damascus after he had taken that city. In Am 1:5 the prophet announces that the people of Syria (Aram) shall go into captivity unto Kir, and in 9:7 it is again referred to as the place whence the Lord had brought the Syrians (Arameans) as Israel had been brought out of Egypt, and the Philistines from Caphtor.

2. How Rendered in the Septuagint:

Except in one manuscript (Septuagint, Codex Alexandrinus), where it appears as the Libyan Cyrene (2Ki 16:9), it is never rendered in the Septuagint as a place-name. Thus the place whence the Syrians were brought (Am 9:7) is not Kir, but "the deep" or "the ditch" Septuagint ek bothrou, "pit"), probably a translation of some variant rather than of the word "Kit" itself. Comparing the Assyrian-Babylonian kiru (for qiru), "wall," "inclosure," "interior," or the like, Kir might have the general meaning of a place parted off for the reception of exiled captives. Parallels would be Kir Moab, "the enclosure of Moab," Kir Heres or Kir Chareseth, "the enclosure of brick" Septuagint hoi lithoi toni toichou). It seems probable that there was more than one place to which the Assyrians transported captives or exiles, and if

their practice was to place them as far as they could from their native land, one would expect, for Palestinian exiles, a site or sites on the eastern side of the Tigris and Euphrates.

3. An Emendation of Isaiah 22:5:

In Isa 22:5 occurs the phrase, "a breaking down of the walls, and a crying to the mountains" (meqarqar qir we-shoa‘ ‘el ha-har—"a surrounding of the wall," etc., would be better), and the mention of qir and shoa‘ here has caused Fried. Delitzsch to suggest that we have to read, instead of qir, qoa‘, combined with shoa‘, as in Eze 23:23. Following this, but retaining qir, Cheyne translates "Kir undermineth, and Shoa is at the mount," but others accept Delitzsch’s emendation, Winckler conjecturing that the rendering should be "Who stirreth up Koa‘ and Shoa‘ against the mountain" (Alttest. Untersuchungen, 177). In the next verse (Isa 22:6) Kir is mentioned with Elam—a position which a city for western exiles would require.

4. Soldiers of Kir in Assyrian Army:

The mention of Elam as taking the quiver, and Kir as uncovering the shield, apparently against "the valley of the vision" (in or close to Jerusalem), implies that soldiers from these two places, though one might expect them to be hostile to the Assyrians in general, were to be found in their armies, probably as mercenaries. See Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 233; Schrader, COT, 425.

T. G. Pinches

KIR OF MOAB

(qir moa’-abh; Septuagint has to teichos, "the wall," "fortress"):

1. Identification:

The name, at least in this form, appears only once (Isa 15:1) as that of a city in Moab. It is named with Ar of Moab, with which possibly it may be identical, since ‘ar or ‘ir is the Hebrew equivalent of the Moabite Qir. The Targum hence reads "Kerak in Moab." There can be no doubt that the Kerak here intended is represented by the modern town of that name, with which, consequently, Kir Moab is almost universally identified. It must always have been a place of importance. It is mentioned as Charakmoba (Karakmoba) in the Ac of the Council of Jerusalem (536 AD) and by the early geographers. It dominated the great caravan road connecting Syria with Egypt and Arabia. The Crusaders therefore directed attention to it, and held possession from 1167 till it fell again into the hands of the Moslems under Saladin, 1188. The Chroniclers speak of it as in el Belqa, and the chief city of Arabia Secunda. Under the title of Petra Deserti the Crusaders founded here a bishop’s see. The Greek bishop of Petra still has his seat in Kerak.

2. Discription:

Kerak stands upon a lofty spur projecting westward from the Moab plateau, with Wady ‘Ain Franjy on the South, and Wady el-Kerak on the North, about 10 miles from the Dead Sea. The sides of the mountain sink sharply into these deep ravines, which unite immediately to the West, and, as Wady el-Kerak, the great hollow runs northwestward to the sea. It is a position of great natural strength, being connected with the uplands to the East only by a narrow neck. It is 3,370 ft. above the level of the sea. The mountains beyond the adjacent valleys are much higher. The place was surrounded by a strong wall, with five towers, which can still be traced in its whole length. The most northerly tower is well preserved. The most interesting building at Kerak is the huge castle on the southern side. It is separated from the adjoining hill on the right by a large artificial moat; and it is provided with a reservoir. A moat also skirts the northern side of the fortress, and on the East the wall has a sloped or battered base. The castle is then separated from the town. The walls are very thick, and are well preserved. Beneath the castle is a chapel in which traces of frescoes are still visible. In days of ancient warfare the place must have been practically impregnable. It could be entered only by two roads passing through rock-cut tunnels. The main danger must always have been failure of water supply. There are springs immediately outside the city; but those alone would not be sufficient. Great cisterns were therefore constructed in the town and also in the castle. The half-nomadic inhabitants of Kerak today number some 1,140 families (Musil, Arabia Petrea, III, 97). The Greek church claims about 2,000 souls; the rest are Moslems. They are wild and fearless people, not greatly inclined to treat strangers with courtesy and kindness. In the spring of 1911 the town was the center of a rising against the government, which was not quelled until much blood had been shed.

W. Ewing

KIRAMA

ki-r’-ma, kir’-a-ma (Kirama; the King James Version, Cirama): The people of Kirama returned with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:20); the "Ramah" of Ezr 2:26 (which see).

KIRIATH

kir’-i-ath (qiryath, "city"; the King James Version Kirjath): Mentioned (Jos 18:28) as a city of Benjamin; has been identified with Kuriet el ‘Enab, "town of grapes," a prosperous town on the highroad between Jerusalem and Jaffa; it is sometimes spoken of by the inhabitants as Qurieh. It is, however, generally thought that Kiriath here stands for KIRIATH-JEARIM (which see). See P E F, III, 132, Sh XVII.

KIRIATH-ARBA

kir-i-ath-ar’-ba.

See HEBRON.

KIRIATH-ARIM

kir-i-ath-a’-rim (Ezr 2:25).

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

KIRIATH-BAAL

kir-i-ath-ba’-al

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

KIRIATH-HUZOTH

kir-i-ath hu’-zoth: qiryath-chutsoth, "city of streets"; Septuagint reads) poleis epauleon, "city of villages," from which we may infer a reading chatseroth, for chutsoth; the King James Version, Kirjathhuzoth): A place to which, after their meeting, Balak and Balaam went together (Nu 22:39). They met at "the City of Moab" (Nu 22:36), which is probably identical with KIR OF MOAB (which see); Kiriath-huzoth was probably therefore not far from that city. Some would identify it with Kiriathaim; some with Kerioth; as yet there is no certainty.

KIRIATH-JEARIM

kir-i-ath je’-a-rim, kir-i-ath je-a’-rim (qiryath-ye‘-arim, "city of thickets"; Septuagint he polis Iareim; the King James Version Kirjathjearim): One of the four chief cities of the Gibeonites (Jos 9:17); a city , of Judah (Jos 15:60), evidently an ancient, Semitic "high place", hence, the name "Kiriath-Baal" (same place) ; it was one of the places on the border line between Judah and Benjamin (Jos 18:14,15; 15:11 (where it is called "Baalah"); compare 1Ch 13:6). It is mentioned as in Judah (Jos 15:60; 18:14; Jud 18:12), but if KIRIATH (which see) is identical with it, it is mentioned as belonging to Benjamin (Jos 18:28; in 2Sa 6:2, Baale-judah).

1. Scripture References:

Jud 18:12 records that the men of Da set forth out of Zorah and Eshtaol and encamped in Mahaneh-dan behind (West of) Kiriath-jearim. (In Jud 13:25 Mahaneh-dan ("the camp of Dan") is described as between Zorah and Eshtaol; see MAHANEH-DAN.) To this sanctuary the ark of Yahweh was brought, from Beth-shemesh by the people of Kiriath-jearim, and they "brought it into the house of Abinadab in the hill (m "Gibeah"]; and sanctified Eleazar his son to keep the ark of Yahweh" (1Sa 7:1). Here it abode twenty years (1Sa 7:2; 2Sa 6:2-4; compare 1Ch 13:6; 2Ch 1:4). Clearly it was in the hills somewhere to the East of Beth-shemesh.

The prophet Uriah-ben-shemaiah, killed by Jehoiskim, belonged to Kiriath-jearim (Jer 26:20 f).

In Ezr 2:25 (compare Ne 7:29), this place occurs under the name "Kiriath-arim." In 1 Esdras 5:19 the name occurs as "Kiriathiarius."

2. Position:

The exact position of this important Israelite sanctuary has never been satisfactorily settled. Some of the data appear to be contradictory. For example, Josephus (Ant., VI, i, 4) says it was a city in the neighborhood of Beth-shemesh, while Eusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon) speak of it ("Cariathiareim") in their day as a village 9 or 10 miles from Jerusalem on the way to Lydda. But it is open to doubt whether the reputed site of their day had any serious claims. Any suggested site should fulfill the following conditions:

(1) It must harmonize with the boundary line of Judah and Benjamin between two known points—the "waters of Nephtoah," very generally supposed to be Lifta, and Chesalon, certainly Kesla (Jos 15:10).

(2) It should not be too far removed from the other cities of the Gibeonites—Gibeon, Chephirah and Beeroth—but those places, which are all identified, are themselves fairly widely apart.

(3) Mahaneh-dan ("the camp of Dan") is described as between Zorah and Eshtaol, and was West of Kiriath-jearim; this, and the statement of Josephus that it was in the neighborhood of Beth-shemesh, makes it probable that the site was near the western edge of the mountains of Judah. Zorah (now Sara‘), Eshtaol (now Eshu‘a) and Beth-shemesh (now ‘Ain Shems), are all within sight of each other close to the Vale of Sorek.

(4) The site should be a sanctuary (or show signs of having been such), and be at least on a height (Gibeah, 1Sa 7:1 margin).

(5) The name may help us, but it is as well to note that the first part of the name, in the form "Kirathiarius" (1 Esdras 5:19), appears to have survived the exile rather than the second.

3. Suggested Identifications:

The first suggested identification was that of Robinson (BE, II, 11,12), namely, Kuriet el ‘Enab, the "town of grapes," a flourishing little town about 9 miles West of Jerusalem on the carriage road to Jaffa. The district around is still fairly well wooded (compare ye‘arim =" thickets"). This village is commonly known as Abu Ghosh, from the name of a robber chieftain who, with his family, flourished there in the first half of the last century. Medieval ecclesiastical tradition has made this place the Anathoth of Jer, and a handsome church from the time of the Crusades, now thoroughly repaired, exists here to mark this tradition. This site suits well as regards the border line, and the name Quriet is the exact equivalent of Kiriath; it also fits in with the distance and direction given the Eusebius, Onomasticon, but it cannot be

called satisfactory in all respects. Soba, in the neighborhood, has, on account of its commanding position, been selected, but except for this one feature it has no special claims. The late Colonel Conder has very vigorously advocated the claims of a site he discovered on the south side of the rugged Wady Ismae‘n, called Khurbet ‘Erma, pointing out truly that ‘Erma is the exact equivalent of ‘Arim (Ezr 2:25). Unfortunately the 2nd part of the name would appear from the references in 1 Esdras and in Eusebius (Onomasticon) to be that part which was forgotten long ago, so that the argument even of the philological —the strongest—grounds cannot be of much value. The greatest objections in the minds of most students are the unsuitability of the position to the requirements of the Judah-Benjamin frontier and its distance from the other Gibeonite cities.

The present writer suggests another site which, in his opinion, meets at least some of the requirements better than the older proposals. Standing on the hill of Beth-shcmesh and looking Northwest, with the cities of Zorah (Sur‘ah) and Eshtaol (Eshu’-a) full in view, a lofty hill crowned by a considerable forest catches the eye. The village a little below the summit is called Beit Machcir, and the hilltop itself is the shrine of a local saint known as Sheikh el Ajam. So "holy" is the site, that no trees in this spot are ever cut, nor is fallen brushwood removed. There is a Wely or sanctuary of the saint, and round about are scores of very curious and apparently ancient graves. Southward from this site the eye follows the line of Judean hills—probably the Mt. Jearim of Jos 15:10—until it strikes the outstanding point of Kesla (Chesslon), some 2 miles to the South. If the ark was taken here, the people of Beth-shemesh could have followed its progress almost the whole way to its new abode. Although the name, which appears to mean "besieged" or "confined," in no degree helps, in all the other respects (see 2 above), this site suits well the conditions of Kiriath-jearim.

LITERATURE.

See P E F S, 1878, 196-99; P E F, III, 43-52; H G H L, 225 f; BR, II, 11 f; Buhl, G A the Priestly Code (P), Index.

E. W. G. Masterman

KIRIATH-SANNAH

kir-i-ath-san’-a (qiryath sannah; the King James Version Kirjath Sannah): In Jos 15:49 it is called "Debir," and is identical with KIRIATH-SEPHER (which see). Aspolis grammaton, "city of books," is the reading in Septuagint, the most natural explanation is that cannah, is a copyist’s error for cepher, but Sayce considers this an ancient Canaanite name meaning "city of instruction," and that it occurs in the Tell el-Amarna Letters in the form "Bit’ sani."

KIRIATH-SEPHER

kir-i-ath-se’-fer (qiryath cepher; translated by many, as if it were Hebrew, as "house of books." Septuagint polis grammaton; the King James Version, Kirjath Sepher; other suggestions have been

made: "border-town" (Moore) or "tolltown" (G.A. Smith): In two parallel passages (Jos 15:15 f; Jud 1:11 f), it is mentioned as identical with DEBIR (which see), which has been frequently identified with edh-Dhaheriyeh. Sayce would place Kiriath-Sepher to the W. of Gath. See P E F S, 1893, 33-35.

KIRIATHAIM

kir-i-aitha'-im (qiryathaym, "two cities"; the King James Version, Kirjathaim):

(1) A city in the uplands of Moab formerly held by Sihon, and given by Moses to Reuben, who is said to have fortified it (Nu 32:37; Jos 13:19). It is named along with Elealeh and Nebo in the former passage, and with Sibmah in the latter. It was in the hands of Moab in Mesha's time, and he claims to have fortified it (M S, l.10). For Jeremiah (48:1,23) and Ezekiel (25:9) it is a Moabite town. Eusebius, Onomasticon, identifies it with Coraitha, a Christian village 10 Roman miles West of Madeba. This is the modern Qaraiyat, about 11 miles West of Madeba, and 5 miles East of Macherus. This, however, may represent Kerioth, while the towns with which it is named would lead us to look for Kiriathaim to the North of Wady Zerqa Ma'in. From this city was named Shaveh-kiriathaim, "the plain of Kiriathaim" (Ge 14:5).

(2) A city in the territory of Naphtali, assigned to the Gershonite Levites (1Ch 6:76), corresponding to "Kartan" in Jos 21:32.

W. Ewing

KIRJATH

kur'-jath, kir'-jath.

See KIRIATH.

KIRJATH-ARBA

kur-jath-ar'-ba, kir-jath-ar'-ba.

See KIRIATH-ARBA.

KIRJATH-BAAL

kur-jath-ba'-al, kir-jath-ba'-al.

See KIRIATH-JEARIM.

KIRJATHAIM

kur-ja-tha’-im, kir-ja-tha’-im.

See KIRIATHAIM.

KISEUS

kis-e’-us (Kiseus; Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus (Swete) reads Keisaios; the King James Version, Cisai): The great-grandfather of Mordecai (Additions to Esther 11:2).

See KISH, (5).

KISH

kish (qish; Kis, Keis, "bow," "power"): The name of five persons mentioned in the Bible:

(1) The son of Abiel and the father of Saul, the first king of Israel. He was of the tribe of Benjamin, of the family of the Matrites (1Sa 9:1; 14:51; compare Ac 13:21; 1Sa 10:21). According to 1Ch 8:33 and 9:39, "Ner begat Kish" By reading "Ner begat Abner" (compare 1Sa 14:51; 1Ch 6:28), the difficulty is at least partly overcome. In 1Ch 12:1, Kish is also mentioned as the father of Saul, and again in 2Sa 21:14, we are told that the sepulcher of Kish was located in the country of Benjamin, in Zela. His place of residence seems to have been at Gibeah.

(2) Another Kish is mentioned (1Ch 8:29 f; 9:35 f) as the son of Jeiel and his wife Maacah. He is usually supposed to be the uncle of Saul’s father.

(3) A Levite, the son of Mahli the Merarite (1Ch 23:21 f; compare 24:29).

(4) Another Merarite Levite in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12).

(5) The great-grandfather of Mordecai, of the tribe of Benjamin (Es 2:5).

William Baur

KISHI

kish’i (qishi, "snarer," "fowler"): Father of Ethan, one of the singers David "set over the service of song" in the house of the Lord (1Ch 6:31); the "Kushaiah" of 1Ch 15:17 (compare 1Ch 6:44).

KISHION

kish’-i-on, kish’-yon (qishyon): A city in the territory of Issachar (Jos 19:20), given to the Gershonite Levites (21:28; the King James Version wrongly "Kishon"). The parallel passage in 1Ch 6:72 reads "Kedesh" instead of "Kishion." The true reading is probably qidhshon. Conder suggests a likely identification with Tell Abu Kedes, not far from Taanach.

KISHON

ki’-shon, kish’on (qishon; Keison): The "watercourse" or "torrent stream" along the banks of which the great battle was fought between Israel, led by Deborah and Barak, and the army of Sisera, in the waters of which so many perished (Jud 4:7, etc.). It is probably mentioned earlier as "the brook that is before Jokneam" (Jos 19:11; see JOKNEAM). It appears again as the scene of Elijah’s slaughter of the prophets of Baal (1Ki 18:40). "The torrent" paragraph excellence in the district is the modern el-MuqaTTa‘, a stream which drains all the plain of Esdraelon to the West of the watershed—a line drawn from Iksal to Nain, and thence to el-Fuleh and Zer‘in. All the water East of this line, from the Nazareth hills, Tabor and Little Hermon, flows down Wady esh-Sherrar and Nahr Jalud into the Jordan. The Kishon collects the streams from the western slopes of Gilboa in the rainy season; and the water from the strong spring at Jenin. Contributions also come from the copious fountains in the neighborhood of Megiddo. At Sa‘adiyeh, again, some 3 miles East of Chaifa, its volume is largely increased by springs rising at the base of Carmel, on the edge of the plain of Acre. From Jenin in the Southeast, the deep torrent bed follows a westerly direction, with numerous. windings cutting the plain in two, until it reaches the pass at the northeastern base of Carmel. Through the gorge between the mountain and the hills of Galilee it reaches the plain of Acre. From Sa‘adiyeh it flows in a deep sluggish stream through the marsh-land to the sea near Chaifa. In this part the crocodile is said to have been seen at times.

In the summer season the water from the springs is largely absorbed by irrigation, and the upper reaches of the river are soon dry. The bed runs along the bottom of a trench some 20 ft. deep through the plain. It is easily crossed at the fords by those who know how to avoid the localities of the springs. In time of heavy rains the trench is swiftly filled, and the soft soil of the plain goes to mud. Remembering this, it is easy to understand the disaster that overwhelmed the heavily armed cavalry and chariots of Sisera. The chief ford for long was to the West of the gorge where the stream issues into the plain of Acre, on the highway from Chaifd to Nazareth. Here it is now spanned by a substantial bridge, while the railway crosses a little higher up. At the mouth of the river it is generally easily forded on the sand bank thrown up by the waves beating against the current of the stream. The main traffic here is now carried by a wooden bridge.

The phrase nachal qedhumim in Jud 5:21 is not easy of interpretation. English Versions of the Bible translates, "that ancient river"; G.A. Smith, "torrent of spates"; while others think it may refer to a stream other than the Kishon. Guthe suggests that both names may be derived from those of places adjoining the river. Kishon may possibly mean the "tortuous" stream, referring to the windings of its course.

W. Ewing

KISLEV

kis’-lef (kiclew; the King James Version Chisleu, the Revised Version (British and American) "Chislev"): The 9th month of the Jewish year, corresponding to December. The word is found in Ne 1:1 and Zec 7:1. The derivation is uncertain.

See CALENDAR.

KISS

(nashaq; phileo, kataphilo, philema): The kiss is common in eastern lands in salutation, etc., on the cheek, the forehead, the beard, the hands, the feet, but not (in Pal) the lips (Cheyne, E B, under the word "Salutations"). In the Bible there is no sure instance of the kiss in ordinary salutation. We have in the Old Testament naschaq, "to kiss," used

(1) of relatives (which seems the origin of the practice of kissing; compare So 8:1, "Oh that thou wert as my brother .... I would kiss thee; yea, and none would despise me"); Ge 27:26,27 (Isaac and Jacob); 29:11 (Jacob and Rachel); 33:4 (Esau and Jacob); 45:15 (Joseph and his brethren); 48:10 (Jacob and Joseph’s sons); 50:1 (Joseph and his father); Ex 4:27 (Aaron and Moses); 18:7 (Moses and Jethro, united with obeisance); Ru 1:9,14 (Naomi and her daughters-in-law—a farewell); 2Sa 14:33 (David and Absalom); 1Ki 19:20 (Elisha and his parents—a farewell); see also Ge 29:13; 31:28,55; Tobit 7:6; 10:12.

(2) Of friendship and affection; compare 1Sa 20:41 (David and Jonathan); 2Sa 15:5 (Absalom and those who came to him); 19:39 (David and Barzillai—a farewell); 20:9 (Joab and Amasa); Pr 27:6 ("the kisses (neshiqah) of an enemy"); 1 Esdras 4:47 ("the king stood up, and kissed him").

(3) Of love; compare So 1:2, "Let him kiss me with the kisses (neshiqah) of his mouth"; Pr 7:13 (of the feigned love of "the strange woman").

(4) Of homage, perhaps; compare 1Sa 10:1 (Samuel after anointing David king); Ge 41:40, "Unto thy word shall all my people be ruled," the Revised Version margin "order themselves," or "do homage," the King James Version margin "Hebrew be armed or kiss" (nashaq); Ps 2:12, "Kiss the son" (American Standard Revised Version), the English Revised Version margin "Some versions render, ‘Lay hold of (or receive) instruction’; others, ‘Worship in purity’ "; some ancient versions give ‘Kiss (or, do homage) purely.’

(5) Of idolatrous practices; compare 1Ki 19:18; Ho 13:2 (compare 8:5,6; 10:5); Job 31:27, probably, "kissing the hand to the sun or moon" (compare 31:26,27). See ADORATION.

(6) A figurative use may be seen in Ps 85:10; Pr 24:26; Eze 3:13, where "touched" is nashaq (see the King James Version margin).

(7) In Additions to Esther 13:13 we have "I could have been content .... to kiss the soles of his feet," and in Ecclesiasticus 29:5, "Till he hath received, he will kiss a man’s hands"—marks of self-humiliation or abasement.

In the New Testament we have phileo, "to kiss," "to be friendly," and kataphileo, "to kiss thoroughly," "to be very friendly"—the first in Mt 26:48; Mr 14:44; Lu 22:47, of the kiss with which Judas betrayed his Master. This was probably meant to be taken as an expression of special regard, which is expressed by the kataphileo of Mt 26:49; Mr 14:45; the same word is used of the woman who kissed the feet of Christ (Lu 7:38,45); of the father’s greeting of the returning prodigal (Lu 15:20); and of the farewell to Paul of the Ephesian Christians (Ac 20:37); philema, "a kiss," "a mark of friendship," is used by our Lord as that which Simon omitted to give him (which may refer to ordinary hospitality), but which the woman had bestowed so impressively (Lu 7:45); of the kiss of Judas (Lu 22:48); and of the "holy kiss" wherewith Christians greeted each other, which, according to the general usage we have seen, would be as the members of one family in the Lord, or as specially united in holy love (Ro 16:16; 1Co 16:20; 2Co 13:12; 1Th 5:26; 1Pe 5:14). There is reason to believe that, as a rule, men only thus greeted men, and women, women. In the Apostolical Constitutions (3rd century) it is so enjoined.

W. L. Walker

KITE

kit (’ayyah; iktinos; Latin Milvus ictinus or regalis): A medium-sized member of the hawk tribe (see HAWK). This bird is 27 inches long, of bright reddish-brown color, has sharply pointed wings and deeply forked tail. It is supposed to have exceptionally piercing eyes. It takes moles, mice, young game birds, snakes and frogs, as well as carrion for food. Its head and facial expression are unusually eagle-like. It was common over Palestine in winter, but bred in the hills of Galilee and rough mountainous places, so it was less conspicuous in summer. It is among the lists of abominations (see Le 11:14 and De 14:13). It is notable that this is the real bird intended by Job to be used as that whose eye could not trace the path to the silver mine:

"That path no bird of prey knoweth,

Neither hath the falcon’s eye seen it" (Job 28:7).

The word used here in the original Hebrew is ‘ayyah, which was the name for kite. Our first translators used "vulture"; our latest efforts give "falcon," a smaller bird of different markings, not having the kite’s reputation for eyesight.

Gene Stratton-Porter

KITHLISH

kith’-lish (kithlish).

See CHITLISH.

KITRON

kit-’ron (qiTron): An unidentified place in Zebulun, not possessed by the tribe (Jud 1:30). It may be identical with Kattath of Jos 19:15. In the Talmud it is identified with Sepphoris, which is represented by the modern village of Seffuriyeh].

KITTIM

kit’-im (kittim, Isa 23:12; Jer 2:10; kittiyim, apparently plural of kitti (not found, but compare (4) below); Ketioi, Kitioi, Ketieim, Jer 2:10; Chettieim, Chettein):ntified with Sepphoris, which is represented by the modern village of Seffuriyeh].

1. Two Usages of the Name:

In Ge 10:4 the word is applied to the descendants of Javan, and indicates, therefore, the Greek-Latin races, whose territory extended along the coasts of the Mediterranean, and included its islands. By the side of Kittim are mentioned Elisha, Tarshish, and Dodanim (= Rodanim of 1Ch 1:7), generally explained respectively as Sicily with Southern Italy, Spain and Rhodes. In its narrower sense Kittim appears simply to have stood for the island of Cyprus—it is mentioned between Bashan (= Pal) and the isles of Elisha in Eze 27:6,7, and with this Isa 23:1,12 agree, Kittim occurring in these passages between Tarshish, Tyre and Sidon.

2. In Its Limited Sense:

The oldest etymology is apparently that of Josephus, who connects Kittim with the well-known old Cypriote city Kition (Citium) (Ant., I, vi, 1), testifying to the settling of the Kittim on the island. This word he further connects with Chethima, from Chethimus, and states that it was on account of Cyprus being the home of those people that all islands were called Chethim by the Hebrews. The derivation of an ancient Chethim from Chethimus, however, would make the m to be a radical, and this, with the substitution of Ch (= Kh) for Kittim, renders his proposed etymology somewhat doubtful.

3. In Its Extended Sense:

The statement of Josephus, that "all islands, and the greatest part of the sea-coast, are called Chethim (= Kittim) by the Hebrews," on the other hand, must be taken as the testimony of one well acquainted with the opinions of the learned world in his time. In Jer 2:10 and Eze 27:6 the isles of Kittim are expressly spoken of, and this confirms the statement of Josephus concerning the extended meaning of the name. This would explain its application to the Roman fleet in Da 11:30 (so the Vulgate), and the Macedonians in 1 Macc 1:1 (Chettieim) and 8:5 ([@Kitians). In the latter passage the Greek writer seems to have been thinking more of the Cyprian Kition than of the Hebrew Kittim.

4. Colonization of Cyprus:

According to Herodotus (vii.90), Cyprus was colonized from Greece, Phoenicia, and Ethiopia. Referring to the plundering of the temple of Aphrodite at Askalon by the Scythians (i.105), he states that her temple in Cyprus was an offshoot from that ancient foundation, as reported by the Cyprians themselves, Phoenicians having founded it at Cythera, on arriving from Syria. The date of the earliest Phoenician settlements in Cyprus is unknown, but it has been suggested that they were anterior to the time of Moses. Naturally they brought with them their religion, the worship of the moon-goddess Atargatis (Derceto) being introduced at Paphos, and the Phoenician Baal at Kition. If Kition be, then, a Semitic word (from the same root as the Hebrew Kittim), it has been transferred from the small band of Phoenician settlers which it at first designated, to the non-Sem Japhethites of the West. Kition occurs in the Phoenician inscriptions of Cyprus under the forms K(i)t(t) and K(i)t(t)i, the latter being by far the more common (CIS, I, i, 10,11,14,19, etc.).

5. Its Successive Masters:

The early history of Cyprus is uncertain. According to the Assyrian copy of Sargon of Agade’s omens, that king (about 3800 BC in the opinion of Nabonidus; 2800 BC in the opinion of many Assyriologists) is said to have crossed "the sea of the setting sun" (the Mediterranean), though the Babylonian copy makes it that of "the rising sun"—i.e. the Persian Gulf. Be this as it may, General Cesnola discovered at Curium, in Cyprus, a seal-cylinder apparently inscribed "Mar-Istar, son of Ilu-bani, servant (worshipper) of Naram-Sin," the last named being the deified son of Sargon. In the 16th century BC, Cyprus was tributary to Thothmes III. About the year 708 BC, Sargon of Assyria received the submission of the kings of the district of Ya’, in Cyprus, and set up at Citium the stele bearing his name, which is now in the Royal Museum at Berlin. Esarhaddon and his son Assur-bani-apli each received tribute from the 10 Cyprian princes who acknowledged Assyrian supremacy. The island was conquered by the Egyptian king Amasis, and later formed part of the Persian empire, until the revolt of Evagoras in 410 BC. The Assyrians knew the island under the name of Yad(a)nanu, the "Wedan" (Vedan) of Eze 27:19 Revised Version (British and American) (Sayce, PSBA, 1912, 26).

6. The Races Therein and Their Languages:

If the orthodox date for the composition of Ge be accepted, not only the Phoenicians, but also the Greeks, or a people of Greek-Latin stock, must have been present in Cyprus, before the time of Moses,

in sufficient number to make them the predominant portion of the population. As far as can be judged, the Phoenicians occupied only the eastern and southern portion of the island. Paphos, where they had built a temple to Ashtoreth and set up an ‘asherah (a pillar symbolizing the goddess), was one of their principal settlements. The rest of the island was apparently occupied by the Aryans, whose presence there caused the name of Kittim to be applied to all the Greek-Latin countries of the Mediterranean. Greek and Phoenician were the languages spoken on the island, as was proved by George Smith’s demonstration of the nature of the non-Phoenician text of the inscription of King Melek-yathon of Citium (370 BC). The signs used in the Greek-Cyprian inscriptions are practically all syllabic.

7. The Testimony of Cyprian Art:

The many influences which have modified the Cyprian race are reflected in the ancient art, which shows the effect of Babylonian, Egyptian Phoenician and Greek contacts. Specimens are to be found in many museums, but the finest collection of examples of Cyprian art is undoubtedly that of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. Some of the full-length figures are life-size, and the better class of work is exceedingly noteworthy.

See CYPRUS.

T. G. Pinches

KNEADING

ned’ing.

See BREAD, III, 2.

KNEE; KNEEL

ne nel ("knee," berekh; Aramaic ‘arekhubbah; gonu; "kneel"; barakh; Aramaic berakh; gonupeto): Most of the uses are obvious, and the figurative use of "knees" as the symbol of strength (Job 4:4; Heb 12:12, etc.) needs no explanation. The disease of the knees mentioned in De 28:35 is perhaps some form of leprosy. In Job 3:12 the "knees" seem to be used for the lap, as the place where a child receives its first care. Three times in Ge the knees appear in connection with primitive adoption customs. In 30:3 a fiction is enacted that purports to represent Rachel as the actual mother of Bilhah’s children. By a somewhat similar rite in 48:12, Jacob (the "knees" here are Jacob’s, not Joseph’s) adopts Ephraim and Manasseh, so that they are counted as two of the twelve patriarchs and not as members of a single Joseph tribe. In the same way Machir’s children are adopted by Joseph in 50:23, and this is certainly connected with the counting of Machir (instead of Manasseh) as one of the tribes in Jud 5:14. See TRIBE; and for the idea underlying this paternal adoption, compare THIGH. From among classical instances of the same customs compare Homer, Odyssey, xix. 401 ff, where Autolukos, grandfather of Ulysses, receives the newborn grandchild on his knees and gives him his name. Thus also we have to

understand the numerous representations in Egyptian sculpture, showing the king as an infant on the knees or the lap of a goddess.

Kneeling was less commonly an attitude of prayer among the Jews than was standing, but references to kneeling are of course abundant. For kneeling (or prostrating one's self) before a superior, see ATTITUDES, 2; SALUTATION.

Burton Scott Easton

KNIFE

nif:

(1) ma'akheleth, literally, an instrument for eating; but used of large knives for slaying animals, cutting up a carcass or a sacrificial victim (Ge 22:6,10; Jud 19:29; Pr 30:14).

(2) cherebh, rendered generally "sword," but in Jos 5:2,3 of stone knives for circumcision (compare Ex 4:25), probably of similar knives in 1Ki 18:28, used by Baal prophets in gashing themselves. In Eze 5:12 the King James Version, "knife," probably better the Revised Version (British and American), "sword."

(3) ta'ar, usually rendered "razor," in combination with ha-copher, "knife of the writer," or "penknife" (Jer 36:23).

(4) machalaphim, "slaughter-knives" (Ezr 1:9).

(5) sakkin, Aramaic, "knife" (Pr 23:2). Early knives were commonly made of sharp stones, especially of flint, later of bronze and iron. The-former remained in use in religious ceremonies long after the latter were in common use.

Knives were not generally used at meals, meats being cut into bits before served, and bread being. broken into fragments. Herod used a knife for paring apples, and attempted suicide with the instrument (Josephus, Ant, XVII, vii, 1; BJ, I, xxxiii, 7).

Edward Bagby Pollard

KNOCK

nok (krouo): The oriental house was fitted with heavy doors which were bolted and locked with wooden keys too large to be carried about, so that even a member of the household could not secure entrance until in response to his knock or call the door should be opened by someone within. At night the delay would be increased by the difficulty of arousing the inmates sleeping within the inner chambers. To

persons familiar with such experiences, the words of Jesus concerning a higher entrance, "Knock, and it shall be opened unto you" (Mt 7:7; Lu 12:36), would have a unique force not easy for us to appreciate.

Russell Benjamin Miller

KNOP

nop: In Ex 25:31 ff; 37:17 ff (kaphtor), part of the ornaments of the golden candlestick; in 1Ki 6:18; 7:24 (peqa‘im), gourd-like ornaments of the lining of Solomon’s temple, and of the brazen sea (in 1Ki 6:18, the Revised Version margin "gourds").

See CANDLESTICK, THE GOLDEN; TEMPLE; SEA, THE MOLTEN.

KNOW; KNOWLEDGE

no, nol’-ej (in Hebrew chiefly yadha‘, noun da‘ath; in Greek ginosko, oida’ "to know fully," epiginosko, noun gnosis epignosis): Knowledge strictly is the apprehension by the mind of some fact or truth in accordance with its real nature; in a personal relation the intellectual act is necessarily conjoined with the element of affection and will (choice, love, favor, or, conversely, repugnance, dislike, etc.). Knowledge is distinguished from "opinion" by its greater certainty. The mind is constituted with the capacity for knowledge, and the desire to possess and increase it. The character of knowledge varies with its object. The senses give knowledge of outward appearances; the intellect connects and reasons about these appearances, and arrives at general laws or truths; moral truth is apprehended through the power inherently possessed by men of distinguishing right and wrong in the light of moral principles; spiritual qualities require for their apprehension spiritual sympathy ("They are spiritually judged," 1Co 2:14). The highest knowledge possible to man is the knowledge of God, and while there is that in God’s infinity which transcends man’s power of comprehension (Job 11:7,9), God is knowable in the measure in which He has revealed Himself in creation (Ro 1:19,20, "that which is known of God," etc.), and supremely in Jesus Christ, who alone perfectly knows the Father, and reveals Him to man (Mt 11:27). This knowledge of God in Jesus Christ is "life eternal" (Joh 17:3). Knowledge is affirmed of both God and man, but with the wide contrast that God’s knowledge is absolute, unerring, complete, intuitive, embracing all things, past, present, and future, and searching the inmost thoughts of the heart (Ps 139:1,23); whereas man’s is partial, imperfect, relative, gradually acquired, and largely mixed with error ("Now we see in a mirror darkly .... in part," 1Co 13:12). All these points about knowledge are amply brought out in the Scripture usage of the terms. A large part of the usage necessarily relates to natural knowledge (sometimes with a carnal connotation, as Ge 4:1,17), but the greatest stress also is laid on the possession of moral and spiritual knowledge (e.g. Ps 119:66; Pr 1:4,7,22,29; 8:10, etc.; Lu 1:77; Ro 15:14; 2Pe 1:5,6). The highest knowledge, as said, is the knowledge of God and Christ, and of God’s will (Ho 6:6; Ro 11:33; Eph 1:17; 4:13; Php 1:9; 3:8; Col 1:9,10, etc.). The moral conditions of spiritual knowledge are continually insisted on ("If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God," Joh 7:17). On the. other hand, the pride of intellectual knowledge is condemned; it must be joined with love ("Knowledge puffeth up, 1Co 8:1). The stronger term epignosis is used to

denote the full and more perfect knowledge which is possessed in Christ, the conditions of which are humility and love. Of knowledge as connoting favor, choice, on the part of God, there are many examples (Ps 1:6, Yahweh knoweth the way of the righteous"; Ga 4:9, "know God, or rather to be known by God"; compare Ro 8:29, "whom he fore-knew").ectual knowledge as the Divine omnipotence is different from muscular strength. Consequently, the passage of this knowledge into a human intellect is impossible, and the problem of the incarnation should be stated: What effect did Divine omniscience in the person have on the conscious intellect of the manhood? There is so little help from the past to be gained in answering this question, that it must remain open at present—if, indeed, it is ever capable of a full answer. But that ignorance in the intellect of the manhood is fully consistent with omniscience in the person seems to be not merely a safe answer to the question as stated, but an inevitable answer if the true humanity of Christ is to be maintained at all.

See FOREKNOWLEDGE.

James Orr

KOA

ko’-a (qoa‘): A people named with Pekod and Shoa as enemies of Jerusalem (Eze 23:23). Their location was probably Northeast of Babylonia.

KOHATH; KOHATHITES

ko’-hath, ko’-hath-its (qehath, qohathi; Kaath): Second son of Levi, and ancestor of Moses and Aaron (Ge 46:11; Ex 6:16-20; Nu 3:17; 1Ch 6:1, etc.). The Kohathites formed one of the three divisions of the tribe of Levi; the other two being the Gershonites and the Merarites (Nu 3:17). The Kohathites consisted of four families, the Amramites, the Izharites, the Hebronites, and the Uzzielites (Nu 3:19,27, etc.). Their place in the wilderness was on the southern side of the tabernacle (Nu 3:29), and their number is given (from a month old) as 8,600 (Nu 3:28). Their special charge was "the ark, and the table, and the candlestick, and the altars, and the vessels of the sanctuary wherewith they minister, and the screen, and all the service thereof" (Nu 3:31; compare Nu 7:9). After the conquest 23 cities were assigned them by lot (Jos 21:4,5). In David’s time and after, Heman, a Kohathite, and his family had a prominent place in the service of the music of the sanctuary (1Ch 6:33 ff; 16:41 ff; 25:1); David likewise divided the Levites into courses (the Kohathites, 1Ch 23:12-20; 24:20-25). We read of the Kohathites in the reign of Jehoshaphat at Engedi (2Ch 20:19), and in connection with the cleansing of the temple under Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12,14).

James Orr

KOHELETH

ko-hel’-eth (qoheleth).

See ECCLESIASTES.

KOLAIAH

ko-la’-ya, ko-li’-a (qolayah, "voice of Yah"):

(1) A Benjamite, son of Maaseiah (Ne 11:7).

(2) Father of Ahab, a false prophet and a lecherous man (Jer 29:21-23).

KONAE

ko’-ne (Kona): Some manuscripts have [@komas, from which we have in the King James Version "the villages." The name occurs in the account of the measures taken to secure the country against Holofernes (Judith 4:4). If Kona be correct, we may possibly identify the place with Cyamon.

KOR

kor.

See COR.

KORAH

ko’-ra, (~qorach], "baldness," possibly; Kore):

(1) One of the 3 sons of Oholibamah, Esau’s Hivite wife. The account says that the 3 were born in Canaan before Esau withdrew to the Seir mountain country. They are mentioned 3 times in the brief account from 3 points of view (Ge 36:5,14,18; , 1Ch 1:35), the 3rd mention being in the list of "chiefs."

(2) One of the sons of Eliphaz, the son of Adah, Esau’s Hittite wife (Ge 36:16). He is mentioned as one of the Edomite "chiefs."

If one has the habit, finding a statement anywhere, of thinking that the statement ought to be changed into something else, he will be interested in the attempts to identify these Edomite Korahs with Korah (3).

(3) A son of Hebron (1Ch 2:43), the son of Mareshah, mentioned in the Caleb group of families in

Judah.

(4) The son of Izhar the son of Kohath the son of Levi (Ex 6:16 ff; Nu 16:1; 1Ch 6:18,31-38), a younger contemporary of Moses. There may have been generations, omitted in the record, between Izhar and Korah; that is a natural way of accounting for Amminadab (1Ch 6:22-30).

1. The Catastrophe in the Wilderness:

This Korah is best known as the man whom the opening earth is said to have swallowed up along with his associates when they were challenging the authority of Moses and Aaron in the wilderness (Nu 16; 17). Korah is presented as the principal in the affair. The company is spoken of as his company, and those who were swallowed up as being "all the men that appertained unto Korah." (Nu 16:11,32). It is under his name that the affair is referred to (Nu 26:9; 27:3). But Dathan and Abiram of the tribe of Reuben are not much less prominent than Korah. In Nu 16 and 26 they are mentioned with Korah, and are mentioned without him in De 11:6 and Ps 106:17. Another Reubenite, On, the son of Peleth, was in the conspiracy. It has been inferred that he withdrew, but there is no reason either for or against the inference. Equally baseless is the inference that Zelophehad of Manassel joined it, but withdrew (Nu 27:3). The account implies that there were other Levites in it besides Korah (Nu 16:7-10), and it particularly mentions 250 "men of renown," princes, such men as would be summoned if there were a public assembly (Nu 16:2,17,35). These men, apparently, were of different tribes.

The position taken by the malcontents was that "all the congregation are holy, every one of them," and that it was therefore a usurpation for Moses and Aaron to confine the functions of an incense-burning priest to Aaron alone. Logically, their objection lay equally against the separation of Aaron and his sons from the rest of the Levites, and against the separation of the Levites from the rest of the people. On the basis of this, Moses made expostulation with the Levites. He arranged that Korah and the 250, along with Aaron, should take their places at the doorway of the tent of meeting, with their censers and fire and incense, so that Yahweh might indicate His will in the matter. Dathan and Abiram insolently refused his proposals.

The record says that Korah’s "whole congregation," including himself and the 250 with their censers, met Moses and Aaron and "all the congregation" of Israel at the doorway of the tent of meeting. For the purposes of the transaction in hand the tent was now "the mishkan of Korah, Dathan and Abiram," and their followers. Yahweh directed Moses to warn all other persons to leave the vicinity. Dathan and Abiram, however, were not at the mishkan. The account says that Moses, followed by the eiders of Israel, went to them to their tents; that he warned all persons to leave that vicinity also; that Dathan and Abiram and the households stood near the tents; that the earth opened and swallowed them and their property and all the adherents of Korah who were on the spot; that fire from Yahweh devoured the 250 who offered incense. The narrative does not say whether the deaths by fire and by the opening of the earth were simultaneous. It does not say whether Korah’s sons participated in the rebellion, or what became of Korah himself. In the allusion in Nu 26 we are told, apparently, that Korah was swallowed up, and that "the sons of Korah died not." The deaths of the principal offenders, by fire and by being

swallowed up, were followed by plague in which 14,700 perished (Nu 16:49 (Hebrew 17:14)).

2. Critical Treatments of This Story:

Any appreciative reader sees at once that we have here either a history of certain miraculous facts, or a wonder-story devised for teaching religious lessons. As a story it is artistically admirable—sufficiently complicated to be interesting, but clear and graphic and to the point. In the Hebrew there are 2 or 3 instances of incomplete grammatical construction, such as abound in the early literary products of any language, when these have been fortunate enough to escape editorial polishing. In such a case it is possibly not unwise just to take a story as it stands. Nothing will be added to either its religious or its literary value by subjecting it to doubtful alleged critical processes.

If, however, one has committed himself to certain critical traditions concerning the Hexateuch, that brings him under obligation to lead this story into conformity with the rest of his theory. Attempts of this kind have been numerous. Some hold that the Korah of this narrative is the Edomite Korah, and that Peleth means Philistine, and that our story originally grew out of some claim made by Edomites and Philistines. It is held that the story of Korah was originally one story, and that of Dathan and Abiram another, and that someone manipulated the two and put them together. See the treatments of the Book of Numbers in Driver, Introduction; Addis, Documents of the Hexateuch; Carpenter and Battersby, Hexateuch; Bacon, Exodus; Paterson on Numbers, in the Polychrome Bible. These and other like works give source-analyses of our story. Some of the points they make are plausible. In such a case no one claims any adequate basis of fact for his work; each theory is simply a congeries of ingenious guesses, and no two of the guessers guess alike.

As in many other Biblical instances, one of the results of the alleged critical study is the resolving of a particularly fine story into two or more supposed earlier stories each of which is absolutely bald and crude and uninteresting, the earlier stories and the combining of these into their present form being alike regarded as processes of legendary accretion. The necessary inference is that the fine story we now have was not the product of some gifted mind, guided by facts and by literary and religious inspiration, but is an accidental result of mere patchwork. Such a theory does not commend itself to persons of literary appreciation.

Willis J. Beecher

KORAHITES; SONS OF KORAH

ko’-ra-its (qorchi), (beno qorach; in the King James Version appears also as Korhite, Kohathite, Kore): This phrase is used to denote Assir and Elkanah and Abiasaph, Korah’s 3 individual sons (Ex 6:24; compare Nu 26:11). But its more frequent use, and that to which interest attaches, is in the titles of some of the Psalms.

The genealogical details concerning Korahites are rather full. In 3 places we find the list of the 7

successive generations closing with the prophet Samuel and his son Joe (1Ch 6:31-38,22-30; 1Sa 1:1,20; 8:2); the two in Ch mention most of the generations between Korahites and Joel. The fragmentary lists in 1Ch 9:25; 26 connect the list with the 4 generations following Joe (1Ch 6:33; 9:19-31; 26:1), and with 2 generations in the very latest Bible times (1Ch 9:31).

The adjective "Korhite" appears also in the King James Version as "Korathite," Kore," and "Korahite," the last being the form preferred in the English Revised Version. It is used 4 times in the singular. Once it designates an individual (1Ch 9:31); 3 times it denotes the successors of Korahites taken collectively (Ex 6:24; Nu 26:58; 1Ch 26:19); 4 times it is used in the plural, denoting the members of this succession of men (1Ch 9:19; 12:6; 26:1; 2Ch 20:19). As variants of this use, "the sons of the Korahites" appears once, and "the children of the Korahites" once (1Ch 26:19; 2Ch 20:19).

In these various passages the Korahites families are counted like the other Levitical families. In 1Ch 12:6 we have an account of 5 men who are designated as "the Korahites," who joined David when he was at Ziklag—Elkanah, Isshiah, Azarel, Joezer, Jashobeam. They are described as expert warriors, especially with the bow and sling, and as being "of Saul’s brethren of Benjamin." Some of them may plausibly be identified with men of the same name mentioned elsewhere. These Korahites may have been cousins of the Samuel family, and they may have resided not very far apart.

The record speaks with some emphasis of a line of Korahites doorkeepers.

In the latest Old Testament times one Mattithiah, "the first-born of Shallum the Korahite," held "the office of trust over the things that were baked in pans" (1Ch 9:31). Shallum was "the son of Kore, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah." In this expression 15 or more generations are omitted between Ebiasaph and Kore, and perhaps as many between Kore and Shallum. The record proceeds to supply some of the omitted names between Kore and Shallum. The representative of the line in David’s time was "Zechariah the son of Meshelemiah" (1Ch 9:21). In all periods the Korahites were "keepers of the thresholds of the tent." Back in the time of "Phinehas the son of Eleazar," "their fathers had been over the camp of Yahweh" (1Ch 9:19,20). Zechariah was, in his time, "porter of the door of the tent of meeting" (1Ch 9:21), and Shallum was still the chief of the porters (1Ch 9:17). The record for David’s time supports and supplements this. It says that the doorkeepers, according to the arrangements made by David, included a Korahites contingent, its leading men being Meshelemiah and his son Zechariah (1Ch 26:1,2,9,14), and that Meshelemiah was "the son of Kore, of the sons of Asaph." Adopting the common conjecture that Asaph is here a variant for Ebiasaph, we have here the same abridgment of the genealogical list as in 1Ch 9.

More interesting, however, than the fighting Korahites who claimed succession from Moses to Nehemiah, are the."sons of Korah" who were somehow connected with the service of song. One of the genealogies is introduced by the statement: "These are they whom David set over the service of song in the house of Yahweh, after that the ark had rest. And they ministered with song before the tabernacle of the tent of meeting, until Solomon had built the house of Yahweh in Jerus" (1Ch 6:31,32). Then the writer proceeds to mention first "Heman the singer, the son of Joel, the son of Samuel," and so on,

carrying the genealogy back to Korah and Levi. After thus mentioning Heman, he speaks of "his brother Asaph, who stood on his right hand," and traces Asaph's descent back to Gershom the son of Levi; and then says, "and on the left hand their brethren the sons of Merari." Of these the principal leader is Ethan (otherwise called Jeduthun), and his descent is here traced back to Levi.

In this way we are introduced to David's 3 great leaders in choral and orchestral music. Among them Heman the Korahite has at first the place of primacy, though Asaph, later, comes to the front. The events just referred to are mentioned again, more in detail, in the account of David's bringing the ark to Jerusalem. There it is said that at the suggestion of David "the Levites appointed Heman the son of Joel," and also Asaph and Ethan, "and with them" several others, "their brethren of the second degree" (1Ch 15:17,18). The record proceeds to speak of the services of "the singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan," and their associates, in the pageantry of the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem. After that, it says, Asaph had charge of the services of thanksgiving and praise before the ark in Jerusalem, while Heman and Jeduthun served in the high place at Gibeon (1Ch 16:4 ff, 37,39-42). Later, the record says (1Ch 25), David made an elaborate organization, under Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun, for prophesying with song and instrumental music.

As the records of David's time, according to the Chronicler, thus attribute to him great achievements in sacred music and song, so the records of subsequent times reiterate the same thing. David's interest in sacred music is mentioned in connection with Solomon's temple, in connection with the times of Joash and Hezekiah and Josiah, in connection with the institutions and exploits of the times after the exile (e.g. 2Ch 7:6; 23:18; 29:25 ff; 35:15; Ezr 3:10; Ne 12:24,36,45,46). Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun led the magnificent choir and orchestra at the dedication of the temple (2Ch 5:12). One of the sons of Asaph prophesied, and the sons of the Korahites sang at the crisis in the time of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:14,19). The sons of Asaph and the sons of Heman and the sons of Jeduthun were present, and there was instrumental music and loud singing, according to the appointment of David and his associates, at the time of Hezekiah's Passover (2Ch 29:13). Singing, and Asaph and Heman and Jeduthun and David have an important place in the record concerning Josiah. And the records of the post-exilian times make the singers and the "sons of Asaph" and the arrangements of David as conspicuous as the law of Moses itself.

Add to this that the names Asaph or Heman or Ethan or Jeduthun, or the designation "the sons of Korah" are attached to 25 or more of the Psalms (e.g. Psalms 42-49; 50; 62; 72-85), and we have a body of testimony that is at least abundant and intelligible. It is to the effect that there was elaborate organization, on a large scale, in connection with the musical services of the temple at Jerusalem; that this began in the time of David, as a part of the preparation for building the temple, under the influence of the family traditions of the prophet Samuel; and that the movement continued in the generations following David, either surviving the exile, or being revived after the exile. In connection with this movement, the phrases "sons of Korah," "sons of Asaph," "sons of Heman," "sons of Jeduthun" denote, in some cases, merely lineal escent; but in other cases they denote each an aggregate of persons interested in sacred song and music—a guild or society or succession or group—arising out of the movement which originated in David's time. See, for example, "sons of Asaph" (1Ch 25:1,2; 2Ch 20:14; compare 2Ch 20:19; 29:13; 35:15; Ezr 2:41; 3:10; Ne 7:44; 11:22) and "sons of Korah" in the titles of

Psalms 42-49 and 84; 85; 87-89. Traces of these aggregates appear in the times of Solomon, of Jehoshaphat, of Joash, of Hezekiah, of Josiah, of Zerubbabel, of Ezra and Nehemiah.

If a person holds that the mention of an event in Chronicles is to be regarded as proof that the event never occurred, that person will of course deny that the testimony thus cited is true to fact. He is likely to hold that the guilds of singers arose in the exile, and that, some generations after Nehemiah, they fabricated for themselves the ecclesiastical and physical pedigrees now found in the Books of Chronicles. If, however, we accord fair play to the Chronicler as a witness, we shall be slow to discredit the minute and interfitting testimony which he has placed before us.

Willis J. Beecher

KORATHITES

ko’-rath-its: In the King James Version for "Korabites," Nu 26:58.

See KORAH, 4.

KORE

ko-’re (qore, "one who proclaims"):

(1) A Levite of David’s time, descended from Kohath and Korah. See KORAH, 4. Shallum, Chief doorkeeper in the latest Bible times, is described as "the son of Kore, the son of Ebiasaph, the son of Korah" (1Ch 9:19). This expression omits the generations between Shallum and Kore, and those between Kore and Ebidsaph, perhaps 15 generations or more in each case. The context supplies two of the omitted names, of the time of David, Meshelemiah and his son Zechariah (1Ch 9:21,22). The record for the time of David mentions these two, with some particulars, calling Meshelemiah the son of Kore (1Ch 26:1,2,9,14). It describes them as "Korahites" "of the sons of Asaph." It is usual to regard this last clause as a variant for "the son of Ebiasaph," thus making the description identical with that in 1Ch 9:19. With this understanding, the text claims that "the Korahites," Kore and Meshelemiah and Zechariah, come midway in a line of sanctuary ministrants, extending continuously from Moses to Nehemiah.

(2) "The son of Imnah the Levite, the porter at the east gate," who "was over the freewill-offerings," in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:14). Very likely in the same line with (1) above.

(3) In 1Ch 26:1 the King James Version for KORAHITES (which see).

Willis J. Beecher

KORHITES

kor’-hits: In the King James Version for "Korahites" in Ex 6:24; 1Ch 12:6; 26:1; 2Ch 20:19.

See KORAH, 3.

KOZ

koz.

See HAKKOZ.

KUSHAIAH

ku-sha’-ya, ku-shi’-a (qushayahu, "bow of Yah"): A Merarite Levite (1Ch 15:17), called in 1Ch 6:44 KISHI (which see).

LAADAH

la’-a-da (la‘dah): A descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:21).

LAADAN

la,’-a-dan.

See LADAN.

LABAN

la’-ban: The person named Laban, labhan; (Laban, possibly connected with the root meaning "to be white," from which in Hebrew the adjective meaning "white" has just this form) is first introduced to the reader of Genesis in the story of the wooing of Rebekah (Genesis 24). He belonged to that branch of the family of Terah that was derived from Abraham’s brother Nahor and his niece Milcah. The genealogy of this branch is traced in Ge 22:20-24; but, true to its purpose and the place it occupies in the book, this genealogy brings the family down to Rebekah, and there stops without mentioning Laban. Accordingly, when Rebekah is introduced in the narrative of Genesis 24, she is referred to (24:15,24) in a way that recalls to the reader the genealogy already given; but when her brother Laban is introduced (24:29), he is related to his sister by the express announcement, "And Rebekah had brother, and his name was Laban." In this chapter he takes prominent part in the reception of Abraham’s servant, and in the determination of his sister’s future. That brothers had an effective voice in the marriage of their sisters is evident, not only from extra-Biblical sources, but from the Bible itself; see e.g. So 8:8. In Ge 24, however, Laban is perhaps more prominent than even such custom can explain (compare 24:31,50,55), and we are led to see in him already the same forcefulness and egotism that are abundantly shown in the stories from his later life. The man’s eager hospitality (verse 31), coming immediately after his mental inventory of the gifts bestowed by the visitor upon his sister (24:30), has usually, and justly, been regarded as a proof of the same greed that is his most conspicuous characteristic in the subsequent chapters.

The story of that later period in Laban’s life is so interwoven with the career of Jacob that little need here be added to what is said of Laban in JACOB, III, 2 (which see). By the time of Jacob’s arrival he is already a very old man, for over 90 years had elapsed since Rebekah’s departure. Yet even at the end of Jacob’s 20 years’ residence with him he is represented as still energetic and active (Ge 31:19,23), not only ready for an emergency like the pursuit after Jacob, but personally superintending the management of his huge flocks.

His home is in Haran, "the city of Nahor," that is, the locality where Nahor and his family remained at

the time when the rest of Terah's descendants emigrated to Canaan (Ge 11:31; 12:5). Since Haran, and the region about it where his flocks fed, belonged to the district called Aram (see PADDAN-ARAM; MESOPOTAMIA), Laban is often called "the Aramean" (English Versions of the Bible, "the Syrian," from Septuagint 5 ho Suros); see Ge 25:20; 28:5; 31:20,24. It is uncertain how far racial affinity may be read into this term, because the origin and mutual relationships of the various groups or strata of the Sere family are not yet clear. For Laban himself it suffices that he was a Semite, living within the region early occupied by those who spoke the Sere dialect that we call Aramaic. This dialect is represented in the narrative of Genesis as already differentiated from the dialect of Canaan that was Jacob's mother-tongue; for "the heap of witness," erected by uncle and nephew before they part (Ge 31:47), is called by the one Jegar-saha-dutha and by the other Galeed—phrases which are equivalent in meaning, the former Aramaic, the latter Hebrew. (Ungnad, Hebrdische Grammatik, 1912, section 6 puts the date of the differentiation of Aramaic from "Amurritish" at "about 1500 BC"; Skinner, "Genesis," ICC, argues that Ge 31:47 is a gloss, following Wellhausen, Dillmann, et al.)

The character of Laban is interesting to observe. On the one hand it shows a family likeness to the portraits of all his relations in the patriarchal group, preeminently, however, to his sister Rebekah, his daughter Rachel, and his nephew Jacob. The nearer related to Laban such figures are, the more conspicuously, as is fitting, do they exhibit Laban's mingled cunning, resourcefulness, greed and self-complacency. And, on the other hand, Laban's character is sui generis; the picture we get of him is too personal and complex to be denominated merely a "type." It is impossible to resolve this man Laban into a mythological personage—he is altogether human—or into a tribal representative (e.g. of "Syria" over against "Israel" equal Jacob) with any degree of satisfaction to the world of scholarship. Whether a character of reliable family tradition, or of popular story-telling, Laban is "a character"; and his intimate connection with the chief personage in Israel's national recollections makes it highly probable that he is no more and no less historical than Jacob himself (compare JACOB, VI).

J. Oscar Boyd

LABANA

lab'-a-na (Labana, 1 Esdras 5:29): Called Lebanah in Ezr 2:45.

LABOR

la'-ber (yeghia', 'amal; kopos): The word (noun and verb) denoting hard work or "toil" (thus in the Revised Version (British and American) of De 26:7; Jos 7:3; Re 2:2) represents several Hebrew and Greek words, chiefly those above. Occasionally, as in Hab 3:17 (ma'aseh), it stands for "fruit of labor." Sometimes, in conjunction with "travail," it refers to childbirth (Ge 35:16,17, yaladh; compare 1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8). Examples of the word in the ordinary sense are: of yeghia', Ge 31:42; Job 39:11,16; Ps 128:2; of 'amal, common in Ec 1:3,8; 2:10,11,18, etc.; of kopos, 1Co 15:58 ("your labor is not vain," etc.); 1Th 1:3 ("work of faith and labor of love"; compare Heb 6:10); 1Ti 5:17 ("labor in the word and in teaching").

See WORK; SLAVERY.

James Orr

LACCUNUS

lak’-u-nus (Lakkounos; the King James Version Lacunus): One of the sons of Addi who returned with Ezra and had married a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:31). The name does not, as might have been expected, occur in Ezr 10:30. See note on the passage (in Lange’s Commentary) as to the reconciliation of the lists in 1 Esdras and Ezra.

LACE

las (pathil, variously rendered in Ge 38:18,25; Ex 39:3; Nu 15:38; 19:15; Jud 16:9; Eze 40:3): In modern English the noun "lace" usually denotes a delicate ornamental fabric, but in the word in the sense of "that which binds" is still in perfectly good use, especially in such combinations as "shoelace" etc. It is this latter significance that is found in Ex 28:28 ("They shall bind .... with a lace of blue"); 28:37; 39:21,31, and in Sirach 6:30 the King James Version, klosma (the Revised Version (British and American) "riband").

LACEDAEMONIANS

las-e-de-mo’-ni-anz (Spartidtai; once only Lakedaimonioi, 2 Macc 5:9): The inhabitants of Sparta or Lacedaemon with whom the Jews claimed some kinship and formed alliances (1 Macc 12:2,5,6,20,21; 14:20,23; 15:23; 2 Macc 5:9). The alliance mentioned in 1 Macc 12:5-23 is based, among other grounds, on that of a common descent of Jews and Lacedaemonians from Abraham, for which the only probable presumption—suggested by Ewald—is the similarity of names, "Pelasgi" and Peleg son of Eber (Ge 10:25; 11:16). This has been reasonably objected to, and perhaps the most that can be said on this point is that the belief in some relationship between the Jews and the Lacedaemonians seems to have prevailed when 1 Macc was written. The alliance itself is said to have been formed (1 Macc 12:20) between Areus, king of the Lacedaemonians and Onias the high priest; but it is not easy to make out a consistent chronology for the transaction. For the renewal of the alliance (circa 144 BC) by Jonathan (1 Macc 12:5-18) and again by Simon (1 Macc 14:16-23), something can be said, as the Greeks had finally been deprived of independence in 146 BC, and Sparta was only obliged to lend assistance to Rome and may be supposed to have been doing so in helping the Jews against Syria. It is possible, too, that as against Syrian Hellenism the Jews were anxious to show that they had the assistance of distinguished Greeks, though the actual power of Sparta was much reduced from that of former times. The facts, at least of the alliance and the correspondence, seem to be sufficiently attested, though it is not easy to reconcile all the particulars. Josephus (Ant., XII, iv, 10; XIII, v, 8; XIV, xii, 2,3) gives the correspondence at greater length than the writer of the Maccabees.

J. Hutchison

LACHISH

la’-kish (lakhish; Septuagint Lachis (Jos 15:39), Maches):

1. Location:

A town in the foothills of the Shephelah on the border of the Philistine plain, belonging to Judah, and, from the mention of Eglon in connection with it, evidently in the southwestern portion of Judah’s territory. Eusebius, Onomasticon locates it 7 miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin) toward Daroma, but as the latter place is uncertain, the indication does not help in fixing the site of Lachish. The city seems to have been abandoned about 400 BC, and this circumstance has rendered the identification of the site difficult. It was formerly fixed at Umm Lakis, from the similarity of the name and because it was in the region that the Biblical references to Lachish seem to indicate, but the mound called Tell el-Hesy is now generally accepted as the site. This was first suggested by Conder in 1877 (PEFS, 1878, 20), and the excavations carried on at the Tell by the Palestine Exploration Fund in 1890-93 confirmed his identification. Tell el-Hesy is situated on a wady, or valley, of the same name (Wady el Hesy), which runs from a point about 6 miles West of Hebron to the sea between Gaza and Askelon. It is a mound on the very edge of the wady, rising some 120 ft. above it and composed of debris to the depth of about 60 ft., in which the excavations revealed the remains of distinct cities which had been built, one upon the ruins of another. The earliest of these was evidently Amorite, and could not have been later than 1700 BC, and was perhaps two or three centuries earlier (Bliss, Mound of Many Cities). The identification rests upon the fact that the site corresponds with the Biblical and other historical notices of Lachish, and especially upon the discovery of a cuneiform tablet in the ruins of the same character as the Tell el-Amarna Letters, and containing the name of Zimridi, who is known from these tablets to have been at one time Egyptian governor of Lachish. The tablets, which date from the latter part of the 15th or early part of the 14th century BC, give us the earliest information in regard to Lachish, and it was then an Egyptian dependency, but it seems to have revolted and joined with other towns in an attack upon Jerusalem, which was also an Egyptian dependency. It was perhaps compelled to do so by the Khabiri who were then raiding this region. The place was, like Gaza, an important one for Egypt, being on the frontier and on the route to Jerusalem, and the importance is seen in the fact that it was taken and destroyed and rebuilt so many times.

2. History:

We first hear of it in the history of Israel when Joshua invaded the land. It was then an Amorite city, and its king, Japhia, joined the confederacy formed by Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem, to resist Joshua. They were defeated in the remarkable battle at Gibeon, and the five confederate kings were captured and put to death at Makkedah (Jos 10$ passim; Jos 12:11). Lachish was included in the lot of Judah (15:39), and it was rebuilt, or fortified, by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:5,9). It was besieged by Sennacherib in the reign of Hezekiah and probably taken (2Ki 18:13) when he invaded Judah and besieged Jerusalem, but the other

references to the siege leave it doubtful (2Ki 18:14,17; 19:8; 2Ch 32:9; Isa 36:2; 37:8). The Assyrian monuments, however, render it certain that the place was captured. The sculptures on the walls of Sennacherib's palace picture the storming of Lachish and the king on his throne receiving the submission of the captives (Ball, Light from the East, 190-91). This was in 701 BC, and to this period we may assign the enigmatical reference to Lachish in Mic 1:13, "Bind the chariot to the swift steed, O inhabitant of Lachish: she was the beginning of sin to the daughter of Zion." The cause of the invasion of Sennacherib was a general revolt in Phoenicia, Palestine, and Philistia, Hezekiah joining in it and all asking Egypt for aid (Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World, chapter ix). Isaiah had warned Judah not to trust in Egypt (Isa 20:5,6; 30:1-5; 31:1), and as Lachish was the place where communication was held with Egypt, being a frontier fortress, perhaps even having an Egyptian garrison, it would be associated with the "sin" of the Egyptian alliance (HGHL, 234).

The city was evidently rebuilt after its destruction by Sennacherib, for we find Nebuchadnezzar fighting against it during his siege of Jerusalem (Jer 34:7). It was doubtless destroyed by him, but we are informed by Nehemiah (11:30) that some of the returned Jews settled there after the captivity. It is very likely that they did not reoccupy the site of the ruined city, but settled as peasants in the territory, and this may account for the transference of the name to Umm Lakis, 3 or 4 miles from Tell el-Hesy, where some ruins exist, but not of a kind to suggest Lachish (Bliss, op. cit). No remains of any importance were found on the Tell indicating its occupation as a fortress or city later than that destroyed by the king of Babylon, but it was occupied in some form during the crusades, Umm Lakis being held for a time by the Hospitallers, and King Richard is said to have made it a base of operations in his war with Saladin (HGHL). The Tell itself, if occupied, was probably only the site of his camp, and it has apparently remained since that time without inhabitants, being used for agricultural purposes only.

See further, PALESTINE EXPLORATION, III, 1.

H. Porter

LACK

(forms of chacer, "to lack," ayin, "nought"): This word in its various forms has the usual meaning of "want," "need," "deficiency." There is but little change in the use of the word in the different versions. Sometimes one of the common synonyms is exchanged for the word itself, e.g. in the Old Testament, 1Sa 21:15 the Revised Version (British and American) has "lack" ("Do I lack madmen?") where the King James Version has "need of"; Pr 5:23, "for lack," instead of "without"; 6:32, "void of" for "lacketh"; 10:21, "lack" for "want"; 31:11, "lack" for "need"; Isa 59:15, "lacking" for "faileth." In the New Testament "lack" is the translation of hustereo, literally, "to be behind," and endees, "in want." In Lu 8:6, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "had no" instead of "lacked" in the King James Version. In 2Co 11:9, the Revised Version gives "my want" for "which was lacking to me" in the King James Version; in Col 1:24 "that which is lacking" for "that which is behind"; Jas 2:15 "lack" for "destitute." It will readily be seen that sometimes the slight variation helps to explain the meaning.

G. H. Gerberding

LACUNUS

la-ku’-nus.

See LACCUNUS.

LAD

In the Old Testament this word occurs as the translation of na‘ar, "young person," "child," "servant," the Revised Version (British and American) properly substituting "servant" in 2Ki 4:19; Jud 16:26 is another passage where either sense of the original word may be intended. The word occurs in the New Testament in Joh 6:9 as the translation of paidarion; in Ac 20:12, pais (the King James Version "young man").

LADAN

la’-dan (la‘dan, the King James Version, Laadan):

(1) A descendant of Ephraim, and an ancestor of Joshua (1Ch 7:26).

(2) A Levite of the family of Gershon (1Ch 23:7,8,9; 26:21), also called LIBNI (which see).

LADANUM

lad’-a-num (loT): Ge 37:25 the Revised Version margin; elsewhere MYRRH (which see).

LADDER

lad’-er.

See SIEGE, 4, (e).

LADDER OF TYRE

(He klimax (apo tes klimakos) Turou): Not mentioned in the Old Testament or the New Testament, but in Apocrypha (1 Macc 11:59), where it is said that Antiochus VI, after having confirmed Jonathan in the high-priesthood, appointed his brother Simon captain over the territory included between the Ladder of Tyre and the borders of Egypt. The Ladder has been located at different points on the coast between

Tyre and Acre, such as the Ras el-‘Abyadh ("Promontorium Album" of the ancient geographers), about 7 miles South of Tyre, and Ras en-Naqurah, about 6 miles farther South, and Ras el-Musheirifeh, a little farther on. These are capes jutting westward into the sea from the ridge which runs parallel to the general line of the coast. These capes project more than a mile into the sea, and present a very bold and precipitous front from 200 to 300 ft. in height. The ascent on either side of the promontory is very steep, and at Ras el-‘Abyadh steps were cut in the white rock, which led to the identification of this point with the Ladder, but a reference to Josephus (B J, II, x, 2) leads to a different conclusion. He locates it 100 stadia North of Acre, which corresponds fairly well with the southern limit of the whole promontory, which is about 12 miles North of Acre, but not at all with Ras el-‘Abyadh. The altitude of el Musheirifeh is greater than that of el-‘Abyadh and may have had steps cut in it similar to the latter. It is more probable that the Ladder of Tyre was here, or at en-Naqurah, but the term applied to the whole promontory, which offered a serious obstacle to the passage of armies, or even caravans, since the approach is precipitous on either side, and at Ras el-‘Abyadh the road skirts the edge of a sheer precipice, where a misstep would hurl one into the sea some 200 ft. below. The application of the term to the whole promontory seems to be indicated by Josephus, since he speaks of it as one of the mountains which encompass the plain of Ptolemais (Acre) and the highest of all. This would not be true of any one of the three capes mentioned, but would be if the hills behind, which form their base, were included. That it was designated as the Ladder of Tyre rather than of Acre was probably due to the fact that the promontory is nearer the former city (see Thomson, LB, II, edition 1882; SWP, name-lists, under the word).

H. Porter

LADE; LADING

lad, lad’-ing: "To lade" in the sense of "to load" is retained by the Revised Version (British and American) in nearly all passages where the word occurs in the King James Version (but compare the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) reading of Ps 68:19; Isa 46:1), "They laded us with such things" (Ac 28:10 the King James Version). The epithithemi, "to put on," is rendered by the Revised Version (British and American), "They put on board such things." Lu 11:46 the Revised Version (British and American) reads "ye load" instead of the King James Version "ye lade."

Lading (phortion) is found in Ac 27:10 in its usual meaning, "the lading of a ship."

LADY

la’-di: This word should be taken in the sense of "mistress" in Isa 47:5,7 (Hebrew gebhereth) (so the American Standard Revised Version). In Jud 5:29; Eat 1:18 it is the translation of another Hebrew word (sarah), best rendered "princess" (so the Revised Version (British and American) in Esther, but not in Judges). In 2 Joh 1:1,5 it is the translation of kuria, which some interpreters regard as a proper name.

See CYRIA; JOHN, THE EPISTLES OF; ELECT LADY.

LAEL

la’-el (la’el, "belonging to God"): Father of Eliasaph, the prince of the father’s house of the Gershonites (Nu 3:24).

LAHAD

la’-had (lahaah): A descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:2).

LAHAI-ROI

la-hi’-roi, la-hi-ro’-i, la’hi-roi (lachay ro’i).

See BEER-LAHAI-ROI.

LAHMAM

la’-mam (lachmam): A town in the Judean Shephelah (Jos 15:40, the Revised Version margin "Lahmas") possibly the modern el-Lachm, 2 1/2 miles South of Beit Jibrin.

LAHMAS

la’-mas.

See LAHMAM.

LAHMI

la’-mi (lachmi): According to 1Ch 20:5, the brother of Goliath of Gath.

See ELHANAN.

LAISH

la’-ish (layish):

(1) A city in the upper Jordan valley, apparently colonized by the Sidonians, which was captured by the Danires and called DAN (which see) (Jud 18:7, etc.; Isa 10:30 the King James Version). In Jos 19:47 the name appears as "Leshem."

(2) A Benjamite, father of Palti or Paltiel, to whom Michal, David's wife, was given by Saul (1Sa 25:44; 2Sa 3:15).

LAISHAH

la-i'-sha, la'-ish-a (layshah, the King James Version, Laish): A place named in Isa 10:30 with Gallim and Anathoth. It should apparently be sought on the North of Jerusalem. Some would identify Gallim with Beit Jala, near Bethlehem. Conder suggests 'Isawiyeh on the eastern slope, to the North-Northeast of the Mount of Olives.

LAKE

lak (limne): The word is used (Lu 5:1,2; 8:22,23,33) of the Lake of Gennesaret or Sea of Galilee, and (Re 19:20; 20:10,14,15; 21:8) of the "lake of fire and brimstone." Lakes are not abundant in Syria and Palestine. The Dead Sea, which might be called a lake, is in most places in English Versions of the Bible called the Salt Sea. It is called by the Arabs Bachr Lut, Sea of Lot. It is a question whether the Waters of Merom (Jos 11:5,7) can be identified with the Chuleh, a marshy lake in the course of the Upper Jordan, North of the Sea of Galilee. East of Damascus on the edge of the desert there are saltish lakes in which the water of the rivers of Damascus (see 2Ki 5:12) is gathered and evaporates. In the Lebanon West of Ba'albek is the small Lake Yammuneh, which is fed by copious springs, but whose water disappears in the latter part of the summer, being drained off by subterranean channels. The Lake of Kums on the Orontes is artificial, though ancient. On the lower Orontes is the Lake of Antioch.

Alfred Ely Day

LAKE OF FIRE

(limne tou puros): Found in Re 19:20; 20:10,14(bis), 15. Re 21:8 has "the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone." The brimstone in connection with "the lake of fire" occurs also in Re 19:20 and 10, the latter being a backward reference to the former passage. In Re 20:14 the words, "This is the second death, even the lake of fire" are either a gloss originally intended to elucidate 20:15 through a reference to 20:6, or, if part of the text, formed originally the close of 20:15, whence they became displaced on account of the identity of the words once immediately preceding them in 20:15 with the words now preceding them in 20:14. The "lake of fire" can be called "the second death" only with reference to the lost among men (20:15), not with reference to death and Hades (20:14). In all the above references "the lake of fire" appears as a place of punishment, of perpetual torment, not of annihilation (20:10). The beast (19:20); the pseudo-prophet (19:20; 20:10); the devil (20:10); the wicked of varying description (20:15; 21:8), are cast into it. When the same is affirmed of death and Hades (20:14), it is doubtful whether this is meant as a mere figure for the cessation of these two evils personified, or has a more realistic background in the existence of two demon-powers so named (compare Isa 25:8; 1Co 15:26,54 ff; 2 Esdras 7:31). The Scriptural source for the conception of "the lake of fire" lies in Ge 19:24, where

already the fire and the brimstone occur together, while the locality of the catastrophe described is the neighborhood of the Dead Sea. The association of the Dead Sea with this fearful judgment of God, together with the desolate appearance of the place, rendered it a striking figure for the scene of eschatological retribution. The two other Old Testament passages which have "fire and brimstone" (Ps 11:6; Eze 38:22) are dependent on the Ge passage, with which they have the figure of "raining" in common. In Re 21:8, "their part" seems to allude to Ps 11:6, "the portion of their cup." In Enoch 67:4 ff the Dead Sea appears as the place of punishment for evil spirits. Of late it has been proposed to derive "the lake of fire" from "the stream of fire" which destroys the enemies of Ahura in the Zoroastrian eschatology; so Bousset, Die Offenbarung Johannis, 1906, 433, 434. But the figures of a stream and a lake are different; compare 2 Esdras 13:9-11, where a stream of fire proceeds from the mouth of the Messiah for the destruction of His enemies. Besides, the Persian fire is, in part, a fire of purification, and not of destruction only (Bousset, 442), and even in the apocalyptic Book of Enoch, the fires of purification and of punishment are not confounded (compare Enoch 67:4 with 90:20). The Old Testament fully explains the entire conception.

Geerhardus Vos

LAKE OF GENNESARET

ge-nes’-a-ret.

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

LAKKUM

lak’-um (laqqum; the King James Version, Lakum): An unidentified town on the border of Naphtali, named with Adami, Nekeb and Jabneel, apparently nearer the Jordan (Jos 19:33).

LAMA

See ELI, ELI, LAMA, SABACHTHANI.

LAMB

lam:

(1) The most used word is kebhes, "a young ram"; compare Arabic kebsh, "ram"; often of sacrifices; (feminine) kabhsah, or kibchsah, "ewe lamb" (2Sa 12:3); by transposition kesebh, and feminine kisbah (Ge 30:40; Le 3:7; 5:6).

(2) kar, "lamb" (De 32:14; 1Sa 15:9; 2Ki 3:4).

(3) seh, "one" of the flock (Ge 22:7; Le 5:7).

(4) tso’n, "sheep," "goats," "flock"; compare Arabic da’n, "sheep" (Ex 12:21); and ben tso’n (Ps 114:4).

(5) Taleh, "young lamb"; compare Arabic Tali, "young lamb"; and Tela’im (1Sa 7:9; Isa 40:11; 65:25).

(6) ‘immerin (Ezr 6:9,17; 7:17).

(7) arnas, accusative plural (Lu 10:3); diminutive arnion (Joh 21:15; Re 5:6, etc.).

(8) amnos (Joh 1:29,36; Ac 8:32; 1Pe 1:19).

See SHEEP.

Alfred Ely Day

LAMB OF GOD

(ho amnos tou theou): This is a title specially bestowed upon our Lord by John the Baptist (Joh 1:29-36), "Behold, the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" In Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs an apocryphal book, probably of the 2nd century—we have the term used for the Messiah, "Honor Judah and Levi, for from them shall arise for you the Lamb of God, saving all nations by grace." But the term does not seem to have been of any general use until it received its distinctly Christian significance. It has been generally understood as referring to the prophetic language of Jer 11:19, and Isa 53:7.

1. Sacrificial Sense of the Term:

It is far more probable, however, that the true source of the expression is to be found in the important place which the "lamb" occupies in the sacrifices, especially of the Priestly Code. In these there was the lamb of the daily morning and evening sacrifice. How familiar this would be to the Baptist, being a member of a priestly family! On the Sabbath the number of the offerings was doubled, and at some of the great festivals a still larger number were laid upon the altar (see Ex 29:38; Nu 28:3,9,13). The lamb of the Passover would also occupy a large place in the mind of a devout Israelite, and, as the Passover was not far off, it is quite possible that John may have referred to this as well as to other suggested ideas connected with the lamb. The sacrificial significance of the term seems to be far more probable than the mere comparison of the character of our Lord with meekness and gentleness, as suggested by the words of the prophets, although these contain much more than the mere reference to character (see below). That this became the clearly defined conception of apostolic teaching is clear from passages in Paul and Peter (1Co 5:7; 1Pe 1:18 f). In the Book of Revelation the reference to the Lamb occurs 27 times. The word here used differs from that in John. The amnos of the Gospel has become the arnion of the Apocalypse, a diminutive form suggestive of affection. This is the word used by our Lord in His rebuke

and forgiveness of Peter (Joh 21:15), and is peculiarly touched therefore with an added meaning of pathetic tenderness. Westcott, in his Commentary on Joh 1:29, refers to the conjecture that there may have been flocks of lambs passing by on their way to Jerusalem to be used at the feast. This is possible, but fanciful. As applied to Christ, the term certainly suggests the meekness and gentleness of our Lord's nature and work, but could not have been used by John without containing some reference to the place which the lamb bore in the Judaic ritualism.

2. As Variously Understood:

The significance of the Baptist's words has been variously understood. Origen, Cyril, Chrysostom, among the ancients, Lucke, DeWette, Meyer, Ewald, Alford, among the moderns, refer it to Isa 53:7; Grotius, Bengel, Hengstenberg, to the paschal lamb; Baumgarten-Crusius, etc., to the sin offering; Lange strongly urges the influence of the passage in Isa 53, and refers to John's description of his own mission under the influence of the second part of Isaiah, in which he is supported by Schaff. The importance of the Isaiah-thought is found in Mt 8:17; Ac 8:32; 1Pe 2:22-25.

3. As Set Forth by Isaiah:

It is to be observed that the Septuagint in Isa 53:7 translates the Hebrew word for sheep (seh), by the Greek word for lamb. In 53:10, the prophet's "suffering one" is said to have made "his soul an offering for Isaiah sin," and in 53:4 "he hath borne our griefs," where bearing involves the conception of sin offering, and as possessing justifying power, the idea of "'taking away." John indeed uses not the Septuagint word (pherein), but (airein), and some have maintained that this simply means "put away" or "support," or "endure." But this surely loses the suggestion of the associated term "lamb," which John could not have employed without some reference to its sacrificial and therefore expiatory force. What Lange calls a "germ perception" of atonement must certainly have been in the Baptist's mind, especially when we recall the Isaiah-passages, even though there may not have been any complete dogmatic conception of the full relation of the death of Christ to the salvation of a world. Even the idea of the bearing of the curse of sin may not be excluded, for it was impossible for an Israelite like John, and especially with his surroundings, to have forgotten the significance of the paschal lamb, both in its memorial of the judgment of Egypt, as well as of the deliverance of Israel. Notwithstanding every effort to take out of this striking phrase its deeper meanings, which involve most probably the combination of all the sources above described, it must ever remain one of the richest mines of evangelical thought. It occupies, in the doctrine of atonement, a position analogous to that brief word of the Lord, "God is a Spirit" (Joh 4:24), in relation to the doctrine of God.

The Lamb is defined as "of God," that is, of Divine providing. See Isa 53; Re 5:6; 13:8. Its emphatic and appointed office is indicated by the definite article, and whether we refer the conception to a specific sacrifice or to the general place of a lamb in the sacrificial institution, they all, as being appointed by and specially set apart for God, suggest the close relation of our Lord to the Divine Being, and particularly to His expiatory sacrifice.

L. D. Bevan

LAME

lam (piceach, nakheh; cholos):

(1) The condition of being unable or imperfectly able to walk, which unfitted any descendant of Aaron so afflicted for service in the priesthood (Le 21:18), and rendered an animal unsuitable for sacrifice (De 15:21). The offering of animals so blemished was one of the sins with which Malachi charges the negligent Jews of his time (Mal 1:8-13).

(2) Those who suffered from lameness, such as Mephibosheth, whose limbs were injured by a fall in childhood (2Sa 4:4; 9:3). In the prophetic description of the completeness of the victory of the returning Israelites, it is predicted that the lame shall be made whole and shall leap like a hart (Jer 3:18; Isa 35:6). The unfitness of the lame for warfare gives point to the promise that the lame shall take the prey (Isa 33:23). Job in his graphic description of his helpfulness to the weak before his calamity says, "And feet was I to the lame" (Job 29:15). The inequality of the legs of the lame is used in Pr 26:7 as a similitude of the ineptness with which a fool uses a parable.

In the enigmatical and probably corrupt passage describing David’s capture of Jerusalem, the lame and blind are mentioned twice. In 2Sa 5:6 it was a taunt on the part of the Jebusites that even a garrison of cripples would suffice to keep out the Israelites. The allusion in 5:8 may be read, "Whosoever smiteth the Jebusites let him .... slay both the lame and blind, which hate David’s soul" as it is in Septuagint. The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) says, "David had offered a reward on that day to the man who should smite the Jebusite and reach the water pipes of the houses, and remove the blind and lame who hated David’s soul." It is possible, however, that Budde’s emendation is more correct and that it is a threat against the indiscriminate slaughter of the Jebusites: "Whoso slayeth a Jebusite shall bring his neck into peril; the lame and blind are not hated of David’s soul." The proverbial saying quoted in 5:8 cannot be correct as rendered in the King James Version, for we read in Mt 21:14 that the lame came to our Lord in the temple and were healed.

The healing of the lame by our Lord is recorded in Mt 11:5; 15:30,31; 21:14; Lu 7:22; 14:13. For the apostolic miracles of healing the lame, see CRIPPLE. In Heb 12:13 the Christians are counseled to courage under chastisement, lest their despair should cause that which is lame to be "turned out of the way."

Alexander Macalister

LAMECH

la’-mek (lemekh; Lamech, "a strong youth"?):

(1) The name is first mentioned in Ge 4:18-24. Here Lamech, the son of Methushael, is named as the last of the descendants of Cain. He was the father of Jabel, Jubal, Tubal-cain, and Naamah. As the husband of two wives, namely, Adah and Zillah, he furnishes the first recorded instance of polygamy. It is very instructive to note that this "father of polygamy" at once becomes the first blustering tyrant and a braggadocio; we are fully permitted to draw this conclusion from his so-called "swordlay" (Ge 4:23 f). He does not put his trust in God, but in the weapons and implements invented by his sons, or rather these instruments, enhancing the physical and material powers of man, are his God. He glories in them and misconstrues the Divine kindness which insured to Cain freedom from the revenge of his fellow-men.

(2) Another Lamech. is mentioned in Ge 5:25,28 (compare 1Ch 1:3; Lu 3:36), the son of Methuselah and the father of Noah. His words (Ge 5:29) show the great difference between this descendant of Seth and the descendant of Cain. While the one is stimulated to a song of defiance by the worldly inventions of his sons, the other, in prophetical mood, expresses his sure belief in the coming of better times, and calmly and prayerfully awaits the period of comfort and rest which he expected to be ushered in by his son Noah.

William Baur

LAMEDH

la’-meth: The 12th letter of Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "1". It came also to be used for the number 30. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

LAMENT

la-ment’.

See MUSIC.

LAMENTATION

lam-en-ta’-shun.

See BURIAL, III, 2; IV, 4, 5, 6.

LAMENTATIONS, BOOK OF

lam-en-ta’-shunz, —The Lamentations of Jeremiah:

1. Name:

This is a collective name which tradition has given to 5 elegies found in the Hebrew Canon that lament the fate of destroyed Jerusalem. The rabbis call this little book ‘Ekhah ("how"), according to the word of lament with which it begins, or qinoth. On the basis of the latter term the Septuagint calls it threnoi, or Latin Threni, or "Lamentations."

2. Form:

The little book consists of 5 lamentations, each one forming the contents of a chapter. The first 4 are marked by the acrostic use of the alphabet. In addition, the qinah ("elegy") meter is found in these hymns, in which a longer line (3 or 4 accents) is followed by a shorter (2 or 3 accents). In La 1 and 2 the acrostic letters begin three such double lines; in La 4, however, two double lines. In La 3 a letter controls three pairs, but is repeated at the beginning of each line. In La 5 the alphabet is wanting; but in this case too the number of pairs of lines agrees with the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet, i.e. 22. In La 2; 3 and 4, the letter ‘ayin (‘) follows pe (p), as is the case in Ps 34. Lamentations 1, however, follows the usual order.

3. Contents:

These 5 hymns all refer to the great national catastrophe that overtook the Jews and in particular the capital city, Jerusalem, through the Chaldeans, 587-586 BC. The sufferings and the anxieties of the city, the destruction of the sanctuary, the cruelty and taunts of the enemies of Israel, especially the Edomites, the disgrace that befell the king and his nobles, priests and prophets, and that, too, not without their own guilt, the devastation and ruin of the country—all this is described, and appeal is made to the mercy of God. A careful sequence of thought cannot be expected in the lyrical feeling and in the alphabetical form. Repetitions are found in large numbers, but each one of these hymns emphasizes some special feature of the calamity. Lamentations 3 is unique, as in it one person describes his own peculiar sufferings in connection with the general calamity, and then too in the name of the others begins a psalm of repentance. This person did not suffer so severely because he was an exceptional sinner, but because of the unrighteousness of his people. These hymns were not written during the siege, but later, at a time when the people still vividly remembered the sufferings and the anxieties of that time and when the impression made on them by the fall of Jerusalem was still as powerful as ever.

4. Author:

Who is the author of these hymns? Jewish tradition is unanimous in saying that it was Jeremiah. The hymns themselves are found anonymously in the Hebrew text, while the Septuagint has in one an additional statement, the Hebrew style of which would lead us to conclude that it was found in the original from which the version was made. This statement reads: "And it came to pass, after Israel had been taken away captive and Jerusalem had been laid waste, that Jeremiah sat weeping, and uttered this lamentation over Jerusalem and said." The Targum also states that Jeremiah was the author. The rabbis and the church Fathers have no doubts on the subject. Jerome (compare on Zec 12:11) thinks that 2Ch 35:25 refers to these hymns. The same is said by Josephus (Ant., X, v, 1). If this were the case, then the

writer of Chronicles would have regarded La as having been written because of the death of Josiah. But this misunderstanding is not to be ascribed to him. It was easily possible that he was acquainted with lamentations of such a nature, but which afterward were lost. At all events, Jeremiah was by nature adapted to the composition of such elegies, as is proved by his book of prophecies.

Only in modern times has the authorship of these hymns by Jeremiah been seriously called into question; and it is now denied by most critics. For this they give formal and material reasons: The language of these lamentations shows many similarities to the discourses of Jeremiah, but at the same time also many differences. The claim that the alphabetical scheme is not worthy of Jeremiah is a prejudice caused by the taste of our times. Hebrew poets had evidently been making use of such methods for a long time, as it helps materially in memorizing. At the time of the first acute suffering on account of the destruction of Jerusalem, in fact, he would probably not have made use of it. But. we have in this book a collection of lamentations' written some time after this great catastrophe. The claim has also been made that the views of Jeremiah and those of the composer or the composers of these poems differ materially. It is said that Jeremiah emphasizes much more strongly the guilt of the people as the cause of the calamity than is done in these hymns, which lament the fate of the people and find the cause of it in the sins of the fathers (La 5:7), something that Jeremiah is said not to accept (Jer 31:29 f). However, the guilt of the people and the resultant wrath of God are often brought out in these hymns; and Jeremiah does not deny (31:29 f) that there is anything like inherited guilt. He declares rather that in the blessed future things would be different in this respect. Then, too, we are not to forget that if Jeremiah is the author of these patriotic hymns, he does not speak in them as the prophet and the appointed accuser of his people, but that he is at last permitted to speak as he humanly feels, although there is no lack of prophetical reminiscences (of La 4:21 f). In these hymns he speaks out of the heart that loves his Jerusalem and his people, and he utters the priestly prayer of intercession, which he was not allowed to do when announcing the judgment over Israel. The fact that he also evinces great reverence for the unfortunate king and his Divinely given hereditary dignity (La 4:20), although as a prophet he had been compelled to pronounce judgment over him, would not be unthinkable in Jeremiah, who had shown warm sympathies also for Jehoiachim (22:24,28). A radical difference of sentiment between the two authors is not to be found. On the other hand, a serious difficulty arises if we claim that Jeremiah was not the author of Lamentations in the denunciations of Lamentations over the prophets of Jerusalem (2:14; 4:13). How could the great prophet of the Destruction be so ignored if he himself were not the author of these sentiments? If he was himself the author we can easily understand this omission. In his book of prophecies he has spoken exactly the same way about the prophets. To this must be added, that La 3 forces us to regard Jeremiah as the author, because of the personal sufferings that are here described. Compare especially La 3:14,37 f, 53 ff, 61,63. What other person was during the period of this catastrophe the cynosure of all eyes as was the prophet, especially, too, because he was guiltless? The claim that here, not an individual, but the personified nation is introduced as speaking, is altogether improbable, and in some passages absolutely impossible (La 3:14,48).

This little book must accordingly be closely connected with the person of Jeremiah. If he himself is the author, he must have composed it in his old age, when he had time and opportunity to live over again all the sufferings of his people and of himself. It is, however, more probable, especially because of the language of the poems, that his disciples put this book in the present shape of uniform sentential

utterances, basing this on the manner of lamentations common to Jeremiah. In this way the origin of Lamentaions 3 can be understood, which cannot artificially be shaped as his sayings, as in this case the personal feature would be more distinctly expressed. It was probably compiled. from a number of his utterances.

In the Hebrew Canon this book is found in the third division, called kethabhim, or Sacred Writings, together with the Psalms. However, the Septuagint adds this book to Jeremiah, or rather, to the Book of Baruch, found next after Jerusalem. The Hebrews count it among the 5 meghilloth, or Rolls, which were read on prominent anniversary days. The day for the Lamentation was the 9th of Abib, the day of the burning of the temple. In the Roman Catholic church it is read on the last three days of Holy Week.

LITERATURE.

Comms. of Thenius, Ewald, Nagelsbach, Gerlach, Keil, Cheyne, Oettli, Lohr, Budde; article by Robertson Smith on "Lamentations" in EB.

C. von Orelli

LAMP; LAMPSTAND

lamp’-stand (nir, ner, lappidh, Phoenician lampadh, whence lampas; luchnos is also used): Ner or nir is properly "light" or "a light-giving thing," hence, "lamp," and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), but often "candle" in the King James Version. Its use in connection with the tabernacle and the temple (Ex 25:37 ff; 2Ch 4:20 f), where oil was employed for light (Ex 35:14; Le 24:2), shows that this is its proper meaning. Lappidh is properly "a torch" and is thus rendered generally in the Revised Version (British and American), but "lamp" in Isa 62:1, where it is used as a simile. the King James Version renders it "lamp" usually, but "torch" in Na 2:3 f; Zec 12:6. In Job 12:5 the Revised Version (British and American) renders it "for misfortune," regarding it as composed of the noun pidh, and the preposition l-. Lampas in Greek corresponds to it, but luchnos is also rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "lamp," while the King James Version gives "candle," as in Mt 5:15 and corresponding passages in the other Gospels.

1. Forms and History:

Lamps were in use in very remote times, though we have few allusions to them in the early history of Egypt. There are indications that they were used there. Niches for lamps are found in the tombs of Tell el-Amarna (Archaeological Survey of Egypt, Tell el-Amarna Letters, Part IV, 14). Lampstands are also represented (ibid., Part III, 7). Torches were of course used before lamps, and are mentioned in Ge (15:17 the Revised Version (British and American)), but clay lamps were used in Canaan by the Amorites before the Israelites took possession. The excavations in Palestine have furnished thousands of specimens, and have enabled us to trace the development from about 2000 BC onward. The exploration carried out at Lachish (Tell Hesy) and Gezer (Tell Jezer) by the Palestine Exploration Fund has given

ample material for the purpose, and the numerous examples from tombs all over Palestine and Syria have supplied a great variety of forms.

2. Figurative Use:

"Lamp" is used in the sense of a guide in Ps 119:105; Pr 6:23, and for the spirit, which is called the lamp of Yahweh in man (Pr 20:27), and it of course often signifies the light itself. It is used also for the son who is to succeed and represent his father (1Ki 15:4), and it perhaps is employed in this sense in the phrase, "The lamp of the wicked shall be put out" (Job 21:17; Pr 13:9; and perhaps Job 18:6).

The early Canaanite or Amorite lamp was a shallow, saucer-like bowl with rounded bottom and vertical rim, slightly pointed or pinched on one side where the lighted end of the wick was placed. This form continued into Jewish times, but was gradually changed until the spout was formed by drawing the rim of the sides together, forming a narrow open channel, the remainder of the rim being rolled outward and flattened, the bottom being also flattened. This was the early Hebrew pattern and persisted for centuries. The open bowl was gradually closed in, first at the spout, where the rim of one side was lapped over the other, and finally the whole surface was closed with only an orifice in the center for receiving the oil, and at the same time the spout was lengthened. This transformation is seen in lamps of the Seleucid period, or from around 300 BC. These lamps have usually a circular foot and sometimes a string-hole on one side. The next development was a circular bowl with a somewhat shorter spout, sometimes being only a bulge in the rim, so that the orifice for the wick falls in the rim, the orifice for filling being quite small at the bottom of a saucer-like depression in the center of the bowl. There is sometimes a loop handle affixed on the side opposite to the spout. Sometimes the handle is horizontal, but commonly vertical. This form is called Roman, and the bowl is often ornamented with mythological human or animal figures (Fig. 5). Other forms are elongated, having numerous wick holes (Fig. 6). The mythological and animal forms were rejected by the Jews as contrary to their traditions, and they made lamps with various other designs on the bowl, such as vine leaves, cups, scrolls, etc. (Figs. 7-11). One very marked Jewish design is the seven-branched candlestick (Ex 25:32) of the temple (Fig. 12). The lamps of the parable of the Ten Virgins were probably similar to these (Mt 25:1). The latest form of the clay lamp was what is called Byzantine, the bowl of which has a large orifice in the center and tapers gradually to the spout (Fig. 13); they are ornamented commonly with a palm branch between the central orifice and the wickhole, or with a cross. Sometimes there is an inscription on the margin (Fig. 13). The words on this read Phos ku(riou) pheni pasin Kale,"the light of the Lord shines to all (beautifully?)." Others read, "The Lord is my light"; "beautiful light," etc. These inscriptions determine the period as being Christian. In Roman times, and earlier also, bronze was much used for the finer lamps, often with covers for the orifice and sometimes with chain and ring for hanging. Very elaborate designs in this material occur.

These terra-cotta lamps are found in the tombs and burial places throughout Palestine and Syria, and they were evidently deposited there in connection with the funeral rites. Very few are found in Canaanite tombs, but they become numerous in later times and especially in the early Christian centuries. The symbolism in their use for funeral purposes is indicated by the inscriptions above mentioned (see PEFS, 1904, 326 ff; Explorations in Palestine, by Bliss. Maclister and Wunsch, 4to, published by the Palestine

Exploration Fund). These lamps were used by the peasants of the country down to recent times, when petroleum has superseded olive oil for lighting. The writer has seen lamps of the Jewish and Roman period with surface blackened with recent usage. Olive oil was commonly used, but terebinth oil also (Thomson, LB, III, 472).

H. Poster

LAMPSACUS

lamp’-sa-kus.

See SAMPSAMES.

LANCE; LANCER; LANCET

lans, lan’-ser, lan’-set. See ARMOR, III, 4, (3); 1Ki 18:28 the Revised Version (British and American) "lances."

LAND

((1) ‘erets;

(2) ‘adhamah;

(3) sadheh,

"a piece of land";

(4) ge, "earth";

(5) agros, "field";

(6) chora, "region";

(7) chorion, diminutive of chora;

(8) xeros, "dry land";

(9) ‘ezrach, "native" the King James Version "born in the land," "born among you," the Revised Version (British and American) "home-born" (Le 19:34; 14:16; Nu 15:30); "like a green tree in its native

soil" (Ps 37:35)):

‘Erets occurs hundreds of times and is used in much the same way as ‘adhamah, which also occurs often: e.g. "land of Egypt," ‘erets mitsrayim (Ge 13:10), and ‘adhmath mitsrayim (Ge 47:20). The other words occur less often, and are used in the senses indicated above.

See COUNTRY; EARTH.

Alfred Ely Day

LAND-CROCODILE (Revised Version (British and American))]

land-crok’-o-dil (koach; Septuagint chamaileon, Le 11:30; the King James Version Chameleon): Koach is found only here, meaning an animal, the fifth in the list of unclean "creeping things." Elsewhere is it translated "strength" or "power," and it has been thought that here is meant the desert monitor, Varanus griseus, a gigantic lizard, which is common in Egypt and Palestine, and which attains the length of 4 ft. "Chameleon," which the King James Version has here, is used by the Revised Version (British and American) for tinshemeth (the King James Version "mole"), the eighth in the list of unclean "creeping things" (compare nasham, "to breathe"; translated "swan" in Le 11:18 margin). While it is by no means certain what animal is meant, there could be no objection to "monitor" or "desert monitor." "Land-crocodile" is objectionable because it is not a recognized name of any animal.

See CHAMELEON; LIZARD.

Alfred Ely Day

LAND LAWS

See AGRARIAN LAWS.

LANDMARK

land’-mark (gebhul, literally, "boundary"): The boundary may have been marked, as at present, simply by a furrow or stone. The iniquity of removing a landmark is frequently insisted on (De 19:14; 27:17; Pr 22:28; 23:10; Job 24:2 gebhulah), its removal being equivalent to theft.

LANE

lan (rhume): An alley or bypath of a city. Occurs once in Lu 14:21, "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city"; elsewhere translated "street," e.g. Mt 6:2; Ac 9:11; Ecclesiasticus 9:7; Tobit 13:18.

LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

lan’-gwaj (Greek).

See ARAMAIC LANGUAGE also:

I. THE VERNACULAR "KOINE" THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. The Old Point of View

2. The Revolution

3. The Proof of the New Position

(1) The Papyri

(2) The Ostraka

(3) The Inscriptions

(4) Modern Greek

(5) Historical and Comparative Grammar

4. Characteristics of the Vernacular "Koine"

II. LITERARY ELEMENTS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

III. THE SEMITIC INFLUENCE

IV. INDIVIDUAL PECULIARITIES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS

V. THE "KOINE" GREEK SPOKEN BY JESUS

LITERATURE

I. The Vernacular "Koine" the Language of the New Testament.

1. The Old Point of View:

The ghost of the old Purist controversy is now laid to rest for good and all. The story of that episode has interest chiefly for the historian of language and of the vagaries of the human intellect. See Winer-Thayer, Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, 1869, 12-19, and Schmiedel's Winer, sectopm 2, for a sketch of this once furious strife. In the 17th century various scholars tried to prove that the Greek of the New Testament was on a paragraph with the literary Attic of the classic period. But the Hebraists won the victory over them and sought to show that it was Hebraic Greek, a special variety, if not dialect, a Biblical Greek The 4th edition of Cremer's Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek (translated by W. Urwick, 1892) quotes, with approval, Rothe's remark (Dogmatik, 1863, 238):

"We may appropriately speak of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is evident that the Holy Spirit has been at work, moulding for itself a distinctively religious mode of expression out of the language of the country which it has chosen as its sphere, and transforming the linguistic elements which it found ready to hand, and even conceptions already existing, into a shape and form appropriate to itself and all its own." Cremer adds: "We have a very clear and striking proof of this in New Testament Greek."

This was only twenty years ago and fairly represented the opinion of that day. Hatch in 1889 (Essays in Biblical Greek, 34) held that with most of the New Testament words the key lay in the Septuagint. But Winer (Winer-Thayer, 20) had long ago seen that the vernacular koine was "the special foundation of the diction of the New Testament," though he still admitted "a Jewish-Greek, which native Greeks did not entirely understand" (p. 27). He did not see the practical identity of New Testament Greek with the vernacular koine—("common" Greek), nor did Schmiedel in the 8. Auflage of Winer (I. Theil; II. Theil, erstes Heft, 1894-97). In the second edition of his Grammar of New Testament Greek (English translation by Thackeray, 1905, 2), Blass sees the dawn of the new day, though his book was first written before it came. Viteau (Etude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament, I, Le verbe, 1893, II, Le sujet, 1896) occupies wholly the old position of a Judaic Greek. An extreme instance of that view is seen in Guillemard's Hebraisms in the Greek Testament (1879).

2. The Revolution:

A turn toward the truth comes with H. A. A. Kennedy's Sources of the New Testament Greek (1895). He finds the explanation of the vocabulary of both the Septuagint and the New Testament to be the vernacular which he traces back to Aristophanes. It is a good exercise to read Westcott's discussion of the "Language of the NT" in DB, III (1888), and then turn to Moulton, "Language of the New Testament," in the 1-vol HDB. Westcott says: "The chief peculiarities of the syntax of the New Testament lie in the reproduction of Hebrew forms." Moulton remarks: "There is no reason to believe that any New Testament writer who ever lived in Palestine learned Greek only as a foreign language when he went abroad." Still better is it to read Moulton, "New Testament Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery" in Cambridge Biblical Essays (1909, 461-505); Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East (1911); or Angus, "The koine, the Language of the New Testament," Princeton Review, January, 1910, 42-92. The revolution has come to stay. It is now clear that the Greek of the New Testament is not a jargon nor a patois. In all essential respects it is just the vernacular koine of the 1st century AD, the lingua franca of the Greek-Roman empire, the legacy of Alexander the Great's conquest of the East.

This world-speech was at bottom the late Attic vernacular with dialectical and provincial influences. It was not a decaying tongue, but a virile speech admirably adapted to the service of the many peoples of the time. The able article in volume III of HDB on the "Language of the New Testament" by Dr. J. H. Thayer appeared in 1900, and illustrates how quickly an encyclopedia article may become out of date. There is a wealth of knowledge here displayed, as one would expect, but Thayer still speaks of "this species of Greek," "this peculiar idiom, ... Jewish Greek," though he sees that its basis is "the common or spoken Greek." The last topic discussed by him is "Problems." He little thought that the biggest "problem" so near solution was the character of the language itself. It was Adolph Deissmann, then of Heidelberg, now of Berlin, who opened the new era in the knowledge of the language of the New Testament. His Bibelstudien (zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums und der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums) appeared in 1895. In this epoch-making volume he proved conclusively from the papyri and the inscriptions that many of the seeming Hebraisms in the Septuagint and the New Testament were common idioms in the vernacular koine. He boldly claimed that the bulk of the Hebraisms were falsely so termed, except in the case of translating Greek from the Hebrew or Aramaic or in "perfect" Hebraisms, genuine Greek usage made more common by reason of similarity to the Semitic idiom. In 1897 he produced Neue Bibelstudien, sprachgeschichtliche Beitrage zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Erklarung des Neuen Testaments.

In 1901 (2nd edition in 1903) these two volumes were translated as one by A. Grieve under the title Bible Studies. Deissmann’s other volumes have confirmed his thesis. The most important are New Light on the New Testament (1907), The Philology of the Greek Bible (1908), Licht vom Osten (1908), Light from the Ancient East (translation by Strachan, 1910), Paul in the Light of Social and Religious History (1912). In Light from the Ancient East, Deissmann illustrates the New Testament language with much detail from the papyri, ostraka and inscriptions. He is now at work on a new lexicon of the New Testament which will make use of the fresh knowledge from these sources.

The otherwise helpful work of E. Preuschen, Vollstandiges griechisch-deutsches Handworterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der ubrigen urchristlichen Literatur (1908-10), fails to utilize the papyri and inscriptions while drawing on the Septuagint and the New Testament Apocrypha and other early Christian literature. But this has been done by Ebeling in his Griechisch-deutsches Worterbuch zum New Testament, 1913. The next step was made by A. Thumb, the great philologian, in his Griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus; Beitrage zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der "koine," 1901, in which the real character of the koine was for the first time properly set forth.

Winer and Blass had both lamented the need of a grammar of the koine, and that demand still exists, but Thumb went a long way toward supplying it in this volume. It is to be hoped that he will yet prepare a grammar of the koine. Thumb’s interests cover the whole range of comparative philology, but he has added in this field "Die Forschungen fiber die hellenistische Sprache in den Jahren 1896-1901," Archiv fur Papyrusforschung, II, 396 f; "Prinzipienfragen der Koina-Forschung," Neue Jahrb. fur das kl. Alt., 1906; "Die sprachgeschichtliche Stellung des biblischen Griechisch," Theologische Rundschau, V, 85-99.

The other most important name to add is that of J. Hope Moulton, who has the credit of being the first to apply the new knowledge directly to the New Testament Greek His Grammar of New Testament Greek, I, Prolegomena (1906, 2nd edition, 1906, 3rd edition, 1908, German translation in 1911, Einleitung in die Sprache des New Testament) is a brilliant piece of work and relates the Greek of the New Testament in careful detail to the vernacular koine, and shows that in all important points it is the common Greek of the time and not a Hebraic Greek. Moulton probably pressed his point too far in certain respects in his zeal against Hebraisms, but the essential position of Deissmann and Moulton is undoubtedly sound.

Moulton had previously published the bulk of this material as "Grammatical Notes from the Papyri," The Expositor, 1901, 271-82; 1903, 104-21, 423-39; The Classical Review, 1901, 31-37, 434-41; 1904, 106-12, 151-55; "Characteristics of New Testament Greek, " The Expositor, 1904.

In 1909 appeared his essay, Greek in the Light of Modern Discovery (see above). Since 1908, The Expositor has had a series of papers by J.H. Moulton and George Milligan called "Lexical Notes from the Papyri," which are very useful on the lexical side of the language. Thus the study is fairly launched on its new career. In 1900, A.T. Robertson produced a Syllabus on the New Testament Greek Syntax from the standpoint of comparative philology, which was rewritten in 1908, with the added viewpoint of the papyri researches, as A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament (2nd edition, 1909, 3rd edition, 1912; translations in Italian in 1910, German and French in 1911, Dutch in 1912). In October, 1909, S. Angus published a good article in the Harvard Theological Review on "Modern Methods in New Testament Philology," followed in January, 1910, by another in the Princeton Review on "The koine, the Language of the New Testament." The new knowledge appears also in Jakob Wackernagel, "Die griechische Sprache" (pp. 291-318, 2nd edition, of Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache, 1907). L. Radermachcr has set forth very ably "die sprachlichen Vorgange in ihrem Zusammenhang," in his Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache. It is in reality the background of the New Testament Greek and is a splendid preparation for the study of the Greek New Testament. A full discussion of the new knowledge in grammatical detail has been prepared by A.T. Robertson under the title A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Moulton and Schmiedel are planning also to complete their works.

3. The Proof of the New Position:

The proof of the new position is drawn from several sources:

(1) The Papyri.

These rolls have lain in the museums of the world many years and attracted little attention. For lists of the chief collections of the papyri see Moulton, Prolegomena, 259-62; Milligan, Selections from the Greek Papyri, xi, xii; Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit; Lautund Wortlehre, vii-x; Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 20-41; Robertson, Grammar of the Greek New Testament, Bibliography. New volumes of papyri as a result of recent explorations in Egypt are

published each year. See PAPYRUS, and in the other encyclopedias under the word. Most of the papyri discovered belong to the period of the koine (the first three centuries BC and AD in round numbers), and with great wealth of illustration they show the life of the common people of the time, whether in Egypt or Herculaneum (the two chief regions represented). There are various degrees of culture shown, as can be seen in any of the large volumes of Grenfell and Hunt, or in the handbooks of Lietzmann, Griechische Papyri (1905), and of Milligan, Greek Papyri (1910). They come from the scrap-heaps of the long ago, and are mainly receipts, contracts, letters of business or love, military documents, etc. They show all grades of culture, from the illiterate with phonetic spelling to the man of the schools. But we have here the language of life, not of the books. In a most startling way one notes the similarities of vocabulary, forms, and syntax between the language of the papyri of the 1st century AD and that of the New Testament books. As early as 1778, F.W. Sturz, made use of the Charta Borgiana, "the first papyrus ever brought to Europe" (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 39), and in 1841 Thiersch likewise saw the value of the papyri for the philology of the Septuagint. But the matter was not pressed. Lightfoot threw out a hint about the value of letters of the people, which was not followed till Deissmann saw the point; compare Moulton, Prol., 242. It is not necessary here to illustrate the matter at length. Deissmann takes up in detail the "Biblical" words in Thayer's Lexicon, and has no difficulty in finding most of them in the papyri (or inscriptions). Thus plerophoreo, is shown to be common in the papyri. See Deissmann, Bible Studies and Light from the Ancient East, for extensive lists. The papyri show also the same meanings for many words once thought peculiar to the Bible or the New Testament. An instance is seen in the official sense of presbuteros, in the papyri, 5 ho presbuteros les komes (Pap. Lugd. A 35 f), "without doubt an official designation" (Deissmann, Bible Studies, 155). So adelphos, for members of the community, anastrophe, for manner of life, antilempsis, "help," leitourgia, "public service," paroikos, "sojourner," etc. (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 107). R. Helbing (Grammatik der Septuaginta, 1908) and H. John Thackeray (A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, 1909) have applied the new knowledge to the language of the Septuagint, and it has been discussed with much ability in the first volumes. The use of the papyri for grammatical purposes is made easier by the excellent volume of E. Mayser, Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemaerzeit; Laut- und Wortlehre (1906), though his "Syntax," is still a desideratum. Useful also is G. Cronert, Memoria Graeca Herculanensis (1903).

(2) The Ostraka.

The literature on this subject is still small in bulk. In 1899 Ulrich Wilcken published Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten und Nubien, and in 1902 W.E. Crum produced his book of Christian ostraka called Coptic Ostraca from the Collections of the Egypt Exploration Fund, the Cairo Museum, and Others. This was followed in 1905 by H.R. Hall's Coptic and Greek Texts of the Christian Period from Ostraka, Stelae, etc. These broken pieces of pottery were used by the lowest classes as writing material. It was very widely used because it was so very cheap. Wilcken has done more than anyone else to collect and decipher the ostraka. Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 46) notes that Cleanthes the Stoic "wrote on ostraka or on leather" because too poor to buy papyrus. So he quotes the apology of a Christian for using potsherd for a letter: "Excuse me that I cannot find papyrus as I am in the country" (Crum, Coptic Ostraca, 55). The use of apecho, on an ostrakon for a receipt in full, illustrates well the frequent use of this word in the New Testament (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 111).

(3) The Inscriptions.

Here caution must be used since many of the inscriptions give, not the vernacular, but the literary language. The official (legal and military) decrees often appear in very formal style. But a number do preserve the vernacular idiom and often have the advantage of being dated. These inscriptions are chiefly on stone, but some are on metal and there are a few wax tablets. The material is vast and is constantly growing. See list of the chief collections in Deissmann's Light from the Ancient East, 10-20. Boeckh is the great name here. As early as 1779 Walch (Observationes in Matt. ex graecis inscriptionibus) made use of Greek inscriptions for New Testament exegesis, and R.A. Lipsius says that his father (K.H.A. Lipsius, author of Grammatische Untersuchungen uber die biblische Gracitat) "contemplated a large grammar of the Greek Bible in which he would have availed himself of the discoveries in modern epigraphy" (Deissmann, Light, etc., 15). Schmiedel has made good use of the inscriptions so far in his revision of Winer; H.A.A. Kennedy (Sources of New Testament Greek, 1895), H. Anz (Subsidia ad Cogn., etc., 1894), R. Helbing (Grammatik der Septuaginta, 1908), J. Psichari (Essai sur le Grec de la Septante, 1908), H. John Thackeray (A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, 1909), and R. Meister (Prol. zu einer Grammatik der Septuaginta, 1907) turned to good account the inscriptions for the linguistic problems of the Septuagint, as indeed Hatch (Essays in Biblical Greek, 1889) had already done. W. Dittenberger added some valuable "Grammatica et orthographica" to his Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (2 volumes, 1903, 1905). See also E. L. Hicks and G. F. Hill, Greek Historical Inscriptions (1901), and Hicks's paper "On Some Political Terms Employed in the New Testament," Classical Review, 1887, 4 ff, 42 ff. W. M. Ramsay's Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia (2 volumes, 1895, 1897) and his other works show keen insight in the use of the inscriptions. Deissmann's Bible Studies (1895, 1901) applied the knowledge of the inscriptions to the Septuagint and to the New Testament. In his Light from the Ancient East (1910) copious use is made of the inscriptions for New Testament study. Moulton (Prol., 1906, 258 f, for lists) is alive to the value of the inscriptions for New Testament grammar, as indeed was Blass (Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch, 1896) before him.

Compare further, G. Thieme, Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maander und das Neue Testament (1906); T. Nageli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus (1905), and J. Rouffiac, Recherches sur les caracteres du Grec dans le New Testament d'apres les Inscr. de Priene (1911). Special treatises or phases of the grammar of the inscriptions appear in Meisterhans-Schwyzer, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften (1900); Nachmanson, Laute und Formen der magnetischen Inschriften (1896); Schweizer, Grammatik der pergamenischen Inschriften (1898).

Moulton and Milligan have drawn freely also on the inscriptions for their "Lexical Studies" running in The Expositor (1908 and the years following). The value of the inscriptions for the Greek of the New Testament is shown at every turn. For instance, prototokos, is no longer a "Biblical" word. It appears in a metrical inscription (undated) of Trachonitis on a tomb of a pagan "high priest" and "friend of the gods" (Deissmann, Light, etc., 88); compare Kaibel, Epigrammata Graeca, etc., number 460. Even agape, occurs on a pagan inscription of Pisidia (Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2, 57). See, further, W.H.P. Hatch's "Some Illustrations of New Testament Usage from Greek

Inscriptions of Asia Minor," Journal of Biblical Literature, 1908, 134-146.

(4) Modern Greek.

As early as 1834 Heilmeier saw that the modern Greek vernacular went back to the koine (Moulton, Prologoumena, 29), but it is only in recent years that it was clearly seen that the modern Greek of the schools and usually in the newspapers is artificial, and not the real vernacular of today. Mullach's work (Grammatik der griechischen Vulgarsprache, 1856) was deficient in this respect. But Jannaris' Historical Greek Grammar (1897) carries the history of the vernacular Greek along with the literary style. Hatzidakis, Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik, 1892, clears the air very much and connects the modern Greek with the New Testament. But it is to Thumb that we are indebted for the best knowledge of the vernacular (he demotike) as opposed to the literary language (he kathareuousa) of today. Mitsotakis (Praktische Grammatik, 1891) had treated both together, though Wied (Die Kunst, die neugriechische Volksprache) gave only the vernacular. But Wied is only elementary. Thumb alone has given an adequate treatment of the modern Greek vernacular, showing its unity and historical contact with the vernacular koine (Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache, 1895; Thumb-Angus, Handbook of Modern Greek Vernacular, 1912). Thus one can see the living stream of the New Testament speech as it has come on down through the ages. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of modern Greek vernacular in the knowledge of New Testament Greek. The disappearance of the optative, the vanishing of the infinitive before hina, and itacism are but instances of many others which are luminous in the light of the modern Greek vernacular. See Psichari, Essais de grammaire historique neo-grecque (1886-89).

(5) Historical and Comparative Grammar.

From this source the koine gets a new dignity. It will take one too far afield to sketch here the linguistic revolution wrought since the publication of, and partly caused by, Bopp's Vergleichende Grammatik (1857), following Sir William Jones' discovery of Sanskrit. The great work of Brugmann and Delbruck (Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen, I-V, 1892-1909) marks the climax of the present development, though many workers have won distinction in this field. The point to accent here is that by means of comparative philology the Greek language is seen in its proper relations with other languages of the Indo-Germanic family, and the right interpretation of case, preposition, mode, tense, voice, etc., is made possible. The old traditional empiricism is relegated to the scrap-heap, and a new grammatical science consonant with the facts has taken its place. See Delbruck, Introduction to the Study of Language (1882), Giles, Short Manual of Comparative Philology (1901), for a resume of the facts. Wright, Comparative Grammar of the Greek Language (1912), applies the new learning to the Greek tongue. The progress in classical scholarship is well shown by Sandys in his History of Classical Scholarship (I-III, 1906-8) and by Gudeman, Geschichte der klass. Philologie, 2. Aufl, 1909. Innumerable monographs have enriched the literature of this subject. It is now feasible to see the Greek language as a whole, and grasp its historical unity. Seen in this light the koine is not a dying tongue or a corrupt dialect. It is a normal and natural evolution of the Greek dialects into a world-speech when Alexander's conquests made it possible. The vernacular koine which has developed into the modern Greek vernacular was itself the direct descendant of the Attic vernacular which had its roots in the

vernacular of the earlier dialects. The dialectical developments are closely sketched by Thumb, Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte (1909), and by Buck, Introduction to the Study of Greek Dialects (1910), not to mention the older works of Hoffmann, Meister, etc. Jannaris has undertaken in his Historical Greek Grammar (1897) to sketch and interpret the facts of the Greek tongue throughout its long career, both in its literary and vernacular aspects. He has succeeded remarkably well on the whole, though not quite seeing the truth about the modern Greek vernacular. Schanz is seeking to lay the foundation for still better work by his Beitrage zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache (1882 and the years following). But the New Testament student must be open to all the new light from this region, and it is very great. See, further, Dieterich, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griech. Sprache von der hellen. Zeit (1898).

4. Characteristics of the Vernacular "Koine":

As already indicated, the Greek of the New Testament is in the main just the vernacular koine of the 1st century AD, though Greek as used by men of ability and varying degrees of culture. The most striking difference between the vernacular koine and the literary Attic is seen in the vocabulary. The writers in the literary koine show more likeness to the classic Attic, but even they reveal the changes due to the intervening centuries. There was, of course, no violent break. The changes came gradually and naturally. It is mainly at this point that Deissmann has done such brilliant work in his Bible Studies and other books. He has taken the lists of "Biblical" and "ecclesiastical" words, as given by Cremer and Thayer, and has shown from the papyri, ostraka, inscriptions, or koine writers that they are not peculiar to the Bible, but belong to the current speech of the time. The proof is so overwhelming and extensive that it cannot be given here. Some words have not yet been found in the non-Biblical koine, but they may be any day. Some few words, of course, belong to the very nature of Christianity christianos, for instance), but apostolos, baptismos, paroikos, sunagoge, and hundreds of others can no longer be listed as "Biblical." New meanings come to old words also. Compare daimonion. It is interesting to note that the New Testament shows many of the words found in Aristophanes, who caught up the vernacular of his day. The koine uses more words from the lower strata of society. Aristotle likewise has many words common in the koine, since he stands at the parting of the ways between the old dialects and the new koine of Alexander’s conquests. The koine develops a fondness for compound and even double compound (sesquipedalian) words; compare, for instance, anekdiegetos; aneklaletos; anexereunetos; antapokrinomai; oikodespotes; oligopsuchos; prosanapleroo; sunantilambanomai; huperentugchano; chrusodaktulios, etc. The use of diminutives is also noteworthy in the koine as in the modern Greek: compare thugatrion; klinarion; korasion; kunarion; onarion; opsarion; ploiarion; otion, etc. The formation of words by juxtaposition is very common as in plerophoreo, cheiro-graphon. In phonetics it is to be noticed that "ei", "oi", "ee", "eei", "u", "i" all had the value of "ee" in "feet." This itacism was apparent in the early koine. So ai = e and o and oo were not sharply distinguished. The Attic tt became ss, except in a few instances, like elatto, kreitton. The tendency toward de-aspiration (compare Ionic) was manifest; compare eph’ helpidi, for the reverse process. Elision is less frequent than in Attic, but assimilation is carried farther. The variable final consonants "n" (nu) and "s" (sigma) are used generally before consonants. We find "-ei-" for "-iei-" as in pein. outheis, and metheis, are common till 100 BC, when they gradually disappear before oudeis, and medeis. In general there is less sense of rhythm and more simplicity and clearness. Some of the subtle refinements of form and syntax of the classic did not

survive in the koine vernacular. In accidence only a few points may be noted. In substantives the Ionic "-res" is frequent. The Attic second declension vanishes. In the third declension forms like nuktan, show assimilation to the first. Both charin, and charita, occur. Contraction is sometimes absent (compare Ionic) as in oreon. Adjectives show forms like asphalen, and indeclinable pleres, appears, and pan, for panta (compare megan), dusi, for duoin. The dual is gone. Even the dual pronouns hekateros, and poteros, are rare. tis, is occasionally used like hostis. hos ean, is more frequent than hos an, in the 1st century AD. The two conjugations blend more and more into one, as the -mi forms vanish. There is some confusion in the use of -ao and -eo verbs, and new presents occur like apoktenno, optano, steko. The forms ginomai, ginosko, are the rule now. There is much increase in aorists like escha, and imperfects like eicha. The form -osan (eichosan, eschosan) occasionally appears. Quite frequent is a perfect like dedokan, and the augment is often absent in the plu-perfect as in dedokei. Per contra, a double augment occurs in apekateste, and a treble augment in eneochthesan. The temporal augment is often absent with diphthong as in oikodomethe. The koine Greek has -tosan, not -nton. In syntax the tendency is toward simplicity, to short sentences, the paratactic construction, and the sparing use of particles. The vernacular koine avoids both the bombast of Asianism and the artificiality of Atticism. There is, indeed, more freedom in violating the rules of concord as to gender, number, and case. The nominativus pendens is common. The comparative does duty often for the superlative adjective, and the superlative generally has the elative sense. The accusative is increasingly common with verbs. The line between transitive and intransitive verbs is not a hard-and-fast one. The growth in the use of prepositions both with nouns and in composition is quite noticeable, but some of the older prepositions, like amphi, are vanishing. The cases used with various prepositions are changing. The instrumental use of en, is very common. Many new adverbial and prepositional phrases have developed. The optative is nearly dead and the infinitive (apart from the use of tou, en to, eis ~to, with the infinitive) is decaying before hina. The future participle is rare. me, begins to encroach on ou, with infinitives and participles. The periphrastic conjugation is specially common. The direct discourse is more frequent than the indirect. The non-final use of hina, is quite noticeable. There are, besides, dialectical and provincial peculiarities, but these do not destroy the real unity of the vernacular koine any more than do individual traits of separate writers.

II. Literary Elements in the New Testament.

Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 245) is disposed to deny any literary quality to the New Testament books save the Epistle to the Hebrews. "The Epistle to the Hebrews shows us Christianity preparing for a flight from its native levels into the higher region of culture, and we are conscious of the beginnings of a Christian world-literature." He speaks of it also as "a work which seems to hang in the background like an intruder among the New Testament company of popular books." One feels that this is an extreme position and cannot be justified by the facts. It is true that Peter and John were agrammatoi kai idiotai (Ac 4:13), and not men of the schools, but this was certainly not the case with Luke and Paul who were men of literary culture in the truest sense. Luke and Paul were not Atticists, but that artificial idiom did not represent the best type of culture. Deissmann admits that the New Testament has become literature, but, outside of He, he denies any literary quality in its composition. Paul, for instance, wrote only "letters," not "epistles." But Romans and Ephesians confront us. See Milligan, Greek Papyri, xxxi, for a protest against the sweeping statement of Deissmann on this point. One need not go to the extreme

of Blass, "Die rhythmische Komposition des Hebr. Brides," Theol. Studien und Kritik, 1902, 420-61; Die Rythmen der asiatischen und romischen Kunstprosa, 1905, to find in Hebrews and Paul's writings illustrations of the artificial rules of the Asianists. There is undoubtedly rhythm in Paul's eloquent passages (compare 1Co 13; 15), but it is the natural poetic quality of a soul aflame with high passions, not conformity to rules of rhetoric. To deny literary quality to Luke and Paul is to give a narrow meaning to the word "literary" and to be the victim of a theory. Christianity did make use of the vernacular koine, the wonderful world-speech so providentially at hand. But the personal equation figured here as always. Men of culture differ in their conversation from illiterate men and more nearly approximate literary style. It is just in Luke, Paul, and the author of He that we discover the literary flavor of men of ability and of culture, though free from artificiality and pedantry. The eloquence of He is that of passion, not of the art of Asianism. Indeed, the Gospels all show literary skill in the use of material and in beauty of language. The Gospel of John has the rare elevation and dignity of the highest type of mind. There is no Atticistic tendency in the New Testament as in Josephus, Ant. There is no posing for the present or for posterity. It is the language of life, the vernacular in the main, but rising at times from the very force of passion to high plateaus of emotion and imagination and poetic grace from the pens of men of real ability, and in some instances of high culture.

III. The Semitic Influence.

It is no longer possible to explain every variation in the New Testament from the classic Attic by the term Hebraism. That easy solution has disappeared. Sooth to say, when the true character of the vernacular koine is understood, there is not very much left to explain. The New Testament Greek as a rule is just normal koine. Milligan (Greek Papyri, xxx) admits on the part of Moulton "an overtendency to minimize" the "presence of undoubted Hebraisms, both in language and grammar." That is true, and is due to his strong reaction against the old theory of so many Hebraisms. The Semiticisms (Hebraisms and Aramaisms) are very natural results of the fact that the vernacular koine was used by Jews who read the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint translation, and who also spoke Aramaic as their native tongue. The Septuagint, as translation of Greek, directly from the Hebrew (or Aramaic), has a much greater number of these Semiticisms. See Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (1900), for the salient facts. Thackeray in his Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek (1909) shows "the koine—the basis of Septuagint Greek" in section 3, and in section 4 discusses "the Semitic element in Septuagint Greek." The matter varies in different parts of the Septuagint, but in all parts the Semitic influence goes far beyond what it is in the New Testament. In the New Testament we have free composition in Greek, except in certain portions of the Gospels and Ac where Aramaic originals (oral or written) lie beyond the Greek text. So in particular Lu 1, the words of Jesus in Lu 2, and the opening chapters of Acts. See Dalman, Words of Jesus (1902), and J.T. Marshall, "The Aramaic Gospel," The Expositor, Ser. IV volumes II-VIII; see also ARAMAIC supra. There is, to some extent, translation-Gr, as in the Septuagint. The quotations from the Old Testament are either from the Hebrew original, or, as most frequently, from the Septuagint. In either case we have translation-Greek again. These two classes cover the more obvious Semiticisms if we add Hebrew names (persons and places) and other transliterations like abbadon, allelouia. The Greek of the Septuagint does not, of course, give a true picture of the Greek spoken by the Jews in Alexandria or in Palestine. But the constant reading of the Septuagint was bound to leave its impress on the style of the people (compare the King James Version and the English

language). The surprise, in fact, is not the number of Semiticisms, but, all things considered, the fewness of them. Luke, just because he was a Gentile and so noted the Hebraisms in the Septuagint, shows rather more of them than the other New Testament writers: compare prosetheto triton pempsai (Lu 20:12). Some of the points of style so common in the Septuagint find occasional parallel in the papyri or inscriptions, like blepon blepo, chara chairo, ov .... hon .... auton. Others are more obviously imitations of the Hebrew style, as in areskein enopion tinos, rather than areskein tini. But there is a certain dignity and elevation of style so characteristic of the Hebrew Old Testament that reappears in the New Testament. The frequent use of kai, in parts of the New Testament reminds one of the Septuagint and the Hebrew waw ("w"). There is, besides, an indefinable tone in the New Testament that is found in the Old Testament. Swete (Apocalypse of John, cxx) laments the tendency to depreciate unduly the presence of Hebraisms in the New Testament. The pendulum may have swung too far away from the truth. It will strike the level, but we shall never again be able to fill our grammars and commentaries with explanations of so many peculiar Hebraisms in the New Testament. On the whole the Greek New Testament is standard vernacular koine.

IV. Individual Peculiarities of the New Testament Writers.

There is not space for an extended discussion of this topic. The fact itself calls for emphasis, for there is a wide range in style between Mark’s Gospel and Hebrews, 1 Peter and Romans, Luke’s Gospel and the Apocalypse. There are no Atticists found in the New Testament (compare 4 Macc in the Septuagint and Jos), but there are the less literary writings (Matthew, Mark, the Johannine books, the other catholic epistles) and the more literary writings (Luke’s writings, Paul’s Epistles, and Hebrews). But even so, no hard-and-fast line can be drawn. Moulton, Cambridge Biblical Essays, 484, thinks 2 Peter more like the Atticistic writings, "though certainly the Atticists would have scorned to own a book so full of ‘solecisms.’" Moulton assumes that 2 Peter is pseudepigraphic, and does not credit the notion that the crude "Babu" Greek, to use Abbott’s term, may be Peter’s own uncorrected style (compare Ac 4:13), while 1 Peter may have the smoothing effect of Silvanus’ hand (compare 1Pe 5:12). A similar explanation is open concerning the grammatical lapses of the Apocalypse, since John is also called agrammatos, in Ac 4:13, whereas the Gospel of John may have had the revision of the elders of Ephesus (compare Joh 21:24). But whatever the explanation, there is no doubt of the wide divergences style between different books and groups of books in the New Testament list. The Lukan, Johannine, Petrine, Pauline groups stand apart, but with cleavages within each group. Harnack (Luke the Physician, 1907; The Sayings of Jesus, 1908; The Ac of the Apostles, 1909; The Date of the Ac of the Apostles, 1911) has accepted and strengthened the contention of Hawkins (Horae Synopticae, 2nd edition, 1909) and of Hobart (Medical Language of Luke, 1882) that the medical terms in the Gospel of Luke and of Ac show that the books were written by the same writer and that a physician, and so Luke. The diversities in style here and there are chiefly due to the sources of information used. Even in the Pauline books, which form so well-marked a collection, striking diversities of language and style appear. But these letters cover a period of some 15 years of intense activity and mental and spiritual development, and treat a great variety of topics. They properly reflect the changing phases of Paul’s preaching of the cross of Christ in different places and under varying circumstances and confronting ever fresh problems. The plays of Shakespeare offer a useful parallel. Even in Paul’s old age, in the Pastoral Epistles the stamp of Paul’s spirit is admitted by those who admit only Pauline fragments; compare J. Weiss, Beitrage zur

Paulinschen Rhetorik (1897). The style is indeed the man, but style is also the function of the subject, and style varies with different periods of a man's life. E.A. Abbott has made an excellent discussion of the Johannine Vocabulary (1905) and of Johannine Grammar (1906), but special grammars of each writer are hardly to be expected or desired. But Nageli has begun a study of Paul's vocabulary in his Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus (1905). The Gospel of Matthew shows very little of that Hebraism that one would expect from the general purpose and tone of the book. It is possible, of course, that the supposed original was in Aramaic, or, if in Greek, of a more Hebraistic type. Whether the present Greek of Matthew made use of Mark's Gospel and a collection of Logia (Q), we do not know. Certainly Mark's Gospel is written in colloquial koine with little evidence of the culture of the schools. Mark is a faithful reporter and does his work with rare simplicity and vividness. He reveals clearly the Aramaic background of Christ's teaching. The writings of James and Jude do not show that only Greek was spoken in the home at Nazareth, nor that they used only Aramaic. These two epistles are evidently free compositions in Greek with much of the freshness of imagery so manifest in the parables of Jesus Himself. This brief sketch does not do justice to the richness and variety of language in the books of the New Testament.

V. The "Koine" Spoken by Jesus.

See ARAMAIC LANGUAGE for proof that Jesus spoke that language as the vernacular of the people of Palestine. But Christ spoke the koine also, so that the New Testament is not an idiom that was unknown to the Master. Gwilliam (1-vol HDB, "Language of Christ") does still deny that Jesus spoke Greek, while Roberts takes the other extreme in his book, Greek the Language of Christ and His Apostles (1888). Per contra again, Julicher considers it impossible to suppose that Jesus used Greek (art. "Hellenism" in EB). J. E. H. Thomson, "The Language of Palestine during the Time of our Lord" (Temple, Bible Dictionary) argues convincingly that Palestine was bi-lingual and that Jesus knew and spoke Greek as well as Aramaic Peter evidently spoke in Greek on the Day of Pentecost and was understood by all. Paul was understood in Jerusalem when he spoke in Greek (Ac 21:37). Jesus taught in Decapolis, a Greek region, in the region of Tyre and Sidon (Greek again). Galilee itself was largely inhabited by Gentiles who spoke Greek. At the time of the Sermon on the Mount, we read that people were present from Decapolis and Perea, besides the mixed multitude from Galilee, Judea, and Jerusalem (Mt 4:25; Lu 6:17). Thomson proves also that in Matthew's Gospel the quotation from the Old Testament in the words of Jesus is from the Septuagint, while Matthew's own quotations are from the Hebrew. The case seems clear. It is not possible to say always when Jesus spoke Greek and when Aramaic. That would depend on the audience. But it is practically certain that Christ Himself knew and spoke at will the vernacular koine, and thus had this linguistic bond with the great world of that era and with lovers of the Greek Testament today.

LITERATURE.

The literature on this subject is very extensive. The most important volumes have been mentioned in the discussion above.

A.T. Robertson

LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

lan’-gwaj-es

I. THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES

1. Members of Semitic Family

2. The Name Hebrew

3. Old Hebrew Literature

II. HISTORY OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE

1. Oldest Form of Language

2. The Hebrew of the Old Testament

3. Its Uniformity

4. The Cause Thereof

5. Differences Due to Age

6. Differences of Style

7. Foreign Influences

8. Poetry and Prose

9. Home of the Hebrew Language

10. Its Antiquity

11. When Hebrew Became a Dead Language

III. CHIEF CHARACTERISTICS OF HEBREW

1. Characteristic Sounds

2. Letters Representing Two Sounds

3. Consonants Representing Vowels

4. The Syllable

5. Three-Letter Roots

6. Conjugations or Derived Stems

7. Absence of Tenses

8. The Pronouns

9. Formation of Nouns

10. Internal Inflexion

11. Syntax of the Verb

12. Syntax of the Noun

13. Poverty of Adjectives

IV. BIBLICAL ARAMAIC

1. Aramaic Portions of the Old Testament

2. Phonology

3. Grammar

4. Syntax

5. Aramaic More Decadent than Hebrew

V. LITERARY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SEMITES

1. Concrete and Abstract

2. View of Nature

3. Pictorial Imagination

4. Prose and Poetry

5. Hebrew Easy of Translation

LITERATURE

There were only two languages employed in the archetypes of the Old Testament books (apart from an Egyptian or Persian or Greek word here and there), namely, Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic, both of which belong to the great family of languages known as Semitic.

I. The Semitic Languages.

The languages spoken in Southwestern Asia during the historical period dealt with in the Bible have been named Shemitic, after the son of Noah from whom the majority of peoples speaking these languages—Arabs, Hebrews, Arameans and Assyrians (Ge 10:21)—were descended. To show, however, that the description does not fit exactly the thing described—the Elamites and Lydians having probably not spoken a Shemitic language, and the Canaanites, including Phoenicians, with the colonists descended from those at Carthage and elsewhere in the Mediterranean coast lands, as well as the Abyssinians (Ethiopians), who did, being reckoned descendants of Ham (Ge 9:18; 10:6)—the word is now generally written "Semitic," a term introduced by Eichhorn (1787). These languages were spoken from the Caspian Sea to the South of Arabia, and from the Mediterranean to the valley of the Tigris.

1. Members of Semitic Family:

The following list shows the chief members of this family:

(1) South Semitic or Arabic:

Including the language of the Sabean (Himyaritic) inscriptions, as well as Ge’ez or Ethiopic. Arabic is now spoken from the Caucasus to Zanzibar, and from the East Indies to the Atlantic.

(2) Middle Semitic or Canaanitish:

Including Hebrew, old and new, Phoenician, with Punic, and Moabite (language of MS).

(3) North Semitic or Aramaic:

Including

(a) East Aramaic or Syrian (language of Syrian Christians), language of Babylonian Talmud, Mandean;

(b) West or Palestinian Aramaic of the Targums, Palestinian Talmud (Gemara), Biblical Aramaic ("Chaldee"), Samaritan, language of Nabatean inscriptions.

(4) East Semitic:

Language of Assyria-Babylonian inscriptions.

2. The Name Hebrew:

With the exception of a few chapters and fragments mentioned below, the Old Testament is written entirely in Hebrew. In the Old Testament itself this language is called "the Jews' "(2Ki 18:26,28). In Isa 19:18 it is called poetically, what in fact it was, "the language (Hebrew "lip") of Canaan." In the appendix to the Septuagint of Job it is called Syriac; and in the introduction to Ecclesiasticus it is for the first time—that is, in 130 BC—named Hebrew. The term Hebrew in the New Testament denotes the language of the Old Testament in Re 9:11, but in Joh 5:2; 19:13,17 this term means the vernacular Aramaic. In other passages it is doubtful which is meant. Josephus uses the same name for both. From the time of the Targums, Hebrew is called "the sacred tongue" in contrast to the Aramaic of everyday use. The language of the Old Testament is called Old Hebrew in contrast to the New Hebrew of the Mishna, the rabbinic, the Spanish poetry, etc.

3. Old Hebrew Literature: Of Old Hebrew the remains are contained almost entirely in the Old Testament. A few inscriptions have been recovered, i.e., the Siloam Inscriptions, a Hebrew calendar, a large number of ostraka from Samaria, a score of pre-exilic seals, and coins of the Maccabees and of the time of Vespasian and Hadrian.

LITERATURE.

E. Renan, Histoire generale et systeme compare des langues semitiques; F. Hommel, Die semit. Volker u. Sprachen; the comparative grammars of Wright and Brockelmann; CIS; article "Semitic Languages" in Encyclopedia Brit, and Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary.

II. History of the Hebrew Language.

Hebrew as it appears to us in the Old Testament is in a state of decadence corresponding to the present position of spoken Arabic. In the earliest period it no doubt resembled the classical Arabic of the 7th and following centuries. The variations found between the various strata of the language occurring in the Old Testament are slight compared with the difference between modern and ancient Arabic.

1. Oldest Form of Language:

Hebrew was no doubt originally a highly inflected language, like classical Arabic. The noun had three cases, nominative, genitive, and accusative, ending in -um’, [~-im, -am, respectively, as in the Sabean inscriptions. Both verbs and nouns had three numbers (singular, dual and plural) and two genders, masculine and feminine In the noun the dual and plural had two cases. The dual and 2nd and 3rd person plural and 2nd person singular feminine of the imperfect of the verb ended in nun. In certain positions the "m" of the endings -um, -im, -am in the noun was dropped. The verb had three moods, indicative, subjunctive, and jussive, ending in -u, -a, and-,respectively; as well as many forms or stems, each of which had an active and passive voice.

2. The Hebrew of the Old Testament:

In the Hebrew of the Old Testament most of these inflexions have disappeared. Of the three cases of the noun only the accusative -am has survived in a few adverbial forms, such as ‘omnam, "truly." The dual has entirely disappeared from the verb, and also from the noun, with the exception of things that occur in pairs, such as hand, eye, which have no plural. The nom. case of the dual and plural of the noun has disappeared, and the oblique case is used for both. Except in cases of poetic archaism the final nun of the verb has been lost, and, as the final vowels have fallen away in verbs, as well as in nouns, the result is that the jussive forms serve for indicative and subjunctive also. Many of the forms or stems have fallen into desuetude, and the passive forms of two alone are used.

3. Its Uniformity:

One of the most remarkable facts connected with the Hebrew of the Old Testament is that although that literature extends through a period of over 1,000 years, there is almost no difference between the language of the oldest parts and that of the latest. This phenomenon is susceptible of several explanations. In the first place, nearly the whole of the Old Testament literature is religious in character, and as such the earliest writings would become the model for the later, just as the Koran—the first prose work composed in Arabic which has survived—has become the pattern for all future compositions. The same was true for many centuries of the influence of Aristophanes and Euripides upon the language of educated Greeks, and, it is said, of the influence of Confucius upon that of the learned Chinese.

4. The Cause Thereof:

But a chief cause is probably the fact that the Semitic languages do not vary with time, but with place. The Arabic vocabulary used in Morocco differs from that of Egypt, but the Arabic words used in each of these countries have remained the same for centuries—in fact, since Arabic began to be spoken in them. Similarly, the slight differences which are found in the various parts of the Old Testament are to be ascribed, not to a difference of date, but to the fact that some writers belonged to the Southern Kingdom, some to the Northern, some wrote in Palestine, some in Babylonia (compare Ne 13:23,24; Jud 12:6;

18:3).

5. Differences Due to Age:

The Old Testament literature falls into two main periods: that composed before and during the Babylonian exile, and that which falls after the exile. But even between these two periods the differences of language are comparatively slight, so that it is often difficult or impossible to say on linguistic grounds alone whether a particular chapter is pre-exilic or post-exilic, and scholars of the first rank often hold the most contrary opinions on these points. For instance, Dillmann places the so-called Document P (Priestly Code) before Document D (Deuteronomic Code) in the regal period, whereas most critics date D about 621 and P about 444 BC.

6. Differences of Style:

It is needless to add that the various writers differ from one another in point of style, but these variations are infinitesimal compared with those of Greek and Latin authors, and are due, as has been said above, largely to locality and environment. Thus the style of Hosea is quite different from that of his contemporary Amos, and that of Deutero-Isaiah shows very distinctly the mark of its place of composition.

7. Foreign Influences:

A much more potent factor in modifying the language was the influence of foreign languages upon Hebrew, especially in respect to vocabulary. The earliest of these was probably Egyptian but of much greater importance was Assyrian, from which Hebrew gained a large number of loan words. It is well known that the Babylonian script was used for commercial purposes throughout Southwestern Asia, even before the Hebrews entered Canaan (see TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT), but the influence of Babylon upon Palestine seems to have been greatly exaggerated. The main point of contact is in the mythology, which may have been common to both peoples. In the later, especially post-exilic stages of the language, many Aramaisms are found in respect to syntax as well as vocabulary; and in later phases still, Persian and even Greek words are found.

8. Poetry and Prose:

As in other languages, so in Hebrew, the vocabulary of the poetical literature differs from that of the prose writers. In Hebrew, however, there is not the hard-and-fast distinction between these two which obtains in the classics. Whenever prose becomes elevated by the importation of feeling, it falls into a natural rhythm which in Hebrew constitutes poetry. Thus most of the so-called prophetical books are poetical in form. Another mark of poetry is a return to archaic grammatical forms, especially the restoration of the final nun in the verb.

9. Home of the Hebrew Language:

The form of Semitic which was indigenous in the land of Canaan is sometimes called Middle Semitic. Before the Israelites entered the country, it was the language of the Canaanites from whom the Hebrews took it over. That Hebrew was not the language of Abraham before his migration appears from the fact that he is called an Aramean (De 26:5), and that Laban's native language was Aramaic (Ge 31:47). A further point is that the word "Sea" is used for the West and "Negeb" for the South, indicating Palestine as the home of the language (so Isa 19:18).

10. Its Antiquity:

As the aboriginal inhabitants of the land of Canaan were not Semites, we cannot infer the existence of the Hebrew language any earlier than the first immigrations of Semites into Palestine, that is, during the third millennium BC. It would thus be a much younger member of the Semitic family than Assyrian-Babylonian, which exhibits all the marks of great antiquity long before the Hebrew language is met with.

11. When Hebrew Became a Dead Language:

The Babylonian exile sounded the death-knell of the Hebrew language. The educated classes were deported to Babylon or fled to Egypt, and those who remained were not slow to adopt the language used by their conquerors. The old Hebrew became a literary and sacred tongue, the language of everyday life being probably Aramaic. Whatever may be the exact meaning of Ne 8:8, it proves that the people of that time had extreme difficulty in understanding classical Hebrew when it was read to them. Yet for the purpose of religion, the old language continued to be employed for several centuries. For patriotic reasons it was used by the Maccabees, and by Bar Cochba (135 AD).

LITERATURE.

Gesenius, Geschichte der hebr. Sprache und Schrift; Bertheau, "Hebr. Sprache" in RE, 2nd edition; see also "Literature" in the following section.

III. Chief Characteristics of Hebrew.

The special marks which particularly distinguish a language may be found in its alphabet, in its mode of inflection, or in its syntax.

1. Characteristic Sounds:

The Hebrew alphabet is characterized by the large number of guttural sounds which it contains, and these are not mere palatals like the Scotch or German chapter, but true throat sounds, such as are not found in the Aryan languages. Hence, when the Phoenician alphabet passed over into Greece, these

unpronounceable sounds, " ‘ "(‘ ayin), "ch" (cheth), "h" (he), "‘ " (’aleph) were changed into vowels, A, E, H, O. In Hebrew the guttural letters predominate. "In the Hebrew dictionaries the four gutturals occupy considerably more than a fourth part of the volume; the remaining eighteen letters occupying considerably less than three-fourths." Besides the guttural, there are three strong consonants "m" (mem), "q" (qoph), and "ts" (tsade), which are sounded with compression of the larynx, and are quite different from our "t," "k" and "s." In Greek, the first was softened into a "th" (theta), the other two were dropped as letters but retained as numerals.

2. Letters Representing Two Sounds:

Though the Hebrew alphabet comprises no more than 22 letters, these represent some 30 different sounds, for the 6 letters b, g, d, k, p and t, when they fall immediately after a vowel, are pronounced bh (v), gh, dh, kh, ph (f) and th. Moreover, the gutturals "ch" (cheth) and " ‘ "(‘ ayin) each represent two distinct sounds, which are still in use in Arabic. The letter "h" is sometimes sounded at the end of a word as at the beginning.

3. Consonants Representing Vowels:

A peculiarity of the Hebrew alphabet is that the letters are all consonants. Four of these, however, were very early used to represent vowel and diphthong sounds, namely, "‘ "," h", "w" and "y". So long as Hebrew was a spoken language no other symbols than these 22 letters were used. It was not until the 7th century AD at the earliest that the well-known elaborate system of signs to represent the vowels and other sounds was invented (see TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT).

4. The Syllable:

A feature of the Hebrew language is that no word or syllable may begin with a vowel: every syllable begins with a consonant. This is also true of the other Semitic languages, except Assyrian-Babylonian. When in the course of word-formation a syllable would begin with a vowel, the slight consonant’ (’aleph) is prefixed. Moreover, more than two consonants may not stand without vowels intervening, as in the English word "strength." At most, two consonants may begin a syllable, and even so a slight vowel is sounded between them, as qero’. A word may end in two consonants without vowels, as ‘amart, but no word or syllable ends in more than two.

5. Three-Letter Roots:

The outstanding feature of the Semitic family of languages is the root, consisting of three consonants. Practically, the triliteral root is universal. There are a few roots with more than three letters, but many of the quadriliteral roots are formed by reduplication, as kabkab in Arabic. Many attempts have been made to reduce three-letter stems to two-letter by taking the factors common to several roots of identical meaning. Thus duwm, damah, damam, "to be still," seem all to come from a root d-m. It is more

probable, however, that the root is always triliteral, but may appear in various forms.

6. Conjugations or Derived Stems:

From these triliteral roots all parts of the verbs are formed. The root, which, it ought to be stated, is not the infinitive, but the 3rd singular masculine perfect active, expresses the simple idea without qualification, as shabhar, "he broke." The idea of intensity is obtained by doubling the middle stem letter, as shibber, "he broke in fragments"; the passive is expressed by the u-vowel in the first place and the a-vowel in the last, as shubbar, "it was broken in fragments." The reflexive sense prefixes an "n" to the simple root, or a "t" (taw) to the intensive, but the former of these is often used as a passive, as nishbar, "it was broken," hithqaddesh, "he sanctified himself." The causative meaning is given by prefixing the letter "h", as malakh, "he was king," himlikh, "he caused (one) to be king." A somewhat similar method of verb building is found outside the Semitic language, for example, in Turkish. In some of these Semitic languages the number of formations is very numerous. In Hebrew also there are traces of stems other than those generally in use.

7. Absence of Tenses:

There are no tenses in Hebrew, in our sense of the word. There are two states, usually called tenses, the perfect and the imperfect. In the first the action is regarded as accomplished, whether in the past or future, as shabhar, "he broke," "he has broken," "he will have broken," or (in prophetic narrative) "he will break"; in the second, the action is regarded as uncompleted, "he will break," "he was breaking," "he is breaking," etc. The present is often expressed by the participle.

8. The Pronouns:

The different persons, singular and plural, are expressed by affixing to the perfect, and by prefixing to the imperfect, fragments of the personal pronouns, as shabharti, "I broke," shabharnu, "we broke," nishbor, "we will break," and so on. The fragments which are added to the perfect to express the nominative of the pronouns are, with some modification, especially the change of "t" into "k", added to the verb to express the accusative, and to the noun to express the genitive; for example, shabharta, "you broke," shebharekha, "he broke you," bethekha, "your house"; capharnu, "we counted," cepharanu, "he counted us," ciphrenu, "our book."

9. Formation of Nouns:

The same principles are followed in regard to the noun as to the verb. Many nouns consist solely of the three stem-letters articulated with one or with two vowels, except that monosyllables generally become dissyllabic, owing to the difficulty of pronouncing two vowelless consonants together: thus, melekh, "king," cepher, "book," goren, "threshingfloor" (instead of malk, ciphr, gorn), dabhar, "a word or thing," qarobh, "near." Nouns denoting place, instrument, etc., are often formed by prefixing the letter "m" to the root, as mishpat, "justice" from shaphat, "he judged," mazlegh, "a fork." Intensity is, given to the

root idea, as in the verb, by doubling the middle consonant: thus, choresh "working," charash (for charrash), "workman"; gonebh, "stealing," gannabh, "a thief." Similarly, words denoting incurable physical defects, ‘illem, "dumb," ‘iwwer, "blind," cheresh (for chirresh), "deaf and dumb." The feminine of nouns, as of the 3rd person of verbs, is formed by adding the letter "t", which when final is softened to "h", gebhirah, "queen-mother," "mistress," but gebhirtekh, "your mistress."

10. Internal Inflexion:

The inflexion of both verbs and nouns is accompanied by a constant lengthening or shortening of the vowels of the word, and this according to two opposite lines. In verbs with vowel-affixes the penultimate vowel disappears, as halakh, "he went," halekhu, "they went"; in the noun the ante-penultimate vowel disappears, as dabhar, "a word," plural debharim. As the vowel system, as stated above, is very late, the vocalization cannot be accepted as that of the living tongue. It represents rather the cantillation of the synagogue; and for this purpose, accents, which had a musical as well as an interpunctional value, have been added.

11. Syntax of the Verb:

Hebrew syntax is remarkable for its simplicity. Simple sentences predominate and are usually connected by the conjunction "and." Subordinate sentences are comparatively rare, but descriptive and temporal clauses are not uncommon. In the main narrative, the predicates are placed at the beginning of the sentence, first simply in the root form (3rd singular masculine), and then only when the subject has been mentioned does the predicate agree with it. Descriptive and temporal clauses may be recognized by their having the subject at the beginning (e.g. Ge 1:2). A curious turn is given to the narrative by the fact that in the main sentences, if the first verb is perfect, those which follow are imperfect, and vice versa, the conjunction which coordinates them receiving a peculiar vocalization—that of the definite article. In the English Bible, descriptive and temporal clauses are often rendered as if they were parts of the main sentence, for example, in the first verses of Genesis of which the literal translation is somewhat as follows: "At the beginning of God’s creating heaven and earth, when the earth was without form and void, and God’s spirit (or, a great wind) moved upon the face of the water, God said, Let there be light." It will thus be seen that the structure of Hebrew narrative is not so simple as it appears.

12. Syntax of the Noun:

In the Semitic languages, compound words do not occur, but this deficiency is made up by what is called the construct state. The old rule, that the second of two nouns which depend on one another is put in the genitive, becomes, in Hebrew, the first of two such nouns is put in the construct state. The noun in the construct state loses the definite article, and all its vowels are made as short as possible, just as if it were the beginning of a long word: for example, ha-bayith, "the house," but beth ha-melekh, "the house of the king," "the palace"; dabhar, "a word," but dibhere ruach, "words of wind," "windy words."

13. Poverty of Adjectives:

The Hebrew language is very poor in adjectives, but this is made up for by a special use of the construct state just mentioned. Thus to express magnitude the word "God" is added in the gen. case, as in the example above (Ge 1:2), "a mighty wind" = a wind of God; Ps 36:6, "the lofty mountains" = the mountains of God (so 68:15); 80:10, "goodly cedars" = cedars of God; so "a holy man" = a man of God; "the sacred box" = the ark of God, and so on; compare in the New Testament, Mt 27:54, "the son of God" = Lu 23:47, "a righteous (man)." Matthew was thinking in Aramaic, Luke in Greek. A similar use is made of other words, e.g. "stubborn" = hard of neck; "impudent" = hard of face; "extensive" = broad of hands; "miserable" = bitter of soul.

LITERATURE.

The articles on the Hebrew Language in Schenkel's Bibel-Lexikon, 1875, by Noldeke; in Encyclopedia Brit, 9th edition, by Robertson Smith; 11th edition by Noldeke; in the Imperial Bible Dict., 1866, by T. H. Weir; also those in HDB, EB.

Grammars:

A. B. Davidson's Elementary Heb Grammar and Syntax; Gesenius, Heb Grammar, English translation by Cowley, 2nd edition.

Dictionaries:

Brown, Briggs and Driver, Hebrew and English Lexicon; Gesenius, Handworterbuch, 15th edition; Feyerabend, Hebrew-English Pocket Dictionary; Breslau, English and Hebrew Dictionary.

IV. Biblical Aramaic.

1. Aramaic Portions of the Old Testament:

The Aramaic portions of the Old Testament are the following: Ezr 4:8-6:18; 7:11-26; Da 2:4-7:28; Ge 31:47 (two words); Jer 10:11. The language in which they are written used to be called Chaldee, but is now generally known simply as Biblical Aramaic. It represents a further declension from classical Semitic as compared with the Hebrew. The following are the principal points in which Biblical Aramaic differs from Hebrew.

2. Phonology:

The accent is placed on the last syllable, the first vowel disappearing, e.g. ‘abhadh for Hebrew ‘abhadh. It is curious that the same feature is found in Algerene and Moroccan Arabic: thus qacr becomes qcar. Dentals take the place of sibilants: dehabh for zahabh; telath for shalosh. The strong Hebrew "ts" (tsade) frequently becomes " ‘ "(‘ ayin), and Hebrew " ‘ "(‘ ayin) becomes "‘ " (’aleph): thus, ‘ar‘a’ for ‘erets;

‘uq for tsuq.

3. Grammar:

In Hebrew the definite article is the prefix hal (ha-); in Aramaic the affix a’; the latter, however, has almost lost its force. The dual is even more sparingly used than in Hebrew. The passive forms of verbs and those beginning with nun ("n") are practically wanting; the passive or reflexive forms are made by prefixing the letter "t" to the corresponding active forms, and that much more regularly than in Hebrew, there being three active and three passive forms.

4. Syntax:

In regard to syntax there is to be noted the frequent use of the participle instead of a finite verb, as in Hebrew; the disuse of the conjunction "and" with the vocalization of the article; and the disuse of the construct state in nouns, instead of which a circumlocution with the relative di is employed, e.g. tselem di dhehabh, "an image of gold." The same periphrasis is found also in West African Arabic.

5. Aramaic More Decadent than Hebrew:

It will thus be seen that if Hebrew represents a decadent form of an original classical language which was very similar to classical Arabic, Biblical Arabic stands on a still lower level. It is not to be supposed that Hebrew passed into Aramaic, though on the analogy of Arabic that view is not untenable. Rather, the different Semitic languages became fixed at different epochs. Arabic as a literary language crystallized almost at the source; Hebrew and the spoken Arabic of the East far down the stream; and Aramaic and Moroccan Arabic farthest down of all.

LITERATURE.

Kautzsch, Grammatik; Strack, Abriss des bibl. Aramaisch; Marti, Bibl. aram. Sprache; the articles on "Aramaic" or "Chaldee" in the Biblical Dicts. cited under III, and article ARAMAIC LANGUAGE in this Encyclopedia; the Hebrew text of Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, edition by Baer. Hebrew Dictionaries. generally include Biblical Aramaic.

V. Literary Characteristics of the Semites.

1. Concrete and Abstract:

The thinking of the Hebrews, like that of other Semites, was done, not in the abstract, but in the concrete. Thus, we find the material put for the immaterial, the expression for the thought, the instrument for the action, the action for the feeling. This mode of expression frequently gives rise to striking anthropomorphisms. Thus we have the eye for watchfulness or care (Ps 33:18); the long hand for far-reaching powers (Isa 59:1); broken teeth for defeated malice (Ps 3:7); the sword for slaughter (Ps

78:62); haughty eyes for superciliousness (Pr 6:17); to say in the heart for to think (Ps 10:6). It would be an interesting study to examine to what extent these expressions have been taken over from Hebrew into English.

2. View of Nature:

The Hebrew does not know the distinction between animate and inanimate Nature. All Nature is animate (Ps 104:29). The little hills rejoice (Ps 65:12); the mountains skip (Ps 114:4); the trees clap their hands (Isa 55:12); even the stones may cry out (Lu 19:40). Such expressions are not to be taken as mere poetical figures of speech; they are meant quite literally. All Nature is one: man is merely a part of Nature (Ps 104:23), even if he be the highest part (Ps 8:5). Hence, perhaps, it arises that there is no neuter gender in the Semitic languages.

3. Pictorial Imagination:

The highly imaginative nature of the Hebrew comes into play when he is recounting past events or writing history. To his mind’s eye all past events are present. He sees history taking place before his eyes as in a picture. Thus the perfect may generally be translated by the English past tense with "have," the imperfect by the English present tense with "is" or "is going to." In livelier style the participle is used: "They are entering the city, and behold Samuel is coming out to meet them" (1Sa 9:14). Hence, the oratio recta is always used in preference to the oratio obliqua. Moreover, the historian writes exactly as the professional story-teller narrates. Hence, he is always repeating himself and returning upon his own words (1Sa 5:1,2).

4. Prose and Poetry:

A result of the above facts is that there is no hard-and-fast distinction in Hebrew between prose and poetry. Neither is there in Hebrew, or in the Semitic language generally, epic or dramatic poetry, because their prose possesses these qualities in a greater degree than does the poetry of other races. All Hebrew poetry is lyric or didactic. In it there is no rhyme nor meter. The nearest approach to meter is what is called the qinah strophe, in which each verse consists of two parallel members, each member having five words divided into three and then two. The best example of this is to be found in Ps 19:7-9, and also in the Book of LAMENTATIONS (which see), from which the verse has received its name.

5. Hebrew Easy of Translation:

From the above description it may be inferred that the language of the Old Testament is one extremely easy of translation into foreign tongues without loss of meaning or rhythm, though it would be extremely difficult to render any modern language into classical Hebrew. Hence, the Psalms, for example, are as fine in their German or English versions as they are in the original. Where the Old Testament has been translated into the language of the country, it has become a classic. The English Bible is as important for the study of the English language as are the plays of Shakespeare.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the articles cited under III, Herder. The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, translation by J. Marsh, 1833; Ed. Konig, Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik in Bezug auf die bibl. Litt. komparativisch dargestellt, 1900; the same author’s brochure on the "Style of Scripture" in HDB, volume V; J. F. McCurdy on the "Semites" in the same volume; J. Kennedy, Hebrew Synonyms.

Thomas Hunter Weir

LANTERN

lan’-tern (phanos, phaino, "to give light"): Lanterns were carried by the mob which arrested Jesus in Gethsemane (Joh 18:3, probably better "torches"). The word "lantern" in the time of early versions had a much wider significance than now. The Romans, however, had lanterns in the times of Christ, made by use of translucent skins, bladders, or thin plates of horn.

LAODICEA

la-od-i-se’-a (Laodikia): A city of Asia Minor situated in the Lycos valley in the province of Phrygia, and the home of one of the Seven Churches of Re (1:11). Distinguished from several other cities of that name by the appellation Ad Lycum, it was founded by Antiochus II (261-246 BC) of Syria, who named it for his wife Laodike, and who populated it with Syrians and with Jews who were transplanted from Babylonia to the cities of Phrygia and Lydia. Though Laodicea stood on the great highway at the junction of several important routes, it was a place of little consequence until the Roman province of Asia was formed in 190 BC. It then suddenly became a great and wealthy center of industry, famous specially for the fine black wool of its sheep and for the Phrygian powder for the eyes, which was manufactured there (compare Re 3:18). In the vicinity was the temple of Men Karou and a renowned school of medicine. In the year 60 AD, the city was almost entirely destroyed by an earthquake, but so wealthy were its citizens that they rejected the proffered aid of Rome, and quickly rebuilt it at their own expense (compare Re 3:17). It was a city of great wealth, with extensive banking operations (compare Re 3:18). Little is known of the early history of Christianity there; Timothy, Mark and Epaphras (Col 1:7) seem to have been the first to introduce it. However, Laodicea was early the chief bishopric of Phrygia, and about 166 AD Sagaris, its bishop, was martyred. In 1071 the city was taken by the Seljuks; in 1119 it was recovered to the Christians by John Comnenus, and in the 13th century it fell finally into the hands of the Turks.

The ruins, now called Eski Hissar, or old castle, lie near the modern Gonjelli on the railroad, and they have long served as a quarry to the builders of the neighboring town of Denizli. Among them nothing from before the Roman period has appeared. One of the two Roman theaters is remarkably well preserved, and there may still be seen the stadium, a colonnade, the aqueduct which brought the water across the valley to the city by an inverted siphon of stone pipes, a large necropolis, and the ruins of

three early Christian churches.

E. J. Banks

LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE

la-od-i-se’-anz, (en te Laodikeon ekklesia .... ten ek Laodikias, "in the church of the Laodiceans .... the epistle from Laodicea," Col 4:16):

I. EXPLANATIONS OF PAUL’S STATEMENT

1. Written by the Laodiceans?

2. Written by Paul from Laodicea?

3. An Epistle Addressed to the Laodiceans

II. EVIDENCE FAVORING EPISTLE TO EPHESIANS

1. Marcion’s Opinion

2. References in Ephesians and Other Epistles

3. Ephesian Church Jewish in Origin

4. Ephesians and Colossians, Sister Epistles

5. Recapitulation

III. LAODICEA DISPLACED BY EPHESUS

1. A Circular Epistle

2. Proof from Biblical Prologues

IV. REASON FOR SUCH AN EPISTLE

Paul here writes to the Colossians, "And when this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea." What was or what is this epistle?

I. Explanations of Paul’s Statement.

The words used by the apostle may mean:

(1) a letter written by the Laodiceans;

(2) an epistle written by Paul from Laodicea;

(3) an epistle written to the Laodiceans, and to be procured from them by the Colossians.

1. Written by the Laodiceans?:

The words may mean a letter written by the Laodiceans. But here it is sufficient to refer to the fact that Paul enjoins the Colossians to procure and to read "the epistle from Laodicea." How could a command of this kind be given in reference to an epistle written by third parties? How could Paul know that a copy of it had been made by the Laodiceans before sending it off? How could he tell that the Laodiceans would be willing to give away a copy of it? The suppositions involved by this hypothesis are incredible. Besides, the context regards the Epistle to the Colossians, and "that from Laodicea," as companion epistles, of which the two churches are to make an interchange, so that each church is directed to read both.

2. Written by Paul from Laodicea?:

Or, the words may refer to an epistle written by Paul from Laodicea. And it has been suggested that the epistle of which we are in search may be 1 Timothy, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, or Galatians. But in the case of these epistles, the probability is that every one of them was written elsewhere than from Laodicea. At the time when Paul wrote to Colosse, he was a prisoner in Rome, and for this reason alone, it was impossible that he could, at any recent date, have written any epistle from Laodicea. But his own statement (Col 2:1) is that those in Laodicea had not seen his face in the flesh. As he had never been in Laodicea, he could, not have written any epistle from that city.

3. An Epistle Addressed to the Laodiceans:

A third possibility is a letter written:

(1) not by Paul, but by some other person. But the whole tone of the passage does not favor this suggestion in the least;

(2) by Paul, but that the epistle is lost; this is the ordinary interpretation;

(3) the apocryphal Latin epistle. "To the Laodiceans."

This spurious epistle is a mere compilation clumsily put together; it has no marks of authenticity. Lightfoot (Col, 282) gives its general character thus: it "is a cento of Pauline phrases strung together without any definite connection or any clear object. They are taken chiefly from the Epistle to the Philippians, but here and there one is borrowed elsewhere, e.g. from the Epistle to the Galatians. Of course, it closes with an injunction to the Laodiceans to exchange epistles with the Colossians. The apostle's injunction in Col 4:16 suggested the forgery, and such currency as it ever attained was due to the support which that passage was supposed to give to it. Unlike most forgeries, it had no ulterior aim. It has no doctrinal peculiarities. It is quite harmless, so far as falsity and stupidity combined can ever be regarded as harmless" (Lightfoot, in the work quoted 282).

See APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES.

(4) The only other alternative is that "the epistle from Laodicea" is an epistle to the Laodiceans from Paul himself, which he directs the Colossians to procure from Laodicea. There seems to be not only a high degree of probability, but proof, that the epistle from Laodicea is the epistle known as the Epistle to the Ephesians. Paul therefore had written an epistle to Laodicea, a city which he had twice already mentioned in the Epistle to the Colossians, "For I would have you know how greatly I strive for you, and for them at Laodicea" (Col 2:1): "Salute the brethren that are in Laodicea, and Nymphas, and the church that is in their house" (Col 4:15). Accepting Col 4:16 to mean that he wrote to Laodicea at the same time as he wrote to Colosse, what has become of the former ep.? Do we know nothing more of it now than is contained in this reference to it in Colossians? The fact that it was, by Paul's express command, to be communicated to at least the two churches in Colosse and Laodicea, would make its disappearance and loss very strange.

II. Evidence Favoring Epistle to Ephesians.

But is there any warrant for concluding that it is lost at all? A statement of the facts of the case seems to show that the epistle which Paul wrote to the Laodiceans is extant, but only under another title. The lines of evidence which seem to show that the so-called Epistle to the Ephesians is in reality the epistle written by Paul to the Laodiceans are these:

It is well known that the words "at Ephesus" (Eph 1:1) in the inscription of the epistle are very doubtful. The Revised Version (British and American) reads in the margin, "Some very ancient authorites omit 'at Ephesus.'" Among the authorities which omit "at Ephesus" are the Vatican and Sinaitic manuscripts, the best and most ancient authorities existing.

1. Marcion's Opinion:

Tertullian asserts that the heretics, i.e. Marcion, had altered the title, "the Epistle to the Ephesians," to "the Epistle to the Laodiceans." But this accusation does not carry with it any doctrinal or heretical charge against Marcion in this respect. "It is not likely," says Moule (Eph, 25), "that Marcion was guilty here, where the change would have served no dogmatic purpose." And the fact that at that very early

period, the first half of the 2nd century, it was openly suggested that the destination of the epistle was Laodicea, is certainly entitled to weight, especially in view of the other fact already mentioned, which is of no less importance, that "at Ephesus" is omitted in the two great manuscripts, the Vatican and the Sinaitic.

2. References in Ephesians and Other Epistles:

The "Epistle to the Ephesians" could not be, primarily at least, addressed to Ephesus, because Paul speaks of his readers as persons in regard to whose conversion from heathenism to the faith of Christ he had just recently heard: "For this cause I also, having heard of the faith in the Lord Jesus which is among you, and the love which ye show toward all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers" (Eph 1:15 f). These words could not well be used in regard to the church at Ephesus, which Paul himself had founded, and in reference to persons among whom he had lived for three years, and where he even knew personally "every one" of the Christians (Ac 20:31).

And in Eph 3:1 f the King James Version, he writes: "For this cause I, Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God which is given me to you-ward." But how could he ever doubt that the elders of the church in Ephesus (Ac 20:17), as well as the members of that important church, were ignorant of the fact that a dispensation of the grace of God had been given to him? The inquiry, whether his readers had heard of the one great fact on which his ministry was based, could not apply in any degree to the Christians in Ephesus. The apostle and the Ephesians had a clear and intimate mutual knowledge. They knew him and valued him and loved him well. When he bade the elders of the church farewell, they all fell on his neck and kissed him (Ac 20:37).

Clearly therefore the statement that he had just recently heard of their conversion, and his inquiry whether they had heard that a dispensation of the grace of God had been entrusted to him, do not and cannot describe the members of the church in Ephesus. "It is plain," writes Moule (Eph, 26), "that the epistle does not bear an Ephesian destination on the face of it."

In the Epistle to the Corinthians there are many local references, as well as allusions to the apostle’s work in Corinth. In the Epistle to the Galatians there are also many references to his work among the people of the churches in Galatia. The same is the case in the Epistle to the Philippians, several names being mentioned of persons known to the apostle. In the two Epistles to the Thessalonians, references also occur to his work among them.

Turning to the Epistle to the Colossians, and to that to the Romans—Colossae and Rome being cities which he had not visited previous to his writing to the churches there—he knows several persons in Colosse; and in the case of the Epistle to the Romans, he mentions by name no fewer than twenty-six persons in that city.

How is it then that in "the Epistle to the Ephesians" there are no references at all to the three years which

he spent in Ephesus? And how also is there no mention of any one of the members of the church or of the elders whom he knew so intimately and so affectionately? "Ephesians" is inexplicable on the ordinary assumption that Ephesus was the city to which the epistle was addressed. The other theory, that the epistle was a circular one, sent in the first instance to Laodicea, involves no such difficulty.

3. Ephesian Church Jewish in Origin:

Another indication in regard to the primary destination of the epistle is in the words, "ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands; that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world" (Eph 2:11,12). Do these words describe the church in Ephesus? Was the church there Gentilein its origin? Very far from this, for as a matter of fact it began by Paul preaching the gospel to the Jews, as is narrated at length by Luke in Ac 18. Then in Ac 19, Paul comes again to Ephesus, where he went into the synagogue and spake boldly for the space of three months, but when divers were hardened and believed not, but spake evil of the Way before the multitude, he separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus.

Here, therefore, is definite proof that the church in Ephesus was not Gentilein its origin. It was distinctly Jewish, but a Gentileelement had also been received into it. Now the church to which Paul writes "the Epistle to the Ephesians" was not Jewish at all. He does not speak to his readers in any other way than "you Gentiles."

4. Ephesians and Colossians Sister Epistles:

But an important consideration is that the "Epistle to the Ephesians" was written by Paul at the same sitting almost as that to the Colossians. These two are sister epistles, and these along with the Epistle to Philemon were written and sent off at the same time, Onesimus and Tychicus carrying the Epistle to the Colossians (Col 4:7,8,9), Onesimus being the bearer of that to Philem, while Tychicus in addition to carrying the Colossian epistle was also the messenger who carried "the Epistle to the Ephesians" (Eph 6:21).

A close scrutiny of Colossians and "Ephesians" shows, to an extent without a parallel elsewhere in the epistles of the New Testament, a remarkable similarity of phraseology. There are only two verses in the whole of Colossians to which there is no parallel in "Ephesians." The same words are used, while the thought is so varied and so rich, that the one epistle is in no sense a copy or repetition of the other (see list of parallelisms, etc., in Paul’s Epistles to Colosse and Laodicea, T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh). Both epistles come warm and instinct with life from the full heart of the great apostle who had not, up to that time, visited either city, but on whom, none the less, there came daily the care of all the churches.

5. Recapitulation:

To recapitulate:

(1) The words "at Ephesus" in the inscription of the epistle are wanting in the two oldest and best manuscripts.

(2) Paul speaks of his readers as persons of whose conversion to Christ he knew only by report. Similarly he speaks of them as knowing only by hearsay of his commission as an apostle of Christ. Also, though he had lived in Ephesus for three years, this epistle does not contain a single salutation.

(3) He speaks of his readers as forming a church exclusively of the Gentiles. But the church in Ephesus, so far from being exclusively gentile, was actually Jewish in origin.

(4) "Ephesians" was written at the same sitting as Colossians, and the same messenger, Tychicus, carried them both.

Therefore as the epistle was not, and could not be, addressed to Ephesus, the conclusion is that it was addressed to some church, and that it was not a treatise sent to the Christian church generally. The words of the first verse of the ep., "to the saints that are," proves that the name of the place to which it was addressed is all that is lost from the manuscripts, but that the name of the city was there originally, as the epistle came from Paul’s hand.

Now Paul wrote an epistle to Laodicea at the same time as he wrote to Colosse. He dispatched both epistles by Tychicus. The thought and feeling and even the diction of the two epistles are such that no other explanation is possible but that they came warm from the heart of the same writer at the same time. On all these grounds the conclusion seems inevitable that the Epistle to Laodicea is not lost at all, but that it is identical with the so-called "Epistle to the Ephesians."

III. Laodicea Displaced by Ephesus.

1. A Circular Epistle:

How then did Ephesus displace Laodicea? It is explained at once if theory is adopted that the epistle was a "circular" one addressed not to Laodicea only, but to other cities. We know e.g. that the apostle orders it to be taken to the church in Colosse and read there. So also it might have been sent to other cities, such as Hierapolis (Col 4:13) and Ephesus. Hence, if the church in Laodicea were not careful to see that the epistle was returned to them, by those churches to whom they had sent it, it can easily be understood how a copyist in any of those cities might leave out the words "in Laodicea," as not agreeing with the name of the city where the manuscript actually was at the time. As copies were multiplied, the words "in Ephesus" would be suggested, as the name of the chief city of Asia, from which province the epistle had come to the knowledge of the whole Christian church, and to which, in point of fact, Paul had sent it. The feeling would be natural, that it was in keeping with the fitness of things, that Paul, who had rounded the church in Ephesus, should have written an epistle to the church there.

2. Proof from Biblical Prologues:

In an article upon "Marcion and the Canon" by Professor J. Rendel Harris, LL.D., in the The Expository Times, June, 1907, there is reference to the Revue Benedictine for January of that year, which contained a remarkable article by de Bruyne, entitled "Biblical Prologues of Marcionite Origin," in which the writer succeeded in showing that a very widely spread series of prefaces to the Pauline Epistles, which occur in certain Latin Bibles, must have been taken from a Marcionite Bible. Professor Rendel Harris adds that the prefaces in question may go back to Marcion himself, for in any case the Marcionite hand, from which they come, antedates the Latin tradition in which the prologues are imbedded. "It is clear from Tertullian's polemic against Marcion, that the Pauline Epistles stood in the following order in the Marcionite Canon: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, then Ephesians (which Marcion calls by the name of the Epistle to the Laodiceans), Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon. .... Let us turn to the prologues that are current in Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) and other manuscripts for Ephesians and Colossains: the Ephesian prologue runs as follows: 'Ephesii sunt Asiani. Hi accepto verbo veritatis perstiterunt in fide. Ho conlaudat apostolus, scribens eis a Roma de carcere!' When, however, we turn to the Colossian prologue, we find that it opens as follows: 'Colossenses et hi sicut Laodicenses sunt Asiani. Et ipsi praeventi erant a pseudapostolis, nec ad hos accessit apostolus sed et hos per epistolam recorrigit,' etc.

"From this it is clear that originally the prologue to the Laodiceans preceded the prologue to Colossians, and that the

Ephesian prologue is a substitute for the Laodicean prologue, which can be partly reconstructed from the references to it in the Colossian prologue. We can see that it had a statement that the Laodiceans belonged to Asia Minor, that they had been under the influence of false apostles, and had never been visited by Paul, who corrects their error by an epistle ....

"We have now shown that the original Canon had 'Laodiceans, Colossians.' It is interesting to observe how some Latin manuscripts naively admit this: 'You must know that the epistle which we have as that written to the Ephesians, the heretics, and especially the Marcionites, entitle the Epistle to the Laodiceans.'"

IV. Reason for Such an Epistle.

Assuming therefore that the "Epistle to the Ephesians" is the epistle which Paul wrote to the Laodiceans, various questions arise, such as, Why did he write to the church there? What was there in the state of the church in Laodicea to call for an epistle from him? Was there any heresy there, like the false teaching which existed in the neighboring church in Colosse?

The answer to such questions is that though we do not possess much information, yet these churches in the province of Asia had many things in common. They had originated at the same time, during the two

whole years of Paul’s residence in Ephesus. They were composed of men of the same races, and speaking the same languages. They were subject to the same influences of doctrinal error. The errors into which any one church fell could not fail to affect the others also. These churches were permeated to a large extent by the same ideas, derived both from the current philosophy and from their ancestral heathen religions. They would, therefore, one and all, require the same apostolic instruction and exhortation. This epistle, accordingly, bears a close resemblance to the Epistle to the Colossians, just for the reason that the circumstances of the church in Laodicea were similar to those of the church in Colosse; and also, that the thoughts which filled Paul’s heart as he wrote to Colosse were adapted, in the first place, to counteract the false teaching in Colosse, but they are also the foundation of all Christian experience, and the very life of all Christian truth and doctrine. These are the great thoughts of Christ the Creator of all things, Christ the Upholder of all things, Christ the Reconciler of all things. Such thoughts filling Paul’s heart would naturally find expression in language bearing a close resemblance to that in which he had just written to Colosse.

It is no more astonishing that Paul should have written to Laodicea, than that he also wrote to Colosse, which was probably the least important of all the cities and churches mentioned in the apostle’s work and career. Neither is it any more to be wondered at that he should have written so profound an epistle as that to "the Ephesians," than that he should also have given directions that it be sent on to Colosse and read there; for this reason, that the exposition of Christ’s great love to the church and of His giving Himself for it—the doctrine of the grace of God—is the very corrective required by the errors of the false teachers at Colosse, and is also the groundwork of Christian truth and experience for all agesú

NOTE: A very remarkable circumstance in regard to the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans is mentioned by Nestle in the preface to his edition of the Latin New Testament, published in Stuttgart in 1906. He writes that "the Epistle to the Laodiceans was for a thousand years part of very many Latin Bibles, and obtained a place in pre-Lutheran German Bibles, together with Jerome’s Epistle to Damasus."

John Rutherfurd

LAP

The word is the translation of three different Hebrew expressions: cheq (Pr 16:33), beghedh (2Ki 4:39), and chotsen (Ne 5:13, besides chatsen, Ps 129:7). In all these passages the meaning is that of a part of oriental clothing, probably the folds of the garment covering the bosom or lap of a person. The flowing garments of Orientals invite the use of the same, on the part of speakers, in driving home certain truths enunciated by impressive gesticulation. Every reader of Roman history recalls the impressive incident of Quintus Fabius Maximus (Cunctator), who, in 219 BC, was ambassador of Rome to Carthage, and who, before the city council, holding the folds of his toga in the shape of a closed pouch, declared that he held enclosed in the same both peace and war, whichever the Carthaginians should desire to choose. When the Carthaginians clamored for war, he opened the folds of his garment and said: "Then you shall have war!" Very much like it, Nehemiah, when pleading for united efforts for the improvement of social

order, addressed the priests of Jerusalem to get a pledge of their cooperation: "Also I shook out my lap (chotsen), and said, So God shake out every man from his house, and from his labor, that performeth not this promise; even thus be he shaken out, and emptied" (Ne 5:13).

In English Versions of the Bible the verb "to lap" is found, which has no etymological connection with the above-mentioned nouns. It is in Hebrew laqaq and refers to the loud licking up of water by dogs (1Ki 21:19; 22:38 the King James Version), and in the story of Gideon's battle against the Midianites, of his 300 warriors (Jud 7:5).

H. L. E. Luering

LAPPIDOTH

lap'-i-doth, -doth (lappidhoth, "flames," "torches"; the King James Version, Lapidoth): Deborah's husband (Jud 4:4). The Hebrew name is a feminine plural like Jeremoth (1Ch 7:8), Naboth (1Ki 21:1). The plural is probably intensive. Jewish interpreters have identified Lappidoth ("flames") with Barak ("lightning"). Some have taken the words rendered "wife of Lappidoth" ('esheth lappidhoth) as a description of Deborah, and have translated them, "woman of lights," i.e. maker of wicks for the sanctuary; or "woman of flames," referring to her prophetic zeal. These explanations are more interesting than probable.

John A. Lees

LAPWING

lap'-wing (dukhiphath; epops): A translation used in early VSS, now universally admitted to be incorrect. The lapwing had a crest, and resembled in size and color the hoopoe (Upupa epops). It appears in the lists of abominations only (Le 11:19 the King James Version and De 14:18 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) HOOPOE, which see). The lapwing is a plover, and its flesh and eggs are delicious food.

LASCIVIOUSNESS

la-siv'-i-us-nes (aselgeia, "licentiousness," "wantonness," "unbridled lust," "shamelessness," "outrageousness"):

1. Sources:

Etymologists assign three probable sources of aselgeia, namely:

(1) from a compound of the alpha privitive (negation) and Selge, a Pisidian city whose inhabitants

according to Thayer (New Testament Lexicon) "excelled in strictness of morals," but, according to Trench, a place whose people "were infamous for their vices";

(2) from a compound of "a" intense, and salagein, "to raise a disturbance or noise";

(3) from a compound of the alpha privitive a- and selgo, or thelgo, "exciting disgust or displeasure." It evidently means conduct and character that is unbecoming, indecent, unrestrainedly shameless.

2. As Used in the New Testament:

Mark uses it in 7:22 with uncertainty as to the vice meant. Paul (2Co 12:21) classes it with uncleanness and fornication as sins to be repented of; also (Ga 5:19; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 14:26, "wantonness") puts it in the same catalogue with other works of the flesh; and (Eph 4:19) he refers to some aged ones so covetous, that they made trade of themselves by giving "themselves up to lasciviousness." The same word is translated "wantonness" in Ro 13:13, meaning wanton manner, filthy words, unchaste movements of the body. Peter (1Pe 4:3) mentions those who "walked in lasciviousness, lusts, winebibbings, revellings, carousings, and abominable idolatries." He speaks (2Pe 2:2) of "lascivious doings" (the King James Version "pernicious ways"); (2Pe 2:7) "lascivious life" (the King James Version "filthy conversation"); and (2Pe 2:18) of "lasciviousness" (the King James Version "wantonness"), as a means "to entice in the lusts of the flesh." Jude 1:4 probably does not refer to any form of sensuality in using the word descriptive of "ungodly men" who perverted the faith of some and denied our only Master.

William Edward Raffety

LASEA

la-se’-a (Lasaia): A town on the South coast of Crete, 5 miles East of Fair Havens (Ac 27:8). The ruins were examined in 1856 by G. Brown (see Code of Hammurabi (St. P), chapter xxiii, 640). If Paul’s ship was detained long at this anchorage, it would be necessary to purchase stores from Lasea; and this in addition to the inconvenience of the roadstead (see FAIR HAVENS) would probably explain the captain’s reluctance to winter there.

LASHA

la’-sha (lasha‘): A place named on the southern boundary of the Canaanites along with Gomorrah, Adnah and Zeboiim (Ge 10:19). Eusebius, Onomasticon identifies it with the hot springs at Callirrhoe in Wady Zerqa Ma‘in, on the East of the Dead Sea; in this agreeing with Targum Jerusalem. This position, however, seems too far to the North, and possibly the site should be sought on the West of the Arabah. The absence of the article (compare Jos 15:2) prevents identification with the promontory el-Lisan, which runs into the sea from the eastern shore. Wellhausen (Comp. des Hexateuch., 15) thinks we should read lesham, since the Hebrew letters, "m" (mem) and " ‘ "(‘ ayin), are like each other in their

Palmyrene form. We should then have indicated the boundary from Gaza to the Dead Sea, and then from the Dead Sea to Leshem, i.e. Dan. This is very precarious. No identification is possible.

W. Ewing

LASSHARON

la-sha'-ron, la-shar'-on (lashsharon or la-sharon, the King James Version Sharon): A royal city of the Canaanites taken by Joshua, named with Aphek (Jos 12:18). Possibly we should here follow the reading of Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus), "the king of Aphek in Sharon." Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Saron") mentions a region between Mt. Tabor and the Lake of Tiberias called Sarona. This is probably represented by the ancient site Sarona, on the plateau 6 1/2 miles Southwest 2 of Tiberias. If Massoretic Text is correct, this may be the place intended.

LAST DAY

See DAY, LAST.

LAST DAYS

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

LAST TIME, TIMES

(kairos eschatos, chronos eschatos (also plural), eschaton tou chronou, hora eschate): In the King James Version this phrase occurs in 1Pe 1:5; 1:20 (plural); 1 Joh 2:18; Jude 1:18. The Revised Version (British and American) has, in 1Pe 1:20, "at the end of the times," and in 1 Joh 2:18, "the last hour," in closer adherence to the Greek. The conception is closely allied to that of "the last day," and, like this, has its root in the Old Testament conception of "the end of days." In the Old Testament this designates the entire eschatological period as that which the present course of the world is to issue into, and not, as might be assumed, the closing section of history. It is equivalent to what was later called "the coming aeon" (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT). In the New Testament, on the other hand, the phrase "the last time" does mark the concluding section of the present world-period, of the present aeon. In three of the New Testament passages the consciousness expresses itself that these "last times" have arrived, and that the period extending from the appearance or the resurrection of Christ until His Second Coming is the closing part of the present age, that the writer and readers are living in "the last times." In one passage (1Pe 1:5) "the last time" is projected farther forward into the future, so that it comes to mean the time immediately preceding the reappearance of Christ. Both usages can be readily explained. The days of the Messiah were to the Old Testament writers part of the future world, although to the later Jewish chiliasm they appeared as lying this side of it, because differing from the world to come in their earthly and temporal character. To the early Christians the days of the Messiah appeared

more closely assimilated in character to the future world, so that no reason existed on this score for not including them in the latter. Still it was also realized that the Messiah in His first appearance had not brought the full realization of the coming world, and that only His return from heaven would consummate the kingdom of God. Accordingly, the days in which they lived assumed to them the character of an intermediate period, marked off on the one hand from the previous development by the appearance of the Messiah, but equally marked off from the coming eon by His reappearance in glory. From a formal point of view the representation resembles the Jewish chiliastic scheme, but with a twofold substantial difference:

(a) the chiliastic scheme restricts the Messiah and His work to the last days, and does not carry Him over into the coming world, whereas to the Christian the coming world, no less than the last days, is thoroughly Messianic;

(b) to the Jewish point of view both the days of the Messiah and the coming world lie in the future, whereas to the Christian the former have already arrived.

It remained possible, however, from the Christian point of view to distinguish within the last times themselves between the immediate present and the future conclusion of this period, and this is done in 1Pe 1:5. Also in 1 Joh 2:18 the inference that "the last hour" has come is not drawn from the presence of the Messiah, but from the appearance of the anti-Christian power, so that here also a more contracted conception of the last stage of history reveals itself, only not as future (1Pe 1:5), but as present (hence, "hour" not "time").

For literature see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Geerhardus Vos

LASTHENES

las’-the-nez (Lasthenes): A highly placed official under King Demetrius II, Nicator. He is called the king’s "kinsman" (the King James Version "cousin") and "father" (1 Macc 11:31,32; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iv, 9), but these are to be taken as court titles rather than as denoting blood-relationship. According to Josephus (Ant., XIII, iv, 3) he was a native of Crete, and raised an army for the king when he made his first descent upon the coast, and rendered him ultimately successful in wresting the throne of Syria from Alexander Balas (1 Macc 10:67; Ant, XIII, iv, 3). The letter addressed to Lasthenes indicates that he was probably prime minister or grand vizier of the kingdom.

J. Hutchinson

LATCHET

lach’-et (serokh; himas): Leather thong used for tying on sandals (see Ge 14:23; Mr 1:7 parallel). The

stooping to untie the dusty shoe-latchet was esteemed by Orientals a service that was at once petty and defiling, and was usually assigned to menials.

LATIN

lat'-in: Was the official language of the Roman Empire as Greek was that of commerce. In Palestine Aramaic was the vernacular in the rural districts and remoter towns, while in the leading towns both Greek and Aramaic were spoken. These facts furnish the explanation of the use of all three tongues in the inscription on the cross of Christ (Mt 27:37; Mr 15:26; Lu 23:38; Joh 19:19). Thus the charge was written in the legal language, and was technically regular as well as recognizable by all classes of the people. The term "Latin" occurs in the New Testament only in Joh 19:20, Rhomaisti, and in Lu 23:38, Rhomaikois (grammasin), according to Codices Sinaiticus, A, D, and N. It is probable that Tertullus made his plea against Paul before Felix (Ac 24) in Latin, though Greek was allowed in such provincial courts by grace of the judge. It is probable also that Paul knew and spoke Latin; compare W.M. Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, 1906, 65, and A. Souter, "Did Paul Speak Latin?" The Expositor, April, 1911. The vernacular Latin had its own history and development with great influence on the ecclesiastical terminology of the West. See W. Bury, "The Holy Latin Tongue," Dublin Review, April, 1906, and Ronsch, Itala und Vulgata, 1874, 480 f. There is no doubt of the mutual influence of Greek and Latin on each other in the later centuries. See W. Schulze, Graeca Latina, 1891; Viereck, Sermo Graecus, 1888.

It is doubtful if the Latin syntax is clearly perceptible in the koine (see LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT).

Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 117 f) finds ergasian didomi (operam dare) in an xyrhynchus papyrus letter of the vulgar type from 2nd century BC (compare Lu 12:58). A lead tablet in Amorgus has krino to dikaion (compare Lu 12:57). The papyri (2nd century AD) give sunairo logon (compare Mt 18:23 f). Moulton (Expositor, February, 1903, 115) shows that to hikanon poiein (satisfacere), is as old as Polybius. Even sumbouilion lambanien (concilium capere), may go with the rest like su opes (Mt 27:4), for videris (Thayer). Moulton (Prol., 21) and Thumb (Griechische Sprache, 121) consider the whole matter of syntactical Latinisms in the New Testament inconclusive. But see also C. Wessely, "Die lateinischen Elemente in der Gracitat d. agypt. Papyrusurkunden," Wien. Stud., 24; Laforcade. Influence du Latin sur le Grec. 83-158.

There are Latin words in the New Testament: In particular Latin proper names like Aquila, Cornelius, Claudia, Clemens, Crescens, Crispus, Fortunatus, Julia, Junia, etc., even among the Christians in the New Testament besides Agrippa, Augustus, Caesar, Claudius, Felix, Festus, Gallio, Julius, etc.

Besides we find in the New Testament current Latin commercial, financial, and official terms like assarion (as), denarion (denarius), kenturion (centurio), kenos (census), kodrantes (quadrans), kolonia (colonia), koustodia (custodia), legeon (legio), lention (linteum), libertinos (libertinus), litra (litra), makellon (macellum), membrana (membrana), milion (mille), modios (modius), xestes (sextarius),

praitorion (praetorium), sikarios (sicarius), simikinthion (semicinctium), soudarion (sudarium), spekoulator (speculator), taberna (taberna), titlos (titulus), phelones (paenula), phoron (forum), phragellion (flagellum), phragelloo (flagello), chartes (charta?), choros (chorus).

Then we meet such adjectives as Herodianoi, Philippesioi, Christianoi, which are made after the Latin model. Mark's Gospel shows more of these Latin words outside of proper names (compare Ro 16), as is natural if his Gospel were indeed written in Rome.

See also LATIN VERSION, THE OLD.

LITERATURE.

Besides the literature already mentioned see Schurer, Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Div II, volume I, 43 ff; Krauss, Griechische und lateinische Lehnworter im Talmud (1898, 1899); Hoole, Classical Element in the New Testament (1888); Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar (1897); W. Schmid, Atticismus, etc. (1887-97); Kapp, Latinismis merito ac falso susceptis (1726); Georgi, De Latinismis N T (1733); Draeger, Historische Syntax der lat. Sprache (1878-81); Pfister, Vulgarlatein und Vulgargriechisch (Rh. Mus., 1912, 195-208).

A. T. Robertson

LATIN VERSION, THE OLD

1. The Motive of Translation

2. Multiplicity of Latin Translations in the 4th Century

3. The Latin Bible before Jerome

4. First Used in North Africa

5. Cyprian's Bible

6. Tertullian's Bible

7. Possible Eastern Origin of Old Latin

8. Classification of Old Latin Manuscripts

9. Individual Characteristics

10. Value of Old Latin for Textual Criticism

LITERATURE

1. The Motive of Translation:

The claim of Christianity to be the one true religion has carried with it from the beginning the obligation to make its Holy Scriptures, containing the Divine message of salvation and life eternal, known to all mankind. Accordingly, wherever the first Christian evangelists carried the gospel beyond the limits of the Greek-speaking world, one of the first requirements of their work was to give the newly evangelized peoples the record of God's revelation of Himself in their mother tongue. It was through the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament that the great truths of revelation first became known to the Greek and Roman world. It is generally agreed that, as Christianity spread, the Syriac and the Latin versions were the first to be produced; and translations of the Gospels, and of other books of the Old and New Testament in Greek, were in all probability to be found in these languages before the close of the 2nd century.

2. Multiplicity of Latin Translations in the 4th Century:

Of the earliest translators of the Bible into Latin no record has survived. Notwithstanding the careful investigations of scholars in recent years, there are still many questions relating to the origin of the Latin Bible to which only tentative and provisional answers can be given. It is therefore more convenient to begin a study of its history with Jerome toward the close of the 4th century and the commission entrusted to him by Pope Damasus to produce a standard Latin version, the execution of which gave to Christendom the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (see VULGATE). The need for such a version was clamant. There existed by this time a multiplicity of translations differing from one another, and there was none possessed of commanding authority to which appeal might be made in case of necessity. It was the consideration of the chaotic condition of the existing translations, with their divergences and variations, which moved Damasus to commission Jerome to his task and Jerome to undertake it. We learn particulars from the letter of Jerome in 383 transmitting to his patron the first installment of his revision, the Gospels. "Thou compellest me," he writes, "to make a new work out of an old so that after so many copies of the Scriptures have been dispersed throughout the whole world I am as it were to occupy the post of arbiter, and seeing they differ from one another am to determine which of them are in agreement with the original Greek." Anticipating attacks from critics, he says, further: "If they maintain that confidence is to be reposed in the Latin exemplars, let them answer which, for there are almost as many copies of translations as manuscripts. But if the truth is to be sought from the majority, why not rather go back to the Greek original, and correct the blunders which have been made by incompetent translators, made worse rather than better by the presumption of unskillful correctors, and added to or altered by careless scribes?" Accordingly, he hands to the Pontiff the four Gospels to begin with after a careful comparison of old Greek manuscripts.

From Jerome's contemporary, Augustine, we obtain a similar picture. "Translators from Hebrew into

Greek," he says (De Doctrina Christiana, ii.11), "can be numbered, but Latin translators by no means. For whenever, in the first ages of the faith, a Greek manuscript came into the hands of anyone who had also a little skill in both languages, he made bold to translate it forthwith." In the same context he mentions "an innumerable variety of Latin translators," "a crowd of translators." His advice to readers is to give a preference to the Itala, "which is more faithful in its renderings and more intelligible in its sense." What the Itala is, has been greatly discussed. Formerly it was taken to be a summary designation of all the versions before Jerome's time. But Professor Burkitt (Texts and Studies, IV) strongly urges the view that by this term Augustine designates Jerome's Vulgate, which he might quite well have known and preferred to any of the earlier translations. However this may be, whereas before Jerome there were those numerous translations, of which he and Augustine complain, after Jerome there is the one preeminent and commanding work, produced by him, which in course of time drove all others out of the field, the great Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) edition, as it came to be called, of the complete Latin Bible.

3. The Latin Bible before Jerome:

We are here concerned with the subject of the Latin Bible before the time of Jerome. The manuscripts which have survived from the earlier period are known by the general designation of Old Latin. When we ask where these first translations came into existence, we discover a somewhat surprising fact. It was not at Rome, as we might have expected, that they were first required. The language of Christian Rome was mainly Greek, down to the 3rd century. Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans in Greek. When Clement of Rome in the last decade of the 1st century wrote an epistle in the name of the Roman church to the Corinthians, he wrote in Greek Justin Martyr, and the heretic Marcion, alike wrote from Rome in Greek. Out of 15 bishops who presided over the Roman. See down to the close of the 2nd century, only four have Latin names. Even the pagan emperor Marcus Aurelius wrote his Meditations in Greek If there were Christians in Rome at that period whose only language was Latin, they were not sufficiently numerous to be provided with Christian literature; at least none has survived.

4. First Used in North Africa:

It is from North Africa that the earliest Latin literature of the church has come down to us. The church of North Africa early received a baptism of blood, and could point to an illustrious roll of martyrs. It had also a distinguished list of Latin authors, whose Latin might sometimes be rude and mixed with foreign idioms, but had a power and a fire derived from the truths which it set forth. One of the most eminent of these Africans was Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who won the martyr's crown in 257. His genuine works consist of a number of short treatises, or tracts, and numerous letters, all teeming with Scripture quotations. It is certain that he employed a version then and there in use, and it is agreed that "his quotations are carefully made and thus afford trustworthy standards of African Old Latin in a very early though still not the earliest stage" (Hort, Introduction to the New Testament in Greek, 78).

5. Cyprian's Bible:

Critical investigation has made it clear that the version used by Cyprian survives in a fragmentary copy of Mark and Matthew, now at Turin in North Italy, called Codex Bobbiensis (k), and in the fragments of the Apocalypse and Ac contained in a palimpsest at Paris called Codex Floriacensis (h). It has been found that another MS, Codex Palatinus (e) at Vienna, has a text closely akin to that exhibited in Cyprian, although there are traces of mixture in it. The text of these manuscripts, together with the quotations of the so-called Speculum Augustini (m), is known among scholars as African Old Latin. Another manuscript with an interesting history, Codex Colbertinus (c) contains also a valuable African element, but in many parts of the Gospels it sides also with what is called the European Old Latin more than with k or e. Codex Bobbiensis (k) has been edited with a learned introduction in the late Bishop John Wordsworth's Old Latin Biblical Texts, the relation of k to Cyprian as well as to other Old Latin texts being the subject of an elaborate investigation by Professor Sanday. That Cyprian, who was not acquainted with Greek, had a written version before him which is here identified is certain, and thus the illustrious bishop and martyr gives us a fixed point in the history of the Latin Bible a century and a half earlier than Jerome.

6. Tertullian's Bible:

We proceed half a century nearer to the fountainhead of the African Bible when we take up the testimony of Tertullian who flourished toward the close of the 2nd century. He differed from Cyprian in being a competent Greek scholar. He was thus able to translate for himself as he made his quotations from the Septuagint or the Greek New Testament, and is thus for us by no means so safe a witness to the character or existence of a standard version. Professor Zahn (GK, I, 60) maintains with considerable plausibility that before 210-240 AD there was no Latin Bible, and that Tertullian with his knowledge of Greek just translated as he went along. In this contention, Zahn is not supported by many scholars, and the view generally is that while Tertullian's knowledge of Greek is a disturbing element, his writings, with the copious quotations from both Old Testament and New Testament, do testify to the existence of a version which had already been for some time in circulation and use. Who the African Wycliffe or Tyndale was who produced that version has not been recorded, and it may in fact have been the work of several hands, the result, as Bishop Westcott puts it, of the spontaneous efforts of African Christians (Canon of the NT7, 263).

7. Possible Eastern Origin of Old Latin:

Although the evidence has, up to the present time, been regarded as favoring the African origin of the first Latin translation of the Bible, recent investigation into what is called the Western text of the New Testament has yielded results pointing elsewhere. It is clear from a comparison that the Western type of text has close affinity with the Syriac witnesses originating in the eastern provinces of the empire. The close textual relation disclosed between the Latin and the Syriac versions has led some authorities to believe that, after all, the earliest Latin version may have been made in the East, and possibly at Antioch. But this is one of the problems awaiting the discovery of fresh material and fuller investigation for its solution.

8. Classification of Old Latin Manuscripts:

We have already noticed the African group, so designated from its connection with the great African Fathers, Tertullian and especially Cyprian, and comprising k, e, and to some extent h and m. The antiquity of the text here represented is attested by these African Fathers.

When we come down to the 4th century we find in Western Europe, and especially in North Italy, a second type of text, which is designated European, the precise relation of which to the African has not been clearly ascertained. Is this an independent text which has arisen on the soil of Italy, or is it a text derived by alteration and revision of the African as it traveled northward and westward? This group consists of the Codex Vercellensis (a) and Codex Vcronensis (b) of the 4th or 5th century at Vercelli and Verona respectively, and there may be included also the Codex Vindobonensis (i) of the 7th century at Vienna. These give the Gospels, and a gives for John the text as it was read by the 4th-century Father, Lucifer of Cagliari in Sardinia. The Latin of the Greek-Latin manuscript D (Codex Bezae) is known as d, and much of Irenaeus are classed with this group.

Still later, Professor Hort says from the middle of the 4th century, a third type, called Italic from its more restricted range, is found. It is represented by Codex Brixianus (f) of the 6th century, now at Brescia, and Codex Monacensis (q) of the 7th century, at Munich. This text is probably a modified form of the European, produced by revision which has brought it more into accord with the Greek, and has given it a smoother Lot aspect. The group has received this name because the text found in many of Augustine’s writings is the same, and as he expressed a preference for the Itala, the group was designated accordingly. Recent investigation tends to show that we must be careful how we use Augustine as an Old Latin authority, and that the Itala may be, not a pre-Vulgate text, but rather Jerome’s Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) This, however, is still uncertain; the fact remains that as far as the Gospels are concerned, f and q represent the type of text most used by Jerome.

9. Individual Characteristics:

That all these groups, comprising in all 38 codices, go back to one original is not impossible. Still there may have been at first local VSS, and then an official version formed out of them. When Jerome’s revision took hold of the church, the Old Latin representatives for the most part dropped out of notice. Some of them, however, held their ground and continued to be copied down to the 12th and even the 13th century Codex C (Ephraemi) is an example of this; it is a manuscript of the 12th century, but as Professor Burkitt has pointed out (Texts and Studies, IV, "Old Latin," 11) "it came from Languedoc, the country of the Albigenses. Only among heretics isolated from the rest of Western Christianity could an Old Latin text have been written at so late a period." An instance of an Old Latin text copied in the 13th century is the Gigas Holmiensis, quoted as Gig, now at Stockholm, and so called from its great size. It contains the Ac and the Apocalypse of the Old Latin and the rest of the New Testament according to the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) It has to be borne in mind that in the early centuries complete Bibles were unknown. Each group of books, Gospels, Ac and Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, and Revelation for the New Testament, and Pentateuch, Historical Books, Psalms and Prophets

for the Old Testament, has to be regarded separately. It is interesting, also, to note that when Jerome revised, or even retranslated from the Septuagint, Tobit and Judith of the Apocrypha, the greater number of these books, the Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and Baruch were left unrevised, and were simply added to the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) from the Old Latin version.

10. Value of Old Latin for Textual Criticism:

These Old Latin translations going back in their earliest forms to nearly the middle of the 2nd century are very early witnesses to the Greek text from which they were made. They are the more valuable inasmuch as they are manifestly very literal translations. Our great uncial manuscripts reach no farther back than the 4th century, whereas in the Old Latin we have evidence—indirect indeed and requiring to be cautiously used—reaching back to the 2nd century. The text of these manuscripts is neither dated nor localized, whereas the evidence of these VSS, coming from a particular province of the church, and being used by Fathers whose period is definitely known, enables us to judge of the type of Greek text then and there in use. In this connection, too, it is noteworthy that while the variations of which Jerome and Augustine complained were largely due to the blunders, or natural mistakes, of copyists, they did sometimes represent various readings in the Greek originals.

LITERATURE.

Wordsworth and White, Old Latin Biblical Texts, 4 volumes; F.C. Burkitt, "The Old Latin and the Itala," Texts and Studies, IV; "Old Latin VSS" by H.A.A. Kennedy in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); "Bibelubersetzungen, Lateinische" by Fritzsche-Nestle in PRE3; Intros to Textual Criticism of the New Testament by Scrivener, Gregory, Nestle, and Lake.

T. Nicol

LATTER DAYS

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

LATTICE

lat'-is.

See HOUSE, II, 1, (9).

LAUD

lod: A verb meaning "to praise," used in Ro 15:11 the King James Version, and Ps 117:1; 145:4. The Revised Version (British and American) either should have avoided the word altogether or else should

have used it much more extensively—preferably the latter, as the word is not obsolete in liturgical English.

LAUGHING-STOCK

laf'-ing-stok: Something set up to be laughed at; thrice in the Revised Version (British and American) the translation of sechoq, "laughter," etc. (Job 12:4 twice; Jer 20:7; compare Jer 48:26,27,39; La 3:14).

See MOCK, MOCKING.

LAUGHTER

laf'-ter (chaq, tsachaq, "to laugh," sechoq, "laughter"; gelao, katagelao):

(1) Laughter as the expression of gladness, pleasurable surprise, is the translation of tsachaq (Ge 17:17; 18:12,13,15; 21:6), which, however, should perhaps be "laugh at me," not "with me," as the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) (so Delitzsch and others; see also Hastings in HDB), not in the sense of derision, but of surprise and pleasure. In the same verse for "God hath made me to laugh," the Revised Version (British and American) gives in margin, "hath prepared laughter for me," and this gave his name to the son, the promise of whose birth evoked the laughter (Yitschaq, Isaac); gelao (Lu 6:21,25) has the same meaning of gladness and rejoicing; sechoq, "laughter," has also this sense (Job 8:21; Ps 126:2). It is, however, "laughed to scorn" in Job 12:4; the Revised Version (British and American) "laughing-stock"; so Jer 20:7; compare 48:26,27,39; La 3:14, "derision."

(2) Sachaq is used (except Job 29:24; Ec 3:4) in the sense of the laughter of defiance, or derision (Job 5:22; 41:29); in Piel it is often translated "play," "playing," "merry"

(3) La'agh is "to scorn" "to laugh to scorn" (2Ki 19:21; Ne 2:19); sachaq has also this sense (2Ch 30:10); tsechoq (Eze 23:32); sechoq (Job 12:4); katagelao (Mt 9:24; Mr 5:40; Lu 8:53); the simple gelao occurs only in Lu 6:21,25; see above. Katagelao is found in Judith 12:12, "laugh to scorn" (Ecclesiasticus 7:11; 20:17; 1 Macc 10:70, the Revised Version (British and American) "derision").

For "laugh" (Job 9:23) the Revised Version (British and American) has "mock"; for "mocked of his neighbor" and "laughed to scorn" (Job 12:4) "laughing-stock"; for "shall rejoice in time to come" (Pr 31:25), "laugheth at the time to come"; "laughter" for "laughing" (Job 8:21).

W. L. Walker

LAUNCH

lanch, lonch.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 1.

LAVER

la’-ver (kiyor):

1. In the Tabernacle:

Every priest in attendance on the altar of Yahweh was required to wash his hands and his feet before entering upon his official duties (Ex 30:19). To this end a laver was ordered to be made as part of the tabernacle equipment (Ex 30:17-21; 38:8). Its composition was of brass (bronze), and it consisted of two parts, the bowl and its pedestal or foot (Ex 30:18, etc.). This first laver was a small one, and was made of the hand mirrors of the women in attendance upon the altar (Ex 38:8). Its place was between the altar and the tabernacle (Ex 40:30).

See TABERNACLE.

2. In the Temple:

The difficulty as to the washing of parts of the sacrificial carcasses was overcome, in the temple of Solomon, by the construction of "10 lavers" and a "molten sea" (1Ki 7:23-37; 2Ch 4:2-6; see TEMPLE; SEA, THE MOLTEN). We learn from 2Ch 4:6 that the "sea" was for the priests to wash in—therefore took the place of the laver in the tabernacle—and the lavers were used as baths for portions of the burnt offerings. The lavers themselves were artistic works of unusual merit for that age. Like that in the tabernacle, each had its own stand or base, which was cast in a separate piece from the laver. These bases rested on wheels which allowed of the laver being moved from one part of the court to another without being turned about. Five stood on the north and five on the south side of the temple. They were ornamented with "lions, oxen, and cherubim," and on a lower level, with a series of wreaths or festoons of flowers (1Ki 7:27-37). In modern speech, the lavers may be described as so many circular open tanks for the storage of water. Each laver contained 40 baths (about 320 gals.) of water. Its height was 5 cubits, the locomotive machinery being 3 cubits in height, and the depth of the bowl or tank, judging from its capacity, about 2 cubits. The last we hear of the lavers, apart from their bases, is that the idolatrous king Ahaz cut off the border of the bases, and removed the bases from them (2Ki 16:17). During the reign of Jehoiakim, Jeremiah foretold that the molten sea and the bases (there being then no lavers) should be carried to Babylon (Jer 27:19). A few years later it is recorded that the bases were broken up, and the brass of which they were made was carried away (Jer 52:17).

3. The Laver in the New Testament:

The Greek word (loutron) occurs twice in the New Testament. In Eph 5:26, Paul says that Christ gave

Himself for the church "that he might sanctify it having cleansed it by the washing (Greek "laver") of water with the word"; and in Tit 3:5 he says that we are saved "through the washing (Greek "laver") of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit." In these passages the reference is to the constant physical purity demanded of the Jewish priests when in attendance upon the temple. Christians are "a holy priesthood," and are cleansed not by water only, but, in the former passage, "with the word" (compare Joh 15:3); in the latter, by the "renewing of the Holy Spirit" (compare Eze 36:25; Joh 3:5). The feet-washing mentioned by Jesus is emblematic of the same thing (Joh 13:10).

W. Shaw Caldecott

LAW IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

lo

The Term "Law"

Austin’s Definition of Law

I. LAW IN THE GOSPELS

1. The Law in the Teaching of Christ

(1) Authority of the Law Upheld in the Sermon on the Mount

(a) Christ and Tradition

(b) Sin of Murder

(c) Adultery and Divorce

(d) Oaths

(e) Retaliation

(f) Love to Neighbors—Love of Enemies

(2) Other References to the Law in the Teaching of Christ

(a) Traditions of the Elders and the 5th Commandment

(b) Christ’s Answer to the Young Ruler

(c) Christ’s Answer to the Lawyer

(d) References in the Fourth Gospel

2. The Law in Relation to the Life of Christ

(1) In His Infancy

(2) In His Ministry

3. The Law in Relation to the Death of Christ

(1) Christ Charged with Blasphemy under the Jewish Law

(2) Christ Charged with Treason under the Roman Law

4. How Christ Fulfilled the Law in All Its Parts

II. LAW IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

1. Stephen’s Witness

2. Practice of Peter and Paul

3. Allusions to the Roman Law

III. LAW IN THE EPISTLES

1. In Romans

2. In Galatians

3. In the Other Pauline Epistles

4. In the Epistle to the Hebrews

5. In the Epistle of James

6. In the Epistles of Peter and John

LITERATURE

The Term "Law":

The Greek word for "law" is nomos, derived from nemo, "to divide," "distribute," "apportion," and generally meant anything established, anything received by usage, a custom, usage, law; in the New Testament a command, law.

Austin’s Definition of Law:

It may not be amiss to note the definition of law given by a celebrated authority in jurisprudence, the late Mr. John Austin: "A law, in the most general and comprehensive acceptation in which the term, in its literal meaning, is employed, may be said to be a rule laid down for the guidance of an intelligent being, by an intelligent being having power over him." Under this comprehensive statement, he classifies "laws set by God to His human creatures, and laws set by men to men." After analyzing the three ideas, command as the expression of a particular desire; duty or obligation, signifying that one is bound or obliged by the command to pursue a certain course of conduct, and sanction, indicating the evil likely to be incurred by disobedience, he thus summarizes: "The ideas or notions comprehended by the term command are the following:

(1) a wish or desire conceived by a rational being that another rational being shall do or forbear;

(2) an evil to proceed from the former and to be incurred by the latter in case the latter comply not with the wish;

(3) an expression or intimation of the wish by words or other signs."

This definition makes it clear that the term "laws of nature" can be used only in a metaphorical sense, the metaphorical application being suggested as Austin shows by the fact that uniformity or stability of conduct is one of the ordinary consequences of a law proper, consequently, "Wherever we observe a uniform order of events, or a uniform order of coexisting phenomena, we are prone to impute that order to a law set by its author, though the case presents us with nothing that can be likened to a sanction or a duty." As used in the New Testament it will be found generally that the term "law" bears the sense indicated by Austin, and includes "command," "duty" and "sanction."

I. Law in the Gospels.

Naturally we first turn to the Gospels, where the word "law" always refers to the Mosaic law, although it has different applications. That law was really threefold: the Moral Law, as summed up in the Decalogue, the Ceremonial Law, prescribing the ritual and all the typical enactments, and what might be called the Civil or Political Law, that relating to the people in their national, political life. The distinction is not closely observed, though sometimes the reference emphasizes one aspect, sometimes another, but

generally the whole Law without any discrimination is contemplated. Sometimes the Law means the whole Old Testament Scriptures, as in Joh 10:34; 12:34; 15:25. At other times the Law means the Pentateuch, as in Lu 24:44.

1. The Law in the Teaching of Christ:

The Law frequently appears in the teaching of Christ. In the Sermon on the Mount He refers most specifically and fully to it. It is frequently asserted that He there exposes the imperfection of the Law and sets His own authority against its authority. But this seems to be a superficial and an untenable view. Christ indeed affirms very definitely the authority of the Law: "Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets" (Mt 5:17). Here the term would seem to mean the whole of the Pentateuch "I came not to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass away from the law, till all things be accomplished" (Mt 5:17,18). A similar utterance is recorded in Lu 16:17: "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall."

(1) Authority of the Law Upheld in the Sermon on the Mount.

The perfection and permanence of the Law as well as its authority are thus indicated, and the following verse in Mt still further emphasizes the authority, while showing that now the Lord is speaking specifically of the moral law of the Decalogue: "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (5:19). These impressive sentences should be borne in mind in considering, the utterances that follow, in which there seems a contrast between the Law and His own teaching, and from which has been drawn the inference that He condemns and practically abrogates the Law. What Jesus really does is to bring out the fullness of meaning that is in the Law, and to show its spirituality and the wideness of its reach. He declares that the righteousness of His disciples must exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 5:20). Their righteousness consisted largely in a punctilious observance of the external requirements of the Law; the disciples must yield heart obedience to the inner spirit of the Law, its external and internal requirements.

(a) Christ and Tradition:

Jesus then proceeds to point out the contrast, not so much between His own teaching and that of the Law, as between His interpretation of the Law and the interpretation of other teachers: "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time" (the King James Version), "to them of old time" the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 5:21). Either rendering is grammatically allowable, but in either case it is evidently not the original utterance of Moses, but the traditional interpretation, which He had in view "Ye have heard that it was said"; Christ’s usual way of quoting the Old Testament is, "It is written" or some other formula pointing to the written Word; and as He has just referred to the written Law as a whole, it would be strange if He should now use the formula "It was said" in reference to the particular

precepts. Evidently He means what was said by the Jewish teachers.

(b) Sin of Murder:

This is further confirmed by the citations: "Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment." The second clause is not found in the Pentateuch as a distinct statement, but it is clearly the generalization of the teachers. Christ does not set Himself in opposition to Moses; rather does He enjoin obedience to the precepts of the scribes when, sitting in Moses' seat, they truly expound the Law (Mt 23:1-8). But these teachers had so expounded the command as if it only referred to the act of murder; so Christ shows the full and true spiritual meaning of it: "But I say unto you, that every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment" (Mt 5:22).

See MURDER.

(c) Adultery and Divorce:

Again, "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery" (Mt 5:27). The traditional teaching confined this mainly to the outward act, 'But I say unto you,' says Christ, 'that adultery pertains even to the lustful thought' (Mt 5:28). In dealing with this matter He passes to the law of divorce which was one of the civil enactments, and did not stand on the same level with the moral precept against committing adultery, nay, the very carrying out of the civil provision might lead to a real breach of the moral precept, and in the interests of the precept itself, in the very desire to uphold the authority of the moral law, Christ pronounces against divorce on any ground, save that of fornication. Later on, as recorded in Mt 19:3-9, He was questioned about this same law of divorce, and again He condemns the light way in which divorce was treated by the Jews, and affirms strongly the sanctity of the marriage institution, showing that it was antecedent to the Mosaic code—was from the beginning, and derived its binding force from the Divine pronouncement in Ge 2:24, rounded upon the nature of things; while as to the Mosaic law of divorce, lie declares that it was permitted on account of the hardness of their hearts, but that no other cause than fornication was sufficient to dissolve the marriage tie. This civil enactment, justified originally on account of the inability of the people to rise to the true moral ideal of the Decalogue, Christ claims authority to transcend, but in doing so He vindicates and upholds the law which said, "Thou shalt not commit adultery."

See DIVORCE.

(d) Oaths:

The next precept Jesus cites is one partly civil and partly ritual, concerning the taking of oaths. The words are not found in the Pentateuch as a definite enactment; they are rather a gathering up of several utterances (Le 19:12; Nu 30:2; De 23:21), and again the form of the citation suggests that it is the rabbinical interpretation that is in question. But the kind of swearing allowed by the law was the very opposite of ordinary profane swearing. It was intended, indeed, to guard the 3rd commandment against

taking the name of Yahweh in vain. Christ in condemning the flippant oaths allowed by the rabbis was really asserting the authority of that 3rd command; lie was enforcing its spirituality and claiming the reverence due to the Divine name. Into the question how far the words of Christ bear upon oath-taking in a court of law we need not enter. His own response to the adjuration of the high priest when practically put upon His oath (Mt 26:63,64) and other instances (Ro 1:9; 2Co 1:23; Ga 1:20; Php 1:8; 1Th 2:5; Heb 6:16,17; Re 10:5,6) would tend to show that such solemn appeals to God are not embraced in Christ's prohibition: "Swear not at all"; but undoubtedly the ideal speech is that of the simple asseveration, the "Yes" or "No" of the man, who, conscious that he speaks in the presence of God, reckons his word inviolable, needing no strengthening epithet, though as between man and man an oath may be necessary for confirmation and an end of strife.

See OATH.

(e) Retaliation:

He next touches upon the "law of retaliation": "an eye for an eye" (Mt 5:38), and consistently with our understanding of the other sayings, we think that here Christ is dealing with the traditional interpretation which admitted of personal revenge, of men taking the law into their own hands and revenging themselves. Such a practice Christ utterly condemns, and inculcates instead gentleness and forbearance, the outcome of love even toward enemies. This law, indeed, finds place among the Mosaic provisions, but it appears there, not as allowing personal spite to gratify itself in its own way, but as a political enactment to be carried out by the magistrates and so to discountenance private revenge. Christ shows that the spirit of His gospel received by His people would supersede the necessity for these. requirements of the civil code; although His words are not to be interpreted quite literally, for He himself when smitten on the one cheek did not turn the other to the smiter (Joh 18:22,23), and the principle of the law of retaliation still holds good in the legislative procedure of all civilized nations, and according to the New Testament teaching, will find place even in the Divine procedure in the day of judgment.

See also PUNISHMENT.

(f) Love to Neighbors—Love of Enemies:

The last saying mentioned in the Sermon clearly reveals its rabbinical character: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor, and hate thine enemy" (Mt 5:43). The first part is indeed the injunction of the Law, the second part is an unwarrantable addition to it. It is only this part that Christ virtually condemns when He says, "But I say unto you, Love your enemies" (Mt 5:44). That the interpretation of these teachers was unwarrantable may be seen from many passages in the Pentateuch, the Prophets and the Psalms, which set forth the more spiritual aspect of the Law's requirement; and as to this particular precept, we need only refer to Pr 25:21,22, "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat." Christ while condemning the addition unfolds the spiritual import of the command itself, for the love of neighbor rightly interpreted involves love of enemies; and so on another occasion (Lu 10:25-37) He answers the lawyer's

question, "Who is my neighbor?" by the parable of the Good Samaritan, showing that everyone in need is our neighbor.

See also FORGIVENESS; WRATH.

The last reference in the Sermon on the Mount to the Law fully bears out the idea that Christ really upheld the authority while elucidating the spirituality of the Law, for He declares that the principle embodied in the "Golden Rule" is a deduction from, is, indeed, the essence of, "the law and the prophets" (Mt 7:12).

(2) Other References to the Law in the Teaching of Christ.

We can only glance at the other references to the Law in the teaching of Christ. In Mt 11:13, "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John," the Law in its teaching capacity is in view, and perhaps the whole of the Pentateuch is meant. In Mt 12:1-8, in rebutting the charge brought against His disciples of breaking the Sabbath, He cites the case of David and his men eating the showbread, which it was not lawful for any but the priests to partake of; and of the priests doing work on the Sabbath day which in other men would be a breach of the Law; from which He deduces the conclusion that the ritual laws may be set aside under stress of necessity and for a higher good. In that same chapter (12:10-13) He indicates the lawfulness of healing—doing good—on the Sabbath day.

(a) Traditions of the Elders and the 5th Commandment:

In Mt 15:1-6 we have the account of the Pharisees complaining that the disciples transgressed the traditions of the elders by eating with unwashed hands. Jesus retorts upon them with the question: "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?" citing the specific case of the 5th commandment which was evaded and virtually broken by their ingenious distinction of qorban. This is a very instructive incident in its bearing upon the point which we have sought to enforce—that it was the traditional interpretation and not the Law itself which Jesus condemned or corrected.

(b) Christ’s Answer to the Young Ruler:

To the young ruler (Mt 19:16-42) He presents the commandments as the rule of life, obedience to which is the door to eternal life, especially emphasizing the manward aspect of the Law’s claims. The young man, professing to have kept them all, shows that he has not grasped the spirituality of their requirements, and it is further to test him that Christ calls upon him to make the "great renunciation" which, after all, is not in itself an additional command so much as the unfolding of the spiritual and far-reaching character of the command, "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

(c) Christ’s Answer to the Lawyer:

To the lawyer who asks Him which is the great commandment in the Law, He answers by giving him

the sum of the whole moral law. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the great and first commandment. And a second like unto it is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mt 22:35-39). In Mark's report (Mr 12:31), He adds, "There is none other commandment greater than these," and in that of Matthew He says, "On these two commandments the whole law hangeth, and the prophets" (Mt 22:40); both utterances showing the high estimation in which He held the Law.

(d) References in the Fourth Gospel:

In His discussion with the Jews, recorded in Joh 7, He charges them with failure to keep the Law: "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you doeth the law?" (7:19). And referring to the healing of the impotent man on the Sabbath day, a deed which had roused their ire, He shows how one law may conflict with another. Moses had enjoined circumcision, and sometimes the time for circumcising would fall on the Sabbath day. Yet with all their reverence for the Sabbath day, they would, in order to keep the law of circumcision, perform the rite on the Sabbath day, and so, He argues, it is unreasonable to complain of Him because on the Sabbath day He had fulfilled the higher law of doing good, healing a poor sufferer. In none of all Christ's utterances is there any slight thrown upon the Law itself; it is always held up as the standard of right and its authority vindicated.

2. The Law in Relation to the Life of Christ:

The passages we have considered show the place of the Law in the teaching of Christ, but we also find that He had to sustain a practical relation to that Law. Born under the Law, becoming part of a nation which honored and venerated the Law, every part of whose life was externally regulated by it, the life of Jesus Christ could not fail to be affected by that Law. We note its operation:

(1) In His Infancy.

On the eighth day He was circumcised (Lu 2:21), thus being recognized as a member of the covenant nation, partaking of its privileges, assuming its responsibilities. Then, according to the ritual law of purification, He is presented in the temple to the Lord (Lu 2:22-24), while His mother offers the sacrifice enjoined in the "law of the Lord," the sacrifice she brings pathetically witnessing to her poverty, "a pair of turtle doves, or two young pigeons" being the alternative allowed to those who were not able to provide a lamb (Le 12). The Divine approval is set upon this consecrating act, for it is while it is being done concerning Him after "the custom of the law" (Le 12:27), that the Spirit of God comes upon Simeon and prompts the great prophecy which links all the Messianic hopes with the Baby of Bethlehem.

Again, according to the Law His parents go up to the Passover feast when the wondrous child has reached His 12th year, the age when a youthful Jew assumed legal responsibility, becoming "a son of the Law," and so Jesus participates in the festal observances, and His deep interest in all that concerns the temple-worship and the teaching of the Law is shown by His absorption in the conversation of the

doctors, whose questions He answers so intelligently, while questioning them in turn, and filling them with astonishment at His understanding (Lu 2:42-47).

(2) In His Ministry.

In His ministry He ever honors the Law. He reads it in the synagogue. He heals the leper by His sovereign touch and word, but He bids him go and show himself to the priest and offer the gift that Moses commanded (Mt 8:4). And again, when the lepers appeal to Him, His response which implies the healing is, "Go and show yourselves unto the priests" (Lu 17:14). He drives out of the temple those that defile it (Mt 21:12,13; Joh 2:15-17), because of His zeal for the honor of His Father's house, and so, while showing His authority, emphasizes the sanctity of the temple and its services. So, while claiming to be the Son in the Father's house, and therefore above the injunctions laid upon the servants and strangers, He nevertheless pays the temple-tax exacted from every son of Israel (Mt 17:24-27). He attends the various feasts during His ministry, and when the shadows of death are gathering round Him, He takes special pains to observe the Passover with His disciples. Thus to the ceremonial law He renders continuous obedience, the motto of His life practically being His great utterance to the Baptist: "Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Mt 3:15). If He obeyed the ceremonial law, unquestionably He obeyed the moral law. His keenest-eyed enemies could find no fault in Him in regard to His moral conduct. His absolute sinlesshess attests the translation of the moral law into actual life.

3. The Law in Relation to the Death of Christ:

We enter not upon theological question as to the relation of the death of Christ to the penal inflictions of the Law Divinely enforced on behalf of sinners—that touches the doctrine of the Atonement—we only note the fact that His death was brought about in professed accordance with the Law. The chief priests, in hatred, sent officers to take Him, but overawed by His matchless eloquence, these officers returned empty-handed. In their chagrin, the chief priests can only say that the people who follow Him now not the Law and are cursed (Joh 7:49). Nicodemus, on this occasion, ventures to remonstrate: "Doth our law judge a man, except it first hear from himself?" (Joh 7:51). This sound legal principle these men are bent on disregarding; their one desire is to put an end to the life of this man, who has aroused their jealousy and hatred, and at last when they get Him into their hands, they strain the forms of the Law to accomplish their purpose. There is no real charge that can be brought against Him. They dare not bring up the plea that He broke the Sabbath, for again and again He has answered their cavils on that score. He has broken no law; all they can do is to bribe false witnesses to testify something to His discredit. The trumpery charge, founded upon a distorted reminiscence of His utterance about destroying the temple, threatens to break down.

(1) Christ Charged with Blasphemy under the Jewish Law.

Then the high priest adjures Him to say upon oath whether or not He claims to be the Christ, the Son of the Living God. Such a claim would assuredly, if unfounded, be blasphemy, and according to the Law, be punishable by death. On a previous occasion the Jews threatened to stone Him for this—to them—

blasphemous claim. Now when Jesus calmly avows that He is the Son of God, the high priest, rending his clothes, declares that no further proof is needed. He has confessed to the blasphemy, and unanimously the council votes Him worthy of death (Mt 26; Mr 14; Lu 22). If Jesus Christ were not what He claimed to be, then the priests were right in holding Him guilty of blasphemy; it never occurred to them to consider whether the claim after all might not be true.

(2) Christ Charged with Treason under the Roman Law.

Not only is the Jewish law invoked to accomplish His death, but also the Roman law. On one other occasion Christ had come into touch with the law of Rome, namely, when asked the ensnaring question by the Herodians as to the lawfulness of giving tribute to Caesar (Mt 22:17; Mr 12:14; Lu 20:22). Now the Jews need the Roman governor's authorization for the death penalty, and Jesus must be tried before him. The charge cannot now be blasphemy—the Roman law will have nothing to say to that—and so they trump up a charge of treason against Caesar.

In preferring it, they practically renounce their Messianic hopes. The charge, however, breaks down before the Roman tribunal, and only by playing on the weakness of Pilate do they gain their end, and the Roman law decrees His death, while leaving the Jews to see to the carrying out of the sentence. In this the evangelist sees the fulfillment of Christ's words concerning the manner of His death, for stoning would have been the Jewish form of the death penalty, not crucifixion.

See JESUS CHRIST, III, E), ii, 3, 4.

4. How Christ Fulfilled the Law in All Its Parts:

Looking at the whole testimony of the Gospels, we can see how it was that Christ fulfilled the Law. He fulfilled the moral law by obeying, by bringing out its fullness of meaning, by showing its intense spirituality, and He established it on a surer basis than ever as the eternal law of righteousness. He fulfilled the ceremonial and typical law, not only by conforming to its requirements, but by realizing its spiritual significance. He filled up the shadowy outlines of the types, and, thus fulfilled, they pass away, and it is no longer necessary for us to observe the Passover or slay the daily lamb: we have the substance in Christ. He also cleared the Law from the traditional excrescences which had gathered round it under the hands of the rabbis. He showed that the ceremonial distinction between meats clean and unclean was no longer necessary, but showed the importance of true spiritual purity (Mt 15:11; Mr 7:18-23). He taught His disciples those great principles when, after His resurrection, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Lu 24:27). And as He opened their mind that they might understand the Scriptures, He declared, "These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me" (Lu 24:44). John sums this up in his pregnant phrase, "The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ" (Joh 1:17). The grace was in contrast to the condemnation of the moral law, the truth was the antithesis to the shadowy outline of the types and ceremonies.

II. Law in the Ac of the Apostles.

Without considering questions of authenticity and historicity in relation to this book which professes to be the earliest church history, we briefly note the place of the Law therein indicated. In the book we have an account of the transition from Judaism to fully developed Christianity, and the Law comes into view in various ways. The disciples, like other Jews, observe the feast of Pentecost, and even after the descent of the Spirit, they frequent the temple and observe the hours of prayer.

1. Stephen’s Witness:

The full-orbed gospel proclaimed by Stephen arouses the suspicion and enmity of the stricter sects of the Jews, who accuse him before the council of speaking blasphemous words against the holy place and the Law. But this was the testimony of suborned witnesses, having doubtless its foundation in the fact that Stephen’s teaching emphasized the grace of the gospel. Stephen’s own defense honors the Law as given by Moses, "who received living oracles" (Ac 7:38), shows how disloyal the people had been, and closes by charging them not only with rejecting and slaying the Righteous One, but of failing to keep the Law "as it was ordained by angels" (Ac 7:53).

2. Practice of Peter and Paul:

Peter’s strict observance of the ceremonial law is shown in connection with his vision which teaches him that the grace of God may pass beyond the Jewish pale (Ac 10). Paul’s preaching emphasizes the fulfilling the Scriptures, Law and Prophecy, by Jesus Christ. The gist of his message, as given in his first reported sermon, is, "By him everyone that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Ac 13:38 f). The conversion of the Gentiles brings up the question of their relation to the ceremonial law, specifically to circumcision. The decision of the council at Jerusalem treats circumcision as unnecessary for the Gentiles, and only enjoins, in relation to the Mosaic ritual, abstinence from things strangled and from blood (Ac 15). The after-course of events would show that this provision was for the time of transition. Paul, though strongly opposed to the idea of imposing circumcision on the Gentiles, nevertheless without inconsistency and as a concession to Jewish feeling, circumcises Timothy (Ac 16:3), and himself fulfills the ceremonial enactments in connection with the taking of a vow (Ac 18:18). He also, following the advice of James, who wished him to conciliate the myriads of believing Jews who were zealous for the Law, and to show them the falseness of the charge that he taught the Jews among the Gentiles "to forsake Moses" (apostasy from Moses), took upon him the ceremonial duty of purifying the "four men that have a vow on them" (Ac 21:20-26). This involved the offering of sacrifices, and the fact that Paul could do so shows that for the Jews the sacrificial system still remained in force. The sequel to the transaction might raise the question whether, after all, the procedure was a wise one; it certainly did not fulfill the expectations of James. Later on, in his defense before Felix, Paul claims to be loyal to the Jewish faith, worshipping in the temple, and "believing all things which are according to the law, and which are written in the prophets" (Ac 24:11-14); and in his address to the Jewish leaders in Rome, he declares that he has "done nothing against the people, or the customs of our fathers" (Ac 28:17), and he seeks to persuade them concerning Jesus, "both from the law

of Moses and from the prophets" (Ac 28:23).

3. Allusions to the Roman Law:

In the Ac we find several allusions to law other than Jewish. In Ac 16 Paul comes into collision with the Roman law. Beaten and imprisoned by the magistrates of Philippi, he is afterward offered the opportunity of quietly slipping away, but standing on his dignity as a Roman citizen, he demands that the magistrates themselves, who had violated the law by publicly beating uncondemned Romans, should come and set them free. This same right as a Roman citizen Paul again asserts when about to be scourged by the command of the centurion (Ac 22:25), and his protest is successful in averting the indignity. His trial before Felix and Festus well illustrates the procedure under the Roman law, and his appeal, as a Roman citizen, to Caesar had important results in his life.

III. Law in the Epistles.

The word is used both with and without the article, but though in some cases the substantive without the article refers to law in general, yet in many other places it undoubtedly refers to the Law of Moses. Perhaps, as has been suggested, it is that, where it does refer to the Mosaic Law, the word without the article points to that law, not so much as Mosaic, but in its quality as law. But speaking generally, the word with and without the article is used in reference to the Law of Moses.

1. In Romans:

(1) Law as a Standard.

In Romans Paul has much to say about law, and in the main it is the moral law that he has in view. In this great epistle, written to people at the center of the famous legal system of Rome, many of them Jews versed in the law of Moses and others Gentiles familiar with the idea of law, its nature, its scope and its sway, he first speaks of the Law as a standard, want of conformity to which brings condemnation. He shows that the Gentiles who had not the standard of the revealed Law nevertheless had a law, the law of Nature, a law written upon their heart and conscience. Roman jurisprudence was familiar with the conception of a law of Nature, which became a law of nations (jus gentium), so that certain principles could be assumed as obtaining among those who had not the knowledge of the Roman code; and in accordance with these principles, the dealings between Romans and barbarians could be regulated. Paul’s conception is somewhat similar, but is applied to the spiritual relations of man and God.

(2) Gentiles Condemned by the Law of Nature.

But the Gentiles, not having lived up to the light of that law, are condemned. They have violated the dictates of their own conscience. And the Jews, with the fuller light of their revealed law, have equally failed. In this connection Paul incidentally lays down the great principle that "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified" (Ro 2:13). His great aim, in the epistle, is

to show that justification is by faith, but he here asserts that if anyone would have justification through law, then he must keep that law in all its details. The Law will pronounce the doer of it justified, but the mere hearing of the Law without doing it will only increase the condemnation. "As many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law" (Ro 2:12). Paul does not pronounce upon the question whether a Gentile may be saved by following the light of Nature; he rather emphasizes the negative side that those who have failed shall perish; they have light enough to condemn, is his point.

(3) All Men under Condemnation.

Having proved that both Jews and Gentiles are under sin, he closes his great indictment with the statement: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it speaketh to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God" (Ro 3:19). Thus the Law shuts up into condemnation. It is impossible for any sinner to be justified "by the works of the law"; the Law not only condemns but "through the law cometh the knowledge of sin" (Ro 3:20). It shows how far short men have come of God’s requirements. It is a mirror in which the sinner sees his defilement, but the mirror cannot cleanse, though it shows the need of cleansing.

(4) The Redeeming Work of Christ Providing Righteousness Apart from the Law.

Then setting forth the great redemption of Jesus Christ, the apostle shows that it provides what the Law had failed to provide, a righteousness which can satisfy the requirements of the Law; a righteousness that is indeed "apart from the law," apart from all men’s attempts to keep the Law, but is nevertheless in deepest harmony with the principles of the Law, and has been witnessed "by the law and the prophets" (Ro 3:21). (In this passage the "law" seems to mean the Pentateuch, and in Ro 3:19, in view of the preceding citations from the Psalms, it appears to mean the whole Old Testament Scriptures.) Since the righteousness secured by Christ comes upon the sinner through faith, manifestly the works of the Law can have nothing to do with our obtaining of it. But so far is faith-righteousness from undermining the Law, that Paul claims that through faith the Law is established (Ro 3:31).

(5) Abraham’s Blessings Came Not through the Law.

Proceeding to show that his idea of justification by faith was no new thing, that the Old Testament saint had enjoyed it, he particularly shows that Abraham, even in his uncircumcised state, received the blessing through faith; and the great promise to him and his seed did not come through the Law, but on the principle of faith.

(6) Law Worketh Wrath and Intensifieth the Evil of Sin.

Indeed, so far from blessing coming to sinners by way of the Law, the "law worketh wrath" (Ro 4:15); not wrath in men against the Law’s restrictions as some have argued, but the holy wrath of God so frequently mentioned by the apostle in this epistle. The Law worketh wrath, inasmuch as when

disobeyed it brings on the sinner the Divine disapproval, condemnation; it enhances the guilt of sin, and so intensifies the Divine wrath against it; and it, in a sense, provokes to sin: the sinful nature rebels against the restrictions imposed by the Law, and the very fact of a thing being forbidden arouses the desire for it. This seems what he means in a subsequent passage (Ro 5:20), "And the law came in besides, that the trespass might abound"; as if the very multiplying of restrictions intensified the tendency to sin, brought out the evil in human nature, showed the utter vileness of the sinful heart and the terrible nature of sin, and thus made the need for salvation appear the greater, the very desperateness of the disease showing the need for the remedy and creating the desire for it; the abounding of sin preparing the way for the super-abounding of grace. That the presence of Law enhances the evil of sin is further shown by the statement, "But where there is no law, neither is there transgression" (Ro 4:15); transgression—parabasis—the crossing of the boundary, is, in the strict sense, only possible under law. But there may be sin apart from a revealed law, as he has already proved in the 2nd chapter.

(7) Law in the Light of the Parallel between Adam and Christ.

In Romans 5, dealing with the parallel between Adam and Christ he says: "For until the law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law" (5:13). He cannot mean that men were not held responsible for their sin, or that sin was not in any sense reckoned to their account, for he has in that 2nd chapter proved the opposite; but sin was not so imputed to them as to bring upon them the punishment of death, which they nevertheless did suffer, and that is traced by him to the sin of Adam. These, he says, had not sinned after the likeness of Adam’s transgression (5:14); they had not transgressed a positive command as he did, although they had undoubtedly violated the law of conscience, and knew that they were sinners. In drawing out the parallel between Adam and Christ, he plainly indicates that as Adam’s transgression of law brought condemnation on the race, so Christ’s obedience to the Law brings justification.

(8) Law and Righteousness.

So far he may be said to have spoken of the Law in regard to the sinner; and it is mainly the Law in its judicial aspect, the Law in relation to righteousness. The Law reveals righteousness, the Law demands righteousness, the Law condemns for unrighteousness. Redemption is a working out of righteousness. The Law witnesses to the perfect righteousness of Christ. The righteousness secured by Christ meets all the requirements of the Law, while gloriously transcending it. The righteous penalty of the Law has been borne by Christ; the righteous requirements of the Law have been fulfilled by Christ. That perfect righteousness secured apart from the Law, but satisfying to the Law, comes to men not through their relation to the Law, but through faith. Now he proceeds to consider the Law in relation to the saint.

(9) The Saint and the Law.

The believer justified through Christ has died with Christ. The "old man"—the sinful nature—has been crucified with Christ; the condemning power of the Law has terminated in the death of Christ, and through the death of the believer with Christ he has freedom from the condemnation of the Law. "He

that hath died is justified from sin" (Ro 6:7). But though in one aspect the believer is dead, in another he is alive. He dies with Christ, but he rises spiritually with Him, and thus spiritually alive he is "to yield," "to present" his "members as instruments of righteousness unto God" (Ro 6:13), and for his comfort he is assured that in this new sphere of life sin shall not have power to bring him under the condemnation of the Law—"Sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under law, but under grace" (Ro 6:14). His relationship to the Law has been altered through his union with Christ, and this fact the apostle proceeds to illustrate. He enounces the principle that "the law hath dominion over a man for so long a time as he liveth" (Ro 7:1). Death dissolves all legal objections. The believer, spiritually dead, is not under the dominion of the Law.

(10) Illustrated by the Law of the Husband.

The specific case is then given of a married woman bound by law to her husband, but freed from that law through his death, and in the application, he says, "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ" (Ro 7:4). If the Law in this metaphorical description is the husband while the soul is the wife, as has been most generally understood by commentators, then the application is based on the general thought of death dissolving the legal obligation, the death of the husband involves the death of the woman as a wife, and so he can speak of the death of the believer rather than of the death of the Law. Another explanation of the metaphor is that the old sinful state is the husband to which the ego, the personality, was bound by the Law, but that the sinful state being brought to death through Christ, the personality is free to enter into union with Christ. Whatever view is adopted, the leading thought of the apostle is clear, that through the death of Christ the believer is free from the Law: "But now we have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were held" (Ro 7:6).

(11) The Purity and Perfection of the Law in Its Own Sphere.

The question is then raised, "Is the law sin?" (Ro 7:7). The thought is repudiated as unthinkable, but he goes on to show how the law was related to sin, giving from his own experience the exemplification of what he had stated in the 3rd chapter, that by the Law is the knowledge of sin. The Law revealed his sin; the Law aroused the opposition of his nature, and through the working of sin under the prohibition of the Law, he found the tendency to be death. Nevertheless, there is no doubt in his mind that the Law is not responsible for the sin, the Law is not in any manner to be blamed, "The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and righteous, and good" (Ro 7:12). Sin in the light of the holy Law is shown to be exceeding sinful, and the Law itself is known to be spiritual.

We need not deal with the difficult passage that follows concerning the inner conflict. There has always been much discussion as to whether this is a conflict in the soul of the unregenerate man or of the regenerate—we believe it is in the regenerate, setting forth the experience of the believer—but whatever view is taken, it is clear that the law cannot bring deliverance; the higher part of man’s nature, or the regenerate nature according to the interpretation one adopts, may "consent unto the law that it is good" (Ro 7:16), may even "delight in the law of God" (Ro 7:22); but there is another law at work, the

law of sin in the members, and the working of this law means captivity and wretchedness from which deliverance can only come through Jesus Christ (Ro 7:23-25). The word "law" in these verses is used in the sense of principle, "the law of my mind," "the law of sin," "the law in my members"; but over against all is the law of God.

(12) Freedom from the Penal Claims of the Law.

The description of the Law as holy, righteous and good, as spiritual, as the object of delight to a true heart, is enough to show that the deliverance which the Christian enjoys is freedom from the penal claims and condemning power of the Law. This is borne out by the exulting conclusion: "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus" (Ro 8:1). The Law's claims, satisfied by Christ, no longer press upon those who are in Him. When the apostle adds, "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death" (Ro 8:2), he is using "law" in the general sense as a principle or power of producing ordered action, and "the law of the Spirit of life" may be taken to mean the method of the Spirit's working, and indeed may well be a way of describing the gospel itself—the new law, through which the Spirit operates. The other phrase, "law of sin and death," is not to be taken as meaning the Law of Moses, but the law, the principle of sin producing death mentioned in the previous chapter, unless we think of it as the holy Law which gives the knowledge of sin and brings the condemnation of death. The failure of the Law to produce a satisfactory result is definitely attributed to the weakness of the flesh, which is in effect reflecting the statement of the previous chapter, but all that the Law could not accomplish is accomplished through the work of Christ. In Christ sin is condemned, and in those who are brought into union with Him the righteousness of the Law is fulfilled.

(13) The Law Remains as a Rule of Life for the Believer.

Thus, the Law is not abrogated. It remains as the standard of righteousness, the "rule of life" for believers. The utmost holiness to which they can attain under the influence of the Holy Spirit, is still the "righteousness" which the Law requires. That the apostle's teaching is far removed from Antinomianism is shown, not only by all that he says in these chapters about the believer's new life of absolute spiritual service, but by the specific statement in Ro 13:8-10, which at once prescribes the commandments as rules of life (in Eph 6:2 he cites and enforces the 5th commandment) and shows how true obedience is possible. "Owe no man anything, save to love one another: for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law." Then, after specifying several of the commands, he declares that these and all other commands are "summed up in this word, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The man in Christ has found the true principle of obedience. He has entered into the true spirit of the holy law. That is all summed up in love, and he having received the love of Christ, living in His love, sees the Law not as a stern taskmaster condemning, but as a bright vision alluring. He indeed sees the Law embodied in Christ, and the imitation of Christ involves obedience to the Law, but he fulfills the Law not simply as a standard outside, but as a living principle within. Acting according to the dictates of the love begotten at the cross, his life is conformed to the image of Christ, and in so far is conformed to the Law—"Love therefore is the fulfillment of the law." In Ro 13:1-7, though the word "law" does not occur, Paul indicates the relation of the Christian to the Roman law, to the sovereignty of Rome in general, showing

that "the powers that be are ordained of God" and that in the ideal they are reflections of Divine authority, and as such are to be obeyed.

2. In Galatians:

In the Epistle to the Galatians, Paul has also a great deal to say about the Law, but as we have dealt so fully with the conception given in Romans, we can only briefly note the teaching of the Galatian Epistle.

(1) Law in Relation to Grace and Spiritual Liberty.

In general, we may say that as the Law in relation to righteousness was the prominent feature in Romans, in Galatians it is the Law in relation to grace and spiritual liberty, and while it was almost exclusively the moral law that Paul had in view in Romans, in Galatians it is rather the Law of Moses in its entirety, with special emphasis upon the ceremonial. He introduces the subject by referring to the episode at Antioch, when he had to rebuke Peter for his "dissimulation" (2:13). He shows the inconsistency of those who knew that they had been "justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law" (2:16), compelling the GentileChristians to live according to the Law, and sums up with the striking statement, "For I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God" (2:19). The Law in revealing his sin and pronouncing condemnation, drove him to Christ for justification. Crucified with Christ he has entered into such vital union with Christ that his whole self-life is dominated by the Christ-life: "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (2:20). Here we have the same line of thought as in Romans; then Paul goes on to show that all the blessings of grace which these Christians enjoy have come to them not by way of the Law, but "by the hearing of faith" (3:2-5). Again, citing the case of Abraham as an instance of justification by faith, he shows how utterly opposed the Law is to the grace that brings salvation, "For as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse" (3:10), but in gracious contrast, "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law" (3:13), having Himself borne the curse, and so the blessing of Abraham can come upon the Gentiles through faith (3:18).

(2) The Function of the Law Not to Give Life, but to Guide Life

As in Romans, he shows that the promise of the inheritance was apart from the Law, was given 430 years before the Law was promulgated, and answers the question as to the purpose of the Law, by saying, "It was added because of transgressions" (Ga 3:19), the thought already noted in Romans. Yet the Law was not in its nature opposed to the promise. If any law could have given life, "could make alive," then so perfect was the Law of Moses that it would have served the purpose; "Verily, righteousness would have been of the law" (Ga 3:21). The Law was never meant to give life to those who had it not. "He that doeth them shall live in them" (Ga 3:12), but the doing implies the possession of life, and the Law only guarantees the continuance of life while it is perfectly obeyed. Law controls life, but cannot confer life. It regulates life, but cannot restore life. It may impel to righteousness, but it cannot impart righteousness.

(3) The Law Our Schoolmaster.

The Law, he shows, was our schoolmaster, our pedagogue, "to bring us unto Christ" (Ga 3:24). The Grecian youth was under the charge of a pedagogue during his minority, one part of the pedagogue's duty being to take the boy, unwilling enough sometimes, to school. In the sense already shown in Romanans, the moral law by showing us our sinfulness leads us to Christ; but here we may take the Law as a whole, including all the ceremonial and typical observances which were designed to lead the people to Christ.

(4) The Bondage of the Law.

But while there was undoubtedly much of privilege for the people under the Mosaic dispensation, there was also something of bondage. And so Paul says, "We were kept in ward under the law" (Ga 3:23), and in the next chapter, he speaks of the child, though heir to a great estate, being "under guardians and stewards until the day appointed of the father" (Ga 4:2), which seems to be the same thought as under the pedagogue, and this he calls a state of "bondage" (Ga 4:3). The Law guarded and tutored and restrained; the great typical observances, though foreshadowing the grace of the gospel, were yet, in their details, irksome and burdensome, and the mass of rules as to every part of the Jew's conduct proved to be, speaking after the present-day manner, a system of red tape. Little was left to the free, spontaneous action of the spirit; the whole course of the Jew from the cradle to the grave was carefully marked out.

(5) Sonship and Its Freedom from the Law's Restrictions.

But in the fullness of time "God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons" (Ga 4:4 f). The gospel of the grace of God embodied in Christ shows its gracious character in that it not only answers the requirements of the moral law and removes its condemnation; fulfills, and by fulfilling abrogates the typical observer of the ceremonial law, but also abolishes all the directions and restrictions given to the Jews as a separate people, and brings its subjects into a condition of liberty where the renewed spirit under the mighty love of Christ can act spontaneously, the great principles of the moral law remaining as its guide, while the minute rules needed for the infancy of the race are no longer appropriate for the "sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus" (Ga 3:26). And so Paul warns these Christians against turning back to the "weak and beggarly rudiments" and observing "months, and seasons, and years" (Ga 4:9,10).

3. In the Other Pauline Epistles:

In the remaining Epistles of Paul, little is said of the Law, and we need only indicate the connections in which the word occurs. In 1Co 7:39 there is a reference to the wife being "bound by the law as long as her husband liveth" (the King James Version). The word "law," however, is omitted from the critical texts and from the Revised Version (British and American). In the same epistle (1Co 9:8,9; 14:21,34) the word is used of the Pentateuch or the Scriptures as a whole. In 1Co 9:20 Paul refers to his practice of seeking to win men to Christ by accommodating himself to their standpoint, "to them that are under the

law, as under the law"; and in 15:56 occurs the pregnant statement, an echo of Romans, "The power of sin is the law." In 2 Corinthians the word does not occur, though the legal system is referred to as the ministration of death, in contrast to the gospel ministration of the Spirit (2 Corintians 3). The word "law" is once used in Eph 2:15, in reference to the work of Christ not only producing harmony between God and man, but between Jew and Gentile: "abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances," also spoken of as "the middle wall of partition," and referring especially to the ceremonial enactments.

In Php 3:5,6,9 we have the fine autobiographical passage wherein we see the self-righteous Pharisee reckoning himself "blameless" in the eye of the Law, until convinced of his sin, and led to find in Christ the righteousness "which is through faith," instead of his own righteousness "which is of the law" (3:9). The word does not occur in Col, but the thought is found of the spiritual circumcision in contrast to the physical, the blotting out through the work of the cross, of the bond written in ordinances and the consequent deliverance of the believer from the bondage of ceremonial observances (2:11-17), those being affirmed to be "a shadow of the things to come," Christ being the glorious substance. In 1Ti 1:8,9, we have the two pregnant statements that "the law is good, if a man use it lawfully," and that "law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless."

4. In the Epistle to the Hebrews:

The word "law" occurs 14 times in this epistle, and a great deal of attention is given to the subject, but it is generally the law in its ceremonial and typical aspect that is in question. It is not necessary to look at the matter in detail, but simply to indicate the line of teaching.

(1) Harmony with the Pauline Teaching.

The ancient doubt as to the authorship of the epistle seems today to have crystallized into certainty, albeit the grounds for a conclusion are no stronger than formerly, but in the desire to prove the non-Pauline authorship, too much emphasis is perhaps laid upon the supposed un-Pauline character of the teaching. There is, after all, profound harmony between the teaching of the Pauline Epistles and the teaching of He, and the harmony applies to this matter of the Law. While Paul, as we have seen, gives prominence in Romans to the moral law, in Galatians and elsewhere he deals with the ceremonial law, in much the same way, though not so fully, as the writer to the Hebrews. Such utterances as, "Our Passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ" (1Co 5:7); "The rock was Christ"; "Now these things were our examples" (types of us) (1Co 10:4-6); "Which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ’s" (Col 2:17) are exactly in line with the teaching of Hebrews.

(2) The Law Transcended by the Gospel.

The author shows how the Law, which was a word spoken through angels, is transcended by the gospel, which has been spoken by the Lord of the angels, and so demands greater reverence (Heb 2:2-4), and all through the epistle it is the transcendent glory of the gospel dispensation introduced by Christ and

ascribed to Him, which is made to shine before us.

(3) Law of Priesthood.

The author deals specifically in Hebrews 7 and 8 with the law of priesthood, showing that Christ's Priesthood, "after the order of Melchisedek," surpasses in glory that of the Aaronic priesthood under the law; not only surpasses but supersedes it; the imperfect gives place to the perfect; the shadowy to the real; the earthly to the heavenly; the temporal to the eternal. And as Paul justifies his doctrine of justification apart from the deeds of the Law by reference to the Old Testament teaching, so here the writer finds in the Old Testament prediction of the New Covenant, the basis for all his reasoning, and in his reference to the description of the New Covenant, he is at one with Paul in regard to the moral law, seeing it as now written on the heart, and becoming an internal power, rather than an external precept.

See NEW COVENANT.

(4) The Law of the Sanctuary and the Sacrifices.

He next deals with the law of the sanctuary, and in connection therewith considers the law of the sacrifices (Hebrews 9-10), and in the same way shows that Christ makes good all that the tabernacle and its services typified, that His one, all-perfect eternal sacrifice takes the place of the many imperfect temporary sacrifices offered under the Law. At the best the Law had "a shadow of the good things to come" (Heb 10:1). The shadow was useful for the time being, the people were greatly privileged in having it, it directed them to the great Figure who cast the shadow. The whole ceremonial system was really a system of grace at the heart of it; in spite of its external rubrics which might well be abused, it made provision for satisfying for the time the breaches of the law; the sacrifices themselves could not take away sin, but periodical forgiveness was conveyed through them, by virtue of their relation to the Coming One. Now the great sacrifice having been offered, eternal redemption is secured, perfect forgiveness obtained, free access into the heavenly Holy Place assured, and the eternal inheritance provided. The Substance of all the shadows has appeared, the shadows pass away, and the great truth indicated by Christ Himself is now fully made known through His Spirit-taught servants. Christ, who "is the end of the law (the moral law) unto righteousness to every one that believeth" (Ro 10:4), is also the end of the ceremonial law, the full realization of all its types and shadows.

5. In the Epistle of James:

James mentions the "law" 10 times in his epistle, and in each case it is the moral law. The influence of the Sermon on the Mount is seen throughout the epistle, and some distinct echoes of it are heard, as e.g. the injunction, "Swear not (at all)" (5:12). James has nothing but good to say of the Law, and that fact in the light of the influence of the Sermon on the Mount is enough to show that Christ, in that wonderful discourse, did not disparage the Law, far less abrogate it, but rather exalted and reinforced it. James taught by Christ exalts the Law, glorifies it, in fact seems almost to identify it with the gospel, for in James 1, when speaking of the Word and the importance of hearing and doing it, he in the same breath

speaks of looking into "the perfect law, the law of liberty" (1:25). And indeed, it is just possible, as some think, that he means the gospel by the epithet, although it seems better to take it as the Law translated in the gospel, the Law looked at in its spirituality, as the guide of the Christian man who has entered into the spirit of it.

Even in the Old Testament, as Psalms 19 and 119 specifically show, it was possible for spiritually-minded men to see the beauty of the Law and find delight in its precepts. In James 2:8 he speaks of the "royal law," and that here he does mean the Mosaic Law is beyond doubt, since he cites the particular requirement, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," in this agreeing with his Master and with Paul, finding in love of neighbor the sum of the Law and its true fulfillment. Respect of persons, he affirms, is a breach of this "royal law," and leads to those indulging in it being "convicted" by the law of transgression (2:9). He then affirms the solidarity of the Law, so that a breach of it in one particular is a breach of the whole, and makes a man "guilty of all" (2:10), a far-reaching principle which Paul had also indicated when quoting in Ga the words, "Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them" (Ga 3:10), and when in Ro 7 he showed that the conviction that he had broken the 10th commandment made him realize that he had broken the whole Law. James then exhorts his readers to speak and act as those who are to be judged by "a law of liberty" (2:12), so that he sets no limit to the range of that law. Finally, in 4:11, he warns them by implication against speaking against the Law or judging the Law, that is, to assume the place of judge instead of "doer of the law." James could not have used such language unless he had a profound conviction of the perfection of the Law. And it is the perfection of the Law as a rule of life for spiritual men redeemed from its condemnation that James considers it, and so we can call it the perfect law, the law of liberty, the Royal Law.

6. In the Epistles of Peter and John:

In the Epistles of Peter and John, the word "law" does not occur, but Peter shows that the holiness of God remains as in the Pentateuch the standard of life, and the example of Christ shows the way (1Pe 2:21), while in the church is found the spiritual realization of the sanctuary, priesthood and sacrifices of the old economy (1Pe 2:5-9). Peter has one reference to the Roman law, enjoining upon his readers obedience to it in the political sphere. John enjoins the keeping of the commandments, these being apparently the commandments of Christ (1 Joh 2:3,4; 5:2), and the test of keeping the commandments is love of the brethren, while hatred of a brother is, as in the Sermon on the Mount, murder. All sin is "lawlessness" (1 Joh 3:4), and the sum of all law-keeping is love of God and love of the brethren, and so the summary of the old Law is echoed and endorsed.

LITERATURE.

Chiefly the works on New Testament theology (Weiss, Beyschlag, Schmid, etc.), and on Christian ethics (Martensen, Dorner, Harless, etc.), with commentaries on Pauline Epistles (Romans, etc.); Ritschl, Entstehung der altk. Kirche (2nd edition); Zahn, Das Gesetz Gottes nach der Lehre und der Erfahrung des Apostels Paulus; J. Denney, in HDB.

Archibald M’Caig

LAW IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

I. TERMS USED

1. Torah ("Law")

2. Synonyms of Torah

(1) Mitswah ("Command")

(2) ‘Edhah ("Witness," "Testimony")

(3) MishpaTim ("Judgments")

(4) Chuqqim ("Statutes")

(5) Piqqudhim ("Precepts")

II. THE WRITTEN RECORD OF THE LAW

1. The Critical Dating of the Laws

2. Groups of Laws in P (the Priestly Code)

3. The Book of the Covenant

(1) Judgments. Compared with Code of Hammurabi

(2) Basis of Law of Covenant. Earlier Customs

4. The Book of the Law of Deuteronomy 31

5. The Law of Holiness

6. The Final Compilation

III. THE GENERAL CHARACTER AND DESIGN OF THE LAW

1. The Civil Law

(1) Servants and the Poor

(2) Punishments

(3) Marriage

(4) Sabbaths and Feasts

2. The Ceremonial Law

(1) Origin of Sacrifice

(2) The Levitical Ritual

(3) The Law Truly a Torah

IV. THE PASSING AWAY OF THE LAW

LITERATURE

Law, at least as custom, certainly existed among the Hebrews in the times before Moses, as appears from numerous allusions to it, both in matters civil and ceremonial, in the earlier Scriptures. But we have no distinct account of such law, either as to its full contents or its enactment. Law in the Old Testament practically means the Law promulgated by Moses (having its roots no doubt in this earlier law or custom), with sundry later modifications or additions, rules as to which have been inserted in the record of the Mosaic law.

The following are matters of pre-Mosaic law or custom to which allusion is made in Genesis and Exodus: the offering of sacrifice and the use of altars (Genesis, passim); the religious use of pillars (Ge 28:18); purification for sacrifice (Ge 35:2); tithes (Ge 14:20; 28:22); circumcision (Ge 17:10; Ex 4:25 f); inquiry at a sanctuary (Ge 25:22); sacred feasts (Ex 5:1, etc.); priests (Ex 19:22); sacred oaths (Ge 14:22); marriage customs (Ge 16; 24; 25:6; 29:16-30); birthright (Ge 25:31-34); elders (Ge 24:2; 50:7; Ex 3:16); homicide (Ge 9:6), etc. We proceed at once to the Law of Moses.

I. Terms Used.

The Hebrew word rendered "law" in our Bibles is torah. Other synonymous words either denote (as indeed does torah itself) aspects under which the Law may be regarded, or different classes of law.

1. Torah ("Law"):

Torah is from horah, the Hiphil of yarah. The root meaning is "to throw"; hence, in Hiphil the word means "to point out" (as by throwing out the hand), and so "to direct"; and torah is "direction." Torah may be simply "human direction," as the "law of thy mother" in Pr 1:8; but most often in the Old Testament it is the Divine law. In the singular it often means a law, the plural being used in the same sense; but more frequently torah in the singular is the general body of Divinely given law. The word tells nothing as to the way in which the Law, or any part of it, was first given; it simply points out the general purpose of the Law, namely, that it was for the guidance of God's people in the various matters to which it relates. This shows that the end of the Law lay beyond the mere obedience to such and such rules, that end being instruction in the knowledge of God and of men's relation to Him, and guidance in living as the children of such a God as He revealed Himself to be. This is dwelt upon in the later Scriptures, notably in Ps 19 and Ps 119.

In the completed Canon of the Old Testament, torah technically denotes the Pentateuch (Lu 24:44) as being that division of the Old Testament Scriptures which contains the text of the Law, and its history down to the death of Moses, the great lawgiver.

2. Synonyms of Torah:

(1) Mitswah ("Command")

Mitswah, "command" (or, in the plural, "commands"), is a term applied to the Law as indicating that it is a charge laid upon men as the expression of God's will, and therefore that it must be obeyed.

(2) 'Edhah ("Witness," "Testimony")

'Edhah, "witness" or "testimony" (in plural "testimonies"), is a designation of God's law as testifying the principles of His dealings with His people. So the ark of the covenant is called the "ark of the testimony" (Ex 25:22), as containing "the testimony" (Ex 25:16), i.e. the tables of the Law upon which the covenant was based. The above terms are general, applying to the torah at large; the two next following are of more restricted application.

(3) MishpaTim ("Judgments")

MishpaTim, "judgments": MishpaT in the singular sometimes means judgment in an abstract sense, as in Ge 18:19; De 32:4; sometimes the act of judging, as in De 16:18,19; 17:9; 24:17. But "judgments" (in the plural) is a term constantly used in connection with, and distinction from, statutes, to indicate laws of a particular kind, namely, laws which, though forming part of the torah by virtue of Divine sanction, originated in decisions of judges upon cases brought before them for judgment. See further below.

(4) Chuqqim ("Statutes")

Chuqqim, "statutes" (literally, "laws engraven"), are laws immediately enacted by a lawgiver. "Judgments and statutes" together comprise the whole law (Le 18:4; De 4:1,8 the King James Version). So also we now distinguish between consuetudinary and statute law.

(5) Piqqudhim ("Precepts")

Piqqudhim, "precepts": This term is found only in the Psalms. It seems to mean rules or counsels provided to suit the various circumstances in which men may be placed. The term may perhaps be meant to apply both to the rules of the actual torah, and to others found, e.g. in the writings of prophets and "wise men."

II. The Written Record of the Law.

The enactment of the Law and its committal to writing must be distinguished. With regard to the former, it is distinctly stated (Joh 1:17) that "the law was given through Moses"; and though this does not necessarily imply that every regulation found in the Pentateuch is his, a large number of the laws are expressly ascribed to him. As regards the latter, we are distinctly told that Moses wrote certain laws or collections of laws (Ex 17:14; 24:4,7; De 31:9). These, however, form only a portion of the whole legislation; and therefore, whether the remaining portions were written by Moses, or—if not by him—when and by whom, is a legitimate matter of inquiry.

It is not necessary here to discuss the large question of the literary history of the Pentateuch, but it must briefly be touched upon. The Pentateuch certainly appears to have reached its present form by the gradual piecing together of diverse materials. Deuteronomy (D) being a separate composition, a distinction would seem to have been clearly established by critical examination between a number of paragraphs in the remaining books which apparently must once have formed a narrative by themselves, and other paragraphs, partly narrative but chiefly legislative and statistical, which appear to have been subsequently added. Without endorsing any of the critical theories as to the relation of these, one to the other, or as to the dates of their composition, we may, in a general way, accept the analysis, and adopt the well-known symbol JE (Jahwist-Elohim) to distinguish the former, and P (Priestly Code) the latter. Confining ourselves to their legislative contents, we find in JE a short but very important body of law, the Law of the Covenant, stated in full in Ex 20-23, and repeated as to a portion of it in Ex 34:10-28. All the rest of the legislation is contained in P and Deuteronomy.

1. The Critical Dating of the Laws:

We are distinctly told in Ex that the law contained in Ex 20-23 was given through Moses. Rejecting this statement, critics of the school of Wellhausen affirm that its true date must be placed considerably later than the time of Joshua. They maintain that previous to their conquest of Canaan the Israelites were mere nomads, ignorant of agriculture, the practice of which, as well as their culture in general, they first learned from the conquered Canaanites. Therefore (so they argue), as the law of Ex 20-23 presupposes

the practice of agriculture, it cannot have been promulgated until some time in the period of the Judges at the earliest; they place it indeed in the early period of the monarchy. All this, however, is mere assumption, support for which is claimed in some passages in which a shepherd life is spoken of, but with utter disregard of others which show that both in the patriarchal period and in Egypt the Israelites also cultivated land. See B.D. Eerdmans, "Have the Hebrews Been Nomads?" The Expositor, August and October, 1908. It can indeed be shown that this law was throughout in harmony with what must have been the customs and conceptions of the Israelites at the age of the exodus (Rule, Old Testament Institutions). Professor Eerdmans in his Alttestamentliche Studien, Part III (1910), vigorously defends the Mosaic origin of the Book of the Covenant.

The same critics bring down the date of the legislation of De to the time of Josiah, or at most a few years earlier. They affirm (wrongly) that the chief object of Josiah's reformation narrated in 2Ki 23 was the centralization of worship at the temple in Jerusalem. They rightly attribute the zeal which carried the reform through to the discovery of the "Book of the Law" (22:8). Then arguing that the frequent previous practice of worship at high places implied the non-existence of any law to the contrary, they conclude that the rule of De 12 was a rule recently laid down by the temple priesthood, and written in a book in Moses' name, this new book being what was "found in the house of Yahweh." But this argument is altogether unsound: its grave difficulties are well set out in Moller's Are the Critics Right? And here again careful study vindicates the Mosaic character of the law of Deuteronomy as a whole and of De 12 in particular. M. Edouard Naville in La decouverte de la loi sous le roi Josias propounds a theory which he supports by a most interesting argument: that the book found was a foundation deposit, which must therefore have been built over by masonry at the erection of the temple by Solomon.

Equally unsound, however plausible, are the arguments which would make the framing of the Levitical ritual the work of the age of Ezra. The difficulties created by this theory are far greater than those which it is intended to remove. On this also see Moller, Are the Critics Right?

Rejecting these theories, it will be assumed in the present article that the various laws are of the dates ascribed to them in the Pentateuch; that whatever may be said as to the date of some "of the laws," all which are therein ascribed to Moses are truly so ascribed.

2. Groups of Laws in P (the Priestly Code):

The laws in P are arranged for the most part in groups, with which narrative is sometimes intermingled. These e.g. are some of the groups: Ex 25-31; Le 1-7; 11-15; Nu 1-4, etc. The structure and probable history of these groups are very interesting. That many of them must have undergone interpolation appears certain from the following considerations. Each of the groups, and often one or more paragraphs within a group, is headed by a recurring formula, "Yahweh spake unto Moses (or unto Aaron, or unto Moses and Aaron), saying." We might at first expect that the contents of each group or paragraph so headed would consist solely of what Yahweh had said unto Moses or Aaron, but this is not always so. Not infrequently some direction is found within such a paragraph which cannot have been spoken to Moses, but must have come into force at some later date. Unless then we reject the statement of the

formula, unless we are prepared to say that Yahweh did not speak unto Moses, we can only conclude that these later directions were at some time inserted by an editor into paragraphs which originally contained Mosaic laws only. That this should have been done would be perfectly natural, when we consider that the purpose of such an editor would be not only to preserve (as has been done) the record of the original Law, but to present a manual of law complete for the use of his age, a manual (to use a modern phrase) made complete to date.

That the passages in question were indeed interpolations appears not only from the fact that their removal rids the text of what otherwise would be grave discrepancies, but because the passages in question sometimes disturb the sequence of the context. Moreover, by thus distinguishing between laws promulgated (as stated) by Moses, and laws to which the formula of statement was not intended to apply, we arrive at the following important result. It is that the former laws can all be shown to be in harmony one with another and with the historical data of the Mosaic age; while the introduction of the later rules is also seen to be what would naturally follow by way of adaptation to the circumstances of later times, and the gradual unfolding of Divine purpose.

It would be much too long a task here to work this out in detail: it has been attempted by the writer of this article in Old Testament Institutions, Their Origin and Development. Two instances, however, may be mentioned.

Instances of interpolation—In Ex 12:43 ff (English Revised Version) we read, "This is the ordinance of the passover: there shall no alien eat thereof; but every man’s servant that is bought for money, when thou hast circumcised him, then shall he eat thereof. A sojourner and a hired servant shall not eat thereof." This was the original Mosaic rule introduced by the formula in 12:43. But in 12:48,49 it is said that sojourners (when circumcised) may eat of the passover. This was plainly a relaxation of later date, made in accordance with the principle which is enlarged upon in Isa 56:3-8.

According to Le 23:34,39 a, 40-42, the Feast of Tabernacles was a feast of seven days only. This was the Mosaic rule as appears from the formula in 23:33, and in certain other passages. But as a development in the feast’s observance, an eighth day was subsequently added, and therefore insertions to that effect were made here at 23:36 and 39b. The introduction of this additional day would be in keeping with that elaboration in the observance of the "set feasts" which we find in Nu 28 and 29, as compared with the simpler observance of the same days ordered in Le 23. Here again the formula in Nu 28:1 plainly covered a few verses immediately following, but not the whole content of the two chapters.

Premising then the existence in writing from an early age of numerous groups of Mosaic laws and their subsequent interpolation, the ultimate compilation of these groups together with other matter and their arrangement in the order in which we now find them must have been the work, perhaps indeed of the interpolator, but in any case of some late editor. These numerous groups do not, however, make up the whole legislative contents of the Pentateuch; for a very large portion of these contents consists of three distinct books of law, which we must now examine. These were the "Book of the Covenant," the "Book of the Law" of De 31:26, and the so-called "Law of Holiness."

3. The Book of the Covenant:

This book, expressly so named (Ex 24:7), is stated to have been written by Moses (24:3,1). It must have comprised the contents of Ex 20-23. The making of the covenant at Sinai, led up to by the revealing words of Ex 3:12-17; 6:2-8; 19:3-6, was a transaction of the very first importance in the religious history of Israel. God's revelation of Himself to Israel being very largely, indeed chiefly, a revelation of His moral attributes (Ex 34:6,7), could only be effectively apprehended by a people who were morally fitted to receive it. Hence, it was that Israel as a nation was now placed by God in a stated relation to Himself by means of a covenant, the condition upon which the covenant was based being, on His people's part, their obedience to a given law. This was the law contained in the "Book of the Covenant."

It consisted of "words of Yahweh" and "Judgments" (Ex 24:3 the King James Version). The latter are contained in Ex 21:1-22:17; the former in Exodus 20, in the remaining portion of Exodus 22, and Exodus 23. The "judgments" (the American Standard Revised Version "ordinances") relate entirely to matters of right between man and man; the "words of Yahweh" relate partly to these and partly to duties distinctively religious.

(1) Judgments. Compared with Code of Hammurabi.

The "judgments" appear to be taken from older consuetudinary law; not necessarily comprising the whole of that law, but so much of it as it pleased God now to stamp with His express sanction and to embody in this Covenant Law. They may well be compared with those contained in the so-called Code of Hammurabi, king of Babylon, who is thought to have been the Amraphel of Ge 14. These are called "the judgments of righteousness which Hammurabi the mighty king confirmed." The resemblances in form and in subject between the two sets of "judgments" are very striking. All alike have the same structure, beginning with a hypothetical clause, "if so and so," and then giving the rule applicable in the third person. All alike relate entirely to civil, as distinguished from religious, matters, to rights and duties between man and man. All seem to have had a similar origin in judgments passed in the first place on causes brought before judges for decision: both sets therefore represent consuetudinary law.

(2) Basis of Law of Covenant. Earlier Customs.

It is remarkable that, alike in matters of right between man and man, and in matters relating directly to the service of God, the Law of the Covenant did little (if anything) more than give a new and Divinely attested sanction to requirements which, being already familiar, appealed to the general conscience of the community. If, indeed, in the "words of Yahweh" there was any tightening of accustomed moral or (more particularly) religious requirements, e.g. in the first and second commandments of the Decalogue, it would seem to have been by way of enforcing convictions which must have been already gaining hold upon the minds of at least the more thoughtful of the people, and that in large measure through the lessons impressed upon them by the events of their recent history. In no other Way could the Law of the Covenant have appealed to their conscience, and so formed a foundation on which the covenant could be securely based.

As in the "judgments" we have a ratification of old consuetudinary law; as again in the second table of the Decalogue we have moral rules in accordance with a standard of moral right—no doubt already acknowledged—very similar indeed to that of the "negative confession" in the Egyptian Book of the Dead; so in the more especially religious rules of the Law of the Covenant we find, not new rules or an establishment of new institutions, but a new sanction of what was already old. These "words of Yahweh" assume the rendering of service to Yahweh: they do not enjoin it as if it were a new thing, but they enjoin that the Israelites shall not add to His service also the service of other gods (Ex 20:3; 23:24). They assume the observance of the three "feasts," they enjoin that these shall be kept to Yahweh—"unto me," i.e. "unto me only" (Ex 23:14,17). They assume the making of certain offerings to Yahweh, they enjoin that these shall be made liberally—"of the first," i.e. of the best—and without delay (Ex 22:29 f). They assume the rendering of worship by sacrifice, and the existence of an accustomed ritual, and therefore they do not lay down any scheme of ritual, but they give a few directions designed to guard against idolatry, or any practices tending either to irreverence or to low and false conceptions of God (Ex 20:4-6,23-26; 22:31; 23:18 f). While insisting upon the observance of the three "feasts," spoken of as already accustomed, it is remarkable that they contain no command to keep the Passover, which as an annual observance was not yet an accustomed thing.

This absence of ritual directions is indeed very noticeable. It was in the counsel of God that He would in the near future establish a reconstituted ritual, based upon what was already traditional, but containing certain new elements, and so framed as more and more to foster spiritual conceptions of God and a higher ideal of holiness. This however was as yet a thing of the future. No mention therefore was made of it in the Law of the Covenant; that law was so restricted as that it should at once appeal to the general conscience of the people, and so be a true test of their desire to do what was right. This would be the firm basis on which to build yet higher things. It is impossible to estimate the true character of the subsequent legislation, i.e. of what in bulk is by far the larger part of the torah—except by first grasping the true character and motive of the Covenant, and the Covenant Law.

See also COVENANT, BOOK OF THE; PENTATEUCH.

4. The Book of the Law of Deuteronomy 31:

Immediately after the making of the Covenant, Moses was called up into the mount, and there received instructions for the erection of the tabernacle, these being followed in due course by the rules of the reconstituted ceremonial of which the tabernacle was to be the home. All these for the present we must pass over.

Having arrived on the East of the Jordan, Moses, now at the close of his career, addressed discourses to the people, in which he earnestly exhorted them to live up to the high calling with which God had called them, in the land of which they were about to take possession. To this end he embodied in his discourse a statement of the Law by which they were to live. And then, as almost his last public act, he wrote "the words of this law in a book," and directed that the book should be placed "by the side of the ark of the covenant" (De 31:24-26). What now was this book? Was it Deuteronomy, in whole or in part? The most

reasonable answer to this question is that the book actually written by Moses comprised at least the contents of De 5-26 and 28. Whether the whole or any parts of the remaining contents of De also formed part of this book, or were subsequently added to it, the whole being brought by a process of editing to our present Deuteronomy, is again a legitimate matter of inquiry.

Characteristics of Deuteronomy.

Regarding De 5-26 and 28 (with or without parts of other chapters) as the "book" of De 31:24-26, we find that it is a manual of instruction for the people at large—it is not a priest's manual. It deals with matters of morals, and of religion in its general principles, but only subordinately with matters of ritual: it warns against perils of idolatry and superstitious corruptions, common in the service of other gods, but which might by no means be mixed up with Yahweh's seryice: it insists upon righteous conduct between man and man, and very strongly inculcates humanity toward the poor and the dependent: it enjoins upon those in authority the impartial maintenance of right, as also fairness, moderation and mercy, in the administration of law and the infliction of punishment: it sets forth the fear of God as the guide of His people's actions, and the love of God in response to His mercy toward them. It does not lay down any scheme of ritual, though it gives rules (De 4:3-21) as to things which might not be eaten as unclean; it also gives directions as to the disposal of tithes (De 14:22-29; 26:12); it enlarges upon the direction in the Law of the Covenant for the observance of the three "feasts," adding to this the observance of the Passover (De 16); it lays down a law (expressed conditionally) restricting to one sanctuary the offering of at least the more solemn sacrifices (De 12); and it frequently inculcates liberality toward the Levites, both on account of the sacred services rendered by them, their dispersal among the tribes, and the precarious character of their livelihood. Like the Law of the Covenant it assumes the existence of an accustomed ceremonial, and it is remarkable that when there is occasion to do so it makes use of phraseology (De 12) similar to that of the ritual laws of Moses in Leviticus and Numbers.

It is quite possible that some interpolations may have been made in the text of Deuteronomy 5-26, but not on any sufficient scale to affect the general character of the original book. This "Book of the Law" then was an expansion of the Law of the Covenant, enforcing its principles, giving directions in greater detail for carrying them out, and setting them in a framework of exhortation, warning and encouragement. Thus, its relation to the covenant is indicated by De 26:16-19; 29:1. This is that "book of the Law of Moses" of which frequent mention is made in the books of Kings, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

5. The Law of Holiness:

In marked contrast to the numerous rules, sometimes intermingled with narrative, which we find in Ex 25-40; Le 1-16, and throughout Numbers, we have in Le 17-26 a collection of laws which evidently was once a book by itself. This, from its constant insistence upon holiness as a motive of conduct, has been called "the Law of Holiness." Though it contains many laws stated to have been spoken by Yahweh to Moses, we are not told by whom it was written, and therefore its authorship and date are a fair subject of inquiry. In its general design it bears much resemblance to the Law of the Covenant, and the Book of the

Law contained in Deuteronomy. As in them, and especially in the latter, the laws are set up in a parenetic framework, the whole closing with promise of reward for obedience and a threat of punishment for disobedience (compare Ex 23:20-33; Le 26; De 28). Like them it deals much with moral duties: Le 19 and 20 are practically an expansion of the Decalogue; but it deals also more than they do with ceremonial. With regard to both it sets forth as the motive of obedience the rule, "Be ye holy, for I am holy."

A Clue as to Date

A clue to its date is to be found in its conception of cleanness. The idea found in the Prophets and the New Testament that moral wrongdoing renders unclean must be based upon some earlier conception, namely, upon the Old Testament conception of ritual uncleanness. Now ritual uncleanness was originally physical uncleanness only; the idea of moral right or wrong did not enter into it at all: this is perfectly clear from the whole contents of Le 11-15. On the other hand we find the idea of moral cleanness and uncleanness fully formed in the Psalms, Proverbs, and in the Prophets, including the earlier prophets, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah. In H (the Law of Holiness, Le 17-26) we find an intermediate conception. We find that whereas in Le 11-15 sexual acts which were lawful rendered unclean equally with those which were unlawful, in H, adultery and incest are denounced as rendering specially unclean, the idea being that their technical uncleanness became more intensely unclean through their immorality (Le 18:24-30). Similarly, converse with familiar spirits and wizards, which probably involved physical defilement (perhaps through the ingredients used in charms), is mentioned as specially causing defilement, probably as such technical defilement would be intensified by the unlawfulness of dealing with familiar spirits and wizards at all (Le 19:31). Sins, however, which did not in themselves entail physical uncleanness, such e.g. as injustice, are not mentioned in H as rendering unclean, though they are so regarded in the Prophets. First, then, we have ritual uncleanness, which is physical only in the rules of Le 11-15 (Mosaic rules undoubtedly embodying a pre-Mosaic conception); lastly, we have moral wrong in itself rendering unclean, in the Psalms and the Prophets; intermediately we have the transitional conception in H. The date therefore of the Law of Holiness may be Mosaic, but must be considerably earlier than the earliest of the writing prophets.

6. The Final Compilation:

The remaining groups of Mosaic laws would appear to have been extant in their original form (i.e. without interpolation), no doubt in the custody of the priesthood for probably a very considerable time, it may have been for centuries, before their final compilation in their present form. The arrangement of these groups as they now stand, before and after H and with narrative intermingled, is by no means haphazard, as it might at first appear.

(1) Exodus.

As the directions for the erection of the tabernacle with the purpose of its several parts were given to Moses immediately after the making of the covenant, they follow the account of it immediately. Thus

Exodus contains the history of the covenant-making, of what led up to it, and of what immediately followed it, namely, the provision of the home for the covenant-worship.

(2) Leviticus.

This book follows with the rules of that worship; not indeed with all its details, but with an account of all that was essential to it. First (in Le 1-7) we have the law of sacrifice, including what was so especially peculiar to the covenant-worship, the law of the sin offering. Then in Le 8-10 we have the consecration of the tabernacle and its contents, the consecration of its priests and the inauguration of the newly prescribed system of worship. Then in Le 11-15 we have the rules for purification from ritual uncleanness, without which it would have been impossible for this system of covenant-worship to be carried on. Then there follows in Le 16 the account of the ceremonies of the Day of Atonement, the crown and completion of the whole. Thus in these 16 chapters we have an account of the essentials of the newly instituted covenant-worship. And then immediately we have in the Law of Holiness the great motive that underlay both this ceremonial law and the preceding moral and religious law of the Book of the Covenant, namely, the principle that God's people must be holy, because He is holy. The emphasizing of this principle in H thus closes this whole statement of law, as its first enunciation had introduced it in Ex 19:6.

(3) Numbers.

The purpose of Numbers is supplementary. Nu 1-6, containing the numbering and ordering of the tribes and rules as to the representative Levitical ministry, sets forth the corporate character of Israel's service of God. The Israelites were not to be a mere aggregation of tribes, but a single nation, the bond of their union being the covenant with God. The camp itself, ordered and carefully guarded against pollution, was to be a symbol of this holy unity. Num 7-10 narrate the remaining occurrences at Sinai, including (9:1-14) the important account of the first commemorative Passover. The remaining chapters contain, alternately, a narrative of events following the departure from Sinai and groups of laws usually in some way connected with the events narrated, but all of them supplementary to the more essential laws already recorded.

(4) Deuteronomy.

As a separate work and based upon sayings and doings at the very close of the 40 years, Deuteronomy naturally follows last.

III. The General Character and Design of the Law. Both in civil matters and in ceremonial the Law had to deal with men who lived in a comparatively early age of human history. Its rules were necessarily adapted in both departments to the standards of the age. At the same time they inculcated principles, the working out of which would by degrees bring about a great advance in men's conceptions both of what is true and of what is right.

1. The Civil Law:

As J.B. Mozley says (Lectures on the Old Testament), "The morality of a progressive revelation is not the morality with which it starts but that with which it concludes"; yet the excellence of the Old Testament Law is evident, not only in its great underlying principles, but in the suitability of its individual rules to promote moral advance.

(1) Servants and the Poor.

We have already noted the similarity between the "judgments" of Ex 20 and 21 and the "judgments" of Hammurabi, in respect to form and subject. Notwithstanding the practical wisdom found in many of the latter, there is in one matter a marked contrast in spirit between them and the former, for while both the Law of the Covenant and its enlargement in De guarded the interest of and secured justice, and mercy too, to slaves and the poor, the laws of Hammurabi were framed rather in the interests of the well-to-do. Compare (e.g.) with the rule as to a runaway slave in De 23:15 f, the following (Code of Hammurabi, section symbol 16): "If a man has harbored in his house a manservant or a maidservant fugitive from the palace, or a poor man, and has not produced them at the demand of the commandant, the owner of that house shall be put to death." The Law indeed permitted slavery, an institution universal in the ancient world, but it made provisions which must very greatly have mitigated its hardship. It was enjoined, both in Exodus and in Deuteronomy, that after six years' service a Hebrew manservant should "go out free for nothing," unless he himself preferred to remain in servitude (Ex 21:2-6; De 15:12-18). The rule in Ex 21:7-11 as to women servants was not exactly the same, but it nevertheless guarded their interests, while Hebrew women servants were afterward included in the rule of De 15:12. A still greater amelioration was brought in by a later rule connected with the law of the Jubilee as set out in Le 25:39-55. Again, though servitude was permitted on account of debt, or as a rescue from poverty (Ex 21:2,7; De 15:12), manstealing was a capital offense (Ex 21:16).

(2) Punishments.

The rule of Ex 21:22-25 ("eye for eye," etc.; compare Le 24:19,20; De 19:16-19) sounds harsh to us, but while the justice it sanctioned was rough and ready according to the age, it put a restraint on vindictiveness. The punishment might be so much, but no more: and the same spirit of restraint in punishment is seen in the rule as to flogging (De 25:2 f). Similarly the rule that murder was to be avenged by "the avenger of blood," a rule under the circumstances of the age both necessary and salutary, was protected from abuse by the appointment of places of refuge, the rule with respect to which was designed to prepare the way for a better system (see Ex 21:12-14; Nu 35:9-24; De 19:1-13).

(3) Marriage.

The marriage customs of the Mosaic age permitted polygamy and concubinage, marriage by purchase or by capture in war, slave-marriage, and divorce. The Law allowed the continuance of these customs, but did not originate them; on the contrary, its provisions were designed to restrict the old license, giving

protection to the weaker party, the woman, limiting as far as possible the evils of the traditional system, a system which could not suddenly be changed, and preparing the way for a better. Consider the effect of the following rules: as to slave-wives (Ex 21:7-11); captives of war (De 21:10-14); plurality of wives (De 21:15-17); adultery (Ex 20:14,17; De 22:22); fornication (De 22:23-29; 23:17,18; Le 21:19); divorce (De 24:1-4); Levirate marriage (De 25:5-10); incest (Le 18:6-18); marriage of priests (Le 21:7,10-15); royal polygamy (De 17:17).

(4) Sabbaths and Feasts.

The law as to these, though partly ceremonial, yet served social ends. The Sabbath day gave to all, and particularly to servants and the poor, and domestic cattle too, a needful respite from daily toil; it also served men's spiritual welfare, and did honor to God (Ex 23:12; De 5:14,15; Ex 31:12-17). The seventh year's rest to the land—it also "a sabbath of solemn rest, a sabbath unto Yahweh"—was for the land's recuperation, but it served also to safeguard common rights at perhaps a time of transition as to customs of land tenure: connected with it also there were rules as to release of slaves and relief of debtors (Ex 23:9-11; Le 25:2-7; De 15:1-18). The observance of the Sabbath year as a rest to the land seems to have fallen into disuse, perhaps as early as some 500 years before the Babylonian captivity (2Ch 36:21), and it is probable that the Jubilee (the design of which seems to have been to adjust conflicting rights under new customs of land tenure and in the relation of employer to employed) was instituted to take its place (Le 25). The law as to the annual feasts insured both the social advantages of festive gatherings of the people, and their sanctification by the worship of God, and the public recognition of His hand in matters agricultural and political, which were either the occasion of, or connected with, these gatherings. Considerate liberality to the poor and dependent was, on these occasions, especially enjoined (Ex 23:14-17; De 16:1-17; 12:12,18,19).

2. The Ceremonial Law:

We have already noted that the conception of sin as uncleanness, rendering the sinner therefore unfit for the presence of God, must have been an outgrowth from the earlier conception of purely ritual (physical) uncleanness. This development, and an accompanying sense of the heinousness of sin and of its need of atonement by sacrifice, were undoubtedly brought about by the gradual working of the law of the sin offering (Le 4:1-5:13; 12-15; 16). Similarly the rules as to guilt offerings (Le 5:14-6:7) must by degrees have led to a true conception of repentance, as including both the seeking of atonement through sacrifice and restitution for wrong committed. The sin offering was, however, a peculiarly Mosaic institution, marking a development in the sacrificial system. The only sacrifices of which we have any trace in pre-Mosaic times were meal and drink offerings, whole burnt offerings and sacrifices (or, to use the Levitical term, peace offerings).

(1) Origin of Sacrifice.

We read of the offering of sacrifice all through the patriarchal history, and farther back even than Noah in the story of Cain and Abel; and there can be no doubt that the Levitical scheme of sacrifice was based

upon, and a development (under Divine ordering) of, the sacrificial system already traditional among the Hebrews. Sacrifice was undoubtedly of Divine origin; yet we have no account, or even hint, of any formal institution of sacrifice. The sacrifices of Cain and Abel are spoken of in a way that leaves the impression that they were offered spontaneously, and the most probable assumption would seem to be that the very first offering of sacrifice was the outcome of a spontaneous desire (Divinely implanted, we may be sure) in early men to render service to the higher Being of whose relation to themselves they were, if ever so dimly, conscious.

Prehistoric research has not yet been able to present to us a distinct picture of primitive men; and even if the results of anthropology were more certain than they can yet claim to be, what in this connection we are concerned in is the conceptions, not of early men everywhere, but of the early ancestors of the Hob race. However infantile their ideas may have been and probably were, there may well have been far more of elementary truth in them—in simple ideas Divinely implanted—than students of anthropology have any knowledge of. Sooner or later early men did make offerings to God; and as the Mosaic sacrificial system was certainly based upon the patriarchal, so we may fairly assume that the ideas underlying the latter were an outgrowth from those which underlay the sacrifice of the patriarch's own still earlier ancestors.

It is well observed by Dr. A.B. Davidson (Old Testament Theology, p. 315) that the sacrifices of Cain and Abel are called a minchah or present; and this idea of sacrifice as a gift to God most easily accounts for the facts with which we have to deal in the history of Old Testament sacrifice. When early men first made offerings to God, they probably did so in the spirit of young children who give gifts to older persons without knowing whether, or in what way, the gifts will be of any use to them. They simply give in affection what is of value in their own eyes. The one only thing of prime value to the earliest men must have been food; hence, offerings to God were everywhere in the first place offerings of food. But here a difficulty must soon have arisen, for men must have become convinced very soon that the Divine Being did not feed upon the food offered, at least in men's way of feeding. Ultimately, among the Israelites, the idea of His actual feeding became eliminated altogether (Ps 50:13,14), but in the meantime the difficulty seems to have been met by the assumption that the Divine Being consumed an inner essence of food; and this being supposed to be set free by fire, food offered in sacrifice came to be burnt in order to fit it to become the food of God. This certainly appears from Le 3:11,16 (compare Le 21:6,8,17,21).

Coming, however, to animal as distinguished from vegetable sacrifice, we do not find that its origin can be accounted for as at the first being an offering of food. We learn from Le 17:10-14 that the essential part of animal sacrifice was the offering of the blood, and that blood was offered because blood was life. The idea that life can be given by giving blood lay at the root of a custom which must have been well-nigh universal in primitive times, that of blood covenanting (see H. Clay Trumbull, Blood Covenant). In this, two persons would give each to the other of his own blood, drawn from the living vein. Persons united in blood covenant were supposed, by the commingling of their blood, to become actual sharers of one life. To give to another of one's own blood was to give one's own life, i.e. one's own self, with all the dedication of love and service which that would imply. Now a similar idea would seem to have lain at the root of the primitive offering of blood to God: it was the offering of the life of the offerer.

In the very first blood offerings it is probable that the blood offered was the blood of the offerer, and that there was no infliction of death—only in this way the dedication of life. The dedicatory rite of circumcision may have been a survival of sacrifice in this its earliest form; so also what is narrated in 1Ki 18:28. When, however, the blood offered had come to be the blood of a substitute, and that a substitute animal, the sacrifice would come (no doubt soon) to include the slaughter of the animal and further the consumption, in whole or in part, of its carcass by fire as an offering of food.

(2) The Levitical Ritual.

Whether the above theory be accepted or not, in so far as animal sacrifice became an offering of food, it would stand in line with vegetable sacrifice; but in both the excellence of the Levitical ritual stood in this, that while it was framed for a people whose conceptions were in a stage of transition, it was yet adaptable to higher conceptions, and fitted to become at length symbolical of purely spiritual truth. It was through the teaching, not only of prophets but of the Lcvitical ritual itself, and while it was still in full force, that the words of Ps 50:13,14 were uttered: "Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving; and pay thy vows unto the Most High." The Levitical ritual, as respects animal sacrifice in particular, was so framed as, on the one hand, to keep alive the idea of sacrifice as the offering of life, not of death, of life's dedication, not its destruction, and therefore to make it a true type of Christ's living sacrifice. On the other hand, the rules of sacrifice guarded against abuses which, as a matter of fact, sprang up widely among the heathen. The rule, e.g. in Le 1:2 and elsewhere, that "ye shall offer your oblation of the cattle, even of the herd and of the flock," excluded human sacrifice. The rule that the first act in every sacrifice must be to slay the creature offered excluded the infliction of unnecessary suffering. The detailed rules as to the offering and disposal of the blood, and the varying modes of disposal of the carcass, kept alive the essential idea of all such sacrifice, and saved it from degenerating into a mere heaping up, as in Egypt, of altars with mere loads of food. The rules of the peace offering, clothing it always with a spiritual motive (see Le 7:12,16), raised it to a level far above the sacrifice of that class among the surrounding heathen, guarding it against their licentious festivity (compare Ho 2:11-13; 4:13,14; Am 2:8; 5:21-23) and gross ideas as to the part of God in the feasting.

(3) The Law Truly a Torah.

In every one of its departments the Law proved itself to be indeed a torah directing God's people in the upward way; leading them on from the state of advancement, such as it was, to which they had already attained by Moses' time, to higher and higher standards, both of faith and of duty, till they were prepared for the gospel of Christ, who Himself said of the old Law, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled" (Mt 5:18 the King James Version). Meanwhile we have, in the teaching of the prophets, not a counter influence, not a system rivaling the Law, but its unfolding, both inspired of God, both instruments in His progressive revelation. "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" were the words of Samuel, a faithful servant of the Law, and himself a frequent offerer of sacrifice. What the Law was to the heart of devout Israelites in the prophetic age is seen in the fervent words of Ps 119.

IV. The Passing Away of the Law.

The great general principles of the Law were not transitory but abiding, and reappear under the gospel dispensation. Otherwise, however, i.e. in those particulars, whether ceremonial or civil, in which it was adapted to merely passing needs, the Law passed away when Christ came. It is not always realized that already before Christ came it had begun to pass away. The following are illustrations:

(1) The whole rationale of the Levitical worship consisted in its being based upon the covenant made at Sinai, and the symbol of the Covenant was the ark containing the tables of the Law and surmounted by the mercy-seat. Therefore one of its most significant acts was the sprinkling of the blood of sin offering within the veil upon the mercy-seat, or without the veil, but yet before the mercy-seat. But this most significant act could no longer be performed when, after the Babylonian captivity, there was no longer either ark or mercy-seat.

(2) The law that tithe should be paid to the Levites, a tithe only of it being paid by them to "Aaron the priest" (Nu 18), was practicable so long as the priests were a small portion only of the whole Levitical body, as they appear in the history down to the middle period of the monarchy. But by the time of the exile they disappeared from history except as actual temple ministrants, and, after the return from the exile, even these were in number a mere handful compared with the priests (Ezr 2:36-42; 8:15-20,24-30; Ne 11:10-19). The attempt to revive the old law (Ne 10:38,39) was well-intentioned but impracticable: it was evidently soon abandoned (Ne 13:10-13; Mal 3:8-10). We learn from Josephus that tithes were regarded later as due to the priests, not to the Levites (Josephus, Ant, XX, viii, 8; ix, 2).

(3) That the Mosaic law as to divorce was to give place to one more stringent appears not only from our Lord’s words in Mt 19:7-9, but from Mal 2:16.

(4) It is probable that some of the supplementary rules in Nu may have been designed for temporary use only, and may have passed away before the close of the Old Testament. It may have been so, e.g., with the law of Nu 5:11-31, a law probably most useful in the circumstances of the Mosaic age, and perhaps itself an endorsement of a pre-Mosaic custom.

LITERATURE.

Driver, Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, with which should be read Moller, Are the Critics Right? and Orr, Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament; A.B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament; J.B. Mozley, Ruling Ideas in Early Ages; Rule, Old Testament Institutions, Their Origin and Development; Kurtz, Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament; Hoonacker, Le sacerdoce levitique; Edouard Naville,

La decouverte de la loi sous le roi Josias; H. Clay Trumbull, The Blood Covenant; Milligan, Resurrection of our Lord (274 ff, on "blood-offering").

Ulric Z. Rule

LAW, JUDICIAL

joo-dish’-al: This was the form of Divine law which, under the dominion of God, as the Supreme Magistrate, directed the policy of the Jewish nation, and hence, was binding only on them, not on other peoples. The position of Yahweh, as the Supreme Ruler, was made legally binding by a formal election on the part of the national assembly (Ex 19:3-8); and that there might be no question about the matter, after the death of Moses, Joshua, in accordance with instructions received by his great predecessor in the office of federal judge, in the public assembly caused the contract to be renewed in connection with most solemn exercises (Jos 8:30-35). No legal contract was ever entered into with more formality and with a clearer understanding of the terms by the several parties than was the contract which made it binding on the Hebrews permanently to recognize Yahweh as the Supreme Ruler (Ex 24:3-8). He was to be acknowledged as the Founder of the nation (Ex 20:2); Sovereign, Ruler, and Judge (Ex 20:2-6); and in these capacities was to be the object of love, reverential fear and worship, service, and absolute obedience. Flagrant disregard of their obligations to Him manifested in idolatry or blasphemy was regarded as high treason, and like high treason in all nations and history was punishable by death (Ex 20:3-5,7; 22:20; Le 24:16; De 17:2-5). The will of Yahweh in critical cases was to be ascertained through special means (Nu 9:8; Jud 1:1,2; 20:18,23,28; 1Sa 10:22).

The ruling official recognized by the Hebrews as a nation was the chief magistrate, but he stood as Yahweh’s vicegerent, and therefore combined various authorities in his person. We must distinguish the functions of the chief magistrate (1) under the republic, (2) under the constitutional monarchy, and (3) under the senatorial oligarchy after the Babylonian captivity. Moses was the first chief magistrate under the republic; after him, Joshua, and the other judges. Under the constitutional monarchy, it was the king whose government was limited, for he was to be elected by the people; must be a native Hebrew; must not keep a large cavalry; must not support a harem; must not multiply riches; must be a defender of the national religion; must be guided by law, not whim; must be gracious and condescending to the people (De 17:15-20). After the Babylonian captivity, the senatorial oligarchy combined ecclesiastical and state authority, later sharing it with the Roman government.

See also SANHEDRIN.

Frank E. Hirsch

LAW, ROMAN

See ROMAN LAW.

LAWFUL

lo’-fool (usually mishpaT, "relating to judgment," or "a pronounced judgment" tsaddiq, "relating to that which is righteous" or "just"; exesti, eunomos, "that which is authorized according to law," or "a privilege according to legitimate custom" (compare Eze 18:5,19, 21,27; Isa 49:24; Mt 12:10; Ac 16:21; 19:39)): Used of persons: of God, as being righteous both in the punishment of the wicked and the rewarding of the righteous (Ps 145:17 Hebrew); of man, as being just and equitable in all his dealings with his fellow-man (Eze 33:19). It is used of things when the same are in accord with a pronounced judgment or a declared will of God, and thus pleasing in His sight (Mr 3:4). When the course of individual conduct is according to God’s law of righteousness, it is declared to be "lawful" (Eze 33:19). The word is used in a forensic sense as declaring the legal status of a person conforming to law. The idea of straighthess, rigid adherence to God’s law, whether religious, civil or ceremonial, cannot be excluded from the definition of the word "lawful."

Neither the King James Version nor the American Standard Revised Version is consistent in its translation of the Hebrew and Greek words translated "lawful." Ofttimes the words "just" and "righteous" are used. To arrive at the full and proper meaning of "lawful," therefore, it is necessary that we study the passages containing these synonymous terms. The written Law of God is the recognized standard by which things, actions and persons are to be judged as being lawful or unlawful.

William Evans

LAWGIVER

lo’-giv-er (mechoqeq; nomothetes): There are two words, one Hebrew and one Greek, which are translated "lawgiver." The former occurs 7 times in the Old Testament, and in the King James Version in every case except Jud 5:14 is thus translated. In the Revised Version (British and American) it bears the translation "lawgiver" but twice (De 33:21; Isa 33:22), though in the other passages (Ge 49:10; Nu 21:18; Jud 5:14; Ps 60:7; 108:8) this meaning is retained in the margin. The Greek word occurs in the New Testament but once (Jas 4:12), where it has a meaning that is almost the exact equivalent of the Hebrew word in Isa 33:22. In both passages God is declared to be the "lawgiver," and in the New Testament passage is so called because He has the power to rule and judge, to save and destroy. Man is denied the authority to judge because he is not the lawgiver. God is the lawgiver, and therefore possesses the right to pronounce judgment (compare Isa, supra). The word, however, implies more than mere legislative function; it also connotes the idea of ruling. Isaiah makes this very plain, since he adds to the statement that God is our judge and lawgiver the further declaration that He is also king. This meaning adheres in the very history of the word. It is based upon the monarchical conception in which the legislative, judicial and administrative functions are all vested in one person. In James the two terms "lawgiver and judge" express the idea of God’s absolute sovereignty. The verb nomothetein occurs in Heb 7:11; 8:6, but it does not extend beyond the meaning "to enact laws."

The Hebrew word is restricted to poetic passages, and except in Isa 33:22 is applied to a tribal or kingly ruler. Moses is pre-eminently the lawgiver in Jewish and Christian circles, but it should be noted that in the Scriptures of neither is he given this title. The primary meaning of the verb from which mechoqeq is

derived is "to cut," "to carve," and a derived meaning is "to ordain." The meaning of the participle mechoqeq is based upon this last. It means

(1) the symbol which expresses the lawmaker’s authority, that is, the commander’s staff; and

(2) the person who possesses the authority (De 33:21).

It has the first of these meanings in Nu 21:18; Ps 60:7; 108:8, and probably in Ge 49:10, though here it may have the second meaning. The parallelism, however, seems to require an impersonal object to correspond to scepter, and so the reading of the text (The Revised Version) is to be preferred to that of the margin (Skinner, at the place). In De 33:21; Jud 5:14; Isa 33:22, it means the person who wielded the symbol of authority, that is the prescriber of laws. In a primitive community this would be a military commander. In Ge 49:10 the "ruler’s staff" is the symbol of kingly authority (Driver), and this verse consequently implies the supremacy of Judah which came in with the Davidic kingdom. This word contains no reference to the Messiah. In Nu 21:18 there is an allusion to the custom of formally and symbolically opening fountains under the superintendence and at the instruction of the leader of the tribe. Such a custom seems to have been in vogue till comparatively modern times. Gray cites Budde in the New World for March, 1895, and Muir’s Mohamet and Islam, 343 f. In Jud 5:14 the word means "military commander," as the context shows. This is the meaning also in De 33:21, where it is affirmed that Gad obtained a position worthy of its warlike character. Targum, Vulgate, Peshitta, and some moderns have seen here a reference to the grave of Moses, but Nebo was in Reuben and not in Gad.

W. C. Morro

LAWLESS

lo’-les (anomos): While occurring but once in the King James Version (1Ti 1:9), is translated in various ways, e.g. "without law" (1Co 9:21); "unlawful" (2Pe 2:8 the King James Version); "lawless" (1Ti 1:9); "transgressor" (Mr 15:28; Lu 22:37); "wicked" (Ac 2:23 the King James Version; 2Th 2:8 the King James Version). When Paul claims to be "without law," he has reference to those things in the ceremonial law which might well be passed over, and not to the moral law. Paul was by no means an antinomian. Those are "lawless" who break the law of the Decalogue; hence, those who disobey the commandment, "Honor thy father and thy mother," are lawless (1Ti 1:9). The civil law is also the law of God. Those breaking it are lawless, hence, called "transgressors." Those who are unjust in their dealings are also "lawless"; for this reason the hands of Pilate and those who with him unjustly condemned Jesus are called "wicked (unlawful) hands" (Ac 2:23 the King James Version). The most notable example of lawlessness is the Antichrist, that "wicked (lawless) one" (2Th 2:8).

William Evans

LAWYER

lo’-yer (nomikos, "according or pertaining to law," i.e. legal; as noun, "an expert in law," "about the law," "lawyer" (Mt 22:35; Lu 7:30; 10:25; 11:45,46,52; 14:3; Tit 3:13)): The work of the "lawyers," frequently spoken of as "scribes," also known as "doctors" of the law (Lu 2:46 margin), was first of all that of jurists. Their business was threefold:

(1) to study and interpret the law;

(2) to instruct the Hebrew youth in the law;

(3) to decide questions of the law. The first two they did as scholars and teachers, the last as advisers in some court.

By virtue of the first-named function, they gradually developed a large amount of common law, for no code can go into such detail as to eliminate the necessity of subsequent legislation, and this usually, to a great extent, takes the form of judicial decisions founded on the code rather than of separate enactment. And so it was among the Hebrews. The provisions of their code were for the most part quite general, thus affording much scope for casuistic interpretation. As a result of the industry with which this line of legal development had been pursued during the centuries immediately preceding our era, the Hebrew law had become a very complicated science; and since it was forbidden to record these judicial decisions, a protracted study was necessary in order to commit them to memory.

But since the law must have universal application, the views of the individual scribe could not be taken as a standard; hence, the several disciples of the law must frequently meet for discussion, and the opinion of the majority then prevailed. To these meetings the youth interested in the study would be invited, that they might memorize the formulas agreed upon and might clear up the points upon which they were uncertain by asking questions of the recognized doctors (Lu 2:46).

Such centers of legal lore, of course, would seldom be found in rural communities; the authorities would naturally gather in large centers of population, especially—until 70 AD—in Jerusalem. While the deliverances of these law schools were purely theoretical, yet they stood in close relation to the practical. Whenever doubt arose regarding the application of the law to a particular case, the question was referred to the nearest lawyer; by him to the nearest company of lawyers, perhaps to the Sanhedrin; and the resultant decision was henceforth authority. Thus the lawyers became law makers, and after the destruction of Jerusalem, which brought an end to the existence of the Sanhedrin, the rabbinical doctors were recognized as the absolute authority in such matters. Frequently a single lawyer of great rank, as for instance Hillel or Gamaliel I, might pronounce dicta of unquestioned recognition with as much authority as a supreme court in our day, though sometimes his opinions were received and corrected by the legal tribunal, especially the Sanhedrin. Of course, frequently, these tribunals were under the sway of such a man’s influence, so that what he said upon his own authority would be ratified in the assembly of the doctors.

The second function of the lawyers was that of teachers. The renowned rabbis always sought to gather a

company of pupils about them whose business it was to repeat the teachers' law formulas until they had "passed into their flesh and blood." For the purposes of such instruction as well as for the discussion of the teachers and the students, there were special schoolhouses, which are often mentioned in connection with the synagogues as places of special merit and privilege. In Jerusalem, these law schools were conducted in the temple—probably in the hall dedicated to this special purpose (Mt 21:23; 26:55; Mr 14:49; Lu 2:46; 20:1; 21:37; Joh 18:20). The students during the lectures sat on the floor, the teacher on a raised platform, hence, the expression "sitting at the feet of" (Ac 22:3; Lu 2:46). Finally, the lawyers were called upon to decide cases in court or to act as advisers of the court. Before the destruction of Jerusalem, technical knowledge of the law was not a condition of eligibility to the office of judge. Anyone who could command the confidence of his fellow-citizens might be elected to the position, and many of the rural courts undoubtedly were conducted, as among us, by men of sterling quality but of limited knowledge. Naturally such men would avail themselves of the legal advice of any "doctor" who might be within reach, especially inasmuch as the latter was obliged to give his services gratuitously. And in the more dignified courts of large municipalities; it was a standing custom to have a company of scholars present to discuss and decide any new law points that might arise. Of course, frequently, these men were elected to the office of judge, so that practically the entire system of jurisprudence was in their hands.

Frank E. Hirsch

LAY; LAYING

la, la'-ing:

(1) sim, "to put," and the Greek equivalent, tithemi, are very frequently translated by "to lay." the Revised Version (British and American) very often changes the King James Version rendering of sim, but never that of tithemi: 1Sa 15:2, "how he set himself against him in the way" (the King James Version "he laid wait for him"); 2Ki 11:16, "So they made way for her" (the King James Version "And they laid hands on her"); compare 2Ch 23:15; Job 24:12, "God regardeth not the folly" (the King James Version "God layeth not folly"); Job 34:23, "For he needeth not further to consider a man" (the King James Version "For he will not lay upon man more"); Isa 28:17, "And I will make justice the line" (the King James Version "Judgment also will I lay to the line"); Job 17:3, "Give now a pledge" (the King James Version "Lay down now").

(2) nathan, literally, "to give," is very commonly translated by "to lay." the Revised Version (British and American) changes the translation of the King James Version in Eze 4:5, "I have appointed"; Eze 33:28 f, "I will make the land a desolation" (the King James Version "I will lay the land most desolate").

(3) "To lay" of the King James Version is frequently rendered differently in the Revised Version (British and American); Isa 54:11, "I will set thy stones" (the King James Version "lay thy stones"); De 29:22, "the sicknesses wherewith Yahweh hath made it sick" (the King James Version "sicknesses which the Lord hath laid upon"). For other differences of the Revised Version (British and American) and the King

James Version compare De 21:8; 2Ki 9:25 m; 2Ki 12:11; Ezr 8:31; Ps 104:5 m; Isa 53:6; Jer 5:26; Mr 7:8; Lu 19:44; Jas 1:21; 1Pe 2:1. In most of these passages the change of the Revised Version (British and American) is due to the peculiar use of the word "to lay" in the King James Version. The following expressions are found very frequently: "to lay hands on," "to lay wait," "to lay up," "to lay aside," "to lay upon," "to lay down," etc.

"Laying of wait," the King James Version, is rendered "lying in wait" in Nu 35:20 ff; Ac 9:24 reads: "But their plot became known" (the King James Version "But their laying await was known"). The "laying on of hands" is a very general expression.

See HANDS, IMPOSITION, LAYING ON OF.

A. L. Breslich

LAZARUS

laz’-a-rus (Lazaros, an abridged form of the Hebrew name Eleazar, with a Greek termination): Means "God has helped." In Septuagint and Josephus are found the forms Eleazar, and Eleazaros. The name was common among the Jews, and is given to two men in the New Testament who have nothing to do with each other.

1. Lazarus of Bethany:

The home of the Lazarus mentioned in Joh 11:1 was Bethany. He was the brother of Martha and Mary (Joh 11:1,2; see also Lu 10:38-41). All three were especially beloved by Jesus (Joh 11:5), and at their home He more than once, and probably often, was entertained (Lu 10:38-41; Joh 11). As intimated by the number of condoling friends from the city, and perhaps from the costly ointment used by Mary, the family was probably well-to-do. In the absence of Jesus, Lazarus was taken sick, died, and was buried, but, after having lain in the grave four days, was brought back to life by the Saviour (Joh 11:3,14,17,43,44). As a result many Jews believed on Jesus, but others went and told the Pharisees, and a council was therefore called to hasten the decree of the Master’s death (Joh 11:45-53). Later, six days before the Passover, at a feast in some home in Bethany where Martha served, Lazarus sat at table as one of the guests, when his sister Mary anointed the feet of Jesus (Joh 12:1-3). Many of the common people came thither, not only to see Jesus, but also the risen Lazarus, believed in Jesus, and were enthusiastic in witnessing for Him during the triumphal entry, and attracted others from the city to meet Him (Joh 12:9,11,17,18). For that reason the priests plotted to murder Lazarus (Joh 12:10). This is all that we really know about the man, for whether the Jews accomplished his death we are not informed, but it seems probable that, satiated with the death of Jesus, they left Lazarus unmolested. Nothing is told of his experiences between death and resurrection (compare Tennyson, "In Memoriam," xxxi), of his emotions upon coming out of the tomb, of his subsequent life (compare Browning, "A Letter to Karshish"), and not a word of revelation does he give as to the other world. His resurrection has been a favorite subject for various forms of Christian art, and according to an old tradition of Epiphanius he was 30 years old

when he was raised from the dead, and lived 30 years thereafter.

As might be expected this miracle has been vigorously assailed by all schools of hostile critics. Ingenuity has been exhausted in inventing objections to it. But all told, they really amount only to three.

(1) The Silence of the Other Gospels.

There is here, no doubt, some difficulty. But the desire of the early Christians, as many scholars think, to screen the family from danger may have kept the story from becoming current in the oral tradition whence the Synoptics drew their materials, though Matthew was probably an eyewitness. But, in any case, the Synoptics do not pretend to give all the deeds of Jesus, and in the report by them we have few save those which were wrought in Galilee. Each of them has omitted elements of highest interest which others have preserved. Thus, Luke alone gives us the raising of the widow's son at Nain. John, knowing that the others had omitted this, tells us what he had himself witnessed, since all danger to the family had long ago passed away, as it was of especial interest to his story, and he had recorded no other case of resurrection. At any rate, the Gospel writers do not seem to regard a resurrection from the dead by the power of Jesus as so much more stupendous than other miracles, as they seem to modern scholars and to the Jews, and, moreover, the Synoptics do unconsciously attest this miracle by describing a sudden outburst of popular excitement in favor of Jesus which can be accounted for only by some extraordinary event.

(2) The Stupendous Character of the Miracle.

But to a philosophical believer in miracles this is no obstacle at all, for to omnipotence there are no such things as big miracles or little ones. Of course, Martha's statement as to the decomposition of the body was only her opinion of the probability in the case, and He, who sees the end from the beginning and who had intended to raise Lazarus, might well in His providence have watched over the body that it should not see corruption. When all is said, "He who has created the organic cell within inorganic matter is not incapable of reestablishing life within the inanimate substance."

(3) Its Non-use as an Accusation against Jesus.

The objection that Joh 11:47-53 is inconsistent with the fact that in accusing Jesus before Pilate no mention is made of this miracle by the enemies of Jesus has little weight. Who would expect them to make such a self-convicting acknowledgment? The dismay of the priests at the miracle and their silence about it are perfectly compatible and natural.

No one of the attempted explanations which deny the reality of the miracle can offer even a show of probability. That Lazarus was just recovering from a trance when Jesus arrived; that it was an imposture arranged by the family and sanctioned by Jesus in order to overwhelm His enemies; that it was a fiction or parable translated into a fact and made up largely of synoptic materials, an allegorical illustration of the words, "I am the resurrection, and the life," a myth—such explanations require more faith than to

believe the fables of the Talmud They well illustrate the credulity of unbelief. The narrative holds together with perfect consistency, is distinguished by vivacity and dramatic movement, the people who take part in it are intensely real and natural, and the picture of the sisters perfectly agrees with the sketch of them in Luke. No morbid curiosity of the reader is satisfied. Invented stories are not like this. Even a Renan declares that it is a necessary link in the story of the final catastrophe.

The purpose of the miracle seems to have been:

(1) to show Himself as Lord of life and death just before He should be Himself condemned to die;

(2) to strengthen the faith of His disciples;

(3) to convert many Jews;

(4) to cause the priests to hasten their movements so as to be ready when His hour had come (Plummer, HDB, III, 87).

2. The Beggar:

In the parable in Lu 16:19-31, Lazarus is pictured as in abject poverty in this world, but highly rewarded and honored in the next. It is the only instance of a proper name used in a parable by Jesus. Some think that he was a well-known mendicant in Jerusalem, and have even attempted to define his disease. But this is no doubt simple invention, and, since "in Christ’s kingdom of truth names indicate realities," this was probably given because of its significance, suggesting the beggar’s faith in God and patient dependence upon Him. It was this faith and not his poverty which at last brought him into Abraham’s bosom. Not one word does Lazarus speak in the parable, and this may also be suggestive of patient submission. He does not murmur at his hard lot, nor rail at the rich man, nor after death triumph over him. The parable is related to that of the Rich Fool (Lu 12:16-21). This latter draws the veil over the worldling at death; the other lifts it. It is also a counterpart of that of the Unjust Steward (Lu 16:1-13), which shows how wealth may wisely be used to our advantage, while this parable shows what calamities result from failing to make such wise use of riches. The great lesson is that our condition in Hades depends upon our conduct here, and that this may produce a complete reversal of fortune and of popular judgments. Thus, Lazarus represents the pious indigent who stood at the opposite extreme from the proud, covetous, and luxury-loving Pharisee. The parable made a deep impression on the mind of the church, so that the term "lazar," no longer a proper name, has passed into many languages, as in lazar house, lazaretto, also lazzarone, applied to the mendicants of Italian towns. There was even an order, half-military, half-monastic, called the Knights of Lazarus, whose special duty it was to minister to lepers.

The rich man is often styled Dives, which is not strictly a proper name, but a Latin adjective meaning "rich," which occurs in this passage in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) But in English literature, as early as Chaucer, as seen in the "Sompnoure’s Tale" and in "Piers Plowman," it appears in

popular use as the name of the Rich Man in this parable. In later theological literature it has become almost universally current. The name Nineuis given him by Euthymius never came into general use, though the Sahidic version has the addition, "whose name was Ninue." His sin was not in being rich, for Abraham was among the wealthiest of his day, but in his worldly unbelief in the spiritual and eternal, revealing itself in ostentatious luxury and hard-hearted contempt of the poor. Says Augustine, "Seems he (Jesus) not to have been reading from that book where he found the name of the poor man written, but found not the name of the rich, for that book is the book of life?"

G. H. Trever

LEACH

lech.

See HORSELEACH.

LEAD

led (‘ophereth): Lead was one of the first metals to be used in the free state, probably because it was so easily obtained from its ores. Lead was found in ancient times in Egypt and the Sinaitic peninsula. There is no lead found in Palestine proper, but in Northern Syria and Asia Minor it occurs in considerable quantities, usually associated with silver. These sources no doubt furnished an important supply in Bible times. It was also brought by the Phoenicians from Spain (Tarshish) (Eze 27:12) and the British Isles.

Lead was used, as it still is, all along the Mediterranean shores for sinkers. Pieces of Egyptian fishnets probably dating from 1200 BC are now preserved in the British Museum, with their lead sinkers still attached. Since lead was the heaviest metal known to the ancients, gold excepted, it was generally used for fish-lines and sounding lines (compare Ac 27:28), especially in the dense waters of the Mediterranean. Moses mentioned the sinking qualities of lead in the sea in his simile of the sinking of Pharaoh’s hosts "as lead in the mighty waters" (Ex 15:10).

Lead was used by the ancients for binding stones together. In most of the ancient ruins of Syria the Arabs have dug holes at the seams between stones in walls and columns in order to remove the iron, bronze, or lead thus used. In the museum of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, there are several specimens of cast-lead sarcophagi dating from the time of Christ.

In Job 19:23,14, lead is mentioned as used in the engraving of permanent records. Two inferences might he drawn from this passage: either that the letters were cut with a chisel (pen) and then the cutting was filled with lead, or that sheets of lead were used as tablets on which to grave the record with an iron tool. Lead is frequently referred to along with iron, brass, silver and tin (Nu 31:22; Eze 22:18,20; 27:12). The use of lead for plumblines is implied in Am 7:7,8; Zec 4:10; as a weight in Zec 5:7,8. That Old Testament writers understood the use of lead for purifying gold is shown by Jer 6:29 and Eze 22:18-22

(compare Mal 3:2,3).

See METALS; REFINER.

James A. Patch

LEAF; LEAVES

lef, levz: Used in three different senses, with reference:

(1) To trees (‘aleh, "a coming up"), Ge 3:7; 8:11; Le 26:36 (Tereph); Eze 17:9; phullon. Figuratively

(a) of spiritual blessings (Eze 47:12; compare Re 22:2) and prosperity (Ps 1:3);

(b) of moral decay (Isa 64:6), and

(c) of a formal, empty profession (Mt 21:19).

(2) To a book (deleth), Jer 36:23 (margin "columns"; see 36:2); as the parchment was gradually unfolded the successive columns could be read.

(3) To doors (tsela‘, "side," qela‘,"a screen," "hanging"), 1Ki 6:34. The door of the Holy Place consisted of two halves, but each half had two leaves (compare Eze 41:24).

M. O. Evans

LEAGUE

leg.

See CONFEDERACY.

LEAH

le’-a (le’ah; Leia, "weary," "dull"(?), "wild cow"): Rachel’s sister, and the elder daughter of Laban (Ge 29:16). We are told that her eyes were "tender" rakkoth). Gesenius renders it "weak," Septuagint astheneis; accordingly, she was weak-eyed, but by no means "blear-eyed" (compare Vulgate). Her eyes were lacking that luster which always and everywhere is looked upon as a conspicuous part of female beauty. Josephus (Ant., I, xix, 7) says of her, ten opsin ouk euprepe, which may safely be rendered, "she was of no comely countenance."

Leah became the wife of Jacob by a ruse on the part of her father, taking advantage of the oriental custom of heavily veiling the prospective bride. When taken to task by his irate son-in-law, Laban excused himself by stating it was against the rule of the place "to give the younger before the first-born" (Ge 29:21-26). Although Rachel was plainly preferred by Jacob to Leah, still the latter bore him six sons: Reuben, Simeon, Levi, Judah (Ge 29:31), Issachar, Zebulun, and a daughter, Dinah (Ge 30:17-21). Up to this time Rachel had not been blessed with children of her own. Thus the lesson is brought home to us that Yahweh has a special and kindly regard for the lowly and despised, provided they learn, through their troubles and afflictions, to look to Him for help and success. It seems that homely Leah was a person of deep-rooted piety and therefore better suited to become instrumental in carrying out the plans of Yahweh than her handsome, but worldly-minded, sister Rachel.

When Jacob decided to return to the "land of his fathers," both of his wives were ready to accompany him (Ge 31:4,14). Before they reached the end of their journey their courage was sorely tried at the time of the meeting between Jacob and his brother Esau. Although Leah was placed between the handmaids in the front, and Rachel with her son Joseph in the rear, she still cannot have derived much comfort from her position. We may well imagine her feeling of relief when she saw Esau and his 400 men returning to Seir (Ge 33:2,16).

According to Ge 49:31, Leah was buried at Machpelah. We cannot know for a certainty that she died before Jacob’s going down to Egypt, though it is very likely. If she went down with her husband and died in Egypt, he had her body sent to the family burying-place. Ru 4:11 discloses the fact that her memory was not forgotten by future generations. When Boaz took Ru for a wife the witnesses exclaimed, "Yahweh make the woman that is come into thy house like Rachel and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel."

William Baur

LEANNOTH

le-an’-oth (Ps 88$, title).

See PSALMS.

LEAPING

lep’-ing.

See GAMES.

LEASING

lez’-ing (kazabh "to devise," "to fabricate," hence, "to lie"; occurs but twice in the King James Version (Ps 4:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "falsehood"; 5:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "lies"); the Hebrew word is translated "liars" (Ps 116:11); "lie" or deceive (Job 6:28)): The idea of treachery, lying, and deceit, lies at the root of this word. Joab’s conduct is a good illustration of the meaning (2Sa 3:27; 20:8-10). In Ps 5:6 David is referring to the cunning, treachery, and falsehood of his adversaries; compare 2Sa 13:28; 15:7-9. Doubtless David had a special person in mind as being guilty of "leasing," probably Ahithophel.

William Evans

LEATHER

leth’-er.

See SKIN; GIRDLE; TANNER.

LEAVEN

lev’-n (se’or, chamets; zume; Latin fermentum): The nomadic ancestors of the Hebrews, like the Bedouin of today, probably made their bread without leaven; but leaven came to play a great part in their bread-making, their law and ritual, and their religious teaching (see Ex 12:15,19; 13:7; Le 2:11; De 16:4; Mt 13:33; 16:6-12; Mr 8:15 f; Lu 12:1; 13:21).

(1) In Bread-Making.

The form of leaven used in bread-making and the method of using it were simple and definite. The "leaven" consisted always, so far as the evidence goes, of a piece of fermented dough kept over from a former baking. There is no trace of the use of other sorts of leaven, such as the lees of wine or those mentioned by Pliny (NH, xviii.26). The lump of dough thus preserved was either dissolved in water in the kneading-trough before the flour was added, or was "hid" in the flour (the King James Version "meal") and kneaded along with it, as was the case mentioned in the parable (Mt 13:33). The bread thus made was known as "leavened," as distinguished from "unleavened" bread (Ex 12:15, etc.).

See BREAD.

(2) In Law and Ritual.

The ritual prohibition of leaven during "the feast of unleavened bread" including the Passover (Ex 23:15, etc.) is a matter inviting restudy. For the historical explanation given in the Scriptures, see especially Ex 12:34-39; 13:3 ff; De 16:3. The antiquity of the prohibition is witnessed by its occurrence in the earliest legislation (Ex 23:18; 34:25). A natural reason for the prohibition, like that of the similar exclusion of

honey, is sought on the ground that fermentation implied a process of corruption. Plutarch voices this ancient view of the matter when he speaks of it as "itself the offspring of corruption, and corrupting the mass of dough with which it is mixed." Fermentatum is used in Persius (Sat., i.24) for "corruption." For this reason doubtless it was excluded also from the offerings placed upon the altar of Yahweh, cakes made from flour without leaven, and these only, being allowed. The regulation name for these "unleavened cakes" was matstsoth (Le 10:12). Two exceptions to this rule should be noted (Le 7:13; compare Am 4:5): "leavened bread" was an accompaniment of the thank offering as leavened loaves were used also in the wave offering of Le 23:17. Rabbinical writers regularly use leaven as a symbol of evil (Lightfoot).

(3) In Teaching.

The figurative uses of leaven in the New Testament, no less than with the rabbins, reflect the ancient view of it as "corrupt and corrupting," in parts at least, e.g. Mt 16:6 parallel, and especially the proverbial saying twice quoted by Paul, "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump" (1Co 5:6 f; Ga 5:9). But as Jesus used it in Mt 13:33, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven," it is clearly the hidden, silent, mysterious but all-pervading and transforming action of the leaven in the measures of flour that is the point of the comparison.

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebrew Arch., II, 145 f; Talmud, Berakhoth, 17a; Lightfoot, Hor. Hebrew. on Mt 16:6.

George B. Eager

LEBANA

le-ba’-na, leb’-a-na (lebhana’), or family of returning exiles (Ezr 2:45; Ne 7:48; compare RAPC 1Es 5:29).

LEBANON

leb’-a-non (lebanon; Septuagint Libanos; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Libanus):

1. Name:

Derived from the root labhen, "to be white," probably from the snow which covers its summits the greater part of the year. "White mountains" are found in almost every country. The light color of the upper limestone may, however, form a sufficient reason for the name. In prose the article is usually connected with the name. In poetry it is more often without the article. In the Septuagint, however, the article is generally present both in prose and poetry.

2. General Description:

The Lebanon range proper borders the east coast of the Mediterranean, for a distance of 100 miles, running North-Northeast and South-Southwest from the mouth of the Litany river, the classic Leontes (which enters the sea a little North of Tyre), to the mouth of the Eleuthurus (Nahr el-Kebir), a few miles North of Tripolis. This river comes through a depression between Lebanon and the Nuseiriyeh mountains, known as "the entrance to Hamath," and connects with a caravan route to the Euphrates through Palmyra. For a considerable distance North of the Litany, the mountain summits average from 4,000 to 6,000 ft. in height, and the range is more or less dissected by short streams which enter the Mediterranean. Most prominent of these is the Nahr ez-Zaherany, which, after running 25 or 30 miles in a southerly direction through the center of the range, like the Litany, turns abruptly West opposite Mt. Hermon, reaching the sea between Tyre and Sidon. In roughly parallel courses Nahr el-‘Awleh and Nahr Damur descend to the sea between Sidon and Beyrout, and Nahr Beyrout just North of the city. Throughout this district the mountain recesses are more or less wooded. Opposite Beyrout the range rises in Jebel Sannin to an elevation of 8,560 ft. Thirty miles farther Northeast the summit is reached in Jebel Mukhmal, at an elevation of 10,225 ft., with several others of nearly the same height. An amphitheater here opens to the West, in which is sheltered the most frequented cedar grove, and from which emerges the Nahr Qadisha ("sacred stream") which enters the Mediterranean at Tripolis. Snow is found upon these summits throughout the year (Jer 18:14), while formerly the level area between them furnished the snow fields from which a glacier descended several miles into the headwaters of the Qadisha, reaching a level of about 5,000 ft. The glacier deposited in this amphitheater a terminal moraine covering several square miles, which at its front, near Bsherreh, is 1,000 ft. in thickness. It is on this that the grove of cedars referred to is growing.

The view from this summit reveals the geographical features of the region in a most satisfactory manner. Toward the East lies Coele-Syria (the modern Buka), 7,000 ft. below the summit, bordered on the eastern side by the mountain wall of Anti-Lebanon, corresponding to the cliffs of Moab East of the Jordan valley, opposite Judea. This depression in fact is but a continuation of the great geological fault so conspicuous in the Jordan valley (see ARABAH). As one looks down into this valley, Ba‘albek appears at the base of Anti-Lebanon, only 20 miles away. The valley is here about 10 miles wide, and forms the watershed between the Orontes and the Litany. To the Northeast the valley of the Orontes is soon obscured by intervening peaks, but to the Southwest the valley of the Litany closes up only where the glistering peak of Mt. Hermon pierces the sky, as the river turns abruptly toward the sea 40 miles distant. Toward the West, the blue waters of the Mediterranean, only 25 miles distant as the crow flies, show themselves at intervals through the gorges cut by the rapid streams which have furrowed the western flanks of the mountain (So 4:15); 3,500 ft. beneath is the amphitheater many square miles in area, filled with the terminal moraine from which the Qadisha river emerges, and on which the grove of cedars (compare 1Ki 4:33; Ps 92:12; Ho 14:5) appears as a green spot in the center. Onward to the West the river gorge winds its way amid numerous picturesque village sites and terraced fields, every foot of which is cultivated by a frugal and industrious people. To the traveler who has made the diagonal journey from Beirut to the cedars, memory fills in innumerable details which are concealed from vision at any one time. He has crossed Nahr el-Kelb ("Dog River"), near its mouth, where he has seen Egyptian

and Assyrian inscriptions dating from the time of Sennacherib's invasion. Ascending this river, after passing numerous villages surrounded by mulberry and olive groves, vineyards, and fields of wheat, and pausing to study the ruins of a temple dating from Roman times, and having crossed a natural bridge at Jisr el-Hagar with a span of 120 ft., rising 75 ft. above the stream, he arrives, at the end of the second day, at the ruins of the famous temple of Venus destroyed by the order of Constantine on account of the impurity of the rites celebrated in it. Here, too, is a famous spring, typical of many others which gush forth on either side of the Lebanon range from beneath the thick deposits of limestone which everywhere crown its summit. The flow of water is enormous, and at certain seasons of the year is colored red with a mineral matter which the ancients regarded with mysterious reverence (see LB, III, 244). The lower part of the amphitheater is covered with verdure and a scanty growth of pine and walnut trees, but the upper part merges in the barren cliffs which lie above the snow line. Onward, alternately through upturned limestone strata, left by erosion in fantastic forms, and through barren areas of red sandstone, where the cedars of Lebanon would flourish if protected from the depredations of man and his domestic animals, he crosses by turns at higher and higher levels the headwaters of the Ibrahim, Fedar, Jozeh, Byblus and the Botrys rivers, and at length reaches, on the fourth day, the Qadisha, 5 miles below the cedars of Lebanon. Viewed from the Mediterranean the Lebanon range presents a continuous undulating outline of light-colored limestone peaks, the whole rising so abruptly from the sea that through most of the distance there is barely room for a road along the shore, while in places even that is prevented by rocky promontories projecting boldly into the sea. The only harbors of importance are at Beyrout and Tripolis, and these are only partially protected, being open to the Northwest. The eastern face of the range falling down into Coele-Syria is very abrupt, with no foothills and but one or two important valleys.

3. Geology:

Geologically considered, the Lebanon consists of three conformable strata of rock thrown up in an anticline with its steepest face to the East. The lowest of these are several thousand ft. thick, consisting of hard limestone containing few fossils, the most characteristic of which is Cidaris glandaria, from which the formation has been named Glandarian limestone. In its foldings this has been elevated in places to a height of 5,000 ft. Through erosion it is exposed in numerous places, where it presents picturesque castellated columns, whose bluish-gray sides are beautifully fluted by atmospheric agencies. The second formation consists of several hundred feet of red-colored sandstone alternating with soft limestone and clay deposits, occasionally containing a poor quality of bituminous coal, with pyrites and efflorescent salts. It is this that occasionally colors the water of the spring at Adonis. The characteristic fossil is Trigonia syriaca. Altogether this formation attains a thickness of 1,000 ft., and it is on its exposed surfaces that the most of the Lebanon pines are found. It contains also many signs of volcanic action. The third formation consists of hippurite limestone, a cretaceous formation, in some places almost wholly composed of fragments of the fossils from which it derives its name. This formation appears on all the highest summits, where in most cases it is nearly horizontal, and in places attains a thickness of 5,000 ft. Between the summits of the range and the foothills this formation has been almost wholly carried away by erosion, thus exposing the underlying formations. Cretaceous strata of still later age are found at low levels near the sea, which in places are covered by small deposits of Tertiary limestone, and by a porous sandstone of the Pleistocene age.

4. Scenery:

The scenery of the western slopes of Lebanon is most varied, magnificent, and beautiful, and well calculated, as indeed it did to impress the imagination of the Hebrew poets. Originally it was heavily covered with forests of pine, oak and cedar; but these have for the most part long since disappeared, except in the valley of Nahr Ibrahim, which is still thickly wooded with pine, oak and plane trees. Of the cedars there remain, besides the grove at the head of the Qadisha, only two or three, and they are of less importance. Every available spot on the western flanks of the Lebanon is cultivated, being sown with wheat or planted with the vine, the olive, the mulberry and the walnut. Irrigation is extensively practiced. When we let the eye range from the snowy summits of the mountain over all that lies between them and the orange groves of Sidon on the seashore, we understand why the Arabs say that "Lebanon bears winter on its head, spring on its shoulders, autumn in its lap, while summer lies at its feet."

In the more desolate places jackals, hyenas, wolves, and panthers are still found (compare 2Ki 14:9).

5. History:

The original inhabitants of Lebanon were Hivites and Gebalites (Jud 3:3; Jos 13:5,6). The whole mountain range was assigned to the Israelites, but was never conquered by them. It seemed generally to have been subject to the Phoenicians. At present it is occupied by various sects of Christians and Mohammedans, of whom the Maronites, Druzes and Orthodox Greeks are most active and prominent. Since 1860 the region has been under the protection of European powers with a Christian governor. No exact figures are available, but the population at present numbers probably about 275,000.

Ruins of ancient temples are numerous throughout Lebanon. Bacon estimates that within a radius of 20 miles of Ba‘albek there are 15 ruined sun-temples, the grandeur and beauty of which would have made them famous but for the surpassing splendor of Ba‘albek.

6. Anti-Lebanon:

Anti-Libanus (Judith 1:7; Jos 13:5; So 7:4) is an extension northward of the great mountain system facing on the East the great geological fault most conspicuous in the valley of the Jordan (see JORDAN, VALLEY OF), extending from the Gulf of Akabah to Antioch on the Orontes River. The system begins at the Barada River just North of Mt. Hermon, and, running parallel to Mt. Lebanon for 65 miles, terminates at Chums, the "entering in of Hamath." The highest points of the range reach an elevation of over 8,000 ft. Eastward the range merges into the plateau of the great Syrian desert. South of Ba‘albek the Yahfufah, a stream of considerable importance, empties into the Litany, while the Barada (the "Abana" of Scripture), rising in the same plateau, flows eastward to Damascus, its volume being greatly increased by fountains coming in from the base of the dissected plateau.

LITERATURE.

The geographical and geological descriptions are largely obtained by the writer from an extended excursion through the region in the company of Professor Day of the Protestant College at Beirut, whose knowledge of the region is most intimate and comprehensive. For more detailed information see Robinson, BRP2, II, 435 ff, 493; G. A. Smith, HGHL, 45 ff; Burton and Drake, Unexplored Syria; Benjamin W. Bacon, and G.F. Wright in Records of the Past, 1906, V, 67-83, 195-204; Baedeker-Socin, Palestine.

George Frederick Wright

LEBAOTH

le-ba'-oth, -oth (lebha'oth): An unidentified city in the South of the territory of Judah (Jos 15:32). It is the same as Bethlebaoth of Jos 19:6, which, by a clerical error appears in 1Ch 4:31 as "Beth-biri."

LEBBAEUS le-be'-us (Lebbaios): Mentioned in Mt 10:3 the King James Version as "Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus" (the Revised Version (British and American) omits); one of the twelve apostles.

See THADDAEUS.

LEBONAH

le-bo'-na (lebhonah): A place on the great north road between Shiloh and Shechem (Jud 21:19). It is represented by the modern Khan el-Lubban, about 3 miles West-Northwest of Seilun ("Shiloh"), on the way to Nablus. It is a wretched village lying on the slope of a hill, with many rock tombs in the vicinity.

LECAH

le'-ka (lekhah): A descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:21).

LEDGE

lej (shalabh): The word in the sense of side-projection is used in 1Ki 7:28,29 in connection with the bases of Solomon's Molten Sea (see SEA, THE MOLTEN); in 7:35,36, where the King James Version uses the same word, the Revised Version (British and American) has "stay" (yadh, literally, "hand"). The Revised Version (British and American) likewise has "ledge" (round) for the King James Version "compass" (karkobh) in the description of the altar in Ex 27:5; 38:4 (see ALTAR), and the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "ledge" for "settle" (‘azarah) in Eze 43:14,17,20; 45:19.

See TEMPLE.

LEEKS

leks (chatsir; ta prasa): This word, elsewhere translated "grass," is in Nu 11:5 rendered "leeks" in all the ancient VSS, on account of its association with garlic and onions; such a use of the word occurs in the Talmud The leek (Allium porrum) is much grown today in Palestine, while in ancient Egypt this vegetable was renowned.

LEES

lez.

See WINE.

LEFT

left (sama’l, "to go to the left," "to turn to the left," semo’l, "the left hand," sema’li, "belonging to the left," "situated on the left"; aristeros, and euphemistically euonumos, literally, "having a good name," "of good omen"): The words are chiefly used in orientation with or without the addition of the word "hand." So Abraham says to Lot: "If thou wilt take the left hand (semo’l), then I will go to the right; or if thou take the right hand, then I will go to the left (sama’l)" (Ge 13:9). Frequently in Hebrew idiom the right hand and the left are mentioned together in order to express the idea "everywhere," "anywhere," "altogether" (Ge 24:49; Ex 14:22,29; Nu 22:26; De 2:27; 5:32; 2Co 6:7). In the geographical sense the left is synonymous with north (Ge 14:15; Jos 19:27; Eze 16:46; Ac 21:3). While the left hand is considered as weaker than the right (see LEFTHANDED), it is the hand which holds the bow (Eze 39:3). The left hand is the side from which bad omens come, and therefore less lucky and less honored than the right hand (see HAND, note).

H. L. E. Luering

LEFTHANDED

left’-hand-ed (’iTTer yadh-yamin; Septuagint amphoterodexios, i.e. "ambidextrous"): The Hebrew presents a combination of words signifying literally, a man whose right hand is impeded or lame, who therefore uses the left hand instead, or one who by habit prefers the use of the left hand, where others use the right. It is interesting to note that in both instances, where the expression occurs in the Scripture, it refers to individuals belonging to the tribe of Benjamin (which name itself signifies "a son of the right hand"!). The first is Ehud, son of Gera, who killed Eglon, king of Moab, and thereby delivered Israel from paying tribute to the Moabites (Jud 3:15). The other instance is that of the 700 selected Benjamites, who, though lefthanded, "could sling stones at a hair-breadth, and not miss" (Jud 20:16; of 1Ch 12:2).

H. L. E. Luering

LEG

(1) shoq, Aramaic shoq;

(2) kara‘, dual kera‘ayim;

(3) reghel; skelos; the King James Version translates also shobhel, and tse‘adhah, with "leg," but mistakenly):

(1) The first Hebrew word (shoq) denotes the upper leg, and is therefore synonymous with THIGH (which see). It expresses metaphorically the muscular strength, and the pride of the runner. "He taketh no pleasure in the legs of a man" (Ps 147:10). "His legs are as pillars of marble, set upon sockets of fine gold" (So 5:15). If the legs have lost their strength as in the lame or the Beri-beri patient, they become a metaphor for anything useless, inefficient or disappointing: "The legs of the lame hang loose; so is a parable in the mouth of fools" (Pr 26:7). The Aramaic form is found in the description of the image of Nebuchadnezzar, "its legs of iron" (Da 2:33).

(2) Kara‘, dual kera‘ayim, the "leg," "respecting the legs," mentioned as a portion of the paschal lamb (Ex 12:9), or, usually, in connection with the head and the inwards, as a sacrificial portion (Ex 29:17; Le 1:9,13; Am 3:12). The word designates also the legs of leaping insects of the orthopterous family, locusts, etc., which were permitted as food to the Israelites (Le 11:21). (3) Reghel, literally, "foot" (which see), found in this sense only once: "He (Goliath) had greaves of brass upon his legs" (1Sa 17:6).

Two passages of wrong translation in the King James Version have been corrected by the Revised Version (British and American). The virgin daughter of Babylon is addressed: "Make bare the leg, uncover the thigh" (Isa 47:2), the Revised Version (British and American) renders: "Strip off the train (shobhel), uncover the leg," the idea being that the gentle maid, who has been brought up in affluence and luxury, will have to don the attire of a slave girl and do menial work, for which her former garments are unsuited. The other passage is in Isa 3:20, where the King James Version reads: "the bonnets, and the ornaments of the legs," the Revised Version (British and American) corrects: "the headtires (ts‘adhah), and the ankle chains."

In the New Testament the word "leg" is found only in connection with the breaking of the legs of the persons crucified with the Saviour (Joh 19:31,32,33). We know from Roman and Greek authors that this was done as a coup de grace to shorten the miseries of criminals condemned to die on the cross. The practice bore the technical name of skelokopia, Latin crurifragium. The verb skelokopein ("to break the legs"), is found in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (1Pe 4:14), where it is distinctly stated that the legs of Jesus were not broken, that His sufferings on the cross might be extended, while the two malefactors crucified with Him were mercifully dispatched in this way. The crurifragium consisted of some strokes with a heavy club or mallet, which always materially hastened the death of the sufferer, and often caused

it almost immediately.

Edersheim, in LTJM, II, 613, suggests that the breaking of legs was an additional punishment, and that it was always followed by a coup de grace, the perforatio or percussio sub alas, a stroke with sword or lance into the side. This, however, is not borne out by any classical information which is known to me, and is contradicted by the statement of the evangelist that Jesus received the percussio, while the malefactors endured the crurifragium. Compare on this subject, especially for parallels from classical authors, Sepp, Das Leben Jesu, VII, 441, and Keim, Jesus von Nazara (English translation), VI, 253, note 3.

H. L. E. Luering

LEGION

le’-jun.

See ARMY; ARMY, ROMAN.

LEGISLATION, OF SANCTITY

lej-is-la’-shun.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

LEHABIM

le-ha’-bim (lehdbhim): Named in Ge 10:13; 1Ch 1:11 as descendants of Mizraim. They are probably to be identified with the LUBIM (which see), and the one word may be a corruption of the other.

LEHI

le’-hi.

See RAMATH-LEHI.

LEMUEL

lem’-u-el (lemu’el, or lemo’-el): A king whose words, an "oracle (taught him by his mother)," are given in Pr 31:1-9; and possibly the succeeding acrostic poem (31:10-31) is from the same source. Instead of translating the word after this name as "oracle" some propose to leave it as a proper name, translating

"king of Massa," and referring for his kingdom to Massa (Ge 25:14), one of the sons of Ishmael, supposedly head of a tribe or sheikh of a country. It is to be noted, however, that the words of Agur in the previous chapter are similarly called massa’," oracle" with not so clear a reason for referring it to a country. See for a suggested reason for retaining the meaning "oracle" in both places, PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF, II, 6.

John Franklin Genung

LEND, LOAN

lon: The translation of 7 Hebrew and 2 Greek vbs.:

1. Lexical Usages:

In the Old Testament: lawah, "to join," "cause to join," "lend" (Ex 22:25; De 28:12,44; Ps 37:26; Pr 19:17); nashah, "to bite," "lend" (De 24:11; Jer 15:10); nashah (same root as last, though different verb stem, Hiphil), "to cause to bite," "lend on usury" (De 15:2; 24:10); nashakh, "to bite," "lend" "(cause to lend) on usury" (De 23:19,20); nathan, "to give" (Le 25:37, the Revised Version (British and American) "to give"); ‘abhat (Hiphil), "to cause to borrow," "to lend" (De 15:6,8); sha’al (Hiphil), "to cause to ask," "to lend" (Ex 12:36, the Revised Version (British and American) "ask"; 1Sa 1:27). In Septuagint daneizo, danizo, "to lend," translates lawah, and ‘abaT in above passages and in Ne 5:4; Pr 22:7, and Isa 24:2; kichrao, also translations lawah and sha’al (Ps 112:5; Pr 13:11); daneion(-ion), "loan," occurs in De 15:8,10; 24:11; 4 Macc 2:8. In the New Testament "lend" translations two Greek verbs, daneizo, "to lend money" (Lu 6:34,35, usually in commercial sense); kichremi, "to lend (as a friendly act)" (Lu 11:5). The substantive "loan," she’elah, occurs only once in the Old Testament (1Sa 2:20 the King James Version and the English Revised Version), not at all in the New Testament.

2. History of Lending in the Bible and Apocrypha:

(1) Lending on interest to the poor is prohibited in the code in Ex 22:25. (2) In the code in De 15:1-6; 23:19,20; 24:10,11; 28:12,44, borrowing and lending are taken for granted as existing in Israel, but the creditor is required to release his Hebrew brother as debtor in the 7th year (either the cancellation of the loan (so in Jewish literature and early Christian scholars) or suspension of payment that year (so most modern scholars)), though he may exact payment from a foreigner. Israel may lend, and will be able to lend, because of Yahweh’s blessing, to other nations, but must not borrow from them. A pledge, or security, must not be taken in person by the creditor from the house of the debtor, nor kept overnight, if the debtor be poor. (3) The code in Le 25:35-38 requires that the Israelite receive no interest from his poor brother, because of the goodness of Yahweh to Israel. (4) Notwithstanding the prohibition of the early laws against lending on interest or usury, the same seems to have become common in Israel before the exile (Isa 24:2; Jer 15:10), was practiced on the return, and was an evil to be corrected by Nehemiah (Ne 5:7,10). (5) According to Ps 37:26; 112:5; Pr 19:17, lending to the needy was regarded as a mark of the pious Hebrew, but no interest is to be charged. (6) According to Apocrypha (The Wisdom of

Solomon 15:16; Sirach 8:12; 18:33; 20:15,29; 4 Macc 2:8), borrowing is discouraged, and lending is exalted as a mark of the merciful man. (7) Jesus teaches that His followers should lend, even to enemies, to men from whom they have no reasonable hope of expecting anything in return, because thus to do is to be like the Most High (Lu 6:34,35). He did not discuss lending for commercial purposes, and so does not necessarily forbid it.

LITERATURE.

See Driver on De 15:1-6; Benzinger, Hebrew Archaeology, (1894), 350 f; Oehler, Old Testament Theology, 150, 10; Plummer on Lu 6:34,35.

Charles B. Williams

LENTILS

len'-tilz ('adhashim; phakos; Ge 25:34; 2Sa 17:28; 23:11; Eze 4:9; the King James Version Lentiles): These are undoubtedly identical with the Arabic 'adas, a small, reddish bean, the product of Ervum lens, a dwarf leguminous plant, half a foot high, which is extensively cultivated in Palestine as a summer crop. The flour is highly nutritious, and the well-known food, Revalenta arabica, is simply one form, specially prepared; 'adas are highly esteemed in Palestine, and are used in soup and as a "pottage" known as mujedderah. This last is of a reddish-brown color and is without doubt the "pottage" of Ge 25:34. Lentils were part of the provisions brought to David when fleeing from Absalom (2Sa 17:28) and were used in the making of the bread for the prophet Ezekiel (4:9). In a "plot of ground full of lentils," Shammah, one of David's "mighty men," stood and defended it and slew the marauding Philistines (2Sa 23:11,12).

E. W. G. Masterman

LEOPARD

lep'-erd ((1) namer (So 4:8; Isa 11:6; Jer 5:6; 13:23; Ho 13:7; Hab 1:8); compare Arabic nimr, "leopard." (2) Chaldaic nemar (Da 7:6). (3) pardalis (Re 13:2; Ecclesiasticus 28:23); compare nimrim Nimrim (Isa 15:6; Jer 48:34), nimrah, Nimrah (Nu 32:3), and beth-nimrah, Beth-nimrah (Nu 32:36; Jos 13:27)): The leopard is found throughout Africa and ranges through Southern Asia from Asia Minor to Japan, being absent from Siberia and Central Asia. Its range is much the same as that of the lion, which latter, however, does not extend so far to the East. Like other animals of wide range, it has local varieties, but these shade into each other imperceptibly, and the one specific name, Felis pardus, includes all. Leopards live in some of the valleys East and South of the Dead Sea, and in the mountains of Sinai and Northwestern Arabia. They have but rarely been seen of recent years in Lebanon or the more settled portions of Palestine. So far as can be judged from skins which are available for comparison, the leopard of Palestine is rather light in color, and is not as large as. some found in Africa or India. It is not certain that the place-names, NIMRIM, NIMRAH, and BETH-NIMRAH (which see),

have to do with namer, "leopard," but their location is in Moab, where leopards are well known, even at the present day. One of the valleys entering the Dead Sea from the East, South of the Arnon, is called Wadi-en-Numeir ("valley of the little leopard"; numeir, diminutive of nimr).

In the Bible "leopard" occurs mainly in figurative expressions, as a large and fierce beast. The leopard is mentioned with the lion and bear in Da 7:6; Ho 13:7; Re 13:2; with the lion, wolf and bear in Isa 11:6; with the lion and wolf in Jer 5:6; with the lion alone in Ecclesiasticus 28:23; with the wolf alone in Hab 1:8. The leopard is smaller than the lion and the tiger, but is more active than either. Its swiftness is referred to in Hab 1:8: "Their horses also (of the Chaldeans) are swifter than leopards." The spots of the leopard are referred to in Jer 13:23: "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?"

The Greek pardalis, and panther, were both applied to the leopard. "Panther" is sometimes used of large leopards, while in America, with its corrupt form "painter," it is one of the names applied to the cougar or puma, Felis concolor, which, as the specific name implies, is not spotted like the leopard, or striped like the tiger.

Alfred Ely Day

LEPER; LEPROSY

lep'-er, lep'-ro-si (tsara'ath; lepra): A slowly progressing and intractable disease characterized by subcutaneous nodules (Hebrew se'eth; Septuagint oule; the King James Version "rising"), scabs or cuticular crusts (Hebrew cappachath; Septuagint semasia) and white shining spots appearing to be deeper than the skin (Hebrew bahereth; Septuagint telaugema). Other signs are

(1) that the hairs of the affected part turn white and

(2) that later there is a growth of "quick raw flesh."

This disease in an especial manner rendered its victims unclean; even contact with a leper defiled whoever touched him, so while the cure of other diseases is called healing, that of leprosy is called cleansing (except in the case of Miriam (Nu 12:13) and that of the Samaritan (Lu 17:15) where the word "heal" is used in reference to leprosy). The disease is described in the Papyrus Ebers as ukhedu (the Coptic name for leprosy is tseht). It is also mentioned in ancient Indian and Japanese history. Hippocrates calls it "the Phoenician disease," and Galen names it "elephantiasis." In Europe it was little known until imported by the returning soldiers of Pompey's army after his Syrian campaign in 61 BC; but after that date it is described by Soranus, Aretaeus and other classic authors.

1. Old Testament Instances:

The first Old Testament mention of this disease is as a sign given by God to Moses (Ex 4:6 (Jahwist)), which may be the basis of the story in Josephus' Apion, I, 31, that Moses was expelled from Heliopolis

on account of his being a leper (see also I, 26 and Ant, III, xi, 4). The second case is that of Miriam (Nu 12:10), where the disease is graphically described (EP2). In De 24:8 there is a reference to the oral tradition concerning the treatment of lepers, without any details, but in Le 13; 14 (Priestly Code) the rules for the recognition of the disease, the preliminary quarantine periods and the ceremonial methods of cleansing are given at length. It is worthy of note that neither here nor elsewhere is there any mention of treatment or remedy; and Jehoram's ejaculation implies the belief that its cure could be accomplished only by miracle (2Ki 5:7).

The case of Naaman (2Ki 5:1) shows that lepers were not isolated and excluded from society among the Syrians. The leprosy of Gehazi (2Ki 5:27) is said to have been the transference of that of Naaman, but, as the incubation period is long, it must have been miraculously inflicted on him. The four lepers of Samaria of 2Ki 7:3 had been excluded from the city and were outside the gate.

The leprous stroke inflicted on Uzziah (2Ki 15:5; 2Ch 26:23) for his unwarrantable assumption of the priestly office began in his forehead, a form of the disease peculiarly unclean (Le 13:43-46) and requiring the banishment and isolation of the leper. It is remarkable that there is no reference to this disease in the prophetical writings, or in the Hagiographa.

2. Leprosy in the New Testament:

In the New Testament, cleansing of the lepers is mentioned as a specific portion of our Lord's work of healing, and was included in the commission given to the apostles. There are few individual cases specially described, only the ten of Lu 17:12, and the leper whom our Lord touched (Mt 8:2; Mr 1:40; Lu 5:12), but it is probable that these are only a few out of many such incidents. Simon the leper (Mt 26:6; Mr 14:3) may have been one of those cured by the Lord.

3. Nature and Locality of the Disease:

The disease is a zymotic affection produced by a microbe discovered by Hansen in 1871. It is contagious, although not very readily communicated by casual contact; in one form it is attended with anesthesia of the parts affected, and this, which is the commonest variety now met with in the East, is slower in its course than those forms in which nodular growths are the most prominent features, in which parts of the limbs often drop off. At present there are many lepers to be seen at the gates of the cities in Palestine. It is likewise prevalent in other eastern lands, India, China, and Japan. Cases are also to be seen in most of the Mediterranean lands and in Norway, as well as in parts of Africa and the West Indies and in South America. In former times it was occasionally met with in Britain, and in most of the older English cities there were leper houses, often called "lazarets" from the mistaken notion that the eczematous or varicose ulcers of Lazarus were leprous (Lu 16:20). Between 1096 and 1472, 112 such leper houses were founded in England. Of this disease King Robert Bruce of Scotland died. There was special medieval legislation excluding lepers from churches and forbidding them to wander from district to district. Leprosy has been sometimes confounded with other diseases; indeed the Greek physicians used the name lepra for the scaly skin disease now called psoriasis. In the priestly legislation there was

one form of disease (Le 13:13) in which the whiteness covers all the body, and in this condition the patient was pronounced to be clean. This was probably psoriasis, for leprosy does not, until a very late stage, cover all the body, and when it does so, it is not white. It has been surmised that Naaman's disease was of this kind. Freckled spots (Hebrew bohaq), which were to be distinguished from true leprosy (Le 13:39), were either spots of herpes or of some other non-contagious skin disease. The modern Arabic word of the same sound is the name of a form of eczema. the Revised Version (British and American) reads for freckled spot "tetter," an old English word from a root implying itchiness (see Hamlet, I, v, 71).

The homiletic use of leprosy as a type of sin is not Biblical. The only Scriptural reference which might approach this is Ps 51:7, but this refers to Nu 19:18 rather than to the cleansing of the leper. The Fathers regarded leprosy as typical of heresy rather than of moral offenses. (See Rabanus Maurus, Allegoria, under the word "Lepra.")

(1) Leprosy in Garments.

The occurrence of certain greenish or reddish stains in the substance of woolen or linen fabrics or in articles made of leather is described in Le 13:47 ff, and when these stains spread, or, after washing, do not change their color, they are pronounced to be due to a fretting leprosy (tsara'ath mam'ereth), and such garments are to be burnt. As among the fellahin articles of clothing are worn for years and are often hereditary, it is little wonder that they become affected by vegetable as well as animal parasites, and that which is here referred to is probably some form of mildew, such as Penicillium or mold-fungus. The destruction of such garments is a useful sanitary precaution. Possibly this sort of decaying garment was in Job's mind when he compares himself to a "rotten thing that consumeth, like a garment that is moth-eaten" (Job 13:28); see also Jude 1:23, "the garment spotted (espilomenon) by the flesh."

(2) Leprosy in the House (Le 14:34).

The occurrence of "hollow streaks, greenish or reddish," in the plaster of a house is regarded as evidence that the wall is affected with leprosy, and when such is observed the occupant first clears his house of furniture, for if the discoloration be pronounced leprous, all in the home would become unclean and must be destroyed. Then he asks the priest to inspect it. The test is first, that the stain is in the substance of the wall, and, second, that it is spreading. In case these conditions are fulfilled, it is pronounced to be leprosy and the affected part of the wall is taken down, its stones cast outside the city, its plaster scraped off and also cast outside the city; new stones are then built in and the house is newly plastered. Should the stain recur in the new wall, then the whole house is condemned and must be destroyed and its materials cast outside the city. The description is that of infection by some fungus attacking whatever organic material is in the mud plaster by which the wall is covered. If in woodwork, it might be the dry rot (Merulius lacrimans), but this is not likely to spread except where there is wood or other organic matter. It might be the efflorescence of mural salt (calcium nitrate), which forms fiocculent masses when decomposing nitrogenous material is in contact with lime; but that is generally white, not green or reddish. Considering the uncleanly condition of the houses of the ordinary fellah, it is little wonder that such fungus growths may develop in their walls, and in such cases destruction of the house and its

materials is a sanitary necessity.

4. The Legal Attitude:

It should be observed here that the attitude of the Law toward the person, garment or house suspected of leprosy is that if the disease be really present they are to be declared unclean and there is no means provided for cure, and in the case of the garment or house, they are to be destroyed. If, on the other hand, the disease be proved to be absent, this freedom from the disease has to be declared by a ceremonial purification. This is in reality not the ritual for cleansing the leper, for the Torah provides none such, but the ritual for declaring him ceremonially free from the suspicion of having the disease. This gives a peculiar and added force to the words, "The lepers are cleansed," as a testimony to our Lord’s Divine mission.

Alexander Macalister

LESHEM

le’-shem.

See LAISH.

LESSAU

les’-o (Lessaou; the King James Version Dessau): A place mentioned only in 2 Macc 14:16 as the scene of a battle between Nicanor and the Jews. "Dessau" of the King James Version arises from confusion of the captical Greek letters, Lambda ("L") with Delta ("D"). The place may be identical with ADASA (which see).

LET

(katecho): Usually in the sense of "permit" (Anglo-Saxon, leetan), but also in Old English with meaning of "hinder" (Anglo-Saxon, lettan). This latter sense is found in 2Th 2:7 the King James Version, "Only he who now letteth will let," where the Revised Version (British and American) has, "Only there is one that restraineth now."

LETHECH

le’-thek (lethekh): A liquid measure equivalent to half a homer (Ho 3:2 margin) and containing about 5 1/2 bushels.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

LETTER

let’-er.

See EPISTLE.

LETTERS

let’-erz.

See ALPHABET; WRITING.

LETUSHIM

le-too’-shim, le-tu’-shim (leTushim): A Dedanite tribe in North Arabia (Ge 25:3). With it are connected the ASSHURIM and LEUMMIM (which see).

LEUMMIM

le-um’-im (le’ummim): A Dedanite tribe of North Arabia, connected with the LETUSHIM (which see).

LEVI (1)

le’-vi (Lewi; Leui; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Leuei):

(1) The 3rd son of Jacob by Leah. See separate article.

(2) (3) Two ancestors of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:24,29).

(4) The apostle Matthew.

See MATTHEW.

LEVI (2)

(Lewi; Leuei): The third of Leah’s sons born to Jacob in Paddan-aram (Ge 29:34). In this passage the name is connected with the verb lawah, "to adhere," or "be joined to," Leah expressing assurance that with the birth of this third son, her husband might be drawn closer to her in the bonds of conjugal affection. There is a play upon the name in Nu 18:2,4, where direction is given that the tribe of Levi be

"joined unto" Aaron in the ministries of the sanctuary. The etymology here suggested is simple and reasonable. The grounds on which some modern scholars reject it are purely conjectural. It is asserted, e. g., that the name is adjectival, not nominal, describing one who attaches himself; and this is used to support theory that the Levites were those who joined the Semitic people when they left Egypt to return to Palestine, who therefore were probably Egyptians. Others think it may be a gentilic form le'ah, "wild cow" (Wellhausen, Prolegomena, 146; Stade, Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 152); and this is held to be the more probable, as pointing to early totem worship!

Levi shared with Simeon the infamy incurred at Shechem by the treacherous slaughter of the Shechemites (Ge 34). Jacob's displeasure was expressed at the time (Ge 34:3), and the memory was still bitter to him in his last days (Ge 49:5 f). The fate predicted for the descendants of Simeon and Levi (Ge 49:7), in the case of the latter on account of the tribe's stedfast loyalty in a period of stern testing, was changed to a blessing (Ex 32:26). In later literature the action condemned by Jacob is mentioned with approval (Judith 9:2 ff). Levi was involved in his brothers' guilt with regard to Joseph (Ge 37), and shared their experiences in Egypt before Joseph made himself known (Ge 42$; 43$; 44$; 45$). Three sons, Gershon, Kohath, and Merari, were born to him in Canaan, and went down with the caravan to Egypt (Ge 46:11). Nothing further is known of the personal history of this patriarch. He died and found sepulture in Egypt. For the tribal history and possessions, see PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

W. Ewing

LEVIATHAN

le-vi'-a-than (liwyathan (Job 41:1-34), from [~lawah, "to fold"; compare Arabic name of the wry neck, Iynx torquilla, abu-luwa, from kindred lawa, "to bend"):

(1) The word "leviathan" also occurs in Isa 27:1, where it is characterized as "the swift serpent .... the crooked serpent"; in Ps 104:26, where a marine monster is indicated; also in Ps 74:14 and Job 3:8. The description in Job 41 has been thought by some to refer to the whale, but while the whale suits better the expressions denoting great strength, the words apply best on the whole to the crocodile. Moreover, the whale is very seldom found in the Mediterranean, while the crocodile is abundant in the Nile, and has been known to occur in at least one river of Palestine, the Zarqa, North of Jaffa. For a discussion of the behemoth and leviathan as mythical creatures, see EB, under the word "Behemoth" and "Leviathan." The points in the description which may well apply to the crocodile are the great invulnerability, the strong and close scales, the limbs and the teeth. It must be admitted that there are many expressions which a modern scientist would not use with reference to the crocodile, but the Book of Job is neither modern nor scientific, but poetical and ancient.

(2) See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 2, 5.

Alfred Ely Day

LEVIRATE; LAW

lev’-i-rat.

See MARRIAGE.

LEVIS

le’-vis (Leuis): 1 Esdras 9:14, properly the Levite of Ezr 10:15; "Shabbethai the Levite" for "Levis and Sabbateus."

LEVITES

le’-vits.

See PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

LEVITICAL CITIES

le-vit’-i-kal

I. LEGAL PROVISIONS

1. Numbers

2. Deuteronomy

II. WELLHAUSEN’S VIEW

III. ALTERNATIVE VIEW AND EVIDENCE

1. Traces of the Cities

2. Wellhausen’s Arguments Answered

3. Van Hoonacker’s Reply

4. Ezekiel’s Vision

5. Priestly Cities and Cities in Which Priests Dwell

LITERATURE

I. Legal Provisions.

1. Numbers: Nu 35:1-8 provides that 48 cities should be given to the Levites, each surrounded by a pasturage. The exact details are not quite clear, for in the Hebrew, Nu 35:4 would naturally be read as meaning that the pasturage was a radius of 1,000 cubits from the city walls, while 35:5 makes each city the center of a square, each side of which was 2,000 cubits long. Extant variants in the versions suggest, however, that the text has suffered slightly in transmission. Originally there seems to have been no discrepancy between the two verses, and it may be doubted whether the intent was that the city was always to be in the mathematical center of the patch. The Levites were to have the right of redeeming the houses at any time, and in default of redemption they were to go out in the Jubilee. The field was not to be sold (Le 25:32 f).

2. Deuteronomy:

De 18:8 undoubtedly recognizes patrimonial possessions of the Levites outside the religious capital, and sees no inconsistency with its earlier statement that Levi had no portion or inheritance with Israel (18:1). The explanation lies in the fact that these cities were not a tribal portion like the territories of the secular tribes. The area occupied by the whole 48 jointly would only have amounted to less than 16 miles.

II. Wellhausen’s View.

Jos 21 relates that this command was fulfilled by the allocation of 48 cities, but it is clear that some of those cities were not in fact reduced into possession; see e.g. Jos 16:10; Jud 1:29 as to Gezer, and Jud 1:27 as to Taanach. Wellhausen treats the whole arrangement as fictitious. His main reasons are: (1) that the arrangement is physically impracticable in a mountainous country, and (2) that "there is not a historical trace of the existence of the Levitical cities." Many remained in the hands of the Canaanites till a late period, while others were "important but by no means ecclesiastical towns" (Prolegomena, 160). Two pages later he says that "four of them were demonstrably famous old seats of worship," and conjectures that most, if not all, were ancient sanctuaries. He also regards Ezekiel’s scheme of a heave offering of land (Eze 45) as the origin of the idea. Yet "Jerus and the temple, which, properly speaking, occasioned the whole arrangement, are buried in silence with a diligence which is in the highest degree surprising" (p. 164).

III. Alternative View and Evidence.

1. Traces of the Cities:

In point of fact, there are traces of some of the Levitical cities in the later history. Such are Anathoth (1Ki 2:26; Jer 1:1; 32$), Jattir (2Sa 20:26, where, as shown in the article PRIESTS AND LEVITES

(which see), Jattirite should be read for the Massoretic Jairite), Beth-shemesh (1Sa 6:13-15; see PRIESTS AND LEVITES as to the text). (From Am 7:17 it appears that Amaziah of Bethel had land, but we do not know that he was of Levitical descent or where the land was.)

2. Wellhausen’s Arguments Answered:

Further, the fact that many other Levitical cities appear to have been centers of worship points to the presence of priests. Was the great high place of Gibeon (1Ki 3:4) unserved by priests? It is surely natural to suppose that during the period between the capture of the Ark and its transport to Jerusalem there was a tendency for high places to spring up in cities where there were priests rather than elsewhere; indeed there would probably be a disposition on the part of unemployed priests to go astray in a direction that would prove lucrative.

3. Van Hoonacker’s Reply:

With regard to the other objection, Van Hoonacker’s answer is convincing: "As to the way in which the measurements were to be carried out in the mountainous country of Palestine, the legislator doubtless knew what method was usually employed. Besides, we are free to believe that he only gives these figures as approximate indications" (Sacerdoce levitique, 433).

4. Ezekiel’s Vision:

The same writer’s reply to theory that the idea originated with Ezekiel is wholly admirable. "Strictly we could ask .... whether Ezekiel did not found himself on the description of the camp of the Israelites in the desert. It is only too manifest that the division and appointment of the territory as presented in Eze 48 of the prophet are scarcely inspired by practical necessities, that they have a very pronounced character of ideal vision; and ‘as no fancy is pure fancy,’ we ought also to find the elements which are at the basis of Ezekiel’s vision. The tents of the tribe of Levi ranged around the tabernacle explain themselves in the Priestly Code; we may doubt whether the Levites, deprived of territory (Eze 44:28) and nevertheless grouped on a common territory, in the conditions described in Eze 48, explain themselves with equal facility. A camp is readily conceived on the pattern of a chessboard, but not the country of Canaan. We need not stop there. It is in fact certain that Ezekiel here has in view the protection of the holiness of the temple from all profanation; and in the realm of the ideal, the means are appropriate to the end" (op. cit., 425 f).

5. Priestly Cities and Cities in Which Priests Dwell:

Lastly there runs through Wellhausen’s discussion the confusion between a city where priests may be dwelling and a priestly city. There were priests in Jerusalem, as there are today in London or Chicago; but none of these three places can be regarded as a priestly city in the same sense as the Levitical cities. Not one of them has ever been a patrimonial city of priests, or could be the origin of such an arrangement.

While therefore the whole of the cities mentioned in Jos 21 were certainly not reduced into possession at the time of the conquest, the Wellhausen theory on this matter cannot be sustained.

LITERATURE.

J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena, 159-63; A. Van Hoonacker, Sacerdoce levitique, 423-35 (very brilliant and important).

Harold M. Wiener

LEVITICUS, 1

le-vit’-i-kus:

I. GENERAL DATA

1. Name

2. Character of Book

3. Unity of Book: Law of Holiness Examination of Critical Theory

II. STRUCTURE

1. Modern Analyses

(1) Theories of Disintegration

(2) Reasons for Dismemberment

(3) Insufficiency of These Reasons

2. Structure of the Biblical Text

(1) Structure in General

(2) Structure of the Individual Pericopes

III. ORIGIN

1. Against the Wellhausen Hypothesis

(1) The Argument from Silence

(2) Attitude of Prophets toward Sacrificial System

(3) The People’s Disobedience

(4) Indiscriminate Sacrificing

(5) Deuteronomy and Priestly Code

2. Connection with Mosaic Period

(1) Priestly Code and Desert Conditions

(2) Unity and Construction Point to Mosaic Origin

IV. THE SIGNIFICANCE

1. Positive

(1) The Law Contains God’s Will

(2) The Law Prepares for the Understanding of Christianity

(3) The Law as a Tutor unto Christ

2. Negative

LITERATURE

I. General Data.

1. Name:

The third book of the Pentateuch is generally named by the Jews according to the first word, wayyiqra’ (Origen Ouikra, by the Septuagint called according to its contents Leuitikon, or Leueitikon, by the Vulgate, accordingly, "Leviticus" (i.e. Liber), sometimes "Leviticum"). The Jews have also another name taken from its contents, namely, torath kohanim, "Law of the Priests."

2. Character of Book:

As a matter of fact ordinances pertaining to the priesthood, to the Levitical system, and to the cults constitute a most important part of this book; but specifically religious and ethical commands, as we find them, e.g. in Le 18; 19; 20, are not wanting; and there are also some historical sections, which, however, are again connected with the matter referring to the cults, namely the consecration of the priests in Le 8 and 9, the sin and the punishment of two sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu (10:1 ff), and the account of the stoning of a blasphemer (24:10 ff). Of the Levites, on the other hand, the book does not treat at all. They are mentioned only once and that incidentally in 25:32 ff. The laws are stated to have been given behar Cinay (7:38; 25:1; 26:46; 27:34), which expression, on account of Le 11, in which Yahweh is described as speaking to Moses out of the tent of meeting, is not to be translated "upon" but "at" Mt. Sinai. The connection of this book with the preceding and following books, i.e. Exodus and Numbers, which is commonly acknowledged as being the case, at least in some sense, leaves for the contents of Leviticus exactly the period of a single month, since the last chronological statement of Ex 40:17 as the time of the erection of the tabernacle mentions the 1st day of the 1st month of the 2nd year of the Exodus, and Nu 1:1 takes us to the 1st day of the 2nd month of the same year. Within this time of one month the consecration of the priests fills out 8 days (Le 8:33; 9:1). A sequence in time is indicated only by Le 16:1, which directly connects with what is reported in Le 10 concerning Nadab and Abihu. In the same way the ordinances given in 10:6 ff are connected with the events described in 8:1-10:5. The laws are described as being revelations of Yahweh, generally given to Moses (compare 1:1; 4:1; 5:14; 6:19,24 (Hebrew 12,17); 7:22,28, etc.); sometimes to Moses and Aaron (compare 11:1; 13:1; 14:33; 15:1, etc.), and, rarely, to Aaron alone (10:8). In 10:12 ff, Moses gives some directions to the priests, which are based on a former revelation (compare 6:16 (Hebrew 9) ff; 7:37 ff). In 10:16 ff, we have a difference of opinion between Moses and Aaron, or rather his sons, which was decided on the basis of an independent application of principles given in Leviticus. Most of these commands are to be announced to Israel (1:2; 4:2; 7:23,19; 9:3 ff; 11:2; 12:2; 15:2; 18:2, etc.); others to the priests (6:9,25 (Hebrew 2,18); 21:2; 22:2, etc.); or to the priests and the Israelites (17:2; 22:18), while the directions in reference to the Day of Atonement, with which Aaron was primarily concerned (16:2), beginning with 16:29, without a special superscription, are undeniably changed into injunctions addressed to all Israel; compare also 21:24 and 21:2. As the Book of Exodus treats of the communion which God offers on His part to Israel and which culminates at last in His dwelling in the tent of meeting (40:34 ff; compare under EXODUS, I, 2), the Book of Leviticus contains the ordinances which were to be carried out by the Israelites in religious, ethical and cultural matters, in order to restore and maintain this communion with God, notwithstanding the imperfections and the guilt of the Israelites. And as this book thus with good reason occupies its well established place in the story of the founding and in the earliest history of theocracy, so too even a casual survey and intelligent glance at the contents of the book will show that we have here a well-arranged and organic unity, a conviction which is only confirmed and strengthened by the presentation of the structure of the book in detail (see under II, below).

3. Unity of Book: Law of Holiness:

As a rule, critics are accustomed first of all to regard Le 17:1-25:55 or 26 as an independent section, and find in these chapters a legal code that is considered to have existed at one time as a group by itself,

before it was united with the other parts.

It is indeed true that a series of peculiarities have been found in these chapters of Leviticus. To these peculiarities belongs the frequent repetition of the formula: "I am Yahweh your God" (18:2,4; 19:2,4, etc.); or "I am Yahweh" (18:5,6,21; 19:14,16, etc.), or "I am Yahweh .... who hath separated you" (20:24), or "who sanctifieth you" (20:8; 21:8,15,23, etc.). To these peculiarities belong the references in words, or, in fact, to the land of Canaan, into which Israel is to be led (18:3,14 ff; 19:23 ff, 29; 20:22 ff; 23; 25), and also to Egypt, out of which He has led the people (18:3; 19:34; 22:33; 26:13,15, etc.); as, further, the demand for sanctification (19:2), or the warning against desecration (19:12; 21:23, etc.), both based on the holiness of Yahweh. In addition, a number of peculiar expressions are repeatedly found in these chapters. Because of their contents these chapters have, since Klostermann, generally been designated by the letter H (i.e. Law of Holiness); or, according to the suggestion of Dillmann, by the letter S (i.e. Sinaitic Law), because, according to 25:1; 26:46, they are said to have been given at Mt. Sinai, and because in certain critical circles it was at one time claimed that these chapters contain old laws from the Mosaic period, although these had been changed in form. These earlier views have apparently now been discarded by the critics entirely.

Examination of Critical Theory.

We, however, do not believe that it is at all justifiable to separate these laws as a special legal code from the other chapters. In the first place, these peculiarities, even if such are found here more frequently than elsewhere, are not restricted to these chapters exclusively. The Decalogue (Ex 20:2) begins with the words, "I am Yahweh thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." Ex 22:31 contains the demand, "Ye shall be holy men unto me." Ex 29:44,45 contains a promise that God will dwell in the midst of the Israelites, so that they shall learn that He is Yahweh, their God, who has brought them out of Egypt in order to dwell in their midst as Yahweh, their God (compare, further, Ex 6:6-8; 31:13 f; Le 10:10,11; 11:44; Nu 15:37-41; 33:52 f, 55 f; De 14:2,21). It is a more than risky undertaking to find in these and in other sections scattered remnants of H, especially if these are seen to be indispensable in the connection in which they are found, and when no reason can be given why they should be separated from this collection of laws. Then, too, the differences of opinion on the part of the critics in assigning these different parts to H, do not make us favorably inclined to the whole hypothesis. Hoffmann, especially (Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese, 16 ff), has shown how impossible it is to separate H from the other ordinances of the Priestly Code in so radical a manner. In saying this we do not at all wish to deny the peculiar character of these chapters, only we do not believe that Le 17 can be added or Le 26 can be taken away from this section; for in Le 17 all the characteristic peculiarities of the Holiness Law are lacking; and, on the other hand, in Le 26 the expression "I am Yahweh your God," or a similar one in 26:12,13,14 f, is found. The subscription in 26:46 connects Le 26 with the preceding; and, further, the reference to the Sabbatical year as described in Le 25, found in 26:34 f, 43, is not to be overlooked. Finally, also, other legal codes, such as that in the first Book of the Covenant (Ex 23:20-33) and that of De (27:11-28:68) close with the offer of a blessing or a curse.

The chapters under consideration (Le 18:1-26:46) are most closely connected with each other solely

through their contents, which have found expression in a particular form, without these facts being sufficient to justify the claim of their being a separate legal code. For since in Le 1-17 all those things which separate the Israelites from their God have been considered and bridged over (compare Le 1-7, the laws concerning sacrifices; Le 8-10, the mediatorship of the priests; Le 11-15, the unclean things; Le 16, the Day of Atonement; Le 17, the use made of blood), we find in Le 18:1-26:46 an account of the God-pleasing conduct, which admits of nothing that desecrates; namely, Le 18; 19; 20 contain laws dealing with marriage and chastity and other matters of a religious, ethical or cultural kind, together with the punishments that follow their transgression; Le 21 f determine the true character of the priests and of the sacred oblations; Le 23 f, the consecration of the seasons, of life and death, etc.; Le 25, the Sabbath and the Jubilee year; Le 26 contains the offer of a blessing or a curse. Le 1-17 have, as it were, a negative character; Le 18:1-26:46 a positive character. In Le 1-17 the consciousness of what is unclean, imperfect and guilty is awakened and the possibility of their removal demonstrated; while in Le 18:1-26:46 the norm of a holy life is set forth. Even if these two parts at certain places show so great a likeness that the occurrence of an interchange of ordinances could be regarded as possible, nevertheless the peculiar character of each part is plainly recognized; and this is also a very essential argument for the view that both parts have one and the same author, who intentionally brought the two parts into closer connection and yet separated the one from the other. On this supposition the peculiarities of Le 18:1-26:46 are sufficiently explained, and also the positive contents of these chapters and the fact that just these chapters are referred to in pre-exilic literature oftener than is the case with Le 1-17, and particularly the close connection between Ezekiel and H is to be regarded as a consequence of the common tendency of both authors and not as the result of their having used a common source (see EZEKIEL, II, 2). In Le 26:46 we have what is clearly a conclusion, which corresponds to 25:1; 7:37 f; 1:1, and accordingly regards Le 1:1-26:46 as a unity; while Le 27, which treats of vows and of tithes, with its separate subscription in 27:34, shows that it is an appendix or a supplement, which is, however, in many ways connected with the rest of the book, so that this addition cannot, without further grounds, be regarded as pointing to another author.

II. Structure.

1. Modern Analyses:

Modern criticism ascribes the entire Book of Leviticus, being a special legal code, to the Priestly Code (P). The questions which arise in connection with this claim will be discussed under III, below. At this point we must first try to awaken a consciousness of the fact, that in this special particular, too, the documentary theory has entered upon the stage of total disintegration; that the reasons assigned for the separation of the sources are constantly becoming more arbitrary and subjective; and that the absurd consequences to which they consistently lead from the very outset arouse distrust as to the correctness of the process. Just as in the historical parts the critics have for long been no longer content with J (Jahwist) and E (Elohist), but have added a J1 and Later additions to J, an E1 and Later additions to E, and as Sievers and Gunkel have gone farther, and in detail have completely shattered both J and E into entirely separate fragments (see GENESIS), So the Priestly Code (P), too, is beginning to experience the same fate. It is high time that, for both the historical and the legal sections, the opposite course be taken, and that we turn from the dismemberment to the combination of these documents; that we seek out and

emphasize those features which, in form and content, unite the text into a clear unity. For this reason we lay the greatest stress on these in this section, which deals with the structure of the book, and which treats of the matter (1) negatively and (2) positively (see also EXODUS, II).

(1) Theories of Disintegration.

We have already seen in the article DAY OF ATONEMENT (I, 2, (2)) in connection with Le 16 an example of these attempts at dissection, and here still add several examples in order to strengthen the impression on this subject.

(a) General Considerations:

If we for the present disregard the details, then, according to Bertholet (Kurzer Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament), not only Le 17:1-26:46 (see, above, under I) at one time existed as a separate legal corpus, but also the sacrificial legislation in Le 1-7, and also the laws concerning the clean and the unclean in Le 11-15. Concerning Le 16 see above. Then, too, Le 27 is regarded as a supplement and is ascribed to a different author. Finally, the so-called "fundamental document" of P (marked Pg) contained only parts from Le 9 f (also a few matters from Le 8), as also one of the three threads of Le 16, for Le 8-10, it is said, described the consecration of the priests demanded in Ex 25 ff, which also are regarded as a part of Pg, and Le 16:1 is claimed to connect again with Le 10 (compare on this point DAY OF ATONEMENT, I, 2). All these separate parts of Leviticus (i.e. Le 1:1-27:34) are further divided into a number of more or less independent subparts; thus, e.g., Le 1-7, containing the sacrificial laws, are made to consist of two parts, namely, Le 1-5 and Le 6-7; or the laws concerning the clean and the unclean in Le 11-15 are divided into the separate pieces, Le 11; 12; 13:1-46; and these are regarded as having existed at one time and in a certain manner independently and separated from each other. But how complicated in detail the composition is considered to be, we can see from Le 17:1-26:46.

(b) Leviticus 17-26 Considered in Detail:

While Baentsch (Hand-Kommentar zum Alten Testament) accepts, to begin with, three fundamental strata (H1 = Le 18; 19; 20 and certain portions from Le 23; 24; 25; H2 = Le 21 f; H3 = Le 17), Bertholet, too (op. cit., x), regards the development of these chapters as follows: "In detail we feel justified in separating the following pieces: (i) Le 17:3,4 (5,7a), 8,9,10-14; (ii) 18:7-10,12-20,22 f; and this united with (iii) 19:3 f, 11 f, 27 f, 30,31,35,36, which was probably done by the author of (iii). The following were inserted by the person who united these parts, namely, 18:6,27,25,26,28,30; (iv) 19:9,10,13-18,19,29,32; (v) 19:5-8,23-26; (vi) 20:2(3), 6(27); (vii) 20:9,10-21; 19:20; (viii) 21:1b-5,7,9-15,17b-24; 22:3,8,10-14,18b-25,27-30; (ix) 23:10-20,39-43; (x) 24:15-22, except verses 16a(?)b; (xi) 25:2-7 (4), 18-22,35-38,39,40a, 42 f, 47,53,15; (xii) 25:8a, 9b, 10a, 13,14-16,17,24 f. In uniting these pieces Rh (the Redactor of the Law of Holiness) seems to have added de suo the following: 17:5 (beginning); 18:2b-5,21,24,26a(?), 29; 19:33 f, 37; 20:4 f, 7 f, 22-26; 21:6,8; 22:2,9,15 f, 31-33; 23:22; 25:11 f; 26:1 f. At the same time he united with these an older parenetic section, 26:3-45, which, by inserting 26:10,34 f, 39-43, he changed into a concluding address of this small legal code. All the rest that is found in Le 17:1-

26:46 seems to be the result of a revision in the spirit of the Priestly Code (P), not, however, as though originally it all came from the hand of Rp (Redactor P). That he rather added and worked together older pieces from P (which did not belong to Pg) is seen from an analysis of Le 23. .... As far as the time when these parts were worked together is concerned, we have a reliable terminus ad quem in a comparison of Ne 8:14-18 with Le 23:36 (P), 39 ff (H). Only we must from the outset remember, that still, after the uniting of these different parts, the marks of the editorial pen are to be noticed in the following Le 17:1-26:46, i.e. that after this union a number of additions were yet made to the text. This is sure as far as 23:26-32 is concerned, and is probable as to 24:1-9,10-14,23; 25:32-34; and that this editorial work even went so far as to put sections from P in the place of parts of H can possibly be concluded from 24:1-9."

(c) Extravagance of Critical Treatment:

This is also true of all the other sections, as can be seen by a reference to the books of Bertholet and Baentsch. What should surprise us most, the complicated and external manner in which our Biblical text, which has such a wonderful history back of it, is declared by the critics to have originated, or the keenness of the critics, who, with the ease of child's play, are able to detect and trace out this growth and development of the text, and can do more than hear the grass grow? But this amazement is thrust into the ackground when we contemplate what becomes of the Bible text under the manipulations of the critics. The compass of this article makes it impossible to give even as much as a general survey of the often totally divergent and contradictory schemes of Baentsch and Bertholet and others on the distribution of this book among different sources; and still less possible is it to give a criticism of these in detail. But this critical method really condemns itself more thoroughly than any examination of its claims would. All who are not yet entirely hypnotized by the spell of the documentary hypothesis will feel that by this method all genuine scientific research is brought to an end. If the way in which this book originated had been so complicated, it certainly could never have been again reconstructed.

(2) Reasons for Dismemberment.

We must at this place confine ourselves to mentioning and discussing several typical reasons which are urged in favor of a distribution among different authors.

(a) Alleged Repetitions:

We find in the parts belonging to P a number of so-called repetitions. In Le 1-7 we find a twofold discussion of the five kinds of sacrifices (1-5; 6:1 ff); in Le 20 punitive measures are enacted for deeds which had been described already in Le 18; in 19:3,10; 23:3; 26:2 the Sabbath command is intensified; in 19:5 ff; 22:29 f, we find commands which had been touched upon already in 7:15 ff; 19:9 f we find almost verbally repeated in 23:22; 24:2 ff repeats ordinances concerning the golden candlestick from Ex 27:20 ff, etc. The existence of these repetitions cannot be denied; but is the conclusion drawn from this fact correct? It certainly is possible that one and the same author could have handled the same materials at different places and from different viewpoints, as is the case in Le 1-7 in regard to the sacrifices. Le 18 and 20 (misdeeds and punishments) are even necessarily and mutually supplementary. Specially

important laws can have been repeated, in order to emphasize and impress them all the more; or they are placed in peculiar relations or in a unique light (compare, e.g., 24:1 ff, the command in reference to the golden candlestick in the pericope Le 23; 24; see below). Accordingly, as soon as we can furnish a reason for the repetition, it becomes unobjectionable; and often, when this is not the case, the objections are unremoved if we ascribe the repetitions to a new author, who made the repetition by way of an explanation (see EXODUS, II, 2, (5)).

(b) Separation of Materials:

Other reasons will probably be found in uniting or separating materials that are related. That Le 16 is connected with Le 8-10, and these connect with Ex 25 ff, is said to prove that this had been the original order in these sections. But why should materials that are clearly connected be without any reason torn asunder by the insertion of foreign data? Or has the interpolator perhaps had reasons of his own for doing this? Why are not these breaks ascribed to the original author? The sacrificial laws in Le 1-7 are properly placed before Le 8-10, because in these latter chapters the sacrifices are described as already being made (9:7,15, the sin offering; 9:7,12,16, the burnt offering; 9:17; 10:12, the meal offering; 9:18, the peace offering; 9:3 f, all kinds). In the same way Le 11-15, through 15:31, are inwardly connected with Le 16, since these chapters speak of the defiling of the dwelling-place of Yahweh, from which the Day of Atonement delivers (16:16 f, 33). As a matter of course, the original writer as well as a later redactor could have at times also connected parts in a looser or more external manner. In this way, in 7:22 ff, the command not to eat of the fats or of the blood has been joined to the ordinances with reference to the use of the peace offerings in 7:19 ff. This again is the case when, in Le 2, verses 11-13 have been inserted in the list of the different kinds of meal offering; when after the general scheme of sin offerings, according to the hierarchical order and rank in Le 4, a number of special cases are mentioned in 5:1 ff; and when in 5:7 ff commands are given to prevent too great poverty; or when in 6:19 ff the priestly meal offerings are found connected with other ordinances with references to the meat offerings in general (6:14 ff); or when the share that belongs to the priest (7:8 ff) is found connected with his claim to the guilt offering (7:1 ff); or the touching of the meat offering by something unclean (7:19 ff) is found connected with the ordinances concerning the peace offerings; or when in Le 11 the ordinances dealing with the unclean animals gradually pass over into ordinances concerning the touching of these animals, as is already indicated by the subscription 11:4,6 f (compare with 11:2). Still more would it be natural to unite different parts in other ways also. In this way the ordinances dealing with the character of the sacrifices in 22:17-30 could, regarded by themselves, be placed also in Le 1-7. But in Le 22 they are also well placed. On the other hand, the character of Le 1-7 would have become too complicated if they were inserted here. In such matters the author must have freedom of action.

(c) Change of Singular and Plural:

Further, the frequent change between the singular and the plural in the addresses found in the laws which are given to a body of persons is without further thought used by the critics as a proof of a diversity of authors in the section under consideration (compare Le 10:12 ff; 19:9,11 ff, 15 ff, etc.). But how easily this change in numbers can be explained! In case the plural is used, the body of the people are regarded as having been distributed into individuals; and in the case of a more stringent application

the plural can at once be converted into the singular, since the author is thinking now only of separate individuals. Naturally, too, the singular is used as soon as the author thinks again rather of the people as a whole. Sometimes the change is made suddenly within one and the same verse or run of thought; and this in itself ought to have banished the thought of a difference of authors in such cases. In the case of an interpolator or redactor, it is from the outset all the more probable that he would have paid more attention to the person used in the addresses than that this would have been done by the original writer, who was completely absorbed by the subject-matter. Besides, such a change in number is frequently found in other connections also; compare in the Book of the Covenant (Ex 22:20-25,29 f; 23:9 ; compare De 12:2 ff, 13). In regard to these passages, also, the modern critics are accustomed to draw the same conclusion; and in these cases, too, this is hasty. In the same way the change in the laws from the 3rd to the 2nd person can best be explained as the work of the lawgiver himself, before whose mind the persons addressed are more vividly present and who, when speaking in the 2nd person, becomes personal (compare Le 2:4 ff with 2:1-3, and also 1:2; 3:17; 6:18,21,25 ff).

(d) Proofs of Religious Development:

A greater importance seemingly must be attributed to the reasons based on a difference in the terminology or on contradictions in the laws, as these appear to lead to a religio-historical development. But the following examples are intended to show how all important it is to be slow in the acceptance of the materials which the critics offer in this connection.

(3) Insufficiency of These Reasons.

(a) In Le 5:1-7, in the section treating of the sin offering (4:1-5:13), we find the word ‘asham, which also signifies "guilt offering" (compare 5:14 ff; 7:1 ff). Accordingly, it is claimed, the author of 5:1-7 was not yet acquainted with the difference between the two kinds of offerings, and that this part is older than that in 4:1 ff; 5:14 ff. However, in 5:1 ff the word ‘asham is evidently used in the sense of "repentance," and does not signify "sin offering" at all; at any rate, already in 5:6 f we find the characteristic term chaTTath to designate the latter, and thus this section appears as entirely in harmony with the connection.

(b) Critics find a contradiction in Le 6:26; 7:33,7, and in 6:29; 7:31,6, since in the first case the officiating priest and in the other case the entire college of priests is described as participating in the sacrifice. In reply it is to be said that the first set of passages treat of the individual concrete cases, while the second set speak of the general principle. In 7:8 f, however, where the individual officiating priest is actually put in express contrast with all the sons of Aaron, the matter under consideration is a difference in the meal offerings, which, beginning with Le 2, could be regarded as known. Why this difference is made in the use of this sacrifice is no longer intelligible to us, as we no longer retain these sacrifices, nor are we in possession of the oral instruction which possibly accompanied the written formulation of these laws; but this is a matter entirely independent of the question as to the author.

(c) According to Ex 29:7; Le 4:3,5,16; 6:20,22; 8:12; 16:32; 21:10,12, the high priest is the only one

who is anointed; while, on the other hand, in Ex 28:41; 29:21; 30:30; 40:15; Le 7:36; 10:7, all the priests are anointed. But the text as it reads does not make it impossible that there was a double anointing. According to the first set of passages, Aaron is anointed in such a manner that the anointing oil is poured out upon his head (compare especially Ex 29:7 and Le 8:12). Then, too, he and all his sons are anointed in such a way that a mixture of the oil and of the blood is sprinkled upon them and on their garments (compare especially Ex 29:21 and Le 8:30). Were we here dealing with a difference in reference to theory and the ranks of the priesthood, as these discussions were current at the time of the exile (see III, below), then surely the victorious party would have seen to it that their views alone would have been reproduced in these laws, and the opposing views would have been suppressed. But now both anointings are found side by side, and even in one and the same chapter!

(d) The different punishments prescribed for carnal intercourse with a woman during her periods in Le 15:24 and 20:18 are easily explained by the fact that, in the first passage, the periods are spoken of which only set in during the act, and in the second passage, those which had already set in before.

(e) As far as the difference in terminology is concerned, it must be remembered that in their claims the critics either overlook that intentional differences may decide the preference for certain words or expressions; or else they ignore the fact that it is possible in almost every section of a writer's work to find some expressions which are always, or at least often, peculiar to him; or finally, they in an inexcusable way ignore the freedom of selection which a writer has between different synonyms or his choice in using these.

All in all, it must be said that however much we acknowledge the keenness and the industry of the modern critics in clearing up many difficulties, and the fact that they bring up many questions that demand answers, it nevertheless is the fact that they take the matter of solving these problems entirely too easily, by arbitrarily claiming different authors, without taking note of the fact that by doing this the real difficulty is not removed, but is only transferred to another place. What could possibly be accepted as satisfactory in one single instance, namely that through the thoughtlessness of an editor discrepancies in form or matter had found their way into the text, is at once claimed to be the regular mode of solving these difficulties—a procedure that is itself thoughtlessness. On the other hand, the critics overlook the fact that it makes little difference for the religious and the ethical value of these commands, whether logical, systematic, linguistic or aesthetic correctness in all their parts has been attained or not; to which must yet be added, that a failure in the one particular may at the same time be an advantage in the other. In this respect we need recall only the anacoluths of the apostle Paul.

2. Structure of the Biblical Text:

(1) Structure in General.

The most effective antidote against the craze to split up the text in the manner described above will be found in the exposition of all those features which unite this text into one inseparable whole. What we have tried to demonstrate in the arts GENESIS; EXODUS, II; DAY OF ATONEMENT, I, 2 (compare

also EZEKIEL, I, 2, (2)) can be repeated at this point. The Book of Leviticus shows all the marks of being a well-constructed and organic literary product, which in its fundamental characteristics has already been outlined under I above. And as this was done in the several articles just cited, we can here add further, as a corroborative factor in favor of the acceptance of an inner literary unity of the book, that the division of the book into its logical parts, even down to minute details, is here, as is so often the case elsewhere, not only virtually self-evident in many particulars, but that the use made of typical numbers in many passages in this adjustment of the parts almost forces itself upon our recognition. In other places the same is at least suggested, and can be traced throughout the book without the least violence to the text. The system need not be forced upon the materials. We often find sections but loosely connected with the preceding parts (compare under 1 above) and not united in a strictly logical manner, but which are nevertheless related in thought and association of ideas. In harmony with the division of the Book of Ge we find at once that the general contents, as mentioned under I above, easily fall into 10 pericopes, and it is seen that these consist of 2 sets each of 5 pericopes together with an appendix.

(a) Ten Pericopes in Two Parts:

Part I, the separation from God and the removal of this separation: (i) Le 1:1-7:38; (ii) Le 8:1-10:20; (iii) Le 11:1-15:33; (iv) Le 16; (v) Le 17.

Part II, the normal conduct of the people of God: (i) Le 18; 19; 20; (ii) Le 21; 22; (iii) Le 23; 24; (iv) Le 25; (v) Le 26.

Appendix, Le 27; compare for the number 10 the division of Ex 1:8-7:7; 7:8-13:16; 13:17-18:27; also the Decalogue, 20:1 ff; 21:1-23:19; 32:1-35:1; and see EXODUS, II, 2; and in Le probably 18:6-18; 19:9-18, and with considerable certainty 19:1-37 (see below).

(b) Correspondence and Connections:

I leave out of consideration in this case the question whether an intentional correspondence among the different parts be traced or not, even in their details. Thus, e.g.; when the 2nd pericope (Le 8$; 9$; 10$; 21$ f) treats particularly of the order of the priests, or when the 4th pericope of the 2nd set (Le 25) states that the beginning of the Year of Jubilee fell on the 10th day of the 7th month, i.e. on the Day of Atonement as described in Le 16, in the 4th pericope of the 1st set (compare 25:9 with 16:29); or when both sets close with two shorter pericopes, which evidently express high stages of development (Le 16; 17, respectively, Le 25; 26 treating of the Day of Atonement, of the use made of blood and the purposes of blood for the altar or the Jubilee Year, of the blessing and the curse).

And, as far as the order in other respects is concerned, it is throughout to be regarded as founded in the subject-matter itself that Le 1-17 must precede Le 18:1-26:46. First that which separates the people from God must be removed, and then only is a God-pleasing conduct possible. Just as easily, and in agreement with the context, it is possible that the consecration of the priests in Le 8-10 presupposes the

sacrificial torah (Le 1-7; compare under 1 above) and follows the latter, and is immediately introduced by the mention made of the installation sacrifices for which otherwise there are no reasons assigned in the concluding formula in 7:37 (compare 8:22-32). The Day of Atonement (Le 16), which in 16:16 f and 33 is spoken of in connection with the purification of the sanctuary, is in turn introduced by Le 11-15, or more particularly by the remark in 15:31, where mention is made of the pollution of the dwelling-place of Yahweh. And on the other hand, the ordinances dealing with the priests (Le 8$; 9$; 10$) in 10:10, where the command is given to discriminate between what is holy and what is unholy and to teach Israel accordingly, already point to the contents of Le 11-15. The sacrifices, with which the first part in Le 1-7 begins, are taken up again by the conclusion in Le 17, in the commandment concerning the blood for the altar. The second part, too, already at the beginning (Le 18; 19; 20) in its religiously cultural and ethical ordinances, shows in the clearest possible manner what matters it proposes to discuss. In this way the systematic structure of the book is apparent in all particulars.

Close connections: comparison with Exodus: And, further, the different pericopes are also so closely Connected among themselves and with the corresponding pericopes in the books of Ex and Nu, that many have thought it necessary to regard them as a special body of laws. But the connection is so close and involves all the details so thoroughly, that all efforts to divide and distribute them after the examples described under 1 above must fail absolutely. We shall now give the proofs for the different pericopes in Lev, but in such a manner as to take into consideration also Ex 25:1-31:18; 35 ff, treating of the tabernacle and its utensils and the Aaronitic priesthood, which are most intimately connected with Lev. All details in this matter will be left out of consideration.

(i) Tabernacle and priesthood: That Le 8-10 (the consecration of the priests, etc.), together with Ex 25 ff, constitutes a single whole is accepted on all hands. But the tent of meeting and its utensils, and also the priesthood, both with and without any emphasis on the Aaronitic origin, are presupposed also in almost each one of the other pericopes of Leviticus; compare for Le 1-7, e.g., 1:3,1; 3:2,8,13; 4:4,5,7,14,16,18; 6:26 (tent of meeting); 1:5,12; 3:5; 4:7,25,30; 6:12 (altar of burnt sacrifices); 4:7,18 (altar of incense sacrifices); 4:6,17 (veil); 6:9,19 (court); 1:5,7,8,11; 2:2; 3:2,5,8,13; 6:9,14,16,20,25, etc. (Aaron and his sons as priests); for Le 11-15 see 12:4,6; 14:11,23; 15:14,29,31 (sanctuary, tent of meeting, dwelling-place); 11:1; 12:6 f; 13:1 ff; 14:2 ff, 33 ff; 15:1 (priesthood); for Le 16 see verses 2,7,16 f, 20,23,13 (sanctuary and Holy of Holies tent of meeting); 16:2,12 (veil); 16:2,13 ff (lid of the Ark of the Covenant); 16:12,18,20,33 (altar); 16:1 ff (Aaronitic priesthood); for Le 17 see verses 4-6,9 (tent of meeting); 17:6,11 (altar); 17:5 (priesthood); for Le 18; 19; 20 see 19:30,21 (sanctuary of Yahweh, tent of meeting); 19:22 (priesthood); for Le 21 f see 21:12 (sanctuary); 21:23 (sanctuaries of Yahweh); 21:23 (veil, altar); 21:1 ff, 21 (Aaronitic priesthood); for Le 23; 24 see 23:2,4,21,24,27,36 f (sanctuary); 24:1 ff (candlestick, tent of meeting); 24:5 ff (table of showbread); 23:10,20 (priesthood); 24:3,1 (Aaronitic priesthood); for Le 26 see verses 2,11,31 (sanctuary, dwelling-place of Yahweh, sanctuaries); for Le 27 see verses 10,33 (sanctuary); 27:8 ff (priesthood).

(ii) In the same way the sacrificial laws of Le 1-7 are mentioned in the following pericopes as matters that are well known. For Le 8-10 see 9:7,15 (sin offering); 9:7,12,16 (burnt offering); 9:17; 10:12 (meal offering); 9:18 (peace offering); 9:3 f (all together); compare also Ex 29:14,18,28. In Le 9:21; 10:14 f (wave-breasts and heave-thigh) direct reference is made to 7:30-36. In the same manner 10:16 ff

presupposes the ordinances dealing with the different ways of offering the sin offerings in 4:3 ff, 13 ff; 6:24-30; for Le 11-15 see 12:6 ff; 14:12 ff (compare especially 14:13 with 4:24); 14:21 ff; 15:14 f, 29 f; for Le 16 see verses 3,5 f, 9,11,15,24 f, 27; for Le 17 see verses 5 ff, 8,11; for Le 18; 19; 20 see 19:6 ff, 21 f (here is therefore the ‘asham found in H, which is claimed to be of a later date); for Le 21 f see 21:6,21 f; 22:17 ff, 29 f; for Le 23; 24 see 23:12 f; 18:19,27,37; 24:9; for Le 26 see verses 30 f; for Le 27 compare verses 15,19,27,31 with 5:16; 6:5.

(iii) Laws on clean and unclean: The laws in reference to the clean and the unclean in Le 11-15 are also interwoven with the whole book. For Le 1-7 see 5:2 f; 6:27; 7:19 ff; for Le 8-10 see 10:10 f; for Le 16 see verses 16,19; for Le 17 see verses 13,15 f; for Le 18; 19; 20 compare 20:25 with 11:44, and in general with Le 11; for Le 21 f see 21:10; 13:45; 22:3 ff with Le 13-15; for Le 27 see verses 11 and 27, as also Le 11.

(iv) The laws in reference to the Day of Atonement found in Le 16 are prepared for by those found in Le 11-15, namely, in 14:4 ff, 49 ff (the ceremony with the two birds in connection with the purification from leprosy), and in 15:31 (compare 16:16,19; see above). For Le 23; 24 compare 23:26 ff with 16:29 if, and for 25:9 with 16:29 see above; compare also Ex 30:10.

(v) Leviticus 17 is re-echoed in Le 1-7 (7:26 f) and in Le 18; 19; 20 (19:26).

(vi) Finally Le 25 (Year of Rest and Year of Jubilee) is presupposed in Le 26:34 f, 43 and in Le 27:17 ff, 23 f.

The above, however, by no means exhausts this list of references and similar thoughts, and we have here given only some leading illustrations. What literary tricks must be resorted to when, over against this overwhelming mass of evidence, critics yet insist that the different parts of the book were originally independent writings, especially, too, when the entire tabernacle and utensils of the Aaronitic priesthood, the Day of Atonement, the Year of Jubilee, the whole sacrificial scheme and the laws dealing with the great festivals, the restriction of the slaying of the sacrificial animals to the central sanctuary, are regarded as the products of imagination alone, according to the Wellhausen hypothesis (compare III, below, and see also EXODUS, III, 5; DAY OF ATONEMENT, III, 1; EZEKIEL, II, 2). And how little is gained in addition when, as is sometimes done, in a most arbitrary manner, the statements found in Le 1-3 concerning the tabernacle of revelation ("tent of meeting") and concerning Aaron’s sons, or concerning Aaron and his sons together, are regarded as later additions. In Le and Ex 25 ff; 35 ff, everything is so entirely of one and the same character and has so clearly emanated from one and the same spirit, that it is impossible to separate from this product any constituent parts and to unite these into groups that were originally independent, then to split up these still further and to trace the parts to their sources, and even to construct a scheme of religious and historical development on this reconstruction of the sources.

(2) Structure of the Individual Pericopes.

As the windows and the column capitals of a medieval cathedral are arranged according to different schemes and this divergence is regarded as an enrichment of the structure, thus, too, we find it to be in the structure of the various pericopes of the Book of Leviticus. These latter, too, possess a certain symphony of different tones, but all are rhythmically arranged, and only when united do they produce the entire symphony.

(a) The Laws Concerning the Sacrifices (Leviticus 1-7):

In the first place, the five different kinds of sacrifices in Israel are mentioned in succession twice, in Le 1:1-7:21: Part I, Le 1-5, namely (i) Le 1, burnt offerings; (ii) Le 2, meal offering; (iii) Le 3, peace offerings; (iv) 4:1-5:13, sin offering; (v) 5:14-26, guilt offering; Part II, 6:1-7:21, namely

(i) 6:8-13, burnt offerings;

(ii) 6:14-23, meal offering;

(iii) 6:24-30, sin offering;

(iv) 7:1-7 with appendix, 7:8-10, dealing with that part of the sacrifices which belongs to the priest (see under 1, above), guilt offering;

(v) 7:11-21, peace offerings.

With this is found connected in 7:22-27 the prohibition of the use of the fat or the blood, and in 7:28-36, the laws concerning the wave-breast and the heave-thigh. We have accordingly at once twelve of these laws (compare on Ex 25:1-30:10 in article on EXODUS, II, 2, (5) and on EZEKIEL, I, 2, 5)). But even apart from this we have no right to ascribe Le 1-5 and 6:1-7:21, on the ground that they are duplicates, to different authors.

That there is a difference between these two accounts is proved, not only by the fact that the first set of laws from Le 1-5 is addressed to all the Israelites (compare 1:2; 4:2), and the second set 6:8; 7:21 to Aaron and his sons (compare 6:9,25); but the second set has also in content a number of altogether different viewpoints as compared with the first set, so that the same author found himself induced or compelled to write both sets. On the other hand, the fact that both have the same author is evident from the very close connection between the two sections. In addition to the fact that both make mention of all five kinds of sacrifices, we can yet compare 3:5 with 6:22 (fat pieces of the peace offering over the burnt sacrifices upon the pieces of wood); and, further, the express reference of 6:17 to Le 4, while 6:30 presupposes the distinct separation of the sin offering, the blood of which is brought into the tent of meeting, from the other sacrifices, as these are given in 4:3 ff, 13 ff over against 4:22 ff, 27 ff. Leviticus 4, with its reference to the peace offerings (4:10,26,31,35), is again most closely connected with Le 3. We must accordingly insist that the whole account is most intimately interwoven. Over against this, the omission within the first set, Le 1-5, in 5:14-16, of the ritual for the peace offering, is sufficiently

explained only by the fact that this ritual was to be used in the second set (6:8-7:21), and here for the first time only in 7:1-15, which fact again speaks for the same author for both sets and against the supposition that they were merely mechanically united by a redactor. The fact that the second set 6:8-7:21 has a different order from that of Le 1-5, by uniting the sin offering immediately with the meal offering (6:24 ff with 6:14-23), is probably on account of the similar ordinances in 7:9 and 7:19 (manner of eating the meal offering and the sin offering). On the other hand, the position of the peace offering at the close of the second set (7:11 ff) furnished the possibility of giving to the piece of the entire pericope embraced in 7:22-27,28-36 a suitable conclusion; since 7:22 ff (prohibition of the eating of the fat and the blood), connected with 7:19 ff, contained in 7:28 ff an ordinance that pertained to the peace offering (heave-breast and wave-thigh). At any rate, these last two pieces are to be regarded separately from the rest, since they are no longer addressed to the priests, as is 6:8-7:21, but to all Israel; compare 7:23,29. On some other data less intimately connected with the matter, compare above under 1.

(b) Consecration of priests and related matters (Le 8-10): In this pericope, as in the following, down to Le 17 inclusive, but especially from Le 11 on, the principle of division on the basis of the number four predominates, in many cases in the details, too; so that this could scarcely be regarded as an accidental feature (compare also the history of Abraham in Ge 12-26; further, in Ex 35:4-40:38; and in EXODUS, II, 2, (7); Le 16, under DAY OF ATONEMENT, I, 2, (1)); De 12-26, too, is probably to be divided on this principle, even to the minutest details (compare finally Le 21-22:16; 22:17-30; Le 23 f and 26).

(i) Leviticus 8, treating of the first seven days of the consecration of the priests: The outline is found in 8:2, namely Aaron, the sacred garments, the anointing oil, the bullock of the sin offering, two rams, unleavened bread (compare 8:6,7 ff, 10 ff, 14 ff, 18 ff, 22 ff, 26 ff).

(ii) Leviticus 9 the first sacrifices of Aaron and his sons on the 8th day (9:2-4 contain the outline, after the manner of 8:2; compare 9:7 ff, 11 ff, the sin offering and the burnt offering of Aaron, with 9:2; also 9:15-18, treating of what the people brought for the sacrifices, with 9:3 f; but it is to be noticed that the meal offering and the peace offering (9:17,18) are given in inverted order from that found in 9:3 f). Here too we find the number seven, if we add the burnt offering for the morning (9:17).

(iii) 10:1-7, the sin of Nadab and Abihu and their punishment by death; (iv) 10:8-20, ordinances concerning the priests, occasioned by 8:1-10:7 and provided with a new superscription in 10:8, namely 10:8, dealing with the prohibition of the use of wine and intoxicants; 10:9 f, distinction between the holy and the unholy; 10:12-15, the eating of the sacred oblations; 10:16-20, the treatment of the goat for the sin offering.

(c) Laws Concerning the Clean and Unclean (Le 11-15):

(i) Le 11, treating of clean and unclean animals. The outline of the chief contents is found in 11:46 with a free transposition of one number. There are accordingly four pieces, namely, 11:2-8, quadrupeds; 11:9-12, water animals; 11:13-23, birds (with an appendix, treating of contact with the unclean, 11:24-28, which give a summary of the animals mentioned (see under 1); 11:29-45, the small animals upon the

earth (again in four subdivisions, namely, (i) 11:29-38; (ii) 11:39 ff; (iii) 11:41 f; (iv) 11:44 f).

(ii) Leviticus 12 treats of women in confinement, also in four pieces (12:2-4, birth of a male child; 12:5, birth of a female child; 12:6 f, purification ceremony; 12:8, ordinances in case of extreme poverty). These parts are not joined logically, but in a rather external manner.

(iii) The passage 13:1-14:53, containing the laws of leprosy, with the subscription in 14:54 ff. (Because seven points are to be enumerated, 14:55 (garments and houses), this is not as in its further exposition separated from the other laws and is placed in their midst.) The exposition contains four pieces, namely, 13:1-44, leprosy on human beings (with concluding 13:45 f), with seven subdivisions, of which the first five longer ones are constructed along fairly parallel lines, and again can be divided into four sub-subdivisions, namely, 13:1-8; 1:9-17; 1:18-23; 1:24-28; 1:29-37; 1:38 f; 1:40-44. The significance of the number seven for the structure (see (2), (b), i, above) is akin to that found, e.g., in Ex 24:18 b through 31:18 (see EXODUS, II, 2, (5)); Le 8; 9 (see above); Le 23; 25; and 27; and possibly 26:3-13,14-39 (see below); finally, the whole Book of Ex is divided into seven parts (see EXODUS, II, 1). 13:47-59, leprosy in connection with garments, with four subdivisions, namely 13:47-50; 13:51 f; 13:53 f; 13:55 ff. The last subdivision can again be readily separated into four sub-subdivisions, namely, 13:55; 13:56; 13:57; 13:58; 14:1-32, purifications (14:2 being a special superscription), with 4 subdivisions, namely,

(i) 14:2b-3a, the leper before the priest;

(ii) 14:3b-9, the purification ceremonies on the first seven days, again divided into 4 sub-subdivisions: 14:3b f; 14:5-7; 14:8; 14:9;

(iii) 14:10-20, the ceremony of the eighth day (4 sacrifices, namely 14:12-18, guilt offering; 14:19a, sin offering; 14:19b, burnt offering; 14:20, meal offering; in the 4 sacrifices (5:12-6:7) there are again 4 different actions: 14:14; 14:15 f; 14:17; 14:18;

(iv) 14:21-32 (in cases of poverty) 14:33-53, leprosy in houses, with four subdivisions: 14:33-35; 14:36-38; 14:39-42; 14:43-53.

(iv) Leviticus 15, sickness or natural issues, with 4 subdivisions, namely, 15:1-15, checked or running issues together with their purification (15:3-12 contain 12 laws: 15:3; 15:4a; 15:4b; 15:5; 15:6; 15:7; 15:8; 15:9; 15:10a; 15:10b; 15:11; 15:12); 15:16-18, issue of seed; 15:19-24, periods; 15:25-30, other flows of blood and their purification. Le 15:1-15 and 15:16-18 refer to men, and 15:19-24 and 15:25-30 to women; and in addition to these implied suggestions, as 15:1-15 and 15:25-30 to dealing with abnormal issues and their purification ceremonies, 15:16-18 and 15:19-24 deal with normal issues.

(d) The Day of Atonement (Le 16):

See IV, 1, (2), 2, and under ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

(e) Uses and significance of the blood of sacrifices (Le 17): (i) 17:3-7, only one place for killing the Sacrifices and the rejection of all foreign cultures; (ii) 17:8,9, only one place for sacrificing; (iii) 17:10-14, prohibitive of eating the blood; (iv) 17:15, pertaining to carcasses of animals found dead or which have been torn by wild beasts.

Here the form and the contents of the section have been brought into perfect harmony by the author. Le 17:3 ff, 8 ff, 10 ff, 13 ff begin with same words, and each contains a similar formula in reference to the punishment, while logically 17:10 ff and 13 ff are evidently only subdivisions of the third part in 17:10-14, which treats of the prohibition of eating blood. In the fourth division, again, while in substance connected with the rest, there is lacking the formal agreement with the first three divisions.

(f) (g) (Le 18; 19; 20; 21): These naturally fall each into 2 parts. Leviticus 18-20 contain

(i) Le 18 f, religious and ethical laws;

(ii) Le 20, laws dealing with punishments. (f) (i) Religious and ethical laws (Le 18 f):

(a) Le 18: Ordinances with reference to marriage and chastity. Le 18:1-5, introductory; 18:6-18, prohibition of marriage between kindred of blood; 18:19-23, prohibition of other sexual sins; 18:24-30, warnings.

The subdivision can perhaps be divided into 10 subordinate parts, if it is permitted to combine the different degrees of relationship mentioned in Le 18:12-14 (namely, 18:7,8,9,10,11,12-14,15,16,17,18). Since it, of itself, manifestly consists of 5 ordinances (18:19,20,21,22,23), this whole section, if we are permitted to divide it into 5 commandments (18:2,3a, 3b, 4,5) and also into 5 (18:24 f, 26-28,29,30a, 30b), would contain 5 X 5 words; but this is uncertain.

(b) Leviticus 19: various commands of the deepest significance. In order to discover the divisions of this chapter we must note the characteristic formula, "I am Yahweh, your Gods" or a similar expression, which often appears at the beginning and at the end of certain divisions, e.g. in series (1) (9) and (10), but which in the middle series appears in each case only once, and which in all the series is found also at the conclusion.

In this way we can compute 10 tetralogues. Thus after the superscription in 19:2 containing a summary, we have

(i) 19:3,1 (19:3a, 3b, 4a, 4b);

(ii) 19:5-10 (19:5 f, 7 f, 9,10);

(iii) 19:11 f (19:11a, 11b(?), 11b(?), 12);

(iv) 19:13 f (19:13a, 13b, 14a, 14b);

(v) 19:15 f (15a, 15b, 16a, 16b);

(vi) 19:17 f (19:17a, 17b, 18a, 18b);

(vii) 19:19-25 (19:19a, 19b, 20-22,23-25);

(viii) 19:26-28 (19:26a, 26b, 27,28),

(ix) 19:29-32 (19:29,30,31,32);

(x) 19:33-36 (19:33,14,35,36); 19:37 constitutes the conclusion of the whole.

(Note that the number ten here is certain in the conviction of the present writer; but he is not quite so sure of the number of subdivisions within the main divisions; we may have to do here with pentalogues and not with tetralogues. If this is the case, then the agreements with Le 18 would under certain circumstances be even greater.)

Possibly groupings of two can yet form a closer union (compare on Ex 1:1-18:27; 21:1-23:33, EXODUS, II, 2, (1-4)). At any rate (iii) and (iv) can be summarized under the general heading of defrauding one's neighbors; (v) and (vi) under that of observation of the laws; (vii) and (viii) under that of heathen abuses; while (ix) and (x) perhaps intentionally mingle together the religious and cultural and ethical elements, in order thereby already to express that all these things are most intimately connected (but compare also Le 19:12,14,17, in the middle sections). In 19:5 ff, 20 ff, 23 ff, the author develops his subject somewhat more fully.

(f ii) Laws dealing with punishments (Le 20): The regulations in reference to punishments stand in such close relation to the contents of Le 18 and to parts of Le 19, that it is absolutely incomprehensible how the Critics can assign these three chapters to different authors. Even if certain regulations of Le 18 are not found here in Le 20:7,10,17 b, 18, and even if another order has been followed, this variation, which doubtless also hangs together with a new grouping of the materials, is rather an advantage than a disadvantage for the whole. It is impossible to conceive that a redactor would have altered anything in two entirely parallel and similar texts, or would himself have written a parallel text differing from the other. Leviticus 20 can probably be divided into 4 parts, namely,

(i) 20:1-8, punishments for idolatry and witchcraft with a concluding formula, 20:7 f;

(ii) 20:9-18, punishment of death for ten crimes, all of which, with the exception of the first, are of a sexual nature (20:9-18). It is a question whether the first in the second group (20:14), i.e. the sixth in the whole series, was intended to be made prominent by the peculiar character of the punishment (burning to death);

(iii) 20:19-21, other sexual sins, with lighter punishments;

(iv) 20:22-27, with 4 subdivisions (warning, 20:22 f; promise, 20:24; emphatic repetitions of two commands already given, 20:25 ff; (compare with 11:44 ff, and in general with Le 11); and 20:27 with 19:26,31; 20:6). Perfectly certain in this chapter is the fact that the different kinds of punishments are likewise decisive for their order. It is doubtless not to be regarded as accidental that both at the beginning and at the end death by stoning is mentioned.

(g) (Le 21:1-22:33):

(i) Laws concerning the quality of the priests (21:1-22,16); and (ii) concerning sacred oblations (22:17-30) with the subscription 22:31-33.

(g i) Qualities of priests: Le 21:1-22:16 in four sections (21:1 ff, 10 ff, 16 ff; 22:1 ff; note also in 21:18-20 the 12 blemishes; in 22:4-8 the 7 cases of uncleanness). (g ii) Sacred oblations: Le 22:17-30 in four sections (22:18-20,21-25,26-28,29 f).

(h) Consecration of seasons, etc. (Le 23; 24):

(i) Le 23, laws for the feasts (7 sections, namely, 23:3,4 f, 6-14,15-22,23-25,26-32,33-36, with the appendix that in every particular suits the connection, in 23:39 ff, added to the feast of the tabernacles);

(ii) 24:1-4, treating of the sacred candlestick, which represents the moral conduct of the Israelites, and for this reason suits admirably in the connection; as this is true also of

(iii) 24:5-9, treating of the showbread, which represents the results of the labor of Israel;

(iv) 24:10-23, containing the report of the punishment of a blasphemer of God and of one who cursed.

Probably the example was made of a person who took the name of God in vain at the time which this chapter describes. But possibly there is a still closer connection to be found with that which precedes. The showbread and the candlestick were found in the holy place, which with its utensils pictured the relation of Israel’s character to their God; while the utensils in the Holy of Holies indicated God’s relation to His people (compare Hengstenberg, Beitrage, III, 644 ff). But since the holy place, in addition to the showbread and the candlestick, contained only the incense altar, which symbolized the prayers of Israel, and as the blasphemer represents the exact opposite of prayer, it is probable that in 24:10 ff prayer is indicated by its counterpart. This section consists of 4 parts, namely, 24:10-12; 24:13-14; 24:15-22 (giving a series of punishments for certain wrongdoings which are more or less closely connected with that found in the text); 24:23.

(i) Sabbatic and Jubilee years (Le 25): Sabbatic and Jubilee years in 7 sections, namely, 25:1-7; 25:8-12; 25:13-28; 25:29-34; 25:35-38; 25:39-46; 25:47-55.

(j) Conclusion: Curse and blessing (Le 26): The grand concluding chapter, offering a curse and a blessing and containing all the prophetic utterances of later times in a nutshell, namely,

(i) 26:1-2, repetition of four important demands (26:1a, 1b, 2a, 2b);

(ii) 26:3-13, the blessing, possibly to be divided into 7 stages, one more spiritual than the other;

(iii) 26:4-39, the curse, possibly to be divided into seven stages, one more intense than the other (compare also the play on words 7 times repeated, in reference to shabbath, possibly found in 26:34 f, and certainly found in 26:18,21,24,27 f);

(iv) 26:40-45, the mercy finally shown by Yahweh for His covenant's sake.

(k) Appendix: Finally, the appendix in Le 27, dealing with vows and tithes, in 7 parts, namely, 27:1-8; 27:9-13; 27:14-15; 27:16-21; 27:26 f; 27:28-29; 27:30-33.

LEVITICUS, 2

III. Origin.

1. Against the Wellhausen Hypothesis:

As in the article ATONEMENT, DAY OF, sec. I, 2, (2), we took a stand against the modern attempts at splitting up the text, and in III, 1 against theory of the late origin of the whole pericope, we must, after trying under II to prove the unity of the Book of Leviticus, yet examine the modern claim that the book as a whole is the product of later times. Since the entire book is ascribed to the Priestly Code (see II, 1 above), the answer to the question as to the time when it was written will depend on the attitude which we take toward the Wellhausen hypothesis, which insists that the Priestly Code was not published until the time of the exile in 444 BC (Ne 8$; 9$; 10$).

(1) The Argument from Silence.

One of the most important proofs for this claim is the "argument from silence" (argumentum e silentio). How careful one must be in making use of this argument can be seen from the fact that, e.g., the high priest with his full title is mentioned but a single time in the entire Book of Leviticus, namely in 21:10; and that the Levites are not mentioned save once (25:32 ff), and then incidentally. As is well known, it is the adherents of the Wellhausen hypothesis themselves who now claim that the bulk of the entire literature of the Old Testament originated in the post-exilic period and long after the year 444 BC.

Leaving out of consideration for the present the Books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, all of which describe the history of Israel from the standpoint of the Priestly Code (P), we note that this later literature is not any richer in its references to P than is the older literature; and that in those cases where such references are found in this literature assigned to a late period, it is just as difficult to decide whether these passages refer merely to a custom or to a codified set of laws.

(2) Attitude of Prophets toward Sacrificial System.

A further proof against the pre-exilic origin of the priestly legislation is found in what is claimed to be the hostile attitude of the prophets to the sacrificial system (compare Am 5:21 ff; 4:4 f; Ho 6:6; Mic 6:6 ff; Isa 1:11 ff; Jer 6:20; 7:21 ff; Ps 40:6; 50:8,9; 51:16 f). But this cannot possibly be an absolute antithesis; for in this case, it would be directed also against the Books of the Covenant and, in part, too, against Deuteronomy, which books in Ex 20:24; 22:19; 23:18; 34:25; De 12:5 f, 11,13,17,26; 15:19-23; 16:2,5 f; 17:1; 18:1,3 also give directions for sacrifices, and which, at least in part, are yet regarded as older writings. Further, these passages under discussion are also, in part, assigned to a later and even a very late period (compare even such cases as Ps 40:6; 50:8 f; 51:16 f; Mic 6:6 ff, and in addition also Mal 1:10), i.e. they are assigned to a time in which, according to the views of the critics, the priestly laws are said to have had their origin or were already regarded as authoritative. As a rule, the prophets make sacrifices, Sabbaths, sacred places and persons a part of their pictures of the future; cf, as far as sacrifices are concerned, e.g. Jer 17:26; 31:14; 33:14 ff. Finally, Le 26:31 shows how, under certain circumstances, even P can declare sacrifices to be useless.

(3) The People’s Disobedience. Further, the transgressions of the Levitical laws in the course of Israel’s history cannot be regarded as a proof of the non-existence of the priestly legislation in pre-exilic times. This is clear from an analogous case. Idolatry was forbidden by the Books of the Covenant (Ex 20$; 21 $; 22$; 23$; 24$; 34$), which are recognized as ancient documents; but according to 2Ki 22 the pious king Josiah down to the year 622 BC takes no offense at idolatry. Even after the reformation, which had been inaugurated in consequence of the finding of the Book of the Law in the temple during the reign of Josiah (2Ki 22 f), idolatry was again practiced in Israel, as is proved by Eze 8 and Jer 44, notwithstanding that the Books of the Covenant and Deuteronomy already were extant at that time, even according to the views of the critics.

But let us pass on to P itself, and not forget that the directions given for the Jubilee Year (Le 25), according to Jewish tradition, were never actually observed. According to the reasoning of the critics, this law could not be in existence even in the present day. According to all reports the transgressions of the Divine ordinances began even as early as the Mosaic period; compare Ex 32 (J, E, golden calf); Am 5:25; Eze 20; De 12:8 and also Le 17:7 (sacrifice to the Satyrs in Priestly Code). This condition of affairs can readily be understood because the religion of Yahweh does not claim to be an emanation from the spirit of the people, but the result of a revelation from on high. In the light of these facts can we be surprised, that in the times of the Judges, when a great prophetic leader was so often not to be found in Israel, the apostasy was so great and so widespread? But all of these cases of disobedience, that have been demonstrated as actual facts in Israel’s history, are not able to eliminate the fact that there are many data to prove the existence of a central sanctuary already in the earliest history of the people, which fact

presupposes as a matter of course that there were also laws for the cults in existence (see EXODUS, III, 5). We must further not forget how the sacrifices of the sons of Samuel (1Sa 2:11), notwithstanding all their arbitrary conduct, presupposes such passages as Le 7:30-32; 10:15; Ex 29:31 f; Le 8:31; Nu 6:19 f; Le 7:23-32; or that the high priest, as described in Priestly Code, is already before the year 444 BC as well-known a character as he is after the exile (compare EZEKIEL, II, 2); or that the question of Hag 2:11 ff takes into consideration a code of cult- laws, and that the answer is given on the basis of Le 6:27; Nu 19:22.

(4) Indiscriminate Sacrificing.

To this must be added that the transgressions, to which the critics appeal in proof of their claims, and which they abuse for their own purposes, must in part be interpreted differently from what they are. In the case of sacrificing indiscriminately at any place whatever, and by any person whatever, we have in many cases to deal with extraordinary instances of theophanies (compare Jud 2:1 ff; 6:11 ff; 13:1), as these had been foreseen in Ex 20:24. Even the Book of Deuteronomy does not insist throughout (compare 16:21) that the sacrifices, must be made at one and the same place (compare also PC: Le 24:31; Jos 22). After the rejection of Shiloh, at which the central sanctuary had been deposited, as recorded in 1Sa 4, the cultural ordinances of Priestly Code, as we learn from Jer 7:11 ff; 26:6; Ps 78:59 ff, became more or less a dead letter. Even the Books of Chronicles, which throughout record history from the standpoint of the Priestly Code, at this period and down to the dedication of the temple take no offense at the cultural acts of a Solomon in contrast with their attitude toward the conduct of Uzziah (see 2Ch 1:6; 6:1-4; 7:1-7, as compared with 26:16 ff). In the same way the pious people in the Northern Kingdom, after it had, by Divine consent, been separated from the Southern, could not do otherwise than erect altars for themselves, since they could not participate in the worship of the calves in Bethel and Dan. Further, modern criticism overlooks the fact that what is regular and normal is much less liable to be reported in historical narrative than that which is irregular and abnormal.

(5) Deuteronomy and Priestly Code.

It is not possible at this place to enter into further details; we accordingly refer only to EXODUS, III and IV; DAY OF ATONEMENT, III, and especially EZEKIEL, II, 2, where the proof has been furnished that this prophet belongs to a later period than Priestly Code as far as Eze 40:1-48:35 (containing his picture of the future) in general is concerned, and as far as Eze 44:4 ff (where it is claimed that the prophet first introduces the distinction between priests and Levites) in particular is concerned. All the important problems that are connected with this matter, especially the difficulties which result from the Wellhausen hypothesis, when the questions as to the purpose, the form, the success and the origin of the priestly legislation come under consideration, are discussed in my book, Are the Critics Right? The result of this investigation is all the more noteworthy, as I was myself formerly an adherent of the Wellhausen school, but was forced to the conclusion that this hypothesis is untenable.

We have here yet to refer to the one fact that the relation of Deuteronomy (D) and the Priestly Code (P), as far as Leviticus in particular is concerned, justifies the scheme of P followed by D as the historical

order, while Wellhausen makes D older than P. De 10:8 f; 33:8 ff presuppose more detailed ordinances in reference to the priests such as those which have been given in P. The book of Deuteronomy further takes into account different kinds of sacrifices (compare 12:5 f, 11,13,17,26; 15:19-23; 17:1; 18:1,3, such as are described in Le 1 ff). The law in De 14 (ordinances with reference to what is clean) agrees almost word for word with Le 11, and is in such perfect harmony with the linguistic peculiarities of Priestly Code, that Le 11 must be regarded as the original, and not vice versa. De 24:8 f refers directly to the injunctions concerning leprosy, as we find these in Le 13 f, and the Deuteronomic passage is doubtless modeled after that of Lev. De 12:15,22; 15:22 cannot be understood at all, except in the light of Le 17:13. De 26:14 ff again expressly takes into account ideas that have been taken from Le 22:3 ff. As far as the laws dealing with the great feasts in De 16 are concerned, it is impossible to understand 16:9 without Le 23:15 ff, 10 f; and the designation "feast of tabernacles" in De 16:13 ff cannot even be understood without a reference to such a law as we find in Le 23:39 ff. The other passages to be discussed on this subject lead us to the following results.

2. Connection with Mosaic Period:

Even if the Book of Deuteronomy were the product of the 7th century BC, the facts that have been stated above would nevertheless disprove the claim of the Wellhausen hypothesis as to an exilic or post-exilic date for the Priestly Code. But if Deuteronomy, even in its essential and fundamental parts, merely, is Mosaic (compare Are the Critics Right? 1-55), then the Priestly Code which is still older than De must also belong to the Mosaic period.

(1) Priestly Code and Desert Conditions.

This conclusion is in this point confirmed still further by a series of facts. As Deuteronomy permits the firstborn to be ransomed (De 14:22), but the Priestly Code demands their consecration in natura (Le 27:26 f; compare Nu 18:15), the latter ordinances could be preferred and enforced only during the wandering in the desert, where the whole nation was in the neighborhood of the sanctuary. The fact that the ordinances dealing with the domestic celebration of the Passover in the private houses on the 14th of Nisan and the holy convocation on the 15th of Nisan at the sanctuary could be carried out only during the wanderings in the desert (compare Ex 12:3 ff, 6; Le 23:5; Nu 28:16; Le 27:6 ff; Nu 28:17 ff), and that this was changed in De 16:5 f to correspond to changed conditions, can be seen by reference to EXODUS, III, 3. Still more important is a third command in Le 17 in comparison with De 12. The commandment that every animal that is to be slain is to be brought to the central sanctuary can have a purpose only for the Mosaic period, and could not even have been invented at a later period. Because of the entrance of Israel into Canaan, the Book of Deuteronomy changes this ordinance in such a way that from this time on the killing of the animals is permitted at any place (12:13 ff, 20 ff). The different commands in reference to the carcasses of animals that have died and of those torn to pieces are all dependent on Le 17. In De 14:21, it was possible to forbid the use of such animals absolutely for Israel, because from now on, and in contrast to Le 17, the killing of sacrificial animals was permitted at any place (17:13 ff). In Ex 22:30 all use of such meat could be forbidden, because Le 17, with its command to bring all blood to the sanctuary, had not yet been given. Leviticus, now, on the other hand, forbids this use only to the priests (22:8), and sees in this use in the case of the other Israelites only a transitory

defilement (compare Le 17:15; 11:40); and in 7:24 forbids only the use of the fat, but not of the meat of these animals; for now, according to Le 17:1 ff, all the killing is a sacrifice which only those who are clean were permitted to eat and which could not be secured at all times (compare Hoffmann, op. cit., 23 f).

Our exposition of Le 17:1 ff is, however, in another respect also of the greatest significance, for in 17:4-6,8 f the tent of meeting is presupposed as existing; in 17:5,8 also different kinds of sacrifices, and in verse 6 the priesthood; so that at once further ordinances concerning the tent of meeting, the sacrificial code, the priesthood, such as we find in Ex 25$ ff; 35 ; Le 1:-7:38; Ex 29; Le 8; 9; 10:21 ff, were possible and necessary, and these very laws must probably originate in and date from the Mosaic period. This same conclusion is sustained by the following considerations. For what other source or time could be in harmony with such statements found very often in other parts of Leviticus also, as "into the camp" in 4:11 ff; 6:11; 13:46; 14:3,8 (unconscious contrast to later times); 14:33 ff, 40,41,45,53; 16:26-28; 24:10-23; or "into the desert," in 16:10,21 f. In 6:15,18; 6:6 (compare also 27:2 ff), the words "according to thy estimation" are addressed personally to Moses. In 6:20 a calculation is based on the day on which Aaron was consecrated to the priesthood, while 6:22 is the first that has general coloring. Such hints, which, as it were, have only been accidentally scattered in the body of the laws, and which point to the situation of the lawgiver and of his times, are of especial value for the argument in favor of the Mosaic origin of these laws. Further, we everywhere find that Aaron and his sons are as yet the only incumbents of the priestly office (compare 1:5,7,8,11; 2:3; 3:13; 6:9,14,16, etc.). All the laws claim to have been given through Moses or Aaron or through both at Mt. Sinai (see I above). And who, in later times, if it was the purpose to magnify the priesthood of Aaron, would have thought of inventing the fact that on the Day of Atonement and on other occasions it was necessary for Aaron to bring a burnt offering and a sin offering for himself (Le 16; 8-10; 6:19), or that Moses in his view of a certain cultural act had been mistaken (compare Le 10:16 ff)? The law concerning the Jubilee Year (Le 25) presupposes that each tribe is confined in its own district and is not intermingled with the other tribes, a presupposition which was no longer possible after the occupation of Canaan, and is accordingly thinkable only in the Mosaic times. And now let us remember that this fact, when we recall (see II, above) that the unity of the book was proved, is a ground for claiming that the entire book dates from the Mosaic period. As far as Leviticus at least is concerned, there is nothing found in the book that calls for a later date. Le 18:24 ff can be regarded as post-Mosaic only if we translate these verses thoughtlessly, as though the inhabitants of the country were here described as being expelled earlier. On the other hand, in 18:24, just as is the case with the parallel passage, 20:22 ff, the idea is, without any doubt, that Israel is not yet in the Holy Land. Accordingly the waw consecutives at this place are to be regarded not as indicating temporal but logical sequences. In the passage 18:27, we further find the archaic form ha’-el for ha’-elleh; compare in the Pentateuch Ge 19:8,25; 26:3,4; De 4:42; 7:22; 19:11. Just as little does Le 26 take us into the exilic period. Only dogmatical prejudices can take offense at prediction of the exile. Le 26 cannot be regarded as a "prophecy after the event," for the reason, too, that the restoration of the people by God’s pardon is here promised (compare 26:40 ff). And, too, the exile is not the only punishment with which Israel is threatened; and finally as far as Israel is concerned, by the side of the statements concerning their dwelling in one single country (26:34,38,41,44), it is also said that they are to be scattered among many nations and countries (compare 26:23,16,39).

(2) Unity and Construction Point to Mosaic Origin.

If to this we yet add the unity of the thought and of the external construction, looking at the whole matter, we do not see anything that would lead us to accept a post-Mosaic period for this book. Then, too, it is from the outset in itself only probable that Moses gave his people a body of cult-laws and did not leave this matter to chance. We need only think of the great role which among the oriental peoples was assigned to their religious cults. It is indeed nowhere said, in so many words, that Moses wrote even the laws of the Priestly Code. But the references made by Deuteronomy to the Priestly Code; the fact that Nu 33, which also is credited to Moses, is characterized by the style of Priestly Code; further, that the author of Deuteronomy could write in the style of P (compare De 14 with Le 11); and, per contra, that the author of Le 26 had the mastery of the style peculiar to Deuteronomy (compare De 28)—all this makes it probable that Moses even wrote these things himself; at any rate, no reasons can be cited against this view. Very interesting in connection with the question of the unity of the Pentateuch are the close connecting links between Le 18:24 ff; 20:22 , and JE. The question whether Moses in the composition of the book made use of his own notes or of those of others, cannot be decided; but this is an irrelevant matter. What the facts may be in reference to the development of other ordinances, which have taken different forms in the Books of the Covenant and in Priestly Code, or in Deuteronomy and in Priestly Code, and whether the existence of these differences in the cases of particular laws compels us to accept later additions, cannot be discussed at this place. Yet from the outset it is to be emphasized that already in the Mosaic period there could possibly have been reasons for changing some of these laws; especially was this so in the Book of Deuteronomy, just before the people entered the promised land (compare e.g. the laws concerning tithes, De 12:6 f, 17 ff; 14:22 ff; 26:12 ; Le 27:30 ff; Nu 18:20 ff, or the laws concerning contributions for sacrifices, De 18:3; Le 7:29 ff).

Then, too, the decision whether this development took place as early as the time of Moses or not is not to be made dependent on the possibility of our being able to explain the reasons for such changes. We lack both the daily practice in these cultural ordinances, as also the oral instruction which makes these ordinances intelligible. The manner in which in Le 1 ff the different kinds of sacrifices are introduced sounds as though these were already known to the people and were practiced by them, except in the case of sin and guilt offerings. This is further in harmony with earlier narratives, which already report concerning sacrifices. It is possible that in this way we can also explain a certain relationship between the Jewish sacrificial ritual and that of Babylon (compare Zimmern, Beitrage zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion). The ordinances in reference to the clean and the unclean may also have emanated from religious and ethical ideas which are older than Moses' times. In this matter the thought was decisive, that everything that was impure, everything that suggested death or decay or sin or displeasure to God, should be kept separated and apart from the religion of Yahweh. In all such cases it is not the newness of the laws but their adaptability to the character and spirit of the Yahweh-religion that is to be regarded as the decisive factor.

IV. The Significance.

1. Positive:

(1) The Law Contains God’s Will.

The law contains God’s will, although in transitory form. In the article EZEKIEL under II, 2, (3) we have referred to the fact that Leviticism is an important and necessary stage in the development of true religion, and that the entire Old Testament did not advance beyond this stage and was not intended to go beyond it. The leading prophets (Isa 40 , Jeremiah, Ezekiel), even in their visions of the future, cling to the temple, sacrifices, holy oblations, sacred seasons and persons. Christianity was the first to discard this external shell, after it had ripened the kernel that was concealed in this shell (compare worship in the spirit and in the truth, Joh 4:20-24). Down to this time, kernel and shell were inseparably united. This must not be forgotten, if we would appreciate the Book of Leviticus properly. It is true that this book to a large extent deals with laws and ordinances, to which we Christians should not and need not return (compare the voice from heaven to Peter, Ac 10:15, "What God hath cleansed, make not thou common," and Paul’s opposition to all work-righteousness that was based on compliance with these external institutions, e.g. in Romans, Galatians, Colossians, as also his independent attitude over against the Jewish law in those cases where it could not be taken into consideration as the way to salvation; compare Ac 21:17 ff; Ro 14:1 ff; 1Co 9:19 ff). But these laws and ordinances were something more than merely external matters, since they contained the highest religious thoughts. We surely should not forget from the outset that Le 19 contains also the word, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (19:18), a command which in 19:33 f is even made to cover the strangers too, and which by Jesus, next to the absolute love demanded for God, is designated as the chief commandment of the law (Mt 22:39); and when in 19:17 f the hatred of the brother and desire for revenge on him are forbidden, we already seem to breathe atmosphere of Christianity. The entire Le 19 is, in addition, as it were, a sermon on almost all of the commandments of the Decalogue, the abiding authority of which the Christian, after the example and interpretation of Jesus, will at once recognize. But as the Decalogue itself is found enclosed in the specifically Jewish national shell (compare Ex 20:2, exodus out of Egypt; 20:8, Sabbath commandment; 20:12, promise of the holy land; 20:17, slaves), so, too, this is the case in Le 19 (compare 19:3,6 ff, 20-22,23-25,29,30,33 f). But how little the specifically Levitical ordinances, in the narrower sense of the term, exclude the spiritual factor, and how closely they are interwoven with the deepest of thoughts, can be seen from Le 26, according to which all merely external sacrifices, into which formalism naturally the Levitical legal code could degenerate, do not protect from punishment, if the heart remains uncircumcised (26:30 f, 41).

Above all, there are four leading thoughts which are emphasized forcibly, particularly by the legal system of Priestly Code. In reality all times, all places, all property, all persons are sacred to God. But as it is impossible that this ideal should be realized in view of the imperfections and guilt of man, it was decided that certain particular seasons and places, gifts and persons should be separated from others, and that in these this sacredness should be realized as far as possible, and that these representatives should by their mere existence continually remind the people of God’s more comprehensive claims, and at the same time arouse and maintain the consciousness that their entire life was to be saturated by the thoughts of a holy God and His demands. From this point of view, none of the particular laws are worthless; and when they are once appreciated in this their central significance, we can understand that each law has its share in the eternal authority of the law (compare Mt 5:17 f). Paul, too, who absolutely rejects the law as a way to salvation expresses no doubt that the law really contains the will of God (Ro 8:3 f); and he

declares that it was the purpose of the sending of Jesus, that the demands made upon us by the law should be fulfilled; and in Ro 13:10 he tells us that love is the fulfillment of the law (compare 13:8); and according to Ro 7:12, it is certain that the law is holy and the commandment is holy, righteous and good.

(2) The Law Prepares for the Understanding of Christianity.

But the ceremonial law, too, contains not only the demands of God's will. It prepares also for the understanding of the work, the person and the mission of Jesus. In Ex 25:8; 29:45 f; 40:34 ff the indwelling of God in the tent of meeting is declared, which prophesied the incarnation of God in Christ Jesus (Joh 1:14); and then the indwelling of God through the Holy Spirit in the Christian congregation (1Pe 2:5; Eph 4:12) and in the individual (1Co 3:16; 6:19; 2Co 6:16; Joh 14:23). Through the sacrificial system in Le 1-7, and the ordinances of the Day of Atonement (Le 16), we are enabled to understand the character of sin, of grace and of the forgiveness of sin (compare ATONEMENT, DAY OF, sec. II). Let us remember to what extent Jesus and Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the other New Testament writings operate with Old Testament thoughts, particularly with those of Le (priest-hood, sacrifices, atonement, Passover, signification of blood, etc.), and Paul correctly says that the righteousness of God was prophesied, not only by the prophets, but also by the law (Ro 3:21).

(3) The Law as a Tutor unto Christ.

Finally, the ceremonial law too has the purpose to protect Israel from the errors of the heathen, a thought that is especially emphasized in the Law of Holiness (compare Le 18:3,14 ff; 19:26 ff; 20:2 ff, 22 ff; 26:1) and which is in harmony with the elementary stage of Israel's education in the Old Testament, when the people still stood in need of the "tutor .... unto Christ" (Ga 3:23 f; 4:1). This already leads us over to the negative side, which Paul particularly emphasizes.

2. Negative:

The law is in itself holy, and the commandment is holy and righteous and good (Ro 7:12), but it has lost its power because the flesh of man is sinful (compare Ro 8:3); and thus it happens that the law is the occasion for sin and leads to a knowledge of sin and to an increase of sin (compare Ro 3:20; 4:15; 5:20; 7:13); and this shall be brought about according to the purposes of God in order that in upright hearts the desire for forgiveness should arise. It is true that nothing was so well adapted as were the details of the law, to bring to consciousness in the untutored mind that in which man yet came short of the Divine commands. And as far as the removal of the guilt was concerned, nothing was needed except the reference to this in order to make men feel their imperfections (compare Heb 7-10). God merely out of grace was for the time being contented with the blood of goats and of calves as a means for atonement; He was already counting on the forgiveness in Christ (Ro 3:25). All the sacrifices in Le 1-7, e.g., did not make the ritual of the Day of Atonement superfluous (Le 16); and in this case the very man who brought the sacrifice was also a sinful creature who must first secure the forgiveness of God for himself. Only Jesus, at once the perfect priest and the perfect sacrifice, has achieved the perfect redemption. It accordingly remains a fact that the righteousness which avails before God can be secured only through

faith in Jesus Christ, and not through the deeds of the law (Romans and Galatians).

The law with its incomplete atonement and with its arousing of the consciousness of sin drives man to Jesus; and this is its negative significance. Jesus, however, who Himself has fulfilled the demands of the law, gives us through His spirit the power, that the law with its demands (1, (1) above) may no longer stand threateningly over against us, but is now written in our hearts. In this way the Old Testament law is fulfilled in its transitory form, and at the same time becomes superfluous, after its eternal contents have been recognized, maintained and surpassed.

LITERATURE.

Commentaries by Ryssel, Lange, Keil, Strack, Baentsch, Bertholet; especially for the Law of Holiness see Horst, Le 17:1-26:46 and Ezk; Wurster, Zeitschrift fur alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1884, 112 ff; Baentsch, Das Heiligkeitsgesetz; Klostermann, Der Pentateuch, 368 ff; Delitzsch, Zeitschrift fur kirch. Wissenschaft und Leben, 1880, 617 ff; Intros to the Old Testament by Baudissin, Strack, Kuenen, Konig, Cornill, Driver, Sellin; Archaeology, by Benzinger, Nowack; History of Israel, by Kohler, Konig, Kittel, Oettli, Klostermann, Stade, Wellhausen; for kindred laws in Babylonia, compare Zimmern, Beitrage zur Kenntnis der babyl. Religion; against the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, Moller, Are the Critics Right? (ibid., "Literature"), and article EZEKIEL in this Encyclopedia; Orr, Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament; Wiener, Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, Wiener, Origin of the Pentateuch; Hoffmann, Die wichtigsten Instanzen gegen die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese; Kegel, Wilh. Vatke und die Graf-Wellhausensche Hypothese.

Wilhelm Moller

LEVY

lev’-i.

See WAR.

LEWD; LEWDNESS

lud, lud’-nes (zimmah, mezimmah, nabhluth; poneros, rhadiourgema):

1. In the Old Testament:

There are three Hebrew words translated "lewd," "lewdness":

(1) Zimmah, meaning a "plan," a "purpose," so translated several times and then shading off into "evil plan"; translated also "heinous crime," "wicked purpose or device." It is the most frequent word for

"lewdness": Eze 16:27, "lewd way"; found in Jud 20:6; Eze 16:27,43,58; 22:9,11; 23:21,27,29,35,44-48,49; 24:13; Ho 6:9.

(2) Mezimmah means a "plan," generally "(evil) machination"; used only in Jer 11:15, "lewdness."

(3) Nabhluth, meaning "disgrace" in reference to females. Found only in Ho 2:10; the American Revised Version margin "shame."

2. In the New Testament:

The word translated "lewd," "lewdness" in the King James Version occurs only twice in the New Testament, and in each instance is more correctly translated in the Revised Version (British and American) by another word:

(1) Poneros, found in Ac 17:5, translated in the American Standard Revised Version "vile." The Greek word elsewhere is translated "bad," "evil," "grievous," "harmful," "malicious," "wicked." the King James Version "lewd" gives the wrong impression. The idea of unchastity is not present in the text or context.

(2) Rhadiourgema likewise occurs only once, namely, Ac 18:14, and is correctly translated in the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version "wicked villany." The thought of impurity or lewdness is foreign to the meaning in this connection.

William Edward Raffety

LIBANUS

lib’-a-nus.

See LEBANON.

LIBATION

li-ba’-shun.

See SACRIFICE.

LIBERAL; LIBERALITY; LIBERALLY

lib’-er-al, lib-er-al’-i-ti, lib’-er-al-i: The different forms of the word all refer to one who is generous, bountiful, willing and ready to give and to help. Both the Hebrew words of the Old Testament and the Greek words of the New Testament translated into the English word "liberal" have a deeper and nobler

meaning than is generally conveyed by the English word. In Pr 11:25, the liberal soul (nephesh berakhah) means a soul that carries a blessing. In Isa 32:5, the American Standard Revised Version has "bountiful" where the King James Version has "liberal," and in Isa 32:8 "noble" takes the place of "liberal" (nadhibh). The principal Greek words are haplotes literally, "simplicity," "sincerity," and charis, "grace," "favor." In 1Co 16:3, "bounty" substitutes "liberality." It is well to bear in mind that a Biblical liberality can spring only out of a noble soul, and is Godlike in its genesis and spirit.

G. H. Gerberding

LIBERTINES

lib’-er-tinz, li-bur’-tinz (Libertinoi): These were among Stephen’s opponents: "There arose certain of them that were of the synagogue called (the synagogue) of the Libertines, and of the Cyrenians, and of the Alexandrians, and of them of Cilicia and Asia, disputing with Stephen" (Ac 6:9).have a deeper and nobler meaning than is generally conveyed by the English word. In Pr 11:25, the liberal soul (nephesh berakhah) means a soul that carries a blessing. In Isa 32:5, the American Standard Revised Version has "bountiful" where the King James Version has "liberal," and in Isa 32:8 "noble" takes the place of "liberal" (nadhibh). The principal Greek words are haplotes literally, "simplicity," "sincerity," and charis, "grace," "favor." In 1Co 16:3, "bounty" substitutes "liberality." It is well to bear in mind that a Biblical liberality can spring only out of a noble soul, and is Godlike in its genesis and spirit.

1. "Synagogue of the Libertines":

How many synagogues are denoted? The answer may aid in the interpretation of "Libertines":

(1) The words may be read as denoting one synagogue (Calvin). However

(a) the number of worshippers would be extremely large,

(b) the bond of union is not obvious,

(c) rabbinic tradition speaks of 480 synagogues in Jerusalem.

(2) The double ton ("of them") seems to denote two parties, the one consisting "of them that were of the synagogue called (the synagogue) of Libertines and Cyrenians and Alexandrians," the other "of them of Cilicia and Asia", (Winer, Wendt, Holtzmann). But the second ton is dependent on synagogue. "As Cyrenians and Alexandrians both belong to towns .... a change of designation would be necessary when the Jews of whole provinces came to be mentioned: this being the case, the article could not but be repeated, without any reference to the ton before" (Alford).

(3) There were three synagogues:

(a) that of the Libertines,

(b) that of the Cyrenians and Alexandrians and

(c) that "of them of Cilicia and Asia" (Alford). There is no grammatical reason for this division, but it is based on an interpretation of "Libertines." There were "Libertines," Africans and Asiatics.

(4) Each party had a separate synagogue (Schurer, Hausrath). The number of worshippers, their different origin and connections, and the number of synagogues in Jerusalem give weight to this view.

2. Interpretation of "Libertines":

(1) They are "freedmen," liberated slaves or their descendants. Against this it is held that the Greek equivalent (apeleutheroi) would have been used in this case. However, the Roman designation would be common all over the empire. In what sense were they "freedmen"? Various answers are given:

(a) they were freedmen from Jewish servitude (Lightfoot);

(b) they were Italian freedmen who had become proselytes;

(c) they were "the freedmen of the Romans" (Chrysostom), the descendants of Jewish freedmen at Rome who had been expelled by Tiberius. In 63 BC Pompey had taken prisoners of war to Rome. These, being liberated by those who had acquired them as slaves, formed a colony on the banks of the Tiber (Philo, Legat. ad Caium). Tacitus relates that the senate decreed (19 AD) that a number of Jewish Libertines should be transported to Sardinia, and that the rest should leave Italy, unless they renounced, before a certain day, their profane customs (Ann. ii, 85; see also Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iii, 5). Many would naturally seek refuge in Jerusalem and build there a synagogue.

(2) They are an African community. There were two synagogues, one of which was Asiatic. In the other were men from two African towns (Cyrene and Alexandria), therefore the Libertines must have been African also, all forming an African synagogue. Various explanations are given:

(a) They were inhabitants of Libertum, a town in Africa proper: an "Episcopus Ecclesiae Catholicae Libertinensis" sat in the Synod of Carthage (411 AD).

(b) Some emend the text; Wetstein and Blass, following the Armenian VS, conjecture Libustinon, "of the Libystines." Schulthess reads for "Libertines and Cyrenians" (Libertinon kai Kurenaion) "Libyans, those about Cyrene" (Libuon ton kata Kurenen) (compare Ac 2:10).

These emendations are conjectural; the manuscripts read "Libertines." It seems, therefore, that 2, (1) (c) above is the correct interpretation.

S. F. Hunter

LIBERTY

lib’-er-ti (deror, rachabh; eleutheria): The opposite of servitude or bondage, hence, applicable to captives or slaves set free from oppression (thus deror, Le 25:10; Isa 61:1, etc.). Morally, the power which enslaves is sin (Joh 8:34), and liberty consists, not simply in external freedom, or in possession of the formal power of choice, but in deliverance from the darkening of the mind, the tyranny of sinful lusts and the enthrallment of the will, induced by a morally corrupt state. In a positive respect, it consists in the possession of holiness, with the will and ability to do what is right and good. Such liberty is possible only in a renewed condition of soul, and cannot exist apart from godliness. Even under the Old Testament godly men could boast of a measure of such liberty (Ps 119:45, rachabh, "room," "breadth"), but it is the gospel of Christ which bestows it in its fullness, in giving a full and clear knowledge of God, discovering the way of forgiveness, supplying the highest motives to holiness and giving the Holy Spirit to destroy the power of sin and to quicken to righteousness. In implanting a new life in the soul, the gospel lifts the believer out of the sphere of external law, and gives him a sense of freedom in his new filial relation to God. Hence, the New Testament expressions about "the glorious liberty" of God’s children (Ro 8:21 the King James Version; compare Ga 2:4; 5:13, etc.), about liberty as resulting from the possession of the Spirit (2Co 3:17), about "the perfect law of liberty" (Jas 1:25). The instrument through which this liberty is imparted is "the truth" (Joh 8:32). Christians are earnestly warned not to presume upon, or abuse their liberty in Christ (Ga 5:13; 1Pe 2:16).

James Orr

LIBNAH

lib’-na (libhnah "whiteness," "transparency," "pavement" (compare Ex 24:10 where libhnath, is translated "paved work" or a "compact foundation"); Lebna):

(1) A desert camp of the Israelites between Rimmon-perez and Rissah (Nu 33:20,21). Probably the same as Laban (De 1:1).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

(2) A town in the Shephelah of Judah (Jos 15:42). "Joshua passed from Makkedah, and all Israel with him, unto Libnah, and fought against Libnah: and Yahweh delivered it also, and the king thereof, into the hand of Israel. .... And Joshua passed from Libnah, and all Israel with him, unto Lachish, and encamped against it, and fought against it" (Jos 10:29-31; 12:15). It was one of the cities given to the "children of Aaron" (Jos 21:13; 1Ch 6:57). In the reign of Joram, Libnah joined the Edomites in a revolt against the king of Judah (2Ki 8:22; 2Ch 21:10). In the reign of Hezekiah, Libnah was besieged by Sennacherib (2Ki 19:8; Isa 37:8). The wife of King Josiah was "Hamutal the daughter of Jeremiah of

Libnah," she was the mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah (2Ki 23:31; 24:18; Jer 52:1).

The site of this important stronghold remains unknown. In the Eusebius, Onomasticon it is described, under the name Lobana or Lobna, as near Eleutheropolis (Beit Jebrin). All the indications point to a site in the Southwest of the Shephelah, not very far from Lachish. The Palestine Exploration Fund surveyors suggested (PEF, III, 259) the commanding site ‘Arak el Menshiyeh, or rather the white chalky mound 250 ft. high to the North of this village, and Stanley proposed Tell es Cafi. (Both these identifications are due to the interpretation of Libnah as meaning "whiteness.") In the PEFS (1897, Sh XX) Conder suggests a ruin called el Benawy, 10 miles Southeast of Lachish.

E. W. G. Masterman

LIBNI

lib’-ni (libhni):

(1) Son of Gershon (Ex 6:17; Nu 3:18; 1Ch 6:17,20). Families who traced their descent from Libni are called Libnites (Nu 3:21; 26:58).

(2) A son of Merari (1Ch 6:29).

See LADAN.

LIBNITES

lib’-nits (ha-libhni).

See LIBNI.

LIBRARIES

li’-bra-riz, li’-brer-iz:

1. The Bible a Library

2. Mythological and Apocryphal Libraries

3. Libraries for the Dead

4. Memory Libraries

5. Prehistoric and Primitive Libraries

6. Mesopotamian Period

7. Patriarchal Period

8. Egyptian Period

9. The Exodus

10. Palestine at the Conquest

11. Period of the Judges

12. Saul to the Maccabees

13. New Testament Times

14. Bookcases and Buildings

LITERATURE

A library is a book or books kept for use, not for sale. A one-book library is just as much a library as a one-cell animal is animal. The earliest libraries, like the earliest plants and animals, were very simple, consisting of a few books or perhaps only a single tablet or manuscript. An archive is a library of official documents not in active use; a registry, a library of going documents.

1. The Bible a Library:

The Bible is itself a library. During the Middle Ages it was commonly called, first, "The Divine Library," and then, "The Library" (Bibliotheca), in the same exclusive sense as it is now known as "The Book" (Biblia as Latin singular). Even the word "Bible" itself is historically "Library" rather than "Book" (for it was originally the neuter plural Biblia, "The Books"; compare Da 9:2). The Bible is also a library in that it is an organized collection of books rather than a single work.

This fact that the Bible is itself a library is increasingly mentioned of late, especially in Old Testament studies (Kent, Narratives of the Beginnings of Hebrew History, 1, "The Old Testament as a Library"; Delitzsch, Babel and Bible, 4, "the Old Testament, that small library of books of the most multifarious kind"). Its profound bearing on the theory of the composition and inspiration of the Bible (compare BOOK) has given the fact new significance and makes an understanding of the nature of a library one of the best tools for the interpretation of the Bible in the face of modern problems. While it is not possible

to elaborate this within these limits, it may be said briefly that the logical end of the application of the doctrine of evolution to books and libraries is that the Bible is, like man, the result of natural selection, and is as unique among books as man among the animals. And, whatever may be true of men, in the case of books the formation of a book-library by natural selection tends toward the elimination of error. The more numerous the individuals and the longer the period, the greater the reduction of error, so that the logical inference as to the Bible is that on purely natural grounds it may be, or is, the nearest approximation to inerrancy among books, because of its history as a library. This does not quite lead to the position that the Bible is as unique among books as Jesus Christ among men, but under the doctrine of a creative Providence, it does imply what may be called real superhuman authorship and authority.

2. Mythological and Apocryphal Libraries:

Somewhat apart from historical libraries, but closely connected with Bible study, are the alleged superhuman libraries, libraries of, or written by, the gods, libraries for the dead and apocryphal libraries. The Vedas are said to have existed as a collection even before the Creator created Himself (Manu 1 21). All religions have their book-gods—Thoth and Seshait, Apollo, Hermes, Minerva, Ida, Bridget, Soma, Brahma, Odin, Kvasir, Ygdrasil and many others. To the ancient Babylonians the whole firmament was a library of "celestial tablets." The mythological ideas often have important bearing on Biblical doctrines, e.g. the Creation, the Word, the Tree of Life, the Book of Life, the Holy Spirit. Apocryphal libraries include the library which Yahweh is alleged to have formed on the 7th day of creation on a mount East of the Garden of Eden, and other libraries ascribed to Enoch, Noah and Seth. See for this the Old Testament pseudepigrapha.

3. Libraries for the Dead:

Another class of collections of real books, written or gathered for mythological purposes, is what may be called libraries for the dead. It is well known that in most countries of antiquity, at one time or another, and among primitive people like the American Indians, in modern times, it has been the custom to bury with the dead the things which friends thought would be useful in the Elysian fields or happy hunting grounds, or on the way thither—the bow and horse of the warrior, the ushabti servants, children’s playthings, the models of food objects, and so on. This same motive led also to the burying of books with the dead. For long periods in the history of Egypt every Egyptian of any position was buried with one or more books. These books were not his chance possessions, buried with him as, in some burials, all a man’s personal belongings are, but books selected for their usefulness to him after death. For the most part these were of the nature of guidebooks to the way to the heavenly world, magic formulas for the opening of doors, instruction as to the right method of progress toward, or introduction into, paradise, etc. These books were afterward gathered together and form what is now known as "the Book of the Dead" and other such books.

4. Memory Libraries:

In modern times the actor or professional story-teller often has in memory a collection of remembered

books which is in effect a library. Among primitive peoples the medicine-man was literally a library of tribal traditions. The priests of India and the minstrels of Greece or of the Middle Ages often had a large repertory. By the prevailing theory of the origin of the books of the Old Testament such memory traditions, transmitted orally, were the chief source of the Hexateuch, but in view of what is now known of the library situation of the time, this must be doubted.

5. Prehistoric and Primitive Libraries:

In general terms it may be said that when man began not only to make but to keep records, libraries began. Even a memorial stone contains the germ of a mnemonic library. The primitive medicine-man's collection of notched message sticks, tallies, quipus or wampum belts is a great advance in complexity on these, and the simplest collection of picture narratives of Hottentot or American Indian, an advance on this. A combination of pictures with signs is still another forward step, and this step is already to be found in the Pyrenean caves of the Stone Age (see WRITING). Most of these earliest libraries were kept at the sanctuary. The gathering together of books in libraries had its origin in the ideas of

(1) preservation,

(2) gathering together like books in order to join together their contents, and

(3) circulation—the great modern expansion of the idea.

The owner of flocks and herds gathers together his lists of cattle or other possessions, his receipts for purchases and record of sales, whether these are recorded on the walls of his cave or on wooden tallies or on knotted cords or on clay tablets gathered in little jars and buried under the floor of his house. Large owners and sovereigns and the temples of Egypt and Assyria gathered large stores of these archival records and with them records of tribute, oracles, etc. As early as 2700 BC we have the account of King Dedkere Isesi, his archival library and his librarian Senezemib. The annals of Thutmose III were preserved in the palace library as well as cut in selections on the walls of the temple. A few years later, and we know that the archival records were kept in a special room in the palace at Amarna—and many of the records themselves were found there. All this was before the year 1300.

6. Mesopotamian Period:

Bible history through Genesis 10 covers the whole civilized world, but its main line up to about 2000 BC is almost wholly Mesopotamian. Up to the time of Abram's migration from Haran, the history of Biblical libraries and the history of Babylonian and Sumerian libraries are one. Most of the cities mentioned in this period are now known to have had collections of books in those days. At the time when Abram left Haran there were hundreds of collections of written documents in scores of different geographical localities and containing millions of tablets.

7. Patriarchal Period:

From Abram’s emigration out of Haran to Jacob’s emigration to Egypt was, on the face of Biblical data, mainly a time of wandering in Palestine, but this was not wholly nomad nor wholly Palestinian. Whether there were libraries in Palestine at this time or not, the Patriarchs were all in close personal contact with the library lands of Babylonia and Egypt. Abram himself was familiar with both Mesopotamia and Egypt. His son Ishmael married an Egyptian, his son Isaac a Mesopotamian. His grandson Jacob married two wives from between the rivers, and had himself 20 years’ residence in the region. While it does not appear that Isaac lived at any time either in Syria or in Egypt, during most of his life all the members of his nearest family, father, mother, wife, sons’ wives, had had from one to three score years’ life in the mother-country. Whether there were public records in this region at this time is another matter, but it would seem that the whole region during the whole period was under the influence of the Babylonian civilization. It was freely traversed by trading caravans, and the Hittite and Mesopotamian records extend at least a little back into this period.

8. Egyptian Period:

The Egyptian period of Bible history begins with the immigration of Jacob and his sons, but fringes back to the visit of Abram (Ge 12:10-20), if not to Mizraim of Ge 10:6. On the other hand, it ends properly with the exodus, but fringes forward through frequent points of contact to the flight of the Virgin and Pentecost. Whether the sojourn was 430 or 215 years, or less, it was a long residence at a time when libraries were very flourishing in Egypt. Already at the time of Abram’s visit, collections of books, not only of official accounts, but of religious texts, medical texts, annals, and the like, had been common in Egypt for nearly 1,000 years, and had perhaps existed for 1,000 years or more before that.

Under the older of the modern datings of the exodus, the period of the sojourn included the times of Thothmes III (Thutmose), and in this reign there are peculiarly interesting records, not only of the existence of temple and palace libraries, but of the nature of their contents. The official recorder of Thothmes III, accompanying him on his campaign in Syria and Palestine, set down each day the events of the day, while he or others also made lists of tribute, spoils, commissary matters, etc. These daily records were deposited in the palace library, as it appears, but a narrative compiled from these and written on a leather roll was deposited in the temple library, and from this roll in turn an abstract was engraved on the walls of the temple, where it remains to this day. This probably gives the library situation of the time in a nutshell:

(1) the simple saving of utilitarian documents, often on papyrus or wood tablets,

(2) the gathering of books written for information on more durable material,

(3) preserving choice books for posterity by a local series of inscriptions.

The rolls must have been kept in chests or small boxes, like the box containing the medical papyri of King Neferikere some 1,300 years before, or the "many boxes" at Edfu long after. Many pictures of

these book-chests or bookcases are found in the monuments (Birt, Buchrolle, 12, 15 ff).

Again, the palace library of King Akhnaton (circa 1360 BC) at Amarna, which contained collections of the royal foreign correspondence on clay tablets, has been excavated. Its bricks bear the inscription, "Place of the records of the palace of the king," and some hundreds of tablets from this spot have been recovered.

At the time of the exodus there were thus probably libraries in all palaces, temples and record offices, although the temple libraries were by no means confined to sacred writings or the palace to secular. There were also at least archives, or registers, in the royal treasury and in all public departments. Schools for scribes were, it would seem, held in the palace, temple and treasury libraries. There were, therefore, apparently, at this time millions of documents or books, in hundreds of organized collections, which could be called archives or libraries.

9. The Exodus:

Supposing any exodus at all, Moses and Aaron and all the Hebrew "officers" ("scribes" or writers) under the Egyptian taskmasters (Ex 5:6,10,14,15,19), brought up as they were in the scribal schools, were of course quite familiar with the Egyptian ways of keeping their books. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the first and chief provision which Moses made for the Tabernacle was a book-chest for the preservation of the sacred directions given by Yahweh. It makes little difference whether the account is taken in its final form, divided horizontally into Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua, or divided perpendicularly into J, E, D, the Priestly Code (P), the fact of the ark and enough of its details are given even in the very oldest sources to show that the authors understood the ark to be a glorified book-chest in or near which were kept written documents: the tables of stone, the inscribed rod, all the testimony given from the mercy-seat which formed its lid, and perhaps the Book of Deuteronomy. The ark is in fact much the size and shape of a portable bookcase, and the Septuagint translation renders the word by the ordinary technical Greek word for the book-chest (kibotos; compare Birt, op. cit., 248-49). It appears also to have been the later Hebrew word for book-chest (compare Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 107 ff). At the exodus, whenever that may have been, Moses is alleged to have made the ark the official library, and in it apparently he is thought to have kept the oracles as uttered from time to time and the record of his travels from day to day (as well as the tables of stone), precisely as the scribe of Thutmose recorded his Syrian campaigns from day to day. This record (if it was a record) was in all likelihood on a leather roll, since this became the traditional form of books among the Hebrews, and this too was like the annals of Thutmose. When the tribes separated to North and South, the books may have been either separated or copied, and doubtless they suffered much wear and tear from the harsh times until we find De turning up again in a temple library (2Ki 22:8 ff; 2Ch 34:14).

The evidence from Egyptian Babylonian, Mitannian, Amorite and Hittite documents shows the existence of official chanceries and by implication of archives throughout the whole region of Syria and Palestine at the time when the "Hebrew" invasion began (Winckler, Tell el-Amarna Tablets).

10. Palestine at the Conquest:

The Tell el-Amarna Letters and the tablets from the Hittite archives at Boghaz-keui (Winckler, Deutsche Orientalische Gesellschaft Mitt., 1907, number 35) include actual letters from the princes, elders and governors of dozens of places, scattered all over this region from Egypt to the land of the Hittites and the Mitannians. These places include among others Jerusalem, Damascus, Tyre, Sidon, Acco, Ashkelon, Gaza, Lachish, Keilah and Aijalon.

Remains of two of such archival libraries have been dug up—one at Lachish and one at Taanach near Megiddo, both dating back to the 14th century BC.

Whether there were temple libraries as well does not appear so clearly from external evidence but may probably be inferred from the names, Debir and (perhaps) Nebo, as well as from the well-known fact that each of the many city-lands must have had its center of worship. When it was thought that writing did not exist to any extent in Palestine before the time of David, it was the fashion to account for the name of the city of "Kirjath Sepher," the "City of Books," by curious tours de force of conjectural emendation (Sephur for Sepher, Tabor for Debir), but with the recent progress of excavation the possibility of the name has been fully established and the insight of Sayce probably justified.

11. Period of the Judges:

That the situation at the Conquest continued also during the period of the Judges appears from sundry considerations:

(1) The fact that all the surrounding nations, Moabites, Edomites, Amorites, Hittites, Mitannians, etc., were literate nations with public archives.

(2) The high state of organization under David requires an evolutionary background.

(3) Even the extreme (and quite untenable) theory that the Hebrews were illiterate wild Arab nomads and remained so for a long time would actually demonstrate the matter, for, as has been pertinently observed (Sellin, Einl, 7), many at least of the Canaanite cities were not destroyed or even occupied for a long time, but were surrounded by the Hebrews, and finally occupied and assimilated. It follows, therefore, that the archival system continued, and, under this theory, for a long time, until the Hebrews absorbed the culture of their neighbors—and, by inference, libraries with the rest.

(4) Taking the evidence of the documents as they stand, the matter is simple enough; various works were kept in or near the ark. Joshua added to these at least the report of a boundary commission (Jos 18:9,10) which was brought to the sanctuary, and Samuel "laid up" the book that he wrote "before Yahweh," i.e. at the ark. Moreover, the Books of Jasher, the Wars of Yahweh, etc., imply a literature which in turn implies libraries. Whenever or however composed, there is no good reason to distrust their historical existence.

(5) Even on the extreme critical hypothesis, "Most of the stories found in the first 8 books of the Old Testament originated before or during the age of song and story (circa 1250-1050)" (Kent, Beginnings, 17).

(6) To this may also be added, with all reservations, the mysterious metal ephod which appears only in this period. The ephod seems to have been either

(a) a case (BDB, 66) or

(b) an instrument for consulting an oracle (BDB, 65). The linen ephod had a pouch for the Urim and Thummim. The metal ephod seems to be distinguished from the image and may have contained the written oracular instructions (torah?) as well as the oracular instruments.

(7) The Kenite scribes of Jabez (1Ch 2:55); the simple fact that a chance captive from Succoth could write out a list of names and some one at least of the rudest 300 survivals of Gideon's 32,000 primitive warriors in those bloody frontier times could read it, the reference to the staff of the muster-master, marshal or scribe, and the "governors" (inscribers), in Deborah's Song, point in the same direction.

While, therefore, the times were doubtless wild, the political unity very slight, and the unity of worship even less, there is evidence that there were both political and religious libraries throughout the period.

12. Saul to the Maccabees:

Beginning with the monarchy, the library situation among the Israelites appears more and more clearly to correspond with that of the surrounding nations. The first act the recorded after the choice and proclamation of Saul as king was the writing of a constitution by Samuel and the depositing of this in the sacred archives (1Sa 10:25). This document Septuagint biblion) was perhaps one of the documents ("words") of Samuel whose words (1Ch 29:29, history, chronicles, acts, book, etc.) seem to have been possibly a register kept by him, perhaps from the time that he succeeded Eli, as later the high-priestly register (day-book) of Johannes Maccabeus was certainly kept from the beginning of his high-priesthood (1 Macc 16:24).

Whether these "words" of Samuel were equivalent to the technical register or "book of the words of days" or not, such registers were undoubtedly kept from the time of David on, and there is nothing so illuminating as to the actual library conditions of the times as the so-called chronicles, histories or acts—the registers, journals or archives of the time. The roll-register seems to be called in full "the book of the words of days," or with explanatory fullness "book of the records of the words of days," but this appears to be an evolution from "words of days" or even "words," and these forms as well as the abbreviations "book of days" and "book" are used of the same technical work, which is the engrossing in chronological book-form of any series of individual documents—all the documents of a record-office, general or local. The name is used also of histories written up on the basis of these register-books (the Books of

Chronicles are in Hebrew, "words of days") but not themselves records. These charter-books, of course, so far as they go, mirror the contents of the archives which they transcribe, and the key to the public-library history of the period, both sacred and royal, as regards contents, at least, is to be found in them, while in turn the key to the understanding of this technical book-form itself lies in the understanding of the "word" as a technical book-form.

The "word" in Hebrew is used of books, speeches, sayings, oracles, edicts, reports, formal opinions, agreements, indictments, judicial decisions, stories, records, regulations, sections of a discourse, lines of poetry, whole poems, etc., as well as acts, deeds, "matters," "affairs," events and words in the narrowest sense. It is thus very exactly, as well as literally, translated in the Septuagint by logos, which as a technical book-term (Birt, Antikes Buchwesen, 28, 29) means any distinct composition, long or short, whether a law, an epigram, or a whole complex work. The best English equivalent for this "work-complete-in-itself," in the case of public records, is "document," and in the case of literary matters, it is "work or writing." The "words" of Samuel or David thus are his "acts" or "deeds" in the sense, not of doings, but of the individual documentary records of those doings quite in the modern sense of the "acts and proceedings" of a convention, or the "deeds" to property.

In the plural, dibhre and logoi or logia alike mean a collection of documents, works or writings, i.e. "a library." Sometimes this is used in the sense of archives or library, at other times as a book containing these collected works.

These collected documents in register-form constituted apparently a continuous series until the time when the Book of Chronicles was written and were extant at that time: the "words" of Samuel, "chronicles" and "last words" of David (1Ch 23:27; 27:24), the "book of the words (acts) of Solomon" (1Ki 11:41), the book of the words of days of the kings of Judah, and the book of the words of days of the kings of Israel—the kingdoms after division each having naturally its own records.

The general situation during the period as to archival matters is pretty well summarized by Moore in the EB. From the time of Solomon, and more doubtfully from the time of David, he recognizes that "records were doubtless kept in the palace," and that "the temples also doubtless had their records," while there may have been also local records of cities and towns. These records contained probably chief events, treaties, edicts, etc.—probably brief annals "never wrought into narrative memoirs." The temple records contained annals of succession, repairs, changes, etc. (EB, II, 2021-28). The records were, however, probably not brief, but contained treaties, etc., verbatim in full. To this should moreover be added the significant fact that these archives contained not only business records but also various works of a more or less literary character. Those mentioned include letters, prophecies, prayers, and even poems and Wisdom literature. The "words" of the kings of Israel contained prayers, visions and other matter not usually counted archival. The "acts" (words) of Solomon also contained literary or quasi-literary material. According to Josephus the archives of Tyre contained similar material and this was also true of the Amarna archives (circa 1380 BC) and those at Boghazkeui, as well as of the palace archives of Nineveh and the great temple archives of Nippur and Abu Habeh (Sippara). So, too, in Egypt the palace archives of King Neferikere contained medical works and those of Rameses III, at least, magical works, while the temple archives in the time of Thutmose III (Breasted, Ancient Records) contained military

annals, and those of Denderah certainly many works of a non-registerial character. The temples of early Greece also contained literary works and secular laws as well as temple archives proper.

In short, the palace collections of Israel were no exception to the general rule of antiquity in containing, besides palace archives proper, more or less of religious archives and literary works, while the temple collections contained more or less political records and literary works.

This record system in Israel and Judah, as appears from the Old Testament itself, was the system of Persia in Old Testament times. It was the system of the Jews in Maccabean times, of Egypt during this whole period and for centuries before and after, and of Northern Syria likewise at about this time (Zakar-Baal, of Gebal, circa 1113 BC). The books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, whenever written, reveal the same system, Exodus to Numbers being in the form of a register, and De represented as an abstract prepared for engraving on stone, a use which Joshua is said to have made of it. We have, therefore, the same system existing before and after and on all sides geographically.

All this neighboring practice points to a system of

(1) archival collections,

(2) contemporary book registers,

(3) contemporary publication by inscription, and, in the light of these, the Old Testament method, from the time of David at least, becomes clear, certainly as to archival collections and registers and hardly less so as to the setting-up of inscriptions in permanent material. Even if D is not earlier than 621 BC, it assumes public inscription long before that time, quite comparable in extent to the inscriptions of Thutmose III or King Mesha of Moab, and, although few long inscriptions have been recovered thus far, there is at least the Siloam inscription (compare also Isa 30:8; Job 19:23,24; Isa 8:1; Jer 17:1; also the Decalogue). Each one of these three elements (even the collection of inscriptions in the temple) was, it must be remembered, called in antiquity a "library."

The reference to "the books" in Da (9:2) may possibly point to or foreshadow the synagogue library.

Little weight is generally and properly given to the statement of 2 Macc 2:13, that Nehemiah founded a library and gathered into it the writings "about the kings, the prophets and David, and the letters of the kings concerning votive offerings," but it is, as a matter of fact, evident that he, as well as Judas Maccabeus, who is linked with him in the statement, must have done just this.

From the time of the Septuagint translated, the idea of the library (bibliotheke) and even the public library ("books of the people," i.e. public records) was familiar enough, the Septuagint itself also, according to Josephus, linking the temple library of Jerusalem with the Alexandrian library through the furnishing of books by the former to the latter for copying.

13. New Testament Times:

With the Roman conquest and the rise of the Idumeans, naturally the methods developed in accordance with Roman practice. It appears from the frequent references of Josephus that the public records were extensive and contained genealogical records as well as official letters, decrees, etc. The triple method of record continues. It appears, further (Blau, 96; Krauss, III, 179), that there were libraries and even lending libraries in the schools and synagogues, not of Palestine only, but wherever Jews were settled. Josephus and Chrysostom with the Mishna confirm the already very clear inference from Luke's account of our Lord's teaching in the synagogue that at this time, and probably from the beginning of the synagogue, the books, the manner of their keeping and the ritual of their using were already essentially as in the modern synagogue. The first preaching-places of the Christians were the synagogues, and when churches succeeded these, the church library naturally followed, but whether in Bible times or not is a matter of conjecture; they appear at least in very early churches.

Whether the rich secular literature to which Josephus had access was in public or private libraries does not appear directly. It is well known that it was as much a part of Roman public policy in Herod's time to found public libraries in the provinces as it was to restore temples. Twenty-four such provincial libraries, chiefly temple libraries, are known.

The Roman practice of the time still mixed literary with the archival material, and it is likely therefore that the public records of the Jewish temple had in them both Greek and Latin secular books in considerable quantity, as well as the Greek Apocrypha and a large amount of Aramaic or late Hebrew literature of Talmudic character.

14. Bookcases and Buildings:

As to the receptacles and places in which the books were kept, we have reference even in the Hebrew period to most of the main forms used among the nations: the wooden box, the clay box or pot, the pouch, and on the other hand, once, the "house of books" so familiar in Egyptian use and apparently referring to an individual chamber or semi-detached building of temple or palace. Most significant, however, is the statement that the books were kept in the palace and temple treasuries or storehouses.

The sacred ark (’aron), whatever it may have originally contained, was looked on when D was written as a sacred wooden book-chest, and the ark in which the teaching priests carried the law about for public reading was in fact likewise a chest.

Such chests were common among the Jews later, some with lids and some with side-opening (Jewish Encyclopedia, II, 107-108; Blau, 178). It is tempting to find in D, where the book is to be put "by (the King James Version "in") the side of the ark" (De 31:26), a chest having both lid and openings in the side, but more likely perhaps D means a separate chest, like the coffer or pouch with the golden mice, which was also put "by the side" (matstsadh) of the ark (1Sa 6:8).

In the New Testament the "cloak" which Paul left behind at Troas (2Ti 4:13) was probably (Wattenb., 614; see also Birt and Gardthausen), if not a wooden "capsa," at least some sort of bookcase or cover.

The earthen vessel in which Jeremiah (32:14) puts the two "books" (translated "deeds"), one sealed and one unsealed, was one of the commonest bookcases of the ancient world. This information has lately been widely reinforced and associated with Biblical history by the discovery of the Elephantine papyri, which were, for the most part, kept in such clay jars (Meyer, Papyrusfund, 15). The word Pentateuch perhaps harks back to a five-roll jar, but more likely to a basket or wooden box with five compartments (Blau, 65; Birt, Buchrolle, 21, 22). It was the collective label of a five-roll case, whether of earthenware, wood or basket work.

The pouch or bag bookcase has perhaps its representative in the phylactery (Mt 23:5), which was a sort of miniature armarium in that each of the four little rolls of its four compartments was technically a "book" (cepher). This name is commonly explained as an amulet guarding against evil spirits, but the term actually occurs in the papyri (Bibliophylax) of the preservation of books.

The "house of books" (Ezr 6:1 margin) or "place of books" is a very close parallel to bibliotheke, by which (in the plural) it is translated in the Septuagint. The phrase was a common term in Egypt for library, perhaps also sometimes for scriptorium or even registry, and it points to a chamber or semi-detached room or building where the book-chests, jars, etc., were kept. That at Edfu is a semi-detached room and contained many such cases.

While there is little record of libraries in Biblical times, the very formation of the Canon itself, whether by the higher critical process, or by natural processes of gathering whole literary works, implies the gathering together of books, and the temple libraries common to both Egypt and Assyria-Babylonia are almost inevitably implied wherever there was a temple or sanctuary, whatever may be the facts as to the temple libraries. According to Hilprecht there were certainly such libraries and from very ancient times. The palace library of Assurbani-pal, though itself a discovery of the last times, brings the story down to the times of the written history. For the rest of the story see literature below, especially Dziatzko, Bibliotheken, and the article on "Libraries" in the Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition).

See also NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.

In the earlier period at least and including for the Jews the New Testament times, the particular locality in palace or temple seems to have been the treasury. In the Book of Ezra, search for the decree of Cyrus was to be made in the king’s treasure-house (Ezr 5:17), and was made in the "house of books where the treasures were laid up" (Ezr 6:1 m). The document was finally found in the palace at Ecbatana—so too in 1 Macc 14:49 the archives are placed in the treasury.

In New Testament times there had already been a good deal of development in the matter of library buildings. A general type had been evolved which consisted of

(1) a colonnade,

(2) a lecture-room, a reading-room or assembly room,

(3) small rooms for book storage.

Such accounts as we have of the Alexandrian libraries, with the excavations at Pergamus, Athens and Rome, reveal the same type—the book-rooms, the colonnade where masters walked or sat and talked with their pupils, the rooms for assembly where the senate or other bodies sometimes sat. In short, as long before in Egypt, whether in palace or temple, the place of teaching was the place of books.

It is significant thus that our Lord taught in the Treasury, which in Herod's Temple was in the court of the temple proper—probably the porticos under the women's gallery, some of the adjoining rooms being used for books. As this was within the barrier which no Gentile could pass, Herod must have had also a library of public records in the outer colonnade.

See further, NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.

LITERATURE.

Ludwig Blau, Studien zum althebraischen Buchwesen, Strassburg i, E, 1902, 178-80: Sam. Krauss, Talmudische Archaologie, Leipzig, 1912, III, 193-98; J.W. Clark, Care of Books, Cambridge, 1901; E. C. Richardson, Biblical Libraries: A Sketch of Library History from 3400 BC to 150 AD. London. Oxford University Press, 1914.

See the literature under WRITING.

E. C. Richardson

LIBRARY OF NINEVEH

See NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF.

LIBYA; LIBYANS

lib'-i-a, lib'-i-anz: In the Old Testament the word occurs in the King James Version in 2Ch 12:3; 16:8; Na 3:9 for "Lubim" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)). the Revised Version (British and American), however, retains "Libyans" in Da 11:43. In Jer 46:9; Eze 30:5; 38:5, the words are replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by PUT (which see). In the New Testament the word "Libya" (Libue) occurs, in close connection with CYRENE (which see) (Ac 2:10). Greek and Roman writers apply the term to the African continent, generally excluding Egypt.

See LUBIM.

LICE

lis (kinnim (Ex 8:17,18; Ps 105:31), kinnim (Ex 8:16), kinnam (Ex 8:17,18); Septuagint skniphes (Ex 8:16,18), ton sknipha, once in Ex 8:18; sknipes (Ps 105:31); Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) scniphes; according to Liddell and Scott, under the word sknips, Slav. sknipa equals culex): The references, both in Exodus and in Psalms, are all to the plague of "lice." the Revised Version margin suggests "fleas" or "sandflies." The Septuagint rendering would favor "sandflies" or "mosquitoes," between which two insects the Old Testament writers would hardly be expected to discriminate. Mosquitoes belong to the order of Diptera, family Culicidae; the sandfly (Plebotomus papataci) to the family of Simuliidae of the same order. The sandflies are much smaller than mosquitoes, and are nearly noiseless, but give a sharp sting which may leave an unpleasant irritation. They are abundant in the Levant. In Southern Europe they cause the "three-day fever" or "papataci." As stated under GNAT (which see), there is little ground other than the authority of the Septuagint for deciding between "lice," "fleas," "sand-flies," or "mosquitoes" as translations of kinnim. See also under GNAT the note on ken, the Revised Version margin "gnat" (Isa 51:6).

Alfred Ely Day

LICENCE

li'-sens: This word is not found at all in the Revised Version (British and American) (except in Judith 11:14; Ecclesiasticus 15:20; 1 Macc 1:13), and twice only in the King James Version (except in 2 Macc 4:9), both times in Acts. In Ac 21:40 (as translation of epitrepo) the American Standard Revised Version has "leave" where the King James Version has "licence." In Ac 25:16, "opportunity to make his defense" (as translation of topon apologias) takes the place of "have licence to answer for himself."

LIDEBIR

lid'-e-ber (lidhebhir): For "of Debir" in EV; the Revised Version margin suggests the name "Lidebir" (Jos 13:26), a city in the territory of Gad. It is probably identical with LO-DEBAR (which see).

LIE; LYING

li, (sheqer (usually, e.g. Isa 9:15; Zec 13:3), or kazabh verb (Job 34:6; Mic 2:11); pseudos (Joh 8:44; Re 21:27), "to speak falsely," "to fabricate," "to make a false statement"; pseudomai, in Ac 5:3,1):

1. Lying Defined:

In its very essence, a lie is something said with intent to deceive. It is not always a spoken word that is a lie, for a life lived under false pretenses, a hypocritical life, may be a lie equally with a false word (Jer 23:14). A vain thing, like an idol, may be a lie (Isa 59:4), as also a false system (Ro 3:7). Error, as opposed to truth, is a lie (1 Joh 2:21). The denial of the deity of Jesus Christ is regarded as "the" lie (1 Joh 2:22).

The origin of lies and lying is traced to Satan who is called "a liar, and the father thereof" (Joh 8:44; Ac 5:3). Satan's dealing with Eve (Ge 3) furnishes us with a splendid illustration of the first lie, so far as we have any record of it.

2. A Racial Sin:

The whole race is guilty of this sin: "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies" (Ps 58:3). It is a part of the old Adamic nature, "the old man" (Col 3:9), which the believer in Jesus Christ is called upon to put off. So prominent a factor is it in the experience of the race that among the condensed catalogue of sins, for the commission of which men are finally condemned, the sin of lying finds its place: "All liars shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone" (Re 21:8 the King James Version).

3. God's Attitude to It:

God's attitude toward this sin is strongly marked throughout both the Old Testament and New Testament. The righteous are called upon to hate lying (Pr 13:5), to avoid it (Ze 3:13), to respect not those who lie, and utterly reject their company (Ps 40:4; 101:7), to pray to be delivered from it (Ps 119:29). The wicked are said to love lying (Ps 52:3), to delight in it (Ps 62:4), to seek after it (Ps 4:2), and to give heed to it (Pr 17:4). Lying leads to worse crimes (Ho 4:1,2).

4. The Penalty:

The punishment to be meted out to liars is of the severest kind. They are positively and absolutely excluded from heaven (Re 21:27; 22:15), and those who are guilty of this sin are cast into the lake of fire (Re 21:8). We are reminded of the awful fate meted out to Ananias and Sapphira when they lied to God and man (Ac 5:1-11). God will "destroy them that speak lies" (Ps 5:6), and "he that uttereth lies shall not escape" (Pr 19:5), yea "a sword is upon the liars" (Jer 50:36 the King James Version). The liar is thereby debarred from rendering any true and acceptable worship unto the Lord (Ps 24:4).

The Scriptures abound with illustrations of lying and the results and penalties therefor. A careful study of these illustrations will reveal the subtlety of falsehood. Sometimes a lie is a half-truth, as set forth in the story of Satan's temptation of Eve (Ge 3). Cain's lie (Ge 4:9) was of the nature of an evasive answer to a direct question. Jacob's deception of his father, in order that he might inherit the blessing of the firstborn, was a barefaced and deliberate lie (Ge 27:19). The answer which Joseph's brethren gave to their father when he asked them concerning the welfare of their brother Joseph is an illustration, as well

as a revelation, of the depth of the wickedness of hearts that deliberately set themselves to falsify and deceive (Ge 37:31,32). Even good men are sometimes overtaken in a lie, which, of course, is no more excusable in them than in the wicked; indeed, it is more shameful because the righteous are professed followers of the truth (David in 1Sa 21:2). What more striking example of the heinousness of lying in the sight of God can we have than the fate which befell Gehazi who, in order to satisfy a covetous desire for possessions, misrepresented his master Elisha to Naaman the Syrian whom the prophet had healed of his leprosy: "The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever. And he went out from his presence a leper as white as snow" (2Ki 5:22-27)? The story of Peter's denial of his Lord, and his persistent asseverations that he did not know Him and was not one of His followers, makes us shudder to think that it is possible for a follower of Christ so far to forget himself as not only to lie, but buttress lying with swearing (Mt 26:72).

5. Pseudos United with Other Words:

Throughout the Scriptures we find pseudos joined to other words, e.g. "false apostles" (pseudapostolos, 2Co 11:13), so called probably because a true apostle delivers the message of another, namely, God, while these "false apostles" cared only for self. Such are from Satan, and, like him, they transform themselves into angels of light, and sail under false colors. We read also of "false prophets" (pseudoprophetes, Mt 7:15; compare Jer 23:16 f), thereby meaning those who falsely claim to bring messages from God and to speak in behalf of God. Mention is made also of "false brethren" (pseudadelphos, 2Co 11:26), meaning Judaizing teachers, as in Ga 2:4; "false teachers" (pseudodidaskalos, 2Pe 2:1), men whose teaching was false and who falsely claimed the teacher's office. We read further of "false witnesses" (pseudomartus, Mt 26:60); by such are meant those who swear falsely, and testify to what they know is not true. So, too, we find mention of the "false Christs" (pseudochristoi, Mt 24:24; Mr 13:22). This personage does not so much deny the existence of a Christ, but rather, on the contrary, builds upon the world's expectations of such a person, and falsely, arrogantly, blasphemously asserts they he is the Christ promised and foretold. It is the Antichrist who denies that there is a Christ; the false Christ affirms himself to be the Christ. Of course there is a sense in which the man of sin will be both Antichrist and a false Christ.

See CHRISTS, FALSE; FALSE PROPHETS; FALSE SWEARING, FALSE WITNESS.

William Evans

LIERS-IN-WAIT

li-erz-in-wat' (Jud 9:25; 16:12; 20:36).

See AMBUSH.

LIEUTENANT

lu-ten’-ant, lef-ten’-ant.

See SATRAPS.

LIFE

lif (chayyim, nephesh, ruach, chayah; zoe, psuche, bios, pneuma):

I. THE TERMS

II. THE OLD TESTAMENT TEACHING

1. Popular Use of the Term

2. Complexity of the Idea

III. IN THE APOCRYPHA

IV. IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. In the Synoptic Gospels

2. In the Fourth Gospel

3. In the Ac of the Apostles

4. In the Writings of Paul

5. In the Writings of John

6. In the Other Books of the New Testament

LITERATURE

I. The Terms.

Of the Hebrew terms, chayah is the verb which means "to live," "to have life," or the vital principle, "to continue to live," or "to live prosperously." In the Piel it signifies "to give life, or preserve, or quicken and restore life." The Hiphil is much like the Piel. The noun hayyim generally used in the plural is an abstract noun meaning "life," i.e. the possession of the vital principle with its energies and activities. Nephesh often means "living being" or "creature." Sometimes it has the force of the reflexive "self." At

other times it refers to the seat of the soul, the personality, the emotions, the appetites—passions and even mental acts. Frequently it means "life," the "seat of life," and in this way it is used about 171 times in the Old Testament, referring to the principle of vitality in both men and animals. Ruach signifies "wind," "breath," principle or source of vitality, but is never used to signify life proper.

II. The Old Testament Teaching.

1. Popular Use of the Term:

The term "life" is used in the Old Testament in the popular sense. It meant life in the body, the existence and activity of the man in all his parts and energies. It is the person complete, conscious and active. There is no idea of the body being a fetter or prison to the soul; the body was essential to life and the writers had no desire to be separated from it. To them the physical sphere was a necessity, and a man was living when all his activities were performed in the light of God's face and favor. The secret and source of life to them was relationship with God. There was nothing good or desirable apart from this relation of fellowship. To overcome or be rid of sin was necessary to life. The real center of gravity in life was in the moral and religious part of man's nature. This must be in fellowship with God, the source of all life and activity.

2. Complexity of the Idea:

The conception of life is very complex. Several meanings are clearly indicated:

(1) Very frequently it refers to the vital principle itself, apart from its manifestations (Ge 2:7). Here it is the breath of life, or the breath from God which contained and communicated the vital principle to man and made him a nephesh or living being (see also Ge 1:30; 6:17; 7:22; 45:5, etc.).

(2) It is used to denote the period of one's actual existence, i.e. "lifetime" (Ge 23:1; 25:7; 47:9; Ex 6:16,18,20, etc.).

(3) The life is represented as a direct gift from God, and dependent absolutely upon Him for its continuance (Ge 1:11-27; 2:7; Nu 16:22).

(4) In a few cases it refers to the conception of children, denoting the time when conception was possible (Ge 18:10,14 margin; 2Ki 4:16,17 margin).

(5) In many cases it refers to the totality of man's relationships and activities, all of which make up life (De 32:47; 1Sa 25:29; Job 10:1, etc.).

(6) In a few instances it is used synonymously with the means of sustaining life (De 24:6; Pr 27:27).

(7) Many times it is used synonymously with happiness or well-being (De 30:15,19; Ezr 6:10; Ps 16:11; 30:5; Pr 2:19, and frequently).

(8) It is always represented as a very precious gift, and offenses against life were to be severely punished (Ge 9:4,5; Le 17:14; 24:17).

Capital punishment is here specifically enjoined because of the value of the life that has been taken. The lexicon talionis required life for life (Ex 21:23; De 19:21); and this even applies to the beast (Le 24:18). The life was represented as abiding in the blood and therefore the blood must not be eaten, or lightly shed upon the ground (Le 17:15; De 12:23). The Decalogue forbids murder or the taking of human life wrongfully (Ex 20:13; De 5:17). Garments taken in pledge must not be kept over night, for thereby the owner's life might be endangered (De 24:6). That life was considered precious appears in 2Ki 10:24; Es 7:7; Job 2:4; Pr 4:23; 6:26. The essence of sacrifice consisted in the fact that the life (the nephesh) resided in the blood; thus when blood was shed, life was lost (De 12:23; Le 17:11). Oppression on the part of judges and rulers was severely condemned because oppression was detrimental to life.

(9) Long life was much desired and sought by the Israelites, and under certain conditions this was possible (Ps 91:16). The longevity of the ante-diluvian patriarchs is a problem by itself (see ANTEDILUVIANS). It was one of the greatest of calamities to be cut off in the midst of life (Isa 38:10-12; 53:8); that a good old age was longed for is shown by Ex 20:12; Ps 21:4; 34:12; 61:6, etc. This long life was possible to the obedient to parents (Ex 20:12; De 5:16), and to those obedient to God (De 4:4; Pr 3:1,2; 10:27); to the wise (Pr 3:16; 9:11); to the pure in heart (Ps 34:12-14; 91:1-10; Ec 3:12,13); to those who feared God (Pr 10:27; Isa 65:18-21; 38:2-5, etc.).

(10) The possibility of an immortal life is dimly hinted at in the earliest writing, and much more clearly taught in the later. The Tree of Life in the midst of the garden indicated a possible immortality for man upon earth (Ge 2:9; 3:22,24) (see TREE OF LIFE).

Failing to partake of this and falling into sin by partaking of the "tree of the knowledge of good and evil," they were driven forth from the garden lest they should eat of the tree of life and become immortal beings in their sinful condition. To deprive man of the possibility of making himself immortal while sinful was a blessing to the race; immortality without holiness is a curse rather than a blessing. The way to the tree of life was henceforth guarded by the cherubim and the flame of a sword, so that men could not partake of it in their condition of sin. This, however, did not exclude the possibility of a spiritual immortality in another sphere. Enoch's fellowship with God led to a bodily translation; so also Elijah, and several hundred years after their deaths, God called Himself the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, implying that they were really alive then. In Isa 26:19 there is a clear prophecy of a resurrection, and an end of death. Da 12:2 asserts a resurrection of many of the dead, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt. Some of the psalmists firmly believed in the continuity of the life in fellowship with God (Ps 16:10,11; 17:15; 23:6; 49:15; 73:24,25). The exact meaning of some of these statements is difficult to understand, yet this much is clear: there was a revolt against death in many pious minds, and a belief that the life of fellowship with God could not end or be broken even by

death itself.

See IMMORTALITY.

(11) The fundamental fact in the possession of life was vital relationship with God. Men first lived because God breathed into them the breath of life (Ge 2:7). Man's vital energies are the outflowing of the spirit or vital energies of God, and all activities are dependent upon the vitalizing power from God. When God sends forth His spirit, things are created, and live; when He withdraws that spirit they die (Ps 104:30). "In his favor is life" (Ps 30:5 the King James Version). He is the fountain of life (Ps 36:9; 63:3). "All my fountains are in thee" (Ps 87:7). The secret of Job's success and happiness was that the Almighty was with him (Job 29:2). This fellowship brought him health, friends, prosperity and all other blessings. The consciousness of the fellowship with God led men to revolt against the idea of going to Sheol where this fellowship must cease. They felt that such a relationship could not cease, and God would take them out of Sheol.

III. In the Apocrypha.

A similar conception of life appears here as in the Old Testament. Zoe and peuche are used and occur most frequently in the books of The Wisdom of Solomon and Ecclus. In 1 and 2 Esdras the word is little used; 2 Esdras 3:5; 16:61 are but a quotation from Ge 2:7, and refer to the vital principle; 2 Esdras 14:30, Tobit, Judith, Ad Esther use it in the same sense also. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus use it in several senses closely resembling the use in Proverbs (compare Ecclesiasticus 4:12; Pr 3:18; 10:16). In general there is no additional meaning attached to the word. The Psalms of Solomon refer to everlasting life in 3:16; 13:10; 14:2,6.

IV. In the New Testament.

Of the Greek terms bios is used at times as the equivalent of the Hebrew chayyim. It refers to life extensively, i.e. the period of one's existence, a lifetime; also to the means of sustaining life, such as wealth, etc. Psuche is also equivalent to chayyim at times, but very frequently to nephesh and sometimes to ruach. Thus, it means the vital principle, a living being, the immaterial part of man, the seat of the affections, desires and appetites, etc. The term zoe corresponds very closely to chayyim, and means the vital principle, the state of one who is animate, the fullness of activities and relationship both in the physical and spiritual realms.

The content of the word zoe is the chief theme of the New Testament. The life is mediated by Jesus Christ. In the Old Testament this life was through fellowship with God, in the New Testament it is through Jesus Christ the Mediator. The Old Testament idea is carried to its completion, its highest development of meaning, being enriched by the supreme teaching and revelation of Jesus Christ. In the New Testament as well as in the Old Testament, the center of gravity in human life is in the moral and religious nature of man.

1. In the Synoptic Gospels:

The teaching here regarding life naturally links itself with Old Testament ideas and the prevailing conceptions of Judaism. The word is used in the sense of

(1) the vital principle, that which gives actual physical existence (Mt 2:20; Mr 10:45; Lu 12:22 f; 14:26).

(2) It is also the period of one's existence, i.e. lifetime (Lu 1:75; 16:25).

(3) Once it may mean the totality of man's relationships and activities (Lu 12:15) which do not consist in abundance of material possessions.

(4) Generally it means the real life, the vital connection with the world and God, the sum total of man's highest interests. It is called "eternal life" (Mt 19:29; 25:46). It is called "life" (Mt 18:8,9; 19:17; Mr 9:43,45,46). In these passages Jesus seems to imply that it is almost equivalent to "laying up treasures in heaven," or to "entering the kingdom of God." The entering into life and entering the kingdom are practically the same, for the kingdom is that spiritual realm where God controls, where the principles, activities and relationships of heaven prevail, and hence, to enter into these is to enter into "life."

(5) The lower life of earthly relationship and activities must be subordinated to the higher and spiritual (Mt 10:39; 16:25; Lu 9:24). These merely earthly interests may be very desirable and enjoyable, but whoever would cling to these and make them supreme is in danger of losing the higher. The spiritual being infinitely more valuable should be sought even if the other relationship should be lost entirely.

(6) Jesus also speaks of this life as something future, and to be realized at the consummation of the age (Mt 19:29; Lu 18:30), or the world to come.

This in no wise contradicts the statement that eternal life can be entered upon in this life. As Jesus Himself was in vital relationship with the spiritual world and lived the eternal life, He sought to bring others into the same blessed state. This life was far from being perfect. The perfection could come only at the consummation when all was perfection and then they would enter into the perfect fellowship with God and connection with the spirit-world and its blessed experiences. There is no conflict in His teaching here, no real difficulty, only an illustration of Browning's statement, "Man never is but wholly hopes to be." Thus in the synoptists Jesus teaches the reality of the eternal life as a present possession as well as future fruition. The future is but the flowering out and perfection of the present. Without the present bud, there can be no future flower.

(7) The conditions which Jesus lays down for entering into this life are faith in Himself as the one Mediator of the life, and the following of Him in a life of obedience. He alone knows the Father and can reveal Him to others (Mt 11:27). He alone can give true rest and can teach men how to live (Mt 11:28 f). The sure way to this life is: "Follow me." His whole ministry was virtually a prolonged effort to win confidence in Himself as Son and Mediator, to win obedience, and hence, bring men unto these spiritual

relationships and activities which constitute the true life.

2. In the Fourth Gospel:

The fullest and richest teachings regarding life are found here. The greatest word of this Gospel is "life." The author says he wrote the Gospel in order that "ye may have life" (Joh 20:31). Most of the teachings recorded, circle around this great word "life." This teaching is in no way distinctive and different from that of the synoptists, but is supplementary, and completes the teaching of Jesus on the subject. The use of the word is not as varied, being concentrated on the one supreme subject.

(1) In a few cases it refers only to the vital principle which gives life or produces a lifetime (Joh 10:11,15-18; 13:37; 15:13).

(2) It represents Jesus the Loges as the origin and means of all life to the world. As the preincarnate Loges He was the source of life to the universe (Joh 1:4). As the incarnate Loges He said His life had been derived originally from the Father (Joh 5:26; 6:57; 10:18). He then was the means of life to men (Joh 3:15,16; 4:14; 5:21,39,40); and this was the purpose for which He came into the world (Joh 6:33,34,51; 10:10).

(3) The prevailing reference, however, is to those activities which are the expression of fellowship with God and Jesus Christ. These relationships are called "eternal life" (Joh 3:15,16,36; 4:14, etc.). The nearest approach to a definition of eternal life is found in Joh 17:3. Though not a scientific or metaphysical definition, it is nevertheless Jesus' own description of eternal life, and reveals His conception of it. It is thus more valuable than a formal definition. It is "to know God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent."

This knowledge is vastly more than mere intellectual perception or understanding. It is moral knowledge, it is personal acquaintance, it is fellowship, a contact, if we may so speak, of personality with personality, an inner affinity and sympathy, an experience of similar thoughts, emotions, purposes, motives, desires, an interchange of the heart's deepest feelings and experiences. It is a bringing of the whole personality of man into right relationship with the personality of God. This relation is ethical, personal, binding the two together with ties which nothing can separate. It is into this experience that Jesus came to bring men. Such a life Jesus says is satisfying to all who hunger and thirst for it (Joh 4:14; 6:35); it is the source of light to all (Joh 1:4; 8:12); it is indestructible (Joh 6:58; 11:26); it is like a well of water in the soul (Joh 4:14); it is procured by personally partaking of those qualities which belong to Jesus (Joh 6:53).

(4) This life is a present possession and has also a glorious future fruition.

(a) To those who exercise faith in Jesus it is a present experience and possession (Joh 4:10; 5:24,40). Faith in Him as the Son of God is the psychological means by which persons are brought into this vital relationship with God. Those who exercised the faith immediately experienced this new power and

fellowship and exercised the new activities.

(b) It has a glorious fruition in the future also (Joh 4:36; 5:29; 6:39,44,54). John does not give so much prominence to the eschatological phase of Jesus' teachings as to the present reality and actual possession of this blessed life.

(5) It has been objected that in speaking of the Loges as the source of life John is pursuing a metaphysical line, whereas the life which he so much emphasizes has an ethical basis, and he makes no attempt to reconcile the two. The objection may have force to one who has imbibed the Ritschlian idea of performing the impossible task of eliminating all metaphysics from theology. It will not appeal very strongly to the average Christian. It is a purely academic objection. The ordinary mind will think that if Jesus Christ is the source of ethical and eternal life it is because He possesses something of the essence and being of God, which makes His work for men possible. The metaphysical and the ethical may exist together, may run concurrently, the one being the source and seat of the other. There is no contradiction. Both metaphysics and ethics are a legitimate and necessary exercise of the human mind.

3. In the Ac of the Apostles:

In His intercessory prayer, John 17, Jesus said His mission was to give eternal life to as many as the Father had given Him (17:2). The record in Ac is the carrying out of that purpose. The word "life" is used in several senses:

(1) the vital principle or physical life (17:25; 20:10,24; 27:10,22);

(2) also the sum total of man's relationships and activities upon earth (5:20; 26:4);

(3) Jesus Christ is regarded as the source and principle of life, being called by Peter, "the Prince of life" (3:15). Also the life eternal or everlasting is spoken of with the same significance as in the Gospels (11:18; 13:46,48).

4. In the Writings of Paul:

Here also the words for "life" are used in various senses:

(1) the vital principle which gives physical vitality and existence (Ro 8:11,38; 11:15; 1Co 3:22; Php 1:20; 2:30);

(2) the sum total of man's relationships and activities (1Co 6:3,4; 1Ti 2:2; 4:8; 2Ti 1:1; 3:10 the King James Version);

(3) those relationships with God and with Christ in the spiritual realm, and the activities arising therefrom which constitute the real and eternal life.

This is mediated by Christ (Ro 5:10). It is in Christ (Ro 6:11). It is the free gift of God (Ro 6:23). It is also mediated or imparted to us through the Spirit (Ro 8:2,6,9,10; 2Co 2:16; 3:6; Ga 6:8). It comes through obedience to the word (Ro 7:10; Php 2:16); and through faith (1Ti 1:16). It may be apprehended in this life (1Ti 6:12,19). It is brought to light through the gospel (2Ti 1:10). It is a reward to those who by patience in well-doing seek it (Ro 2:7). It gives conquering power over sin and death (Ro 5:17,18,21). It is the end or reward of a sanctified life (Ro 6:22). It is a present possession and a hope (Tit 1:2; 3:7). It will be received in all its fullness hereafter (Ro 2:7; 2Co 5:4). Thus Paul's use of the word substantially agrees with the teaching in the Gospels, and no doubt was largely based upon it.

5. In the Writings of John:

In the Johannine Epistles and Revelation, the contents of the term "life" are the same as those in the Fourth Gospel. Life in certain passages (1 Joh 3:16; Re 8:9; 11:11; 12:11) is mere physical vitality and existence upon earth. The source of life is Christ Himself (1 Joh 1:1 f; 5:11 f, 16). The blessed eternal life in Christ is a present possession to all those who are in fellowship with the Father and the Son (1 Joh 5:11,12). Here is an echo of the words of Jesus (Joh 17:3) where John describes the life, the eternal life which was with the Father and was manifested unto us. It is virtually fellowship with the Father and with the Son (1 Joh 1:2,4). Life is promised to those who are faithful (Re 2:7); and the crown of life is promised to those who are faithful unto death (Re 2:10). The crown of life doubtless refers to the realization of all the glorious possibilities that come through fellowship with God and the Son. The thirsty are invited to come and drink of the water of life freely (Re 21:6; 22:17). The river of life flows through the streets of the New Jerusalem (Re 22:1), and the tree of life blooms on its banks, bearing twelve manner of fruit (22:2,14).

See TREE OF LIFE.

6. In the Other Books of the New Testament:

The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of our lifetime or periods of existence upon earth (2:15; 7:3), likewise of the power of an indissoluble life (7:16); James promises the crown of life to the faithful (1:12). This reward is the fullness of life's possibilities hereafter. Our lifetime is mentioned in 4:14 and represented as brief as a vapor. Peter in 1Pe 3:7 speaks of man and wife as joint-heirs of the grace of life, and of loving life (1Pe 3:10), referring to the totality of relationships and activities. The "all things that pertain unto life and godliness" (2Pe 1:3) constitute the whole Christian life involving the life eternal.

LITERATURE.

Articles on "Life" in HDB, DCG, Jewish Encyclopedia; on "Soul," "Spirit," etc., ibid, and in Encyclopedia Brit, EB, Kitto, Smith, Standard, etc.; Laidlaw, Bible Doctrine of Man; Delitzsch, A System of Biblical Psychology; cornms. on the various passages; Davidson, Old Testament Theology; Oehler and Schultz, Old Testament Theology; Stevens, Johannine Theology and Pauline Theology;

Holtzmann, New Testament Theology, I, 293 ff; G. Dalman, Words of Jesus; Phillips Brooks, More Abundant Life; B.F. Westcott, Historic Faith; F.J.A. Hort, The Way, the Truth, the Life; J.G. Hoare, Life in John's Gospels; E. White, Life and Christ; Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality; R.J. Knowling, Witness of the Epistles and The Testimony of Paul to Christ; commentaries on the various passages; McPherson, "The New Testament View of Life," The Expositor, I, set. v, 72 ff; Massie, "Two New Testament Words Denoting Life," The Expositor, II, series iv, 380 ff; Schrenk, Die Johannistische Anschauung yom Leben.

J. J. Reeve

LIFE, TREE OF

See TREE OF LIFE.

LIFT

To make lofty, to raise up. A very common word in English Versions of the Bible representing a great variety of Hebrew and Greek words, although in the Old Testament used chiefly as the translation of nasa'. Of none of these words, however, is "lift" used as a technical translation, and "lift" is interchanged freely with its synonyms, especially "exalt" (compare Ps 75:5; 89:24) and "raise" (compare Ec 4:10; 2Sa 12:17). "Lift" is still perfectly good English, but not in all the senses in which it is used in English Versions of the Bible; e.g. such phrases as "men that lifted up axes upon a thicket" (Ps 74:5), "lift up thy feet unto the perpetual ruins" (Ps 74:3, etc.), and even the common "lift up the eyes" or "hands" are distinctly archaic. However, almost all the uses are perfectly clear, and only the following need be noted. "To lift up the head" (Ge 40:13,19,20; 2Ki 25:27; Ps 3:3; Sirach 11:13; Lu 21:28) means to raise from a low condition (but on Ps 24:7,9 see GATE). To "lift up the horn" (Ps 75:5) is to assume a confident position, the figure being taken from fighting oxen (see HORN). "Lift up the face" may be meant literally (2Ki 9:32), or it may denote the bestowal of favor (Ps 4:6); it may mean the attitude of a righteous man toward God (Job 22:26), or simply the attitude of a suppliant (Ezr 9:6).

Burton Scott Easton

LIGHT

lit ('or, ma'or; phos; many other words):

1. Origin of Light

2. A Comprehensive Term

(1) Natural Light

(2) Artificial Light

(3) Miraculous Light

(4) Mental, Moral, Spiritual Light

3. An Attribute of Holiness

(1) God

(2) Christ

(3) Christians

(4) The Church

4. Symbolism

5. Expressive Terms

1. Origin of Light:

The creation of light was the initial step in the creation of life. "Let there be light" (Ge 1:3) was the first word of God spoken after His creative Spirit "moved" upon the primary material out of which He created the heavens and the earth, and which lay, until the utterance of that word, in the chaos of darkness and desolation. Something akin, possibly, to the all-pervasive electro-magnetic activity of the aurora borealis penetrated the chaotic night of the world. The ultimate focusing of light (on the 4th day of creation, Ge 1:14) in suns, stars, and solar systems brought the initial creative process to completion, as the essential condition of all organic life. The origin of light thus finds its explanation in the purpose and very nature of God whom John defines as not only the Author of light but, in an all-inclusive sense, as light itself: "God is light" (1 Joh 1:5).

2. A Comprehensive Term:

The word "light" is Divinely rich in its comprehensiveness and meaning. Its material splendor is used throughout the Scriptures as the symbol and synonym of all that is luminous and radiant in the mental, moral and spiritual life of men and angels; while the eternal God, because of His holiness and moral perfection, is pictured as "dwelling in light unapproachable" (1Ti 6:16). Every phase of the word, from the original light in the natural world to the spiritual glory of the celestial, is found in Holy Writ.

(1) Natural Light.

The light of day (Ge 1:5); of sun, moon and stars; "lights in the firmament" (Ge 1:14-18; Ps 74:16; 136:7; 148:3; Ec 12:2; Re 22:5). Its characteristics are beauty, radiance, utility. It "rejoiceth the heart" (Pr 15:30); "Truly the light is sweet" (Ec 11:7); without it men stumble and are helpless (Joh 11:9,10); it is something for which they wait with inexpressible longing (Job 30:26; compare Ps 130:6). Life, joy, activity and all blessings are dependent upon light.

Light and life are almost synonymous to the inhabitants of Palestine, and in the same way darkness and death. Theirs is the land of sunshine. When they go to other lands of clouded skies their only thought is to return to the brightness and sunshine of their native land. In Palestine there is hardly a day in the whole year when the sun does not shine for some part of it, while for five months of the year there is scarcely an interruption of the sunshine. Time is reckoned from sunset to sunset. The day’s labor closes with the coming of darkness. "Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labor until the evening" (Ps 104:23).

The suddenness of the change from darkness to light with the rising sun and the disappearance of the sun in the evening is more striking than in more northern countries, and it is not strange that in the ancient days there should have arisen a worship of the sun as the giver of light and happiness, and that Job should mention the enticement of sun-worship when he "beheld the sun when it shined, or the moon walking in brightness" (Job 31:26). The severest plague in Egypt next to the slaying of the firstborn was the plague of darkness which fell upon the Egyptians (Ex 10:23). This love of light finds expression in both Old Testament and New Testament in a very extensive use of the word to express those things which are most to be desired and most helpful to man, and in this connection we find some of the most beautiful figures in the Bible.

(2) Artificial Light.

When natural light fails, man by discovery or invention provides himself with some temporary substitute, however dim and inadequate. The ancient Hebrews had "oil for the light" (Ex 25:6; 35:8; Le 24:2) and lamps (Ex 35:14; Mt 5:15). "There were many lights. (lampas) in the upper chamber" at Troas, where Paul preached until midnight (Ac 20:8); so Jer 25:10 the Revised Version (British and American), "light of the lamp;" the King James Version, "candle."

(3) Miraculous Light.

When the appalling plague of "thick darkness," for three days, enveloped the Egyptians, terrified and rendered them helpless, "all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings" (Ex 10:23). Whether the darkness was due to a Divinely-ordered natural cause or the light was the natural light of day, the process that preserved the interspersed Israelites from the encompassing darkness was supernatural. Miraculous, also, even though through natural agency, was the "pillar of fire" that gave light to the Israelites escaping from Pharaoh (Ex 13:21; 14:20; Ps 78:14), "He led them .... all the night with a light of fire." Supernatural was the effulgence at Christ’s transfiguration that made "his garments .... white as

the light" (Mt 17:2). Under the same category Paul classifies ‘the great light’ that ‘suddenly shone round about him from heaven’ on the way to Damascus (Ac 22:6; compare Ac 9:3). In these rare instances the supernatural light was not only symbolic of an inner spiritual light, but instrumental, in part at least, in revealing or preparing the way for it.

(4) Mental, Moral, Spiritual Light.

The phenomena of natural light have their counterpart in the inner life of man. Few words lend themselves with such beauty and appropriateness to the experiences, conditions, and radiance of the spiritual life. For this reason the Scriptures use "light" largely in the figurative sense. Borrowed from the natural world, it is, nevertheless, inherently suited to portray spiritual realities. In secular life a distinct line of demarcation is drawn between intellectual and spiritual knowledge and illumination. Education that enlightens the mind may leave the moral man untouched. This distinction rarely obtains in the Bible, which deals with man as a spiritual being and looks upon his faculties as interdependent in their action.

(a) A few passages, however, refer to the light that comes chiefly to the intellect or mind through Divine instruction, e.g. Ps 119:130, "The opening of thy words giveth light"; so Pr 6:23, "The law is light." Even here the instruction includes moral as well as mental enlightenment.

(b) Moral: Job 24:13,16 has to do exclusively with man’s moral attitude to truth: "rebel against the light"; "know not the light." Isa 5:20 describes a moral confusion and blindness, which cannot distinguish light from darkness.

(c) For the most part, however, light and life go together. It is the product of salvation: "Yahweh is my light and my salvation" (Ps 27:1). "Light," figuratively used, has to do preeminently with spiritual life, including also the illumination that floods all the faculties of the soul: intellect, conscience, reason, will. In the moral realm the enlightenment of these faculties is dependent wholly on the renewal of the spirit. "In thy light .... we see light" (Ps 36:9); "The life was the light of men" (Joh 1:4).

Light is an attribute of holiness, and thus a personal quality. It is the outshining of Deity.

3. An Attribute of Holiness:

(1) God.

"God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 Joh 1:5). Darkness is the universal symbol and condition of sin and death; light the symbol and expression of holiness. "The light of Israel will be for a fire, and his Holy One for a flame" (Isa 10:17). God, by His presence and grace, is to us a "marvellous light" (1Pe 2:9). The glory of His holiness and presence is the "everlasting light" of the redeemed in heaven (Isa 60:19,20; Re 21:23,14; 22:5).

(2) Christ.

Christ, the eternal Word (logos, Joh 1:1), who said "Let there be light" (Ge 1:3), is Himself the "effulgence of (God's) glory" (Heb 1:3), "the light which lighteth every man, coming into the world" (Joh 1:9) (compare the statements concerning Wisdom in The Wisdom of Solomon 7:25 f and concerning Christ in Heb 1:3; and see CREEDS; LOGOS; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY; WISDOM). As the predicted Messiah, He was to be "for alight of the Gentiles" (Isa 42:6; 49:6). His birth was the fulfillment of this prophecy (Lu 2:32). Jesus called Himself "the light of the world" (Joh 8:12; 9:5; 12:46); As light He was "God .... manifest in the flesh (1Ti 3:16 the King James Version). "The Word was God" (Joh 1:1). Jesus as logos is the eternal expression of God as a word is the expression of a thought. In the threefold essence of His being God is Life (zoe) (Joh 5:26; 6:57); God is Love (agape) (1 Joh 4:8); God is Light (phos) (1 Joh 1:5). Thus Christ, the logos, manifesting the three aspects of the Divine Nature, is Life, Love and Light, and these three are inseparable and constitute the glory. which the disciples beheld in Him, "glory as of the only begotten from the Father" (Joh 1:14). In revealing and giving life, Christ becomes "the light of men" (Joh 1:4). God gives "the light of the knowledge of (his) glory in the face of Jesus Christ" (2Co 4:6), and this salvation is called "the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ" (2Co 4:4). Christ is thus the Teacher, Enlightener ("Christ shall give thee light," Eph 5:14 the King James Version), Guide, Saviour of men.

(3) Christians.

All who catch and reflect the light of God and of Christ are called "light," "lights."

(a) John the Baptist: "a burning and a shining light" (Joh 5:35 the King James Version). It is significant that this pre-Christian prophet was termed luchnos, while the disciples of the new dispensation are called phos (Mt 5:14): "Ye are the light of the world."

(b) Henceforth Christians and saints were called "children of light" (Lu 16:8; Joh 12:36; Eph 5:8), and were expected to be "seen as lights in the world" (Php 2:15).

(c) The Jew who possessed the law mistakenly supposed he was "a light of them that are in darkness" (Ro 2:19).

(4) The Church.

Zion was to "shine" because her 'light had come' (Isa 60:1). The Gentiles were to come to her light (Isa 60:3). Her mission as the enlightener of the world was symbolized in the ornamentations of her priesthood. The Urim of the high priest's breastplate signified light, and the name itself is but the plural form of the Hebrew 'or. It stood for revelation, and thummim for truth. The church of the Christian dispensation was to be even more radiant with the light of God and of Christ. The seven churches of Asia were revealed to John, by the Spirit, as seven golden candlesticks, and her ministers as seven stars, both luminous with the light of the Gospel revelation. In Ephesians, Christ, who is the Light of the

world, is the Head of the church, the latter being His body through which His glory is to be manifested to the world, "to make all men see," etc. (Eph 3:9,10). "Unto him be the glory in the church" (Eph 3:21), the church bringing glory to God, by revealing His glory to men through its reproduction of the life and light of Christ.

4. Symbolism:

Light symbolizes:

(1) the eye, "The light of the body is the eye" (Mt 6:22, the King James Version; Lu 11:34);

(2) watchfulhess, "Let your lights (the Revised Version (British and American) "lamps") be burning," the figure being taken from the parable of the Virgins;

(3) protection, "armor (Ro 13:12), the garment of a holy and Christ-like life;

(4) the sphere of the Christian's daily walk, "inheritance of the saints in light" (Col 1:12);

(5) heaven, for the inheritance just referred to includes the world above in which "the Lamb is the light thereof"

(6) prosperity, relief (Es 8:16; Job 30:26), in contrast with the calamities of the wicked whose "light .... shall be put out" (Job 18:5);

(7) joy and gladness (Job 3:20; Ps 97:11; 112:4);

(8) God's favor, the light of thy countenance" (Ps 4:6; 44:3; 89:15), and a king's favor (Pr 16:15);

(9) life (Ps 13:3; 49:19; Joh 1:4).

5. Expressive Terms:

Expressive terms are:

(1) "fruit of the light" (Eph 5:9), i.e. goodness, righteousness, truth;

(2) "light in the Lord" (Eph 5:8), indicating the source of light (compare Isa 2:5);

(3) "inheritance of the saints in light" (Col 1:12), a present experience issuing in heaven;

(4) "Father of lights" (Jas 1:17), signifying the Creator of the heavenly bodies;

(5) "marvellous light" (1Pe 2:9), the light of God’s presence and fellowship;

(6) "Walk in the light" (1 Joh 1:7), in the light of God’s teaching and companionship;

(7) "abideth in the light" (1 Joh 2:10), in love, Divine and fraternal;

(8) "Light of the glorious gospel of Christ ";" light of the knowledge of the glory of God" (2Co 4:4,6 the King James Version).

Dwight M. Pratt

LIGHT; LIGHTNESS lit’-nes: "Light" is used in Scripture, as in ordinary speech, in the sense of what is small, slight, trivial, easy; "lightness" with the connotation of vacillation or lasciviousness. Thus in the Old Testament, "a light thing," a small, easy, slight thing (qalal, 2Ki 3:18; Isa 49:6; Eze 8:17; 22:7, in the last case "to treat slightingly"). "Lightness" (qol) occurs in Jer 3:9 ("the lightness of her whoredom"); in 23:32, the Revised Version (British and American) changes "lightness" (a different word) to "vain boasting." In the New Testament the phrase occurs in Mt 22:5, "made light of it" (ameleo), i.e. "treated it with neglect"; and Paul asks (2Co 1:17), "Did I show lightness?" (the Revised Version (British and American) "fickleness"). These examples sufficiently illustrate the meaning.

James Orr

LIGHTNING

lit’-ning (baraq, chaziz; astrape): Lightning is caused by the discharge of electricity between clouds or between clouds and the earth. In a thunder-storm there is a rapid gathering of particles of moisture into clouds and forming of large drops of rain. This gathers with it electric potential until the surface of the cloud (or the enlarged water particles) is insufficient to carry the charge, and a discharge takes place, producing a brilliant flash of light and the resulting thunder-clap. Thunder-storms are common in Syria and Palestine during the periods of heavy rain in the spring and fall and are often severe. Lightning is usually accompanied by heavy rainfall or by hail, as at the time of the plague of hail (Ex 9:24).

See HAIL.

In the Scriptures it is used:

(a) indicating the power of God: The power of God is shown in His command of the forces of Nature, and He is the only one who knows the secrets of Nature: "He made .... a way for the lightning" (Job 28:26); "He directeth .... his lightning" (Job 37:3 the King James Version); "Canst thou send forth

lightnings, that they may go?" (Job 38:35); "Ask ye of Yahweh .... that maketh lightnings" (Zec 10:1). See also Ps 18:14; 97:4; 135:7; Job 36:32; Jer 10:13;

(b) figuratively and poetically: David sings of Yahweh, "He sent .... lightnings manifold, and discomfited them" (Ps 18:14); used for speed: "The chariots .... run like the lightnings" (Na 2:4): "His arrow shall go forth as the lightning" (Zec 9:14); "The living creatures ran and returned as the appearance of a flash of lightning" (Eze 1:14). The coming of the kingdom is described by Jesus as the shining of the lightning from one part of heaven to another, even "from the east unto the west" (Mt 24:27; Lu 17:24);

(c) meaning bright or shining: Daniel in his vision saw a man and "his face (was) as the appearance of lightning" (Da 10:6). See also Re 4:5; 8:5; 16:18.

Alfred H. Joy

LIGN-ALOES

lin-al'-oz, lig-nal'-oz.

See ALOES.

LIGURE

lig'-ur (Ex 28:19; 39:12 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "jacinth").

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

LIKE; LIKEN; LIKENESS; LIKING

lik, lik'-n, lik'-nes, lik'-ing:

(1) As a noun, "like" in modern English is virtually obsolete, except in the phrase "and the like," which is not found in English Versions of the Bible. "The like," however, occurs in 1Ki 10:20 parallel 2Ch 9:19; 2Ch 1:12; Eze 5:9; 18:10 (the Revised Version (British and American) "any one of these things"—the text is uncertain); 45:25; Joe 2:2; The Wisdom of Solomon 16:1 (the Revised Version (British and American) "creatures like those"); Sirach 7:12. "His like" is found in Job 41:33; Sirach 13:15; "their like" in Sirach 27:9. "And such like" (Ga 5:21) is only slightly archaic, but "doeth not such like" (Eze 18:14) is quite obsolete.

(2) As an adjective "like" is common in the King James Version in such combinations as "like manner" (frequently), "like weight" (Ex 30:34), "like occupation" (Ac 19:25), etc. Modern English

would in most cases replace "like" by "the same," as has been done in 1Th 2:14 the Revised Version (British and American) (compare Ro 15:5; Php 2:2). So the Revised Version (British and American) has modernized the archaic "like precious faith" of 2Pe 1:1 by inserting "a" before "like." The King James Version's rendering of 1Pe 3:21, "the like figure whereunto," could not have been very clear at any time, and the Revised Version (British and American) has revised completely into "after a true likeness" (margin, "in the antitype").

(3) As an adverb "like" is used in Jer 38:9, "He is like to die"; Jon 1:4, "like to be broken." the Revised Version (British and American) could have used "likely" in these verses. Most common of all the uses of "like" is the quasi-prepositional construction in "He is like a man," etc. This is of course good modern English, but not so when "like" is enlarged (as it usually is in the English Versions of the Bible) into the forms "like to" (Da 7:5), "like unto" (very common), "like as" (Isa 26:17, etc.). These forms and the simple "like" are interchanged without much distinction, and the Revised Version (British and American) has attempted little systematizing beyond reducing the occurrences of "like as" (compare Mt 12:13, and the American Standard Revised Version Isa 13:4; Jer 23:29).

(4) The verb "like" has two distinct meanings, "be pleased with" and "give pleasure to." The latter sense occurs in De 23:16 (The King James Version, the English Revised Version), "in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best," and in Es 8:8; Am 4:5 the King James Version; Sirach 33:13 (the American Standard Revised Version has "pleaseth" in the three Old Testament passages). The other use of "like" belongs also to modern English, although in a much weakened sense. On account of this weakening, 1Ch 28:4 the King James Version, "liked me to make me king" and Ro 1:28 the King James Version "did not like to retain God," have become in the Revised Version (British and American) "took pleasure in" and "refused to" (margin "did not approve"). It would have been better if De 25:7,8, "like not to take," had been modified also into "hath no wish to take." From this use of "like" is derived liking in the modern sense in The Wisdom of Solomon 16:21, tempered itself to every man's liking" (the Revised Version (British and American) "choice"). In 1 Esdras 4:39, "All men do well like of her works" is a further obsolete use.

(5) Liken and "make like" are common. To be noted only is that, in Heb 7:3, "made like unto the Son of God," the sense really is "likened to," "presented by the writer with the qualities of." Likeness normally means "a copy of," but in Ps 17:15 it means the actual form itself ("form" in the American Standard Revised Version, the English Revised Version margin); compare Ro 6:5; 8:3; Php 2:7, and perhaps Ac 14:11. Closely allied with likeness" is an obsolete use of "liking" (quite distinct from that above) in Job 39:4 the King James Version the English Revised Version, "Their young ones are in good liking" Da 1:10, "see your faces worse liking." The meaning is "appearance," "appearing," and the American Standard Revised Version renders "their young ones become strong," "see your faces worse looking." Likewise varies in meaning from the simple conjunction "and" to a strong adverb, "in exactly the same way." the Revised Version (British and American) has made some attempt to distinguish the various forces (e.g. compare the King James Version with the Revised Version (British and American) in Lu 22:36; 15:7; 22:20). But complete consistency was not attainable, and in certain instances was neglected deliberately, in order to preserve the familiar wording, as in Lu 10:37, "Go, and do thou likewise."

Burton Scott Easton

LIKHI

lik’-hi (liqchi): A descendant of Manasseh (1Ch 7:19).

LILITH

lil’-ith, li’-lith.

See NIGHT-MONSTER.

LILY

lil’-i (shushan (1Ki 7:19), shoshannah (2Ch 4:5; So 2:1 f; Ho 14:5); plural (So 2:16; 4:5; 5:13; 6:2 f; 7:2; Ecclesiasticus 39:14; 50:8); krinon (Mt 6:28; Lu 12:27)): The Hebrew is probably a loan word from the Egyptian the original s-sh-n denoting the lotus-flower, Nymphaea lotus. This was probably the model of the architectural ornament, translated "lily-work," which appeared upon the capitals of the columns in the temple porch (1Ki 7:19), upon the top of the pillars (1Ki 7:22) and upon the turned-back rim of the "molten sea" (1Ki 7:26).

Botanically the word shoshannah, like the similar modern Arabic Susan, included in all probability a great many flowers, and was used in a way at least as wide as the popular use of the English word "lily." The expression "lily of the valleys" (So 2:1) has nothing to do with the plant of that name; the flowers referred to appear to have been associated with the rank herbage of the valley bottoms (So 4:5); the expression "His lips are as lilies" (So 5:13) might imply a scarlet flower, but more probably in oriental imagery signifies a sweet-scented flower; the sweet scent of the lily is referred to in Ecclesiasticus 39:14, and in 50:8 we read of "lilies by the rivers of water." The beauty of the blossom is implied in Ho 14:5, where Yahweh promises that repentant Israel shall "blossom as the lily." A "heap of wheat set about with lilies" (So 7:2) probably refers to the smoothed-out piles of newly threshed wheat on the threshing-floors decorated by a circlet of flowers.

The reference of our Lord to the "lilies of the field" is probably, like the Old Testament references, quite a general one.

The Hebrew and the Greek very likely include not only any members of the great order Liliaceae, growing in Palestine, e.g. asphodel, squill, hyacinth, ornithogalum ("Star of Bethlehem"), fritillaria, tulip and colocynth, but also the more showy irises ("Tabor lilies" "purple irises," etc.) and the beautiful gladioli of the Natural Order. Irideae and the familiar narcissi of the Natural Order Amaryllideae.

In later Jewish literature the lily is very frequently referred to symbolically, and a lotus or lily was

commonly pictured on several Jewish coins.

E. W. G. Masterman

LILY-WORK

The ornament of the capitals on the bronze pillars, Jachin and Boaz, in front of Solomon’s temple (1Ki 7:19,22).

See LILY; TEMPLE; JACHIN AND BOAZ.

LIME

lim

(1) sidh; compare Arabic shad, "to plaster";

(2) gir; compare Arabic jir, "gypsum" or "quick-lime";

(3) ‘abene-ghir):

Sidh is translated "lime" in Isa 33:12, "And the peoples shall be as the burnings of lime, as thorns cut down, that are burned in the fire," and in Am 2:1, "He burned the bones of the king of Edom into lime." It is translated "plaster" in De 27:2, "Thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaster them with plaster," also in De 27:4. Gir is translated "plaster" in Da 5:5, "wrote .... upon the plaster of the wall." In Isa 27:9 we have, "He maketh all the stones of the altar as chalkstones" (’abhene-ghir).

Everywhere in Palestine limestone is at hand which can be converted into lime. The lime-kiln is a thick-walled, cylindrical or conical, roofless structure built of rough stones without mortar, the spaces between the stones being plastered with clay. It is usually built on the side of a hill which is slightly excavated for it, so that the sloping, external wall of the kiln rises much higher from the ground on the lower side than on the upper. The builders leave a passage or tunnel through the base of the thick wall on the lower side. The whole interior is filled with carefully packed fragments of limestone, and large piles of thorny-burner and other shrubs to serve as fuel are gathered about the kiln. The fuel is introduced through the tunnel to the base of the limestone in the kiln, and as the fire rises through the mass of broken limestone a strong draft is created. Relays of men are kept busy supplying fuel day and night. By day a column of black smoke rises from the kiln, and at night the flames may be seen bursting from the top. Several days are required to reduce the stone to lime, the amount of time depending upon the size of the kiln and upon the nature of the fuel. At the present day, mineral coal imported from Europe is sometimes employed, and requires much less time than the shrubs which are ordinarily used.

See CHALKSTONE; CLAY.

Alfred Ely Day

LIMIT

lim’-it (gebhul, "bound"): Occurs once in Eze 43:12 ("limit" of holy mountain). "Limited" (Ps 78:41) and "limiteth" (horizo, Heb 4:7) are changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "provoked" (the margin retains "limited") and "defineth" respectively.

LINE

lin (qaw, chebhel): Usually of a measuring line, as Jer 31:39; Eze 47:3; Zec 1:16 (qaw); Ps 78:55; Am 7:17; Zec 2:1 (chebhel). Other Hebrew words mean simply a cord or thread (Jos 2:18,21; 1Ki 7:15; Eze 40:3). In Ps 19:4 (qaw, "Their line is gone out through all the earth"), the reference is probably still to measurement (the heaven as spanning and bounding the earth), though the Septuagint, followed by Ro 10:18, takes it as meaning a musical cord phthoggos). The "line," as measure, suggests rule of conduct (Isa 28:10). For "line" in Isa 44:13, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "pencil," margin "red ochre" (seredh), and in 2Co 10:16, "province," margin "limit" (kanon).

See also MEASURING LINE; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

James Orr

LINEAGE

lin’-e-aj (patria): Found only once in Lu 2:4 (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "family"), and signifying the line of paternal family descent. A word pregnant in meaning among the Jews, who kept all family records with religious care, as may be seen from the long genealogical records found everywhere in the Old Testament.

LINEN

lin’-en (badh, "white linen," used chiefly for priestly robes, buts, "byssus," a fine white Egyptian linen, called in the earlier writings shesh; pesheth, "flax," cadhin; bussos, othonion, linon, sindon): Thread or cloth made of flax.

1. History:

Ancient Egypt was noted for its fine linen (Ge 41:42; Isa 19:9). From it a large export trade was carried on with surrounding nations, including the Hebrews, who early learned the art of spinning from the

Egyptians (Ex 35:25) and continued to rely on them for the finest linen (Pr 7:16; Eze 27:7). The culture of flax in Palestine probably antedated the conquest, for in Jos 2:6 we read of the stalks of flax which Rahab had laid in order upon the roof. Among the Hebrews, as apparently among the Canaanites, the spinning and weaving of linen were carried on by the women (Pr 31:13,19), among whom skill in this work was considered highly praiseworthy (Ex 35:25). One family, the house of Ashbea, attained eminence as workers in linen (1Ch 4:21; 2Ch 2:14).

2. General Uses:

Linen was used, not only in the making of garments of the finer kinds and for priests, but also for shrouds, hangings, and possibly for other purposes in which the most highly prized cloth of antiquity would naturally be desired.

3. Priestly Garments:

The robes of the Hebrew priests consisted of 4 linen garments, in addition to which the high priest wore garments of other stuffs (Ex 28; 39; Le 6:10; 16:4; 1Sa 22:18; Eze 44:17,18). Egyptian priests are said to have worn linen robes (Herod. ii.37). In religious services by others than priests, white linen was also preferred, as in the case of the infant Samuel (1Sa 2:18), the Levite singers in the temple (2Ch 5:12), and even royal personages (2Sa 6:14; 1Ch 15:27). Accordingly, it was ascribed to angels (Eze 9:2,3,11; 10:2,6,7; Da 10:5; 12:6,7). Fine linen, white and pure, is the raiment assigned to the armies which are in heaven following Him who is called Faithful and True (Re 19:14). It is deemed a fitting symbol of the righteousness and purity of the saints (Re 19:8).

4. Other Garments:

Garments of distinction were generally made of the same material: e.g. those which Pharaoh gave Joseph (Ge 41:42), and those which Mordecai wore (Es 8:15; compare also Lu 16:19). Even a girdle of fine linen could be used by a prophet as a means of attracting attention to his message (Jer 13:1). It is probable that linen wrappers of a coarser quality were used by men (Jud 14:12,13) and women (Pr 31:22). The use of linen, however, for ordinary purposes probably suggested unbecoming luxury (Isa 3:23; Eze 16:10,13; compare also Re 18:12,16). The poorer classes probably wore wrappers made either of unbleached flax or hemp (Ecclesiasticus 40:4; Mr 14:51). The use of a mixture called sha’aTnez, which is defined (De 22:11) as linen and wool together, was forbidden in garments.

5. Shrouds:

The Egyptians used linen exclusively in wrapping their mummies (Herod. ii.86). As many as one hundred yards were used in one bandage. Likewise, the Hebrews seem to have preferred this material for winding-sheets for the dead, at least in the days of the New Testament (Mt 27:59; Mr 15:46; Lu 23:53; Joh 19:40; 20:5) and the Talmud (Jerusalem Killayim 9:32b).

6. Hangings:

The use of twisted linen (shesh moshzar) for fine hangings dates back to an early period. It was used in the tabernacle (Ex 26:1; 27:9; 35$; 36$; 38$; Josephus, Ant, III, vi, 2), in the temple (2Ch 3:14), and no doubt in other places (Mishna, Yoma', iii.4). Linen cords for hangings are mentioned in the description of the palace of Ahasuerus at Shushan (Es 1:6).

7. Other Uses:

Other uses are suggested, such as for sails, in the imaginary ship to which Tyre is compared (Eze 27:7), but judging from the extravagance of the other materials in the ship, it is doubtful whether we may infer that such valuable material as linen was ever actually used for this purpose. It is more likely, however, that it was used for coverings or tapestry (Pr 7:16), and possibly in other instances where an even, durable material was needed, as in making measuring lines (Eze 40:3).

Ella Davis Isaacs

LINTEL

lin'-tel.

See HOUSE, II, 1, (4).

LINUS

li'-nus (Linos (2Ti 4:21)): One of Paul's friends in Rome during his second and last imprisonment in that city. He was one of the few who remained faithful to the apostle, even when most of the Christians had forsaken him. And writing to Timothy when he realized that his execution could not be very far distant—for he was now ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand (2Ti 4:6)—he sends greeting to Timothy from four friends whom he names, and Linus is one of them. There is a tradition that Linus was bishop of the church at Rome. "It is perhaps fair to assume, though of course there is no certainty of this, that the consecration of Linus to the government of the Roman church as its first bishop was one of the dying acts of the apostle Paul" (H.D.M. Spence, in Ellicott's New Testament Commentary on 2 Tim).

Irenaeus—bishop of Lyons about 178 AD—in his defense of orthodox doctrine against the Gnostics "appeals especially to the bishops of Rome, as depositories of the apostolic tradition." The list of Irenaeus commences with Linus, whom he identifies with the person of this name mentioned by Paul, and whom he states to have been "entrusted with the office of the bishopric by the apostles ..... With the many possibilities of error, no more can safely be assumed of Linus .... than that he held some prominent position in the Roman church" (Lightfoot's "Dissertation on the Christian Ministry," in Commentary on Phil, 220 f).

"Considering the great rarity of this Greek mythological name as a proper name for persons, we can hardly doubt that here, as Irenaeus has directly asserted, the same Roman Christian is meant who, according to ancient tradition, became after Peter and Paul the first bishop of Rome. Among the mythical characters in Apostolical Constitutions, vii, 46 occurs Linos ho Klaudias, who is declared to have been ordained by Paul as the first bishop of Rome. He is thus represented as the son or husband of the Claudia whose name comes after his in 2Ti 4:21.

"These meager statements have been enlarged upon by English investigators. The Claudia mentioned here is, they hold, identical with the one who, according to Martial, married a certain Pudens (85-90 AD), and she, in turn, with the Claudia Rufina from Britain, who is then made out to be a daughter of the British king, Cogidumnus, or Titus Claudius Cogidubnus. For a refutation of these assumptions, which, even chronologically considered, are impossible, see Lightfoot, Clement, I, 76-79" (Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, 20).

John Rutherfurd

LION

li’-un:

(1) Occurring most often in the Old Testament is ‘aryeh, plural ‘ardyoth. Another form, ‘ari, plural ‘arayim, is found less often.

1. Names:

Compare ‘ari’el, "Ariel" (Ezr 8:16; Isa 29:1,2,7); char’el, "upper altar," and ‘ari’el, "altar hearth" (Eze 43:15); ‘aryeh, "Arieh" (2Ki 15:25); ‘ar’eli, "Areli" and "Arelites" (Ge 46:16; Nu 26:17).

(2) kephir, "young lion," often translated "lion" (Ps 35:17; Pr 19:12; 23:1, etc.).

(3) shachal, translated "fierce lion" or "lion" (Job 4:10; 10:16; 28:8; Ho 5:14).

(4) layish, translated "old lion" or "lion" (Job 4:11; Pr 30:30; Isa 30:6).

Compare Arabic laith, "lion": layish, "Laish," or "Leshem" (Jos 19:47; Jud 18:7,14,27,29); layish, "Laish" (1Sa 25:44; 2Sa 3:15).

(5) lebhi, plural lebha’im, "lioness", also labhi’, and ‘lebhiya’ (Ge 49:9; Nu 23:24; 24:9); compare town in South of Judah, Lebaoth (Jos 15:32) or Beth-lebaoth (Jos 19:6); also Arabic labwat, "lioness "; Lebweh, a town in Coele-Syria.

(6) aur, gor, "whelp," with ‘aryeh or a pronoun, e.g. "Judah is a lion’s whelp," gur ‘aryeh (Ge 49:9); "young ones" of the jackal (La 4:3). Also bene labhi’," whelps (sons) of the lioness" (Job 4:11); and kephir ‘arayoth, "young lion," literally, "the young of lions" (Jud 14:5). In Job 28:8, the King James Version has "lion’s whelps" for bene shachats, the Revised Version (British and American) "proud beasts." the Revised Version margin "sons of pride"; compare Job 41:34 (Hebrew 26).

(7) leon, "lion" (2Ti 4:17; Heb 11:33; 1Pe 5:8; Re 4:7; 5:5; The Wisdom of Solomon 11:17; Ecclesiasticus 4:30; 13:19; Bel and the Dragon 31,32,34).

(8) skumnos, "whelp" (1 Macc 3:4).

2. Natural History:

The lion is not found in Palestine at the present day, though in ancient times it is known to have inhabited not only Syria and Palestine but also Asia Minor and the Balkan peninsula, and its fossil remains show that it was contemporary with prehistoric man in Northwestern Europe and Great Britain. Its present range extends throughout Africa, and it is also found in Mesopotamia, Southern Persia, and the border of India. There is some reason to think that it may be found in Arabia, but its occurrence there remains to be proved. The Asiatic male lion does not usually have as large a mane as the African, but both belong to one species, Fells leo.

3. Figurative:

Lions are mentioned in the Bible for their strength (Jud 14:18), boldness (2Sa 17:10), ferocity (Ps 7:2), and stealth (Ps 10:9; La 3:10). Therefore in prophetical references to the millennium, the lion, with the bear, wolf, and leopard, is mentioned as living in peace with the ox, calf, kid, lamb and the child (Ps 91:13; Isa 11:6-8; 65:25). The roaring of the lion is often mentioned (Job 4:10; Ps 104:21; Isa 31:4 (the Revised Version (British and American) "growling"); Jer 51:38; Eze 22:25; Ho 11:10). Judah is a "lion’s whelp" (Ge 49:9), likewise Da (De 33:22). It is said of certain of David’s warriors (1Ch 12:8) that their "faces were like the faces of lions." David’s enemy (Ps 17:12) "is like a lion that is greedy of his prey." "The king’s wrath is as the roaring of a lion" (Pr 19:12). God in His wrath is "unto Ephraim as a lion, and as a young lion to the house of Judah" (Ho 5:14). "The devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour" (1Pe 5:8). "Lion" occurs in the figurative language of Ezekiel, Daniel, and Revelation. The figures of lions were used in the decorations of Solomon’s temple and throne (1Ki 7:29,36; 10:19 f).

4. Narrative:

Nearly all references to the lion are figurative. The only notices of the lion in narrative are of the lion slain by Samson (Jud 14:5); by David (1Sa 17:34 f); by Benaiah (2Sa 23:20; 1Ch 11:22); the prophet slain by a lion (1Ki 13:24; also 1Ki 20:36); the lions sent by the Lord among the settlers in Samaria (2Ki

17:25); Daniel in the lions' den (Da 6:16). In all these cases the word used is 'aryeh or 'ari.

5. Vocabulary:

The Arabic language boasts hundreds of names for the lion. Many of these are, however, merely adjectives used substantively. The commonest Arabic names are sab', 'asad, laith, and labwat, the last two of which are identified above with the Hebrew layish and labhi'. As in Arabic, so in Hebrew, the richness of the language in this particular gives opportunity for variety of expression, as in Job 4:10,11:

"The roaring of the lion ('aryeh), and the voice of the fierce lion (shachal),

And the teeth of the young lions (kephirim), are broken.

The old lion (layish) perisheth for lack of prey,

And the whelps of the lioness (bene labhi') are scattered abroad."

In Jud 14:5-18, no less than three different terms, kephir 'arayoth, aryeh, and 'ari, are used of Samson's lion.

Alfred Ely Day

LIP

(saphah, sepheth, "lip," "language," "speech," "talk" (also "rim," "border," "shore," "bank," etc.), sapham, "(upper) lip," "moustache," "beard"; cheilos, "lip" (also once, "shore" in the quotation Heb 11:12 equals Ge 22:17)):

(1) Lips stand in oriental idiom for speech or language, like "mouth," "tongue"; therefore they stand in parallelism. "The lip of truth shall be established for ever; but a lying tongue is but for a moment" (Pr 12:19). "To shoot out the lip" (Ps 22:7) means to make a mocking, contemptuous, scornful face. As the lips are the chief instrument of speech, we find numerous idiomatic phrases for "speaking," such as: "the utterance of the lips" (Nu 30:6,8), "to proceed out of the lips" (Nu 30:12), "to open the lips" (Job 32:20), "to go out of the lips" (Ps 17:1). These expressions do not convey, as a rule, the idea that the utterance proceeds merely out of the lips, and that it lacks sincerity and the consent of the heart, but occasionally this is intended, e.g. "This people draw nigh unto me, and with their mouth and with their lips do honor me, but have removed their heart far from me" (Isa 29:13; compare Mt 15:8). The "fruit of the lips" (Isa 57:19 equals Heb 13:15) and "calves of the lips" (Ho 14:2 the King James Version) designate the praise and thanksgiving due to God. "Fervent (the King James Version "burning") lips" (Pr 26:23) are synonymous with eloquence. "To refrain the lips" (Ps 40:9; Pr 10:19) means to keep silence, where the godless or unwise would wish to assert his rights.

Numerous other expressions need no further explanation, such as "perverse lips" (Pr 4:24), "uncircumcised lips" (Ex 6:12,30), "feigned lips" (Ps 17:1), "lying lips" (Ps 31:18; Pr 10:18; 12:22), "wicked (or false) lips" (Pr 17:4), "unclean lips" (Isa 6:5), "strange (the King James Version "stammering") lips" (Isa 28:11), "flattering lips" (Ps 12:2,3; Pr 7:21), "righteous lips" (Pr 16:13).

(2) The Hebrew word sapham is found only in the phrase "to cover the lip or lips," which is an expression of mourning, submission and shame. The Oriental covers his lips with his hand or a portion of his garment, when he has been sunk into deep grief and sorrow. He expresses, thereby, that he cannot open his mouth at the visitation of God. Differently, however, from common mourners, Ezekiel was forbidden of God "to cover his lips" (Eze 24:17; see also Eze 24:22), i.e. to mourn in the usual way over Israel's downfall, as Israel had brought these judgments upon himself. The leper, victim of an incurable disease, walks about with rent clothes and hair disheveled, covering his lips, crying: "Unclean, unclean!" (Le 13:45). The thought here is that even the breath of such a one may defile. The prophet calls upon all seers and diviners, to whom God has refused the knowledge of the future, to cover their lips in shame and confusion (Mic 3:7).

H. L. E. Luering

LIQUOR

lik'-er: Every sort of intoxicating liquor except the beverage prepared from the juice of the grape (yayin), according to the usage of the Old Testament, is comprehended under the generic term shekhar (compare shakhar, to "be drunk"), rendered "strong drink" (compare Greek sikera in Lu 1:15). The two terms, yayin and shekhar, "wine" and "strong drink," are often found together and are used by Old Testament writers as an exhaustive classification of the beverages in use among the ancient Hebrews (Le 10:9; 1Sa 1:15; Pr 20:1, etc.).

See WINE; DRINK, STRONG.

LIST

A variant of "lust" (see LUST), meaning "to wish," found in the King James Version of Mt 17:12 parallel Mr 9:13; Joh 3:8, as translation of thelo, and in Jas 3:4 as translation of boulomai. The last case the English Revised Version has rendered "will," and the American Standard Revised Version has made the same change throughout. The word is obsolete in modern English, but Joh 3:8 is still used proverbially, "The wind bloweth where it listeth."

LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC, 1

lit'-er-a-tur, sub-ap-os-tol'-ik (Christian):

I. EPISTLE OF CLEMENT TO THE CORINTHIANS

1. Authorship and Date

2. Occasion and Contents

3. Apologetic Testimony

4. Doctrinal Testimony

5. Office-Bearers and Organization

6. Ritual

II. THE DIDACHE

1. Disappearance and Recovery

2. Date

3. Standpoint, Authorship and Object

4. Testimony to New Testament Writings

5. Contents and Notabilia

III. EPISTLES OF IGNATIUS

1. Author and Date

2. Genuineness

3. Leading Ideas

4. Other Notabilia

IV. EPISTLES OF POLYCARP

1. Date and Genuineness

2. Occasion and Contents

3. Notabilia

V. PAPIAS FRAGMENTS

1. Author and Date

2. Testimony to Matthew and Mark

3. Other Notabilia

VI. EPISTLE OF BARNABAS

1. Authorship

2. Date

3. Object and Contents

4. Notabilia

VII. PASTOR (SHEPHERD) OF HERMAS

1. Authorship and Date

2. Object and Contents

3. Notabilia

VIII. SECOND EPISTLE OF CLEMENT

1. Nature and Document

2. Date and Authorship

3. Contents

4. Notabilia

IX. APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES

1. Recovery and Date

2. Contents

3. Notabilia

X. JUSTIN MARTYR

1. Incidents of Life

2. First Apology

3. Second Apology

4. Dialogue with Trypho the Jew

5. Notabilia

XI. EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

1. Date and Authorship

2. Contents

LITERATURE

The Sub-apostolic Age is usually held to extend from the death of John, the last surviving apostle, about 100 AD, to the death of Polycarp, John's aged disciple (155-56 AD). The Christian literature of this period, although as a whole of only moderate intrinsic value, is of historical interest and importance. This is owing to the light which it throws back on apostolic times, and the testimony borne to Christian life, thought, worship, work and organization during an age when the church was under the guidance, mainly, of men who had been associated with the apostles and who might be supposed, therefore, to know their mind. Some writings are omitted from this review, having been dealt with in previous articles. For the Protevangelium of James and the Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; APOCRYPHAL ACTS. For an account of extant fragments of Basilides and Valentinus, see GNOSTICISM. For pseudo-Clementine writings see PETER, EPISTLES OF; SIMON MAGUS.

I. Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians.

1. Authorship and Date:

Only the larger part had previously been extant, when the complete epistle was recovered in 1875 by Bryennios, bishop of Nicomedia. The high honor in which it was held by early Christendom is attested

(1) by its position in Codex Alexandrinus, at the end of the New Testament, and in an ancient Syriac MS, between the Catholic and Pauline Epistles;

(2) by its being publicly read in many churches down to the 4th century.

(Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 16). The work is anonymous, but sent in the name of the Roman church. Dionysius of Corinth (170 AD) refers to it as written by the agency of (dia) Clement (Historia Ecclesiastica, IV, 23); Clement of Alexandria states distinctly the Clementine authorship (Strom., iv.17). The writer is evidently leading office-bearer of his church, and is identified with the Clement whom Eusebius designates as third "bishop" (or chief presbyter) of Rome after Peter, and as holding office between 92 and 101 AD (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 34). Clement is further identified by Origen (Commentary on John) and in HE, III, 15 with the Clement of Php 4:3; but the name is too common and the interval too long to render this identity more than possible. Some conjecture the writer to be the consul, Flavius Clemens, whom Domitian (his cousin) put to death in 95 AD for alleged "atheism," i.e. probably, profession of Christianity (see Harnack, Gesch. Lit., I, 253, note 1). But Clement the "bishop" is never otherwise referred to as a martyr, and a member of the imperial family would hardly have been head of the Roman church without so signal a fact being noted by some contemporary or later writer. Lightfoot, with some probability, supposes (Apostolic Fathers, I, 61) that Clement was a "freedman or the son of freedman, belonging to the household of Flavius Clemens." From Paul’s time (Php 4:22) the imperial household included Christians; and many slaves were men of culture. To such a Christian freedman’s influence the consul’s conversion may have been due. Internal evidence points to Clement having been a Hellenist Jew or proselyte of Judaism; for he writes with some classical culture and with knowledge of Old Testament history and of the Septuagint; his style, moreover, has a "strong Hebraistic tinge" (Lightfoot, p. 59). The date of the epistle is fixed approximately by a reference to a persecution at Rome in progress or very recent; this persecution (during Clement’s "episcopate") was doubtless that by Domitian in 95 AD. Clement’s Epistle is thus not strictly within the Sub-apostolic Age, but it is uniformly included in sub-apostolic literature.

2. Occasion and Contents:

The occasion was a church feud at Corinth, and the expulsion of some faithful presbyters. The writer seeks to procure their restoration and to heal the dissension. He quotes Old Testament examples of the evil issue of envy and strife, and of the blessedness of humility, submission and concord. He adduces as a pattern the peace and harmony of Nature. In this connection occurs an anticipation of geographical discovery, when the author writes (chapter xx) of "the impassable ocean and the worlds beyond it" (compare Seneca, Medea ii.375; Strabo i.4; Plut. Mor. ix.41). Paul’s warnings in 1 Corinthians about party spirit are recalled; a not unworthy echo of 1Co 13 is embodied; and the erring community is solemnly monished.

In the course of the letter, with obvious reference to 1Co 15, Clement introduces the resurrection, for which he argues from the Old Testament and from natural analogies. He refers to the phoenix which lives 500 years, and, when dissolution approaches, builds a nest of spices into which it enters to die. As the flesh decays, however, a "worm is generated, which is nurtured from the dead bird's moisture and putteth forth wings." The fable is mentioned by Herodotus and Pliny.

A lengthy prayer of intercession for "all sorts and conditions of men" is abruptly introduced near the end, in order, presumably, to imbue Corinthian Christians with that charity which they needed and which is the chief incentive to intercession. The epistle closes with a hopeful anticipation of restored concord and peace.

3. Apologetic Testimony:

Apologetic testimony is found to (1) books of the New Testament, namely, to the Pauline authorship of I Corinthians; to Mark's Gospel, through which (chapter xv) he quotes Isa 29:13, reproducing Mark's variations from the Septuagint; to Acts, through which he similarly quotes (chapter xviii) 1Sa 13:14; to Romans, Ephesians, 1 Timothy, Titus, James, 1 Peter (chapters xxxv, xlvi, xxi, ii, xlvi, xlix, respectively). The parallels between Clement and He are so numerous that the latter work has from early times been ascribed to him by some (Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 25). But the general type both of thought and of diction is dissimilar; (2) against the Tubingen theory of essential divergence between the doctrine of Peter and of Paul. The chief presbyter of Rome could not have been ignorant of such divergence; yet he refers the partisanship of which the two apostles were victims entirely to the Corinthians, not at all to the apostles (chapter xlix).

4. Doctrinal Testimony:

Doctrinal testimony is found:

(1) to the Trinity, "As God liveth and the Lord Jesus Christ liveth, and the Holy Spirit" (chapter lviii);

(2) to the personality of Christ, "The Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the majesty forever." In union and communion with Christ we have life, are sanctified, possess love, manifest godliness (chapter i, xxxvi);

(3) to the atonement: Clement ascribes to Christ's death not merely subjective moral influence, but objective vicarious efficacy in securing our salvation, without any attempt, however, to explain the mystery. Christ hath "given his flesh for our flesh, his life for our lives" (chapter xlix);

(4) to justification which is distinctly enunciated as before God through faith (chapter xxxii). But this faith (as in Paul's writings) is a "faith which worketh" (chapter xxxv), and such justification is consistent with our being justified by works before men;

(5) to the inspiration of Scripture, which is real ("the Holy Spirit saith"), but not verbal; for quotations are often inexact. Apocryphal books are quoted, but not with a formula indicating Divine authority.

5. Office-Bearers and Organization:

(1) The basis of authority is not sacerdotal, but a combination of official succession and popular call; office-bearers are appointed "by the apostles or afterward by men of repute with consent of the whole ecclesia."

(2) Clement indicates no distinction between presbyter and bishop. Office-bearers designated as presbyters (chapters xlvii, liv) are referred to (chapters xlii, xliv) as filling the office of bishop. Addressing a church on congregational strife and insubordination, he refers to no single bishop in authority over the church. Had the episcopate, in the post-New Testament sense of mono-episcopate, been apostolically enjoined, surely the injunction would have been obeyed or enforced in Corinth.

(3) None the less we discern in Clement’s own position and action the anticipation of the later episcopate. Clement is an example of how, through the personal qualities and ecclesiastical services of the man, the status of presiding presbyter developed out of seniority into superiority, out of representativeness into official authority.

(4) The early germ of the papacy is disclosed in the passage: "If certain persons should be disobedient unto the words spoken by God through us, let them understand that they will entangle themselves in no slight transgression and peril" (chapter lix). Such assumption by a revered man like Clement might give no offense, and the Corinthians plainly needed correction. Still we have here the first stage in the process which ultimately issued in the Roman claim to universal spiritual supremacy. The assumption, however, is not grounded on Clement’s own official position (he speaks always in the 1st person plural), but on the superior dignity of the Roman church. The later theory of supremacy builds Roman authority on the primacy of Peter and his successors; but here the authority of the leading presbyter, in dealing with a provincial church, rests on the suggested primacy of the ecclesia in which he presides.

6. Ritual:

(1) The long prayer (chapters lix-lxi) bears internal evidence of liturgical character, through its balanced and rhythmical style, its somewhat remote relevance to the special object of the ep., and greater suitability for congregational worship, than as part of a counsel to a sister church. This internal testimony is confirmed by the correspondence of the prayer in certain verbal details with the earliest extant liturgies, particularly those of Mark and James, pointing to the early use in the Roman church of forms of prayer afterward incorporated into these liturgies. While there is evidence that down at least to the time (148 AD) of Justin’s 1st Apology (chapter lxvii) a minister offered up prayers of his own composition, this prayer of Clement’s Epistle indicates that before the close of the Apostolic Age, forms of supplication had begun to be introduced, not to the exclusion of "free prayer," but simply as a mode of congregational devotion countenanced by a venerated leader of the church at Rome.

(2) In chapter lvi Clement writes about "compassionate remembrance of them (i.e. the erring brethren) before God and the saints." By the saints, however, are most probably meant, not the beatified dead, but the living Christian brotherhood, as in 1Co 1:2; 2Co 8:4.

This epistle leaves on readers' minds two different yet mutually compatible impressions—impressions both apparently made on the early church, by which the letter was widely read at public worship and yet excluded from the Canon of Scriptures. We realize, on the one hand, the inferiority of this writing to epistles of apostles. Clement's mind is receptive, not creative; and the freshness of thought characteristic of New Testament writers is absent. What New Testament book, moreover, contains such a foolish legend as that of the phoenix? On the other hand, this epistle breathes much of the spirit, as it adopts in considerable measure the phraseology and style of apostolic writings. It is as if, although the sun of special inspiration had sunk below the horizon, there remained to the church for a while a spiritual afterglow.

II. The "Didache"

1. Disappearance and Recovery:

The "Didache" or Teaching (longer title, "The Teaching of the Lord, by (dia) the Twelve Apostles, to the Gentiles").—This work is quoted as "Scripture," without being named, by Clement of Alexandria (circa 170 AD, in Strom., i.20). It is mentioned in HE, III, 25 as the "Teachings so-called of the Apostles," "recognized by most ecclesiastical writers," although "not a genuine" composition of apostles. Athanasius (Fest. Epistle, 39) denies its canonicity, but acknowledges its utility. The latest ancient reference to the work from personal knowledge is by Nicephoros (9th century) who includes it among apocryphal writings. Thenceforth it disappears until its recent recovery in 1875 by Bryennios.

2. Date:

There is no reliable external testimony to date. Resemblances too considerable to be accidental exist between the Didache and the Epistle of Barnabas; but opinion is divided as to priority of composition. Lightfoot and others favor a common lost source. As to internal evidence the simplicity of the Eucharist and of baptism as here described, with no formal admission to the catechumenate (chapter vii); the use of "bishop" to denote the same office-bearer as presbyter; and the expectation of an impending Second Advent—point to an early date. On the other hand it is unlikely that a writing which professes to give the Teaching of the Twelve would be issued until all or most apostles had passed away; and the writer seems to be acquainted with writings of John (Didache, ix.2; x.2; x.5; see Schaff, Oldest Church Manual, 90). Probably the document went through a series of recensions (Harnack in Sch-Herz; Bertlet in DB, V), and the date or dates of composition may be put between 80 and 120 AD.

3. Standpoint, Authorship and Object:

The work does not profess to be written by apostles; but the author seems to be a Jewish Christian, for he calls Friday "Preparation Day," and the style and diction are Hebraic. The work is neither Judaistic nor Ebionite: circumcision, the Sabbath, and special Mosaic observances, are ignored. From the book in whole or in part being addressed specially, although not exclusively, to Gentiles, we infer that the community among whom it was composed, while mainly Jewish Christian, made special provision for conversion and instruction of Gentiles. The doctrinal standpoint is neither Pauline nor anti-Pauline, but resembles that of Jas. Canon Spence (Teaching) conjectures plausibly that the author may be Simeon, cousin of James the Lord's brother, who became chief presbyter of the Jewish Christian community, first at Jerusalem, afterward at Pella, until his martyrdom in 107 AD.

4. Testimony to New Testament Writings:

Mt was certainly in the writer's hands; for the Didache contains 22 quotations from, or reminiscences of, that Gospel, extending over ten chapters of it. Particularly notable is Didache, viii.2, "Neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded in His Gospel; after this manner pray ye, Our Father," etc. (see also vii.1; ix.5; xvi.6). There are also references to the Gospel of Luke (Didache, iii.5, 16); John's writings (see above); Ac (Didache, iv.8), Romans (Didache, iv.5), 2Th (Didache, xiv.1), 1Pe (Didache, i.4). No extra-canonical saying of our Lord is recorded.

5. Contents and Notabilia:

The contents and notabilia may be examined as follows:

(1) Didactic (Chapters i through vi):

Intended for catechumens in preparation for baptism. This catechetical manual (the earliest of its kind) opens with the words: "There are two ways: one of life and one of death" (suggested probably by Jer 21:8). From this text the writer gives a summary of Christian duty especially toward our neighbor, based on the Decalogue, the Golden Rule, and the Sermon on the Mount, which is frequently quoted.

Among notable precepts is a command to fast as well as pray for enemies; a warning against infanticide which, in the case of sickly infants, heathenism approved, and against augury and astrology as generating idolatry; an admonition not to" stretch out one's hands for receiving and to draw them in for giving"; an injunction to " share all things with thy brethren, and not to say that they are thine own"; a command to "love some above thine own life"; and a quaint corrective against indiscriminate and ill-informed beneficence: "Let thine alms sweat into thy hands until thou know to whom thou shouldest give." A precept to "give with thy hands a ransom for sin" may not mean more than that sinful habits are subdued by good works, but it suggests and paves the way for the error of the atoning efficacy of almsgiving. The summary of duty relates chiefly to the second Table of the Law; duty toward God is afterward (so far) dealt with under "worship." This may account for obedience to parents being strangely omitted; for among the Jews the Fifth Commandment was included in the First Table.

(2) Devotional: Worship and Rites (Chapters vii through x, xiv).

The Lord’s Prayer is to be used thrice a day. "Heaven" and "debt" are found instead of "heavens" and "debts." The Doxology is added (with "kingdom" omitted)—its earliest recorded use in this connection. Christians are to fast on Wednesday and Friday, the days of the betrayal and crucifixion. Fasting is enjoined for a day or two before baptism, both on baptizer and on baptized; it is recommended to "others who can." There is no mention of oil, salt, or exorcism. The baptismal formula, "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," is commanded, confirming the historical trustworthiness of Mt 28:19. Triple immersion in "living water" is assumed to be normal; but where this is impracticable, other water and affusion are permitted (see TRINE IMMERSION). The Lord’s Supper is dealt with only on its eucharistic side, the writer’s object being not to expound the nature of the rite, but to give models of thanksgiving.

The phrase, "after being filled give thanks," suggests that the Agape was still associated with the sacrament: the dissociation had begun when Pliny wrote to Trajan in 112 AD. A liturgical element in sacramental worship is indicated by the prescription of forms of thanksgiving for the cup, the broken bread, and spiritual mercies. "Give thanks thus." The thanksgiving for the cup is as follows: "We give thanks to thee our Father, for the holy vine of David, thy servant, which thou hast made known to us through Jesus Christ." But nothing suggests that the entire service is liturgical, and the forms supplied are not rigidly imposed; for prophets are to offer thanks in such terms as they choose. On the Lord’s Day congregational worship and eucharistic bread-breaking, after confession to God and reconciliation with men, are distinctly enjoined.

(3) Ecclesiastical (Chapters xi through xiii, xv).

Of church office-bearers, two classes are mentioned, ordinary and extraordinary. Of the former (essential to congregational organization) only bishops and deacons are mentioned, i.e. those entrusted with rule and oversight, with their assistants. Presbyter and bishop appear to be still identical, as the former is not specified (compare Php 1:1). Popular election of these functionaries is indicated: "Elect for yourselves"; without denial, however, of those already in office having a share in the settlement. In the second class, apostles, prophets and teachers are included. "Apostle" is used, not in the narrower sense of men called to the office personally by Christ, but in the wider sense which embraces all whose call to be His ambassadors has been signalized by Divine gifts-specially accredited evangelists unconnected with any particular community. (Among Jewish Christians the designation survived to the 4th century, for the Theodosian Code of that period refers to Jewish presbyters and to those "quos ipsi apostolos vocant.") These apostles were to be received as the Lord," and hospitably entertained; but, unlike apostles in the special sense, they were not to remain anywhere longer than "one or two days." Their function was to scatter the seed widely, and any expression of desire to remain longer was to be discouraged, while a demand for salary from a particular community would be evidence of false apostleship. The special function of prophets and teachers, on the other hand, was the instruction and comfort of church members. They accordingly might be encouraged to settle in a community and receive "first-fruits" for their support. These prophets and teachers, however, were not to supersede the "bishops" or presbyters in ruling, but were to undertake only those functions for which they were

specially qualified. On the other hand, bishops and deacons were not to be excluded from preaching and teaching by the settlement of prophets and official teachers in particular communities; and in the Didache may be traced the transition, then being gradually accomplished, of the preaching and teaching functions from extraordinary to ordinary office-bearers. "They also (the bishops and deacons) minister to you the ministry of prophets and teachers: therefore despise them not." Even before the close of Paul's ministry, the episkopos, whose essential function was rule and oversight, was expected, if not required, also to be didatikos, "qualified to teach," i.e. along with teachers specially set apart for the purpose (1Ti 3:2; 5:17). By the middle of the 2nd century, the prophets had disappeared, and their preaching function had been vested in the office of bishop or presbyter, assisted by the diaconate.

(4) Eschatological (Chapter xvi).

This concluding section consists chiefly of exhortations to watchfulness in view of the Second Advent. The premonitory signs of that Coming are given, with reminiscences from Christ's eschatological discourses, namely, rise of false prophets, decline of love, persecution, lawlessness, and the appearance of Antichrist, who is designated the World-deceiver. Without definitely stating chiliastic doctrine, the writer suggests it; for in referring to the immediate signals of Christ's advent (opening in heaven, voice of trumpet, resurrection of dead) he is careful to add "Not of all the dead; but the Lord shall come, and all the saints with Him"—implying that the general resurrection would take place at an after-stage, presumably, as Millennialists held, after the 1,000 years had expired. Without dogmatic authority, and with only moderate spiritual value, the Didache is important historically as a witness to the church's beliefs, usages and condition during the transition between the Apostolic and the Post-apostolic Age. During that transition period, we see much of the freedom of primitive Christianity mingled with rudiments of ecclesiastical regulations and formularies; and while we cannot assume that every belief and usage recorded in the Didache were sanctioned by apostles, we may reasonably ascribe them to apostolic times, and regard them as not opposed by those apostles within whose view they must have come.

III. Epistles of Ignatius.

1. Author and Date:

Ignatius was bishop of Antioch early in the 2nd century Origen (Hom. vi on Luke) refers to him as "second after Peter"; Euodius came between (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 22). As he calls himself ektroma, "untimely born" (compare 1Co 15:8), he was probably converted in mature life: the legend of his being the "child" of Mt 18:3 rests on misinterpretation of his designation "Theophotos." Traditions current in the 4th century represent him as a disciple of John (Eusebius, Chron.) and ordained by Paul (Apostolical Constitutions, vii.46).

The Martyrium of Ignatius (6th century) dates his trial at Antioch in the 9th year of Trajan's reign (107-8 AD) and represents it as conducted before the emperor. Only one visit, however, of Trajan to Antioch is known, in 114-15; neither any Ignatian letter nor Eusebius, nor any other early writer refers to so

memorable a circumstance as the presidency of an emperor over a Christian's trial, and Ignatius speaks of a proposed attempt by Roman friends to secure a reversal of the sentence, which would have been impossible had Trajan personally pronounced it. His alleged presence, therefore, must be rejected as a later embellishment.

The epistles, so far as genuine, were written after Ignatius' condemnation, on his way to martyrdom at Rome.

2. Genuineness:

The epistles are extant in 3 editions:

(1) the longer Greek, of 15 letters now admitted to be largely spurious;

(2) a Syriac recension of three letters, now generally held to be a mere epitome;

(3) the shorter Greek edition, containing 7 letters of intermediate length, to the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Philadelphians, Smyrneans, Romans, and Polycarp. Lightfoot, Zahn, and most recent critics accept the substantial genuineness of these seven.

The chief external evidence is that of Polycarp (Phil., xiii), who, soon after Ignatius' death, writes of a letter addressed to himself, of another to the Smyrneans, and of "all the rest which we have by us." Now 2 Ignatian epistles are addressed to Polycarp and the Christians of Smyrna, while 4 profess to be written by Ignatius at Smyrna, harmonizing well with copies of these being in Polycarp's possession.

Further external evidence is supplied by Irenaeus (v.29) who quotes a saying from Ignat., Romans, iv, as that of a martyr, and who uses 8 notable phrases borrowed apparently from Ignatius. This external testimony (only got rid of by an arbitrary assumption of Polycarp's Epistle being wholly or partly spurious) is supported by strong internal and cumulative evidence:

(1) Frequent Grammatical Dislocation:

Natural in letters written on a journey but unaccountable on the supposition of a later forgery (Rom., i; Mag., ii; Eph., i).

(2) Geographical Particulars:

E.g. Ignatius goes by land from Antioch to Smyrna—an unusual route which a forger would hardly invent.

(3) Historical Illustrations:

E.g. conveyance of prisoners from distant provinces to Rome harmonizes with the account by Dion Cassius (lxviii.15) of the magnitude of amphitheatrical exhibitions under Trajan causing extensive orders for human victims from all parts.

(4) Theological Evidence:

E.g. these epistles refer to Judaistic error combined with a type of doctrine denying any real incarnation —a combination which ceased after Ignatius' time.

(5) Ecclesiastical Usage:

Thus, the Agape still includes the Eucharist (Smyr., viii), whereas soon after Ignatius' death these were separated (Pliny, Epistle 96; Just., 1 Ap., 65,67).

(6) Personal References.

The writer shows an excess and affectation of self-depreciation—"last of Antiochene Christians" (Trall., xiii) "not worthy to be counted one of the brotherhood" (Rom., ix)—such as a later forger would hardly have introduced.

3. Leading Ideas:

(1) Joy and Glory of Martyrdom.

Heroic courage and loyalty to Christ are united with fanatical craving after a martyr's death: "I would rather die for Christ than reign over the whole earth" (Rom., vi); "He who is near the sword is near to God" (Smyr., iv). This is noble; but when he writes, "Entice wild beasts to become my sepulchre" (Rom., iv); "May I have joy of the wild beasts and find them prompt"; "Though they be unwilling I will force them" (Rom., iv.5), we realize how Aurelius (recalling perhaps some such case) was moved to write that "death was to be encountered, not as by the Christians like a military display, but solemnly, and not as if one acted in a tragedy" (Med. xi.3).

(2) Evil and Peril of Heresy and Schism.

"Abstain from heresy"; "These heretics mix up Jesus Christ with their own poison" (Trall., vi); "Flee those evil outshoots, which produce death-bearing fruit" (Trall., xi); "Avoid all divisions as the beginning of evils"; "Nothing is better than unity" (To Polyc., i; Phil., iii).

(3) Submission to Office-Bearers, Especially to the Bishop.

"Do nothing without your bishop, and be subject to the presbyters" (Mag., vii); "Be on your guard

against heresy: and this will be, if ye continue in intimate union with Christ and with the bishop"; "He who does anything without the bishop's knowledge serveth the devil" (Smyr., ix). The bishop here is higher than "primus inter pares"; he is a new and separate office-bearer. Yet, without going beyond these epistles, we discern that such an episcopate was not an express apostolic institution. For had Ignatius been able to magnify the office as apostolically enjoined, so zealous a champion of episcopal authority would have adduced such injunction as the most cogent reason for submission. His zeal for the episcopate apparently sprang only from its high ecclesiastical expediency as the most effective agency for maintaining the church's unity against heresy and schism.

4. Other Notabilia:

(1) References to the Gospel of John.

The Gospel of John is never quoted, but numerous phrases suggest that it was in the writer's hands. He speaks of Christ "proceeding from the Father," "doing nothing without the Father," "in all things pleasing Him who sent Him." Christ is the "Door of the Father" and "Living water." Satan is the" Prince of this world." "The Holy Spirit knoweth whence He cometh and whither He goeth."

(2) Doctrine.

Ignatius asserts emphatically Christ's true Divinity: "Our God" (Eph., xviii; Trall, vii). The Trinity is frequently suggested, although not expressly affirmed. Christians are "established in the Son, the Father, and the Spirit"; "subject to Christ and the Father, and the Spirit." With strong support of episcopal authority no sacerdotalism is united. "Priest" occurs only once, "The priests are good: but Christ, the High Priest, is better." Here, as the context shows, the imperfect Levitical priesthood is contrasted with perfect high-priesthood of Christ.

(3) Ecclesiastical Usage.

Ignatius contains one of the latest references to the Agape as still conjoined with the Eucharist. The letter to Polycarp (chapter iv) contains the earliest allusion to the practice of redeeming Christian slaves at the cost of the congregation. Slaves are not to "long to be set free," thus implying that such emancipation, while not required as a duty, was often conferred as a privilege.

(4) General Characteristics.

Ignatius presents striking contrast, as a writer, to Clement. Clement is calm, cultured, chaste in diction, but somewhat commonplace and deficient in originality; his best passages are echoes of Scripture. The diction and style of Ignatius are impassioned, rugged, turgid, but pithy, fresh and individualistic.

IV. Epistles of Polycarp.

1. Date and Genuineness:

Polycarp was born not later, perhaps considerably earlier, than 70 AD; for at his martyrdom, of which the now accepted date is 155 or 156 (Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, II, i, 629), he declared, when invited to abjure his faith, that he had "served Christ for 86 years" (Mart. Pol., ix). He was disciple of John, who ordained him as bishop or leading presbyter of Smyrna before 100 AD (Iren., iii.3, 4). Of several letters by Polycarp, only this epistle remains: it professes (chapter xiii) to have been written soon after the martyrdom of Ignatius. The genuineness of the letter is attested by Irenaeus, Polycarp's own disciple (in the place cited), whose evidence cannot be set aside on the ground of its testimony to the Ignatian letters without an obvious begging of the question. The supposition that the Ignatian letters and Polycarp's Epistle are parts of one great forgery is otherwise negatived by the very marked difference of style and standpoint between those writings (Lightfoot, l.c., 577).

2. Occasion and Contents:

The epistle replies to a letter from the Philippian church inviting his counsel, and asking for epistles of the recently martyred Ignatius. He acknowledges their kind ministry to that martyr and to others, "entwined with saintly fetters," who had "set a pattern of all patience." He sends what he has of the letters of Ignatius and asks in return for any information which they might possess. He commends to their careful study Paul's epistle to themselves, acknowledging his inability to attain to the apostle's wisdom. With much Scripture language, interwoven with his own matter, and giving to his letter the semblance of an apostolic echo, he exhorts his readers to righteousness and godliness, charity and mercy, and warns them against covetousness, evil-speaking and revenge. He dwells on the mutual relations and obligations of presbyters and deacons, on the one hand, and of the congregation on the other. He repeats John's admonition against teachers who denied the reality of the incarnation: "Every spirit that confesseth not," etc. (1 Joh 4:3). He grieves over the lapse of a Philippian presbyter, Valens, who, along with his wife had flagrantly sinned; but he bids his readers not count such as enemies, but seek to recall them from their wanderings.

3. Notabilia:

(1) Polycarp mentions only one book of the New Testament, namely, Philippians, but within the brief compass of 200 lines he quotes verses or reproduces phrases from 12 New Testament writings, Matthew, 1 Peter, 1 John, and 9 Pauline Epistles, including three whose early date has been disputed in modern times (1 and 2 Timothy and Ephesians). The absence of any quotation from the Gospel of John is notable, considering his relation to the apostle; but the shortness of the letter prevents any conclusion being drawn against the authenticity of that Gospel; and he quotes (as we have seen) from 1 John, which is a kind of appendix to the Gospel (Lightfoot).

(2) At a time when Ignatius had been emphasizing the paramount duty of submission to the bishop, Polycarp, even when enjoining subjection to presbyters, does not mention a bishop. These two inferences are irresistible:

(a) there was then no episkopos, in the post-New Testament, sense, at Philippi;

(b) Polycarp did not consider the defect (?) sufficiently important to ask the Philippians to supply it.

Had John instituted the mono-episcopate as the one proper form of church government, surely his disciple Polycarp would have embraced the opportunity, when the Philippians invited his counsel, to inform them of the apostolic ordinance, and to enjoin its adoption.

LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC, 2

V. Papias Fragments.

1. Author and Date:

Papias is called by his younger contemporary Irenaeus (v.33) a "disciple of John and friend of Polycarp." Eusebius writes (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 36) that he was episkopos of Hierapolis in Phrygia. The Chronicon Paschale (7th century, but embodying materials from older documents) states that he was martyred about the same time as Polycarp (155-56). His work, Exposition of our Lord's Sayings, was extant in the 13th century, but only fragments quoted by Irenaeus, Eusebius, etc., remain. These bear out the twofold description of Papias by Eusebius, as a "man of little judgment" yet "most learned and well acquainted with the Scriptures" (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39, 36). (But the words of praise in verse 36 may be a gloss.) Papias states that he subjoins to his expositions "whatsoever I learned carefully from the elders and treasured up in my memory .... I was wont to put questions regarding the words of the elders (i.e. presumably men of an earlier generation), what Andrew or Peter said, or what Philip or Thomas, or James, or what John or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples said, as well as regarding what Aristion, and the presbyter John, the disciple of the Lord, have to say."

It is disputed whether Papias here refers to two Johns, the apostle and another disciple of the same name; or to John the apostle in two different relations, i.e. first as one about whose testimony Papias heard from others, and second, as one with whom, also, he held personal communication. In favor of the first view is,

(1) Eusebius' own opinion (in the place cited);

(2) the alleged unlikelihood of the same John being twice mentioned in one sentence;

(3) a statement by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39) that in his day two monuments (mnemata) of "John" existed at Ephesus.

For the latter view is,

(1) no other writer until Eusebius hints the existence of a presbyter John distinct from the apostle;

(2) the change in the quotation from "said" to "say" seems to give a reason for John being twice mentioned; some things stated by John having been heard by Papias through "elders," others having been told him by the apostle himself.

The fact that John is called presbyter, instead of apostle, is no insuperable objection, since John so designates himself in 2 John and 3 John; and Jerome denies that the two mnemata were both tombs. See Lightfoot, Essay on Papias, and Nicol, Four Gospels, 187 if, who come to divergent conclusions.

2. Testimony to Matthew and Mark:

On the testimony to Matthew and Mark see MATTHEW, THE GOSPEL OF; MARK, THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO.

3. Other Notabilia:

(1) According to Eusebius, Papias relates the story of "a woman accused before our Lord"—the story, presumably, which eventually crept into Joh 8; so that to him, in part, is due the preservation of a narrative, which, whether historical or not, finely illustrates the union in our Lord of holy purity and merciful charity.

(2) Papias is quoted by the Chronicler Georgius Hamartolos (in a manuscript of the 9th century) as declaring in his Expositon that John "was put to death by the Jews," and a similar quotation is made by Philip of Side (Epitome manuscript of the 7th-8th centuries). On the bearing of this upon the question of the apostle’s residence at Ephesus see JOHN, THE APOSTLE.

(3) Irenaeus (v.32) quotes Papias as writing about a Post-resurrection millennium, and as reporting, on John’s authority, how the Lord said, "The days will come when vines shall grow having each 10,000 branches, and on each branch 10,000 twigs, and on each twig 10,000 shoots," etc. This may be an exaggerated record (misunderstood by Papias) of some parabolic utterance of Christ, indicating prophetically the wonderful extension of the church.

VI. Epistle of Barnabas.

1. Authorship:

This book is first expressly quoted by Clement of Alexandria (circa 190 AD) as the composition of Barnabas, companion of Paul (Strom., ii.6). Origen concurs, and calls it a "Catholic ep." (Con. Celsum, i.63), thus suggesting canonical position; Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25) testifies to the widespread ascription of it to this Barnabas, although he himself regards it as "spurious." Codex Sinaiticus places it immediately after the New Testament, as being read in churches, and thus suggests

its composition by a companion at least of apostles. Against this external testimony, however, to authorship by the Barnabas of Acts, is strong internal evidence:

(1) apostolic sinfulness prior to discipleship is spoken of in exaggerated terms hardly credible in a writer who knew the Twelve—"exceedingly lawless beyond all (ordinary) sin" (chapter v)—an echo apparently of Paul's "sinners of whom I am chief";

(2) ignorance of Jewish rites incomprehensible in a Levite who had lived in Jerusalem, e.g. the priests are said to eat goat's flesh on the great Day of Atonement;

(3) extreme anti-Judaism (see below), inconsistent with the representation of Barnabas in Ac and Galatians.

The writer may have been some other Barnabas, a converted Alexandrian Jew, or, more probably, a converted Gentileproselyte, trained in Philo's school, but ignorant of Jewish rites as practiced at Jerusalem, and possessing little real sympathy with Judaism.

2. Date:

The epistle must be dated after 70 AD, as the destruction of Jerusalem is referred to (chapter xvi); also after the publication of the Gospel of Jn, of which there are several reminiscences. But the absence of any reference to the rebuilding of Jerusalem under Hadrian, in 120 AD, in a passage (chapter xvi) where such allusion might have been expected, suggests a date prior to that year. We may place the writing between 90 and 120 AD.

3. Object and Contents:

The object is to deter both Jewish and Gentile Christians from Judaistic lapse by a bold application of the allegorizing method to the Old Testament, far beyond what Philo would have sanctioned. Jewish sacrifices, festivals, Sabbath enactments, temple-worship, distinction of clean and unclean food, are not only not of perpetual obligation, but never were binding at all, even on Jews. Belief in their obligatoriness rests on a slavishly liberal exegesis of the Old Testament, which, properly interpreted, is not a preparation for Christ but Christianity itself in allegorical disguise.

Ceremonies are simply allegorical enforcements of spiritual worship; distinctions of clean and unclean are merely pictorial representations of the necessity of separation from vice and vicious men; interdict of swine's flesh means no more than "associate not with swinish men." The only circumcision really commanded by God is circumcision of the heart. Barnabas ignores what Paul realized, that Jewish laws and rites, even literally interpreted, are a Divine discipline of wholesome self-restraint, neighborly consideration and obedience to God. Barnabas not only explains away Old Testament enactments, but finds in trivial Old Testament statements Christian fact and truth. Thus, in Abraham's circumcision of the 318 men of his house, the 10 and 8 are significantly denoted by the Greek letters "I" and "H", the

initial letters of Iesous (Jesus); while the 300 represented by the Greek "T", points to the cross. The writer self-complacently intimates that "no one has been admitted by me to a more genuine piece of knowledge than this!" (chapter ix).

When Barnabas, however, leaves obscure allegory for plain exhortation, he writes effectively of the "two ways" of light and darkness. Among edifying admonitions the following are outstanding: "Thou shalt not go to prayer with an evil conscience"; "Thou shalt not let the word of God issue from lips stained with impurity"; "Be not ready to stretch forth thine hands to take, while thou contractest them to give"; "Thou shalt not issue orders with bitterness to thy servant, lest thou fail in reverence to God who is above you both"; "Thou shalt not make a schism, but shalt bring together them who contend"; "The way of darkness is crooked"; "In this way are (among others mentioned) those who labor not to aid him who is overdone with toil" (chapters xix, xx).

4. Notabilia:

(1) The Divinity of Christ is emphasized: "Lord of all the world"; "Joint Creator, with the Father, of mankind" (chapter v). (2) The writer, while following the Alexandrian method of allegorical interpretation, is free from the Alexandrian doctrine of the essential evil of matter; the necessity of a real incarnation is affirmed (chapter v). (3) In chapter xi, he writes, "We go down into the water full of sins and filth, and come up bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear of God and trust in Jesus in our spirit." This has been interpreted as involving the doctrine of baptismal regeneration; but the reference may be rather to the regeneration which baptism symbolizes. (4) In chapter xv, the words, "We keep the 8th day with joy, the day on which Jesus rose again," are the earliest express testimony that the observance of the Lord’s Day was a memorial of our Lord’s resurrection. This observance is distinguished from Jewish Sabbath-keeping which is called an error; the Sabbath really intended to be kept being a period of 1,000 years after the 6,000 years in which all things will be finished (chapter xv). (5) Testimony to New Testament Books,

(a) the existence and canonical authority of the Gospel of Mt are attested (chapter iv) by the quotation of Mt 22:14, "Many are called, but few chosen," introduced by the formula, "It is written";

(b) various passages taken together testify to the writer having the Gospel of John in his hands: "Whoso eateth of these shall live for ever" (chapter xi and Joh 6:58); "Abraham looking before in Spirit to Jesus" (chapter ix and Joh 8:58); "the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ" (chapter ii and Joh 13:34); a reference to the brazen serpent as a type of Christ’s suffering, glory and healing power (chapter xii and Joh 3:14);

(c) "Thou shalt not say that anything is thine own" (chapter xix) appears to be a reminiscence of Ac 4:32; (d) the passage in xv, "The day of the Lord shall be as a thousand years," seems to be an echo of 2Pe 3:8, and, if so, is the earliest testimony to the existence of that writing, and thus proves its great antiquity, although not its canonicity.

VII. Pastor (Shepherd) of Hermas.

1. Authorship and Date:

This work is the earliest example, on a large scale, of Christian allegory, and was hardly less popular in the early church than the Pilgrim's Progress in later times. It was reckoned by many almost, by some altogether, as "Scripture." Irenaeus quotes it as "Scripture" (iv.20); Clement of Alexandria refers to it as "containing revelations Divinely imparted" (Strom., i.29); Origen regards it as "Divinely inspired" (Commentary on Romans 16:14). It is placed with the Epistle of Barnabas in the Codex Sinaiticus at the close of the New Testament, and was read in many churches down to Jerome's time (Works, II, 846). The writer represents himself as a slave sold to a Roman Christian lady. He afterward obtained freedom, lived with his family in Rome, became earnestly religious, and saw visions which he imparted the community in this book with a view to repentance and spiritual well-being.

Origen (followed by Eusebius, Jerome, etc.) ascribes the work to the Hermes of Ro 16:14; but his opinion is pure conjecture (puto). The Canon Muratori (170 AD) of Italian authorship describes the work as "recently composed at Rome by the brother of Plus during the latter's episcopate" (137-54). This distinct local testimony has been widely accepted (Hefele, Lightfoot, Charteris, Cruttwell, etc.). Yet the writer represents himself (Vision, ii.4) as enjoined to send his book to Clement as man in authority in the church, whom it is natural to identify with the chief presbyter of Rome between 92 and 101. This reference, along with the absence of any allusion to Gnosticism or to the mono-episcopate, has led Schaff, Zahn, and others to fix the date of the work at about 100 AD. The external and internal evidence, thus apparently divergent, may be reconciled by supposing (with Kruger and Harnack) that the book was not "written in a single draft"; that portions were issued successively during Clement's episcopate; and that under Plus (circa 140) the separate issues were gathered into a volume under the title of The Pastor. In Rome, where the author was known, the Canon Muratori attested at once its religious usefulness as a "book to be read" and the absence of any claim to canonical authority.

2. Object and Contents:

The purpose of the book is not doctrinal but ethical; it is an allegorical manual of Christian duty with earnest calls to individual repentance and church revival in view of the near Advent.

The book consists of

(1) Five Visions,

(2) Twelve Mandates,

(3) Ten Similitudes or Parables.

In (1) the church appears' to the writer as a venerable matron, then as a tower near completion,

thereafter as a Holy Virgin. In the last vision, the Angel of Repentance, in pastoral garb, delivers to him the Mandates and Similitudes. The Mandates deal with chastity, truth, patience, meekness, reverence, prayer, penitence, and warn against grieving the Spirit. In the similitudes the church is again a tower whose stones are examined for approbation or reprobation. Similitudes are also drawn from trees. The vine clinging to the elm signifies union of rich and poor in the church; a large willow from which a multitude receive branches or twigs, some of these blossoming or fruit-bearing, others dry or rotten, symbolizes the diverse effect of law and gospel on different souls. The author, although a Gentile, writes from the standpoint of James rather than of Paul. The closing words summarize his combined ethical and eschatological purpose: "Ye who have received good from the Lord, do good works, lest while ye delay, the tower be completed, and you be rejected."

3. Notabilia:

(1) Montanistic Affinity.

Hermas, indeed, differs from Montanists in permitting, though not encouraging, second marriage, and recognizing one possible repentance after post-baptismal flagrant sin; but he is also their fore-runner, through his disallowance of readmission after second lapse, through emphatic expectation of an impending Advent, and through his rigorous view of fasting: "On the fast day taste nothing but bread and water."

(2) Fasting, However, Is Regarded Not as an End but as a Means

A discipline toward humility, purity, charity. Fasting for charity is illustrated by the injunction (Sim., v.3) to "reckon up the price of what you meant to eat, and give that to one in want."

(3) Absence of Names "Jesus" and "Christ."

The names" Jesus and "Christ" never occur. He is "Son of God" and "Lord of His people," whom "God made to dwell in flesh," by whom "the whole world is sustained," who "endured great sufferings that He might do away with the sins of His people" (Sim., .v.6; ix. 14).

(4) Church Organization.

Hermas is charged (Via., ii.4) to "read his writings to (or along with) the presbyters who preside over the church" in Rome. It is reasonable to conclude that no one in that community could then be called "bishop" in the later sense of the holder of an office distinct from and superior to the presbyterate. Episkopoi ("bishops") are mentioned (Sim., ix.27) as "given to hospitality," the description of the episkopos in 1Ti 3:2, where admittedly bishop = presbyter.

VIII. Second Epistle of Clement.

1. Nature of Document:

This writing is doubly miscalled: it is neither an epistle nor a composition of Clement. Style, thought, and standpoint differ from those of the accepted Ep., and HE, III, 38, suggests that the Clementine authorship was not generally recognized. The recent recovery by Bryennios of the previously lost conclusion proves that the writing is a sermon (chapter xix).

Antiquity is indicated by (1) the use, as an authority, of the lost heretical Gospel of the Egyptians, which by the time of the Canon Muratori (175 AD) had ceased to be regarded as Scripture by Catholics; (2) the adoption, without Gnostic intention, of phrases which became notably associated, after 150 AD with Gnosticism: "God made male and female: the male is Christ, the female, the church" (chapter xiv).

2. Date and Authorship:

The date usually assigned is 120-150 AD (Lightfoot, Part I, volume II, 201). The author is a Gentilepresbyter; he had "worshipped stocks and stones." The sermon was probably preached at Corinth, for the preacher describes many arriving by sea for the race-course, without mentioning a port, which would be appropriate in a sermon preached to Corinthians.

3. Contents:

No text is given, but the sermon starts from Isa 54:1, without express quotation; this chapter had probably been read at the service. The discourse, without great literary merit, is earnest and practical. There are exhortations to repentance and good works, to purity, charity, prayer and fasting, with special reference to coming judgment. The standpoint is that of James. "Be not troubled (so the sermon concludes) because we see the unrighteous with abundance, and God’s servants in straits. Let us have faith, brethren and sisters. Had God recompensed the righteous speedily, we should have had training not in piety but in bargaining; and our uprightness would be a mere semblance, since our pursuit would be not of godliness but of gain."

4. Notabilia:

(1) The sermon is the oldest extant in post-New Testament times, and appears to have been read (chapter xix) to a congregation.

(2) Sayings of Christ not in our Gospels are quoted:

(a) "The Lord, being asked when His kingdom would come, answered: When the two shall be one (i.e. when harmony shall prevail?), and when the outside shall be as the inside (i.e. when men shall be as they seem?); and the male with the female, neither male nor female" (interpreted by this preacher ascetically as discountenancing marriage, presumably because "the time is short," but explained mystically by Clement of Alexandria in Strom., iii.13, as indicating the abolition of all distinctions in God’s kingdom).

Clement assigns the passage to the lost Gospel of the Egyptians.

(b) "The Lord saith, ye shall be as lambs among wolves. Peter answered: What if the wolves tear the lambs? Jesus said: Let not the lambs fear the wolves: and ye, also, fear not them which kill you, and can do nothing more to you."

(3) No episcopate, apparently, in the post-New Testament sense, existed in the church where this sermon was delivered. Unfaithful men are represented as confessing, "We obeyed not the presbyters when they told us of salvation." Had a bishop in the later sense been head of the community, obedience to his admonitions would surely have been inculcated.

(4) The Christology is high; "We ought to think of Christ as of God"; "When we think mean things of Christ, we expect to receive mean things" (chapter i).

IX. Apology of Aristides.

1. Recovery and Date:

Aristides was an Athenian philosopher, who (according to HE, IV, 3) presented an Apology to Hadrian, presumably when the emperor was at Athens (125 AD). After disappearance in the 17th century, a fragment in an Armenian version was discovered in 1878, and the entire Apology in Syriac was found in 1889. It was then found that almost the whole treatise was imbedded anonymously in a Greek medieval romance, Barlaam and Josaphat. The Apology in the Syriac is inscribed to Antoninus; it may have been addressed to both emperors successively, or the real date may be 137, when they were colleagues in the empire.

2. Contents:

The treatise refers to oppression, imprisonment, and other maltreatment endured by Christians, and pleads for their protection against persecution, because of their true and noble creed, and their pure and benevolent lives. The writer compares the Christian doctrine of Godhead with that of barbarians, Greeks, Egyptians, Jews, and dwells on the elevating influence of Christian belief in Jesus Christ and in a future life. He refers to the abstention of Christians from unchastity, dishonesty and other vices; to their abounding charity and brotherliness which are shown particularly to the widow, the orphan, the poor, the stranger, the oppressed, and even their oppressors. All who become Christians, of however low a station, are brethren. This bright picture has, however, its shadows: "If Christians see that one of their number has died in his sins, over him they weep bitterly as over one about to go into punishment." This frank acknowledgment of some black sheep gives point to his general testimony, "Blessed is the race of Christians above all men."

3 Notabilia:

(1) A distinct reference to a collection of Christian writings, and especially of Gospels, designated the Gospel, and indicating the existence of a kind of rudimentary New Testament Canon.

(2) Similar indication of a rudimentary Apostles' Creed. Christians are said to believe in God, "the Maker of Heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ who was born of a Hebrew virgin, who was transfixed by the Jews; he died and was buried; and Christians state that after three days he rose again and ascended into heaven." In this early time the virgin birth was apparently a settled matter—part of the Creed.

(3) Aristides describes a familiar custom among poor Christians of fasting two or three days, so as to supply with needful food Christians poorer still (Compare Hermas).

(4) The Apology is interesting as the earliest known literary tribute of a philosopher to Christianity, and probably the earliest extant defense of the faith, if the Epistle to Diognetus be not ancient. It is notable also as a treatise on Christian evidence drawn not from miraculous credentials, but from the self-evidencing excellence and effect of Christianity.

Finally, it is interesting as the earliest detailed record of harvest reaped at Athens from seed sown by Paul 80 or 90 years before. Athens appeared at first a barren soil; but by and by this church in a university city took the lead, as this treatise and another lost apology by Quadratus show, in the literary defense of the Christian faith. Quadratus is stated in HE IV, 3, to have presented his Apology to Hadrian, and is described by Jerome as "a disciple of the apostles." In a fragment preserved in HE, he attests the survival ("to our own day") of some whom Christ had healed.

X. Justin Martyr.

1. Incidents of Life:

Born of pagan parents at Flavia Neapolis (Nablous), in Samaria about 100 AD—a seeker for truth, who, after trying Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonic philosophies, found in Christ and Christianity the satisfaction of philosophic cravings and spiritual needs. He became a Christian apostle and apologist, wearing still the philosopher's mantle in token of continued quest after wisdom, but making it now his life-work, not as presbyter, but as itinerating Christian teacher, to impart to pagan, to Jew and also to heretic the truth which he himself had found and prized. After long Christian service, he suffered martyrdom under Aurelius in 166 AD.

2. First Apology:

It is addressed to Antoninus and dated 138-48. He approaches the emperor without flattery, and asks judgment after searching inquiry. He answers three charges against Christians:

(1) atheism: Justin replies that Christians were atheists only as Socrates was; they disbelieved in so-

called gods who were wicked demons or humanly fashioned images; but they worshipped the Father of Righteousness;

(2) immorality: Justin admits the existence of pretended Christians who are evil-doers; but Christianity makes the evil good, the licentious chaste, the covetous generous, the revengeful forgiving;

(3) disloyalty: this is calumny based on the preaching of Christ's kingdom which is spiritual, not temporal.

Christians are taught and are wont to pay tribute promptly and to pray for rulers regularly. Justin then sets forth the credibility and excellence of Christianity, adducing,

(1) its pure morality as contrasted with vices condoned by heathens,

(2) its noble doctrines—immortality, resurrection, future judgment, incarnation,

(3) Old Testament prophecy regarding the Divinity and sufferings of the Christ. His reference to the prediction of a virgin bringing forth Emmanuel (chapter xxxiii) shows that in his day the virgin birth was accepted, although Jews understood by virgin (in Isaiah) merely a young woman,

(4) foreshadowings of Christian truth by philosophy, referring especially to Plato's teaching about the Divine Logos and judgment to come.

To refute prevalent calumny Justin describes Sunday service and administration of sacraments in his time. On the Lord's Day Christians assembled for worship; prophetic Scriptures and "memoirs" by apostles and their followers were read; prayers and thanksgivings were offered and an address delivered by the "president"; bread and wine were distributed and sent by deacons to those absent; and an offering for charitable purposes was made. "As many as believe what is taught, and undertake to live accordingly, are, after prayer and fast, baptized" (chapters lxv, lxvii).

3. Second Apology:

This is probably a postscript to the first; Eusebius quotes from both as from one work. After a protest against a recent summary execution of three Christians without proper trial, Justin deals with two popular taunts:

(1) "If at death they went to heaven, why did they not commit suicide?": "We do not shrink from death but from opposing God's will."

(2) "If God is really on the Christians' side, why does He allow them to be persecuted?": "The world by Divine decree is meanwhile under the dominion of angels who have become demons." Justin here contrasts Christ with Socrates, whom yet he describes as a preacher of the "true but then unknown

God" (chapter x): "No one put such faith in Socrates as to die for his convictions." Christ hath won the faith, "not only of philosophers, but of simple folk who through faith can despise death." Justin, however, testifies clearly and warmly to the Christian element by anticipation, in the higher teachings and aspirations of heathen philosophy through an implanted seed of the Divine Logos; and he recognizes thus a pre-advent ministry of the Son of God, not only in the sheltered fold of Judaism, but in the broad open of heathendom.

4. Dialogue with Trypho the Jew:

This Dialogue indicates the attitude of some cultured Jews of that day to Christianity, and the mode in which their objections to it were met. Trypho argued that Jesus did not fulfill Old Testament prophecy which represented the Messiah as establishing a glorious and everlasting kingdom; whereas Jesus was a humble peasant who died an ignominious death; Justin pleads Isa 53. Trypho charges Christianity with treason to theocracy through exalting Jesus to Godhead, thus trenching on the Divine unity, and also through repudiating the perpetual obligation of the Law. Justin, in reply, quotes Genesis, "Let us make man," and also Psalms 45, 72, 110, with Isa 7 about Emmanuel. The Mosaic Law was intended to be temporary, and was now superseded by the Law of Christ; moreover, the destruction of Jerusalem rendered complete fulfillment of the Jewish Law impracticable. The disputants part on friendly terms, "I have been particularly pleased with this conference," says Trypho. "If we could confer oftener we should be much helped in reading the Scriptures." "For my part," replies Justin, "I would have wished to repeat our conference daily; but since I am about to set sail, I bid you give all diligence in this struggle after salvation." Of other works ascribed to Justin, two (On the Resurrection and Appeal to the Greeks) may or may not be genuine; the others are spurious.

5. Notabilia:

(1) Justin’s Quotations:

Bearing of Justin’s quotations from "memoirs" on the Age of Our Gospels (see GOSPELS).

(2) Testimony to Harmony of Apostolic Doctrine.

Justin is a disciple of Paul, and a strong anti-Judaist; yet he recognizes thoroughly the Twelve as the true source of Christian teaching, "sent by Christ to teach to all the Word of God" (1 Ap., 39,49; Dial., 42, 109).

(3) Diffusion of Christianity:

From personal knowledge as a traveler, Justin testifies to the wide diffusion of Christianity: "No race of men exists among whom prayers are not offered up to the Father through the name of the crucified Jesus (Dial., 117).

(4) Authorship of Revelation:

"John, one of the apostles, prophesied, by a revelation made to him, that believers would dwell 1,000 years in Jerus" (Dial., 81)—the earliest direct witness to Johannine authorship, by one who had resided at Ephesus.

(5) Belief of the Primitive Church in Our Lord's True Divinity:

Writing in the name of Christians as a body, he declares, "Both Him (the Father) and the Son who came forth from Him we adore" (1 Ap., 5). He speaks also of some "who held that Jesus was a mere man" as a small and heretical minority (Dial., 48). He writes elsewhere (1 Ap., 13) of the Son as the object of worship "in the second place"; but this statement, made long before the Arian Controversy necessitated precision of language, does not invalidate his other testimonies.

(6) The Holy Spirit:

As to the Holy Spirit, Justin refers to baptism as administered in "the name of Father, Son, and Spirit" (1 Ap., 61), implying the Divinity of the Third Person; although elsewhere he appears to subordinate Him to the Son, as the Son to the Father. He is to be "worshipped in the third order" (1 Ap., 13).

(7) Millenarianism:

"I and others are assured that there will be a resurrection of the dead and 1,000 years in Jerusalem which will be built, adorned and enlarged" (Dial., 80). He admits, however, that many pure and pious Christians think otherwise.

(8) Future punishment: On this subject Justin speaks with two voices. In 1 Ap., 8, he writes of "condemned souls suffering eternal punishment, not for a millennial period only." But in Dial., 5, he introduces an old man who was the immediate means of his conversion as saying that "the wicked shall be punished as long as God shall will them to exist."

(9) Angel-worship:

In 1 Ap., 6, Justin, when refuting the charge of atheism, writes: "We reverence and worship the Father, and the Son, and the host of other good messengers (or angels), and the Prophetic Spirit." The context, however, shows that this cult does not necessarily amount to what is usually meant by worship, but simply to veneration and homage. The Greek words here, sebomai and proskuneo, are often used in this lower sense; and the train of thought seems to be this: "You call us atheists; the charge is not true, for we not only believe in one God and Father of all, but in one who is preeminently the Son of God, who was sent by God. We believe further in other heavenly messengers from God, a host of angelic spirits; yea we believe in one who is preeminently God's Spirit, by whom prophets were inspired. All these are the object in different degrees of our veneration and homage." Undoubtedly, however, the statement is at

best unguarded and misleading.

(10) Doctrine of the Sacraments:

Justin uses "regenerate" as the synonym of "baptized" (1 Ap., 61), but he identifies the two, not as essentially inseparable, but as uniformly associated. As regards the Lord's Supper, while emphasizing the ideas of commemoration, communion, and thanksgiving, he in one place speaks of the bread and wine being the flesh and blood of the Incarnate Jesus, "from which, by a transmutation, our flesh and blood are nourished" (1 Ap., 66). These words tend to transubstantiation; but, in the absence of any controversy at the time, may be no more than a strongly figurative representation of a spiritual participation.

XI. Epistle to Diognetus.

1. Date and Authorship:

This short apologetic work is mentioned by no ancient writer, and was unknown until its discovery in 1592 by Henry Stephens in a manuscript which perished in the Strassburg fire of 1870. The manuscript appears to ascribe it to the author of another work (To the Greeks); and this, again, is attributed with some probability on the authority of a Syriac document (600-700 AD) to one Ambrosius, "chief among the Greeks" otherwise unknown (see Birks in DCB, "Ep. to D."). If genuinely ancient, the epistle probably belongs to the Sub-apostolic Age, for it refers to Christianity as "having only now entered the world, not long ago"; and in chapter xi (written, however, by a different hand or at a different time) the author calls himself a "disciple of the apostles." Diognetus was a very common Greek name, so that his identification with the tutor of Marcus Aurelius (130-40 AD) is a mere conjecture. Donaldson (Chr. Lit., II, 142) inclines to the belief that the work was composed by one of the many Greeks who came westward in the 14th century and that the author intended merely to write a "good declamation in the old style." The smart but superficial way in which heathenism and Judaism are dealt with is more befitting a medieval rhetorical exercise than the serious treatment, by a cultured writer, of prevalent religions.

2. Contents:

The author, after welcoming the inquiry of Diognetus about Christianity, pours contempt on the pagan worship of gods of wood, stone and metal, without any apparent realization that for cultured heathens of that time such images were not objects, but only symbolic media of worship; and he ridicules Mosaic observances without any recognition of their significance as a Divine educative discipline. But when he proceeds (chapters vii through xii) to describe Christianity, the work merits Hefele's designation, praestantissima Epistola. Into a world, yea, into human hearts, which had become degenerate and wicked, "God sent no mere servant or angel, but His own Son," and Him, not as a condemning Judge, or fear-inspiring Tyrant, but as a gracious Saviour. To the inquiry, "If Christianity is so precious, why was Christ sent so late?" the author replies: "In order first to bring home to mankind their unworthiness to attain eternal life through their own works" and their incapacity for salvation apart from Him "who is

able to save even what it was impossible (formerly) to save." But faith in the Son of God now revealed, would lead to "knowledge of the Father"; knowledge of God to "love of Him who hath first so loved us"; and love of God to "imitation of Him and of His lovingkindness." And wherein consists such imitation? Not in "seeking lordship over those weaker," or in "showing violence toward those below us"; but in "taking on oneself the burden of one's neighbor," even as "God took on Himself the burden of our iniquities, and gave His own Son as a ransom for us." "He who in whatsoever he may be superior is ready to benefit another who is deficient; he who, by distributing to the needy what he has received from God, becomes a god to those who receive his benefits: he is an imitator of God."

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers, larger and smaller editions; in Clark's "Ante-Nicene Libary," Apostolic Fathers, Justin Martyr, and Recently Discovered Additions to Early Christian Literature (American edition, The Ants-Nicene Fathers); Eusebius, HE, particularly McGiffert's translation with excellent notes; James Donaldson, Critical History of Christian Literature; Cruttwell, Literary History of Early Christianity; Kruger, History of Early Christian Literature, translation by Gillett; Harnack, Geschichte der altchr. Litt.; Zahn, Geschichte des New Testament Kanons; Forschungen zur Gesch. des New Testament Kanons und der altchr. Lift.; Robinson, Texts and Studies, Aristides; Schaff, Oldest Christian Manual: H.D.M. Spence, Teaching of the Twelve Apostles; Bartlet, article on "Didache" in HDB; Cunningham, Epistle of Barnabas; articles in DCB (Smith and Wace).

Henry Cowan

LITTER

lit'-er (tsabh): (1) Used upon backs of camels for easy riding, made of a wooden frame with light mattress and pillows, also a covering above, supported by upright pieces, sometimes having also side awnings for protection from the sun's rays. Mule litters were made with pairs of shafts projecting before and behind, between which the animals were yoked (Isa 66:20). Litter-wagons ('eghloth tsabh) are mentioned in Nu 7:3; the horse litter (phorion) is mentioned in 2 Macc 9:8; compare 3:27. (2) miTTah, "palanquin" or "litter of Solomon" (So 3:7; compare So 3:9).

See PALANQUIN.

LITTLE GENESIS

See BOOK OF JUBILEES.

LIVELY; LIVING

liv'-li, liv'-ing (chay; zao): "Living," sometimes "lively," is the translation of chay (often also translated

"life"); it denotes all beings possessed of life (Ge 1:21,24; 2:7,19; Ex 21:35, "live"); we have frequently the phrase, "the land of the living" (as contrasted with she’ol, the abode of the dead), e.g. Job 28:13; Ps 27:13; 52:5; Isa 38:11; the characteristically Biblical expression, "the living God," also frequently occurs (Jos 3:10; 1Sa 17:26,36; 2Ki 19:4; Ps 84:2); also frequently in the New Testament as the translation of zao (Mt 16:16; 26:63; Joh 6:57, "the living Father"; Ac 14:15); "lively" in Ex 1:19 (chayeh) and Ps 38:19 denotes fullness of life, vigor; chayyah, "a living being," is mostly confined to Ezekiel, translated "living creatures" (1:5,13,14, etc.), also Ge 1:28; 8:17, "living thing"; "living" is sometimes applied figuratively to that which is not actually alive; thus we have the phrase "living waters" (Jer 2:13; 17:13; Zec 14:8, "Living waters shall go out from Jerusalem") in contrast with stagnant waters—waters that can give life; so Joh 4:10,11 (bubbling up from the spring at bottom of the well); 7:38; Re 7:17 the King James Version; "living bread" (Joh 6:51); a new and living way (Heb 10:20), perhaps equivalent to "ever-living" in Christ; "living stones" (1Pe 2:4,5) are those made alive in Christ; a "living hope" (a hope full of life), 1Pe 1:3; "living" (zao)is sometimes also "manner of life" (Lu 15:13; Col 2:20); diago, "to lead or go through," is also so translated (Tit 3:3); bios is "means of life," translated "living" (Mr 12:44; Lu 8:43); "living," in this sense, occurs in Apocrypha as the translation of zoe, "Defraud not the poor of his living" (Ecclesiasticus 4:1).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "living" for "alive" (Le 14:4), for "the lively" (Ac 7:38), for "quick" (Heb 4:12), for "lively" (1Pe 1:3; 2:5), for "conversation" (1Pe 1:15; 2Pe 3:11); "living creatures" for "beasts" (Re 4:6; 5:6, etc.); "every living thing" for "all the substance" (De 11:6); "living things" for "beasts" (Le 11:2,47 twice); for "living" (Ps 58:9), "the green" (thorns under the pots), margin "Wrath shall take them away while living as with a whirlwind"; for "the book of the living" (Ps 69:28), "the book of life"; for "(I am) he that liveth" (Re 1:18), "the Living one"; for "living fountains of waters" (Re 7:17), "fountains of waters of life"; for "trade" (Re 18:17), "gain their living," margin "work the sea"; for "Son of the living God" (Joh 6:69), "the Holy One of God" (emended text).

W. L. Walker

LIVER

liv’-er (qabhedh, derived from a root meaning "to be heavy," being the heaviest of the viscera; Septuagint hepar): The word is usually joined with the Hebrew yothereth (see CAUL) (Ex 29:13,22; Le 9:10,19) as a special portion set aside for the burnt offering.

This represents the large lobe or flap of the liver, Lobos tou hepatos (thus, Septuagint and Josephus, Ant, III, ix, 2, (228)). Others, however, interpret it as the membrane which covers the upper part of the liver, sometimes called the "lesser omenturn." Thus, the Vulgate: reticulurn iecoris. It extends from the fissures of the liver to the curve of the stomach. Still others consider it to be the "fatty mass at the opening of the liver, which reaches to the kidneys and becomes visible upon the removal of the lesser omentum or membrane" (Driver and White, Leviticus, 65).

As in the scholastic psychology of the Middle Ages, the liver played an important part in the science of

Semitic peoples. It was the seat of feeling, and thus became synonymous with temper, disposition, character (compare Assyrian kabittu, "liver", "temper," "character," and Arabic kabid, vulgar kibdi). Thus, Jeremiah expresses his profound grief with the words: "My liver is poured upon the earth, because of the destruction of the daughter of my people" (La 2:11). The liver is also considered one of the most important and vital parts of the body (compare Virgil, cerebrum, iecur domicilia vitae). A hurt in it is equivalent to death. So we find the fate of a man enticed by the flattering of a loose woman compared to that of the ox that "goeth to the slaughter .... till an arrow strike through his liver; as a bird hasteth to the snare, and knoweth not that it is for his life" (Pr 7:22,23; the rest of the verse is obscure as to its meaning).

In a few passages of the Old Testament, kabhedh ("liver") and kabhodh ("glory") have been confounded, and we are in uncertainty as to the right translation Several authors, to give but one example, would read kabhedh in Ps 16:9, for reasons of Hebrew poetical parallelism: "Therefore my heart is glad and my liver (English Versions of the Bible, "glory") rejoiceth." While this is quite possible, it is not easy to decide, as according to Jewish interpretation "my glory" is synonymous with "my soul," which would present as proper a parallelism.

The liver has always played an important role in heathen divination, of which we have many examples in old and modern times among the Greeks, Etrurians, Romans and now among African tribes. The prophet Ezekiel gives us a Biblical instance. The king of Babylon, who had been seeking to find out whether he should attack Jerusalem, inquired by shaking "arrows to and fro, he consulted the teraphim, he looked in the liver" (Eze 21:21 (Hebrew 21:26); compare Tobit 6:4 ff; 8:2).

See ASTROLOGY, 3; DIVINATION.

H. L. E. Luering

LIVING CREATURE

liv’-ing kre’-tur:

(1) (nephesh chayyah, or nephesh hachayyah (nephesh, "breath" or "living things"; chayyah, "living"; compare Arabic nefs, "breath," chaiy, "living")): In the account of the creation this term is used of aquatic animals (Ge 1:21), of mammals (Ge 1:24) and of any animals whatsoever (Ge 2:19).

(2) ([chayyoth], plural of chayyah): The name of the "living creatures" of Eze 1:5-25, which had wings and the faces of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle; compare Eze 10:1-22.

(3) (zoon, "living thing," "animal"): The four "living creatures" (the King James Version "beasts") of Re 4:6, etc., the first like a lion, the second like a calf, the third having a face as of a man, and the fourth like an eagle, having each six wings.

See CREATURE, LIVING.

Alfred Ely Day

LIZARD

liz’-ard: The list of unclean "creeping things" in Le 11:29,30 contains eight names, as follows:

1. Names:

(1) choledh, English Versions of the Bible "weasel" (which see);

(2) ‘akhbar, English Versions of the Bible "mouse" (which see);

(3) tsabh, the King James Version "tortoise," the Revised Version (British and American) "great lizard" (which see);

(4) ‘anaqah, the King James Version "ferret," the Revised Version (British and American) "gecko" (which see);

(5) koach, the King James Version "chameleon," the Revised Version (British and American) "land-crocodile" (which see);

(6) leTa’ah, English Versions of the Bible "lizard"; compare Arabic laTa’," to cling to the ground";

(7) chormeT, the King James Version "snail," the Revised Version (British and American) "sand-lizard" (which see);

(8) tinshemeth, the King James Version "mole," the Revised Version (British and American) "chameleon" (which see). In Pr 30:28, we find

(9) semamith, the King James Version "spider," the Revised Version (British and American) "lizard."

Since (1), (3), (4), (5), (6) and (7) occur as names of animals only in this passage, and as the philological evidence available is in most cases not very convincing, their determination is difficult and uncertain. the Revised Version margin to "gecko" (Le 11:30) has "Words of uncertain meaning, but probably denoting four kinds of lizards."

2. Lizards of Palestine:

Among the many lizards of Palestine, the monitor and thorny-tailed lizard are remarkable for their size,

and the chameleon for its striking appearance and habits. On etymological grounds, koach, the King James Version "chameleon," the Revised Version (British and American) "land-crocodile," Septuagint chamaileon, has been taken to be the monitor; tsabh, the King James Version "tortoise," the Revised Version (British and American) "great lizard," Septuagint krokodeilos chersaios, to be the thorny-tailed lizard; and tinshemeth, the King James Version "mole," the Revised Version (British and American) "chameleon," Septuagint aspalax, to be the chameleon. On the same grounds, choledh, English Versions of the Bible "weasel," Septuagint gale, might be the mole-rat.

See CHAMELEON; TORTOISE; WEASEL.

The commonest lizard of Palestine is the rough-tailed agama, Agama stellio, Arabic chirdaun or chirdaun, which is everywhere in evidence, running about on the ground, rocks or walls, frequently lying still basking in the sun, or bobbing its head up and down in the peculiar manner that it has. The gecko, Ptyodactylus lobatus, is common in houses. By means of adhesive disks on the under sides of its toes, it clings with ease to smooth walls which other lizards cannot scale. Although perfectly harmless, it is believed to be poisonous, and is much feared. It is called abu-brais, "father of leprosy," either on account of its supposed poisonous qualities or because it has a semi-transparent and sickly appearance, being of a whitish-yellow color with darker spots. It utters a little cry, which may be the reason why the Revised Version (British and American) has "gecko" for ‘anaqah; the King James Version has "ferret."

Various species of the genus Lacerta and its allies, the true lizards, may always be found searching for insects on trees and walls. They are scaly, like all lizards, but are relatively smooth and are prettily colored, and are the most attractive members of the group which are found in the country. They are called by the Arabs saqqaiyeh or shammuseh.

The skinks include Scincus officinalis, and allied species. Arabic sa qanqur = Greek skigkos (skinkos). They are smooth, light-colored lizards, and are found in sandy places. They cannot climb, but they run and burrow in the sand with remarkable rapidity. The dried body of Scincus officinalis is an important feature of the primitive oriental materia medica, and may be found in the shops (officinae) of the old-style apothecaries.

3. Identifications:

Semamith (Pr 30:28, the King James Version "spider," the Revised Version (British and American) "lizard") is one of the "four things which are little .... but .... exceeding wise." the Revised Version (British and American) reads:

"The lizard taketh hold with her hands,

Yet is she in kings’ palaces."

The Septuagint (Septuagint) has kalabotes, which according to Liddell and Scott = askalabotes, "a

spotted lizard." There is no other lizard which fits this passage as does the gecko. If Gesenius is correct in deriving semamith from the root samam (compare Arabic samma, "to poison"), we have another reason for making this identification, in which case we must rule out the rendering of the Revised Version margin, "Thou canst seize with thy hands."

For none of the names in Le 11:29,30 have we as many data for identification as for semamith. For leTa’ah, English Versions of the Bible "lizard," the Septuagint has chalabotes, which is another variant of askalabotes. If we follow the Septuagint, therefore, we should render leTa’ah "gecko." Tristram quotes Bochart as drawing an argument that leTa’ah is "gecko" from the Arabic laTa’," to cling to the ground." This view is at least in accordance with Septuagint. It is of course untenable if ‘anaqah is "gecko," but (see FERRET) the writer thinks it quite possible that ‘anaqah may mean the shrew or field-mouse, which is also in agreement with Septuagint. It will not do to follow Septuagint in all cases, but it is certainly safe to do so in the absence of a clear indication to the contrary.

There seems to be little evidence available for deciding the identity of chomeT, the King James Version "snail," the Revised Version (British and American) "sand-lizard." Septuagint has saura, and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) lacerta, both words for lizard. Gesenius refers the word to an obsolete chamaT, "to bow down," "to lie upon the ground." Tristram, NHB, cites Bochart as referring to a word meaning "sand." Hence, perhaps the Revised Version (British and American) "sand-lizard." If by this is meant the skink, there is no inherent improbability in the identification.

We have thus more or less tentatively assigned various words of the list to the monitor, the thorny-tailed lizard, the chameleon, the gecko and the skink, but we have done nothing with the rough-tailed agama and the Lacertae, or true lizards, which are the commonest lizards of Palestine, and this fact must be reckoned against the correctness of the assignment. The translation of the Revised Version (British and American) has this to commend it, that it gives two small mammals followed by six lizards, and is therefore to that extent systematic. It is, however, neither guided in all cases by etymological considerations, nor does it follow Septuagint.

As none of the etymological arguments is very cogent, the writer can see no harm in consistently following Septuagint, understanding for

(1) gale, weasel or pole-cat; for

(2) mus, mouse; for

(3) krokodeilos chersaios, some large lizard, either the monitor or the thorny-tailed lizard; for

(4) mugale, shrew or field-mouse; for

(5) chamaileon, chameleon; for

(6) chalabotes, gecko; for

(7) saura, a Lacerta or true lizard; for

(8) aspalax, mole-rat.

On the other hand, if etymological considerations are to be taken into account and Septuagint abandoned when it conflicts with them we might have

(1) holedh, mole-rat;

(2) ‘akhbar, mouse;

(3) tsabh, thorny-tailed lizard;

(4) ‘anaqah, field-mouse;

(5) koach, monitor;

(6) leTa’ah, gecko;

(7) chomeT, skink;

(8) tinshemeth, chameleon.

Neither of these lists has the systematic arrangement of that of the Revised Version (British and American), but we must remember that the Biblical writers were not zoologists, as is seen in the inclusion of the bat among birds (Le 11:19; De 14:18), and of the hare and coney among ruminants (Le 11:5,6; De 14:7).

Alfred Ely Day

LO-AMMI

lo-am’-i (lo’-‘ammi, "not my people"): The 2nd son and 3rd child of Gomer bath-Diblaim, wife of the prophet Hosea (Ho 1:9). An earlier child, a daughter, had been named Lo-ruhamah (lo’-ruchamah, "uncompassionated"). The names, like those given by Isaiah to his children, are symbolic, and set forth Hosea’s conviction that Israel has, through sin, forfeited Yahweh’s compassion, and can no longer claim His protection. Of the bearers of these names nothing further is known; but their symbolism is alluded to in Ho 2:1,23. This latter passage is quoted by Paul (Ro 9:25 f).

See HOSEA; JEZREEL.

John A. Lees

LO-DEBAR

lo’-de-bar, lo-de’-bar (lo dhebhar): A place in Gilead where dwelt Machir, son of Ammiel, who sheltered Mephibosheth, son of Saul, after that monarch’s death (2Sa 9:4), until he was sent for by David. This same Machir met David with supplies when he fled to Gilead from Absalom (2Sa 17:27 f). Possibly it is the same place as Lidebir in Jos 13:26 (Revised Version margin). No certain identification is possible; but Schumacher (Northern ‘Ajlun, 101) found a site with the name Ibdar about 6 1/2 miles East of Umm Qeis, North of the great aqueduct, which may possibly represent the ancient city. Lidebir, at least, seems to be placed on the northern boundary of Gilead. The modern village stands on the southern shoulder of Wady Samar. There is a good spring to the East, a little lower down, while ancient remains are found in the neighborhood.

W. Ewing

LO-RUHAMAH

lo-roo-ha’-ma, lo-roo-ha’-ma.

See LO-AMMI.

LOAF

lof.

See BREAD.

LOCKS

loks

((1) tsitsith,

(2) pera’;

(3) machlaphah,

(4) qewutstsah):

See in general the article on HAIR.

(1) The first word, tsitsith, means really a tassel, such as is worn by the Jews on the four corners of the prayer-shawl or Tallith and on the ‘arba‘ kanephoth (De 22:12), translated in the New Testament by kraspedon (Mt 9:20; 14:36; 23:5; Mr 6:56; Lu 8:44). Once it is applied to a forelock of hair. The prophet Ezekiel, describing his sensations which accompanied his vision of Jerusalem, says: "He put forth the form of a hand, and took me by a lock of my head; and the Spirit lifted me up between earth and heaven, and brought me in the visions of God to Jerus" (Eze 8:3).

(2) The word pera‘ signifies the uncut and disheveled locks of the Nazirite (Nu 6:5) or of the priests, the sons of Zadok (Eze 44:20).

(3) The Book of Judges employs the word machlaphah when speaking of the "seven locks" of Samson (Jud 16:13,19), which really represent the plaited (etymologically, "interwoven") strands of hair still worn in our days by youthful Bedouin warriors.

(4) Qewutstsah (So 5:2,11) means the luxuriant hair of the Hebrew youth, who was careful of his exterior. It is called bushy (the Revised Version margin "curling") and black as a raven. the King James Version translations also the word tsammah with "locks" (So 4:1; 6:7; Isa 47:2), but the Revised Version (British and American) has corrected this into "veil," leaving the word "locks" in So 4:1 margin.

H. L. E. Luering

LOCUST

lo’-kust: The translation of a large number of Hebrew and Greek words:

1. Names:

(1) ‘arbeh from the root rabhah, "to increase" (compare Arabic raba’," to increase").

(2) sal‘am, from obsolete [?] cal‘am, "to swallow down," "to consume."

(3) chargol (compare Arabic charjal, "to run to the right or left," charjalat, "a company of horses" or "a swarm of locusts," charjawan, a kind of locust).

(4) chaghabh (compare Arabic chajab, "to hide," "to cover").

(5) gazam (compare Arabic jazum, " to cut off")

(6) yeleq, from the root laqaq "to lick" (compare Arabic laqlaq, "to dart out the tongue" (used of a serpent)).

(7) chacil, from the root chacal, "to devour" (compare Arabic chaucal, "crop" (of a bird)).

(8) gobh, from the obsolete root gabhah (compare Arabic jabi, "locust," from the root jaba',"to come out of a hole").

(9) gebh, from same root.

(10) tselatsal from [?] tsalal (onomatopoetic), "to tinkle," "to ring" (compare Arabic call, "to give a ringing sound" (used of a horse's bit); compare also Arabic Tann, used of the sound of a drum or piece of metal, also of the humming of flies).

(11) akris (genitive akridos; diminutive akridion, whence Acridium, a genus of locusts).

2. Identifications:

(1), (2), (3) and (4) constitute the list of clean insects in Le 11:21 f, characterized as "winged creeping things that go upon all fours, which have legs above their feet, wherewith to leap upon the earth." This manifestly refers to jumping insects of the order Orthoptera, such as locusts, grasshoppers and crickets, and is in contrast to the unclean "winged creeping things that go upon all fours," which may be taken to denote running Orthoptera, such as cockroaches, mole-crickets and ear-wigs, as well as insects of other orders.

'Arbeh (1) is uniformly translated "locust" in the Revised Version (British and American). the King James Version has usually "locust," but "grasshopper" in Jud 6:5; 7:12; Job 39:20; Jer 46:23. Septuagint has usually akris, "locust"; but has brouchos, "wingless locust," in Le 11:22; 1Ki 8:37 (akris in the parallel passage, 2Ch 6:28); Na 3:15; and attelebos, "wingless locust," in Na 3:17. 'Arbeh occurs (Ex 10:4-19) in the account of the plague of locusts; in the phrase "as locusts for multitude" (Jud 6:5; 7:12); "more than the locusts .... innumerable" (Jer 46:23);

"The locusts have no king,

Yet go they forth all of them by bands" (Pr 30:27).

'Arbeh is referred to as a plague in De 28:38; 1Ki 8:37; 2Ch 6:28; Ps 78:46; in Joe and in Nahum. These references, together with the fact that it is the most used word, occurring 24 times, warrant us in assuming it to be one of the swarming species, i.e. Pachtylus migratorius or Schistocerca peregrina, which from time to time devastate large regions in the countries bordering on the Mediterranean.

Cal‘am (2), English Versions of the Bible "bald locust," occurs only in Le 11:22. According to Tristram, NBH, the name "bald locust" was given because it is said in the Talmud to have a smooth head. It has been thought to be one of the genus Tryxalis (T. unguiculata or T. nasuta), in which the head is greatly elongated.

Chargol (3), the King James Version "beetle," the Revised Version (British and American) "cricket," being one of the leaping insects, cannot be a beetle. It might be a cricket, but comparison with the Arabic (see supra) favors a locust of some sort. The word occurs only in Le 11:22.

See BEETLE.

Haghabh (4) is one of the clean leaping insects of Le 11:22 (English Versions of the Bible "grasshopper"). The word occurs in four other places, nowhere coupled with the name of another insect. In the report of the spies (Nu 13:33), we have the expression, "We were in our own sight as grasshoppers"; in Ec 12:5, "The grasshopper shall be a burden"; in Isa 40:22, "It is he that sitteth above the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers." These three passages distinctly favor the rendering "grasshopper" of the English Versions of the Bible. In the remaining passage (2Ch 7:13), ".... if I command the locust (English Versions) to devour the land," the migratory locust seems to be referred to. Doubtless this as well as other words was loosely used. In English there is no sharp distinction between the words "grasshopper" and "locust."

The migratory locusts belong to the family Acridiidae, distinguished by short, thick antennae, and by having the organs of hearing at the base of the abdomen. The insects of the family Locustidae are commonly called "grasshoppers," but the same name is applied to those Acridiidae which are not found in swarms. The Locustidae have long, thin antennae, organs of hearing on the tibiae of the front legs, and the females have long ovipositors. It may be noted that the insect known in America as the seventeen-year locust, which occasionally does extensive damage to trees by laying its eggs in the twigs, is a totally different insect, being a Cicada of the order Rhynchota. Species of Cicada are found in Palestine, but are not considered harmful.

The Book of Joe is largely occupied with the description of a plague of locusts. Commentators differ as to whether it should be interpreted literally or allegorically (see JOEL). Four names ‘arbeh (1), gazam (5), yeleq (6) and chacil (7), are found in Joe 1:4 and again in 2:25.

For the etymology of these names, see 1 above. Gazam (Am 4:9; Joe 1:4; 2:25) is in the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly translated "palmer-worm" Septuagint kampe, "caterpillar"). Chacil in the Revised Version (British and American) (1Ki 8:37; 2Ch 6:28; Ps 78:46; Isa 23:4; Joe 1:4; 2:25) is uniformly translated "caterpillar." The Septuagint has indifferently brouchos, "wingless locust," and erusibe, "rust" (of wheat). Yeleq (Ps 105:34; Jer 51:14,27; Joe 1:4; 2:25; Na 3:15,16) is everywhere "canker-worm" in the Revised Version (British and American), except in Ps 105:34, where the American Standard Revised Version has "grasshopper." the King James Version has "caterpillar" in Psalms and Jeremiah and "canker-worm" in Joe and Nahum. Septuagint has indifferently akris and brouchos.

"Palmerworm" and "canker-worm" are both Old English terms for caterpillars, which are strictly the larvae of lepidopterous insects, i.e. butterflies and moths.

While these four words occur in Joe 1:4 and 2:25, a consideration of the book as a whole does not show that the ravages of four different insect pests are referred to, but rather a single one, and that the locust. These words may therefore be regarded as different names of the locust, referring to different stages of development of the insect. It is true that the words do not occur in quite the same order in 14 and in 2:25, but while the former verse indicates a definite succession, the latter does not. If, therefore, all four words refer to the locust, "palmer-worm," "canker-worm," "caterpillar" and the Septuagint erusibe, "rust," are obviously inappropriate.

Gobh (8) is found in the difficult passage (Am 7:1), ".... He formed locusts (the King James Version "grasshoppers," the King James Version margin "green worms," Septuagint akris) in the beginning of the shooting up of the latter growth"; and (Na 3:17) in ".... thy marshals (are) as the swarms of grasshoppers (Hebrew gobh gobhay; the King James Version "great grasshoppers"), which encamp in the hedges in the cold day, but when the sun ariseth they flee away, and their place is not known where they are." The related gebh (9) occurs but once, in Isa 33:4, also a disputed passage, "And your spoil shall be gathered as the caterpillar (chacil) gathereth: as locusts (gebhim) leap shall men leap upon it." It is impossible to determine what species is meant, but some kind of locust or grasshopper fits any of these passages.

In De 28:42, "All thy trees and the fruit of thy ground shall the locust (English Versions of the Bible) possess," we have (10) tselatsal, Septuagint erusibe). The same word is translated in 2Sa 6:5 and Ps 150:5 bis "cymbals," in Job 41:7 "fish-spears," and in Isa 18:1 "rustling." As stated in 1, above, it is an onomatopoetic word, and in De 28:42 may well refer to the noise of the wings of a flight of locusts.

In the New Testament we have (11) akris, "locust," the food of John the Baptist (Mt 3:4; Mr 1:6); the same word is used figuratively in Re 9:3,1; and also in the Apocrypha (Judith 2:20; The Wisdom of Solomon 16:9; and see 2 Esdras 4:24).

3. Habits:

The swarms of locusts are composed of countless individuals. The statements sometimes made that they darken the sky must not be taken too literally. They do not produce darkness, but their effect may be like that of a thick cloud. Their movements are largely determined by the wind, and while fields that are in their path may be laid waste, others at one side may not be affected. It is possible by vigorous waving to keep a given tract clear of them, but usually enough men cannot be found to protect the fields from their ravages.

Large birds have been known to pass through a flight of locusts with open mouths, filling their crops with the insects. Tristram, NHB, relates how he saw the fishes in the Jordan enjoying a similar feast, as the locusts fell into the stream. The female locust, by means of the ovipositor at the end of her abdomen,

digs a hole in the ground, and deposits in it a mass of eggs, which are cemented together with a glandular secretion. An effective way of dealing with the locusts is to gather and destroy these egg-masses, and it is customary for the local governments to offer a substantial reward for a measure of eggs. The young before they can fly are frequently swept into pits or ditches dug for the purpose and are burned.

The young are of the same general shape as the adult insects, differing in being small, black and wingless. The three distinct stages in the metamorphosis of butterflies and others of the higher insects are not to be distinguished in locusts. They molt about six times, emerging from each molt larger than before. At first there are no wings. After several molts, small and useless wings are found, but it is only after the last molt that the insects are able to fly. In the early molts the tiny black nymphs are found in patches on the ground, hopping out of the way when disturbed. Later they run, until they are able to fly.

In all stages they are destructive to vegetation. Some remarkable pictures of their ravages are found in Joe 1:6,7, "For a nation is come up upon my land, strong, and without number; his teeth are the teeth of a lion, and he hath the jaw-teeth of a lioness. He hath laid my vine waste, and barked my figtree: he hath made it clean bare, and cast it away; the branches thereof are made white" (see also 2:2-9,20).

4. Figurative:

Locusts are instruments of the wrath of God (Ex 10:4-19; De 28:38,42; 2Ch 7:13; Ps 78:46; 105:34; Na 3:15-17; The Wisdom of Solomon 16:9; Re 9:3); they typify an invading army (Jer 51:14,27); they are compared with horses (Joe 2:4; Re 9:7); in Job 39:20, Yahweh says of the horse: "Hast thou made him to leap as a locust?" the King James Version "Canst thou make him afraid as a grasshopper?" Locusts are among the "four things which are little upon the earth, but .... are exceeding wise" (Pr 30:27). Like the stars and sands of the sea, locusts are a type of that which cannot be numbered (Jud 6:5; 7:12; Jer 46:23; Judith 2:20). Grasshoppers are a symbol of insignificance (Nu 13:33; Ec 12:5; Isa 40:22; 2 Esdras 4:24).

5. Locusts as Food:

The Arabs prepare for food the thorax of the locust, which contains the great wing muscles. They pull off the head, which as it comes away brings with it a mass of the viscera, and they remove the abdomen (or "tail"), the legs and the wings. The thoraxes, if not at once eaten, are dried and put away as a store of food for a lean season. The idea of feeding upon locusts when prepared in this way should not be so repellent as the thought of eating the whole insect. In the light of this it is not incredible that the food of John the Baptist should have been "locusts and wild honey" (Mt 3:4).

See INSECTS.

Alfred Ely Day

LOD; LYDDA

(lodh; Ludda):

1. Scriptural Notices:

Ono and Lod and the towns thereof are said to have been built by Shemed, a Benjamite (1Ch 8:12). The children of Lod, Hadid and One, to the number of 725, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:33; Ne 7:37 (721)). The town lay in the Shephelah, perhaps in ge ha-charashim, "the valley of craftsmen" (Ne 11:35). In the New Testament it appears as Lydda. Here the apostle Peter visited the saints and healed the palsied Arenas (Ac 9:32). Hence he was summoned by messengers from Joppa on the death of Dorcas.

2. History from Maccabean Times:

The three governments of Aphaerema, Lydda and Ramathaim were added to Judea from the country of Samaria by King Demetrius II (1 Macc 11:34). Lydda presided over one of the toparchies under Jerusalem, into which Judea was divided (BJ, III, iii, 5). After the death of Julius Caesar the inhabitants of Lydda and certain other towns, having failed to pay the contributions Cassius demanded, were by him sold into slavery. They were freed by Antony (Ant., XIV, xi, 2; xii, 2). Lydda suffered severely under Cestius Gallus (BJ, II, xix, 1). Along with Jamnia it surrendered to Vespasian (BJ, IV, viii, 1). After the fall of Jerusalem it was noted as a seat of rabbinical learning. The classical name of the city was Diospolis. In the 4th century it was connected with the trade in purple. It became the seat of a bishopric, and the bishop of Lydda was present at the Council of Nicea. At Lydda, in 415 AD, took place the trial of Pelagius for heresy.

Under the Moslems it became capital of the province of Filastin but later it was superseded by er-Ramleh, founded by Khalif Suleiman, whither its inhabitants were removed (Ya’kubi, circa 891 AD). Mukaddasi (circa 985) says that in Lydda "there is a great mosque in which are wont to assemble large numbers of people from the capital (er-Ramleh) and from the villages around. In Lydda, too, is that wonderful church (of George) at the gate of which Christ will slay the antichrist" (quoted by Guy le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 493). It was rebuilt by the Crusaders; but was destroyed by Saladin after the battle of ChaTTin, 1191 AD. It was again restored; but in 1271 it was sacked by the Mengels, and from this blow it has never recovered.

3. Identification and Description:

The ancient Lod or Lydda is represented by the modern village of Ludd, on the road to Jerusalem, about 11 miles Southeast of Yafa. It is a station on the Jaffa-Jerusalem Railway. It occupies a picturesque hollow in the plain of Sharon, and is surrounded by gardens and orchards, the beauty of which intensifies by contrast the squalor of the village. It was the reputed birthplace of George, and here he is said to have been buried. The one ruin of importance in the place is that of the church which perpetuates his name.

The town stood on the great caravan road between Babylon and Egypt, near its intersection with that from Joppa to Jerusalem and the East. Its position on these great arteries of commerce meant trade for the inhabitants. "The manufacture and repair of such requisites for the journey as sacks, saddles and strappings would create the skilled labor in cloth, leather, wood and metal that made the neighborhood once the valley of craftsmen" (Mackie, HDB, under the word). Like many other once prosperous cities on these and similar caravan routes, Lydda suffered from diversion of traffic to the sea; and it may be that for none of them is any great revival now possible.

W. Ewing

LODDEUS

lod-e'-us (Loddeus; Swete reads Laadaios with Doldaiosas variant in Codex Alexandrinus; the King James Version Daddeus, Saddeus): The captain, who was in the place of the treasury. Ezra sent to him for men who "might execute the priests' office" (1 Esdras 8:46); called "Iddo" in Ezr 8:17.

LODGE

loj (lin; kataskenoo, etc.): To stay or dwell, temporarily, as for the night (Ge 32:13,21; Nu 22:8; Jos 2:1 the King James Version; Jos 4:3; Lu 13:19; Mt 21:17, aulizomai), or permanently (Ru 1:16). In Isa 1:8, "a lodge (melunah) in a garden of cucumbers," the meaning is "hut," "cottage." "Evil thoughts" are said to "lodge" in the wicked (Jer 4:14).

LOFT

In 1Ki 17:23, changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "chamber."

LOFTILY; LOFTINESS; LOFTY

lof'-ti-li, lof'-ti-nes: The first form is only in Ps 73:8, where it means "haughtily," as if from on high. The second is found only in Jer 48:29, where the loftiness of Moab also means his haughtiness, his groundless self-conceit.

Lofty likewise means '"haughty," "lifted up" (compare Ps 131:1; Isa 2:11; Pr 30:13). In Isa 26:5 it refers to a self-secure and boastful city. In 57:15 it is used in a good sense of God who really is high and supreme. Isaiah uses the word more than all the other sacred writers put together.

LOG

log, logh, "deepened," "hollowed out" (Le 14:10-24)): The smallest liquid or dry measure of the

Hebrews, equal to about 1 pint.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

LOGIA, THE log’-i-a, (Logia):

1. The Word "Logia" and Its History:

The word logion, which is a diminutive of logos, was regularly used of Divine utterances. There are examples in the classics, the Septuagint, the writings of Josephus and Philo and in four passages in the New Testament (Ac 7:38; Ro 3:2; Heb 5:12; 1Pe 4:11) where it is uniformly rendered both in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "oracles." It is not, therefore, surprising that early Christian writers, who thought of Christ as Divine, applied this term to His sayings also. We find this use, according to the usual interpretation, in the title of the lost work of Papias as preserved by Eusebius, Logion kuriakon exegesis, "Exposition of the Lord’s Logia" (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39), in that writer’s obscure reference to a Hebrew or Aramaic writing by the apostle Matthew (same place) , and in Polycarp’s Epistle (section symbol 7), "the logia of the Lord." The modern use of the word is twofold:

(a) as the name of the document referred to by Papins which may or may not be the Q of recent inquirers;

(b) as the name of recently discovered sayings ascribed to Jesus. For the former compare GOSPELS.

The latter is theme of this article.

2. The Discovery of the Logia:

About 9 1/2 miles from the railway station of Beni Mazar, 121 miles from Cairo, a place now called Behnesa marks the site of an ancient city named by the Greeks Oxyrhynchus, from the name of a sacred fish, the modern binni, which had long been known as a great Christian center in early times and was therefore selected by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt for exploration in behalf of the Egyptian Exploration Fund. They began work on the ruins of the town, January 11, 1897, and on the following day discovered a papyrus leaf inscribed with a number of sayings introduced by the formula legei Iesous, "saith Jesus," some of which were at once seen to be quite new. When excavation was resumed in February, 1903, a second fragment was discovered, which must have belonged to the same or a similar collection, as the formula "saith Jesus" is employed in exactly the same way, and the sayings exhibit the same mixed character. The first of these two fragments was named by the discoverers logia, but the short preface to the second fragment suggests that the word used in the original title may have been logoi, which is found in Ac 20:35 as the title perhaps of a collection of sayings of Jesus used by the apostle Paul. It is convenient, however, to retain logia, at any rate for the present. Other remains of early Christian texts have been found on the same site (compare AGRAPHA) but none of precisely the same character.

3. Description of the Texts:

The first fragment, found and published in 1897, afterward referred to as A, is a leaf from a papyrus book measuring in its present state 5 3/4 X 3 3/4 inches and having 42 lines on the two pages. As it is broken at the bottom it is impossible, in the absence of another leaf, to ascertain or even conjecture how much has been lost. At the top right-hand corner of one page are the letters iota, alpha, used as numerals, that is 11, and it has been suggested that this, with other characteristics, marks the page as the first of the two. The uncial writing is assigned to the 3rd century, perhaps to the early part of it. The text is fairly complete except at the end of the third logion, for the five following lines, and at the bottom. The second fragment, henceforth referred to as B, found in 1903 and published in 1904, has also 42 lines, or rather parts of lines, but on only one page or column, the Christian text being written on the back of a roll the recto of which contained a survey list. The characters of this, too, are uncial, and the date, like that of A, seems to be also the 3rd century, but perhaps a little later. B is unfortunately very defective, the bit of papyrus being broken vertically throughout, so that several letters are lost at the end of each line, and also horizontally for parts of several lines at the bottom.

4. Logia with Canonical Parallels:

Seven of these sayings, or logia, inclusive of the preface of B, have or contain canonical parallels, namely:

(1) A1, which coincides with the usual text of Lu 6:42;

(2) A5a (according to the editio princeps, 6a), which comes very close to Lu 4:24;

(3) A6 (or 7), a variant of Mt 5:14;

(4) the saying contained in the preface of B which resembles Joh 8:52;

(5) B2, ll. 7 f, "The kingdom of heaven is within you," which reminds us of Lu 17:21;

(6) B3, ll. 4 f, "Many that are first shall be last; and the last first," which corresponds to Mr 10:31; compare Mt 19:30; Lu 13:30;

(7) B4, ll. 2-5, "That which is hidden from thee shall be revealed to thee: for there is nothing hidden that shall not be made manifest," which is like Mr 4:22 (compare Mt 10:26; Lu 12:2).

These parallels or partial parallels—for some of them exhibit interesting variations—are, with one exception, of synoptic character.

5. New Sayings:

The other seven or eight logia, although not without possible echoes of the canonical Gospels in thought and diction, are all non-canonical and with one exception new.

Three of them, namely B2 and 3 (apart from the canonical sayings given above) and 5, may be set aside as too uncertain to be of any value. What is preserved of the first ("Who are they that draw you (MS, us) to the kingdom?" etc.) is indeed very tempting, but the restoration of the lost matter is too precarious for any suggestion to be more than an ingenious conjecture. This is seen by comparing the restoration of this logion by the discoverers, Dr. Swete and Dr. C. Taylor, with that proposed by Delssmann (Licht vom Osten1, 329). While the English scholars take helko in the sense of "draw," the German takes it in the sense which it has in the New Testament, "drag," with the result of utter divergence as to the meaning and even the subject of the logion. The logia which remain are undeniably of great interest, although the significance of at least one is exceedingly obscure. The number of the sayings is not certain. Dr. Taylor has shown that in A2 f "and" may couple two distinct utterances brought together by the compiler. If this suggestion is adopted, and if the words after A3 in the editio princeps are regarded as belonging to it and not as the remains of a separate logion, we get the following eight sayings:

(1) "Except ye fast to the world (or "from the world"), ye shall in no wise find the kingdom of God" (A2a);

(2) "Except ye keep the sabbath (Taylor "sabbatize the sabbath"), ye shall not see the Father" (A2b);

(3) "I stood in the midst of the world, and in flesh was I seen of them, and I found all men drunken, and none found I athirst among them" (A3a);

(4) "My soul grieveth over the sons of men, because they are blind in their heart and see not their wretchedness and their poverty" (the last clause restored by conjecture) (A3b);

(5) "Wherever there are two they are not without God, and where there is one alone I say I am with him (after Blass). Raise the stone and (there) thou shalt find me: cleave the wood (Taylor, "the tree") and there am I" (A4);

(6) "A physician does not work cures on them that know him" (A5b);

(7) "Thou hearest with one ear but the other thou hast closed" (largely conjectural but almost certain) (A6);

(8) "(There is nothing) buried which shall not be raised" (or "known") (B4, 1,5).

6. Origin and Character of the Logia:

Attempts have been made to trace the collection represented by these fragments (assuming that they belong to the same work) to some lost gospel—the Gospel according to the Egyptians (Harnack, Van Manen), the Gospel of the Ebionites or the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles (Zahn), or the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Batiffol), but without decisive result. That there is a connection of some kind with the last-mentioned apocryphal work is evident from the fact that B1 ("Jesus saith, Let not him who seeks .... cease until he find Him; and having found Him, let him be amazed; and being amazed he shall reign, and reigning shall rest") is ascribed by Clement of Alexandria to this writing, but that cannot have been the only source. It was probably one of a number drawn on by the compiler. The latter, so far as B is concerned, represents the sayings as spoken by Jesus to ".... and Thomas." In whatever way the gap is supplied—whether by "Philip," or "Judas" or "the other disciples"—one of the Twelve known as Thomas is clearly referred to as the medium or one of the media of transmission. It is possible that the short preface in which this statement is made belongs not to the whole collection but to a part of it. The whole work may, as Swete suggests (Expository Times, XV, 494), have been entitled "Words of Jesus to the Twelve," and this may have been the portion addressed to Thomas. The other fragment, A, might belong to a section associated with the name of another apostle. In any case the Logia must have formed part of a collection of considerable extent, as we know of material for 24 pages or columns of about 21 or 22 lines each. So far as can be judged the writing was not a gospel in the ordinary sense of that term, but a collection of sayings perhaps bearing considerable resemblance as to the form to the Logia of Matthew mentioned by Papias.

The remains of B5, however, show that a saying might be prefaced with introductory matter. Perhaps a short narrative was sometimes appended. The relation to the canonical Gospels cannot be determined with present evidence. The sayings preserved generally exhibit the synoptic type, perhaps more specifically the Lukan type, but Johannine echoes, that is, possible traces of the thought and diction represented in the Fourth Gospel, are not absent (compare A, logia 2 f, and preface to B). It seems not improbable that the compiler had our four Gospels before him, but nothing can be proved. There is no distinct sign of heretical influence. The much-debated saying about the wood and the stone (A4b) undoubtedly lends itself to pantheistic teaching, but can be otherwise understood.

Under these circumstances the date of the compilation cannot at present be fixed except in a very general way. If our papyri which represent two copies were written, as the discoverers think, in the 3rd century, that fact and the indubitably archaic character of the sayings make it all but certain that the text as arranged is not later than the 2nd century. To what part of the century it is to be assigned is at present undiscoverable. Sanday inclines to about 120 AD, the finders suggest about 140 AD as the terminus ad quem, Zahn dates 160-70 AD, and Dr. Taylor 150-200 AD. Further research may solve these problems, but, with the resources now available, all that can be said is that we have in the Logia of Oxyrhynchus a few glimpses of an early collection of sayings ascribed to Jesus which circulated in Egypt in the 3rd century of great interest and possibly of considerable value, but of completely unknown origin.

LITERATURE.

Of the extensive literature which has gathered round the Logia—as many as fifty publications relating to A only in the first few months—only a few can be mentioned here. A was first published in 1897 as a

pamphlet and afterward as Number 1 of Oxyrhynchus Papyri. Valuable articles by Cross and Harnack peared in The Expositor, series V, volume VI, 257 ff, 321 ff, 401 ff, an important lecture by Swete in The Expository Times, VIII, 544 ff, 568, and a very useful pamphlet by Sanday and Lock in the same year. B appeared in 1904 in pamphlet form and as Number 654 of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, with a fuller commentary. Dr. C. Taylor's pamphlets on A and B issued respectively in 1899 and 1905, and Swete's lecture on B, The Expositor T, XV, 488 ff, are of exceptional significance for the study of the subject. Compare also Griffinhoofe, The Unwritten Sayings of Christ (A only), 55-67; Klostermann, Kleine Texte, Numbers 8, pp. 11 f and 11, pp. 17 ff; Resch, Agrapha2, 68-73, 353 f; HDB, article "Agrapha," extra vol; also articles on "Unwritten Sayings" in HDB, 1909, and DCG.

William Taylor Smith

LOGOS

log'-os (logos):

I. GREEK SPECULATION

1. Heraclitus

2. Anaxagoras

3. Plato

4. Aristotle

5. Stoics

II. HEBREW ANTICIPATION OF DOCTRINE

1. Word as Revelation of God

2. Suggestions of Personal Distinctions in Deity

3. Theophanies

4. Wisdom

5. Targums

III. ALEXANDRIAN SYNTHESIS

Philo

IV. CHRISTIAN REALIZATION

1. Pauline Doctrine

2. Doctrine in Hebrews

3. Doctrine in Fourth Gospel

(1) Content of Doctrine

(a) Relation of Logos to God

(b) Relation of Logos to World

(2) Origin of Terminology

(a) Hebrew Source

(b) Hellenic Source

(c) Contrast between Philo and John

V. PATRISTIC DEVELOPMENT

LITERATURE

The doctrine of the Logos has exerted a decisive and far-reaching influence upon speculative and Christian thought. The word has a long history, and the evolution of the idea it embodies is really the unfolding of man’s conception of God. To comprehend the relation of the Deity to the world has been the aim of all religious philosophy. While widely divergent views as to the Divine manifestation have been conceived, from the dawn of Western speculation, the Greek word logos has been employed with a certain degree of uniformity by a series of thinkers to express and define the nature and mode of God’s revelation.

Logos signifies in classical Greek both "reason" and "word." Though in Biblical Greek the term is mostly employed in the sense of "word," we cannot properly dissociate the two significations. Every word implies a thought. It is impossible to imagine a time when God was without thought. Hence, thought must be eternal as the Deity. The translation "thought" is probably the best equivalent for the

Greek term, since it denotes, on the one hand, the faculty of reason, or the thought inwardly conceived in the mind; and, on the other hand, the thought outwardly expressed through the vehicle of language. The two ideas, thought and speech, are indubitably blended in the term logos; and in every employment of the word, in philosophy and Scripture, both notions of thought and its outward expression are intimately connected.

In this article it will be our aim to trace the evolution of the doctrine from its earliest appearance in Greek philosophy through its Hebrew and Alexandrian phases till it attained its richest expression in the writings of the New Testament, and especially in the Fourth Gospel.

The doctrine may be said to have two stages: a Hellenistic and a Hebrew; or, more correctly, a pre-Christian and a Christian. The theory of Philo and of the Alexandrian thinkers generally may be regarded as the connecting link between the Greek and the Christian forms of the doctrine. The Greek or pre-Christian speculation on the subject is marked by the names of Heraclitus, Plato and the Stoics. Philo paves the way for the Christian doctrine of Paul, Hebrews and the Johannine Gospel.

I. Greek Speculation.

The earliest speculations of the Greeks were occupied with the world of Nature, and the first attempts at philosophy take the shape of a search for some unitary principle to explain the diversity of the universe.

1. Heraclitus:

Heraclitus was practically the first who sought to account for the order which existed in a world of change by a law or ruling principle. This profoundest of Greek philosophers saw everything in a condition of flux. Everything is forever passing into something else and has an existence only in relation to this process. We cannot say things are: they come into being and pass away. To account for this state of perpetual becoming, Heraclitus was led to seek out a new and primary element from which all things take their rise. This substance he conceived to be, not water or air as previous thinkers had conjectured, but something more subtle, mysterious and potent—fire. This restless, all-consuming and yet all-transforming activity—now darting upward as a flame, now sinking to an ember and now vanishing as smoke—is for him at once the symbol and essence of life. But it is no arbitrary or lawless element. If there is flux everywhere, all change must take place according to "measure." Reality is an "attunement" of opposites, a tension or harmony of conflicting elements. Heraclitus saw all the mutations of being governed by a rational and unalterable law. This law he calls sometimes "Justice," sometimes "Harmony"; more frequently "Logos" or "Reason," and in two passages at least, "God." Fire, Logos, God are fundamentally the same. It is the eternal energy of the universe pervading all its substance and preserving in unity and harmony the perpetual drift and evolution of phenomenal existence. Though Heraclitus sometimes calls this rational principle God, it is not probable that he attached to it any definite idea of consciousness. The Logos is not above the world or even prior to it. It is in it, its inner pervasive energy sustaining, relating and harmonizing its endless variety.

2. Anaxagoras:

Little was done by the immediate successors of Heraclitus to develop the doctrine of the Logos, and as the distinction between mind and matter became more defined, the term nous superseded that of Logos as the rational force of the world. Anaxagoras was the first thinker who introduced the idea of a supreme intellectual principle which, while independent of the world, governed it. His conception of the nous or "mind" is, however, vague and confused, hardly distinguishable from corporeal matter. By the artificial introduction of a power acting externally upon the world, a dualism, which continued throughout Greek philosophy, was created. At the same time it is to the merit of Anaxagoras that he was the first to perceive some kind of distinction between mind and matter and to suggest a teleological explanation of the universe.

3. Plato:

In Plato the idea of a regulative principle reappears. But though the word is frequently used, it is nous and not Logos which determines his conception of the relation of God and the world. The special doctrine of the Logos does not find definite expression, except perhaps in the Timaeus, where the word is employed as descriptive of the Divine force from which the world has arisen. But if the word does not frequently occur in the dialogues, there is not wanting a basis upon which a Logos-doctrine might be framed; and the conception of archetypal ideas affords a philosophical expression of the relation of God and the world. The idea of a dominating principle of reason was lifted to a higher plane by the distinction which Plato made between the world of sense and the world of thought, to the latter of which God belonged. According to Plato, true reality or absolute being consisted of the "Ideas" which he conceived as thoughts residing in the Divine mind before the creation of the world. To these abstract concepts was ascribed the character of supersensible realities of which in some way the concrete visible things of the world were copies or images. Compared with the "Ideas," the world of things was a world of shadows. This was the aspect of the Platonic doctrine of ideas which, as we shall see, Philo afterward seized upon, because it best fitted in with his general conception of the transcendence of God and His relation to the visible world. Three features of Plato’s view ought to be remembered as having a special significance for our subject:

(1) While God is regarded by Plato as the intelligent power by which the world is formed, matter itself is conceived by him as in some sense eternal and partly intractable.

(2) While in the Philebus Plato employs the expression, "the regal principle of intelligence in the nature of God" nous basilikos en te tou Dios phusei), it is doubtful if reason was endowed with personality or was anything more than an attribute of the Divine mind.

(3) The ideas are merely models or archetypes after which creation is fashioned.

4. Aristotle:

The doctrine of the Logos cannot be said to occupy a distinctive place in the teaching of Aristotle, though the word does occur in a variety of senses (e.g. orthos logos, "right insight," the faculty by which the will is trained to proper action). Aristotle sought to solve the fundamental problem of Greek philosophy as to how behind the changing multiplicity of appearances an abiding Being is to be thought by means of the concept of development. Plato had regarded the "ideas" as the causes of phenomena—causes different from the objects themselves. Aristotle endeavored to overcome the duality of Plato by representing reality as the essence which contains within itself potentially the phenomena, and unfolds into the particular manifestations of the sensible world. This conception has exerted a powerful influence upon subsequent thought, and particularly upon the monotheistic view of the world. At the same time in working it out, the ultimate "prime-mover" of Aristotle was not materially different from the idea of "the Good" of Plato. And inasmuch as God was conceived as pure thought existing apart from the world in eternal blessedness, Aristotle did not succeed in resolving the duality of God and the universe which exercised the Greek mind.

5. Stoics:

It is to the Stoics we must look for the first systematic exposition of the doctrine of the Logos. It is the key to their interpretation of life, both in the realms of Nature and of duty. Interested more in ethical than physical problems, they were compelled to seek general metaphysical basis for a rational moral life. Some unitary idea must be found which will overcome the duality between God and the world and remove the opposition between the sensuous and supersensuous which Plato and Aristotle had failed to reconcile. For this end the Logos-doctrine of Heraclitus seemed to present itself as the most satisfactory solution of the problem. The fundamental thought of the Stoics consequently is that the entire universe forms a single living connected whole and that all particulars are the determinate forms assumed by the primitive power which they conceived as never-resting, all-pervading fire. This eternal activity or Divine world-power which contains within itself the conditions and processes of all things, they call Logos or God. More particularly as the productive power, the Deity is named the logos spermatikos, the Seminal Logos or generative principle of the world. This vital energy not only pervades the universe, but unfolds itself into innumerable logoi spermatikoi or formative forces which energize the manifold phenomena of Nature and life. This subordination of all particulars to the Logos not only constitutes the rational order of the universe but supplies a norm of duty for the regulation of the activities of life. Hence, in the moral sphere "to live according to Nature" is the all-determining law of conduct.

II. Hebrew Anticipation of Doctrine.

So far we have traced the development of the Logos-doctrine in Greek philosophy. We have now to note a parallel movement in Hebrew thought. Though strictly speaking it is incorrect to separate the inner Reason from the outer expression in the term Logos, still in the Hellenistic usage the doctrine was substantially a doctrine of Reason, while in Jewish literature it was more especially the outward expression or word that was emphasized.

1. Word as Revelation of God:

The sources of this conception are to be found in the Old Testament and in the post-canonical literature. The God who is made known in Scripture is regarded as one who actively reveals Himself. He is exhibited therefore as making His will known in and by His spoken utterances. The "Word of God" is presented as the creative principle (Ge 1:3; Ps 33:6); as instrument of judgment (Ho 6:5); as agent of healing (Ps 107:20); and generally as possessor of personal qualities (Isa 55:2; Ps 147:15). Revelation is frequently called the "Word of the Lord," signifying the spoken as distinct from the written word.

2. Suggestions of Personal Distinctions in Deity:

In particular, we may note certain adumbrations of distinction of persons within the Being of God. It is contended that the phrase "Let us make" in Genesis points to a plurality of persons in the God-head. This indefinite language of Genesis is more fully explained by the priestly ritual in Nu (6:23-26) and in the Psalter. In Jer, Ezr and the vision of Isa (6:2-8) the same idea of Divine plurality is implied, showing that the Old Testament presents a doctrine of God far removed from the sterile monotheism of the Koran (compare Liddon, Divinity of our Lord, and Konig).

3. Theophanies:

Passing from these indefinite intimations of personal distinction in the inner life of God, we may mention first that series of remarkable apparitions commonly known as the theophanies of the Old Testament. These representations are described as the "Angel of Yahweh" or of "the Covenant"; or as the "Angel of his presence." This angelic appearance is sometimes identified with Yahweh (Ge 16:11,13; 32:29-31; Ex 3:2; 13:21), sometimes distinguished from Him (Ge 22:15; 24:7); sometimes presented in both aspects (Ex 3:6; Zec 1:11). We find God revealing Himself in this way to Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Hagar, Jacob, Moses, Joshua, Gideon, Manoah. Who was this angel? The earliest Fathers reply with general unanimity that He was the "Word" or "Son of God." But while the earlier church teachers distinguished between the "Angel of the Lord" and the Father, the Arians sought to widen the distinction into a difference of natures, since an invisible Being must be higher than one cognizable by the senses. Augustine insists upon the Scriptural truth of the invisibility of God as God, the Son not less than the Father. He will not presume, however, to say which of the Divine persons manifested Himself in this or that instance; and his general doctrine, in which he has been followed by most of the later teachers of the church, is that theophanies were not direct appearances of a Person of the Godhead, but self-manifestations of God through a created being.

4. Wisdom:

A further development of the conception of a personal medium of revelation is discernible in the description of Wisdom as given in some of the later books of the Old Testament. The wisdom of Jewish Scripture is more than a human endowment or even an attribute of God, and may be said to attain almost to a personal reflex of the Deity, reminding us of the archetypal ideas of Plato. In Job, wisdom is represented as existent in God and as communicated in its highest form to man. It is the eternal thought in which the Divine Architect ever beholds His future creation (Job 28:23-27). If in Job wisdom is

revealed only as underlying the laws of the universe and not as wholly personal, in the Book of Proverbs it is coeternal with Yahweh and assists Him in creation (Pr 8:22-31). It may be doubtful whether this is the language of a real person or only of a poetic personification. But something more than a personified idea may be inferred from the contents of the sapiential books outside the Canon. Sirach represents Wisdom as existing from all eternity with God. In Baruch, and still more in Wisdom, the Sophia is distinctly personal—"the very image of the goodness of God." In this pseudo-Solomonic book, supposed to be the work of an Alexandrian writer before Philo, the influence of Greek thought is traceable. The writer speaks of God's Word (me'mera') as His agent in creation and judgment.

5. Targums:

Finally in the Targums, which were popular interpretations or paraphrases of the Old Testament Scripture, there was a tendency to avoid anthropomorphic terms or such expressions as involved a too internal conception of God's nature and manifestation. Here the three doctrines of the Word, the Angel, and Wisdom are introduced as mediating factors between God and the world. In particular the chasm between the Divine and human is bridged over by the use of such terms as me'mera' ("word") and shekhinah ("glory"). The me'mera proceeds from God, and is His messenger in Nature and history. But it is significant that though the use of this expression implied the felt need of a Mediator, the Word does not seem to have been actually identified with the Messiah.

III. Alexandrian Synthesis.

We have seen that according to Greek thought the Logos was conceived as a rational principle or impersonal energy by means of which the world was fashioned and ordered, while according to Hebrew thought the Logos was regarded rather as a mediating agent or personal organ of the Divine Being. The Hellenistic doctrine, in other words, was chiefly a doctrine of the Logos as Reason; the Jewish, a doctrine of the Logos as Word.

Philo:

In the philosophy of Alexandria, of which Philo was an illustrious exponent, the two phases were combined, and Hellenistic speculation was united with Hebrew tradition for the purpose of showing that the Old Testament taught the true philosophy and embodied all that was highest in Greek reflection. In Philo the two streams meet and flow henceforth in a common bed. The all-pervading Energy of Heraclitus, the archetypal Ideas of Plato, the purposive Reason of Aristotle, the immanent Order of the Stoics are taken up and fused with the Jewish conception of Yahweh who, while transcending all finite existences, is revealed through His intermediatory Word. As the result of this Philonic synthesis, an entirely new idea of God is formulated. While Philo admits the eternity of matter, he rejects the Greek view that the world is eternal, since it denies the creative activity and providence of God. At the same time he separates Divine energy from its manifestations in the world, and is therefore compelled to connect the one with the other by the interposition of subordinate Powers. These Divine forces are the embodiment of the ideai, of Plato and the aggeloi, of the Old Testament. The double meaning of Logos—

thought and speech—is made use of by Philo to explain the relation subsisting between the ideal world existing only in the mind of God and the sensible universe which is its visible embodiment. He distinguishes, therefore, between the Logos inherent in God (logos endiathetos), corresponding to reason in man, and the Logos which emanates from God (logos prophorikos), corresponding to the spoken Word as the revelation of thought. Though in His inner essence God is incomprehensible by any but Himself, He has created the intelligible cosmos by His self-activity. The Word is therefore in Philo the rational order manifested in the visible world.

Some special features of the Philonic Logos may be noted:

(1) It is distinguished from God as the instrument from the Cause.

(2) As instrument by which God makes the world, it is in its nature intermediate between God and man.

(3) As the expressed thought of God and the rational principle of the visible world, the Logos is "the Eldest or Firstborn Son of God." It is the "bond" (desmos) holding together all things (De Mundi, i.592), the law which determines the order of the universe and guides the destinies of men and nations (same place) . Sometimes Philo calls it the "Man of God": or the "Heavenly man," the immortal father of all noble men; sometimes he calls it "the Second God," "the Image of God."

(4) From this it follows that the Logos must be the Mediator between God and man, the "Intercessor" (hiketes) or "High Priest," who is the ambassador from heaven and interprets God to man. Philo almost exhausts the vocabulary of Hebrew metaphor in describing the Logos. It is "manna," "bread from heaven," "the living stream," the "sword" of Paradise, the guiding "cloud," the "rock" in the wilderness.

These various expressions, closely resembling the New Testament descriptions of Christ, lead us to ask: Is Philo’s Logos a personal being or a pure abstraction? Philo himself seems to waver in his answer, and the Greek and the Jew in him are hopelessly at issue. That he personifies the Logos is implied in the figures he uses; but to maintain its personality would have been inconsistent with Philo’s whole view of God and the world. His Jewish faith inclines him to speak of the Logos as personal, while his Greek culture disposes him to an impersonal interpretation. Confronted with this alternative, the Alexandrian wavers in indecision. After all has been said, his Logos really resolves itself into a group of Divine ideas, and is conceived, not as a distinct person, but as the thought of God which is expressed in the rational order of the visible universe.

In the speculations of Philo, whose thought is so frequently couched in Biblical language, we have the gropings of a sincere mind after a truth which was disclosed in its fullness only by the revelation of Pentecost. In Philo, Greek philosophy, as has been said, "stood almost at the door of the Christian church." But if the Alexandrian thinker could not create the Christian doctrine, he unconsciously prepared the soil for its acceptance. In this sense his Logos-doctrine has a real value in the evolution of Christian thought. Philo was not, indeed, the master of the apostles, but even if he did nothing more than

call forth their antagonism, he helped indirectly to determine the doctrine of Christendom.

IV. Christian Realization.

We pass now to consider the import of the term in the New Testament. Here it signifies usually "utterance," "speech" or "narrative." In reference to God it is used sometimes for a special utterance, or for revelation in general, and even for the medium of revelation—Holy Scripture. In the prologue of the Fourth Gospel it is identified with the personal Christ; and it is this employment of the term in the light of its past history which creates the interest of the problem of the New Testament doctrine.

1. Pauline Doctrine:

The author of the Fourth Gospel is not, however, the first New Testament writer who represents Jesus as the Logos. Though Paul does not actually use the word in this connection, he has anticipated the Johannine conception. Christ is represented by Paul as before His advent living a life with God in heaven (Ga 4:4; Ro 10:6). He is conceived as one in whose image earthly beings, and especially men, were made (1Co 11:7; 15:45-49); and even as participating in the creation (1Co 8:6). In virtue of His distinct being He is called God’s "own Son" (Ro 8:32).

Whether Paul was actually conversant with the writings of Philo is disputed (compare Pfleider, Urchristentum), but already when he wrote to the Colossians and Ephesians the influence of Alexandrian speculation was being felt in the church. Incipient Gnosticism, which was an attempt to correlate Christianity with the order of the universe as a whole, was current. Most noticeable are the pointed allusions to Gnostic watchwords in Eph 3:19 ("fullness of God") and in Col 2:3 ("Christ, in whom are all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden"), where Paul shows that everything sought for in the doctrine of the Pleroma is really given in Christ. The chief object of these epistles is to assert the unique dignity and absolute power of the Person of Christ. He is not merely one of the Eons which make up the Pleroma, as Gnostic teachers affirm, but a real and personal Being in whom all the fullness of the Godhead dwells. He is not merely an inferior workman creating glory for a higher Master. He creates for Himself. He is the end as well as the source of all created. things (Col 1:15-20). Though throughout this epistle the word "Logos" is never introduced, it is plain that the eikon, of Paul is equivalent in rank and function to the Logos of John. Each exists prior to creation, each is equal to God, shares His life and cooperates in His work.

2. Doctrine in Hebrews:

In the Epistle to the Hebrews we have an equally explicit, if not fuller, declaration of the eternal Deity of Christ. Whatever may be said of Paul there can be little doubt that the author of He was familiar with the Philonic writings. Who this writer was we do not know; but his Philonism suggests that he may have been an Alexandrian Jew, possibly even a disciple of Philo. In language seemingly adapted from that source ("Son of God," "Firstborn," "above angels," "Image of God," "Agent in Creation," "Mediator," "Great High Priest" "Melchizedek") the author of He sneaks of Christ as a reflection of the majesty and

imprint of the nature of God, just as in a seal the impression resembles the stamp. The dignity of His title indicates His essential rank. He is expressly dressed as God; and the expression "the effulgence of his glory" (the Revised Version (British and American) apaugasma) implies that He is one with God (Heb 1:3). By Him the worlds have been made, and all things are upheld by the fiat of His word (Heb 1:3). In the name He bears, in the honors ascribed to Him, in His superiority to angels, in His relationship as Creator both to heaven and earth (Heb 1:10), we recognize (in language which in the letter of it strongly reminds us of Philo, yet in its spirit is so different) the description of one who though clothed with human nature is no mere subordinate being, but the possessor of all Divine prerogatives and the sharer of the very nature of God Himself.

3. Doctrine in the Fourth Gospel:

In the Fourth Gospel the teaching of Paul and the author of He finds its completest expression. "The letter to the He stands in a sense half-way between Pauline and Johannine teaching" (Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, V, 11). It is, however, too much to say that these three writers represent the successive stages of single line of development. While all agree in emphasizing the fact of Christ's Divine personality and eternal being, Paul represents rather the religious interest, the Epistle to the Hebrews the philosophical. In the Johannine Christology the two elements are united.

In discussing the Johannine doctrine of the Logos we shall Speak first of its content and secondly of its terminology.

(1) Content of Doctrine.

The evangelist uses "Logos" 6 times as a designation of the Divine preexistent person of Christ (Joh 1:1,14; 1 Joh 1:1; Re 19:13), but he never puts it into the mouth of Christ. The idea which John sought to convey by this term was not essentially different from the conception of Christ as presented by Paul. But the use of the word gave a precision and emphasis to the being of Christ which the writer must have felt was especially needed by the class of readers for whom his Gospel was intended. The Logos with whom the Fourth Gospel starts is a Person. Readers of the Synoptics had long been familiar with the term "Word of God" as equivalent to the Gospel; but the essential purport of John's Word is Jesus Himself, His Person. We have here an essential change of meaning. The two applications are indeed connected; but the conception of the perfect revelation of God in the Gospel passes into that of the perfect revelation of the Divine nature in general (compare Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, V, ii, 320).

In the prologue (which, however, must not be regarded as independent of, or having no integral connection with, the rest of the book) there is stated: (a) the relation of the Logos to God; and (b) the relation of the Logos to the world.

(a) Relation of Logos to God:

Here the author makes three distinct affirmations:

(i) "In the beginning was the Word."

The evangelist carries back his history of our Lord to a point prior to all temporal things. Nothing is said of the origin of the world. As in Ge 1:1, so here there is only implied that the Logos was existent when the world began to be. When as yet nothing was, the Logos was. Though the eternal preexistence of the Word is not actually stated, it is implied.

(ii) "The Word was with God."

Here His personal existence is more specifically defined. He stands distinct from, yet in eternal fellowship with, God. The preposition pros (bei, Luther) expresses beyond the fact of coexistence that of perpetual intercommunion. John would guard against the idea of mere self-contemplation on the one hand, and entire independence on the other. It is union, not fusion.

(iii) "The Word was God."

He is not merely related eternally, but actually identical in essence with God. The notion of inferiority is emphatically excluded and the true Deity of the Word affirmed. In these three propositions we ascend from His eternal existence to His distinct personality and thence to His substantial Godhead. All that God is the Logos is. Identity, difference, communion are the three phases of the Divine relationship.

(b) Relation of Logos to the World:

The Logos is word as well as thought, and therefore there is suggested the further idea of communicativeness. Of this self-communication the evangelist mentions two phases—creation and revelation. The Word unveils Himself through the mediation of objects of sense and also manifests Himself directly. Hence, in this section of the prologue (Joh 1:3-5) a threefold division also occurs.

(i) He is the Creator of the visible universe. "All things were made through him"—a phrase which describes the Logos as the organ of the entire creative activity of God and excludes the idea favored by Plato and Philo that God was only the architect who molded into cosmos previously existing matter. The term egeneto ("becomes," werden), implies the successive evolution of the world, a statement not inconsistent with the modern theory of development.

(ii) The Logos is also the source of the intellectual, moral and spiritual life of man. "In him was life; and the life was the light of men." He is the light as well as the life—the fountain of all the manifold forms of being and thought in and by whom all created things subsist, and from whom all derive illumination (compare 1 Joh 1:1-3; also Col 1:17). But inasmuch as the higher phases of intelligent life involve freedom, the Divine Light, though perfect and undiminished in itself, was not comprehended by a world which chose darkness rather than light (Joh 1:5,11).

(iii) The climax of Divine revelation is expressed in the statement, The Word became flesh," which implies on the one hand the reality of Christ's humanity, and, on the other, the voluntariness of His incarnation, but excludes the notion that in becoming man the Logos ceased to be God. Though clothed in flesh, the Logos continues to be the self-manifesting God, and retains, even in human form, the character of the Eternal One. In this third phase is embodied the highest manifestation of the Godhead. In physical creation the power of God is revealed. In the bestowal of light to mankind His wisdom is chiefly manifested. But in the third especially is His love unveiled. All the perfections of the Deity are focused and made visible in Christ—the "glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth" (Joh 1:14).

Thus the Word reveals the Divine essence. The incarnation makes the life, the light and the love which are eternally present in God manifest to men. As they meet in God, so they meet in Christ. This is the glory which the disciples beheld; the truth to which the Baptist bore witness (Joh 1:7); the fullness whereof His apostles received (Joh 1:16); the entire body of grace and truth by which the Word gives to men the power to become the sons of God.

There is implied throughout that the Word is the Son. Each of these expressions taken separately have led and may lead to error. But combined they correct possible misuse. On the one hand, their union protects us from considering the Logos as a mere abstract impersonal quality; and, on the other, saves us from imparting to the Son a lower state or more recent origin than the Father. Each term supplements and protects the other. Taken together they present Christ before His incarnation as at once personally distinct from, yet equal with, the Father—as the eternal life which was with God and was manifested to us.

(2) Origin of Terminology.

We have now to ask whence the author of the Fourth Gospel derived the phraseology employed to set forth his Christology. It will be well, however, to distinguish between the source of the doctrine itself and the source of the language. For it is possible that Alexandrian philosophy might have suggested the linguistic medium, while the doctrine itself had another origin. Writers like Reuss, Keim, Holtzmann, Weizsacker, Schmiedel, etc., who contend for the Alexandrian derivation of the prologue, are apt to overlook two considerations regarding the Johannine doctrine:

(1) There is no essential difference between the teaching of John and that of the other apostolic writers; and even when the word "Logos" is not used, as in Paul's case, the view of Christ's person is virtually that which we find in the Fourth Gospel.

(2) The writer himself affirms that his knowledge of Christ was not borrowed from others, but was derived from personal fellowship with Jesus Himself. "We beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten." This is John's summary and witness upon which he proceeds to base the vivid memories of Jesus which follow. The Johannine doctrine is not to be regarded merely as a philosophical account of the nature of God and His creation of the world, but rather as the statement of a belief which already

existed in the Christian church and which received fresh testimony and assurance from the evangelist's own personal experience.

But the question may still be asked: Even if it was no novel doctrine which John declared, what led him to adopt the language of the Logos, a word which had not been employed in this connection by previous Christian writers, but which was prevalent in the philosophical vocabulary of the age? It would be inconceivable that the apostle lighted upon this word by chance or that he selected it without any previous knowledge of its history and value. It may be assumed that when he speaks of the "Word" in relation to God and the world, he employs a mode of speech which was already familiar to those for whom he wrote and of whose general import he himself was well aware.

The truth that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ was borne in upon John. The problem which confronted him was how he could make that truth real to his contemporaries. This he sought to do by using the language of the highest religious thought of his day.

We have seen that the term "Logos" had undergone a twofold and to some extent parallel evolution. On the one hand, it had a Hebrew and, on the other, a Hellenic history. In which direction are we to look for the immediate source of the Johannine terminology?

(a) Hebrew Source:

As a Palestinian Jew familiar with current Jewish ideas and forms of devout expression, it would be natural for him to adopt a word, or its Greek equivalent, which played so important a part in shaping and expressing the religious beliefs of the Old Testament people. Many scholars consider that we have here the probable source of Johannine language. In the Old Testament, and particularly, in the Targums or Jewish paraphrases, the "Word" is constantly spoken of as the efficient instrument of Divine action; and the "Word of God" had come to be used in a personal way as almost identical with God Himself. In Re 19:13, we have obviously an adoption of this Hebrew use of the phrase. Throughout the Gospel there is evinced a decided familiarity and sympathy with the Old Testament teaching, and some expressions would seem to indicate the evangelist's desire to show that Jesus is the fulfillment of Jewish expectation (e.g. Joh 1:14,29,31; 2:19; 3:14; 6:32,48-50), and the living embodiment of Israelite truth (Joh 1:16; 8:12; 11:25; 14:6). But as against this it has been pointed out by Weizsacker (Apostolisches Zeitalter) that the Word of God is not conceived in the Old Testament as an independent Being, still less as equivalent for the Messiah, and that the rabbinical doctrine which identifies the memra with God is of much later date.

At the same time the Hebrew cast of thought of the Johannine Gospel and its affinities with Jewish rather than Hellenic modes of expression can hardly be gainsaid. Though John's knowledge of and sympathy with Palestinian religion may not actually account for his use of the term "Logos," it may have largely colored and directed his special application of it. For, as Neander observes, that name may have been put forward at Ephesus in order to lead those Jews, who were busying themselves with speculations on the Logos as the center of all theophanies, to recognize in Christ the Supreme Revelation of God and

the fulfillment of their Messianic hopes.

(b) Hellenic Source:

Other writers trace the Johannine ideas and terms to Hellenic philosophy and particularly to Alexandrian influence as represented in Philo. No one can compare the Fourth Gospel with the writings of Philo without noting a remarkable similarity in diction, especially in the use of the word "Logos". It would be hazardous, however, on this ground alone to impute conscious borrowing to the evangelist. It is more probable that both the Alexandrian thinker and the New Testament writer were subject to common influences of thought and expression. Hellenism largely colors the views and diction of the early church. Paul takes over many words from Greek philosophy. "There is not a single New Testament writing," says Harnack (Dogmen-Geschichte, I, 47, note), "which does not betray the influence of the mode of thought and general culture which resulted from the Hellenizing of the East." But, while that is true, it must not be forgotten, as Harnack himself points out, "that while the writers of the New Testament breathe an atmosphere created by Greek culture, the religious ideas in which they live and move come to them from the Old Testament."

It is hardly probable that John was directly acquainted with the writings of Philo. But it is more than likely that he was cognizant of the general tenor of his teaching and may have discovered in the language which had floated over from Alexandria to Ephesus a suitable vehicle for the utterance of his own beliefs, especially welcome and intelligible to those who were familiar with Alexandrian modes of thought.

But whatever superficial resemblances there may be between Philo and John (and they are not few or vague), it must be at once evident that the whole spirit and view of life is fundamentally different. So far from the apostle being a disciple of the Alexandrian or a borrower of his ideas, it would be more correct to say that there is clearly a conscious rejection of the Philonic conception, and that the Logos of John is a deliberate protest against what he must have regarded as the inadequate and misleading philosophy of Greece.

(c) Contrast between Philo and John:

The contrast between the two writers is much more striking than the resemblance. The distinction is not due merely to the acceptance by the Christian writer of Jesus as the Word, but extends to the whole conception of God and His relation to the world which has made Christianity a new power among men. The Logos of Philo is metaphysical, that of John, religious. Philo moves entirely in the region of abstract thought, his idea of God is pure being; John’s thought is concrete and active, moving in a region of life and history. Philo’s Logos is intermediate, the instrument which God employs in fashioning the world; John’s Logos is not subsidiary but is Himself God, and as such is not a mere instrument, but the prime Agent in creation. According to Philo the Deity is conceived as an architect who forms the world out of already existent matter. According to John the Logos is absolute Creator of all that is, the Source of all being, life and intelligence. In Philo the Logos hovers between personality and impersonality, and if it is

sometimes personified it can hardly be said to have the value of an actual person; in John the personality of the Logos is affirmed from the first and it is of the very essence of his doctrine, the ground of His entire creative energy. The idea of an incarnation is alien to the thought of Philo and impossible in his scheme of the universe; the "Word that has become flesh" is the pivot and crown of Johannine teaching. Philo affirms the absolute incomprehensibility of God; but it is the prime object of the evangelist to declare that God is revealed in Christ and that the Logos is the unveiling through the flesh of man of the self-manifesting Deity. Notwithstanding the personal epithets employed by Philo, his Logos remains a pure abstraction or attribute of God, and it is never brought into relation with human history. John's Logos, on the other hand, is instinct with life and energy from the beginning, and it is the very heart of his Gospel to declare as the very center of life and history the great historical event of the incarnation which is to recreate the world and reunite God and man.

From whatever point of view we compare them, we find that Philo and John, while using the same language, give an entirely different value to it. The essential purport of the Johannine Logos is Jesus Christ. The adoption of the term involves its complete transformation. It is baptized with a new spirit and henceforth stands for a new conception. From whatsoever source it was originally derived—from Hebrew tradition or Hellenic speculation—on Christian soil it is a new product. It is neither Greek nor Jewish, it is Christian. The philosophical abstraction has become a religious conception. Hellenism and Hebrewism have been taken up and fused into a higher unity, and Christ as the embodiment of the Logos has become the creative power and the world-wide possession of mankind.

The most probable view is that Philo and John found the same term current in Jewish and Gentilecircles and used it to set forth their respective ideas; Philo, following his predilections for Greek philosophy, to give a Hellenic complexion to his theory of the relation of Divine Reason to the universe; John, true to , his Hebrew instincts, seeing in the Logos the climax of that revelation of God to man of which the earlier Jewish theophanies were but partial expressions.

There is nothing improbable in the surmise that the teaching of Philo gave a fresh impulse to the study of the Logos as Divine Reason which was already shadowed forth in the Biblical doctrine of Wisdom (Westcott). Nor need we take offense that such an important idea should have come to the Biblical author from an extra-Biblical writer (compare Schmiedel, Johannine Writings), remembering only that the author of the Johannine Gospel was no mechanical borrower, but an entirely independent and original thinker who gave to the Logos and the ideas associated with it a wholly-new worth and interpretation. Thus, as has been said, the treasures of Greece were made contributory to the full unfolding of the Gospel.

V. Patristic Development.

The Johannine Logos became the fruitful source of much speculation in Gnostic circles and among the early Fathers regarding the nature of Christ. The positive truth presented by the Fourth Gospel was once more broken up, and the various elements of which it was the synthesis became the seeds of a number of partial and one-sided theories respecting the relation of the Father and the Son. The influence of Greek

ideas, which had already begun in the Apostolic Age, became more pronounced and largely shaped the current of ante-Nicene theology (see Hatch, Hibbert Lectures).

Gnosticism in particular was an attempt to reconcile Christianity with philosophy; but in Gnostic systems the term "Logos" is only sparingly employed. According to Basilides the "Logos" was an emanation from the nous as personified Wisdom, which again was directly derived from the Father. Valentinus, in whose teaching Gnosticism culminated, taught that Wisdom was the last of a series of Eons which emanated from the Primal Being, and the Logos was an emanation of the first two principles which issued from God—Reason, Faith. Justin Martyr, the first of the sub-apostolic Fathers, sought to unite the Scriptural idea of the Logos as Word with the Hellenic idea of Reason. According to him God produced in His own nature a rational power which was His agent in creation and took the form in history of the Divine Man. Christ is the organ of all revelations, and as the logos spermatikos, He sows the seeds of virtue and truth among the heathen. All that is true and beautiful in the pagan world is to be traced to the activity of the Logos before His incarnation. Tatian and Theophilus taught essentially the same doctrine; though in Tatian there is a marked leaning toward Gnosticism, and consequently a tendency to separate the ideal from the historical Christ. Athenagoras, who ascribes to the Logos the creation of all things, regarding it in the double sense of the Reason of God and the creative energy of the world, has a firm grasp of the Biblical doctrine, which was still more clearly expressed by Irenaeus, who held that the Son was the essential Word, eternally begotten of the Father and at once the interpreter of God and the Creator of the world.

The Alexandrian school was shaped by the threefold influence of Plato, Philo and the Johannine Gospel. Clement of Alexandria views the Son as the Logos of the Father, the Fountain of all intelligence, the Revealer of the Divine Being and the Creator and Illuminator of mankind. He repudiates the idea of the inferiority of the Son, and regards the Logos not as the spoken but as the creative word. Origen seeks to reconcile the two ideas of the eternity and the subordination of the Logos, and is in this sense a mediator between the Arian and more orthodox parties and was appealed to by both. According to him the Son is equal in substance with the Father, but there is a difference in essence. While the Father is "the God" (ho theos) and "God Himself" (autotheos), the Logos is "a second God" (deuteros theos). In the Nicene Age, under the shaping influence of the powerful mind of Athanasius, and, to a lesser degree, of Basil and the two Gregories, the Logos-doctrine attained its final form in the triumphant statement of the Nicene Creed which declared the essential unity, but, at the same time, the personal distinction of the Father and Son. The Council of Nicea practically gathered up the divergent views of the past and established the teaching of the Fourth Gospel as the doctrine of the church.

LITERATURE.

(1) On Greek Logos:

Schleiermacher, Herakleitos der Dunkle; Histories of Philosophy, Zeller, Ueberweg, Hitter; Heinze, Die Lehre yore Logos in der Greek Phil. (1872); Aall, Gesch. d. Logosidee in d. Greek Phil. (1896).

(2) On Jewish Doctrine:

Oehler, O T Theol. (1873); Schurer, Lehrbuch d. New Testament Zeitgesch; Schultz, Old Testament Theol.

(3) On Alexandrian Doctrine:

Gfrorer, Philo u. die alex. Theosophie (1831); Dahne, Gesch. Darstell. der jud-alex. Religions-Philosophic (1843); Keferstein, Philos Lehre yon den gottlichen Mittelwesen (1846); Dorner, Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre v. d. Person Christi; Siegfried, Philo v. Alex. (1875); Drummond, Philo Judaeus (1888); Reville, La doctrine du Logos; Huber, Die Philosophic der Kirchenvater; Grossmann, Questiones Philoneae (1841); Watson, Philos. Basis of Religion (1907).

(4) On Johannine Gospel:

Relative comma. of Meyer, Godet, Westcote, Luthardt, E. Scott (1907); Liddon, Divinity of our Lord ("Bampton Lectures," 1866); Watkins, Modern Criticism on the Fourth Gospel ("Bampton Lectures," 1890); Gloag, Introduction to Johannine Writing, (1891); Stevens, Johannine Theol. (1894); Drummond, Gospel of John; Bertling, Der Johan. Logos (1907); Schmiedel, The Johannine Writings (1908); Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, V, ii; Beyschlag and Weiss, Biblical Theol. of New Testament; Drummond, Via, Veritas, Vita (1894); Hatch, Greek Ideas and Usages, Their Influence upon the Christian Church (Hibbert Lectures, 1888).

(5) Patristic Period:

Harnack, Dogmen-Gesch.; Baur, Kirchen-Gesch.; Dorner, System d. chr. Glaubenslehre; Loofs, Leitfaden fur seine Vorlesungen uber Dogmengeschichte; Atzbergen, Die Logoslehre d. heiligen Athanasius (1880).

B.D. Alexander

LOINS

loinz (chalats, Aramaic charats, mothen, kecel, yarekh; osphus): This variety of Hebrew synonyms seems to be used rather promiscuously for the loins, though there is no little difference in the secondary meanings of these words. They represent various modes of expressing the loins as the seat of strength and vigor (Job 40:16, Hebrew mothen, here used of Behemoth), the center of procreative power, the portion of the body which is girded about, and is considered as specially needful of covering, even under primitive conditions of life (Job 31:20), and where painful disease most effectually unfits a man for work and warfare.

Jacob receives the Divine promise that "kings shall come out of (his) loins" (chalats, Ge 35:11), and we

read of 66 souls "that came out of his loins" (yarekh) which went into Egypt (Ge 46:26). The Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the Levites as having come out of the loins of Abraham (Heb 7:5).

As the seat of strength (compare LEG; THIGH), the loins are girded with belts of leather (2Ki 1:8; Mt 3:4), or cloth, often beautifully embroidered (Ex 28:39), or of costly material (Ex 39:29; Jer 13:1 f). Girded loins are a sign of readiness for service or endeavor (Ex 12:11; 1Ki 18:46; 2Ki 4:29; Job 38:3; Pr 31:17; Lu 12:35; 1Pe 1:13). Of God it is said that "he looseth the bond of kings, and bindeth their loins with a girdle," i.e. strengthens them (Job 12:18). On the loins the sword is worn (2Sa 20:8). It is a sign of mourning to gird the loins with sackcloth (1Ki 20:32; Isa 32:11; Jer 48:37; Am 8:10; see also the First Papyrus of Elephantine, l. 20). A man whose strength is in his attachment to truth, in other words is faithful, is spoken of as having his loins girt about with truth (Eph 6:14). Thus, the Messiah is described: "Righteousness shall be the girdle of his waist, and faithfulness the girdle of his loins" (Isa 11:5). One of the most primitive modes of clothing consisted of a fleece tied around the loins (Job 31:20).

The condition of unfitness for service is described in that the loins (kecel) are filled with a burning (Ps 38:7, the King James Version "loathsome disease"), or that "a sore burden" is laid upon the "loins" (mothen, Ps 66:11). Thus the loins are made "continually to shake" (Ps 69:23), "the joints of (the) loins" (charats) are loosed (Da 5:6), the "loins are filled with anguish" (Isa 21:3). It is very likely that originally a disabling lumbago or the painful affections of the gall or the bladder (calculus, etc.) are meant, but very soon the expression becomes merely metaphorical to express personal helplessness, especially that which can but rely upon assistance and help from God.

H. L. E. Luering

LOIS

lo’-is (Lois (2Ti 1:5)): The grandmother of Timothy, and evidently the mother of Eunice, Timothy’s mother. The family lived at Lystra (Ac 16:1). It was on the occasion of Paul’s first missionary journey (Ac 14) that Eunice and Timothy were converted to Christ, and it was, in all likelihood, on the same occasion that Lois also became a Christian. Paul speaks of the unfeigned faith that there was in Timothy, and he adds that this faith dwelt at the first in thy grandmother Lois, and thy mother Eunice. This is the only passage where Lois is mentioned; but by comparing 2Ti 1:5 with 2Ti 3:15 (the King James Version), where Paul refers to Timothy’s having "from a child known the holy scriptures," it would appear that Lois was associated with Eunice, both in a reverent faith in God and in the careful instruction in the Old Testament which was given to Timothy.

See EUNICE; TIMOTHY.

John Rutherfurd

LONGEVITY

lon-jev’-i-ti: In the part of Genesis ascribed to the Priestly Code (P), the names and genealogies of the patriarchs are given (Ge 5; 11). In the three versions which are our chief sources, Massoretic Text, Septuagint and Sam, the age-numbers given for these patriarchs are hopelessly at variance. It is in accord with what we find in the earliest legend of most races that in these chapters a great length of life is ascribed to these; thus Berosus attributes to the first 10 kings of Babylonia a span of 430,000 years, and Hesiod (Works and Days, 129) says that in the Silver Age childhood lasted 100 years, during which a boy was reared and grew up beside his mother. On the other hand the evidence of prehistoric archaeology shows that the rate of development of the individual in the early Stone Age differed very little from that of humanity at the present day. It is possible that, in the case of the Hebrew record, the names of certain pre-Abrahamic patriarchs were derived from an ancient tradition, and that in the desire to fill up the chronology of the period before the call of Abraham, these names were inserted and the time which was supposed to have elapsed was divided among them; on the basis of some such hypothesis as that which is said to have existed among the Jews, that the Messiah should come 4,000 years after Adam.

We know from the archaeological evidence that the antiquity of primitive man extends to a date very much farther back than 4,000 years. Indeed, we can prove that before 4000 BC there were settled nationalities both in the valley of the Nile and that of the Euphrates, and that among these the duration of individual life was much the same as at the present day. The first three dynasties in Egypt, starting at or about 4400 BC, consisted of 25 consecutive kings, the average length of whose several reigns was about 30 years. The biographic sketches of Biblical persons other than those in Genesis showed that their longevity did not exceed that of our contemporaries. Eli was blind and feeble at 98. At 70 David was bedridden and frail. Manasseh, the king of Judah whose reign was longest, died at 67; Uzziah died at 68. The statement in Ps 90:10 attributed to Moses is a correct estimate of what has been the expectation of life at all time.

At the present day among Palestinian fellahin very old men are uncommon. I have never seen anyone among them who could prove that he was 80 years of age; the rate of infant mortality is appallingly high. Maturity is earlier, and signs of senility appear among them sooner than among the same class in Great Britain.

Alexander Macalister

LONGSUFFERING

long-suf’-er-ing (’erekh ‘appayim; makrothumia): The words ‘erekh ‘appayim, translated longsuffering, mean literally, "long of nose" (or "breathing"), and, as anger was indicated by rapid, violent breathing through the nostrils, "long of anger," or "slow to wrath." The adjective is applied to God (Ex 34:6 the King James Version, in the name of Yahweh as proclaimed to Moses; Nu 14:18 the King James Version; Ps 86:15 the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) "slow to anger," which is also the translation in other places; the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Ne 9:17; Ps 103:8; 145:8; Pr 15:18; 16:32; Joe 2:13; Jon 4:2; Na 1:3); it is associated

with "great kindness" and "plenteous in mercy." The substantive occurs in Jer 15:15: "Take me not away in thy longsuffering." In Ec 7:8, we have ‘erekh ruach, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "patient in spirit."

The word in the New Testament rendered "longsuffering," makrothumia (once makrothumeo, "to be longsuffering"), which is the rendering of ‘erekh ‘appayim in the Septuagint, is literally, "long of mind or soul" (regarded as the seat of the emotions), opposed to shortness of mind or soul, irascibility, impatience, intolerance. It is attributed to God (Ro 2:4; 9:22; 2Pe 3:9), of His bearing long with sinners and slowness to execute judgment on them. It is, therefore, one of "the fruits of the Spirit" in man (Ga 5:22) which Christians are frequently exhorted to cherish and show one toward the other (Eph 4:2; Col 1:11; 3:12, etc.); it belongs, Paul says, to the love, without which all else is nothing: "Love suffereth long (makrothumei), and is kind" (1Co 13:4); The verb makrothumeo is sometimes translated by "patience" (Mt 18:26,29, "Have patience with me"). Lu 18:7 has been variously rendered; the King James Version has "And shall not God avenge his own elect .... though he bear long with them"; the Revised Version (British and American) "and yet he is longsuffering over them," the American Revised Version margin "and is he slow to punish on their behalf?" Weymouth (New Testament in Modern Speech) has "although he seems slow in taking action on their behalf," which most probably gives the sense of the passage; in Jas 5:7,8 the verb occurs thrice, the King James Version "be patient," "hath long patience"; the Revised Version (British and American) also translates by "patient"; this, however, as in Mt 18:26,29, seems to lose the full force of the Greek word. According to Trench (Synonyms of the New Testament, 189), the difference between hupomone ("patience") and makrothumia is that the latter word expresses patience in respect to persons, and the former in respect to things; hence, hupomone is never ascribed to God; where He is called "the God of patience," it is as He gives it to His servants and saints. But in Jas 5:7 it is used with reference to things, and in Col 1:11 it is associated with patience (compare Heb 6:12,15), suggesting patient endurance of trials and sufferings. In Col 1:11 it is also associated with "joy," indicating that it is not a mere submissiveness, but a joyful acceptance of the will of God, whatever it may be. In The Wisdom of Solomon 15:1; Ecclesiasticus 5:4, we have "longsuffering" (makrothumos) ascribed to God; also in Ecclesiasticus 2:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "mercy."

W. L. Walker

LOOK

look:

(1) The uses of the simple verb in English Versions of the Bible are nearly all good modern English. In Isa 5:2, however, "He looked that it should bring forth grapes"—"look" is used in the sense of "expect." Compare the King James Version of Sirach 20:14; Ac 28:6, "They looked when he should have swollen" (the Revised Version (British and American) "They expected that he would have swollen"). In 1 Macc 4:54, the King James Version has inserted "look" (omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)) as a simple interjection, without a corresponding word in the Greek

(2) "Look upon" means "fix one's attention on," and is often so used in English Versions of the Bible without further significance (Ec 2:11; Lu 22:56, etc.); but in 2Ch 24:22 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "Yahweh look upon it" means "remember." However, continual attention given to an object usually denotes that pleasure is found in it, and from this fact such uses as those of Pr 23:31, "Look not thou upon the wine when it is red," are derived. In particular, God's "looking upon" a person becomes a synonym for "showing favor unto," as in De 26:7 the King James Version; Ps 84:9 the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); Ps 119:132 the King James Version; Lu 1:48 the Revised Version (British and American) only, etc. (the Revised Version (British and American) usually, re-words, in such passages). On the other hand, "look on" may be weakened, as in such phrases as "fair to look unon" (Ge 12:11 etc.), where it means only "fair to the sight." Or as in modern English, "look on" may describe the attitude of the passive spectator, even when applied to God. So Ps 35:17, "Lord, how long wilt thou look on?"

(3) "Look to" usually means "pay attention to," as in Pr 14:15; Jer 39:12; 2 Joh 1:8, etc., and the Revised Version (British and American) occasionally uses this phrase in place of AV's "look upon" (Php 2:4). The reverse change is made in the King James Version's 1Sa 16:12, "goodly to look to"; Eze 23:15, "all of them princes to look to," but in the latter verse a more drastic revision was needed, for the meaning is "all of them in appearance as princes." "Look out" may mean "search for" (Ge 41:33; Ac 6:3), but may also be used literally, (Ge 26:8, etc.). The King James Version's "looking after those things" in Lu 21:26 has been changed by the Revised Version (British and American) into "expectation of the things." "Look one another in the face" in 2Ki 14:8,11 means "meet in battle."

Burton Scott Easton

LOOKING-GLASS

look'-ing-glas (Ex 38:8 the King James Version margin "brasen glasses").

See GLASS; MIRROR.

LOOM

loom.

See WEAVING.

LOOP

loop (in plural lula'oth (Ex 26:4 f, 10 f; 36:11 f, 17)): A ring or fold made of blue thread to fasten into the corresponding golden clasps, or taches upon the curtains of the tabernacle, joining them in sets, or pairs.

See TABERNACLE.

LORD OF HOSTS

A name or title of God frequently used in the Old Testament, always translated "Yahweh of Hosts" (Yahweh tsebha’oth) in the American Standard Revised Version, since Yahweh, never ‘Adhonay, is used in this phrase. Evidently the meaning of the title is that all created agencies and forces are under the leadership or dominion of Yahweh, who made and maintains them (Ge 2:1; Isa 45:12). It is used to express Yahweh’s great power.

See GOD, NAMES OF, III, 8.

LORD’S DAY

(he kuriake hemera):

1. Linguistic:

Formerly it was supposed that the adjective kuriakos (translated "the Lord’s") was a purely Christian word, but recent discoveries have proved that it was in fairly common use in the Roman Empire before Christian influence had been felt. In secular use it signified "imperial," "belonging to the lord"—the emperor—and so its adoption by Christianity in the sense "belonging to the Lord"—to Christ—was perfectly easy. Indeed, there is reason to suppose that in the days of Domitian, when the issue had been sharply defined as "Who is Lord? Caesar or Christ?" the use of the adjective by the church was a part of the protest against Caesar-worship (see LORD). And it is even possible that the full phrase, "the Lord’s day," was coined as a contrast to the phrase, "the Augustean day" he sebaste hemera), a term that seems to have been used in some parts of the Empire to denote days especially dedicated in honor of Caesar-worship.

2. Post-Apostolic:

"Lord’s day" in the New Testament occurs only in Re 1:10, but in the post-apostolic literature we have the following references: Ignatius, Ad Mag., ix.1, "No longer keeping the Sabbath but living according to the Lord’s day, on which also our Light arose"; Ev. Pet., verse 35, "The Lord’s day began to dawn" (compare Mt 28:1); verse 50, "early on the Lord’s day" (compare Lu 24:1); Barn 15 9, "We keep the eighth day with gladness," on which Jesus arose from the dead." I.e. Sunday, as the day of Christ’s resurrection, was kept as a Christian feast and called "the Lord’s day," a title fixed so definitely as to be introduced by the author of Ev. Pet. into phrases from the canonical Gospels. Its appropriateness in Re 1:10 is obvious, as John received his vision of the exalted Lord when all Christians had their minds directed toward His entrance into glory through the resurrection.

3. In the New Testament:

This "first day of the week" appears again in Ac 20:7 as the day on which the worship of the "breaking of bread" took place, and the impression given by the context is that Paul and his companions prolonged their visit to Troas so as to join in the service. Again, 1Co 16:2 contains the command, "Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store," where the force of the form of the imperative used (the present for repeated action) would be better represented in English by "lay by on the successive Sundays." Worship is here not explicitly mentioned (the Greek of "by him" is the usual phrase for "at home"), but that the appropriateness of the day for Christian acts involves an appropriateness for Christian worship is not to be doubted. Indeed, since the seven-day week was unknown to Greek thought, some regular observance of a hebdomadal cycle must have been settled at Corinth before Paul could write his command. Finally, the phrase, "first day in the week" is found elsewhere in the New Testament only in Mt 28:1; Mr 16:2; Lu 24:1; Joh 20:1,19. The word in all passages for "first" is poor Greek (mia, "one," for prote, a Hebraism), and the coincidence of the form of the phrase in Ac 20:7 and 1Co 16:2 with the form used by all four evangelists for the Resurrection Day ‘is certainly not accidental; it was the fixed Christian base, just as "Lord’s day" was to the writer of Ev. Pet.

4. Origin:

The hebdomadal observance of Sunday points back of Corinth to Jewish-Christian soil, but it is impossible to say when the custom first began. Not, apparently, in the earliest days, for Ac 2:46 represents the special worship as daily. But this could not have continued very long, for waning of the first enthusiasm, necessity of pursuing ordinary avocations, and increasing numbers of converts must soon have made general daily gatherings impracticable. A choice of a special day must have become necessary, and this day would, of course, have been Sunday. Doubtless, however, certain individuals and communities continued the daily gatherings to a much later date, and the appearance of Sunday as the one distinctive day for worship was almost certainly gradual.

5. Sunday and the Sabbath:

Sunday, however, was sharply distinguished from the Sabbath. One was the day on which worship was offered in a specifically Christian form, the other was a day of ritual rest to be observed by all who were subject? the Law of Moses through circumcision (Ga 5:3; compare Ac 21:20). Uncircumcised Gentiles, however, were free from any obligation of Sabbath observance, and it is quite certain that in apostolic times no renewal of any Sabbath rules or transfer of them to Sunday was made for Gentileconverts. No observance of a particular "day of rest" is contained among the "necessary things" of Ac 15:28,29, nor is any such precept found among all the varied moral directions given in the whole epistolary literature. Quite on the contrary, the observance of a given day as a matter of Divine obligation is denounced by Paul as a forsaking of Christ (Ga 4:10), and Sabbath-keeping is condemned explicitly in Col 2:16. As a matter of individual devotion, to be sure, a man might do as he pleased (Ro 14:5,6), but no general rule as necessary for salvation could be compatible with the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.

Evidently, then, the fact that the Christian worship was held on Sunday did not sanctify Sunday any more than (say) a regular Wednesday service among us sanctifies Wednesday, noting especially that the apostolic service was held in the evening. For it was felt that Christian enthusiasm would raise every day to the highest religious plane, the decay of that enthusiasm through the long delay of the Parousia not being contemplated.

6. Later History:

The delay occurred, however, and for human beings in the ordinary routine of life there are necessary, not only set periods of worship, but set periods of relaxation from routine to make worship profitable. And the Christian fundamental doctrine of mercy demands that Christianity, where she has the power, shall give to men relief from the drain of continuous toil.

The formulation of general rules to carry these principles into effect, however, belongs to a period outside New Testament times, and so does not come within the scope of this Encyclopedia. It is enough to say that the ecclesiastical rules for Sunday were felt to be quite distinct from the laws for Sabbath observance, and that Alcuin (733?-804) is the first to hold that the church had transferred the Sabbath rules as a whole to Sunday. This principle is still maintained in Roman Catholic theology, but at the Reformation was rejected uncompromisingly by both Lutherans (Augsb. Conf., II, 7) and Calvinists (Helvet. Conf., XXIV, 1-2) in favor of a literally apostolic freedom (Calvin even proposed to adopt Thursday in place of Sunday). The appearance of the opposite extreme of a genuinely "legalistic" Sabbatarianism in the thoroughly Evangelical Scotch and English Puritanism is an anomaly that is explained by reaction from the extreme laxity of the surroundings.

7. Practical:

Sunday was fixed as the day for Christian worship by general apostolic practice, and the academic possibility of an alteration hardly seems worth discussing. If a literal apostolicity is to be insisted upon, however, the "breaking of bread" must be made part of the Sunday service. Rest from labor for the sake of worship, public and private, is intensely desirable, since the regaining of the general apostolic enthusiasm seems unattainable, but the New Testament leaves us quite free as to details. Rest from labor to secure physical and mental renewal rests on a still different basis, and the working out of details involves a knowledge of sociological and industrial conditions, as well as a knowledge of religious principles. It is the task of the pastor to combine the various principles and to apply them to the particular conditions of his people in their locality, in accordance with the rules that his own church has indubitably the right to lay down—very special attention being given, however, to the highly important matter of the peculiar problem offered by children. In all cases the general principles underlying the rules should be made clear, so that they will not appear as arbitrary legalism, and it is probably best not to use the term "Sabbath" for Sunday. Under certain conditions great freedom may be desirable, and such is certainly not inconsistent with our liberty in Christ. But experience, and not least of all the experience of the first churches of the Reformation, has abundantly shown that much general laxness in Sunday rules invariably results disastrously.

See further, ETHICS OF JESUS, I, 3, (1).

LITERATURE. For the linguistic matters, Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 1910, 361-66. Hessey’s Sunday (ed 1880) ("Bampton Lectures," 1860) contains a good summary of the history of the problems. Zockler’s "Sonntagsfeier," PRE, edition 3, XVIII, 1906, 521-29 is the best general survey. In Sch-Herz this article ("Sunday") is harmed by abbreviation, but an exhaustive bibliography is added.

Burton Scott Easton

LORD’S PRAYER, THE

(Mt 6:9-13; Lu 11:2-4): Prayer occupied an important place in the life and the teachings of Jesus. He was emphatically a man of prayer, praying frequently in private and in public, and occasionally spending whole nights in communion with His heavenly Father. He often spoke to His disciples on the subject of prayer, cautioning them against ostentation, or urging perseverance, faith and large expectation, and He gave them a model of devotion in the Lord’s prayer.

1. Twofold Form:

This prayer is given by the evangelists in two different forms and in two entirely different con nections. In Matthew’s account the prayer is given as a part of the Sermon on the Mount and in connection with a criticism of the ostentation usual in the prayers of the hypocrites and the heathen. Lu introduces the prayer after the Galilean ministry and represents it as given in response to a request from one of His disciples, "Lord teach us to pray, as John taught his disciples." It gives us, however, no note of time or place, and it is quite possible that the incident which it records took place much earlier. The later form is much shorter than that of Mt and the common parts differ materially in language.

In view of the differences, the reader instinctively inquires whether the prayer was given on two different occasions in these different connections, or the evangelists have presented the same incident in forms derived from different sources, or modified the common source to suit their immediate purposes.

If the prayer was given only on one occasion, there is little doubt that Luke preserves the true historical circumstances, though not necessarily the accurate point of time or place, or the exact form of language. Such a request made at the close of the prayer of Jesus would be natural, and the incident bears every mark of reality. On the other hand, it would be reasonable to assume that the author of Matthew’s source, remembering the incident, incorporated the prayer in the Sermon on the Mount as an illustration of the injunctions concerning prayer.

There are many reasons for regarding the Sermon as a collection of sayings spoken on different occasions and summarized for convenience in teaching and memorizing. There is, however, no proof that the prayer was given but once by Jesus. We need not suppose that His disciples were always the

same, and we know that He gave instruction in prayer on various occasions. He may have given the model prayer on one occasion spontaneously and at another time on the request of a disciple. It is probable that the two evangelists, using the same or different sources, presented the prayer in such connection as best suited the plan of their narratives. In any case, it is rather remarkable that the prayer is not quoted or directly mentioned anywhere else in the New Testament.

2. Arrangement:

In addition to the opening salutation, "Our Father who art in heaven," the Lord's Prayer consists of six petitions. These are arranged in three equal parts. In the first part, the thought is directed toward God and His great purposes. In the second part, the attention is directed to our condition and wants. The two sets of petitions are closely related, and a line of progress runs through the whole prayer. The petitions of the first part are inseparable, as each includes the one which follows. As the hallowing of God's name requires the coming of His kingdom, so the kingdom comes through the doing of His will. Again, the first part calls for the second, for if His will is to be done by us, we must have sustenance, forgiveness and deliverance from evil. If we seek first the glory of God, the end requires our good. While we hallow His name we are sanctified in Him. The doxology of Mt and our rituals is not found in the leading manuscripts and is generally regarded as an ancient liturgical addition. For this reason it is omitted by the Revised Version (British and American).

3. Sources:

The sources of the two accounts cannot be known with certainty. It is hardly correct to say that one account is more original than the other. The original was spoken in Aramaic, while both of the reports are certainly based on Greek sources. The general agreement in language, especially in the use of the unique term epiousios shows that they are not independent translations of the Aramaic original.

4. Special Expressions:

Three expressions of the prayer deserve special notice. The words, "Our Father," are new in the Bible and in the world. When God is called Father in the Old Testament, He is regarded as Father of the nation, not of the individual. Even in the moving prayer of Isa 63:16 (the King James Version), "Doubtless thou art our father," the connection makes clear that the reference is to God in the capacity of Creator. The thought of God as the Father of the individual is first reached in the Apocrypha: "O Lord, Father and Master of my life" (Sirach 23:1; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 2:16; 14:3). Here also the notion is veiled in the thought of God as Creator. It was left for Jesus the Son to give us the privilege of calling God "Our Father."

Of the adjective epiousion, "daily" or "needful," neither the origin nor the exact meaning is or is likely to be known. Whether it is qualitative or temporal depends on its derivation from epeinai, or epienai. Our translators usually follow the latter, translating "daily." the American Standard Revised Version gives "needful" as a marginal rendering.

The phrase apo tou ponerou, is equally ambiguous. Since the adjective may be either masculine or neut., it is impossible to decide whether "from the evil one" or "from the evil" was intended. The probability is in favor of the masculine. The Oriental naturally thought of evil in the concrete, just as we think of it in the abstract. For this reason the Authorized rendering "from evil" is more real to us. The evil deprecated is moral, not physical.

5. Purpose: The Lord’s Prayer was given as a lesson in prayer. As such this simple model surpasses all precepts about prayer. It suggests to the child of God the proper objects of prayer. It supplies suitable forms of language and illustrates the simple and direct manner in which we may trustingly address our heavenly Father. It embraces the elements of all spiritual desire summed up in a few choice sentences. For those who are not able to bring their struggling desires to birth in articulate language it provides an instructive form. To the mature disciple it ever unfolds with richer depths of meaning. Though we learn these words at our mother’s knee, we need a lifetime to fill them with meaning and all eternity to realize their answer.

LITERATURE.

The literature of this subject is very extensive. For brief treatment the student will consult the relative sections in the commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and Luke and in the Lives of Christ and the articles on the Lord’s Prayer in the several Bible diets. A collection of patristic comment is given by G. Tillmann in his Das Gebet nach der Lehre der Heiligen dargestellt, 2 volumes, Freiburg, 1876. The original comments may be found in any of the standard collections of the Church Fathers.

Among historical studies may be mentioned, F.H. Chase, The Lord’s Prayer in the Early Church, Cambridge, 1891, and G. Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, I, Leipzig, 1898, English translation, Edinburgh, 1902.

Among the numerous interpretative treatments, the following are some of the more important: N. Hall, The Lord’s Prayer, Edinburgh, 1889; H.J. Van Dyke, The Lord’s Prayer, New York, 1891; J. Ruskin, Letters to the Clergy on the Lord’s Prayer and the Church, late edition, New York, 1896; E. Wordsworth, Thoughts on the Lord’s Prayer, New York, 1898; C.W. Stubbs, Social Teachings of the Lord’s Prayer, London, 1900; A.B. Bruce, The Training of the Twelve, chapter vi, 4th edition, New York, 1905; L.T. Chamberlain, The True Doctrine of Prayer, New York, 1906; F.M. Williams, Spiritual Instructions on the Lord’s Prayer, New York, 1907.

Russell Benjamin Miller

LORD’S SUPPER; (EUCHARIST)

u’-ka-rist

GENERAL

I. DEFINITION

II. NEW TESTAMENT SOURCES

1. Textual Considerations

2. Narratives Compared

(1) Mark

(2) Matthew

(3) Pauline

(4) Luke

3. Other Pauline Data

III. PREPARATION FOR THE EUCHARIST

1. Miracles of Loaves and Fishes

2. Discourse at Capernaum

IV. HISTORICAL SETTING OF THE EUCHARIST

1. Other Ac and Words of Christ on Eve of the Passion

2. Sacrificial Language of the Institution

3. Sacrificial System of Jewish Dispensation

4. Paschal Background of the Institution of the Eucharist

V. SEQUENCE OF THE INSTITUTION

Points to Be Noted

VI. THE CHURCH'S OBSERVATIONS or THE EUCHARIST

1. Heavenly Background

(1) Christians a Priestly Race

(2) Christ, the Eternal High Priest

2. Celebrated Each Lord’s Day

3. Names of the Eucharist

(1) Eucharist

(2) Lord’s Supper

(3) Breaking of Bread

(4) Communion

(5) Oblation

VII. POST-APOSTOLIC CHURCH

1. Guidance by the Holy Spirit

2. The Early Fathers

(1) Ignatian Epistles

(2) Justin Martyr

(3) Irenaeus

(4) Cyprian

VIII. LITURGICAL TRADITION

1. Outline of Eucharistic Prayer

2. Significance of This for Unity

LITERATURE

I. Definition.

Eucharist.—The distinctive rite of Christian worship, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ upon the eve of His atoning death, being a religious partaking of bread and wine, which, having been presented before God the Father in thankful memorial of Christ's inexhaustible sacrifice, have become (through the sacramental blessing) the communion of the body and blood of Christ (compare Joh 6:54; Ac 2:42; 20:7,11; Ro 15:16; 1Co 10:16; 11:23-26).

II. New Testament Sources.

The New Testament sources of our knowledge of the institution of the Eucharist are fourfold, a brief account thereof being found in each of the Synoptic Gospels and in Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians (Mt 26:26-29; Mr 14:22-25; Lu 22:14-20; 1Co 11:23-26; compare 10:16,17).

1. Textual Considerations:

The text of these narratives has been found to need little amendment, save the dropping of a word or two, from each account, that had crept in through the tendency of copyists, consciously or unconsciously, to assimilate the details of parallel passages. The genuineness of Lu 22:19,20 is absolutely beyond question. Their omission in whole or part, and the alterations in the order of two or three verses in the whole section (22:14-20), characteristic of a very small number of manuscripts, are due to confusion in the minds of a few scribes and translators, between the paschal cup (22:17) and the eucharistic cup (22:20), and to their well-meant, but mistaken, attempt to improve upon the text before them.

2. Narratives Compared:

(1) Mark:

The briefest account of the institution of the Eucharist is found in Mr 14:22-24. In it the Eucharist is not sharply distinguished from its setting, the paschal meal: "And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many." This represents a tradition settled within 20 years of the event described.

(2) Matthew:

Mt 26:26-28 gives a few touches by way of revision, apparently from one then present. He adds the

exhortation "eat" at the giving of the bread, and puts the personal command, "Drink ye all of it," in place of the mere statement, "and they all drank of it." He adds also of the blood that, as "poured out for many," it is "unto remission of sins."

(3) Pauline:

The Pauline-account, 1Co 11:23-26 (the earliest written down, circa 55 AD), was called forth in rebuke of the scandalous profanation of the Eucharist at Corinth. It gives us another tradition independent of; and supplementary to, that of Mark-Matthew. It claims the authority of the Savior as its source, and had been already made known to the Corinthians in the apostle's oral teaching. The time of the institution is mentioned as the night of the betrayal. We note of the bread, "This is my body, which is for you," of the cup, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood," and the redoubled command, "This do in remembrance of me."

(4) Luke:

The narrative given in Lu 22:14-20 is the latest (circa 80 AD) of our New Testament records. Luke had taken pains to follow up everything to its source, and had reedited the oral tradition in the light of his historical researches (1:2,3), and thus his account is of the highest value. Writing for a wider circle of readers, he carefully separates and distinguishes the Eucharist from the paschal meal which preceded it, and puts the statement of Christ about not drinking "from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come," in its proper place as referring to the paschal cup (compare Mt 26:29; Mr 14:25; and Lu 22:15-18). In describing the actual institution of the Eucharist, he gives us an almost verbal identity with the account given by Paul (1Co 11:23-25).

3. Other Pauline Data: We should note the statement appended by Paul to his account of the Institution, wherein he emphasizes the memorial aspect and evidential value of the witness the eucharistic observance would give throughout the ages of the Christian dispensation (1Co 11:26). We should also note the fact upon which the apostle bases his rebuke to the profane (Corinthians, namely, the real, though undefined, identity of the bread and wine of the Eucharist with the body and blood of Christ (1Co 11:27-29); an identity established through the blessing pronounced upon them, so that the bread and cup have come to be the "communion of the body of Christ" and the "communion of the blood of Christ," respectively (1Co 10:15-17). To receive the Eucharist, and also to partake of sacrifices offered to idols, is utterly incompatible with Christian loyalty. To receive the Eucharist after a gluttonous, winebibbing agape, not recognizing the consecrated elements to be what the Lord Christ called them, is, likewise, a defiance of God. Both acts alike provoke the judgment of God's righteous anger (1Co 10:21,22; 11:21,22,27-29).

III. Preparation for the Eucharist.

The institution of the Eucharist had been prepared for by Christ through the object-lesson of the feeding of the five thousand (Mt 14:13-21; Mr 6:35-44; Lu 9:12-17; Joh 6:4-13), which was followed up by the

discourse about Himself as the Bread of Life, and about eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood as the nourishment of eternal life.

1. Miracles of Loaves and Fishes:

This again was clinched by the second object-lesson of the feeding of the four thousand afterward (Mt 15:32-39; Mr 8:1-9). The Lord Christ's thanksgiving, and His blessing of the loaves and fishes—acts not elsewhere recorded of Him, except at the institution of the Eucharist, and at the self-revealing meal at Emmaus (Lu 24:30)—deeply impressed those present, as indicating the source whence came His power to satisfy the hunger of the multitude (compare Mt 14:19; 15:36; Mr 6:41; 8:6,7; Lu 9:16; Joh 6:11,23).

2. Discourse at Capernaum:

In the discourse at Capernaum (Joh 6:26-58) Christ led the thought of His hearers from earthly to heavenly food, from food that perished to the true bread from heaven. He declared Himself to be the living bread, and, further, that it is through eating His flesh and drinking His blood that they shall possess true life in themselves, and be raised by Him at the last day. The difficulties raised by this discourse Christ did not solve at the time. His ascension would but add to them. He asked of His disciples acceptance of His words in faith. Under the administration of the Spirit would these things be realized (Joh 6:60-69). The institution of the Eucharist, later, gave the clue to these otherwise "hard" words. Today the Eucharist remains as the explanation of this discourse. A hardy mountaineer, e.g. who had read Joh 6 many times, could form no notion of its purport. When first privileged to be present at the eucharistic service of the Book of Common Prayer, the meaning of feeding upon Christ's flesh and blood forthwith became apparent to him (see The Spirit of Missions, July, 1911, 572-73).

IV. Historical Setting of the Eucharist.

1. Other Ac and Words of Christ on Eve of the Passion:

We should note the setting in which the institution of the Eucharist was placed. Though the Fourth Gospel does not record this, it gives us many otherwise unknown data of the words of Christ spoken upon the eve of His death, in which historically the institution of the Eucharist was set. The symbolic washing of the feet of the disciples (Joh 13:3-10), the "new" commandment (Joh 13:34), Christ as the means of access to the Father (Joh 14:6), love for Christ to be shown by keeping His commandments (Joh 14:15,21,23,24), the sending of the Paraclete Spirit (Joh 14:16,17,26; 15:26; 16:13,14), the intimate fellowship of Christ and His disciples, shown in the metaphor of the vine and its branches (Joh 15:1-9,13-16)—all these throw their illumination upon the commandment, "This do in remembrance of me" (Lu 22:19; 1Co 11:24,25). The efficacy of prayer 'in Christ's name' (Joh 16:23,24,26-28) after His final withdrawal from the midst of His disciples, and His great prayer of self-oblation and intercession for His church throughout time (Joh 17, especially 17:9-26) must not be forgotten in considering, "This is my body which is given for you" (Lu 22:19), and, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:28).

2. Sacrificial Language of the Institution:

The sacrificial connotation of many of the words used in the narratives of institution should be noted: e. g. "body," "blood," "covenant," "given," "poured out," "for you," "for many" "unto remission of sins," "memorial" (compare Ex 24:6-8; Le 2:2,9,16; 4:5-7,16-18,34; 17:11,14; 24:7; Nu 10:10; Heb 9:11-28; 10:4-10,19,20). The very elements of bread and wine also suggested the idea of sacrifice to those accustomed to their use in the older system of worship (compare Ex 29:38-42; Nu 15:4-10; 28 and 29 passim).

3. Sacrificial System of Jewish Dispensation:

The general background, moreover, out of which the institution of the Eucharist stands forth, is the sacrificial system of the older dispensation. The chosen people of God, as a priestly race, a holy nation (Ex 19:5,6; De 7:6), worshipped God with a sequence of offerings, Divinely molded and inspired, which set forth the sovereign majesty and overloading of God, His holiness, and the awe and penitence due from those who would draw nigh unto Him, and their desire for communion with Him.

The more immediate background of the Eucharist is the Passover, and that without prejudice as to whether the Lord Christ ate the paschal meal with His disciples before He instituted the Eucharist, as seems most probable (compare Lu 22:7-18), or whether He died upon the day of its observance (see article "Preparation," DCG, II, 409).

4. Paschal Background of the Institution of the Eucharist:

The Passover was at once a covenant-recalling and a covenant-renewing sacrifice, and the Eucharist, as corresponding to it, was instituted at the time of its yearly observance, and of the immolation of the true paschal lamb, of whose death it interpreted the value and significance (Ex 12:3-28; compare 13:3-10; De 16:1-8; 1Co 5:7; Joh 6:51; 10:10,11,15,17,18; 15:13; 17:19).

V. Sequence of the Institation.

Let us put before ourselves clearly the sequence of the Lord Christ’s acts and words at the institution of the Eucharist ere we proceed to examine the church’s mode of celebrating this ordinance.

Points to Be Noted

At the close of the paschal Supper,

(1) the Lord Christ "took" the bread and cup, respectively, for use in His new rite;

(2) He "gave thanks" over them, constituting them a thank offering to God;

(3) He "blessed" them to their new and higher potency;

(4) He "gave" them to the apostles (the breaking being a requisite preliminary to distribution of the bread);

(5) He bade them "Take, eat," and "Drink ye all of it," respectively;

(6) He declared, of the bread, "This is my body given for you," of the cup, "This is my blood of the covenant," or, "This is the new covenant in my blood which is poured out for you," "unto remission of sins";

(7) He adds the reiterated command, "This do for my memorial."

It is obvious that we are bidden to follow out the same series of acts, and statements, as those of Christ Himself. We should take bread and wine, set them apart by rendering thanks to God over them, presenting them to Him as symbols of Christ's body and blood, once for all "given" and "poured out" for us; bless them by asking God's blessing upon them (compare Ge 14:19; Nu 6:23-27; Mr 8:7; Lu 2:34; 9:16; 24:50); and receive and give them as the body and blood of Christ; for, "the cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ?" (1Co 10:16). It is obvious that we shall not forget, in this connection, the distinction between the natural body of Christ which He took of the Blessed Virgin, and the bread which He held in His hand, and blessed and made to function as His body for our participation and inherence in Him thereby—His sacramental body. The church with her many members united to the Head, and thus to each other, is also called His body mystical (1Co 10:17; 12:27; Eph 1:22,23; Col 1:24).

VI. The Church's Observance of the Eucharist.

1. Heavenly Background:

(1) Christians a Priestly Race:

We should remember the priestly character of the church of Christ, whose sacrifices are made under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit (1Pe 2:5,9; Re 1:6; compare Ac 1:2,8); and also the eternal priesthood in the heavens of our risen, ascended and ever-living Lord Christ.

(2) Christ the Eternal High Priest:

He laid down His life in order to take it again (Joh 10:17), and now in the perfection of His glorified human nature, by His very presence in heaven, He is forever the propitiation inexhaustible for our sins (Heb 2:17-3:3; 4:14-5:10; 7:1-8:7; 9:11-28; 10:1-25; compare 1Joh 2:1,2). As the Lamb slain once for all but alive for evermore, the Lord Christ is the focus of the worship of angels and the redeemed (Re

1:17,18; 5:6-14; 7:9,10), and the Christian disciple has the privilege of feeding upon that eternal Priest and Victim (Heb 13:10; 1Co 10:16).

2. Celebrated Each Lord’s Day:

The celebration of the Eucharist was characteristic of the pentecostal church (Ac 2:42), especially upon the Lord’s Day (Ac 20:7). Its observance was preceded by the agape (1Co 11:20,34) on the eve (for the circumstances of the institution were closely imitated, and the day was reckoned as beginning at sunset after the Jewish fashion), and thus the Eucharist proper came late into the night, or toward morning (Ac 20:11).

3. Names of the Eucharist:

(1) Eucharist:

The name" Eucharist" is derived from the eucharistesas (" gave thanks") of the institution and was the most widely used term in primitive times, as applied to the whole service, to the consecration of the bread and wine or to the consecrated elements themselves (compare 1Co 14:16).

(2) Lord’s Supper:

It should be noted that the name, "Lord’s Supper," belongs to the agape rather than to the Eucharist; its popular use is a misnomer of medieval and Reformation times.

(3) Breaking of Bread:

The term "breaking of bread" (Ac 2:42; 20:7,11) had little vogue after New Testament times.

(4) Communion:

"Communion" obviously is derived from 1Co 10:16.

(5) Oblation:

In connection with the early and frequent use of the word "oblation" (prosphora) and its cognates, we should note Paul’s description of his ministry in terms that suggest the rationale of the prayer of consecration, or eucharistic prayer, as we know it in the earliest liturgical tradition: "that I should be a minister of Christ Jesus unto the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be made acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit" (Ro 15:16).

VII. Post-Apostolic Church.

1. Guidance by the Holy Spirit:

The same Spirit who guided the church in the determination of the Canon of the New Testament Scriptures, the same Spirit who guided the church in the working out of her explicit formulation of the Christian doctrine of the Godhead, and of the Christ—that self-same Spirit guided the church in the formation and fashioning of her great eucharistic prayer into its norm in the same 4th century. The historic churches of the East, by their faithful adherence to this norm, have been almost undisturbed by the dissensions and disputes of Western Christendom touching the Eucharist.

2. The Early Fathers:

The glimpses given us in the earlier Fathers of the Eucharist are in entire accord with the more articulate expression of the church's corporate eucharistic worship, which we find in the liturgical documents and writings of the Nicene era.

(1) Ignatian Epistles:

The Ignatian Epistles show us the Eucharist as the focus of the church's life and order, the source of unity and fellowship. The Eucharist consecrated by the prayer of the bishop and church is the Bread of God, the Flesh and Blood of Christ, the communication of love incorruptible and life eternal (compare Ephesians, 5,13,10; Trallians, 7,8; Romans, 7; Philadelphians, 4; Smyrnaeans, 7,8; Magnesians, 7).

(2) Justin Martyr:

Justin Martyr tells us that the Eucharist was celebrated on the Lord's Day, the day associated with creation and with Christ's resurrection. To the celebrant were brought bread and wine mixed with water, who then put up to God, over them, solemn thanksgiving for His lovingkindness in the gifts of food and health and for the redemption wrought by Christ. The oblations of bread and wine are presented to God in memorial of Christ's passion, and become Christ's body and blood through prayer. The Eucharist is a spiritual sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving commemorative of Christ's death; and the consecrated elements the communion of Christ's body and blood, by reason of the sacramental character bestowed upon them by the invocation of the Divine blessing (compare 1 Apol., 13,15, 66, 67; Dial. with Trypho, 41,70, 117).

(3) Irenaeus:

Irenaeus, also, emphasizes the fact that Christ taught His disciples to offer the new oblation of the New Covenant, to present in thank offering the first-fruits of God's creatures—bread and wine—the pure sacrifice prophesied before by Malachi. The Eucharist consecrated by the church, through the invocation of God's blessing, is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, just as He pronounced the elements to be at the institution (compare Against Heresies, i.13,1; iv.17,5; 18,1-6; 33,1; v.22,3).

(4) Cyprian:

Cyprian, too, gives evidence of the same eucharistic belief, and alludes very plainly to the "Lift up your hearts," to the great thanksgiving, and to the prayer of consecration. This last included the rehearsal of what Christ did and said at the institution, the commemoration of His passion, and the invocation of the Holy Spirit (compare Epistle to Caecilius, sections 1, 2, 4, 9, 10, 14, 17; Epistle to Epictetus, sections 2, 4; On the Unity of the Church, I, 17; On the Lord's Prayer, section 31; Firmilian to Cyprian, sections 10, 17).

VIII. Liturgical Tradition.

1. Outline of Eucharistic Prayer:

When we proceed to examine the early liturgical remains we find the articulate expression of the church's sacrifice following along these lines. After an introductory summons to the worshippers to "lift up their hearts," the great eucharistic prayer goes on to pour forth sublime praises to God for all the blessings of creation, and for the fruits of the earth; aligning the praises of the church with the worship of the heavenly host around the throne of God. The love of God in bringing about the redemption of fallen man through the incarnation, and through the self-oblation of His only Son upon the cross is then recalled in deep thankfulness. The institution of the Eucharist in the night of the betrayal is next related, and then, taking up, and fulfilling the command of Christ ('Do this for my memorial') therein recited, most solemn memorial is made before God, with the antitypical elements, of the death and of the victorious resurrection and ascension of the Lord Christ. Then, as still further carrying out this act of obedience, most humble prayer is made to the Eternal Father for the hallowing of the oblations, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, to be the body and blood of Christ, and to be to those who partake of them, for the imparting of remission of sins, and the bestowal of life eternal. To this great act of praise and prayer the solemn "Amen" of the assembled congregation assents, and thereafter the sacramental gifts are received by the faithful present, with another "Amen" from each recipient to whom they are administered.

The great eucharistic prayer, as outlined, was the first part of the liturgy to crystallize into written form, and of its component parts the invocation of the Divine blessing upon the elements was probably the first to be written down.

2. Significance of This for Unity:

Around the simplicity and the depth of such a truly apostolic norm of eucharistic worship, alone, can be gathered into one the now dispersed and divided followers of the Christ, for therein subsist in perfect harmony the Godward and the manward aspects of the memorial He commanded us to make as complementary, not contradictory; and the identity of the consecrated bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ is manifested to be in the realm of their spiritual function and potency.

LITERATURE.

E.F. Willis, The Worship of the Old Covenant .... in Relation to That of the New; Frederic Rendall, Sacrificial Language of the New Testament; Maurice Goguel, L'eucharistie des origines a Justin Martyr, 105 ff; W.B. Frankland, The Early Eucharist (excellent); H.B. Swete, "Eucharistic Belief in the 2nd and 3rd Cents.," Journal of Theological Studies, June, 1902, 161 ff; R.M. Woolley, The Liturgy of the Primitive Church; M. Lepin, L'idee du sacrifice dans la religion chretienne; W. Milligan, The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord; Thomas Brett, A True Scripture Account of the Nature and benefits of the Holy Eucharist, 1736; id, A Discourse Concerning the Necessity of Discerning the Lord's Body in the Holy Communion, 1720; J.R. Milne, Considerations on Eucharistic Worship; id, The Doctrine and Practice of the Eucharist; H.R. Gummey, The Consecration of the Eucharist; A.J. Maclean, Recent Discoveries Illustrating Early Christian Life and Worship; id, The Ancient Church Orders; L. Duchesne, Origines du culte chretien; J.T. Levens, Aspects of the Holy Communion; John Wordsworth, The Holy Communion; F.E. Brightman, Liturgies, Eastern and Western.

Henry Riley Gummey

HISTORICAL

1. Original Institution

2. The Elements

3. The Eucharist in the Apostolic Church

4. The Eucharist in the Post-apostolic Church

5. Rome and the Eucharist

6. Luther and the Eucharist

7. Zwingli and the Eucharist

8. Calvin and the Eucharist

This name of the Lord's Supper is derived from eucharistia, the prayer of consecration, and this in turn points back to Mt 26:27, "And he took a cup, and gave thanks" (eucharistesas). The most common name is "Lord's Supper" (deipnon kuriou (1Co 11:20)). It is also called "Lord's table" (trapeza kuriou (1Co 10:21 the King James Version)); while the cup is called "the cup of blessing" (poterion tes eulogias (1Co 10:16)) and "the cup of the Lord" (poterion kuriou (1Co 10:21)). The word koinonia points both to the bread and the cup, whence our common term "communion." In post-apostolic days it became known as leitourgia, a sacred ministration, whence our word "liturgy." It was also named thusia, a sacrifice, and

musterion, from its mystic character and perhaps from the fact that it was celebrated only in the closed circle of believers. The Roman Catholic church calls it missa or "mass," from the words congregatio missa est, whereby in post-apostolic times the first part of worship, called the missa cathechumenorum, was closed, and whereby the second part of worship was ushered in, known as the missa fidelium, the sacramental part of worship, only destined for believers.

1. Original Institution:

The origin of the Eucharist is described in Mt 26; Mr 14, and Lu 22. Paul introduces his simple and comprehensive recital of the origin of the institution—the earliest written record of it—with the words: "For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you" (1Co 11:23). A comparison between the Gospels and Ex 12 indicates a considerable modification of the original Passover ritual in the days of Jesus (see Smith's DB, article "Lord's Supper"). The composite Gospel-picture of the institution of the Eucharist shows us the Saviour in the deep consciousness of the catastrophe about to overwhelm Him, surrounded by treason on the part of Judas and a strange and total lack of appreciation of the true situation on the part of the other disciples. He had greatly 'desired to eat this passover with them before he suffered' (Lu 22:15), and yet they are wholly unresponsive, the chief question apparently in their minds being the old contention of rank and preeminence. Whether or not Judas was present at the eating of the Supper is a moot point, which we will not discuss here. Neither will we touch the question whether or not this Passover-meal was the true Jewish festive meal or an anticipation of it, called pascha only, in allusion to the great feast, which had brought the hundreds of thousands of Jews to Jerusalem (compare Mt 26; Mr 14 with Joh 12:1; 13:1,2,29; 18:28; 19:14,31).

Both Matthew and Mark leave the exact place of the institution of the Supper in the festive meal indefinite, "as they were eating" (Mt 26:26; Mr 14:22); the words of Lk, "after supper" (22:20), may be a hint in regard to this matter (see Joh 13:1; 1Co 11:25). But the custom of the early church of celebrating the Eucharist after the agape or "love feast" appears to be strong evidence that the original institution was separate from the paschal festival and followed it. The entire subject of the Eucharist has been called in question by the radical German critics, who point to the absence of the whole matter in Joh and to the omission of the words, "Do this in remembrance of me," in Matthew and Mark. Its occurrence in Luke is ascribed to Paul's influence over him and to his familiarity with the story of the institution as described by the apostle. But this position is utterly untenable in the light of the unquestioned fact that the Lord's Supper as a fixed part of worship was firmly established from the earliest days of the Christian church. The doctrine of Christ's vicarious suffering is nowhere so clearly enunciated as in the words of the institution of the Supper, "This is my body which is given for you" (Lu 22:19); "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:28). Small wonder that those who have utterly done away with the doctrine of the vicarious atonement or of substitution should attack the historicity of the Eucharist and should seek by all means to wipe it from the record.

Jesus bids His followers to observe the new institution "in remembrance of" Him. As Dr. Bavinck says, "The Lord's Supper is instituted by Christ as a permanent benefit to His church; it is a blessing added to all other blessings to signify and to seal them" (Geref. Dogm., IV, 310).

2. The Elements:

As to the elements used in the original institution of the Supper, they were bread and wine. The bread of course was the unleavened bread of the Passover, during which feast every trace of leaven was removed (Ex 12:19). The Eastern church, perhaps influenced by the bitter Ebionite spirit of the Judaizers, later adopted the use of common bread (koinos artos); the Western church used unleavened bread. Protestantism left the matter among the adiaphora.

As regards the wine, the matter has been in dispute from the beginning (see Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature). The early church always used mixed wine, wine and water, following the Jewish custom. Whether the wine used at the institution of the Lord's Supper was fermented or unfermented wine, must of course be determined by the Jewish Passover-customs prevailing at that time. The matter is in dispute and is not easily settled.

Modern Jews quite generally use raisin-wine, made by steeping raisins over night in water and expressing the juice the next day for use at the Passover-meal. The ancient Jews, we are told, used for this purpose a thick boiled wine, mixed with water (Mishna, Terumoth, xi). Whether oinos, the word used in the New Testament, stands literally, as the name indicates, for fermented wine, or figuratively for the mixed drinks, well known to ancient and modern Jews, is a debatable matter. As late as the 16th century the Nestorian Christians celebrated communion with raisin-wine, and the same is said of the Indian Christians ("St. Thomas Christians"). The word "new," used by Christ in Mt 26:29, is believed by some to indicate the character of the wine used by Christ at the institution of the Eucharist, namely, the juice of grapes fresh pressed out (see Clem. Alex., Paed., xi). On the other hand the third Council of Braga explicitly forbade this practice as heretical. It is evident that the whole subject is shrouded in much mystery. Some ancient sects substituted an entirely different element, water and milk, for instance, being used (Epiph., Haer., xlix; Aug., Haer., xxviii). Such customs were utterly condemned by the Council of Braga (675 AD). In general, however, the Christian church, almost from the beginning, seems to have used fermented red wine, either mixed or pure, in the administration of the Eucharist, in order to maintain the correspondence between the symbol and the thing symbolized.

3. The Eucharist in the Apostolic Church:

Originally the apostolic church celebrated communion at every meeting for worship. They continued steadfastly in the apostle's teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers (Ac 2:42,46). Very soon, however, if we may judge from the Ac and the Church Pauline Epistles, its administration was confined to the meeting on the first day of the week. The agape always preceded communion, and at some part of the service the believers, the sexes after the plan of the synagogue being separated, would salute each other with the "holy kiss" (philema hagion) (1Co 16:20; 2Co 13:12). But the introduction of the sacrament, with all its accessories, had evidently occasioned grave abuses at Corinth (1Co 11:34). Paul corrects these in unmistakable language. Thus we received our first written record of the institution of the Supper. In Corinth it seems to have been restricted from the beginning to the first day of the week (Ac 20:7; 1Co 16:2). By a slow transition the deipnon was transferred from the

midnight hour to the morning. At least we find that Paul kept it after midnight at Troas (Ac 20:11). It would appear as if the apostle had also partaken of the Lord's Supper, together with his Christian companions, on board the ship, toward the close of his fateful trip on the Adriatic (Ac 27:35).

4. The Eucharist in the Post-apostolic Church:

In the post-apostolic church the Eucharist continued to be celebrated every Lord's day. But it separated itself from the preaching of the Word and from prayers, as in the previous period. It was invested with a mystic meaning, something too holy for the common eye, and thus the missa catechumenorum, the open church-meeting, was separated from the missa fidelium, the gathering of believers only, in which the Eucharist was celebrated. Bread, wine, oil, milk, honey, all the ingredients for the agape, from which the elements for the Supper were selected, were furnished by the free-will offerings of the believers. These were solemnly set apart by the officiating bishop with a consecrating prayer, eucharistia, and thus the sacrament obtained the name "Eucharist." The gifts themselves were called prosphorai, "oblations," or thusiai, "sacrifices." The sacrificial conception of the Supper was thus gradually created (Ign., Phil., iv; Smyrna, vii, viii; Justin, Apol., i. 66; Dial., xii. 70; Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., iv. 18,5). The Eucharist once being conceived as a sacrifice, the conception of the officiating bishop as a priest became logically inevitable. The Apostolical Constitutions, xliii (4) gives us a fair idea of the worship of the church, toward the close of the 3rd century. Even at that early day a well-developed ritual had replaced the simplicity of the worship of the apostolic days. In the African and Eastern churches, baptized children were allowed to partake of communion, through the fear engendered by Joh 6:53. The regenerative conception of baptism largely influenced this custom. The remnants of the consecrated elements were brought by the deacons to the sick and to imprisoned believers. We have not the space in a brief article like this to enter fully into the development of the doctrinal conception of the Supper as found in the Fathers. Suffice it to say that the symbolical and spiritual concept of the Eucharist, usually defined as the "dynamic" view of the Supper, was advocated by such men as Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzen and others. On the other hand Cyril, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom and John Damascenus developed the "realistic" theory of the Eucharist, and this view again divided itself into the "diophysitic" theory, later called "consubstantiation," and the "monophysitic" theory, later known as "transubstantiation." Augustinns, the great Latin Father, knew nothing of theory of tran-substantiation. He taught that communion carries a blessing only for believers, while to the unbelieving it is a curse, and that the true eating of the body of Christ consists in believing (Serm. Ad Infantes, De Civ., x.6; xxii. 10; Tract. 25 in Joann.). Paschasins Radbert (died 865 AD) was the first fully to formulate the realistic view as the doctrine of the Romish church, and although the dynamic view triumphed for a while, the condemnation of Berengarius of Tours (died 1088 AD) proved that by the middle of the 11th century the realistic view of the Supper had become the generally accepted doctrine of the Eucharist.

5. Rome and the Eucharist:

The Romish church couches its doctrine of the Eucharist in the word "transubstantiation," which means the conversion of the substance of the elements used in the Eucharist. The word was first used by Hildebert of Tours (died 1134 AD) in a sermon. The doctrine of the Supper was finally fixed, together

with the new term, by Pope Innocent III, at the Lateran Council 1215 AD. It was decided that the body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar, under the species of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood of Christ, by the Divine power. This has been the Romish doctrine of the Supper ever since. The bread and wine are changed into the veritable body and blood of Christ, by the words of the institution. By the institution of the Supper, Christ made His disciples priests, wherefore the Eucharist may be administered only by an ordained priest. In the miracle of the sacrament, the "accidents" of the elements—bread and wine—remain, but they are no longer inherent in a subject, the substance in which they inhered being replaced by another. This new substance is the body and blood of Christ, which is hidden from observation under the appearance of the elements. The whole Christ is present in each of these elements, hence, it is not necessary to commune under both forms (sub utraque). In the Romish conception of the Supper communion with Christ is a secondary idea. The main idea is that of the transubstantiation itself, for the Supper is more a sacrifice than a sacrament; thus the mass becomes a sin offering. While it feeds faith, keeps us from mortal sin, wards off temporal punishment, unites believers, it also has a potency for those who are not present, and even for the dead in purgatory. Thus the mass became the very heart and center of the entire Romish cult (Conf. Trid., XIII, 21, 22; Cat. Rom., CXII, c. 4; Bellarm, De Sacr. Euch., I, iv; Moehler, Symb., section 34).

6. Luther and the Eucharist:

The Reformers rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation, the sacrificial conception of the Eucharist, the adoration of the "host," the withholding of the cup, the efficiency of the Eucharist in behalf of the dead, the entire Romish conception of the sacrament of the Supper. The original position of Luther, that the elements in the Supper were signs and seals of the remission of sins, was soon replaced by the doctrine of "consubstantiation." The bitter controversy with Carlstadt, and especially the failure of the Marburg Conference, drove Luther forever into the camp of the realists. As early as 1524 he had outlined his doctrine against Carlstadt. He placed himself squarely on the realistic conception of the words of the institution, and held that "the body of Christ in accordance with the will and omnipotence of God and its own ubiquity is really and substantially present in, with and under the Supper, even as His Divine nature is in the human as warmth is in the iron. Wherefore the Supper is physically partaken of by those who are unworthy, albeit to their own destruction" (Bavinck, Geref. Dogm., IV, 318). This doctrine has been fully developed by the Lutheran divines, and is till this day the view of the Lutheran church.

7. Zwingli and the Eucharist:

Zwingli essentially sided with Carlstadt in his controversy with Luther, whom he thereby greatly embittered. He interpreted the words of the institution—"this is"—as signifying "this stands for," "this signifies." This view was fully set forth in a letter to Matthew Alber at Reutlingen in 1524 and was given its final form in his dogmatic tract, Com. de vera et falsa rel. (1525), where he characterizes Luther’s doctrine as "an opinion not only rustic but even impious and frivolous." The breach was widened by the Marburg Conference of 1529. Reduced to its last analysis, the eucharistic concept of Zwingli is that of a symbolical memorial of the suffering and death of Christ, although Zwingli does not deny that Christ is present to the eye of faith. On the contrary, He is enjoyed through the word and through faith, i.e. in a

spiritual way. In the Supper we confess our faith, we express what that faith means to us, and we do it in memory of Christ's death (Oper., ii.1, 426; iii.239, 326, 459; iv.51, 68). The Zwinglian view has been consciously or unconsciously adopted by a very large portion of the Protestant church.

8. Calvin and the Eucharist:

Calvin's position on the doctrine of the Eucharist tends rather to the Lutheran than to the Zwinglian view. With Zwingli the sacrament is little more than a sign, with Calvin it is both a sign and a seal. The reality of communion with Christ and the benefits of His death, received by a living faith—all this is common to the Lutheran and the Calvinistic views. The Lord's Supper is far more than a mere memorial service, it is a marvelous means of grace as well. Calvin sides with Zwingli in denying all physical, local or substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist. But he differs from him in making the eucharistic act far more than a confession of faith, and he lays far greater stress than Zwingli on the meaning of its true participation. With Luther he holds that Christ is truly present in the Supper, and he lays stress especially on the mystic union of the believer with Christ. In the Supper both the benefits of Christ's death and His glorious person are touched. But Christ does not descend in the Supper to the believer, but the latter ascends to Him in heaven. The central thought of the Calvinistic conception of the Supper is this, that the communicant, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, comes in spiritual contact with the entire person of Christ and that he is thus fed unto life eternal. Every close student of Calvin's works will have to admit that his ideas on the subject are somewhat involved and confusing. This is due no doubt to the mediating position he occupied between Luther and Zwingli. But his position as a whole is quite plain. All his followers agree in holding that (1) Christ is only spiritually present in the Supper; (2) that the participation in the benefits of the Supper must therefore be spiritual, although it is real, and (3) that only true communicants, by a living faith, can communicate therein, and that this participation in the atoning death of the Saviour is sealed to us by the use of the ordained signs of the sacrament.

Henry E. Dosker

LUTHERAN INTERPRETATION

I. THE TERM

1. The Derivation and Meaning

2. Synonyms

II. THE ORDINANCE

1. Source and Norm of the Doctrine of the Eucharist

2. Interpretation of the Eucharistic Texts

3. Doctrinal Contents of the Eucharistic Passages

III. DIFFICULTIES

1. Question of Possibility

2. The Place of Faith in the Sacrament

3. The Words of the Institution

I. The Term.

1. The Derivation and Meaning:

"Eucharist" is the anglicized form of the Greek noun eucharistia, which signifies "gratitude," "thanks," or "praise offering." The noun is derived from the verb eucharisteo, which, with the verb eulogeo of kindred meaning in Mt 26:26,27; Mr 14:22,23, is used to describe the action of the Lord in blessing the bread and wine at the institution of the Lord's Supper (Lu 22:19; 1Co 11:23). When used absolutely, as in these places, it signifies "the offering up of praise that is prompted by nothing else than God Himself and His revealed glory" (Cremer). The blessing of the physical elements was part of the sacramental action at subsequent celebrations of the ordinance (1Co 10:16), and thus eucharistia soon (2nd century) came to mean the blessed elements and the entire ordinance in which these were administered.

2. Synonyms:

Other Scriptural terms for the same ordinance are "Communion" (from koinonia, in the twofold sense indicated in 1Co 10:16,17), "Lord's Supper" (kuriakon deipnon (1Co 11:20)), "Lord's Table" (trapeza kuriou (1Co 10:21)), "Breaking of Bread" (klasis tou artou (Ac 2:42)). The literature of the church developed a great many terms which emphasize one or the other feature of the ordinance. Luther, in his Small Catechism, adopts the name "Sacrament of the Altar," because it is administered at the altar. The Lutheran Confessions occasionally employ the term "mass," however, in the original meaning which the early church, not in that which the Roman church, connects with the term ("mass" derived either from missa, "things sent," because the materials for communion were sent to the place of celebration, or from missio, "a sending (away)," because worshippers who were not members, or minors, were dismissed from the service before the celebration of the Eucharist began; but see McClintock and Strong, Cyclop. of Biblical, Theol., and Eccles. Lit., V, 863).

II. The Ordinance.

1. Source and Norm of the Doctrine of the Eucharist:

The "seats of doctrine," i.e. the Scripture texts which must be employed for determining every essential part of the teaching of Scripture regarding the second sacrament of the Christian church, are the words of institution recorded in Mt 26:26-28; Mr 14:22-24; Lu 22:19,20; 1Co 11:23-25. Valuable statements, chiefly concerning the proper use of the sacrament, are found in 1Co 10:15 ff; 11:20 ff. That these texts are disputed is no reason why a doctrine should not be established from them. No doctrine of the Christian religion could be established, if every text of Scripture had to be withdrawn from the argument, so soon as it had become disputed. Joh 6:32-59 does not treat of this ordinance, because

(1) the ordinance must be dated from the night of the betrayal, which was considerably after the Lord's discourse at Capernaum;

(2) because this passage speaks of "eating the flesh," not the body, of the Son of man, and of drinking "his blood," in such a manner that a person's eternal salvation is made to depend upon this eating and drinking. If this passage were eucharistic, infants, children, persons in durance among pagans, or temporarily deprived of the ministration of the Christian church, hence, unable to commune, could not be saved.

2. Interpretation of the Eucharistic Texts:

The exposition of the genuine eucharistic texts of Scripture is governed by the common law of Bible exegesis, namely, that every word and statement of Scripture must be understood in its proper and native sense, unless a plain and urgent reason compels the adoption of a figurative interpretation. The writers who have recorded the institution of the sacrament have given no hint that they wish to be understood figuratively. The solemn occasion—the Eucharist being the expression of the last will or testament of the Lord—forbids the use of figurative language (Ga 3:15). The fact that a statement of Scripture transcends our natural powers of comprehension does not justify us in giving it a figurative meaning. If this rationalistic principle were to be applied in explaining Scripture, we could not retain a single revealed doctrine. Besides, those who have adopted a figurative interpretation are not agreed where to locate the figure in the words of institution. Some claim that the word touto, others that esti, others that to soma mou contain a figure, while still others would take the institutional words in their proper sense, but understand the entire ordinance figuratively.

3. Doctrinal Contents of the Eucharistic Passages:

The eucharistic passages contain: (1) a statement fixing the time and occasion of the institution. It was "in the night in which he was betrayed," immediately before the beginning of the passio magna of Christ, and in connection with the celebration of the Jewish Passover (Mt 26:17). The ordinance which Christ instituted was to take the place of the ancient Passover (1Co 5:7, which text Luther aptly renders: "We, too, have a passover, which is Christ crucified for us"). Jewish custom at the time of Christ seems to have allowed some latitude as regards the time for eating the paschal lamb. Thus the difference between John (18:28; 19:42) and the synoptists is overcome. our Lord was deeply stirred with thoughts of love and affection for His disciples at the time of the institution (13:1).

(2) An authoritative declaration of Christ, the God-man, fixing the constituent parts of the sacrament, and the essential features of the sacramental act (speciem actus). This declaration names:

(a) The elements of the sacrament, which are of two kinds: bread and wine (materia terrena), and the body and blood of the Lord (materia coelestis) (see Ireneus Adv. Haer., iv.34,363, quoted in Form. Conc. Sol. Decl., Art. VII, number 14, 649). There is no law laid down as regards the quality, form, or quantity of the bread (leavened or unleavened, round or oblong, in large loaves, cakes, or in wafer form ready for immediate distribution). Likewise the color and quality of the wine is left undefined. The expression gennema tes ampelou, "fruit of the vine" (Mt 26:29), sanctions the use of any substance that has grown on the vine, has been pressed from grapes, and has the characteristics of the substance known as wine. That the wine used by the Lord at that season of the year and in accordance with Jewish custom was fermented wine, there can be no doubt (Hodge, Systematic Theol., III, 616). The use of unfermented wine is apt to introduce an element of uncertainty into the sacrament. The heavenly elements are defined thus: "My body, which is given for you," "my blood, which is shed for many." These terms signify the real, substantial, natural body of Christ, and His real, natural blood (Luther: "the true body and blood of our Lord "). Both the earthly and the heavenly elements are really present at the same time in every eucharistic act. To deny either the presence of real bread and wine at any stage during the eucharistic act, as the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation does (against 1Co 11:26,28), or the real presence of the true body and blood of Christ, as reformed teaching does, is not doing justice to Scripture.

(b) The relation of the elements to one another: In offering the physical elements to the disciples the Lord employs the locutio exhibitiva, common to every language of men: He names that which is not seen while giving that which is seen. (" Here are your spices," says the grocer delivering the package containing them.) The locutio exhibitiva, except when used by a jester or dishonest person, always states a fact. The bread in the Eucharist is the body of Christ, the wine, likewise, is the blood of Christ. The relation is expressed in 1Co 10:16,17 by koinonia, "communion." This term is not the same as metocht, "participation," which would refer to the communicants (Plummer, HDB, III, 149). Koinonia declares a communion of the bread with the body, of the wine with the blood, of Christ. It is impossible to define the mode and manner of this communion of the earthly with the heavenly elements. Such terms as "consubstantiation," "impanation," "invination," are faulty attempts to define the undefinable. All we can assert is, that in a manner incomprehensible to us the body and blood of the Lord are in a sacramental union with the eucharistic bread and wine.

(c) The action required, namely, "take, eat"; "take, drink." These words refer to the distribution and reception of the sacramental elements. These are essential, the mode is not, unless one wishes to emphasize, e.g. by the breaking of the bread, the merely symbolical meaning of the entire ordinance. Accordingly, it is also immaterial whether the administrant place the elements into the hands of the communicant, who then conveys them to his mouth, or whether the administrant conveys the elements directly to the mouth of the communicant. The acts of distributing and receiving, however, extend to the entire sacramental substance, i.e. not the bread, or the wine, alone are distributed and received, but "in, with, and under the bread" the body, "in, with, and under the wine" the blood, of Christ. The eating and drinking in the Eucharist is of a peculiar kind. It differs from mere natural eating and drinking of

common food, and from spiritual eating and drinking, which is a figurative expression signifying the believing appropriation of the Saviour’s atoning work, and which can never be "for judgment." In natural eating and drinking there would be only bread and wine, not the body and blood of the Lord; in spiritual eating and drinking there would be only the merits of the Redeemer, not bread and wine. In sacramental eating and drinking both the bread and the body, the wine and the blood, of Christ, are sacramentally received, the earthly elements in a natural, the heavenly in a supernatural, undefinable manner, both, however, orally, and both by every communicant. For, according to 1Co 11:29, also the unworthy communicant receives the Lord’s body, and that for his judgment, "not discerning" it (the King James Version).

(d) The end and aim of the ordinance: The Lord says: "This do in remembrance of me." Paul says: "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord’s death till he come." These words make the Eucharist an efficient means for strengthening the spiritual union of the disciples with the Lord until His second coming. They are a call for faith on the part of the communicants, and restrict admission to communion to the believing followers of the Lord. Worthy communicants are those who understand the meaning of Christ’s sacrifice and hope for His return in glory. (Luther: "The sacrament is instituted for us Christians.") The duty of self-exploration enjoined upon communicants further emphasizes the purpose of this ordinance. Self-exploration embraces knowledge and acknowledgment of our sinful state, confidence in the ever-present forgiveness of God for Christ’s sake, and a sincere purpose to forsake sin and grow in holiness. Accordingly, non-believers, morally irresponsible persons, and persons who lead offensive lives which they will not amend, cannot be admitted to communion (Mt 7:6). In 1Co 10:17 Paul names another purpose: the strengthening of the bonds of brotherly love and fellowship by means of communion. Hence, unity of faith and active Christian charity are required in those who are to commune together (Mt 5:23,14), and "close communion," not "open, or promiscuous communion" is in accord with the teaching of Scripture. In the absence of any fixed rule as to the frequency of a Christian’s communing, the above reasons suffice to induce him to commune frequently ("as often as").

(3) An authoritative statement of Christ concerning the continued use of the sacrament (exercitium actus): "This do." This means

(a) that the action of Christ is to be repeated, i.e., bread and wine should be blessed, distributed and received. The blessing is called the consecration and consists in the reciting of a prayer and the words of the institution. Consecration has no magical effects, it does not produce the sacramental union. On the other hand, it is not a mere meaningless ceremony, but a solemn declaration that in accordance with the will of the Lord, bread and wine are now being separated from their common use, to be devoted to the use which the Lord commanded. It is also a prayer to the Lord to be present in the sacrament;

(b) that whenever disciples do as their Lord did, He will connect His body and blood with the earthly substances as He did at the first communion;

(c) that besides the blessing of the elements, only the giving, or distribution, and the taking, or reception,

of the sacramental elements are proper and essential parts of a sacramental action. A true sacramental action is complete only where these three acts concur: consecration, distribution, reception, and outside of these acts nothing that may be done with the elements possesses the nature of a sacrament or a sacramental action. Offering the consecrated wafer for adoration is no part of the sacrament, but is a form of idolatry (artolatry), because there is no sacramental union except in the act of distributing and receiving the consecrated elements. The withdrawal of the cup from the lay communicants is an unwarranted mutilation of the sacrament (Mt 26:27; Mr 14:23). But the grossest perversion of the sacrament, and a standing reproach to the completeness of the atoning sacrifice of the Lord is the offering up of the consecrated elements as an unbloody sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, which is being done in the Roman mass (Heb 10:14,18).

III. Difficulties.

1. Question of Possibility:

"How can these things be?" This question might be raised against every doctrine of Scripture. The union of the natures in the God-man, the imputation of His merit to the believer, the quickening power of the word of Divine grace, the resurrection of the dead, etc., can all be subjected to the same questioning.

2. The Place of Faith in the Sacrament:

"Has faith no place in this sacrament?" Faith does not create, nor help to create the sacrament, neither the administrant’s nor the communicant’s faith. The sacrament is fully constituted in all its parts by the institutional act of the Lord and by His command to continue the observance of it. Man’s faith cannot make, man’s unbelief cannot unmake, an ordinance of God. But faith is necessary in order that a communicant may receive the blessings offered in the Eucharist, and testify to his believing relation to the Lord and to his Christian fellowship with the brethren. The sacrament bestows no blessing ex opere operato, i.e. by the mere mechanical performance of the physical act.

3. The Words of the Institution:

"Are the words of the institution part of the sacred text?" Up to the age of Paulus, they were universally regarded so, and the critical labors of Briggs, P. Gardner, Grafe, Immer, Julicher, etc., which can readily be explained by theological position of these men, lack unity of result and are offset by the labors of Scrivener, Schultzen, R.A. Hoffman, Blass, Beyschlag, etc. Christianity as yet sees no reason for discarding the words of the institution and for discontinuing the Eucharist as a Divine ordinance.

W. H. T. Dau

ACCORDING TO THE BELIEF AND PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN (DUNKERS)

I. THE LAST SUPPER WAS NOT THE JEWISH PASSOVER

1. Date

2. Doctrinal

3. Tradition

II. THE PERPETUATION OF THE LAST SUPPER

III. PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH OF THE BRETHREN

IV. THE MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE LOVE FEAST

LITERATURE

The interest of this denomination in the Lord’s Supper as related to the Passover consists in two points:

(1) that the "Lord’s Supper" was not the Jewish Passover, but was eaten the evening before the Jewish feast; and

(2) that this "Last Supper" was intended to be perpetuated. This is perpetuated by the Church of the Brethren under the name of "Love Feast" (see AGAPE).

I. The Last Supper Was Not the Jewish Passover.

1. Date:

John gives five distinct intimations of the date:

(1)) "Now before the feast of the passover" (Pro de tes heortes tou pascha; Joh 13:1). This shows that the washing of the disciples’ feet, and the discourses at the Last Supper were before the Passover.

(2) "Buy what things we have need of for the feast" agorason hon chreian echomen eis ten heorten; Joh 13:29). This shows that the Supper (daiphon) was not the Passover feast [@heorten).

(3) "They lead Jesus therefore from Caiaphas into the Pretorium; and it was early; and they themselves entered not into the Pretorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover" (hina phagosin to pascha; Joh 18:28). This was after the Supper, early on the day of crucifixion, before the Passover.

(4) "Now it was the Preparation of the passover: it was about the sixth hour" (en de paraskeue tou

pascha; Joh 19:14). This again shows conclusively that the Passover was not yet eaten. Jesus is before Pilate; it is the day of the crucifixion, and after the Last Supper.

(5) "The Jews therefore, because it was the Preparation, that the bodies should not remain on the cross upon the sabbath (for the day of that sabbath was a high day)," Joh 19:31, etc. Here we have again a reference to the Preparation (paraskeue tou pascha), and also to the Sabbath which, in this case was a "high day" (en gar megale he hemera ekeinou tou sabbatou). This shows that the Passover was eaten on Friday evening after sunset on the 15th of Nisan at the beginning of the Jewish Sabbath. Whenever the Passover fell upon the Sabbath, that Sabbath was a "high day."

2. Doctrinal:

Christ is our Passover: died at the time the Passover lamb was slain, hence, after the Last Supper.

(1) Christ died at the time the Passover lamb was slain on Friday afternoon, the 14th of Nisan, and thus became Our Passover (1Co 5:7), "For our passover also hath been sacrificed, even Christ."

(2) Jesus, the "Lamb of God" (Joh 1:29) corresponds to the Passover lamb (Ex 12:3). "Without blemish" (Ex 12:5) = Jesus, "who did no sin" (1Pe 2:22-24). The blood of a lamb sprinkled upon houses (Ex 12:7,13) corresponds to salvation by the blood of Jesus (1 Joh 1:7-9).

(3) Jesus arose the third day and became "the first-fruits of them that are asleep" (1Co 15:4,20,23). The resurrection was on the first day of the week. The sheaf, or first-fruits, was gathered on the 16th of Nisan. Therefore Jesus must have died on Friday the 14th of Nisan, when the Passover lamb was slain; hence, after the Last Supper.

3. Tradition:

All the early traditions, both Jewish and Christian, agree that Jesus was crucified on the day of Preparation of the Passover, and they distinguish between the Passover and the Last Supper which was eaten the evening before the Jewish feast.

II. The Perpetuation of the Last Supper.

(1) Since the Last Supper was a new institution, there is no more reason for perpetuating one part than another. It is a unit, and each event of that night has its meaning and place.

(2) Jesus commanded the disciples to perpetuate feet-washing (see WASHING OF FEET) (Joh 13:14,15,17), and likewise He commanded the Eucharist to be perpetuated as a memorial of Him (1Co 11:24,25). Why not the Agape?

(3) The Agape was perpetuated by the apostles and disciples. They certainly understood Jesus to mean

that the entire services of the Last Supper should be perpetuated, else they would not have done so.

III. Practice of the Church of the Brethren.

The "Love Feast" commemorates Jesus' Last Supper with His disciples. These Love Feasts are held once or twice each year, always in the evening, by each local church or congregation. Preparatory services on "self-examination" (1Co 11:28) precede the ordinances. The church pews are converted into tables. The Supper (deipnon) is made ready beforehand by the deacons and deaconesses. The devotional exercises aim to accomplish special consecration, confession, and reconciliation. Before the eating of the Supper, Joh 13:1-17 is read and explained, whereupon the brethren proceed to wash one another's feet, and the sisters likewise by themselves. All tarry one for another (1Co 11:33) until they are ready for the Supper. The officiating elder then calls upon someone to offer prayer for the meal, which is then eaten together. Another prayer of thanksgiving is offered at the close of the meal. After the meal, the officiating elder calls upon one to read the story of Christ's sufferings (Isa 53, or Joh 19). After a short explanation of the meaning of the symbol, the communicants rise while the officiating elder gives thanks for the bread. He then turns to his brother at his right and breaks a piece of the unleavened bread for him with the words, "My beloved brother, the bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ" (see 1Co 10:16). The brethren then break the bread one to the other, with these words. Likewise the sisters in the same manner. Again the congregation rises while the officiating elder gives thanks for the cup, which is then passed by one to the other with the words "Beloved brother (or sister), the cup of the New Testament is the communion of the blood of Christ" (1Co 10:16). This is followed by prayers of praise and thanksgiving, then a hymn (Mt 26:30) and a benediction.

IV. The Meaning and Significance of the Love Feast.

All these ordinances or symbols signify some fundamental virtue in the Christian life. We are commanded to follow our Master who is the Way and the Truth. But these symbols have a real significance, apart from merely "following" or "obeying" the Lord's command.

(1) Feet-washing symbolized humility and service, and also the partial cleansing which all Christians need.

(2) The Agape signifies the bread-and-water covenant of brotherhood and peace. It is not only the symbol of true Christian fellowship, but is productive of such fellowship. It is also symbolic of the "Marriage Supper of the Lamb," which is supremely a symbol of joy.

(3) the Eucharist:

(a) The broken bread represents the "body of Christ" (1Co 10:16) "which is broken for you" (1Co 11:24 the King James Version); hence, the symbol of sacrifice. It is a memorial of Christ's sufferings, and a consecration to suffer with Him. It means also feeding on Christ, whose flesh we must eat (Joh 6:35,51,53,54).

(b) The cup represents the blood of Christ (1Co 10:16; Joh 6:53,54). It is the blood covenant that symbolizes the unity of man with God (Joh 17:21). Jesus is the vine, we are the branches (Joh 15). The same mind, spirit, life and love which are in God and Christ are to be in us.

LITERATURE.

C. F. Yoder, God’s Means of Grace; R.H. Miller, Doctrine of Brethren Defended; D. W. Kurtz, Outline of the Fundamental Doctrines (all of Elgin, Illinois, U.S.A.).

Daniel Webster Kurtz

LORD; THE LORD lord, This English word in our Bible represents one Aramaic, 3 Greek and 9 Hebrew words, two of them in two forms. It thus expresses all grades of dignity, honor, and majesty. It is not always possible to be sure of the sense in which the term is to be taken. In Ge 18:3; 19:18, the translators waver between interpreting of the Divine Person and a finite angel (compare marginal readings). It represents the most sacred Hebrew name for God, as their covenant God, Yah, Yahweh, and the more usual designation of Deity, ‘Adhonay, ‘Adhon, a term which they adopted to avoid pronouncing the most holy designation. They had placed on Le 24:16 an interpretation that aroused such a dread that they seldom dared use the name at all. When two of the words usually translated "Lord," both referring to God, occur together, the King James Version renders "Lord God," and the American Standard Revised Version "Lord Yahweh." the American Standard Revised Version has adopted the rule of using the covenant name transliterated, instead of the term "Lord," in which the King James Version adopts the rule of the Hebrews to avoid the holy name.

The Aramaic designation, Mare’, occurs only in Da (e.g. 2:47; 5:23), and the same word refers to a man (4:24).

Of the Greek words, Kurios is freely used of both the Deity and men. Despotes, of men in classic usage, occurs only of God, including the ascended Jesus, and is employed only 5 times. Megistanes (plural) is found once, of men (Mr 6:21). Rabboni (Hebrew in Greek letters) is applied only to the Christ, and is simply transliterated in the Revised Version (British and American), but rendered "Lord" in the King James Version (compare Mr 10:51).

Our English versions distinguish the 3 main uses of the term thus:

(1) "LORD" represents the Hebrew Yahweh, Septuagint Kurios, except where ‘Adhonay or ‘Adhon is combined with Yahweh (=" Lord God"); the American Standard Revised Version has in these examples employed the name as it is found in the Hebrew, simply transliterated.

(2) "Lord" corresponds to ‘Adhonay, ‘Adhon, Mare’, also Greek Kurios (see (1)), and Despotes, for which the American Standard Revised Version has always "Master" in either the text or the margin.

(3) "Lord" ("lord") translates all the remaining 8 Hebrew words and the Greek words except Despotes. It is thus seen that Kurios corresponds to all three forms of writing the English term.

See JEHOVAH.

William Owen Carver

LORDS OF THE PHILISTINES

(ceren, same as Hebrew word for "axle," probably a native designation): These "lords" (Jos 13:3; Jud 3:3; 16:5, etc.; 1Sa 5:8,11, etc.), elsewhere called "princes" (sar, 1Sa 18:30; 29:3,4,9), were the petty rulers or kings of the 5 Philistine cities, Gaza, Ashkelon, Ashdod, Ekron, Gath.

See PHILISTINES.

LOSS

chaTa "to suffer as one erring, or as a sinner" (Ge 31:39, where Jacob assures Laban that he (Jacob) suffered the loss of all animals of the flock torn by beasts); shekhol, "bereavement" (Isa 47:8 f, where the prophet foretells the humiliation of proud Babylon who shall suffer the loss of her children, and widowhood); shikkulim, "bereavement" (Isa 49:20, translated "bereavement" in the Revised Version (British and American), where the prophet promises to the desolate Zion enlargement). In the New Testament the translations of three Greek words: apobole, "casting away" (Ac 27:22, where Paul assures the crew and passengers that there shall be no "loss" of life from the storm); zemia, "loss" (Ac 27:21, referring to the harm sustained in the storm; Php 3:7 f, where Paul counts all his natural privileges and attainments as forfeited for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ); zemioo. "to suffer loss" (1Co 3:15, where Paul says the man whose works are burned shall suffer "loss"; Php 3:8, same context as above).

Charles B. Williams

LOT (1)

lot:

I. Personality.

The man who bore the name Lot (lot; Lot) is mentioned for the first time in Ge 11:27, at the beginning of that section of Genesis which is entitled "the generations of Terah." After Terah’s 3 sons are named, it is added that the third of these, Haran, begat Lot.

The reason for thus singling out but one of the grandsons of Terah appears in the next verse, where we are told that "Haran died before his father Terah in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees." For that period in the life of this family, therefore, which begins with the migration from Ur, Lot represents his father's branch of the family (Ge 11:31). It is hardly probable that the relation between Abraham and Lot would have been what it was, had not Haran died; but be this as it may, we read this introduction of Lot into the genealogy of Terah as an anticipation of the story to which it furnishes an introduction, and in which Lot is destined to play an important part.

The sections of that story in which Lot appears are: in Ge 11, the migration from Ur to Haran; in Ge 12, Abraham's wanderings; in Ge 13, the separation of Abraham and Lot; in Ge 14, the campaign of the eastern kings against Sodom and Abraham's recovery of the captives; and in Ge 19, the destruction of Sodom.

In Ge 14:14,16 Lot is termed the "brother" of Abraham; but that this does not represent a variant tradition is proved by reference to 14:12 of the same chapter (ascribed to "an independent source") and to 13:8 (ascribed to J; compare 11:28 J).

II. Career.

1. First Period:

Lot's life, as the scanty references to him permit us to reconstruct it, falls into four periods. Of the first period—that previous to the migration from Haran—we know nothing save Lot's birth in Ur, the death of his father there, the marriage of his sister Milcah to his uncle Nahor (of another sister, Iscah, we learn only the name), and the journey to Haran in company with Terah, Abraham and Sarah. The fact that Sarah's childlessness and Haran's death are the only two circumstances related of the family history, may serve to explain why Lot went with Abraham instead of staying with Nahor. A childless uncle and a fatherless nephew may well have remained together with the idea that, even if there was no formal adoption, the nephew might become his uncle's heir. Certainly, the promise of a numberless seed, so often repeated to the patriarchs, comes first to Abraham immediately after Lot has separated from him (see Ge 13:6-18).

2. Second Period:

In the second period of Lot's life, we find him the companion of Abraham on his journeys from Mesopotamia to Canaan, through Canaan to Egypt, and back again to the neighborhood of Beth-el. His position is subordinate, for his uncle is head of the family, and oriental custom is uniform and rigorous in the matter of family rule. Hence, the use of the singular number throughout the narrative. What Abraham did, his whole "clan" did. Yet Lot's position was as nearly independent as these patriarchal conditions admit. When the story reaches the point where it is necessary to mention this fact, the narrator explains, first, the generosity with which Abraham treated his nephew, in permitting him to have "flocks, and herds, and tents" of his own, a quasi-independent economy, and second, that disproportion

between their collective possessions and the land's resources which made separation inevitable. Up to this point the only mention of Lot during this period of wandering is contained in Ge 13:1, in the words "and Lot with him." And even here the words are useless (because stating a fact perfectly presumable here as elsewhere), except as they prepare the reader for the story of the separation that is immediately to follow.

3. Third Period:

That story introduces the third period of Lot's career, that of his residence in the Kikkar (the Revised Version (British and American) "Plain," the Revised Version margin "Circle") and in Sodom. To the fundamental cause of separation, as above stated, the author adds the two circumstances which contributed to produce the result, namely, first, the strife that arose between Abraham's herdsmen and Lot's herdsmen, and, second, the presence in the same country of others—the Canaanites and Perizzites—thus reminding his readers that it was no vacant land, through which they might spread themselves absolutely at will and so counteract the operation of the principal cause and the contributory cause already set forth.

With a magnanimity that must have seemed even greater to minds accustomed to patriarchal authority than it seems to us, and that was in fact much more remarkable than it would be here and now, Abraham offers to his nephew the choice of the land—from the nomad's point of view. In the "we are brethren" (Ge 13:8), the whole force of the scene is crystallized. Lot, who believes himself to have chosen the better part, is thereupon traced in his nomadic progress as far as Sodom, and the reader leaves him for a time face to face with a city whose men "were wicked and sinners against Yahweh exceedingly," while the narrative moves on with Abraham through that fresh scene of revelation which presented to this man of magnanimity a Divine deed to all the land, and to this man, now left without an heir from among his own kindred (compare Ge 15:2,3), a Divine pledge of innumerable offspring.

Lot returns for a moment to our view as the mainspring of Abraham's motions in the campaign of Ge 14. We are expressly told that it was "when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive," that he "led forth his trained men .... and pursued." On the one hand we hear that Lot now "dwelt in Sodom," having abandoned the life in tents that he had led since Mesopotamian days, and on the other hand we find in him a foil to the energetic, decisive and successful figure of his uncle—for Lot plays a sorry role, bracketed always with "the women and the goods."

This period of his life ends with the annihilation of his chosen home, his wealth, his companions, and all that was his save two daughters, who, it would seem, might better have perished with the rest. Genesis 19, coming immediately after the intercession of Abraham for Sodom that poignantly impresses on the reader's mind the wickedness of Lot's environment, exhibits to us the man himself in his surroundings, as they have affected him through well-nigh a score of years (compare 12:4; 17:1). What we see is a man who means well (courtesy, 19:1; hospitality, 19:2,3,6-8; natural shame, 19:7; loyalty, 19:14; and gratitude, 19:19), but who is hopelessly bound up with the moral life of the city through his family connections—alliances that have pulled him down rather than elevated others (19:9,14,26,31-35). The

language of 2Pe 2:7,8 reminds us that Lot was, even at this time of his life, a "righteous" man. Viewed as a part of his environment (the writer has been speaking of Sodom, 19:6), Lot was certainly entitled to be called a "righteous" man, and the term fits the implications of Ge 18:23-32. Moreover, Ge 19 itself shows Lot "vexed .... with their lawless deeds" and "sore distressed by the lascivious life of the wicked" (compare 19:3,7,8,14). Yet the contrast with Abraham is always present in the reader's mind, so that the most lasting impressions are made by Lot's selfishness worldliness vacillation and cowardice, not to mention the moral effect made by the closing scene of his life (19:30-38).

4. Fourth Period:

The fourth period of Lot's career is of uncertain duration. Upon the destruction of Sodom he dwelt at first in Zoar, the "little" city, spared as a convenient refuge for him and his; but at some time unspecified, he "went up out of Zoar," for "he feared to dwell in Zoar"—why, we cannot say. This fear was greater than even the evidently great fear he entertained of dwelling in "the mountain" (Ge 19:19). In this mountain-country of rocks and caves (Driver in HDB, article "Lot," cites Buckingham, Travels in Syria, 61-63, 87, as authority for the statement that people still live in caves in this region), Lot and his two remaining daughters dwell; and the biography of this companion of "the friend of God" ends in a scene of incest, which supplies the logical epilogue to a drama of progressive moral deterioration. This bestial cave-man of Ge 19 is the "brother" of Abraham, but he has reached this goal because his path had led down from Beth-el to Sodom. The origin of the two neighboring and kindred nations, Moab and Ammon, is by the Hebrew tradition traced thus to Lot and his daughters.

III. Place in Later Literature.

In the Bible, Lot finds mention only as the father of Moab and Ammon (De 2:9,19; Ps 83:8), and in the passage in 2Pe already noticed; and, besides these places, in Lu 17:28-32. Here Lot represents the central figure in the destruction of Sodom, as Noah in the flood in the preceding context (compare the association of these two characters in 2Pe and the Koran). His deliverance is mentioned, the haste and narrowness of that escape is implied, and his wife's fate is recalled. In Jewish and Mohammedan lore (including many passages in the Koran itself), Lot is a personage of importance, about whom details are told which fancy has added to the sober traditions of old Israel. But particularly for Mohammed there was point of attachment in Lot's career, offered in Ge 19:7,14. Like Mohammed to the men of wicked Mecca, Lot becomes a preacher of righteousness and a messenger of judgment to the men of wicked Sodom. He is one of the line of apostles, sent to reveal God's will and purpose to his contemporaries.

IV. Critical Theories about the Figure of Lot.

The common view of those who deny the historical reality of Lot is that this name simply stands for the ethnic group, Moab and Ammon. Wellhausen, e.g., expressly calls "Lot" a national name (Volksname). As to what is told of him in Ge he remarks: "Were it not for the remarkable depression in which the Dead Sea lies, Sodom and Gomorrah would not have perished; were it not for the little flat tongue of land that reaches out into the swamp from the Southeast, Lot would have fled at once to the mountains

of his sons, Moab and Ammon, and not have made the detour by Zoar, which merely serves the purpose of explaining why this corner is excepted from ‘the overthrow,’ to the territory of which it really belongs" (Prolegomena 6, 323). Meyer confesses that nothing can be made of Lot, because "any characteristic feature that might furnish a point of attachment is entirely lacking." The first of the families of the Horites of Seir was named Lotan (Ge 36:20,22), and this writer believes it "probable that this name is derived from Lot; but that Lot was ever a tribal name (Stammname) follows neither from this fact (rather the contrary) nor from the designation of Moab and the bene ‘Ammon as ‘Sons of Lot’ "(Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstamme, 311; Compare 261, 339). If "Horite" was understood as "cave-dweller," the story in Ge 19:30 might be adduced in support of this combination. But the most recent line of reasoning concerning these patriarchal figures makes their names "neither Divine names nor tribal names, whether in actual use or regarded as such, but rather simple personal names like Tom, Dick and Harry. .... Typical names they became .... so that .... Israel’s story-tellers would connect the name of Lot with the overthrow of the cities" (Gressmann, article in ZATW, 1910). These names were chosen just because "they were very common at the time when the narratives were stamped into types"; later they became unfashionable, but the story-tellers held fast to the old names. "One sees from this at once into how ancient a time the proper names Abraham and Lot must reach, and understands therefore the more easily how they could be changed into tribal ancestors." It does not require the cautions, uttered by writers of this way of thinking, against regarding their views as a return to the old historical view of the patriarchs, to remind us that, in spite of all that may be said to the contrary, the present trend of thought among the most radical critics of the Genesis-traditions is much mote favorable to that conservative historical view than were the opinions which they have overthrown. So that it may justly be asserted, as Gressmann writes: "Confidence in tradition is in any case on the rise."

Lot’s Wife: This woman, unknown by name, figures in the narrative of Lot that relates his escape from Sodom. She is mentioned in Ge 19 only in verses 15-17, where she is commanded to flee from the doomed city with her husband and daughters, and is laid hold upon by the angelic visitors in their effort to hasten the slow departure; and in 19:26, where she alone of the four fugitives disobeys the warning, looks back, and becomes a "pillar of salt" This disobedience, with the moral state it implied and the judgment it entailed, is held up as an example by Christ in Lu 17:32. In the Scriptures this is all that is said of a person and event that furnished the basis for a great deal of speculation. Josephus (Ant., I, xi, 4) adds to the statement derived from Gen, "She was changed into a pillar of salt," the words, "for I visited it, and it still remains even now" (see also The Wisdom of Solomon 10:7).

Among Christian writers contemporary with and subsequent to Josephus, as well as among the Jews themselves and other Orientals, the same assertion is found, and down to recent times travelers have reported the persistence of such a "pillar of salt," either on the testimony of natives or as eyewitnesses. The question of the origin and nature of these "pillars" is a part of the larger question of Sodom and its neighborhood (see SALT; SIDDIM; SLIME); for that no one particular "pillar" has persisted through the centuries may be regarded as certain; nor if it had, would the identification of Lot’s wife with it and with it alone be ascertainable. This is just an early, persistent and notable case of that "identification" of Biblical sites which prevails all over the Holy Land. It is to be classed with the myth-and legend-building turn of mind in simple peoples, which has e.g. embroidered upon this Old Testament account of the destruction of Sodom such marvelous details and embellishments.

The principal thing to observe is the vagueness and the simplicity of the story in Gen. For it does not necessarily imply the "metamorphosis" popularly attributed to it, in the strict sense of that word. And it lacks, even in a narrative like this, where the temptation would be greatest, all indications of that "popular archaeology" or curiosity, which according to some critics, is alleged to have furnished the original motive for the invention of the patriarchal narratives. "She became a pillar of salt," and "Remember Lot's wife": this is the extent of the Biblical allusions. All the rest is comment, or legend, or guess, or "science."

J. Oscar Boyd

LOT (2)

See DIVINATION.

LOTAN

lo'-tan (loTan): Son of Seir, a chief (the King James Version "duke") of Edom (Ge 36:20,22,29; 1Ch 1:38 f).

LOTHASUBUS

loth-a-su'-bus (Lothasoubos): One of those who stood by Ezra at the reading of the law (1 Esdras 9:44); called "Hashum" in Ne 8:4.

LOTS

See DIVINATION.

LOTS, FEAST OF

See PURIM.

LOTUS TREES

lo'-tus (tse'elim; the King James Version shady trees): The trees under which behemoth (the "hippopotams") rests; "He lieth under the lotus-trees," "The lotus-trees cover him with their shade" (Job 40:21,22). The Arabic equivalent is the dom tree, Zizyphus lotus, a species of jujube tree (Natural Order Rhamneae); it has many spines and small globular fruit a little bigger than a pea. It is common in the Jordan valley. This plant has nothing to do with the Egyptian lotus.

See LILY.

LOVE

luv (’ahebh, ‘ahabhah, noun; phileo, agapao, verb; agape, noun): Love to both God and man is fundamental to true religion, whether as expressed in the Old Testament or the New Testament. Jesus Himself declared that all the law and the prophets hang upon love (Mt 22:40; Mr 12:28-34). Paul, in his matchless ode on love (1Co 13), makes it the greatest of the graces of the Christian life—greater than speaking with tongues, or the gift of prophecy, or the possession of a faith of superior excellence; for without love all these gifts and graces, desirable and useful as they are in themselves, are as nothing, certainly of no permanent value in the sight of God. Not that either Jesus or Paul underestimates the faith from which all the graces proceed, for this grace is recognized as fundamental in all God’s dealings with man and man’s dealings with God (Joh 6:28 f; Heb 11:6); but both alike count that faith as but idle and worthless belief that does not manifest itself in love to both God and man. As love is the highest expression of God and His relation to mankind, so it must be the highest expression of man’s relation to his Maker and to his fellow-man.

I. Definition.

While the Hebrew and Greek words for "love" have various shades and intensities of meaning, they may be summed up in some such definition as this: Love, whether used of God or man, is an earnest and anxious desire for and an active and beneficent interest ins the well-being of the one loved. Different degrees and manifestations of this affection are recognized in the Scriptures according to the circumstances and relations of life, e.g. the expression of love as between husband and wife, parent and child, brethren according to the flesh, and according to grace; between friend and enemy, and, finally, between God and man. It must not be overlooked, however, that the fundamental idea of love as expressed in the definition of it is never absent in any one of these relations of life, even though the manifestation thereof may differ according to the circumstances and relations. Christ’s interview with the apostle Peter on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias (Joh 21:15-18) sets before us in a most beautiful way the different shades of meaning as found in the New Testament words phileo, and agapao. In the question of Christ, "Lovest thou me more than these?" the Greek verb agapas, denotes the highest, most perfect kind of love (Latin, diligere), implying a clear determination of will and judgment, and belonging particularly to the sphere of Divine revelation. In his answer Peter substitutes the word philo, which means the natural human affection, with its strong feeling, or sentiment, and is never used in Scripture language to designate man’s love to God. While the answer of Peter, then, claims only an inferior kind of love, as compared to the one contained in Christ’s question, he nevertheless is confident of possessing at least such love for his Lord.

II. The Love of God.

First in the consideration of the subject of "love" comes the love of God—He who is love, and from whom all love is derived. The love of God is that part of His nature—indeed His whole nature, for "God

is love"—which leads Him to express Himself in terms of endearment toward His creatures, and actively to manifest that interest and affection in acts of loving care and self-sacrifice in behalf of the objects of His love. God is "love" (1 Joh 4:8,16) just as truly as He is "light" (1 Joh 1:5), "truth" (1 Joh 1:6), and "spirit" (Joh 4:24). Spirit and light are expressions of His essential nature; love is the expression of His personality corresponding to His nature. God not merely loves, but is love; it is His very nature, and He imparts this nature to be the sphere in which His children dwell, for "he that abideth in love abideth in God, and God abideth in him" (1 Joh 4:16). Christianity is the only religion that sets forth the Supreme Being as Love. In heathen religions He is set forth as an angry being and in constant need of appeasing.

1. Objects of God’s Love:

The object of God’s love is first and foremost His own Son, Jesus Christ (Mt 3:17; 17:5; Lu 20:13; Joh 17:24). The Son shares the love of the Father in a unique sense; He is "my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth" (Isa 42:1). There exists an eternal affection between the Son and the Father—the Son is the original and eternal object of the Father’s love (Joh 17:24). If God’s love is eternal it must have an eternal object, hence, Christ is an eternal being.

God loves the believer in His Son with a special love. Those who are united by faith and love to Jesus Christ are, in a different sense from those who are not thus united, the special objects of God’s love. Said Jesus, thou "lovedst them, even as thou lovedst me" (Joh 17:23). Christ is referring to the fact that, just as the disciples had received the same treatment from the world that He had received, so they had received of the Father the same love that He Himself had received. They were not on the outskirts of God’s love, but in the very center of it. "For the father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me" (Joh 16:27). Here phileo is used for love, indicating the fatherly affection of God for the believer in Christ, His Son. This is love in a more intense form than that spoken of for the world (Joh 3:16).

God loves the world (Joh 3:16; compare 1Ti 2:4; 2Pe 3:9). This is a wonderful truth when we realize what a world this is—a world of sin and corruption. This was a startling truth for Nicodemus to learn, who conceived of God as loving only the Jewish nation. To him, in his narrow exclusiveism, the announcement of the fact that God loved the whole world of men was startling. God loves the world of sinners lost and ruined by the fall. Yet it is this world, "weak," "ungodly," "without strength," "sinners" (Ro 5:6-8), "dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph 2:1 the King James Version), and unrighteous, that God so loved that He gave His only begotten Son in order to redeem it. The genesis of man’s salvation lies in the love and mercy of God (Eph 2:4 f). But love is more than mercy or compassion; it is active and identifies itself with its object. The love of the heavenly Father over the return of His wandering children is beautifully set forth in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Lu 15). Nor should the fact be overlooked that God loves not only the whole world, but each individual in it; it is a special as well as a general love (Joh 3:16, "whosoever"; Ga 2:20, "loved me, and gave himself up for me").

2. Manifestations of God’s Love:

God’s love is manifested by providing for the physical, mental, moral and spiritual needs of His people

(Isa 48:14,20,21; 62:9-12; 63:3,12). In these Scriptures God is seen manifesting His power in behalf His people in the time of their wilderness journeying and their captivity. He led them, fed and clothed them, guided them and protected them from all their enemies. His love was again shown in feeling with His people, their sorrows and afflictions (Isa 63:9); He suffered in their affliction, their interests were His; He was not their adversary but their friend, even though it might have seemed to them as if He either had brought on them their suffering or did not care about it. Nor did He ever forget them for a moment during all their trials. They thought He did; they said, "God hath forgotten us," "He hath forgotten to be gracious"; but no; a mother might forget her child that she should not have compassion on it, but God would never forget His people. How could He? Had He not graven them upon the palms of His hands (Isa 49:15 f)? Rather than His love being absent in the chastisement of His people, the chastisement itself was often a proof of the presence of the Divine love, "for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth" (Heb 12:6-11). Loving reproof and chastisement are necessary oftentimes for growth in holiness and righteousness. Our redemption from sin is to be attributed to God’s wondrous love; "Thou hast in love to my soul delivered it from the pit of corruption; for thou hast cast all my sins behind thy back" (Isa 38:17; compare Ps 50:21; 90:8). Eph 2:4 f sets forth in a wonderful way how our entire salvation springs forth from the mercy and love of God; "But God, being rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were dead through our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ," etc. It is because of the love of the Father that we are granted a place in the heavenly kingdom (Eph 2:6-8). But the supreme manifestation of the love of God, as set forth in the Scripture, is that expressed in the gift of His only-begotten Son to die for the sins of the world (Joh 3:16; Ro 5:6-8; 1 Joh 4:9 f), and through whom the sinful and sinning but repentant sons of men are taken into the family of God, and receive the adoption of sons (1 Joh 3:1 f; Ga 4:4-6). From this wonderful love of God in Christ Jesus nothing in heaven or earth or hell, created or uncreated or to be created, shall be able to separate us (Ro 8:37 f).

III. The Love of Man.

1. Source of Man’s Love:

Whatever love there is in man, whether it be toward God or toward his fellowman, has its source in God —"Love is of God; and every one that loveth is begotten of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love" (1 Joh 4:7 f); "We love, because he first loved us" (1 Joh 4:19). Trench, in speaking of agape, says it is a word born within the bosom of revealed religion. Heathen writers do not use it at all, their nearest approach to it being philanthropia or philadelphia—the love betweeen those of the same blood. Love in the heart of man is the offspring of the love of God. Only the regenerated heart can truly love as God loves; to this higher form of love the unregenerate can lay no claim (1 Joh 4:7,19,21; 2:7-11; 3:10; 4:11 f). The regenerate man is able to see his fellow-man as God sees him, value him as God values him, not so much because of what he is by reason of his sin and unloveliness, but because of what, through Christ, he may become; he sees man’s intrinsic worth and possibility in Christ (2Co 5:14-17). This love is also created in the heart of man by the Holy Ghost (Ro 5:5), and is a fruit of the Spirit (Ga 5:22). It is also stimulated by the example of the Lord Jesus Christ, who, more than anyone else, manifested to the world the spirit and nature of true love (Joh 13:34; 15:12; Ga 2:20; Eph 5:25-27; 1 Joh 4:9 f).

2. Objects of Man’s Love:

God must be the first and supreme object of man’s love; He must be loved with all the heart, mind, soul and strength (Mt 22:37 f; Mr 12:29-34). In this last passage the exhortation to supreme love to God is connected with the doctrine of the unity of God (De 6:4 f)—inasmuch as the Divine Being is one and indivisible, so must our love to Him be undivided. Our love to God is shown in the keeping of His commandments (Ex 20:6; 1 Joh 5:3; 2 Joh 1:6). Love is here set forth as more than a mere affection or sentiment; it is something that manifests itself, not only in obedience to known Divine commands, but also in a protecting and defense of them, and a seeking to know more and more of the will of God in order to express love for God in further obedience (compare De 10:12). Those who love God will hate evil and all forms of worldliness, as expressed in the avoidance of the lust of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride of life (Ps 97:10; 1 Joh 2:15-17). Whatever there may be in his surroundings that would draw the soul away from God and righteousness, that the child of God will avoid. Christ, being God, also claims the first place in our affections. He is to be chosen before father or mother, parent, or child, brother or sister, or friend (Mt 10:35-38; Lu 14:26). The word "hate" in these passages does not mean to hate in the sense in which we use the word today. It is used in the sense in which Jacob is said to have "hated" Leah (Ge 29:31), that is, he loved her less than Rachel; "He loved also Rachel more than Leah" (Ge 29:30). To love Christ supremely is the test of true discipleship (Lu 14:26), and is an unfailing mark of the elect (1Pe 1:8). We prove that we are really God’s children by thus loving His Son (Joh 8:42). Absence of such love means, finally, eternal separation (1Co 16:22).

Man must love his fellow-man also. Love for the brotherhood is a natural consequence of the love of the fatherhood; for "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother" (1 Joh 3:10). For a man to say "I love God" and yet hate his fellowman is to brand himself as "a liar" (1 Joh 4:20); "He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, cannot love God whom he hath not seen" (1 Joh 4:20); he that loveth God will love his brother also (1 Joh 4:21). The degree in which we are to love our fellow-man is "as thyself" (Mt 22:39), according to the strict observance of law. Christ set before His followers a much higher example than that, however. According to the teaching of Jesus we are to supersede this standard: "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; even as I have loved you, that ye also love one another" (Joh 13:34). The exhibition of love of this character toward our fellow-man is the badge of true discipleship. It may be called the sum total of our duty toward our fellow-man, for "Love worketh no ill to his neighbor: love therefore is the fulfillment of the law"; "for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law" (Ro 13:8,10). The qualities which should characterize the love which we are to manifest toward our fellow-men are beautifully set forth in 1Co 13. It is patient and without envy; it is not proud or self-elated, neither does it behave discourteously; it does not cherish evil, but keeps good account of the good; it rejoices not at the downfall of an enemy or competitor, but gladly hails his success; it is hopeful, trustful and forbearing—for such there is no law, for they need none; they have fulfilled the law.

Nor should it be overlooked that our Lord commanded His children to love their enemies, those who spoke evil of them, and despitefully used them (Mt 5:43-48). They were not to render evil for evil, but

contrariwise, blessing. The love of the disciple of Christ must manifest itself in supplying the necessities, not of our friends only (1 Joh 3:16-18), but also of our enemies (Ro 12:20 f).

Our love should be "without hypocrisy" (Ro 12:9); there should be no pretense about it; it should not be a thing of mere word or tongue, but a real experience manifesting itself in deed and truth (1 Joh 3:18). True love will find its expression in service to man: "Through love be servants one to another" (Ga 5:13). What more wonderful illustration can be found of ministering love than that set forth by our Lord in the ministry of foot-washing as found in Joh 13? Love bears the infirmities of the weak, does not please itself, but seeks the welfare of others (Ro 15:1-3; Php 2:21; Ga 6:2; 1Co 10:24); it surrenders things which may be innocent in themselves but which nevertheless may become a stumbling-block to others (Ro 14:15,21); it gladly forgives injuries (Eph 4:32), and gives the place of honor to another (Ro 12:10). What, then, is more vital than to possess such love? It is the fulfillment of the royal law (Jas 2:8), and is to be put above everything else (Col 3:14); it is the binder that holds all the other graces of the Christian life in place (Col 3:14); by the possession of such love we know that we have passed from death unto life (1 Joh 3:14), and it is the supreme test of our abiding in God and God in us (1 Joh 4:12,16).

William Evans

LOVE, BROTHERLY

See BROTHERLY LOVE.

LOVE-FEAST

luv'-fest.

See AGAPE.

LOVELY

luv'-li ('ahabh, 'ahebh; prosphiles): "Lovely" occurs only 4 times. In 2Sa 1:23 it is the translation of 'ahebh, "to be loved" ("Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant (the King James Version margin "sweet") in their lives"), where it seems to mean "loving" or "lovable." Two other words are so translated in the Old Testament: machmadch, "desire" a "desirable thing" (So 5:16, "He is altogether lovely," that is, "lovable," "to be desired," literally, "all of him lovableness," or "desirableness"); 'aghabhim "loves," or "charms" (Eze 33:32, "Thou art unto them as a very lovely song," the King James Version margin "a song of loves," the Revised Version margin "a love-song"; in 33:31 the same word is translated "much love," the King James Version margin "They make loves or jests"); in Php 4:8 we have prosphiles, "very lovely," or "lovable," "whatsoever things are lovely."

W. L. Walker

LOVER

luv'-er ('ohebh, 'ahebh): In the Old Testament 'ohebh, from 'ahebh, "to love," is sometimes "lover" in the sense of "friend," in the older English sense of the word (1Ki 5:1, "Hiram was ever a lover of David"; Ps 38:11; 88:18; La 1:2); more frequently it has the meaning of "lover" in the special sense, sometimes in the evil sense of the word (Jer 22:20,22; 30:14; Eze 16:33,36 f, etc.; Ho 2:5,7,10, etc.); 'aghabh, "to love" (Jer 4:30), rea', "companion" (Jer 3:1), and ahabhim, "loves" (Ho 8:9), are also translated "lovers" in this sense.

In the New Testament the simple word "lover" does not occur, but we have various compound words, philotheos "lover of God" (2Ti 3:4); philagathos, "lover of good," and philoxenos, "lover of hospitality" (Tit 1:8); philautos, "lover of self" (2Ti 3:2); philedonos, "lover of pleasure" (2Ti 3:4).

In the Revised Version (British and American) we have, for "a lover of hospitality" (Tit 1:8), "given to"; for "covetous" (Lu 16:14; 2Ti 3:2), "lovers of money"; for "not covetous" (1Ti 3:3), "no lover of money"; for "despisers of them that are good" (2Ti 3:3), "no lovers of good."

W. L. Walker

LOVES

luvz (Ps 45:1, title).

See PSALMS.

LOVINGKINDNESS

luv-ing-kind'-nes (hecedh): "Lovingkindness" in the King James Version always represents this word (30 times), but of hecedh there are many other renderings, e.g. "mercy" (frequently), "kindness" (38), "goodness" (12). The word is derived from chacadh, meaning, perhaps, "to bend or bow oneself," "to incline oneself"; hence, "to be gracious or merciful." the English Revised Version has not many changes, but in the American Standard Revised Version "lovingkindness" is invariably employed when checedh is used of God, and, as a rule, "kindness" when it is used of man, as in Ge 21:23; Jud 1:24 (the King James Version "mercy," the Revised Version (British and American) "deal kindly"); Ru 3:10; 2Ch 32:32; 35:26 (the King James Version "goodness,"'); margin "Hebrew: kindness" the Revised Version (British and American) "good deeds"); Job 6:14, etc. Of the uses of the word as on man's part toward God, the only occurrences are: Jer 2:2, "I remember for thee the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals," etc.; Ho 6:4,6, "Your goodness (the Revised Version margin "or kindness") is as a morning cloud," "I desire goodness (the King James Version "mercy," the Revised Version margin "Kindness"),

and not sacrifice," which last passage may denote kindness as toward man.

When used of God checedh denotes, in general, "the Divine Love condescending to His creatures, more especially to sinners, in unmerited kindness" (Delitzsch). It is frequency associated with forgiveness, and is practically equivalent to "mercy" or "mercifulness" (Ex 20:6), "showing lovingkindness (the English Revised Version "mercy") unto thousands of them that love me"; Ex 34:6 f, "slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness (the English Revised Version "plenteous in mercy")"; (34:7) "keeping lovingkindness (the English Revised Version "mercy") for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin" (compare Nu 14:18); Mic 7:18, "He retaineth not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in lovingkindness" (the English Revised Version "mercy"). This quality in Yahweh was one by which He sought to bind His people to Himself. It is greatly magnified in the Old Testament, highly extolled and gloried in, in many of the psalms (Ps 136 has the constant refrain, "For his lovingkindness endureth forever"). In De 7:12 it is associated with the covenant, and in 2Sa 7:15 with the covenant with David (compare Isa 55:3, etc.). It was something that could always be relied on.

Being such an essential and distinctive quality of God, the prophets taught that it should also characterize His people. It is part of the Divine requirement in Mic 6:8, "to love kindness" (compare Zec 7:9, "Show kindness and compassion every man to his brother"). The want of it in the nation was a cause of Yahweh’s controversy with them, e.g. Ho 4:1, "There is no truth, nor goodness (checedh) (the King James Version and the English Revised Version "mercy"), nor knowledge of God in the land"; Ho 12:6, "Therefore turn thou to thy God: keep kindness (the King James Version and the English Revised Version "mercy") and justice, and wait for thy God continually." Cheyne (Encyclopedia Biblica) regards [~checedh as denoting paternal affection on God’s part, answered by filial and loyal affection and brotherly love on man’s part (philadelphia in the New Testament).

The word "lovingkindness" does not occur in the New Testament, but as its equivalents we have such terms as "mercy" "goodness," "kindness," "brotherly love" (see special articles).

W. L. Walker

LOW COUNTRY

See SHEPHELAH.

LOWLAND

lo’-land (shephelah; compare Arabic sufalat, "the lowest part"): The western part of Palestine, including the maritime plain and the foothills. There has been an attempt to restrict the term to the foothills, at least as far as the more ancient documents are concerned, but there can be little doubt that the maritime plain should be included. the Revised Version (British and American) has "lowland" throughout for shephelah, while the King James Version has "low country" (2Ch 26:10; 28:18), "low plains" (1Ch 27:28; 2Ch 9:27), "plain" (Jer 17:26; Ob 1:19; Zec 7:7), "vale" or "valley" (De 1:7; Jos 9:1; 10:40).

See COUNTRY; SHEPHELAH.

Alfred Ely Day

LOZON

lo’-zon (Lozon): Head of a family of Solomon’s servants (1 Esdras 5:33); called "Darkon" in Ezr 2:56; Ne 7:58.

LUBIM

lu’-bim (lubhim): A people mentioned in the Old Testament (2Ch 12:3; 16:8; Da 11:43; Na 3:9). In all these cases the word is translated in the King James Version "Libyans"; in the Revised Version (British and American) only in Da 11:43. The people so named had their seat in North Africa, West of Egypt (compare Ac 2:10, "the parts of Libya about Cyrene"). See LIBYA. On three different occasions the Libyans invaded Egypt, and at length, in the 10th century BC, succeeded in founding an Egyptian dynasty under SHISHAK (which see).

LUCAS

lu’-kas, loo’-kas. In Phm 1:24 the King James Version, for "Luke" (Revised Version).

LUCIFER

lu’-si-fer, loo’-si-fer: The morning star, an epithet of the planet Venus.

See ASTROLOGY, 11.

LUCIUS (1)

lu’-shi-us, lu’-shus (Loukios, Leukios): A Roman consul who is said (1 Macc 15:16 ff) to have written a letter to Ptolemy Euergetes securing to Simon the high priest and to the Jews the protection of Rome. As the praenomen only of the consul is given, there has been much discussion as to the person intended. The weight of probability has been assigned to Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was one of the consuls in 139-138 BC, the fact of his praenomen being Cneius and not Lucius being explained by an error in transcription and the fragmentary character of the documents. The authority of the Romans not being as yet thoroughly established in Asia, they were naturally anxious to form alliances with the kings of Egypt and with the Jews to keep Syria in check. The imperfections that are generally admitted in the transcription of the Roman letter are not such as in any serious degree to invalidate the authority of the narrative in 1 Maccabees.

J. Hutchison

LUCIUS (2)

(Loukios): This name is mentioned twice:

(1) In the church at Antioch which sent out Barnabas and Saul as its missionaries were several prophets and teachers, among whom was Lucius of Cyrene (Ac 13:1). He was probably one of those "men of Cyprus and Cyrene, who, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Greeks also" (Ac 11:20). It has been suggested that he is the same as Luke, but this is merely conjecture.

(2) "Lucius and Jason and Sosipater, my kinsmen" were among those who joined Paul in saluting the Christians in Rome (Ro 16:21). By "kinsmen" Paul means "Jews" (compare Ro 9:3; 16:11,21). This Lucius may have been the same person as (1), but, as we have no more information about either, we cannot determine this.

S. F. Hunter

LUCRE

lu'-ker, loo'-ker (betsa'>; kerdos): Literally, "gain" (1Sa 8:3; Tit 1:7), hence, in the New Testament always qualified by "filthy" (1Ti 3:8, "not greedy of filthy lucre" aischrokerdes; so Tit 1:7). The adverb is found in 1Pe 5:2 (see also Tit 1:11). In 1Ti 3:3, the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version to "no lover of money" (@aphilarguros).

LUD; LUDIM

lud, lu'-dim, lood'-im (ludh, ludhim, ludhiyum, "Ludites"; Loud, Loudieim; Targum Onk: ludha'e):

1. Two Different Nationalities:

In Ge 10:13 Ludim appears as the firstborn of Mizraim (Egypt), and in 10:22 Lud is the fourth son of Shem. We have therefore to do with two different nationalities bearing the same name, and not always easy to distinguish. 1Ch 1:11,17 simply repeat the statements of Ge 10:13,22. In Isa 66:19 Lud is mentioned with Tarshish and Pul (generally regarded as a mistake for Phut), Tubal, Javan, and the isles. Accepting this emendation, the passage agrees with Jer 46:9, where the Ludim are spoken of with Kush and Phut as the allies of Egypt; and also with Eze 27:10, where Lud is referred to with Persia and Put as soldiers of Tyre. Lud, again, is mentioned with Ethiopia (Gush), Put, all the mingled people, Cab, and the children of the land which is in league (or, margin "the land of the covenant"), which were all to fall by the sword (Eze 30:5).

2. The Semitic Lud:

Coming to the Semitic Lud, it is to be noted that the Assyrians called Lydia Lu(d)du, and that the mythical ancestor of the Lydians, according to Herodotus (i.7), was Lydos, and their first king, Agros, was descended from Ninos and Belos, i.e. Assyria and Babylonia. The apparently Assyrian colony in Cappadocia about 2000 BC, who used the Babylonian script, may be regarded as supporting this statement, and that there were other colonies of the same nationality in the neighborhood is implied by the fact that Assyro-Babylonian was one of the official languages of the Hittite state whose capital was Hattu or Boghaz-keui. On the other hand when Gyges sent an embassy to Assur-bani-apli of Assyria, Lu (d)du is described as a country whose name had never before been heard, and whose language was unknown. As, however, the earlier kings of Assyria certainly warred in that district, this statement has to be taken with caution. Perhaps the name had changed in the interval, owing to an immigration similar to that which brought the Hittites into Asia Minor, and caused change in the language at the same time.

3. Not Recognizable as Semitic Later:

Naturally Lydia was not recognizable as Semitic in classical times. The existence of Lud in the neighborhood of Egypt as well as in Asia Minor finds parallels in the Syrian Mucri of the Assyrian inscriptions by the side of the Mucur which stood for Egypt, and still more in the Cappadocian Cush (Kusu) of certain Assyrian letters relating to horses, by the side of the Cush (Kusu likewise) which stands for Ethiopia.

4. Egyptian Lud Not Recognizable:

Everything points, therefore, to the Semitic Lud and Ludim being Lydia, and the identification may be regarded as satisfactory. It is altogether otherwise with the Egyptian Lud and Ludim, however, about which little can be said at present. The reference to a city which seems to be Putu-yawan in an inscription mentioning the 37th year of Nebuchadrezzar, and apparently referring to an expedition against Amasis, though it may stand for "Grecian Phut," has very little bearing upon the position of the Egyptian Lud, especially as the text in which it occurs is very mutilated. One thing is certain, however: the Hebrews regarded this Lud and Ludim as being Hamitic, and not Semitic.

T. G. Pinches

LUHITH, ASCENT OF

lu’-hith, loo’-hith, ma‘-aleh ha-luchith): A place named in Isa 15:5; Jer 48:5. It is clearly identical with the way, or descent, of Horonaim. Eusebius, Onomasticon places Luhith between Areopolis and Zoar. Some way is intended by which fugitives from the Arabah could reach the uplands of the Moabite plateau. Guthe thinks it may be the road which leads from the district of the ancient Zoar on the eastern shore of the Dead Sea to the uplands through Wady Bene Hammad. Along this track ran also a Roman

road. If Horonaim were the higher of the two places, this might account for the way being called the "descent" of Horonaim as going down from that place, and the "ascent" of Luhith as going up thence. Neither place can as yet be identified with certainty.

W. Ewing

LUKE, THE EVANGELIST

look, luk.

1. Name:

The name Luke (Loukas) is apparently an abbreviation for Loukanos. Old Latin manuscripts frequently have the words CATA LUCANUM as the title of the Third Gospel. (But the form Loukios, is also found in inscriptions synonymous with Loukas; compare Ramsay, The Expositor, December, 1912.)

It was a common fashion in the koine to abbreviate proper names, as it is today, for that matter (compare Amphias from Amphiatos, Antipas from Antipatros, Apollos from Apollonias, Demas from Demetrios, Zenas from Zenodoros, etc.; and see Jannaris, Historical Greek Grammar, section 287).

2. Mentioned Three Times by Name:

Paul alone names Luke (Col 4:14; 2Ti 4:11; Phm 1:24). He does not mention his own name in the Gospel or in the Acts. Compare the silence of the Fourth Gospel concerning the name of the apostle John. There was no particular occasion to mention Luke’s name in the Gospel, except as the author, if he had so wished. The late legend that Luke was one of the Seventy sent out by Jesus (Epiphanius, Haer., ii.51, 11) is pure conjecture, as is the story that Luke was one of the Greeks who came to Philip for an introduction to Jesus (Joh 12:20 f), or the companion of Cleopas in the walk to Emmaus (Lu 24:13). The clear implication of Lu 1:2 is that Luke himself was not an eyewitness of the ministry of Jesus.

3. A Gentile:

In Col 4:14 Luke is distinguished by Paul from those "of the circumcision" (Aristarchus, Mark, Jesus Justus). Epaphras, Luke, Demas form the Gentilegroup. He was believed by the early Christian writers to have come directly from heathendom to Christianity. He may or may not have been a Jewish proselyte. His first appearance with Paul at Troas (compare the "we"-sections, Ac 16:10-12) is in harmony with this idea. The classic introduction to the Gospel (Lu 1:1-4) shows that he was a man of culture (compare Apollos and Paul). He was a man of the schools, and his Greek has a literary flavor only approached in the New Testament by Paul’s writings and by the Epistle to the Hebrews.

4. Home:

His home is very uncertain. The text of D (Codex Bezae) and several Latin authorities have a "we-"passage in Ac 11:27. If this reading, the so-called B text of Blass, is the original, then Luke was at Antioch and may have been present at the great event recorded in Ac 13:1 f. But it is possible that the Western text is an interpolation. At any rate, it is not likely that Luke is the same person as Lucius of Ac 13:1. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 389 f) thinks that Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, iv, 6) does not mean to say that Luke was a native of Antioch, but only that he had Antiochian family connections. Jerome calls him Lucas medicus Antiochensis. He certainly shows an interest in Antioch (compare Ac 11:19-27; 13:1; 14:26; 15:22,23,30,35; 18:22). Antioch, of course, played a great part in the early work of Paul. Other stories make Luke live in Alexandria and Achaia and narrate that he died in Achaia or Bithynia. But we know that he lived in Philippi for a considerable period. He first meets Paul at Troas just before the vision of the Man from Macedonia (Ac 16:10-12), and a conversation with Paul about the work in Macedonia may well have been the human occasion of that vision and call. Luke remains in Philippi when Paul and Silas leave (Ac 16:40, "They .... departed"). He is here when Paul comes back on his 3rd tour bound for Jerusalem (Ac 20:3-5). He shows also a natural pride in the claims of Philippi to the primacy in the province as against Amphipolis and Thessalonica (Ac 16:12, "the first of the district"). On the whole, then, we may consider Philippi as the home of Luke, though he was probably a man who had traveled a great deal, and may have been with Paul in Galatia before coming to Troas. He may have ministered to Paul in his sickness there (Ga 4:14). His later years were spent chiefly with Paul away from Philippi (compare Ac 20:3-28,31, on the way to Jerusalem, at Caesarea, the voyage to Rome and in Rome).

5. Physician:

Paul (Col 4:14) expressly calls him "the beloved physician." He was Paul’s medical adviser, and doubtless prolonged his life and rescued him from many a serious illness. He was a medical missionary, and probably kept up his general practice of medicine in connection with his work in Rome (compare Zahn, Intro, III, 1). He probably practiced medicine in Malta (Ac 28:9 f). He naturally shows his fondness for medical terms in his books (compare Hobart, The Medical Language of Luke; Harnack, New Testament Studies: Luke the Physician, 175-98). Harnack adds some examples to those given by Hobart, who has overdone the matter in reality.

See further, ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

6. Brother of Titus:

It is possible, even probable (see Souter’s article in DCG), that in 2Co 8:18 "the brother" is equivalent to "the brother" of Titus just mentioned, that is, "his brother." If so, we should know that Paul came into contact with Luke at Philippi on his way to Corinth during his 2nd tour (compare also 2Co 12:18). It would thus be explained why in Ac the name of Titus does not occur, since he is the brother of Luke the author of the book.

7. Connection with Paul:

If the reading of Codex Bezae (D) in Ac 11:27 f is correct, Luke met Paul at Antioch before the 1st missionary tour. Otherwise it may not have been till Troas on the 2nd tour. But he is the more or less constant companion of Paul from Philippi on the return to Jerusalem on the 3rd tour till the 2 years in Rome at the close of the Acts. He was apparently not with Paul when Php 2:20 was written, though, as we have seen, he was with Paul in Rome when he wrote Colossians and Philemon. He was Paul's sole companion for a while during the 2nd Roman imprisonment (2Ti 4:11). His devotion to Paul in this time of peril is beautiful.

8. Author of Both Gospel and Acts:

For the proof of the Lukan authorship of the Ac see ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. For the discussion of the Lukan authorship of the Gospel with his name, see LUKE, THE GOSPEL OF. Our interest in him is largely due to this fact and to his relations with Paul. The Christian world owes him a great debt for his literary productions in the interest of the gospel.

9. Legends:

One legend regarding Luke is that he was a painter. Plummer (Commentary on Luke, xxi f) thinks that the legend is older than is sometimes supposed and that it has a strong element of truth. It is true that he has drawn vivid scenes with his pen. The early artists were especially fond of painting scenes from the Gospel of Luke. The allegorical figure of the ox or calf in Eze 1 and Re 4 has been applied to Luke's Gospel.

LITERATURE.

Bible dicts., comms., lives of Paul, instroductions. See also Harnack, "Lukas, der Arzt, der Verfasser" (1906); New Testament Studies: Luke the Physician (1907); Ramsay, Luke the Physician (1908); Selwyn, Luke the Prophet (1901); Hobart, The Medical Language of Luke (1882); Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A Study in the Credibility of Luke (1898); Maclachlan, John, Evangelist and Historian (1912).

A. T. Robertson

LUKE, THE GOSPEL OF

1. Text

2. Canonicity

3. Authorship

4. Sources

5. Credibility

6. Characteristics

7. Date

8. Analysis

LITERATURE

1. Text:

The five primary uncials (Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi, Bezae) are the chief witnesses for the text of Luke's Gospel. This group is reinforced by L, Codex Delta and the Freer (Detroit) MS; R, T, X and Xi are also valuable in fragments. The other uncials are of secondary value. The Latin, Egyptian and Syriac versions are also of great importance. There are 4 Latin versions (African, European, Italian, Vulgate), 3 Egyptian (Memphitic, Sahidic, Bohairic), 5 Syriac (Curetonian, Sinaitic, Peshitto, Harclean, Palestinian or Jerusalem). Many of the cursive (minuscule) manuscripts are also of considerable worth, as are some of the quotations from the Fathers.

Blass, Philology of the Gospels (1898), has advanced theory of two recensions of this Gospel (a longer and a shorter), such as he holds to be true of Acts. In the case of Acts, theory has won some acceptance (see ACTS OF THE APOSTLES), but that is not true of the Gospel to any extent. The Western text of the Gospel is the shorter text, while in Ac it is the longer text. In both instances Blass holds that the shorter text was issued after the longer and original text. His idea is that Luke himself revised and issued the shorter text. In itself this is, of course, possible, since the books are both addressed to an individual, Theophilus. The other edition may have been meant for others. Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek explain the omission in the Western text of the Gospel as "Western non-interpolations," and often hold them to be the true text. As samples one may note Lu 10:41; 12:19; 24:36,40,42, where the Western text is the shorter text. This is not always true, however, for in 6:2 ff Codex Bezae (D) has the famous passage about the man working on the Sabbath, which the other documents do not give. In Lu 3:22, D has the reading of Ps 2:7 (" Thou art my Son; this day I have begotten thee") for the usual text. Zahn (Introduction, III, 38) accepts this as the true text. There is no doubt of the interest and value of the Western readings in Luke, but it cannot be said that Blass has carried his point here. The peculiar mutilation of the Gospel by Marcion has an interest of its own.

2. Canonicity:

Plummer (Commentary on Luke, lxxx) says: "In the second half of the 2nd century this Gospel is recognized as authentic and authoritative; and it is impossible to show that it had not been thus

recognized at a very much earlier date." On the other hand, Schmiedel (Encyclopedia Biblica) says: "This ‘tradition,’ however, cannot be traced farther back than toward the end of the 2nd century (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and the Muratorian Fragment); there is no sound basis for the contention of Zahn (II, 175) that the existence of the tradition can also be found as early as in Marcion, because that writer, from his aversion to the Third Gospel (which nevertheless was the only one he admitted into his collection—with alterations it is true) omitted the expression of honor applied to Luke in Col 4:14." Here the two views are well stated. Schmiedel shows dogmatic bias and prejudice against Luke. Julicher, however, frankly admits (Intro, 330) that "the ancients were universally agreed that the writer was that Luke, disciple of Paul, who is mentioned in Phm 1:24; 2Ti 4:11, and called ‘the physician’ in Col 4:14; presumably a native of Antioch." This statement bears more directly on the question of authorship than of canonicity, but it is a good retort to the rather cavalier tone of Schmiedel, who is reluctant to admit the facts. The recognition of the Third Gospel in the Muratorian Canon (170 AD) is a fact of much significance. It was used in Tatian’s Diatessaron (circa 170 AD) as one of the four recognized Gospels (compare Hemphill, Diatessaron of Tatian, 3 ff). The fact that Marcion (140 AD) mutilated this Gospel to suit his theology and thus used it is even more significant (compare Sanday, Gospels in the 2nd Century, Appendix). Other heretics like the Valentinians (compare Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 5-7) made use of it, and Heracleon (compare Clement of Alexandria, Strom., iv.9) wrote a commentary on it. Irenaeus (end of the 2nd century) makes frequent quotations from this Gospel. He argues that there could be only "four" Gospels because of the four points of the compass—an absurd argument, to be sure, but a powerful testimony to the general acceptance of this Gospel along with the other three. It is needless to appeal to the presence of the Third Gospel in the Curetonian Syriac, the Sinaitic Syriac, the African Latin—versions that date to the 2nd century, not to mention the probability of the early date of the Memphitic (Coptic) versions. Examples of the early use of this Gospel occur in various writings of the 2nd century, as in Justin Martyr (150 AD), the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (circa 140 AD), Celsus (circa AD 160), the Gospel of Peter (2nd century), the Epistle of the Church of Lyons and Vienne (177 AD), probably also the Didache (2nd century), Clement of Alexandria (190-202 AD), Tertullian (190-220 AD). It is doubtful about Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Polycarp; and the Epistle of Barnabas seems to make no use of the Third Gospel. But Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Polycarp quote Acts. But surely the general use and acceptance of the Third Gospel in the early 2nd century is beyond reasonable doubt. It is not easy to decide when the actual use began, because we have so little data from the 1st century (compare Plummer, Commentary, lxxiii).

The fact that the author was not an apostle affected the order of the book in some lists. Most manuscripts and versions have the common order of today, but the Western order (Matthew, John, Luke, Mark) is given by D, many Old Latin manuscripts, the Gothic VS, the Apostolical Constitutions. The object was probably to place the books by apostles together and first. The Old Latin has Luke second (John, Luke, Mark, Matthew), while the Curetonian Syriac has Luke last of the four. The cursives 90 and 399 also have Luke second.

3. Authorship:

The first writers who definitely name Luke as the author of the Third Gospel belong to the end of the 2nd century. They are the Canon of Muratori (possibly by Hippolytus), Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of

Alexandria. We have already seen that Julicher (Introduction, 330) admits that the ancients Universally agreed that Luke wrote the Third Gospel. In the early part of the 2nd century the writers did not, as a rule, give the names of the authors of the Gospels quoted by them. It is not fair, therefore, to use their silence on this point as proof either of their ignorance of the author or of denial of Luke's authorship. Julicher for instance, says (Introduction, 330): "There is no tradition worthy of the name concerning Luke, whom Papias did not mention, or at any rate did not know." But we owe to Eusebius all the fragments that we have preserved from the writings of Papias. Our ignorance of Papias can hardly be charged up to him. Plummer (Commentary, xii) says that nothing in Biblical criticism is more certain than the fact that Luke wrote the Third Gospel. On the other hand, Julicher (Introduction, 331) is not willing to let it go as easily as that. He demands appeal to Acts, and there (ibid., 447) he denies the Lukan authorship save as to the "we" sections. J. Weiss (Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments; das Lukas Evang., 1906, 378) admits that but for Ac no sufficient reason would exist for denying the authorship of the Third Gospel to Luke, the disciple of Paul. A Pauline point of view in this Gospel is admitted generally. Many modern critics take it for granted that the Lukan authorship of Ac is disproved, and hence, that of the Gospel likewise falls by the way. So argue Baur, Clemen, De Wette, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Julicher, Pfleiderer, Schurer, Spitta, von Soden, J. Weiss, Weizsacker, Zeller. Men like Blass, Credner, Harnack, Hawkins, Hobart, Klostermann, Plummer, Ramsay, Renan, Vogel, Zahn, stand by the tradition of Lukan authorship, but Harnack is almost irritated (Luke the Physician, 1907, 6), since "the indefensibility of the tradition is regarded as being so clearly established that nowadays it is thought scarcely worth while to reprove this indefensibility, or even to notice the arguments of conservative opponents." Harnack proceeds to make a plea for a hearing. Jacobus (Standard Bible Dictionary) admits that "Ac tells us nothing more of the author than does the Gospel." That is true so far as express mention is concerned, but not so far as natural implication goes. It is true that the place to begin the discussion of the Lukan authorship of the Gospel is Acts. For detailed discussion of the proof that Luke wrote Acts, see ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. It is there shown that the line of argument which has convinced Harnack, the leader of the liberal criticism of Germany, ought to convince any openminded critic. It means a good deal when Harnack (Luke the Physician, 14) says: "I subscribe to the words of Zahn (Einleitung, II, 427): 'Hobart has proved for everyone who can at all appreciate proof that the author of the Lukan work was a man practiced in the scientific language of Greek medicine—in short, a Greek physician.' " It is here assumed that the line of argument pursued in the article on ACTS OF THE APOSTLES is conclusive. If so, little remains to be done in the way of special proof for the Gospel. The author of Ac specifically refers (Ac 1:1) to a former treatise which was likewise addressed to Theophilus. This we find to be the case with the Gospel passing under the name of Luke (1:4). The critics who admit the Lukan authorship of Ac and deny the Lukan authorship of the Gospel are hardly worth considering.

It is, therefore, largely a work of supererogation to give at length the proof from internal grounds that Luke wrote the Gospel, after being convinced about Acts. Still it may be worth while to sketch in outline the line of argument, even though it is very simple. Plummer (Comm., x-xvii) argues three propositions:"

(1) The author of the Third Gospel is the author of the Acts.

(2) The author of Ac was a companion of Paul.

(3) This companion was Luke."

Harnack (The Ac of the Apostles, 1909) has argued with great minuteness and skill theory that the same linguistic peculiarities occur in all portions of Acts, including the "we-"sections. He accepts the facts set forth by Hawkins (Horae Synopticae) and adds others. He agrees, therefore, that the author of Ac was a companion of Paul. Harnack is convinced by the exhaustive labors of Hobart (Medical Language of Luke) that this author was a physician, as we know Luke to have been (Col 4:14). He shows this to be true of the author of Ac by the use of "us" in Ac 28:10, showing that the author of Ac received honors along with Paul, probably because he practiced medicine and treated many (compare Barnack, Luke the Physician, 15 f). These medical terms occur in the Gospel of Luke also, and the same general linguistic style is found in both the Gospel and Acts. Hawkins has made a careful study of likenesses and variations in style in these two books (compare Horae Synopticae, 15-25, 174-89). The argument is as conclusive as such a line of proof can be expected to be. For further discussion see Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 1908, 1-68; Zahn, Introduction, III, 160 ff. There are no phenomena in the Gospel hostile to this position save the Semitic character of Luke 1 and 2 (barring the classical introduction 1:1-4). Luke, though a Gentile, has in these chapters the most Semitic narrative in the New Testament. But the explanation is obvious. He is here using Semitic material (either oral or written), and has with true artistic skill preserved the tone of the original. To a certain extent the same thing is true of the opening chapters of Acts.

4. Sources:

The synoptic problem (see GOSPELS, THE SYNOPTIC) remains the most difficult one in the realm of New Testament criticism. But the Gospel of Luke yields on the whole more satisfactory results than is yet true of Matthew.

(1) Unity.

If the Lukan authorship of the book is accepted, there remains no serious doubt concerning the unity and integrity of the Gospel. The abridgment of Luke’s Gospel used by Marcion does not discredit those portions of the Gospel omitted by him. They are omitted for doctrinal reasons (compare Sanday, Gospels in the 2nd Century, chapter viii). His readings are of interest from the viewpoint of textual criticism, as are the quotations of other early writers, but his edition does not seriously challenge the value of Luke’s work.

(2) Luke’s Method.

Luke has announced his methods of work in a most classic introduction (1:1-4). Here we catch a glimpse of the author’s personality. That is not possible in Mark nor in Matthew, and only indirectly in passing shadows in the Fourth Gospel. But here the author frankly takes the reader into his confidence and

discloses his standpoint and qualifications for the great task. He writes as a contemporary about the recent past, always the most difficult history to interpret and often the most interesting. He speaks of "those matters which have been fulfilled among us," in our time. He does not himself claim to have been an eyewitness of "those matters." As we know already, Luke was a Gentile and apparently never saw Jesus in the flesh. He occupies thus a position outside of the great events which he is to record. He does not disguise his intense interest in the narrative, but he claims the historical spirit. He wishes to assure Theophilus of "the certainty concerning the things wherein thou wast instructed." He claims to have investigated "the course of all things accurately from the first," just as the true historian would. He thus implies that some of the attempts made had been fragmentary at any rate, and to that extent inaccurate. He has also produced an "orderly" narrative by which Theophilus may gain a just conception of the historical progress of the events connected with the life of Jesus of Nazareth. The fact that "many have taken in hand to draw up a narrative concerning those matters" does not deter Luke from his task. The rather he is stirred thereby ("It seemed good to me also") to give his interpretation of the life and work of Jesus as the result of his researches. He stands not farther away than one generation from the death of Jesus. He has the keen interest natural to a cultured follower of Jesus in the origin of what had become a great world-movement. He is able to get at the facts because he has had intercourse with eyewitnesses of Jesus and His work, "even as they delivered them unto us, who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and ministers of the word." Luke had abundant opportunity during the two years at Caesarea with Paul (Ac 24-26) to make careful and extended investigations. Many of the personal followers of Jesus were still living (1Co 15:6). It was a golden opportunity for Luke’s purpose. He had also the written narratives which others ("many") had already drawn up. We are, then, to expect in Luke’s Gospel a book closely akin to Ac in style and plan, with the historian’s love of accuracy and order, with the author’s own contribution in the assimilation and use of this oral and written material. One would not expect in such a writer slavish copying, but intelligent blending of the material into an artistic whole.

(3) The Aramaic Infancy Narrative.

The very first section in this Gospel (Lu 1:5-2:52) illustrates Luke’s fidelity in the use of his material. Wellhausen drops these two chapters from his edition of Luke’s Gospel as not worthy of consideration. That is conjectural criticism run mad and is not to be justified by the example of Marcion, who begins with chapter 4. Wright (Gospel according to Luke in Greek, 1900, viii f; under the word "Luke’s Gospel," DCG) holds that this section was the last to be added to the Gospel though he holds that it comes from Luke. It may be said in passing that Wright is a stout advocate for the oral source for all of Luke’s Gospel. He still holds out against the "two-document" or any document theory. However, he claims rightly that Luke’s information for these two chapters was private. This material did not form part of the current oral Gospel. In Matthew the narrative of the birth of Jesus is given from the standpoint of Joseph, and Mary is kept in the background, according to Eastern feeling (Wright). But in Lu the story is told from Mary’s point of view. Luke may, indeed, have seen Mary herself in the years 57-59 AD (or 58-60). He could easily have seen some of Mary’s intimate friends who knew the real facts in the case. The facts were expressly said to have been kept in Mary’s heart. She would tell only to sympathetic ears (compare Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 74 f). It is not possible to discredit Luke’s narrative of the Virgin Birth on a priori grounds (compare Orr, The Virgin Birth of Christ, 1907; Sweet, Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 1906). The curious Semitic flavor of this narrative argues strongly for its

genuineness, since Luke was a Greek. We do not know whether Luke knew Aramaic or not. That was possible, since he spent these 2 years in Palestine. We do not know whether this information came to him in written form (note especially the hymns of Mary and of Zacharias) or in oral tradition. But it is hardly possible to credit a Greek with the invention of these birth-narratives and poems which ring so true to the soil and the Hebrew life. Immediately after Luke's statement about historical research comes the narrative of the birth of Jesus. It is the first illustration of his work on his sources.

(4) Luke's Relation to Mark's Gospel.

Luke knew Mark in Rome (Col 4:10,14; Phm 1:24). He may have met him in Palestine also. Had he seen Mark's Gospel when he wrote his own? Was it one of the "many" narratives that came under Luke's eye? Wright (compare DCG) denies that Luke had our Mark. He admits that he may have had an Urmarkus or proto-Mark which he heard in oral form, but not the present (written) Gospel of Mark. He thinks that this can best be accounted for by the fact that out of 223 sections in Mark there are 54 not in Luke. But most modern critics have come to the conclusion that both Matthew and Luke had Mark before them as well as other sources. Matthew, if he used Mark, in the early chapters, followed a topical arrangement of his material, combining Mark with the other source or sources. But Luke has followed the order of Mark very closely in this part and indeed throughout. Luke has a special problem in 9:51-19:27, but the broad general outline follows that of Mark. But it cannot be said that Luke made a slavish use of Mark, if he had this Gospel before him. He gives his own touch to each incident and selects what best suits his purpose. It is not possible for us to tell always that motive, but it is idle to suppose that Luke blindly recorded every incident found in every document or every story that came to his ears. He implies in his introduction that he has made a selection out of the great mass of material and has woven it into a coherent and progressive narrative. We may admit with Harnack (New Testament Studies: Sayings of Jesus, xiii) that the Markan problem "has been treated with scientific thoroughness" and that Luke had Mark as one of his sources. The parallel between Luke and Mark in the narrative portion is easily seen in any Harmony of the Gospels, like Broadus or Stevens and Burton.

(5) Q (Quelle) or the Logia.

It is a matter of more uncertainty when we come to the mass of material common to Matthew and Luke, but absent from Mark. This is usually found in the discourses of Jesus. The more generally accepted theory today is that both Matthew and Luke made use of Mark and also this collection of Logia called Q for short (Ger. Quelle, "source"). But, while this theory may be adopted as a working hypothesis, it cannot be claimed that it is an established fact. Zahn (compare Introduction) stoutly stands up for the real authorship of the First Gospel of Matthew. Arthur Carr ("Further Notes on the Synoptic Problem," The Expositor, January, 1911, 543-553) argues strongly for the early date and Matthean authorship of the First Gospel. He says on the whole subject: "The synoptic problem which has of late engaged the speculation of some of our keenest and most laborious students is still unsolved." He even doubts the priority of Mark's Gospel. Wellhausen (Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 73-89) advocates the priority of Mark to Q. But Harnack balances the problem of "Q and Mark" (Sayings of Jesus, 193-233) and decides in favor of Q. In any case, it is to be noted that the result of critical research into the value of Q is to put it quite on a paragraph with Mark. Harnack is quite impressed with the originality and vivid

reality of the matter in Q. The material present in Q cannot be gauged so accurately as that in Mark, since we have the Gospel of Mark in our hands. Where both Matthew and Luke give material not found in Mark, it is concluded that this is drawn from Q. But it cannot be shown that Matthew may not have used Q at some points and Luke at still others independently. Besides Q may have contained material not preserved either in Matthew or Luke. A careful and detailed comparison of the material common to both Matthew and Luke and absent from Mark may be found in Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 10713; Harnack, Sayings of Jesus, 127-82; Wellhausen, Einleitung, 66; Robertson, "Matthew" in Bible for Home and School, 14-19. But, if it is true that Luke made use of Q as of Mark, he was no mere copyist. No solution of the synoptic problem can ever be obtained on the idea that the Gospels are mere reproductions of previous documents. There was freedom in the use of all the material, both oral and written, and the writer gave his own interpretation to the result. It was often a restatement in the author's own language, not formal quotation. Wright (DCG) calls this editorial element "editorial notes"; that is, of course, often true when the author makes comments on the matters presented, but "ancient authors took immense pains to reduce the rude chronicles which they used, into literary form" (same place) . The point of all this is that a great deal of criticism of the Gospels is attempting the impossible, for many of the variations cannot possibly be traced to any "source." Wright (same place) puts it tersely again: "And if in John's Gospel it is more and more recognized that the mind of the evangelist cast the utterances of our Lord into the peculiar form which they there hold, the same process of redaction may be observed in Luke, who comes nearest of the synoptists to the methods of John." As a matter of fact, this is as it should be expected. The frank recognition of this point of view marks progress in synoptic criticism.

(6) Other Sources.

There is a large block of material in Lu 9:51-18:14 which is given by him alone. There are various sayings like some reported by Matthew (or Mark) in other connections. Some of the incidents are similar to some given elsewhere by Matthew and Mark. There are various theories concerning this position of Luke. Some critics hold that Luke has here put a mass of material which he had left over, so to speak, and which he did not know where to locate, without any notion of order. Against this theory is the express statement of Luke that he wrote an orderly narrative (1:3 f). One is disposed to credit Luke's own interpretation unless the facts oppose it. It is common for traveling preachers, as was Jesus, to have similar experiences in different parts of the country and to repeat their favorite sayings. So teachers repeat many of their sayings each year to different classes. Indeed, it is just in this section of Luke that the best parts of his Gospel are found (the parables of the Good Samaritan, the Prodigal Son, the Pharisee and the Publican, etc.). "The more we consider this collection, the more we are entranced with it. It is the very cream of the Gospel, and yet (strange to say) it is peculiar to Luke" Wright DCG) Wright calls this "a Pauline collection, not because Paul is responsible for the material, but because the chapters breathe cosmopolitan spirit of Paul. That is true, but Jesus loved the whole world. This side of the teaching of Jesus may have appealed to Luke powerfully because of its reflection in Paul. Matthew's Gospel was more narrowly Jewish in its outlook, and Mark's had fewer of the sayings of Christ. But it is to be noted that this special material in Luke extends more or less all through the Gospel. Burton (Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem, 49) calls this special material in Lu 9:51-18:14 "the Perean document." We do not know, of course, anything of the actual source of this material. Whether Luke has here followed one or more documents, he has, as elsewhere,

given his own stamp to the whole, while preserving in a marvelous way the spirit of Jesus. (For the possible parallel between this section of Luke and John see Robertson's "Notes" to Broadus, Harmony of the Gospels, 249-52.) For the earlier material in Luke not found elsewhere (3:7-15,17,18; 4:2b-13 (14,15), 16-30; 5:1-11; 6:21-49; 7:1-8:3) Burton suggests "the Galilean document" as the source. Wright, on the other hand, proposes "anonymous fragments" as the source of Luke's material not in the infancy narrative, nor in Mark, nor in Q, nor in the "Pauline" or Perean document. At any rate, it is certain that Luke's own words of explanation should warn us against drawing too narrow a line around the "sources" used by him. His "many" may well have included a dozen sources, or even more. But it may be said, in a word, that all that criticism has been able to learn on the subject has confirmed the statement of Luke himself concerning his method of research and his use of the material.

5. Credibility:

More fault has been found with Luke as a historian in Ac than in the Gospel. Harnack (Ac of the Apostles) is not disposed to give Luke full credit as a reliable historian. But Ramsay (Luke the Physician, 5) champions the reliability of Luke (compare also Paul the Traveler; The Church in the Roman Empire) against the skepticism of Harnack, which is growing less, since in the Theol. Literaturzeitung (July 7, 1906, S. 4) he speaks well of Luke's ability to secure correct information. So in Luke the Physician (121-45) Harnack urges that the possible "instances of incredibility have been much exaggerated by critics." He adds about Ac 5:36: "It is also possible that there is a mistake in Jos" (compare Chase, Credibility of the Book of the Ac of the Apostles; see also ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

But the Gospel is not free from attack. The chief matter in the Gospel of Lu which is challenged on historical grounds, apart from the birth-narratives, which some critics treat as legendary, is the census in Lu 2:1 ff. Critics, who in general have accepted Luke's veracity, have sometimes admitted that here he fell into error and confused the census under Quirinius in 6-7 AD when Quirinius came, after the banishment of Archelaus, to take a census and to collect taxes, much to the indignation of the Jews (compare Ac 5:37; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, i). It was not known that Quirinius had been governor of Syria before this time, nor was there any other knowledge of a census under Augustus. The case against Luke seemed strong. But Ramsay (Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 227 ff) shows that the inscription at Tibur, as agreed by Mommsen and like authorities, shows that Quirinius "twice governed Syria as legatus of the divine Augustus." He was consul in 12 BC, so that the first mission was after that date. Ramsay shows also from the papyri that the 14-year cycle was used for the Roman census (many census papers are known from 20 AD on). He argues that the first one was instituted by Augustus in 8 BC. Herod, as a vassal king, would naturally be allowed to conduct it in the Jewish fashion, not the Roman, and it was probably delayed several years in the provinces. Thus once more Luke is vindicated in a remarkable way (see CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, sec. I, 1, (2)).

The Ac of the Apostles has come out of the critical ordeal in a wonderful manner, so that Luke's credit as a historical writer is now very high among those qualified to know the facts. He has been tested and found correct on so many points that the presumption is in his favor where he cannot as yet be verified. Moffatt (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 265) finds Luke "more graphic than

historical."

6. Characteristics:

He was the most versatile of the Gospel writers. He was a Greek, a Christian, a physician, a man of travel, a man of world-outlook, sympathetic, cultured, poetic, spiritual, artistic, high-minded. His Prologue is the most classic piece of Greek in the New Testament, but the rest of chapter 1 and all of chapter 2 are the most Semitic in tone. The breadth of his literary equipment is thereby shown. He not only uses many medical terms common to technical circles, but he has the physician's interest in the sick and afflicted, as shown in the large number of miracles of healing narrated. His interest in the poor is not due to Ebionitic prejudice against the rich, but to human compassion for the distressed. His emphasis on the human side of the work of Jesus is not due to Ebionitic denial of the Divinity of Jesus, but to his keen appreciation of the richness of the human life of the Son of God. His rich and varied vocabulary reveals a man who read and mingled with the best life of his time. He wrote his books in the vernacular, but the elevated vernacular of an educated man touched with a distinct literary flavor. His poetic temperament is shown in the preservation of the beautiful hymns of the nativity and in the wonderful parables of Jesus in chapters 10, 15-18. They are reported with rare grace and skill. Luke is fond of showing Christ's sympathy with women and children, and he has more to say about prayer than the authors of the other Gospels. His interest in individuals is shown by the dedication of both his books to Theophilus. His cosmopolitan sympathies are natural in view of his training and inheritance, but part of it is doubtless due to his association with the apostle Paul. He comes to the interpretation of Jesus from a world-standpoint and does not have to overcome the Pharisaic limitations incident to one reared in Palestine. It is a matter of rejoicing that we have this book, called by Renan the most beautiful book in the world, as a cultured Greek's interpretation of the origin of Christianity. He thus stands outside of the pale of Judaism and can see more clearly the world-relations and world-destiny of the new movement. With Luke, Jesus is distinctly the world's Saviour. The accent on sin is human sin, not specifically Jewish sin. John in his Gospel came in his old age to look back upon the events in Judea from a non-Jewish standpoint. But he rose to the essentially spiritual and eternal apprehension of Christ, rather than extended his vision, as Luke did, to the cosmopolitan mission and message of Jesus, though this did not escape John. The Gospel of Luke thus has points of affinity with Paul, John and the author of Hebrews in style and general standpoint. But while Luke's own style is manifest throughout, it is not obtrusive. He hides himself behind the wonderful portrait of Jesus which he has here drawn in undying colors.

7. Date:

The extreme position of Baur and Zeller may be dismissed at once. There is no reason for dating the Gospel of Luke in the 2nd century on the ground that he used Marcion's Gospel, since it is now admitted all round that Marcion made use of Luke. The supposed use of Josephus by Luke (see ACTS OF THE APOSTLES for discussion and refutation) leads a goodly number of radical scholars (Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Holtzmann, Julicher, Krenkel, Weizsacker, Wernle) to date the book at the end of the 1st century. This is still extreme, as Harnack had already shown in his Chronologie der altchristl. Litt., I, 1897, 246-50. Any use of Josephus by Luke is highly improbable (see Plummer on Lk, xxix). The Gospel was certainly written before Ac (Ac 1:1) and while Paul was alive, if 1Ti 5:18 be taken as a

quotation from Lu 10:7, which is by no means certain, however. But it is true that the most natural way to interpret the sudden close of Acts, after 2 years in Rome (Ac 28:31), is the fact that Luke finished the book at that time (Maclean, 1 volume HDB). Moffatt (Historical New Testament, 273) calls this early date "reactionary" and "extravagant." But it is supported by Alford, Blass, Ebrard, Farrar, Gloag, Godet, Grau, Guericke, Hahn, Headlam, Hitzig, Hofmann, Hug, Keil, Lange, Lumby, Marshall, Nosgen, Oosterzee, Resch, Riehm, Schaff, Schanz, Thiersch, Tholuck, Wieseler, and Harnack himself is now ready to join this goodly company. He warns critics against too hasty a closing of the chronological question (Ac of the Apostles, 291), and admits that Ac was written "perhaps so early as the beginning of the 7th decade of the 1st century" (ibid., 297), "the Ac (and therefore also the Gospel)." In the Date of the Ac and the Synoptic Gospels (1911, 124) Harnack says: "It seems now to be established beyond question that both books of this great historical order were written while Paul was still alive." There is an intermediate date about 80 AD, assigned by Adeney, Bartlett, Plummer, Sanday, Weiss, Wright, on the ground that the investigations mentioned in Lu 1:1-4 describe the use of narratives which could have been written only after a long period of reflection. But that is not a valid objection. There is no sound critical reason why the Gospel of Mark, Q, the infancy narratives, and all the other sources alluded to by this preface could not have been in circulation in Palestine by 55 AD. Indeed, Allen writes in The Expository Times (July, 1910): "I see no reason why such an original (Mark’s Gospel in Aramaic) should not have appeared before the year 50 AD." The other objection to the early date comes out of Lu 21:20, "Jerus compassed with armies" as compared with "the abomination of desolation" in Mr 13:14. The change is so specific that it is held by some critics to be due to the fact that Luke is writing after the destruction of Jerusalem. But it is just as likely (Maclean) that Luke has here interpreted the Hebraism of Mark for his Gentilereaders. Besides, as Plummer (p. xxxi) shows, Luke in 21:5-36 does not record the fact that Jerusalem was destroyed, nor does he change Christ’s "flee to the mountains" to "Pella in North Peraea," whither the Christians actually fled. Besides, the fact that Ac shows no acquaintance with Paul’s Epistles is best explained on the assumption of the early date. The question is thus practically settled in favor of the early date. The place of the writing is not known. The early date naturally falls in with Caesarea (Blass, Michaelis, Thiersch), but there is little to guide one.

8. Analysis:

(1) Prologue, Luke 1:1-4.

(2) Infancy and childhood of John and Jesus, Luke 1:5-2:52.

(3) Beginning of Christ’s Ministry, Luke 3:1-4:13.

(4) Galilean Campaign, Luke 4:14-9:6.

(5) Retirement from Galilee, Luke 9:7-50.

(6) Later Judean and Perean Ministry, Luke 9:51-19:28.

(7) Close of the Public Ministry in Jerusalem, Luke 19:29-21:37.

(8) The Dreadful End, Luke 21-23.

(9) Resurrection of Christ, Luke 24.

LITERATURE.

See extended list of books at close of article on ACTS OF THE APOSTLES; the extensive list of Commentaries Plummer's Commentary on Luke can also be consulted. After Plummer the best commentaries on Luke's Gospel are Bruce, Expositor's Greek Test.; Weiss' Meyer Krit.-exeget. Komm.; Godet; Holtzmann, Hand-Commentary Of the many Introduction to the New Testament, Zahn's is the ablest and most exhaustive (conservative) and Julicher's is the fairest of the radical school. The best of the briefer ones is Gregory's Canon and Text (1907). Special treatises deserving mention here are Blass, Philology of the Gospels (1898); Ev. secundum Lukam (1897); Wellhausen. Das Ev. Lukae (1904); Sense, Origin of the Third Gospel (1901); Friedrich, Das Lukasevangelium und die Apostelgeschichte, Werke desselben Verfassers (1890); Harnack, Luke the Physician (1907), and Sayings of Jesus (1908); The Date of the Ac and the Synoptic Gospels (1911); Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (2nd edition, 1909); Hervey. Authenticity of Luke (1892); Hobart, Medical Language of Luke (1882); Litzinger, Die Entstehung des Lukasevangelium und der Apostelgeschichte (1883); Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? (1898) and Luke the Physician (1908); Resch, Das Kindheit-Evangelium nach Lukas und Matthaus; Selwyn, Luke the Prophet (1901); Vogel, Zur Characteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil (1897); Weiss, Quellen des Lukasevangelium (1907); Wright, Synopsis of the Gospels and his Gospel according to Luke in Greek (1900).

A. T. Robertson

LUNATIC(K)

lu'-na-tik:

I. Epilepsy.

1. Incorrect Translation:

The English word "lunatic," which in popular speech signifies a sufferer from any mental derangement, whether periodic or chronic, other than congenital idiocy, appears in the King James Version as a translation of the Greek word seleniazomai, in the two passages where it occurs. In the Revised Version (British and American) the word has very properly been displaced by the strictly accurate term "epileptic." This change is justified not only by the extra-Biblical usage (see Liddell and Scott, under the word), but clearly enough by Mt 17:15 (compare 4:24), where epilepsy is circumstantially described.

2. Original Meaning:

The original meaning of the term seleniazomai, "moon-struck," is connected with the popular belief, widespread and of strange persistency, that the moon, in certain of its phases, is injurious to human beings, especially in the case of diseases of a periodic or remittent character. There are no data by which to determine whether, in the New Testament times, this particular word represented a living and active belief or had passed into the state of usage in which the original metaphor disappears, and the word simply indicates the fact signified without reference to the idea embodied in the etymology. We still use the word "lunatic" to signify a person mentally diseased, although we have long since ceased to believe in the moon's influence in such cases.

II. Madness.

The Bible designates "madness," or alienation of mind, by various terms, all of which seem to be onomatopoetic. These various words seem to be derived from the strange and fierce or mournful cries uttered by the unfortunate victims of this dread malady. In De 28:34 the word "maddened" is meshugga', participle of shagha' (compare also 1Sa 21:15). With this corresponds the word mainomai, in the New Testament. In 1Sa 21:13 (Hebrew 14) the word is a form of the verb chalal, which is also a derivative from the sound indicated.

In certain cases, though by no means uniformly, madness is ascribed to demon-possession (Lu 8:26 f) . One is struck by the fact that mental derangement occupies a very small place in Scripture.

Louis Matthews Sweet

LURK; LURKING-PLACE

lurk, lurk'-ing-plas: "To lurk" means "to lie in wait," usually with intent to do harm (see Ps 17:12; Pr 1:11,18).

Lurking-place, a place of hiding, usually for the purpose of murder. See 1Sa 23:23; Ps 10:8.

LUST

(5 Hebrew and 5 Greek words are so rendered, namely:

(1) nephesh,

(2) sheriruth,

(3) ta'awah,

(4) chamadh,

(5) ‘awah;

(1) epithumia,

(2) hedone,

(3) epipotheo,

(4) orexis,

(5) pathos):

The word both as verb and as substantive has a good and a bad meaning. It probably meant at first a strong desire, a craving, abnormal appetite, not only for physical but for spiritual satisfaction. It has come, however, to be confined in its use almost entirely to the bad sense. Some old translations are not accepted now, the word being used in connections which at present seem almost irreverent. Shades of meaning are learned from an examination of the Hebrew and Greek originals.

1. The Old Testament Use:

The substantive and verbs are:

(1) Nephesh, in Ex 15:9 and Ps 78:18 translated "desire"; "My desire shall be satisfied"; "by asking food according to their desire." A strong but not sensual sense.

(2) Sheriruth, meaning "obstinacy," evil imagination. Yahweh said (Ps 81:12), "I let them go after the stubbornness of their heart," a willful self-satisfaction.

(3) Ta’awah, "a delight" "a longing satisfaction," and so it came to mean "sinful pleasure." Translated in Ps 78:30, "that which they desired," intensely longed for, referring to Yahweh’s provision of food in the wilderness. Also in Nu 11:4 concerning "flesh to eat" it is said the multitude "lusted exceedingly" i.e. "craved eagerly.

(4) Chamadh, the verb meaning "to delight in," "greatly belove," "covet," probably for evil purposes. The young man is warned against the evil woman (Pr 6:25): "Lust not after her beauty." Here the bad sense is evident, for in the same connection are used such expressions as "harlot," "adulteress," "evil woman."

(5) ‘Awah, meaning "greatly to desire," long after, with undue emphasis, with evil spirit though not perhaps with impure thought. In Nu 11:34 reference is made to a place called qibhroth ha-ta’wah, "the graves of lust, where "they buried the people that lusted." Ps 106:14 also refers to the Israelites who "lusted exceedingly." Translated in De 12:15,21 "desire of thy soul"; 12:20; 14:26, "thy soul desireth." These Deuteronomy passages evidently mean lust only in the good sense.

2. The New Testament Use:

As in the Old Testament, so in the New Testament we find both meanings of the word.

(1) Epithumia is used most frequently, and means a longing for the unlawful, hence, concupiscence, desire, lust. The following references hold the idea, not only of sinful desire known as "fleshly," "worldly," as opposed to "spiritual" "heavenly," "the will of man" as opposed to "the will of God," but also the sensual desire connected with adultery, fornication; verb in Mt 5:28; Mr 4:19; Joh 8:44; Ro 1:24; 1Co 10:6; Ga 5:16,17,24; Tit 2:12; 1Pe 1:14; 1 Joh 2:16 f; Jude 1:16,18; Re 18:14.

(2) Hedone, delight in sensuality, hence, wicked pleasures; translated in Jas 4:1,3 "pleasures": "Your pleasures that war in your members"; "Ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures" (the King James Version "lust").

(3) Epipotheo means to crave intensely the wrong possession; translated in Jas 4:5 "long (the King James Version "lusteth") unto envying."

(4) Orexis, used in Ro 1:27, from context evidently meaning "lust" in the worst sense; translated "lust."

(5) Pathos, meaning "passion" inordinate affection, with the idea in it of suffering; translated in 1Th 4:5 "passion of lust."

William Edward Raffety

LUTE

lut (nebhel; thus the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version viol (Isa 5:12)): Nebhel is rendered elsewhere by psaltery" or "viol." The lute was originally an Arabic instrument. It resembled a guitar, though with a longer and more slender neck. The name is derived from Arabic al’ood, with a of article elided; hence, Italian liuto; French luth.

See MUSIC.

LUZ

(Luz):the Hebrew word means "almond tree" or "almond wood" (OHL, under the word). It may also mean "bone," particularly a bone of the spine, and might be applied to a rocky height supposed to resemble a backbone (Lagarde, Uebersicht., 157 f). Winckler explains it by Aramaic laudh, "asylum," which might be suitably applied to a sanctuary (Geschichte Israels). Cheyne (EB, under the word) would derive it by corruption from chalutsah, "strong (city)."

(1) This was the ancient name of Bethel (Ge 28:19; Jud 1:23; compare Ge 35:6; 48:3; Jos 16:2; 18:13). It has been thought that Jos 16:2 contradicts this, and that the two places were distinct. Referring to Ge 28:19, we find that the name Bethel was given to "the place," ha-maqom, i.e. "the sanctuary," probably "the place" (28:11, Hebrew) associated with the sacrifice of Abraham (12:8), which lay to the East of Bethel. The name of the city as distinguished from "the place" was Luz. As the fame of the sanctuary grew, we may suppose, its name overshadowed, and finally superseded, that of the neighboring town. The memory of the ancient nomenclature persisting among the people sufficiently explains the allusions in the passages cited.

(2) A Bethelite, the man who betrayed the city into the hands of the children of Joseph, went into the land of the Hittites, and there founded a city which he called Luz, after the ancient name of his native place (Jud 1:26). No satisfactory identification has been suggested.

W. Ewing

LYCAONIA

lik-a-o’-ni-a, li-ka-o’-ni-a (Lukaonia (Ac 14:6), Lukaonisti, (Ac 14:11, "in the speech of Lycaonia"); Lycaonia is meant, according to the South Galatian view, by the expression ten Galatiken choran, in Ac 18:23, and the incidents in Ac 16:1-4 belong to Lycaonia): Was a country in the central and southern part of Asia Minor whose boundaries and extent varied at different periods. In the time of Paul, it was bounded on the North by Galatia proper (but lay in the Roman province Galatia), on the East by Cappadocia, on the South by Cilicia Tracheia, and on the West by Pisidia and Phrygia. The boundary of Phrygia and Lycaonia passed between Iconium and Lystra (see ICONIUM). Lycaonia consists of a level plain, waterless and treeless, rising at its southern fringe for some distance into the foothills of Taurus, and broken on its eastern side by the volcanic mass of Kara-Dagh and by many smaller hills. Strabo informs us that King Amyntas of Galatia fed many flocks of sheep on the Lycaonian plain. Much of the northern portion of Lycaonia has been proved by recent discovery to have belonged to the Roman emperors, who inherited the crown lands of Amyntas.

In Ac 14:6 Lycaonia is summed up as consisting of the cities of Lystra and Derbe and the district (including many villages) lying around them. This description refers to a particular division of Lycaonia, which alone is mentioned in the Bible. In the time of Paul, Lycaonia consisted of two parts, a western and an eastern. The western part was a "region" or subdivision of the Roman province Galatia; the eastern was called Lycaonia Antiochiana, after Antiochus of Commagene under whom it had been placed in 37 AD. This non-Roman portion was traversed by Paul; but nothing is recorded of his journey

through it (see DERBE). It included the important city of Laranda; and when Lycaonia is described as consisting of the cities of Lystra and Derbe and the surrounding district, the writer is clearly thinking only of the western portion of Lycaonia, which lay in, and formed a "region" of, the province Galatia. This is the tract of country which is meant in Ac 18:23, where it is called the "region" of Galatia, and placed side by side with Phrygia, another region of Galatia. The province Galatia was divided into districts technically known as "regions," and Roman Lycaonia is called the "region of Galatia" in implied contrast with Antiochian Lycaonia, which lay outside the Roman province. Of the language of Lycaonia. (see LYSTRA) nothing survives except some personal and place names, which are discussed in Kretschmar's Einleitung in die Gesch. der griech. Sprache.

LITERATURE.

Ramsay, Historical Commentary on Galatians (Introduction); Sterrett, Wolfe Expedition (inscriptions).

W. M. Calder

LYCIA

lish'-i-a (Lukia): An ancient country forming the southeast portion of Asia Minor. The surface of Lycia is exceedingly rugged, and its lofty mountains rise almost directly from the sea. Over them several trade routes or passes lead from the coast to the interior. Down the mountain sides rush many small rivers, of which the Xanthus is the chief. The history of Lycia, like that of the neighboring countries, forms a part of the history of Asia Minor. Successively it was in the possession of the Persians, of Alexander the Great, of the Seleucid kings and of the Ptolemies. In 188 BC it fell into the hands of the Romans, who gave it to the island of Rhodes; 20 years later, because of its loyalty to Rome, it became free and independent (1 Macc 15:23). In 53 AD, during the reign of the emperor Claudius, it became a Roman province, and in 74 AD it was united with Pamphylia to form a double province over which a Roman governor presided.

At different times during the history of Lycia, there were about 100 places which issued coins of their own. Pliny speaks of 70 cities which had existed there, but in his age there were but 36. Of these, Patara, Myra and Phaselis are of interest to Bible students. From the coast city of Patara, according to Ac 21 f, Paul took ship for Phoenicia. It was a place celebrated not only as a trading-center, and a port of entry to the interior, but as the seat of the oracle of Apollo, and the birthplace of Nicholas. Myra, though over 2 miles from the coast, possessed a harbor, and was also a trading-center. Here, according to Ac 27:5-38, Paul found a grain ship from Alexandria. For some time Myra was the capital of the Roman province; to Christendom it is especially known as the home of Nicholas, who was its bishop and the patron saint of the sailors along the coast. Phaselis, on the border of Pamphylia, was also the home of the bishop.

Lycia was a stopping-place, rather than the scene of the active work of Paul, and therefore it figures little in the earliest history of Christianity. For a long time the people strongly opposed the introduction of a strange religion, and in 312 AD they even petitioned the Roman emperor Maximin against it. A portion

of the petition has been discovered at Arykander.

E. J. Banks

LYDDA

lid’-a.

See LOD.

LYDIA (1)

lid’-i-a (Ludia): An important country in the western part of Asia Minor bounded on the North by Mysia, on the East by Phrygia, on the South by Caria, and on the West by the Aegean Sea. Its surface is rugged, but along the valleys between its mountain ranges ran some of the most important highways from the coast cities to the distant interior. Of its many rivers the chief are the Cayster, the Lower Hermus, the Cogamos, the Caicus and, during a part of its course, the Meander.

Lydia was an exceedingly ancient and powerful kingdom whose history is composed chiefly of that of its individual cities. In 546 BC it fell into the hands of the Persians, and in 334 BC it became a part of Alexander’s empire. After the death of Alexander its possession was claimed by the kings both of Pergamos and of Seleucia, but in 190 BC it became the undisputed possession of the former (1 Macc 8:8). With the death of Attalus III, 133 BC, it was transferred by the will of that king to Rome, and Lydia, which then became but a name, formed, along with Caria, Mysia and Phrygia, a part of the Roman province of Asia (see ASIA). Chief among its cities were Smyrna and Ephesus, two of the most important in Asia Minor, and Smyrna is still the largest and wealthiest city of that part of Turkey. At Ephesus, the seat of the goddess Diana, Paul remained longer than elsewhere in Asia, and there his most important missionary work was done (Ac 19). Hence, Lydia figures prominently in the early history of the church; it became Christianized during the residence of the apostle at Ephesus, or soon afterward (see also LUD).

E. J. Banks

LYDIA (2)

lid’-i-a (Ludia): The feminine of Lydian, a native of Lydia, a large country on the West of Asia Minor, and the name of Paul’s first convert in Europe. This name was a popular one for women (compare Horace Odes i.8; iii.9; vi.20), but Ramsay thinks she "was familiarly known in the town by the ethnic that showed her origin" (H D B, under the word "Lydia"; compare Paul the Traveler, 214). It has always been and is still a common custom in the Orient to refer to one living in a foreign land by employing the adjective which designates the nationality. Renan thinks it means "the Lydian"; Thyatira is a city of

Lydia. Lydia was (1) living in Philippi, (2) of the city of Thyatira, (3) a seller of the purple-dyed garments from her native town, (4) and "one that worshipped God." Her occupation shows her to have been a woman of some capital. The phrase which describes her religion (sebomene ton Theon) is the usual designation for a proselyte. She was in the habit of frequenting a place of prayer by a riverside, a situation convenient for the necessary ablutions required by the Jewish worship, and there Paul and his companions met her. After she had been listening to Paul (Greek imperfect), the Lord opened her heart to give heed to his teaching ("To open is the part of God, to pay attention that of the woman," Chrysostom). Her baptism and that of her household followed. To prove her sincerity she besought the missionaries to accept the hospitality of her home. Her house probably became the center for the church in Philippi (Ac 16:14,15,40). Lydia is not mentioned in Paul's letter to the Philippians, but, if Ramsay be correct, she may have been Euodias or Syntyche (Php 4:2).

S. F. Hunter

LYDIAN

lid'-i-an.

See LYDIA.

LYE

li.

See NITRE.

LYING

li'-ing.

See LIE.

LYSANIAS

li-sa'-ni-as (Lusanias): Mentioned in Lu 3:1 as tetrarch of Abilene in the 15th year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, and thus fixing the date of the preaching of John the Baptist in the wilderness at about 26 or 28 AD. A Lysanias is mentioned by Josephus as having ruled over Chalcis and Abilene, and as having been slain by Mark Antony at the instigation of Cleopatra. As this happened about 36 BC, Luke has been charged with inaccuracy. Inscriptions, however, corroborate the view that the Lysanias of Luke was probably a descendant of the Lysanias mentioned by Josephus (compare Schurer, H J the Priestly Code (P), div I, volume II, App. 1, p. 338).

C. M. Kerr

LYSIAS

lis’-i-as (Lusias):

(1) "A noble man, and one of the blood royal" whom Antiochus Epiphanes (circa 166 BC) left with the government of Southern Syria and the guardianship of his son, while he went in person into Persia to collect the revenues which were. not coming in satisfactorily (1 Macc 3:32; 2 Macc 10:11). According to Josephus (Ant., XII, vii, 2), the instructions of Lysias were’ "to conquer Judea, enslave its inhabitants, utterly destroy Jerusalem and abolish the whole nation." Lysias, accordingly, armed against Judas Maccabeus a large force under Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, Nicanor and Gorgias. Of this force Judas defeated the two divisions under Nicanor and Gorgias near Emmaus (166 BC), and in the following year Lysias himself at Bethsura (1 Macc 4), after which he proceeded to the purification of the temple. In the narration of these campaigns there are considerable differences between the writers of 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees which scholars have not found easy to explain. Antiochus died at Babylon on his Persian expedition (164 BC), and Lysias assumed the office of regent during the minority of his son, who was yet a child (1 Macc 6:17). He collected another army at Antioch, and after the recapture of Bethsura was besieging Jerusalem when he learned of the approach of Philip to whom Antiochus, on his deathbed, had entrusted the guardianship of the prince (1 Macc 6:15; 2 Macc 13). He defeated Philip in 163 BC and was supported at Rome, but in the following year he fell with his ward Antiochus into the hands of Demetrius I (Soter), who put both of them to death (1 Macc 7:1-23).

(2) See CLAUDIUS LYSIAS (Ac 23:26).

J. Hutchison

LYSIMACHUS

li-sim’-a-kus (Lusimachos):

(1) The son of Ptolemy, of Jerusalem, is named (Additions to Esther 11:1) as the interpreter (translator of the Rest of Esther into Greek).

See ESTHER, THE REST OF.

(2) Brother of Menelaus, a Greek name said by Josephus (Ant., XII, v, 1) to have been assumed by Onias, the high priest in the hellenizing days of Antiochus Epiphanes, as the Jewish name Jesus was changed to Jason. When Menelaus was summoned to Antioch (2 Macc 4:29) on a charge of malversation, he left Lysimachus as his deputy in the priesthood at Jerusalem. Lysimachus robbed the temple and caused an insurrection in which he met his death beside the treasury (2 Macc 4:42). The

name of Lysimachus does not appear in the narrative of these events given by Josephus

J. Hutchison

LYSTRA

lis’-tra: The forms Lustran, and Lustrois, occur. Such variation in the gender of Anatolian city-names is common (see Harnack, Apostelgeschichte, 86; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 128). Lystra was visited by Paul 4 times (Ac 14:6,21; 16:1; 18:23 —the last according to the "South Galatian" theory), and is mentioned in 2Ti 3:10 f as one of the places where Paul suffered persecution. Timothy resided in Lystra (Ac 16:1).

1. Character and Site:

Lystra owed its importance, and the attention which Paul paid to it, to the fact that it had been made a Roman colonia by Augustus (see ANTIOCH), and was therefore, in the time of Paul, a center of education and enlightenment. Nothing is known of its earlier, and little of its later, history. The site of Lystra was placed by Leake (1820) at a hill near Khatyn Serai, 18 miles South-Southwest from Iconium; this identification was proved correct by an inscription found by Sterrett in 1885. The boundary between Phrygia and Lycaonia passed between Iconium and Lystra. (Ac 14:6) (see ICONIUM).

The population of Lystra consisted of the local aristocracy of Roman soldiers who formed the garrison of the colonia, of Greeks and Jews (Ac 16:1,3), and of native Lycaonians (Ac 14:11).

2. Worship of Paul and Barnabas:

After Paul had healed a life-long cripple at Lystra, the native population (the "multitude" of Ac 14:11) regarded him and Barnabas as pagan gods come down to them in likeness of men, and called Barnabas "Zeus" and Paul "Hermes." Commentators on this incident usually point out that the same pair of divinities appeared to Baucis and Philemon in Ovid’s well-known story, which he locates in the neighboring Phrygia. The accuracy in detail of this part of the narrative in Ac has been strikingly confirmed by recent epigraphic discovery. Two inscriptions found in the neighborhood of Lystra in 1909 run as follows:

(1) "Kakkan and Maramoas and Iman Licinius priests of Zeus";

(2) "Toues Macrinus also called Abascantus and Batasis son of Bretasis having made in accordance with a vow at their own expense (a statue of) Hermes Most Great along with a sun-dial dedicated it to Zeus the sun-god."

Now it is evident from the narrative in Ac that the people who were prepared to worship Paul and

Barnabas as gods were not Greeks or Romans, but native Lycaonians. This is conclusively brought out by the use of the phrase "in the speech of Lycaonia" (Ac 14:11). The language in ordinary use among the educated classes in Central Anatolian cities under the Roman Empire was Greek; in some of those cities, and especially of course, in Roman colonies, Latin also was understood, and it was used at this period in official documents. But the Anatolian element in the population of those cities continued for a long time to use the native language (e.g. Phrygian was in use at Iconium till the 3rd century of our era; see ICONIUM). In the story in Ac a fast distinction is implied, and in fact existed, between the ideas and practices of the Greeks and the Roman colonists and those of the natives. This distinction would naturally maintain itself most vigorously in so conservative an institution as religious ritual and legend. We should therefore expect to find that the association between Zeus and Hermes indicated in Ac belonged to the religious system of the native population, rather than to that of the educated society of the colony. And this is precisely the character of the cult illustrated in our two inscriptions. It is essentially a native cult, under a thin Greek disguise. The names in those inscriptions can only have been the names of natives; the Zeus and Hermes of Ac and of our inscriptions were a graecized version of the Father-god and Son-god of the native Anatolian system. The college of priests which appears in inscription number 1 (supporting the Bezan variant "priests" for "priest" in Ac 14:13) was a regular Anatolian institution. The miracle performed by Paul, and his companionship with Barnabas would naturally suggest to the natives who used the "speech of Lycaonia" a pair of gods commonly associated by them in a local cult. The two gods whose names rose to their lips are now known to have been associated by the dedication of a statue of one in a temple, of the other in the neighborhood of Lystra.

LITERATURE.

Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 407 ff. On the new inscriptions, see Calder, The Expositor, 1910, 1 ff, 148 ff; id, Classical Review, 1910, 67 ff. Inscriptions of Lystra are published in Sterrett, Wolfe Expedition, and in Jour. Hell. Stud., 1904 (Cronin).

W. M. Calder

MAACAH

ma’-a-ka (ma‘akhah; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Mocha; Codex Alexandrinus Maacha): A small Syrian kingdom adjoining that of Geshur on the western border of Bashan, the inhabitants of which are called Maachathites (the Revised Version (British and American) "Maacathites"), whose territory was taken by Jair (De 3:14; Jos 12:5). The border of the Geshurites and the Maacathites and all Mt. Hermon were given to the half-tribe of Manasseh (Jos 13:11). The inhabitants of these kingdoms, however, were not driven out by Israel (Jos 13:13), and at a later day the children of Ammon hired mercenaries from Maacah for their encounter with David. The armies met near Medeba when the "Syrians" from Maacah found themselves opposed to Joab. That famous captain completely routed them (2Sa 10:6 ff the Septuagint has "Amalek"). In 1Ch 19:6 it is called Aram-maacah, Syria-maachah (the King James Version); and in 1Ch 2:23 "Aram" appears instead of "Maacah."

It evidently lay between Geshur on the South and Hermon on the North, being probably bounded by Jordan on the West, although no certain indication of boundaries is now possible. They would thus be hemmed in by Israel, which accounts for ‘Geshur and Maacath dwell in the midst of Israel" (Jos 13:13). It is possible that Abel-beth-maacah may have been a colony founded by men from Maacah.

W. Ewing

MAACAH; MAACHAH

ma’-a-ka (ma‘akhah):

(1) Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Mocha; Codex Alexandrinus Mocha, daughter of Nahor, borne to him by Reumah (Ge 22:24).

(2) Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Maacha; Codex Alexandrinus Maachath, the one wife of David who was of royal rank, the daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur, who became the mother of Absalom (2Sa 3:3; 1Ch 3:2).

(3) Maacha, father of Achish, king of Gath (1Ki 2:39). He is probably referred to as "Maoch" in 1Sa 27:2.

(4) The daughter of Absalom, the favorite wife of Rehoboam, and mother of Abijah (1Ki 15:2; 2Ch 11:20, etc.). Evidently "daughter" must here be understood as "granddaughter," according to a common oriental usage. Tamar was the only daughter of Absalom. If Tamar married Uriel of Gibeah (2Ch 13:2), then Maacah was her daughter. In that case the name Micaiah in this passage would be either a copyist’s

error or a variant of Maacah. She must have been a woman of strong personality. Unfortunately, her influence was cast upon the side of idolatry. She maintained her position in the palace, however, till the reign of her grandson Asa. Possibly she acted as regent during his minority. Ultimately, she was degraded by him for an act of peculiar infamy (1Ki 15:13; 2Ch 15:16).

(5) Concubine of Caleb, son of Hezron (1Ch 2:48).

(6) Sister of Huppim and Shuppim the Benjamites, who became the wife of Machir the Manassite, the "father" of Gilead (1Ch 7:12,15 f).

(7) Wife of Jeiel, the "father" of Gibeon, an ancestress of King Saul (1Ch 8:29; 9:35).

(8) Father of Hanan, one of David's mighty men (1Ch 11:43).

(9) Father of Shephatiah, ruler of the Simeonites under David (1Ch 27:16).

W. Ewing

MAACATHITES

ma-ak'-a-thits (~hama'akhathi]; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus ho Machatei; Codex Alexandrinus Machathi): Mentioned in Scripture are Ahasbai M (2Sa 23:34), Jaazaniah (2Ki 25:23), Naham (1Ch 4:19) and Jezaniah (Jer 40:8). See preceding article.

MAADAI

ma-a-da'-i, ma'-a-di (ma'adhay): Son of Bani; one of those who married foreign wives (Ezr 10:34).

MAADIAH

ma-a-di'-a (ma'adhyah, "whose ornament is Jah"): A priest who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:5). The name also occurs in the form "Moadiah" (Ne 12:17).

MAAI

ma-a'-i, ma'i (ma'ay): An Asaphite musician who took part in the ceremony of the dedication of the walls (Ne 12:36).

MAALEH-ACRABBIM

ma’-a-la-a-krab’-im, ma-al’-a-.

See AKRABBIM.

MAANI

ma’-a-ni (Maani):

(1) the King James Version "Meani" (1 Esdras 5:31), corresponding to "Meunim" in Ezr 2:50; Ne 7:52.

(2) the Revised Version (British and American) "Baani," head of a family, many of whom had married foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:34; called "Bani" in Ezr 10:34).

MAARATH

ma’-a-rath (ma‘arath): A city in the hill country of Judah, mentioned between Gedor and Beth-anoth (Jos 15:59). The small village of Beit Ummar upon the watershed, a little to the West of the carriage road to Hebron and about a mile from Khirbet Jedur (Gedor), is a probable site. There are many rock tombs to its East. The village mosque is dedicated to Nebi Matta, i.e. Matthew. See P E F, III, 305, Sh XXI.

MAAREH-GEBA

ma’-a-re-ge’-ba, -ga’-ba (ma‘areh gebha‘; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Maraagabe; Codex Alexandrinus dusmon tes Gabaa): The place where the men of Israel lay in ambush, from which they broke forth upon the children of Benjamin (Jud 20:33). the King James Version renders "the meadows of Gibeah," the Revised Version margin "the meadow of Geba (or Gibeah)." The Septuagint’s Codex Alexandrinus affords a clue to the correct reading. It to read place-name. The text must be emended to read mima‘arabh legebha‘, "to the West of Geba." Peshitta suggests a reading mime-‘arath gebha‘, "from the cave of Geba." This, however, there is nothing to warrant.

W. Ewing

MAASAI

ma’-a-si, ma-as’-i (ma‘say; the King James Version, Maasiai): A priest, son of Abdid (1Ch 9:12).

MAASEAS

ma-a-se’-as (Maasaios; the King James Version Maasias): Grandfather of Baruch (Baruch 1:1); called Mahseiah in Jer 32:12; 51:59.

MAASEIAH

ma-a-se’-ya, ma-a-si’a (ma‘aseyahu, "Yahweh’s work"; Maassaia, and Massaias in the Septuagint): A name common in exilic and late monarchic times (Gray, H P N).

(1) A Levite musician named in connection with David’s bringing up of the ark from the house of Obed-edom (1Ch 15:18,20).

(2) A Levite captain who aided Jehoiada at the coronation of Joash (2Ch 23:1).

(3) An officer of Uzziah (2Ch 26:11).

(4) Ahaz’ son, slain by the Ephraimite, Zichri (2Ch 28:7).

(5) A governor of Jerusalem under Josiah (2Ch 34:8).

(6) (7) (8) (9) The name of 4 men, 3 of them priests, who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:18,21,22,30).

(10) Father of Azariah, one of the builders of the wall (Ne 3:23).

(11) One of those who stood at Ezra’s right hand during the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4).

(12) One of the expounders of the Law (Ne 8:7).

(13) One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Ne 10:25).

(14) A Judahite inhabitant of Jerusalem (Ne 11:5), who in 1Ch 9:5 is called Asaiah.

(15) A Benjamite (Ne 11:7).

(16) (17) Name of two priests (Ne 12:41 f).

(18) A priest in Zedekiah’s reign, father of a certain Zephaniah who interviewed the prophet Jeremiah (Jer 21:1; 29:25; 37:3).

(19) Father of the false prophet Zedekiah (Jer 29:21).

(20) A keeper of the threshold in the reign of Jehoiakim (Jer 35:4).

(21) Baaseiah (which see), a Kohathite name (1Ch 6:40), is probably a textual error for Maaseiah.

(22) the King James Version for Mahseiah, an ancestor of Baruch (Jer 32:12).

John A. Lees

MAASIAI

ma-as’-i-i.

See MAASAI.

MAASMAS

ma-as’-mas, ma’-as-mas (Maasmas; Swete reads Maasman; the King James Version Masman, 1 Esdras 8:43): Corresponds to "Shemaiah" in Ezr 8:16.

MAATH

ma’-ath (Maath): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy in the 12th generation before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lu 3:26).

MAAZ

ma’-az (ma‘ats): A descendant of Judah (1Ch 2:27).

MAAZIAH

ma-a-zi’-a (ma‘azyahu):

(1) The priest to whom fell the lot for the 24th course (1Ch 24:18).

(2) One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Ne 10:8).

MABDAI

mab’-da-i.

See MAMDAI.

MABNABEDAI

mab-nab’-e-di.

See MACHNADEBAI.

MACALON

mak’-a-lon (hoi ek Makalon; 1 Esdras 5:21): This corresponds to "the men of Michmas" in Ezr 2:27. The mistake has probably arisen through reading Macalon in Greek uncials for "AL".

MACCABAEUS; MACCABEES

mak-a-be’-us (Makkabaios), mak’-a-bez (hoi Makkabaioi):

I. PALESTINE UNDER KINGS OF SYRIA

1. Rivalry of Syria and Egypt

2. Palestine Seized by Antiochus the Great

3. Accession of Antiochus Epiphanes

II. PALESTINE UNDER THE MACCABEES

1. Mattathias

2. Judas

3. Jonathan

4. Simon

5. John Hyrcanus

6. John and Eleazar

LITERATURE

The name Maccabeus was first applied to Judas, one of the sons of Mattathias generally called in

English the Maccabees, a celebrated family who defended Jewish rights and customs in the 2nd century BC (1 Macc 2:1-3). The word has been variously derived (e.g. as the initial letters of Mi Khamokha, Ba-’elim Yahweh! "Who is like unto thee among the mighty, O Yahweh ?"), but it is probably best associated with maqqabhah "hammer," and as applied to Judas may be compared with the malleus Scotorum and malleus haereticorum of the Middle Ages (see next article). To understand the work of the Maccabees, it is necessary to take note of the relation in which the Jews and Palestine stood at the time to the immediately neighboring nations.

I. Palestine under Kings of Syria.

1. Rivalry of Syria and Egypt:

On the division of Alexander’s empire at his death in the year 323 BC, Palestine became a sort of buffer state between Egypt under the Ptolemies on the South, and Syria, under the house of Seleucus, the last survivor of Alexander’s generals, on the North. The kings of Syria, as the Seleucid kings are generally called, though their dominion extended practically from the Mediterranean Sea to India, had not all the same name, like the Ptolemies of Egypt, though most of them were called either Seleucus or Antiochus. For a hundred years after the death of Alexander, the struggle went on as to which of the two powers was to govern Palestine, until in the year 223 came the northern prince under whom Palestine was destined to fall to the Seleucids for good.

2. Palestine Seized by Antiochus the Great:

This was Antiochus III, commonly known as Antiochus the Great. He waged two campaigns against Egypt for the possession of Palestine, finally gaining the upper hand in the year 198 BC by his victory at Panium, so called from its proximity to a sanctuary of the god Pan, a spot close to the sources of the Jordan and still called Banias. The Jews helped Antiochus to gain the victory and, according to Josephus, his rule was accepted by the Jews with good will. It is with him and his successors that the Jews have now to deal. Antiochus, it should be noticed, came in contact with the Romans after their conquest of Macedonia in 197, and was defeated by Scipio Asiaticus at Magnesia in 190. He came under heavy tribute which he found it difficult to pay, and met his end in 187, while plundering a Greek temple in order to secure its contents. His son and successor Seleucus IV was murdered by his prime minister Heliodorus in 176-175 BC, who reaped no benefit from his crime.

3. Accession of Antiochus Epiphanes:

The brother of the murdered king succeeded to the throne as Antiochus IV, generally known as Antiochus Epiphanes ("the Illustrious"), a typical eastern ruler of considerable practical ability, but whose early training while a hostage at Rome had made him an adept in dissimulation. Educated in the fashionable Hellenism of the day, he made it his aim during his reign (175-164 BC) to enforce it upon his empire a policy which brought him into conflict with the Jews. Even before his reign many Jews had yielded to the attraction of Greek thought and custom, and the accession of a ruler like Antiochus

Epiphanes greatly increased the drift in that direction, as will be found described in the article dealing with the period between the Old and the New Testaments (see BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS). Pious Jews meanwhile, men faithful to the Jewish tradition, Chasidim (see HASIDAEANS), as they were called, resisted this tendency, and in the end were driven to armed resistance against the severe oppression practiced by Antiochus in advancing his Hellenizing views.

See ASMONEANS.

II. Palestine under the Maccabees.

1. Mattathias:

Mattathias, a priest of the first 24 courses and therefore of the noblest who dwelt at Modin, a city of Judah, was the first to strike a blow. With his own hand he slew a Jew at Modin who was willing to offer the idolatrous sacrifices ordered by the king, and also Apelles, the leader of the king’s messengers (1 Macc 2:15-28). He fled with his sons to the mountains (168 BC), where he organized a successful resistance; but being of advanced age and unfit for the fatigue of active service, he died in 166 BC and was buried "in the sepulchres of his fathers" at Modin (1 Macc 2:70; Josephus, Ant, XII, vi, 3). He apparently named as his successor his 3rd son, Judas, though it was with real insight that on his deathbed he recommended the four brothers to take Simon as their counselor (1 Macc 2:65).

2. Judas:

Judas, commonly called Judas Maccabeus—often called in 2 Maccabees "Judas the Maccabee"—held strongly the opinions of his father and proved at least a very capable leader in guerrilla warfare. He defeated several of the generals of Antiochus—Apollonius at Beth-horon, part of the army of Lysias at Emmaus (166 BC), and Lysias himself at Bethsura the following year. He took possession of Jerusalem, except the "Tower," where he was subsequently besieged and hard pressed by Lysias and the young king Antiochus Eupator in 163 BC; but quarrels among the Syrian generals secured relief and liberty of religion to the Jews which, however, proved of short duration. The Hellenizing Jews, with ALCIMUS (which see) at their head, secured the favor of the king, who sent Nicanor against Judas. The victory over Nicanor first at Capharsalama and later (161 BC) at Adasa near Beth-horon, in which engagement Nicanor was slain, was the greatest of Judas’ successes and practically secured the independence of the Jews. The attempt of Judas to negotiate an alliance with the Romans, who had now serious interests in these regions, caused much dissatisfaction among his followers; and their defection at Elasa (161 BC), during the invasion under Bacchides, which was undertaken before the answer of the Roman Senate arrived, was the cause of the defeat and death of Judas in battle. His body was buried "in the sepulchres of his fathers" at Modin. There is no proof that Judas held the office of high priest like his father Mattathias. (An interesting and not altogether favorable estimate of Judas and of the spiritual import of the revolt will be found in Jerusalem under the High Priests, 97-99, by E.R. Bevan, London, 1904.)

3. Jonathan:

Jonathan (called Apphus, "the wary"), the youngest of the sons of Mattathias, succeeded Judas, whose defeat and death had left the patriotic party in a deplorable condition from which it was rescued by the skill and ability of Jonathan, aided largely by the rivalries among the competitors for the Syrian throne. It was in reality from these rivalries that resulted the 65 years (129-64 BC) of the completely independent rule of the Hasmonean dynasty (see ASMONEANS) that elapsed between the Greek supremacy of the Syrian kings and the Roman supremacy established by Pompey. The first step toward the recovery of the patriots was the permission granted them by Demetrius I to return to Judea in 158 BC —the year in which Bacchides ended an unsuccessful campaign against Jonathan and in fact accepted the terms of the latter. After his departure, Jonathan "judged the people at Michmash" (1 Macc 9:73). Jonathan was even authorized to reenter Jerusalem and to maintain a military force, only the "Tower" the Akra, as it was called in Greek, being held by a Syrian garrison.

See further under ASMONEANS; LACEDAEMONIANS; TRYPHON.

4. Simon:

Simon, surnamed Thassi ("the zealous"?) was now the only surviving member of the original Maccabean family, and he readily took up the inheritance. Tryphon murdered the boy-king Antiochus Dionysus and seized the throne of Seleucus, although having no connection with the Seleucid family. Simon accordingly broke entirely with Tryphon after making successful overtures to Demetrius, who granted the fullest immunity from all the dues that had marked the Seleucid supremacy. Even the golden crown, which had to be paid on the investiture of a new high priest, was now remitted. On the 23rd of Ijjar (May), 141, the patriots entered even the Akra "with praise and palm branches, and with harps, and with cymbals and with viols, and with hymns, and with songs" (1 Macc 13:51). Simon was declared in a Jewish assembly to be high priest and chief of the people "for ever, until there should arise a prophet worthy of credence" (1 Macc 14:41), a limitation that was felt to be necessary on account of the departure of the people from the Divine appointment of the high priests of the old line and one that practically perpetuated the high-priesthood in the family of Simon. Even a new era was started, of which the high-priesthood of Simon was to be year 1, and this was really the foundation of the Hasmonean dynasty (see ASMONEANS).

5. John Hyrcanus:

John Hyrcanus, one of the sons of Simon, escaped from the plot laid by Ptolemy, and succeeded his father, both as prince and high priest. See ASMONEANS. He was succeeded (104 BC) by his son Aristobulus I who took the final step of assuming the title of king.

6. John and Eleazar:

Two members of the first generation of the Maccabean family still remain to be mentioned:

(1) John, the eldest, surnamed Gaddis (the King James Version "Caddis"), probably meaning "my fortune," was murdered by a marauding tribe, the sons of JAMBRI (which see), near Medeba, on the East of the Jordan, when engaged upon the convoy of some property of the Maccabees to the friendly country of the Nabateans (1 Macc 9:35-42).

(2) Eleazar, surnamed Avaran, met his death (161 BC) in the early stage of the Syrian war, shortly before the death of Judas. In the battle of Bethzacharias (163 BC), in which the Jews for the first time met elephants in war, he stabbed from below the elephants on which he supposed the young king was riding. He killed the elephant but he was himself crushed to death by its fall (1 Macc 6:43-46). For the further history of the Hasmonean dynasty, see ASMONEANS; MACCABEES, BOOKS OF.

LITERATURE.

There is a copious literature on the Maccabees, a family to which history shows few, if any, parallels of such united devotion to a sacred cause. The main authorities are of course the Maccabean Books of the Apocrypha; but special reference may be made to the chapters of Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, dealing with the subject, and to E.R. Bevan. Jerusalem under the High Priests, 1904, or to the 2nd volume of House of Seleucus by the same author, 1902.

J. Hutchison

MACCABEES, BOOKS OF, 1-2

mak’-a-bez,

I. 1 MACCABEES

1. Name

2. Canonicity

3. Contents

4. Historicity

5. Author’s Standpoint and Aim

6. Date

7. Sources

8. Original Language

9. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

II. 2 MACCABEES

1. Name

2. Canonicity

3. Contents

4. Sources

5. Historicity

6. Teaching of the Book

7. Author

8. Date

9. Original Language

10. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

III. 3 MACCABEES

1. Name

2. Canonicity

3. Contents

4. Historicity

5. Aim and Teaching

6. Authorship and Date

7. Original Language

8. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

IV. 4 MACCABEES

1. Name

2. Canonicity

3. Contents

4. Teaching

5. Authorship and Date

6. Original Language

7. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

V. 5 MACCABEES

1. Name

2. Canonicity 3. Contents

4. Historicity

5. Original Language

6. Aim and Teaching

7. Authorship and Date

8. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

I. 1 Maccabees.

1. Name:

The Hebrew title has perished with the original Hebrew text. Rabbinical writers call the Books of Maccabees ciphere ha-chashmonim, "The Book of the Hasmoneans" (see ASMONEANS). Origen gives to Book I (the only one he seemed to know of) the name Sarbeth Sabanaiel, evidently a Hebrew or Aramaic name of very uncertain meaning, but which Dalman (Aramaic Grammar, section 6) explains as a corruption of Aramaic words=" The Book of the House of the Hasmoneans" (compare the rabbinical name given above). In the Greek manuscripts N, V (Codex Venetus), the 4 books go under the designation Makkabaion, [Codices Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Gamma Delta, biblos, being understood. In the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) the 1st and 2nd books are alone found, and appear under the name Machabaeorum liber primus, secundus. The spelling Machabaeorum reproduces probably the pronunciation current in Jerome’s day.

The name "Maccabee" belongs strictly only to Judas, who in 2 Maccabees is usually called "the Maccabee" (ho Makkabaios). But the epithet came to be applied to the whole family and their descendants. The word means probably "extinguisher" (of persecution) (makhbi, from kabhah, "to be extinguished"; so Niese; Josephus, Ant, XII, vi, 1 f; S.J. Curtis, The Name Maccabee). The more usual explanation, "hammerer" (maqqabhay), is untenable, as the noun from which it is derived (maqqebheth) (Jud 4:21) denotes a smith’s hammer.

2. Canonicity:

Since the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) includes only the first 2 books of Maccabees, these are the only books pronounced canonical by the Council of Trent and included in recognized Protestant versions of the Apocrypha (see APOCRYPHA). That 1 Maccabees was used largely in the early Christian church is proved by the numerous references made to it and quotations from it in the writings of Tertullian (died 220), Clement of Alexandria (died 220), Hippolytus (died 235), Origen (died 254), etc. The last named states that 1 Maccabees is uncanonical, and it is excluded from the lists of canonical writings given by Athanasius (died 373), Cyril of Jerusalem (died 386), and Gregory of Nazianzus (died 390). Indeed, none of the books of the Maccabees was recognized as canonical until the Council of Trent (1553) gave this rank to the first 2 books, and Protestants continue in their confessions to exclude the whole of the Apocrypha from the Bible proper, though Luther maintained that 1 Maccabees was more worthy of a place in the Canon than many books now included in it.

3. Contents:

1 Maccabees gives first of all a brief view of the reign of Alexander the Great and the partition of his kingdom among his successors. Having thus explained the origin of the Seleucid Dynasty, the author proceeds to give a history of the Jews from the accession of Antiochus IV, king of Syria (175 BC), to the death of Simon (135 BC). The events of these 40 years are simply but graphically related and almost entirely in the order of their occurrence. The contents of 1 Maccabees and 2 Macc 4-15 are in the main parallel, dealing with the same incidents; but the simple narrative character of 1 Maccabees, in contrast to the didactic and highly religious as well as supernatural coloring of 2 Maccabees, can easily be seen in these corresponding parts. The victories due to heroism in 1 Maccabees are commonly ascribed to miraculous intervention on the part of God in 2 Maccabees (see 1 Macc 4:1 f; compare 2 Macc 8:23 f). 2 Maccabees is more given to exaggerations. The army of Judas at Bethsura consists of 10,000 according to 1 Macc 4:29, but of 80,000 according to 2 Macc 11:2. The following is a brief analysis of 1 Maccabees:

(1) 1 Maccabees 1:1-10:

An account of the rise of the Seleucid Dynasty.

(2) 1 Maccabees 1:11-16:24:

History of the Jews from 175 to 135 BC.

(a) 1 Maccabees 1:11-64: Introductory. Some Jews inclined to adopt Greek customs (religious, etc.); Antiochus' aim to conquer Egypt and to suppress the Jewish religion as a source of Jewish disloyalty. Desecration of the Jewish temple: martyrdom of many faithful Jews.

(b) 1 Maccabees 2:1-70: The revolt of Mattathias

(c) 1 Maccabees 3:1-9:22: Leadership of Judas Maccabeus after his father's death. Brilliant victories over the Syrians. Purification of the temple. Death of Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) and accession of Antiochus V (Eupator) (164 BC). Demetrius I became king of Syria, and Alcimus Jewish high priest (162 BC). Treaty between Jews and Romans. Defeat of Jews at Eleasa and death of Judas Maccabeus (161 BC).

(d) 1 Maccabees 9:23-12:53: Leadership of Jonathan, 5th son of Mattathias, elected to succeed his brother Judas. He becomes high priest. Political independence of Judea secured.

(e) 1 Maccabees 13:31-16:24: Peaceful and prosperous rule of Simon, brother of Jonathan; accession of his son John Hyrcanus (135 BC).

4. Historicity:

That the author of 1 Maccabees aims at giving a correct narrative, and that on the whole his account is correct, is the opinion of practically all scholars. The simple, straight-forward way in which he writes inspires confidence, and there can be no doubt that we have here a first-class authority for the period covered (175-135 BC). It is the earliest Jewish history which dates events in reference to a definite era, this era being that of the Seleucids, 312 BC, the year of the founding of that dynasty. The aid received from God is frequently recognized in the book (2:51 ff; 3:18; 4:10 f; 9:46; 16:3), yet it is mainly through personal valor that the Jews conquer, not, as in 2 Maccabees (see III, 3 below), through miraculous Divine interpositions. Ordinary, secondary causes are almost the only ones taken into account, so that the record may be relied upon as on the whole trustworthy. Yet the writer shows the defects which belong to his age and environment, or what from the standpoint of literal history must be counted defects, though, as in the case of 2 Maccabees (compare Chronicles), a writer may have other aims than to record bare objective facts. In 1:1-9 the author errs through ignorance of the real facts as regards Alexander's partition of his kingdom; and other misstatements of fact due to the same cause occur in 10:1 ff (Alexander (Balas), son of Antiochus Epiphanes) and in 13:31 ff (time of assassination of Antiochus VI by Tryphon). In 6:37 it is said there were 32 men upon each elephant, perhaps a misreading of the original "2 or 3," although the Indian elephant corps at the turn of this century carried more.

We know nothing of a Persian village Elymais (1 Macc 6:1). The number of Jewish warriors that fought and the number slain are understated, while there are evident exaggerations of the number of soldiers who fought against them and of those of them who were left dead on the field (see 1 Macc 4:15; 7:46; 11:45-51, etc.).

But in this book, prayers, speeches and official records abound as they do in Ezra, Nehemiah (see Century Bible, "Ezra," "Nehemiah," "Esther," 12 ff), and many modern Protestant writers doubt or deny the authenticity of a part of those, though that is not necessarily to question their genuineness as part of the original narrative.

As regards the prayers (1 Macc 3:50-54; 4:30-33) and speeches (1 Macc 2:7-13; 2:50-68; 4:6-11, etc.), there is no valid reason for doubting that they give at least the substance of what was originally said or written, though ancient historians like Thucydides and Livy think it quite right to edit the speeches of their characters, abbreviating, expanding or altering. Besides, it is to be remembered that the art of stenography is a modern one; even Dr. Johnson, in default of verbatim reports, had to a large extent to make the speeches which he ostensibly reported.

There is, however, in the book a large number of official documents, and it is in regard to the authenticity of these that modern criticism has expressed greatest doubt. They are the following:

(1) Letter of the Jews in Gilead to Judas (1 Macc 5:10-13).

(2) Treaty of alliance between the Romans and Jews; copy written on brass tablets sent to Judas (1 Macc 8:22-32).

(3) Letter from King Alexander Balas to Jonathan (1 Macc 10:18-20).

(4) Letter from King Demetrius I to Jonathan (1 Macc 10:25-45).

(5) Letter from King Demetrius II to Jonathan (1 Macc 11:30-37), together with letter to Lasthenes (1 Macc 11:31-37).

(6) Letter from the young prince Antiochus to Jonathan, making the latter high priest (1 Macc 11:57).

(7) Letter from Jonathan to the Spartans, asking for an alliance (1 Macc 12:5-18).

(8) Earlier letter of the Spartan king Arius to the high priest Onias (1 Macc 12:20-23).

(9) Letter from King Demetrius II to Simon (1 Macc 13:36-40).

(10) Letter from the Spartans to Simon (1 Macc 14:20-24).

(11) A decree of the Jews recognizing the services of Simon and his brothers (1 Macc 14:27-45).

(12) Letters from Antiochus VII (Sidetes) to Simon (1 Macc 15:2-9).

(13) Message from the Roman consul Lucius to Ptolemy, king of Egypt, asking protection for the Jews (1 Macc 15:16-21). A copy was sent to Simon (1 Macc 15:24).

Formerly the authenticity of these state documents was accepted without doubt, as they still are by Romanist commentators (Welte, Scholz, etc.). At most, they are but translations of translations, for the originals would be written in Greek and Latin, from which the author would translate into Hebrew. The Greek of our book is a translation from the Hebrew (see II, 8 below).

Rawlinson (Speaker’s Apocrypha, II, 329) says these documents "have a general air of authenticity." Most modern scholars reject the letters purporting to emanate from the Romans (numbers 2 and 13 above) and from the Spartans (numbers 8, 10 above), together with Jonathan’s message to the latter (number 7, above), on the ground that they contain some historical inaccuracies and imply others. How could one consul issue official mandates in the name of the Roman republic (see number 13, above)? In number 8 above, it is the king of the Spartans who writes on behalf of his people to Onias the high priest; but it is the ephoroi or rulers who write for the Spartans to Simon. Why the difference? Moreover, in 1 Macc 12:21 the Spartans and Jews are said to be kinsmen (literally, brothers), both alike being descendants of Abraham; so also 14:20. This is admittedly contrary to fact. For a careful examination of these official documents and their objective value, see Kautzsch, Die Apokryphen des Altes Testament, 27-30. Though, however, these documents and some others can be proved incorrect as they stand, they do seem to imply actual negotiations of the kind described; i.e. the Jews must have had communications

with the Romans and Spartans, the Jews of Gilead must have sent a missive to Judas (number 1), Alexander Balas did no doubt write to Jonathan, etc., though the author of 1 Maccabees puts the matter in his own way, coloring it by his own patriotic and religious prejudices.

5. Author’s Standpoint and Aim:

Though the name of the author is unknown, the book itself supplies conclusive evidence that he belonged to the Sadducee party, the party favored by the Hasmoneans. The aim of the writer is evidently historical and patriotic, yet his attitude toward religious questions is clearly indicated, both directly and indirectly.

(1) Nowhere in the book is the Divine Being mentioned under any name except Heaven (1 Macc 3:18 f, 50,60; 4:10,55; 12:15, etc.), a designation common in rabbinical Hebrew (Talmud, etc.). As early as 300 BC the sacred name "Yahweh" was discarded in favor of "Adonai" (Lord) for superstitious reasons. But in 1 Maccabees no strictly Divine name meets us at all. This would seem to suggest the idea of a certain aloofness of God, such as characterized theology of the Sadducee party. Contrast with this the mystic closeness of God realized and expressed by the psalmists and prophets of the Old Testament.

(2) The author is a religious patriot, believing that his people have been Divinely chosen and that the cause of Israel is the cause of God.

(3) He is also a strict legalist, believing it the duty of every Jew to keep the Law and to preserve its institutions (1 Macc 1:11,15,43,49,54,60,62 f; 2:20 ff, 27,42,48,50; 3:21, etc.), and deprecating attempts to compel Jews to desecrate the Sabbath and feast days (1 Macc 1:45), to eat unclean food (1 Macc 1:63) and to sacrifice to idols (1 Macc 1:43). Yet the comparatively lax attitude toward the Sabbath implied in 1 Macc 2:41 ff, involving the principle of Christ’s words, "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath" (Mr 2:27), agrees with the Sadducee position against that of the Pharisees.

(4) The book teaches that the age of inspiration is past, and that the sacred books already written are the only source of comfort in sorrow and of encouragement under difficulties (1 Macc 12:9).

(5) The legitimacy of the high-priesthood of Simon is not once questioned, though it is condemned by both the Deuteronomic law (D), which restricts the priesthood to the tribe of Levi, and by the priestly law (P), which requires in addition that a priest must be of the family of Aaron. This laxity agrees well with the general tenets of the Sadducees.

(6) The book contains no trace of the Messianic hope, though it was entertained at the time in other circles (the Pharisees; see MESSIAH, II, 2; PROPHECY); 1 Macc 2:57 is no exception, for it implies no more than a belief that there would be a restoration of the Davidic Dynasty. Perhaps it is implied that that expectation was realized in the Hasmoneans.

(7) There is no reference in the book to the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead or to that of the

immortality of the soul, though we know that both these beliefs were commonly held by Jews of the time (see Da 12:3; Enoch 19; 22:11-14; 9:1,5 ff; 2 Macc 7:9,11,14,29). We know that the Pharisee party believed in a resurrection (see Ac 23:6). The Maccabean heroes fought their battles and faced death without fear, not because, like Moslems, they looked to the rewards of another life, but because they believed in the rightness of their cause and coveted the good name won by their fathers by acts of similar courage and devotion.

This outline of the doctrines taught or implied in the book makes it extremely likely that the author was a member of the Sadducee party.

6. Date:

1 Maccabees must have been written before the Roman conquest under Pompey, since the writer speaks of the Romans as allies and even friends (8:1,12; 12:1; 14:40); i.e. the composition of the book must have been completed (unless we except chapters 14-16; see below) before 63 BC, when Pompey conquered Jerusalem, and Judea became a Roman province. We thus get 63 BC as a terminus ad quem. Moreover, the historical narrative is brought down to the death of Simon (16:16), i.e. to 135 BC. We have thus an undoubted terminus a quo in 135 BC. The book belongs for certain to the period between 135 and 63 BC. But 1 Macc 16:18-24 implies that John Hyrcanus (died 105 BC) had for some time acted as successor to Simon, and Reuss, Ewald, Fritzsche, Grimm, Schurer, Kautzsch, etc., are probably right in concluding from 16:23 f that John was dead when the book was completed, for we have in this verse the usual formula recording the close of a royal career (see 1Ki 11:41; 2Ki 10:34, etc.), and the writer makes it sufficiently understood that all his acts were already "entered in the public annals of the kingdom" (Ewald, History of Israel, V, 463, note), so that repetition was unnecessary. But Bertheau, Keil, Wellhausen and Torrey draw the contrary conclusion, arguing that John had but begun his rule, so that at the time of writing there was practically nothing to record of the doings subsequent to 135, when John succeeded Simon (see EB, III, 2860 (Toy)). In 1 Macc 13:30 we read that the monument erected in 143 BC by Simon in memory of his father and brothers was standing at the time when this book was written, words implying the lapse of say 30 years at least. This gives a terminus a quo of 113 BC. Moreover, the panegyric on Simon (died 135 BC) and his peaceful rule in 14:4-15 leaves the impression that he had been long in his grave. We cannot be far wrong in assigning a date for the book in the early part of the last century BC, say 80 BC.

Destinon (Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus, I, 1882, 80 ff), followed by Wellhausen (IJG, 1894, 222 f), maintained that Josephus (died circa 95), who followed 1 Maccabees up to the end of chapter 13, could not have seen chapters 14-16 (or from 14:16?), or he would not have given so meager an account of the high-priesthood of Simon (see Ant, XIII, vi, 7), which the author of 1 Maccabees describes so fully in those chapters. But Josephus must have used these chapters or he could not have written of Simon even as fully as he does.

7. Sources:

If, as Torrey (EB, III, 2862) holds, we have in 1 Maccabees "the account of one who had witnessed the whole Maccabean struggle from its beginning," the book having been completed soon after the middle of the 2nd century BC, it may then be assumed that the writer depended upon no other sources than his own. But even in this case one is compelled, contrary to Torrey (loc. cit.), to assume that written sources of his own were used, or the descriptions would not have been so full and the dating so exact. If, however, we follow the evidence and bring down the date of the book to about 80 BC (see I, 6), it must be supposed that the author had access to written sources. It may legitimately be inferred from 1 Macc 9:22 and 16:23 and from the habit of earlier times (see Century Bible, "Ezra," etc., 11 ff) that official records were kept in the archives of the temple, or elsewhere. These might have contained the state documents referred to in I, 4, some or all, and reports of speeches and prayers, etc. It must be admitted that, unlike the compilers of the historical books of the Old Testament (Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, etc.), the author of 1 Maccabees does not definitely name his written sources. The writer might well be supposed to have kept a kind of diary of his own in which the events of his own early life were recorded. Oral tradition, much more retentive of songs, speeches and the like in ancient than in modern times, must have been a very important source.

8. Original Language:

We have the testimony of Origen (see I, 1) and Jerome (Prolog. Galeatus) that the book existed in Hebrew in their day. But it is doubtful whether the words of Origen imply a Hebrew or an Aramaic original, and though Jerome does speak of the book as Hebrew (hebraicus), it has to be remembered that in later times the Greek adjective denoting Hebrew (hebraisti) and perhaps the corresponding Latin one (hebraicus) often denoted Palestinian Aramaic (see Jud 5:2; 19:13,17; and Kautzsch, Grammatik des bib. Aramaic, 19).

Hebraisms (or Aramaisms?) abound throughout the book. In the following examples Hebraisms are literally rendered in Greek, though in the latter language they are unidiomatic and often unintelligible: "two years of days" = two full years (1 Macc 1:29, etc.); "month and month" = every month (1 Macc 1:58); "a man (or each one) his neighbor" = each .... the other (1 Macc 2:40; 3:43); "sons of the fortress" = occupants of the fortress (1 Macc 4:2); "against our face" = before us (1 Macc 4:10); "men of power" = warriors (1 Macc 5:32); "of them" = some of them (1 Macc 6:2; compare 7:33, "of the priests" = some of the priests); "the right hand wing" = the southern wing (1 Macc 9:1); "yesterday and the third day" = hitherto (1 Macc 9:44). The above are strictly Hebraisms and not for the most part Aramaisms. The implied use of the "waw-consecutive" in 1 Macc 3:1,41; 8:1; 9:1, and often, points also to a Hebrew, not to an Aramaic origin.. "Heaven" as a substitute for "God," so common in this book (see I, 5), is perhaps as much an Aramaism as a Hebraism (see Targum Jerusalem). Many of the proper names in the book are obviously but trans-literations from the Hebrew; thus, Phulistiein (1 Macc 3:24); compare Sirach 46:18; 47:7; see the names in 1 Macc 11:34; and Schurer, GJV4, I, 233.

9. Text and Versions:

The original Hebrew text of 1 Maccabees (see I, 8) must have been lost at a very early time, since we

have no evidence of its use by any early writer. J.D. Michaells held that Josephus used it, but this idea has been abandoned in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary. The Hebrew text of the first half of 1 Macc, edited by A. Schweitzer and taken by him to be a part of the original text, is in reality a translation from the Latin made in the 11th century of our era (so Noldeke, etc.).

(1) Greek.

The Greek text from which the other versions are nearly all made is given in all editions of the Septuagint. It occurs in the uncials Codex Sinaiticus (Fritzsche, X) , Codex Alexandrinus (Fritzsche, III), and Codex Venetus (8th or 9th century), not in Codex Vaticanus; and in a large number of cursives. Swete (Old Testament in Greek) gives the text of Codex Alexandrinus with the variations of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Venetus. Though the Greek text has so many Hebraisms, it is an exceedingly good rendering, full of spirit and on the whole more idiomatic than the rest of the Septuagint.

(2) Latin.

There are two Latin recensions of the book: (a) that found in the Vulgate, which agrees almost entirely with the Old Latin version. It is in the main a literal rendering of the Greek (b) Sabatier (Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae, II) published in 1743 a Latin version of 1 Macc 1-13 found in but one manuscript (Sangermanensis). Though it is evidently made from the Greek it differs at many points from the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) It is probably older than the Old Latin and therefore than the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

(3) Syriac.

There are also two varying texts in this language.

(a) The best known is that printed in the Paris Polyglot (Vol. IX), copied with some changes into the London Polyglot (Vol. IV; for readings see volume V). Lagarde (Lib. Vet. Test. Apocrypha. Syriac., 1861) has edited this version, correcting and appending readings.

(b) A text differing in many respects from (a) is given by Ceriani in his Codex Ambros. of the Peshitta (1876-83), though this also is made from the Greek For a careful collection of both the above Syriac texts by G. Schmidt, see Z A T W, 1897, 1-47, 233-62.

LITERATURE.

See literature cited in the foregoing material. For texts and commentaries on the Apocrypha, see APOCRYPHA. The following commentaries deserve special mention: Grimm, Kurz. exeg. Handbuch, etc., to which the commentaries by Keil (1 and 2 Maccabees) and Bissel (Lange) owe very much; Kautzsch, Die Apocrypha des AT; W. Fair-weather and J.S. Black, Cambridge Bible, "1 Maccabees," and Oesterley in the Oxford Apocrypha edited by R. H. Charles (1913). Of the dict. articles those in E B

(Torrey) and H D B (Fairweather) are excellent. See also E. Montet, Essai sur les origines des saduceens et des pharisiens, 1885; Wibrich, Juden und Griechen vor der mak. Erhebung, 1875, 69-76; B. Niese, Kritik der beiden Makkabderbucher, 1900. For a very full bibliography see Schurer, GJ V4, III, 198 ff, and his article "Apocrypha" in R E3, and in Sch-Herz.

II. 2 Maccabees.

1. Name:

See I, above. The earliest extant mention of the book as 2 Maccabees is in Euseb., Praep. Evang., VIII, 9. Jerome also (Prol. Galeatus) calls it by this name.

2. Canonicity:

In the early church 2 Maccabees was much less valued and therefore less read than 1 Maccabees. Augustine was the only church Father to claim for it canonical rank and even he in a controversy with the Donatists who quoted 2 Maccabees, replied that this book had never been received into the Canon. Since they formed an integral part of the Vulgate, 1 and 2 Maccabees were both recognized by the Council of Trent as belonging to the Romanist Canon.

3. Contents:

(1) 2 Maccabees 1-9:18:

Two letters from the Jews of Jerusalem to their brethren in Egypt, urging them to keep the Feast of Dedication and in a general way to observe the Law given them by God through Moses. Both letters appear designed to win for the Jerusalem temple the love and devotion which the Jews of Egypt were in danger of lavishing upon the Leontopolis temple in Egypt. These letters have no connection with the rest of the book or with each other, and both are undoubted forgeries. There can be no doubt that 2 Maccabees was first of all composed, and that subsequently either the author or a later hand prefixed these letters on account of their affinity in thought to the book as it first existed. See further on these letters II, 4 and 9.

(2) 2 Maccabees 2:19-32:

Introduction to what follows. The author or epitomizer claims that his history (chapter 3 to end of the book) is an epitome in one book of a larger work in 5 books by Jason of Cyrene. But see II, 4, below.

(3) 2 Maccabees 3:1-15:39 (End of Book):

History of the rise and progress of the Maccabean wars from 176 BC, to the closing year of the reign of Seleucus IV Philopator, to the defeat and death of Nicanor in 161 BC, a period of 15 years. The record

in 2 Maccabees begins one year earlier than that of 1 Maccabees, but as the latter reaches down to 135 BC (and probably below 105 BC; see I, 5), 1 Maccabees covers a period of at least 40 years, while 2 Maccabees gives the history of but 15 years (176-161 BC). The history of this period is thus treated:

(a) 2 Macc 3:1-4:6: Traitorous conduct of the Benjamite Simon in regard to the temple treasures and the high priest; futile attempt of Heliodorus, prime minister of Seleucus IV, to rob the temple (see I, 3, (11) above);

(b) 2 Macc 4:7-7:42 parallel 1 Macc 1:10-64 with significant variations and additions. Accession of Antiocus Epiphanes (175 BC); the Hellenizing of some Jews; persecution of the faithful; martyrdom of Eleazar and the 7 brethren and their mother (this last not in 1 Maccabees);

(c) 2 Macc 8-15 (end) parallel 1 Macc 3-7, with significant divergences in details.

Rise and development of the Maccabean revolt (see I, 3, above). In the closing verses (2 Macc 15:38 ff) the writer begs that this composition may be received with consideration.

The record of events in 2 Maccabees ends with the brilliant victory of Judas over Nicanor, followed by the death of the latter; but it is strange that the history of the main hero of the book should be dropped in the middle. Perhaps this abrupt ending is due to the writer’s aim to commend to the Jews of Egypt the two new festivals, both connected with the Jerusalem temple:

(a) Chanukkah (Festival of Dedication) (1:9,18; 2:16; 10:8);

(b) Nicanor Day (15:36), to commemorate the defeat and death of Nicanor.

To end the book with the account of the institution of the latter gives it greater prominence.

4. Sources:

In its present form 2 Maccabees is based ostensibly on two kinds of written sources.

(1) In 2 Macc 2:19-32 the writer of 3:1 to the end, which constitutes the book proper, says that his own work is but an epitome, clearly, artistically and attractively set out, of a larger history by one Jason of Cyrene. Most commentators understand this statement literally, and endeavor to distinguish between the parts due to Jason and those due to the epitomizer. Some think they see endings of the 5 books reflected in the summaries at 3:40; 7:42; 10:9; 13:26; 15:37. But W.H. Kosters gives cogent reasons for concluding that the reference to Jason is but a literary device to secure for his own composition the respect accorded in ancient, as in a lesser degree in modern, times to tradition. The so-called "epitomizer"is in that case alone responsible for the history he gives. The present writer has no hesitation in accepting these conclusions. We read such nowhere a large else of a historian called "Jason," or of such a large history at his must have been if it extended to 5 books dealing with the events of 15 years,

though such a man and so great a work could hardly have escaped notice. Hitzig (Gesch. des Volkes Israels, II, 415) held that Jason or his supposed epitomizer made use of 1 Maccabees, altering, adding and subtracting to suit his purpose. But the different order of the events and the contradictions in statements of facts in the 2 books, as well as the omission from 2 Maccabees of important items found in 1 Maccabees, make Hitzig's supposition quite untenable. A careful examination of 2 Maccabees has led Grimm, Schurer, Zockler, Wibrich, Cornill, Torrey and others to the conclusion that the author depended wholly upon oral tradition. This gives the best clue to the anachronisms, inconsistencies and loose phrasing which characterize the book. According to 1 Macc 4:26-33, the first campaign of Lysias into Judea took place in 165 BC, the year before the death of Antiochus IV; but 2 Macc 11 tells us that it occurred in 163 BC, i.e. subsequent to the death of Antiochus IV. Moreover, in the latter passage this 1st expedition of Lysias is connected with the grant of freedom to the Jews, which is really an incident of the 2nd expedition, and in 2 Macc 13:1-24 is rightly mentioned in the account of the 2nd expedition. The writer of 2 Maccabees, relying upon memory, evidently mixes up the stories of two different expeditions. Similarly the invasions of neighboring tribes under Judas, which are represented in 1 Macc 5:1-68 as taking place in quick succession, belong, according to 2 Macc 8:30; 10:15-38; 12:2-45, to separate dates and different sets of circumstances. The statements in 2 Maccabees are obscure and confused, those in 1 Macc 5 clear and straightforward. Though in 2 Macc 10:37 we read of the death of Timotheus, yet in 12:2 ff he appears as a leader in other campaigns. There again the writer's memory plays him false as he recalls various accounts of the same events. It was Mattathias who gathered together the Jews and organized them for resistance against Syria, if we follow 1 Macc 2:1-70; but 2 Macc 8:1-7 ascribes this role to his son Judas. The purification of the temple took place 3 years subsequent to its profanation, according to 1 Macc 1:54; 4:52, but only 2 years, according to 2 Macc 10:3.

(2) The two letters sent from Palestinian to Egyptian Jews (2 Macc 1:1-2:18) form no integral part of the original 2 Maccabees. They are clearly forgeries, and abound in inaccuracies and inconsistencies. The second letter, much the longer, gives an account of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, which is irreconcilable with that in 9:1-28 and also with that in 1 Macc 6:1-16. Nehemiah is said in 1:18 to have rebuilt the temple and altar, a work accomplished by Zerubbabel nearly a century earlier (Ezr 3:3; 6:15). Nehemiah's work was to repair the gates and walls (Ne 3:1-32; 6:1; 7:1; Sirach 49:13). The writer of this letter says (2 Macc 2:3-5) that at the time of the exile, Jeremiah concealed in a cave on Mt. Pisgah the tabernacle, the ark of the covenant and the altar of incense, a statement which no one accepts as correct or even plausible. That the author of the rest of the book is not the composer of the letters is proved by the difference of style and the contradictions in subject-matter. But that he himself prefixed them is made probable by the connecting particle in the Greek (de), though some (Bertholdt, Grimm, Paulus, Kosters) think rather plausibly that the letters were added by a later hand, the connection in the Greek being also introduced by him and not by the author of the rest of the book. It has been maintained that we have but one letter in 2 Macc 1:1-2:18, and on the other hand that there are three. But the division into two is quite natural and is almost universally accepted.

5. Historicity: 2 Maccabees belongs to the class of literature called by the Germans Tendenz-Schriften, i. e. writings originating in the desire to teach some doctrine or to correct some supposed error. 1 Maccabees gives us a history of the Maccabean wars as such, taking so little notice of the part played by

God that the Divine Being is not so much as mentioned, except under the impersonal form Heaven (compare "Heaven helps those who help themselves"). Nor has 1 Maccabees a word to say about a life beyond the grave. In short, 1 Maccabees is written from the standpoint of the Sadducees, to which party the reigning dynasty (the Hasmonean) belonged. The writer of 2 Maccabees is evidently a Pharisee and his aim is not historical but doctrinal; i.e. the book is a historical romance with a purpose, that purpose being to make prominent the outstanding tenets of the Pharisees (see II, 6). Two extreme opinions have been defended as to the historical value of 2 Maccabees:

(1) That 2 Maccabees is a strictly historical work, is more trustworthy than 1 Maccabees and is to be followed when the two books differ; so the bulk of Roman Catholics and also Niese and Schlatter. The supernaturalism of the book is to Romanists a recommendation.

(2) That 2 Maccabees has virtually no historical value, since it was written for other than historical ends; so Wibrich, Kosters and Kamphausen.

But the bulk of Protestant critics of recent times occupy a portion midway between these two opposite opinions, namely, that 1 Maccabees is much more accurate than 2 Maccabees and is to be preferred when the 2 books of Maccabees differ or contradict each other; so Grimm, Reuss, Schurer, Kamphausen. On the other hand, when 2 Maccabees contains historical matter absent from 1 Maccabees it is to be accepted as correct unless opposed by intrinsic improbability or direct contrary evidence. In 2 Macc 3-5 we have details concerning the Maccabean revolt not found in 1 Maccabees, and in treatment of episodes or incidents with which 1 Maccabees deals it is often fuller and more specific, as in 2 Macc 10:14-23; 12:7-9 (compare 1 Macc 5:1-5; 12:17-25); 2 Macc 10:24-38 (compare 1 Macc 5:29-44); 2 Macc 12:32-45 (compare 1 Macc 5:65,68,63 f). On the other hand, the account of the celestial appearances in 2 Macc 3:24 ff; 11:8, etc., and the description in 6:18 ff of the martyrdom of Eleazar the scribe and of the 7 brethren and their mother, carry on their face the marks of their legendary and unhistorical character. The edifying remarks scattered throughout the book, many of them pragmatic and reminding one of the Book of Daniel, confirm the impression otherwise suggested, that the author’s aim was didactic and not historical. The book as it stands is a real authority for the ideas prevalent in the writer’s circle at the time of its composition.

6. Teaching of the Book:

In general it may be said that the doctrines taught in 2 Maccabees are those of the Pharisees of the day. Several scholars consider 2 Maccabees the answer of Pharisaism to the Sadduceeism of 1 Maccabees (see Wellhausen, Die Pharisaer und die Saducaer; compare Geiger, Urschrift und Ubersetzungen der Bibel, 219 ff). But there is evidence enough (see II, 4) that the author of 2 Maccabees had not seen 1 Maccabees. Yet it is equally clear that 2 Maccabees does give prominence to the distinctive tenets of Pharisaism, and it was probably written on that account.

(1) The strictest observance of the law is enforced. The violation of the sanctity of the Sabbath countenanced under special circumstances in 1 Macc (2:39-48) is absolutely forbidden in 2 Macc

(6:6,11; 8:26 f; 12:38); compare the words of the Pharisees to Petronius when the latter proposed to have a statue of the emperor Caius erected in the temple: "We will die rather than transgress the law" (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, viii, 3).

(2) The Pharisaic party took but little interest in political affairs, and supported the Hasmoneans only because and in so far as they fought for the right to observe their religious rites. When, however, they compromised with Hellenism, the Pharisees turned against them and their allies the Sadducees. In this book we miss the unstinted praise accorded the Hasmonean leaders in 1 Maccabees, and it is silent as to the genealogy of the Hasmoneans, the death of Judas Maccabeus and the family grave at Modin.

(3) The book reveals thus early the antagonism between the Pharisees and the priestly party, which is so evident in the Gospels. The high-priesthood had through political circumstances become the property of the Maccabees, though they were not of the Aaronic family, or even of the tribe of Levi. The priestly circle became the aristocratic, broad-church party, willing to come to terms with Greek thought and life. Hence, in 2 Maccabees, Jason and Menelaus are fit representatives of the priesthood. In the list of martyrs (chapters 6 f) no priest appears, but on the other hand, Eleazar, one of the principal scribes—scribes and Pharisees were then as in New Testament times virtually one party—suffered for his loyalty to the national religion, "leaving his death for an example" (6:18-31).

(4) The temple occupies a high and honorable place in 2 Maccabees, as in the mind of the orthodox party (see 2:19; 3:2; 5:15; 9:16; 13:23; 14:31). Great stress is laid on the importance of the feasts (6:6; 10:8, etc.), of sacrifice (10:3), of circumcision (6:10), of the laws of diet (6:18; 11:31). The author seems in particular anxious to recommend to his readers (Egyptian Jews) the observance of the two new festivals instituted to commemorate the purification of the temple after its pollution by the Syrians and also the victory over Nicanor. According to this book the Chanukkah feast was established immediately after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (10:6 ff), not before this event (1 Macc 4:56), probably to give it additional importance. The book closes with the defeat and death of Nicanor and the founding of the Nicanor Day festival, without mentioning the death of Judas, as though the writer’s aim was to give prominence to the two new festivals.

(5) 2 Maccabees shows a Jewish particularism which agrees well with Pharisaism and Scribism, but is opposed to the broader sentiments of the ruling party: Israel is God’s people (1:26); His portion (14:15); He often intervenes miraculously on behalf of Israel and the religion of Israel (3:24-30; 10:29 f; 11:6-8); even the calamities of the nation are proofs of Divine love because designed for the nation’s good (5:18); but the sufferings brought upon the heathen are penal and show the Divine displeasure (4:38; 5:9; 13:8; 15:32 f). The writer is deadly opposed to the introduction of Greek customs and in particular to the establishment of a gymnasium in Jerusalem (4:7 f; 11:24). The Book of Jubilees, also written by a zealous Pharisee, takes up the same hostile attitude toward foreign customs (see 3:31; 7:20, and the note by R. H. Charles (Book of Jubilees) on the former).

(6) This book gives prominence to the doctrine of a resurrection and of a future life about which 1 Maccabees, a document of the Sadducee party, is silent, (compare I, 5 above; see 2 Macc 7:9,11,14,36;

12:43-45; 14:46 (compare IV, 4, below)). The Sadducees, to which the Hasmoneans belonged, denied a resurrection, limiting their conception of religion to the present life, in this agreeing with the teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures down to the time of the exile (536 BC). But the Pharisees and scribes, though professing to rest their beliefs on the "Law of Moses," departed from that law in this matter (see Warburton, The Divine Legation of Moses). The resurrection is to be a bodily one (2 Macc 7:11,22 f; 14:46) and to a life that is unending (2 Macc 7:9,36). The following related beliefs supported in this book and forming part of the creed of orthodox Pharisaism are adduced by Romanists on behalf of their own teaching: (a) the efficacy of prayers for the dead (2 Macc 12:44); (b) the power exercised by the intercession of saints (2 Macc 15:12-14); Philo (De execrat., 9) and Josephus (Ant., I, xi, 3) held the same doctrine; (c) the atoning character of the martyrdom of the righteous (2 Macc 7:36,38; compare 4 Macc 17:22; see IV, 4, (3), below).

(7) The angelology of 2 Maccabees forms a prominent feature of the book (see 3:24-30; 10:29 f; 11:6-8). The Sadducees accepted the authority of the Pentateuch, though they rejected tradition. They were therefore inconsistent in allowing no place for angelic beings in their creed, though consistent in rejecting the doctrine of a future life.

(8) The comparative silence of this book on the question of the Messianic hope is strikingly in contrast with the prominence of the subject in Psalter of Solomon (17:23 ff, etc.; see Ryle and James, Psalms of Solomon, lii ff) and other contemporary writings emanating from the Pharisees. But why should the author of 2 Maccabees be expected to give equal prominence to all his opinions in one tract? Some such hope as that connected with the Messiah does, however, seem to be implied in 1:27; 2:18; 7:33; 14:15.

The present writer holds that one man is responsible for 2 Maccabees in its present form and that the only written source was the 2 letters with which the book opens (1:1-2:18) (see II, 4, above).

7. Author:

Even if we have to assume an original in 5 books of which 2 Maccabees, as we have it, is but an epitome, it is not possible to distinguish between the sentiments of "Jason" and his epitomizer. The author—assuming but one—was evidently an Egyptian probably an Alexandrian Jew, who nevertheless retained his loyalty to the Jerusalem temple and its constitutions and desired to prevent the alienation of his fellow-countrymen in the same country from the home sanctuary and its feasts, especially the two new feasts, Chanukkah (Dedication) and Nicanor Day. The Jews of Egypt had a temple of their own, in opposition to the teaching of the Jewish law (D and P; compare De 12:2-18 and Le 17:1-9; 19:30), and it was perhaps the growing influence of this temple that prompted the author to compose this book which sets so much honor upon the Jerusalem temple and its observances. The character of the Greek (see II, 9, below), the ignorance of Palestine and also the deep interest in Egypt which this book reveals—these and other considerations point to the conclusion that the author lived and wrote in Egypt. There is no evidence that Judas Maccabeus (Leon Allatius), or the author of Sirach (Hasse) or Philo the Jew (Honorius d’Autun) or Josephus wrote the book, though it has been ascribed by different scholars to each of the persons named.

8. Date:

The book must have been written sufficiently long after 161 BC, the year with which the record closes, to allow mythical tales of the martyrdoms in 2 Macc 6 f and the history of the supernatural appearances in 3:24-30, etc., to arise. If we allow 30 years, or the lifetime of a generation, we come down to say 130 BC as a terminus a quo. There is probably in 15:36 a reference to the Book of Es (so Cornill, Kautzsch and Wellhausen, IJG4, 302 f) which would bring the terminus a quo down to about 100 BC. That 2 Maccabees was written subsequently to 1 Maccabees (i.e. after 80 BC) is made certain by the fact that the Jews now pay tribute to Rome (2 Macc 8:10,36). Since Philo, who died about 40 AD, refers to 2 Macc 4:8-7:42 (Quod omnis probus liber, Works, edition Mangey, II, 459), the book must have been composed before 40 AD. This is confirmed by the certainty that it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (70 AD), for the city still exists and the temple services are in full operation (3:6 ff, etc.). Heb 11:35 f is no doubt an echo of 2 Macc 6:18-7:42 and shows that the unknown author of Hebrews had 2 Maccabees before him. The teaching of the book represents the views of the Pharisees about the middle of the last century BC. A date about 40 BC would agree with all the evidence.

9. Original Language:

That the original language was Greek is made exceedingly likely by the easy flow of the style and the almost entire absence of Hebraisms (yet see 2 Macc 8:15; 9:5; 14:24). No scholar of any standing has pleaded for a Hebrew original of the present book. Bertholdt, however, argued that the two letters (2 Macc 1:1-2:18) were composed in Hebrew (or Aramaic) Ewald held that the 2nd letter (2 Macc 1:11-2:18) is from the Hebrew, and Schlunkes that this applies to the 1st only. But the evidence given by these scholars is unconvincing, though the 1st letter is certainly more Hebraic in style than the 2nd letter, the contrary of what Ewald said.

10. Text and Versions:

As to the texts and versions, see I, 9, above, where the statements apply here with but slight qualifications. But the book is lacking in Codex Sinaiticus as well as in Codex Alexandrinus. In addition to the Old Latin text and adopted for the Vulgate, we have another Latin text in Codex Ambrosianus, published in 1824 by Peyron; but this book is unrepresented in Sabatier’s collection of Old Latin texts.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the literature mentioned under APOCRYPHA and I above, and in the course of the present article, note the following items: Commentary of Moffatt (Oxford Apocrypha); C. Bertheau, De section lib. Macc., 1829 (largely quoted by Grimm); W.H. Kosters, "De Polemiek van het tweede boek de Mak," TT, XII, 491-558; Schlatter, "Jason von Cyrene," TLZ, 1893, 322; A. Buchler, Die Tobliden u. die Oniaden im II Mak, 1889; Wibrich, Juden und Griechen, etc., 1895, 64; Kamphausen (Kautzsch, Die Apocrypha des AT). The following discussing the two letters (1:1-2:18) deserve mention: Valckenaer, De Aristobulo, 38-44; Schlunkes, Epistolae quae secundo Macc libro I, etc., 1844, 1-9; also

Difficiliorum locorum epistolae, etc., 1847; Graetz, "Das Sendschreiben der Palaestinenser an die aegyptischen Gemeinden," etc., Monatss. fur Gesch. u. Wissen. des Judenthums, 1877, 1-16, 49-60; A. Buchler, "Das Sendschreiben der Jerusalemer," etc., Monatss. fur Gesch. u. Wissen. des Judenthums; see last notice, 1897, 481-500, 529-54); Bruston, "Trois lettres des Juifs de Palestine," ZATW, X, 110-17; W. H. Kosters, "Strekking der brieven in 2 Macc," TT, 1898, 68-76; Torrey, "Die Briefe 2 Mak," ZATW, 1900, 225-42.

MACCABEES, BOOKS OF, 3-5

III. 3 Maccabees.

1. Name:

The name 3 Maccabees, though occurring in the oldest manuscripts and VSS, is quite unsuitable, because the book refers to events which antedate the Maccabean age by about half a century, and also to events in which the Maccabees took no part. But this book tells of sufferings and triumphs on the part of loyal Jews comparable to those of the Maccabean period. Perhaps the term Maccabees was generalized so as to denote all who suffered for their faith. Some hold that the book was written originally as a kind of introduction to the Books of Maccabees, which it precedes as Book I in Cotton’s Five Books of Maccabees. But the contents of the book do not agree with this view. Perhaps the title is due to a mistake on the part of a copyist.

2. Canonicity:

The book has never been reckoned as canonical by the Western church, as is shown by the fact that it exists in no edition of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and was not included in the Canon by the Council of Trent. It is for the latter reason absent from the Protestant versions of the Apocrypha which contain but the Books of Maccabees (1 and 2). But 3 Maccabees has a place in two uncials of the Septuagint (A and V) and also in the ancient (Peshitta) Syriac version of the Scriptures, and it is given canonical rank in the Apostolical Constitutions (canon 85). The book must therefore have been held in high esteem in the early church.

3. Contents:

3 Maccabees is a historical novel in which there is much more romance than history, and more silly and superficial writing than either. It professes to narrate occurrences in the history of the Jews which took place at Jerusalem and at Alexandria in which the Jews were persecuted but in various ways delivered.

(1) 3 Maccabees 1:1-2:24:

After conquering at Raphia Antiochus III, the great king of Syria (224-187 BC), Ptolemy IV Philopator, king of Egypt (221-204 BC), resolved to visit Jerusalem and to enter the sanctum ("holy of holies,"

naos) of the temple to which by the Jewish law access was allowed only to the high priest, and even to him but once a year (Day of Atonement (1:11)). The Jews, priests and people, were in a paroxysm of grief and earnestly entreated him to desist, but he persisted in his plan. They then through Simon, the high priest, 219-199 BC, prayed that God might intervene and avert this desecration. The prayer is answered, the king being paralyzed before realizing his purpose.

(2) 3 Maccabees 2:25-30:

Returned to Alexandria, Ptolemy is exasperated at the failure of his long-cherished project and resolves to wreak his vengeance upon the Jews of Egypt. He issues a decree that all Jews in Alexandria who refused to bend the knee to Bacchus should be deprived of all their rights as citizens.

(3) 3 Maccabees 2:31-4:21:

A goodly number of Alexandrian Jews refuse to obey the royal mandate, whereupon Ptolemy issues an edict that all the Jews of Egypt, men, women and children, shall be brought in chains to Alexandria and confined in the race-course (hippodrome), with a view to their wholesale massacre. Prior to the massacre there is to be a complete register taken of the names of the assembled Jews. Before the list is complete the writing materials give way and the huge slaughter is averted.

(4) 3 Maccabees 4:22-6:21:

The king, still thirsting for the blood of this people, hits upon a different method of compassing their ruin. Five hundred elephants are intoxicated with wine and incense and let loose upon the Jews in the race-course. Here we have the principal plot of the book, and we reach the climax in the various providential expedients, childish in their character, of preventing the execution of the king’s purpose. The lesson of it all seems to be that God will deliver those who put their trust in Him.

(5) 3 Maccabees 6:22-7:23:

At length the king undergoes a change of heart. He releases the Jews and restores them to all their lost rights and honors. In response to their request, he gives them permission to slay their brother-Jews who, in the hour of trial, had given up their faith. They put to death 300, "esteeming this destruction of the wicked a season of joy" (7:15).

3 Maccabees is made up of a number of incredible tales, the details of which are absurd and contradictory. The beginning of the book has evidently been lost, as appears from the opening words, "Now when Philopator" (ho de Philopator), and also from the references to an earlier part of the narrative now lost, e.g.: 1:1 ("from those who came back"); 1:2 ("the plot afore mentioned"); 2:25 ("the aforenamed boon companions"), etc.

4. Historicity:

The book contains very little that is true history, notwithstanding what Israel Abrahams (see "Literature" to this section), depending largely on Mahaffy (The Empire of the Ptolemies), says to the contrary. It is much more manifest than even in the case of 2 Maccabees that the writer's aim was to convey certain impressions and not to write history (see III, 5).

The improbabilities of the book are innumerable (see Bissell, The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, 616 f), and it is evident that we have to do here with a combination of legends and fables worked up in feeble fashion with a view to making prominent certain ideas which the author wishes his readers to keep in mind. Yet behind the fiction of the book there are certain facts which prompted much of what the writer says.

(1) That Ptolemy IV bore the character of cruelty and capriciousness and effeminacy is borne out by Polybius (204-121 BC) in his History and by Plutarch in his Life of Cleomenes.

(2) The brief outline of the war between Ptolemy IV and Antiochus III, the latter being conquered at Raphia (chapters 1 f), agrees in a general way with what has been written by Polybius, Livy and Justin.

(3)in this book, by the command of Ptolemy, 500 intoxicated elephants are let loose upon the Jews brought bound to the race-course of Alexandria. Josephus (Apion, II, v) tells us that Ptolemy VII Physcon, king of Egypt, 145-117 BC, had the Jews of Alexandria, men, women and children, brought bound and naked to an enclosed space and that he had let loose on them a herd of elephants, which, however, turned instead upon his own men, killing a large number of them. The cause of the king's action was that the Jewish residents of Alexandria sided with his foes. In 3 Maccabees the cause of the action of Ptolemy IV was the failure of his project to enter the sanctum of the Jerusalem temple; this last perhaps a reflection of 2 Macc 3:9 ff, where it is related that Heliodorus was hindered from entering the temple by a ghostly apparition. Now these two incidents, in both of which Jews are attacked by intoxicated elephants, must rest upon a common tradition and have probably a nucleus of fact. Perhaps, as Israel Abrahams holds, the tradition arose from the action of the elephants of Ptolemy in the Battle of Raphia. Most writers think that the reference is to something that occurred in the reign of Ptolemy VII.

(4) The shutting-up of the Jews in the racecourse at Alexandria was not improbably suggested by a similar incident in which Herod the Great was the principal agent.

(5) In the opinion of Grimm (Comm., 216) we have in the two festivals (3 Macc 6:36; 7:19) and in the existence of the synagogue at Ptolemais an implied reference to some great deliverance vouchsafed to the Jews.

5. Aim and Teaching:

3 Maccabees was probably written by an Alexandrian Jew at a time when the Jews in and around Alexandria were sorely persecuted on account of their religion. The purpose of the author seems to have

been to comfort those suffering for the faith by giving examples showing how God stands by His people, helping in all their trials and delivering them out of the hands of their enemies. Note further the following points:

(1) The book, unlike 2 Maccabees, is silent as to a bodily resurrection and a future life, though this may be due to pure accident. Hades (Haides) in 3 Macc 4:8; 5:42; 6:31, etc., appears to stand only for death, regarded as the end of all human life.

(2) Yet the belief in angelic beings is clearly implied (see 6:18 ff).

(3) The author has much confidence in the power of prayer (see 2:10; 2:21-24; 5:6-10,13,50 f; 6:1-15, etc.).

(4) The book lays stress upon the doctrine that God is on the side of His people (4:21, etc.), and even though they transgress His commandments He will forgive and save them (2:13; 4:13, etc.).

6. Authorship and Date:

From the character of the Greek, the interest shown in Alexandrian Judaism, and the acquaintance displayed with Egyptian affairs (see I. Abrahams, op. cit., 39 ff), it may be inferred with confidence that the author was a Jew residing in Alexandria. The superior limit (terminus a quo) for the date is some time in the last century BC. Since the existence of the additions to Da is implied (see Da 6:6), the inferior limit (terminus ad quem) is some time before 70 AD. If the temple had been destroyed, the continuance of the temple services could not have been implied (see 3 Macc 1:8 ff). As the book seems written to comfort and encourage Alexandrian Jews at a time when they were persecuted, Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss and others thought it was written during the reign of the emperor Caligula (37-41 AD), when such a persecution took place. But if Ptolemy is intended to represent Caligula, it is strange, as Schurer (GJV4, III, 491) remarks, that the writer does not make Ptolemy claim Divine honors, a claim actually made by Caligula.

Though Josephus (died 95 AD) could not have known the book, since his version of the same incidents differs so much, yet it must have been written some 30 years before his death, i.e. before the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 71 AD.

7. Original Language:

That 3 Maccabees was composed in Greek is the opinion of all scholars and is proved by the free, idiomatic and rather bombastic character of the language in the Septuagint.

8. Text and Versions:

(1) Greek.

This book occurs in the two unicals Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Venetus (not in Codex Vaticanus or Codex Sinaiticus), in most cursives and also in nearly all editions of the Septuagint.

(2) Syriac.

The Syriac version (Peshitta) reproduced in the Paris and London Polyglot and by Lagarde, Lib. Apocrypha. Vet. Test. It is not a good translation.

(3) Latin.

The earliest Latin translation is that made for the Complutensian Polyglot.

(4) English.

The earliest in English is that of Walter Lynne (1650).

LITERATURE.

Besides the commentaries by Grimm (the best), Bissell (Lange), Kautzsch and Emmet (Oxford Apocrypha), and the articles in HDB (Fairweather, excellent), Encyclopedia Biblica (Torrey, good), GJV4 (Schurer), III, 489-92; HJP, II, iii, 216-19, let the following be noted: A. Hausrath, A History of New Testament Times, 1895, II, 70 ff; Wibrich, Juden u. Griechen; Abrahams, "The Third Book of the Mace," JQR, IX, 1897, 39-58; A. Buchler, Die Tobiaden u. die Oniaden, 1899, 172-212. Both Abrahams and Buchler defend the historicity of some parts of 3 Maccabees; Wibrich, "Der historische Kern des III Makk," Hermes, Bd. 39, 1904, 244-58. For English translation see (1) Henry Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees (Cotton calls it First Book of Maccabees); (2) W.R. Churton, The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scriptures, and (3) Baxter, The Apocrypha, Greek and English

IV. 4 Maccabees.

1. Name:

4 Maccabees is a philosophical treatise or discourse on the supremacy of pious reason (= religious principle) in the virtuous man. The oldest title of the book, 4 Maccabees (Makkabaion d, (4)), occurs in the earliest extant manuscripts of the Septuagint (Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Venetus, etc.), in the list of the Codex Claromontanus (3rd century?), the Catalogue of the Sixty Canonical Books (5th century?) and the Synopsis of Athanasius (9th century). It obtained this name from the fact that it illustrates and enforces its thesis by examples from the history of the Maccabees. Some early Christian writers, believing 4 Maccabees to be the work of Josephus (see IV, 5), gave it a corresponding title. Eusebius and Jerome, who ascribe the book to Josephus, speak of it under the name of: A Discourse concerning the Supreme Power of Reason.

2. Canonicity:

Though absent from the Vulgate, and therefore from the Romanist Canon and from Protestant versions of its Apocrypha, 4 Maccabees occurs in the principal manuscripts (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Venetus, etc.) and editions (Fritzsche, Swete, not Tischendorf) of the Septuagint, showing it was highly esteemed and perhaps considered canonical by at least some early Christian Fathers.

3. Contents:

This book is a philosophical disquisition in the form of a sermon on the question "Whether pious reason is absolute master of the passions" (4 Macc 1:1).

(1) 4 Maccabees 1:1-12:

First of all, the writer states his theme and the method in which he intends to treat it.

(2) 4 Maccabees 1:13-3:18:

He defines his terms and endeavors from general principles to show that pious reason does of right rule the passions.

(3) 4 Maccabees 3:19 to End of Book:

He tries to prove the same proposition from the lives of the Maccabean martyrs. These historical illustrations are based on 2 Macc 6:18-7:42 (compare 3 Macc 6).

Because the book is written as a discourse or sermon and is largely addressed to an apparent audience (4 Macc 1:17; 2:14; 13:10; 18:4), Freudenthal and others think we have here an example of a Jewish sermon delivered as here written. But Jewish preachers based their discourses on Scripture texts and their sermons were more concise and arresting than this book.

4. Teaching:

The author’s philosophical standpoint is that of Stoicism, namely, that in the virtuous man reason dominates passion. His doctrine of four cardinal virtues (phronesis, dikaiosune, andreia, sophrosune, "Providence," "Justice" "Fortitude," "Temperance" (4 Macc 1:18)), is also derived from Stoicism. Though, however, he sets out as if he were a true Stoic, he proceeds to work out his discourses in orthodox Jewish fashion. His all-dominating reason is that which is guided by the Divinely revealed law, that law for the faithful observing of which the martyrs died. The four cardinal virtues are but forms of that true wisdom which is to be obtained only through the Mosaic law (4 Macc 7:15-18). Moreover, the

passions are not, as Stoicism taught, to be annihilated, but regulated (4 Macc 1:61; 3:5), since God has planted them (4 Macc 2:21).

The author's views approach those of Pharisaism.

(1) He extols the self-sacrificing devotion to the law exhibited by the Maccabean martyrs mentioned in 4 Macc 3:9 to the end of the book.

(2) He believes in a resurrection from the dead. The souls of the righteous will enjoy hereafter ceaseless fellowship with God (9:8; 15:2; 18:5), but the wicked will endure the torment of fire forever and ever (10:11,15; 12:12; 13:14). Nothing, however, is said of the Pharisees' doctrine of a bodily resurrection which 2 Maccabees, a Pharisaic document (see II, 6, (6) above), clearly teaches.

(3) The martyrdom of the faithful atones for the sins of the people (4 Macc 6:24; 17:19-21; compare Ro 3:25).

5. Authorship and Date:

According to Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 6), Jerome (De Viris Illust., xiii; C Peleg, ii.6), Suidas (Lex Iosepos) and other early writers, Josephus is the author of this book, and in Greek editions of his works it constitutes the last chapter with the heading: Phlab. Iosepou eis Makkabaions logos, e peri autokratoros logismou, "The Discourse of Flavius Josephus: or concerning the Supreme Power of Reason" (so Niese, Bekker, Dindorf, etc.). But this tradition is negated by the style and thought, which differ completely from those found in the genuine writings of that Jewish historian. Besides this, the author of the book makes large use of 2 Maccabees, of which Josephus was ignorant. Moreover, there are traditions equally ancient of a contrary kind.

The author must have been a Jew and he probably belonged to the Pharisee party (see IV, 7). He was also a Hellenist, for he reveals the influence of Greek thought more than any other apocryphal writer. He was also, it would appear, a resident of Alexandria, for the earliest notices of it occur in literature having an Alexandrian origin, and the author makes considerable use of 2 Maccabees, which emanated from Alexandria.

It is impossible definitely to fix the date of the book. But it was certainly written before the destruction of the temple in 70 AD and after the composition of 2 Maccabees, on which it largely depends. A date in the first half of the 1st century of our era would suit all the requirements of the case.

6. Original Language:

The book was certainly written in Greek, as all scholars agree. It employs many of the terms of Greek philosophy and it bears the general characteristics of the Greek spoken and written at Alexandria at the commencement of the Christian era.

7. Text and Versions:

(1) Greek.

This book occurs in the principal manuscripts (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Venetus, etc.) and printed editions (Grabe, Breitinger, Apel, Fritzsche, Swete (Codex Alexandrinus with variants of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Venetus) and Baxter, The Apocrypha, Greek and English), also in various Josephus manuscripts and most editions of Josephus, including Naber, but not Niese.

(2) Latin.

No Old Latin version has come down to us.

(3) Syriac.

The Peshitta text is printed in Codex Ambros. (Ceriani) and by Bensley from a manuscript in The Fourth Book of Maccabees and Kindred Documents in Syriac (agrees mostly with Codex Alexandrinus). Sixtus Senensis (Bibliotheca Sancta, 1566, I, 39) speaks of having seen another 4 Maccabees. But this was probably "simply a reproduction of Josephus" (Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, iii, 14).

LITERATURE.

Besides the literature mentioned under the other books of Maccabees, under APOCRYPHA, and in the course of the present article, note the following: The commentaries of Grimm (excellent; the only one on the complete book) and Deissmann (in Kautzsch, A pok des Altes Testament, brief but up to date and good); the valuable monograph by Freudenthal: Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift uber die Herrschafft der Vernunft (IV. Makkabaerbuch) Untersucht, 1869. See, besides the articles in HDB (Fairweather); Encyclopedia Biblica (Torrey); Gfrorer, Philo, etc., II, 1831, 173-200; Dahne, Gesch. Darstellung der jud.-alex. Religions Philosophie, II, 1834, 190-99; and the History of Ewald, IV, 632 ff. There are English translations in Cotton, The Five Books of Maccabees, Oxford, 1832; W.R. Churton, The Uncanonical and Apocryphal Scripture; Baxter, The Apocrypha, Greek and English.

V. 5 Maccabees.

1. Name:

The designation 5 Maccabees was first given to the book (now commonly so called) by Cotton (The Five Books of Maccabees English, 1832), and it has been perpetuated by Dr. Samuel Davidson (Introduction to the Old Testament, III, 465); Ginsburg (Kitto’s Cycyclopedia of Biblical Literature); Bissell (Apocrypha of the Old Testament) and others. It has been called the Arabic 2 Maccabees (so in

the Paris and London Polyglot), and the Arabic Maccabees. The 5 Maccabees in the Translatio Syra Peshitto, edited by Ceriani, is really nothing more than a Syriac version of the 6th book of Josephus, The Wars of the Jews.

2. Canonicity:

This book has never been recognized as canonical by either Jews or Christians.

3. Contents:

The book is ostensibly a history of the Jews from the attempt of Heliodorus to plunder the temple (186 BC) to about 6 BC. It is really nothing more than a clumsy compilation from 1 and 2 Maccabees and Josephus (except 5 Macc 12, which is the only original part, and this teems with errors of various kinds); a note at the end of 5 Macc 16 says 1:1-16:26 is called The Second Book of Maccabees according to the Translation of the Hebrews. 5 Macc 19 closes with the events narrated at the end of 1 Maccabees. The rest of the book (5 Macc 20-59) follows Josephus (BJ, I f) closely. Perhaps the original work ended with 5 Macc 19. Ginsburg (op. cit., III., 17), Bissell (Apocrypha, 639) and Wellhausen (Der arab. Josippus) give useful tables showing the dependence of the various parts of 5 Maccabees on the sources used.

4. Historicity:

In so far as this book repeats the contents of 1 and 2 Maccabees and Josephus, it has the historical value of the sources used. But in itself the book has no historical worth. The author calls Roman and Egyptian soldiers "Macedonians," Mt. Gerizim, "Jezebel," Samaria "Sebaste," Shechem "Neapolis" or "Naploris." Herod and Pilate exchange names. Some of the mistakes may of course be traceable to the translation.

5. Original Language:

The original work was almost certainly composed in Hebrew, though we have no trace of a Hebrew text (so Ginsburg, op. cit., and Bissell). This conclusion is supported by the numerous Hebraisms which show themselves even in a double translation. The Pentateuch is called the "Torah," the Hebrew Scriptures are spoken of as "the twenty-four books," the temple is "the house of God" or "the holy house," Judea is "the land of the holy house" and Jerusalem is "the city of the holy house." These and like examples make it probable that the writer was a Jew and that the language he used was Hebrew. Zunz (Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage, 1832, 146 ff), Graetz (Geschichte, V, 281) and Dr. S. Davidson (op. cit., 465) say the book was written in Arabic from Hebrew memoirs. According to Zunz (loc. cit.) and Graetz (loc. cit.) the Jewish history of Joseph ben Gorion (Josippon), the "pseudo-Josephus" (10th century), is but a Hebrew recension of 5 Maccabees (the Arabic 2 Maccabees). On the contrary, Wellhausen (op. cit.) and Schurer (GJV4, I, 159 f) maintain that the shorter narrative in 5 Maccabees represents the extent of the original composition far more correctly than the Hebrew history of Josippon (which ranges from Adam to 70 AD), and than other recensions of the same history.

6. Aim and Teaching:

The book was compiled for the purpose of consoling the Jews in their sufferings and encouraging them to be stedfast in their devotion to the Mosaic law. The same end was contemplated in 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees and in a lesser degree in 1 Maccabees, but the author or compiler of the present treatise wished to produce a work which would appeal in the first instance and chiefly to Hebrew (or Arabic?) readers. The author believes in a resurrection of the body, in a future life and a final judgment (5 Macc 5:13,43 f). The righteous will dwell in future glory, the wicked will be hereafter punished (5 Macc 5:49,50 f; 59:14).

7. Authorship and Date:

We have no means of ascertaining who the author was, but he must have been a Jew and he lived some time after the destruction of the temple in 70 AD (see 5 Macc 9:5; 21:30; 22:9; 53:8, though Ginsburg regards these passages as late additions and fixes the date of the original work at about 6 BC, when the history ends). The author makes large use of Josephus (died 95 AD), which also favors the lower date.

8. Text and Versions:

The Arabic text of the book and a Latin translation by Gabriel Sionita is printed in the Paris and London Polyglots. No other ancient text has come down to us. cotton (op. cit., xxx) errs in saying that there is a Syriac version of the book.

LITERATURE.

The most important literature has been mentioned in the course of the article. The English and earlier German editions of Schurer, GJ V, do not help. The only English translation is that by Cotton made directly from the Latin of Gabriel Sionita. Bissell says that a French version appears as an appendix in the Bible of de Sacy; not, however, in the Nouvelle Edition (1837) in the possession of the present writer.

T. Witton Davies

MACEDONIA

mas-e-do’-ni-a (Makedonia, ethnic Makedon,):

I. THE MACEDONIAN PEOPLE AND LAND

II. HISTORY OF MACEDONIA

1. Philip and Alexander

2. Roman Intervention

3. Roman Conquest

4. Macedonia a Roman Province

5. Later History

III. PAUL AND MACEDONIA

1. Paul’s First Visit

2. Paul’s Second Visit

3. Paul’s Third Visit

4. Paul’s Later Visits

IV. THE MACEDONIAN CHURCH

1. Prominence of Women

2. Marked Characteristics

3. Its Members

LITERATURE

A country lying to the North of Greece, afterward enlarged and formed into a Roman province; it is to the latter that the term always refers when used in the New Testament.

I. The Macedonian People and Land.

Ethnologists differ about the origin of the Macedonian race and the degree of its affinity to the Hellenes. But we find a well-marked tradition in ancient times that the race comprised a Hellenic element and a non-Hellenic, though Aryan, element, closely akin to the Phrygian and other Thracian stocks. The dominant race, the Macedonians in the narrower sense of the term, including the royal family, which was acknowledged to be Greek and traced its descent through the Temenids of Argos back to Heracles (Herodotus v.22), settled in the fertile plains about the lower Haliacmon (Karasu or Vistritza) and Axius

(Vardar), to the North and Northwest of the Thermaic Gulf. Their capital, which was originally at Edessa or Aegae (Vodhena), was afterward transferred to Pella by Philip II. The other and older element —the Lyncestians, Orestians, Pelagonians and other tribes—were pushed back northward and westward into the highlands, where they struggled for generations to maintain their independence and weakened the Macedonian state by constant risings and by making common cause with the wild hordes of Illyrians and Thracians, with whom we find the Macedonian kings in frequent conflict. In order to maintain their position they entered into a good understanding from time to time with the states of Greece or acknowledged temporarily Persian suzerainty, and thus gradually extended the sphere of their power.

II. History of Macedonia.

Herodotus (viii.137-39) traces the royal line from Perdiccas I through Argaeus, Philip I, Aeropus, Alcetas and Amyntas I to Alexander I, who was king at the time of the Persian invasions of Greece. He and his son and grandson, Perdiccas II and Archelaus, did much to consolidate Macedonian power, but the death of Archelaus (399 BC) was followed by 40 years of disunion and weakness.

1. Philip and Alexander:

With the accession of Philip II, son of Amyntas II, in 359 BC, Macedonia came under the rule of a man powerful alike in body and in mind, an able general and an astute diplomatist, one, moreover, who started out with a clear perception of the end at which he must aim, the creation of a great national army and a nation-state, and worked consistently and untiringly throughout his reign of 23 years to gain that object. He welded the Macedonian tribes into a single nation, won by force and fraud the important positions of Amphipolis, Pydna, Potidaea, Olynthus, Abdera and Maronea, and secured a plentiful supply of gold by founding Philippi on the site of Crenides. Gradually extending his rule over barbarians and Greeks alike, he finally, after the battle of Chaeronea (338 BC), secured his recognition by the Greeks themselves as captain-general of the Hellenic states and leader of a Greco-Macedonian crusade against Persia. On the eve of this projected eastern expedition, however, he was assassinated by order of his dishonored wife Olympias (336 BC), whose son, Alexander the Great, succeeded to the throne. After securing his hold on Thrace, Illyria and Greece, Alexander turned eastward and, in a series of brilliant campaigns, overthrew the Persian empire. The battle of the Granicus (334 BC) was followed by the submission or subjugation of most of Asia Minor. By the battle of Issus (333), in which Darius himself was defeated, Alexander’s way was opened to Phoenicia and Egypt; Darius’ second defeat, at Arbela (331), sealed the fate of the Persian power. Babylon, Susa, Persepolis and Ecbatana were taken in turn, and Alexander then pressed eastward through Hyrcania, Aria, Arachosia, Bactria and Sogdiana to India, which he conquered as far as the Hyphasis (Sutlej): thence he returned through Gedrosia, Carmania and Persis to Babylon, to make preparations for the conquest of Arabia. A sketch of his career is given in 1 Macc 1:1-7, where he is spoken of as "Alexander the Macedonian, the son of Philip, who came out of the land of Chittim" (1:1): his invasion of Persia is also referred to in 1 Macc 6:2, where he is described as "the Macedonian king, who reigned first among the Greeks," i.e. the first who united in a single empire all the Greek states, except those which lay to the West of the Adriatic. It is the conception of the Macedonian power as the deadly foe of Persia which is responsible for the description of Haman in Additions to Esther 16:10 as a Macedonian, "an alien in truth from the Persian blood," and for the

attribution to him of a plot to transfer the Persian empire to the Macedonians (verse 14), and this same thought appears in the Septuagint's rendering of the Hebrew Agagite ('aghaghi) in Es 9:24 as Macedonian (Makedon).

2. Roman Intervention:

Alexander died in June 323 BC, and his empire fell a prey to the rivalries of his chief generals (1 Macc 1:9); after a period of struggle and chaos, three powerful kingdoms were formed, taking their names from Macedonia, Syria and Egypt. Even in Syria, however, Macedonian influences remained strong, and we find Macedonian troops in the service of the Seleucid monarchs (2 Macc 8:20). In 215 King Philip V, son of Demetrius II and successor of Antigonus Doson (229-220 BC), formed an alliance with Hannibal, who had defeated the Roman forces at Lake Trasimene (217) and at Cannae (216), and set about trying to recover Illyria. After some years of desultory and indecisive warfare, peace was concluded in 205, Philip binding himself to abstain from attacking the Roman possessions on the East of the Adriatic. The Second Macedonian War, caused by a combined attack of Antiochus III of Syria and Philip of Macedon on Egypt, broke out in 200 and ended 3 years later in the crushing defeat of Philip's forces by T. Quinctius Flamininus at Cynoscephalae in Thessaly (compare 1 Macc 8:5). By the treaty which followed this battle, Philip surrendered his conquests in Greece, Illyria, Thrace, Asia Minor and the Aegean, gave up his fleet, reduced his army to 5,000 men, and undertook to declare no war and conclude no alliance without Roman consent.

3. Roman Conquest:

In 179 Philip was succeeded by his son Perseus, who at once renewed the Roman alliance, but set to work to consolidate and extend his power. In 172 war again broke out, and after several Roman reverses the consul Lucius Aemilius Paulus decisively defeated the Macedonians at Pydna in 168 BC (compare 1 Macc 8:5, where Perseus is called "king of Chittim "). The kingship was abolished and Perseus was banished to Italy. The Macedonians were declared free and autonomous; their land was divided into four regions, with their capitals at Amphipolis, Thessalonica, Pella and Pelagonia respectively, and each of them was governed by its own council; commercium and connubium were forbidden between them and the gold and silver mines were closed. A tribute was to be paid annually to the Roman treasury, amounting to half the land tax hitherto exacted by the Macedonian kings.

4. Macedonia a Roman Province:

But this compromise between freedom and subjection could not be of long duration, and after the revolt of Andriscus, the pseudo-Philip, was quelled (148 BC), Macedonia was constituted a Roman province and enlarged by the addition of parts of Illyria, Epirus, the Ionian islands and Thessaly. Each year a governor was dispatched from Rome with supreme military and judicial powers; the partition fell into abeyance and communication within the province was improved by the construction of the Via Egnatia from Dyrrhachium to Thessalonica, whence it was afterward continued eastward to the Nestus and the Hellespont. In 146 the Acheans, who had declared war on Rome, were crushed by Q. Caecilius Metellus

and L. Mummius, Corinth was sacked and destroyed, the Achean league was dissolved, and Greece, under the name of Achea, was made a province and placed under the control of the governor of Macedonia. In 27 BC, when the administration of the provinces was divided between Augustus and the Senate, Macedonia and Achea fell to the share of the latter (Strabo, p. 840; Dio Cassius liii.12) and were governed separately by ex-praetors sent out annually with the title of proconsul. In 15 AD, however, senatorial mismanagement had brought the provinces to the verge of ruin, and they were transferred to Tiberius (Tacitus, Annals, i.76), who united them under the government of a legatus Augusti pro praetore until, in 44 AD, Claudius restored them to the Senate (Suetonius, Claudius 25; Dio Cassius lx .24). It is owing to this close historical and geographical connection that we find Macedonia and Achia frequently mentioned together in the New Testament, Macedonia being always placed first (Ac 19:21; Ro 15:26; 2Co 9:2; 1Th 1:7,8).

5. Later History:

Diocletian (284-305 AD) detached from Macedonia Thessaly and the Illyrian coast lands and formed them into two provinces, the latter under the name of Epirus Nova. Toward the end of the 4th century what remained of Macedonia was broken up into two provinces, Macedonia prima and Macedonia secunda or salutaris, and when in 395 the Roman world was divided into the western and eastern empires, Macedonia was included in the latter. During the next few years it was overrun and plundered by the Goths under Alaric, and later, in the latter half of the 6th century, immense numbers of Slavonians settled there. In the 10th century a large part of it was under Bulgarian rule, and afterward colonies of various Asiatic tribes were settled there by the Byzantine emperors. In 1204 it became a Latin kingdom under Boniface, marquis of Monferrat, but 20 years later Theodore, the Greek despot of Epirus, founded a Greek empire of Thessalonica. During the 2nd half of the 14th century the greater part of it was part of the Servian dominions, but in 1430 Thessalonica fell before the Ottoman Turks, and from that time down to the year 1913 Macedonia has formed part of the Turkish empire. Its history thus accounts for the very mixed character of its population, which consists chiefly of Turks, Albanians, Greeks and Bulgarians, but has in it a considerable element of Jews, Gypsies, Vlachs, Servians and other races.

III. Paul and Macedonia.

In the narrative of Paul’s journeys as given us in Ac 13-28 and in the Pauline Epistles, Macedonia plays a prominent part. The apostle’s relations with the churches of Philippi, Thessalonica, and Berea will be found discussed under those several headings; here we will merely recount in outline his visits to the province.

1. Paul’s First Visit:

On his 2nd missionary journey Paul came to Troas, and from there sailed with Silas, Timothy and Luke to Neapolis, the nearest Macedonian seaport, in obedience to the vision of a Macedonian (whom Ramsay identifies with Luke: see under the word "Philippi") urging him to cross to Macedonia and preach the

gospel there (Ac 16:9). From Neapolis he journeyed inland to Philippi, which is described as "a city of Macedonia, the first of the district" (Ac 16:12). Thence Paul and his two companions (for Luke appears to have remained in Philippi for the next 5 years) traveled along the Ignatian road, passing through Amphipolis and Apollonia, to Thessalonica, which, though a "free city," and therefore technically exempt from the jurisdiction of the Roman governor, was practically the provincial capital. Driven thence by the hostility of the Jews, the evangelists preached in Berea, where Silas and Timothy remained for a short time after a renewed outbreak of Jewish animosity had forced Paul to leave Macedonia for the neighboring province of Achaia (Ac 17:14). Although he sent a message to his companions to join him with all speed at Athens (Ac 17:15), yet so great was his anxiety for the welfare of the newly founded Macedonian churches that he sent Timothy back to Thessalonica almost immediately (1Th 3:1,2), and perhaps Silas to some other part of Macedonia, nor did they again join him until after he had settled for some time in Corinth (Ac 18:5; 1Th 3:6). The rapid extension of the Christian faith in Macedonia at this time may be judged from the phrases used by Paul in his 1st Epistle to the Thessalonians, the earliest of his extant letters, written during this visit to Corinth. He there speaks of the Thessalonian converts as being an example "to all that believe in Macedonia and in Achaia" (1Th 1:7), and he commends their love "toward all the brethren that are in all Macedonia" (1Th 4:10). Still more striking are the words, "From you hath sounded forth the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth" (1Th 1:8).

2. Paul’s Second Visit:

On his 3rd missionary journey, the apostle paid two further visits to Macedonia. During the course of a long stay at Ephesus he laid plans for a 2nd journey through Macedonia and Achaia, and dispatched two of his helpers, Timothy and Erastus, to Macedonia to prepare for his visit (Ac 19:21,22). Some time later, after the uproar at Ephesus raised by Demetrius and his fellow-silversmiths (Ac 19:23-41), Paul himself set out for Macedonia (Ac 20:1). Of this visit Luke gives us a very summary account, telling us merely that Paul, "when he had gone through those parts, and had given them much exhortation, ... came into Greece" (Ac 20:2); but from 2 Cor, written from Macedonia (probably from Philippi) during the course of this visit, we learn more of the apostle’s movements and feelings. While at Ephesus, Paul had changed his plans. His intention at first had been to travel across the Aegean Sea to Corinth, to pay a visit from there to Macedonia and to return to Corinth, so as to sail direct to Syria (2Co 1:15,16). But by the time at which he wrote the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, probably near the end of his stay at Ephesus, he had made up his mind to go to Corinth by way of Macedonia, as we have seen that he actually did (1Co 16:5,6). From 2Co 2:13 we learn that he traveled from Ephesus to Troas, where he expected to find Titus. Titus, however, did not yet arrive, and Paul, who "had no relief for (his) spirit," left Troas and sailed to Macedonia. Even here the same restlessness pursued him: "fightings without, fears within" oppressed him, till the presence of Titus brought some relief (2Co 7:5,6). The apostle was also cheered by "the grace of God which had been given in the churches of Macedonia" (2Co 8:1); in the midst of severe persecution, they bore their trials with abounding joy, and their deep poverty did not prevent them begging to be allowed to raise a contribution to send to the Christians in Jerusalem (Ro 15:26; 2Co 8:2-4). Liberality was, indeed, from the very outset one of the characteristic virtues of the Macedonian churches. The Philippians had sent money to Paul on two occasions during his first visit to Thessalonica (Php 4:16), and again when he had left Macedonia and was staying at Corinth (2Co 11:9;

Php 4:15). On the present occasion, however, the Corinthians seem to have taken the lead and to have prepared their bounty in the previous year, on account of which the apostle boasts of them to the Macedonian Christians (2Co 9:2). He suggests that on his approaching visit to Achaia he may be accompanied by some of these Macedonians (2Co 9:4), but whether this was actually the case we are not told.

3. Paul's Third Visit:

The 3rd visit of Paul to Macedonia took place some 3 months later and was occasioned by a plot against his life laid by the Jews of Corinth, which led him to alter his plan of sailing from Cenchrea, the eastern seaport of Corinth, to Syria (2Co 1:16; Ac 20:3). He returned to Macedonia accompanied as far as Asia by 3 Macedonian Christians—Sopater, Aristarchus and Secundus—and by 4 from Asia Minor. Probably Paul took the familiar route by the Via Egnatia, and reached Philippi immediately before the days of unleavened bread; his companions preceded him to Troas (Ac 20:5), while he himself remained at Philippi until after the Passover (Thursday, April 7, 57 AD, according to Ramsay's chronology), when he sailed from Neapolis together with Luke, and joined his friends in Troas (Ac 20:6).

4. Paul's Later Visits:

Toward the close of his 1st imprisonment at Rome Paul planned a fresh visit to Macedonia as soon as he should be released (Php 1:26; 2:24), and even before that he intended to send Timothy to visit the Philippian church and doubtless those of Berea and Thessalonica also. Whether Timothy actually went on this mission we cannot say; that Paul himself went back to Macedonia once more we learn from 1Ti 1:3, and we may infer a 5th visit from the reference to the apostle's stay at Troas, which in all probability belongs to a later occasion (2Ti 4:13).

IV. The Macedonian Church.

1. Prominence of Women:

Of the churches of Macedonia in general, little need be said here. A striking fact is the prominence in them of women, which is probably due to the higher social position held by women in this province than in Asia Minor (Lightfoot, Philippians4, 55 ff). We find only two references to women in connection with Paul's previous missionary work; the women proselytes of high social standing take a share in driving him from Pisidian Antioch (Ac 13:50), and Timothy's mother is mentioned as a Jewess who believed (Ac 16:1). But in Macedonia all is changed. To women the gospel was first preached at Philippi (Ac 16:13); a woman was the first convert and the hostess of the evangelists (Ac 16:14,15); a slave girl was restored to soundness of mind by the apostle (Ac 16:18), and long afterward Paul mentions two women as having "labored with (him) in the gospel" and as endangering the peace of the church by their rivalry (Php 4:2,3). At Thessalonica a considerable number of women of the first rank appear among the earliest converts (Ac 17:4), while at Berea also the church included from the outset numerous Greek women of high position (Ac 17:12).

2. Marked Characteristics:

The bond uniting Paul and the Macedonian Christians seems to have been a peculiarly close and affectionate one. Their liberality and open-heartedness, their joyousness and patience in trial and persecution, their activity in spreading the Christian faith, their love of the brethren—these are a few of the characteristics which Paul specially commends in them (1 and 2 Thessalonians; Philippians; 2Co 8:1-8), while they also seem to have been much freer than the churches of Asia Minor from Judaizing tendencies and from the allurements of "philosophy and vain deceit."

3. Its Members:

We know the names of a few of the early members of the Macedonian churches—Sopater (Ac 20:4) or Sosipater (Ro 16:21: the identification is a probable, though not a certain, one) of Berea; Aristarchus (Ac 19:29; 20:4; 27:2; Col 4:10; Phm 1:24), Jason (Ac 17:5-9; Ro 16:21) and Secundus (Ac 20:4) of Thessalonica; Clement (Php 4:3), Epaphroditus (Php 2:25; 4:18), Euodia (Php 4:2; this, not Euodias (the King James Version), is the true form), Syntyche (same place) , Lydia (Ac 16:14,40; a native of Thyatira), and possibly Luke (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 201 ff) of Philippi. Gaius is also mentioned as a Macedonian in Ac 19:29, but perhaps the reading of a few manuscripts Makedona is to be preferred to the Textus Receptus of the New Testament Makedonas in which case Aristarchus alone would be a Macedonian, and this Gaius would probably be identical with the Gaius of Derbe mentioned in Ac 20:4 as a companion of Paul (Ramsay, op. cit., 280). The later history of the Macedonian churches, together with lists of all their known bishops, will be found in Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, II, 1 ff; III, 1089 ff 1045 f.

LITERATURE.

General: C. Nicolaides, Macedonien, Berlin, 1899; Berard, La Macedoine, Paris, 1897; "Odysseus," Turkey in Europe, London, 1900. Secular History: Hogarth, Philip and Alexander of Macedon, London, 1897, and the histories of the Hellenistic period by Holm, Niese, Droysen and Kaerst. Ethnography and Language: O. Hoffmann, Die Makedonen, ihre Sprache und ihr Volkstum, Gottingen, 1906. Topography and Antiquities: Heuzey and Daumet, Mission archeologique de Macedoine, Paris, 1876; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Macedoine, Paris, 1831; Clarke, Travels 4, VII, VIII, London, 1818; Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, III, London, 1835; Duchesne and Bayet, Memoire sur une mission en Macedoine et au Mont Athos, Paris, 1876; Hahn, Reise von Belgrad nach Saloniki, Vienna, 1861. Coins: Head, Historia Nummorum, 193 f; British Museum Catalogue of Coins: Macedonia, etc., London, 1879. Inscriptions: CIG, numbers 1951-2010; CIL, III, 1 and III, Suppl.; Dimitsas, ‘H ... Athens, 1896.

M. N. Tod

MACHAERUS

ma-ke’-rus (Machairous): Not mentioned in Scripture, canonical or apocryphal, but its importance in Jewish history justifies its inclusion here. Pliny (NH, v.16,72) speaks of it as, after Jerusalem, the strongest of Jewish fortresses. It was fortified by Alexander Janneus (BJ, VII, vi, 2). It was taken and destroyed by Gabinius (ibid., I, viii, 5; Ant, XIV, v, 4). Herod the Great restored it and, building a city here, made it one of his residences (BJ, VII, vi, 1, 2). It lay within the tetrarchy assigned to Antipas at the death of Herod. The wife of Antipas, daughter of Aretas, privately aware of his infidelity, asked to be sent hither (Ant., XVIII, v, 1). Here Josephus has fallen into confusion if he meant by the phrase "a place in the borders of the dominions of Aretas and Herod" that it was still in Herod’s hands, since immediately he tells us that it was "subject to her father." It was natural enough, however, that a border fortress should be held now by one and now by the other. It may have passed to Aretas by some agreement of which we have no record; and Herod, unaware that his wife knew of his guilt, would have no suspicion of her design in wishing to visit her father. If this is true, then the Baptist could not have been imprisoned and beheaded at Macherus (ibid., 2). The feast given to the lords of Galilee would most probably be held at Tiberias; and there is nothing in the Gospel story to hint that the prisoner was some days’ journey distant (Mr 6:14). The citadel was held by a Roman garrison until 66 AD, which then evacuated it to escape a siege (BJ, II, xviii, 6). Later by means of a stratagem it was recovered for the Romans by Bassus, circa 72 AD (BJ, VII, vi, 4).

The place is identified with the modern Mkaur, a position of great strength on a prominent height between Wady Zerqa Ma‘in and Wady el-Mojib, overlooking the Dead Sea. There are extensive ruins.

W. Ewing

MACHBANNAI

mak’-ba-ni, -ba-na’-i (makhbannay; the King James Version Machbanai): A Gadite who attached himself to David in Ziklag (1Ch 12:13).

MACHBENA

mak-be’-na (makhbenah; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Machabena; Codex Alexandrinus Machamena; the King James Version, Machbenah): A name which occurs in the genealogical list of Judah (1Ch 2:49), apparently the name of a place, which may be the same as "Cabbon" (Jos 15:40), probably to be identified with el-Kubeibeh, about 3 miles South of Beit Jibrin.

MACHI

ma’-ki (makhi; Peshitta and some manuscripts of Septuagint read "Machir"): A Gadite, father of Geuel, one of the 12 spies (Nu 13:15).

MACHIR; MACHIRITE

ma’-kir (makhir; Macheir), ma’-kir-it:

(1) The eldest son of Manasseh (Ge 50:23). In Nu 26:29 it is recorded that Machir begat Gilead, but another narrative informs us that the children of Machir "went to Gilead, and took it, and dispossessed the Amorites that were therein. And Moses gave Gilead unto Machir the son of Manasseh; and he dwelt therein" (Nu 32:39,40; Jos 17:1,3; compare also 1Ch 2:21,25; 7:14-17; De 3:15; Jos 13:31). In the song of Deborah, Machir is used as equivalent to Manasseh (Jud 5:14).

(2) Son of Ammiel, dwelling in Lo-debar (2Sa 9:4,5), a wealthy landowner who protected Mephibosheth (Meribbaal), son of Jonathan, until assured of the friendly intentions of David (compare Ant, VII, ix, 8). Afterward, during the rebellion of Absalom, Machir with others came to David’s assistance at Mahanaim, bringing supplies for the king and his men (2Sa 17:27).

John A. Lees

MACHMAS

mak’-mas.

See MICHMASH.

MACHNADEBAI

mak-nad’-e-bi, mak-na-de’-bi (makhnaddebhay): Son of Bani, one of those who married foreign wives (Ezr 10:40).

MACHPELAH

mak-pe’-la (ha-makhpelah, "the Machpelah"; to diploun, "the double"): The name of a piece of ground and of a cave purchased by Abraham as a place of sepulcher. The word is supposed to mean "double" and refers to the condition of the cave. It is translated "double cave" (to diploun spelaion) in the Septuagint in Ge 23:17. The name is applied to the ground in Ge 23:19; 49:30; 50:13, and to the cave in Ge 23:9; 25:9. In Ge 23:17 we have the phrase "the field of Ephron, which was in (the) Machpelah."

1. Scriptural Data:

The cave belonged to Ephron the Hittite, the son of Zohar, from whom Abraham purchased it for 400 shekels of silver (Ge 23:8-16). It is described as "before," i.e. "to the East of" Mamre (Ge 23:17) which (Ge 23:19) is described as the same as Hebron (see, too, Ge 25:9; 49:30; 50:13). Here were buried Abraham and Sarah, Isaac and Rebecca, Jacob and Leah. (Compare however the curious variant tradition in Ac 7:16, "Shechem" instead of "Hebron.")

2. Tradition Regarding the Site:

Josephus (BJ, IV, ix, 7) speaks of the monuments (mnemeia) of Abraham and his posterity which "are shown to this very time in that small city (i.e. in Hebron); the fabric of which monuments are of the most excellent marble and wrought after the most excellent manner"; and in another place he writes of Isaac being buried by his sons with his wife in Hebron where they had a monument belonging to them from their forefathers (Ant., I, xxii, 1). The references of early Christian writers to the site of the tombs of the patriarchs only very doubtfully apply to the present buildings and may possibly refer to Ramet el-Khalil (see MAMRE). Thus the Bordeaux Pilgrim (333 AD) mentions a square enclosure built of stones of great beauty in which Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were buried with their wives. Antonius Martyr (circa 600) and Arculf (698) also mention this monument. Mukaddasi speaks (circa 985) of the strong fortress around the tombs of the patriarchs built of great squared stones, the work of Jinns, i.e. of supernatural beings. From this onward the references are surely to the present site, and it is difficult to believe, if, as good authorities maintain, the great buttressed square wall enclosing the site is work at least as early as Herod, that the earlier references can be to any other site. It is certain that the existing buildings are very largely those which the Crusaders occupied; there are many full references to this place in medieval Moslem writers.

3. The Charam at Hebron:

The Charam at Hebron, which present-day tradition, Christian, Jewish and Moslem, recognizes as built over the cave of Machpelah, is one of the most jealousy guarded sanctuaries in the world. Only on rare occasions and through the exercise of much political pressure have a few honored Christians been allowed to visit the spot. The late King Edward VII in 1862 and the present King George V, in 1882, with certain distinguished scholars in their parties, made visits which have been chiefly important through the writings of their companions—Stanley in 1862 and Wilson and Conder in 1882. One of the latest to be accorded the privilege was C.W. Fairbanks, late vice-president of the United States of America. What such visitors have been permitted to see has not been of any great antiquity nor has it thrown any certain fight on the question of the genuineness of the site.

The space containing the traditional tombs is a great quadrangle 197 ft. in length (Northwest to Southeast) and 111 ft. in breadth (Northeast to Southwest). It is enclosed by a massive wall of great blocks of limestone, very hard and akin to marble. The walls which are between 8 and 9 ft thick are of solid masonry throughout. At the height of 15 ft. from the ground, at indeed the level of the floor within, the wall is set back about 10 inches at intervals, so as to leave pilasters 3 ft. 9 inches wide, with space between each of 7 ft. all round. On the longer sides there are 16 and on the shorter sides 8 such pilasters, and there are also buttresses 9 ft. wide on each face at each angle. This pilastered wall runs up for 25 ft., giving the total average height from the ground of 40 ft. The whole character of the masonry is so similar to the wall of the Jerusalem Charam near the "wailing place" that Conder and Warren considered that it must belong to that period and be Herodian work.

The southern end of the great enclosure is occupied by a church—probably a building entirely of the crusading period—with a nave and two aisles. The rest is a courtyard open to the air. The cenotaphs of Isaac and Rebecca are within the church; those of Abraham and Sarah occupy octagonal chapels in the double porch before the church doors; those of Jacob and Leah are placed in chambers near the north end of the Charam. The six monuments are placed at equal distances along the length of the enclosure, and it is probable that their positions there have no relation to the sarcophagi which are described as existing in the cave itself.

4. The Cave:

It is over this cave that the chief mystery hangs. It is not known whether it has been entered by any man at present alive, Moslem or otherwise. While the cave was in the hands of the Crusaders, pilgrims and others were allowed to visit this spot. Thus Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela, writing in 1163 AD, says that "if a Jew comes, who gives an additional fee to the keeper of the cave, an iron door is opened, which dates from the times of our forefathers who rest in peace, and with a burning candle in his hand the visitor descends into a first cave which is empty, traverses a second in the same state and at last reaches a third which contains six sepulchres—those of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and of Sarah, Rebecca and Leah, one opposite the other. ... A lamp burns in the cave and upon the sepulchre continually, both night and day." The account reminds us of the condition of many Christian tomb-shrines in Palestine today.

It would appear from the description of modern observers that all entrance to the cave is now closed; the only known approaches are never now opened and can only be reached by breaking up the flags of the flooring. Through one of the openings—which had a stone over it pierced by a circular hole 1 ft. in diameter—near the northern wall of the old church, Conder was able by lowering a lantern to see into a chamber some 15 ft. under the church. He estimated it to be some 12 ft. square; it had plastered walls, and in the wall toward the Southeast there was a door which appeared like the entrance to a rock-cut tomb. On the outside of the Charam wall, close to the steps of the southern entrance gateway is a hole in the lowest course of masonry, which may possibly communicate with the western cave. Into this the Jews of Hebron are accustomed to thrust many written prayers and vows to the patriarchs.

The evidence, historical and archaeological seems to show that the cave occupies only the south end of the great quadrilateral enclosure under part only of the area covered by the church.

See HEBRON.

LITERATURE.

PEF, III., 333-46; PEFS, 1882, 197; 1897, 53; 1912, 145-150; HDB, III., article "Machpelah," by Warren; Stanley, SP and Lectures on the Jewish Church; "Pal under the Moslems," PEF; Pilgrim Text Soc. publications.

E. W. G. Masterman

MACONAH

ma-ko’-na: the King James Version Mekonah (which see).

MACRON

ma’-kron (Makron>): Ptolemy Macron who had been appointed by Ptolemy Philmetor VI governor of Cyprus and deserted to Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria (2 Macc 10:12 ff). Under Antiochus he was governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (2 Macc 8:8). In 1 Macc 3:38 and 2 Macc 4:45 he is called "Ptolemy the son of Dorymenes." At first he was a fierce and cruel enemy of the Jews and was one of those chosen by Lysias to destroy Israel and reduce Judas Maccabee (same place). Later he apparently relented toward the Jews (2 Macc 10:12), fell into disfavor with Antiochus Eupator, before whom he was accused by the king’s friends, and was so galled by being constantly called traitor that he ended his life with poison (2 Macc 10:13).le in the lowest course of masonry, which may possibly communicate with the western cave. Into this the Jews of Hebron are accustomed to thrust many written prayers and vows to the patriarchs.

S. Angus

MAD; MADNESS

halal, shagha‘; mania):

1. In the Old Testament:

These words, and derivatives from the same roots are used to express various conditions of mental derangement. Though usually translated "mad," or "madness" they are often used for temporary conditions to which one would scarcely apply them today except as common colloquial inaccuracies. The madness coupled with folly in Ecclesiastes is rather the excessive frivolity and dissipation on the part of the idle rich (so in 1:17; 2:2-12; 7:25; 9:3; 10:13). The insensate fury of the wicked against the good is called by this name in Ps 102:8. In De 28:28-34 it is used to characterize the state of panic produced by the oppression of tyrannical conquerors, or (as in Zec 12:4) by the judgment of God on sinners. This condition of mind is metaphorically called a drunkenness with the wine of God’s wrath (Jer 25:16; 51:7). The same mental condition due to terror-striking idols is called "madness" in Jer 50:38. The madman of Pr 26:18 is a malicious person who carries his frivolous jest to an unreasonable length, for he is responsible for the mischief he causes. The ecstatic condition of one under the inspiration of the Divine or of evil spirits, such as that described by Balaam (Nu 24:3 f), or that which Saul experienced (1Sa 10:10), is compared to madness; and conversely in the Near East at the present day the insane are supposed to be Divinely inspired and to be peculiarly under the Divine protection. This was the motive which led David, when at the court of Achish, to feign madness (1Sa 21:13-15). It is only within the last few years that any provision has been made in Palestine for the restraint even of dangerous lunatics, and

there are many insane persons wandering at large there.

This association of madness with inspiration is expressed in the name "this mad fellow" given to the prophet who came to anoint Jehu, which did not necessarily convey a disrespectful meaning (2Ki 9:11). The true prophetic spirit was, however, differentiated from the ravings of the false prophets by Isaiah (44:25), these latter being called mad by Jeremiah (29:26) and Hosea (9:7).

The most interesting case of real insanity recorded in the Old Testament is that of Saul, who, from being a shy, self-conscious young man, became, on his exaltation to the kingship, puffed up with a megalomania, alternating with fits of black depression with homicidal impulses, finally dying by suicide. The cause of his madness is said to have been an evil spirit from God (1Sa 18:10), and when, under the influence of the ecstatic mood which alternated with his depression, he conducted himself like a lunatic (1Sa 19:23 f), his mutterings are called "prophesyings." The use of music in his case as a remedy (1Sa 16:16) may be compared with Elisha's use of the same means to produce the prophetic ecstasy (2Ki 3:15).

The story of Nebuchadnezzar is another history of a sudden accession of insanity in one puffed up by self-conceit and excessive prosperity. His delusion that he had become as an ox is of the same nature as that of the daughters of Procyus recorded in the So of Silenus by Virgil (Ecl. vi.48).

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament the word "lunatic" (seleniazomenoi) (the King James Version Mt 4:24; 17:15) is correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "epileptic." Undoubtedly many of the demoniacs were persons suffering from insanity. The words "mad" or "madness" occur 8 times, but usually in the sense of paroxysms of passion, excitement, and foolishness. Thus in Ac 26:11 Paul says that before his conversion he was "exceedingly mad" (emmainomenos) against the Christians. In 1Co 14:23, those who "speak with tongues" in Christian assemblies are said to appear "mad" to the outsider. Rhoda was called "mad" when she announced that Peter was at the door (Ac 12:15). The madness with which the Jews were filled when our Lord healed the man with the withered hand is called anoia, which is literally senselessness (Lu 6:11), and the madness of Balaam is called paraphronia, "being beside himself" (2Pe 2:16). Paul is accused by Festus of having become deranged by overstudy (Ac 26:24). It is still the belief among the fellahin that lunatics are people inspired by spirits, good or evil, and it is probable that all persons showing mental derangement would naturally be described as "possessed," so that, without entering into the vexed question of demoniacal possession, any cases of insanity cured by our Lord or the apostles would naturally be classed in the same category.

See also LUNATIC.

Alexander Macalister

MADAI

mad’-a-i, ma’-di (madhay).

See MEDES.

MADIABUN

ma-di’-a-bun (Madiaboun, the King James Version).

See EMADABUN.

MADIAN

ma’-i-an (the King James Version Judith 2:26; Ac 7:29 the King James Version).

See MIDIAN.

MADMANNAH

mad-man’-a (madhmannah; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Macharim; Codex Alexandrinus Bedebena (Jos 15:31); Codex Vaticanus Marmena; Codex Alexandrinus Madmena (1Ch 2:49)): This town lay in the Negeb of Judah and is mentioned with Hormah and Ziklag. It is represented in Jos 19:5, etc., by Beth-marcaboth. Umm Deimneh, 12 miles North of Beersheba, has been proposed on etymological grounds (PEF, III, 392, 399, Sh XXIV).

MADMEN

mad’-men (madhmen; kai pausin pausetai): An unidentified town in Moab against which Jeremiah prophesied (48:2). The play upon the words here suggests a possible error in transcription: gam madhmen tiddomi, "Also, Madmen, thou shalt be silenced." The initial "M" of "Madmen" may have arisen by dittography from the last letter of gam. We should then vocalize it as "Dimon," which of course is "Dibon."

MADMENAH

mad-me’-na (madhmenah; Madebena): A place mentioned only in Isaiah’s description of the Assyrian advance upon Jerusalem (Isa 10:31). It is not identified.

MADNESS

mad’-nes.

See MAD, MADNESS.

MADON

ma’-don (madhon; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Marrhon; Codex Alexandrinus Madon (Jos 11:1); Codex Vaticanus Marmoth; Codex Alexandrinus Maron (Jos 12:19)): A royal city of the Canaanites named along with Hazor of Galilee. El-Medineh, "the city," on the heights West of the Sea of Galilee, with which it might possibly be identified, probably dates only from Moslem times. It seems likely that the common confusion of the Hebrew letter daleth ("d") for the Hebrew letter resh ("r") has occurred, and that we should read "Maron." The place may be then identified with Meiron, a village with ancient ruins and rock tombs at the foot of Jebel Jermuk, a little to the Northwest of Safed.

W. Ewing

MAELUS

ma-e’-lus (LXX: Codex Alexandrinus Maelos; Codex Vaticanus Milelos): One of those who at Esdras’ request put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:26 equals "Mijamin" in the parallel Ezr 10:25).

MAGADAN

mag’-a-dan, ma-ga’-dan (Magadan; the reading of the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Magdala (the King James Version), but Magdala is unsupported): This name appears only in Mt 15:39. In the parallel passage, Mr 8:10, its place is taken by Dalmanutha. From these two passages it is reasonable to infer that "the borders of Magadan" and "the parts of Dalmanutha" were contiguous. We may perhaps gather from the narrative that they lay on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee. After the feeding of the 4,000, Jesus and His disciples came to these parts. Thence they departed to "the other side" (Mr 8:13), arriving at Bethsaida. This is generally believed to have been Bethsaida Julias, Northeast of the sea, whence He set out on His visit to Caesarea Philippi. In this case we might look for Dalmanutha and Magadan somewhere South of the Plain of Gennesaret, at the foot of the western hills. Stanley (SP, 383) quotes Schwarz to the effect that a cave in the face of these precipitous slopes bears the name of Teliman or Talmanutha. If this is true, it points to a site for Dalmanutha near ‘Ain el-Fuliyeh. Magadan might then be represented by el-Mejdel, a village at the Southwest corner of the Plain of Gennesaret. It is commonly identified with Magdala, the home of Mary Magdalene, but without any evidence. The name suggests that this was the site of an old Hebrew mighdal, "tower" or "fortress." The village with its ruins is now the property of the German Roman Catholics. The land in the plain has been purchased by a colony of Jews, and is once more being brought under cultivation.

The identification with Magdala is made more probable by the frequent interchange of "l" for "n", e.g.

Nathan (Hebrew), Nethel (Aramaic).

W. Ewing

MAGBISH

mag’-bish (maghbish; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Magebos; Codex Alexandrinus Maabeis): An unidentified town in Benjamin, 156 of the inhabitants of which are said to have returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:30). It does not appear in Nehemiah’s list (Ne 7:33). Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus), however, has Magebos. The name is probably identical with Magpiash, "one who sealed the covenant" (Ne 10:20).

MAGDALA

mag’-da-la.

See MAGADAN.

MAGDALENE

mag’-da-len, mag-da-le’-ne.

See MARY, III.

MAGDIEL

mag’-di-el (maghdi’el; Ge 36:43, Septuagint: Codex Alexandrinus Metoduel; 1Ch 1:54; Codex Alexandrinus Mageduel; Codex Vaticanus Meduel): One of the "dukes" of Edom.

MAGED

ma’-ged.

See MAKED.

MAGI, STAR OF

See STAR OF THE MAGI.

MAGI, THE

ma’-ji, (Magoi (Mt 2:1,7,16, "Wise-men," the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version, "Magi" the Revised Version margin)):

1. Originally a Median Tribe:

Were originally a Median tribe (Herodotus i.101); and in Darius’ Inscriptions Magush means only a member of that tribe. It was one of them, Bardiya, who pretended to be Smerdis and raised the rebellion against Cambyses. Rabh Magh in Jer 39:3 does not mean "Chief Magus," but is in Assyrian Rab mugi (apparently "commander"; compare tab mugi sa narkabti, "commander of chariots"), having no connection with "Magus" (unless perhaps Magians were employed as charioteers, Media being famous for its Nisean steeds). The investment of the Magi with priestly functions, possibly under Cyrus (Xen. Cyrop. viii), but probably much later, was perhaps due to the fact that Zoroaster (Zarathustra) belonged, it is said, to that tribe. They guarded the sacred fire, recited hymns at dawn and offered sacrifices of haoma-juice, etc. Herodotus i.132) says they also buried the dead (perhaps temporary burial is meant as in Vendidad, Farg. viii). They were granted extensive estates in Media for their maintenance, and the athravans and other priests mentioned in the Avesta may have been of their number, though only once does the word "Magus" occur in the book (in the compound Moghu-thbish, "Magus-hater," Yasna, lxv.7, Geldner’s edition). The Magi even in Herodotus’ time had gained a reputation for "magic" articles (compare Ac 13:6,8). They also studied astrology and astronomy (rationes mundani motus et siderum (Amm. Marc., xxiii.6, 32)), partly learned from Babylon.

2. The Magi at Bethlehem:

These latter studies explain why a star was used to lead them to Christ at Bethlehem, when our Lord was less than two years old (Mt 2:16). No reliable tradition deals with the country whence these particular magi came. Justin Martyr, Tertullian and Epiphanius fancied that they came from Arabia, founding their opinion on the fact that "gold, frankincense and myrrh" abounded in Yemen. But the text says they came not from the South but from the East. Origen held that they came from Chaldea, which is possible. But Clement of Alexandria, Diodorus of Tarsus, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Juvencus, Prudentius and others are probably right in bringing them from Persia. Sargon’s settlement of Israelites in Media (circa 730-728 BC (2Ki 17:6)) accounts for the large Hebrew element of thought which Darmesteter recognizes in the Avesta (SBE, IV, Intro, chapter vi). Median astronomers would thus know Balaam’s prophecy of the star out of Jacob (Nu 24:17). That the Jews expected a star as a sign of the birth of the Messiah is clear from the tractate Zohar of the Gemara and also from the title "Son of the Star" (Bar Kokhebha) given to a pseudo-Messiah

(130-35 AD). Tacitus (Hist. v.13) and Suetonius (Vesp. iv) tell us how widespread in the East at the time of Christ’s coming was the expectation that "at that time men starting from Judea would make themselves masters of things" (compare Virgil, Ecl. iv). All this would naturally prepare the Magi to follow the star when it appeared.

See also ASTROLOGY; ASTRONOMY; DIVINATION; MAGIC; WISE MEN; ZOROASTRIANISM.

LITERATURE.

Herodotus; Xenophon; Amm. Marcellinus; Strabo; Spiegel, Altpersische Keilinschriften; Geldner, Avesta; Muss-Arnolt, Assyrian Dict.; BDB; RE.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

MAGIC; MAGICIAN

maj'-ik, ma-jish'-an:

I. DEFINITION

II. DIVISION OF THE SUBJECT

1. Magic as Impersonal

2. Margic as Personal

III. MAGIC AND RELIGION

IV. MAGIC IN THE BIBLE

1. Hostility to Magic

2. Potency of Magical Words

3. Influence of Charms

V. MAGICAL TERMS USED IN THE BIBLE

1. Divination

2. Sorcery

3. Enchantment

4. Amulets

5. Incantation

6. Repeated Utterances

7. Impostors

8. Witchcraft

LITERATURE

The word comes from a Greek adjective (magike) with which the noun techne, "art," is understood. The full phrase is "magical art" (The Wisdom of Solomon 17:10). But the Greek word is derived from the magi or Zarathustran (Zoroastrian) priests. Magic is therefore historically the art practiced in Persia by the recognized priests of the country. It is impossible in the present article, owing to exigencies of space, to give a full account of this important subject and of the leading views of it which have been put forth. The main purpose of the following treatment will be to consider the subject from the Biblical standpoint.

I. Definition.

In its modern accepted sense magic may be described as the art of bringing about results beyond man’s own power by superhuman agencies. In the wide sense of this definition divination is only a species of magic, i.e. magic used as a means of securing secret knowledge, especially a knowledge of the future. Divination and magic bear a similar relation to prophecy and miracle respectively, the first and third implying special knowledge, the second and fourth special power. But divination has to do generally with omens, and it is better for this and other reasons to notice the two subjects—magic and divination—apart as is done in the present work.

II. Division of the Subject.

1. Magic as Impersonal:

There are two kinds of magic:

(1) impersonal;

(2) personal.

In the first, magic is a species of crude science, for the underlying hypothesis is that there are forces in the world which can be utilized on certain conditions, incantations, magical acts, drugs, etc. The magician in this case connects what on a very slender induction he considers to be causes and effects, mainly on the principle of post hoc ergo propter hoc. He may not know much of the causal agency; it is

enough for him to know that by performing some act or reciting some formula (see CHARM) or carrying some object (see AMULET) he can secure some desired end. Frazer (Golden Bough(2), I, 61) says: "Magic is a kind of savage logic, an elementary species of reasoning based on similarity, contiguity and contrast." But why does the savage draw conclusions from association of ideas? There must be an implied belief in the uniformly of Nature or in the controlling power of intelligent beings.

2. Magic as Personal:

In personal magic, living, intelligent, spiritual beings are made the real agents which men by incantations, etc., influence and even control. The magical acts may in an advanced stage include sacrifice, the incantations become prayer.

Impersonal magic is regarded by most anthropologists, including E.B. Tylor and J. Frazer, as more primitive than the second and as a lower form of it. This conclusion rests on an assumption that human culture is always progressive, that the movement is uniformly onward and upward. But this law does not always hold. The religion of Israel as taught in the 8th century BC stands on a higher level ethically and intellectually than that taught in the writings of Haggai, Zechariah and Eccelesiastes centuries later. Among the ancient Indians, the Rig Veda occupies much loftier ground than the much later Atharva Veda.

III. Magic and Religion.

Personal magic in its higher forms shades off into religion, and very commonly the two exist together. It is the practice to speak of sacrifice and prayer as constituting elements of the ancient and modern religions of India. But it is doubtful whether either of these has the same connotation that it bears in the Jewish and Christian Scriptures. J. Frazer (Golden Bough(2), I, 67 ff) says that where the operation of spirits is assumed (and "these cases are exceptional"), magic is "tinged and alloyed with religion." Such an assumption is, he admits, often made and the present writer thinks it is generally made, for even the operation of the laws of association implies it. But Frazer concludes from various considerations that "though magic is .... found to fuse and amalgamate with religion in many ages and in many lands, there are some grounds for thinking that this fusion is not primitive." It is of course personal magic to which religion stands in closest relations. As soon as man comes to see in the beings by whose power marvels are wrought, personalities capable of emotions like himself and susceptible to persuasion, his magical art becomes an intelligent effort to propitiate these superior beings and his incantations become hymns and prayers. In all religions, Jewish, Moslem, Christian or pagan, when the act or prayer as such is held to produce certain results or to secure certain desired boons, we have to do with a species of magic. The word "religion" is inapplicable, unless it includes the idea of personal faith in a God or gods whose favor depends on moral acts and on ritual acts only in so far as they have a voluntary and ethical character. If it be granted that magic, the lower, precedes religion, the higher, this does not necessarily negative the validity of the religious concept. Mature knowledge is preceded by elementary impressions and beliefs which are subjective without objective correspondences. But this higher knowledge is none the less valid for its antecedents. If it can be proved that the Christian or any other religion has become what it is by

gradual ascent from animism, magic, etc., its validity is not by this destroyed or even impaired. Religion must be judged according to its own proper evidence. But see II, end.

IV. Magic in the Bible.

1. Hostility to Magic:

The general remarks made on the Bible and divination in DIVINATION, V, have an equal application to the attitude of the Bible toward magic. This attitude is distinctly hostile, as it could not but be in documents professing to inculcate the teaching of the ethical and spiritual religion of Israel (see De 18:10 f; 2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6, etc.). Yet it is equally clear that the actual power of magic is acknowledged as clearly as its illegitimacy is pointed out. In P's account of the plagues (Ex 7-11) it is assumed that the magicians of Egypt had real power to perform superhuman feats. They throw their rods and they become serpents; they turn the waters of the Nile into blood. It is only when they try to produce gnats that they fail, though Aaron had succeeded by Yahweh's power in doing this and thus showed that Yahweh's power was greatest. But that the magicians had power that was real and great is not so much as called in question.

2. Potency of Magical Words:

Among the ancient Semites (Arabs, Assyrians, Hebrews, etc.) there was a strong belief in the potency of the magical words of blessing and of curse. The mere utterance of such words was regarded as enough to secure their realization. That the narrator of Nu 22-24 (Jahwist) ascribed to Balaam magical power is clear from the narrative, else why should Yahweh be represented as transferring Balaam's service to the cause of Israel? We have other Biblical references to the power of the spoken word of blessing in Ge 12:3; Ex 12:32; Jud 17:2; 2Sa 21:3, and of curse in Ge 27:29; Jud 5:23; Job 3:8 (compare the so-called Imprecatory Psalms, and see Century Bible, "Psalms," volume II, 216). On the prevalence of the belief among the Arabs, see the important work of Goldziher, Abhandlungen zur arabischen Philologie, Theil I, 23 ff.

3. Influence of Charms:

In Ge 30:14 (Jahwist) we have an example of the belief in the power of plants (here mandrakes) to stir up and strengthen sexual love, and we read in Arabic literature of the very same superstition in connection with what is called Yabruch, almost certainly the same plant. Indeed one of the commonest forms in which magic appears is as a love-charm, and as this kind of magic was often exercised by women, magic and adultery are frequently named together in the Old Testament (see 2Ki 9:22; Na 3:4; Mal 3:5; and compare Ex 22:18 (17), where the sorceress (the King James Version "witch") is to be condemned to death). We have an instance of what is called sympathetic magic (for a description of which see Jevons, Introduction to History of Religion, 28 ff, and Frazer, Golden Bough(2), I, 49 ff) in Ge 30:37 ff. Jacob placed before the sheep and goats that came to drink water peeled rods, so that the pregnant ones might bring forth young that were spotted and striped. The teraphim mentioned in Ge

31:19 ff and put away with wizards during the drastic reforms of Josiah (2Ki 23:24; compare Zec 10:2) were household objects supposed capable of warding off evil of every kind. The Babylonians and Assyrians had a similar custom. We read of an Assyrian magician that he had statues of the gods Lugalgira and Alamu put on each side of the main entrance to his house, and in consequence he felt perfectly impregnable against evil spirits (see Tallquist, Assyrian. Beach, 22).

In Isa 3:2 the qocem ("magician" or "diviner") is named along with the knight warrior, the judge, prophet and elder, among the stays and supports of the nation; no disapproval is expressed or implied with regard to any of them. Yet it is not to be denied that in its essential features pure Yahwism, which enforced personal faith in a pure spiritual being, was radically opposed to all magical beliefs and practices. The fact that the Hebrews stood apart as believers in an ethical and spiritual religion from the Semitic and other peoples by which they were surrounded suggests that they were Divinely guided, for in other respects—art, philosophy, etc.—this same Hebrew nation held a lower place than many contemporary nations.

V. Magical Terms Used in the Bible.

Many terms employed in the Old Testament in reference to divination have also a magical import. See DIVINATION, VII. For a fuller discussion of Biblical terms connected with both subjects, reference may be made to T. Witton Davies, Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbours, 44 iff, 78 ff; see also articles "Divination" and "Magic" in EB, by the present writer.

1. Divination:

Here a few brief statements are all that can be attempted. Qecem, usually rendered "divination" (see Nu 23:23), has primarily a magical reference (Fleischer), though both Wellhausen (Reste des arabischen Heidenthums 2, 133, note 5) and W. Robertson Smith (Jour. Phil., XIII, 278) hold that its first use was in connection with divination. The Arabic verb ("to exorcise") and noun ("an oath") have magical meanings. But it must be admitted that the secondary meaning ("divination") has almost driven out the other. See under I, where it is held that at bottom magic and divination are one.

2. Sorcery:

The verb kashaph, the Revised Version (British and American) "to practice sorcery," comes, as Fleischer held, from a root denoting "to have a dark appearance," to look gloomy, to be distressed, then as a suppliant to seek relief by magical means. The corresponding nouns kashshaph and mekashsheph are rendered "sorcerer" in English Versions of the Bible.

3. Enchantment:

Lachash, English Versions of the Bible "enchantment," etc. (see Isa 3:3, nebhon lachash, the Revised Version (British and American) "the skillful enchanter"), is connected etymologically with nachash, "a

serpent,"‘ the "n" and "l" often interchanging in Semitic Lachash is, therefore, as might have been expected from this etymology, used specifically of serpent charming (see Jer 8:17; Ec 10:11; compare melachesh in Ps 58:5 (6), English Versions of the Bible "charmer").

4. Amulets:

Chebher occurs in the plural only (Isa 47:9,12, English Versions of the Bible, "enchantments"). It comes from a root meaning "to bind," and it denotes probably amulets of some kind carried on the person to ward off evil. It seems therefore to be the Biblical equivalent of the Talmudic qemia‘, literally, equals "something bound" from qama‘, "to bind."

5. Incantation:

Shichar (Isa 47:11) seems to have an etymological connection with the principal Arabic word for "magic" (sichrun), and is explained by the great majority of recent commentators following J.H. Michaelis (Hitzig, Ewald, Dillmann, Whitehouse in Century Bible, etc.) as meaning "to charm away" (by incantations). So also Targum, Rashi, J H and Jastrow, Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmudim, and Midrashic Literature, Michaelis, Eichhorn, etc.

6. Repeated Utterances:

The verb battologeo in Mt 6:7 (equals "say not the same thing over and over again") refers to the superstition that the repeated utterance of a word will secure one’s wish. In India today it is thought that if an ascetic says in one month the name of Radha, Krishna, or Ro 100,000 times, he cannot fail to obtain what he wants (see 1Ki 18:26).

See REPETITIONS.

7. Impostors:

The term goetes, the Revised Version (British and American) "impostors," the King James Version "seducers," is used of a class of magicians who uttered certain magical formulas in a deep, low voice (compare the verb goao, which =" to sigh," "to utter low moaning tones"). Herodotus (ii.33) says that there were persons of the kind in Egypt, and they are mentioned also by Euripides and Plato.

8. Witchcraft:

Paul in Ga 5:20 classes with uncleanness, idolatry, etc., what he calls pharmakeia, the King James Version "witchcraft" the Revised Version (British and American) "sorcery." The word has reference first of all to drugs used in exercising the magical article Note the name Simon Magus, which = Simon the magician (Ac 8:9 f), and Bar-Jesus, whom Luke calls a magician (magos, English Versions of the Bible, "sorcerer") and to whom he gives also the proper name Elymas, which is really the Arabic ‘alim ="

learned," and so one skillful in the magical article.

See also under AMULET; CHARM; DEMONOLOGY; WITCHCRAFT.

LITERATURE.

A Very full bibliography of the subject will be found in T. Witton Davies, Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbours, xi through xvi. See also the literature under DIVINATION and in addition to the literature cited in the course of the foregoing article, note the following: A. Lehmann, Aberglaube und Zauberei2, 1908; A.C. Haddon, Magic and Fetishism, 1906; Blau, Das altjudische Zauberwesen, 1898; Smith, "Witchcraft in the Old Testament," Biblical Soc., 1902, 23-35; W.R. Halliday, Greek Divination; A Study of Its Methods and Principles, London, Macmillan (important) and the valuable article on "Magic" by Northwest Thomas in the Encyclopedia Brittanica, and also the relevant articles in the Bible dictionaries.

T. Witton Davies

MAGISTRATE

maj'-is-trat (shephaT, corresponding to shaphaT, "to judge," "to pronounce sentence" (Jud 18:7)): Among the ancients, the terms corresponding to our "magistrate" had a much wider signification. "Magistrates and judges" (shopheTim we-dhayyanim) should be translated "judges and rulers" (Ezr 7:25). ceghanim "rulers" or "nobles," were Babylonian magistrates or prefects of provinces (Jer 51:23,28,57; Eze 23:6). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, the Jewish magistrates bore the same title (Ezr 9:2; Ne 2:16; 4:14; 13:11). The Greek archon, "magistrate" (Lu 12:58; Tit 3:1 the King James Version), signifies the chief in power (1Co 2:6,8) and "ruler" (Ac 4:26; Ro 13:3).

The Messiah is designated as the "prince (archon) of the kings of the earth" (Re 1:5 the King James Version), and by the same term Moses is designated the judge and leader of the Hebrews (Ac 7:27,35). The wide application of this term is manifest from the fact that it is used of magistrates of any kind, e.g. the high priest (Ac 23:5); civil judges (Lu 12:58; Ac 16:19); ruler of the synagogue (Lu 8:41; Mt 9:18,23; Mr 5:22); persons of standing and authority among the Pharisees and other sects that appear in the Sanhedrin (Lu 14:1; Joh 3:1; Ac 3:17). The term also designates Satan, the prince or chief of the fallen angels (Mt 9:34; Eph 2:2).

In the New Testament we also find strategos, employed to designate the Roman praetors or magistrates of Philippi, a Roman colony (Ac 16:20,22,35,36,38). A collective term for those clothed with power (Eng. "the powers"), exousiai, is found in Lu 12:11 the King James Version; Ro 13:2,3; Tit 3:1. The "higher powers" (Ro 13:1) are all those who are placed in positions of civil authority from the emperor down.

In early Hebrew history, the magisterial office was limited to the hereditary chiefs, but Moses made the

judicial office elective. In his time the "heads of families" were 59 in number, and these, together with the 12 princes of the tribes, composed the Sanhedrin or Council of 71. Some of the scribes were entrusted with the business of keeping the genealogies and in this capacity were also regarded as magistrates.

Frank E. Hirsch

MAGNIFICAL

mag-nif'-i-kal (gadhal, in Hiphil "to make great"): Old form retained from Genevan version in 1Ch 22:5; in the American Standard Revised Version "magnificent."

MAGNIFICAT

mag-nif'-i-kat: The name given to the hymn of Mary in Lu 1:46-55, commencing "My soul doth magnify the Lord." Three old Latin manuscripts substitute the name "Elisabeth" for "Mary" in 1:46, but against this is the authority of all Greek manuscripts and other Latin versions. The hymn, modeled in part on that of Hannah in 1Sa 2:1 ff, is peculiarly suitable to the circumstances of Mary, and plainly could not have been composed after the actual appearance and resurrection of Christ. Its early date is thus manifest.

MAGNIFY

mag'-ni-fi (Hiphil of gadhal; megaluno, "to make great," "extol," "celebrate in praise"): Used especially of exaltation of the name, mercy, and other attributes of God (Ge 19:19; 2Sa 7:26; Ps 35:27; 40:16; 70:4; Lu 1:46; Ac 10:46); of God's "word" (Ps 138:2); or of Christ (Ac 19:17; Php 1:20). Men also can be "magnified" (Jos 4:14; 1Ch 29:25, etc.). In Ro 11:13, "magnify mine office," the word (Greek, doxazo) is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "glorify."

MAGOG

ma'-gog (maghogh; Magog): Named among the sons of Japheth (Ge 10:2; 1Ch 1:5). Ezekiel uses the word as equivalent to "land of Gog" (Eze 38:2; 39:6). Josephus identifies the Magogites with the Scythians (Ant., I, vi, 1). From a resemblance between the names Gog and Gyges (Gugu), king of Lydia, some have suggested that Magog is Lydia; others, however, urge that Magog is probably only a variant of Gog (Sayce in HDB). In the Apocalypse of John, Gog and Magog represent all the heathen opponents of Messiah (Re 20:8), and in this sense these names frequently recur in Jewish apocalyptic literature.

John A. Lees

MAGOR-MISSABIB

ma’-gor-mis’-a-bib (maghor miccabhibh, "terror on every side"): A name given by Jeremiah to Pashhur ben Immer, the governor of the temple, who had caused the prophet to be beaten and set in the stocks (Jer 20:3). The same expression is used (not as a proper name) in several other passages (Ps 31:13; Jer 6:25; 20:10; 46:5; 49:29; La 2:22).

MAGPIASH

mag’-pi-ash.

See MAGBISH.

MAGUS, SIMON

ma’-gus.

See SIMON MAGUS; MAGI; MAGIC.

MAHALAH

ma-ha’-la, ma’-ha-la (machlah; the Revised Version (British and American) has the correct form MAHLAH): A descendant of Manasseh (1Ch 7:18).

MAHALALEL

ma-ha’-la-lel (mahalal’el; the King James Version Mahalaleel, ma-ha’la-le-el, ma-hal’a-lel):

(1) Son of Cainan, the grandson of Seth (Ge 5:12 ff; 1Ch 1:2).

(2) The ancestor of Athaiah, one of the children of Judah who dwelt in Jerusalem after the return from exile (Ne 11:4).

MAHALATH

ma’-ha-lath (machalath):

(1) In Ge 28:9 the name of a wife of Esau, daughter of Ishmael, and sister of Nebaioth, called in 36:3, BASEMATH (which see). The Samaritan Pentateuch, however, throughout Genesis 36 retains "Mahalath." On the other hand, in 26:34 Basemath is said to be "the daughter of Elon the Hittite," probably a confusion with Adah, as given in 36:2, or corruption may exist in the lists otherwise.

(2) One of the 18 wives of Rehoboam, a grand-daughter of David (2Ch 11:18).

(3) The word is found in the titles of Ps 53 (the Revised Version (British and American) "set to Mahalath") and Ps 88 (the Revised Version (British and American) "set to Mahalath Leannoth," margin "for singing"). Probably some song or tune is meant, though the word is taken by many to denote a musical instrument. Hengstenberg and others interpret it as indicating the subject of the Psalms.

See PSALMS.

James Orr

MAHALI

ma’-ha-li.

See MAHLI.

MAHANAIM

ma-ha-na’-im (machanayim; the Greek is different in every case where the name occurs, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus also giving variant forms; the dual form may be taken as having arisen from an old locative ending, as, e.g. yerushala(y)im from an original yerushalem. In Ge 32:21 machaneh is evidently a parallel form and should be rendered as a proper name, Mahaneh, i.e. Mahanaim): The city must have been one of great strength. It lay East of the Jordan, and is first mentioned in the history of Jacob. Here he halted after parting from Laban, before the passage of the Jabbok (Ge 31:2), "and the angels of God met him." Possibly it was the site of an ancient sanctuary. It is next noticed in defining the boundaries of tribal territory East of the Jordan. It lay on the border of Gad and Manasseh (Jos 13:26,30). It belonged to the lot of Gad, and was assigned along with Ramoth in Gilead to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:38; 1Ch 6:80—the former of these passages affords no justification to Cheyne in saying (EB, under the word) that it is mentioned as a "city of refuge"). The strength of the place doubtless attracted Abner, who fixed here the capital of Ishbosheth’s kingdom. Saul’s chivalrous rescue of Jabesh-gilead was remembered to the credit of his house in these dark days, and the loyalty of Mahanaim could be reckoned on (2Sa 2:8, etc.). To this same fortress David fled when endangered by the rebellion of Absalom; and in the "forest" hard by, that prince met his fate (2Sa 17:24, etc.). It was made the center of one of Solomon’s administrative districts, and here Abinadab the son of Iddo was stationed (1Ki 4:14). There seems to be a reference to Mahanaim in So 6:13 the Revised Version (British and American). If this is so, here alone it appears with the article. By emending the text Cheyne would read: "What do you see in the Shulammite? A narcissus of the valleys."

It is quite clear from the narrative that Jacob, going to meet his brother, who was advancing from the South, crossed the Jabbok after leaving Mahanaim. It is therefore vain to search for the site of this city

South of the Jabbok, and Conder's suggested identification with some place near el-Buqei'a, East of es-Salt], must be given up.

On the North of the Jabbok several positions have been thought of. Merrill (East of the Jordan, 433 ff) argues in favor of Khirbet Saleikhat, a ruined site in the mouth of Wady Saleikhat, on the northern bank, 3 miles East of Jordan, and 4 miles North of Wady 'Ajlun. From its height, 300 ft. above the plain, it commands a wide view to the West and South. One running "by the way of the Plain" could be seen a great way off (2Sa 18:23). This would place the battle in the hills to the South near the Jordan valley. Ahimaaz then preferred to make a detour, thus securing a level road, while the Cushite took the rough track across the heights. Others, among them Buhl (GAP, 257), would place Mahanaim at Michneh, a partly overgrown ruin 9 miles East of Jordan, and 4 miles North of 'Ajlun on the north bank of Wady Machneh. This is the only trace of the ancient name yet found in the district. It may be assumed that Mahanaim is to be sought in this neighborhood. Cheyne would locate it at 'Ajlun, near which rises the great fortress Kal'ater-Rabad. He supposes that the "wood of Mahanaim" extended as far as Michneh, and that "the name of Mihneh is really an abbreviation of the ancient phrase." Others would identify Mahanaim with Jerash, where, however, there are no remains older than Greek-Roman times.

Objections to either 'Ajlun or Michneh are:

(1) The reference to this Jordan" in Ge 32:10, which seems to show that the city was near the river. It may indeed be said that the great hollow of the Jordan valley seems close at hand for many miles on either side, but this, perhaps, hardly meets the objection.

(2) The word kikkar, used for "Plain" in 2Sa 18:23, seems always elsewhere to apply to the "circle" of the Jordan. Buhl, who identifies Mahanaim with Michneh, yet cites this verse (G A the Priestly Code (P), 112) as a case in which kikkar applies to the plain of the Jordan. He thus prescribes for Ahimaaz a very long race. Cheyne sees the difficulty. The battle was obviously in the vicinity of Mahanaim, and the nearest way from the "wood" was by the kikkar, "or, since no satisfactory explanation of this reading has been offered by the nachal, that is to say, the eager Ahimaaz ran along in the wady in which, at some little distance, Mahanaim lay" (EB, under the word). The site for the present remains in doubt.ter-Rabad. He supposes that the "wood of Mahanaim" extended as far as Michneh, and that "the name of Mihneh is really an abbreviation of the ancient phrase." Others would identify Mahanaim with Jerash, where, however, there are no remains older than Greek-Roman times.

W. Ewing

MAHANEH-DAN

ma'-ha-ne-dan (machaneh-dhan; parembole Dan): This place is mentioned twice: in Jud 13:25 (the King James Version "the camp of Dan"), and Jud 18:12. In Mahaneh-dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol, the spirit of the Lord began to move Samson. Here the 600 marauders of Dan, coming from Zorah and Eshtaol, encamped behind Kiriath-jearim. It has been thought that these two statements contradict each

other; or at least that they cannot both apply to the same place. But if we accept the identification of Zorah with Surah, and of Eshtaol with Eshu‘, which there seems no reason to question; and if, further, we identify Kiriath-jearim with Khirbet Erma, which is at least possible, the two passages may be quite reconciled. Behind Kiriath-jearim, that is West of Khirbet Erma, runs the Vale of Sorek, on the north bank of which, about 2 miles apart, stand Zorah and Eshtaol; the former 3 1/2 miles, the latter 2 1/2 miles fron khirbet Erma. No name resembling Mahanehdan has yet been recovered; but the place may have lain within the area thus indicated, so meeting the conditions of both passages, whether it was a permanent settlement, or derived its name only from the incident mentioned in Jud 18:12.

W. Ewing

MAHARAI

ma-har’-a-i, ma’-ha-ri (maharay, "impetuous"): One of David’s "braves" (2Sa 23:28; 1Ch 11:30; 27:13). He was one of the 12 monthly captains of David’s administration, and took the 10th month in rotation. He was of the family of Zerah, and dwelt in Netophah in Judah.

MAHATH

ma’-hath (machath, "snatching"; Meth):

(1) One of the Kohathites having charge of the "service of song" in David’s time, son of Amasai (1Ch 6:35). Possibly the same as Ahimoth (1Ch 6:25). He seems also to be the same as the person named in 2Ch 29:12 during Hezekiah’s time, though it is probable there is some confusion in the narrative. He is there represented as taking part in the new covenant of Hezekiah and the cleansing of the Lord’s house.

(2) One of the overseers of the temple under Conaniah and Shimei (2Ch 31:13); three passages of Scripture give the name, but it is difficult to individuate these because the genealogy identifies the two first named (1Ch 6:35; 2Ch 29:12), while the chronology seems to divide them—one in David’s day, the other in Hezekiah’s. It is not, however, impossible to identify the man of 2Ch 29:12 with him of 2Ch 31:13. Possibly the genealogy has been mistakenly repeated in 2Ch 29:12.

Henry Wallace

MAHAVITE

ma’-ha-vit (machawim, "villagers"): The description given to Eliel, one of David’s warrior guard (1Ch 11:46), perhaps to distinguish him from the Eliel in the next verse. Massoretic Text is very obscure here.

MAHAZIOTH

ma-ha’-iz-oth, ma-ha’-zi-oth (machazi’oth "visions"): One of the 14 sons of Heman the Kohathite in the temple choir. "He was leader of the 23rd course of musicians whose function was to blow the horns" (1Ch 25:4,30).

MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ

ma’-her-shal’-al-hash’-baz (maher shalal chash baz, "the spoil speedeth; the prey hasteth"): Asymbolic name given to Isaiah’s son to signify the sharp destruction of Rezin and Pekah by the Assyrian power (Isa 8:1,3). Compare the Greek idea of Nemesis.

MAHLAH

ma’-la (machlah "sickness" or "song," etymology doubtful):

(1) Eldest of Zelophehad’s 5 daughters (Nu 26:33; 27:1). As Zelophehad, grandson of Manasseh, had no sons, the daughters successfully claimed their father’s inheritance. The law was altered in their favor on condition that they married into their father’s tribe. They agreed and married their cousins (Nu 36:11). The whole chapter should be read and compared with Jos 17:3 ff, because the decision became a precedent.

(2) Another (the King James Version "Mahalah"), same Hebrew name as above, daughter of Hammoleketh, grand-daughter of Manasseh (1Ch 7:18).

Henry Wallace

MAHLI

ma’-li (machli, "a sick or weak one"‘):

(1) A son of Merari (Ex 6:19, the King James Version Mahali; Nu 3:20), grandson of Levi and founder of the Levitical family of MAHLITES (which see).

(2) A son of Mushi, Mahli’s brother, bears the same name (1Ch 6:47; 23:23; 24:30). Compare Ezr 8:18 and 1 Esdras 8:47.

MAHLITES

ma’-lits (machli): Descendants of Mahli, son of Merari (Nu 3:33; 26:58). These Mahlites appear to have followed the example of the daughters of Zelophehad, mutatis mutandis. (See MAHLAH; had the name become the description of a practice?) They married the daughters of their uncle Eleazar (1Ch 23:21,22).

MAHLON

ma’-lon (machlon, "invalid"): Ruth’s first husband (Ru 12,5; 4:9,10). In the latter passage is further evidence of the unwillingness to allow a family connection or inheritance to drop (see MAHLAH; MAHLI). Note that David’s descent and that of his "Greater Son" come through Ru and Boaz (Ru 4:22).

MAHOL

ma’-hol (machol, "dance"; compare bene-machol, "sons of dance"): The father of the 4 sages reputed next in wisdom to Solomon (1Ki 4:31). Their names were Ethan, Heman, Chalcol, Darda.

MAHSEIAH

ma-se’-ya, ma-si’-a (machceyah, "Yah a refuge"): Grandfather of Baruch (Jer 32:12) and of Seraiah (Jer 51:59). The name (not to be confused with MAASEIAH (which see) as the King James Version has done even in the above passages) is spelt "Maaseas" (which see) in Baruch 1:1.

MAIANNAS

mi-an’-as (Maiannas; the King James Version Maianeas): One of the Levites who taught the law for Esdras (1 Esdras 9:48) = MAASEIAH (which see) in Ne 8:7.

MAID; MAIDEN

mad, mad’-’n: Used in the King James Version in the sense of a girl or young female; of an unmarried woman or virgin, and of a female servant or handmaid. Thus, it translates several Hebrew words:

(1) The more generic word is na‘arah, "girl," feminine form of the common na‘ar, "boy" (1Sa 9:11; 2Ki 5:2,4; Es 2:4,7 ff; Job 41:5; Am 2:7) In several places masculine form na‘ar, with feminine form of verb rendered "damsel" (Ge 24:14,16,28,55; 34:3,12; De 22:15); compare he pais (Lu 8:51,54); see also paidiske, diminutive (Sirach 41:22; Mr 14:66,69; Lu 12:45; korasion, Septuagint for na‘arah, "maid," in Mt 9:24 f with Job 6:12 f; Susanna verses 15,19).

(2) The Hebrew ‘almah, also rendered "maid," refers to a woman of marriageable age (Ex 2:8; Pr 30:19), whether married or not, whether a virgin or not. The same word is translated "virgin" in several places (Ge 24:43 the King James Version; So 13; 6:8; Isa 7:14).

(3) The word bethulah, a common Hebrew word for "virgin," a chaste woman Septuagint parthenos), is frequently rendered "maid" and "maiden" (Ex 22:16; Jud 19:24; 2Ch 36:17; Ps 78:63; 148:12; Jer 51:22; La 5:11; Eze 9:6; 44:22; Zec 9:17; compare De 22:14,17, having "the marks (tokens) of virginity"); bethulim, rendered "maid." See VIRGIN.

(4) Two Hebrew words covering the idea of service, handmaid, handmaiden, and in numerous passages so rendered:

(a) ‘amah, translated "maid" (Ge 30:3; Ex 2:5; 21:20,26; Le 25:6; Ezr 2:65; Job 19:15; Na 2:7);

(b) shiphchah, "a family servant," "a handmaid," so rendered in numerous passages ("maid," "maiden," Ge 16:2 ff; 29:24,29; 30:7,9,10,12,18; Isa 24:2; Ps 123:2; Ec 2:7). In the King James Version they are variously translated "maid," "handmaid," etc.

(5) The rather rare word habra, "favorite slave," is rendered "maid" in Judith 10:2,5; 13:9; 16:23; Additions to Esther 15:2,7.

(6) doule, "female slave," in the King James Version Judith 12:49 (the Revised Version (British and American) "servant").

Maidservant means simply a female slave in the different positions which such a woman naturally occupies. They were the property of their masters; sometimes held the position of concubines (Ge 31:33); daughters might be sold by their fathers into this condition (Ex 21:7). It is regrettable that no uniform translation was adopted in the King James Version. And in the Revised Version (British and American) compare Tobit 3:7; Judith 10:10; Sirach 41:22.

"Maidservants" replaces "maidens" of the King James Version in Lu 12:45. Compare Job 31:13.

Edward Bagby Pollard

MAIL

mal.

See ARMOR.

MAIMED

mam’-d (charuts; kullos, anaperos): The condition of being mutilated or rendered imperfect as the result of accident, in contrast to congenital malformation. An animal thus affected was declared to be unfit to be offered in sacrifice as a peace offering (Le 22:22); although under certain conditions a congenitally deformed animal might be accepted as a free-will offering, apparently the offering of a maimed animal was always prohibited (Le 22:23,24). The use of such animals in sacrifice was one of the charges brought against the Jews of his time by Malachi (1:8-14). The word is also used to denote those who were so mutilated. Among those made whole by our Lord in Galilee were the maimed as well as the halt

(Mt 15:30).

Figuratively the casting off of any evil habit or distracting condition which interferes with the spiritual life is called "maiming" (Mt 18:8; Mr 9:43); with this may be taken the lesson in Mt 19:12. In these passages "maimed" (kullos) is used of injuries of the upper limb, and cholos of those affecting the feet, rendering one halt. Hippocrates, however, uses kullos for a deformation of the legs in which the knees are bent so far outward as to render the patient lame; while he applies the term cholos as a generic name for any distortion, and in one place uses it to describe a mutilation of the head (Prorrhetica, 83). The maimed and the halt are among the outcasts who are to be brought into the gospel feast according to the parable (Lu 14:13-21).

Alexander Macalister

MAINSAlL

man’-sal.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

MAKAZ

ma’-kaz (maqats): One of the cities of the 2nd of the 12 districts or prefectures which supplied victuals for Solomon (1Ki 4:9). It is associated with Shaalbim, Beth-shemesh and Elon-beth-hanan, all three probably identical with cities mentioned (Jos 19:41,42) as on the border of Dan. Cheyne (EB, II, col. 2906) suggests that Makaz may bc identical with MEJARGON (which see) in the latter list.

MAKE, MAKER

mak, mak’-er (‘asah, nathan, sum; poieo, tithemi, kathistemi):

1. As Used in the Old Testament:

"Make" is a frequently used word, meaning "to create," "construct," "cause," "constitute," etc., and represents different Hebrew words. It is very often in the King James Version

(1) the translation of ‘asah, "to do," "make," etc., usually’ in the sense of constructing, effecting. In Ge 1:7,16,25,31, etc., it is used of the creation; of the creation of man in the likeness of God (5:1); of the ark (6:14); of a feast (21:8); of the tabernacle and all the things belonging to it (Ex 25:8, etc.); of idols (Isa 2:8; Jer 2:28, etc.);

(2) of nathan (literally, "to give"), chiefly in the sense of constituting, appointing, causing; of a covenant

(Ge 9:12; 17:2); of Abraham as the father of many nations, etc. (Ge 17:5,6); of Ishmael as a great nation (Ge 17:20); of Moses as a god to Pharaoh (Ex 7:1); of judges and officers (De 16:18); of laws (Le 26:46, etc.); it has the meaning of "to cause" (Ex 18:16; 23:27; Nu 5:21; 1Sa 9:22; Ps 106:46);

(3) sum, "to set," "put," "lay," has a similar significance: of Abraham's seed (Ge 13:16; 32:12); Joseph lord of all Egypt (Ge 45:9; compare Ex 2:14; De 1:13; 10:22);

(4) shith, with same meaning, occurs (2Sa 22:12, "He made darkness pavilions round about him"; 1Ki 11:34; Ps 18:11; 21:6).

Other words are 'abhadh (Aramaic); "to make," "do," (Jer 10:11; Da 3:1); 'amadh, "to set up" (2Ch 11:22; 25:5; Ne 10:32); 'atsabh, "to labor," etc. (Job 10:8, the King James Version margin "took pains about me"); banah, "to build up" (Ge 2:22; 1Ki 22:39); bara'," to prepare," "create" (Nu 16:30; Ps 89:47); yatsagh, "to set up" (Job 17:6; Jer 51:34); yatsar, "to form," "constitute" (Ps 74:17; 104:26); pa'al, "to work," "make" (Ex 15:17; Ps 7:15); words with special meanings are: paqadh, "to give a charge" (1Ki 11:28; 2Ki 25:23); karath, "to cut," or "prepare", "to make a convent or league" (Ge 15:18; Ex 24:8; Jos 9:16); qashar, "to bind together," "to make a conspiracy" (2Ki 12:20; 14:19); parats, "to break forth," "to make a breach" (2Sa 6:8; 1Ch 13:11; 15:13); labhen, "to make brick" (Ge 11:3); labhabh (denominative of lebhibhah), "to make cakes" (2Sa 13:6,8); malakh, "to make a king" (1Sa 8:22; 12:1); among obsolete and archaic words and phrases may be mentioned, "What makest thou in this place?" (Jud 18:3), the Revised Version (British and American) "doest"; "made" for "pretend" (2Sa 13:5,6), the Revised Version (British and American) "feign," "feigned"; "made as if" (Jos 8:15; 9:4), so the Revised Version (British and American); "make for him" (Eze 17:17), the Revised Version (British and American) "help him"; "make mention" (Jer 4:16); "make mention of" (Ge 40:14; Ps 87:4); "make account" (Ps 144:3); "make an end" (Jud 3:18; 15:17); "make an end" is also "to bring to nought," "to destroy" (Isa 38:12); "make riddance" (Le 23:22), the Revised Version (British and American) "wholly reap." In 1 Macc 16:22, we have "to make him away" as translation of apolesai auton, the Revised Version (British and American) "destroy."

Maker is the translation of 'asah (Job 4:17; Ps 95:6), of yatsar (Isa 45:9,11; Hab 2:18 twice), of charash, "graver" (Isa 45:16), of pa'al (Job 36:3; Isa 1:31, or po'al).

2. As Used in the New Testament:

In the New Testament the chief word for "make" is poieo, "to do," "make," etc. (Mt 3:3; Joh 2:16; 5:15); of kathistemi, "to set down," "to appoint" (Mt 24:45,47; Ro 5:19); of tithemi, "to set," "lay" (Mt 22:44; Mr 12:36); of diatithemi, "to set or lay throughout" (Ac 3:25; Heb 8:10; 10:16); of didomi, "to give" (2Th 3:9; Re 3:9); of eimi, "to be" (Mr 12:42); of epiteleo "to complete" (Heb 8:5; Ga 3:3, "make perfect," the Revised Version margin "make an end"); of Kataskeuazo, "to prepare thoroughly" (Heb 9:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "prepared"); of ktizo, "to make" "found" (Eph 2:15); of plerophoreo, "to bear "on fully" (2Ti 4:5, "make full proof of thy ministry," the Revised Version (British and American) "fulfil"); doxazo "to make honorable or glorious" (2Co 3:10); of peritrepo (eis manian),

"to turn round to raving" (Ac 26:24, "doth make thee mad," the Revised Version (British and American) "is turning thee mad," margin "Greek: turneth thee to madness"); of emporeuomai, "to traffic," "cheat" (2Pe 2:3 "make merchandise of you"); of eirenopoieo, "to make peace" (Col 1:20); of sumballo, "to throw together" (Lu 14:31; "to make war," the Revised Version (British and American) "goeth to encounter"); "made" is frequently the translation of ginomai, "to become," "begin to be" (Mt 4:3; 9:16; Mr 2:21,27; Joh 1:3 (thrice), 10, "The world was made through him," 1:14, "The word was made flesh," the Revised Version (British and American) "became flesh"; 2:9, water "made wine," the Revised Version (British and American) "now become wine," margin "that it had become"; 8:33, "made free"‘ Ro 1:3, Revised Vesion "born" Ga 3:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "having become a curse for us"; 4:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "born of a woman," etc.; Php 2:7, "was made in the likeness of men," the Revised Version margin "Greek: becoming in"; 1Pe 2:7, etc.).

In addition to the changes in the Revised Version (British and American) already noted may be mentioned, for "maketh collops" (Job 15:27) "gathered fat"; for "set us in the way of his steps" (Ps 85:13), "make his footsteps a way to walk in"; for "did more grievously afflict her" (Isa 9:1), "hath made it glorious"; for "shall make him of quick understanding" (Isa 11:3), ‘his delight shall be in"; for "make sluices and ponds for fish" (Isa 19:10), "they that work for hire," margin "or make dams "; for "ye that make mention of the Lord" (Isa 62:6), "ye that are Yahweh’s remembrancers"; for "he shall confirm the covenant" (Da 9:27), "he shall make a firm covenant"; for "maketh my way perfect" (2Sa 22:33), "guideth the perfect in his way" (see margin); for "the desire of a man is his kindness" (Pr 19:22), "that which maketh a man to be desired"; for, "maketh intercession" (Ro 11:2), "pleadeth"; for hath made us accepted" (Eph 1:6), "freely bestowed on us," margin "wherewith he endued us"; . for "made himself of no reputation" (Php 2:7), "emptied himself"; for "spoil you" (Col 2:8), "maketh spoil of you"; for "is the enemy of God" (Jas 4:4), "maketh himself"; for "worketh abomination or (maketh) a lie" (Re 21:27), "maketh (m" doeth") an abomination and a lie"; we have "become" for "made" (Mt 4:3; Lu 3:5; 4:3), "became" (Ro 10:20; 1Co 15:45, bis); "becoming in" for "being made" (Php 2:7 margin).

W. L. Walker

MAKEBATES

mik’-bats: This is the plural of the word makebate, which means "one who stirs up strife." It occurs only in the King James Version margin of 2Ti 3:3 and Tit 2:3 as an alternative translation of diaboloi, which the King James Version renders "false accusers," and the Revised Version (British and American) "slanderers."

MAKED

ma’-ked (Maked, Makeb) :A strong city East of the Jordan, not yet identified. It is named along with Bosor, Alema and Casphor (1 Macc 5:26). In 1 Macc 5:36, the King James Version reads "Maged."

MAKER

ma’-ker.

See MAKE.

MAKHELOTH

mak-he’-loth, mak-he’-loth (maqheloth, "assemblies"): A desert camp of the Israelites between Haradah and Tahath (Nu 33:25,26).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MAKKEDAH

ma-ke’-da (maqqedhah; Makeda): A Canaanite royal city which Joshua captured, utterly destroying the inhabitants, and doing to the king as he had done unto the king of Jericho (Jos 10:28; 12:16). It lay in the Shephelah of Judah (Jos 15:41). It was brought into prominence by the flight thither of the 5 kings of the Amorites who, having united their forces for the destruction of Gibeon, were themselves defeated and pursued by Joshua (chapter 10). Seeing their danger, the men of Gibeon sent to the camp at Gilgal beseeching Joshua to save and help them. That energetic commander marched all night with his full strength, fell upon the allies at Gibeon, slew them with a great slaughter, chased the fugitives down the valley by way of Beth-horon, and smote them unto Azekah and unto Makkedah. It was during this memorable pursuit that in response to Joshua’s appeal:

"Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;

And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon," the sun stayed in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down a whole day, until the nation had avenged themselves of their enemies.

The 5 kings sought refuge in the cave at Makkedah, where, by Joshua’s orders, they were blocked in with great stones, until the slaughter of the fugitives should be completed. Then the royal prisoners were brought out, and, after the chiefs of Israel had set their feet upon their necks, Joshua slew them and hanged them on five trees until sunset. This is an illustration of the old practice of impaling enemies after death. The bodies were then cast into the cave where they had sought to hide, and great stones were rolled against the entrance.

The flight of the allies was past Beth-boron and Azekah to Makkedah. Azekah is not identified, but it is named with Gederoth, Beth-dagon, and Naamah (Jos 15:41). These are probably represented by Qatrah, Dajan and Na‘aneh, so that in this district Makkedah may be sought. The officers of the Palestine Exploration Fund agree in suggesting el-Mughdr, "the cave," on the northern bank of Wady es-Surar, about 4 miles from the sand dunes on the shore. There are traces of old quarrying and many rock-cut

tombs with loculi. "The village stands on a sort of promontory stretching into the valley .... divided into three plateaus; on the lower of these to the South is the modern village, el-Mughar, built in front of the caves which are cut out of the sandstone" (Warren). In no other place in the neighborhood are caves found. The narrative, however, speaks not of caves, but of "the cave," as of one which was notable. On the other hand the events narrated may have lent distinction to some particular cave among the many. "The cave" would therefore be that associated with the fate of the 5 kings. No certainty is possible.

W. Ewing

MAKTESH, THE

mak’-tesh, (ha-makhtesh, "the mortar"; compare Jud 15:19, "the mortar," English Versions of the Bible "hollow place that is in Lehi"): A quarter of Jerusalem so named, it is supposed, on account of the configuration of the ground and associated (Ze 1:10,11) with the "fish gate" and MISHNEH (which see) or "second quarter." Most authorities think it was in the northern part of the city, and many consider that the name was derived from the hollowed-out form of that part of the Tyropeon just N. of the walls, where foreign merchants congregated; others have suggested a hollow farther West, now occupied by the muristan and the three long bazaars.

E. W. G. Masterman

MALACHI

mal’-a-ki:

1. Name of the Prophet

2. The Prophet’s Times

3. Contents

4. Style

5. Message

LITERATURE

1. Name of the Prophet:

The last book of the Old Testament. Nothing is known of the person of Malachi. Because his name does not occur elsewhere, some scholars indeed doubt whether "Malachi" is intended to be the personal name

of the prophet. But none of the other prophetic books of the Old Testament is anonymous. The form mal'akhi, signifies "my messenger"; it occurs again in 3:1; compare 2:7. But this form of itself would hardly be appropriate as a proper name without some additional syllable such as Yah, whence mal'akhiah, i.e. "messenger of Yahweh." Haggai, in fact, is expressly designated "messenger of Yahweh" (Hag 1:13). Besides, the superscriptions prefixed to the book, in both the Septuagint and the Vulgate, warrant the supposition that Malachi's full name ended with the syllable -yah. At the same time the Septuagint translates the last clause of Mal 1:1, "by the hand of his messenger," and the Targum reads, "by the hand of my angel, whose name is called Ezra the scribe." Jerome likewise testifies that the Jews of his day ascribed this last book of prophecy to Ezra (V. Praef. in duodecim Prophetas). But if Ezra's name was originally associated with the book, it would hardly have been dropped by the collectors of the prophetic Canon who, lived only a century or two subsequent to Ezra's time. Certain traditions ascribe the book to Zerubbabel and Nehemiah; others, still, to Malachi, whom they designate as a Levite and a member of the "Great Synagogue." Certain modern scholars, however, on the basis of the similarity of the title (1:1) to Zec 9:1; 12:1, declare it to be anonymous; but this is a rash conclusion without any substantial proof other than supposition. The best explanation is that of Professor G.G. Cameron, who suggests that the termination of the word "Malachi" is adjectival, and equivalent to the Latin angelicus, signifying "one charged with a message or mission" (a missionary). The term would thus be an official title; and the thought would not be unsuitable to one whose message closed the prophetical Canon of the Old Testament, and whose mission in behalf of the church was so sacred in character (1-vol HDB).

2. The Prophet's Times:

Opinions vary as to the prophet's exact date, but nearly all scholars are agreed that Malachi prophesied during the Persian period, and after the reconstruction and dedication of the second temple in 516 BC (compare Mal 1:10; 3:1,10). The prophet speaks of the people's governor" (Hebrew pechah, Mal 1:8), as do Haggai and Nehemiah (Hag 1:1; Ne 5:14; 12:26). The social conditions portrayed are unquestionably those also of the period of the Restoration. More specifically, Malachi probably lived and labored during the times of Ezra and Nehemiah. Serious abuses had crept into Jewish life; the priests had become lax and degenerate, defective and inferior sacrifices were allowed to be offered upon the temple altar, the people were neglecting their tithes, divorce was common and God's covenant was forgotten and ignored; just such abuses as we know from the Book of Ne were common in his day (compare Ne 3:5; 5:1-13). Yet, it is doubtful whether Malachi preached during Nehemiah's active governorship; for in Mal 1:8 it is implied that gifts might be offered to the "governor," whereas Nehemiah tells us that he declined all such (Ne 5:15,18). On the other hand, the abuses which Malachi attacked correspond so exactly with those which Nehemiah found on his 2nd visit to Jerusalem in 432 BC (Ne 13:7) that it seems reasonably certain that he prophesied shortly before that date, i.e. between 445 and 432 BC. As Dr. J.M.P. Smith says, The Book of Mal fits the situation amid which Nehemiah worked as snugly as a bone fits its socket" (ICC, 7). That the prophet should exhort the people to remember the law of Moses, which was publicly read by Ezra in the year 444 BC, is in perfect agreement with this conclusion, despite the fact that Stade, Cornill and Kautzsch argue for a date prior to the time of Ezra. On the other hand, Nagelsbach, Kohler, Orelli, Reuss and Volck rightly place the book in the period between the two visits of Nehemiah (445-432 BC).

3. Contents:

The book, in the main, is composed of two extended polemics against the priests (Mal 1:6-2:9) and the people (Mal 2:10-4:3), opening with a clear, sharp statement of the prophet's chief thesis that Yahweh still loves Israel (Mal 1:2-5), and closing with an exhortation to remember the Law of Moses (Mal 4:4-6). After the title or superscription (Mal 1:1) the prophecy falls naturally into seven divisions:

(1) Malachi 1:2-5, in which Malachi shows that Yahweh still loves Israel because their lot stands in such marked contrast to Edom's. They were temporarily disciplined; Edom was forever punished.

(2) Malachi 1:6-2:9, a denunciation of the priests, the Levites, who have become neglectful of their sacerdotal office, indifferent to the Law, and unmindful of their covenant relationship to Yahweh.

(3) Malachi 2:10-16, against idolatry and divorce. Some interpret this section metaphorically of Judah as having abandoned the religion of his youth (2:11). But idolatry and divorce were closely related. The people are obviously rebuked for literally putting away their own Jewish wives in order to contract marriage with foreigners (2:15). Such marriages, the prophet declares, are not only a form of idolatry (2:11), but a violation of Yahweh's intention to preserve to Himself a "godly seed" (2:15).

(4) Malachi 2:17-3:6, an announcement of coming judgment. Men are beginning to doubt whether there is longer a God of justice (2:17). Malachi replies that the Lord whom the people seek will suddenly come, both to purify the sons of Levi and to purge the land of sinners in general. The nation, however, will not be utterly consumed (3:6).

(5) Malachi 3:7-12, in which the prophet pauses to give another concrete example of the people's sins: they have failed to pay their tithes and other dues. Accordingly, drought, locusts, and famine have ensued. Let these be paid and the nation will again prosper, and their land will become "a delightsome land."

(6) Malachi 3:13-4:3, a second section addressed to the doubters of the prophet's age. In 2:17, they had said, "Where is the God of justice?" They now murmur: "It is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept his charge?" The wicked and the good alike prosper (3:14,15). But, the prophet replies, Yahweh knows them that are His, and a book of remembrance is being kept; for a day of judgment is coming when the good and the evil will be distinguished; those who work iniquity will be exterminated, while those who do righteously will triumph.

(7) Malachi 4:4-6, a concluding exhortation to obey the Mosaic Law; with a promise that Elijah the prophet will first come to avert, if possible, the threatened judgment by reconciling the hearts of the nation to one another, i.e. to reconcile the ideals of the old to those of the young, and vice versa.

4. Style:

Malachi was content to write prose. His Hebrew is clear and forceful and direct; sometimes almost rhythmical. His figures are as numerous as should be expected in the brief remnants of his sermons which have come down to us, and in every case they are chaste and beautiful (1:6; 3:2,3,17; 4:1-3). His statements are bold and correspondingly effective. The most original feature in his style is the lecture-like method which characterizes his book throughout; more particularly that of question and answer. His style is that of the scribes. It is known as the didactic-dialectic method, consisting first of an assertion or charge, then a fancied objection raised by his hearers, and finally the prophet's refutation of their objection. Eight distinct examples of this peculiarity are to be found in his book, each one containing the same clause in Hebrew, "Yet ye say" (1:2,6,7; 2:14,17; 3:7,8,13). This debating style is especially characteristic of Malachi. Ewald called it "the dialogistic" method. Malachi shows the influence of the schools (compare his use of "also" and "again" in 1:13; 2:13, which is equivalent to our "firstly," "secondly," etc.).

5. Message:

Malachi's message has a permanent value for us as well as an immediate value for his own time. He was an intense patriot, and accordingly his message was clean-cut and severe. His primary aim was to encourage a disheartened people who were still looking for Haggai's and Zechariah's optimistic predictions to be fulfilled. Among the lessons of abiding value are the following:

(1) That ritual is an important element in religion, but not as an end in itself. Tithes and offerings are necessary, but only as the expression of sincere moral and deeply spiritual life (Mal 1:11).

(2) That a cheap religion avails nothing, and that sacrifices given grudgingly are displeasing to God. Better a temple closed than filled with such worshippers (Mal 1:8-10).

(3) That divorce and intermarriage with heathen idolaters thwarts the purpose of God in securing to Himself a peculiar people, whose family life is sacred because it is the nursery of a "godly seed" (Mal 2:15).

(4) That there is eternal discipline in the Law. Malachi places the greatest emphasis upon the necessity of keeping the Mosaic Law. The priests, he says, are the custodians and expounders of the Law. At their mouth the people should seek knowledge. "To undervalue the Law is easy; to appraise it is a much harder task" (Welch). With Malachi, no less than with Christ Himself, not one jot or tittle should ever pass away or become obsolete.

LITERATURE.

Driver, "Minor Prophets," II, NewCentury Bible (1906); G. A. Smith, "The Book of the Twelve Prophets," Expositor's Bible (1898); Dods, Post-Exilian Prophets: "Hag," "Zec," "Mal"; "Handbooks for Bible Classes"; J. M. P. Smith, ICC (1912). Among the numerous other commentaries on Mal may be

mentioned: Eiselen (1907), Marti (1903), Nowack (1903), Orelli (1908), Wellhausen (1898), Van Hoonacker (1908) and Isopeocul (1908). The various Introductions to the Old Testament should also be consulted, notably those by Driver (1910), Strack (1906), Wildeboer (1903), Gautier (1906), Cornill (1907), Konig (1893); and the articles entitled "Malachi" in the various Dicts. and Bible Encs: e.g. in Encyclopedia Biblica (1902), by C. 0. Torrey; in HDB (1901), by A. O. Welch; in 1-vol HDB (1909), by G. G. Cameron; and RE (1905), by Volck.

George L. Robinson

MALACHY

mal’-a-ki: Another form of the name of the prophet "Malachi" (which see), found in the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version of 2 Esdras 1:40.

MALCAM

mal’-kam (malkam, "their king"; the King James Version Maleham):

(1) A chief of the Benjamites, son of Shaharaim (1Ch 8:9).

(2) The name of an idol as well as the possessive pronominal form of melekh, "king" (2Sa 12:30 the Revised Version margin; Jer 49:1,3 Septuagint Melchol); Ze 1:5). In Am 1:15 it appears to be best translated "their king," as in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American). Only a careful examination of the context can determine whether the word is the proper name of the idol (Moloch) or the 3rd personal possessive pronoun for king. The idol is also spelt "Milcom" and "Molech."

MALCHI-SHUA

mal-ki-shoo’-a (malkishua‘, "my king saves"): One of the sons of Saul (1Sa 14:49; 31:2, the King James Version "Melchishua"; 1Ch 8:33; 9:39). He was slain by the Philistines with his brothers at the battle of Gilboa (1Ch 10:2; 1Sa 31:2).

MALCHIAH

mal-ki’-a.

See MALCHIJAH.

MALCHIEL

mal’-ki-el (malki’el, "God is king"): Grandson of Asher (Ge 46:17; Nu 26:45; 1Ch 7:31).

MALCHIELITES

mal’-ki-el-its (malki’eli): Descendants of Malchiel (Nu 26:45).

MALCHIJAH

mal-ki’-ja (malkiyah, "Yah is king"; Melcheias, with variants):

(1) A Levite, descendant of Gershom, of those whom David set over the "service of sting" in the worship (1Ch 6:40).

(2) The head of the 5th course of priests (1Ch 24:9).

(3) One of the laymen who had taken "strange wives" during the exile (Ezr 10:25); the "Melchias" of 1 Esdras 9:26.

(4) Another of the same name (Ezr 10:25; two in same verse). Called "Asibias" in 1 Esdras 9:26.

(5) Another under the same offense, son of Harim (Ezr 10:31). "Melchias" in 1 Esdras 9:32.

(6) One of the "repairers" who helped with the "tower of the furnaces" (Ne 3:11).

(7) Son of Rechab ruler of Beth-haccerem, repairer of the dung gate (Ne 3:14).

(8) A goldsmith who helped in building the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 3:31).

(9) One of those at Ezra’s left hand when he read the law (though possibly one of the above (Ne 8:4)). In 1 Esdras 9:44 "Melchias."

(10) One of the covenant signatories (Ne 10:3).

(11) The father of Pashhur (Ne 11:12; Jer 21:1; 38:1).

(12) A priest, a singer at the dedication of the walls of Jerusalem under Ezra and Nehemiah (Ne 12:42).

(13) (malkiyahu as above with u ending): Son of Ham-melech (or, as 1Ki 22:26; 2Ch 28:7 translate it, "king’s son"). Jeremiah was cast into his dungeon or pit (Jer 38:6).

The King James Version spells "Malchiah" or "Malchijah" indifferently with "Melchiah" in Jer 21:1; the English Revised Version has "Malchiah" in Jer 21:1; 38:1,6, elsewhere "Malchijah"; the American Standard Revised Version has "Malchijah" throughout.

Henry Wallace

MALCHIRAM

mal-ki’-ram (malkiram, "uplifted king"): Son of Jeconiah, descendant of David (1Ch 3:18).

MALCHUS

mal’-kus (Malchos, from melekh, i.e. "counselor" or "king"): The name of the servant of the high priest Caiaphas whose right ear was smitten off by Simon Peter at the arrest of Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane (compare Mt 26:51; Mr 14:47; Lu 22:50; Joh 18:10). It is noteworthy that Luke "the physician" alone gives an account of the healing of the wound (Lu 22:51). As Jesus "touched his ear, and healed him," the ear was not entirely severed from the head. The words of Jesus, "Suffer ye thus far," may have been addressed either to the disciples, i.e. "Suffer ye that I thus far show kindness to my captors," or to those about to bind him, i.e. asking a short respite to heal Malchus. They were not addressed directly to Peter, as the Greek form is plural, whereas in Mt 26:52; Joh 18:11, where, immediately after the smiting of Malchus, Jesus does address Peter, the singular form is used; nor do the words of Jesus there refer to the healing but to the action of his disciple. A kinsman of Malchus, also a servant of the high priest, was one of those who put the questions which made Peter deny Jesus (Joh 18:26).

C. M. Kerr

MALE

mal

(1) zakhar, zakhar, zakhur (the root means "to stand out," "to be prominent," here a physiological differentiation of the sex, as neqebhah, "female," which see);

(2) ‘ish literally, "man";

(3) by circumlocution, only in the books of Samuel and Kings, mashtin beqir; ouron pros toichon, which the Revised Version (British and American) euphemistically renders "man-child" (1Sa 25:22,34; 1Ki 14:10)):

Gesenius has rightly pointed out that this phrase designates young boys, who do not as yet wear clothes,

of whom the above description is accurate, while it does not apply in the case of adults, even in the modern Orient. We know this from the statement of Herodotus ii.35, relating to Egypt, and from Jud 3:24; 1Sa 24:3. The Greek translates these words with arsen, arrhen, while 1 Macc 5:28,51 has the adjective arsenikos.

The above words (the phrase mashtin beqir excepted) are used promiscuously of animals and men, e.g. "Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee seven and seven, the male (’ish) and his female, of the birds also of the heavens, seven and seven, male (zakhar) and female" (Ge 7:2,3). A careful distinction was made in the use of male and female animals in the rules concerning sacrifice; in some offerings none but males were allowed, in others females were permitted along with the males (Le 3:6). The same distinction was made in the valuation of the different sexes (Ge 32:14,15; Le 27:5). Certain priestly portions were permitted to the Levites or the male descendants of Aaron for food, while women were not permitted to partake of the same (Nu 18:10,11).

As a rule Jewish parents (as is now common in the Orient) preferred male children to daughters. This is seen from the desire for male progeny (1Sa 1:8-18) and from the ransom paid for firstborn sons to Yahweh (Ex 13:12; Lu 2:23). It was reserved to the New Testament to proclaim the equality of the sexes, as it does of races and conditions of men: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus" (Ga 3:28).

See WOMAN.

Among the prominent sins of oriental peoples, "the abominations of the nations which Yahweh drove out before the children of Israel" was one of the most heinous character, that of sodomy, against which God’s people are repeatedly warned. The Greek expression for the devotee of this vice is a compound noun, arsenokoites, literally, "he who lies with man," the abuser of himself with mankind, the sodomite (1Co 6:9), while the Hebrew qadhesh, literally means the (male) devotee of lascivious and licentious idolatry (De 23:17; 1Ki 14:24; 15:12; 22:46; 2Ki 23:7; Job 36:14).

H. L. E. Luering

MALEFACTOR

mal-e-fak’-ter (kakopoios, "a bad doer," i.e. "evildoer," "criminal"; kakourgos, "a wrongdoer"): The former occurs in Joh 18:30 the King James Version, the latter, which is the stronger term, in Lu 23:32,39. The former describes the subject as doing or making evil, the latter as creating or originating the bad, and hence, designates the more energetic, aggressive, initiating type of criminality.

MALELEEL

ma-le’-le-el, mal’-e-lel (Maleleel, the King James Version): Greek form of "Mahalalel" (Lu 3:37); the Revised Version (British and American) "Mahalaleel."

MALICE, MALIGNITY

mal’-is, ma-lig’-ni-ti (kakia, poneros, kakoetheia): "Malice," now used in the sense of deliberate ill-will, by its derivation means badness, or wickedness generally, and was so used in Older English. In the Apocrypha it is the translation of kakia, "evil," "badness" (The Wisdom of Solomon 12:10,20; 16:14; 2 Macc 4:50, the Revised Version (British and American) "wickedness"); in Ecclesiasticus 27:30; 28:7, we have "malice" in the more restricted sense as the translation of menis, "confirmed anger." In the New Testament "malice" and "maliciousness" are the translation of kakia (Ro 1:29; 1Co 5:8; 14:20; Col 3:8); malicious is the translation of poneros, "evil" (3 Joh 1:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "wicked"); it also occurs in Additions to Esther 13:4,7, verse 4, "malignant"; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:4, the Revised Version (British and American) that deviseth evil"; 2 Macc 5:23; malignity occurs in Ro 1:29 as the translation of kakoetheia, "evil disposition"; "maliciously," Susanna verses 43,62; 2 Macc 14:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "having ill will."

W. L. Walker

MALLOS

mal’-os,

See MALLUS.

MALLOTHI

mal’-o-thi, ma-lo’-thi (mallothi, "my discourse"): Son of Heman, a Kohathite singer (1Ch 6:33; 25:4). The song service in the house of the Lord was apportioned by David and the captains of the host to the 3 families of Asaph, Heman, and Jeduthun (1Ch 25:1). Their place in the "courses" was, however, settled by "lot" (1Ch 25:8,9). Mallothi was one of Heman’s 17 children—14 sons and 3 daughters (1Ch 25:5)—and was chief of the 19th course of twelve singers into which the temple choir was divided (1Ch 25:26).

Henry Wallace

MALLOWS

mal’-oz.

See SALT-WORT.

MALLUCH

mal’-uk (mallukh, "counsellor"):

(1) A Levite of the sons of Merari, ancestor of Ethan the singer (1Ch 6:44; compare 6:29).

(2) Son of Bani, among those who had foreign wives (Ezr 10:29). He is a descendant of Judah (1Ch 9:4) and is the Mamuchus of 1 Esdras 9:30.

(3) A descendant of Harim, who married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:32).

(4) (5) Two who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:4,27).

(6) Possibly the same as (4). One of the priests who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:2). Doubtless the Melicu of verse 14’s margin.

Henry Wallace

MALLUCHI

mal’-u-ki (mallukhi, "my counselor"): A family of priests that came over with Zerubbabel (Ne 10:4; 12:14). May be the patronymic MALLUCH, (4) (which see).

MALLUS

mal’-us (Mallos; the King James Version, Mallos): A city in Cilicia, the inhabitants of which along with those of Tarsus, revolted from Antiochus Epiphanes in protest against his action in giving them to his concubine, Antiochis (2 Macc 4:30). The ancient name was Marlos. The river Pyramos divides about 10 miles from the sea, one branch flowing to the West, the other to the East of the low range of hills along the coast on which stands Kara-Tash. Mallus stood on a height (Strabo, 675) to the East of the western arm, a short distance from the shore. The site is a little West of Kara-Tash, where inscriptions of Antiocheia and Mallus have been found. Tarsus lay about 35 miles to the Northwest. The two cities were rivals in trade. The position of Mallus with her harbor on the shore gave her really no advantage over Tarsus, with her river navigable to the city walls. The fine wagon road over the mountain by way of the Cilician Gates opened for her easy access to the interior, compared with that furnished for Mallus by the old caravan track to the North by way of Adana. This sufficiently explains the greater prosperity of the former city.

W. Ewing

MALOBATHRON

mal-o-bath’-ron: the Revised Version margin suggests that this translation may be right instead of

Bether in the phrase hare bether (So 2:17). But this spice never grew wild in Palestine, and so could hardly have given its name to a mountain, or mountain range. The name Bether ought therefore to be retained, notwithstanding Wellhausen (Prol. 2, 415). The spice is the leaf of the Cassia lignea tree.

MALTANNEUS

mal-ta-ne'-us (Maltannaios, Codex Vaticanus and Swete; Altannaios, Codex Alexandrinus and Fritzsche —the "M" being perhaps dropped because of the final "M" in the preceding word; the King James Version Altaneus): One of the sons of Asom who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:33) =" Mattenai" in Ezr 10:33.

MAMAIAS

ma-ma'-yas.

See SAMAIAS, (3).

MAMDAI

mam'-da-i, mam'-di (LXX: Codex Vaticanus Mamdai; Codex Alexandrinus Mandai): One of those who consented to put away their "strange wives" at Esdras' order (1 Esdras 9:34) = the King James Version "Mabdai" =" Benaiah" in Ezr 10:35.

MAMMON

mam'-un (Mamonas): A common Aramaic word (mamon) for riches, used in Mt 6:24 and in Lu 16:9,11,13. In these passages mammon merely means wealth, and is called "unrighteous," because the abuse of riches is more frequent than their right use. In Lu 16:13 there is doubtless personification, but there is no proof that there was in New Testament times a Syrian deity called Mammon. The application of the term in Matthew is apparent and requires no comment. In Lk, however, since the statement, "Make to yourselves friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness," follows as a comment on the parable of the Unjust Steward, there is danger of the inference that Jesus approved the dishonest conduct of the steward and advised His disciples to imitate his example. On the contrary, the statement is added more as a corrective against this inference than as an application. 'Do not infer,' He says, that honesty in the use of money is a matter of indifference. He that is unfaithful in little is unfaithful in much. So if you are not wise in the use of earthly treasure how can you hope to be entrusted with heavenly treasure?' The commendation is in the matter of foresight, not in the method. The steward tried to serve two masters, his lord and his lord's creditors, but the thing could not be done, as the sequel shows. Neither can men serve both God and riches exalted as an object of slavish servitude. Wealth, Jesus teaches, does not really belong to men, but as stewards they may use wealth prudently unto their eternal advantage. Instead of serving God and mammon alike we may serve God by the use of wealth, and thus lay up

treasures for ourselves in heaven. Again, the parable is not to be interpreted as teaching that the wrong of dishonest gain may be atoned for by charity. Jesus is not dealing with the question of reparation. The object is to point out how one may best use wealth, tainted or otherwise, with a view to the future.

Russell Benjamin Miller

MAMNITANEMUS

mam-ni-ta-ne'-mus (Mamnitanaimos; Codex Vaticanus Mamtitanaimos; the King James Version, Mamnitanaimus): 1 Esdras 9:34, where it represents the two names Mattaniah and Mattenai in the parallel Ezr 10:37, which probably represent only one person. It must be a corruption of these names. The Aldine gives a still more corrupt form, Mamnimatanaimos.

MAMRE

mam'-re (mamre'; Septuagint Mambre):

(1) In Ge 14:24 Mamre is mentioned as the name of one of Abraham's allies, who in 14:13 is described as the Amorite, brother of Eschcol and Aner.

1. Biblical Data:

The name of the grove of trees is evidently considered as derived from this sheikh or chieftain. The "oaks" ("terebinths") of Mamre where Abram pitched his tent (Ge 14:13; 18:1) are described (Ge 13:18) as "in Hebron." Later on MACHPELAH (which see) is described as "before," i.e. "to the East of Mamre" (Ge 23:17; 25:9; 49:30; 50:13), and Mamre is identified with Hebron itself (Ge 23:19).

2. Traditional Sites:

While Mamre has always been looked for in the vicinity of Hebron, the traditions have varied greatly, determined apparently by the presence of a suitable tree. The one site which has a claim on grounds other than tradition is that called Khirbet and 'Ain Nimreh (literally, the "ruin" and "spring" of "the leopard"), about 1/2 mile North-Northwest of modern Hebron. The word Nimreh may be a survival of the ancient Mamre, the name, as often happens, being assimilated by a familiar word. The site is a possible one, but, beyond this, the name has not much to commend it.

Tradition has centered round three different sites at various periods:

(1) The modern tradition points to a magnificent oak (Quercus ilex, Arabic Sindian), 1 1/2 miles West-Northwest of the modern city, as the terebinth of Abraham; its trunk has a girth of 32 ft. It is now in a dying condition, but when Robinson visited it (BR, II, 72, 81) it was in fine condition; he mentions a

Mohammedan tradition that this was "Abraham's oak." Since then the site had been bought by the Russians, a hospice and church have been erected, and the tradition, though of no antiquity, has become crystallized.

(2) The second tradition, which flourished from the 16th century down to the commencement of the 19th century, pointed to the hill of Deir el Arba'in (see HEBRON) as that of Mamre, relying especially, no doubt, in its inception on the identity of Mamre and Hebron (Ge 23:19). A magnificent terebinth which stood there was pointed out as that of Abraham. The site agrees well with the statement that the cave of Machpelah was "before," i.e. to the East of Mamre (Ge 23:17, etc.).

(3) The third and much older tradition, mentioned in several Christian writers, refers to a great terebinth which once stood in an enclosure some 2 miles North of Hebron, near the road to Jerusalem. It is practically certain that the site of this enclosure is the strange Ramet el-Khalil. This is an enclosure some 214 ft. long and 162 ft. wide. The enclosing walls are made of extremely fine and massive masonry and are 6 ft. thick; the stones are very well laid and the jointing is very fine, but the building was evidently never completed. In one corner is a well—Bir el-Khalil—lined with beautiful ashlar masonry, cut to the curve of the circumference.

It is probable that this enclosure surrounded a magnificent terebinth; if so, it was at this spot that before the days of Constantine a great annual fair was held, attended by Jews, Christians and heathen who united a pay honor to the sacred tree, while the well was on the same occasion illuminated, and offerings were made to it. Similar customs survive today at several shrines in Palestine. Constantine suppressed these "superstitions," and built a church in the neighborhood, probably the so-called "Abraham's house," Beit Ibrahim of today. The tree which stood here is apparently that mentioned by Josephus (BJ, IV, ix, 7) as having continued "since the creation of the world." At this enclosure, too, Jewish women and children were sold at auction after the suppression of the revolt of Bar Cochba. Whatever the origin of the veneration paid to this terebinth—now long centuries dead and gone—early Christian tradition associated it with Abraham and located Mamre here. This tradition is mentioned by Jerome (4th century), by Eucherius (6th century), by Areulphus (700 AD) and by Benjamin of Tudela (1163 AD). Among the modern Jews it is looked upon as the site of "Abraham's oak." It is probable that the view that Abraham was connected with this tree is one attached to it much later than its original sanctity; it was originally one of the many "holy trees" of the land venerated by primitive Semitic religions feeling, and the nearness of Hebron caused the Bible story to be attached to it. Judging from the Bible data, it appears to be too far from Hebron and Machpelah to suit the conditions; the site of Mamre must have been nearer to Deir el Arba'in, but it has probably been entirely lost since very early times.

For a very good discussion about Mamre see Mambre by Le R. P. Abel des Freres Precheurs in the Conferences de Saint Etienne, 1909-10 (Paris).

(2) An Amorite chief, owner of the "oaks" mentioned above (Ge 14:13,14).

E. W. G. Masterman

MAMUCHUS

ma-mu’-kus (Mamouchos): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:30); identical with "Malluch" in Ezr 10:29.

MAN

See ANTHROPOLOGY.

MAN OF SIN

(ho anthropos tes hamartias; many ancient authorities read, "man of lawlessness," anomias):

1. The Pauline Description:

The name occurs in Paul’s remarkable announcement in 2Th 2:3-10 of the manifestation of a colossal anti-Christian power prior to the advent, which some of the Thessalonians had been misled into thinking of as immediately impending (2:2). That "day of the Lord," the apostle declares, will not come till, as he had previously taught them (2:5), there has first been a great apostasy and the revelation of "the man of sin" (or "of lawlessness"; compare 2:8), named also "the son of perdition" (2:3). This "lawless one" (2:8) would exalt himself above all that is called God, or is an object of worship; he would sit in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God (2:4). For the time another power restrained his manifestation; when that was removed, he would be revealed (2:6,7). Then "the mystery of lawlessness," which was already working, would attain its full development (2:7,8). The coming of this "man of sin," in the power of Satan, would be with lying wonders and all deceit of unrighteousness, whereby many would be deceived to their destruction (2:9,10). But only for a season (2:6). Jesus would slay (or consume) him with the breath of His mouth (compare Isa 11:4), and bring him to nought by the manifestation of His coming (2Th 2:8).

2. The Varying Interpretations:

Innumerable are theories and speculations to which this Pauline passage has given rise a very full account of these may be seen in the essay on "The Man of Sin" appended to Dr. J. Eadie’s posthumous Commentary on Thessalonians, and in Lunemann’s Commentary, 222 ff, English translation).

(1) There is the view, favored by "moderns," that the passage contains no genuine prediction (Paul "could not know" the future), but represents a speculation of the apostle’s own, based on Da 8:23 ff; 11:36 ff, and on current ideas of Antichrist (see ANTICHRIST; BELIAL; compare Bousset, Der Antichrist, 93 ff, etc.). This view will not satisfy those who believe in the reality of Paul’s apostleship and inspiration.

(2) Some connect the description with Caligula, Nero, or other of the Roman emperors. Caligula, indeed, ordered supplication to be made to himself as the supreme god and wished to set up his statue in the temple of Jerusalem (Suet. Calig. xxii.33; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, viii). But this was long before Paul's visit to Thessalonica, and the acts of such a madman could not furnish the basis of a prediction so elaborate and important as the present (compare Lunemann and Bousset).

(3) The favorite Protestant interpretation refers the prediction to the papacy, in whom, it is contended, many of the blasphemous features of Paul's representation are unmistakably realized. The "temple of God" is here understood to be the church; the restraining power the Roman empire; "the man of sin" not an individual, but the personification of an institution or system. It is cult, however, to resist the impression that the apostle regards "the mystery of lawlessness" as culminating in an individual—a personal Antichrist—and in any case the representation outstrips everything that can be conceived of as even nominally Christian.

(4) There remains the view held by most of the Fathers, and in recent times widely adopted, that "the man of sin" of this passage is an individual in whom, previous to the advent, sin will embody itself in its most lawless and God-denying form. The attempts to identify this individual with historical characters may be set aside; but the idea is not thereby invalidated. The difficulty is that the apostle evidently conceives of the manifestation of the "man of sin" as taking place, certainly not immediately, but at no very remote period—not 2,000 years later—and as connected directly with the final advent of Christ, and the judgment on the wicked (compare 2Th 1:7-9), without apparently any reference to a "millennial" period, either before or after.

It seems safest, in view of the difficulties of the passage, to confine one's self to the general idea it embodies, leaving details to be interpreted by the actual fulfillment.

3. The Essential Idea:

There is much support in Scripture—not least in Christ's own teaching (compare Mt 13:30,37-43; 24:11-14; Lu 18:8)—for the belief that before the final triumph of Christ's kingdom there will be a period of great tribulation, of decay of faith, of apostasy, of culmination of both good and evil ("Let both grow together until the harvest," Mt 13:30), with the seeming triumph for the time of the evil over the good. There will be a crisis-time—sharp, severe, and terminated by a decisive interposition of the Son of Man ("the manifestation of his coming," the Revised Version margin "Gr presence"), in what precise form may be left undetermined. Civil law and government—the existing bulwark against anarchy (in Paul's time represented by the Roman power)—will be swept away by the rising tide of evil, and lawlessness will prevail. It may be that impiety will concentrate itself, as the passage says, in some individual head; or this may belong to the form of the apostle's apprehension in a case where "times and seasons" were not yet fully revealed: an apprehension to be enlarged by subsequent revelations (see REVELATION OF JOHN), or left to be corrected by the actual course of God's providence. The kernel of the prediction is not, any more than in the Old Testament prophecies, dependent on its literal realization in every detail. Neither does the final manifestation of evil exclude partial and anticipatory realizations, embodying

many of the features of the prophecy.

See THESSALONIANS, THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE, III.

James Orr

MAN OF WAR

See WAR.

MAN, NATURAL

nat'-u-ral, nach'-u-ral (psuchikos anthropos): Man as he is by nature, contrasted with man as he becomes by grace. This phrase is exclusively Pauline.

I. Biblical Meaning.

The classical passage in which it occurs is 1Co 2:14 King James Version: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." In his anthropology Paul uses four groups of descriptive adjectives in contrasted pairs:

(1) the old man and the new man (Ro 6:6; Eph 4:22; Col 3:9; Eph 2:15; 4:24; Col 3:10);

(2) the outward man and the inward man (2Co 4:16; Ro 7:22; Eph 3:16);

(3) the carnal man and the spiritual man (Ro 8:1-14; 1Co 3:1,3,4);

(4) the natural man and the spiritual man (2Co 2:14; 3:3,4; Eph 2:3; 1Co 2:15; 3:1; 14:37; 15:46; Ga 6:1).

A study of these passages will show that the adjectives "old," "outward," "carnal," and "natural" describe man, from different points of view, prior to his conversion; while the adjectives "new," "inward" and "spiritual" describe him, from different points of view, after his conversion. To elucidate the meaning, the expositor must respect these antitheses and let the contrasted words throw light and meaning upon each other.

1. The Old Man:

The "old man" is the "natural man" considered chronologically—prior to that operation of the Holy Spirit by which he is renovated into the "new man."

The old house is the house as it was before it was remodeled; an old garment is the garment as it was before it was re-fashioned; and the "old man" is man as he was before he was regenerated and sanctified by the grace of the Spirit. "Our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin" (Ro 6:6 the King James Version). Here the "old man" is called the "body of sin," as the physical organism is called the body of the soul or spirit, and is to be "crucified" and "destroyed," in order that man may no longer be the "servant of sin." "Put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt. .... Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph 4:22,24 the King James Version). Here the "old man" is said to be "corrupt," and we are called upon to "put it off." The figure is that of putting off old clothes which are unclean, and putting on those garments which have come from the wash clean and snowy white. We have the same idea, in different language and with a slightly different imagery.

When Paul calls the "natural man" the "old man," and describes it as the "body of sin" which is "corrupt" in its nature and "deeds," and tells us that it must be "crucified" and "destroyed" and "put off" in order that we may "not serve sin," but may have "righteousness" and "true holiness" and "knowledge" and the "image" of God, we get some conception of the moral meaning which he is endeavoring to convey by these contrasts (Ga 5:19-24). He has reference to that sinful nature in man which is as old as the individual, as old as the race of which he is a member, which must be graciously renovated according to that gospel which he preached to Corinthians, Colossians, Ephesians, Romans and all the world.

See OLD MAN; MAN, I, 3.

2. The Outward Man:

The apostle also establishes a contrast between "the inward man" and "the outward man." "Though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day" (2Co 4:16). Now what sort of man is the "outward man" as contrasted with the "inward man"? In Greek, the exo-anthropos is set over against the eso-anthropos.

See OUTWARD MAN.

"The contrast here drawn between the ‘outward’ and the ‘inward man,’ though illustrated by the contrast in Ro 7:22 between the ‘law in the members’ and ‘the inner man,’ and in Eph 4:22; Col 3:9 between ‘the old man’ and ‘the new man’ is not precisely the same. Those contrasts relate to the difference between the sensual and the moral nature, ‘the flesh’ and ‘the spirit’; this to the difference between the material and the spiritual nature" (Stanley, in the place cited.).

"The outward man" is the body, and "the inward man" is the soul, or immaterial principle in the human make-up. As the body is wasted by the afflictions of life, the soul is renewed; what is death to the body is life to the soul; as afflictions depotentiate man’s physical organism, they impotentiate man’s spiritual principle. That is, the afflictions of life, culminating in death itself, have diametrically opposite effects

upon the body and upon the soul. They kill the one; they quicken the other.

"The inward man" is the whole human nature as renewed and indwelt and dominated by the Spirit of God as interpenetrated by the spirit of grace. As the one is broken down by the adverse dispensations of life, the other is upbuilt by the sanctifying discipline of the Spirit.

3. The Carnal Man:

There is another Pauline antithesis which it is necessary for us to interpret in order to understand what he means by the "natural man." It is the distinction which he draws between the "carnal mind" and the "spiritual mind." The critical reference is Ro 8:1-14. In this place the "carnal mind" is identified with the "law of death," and the "spiritual mind" is identified with the "law of the Spirit." These two "laws" are two principles and codes: the one makes man to be at "enmity against God" and leads to "death"; the other makes him the friend of God, and conducts to "life and peace." The word "carnal" connotes all that is fallen and sinful and unregenerate in man’s nature. In its gross sense the "carnal" signifies that which is contrary to nature, or nature expressing itself in low and bestial forms of sin.

4. The Natural Man:

The "natural man" is the "old man," the "outward man," the "carnal man"—man as he is by nature, as he is firstborn, contra-distinguished to man as he is changed by the Spirit, as he is second-born or regenerated. There. is an "old" life, an "outward" life, a "carnal" life, a "natural" life, as contrasted with the "new" life, the "inward" life, the "spiritual" life, the "gracious" life. The "natural man" is a bold and vivid personification of that depraved nature which we inherit from Adam fallen, the source and seat of all actual and personal transgressions.

II. Theological Meaning.

We know what we mean by the nature of the lion, by the nature of the lamb. We are using perfectly comprehensible language when we speak of the lion as naturally fierce, and of the lamb when we say he is naturally gentle. We have reference to the dominant dispositions of these animals, that resultant of their qualities which defines their character and spontaneity. So we are perfectly plain when we say that man is naturally sinful. We are but saying that sinfulness is to man what fierceness is to the lion, what gentleness is to the lamb. The "natural man" is a figure of speech for that sinful human nature, common to us all. It is equivalent to the theological phrases: the "sinful inclination," the "evil disposition," the "apostate will," "original sin," "native depravity." It manifests itself in the understanding as blindness, in the heart as hardness, in the will as obstinacy.

See MAN.

Robert Alexander Webb

MAN, OLD

See MAN; OLD MAN.

MAN, OUTWARD

See MAN, NATURAL; OUTWARD MAN.

MAN, SON OF

See SON OF MAN.

MAN-CHILD

man’-child (American Standard Revised Version; "man child," the English Revised Version; not in the King James Version; mashtin beqir): The expression is used with the meaning of "male," but is found only in the description of the extermination of a whole family, where it is employed to express every male descendant of any age. It occurs in 1Sa 25:22,34; 1Ki 14:10; 16:11; 21:21; 2Ki 9:8.

MAN; NEW

(neos anthropos or kainos anthropos): Generally described, the "new man" is man as he becomes under the transforming power of the Holy Spirit, contrasted with man as he is by nature. The phrase has (1) its Biblical, and (2) its theological, meanings.

I. Biblical Meaning.

There are four Biblical contrasts which must be considered as opposites:

(1) the "old man" (palaios anthropos) and the "new man" (neos anthropos or kainos anthropos);

(2) the "outward man" (exoanthropos) and the "inward man" (esoanthropos);

(3) the "carnal man" (sarkikos anthropos) and the "spiritual man" (pneumatikos anthropos);

(4) the "natural man" (psuchikos anthropos) and the "spiritual man" (pneunatikos anthropos).

These are not four different sorts of men, but four different sorts of man. Take up these antitheses in their reverse order, so as to arrive at some clear and impressive conception of what the Biblical writer means by the "new man."

1. The Spiritual Man:

The "spiritual man" is a designation given in opposition to the "carnal man" and to the "natural man" (Ro 8:1-14; 1Co 2:15; 3:1,3,4; 2:14; 3:11; 14:37; 15:46; Ga 6:1; Eph 2:3). All three of these terms are personifications of human nature. The "carnal man" is human nature viewed as ruled and dominated by sensual appetites and fleshly desires—as energized by those impulses which have close association with the bodily affections. The "natural man" is human nature ruled and dominated by unsanctified reason—those higher powers of the soul not yet influenced by Divine grace. The "spiritual man" is this same human nature after it has been seized upon and interpenetrated and determined by the Holy Spirit. The word "spiritual" is sometimes used in a poetic and idealistic sense, as when we speak of the spirituality of beauty; sometimes in a metaphysical sense, as when we speak of the spirituality of the soul; but in its prevalent Biblical and evangelical sense it is an adjective with the Holy Spirit as its noun-form. The spiritual life is that life of which the Holy Spirit is the author and preserver; and the "spiritual man" is that nature or character in man which the Holy Spirit originates, preserves, determines, disciplines, sanctifies and glorifies.

2. The Inward Man:

The "inward man" is a designation of human nature viewed as internally and centrally regenerated, as contrasted with the "outward man" (2Co 4:16; Ro 7:22; Eph 3:16). See MAN, OUTWARD. This phrase indicates the whole human nature conceived as affected from within—in the secret, inside, and true springs of activity—by the Holy Spirit of God. Such a change—regeneration—is not superficial, but a change in the inner central self; not a mere external reformation, but an internal transformation. Grace operates not from the circumference toward the center, but from the center toward the circumference, of life. The product is a man renovated in his "inward parts," changed in the dynamic center of his heart.

3. The New Man:

The "new man" is an appellation yielded by the contrasted idea of the "old man" (Ro 6:6; Eph 4:22; Col 3:9; Eph 2:15; 4:24; Col 3:10). The "old" is "corrupt" and expresses itself in evil "deeds"; the "new" possesses the "image of God" and is marked by "knowledge," "righteousness," and "holiness." There are two Greek words for "new"—neos and kainos. The former means new in the sense of young, as the new-born child is a young thing; the latter means "new" in the sense of renovated, as when the house which has been rebuilt is called a new house. The converted man is "new" (neo-anthropos) in the sense that he is a "babe in Christ," and "new" (kaino-anthropos) in the sense that his moral nature is renovated and built over again.

In the New Testament there are 5 different verbs used to express the action put forth in making the "old man" a "new man."

(1) In Eph 2:10 and 4:24, he is said to be "created" (ktizo), and in 2Co 5:17 the product is called a "new creature" (kaine kisis), a renovated creature. Out of the "old man" the Holy Spirit has created the "new

man."

(2) In 1Pe 1:3,13 and elsewhere, he is said to be "begotten again" (anagennao), and the product is a "babe in Christ" (1Co 3:1). The "old man" thus becomes the "new man" by a spiritual begetting: his paternity is assigned to the Holy Ghost.

(3) In Eph 2:5 and elsewhere, he is said to be ‘quickened’ (zoopoieo), and the product is represented as a creature which has been made "alive from the dead" (Ro 6:13). The "old man," being ‘dead in trespasses and sins’ (Eph 2:1), is brought forth from his sin-grave by a spiritual resurrection.

(4) In Eph 4:23 he is represented as being made "young" (ananeoo), and the product is a child of the Spirit at the commencement of his religious experience. The "old man," dating his history back to the fall in Eden, has become, through the Spirit, a young man in Christ Jesus.

(5) In 2Co 4:16 and in Ro 12:2, he is said to be ‘renovated’ (anakainoo). The "old man" is renovated into the "new man." Sinful human nature is taken by the Spirit and morally recast.

II. Theological Meaning.

The "new man" is the converted, regenerated man. The phrase has its significance for the great theological doctrine of regeneration as it expands into the broad work of sanctification. Is the sinner dead? Regeneration is a new life. Is holiness non-existent in him? Regeneration is a new creation. Is he born in sin? Regeneration is a new birth. Is he determined by his fallen, depraved nature? Regeneration is a spiritual determination. Is he the subject of carnal appetites? Regeneration is a holy appetency. Is he thought of as the old sinful man? Regeneration is a new man. Is the sinful mind blind? Regeneration is a new understanding. Is the heart stony? Regeneration is a heart of flesh. Is the conscience seared? Regeneration is a good conscience. Is the will impotent? Regeneration is a new impotentiation. The regenerated man is a man with a new governing disposition—a "new man," an "inward man," a "spiritual man."

(1) The "New Man"—the Regenerate Man—Is Not a Theological Transubstantiation:

A being whose substance has been supernaturally converted into some other sort of substance.

(2) He Is Not a Scientific Transmutation:

A species of one kind which has been naturally evolved into a species of another kind.

(3) He Is Not a Metaphysical Reconstruction:

Being with a new mental equipment.

(4) He Is an Evangelical Convert:

An "old man" with a new regnant moral disposition, an "outward man" with a new inward fons et origo of moral life; a "natural man" with a new renovated spiritual heart.

See MAN, NATURAL; REGENERATION.

Robert Alexander Webb

MANAEN

man’-a-en (Manaen, Greek form of Hebrew name "Menahem," meaning "consoler"): Manaen is mentioned, with Barnabas, Saul and others, in Ac 13:1, as one of the "prophets and teachers" in the recently rounded Gentile church at Antioch, at the time when Barnabas and Saul were "separated" by Divine call for their missionary service. He is further described as "the foster-brother (suntrophos) of Herod the tetrarch" (i.e. Herod Antipas (see HEROD)). He was probably brought up and educated with this Herod and his brother Archelaus. An earlier glimpse of Christian influence in Herod’s court is afforded by Joanna, the wife of Herod’s steward Chuzas, among the holy women who ministered to Jesus (Lu 8:3). Manaen may have been related to the older Manaen, the Essene, who, Josephus tells us, foretold the greatness of Herod the Great, and was afterward treated by Herod as his friend (Ant., XV, x, 5). His position in the church at Antioch was evidently an influential one, whether he himself ranked among the "prophets," or perhaps only among the "teachers."

James Orr

MANAHATH

man’-a-hath (manachath; Machanathi):

(1) A place to which certain Benjamites, victims, apparently, of intra-tribal jealousy, were carried captive (1Ch 8:6). Of this town the Manahathites were probably natives. It is possibly denoted by Manocho which Septuagint adds to the list of towns in Judah (Jos 15:59). This place is named along with Bether (Bittir). The name seems to be preserved in that of Malicha, a large village not far from Bittir, Southwest of Jerusalem. The change of "l" to "n", and vice versa, is not uncommon. The same place may be intended by Menuhah (Jud 20:43 the Revised Version margin), where the King James Version reads "with ease," and the Revised Version (British and American) "at their resting-place."

(2) One of the sons of Shobal, the son of Seir the Horite (Ge 36:23; 1Ch 1:40), the "name-father" of one of the ancient tribes in Mt. Seir, afterward subdued and incorporated in Edom.

W. Ewing

MANAHATHITES

man’-a-hath-its (menuchoth (1Ch 2:52), manachti (1Ch 2:54); Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Monaio; Codex Alexandrinus Ammanith (1Ch 2:52); Codex Vaticanus Malathei; Codex Alexandrinus Manath, (1Ch 2:54); the King James Version, Manahethites): These men were the inhabitants of Manahath. They were descendants of Caleb, one-half being the progeny of Shobal, and the other of Salma. In 1Ch 2:52 the Revised Version (British and American) transliterates "Menuhoth," but Manahathites is preferable.

MANAHETHITES

man-a-he’-thits, ma-na’-heth-its.

See MANAHATHITES.

MANASSEAS

man-a-se’-as (Manasseas): One of those who had married "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:31); "Manasseh" of Ezr 10:30.

MANASSEH (1)

ma-nas’-e (menashsheh, "causing to forget"; compare Ge 41:51; Man(n)asse):

(1) The firstborn of Joseph by Asenath, daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On. See next article.

(2) The tribe named from Manasseh, half of which, with Gad and Reuben, occupied the East of Jordan (Nu 27:1, etc.). See next article.

(3) The "Manasseh" of Jud 18:30,31 the King James Version is really an intentional mistake for the name Moses. A small nun ("n"), a Hebrew letter, has been inserted over and between the first and second Hebrew letters in the word Moses, thus maNesheh for mosheh. The reason for this is that the individual in question is mentioned as priest of a brazen image at Dan. His proper name was Moses. It was felt to be a disgrace that such a one bearing that honored name should keep it intact. The insertion of the nun hides the disgrace and, moreover, gives to the person a name already too familiar with idolatrous practices; for King Manasseh’s 55 years of sovereignty were thus disgraced.

(4) King of Judah. See separate article.

(5) Son of PAHATH-MOAB (which see), who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:30). Manaseas in 1 Esdras 9:31.

(6) The Manasses of 1 Esdras 9:33. A layman of the family of Hashum, who put away his foreign wife at Ezra's order (Ezr 10:33).

In the Revised Version (British and American) of Mt 1:10 and Re 7:6 the spelling "Manasseh" is given for the King James Version "Manasses." The latter is the spelling of the husband of Judith (Judith 8:2,7; 10:3; 16:22,23,24); of a person named in the last words of Tobit and otherwise unknown (Tobit 14:10), and also the name given to a remarkable prayer probably referred to in 2Ch 33:18, which Manasseh (4) is said to have uttered at the end of his long, unsatisfactory life. See MANASSES, THE PRAYER OF. In Jud 12:4, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "Manasseh" for the King James Version "Manassites."

Henry Wallace

MANASSEH (2)

1. Son of Joseph:

Following the Biblical account of Manasseh (patriarch, tribe, and territory) we find that he was the eider of Joseph's two sons by Asenath, the daughter of Poti-phera, priest of On (Ge 41:51). The birth of a son marked the climax of Joseph's happiness after the long bitterness of his experience. In the joy of the moment, the dark years past could be forgotten; therefore he called the name of the firstborn Manasseh ("causing to forget"), for, said he, God hath made me to forget all my toil. When Jacob was near his end, Joseph brought his two sons to his father who blessed them. Himself the younger son who had received the blessing of the firstborn, Jacob preferred Ephraim, the second son of Joseph, to Manasseh his elder brother, thus indicating the relative positions of their descendants (Ge 48). Before Joseph died he saw the children of Machir the son of Manasseh (Ge 50:23). Machir was born to Manasseh by his concubine, an Aramitess (1Ch 7:14). Whether he married Maacah before leaving for Egypt is not said. She was the sister of Huppim and Shuppim. Of Manasseh's personal life no details are recorded in Scripture. Acccording to Jewish tradition he became steward of his father's house, and acted as interpreter between Joseph and his brethren.

2. The Tribes in the Wilderness and Portion in Palestine:

At the beginning of the desert march the number of Manasseh's men of war is given at 32,200 (Nu 1:34 f). At the 2nd census they had increased to 52,700 (Nu 26:34). Their position in the wilderness was with the tribe of Benjamin, by the standard of the tribe of Ephraim, on the West of the tabernacle. According to Targum Pseudojon, the standard was the figure of a boy, with the inscription "The cloud of Yahweh rested on them until they went forth out of the camp." At Sinai the prince of the tribe was Gamaliel, son of Pedahzur (Nu 2:20). The tribe was represented among the spies by Gaddi, son of Susi (Nu 13:11, where the name "tribe of Joseph" seems to be used as an alternative). At the census in the plains of Moab, Manasseh is named before Ephraim, and appears as much the stronger tribe (Nu 26:28). The

main military exploits in the conquest of Eastern Palestine were performed by Manassites. Machir, son of Manasseh, conquered the Amorites and Gilead (Nu 32:39). Jair, son of Manasseh, took all the region of Argob, containing three score cities; these he called by his own name, "Havvoth-jair" (Nu 32:41; De 3:4,14). Nobah captured Kenath and the villages thereof (Nu 32:42; Jos 17:1,5). Land for half the tribe was thus provided, their territory stretching from the northern boundary of Gad to an undetermined frontier in the North, marching with Geshur and Maacah on the West, and with the desert on the East. The warriors of this half-tribe passed over with those of Reuben and Gad before the host of Israel, and took their share in the conquest of Western Palestine (Jos 22). They helped to raise the great altar in the Jordan valley, which so nearly led to disastrous consequences (Jos 22:10). Golan, the city of refuge, lay within their territory.

The possession of Ephraim and Manasseh West of the Jordan appears to have been undivided at first (Jos 17:16). The portion which ultimately fell to Manasseh marched with Ephraim on the South, with Asher and Issachar on the North, running out to the sea on the West, and falling into the Jordan valley on the East (Jos 17:7). The long dwindling slopes to westward and the fiat reaches of the plain included much excellent soil. Within the territory of Issachar and Asher, Beth-shean, Ibleam, Dor, Endor, Taanach and Megiddo, with their villages, were assigned to Manasseh. Perhaps the men of the West lacked the energy and enterprise of their eastern brethren. They failed, in any case, to expel the Canaanites from these cities, and for long this grim chain of fortresses seemed to mock the strength of Israel (Jos 17:11)

Ten cities West of the Jordan, in the portion of Manasseh, were given to the Levites, and 13 in the eastern portion (Jos 21:5,6).

Manasseh took part in the glorious conflict with the host of Sisera (Jud 5:14). Two famous judges, Gideon and Jephthah, belonged to this tribe. The men of the half-tribe East of Jordan were noted for skill and valor as warriors (1Ch 5:18,23 f). Some men of Manasseh had joined David before the battle of Gilboa (1Ch 12:19).

3. Its Place in Later History:

Others, all mighty men of valor, and captains in the host, fell to him on the way to Ziklag, and helped him against the band of rovers (1Ch 12:20). From the half-tribe West of the Jordan 18,000 men, expressed by name, came to David at Hebron to make him king (1Ch 12:31); while those who came from the East numbered, along with the men of Reuben and Gad, 120,000 (1Ch 12:37). David organized the eastern tribes under 2,700 overseers for every matter pertaining to God and for the affairs of the king (1Ch 26:32). The rulers of Manasseh were, in the West, Joel, son of Pedaiah, and in the East, Iddo, son of Zechariah (1Ch 27:20,21). Divers of Manasseh humbled themselves and came to Jerusalem at the invitation of Hezekiah to celebrate the Passover (2Ch 30:11). Although not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary, they ate the Passover. Pardon was successfully sought for them by the king, because they set their hearts to seek God (2Ch 30:18).

Of the eastern half-tribe it is said that they went a-whoring after the gods of the land, and in consequence they were overwhelmed and expatriated by Pul and Tiglath-pileser, kings of Assyria (1Ch 5:25 f). Reference to the idolatries of the western half-tribe are also found in 2Ch 31:1; 34:6.

There is a portion for Manasseh in Ezekiel's ideal picture (Eze 48:4), and the tribe appears in the list in Re (7:6). The genealogies in Jos 17:1 ff; Nu 26:28-34; 1Ch 2:21-23; 7:14-19 have fallen into confusion. As they stand, they are mutually contradictory, and it is impossible to harmonize them.

The theories of certain modern scholars who reject the Biblical account are themselves beset with difficulties: e.g. the name is derived from the Arabic, nasa, "to injure a tendon of the leg." Manasseh, the Piel part., would thus be the name of a supernatural being, of whom the infliction of such an injury was characteristic. It is not clear which of the wrestlers at the Jabbok suffered the injury. As Jacob is said to have prevailed with gods and men, the suggestion is that it was his antagonist who was lamed. "It would appear therefore that in the original story the epithet Manasseh was a fitting title of Jacob himself, which might be borne by his worshippers, as in the case of Gad" (EB, under the word, par. 4).

It is assumed that the mention of Machir in Jud 5:14 definitely locates the Manassites at that time on the West of the Jordan. The raids by members of the tribe on Eastern Palestine must therefore have taken place long after the days of Moses. The reasoning is precarious. After the mention of Reuben (5:15,16), Gilead (5:17) may refer to Gad. It would be strange if this warlike tribe were passed over (Guthe). Machir, then probably the strongest clan, stands for the whole tribe, and may be supposed to indicate particularly the noted fighters of the eastern half.

In dealing with the genealogies, "the difficult name" Zelophehad must be got rid of. Among the suggestions made is one by Dr. Cheyne, which first supposes the existence of a name Salhad, and then makes Zelophehad a corruption of this.

The genealogies certainly present difficulties, but otherwise the narrative is intelligible and self-consistent without resort to such questionable expedients as those referred to above.

W. Ewing

MANASSEH (3)

A king of Judah, son and successor of Hezekiah; reigned 55 years (2Ki 21:1; 2Ch 33:1), from circa 685 onward. His was one of the few royal names not compounded with the name of Yahweh (his son Amon's was the only other if, as an Assyrian inscription gives it, the full name of Ahaz was Jehoahaz or Ahaziah); but it was no heathen name like Amon, but identical with that of the elder son of Joseph. Born within Hezekiah's added 15 years, years of trembling faith and tender hope (compare Isa 38:15 f), his name may perhaps memorialize the father's sacred feelings; the name of his mother Hephzibah too was used long afterward as the symbol of the happy union of the land with its loyal sons (Isa 62:4). All this, however, was long forgotten in the memory of Manasseh's apostate career.

I. Sources of His Life.

The history (2Ki 1-18) refers for "the rest of his acts" to "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah," but the body of the account, instead of reading like state annals, is almost entirely a censure of his idolatrous reign in the spirit of the prophets and of the Deuteronomic strain of literature. The parallel history (2Ch 33:1-20) puts "the rest of his acts" "among the acts of the kings of Israel," and mentions his prayer (a prayer ascribed to him is in the Apocrypha) and "the words of the seers that spoke to him in the name of Yahweh." This history of Chronicles mentions his captive journey to Babylon and his repentance (2Ch 33:10-13), also his building operations in Jerusalem and his resumption of Yahweh-worship (2Ch 33:14-17), which the earlier source lacks. From these sources, which it is not the business of this article either to verify or question, the estimate of his reign is to be deduced.

II. Character of His Reign.

1. Political Situation:

During his reign, Assyria, principally under Esar-haddon and Assur-banipal, was at the height of its arrogance and power; and his long reign was the peaceful and uneventful life of a willing vassal, contented to count as tributary king in an illustrious world-empire, hospitable to all its religious and cultural ideas, and ready to take his part in its military and other enterprises. The two mentions of his name in Assyrian inscriptions (see G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 182) both represent him in this tributary light. His journey to Babylon mentioned in 2Ch 33:11 need not have been the penalty of rebellion; more likely it was such an enforced act of allegiance as was perhaps imposed on all provincial rulers who had incurred or would avert suspicion of disloyalty. Nor was his fortification of Jerusalem after his return less necessary against domestic than foreign aggression; the more so, indeed, as in so long and undisturbed a reign his capital, which was now practically synonymous with his realm (Esar-haddon calls him "king of the city of Judah"), became increasingly an important center of wealth and commercial prosperity. Of the specific events of his reign, however, other than religious, less is known than of almost any other.

2. Reactionary Idolatry:

That the wholesale idolatry by which his reign is mainly distinguished was of a reactionary and indeed conservative nature may be understood alike from what it sought to maintain and from what it had to react against. On the one side was the tremendous wave of ritual and mechanical heathen cults which, proceeding from the world-centers of culture and civilization (compare Isa 2:6-8), was drawing all the tributary lands, Judah with the rest, into its almost irresistible sweep. Manasseh, it would seem, met this not in the temper of an amateur, as had his grandfather Ahaz, but in the temper of a fanatic. Everything old and new that came to his purview was of momentous religious value—except only the simple and austere demands of prophetic insight. He restored the debasing cults of the aboriginal Nature-worship which his father had suppressed, thus making Judah revert to the sterile Baal-cults of Ahab; but his blind

credence in the black arts so prevalent in all the surrounding nations, imported the elaborate worship of the heavenly bodies from Babylon, invading even the temple-courts with its numerous rites and altars; even went to the horrid extreme of human sacrifice, making an institution of what Ahaz had tried as a desperate expedient. All this, which to the matured prophetic sense was headlong wickedness, was the mark of a desperately earnest soul, seeking blindly in this wholesale way to propitiate the mysterious Divine powers, his nation's God among them, who seemed so to have the world's affairs in their inscrutable control. On the other side, there confronted him the prophetic voice of a religion which decried all insincere ritual ('wickedness and worship,' Isa 1:13), made straight demands on heart and conscience, and had already vindicated itself in the faith which had wrought the deliverance of 701. It was the fight of the decadent formal against the uprising spiritual; and, as in all such struggles, it would grasp at any expedient save the one plain duty of yielding the heart to repentance and trust.

3. Persecution:

Meanwhile, the saving intelligence and integrity of Israel, though still the secret of the lowly, was making itself felt in the spiritual movement that Isaiah had labored to promote; through the permeating influence of literature and education the "remnant" was becoming a power to be reckoned with. It is in the nature of things that such an innovating movement must encounter persecution; the significant thing is that already there was so much to persecute. Persecution is as truly the offspring of fear as of fanaticism. Manasseh's persecution of the prophets and their adherents (tradition has it that the aged Isaiah was one of his victims) was from their point of view an enormity of wickedness. To us the analysis is not quite so simple; it looks also like the antipathy of an inveterate formal order to a vital movement that it cannot understand. The vested interests of almost universal heathenism must needs die hard, and "much innocent blood" was its desperate price before it would yield the upper hand. To say this of Manasseh's murderous zeal is not to justify it; it is merely to concede its sadly mistaken sincerity. It may well have seemed to him that a nation's piety was at stake, as if a world's religious culture were in peril.

4. Return to Better Mind:

The Chronicler, less austere in tone than the earlier historian, preserves for us the story that, like Saul of Tarsus after him, Manasseh got his eyes open to the truer meaning of things; that after his humiliation and repentance in Babylon he "knew that Yahweh he was God" (2Ch 33:10-13). He had the opportunity to see a despotic idolatry, its evils with its splendors, in its own home; a first-fruit of the thing that the Hebrew exiles were afterward to realize. On his return, accordingly, he removed the altars that had encroached upon the sacred precincts of the temple, and restored the ritual of the Yahweh-service, without, however, removing the high places. It would seem to have been merely the concession of Yahweh's right to a specific cult of His own, with perhaps a mitigation of the more offensive extremes of exotic worship, while the toleration of the various fashionable forms remained much as before. But this in itself was something, was much; it gave Yahweh His chance, so to say, among rivals; and the growing spiritual fiber of the heart of Israel could be trusted to do the rest. It helps us also the better to understand the situation when, only two years after Manasseh's death, Josiah came to the throne, and to understand why he and his people were so ready to accept the religious sanity of the Deuteronomic law.

He did not succeed, after all, in committing his nation to the wholesale sway of heathenism. Manasseh's reactionary reign was indeed not without its good fruits; the crisis of religious syncretism and externalism was met and passed.

John Franklin Genung

MANASSES

ma-nas'-ez (Manasses; Codex Vaticanus Manasse):

(1) One who had married a "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:33) equals "Manasseh" of Ezr 10:33.

(2) The wealthy husband of Judith; died of sunstroke when employed at the barley harvest (Judith 8:2 f, 7; 10:3; 16:22 ff).

(3) A person mentioned in Tobit 14:10, who "gave alms, and escaped the snare of death." It must be admitted that Manasses here is an awkward reading and apparently interrupts the sense, which would run more smoothly if Manasses were omitted or Achiacharus read. There is great variety of text in this verse. Codex Sinaiticus (followed by Fritzsche, Libri apoc. vet. Test Greek, 1871) reads en to poiesai me eleemosunen exelthen, where Manasses is omitted and Achiacharus is understood as the subject. Itala and Syriac go a step further and read Achiacharus as subject. But Codex Vaticanus (followed by Swete, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) reads Manasses, which must be the correct reading on the principle of being the most difficult. Explanations have been offered

(1) that Manasses is simply the Hebrew name for Achiacharus, it not being uncommon for a Jew to have a Greek and a Hebrew name;

(2) that on reading Amon, Manasses was inserted for Achiacharus according to 2Ch 33:22 ff;

(3) that Manasses here is an incorrect reading for Nasbas (Tobit 11:18), identified by Grotius with Achiacharus: "It seems impossible at present to arrive at a satisfactory explanation" (Fuller, Speaker's Commentary).

There is as great uncertainty as to the person who conspired against Manasses: Aman, in Codex Alexandrinus, followed by the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), who is by some identified with the Haman of Esther and Achiacharus with Mordecai; Adam, in Codex Vaticanus, followed by Swete; Itala Nadab; Syriac Ahab (Acab).

(4) A king of Judah (Mt 1:10 the King James Version, Greek form, the Revised Version (British and American) "Manasseh"), whose prayer forms one of the apocryphal books.

See MANASSES, THE PRAYER OF.

(5) The elder son of Joseph (Re 7:6, the King James Version Greek form, the Revised Version (British and American) "Manasseh").

S. Angus

MANASSES, THE PRAYER OF

1. Name

2. Canonicity and Position

3. Contents

4. Original Language

5. Authenticity

6. Author and Motive

7. Date

8. Text and Versions

(1) Greek

(2) Latin

LITERATURE

The Prayer of Manasses purports to be, and may in reality be, the prayer of that king mentioned in 2Ch 33:13,18 f.

1. Name:

In Cod.

A. it is called simply "A Prayer of Manasses," in the London Polyglot "A Prayer of Manasses, King of the Jews." Its title in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is "A Prayer of Manasses, King of Judah, when He Was Held Captive in Babylon." In Baxter’s Apocrypha, Greek and English this

Prayer appears at the end with the heading "A Prayer of Manasses, son of Ezekias" (equals Hezekiah).

2. Canonicity and Position:

The Greek church is the only one which has consistently reckoned this Prayer as a part of its Bible. Up to the time of the Council of Trent (1545-1563 AD), it formed a part of the Vulgate, but by that council it was relegated with 3 and 4 (1 and 2) Esdras to the appendix (which included uncanonical scriptures), "lest they should become wholly lost, since they are occasionally, cited by the Fathers and are found in printed copies. Yet it is wholly absent from the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) of Sixtus V, though it is in the Appendix of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) of Clement VIII. Its position varies in manuscripts, versions and printed editions of the Septuagint. It is most frequently found among the odes or canticles following the Psalter, as in Codices Alexandrinus, T (the Zurich Psalter) and in Ludolf's Ethiopic Psalter. In Swete's Septuagint the Psalter of Solomon followed by the odes (Odai), of which The Prayer of Manasseh is the 8th, appear as an Appendix after 4 Maccabees in volume III. It was placed after 2 Chronicles in the original Vulgate, but in the Romanist Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) it stands first, followed by 3 and 4 (1 and 2) Esdras in the apocryphal Appendix. It is found in all manuscripts of the Armenian Bible, where, as in Swete's Septuagint, it is one of many odes. Though not included in Coverdale's Bible or the Geneva VS, it was retained (at the close of the Apocrypha) in Luther's translation, in Mathew's Bible and in the Bishops' Bible, whence it passed into our English Versions of the Bible.

3. Contents:

According to 2Ch 33 (compare 2Ki 21) Manasseh was exiled by the Assyrians to Babylon as a punishment for his sins. There he became penitent and earnestly prayed to God for pardon and deliverance. God answered his prayer and restored him to Jerusalem and to the throne. Though the prayer is mentioned in 2Ch 33:13,18 f, it is not given, but this lack has been supplied in the The Prayer of Manasseh of the Apocrypha. After an opening invocation to the God of Abraham, Isaac, Judah and their righteous seed, the Creator of all things, most high, yet compassionate, who has ordained repentance, not for perfect ones like the patriarchs who did not need it, but for the like of the person praying, there follows a confession of sin couched for the most part in general terms, a prayer for pardon and a vow to praise God forever if this prayer is answered.

4. Original Language:

The bulk of scholars (Fritzsche, Reuss, Schurer, Ryssel, etc.) agree that this Prayer was composed in Greek. The Greek recension is written in a free, flowing and somewhat rhetorical style, and it reads like an original work, not like a translation. Though there are some Hebraisms, they are not more numerous or striking than usually meet us in Hellenistic Greek. It is of some importance also that, although Jewish tradition adds largely to the legends about Manasseh, it has never supplied a Hebrew version of the Prayer (see VERSIONS; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). On the other hand, Ewald (Hist. Isr, I, 186; IV, 217, note 5, German edition, IV, 217 f), Furst (Gesch. der bibl. Lit., II, 399), Budde (ZAW,

1892, 39 ff), Ball (Speaker's Apocrypha) and others argue for a Hebrew original, perhaps existing in the source named of 2Ch 33:18 f (see Ryssel in Kautzsch, Die Apocrypha des Altes Testament, 167).

5. Authenticity:

Have we here the authentic prayer of Manasseh offered under the circumstances described in 2Ch 33? Ewald and the other scholars named (see foregoing section), who think the Prayer was composed in Hebrew, say that we have probably here a Greek rendering of the Hebrew original which the Chronicler saw in his source. Ball, on the other hand, though not greatly opposed to this view, is more convinced that the Hebrew original is to be sought in a haggadic narrative concerning Manasseh. Even if we accept the view of Ewald or of Ball, we still desiderate evidence that this Hebrew original is the very prayer offered by the king in Babylon. But the arguments for a Greek original are fairly conclusive. Many Old Testament scholars regard the narrative of the captivity, prayer and penitence of Manasseh as a fiction of the Chronicler's imagination, to whom it seemed highly improper that this wicked king should escape the punishment (exile) which he richly deserved. So De Wette (Einleitung), Graf (Stud. u. Krit., 1859, 467-94, and Gesch. Bucher des Altes Testament, 174) and Noldeke (Schenkel's Bibelwerk, "Manasse"). Nothing corresponding to it occurs in the more literal narrative of 2Ki 21, an argument which, however, has but little weight. Recent discoveries of cuneiform inscriptions have taken off the edge of the most important objections to the historicity of this part of Chronicles. See Ball (op. cit., 361 ff) and Bissell (Lange's Apocrypha, 468). The likeliest supposition is that the author of the Prayer was an Alexandrian Jew who, with 2Ch 33 before him, desired to compose such a prayer as Manasseh was likely to offer under the supposed circumstances. This prayer, written in excellent Alexandrian Greek, is, as Fritzsche points out, an addition to 2Ch 33, corresponding to the prayers of Mordecai and Esther added to the canonical Es (Additions to Esther 13:8-14:19), and also to the prayer of Azarias (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:2-22) and the So of the Three Young Men (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:29-68) appended to the canonical Book of Daniel.

6. The Author and His Motive:

That the author was an Alexandrian Jew is made probable by the (Greek) language he employs and by the sentiments he expresses. It is strange to find Swete (Expository Times, II, 38 f) defending the Christian authorship of this Prayer. What purpose could the writer seek to realize in the composition and publication of the penitential psalm? In the absence of definite knowledge, one may with Reuss (Das Altes Testament, VI, 436 f) suppose that the Jewish nation was at the time given up to great unfaithfulness to God and to gross moral corruption. The lesson of the Prayer is that God will accept the penitent, whatever his sins, and remove from the nation its load of sufferings, if only it turns to God.

7. Date:

Ewald and Furst (op. cit.) hold that the prayer is at least as old as the Book of Chronicles (300 BC), since it is distinctly mentioned, they say, in 2Ch 33:13,18 f. But the original form was, as seen (compare 4 above), Greek, not Hebrew. Moreover, the teaching of the Prayer is post-Biblical. The patriarchs are

idealized to the extent that they are thought perfect and therefore not needing forgiveness (33:8); their merits avail for the sinful and undeserving (33:1) (see Weber, Jud. Theologie, 292). The expressions "God of the Just" (33:8), "God of those who repent" (33:13), belong to comparatively late Judaism. A period about the beginning of the Christian era or (Fritzsche) slightly earlier would suit the character (language and teaching) of the Prayer. The similarity between the doctrines implied in The Prayer of Manasseh and those taught in apocryphal writings of the time confirms this conclusion. There is no need with Bertholdt to bring down the writing to the 2nd or 3rd century AD. Fabricius (Liber Tobit, etc., 208) dates the Prayer in the 4th or 5th century AD, because, in his opinion, its author is the same as that of the Apostolical Constitutions which has that date. But the source of this part of the Apostolical Constitutions is the Didaskalia (3rd century), and moreover both these treatises are of Christian origin, the Prayer being the work of an Alexandrian Jew.

8. Text and Versions:

(1) Greek:

The Greek text occurs in Codices Alexandrinus, T (Psalterium Turicence 262, Parsons). Swete (OLD TESTAMENT in Greek, III, 802-4) gives the text of Codex Alexandrinus with the variations of T. It is omitted from the bulk of ancient manuscripts and editions of the Septuagint, as also from several modern editions (Tischendorf, etc.). Nestle (Septuaginta Studien, 1899, 3) holds that the Greek text of Codices Alexandrinus, T, etc., has been taken from the Apostolical Constitutions or from the Didaskalia. The common view is that it was extracted by the latter from the Septuagint.

(2) Latin:

The Latin text in Sabatier (Bib. Sac. Latin, III, 1038) is not by Jerome, nor is it in the manner of the Old Latin; its date is later.

LITERATURE.

The outstanding literature has been cited in the foregoing article. Reference may be made to Howorth ("Some Unconventional Views on the Text of the Bible," PSBA, XXXI, 89 ff: he argues that the narrative concerning Manasseh, including the Prayer in the Apostolical Constitutions, represents a portion of the true Septuagint of 2Ch 33).

T. Witton Davies

MANASSITES ma-nas'-its (menashshi; ho Manasse): Members of the tribe of Manasseh (De 4:43; Jud 12:4 the King James Version; 2Ki 10:33).

MANDRAKES

man’-draks (dudha’im; mandragoras (Ge 30:14 f; So 7:13); the marginal reading "love apples" is due to the supposed connection of dudha’im with dodhim, "love"): Mandrakes are the fruit of the Mandragora officinarum, a member of the Solanaceae or potato order, closely allied to the Atropa belladonna. It is a common plant all over Palestine, flourishing particularly in the spring and ripening about the time of the wheat harvest (Ge 30:14). The plant has a rosette of handsome dark leaves, dark purple flowers and orange, tomato-like fruit. The root is long and branched; to pull it up is still considered unlucky (compare Josephus, BJ, VII, vi, 3). The fruit is called in Arabic baid el-jinn, the "eggs of the jinn"; they have a narcotic smell and sweetish taste, but are too poisonous to be used as food. They are still used in folklore medicine in Palestine. The plant was well known as an aphrodisiac by the ancients (So 7:13).

E. W. G. Masterman

MANEH; MINA

man’-e, or mi’-na (maneh; mna, "pound" (English Versions of the Bible)): A weight containing 50 shekels, according to Hebrew usage, but which varied according to the standard adopted. Estimated on the Phoenician, or commercial, standard, it was equal to 11,200 grains, or about 2 lbs. troy, or about 1,6 lbs. avoirdupois. This is probably the weight intended in 1Ki 10:17; Ezr 2:69 and Ne 7:71 f (see WEIGHTS AND MEASURES). When used in a monetary sense, the maneh of silver was worth about 6 pounds 17 shillings, or $34 (in 1915); the gold maneh was equal to about 102 pounds 10 shillings, or $510 (in 1915).

H. Porter

MANES

ma’-nez (Manes): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:21). It represents the two names Maaseiah and Elijah of the parallel Ezr 10:21. The real equivalent is probably Maaseiah, Elijah being dropped. the Revised Version margin and the King James Version margin give Harim of Ezr 10:21 as identical—apparently incorrectly, for the words "and of the sons of Harim" (Ezr 10:21) are simply omitted. the King James Version blunders strangely here in reading Eanes after a misprint Eanes (for Manes) in the Aldine edition.

MANGER

man’-jer (phatne): Properly the place in a stall or stable where the food of cattle is placed (in the Old Testament "crib" (Job 39:9; Pr 14:4; Isa 1:3)); thus also, apparently, in the narrative of the nativity in Lu 2:7,12,16. In Septuagint, the Greek word, representing different Hebrew words, has also the extended meaning of "stall" (2Ch 32:28; Hab 3:17); thus also in Lu 13:15, where the Revised Version margin has "manger." Old tradition says that Jesus was born in a cave in the neighborhood of Bethlehem; even so, a place for food for cattle may have been cut in the side of the rock.

James Orr

MANI

ma’-ni (Mani): Head of a family (1 Esdras 9:30) equals "Bani" in Ezr 10:29, the form which appears in 1 Esdras 5:12.

MANIFEST; MANIFESTATION

man’-i-fest, man-i-fes-ta’-shun (phaneroo, phaneros): "To manifest" is generally the translation of phaneroo, "to make apparent" (Mr 4:22; Joh 17:6; Ro 3:21; 1Ti 3:16, "God was manifest in the flesh," the Revised Version (British and American) "manifested"; 1 Joh 1:2 twice, etc.); also of phaneros, "manifest" (Ac 4:16; Ro 1:19; 1Co 3:13; 1Joh 3:10, etc.); "to make manifest" (phaneroo) (Joh 1:31; Ro 16:26); of emphanizo, "to make fully manifest" (Joh 14:21 f); of emphanes, "fully manifest" (Ro 10:20); of delos, "evident," translated "manifest" (1Co 15:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "evident"); of ekdelos, "very evident" (2Ti 3:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "evident"); of prodelos, "evident beforehand" (1Ti 5:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "evident"); of aphanes, is "not manifest" (Heb 4:13, "There is no creature that is not manifest in his sight"); "manifest," occurs once in the Old Testament as the translation of barar, "to clear," "to purify" (Ec 3:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "prove"); of phaneros (2 Macc 3:28, the Revised Version (British and American) "manifestly").

Manifestation is the translation of apokalupsis, "uncovering" (Ro 8:19, "the manifestation of the sons of God," the Revised Version (British and American) "revealing"); of phanerosis, "manifestation" (1Co 12:7; 2Co 4:2).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "manifest" for "shew" (Joh 7:4); "was manifested" for "appeared" (Mr 16:12,14); "was manifested to the," for "shewed himself to his" (Joh 21:14); "be made manifest" for "appear" (2Co 5:10; 7:12; Re 3:18); "became manifest" for "was made known" (Ac 7:13); "gave him to be made manifest" for "shewed him openly" (Ac 10:40); "He who was manifested" for "God was manifest" (1Ti 3:16) (margin "The word "God," in place of "He who," rests on no sufficient ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read which"); "is not yet made manifest" for "doth not yet appear" (1 Joh 3:2); "by the manifestation" for "with the brightness" (2Th 2:8) "be manifested" for "appear" (Col 3:4 twice; 1Pe 5:4); "if he shall be manifested" for "when he shall appear" (1Joh 2:28; 3:2), etc.

W. L. Walker

MANIFESTLY

man’-i-fest-li (mar’eh, "(in) personal presence"): Has the meaning of "by direct vision," as in 1Co 13:12,

"face to face," stating positively (Nu 12:8) what the next clause states negatively, namely, "not in dark speeches." "Apparently" of the King James Version is ambiguous.

MANIFOLD

man'-i-fold (rabh; poikilos): "Manifold," which occurs only a few times, is in the Old Testament the translation of rabh, "many," "abundant" (Ne 9:19,27; Am 5:12, where it is equivalent to "many"), and of rabhabh, "to multiply," "to increase" (Ps 104:24, "O Yahweh, how manifold are thy works"); poikilos, properly, "many colored," "spotted," "variegated," is translated "manifold": 1Pe 1:6 margin, "manifold temptations"; 4:10, "manifold grace," suggests variety, diverseness; polupoikilos has this meaning more intensely (Eph 3:10, "the manifold wisdom of God"). With this may be compared a fine passage in The Wisdom of Solomon 7:22, where it is said that in Wisdom there is "an understanding spirit, holy, one only (the Revised Version (British and American) "alone in kind," margin "Greek: sole-born"), manifold (polumeres)." In like manner, pollaplasion, "manifold more" (Lu 18:30), indicates the varied elements of the reward of him who is faithful to Christ. In Ecclesiasticus 51:3, we have "manifold afflictions" (pleion).

W. L. Walker

MANIUS; TITUS

ma'-ni-us, ti'-tus (Tito Manios, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Venetus, and the Syriac; Manlios, Swete following Codex Alexandrinus; Manilius, Itala and Vulgate, the King James Version, Manlius): Titus Manius and Quintus Memmius were the legates of the Romans who carried a letter unto the Jewish people consenting to the favorable terms which Lysias, the captain of Antiochus, granted to the Jews after his defeat, 163 BC (2 Macc 11:34). That the letter is spurious appears from the facts

(1) that it is dated in the 148th year of the Seleucidian era adopted by the Jews and not, after the Ro fashion, according to consulates;

(2) that it is also dated the same day as that of Eupator—the 15th of the month Xanthicus;

(3) that the Jews had as yet no dealings with the Romans; Judas first heard of the fame of the Romans a year or two years later (1 Macc 8:1 ff), after the death of Nicanor (1 Macc 7:47);

(4) that no such names are found among the Roman legati mentioned by Polybius as sent to the East.

If Manius is not altogether a fabrication, it is difficult to decide exactly who he is. The reading fluctuates between "Manius" and "Manlius." About the same time a T. Manlius Torquatus was sent by the Romans on an embassy to Egypt to settle a quarrel between Philometor and Euergetes II Physc. on (Polyb. xxxi. 18; Livy xliii.11), but not to Syria, and his colleague was Cn. Merula. Perhaps Manius Sergius is intended, who with C. Sulpicius was sent to investigate the state of Greece and to see what Antiochus

Epiphanes and Eumanes were doing (165 BC) (Polyb. xxxi.9). But no such name as Titus Manius or Manlius is otherwise found as legate to Asia with a colleague Quintus Memmius.

See also MEMMIUS.

S. Angus

MANKIND man-kind’:In Le 18:22; 20:13, the term is applied to men, as distinguished from women; in Job 12:10, to the human race; in Jas 3:7, to the human nature.

MANLIUS, TITUS

man’-li-us.

See MANIUS, TITUS.

MANNA

man’-a (man; manna): The Hebrew man is probably derived, as Ebers suggests, from the Egyptian mennu, "food." In Ex 16:15, we have a suggested source of the name, "They said one to another, What is it?" i.e. manhu, which also means, "It is manna" (see margin).

1. Old Testament References:

This substance is described as occurring in flakes or small round grains, literally, "hoax frost"; it fell with the dew (Nu 11:9) and appeared when the dew left the ground (Ex 16:14); "It was like coriander seed, white; and the taste of it was like wafers made with honey" (Ex 16:31). In Nu 11:8, its taste is described "as the taste of fresh oil," margin "cakes baked with oil." "And the children of Israel did eat the manna forty years, until they came .... unto the borders of the land of Canaan" (Ex 16:35). It ceased the day after they ate the produce of the land, unleavened cakes and parched grain, in the plains of Jericho (Jos 5:10-12). Although an important article of diet, it was by no means the sole one as seems implied in Nu 21:15; there are plenty of references (e.g. Ex 17:3; 24:5; 34:3; Le 8:2,26,31; 9:4; 10:12; 24:5; Nu 7:13,19 f, etc.) which show that they had other food besides. The food was gathered every morning, "every man according to his eating: and when the sun waxed hot, it melted" (Ex 16:21); a portion of the previous day’s gathering bred worms and stank if kept (Ex 16:20); on the 6th day a double amount was gathered, the Sabbath portion being miraculously preserved (Ex 16:22-27). A pot—a golden one (Heb 9:4)—with an omer of manna was "laid up before Yahweh" in the tabernacle (Ex 16:33). Manna is referred to in Ne 9:20. It is described poetically as "food from heaven" and "bread of the mighty" (Ps 78:24 f); as "bread of heaven" (Ps 105:40); and as "angels’ bread" (2 Esdras 1:19; The Wisdom of Solomon 16:20).

2. New Testament References:

In Joh 6:31-63, our Lord frequently refers to "the manna" or "bread from heaven" as typical of Himself. Paul (1Co 10:3) refers to it as "spiritual food," and in Re 2:17 we read, "To him that overcometh, to him will I give of the hidden manna."

Manna, as might be expected, figures largely in rabbinical literature. It was, it is said, adapted to the taste of each individual who could by wishing taste in the manna anything he desired (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 16:21). Manna is reserved as the future food of the righteous (compare Re 2:17), for which purpose it is ground in a mill situated in the third heaven (Chag 12b; Tan. Beshallach 22).

3. Natural Explanations:

No substance is known which in any degree satisfies all the requirements of the Scriptural references, but several travelers in the wilderness have reported phenomena which suggest some of the features of the miraculous manna.

(1) In the Peninsula of Sinai, on the route of the children of Israel, a species of tamarisk, named in consequence by Ebers Tammaris mannifera, is found to exude a sweet, honey-like substance where its bark is pierced by an insect, Gossyparia mannifera. It collects upon the twigs and falls to the ground. The Arabs who gather it to sell to pilgrims call it mann-es-sama, "heavenly manna"; it is white at first but turns yellow; in the early morning it is of the consistency of wax but when the sun is hot it disappears. This substance occurs only after mid-summer and for a month or two at most.

(2) A second proposal is to identify manna with a lichen—Lecanora esculenta and allied species—which grows in the Arabian and other deserts upon the limestone. The older masses become detached and are rolled about by the wind. When swept together by sudden rain storms in the rainy season they may collect in large heaps. This lichen has been used by the Arabs in time of need for making bread. It is a quite reasonable form of nourishment in the desert, especially when eaten with the sugary manna from the trees.

E. W. G. Masterman

MANNER; MANNERS

man’-er, man’-erz (dabhar, derekh, mishpaT; ethos, houtos):

1. As Used in the Old Testament:

"Manner" (probably from manus, "the hand," mode of handling things, or acting) is in the Bible in general equivalent

(1) to way, custom, habit, etc.,

(2) to kind or sort.

There are some special senses, however, and archaic usages. It is frequently the translation of dabhar, "speaking," "word," "thing" (Ge 18:25, "That be far from thee to do after this manner" (i.e. in this way); Ge 32:19, "On this manner shall ye speak unto Esau" (in this way); Ge 39:19, "After this manner (in this way) did thy servant to me"; Ex 22:9, "every manner of trespass" (every kind, sort, or way); De 15:2; 1Sa 17:27,30 bis); also of derekh, "way" (Ge 19:31, "after the manner of all the earth (way); 1Sa 21:5 the King James Version "(the bread) is in a manner common"; "manner" here might be taken as equivalent to "way" or "measure," but the passage is a difficult one and the text uncertain; the Revised Version (British and American) omits "manner," and in the text makes the reference to be to the journey, not to the bread, but in the margin it has "common (bread)"; Isa 10:24,26, after the manner of Egypt" (after the way or fate of Egypt); so also Am 4:10; 8:14, the manner of Beer-sheba liveth" the Revised Version (British and American) "the way," margin "manner, the reference here being to the religious way, or manner of worship); of mishpaT, "judgment," "ordinance," hence, also "manner" or "custom" (Ge 40:13; Ex 21:9; 2Ki 1:7, "what manner of man" (sort or kind); 2Ki 17:26 the King James Version; 1Ch 24:19; Eze 11:12, "after the manners (the Revised Version (British and American) "ordinances") of the nations"); torah, "instruction," "law," is also translated "manner" (2Sa 7:19, "(is) this the manner (margin "law") of man, O Lord God?" the Revised Version (British and American) "and this (too) after the manner of men, O Lord Yahweh," margin "and is this the law of man, O Lord Yahweh?"). Other words are: ‘orach, "path," "custom" (Ge 18:11); dobher, "leading," "pasture" (compare "sheep-walk," "sheep-fold"); Isa 5:17, "Then shall the lambs feed after their manner," the Revised Version (British and American) "as in their pasture" (in Mic 2:12, the same word is translated the King James Version "fold," the Revised Version (British and American) "pasture"); demuth, "likeness" (Eze 23:15); dath, "law," "sentence" (Es 2:12); chuqqah, "statute," "custom" (Le 20:23) in the King James Version. In Nu 5:13 "with the manner" is supplied to "taken" (in adultery). "Manner" here is an old law-French phrase, "a thief taken with the mainour"—that is, with the thing stolen upon him in manu (in his hand) (Blackstone, Comm., IV, xxiii), the Revised Version (British and American) "in the act" (compare Joh 8:4 "in the very act"); gam, "also" is translated (1Sa 19:24) "in like manner," the Revised Version (British and American) "also."

2. As Used in the Apocrypha:

In Apocrypha, 2 Macc 4:13 the King James Version, we have "increase of heathenish manners," the Revised Version (British and American) "an extreme of Greek fashions"; 2 Macc 6:9, the "manners of the Gentiles," the Revised Version (British and American) "the Greek rites"; in 2 Esdras 9:19, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), "manners" appears in the sense of "morals"; compare 1Co 15:33, the Revised Version (British and American) "Evil companionships corrupt good morals."

3. As Used in the New Testament:

In the New Testament various words and phrases are rendered by "manner"; we have ethos, "custom," "usage," "manner" (Joh 19:40; Ac 15:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "custom"); kata to eiothos (Lu 4:16, the Revised Version (British and American) "as his custom was"); tropos a "turning," "manner," "way" (Jude 1:7); hon tropon, "in which manner" (Ac 1:11); houtos, "thus," "so," "accordingly," is "after this manner," "in like manner" (Mt 6:9; Mr 13:29 the King James Version); in Ac 15:23, "after this manner" stands in the King James Version for "by their hands," the Revised Version (British and American) "thus"; pos (Ac 20:18), "after what manner"; agoge, "course of life" (2Ti 3:10, the Revised Version (British and American) "conduct"); biosis, "mode of life" (Ac 26:4); in 1Co 15:33, we have manners in the moral sense, "Evil communications corrupt good manners," the American Standard Revised Version "Evil companionships corrupt good morals." Ac 13:18 is interesting because of diversities of rendering; the King James Version has "suffered he their manners in the wilderness," margin "etropophoresen, perhaps for etrophophoresen, bore, or fed them as a nurse beareth or feedeth her child, De 1:31 (2 Macc 7:27) according to Septuagint, and so Chrysostom"; the English Revised Version text, same as the King James Version margin "Many ancient authorities read ‘bear he them as a nursing father in the wilderness.’ See De 1:31"; the American Standard Revised Version (text) "as a nursing-father bare he them in the wilderness," margin "Many ancient authorities read ‘Suffered he their manners in the wilderness.’ See De 9:7." The Greek words differ only by a single letter, and authorities are pretty equally divided.

Among other changes the Revised Version (British and American) has frequently "ordinance" for "manner" (Le 5:10, etc.) and "custom" (Ru 4:7; Joh 19:40; Heb 10:25, etc.); "manner of" is introduced (1Sa 4:8, etc.); "manner of" and "manner" omitted (Ge 25:23; Ex 35:29, etc.); "what manner of house" for "where is the house" (Isa 66:1); "manner of life" for "conversation" (Ga 1:13; Eph 4:22); "after the manner of men" for "as a man" (Ro 3:5; 1Co 9:8); "how to inquire concerning these things" (Ac 25:20) for "of such manner of questions"; "in an unworthy manner," the American Standard Revised Version, for "unworthily" (1Co 11:27); "who" for "what manner of man" (Mr 4:41; Lu 8:25, "who then is this?"); in Lu 9:55, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of" is omitted, with the margin "Some ancient authorities add and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of."

W, L. Walker

MANOAH

ma-no’-a (manoach, "rest"): A man of Zorah and of the family of the Danites. Manoah was the father of Samson, and his life-story is but imperfectly told in the history of the conception, birth and early life of his son. No children had been born to Manoah and his wife, and the latter was considered barren (Jud 13:2). Finally it was revealed to her by an angel of the Lord that she would conceive and bear a child. She was cautioned against strong drink and "unclean" food, for her child was to be born and reared a Nazirite to the end that he might save Israel out of the hands of the Philistines (Jud 13:3-5). That Manoah was a devout man seems certain in view of the fact that, upon hearing of the angel’s visit, he offered a prayer for the angel’s return, in order that he and his wife might be instructed as to the proper care of the child to be born (Jud 13:8). The request was granted and the angel repeated the visit and the

instructions (Jud 13:9-13). Manoah with true hospitality would have the guest remain and partake of food. The angel refused, but commanded a sacrifice unto Yahweh. When Manoah had prepared the sacrifice and lit it on the altar, the angel ascended in the flame from the altar and appeared no more (Jud 13:15-21). The child was born according to the promise and was named Samson. Manoah and his wife appear twice in the narrative of Samson's early life—once as they protestingly accompanied him to sue for the hand of a Philistine woman of Timnah in marriage, and again when they went with him to Timnab for the wedding.

Josephus richly embellishes this Scriptural narrative concerning Manoah, but offers no further light upon the occupation or character of Manoah. At the death of Samson, his brothers went down to Gaza and brought back the body and buried it by the side of Manoah in the family tomb near Zorah (Jud 16:31). In Samson Agonistes Milton gains dramatic effect by having Manoah survive Samson and in deep sorrow assist at his burial.

C. E. Schenk

MANSERVANT

man'sur-vant ('ebhedh): A male slave; usually coupled with maidservant or female slave (Ge 12:16; Ex 20:10; 1Sa 8:16; Job 31:13; Lu 12:45).

See SERVANT; SLAVE.

MANSION

man'-shun (mone, "abode"): In Joh 14:2, the word is used in the plural: "In my Father's house are many mansions," the Revised Version margin "abiding places." The ideas conveyed are those of abundance of room, and permanence of habitation, in the heavenly world.

MANSLAYER

man'-sla-er (meratstseach, from ratsach (Nu 35:6,12); androphonos (1Ti 1:9)): A term employed with reference to both premeditated and accidental or justifiable killing. In the latter case, an asylum was granted (Nu 35:6,12) until the death of the high priest, after which the slayer was allowed to "return into the land of his possession" (Nu 35:28). The cases in which the manslayer was to be held clearly immune from the punishment imposed on willful killing were:

(1) death by a blow in a sudden quarrel (Nu 35:22);

(2) death by anything thrown at random (Nu 35:22,23);

(3) death by the blade of an axe flying from the handle (De 19:5).

Among the cases in which one would be held responsible for the death of another, is to be counted the neglectful act of building a house without a parapet (De 22:8).

Manslaughter, as a modern legal term, is employed to distinguish unpremeditated killing from coldblooded murder, but formerly (2 Esdras 1:26) it was used in a more general sense.

See MURDER.

Frank E. Hirsch

MANSTEALING

man’-stel-ing.

See CRIME, under "Kidnapping"; PUNISHMENT.

MANTELET

man’-tel-et, man’-t’-l-et, mant’-let (Na 2:5).

See SIEGE, 4, (d).

MANTLE

man’-t’-l: Used 5 times of Elijah’s mantle (’addereth, 1Ki 19:18,19; 2Ki 2:8,13,14), which was probably of hair. Found in plural once (Isa 3:22), where it (ma‘ataphoth) is an upper wide tunic with sleeves (kethoneth).

See DRESS; KERCHIEF.

MANUSCRIPTS

man’-u-skripts: In the broadest sense manuscripts include all handwritten records as distinguished from printed records. In a narrower sense they are handwritten codices, rolls and folded documents, as distinguished from printed books on the one hand and inscriptions, or engraved documents, on the other. More loosely, but commonly, the term is used as synonym of the codex.

The Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Old Testament and New Testament, respectively, form the

primary sources for establishing the text or true original words of the respective authors. The subordinate sources, versions and quotations have also their text problem, and manuscripts of the versions and of the church Fathers, and other ancient writers who refer to Biblical matters, play the same part in establishing the true words of the version or the writer that the Hebrew and Greek manuscripts play in establishing the original of Scripture. For discussion of the textual aspects, see the articles on TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, on VERSIONS, and especially the SEPTUAGINT. For the material, writing instruments, form of manuscripts, etc., see BOOK; and especially the literature under WRITING.

E. C. Richardson

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

See TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

See LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

MAOCH

ma’-ok (ma‘okh, "oppressed," "bruised"): The same as Maacah (1Ki 2:39). The father of that Achish, king of Gath, with whom David and his 600 sojourned under fear of Saul’s treachery (1Sa 27:2).

MAON; MAONITES

ma’-on, ma’-on-its, ma-o’-nits (ma‘on; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Maor, Maan; Codex Alexandrinus Maon):

(1) A town in the mountain of Judah named along with Carmel and Ziph (Jos 15:55). It appears again as the home of Nabal, the great flockmaster (1Sa 25:2). In the genealogical list of 1Ch 2, Maon stands as the "son" of Shammai and the "father" of Beth-zur (2:44,45). This evidently means that Shammai was the founder of Maon. About a mile South of el-Karmil, the ancient Carmel, lies Tell Ma‘in. This may be confidently identified with Maon, the radicals of the names being the same. It suits the requirements of the narratives in other respects, being near to Carmel, while the surrounding wilderness is still used as the wide pasture land for multitudinous flocks. In this district, the wilderness of Maon, David was hiding when his whereabouts was betrayed to Saul by the men of Ziph (1Sa 23:24 f), and only a timely raid by the Philistines delivered him out of that monarch’s hands (1Sa 23:27).

(2) (Madiam): Maon is named along with the Zidonians and Amalek as having at some time, not mentioned, oppressed Israel (Jud 10:12). The Septuagint "Midian" has been accepted by some scholars

as restoring the original text, since, otherwise, the Midianites remain unmentioned. But the Maonites are evidently identical with the Meunim of 1Ch 4:41 (Revised Version), the pastoral people destroyed by Hezekiah. In 2Ch 20:1 the King James Version, instead of "other beside the Ammonites" we must read "some of the Meunim," as associated with the Ammonites in the battle with Jehoshaphat. Against them also Uzziah was helped of God (2Ch 26:7). They are included among the inhabitants of Mt. Seir (2Ch 20:10,23), so that an Edomite tribe is intended. It is natural to connect them with Ma‘an, a place on the great pilgrimage road, and now a station on the Damascus-Hejaz Railway, to the Southeast of Petra. It undoubtedly represents an ancient stronghold.

The Maonites appear in the lists of those who returned from exile (Ezr 2:50, the King James Version "Mehunim," the Revised Version (British and American) "Meunim"; Ne 7:52, "Meunim"). These may possibly be the descendants of prisoners taken in the wars of Jehoshaphat and Uzziah, to whom menial tasks may have been appointed in the temple services.

W. Ewing

MAR

mar: "To mar" means "to destroy," "to disfigure," "to damage." Job 30:13, "They mar my path" (the Revised Version margin "they break up"); Na 2:2, "and destroyed their vine" (the King James Version "and marred their vine"); compare Le 19:27; 2Ki 3:19; Isa 52:14; Jer 13:9.

MARA

ma’-ra, mar’-a (marah, "bitter"): The term which Naomi applies to herself on her return from Moab to her native country (Ru 1:20). Changed beyond recognition, she creates astonishment among her former acquaintances, who ask, "Is this Naomi?" She replies, "Call me not Naomi" (i.e. "pleasant" or "sweet"), but "call me Mara" (i.e. "bitter"). In the light of her bitter experience, and her present pitiable plight, the old name has become peculiarly inappropriate.

MARAH

ma’-ra, mar’-a (marah, "bitter"): The first camp of the Israelites after the passage of the Red Sea (Ex 15:23; Nu 33:8 f). The name is derived from the bitterness of the brackish water. Moses cast a tree into the waters which were thus made sweet (Ex 15:23).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MARALAH

mar’-a-la (mar‘alah; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Maragelda; Codex Alexandrinus Marila): A place on

the western border of Zebulun (Jos 19:11). Peshitta renders Ramath ta‘le’," height of the fox." It is not identified.

MARANATHA

mar-a-nath’-a, mar-an-a’-tha (from Aramaic words, marana’ ‘athah, "Our Lord cometh, or will come"; according to some, "has come"; to others, "Come!" an invitation for his speedy reappearance (compare Re 22:20); maranatha, or maran atha): Used in connection with anathema, "accursed" (1Co 16:22), but has no necessary connection therewith. It was used by early Christians to add solemn emphasis to previous statement, injunction or adjuration, and seems to have become a sort of watchword; possibly forming part of an early liturgy.

MARBLE

mar’-b’-l (shayish, shesh, ‘abhne shayish, "stones of marble" (1Ch 29:2); ritspath bahat wa-shesh we-dhar we-cochareth, "a pavement of red, and white, and yellow, and black marble," or, according to the margin, "a pavement of porphyry, and white marble, and alabaster, and stone of blue color" (Es 1:6); ‘ammudhe shesh, "pillars of marble" (Es 1:6; So 5:15); compare shesh, the King James Version margin "silk" or the Revised Version (British and American) "fine linen" (Ge 41:42; Ex 25:4, etc.); shoshannim, "lilies" (So 2:16, etc.), apparently from a root signifying "white"; marmaros, "marble" (Re 18:12)): Marble is properly crystalline limestone, usually pure white or veined with black, the former being in demand for statuary, while the latter is used in architecture, especially for floors and pillars. True marble is not found in Palestine, but is obtained from Greece or Italy. Much of the stone described as marble is non-crystalline limestone capable of being smoothed and polished. White or yellow stone of this character is abundant in Palestine. Non-crystalline rocks of other colors are also sometimes called marble. In the passage from Esther cited above (compare margin), it is a question whether the reference is to marble and other stones or to marble of different colors. In 1Ch 29:2, "marble stones" are mentioned among the materials brought together by David for the building of the temple. In Es 1:6, pillars and a pavement of marble are features of the palace of Ahasuerus. In So 5:15, the various parts of the body of the "beloved" are likened to gold, beryl, ivory, sapphire, and marble. In Re 18:12, marble occurs in the list of the merchandise of Babylon. All these references imply a costly stone, and therefore probably one imported from other countries, and make it likely that true crystalline marble is meant.

Alfred Ely Day

MARCH; MARCHES

march, march’-iz.

See ARMY; WAR.

MARCHESHVAN

mar-chesh’-van.

See TIME.

MARCION, GOSPEL OF

mar’-shun.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

MARCUS

mar’-kus.

See MARK, JOHN.

MARDOCHEUS

mar-do-ke’-us (Mardochaios):

(1) One of the Jewish leaders who accompanied Zerubbabel on the return from Babylon to Judah (1 Esdras 5:8, where it stands for "Mordecai" of Ezr 2:2 and Ne 7:7).

(2) Another form of Mordecai, the uncle of Esther (Additions to Esther 10:4; 11:2,12; 12:1,4 ff; 16:13).

MARE

mar

(1) cucah, "steed," the King James Version "company of horses"; Septuagint he hippos, "mare" (So 1:9);

(2) bene ha-rammakhim, "bred of the stud," the King James Version and the Revised Version margin "young dromedaries" (Es 8:10); compare Arabic ramakat, "mare"): The word "mare" does not occur in English Versions of the Bible, but in So 1:9 we find cucah, the feminine of cuc, "horse," and in Es 8:10, bene ha-rammakhim is by some translated "sons of mares."

See CAMEL; HORSE.

MARESHAH

ma-re’-sha (mareshah; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Bathesar; Codex Alexandrinus Maresa): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Keilah and Achzib (Jos 15:44). It occupied such a position that Rehoboam thought well to fortify it for the protection of Jerusalem (2Ch 11:8). In the valley of Zephathah at Mareshah, Asa overwhelmed Zerah the Ethiopian and his army, pursuing them as far as Gezer (2Ch 14:9). From Mareshah came Eliezer the prophet who denounced disaster upon the commercial copartnery of Jehoshaphat and Ahaziah (2Ch 20:37). The place is mentioned in Mic (2Ch 1:15). Mareshah was plundered and burned by Judas Maccabeus (Ant., XII, viii, 6; 1 Macc 5:66 the Revised Version margin). Hither Gorgias escaped, having been rescued from the hands of Dositheus by a Thracian horseman (2 Macc 12:35). It was taken by John Hyrcanus, who allowed the inhabitants to remain on condition that they adopt circumcision and submit to the Jewish law. This they did; and later John avenged an injustice done to Mareshah by the Samaritans. It is then described as "a colony of Jews" (Ant., XIII, ix, 1; x, 2). The city was treated with favor by Pompey (XIV, iv, 4). When the Parthians invaded Judea in support of Antigonus they demolished Mareshah (xiii, 9).

According to Eusebius, Onomasticon, Mareshah was 2 Roman miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin). Until recently it was thought that Khirbet Mir‘ash, where the old name lingers, not far Southwest of Beit Jibrin, represented the ancient city. The work of Dr. Bliss, however ("Excavations in Palestine," PEF), shows that it must be located at Tell Sandachannah, about a mile South of Beit Jibrin. A series of remarkable tombs was discovered here. From 1Ch 2:42 we may perhaps gather that Hebron was colonized by the men of Mareshah.

W. Ewing

MARIMOTH

mar’-i-moth, mar’-i-moth: An ancestor of Esdras (Ezra) (2 Esdras 1:2), identical with Meraioth (Ezr 7:3). In 1 Esdras 8:2, it appears also as "Memeroth" (the King James Version "Meremoth").

MARINER

mar’-i-ner.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3); III, 2.

MARISA

mar’-i-sa (Marisa): The Greek form of MARESHAH (which see) in 2 Macc 12:35.

MARISH

mar’-ish (gebhe’; helos): An old form of "marsh," found in the King James Version, the English Revised Version Eze 47:11 (the American Standard Revised Version "marsh"). Some (not all) editions of the King James Version Apocrypha have retained this same spelling in 1 Macc 9:42,45 (the Revised Version (British and American) "marsh").

MARK

mark: In the King James Version this word is used 22 times as a noun and 26 times as a predicate. In the former case it is represented by 5 Hebrew and 3 Greek words; in the latter by 11 Hebrew and 2 Greek words. As a noun it is purely a physical term, gaining almost a technical significance from the "mark" put upon Cain (Ge 4:15 the King James Version); the stigmata of Christ in Paul’s body (Ga 6:17); the "mark of the beast" (Re 16:2).

As a verb it is almost exclusively a mental process: e.g. "to be attentive," "understand ": bin (Job 18:2 the King James Version), rightly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "consider"; shith, "Mark ye well her bulwarks" (Ps 48:13), i.e. turn the mind to, notice, regard; shamar, i.e. observe, keep in view; so Ps 37:37, "Mark the perfect man"; compare Job 22:15 the King James Version. This becomes a unique expression in 1Sa 1:12, where Eli, noticing the movement of Hannah’s lips in prayer, is said to have "marked her mouth." Jesus "marked" how invited guests chose out (epecho, i.e. "observed") the chief seats (Lu 14:7); so skopeo (Ro 16:17; Php 3:17), "Mark them," i.e. look at, signifying keen mental attention, i.e. scrutinize, observe carefully. The only exceptions to this mental signification of the verb are two verses in the Old Testament: Isa 44:13, "He marketh it out with a pencil" ("red ochre," the King James Version "line"), and "with the compasses," where the verb is ta’ar, "to delineate," "mark out"; Jer 2:22, "Thine iniquity is marked (katham, "cut (i.e. engraved)) before me," signifying the deep and ineradicable nature of sin. It may also be rendered "written," as in indelible hieroglyphics.

As a noun the term "mark" may signify, according to its various Hebrew and Greek originals, a sign, "a target" an object of assault, a brand or stigma cut or burnt in the flesh, a goal or end in view, a stamp or imprinted or engraved sign.

(1) ‘oth, "a sign": Ge 4:15 the King James Version, "The Lord set a mark upon Cain" (the American Standard Revised Version "appointed a sign"). It is impossible to tell the nature of this sign. Delitzsch thinks that the rabbins were mistaken in regarding it as a mark upon Cain’s body. He considers it rather "a certain sign which protected him from vengeance," the continuance of his life being necessary for the preservation of the race. It was thus, as the Hebrew indicates, the token of a covenant which God made with Cain that his life would be spared.

(2) mattara’," an aim," hence, a mark to shoot at. Jonathan arranged to shoot arrows as at a mark, for a sign to David (1Sa 20:20); Job felt himself to be a target for the Divine arrows, i.e. for the Divinely decreed sufferings which wounded him and which he was called to endure (Job 16:12); so Jeremiah, "He

hath set me as a mark for the arrow" (La 3:12); closely akin to this is miphga‘, an object of attack (Job 7:20), where Job in bitterness of soul feels that God has become his enemy, and says, ‘Why hast thou made me the mark of hostile attack?’;" set me as a mark for thee."

See TARGET.

(3) taw, "mark" (Eze 9:4,6). In Ezekiel’s vision of the destruction of the wicked, the mark to be set upon the forehead of the righteous, at Yahweh’s command, was, as in the case of the blood sprinkled on the door-posts of the Israelites (Ex 12:22,23), for their protection. As the servants of God (Re 7:2,3)—the elect—were kept from harm by being sealed with the seal of the living God in their foreheads, so the man clothed in linen, with a writer’s inkhorn by his side, was told to mark upon their foreheads those whom God would save from judgment by His sheltering grace. Taw also appears (Job 31:35) for the attesting mark made to a document (the Revised Version (British and American) "signature," margin "mark").

The equivalent Hebrew letter taw ("t") in the Phoenician alphabet and on the coins of the Maccabees had the form of a cross (T). In oriental synods it was used as a signature by bishops who could not write. The cross, as a sign of ownership, was burnt upon the necks or thighs of horses and camels. It may have been the "mark" set upon the forehead of the righteous in Ezekiel’s vision.

(4) qa‘aqa‘, "a stigma" cut or burnt. The Israelites were forbidden (Le 19:28) to follow the custom of other oriental and heathen nations in cutting, disfiguring or branding their bodies.

The specific prohibition "not to print any marks upon" themselves evidently has reference to the custom of tattooing common among savage tribes, and in vogue among both men and women of the lower orders in Arabia, Egypt, and many other lands. It was intended to cultivate reverence for and a sense of the sacredness of the human body, as God’s creation, known in the Christian era as the temple of the Holy Spirit.

See also CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH.

(5) skopos, something seen or observed in the distance, hence, a "goal." The Christian life seemed to Paul, in the intensity of his spiritual ardor, like the stadium or race-course of the Greeks, with runners stretching every nerve to reach the goal and win the prize. "I press on toward the goal (the King James Version "mark") unto the prize" (Php 3:14). The mark or goal is the ideal of life revealed in Christ, the prize, the attainment and possession of that life.

In The Wisdom of Solomon 5:21 "they fly to the mark" is from eustochoi, "with true aim" (so the Revised Version (British and American)).

(6) stigma, "a mark pricked or branded upon the body." Slaves and soldiers, in ancient times, were stamped or branded with the name of their master. Paul considered and called himself the bondslave of

Jesus Christ. The traces of his sufferings, scourging, stonings, persecution, wounds, were visible in permanent scars on his body (compare 2Co 11:23-27). These he termed the stigmata of Jesus, marks branded in his very flesh as proofs of his devotion to his Master (Ga 6:17).

This passage gives no ground for the Romanist superstition that the very scars of Christ's crucifixion were reproduced in Paul's hands and feet and side. It is also "alien to the lofty self-consciousness" of these words to find in them, as some expositors do, a contrast in Paul's thought to the scar of circumcision.

(7) charagma, "a stamp" or "imprinted mark." "The mark of the beast" (peculiar to Revelation) was the badge of the followers of Antichrist, stamped on the forehead or right hand (Re 13:16; compare Eze 9:4,6). It was symbolic of character and was thus not a literal or physical mark, but the impress of paganism on the moral and spiritual life. It was the sign or token of apostasy. As a spiritual state or condition it subjected men to the wrath of God and to eternal torment (Re 14:9-11); to noisome disease (Re 16:2); to the lake of fire (Re 19:20). Those who received not the mark, having faithfully endured persecution and martyrdom, were given part in the first resurrection and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years (Re 20:4). The "beast" symbolizes the anti-Christian empires, particularly Rome under Nero, who sought to devour and destroy the early Christians.

(8) molops, "bruise," Sirach 23:10 (the Revised Version (British and American) "bruise"); 28:17.

Dwight M. Pratt

MARK, JOHN

mark, John (Ioannes) represents his Jewish, Mark (Markos) his Roman name. Why the latter was assumed we do not know.

1. Name and Family: Perhaps the aorist participle in Ac 12:25 may be intended to intimate that it dated from the time when, in company with Barnabas and Saul, he turned to service in the great Gentilecity of Antioch. Possibly it was the badge of Roman citizenship, as in the case of Paul. The standing of the family would be quite consistent with such a supposition.

His mother's name was Mary (Ac 12:12). The home is spoken of as hers. The father was probably dead. The description of the house (with its large room and porch) and the mention of the Greek slave, suggest a family of wealth. They were probably among the many zealous Jews who, having become rich in the great world outside, retired to Jerusalem, the center of their nation and faith. Mark was "cousin" to Barnabas of Cyprus (Col 4:10) who also seems to have been a man of means (Ac 4:36). Possibly Cyprus was also Mark's former home.

2. His History as Known from the New Testament:

When first mentioned, Mark and his mother are already Christians (44 AD). He had been converted through Peter's personal influence (1Pe 5:13) and had already won a large place in the esteem of the brethren, as is shown by his being chosen to accompany Barnabas and Saul to Antioch, a little later. The home was a resort for Christians, so that Mark had every opportunity to become acquainted with other leaders such as James and John, and James the brother of the Lord. It was perhaps from the latter James that he learned the incident of Mr 3:21 which Peter would be less likely to mention.

His kinship with Barnabas, knowledge of Christian history and teaching, and proved efficiency account for his being taken along on the first missionary journey as "minister" (huperetes) to Barnabas and Saul (Ac 13:5). Just what that term implies is not clear. Chase (HDB) conjectures the meaning to be that he had been huperetes, "attendant" or chazzan in the synagogue (compare Lu 4:20), and was known as such an official. Wright (English translation, February, 1910) suggests that he was to render in newly founded churches a teaching service similar to that of the synagogue chazzan. Hackett thought that the kai of this verse implies that he was to be doing the same kind of work as Barnabas and Saul and so to be their "helper" in preaching and teaching. The more common view has been (Meyer, Swete, et al.) that he was to perform "personal service not evangelistic," "official service but not of the menial kind"—to be a sort of business agent. The view that he was to be a teacher, a catechist for converts, seems to fit best all the facts.

Why did he turn back from the work (Ac 13:13)? Not because of homesickness, or anxiety for his mother's safety, or home duties, or the desire to rejoin Peter, or fear of the perils incident to the journey, but rather because he objected to the offer of salvation to the Gentiles on condition of faith alone. There are hints that Mark's family, like Paul's, were Hebrews of the Hebrews, and it is not without significance that in both verses (Ac 13:5,13) he is given only his Hebrew name. The terms of Paul's remonstrance are very strong (Ac 15:38), and we know that nothing stirred Paul's feelings more deeply than this very question. The explanation of it all may be found in what happened at Paphos when the Roman Sergius Paulus became a believer. At that time Paul (the change of name is here noted by Luke) stepped to the front, and henceforth, with the exception of 15:12,25, where naturally enough the old order is maintained, Luke speaks of Paul and Barnabas, not Barnabas and Saul. We must remember that, at that time, Paul stood almost alone in his conviction. Barnabas, even later than that, had misgivings (Ga 2:13). Perhaps, too, Mark was less able than Barnabas himself to see the latter take second place.

We hear nothing further of Mark until the beginning of the second missionary journey 2 years later, when Paul's unwillingness to take him with them led to the rupture between Paul and Barnabas and to the mission of Barnabas and Mark to Cyprus (Ac 15:39). He is here called Mark, and in that quiet way Luke may indicate his own conviction that Mark's mind had changed on the great question, as indeed his willingness to accompany Paul might suggest. He had learned from the discussions in the council at Jerusalem and from subsequent events at Antioch.

About 11 years elapse before we hear of him again (Col 4:10 f; Phm 1:24). He is at Rome with Paul. The breach is healed. He is now one of the faithful few among Jewish Christians who stand by Paul. He is Paul's honored "fellowworker" and a great "comfort" to him.

The Colossian passage may imply a contemplated visit by Mark to Asia Minor. It may be that it was carried out, that he met Peter and went with him to Babylon. In 1Pe 5:13 the apostle sends Mark's greeting along with that of the church in Babylon. Thence Mark returns to Asia Minor, and in 2Ti 4:11 Paul asks Timothy, who is at Ephesus, to come to him, pick up Mark by the way, and bring him along. In that connection Paul pays Mark his final tribute; he is "useful for ministering" (euchrestos eis diakonian), so useful that his ministry is a joy to the veteran's heart.

3. His History as Known from Other Sources:

The most important and reliable tradition is that he was the close attendant and interpreter of Peter, and has given us in the Gospel that bears his name account of Peter's teaching. For that comradeship the New Testament facts furnish a basis, and the gaps in the New Testament history leave plenty of room. An examination of the tradition will be found in MARK, THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO (which see).

Other traditions add but little that is reliable. It is said that Mark had been a priest, and that after becoming a Christian he amputated a finger to disqualify himself for that service. Hence, the nickname kolobo-daktulos, which, however, is sometimes otherwise explained. He is represented as having remained in Cyprus until after the death of Barnabas (who was living in 57 AD according to 1Co 9:5 f) and then to have gone to Alexandria, founded the church there, become its first bishop and there died (or was marthyred) in the 8th year of Nero (62-63). They add that in 815 AD Venetian soldiers stole his remains from Alexandria and placed them under the church of Mark at Venice.

LITERATURE.

Chase, HDB, III, 245 ff; Rae, DCG, II, 119 f; Harnack, Encyclopedia Brit; Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, II, 427-56; Lindsay, Salmond, Morison and Swete in their Comms.

J. H. Farmer

MARK, THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO, 1

I. OUR SECOND GOSPEL

II. CONTENTS AND GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. Scope

2. Material Peculiar to Mark

3. Quotations

4. A Book of Mighty Works

5. The Worker Is Also a Teacher

6. A Book of Graphic Details

III. THE TEXT

IV. LANGUAGE

1. General Character

2. Vocabulary

3. Style

4. Original Language

V. AUTHORSHIP

1. External Evidence

2. Internal Evidence

VI. SOURCES AND INTEGRITY

VII. DATE AND PLACE OF COMPOSITION

VIII. HISTORICITY

IX. PURPOSE AND PLAN

1. The Gospel for Romans

2. Plan of the Gospel

X. LEADING DOCTRINES

1. Person of Christ

2. The Trinity

3. Salvation

4. Eschatology

LITERATURE

I. Our Second Gospel.

The order of the Gospels in our New Testament is probably due to the early conviction that this was the order in which the Gospels were written. It was not, however, the invariable order. The question of order only arose when the roll was superseded by the codex, our present book-form. That change was going on in the 3rd century. Origen found codices with the order John-Matthew-Mark-Luke—due probably to the desire to give the apostles the leading place. That and the one common today may be considered the two main groupings—the one in the order of dignity, the other in that of time. The former is Egyptian and Latin; the latter has the authority of most Greek manuscripts, Catalogues and Fathers, and is supported by the old Syriac.

Within these, however, there are variations. The former is varied thus: John-Matthew-Luke-Mark, and Matthew-John-Mark-Luke, and Matthew-John-Luke-Mark; the latter to Matthew-Mark-John-Luke. Mark is never first; when it follows Luke, the time consideration has given place to that of length.

II. Contents and General Characteristics.

1. Scope:

The Gospel begins with the ministry of John the Baptist and ends with the announcement of the Resurrection, if the last 12 verses be not included. These add post-resurrection appearances, the Commission, the Ascension, and a brief summary of apostolic activity. Thus its limits correspond closely with those indicated by Peter in Ac 10:37-43. Nothing is said of the early Judean ministry. The Galilean ministry and Passion Week with the transition from the one to the other (in Ac 10) practically make up the Gospel.

2. Material Peculiar to Mark:

Matter peculiar to Mark is found in 4:26-29 (the seed growing secretly); 3:21 (his kindred’s fear); 7:32-37 (the deaf and dumb man); 8:22-26 (the blind man); 13:33-37 (the householder and the exhortation to watch); 14:51 (the young man who escaped). But, in addition to this, there are many vivid word-touches with which the common material is lighted up, and in not a few of the common incidents Mark’s account is very much fuller; e.g. 6:14-29 (death of John the Baptist); Mr 7:1-23 (on eating with unwashen hands); 9:14-29 (the demoniac boy); 12:28-34 (the questioning scribe). There is enough of this material to show clearly that the author could not have been wholly dependent on the other evangelists. Hawkins

reckons the whole amount of peculiar material at about fifty verses (Hor. Syn., 11).

3. Quotations:

In striking contrast to Matthew who, in parallel passages, calls attention to the fulfillment of prophecy by Jesus, Mark only once quotes the Old Testament and that he puts in the very forefront of his Gospel. The Isa part of his composite quotation appears in all 4 Gospels; the Malachi part in Mark only, though there is a reflection of it in Joh 3:28. This fact alone might convey an erroneous impression of the attitude of the Gospel to the Old Testament. Though Mark himself makes only this one twofold reference, yet he represents Jesus as doing so frequency. The difference in this respect between him and Matthew is not great. He has 19 formal quotations as compared with 40 in Matthew, 17 in Luke and 12 in John. Three of the 19 are not found elsewhere. The total for the New Testament is 160, so that Mark has a fair proportion. When Old Testament references and loose citations are considered the result is much the same. Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek give Matthew 100, Mark 58, Luke 86, John 21, Ac 107. Thus. the Old Testament lies back of Mark also as the authoritative word of God. Swete (Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 393) points out that in those quotations which are common to the synoptists the Septuagint is usually followed; in others, the Hebrew more frequently. (A good illustration is seen in Mr 7:7 where the Septuagint is followed in the phrase, "in vain do they worship me"—a fair para-phrase of the Hebrew; but "teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men" is a more correct representation of the Hebrew than the Septuagint gives.) Three quotations are peculiar to Mark, namely, 9:48; 10:19; 12:32.

4. A Book of Mighty Works:

Judged by the space occupied, Mark is a Gospel of deeds. Jesus is a worker. His life is one of strenuous activity. He hastens from one task to another with energy and decision. The word euthus, i.e. "straightway," is used 42 times as against Matthew’s 7 and Luke’s 1. In 14 of these, as compared with 2 in Matthew and none in Luke, the word is used of the personal activity of Jesus. It is not strange therefore that the uneventful early years should be passed over (compare Joh 2:11). Nor is it strange that miracles should be more numerous than parables. According to Westcott’s classification (Introduction to Study of the Gospel, 480-86), Mark has 19 miracles and only 4 parables, whereas the corresponding figures for Matthew are 21 to 15 and for Luke 20 to 19. Of the miracles 2 are peculiar to Mark, of the parables only 1. The evangelist clearly records the deeds rather than the words of Jesus. These facts furnish another point of contact with Peter’s speeches in Acts—the beneficent character of the deeds in Ac 10:38, and their evidential significance in Ac 2:22 (compare Mr 1:27; 2:10, etc.).

The following are the miracles recorded by Mark: the unclean spirit (1:21-28), the paralytic (2:1-12), the withered hand (3:1-5), the storm stilled (4:35-41), the Gerasene demoniac (5:1-17), Jairus’ daughter (5:22 ff), the woman with the issue (5:25-34), feeding the 5,000 (6:35-44), feeding the 4,000 (8:1-10), walking on the water (6:48 ff); the Syrophoenician’s daughter (7:24-30), the deaf mute (7:31-37), the blind man (8:22-26), the demoniac boy (9:14 ff), blind Bartimeus (10:46-52), the fig tree withered (11:20 ff), the resurrection (16:1 ff). For an interesting classification of these see Westcott’s Introduction

to Study of the Gospels, 391. Only the last three belong to Judea.

5. The Worker Is Also a Teacher:

Though what has been said is true, yet Mark is by no means silent about Jesus as a teacher. John the Baptist is a preacher (Mr 1:4,7), and Jesus also is introduced as a preacher, taking up and enlarging the message of John. Very frequent mention is made of him as teaching (e.g. Mr 1:21; 2:13; 6:6, etc.); indeed the words didache, and didasko, occur more frequently in Mark than in any other Gospel. Striking references are made to His originality, methods, popularity and peerlessness as a teacher (Mr 1:22; 4:1 f, 33; 11:27-12:37; especially 12:34). A miracle is definitely declared to be for the purpose of instruction (Mr 2:10), and the implication is frequent that His miracles were not only the dictates of His compassion, but also purposed self-revelations (Mr 5:19 f; 11:21-23). Not only is He Himself a teacher, but He is concerned to prepare others to be teachers (Mr 3:13 f; 4:10 f). Mark is just as explicit as Matthew in calling attention to the fact that at a certain stage He began teaching the multitude in parables, and expounding the parables to His disciples (Mr 4:2-11 f). He mentions, however, only four of them—the Sower (Mr 4:1-20), the Seed Growing Secretly (Mr 4:26-29), the Mustard Seed (Mr 4:30-32) and the Husband-men (Mr 12:1-12). The number of somewhat lengthy discourses and the total amount of teaching is considerably greater than is sometimes recognized. Mark 4 and 13 approach most nearly to the length of the discourses in Matthew and correspond to Mt 13 and 24 respectively. But in Mr 7:1-23; 9:33-50; 10:5-31,39-45 and 12:1-44 we have quite extensive sayings. If Jesus is a worker, He is even more a teacher. His works prepare for His words rather than His words for His works. The teachings grew naturally out of the occasion and the circumstances. He did and taught. Because He did what He did He could teach with effectiveness. Both works and words reveal Himself.

6. A Book of Graphic Details:

There is a multitude of graphic details: Mark mentions actions and gestures of Jesus (7:33; 9:36; 10:16) and His looks of inquiry (5:32), in prayer (6:41; 7:34), of approval (3:34), love (10:21), warning (to Judas especially 10:23), anger (3:5), and in judgment (11:11). Jesus hungers (11:12), seeks rest in seclusion (6:31) and sleeps on the boat cushion (4:38); He pities the multitude (6:34), wonders at men’s unbelief (6:6), sighs over their sorrow and blindness (6:34; 8:12), grieves at their hardening (3:5), and rebukes in sadness the wrong thought of His mother and brothers, and in indignation the mistaken zeal and selfish ambitions of His disciples (8:33; 10:14). Mark represents His miracles of healing usually as instantaneous (1:31; 2:11 f; 3:5), sometimes as gradual or difficult (1:26; 7:32-35; 9:26-28), and once as flatly impossible "because of their unbelief" (6:6). With many vivid touches we are told of the behavior of the people and the impression made on them by what Jesus said or did. They bring their sick along the streets and convert the market-place into a hospital (1:32), throng and jostle Him by the seaside (3:10), and express their astonishment at His note of authority (1:22) and power (2:12). Disciples are awed by His command over the sea (4:41), and disciples and others are surprised and alarmed at the strange look of dread as He walks ahead alone, going up to Jerusalem and the cross (10:32). Many other picturesque details are given, as in 1:13 (He was with the wild beasts); 2:4 (digging through the roof); 4:38 (lying asleep on the cushion); 5:4 (the description of the Gerasene demoniac); 6:39 (the companies, dressed in many colors and looking like flower beds on the green mountain-side). Other details peculiar to Mark

are: names (1:29; 3:6; 13:3; 15:21), numbers (5:13; 6:7), time (1:35; 2:1; 11:19; 16:2), and place (2:13; 3:8; 7:31; 12:41; 13:3; 14:68 and 15:39). These strongly suggest the observation of an eyewitness as the final authority, and the geographical references suggest that even the writer understood the general features of the country, especially of Jerusalem and its neighborhood. (For complete lists see Lindsay, Mark's Gospel, 26 ff.)

III. The Text.

Of the 53 select readings noted by Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek (Into), only a few are of special interest or importance. The following are to be accepted: en to Esaia to prophete (Mr 1:2) hamartematos (Mr 3:29); pleres (indeclinable, 4:28); to tekton (Mr 6:3; Jesus is here called "the carpenter"); autou (Mr 6:22, Herod's daughter probably had two names, Salome and Herodias); pugme (Mr 7:23, "with the fist," i.e. "thoroughly," not pukna "oft"). Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek are to be followed in rejecting pisteusai (leaving the graphic To Ei dune (Mr 9:23)); kai nesteia (Mr 9:29); pasa...halisthesetai (Mr 9:49); tous...chremasi (Mr 10:24); but not in rejecting huiou Theou (Mr 1:1). They are probably wrong in retaining hous...onomasan (Mr 3:14; it was probably added from Lu 6:31); and in rejecting kai klinon and accepting hrantisontai instead of baptisontai (Mr 7:4; ignorance of the extreme scrupulosity of the Jews led to these scribal changes; compare Lu 11:38, where ebaptisthe is not disputed). So one may doubt eporei (Mr 6:20), and suspect it of being an Alexandrian correction for epoiei which was more difficult and yet is finely appropriate.

The most important textual problem is that of Mr 16:9-20. Burgon and Miller and Salmon believe it to be genuine. Miller supposes that up to that point Mark had been giving practically Peter's words, that for some reason those then failed him and that 16:9-20 are drawn from his own stores. The majority of scholars regard them as non-Markan; they think 16:8 is not the intended conclusion; that if Mark ever wrote a conclusion, it has been lost, and that 16:9-20, embodying traditions of the Apostolic Age, were supplied later. Conybeare has found in an Armenian manuscript a note referring these verses to the presbyter Ariston, whom he identifies with that Aristion, a disciple of John, of whom Papias speaks. Many therefore would regard them as authentic, and some accept them as clothed with John's authority. They are certainly very early, perhaps as early as 100 AD, and have the support of Codices Alexandrinus, Ephraemi, Bezae, Xi, Gamma, Delta, Zeta all late uncials, all cursives, most versions and Fathers, and were known to the scribes of Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus, who, however, do not accept them.

It is just possible that the Gospel did end at verse 8. The very abruptness would argue an early date when Christians lived in the atmosphere of the Resurrection and would form an even appropriate closing for the Gospel of the Servant (see below). A Servant comes, fulfills his task, and departs—we do not ask about his lineage, nor follow his subsequent history.

IV. Language.

1. General Character:

Mark employs the common coloquial Greek of the day, understood everywhere throughout the Greek-Roman world. It was emphatically the language of the Character people, "known and read of all men." His vocabulary is equally removed from the technicalities of the schools and from the slang of the streets. It is the clean, vigorous, direct speech of the sturdy middle class.

2. Vocabulary:

Of his 1,330 words, 60 are proper names. Of the rest 79 are peculiar to Mark, so far as the New Testament is concerned; 203 are found elsewhere only in the Synoptics, 15 only in John's Gospel, 23 only in Paul (including Hebrews), 2 in the Catholic Epistles (1 in James, 1 in 2 Peter), 5 in the Apocalypse (Revelation) (see Swete, Commentary on Mark). Rather more than a fourth of the 79 are non-classical as compared with one-seventh for Luke and a little more than one-seventh for Mr. Hawkins also gives a list of 33 unusual words or expressions. The most interesting of the single words are schizomanous, ephien, komopoleis, ekephaliosan, proaulion, and hoti, in the sense of "why" (Mr 2:16; 9:11,28); of the expressions, the distributives in Mr 6:7,39 f and 14:19, the Hebraistic ei dothesetai, and hotan with the indicative. Of ordinary constructions the following are found with marked frequency: kai (reducing his use of de to half of Matthew's or Luke's), historic present (accounting for the very frequent use of legei instead of eipen the periphrastic imperfect, the article with infinitives or sentences, participles, and prepositions.

There are indications that the writer in earlier life was accustomed to think in Aramaic. Occasionally that fact shows itself in the retention of Aramaic words which are proportionately rather more numerous than in Matthew and twice as numerous as in Luke or John. The most interesting of these are taleitha koum, ephphatha, and Boanerges, each uttered at a time of intense feeling.

Latinisms in Mark are about half as numerous as Aramaisms. They number 11, the same as in Matthew, as compared with 6 in Luke and 7 in John. The greater proportion in Mark is the only really noteworthy fact in these figures. It suggests more of a Roman outlook and fits in with the common tradition as to its origin and authorship.

For certain words he has great fondness: euthus 42 times; akathartos 11 times; blepo, and its compounds very frequently; so eperotan, hupagein, exousia, euaggelion, proskaleisthai, epitiman compounds of poreuesthai, sunzetein, and such graphic words as ekthambeisthai, embrimasthai, enagkalizesthai, and phimousthai. The following he uses in an unusual sense: eneichen, pugme, apechei, epibalon.

The same exact and vivid representation of the facts of actual experience accounts for the anacolutha and other broken constructions, e.g. Mr 4:31 f; 5:23; 6:8 f; 11:32. Some are due to the insertion of explanatory clauses, as in 7:3-5; some to the introduction of a quotation as in 7:11 f. These phenomena represent the same type of mind as we have already seen (II, 6 above).

3. Style:

The style is very simple. The common connective is kai. The stately periods of the classics are wholly absent. The narrative is commonly terse and concise. At times, however, a multitude of details are crowded in, resulting in unusual fullness of expression. This gives rise to numerous duplicate expressions as in Mr 1:32; 2:25; 5:19 and the like, which become a marked feature of the style. The descriptions are wonderfully vivid. This is helped out by the remarkably frequent use of the historic present, of which there are 151 examples, as contrasted with 78 in Matthew and 4 in Luke, apart from its use in parables. Mark never uses it in parables, whereas Matthew has 15 cases, and Luke has 5. John has 162, a slightly smaller proportion than Mark on the whole, but rather larger in narrative parts. But Mark's swift passing from one tense to another adds a variety and vividness to the narrative not found in John.

4. Original Language:

That the original language was Greek is the whole impression made by patristic references. Translations of the Gospel are always from, not into, Greek. It was the common language of the Roman world, especially for letters. Paul wrote to the Romans in Greek. Half a century later Clement wrote from Rome to Corinth in Greek. The Greek Mark bears the stamp of originality and of the individuality of the author.

Some have thought it was written in Latin. The only real support for that view is the subscription in a few manuscripts (e.g. 160, 161, egraphe Rhomaisti en Rhome) and in the Peshitta and Harclean Syriac. It is a mistaken deduction from the belief that it was written in Rome or due to the supposition that "interpreter of Peter" meant that Mark translated Peter's discourses into Latin

Blass contended for an Aramaic original, believing that Luke, in the first part of Acts, followed an Aramaic source, and that that source was by the author of the Second Gospel which also, therefore, was written in Aramaic. He felt, moreover, that the text of Mark suggests several forms of the Gospel which are best explained as translations of a common original. Decisive against the view is the translation of the few Aramaic words which are retained.

V. Authorship.

1. External Evidence:

The external evidence for the authorship is found in the Fathers and the manuscripts. The most important patristic statements are the following:

Papias—Asia Minor, circa 125 AD—(quoted by Eus., HE, III, 39): "And this also the elder said: Mark, having become the interpreter (hermeneutes) of Peter, wrote accurately what he remembered (or recorded) of the things said or done by Christ, but not in order. For he neither heard the Lord nor followed Him; but afterward, as I said (he attached himself to) Peter who used to frame his teaching to meet the needs (of his hearers), but not as composing an orderly account (suntaxin) of the Lord's

discourses, so that Mark committed no error in thus writing down some things as he remembered them: for he took thought for one thing not to omit any of the things he had heard nor to falsify anything in them."

Justin Martyr—Palestine and the West, circa 150 AD—(In Dial. with Trypho, cvi, Migne ed.): "And when it is said that He imposed on one of the apostles the name Peter, and when this is recorded in his 'Memoirs' with this other fact that He named the two sons of Zebedee 'Boanerges,' which means 'Sons of Thunder,' " etc.

Irenaeus—Asia Minor and Gaul, circa 175 AD—(Adv. Haer., iii. 1, quoted in part Eus., HE, V, 8): "After the apostles were clothed with the power of the Holy Spirit and fully furnished for the work of universal evangelization, they went out ("exierunt," in Rufinus' translation) to the ends of the earth preaching the gospel. Matthew went eastward to those of Hebrew descent and preached to them in their own tongue, in which language he also (had?) published a writing of the gospel, while Peter and Paul went westward and preached and founded the church in Rome. But after the departure (exodon. "exitum" in Rufinus) of the, Mark, the disciple and interpreter (hermeneutes) of Peter, even he has delivered to us in writing the things which were preached by Peter."

Clement of Alexandria—circa 200 AD—(Hypotyp. in Eus., HE, VI, 14): "The occasion for writing the Gospel according to Mark was as follows: After Peter had publicly preached the word in Rome and declared the gospel by the Spirit, many who were present entreated Mark, as one who had followed him for a long time and remembered what he said, to write down what he had spoken, and Mark, after composing the Gospel, presented it to his petitioners. When Peter became aware of it he neither eagerly hindered nor promoted it."

Also (Eus., HE, II, 15): "So charmed were the Romans with the light that shone in upon their minds from the discourses of Peter, that, not contented with a single hearing and the viva voce proclamation of the truth, they urged with the utmost solicitation on Mark, whose Gospel is in circulation and who was Peter's attendant, that he would leave them in writing a record of the teaching which they had received by word of mouth. They did not give over until they had prevailed on him; and thus they became the cause of the composition of the so-called Gospel according to Mk. It is said that when the apostle knew, by revelation of the Spirit, what was done, he was pleased with the eagerness of the men and authorized the writing to be read in the churches."

Tertullian—North Africa, circa 207 AD—(Adv. Marc., iv. 5): He speaks of the authority of the four Gospels, two by apostles and two by companions of apostles, "not excluding that which was published by Mark, for it may be ascribed to Peter, whose interpreter Mark was."

Origen—Alexandria and the East, c 240 AD—("Comm. on Mt" quoted in Eus., HE, VI, 25): "The second is that according to Mark who composed it, under the guidance of Peter (hos Petros huphegesato auto), who therefore, in his Catholic (universal) epistle, acknowledged the evangelist as his son."

Eusebius—Caesarea, circa 325 AD—(Dem. Evang., III, 5): "Though Peter did not undertake, through excess of diffidence, to write a Gospel, yet it had all along been currency reported, that Mark, who had become his familiar acquaintance and attendant (gnorimes kat phoitetes) made memoirs of (or recorded, apomnemoeusai) the discourses of Peter concerning the doings of Jesus." "Mark indeed writes this, but it is Peter who so testifies about himself, for all that is in Mark are memoirs (or records) of the discourses of Peter."

Epiphanius—Cyprus, circa 350 AD—(Haer., 41): "But immediately after Matthew, Mark, having become a follower (akolouthos) of the holy Peter in Rome, is entrusted in the putting forth of a gospel. Having completed his work, he was sent by the holy Peter into the country of the Egyptians."

Jerome—East and West, circa 350 AD—(De vir. illustr., viii): "Mark, disciple and interpreter of Peter, at the request of the brethren in Rome, wrote a brief Gospel in accordance with what he had heard Peter narrating. When Peter heard it he approved and authorized it to be read in the churches."

Also xi: "Accordingly he had Titus as interpreter just as the blessed Peter had Mark whose Gospel was composed, Peter narrating and Mark writing."

Preface Commentary on Matthew: "The second is Mark, interpreter of the apostle Peter, and first bishop of the Alexandrian church; who did not himself see the Lord Jesus, but accurately, rather than in order, narrated those of His deeds, which he had heard his teacher preaching."

To these should be added the Muratorian Fragment—circa 170 AD—"which gives a list of the New Testament books with a brief account of the authorship of each. The account of Matthew and most of that of Mark are lost, only these words relating to Mark being left: ‘quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit’ "(see below).

These names represent the churches of the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th centuries, and practically every quarter of the Roman world. Quite clearly the common opinion was that Mark had written a Gospel and in it had given us mainly the teaching of Peter.

That our second Gospel is the one referred to in these statements there can be no reasonable doubt. Our four were certainly the four of Irenaeus and Tatian; and Salmon (Introduction) has shown that the same four must have been accepted by Justin, Papias and their contemporaries, whether orthodox or Gnostics. Justin’s reference to the surname "Boanerges" supports this so far as Mark is concerned, for in the Gospel of Mark alone is that fact mentioned (3:17).

A second point is equally clear—that the Gospel of Mark is substantially Peter’s. Mark is called disciple, follower, interpreter of Peter. Origen expressly quotes "Marcus, my son" (1Pe 5:13 the King James Version) in this connection. "Disciple" is self-explanatory. "Follower" is its equivalent, not simply a traveling companion. "Interpreter" is less clear. One view equates it with "translator," because Mark translated either Peter’s Aramaic discourses into Greek for the Hellenistic Christians in Jerusalem

(Adeney, et al.), or Peter’s Greek discourses into Latin for the Christians in Rome (Swete, et al.). The other view—that of the ancients and most moderns (e.g. Zahn, Salmon)—is that it means "interpreter" simply in the sense that Mark put in writing what Peter had taught. The contention of Chase (HDB, III, 247) that this was a purely metaphorical use has little weight because it may be so used here. The conflict in the testimony as to date and place will be considered below (VII).

There is no clear declaration that Mark himself was a disciple of Jesus or an eyewitness of what he records. Indeed the statement of Papias seems to affirm the contrary. However, that statement may mean simply that he was not a personal disciple of Jesus, not that he had never seen Him at all.

The Muratorian Fragment is not clear. Its broken sentence has been differently understood. Zahn completes it thus: "(ali) quibus tamen interfuit, et ita posuit," and understands it to mean that "at some incidents (in the life of Jesus), however, he was present and so put them down." Chase (HDB) and others regard "quibus tamen" as a literal translation of the Greek hois de, and believe the meaning to be that Mark, who had probably just been spoken of as not continuously with Peter, "was present at some of this discourses and so recorded them." Chase feels that the phrase following respecting Luke: "Dominum tamen nec ipse vidit in carne," compels the belief that Mark like Luke had not seen the Lord. But Paul, not Mark, may be there in mind, and further, this interpretation rather belittles Mark’s association with Peter.

The patristic testimony may be regarded as summarized in the title of the work in our earliest manuscripts, namely, kata Markon. This phrase must refer to the author, not his source of information, for then it would necessarily have been kata Petron. This is important as throwing light on the judgment of antiquity as to the authorship of the first Gospel, which the manuscripts all entitle kata Matthaion.

2. Internal Evidence:

The internal evidence offers much to confirm the tradition and practically nothing to the contrary. That Peter is back of it is congruous with such facts as the following:

(1) The many vivid details referred to above (III, 6) must have come from an eyewitness. The frequent use of legei, in Mark and Matthew where Luke uses eipen, works in the same direction.

(2) Certain awkward expressions in lists of names can best be explained as Mark’s turning of Peter’s original, e.g. Mr 1:29, where Peter may have said, "We went home, James and John accompanying us." So in Mr 1:36 (contrasted with Luke’s impersonal description, Lu 4:42 f); Mr 3:16; 13:3.

(3) Two passages (Mr 9:6; 11:21) describe Peter’s own thought; others mention incidents which Peter would be most likely to mention: e.g. Mr 14:37 and 14:66-72 (especially imperfect erneito); 16:7; 7:12-23 in view of Ac 10:15).

(4) In Mr 3:7 the order of names suits Peter’s Galilean standpoint rather than that of Mark in Jerusalem—

Galilee, Judea, Jerusalem, Perea, Tyre, Sidon. The very artlessness of these hints is the best kind of proof that we are in touch with one who saw with his own eyes and speaks out of his own consciousness.

(5) Generally Mark, like Matthew, writes from the standpoint of the Twelve more frequently than Luke; and Mark, more frequently than Matthew, from the standpoint of the three most honored by Jesus. Compare Mr 5:37 with Mt 9:23, where Matthew makes no reference to the three; the unusual order of the names in Luke's corresponding passage (Lu 8:51) suggests that James was his ultimate source. The language of Mr 9:14 is clearly from one of the three, Luke's may be, but Matthew's is not. The contrast in this respect between the common synoptic material and Lu 9:51-18:14 lends weight to this consideration.

(6) The scope of the Gospel which corresponds to that outlined in Peter's address to Cornelius (Ac 10:37-41).

(7) The book suits Peter's character—impressionable rather than reflective, and emotional rather than logical. To such men arguments are of minor importance. It is deeds that count (Burton, Short Intro).

It may seem to militate against all this that the three striking incidents in Peter's career narrated in Mt 14:28-33 (walking on the water), 17:24-27 (tribute money), and 16:16-19 (the church and the keys), should be omitted in Mark. But this is just a touch of that fine courtesy and modesty which companionship with Jesus bred. We see John in his Gospel hiding himself in a similar way. These men are more likely to mention the things that reflect discredit on themselves. It is only in Matthew's list of the Twelve that he himself is called "the publican." So "Peter never appears in a separate role in Mark except to receive a rebuke" (Bacon).

As to Mark's authorship, the internal evidence appears slight. Like the others, he does not obtrude himself. Yet for that very reason what hints there are become the more impressive.

There may be something in Zahn's point that the description of John as brother of James is an unconscious betrayal of the fact that the author's own name was John. There are two other passages, however, which are clearer and which reinforce each other. The story of the youth in Mr 14:51 seems to be of a different complexion from other Gospel incidents. But if Mark himself was the youth, its presence is explained and vindicated. In that case it is likely that the Supper was celebrated in his own home and that the upper room is the same as that in Ac 12. This is favored by the fuller description of it in Mark, especially the word "ready"—a most natural touch, the echo of the housewife's exclamation of satisfaction when everything was ready for the guests. It is made almost a certainty when we compare Mr 14:17 with the parallels in Matthew and Luke. Mt 26:20 reads: "Now when even was come, he was sitting at meat with the twelve disciples"; Lu 22:14: "And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the apostles with him"; while Mark has: "And when it was evening he cometh with the twelve." The last represents exactly the standpoint of one in the home who sees Jesus and the Twelve approaching. (And how admirably the terms "the twelve disciples," "the apostles" and "the twelve" suit Matthew, Luke, and Mark respectively.) Such phenomena, undesigned (save by the inspiring Spirit), are just those that would

not have been invented later, and become the strongest attestation of the reliability of the tradition and this historicity of the narrative. Modern views opposed to this are touched upon in what follows.

MARK, THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO, 2

VI. Sources and Integrity.

We have seen that, according to the testimony of the Fathers, Peter's preaching and teaching are at least the main source, and that many features of the Gospel support that view. We have seen, also, subtle but weighty reasons for believing that Mark added a little himself. Need we seek further sources, or does inquiry resolve itself into an analysis of Peter's teaching?

B. Weiss believes that Mark used a document now lost containing mainly sayings of Jesus, called Logia (L) in the earlier discussions, but now commonly known as Q (Quelle). In that opinion he has recently been joined by Sanday and Streeter. Harnack, Sir John Hawkins and Wellhausen have sought to reconstruct Q on the basis of the non-Markan matter in Matthew and Luke. Allen extracts it from Matthew alone, thinking that Mark also may have drawn a few sayings from it. Some assign a distinct source for Mark 13. Streeter considers it a document written shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, incorporating a few utterances by Jesus and itself incorporated bodily by Mark. Other sources, oral or written, are postulated by Bacon for smaller portions and grouped under X. He calls the final redactor R —not Mark but a Paulinist of a radical type.

In forming a judgment much depends upon one's conception of the teaching method of Jesus and the apostles. Teaching and preaching are not synonymous terms. Matthew sums up the early ministry in Galilee under "teaching, preaching and healing," and gives us the substance of that teaching as it impressed itself upon him. Mark reports less of it, but speaks of it more frequently than either Matthew or Luke. Jesus evidently gave teaching a very large place, and a large proportion of the time thus spent was devoted to the special instruction of the inner circle of disciples. The range of that instruction was not wide. It was intensive rather than extensive. He held Himself to the vital topic of the kingdom of God. He must have gone over it again and again. He would not hesitate to repeat instructions which even chosen men found it so difficult to understand. Teaching by repetition was common then as it is now in the East. The word "catechize" (katecheo) implies that, and that word is used by Paul of Jewish (Ro 2:18) and by Luke of Christian teaching (Lu 1:4).

See CATECHIST.

The novelty in His teaching was not in method so much as in content, authority and accompanying miraculous power (Mr 1:27). Certainly He was far removed from vain repetition. His supreme concern was for the spirit. Just as certainly He was not concerned about a mere reputation for originality or for wealth and variety of resources. He was concerned about teaching them the truth so effectively that they would be prepared by intellectual clearness, as well as spiritual sympathy, to make it known to others. And God by His Providence, so kind to all but so often thwarted by human self-will was free to work

His perfect work for Him and make all things work together for the furtherance of His purpose. Thus incidents occur, situations arise and persons of all types appear on the scene, calling forth fresh instruction, furnishing illustration and securing the presentation of truth in fullness with proper balance and emphasis and in right perspective.

Thus before His death the general character of that kingdom, its principles and prospects, were taught. That furnished the warp for the future Gospels. The essence, the substance and general form were the same for all the Twelve; but each from the standpoint of his own individually saw particular aspects and was impressed with special details. No one of them was large enough to grasp it all, for no one was so great as the Master. And it would be strange indeed, though perhaps not so strange as among us, if none of them wrote down any of it. Ramsay, Salmon and Palmer are quit justified in feeling that it may have been put in writing before the death of Jesus. It may well be that Matthew wrote it as it lay in his mind, giving us substantially Harnack's Q. John and James may have done the same and furnished Luke his main special source. But whether it was written down then or not, the main fact to be noted is that it was lodged in their minds, and that the substance was, and the details through mutual conference increasingly became, their common possession. They did not understand it all—His rising from the dead, for example. But the words were lodged in memory, and subsequent events made their meaning clear.

Then follow the great events of His death and resurrection, and for forty days in frequent appearances He taught them the things concerning the kingdom of God and expounded in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself, especially the necessity of His death and resurrection. These furnished the woof of the future Gospels. But even yet they are not equipped for their task. So He promises them His Spirit, a main part of whose work will be to bring to their remembrance all He had said, to lead them into all the truth, and show them things to come. When He has come they will be ready to witness in power.

The apostles' conception of their task is indicated in some measure by Peter when he insisted that an indispensable qualification in a successor to Judas was that he must have been with them from the beginning to the end of Christ's ministry, and so be conversant with His words and deeds. From the day of Pentecost onward they gave themselves preeminently to teaching. The thousands converted on that day continued in the teaching of the apostles. When the trouble broke out between Hebrews and Hellenists, the Seven were appointed because the apostles could not leave the word of God to serve tables. The urgency of this business may have been one reason why they stayed in Jerusalem when persecution scattered so many of the church (Ac 8:2). They were thus in close touch for years, not only through the struggle between Hebrews and Hellenists, but until the admission of the GentileCornelius and his friends by Peter had been solemnly ratified by the church in Jerusalem and possibly until the Council had declared against the contention that circumcision was necessary for salvation. During these years they had every opportunity for mutual conference, and the vital importance of the questions that arose would compel them to avail themselves of such opportunities. Their martyr-like devotion to Jesus would make them quick to challenge anything that might seem a misrepresentation of His teaching. The Ac account of their discussions at great crises proves that conclusively. To their success in training others and the accuracy of the body of catechetical instruction Luke pays fine tribute when he speaks of the "certainty" or undoubted truth of it (Lu 1:4). Thus Jesus' post-resurrection expositions, the

experience of the years and the guidance of the Spirit are the source and explanation of the apostolic presentation of the gospel.

Of that company Peter was the recognized leader, and did more than any other to determine the mold into which at least the post-resurrection teachings were cast. Luke tells us of many attempts to record them. He himself in his brief reports of Peter's addresses sketches their broad outlines. Mark, at the request of Roman Christians and with Peter's approval, undertook to give an adequate account. Two special facts influenced the result—one, the character of the people for whom he wrote; the other, the existence (as we may assume) of Matthew's Q. It would be natural for him to supplement rather than duplicate that apostolic summary. Moreover, since Q presented mainly the ethical or law side of Christianity the supplement would naturally present the gospel side of it—and so become its complement—while at the same time this presentation and the needs of the people for whom he specially writes make it necessary to add something from the body of catechetical material, oral or written, not included in Q, as his frequent kai elegen, seems to imply (Buckley, 152 ff). So Mk's is "the beginning of the Gospel." He introduces Jesus in the act of symbolically devoting Himself to that death for our sins and rising again, which constitutes the gospel and then entering upon His ministry by calling upon the people to "repent and believe in the gospel." The book is written from the standpoint of the resurrection, and gives the story of the passion and of the ministry in a perspective thus determined. About the same time it may be, Matthew, writing for Jewish Christians, combines this gospel side of the teaching with his own Q side of it, adding from the common stock or abridging as his purpose might suggest or space might demand. Later Luke does a similar service for Greek Christians (compare Harnack, The Twofold Gospel in the New Testament).

The only serious question about the integrity of the book concerns the last twelve verses, for a discussion of which see under III above. Some have suggested that Mr 1:1-13 is akin to 16:9-20, and may have been added by the same hand. But while vocabulary and connection are main arguments against the genuineness of the latter, in both these respects 1:1-13 is bound up with the main body of the book. Nor is there sufficient reason for denying Mark 13 as a true report of what Jesus said. Wendling's theory of three strata assignable to three different writers—historian, poet, and theologian—is quite overdrawn. Barring the closing verses, there is nothing which can possibly demand anything more than an earlier and a later edition by Mark himself, and the strongest point in favor of that is Luke's omission of Mr 6:45-8:26. But Hawkins gives other reasons for that.

VII. Date and Place of Composition.

Ancient testimony is sharply divided. The Paschal Chronicle puts it in 40 AD, and many manuscripts, both uncial and cursive (Harnack, Chronologie, 70, 124) 10 or 12 years after the Ascension. These Swete sets aside as due to the mistaken tradition that Peter began work in Rome in the 2nd year of Claudius (42 AD). Similarly he would set aside the opinion of Chrysostom (which has some manuscripts subscriptions to support it) that it was written in Alexandria, as an error growing out of the statement of Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 16) that Mark went to Egypt and preached there the Gospel he composed. This he does in deference to the strong body of evidence that it was written in Rome about the time of Peter's death. Still there remains a discrepancy between Irenaeus, as commonly understood,

and the other Fathers. For, so understood, Irenaeus places it after the death of Peter, whereas Jerome, Epiphanius, Origen and Clement of Alexandria clearly place it within Peter's lifetime. But it does not seem necessary so to understand Irenaeus. It may be that it was composed while Peter was living, but only published after his death. Christopherson (1570 AD) had suggested that and supported it by the conjectural emendation of ekdosin, "surrendering," "imprisonment" for exodon, in Irenaeus. Grabe, Mill and others thought Irenaeus referred, not to Peter's death, but to his departure from Rome on further missionary tours. But if we take exodon in that sense, it is better to understand by it departure from Palestine or Syria, rather than from Rome. Irenaeus' statement that the apostles were now fully furnished for the work of evangelization (Adv. Haer., iii.1) certainly seems to imply that they were now ready to leave Palestine; and his next statement is that Matthew and Mark wrote their respective Gospels. And Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 24) states explicitly that Matthew committed his Gospel to writing "when he was about" to leave Palestine "to go to other peoples." The same may very possibly be true of Mark. If the fact be that Romans in Caesarea or Antioch made the request of Mark, we can easily understand how, by the time of Irenaeus, the whole incident might be transferred to Rome.

If this view be adopted, the date would probably not be before the council at Jerusalem and the events of Ga 2:11 ff. It is true the New Testament hints are that the apostles had left Jerusalem before that, but that they had gone beyond Syria is not likely. At any rate, at the time of the clash at Antioch they had not become so clear on the question touching Jews and Gentiles in the church as to be "fully furnished for the work of universal evangelization." But may it not be that Paul's strong statement of the seriousness of their error actually did settle those questions in the minds of the leaders? If so, and if with new vision and ardor, they turn to the work of world-wide evangelism, that would be a natural and worthy occasion for the composition of the Gospel. The place may be Caesarea or Antioch, and the date not earlier than 50 AD. This is the simplest synthesis of the ancient testimony. Modern opinion as to date has ranged more widely than the ancient. Baur and Strauss were compelled by their tendency and mythical theories to place it in the 2nd century. Recent criticism tends strongly to a date in the sixties of the 1st century, and more commonly the later sixties. This is based partly on hints in the Gospel itself, partly on its relation to Matthew and Luke. The hints usually adduced are Mr 2:26 and 13. The former, representing the temple as still standing, has force only if the relative clause be Mark's explanatory addition. Mark 13 has more force because, if Jerusalem had already fallen, we might expect some recognition of the fact.

Two other slight hints may be mentioned. The omission by the synoptists of the raising of Lazarus, and of the name of Mary in connection with the anointing of Jesus argues an early date when mention of them might have been unpleasant for the family. When the Fourth Gospel was published, they may have been no longer alive. The description of John as the brother of James (Mr 5:37) may also take us back to an early date when James was the more honored of the two brothers—though the unusual order of the names may be due, as Zahn thinks, to the author's instinctively distinguishing that John from himself.

The relation of Mark to Matthew and Luke is important if the very widespread conviction of the priority of Mark be true. For the most likely date for Ac is 62 AD, as suggested by the mention of Paul's two years' residence in Rome, and Luke's Gospel is earlier than the Acts. It may well have been written at Caesarea about 60 AD; that again throws Mark back into the fifties.

The great objection to so early a date is the amount of detail given of the destruction of Jerusalem. Abbott and others have marshalled numerous other objections, but they have very little weight—most of them indeed are puerile. The real crux is that to accept an earlier date than 70 AD is to admit predictive prophecy. Yet to deny that, especially for a believer in Christ, is an unwarranted pre-judgment, and even so far to reduce it as to deny its presence in this passage is to charge Luke—a confessedly careful historian—with ascribing to Jesus statements which He never made.

The eagerness to date Matthew not earlier than 70 is due to the same feeling. But the problem here is complicated by the word "immediately" (24:29). Some regard that as proof positive that it must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Others (e.g. Allen and Plummer) feel that it absolutely forbids a date much later than 70 AD, and consider 75 AD as a limit. But is it not possible that by by eutheos (not parachrema), Christ, speaking as a prophet, may have meant no more than that the next great event comparable with the epochal overthrow of Judaism would be His own return and that the Divine purpose marches straight on from the one to the other? The New Testament nowhere says that the second advent would take place within that generation. See below under "Eschatology." There is therefore no sufficient reason in the Olivet discourse for dating Luke or Matthew later than 60 AD, and if Mark is earlier, it goes back into the fifties.

VIII. Historicity.

Older rationalists, like Paulus, not denying Mark’s authorship, regarded the miraculous elements as misconceptions of actual events. Strauss, regarding these as mythical, was compelled to postulate a 2nd-century date. When, however, the date was pushed back to the neighborhood of 70 AD, the historicity was felt to be largely established. But recently theory of "pragmatic values" has been developed; Bacon thus states it: "The key to all genuinely scientific appreciation of Biblical narrative .... is the recognition of motive. The motive .... is never strictly historical but always etiological and frequently apologetic. .... The evangelic tradition consists of so and so many anecdotes, told and retold for the purpose of explaining or defending beliefs and practices of the contemporary church" (Modern Commentary, Beginnings of Gospel Story, 9). Bacon works out the method with the result that Mark is charged again and again with historical and other blunders. This view, like Baur’s tendency-theory, has elements of truth. One is that the vocabulary of a later day may be a sort of necessary translation of the original expression. But translation is neither invention nor perversion. The other is that each author has his purpose, but that simply determines his selection and arrangement of material; it neither creates nor misrepresents it if the author be honest and well informed. The word "selection" is advisedly chosen. The evangelists did not lack material. Each of the Twelve had personal knowledge beyond the content of Q or of Mark. These represent the central orb—the one the ethical, the other the evangelic side of it—but there were rays of exceeding brightness radiating from it in all directions. Luke’s introduction and John’s explicit declaration attest that fact. And neither John nor Luke throws the slightest suspicion on the reliability of the material they did not use. There is no sufficient reason for charging them with misstating the facts to make a point. Bacon seems to trust any other ancient writers or even his own imagination rather than the evangelists. The test becomes altogether too subjective. Yet since Christianity is a historical revelation, perversion of history may become perversion of most vital religious teaching. In the last analysis, the critic undertakes to decide just what Jesus could or could not

have done or said. The utter uncertainty of the result is seen by a comparison of Schmiedel and Bacon. The former is sure that the cry "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me" is one of the very few genuine sayings of Jesus; Bacon is equally sure that Jesus could not have uttered it. Bacon also charges Mark with "immoral crudity" because in 10:45 he reports Jesus as saying that He came "to give his life a ransom for (anti) many." Thus, on two most vital matters he charges the evangelists with error because they run counter to his own religious opinions.

Plummer's remark is just (Commentary on Matthew, xxxiii): "To decide a priori that Deity cannot become incarnate, or that incarnate Deity must exhibit such and such characteristics, is neither true philosophy nor scientific criticism." And A.T. Robertson ("Matthew" in Bible for Home and School, 26): "The closer we get to the historic Jesus the surer we feel that He lived and wrought as He is reported in the Synoptic Gospels." The evangelists had opportunities to know the facts such as we have not. The whole method of their training was such as to secure accuracy. They support each other. They have given us sketches of unparalleled beauty, vigor and power, and have portrayed for us a Person moving among men absolutely without sin—a standing miracle. If we cannot trust them for the facts, there is little hope of ever getting at the facts at all.

IX. Purpose and Plan.

1. The Gospel for Romans:

Mark's purpose was to write down the Gospel as Peter had presented it to Romans, so say the Fathers, at least, and internal evidence supports them. In any additions made by himself he had the same persons in mind. That the Gospel was for Gentiles can be seen (a) from the translation of the Aramaic expressions in Mr 3:17 (Boanerges), 5:41 (Talitha cumi), 7:11 (Corban), 10:46 (Bartimaeus), 14:36 (Abba), 15:22 (Golgotha); (b) in the explanation of Jewish customs in 14:12 and 15:42; (c) from the fact that the Law is not mentioned and the Old Testament is only once quoted in Mark's own narrative; (d) the Gentile sections, especially in Mark 6-8.

That it was for Romans is seen in

(a) the explanation of a Greek term by a Latin in Mr 12:42;

(b) the preponderance of works of power, the emphasis on authority (2:10), patience and heroic endurance (10:17 ff);

(c) 10:12 which forbids a practice that was not Jewish but Roman.

Those who believe it was written at Rome find further hints in the mention of Rufus (15:21; compare Ro 16:13) and the resemblance between 7:1-23 and Ro 14. The Roman centurion's remark (15:39) is the Q. E.D. of the author, and bears the same relation to Mark's purpose as Joh 20:31 to John's.

But one cannot escape the feeling that we have in this Gospel the antitype of the Servant of Yahweh. A. B. Davidson (Old Testament Theology, 365) tells us that there are two great figures around which Isaiah's thoughts gather—the King and the Servant. The former rises "to the unsurpassable height of 'God with us,' 'mighty God,' teaching that in Him God shall be wholly present with His people." The Servant is the other. The former is depicted in Mt, who also identifies Him with the Servant (12:18 f); the latter by Mr who identifies Him with the Messianic King (11:10; 14:62). Davidson summarizes the description of the Servant: "

(1) He is God's chosen;

(2) He has a mission to establish judgment on the earth. .... The word is His instrument and the Lord is in the Word, or rather He Himself is the impersonation of it;

(3) His endowment is the Spirit and an invincible faith;

(4) There is in Him a marvelous combination of greatness and lowliness;

(5) There are inevitable sufferings—bearing the penalty of others' sins;

(6) He thus redeems Israel and brings light to the Gentiles.

(7) Israel's repentance and restoration precede that broader blessing."

It is not strange that this Servant-conception—this remarkable blend of strength and submission, achieving victory through apparent defeat—should appeal to Peter. He was himself an ardent, whole-souled man who knew both defeat and victory. Moreover, he himself had hired servants (Mr 1:20), and now for years had been a servant of Christ (compare Ac 4:29). That it did appeal to him and became familiar to the early Christians can be seen from Ac 3:13 and 4:30. In his First Epistle he has 17 references to Isaiah, 9 of which belong to the second part. Temperamentally Mark seems to have been like Peter. And his experience in a wealthy home where servants were kept (Ac 12:13), and as himself huperetes of apostles in Christian service, fitted him both to appreciate and record the character and doings of the perfect servant—the Servant of Yahweh. For Roman Christians that heroic figure would have a peculiar fascination.

2. Plan of the Gospel:

The plan of the Gospel seems to have been influenced by this conception. Christ's kingship was apprehended by the Twelve at a comparatively early date. It was not until after the resurrection, when Jesus opened to them the Scriptures, that they saw Him as the Suffering Servant of Isa 53. That gave Peter his gospel as we have already seen, and at the same time the general lines of its presentation. We see it sketched for Romans in Ac 10. That sketch is filled in for us by Mark. So we have the following analysis:

Title: Mark 1:1

1. The Baptist preparing the way: Mr 1:2-8; compare Isa 40:3 f.

2. Devotement of Jesus to death for us and endowment by the Spirit: Mr 1:9-3; compare Isa 42:1 ff.

3. His greatness—the Galilean Ministry: Mr 1:14-8:30; compare Isa 43-52:12.

(1) In the synagogue: period of popular favor leading to break with Pharisaic Judaism: Mr 1:14-3:6.

(2) Outside the synagogue: parabolic teaching of the multitude, choice and training of the Twelve and their Great Confession: Mr 3:7 ff through 8:30.

4. His lowliness—mainly beyond Galilee: Mr 8:31-15; compare Isa 52:13-53:9.

(1) In the north—announcement of death: Mr 8:31-9:29.

(2) On the way to Jerusalem and the cross—through Galilee (Mr 9:30-50), Peraea (Mr 10:1-45), Judea (Mr 10:46-52).

(3) The triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mr 11:1-11).

(4) In Jerusalem and vicinity—opposed by the leaders (Mr 11:12-12:44); foretelling their doom (Mr 13); preparing for death (Mr 14:1-42); betrayed, condemned, crucified and buried in a rich man’s tomb (Mr 14:43-15).

5. His victory—the resurrection: Mark 16; compare Isa 53:10-12. What follows in Isaiah is taken up in Acts, for the first part of which Peter or Mark may have been Luke’s main source.

Generally speaking the plan is chronological, but it is plain that the material is sometimes grouped according to subject-matter.

This Servant-conception may also be the real explanation of some of the striking features of this Gospel, e.g. the absence of a genealogy and any record of His early life; the frequent use of the word "straightway"; the predominance of deeds; the Son’s not knowing the day (Mr 13:32); and the abrupt ending at Mr 16:8 (see III).

X. Leading Doctrines.

1. Person of Christ:

The main one, naturally, is the Person of Christ. The thesis is that He is Messiah, Son of God, Author (Source) of the gospel. The first half of the book closes with the disciples' confession of His Messiahship; the second, with the supreme demonstration that He is Son of God. Introductory to each is the Father's declaration of Him as His Beloved Son (Mr 1:11; 9:7). That the sonship is unique is indicated in Mr 12:6 and 13:32. At the same time He is the Son of Man—true man (4:38; 8:5; 14:34); ideal man as absolutely obedient to God (10:40; 14:36), and Head of humanity (2:10,28), their rightful Messiah or King (1:1; 14:62)—yet Servant of all (10:44 f); David's Son and David's Lord (12:37). The unique Sonship is the final explanation of all else, His power, His knowledge of both present (2:5,8; 8:17) and future (8:31; 10:39; 14:27; 13), superiority to all men, whether friends (1:7; 9:3 ff) or foes (12:34), and to superhuman beings, whether good (13:32) or evil (1:13,12; 3:27).

2. The Trinity:

The Father speaks in Mr 1:11; 9:7; is spoken of in 13:32; and spoken to in 14:36. The usual distinction between His fatherhood in relation to Christ and in relation to us is seen in 11:25; 12:6 and 13:32. The Spirit is mentioned in 1:8,10,12; 3:29 and 13:11. The last passage especially implies His personality.

3. Salvation:

As to salvation, the Son is God's final messenger (Mr 12:6); He gives His life a ransom instead of many (Mr 10:45); His blood shed is thus the blood of the covenant (Mr 14:24); that involves for Him death in the fullest sense, including rupture of fellowship with God (Mr 15:34). From the outset He knew what was before Him—only so can His baptism be explained (Mr 1:5,11; compare 2:20); but the horror of it was upon Him, especially from the transfiguration onward (Mr 10:32; 14:33-36); that was the Divine provision for salvation: He gave His life (Mr 10:45). The human condition is repentance and faith (Mr 1:15; 2:5; 5:34,36; 6:5; 9:23; 16:16), though He bestows lesser blessings apart from personal faith (Mr 1:23-26; 5:1-20; 6:35-43). The power of faith, within the will of God, is limitless (Mr 11:25); faith leads to doing the will of God, and only such as do His will are Christ's true kindred (Mr 3:35). Salvation is possible for Gentile as well as Jew (Mr 7:24-30).

4. Eschatology:

The eschatology of this Gospel is found chiefly in Mr 8:34-9:1 and 13. In Mr 9:1 we have a prediction of the overthrow of Jerusalem which is here given as a type and proof of His final coming for judgment and reward which He has had in mind in the preceding verses. Mark 13 is a development of this—the destruction of Jerusalem being meant in 13:5-23 and 28-31, the final coming in 13:24-27 and 32. The distinction is clearly marked by the pronouns (tauta, and ekeines, in 13:30 and 32 (compare Mt 24:34,36). In each passage (Mr 9:1; 13:30) the fall of Jerusalem is definitely fixed as toward the close of that generation; the time of the latter is known only to the Father (Mr 13:32). Between Christ's earthly life and the Second Coming He is seated at the right hand of God (Mr 12:36; 16:19). The resurrection which He predicted for Himself (Mr 8:31; 9:31; 10:34) and which actually took place (Mark 16), He affirms for others also (Mr 12:24-27).

LITERATURE.

The works marked with the asterisk are specially commended; for very full list see Moffat's Introduction.

Commentaries:

Fritzsche, 1830; Olshausen, translated 1863; J.A. Alexander, 1863; Lange, translated 1866; Meyer, 1866, American edition, 1884; Cook, Speaker's Commentary, 1878; Plumptre, Ellicott's, 1879; Riddle, Schaff's, 1879; W.N. Clarke, Amer. Comm., 1881; Lindsay, 1883; Broadus, 1881 and 1905; Morison, 1889; H.G. Holtzmann(3), 1901; Maclean, Cambridge Bible, 1893; Gould, International Critical Commentary, 1896; Bruce, The Expositor Greek Testament, 1897; B. Weiss, Meyer, 1901; Menzies, The Earliest Gospel, 1901; Salmond, Century Bible; Wellhausen2, 1909; Swete, 1908; Bacon, The Beginnings of Gospel Story, 1909; Wohlenberg, Zahn's Series, Das Evangelium des Markus, 1910. For the earlier see Swete.

Introduction:

Eichhorn, 1827; Credner, 1836; Schleiermacher, 1845; De Wette, 1860; Bleek, 1866, translated 1883; Reuss, 1874, translated 1884; B. Weiss. 2nd edition, translated 1886; 3rd edition, 1897; H.J. Holtzmann, 1892; Th. Zahn, 1897, translated 1909; Godet, 1899; Julicher(6), 1906; von Soden, 1905, translated 1906; Wendling, Ur-Marcus, 1905; A. Muller, Geschichtskerne in den Evang., 1905; Wrede, Origin of New Testament Scriptures, 1907, translated 1909; Horne, 1875; Westcott, Introduction to Study of Gospels, 7th edition, 1888, and The Canon, 6th edition, 1889; Salmon, 1897; Adeney, 1899; Bacon, 1900; Burton, 1904; Moffat, Historical New Testament, 1901; Introduction to the Literature of New Testament, 1911; Peake, 1909; Gregory, Einleitung., 1909; Charteris, Canonicity, 1881; The New Testament Scriptures, 1882, and popular Intros by Plumptre, 1883; Lumby, 1883; Kerr, 1892; McClymont, 1893; Dods, 1894; Lightfoot, Essays on the Work Entitled Supernatural Religion, 1889; Sanday, Gospels in the 2nd Century, 1874; Stanton, Gospels as Historical Documents, I, 1903; II, 1909.

Mark and the Synoptic Problem:

Rushbrooke, Synopticon, 1880; Wright, Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek, 3rd edition, 1906; Composition of the Four Gospels, 1890; Some New Testament Problems, 1898; H.J. Holtzmann, Die synopt. Evang., 1863; Weizsacker, Untersuch. uber die evang. Gesch., 2nd edition, 1901; Wernle, Die synopt. Frage, 1899; Loisy, Les ev. syn., 1908; Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evang., 1905; Blass, Origin and Char. of Our Gospels, English translation, xviii; Norton, Internal Evid. of the Genuineness of the Gospels, 1847; F.H. Woods, Stud. Bibl., II, 594; Palmer, Gospel Problems and Their Solution, 1899; J.A. Robinson, The Study of the Gospels, 1902; Gloag, Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels; Burton, Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem, 1904; Stanton, as above, and in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), II, 234 ff; Turner,

"Chronology of New Testament," Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), I, 403 ff; J.J. Scott, The Making of the Gospels, 1905; Burkitt, Gospel History and Its Transmission, 1906; Salmon, Human Element in the Gospels, 1907; Harnack, Gesch. der altchristl. Lit., I, 1893; II, 2nd edition, 1904; Beitrage zur Einleitung in das New Testament, 4 volumes, translated in "Crown Theol. Lib.," Luke the Physician, 1907; The Sayings of Jesus, 1908; The Ac of the Apostles, 1909; The Date of the Ac and of the Synoptic Gospels, 1911; Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, 1909; Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 2nd edition, 1909; Denney, Jesus and the Gospel; Cambridge Biblical Essays, edition by Swete, 1909; Oxford Studies in the Syn. Problem, edition by Sanday, 1911; Salmond, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), III, 248 ff; Maclean, Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, II, 120 f; Petrie, Growth of Gospels Shown by Structural Criticism, 1910; Buckley, Introduction to Synoptic Problem, 1912.

The Language:

Dalman, Words of Jesus, translated 1909; Deissmann, Bible Studies, translated 1901; Light from the Ancient East, translated 1910; Allen, The Expositor, I, English translation, 1902; Marshall, The Expositor, 1891-94; Wellhausen, Einleitung.; Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek, 1889; Swete and Hawkins.

Text:

Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Introduction to the New Testament in Greek; Salmon, Introduction, chapter ix; Gregory, Text and Canon; Morison and Swete, in Commentary; Burgon, The Last Twelve Verses of Mark.

Special:

Schweizer, Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910; Sanday, Life of Christ in Recent Research; Emmet, Eschatological Question in the Gospels, 1911; Hogg, Christ’s Message of the Kingdom, 1911; Forbes, The Servant of the Lord, 1890; Davidson, Old Testament Theology.

J. H. Farmer

MARKET, SHEEP See SHEEP MARKET.

MARKET; MARKETPLACE; MART

mar’-ket, mar’-ketplas, mart (ma‘arabh, cachar; agora):

(1) Ma‘arabh, from a root meaning "trading" and hence, goods exchanged, and so "merchandise" in the Revised Version (British and American), "market" in the King James Version, occurs only in Eze

27:13,17,19,25, and is translated correctly "merchandise" in both the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version.

(2) Cachar means a "trading emporium," hence, mart, and merchandise. It occurs only in Isa 23:3 (see MERCHANDISE).

(3) Agora, from root meaning "to collect," means a "town meeting-place," "resort of the people," so a place where the public generally met to exchange views and wares. No doubt, the central place soon filling up, the people thronged the adjoining streets, and so in time each street thus used came to be called agora, "marketplace"; translated "marketplace(s)" in 1 Esdras 2:18; Tobit 2:3; Mt 11:16; 20:3; 23:7; Mr 6:56; 7:4; 12:38; Lu 7:32; 11:43; 20:46; Ac 16:19; 17:17; "Market of Appius" in Ac 28:15 means, probably, "street" (see APPII FORUM).

The marketplace in New Testament times was the public open space, either simple or ornate, in town, city or country, where (Mr 6:56) the people congregated, not only for exchange of merchandise, but for one or more of the following purposes:

(1) a place where the children came together to sing, dance and play, a "back-to-date" municipal recreation center (Mt 11:16,17; Lu 7:32);

(2) a place for loafers, a sort of ancient, irresponsible labor bureau where the out-of-work idler waited the coming of an employer with whom he might bargain for his services, usually by the day (Mt 20:1-16);

(3) a place where the proud pretender could parade in long robes and get public recognition, "salutations in the market-places," e.g. the scribes and Pharisees against whom Jesus emphatically warns His disciples (Mt 23:3-7; Mr 12:38; Lu 11:43; 20:46);

(4) a place where the sick were brought for treatment, the poor man’s sanatorium, a municipal hospital; Jesus "who went about doing good" often found His opportunity there (Mr 6:56);

(5) a place of preliminary hearing in trials, where the accused might be brought before rulers who were present at the time, e.g. Paul and Silas at Philippi (Ac 16:19);

(6) a place for religious and probably political or philosophical discussion (gossip also), a forum, a free-speech throne; no doubt often used by the early apostles not only as a place of proclaiming some truth of the new religion but also a place of advertisement for a coming synagogue service, e.g. Paul in Athens (Ac 17:17).

The Wisdom of Solomon 15:12 (the King James Version) has "They counted ... our time here a market for gain," the Revised Version (British and American) "a gainful fair," margin "a keeping of festival," Greek panegurismos, "an assembly of all." Such assemblies offered particular opportunities for business

dealings.

William Edward Raffety

MARMOTH

mar’-moth, mar’-moth (Codex Vaticanus, Marmothi; Codex Alexandrinus, Marmathi): "The priest the son of Urias" to whom were committed the silver and gold for the temple by the returning exiles (1 Esdras 8:62) =" Meremoth" in parallel Ezr 8:33.

MAROTH

ma’-roth, ma’-roth (maroth; (katoikousa) (odunas): An unknown town probably in the Philistine plain, named by Micah (1:12).

MARRIAGE

mar’-ij:

Introduction

Scope and Viewpoint of the Present Article

1. Marriage among the Hebrews

2. Betrothal the First Formal Part

3. Wedding Ceremonies

4. Jesus’ Sanction of the Institution

5. His Teaching concerning Divorce

LITERATURE

It would be interesting to study marriage biologically and sociologically, to get the far and near historical and social background of it as an institution, especially as it existed among the ancient Jews, and as it figures in the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the New Testament. For, like all social institutions, marriage, and the family which is the outcome of marriage, must be judged, not by its status at any particular time, but in the light of its history. Such a study of it would raise a host of related historic questions, e.g. What was its origin? What part has it played in the evolution and civilization of

the race? What social functions has it performed? And then, as a sequel, Can the services it has rendered to civilization and progress be performed or secured in any other way? This, indeed, would call for us to go back even farther—to try to discover the psychology of the institution and its history, the beliefs from which it has sprung and by which it has survived so long. This were a task well worth while and amply justified by much of the thinking of our time; for, as one of the three social institutions that support the much challenged form and fabric of modern civilization, marriage, private property and the state, its continued existence, in present form at least, is a matter of serious discussion and its abolition, along with the other two, is confidently prophesied. "Marriage, as at present understood, is an arrangement most closely associated with the existing social status and stands or falls with it" (Bebel, Socialism and Sex, 199, Reeves, London; The Cooperative Commonwealth in Its Outline, Gronlund, 224). But such a task is entirely outside of and beyond the purpose of this article.

Neither the Bible in general, nor Jesus in particular, treats of the family from the point of view of the historian or the sociologist, but solely from that of the teacher of religion and morals. In short, their point of view is theological, rather than sociological. Moses and the prophets, no less than Jesus and His apostles, accepted marriage as an existing institution which gave rise to certain practical, ethical questions, and they dealt with it accordingly. There is nothing in the record of the teachings of Jesus and of His apostles to indicate that they gave to marriage any new social content, custom or sanction. They simply accepted it as it existed in the conventionalized civilization of the Jews of their day and used it and the customs connected with it for ethical or illustrative purposes. One exception is to be made to this general statement, namely, that Jesus granted that because of the exigencies of the social development Moses had modified it to the extent of permitting and regulating divorce, clearly indicating, however, at the same time, that He regarded such modification as out of harmony with the institution as at first given to mankind. According to the original Divine purpose it was monogamous, and any form of polygamy, and apparently of divorce, was excluded by the Divine idea and purpose. The treatment of the subject here, therefore, will be limited as follows: Marriage among the Ancient Hebrews and Other Semites; Betrothal as the First Formal Part of the Transaction; Wedding Ceremonies Connected with Marriage, especially as Reflected in the New Testament; and Jesus' Sanction and Use of the Institution, Teaching concerning Divorce, etc.

1. Marriage among the Hebrews:

With the Hebrews married life was the normal life. Any exception called for apology and explanation. "Any Jew who has not a wife is no man" (Talmud). It was regarded as awaiting everyone on reaching maturity; and sexual maturity comes much earlier indeed in the East than with us in the West—in what we call childhood. The ancient Hebrews, in common with all Orientals, regarded the family as the social unit. In this their view of it coincides with that, of modern sociologists. Of the three great events in the family life, birth, marriage and death, marriage was regarded as the most important. It was a step that led to the gravest tribal and family consequences. In case of a daughter, if she should prove unsatisfactory to her husband, she would likely be returned to the ancestral home, discarded and discredited, and there would be almost inevitably a feeling of injustice engendered on one side, and a sense of mutual irritation between the families (Jud 14:20; 1Sa 18:19). If she failed to pass muster with her mother-in-law she would just as certainly have to go, and the results would be much the same (compare customs in China).

It was a matter affecting the whole circle of relatives, and possibly tribal amity as well. It was natural and deemed necessary, therefore, that the selection of the wife and the arrangement of all contractual and financial matters connected with it should be decided upon by the parents or guardians of the couple involved. Though the consent of the parties was sometimes sought (Ge 24:8) and romantic attachments were not unknown (Ge 29:20; 34:3; Jud 14:1; 1Sa 18:20), the gift or woman in the case was not currently thought of as having a personal existence at her own disposal. She was simply a passive unit in the family under the protection and supreme control of father or brothers. In marriage, she was practically the chattel, the purchased possession and personal property of her husband, who was her ba‘al or master (Ho 2:16), she herself being be‘ulah (Isa 62:4). The control, however, was not always absolute (Ge 26:34; Ex 2:21).

The bargaining instinct, so dominant among Orientals then as now, played a large part in the transaction. In idea the family was a little kingdom of which the father was the king, or absolute ruler. There are many indications, not only that the family was the unit from which national coherence was derived, but that this unit was perpetuated through the supremacy of the oldest male. Thus society became patriarchal, and this is the key of the ancient history of the family and the nation. Through the expansion of the family group was evolved in turn the clan, the tribe, the nation, and the authority of the father became in turn that of the chief, the ruler, and the king. The Oriental cannot conceive, indeed, of any band, or clan, or company without a "father," even though there be no kith or kinship involved in the matter. The "father" in their thought, too, was God’s representative, and as such he was simply carrying out God’s purpose, for instance, in selecting a bride for his son, or giving the bride to be married to the son of another. This is as true of the far East as of the near East today. Accordingly, as a rule, the young people simply acquiesced, without question or complaint, in what was thus done for them, accepting it as though God had done it directly. Accordingly, too, the family and tribal loyalty overshadowed love-making and patriotism, in the larger sense. Out of this idea of the solidarity and selectness of the tribe and family springs the overmastering desire of the Oriental for progeny, and for the conservation of the family or the tribe at any cost. Hence, the feuds, bloody and bitter, that persist between this family or tribe and another that has in any way violated this sacred law.

Traces of what is known as beena marriage are found in the Old Testament, e.g. that of Jacob, where Laban claims Jacob’s wives and children as his own (Ge 31:31,43), and that of Moses (Ex 2:21; 4:18). This is that form of marriage in which the husband is incorporated into the wife’s tribe, the children belonging to her tribe and descent being reckoned on her side (compare W. Robertson Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, 94). In Samson’s case we seem to have an instance of what is known among Arabs as tsadqat marriage (from tsadaq, "gift"), the kid here being the customary tsadaq (Jud 14; 15:1; 16:4). There is no hint that he meant to take his wife home. It is differentiated from prostitution in that no disgrace is attached to it and the children are recognized as legitimate by the tribe. Such marriages make it easier to understand the existence of the matriarchate, or the custom of reckoning the descent of children and property through the mothers. The influence of polygamy would work in the same direction, subdividing the family into smaller groups connected with the several wives. There is, however, no clear evidence in the Old Testament of polyandry (a plurality of husbands), though the Levirate marriage is regarded by some as a survival of it. In other words, polygamy among the Hebrews seems to have been confined to polygyny (a plurality of wives). It is easy to trace its chief causes: (1)

desire for a numerous offspring ("May his tribe increase!"); (2) barrenness of first wife (as in Abraham's case); (3) advantages offered by marital alliances (e.g. Solomon); (4) the custom of making wives of captives taken in war (compare Ps 45:3,9); (5) slavery, which as it existed in the Orient almost implied it.

2. Betrothal the First Formal Part:

Betrothal with the ancient Hebrews was of a more formal and far more binding nature than the "engagement" is with us. Indeed, it was esteemed a part of the transaction of marriage, and that the most binding part. Among the Arabs today it is the only legal ceremony connected with marriage. Ge 24:58,60 seems to preserve for us an example of an ancient formula and blessing for such an occasion. Its central feature was the dowry (mohar), which was paid to the parents, not to the bride. It may take the form of service (Ge 29; 1Sa 18:25). It is customary in Syria today, when the projected marriage is approved by both families, and all the financial preliminaries have been settled, to have this ceremony of betrothal. It consists in the acceptance before witnesses of the terms of the marriage as contracted for. Then God's blessing is solemnly asked on the union thus provided for, but to take place probably only after some months, or perhaps some years. The betrothal effected, all danger from any further financial fencing and bluffing now being at an end, happiness and harmony may preside over all the arrangements for the marriage day. Among the Jews the betrothal was so far regarded as binding that, if marriage should not take place, owing to the absconding of the bridegroom or the breach of contract on his part, the young woman could not be married to another man until she was liberated by a due process and a paper of divorce. A similar custom prevails in China and Japan, and in cases becomes very oppressive. The marriage may have been intended by the parents from the infancy of the parties, but this formality of betrothal is not entered on till the marriage is considered reasonably certain and measurably near. A prolonged interval between betrothal and marriage was deemed undesirable on many accounts, though often an interval was needed that the groom might render the stipulated service or pay the price—say a year or two, or, as in the case of Jacob, it might be seven years. The betrothed parties were legally in the position of a married couple, and unfaithfulness was "adultery" (De 22:23; Mt 1:19).

Polygamy is likely to become prevalent only where conditions are abnormal, as where there is a disproportionate number of females, as in tribal life in a state of war. In settled conditions it is possible only to those able to provide "dowry" and support for each and all of the wives.

The fact of polygamy in Old Testament times is abundantly witnessed in the cases of Abraham, Jacob, the judges, David, Solomon, etc. It was prevalent in Issachar (1Ch 7:4); among the middle class (1Sa 1:1 f). But it is treated, even in the Old Testament, as incompatible with the Divine ideal (Ge 2:24), and its original is traced to deliberate departure from that ideal by Lamech, the Cainite (Ge 4:19). Kings are warned against it (De 17:17; compare Ge 29:31; 30). Noah, Isaac and Joseph had each only one wife, and Bible pictures of domestic happiness are always connected with monogamy (2Ki 4; Ps 128; Pr 31; compare Sirach 25:1; 26:1,13). Marriage is applied figuratively, too, to the union between God and Israel, implying monogamy as the ideal state. Nevertheless, having the advantage of precedent, it was long before polygamy fell into disuse in Hebrew society. Herod had nine wives at one time (Josephus, Ant, XVII, i, 2). Justin Martyr (Dial., 134, 141) reproaches Jews of his day with having "four or even

five wives," and for "marrying as many as they wish" (compare Talm). It was not definitely and formally forbidden among Jews until circa 1000 AD. It exists still among Jews in Moslem lands. Side by side with this practice all along has been the ideal principle (Ge 2:18) rebuking and modifying it. The legal theory that made the man "lord" of the wife (Ge 3:16; Tenth Commandment) was likewise modified in practice by the affection of the husband and the personality of the wife.

The difference between a concubine and a wife was largely due to the wife's birth and higher position and the fact that she was usually backed by relatives ready to defend her. A slave could not be made a concubine without the wife's consent (Ge 16:2).

3. Wedding Ceremonies:

There is a disappointing uncertainty as to the exact ceremonies or proceedings connected with marriage in Bible times. We have to paint our picture from passing allusions or descriptions, and from what we know of Jewish and Arabic customs. In cases it would seem that there was nothing beyond betrothal, or the festivities following it (see Ge 24:3 ff). Later, in the case of a virgin, an interval of not exceeding a year came to be observed.

The first ceremony, the wedding procession, apparently a relic of marriage by capture (compare Jud 5:30; Ps 45:15), was the first part of the proceedings. The bridegroom's "friends" (Joh 3:29) went, usually by night, to fetch the bride and her attendants to the home of the groom (Mt 9:15; Joh 3:29). The joyousness of it all is witnessed by the proverbial "voice of the bridegroom" and the cry, "Behold the bridegroom cometh!" (Jer 7:34; Re 18:23). The procession was preferably by night, chiefly, we may infer, that those busy in the day might attend, and that, in accordance with the oriental love of scenic effects, the weird panorama of lights and torches might play an engaging and kindling part.

The marriage supper then followed, generally in the home of the groom. Today in Syria, as Dr. Mackie, of Beirut, says, when both parties live in the same town, the reception may take place in either home; but the older tradition points to the house of the groom's parents as the proper place. It is the bringing home of an already accredited bride to her covenanted husband. She is escorted by a company of attendants of her own sex and by male relatives and friends conveying on mules or by porters articles of furniture and decoration for the new home. As the marriage usually takes place in the evening, the house is given up for the day to the women who are busy robing the bride and making ready for the coming hospitality. The bridegroom is absent at the house of a relative or friend, where men congregate in the evening for the purpose of escorting him home. When he indicates that it is time to go, all rise up, and candles and torches are supplied to those who are to form the procession, and they move off. It is a very picturesque sight to see such a procession moving along the unlighted way in the stillness of the starry night, while, if it be in town or city, on each side of the narrow street, from the flat housetop or balcony, crowds look down, and the women take up the peculiar cry of wedding joy that tells those farther along that the pageant has started. This cry is taken up all along the route, and gives warning to those who are waiting with the bride that it is time to arise and light up the approach, and welcome the bridegroom with honor. As at the house where the bridegroom receives his friends before starting some come late, and speeches

of congratulation have to be made, and poems have to be recited or sung in praise of the groom, and to the honor of his family, it is often near midnight when the procession begins. Meanwhile, as the night wears on, and the duties of robing the bride and adorning the house are all done, a period of relaxing and drowsy waiting sets in, as when, in the New Testament parable, both the wise and the foolish virgins were overcome with sleep. In their case the distant cry on the street brought the warning to prepare for the reception, and then came the discovery of the exhausted oil.

Of the bridegroom's retinue only a limited number would enter, their chief duty being that of escort. They might call next day to offer congratulations. An Arabic wedding rhyme says:

"To the bridegroom's door went the torch-lit array,

And then like goats they scattered away."

With their dispersion, according to custom, the doors would be closed, leaving within the relatives and invited guests; and so, when the belated virgins of the parable hastened back, they too found themselves inexorably shut out by the etiquette of the occasion. The opportunity of service was past, and they were no longer needed.

At the home all things would be "made ready," if possible on a liberal scale. Joh 2 gives a picture of a wedding feast where the resources were strained to the breaking point. Hospitality was here especially a sacred duty, and, of course, greatly ministered to the joy of the occasion. An oriental proverb is significant of the store set by it:

"He who does not invite me to his marriage

Will not have me to his funeral."

To decline the invitation to a marriage was a gross insult (Mt 22).

It was unusual in Galilee to have a "ruler of the feast" as in Judea (Joh 2). There was no formal religious ceremony connected with the Hebrew marriage as with us—there is not a hint of such a thing in the Bible. The marriage was consummated by entrance into the "chamber," i.e. the nuptial chamber (Hebrew chedher), in which stood the bridal bed with a canopy (chuppah), being originally the wife's tent (Ge 24:67; Jud 4:17). In all lands of the dispersion the name is still applied to the embroidered canopy under which the contracting parties stand or sit during the festivities. In Arabic, Syriac, and Hebrew the bridegroom is said to "go in" to the bride.

A general survey of ancient marriage laws and customs shows that those of the Hebrews are not a peculiar creation apart from those of other peoples. A remarkable affinity to those of other branches of the Semitic races especially, may be noted, and striking parallels are found in the Code of Hammurabi, with regard, e.g., to betrothal, dowry, adultery and divorce. But modern researches have emphasized the

relative purity of Old Testament sexual morality. In this, as in other respects, the Jews had a message for the world. Yet we should not expect to find among them the Christian standard. Under the new dispensation the keynote is struck by our Lord's action. The significance of His attending the marriage feast at Cana and performing His first miracle there can hardly be exaggerated. The act corresponds, too, with His teaching on the subject. He, no less than Paul, emphasizes both the honorableness of the estate and the heinousness of all sins against it.

4. Jesus' Sanction of the Institution:

The most characteristic use of marriage and the family by our Lord is that in which He describes the kingdom of God as a social order in which the relationship of men to God is like that of sons to a father, and their relation to each other like that between brothers. This social ideal, which presents itself vividly and continuously to His mind, is summed up in this phrase, "Kingdom of God," which occurs more than a hundred times in the Synoptic Gospels. The passages in which it occurs form the interior climax of His message to men. It is no new and noble Judaism, taking the form of a political restoration, that He proclaims, and no "far-off Divine event" to be realized only in some glorious apocalyptic consummation; but a kingdom of God "within you," the chief element of it communion with God, the loving relation of "children" to a "Father," a present possession. Future in a sense it may be, as a result to be fully realized, and yet present; invisible, and yet becoming more and more visible as a new social order, a conscious brotherhood with one common, heavenly Father, proclaimed in every stage of His teaching in spite of opposition and varying fortunes with unwavering certainty of its completion—this is the "kingdom" that Jesus has made the inalienable possession of the Christian consciousness. His entire theology may be described as a transfiguration of the family (see Peabody, Jesus Christ, and the Social Question, 149 ff; Holtzmann, New Testament Theology, I, 200; Harnack, History of Dogma, I, 62; B. Weiss, Biblical Theol. of the New Testament, I, 72, English translation, 1882).

Beyond this Jesus frequently used figures drawn from marriage to illustrate His teaching concerning the coming of the kingdom, as Paul did concerning Christ and the church. There is no suggestion of reflection upon the Old Testament teaching about marriage in His teaching except at one point, the modification of it so as to allow polygamy and divorce. Everywhere He accepts and deals with it as sacred and of Divine origin (Mt 19:9, etc.), but He treats it as transient, that is of the "flesh" and for this life only.

5. His Teaching concerning Divorce:

A question of profound interest remains to be treated: Did Jesus allow under any circumstances the remarriage of a divorced person during the lifetime of the partner to the marriage? Or did He allow absolute divorce for any cause whatsoever? Upon the answer to that question in every age depend momentous issues, social and civic, as well as religious. The facts bearing on the question are confessedly enshrined in the New Testament, and so the inquiry may be limited to its records. Accepting with the best scholarship the documents of the New Testament as emanating from the disciples of Jesus in the second half of the 1st century AD, the question is, what did these writers understand Jesus to teach

on this subject? If we had only the Gospels of Mark and Luke and the Epistles of Paul, there could be but one answer given: Christ did not allow absolute divorce for any cause (see Mr 10:2 ff; Lu 16:18; Ga 1:12; 1Co 7:10). The Old Testament permission was a concession, He teaches, to a low moral state and standard, and opposed to the ideal of marriage given in Ge (2:23).

"The position of women in that day was far from enviable. They could be divorced on the slightest pretext, and had no recourse at law. Almost all the rights and privileges of men were withheld from them. What Jesus said in relation to divorce was more in defense of the rights of the women of His time than as a guide for the freer, fuller life of our day. Jesus certainly did not mean to recommend a hard and enslaving life for women. His whole life was one long expression of full understanding of them and sympathy for them" (Patterson, The Measure of a Man, 181 f).

Two sayings attributed to Christ and recorded by the writer or editor of the First Gospel (Mt 5:32; 19:9) seem directly to contravene His teaching as recorded in Mr and Luke. Here he seems to allow divorce for "fornication" (ei me epi porneia, save for fornication"), an exception which finds no place in the parallels (compare 1Co 7:15, which allows remarriage where a Christian partner is deserted by a heathen). The sense here demands that "fornication" be taken in its wider sense (Ho 2:5; Am 7:17; 1Co 5:1). Divorce to a Jew carried with it the right of remarriage, and the words ‘causeth her to commit adultery’ (Mt 5:32) show that Jesus assumed that the divorced woman would marry again. Hence, if He allowed divorce, He also allowed remarriage. A critical examination of the whole passage in Mt has led many scholars to conclude that the exceptive clause is an interpolation due to the Jewish-Christian compiler or editor through whose hands the materials passed. Others think it betrays traces of having been rewritten from Mark or from a source common to both Matthew and Mark, and combined with a semi-Jewish tradition, in short, that it is due to literary revision and compilation. The writer or compiler attempted to combine the original sayings of Jesus and His own interpretation. Believing that our Lord had not come to set aside the authority of Moses, but only certain Pharisaic exegesis, and supported, as doubtless he was, by a Jewish-Christian tradition of Palestine, he simply interpreted Mark’s narrative by inserting what he regarded as the integral part of an eternal enactment of Yahweh. In doing this he was unconsciously inconsistent, not only with Mark and Luke, but also with the context of the First Gospel itself, owing to his sincere but mistaken belief that the Law of Moses must not be broken. The view implied by the exception, of course, is that adultery ipso facto dissolves the union, and so opens the way to remarriage. But remarriage closes the door to reconciliation, which on Christian principles ought always to be possible (compare Hosea; Jer 3; Hermas, Mand iv.1). Certainly much is to be said for the view which is steadily gaining ground, that the exception in Matthew is an editorial addition made under the pressure of local conditions and practical necessity, the absolute rule being found too hard (see Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), extra vol, 27b, and The Teaching of our Lord as to the Indissolubility of Marriage, by Stuart Lawrence Tyson, M.A. Oxon., University of the South, 1912).

The general principle expanded in the New Testament and the ideal held up before the Christians is high and clear. How far that ideal can be embodied in legislation and applied to the community as a whole all are agreed must depend upon social conditions and the general moral development and environment.

See further DIVORCE.

LITERATURE.

Material from Mishna in Selden, Uxor Heb, London, 1546; Hamberger, Real. Encyclopedia f. Bibel und Talmud, Breslau, 1870; Benzinger, Hebraische Archaologie; Nowack, Lehrbuch der hebraischen Archaologie; McLennan, Primitive Marriage; Westermarck, History of Human Marriage, London, 1891; W. R. Smith, Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, Cambridge, 1895; Tristram, Eastern Customs, London, 1894; Mackie, Bible Manners and Customs, London, 1898; Peabody, Jesus Christ and the Social Question, III, concerning the family.

George B. Eager

MARROW

mar’-o (moach, chelebh, shiqquy, machah, "to make fat," "to grease"; muelos): Marrow is the nourisher and strengthener of the bones; it is said to moisten the bones: "The marrow (moach) of his bones is moistened" (Job 21:24). The fear of Yahweh "will be health to thy navel, and marrow (shiqquy, margin "refreshing, Hebrew moistening") to thy bones" (Pr 3:8). Thus, the expression is used figuratively of the things which alone can satisfy the soul: "My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow (chelebh, "fat") and fatness" (Ps 63:5); "In this mountain will Yahweh of hosts make unto all peoples a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees, of fat things full of marrow (memuchayim, particle, plural, Pual of machah), of wines on the lees well refined" (Isa 25:6). In the Epistle to the Hebrews the writer speaks of the word of God, which is "living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow" (Heb 4:12).

H. L. E. Luering

MARS’ HILL

marz hil.

See AREOPAGUS.

MARSENA

mar-se’-na, mar’-se-na (marcena’; derivation unknown but probably of Persian origin (Es 1:14)): One of "the seven princes of Persia and Media, who saw the king’s face, and sat first in the kingdom."

MARSH

marsh ((1) gebhe’, the American Standard Revised Version "marsh," the King James Version and the

English Revised Version "marish" (Eze 47:11); the King James Version "pit," the Revised Version (British and American) "cistern" (Isa 30:14); compare Arabic jaba’," reservoir," "watering-through"; (2) bots, "mire"; bitstsah, "mire," "fen"; compare Arabic badda, to "trickle," badad, "a little water"; (3) TiT, "mire" "clay"; (4) chomer, "mire," "clay," "mortar"; (5) ma‘abheh ha-’adhamah (1Ki 7:46), and ‘abhi ha-’adhamah (2Ch 4:17), "clay ground"): In the vision of Ezekiel the saltness of the Dead Sea is "healed" by the stream issuing from under the threshold of the temple, "But the miry places (bitstsah) thereof, and the marshes (gebhe’) thereof, shall not be healed" (Eze 47:11). Gebhe’ occurs elsewhere only in Isa 30:14, where the King James Version has "pit" and the Revised Version (British and American) "cistern." Bots, "mire," is found only in Jer 38:22. Bitstsah is found also in Job 8:11,

"Can the rush grow up without mire (bitstsah)?

Can the flag grow without water?"

and in Job 40:21 (of the behemoth),

"He lieth under the lotus-trees,

In the covert of the reed, and the fen (bitstsah)."

In 1 Macc 9:42,45 helos, but in 9:42 Codex Vaticanus reads oros, "mount." Marshes are found near the mouths of some of the rivers, as the Kishon, about the Chuleh (? waters of Merom), at various places in the course of the Jordan and about the Dead Sea, especially at its south end. For the most part Palestine is rocky and dry.

Alfred Ely Day

MARSHAL

mar’-shal: Not found in the King James Version, but in the Revised Version (British and American) the word represents two Hebrew words: (1) copher (Jud 5:14), translated "they that handle the marshal’s staff." A difficulty arises because the usual meaning of copher is "scribe" or "writer" (so the King James Version). The revisers follow Septuagint and Greek authority which favor "marshal" as against "scribe." The office of marshal was to help the general to maintain discipline (compare 1 Macc 5:42). (2) Tiphcar (Jer 51:27), a loan-word whose meaning is clear. Lenormant thinks it akin to a Babylonian-Assyrian word meaning "tablet-writer" (compare Delitzsch). Accordingly, the Revised Version margin renders Na 3:17 "thy scribes," though the Syriac has "thy warriors," as does the Targum in Jeremiah. We must await further light on both words.

George B. Eager

MART

mart.

See MARKET.

MARTHA

mar’-tha (Martha, "mistress," being a transliteration of the feminine form of mar, "Lord"): Martha belonged to Bethany, and was the sister of Lazarus and Mary (Joh 11:1 f). From the fact that the house into which Jesus was received belonged to Martha, and that she generally took the lead in action, it is inferred that she was the eider sister. Martha was one of those who gave hospitality to Jesus during His public ministry. Thus, in the course of those wanderings which began when "he stedfastly set his face to go to Jerus" (Lu 9:51), he "entered into a certain village"—its name is not stated—and "a certain woman named Martha received him into her house" (Lu 10:38). Martha, whose sense of responsibility as hostess weighed heavily upon her, was "cumbered about much serving," and her indignation was aroused at the lack of assistance given to her by her sister. Her words, "Lord, dost thou not care?" implied a certain reproach to Jesus also, in that she felt He showed a want of sympathy with her efforts and was the cause of Mary’s remissness. But Jesus, in tones of gentle reproof, reminded her that for Him not the preparation of an elaborate meal but the hearing of His Word in the spirit of Mary was the "one thing needful" (Lu 10:39-42).

Martha is first mentioned by John—the only other Gospel writer who refers to Martha—in his account of the raising of Lazarus from the dead at Bethany (Joh 11:1-44). The narrative indicates, however, that Jesus was already on terms of the closest friendship with her and her household (compare 11:3,5). In the incident which John here records, Martha again displayed her more practical nature by going out to meet Jesus, while Mary sat in the house (11:20). But she was not behind her sister in her love for her brother (11:19), in her faith in Jesus (11:21 f) and in her belief in the final resurrection (11:24). The power of Him, whom she termed the "Teacher," to restore Lazarus to life even upon earth was beyond her understanding. To the words of Jesus concerning this she gave, however, a verbal assent, and went and informed Mary, "The Teacher is here, and calleth thee" (11:27 f). Yet she remained inwardly unconvinced, and remonstrated when Jesus ordered the stone before the grave to be removed (11:39). Jesus then recalled His previous words to her remembrance (11:40), and vindicated them by restoring her brother to life (11:41-44). After the raising of Lazarus, Jesus then made His departure, but after a short stay in Ephraim (11:54) He returned to Bethany (Joh 12:1). While He supped there, Martha once more served, and Lazarus was also present (Joh 12:2). It was on this occasion that Mary anointed the feet of Jesus (Joh 12:3-8). According to Mt 26:6-13; Mr 14:3-9, the anointing took place in the house of Simon the leper, and it has hence been concluded by some that Martha was the wife or widow of Simon. The anointing described in Lu 7:36-50 happened in the house of Simon a Pharisee. But in none of the synoptist accounts is Martha mentioned. For the relationship of these anointings with each other, see MARY, IV. As, according to John, the abode of the sisters was in Bethany, a further difficulty of a topographical nature is raised by those who hold that Luke implies, from the Galilean setting of Lu

10:38-41, that the sisters lived in Galilee. But the information supplied by Luke, upon which this inference is based, is of the vaguest (compare Lu 10:38), and the great division of Luke's Gospel (Lu 9:51-18:31) has within it no organic cohesion of parts. In it is mentioned that on two separate occasions Jesus passed through Samaria (Lu 9:52; 17:11). It is therefore more logical to suppose that the events described in Lu 10:38-41, falling within the intervening period, took place in Bethany during an excursion of Jesus to Judea, and formed one of the several visits upon which the friendship recorded in Joh 11:3,5 was built. According to a fragment of a Coptic gospel belonging to the 2nd century (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 38, 39), Martha was present with the other two Marys at the empty grave of Jesus (compare Mt 28:1,11), and went and informed the disciples.

C. M. Kerr

MARTYR

mar'-ter (martus, Aeolic martur): One who gives heed, and so, a "witness," so translated in numerous passages, both as of one bearing testimony, and also as of one who is a spectator of anything (see WITNESS). In the King James Version rendered "martyr" in Ac 22:20, "thy martyr Stephen"; and Re 2:13, "Antipas my faithful martyr"; also 17:6, "the blood of the martyrs of Jesus," where alone the American Standard Revised Version retains "martyrs." These 3 passages are the beginning of the use of the word "martyr" for such witnesses as were faithful even unto death, its uniform modern use.

MARVEL; MARVELOUS

mar'-vel, mar'-vel-us (tamah, pala'; thaumazo, thaumastos): "To marvel" is the translation of tamah, "to wonder" (Ge 43:33; Ps 48:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "were amazed"; Ec 5:8); of thaumazo, "to admire," "wonder" (Mt 8:10,27; Mr 5:20; Joh 3:7; Ac 2:7; Re 17:7 the King James Version, etc.); "marvel" (substantive) occurs in the plural as translation of pala'," to distinguish," figuratively, "to make wonderful" (Ex 34:10, "I will do marvels, such as have not been wrought" (the Revised Version margin "created")); and of thaumastos (thauma) (2Co 11:14).

"Marvelous" is the translation of pala'," marvelous works" (1Ch 16:12,24; Ps 9:1); "marvelous things" (Job 5:9; 10:16; Ps 31:21; 118:23; Isa 29:14; Da 11:36; Zec 8:6, bis); "marvellously," pala' (Job 37:5; Hab 1:5 twice (tamah), "regard and wonder marvelously," literally, "marvel marvelously"); thaumastos, "admirable," "wonderful," is translated "marvelous" (Mt 21:42; 1Pe 2:9; Re 15:1,3, etc.).

In Apocrypha we have "marvel" (Ecclesiasticus 11:13; 47:17; 2 Macc 1:22; 7:12); "marvelleth" (Ecclesiasticus 40:7; 43:18); "marvellous" (The Wisdom of Solomon 10:17; 19:8, etc., mostly thaumazo and compounds).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "wonder" for "marvel" (Re 17:7)' "the marvel" for a "marvellous thing" (Joh 9:30); "marvelled" for "wondered" (Lu 8:25; 11:14); "marvelled at" for "admired" (2Th 1:10); "marveling" for "wondered" (Lu 9:43); "marvellous" for "wondrous" (1Ch 16:9;

Ps 105:2); "marvellous things" for "and wonders" (Job 9:10); "wonderful" for "marvellous" (Ps 139:14); for "marvelled" (Mt 9:8), "were afraid," and (Mr 12:17) "marvelled greatly" (different texts).

W. L. Walker

MARY

ma’-ri, mar’-i (Maria, Mariam, Greek form of Hebrew miryam):

I. DEFINITION AND QUESTIONS OF IDENTIFICATION

The Name Mary in the New Testament

II. MARY, THE VIRGIN

1. Mary in the Infancy Narratives

2. Mary at Cana

3. Mary and the Career of Jesus

4. Mary at the Cross

5. Mary in the Christian Community

6. Mary in Ecclesiastical Doctrine and Tradition

(1) Legend

(2) Dogma

(a) The Dogma of Her Sinlessness

(b) Dogma of Mary’s Perpetual Virginity

(c) Doctrine of Mary’s Glorification as the Object of Worship and Her Function as Intercessor

(3) Conclusion

III. MARY MAGDALENE

1. Mary Not the Sinful Woman of Luke 7

2. Mary Not a Nervous Wreck

IV. MARY OF BETHANY

1. Attack upon Luke’s Narrative

2. Evidence of Luke Taken Alone

3. Evidence Sifted by Comparison

4. Character of Mary

V. MARY, THE MOTHER OF JAMES AND JOSES

VI. MARY, THE MOTHER OF JOHN MARK

I. Definition and Questions of Identification.

A Hebrew feminine proper name of two persons in the Old Testament (see Ex 15:20; Nu 12:1; Mic 6:4; 1Ch 4:17) and of a number not certainly determined in the New Testament. The prevalence of the name in New Testament times has been attributed, with no great amount of certainty, to the popularity of Mariamne, the last representative of the Hasmonean family, who was the second wife of Herod I.

The Name Mary in the New Testament:

(1) The name Mary occurs in 51 passages of the New Testament to which the following group of articles is confined (see MIRIAM). Collating all these references we have the following apparent notes of identification:

(a) Mary, the mother of Jesus;

(b) Mary Magdalene;

(c) Mary, the mother of James;

(d) Mary, the mother of Joses;

(e) Mary, the wife of Clopas;

(f) Mary of Bethany;

(g) Mary, the mother of Mark;

(h) Mary of Rome;

(i) the "other" Mary.

(2) A comparison of Mt 27:56; 28:1 with Mr 15:47 seems clearly to identify the "other" Mary with Mary the mother of Joses.

(3) Mr 15:40 identifies Mary the mother of James and Mary the mother of Joses (compare Mr 15:47) (see Allen's note on Mt 27:56).

(4) At this point a special problem of identification arises. Mary, the wife of Clopas, is mentioned as being present at the cross with Mary the mother of Jesus, the latter's sister and Mary of Magdala (Joh 19:25). In the other notices of the group at the cross, Mary, the mother of James, is mentioned (Mt 27:56; Mr 15:40). Elsewhere, James is regularly designated "son of Alpheus" (Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:15). Since it can hardly be doubted that James, the apostle, and James the Less, the son of Mary, are one and the same person, the conclusion seems inevitable that Mary, the mother of James, is also the wife of Alpheus. Here we might stop and leave the wife of Clopas unidentified, but the fact that the name Alpheus (Alphaios) is the Greek transliteration of the Aramaic chalpay, together with the unlikelihood that anyone important enough to be mentioned by John would be omitted by the synoptists and that another Mary, in addition to the three definitely mentioned, could be present and not be mentioned, points to the conclusion that the wife of Clopas is the same person as the wife of Alpheus (see ALPHAEUS). Along with this reasonable conclusion has grown, as an excrescence, another for which there is no basis whatever; namely, that the wife of Clopas was the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus. This would make the apostle James the cousin of Jesus, and, by an extension of the idea, would identify James, the apostle, with James, the "Lord's brother." The available evidence is clearly against both these inferences (see Mt 13:55; Mr 6:3; Ga 1:19).

(5) One other possible identification is offered for our consideration. Zahn, in an exceedingly interesting note (New Testament, II, 514), identifies Mary of Rome (Ro 16:6) with the "other" Mary of Matthew. We need not enter into a discussion of the point thus raised, since the identification of a woman of whom we have no details given is of little more than academic interest.

We are left free, however, by the probabilities of the case to confine our attention to the principal individuals who bear the name of Mary. We shall discuss Mary, the mother of Jesus; Mary of Magdala; Mary of Bethany; Mary, the mother of James and Joses; Mary, the mother of Mark.

II. Mary, the Virgin.

The biography of the mother of Jesus is gathered about a brief series of episodes which serve to exhibit her leading characteristics in clear light. Two causes have operated to distort and make unreal the very clear and vivid image of Mary left for us in the Gospels. Roman Catholic dogmatic and sentimental exaggeration has well-nigh removed Mary from history (see IMMACULATE CONCEPTION). On the other hand, reaction and overemphasis upon certain features of the Gospel narrative have led some to credit Mary with a negative attitude toward our Lord and His claims, which she assuredly never occupied. It is very important that we should follow the narrative with unprejudiced eyes and give due weight to each successive episode.

Mary appears in the following passages: the Infancy narratives, Mt 1 and 2; Lu 1 and 2; the wedding at Cana of Galilee, Joh 2:1-11; the episode of Mt 12:46; Mr 3:21,31 ff; the incident at the cross, Joh 19:25 ff; the scene in the upper chamber, Ac 1:14.

1. Mary in the Infancy Narratives:

(1) It is to be noted, first of all, that Mary and her experiences form the narrative core of both Infancy documents. This is contrary to the ordinary opinion, but is unquestionably true. She is obviously the object of special interest to Luke (see Ramsay, Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? 76 f), and there are not wanting indications that Luke's story came from Mary herself. But, while Matthew's account does not exhibit his interest in Mary quite so readily, that he was interested in the pathetic story of the Lord's mother is evident.

Luke tells the story of Mary's inward and deeply personal experiences, her call (1:26 f), her maidenly fears (1:29,35), her loyal submission (1:38), her outburst of sacred and unselfish joy (1:39-55). From this anticipatory narrative he passes at once to the Messianic fulfillment.

Matthew tells the story of the outward and, so to say, public experiences of Mary which follow hard upon the former and are in such dramatic contrast with them: the shame and suspicion which fell upon her (1:18); her bitter humiliation (1:19), her ultimate vindication (1:20 f). Here the two narratives supplement each other by furnishing different details but, as in other instances, converge upon the central fact—the central fact here being Mary herself, her character, her thoughts, her experiences. The point to be emphasized above all others is that we have real biography, although in fragments; in that the same person appears in the inimitable reality of actual characterization, in both parts of the story. This is sufficient guaranty of historicity; for no two imaginary portraits ever agreed unless one copied the other —which is evidently not the case here. More than this, the story is a truly human narrative in which the remarkable character of the events which took place in her life only serves to bring into sharper relief the simple, humble, natural qualities of the subject of them.

(2) One can hardly fail to be impressed, in studying Mary's character with her quietness of spirit; her meditative inwardness of disposition; her admirable self-control; her devout and gracious gift of sacred silence. The canticle (Lu 1:46-55), which at least expresses Luke's conception of her nature, indicates that she is not accustomed to dwell much upon herself (4 lines only call particular attention to herself),

and that her mind is saturated with the spirit and phraseology of the Old Testament. The intensely Jewish quality of her piety thus expressed accounts for much that appears anomalous in her subsequent career as depicted in the Gospels.

2. Mary at Cana:

The first episode which demands our attention is the wedding at Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:1-11). The relationship between Jesus and His mother has almost eclipsed other interests in the chapter. It is to be noted that the idea of wanton interference on the part of Mary and of sharp rebuke on the part of Jesus is to be decisively rejected. The key to the meaning of this episode is to be found in 4 simple items:

(1) in a crisis of need, Mary turns naturally to Jesus as to the one from whom help is to be expected;

(2) she is entirely undisturbed by His reply, whatever its meaning may be;

(3) she prepares the way for the miracle by her authoritative directions to the servants;

(4) Jesus does actually relieve the situation by an exercise of power.

Whether she turned to Jesus with distinctly Messianic expectation, or whether Jesus intended to convey a mild rebuke for her eagerness, it is not necessary for us to inquire, as it is not possible for us to determine. It is enough that her spontaneous appeal to her Son did not result in disappointment, since, in response to her suggestion or, at least, in harmony with it, He "manifested his glory." The incident confirms the Infancy narrative in which Mary’s quiet and forceful personality is exhibited.

3. Mary and the Career of Jesus:

In Mt 12:46 (parallel Mr 3:31-35), we are told that, when His mother and His brethren came seeking Him, Jesus in the well-known remark concerning His true relatives in the kingdom of heaven intended to convey a severe rebuke to His own household for an action which involved both unbelief and presumptuous interference in His great life-work. The explanation of this incident, which involves no such painful implications as have become connected with it in the popular mind, is to be found in Mark’s account. He interrupts his narrative of the arrival of the relatives (which belongs in Mr 3:21) by the account of the accusation made by the scribes from Jerusalem that the power of Jesus over demons was due to Beelzebub. This goes a long way toward explaining the anxiety felt by the relatives of Jesus, since the ungoverned enthusiasm of the multitude. which gave Him no chance to rest and seemed to threaten His health, was matched, contrariwise, by the bitter, malignant opposition of the authorities, who would believe any malicious absurdity rather than that His power came from God. The vital point is that the attempt of Mary and her household to get possession of the person of Jesus, in order to induce Him to go into retirement for a time, was not due to captious and interfering unbelief, but to loving anxiety. The words of Jesus have the undoubted ring of conscious authority and express the determination of one who wills the control of his own life—but it is a serious mistake to read into them

any faintest accent of satire. It has been well said (Horace Bushnell, Sermons on Living Subject, 30) that Jesus would scarcely make use of the family symbolism to designate the sacred relationships of the kingdom of heaven, while, at the same time, He was depreciating the value and importance of the very relationships which formed the basis of His analogy. The real atmosphere of the incident is very different from this.

4. Mary at the Cross:

To be sure that many have misinterpreted the above incident we need only turn to the exquisitely tender scene at the cross recorded by John (19:25 ff). This scene, equally beautiful whether one considers the relationship which it discloses as existing between Jesus and His mother, or between Jesus and His well-beloved disciple removes all possible ambiguity which might attach to the preceding incidents, and reveals the true spirit of the Master's home. Jesus could never have spoken as He did from the cross unless He had consistently maintained the position and performed the duties of an eldest son. The tone and quality of the scene could never have been what it is had there not been a steadfast tie of tender love and mutual understanding between Jesus and His mother. Jesus could hand over His sacred charge to the trustworthy keeping of another, because He had faithfully maintained it Himself.

5. Mary in the Christian Community:

The final passage which we need to consider (Ac 1:14) is especially important because in it we discover Mary and her household at home in the midst of the Christian community, engaged with them in prayer. It is also clear that Mary herself and the family, who seemed to be very completely under her influence, whatever may have been their earlier misgivings, never broke with the circle of disciples, and persistently kept within the range of experiences which led at last to full-orbed Christian faith. This makes it sufficiently evident, on the one hand, that the household never shared the feelings of the official class among the Jews; and, on the other, that the family of Jesus passed through the same cycle of experiences which punctuated the careers of the whole body of disciples on the way to faith. The beating of this simple but significant fact upon the historical trustworthiness of the body of incidents just passed in review is evident.

The sum of the matter concerning Mary seems to be this: The mother of Jesus was a typical Jewish believer of the best sort. She was a deeply meditative, but by no means a daring or original thinker. Her inherited Messianic beliefs did not and perhaps could not prepare her for the method of Jesus which involved so much that was new and unexpected. But her heart was true, and from the beginning to the day of Pentecost, she pondered in her heart the meaning of her many puzzling experiences until the light came. The story of her life and of her relationship to Jesus is consistent throughout and touched with manifold unconscious traits of truth. Such a narrative could not have been feigned or fabled.

6. Mary in Ecclesiastical Doctrine and Tradition:

(1) Legend.

The ecclesiastical treatment of Mary consists largely of legend and dogma, about equally fictitious and unreliable. The legendary accounts, which include the apocryphal gospels, deal, for the most part, with details tails of her parentage and early life; her betrothal and marriage to Joseph; her journey to Bethlehem and the birth of her child. At this point the legendary narratives, in their crass wonder-mongering and indelicate intimacy of detail, are in striking contrast to the chaste reserve of the canonical story, and of evidential value on that account.

(2) Dogma.

There is, in addition, a full-grown legend concerning Mary's later life in the house of John; of her death in which the apostles were miraculously allowed to participate; her bodily translation to heaven; her reception at the hands of Jesus and her glorification in heaven. In this latter series of statements, we have already made the transition from legend to dogma. It is quite clear, from the statements of Roman Catholic writers themselves, that no reliable historical data are to be found among these legendary accounts. The general attitude of modern writers is exhibited in the following sentences (from Wilhelm and Scannel, Manual of Catholic Theology, II, 220, quoted by Mayor, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, II, 288, note): "Mary's corporeal assumption into heaven is so thoroughly implied in the notion of her personality as given by Bible and dogma, that the church, can dispense with strict historical evidence of the fact." If that is the way one feels, there is very little to say about it. Aside from the quasi-historical dogma of Mary's bodily assumption, the Roman Catholic doctrinal interpretation of her person falls into three parts.

(a) The Dogma of Her Sinlessness:

This is discussed under IMMACULATE CONCEPTION (which see) and need not detain us here.

(b) Dogma of Mary's Perpetual Virginity:

It is evident that this, too, is a doctrine of such a nature that its advocates might, with advantage to their argument, have abstained from the appearance of critical discussion.

Even if all the probabilities of exegesis are violated and the cumulative evidence that Mary had other children done away with; if the expression, "brethren of the Lord" is explained as "foster-brethren," "cousins" or what-not; if Jesus is shown to be not only "first-born" but "only-born" Son (Lu 2:7); if the expression of Mt 1:25 is interpreted as meaning "up to and beyond" (Pusey, et al.; compare Roman Catholic Dict., 604), it would still be as far as possible from a demonstration of the dogma. That a married woman has no children is no proof of virginity—perpetual or otherwise. That this thought has entered the minds of Roman Catholic apologists although not openly expressed by them, is evidenced by the fact that while certain forms of dealing with the "brethren-of-the-Lord" question make these the sons of Joseph by a former marriage, the favorite doctrine includes the perpetual virginity of Joseph. Just as the idea of the sinlessness of Mary has led to the dogma of the immaculate conception, so the idea of her perpetual virginity demands the ancillary notion of Joseph's. No critical or historical considerations are

of any possible use here. It is a matter of dogmatic assumption unmixed with any alloy of factual evidence, and might better be openly made such.

It is evident that a very serious moral issue is raised here. The question is not whether virginity is a higher form of life than marriage. One might be prepared to say that under certain circumstances it is. The point at issue here is very different. If Mary was married to Joseph and Joseph to Mary in appearance only, then they were recreant to each other and to the ordinance of God which made them one. How a Roman Catholic, to whom marriage is a sacrament, can entertain such a notion is an unfathomable mystery. The fact that Mary was miraculously the mother of the Messiah has nothing to do with the question of her privilege and obligation in the holiest of human relationships. Back of this unwholesome dogma are two utterly false ideas: that the marriage relationship is incompatible with holy living, and that Mary is not to be considered a human being under the ordinary obligations of human life.

(c) Doctrine of Mary's Glorification as the Object of Worship and Her Function as Intercessor: With no wish to be polemic toward Roman Catholicism, and, on the contrary, with every desire to be sympathetic, it is very difficult to be patient with the puerilities which disfigure the writings of Roman Catholic dogmaticians in the discussion of this group of doctrines.

(i) Take, for example, the crude literalism involved in the identification of the woman of Re 12:1-6 with Mary. Careful exegesis of the passage (especially 12:6), in connection with the context, makes it clear that no hint of Mary's status in heaven is intended. As a matter of fact, Mary, in any literal sense, is not referred to at all. Mary's motherhood along with that of the mother of Moses is very likely the basis of the figure, but the woman of the vision is the church, which is, at once, the mother and the body of her Lord (see Milligan, Expositors' Bible, "Revelation," 196 f).

Three other arguments are most frequently used to justify the place accorded to Mary in the liturgy.

(ii) Christ's perpetual humanity leads to His perpetual Sonship to Mary. This argument, if it carries any weight at all, in this connection, implies that the glorified Lord Jesus is still subject to His mother. It is, however, clear from the Gospels that the subjection to His parents which continued after the incident in the Temple (Lu 2:51) was gently but firmly laid aside at the outset of the public ministry (see above, II, 2, 3). In all that pertains to His heavenly office, as Lord, Mary's position is one of dependence, not of authority.

(iii) Christ hears her prayers. Here, again, dogmatic assumption is in evidence. That He hears her prayers, even if true in a very special sense, does not, in the least, imply that prayers are to be addressed to her or that she is an intercessor through whom prayers may be addressed to Him.

(iv) Since Mary cared for the body of Christ when He was on earth, naturally His spiritual body would be her special care in heaven. But, on any reasonable hypothesis, Mary was, is, and must remain, a part of that body (see Ac 1:14). Unless she is intrinsically a Divine being, her care for the church cannot

involve her universal presence in it and her accessibility to the prayers of her fellow-believers.

To a non-Romanist, the most suggestive fact in the whole controversy is that the statements of cautious apologists in support of the ecclesiastical attitude toward Mary, do not, in the least degree, justify the tone of extravagant adulation which marks the non-polemical devotional literature of the subject (see Dearden, Modern Romanism Examined, 22 f).

(3) Conclusion.

Our conclusion on the whole question is that the literature of Mariolatry belongs, historically, to unauthorized speculation; and, psychologically, to the natural history of asceticism and clerical celibacy.

III. Mary Magdalene

(Maria Magdalene = of "Magdala").—A devoted follower of Jesus who entered the circle of the taught during the Galilean ministry and became prominent during the last days. The noun "Magdala," from which the adjective "Magdalene" is formed, does not occur in the Gospels (the word in Mt 15:39, is, of course, "Magadan"). The meaning of this obscure reference is well summarized in the following quotations from Plummer (International Critical Commentary, "Luke," 215): "'Magdala is only the Greek form of mighdol or watch-tower, one of the many places of the name in Palestine' (Tristram, Bible Places, 260); and is probably represented by the squalid group of hovels which now bears the name of Mejdel near the center of the western shore of the lake."

1. Mary not the Sinful Woman of Luke 7:

As she was the first to bear witness to the resurrection of Jesus, it is important that we should get a correct view of her position and character. The idea that she was a penitent, drawn from the life of the street, undoubtedly arose, in the first instance, from a misconception of the nature of her malady, together with an altogether impossible identification of her with the woman who was a sinner of the preceding section of the Gospel. It is not to be forgotten that the malady demon-possession, according to New Testament ideas (see DEMON, DEMONOLOGY), had none of the implications of evil temper and malignant disposi-tion popularly associated with "having a devil." The possessed was, by our Lord and the disciples looked upon as diseased, the victim of an alien and evil power, not an accomplice of it. Had this always been understood and kept in mind, the unfortunate identification of Mary with the career of public prostitution would have been much less easy.

According to New Testament usage, in such cases the name would have been withheld (compare Lu 7:37; Joh 8:3). At the same time the statement that 7 demons had been cast out of Mary means either that the malady was of exceptional severity, possibly involving several relapses (compare Lu 11:26), or that the mode of her divided and haunted consciousness (compare Mr 5:9) suggested the use of the number 7. Even so, she was a healed invalid, not a rescued social derelict.

The identification of Mary with the sinful woman is, of course, impossible for one who follows carefully the course of the narrative with an eye to the transitions. The woman of Luke 7 is carefully covered with the concealing cloak of namelessness. Undoubtedly known by name to the intimate circle of first disciples, it is extremely doubtful whether she was so known to Luke. Her history is definitely closed at 7:50.

The name of Mary is found at the beginning of a totally new section of the Gospel (see Plummer's analysis, op. cit., xxxvii), where the name of Mary is introduced with a single mark of identification, apart from her former residence, which points away from the preceding narrative and is incompatible with it. If the preceding account of the anointing were Mary's introduction into the circle of Christ's followers, she could not be identified by the phrase of Luke. Jesus did not cast a demon out of the sinful woman of Luke 7, and Mary of Magdala is not represented as having anointed the Lord's feet. The two statements cannot be fitted together.

2. Mary Not a Nervous Wreck:

Mary has been misrepresented in another way, scarcely less serious. She was one of the very first witnesses to the resurrection, and her testimony is of sufficient importance to make it worth while for those who antagonize the narrative to discredit her testimony. This is done, on the basis of her mysterious malady, by making her a paranoiac who was in the habit of "seeing things." Renan is the chief offender in this particular, but others have followed his example.

(1) To begin with, it is to be remarked that Mary had been cured of her malady in such a marked way that, henceforth, throughout her life, she was a monument to the healing power of Christ. What He had done for her became almost a part of her name along with the name of her village. It is not to be supposed that a cure so signal would leave her a nervous wreck, weak of will, wavering in judgment, the victim of hysterical tremors and involuntary hallucinations.

(2) There is more than this a priori consideration against such an interpretation of Mary. She was the first at the tomb (Mt 28:1; Mr 16:1; Lu 24:10). But she was also the last at the cross—she and her companions (Mt 27:61; Mr 15:40). A glance at the whole brief narrative of her life in the Gospels will interpret this combination of statements. Mary first appears near the beginning of the narrative of the Galilean ministry as one of a group consisting of "many" (Lu 8:3), among them Joanna, wife of Chuzas, Herod's steward, who followed with the Twelve and ministered to them of their substance. Mary then disappears from the text to reappear as one of the self-appointed watchers of the cross, thereafter to join the company of witnesses to the resurrection. The significance of these simple statements for the understanding of Mary's character and position among the followers of Jesus is not far to seek. She came into the circle of believers, marked out from the rest by an exceptional experience of the Lord's healing power. Henceforth, to the very end, with unwearied devotion, with intent and eager willingness, with undaunted courage even in the face of dangers which broke the courage of the chosen Twelve, she followed and served her Lord. It is impossible that such singleness of purpose, such strength of will, and, above all, such courage in danger, should have been exhibited by a weak, hysterical, neurotic incurable.

The action of these women of whom Mary was one, in serving their Master's need while in life, and in administering the last rites to His body in death, is characteristic of woman at her best.

IV. Mary of Bethany.

Another devoted follower of Jesus. She was a resident of Bethany (Bethania), and a member of the family consisting of a much-beloved brother, Lazarus, and another sister, Martha, who made a home for Jesus within their own circle whenever He was in the neighborhood.

The one descriptive reference, aside from the above, connected with Mary, has caused no end of perplexity. John (11:2) states that it was this Mary who anointed the Lord with ointment and wiped His feet with her hair, whose brother Lazarus was sick. This reference would be entirely satisfied by the narrative of Joh 12:1,8, and no difficulty would be suggested, were it not for the fact that Luke (7:36-50) records an anointing of Jesus by a woman, accompanied with the wiping of His feet with her hair. The identification of these two anointings would not occasion any great difficulty, in spite of serious discrepancies as to time, place and other accessories of the action, but for the very serious fact that the woman of Lu 7 is described as a sinner in the dreadful special sense associated with that word in New Testament times. This is so utterly out of harmony with all that we know of Mary and the family at Bethany as to be a well-nigh intolerable hypothesis.

On the other hand, we are confronted with at least one serious difficulty in affirming two anointings. This is well stated by Mayor (Hastings Dictionary Bible, III, 280a): "Is it likely that our Lord would have uttered such a high encomium upon Mary's act if she were only following the example already set by the sinful woman of Galilee; or (taking the other view) if she herself were only repeating under more favorable circumstances the act of loving devotion for which she had already received His commendation?" We shall be compelled to face this difficulty in case we are forced to the conclusion that there were more anointings than one.

1. Attack upon Luke's Narrative:

In the various attempts to solve this problem, or rather group of problems, otherwise than by holding to two anointings, Luke, who stands alone against Mark, Matthew and John, has usually suffered loss of confidence. Mayor (op. cit., 282a) suggests the possibility that the text of Luke has been tampered with, and that originally his narrative contained no reference to anointing. This is a desperate expedient which introduces more difficulties than it solves. Strauss and other hostile critics allege confusion on the part of Luke between the anointing at Bethany and the account of the woman taken in adultery, but, as Plummer well says, the narrative shows no signs of confusion. "The conduct both of Jesus and of the woman is unlike either fiction or clumsily distorted fact. His gentle severity toward Simon, and tender reception of the sinner, are as much beyond the reach of invention as the eloquence of her speechless affection" (International Critical Commentary, "Luke," 209).

2. Evidence of Luke Taken Alone:

The first step in the solution of this difficulty is to note carefully the evidence supplied by Luke's narrative taken by itself. Mary is named for the first time in Lu 10:38-42 in a way which clearly indicates that the family of Bethany is there mentioned for the first time (a "certain tis woman named Martha," and "she had a sister called Mary," etc.). This phrasing indicates the introduction of a new group of names (compare Joh 11:1). It is also a clear indication of the fact that Luke does not identify Mary with the sinful woman of Luke 7 (compare Mt 26:6-13; Mr 14:3-9; Lu 7:36-50; Joh 12:1-8).

3. Evidence Sifted by Comparison:

Our next task is to note carefully the relationship between the narratives of Mark, Matthew and John on one side, and that of Luke on the other. We may effectively analyze the narratives under the following heads:

(1) notes of time and place;

(2) circumstances and scenery of the incident;

(3) description of the person who did the anointing;

(4) complaints of her action, by whom and for what;

(5) the lesson drawn from the woman's action which constitutes our Lord's defense of it;

(6) incidental features of the narrative.

Under

(1) notice that all three evangelists place the incident near the close of the ministry and at Bethany.
Under

(2) it is important to observe that Matthew and Mark place the scene in the house of Simon "the leper," while John states vaguely that a feast was made for Him by persons not named and that Martha served.
Under

(3) we observe that Matthew and Mark say "a woman," while John designates Mary.

(4) According to Matthew, the disciples found fault; according to Mark, some of those present found fault; while according to John, the fault-finder was Judas Iscariot. According to all three, the ground or complaint is the alleged wastefulness of the action.

(5) Again, according to all three, our Lord defended the use made of the ointment by a mysterious

reference to an anointing of His body for the burial. John’s expression in particular is most interesting and peculiar (see Joh 12:7).

(6) The Simon in whose house the incident is said to have taken place is by Matthew and Mark designated "the leper." This must mean either that he had previously been cured or that his disease had manifested itself subsequent to the feast. Of these alternatives the former is the more natural (see Gould, International Critical Commentary, "Mark," 257). The presence of a healed leper on this occasion, together with the specific mention of Lazarus as a guest, would suggest that the feast was given by people, in and about Bethany, who had especial reason to be grateful to Jesus for the exercise of His healing power.

It is beyond reasonable doubt that the narratives of Matthew, Mark and John refer to the same incident. The amount of convergence and the quality of it put this identification among the practical certainties. The only discrepancies of even secondary importance are a difference of a few days in the time (Gould says four) and the detail as to the anointing of head or feet. It is conceivable, and certainly no very serious matter, that John assimilated his narrative at this point to the similar incident of Lu 7.

An analysis of the incident of Lu 7 with reference to the same points of inquiry discloses the fact that it cannot be the same as that described by the other evangelists.

(1) The time and place indications, such as they are, point to Galilee and the Galilean ministry. This consideration alone is a formidable obstacle in the way of any such identification.

(2) The immediate surroundings are different. Simon "the leper" and Simon "the Pharisee" can hardly be one person. No man could have borne both of these designations. In addition to this, it is difficult to believe that a Pharisee of Simon’s temper would have entertained Jesus when once he had been proscribed by the authorities. Simon’s attitude was a very natural one at the beginning of Christ’s ministry, but the combination of hostility and questioning was necessarily a temporary mood.

(3) The description of the same woman as sinner in the sense of Lu 7 in one Gospel; simply as a woman in two others; and as the beloved and honored Mary of Bethany in a third is not within the range of probability, especially as there is no hint of an attempt at explanation on the part of any of the writers. At any rate, prima facie, this item in Luke’s description is seriously at variance with the other narratives.

(4) Luke is again at variance with the others, if he is supposed to refer to the same event, in the matter of the complaint and its cause. In Luke’s account there is no complaint of the woman’s action suggested. There is no hint that anybody thought or pretended to think that she had committed a sinful waste of precious material. The only complaint is Simon’s, and that is directed against the Lord Himself, because Simon, judging by himself, surmised that Jesus did not spurn the woman because He did not know her character. This supposed fact had a bearing on the question of our Lord’s Messiahship, concerning which Simon was debating; otherwise one suspects he had little interest in the episode. This fact is, as we shall see, determinative for the understanding of the incident and puts it apart from all other similar

episodes.

(5) The lesson drawn from the act by our Lord was in each incident different. The sinful woman was commended for an act of courtesy and tenderness which expressed a love based upon gratitude for deliverance and forgiveness. Mary was commended for an act which had a mysterious and sacramental relationship to the Lord's death, near at hand.

This brings us to the point where we may consider the one serious difficulty, that alleged by Mayor and others, against the hypothesis of two anointings, namely, that a repetition of an act like this with commendation attached would not be likely to occur. The answer to this argument is that the difficulty itself is an artificial one due to a misreading of the incident. In the point of central reference the two episodes are worlds apart. The act of anointing in each case was secondary, not primary. Anointing was one of those general and prevalent acts of social courtesy which might mean much or little, this or that, and might be repeated a score of times in a year with a different meaning each time. The matter of primary importance in every such case would be the purpose and motive of the anointing. By this consideration alone we may safely discriminate between these incidents. In the former case, the motive was to express the love of a forgiven penitent. In the latter, the motive was gratitude for something quite different, a beloved brother back from the grave, and, may we not say (in view of Joh 12:7), grief and foreboding? That Mary's feeling was expressed in the same way outwardly as that of the sinful woman of the early ministry does not change the fact that the feeling was different, that the act was different and that, consequently, the commendation she received, being for a different thing, was differently expressed. The two anointings are not duplicates. Mary's act, though later, was quite as spontaneous and original as that of the sinful woman, and the praise bestowed upon her quite as natural and deserved.

4. Character of Mary:

With this fictitious and embarrassing identification out of the way, we are now free to consider briefly the career and estimate the character of Mary.

(1) At the outset it is worth mentioning that we have in the matter of these two sisters a most interesting and instructive point of contact between the synoptic and Johannine traditions. The underlying unity and harmony of the two are evident here as elsewhere. In Lu 10:38-42 we are afforded a view of Mary and Martha photographic in its clear revelation of them both. Martha is engaged in household affairs, while Mary is sitting at the feet of Jesus, absorbed in listening. This, of course, might mean that Mary was idle and listless, leaving the burden of responsibility for the care of guests upon her more conscientious sister. Most housewives are inclined to take this view and to think that Martha has been hardly dealt with. The story points to the contrary. It will be noticed that Mary makes no defense of herself and that the Master makes no criticism of Martha until she criticizes Mary. When He does speak, it is with the characteristic and inimitable gentleness, but in a way leaving nothing to be desired in the direction of completeness. He conveyed His love, His perfect understanding of the situation, His defense of Mary, His rebuke to Martha, in a single sentence which contains a perfect photograph of the two loved sisters. Martha is not difficult to identify. She was just one of those excellent and tiresome women whose fussy

concern and bustling anxiety about the details of household management make their well-meant hospitality a burden to all their guests. Mary's quiet and restful interest in the guest and His conversation must be set against the foil of Martha's excess of concern in housework and the serving of food. When one comes to think of it, Mary chose the better part of hospitality, to put no higher construction upon her conduct.

(2) In Joh 11:20, we are told that Martha went forth to meet Jesus while Mary remained in the house. In this we have no difficulty in recognizing the same contrast of outwardness and inwardness in the dispositions of the sisters; especially, as when Mary does come at Martha's call to meet Jesus, she exhibits an intensity of feeling of which Martha gives no sign. It is significant that, while Mary says just what Martha had already said (11:21,32), her way of saying it and her manner as a whole so shakes the Lord's composure that He is unable to answer her directly but addresses His inquiry to the company in general (11:34).

(3) Then we come to the events of the next chapter. The supper is given in Bethany. Martha serves. Of course she serves. She always serves when there is opportunity. Waiting on guests, plate in hand, was the innocent delight of her life. One cannot fail to see that, in a single incidental sentence, the Martha of Lu 10:38-42 is sketched again in lifelikeness. It is the same Martha engaged in the same task. But what of Mary in this incident? She is shown in an unprecedented role, strange to an oriental woman and especially to one so retiring in disposition as Mary. Her action not only thrust her into a public place alone, but brought her under outspoken criticism. But after all, this is just what we come to expect from these deep, intense, silent natures. The Mary who sat at Jesus' feet in listening silence while Martha bustled about the house, who remained at home while Martha went out to meet Him, is the very one to hurl herself at His feet in a storm and passion of tears when she does meet Him and to break out in a self-forgetful public act of devotion, strange to her modest disposition, however native to her deep emotion.

Martha was a good and useful woman. No one would deny that, least of all the Master who loved her (Joh 11:5). But she lived on the surface of things, and her affections and her piety alike found adequate and satisfying expression at all times in the ordinary kindly offices of hospitality and domestic service. Not so Mary. Her disposition was inward, silent, brooding, with a latent capacity for stress and the forthwith, unconventional expression of feelings, slowly gathering intensity through days of thought and repression. Mary would never be altogether at home in the world of affairs. Hers was a rare spirit, doomed often to loneliness and misunderstanding except at the hands of rarely discerning spirits, such as she happily met in the person of her Lord.

V. Mary, the Mother of James and Joses.

Under this caption it is necessary merely to recall and set in order the few facts concerning this Mary given in the Gospels (see Mt 27:55,56,61; Mr 15:40; 16:1; Lu 24:10; compare Lu 23:49-56).

In Mt 27:55,56 (parallel Mr 15:40), we are told that at the time of the crucifixion there was a group of women observing the event from a distance. These women are said to have followed Jesus from Galilee,

ministering to Him and to the disciples. Among these were Mary Magdalene (see III, above); Mary, mother of James and Joses; and the unnamed mother of Zebedee's children. By reference to Lu 8:2,3, where this group is first introduced, it appears that, as a whole, it was composed of those who had been healed of infirmities of one kind or another. Whether this description applies individually to Mary or not we cannot be sure, but it is altogether probable. At any rate, it is certain that Mary was one who persistently followed with the disciples and ministered of her substance to aid and comfort the Lord in His work for others. The course of the narrative seems to imply that Mary's sons accompanied their mother on this ministering journey and that one of them became an apostle. It is interesting to note that two mothers with their sons joined the company of the disciples and that three out of the four became members of the apostolic group. Another item in these only too fragmentary references is that this Mary, along with her of Magdala and the others of this group, was of sufficient wealth and position to be marked among the followers of Jesus as serving in this particular way. The mention of Chuzas' wife (Lu 8:3) is an indication of the unusual standing of this company of faithful women.

The other notices of Mary show her lingering late at the cross (Mr 15:40); a spectator at the burial (Mr 15:47); and among the first to bear spices to the tomb. This is the whole of this woman's biography extant, but perhaps it is enough. We are told practically nothing, directly, concerning her; but, incidentally, she is known to be generous, faithful, loving, true and brave. She came in sorrow to the tomb to anoint the body of her dead Lord; she went away in joy to proclaim Him alive forevermore. A privilege to be coveted by the greatest was thus awarded to simple faith and trusting love.

VI. Mary, the Mother of John Mark.

This woman is mentioned but once in the New Testament (Ac 12:12), but in a connection to arouse intense interest. Since she was the mother of Mark, she was also, in all probability, the aunt of Barnabas. The aunt of one member and the mother of another of the earliest apostolic group is a woman of importance. The statement in Acts, so far as it concerns Mary, is brief but suggestive. Professor Ramsay (see Paul the Traveler, etc., 385) holds that the authority for this narrative was not Peter but Mark, the son of the house. This, if true, adds interest to the story as we have it. In the first place, the fact that Peter went thither directly upon his escape from prison argues that Mary's house was a well-known center of Christian life and worship. The additional fact that coming unannounced and casually the apostle found a considerable body of believers assembled points in the same direction. That "many" were gathered in the house at the same time indicates that the house was of considerable size. It also appears that Rhoda was only one of the maids, arguing a household of more than ordinary size. There is a tradition of doubtful authenticity, that Mary's house was the scene of a still more sacred gathering in the upper room on the night of the betrayal. We conclude that Mary was a wealthy widow of Jerusalem, who, upon becoming a disciple of Christ, with her son, gave herself with whole-souled devotion to Christian service, making her large and well-appointed house a place of meeting for the proscribed and homeless Christian communion whose benefactor and patron she thus became.

Louis Matthews Sweet

MARY, THE PASSING OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

MASALOTH

mas’-a-loth.

See MESALOTH.

MASCHIL

mas’-kil.

See PSALMS.

MASH

(mash): Named in Ge 10:23 as one of the sons of Aramaic In the parallel passage in 1Ch 1:17 the name is given as "Meshech" (meshekh), and the Septuagint (Mosoch) supports this form in both passages. "Meshech," however, is a Japhetic name (Ge 10:2), and "Mash" would seem to be the original reading. It is probably to be identified with the Mons Masius of classical writers (Strabo, etc.), on the northern boundary of Mesopotamia.

MASHAL

ma’-shal (mashal, 1Ch 6:74).

See MISHAL.

MASIAS

ma-si’-as (Codex Alexandrinus, Masias; Codex Vaticanus, Meisaias): The head of one of the families of Solomon’s servants (1 Esdras 5:34); it has no equivalent in the parallel Ezr 2:55 ff; the Revised Version margin "Missaias."

MASMAN

mas’-man.

See MAASMAS.

MASON

ma’-s’n: The translation of 4 Hebrew words:

(1) charash ‘ebhen, "graver of stone" (2Sa 5:11);

(2) (3) gadhar (2Ki 12:12), charash qur (1Ch 14:1), "maker of a wall (or hedge)";

(4) chatsabh, "a hewer or digger (of stones)" (1Ch 22:2; Ezr 3:7).

Lebanon still supplies the greater number of skilled masons to Palestine and Syria (see 2Sa 5:11), those of Shweir being in special repute.

See CRAFTS, II, 8; also ARCHITECTURE; BUILDING; GEBAL; HOUSE.

MASPHA

mas’-fa (1 Macc 3:46, the Revised Version (British and American) "Mizpeh").

See MIZPEH, 4.

MASREKAH

mas’-re-ka, mas-re’-ka (masreqah; Masekka): A place mentioned in the list of ancient rulers of Edom (Ge 36:31), "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel." Masrekah was the royal city of Samlah, son of Hadad (Ge 36:36; 1Ch 1:47). The name may mean "place of choice vines," but there is nothing to show in what locality it must be sought.

MASSA

mas’-a (massa’," burden"): Descendant of Abraham through Ishmael (Ge 25:14; 1Ch 1:30). His people may be the Masani of Ptolemy, having Eastern Arabia near Babylon as their habitat. The marginal reading of the heading to Pr 31 mentions Lemuel as king of Massa. If that reading is accepted, it would seem that a tribe and probably a place were named from Ishmael’s descendant. The reading is doubtful, however, for where the phrase recurs in Pr 30 (Revised Version (British and American)) it appears to be a gloss.

MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENTS

mas’-a-ker.

See INNOCENTS, MASSACRE OF THE.

MASSAH AND MERIBAH

mas’-a, mer’-i-ba (maccah umeribhah, "proving and strife"; peirasmos kai loidoresis): These names occur together as applied to one place only in Ex 17:7; they stand, however, in parallelism in De 33:8; Ps 95:8. In all other cases they are kept distinct, as belonging to two separate narratives. The conjunction here may be due to conflation of the sources. Of course, it is not impossible that, for the reason stated, the double name was given, although elsewhere (De 6:16; 9:22) the place is referred to as Massah.

1. First Instance:

This scene is laid in Ex 17:1 at REPHIDIM (which see) and in 17:6 at HOREB (which see). It is near the beginning of the desert wanderings. In dearth of water the people murmur and complain. Moses, appealing to God, is told what to do. He takes with him the elders of Israel, and smites with his rod the rock on which the Lord stands in Horeb, whereupon water gushes forth, and the people drink. Here Moses alone is God’s agent. There is no hint of blame attaching to him. He called the place Massah and Meribah, because of the of the striving of the children of Israel, and because they tempted the Lord (17:7). In some way not indicated, here and at Meribah, God put the Levites to proof (De 33:8).

2. Second Instance:

The second narrative describes what took place at Kadesh (i.e. "Kadesh-barnea") when the desert wanderings were nearly over (Nu 20:1-13). The flow of water from the famous spring for some reason had ceased. In their distress the people became impatient and petulant. At the door of the tent of meeting Moses and Aaron received the Lord’s instructions. In his speech of remonstrance to the people Moses seemed to glorify himself and his brother; and instead of speaking to the rock as God had commanded, he struck it twice with his rod. The flow of water was at once restored; but Moses and Aaron were heavily punished because they did not sanctify God in the eyes of the children of Israel. The "Waters of Meribah" was the name given to this scene of strife. The incident is referred to in Nu 20:24, and De 32:51 (merobhath qadhesh, the King James Version "Meribah-Kadesh," the Revised Version (British and American) "Meribah of Kadesh"). In Ps 81:7 God appears as having tested Israel here. The sin of Israel and the ensuing calamity to Moses are alluded to in Ps 106:32.

The place appears in Eze 47:19; 48:28, as on the southern border of the land of Israel, in the former as "Meriboth-kadesh," in the latter as "Meribath-kadesh" (Meriboth = plural Meribath =" construct singular") where the position indicated is that of ‘Ain Qadis, "Kadesh-barnea."

In De 33:2, by a slight emendation of the text we might read meribhoth qadhesh for meribhebhoth

qodhesh. This gives a preferable sense.

W. Ewing

MASSIAS

ma-si’-as (Codex Alexandrinus, Massias; Codex Vaticanus, Asseias): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:22) =" Maaseiah" of Ezr 10:22.

MAST

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3); 3.

MASTER

mas’-ter (’adhon, ba‘al, rabbi; despotes, didaskalos, kurios, rhabbi): "Master," when the translation of ‘adhon, "ruler," "lord" (Sir), often translated "lord," denotes generally the owner or master of a servant or slave (Ge 24:9, etc.; 39:2, etc.; Ex 21:4, etc.; De 23:15 bis; 2Sa 9:9,10 twice; Pr 30:10); elsewhere it is rather "lord" or "ruler" (often king, e.g. 1Sa 24:6,8; 26:16); in the plural ‘adhonim, it is, as the rule, used only of God (but see Ge 19:2,18; De 10:17; Ps 136:3, "Lord of lords"; Isa 26:13, "other lords"; 19:4 (Hebrew "lords"); 24:2). Ba‘al, "lord," "owner," is translated "master": "the master of the house" (Ex 22:8; Jud 19:22,23); "the ass his master’s crib" (Isa 1:3). We have it also translated "masters of assemblies" (Ec 12:11). See ASSEMBLIES, MASTERS OF. Compare Ecclesiasticus 32:1, "master (of a feast)," the Revised Version (British and American) "ruler"; Joh 2:9, "ruler of the feast"; [rabh] (Da 1:3; Jon 1:6, "shipmaster"); rabh, Aramaic, "great," "mighty," "elder" (Da 4:9; 5:11," master of the magicians"); also [sar], "head" or "chief" (Ex 1:11, "taskmasters"; 1Ch 15:27, "master of the song," the Revised Version margin "the carrying of the ark, Hebrew the lifting up"); ‘ur, "to call," "to awake," is also rendered "master" in the King James Version, "The Lord will cut off the man that doeth this, the master and the scholar," margin "him that waketh and him that answereth," the Revised Version (British and American) as the King James Version margin (Mal 2:12).

The verb "to master" does not occur in the Old Testament, but we have in Apocrypha (The Wisdom of Solomon 12:18) "mastering thy power" (despozon ischuos), the Revised Version (British and American) "being sovereign over (thy) strengh."

In the New Testament despotes answers to ‘adhon as "master" (1Ti 6:1,2; 2Ti 2:21), rendered also "Lord" (Lu 2:29, etc.); kurios, is "Master," "Lord," "Sir," used very frequently of God or of Christ (Mt 1:20,22,24), translated "Master" (Mt 6:24; 15:27; the King James Version Mr 13:35; Ro 14:4, etc.); kathegetes, a "leader," is translated "Master" (Mt 23:8 (the King James Version), 10); didaskalos, a title very often applied to our Lord in the Gospels, is "Teacher," translated "Master" in the King James Version Mt 8:19; 9:11; Mr 4:38; Lu 3:12, etc.; the Revised Version (British and American) "Teacher";

also Joh 3:2,10; Jas 3:1, "be not many masters," the Revised Version (British and American) "teachers"; rhabbi, rhabbei ("Rabbi") (a transliterated Hebrew term signifying "my Teacher") is also in several instances applied to Jesus, the King James Version "Master" (Mt 26:25,49; Mr 9:5; 11:21; Joh 9:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) leaves untranslated) Mr 10:51, "Rabboni," the King James Version "Lord"; Joh 20:16 ("Rabbouni"), the Revised Version (British and American) "Rabboni," which see).

For "master" the Revised Version (British and American) has "lord" (1Sa 26:16; 29:4,10; Am 4:1; Mr 13:35; Ro 14:4); "master" for "lord" (Ge 39:16; 2Pe 2:1; Re 6:10); for "good man of the house" (Mt 24:43; Lu 12:39), "master of the house"; in Eph 6:5, the Revised Version margin gives "Gr lords" (in 6:9, "their Master and yours" is also Greek kurios); instead of "the only Lord God and our Lord Jesus Christ" (Jude 1:4), the Revised Version (British and American) reads "our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ," margin "the only Master, and our Lord Jesus Christ"; for "overcame them" (Ac 19:16), "mastered both of them."

W. L. Walker

MASTERY

mas'-ter-i, gebhurah, shelet, Aramaic; agonizomai, athleo): "Mastery" occurs twice in the Old Testament and twice in the King James Version of the New Testament: in Ex 32:18 (gebhurah, "might"), "the voice of them that shout for mastery"; in Da 6:24 ([~shelet, "to have power"), "The lions had the mastery of them"; in 1Co 9:25, agonizomai, "to contend for a prize," to be a combatant in the public games, is translated "striveth for the mastery," the Revised Version (British and American) "striventh in the games"; and in 2Ti 2:5, athelo, with the same meaning, is translated "strive for masteries," the Revised Version (British and American) "contend in the games." From the Greek we have the words "athlete," etc..

W. L. Walker

MASTIC, MASTICK

mas'-tik (schinos): A tree mentioned only in Susanna verse 54 (compare Ge 37:25 margin). It is the Pistacia lentiscus (Arabic, Mistaki), a shrub which attains a height of 10 to 12 ft., growing in thickets on the slopes round the Mediterranean. The gum which exudes through incisions made in the bark is greatly prized as a masticatory. The smell and flavor are suggestive of the terebinth. It is chewed in order to preserve the teeth and gums. But often men chew it without any special purpose, just because they like it. The mastick produced in Chios is most highly esteemed. It is employed in making perfumes and sweetmeats; in preparing bread a little is sometimes added to the dough just before it is put into the oven.

W. Ewing

MATHANIAS

math-a-ni’-as: the King James Version in 1 Esdras 9:31.

See MATTHANIAS.

MATHELAS

ma-the’-las (Codex Alexandrinus, Mathelas; Codex Vaticanus, Maeelas; the King James Version Matthelas): One of the priests who had married "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:19) =" Maaseiah" of Ezr 10:18.

MATHUSALA

ma-thu’-sa-la (Mathousala): Greek form of "Methuselah," the Revised Version (British and American) (Lu 3:37 the King James Version).

MATRED

ma’-tred (maTredh, "expulsion"): The mother of Mehetabel, wife of Hadar, one of the kings of Edom (Ge 36:39; 1Ch 1:50, "Hadad"). The Septuagint and Peshitta designate Matred as male, i.e. as son of Mezahab instead of daughter.

MATRI

ma’-tri (maTri, "rainy"): A family of the tribe of Benjamin to which King Saul belonged (1Sa 10:21 the King James Version).

MATRITES

ma’-trits (ha-maTri): The Revised Version (British and American) translation of maTri with the definite article, "the Matrites" (1Sa 10:21).

MATTAN

mat’-an (mattan, "a gift"):

(1) A priest in the house of Baal, slain by Jehoiada before Baal’s altar (2Ki 11:18; 2Ch 23:17).

(2) The father of Shephatiah a contemporary and persecutor of Jeremiah (Jer 38:1), one of those who put Jeremiah into Malechiah's dungeon (38:6).

MATTANAH

mat'-a-na (mattanah; Codex Vaticanus, Manthanaein; Codex Alexandrinus, Manthanein): A station of the Israelites which seems to have lain between Beer and Nahaliel (Nu 21:18 f). The name means "gift," and might not inappropriately be applied to a well in the wilderness (Budde translates "Out of the desert a gift"; see The Expository Times, VI, 482). Some would therefore identify it with Beer. This is improbable. There is now no clue to the place, but it must have lain Southwest of the Dead Sea.

MATTANIAH

mat-a-ni'-a (mattanyaha, "gift of Yah"):

(1) King Zedekiah's original name, but changed by Nebuchadnezzar when he made him king over Judah instead of his nephew Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:17).

(2) A descendant of Asaph (1Ch 9:15), leader of the temple choir (Ne 11:17; 12:8). Mentioned among the "porters," keepers of "the storehouses of the gates" (Ne 12:25), and again in Ne 12:35 as among the "priests' sons with trumpets."

(3) May be the same as (2), though in 2Ch 20:14 he is mentioned as an ancestor of that Jahaziel whose inspired words in the midst of the congregation encouraged Jehoshaphat to withstand the invasion of Moab, Ammon and Seir (20:14 ff).

(4-7) Four others who had foreign wives,

(a) the Matthanias of 1 Esdras 9:27 (Ezr 10:26);

(b) the Othonias of 1 Esdras 9:28 (Ezr 10:27);

(c) the Matthanias of 1 Esdras 9:31 (Ezr 10:30);

(d) the fourth of these in 1 Esdras 9:34 the King James Version has had his name blended into that of Mattenai, and the two appear as the composite name Mamnitanemus (Ezr 10:37). He is a son of Bani.

(8) A Levite, father of Zaccur, ancestor of Hanan the under-treasurer of the Levitical offerings under Nehemiah (Ne 13:13).

(9) One of the sons of Heman the singer, whose office it was to blow the horns in the temple-service as

David had appointed it (1Ch 25:4,5). He was head of the 9th division of the 12 Levites (1Ch 25:16), who were proficient in the Songs of Yahweh (1Ch 25:7).

(10) One of the sons of Asaph who helped Hezekiah in the fulfilling of his vow to cleanse the house of the Lord (2Ch 29:13).

Henry Wallace

MATTATHA

mat'-a-tha (Mattatha): Son of Nathan the son of David in the genealogy of Jesus (Lu 3:31).

MATTATHAH

mat'-a-tha: the Revised Version (British and American).

See MATTATTAH.

MATTATHIAS

mat-a-thi'-as (Mattathias). The persons of this name in the Apocrypha are:

(1) Mattathias the father of the Maccabees.

See ASMONEANS; MACCABEES.

(2) One of the 7 who stood on Ezra's right hand as he read the law (1 Esdras 9:43) =" Mattithiah" of Ne 8:4.

(3) The son—probably the youngest (compare 1 Macc 16:2)—of Simon the Maccabean, treacherously murdered along with his father and his brother Judas by his brother-in-law Ptolemy, son of Abubus in the stronghold of Dok near Jericho in the 177th Seleucid—136-135 BC (1 Macc 16:14).

(4) Son of Absalom, one of the two "captains of the forces" who in the campaign against Demetrius in the plain of Hazor gallantly supported Judas, enabling the latter to turn an impending defeat into a great victory (1 Macc 11:70).

(5) One of the three envoys sent by Nicanor to treat with Judas in 161 BC (2 Macc 14:19). No names of envoys are given in the account of 1 Macc 7:27 ff.

(6) One of the sons of Asom who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:33) = the King James Version

"Matthias" =" Mattattah" of Ezr 10:33.

In addition to these two of this name are mentioned in the New Testament:

(7) Lu 3:25, "son of Amos."

(8) Lu 3:26, "son of Semein."

S. Angus

MATTATTAH

mat’-a-ta (mattattah): the Revised Version (British and American) for "Mattathah" in the King James Version (Ezr 10:33). The same as "Mattathias" of 1 Esdras 9:33, the King James Version "Matthias" (which see).

MATTENAI

mat-e-na’-i, mat’-e-ni (mattenay, "liberal"):

(1) (2) Two who married foreign wives, one a son of Hashum (Ezr 10:33; in RAPC 1Es 9:33 "Altanneus"); the other a son of Bani (Ezr 10:37).

(3) A priest in the days of Joiakim son of Jeshua (Ne 12:19), representing the house of Joiarib.

MATTER

mat’-er: This word being a very general term may express various ideas. the Revised Version (British and American) therefore frequently changes the reading of the King James Version in order to state more definitely the meaning of the context (compare Ex 24:14; 1Sa 16:18; 1Ki 8:59; 2Sa 11:19; Es 3:4; Ps 35:20; 64:5; Pr 16:20; 18:13). dabhar, and the Greek logos, both meaning "word," are very frequently translated by "matter." hule, "wood," is rendered "matter" in Jas 3:5 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "how much wood is kindled"; compare Sirach 28:10). Job 32:18 translates literally, "words"; also Da 4:17, "sentence." diaphero, "to carry in different places," "to differ," is rendered "to make matter" (Ga 2:6). The meaning is "it makes a difference," "it matters," "it is of importance."

A. L. Breslich

MATTHAN

mat’-than (Textus Receptus Matthan, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek Maththan): An ancestor of Jesus, grandfather of Joseph the husband of Mary (Mt 1:15).

See MATTHAT.

MATTHANIAS

mat-tha-ni’-as (Codex Alexandrinus, Matthanias, Codex Vaticanus, Matan):

(1) One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:27) equals "Mattaniah" of Ezr 10:26.

(2) the King James Version "Mathanias" (1 Esdras 9:31) equals "Mattaniah" of Ezr 10:30. Codex Vaticanus, followed by Swete, reads Beskaspasmus.

MATTHAT

mat’-that (Matthat, Maththat): The name of two ancestors of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:24,29), one being the grandfather of Joseph, the husband of Mary.

MATTHEW

math’-u: Matthew the apostle and evangelist is mentioned in the 4 catalogues of the apostles in Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13, though his place is not constant in this list, varying between the 7th and the 8th places and thus exchanging positions with Thomas. The name occurring in the two forms Matthaios, and Maththaios, is a Greek reproduction of the Aramaic Mattathyah, i.e. "gift of Yahweh," and equivalent to Theodore. Before his call to the apostolic office, according to Mt 9:9, his name was Levi. The identity of Matthew and Levi is practically beyond all doubt, as is evident from the predicate in Mt 10:3; and from a comparison of Mr 2:14; Lu 5:27 with Mt 9:9. Mark calls him "the son of Alpheus" (Mr 2:14), although this cannot have been the Alpheus who was the father of James the Less; for if this James and Matthew had been brothers this fact would doubtless have been mentioned, as is the case with Peter and Andrew, and also with the sons of Zebedee. Whether Jesus, as He did in the case of several others of His disciples, gave him the additional name of Matthew is a matter of which we are not informed. As he was a customs officer (ho telones, Mt 10:3) in Capernaum, in the territory of Herod Antipas, Matthew was not exactly a Roman official, but was in the service of the tetrarch of Galilee, or possibly a subordinate officer, belonging to the class called portitores, serving under the publicani, or superior officials who farmed the Roman taxes. As such he must have had some education, and doubtless in addition to the native Aramaic must have been acquainted with the Greek His ready acceptance of the call of Jesus shows that he must have belonged to that group of publicans and sinners, who in Galilee and elsewhere looked longingly to Jesus (Mt 11:19; Lu 7:34; 15:1). Just at what period of Christ’s ministry he was called does not appear with certainty, but evidently not at once, as on the day when he was called (Mt 9:11,14,18; Mr 5:37), Peter, James and John are already trustworthy disciples of

Jesus. Unlike the first six among the apostles, Matthew did not enter the group from among the pupils of John the Baptist. These are practically all the data furnished by the New Testament on the person of Matthew, and what is found in post-Biblical and extra-Biblical sources is chiefly the product of imagination and in part based on mistaking the name of Matthew for Matthias (compare Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, chapter liv, note 3). Tradition states that he preached for 15 years in Palestine and that after this he went to foreign nations, the Ethiopians, Macedonians, Syrians, Persians, Parthians and Medea being mentioned. He is said to have died a natural death either in Ethiopia or in Macedonia. The stories of the Roman Catholic church that he died the death of a martyr on September 21 and of the Greek church that this occurred on November 10 are without any historical basis. Clement of Alexandria (Strom., iv.9) gives the explicit denial of Heracleon that Matthew suffered martyrdom.

G. H. Schodde

MATTHEW, THE GOSPEL OF

(euaggelion kata Maththaion (or Matthaion)):

1. Name of Gospel—Unity and Integrity

2. Canonicity and Authorship

3. Relation of Greek and Aramaic Gospels

4. Contents, Character, and Purpose

5. Problems of Literary Relation

6. Date of Gospel

LITERATURE

1. Name of Gospel—Unity and Integrity:

The "Gospel according to Matthew," i.e. the Gospel according to the account of Matthew, stands, according to traditional, but not entirely universal, arrangement, first among the canonical Gospels. The Gospel, as will be seen below, was unanimously ascribed by the testimony of the ancient church to the apostle Matthew, though the title does not of itself necessarily imply immediate authorship. The unity and integrity of the Gospel were never in ancient times called in question. Matthew 1; 2, particularly—the story of the virgin birth and childhood of Jesus—are proved by the consentient testimony of manuscripts, VSS, and patristic references, to have been an integral part of the Gospel from the beginning (see VIRGIN BIRTH). The omission of this section from the heretical Gospel of the

Ebionites, which appears to have had some relation to our Gospel, is without significance.

The theory of successive redactions of Mt, starting with an Aramaic Gospel, elaborated by Eichhorn and Marsh (1801), and the related theories of successive editions of the Gospel put forth by the Tubingen school (Baur, Hilgenfeld, Kostlin, etc.), and by Ewald (Bleek supposes a primitive Greek Gospel), lack historical foundation, and are refuted by the fact that manuscripts and versions know only the ultimate redaction. Is it credible that the churches should quietly accept redaction after redaction, and not a word be said, or a vestige remain, of any of them?

2. Canonicity and Authorship:

(1) Canonicity.

The apostolic origin and canonical rank of the Gospel of Matthew were accepted without a doubt by the early church. Origen, in the beginning of the 3rd century could speak of it as the first of "the four Gospels, which alone are received without dispute by the church of God under heaven" (in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 25). The use of the Gospel can be traced in the apostolic Fathers; most distinctly in Barnabas, who quotes Mt 22:14 with the formula, "It is written" (5). Though not mentioned by name, it was a chief source from which Justin took his data for the life and words of Jesus (compare Westcott, Canon, 91 ff), and apostolic origin is implied in its forming part of "the Memoirs of the Apostles," "which are called Gospels," read weekly in the assemblies of the Christians (Ap. i.66, etc.). Its identity with our Matthew is confirmed by the undoubted presence of that Gospel in the Diatessaron of Tatian, Justin’s disciple. The testimony of Papias is considered below. The unhesitating acceptance of the Gospel is further decisively shown by the testimonies and use made of it in the works of Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and by its inclusion in the Muratorian Canon, the Itala, Peshitta, etc.

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; GOSPELS.

(2) Authorship.

The questions that cluster around the First Gospel have largely to do with the much-discussed and variously disputed statement concerning it found in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39), cited from the much older work of Papias, entitled Interpretation of the Words of the Lord. Papias is the first who mentions Matthew by name as the author of the Gospel. His words are: "Matthew composed the Logia (logia, "words," "oracles") in the Hebrew (Aramaic) tongue, and everyone interpreted them as he was able." Papias cannot here be referring to a book of Matthew in which only the discourses or sayings of Jesus had been preserved, but which had not any, or only meager accounts of His deeds, which imaginary document is in so many critical circles regarded as the basis of the present Gospel, for Papias himself uses the expression ta logia, as embracing the story, as he himself says, in speaking of Mark, "of the things said or done by Christ" (Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 24; compare particularly T. Zahn, Introduction to New Testament, section 54, and Lightfoot, Supernatural Religion, 170 ff). Eusebius further reports that after Matthew had first labored among his Jewish compatriots, he went to

other nations, and as a substitute for his oral preaching, left to the former a Gospel written in their own dialect (III, 24). The testimony of Papias to Matthew as the author of the First Gospel is confirmed by Irenaeus (iii.3, 1) and by Origen (in Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, V, 10), and may be accepted as representing a uniform 2nd-century tradition. Always, however, it is coupled with the statement that the Gospel was originally written in the Hebrew dialect. Hence, arises the difficult question of the relation of the canonical Greek Gospel, with which alone, apparently, the fathers were acquainted, to this alleged original apostolic work.

3. Relation of Greek and Aramaic Gospels:

One thing which seems certain is that whatever this Hebrew (Aramaic) document may have been, it was not an original form from which the present Greek Gospel of Matthew was translated, either by the apostle himself, or by somebody else, as was maintained by Bengel, Thiersch, and other scholars. Indeed, the Greek Matthew throughout bears the impress of being not a translation at all, but as having been originally written in Greek, and as being less Hebraistic in the form of thought than some other New Testament writings, e.g. the Apocalypse. It is generally not difficult to discover when a Greek book of this period is a translation from the Hebrew or Aramaic. That our Matthew was written originally in Greek appears, among other things, from the way in which it makes use of the Old Testament, sometimes following the Septuagint, sometimes going back to the Hebrew. Particularly instructive passages in this regard are 12:18-21 and 13:14,15, in which the rendering of the Alexandrian translation would have served the purposes of the evangelist, but he yet follows more closely the original text, although he adopts the Septuagint wherever this seemed to suit better than the Hebrew (compare Keil’s Commentary on Matthew, loc. cit.).

The external evidences to which appeal is made in favor of the use of an original Hebrew or Aramaic. Matthew in the primitive church are more than elusive. Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, V, 10) mentions as a report (legetai) that Pantaenus, about the year 170 AD, found among the Jewish Christians, probably of South Arabia, a Gospel of Matthew in Hebrew, left there by Bartholomew; and Jerome, while in the Syrian Berea, had occasion to examine such a work, which he found in use among the Nazarenes, and which at first he regarded as a composition of the apostle Matthew, but afterward declared not to be such, and then identified with the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Evangelium secundum or juxta Hebraeos) also called the Gospel of the Twelve Apostles, or of the Nazarenes, current among the Nazarenes and Ebionites (De Vir. Illustr., iii; Contra Pelag., iii.2; Commentary on Mt 12:13, etc.; see GOSPEL ACCORDING TO THE HEBREWS). For this reason the references by Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius to the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew are by many scholars regarded as referring to this Hebrew Gospel which the Jewish Christians employed, and which they thought to be the work of the evangelist (compare for fuller details See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, XII, article "Matthaeus der Apostel"). Just what the original Hebrew. Mathew was to which Papias refers (assuming it to have had a real existence) must, with our present available means, remain an unsolved riddle, as also the possible connection between the Greek and Hebrew texts. Attempts like those of Zahn, in his Kommentar on Matthew, to explain readings of the Greek text through an inaccurate understanding of the imaginary Hebrew original are arbitrary and unreliable. There remains, of course, the possibility that the apostle himself, or someone under his care (thus

Godet), produced a Greek recension of an earlier Aramaic work.

The prevailing theory at present is that the Hebrew Matthean document of Papias was a collection mainly of the discourses of Jesus (called by recent critics Q), which, in variant Greek translations, was used both by the author of the Greek Matthew and by the evangelist Luke, thus explaining the common features in these two gospels (W.C. Allen, however, in his Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Matthew, disputes Luke's use of this supposed common source, Intro, xlvi ff). The use of this supposed Matthean source is thought to explain how the Greek Gospel came to be named after the apostle. It has already been remarked, however, that there is no good reason for supposing that the "Logia" of Papias was confined to discourses. See further on "sources" below.

4. Contents, Character and Purpose:

(1) Contents and Character.

As respects contents, the Gospel of Mt can be divided into 3 chief parts:

(1) preliminary, including the birth and early youth of the Lord (Matthew 1; 2);

(2) the activity of Jesus in Galilee (Matthew 3-18);

(3) the activity of Jesus in Judea and Jerusalem, followed by His passion, death, and resurrection (Matthew 19-28).

In character, the Gospel, like those of the other evangelists, is only a chrestomathy, a selection from the great mass of oral tradition concerning the doings and sayings of Christ current in apostolic and early Christian circles, chosen for the special purpose which the evangelist had in view. Accordingly, there is a great deal of material in Matthew in common with Mark and Lk, although not a little of this material, too, is individualistic in character, and of a nature to vex and perplex the harmonist, as e.g. Matthew's accounts of the temptation, of the demoniacs at Gadara, of the blind man at Jericho (4:1-11; 8:28-34; 20:20-34); yet there is much also in this Gospel that is peculiar to it. Such are the following pericopes: Matthew 1; 2; 9:27-36; 10:15,37-40; 11:28-30; 12:11,12,15-21,33-38; 13:24-30,36-52; 14:28-31; 16:17-19; 17:24-27; 18:15-35; 19:10-12; 20:1-16; 21:10 f, 14-16,28-32; 22:1-14; 23:8-22; 24:42-25:46; 27:3-10,62-66; 28:11 ff. The principle of arrangement of the material is not chronological, but rather that of similarity of material. The addresses and parables of Jesus are reported consecutively, although they may have been spoken at different times, and material scattered in the other evangelists—especially in Luke—is found combined in Matthew. Instances are seen in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5-7), the "mission address" (Matthew 10), the seven parables of the Kingdom of God (Matthew 13), the discourses and parables (Matthew 18), the woes against the Pharisees (Matthew 23), and the grand eschatological discourses (Matthew 24; 25) (compare with parallel in the other gospels, on the relation to which, see below).

(2) Purpose.

The special purpose which the writer had in view in his Gospel is nowhere expressly stated, as is done, e. g., by the writer of the Fourth Gospel in Joh 20:30,31, concerning his book, but it can readily be gleaned from the general contents of the book, as also from specific passages. The traditional view that Matthew wrote primarily to prove that in Jesus of Nazareth is to be found the fulfillment and realization of the Messianic predictions of the Old Testament prophets and seers is beyond a doubt correct. The mere fact that there are about 40 proof passages in Matthew from the Old Testament, in connection even with the minor details of Christ's career, such as His return from Egypt (2:15), is ample evidence of this fact, although the proof manner and proof value of some of these passages are exegetical cruces, as indeed is the whole way in which the Old Testament is cited in the New Testament.

See QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The question as to whether the Gospel was written for Jewish Christians, or for Jews not yet converted, is less important, as this book, as was the case probably with the Epistle of James, was written at that transition period when the Jewish and the Christian communions were not yet fully separated, and still worshipped together.

Particular indications as to this purpose of the Gospel are met with at the beginning and throughout the whole work; e.g. it is obvious in Mt 1:1, where the proof is furnished that Jesus was the son of Abraham, in whom all families of the earth were to be blessed (Ge 12:3), and of David, who was to establish the kingdom of God forever (2Sa 7). The genealogy of Luke, on the other hand (3:23 ff), with its cosmopolitan character and purpose, aiming to show that Jesus was the Redeemer of the whole world, leads back this line to Adam, the common ancestor of all mankind. Further, as the genealogy of Matthew is evidently that of Joseph the foster and legal father of Jesus, and not that of Mary, as is the case in Luke, the purpose to meet the demands of the Jewish reader is transparent. The full account in Matthew of the Sermon on the Mount, which does not, as is sometimes said, contain a "new program of the kingdom of God"—indeed does not contain the fundamental principles of the Gospel at all—but is the deeper and truly Biblical interpretation of the Law over against the superficial interpretation of the current Pharisaism, which led the advocates of the latter in all honesty to declare, "What lack I yet?" given with the design of driving the auditors to the gospel of grace and faith proclaimed by Christ (compare Ga 3:24)—all this is only intelligible when we remember that the book was written for Jewish readers. Again the gegraptai—i.e. the fulfillment of Old Testament Scripture, a matter which for the Jew was everything, but for the Gentile was of little concern—appears in Matthew on all hands. We have it e. g. in connection with the birth of Jesus from a virgin, His protection from Herod, His coming to Nazareth (Mt 1:22 f; 2:5,6,15,17 f, 23), the activity of John the Baptist (Mt 3:3; compare Mt 11:10), the selection of Galilee as the scene of Jesus' operations (Mt 4:14), the work of Jesus as the fulfillment of the Law and Prophets (Mt 5:17), His quiet, undemonstrative methods (Mt 12:17), His teaching by parables (Mt 13:35), His entrance into Jerusalem (Mt 21:4 f, 16), His being arrested (Mt 26:54), the betrayal of Judas (Mt 27:9), the distribution of His garments (Mt 27:35). Throughout, as Professor Kubel says, the Gospel of Mt shows a "diametrical contrast between Christ and Pharisaism." Over against the false Messianic ideas and ideals of contemporary teachings among the Jews, Mt selects those facts from

the teachings and deeds of Christ which show the true Messiah and the correct principles of the kingdom of God. In this respect the Gospel can be regarded as both apologetic and polemical in its aim, in harmony with which also is its vivid portraiture to the growing hostility of the Jews to Christ and to His teachings which, in the latter part of Matthew, appears as intense as it does in John. Nowhere else do we find such pronounced denunciations of the Pharisees and their system from the lips of Jesus (compare Mt 9:11 ff; 12:1 ff; 15:1 ff; 16:1 ff; and on particular points 5:20 ff; 9:13; 23:23; see also 8:12; 9:34; 12:24; 21:43). It is from this point of view, as representing the antithesis to the narrow Pharisaic views, that we are to understand the writer's emphasis on the universality of the kingdom of Jesus Christ (compare Mt 3:1-12; 8:10-12; 21:33-44; 28:18-20)—passages in which some have thought they discerned a contradiction to the prevailing Jewish strain of the Gospel.

5. Problems of Literary Relation:

The special importance of the Gospel of Matthew for the synoptic problem can be fully discussed only in the article on this subject (see GOSPELS, THE SYNOPTIC), and in connection with Mark and Luke. The synoptic problem deals primarily with the literary relations existing between the first 3 Gospels. The contents of these are in many cases so similar, even in verbal details, that they must have some sources in common, or some dependence or interdependence must exist between them; on the other hand, each of the 3 Gospels shows so many differences and dissimilarities from the other two, that in their composition some independent source or sources—oral or written—must have been employed. In general it may be said that the problem itself is of little more than literary importance, having by no means the historical significance for the development of the religion of the New Testament which the Pentateuchal problem has for that of the Old Testament. Nor has the synoptic problem any historical background that promises a solution as the Pentateuchal problem has in the history of Israel. Nothing save an analysis of the contents of these Gospels, and a comparison of the contents of the three, offers the scholar any material for the study of the problem, and as subjective taste and impressions are prime factors in dealing with materials of this sort, it is more than improbable, in the absence of any objective evidence, that the synoptic problem in general, or the question of the sources of Matthew in particular, will ever be solved to the satisfaction of the majority of scholars. The hypothesis which at present has widest acceptance is the "two-source" theory, according to which Mark, in its existing or some earlier form, and the problematical original Matthew (Q), constitute the basis of our canonical Gospel.

In proof of this, it is pointed out that nearly the whole of the narrative-matter of Mark is taken up into Matthew, as also into Luke, while the large sections, chiefly discourses, common to Matthew and Luke are held, as already said, to point to a source of that character which both used. The difficulties arise when the comparison is pursued into details, and explanation is sought of the variations in phraseology, order, sometimes in conception, in the respective gospels.

Despite the prestige which this theory has attained, the true solution is probably a simpler one. Matthew no doubt secured the bulk of his data from his own experience and from oral tradition, and as the former existed in fixed forms, due to catechetical instruction, in the early church, it is possible to explain the similarities of Matthew with the other two synoptics on this ground alone, without resorting to any literary dependence, either of Matthew on the other two, or of these, or either of them, on Matthew. The

whole problem is purely speculative and subjective and under present conditions justifies a cui bono? as far as the vast literature which it has called into existence is concerned.

6. Date of Gospel:

According to early and practically universal tradition Mt wrote his Gospel before the other three, and the place assigned to it in New Testament literature favors the acceptance of this tradition. Irenaeus reports that it was written when Peter and Paul were preaching in Rome (ill.1), and Eusebius states that this was done when Matthew left Palestine and went to preach to others (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 24). Clement of Alexandria is responsible for the statement that the presbyters who succeeded each other from the beginning declared that "the gospels containing the genealogies (Matthew and Luke) were written first" (Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, VI, 14). This is, of course, fatal to the current theory of dependence on Mark, and is in consequence rejected. At any rate, there is the best reason for holding that the book must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD (compare 2415). The most likely date for the Greek Gospel is in the 7th Christian decade. Zahn claims that Matthew wrote his Aramaic Gospel in Palestine in 62 AD, while the Greek Matthew dates from 85 AD, but this latter date is not probable.

LITERATURE.

Introduction to the Commentary on Matthew (Meyer, Alford, Allen (ICC), Broadus (Philadelphia, 1887), Morison, Plummer, Schaeffer in Lutheran Commentary (New York, 1895), etc.); works on Introduction to the New Testament (Salmon, Weiss, Zahn, etc.); articles in Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopedia may be consulted. See also F.C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission; Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Matthaei and Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien; Sir J.C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae; Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels; Lightfoot, Essays on Supernatural Religion, V, "Papias of Hierapolis" (this last specially on the sense of Logia).

See also the works cited in MARK, THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO.

G. H. Schodde

MATTHIAS

ma-thi’-as (Matthias, or Maththias; Mattithyah, "given of Yah"): Matthias was the one upon whom the lot fell when he, along with Joseph Barsabbas, was put forward to fill up the place in the apostleship left vacant by Judas Iscariot (Ac 1:15-26). This election was held at Jerusalem, and the meeting was presided over by Peter. The conditions demanded of the candidates were that they should "have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John, unto the day that he was received up from us," and that the one chosen should "become a witness with us of his resurrection" (Ac 1:21,22). The mode of procedure was by lot, and with prayer was the election made (compare Ac 1:24).

Hilgenfeld identifies Matthias with Nathanael (compare NATHANAEL). He was traditionally the author of the "Gospel of Matthias," a heretical work referred to by Origen (Hom. on Lk, i), by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25, 6) and by Hieronymus (Proem in Matth.). No trace of it is left. The Gnostic Basilides (circa 133 AD) and his son Isidor claimed to ground their doctrine in the "Gospel of Basilides" on the teaching Matthias received directly from the Saviour (Hippol., vii.20) (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 167). Various parts of the apocryphal "Contendings of the Apostles" deal with the imprisonment and blinding of Matthias by the Ethiopian cannibals, and his rescue by Andrew (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 163, 164, 267-88; see also ANDREW). According to the Martyrdom of Matthias (Budge, II, 289-94) he was sent to Damascus, and died at Phalaeon, a city of Judea. Other sources mention Jerusalem as the place of Matthias' ministry and burial.

C. M. Kerr

MATTITHIAH

mat-i-thi'-a (mattithyah, or mattithyahu, "gift of Yah"):

(1) The Mattithiah of Ne 8:4 (1st spelling) was one of those who stood at Ezra's right hand while he read the law (compare 1 Esdras 9:43). He may be the individual set over "things that were baked in pans" (1Ch 9:31).

(2) One of those appointed by David to minister before the ark, and to "celebrate and to thank and praise Yahweh, the God of Israel" (1Ch 16:4,5).

(3) One of those who had foreign wives (Ezr 10:43). In 1 Esdras 9:35, "Mazitias."

(4) One of the Levites who ministered before the ark with harps 1Ch 15:18,21; 25:3,11, 2nd spelling).

Henry Wallace

MATTOCK

mat'-ok: The translation of 3 Hebrew words:

(1) machereshah, probably "a pick-axe" (1Sa 13:20,21; compare 1Sa 13:21 margin);

(2) cherebh, "sword," "ax," "tool" (2Ch 34:6 the King James Version, "with their mattocks," the King James Version margin "mauls," the Revised Version (British and American) "in their ruins," the Revised Version margin "with their axes");

(3) ma‘-der, "a hoe," "rake," "chopping instrument" (Isa 7:25). Vines were usually grown on terraces on the hills of Palestine, and then the mattock was in constant use. The usual mattock is a pick with one end broad, the other pointed.

MAUL

mol (mephits, literally, "a breaker," "a club," "mace," "mattock"): A smashing weapon like the oriental war-club or the clubs always carried by the shepherds of Lebanon (Pr 25:18; compare Jer 51:20 margin).

MAUZZIM

moz’-em, mots’-em (ma‘uzzim, "places of strength," "fortress"): Many conjectures as to the meaning of this word and its context (Da 11:38; compare Da 11:19,39) have been made. The Septuagint (uncertainly), Theodotion, and the Geneva Version render it as a proper name. Theodoret adopted Theodotion’s reading and explained it as "Antichrist"! Grotius thought it a corruption of "Azizos, the Phoenician war-god, while Calvin saw in it the "god of wealth"! Perhaps the buzz of conjectures about the phrase is owing to the fact that in the first passage cited the word is preceded by ‘Eloah, meaning God. The context of the passage seems clearly to make the words refer to Antiochus Epiphanes, and on this account some have thought that the god Mars—whose figure appears on a coin of Antiochus—is here referred to. All this is, however, little better than guesswork, and the Revised Version (British and American) translation, by setting the mind upon the general idea that the monarch referred to would trust in mere force, gives us, at any rate, the general sense, though it does not exclude the possibility of a reference to a particular deity. In Da 11:19 and 39, the word "Mauzzim" is simply translated "fortresses," and the idea conveyed is that the mental obsession of fortresses is equivalent to deifying them. A conjecture of Layard’s (Nineveh, II, 456, note), is, at any rate, worth referring to.

Henry Wallace

MAW

mo (qebhah (compare qobhah, Nu 25:8), keres; Septuagint enustron): The first word means the maw or stomach of ruminants. It is derived from a root designating "hollowed out." It is mentioned alongside of the shoulder and the two cheeks of ox and sheep, which are the priest’s share of any sacrifice brought by Israelites (De 18:3). Septuagint, where enustron corresponds to Attic enustron, denotes the fourth stomach or abomasum, which was considered as a delicacy, and was almost a national dish of the Athenians, just as tripe is of the Londoners. The parallel form qobhah is used for the body of a woman, which is being transfixed by a spear thrust in Nu 25:8. The last word keres is found in a metaphorical sense: "(Nebuchadrezzar) hath, like a monster, swallowed me up, he hath filled his maw with my delicacies" (Jer 51:34).

H. L. E. Luering

MAZITIAS

maz-i-ti’-as (Codex Alexandrinus, Mazitias; Codex Vaticanus, Zeitias): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:35), identical with Mattithiah (Ezr 10:43).

MAZZALOTH

maz’-a-loth (The Planets).

See ASTROLOGY, 9.

MAZZAROTH

maz’-a-roth: The 12 constellations of the Zodiac.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 12.

MAZZEBAH

maz-e’-ba, mats-e’-ba.

See PILLAR.

ME-JARKON

me-jar’-kon (me ha-yarqon; thalassa Hierakon): The Hebrew may mean "yellow water." The phrase is literally, "the waters of Jarkon." Septuagint reads "and from the river, Jarkon and the boundary near Joppa." From this possibly we should infer a place called Jarkon in the lot of Dan; but no name resembling this has been found. The text (Jos 19:46) is corrupt.

ME-ZAHAB

mez’-a-hab, me-za’-hab (me zahabh, "waters of gold"; Codex Vaticanus Maizoob, Codex Alexandrinus, Mezoob): Grandfather of Mehetabel, the wife of Hadar, the last-mentioned "duke" of Edom descended from Esau (Ge 36:39). The Jewish commentators made much play with this name. Abarbanel, e.g., says he was "rich and great, so that on this account he was called Mezahab, for the gold was in his house as water." The name, however, may denote a place, in which case it may be identical with Dizahab.

MEADOW

med’-o:

(1) ‘aroth, "the meadows (the King James Version "paper reeds") by the Nile" (Isa 19:7); ma‘areh-gabha‘, the King James Version "meadows of Gibeah," the Revised Version (British and American) "Maareh-geba," the Revised Version margin "the meadow of Geba, or Gibeah" (Jud 20:33); from ‘arah, "to be naked"; compare Arabic ariya, "to be naked," ‘ara’a’," a bare tract of land." ‘Aroth and ma‘areh signify tracts bare of trees.

(2) ‘achu, in Pharaoh’s dream of the kine, the King James Version "meadow," the Revised Version (British and American) "reed grass" (Ge 41:2,18). ‘Achu is found also in Job 8:11, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "flag," the Revised Version margin "reed-grass." According to Gesenius, achu is an Egyptian word denoting the vegetation of marshy ground.

(3) ‘abhel keramim, "Abel-cheramim," the Revised Version margin "The meadow of vineyards," the King James Version "the plain (the King James Version margin, "Abel") of the vineyards" (Jud 11:33); "Abel-beth-maacah" (1Ki 15:20; 2Ki 15:29; compare 2Sa 20:14,15,18); "Abel-shittim" (Nu 33:49; compare Nu 25:1; Jos 2:1; 3:1; Jud 7:22; Joe 3:18; Mic 6:5); "Abel-meholah" (Jud 7:22; 1Ki 4:12; 19:16); "Abel-maim" (2Ch 16:4); "Abel-mizraim" (Ge 50:11); "stone," the King James Version "Abel," the Revised Version margin "Abel," that is "a meadow" (1Sa 6:18); compare Arabic ‘abal, "green grass," and ‘abalat, "unhealthy marshy ground," from wabal, "to rain."

Alfred Ely Day

MEAH

me’-a (me’ah, "hundred").

See HAMMEAH.

MEAL

mel (’okhel): Denotes the portion of food eaten at any one time. It is found as a compound in Ru 2:14, "meal-time," literally, "the time of eating."

See FOOD.

MEAL OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

MEALS, MEAL-TIME

melz: Bread materials, bread-making and baking in the Orient are dealt with under BREAD (which see). For food-stuffs in use among the Hebrews in Bible times more specifically see FOOD. This article aims to be complementary, dealing especially with the methods of preparing and serving food and times of meals among the ancient Hebrews.

The Book of Judges gives a fair picture of the early formative period of the Hebrew people and their ways of living. It is a picture of semi-savagery—of the life and customs of free desert tribes. In 1 Samuel we note a distinct step forward, but the domestic and cultural life is still low and crude. When they are settled in Palestine and come in contact with the most cultured people of the day, the case is different. Most that raised these Semitic invaders above the dull, crude existence of fellahin, in point of civilization, was due to the people for whom the land was named (Macalister, Hist of Civilization in Pal). From that time on various foreign influences played their several parts in modification of Hebrew life and customs. A sharp contrast illustrative of the primitive beginnings and the growth of luxury in Israel in the preparation and use of foods may be seen by a comparison of 2Sa 17:28 f with 1Ki 4:22 f.

I. Methods of Preparing Food.

1. Cereals:

The most primitive way of using the cereals was to pluck the fresh ears (Le 23:14; 2Ki 4:42), remove the husk by rubbing (compare De 23:25 and Mt 12:1), and eat the grain raw. A practice common to all periods, observed by fellahin today, was to parch or roast the ears and eat them not ground. Later it became customary to grind the grain into flour, at first by the rudimentary method of pestle and mortar (Nu 11:8; compare Pr 27:22), later by the hand-mill (Ex 11:5; Job 31:10; compare Mt 24:41), still later in mills worked by the ass or other animal (Mt 18:6, literally, "a millstone turned by an ass"). The flour was then made into bread, with or without leaven.

See LEAVEN.

Another simple way of preparing the grain was to soak it in water, or boil it slightly, and then, after drying and crushing it, to serve it as the dish called "groats" is served among western peoples.

The kneading of the dough preparatory to baking was done doubtless, as it is now in the East, by pressing it between the hands or by passing it from hand to hand; except that in Egypt, as the monuments show, it was put in "baskets" and trodden with the feet, as grapes in the wine press. (This is done in Paris bakeries to this day.)

See BREAD; FOOD.

2. Vegetables:

Lentils, several kinds of beans, and a profusion of vegetables, wild and cultivated, were prepared and eaten in various ways. The lentils were sometimes roasted, as they are today, and eaten like "parched corn." They were sometimes stewed like beans, and flavored with onions and other ingredients, no doubt, as we find done in Syria today (compare Ge 25:29,34), and sometimes ground and made into bread (Eze 4:9; compare Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palastina-Vereins, IX, 4). The wandering Israelites in the wilderness looked back wistfully on the cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions and garlic of Egypt (Nu 11:5), and later we find all of these used for food in Palestine How many other things were prepared and used for food by them may be gathered from the Mishna, our richest source of knowledge on the subject.

3. Meat:

The flesh of animals—permission to eat which it would seem was first given to Noah after the deluge (Ge 1:29 f; 9:3 f)—was likewise prepared and used in various ways:

(a) Roasting was much in vogue, indeed was probably the oldest of all methods of preparing such food. At first raw meat was laid upon hot stones from which the embers had been removed, as in the case of the "cake baken on the hot stones" (1Ki 19:6 the Revised Version margin; compare Ho 7:8, "a cake not turned"), and sometimes underneath with a covering of ashes. The fish that the disciples found prepared for them by the Sea of Galilee (Joh 21:9) was, in exception to this rule, cooked on the live coals themselves. A more advanced mode of roasting was by means of a spit of green wood or iron (for baking in ovens, see FOOD).

(b) Boiling was also common (see Ge 25:29; Ex 12:9, etc., the American Standard Revised Version; English Versions of the Bible more frequently "seething," "sod," "sodden"), as it is in the more primitive parts of Syria today. The pots in which the boiling was done were of earthenware or bronze (Le 6:28). When the meat was boiled in more water than was required for the ordinary "stew" the result was the broth (Jud 6:19 f), and the meat and the broth might then be served separately. The usual way, however, was to cut the meat into pieces, larger or smaller as the case might demand (1Sa 2:13; Eze 24:3 ; compare Micah’s metaphor, Mic 3:3), and put these pieces into the cooking-pot with water sufficient only for a stew. Vegetables and rice were generally added, though crushed wheat sometimes took the place of the rice, as in the case of the "savory meat" which Rebekah prepared for her husband from the "two kids of the goats" (Ge 27:9). The seeds of certain leguminous plants were also often prepared by boiling (Ge 25:29; 2Ki 4:38).

(c) The Hebrew housewives, we may be sure, were in such matters in no way behind their modern kinswomen of the desert, of whom Doughty tells: "The Arab housewives make savory messes of any grain, seething it and putting thereto only a little salt and samn (clarified butter)."

4. Oil:

Olive oil was extensively and variously used by the ancient Hebrews, as by most eastern peoples then, as

it is now.

(a) Oriental cooking diverges here more than at any other point from that of the northern and western peoples, oil serving many of the purposes of butter and lard among ourselves.

(b) Oil was used in cooking vegetables as we use bacon and other animal fats, and in cooking fish and eggs, as sJso in the finer sorts of baking. See BREAD; FOOD; OIL.

(c) They even mixed oil with the flour, shaped it into cakes and then baked it (Le 2:4). The "little oil" of the poor widow of Zerephath was clearly not intended for the lamps, but to bake her pitiful "handful of meal" (1Ki 17:12).

(d) Again the cake of unmixed flour might be baked till almost done, then smeared with oil, sprinkled with anise seed, and brought by further baking to a glossy brown. A species of thin flat cakes of this kind are "the wafers anointed with oil" of Ex 29:2, etc.

(e) Oil and honey constituted, as now in the East, a mixture used as we use butter and honey, and are found also mixed in the making of sweet cakes (Eze 16:13,19). The taste of the manna is said in Ex 16:31 to be like that of "wafers made with honey," and in Nu 11:8 to be like "the taste of cakes baked with oil" (Revised Version margin).

II. Meals, Meal-Time, etc.

(1) It was customary among the ancient Hebrews, as among their contemporaries in the East in classical lands, to have but two meals a day. The "morning morsel" or "early snack," as it is called in the Talmud, taken with some relish like olives, oil or melted butter, might be used by peasants, fishermen, or even artisans, to "break their fast" (see the one reference to it in the New Testament in Joh 21:12,15), but this was not a true meal. It was rather ariston proinon (Robinson, BRP, II, 18), though some think it the ariston, of the New Testament (Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 205, note 3; compare Plummer, International Critical Commentary, on Lu 11:37). To "eat a meal," i.e. a full meal, in the morning was a matter for grave reproach (Ec 10:16), as early drinking was unusual and a sign of degradation (of Ac 2:15).

(2) The first meal (of "meal-time," literally, "the time of eating," Ru 2:14; Ge 43:16), according to general usage, was taken at or about noon when the climate and immemorial custom demanded a rest from labor. Peter’s intended meal at Joppa, interrupted by the messengers of Cornelius, was at "the sixth hour," i.e. 12 M. It corresponded somewhat to our modern "luncheon," but the hour varied according to rank and occupation (Shabbath 10a). The Bedawi take it about 9 or 10 o’clock (Burckhardt, Notes, I, 69). It is described somewhat fully by Lane in Modern Egyptians. To abstain from this meal was accounted "fasting" (Jud 20:26; 1Sa 14:24). Drummond (Tropical Africa) says his Negro bearers began the day’s work without food.

(3) The second and main meal (New Testament, deipnon) was taken about the set of sun, or a little before or after, when the day's work was over and the laborers had "come in from the field" (Lu 17:7; 24:29 f). This is the "supper time," the "great supper" of Lu 14:16, the important meal of the day, when the whole family were together for the evening (Burckhardt, Notes, I, 69). It was the time of the feeding of the multitudes by Jesus (Mr 6:35; Mt 14:15; Lu 9:12), of the eating of the Passover, and of the partaking of the Lord's Supper. According to Jewish law, and for special reasons, the chief meal was at midday—"at the sixth hour," according to Josephus (Vita, 54; compare Ge 43:16-25; 2Sa 24:15 Septuagint). It was Yahweh's promise to Israel that they should have "bread" in the morning and "flesh" in the evening (Ex 16:12), incidental evidence of one way in which the evening meal differed from that at noon. At this family meal ordinarily there was but one common dish for all, into which all "dipped the sop" (see Mt 26:23; Mr 14:20), so that when the food, cooked in this common stew, was set before the household, the member of the household who had prepared it had no further work to do, a fact which helps to explain Jesus' words to Martha, 'One dish alone is needful' (Lu 10:42; Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, under the word "Meals").

(4) Sabbath banqueting became quite customary among the Jews (see examples cited by Lightfoot, Hor. Heb et Talmud on Lu 14:1; compare Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 52, 437; Farrar, Life of Christ, II, 119, note). Indeed it was carried to such an excess that it became proverbial for luxury. But the principle which lay at the root of the custom was the honor of the Sabbath (Lightfoot, op. cit., III, 149), which may explain Jesus countenance and use of the custom (compare Lu 7:36; 11:37; 14:7-14), and the fact that on the last Sabbath He spent on earth before His passion He was the chief guest at such a festive meal (Joh 12:2). It is certain that He made use of such occasions to teach lessons of charity and religion, in one case even when His host was inclined to indulge in discourteous criticism (Lu 7:39; 11:38,45 f; compare Joh 12:7 f). He seems to have withheld His formal disapproval of what might be wrong in tendency in such feasts because of the latent possibilities for good He saw in them, and so often used them wisely and well. It was on one of these occasions that a fellow-guest in his enthusiasm broke out in the exclamation, "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God" (Lu 14:15), referring evidently to the popular Jewish idea that the Messianic kingdom was to be ushered in with a banquet, and that feasting was to be a chief part of its glories (compare Isa 25:6; Lu 13:29).

See BANQUET.

III. Customs at Meals.

In the earliest times the Hebrews took their meals sitting, or more probably squatting, on the ground like the Bedouin and fellahin of today (see Ge 37:25, etc.), with the legs gathered tailor-fashion (Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1905, 124). The use of seats naturally followed upon the change from nomadic to agricultural life, after the conquest of Canaan. Saul and his mess-mates sat upon "seats" (1Sa 20:25), as did Solomon and his court (1Ki 10:5; compare 1Ki 13:20, etc.). With the growth of wealth and luxury under the monarchy, the custom of reclining at meals gradually became the fashion. In Amos' day it was regarded as an aristocratic innovation (Am 3:12; 6:4), but two centuries later Ezekiel speaks of "a stately bed" or "couch" (compare Es 1:6 the Revised Version (British and American)) with "a table prepared before it" (Eze 23:41), as if it was no novelty. By the end of the 3rd century BC it was

apparently universal, except among the very poor (Judith 12:15; Tobit 2:1). Accordingly, "sitting at meat" in the New Testament (English Versions of the Bible) is everywhere replaced by "reclining" (Revised Version margin), though women and children still sat. They leaned on the left elbow (Sirach 41:19), eating with the right hand (see LORD'S SUPPER). The various words used in the Gospels to denote the bodily attitude at meals, as well as the circumstances described, all imply that the Syrian custom of reclining on a couch, followed by Greeks and Romans, was in vogue (Edersheim, II, 207). Luke uses one word for it which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament (kataklithenai, 7:36; 14:8; 24:30; and kataklinein, 9:14,15), which Hobart says is the medical term for laying patients or causing them to lie in bed (Medical Language of Luke, 69). For costumes and customs at more elaborate feasts see BANQUET; DRESS. For details in the "minor morals" of the dinner table, see the classical passages (Sirach 31:12-18; 32:3-12), in which Jesus ben-Sira has expanded the counsel given in Pr 23:1 f; compare Kennedy in The 1-Volume Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, under the word "Meals."

LITERATURE.

Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah; O. Holtzmann, Eine Untersuchung zum Leben Jesu, English translation, 206; B. Weiss, The Life of Christ, II, 125, note 2; Plummer, International Critical Commentary, "Luke," 159 f; Farrar, Life of Christ; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, the 1-volume Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible; Encyclopedia Biblica; Jewish Encyclopedia, etc.

George B. Eager

MEAN

men: The noun "meaning" (Da 8:15 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "I sought to understand"; and 1Co 14:11) is synonymous with "signification" but in 1 Macc 15:4 the King James Version it expresses "purpose" (the Revised Version (British and American) "I am minded to land"). The noun "mean" in Hebrew always occurs in the plural, and is generally used in the sense of "agency," "instrument" (compare 1Ki 10:29, etc.). the Revised Version (British and American) very frequently changes, King James Version: The Wisdom of Solomon 8:13, "because of her"; 2Th 2:3, "in any wise"; Lu 8:36, "how"; Pr 6:26, "on account of"; Re 13:14, "by reason of" (compare also 2Th 3:16; Joh 9:21). Heb 9:15 (the King James Version "that by means of death") translates literally, "that a death having taken place," from ginomai, "to become," "to happen." Ac 18:21 the King James Version, "I must by all means keep this feast," is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American) in harmony with several cursives, the Vulgate, and some other versions

The adjective "mean" is used in the sense of "common," "humble" (’adham, "man"; compare Isa 2:9; 5:15; 31:8 omits "mean"). It is also used in the sense of "obscure" (Pr 22:29, chashokh, "obscure"; asemos, literally, "without a mark," "unknown," Ac 21:39). "Mean" is found in expressions like "in the meanwhile" (the King James Version 1Ki 18:45, the Revised Version (British and American) "little while"; Joh 4:31; Ro 2:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "one with another"); "in the

meantime" (1 Macc 11:41 the King James Version; Lu 12:1); and "in the mean season" the King James Version (1 Macc 11:14; 15:15). The adverb "meanly" is found (2 Macc 15:38) in the sense of "moderately."

The verb "mean" expresses purpose (Isa 3:15; 10:7; Ge 50:20, etc.). In some cases the Revised Version (British and American) renders literal translation: Ac 27:2, "was about to sail" (the King James Version "meaning to sail"); compare Ac 21:13; 2Co 8:13. In other instances the idea of "to mean" is "to signify," "to denote" (1Sa 4:6; Ge 21:29; Mt 9:13, etc.). Lu 15:26 translates literally, "what these things might be." In Ex 12:26 the sense of "mean ye" is "to have in mind."

A. L. Breslich

MEANI

me-a’-ni: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Maani" (1 Esdras 5:31).

MEARAH

me-a’-ra (me‘arah; omitted in the Septuagint): A town or district mentioned only in Jos 13:4, as belonging to the Zidonians. The name as it stands means "cave." If that is correct it may be represented by the modern village Mogheiriyeh, "little cave," not far from Sidon. Perhaps, however, we should find in the word the name of a Sidonian city, with the preposition min, that has suffered change in transcription. Septuagint reads "from Gaza"; but Gaza is obviously too far to the South.

MEASURE; MEASURES

mezh’-ur, Several different words in the Hebrew and Greek are rendered by "measure" in English Versions of the Bible. In Job 11:9 and Jer 13:25 it stands for madh, middah, and it is the usual rendering of the verb madhadh, "to measure," i.e. "stretch out," "extend," "spread." It is often used to render the words representing particular measures, such as [’ephah] (De 25:14,15; Pr 20:10; Mic 6:10); or kor (1Ki 4:22; 5:11 (1Ki 5:2, 5:25 Hebrew text); 2Ch 2:10 (Hebrew text 2:9) 27:5; Ezr 7:22); or seah (Ge 18:6; 1Sa 25:18; 1Ki 18:32; 2Ki 7:1,16,18); or batos, "bath" (Lu 16:6). For these terms see WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. It also renders middah, "measure of length" (Ex 26:2); mesurah, a liquid measure (Le 19:35; 1Ch 23:29; Eze 4:11,16); mishpaT, "judgment" (Jer 30:11; 46:28); ca’ce’ah, a word of uncertain meaning, perhaps derived from seah (Isa 27:8); shalish, "threefold, large measure" (Ps 80:5 (Hebrew text Ps 80:6); Isa 40:12); tokhen, and mathkoneth, "weight" and that which is weighed, taken as measure (Eze 45:11). In Isa 5:14 it stands for choq, "limit." In the New Testament, besides being the usual rendering of the verb metreo, and of the noun metron, it is used for choinix, a dry measure containing about a quart (Re 6:6).

H. Porter

MEASURING LINE

(qaw, qeweh): The usual meaning is simply line, rope or cord, in Isa 28:10,13, but the line was used for measurement, as is evident from such passages as 1Ki 7:23; Job 38:5; Jer 31:39. Whether the line for measuring had a definite length or not we have no means of knowing. In Isa 44:13 it refers to the line used by the carpenter in marking the timber on which he is working, and in Zec 1:16 it refers to the builder’s line.

Figuratively: It signifies destruction, or a portion of something marked off by line for destruction, as in 2Ki 21:13; or for judgment, as in Isa 28:17.

H. Porter

MEASURING REED

(qeneh hamiddah; kalamos): Used in Eze 40:5 ff; 42:16; 45:1; Re 11:1; 21:15,16. The length of the reed is given as 6 cubits, each cubit being a cubit and a palm, i.e. the large cubit of 7 palms, or about 10 ft. See CUBIT. Originally it was an actual reed used for measurements of considerable length, but came at last to be used for a measure of definite length, as indicated by the reference in Ezkiel (compare "pole" in English measures).

MEAT

met (broma, brosis): In the King James Version used for food in general, e.g. "I had my meat of herbs" (2 Esdras 12:51); "his disciples were gone away into the city to buy meat," the Revised Version (British and American) "food" (Joh 4:8). The English word signified whatever is eaten, whether of flesh or other food.

MEAT OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

MEBUNNAI

me-bun’-i, me-bun’-a-i (mebhunnay, "well-built"): One of David’s "braves" (2Sa 23:27). In 2Sa 21:18 he is named "Sibbechai" (the Revised Version (British and American) "Sibbecai"), and is there mentioned as the slayer of a Philistine giant. The Revised Version (British and American) spelling occurs in 1Ch 11:29, the King James Version "Sibbechai" in 1Ch 20:4 (compare 2Sa 21:18); and in 1Ch 27:11 the Revised Version (British and American) spelling recurs, where this person is mentioned as

captain of the 8th course of the 12 monthly courses that served the king in rota. Scribal error, and the similarity in Hebrew spelling of the two forms accounts for the difference in spelling. the Revised Version (British and American) consistently tries to keep this right.

Henry Wallace

MECHERATHITE

me-ke'-rath-it (mekherathi, "dweller in Mecharah"): Possibly this is a misreading of "Maachathite" (the King James Version). It is the description of Hepher, one of David's valiant men (1Ch 11:36).

In the Wallel list of 2Sa 23, especially 23:34, the "Maachathite" is mentioned without name in the place in the list given to Hepher in 1Ch 11:36. The variations do not destroy the conviction that the list is virtually the same.

MECONAH

me-ko'-na (mekhonah; Machna): A town apparently in the neighborhood of Ziklag, named only in Ne 11:28, as reoccupied by the men of Judah after the Captivity. It is not identified.

MEDABA

med'-a-ba: The Greek form of "Medeba" in 1 Macc 9:36.

MEDAD

me'-dad (medhadh, "affectionate"): One of the 70 elders on whom the spirit of the Lord came in the days of Moses enabling them to prophesy. Medad and one other, Eldad, began to prophesy in the camp, away from the other elders who had assembled at the door of the tabernacle to hear God's message. Joshua suggested that Eldad and Medad be stopped, but Moses interceded on their behalf, saying, "Would that all Yahweh's people were prophets!" (Nu 11:26-29). The subject-matter of their prophecy has been variously supplied by tradition. Compare the Palestine Targums at the place, the apocalyptic Book of Eldad and Modad, and Ba'al ha-Turim (ad loc.).

Ella Davis Isaacs

MEDAN

me'-dan (medhan, "strife"): One of the sons of Abraham by Keturah (Ge 25:2; 1Ch 1:32). The tribe and its place remain unidentified, and the conjecture that the name may be connected with the Midianites is unlikely from the fact that in the list of the sons of Abraham and Keturah Midian is mentioned alongside

of Medan.

MEDEBA

med’-e-ba (medhebha’; Maidaba, Medaba): The name may mean "gently flowing water," but the sense is doubtful. This city is first mentioned along with Heshbon and Dibon in an account of Israel’s conquests (Nu 21:30). It lay in the Mishor, the high pastoral land of Moab. The district in which the city stood is called the Mishor or plain of Medeba in the description of the territory assigned to Reuben (Jos 13:9), or the plain by Medeba (Jos 13:16). Here the Ammonites and their Syrian allies put the battle in array against Joab, and were signally defeated (1Ch 19:7). This must have left the place definitely in the possession of Israel. But it must have changed hands several times. It was taken by Omri, evidently from Moab; and Mesha claims to have recovered possession of it (M S, ll. 7,8,29,30). It would naturally fall to Israel under Jeroboam II; but in Isa 15:2 it is referred to as a city of Moab. It also figures in later Jewish history. John, son of Mattathias, was captured and put to death by the Jambri, a robber tribe from Medeba. This outrage was amply avenged by Jonathan and Simon, who ambushed a marriage party of the Jambri as they were bringing a noble bride from Gabbatha, slew them all and took their ornaments (1 Macc 9:36 ff; Ant, XII, i, 2, 4). Medeba was captured by Hyrcanus "not without the greatest distress of his army" (Ant., XIII, ix, 1). It was taken by Janneus from the Nabateans. Hyrcanus promised to restore it with other cities so taken to Aretas in return for help to secure him on the Judean throne (ibid., xv, 4; XIV, i, 4). Ptolemy speaks of it as a town in Arabia Petrea, between Bostra and Petra. Eusebius and Jerome knew it under its ancient name (Onomasticon, under the word). It became the seat of a bishropric, and is mentioned in the Ac of the Council of Chalcedon (451 AD), and in other ecclesiastical lists.

The ancient city is represented by the modern Madeba, a ruined site with an Arab village, crowning a low hill, some 6 miles South of Heshbon, with which it was connected by a Roman road. The ruins, which are considerable, date mainly from Christian times. The surrounding walls can be traced in practically their whole circuit. There is a large tank, now dry, measuring 108 yds. X 103 yds., and about 12 ft. in depth. In 1880 it was colonized by some Christian families from Kerak, among whom the Latins carry on mission work. In December, 1896, a most interesting mosaic was found. It proved to be a map of part of Palestine and Lower Egypt of the time of Justinian. Unfortunately it is much damaged. An account of it will be found in Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1897, 213 ff, 239; 1898, 85, 177 ff, 251.

W. Ewing

MEDES

medz (madhi; Assyrian Amada, Mada; Achaem. Persian Mada; Medoi (Ge 10:2; 2Ki 17:6; 18:11; 1Ch 1:5; Ezr 6:2; Es 1:3,14,18,19; 10:2; Isa 13:17; 21:2; Jer 25:25; 51:11,28; Da 5:28; 6:1,9,13,16; 8:20; 9:1; 11:1)): Mentioned as Japhethites in Ge 10:2, i.e. Aryans, and accordingly they first called themselves Arioi (Herod. vii.62), in Avestic Airya = Skt. Arya, "noble." They were closely allied in descent,

language and religion with the Persians, and in secular history preceded their appearance by some centuries. Like most Aryan nations they were at first divided into small village communities each governed by its own chiefs (called in Assyrian chazanati by Assur-bani-pal: compare Herod. i.96). Shalmaneser II mentions them (Nimrod Obelisk, i.121) about 840 BC. They then inhabited the modern A'zarbaijan (Media Atropatene). Rammanu-nirari III of Assyria (Rawlinson, Western Asiatic Inscriptions, I, 35) declares that he (810-781 BC) had conquered "the land of the Medes and the land of Parsua" (Persis), as well as other countries. This probably meant only a plundering expedition, as far as Media was concerned. So also Assur-nirari II (Western Asiastic Inscriptions, II, 52) in 749-748 BC overran Namri in Southwest Media. Tiglath-pileser IV (in Babylonian called Pulu, the "Pul" of 2Ki 15:19) and Sargon also overran parts of Media. Sargon in 716 BC conquered Kisheshin, Kharkhar and other parts of the country. Some of the Israelites were by him transplanted to "the cities of the Medes" (2Ki 17:6; 18:11; the Septuagint reading Ore, cannot be rendered "mountains" of the Medes here) after the fall of Samaria in 722 BC. It was perhaps owing to the need of being able to resist Assyria that about 720 BC the Medes (in part at least) united into a kingdom under Deiokes, according to Herodotus (i.98). Sargon mentions him by the name Dayaukku, and says that he himself captured this prince (715 BC) and conquered his territory two years later. After his release, probably, Deiokes fortified Ecbatana (formerly Ellippi) and made it his capital. It has been held by some that Herodotus confounds the Medes here with the Manda (or Umman-Manda, "hosts of the Manda") of the inscriptions; but these were probably Aryan tribes, possibly of Scythian origin, and the names Mada and Manda may be, after all, identical. Esar-haddon in his 2nd year (679-678 BC) and Assurbani-pal warred with certain Median tribes, whose power was now growing formidable. They (or the Manda) had conquered Persis and formed a great confederacy. Under Kyaxares (Uvakh-shatara—Deiokes' grandson, according to Herodotus), they besieged Nineveh, but Assur-bani-pal, with the assistance of the Ashguza (? the Ashkenaz of Ge 10:3), another Aryan tribe, repelled them. The end of the Assyrian empire came, however, in 606 BC, when the Manda under their king Iriba-tukte, Mamiti-arsu "lord of the city of the Medes," Kastarit of the Armenian district of Kar-kassi, the Kimmerians (Gimirra = Gomer) under Teushpa (Teispes, Chaishpish), the Minni (Manna; compare Jer 51:27), and the Babylonians under Nabu-pal-ucsur, stormed and destroyed Nineveh, as Nabu-nahid informs us. The last king of Assyria, Sin-sar-iskun (Sarakos), perished with his people.

Herodotus says that Deiokes was succeeded by Phraortes (Fravartish) his son, Phraortes by his son Kyaxares; and the latter in turn left his kingdom to his son Astyages whose daughter Mandane married Cambyses, father of the great Cyrus. Yet there was no Median empire (such as he describes) then, or at least it did not embrace all the Aryan tribes of Western Asia, as we see from the inscriptions that in 606 BC, and even later, many of them were under kings and princes of their own (compare Jer 25:25; 51:11). Herodotus tells us they were divided into six tribes, of whom the Magi were one (Herod. i.101). Kyaxares warred for 5 years (590-585 BC) with the Lydians, the struggle being ended in May, 585, by the total eclipse of the sun foretold by Thales (Herodotus i.74).

The alliance between the Medes and the Babylonians ended with Nebuchadnezzar's reign. His successor Nabu-nahid (555 BC) says that in that year the Medes under Astyages (Ishtuwegu) entered Mesopotamia and besieged Haran. Soon after, however, that dynasty was overthrown; for Cyrus the Persian, whom Nabu-nahid the first time he mentions him styles Astyages' "youthful slave" (ardusu cachru), but who

was even then king of Anshan (Anzan), attacked and in 549 BC captured Astyages, plundered Ecbatana, and became king of the Medes. Though of Persian descent, Cyrus did not, apparently, begin to reign in Persia till 546 BC. Henceforth there was no Median empire distinguished from the Persian (nor is any such mentioned in Daniel, in spite of modern fancies). As the Medes were further advanced in civilization and preceded the Persians in sovereignty, the Greek historians generally called the whole nation "the Medes" long after Cyrus' time. Only much later are the Persians spoken of as the predominant partners. Hence, it is a sign of early date that Daniel (8:20) speaks of "Media and Persia," whereas later the Book of Esther reverses the order ("Persia and Media," Es 1:3,14,18,19; 10:2), as in the inscriptions of Darius at Behistun. Under Darius I, Phraortes (Fravartish) rebelled, claiming the throne of Media as a descendant of Kyaxares. His cause was so powerfully supported among the Medes that the rebellion was not suppressed till after a fierce struggle. He was finally taken prisoner at Raga (Rai, near Tehran), brutally mutilated, and finally impaled st Ecbatana. After that Median history merges into that of Persia. The history of the Jews in Media is referred to in Daniel and Esther. 1 Maccabees tells something of Media under the Syrian (6:56) and Parthian dominion (14:1-3; compare Josephus, Ant, XX, iii). Medes are last mentioned in Ac 2:9. They are remarkable as the first leaders of the Aryan race in its struggle with the Semites for freedom and supremacy.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

MEDIA

me'-di-a (madhay; Achaem. Persian Mada; Media): Lay to the West and Southwest of the Caspian, and extended thence to the Zagrus Mountains on the West On the North in later times it was bounded by the rivers Araxes and Cyrus, which separated it from Armenia. Its eastern boundaries were formed by Hyrcania and the Great Salt Desert (now called the Kavir), and it was bounded on the South by Susiana. In earlier times its limits were somewhat indefinite. It included Atropatene, (Armenian Atrpatakan, the name, "Fire-guarding," showing devotion to the worship of Fire) to the North, and Media Magna to the South, the former being the present A'zarbaijan. Near the Caspian the country is low, damp and unhealthy, but inland most of it is high and mountainous, Mt. Demavand in the Alburz range reaching 18,600 ft. Atropatene was famed for the fertility of its valleys and table-lands, except toward the North. Media Magna is high; it has fruitful tracts along the course of the streams, but suffers much from want of water, though this was doubtless more abundant in antiquity. It contained the Nisaean Plain, famous for its breed of horses. The chief cities of ancient Media were Ecbatana, Gazaea, and Ragae. The Orontes range near Ecbatana is the present Alvand. Lake Spauta is now known as Urmi (Urumiah).

W. St. Clair Tisdall

MEDIAN

me'-di-an.

See DARIUS; MEDES; MEDIA.

MEDIATION; MEDIATOR

me-di-a’-shun, me’-di-a-ter:

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. The Terms

(1) Mediation

(2) Mediator

2. The Principle of Mediation

II. MEDIATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Negative Teaching in the Old Testament

2. The Positive Teaching: Early Period

3. Prophetic Mediation

4. Priestly Mediation

5. The Theocratic King: the Messiah

6. The Suffering Servant

7. Superhuman Agents of Mediation

(1) Angelic Mediation

(2) Divine Wisdom

III. IN SEMI-CANONICAL AND NON-CANONICAL JEWISH LITERATURE

IV. MEDIATION AND MEDIATOR IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. The Synoptic Gospels

(1) Christ as Prophet

(2) Christ as King

(3) Christ as Priest (Redeemer)

2. Primitive Apostolic Teachings

(1) The Early Speeches in Acts

(2) Epistles of James and Jude

(3) 1 Peter

3. Epistles of Paul

(1) The Need of a Mediator

(2) The Qualifications

(3) The Means, the Death of Christ

(4) The Resurrection and Exaltation

(5) The Cosmic Aspect of Christ’s Mediatorship

4. Epistle to the Hebrews

5. The Johannine Writings

(1) The Fourth Gospel

(2) The Epistles

(3) The Apocalypse

V. CONCLUSION

LITERATURE

I Introductory.

1. The Terms:

(1) Mediation:

"Mediation" in its broadest sense may be defined as the act of intervening between parties at variance for the purpose of reconciling them, or between parties not necessarily hostile for the purpose of leading them into an agreement or covenant. Theologically, it has reference to the method by which God and man are reconciled through the instrumentality of some intervening process, act or person, and especially through the atoning work of Jesus Christ. The term itself does not occur in Biblical literature.

(2) Mediator:

The term "mediator" (equals middleman, agent of mediation) is nowhere found in Old Testament or Apocrypha (English Versions of the Bible), but the corresponding Greek word mesites, occurs once in Septuagint (Job 9:33 the King James Version, "Neither is there any daysman betwixt us," where "daysman" stands for Hebrew mokhiach, "arbitrator," the American Standard Revised Version, the English Revised Version margin "umpire" (see DAYSMAN); Septuagint has ho mesites hemon, "our mediator," as a paraphrase for Hebrew benenu, "betwixt us"). Even in the New Testament, mesites, "mediator," occurs only 6 times, namely, Ga 3:19,20 (of Moses), and 1Ti 2:5; Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24 (of Christ).

2. The Principle of Mediation:

Though the actual terms are thus very rare, the principle of mediation is one of great significance in Biblical theology, as well as in the Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy. It corresponds to a profound human instinct or need which finds expression in some form or other in most religions. It is an attempt to solve the problem raised by (1) the idea of the infinite distance which separates God from man and the universe, and (2) the deeply felt want of bringing them into a harmonious relation. The conception of mediation will differ, therefore, according to whether the distance to be surmounted is understood ethically or metaphysically. If it be thought of in an ethical or religious sense, that is, if the emphasis be laid on the fact of human sin as standing in the way of man’s fellowship with God, then mediation will be the mode by which peaceful relations are established between sinful man and the absolutely righteous God. But if the antithesis of God and the world be conceived of metaphysically, i.e. be based on the ultimate nature of God and of the world conceived as essentially opposed to each other, then mediation will be the mode by which the transcendent God, without Himself coming into direct contact with the world, is able to produce effects in it through an intermediate agent (or agents). The latter conception (largely the result of an exaggerated Platonic dualism) exerted an important influence on later Jewish thought, and even on Christian theology, and will come briefly under our consideration. But in the main we shall be concerned with the former view, as more in harmony with the development of Biblical theology which culminates in the New Testament doctrine of atonement. Mediation between God and

man as presented in the Scriptures has 3 main aspects, represented respectively by the functions of the prophet, the priest, and theocratic king. Here and there in the Old Testament these tend to meet, as in Melchizedek the priest-king, and in the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah, who unites the priestly function of sacrifice with the prophetic function of revealing the Divine will. But on the whole, these aspects of mediation in the Old Testament run along lines which have no meeting-point in one person adequate to all the demands. In the New Testament they intersect in the person and work of Jesus Christ, who realizes in Himself the full meaning of the prophetic, priestly, and kingly ideals.

II. Mediation in the Old Testament.

1. Negative Teaching in the Old Testament:

We do not find in the Old Testament a fixed and final doctrine of mediation universally accepted as an axiom of religious thought, but only a gradual movement toward such a doctrine, under the growing sense of God’s exaltation and of man’s frailty and sinfulness. Such a passage as 1Sa 2:25 seems definitely to contradict the idea of mediation. Still more striking are the words of Job above referred to, "There is no umpire betwixt us, that might lay his hand upon us both," i.e. to enforce his decision (Job 9:33), where the Septuagint paraphrases, "Would that there were a mediator and a reprover and a hearer between us both." The note of despair which characterizes this passage shows that Job has no hope that such an arbitrator between him and God is forthcoming. Yet the words give pathetic utterance to the deep inarticulate cry of humanity for a mediator. In this connection we should note the protests of prophets and psalmists against an unethical view of mediation by animal sacrifices (Mic 6:6-8; Ps 40:6-8, etc.), and their frequent direct appeals to God for mercy without reference to any mediation (Ps 25:7; 32:5; 103:8 , etc.).

2. The Positive Teaching: Early Period:

(1) Mediatory Sacrifice.

In the patriarchal age, before the official priest had been differentiated from the rest of the community, the function of offering sacrifice was discharged by the head of the family or clan on behalf of his people, as by Noah (Ge 8:20), Abraham (Ge 12:7,8; 15:9-11), Isaac (Ge 26:24 f), Jacob (Ge 31:54; 33:20). So Job, conceived by the writer as living in patriarchal antiquity, is said to have offered sacrifices vicariously for his sons (Job 1:5). Melchizedek, the priest-king of Salem (Ge 14:18-20), is a figure of considerable theological interest, inasmuch as he was taken by the author of Ps 110 as the forerunner of the ideal theocratic king who was also priest, and by the author of He as prototype of Christ’s priesthood.

(2) Intercessory Prayer.

Intercession is in all stages of thought an essential element in mediation. We have striking examples of it in Ge 18:22-33; Job 42:8-10.

(3) The Mosaic Covenant.

In Moses we have for the first time a recognized national representative who acted both as God's spokesman to the people, and the people's spokesman before God. He alone was allowed to "come near unto Yahweh," and to him Yahweh spake "face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend" (Ex 33:11). He went up to God and "reported the words of the people" to Him, as to a sovereign who cannot be approached save by his duly accredited minister (Ex 19:8). We have a striking example of his intercessory mediation in the episode of the golden calf, when he pleaded effectively with God to turn from His wrath (Ex 32:12-14), and even offered to "make atonement for" (kipper, literally, "cover") their sin by confessing their sin before God, and being willing to be blotted out of God's book, so that the people might be spared (Ex 32:30-32). Here we have already the germs of the idea of vicarious suffering for sin.

(4) Intercessory Mediation.

Samuel is by Jeremiah classed with Moses as the chief representative of intercessory mediation (Jer 15:1). He is reported as mediating by prayer between Israel and God, and succeeding in warding off the punishment of their sin (1Sa 7:5-12). On such occasions, prayer was wont to be accompanied by confessions of sins and by an offering to Yahweh.

3. Prophetic Mediation:

Samuel represents the transition from the ancient seer or soothsayer to the prophetic order. The prophet was regarded as the organ of Divine revelation, to consult whom was equivalent to "inquiring of God" (1Sa 9:9)—a commissioner sent by God (Isa 6:8 f) to proclaim His will by word and action. In that capacity he was Yahweh's representative among men, and so could speak in a tone of authority. Prophetic revelation is essential to the Old Testament religion (compare Heb 1:1), which by it stands distinguished from a mere philosophy or natural religion. God is not merely a passive object of human discovery, but one who actively and graciously reveals Himself to His chosen people through the medium of the authorized exponents of His mind and will. Thus in the main the prophet stands for the principle of mediation in its man-ward aspect. But the God-ward aspect is not absent, for we find the prophet mediating with God on behalf of men, making intercession for them (Jer 14:19-22; Am 7:2 f, 5 f).

4. Priestly Mediation:

Mediation is in a peculiar sense the function of the priest. In the main he stands for the principle in its God-ward aspect. Yet in the early period it was the man-ward aspect that was most apparent; i.e. the priest was at first regarded as the medium through which Yahweh delivered His oracles to men, the human mouthpiece of supernatural revelation, giving advice in difficult emergencies by casting the sacred lot. Before the time of the first literary prophets, the association of the priests with the ephod and

the lot had receded into the background (though the high priest theoretically retained the gift of interpreting the Divine will through the Urim and Thummim, Ex 28:30; Le 8:8); but the power they lost with the oracle they gained at the altar. First they acquired a preferential status at the local sanctuaries; then, in the Deuteronomic legislation, where sacrifice is limited to the Jerusalem sanctuary, it is assumed that only Levite priests can officiate. Finally, in the Levitical system as set forth in the Priestly Code (which regulated Jewish worship in the post-exilic times), the Aaronic priests, now clearly distinguished from the Levites, have the sole privilege of immediate access to God in His sanctuary (Nu 4:19,20; 16:3-5). God's transcendence and holiness are now so emphasized that between Him and the sin-stained people there is almost an infinite chasm. Hence, the people can only enjoy its ideal right of drawing nigh unto God and offering sacrifice to Him through the mediation of the official priesthood. The mediatorship of priests derived its authority, not from their moral purity or personal worth, but from the ceremonial purity which attached to their office. All priests are not on the same level. A process of graduated sanctity narrows down their number as the approach is made to the Most Holy Place, which symbolizes the presence chamber of Yahweh.

(1) Out of the sacred nation as a whole, the priestly tribe of Levi is elected and invested with a special sanctity to perform all the subordinate acts of service within the tabernacle (Nu 8:19; 18:6).

(2) Within this sacred tribe, the members of the house of Aaron are set apart and invested with a still higher sanctity; they alone officiate at the altar in the Holy Place and expiate the guilt of the people by sacrifice and prayer, thus representing the people before God. Yet even they are only admitted to the proximate nearness of the Holy Place.

(3) The gradation of the hierarchy is completed by the recognition of a single, supreme head of the priesthood—the high priest. He alone can enter the Holy of Holies, and that alone once a year, on the Day of Atonement, when he makes propitiation not only for himself and the priesthood, but for the entire congregation. The ritual of the Day of Atonement is the highest exercise of priestly mediatorship. On that day, the whole community has access to Yahweh through their representative, the high priest, and through him offer atonement for their sins. Moreover, the role of the high priest as mediator is symbolized by his wearing the breastplate bearing the names of the children of Israel, whenever he goes into the Holy Place (Ex 28:29).

Something must be said of the sacrificial system, through which alone the priest exercised his mediatorial functions. For his mediatorship did not depend on his direct personal influence with God, exercised, for instance, through intercessory prayer (intercession is not mentioned by the Priestly Code (P) as a duty of the priest, though referred to by the prophets, Joe 2:17; Mal 1:9). It depended rather on an elaborate system of sacrifice, of which the priest was but an official agent. It was he who derived his authority from the system, rather than the system from him. The most characteristic features in the ritual of P are the sin offering (chatta'th, Le 4; 5; 6:24-30) and the guilt offering ('asham, Le 5$; 6$; 7$; 14$; 19$), which seem peculiar to P. These are meant to restore the normal relation of the people or of individuals to God, a relation which sin has disturbed. Hence, these sacrifices, when duly administered by the priest, are distinctly mediatorial or reconciliatory in character, i.e. they make atonement for or "cover" (kipper) the sin of the guilty community or individuals. This seems the case also, though in a far

less degree, even with the burnt, peace, and meal offerings, which, though "not offered expressly, like the sin and guilt offerings, for the forgiveness of sin, nevertheless were regarded .... as ‘covering,’ or neutralizing, the offerer’s unworthiness to appear before God, and so, though in a much less degree than the sin or guilt offering, as effecting propitiation" (Driver in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 132). We must beware, however, of reading the full New Testament doctrine of sin and propitiation into the sacrificial law. Two important points of difference may be noted: (1) The law does not provide atonement for all sins, but only for sins of ignorance or inadvertence, committed within the covenant. Deliberate sins fall outside the scope of priestly mediation. (2) While sin includes moral impurity, it must be admitted that the chief emphasis falls on ceremonial uncleanness, because it is only violation of physical sanctity that can be fully rectified by ritual ordinance. The law was essentially a civil code, and was not adequate to deal with inward sins. Thus the sacrificial system in itself is but a faint adumbration of the New Testament doctrine of Christ’s high-priestly work, which has reference to sin in its widest and deepest meaning. Yet, in spite of these limitations, the priestly ritual was, as far as it went, an organized embodiment of the sin-consciousness, and so prepared the way for the coming of a perfect Mediator.

5. The Theocratic King: the Messiah:

On another plane than that of the priest is the mediation of theocratic king. Yahweh was ideally the sole king of Israel. But He governed the people mediately through His vicegerent theocratic king, the agent of His will. The king was regarded as "Yahweh’s anointed" (1Sa 16:6, etc.), and his person as inviolable. He was the "visible representative of the invisible Divine King" (Riehm). The ideal of theocratic king was most nearly represented by David, the man after Yahweh’s own heart (compare 1Sa 13:14). This fact led to Yahweh’s covenant-promise that David’s house should constitute a permanent dynasty, and his throne be established forever (2Sa 7:5-17; compare Ps 89:19-37). The indestructibility of the Davidic dynasty was the basal conviction on which the hope of a Messiah was built. It led to attention being further concentrated on one preeminent King in David’s line, who should be the Divinely accredited representative of Yahweh, and reign in His name. As a Divinely endowed human hero, the Messiah will possess attributes which will qualify Him to mediate between God and His people in national life and affairs, and so inaugurate the ideal age of peace and righteousness. He is portrayed especially as the Royal Saviour of Israel, through whom the salvation of the people is mediated and justice administered (e.g. Isa 11:1-10; 61:1-3; Ps 72:4,13; Jer 23:5,6; 33:15,16).

6. The Suffering Servant:

In the wonderful figure of exilic prophecy, the Suffering Servant of Yahweh, the principle of mediation is exemplified both in its man-ward and God-ward aspects. In its man-ward aspect, his mission is the prophetic one of being God’s anointed messenger to men, His witness before the world (Isa 42:6,19; 43:10; 49:2; 50:4,5; 61:1-3). But the profound originality of the conception of the Servant lies chiefly in the God-ward significance of his suffering (Isa 53). The Servant suffered vicariously as an atonement for the sins of the people. His death is even said to be a "guilt-offering" (’asham, Isa 53:10), and he is represented as making "intercession for the transgressors" (Isa 53:12). Here is the profoundest expression in the Old Testament of the principle of mediatorship.

The substitution of voluntary, deliberate, human sacrifice for that of unwilling beasts elevates the sacrificial idea to a new ethical plane, and brings it into far more vital and organic relation to human life. The basis of the mediatorship of the Servant seems to be the principle of the solidarity or organic unity of the people, involving the ideal unity of the Servant and the people he represents. In the earlier servant-passages the Servant is identical with the whole nation (Isa 41:8; 44:1 f, and often), and the unity is therefore actual, not ideal merely. In other passages, however, they are clearly to be distinguished, for while the people as a whole is unfaithful to its mission, the Servant remains faithful and suffers for it. Whether in Isa 53 the Servant is the pious remnant of the people or is conceived of as an individual we need not here consider. In either case, the tie between the Servant and the whole nation is never completely broken; the idea of their mystical union is still the groundwork of the prophet's thought. In virtue of this ideal relation, the Servant is the representative of the nation before God, not in a mere official sense (as in the case of the priest), but on the ground of personal merit, as the true Israel, the embodiment of the national ideal. On that ground God can accept his suffering in lieu of the deserved penalty of the whole people. We have here a wonderful adumbration of the New Testament doctrine of atonement through the One Mediator, the Son of Man, the representative of the race.

See SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

7. Superhuman Agents of Mediation:

In later Judaism, the growing sense of God's transcendence favored the tendency to introduce supernatural intermediaries between God and the world.

(1) Angelic Mediation.

Not until post-exilic times did angels come to have theological significance. Previously, when God was anthropomorphically conceived as appearing periodically on earth in visible form, the need of angelic mediation was not felt. The "angel" in early narrative (e.g. Ge 16:7-11) did not possess abiding personality distinct from God, but was God Himself temporarily manifested in human form. But the more God came to be conceived as "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity," the greater was the need for mediation between God and the world, and even between God and His servant the prophet. In post-exilic writers there is an increasing disposition to fill up the gap between God and the prophet with superhuman beings. Thus Zechariah receives all Divine instruction through angels; and similarly Daniel receives explanations of his dreams. We do not in the Old Testament hear of angels interceding with God (God-ward mediation), but only as intermediaries of revelation and of the Divine will (man-ward mediation). Modern Jewish scholars deny that Judaistic angelology implied that God was transcendent in the sense of being remote and out of contact with the world. So, e.g., Montefiore (Hibbert Lectures, 423-31), but even he admits a "natural disinclination to bring the Godhead downward to human conditions," and that "for supernatural conversations angels formed a convenient substitute for God" (p. 430). The doctrine of angels had no influence on the New Testament doctrine of mediation, which moves on the plane of the ethical, rather than on the basis of the merely physical transcendenee of God.

(2) Divine Wisdom.

Of more importance as a preparation for theology of the New Testament is the doctrine of Wisdom, in which the Jews found "a middle term between the religion of Israel and the philosophy of Greece." In Pr 8:22-31 Wisdom is depicted as an individual energy, God's elect Son, His companion and master-workman (Pr 8:30) in creation, but whose chief delight is with the children of men. Though the personification is here purely ideal and poetical, and the ethical interest predominates over the metaphysical, yet we have in such a passage a clear proof of contact with Greek thought (especially Platonism and Stoicism), and of the felt need of a mediator between God and the visible world. This mode of thought, linked to the Hebrew conception of the Divine Word as the efficient expression of God's thought and the medium of His activity (Isa 55:11; Ps 33:6; 107:20), has left its mark on Philo's Logos-doctrine and on the New Testament Christology.

See WISDOM.

III. In Semi-and Non-canonical Jewish Literature.

In the Apocrypha, the idea of mediation is for the most part absent. We have one or two references to angelic intercession (Tobit 12:12,15), a function not attributed to angels in the Old Testament, but prominent in later apocalyptic literature (e.g. Enoch 9:10; 15:2; 40:6). The tradition of the agency of angels in the promulgation of the law is first found in the Septuagint of De 33:2 (not in the Hebrew original), but was greatly amplified in rabbinical literature (Josephus, Ant, XV, v, 3). In The Wisdom of Solomon a bold advance is made toward the conception of Wisdom as a personal mediator of creation (especially 7:22-27). In later Judaism, the idea of the Word is further developed. The Targums constantly refer the Divine activity to the memera' or "Word" of God, where the Old Testament refers it to God directly, and speaks of it as Israel's Intercessor before God and as Redeemer. This usage seems to arise out of a reluctance to bring God into immediate contact with the world; hence, God's self-manifestation is represented as mediated through a quasi-personal agent. The tendency finds its full development, however, not among the Jerusalem Jews, but among the Jews of Alexandria, especially in Philo's Logos-doctrine. Deeply influenced by the Platonic dualism, Philo thought of God as pure Spirit, incapable of contact with matter, so that without mediation God could not act on the world. To fill up the great gap he conceived of intermediary beings which represented at once the Ideas of Plato, the active Powers of the Stoics, and the angels of the Old Testament. The highest of these was the Divine Logos, the mediator between the inaccessible, transcendent Being and the material universe. On the one hand, in relation to the world, the Logos is the Mediator of creation and of revelation; on the other, in his God-ward activity, he is the representative of the world before God, its High Priest, Intercessor, and Paraclete. Yet Philo's Logos was probably nothing more than a high philosophical abstraction vividly imaged in the mind. In spite of Philo's influence on early Christian theology, and even perhaps on some New Testament writers, his doctrine of mediation moves on quite different lines from the central New Testament doctrine, which is concerned above all with the reconciliation of God and man on account of sin, and not with the metaphysical reconciliation of the absolute and the finite world. The Mediator of Philo is an abstraction of speculative thought; the Mediator of the New Testament is a concrete historical

person known to experience.

See PHILO, JUDAEUS.

IV. Mediation and Mediator in the New Testament.

The relatively independent lines of development which the conception of mediation has hitherto taken now meet and coalesce in Jesus Christ.

1. The Synoptic Gospels:

The traditional division of Christ's mediatorial work into that of prophet, priest and king (very common since Calvin, but now often discarded) offers a convenient method of treating the subject, though we must avoid making the division absolute, as if Christ's work fell apart into three separate and independent functions. The unity of the work of salvation is preserved by the fact that "no one of the offices fills up a moment of time alone, but the others are always cooperative," although "Christ's mediatorial work puts now this, now that side in the foreground." "The triple division is of special value, because it sets in a vivid light the continuity between the Old Testament theocracy and Christianity" (Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, English translation, III, 385 ff). These three aspects of Christ's mediatorship can be distinguished in the Synoptics, although the formal distinction is the work of later analysis.

(1) Christ as Prophet.

It was in the character of Prophet that He mainly impressed the common mind, which was moved to inquire "Whence hath this man this wisdom?" and by His reply, "A prophet is not without honor," etc., He virtually accepts that title (Mt 13:54,57). As Prophet, Christ is the mediator of revelation; through Him alone can men come to know God as Father (Mt 11:27) and "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven" (Mt 13:11). In all His teaching we feel that He speaks within the center of truth, and hence can teach with authority and not as the scribes (Mt 7:29), who approach the truth from without. His teaching is part of His redemptive work, and not something extraneous to it, for the sin from which He redeems includes ignorance and error.

(2) Christ as King.

The official name "Christ" (equals Messiah, the anointed King) refers primarily to His kingship. The Messianic hope had taught men to look forward to the rule of God on earth instituted and administered through His representative. Christ was the fulfillment of that hope. Though He held an attitude of reserve in the matter, there can be no doubt that He conceived of Himself as the Messiah (Mr 8:27-30; 14:16 f; compare His entry into Jerusalem as a triumphant king, Mr 11:1 ; the inscription on the cross, Mr 15:26). But it is also clear that He fundamentally modified the Messianic idea, (a) by suffusing it with the thought of vicarious suffering, and (b) by giving it an ethical and spiritual rather than a national

and official significance. The note of His kingship was that of authority (Mr 1:27; 2:10; Mt 7:29; 28:18) exercised in the realm of truth and conscience. His kingship includes the future as well as the present; He is the arbiter of human destiny (Mt 25:31).

(3) Christ as Priest (Redeemer).

The synoptists do not hint at the priestly analogy. Our Lord often spoke of forgiveness without mentioning Himself as the one through whom it was mediated, as if it flowed directly from the gracious heart of the Father (compare the parables of Lu 15). But there are other passages which emphasize the close connection of His person with men's redemption. Men's attitude to Him decides absolutely their relation to God (Mt 10:32,40). Rest of soul is mediated to the heavy laden through Him (Mt 11:28-30). He claims authority on earth to forgive sins (Mr 2:10). We have no evidence that He spoke definitely of His death until after Peter's confession at Caesarea (Mr 8:31, "began to teach," etc.), though we seem to have vague allusions earlier (e.g. the allegory of the bridegroom, Mr 2:19,20). This may be partly due to conscious reserve, in accordance with the true pedagogical method by which He adapted His teaching to the progressive receptivity of His followers. But inasmuch as we must think of Him as subject to the ordinary laws of human psychology, the idea of His death must have been to Him a growth, matured partly by outward events, and partly by the development of His inner consciousness as the Suffering Messiah. In His later ministry, He frequently taught that He must suffer and die (Mr 9:12,31; 10:32 f; 12:8; 14:8 and parallel passages; compare Mr 10:38; Lu 12:49 f). There are two important passages which expressly connect His death with His mediatorial work. The first is Mr 10:45 (parallel Mt 20:28), "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." The context shows that it was while the thought of His approaching death filled His mind that our Lord uttered these words (compare Mr 10:33,38 f). As to the exact meaning of ransom (lutron) there are two circles of ideas with which it may be associated. (a) It may mean a sacrificial offering, representing Hebrew kopher (literally, "covering," "propitiatory gift") which it translates several times in Septuagint (e.g. Ex 30:12). Thus, Ritschl defines it as "an offering which, because of its specific worth to God, is a protection or coveting against sin" (Rechtfertigung und Versohnung, II, 68-88). (b) It may mean ransom price, the purchase-money paid for the emancipation of a slave. In Septuagint, lutron in most cases stands for some form of the roots ga'al, "to deliver," padhah, "to redeem" (e.g. Le 25:51; Nu 3:51). Hence, Wendt explains the "ransom" as the price by which Jesus redeemed His disciples from their bondage to suffering and death (Teaching of Jesus, II, 226 ff). This analogy certainly suits the context better than that drawn from the Levitical ritual, for it brings out the contrast between the liberating work of Christ and the enslaving work of those who "lord it over" men. We must not press the analogy in detail or seek here an answer to the question, who was the recipient of the ransom price (e.g. whether the Devil, as many Fathers, notably Origen and Gregory of Nyssa; God, as Anselm and later theologians; the "eternal law of righteousness," as Dale). The purpose of the passage is primarily practical, not speculative. It is certainly pressing the figurative language of Jesus too far to insist that the ransom price is the exact quantitative equivalent of the lives liberated, or of the penalty they had deserved regarded as a debt. This is too prosaic and literalistic an interpretation of a passage which has its setting in the ethical rather than in the commercial realm, and which breathes a spirit closely akin to that of Isa 53, where suffering and service axe, as here, combined.

The other passage in which Christ definitely connects His mediatorship with His death is that which reports His words at the Last Supper (Mr 14:22-24; Mt 26:26-28; Lu 22:19 f; compare 1Co 11:24 f). The reported words are not identical in the several narratives. But even in their simplest form (in Mark), there is evidently a threefold allusion, to the paschal lamb, to the sacrifice offered by Moses at the ratification of the covenant at Sinai (Ex 24:8), and to Jeremiah's prophecy of a new covenant (Ex 31$; 32 $; 33$; 34$). There can be little doubt that the paschal feast, though it does not conform in detail to any of the Levitical sacrifices, was regarded as a sacrifice, as is indicated by the blood ceremonial (Ex 12:21-27). The blood of the covenant, too, is sacrificial; and, as we have seen, it is probable that all blood sacrifices, and not those of the sin and guilt offerings only, were associated with propitiatory power. Wendt denies that there is here any reference to sin and its forgiveness (Teachings of Jesus, II, 241 f). It must be admitted that the words in Matthew "unto remission of sins," which have no counterpart in the other reports, are probably an explanatory expansion of the words actually uttered. But they are a true interpretation of their meaning, as is attested by the fact that the new covenant of Jeremiah's prophecy was one of forgiveness and justification (Jer 31:34), and that Christ speaks of His blood as shed for others. And as the Passover signified deliverance from bondage to an earthly power (Egypt), so the Supper stands for forgiveness and deliverance from a spiritual power (sin). Clearly Christ here represents Himself as the Mediator of the new covenant, through whom men are to find acceptance with God, though the exact modus operandi of His sacrifice is not indicated.

The Synoptics give special prominence to those historical events which are most intimately associated with Christ's mediatorship—not only the agony in the garden and the crucifixion, but also the resurrection and ascension (which make possible His intercessory mediation in heaven).

2. Primitive Apostolic Teachings:

(1) The Early Speeches in Acts.

The early speeches in Ac reveal a primitive stage of theological reflection. Yet they are essentially Christocentric. (a) It is the Messianic Kingship of Christ that is chiefly emphasized. The main thesis is that Jesus is the Messiah (the "anointed one"; compare Ac 4:27; 10:38), and that His Messiahship was realized in the crucifixion and attested by the resurrection. An important feature is the use of the title "Servant" for Christ (Ac 3:13,16; 4:27,30; compare Ac 8:30-35), in evident reference to the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. In the phrase, "thy holy Servant .... whom thou didst anoint," coming immediately after the Messianic quotation, "against the Lord, and against his Anointed" (Ac 4:26 f), we have a concise instance of that coalescing of the idea of the Messiah with that of the Suffering Servant which gave the Messianic idea an entirely new meaning. As Messiah, Jesus was the sole Mediator of salvation (Ac 4:12). (b) Another Old Testament type which finds its fulfillment in Jesus is that of the "prophet like unto" Moses (Ac 3:22; 7:37; compare De 18:15,18). (c) But the priestly functions of Christ are not explicitly touched on. The questions are not faced, What is the God-ward significance of His death? How is it effective for man's salvation? It is rather the man-ward significance that is made explicit, i.e. Jesus as Messiah mediates salvation to men from His place of exaltation at the right hand of God. Yet the germs of a God-ward mediation are found in the identification of the Messiah with the Suffering Servant.

(2) Epistles of James and Jude.

In these epistles the doctrine of Christ’s mediation does not occupy a prominent place. To James, Christianity is the culmination of Judaism. Christ’s mediatorial functions are set forth more by way of presupposition than by explicit statement, and the whole weight is laid on the kingly and prophetic offices. The Messiahship of Jesus is assumed to such an extent that the title "Christ" has become part of the proper name, and His Lordship is also implied (1:1; 2:1). Nothing definite is said of His function in salvation; it is God Himself who regenerates, but the medium of regeneration is "the word of truth," "the implanted word" (1:18,21), which

must refer to the word which Jesus had preached. This implies that Jesus as prophetic teacher is the Mediator of salvation. Nothing is said of the death on the cross or its saving significance. The Epistle of Jude assumes the Lordship of Christ, through whom God’s Saviourhood works, and whose mercy results in eternal life (1:4,21,25).

(3) 1 Peter.

In 1 Peter we have the early apostolic teaching touched with Paulinism. The fact that salvation is mediated through the sufferings and death of Christ is now explicitly stated. Christ has suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous (3:18). The suffering has significance both God-ward and man-ward. Relatively to God it is a sacrificial offering which opens up a way of access to Him; He suffered "that he might bring us to God" (3:18), and that through His representative priesthood the ideal "holy priesthood" of all God’s people might be realized, for it is "through Jesus Christ" that men’s "spiritual sacrifices" become "acceptable to God" (2:5). So the elect are sprinkled with the blood of Christ, i.e. brought into communion with God by His sacrifice (1:2). Relatively to man, it is a means of ransoming or liberating man from the bondage compare sin. "Knowing that ye were redeemed (elutrothete, literally, "ransomed," from lutron, "ransom," an echo of Mr 10:45) .... with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" (1Pe 1:18,19). The sacrificial language is simple and undeveloped, and it is not clear whether the figure of "lamb" implies a reference to the paschal lamb or to Isa 53:7, or to both. The effect on man is, however, clear. Christ "bare our sins in his body upon the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness; by whose stripes ye were healed" (1Pe 2:24; see the whole passage, 1Pe 2:21-24, reminiscent of the figure of the Suffering Servant of Isa 53$).

3. Epistles of Paul:

Christ’s mediatorship stands at the very center of Paul’s gospel; this in spite of the fact that only once does he apply the term "mediator" to Christ (1Ti 2:5), and that in the only other passage where he uses the word, he applies it to Moses, in a sense which might seem to be inconsistent with the idea of Christ’s mediatorship, namely, where he discusses the relation of law to promise. The law was "ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not .... of one; but God is one" (Ga 3:19,20).

This passage has had to undergo about 300 different interpretations. The view that the "mediator" here is Christ (Origen, Augustine and most of the Fathers, Calvin, etc.) is clearly untenable. Modern exegetes agree that the reference is to Moses (compare Le 26:46, where the Septuagint has "by the hand of Moses"; Philo calls Moses "mediator and reconciler," De Vit. Moys, iii.19), who, according to a rabbinical tradition, received the Law through the intermediation of angles (compare Ac 7:53; Heb 2:2). Nor is it likely that Paul meant the reader to realize the glory of the law and the solemnity of its ordination (Meyer). The point is rather the inferiority of the law to the evangelical promise to Abraham. Mediation implies at least two parties between whom it is carried on. The law was given by a double mediatorship, that of the angels and that of Moses, and was thus two removes from its Divine source. But in relation to the promise God stood alone, i.e. acted freely, unconditionally, independently, and for Himself alone. The promise is no agreement between two, buy the free gift of the one God (so Schleiermacher, Lightfoot, etc.). This is by no means a denial of the Divine origin of the law (Ritschl), for the mediation of angels and of Moses was Divinely authorized; but it does seem to make the method of mediation inferior to that of the direct communication of God’s gracious will to man. Paul is not, however, treating of the principle of mediation in the abstract, but only that form of it which implies a contract between two parties. Christ is not Mediator in the same sense as Moses, for the free and unconditioned character of the forgiving grace which Christ mediates is by no means diminished by the fact of His mediation.

What, then, is Paul’s positive teaching on Christ’s Mediatorship?

(1) The Need of a Mediator:

The need of a Mediator arises out of the fact of sin. Sin interrupts the harmonious relation between God and man. It results in a state of mutual alienation. On the one hand, man is in a state of enmity to God (Ro 5:10; 8:7; Col 1:21). On the other hand, God is moved to righteous wrath in relation to the sinner (Ro 1:18; 5:9; Eph 5:6; Col 3:6). Hence, the need of a mutual change of attitude, a removal of God’s displeasure against the sinner as well as of the sinner’s hostility to God. God could not restore man to favor by a mere fiat, without some public exhibition of Divine righteousness, and vindication of His character as not indifferent to sin (compare Ro 3:25,26). Such exhibition demanded a Mediator.

(2) The Qualifications:

The qualification of Christ to be the Mediator depends on His intimate relation to both parties at variance.

(a) Christ’s Relation to Man:

Firstly, He is Himself a man, i.e. not merely "man" generically, but an individual man. The "one mediator between God and men" is "himself man, Christ Jesus" (1Ti 2:5), "born of a woman" (Ga 4:4), "in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Ro 8:3, where the word "likeness" does not make "flesh" unreal, but qualifies "sinful"), i.e. bore to the eye the aspect of an ordinary man; secondly, He bore a particular

relation to a section of humanity, the Jews (Ro 1:3; 9:5); thirdly, He bore a universal relation to mankind in general. He was more than an individual among many, like a link in a chain. He was the Second Adam, the archetypal, universal, representative Man, whose actions therefore had significance beyond Himself and were ideally the actions of humanity, just as Adam's act had, on a lower plane, a significance for the whole race (Ro 5:12-21; 1Co 15:22,45).

(b) His Relation to God:

Paul very frequently speaks of Christ as the "Son of God," and that in a unique sense. Moreover, He was the "image of God" (2Co 4:4; Col 1:15), and subsisted originally "in the form of God" (Php 2:6). He is set alongside with God over against idols (1Co 8:5,6), and is coordinated with God in the benediction (2Co 13:14). Clearly Paul sets Him in the Divine sphere over against all that is not God. Yet he assigns Him a certain subordination, and even asserts that His mediatorial kingship will come to an end, that God may be all in all (1Co 15:24,28). But this cessation of His function as Mediator of salvation, when its end shall have been attained, cannot affect His Divine dignity, "since the mediatorial sovereignty which is now ceasing was not its cause, but its consequence" (B. Weiss, II, 396).

(3) The Means, the Death of Christ:

The means of effecting the reconciliation was mainly the death on the cross. Paul emphasizes the mediating value of the death both on its objective (God-ward) side and on its subjective (man-ward) side. First, it is the objective ground of forgiveness and favor with God. On the basis of what Christ has done, God ceases to reckon to men their sins (2Co 5:19). Paul's view of the death may be seen by considering some of his most characteristic expressions.

(a) It is an act of reconciliation. This involves a change of attitude, not only in man, but in God, a relinquishing of the Divine wrath without which there can be no restoration of peaceful relations (though this is disputed by many, e.g. Ritschl, Lightfoot, Westcott, Beyschlag), but not a change of nature or of intention, for the Divine wrath is but a mode of the eternal love, and moreover it is the Father Himself who provides the means of reconciliation and undertakes to accomplish it (2Co 5:19; compare Col 1:20,21; Eph 2:16).

(b) It is an act of propitiation (Ro 3:25, hilasterion, from hilaskesthai, "to render favorable" or "propitious"). Here there is a clear though tacit reference to a change of attitude on God's part. He who was not formerly propitious to man was appeased through the death of Christ. Yet the propitiatory means are provided by God Himself, who takes the initiative in the matter ("whom God set forth," etc.).

(c) It is a ransom. The Mediator "gave himself a ransom for all" (1Ti 2:6). The idea of payment of a ransom price is clearly implied in the word "redemption" (Ro 3:24; 1Co 1:30; Eph 1:7; Col 1:14, apolutrosis, from lutron, "ransom"). It is not alone the fact of liberation (Westcott, Ritschl), but also the cost of liberation that is referred to. Hence, Christians are said to be "redeemed," "bought with a price" (Ga 3:13; 4:5; 1Co 6:20; 7:23; compare 1Pe 1:18 f). Yet the metaphor cannot be pressed to yield

an answer to the question to whom the ransom was paid. All that can safely be said is that it expresses the tremendous cost of our salvation, namely, the self-surrendered life ("the blood") of Christ.

(d) Strong substitutionary language is sometimes used, notably in Ga 3:13 ("having become a curse for us") and in 2Co 5:21 ("Him who knew no sin he made to be sin on our behalf"). But the sinless substitute is not regarded as actually punished (that would be a moral contradiction). His death was not penal substitution, but a substitute for penalty. It had the value to God of the punishment of sinners, in virtue of His oneness with the race. It was the recognition from within humanity of the sinfulness of sin, and expressed the Divine righteousness as fully as penalty would have done. The secret seems to be Christ's sympathetic love by which He identified Himself with man's sin and doom of death.

(e) Sacrificial language is used, as in 1Co 5:7; Eph 5:2, and in the references to Christ's "blood." Not often, however, does Paul explicitly speak of the death in terms of the Levitical ritual, which would be less congenial to his mind than the prophetic conception of the Suffering Servant. Yet he does seem to regard the death of Christ as the culmination of all that the sacrifices of the Old Testament had imperfectly realized. Secondly, the subjective aspect of Christ's work is emphasized quite as much as the objective. The death of Christ, being inwardly assimilated by faith, becomes to the believer the principle of ethical transformation, so that he may become worthy of the Divine favor which he now enjoys. As a result of his subjective identity with Christ through faith, the objective state of privilege is changed into actual liberation from sin (Ga 2:20; 6:14; Ro 6:6,7; Col 3:3).

(4) The Resurrection and Exaltation:

The resurrection and exaltation of Christ are essential to His mediatorial work (1Co 15:17). It is not alone that the resurrection "proves that the death of Christ was not the death of a sinner, but the vicarious death of the sinless Mediator of salvation" (B. Weiss, I, 436), but that salvation cannot be realized except through communion with the living, glorified Christ, without which the subjective identity of the believer with Christ by which redemption is personally appropriated would not be possible (Ga 2:20; Ro 6:4,5; Php 3:10; Col 3:1). The exaltation also makes possible His continuous heavenly intercession on our behalf (Ro 8:34), which is the climax of His mediatorial activities.

(5) The Cosmic Aspect of Christ's Mediatorship:

In his later epistles (especially Colossians and Ephesians), Paul lays stress on Christ's mediatorial activity in creation and providence, though the germs of his later teaching are found in the earlier epistles (1Co 8:6). He is resisting a kind of nascent Gnostic dualism, according to which God could communicate with the world only through a hierarchy of intermediate powers. Against this he proclaims Christ as the one and only Mediator between God and the universe, having, on the one hand, a unique relation to God ("the image of the invisible God," Col 1:15; in whom the fullness of God dwells, 1:19; 2:9), and, on the other hand, a unique relation to the world, as its creative agent, its immanent principle of unity, and its ultimate goal (Col 1:15-17). Here the apostle shows affinity with the Logos-doctrine of Philo, though the differences are marked and fundamental. Corresponding to this wider view of Christ's

person, there is a wide view of the reconciliation wrought through Him. It even extends to the world beyond man, and restores the broken harmony of the universe (Col 1:20; Eph 1:10).

4. Epistle to the Hebrews:

The main thesis of Hebrews is the absoluteness and finality of the gospel and its superiority over Judaism. The finality of Christianity depends on the fact that it has a perfect Mediator, who is the substance of which the various Jewish forms of mediation were types and shadows. He illustrates this by a series of contrasts between Christ and the mediators of the old system (by the application of principles and exegetical methods which reveal the influence of the school of Philo). In each contrast, Christ's superiority is based on His Sonship.

(1) Christ is superior to the prophets as Mediator of revelation. The Old Testament revelation was fragmentary and multiform, while now God speaks, not through many agents, but through One, and that one a Son. As Son He is the perfectly adequate expression of the Father. The author takes us at once to the high transcendental sphere of Christ's relations to God and the universe, in virtue of which He is God's Mediator in creation, providence, revelation and redemption (Heb 1:1-3).

(2) He is superior to the angels, through whose mediation the law was given (Heb 1:4-14).

(3) He is superior to Moses, the human agent in the giving of the law (Heb 3:1-6). (4) He is greater than Aaron the high priest, the people's representative before God. This leads to the central doctrine of the epistle, the high-priesthood of Jesus. The following are the salient points in the elaborate treatment of this subject:

(1) Christ's Qualification for the High-Priesthood Is Twofold:

(a) His participation in all human experience (except sin), which guarantees His power of sympathy. Every high priest, as men's representative before God, must be "taken from among men" (Heb 5:1). Hence, the author lays great stress on the human nature and experiences of Christ (compare Heb 2:10,17,18; 4:15; 5:7,8). (b) His Divine appointment. Every priest must have a call from God. So Christ has been appointed priest, not indeed in the Aaronic line, but after the order of Melchizedek (Heb 5:1-10).

(2) The Nature of His Priesthood, Its Superiority to the Levitical Priesthood.

The priests of the Old Testament themselves needed atonement, for they were not sinless; Christ is holy, guileless, undefiled, and need not make atonement for His own sins. They were priests only for a time, and were many in number, for they were mortal; but He abideth forever, and His priesthood is eternal. They were dependent on the law of physical descent; He was a priest after the order of Melchizedek, whose priesthood did not depend on genealogy or pedigree, and who combined the functions of king with those of priest. In a word, their order was transient, temporary, shadowy; His belonged to the world

of unchanging reality (Heb 7).

(3) The Realization of His High-Priesthood.

A high priest implies a sacrifice; hence, Christ must "have somewhat to offer" (Heb 8:3). In the Levitical system, the priest and the sacrifice are distinct from each other. But Christ offered not an external gift, but Himself. Much stress is laid on Christ's voluntary obedience (Heb 5:8; 10:7), progressively attained through suffering, and culminating in the absolute surrender of His life ("blood") in death. His sacrifice harmonizes with the principle that "apart from shedding of blood there is no remission" (Heb 9:22), although the principle is lifted from the physical to the spiritual realm. In working this out, the author makes use of analogies drawn from three parts of the Levitical ritual.

(a) Christ's death was a sin offering. He has offered one final sacrifice for sins (Heb 10:12,18). As priest, he has "made propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb 2:17); as victim He was "once (for all) offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb 9:28).

(b) The Sinaitic covenant (Ex 24:8) is made use of. Christ is "the mediator of a new (better) covenant" (Heb 8:6; 9:15; 12:24), i.e. the agent interposing between God and man in the establishment of a new relationship analogous to Moses in the old covenant. Even the first covenant was dedicated with blood, and so the blood of the Son of God was "the blood of the covenant" (Heb 10:29; compare Mr 14:24). On the double meaning of the word diatheke ("covenant," "testament"), the author bases a twofold argument for the necessity of Christ's death (Heb 9:15).

(c) The ritual of the Day of Atonement furnishes another analogy. As the high priest once a year entered the most holy place of the earthly people, so Christ has entered once for all the true spiritual sanctuary in heaven, and there He presents Himself to God as the Mediator able to make intercession for us with the Father (Heb 9:12,24-26; compare Heb 7:25). He is a ministering priest in the true tabernacle, the immediate presence of God (Heb 8:2). Thus the ascension and session make possible the culmination of the mediatorial work of Christ in the eternal sacrifice and intercession within the veil.

(4) The Man-ward Efficacy of His Mediatorship.

The effect of Christ's death on man is described by the words "cleanse," "sanctify," "perfect" (Heb 9:14; 10:10,14,29; 13:12), words which have a ritualistic quite as much as an ethical sense, meaning the removal of the sense of guilt, dedication to God, and the securing of the privilege of full fellowship with Him. The ultimate blessing that comes to man through the work of Christ is the privilege of free, unrestricted access to God by the removal of the obstacle of guilt (Heb 4:16; 10:19).

5. The Johannine Writings:

(1) The Fourth Gospel.

Aspects of our Lord’s teaching unassimilated by the other disciples, and therefore but meagerly touched on in the Synoptics, find prominence in the Gospel of John, but colored by his own meditations. Great emphasis is laid on the idea of salvation by revelation mediated through Jesus Christ. The historical revelation of God in the person and teaching of Jesus is the main subject of the Gospel. But in the Prologue we have the eternal background of the historical manifestation in the doctrine of the Logos, who, as Son in eternal fellowship with the Father, His mediator in creation, and the immanent principle of revelation in the world, is fitted to become God’s Revealer in history (1:11-18). His work on earth is to dispense light and life, knowledge of God and salvation. Through Him God gives to the world eternal life (3:16). He is the Water of Life (4:14; 7:37), the Bread of Life (6:48 ff), the Light of the World (8:12); it is by inward appropriation of Him that salvation is mediated to men (6:52 ff). He is the perfect revealer of God, hence, the only means of access to the Father (14:6,9). It is on salvation by illumination and communion, rather than on salvation by reconciliation and atonement that chief stress is laid. Sacrificial or propitiatory language is not used of Christ’s death. Yet emphasis is laid on the voluntary and vicarious character of His death. He lays down His life of Himself (10:18); "The good shepherd layeth down his life for (equals on behalf of) the sheep" (10:11; compare 15:13). Christ’s death was the supreme example of the law that self-sacrifice is necessary to the highest and most fruitful life (12:23 ff). In John 17 we have a unique instance of our Lord’s intercessory prayer.

(2) The Epistles.

In 1 John we find more explicit statements with regard to the connection between the death of Christ and sin. "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin" (1:7); "He was manifested to take away sins" (3:5); "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father," i.e. a pleader who will mediate with God on our behalf, the ground of His intercessory efficacy being that He is the "propitiation for our sins" (2:2; 4:10, a term which links the Johannine doctrine to that of Paul, though 1 John represents Christ Himself, and not merely His death on the cross, as the propitiation). This latter term shows that an objective value is attached to the atonement, as in some way neutralizing or making amends for sin in the eyes of God, yet in such a way as not to contradict the principles of righteousness (compare "Jesus Christ the righteous," 2:1).

(3) The Apocalypse.

The Apocalypse presents both aspects of Christ’s mediation. On the one hand, He is associated with God in the government of the world and in judgment (Re 3:21; 7:10; 6:16), holds the keys of death and Hades (Re 1:18), is the Lord of lords and King of kings (Re 17:14; 19:16), and is the Mediator of creation (Re 3:14). On the other hand, by His sacrificial act He represents men before God. The most characteristic expression of this is the title "the Lamb" (29 t). By His blood the guilty are cleansed and made saints, purchased unto God (Re 5:9; 7:14). The lamb is the symbol of the sacrificial love which is the heart of God’s sovereignty (Re 5:6). It is not clear whether the allusion in this title is to the paschal lamb or to the Suffering Servant pictured as a lamb led to the slaughter (Isa 53:7), or to both. In any case it contains the idea of Christ’s redemptive sacrifice, which is declared to be an essential part of God’s eternal counsel (Re 13:8 margin, "the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world").

V. Conclusion.

Our inquiry will have shown how central and prominent is the idea of mediation throughout the Scriptures. We might even say it supplies the key to the unity of the Bible. In the Old Testament the principle is given "in divers portions and in divers manners," but in the New Testament it converges in the doctrine of the person and work of the One final Mediator, the Son of God. Amid all the rich diversity of the various parts of the New Testament, there is one fundamental conception common to all, that of Christ as at once the interpreter of God to men and the door of access for men to God. Especially is Christ's self-sacrifice presented as the effective cause of our salvation, as a means of removing the guilt and sin which stand as a barrier in the way of God's purpose concerning man and of man's fellowship with God. There is a tendency in some influential writers of today to speak disparagingly of the doctrine of the one Mediator, on the ground that it injures the direct relationship of man with God (e. g. R. Eucken, Truth of Religion, 583 ff). Here we can reply only that the doctrine properly defined is attested in universal Christian experience, and that, so far from standing in the way of our personal approach to God, it is a simple historical fact that apart from the work of Jesus we would not enjoy that free access to Him which is now our privilege.

LITERATURE.

Besides the commentaries, such works on Old Testament Theology as those of Oehler, Schultz, A.B. Davidson, and on New Testament Theology by B. Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, W.B. Stevens, Weinel; Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus; A.B. Bruce, Paul's Conception of Christianity and The Epistle to the Hebrews; J. Denney, The Death of Christ; Du Bose, The Gospel in the Gospels, The Gospel according to Paul, High-Priesthood and Sacrifice. For the idea of mediation in Jewish religion, Oesterley, The Jewish Doctrine of Mediation; Toy, Judaism and Christianity. Much material on the Biblical doctrine may be found in such works as Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine; Ritschl, Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versohnung, 3 volumes (Volumes I and III, English translation); Dale, The Atonement; McLeod Campbell, The Nature of the Atonement; F.D. Maurice, The Doctrine of Sacrifice; Moberly, Atonement and Personality; J. Scott Lidgett, The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement; G.B. Stevens, Christian Doctrine of Salvation; articles in HDB, DCG, and in this Encyclopedia on "Mediation"; "Mediator"; "Atonement"; "Messiah"; "Propitiation"; "Prophets"; "Priests"; "Ransom"; "Reconciliation"; "Sacrifice"; Salvation," etc.

D. Miall Edwards

MEDICINE

med'-i-sin, med'-i-s'-n (gehah, teruphah, rephu'ah): These words are used in the sense of a remedy or remedies for disease. In Pr 17:22 the King James Version, a merry heart is said to do good "like a medicine." There is an alternative reading in the King James Version margin, "to a medicine," the Revised Version (British and American) "is a good medicine"; the Revised Version margin gives another rendering, "causeth good healing," which is the form that occurs in the Septuagint and which

was adopted by Kimchi and others. Some of the Targums, substituting a waw for the first h in gehah, read here "doeth good to the body," thus making this clause antithetic to the latter half of the verse. In any case the meaning is that a cheerful disposition is a powerful remedial agent.

In the figurative account of the evil case of Judah and Israel because of their backsliding (Jer 30:13), the prophet says they have had no rephu'ah, or "healing medicines." Later on (Jer 46:11), when pronouncing the futility of the contest of Neco against Nebuchadrezzar, Jeremiah compares Egypt to an incurably sick woman going up to Gilead to take balm as a medicine, without any benefit. In Ezekiel's vision of the trees of life, the leaves are said (the King James Version) to be for medicine, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "healing," thereby assimilating the language to that in Re 22:2, "leaves of the tree .... for the healing of the nations" (compare Eze 47:12).

Very few specific remedies are mentioned in the Bible. "Balm of Gilead" is said to be an anodyne (Jer 8:22; compare Jer 51:8). The love-fruits, "mandrakes" (Ge 30:14) and "caperberry" (Ec 12:5 margin), myrrh, anise, rue, cummin, the "oil and wine" of the Good Samaritan, soap and sodic carbonate ("natron," called by mistake "nitre") as cleansers, and Hezekiah's "fig poultice" nearly exhaust the catalogue. In the Apocrypha we have the heart, liver and gall of Tobit's fish (Tobit 6:7). In the Egyptian pharmacopoeia are the names of many plants which cannot be identified, but most of the remedies used by them were dietetic, such as honey, milk, meal, oil, vinegar, wine. The Babylonian medicines, as far as they can be identified, are similar. In the Mishna we have references to wormwood, poppy, hemlock, aconite and other drugs. The apothecary mentioned in the King James Version (Ex 30:25, etc.) was a maker of perfumes, not of medicines. Among the fellahin many common plants are used as folk-remedies, but they put most confidence in amulets or charms, which are worn by most Palestinian peasants to ward off or to heal diseases.

Alexander Macalister

MEDITATION

med-i-ta'-shun (haghuth, sichah): "Meditation" is the translation of haghuth, from haghah, "to murmur," "to have a deep tone," hence, "to meditate" (Ps 49:3); of haghigh, "sighing," "moaning" (Ps 5:1; see Ps 5:2); of higgayon, "the murmur" or dull sound of the harp, hence, meditation (Ps 19:14, "Let .... the meditation of my heart be acceptable in thy sight"); of siach, "speech," "meditation" (Ps 104:34, "Let my meditation be sweet unto him"); of sichah, a "bowing down," "musing" (Ps 119:97,99; RAPC 2Es 10:5). "To meditate" is the translation of haghah (Jos 1:8; Ps 1:2; 63:6; Isa 33:18 the King James Version); of suach (Ge 24:63); of siach (Ps 119:15,23, etc.; Ps 143:5, the King James Version "muse"; 1Ch 16:9; Ps 105:2 margin). In Apocrypha we have "to meditate" (Ecclesiasticus 14:20, "Blessed is the man that shall mediate in wisdom," the Revised Version margin "most authorities read come to an end" (teleutesei); Ecclesiasticus 39:1, "meditateth in the law of the Most High" (dianoeomai)). The lack of meditation is a great want in our modern religious life. In the New Testament, we have "to meditate" (promeletao, "to take care beforehand"), Lu 21:14, and "meditate" (meletao, "to take care"), 1Ti 4:15 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "be diligent"); compare Php 4:8; Col 3:2.

W. L. Walker

MEDITERRANEAN SEA

med-i-te-ra’-ne-an (he thalassa): To the Hebrews the Mediterranean was the sea, as was natural from their situation.

Hence, they speak of it simply as "the sea" (ha-yam), e.g. Ge 49:13; Nu 13:29; 34:5; Jud 5:17; or, again, it is "the great sea" (ha-yam ha-gadhol, e.g. Nu 34:6,7; Jos 9:1; 15:12,47; Eze 47:10,15,19,20; 48:28); or, because it lay to the West of Palestine, as "the great sea toward the going down or the sun" (Jos 1:4; 23:4), and, since the west was regarded as the "back," in contrast to the east as the "front," as "hinder (or "western" the Revised Version (British and American), "uttermost" or "utmost" the King James Version) sea" (ha-yam ha-’acharon), De 11:24; 34:2; Zec 14:8; Joe 2:20, in the last two passages contrasted with "the former (King James Version, "eastern" the Revised Version (British and American)) sea" ha-yam ha-qadhmoni), i.e. the Dead Sea. See FORMER. That portion of the Mediterranean directly West of Palestine is once (Ex 23:31) referred to as "the sea of the Philis" yam pelishtim). the King James Version has "sea of Joppa" (Ezr 3:7) where the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "to the sea, unto Joppa" (compare 2Ch 2:16). Similarly, the King James Version "the sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia" (Ac 27:5) is better rendered "the sea which is off Cilicia and Pamphylia" (Revised Version).

In the New Testament, references to the Mediterranean are common, especially in the accounts of Paul’s voyages, for which see PAUL. Jesus once (Mr 7:24) came to or near the sea.

The Mediterranean basin was the scene of most ancient civilizations which have greatly influenced that of the western world, except those whose home was in the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates; and even these continually thrust themselves into it, so far as they could. As its name implies, it is an inland area, united to the Atlantic only by the narrow Straits of Gibraltar. In comparatively recent geological time it was also joined to the Red Sea, the alluvial deposits of the Nile, which have extended the line of the Delta, having with the aid of drifting desert sands subsequently closed the passage and joined the continents of Asia and Africa. The total length of the Mediterranean is about 2,300 miles, its greatest breadth about 1,080 miles, and its area about 1,000,000 square miles. It falls naturally into the western and eastern (Levant) halves, dividing at the line running from Tunis to Sicily, where it is comparatively shallow; the western end is generally the deeper, reaching depths of nearly 6,000 ft. On the North it is intersected by the Italian and Balkan peninsulas, forming the Gulf of Lyons, the Adriatic and the Aegean. In ancient times these and other divisions of the Mediterranean bore specific names given by the Greeks and Romans, but from the nature of the case their limits were ill defined. The temperature of the Mediterranean is in summer warmer, in winter about the same as that of the Atlantic. Its water has a slightly greater specific gravity, probably because of a larger proportionate evaporation.

William Arthur Heidel

MEEDA

me-e’-da.

See MEEDDA.

MEEDDA

me-ed’-a (Meedda, but Swete, Dedda, following Codex Vaticanus; the King James Version Meeda): The head of one of the families of Nethinim (temple slaves) who went up with Zerubbabel from the captivity (1 Esdras 5:32); identical with "Mehida" of Ezr 2:52 and Ne 7:54.

MEEKNESS

mek’-nes (‘anawah; praotes, prautes): "Meekness" in the Old Testament (‘anawah, ‘anwah) is from ‘anaw, "suffering," "oppressed," "afflicted," denoting the spirit produced under such experiences. The word is sometimes translated "poor" (Job 24:4, the Revised Version margin "meek"; Am 8:4); "humble" (Ps 9:12,18, the Revised Version margin "meek"); "lowly" (Pr 3:34; 16:19, the Revised Version (British and American) "poor," margin "meek"). It is generally associated with some form of oppression. The "meek" were the special objects of the Divine regard, and to them special blessings are promised (Ps 22:26, "The meek shall eat and be satisfied"; 25:9, "The meek will he guide in justice; and the meek will he teach his way"; 37:11, "The meek shall inherit the land"; 147:6, "Yahweh upholdeth the meek"; 149:4, "He will beautify the meek with salvation," the Revised Version margin "victory"; compare Isa 11:4; 29:19; 61:1, "Yahweh hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek," the Revised Version margin "poor"; Ze 2:3; Ps 45:4, "because of (the Revised Version margin "in behalf of") truth and meekness and righteousness"). Of Moses it is said he "was very meek, above all the men that were upon the face of the earth," notwithstanding the Divine revelations given him, and in the face of opposition (Nu 12:3; compare 2Co 12:1-6). Meekness is ascribed even to Yahweh Himself (2Sa 22:36, "Thy gentleness (‘anawah) hath made me great"; compare Ps 18:36 (‘anwah), the Revised Version margin "condescension"); men are exhorted to seek it (Ze 2:3, "Seek righteousness, seek meekness"; compare Pr 15:1; 16:14; 25:15; Ec 10:4).

In the Apocrypha also "meekness" holds a high place (Ecclesiasticus 1:27, "The fear of the Lord is wisdom and instruction: faith and meekness are his delight," the Revised Version (British and American) "in faith and meekness is his good pleasure"; Ecclesiasticus 3:19, "Mysteries are revealed unto the meek" (the Revised Version (British and American) omits); compare 10:14).

"Meekness" in the New Testament (praotes, prautes) is not merely a natural virtue, but a Christian "grace"; it is one of the "fruits of the Spirit" (Ga 5:23). The conception of meekness, as it had been defined by Aristotle, was raised by Christianity to a much higher level, and associated with the commonly despised quality of humility (see under the word). It was the spirit of the Saviour Himself (Mt 11:29): "I am meek (praos) and lowly in heart" (compare 2Co 10:1, "by the meekness and

gentleness of Christ"); it presupposes humility, flows from it, and finds expression in moderation (see under the word). (See Trench, Syn. of New Testament, 145; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, New Testament Lexicon, under the word) Christians are exhorted to cherish it and show it in their relations to one another (Eph 4:2; Col 3:12; 1Ti 6:11; Tit 3:2, "showing all meekness toward all men"); it ought to characterize Christian teachers or those in authority in "instructing (the Revised Version (British and American) "correcting," margin "instructing") them that oppose themselves" (2Ti 2:25); the saving, "implanted" (the Revised Version margin "inborn") word is to be received "with meekness" (Jas 1:21); a man is to "show by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom" (Jas 3:13), and to give a reason for the hope that is in him, "with meekness and fear" (1Pe 3:15).

The interchangeableness of "meek" with "poor," etc., in the Old Testament ought to be specially noted. our Lord's opening of His ministry at Nazareth (Lu 4:18, "He anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor"), and His message to John (Mt 11:5, "The poor have good tidings preached to them") are in harmony therewith.

W. L. Walker

MEET

met, adjective (yashar; axios): Various words are employed to express meetness, the sense of what is proper, worthy, or fit. We have yashar, "straight," "upright," "right" (2Ki 10:3, "meetest"; Jer 26:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "right"); yashar (Jer 27:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "right"); yosher (Pr 11:24, the Revised Version margin "what is justly due"); ‘arikh, Aramaic "meet" (Ezr 4:14); bene, "sons of" (De 3:18, the King James Version "meet for the war," margin "Hebrew sons of power," the Revised Version (British and American) "men of valor"); kun, "to be right" etc. (Ex 8:26); ‘asah "to be made," "used" (Eze 15:5 twice, the Revised Version margin "made into"), tsaleach, "to be good or fit for" (Eze 15:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "profitable"); ra’ah, "seen," "looked out," "chosen" (Es 2:9); axios, "worthy" (Mt 3:8; Ac 26:20, the Revised Version (British and American) "worthy"; 1Co 16:4; 2Th 1:3); dikaios, "just," "right" (Php 1:7 the Revised Version (British and American) "right"; 2Pe 1:13 the Revised Version (British and American) "right"); euthetos, "we set" (Heb 6:7); euchrestos, "very useful," "profitable" (2Ti 2:21, "meet for the master’s use"); hikanos, "sufficient" (1Co 15:9); hikanoo, "to make sufficient" (Col 1:12); kalos, "beautiful," "honest" (Mt 15:26; Mr 7:27); dei "it behooveth" (Lu 15:32; Ro 1:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "due"). For "meet" (supplied) (Jud 5:30), the Revised Version (British and American) has "on"; for "Surely it is meet to be said unto God" (Job 34:31), "For hath any said unto God?" In 2 Macc 9:12, we have dikaios, the Revised Version (British and American) "right."

W. L. Walker

MEGIDDO; MEGIDDON

me-gid’-o, me-gid’-on (meghiddo, meghiddon; Magiddo, Mageddon, Magdo): A royal city of the

Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (Jos 12:21). It lay within the territory of Issachar, but was one of the cities assigned to Manasseh (Jos 17:11; 1Ch 7:29). Manasseh, however, was not able to expel the Canaanites, who therefore continued to dwell in that land. Later, when the children of Israel were waxen strong, the Canaanites were put to taskwork (Jos 17:12 f; Jud 1:27 f). The host of Sisera was drawn to the river Kishon, and here, "by the waters of Megiddo," the famous battle was fought (Jud 5:19). By the time of Solomon, Israel's supremacy was unquestioned. Megiddo was included in one of his administrative districts (1Ki 4:12), and it was one of the cities which he fortified (1Ki 9:15). Ahaziah, mortally wounded at the ascent of Gur, fled to Megiddo to die (2Ki 9:27). At Megiddo, Josiah, king of Judah, attempted to arrest Pharaoh-necoh and his army on their march to the Euphrates against the king of Assyria. Here the Egyptian monarch "slew him .... when he had seen him," and from Megiddo went the sorrowful procession to Jerusalem with Josiah's corpse (2Ki 23:29 f; 2Ch 35:20). The sad tale is told again in 1 Esdras 1:25 ff. "The mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon" became a poetical expression for the deepest and most despairing grief (Zec 12:11).

See also ARMAGEDDON.

The constant association of Megiddo with Taanach (Tell Ta'anek) points to a position on the south edge of the plain of Esdraelon. In confirmation of this, we read (RP, 1st series, II, 35-47) that Thothmes III captured Megiddo, after having defeated the Palestinian allies who opposed him. He left his camp at Aruna (possibly 'Ar'arah), and, following a defile (possibly Wady 'Arah), he approached Megiddo from the South We should thus look for the city where the pass opens on the plain; and here, at Khan el-Lejjan, we find extensive ruins on both sides of a stream which turns several mills before falling into the Kishon. We may identify the site with Megiddo, and the stream with "the waters of Megiddo." Pharaoh-necoh would naturally take the same line of march, and his advance could be nowhere more hopefully opposed than at el-Lejjun. Tell el-Mutasellim, a graceful mound hard by, on the edge of the plain, may have formed the acropolis of Megiddo.

The name Mujadda' attaches to a site 3 miles South of Beisan in the Jordan valley. Here Conder would place Megiddo. But while there is a resemblance in the name, the site really suits none of the Biblical data. The phrase "Taanach by the waters of Megiddo" alone confines us to a very limited area. No position has yet been suggested which meets all the conditions as well as el-Lejjun.

The Khan here shows that the road through the pass from Esdraelon to the plain of Sharon and the coast was still much frequented in the Middle Ages.

W. Ewing

MEHETABEL; MEHETABEEL

me-het'-a-bel, me-het'-a-bel (mehetah'el, "whom God makes happy"):

(1) Daughter of Matred, wife of Hadad or Hadar, the 8th and apparently last of the kings of Edom (Ge

36:39; 1Ch 1:50).

(2) Grandfather of that Shemaiah who played a treacherous part against Nehemiah at the suggestion of Tobiah and Sanballat, by trying to persuade Nehemiah to commit sacrilege (Ne 6:10-13).

MEHIDA

me-hi’-da (mechidha’," renowned"; "Meeda" (1 Esdras 5:32)): Ancestor and patronymic of a family of Nethinim who came back from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:52; Ne 7:54).

MEHIR

me’-her (mechir, "price," "hire"): A descendant of Judah, son of Chelub, nephew of Shuah (1Ch 4:11). Perug, a Chaldee name of equivalent meaning, is given for this person in the Targum of Rabbi Joseph.

MEHOLATHITE

me-ho’-la-thit (mecholathi): The Gentiledesignation of Adriel, the son of Barzillai, who married Merab, the daughter of King Saul (1Sa 18:19; 2Sa 21:8), the name Michal in 2Sa 21:8 being doubtless a copyist’s error.

See ABEL-MEHOLAH.

MEHUJAEL

me-hu’-ja-el (mechuya’el, mechiya’el, "smitten of God"): A descendant of Cain through Enoch and Irad (Ge 4:18). The list in Ge 5:12 ff is a working-over of the same material of genealogy by another hand at a different date of spelling (compare spelling of Chaucer and that of today). In that ease, Mehalalel would be the correspondent name to Mehujael (see Expository Times, X, 353).

MEHUMAN

me-hu’-man (me‘human (Es 1:10)): A eunuch of Ahasuerus, the first of the seven chamberlains.

MEHUNIM

me-hu’-nim (me‘unim).

See MEUNIM.

MEKONAH

me-ko’-na (mekhonah).

See MECONAH.

MELATIAH

mel-a-ti’-a (melatyah, "Yah’s deliverance"): A Gibeonite who assisted in building the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Ne 3:7).

MELCHI

mel’-ki (Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Melchei; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Melchi): The name of two ancestors of Jesus according to Luke’s genealogy, one being in the 4th generation before Joseph, the husband of Mary, the other being in the 3rd generation before Zerubbabel (Lu 3:24,28).

MELCHIAH

mel-ki’-a (malkhiyah, "Yah’s king"): A priest and father of Pashur (Jer 21:1 the King James Version); elsewhere and in the Revised Version (British and American) called MALCHIAH and MALCHIJAH (which see).

MELCHIAS

mel-ki-as (Codex Vaticanus, Melcheias, Codex Vaticanus (b), Codex Alexandrinus, Melchias): Name of three men who had taken "strange wives":

(1) 1 Esdras 9:26 =" Malchijah" (Ezr 10:25).

(2) 1 Esdras 9:32 =" Malchijah" (Ezr 10:31).

(3) One of those who stood at Ezra’s left hand when the law was read (1 Esdras 9:44) =" Malchijah" (Ne 8:4), possibly identical with (1) or (2).

MELCHIEL

mel’-ki-el (Melchiel, Codex Vaticanus, Melcheiel): The father of Charmis, one of the governors of Bethulia (Judith 6:15). Other readings are Sellem and Mochisel.

MELCHISHUA

mel-ki-shoo’-a (malkishua‘, "king’s help").

See MALCHI-SHUA.

MELCHIZEDEK; MELCHISEDEC

mel-kiz’e-dek, and (the King James Version in the book of Hebrews) (malki-tsedheq, "Tsedheq, or Tsidhiq is my king" (Ge 14:18 ff; Ps 110:4); Melchisedek (Heb 5:6,10; 6:20; 7:1,10,11,15,17)): The name is explained in Heb 7:2 as "king of righteousness," with "-i" as the old genitive ending; but the correct explanation is no doubt the one given above; compare Adoni-zedek in Jos 10:1, where Septuagint with Jud 1:5-7 has Adonibezek. Melchizedek was king of Salem (= Jerusalem) and "a priest unto ‘El ‘Elyon" (Ge 14:18). He brought bread and wine to Abraham after the latter’s victory over the kings, and also bestowed upon him the blessing of ‘El ‘Elyon. Abraham gave him "a tenth of all," i.e. of the booty probably, unless it be of all his possessions. Ge 14:22 identifies Yahweh with ‘El ‘Elyon, the title of the Deity as worshipped at Jerusalem; and so Heb 7:1 ff, following Septuagint of Ge 14:18 ff, calls Melchizedek. "priest of God Most High," i.e. Yahweh.

Skinner (Gen, 271, where Josephus, Ant, XVI, vi, 2, and Am M 6:1 are cited) points out that the Maccabees were called "high priests of God most high." Hence, some hold that the story of Melchizedek is an invention of Judaism, but Gunkel (Genesis 3, 285 ff) maintains that he is a traditional, if not a historical, character.

Ps 110:4 makes the klng-priest who is addressed there a virtual successor of Melchizedek, and the kings of Jerusalem might well, as Gunkel suggests, have been considered successors of Melchizedek in the same way that Charlemagne was regarded as the successor of the Caesars, and the latter as successors of the Pharaohs in Egypt. This leads naturally to an early date being ascribed to Ps 110.

The thought of a priest after the order of Melchizedek is taken up by the author of Hebrews. He wanted to prove the claim of Christ to be called priest. It was impossible, even had he so wished, to consider Jesus as an Aaronic priest, for He was descended from the tribe of Judah and not from that of Levi (7:14). The words of Ps 110:4 are taken to refer to Him (Heb 5:5 f), and in Heb 7:5 ff the order of Melchizedek is held to be higher than that of Aaron, for the superiority of Melchizedek was acknowledged by Abraham (a) when he paid tithes to Melchizedek and (b) when he was blessed by Melchizedek, for "the less is blessed of the better." It might be added that Jesus can be considered a priest after the order of Melchizedek in virtue of His descent from David, if the latter be regarded as successor to Melchizedek But the author of He does not explicitly say this. Further, Aaron is only a "type" brought forward in He to show the more excellent glory of the work of Jesus, whereas Melchizedek is "made like unto the Son of God" (7:3), and Jesus is said to be "after the likeness of Melchizedek" (7:15).

Heb 7:1 ff presents difficulties. Where did the author get the material for this description of Melchizedek?

(1) Melchizedek is said to be "without father, without mother, (i.e.) without genealogy"; and

(2) he is described as "having neither beginning of days nor end of life"; he "abideth a priest continually."

The answer is perhaps to be had among the Tell el-Amarna Letters, among which are at least 6, probably 8, letters from a king of Urusalim to Amenophis IV, king of Egypt, whose "slave" the former calls himself. Urusalim is to be identified with Jerusalem, and the letters belong to circa 1400 BC. The name of this king is given as Abd-Khiba (or Abd-chiba), though Hommel, quoted by G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 14, note 7, reads Chiba. Zimmer, in ZA, 1891, 246, says that it can be read Abditaba, and so Sayce (HDB, III, 335b) calls him ‘ebhedh tobh. The king tells his Egyptian overlord, "Neither my father nor my mother set me in this place: the mighty arm of the king (or, according to Sayce, "the arm of the mighty king") established me in my father’s house" (Letter 102 in Berlin collection, ll. 9-13; also number 103, ll. 25-28; number 104, ll. 13-15; see, further, H. Winckler, Die Thontafeln von Tell-el-Amarna; Knudtzon, Beitrage zur Assyriologie, IV, 101 ff, 279 ff, cited by G.A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 8, note 1).

It thus becomes clear that possibly tradition identified Melchizedek with Abd-Khiba. At any rate the idea that Melchizedek was "without father, without mother, (i.e.) without genealogy" can easily be explained if the words of Abd-Khiba concerning himself can have been also attributed to Melchizedek. The words meant originally that he acknowledged that he did not come to the throne because he had a claim on it through descent; he owed it to appointment. But Jewish interpretation explained them as implying that he had no father or mother. Ps 110:4 had spoken of the king there as being "a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," and this seems to have been taken to involve the perpetuity of Melchizedek also as priest. Melchizedek was then thought of as "having neither beginning of days" =" without father, without mother, without genealogy," and again as not having "end of life" =" abideth a priest continually." Hence, he is "made like unto the son of God," having neither beginning of days nor end of life. We get another New Testament example of Jewish interpretation in Ga 4:21 ff. We have no actual proof that Melchizedek is identical with Abd-Khiba; possibly the reference to the former as being "without father," etc., is not to be explained as above. But why should Melchizedek, and he alone, of all the Old Testament characters be thought of in this way?

Westcott, Hebrews, 199, has a suggestive thought about Melchizedek: "The lessons of his appearance lie in the appearance itself. Abraham marks a new departure. .... But before the fresh order is established we have a vision of the old in its superior majesty; and this, on the eve of disappearance, gives its blessing to the new."

On the references to Melchizedek in Philo see Westcott, op. cit., 201; F. Rendall, Hebrews, App., 58 ff; and especially (with the passages and other authorities cited there) G. Milligan, Theology of Epistle to

the Hebrews, 203 ff.

The conclusions we come to are:

(1) There was a tradition in Jerusalem of Melchizedek, a king in pre-Israelitish times, who was also priest to ‘El ‘Elyon. This is the origin of Ge 14:18 ff, where ‘El ‘Elyon is identified with Yahweh.

(2) Ps 110 makes use of this tradition and the Psalmist’s king is regarded as Melchizedek’s successor.

(3) The Epistle to the Hebrews makes use of

(a) Ps 110, which is taken to be a prophecy of Christ, (b) of Ge 14:18 ff, and

(c) of oral tradition which was not found in the Old Testament. It is this unwritten tradition that is possibly explained by the Tell el-Amarna Letters. See, further, articles by Sayce, Driver, and Hommel in Expository Times, VII, VIII.

See also JERUSALEM.

David Francis Roberts

MELEA

me’-le-a, mel’-e-a (Melea): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:31).

MELECH

me’-lek (melekh, "king"): Great-grandson of Jonathan, son of Saul, grandson of Mephibosheth or Meribbaal (1Ch 8:35; 9:41).

MELICU

mel’-i-ku (melikhu, also melukhi, "regnant"): Same as MALLUCHI (which see).

MELITA

mel’-i-ta (Melite, Ac 28:1): Is now generally identified with Malta. The former error in attributing the reference to the island of Meleda on the East coast of the Adriatic Sea was due to the ancient practice of employing the term Adria to include the Ionian and Sicilian seas.

Malta is the largest of a group of islands including Gozo and the islets Comino, Cominotto and Filfla, lying about 56 miles from the southern extremity of Sicily, 174 from the mainland of Italy, and 187 from the African coast. Malta itself is 17 1/2 miles long and 9 1/4 broad, and contains an area of 95 square miles. Its modern capital, Valetta, is situated in 35 degrees 54’ North latitude and 14 degrees 31’ East longitude.

The central position of Malta in the Mediterranean Sea gave it great importance as a naval station. It was probably at first a Phoenician colony, and later passed under the influence, if not domination, of the Sicilian Greeks. But the Romans captured it from the Carthaginians in 218 BC (Livy xxi.51) and attached it definitely to the province of Sicily. Under Roman rule the inhabitants were famous for their industry, especially in the production of textile fabrics, probably of native cotton. The celebrated vestis melitensis was a fine and soft material for dresses and for the covering of couches (Cicero Verr. ii.72,176; ii.74,183; iv.46,103; Diodorus v.12,22). At the time when Paul visited the island it would seem that the administration was entrusted to a deputy of the proprietor of Sicily, who is referred to as protos Melitaion (Ac 28:7; CIG, 5754), or Melitensium primus omnium (CIL, x, 7495) (see PUBLIUS). A bay 2 1/2 miles Northwest of Valetta, the mouth of which is held by tradition to be the place where the vessel that bore Paul ran ashore, tallies admirably with the description of the locality in Acts. The Admiralty charts indicate places near the west side of the entrance to the bay, where the depth is first 20 ft. and then 15 ft., while the rush of the breakers in front of the little island of Salmoneta and behind it suit the reference to a place "where two seas met" (Ac 27:41). The inlet is called the Bay of Paul. The topographical question has been exhaustively treated by Ramsay in Paul the Traveler.

George H. Allen

MELODY

mel’-o-di: zimrah, a musical piece or song to be accompanied by an instrument (Isa 51:3); an instrument of praise (Am 5:23); naghan, "to play on a stringed instrument," "Make sweet melody, sing many songs" (Isa 23:16); psallo to celebrate the praises of God with music (Eph 5:19).

See MUSIC.

MELONS

mel’-unz (‘abhattichim; compare Arabic battikh, the "water melon"; pepones): In Nu 11:5, the melon is referred to as common in Egypt, and there can be no doubt that the variety indicated is the watermelon (Citrullus vulgaris) which is indigenous in tropical Africa. It has been cultivated in Egypt since the earliest times.

MELZAR

mel’-zar (ha-meltsar; Septuagint Abiesdri, Theod. Hamelsad): Possibly a transliteration of the Babylonian Ameluucur, the officer to whom was entrusted the bringing-up of Daniel and his three companions (Da 1:11 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the steward," margin "Hebrew: Hammelzar"). It has been suggested that the name is not the name of a person, but denotes the office of guardian, like the Babylonian maccaru. In this case the "l" would come by dissimulation from the first of the two "s" sounds, which on its side has come from an assimilated "n", the root being nacaru, "to protect" "to guard."

R. Dick Wilson

MEM

mam, mem "m" :The 13th letter of the Hebrew alphabet, transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "m". It came also to be used for the number 40.

See ALPHABET, for name, etc.

MEMBER

mem’-ber

(1) yatsur; melos;

(2) shaphekhah, "membrum virile" (De 23:1)):

The first Hebrew word is derived from a root meaning "to knead," "to mold in clay," "to create." It therefore denotes any feature or part of the body. "So the tongue also is a little member, and boasteth great things" (Jas 3:5). "The members" is equivalent with "the body" (which see; compare Ps 139:16 the King James Version). The members are not self-governing, but execute the orders of the mind, obeying either the lower nature in the commission of sin or iniquity, unrighteousness and uncleanness (Ro 6:13,19), or following the higher nature, the Divine impulses in the fulfilling of the law of Christ (6:19).

By nature, the "law in my members" (Ro 7:23) is opposed to the better nature (Jas 4:1) until by "regeneration" (which see) this condition is changed, when the Spirit of Christ becomes the governing power, using our members, i.e. all our abilities, in the execution of His plans. This is not done while we remain passive, but only when we have actively presented or yielded our members to His service (Ro 6:19). Therefore our bodies must not be desecrated by baser uses (1Co 6:15,19,20). The Lord Jesus illustrates the severe discipline which is needed to subdue the members of even the regenerate to perfect submission under the higher law of the Spirit by the simile of the right eye, which is to be plucked out, and the right hand, which is to be cut off (Mt 5:29,30), and Paul speaks of putting to death (the King James Version "mortifying") the "members which are upon the earth" (Col 3:5).

It is the difference in character and gifts of individual Christians which leads Paul to speak of the variety of members, which, though of manifold functions, are equally important to the completeness of the body. It is thus in the manifold variety of the body of Christ (1Co 12:12-27; Eph 4:16), and Christians being members of Christ, who is the head (Eph 1:22; 4:15; 5:23), are members one of another (Ro 12:5; Eph 4:25).

In De 23:1 the Israelite Law against emasculation is referred to, and a religious disability is stated for the eunuch. Heathen Semites and other neighbors of Israel often castrated for religious purposes in the temple service of various divinities and for functions in princely palaces and harems. Heathen monarchs almost invariably had large numbers of these unfortunates, who frequently attained to positions of high power and responsibility. Herodotus states their frequent occurrence among the Persians (Hist. vi.32), and in the light of 2Ki 20:18 and Da 1:3 it appears as not impossible that Daniel and his friends belonged to this class. In later years their existence is certain in Israel (1Sa 8:15 the Revised Version margin; Jer 38:7; Mt 19:12).

See also CONCISION; EUNUCH.

H. L. E. Luering

MEMEROTH

mem’-e-roth (Codex Alexandrinus, Mareroth; Codex Vaticanus here omits Memeroth and two other names; the King James Version Meremoth): A name in the genealogy of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2) =" Meraioth" in Ezr 7:3, also "Marimoth" in 2 Esdras 1:2.

MEMMIUS, QUINTUS

mem’-i-us, kwin’-tus (Kointos Memmios): One of the 2 Roman legates who bore a letter to the Jews after their victory over Lysias 163 BC (2 Macc 11:34). No Quintus Memmius is otherwise known to history, and no Memmius among the list of legates sent to Asia. Polybius (xxxi.18) mentions a Quintus and a Canuleius as sent to Egypt, 162 BC, and again (xxxiii.15) the same Quintus as sent as an ambassador to Rhodes, 153 BC. A Titus Memmius had been an envoy of the senate to Achaia and Macedonia before the date of this letter (Livy xliii.5). None of these is likely to be the one referred to in 2 Macc 11:34, and it is possible that no such person was sent with the letter, which is spurious.

See MANIUS.

S. Angus

MEMORIAL; MEMORY

me-mo’-ri-al, mem’-o-ri (’azkarah, zekher, zekher, zikkaron; mnemosunon): "Memorial" as the translation of ‘azkdrah is a sacrificial term, that which brings the offerer into remembrance before God, or brings God into favorable remembrance with the offerer; it is used of the burning of a portion of the meal offering, the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "meat-offering"); better, cereal offering, on the altar (Le 2:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "as the memorial"; Le 2:9,16; 5:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "as"; Le 24:7; Nu 5:26, the Revised Version (British and American) "as"); as the translation of zekher (zekher), zikkaron, it is a memorial in the sense of a remembrance (zekher, zekher, Ex 3:15; the memorial (name) of Yahweh); hence, we have in the Revised Version (British and American) "memorial name" for "remembrance" (Ps 30:4 the American Standard Revised Version; Ps 97:12, the English Revised Version "holy name," marin "Hebrew memorial"; Ps 102:12; 135:13; Isa 26:8; Ho 12:5, the English Revised Version "memorial"); for "memorial" (Es 9:28; Ps 9:6, the American Standard Revised Version "remembrance"); zikkaron, "a remembrance" (Ex 12:14; 13:9; Le 23:24; Nu 5:15 (of the meal offering); Jos 4:7; Ne 2:20; Zec 6:14); the Passover feast was to be in this sense "a memorial .... for ever" (Ex 12:14; 13:9); so also the shema‘ (De 6:4 f) ;" memorial" occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 4:1 (mneme), the Revised Version (British and American) "memory"; The Wisdom of Solomon 4:19; Ecclesiasticus 45:1 (mnemosunon); Ecclesiasticus 49:1; 1 Macc 3:7; 12:53, the Revised Version (British and American) "memorial."

"Memorial" occurs in the New Testament as the translation of mnemosunon, "a token of remembrance" (Mt 26:13; Mr 14:9; Ac 10:4, "Thy prayers and thine alms are gone up for a memorial before God," which suggests the sense in which "memorial" was used in the sacrificial ritual, and also the "better sacrifices" of the new dispensation).

Memory is the translation of zekher (zekher) (Ps 109:15; 145:7; Pr 10:7; Ec 9:5; Isa 26:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "remembrance"); it occurs also in 1 Macc 13:29; 2 Macc 7:20. Katecho, "to have or hold fast," is rendered in 1Co 15:2 the King James Version "keep in memory," margin "hold fast," the American Standard Revised Version "hold fast," the English Revised Version "hold it fast," i.e. the word preached to them.

W. L. Walker

MEMPHIS

mem’-fis:

1. Name:

The ancient capital of Egypt, 12 miles South of the modern Cairo. This Greek and Roman form of the name was derived from the Coptic form Menfi (now Arabic Menf), the abbreviation of the Egyptian name Men-nofer, "the good haven." This name was applied to the pyramid of Pepy I, in the cemetery above the city; some have thought the city name to have been derived from the pyramid, but this is

unlikely, as the city must have had a regular name before that. It may perhaps mean "the excellence of Mena," its founder. It appears still more shortened in Ho (9:6) as Moph (moph), and in Isa (19:13), Jer (2:16), and Eze (30:13) as Noph (noph).

2. Political Position:

The classical statements show that the city in Roman times was about 8 miles long and 4 miles wide, and the indications of the site agree with this. It was the sole capital of Position Egypt from the Ist to the XVIIth Dynasty; it shared supremacy with Thebes during the XVIIIth to XXVth Dynasties, and with Sais to the XXXth Dynasty. Alexandria then gradually obscured it, but the governor of Egypt signed the final capitulation to the Arabs in the old capital. While other cities assumed a political equality, yet commercially Memphis probably remained supreme until the Ptolemies.

3. The Founders and the City:

The oldest center of settlement was probably the shrine of the sacred bull, Apis or Hapy, which was in the South of the city. This worship was doubtless prehistoric, so that when the first king of all Egypt, Mena, founded his capital, there was already a nucleus. His great work was taking in land to the North, and founding the temple of the dynastic god Ptah, which was extended until its enclosure included as much as the great temple of Amon at Thebes, about 3 furlongs long and 2 furlongs wide. To the North of this was the sacred lake; beyond that, the palace and camp. Gradually the fashionable quarters moved northward in Egypt, in search of fresher air; the rulers had moved 10 miles North to Babylon by Roman times, then to Fostat, then Cairo, and lastly now to Abbasiyeh and Kubkeh, altogether a shift of 18 miles in 8,000 years.

4. Archaeological Results:

After the shrine of Apis the next oldest center is that of Ptah, founded by Mena. This was recently cleared in yearly sections by the British School, finding principally sculptures of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties. The account of the north gate given by Herodotus, that it was built by Amenemhat III, has been verified by finding his name on the lintel. An immense sphinx of alabaster 26 ft. long has also been found. To the East of this was the temple of the foreign quarter, the temple of King Proteus in Greek accounts, where foreign pottery and terra cotta heads have been found. Other temples that are known to have existed in Memphis are those of Hathor, Neit, Amen, Imhotep, Isis, Osiris-Sokar, Khnumu, Bastel, Tahuti, Anubis and Sebek.

A large building of King Siamen (XXIst Dynasty) has been found South of the Ptah temple. To the North of the great temple lay the fortress, and in it the palace mound of the XXVIth Dynasty covered two acres. It has been completely cleared, but the lower part is still to be examined. The north end of it was at least 90 ft. high, of brickwork, filled up to half the height by a flooring raised on cellular brickwork. The great court was about 110 ft. square, and its roof was supported by 16 columns 45 ft. high.

The principal sights of Memphis now are the great colossus of Rameses II, the lesser colossus of the same, and the immense alabaster sphinx. The cemetery of the city is the most important in Egypt; it lies 2 miles to the West on the desert, and is known as Saqqareh, from So-kar, the god of the dead.

See SAQQAREH.

W. M. Flinders Petrie

MEMUCAN

me-mu'-kan (memukhan; derivation unknown but probably of Persian origin (Es 1:14,16,21)): One of "the seven princes of Persia and Media, who saw the king's face, and sat first in the kingdom." Ahasuerus consults these men, as those "that knew law and judgment," as to the proper treatment of the rebellious Vashti. Memucan is the spokesman of the reply. He recommends Vashti's deposition so that "all the wives will give to their husbands honor, both to great and small." This advice is adopted and incorporated into a royal decree—with what success is not said.

MENAHEM

men'-a-hem (menachem, "one who comforts"; Manaem; 2Ki 15:14-22):

1. Accession and Reign:

Son of Gadi and 16th king of Israel. He reigned 10 years. Menahem was probably the officer in charge of the royal troops in Tirzah, one of the king's residences, at the time of the murder of Zechariah by Shallum. Hearing of the deed, he brought up his troops and avenged the death of his master by putting Shallum to death in Samaria. He then seized the vacant throne. His first full year may have been 758 BC (others, as seen below, put later).

2. Early Acts:

The country at this time, as depicted by Hosea and Amos, was in a deplorable condition of anarchy and lawlessness. Menahem, with a strong hand, enforced his occupation of the throne. One town only seems to have refused to acknowledge him. This was Tiphsah, a place 6 miles Southwest of Shechem, now the ruined village of Khurbet Tafsah. As Menahem is said to have attacked this enclosed city from Tirzah, lying to its North, it is probable that he took it on the way to Samaria, before proceeding to do battle with Shallum. If this was so, it is some explanation of the cruelty with which he treated its inhabitants (2Ki 15:16). One such instance of severity was enough. The whole kingdom was at his feet. He proved to be a strong and determined ruler, and during the 9 or 10 years of his governorship had no further internecine trouble to contend with.

3. Menahem and Assyria:

But there was another source of disquiet. Assyria, under Pul, had resumed her advance to the West and threatened the kingdoms of Palestine. Menahem resolved on a policy of diplomacy, and, rather than risk a war with the conqueror of the East, agreed to the payment of a heavy tribute of 1,000 talents of silver. To raise this sum he had to assess his wealthier subjects to the extent of 50 shekels each. As there are 3,000 shekels in a talent of silver, it is obvious that some 60,000 persons, "mighty men of wealth," must have been laid under contribution in this levy—an indication at once of the enormity of the tribute, and of the prosperity of the country at the time. However short-sighted the policy, its immediate purpose was attained, which was that the hand of the Assyrian king "might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand" (2Ki 15:19).

4. A Conflict of Dates:

A difficulty attaches to the dates of this period. The Pul of 2Ki 15:19 and 1Ch 5:26 is now identified with Tiglath-pileser III, who took this title on ascending the throne of Assyria in 745 BC. In an inscription of Tiglath-pileser, Menahem appears as Minehimmu Samarina (Menahem the Samarian), together with Racunnu (Rezin) of Damascus and Hirumu (Hiram) of Tyre. The date given to this inscription is 738 BC, whereas the last year we can give to Menahem is 749, or 10 years earlier.

5. Proposed Solutions:

The chronological difficulty which thus arises may be met in one of two ways. Either the inscription, like that on the black obelisk of Kurkh (see JEHU), was written some years after the events to which it refers and contains records of operations in which Tiglath-pileser took part before he became king; or Pekah—who was on the throne of Israel in 738 (?)—is spoken of under the dynastic name Menahem, though he was not of his family. The former of these hypotheses is that which the present writer is inclined to adopt. (By others the dates of Menahem are lowered in conformity with the inscription.)

See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

6. Character:

Menahem attempted no reformation in the national religion, but, like all his predecessors, adhered to the worship of the golden calves. On this account, like them, he incurs the heavy censure of the historian.

W. Shaw Caldecott

MENAN

me’-nan.

See MENNA.

MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN

me’-ne, me’-ne, te’-kel, u-far’-sin, men’-a, men’a, tek’-el, oo-far’-sin (mene’ ~mene’ ~teqel ~upharcin; Theodotion, Mane, thekel, phares): These are the words that, according to Daniel’s reading, were inscribed on the walls of Belshazzar’s palace and that caused the great commotion on the occasion of his last feast (Da 5:25). As the only authority that we have for the reading is that of Daniel, it seems but fair that the interpretation of the terms be left to the person who gave us the text. According to his interpretation, there is a double sense to be found in the three different words of the inscription (Da 5:26-28).

Mene’, which, however it is pointed, must be taken from the verb menah (Hebrew manah; Babylonian manu), is said to have indicated that God had numbered (the days of) Belshazzar’s kingdom and finished it (or delivered it up). Both of these meanings can be shown to be proper to the menah.

Teqel, on the contrary, is interpreted as coming from two roots: the first, teqal, "to weigh," and the second, qal, "to be light or wanting" (Hebrew qalal; Babylonian qalalu).

Perec (or parcin) also is interpreted as coming from two roots: first, perac, "to divide" (Hebrew paras or parash; Babylonian parasu), and the second as denoting the proper name Parac, "Persia." Thus interpreted, the whole story hangs together, makes good sense, and is fully justified by the context and by the language employed. If the original text was in Babylonian, the signs were ambiguous; if they were in Aramaic, the consonants alone were written, and hence, the reading would be doubtful. In either case, the inscription was apparent but not readable, except by Daniel with the aid of God, through whom also the seer was enabled to give the proper interpretation. That Daniel’s interpretation was accepted by Belshazzar and the rest shows that the interpretation of the signs was reasonable and convincing when once it had been made. We see, therefore, no good reason for departing from the interpretation that the Book of Daniel gives as the true one.

As to the interpretation of the inscription, it makes no difference whether the signs represented a mina, a shekel, and two perases, as has been recently suggested by M. Clermont-Ganneau. In this case the meaning was not so apparent, but the puns, the play upon the sounds, were even better. We doubt, however, if it can be shown that teqel means sheqel. On the old Aramaic documents of Egypt and Assyria, it is with one exception spelled sheqel. In the Targum of Onkelos, sheqel is always rendered by cela‘; in the Peshitta and Arabic VSS, by mathqal; in the Samaritan Targum, by mathqal (except only perhaps in Ge 23:16, where we have ethqel). In the Targum of Onkelos, wherever tiqla’ occurs, it translates the Hebrew beqa‘ (Ge 24:22 and Ex 38:26 only). Mene’, to be sure, may have meant the mina, and perec, the half-mina. The parash is mentioned in the inscription of Panammu and in an Aramaic inscription on an Assyrian weight. Besides this, it is found in the New Hebrew of the Mishna It is not found, however, in the Targum of Onkelos, nor in Syriac, nor in the Old Testament Hebrew; nor in the sense of half-shekel in the Aramaic papyri. While, then, it may be admitted that Daniel may have read,

"A mina, a mina, a shekel, and two half-minas," it is altogether unlikely, and there is certainly no proof that he did. Yet, if he did, his punning interpretations were justified by the usage of ancient oracles and interpreters of signs, and also by the event.

R. Dick Wilson

MENELAUS

men-e-la'-us (Menelaos): According to the less likely account of Josephus (Ant., XII, v, 1; XV, iii, 1; XX, x, 3), Menelaus was a brother of Jason and Onias III, and his name was really Onias. But it is very unlikely that there should be two brothers of the same name. The account of 2 Maccabees is more credible—that Menelaus was the brother of the notorious Simon who suggested to the Syrians the plundering of the temple; he was thus of the tribe of Benjamin (2 Macc 4:23; compare with 3:4) and not properly eligible to the high-priesthood. He was entrusted by Jason (171 BC), who had supplanted Onias, with contributions to the king of Syria, Antiochus Epiphanes, and by outbidding Jason in presents he secured the office of high priest for himself (2 Macc 4:23 f), 171 BC. Menelaus returned with "the passion of a cruel tyrant" to Jerusalem, and Jason fled. But as Menelaus failed to pay the promised amount, both he and Sostratus, the governor, were summoned to appear before the king. Lysimachus, the brother of Menelaus, was left at Jerusalem in the meantime as deputy high priest. The king was called from his capital to suppress an insurrection of Tarsus and Mallus. Menelaus took advantage of his absence to win over Andronicus, the king's deputy, by rich presents stolen from the temple. For this sacrilege Onias III sharply reproved him and fled to a sanctuary, Daphne, near Antioch. Andronicus was then further persuaded by Menelaus to entice Onias from his retreat and murder him (2 Macc 4:34 f)—an act against which both Jews and Greeks protested to the king on his return, and secured deserved punishment for Andronicus. Meanwhile, the oppression of Lysimachus, abetted by Menelaus, caused a bloody insurrection in Jerusalem, in connection with which a Jewish deputation brought an accusation against Menelaus on the occasion of Antiochus' visit to Tyre. Menelaus bribed Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, to win over the king to acquit himself and secure the execution of "those hapless men, who, if they had pleaded even before Scythians, would have been discharged uncondemned" (2 Macc 4:39 ff). Menelaus returned in triumph to his office. But Jason, taking advantage of Epiphanes' absence in Egypt and a false rumor of his death, made a bloody but unsuccessful attempt upon the city, in order to secure his office again; his rival took refuge in the citadel. The king returned in fury, caused a three days' slaughter of the citizens, rifled the temple with Menelaus as guide, and left him as one of his agents to keep the Jews in subjection (2 Macc 5:1 ff). He appears next and for the last time in the reign of Eupator in 162 BC. Lysias, the king's chancellor, accused him to the king as the cause of all the troubles in Judea (2 Macc 13:3-8). Eupator caused him to be brought to Berea and there—before, according to 2 Maccabees, loc. cit., or after, according to Josephus, Ant, XII, ix, 7, the invasion of Judea by Eupator and Lysias—to be put to death by being flung from the top of a high tower into the ashes of which it was full—a fitting end for such a wretch.

S. Angus

MENESTHEUS

me-nes’-thus, me-nes’-the-us (Menestheus Codex Alexandrinus, Menestheseos): The father of Apollonius, a general of Epiphanes (2 Macc 4:21 and in 2 Macc 4:4 the Revised Version (British and American), following a conjecture of Hort Menestheos for mainesthai heos the latter is retained in Swete and Fritzache]). "Son of Menestheus" is added to distinguish this Apollonius from "Apollonius, Son of Thrasaeus" (2 Macc 3:5) and "Apollonius, Son of Gennaeus" (2 Macc 12:2).

See APOLLONIUS.

MENI

me’-ni: Destiny, a god of Good Luck, possibly the Pleiades (Isa 65:11 margin).

See ASTROLOGY, 10; GAD.

MENNA

men’-a (Menna Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Tregelles, Tischendorf; Mainan Textus Receptus of the New Testament; the King James Version Menan): An ancestor of Jesus, a great-grandson of David (Lu 3:31).

MENUHAH

men-u’-ha, men-u’-ka (menuchah, "place of rest"; the King James Version Menuchah): Rendered in Jud 20:43 the King James Version "with ease," the Revised Version (British and American) "at their resting-place." Both, however, have a marginal suggestion which would make the word a place-name, which would then more naturally read "from Nuhah over against Gibeah," thus describing the ground over which the slaughter of the Benjamites occurred. In 1Ch 8:2 the word "Nohah" occurs as that of a Benjamite elan. The place intended is perhaps MANAHATH (which see).

MENUHOTH

men-u’-hoth (menuchoth, "dwellings"; the King James Version manachti Manahethites): The first form is the Revised Version (British and American) transliterated in the name; the second form is the King James Version retained by the Revised Version (British and American) in the passages where the word occurs (1Ch 2:52; compare 2:54). The people here spoken of by the King James Version as "half of the Manahethites" are mentioned as descendants of Salma (1Ch 2:54), while those mentioned as Menuhoth are mentioned as descendants of Judah through Shobal, father of Kiriath-jearim. Both words are from the same root. the King James Version keeps the same designation for both passages, while the Revised Version (British and American) has marked the difference in spelling by changing the first passage and

following the King James Version in the second. Both sections of the family belong to the Caleb clan, and it would seem that they became the dominant people in the otherwise unknown town of Manahath, so that it came to be regarded as belonging to Judah. It may be connected with the Menuchah (the Revised Version (British and American) "Menuhah") suggested as a place-name in Jud 20:43 margin. In the Septuagint, between Joshua 15:59 and 60, the names of 11 cities are inserted, among them being a Manocho whose Hebrew equivalent gives the word. It is difficult to identify, and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) cuts the knot by translating "dimidium requietionum"!

See MANAHATH.

Henry Wallace

MEONENIM, OAK OF

me-on'-e-nim, me-o'-ne-nim: ('elon me'onenim; Codex Vaticanus, Elonmaonemein, Codex Alexandrinus, druos apobleponton; the King James Version Plain of): This was a sacred tree which apparently could be seen from the gate of Shechem (Jud 9:37). No doubt it took its name from the soothsayers who sat under it, practicing augury, etc. Several times mention is made of sacred trees in the vicinity of Shechem (Ge 35:4; Jos 24:26; Jud 9:6, etc.). Where this tree stood is not known.

See AUGUR'S OAK.

MEONOTHAI

me-on'-o-thi, me-o'-no-thi, me-o-no'-thi (me'onothai, "my dwellings"): A son of Othniel, nephew of Caleb (1Ch 4:14). Possibly, as the King James Version margin suggests, and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and Complutensian Septuagint say, 1Ch 4:13,14 should read "the sons of Othniel, Hathath and Meonothai; and Meonothai begat Ophrah," etc. The latter may be founder of the town of that name.

MEPHAATH

mef'-a-ath, me-fa'-ath (mepha'ath and meypha'ath, mopha'ath; Codex Vaticanus, Maiphaath, Mephaath): A city of the Amorites in the territory allotted to Reuben, named with Kedemoth and Kiriathaim (Jos 13:18), and given to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:37; 1Ch 6:79). It appears again as a Moabite town in Jer 48:21. It was known to Eusebius and Jerome (Onom) as occupied by a Roman garrison, but the site has been lost.

MEPHIBOSHETH

me-fib'-o-sheth (mephibhosheth, "idol-breaker," also MERIB-BAAL (which see); Memphibosthe):

(1) Son of Saul by his concubine RIZPAH (which see), daughter of Aiah (2Sa 21:8).

See also ARMONI.

(2) Grandson of Saul, son of Jonathan, and nephew of Mephibosheth (1) (2Sa 4:4). He was 5 years old when his father and grandfather were slain. He was living in charge of a nurse, possibly because his mother was dead. Tidings of the disaster at Jezreel and the onsweep of the Philistines terrified the nurse. She fled with her charge in such haste that a fall lamed the little prince in both feet for life. His life is a series of disasters, disappointments, and anxieties. It is a weary, broken, dispirited soul that speaks in all his utterances. The nurse carried him to Lo-debar among the mountains of Gilead, where he was brought up by Machir, son of Ammiel (2Sa 9:4). There he evidently married, for he had a son Mica when he returned later at David's request. When David had settled his own affairs and subdued his enemies, he turned his inquiries to Saul's household to see whether there were any survivors to whom he might show kindness for Jonathan's sake (2Sa 9:1). The search caused the appearance of Ziba, a servant of Saul's house (2Sa 9:2), who had meanwhile grown prosperous by some rapid process which can only be guessed at (2Sa 9:9,10). From him David learned about Mephibosheth, who was sent for. His humble bearing was consistent with his chronically broken spirit. David put Ziba's property (which had belonged to Saul) at Mephibosheth's disposal and made Ziba steward thereof. Mephibosheth was also to be a daily guest at David's table (2Sa 9:11-13). Seventeen years pass, during which Mephibosheth seems to have lived in Jerusalem. Then came Absalom's rebellion. David determined to flee, so distraught was he by the act of his son. At the moment of flight, in great depression and need, he was opportunely met by Ziba with food, refreshment and even means for travel. Naturally, the king inquired for Ziba's master. The treacherous reply was made (2Sa 16:1-4) that Mephibosheth had remained behind for his own ends, hoping the people would give him, Saul's grandson, the kingdom. David believed this and restored to Ziba the property lost. Not till many days after did the lame prince get his chance to give David his own version of the story. He met David on his return from quelling Absalom's rebellion. He had not dressed his feet, trimmed his beard nor washed his clothes since the hour of David's departure (2Sa 19:24). At David's anxious request Mephibosheth told his story: his servant had deceived him; he wanted to go with David, had even asked for his beast to be saddled; but Ziba had left him, and had slandered him to the king. But he would not plead his cause any more; David is "as an angel of God"; whatever he decides will be well! (2Sa 19:26,27). Thus characteristically continued the speech of this lame, broken, humble man, son of a proud family (2Sa 19:28). David wearily settled the matter by dividing the property between the prince and his servant, the prince expressing utmost content that Ziba should take all so long as David remained friendly (2Sa 19:29,30). That David accepted Mephibosheth's explanation and was drawn out in heart toward the character of the broken man is shown by the fact that when some expiation from Saul's household was considered necessary to turn away the famine sent by an offended deity, Mephibosheth is spared when other members of Saul's household were sacrificed (2Sa 21:7). The character of Mephibosheth well illustrates the effect of continued disaster, suspicion and treachery upon a sensitive mind.

Henry Wallace

MERAB

me’-rab (merabh "increase"; Merob): The elder daughter of Saul (1Sa 14:49), promised, though not by name, to the man who should slay the Philistine Goliath (1Sa 17:25). David did this and was afterward taken by Saul to court (1Sa 18:2), where he was detained in great honor. Merab was not, however, given to him as quickly as the incident would lead one to expect, and the sequel showed some unwillingness on the part of some persons in the contract to complete the promise. The adulation of the crowd who met David on his return from Philistine warfare and gave him a more favorable ascription than to Saul (1Sa 18:6-16) awoke the angry jealousy of Saul. He "eyed David from that day and forward" (1Sa 18:9). Twice David had to "avoid" the "evil spirit" in Saul (1Sa 18:11). Saul also feared David (1Sa 18:12), and this led him to incite the youth to more dangerous deeds of valor against the Philistines by a renewed promise of Merab. He will have David’s life, but rather by the hand of the Philistines than his own (1Sa 18:17). Merab was to be the bait. But now another element complicated matters—Michal’s love for David (1Sa 18:20), which may have been the retarding factor from the first. At any rate Merab is finally given to Adriel the Meholathite (1Sa 18:19). The passage in 2Sa 21:8 doubtless contains an error—Michal’s name occurring for that of her sister Merab—though the Septuagint, Josephus, and a consistent Hebrew text all perpetuate it, as well as the concise meaning of the Hebrew word Yaladh, which is a physiological word for bearing children, and cannot be translated "brought up." A Targum explanation reads: "The 5 sons of Merab (which Michal, Saul’s daughter brought up) which she bare," etc. Another suggestion reads the word "sister" after Michal in the possessive case, leaving the text otherwise as it stands. It is possible that Merab died comparatively young, and that her children were left in the care of their aunt, especially when it is said she herself had none (2Sa 6:23). The simplest explanation is to assume a scribal error, with the suggestion referred to as a possible explanation of it. The lonely Michal (2Sa 6:20-23) became so identified with her (deceased) sister’s children that they became, in a sense, hers.

Henry Wallace

MERAIAH

me-ra’-ya, me-ri’-a (merayah, "contumacious"): A priest in the time of Joiakim son of Jeshua, and head of the priestly house of Seraiah to which Ezra belonged (Ne 12:12; compare Ezr 7:1).

MERAIOTH

me-ra’-yoth, me-ri’-oth (merayoth): The name varies much in the Greek.

(1) A Levite, a descendant of Aaron (1Ch 6:6 f; Ezr 7:3), called "Memeroth" in 1 Esdras 8:2; and "Marimoth" in 2 Esdras 1:2.

(2) The son of Ahitub and father of Zadok (1Ch 9:11).

(3) A priestly house of which, in the days of Joiakim, Helkai was head (Ne 12:15). In Ne 12:3 the name is given as "Meremoth."

MERAN

me’-ran.

See MERRAN.

MERARI

me-ra’-ri (merari, "bitter"; Mararei):

(1) The 3rd son of Levi, his brothers, Gershon and Kohath, being always mentioned together with him (Ge 46:11; Ex 6:16). He was among those 70 who went down to Egypt with Jacob (Ge 46:8,11; compare 46:26 and Ex 1:5).

(2) The family of Merari, descendants of above, and always (with one exception, for which see MERARITES) spoken of as "sons of Merari" in numerous references, such as 1Ch 6:1,16,19,29, which only repeat without additional information the references to be found in the body of this article. We early find them divided into two families, the Mahli and Mushi (Ex 6:19; Nu 3:17,20,33). At the exodus they numbered, under their chief Zuriel, 6,200, and they were assigned the north side of the tabernacle as a tenting-place (Nu 3:34,35), thus sharing in the honor of those who immediately surrounded the tabernacle—the south side being given to the Kohathites, the west to the Gershonites, and the east—toward the sun-rising—being reserved for Moses, Aaron and his sons (Nu 3:23,29,35,38). To the Merarites was entrusted the care of the boards, bars, pillars, sockets, vessels, pins and cords of the tabernacle (Nu 3:36,37; 4:29-33). They and the Gershonites were "under the hand" of Ithamar, son of Aaron, the sons of Gershon having charge of the softer material of the tabernacles—curtains, covers, hangings, etc. (Nu 3:25,26). When reckoned by the number fit for service, i.e. between 30 and 50 years, the sons of Merari were 3,200 strong (Nu 4:42-45). Because of the weight of the material in their charge they were allowed 4 wagons and 8 oxen for carriage (Nu 7:8). In marching, when the tabernacle was taken down, the standard of Judah went first (Nu 10:14); then followed the Merarites bearing the tabernacle (Nu 10:17), and after them came the standard of Reuben (Nu 10:18). After the settlement in Canaan they had 12 cities assigned them out of Gad, Reuben and Zebulun (Jos 21:7,34-40; 1Ch 6:63,77-81), just as the other two branches of Levi’s family had their 12 cities respectively assigned out of the other tribes (Jos 21). The names of these Merarite cities are given (loc. cit.), and among them is Ramoth-gilead, one of the cities of refuge (Jos 21:38). It is evident from 1Ch 6:44-47; 16:41; 25:1,3,6,9,11,15,19,21 f; compare 15:6,17-19 that they had charge under Ethan or Jeduthun of the temple music in the service. In David’s time Asaiah was their chief (1Ch 15:6). Himself and 220 of the family helped David to bring up the Ark. David divided the Levites into courses among the Gershonites, Kohathites and Merarites (1Ch 23:6; compare 23:21-23; 24:26-30). The functions of certain Merarites are described in 1Ch 26:10-19. They also took part in cleansing the temple in Hezekiah’s time (2Ch

29:12) as well as in the days of Josiah (2Ch 34:12), helping to repair the house of the Lord. Among the helpers of Ezra, too, we find some of them numbered (Ezr 8:18,19). The family seems to have played a very important part in keeping steady and true such faithfulness as remained in Israel.

(3) The father of Judith (Judith 8:1; 16:7).

Henry Wallace

MERARITES

me-ra'-rits (merari, "bitter"): The descendants of MERARI (which see), son of Levi. The only place where this form of the word occurs is Nu 26:57. Elsewhere they are always referred to as "sons of Merari."

MERATHAIM

mer-a-tha'-im (merathayim "double rebellion"): A name used for Babylon in Jer 50:21. According to Delitzsch it may be equivalent to the Babylonian Marratun, i.e. land by the nar Marratu, "the bitter river" (Persian Gulf) = Southern Babylonia (OHL, under the word).

MERCHANDISE

mur'-chan-diz

(1) 'amar

(2) cachar,

(3) cachar,

(4) cechorach,

(5) rekhullah,

(6) ma'arabh,

(7) markoleth;

(8) emporia

(9) emporion,

(10) gomos)

: There seem to be 4 distinct meanings of the word according to the Revised Version (British and American), namely: (1) The products, i.e. goods or things sold or exchanged, and so merchandise in the present-day usage:

(a) cachar is translated thus in Pr 31:18; Isa 23:18;

(b) cachar is translated thus in Isa 45:14; these two are from a root meaning "to travel around as a peddler";

(c) rekhullah, translated thus in Eze 26:12, from a root meaning "to travel for trading purposes";

(d) ma‘arabh, translated thus in Eze 27:9,27,33,34, from a root meaning "to intermix, to barter";

(e) markoleth, translated thus in Eze 27:24 (the above 5 Hebrew words are all used to designate the goods or wares which were bartered);

(f) ‘amar, occurring in De 21:14; 24:7, translated in the King James Version "make merchandise of," but in the Revised Version (British and American) "deal with as a slave," or the Revised Version margin "deal with as a chattel";

(g) emporia, translated "merchandise" in Mt 22:5;

(h) emporion, likewise in Joh 2:16 (the same Greek word is used in 2Pe 2:3 for the American Standard Revised Version "make merchandise of you");

(i) gomos, "merchandise," margin "cargo."

(2) The process of trade itself, i.e. the business: rekhullah has in it the root meaning of "itinerant trading", and so in Eze 28:16 the correct translation is not "merchandise," as in the King James Version, but "traffic," "abundance of thy traffic," i.e. doing a thriving business: "trade was good."

(3) The place of trading, i.e. emporium, mart, etc.: cechorah in Eze 27:15 is translated "mart." In Joh 2:16 reference is made to the "house of merchandise."

(4) The profits of trading: In Pr 3:14, cachar is translated "gaining." Referring to wisdom, "For the gaining of it is better than the gaining of silver, and the profit thereof than fine gold"; the King James Version "merchandise."

William Edward Raffety

MERCHANT; MERCHANTMAN

mur’-chant, mur’-chant-man.

See COMMERCE; MERCHANDISE; TRADE.

MERCURY; MERCURIUS

mur’-ku-ri, mer-ku’ri-us: The translation of Hermes, in Ac 14:12: "They called Barnabas, Jupiter; and Paul, Mercury, because he was the chief speaker." Hermes was the god of eloquence (and also of theft), the attendant, messenger and spokesman of the gods. The more commanding presence of Barnabas (compare 2Co 10:10) probably caused him to be identified with Zeus (the Roman Jupiter), while his gift of eloquence suggested the identification of Paul with Hermes (the Roman Mercury). The temple of Jupiter was before Lystra, and to him the Lycaonians paid their chief worship. Compare the legend of Baucis and Philemon (Ovid, Metam. viii.611 f).

See HERMES; JUPITER; GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT.

M. O. Evans

MERCY-SEAT, THE

mur’-si-set (kapporeth; New Testament hilasterion, Heb 9:5): The name for the lid or covering of the ark of the covenant (Ex 25:17, etc.). The Old Testament term means "covering," then, like the New Testament word, "propitiatory" (compare kipper, "to cover guilt," "to make atonement"). The ark contained the two tables of stone which witnessed against the sin of the people. The blood of sacrifice, sprinkled on the mercy-seat on the great day of atonement, intercepted, as it were, this condemning testimony, and effected reconciliation between God and His people. See ATONEMENT; ATONEMENT, DAY OF; PROPITIATION; ARK OF THE COVENANT. In Ro 3:25, Jesus is said to be set forth as "a propitiation (literally, "propitiatory"), through faith, in his blood," thus fulfilling the idea of the mercy-seat (compare Heb 9:5,7,11,12, etc.).

W. Shaw Caldecott

MERCY; MERCIFUL

mur’-si, mur’-si-fool (checedh, racham, chanan; eleos, eleeo, oiktirmos): "Mercy" is a distinctive Bible word characterizing God as revealed to men.

In the Old Testament it is most often the translation of checedh, "kindness," "loving-kindness" (see LOVINGKINDNESS), but rachamim, literally, "bowels" (the sympathetic region), and chanan, "to be inclined to," "to be gracious," are also frequently translated "mercy"; eleos, "kindness," "beneficence," and eleeo, "to show kindness," are the chief words rendering "mercy" in the New Testament; oiktirmos, "pity," "compassion," occurs a few times, also oiktirmon, "pitiful," eleemon, "kind," "compassionate," twice; hileos, "forgiving," and anileos, "not forgiving," "without mercy," once each (Heb 8:12; Jas 2:13).

(1) Mercy is

(a) an essential quality of God (Ex 34:6,7; De 4:31; Ps 62:12, etc.); it is His delight (Mic 7:18,20; Ps 52:8); He is "the Father of mercies" (2Co 1:3), "rich in mercy" (Eph 2:4), "full of pity, and merciful" (Jas 5:11);

(b) it is associated with forgiveness (Ex 34:7; Nu 14:18; 1Ti 1:13,16);

(c) with His forbearance (Ps 145:8, "Yahweh is gracious and merciful, slow to anger and of great lovingkindness"; compare Roman 2:4; 11:32);

(d) with His covenant (1Ki 8:23; Ne 1:5), with His justice (Ps 101:1), with His faithfulness (Ps 89:24), with His truth (Ps 108:4); mercy and truth are united in Pr 3:3; 14:22, etc. (in Ps 85:10 we have "Mercy and truth are met together");

(e) it goes forth to all (Ps 145:9, "Yahweh is good to all; and his tender mercies are over all his works"; compare 145:16, "Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing," the Revised Version margin "satisfiest every living thing with favor");

(f) it shows itself in pitying help (Ex 3:7; Ezr 9:9 f), supremely in Christ and His salvation (Lu 1:50,54,58; Eph 2:4);

(g) it is abundant, practically infinite (Ps 86:5,15; 119:64);

(h) it is everlasting (1Ch 16:34,41; Ezr 3:11; Ps 100:5; 136 repeatedly).

(2) "Mercy" is used of man as well as of God, and is required on man’s part toward man and beast (De 25:4; Ps 37:21; 109:16; Pr 12:10; Da 4:27; Mic 6:8; Mt 5:7, "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy"; 25:31-46; Lu 6:36, "Be ye merciful, even as your Father is merciful"; Lu 10:30 f, the Good Samaritan; Lu 14:12-16; Jas 3:17).

(3) In the New Testament "mercy" (eleos, usually the Septuagint translation of checedh) is associated with "grace" (charis) in the apostolical greetings and elsewhere. Trench points out that the difference between them is that the freeness of God’s love is the central point of charis, while eleos has in view

misery and its relief; charis is His free grace and gift displayed in the forgiveness of sins—extended to men as they are guilty; His eleos (is extended to them) as they are miserable. The lower creation may be the object of His mercy (eleos), but man alone of His grace (charis); he alone needs it and is capable of receiving it (Synonyms of the New Testament, 163 f).

(4) From all the foregoing it will be seen that mercy in God is not merely His pardon of offenders, but His attitude to man, and to the world generally, from which His pardoning mercy proceeds. The frequency with which mercy is enjoined on men is specially deserving of notice, with the exclusion of the unmerciful from sonship to the all-merciful Father and from the benefits of His mercifulness. Shakespeare's question, "How canst thou hope for mercy rendering none?" is fully warranted by our Lord's teaching and by Scripture in general; compare especially the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt 18:21-35).

(5) As the rule, the American Standard Revised Version has "lovingkindness" for "mercy" when checedh is used of God, and "kindness" when it is used of men in relation to each other. "Compassion" (translation of racham) is also in several instances substituted for "mercy" (Isa 9:17; 14:1; 27:11; Jer 13:14; 30:18), also "goodness" (translation of checedh referring to man) (Ho 4:1; 6:6).

W. L. Walker

MERED

me'-red (meredh, "rebellion"; Septuagint has at least four variants in 1Ch 4:17,18): A descendant of Judah through Caleb, and mentioned as a "son of Ezrah" (1Ch 4:17).

Revised Version, rightly following the orthography of the Hebrew which has here the Hebrew letter he (h) instead of 'aleph (') , as in the name of the well-known Ezra, saves us from confusing this Ezrah with the other by giving him the correct terminal letter. Moreover, even if the question of spelling were waived, the absence of the mention of children in any known passages of the life of the scribe Ezra should settle the question, since this passage (1Ch 4:17) is associated with progeny.

A difficulty meets us in 1Ch 4:18, where Mered is mentioned as taking to wife "Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh." That Pharaoh is not the proper name of some individual but the official title of Egypt's sovereign seems evident from the fact that the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) text agree in translating the other wife of Mered as "the Jewess," rather than as a proper name Jehudijah, as if to distinguish the "Jewess" from the Egyptian. Probably "Hodiah" also is a corruption of Jehudijah in 1Ch 4:19, and should be translated again "the Jewess." Targums and traditions have so changed and transposed and "interpreted" this passage that a sufficiently confused text has become worse confounded, and the only solid fact that emerges is that once a comparatively obscure Judahite (though the founder of several towns—Gedor, Soco, Eshtemoa, etc., 4:18) married an Egyptian princess, whether as a captive or a freewoman we do not know.

See BITHIAH.

Henry Wallace

MEREMOTH

mer’-e-moth, me-re’-moth (meremoth, "heights"; Mereimoth):

(1) Son of Uriah (Ezr 8:33), who was head of the 7th course of priests appointed by David (1Ch 24:10, Hakkoz = Koz; compare Ne 3:4,21). The family of Koz were among those unable to prove their pedigree on the return from Babylon, and were therefore deposed as polluted (Ezr 2:61,62). Meremoth’s division of the family must, however, have been scatheless, for he is employed in the temple after the return as weigher of the gold and the vessels (Ezr 8:33), a function reserved for priests alone (Ezr 8:24-28). He takes a double part in the reconstruction under Nehemiah, first as a builder of the wall of the city (Ne 3:4), then as a restorer of that part of the temple abutting on the house of Eliashib the priest (Ne 3:21); "Marmoth" in 1 Esdras 8:62.

(2) A member of the house of Bani, and, like so many of that house, among those who married and put away foreign wives (Ezr 10:36). He seems to be named Carabasion (!) in the corresponding list of 1 Esdras 9:34.

(3) The name occurs in Ne 10:5 among those who "seal the covenant" with Nehemiah (Ne 10:1). It may there be the name of an individual (in which case there were 4 of the name), or it may be a family name. Certainly a "Meremoth" came back under Zerubbabel 100 years before (Ne 12:3), and the signatory in question may be either a descendant of the same name or a family representative. The name recurs later in the same list (Ne 12:15) as "Meraioth" through a scribal error confusing the two Hebrew letters yodh (y) and cholem (o) for mem (m). A comparison of Ne 12:1-3 and 12:12-15 shows clearly that it is the same person. Note that in 12:15 "Helkai" is the name of the contemporary leader.

(4) For Meremoth (1 Esdras 8:2 the King James Version).

See MEMEROTH.

Henry Wallace

MERIB-BAAL

mer-ib-ba’-al (meribhba‘al; also meri-bha‘al, "Baal contends"): The spelling varies in a single verse; 1Ch 9:40 contains the name twice: first, in the first form above; second, in the second form. The name is given also in 1Ch 8:34. It is the other name of MEPHIBOSHETH (2) (which see).

In Jer 11:13 and Ho 9:10 the terms "Baal" and "Bosheth" seem to stand in apposition, the latter form being a slightly contemptuous alternative rendered "shame." This is akin to other like changes, such as Esh-baal for Ish-bosheth, Jerub-besheth for Jerub-baal, etc. The change in the first part of the name could occur through a clerical confusion of the Hebrew aspirate pe (p) and resh (r) in Hebrew.

Henry Wallace

MERIBAH

mer’-i-ba, me-re’-ba.

See MASSAH AND MERIBAH.

MERIBATH-KADESH; MERIBOTH-KADESH

mer’-i-bath-ka’-desh, mer’-i-both-k (Eze 48:28; 47:19): The southern limit of Ezekiel’s ideal land of Israel.

See MERIBAH.

MERODACH

me-ro’-dak, mer’-o-dak (merodhakh): The supreme deity of the Babylonians (Jer 50:2); the Nimrod of Ge 10:8-12; and among the constellations, Orion.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 11; BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF; NIMROD.

MERODACH-BALADAN

me-ro’-dak-bal’-a-dan, mer’-o-dak-b. (mero’dhakh bal’adhan; Marodach Baladan): The son of Baladan, is mentioned in Isa 39:1, as a king of Babylon who sent an embassy to Hezekiah, king of Judah, apparently shortly after the latter’s illness, in order to congratulate him on his recovery of health, and to make with him an offensive and defensive alliance. This Merodach-baladan was a king of the Chaldeans of the house of Yakin, and was the most dangerous and inveterate foe of Sargon and his son Sennacherib, kings of Assyria, with whom he long and bitterly contested the possession of Babylon and the surrounding provinces. Merodach-Baladan seems to have seized Babylon immediately after the death of Shalmaneser in 721 BC; and it was not till the 12th year of his reign that Sargon succeeded in ousting him. From that time down to the 8th campaign of Sennacherib, Sargon and his son pursued with relentless animosity Merodach-Baladan and his family until at last his son Nabushumishkun was captured and the whole family of Merodach-Baladan was apparently destroyed. According to the monuments, therefore, it was from a worldly point of view good politics for Hezekiah and his western

allies to come to an understanding with Merodach-Baladan and the Arameans, Elamites, and others, who were confederated with him. From a strategical point of view, the weakness of the allied powers consisted in the fact that the Arabian desert lay between the eastern and western members of the confederacy, so that the Assyrian kings were able to attack their enemies when they pleased and to defeat them in detail.

R. Dick Wilson

MEROM, WATERS OF

me’-rom (me-merom; hudor Marron or hudor Merron): The place which was the scene of Joshua’s victory over Jabin and his confederates (Jos 11:7), commonly identified with Lake Huleh in the upper part of the Jordan valley, but with doubtful propriety. Josephus says (Ant., V, i, 18) that the camp of the allies was at Beroth in upper Galilee, and that Beroth was not far from Kadesh, which is upon the summit of the Galilean hills. According to the Scriptural account, the pursuit was to Sidon and Hazor on the West of the mountains (see HAZOR), while the names of the confederates are those of places in lower Galilee and the maritime plain. It seems improbable that a force of chariots should be brought over to be hemmed in by the rugged mountains which border the narrow plain of Huleh on both sides, plains that are made still narrower by the swamps surrounding the lake (see JORDAN VALLEY) in Joshua’s time, when they were much larger than they are now after having been filled with the accumulation of sediment brought down by mountain streams for 3,000 years. Conder, with much reason, supposes the "waters of Merom" to be the perennial stream Wady el-Melek, near Shimrom-Merom (Semunieh), 5 miles West of Nazareth. Were Lake Huleh referred to, the proper phrase would be Sea (yam) of Merom, rather than waters (mayim).

George Frederick Wright

MERONOTHITE

me-ron’-thit, me-ro’-no-thit (meronothi, root meaning "fertility"): The designation of two persons in the Old Testament:

(1) Jehdeiah, who was in charge of the royal asses under David (1Ch 27:30).

(2) Jadon who was among the repairers of the wall under Nehemiah (Ne 3:7). No place of the name Meronoth can be identified. That Jadon worked on the wall near Gibeonites and Mizpahites affords no clear clue to the place, unless it be shown that there was some geographical rota in the wall repairers.

MEROZ

me’-roz (meroz; Codex Vaticanus, Meroz; Codex Alexandrinus, Mazor): This name occurs only once in

Scripture. The angel of the Lord is represented as invoking curses upon Meroz because the inhabitants "came not to the help of Yahweh" on the day of Deborah and Barak's victory (Jud 5:23). It is a strange fate, shared with Chorazin, to be preserved from oblivion only by the record of a curse. The bitterness in the treatment of Meroz, not found in the references to any of the other delinquents, must be due to the special gravity of her offense. Reuben, Gilead and Da were far away. This, however, is not true of Asher, who was also absent. Perhaps Meroz was near the field of battle and, at some stage of the conflict, within sight and hearing of the strife. If, when Zebulun "jeopardized their lives unto the death, and Naphtali, upon the high places of the field," they turned a deaf ear and a cold heart to the dire straits of their brethren, this might explain the fierce reproaches of Deborah.

Meroz may possibly be identified with el-Murussus, a mud-built village about 5 miles Northwest of Beisan, on the slopes to the North of the Vale of Jezreel. If the Kedesh where Heber's tent was pitched be identical with Qadish to the West of the Sea of Galilee, Sisera's flight, avoiding the Israelites in the neighborhood of Mt. Tabor, may have carried him past el-Murussus. If the inhabitants had it in their power to arrest him, but suffered him to escape (Moore, "Jgs," ICC, 163), such treachery to the na tion's cause might well rouse the indignation of the heroic prophetess.

W. Ewing

MERRAN

mer'-an (Merran; the King James Version Meran): Many identifications have been suggested on the assumption that the text as it stands is correct. Some of these are the Sidonian Meareh (Grotius), Marane, a city of which Pliny speaks as being near the Red Sea (Keil), and the desert of Mahrah in Arabia (Fritzsche). It is very probable, however, that the name represents an error in transcription from the original Semitic text, confusing the Hebrew letter daleth ("d") with the Hebrew letter resh ("r"), so that we should read Meddan, or Medan, i.e. Midian. The phrase will then run, "the merchants of Midian and Teman" (Baruch 3:23). The merchants of Midian are referred to in Ge 37:28.

W. Ewing

MERUTH

me'-ruth.

See EMMERUTH.

MESALOTH

mes'-a-loth (Messaloth, Maisaloth): A place mentioned in the account of the march of Bacchides and Alcimus into Judah, as "in Arbela" (1 Macc 9:2). If Arbela be identical with Irbil or Irbid on the

southern lip of Wady el-Chamam, West of the Sea of Galilee, this fixes the locality; but no name resembling Mesaloth has been found.

MESECH

me’-sek.

See MESHECH.

MESHA

me’-sha:

(1) (mesha‘; Codex Vaticanus, Marisa; Codex Alexandrinus, Marisas): Caleb’s firstborn son, the father of Ziph, probably the ancestor of the Ziphites (1Ch 2:42).

(2) (mesha’; Codex Vaticanus, Misa; Codex Alexandrinus, Mosa): A Benjamite, son of Shaharaim by his wife Hodesh, born in the land of Moab (1Ch 8:9).

(3) (mesha‘; Mosa): A king of Moab. All the Biblical information regarding this monarch is contained in 2Ki 3. Here we gather that Mesha was contemporary with Ahab, Ahaziah and Jehoram. He was tributary to Israel, his annual contribution consisting of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams. after the death of Ahab he asserted his independence. Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, and the king of Edom joined forces with Jehoram in an attempt to quell the rebellion at the instance of Elisha, who accompanied the host, water was miraculously provided when the army of the allies was ready to perish of thirst. Mesha came out against them and fell upon the camp. His attack was repulsed with heavy slaughter, and the defeated king was chased by the victors until he took refuge in the great fortress of Kir-hareseth. A vigorous siege was begun. Seeing that his case was desperate, Mesha attempted, with 700 men, to break through the lines. Failing in this, he offered his firstborn as a burnt offering upon the wall. Then "there came great wrath upon Israel" (by which, probably, panic is meant), and the besiegers retired, leaving their conquest incomplete.

In his inscription (see MOABITE STONE) Mesha gives an account of his rebellion, naming the places captured and fortified by him. It is not surprising that he says nothing of his defeat by Jehoram and his allies. There is, however, one serious discrepancy. The time Moab was under the supremacy of Israel, during the reign of Omri and half the reign of Ahab, he puts at 40 years. According to Biblical chronology, Omri and Ahab together reigned only 34 years. If, with Mesha, we deduct half the reign of Ahab, the period is reduced to 23 years. It is impossible to add to the length of either reign. So great a difference cannot be explained by the use of round numbers. Why Mesha should wish to increase the time of his people’s subjection is not clear, unless, indeed, he thought in this way to magnify the glory of their deliverer.

In Mesha the sentiment of patriotism was wedded to some measure of military capacity. Judging by his inscription, he was also a deeply religious man according to his lights. Substitute "Yahweh" for "Chemosh," and his phraseology might be that of a pious Hebrew king. The sacrifice of his son is at once the mark of the heathen and an index of the strength of his devotion.

(4) (mesha’; Masse): This appears to mark the western boundary of the land occupied by the descendants of Joktan (Ge 10:30). No certain identification is possible, but several more or less probable have been suggested: e.g.

(a) The Greek Mesene, on the Persian Gulf, not far from the mouth of the Tigris and the Euphrates;

(b) the Syro-Arabian desert, called Mashu in the Assyrian inscriptions; the name here, however, could hardly cover such a vast tract as this; more probably it denoted a place;

(c) Dillmann would alter the vowels and identify it with Massa’, a branch of the Ishmaelite stock (Ge 25:14; 1Ch 1:30). This, however, furnishes no clue to the locality, the territory of that tribe being also unidentified.

W. Ewing

MESHACH

me’-shak (meshakh): Possibly the Sumerian form of the Babylonian Cil-Asharidu, "the shadow of the prince," just as Shadrach probably means "the servant of Sin," and Abednego the "servant of Ishtar." Meshach was one of the three Hebrew companions of Daniel, whose history is given in the first chapters of the Book of Daniel.

See, further, under SHADRACH.

MESHECH; MESECH

me’-shek, me’-sek (meshekh, "long," "tall"; Mosoch): Son of Japheth (Ge 10:2; 1Ch 1:5; 1:17 is a scribal error for "Mash"; compare Ge 10:22,23). His descendants and their dwelling-place (probably somewhere in the neighborhood of armenia (Herodotus iii.94)) seem to be regarded in Scripture as synonyms for the barbaric and remote (Ps 120:5; compare Isa 66:19, where Meshech should be read instead of "that draw the bow"). It is thought that the "Tibareni and Moschi" of the classical writers refer to the same people. Doubtless they appear in the annals of Assyria as enemies of that country under the names Tabali and Mushki—the latter the descendants of Meshech and the former those of Tubal to whom the term "Tibareni" may refer in the clause above. This juxtaposition of names is in harmony with practically every appearance of the word in Scripture. It is seldom named without some one of the others —Tubal, Javan, Gog and Magog. It is this which forms a good justification for making the suggested

change in Isa 66:19, where Meshech would be in the usual company of Tubal and Javan. Ezekiel mentions them several times, first, as engaged in contributing to the trade of Tyre (Tiras of Ge 10:2?), in "vessels of brass" and—very significantly—slaves; again there is the association of Javan and Tubal with them (Eze 27:13); second, they are included in his weird picture of the under-world: "them that go down into the pit" (Eze 32:18,26). They are mentioned again with Gog and Magog twice as those against whom the prophet is to "set his face" (Eze 38:2,3; 39:1).

Henry Wallace

MESHELEMIAH

me-shel-e-mi’-a (meshelemyah, "Yah repays"): Father of Zechariah, one of the porters of the tabernacle (1Ch 9:21; 26:1,2,9). In the latter passage Meshelemiah, with a final "-u", is credited with "sons and brethren, valiant men, 18." He is the "Shelemiah" of 1Ch 26:14, the "Shallum" of 1Ch 9:17,19,31, and the "Meshullam" of Ne 12:25.

MESHEZABEL

me-shez’-a-bel (meshezebhe’el, "God a deliverer"; the King James Version Meshezabeel, me-shez’-a-bel):

(1) A priest, ancestor of Meshullam, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:4).

(2) One of the chiefs of the people giving name to the family which sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:21).

(3) A descendant of Judah through Zerah, and father of Pethahiah (Ne 11:24).

MESHILLEMITH

me-shil’-e-mith (meshillemith, "retribution"): A priest, son of Immer, ancestor, according to 1Ch 9:12, of Adaiah and Pashhur, and according to Ne 11:13, of Amashai. In the latter passage this name is spelled MESHILLEMOTH (which see).

MESHILLEMOTH

me-shil’-e-moth, me-shil’-e-moth (meshillemoth, "recompense"):

(1) An Ephraimite ancestor of Berechiah, chief of the tribe, in the reign of Pekah (2Ch 28:12).

(2) The "Meshillemith" of Ne 11:13.

MESHOBAB

me-sho’-bab (meshobhabh): A Simeonite (1Ch 4:34). This name heads the list of those who, for the sake of wider pasturelands, occupied a Hamitic settlement in the neighborhood of Gerar (Mount GEDOR (which see)), and a Maonite settlement in Edomite territory (1Ch 4:39-41). The latter event is dated in the days of Hezekiah (see Curtis, Chronicles, in the place cited.).

MESHULLAM

me-shul’-am (meshullam, "resigned" or "devoted"; compare Arabic Muslim; Mesollam): An Old Testament name very common in post-exilic times.

(1) The grandfather of Shaphan (2Ki 22:3).

(2) A son of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19).

(3) A Gadite (1Ch 5:13).

(4) (5) (6) Three Benjamites (1Ch 8:17; 9:7,8).

(7) The father of Hilkiah (1Ch 9:11; Ne 11:11).

(8) A priest, son of Meshillemith (1Ch 9:12); the parallel list (Ne 11:13) omits the name.

(9) A Kohathite appointed by Josiah as one of the overseers to direct the repairs of the temple (2Ch 34:12).

(10) One of the chief men sent by Ezra to procure Levites to go up with him to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16; compare 1 Esdras 8:44).

(11) A Levite opposed to Ezra’s regulations anent marriage with foreigners (Ezr 10:15; 1 Esdras 9:14).

(12) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:29; compare 1 Esdras 9:30).

(13) One of the repairers of the wall (Ne 3:4,30). His daughter was married to Jehohanan, the son of Tobiah the Ammonite (Ne 6:18).

(14) One of the repairers of the Old Gate (Ne 3:6).

(15) A supporter of Ezra at the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4).

(16) One of those who subscribed the Covenant (Ne 10:20).

(17) A priest who subscribed the Covenant (Ne 10:7).

(18) (19) Two priests at the time of the high priest Joiakim (Ne 12:13,16).

(20) A porter at the time of the high priest Joiakim (Ne 12:25).

(21) A processionist at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 12:33).

John A. Less

MESHULLEMETH

me-shul’-e-meth (meshullemeth): The wife of King Manasseh and mother of Amon (2Ki 21:19). She is further designated "daughter of Haruz of Jotbah." This is the earliest instance of the birthplace being added to the designation of the queen mother. The name is properly the feminine of the frequently occurring MESHULLAM (which see).

MESOBAITE

me-so’-ba-it.

See MEZOBAITE.

MESOPOTAMIA

mes-o-ta’-mi-a.

See SYRIA.

MESS

mes (mas’eth): Any dish of food sent (Latin missum; French messe) to the table. It occurs in the Old Testament in Ge 43:34 (twice); 2Sa 11:8 English Versions of the Bible, and in the New Testament in Heb 12:16, translating brosis.

MESSENGER

mes’-en-jer: The regular Hebrew word for "messenger" is mal’akh, the Greek aggelos. This may be a human messenger or a messenger of God, an angel. The context must decide the right translation. In Hag 1:13 the prophet is called God’s messenger; Job 33:23 changes the King James Version to "angel" (margin "messenger"); and Mal 3:1 margin, suggests "angel" instead of "messenger." Mal 2:7 and Mal 3:1 (twice) have caused a great deal of comment. See MALACHI. The Greek apostolos, "apostle," is rendered "messenger" in 2Co 8:23; Php 2:25; 1Sa 4:17 translations literally, from Hebrew basar, "to tell good news," "he that brought the tidings." Ge 50:16 reads "message" instead of "messenger."

A. L. Breslich

MESSIAH

me-si’-a (mashiach; Aramaic meshicha’; Septuagint Christos, "anointed"; New Testament "Christ"):

1. Meaning and Use of the Term

2. The Messianic Hope

I. THE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. The Messianic King

(1) Isaiah

(2) Jeremiah and Ezekiel

(3) Later Prophets

2. Prophetic and Priestly Relations

3. Servant of Yahweh

4. Transformation of the Prophetic Hope into the Apocalyptic

II. THE MESSIAH IN THE PRE-CHRISTIAN AGE

1. Post-prophetic Age

2. Maccabean Times

3. Apocalyptic Literature

III. THE MESSIAH IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. The Jewish Conception

(1) The Messiah as King

(2) His Prophetic Character

(3) The Title "Son of God"

2. Attitude of Jesus to the Messiahship

3. The Christian Transformation

4. New Elements Added

(1) Future Manifestation

(2) Divine Personality

(3) Heavenly Priesthood

5. Fulfillment in Jesus

LITERATURE

1. Meaning and Use of the Term:

"Messias" (Joh 1:41; 4:25 the King James Version) is a transcription of Messias, the Greek representation of the Aramaic. "Messiah" is thus a modification of the Greek form of the word, according to the Hebrew.

The term is used in the Old Testament of kings and priests, who were consecrated to office by the ceremony of anointing. It is applied to the priest only as an adjective—"the anointed priest" (Le 4:3,5,16; 6:22 (Hebrew 15)). Its substantive use is restricted to the king; he only is called "the Lord’s anointed," e.g. Saul (1Sa 24:6,10 (Hebrew 7,11), etc.); David (2Sa 19:21 (Hebrew 22); 2Sa 23:1, "the anointed of the God of Jacob"); Zedekiah (La 4:20). Similarly in the Psalms the king is designated "mine," "thine," "his anointed." Thus also even Cyrus (Isa 45:1), as being chosen and commissioned by

Yahweh to carry out His purpose with Israel. Some think the singular "mine anointed" in Hab 3:13 denotes the whole people; but the Hebrew text is somewhat obscure, and the reference may be to the king. The plural of the substantive is used of the patriarchs, who are called "mine anointed ones" (Ps 105:15; 1Ch 16:22), as being Yahweh's chosen, consecrated servants, whose persons were inviolable.

It is to be noted that "Messiah" as a special title is never applied in the Old Testament to the unique king of the future, unless perhaps in Da 9:25 f (mashiach naghidh, "Messiah-Prince"), a difficult passage, the interpretation of which is very uncertain. It was the later Jews of the post-prophetic period who, guided by a true instinct, first used the term in a technical sense.

2. The Messianic Hope:

The Messiah is the instrument by whom God's kingdom is to be established in Israel and in the world. The hope of a personal deliverer is thus inseparable from the wider hope that runs through the Old Testament. The Jews were a nation who lived in the future. In this respect they stand alone among the peoples of antiquity. No nation ever cherished such strong expectations of a good time coming, or clung more tenaciously amid defeat and disaster to the certainty of final triumph over all enemies and of entrance upon a state of perfect peace and happiness. The basis of this larger hope is Yahweh's covenant with Israel. "I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God" (Ex 6:7). On the ground of this promise the prophets, while declaring God's wrath against His people on account of their sin, looked beyond the Divine chastisements to the final era of perfect salvation and blessedness, which would be ushered in when the nation had returned to Yahweh.

The term "Messianic" is used in a double sense to describe the larger hope of a glorious future for the nation, as well as the narrower one of a personal Messiah who is to be the prominent figure in the perfected kingdom. It may be remarked that many writers, both prophetic and apocalyptic, who picture the final consummation, make no allusion whatever to a coming deliverer.

This article will treat of the personal Messianic hope as it is found in the Old Testament, in the pre-Christian age, and in the New Testament.

I. The Messiah in the Old Testament.

1. The Messianic King:

The chief element in the conception of the Messiah in the Old Testament is that of the king. Through him as head of the nation Yahweh could most readily work out His saving purposes. But the kingdom of Israel was a theocracy. In earlier times Moses, Joshua, and the judges, who were raised up by Yahweh to guide His people at different crises in their history, did not claim to exercise authority apart from their Divine commission. Nor was the relation of Yahweh to the nation as its real ruler in any way modified by the institution of the monarchy. It was by His Spirit that the king was qualified for the righteous government of the people, and by His power that he would become victorious over all enemies. The

passage on which the idea of the Messianic king who would rule in righteousness and attain universal dominion was founded is Nathan’s oracle to David in 2Sa 7:11 ff. In contrast to Saul, from whom the kingdom had passed away, David would never want a descendant to sit on the throne of Israel. How strong an impression this promise of the perpetuity of his royal house had made on David is seen in his last words (2Sa 23); and to this "everlasting covenant, and sure," the spiritual minds in Israel reverted in all after ages.

(1) Isaiah.

Isaiah is the first of the prophets to refer to an extraordinary king of the future. Amos (9:11) foretold the time when the shattered fortunes of Judah would be restored, while Hosea (3:5) looked forward to the reunion of the two kingdoms under David’s line. But it is not till we reach the Assyrian age, when the personality of the king is brought into prominence against the great world-power, that we meet with any mention of a unique personal ruler who would bring special glory to David’s house.

The kings of Syria and Israel having entered into a league to dethrone Ahaz and supplant him by an obscure adventurer, Isaiah 7:10-17 announces to the king of Judah that while, by the help of Assyria, he would survive the attack of the confederate kings, Yahweh would, for his disobedience, bring devastation upon his own land through the instrumentality of his ally. But the prophet’s lofty vision, though limited as in the case of other seers to the horizon of his own time, reaches beyond Judah’s distress to Judah’s deliverance. To the spiritual mind of Isaiah the revelation is made of a true king, Immanuel, "God-with-us," who would arise out of the house of David, now so unworthily represented by the profligate Ahaz. While the passage is one of the hardest to interpret in all the Old Testament, perhaps too much has been made by some scholars of the difficulty connected with the word ‘almah, "virgin." It is the mysterious personality of the child to which prominence is given in the prophecy. The significance of the name and the pledge of victory it implies, the reference to Immanuel as ruler of the land in 8:8 (if the present rendering be correct), as well as the parallelism of the line of thought in the prophecy with that of Isa 9, would seem to point to the identity of Immanuel with the Prince of the four names, "Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace" (9:6 the Revised Version margin). These Divine titles do not necessarily imply that in the mind of the prophet the Messianic king is God in the metaphysical sense—the essence of the Divine nature is not a dogmatic conception in the Old Testament—but only that Yahweh is present in Him in perfect wisdom and power, so that He exercises over His people forever a fatherly and peaceful rule. In confirmation of this interpretation reference may be made to the last of the great trilogy of Isaianic prophecies concerning the Messiah of the house of David (11:2), where the attributes with which He is endowed by the Spirit are those which qualify for the perfect discharge of royal functions in the kingdom of God.

See IMMANUEL.

A similar description of the Messianic king is given by Isaiah’s younger contemporary Micah (5:2 ff), who emphasizes the humble origin of the extraordinary ruler of the future, who shall spring from the Davidic house, while his reference to her who is to bear him confirms the interpretation which regards

the virgin in Isaiah as the mother of the Messiah.

(2) Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

After the time of Isaiah and Micah the throne of David lost much of its power and influence, and the figure of the ideal king is never again portrayed with the same definiteness and color. Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk make no reference to him at all. By the great prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, however, the hope of a Davidic ruler is kept before the people. While there are passages in both of these writers which refer to a succession of pious rulers, this fact should not dominate our interpretation of other utterances of theirs which seem to point to a particular individual. By Jeremiah the Messiah is called the "righteous Branch" who is to be raised unto David and be called "Yahweh (is) our righteousness," that is, Yahweh as the one making righteous dwells in him (Jer 23:5 f; compare 30:9). In Ezekiel he is alluded to as the coming one "whose right it is" (21:27), and as Yahweh's "servant David" who shall be "prince" or "king" forever over a reunited people (34:23 f; 37:24). It is difficult to resist the impression which the language of Ezekiel makes that it is the ideal Messianic ruler who is here predicted, notwithstanding the fact that afterward, in the prophet's vision of the ideal theocracy, not only does the prince play a subordinate part, but provision is made in the constitution for a possible abuse of his authority.

(3) Later Prophets.

After Ezekiel's time, during the remaining years of the exile, the hope of a preeminent king of David's house naturally disappears. But it is resuscitated at the restoration when Zerubbabel, a prince of the house of David and the civil head of the restored community, is made by Yahweh of hosts His signet-ring, inseparable from Himself and the symbol of His authority (Hag 2:23). In the new theocracy, however the figure of the Messianic ruler falls into the background before that of the high priest, who is regarded as the sign of the coming Branch (Zec 3:8). Still we have the unique prophecy of the author Of Zec 9:9, who pictures the Messiah as coming not on a splendid charger like a warrior king, but upon the foal of an ass, righteous and victorious, yet lowly and peaceful, strong by the power of God to help and save. There is no mention of the Messianic king in Joe or Malachi; but references in the later, as in the earlier, Psalms to events in the lives of the kings or the history of the kingdom prove that the promise made to David was not forgotten, and point to one who would fulfill it in all its grandeur.

2. Prophetic and Priestly Relations:

The Messianic king is the central figure in the consummation of the kingdom. It is a royal son of David, not a prophet like unto Moses, or a priest of Aaron's line, whose personal features are portrayed in the picture of the future. The promise in De 18:15-20, as the context shows, refers to a succession of true prophets as opposed to the diviners of heathen nations. Though Moses passed away there would always be a prophet raised up by Yahweh to reveal His will to the people, so that they would never need to have recourse to heathen soothsayers. Yet while the prophet is not an ideal figure, being already fully inspired by the Spirit, prophetic functions are to this extent associated with the kingship, that the Messiah is

qualified by the Spirit for the discharge of the duties of His royal office and makes known the will of God by His righteous decisions (Isa 11:2-5).

It is more difficult to define the relationship of the priesthood to the kingship in the final era. They are brought into connection by Jeremiah (30:9,21) who represents the new "David" as possessing the priestly right of immediate access to Yahweh, while the Levitical priesthood, equally with the Davidic kingship, is assured of perpetuity on the ground of the covenant (Jer 33:18). But after the restoration, when prominence is given to the high priest in the reconstitution of the kingdom, Joshua becomes the type of the coming "Branch" of the Davidic house (Zec 3:8), and, according to the usual interpretation, receives the crown—a symbol of the union of the kingly and priestly offices in the Messiah (Zec 6:11). Many scholars, however, holding that the words "and the counsel of peace shall be between them both" can only refer to two persons, would substitute "Zerubbabel" for "Joshua" in Zec 6:11, and read in 6:13, "there shall be a priest upon his right hand" (compare the Revised Version (British and American), Septuagint (Septuagint). The prophet’s meaning would then be that the Messianic high priest would sit beside the Messianic king in the perfected kingdom, both working together as Zerubbabel and Joshua were then doing. There is no doubt, however, that the Messiah is both king and priest in Ps 110.

3. Servant of Yahweh:

The bitter experiences of the nation during the exile originated a new conception, Messianic in the deepest sense, the Servant of Yahweh (Isa 40—66; chiefly 41:8; 42:1-7,19 f; 43:8,10; 44:1 f, 21; 49:3-6; 50:4-9; 52:13—53). As to whom the prophet refers in his splendid delineation of this mysterious being, scholars are hopelessly divided. The personification theory—that the Servant represents the ideal Israel, Israel as God meant it to be, as fulfilling its true vocation in the salvation of the world—is held by those who plead for a consistent use of the phrase throughout the prophecy. They regard it as inconceivable that the same title should be applied by the same prophet to two distinct subjects. Others admit that the chief difficulty in the way of this theory is to conceive it, but they maintain that it best explains the use of the title in the chief passages where it occurs. The other theory is that there is an expansion and contraction of the idea in the mind of the prophet. In some passages the title is used to denote the whole nation; in others it is limited to the pious kernel; and at last the conception culminates in an individual, the ideal yet real Israelite of the future, who shall fulfill the mission in which the nation failed.

What really divides expositors is the interpretation of Isa 52:13—53. The question is not whether this passage was fulfilled in Jesus Christ—on this all Christian expositors are agreed—but whether the "Servant" is in the mind of the prophet merely the personification of the godly portion of the nation, or a person yet to come.

May not the unity argument be pressed too hard? If the Messiah came to be conceived of as a specific king while the original promise spoke of a dynasty, is it so inconceivable that the title "Servant of Yahweh" should be used in an individual as well as in a collective sense? It is worthy of note, too, that not only in some parts of this prophecy, but all through it, the individuality of the sufferer is made prominent; the collective idea entirely disappears. The contrast is not between a faithful portion and the

general body of the people, but between the "Servant" and every single member of the nation. Moreover, whatever objections may be urged against the individual interpretation, this view best explains the doctrine of substitution that runs through the whole passage. Israel was Yahweh's elect people, His messenger of salvation to the Gentiles, and its faithful remnant suffered for the sins of the mass; even "Immanuel" shared in the sorrows of His people. But here the "Servant" makes atonement for the sins of individual Israelites; by his death they are justified and by his stripes they are healed. To this great spiritual conception only the prophet of the exile attains.

It may be added that in the Suffering Servant, who offers the sacrifice of himself as an expiation for the sins of the people, prophetic activity and kingly honor are associated with the priestly function. After he has been raised from the dead he becomes the great spiritual teacher of the world—by his knowledge of God and salvation which he communicates to others he makes many righteous (Isa 53:11; compare 42:1 ff; 49:2; 50:4); and as a reward for his sufferings he attains to a position of the highest royal splendor (Isa 52:15 b; 53:12a; compare 49:7).

See SERVANT OF JEHOVAH.

4. Transformation of the Prophetic Hope into the Apocalyptic:

In the Book of Daniel, written to encourage the Jewish people to steadfastness during the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Messianic hope of the prophets assumes a new form. Here the apocalyptic idea of the Messiah appears for the first time in Jewish literature. The coming ruler is represented, not as a descendant of the house of David, but as a person in human form and of super-human character, through whom God is to establish His sovereignty upon the earth. In the prophet's vision (Da 7:13 f) one "like unto a son of man," kebhar 'enash (not, as in the King James Version, "like the son of man"), comes with the clouds of heaven, and is brought before the ancient of days, and receives an imperishable kingdom, that all peoples should serve him.

Scholars are by no means agreed in their interpretation of the prophecy. In support of the view that the "one like unto a son of man" is a symbol for the ideal Israel, appeal is made to the interpretation given of the vision in Da 7:18,22,27, according to which dominion is given to "the saints of the Most High." Further, as the four heathen kingdoms are represented by the brute creation, it would be natural for the higher power, which is to take their place, to be symbolized by the human form.

But strong reasons may be urged, on the other hand, for the personal Messianic interpretation of the passage. A distinction seems to be made between "one like unto a son of man" and the saints of the Most High in Da 7:21, the saints being there represented as the object of persecution from the little horn. The scene of the judgment is earth, where the saints already are, and to which the ancient of days and the "one like unto a son of man" descend (7:22,13). And it is in accordance with the interpretation given of the vision in 7:17, where reference is made to the four kings of the bestial kingdoms, that the kingdom of the saints, which is to be established in their place, should also be represented by a royal head.

It may be noted that a new idea is suggested by this passage, the pre-existence of the Messiah before His manifestation.

II. The Messiah in the Pre-Christian Age.

1. Post-prophetic Age:

After prophetic inspiration ceased, there was little in the teaching of the scribes, or in the reconstitution of the kingdom under the rule of the high priests, to quicken the ancient hope of the nation. It would appear from the Apocrypha that while the elements of the general expectation were still cherished, the specific hope of a preeminent king of David's line had grown very dim in the consciousness of the people. In Ecclesiasticus (47:11) mention is made of a "covenant of kings and a throne of glory in Israel which the Lord gave unto David"; yet even this allusion to the everlasting duration of the Davidic dynasty is more of the nature of a historical statement than the expression of a confident hope.

2. Maccabean Times:

In the earlier stages of the Maccabean uprising, when the struggle was for religious freedom, the people looked for help to God alone, and would probably have been content to acknowledge the political supremacy of Syria after liberty had been granted them in 162 BC to worship God according to their own law and ceremonial. But the successful effort of the Maccabean leaders in achieving political independence, while it satisfied the aspirations of the people generally "until there should arise a faithful prophet" (1 Macc 14:41; compare 2:57), brought religious and national ideals into conflict. The "Pious" (chacidhim), under the new name of Pharisees, now became more than ever devoted to the Law, and repudiated the claim of a Maccabean to be high priest and his subsequent assumption of the royal title, while the Maccabees with their political ambitions took the side of the aristocracy and alienated the people. The national spirit, however, had been stirred into fresh life. Nor did the hope thus quickened lose any of its vitality when, amid the strife of factions and the quarrels of the ruling family, Pompey captured Jerusalem in 63 BC. The fall of the Hasmonean house, even more than its ascendancy, led the nation to set its hope more firmly on God and to look for a deliverer from the house of David.

3. Apocalyptic Literature:

The national sentiment evoked by the Maccabees finds expression in the Apocalyptic literature of the century and a half before Christ.

In the oldest parts of the Sibylline Oracles (3:652-56) there occurs a brief prediction of a king whom God shall send from the sun, who shall "cause the whole earth to cease from wicked war, killing some and exacting faithful oaths from others. And this he will do, not according to his own counsel, but in obedience to the beneficent decrees of God." And in a later part of the same book (3:49) there is an allusion to "a pure king who will wield the scepter over the whole earth forever." It may be the Messiah also who is represented in the earlier part of the Book of Enoch (90:37 f) as a glorified man under the

symbol of a white bull with great horns, which is feared and worshipped by all the other animals (the rest of the religious community) and into whose likeness they are transformed.

But it is in the Psalms of Solomon, which were composed in the Pompeian period and reveal their Pharisaic origin by representing the Hasmoneans as a race of usurpers, that we have depicted in clear outline and glowing colors the portrait of the Davidic king (Ps 17:18). The author looks for a personal Messiah who, as son of David and king of Israel, will purge Jerusalem of sinners, and gather together a holy people who will all be the "sons of their God." He shall not conquer with earthly weapons, for the Lord Himself is his King; he shall smite the earth with the breath of his mouth; and the heathen of their own accord shall come to see his glory, bringing the wearied children of Israel as gifts. His throne shall be established in wisdom and justice, while he himself shall be pure from sin and made strong in the Holy Spirit.

It is evident that in these descriptions of the coming one we have something more than a mere revival of the ancient hope of a preeminent king of David’s house. The repeated disasters that overtook the Jews led to the transference of the national hope to a future world, and consequently to the transformation of the Messiah from a mere earthly king into a being with supernatural attributes. That this supernatural apocalyptic hope, which was at least coming to be cherished, exercised an influence on the national hope is seen in the Psalter of Solomon, where emphasis is laid on the striking individuality of this Davidic king, the moral grandeur of his person, and the Divine character of his rule.

We meet with the apocalyptic conception of the Messiah in the Similitudes of Enoch (chapters 37—71) and the later apocalypses. Reference may be made at this point to the Similitudes on account of their unique expression of Messianic doctrine, although their pre-Christian date, which Charles puts not later than 64 BC, is much disputed. The Messiah who is called "the Anointed," "the Elect one" "the Righteous one" is represented, though in some sense man, as belonging to the heavenly world. His pre-existence is affirmed. He is the supernatural Son of Man, who will come forth from His concealment to sit as Judge of all on the throne of His glory, and dwell on a transformed earth with the righteous forever.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE (JEWISH); ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

III. The Messiah in the New Testament.

To the prevalence of the Messianic hope among the Jews in the time of Christ the Gospel records bear ample testimony. We see from the question of the Baptist that "the coming one" was expected (Mt 11:3 and parallel), while the people wondered whether John himself were the Christ (Lu 3:15).

1. The Jewish Conception:

(1) The Messiah as King.

In the popular conception the Messiah was chiefly the royal son of David who would bring victory and

prosperity to the Jewish nation and set up His throne in Jerusalem. In this capacity the multitude hailed Jesus on His entry into the capital (Mt 21:9 and parallel); to the Pharisees also the Messiah was the son of David (Mt 22:42). It would seem that apocalyptic elements mingled with the national expectation, for it was supposed that the Messiah would come forth suddenly from concealment and attest Himself by miracles (Joh 7:27,31).

But there were spiritual minds who interpreted the nation's hope, not in any conventional sense, but according to their own devout aspirations. Looking for "the consolation of Israel," "the redemption of Jerusalem," they seized upon the spiritual features of the Messianic king and recognized in Jesus the promised Saviour who would deliver the nation from its sin (Lu 2:25,30,38; compare 1:68-79).

(2) His Prophetic Character.

From the statements in the Gospels regarding the expectation of a prophet it is difficult to determine whether the prophetic function was regarded as belonging to the Messiah. We learn not only that one of the old prophets was expected to reappear (Mt 14:2; 16:14 and parallel), but also that a preeminent prophet was looked for, distinct from the Messiah (Joh 1:21,25; 7:40 f). But the two conceptions of prophet and king seem to be identified in Joh 6:14 f, where we are told that the multitude, after recognizing in Jesus the expected prophet, wished to take Him by force and make Him a king. It would appear that while the masses were looking forward to a temporal king, the expectations of some were molded by the image and promise of Moses. And to the woman of Samaria, as to her people, the Messiah was simply a prophet, who would bring the full light of Divine knowledge into the world (Joh 4:25). On the other hand, from Philip's description of Jesus we would naturally infer that he saw in Him whom he had found the union of a prophet like unto Moses and the Messianic king of the prophetical books (Joh 1:45).

(3) The Title "Son of God."

It cannot be doubted that the "Son of God" was used as a Messianic title by the Jews in the time of our Lord. The high priest in presence of the Sanhedrin recognized it as such (Mt 26:63). It was applied also in its official sense to Jesus by His disciples: John the Baptist (Joh 1:34), Nathaniel (Joh 1:49), Mary (Joh 11:27), Peter (Mt 16:16, though not in parallel). This Messianic use was based on Ps 2:7; compare 2Sa 7:14. The title as given to Jesus by Peter in his confession, "the Son of the living God," is suggestive of something higher than a mere official dignity, although its full significance in the unique sense in which Jesus claimed it could scarcely have been apprehended by the disciples till after His resurrection.

2. Attitude of Jesus to the Messiahship:

(1) His Claim.

The claim of Jesus to be the Messiah is written on the face of the evangelic history. But while He accepted the title, He stripped it of its political and national significance and filled it with an ethical and

universal content. The Jewish expectation of a great king who would restore the throne of David and free the nation from a foreign yoke was interpreted by Jesus as of one who would deliver God's people from spiritual foes and found a universal kingdom of love and peace.

(2) His Delay in Making It.

To prepare the Jewish mind for His transformation of the national hope Jesus delayed putting forth His claim before the multitude till His triumphal entry into Jerusalem, which, be it noted, He made in such a way as to justify His interpretation of the Messiah of the prophets, while He delayed emphasizing it to His disciples till the memorable scene at Caesarea Philippi when He drew forth Peter's confession.

(3) "The Son of Man."

But he sought chiefly to secure the acceptance of Himself in all His lowliness as the true Messianic king by His later use of His self-designation as the "Son of Man." While "Son of Man" in Aramaic, bar nasha', may mean simply "man," an examination of the chief passages in which the title occurs shows that Jesus applied it to Himself in a unique sense. That He had the passage in Daniel in His mind is evident from the phrases He employs in describing His future coming (Mr 8:38; 13:26 and parallel; 14:62 and parallel). By this apocalyptic use of the title He put forward much more clearly His claim to be the Messiah of national expectation who would come in heavenly glory. But He used the title also to announce the tragic destiny that awaited Him (Mr 8:31). This He could do without any contradiction, as He regarded His death as the beginning of His Messianic reign. And those passages in which He refers to the Son of Man giving His life a ransom "for many" (Mt 20:28 and parallel) and going "as it is written of him" (Mt 26:24 and parallel), as well as Lu 22:37, indicate that He interpreted Isa 53 of Himself in His Messianic character. By His death He would complete His Messianic work and inaugurate the kingdom of God. Thus, by the help of the title "Son of Man" Jesus sought, toward the close of His ministry, to explain the seeming contradiction between His earthly life and the glory of His Messianic kingship.

It may be added that our Lord's use of the phrase implies what the Gospels suggest (Joh 12:34), that the "Son of Man," notwithstanding the references in Daniel and the Similitudes of Enoch (if the pre-Christian date be accepted), was not regarded by the Jews generally as a Messianic title. For He could not then have applied it, as He does, to Himself before Peter's confession, while maintaining His reserve in regard to His claims to be the Messiah. Many scholars, however, hold that the "Son of Man" was already a Messianic title before our Lord employed it in His conversation with the disciples at Caesarea Philippi, and regard the earlier passages in which it occurs as inserted out of chronological order, or the presence of the title in them either as a late insertion, or as due to the ambiguity of the Aramaic.

See SON OF MAN.

3. The Christian Transformation:

The thought of a suffering Messiah who would atone for sin was alien to the Jewish mind. This is evident from the conduct, not only of the opponents, but of the followers of Jesus (Mt 16:22; 17:23). While His disciples believed Him to be the Messiah, they could not understand His allusions to His sufferings, and regarded His death as the extinction of all their hopes (Lu 18:34; 24:21). But after His resurrection and ascension they were led, by the impression His personality and teaching had made upon them, to see how entirely they had misconceived His Messiahship and the nature and extent of His Messianic kingdom (Lu 24:31; Ac 2:36,38 f). They were confirmed, too, in their spiritual conceptions when they searched into the ancient prophecies in the light of the cross. In the mysterious form of the Suffering Servant they beheld the Messianic king on His way to His heavenly throne, conquering by the power of His atoning sacrifice and bestowing all spiritual blessings (Ac 3:13,18-21,26; 4:27,30; 8:35; 10:36-43).

4. New Elements Added:

(1) Future manifestation.

New features were now added to the Messiah in accordance with Jesus' own teaching. He had ascended to His Father and become the heavenly king. But all things were not yet put under Him. It was therefore seen that the full manifestation of His Messiahship was reserved for the future, that He would return in glory to fulfill His Messianic office and complete His Messianic reign.

(2) Divine Personality.

Higher views of His personality were now entertained. He is declared to be the Son of God, not in any official, but in a unique sense, as coequal with the Father (Joh 1:1; Ro 1:4,7; 1Co 1:3, etc.). His pre-existence is affirmed (Joh 1:1; 2Co 8:9); and when He comes again in his Messianic glory, He will exercise the Divine function of Universal Judge (Ac 10:42; 17:30 f, etc.).

(3) Heavenly Priesthood.

The Christian conception of the Messianic king who had entered into His glory through suffering and death carried with it the doctrine of the Messianic priesthood. But it took some time for early Christian thought to advance from the new discovery of the combination of humiliation and glory in the Messiah to concentrate upon His heavenly life. While the preaching of the first Christians was directed to show from the Scriptures that "Jesus is the Christ" and necessarily involved the ascription to Him of many functions characteristic of the true priest, it was reserved for the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews to set forth this aspect of His work with separate distinctness and to apply to Him the title of our "great high priest" (Heb 4:14). As the high priest on the Day of Atonement not only sprinkled the blood upon the altar, but offered the sacrifice, so it was now seen that by passing into the heavens and presenting to God the offering He had made of Himself on earth, Jesus had fulfilled the high-priestly office.

5. Fulfillment in Jesus:

Thus the ideal of the Hebrew prophets and poets is amply fulfilled in the person, teaching and work of Jesus of Nazareth. Apologists may often err in supporting the argument from prophecy by an extravagant symbolism and a false exegesis; but they are right in the contention that the essential elements in the Old Testament conception—the Messianic king who stands in a unique relation to Yahweh as His "Son," and who will exercise universal dominion; the supreme prophet who will never be superseded; the priest forever—are gathered up and transformed by Jesus in a way the ancient seers never dreamed of. As the last and greatest prophet, the suffering Son of Man, and the sinless Saviour of the world, He meets humanity's deepest longings for Divine knowledge, human sympathy, and spiritual deliverance; and as the unique Son of God, who came to reveal the Father, He rules over the hearts of men by the might of eternal love. No wonder that the New Testament writers, like Jesus Himself, saw references to the Messiah in Old Testament passages which would not be conceded by a historical interpretation. While recognizing the place of the old covenant in the history of salvation, they sought to discover in the light of the fulfillment in Jesus the meaning of the Old Testament which the Spirit of God intended to convey, the Divine, saving thoughts which constitute its essence. And to us, as to the early Christians, "the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy" (Re 19:10). To Him, hidden in the bosom of the ages, all the scattered rays of prophecy pointed; and from Him, in His revealed and risen splendor, shine forth upon the world the light and power of God's love and truth. And through the history and experience of His people He is bringing to larger realization the glory and passion of Israel's Messianic hope.

LITERATURE.

Drummond, The Jewish Messiah; Stanton, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah; Riehm, Messianic Prophecy; Delitzsch, Messianic Prophecies; von Orelli, Old Testament Prophecy; A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy; Schultz, Old Testament Theology; Schurer, HJP, div II, volume II, section 29, "The Messianic Hope"; Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the Gospels, chapter ii, "The Jewish Doctrine of Messiah"; Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, book II, chapter v, "What Messiah Did the Jews Expect?"; E. F. Scott, The Kingdom and the Messiah; Fairweather, The Background of the Gospels; articles in DB, HDB, EB, DCG. For further list see Riehm and Schurer.

See also APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

James Crichton

METAL

met'-al (chashmal; elektron; the King James Version amber; Eze 8:2, the Revised Version margin "amber"): The substance here intended is a matter of great uncertainty. In Egypt bronze was, called chesmen, which may be connected with the Hebrew chashmal; the Greek elektron too has generally been accepted as an alloy of gold or silver or other metals, but this is far from certain. Professor Ridgeway (EB, I, cols. 134-36) has conclusively shown, however, that amber was well known in early

times and that there is nothing archaeologically improbable in the reading of the King James Version.

Amber is a substance analogous to the vegetable resins, and is in all probability derived from extinct coniferous trees. The best or yellow variety was obtained by the ancients from the coasts of the Baltic where it is still found more plentifully than elsewhere. A red amber has been found in South Europe and in Phoenicia. From earliest times amber has been prized as an ornament; Homer apparently refers to it twice. Amber bracelets and necklaces are highly prized by the Orientals—especially Jewesses—today, and they are credited with medicinal properties.

See ELECTRUM; STONES, PRECIOUS.

E. W. G. Masterman

METAL WORKING

See CRAFTS, 10; MINING.

METALLURGY

met’-al-ur-ji: There are numerous Biblical references which describe or allude to the various metallurgical operations. In Job 28:1 occurs zaqaq, translated "refine," literally, "strain." This undoubtedly refers to the process of separating the gold from the earthy material as pictured in the Egyptian sculptures (Thebes and Beni Hassan) and described by Diodorus. The ore was first crushed to the size of lentils and then ground to powder in a handmill made of granite slabs. This powder was spread upon a slightly inclined stone table and water was poured over it to wash away the earthy materials. The comparatively heavy gold particles were then gathered from the table, dried, and melted in a closed crucible with lead, salt and bran, and kept in a molten condition for 5 days, at the end of which time the gold came out pure.

The alloying of gold and silver with copper, lead or tin, and then removing the base metals by cupellation is used figuratively in Eze 22:18,22 to denote the coming judgment of Yahweh. Again in Isa 1:25 it indicates chastening. The fact that the prophets used this figure shows that the people were familiar with the common metallurgical operations.

See REFINER.

James A. Patch

METALS

met’-alz (Latin metallum, "metal," "mine"; Greek metallon, "mine"): The metals known by the ancients

were copper, gold, iron, lead, silver and tin. Of these copper, gold and silver were probably first used, because, occurring in a metallic state, they could be separated easily from earthy materials by mechanical processes. Evidence is abundant of the use of these three metals by the people of remotest antiquity. Lead and tin were later separated from their ores. Tin was probably used in making bronze before it was known as a separate metal, because the native oxide, cassiterite, was smelted together with the copper ore to get bronze. Because of the difficulties in getting it separated from its compounds, iron was the last in the list to be employed. In regard to the sources of these metals in Bible times we have few Biblical references to guide us. Some writers point to De 8:9, "a land whose stones are iron," etc., as referring to Palestine. Palestine can be disregarded, however, as a sourc e of metals, for it possesses no mineral deposits of any importance. If it was expected that Israel would possess Lebanon also, then the description would be more true. There is some iron ore which was in ancient times worked, although present-day engineers have declared it not to be extensive enough to pay for working. There is a little copper ore (chalcopyrite, malachite, azurite). In the Anti-Lebanon and Northern Syria, especially in the country East of Aleppo now opened up by the Bagdad Railroad and its branches, there are abundant deposits of copper. This must have been the land of Nuhasse referred to in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. If Zec 6:1 is really a reference to copper, which is doubtful, then the last-mentioned source was probably the one referred to. No doubt Cyprus (Alasia in Tell el-Amarna Letters (?)) furnished the ancients with much copper, as did also the Sinaitic peninsula.

Tarshish is mentioned (Eze 27:12) as a source of silver, iron, tin, and lead. This name may belong to Southern Spain. If so it corresponds to the general belief that the Phoenicians brought a considerable proportion of the metals used in Palestine from that country. Havilah (Ge 2:11), Ophir (1Ki 10:11), Sheba (Ps 72:15) are mentioned as sources of gold. These names probably refer to districts of Arabia. Whether Arabia produced all the gold or simply passed it on from more remote sources is a question.

See GOLD.

From the monuments in Egypt we learn that that country was a producer of gold and silver. In fact, the ancient mines and the ruins of the miners' huts are still to be seen in the desert regions of upper Egypt. In the Sinaitic peninsula are deposits of copper, lead, gold, and silver. The most remarkable of the ancient Egyptian mines are situated here (J. Sarabit el Khadim, U. Sidreh, W. Magharah). The early Egyptian kings (Sneferu, Amenemhat II, and others) not only mined the metals, but cut on the walls of the mines inscriptions describing their methods of mining. Here, as in upper Egypt, are remains of the buildings where miners lived or carried out their metallurgical operations. It is hardly to be conceived that the large deposits of lead (galena) in Asia Minor were unworked by the ancients. No nearer deports of tin than those in Southeastern Europe have yet been found. (For further information on metals see separate articles.)

James A. Patch

METE

met (madhadh): "To measure," either with a utensil of dry measure, as in Ex 16:18, or to measure with a line or measure of length, as in Ps 60:6; 108:7; Isa 40:12. In Isa 18:2,7 it is the rendering of qaw qaw, literally, "line-line" i.e. measuring line, referring to the Ethiopians as a nation that measured off other peoples for destruction and trod them down, as in the Revised Version (British and American). It is regarded by some as signifying strength, being cognate with the Arabic kawi, "strong." For mete of Mt 7:2 and parallel passages in Mr 4:24; Lu 6:38, see MEASURE.

H. Porter

METERUS

me-te’-rus.

See BAITERUS.

METEYARD

met’-yard (middah, "a measure," Le 19:35): Has this meaning in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), but in the American Standard Revised Version, "measures of length."

METHEG-AMMAH

me-theg-am’-a, meth-eg-am’-a (mathegh ha-’ammah, "bridle of the metropolis"; Septuagint ten aphorismenen): It is probable that the place-name Metheg-Ammah in 2Sa 8:1 the King James Version should be rendered as in the Revised Version (British and American), "the bridle of the mother city," i.e. Gath, since we find in the parallel passage in 1Ch 18:1 gath ubhenotheha, "Gath and her daughters," i.e. daughter towns. The Septuagint has an entirely different reading: "and David took the tribute out of the hand of the Philistines," showing that they had a different text from what we now have in the Hebrew. The text is evidently corrupt. If a place is intended its site is unknown, but it must have been in the Philistine plain and in the vicinity of Gath.

H. Porter

METHUSAEL

me-thu’-sa-el.

See METHUSHAEL.

METHUSELAH

me-thu’-se-la, me-thu’-se-la (methushelach, "man of the javelin"): A descendant of Seth, the son of Enoch, and father of Lamech (Ge 5:21 ff; 1Ch 1:3; Lu 3:37). Methuselah is said to have lived 969 years; he is therefore the oldest of the patriarchs and the oldest man. It is doubtful whether these long years do not include the duration of a family or clan.

METHUSHAEL

me-thu’-sha-el (methusha’el): A descendant of Cain, and father of Lamech in the Cainite genealogy (Ge 4:18). The meaning of the name is doubtful. Dillmann suggested "suppliant or man of God."

MEUNIM

me-u’-nim (the King James Version Mehunim).

See MAON.

MEUZAL

me-u’-zal (me’uzal, or me’uzal): A word which occurs only in the King James Version margin of Eze 27:19. The rendering in the King James Version text is "going to and fro," in the Revised Version (British and American) text "with yarn," but in Revised Version, margin, in agreement with BDB and most modern authorities, Meuzal is regarded as a proper noun with a prefixed preposition, and is rendered "from Uzal."

See UZAL.

MEZARIM

mez’-a-rim (NORTH).

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 13, (1).

MEZOBAITE

me-zo’-ba-it (ha-metsbhayah): The designation of Jaasiel, one of David’s heroes (1Ch 11:47).

MIAMIN

mi’-a-min.

See MIJAMIN; MINIAMIN.

MIBHAR

mib’-har (mibhchar, "choice"(?)): According to 1Ch 11:38, the name of one of David’s heroes. No such name, however, occurs in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:36). A comparison of the two records makes it probable that mibhchar is a corruption of mitstsbhah =" from Zobah," which completes the designation of the former name, Nathan of Zobah. The concluding words of the verse, Ben-Hagri =" the son of Hagri," will then appear as a misreading of Bani ha-gadhi =" Bani, the Gadite," thus bringing the two records into accord.

MIBSAM

mib’-sam (mibhsam, "perfume"(?)):

(1) A son of Ishmael (Ge 25:13; 1Ch 1:29).

(2) A Simeonite (1Ch 4:25).

MIBZAR

mib’-zar (mibhtsar, "a fortress"): An Edomite chief, the King James Version "duke" (Ge 36:42; 1Ch 1:53). According to Eusebius, Mibzar is connected with Mibsara, a considerable village subject to Petra and still existing in his time. Compare Holzinger and Skinner in respective commentaries on Genesis.

MICA

mi’-ka (mikha’): A variant of the name Micah, and probably like it a contracted form of MICAIAH (which see). In the King James Version it is sometimes spelled "Micha."

(1) A son of Merib-baal or Mephibosheth (2Sa 9:12, the King James Version "Micha"). In 1Ch 8:34, he is called "Micah."

(2) The son of Zichri (1Ch 9:15). In Ne 11:17 (the King James Version "Micha"), he is designated "the son of Zabdi," and in Ne 12:35, his name appears as "Micaiah (the King James Version "Michaiah"), the son of Zaccur."

(3) One of the signatories of the Covenant (Ne 10:11, the King James Version "Micha").

John A. Less

MICAH (1)

mi’-ka (mikhah, contracted from mikhayahu, "who is like Yah?"; Codex Vaticanus, Meichaias; Codex Alexandrinus, Micha; sometimes in the King James Version spelled Michah):

(1) The chief character of an episode given as an appendix to the Book of Judges (Jud 17$; 18$). Micah, a dweller in Mt. Ephraim, was the founder and owner of a small private sanctuary with accessories for worship (17:1-5), for which he hired as priest a Judean Levite (17:7-13). Five men sent in quest of new territory by the Danites, who had failed to secure a settlement upon their own tribal allotment, visited Micah’s shrine, and obtained from his priest an oracle favoring their quest (Jud 18:1-6). They then went on until they reached the town of Laish in the extreme North, and deeming it suitable for the purpose, they returned to report to their fellow-tribesmen. These at once dispatched thither 600 armed men, accompanied by their families (Jud 18:7-12). Passing Micah’s abode, they appropriated his idols and his priest, and when their owner pursued, he was insulted and threatened (Jud 18:13-26). They took Laish, destroyed it with its inhabitants and rebuilt it under the name of Dan. There they established the stolen images, and appointed Micah’s Levite, Jonathan, a grandson of Moses (the King James Version "Manasseh"), priest of the new sanctuary, which was long famous in Israel (Jud 18:27-31).

The purpose of the narrative is evidently to set forth the origin of the Danite shrine and priesthood. A few peculiarities in the story have led some critics—e.g., Moore, "Judges," in ICC and "Judges" in SBOT; Budde, Richter—to regard it as composite. Wellhausen, however, considers that the peculiarities are editorial and have been introduced for the purpose of smoothing or explaining the ancient record. Most authorities are agreed that the story is nearly contemporary with the events which it narrates, and that it is of the highest value for the study of the history of Israelite worship.

See also JUDGES; DAN; PRIESTHOOD.

(2) A Reubenite, whose descendant Beerah was carried into exile by Tiglath-pileser (1Ch 5:5).

(3) A son of Merib-baal (1Ch 8:34 f; 9:40 f).

See MICA, (1).

(4) A Kohathite Levite (1Ch 23:20; 24:24 f).

(5) The father of Abdon, one of Josiah’s messengers to the prophetess Huldah (2Ch 34:20). In the parallel passage (2Ki 22:12), the reading is "Achbor the son of Micaiah," the King James Version "Michaiah."

(6) A Simeonite mentioned in the Book of Judith (Judith 6:15).

(7) The prophet, called, in Jer 26:18 (Hebrew), "Micaiah the Morashtite." See special article.

(8) The son of Imlah.

See MICAIAH, (7).

John A. Less

MICAH (2)

(mikhah; Meichaias; an abbreviation for Micaiah (Jer 26:18), and this again of the longer form of the word in 2Ch 17:7; compare 1Ki 22:8):

1. Name and Person:

The name signifies "who is like Yah?"; compare Michael, equal to "who is like El?" (i.e. God). As this name occurs not infrequently, he is called the "Morashtite," i.e. born in Moresheth. He calls his native city, in Mic 1:14, Moresheth-gath, because it was situated near the Philistine city of Gath. According to Jerome and Eusebius, this place was situated not far eastward from Eleutheropolis. The prophet is not to be confounded with Micah ben Imla, in 1Ki 22:8, an older prophet of the Northern Kingdom.

2. Time of Micah:

According to Jer 26:18, Micah lived and prophesied in the reign of Hezekiah; according to Mic 1:1, he labored also under Jotham and Ahaz. This superscription has, it must be said, great similarity to Isa 1:1 and is probably of a later date. Yet the contents of his first discourse confirm the fact that he prophesied, not only before the destruction of Samaria, but also before the reformation of Hezekiah (compare Mic 1:5). Accordingly, Micah 1 is probably a discourse spoken already under Ahaz, and Micah 2-5 under Hezekiah. No mention is any longer made of Samaria in chapters 2 to 5. This city has already been destroyed; at any rate, is being besieged. Accordingly, these discourses were pronounced after the year 722 BC, but earlier than 701 BC, as the reformation of Hezekiah had not yet been entirely completed. It is impossible to date exactly these discourses, for this reason, that all the separate sentences and addresses were afterward united into one well-edited collection, probably by Micah himself. The attacks that have been made by different critics on the authenticity of Micah 4 and 5 have but a poor foundation. It is a more difficult task to explain the dismal picture of the conditions of affairs as described in Micah 6 and 7 as originating in the reign of Hezekiah. For this reason, scholars have thought of ascribing them to the reigns of Jotham and Ahaz. But better reasons speak for placing them in the degenerate reign of Manasseh. There is no reason for claiming that Micah no longer prophesied in the times of this king. It is true that a number of critics declare that Micah did not write these chapters, especially the so-called psalm in 7:7-20, which, it is claimed, clearly presupposes the destruction of Jerusalem (7:11)! But it is a fact that Micah did really and distinctly predict this destruction and the exile that followed this event in 3:12; and accordingly he could in this concluding hymn very easily have looked even beyond this

period.

Micah is, then, a younger contemporary of Isaiah, and, like the latter, he prophesied in Judah, perhaps also in Jerusalem. To the writings of this great prophet his book bears a close resemblance both in form and in contents, although he did not, as was the case with Isaiah, come into personal contact with the kings and make his influence felt in political affairs.

3. Relation to Isaiah:

The statement in Mic 4:1 ff is found almost literally in Isa 2:2 ff. Opinions differ as to who is to be credited with the original, Isaiah or Micah. In the latter, the passage seems to suit better into the connection, while in Isa 2 it begins the discourse abruptly, as though the prophet had taken it from some other source. However, Mic 4:4 f is certainly a sentence added by Micah, who, accordingly, was not the first to formulate the prophecy itself. It is possible that both prophets took it from some older prophet. But it is also conceivable that Isaiah is the author. In this case, he placed this sentence at the head of his briefer utterances when he composed his larger group of addresses in Micah 2—4, for the purpose of expressing the high purposes which God has in mind in His judgments.

4. Contents of the Prophecies:

Micah combats in his discourses, as does Isaiah, the heathenish abuses which had found their way into the cult, not only in Samaria, but also in Judah and Jerusalem, and which the reformation of Hezekiah could counteract only in part and not at all permanently (compare Mic 1:5-7; 5:11-13; 6:7,16). Further, he rebukes them for the social injustice, of which particularly the powerful and the great in the land were guilty (Mic 2:1 ff; 3:2 f.10 f); and the dishonesty and unfaithfulness in business and in conduct in general (compare Mic 6:10 ff; 7:2 ff). At all times Micah, in doing this, was compelled to defend himself against false prophets, who slighted these charges as of little importance, and threatened and antagonized the prophet in his announcements of impending evil (compare 2:5 ff, 11 ff). In pronounced opposition to these babblers and their predictions of good things, Micah announces the judgment through the enemies that are approaching, and he even goes beyond Isaiah in the open declaration that Jerusalem and the temple are to be destroyed (Mic 3:12; 4:10; 5:1). The first-mentioned passage is also confirmed by the event reported in Jer 26:17 ff. The passage Mic 4:10, where in a surprising way Babylon is mentioned as the place of the exile, is for this reason regarded as unauthentic by the critics, but not justly. Micah predicts also the deliverance from Babylon and the reestablishment of Israel in Jerusalem, and declares that this is to take place through a King who shall come forth from the deepest humiliation of the house of David and shall be born in Bethlehem, and who, like David, originally a simple shepherd boy, shall later become the shepherd of the people, and shall make his people happy in peace and prosperity. Against this King the last great onslaught of the Gentiles will avail nothing (4:11-13; 5:4 ff). As a matter of course, he will purify the country of all heathen abuses (5:9 ff). In the description of this ruler, Micah again agrees with Isaiah, but without taking the details from that prophet.

5. Form of the Prophecies:

The form of the prophecies of Micah, notwithstanding their close connection with those of his great contemporary, has nevertheless its unique features. There is a pronounced formal similarity between Mic 1:10 ff and Isa 10:28 ff. Still more than is the case in Isaiah, Micah makes use of the names of certain places. Witty references, which we can understand only in part, are not lacking in this connection; e.g. Lachish, the "city of horses," is made the object of a play on words. (Recently in the ruins of this city a large wall has been unearthed.) The style of Micah is vigorous and vivid. He loved antitheses. It is a peculiarity of his style that he indulges in dramatic interruptions and answers; e.g. 2:5,12; 3:1; 6:6-8; 7:14 f. He also loves historical references; as e.g. 1:13,15; 5:5; 6:4 f, 6,16; 7:20. He makes frequent use of the image of the shepherd, 2:12; 3:2 f; 4:6; 5:3 ff; 7:14. The fact that these peculiarities appear in all parts of his little book is an argument in favor of its being from one author. He is superior to Isaiah in his tendency to idyllic details, and especially in a deeper personal sympathy, which generally finds expression in an elegiac strain. His lyrical style readily takes the form of a prayer or of a psalm (compare Mic 7).

LITERATURE.

C. P. Caspari; Ueber Micha den Morasthiten, 1851; T.K. Cheyne, Micah with Notes and Introduction, 1882; V. Ryssel, Untersuchungen uber Textoeatalt und Echtheit des Buches Micha, 1887. See the commentaries on the 12 minor prophets by Hitzig, Ewald, C. F. Keil, P. Kleinert, W. Nowack, C. v. Orelli, K. Marti; Paul Haupt, The Book of Micah, 1910; Pusey, The Minor Prophets, 1860.

C. von Orelli

MICAIAH

mi-ka’-ya, mi-ki’-a (mikhayahu, "who is like Yah?"; Meichaias): A frequently occurring Old Testament name occasionally contracted to MICA or MICAH (which see). In the King James Version it is usually spelled "Michaiah."

(1) The mother of Abijah (2Ch 13:2, the King James Version "Michaiah"). The parallel passage (1Ki 15:2; compare 2Ch 11:20) indicates that Michaiah here is a corruption of MAACAH (which see) (so the Septuagint).

(2) The father of Achbor (2Ki 22:12, the King James Version "Michaiah").

See MICAH, (5).

(3) A prince of Judah sent by Jehoshaphat to teach in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:7, the King James Version "Michaiah").

(4) The son of Zaccur, a priestly processionist at the derivation of the wall (Ne 12:35, the King James

Version, "Michaiah").

(5) A priestly processionist at the dedication of the wall (Ne 12:41; wanting in the Septuagint (Septuagint)).

(6) The canonical prophet.

See MICAH, (7), and special article.

(7) The son of Imlah, the chief character of an important episode near the end of the reign of Ahab (1Ki 22:4-28 parallel 2Ch 18:3-27). In the Hebrew, his name appears once in the contracted form "Micah" (2Ch 18:14). Ahab had suggested to his victor, Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, that they should undertake a joint campaign against Ramoth-gilead. Jehoshaphat politely acquiesced, but asked that the mind of Yahweh should first be ascertained. Ahab forthwith summoned the official prophets to the number of 400, into the royal presence. Obsequious to their master, they, both by oracular utterance and by the symbolic action of their leader, Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, gave the king a favorable answer. Their ready chorus of assent seems to have made Jehoshaphat suspicious, for he pleaded that further guidance be sought. Micaiah, for whom Ahab, then, with evident reluctance, sent, at first simply repeated the favorable response of the 400; but adjured by the king to speak the whole truth, he dropped his ironical tone, and in sad earnest described a vision of disaster. Ahab endeavored to lessen the effect of this oracle by pettishly complaining that Micaiah was always to him a prophet of evil. The latter thereupon related an impressive vision of the heavenly court, whence he had seen a lying spirit dispatched by Yahweh to the prophets in order to bring about Ahab’s delusion and downfall. In answer to a rude challenge from Zedekiah, who acted as spokesman for the 400, Micaiah confidently appealed to the issue for proof of the truth of his prediction, and was promptly commuted to prison by the king.

The narrative is exceedingly vivid and of the utmost interest to students of Issraelite prophecy. Several of its details have given rise to discussion, and the questions: How far were the prophet’s visions objective? How far did he admit the inspiration of his opponents? Is the Divine action described consistent with the holy character of Yahweh? have occasioned difficulty to many. But their difficulty arises largely either because of their Christian viewpoint, or because of their hard and mechanical theory of prophetic inspiration. Micaiah’s position was a delicate one. Foreboding or foreseeing disaster, he did his best to avert it. This he could do only by weaning the king from the influence of the 400 time-serving prophets. He sought to gain his end; first, by an ironical acquiescence in their favorable answer; then, by a short oracle forecasting disaster especially to Ahab; and, these means having failed, by discrediting in the most solemn manner the courtly prophets opposed to him. Thus regarded, his vision contains no admission of their equal inspiration; rather is it an emphatic declaration that these men were uttering falsehood in Yahweh’s name, thereby endangering their country’s safety and their king’s life. Their obsequious time-service made them fit forerunners of the false prophets denounced by Jeremiah (Jer 23:9-40) and by Ezekiel (Eze 13:1-15). The frank anthropomorphism of the vision need be no stumbling-block if allowed to drop into its proper place as the literary device of a prophet intensely conscious of his own inspiration and as whole-heartedly patriotic as those opposed to him.

The record ends very abruptly, giving no account of Micaiah’s vindication when at length the course of events brought about the fulfillment of his prediction. The closing words, "Hear, ye peoples, all of you" (1Ki 22:28 parallel 2Ch 18:27), a quotation of Mic 1:2, are an evident interpolation by some late scribe who confused the son of Imlah with the contemporary of Isaiah.

For fuller treatment see EB, HDB, and commentaries on Kings and Chronicles.

John A. Lees

MICE

mis.

See MOUSE.

MICHA; MICHAH

mi’-ka, mi’-ka.

See MICA; MICAH.

MICHAEL

mi’-ka-el, mi’-kel (mikha’el, "who is like God?" Michael):

(1) The father of Sethur the Asherite spy (Nu 13:13).

(2) (3) Two Gadites (1Ch 5:13,14).

(4) A name in the genealogy of Asaph (1Ch 6:40 (Hebrew 25)).

(5) A son of Izrahiah of Issachar (1Ch 7:3).

(6) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:16).

(7) A Manassite who ceded to David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20).

(8) The father of Omri of Issachar (1Ch 27:18).

(9) A son of King Jehoshaphat (2Ch 21:2).

(10) The father of Zebediah, an exile who returned with Ezra (Ezr 8:8 parallel RAPC 1Es 8:34).

(11) "The archangel" (Jude 1:9). Probably also the unnamed archangel of 1Th 4:16 is Michael. In the Old Testament he is mentioned by name only in Daniel. He is "one of the chief princes" (Da 10:13), the "prince" of Israel (Da 10:21), "the great prince" (Da 12:1); perhaps also "the prince of the host" (Da 8:11). In all these passages Michael appears as the heavenly patron and champion of Israel; as the watchful guardian of the people of God against all foes earthly or devilish. In the uncanonical apocalyptic writings, however, Jewish angelology is further developed. In them Michael frequently appears and excretes functions similar to those which are ascribed to him in Daniel. He is the first of the "four presences that stand before God"—Michael, Gabriel, Raphael and Uriel or Phanuel (En 9:1; 40:9). In other apocryphal books and even elsewhere in En, the number of archangels is given as 7 (En 20:1-7; Tobit 12:15; compare also Re 8:2). Among the many characterizations of Michael the following may be noted: He is "the merciful and long-suffering" (En 40:9; 68:2,3), "the mediator and intercessor" (Ascension of Isaiah, Latin version 9:23; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Levi 5; Da 6). It is he who opposed the Devil in a dispute concerning Moses' body (Jude 1:9). This passage, according to most modern authorities, is derived from the apocryphal Assumption of Moses (see Charles' edition, 105-10). It is Michael also who leads the angelic armies in the war in heaven against "the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan" (Re 12:7). According to Charles, the supplanting of the "child" by the archangel is an indication of the Jewish origin of this part of the book.

The earlier Protestant scholars usually identified Michael with the preincarnate Christ, finding support for their view, not only in the juxtaposition of the "child" and the archangel in Re 12, but also in the attributes ascribed to him in Daniel (for a full discussion see Hengstenberg, Offenbarung, I, 611-22, and an interesting survey in English by Dr. Douglas in Fairbairn's BD).

John A. Lees

MICHAH

mi'-ka.

See MICAH.

MICHAIAH

mi-ka'-ya, mi-ki'-a.

See MICAIAH.

MICHAL

mi’-kal (mikhal, contracted from mikha’el, "Michael" (which see); Melchol): Saul’s younger daughter (1Sa 14:49), who, falling in love with David after his victory over Goliath (1Sa 18:20), was at last, on the payment of double the dowry asked, married to him (1Sa 18:27). Her love was soon put to the test. When Saul in his jealousy sent for David, she was quick to discern her husband’s danger, connived at his escape, and not only outwitted and delayed the messengers, but afterward also soothed her father’s jealous wrath (1Sa 19:11-17). When David was outlawed and exiled, she was married to Palti or Paltiel, the son of Laish of Gallim (1Sa 25:44), but was, despite Palti’s sorrowful protest, forcibly restored to David on his return as king (2Sa 3:14-16). The next scene in which she figures indicates that her love had cooled and had even turned to disdain, for after David’s enthusiastic joy and ecstatic dancing before the newly restored Ark of the Covenant, she received him with bitter and scornful mockery (2Sa 6:20), and the record closes with the fact that she remained all her life childless (2Sa 6:23; compare 2Sa 21:8 where Michal is an obvious mistake for Merab). Michal was evidently a woman of unusual strength of mind and decision of character. She manifested her love in an age when it was almost an unheard-of thing for a woman to take the initiative in such a matter. For the sake of the man whom she loved too she braved her father’s wrath and risked her own life. Even her later mockery of David affords proof of her courage, and almost suggests the inference that she had resented being treated as a chattel and thrown from one husband to another. The modern reader can scarce withhold from her, if not admiration, at least a slight tribute of sympathy.

John A. Lees

MICHEAS; MICHAEAS

mi-ke’-as: In 2 Esdras 1:39 equals the prophet Micah.

MICHMAS

mik’-mas (mikhmac; Codex Vaticanus Machmas; Codex Alexandrinus Chammas): The form of the name "Michmash" found in Ezr 2:27; Ne 7:31. In 1 Esdras 5:21 it appears as MACALON (which see).

MICHMASH

mik’-mash (mikhmash; Machmas): A town in the territory of Benjamin, apparently not of sufficient importance to secure mention in the list of cities given in Jos 18:21 ff. It first appears as occupied by Saul with 2,000 men, when Jonathan, advancing from Gibeah, smote the Philistine garrison in Geba (1Sa 13:2). To avenge this injury, the Philistines came up in force and pitched in Michmash (1Sa 13:5). Saul and Jonathan with 600 men held Geba, which had been taken from the Philistine garrison (1Sa 13:16). It will assist in making clear the narrative if, at this point, the natural features of the place are described.

Michmash is represented by the modern Mukhmas, about 7 miles North of Jerusalem. From the main

road which runs close to the watershed, a valley sloping eastward sinks swiftly into the great gorge of Wady es-Suweinit. The village of Mukhmas stands to the North of the gorge, about 4 miles East of the carriage road. The ancient path from Ai southward passes to the West of the village, goes down into the valley by a steep and difficult track, and crosses the gorge by the pass, a narrow defile, with lofty, precipitous crags on either side—the only place where a crossing is practicable. To the South of the gorge is Geba, which had been occupied by the Philistines, doubtless to command the pass. Their camp was probably pitched in a position East of Mukhmas, where the ground slopes gradually northward from the edge of the gorge. The place is described by Josephus as "upon a precipice with three peaks, ending in a small, but sharp and long extremity, while there was a rock that surrounded them like bulwarks to prevent the attack of the enemy" (Ant., VI, vi, 2). Conder confirms this description, speaking of it as "a high hill bounded by the precipices of Wady es-Suweinit on the South, rising in three flat but narrow mounds, and communicating with the hill of Mukhmas, which is much lower, by a long and narrow ridge." The Philistines purposed to guard the pass against approach from the South. On the other hand they were not eager to risk an encounter with the badly armed Israelites in a position where superior numbers would be of little advantage. It was while the armies lay thus facing each other across the gorge that Jonathan and his armor-bearer performed their intrepid feat (1Sa 14:1).

See BOZEZ; SENEH.

It will be noted that the Philistines brought their chariots to Michmash (1Sa 13:5). In his ideal picture of the Assyrian advance on Jerusalem, Isaiah makes the invader lay up his baggage at Michmash so that he might go lightly through the pass (Isa 10:28). A company of the men of Michmash (see MICHMAS) returned with Zerubbabel from exile (Ezr 2:27; Ne 7:31). Michmash produced excellent barley. According to the Mishna, "to bring barley to Michmash" was equivalent to our English "to carry coal to Newcastle." Michmash was the seat of government under Jonathan Maccabeus (1 Macc 9:73).

The modern village is stone-built. There are rock-cut tombs to the North. Cisterns supply the water. There are foundations of old buildings, large stones, and a vaulted cistern.

W. Ewing

MICHMETHAH

mik’-me-tha (ha-mikhmethah; Codex Vaticanus Hikasmon; Codex Alexandrinus Machthoth): A place named in defining the territory of Ephraim and Manasseh (Jos 16:6; 17:7). It is said to lie "before," i.e. to the East of Shechem. In the name itself, the meaning of which is obscure, there is nothing to guide us. The presence of the article, however ("the Michmethah"), suggests that it may not be a proper name, but an appellative, applying to some feature of the landscape. Condor suggests the plain of Makhneh, which lies to the East of Nablus (Shechem), in which there may possibly be an echo of the ancient name.

MICHRI

mik’-ri (mikhri): A Benjamite dweller in Jerusalem (1Ch 9:8).

MICHTAM

mik’-tam.

See PSALMS.

MICRON

mig’-ron (mighron; Magon):

(1) A place in the uttermost part of Geba—which read here instead of Gibeah—marked by a pomegranate tree, where Saul and his 600 men encamped over against the Philistines, who were in Michmash (1Sa 14:2). Josephus describes the distress of Saul and his company as they sat on a high hill (bounos hupselos) viewing the widespread desolation wrought by the enemy. There is, however, nothing to guide us as to the exact spot. Many suppose that the text is corrupt; but no emendation suggested yields any satisfactory result. The place was certainly South of Michmash.

(2) (Codex Vaticanus Magedo; Codex Alexandrinus Mageddo): The Migron of Isa 10:28 is mentioned between Aiath (Ai) and Michmash. If the places are there named in consecutive order, this Migron must be sought to the North of Michmash. It may with some confidence be located at Makrun, a ruined site to the North of the road leading from Michmash to Ai.

There is nothing extraordinary in two places having the same name pretty close to each other. The two Beth-horons, although distinguished as upper and lower, are a case in point. So also are the two Bethsaidas. There is therefore no need to try to identify the two with one another, as some (e.g. Robertson Smith in Journal of Philology, XIII, 62 ff) have attempted to do with no success.

W. Ewing

MIDDAY

mid’-da (machatsith ha-yom, tsohorayim; hemera mese): The Hebrew machatsith ha-yom (Ne 8:3) and the Greek hemeras meses (Ac 26:13) are strictly the middle of the day, but the Hebrew tshorayim is a dual form from tsohar, meaning "light," hence, light or brightness, i.e. the brightest part of the day (1Ki 18:29).

See NOON.

MIDDIN

mid’-in (middin; in GB, Ainon, "springs"): One of the six cities in the wilderness of Judah (Jos 15:61). There are not many possible sites. The Hebrew name may possibly survive in Khirbet Mird, a very conspicuous site with many ancient cisterns overlooking the plateau el Bukea‘, above which it towers to a height of 1,000 ft.; it is the Mons Mardes of early Christian pilgrims; the existing remains are Byzantine. It is a site of great natural strength and was clearly once a place of some importance. The Greek reading Ainon, "place of springs," suggests the neighborhood of the extensive oasis of ‘Ain Feshkhah at the northwest corner of the Dead Sea where there are at Kh. Kumram remains of buildings and a rock-cut aqueduct. See PEF, III, 210, 212, Sh XVIII.

E. W. G. Masterman

MIDDLE WALL

See PARTITION.

MIDIAN; MIDIANITES

mid’-i-an, mid’-i-an-its (midhyan, midhyanim; Madiam, Madienaioi):

1. The Seed of Abraham to the Time of the Judges:

Midian was a son of Abraham by his concubine Keturah. To him were born 5 sons, Ephah, Epher, Hanoch, Abida and Eldaah (Ge 25:2,4; 1Ch 1:32 f). Bearing gifts from Abraham, he and his brothers, each with his own household, moved off from Isaac into "the east country" (Ge 25:6). The first recorded incident in the history of the tribe is a defeat suffered "in the field of Moab" at the hands of Hadad, king of Edom. Of this nothing beyond the fact is known (Ge 36:35; 1Ch 1:46). The Midianites next appear as merchantmen traveling from Gilead to Egypt, with "spicery and balm and myrrh," with no prejudice against a turn of slave-dealing (Ge 37:25). Moses, on fleeing from Egypt, found refuge in the land of Midian, and became son-in-law of Jethro, the priest of Midian (Ex 2:15,21). In Midian Moses received his commission to Israel in Egypt (Ex 4:19). A Midianite, familiar with the desert, acted as guide ("instead of eyes") to the children of Israel in their wilderness wanderings (Nu 10:29). The friendly relations between Israel and Midian, which seem to have prevailed at first, had been ruptured, and we find the elders of Midian acting with those of Moab in calling Balaam to curse Israel (Nu 22:4-7). Because of the grievous sin into which they had seduced Israel on the shrewd advice of Balaam, a war of vengeance was made against the Midianites in which five of their chiefs perished; the males were ruthlessly slain, and Balaam also was put to death (Nu 25:15,17; 31:2). We next hear of Midian as oppressing Israel for 7 years. Along with the Amalekites and the children of the East they swarmed across the Jordan, and their multitudinous beasts swept up the produce of the earth. Overwhelming disaster befell this horde at the onset of Gideon’s chosen men. In the battle and pursuit "there fell a hundred and twenty thousand men that drew sword"; their kings, Zebah and Zalmunna, and their princes, Oreb and Zeeb, sharing the common fate (Jud 6$; 7$; 8$). Echoes of this glorious victory—"the

day of Midian"—are heard in later literature (Ps 83:9; Isa 9:4; 10:26; Hab 3:7).

2. The Kenite Branch:

The Kenites appear to have been a branch of the Midianites. Jethro could hardly have attained the dignity of the priesthood in Midian had he been of alien blood (Jud 1:16). See KENITES. Again, the tribesmen are named indifferently Ishmaelites and Midianites (Ge 37:25,28,36; Jud 8:22,24). They must therefore have stood in close relations with the descendants of Hagar's son.

3. Modern Arabs:

The representations of Midian in Scripture are consistent with what we know of the immemorial ways of Arabian tribes, now engaged in pastoral pursuits, again as carriers of merchandise, and yet again as freebooters. Such tribes often roam through wide circles. They appear not to have practiced circumcision (Ex 4:25), which is now practically universal among the Arabs. The men wore golden ornaments, as do the modern nomads (Jud 8:24).

4. Historical References:

The name of "Midian" is not found in Egyptian or Assyrian documents. Delitzsch (Wo lag das Paradies? 304) suggests that Ephah (Ge 25:4) may be identical with Chayapa of the cuneiform inscriptions. If this is correct the references point to the existence of this Midianite tribe in the North of el-Chijaz in the times of Tiglath-pileser and Sargon (745-705 BC). Isaiah speaks of Midian and Ephah apparently as separate tribes, whose dromedaries bear gold and frankincense to Zion (60:6); but he gives no hint of the districts they occupied. The tribe of Ghifar, found in the neighborhood of Medina in Mohammed's day, Knobel would identify with Epher, another of Midian's sons.

5. Territory:

No boundaries can now be assigned to "the land of Midian." It included territory on the West as well as on the East of the Gulf of ʻAqaba (Ex 4:19). It lay between Edom and Paran (1Ki 11:18). In the time of the Judges their district seems to have extended northward to the East of Gilead (8:10).

A trace of the ancient name is found in that of Madyah, a place mentioned by the Arabic geographers, with a plentiful supply of water, now called Maghair Shoʻaib. It lies East of the Gulf of ʻAqaba, some miles from the coast, almost opposite the point of the Sinaitic peninsula. The name Shoʻaib, given by Mohammed to Jethro, may here be due to ancient Midianite tradition.

W. Ewing

MIDIANITISH, WOMAN

mid’-i-an-it-ish, (ha-midhyanith, "the Midianitess"): The designation given to the daughter of Zur, Cozbi, whom Zimri the son of Salu brought into the camp of Israel (Nu 25:6-18). Both were of noble parentage (Nu 25:14,15). The majority of the people strongly resented this act of profanation (Nu 25:6). A pestilence was raging in the camp, and Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, in an outburst of zeal pursued the two delinquents and slew them by a spear-thrust through their bodies (Nu 25:8). He obtained as a reward the immediate staying of the plague and the promise of perpetual priesthood to his family (Nu 25:8,13).

John A. Lees

MIDNIGHT

mid’-nit (chatsoth laylah, "middle of the night" (Ex 11:4; Job 34:20; Ps 119:62), chatsi ha-laylah, "the half of the night" (Ex 12:29; Jud 16:3; Ru 3:8), tokh ha-laylah, "the division of the night" and hence, the middle point (1Ki 3:20); meses nuktos (Mt 25:6), or meson tes nuktos, "the middle of the night" (Ac 27:27), mesonuktios, "midnight"; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, mesonuktion (Ac 16:25, etc.)): In the period before the exile midnight does not seem to have been very accurately determined. The division of the night was into three watches, the middle one of which included midnight. In New Testament times the four-watch division was used where midnight must have been more or less accurately determined.

See TIME; WATCH.

H. Porter

MIDRASH

mid’-rash (midhrash): The Hebrew word corresponding to the King James Version "story" and the Revised Version (British and American) "commentary" in 2Ch 13:22; 24:27. A midrash is properly a story developed for purposes of edification.

See COMMENTARY.

MIDWIFE

mid’-wif (meyalledheth): Those who in patriarchal times attended mothers at childbirth are so named in Ge 35:17; 38:28; Ex 1:15-22. Such attendants were probably then (1Sa 4:20), as they usually are now, the older female relatives and friends of the mother. The duties which they had to perform are enumerated in Eze 16:4: division of the cord, washing the infant in water, salting with salt and swathing in swaddling clothes. During the Egyptian bondage there were two midwives who attended the Hebrew women; from their names, they were probably Hebrews, certainly they were not Egyptians. From this passage it appears that they used a certain double-round form of birthstool called ‘obhnayim, concerning

which there are several rabbinical comments. It probably was like the kuru elwiladeh, or "birth-seat," still used by the Egyptian fellahin. I have not found any record of its use among the Palestinian fellahin. There is a curious passage in the Talmud (Cotah 2 b) in which it is said that the two midwives had different duties, Shiphrah being the one who dressed the infant, Puah, the one who whispered to it. One Jewish commentator on this supposes that Puah used artificial respiration by blowing into the child's mouth. The midwives must have had considerable skill, as a case like that of Tamar required some amount of operative manipulation.

The English word means originally the woman who is "with the mother" (compare "the women that stood by," in 1Sa 4:20), but very early became applied to those who gave skilled assistance, as in Raynold's Birth of Mankind, 1565.

Alexander Macalister

MIGDAL-EDER

mig-dal-e-der.

See EDER.

MIGDAL-EL

mig'-dal-el (mighdal-'el; Codex Vaticanus Megalaareim; Codex Alexandrinus Magdalieoram): The name, which means "tower of God," occurs between Iron and Horem in the list of the fenced cities of Naphtali (Jos 19:38). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 9 miles from Dora (Tanturah), on the way to Ptolemais, which points to Athlit. But this is far from the territory of Naphtali. It is probably to be identified with either Khirbet Mejdel, 3 miles North of Qedes, or Mejdel Islim, 5 miles farther to the Northwest.

MIGDAL-GAD

mig'-dal-gad (mighdalgadh, "tower of Gad"): One of a group of 16 cities of Judah situated in the "lowland" (Jos 15:37). Of these, only Lachish, Eglon, Beth-dagon and Naamah have been identified with any certainty. This would indicate a site in the Philistine plain, and the modern flourishing town of Mejdel, 2 1/2 miles Northeast of Ashkelon, appears to be a possible identification. It is the most important town in the district which is named after it Nahiet el-Mejdel. It must, however, be admitted that it is difficult to see how Judah could have held a site so close to the great Philistine strongholds. It is very probable that Mejdel ("tower") is the tower mentioned in Josephus, BJ, III, ii, 3, as close to Ashkelon, and it or Migdalgad (or both if they are the same sites) may be identical with the Magtal of the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Petrie, Hist. Egypt, II, 329). For Mejdel see Palestine Exploration Fund, II, 410, Sh XVI.

E. W. G. Masterman

MIGDOL

mig’-dol, mig’-dol (mighdol; Magdolon): This name ("the tower") is applied to two places on the east frontier of Egypt.

1. Exodus 14:2; Numbers 33:7:

In Ex 14:2; Nu 33:7, the Hebrew camp, on the march from Etham after they had "turned" (apparently to the South), is defined as ‘facing Pi-hahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, over against Baal-zephon.’ It is thus to be sought (see EXODUS) West of the Bitter Lakes, and may have been a watchtower on the spur of Jebel ‘Ataqah. Israel was supposed to be "entangled in the land," and shut in in the "wilderness," between this range and the Bitter Lakes, then forming the head of the Red Sea. The exact site is unknown. In about 385 AD, Silvia, traveling from Clysma (Suez), was shown the sites above mentioned on her way to Heroopolis, but none of these names now survive.

2. Jeremiah 44:1; 46:14:

In Jer 44:1; 46:14, a Migdol is noticed with Memphis, and with Tahpanhes Septuagint "Taphnas"), this latter being supposed to be the Daphnai of Greek writers, now Tell Defeneh, West of Qantarah. The same place is probably intended in Eze 29:10; 30:6 (compare 30:15-18), the borders of Egypt being defined as reaching "from Migdol to Syene" (see the Revised Version margin), as understood by the Septuagint translators. The Antonine Itinerary places Migdol 12 miles South of Pelusium, and the site appears to have been at or near Tell es Samut, the Egyptian name, according to Brugsch (Hist, II, 351), being Samut. This Migdol was thus apparently a "watchtower" on the main road along the coast from Palestine, which is called (Ex 13:17) "the way of the land of the Philistines," entering Egypt near Daphnai.

These Sites Not Identical.

We are specially told that this was not the route taken at the exodus, and this Migdol cannot therefore be the same as (1), though Brugsch, in consequence of a theory as to the exodus which has not been accepted by other scholars, has confused the two sites, as apparently does the Antonine Itinerary when placing Pithom on the same route leading to Zoan. Brugsch (Geography, III, 19) supposes the Egyptian town name Pa-Ma’kal (with the determinative for "wall" added) to stand for Migdol, but the prefix "Pa-"(" city") seems to show that this word is purely native, and not Semitic, to say nothing of philological objections. This town may, however, have lain in the required direction, according to a scribe’s report of the time of Seti II (or about 1230 BC).

As much confusion has been created by quoting this report as illustrative of the exodus, the actual words

according to Brugsch’s translation may be given (History, II, 132): "I set out from the hall of the royal palace on the 9th day of Epiphi, in the evening, after the two servants. I arrived at the fortress Thuku (T-k-u) on the 10th of Epiphi. I was informed that the men had resolved to take their way toward the South. On the 12th I reached Khetam. There I was informed that grooms who had come from the neighborhood (of the "sedge city") reported that the fugitives had already passed the rampart (Anbu or "wall"), to the North of the Ma’ktal of King Seti Minepthah." As to the position of this "wall," see SHUR.

C. R. Conder

MIJAMIN

mij’-a-min (miyamin; the King James Version Miamin):

(1) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:25). He is also called Maelus (1 Esdras 9:26).

(2) The one to whom fell the lot for the 6th priestly course (1Ch 24:9). His family returned with Zerubbabel and Joshua (Ne 12:5).

(3) A signatory of the Covenant (Ne 10:7).

MIKLOTH

mik’-loth, mik’-loth (miqloth):

(1) A Benjamite, son of Jeiel (1Ch 8:32; 9:37,38). A comparison of the two passages shows that the name Mikloth has been dropped at the end of 1Ch 8:31.

(2) An officer designated "the ruler," appointed in the priestly course for the 2nd month (1Ch 27:4).

MIKNEIAH

mik-ne’-ya, mik-ni’-a (miqneydhu): A Levite doorkeeper (1Ch 15:18).

MILALAI

mil-a-la’-i, mil’-a-li (milalay): A Levite musician (Ne 12:36).

MILCAH

mil’-ka (milkah; Melcha):

(1) Daughter of Haran, wife of Nahor, and grandmother of Rebekah (Ge 11:29; 22:20-23; 24:15,24,47).

(2) Daughter of Zelophehad (Nu 26:33; 27:1; 36:11; Jos 17:3). Many recent authorities are of opinion that Milcah is an abbreviation of Bethmilcah, and is a geographical rather than a personal name.

MILCOM

mil’-kom, mil’-kom. See MOLECH.

MILDEW

mil’-du (yeraqon; Septuagint usually ikteros, literally, "jaundice"): In the 5 passages where it occurs it is associated with shiddaphon, "blasting" (De 28:22; 1Ki 8:37; 2Ch 6:28; Am 4:9; Hag 2:17). In Jer 30:6, the same word is translated "paleness," the yellow color of one with abdominal disease. The root-meaning is "greenish yellow"; compare the Arabic yarqan, meaning both "jaundice" and "blight." Mildrew or "rust" in grain is due to a special fungus, Puccinia graminis, whose life is divided between the barberry and cereals. Many other varieties of fungi which flourish upon other plants are also designated "mildew."

See BLASTING.

E. W. G. Masterman

MILE

mil (milion, Latin mille passus, milia passuum): A thousand paces, equal to 1,618 English yards. (Mt 5:41).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

MILETUS

mi-le’-tus (Miletos): A famous early Ionian Greek city on the coast of Caria, near the mouth of the Meander River, which, according to Ac 20:15-21:1, and 2Ti 4:20 (the King James Version "Miletum"), Paul twice visited. In the earliest times it was a prominent trading post, and it is said that 75 colonies were founded by its merchants. Among them were Abydos, Cyzicus and Sinope. In 494 BC, the city was taken by the Persians; it was recovered by Alexander the Great, but after his time it rapidly declined, yet it continued to exist until long after the Christian era. In the history of early Christianity it plays but a little part. The Meander brings down a considerable amount of sediment which it has deposited at its mouth, naturally altering the coast line. The gulf into which the river flows has thus been nearly filled

with the deposit. In the ancient gulf stood a little island called Lade; the island now appears as a mound in the marshy malarial plain, and Palatia, the modern village which stands on the site of Miletus, is 6 miles from the coast. Without taking into account the great changes in the coast line it would be difficult to understand Ac 20:15-21, for in the days of Paul, Ephesus could be reached from Miletus by land only by making a long detour about the head of the gulf. To go directly from one of these cities to the other, one would have been obliged to cross the gulf by boat and then continue by land. This is what Paul's messenger probably did. The direct journey may now be made by land. Miletus has been so ruined that its plan can no longer be made out. Practically the only remaining object of unusual interest is theater, the largest in Asia Minor, which was not built in a hollow of the hillside, as most ancient theaters were, but in the open field.

E. J. Banks

MILK

milk (chalabh; gala; Latin lac (2 Esdras 2:19; 8:10)): The fluid secreted by the mammary glands of female mammals for the nourishment of their young. The word is used in the Bible of that of human beings (Isa 28:9) as well as of that of the lower animals (Ex 23:19). As a food it ranked next in importance to bread (Ecclesiasticus 39:26). Palestine is frequently described as a land "flowing with milk and honey" (Ex 3:8,17; Nu 13:27; De 6:3; Jos 5:6; Jer 11:5; Eze 20:6,15). Milk was among the first things set before the weary traveler (Ge 18:8). In fact, it was considered a luxury (Jud 5:25; So 5:1). The people used the milk of kine and also that of sheep (De 32:14), and especially that of goats (Pr 27:27). It was received in pails (’atinim, Job 21:24), and kept in leather bottles (no’dh, Jud 4:19), where it turned sour quickly in the warm climate of Palestine before being poured out thickly like a melting substance (nathakh; compare Job 10:10). Cheese of various kinds was made from it (gebhinah and charitse he-chalabh, literally, "cuts of milk"); or the curds (chem’ah) were eaten with bread, and possibly also made into butter by churning (Pr 30:33). See FOOD, II. It is possible that milk was used for seething other substances; at least the Israelites were strictly forbidden to seethe a kid in its mother’s milk (Ex 23:19; 34:26; De 14:21), and by a very general interpretation of these passages Jews have come to abstain from the use of mixtures of meat and milk of all kinds.

Figuratively the word is used

(1) of abundance (Ge 49:12);

(2) of a loved one’s charms (So 4:11);

(3) of blessings (Isa 55:1; Joe 3:18);

(4) of the (spiritual) food of immature people (1Co 3:2; Heb 5:12,13);

(5) of purity (1Pe 2:2).

Nathan Isaacs

MILL; MILLSTONE

mil, mil’-ston (recheh; mulos, mulon): The two most primitive methods of grinding grain were

(1) by pounding it in a mortar, and

(2) by rubbing it between two stones.

In Nu 11:8 both methods are mentioned as used for rendering the manna more fit for cooking. Numerous examples of both mill and mortar have been found in ancient excavations. Bliss and Macalister in their excavations at Gezer and other places have found specimens of what is called the saddle-quern or mill, which consists of two stones. The "nether" stone, always made of hard lava or basalt from the district of the Hauran, was a large heavy slab varying in length from 1 1/2 ft. to 2 3/4 ft., and in width from 10 inches to 1 1/3 ft. Its upper surface was hollowed out slightly, which made it look a little like a saddle and may have suggested the name of "riding millstone" applied by the Hebrews to the upper stone which rested on it (Jud 9:53). The "upper stone" or "rider" was much smaller, 4 inches to 8 in. long and 2 3/4 inches to 6 inches wide, and of varying shapes. This could be seized with the two hands and rubbed back and forth over the nether stone much the same as clothes are scrubbed on a wash-board. Such a stone could be used as a weapon (Jud 9:53; 2Sa 11:21), or given as a pledge (De 24:6).

Macalister goes so far as to say that "the rotary handquern in the form used in modern Palestine and in remote European regions, such as the Hebrides, is quite unknown throughout the whole history, even down to the time of Christ" (Excavations at Gezer). The same writer, however, describes some mills belonging to the 3rd and 4th Sere periods which are much like the present rotary quern, except smaller (4 inches to 6 inches in diameter), and with no provision for a turning handle. Schumacher describes these as paint grinders. The only perforated upper millstones found in the excavations at Gezer belong to the early Arabic period.

If the above assertions are substantiated then we must alter somewhat the familiar picture of the two women at the mill (Mt 24:41), commonly illustrated by photographs of the mills still used in modern Palestine These latter consist of two stone discs each 18 inches to 20 inches in diameter, usually made of Hauran basalt. The upper one is perforated in the center to allow it to rotate on a wooden peg fixed in the nether stone, and near the circumference of the upper stone is fixed a wooden handle for turning it. The grain to be ground is fed into the central hole on the upper stone and gradually works down between the stones. As the grain is reduced to flour, it flies out from between the stones on to a cloth or skin placed underneath the mill. To make the flour fine it is reground and sifted. Larger stones 4 ft. to 5 ft. in diameter, working on the principle of the handmill, are still used for grinding sesame seed. These are turned by asses or mules. Another form of mill, which is possibly referred to in Mt 18:6; Mr 9:42; Re 18:21,22, consisted of a conical nether stone on which "rode" a second stone like a hollowed-out

capstan. The upper stone was probably turned with handspikes in much the same way as an old-fashioned ship’s capstan was turned. The material to be ground was fed into the upper cone which formed the hopper and from which it was delivered to the grinding surfaces between the "rider" and the nether stone. This form of mill must have been known in late Biblical times, because many examples of the upper stone dating from the Greek-Roman period have been found. One may be seen in the museum of the Syrian Protestant College at Beirut. Another large one lies among the ruins at Petra, etc. In Mt 18:6; Mr 9:42, the mill is described as a mulos onikos, literally, a mill turned by an ass, hence, a great millstone. It is not at all unlikely that the writers have confused the meaning of onos (chamor), a term commonly applied to the upper millstone of a handmill, thinking it referred instead to the animal which turned the mill. This explanation would make Christ’s words of condemnation more applicable. The upper millstone of a handmill would be more than sufficient to sink the condemned, and the punishment would be more easily carried out. A few years from now handmills will have disappeared from the Syrian households, for the more modern gristmills turned by water or other motor power are rapidly replacing them.

See CRAFTS, II, 8.

Figuratively:

(1) Of firmness and undaunted courage (Job 41:24). "The heart of hot-blooded animals is liable to sudden contractions and expansions, producing rapid alternations of sensations; not so the heart of the great saurians" (Canon Cook, at the place).

(2) To "grind the face of the poor" (Isa 3:15) is cruelly to oppress and afflict them.

(3) The ceasing of the sound of the millstone was a sign of desolation (Jer 25:10; Re 18:22).

James A. Patch

MILLENNIUM, POSTMILLENNIAL VIEW

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

MILLENNIUM, PREMILLENNIAL VIEW

mi-len’-i-um

Divergent Views—Scope of Article I. THE TEACHING OF JESUS

The Millennium Not before the Advent

(1) Parable of the Wheat and Tares

(2) Parable of the Pounds

II. TEACHING OF THE APOSTLES

1. Expectation of the Advent

2. Possibility of Survival—Its Implications

3. Prophecy of "Man of Sin"

4. No Room for Millennium

5. Harmony of Christ and Apostles

LITERATURE

Divergent Views—Scope of Article:

The great majority of evangelical Christians believe that the kingdom of God shall have universal sway over the earth, and that righteousness and peace and the knowledge of the Lord shall everywhere prevail. This happy time is commonly called the Millennium, or the thousand years' reign. Divergent views are entertained as to how it is to be brought about. Many honest and faithful men hold that it will be introduced by the agencies now at work, mainly by the preaching of the gospel of Christ and the extension of the church over the world. An increasing number of men equally honest teach that the Millennium will be established by the visible advent of the Lord Jesus Christ. The aim of this brief article is to set forth some of the Scriptural grounds on which this latter view rests. No reference will be made to objections, to counter-objections and interpretations; the single point, namely, that the Millennium succeeds the second coming of Jesus Christ, that it does not precede it, will be rigidly adhered to. Those who hold this view believe that neither Christ nor His apostles taught, on fair principles of interpretation, that the Millennium must come before His advent.

I. The Teaching of Jesus.

The Lord Jesus said nothing about world-wide conversion in His instructions to His disciples touching their mission (Mt 28:19,20; Mr 16:15; Lu 24:46-48; Ac 1:8).

The Millennium Not before the Advent:

They were to be His witnesses and carry His message to the race, but He does not promise the race will

receive their testimony, or that men will generally accept His salvation. On the contrary, He explicitly forewarns them that they shall be hated of all men, that sufferings and persecutions shall be their lot, but if they are faithful to the end their reward will be glorious. But world-wide evangelism does not mean world-wide conversion. The universal offer of salvation does not pledge its universal acceptance. In His instructions and predictions the Lord does not let fall a hint that their world-wide mission will result in world-wide conversion, or that thereby the longed-for Millennium will be ushered in. But there is a time to come when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters the sea, when teaching shall no longer be needed, for all shall know Him from the least to the greatest. Our dispensation, accordingly, cannot be the last, for the effects stated in that are not contemplated in the instructions and the results of this. To the direct revelation of Christ on the subject we now turn. In two parables He explicitly announces the general character and the consummation of the gospel age, and these we are briefly to examine.

(1) Parable of the Wheat and Tares (Matthew 13:24-30,36-43).

Happily we are not left to discover the meaning and scope of this parable. We enjoy the immense advantage of having our Lord’s own interpretation of it. Out of His Divine explanation certain most important facts emerge:

(a) The parable covers the whole period between the first and second advents of the Saviour. The Sower is Christ Himself. He began the good work; He opened the new era.

(b) The field is the world. Christ’s work is no longer confined to a single nation or people as once; it contemplates the entire race.

(c) His people, the redeemed, begotten by His word and Spirit, are the good seed. Through them the gospel of His grace is to be propagated throughout the whole world.

(d) The devil is also a sower. He is the foul counterfeiter of God ‘s work. He sowed the tares, the sons of the evil one.

(e) The tares are not wicked men in general, but a particular class of wicked brought into close and contaminating association with the children of God. "Within the territory of the visible church the tares are deposited" (Dr. David Brown). It is the corruption of Christendom that is meant, a gigantic fact to which we cannot shut our eyes.

(f) The mischief, once done, cannot be corrected. "Let both grow together until the harvest." Christendom once corrupted remains so to the end.

(g) The harvest is the consummation of the age. This is the culmination of our age; it terminates with the advent and judgment of the Son of God. He will send forth His angels who will "gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity, and shall cast them into the furnace

of fire ..... Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

Here, then, we have the beginning, progress and consummation of our age. Christ Himself introduced it, and it was distinguished for its purity and its excellence. But the glorious system of truth was soon marred by the cunning craftiness of Satan. No after-vigilance or earnestness on the part of the servants could repair the fatal damage. They were forbidden to attempt the removal of the tares, for by so doing they would endanger the good grain, so intermixed had the two become! The expulsion of the tares is left for angels' hands in the day of the harvest. This is our Lord's picture of our age: a Zizanian field wherein good and bad, children of God and children of the evil one, live side by side down to the harvest which is the end. In spite of all efforts to correct and reform, the corruption of Christendom remains, nay, grows apace. To expel the vast crop of false doctrine, false professors, false teachers, is now as it has been for centuries an impossibility. Christ's solemn words hold down to the final consummation, "Let both grow together until the harvest." In such conditions a millennium of universal righteousness and knowledge of the Lord seems impossible until the separation takes place at the harvest.

(2) Parable of the Pounds (Luke 19:11-27).

Jesus was on His last journey to Jerusalem, and near the city. The multitude was eager, expectant. They supposed the Kingdom of God was immediately to appear. The parable was spoken to correct this mistake and to reveal certain vital features of it. "A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return." There is little difficulty in grasping the main teaching of this suggestive narrative. The nobleman is the Lord Jesus Christ Himself; the far country is heaven; the kingdom He goes to receive is the Messianic kingdom, for the victorious establishment of which all God's people long and pray. The servants are those who sustain responsible relation to the Lord because of the trust committed to them. The rebellious citizens are those who refuse subjection to His will and defy His authority. His return is His second coming. The parable spans the whole period between His ascension and His advent. It measures across our entire age. It tells of Christ's going away, it describes the conduct of His servants and of the citizens during His absence; it foretells His return and the reckoning that is to follow. Mark the words, "And it came to pass, when he was come back again, having received the kingdom." It is in heaven He receives the investiture of the kingdom (Re 5:6). It is on earth that He administers it. The phrase, "having received the kingdom," cannot by any dexterity of exegesis be made to denote the end of time or the end of the Millennium, or of His receiving it at the end of the world; it is then He delivers it up to God, even the Father (1Co 24-28).

The order and sequence of events as traced by the Lord disclose the same fact made prominent in the parable of the Wheat and Tares, namely, that during the whole period between His ascension and His return there is no place for a Millennium of world-wide righteousness and prosperity. But Scripture warrants the belief that such blessedness is surely to fill the earth, and if so, it must be realized after Christ's second coming.

II. Teaching of the Apostles.

1. Expectation of the Advent:

There is no unmistakable evidence that the apostles expected a thousand years of prosperity and peace during Christ's absence in heaven. In Ac 1:11 we read that the heavenly visitants said to the apostles, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven?" This attitude of the men of Galilee became the permanent attitude of the primitive church. It was that of the uplifted gaze. Paul's exultant words respecting the Thessalonians might well be applied to all believers of that ancient time, that they "turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven" (1Th 1:9,10). It is the prominent theme of the New Testament epistles. In the New Testament it is mentioned 318 t. One verse in every thirty, we are told, is occupied with it. It is found shining with a glad hope in the first letters Paul wrote, those to the Thessalonians. It is found in the last he wrote, the second to Timothy, gleaming with the bright anticipation of the crown he was to receive at the Redeemer's appearing. James quickens the flagging courage, and reanimates the drooping spirits of believers with this trumpet peal: "Be ye also patient; establish your hearts: for the coming of the Lord is at hand" (5:8). Peter exhorts to all holy conversation and godliness by the like motive: "Looking for and hastening the coming of the day of God" (2Pe 3:12 margin). Amid the deepening gloom and the gathering storms of the last days, Jude 1:14 cheers us with the words of Enoch, the seventh from Adam, 'Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon .... the ungodly.' John closes the Canon with the majestic words, "Behold, he cometh with the clouds," "Behold, I come quickly." These men, speaking by the Spirit of the living God, know there can be no reign of universal righteousness, no deliverance of groaning creation, no redemption of the body, no binding of Satan, and no Millennium while the tares grow side by side with the wheat; while the ungodly world flings its defiant shout after the retiring nobleman, "We will not have this man to reign over us"; and while Satan, that strong, fierce spirit, loose in this age, deceives, leads captive, devours and ruins as he lists. Therefore the passionate longing and the assurance of nearing deliverance at the coming of Christ fill so large a place in the faith and the life of the primitive disciples.

2. Possibility of Survival—Its Implications:

In 1Th 4:17 Paul speaks of himself and others who may survive till the Lord's coming: "Then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air" (compare 1Co 15:51,52).

This implies fairly that the apostle did not know that long ages would elapse between his own day and Christ's advent. There was to his mind the possibility of His coming in his lifetime; in fact, he seems to have an expectation that he would not pass through the gates of death at all, that he would live to see the Lord in His glorious return, for the day and the hour of the advent is absolutely concealed even from inspired men. The inference is perfectly legitimate that Paul and his fellow-disciples did not anticipate that a thousand years should intervene between them and the coming.

3. Prophecy of the "Man of Sin":

Furthermore, the Thessalonians had fallen into a serious mistake (2Th 2:1-2). By a false spirit, or by a forged epistle as from Paul, they were led to believe that "the day of the Lord is now present" (English Revised Version), 2Th 2:2. The apostle sets them right about this solemn matter. He assures them that some things must precede that day, namely, "the falling away," or apostasy, and the appearing of a powerful adversary, whom he calls "the Man of Sin," and describes as "the Son of Perdition." Neither the one nor the other of these two, the apostasy and the Man of Sin, was then present. But the road was fast getting ready for them. There was the "mystery of lawlessness" already at work at the time, and although a certain restraint held it in check, nevertheless when the check was removed it would at once precipitate the apostasy, and it would issue in the advent of the Man of Sin, and he should be brought to nought by the personal coming of Jesus Christ. This appears to be the import of the passage.

Here was the appropriate place to settle forever for these saints and for all others the question of a long period to intervene before the Saviour's advent. How easy and natural it would have been for Paul to write, "Brethren, there is to be first a time of universal blessedness for the world, the Millennium, and after that there will be an apostasy and the revelation of the Man of Sin whom Christ will destroy by the brightness of His coming." But Paul intimated nothing of the sort. Instead, he distinctly says that the mystery of lawlessness is already working, that it will issue in "the falling away," and then shall appear the great adversary, the Lawless One, who shall meet his doom by the advent of Christ. The mystery of lawlessness, however, is held in restraint, we are told. May it not be possible that the check shall be taken off, then the Millennium succeed, and after that the apostasy and the Son of Perdition? No, for its removal is immediately followed by the coming of the great foe, the Antichrist. For this foe has both an apocalypse and a parousia like Christ Himself. Hence, the lifting of the restraint is sudden, by no means a prolonged process.

4. No Room for Millennium:

The apostle speaks of the commencement, progress, and close of a certain period. It had commenced when he wrote. Its close is at the coming of Christ. What intervenes? The continuance of the evil secretly at work in the body of professing Christians, and its progress from the incipient state to the maturity of daring wickedness which will be exhibited in the Man of Sin. This condition of things fills up the whole period, if we accept Paul's teaching as that of inspired truth. There appears to be no place for a Millennium within the limits which the apostle here sets. The only escape from this conclusion, as it seems to us, is, to deny that the coming of Christ is His actual, personal second coming. But the two words, epiphaneia and parousia, which elsewhere are used separately to denote His advent, are here employed to give "graphic vividness" and certainty to the event, and hence, they peremptorily forbid a figurative interpretation. The conclusion seems unavoidable that there can be no Millennium on this side of the advent of Christ.

5. Harmony of Christ and Apostles:

Our Lord's Olivet prophecy (Mt 24; 25; Mr 13; Lu 21) accords fully with the teaching of the apostles on the subject. In that discourse He foretells wars, commotions among the nations, Jerusalem's capture and

the destruction of the temple, Israel’s exile, Christians persecuted while bearing their testimony throughout the world, cosmic convulsions, unparalleled tribulation and sufferings which terminate only with His advent. From the day this great prophecy was spoken down to the hour of His actual coming He offers no hope of a Millennium. He opens no place for a thousand years of blessedness for the earth.

These are some of the grounds on which Biblical students known as Premillennialists rest their belief touching the coming of the Lord and the Millennial reign.

LITERATURE.

Premillenarian: H. Bonar, The Coming of the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus; Wood, The Last Things; Guinness, The Approaching End of the Age; Seiss, The Last Times; Gordon, Ecce Venit; Premillennial Essays; Peters, The Theocratic Kingdom; West, The Thousand Years in Both Testaments; Trotter, Plain Papers on Prophetic Subjects; Brookes, Maranatha; Andrews, Christianity and Antichristianity; Kellogg, Predition and Fulfillment.

William G. Moorehead

MILLET

mil’-et, mil’-it (dochan; kegchros): One of the ingredients of the prophet’s bread (Eze 4:9). The Arabic equivalent is dukhn, the common millet, Panicum miliaceum, an annual grass 3 or 4 ft. high with a much-branched nodding panicle. Its seeds arc as small as mustard seeds and are used largely for feeding small birds, but are sometimes ground to flour and mixed with other cereals for making bread. The Italian millet, setaria Italica, known as Bengal grass, is also called in Arabic dukhn, and has a similar seed. A somewhat similar grain, much more widely cultivated as a summer crop, is the Indian millet—also called "Egyptian maize"—the Sorghum annuum. This is known as dhurah in Arabic, and the seed as dhurah beida, "white dourra." It is a very important crop, as it, like the common millet, grows and matures without any rain. It is an important breadstuff among the poor.

Both the common millet and the dourra were cultivated in Egypt in very ancient times; the Hebrew dochan was certainly the first, but may include all three varieties.

E. W. G. Masterman

MILLO

mil’-o. (millo generally interpreted to mean a "filling," e.g. a solid tower or an earth embankment; in Jud 9:6,20; 2Ki 12:20, we get beth millo’, translated in English Versions of the Bible "House of Millo," which Winckler thinks may have been the original Jebusite temple-shrine of Jerusalem (see BETH-MILLO); Septuagint reads Bethmaalon, also Maalon and oikos Maallon):

1. Old Testament References

It is generally supposed that "The Millo" was some kind of fortress or other defense, but many speculations have been made regarding its position. In 2Sa 5:9, we read that David built round about from the Millo and inward, or (in the Septuagint, Septuagint) "he fortified it, the city, round about from the Millo and his house" (compare 1Ch 11:8). In connection with Solomon's strengthening of the fortifications, there are several references to Millo. In 1Ki 9:15, Solomon raised a levy "to build the house of Yahweh, and his own house, and Millo, and the wall of Jerusalem," etc.; in 9:24, "Pharaoh's daughter came up out of the city of David unto her house which Solomon had built for her: then did he build Millo"; in 1Ki 11:27, Solomon "built Millo, and repaired the breach of the city of David his father." At a later time Hezekiah "took courage, and built up all the wall that was broken down, and raised it up to the towers, and the other wall without, and strengthened Millo in the city of David" (2Ch 32:5; 2Ki 12:20); Joash was slain by his servants "at the house of Millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla," but possibly this may have been in Shechem (compare Jud 9:6).

2. Identical with the Akra Site:

The mention of the site in the days of David and the reference to it in connection with the city of David (1Ki 11:27) point to some part of the southeastern hill South of the temple. It is suggestive that Millo is in Septuagint always translated by "Akra." It seems to the present writer very probable that it was a fortress crowning the hill on which at a later time stood the Syrian Akra, which hill, if we are to believe Josephus (BJ, V, iv, 1, etc.), was cut down because its commanding situation dominated the temple. This hill cannot have been the site of Zion afterward known as "David's Burg" (City of David), because the tombs of the Judean kings were within its walls, and that alone would have made the complete leveling of the site impossible, but whereas the Jebusite fortress was probably not far from Gihon, this fortified summit may have been, as Watson suggests for the Akra, as far north as where the present Al Aqsa mosque is situated. In David's time it may have been an isolated and detached fort guarding the north approach, but if it was originally a Jebusite high place (Winckler) partly of sun-dried brick like similar constructions in Babylonia, the account of its being leveled would be much more credible. The importance of this site in the days of Solomon is fully explicable if this was the citadel guarding the newly built temple and royal palaces.

Dr. G.A. Smith is inclined to think that Millo may have been a fortress "off the south end of Ophel, to retain and protect the old pool," and Vincent suggests that the site of Millo is that now occupied by the great causeway connecting the Western and Eastern hills along which runs the Tariq bab es silsileh.

E. W. G. Masterman

MILLSTONE

mil'-ston.

See MILL.

MINA

mi’-na.

See MANEH.

MINCING

min’-sing (Taphaph): "Taking short steps," "walking trippingly." Only in Isa 3:16, "walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling (a jingling of the metal anklets) with their feet." Compare OHL.

MIND

mind (nous, dianoia, sunesis):

1. No Precision in the Terms Used:

We look in vain in the Old Testament and New Testament for anything like scientific precision in the employment of terms which are meant to indicate mental operations.

In the Old Testament lebh is made to stand for the various manifestations of our intellectual and emotional nature. We are often misled by the different renderings in the different versions, both early and late.

Sometimes nephesh or "soul" is rendered by "mind" (De 18:6 the King James Version, "desire of his soul" or "mind"); sometimes ruah or "spirit" (Ge 26:35, "grief of mind," ruah). Here Luther renders the term Herzeleid ("grief of heart"), and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) animum. Sometimes lebh is used, as in Isa 46:8, "bring it to mind" (literally, "heart"), or in Ps 31:12, "I am forgotten as a dead man out of mind" (literally, "heart"), as in Septuagint, kardia, and in Vulgate, a corde, Luther, im Herzen, new Dutch translated, uit de gedachtenis (i.e. "memory").

In the Apocrypha this precision is equally lacking. Thus we read in The Wisdom of Solomon 9:15, "For the corruptible body (soma) presseth down the soul (psuche) and the earthly tabernacle weigheth down the mind (nous) that museth upon many things." But these distinctions are alien to the letter and spirit of revelation, a product of the Greek and not of the Hebrew mind.

In the New Testament the words nous and dianoia are used, but not with any precision of meaning.

Here too several terms are rendered by the same word. Thus the Hebrew ruach is rendered by nous in 1Co 2:16 ("mind of the Lord," with reference to Isa 40:13, where "ruach YHWH (spirit of Yahweh)" occurs). Nous evidently means here the organ of spiritual perception—a word borrowed from the Septuagint, where it is sometimes made to stand for lebh (Job 7:17; Isa 41:22); sometimes for ruah (Isa 40:13). In Lu 24:45—the solitary text, where nous occurs in the Gospels—it is rendered "understanding" in the King James Version, "mind" in the Revised Version (British and American).

2. Ethical Sense:

For a true solution we must turn to the Epistles of Paul, where the word frequently occurs in an ethical sense—sometimes in connection with (sinful) flesh as in Col 2:18, "puffed up by his fleshly mind," sometimes in direct contrast to it, as in Ro 7:25, ‘with my mind I serve the law of God; with the flesh the law of sin.’ In Tit 1:15 it is brought into parallelism with conscience ("Their mind and their conscience are defiled"). Phrases like "a reprobate mind," "corrupted in mind" occur elsewhere (Ro 1:28; 1Ti 6:5). From this state of "reprobation" and "corruption" man must be saved. Hence, the necessity of complete transformation and renewal of the inner man (Ro 12:2), "transformed by the renewing of your mind (nous)."

3. Dianoia and Nous:

Another word, with possibly a deeper meaning, is sometimes employed, namely, dianoia, which literally means "meditation," "reflection." It is found as synonymous with nous in a good sense, as e.g. in 1 Joh 5:20 (He "hath given us an understanding, that we know him that is true"). Evidently the sense here is the same as in Ro 12:2, a renovated mind capable of knowing Christ. It may also bear a bad sense, as in Eph 4:18, where the Gentiles are represented as having "a darkened understanding," or in parallelism with sarx: "the desires of the flesh and of the mind" (Eph 2:3), and with nous: ‘walking in vanity of mind (nous) and a darkened understanding (dianoia)’ in Eph 4:18. At times also "heart" and "mind" are joined to indicate human depravity (Lu 1:51 "He hath scattered the proud in the imagination (dianoia) of their heart"). It is interesting also to know that the Great Commandment is rendered in Mt 22:37—"Thou shall love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul (psuche), and with all thy understanding (dianoia) (English Versions of the Bible, "mind")"—though Mark has two renderings in one of which dianoia occurs, and in the other sunesis (Mark 12:30,33), though possibly without any psychological refinement of meaning, for the term sunesis occurs elsewhere in conjunction with pneumatikos ("spiritual understanding," Col 1:9). It also stands alone in the sense of an "understanding enlightened from above" (2Ti 2:7 King James Version: "The Lord give thee understanding (sunesis) in all things"). The history of these terms is interesting, but not of great theological significance.

4. The Great Commandment:

It seems to us that Godet’s interpretation of the Great Commandment in Lu 10:27 is somewhat far-fetched. He considers the heart as "the central focus from which all rays of the moral life go forth, and that in their three principal directions: the powers of feeling, or the affections, nephesh (‘soul’) in the

sense of feeling; the active powers, the impulsive aspirations, the might (‘with all thy might’), the will; and in the intellectual powers, analytical or contemplative, dianoia (‘with all thy mind’). The difference between the heart, which resembles the trunk and the three branches, feeling, will, understanding, is emphatically marked in the Alexandrian variation, by the substitution of the preposition en (‘in’) for ek (‘with,’ ‘from’) in the three last members. Moral life proceeds from the heart and manifests itself without, in the three forms of activity. The impulse God-ward proceeds from the heart, and is realized in the life through the will, which consecrates itself actively to the accomplishment of His will; and through the mind, which pursues the track of His thought in all His works" (Godet, Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, II, 38, 39).

J. I. Marais

MINE; MINING

min, min’-ing: In Job 28:1-11 we have the only Biblical reference to mines. The writer very likely derived his information either from personal observation or from a description by an eyewitness, of the mining operations of Sinai (see METALS). No traces of ancient mines have yet been found in Palestine and Syria. What metals were taken out came from the superficial strata. The mines of Upper Egypt have already been mentioned. Burton and other travelers in Northern Arabia and the Red Sea country have found there evidences of ancient mining operations.

The usual Egyptian method of mining was to follow the vein from the surface as far as it was practicable with tools corresponding to our pick and hoe, hammer and chisel. The shafts frequently extended into the ground a distance of 180 to 200 ft. The rock when too hard to be dug out was first cracked by having fires built on it. The metal-bearing stone was carried in baskets to the surface, where the crushing and separating took place. The mining operations were performed by an army of slaves who were kept at their work day and night, driven with the lash until they died, when their places were taken by others.

See METALS; CRAFTS, II, 10.

James A. Patch

MINERALS

min’-er-alz.

See METALS; STONES, PRECIOUS.

MINGLED PEOPLE; (MIXED MULTITUDE)

min’-g’-ld pe’-pl:

(1) "Mixed multitude" occurs in Nu 11:4 as a translation of asaphcuph, "collection," "rabble." The same phrase in Ex 12:38; Ne 13:3 is the rendition of erebh. "Mingled people" is used also to translate ‘erebh, and is found in Jer 25:20,24; 50:37; Eze 30:5, and in 1Ki 10:15 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "Arabia"; compare the American Revised Version margin). In the last case both revised versions have followed the pointing of the Massoretic Text, and this pointing alone distinguishes "mingled people" (‘erebh) from "Arabia" (‘arabh); in the unvocalized text both words are equally ‘-r-b. Now "the traffic of the merchants, and of all the kings of the mingled people, and of the governors of the country" is very awkward, and the correction into "Arabia," as in the Massoretic Text (and English Versions of the Bible) of the parallel 2Ch 9:14, is indicated. Probably the same change should be made in Eze 30:5, reading "Ethiopia, and Put, and Lud, and Arabia, and Cub." A similar textual confusion seems to be responsible for either "and all the kings of Arabia" or "and all the kings of the mingled people" in Jer 25:24. On all these verses see the commentaries.

(2) In Jer 25:20; 50:37, "mingled people" is a term of contempt for the hybrid blood of certain of Israel’s enemies. Something of this same contempt may be contained in Ex 12:38, where a multitude of non-Israelite camp-followers are mentioned as accompanying the children of Israel in the exodus, and in Nu 11:4 it is this motley body that seduced Israel to sin. But who they were, why they wished or were permitted to join in the exodus, and what eventually became of them or of their descendants is a very perplexing puzzle. In Ne 13:3, the "mixed multitude" consists of the inhabitants of Palestine whom the Jews found there after the return from the exile (see SAMARIA). In accord with the command of De 23:3-5, the Jews withdrew from all religious intercourse whatever had been established with these.

NOTE.—The Hebrew noun for "mingled people" may or may not be connected with the verb translated "mingle" in Ezr 9:2; Ps 106:35; Da 2:43. On this see the lexicons.

Burton Scott Easton

MINIAMIN

min’-ya-min, mi-ni’-a-min (minydmin):

(1) A Levite who assisted Kore, the son of Imnah, in the distribution of the freewill offerings (2Ch 31:15).

(2) A priestly family of the time of the high priest Joiakim (Ne 12:17), probably equals MIJAMIN (2).

(3) A priestly participant in the ceremony of the dedication of the wall (Ne 12:41).

MINISH

min’-ash (the King James Version and the English Revised Version Ex 15:19; Ps 107:39; the English

Revised Version Isa 19:6; Ho 8:10): The verb "mannish," "make small," is now obsolete, being replaced by its derivative "diminish" (compare the American Standard Revised Version in all verses above).

MINISTRY

min’-is-tri:

I. THE WORD "MINISTRY"

Use of the Word in This Article

II. TWO KINDS OF MINISTRY

1. The Prophet Ministry

(1) Apostles

(2) Prophets

(3) Teachers

2. The Local Ministry

Origin

III. THREEFOLD CONGREGATIONAL MINISTRY

1. Insistence on Organization

(1) Aid Given in Selecting a Bishop

(2) Bishops and Presbyters

2. Multiplication of Orders: Growth of a Hierarchy

IV. SYNODS

LITERATURE

I. The Word "Ministry."

The common New Testament term for the ministry is diakonia, and along with it we find diakonos, "minister," ho diakonon), "he who ministers," and diakonein, "to minister." All these words have a very extensive application within the New Testament and are by no means restricted to denote service within the Christian church; even when so restricted the words are used in a great variety of meanings: e.g.

(1) discipleship in general (Joh 12:26);

(2) service rendered to the church because of the "gifts" bestowed (Ro 12:7; 1Co 12:5), and hence, all kinds of service (Ac 6:2; Mt 20:26);

(3) specifically the "ministry of the Word" (Eph 4:12), and most frequently the "apostleship" (Ac 1:17; 20:24; 21:19; Ro 11:13, etc.);

(4) such services as feeding the poor (Ac 6:1; 11:29; 12:25), or organizing and providing the great collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem (Ro 15:25; 2Co 8:4,19, etc.);

(5) such services as those rendered by Stephanas (1Co 16:15), by Archippus (Col 4:17), by Tychicus (Eph 6:21; Col 4:7), etc.

Use of the Word in This Article:

In this article the word has to do with the guidance and government of a united community, fellowship, or brotherhood of men and women whose inward bond of union was the sense of fellowship with Jesus their Risen Lord. In all ages of Christianity the call to become the follower of Jesus, while it is the deepest of all personal things and comes to each one singly, never comes solitarily. The devout soul must share his experiences with those like-minded, and the fellowship thus formed must be able to take outward shape, which cannot fail to render necessary some sort of rule and guidance. The very thought of the church with articulate expression of a common faith, administration of the sacraments, meetings and their right conduct, aid given to the spiritual and bodily needs of their fellow-members, implies a ministry or executive of some kind. To endeavor to explain what was the character of the ministry of the Christian church in the earliest centuries of its existence and how it came into being is the aim of this article.

II. Two Kinds of Ministry.

The earliest fact we have about the organization of the Christian church is given in Ac 6, where we are told that "seven" men were appointed to what is called a "ministry of tables" (diakonein trapezais), which is distinguished from the "ministry of the word" (diakonia tou logou). This distinction between two different kinds of "ministry" which appears at the very beginning is seen to exist all through the apostolic church and beyond it into the sub-apostolic. It can be traced in the Epistles of Paul and in other parts of the New Testament. It is seen in the Didache, in the Pastor of Hermas, in the Epistles of Barnabas, in the Apology of Justin Martyr, in the writings of Irenaeus and elsewhere. (For a full list of

authorities, compare Harnack, Texte u. Untersuchungen, II, ii, 111 ff.) The one ministry differs from the other in function, and the distinction depends on a conception to be afterward examined—that of "gifts." The common name, in apostolic and sub-apostolic literature, for the members of the one kind of ministry is "those who speak the Word of God" (lalountes ton logon tou Theou). Modern writers have called it the charismatic, but perhaps the better term is the prophetic ministry; while to the other class belong all the names which are given to denote office-bearers in the local churches. The two existed side by side. The great practical distinction between them was that the members of the former were in no sense office-bearers in any one Christian community; they were not elected or appointed to any office; they were not set apart for duties by any ecclesiastical ceremony. The "Word" came to them and they were compelled by inward impulsion to speak the message given them to deliver. Some were wanderers; others confined themselves to their own community. They were responsible to no ecclesiastical authority. Churches were encouraged to test them and their message; for the "gift" of discerning whether a so-called prophet spoke a truly Divine message was always presupposed to be within the local church. But once accepted they took a higher place than the office-bearers, they presided at the Lord’s Supper, and their judgment in cases of discipline could overbear ordinary ecclesiastical rules. The contest of Cyprian with the "confessors" at Carthage was the last stage of the long struggle which arose in the 2nd century between the two ministries. Out of the other kind of ministry came, by ordinary development, all the various kinds of ecclesiastical organization which now exist. Its members were office-bearers in the strictest sense of the word; they were selected to do ecclesiastical work in a given community, they were set apart for it in a special way, and they were responsible to the church for its due performance.

But it is important to remember that while the two kinds of ministries are thoroughly distinct from each other, the same individuals might belong to both kinds. The "prophetic gift" might fall on anyone, private member or office-bearer alike. Office-holding did not prevent the "gift." Polycarp, office-bearer at Smyrna, was a prophet; so was Ignatius of Antioch, and many others. The "gift" of speaking the Word of God was a personal and not an official source of enlightenment.

1. The Prophetic Ministry:

In the prophetic ministry we find a threefold division—apostles, prophets and teachers. Some would add a fourth, evangelists, i.e. men like the apostles in all respects save in having seen the. Lord in the flesh. The distinction may hold good for the apostolic period, though that appears to be very doubtful; it disappears utterly in the sub-apostolic; evangelist and apostle seem to be one class. This triple division may be traced through early Christian literature from 1 Corinthians down to the Clementine Homilies, which can scarcely be earlier than 200 AD. It is hardly possible to define each class in any mechanical fashion; speaking generally, the first were the missionary pioneers whose message was chiefly to the unconverted, while to the second and third classes belonged exhortation and instruction within the Christian communities.

(1) Apostles.

In the New Testament and in the other literature of the early church the word "apostle" is used in a

narrower and in a wider sense, and it is the more extensive use of the word which denotes the first division of the prophetic ministry. The Lord selected the Twelve, "whom also he named apostles" (Mr 3:14, the Revised Version margin), to be trained by personal fellowship with Him and by apprentice mission work among the villages of Galilee for that proclamation of His gospel which was to be their future life-work. Two things strictly personal and excluding every thought of successors separated the "Eleven" from all other men: long personal fellowship with Jesus in the inner circle of His followers, and their selection by Himself while still in the flesh. They were the "Apostles" in the narrow sense of the word. But the name was given to many others. Matthias, who had enjoyed personal intercourse with Jesus both before and after the resurrection, was called by the disciple company, confirmed by decision of the lot, to the same ‘service and sending forth’ (diakonia kai apostole) (Ac 1:25). Paul was called by the Lord Himself, but in vision and inward experience, and took rank with those before mentioned (Ro 1:1 ff; Ga 2:7-9). Others, called apostles, are mentioned by name in the New Testament. Barnabas is not only an apostle but is recognized to have rank equal to the "Eleven" (Ac 14:14; Ga 2:7-9). The correct rendering of the text (Ro 16:7) declares that Andronicus and Junias were apostles who had known Christ before Paul became a believer. Chrysostom, who thinks that Junias or Junia was a woman, does not believe that her sex hindered her from being an apostle. Silas or Silvanus and Timothy, on the most natural interpretation of the passage, are called apostles by Paul in 1Th 1:1,6. The title can hardly be denied to Apollos (1Co 4:6,9). Paul praises men, whom he calls "the apostles of the churches," and declares them to be "the glory of Christ" (2Co 8:23 margin). One of them, Epaphroditus, is mentioned by name—"your apostle," says Paul writing to the Christians of Philippi (Php 2:25 margin); and there must have been many others. "Apostles" are distinguished from the "Twelve" by Paul in the rapid summary he gives of the appearances of Jesus after the resurrection (1Co 15:5,7). Besides those true apostles the New Testament mentions others who are called "false apostles" (2Co 11:13), and the church of Ephesus is praised for using its "gift" of discrimination to reject men who "call themselves apostles, and they are not" (Re 2:2). This wider use of the word has descended to the present day; "apostles" or "holy apostles" is still the name for missionaries and missioners in some parts of the Greek church. The double use of the word to denote the "Twelve" or the "Eleven" is seen in the sub-apostolic age in the Didache, which recognizes the narrower use of the word in its title ("The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles"), and in the text portrays the itinerant missionaries to whom the name in its widest use belonged.

Those "apostles," to whatever class they belonged, had one distinguishing characteristic: they had chosen as their life-work to be the missionary pioneers of the gospel of the Kingdom of Christ. They were all engaged in aggressive work, and were distinguished from others not so much by what they were as by what they did. They were wanderers with no fixed place of residence. The requirements of their work might make them abide for long periods in some center (as did Paul at Corinth and at Ephesus, or some of the "Eleven" at Jerusalem), but they had no permanent home life. As the earlier decades passed, their numbers increased rather than diminished. They are brought vividly before us in such writings as the Didache. They were to be highly honored, but as severely tested. They were not expected to remain longer than three days within a Christian community, nor to fare softly when there (Didache ii.4-6). The vindication of their call was what they were able to accomplish, and to this Paul, the greatest of them, appeals over and over again.

(2) Prophets.

Prophets had been the religious guides of Israel of old, and the spirit of prophecy had never entirely died out. John the Baptist (Mt 11:9), Simeon (Lu 2:25,26), and Anna (Lu 2:36) had the gift in the days of Christ. It was natural for the Samaritan woman to believe that the stranger who spoke to her by the well was a prophet (Joh 4:19). The reappearance of prophecy in its old strength was looked on as a sign of the nearness of the coming of the Messiah. Jesus Himself had promised to send prophets among His followers (Mt 10:41; 23:34; Lu 11:49). The promise was fulfilled. Christian prophets appeared within the church from its beginning. Nor were they confined to communities of Jewish Christians; prophecy appeared spontaneously wherever Christianity spread. We are told of prophets in the churches of Jerusalem and Caesarea where the membership was almost purely Jewish; at Antioch where Jews and Gentiles united to make one congregation; and everywhere throughout the Gentile churches—in Rome, Corinth, Thessalonica and in the Galatian churches (Ac 11:27; 15:32; 21:9,10; Ro 12:6,7; 1Co 14:32,36,37; 1Th 5:20; Ga 3:3-5). Prophets are mentioned by name—Agabus (Ac 11:28; 21:10), Symeon and others at Antioch (Ac 13:1), Judas and Silas in Jerusalem (Ac 15:32). Nor was the "gift" confined to men; women prophesied—the four daughters of Philip among others (Ac 21:9). From the earliest times down to the close of the 2nd century and later, an uninterrupted stream of prophets and prophetesses appeared in the Christian churches. The statements of New Testament writers, and especially of Paul, imply that prophets abounded in the earliest churches. Paul, for example, expected the prophetic gift to appear in every Christian community. He recognized that they had a regular place in the meeting for public worship (1Co 14); he desired that every member in the Corinthian church should possess the "gift" and cultivate it (1Co 14:1,5,39); he exhorted the brethren at Thessalonica to ‘cherish prophesyings’ (1Th 5:20), and those in Rome to make full use of prophecy (Ro 12:6). If he criticized somewhat severely the conduct of the "prophets" in the Corinthian church, it was to teach them how to make full use of their "gift" for the right edifying of the brethren.

Prophecy was founded on revelation; the prophets were men especially "gifted" with spiritual intuition and magnetic speech. Sometimes their "gift" took the form of ecstasy, but by no means always; Paul implies that prophets have a real command of and can control their utterances. Sometimes their message came to them in visions, such as we find in the Apocalypse and in Hermas; but this was not a necessary means. The prophets spoke as they were moved, and the Spirit worked on them in various ways.

The influence of those prophets seems to have increased rather than diminished during the earlier decades of the 2nd century. While the duty of the apostle was to the unbelievers, Jewish or heathen, the sphere of the activity of the prophet was within the Christian congregation. It was his business to edify the brethren. Prophets had a recognized place in the meeting for the public worship of the congregation; if one happened to be present at the dispensation of the Lord’s Supper, he presided to the exclusion of the office-bearers, and his prayers were expected to be extempore (Didache x.7); he had special powers when matters of discipline were discussed, as is plain from a great variety of evidence from Hermas down to Tertullian. From Paul’s statements it seems that the largest number of the prophets he speaks of were members of the communities within which they used their "gift" of prophecy; but many of the more eminent prophets traveled from community to community edifying each. When such wandering prophets, with their wives and families, dwelt for a time in any Christian society, preaching and

exhorting, it was deemed to be the duty of that society to support them, and regulations were made for such support. According to the Didache (chapter xiii): "Every true prophet who shall settle among you is worthy of his support ..... Every first-fruit then of the products of the winepress and threshing-floor, of oxen and of sheep, thou shalt take and give to the prophets ..... In like manner also when thou openest a jar of wine or oil, take the first of it and give it to the prophets; and of money and clothing and every possession take the first as may seem right to thee, and give according to the commandment." Only, the receivers were to be true prophets. Each congregation had to exercise the "gift" of discrimination and sift the true from the false; for "false" prophets confronted the true in early Christianity as well as in the old Judaism.

(3) Teachers.

While the third class of the prophetic ministry, the teachers, is found joined to the other two both in the New Testament and in sub-apostolic literature, and while Paul assigns a definite place for their services in the meeting for edification (1Co 14:26), we hear less about them and their work. They seem, however, to have lingered much longer in active service in the early church than did the apostles and the prophets.

2. The Local Ministry:

As has been said, the first notice we have of organization within a local church is in Ac 6, where at the suggestion of the apostles seven men were selected to administer the charity of the congregation.

The conception that "the Seven" were a special order of office-bearers, deacons, is a comparatively late suggestion. These men are nowhere called deacons; the official designation is "The Seven." It may be that the appointment of those men was only a temporary expedient, but it is more probable that "the Seven" of Ac 6 are the elders of Ac 11; for we find those "elders" performing the duties which "the Seven" were appointed to fulfil. If so, we have in Ac 6 the narrative of the beginnings of local organization as a whole. When we turn to the expansion of Christian communities outside Jerusalem, we have no such distinct picture of beginnings; but as all the churches in Palestine evidently regarded the society in Jerusalem as the mother church, it is likely that their organization was the same. Ac tells us that Paul and Barnabas left behind them at Derbe, Lystra and Iconium societies of brethren with "elders" at their head. The word used suggests an election by popular vote and was probably the same as had been used in the selection of the "Seven" men.

When we examine the records of the distinctively Pauline churches, there is not much direct evidence for the origins of the ministry there, but a great deal about the existence of some kind of rule and rulers. For one thing, we can see that these churches had and were encouraged to have feelings of independence and of self-government; a great deal is said about the possession of "gifts" which imply the presence and power of the Spirit of Jesus within the community itself. We find names applied to men who, if not actually office-bearers, are at least leaders and perform the functions of office-bearers—proistamenoi, poimenes, episkopoi, diakonoi—and where special designations are lacking a distinction is always drawn between those who obey and those who are to be obeyed. In all cases those leaders or ministers

are mentioned in the plural.

It may be said generally that about the close of the 1st century every Christian community was ruled by a body of men who are sometimes called presbyters (elders), sometimes but more rarely bishops (overseers), and whom modern church historians are inclined to call presbyter-bishops. Associated with them, but whether members of the same court or forming a court of their own it is impossible to say, were a number of assistant rulers called deacons. See BISHOP; CHURCH GOVERNMENT; DEACON; ELDER. The court of elders had no president or permanent chairman. There was a two-fold not a threefold ministry. During the 3rd century, rising into notice by way of geographical distribution rather than in definite chronological order, this twofold congregational ministry became threefold in the sense that one man was placed at the head of each community with the title of pastor or bishop (the titles are interchangeable as late as the 4th century at least). In the early centuries those local churches, thus organized, while they never lacked the sense that they all belonged to one body, were independent self-governing communities preserving relations to each other, not by any political organization embracing them all, but by fraternal fellowship through visits of deputies, interchange of letters, and in some indefinite way giving and receiving assistance in the selection and setting apart of pastors.

Origin.

The question arises, How did this organization come into being? We may dismiss, to begin with, the idea once generally accepted among the Reformed churches, that the Christian society simply took over and made use of the synagogue system of organization (Vitringa, De synagoga vetere). The points common to both reveal a superficial resemblance, but no more. The distinctive differences are great. When we add to them the decisive statement of Epiphanius (Haeresis, xxx. 18), that the Jewish Christians (Judaizing) organized their communities with archons and an archisynagogos like the Jewish synagogues of the Dispersion and unlike the Christian churches, all the evidence makes it impossible to believe that the earliest Christian organization was simply taken over from the Jewish. On the other hand, there is little evidence that the apostles (the Twelve and Paul) received a special commission from our Lord, to appoint and ordain the office-bearers of the earliest Christian communities, so exclusive that there could be no legitimate organization without this apostolic authority and background. We find, on the contrary, the church in Rome exercising all the disciplinary functions of a congregation without this apostolic ecclesiastical rule supposed to be essential. Even in the mother-church in Jerusalem, the congregational meeting exercised rule over the apostles themselves, for we find apostles summoned before it and examined on their conduct (Ac 11:1-4). The whole question demands the recognition of several facts:

(1) Evidence abounds to show that the local churches during the apostolic and sub-apostolic age were self-governing communities and that the real background of the ministry was not apostolic authority but the congregational meeting. Its representative character and its authority are seen in the apostolic and sub-apostolic literature from Paul to Cyprian.

(2) The uniquely Christian correlation of the three conceptions of leadership, service and "gifts";

leadership depended on service, and service was possible by the possession and recognition of special "gifts" which were the evidence of the presence and power of the Spirit of Jesus within the community. These "gifts" gave the church a Divine authority to exercise rule and oversight apart from any special apostolic direction.

(3) The general evidence existing to show that there was a gradual growth of the principle of association from looser to more compact forms of organization (Gayford, article "Church" in HDB; also Harnack, The Expositor, 1887, January to June, 322-24), must not be forgotten; only one must remember that in young communities the growth is rapid.

(4) We must also bear in mind that the first Christians were well acquainted with various kinds of social organization which entered into their daily life and which could not fail to suggest how they might organize their new societies.

Examples occur readily:

(a) Every Jewish village community was ruled by its "seven wise men," and it is probable that the appointment of the "Seven" in the primitive Jewish church was suggested by familiarity with this example of social polity.

(b) It was and is an almost universal oriental usage that the "next of kin" to the founder was recognized, after the founder's death, to be the head of the new religious community founded, and this usage accounts for the selection of James, the eldest male surviving relative of our Lord, to be the recognized and honored head of the church in Jerusalem. James has been called the first bishop; but when we read in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 11, 1,2; 32,4; IV, 22, 4; III, 20, 1-8) how his successors were chosen, the term seems inappropriate. A succession in the male line of the kindred of Jesus, where the selection to office is mainly in the hands of a family council, and where two (James and Zoker) can rule together, has small analogy to episcopal rule.

(c) The relation of "patron" to "client," which in one form or other had spread throughout the civilized world, is suggested by a series of kindred words used to denote rulers in local churches. We find proistamenoi, prostatis, prostates, proestos, in various writers, and the last was used as late as the middle of the 2nd century to denote ministry in the Roman church (Ro 12:8; 16:2; 1Th 5:12; Hermas, Pastor. Vis. 2, 4; Justin, Apol, i.65).

(d) The Ro empire was honeycombed with "gilds," some recognized by law, most of them without legal recognition and liable to suppression. These confraternities were of very varied character—trades unions, burial clubs, etc., but a large proportion were for the purpose of practicing special religious rites.

The Jewish synagogues of the Dispersion seemed to have been enrolled among those confraternities, and certainly appeared to their heathen neighbors to be one kind of such private associations for the practice of a religion which had been legalized. Many scholars have insisted that the Gentile Christian churches

simply copied the organization of such confraternities (Renan, Les Apotres; Heinrici, Zeitschrift f. wissensch. Theol., 1876-77); Hatch, Organization of the Early Christian Churches). There must have been some external resemblances. Pliny believed that the Christian churches of Bithynia were illicit confraternities (Ep. 96; compare Lucian, Peregrinus Proteus). They had, in common with the churches, a democratic constitution; they shared a "common meal" at stated times; they made a monthly collection; they were ruled by a committee of office-bearers; and they exercised a certain amount of discipline over their members. Multitudes of Christians must have been members of such confraternites, and many continued to be so after accepting Christianity (Cyprian, Ep., lxvii. 6).

But while the Christian churches may have learned much about the general principles of associated life from all those varied forms of social organization, it cannot be said that they copied any one of them. The primitive Christian societies organized themselves independently in virtue of the new moral and social life implanted within them; and though they may have come to it by various paths, they all in the end arrived at one common form—a society ruled by a body of office-bearers who possessed the "gifts" of government and of subordinate service embodied in the offices of presbyter and deacon.

III. Threefold Congregational Ministry.

During the 2nd century the ministry was subject to a change. The ruling body of office-bearers in every congregation received a permanent president, who was called the pastor or bishop, the latter term being the commoner. The change came gradually. It provoked no strong opposition. By the beginning of the 3rd century it was everywhere accepted.

When we seek to trace the causes why the college of elders received a president, who became the center of all the ecclesiastical life in the local church and the one potent office-bearer, we are reduced to conjecture. This only can be said with confidence, that the change began in the East and gradually spread to the West, and that there are hints of a gradual evolution (Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries, 180, 183-85). Scholars have brought forward many reasons for the change; the need for an undivided leadership in times of danger from external persecution or from the introduction of Gnostic speculations which disturbed the faith of the members; the convenience of being represented to other local churches by one man who could charge himself with the administration of the external affairs of the congregation; the need of one man to preside at the solemn and crowning act of worship, the administration of the Lord’s Supper; the sense of congregational unity implied in the possession of one leader—each or all are probable ways in which the churches were influenced in making this change in their ministry.

This threefold congregational ministry is best seen in the Epistles of Ignatius of Antioch. They portray a Christian community having at its head a bishop, a presbyterium or session of elders, and a body of deacons. These form the ministry or office-bearers of the congregation to whom obedience is due. Nothing is to be done without the consent of the bishop, neither love-feast, nor sacrament, nor anything congregational. The ruling body is a court where the bishop sits as chairman surrounded by his council or session of elders; and the one is helpless without the other, for if the bishop be the lyre, the elders are

the chords, and both are needed to produce melody. Ignatius compares the bishop to Jesus, and the elders to the apostles who surrounded Him. There is no trace of sacerdotalism, apostolic succession, one-man government, diocesan rule in those letters of Ignatius; and what they portray is unlike any form of diocesan episcopacy.

1. Insistence on Organization:

It is interesting to remark how all throughout the 3rd century and later every body of Christians, even if consisting of fewer than twelve families, is instructed to organize itself into a church under a ministry of office-bearers, consisting of a bishop or pastor, at least two elders and at least three deacons. Should the bishop be illiterate—for character more than erudition determined his choice—the congregation was told to elect a reader, and provision was made for a ministry of women. It was possible to obey such instructions, because the ministry of the early church received no stipends. The ministry were office-bearers, to whom ecclesiastical obedience was due in virtue of their call and election and their being set apart by prayer, and perhaps by laying on of hands, for sacred office; but they were at the same time merchants, artisans, or engaged in other secular callings, and supported themselves. Buildings, set apart for public worship, did not exist until the very close of the 2nd century, and then only in a few populous centers in towns which had felt persecution but slightly. The only property which a church possessed, besides its copies of the Scriptures, its congregational records and perhaps a place of burial, were the offerings which were presented by members of the congregation, mostly in kind, after the Eucharist; and these offerings were distributed to the poor of the congregation. If office-bearers received a share, it was only on account of their poverty and because they were on the roll of widows, orphans and helpless poor.

This threefold congregational ministry has been called by some scholars "monarchical episcopacy," a title as high-sounding as it is misleading. The kingdom over which those so-called monarchs presided might and often did consist of less than twelve families, and their rule was fenced in with many restrictions. We can collect from the Epistles of Ignatius what were the powers and what the limitations (Epistle to Polycarp) of the bishop. He administered the finances of the church; he was president of the court of Elders; he had the right to call and presumably to preside over the court of discipline; and he had the regulation of the sacraments in his hands. On the other hand, it is very doubtful whether he, or even he in conjunction with the elders, could excommunicate; that appears to have remained in the hands of the congregational meeting. The bishop might convoke the congregational meeting for the purpose, but it belonged to the meeting and not to the bishop to appoint delegates and messengers to other churches; and the meeting had the power to order the bishop to go on such a mission.

(1) Aid Given in Selecting a Bishop.

From what has been said it is plain that the selection of a bishop became one of the most important acts a congregation was called upon to perform. Accordingly, provision was made for its assistance. It is declared in the Apostolic Canons that if a congregation contains fewer than twelve men competent to vote at the election of a bishop, neighboring, "well-established" churches are to be written to in order

that three men may be sent to assist the congregation in selecting their pastor (Sources of the Apostolic Canons, 7, 8). This is evidently the origin of what afterward became the custom and later a law, that the consecration of a bishop required the presence of three neighboring bishops—a rule which has given occasion to the saying that "all Christendom becomes Presbyterian on a consecration day." This custom and rule, which in its beginnings was simply practical assistance given to a weak by stronger congregations, came to bear the meaning that the bishop thus consecrated was an office-bearer in the church universal as well as the pastor of a particular congregation. It is also more than probable that this practice of seeking assistance in an emergency is the germ out of which grew the Synod—the earliest recorded synods being congregational meetings assisted in times of difficulty by advice of experienced persons from other churches.

(2) Bishops and Presbyters.

When a small group of villagers had been won to Christianity through the efforts of the Christian congregation in a neighboring town, they commonly were disinclined to separate from it, and came from their villages into town to join in the public worship. "On the day called Sunday," says Justin Martyr, "all who live in the city and in the country gather together into one place" (Ap., i.67). The earliest collections of canons show that the bishop was able in time of absence or sickness to delegate his duties to elders or even to deacons; and this enabled him, when occasion for it arose, to be, through his office-bearers, the pastor of several congregations. We can see the same process at work more clearly in large towns where the number of Christians had become very large. The bishop was always held to be the head of the Christian community, however large, in one place. He was the pastor; he baptized; he presided at the Holy Supper; he admitted catechumens to the full communion of the brotherhood. By the middle of the 3rd century the work in most large towns was more than one man could do. No record exists of the number of members belonging to the Roman church at this time, but some idea of its size may be obtained from the fact that it had more than 1,500 persons on its poor-roll; and before the close of the century the Roman Christians worshipped in over 40 separate places of meeting. It is obvious that one man could not perform the whole pastoral duties for such a multitude, and that most of the pastoral work must have been delegated to the elders or presbyters. The unity of the pastorate was for long strictly preserved by the custom that the bishop consecrated the communion elements in one church, and these were carried round to the other congregations. The bishop was thus the pastor in every congregation; the elders and deacons belonged to the whole Christian community; they served all the congregations and were not attached to one distinctively. In Alexandria, on the other hand, something like a parochial system gathered round the bishop, for individual presbyters were set over the separate congregations within the city. But always and without exception the original pastoral status of the bishop was preserved by the fact that one portion of the pastoral duties was invariably left in his hands—the rite of confirmation whereby catechumens were admitted to full communion.

II. Multiplication of Orders: Growth of a Hierarchy:

The middle of the 3rd century witnessed two changes in the ministry of the church. One was a multiplication of orders and the other the growth of a hierarchy; and while many causes went to produce these changes it can hardly be doubted that they were at least partly due to the imitation of pagan

religious organization. Although we find the distinction between those who are to be obeyed and those who are to obey clearly laid down in the Epistles of Paul, we do not find a common term in general use to denote the former class until the beginning of the 3rd century. In the west the word was ordo, and in the east clerus, from which come our "orders" and "clergy." Ordo was the designation for the municipality in towns or for the committee which presided over a confraternity; and clerus denoted rank or class. The introduction of ministerial stipends and the implication that a paid ministry was expected to give its whole time to the service of the church made the distinction between clergy and laity more emphatic. When we investigate the matter, it is evident that the fact that the clergy are paid complicates the question; for the earliest lists are evidently those who are entitled to share in the funds of the church, and widows and orphans figure as members of the ordo or clerus. Setting this disturbing element aside we find that the earliest division of the ministry in the 3rd century is into bishops, presbyters and deacons (all congregational); but bishops and presbyters are sometimes said to form the special ordo ecclesiasticus. The earliest addition to those three orders is the reader, and there follows soon the sub-deacon. Then come such persons as exorcists, acolyths, singers, door-keepers and even grave-diggers; and to such the name "minor orders" is given. All are included within the clergy, all receive a proportionate share of the revenues of the congregational funds. The presence of bishops, presbyters and deacons needs no explanation. Readers, as we have seen, were needed at first to assist illiterate bishops or pastors; their retention and the insertion of exorcists have been plausibly accounted for by the idea that they represented the absorption of the old prophetic ministry. But in instituting the other minor orders the Christian church evidently copied the pagan temple usages where persons who performed corresponding services were included among the temple ministry and had due share of the temple revenues. In the institution of a graded hierarchy including metropolitans and patriarchs, the churches probably followed the example of the great pagan organization called forth by the imperial cult of the Divi and Divae (Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry, 335 ff). As Mommsen remarks, "The conquering Christian church took its hierarchic weapons from the arsenal of the enemy."

IV. Synods:

Synods to begin with were essentially democratic assemblies. They were, in their primitive form, congregational meetings assisted in times of emergency by delegates (not necessarily bishops) from "well-established churches," and they grew to be the instrument by which churches grouped round one center became united into one compact organization. The times were not democratic, and gradually the presence of the laity and even of presbyters and deacons and their combined assent to the decisions of the assembly became more and more a matter of form and gradually ceased altogether. The synods consisted exclusively of bishops and became councils for registering their decisions; and this implied that each local church was fully and completely represented by its pastor or bishop, who had become very much of an autocrat, responsible, not to his congregation nor even to a synod, but to God alone. Before the end of the 3rd century and onward, synods or councils had become a regular part of the organization of the whole church, and the membership was confined to the bishops of the several churches included within the group. It was natural that such assemblies should meet in the provincial capitals, for the roads converged to the cities which were the seats of the Roman provincial administration. A synod required a chairman, and various usages obtained about the natural chairman. At first the oldest bishop present was placed in the chair, and this continued long to be the practice in

several parts of the empire. Gradually it became the habit to put into the chair the bishop of the town in which the council met, and this grew to a prescriptive right. It was then that the bishops of the towns which were the meeting-places of synods came to be called metropolitans. The title was for long one of courtesy only and did not carry with it any ecclesiastical rank and authority. But by the middle of the 4th century the metropolitans had acquired the right to summon the synods and even to exercise some authority over the bishops of the bounds, especially in the matter of election and consecration. When Christianity was thoroughly established as the religion of the empire, the more important bishops secured for themselves the civil precedence and privileges which had belonged to the higher priests of the abandoned Imperial Cult, and the higher ranks of the Christian ministry came into the possession of a lordship strangely at variance with their earlier position of service.

LITERATURE.

C. Vitringa, De synagoge vetere libra tres, Leucopetrae (Weissenfels), 1726; Bingham, Antiquities of the Christian Church, 1708-32; Bannermann, The Scripture Doctrine of the Church; Hort, The Christian Ecclesia; Lightfoot, Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (dissertation on the ministry); Hatch, The Organization of the Early Christian Church, and articles on "Orders" in Smith’s Dictionary of Christian Antiquities; Harnack, The Expositor for January to June, 1887, and Entstehung u. Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung .... in d. zwei ersten Jahrhunderten (1910) (English translation, The Constitution and Law of the Church); Lindsay, The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries; Schmiedel, article "Ministry" in EB; Gayford, article "Church" in HDB.

T. M. Lindsay

MINNI

min’-i (minni): A kingdom mentioned in Jer 51:27, along with Ararat and Ashkenaz, as assailants of Babylon. It is identified with the Minnai of the Assyrian inscriptions, in close relation with, or part of, Armenia.

MINNITH

min’-ith (minnith; Codex Vaticanus achris Arnon; Codex Alexandrinus eis Semoeith): After Jephthah defeated the Ammonites, he is said to have smitten them from Aroer "until thou come to Minnith" (Jud 11:33). Eusebius, Onomasticon mentions a place called Maanith, 4 Roman miles from Heshbon, on the road to Philadelphia (‘Amman), and locates Abelcheramim, which is mentioned with Minnith, 7 miles from Philadelphia, without indicating the direction. Some travelers have spoken of a Menjah, 7 miles East of Heshbon, but of this place Tristram (Land of Moab, 140) could find no trace. The same place appears to be mentioned in Eze 27:17 as supplying wheat, which figures in the trade between Judah and Tyre. There are really no reliable data on which to suggest an identification, while there are grave reasons to suspect the integrity of the text.

W. Ewing

MINSTREL

min’-strel.

See MUSIC.

MINT

mint (heduosmon): Mentioned (Mt 23:23; Lu 11:42) as one of the small things which were tithed. The cultivated variety (Mentha piperita), "peppermint," was doubtless primarily intended, but the wild Mentha silvestris or horsemint, which flourishes all over the mountains of Palestine, is probably included.

MIPHKAD; GATE OF

mif’-kad, (sha‘ar ha-miphqadh; the Revised Version (British and American) "Hammiphkad" (Ne 3:31)): A gate in, or near, the north end of the east wall of Jerusalem, rebuilt under Nehemiah. Its exact position is uncertain.

See JERUSALEM.

MIRACLE

mar’-a-k’-l:

I. THE NATURE OF MIRACLES

1. General Idea

2. Biblical Terms Employed

II. MIRACLE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Miracles in Gospel History

2. Special Testimony of Luke

3. Trustworthiness of Evidence in Gospels and Acts

III. MIRACLE AND LAWS OF NATURE

1. Projudgment of Negative Criticism

2. Sir George Stokes Quoted

3. Effects on Nature of New Agencies

4. Agreement with Biblical Idea and Terms

5. J.S. Mill on Miracle

6. Miracle as Connected with Command

IV. EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF MIRACLE

1. Miracles as Proofs of Revelation

2. Miracles of Christ in This Relation

3. Miracles Part of Revelation

V. MIRACLES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Analogy with New Testament Miracles

2. The Mosaic Miracles

3. Subsequent Miracles

4. Prophecy as Miracle

VI. ECCLESIASTICAL MIRACLES

1. Probability of Such Miracles

2. Pascal Quoted

VII. MIRACLE IN WORKS OR GRACE

LITERATURE.

I. Nature of Miracle.

1. General Idea:

"Miracle" is the general term for the wonderful phenomena which accompanied the Jewish and Christian revelation, especially at critical moments, and which are alleged to have been continued, under certain conditions, in the history of the Christian church. The miracle proper is a work of God (Ex 7:3 ff; De 4:34,35, etc.; Joh 3:2; 9:32,33; 10:38; Ac 10:38, etc.); but as supernatural acts miracles are recognized as possible to evil agencies (Mt 24:24; 2Th 2:9; Re 13:14; 16:14, etc.).

2. Biblical Terms Employed:

The Biblical idea of miracle as an extraordinary work of God, generally though not invariably ("providential" miracles—see below, II, 6), transcending the ordinary powers of Nature, wrought in connection with the ends of revelation, is illustrated by the terms used to describe miracles in the Old Testament and New Testament. One class of terms brings out the unusual, exceptional, and striking character of the works, as pele', niphla'oth (Ex 3:20; 15:11, etc.), teras, literally, "a portent" (in plural Mt 24:24; Ac 2:22,43, etc.); another lays stress on the power displayed in them, as gebhurah, dunamis (in plural "mighty works," the Revised Version margin "powers," Mt 11:20,21,23; 13:54; 14:2; 2Co 12:12, etc.); a third gives prominence to their teleological significance—their character as "signs," as 'oth (plural the Revised Version (British and American) "signs," Nu 14:22; De 11:3, etc.), semeion (plural the Revised Version (British and American) "signs," Joh 2:11,23, and frequently; Ac 4:16,22; 6:8; Re 13:14, etc.). Another Old Testament word for "wonder" or "miracle" is mopheth (Ex 7:9; De 29:3). See, further, below, III, 4.

II. Miracle in the New Testament.

1. Miracles in Gospel History:

The subject of miracles has given rise to much abstract discussion; but it is best approached by considering the actual facts involved, and it is best to begin with the facts nearest to us: those which are recorded in the New Testament. Our Lord's ministry was attended from first to last by events entirely beyond the ordinary course of Nature. He was born of a Virgin, and His birth was announced by angels, both to His mother, and to the man to whom she was betrothed (Matthew and Luke). He suffered death on the cross as an ordinary man, but on the third day after His crucifixion He rose from the tomb in which He was buried, and lived with His disciples for 40 days (Ac 1:3), eating and drinking with them, but with a body superior to ordinary physical conditions. At length He ascended to the heavens, and a cloud received Him out of their sight. But besides these two great miracles of His birth and His resurrection, Jesus was continually performing miracles during His ministry. His own words furnish the best description of the facts. In reply to the question of John the Baptist, His predecessor, He said, "Go

and tell John the things which ye hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them" (Mt 11:4,5). Specimens of these miracles are given in detail in the Gospel narratives; but it is a mistake to consider the matter, as is too often done, as though these particular miracles were the only ones in question. Even if they could be explained away, as has often been attempted, there would remain reiterated statements of the evangelists, such as Matthew's that He "went about in all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of disease and all manner of sickness among the people" (Mt 4:23), or Luke's "And a great number of the people from all Judea and Jerusalem, and the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon, who came to hear him, and to be healed of their diseases; and they that were troubled with unclean spirits were healed. And all the multitude sought to touch him; for power came forth from him, and healed them all" (Lu 6:17-19).

2. Special Testimony of Luke:

It must be borne in mind that if there is any assured result of modern criticism, it is that these accounts proceed from contemporaries and eyewitnesses, and with respect to the third evangelist there is one unique consideration of great import. The researches of Dr. Hobart have proved to the satisfaction of a scholar like Harnack, that Luke was a trained physician. His testimony to the miracles is therefore the nearest thing possible to the evidence which has often been desired—that of a man of science. When Luke, e.g., tells us of the healing of a fever (4:38,39), he uses the technical term for a violent fever recognized in his time (compare Meyer, in the place cited); his testimony is therefore that of One who knew what fevers and the healing of them meant. This consideration is especially valuable in reference to the miracles recorded of Paul in the latter part of Acts. it should always be borne in mind that they are recorded by a physician, who was an eyewitness of them.

3. Trustworthiness of Evidence in Gospels and Acts:

It seems to follow from these considerations that the working of miracles by our Lord, and by Paul in innumerable cases, cannot be questioned without attributing to the evangelists a wholesale untrustworthiness, due either to willful, or to superstitious misrepresentation, and this is a supposition which will certainly never commend itself to a fair and competent judgment. It would involve, in fact, such a sweeping condemnation of the evangelists, that it could never be entertained at all except under one presupposition, namely, that such miraculous occurrences, as being incompatible with the established laws of Nature, could not possibly have happened, and that consequently any allegations of them must of necessity be attributed to illusion or fraud.

III. Miracle and Laws of Nature.

1. Pre-judgment of Negative Criticism:

This, in fact, is the prejudgment or prejudice which has prompted, either avowedly or tacitly, the great mass of negative criticism on this subject, and if it could be substantiated, we should be confronted, in

the Gospels, with a problem of portentous difficulty. On this question of the abstract possibility of miracles, it seems sufficient to quote the following passage from the Gifford Lectures for 1891 of the late eminent man of science, Professor Sir George Stokes.

2. Sir George Stokes Quoted:

On page 23 Professor Stokes says: "We know very well that a man may in general act uniformly according to a certain rule, and yet for a special reason may on a particular occasion act quite differently. We cannot refuse to admit the possibility of something analogous taking place as regards the action of the Supreme Being. If we think of the laws of Nature as self-existent and uncaused, then we cannot admit any deviation from them. But if we think of them as designed by a Supreme Will, then we must allow the possibility of their being on some particular occasion suspended. Nor is it even necessary, in order that some result out of the ordinary course of Nature should be brought about, that they should even be suspended; it may be that some different law is brought into action, whereby the result in question is brought about, without any suspension whatever of the laws by which the ordinary course of Nature is regulated. .... It may be that the event which we call a miracle was brought about, not by any suspension of the laws in ordinary operation, but by the superaddition of something not ordinarily in operation, or, if in operation, of such a nature that its operation is not perceived."

3. Effects on Nature of New Agencies:

Only one consideration need be added to this decisive scientific statement, namely, that if there be agencies and forces in existence outside the ordinary world of Nature, and if they can under certain circumstances interpose in it, they must necessarily produce effects inconsistent with the processes of that world when left to itself. Life under the surface of the water has a certain course of its own when undisturbed; but if a man standing on the bank of a river throws a stone into it, effects are produced which must be as unexpected and as unaccountable as a miracle to the creatures who live in the stream. The nearness of two worlds which are absolutely distinct from one another receives, indeed, a striking illustration from the juxtaposition of the world above the water and the world below its surface. There is no barrier between them; they are actually in contact; yet the life in them is perfectly distinct. The spiritual world may be as close to us as the air is to the water, and the angels, or other ministers of God’s will, may as easily, at His word, interpose in it as a man can throw a stone into the water. When a stone is thus thrown, there is no suspension or modification of any law; it is simply that, as Sir George Stokes supposes in the case of a miracle, a new agency has interposed.

4. Agreement with Biblical Idea and Terms:

This, indeed, is the main fact of which miracles are irresistible evidence. They show that some power outside Nature, some supernatural power, has intervened. They are exactly described by the three words in the New Testament already mentioned. They are terata, "prodigies" or "wonders"; they are also dunameis, virtutes, "powers," or "manifestation of powers"; and finally they are semeia, "signs." The three conceptions are combined, and the source of such manifestations stated with them, in a pregnant

verse of Hebrews: "God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will" (2:4).

5. J. S. Mill on Miracle:

The words of J. S. Mill on the question of the possibility of miracles may also be quoted. Dealing with the objection of Hume in his Essay on Miracles, Mill observes: "In order that any alleged fact should be contradictory to a law of causation, the allegation must be, not simply that the cause existed without being followed by the effect, for that would be no uncommon occurrence; but that this happened in the absence of any adequate counteracting cause. Now in the case of an alleged miracle, the assertion is the exact opposite of this. It is that the effect was defeated, not in the absence, but in consequence, of a counteracting cause, namely, a direct interposition of an act of the will of some being who has power over Nature; and in particular of a Being, whose will being assumed to have endowed all the causes with the powers by which they produce their effects, may well be supposed able to counteract them. A miracle (as was justly remarked by Brown) is no contradiction to the law of cause and effect; it is a new effect, supposed to be produced by the introduction of a new cause. Of the adequacy of that cause, if present; there can be no doubt; and the only antecedent improbability which can be ascribed to the miracle is the improbability that any such cause existed" (System of Logic, II, 161-62).

6. Miracle as Connected with Command:

There is, however, one other important characteristic of miracles—of those at least with which we are concerned—namely, that they occur at the command, or at the prayer, of the person to whom they are attributed. This is really their most significant feature, and the one upon which their whole evidential value depends. One critic has compared the fall of the fortifications of Jellalabad, on a critical occasion, with the fall of the walls of Jericho, as though the one was no more a miracle than the other. But the fall of the walls of Jericho, though it may well have been produced by some natural force such as an earthquake, bears the character of a miracle because it was predicted, and was thus commanded by God to occur in pursuance of the acts prescribed to Joshua. Similarly the whole significance of our Lord’s miracles is that they occur at His word and in obedience to Him. "What manner of man is this," exclaimed the disciples, "that even the winds and the sea obey him?" (Mt 8:27).

IV. Evidential Value of Miracle.

1. Miracles as Proofs of Revelation:

This leads us to the true view of the value of miracles as proofs of a revelation. This is one of the points which has been discussed in far too abstract a manner. Arguments have been, and still are, constructed to show that there can be no real revelation without miracles, that miracles are the proper proof of a revelation, and so on. It is always a perilous method of argument, perhaps a presumptuous one, to attempt to determine whether God could produce a given result in any other way than the one which He has actually adopted. The only safe, and the sufficient, method of proceeding is to consider whether as a

matter of fact, and in what way, the miracles which are actually recorded do guarantee the particular revelation in question.

2. Miracles of Christ in This Relation:

Consider our Lord's miracles in this light. Assuming, on the grounds already indicated, that they actually occurred, they prove beyond doubt that He had supreme command over Nature; that not only the winds and the sea, but the human soul and body obeyed him, and in the striking words of the English service for the Visitation of the Sick, that He was "Lord of life and death, and of all things thereto pertaining, as youth, strength, health, age, weakness and sickness." This is the grand fact which the miracles establish. They are not like external evidence, performed in attestation of a doctrine. They are direct and eloquent evidence of the cardinal truth of our faith, that our Lord possessed powers which belong to God Himself. But they are not less direct evidence of the special office He claimed toward the human race—that of a Saviour. He did not merely work wonders in order that men might believe His assertions about Himself, but His wonderful works, His powers—virtues—were direct evidence of their truth. He proved that He was a Saviour by doing the works of a Saviour, by healing men and women from their diseases of both body and soul. It is well known that salvation in the true sense, namely, saving men out of evils and corruptions into which they have fallen, is an idea which was actually introduced into the world by the gospel. There was no word for it in the Roman language. The ancients know of a servator, but not of a salvator. The essential message of the miracles is that they exhibit our Lord in this character—that of one who has alike the will and the power to save. Such is our Lord's own application of them in His answer, already quoted, to the disciples of John the Baptist (Mt 11:4,5).

3. Miracles Part of Revelation:

It is therefore an extraordinary mistake to suppose that the evidence for our faith would not be damaged if the miracles were set aside. We should lose the positive evidence we now possess of our Lord's saving power. In this view, the miracles are not the mere proofs of a revelation; they are themselves the revelation. They reveal a Saviour from all human ills, and there has been no other revelation in the world of such a power. The miracles recorded of the apostles have a like effect. They are wrought, like Peter's of the impotent man, as evidence of the living power of the Saviour (Ac 3; 4). "Be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in him doth this man stand here before you whole. .... And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved" (Ac 4:10,12). In a word, the miracles of the New Testament, whether wrought by our Lord or by His apostles, reveal a new source of power, in the person of our Lord, for the salvation of men. Whatever interference they involve with the usual order of Nature is due, not to any modification of that order, but to the intervention of a new force in it. The nature of that force is revealed by them, and can only be ascertained by observation of them. A man is known by his words and by his deeds, and to these two sources of revelation, respecting His person and character, our Lord expressly appealed. "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father" (Joh 10:37,38).

It is therefore a mistake to try to put the evidence of the miracles into a logically demonstrative argument. Paley stated the case too much in this almost anathematized form.

"It is idle," he said, "to say that a future state had been discovered already. It had been discovered as the Copernican system was; it was one guess among many. He alone discovers who proves; and no man can prove this point but the teacher who testifies by miracles that his doctrine comes from God" (Moral and Polit. Philosophy, book V, chapter ix, close).

Coleridge, in the Aids to Reflection, criticizes the above and puts the argument in a more just and more human form.

"Most fervently do I contend, that the miracles worked by Christ, both as miracles and as fulfillments of prophecy, both as signs and as wonders, made plain discovery, and gave unquestionable proof, of His Divine character and authority; that they were to the whole Jewish nation true and appropriate evidences, that He was indeed come who had promised and declared to their forefathers, Behold your God will come with vengeance, even God, with a recompense! He will come and save you. I receive them as proofs, therefore, of the truth of every word which He taught who was Himself the Word: and as sure evidences of the final victory over death and of the life to come, in that they were manifestations of Him who said: I am the resurrection and the life!" (note prefatory to Aphorism CXXIII).

This seems the fittest manner in which to contemplate the evidence afforded by miracles.

V. Miracles in the Old Testament.

1. Analogy with New Testament Miracles:

If the miracles ascribed to our Lord and His apostles are established on the grounds now stated, and are of the value just explained, there can be little difficulty in principle in accepting as credible and applying the miracles of the Old Testament. They also are obviously wrought as manifestations of a Divine Being, and as evidences of His character and will.

2. The Mosaic Miracles:

This, e.g., was the great purpose of the miracles wrought for the deliverance of the people of Israel out of Egypt. The critical theories which treat the narrative of those events as "unhistorical" are, I am convinced, unsound. If they could be established, they would deprive us of some of the most precious evidences we possess of the character of God. But, in any case, the purpose to which the alleged miracles are ascribed is of the same character as in the case of the New Testament miracles. "For ask now," says Moses, "of the days that are past .... whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? Did ever a people hear the voice of God speaking out of the midst of the fire, as thou hast heard, and live? Or hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by trials, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by an

outstretched arm, and by great terrors, according to all that Yahweh your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? Unto thee it was showed, that thou mightest know that Yahweh he is God; there is none else besides him" (De 4:32-35). The God of the Jews was, and is, the God manifested in those miraculous acts of deliverance. Accordingly, the Ten Commandments are introduced with the declaration: "I am Yahweh thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage," and on this follows: "Thou shalt have no other gods before me" (Ex 20:2,3). Without these miracles, the God of the Jews would be an abstraction. As manifested in them, He is the living God, with a known character, "a just God and a Saviour" (Isa 45:21), who can be loved with all the heart, and soul, and mind, and strength.

3. Subsequent Miracles:

The subsequent miracles of Jewish history, like those wrought by Elijah, serve the same great end, and reveal more and more both of the will and the power of God. They are not mere portents, wrought as an external testimony to a doctrine. They are the acts of a living Being wrought through His ministers, or with their cooperation, and He is revealed by them. If the miracles of the New Testament were possible, those of the Old Testament were possible, and as those of the New Testament reveal the nature and will of Christ, by word and deed, so those of the Old Testament reveal the existence, the nature, and the will of God. Nature, indeed, reveals God, but the miracles reveal new and momentous acts of God; and the whole religious life of the Jews, as the Psalms show, is indissolubly bound up with them. The evidence for them is, in fact, the historic consciousness of a great and tenacious nation.

4. Prophecy as Miracle:

It should be added that the Jewish Scriptures embody one of the greatest of miracles—that of prophecy. It is obvious that the destiny of the Jewish people is predicted from the commencement, in the narrative of the life of Abraham and onward. There can, moreover, be no question that the office of the Christ had been so distinctly foreshadowed in the Scriptures of the Old Testament that the people, as a whole, expected a Messiah before He appeared. our Lord did not, like Buddha or Mohammed, create a new office; He came to fill an office which had been described by the prophets, and of which they had predicted the functions and powers. We are told of the Saviour, "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself" (Lu 24:27). That, again, is a revelation of God’s nature, for it reveals Him as "knowing the end from the beginning," and as the Ruler of human life and history.

VI. Ecclesiastical Miracles.

1. Probability of Such Miracles:

Some notice, finally, must be taken of the question of what are called ecclesiastical miracles. There seems no sufficient reason for assuming that miracles ceased with the apostles, and there is much evidence that in the early church miraculous cures, both of body and soul, were sometimes vouchsafed.

There were occasions and circumstances when the manifestation of such miraculous power was as appropriate as testimony of the living power of Christ, as in the scenes in the Acts. But they were not recorded under inspired guidance, like the miracles of the Apostolic Age, and they have in many cases been overlaid by legend.

2. Pascal Quoted:

The observation in Pascal's Thoughts eminently applies to this class of miracles: "It has appeared to me that the real cause (that there are so many false miracles, false revelations, etc.) is that there are true ones, for it would not be possible that there should be so many false miracles unless there were true, nor so many false religions unless there were one that is true. For if all this had never been, it is impossible that so many others should have believed it. .... Thus instead of concluding that there are no true miracles since there are so many false, we must on the contrary say that there are true miracles since there are so many false, and that false miracles exist only for the reason that there are true; so also that there are false religions only because there is one that is true" (On Miracles).

VII. Miracle in Works of Grace.

It has lately been argued with much earnestness and force in Germany, particularly by J. Wendland, in his Miracles and Christianity, that belief in miracles is indispensable to our apprehension of a real living God, and to our trust in His saving work in our own souls. The work of grace and salvation, indeed, is all so far miraculous that it requires the influence upon our nature of a living power above that nature. It is not strictly correct to call it miraculous, as these operations of God's Spirit are now an established part of His kingdom of grace. But they none the less involve the exercise of a like supernatural power to that exhibited in our Lord's miracles of healing and casting out of demons; and in proportion to the depths of man's Christian life will he be compelled to believe in the gracious operation on his soul of this Divine interposition.

On the whole, it is perhaps increasingly realized that miracles, so far from being an excrescence on Christian faith, are indissolubly bound up with it, and that there is a complete unity in the manifestation of the Divine nature, which is recorded in the Scriptures.

LITERATURE.

Trench, Notes on the Miracles; Mozley, Bampton Lectures (Mozley's argument is perhaps somewhat marred by its too positive and controversial tone, but, if the notes be read as well as the Lectures, the reader will obtain a comprehensive view of the main controversies on the subject); A.B. Bruce, The Miraculous Element in the Gospels. For modern German views see J. Wendland, Miracles and Christianity; Christlieb, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. Paley's Evidences and Butler's Analogy may profitably be consulted. On continuance of miracles, see Bushnell, Nature and the Supernatural, chapter xiv, and Christlieb, as above, Lecture V.

H. Wace

MIRACLES, GIFT OF

See SPIRITUAL GIFTS; MIRACLE.

MIRAGE

me-razh’ (sharabh, "heat-mirage"; Arabic sarab, from verb which means "to go forth," "to flow"; hence, "flowing of water"): "The glowing sand shall become a pool, and the thirsty ground springs of water" (Isa 35:7); the King James Version has "parched ground" and the Revised Version margin "mirage." The same Hebrew word is also used in Isa 49:10, "Neither shall the heat (margin "mirage") nor sun smite them." These are the only uses of the word in the Scriptures, although mirages are very common in the drier parts of the country. However, the context in both cases seems to justify the translation usually given, rather than "mirage."

Alfred H. Joy

MIRE

mir.

See CHALKSTONE; CLAY; MARSH.

MIRIAM

mir’-i-am (miryam; Septuagint and the New Testament Mariam; English Versions of the Bible of the New Testament "Mary"):

(1) Daughter of Amram and Jochebed, and sister of Aaron and Moses. It is probable that it was she who watched the ark of bulrushes in which the child Moses was laid (Ex 2:4). She associated herself with her brothers in the exodus, is called "the prophetess," and led the choir of maidens who sang the triumph-song after the crossing of the Red Sea (Ex 15:20 f). Along with Aaron, she opposed Moses at Hazeroth (Nu 12:1-5). She was smitten with leprosy in punishment, but on Aaron’s intercession was pardoned and healed (Nu 12:10-15). She died and was buried at Kadesh (Nu 20:1). In the Deuteronomic Law respecting leprosy, Miriam is mentioned as a warning to the Israelites (De 24:8 f). In Mic 6:4, she is referred to along with Moses and Aaron as a leader of God’s people.

(2) Son (or daughter) of Jether (1Ch 4:17). The latter half of the verse is in its present situation unintelligible; it should probably follow verse 18 (see Curtis, Chronicles, in the place cited.).

John A. Lees

MIRMAH

mur’-ma (mirmah, "deceit"): A Benjamite (1Ch 8:10).

MIRROR

mir’er.

See LOOKING-GLASS.

MISAEL

mis’-a-el, mi’-sa-el (Codex Alexandrinus Misael; Codex Vaticanus Meisael):

(1) One of those who stood on Ezra’s left hand as he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:44 equals "Mishael," Ne 8:4).

(2) In The So of the Three Children verse 66 (Septuagint Da 1:7), for "Mishael," one of Daniel’s companions in captivity.

MISAIAS

mi-sa’-yas, mi-si’-as: the Revised Version margin equals "Masias."

MISCHIEF

mis’-chif: The word, in the sense of "hurt" or "evil" befalling, plotted against, or done to, anyone, represents a variety of Hebrew terms (e.g. ‘acon, the King James Version Ge 42:4; 44:29; Ex 21:22; ra‘, 1Sa 23:9; 2Sa 16:8; 1Ki 11:25, etc.; ‘amal, Ps 7:14,16; 10:7,14; Pr 24:2, etc.). Sometimes the Revised Version (British and American) changes the word, as to "evil" (Ex 32:12,22); in Ac 13:10, to "villany" (rhadiourgia).

In the Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha the word is used for kaka, "evils," Additions to Esther 13:5 (compare Sirach 19:28); kakia, "evil," 1 Macc 7:23; and Latin malum, "evil," 2 Esdras 15:56. "Mischievous" is used, Additions to Esther 14:19, for ponereuomai, "to be evil." The use in the King James Version Apocrypha is considerably more extended (Sirach 11:33; 19:27; 27:27, etc.).

James Orr

MISGAB

mis’-gab (ha-misgabh; Codex Vaticanus Amath; Codex Alexandrinus to krataioma): Named with Nebo and Kiriathaim in the denunciation of doom against Moab (Jer 48:1). No trace of any name resembling this has been found. Possibly we should take it, not as a place-name, but as an appellation of some strong fortress, perhaps of Kir-moab itself. The term is elsewhere translated "high fortress" (Isa 25:12, etc.).

MISHAEL

mish’-a-el, mi’-sha-el (misha’el, perhaps equals "who is equal to God?"):

(1) A Kohathite, 4th in descent from Levi (Ex 6:22). He and his brother Elzaphan carried out Moses’ order to remove from the sanctuary and the camp the corpses of Nadab and Abihu (Le 10:4 f).

(2) A supporter of Ezra at the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4).

(3) The Hebrew name of one of Daniel’s 3 companions (Da 1:6,7,11,19; 2:17). His Babylonian name was MESHACH (which see).

MISHAL

mi’-shal (mish’al): A town in the territory of Asher (Jos 19:26, the King James Version "Misheal," Maasa), assigned to the Gershonite Levites (Jos 21:30; Codex Vaticanus Bassellan; Codex Alexandrinus Masaal equals "Mashal" of 1Ch 6:74). Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Masan") places it near Carmel by the sea. It is not identified.

MISHAM

mi’-sham (mish‘am): A Benjamite, son of Elpaal (1Ch 8:12).

MISHEAL

mish’-e-al.

See MISHAL.

MISHMA

mish’ma (mishma‘):

(1) A son of Ishmael (Ge 25:14; 1Ch 1:30).

(2) A Simeonite (1Ch 4:25).

MISHMANNAH

mish-man’-a (mishmannah): A Gadite warrior who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:10).

MISHNA

mish’-na.

See TALMUD.

MISHNEH

mish’-ne (ha-mishneh; 2Ki 22:14; 2Ch 34:22, the King James Version "college," the Revised Version (British and American) "second quarter," margin "Hebrew Mishneh"; Ze 1:10, the King James Version "the second," the Revised Version (British and American) "second quarter," margin "Hebrew: Mishneh"): A part of Jerusalem, apparently not far from the FISH GATE (which see) and the MAKTESH (which see). The translation "college" is due to Targum of Jonathan on 2Ki 22:14. The Revised Version (British and American) interpretation of Mishneh is connected with the belief that Hezekiah, when he built "the other wall without" (2Ch 32:5), made the second wall on the North. There seems little evidence of this (see JERUSALEM, VI, 11), and the "second" may refer to the district of the city on the west hill or perhaps to the hill itself.

See COLLEGE.

E. W. G. Masterman

MISHOR

mi’-shor.

See PLAIN, and also note in HDB, III, 309.

MISHRAITES

mish’-ra-its (ha-mishraʻi): One of the families of Kiriath-jearim (1Ch 2:53).

MISPAR

mis’-par (micpar): An exile who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2). the King James Version spells the name "Mizpar." In the parallel verse of Nehemiah it appears as "Mispereth" (Ne 7:7).

MISPERETH

mis’-pe-reth (micpereth).

See MISPAR.

MISREPHOTH-MAIM

miz-re-foth-ma’-im (misrephoth mayim; Septuagint Maseron, Masereth Memphomaim): A place to which Joshua chased the various tribes, which were confederated under Jabin, after their defeat at the waters of Merom (Jos 11:8). It follows the mention of great Sidon, as though it was a place in the same region but farther from the point of departure. In Jos 13:6, it is also mentioned in connection with the Sidonians, as though it was included in their territory, so it must have been in the coast district, or Phoenicia, which was in that period dominated by Sidon. The Canaanites who were among the tribes forming the hosts of Jabin would naturally seek refuge among their brethren in Sidon and its territory. They fled across the hill country which lies between the waters of Merom and the coast, but as Sidon is situated considerably to the North of Merom, some would seek the coast by a more southerly route, and we may look for Misrephoth-maim there. Dr. Thomson (LB, II, 266-67, edition 1882) locates it at Ras el-Musheirifeh, some 13 miles South of Tyre, where there was a stronghold, and where the fugitives might find refuge (see LADDER OF TYRE). Though the name hardly suggests Misrephoth-maim, the identification may be accepted until some better one is found.

H. Porter

MIST

(’edh; achlus, homichie): Mist is caused by particles of water vapor filling the air until it is only partially transparent. Mist and haze produce much the same effect, the one being due to moisture in the atmosphere and the other to dust particles. Mist or fog is not common on the plains of Palestine and Syria at sea-level, but is of almost daily occurrence in the mountain valleys, coming up at night and disappearing with the morning sun (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:4). It is nothing else than a cloud touching the land. In the account of creation, "there went up a mist from the earth," giving a description of the warm humid atmosphere of the carboniferous ages which agrees remarkably with the teaching of modern science (Ge 2:6). The word is used figuratively in Ac 13:11 to describe the shutting out of light. Those who bring confusion and uncertainty are compared to "mists driven by a storm" (2Pe 2:17).

See VAPOR.

Alfred H. Joy

MISTRESS

mis’-tres (ba‘alah, gebhereth): Is the translation of ba‘alah, "lady," "owner" (1Ki 17:17; Na 3:4); in 1Sa 28:7, "a woman that hath a familiar spirit" is literally, "the mistress of a familiar spirit"; of gebhereth (Ge 16:4,8,9; 2Ki 5:3; Ps 123:2; Pr 30:23; Isa 24:2); in Isa 47:5,7, we have the King James Version and the English Revised Version "lady," the American Standard Revised Version "mistress."

MITE

mit (lepton): The smallest copper or bronze coin current among the Jews. They were first struck by the Maccabean princes with Hebrew legends, and afterward by the Herods and the Roman procurators with Greek legends. The "widow’s mite" mentioned in Mr 12:42 and Lu 21:2 was probably of the first kind, since those with Greek legends were regarded as unlawful in the temple service. According to Mark, the lepton was only half a kodrantes (Latin quadrans), which would indicate a value of about one-fourth of a cent or half an English farthing.

See MONEY.

H. Porter

MITHKAH

mith’-ka (mithqah "sweetness"; the King James Version Mithcah): Name given owing to sweetness of pasture or water. A desert camp of the Israelites between Terah and Hashmonah (Nu 33:28 f).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MITHNITE

mith’-nit (ha-mithni): Designation of Jehoshaphat, one of David’s officers (1Ch 11:43).

MITHRADATES

mith-ra-da’-tez (Codex Alexandrinus Mithradates; Codex Vaticanus Mithridates; the King James Version Mithridates):

(1) The treasurer of Cyrus to whom the king committed the vessels which had been taken from the temple and who delivered them to the governor, Sanabassar (1 Esdras 2:11 equals "Mithredath" of Ezr 1:8).

(2) Apparently another person of the same name—one of the commissioners stationed in Samaria who wrote a letter to Artaxerxes persuading him to put a stop to the rebuilding of Jerusalem (1 Esdras 2:16 equals "Mithredath" of Ezr 4:7).

S. Angus

MITHREDATH

mith’-re-dath (mithredhath; Persian equals "gift of Mithra" or "consecrated to Mithra"):

(1) The Persian treasurer through whom Cyrus restored the sacred vessels to the returning Jewish exiles (Ezr 1:8).

(2) A Persian, perhaps an official, who was associated with Bishlam and Tabeel in corresponding with Artaxerxes concerning the restoration of Jerusalem (Ezr 4:7). In 1 Esdras 2:11,16, the name is written MITHRADATES (which see).

MITRE

mi’-ter In the King James Version this word renders two Hebrew words, both of which, however, come from the same stem, namely, tsanaph, "to coil" or "to wrap round." In Ex 28, a mitre (the Revised Version margin "turban") is enumerated among Aaron’s articles of dress, which were to be made by tailors of recognized skill. On the forefront of the mitre was a "plate of pure gold" with the words "Holy to Yahweh" (i.e. consecrated to Yahweh) inscribed upon it. This gold plate was fastened to the mitre by a blue ribbon. The material of the mitre was fine linen or silk. The word for the headtire (the King James Version "bonnet") of the ordinary priest was a different word. Ezekiel uses the word in connection with Zedekiah (21:26); the prophet associated regal and priestly functions with the throne. It is possible, however, that the two sentences—"remove the mitre," and "take off the crown"—refer to the degradation of the priesthood and of the throne which the downfall of Jerusalem will involve. The Septuagint varies between kidaris and mitra, the former word being used in Sirach 45:12.

T. Lawns

MITYLENE

mit-i-le’-ne, mit-i-lye’-nye (Mitulene, or Mutilene as usually on coins):

1. Importance and History:

In antiquity the most important city of the Asiatic Aeolians and of the island of Lesbos. It had 2 harbors and strong fortresses. The city was noted for its high culture and for its zeal for art and science from the earliest times. The island, under the leadership of Mitylene, revolted in 428 BC from the Athenian confederacy. The city was besieged by the Athenians and finally taken. The inhabitants of Mitylene were treated with great severity; the walls were dismantled, and the city was deprived of its power on the sea. In the time of Alexander the Great, Mitylene suffered most through the Persians, and later by the occupation of the Macedonians, but afterward regained its power and prosperity, and still later was favored by the Roman emperors, being made a free city by Pompey.

In the Middle Ages, the name Mitylene was applied to the whole island. The present capital, often called simply Castro, has a large castle built on the site of the ancient acropolis (in 1373). The city was conquered by the Turks in 1462. It contains 14 mosques, 7 churches, and has a population of about 15,000.

2. Paul’s Visit:

On his third missionary journey, Paul traveled to the Hellespont from Philippi, thence through the Troad by land to Assos on the southern side—where extensive excavations were carried on in 1881 by an American archaeological expedition—thence by ship to Mitylene (Ac 20:14), where he spent the night. Leaving Lesbos, he sailed southward to a point opposite the island of Chios (Ac 20:15). There is no record that a Christian church had been established in Mitylene at this time.

LITERATURE.

Tozer, Islands of the Aegean, 121, 134 f, 136; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 291 ff.

J. E. Harry

MIXED, MULTITUDE

mikst, mul’-ti-tud.

See MINGLED PEOPLE.

MIZAR, THE HILL

mi’-zar, (har mits‘ar; oros mikros): The name of a mountain found only in Ps 42:6; "I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and the Hermons, from the hill Mizar." The term may be taken as an appellative meaning "littleness" and the phrase mehar mits‘ar would then mean "from the little mountain," i.e. the

little mountain of Zion. Some scholars think that the "m" in mehar may have arisen from dittography, and that we should read, "from the land of Jordan, and the Hermons, O thou little mountain (of Zion)." G. A. Smith discusses the question in a note (HGHL, 477). He suggests that certain names found in the district (za‘ura, wady za‘arah, and Khirbet Mazara) may be a reminiscence of the name of a hill in the district called Mits‘ar; and surly none other would have been put by the Psalmist in apposition to the Hermons. Cheyne says: "To me this appendage to Hermonim seems a poetic loss. Unless the little mountain has a symbolic meaning I could wish it away." I cannot see this: the symbolic meanings suggested for Hermonim and Mits‘ar are all forced, and even if we got a natural one, it would be out of place after the literal land of Jordan. To employ all as proper names is suitable to a lyric. No identification is at present possible.

W. Ewing

MIZPAH; MIZPEH

miz’-pa, miz’-pe: This name is pointed both ways in the Hebrew, and is found usually with the article. The meaning seems to be "outlook" or "watchtower." It is natural, therefore, to look for the places so named in high positions commanding wide prospects.

(1) (ha-mitspah (Ge 31:49; Jud 11:11,34), mitspah (Ho 5:1), mitspeh ghil‘adh (Jud 11:29); Massepha, ten skopian, and other forms): It seems probable that the same place is intended in all these passages, and that it is identical with Ramath-mizpeh of Jos 13:26. It is the place where Jacob and Laban parted in Mt. Gilead; consequently it lay to the North of Mahanaim. Here was the home of Jephthah, to which he returned after the defeat of the Aremonites, only to realize how his rash vow had brought desolation to his house. It was taken by Judas Maccabeus, who destroyed the inhabitants and burned the city (1 Macc 5:35). Jerash, and Kal‘at er-Rabad; but these seem all to lie South of any possible site for Mahanaim. A ruined site was discovered by Dr. Schumacher (M und NPDV, 1897, 86), with the name Macfa, which is just the Arabic equivalent of the Hebrew Mitspah. It lies some distance to the Northwest of Jerash and claims consideration in any attempt to fix the site of Mizpah.

(2) (’erets ha-mitspah (Jos 11:3), biq‘ath mitspeh (verse 8); Masseuman, Massephath, and other forms): The "land of Mizpah" and the "valley of Mizpah" may be taken as applying to the same district. It lay on the southwest slopes of Hermon Northeast of the Waters of Merom. The site must be looked for on one of the heights in the region indicated, from which a wide view is obtained. MuTallah, a Druze village standing on a hill to the North of ‘Abil and East of Nahr el-Chasbany, was suggested by Robinson. The present writer agrees with Buhl (GAP, 240) that the ancient castle above Banias, Kal‘at ec-Cubeibeh, occupies a more likely position.

(3) (mitspeh; Maspha): A town in the Shephelah of Judah named with Dilan, Joktheel and Lachish (Tell el-Hesy). Eusebius, Onomasticon mentions a Macfa in the neighborhood of Eleutheropolis, to the North. The identification proposed by Van de Velde and Guerin would suit this description. They would locate Mizeph at Tell ec-Cafiyeh, about 7 1/2 miles Northwest of Beit Jibrin, "a conspicuous hill with a

glittering white cliff rising like an isolated block above the adjacent country" (PEFS, 1903, 276). Many identify this site with Gath, but the name and character of the place point rather to identification with Mizpeh, the Blanche Guarde or Alba Specula of the Middle Ages.

(4) (ha-mitspah; Massema, Maspha): A town in the territory of Benjamin (Jos 18:26). Hither came the men of Israel to deal with the Benjamites after the outrage on the Levite's concubine (Jud 20:1,3; 21:1,5,8). At Mizpah, Samuel gathered his countrymen. While there crying to God in their distress, they were attacked by the Philistines, whom they defeated with great slaughter (1Sa 7:5, etc.). Here also Saul, the son of Kish, was chosen king, after which Samuel told the people the "manner of the kingdom" (10:17, etc.). Mizpah was fortified by Asa, king of Judah, with materials which Baasha, king of Israel, had used to fortify Ramah (1Ki 15:22; 2Ch 16:6). When Nebuchadnezzar captured Jerusalem and made Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, governor of the remnant of the people left in the land of Judah, the governor's residence was fixed at Mizpah (2Ki 25:23). Here he was joined by Jeremiah, whom Nebuzaradan, captain of the Babylonian guard, had set free. At Mizpah, Ishmael, son of Nathaiah, treacherously slew Gedaliah and many who were with him. Two days later he murdered a company of pilgrims, throwing their dead bodies into the great cistern which Asa had made when strengthening the place against possible attack by Baasha of Samaria. He then made prisoners of the people, including the king's daughters, and attempted to convey them away to the Ammonites, an attempt that was frustrated by Johanan, son of Kareah (Jer 40$; 41$). Mizpah was the scene of memorable assembly in a day of sore anxiety for Judah, when Judas Maccabeus called the warriors of Judah together for counsel and prayer (1 Macc 3:46). From this passage we also learn that the place was an ancient sanctuary—"for in Mizpah there was a place of prayer aforetime for Israel."

It has been proposed to identify Mizpah with Tell Nasbeh, a site on the watershed South of Bireh. The Abbe Raboisson established the fact that Jerusalem can be seen from this point. In this respect it agrees with Maundeville's description. "It is a very fair and delicious place, and it is called Mt. Joy because it gives joy to pilgrims' hearts, for from that place men first see Jerusalem." But Jer 41:10 may be taken as decisive against this identification. Ishmael departed to go east. From Tell Nasbeh this would never have brought him to the great waters that are in Gibeon (PEFS, 1898, 169, 251; 1903, 267). A more probable identification is with Neby Samwil, a village on high ground 4 1/2 miles Northwest of Jerusalem, the traditional burying-place of Samuel. It is 2,935 ft. above sea-level, and 500 ft. higher than the surrounding land. Here the pilgrims coming up by way of Beth-heron from Jaffa, the ancient route, first saw the Holy City. The mosque of the village was formerly a church, dating from Crusading times; and here the tomb of Samuel is shown. If this is the ancient Mizpah, a very slight detour to the North would bring Ishmael to the great waters that are in Gibeon, el-Jib (Gibeon) being only a mile and a quarter distant.

(5) (mitspeh mo'abh "Mizpeh of Moab"; Masepha): A town in Moab to which David took his parents for safety during Saul's pursuit of him (1Sa 22:3). It is possibly to be identified with Kir-moab, the modern Kerak, whither David would naturally go to interview the king. But there is no certainty. Possibly we should read "Mizpah" instead of "the hold" in 1Sa 22:5.

(6) In 2Ch 20:24, probably we should read "Mizpah" instead of "watch-tower": ha-mitspeh la-midhbar

would then point to a Mizpeh of the Wilderness to be sought in the district of Tekoa (20:20).

W. Ewing

MIZPAR

miz’-par.

See MISPAR.

MIZRAIM

miz’-ra-im (mitsrayim):

(1) A son of Ham, and ancestor of various peoples, Ludim, Anamim, etc. (Ge 10:6,13; 1Ch 1:8,11).

See TABLE OF NATIONS.

(2) The name of Egypt.

See EGYPT.

The land of Ham.—cham, was another name for the land of Egypt. It occurs only in Ps 105:23,17; 106:22; Ps 78:51 probably refers to the land of Ham, though it may refer to the children of Ham. The origin and significance of this name are involved in much obscurity. Two improbable etymologies and one probable etymology for Ham as a name of Egypt have been proposed, and the improbable ones very much urged:

(1) Ham is often thought to be a Hebrew appropriation of the Egyptian name "Kemt," a name for the "black land" as distinguished from "desherr," the red land of the desert which surrounded it. This etymology is very attractive, but phonetically very improbable to say the least.

(2) Ham has sometimes been connected directly with cham, the second son of Noah whose descendants under the name Mitsraim occupied a part of Northeastern Africa. But as there is no trace of this name among the Egyptians and no use of it in the historical books of the Old Testament, this can hardly be said to be a probable derivation of the word.

(3) There is a third proposed etymology for Ham which connects it ultimately but indirectly with Ham, the second son of Noah. Some of the earliest sculptures yet found in Egypt represent the god Min (Menu; compare Koptos by Professor Petrie). This god seems also to have been called Khem, a very exact Egyptian equivalent for Cham, Ham, the second son of Noah and the ancestor of the Hamitic

people of Egypt. That Ham the son of Noah should be deified in the Egyptian pantheon is not surprising. The sensuality of this god Min or Khem also accords well with the reputation for licentiousness borne by Ham the son of Noah. These facts suggest very strongly a trace in Egyptian mythology of the actual history of the movements of Hamitic people.

(4) While the preceding division (3) probably states the real explanation of the early name of Egypt, it still remains to be noted that the use of the name Ham by the Psalmist may be entirely poetic. Until it be found that the name Ham was applied to Egypt by other writers of that period it will ever be in some measure unlikely that the Psalmist was acquainted with the mythological use of the name Ham in Egypt, and so, in equal measure, probable that he meant nothing more than to speak of the land of the descendants of Ham the son of Noah.

See also HAM.

M. G. Kyle

MIZZAH

miz’-a (mizzah, "strong," "firm"): Grandson of Esau, one of the "dukes" of Edom (Ge 36:13,17; 1Ch 1:37).

MNASON

na’-son, m’-na’-son (Mnason): All that we know of Mnason is found in Ac 21:16.

(1) He accompanied Paul and his party from Caesarea on Paul’s last visit to Jerusalem;

(2) he was a Cyprian;

(3) "an early disciple," an early convert to Christianity, and

(4) the one with whom Paul’s company was to lodge.

The "Western" text of this passage is very interesting. Blass, following Codex Bezae (D), the Syriac, reads, for "bringing," etc., "And they brought us to those with whom one should lodge, and when we had come into a certain village we stayed with Mnason a Cyprian, an early disciple, and having departed thence we came to Jerusalem and the brethren," etc. Meyer-Wendt, Page and Rendell render the accepted text, "bringing us to the house of Mnason," etc. However, giving the imperfect transitive of anebainomen, "we were going up" to Jerusalem (21:15), we might understand that the company lodged with Mnason on the 1st night of their journey to Jerusalem, and not at the city itself. "Ac 21:15, they set about the journey; 21:16, they lodged with Mnason on the introduction of the Cesarean disciples; 21:17,

they came to Jerus" (Expositor’s Greek Testament, in the place cited.).

S. F. Hunter

MOAB; MOABITES

mo’-ab, mo’-ab-its (Moab, mo’abh, Moabite Stone, M-’-B; Greek (Septuagint) Moab, he Moabeitis, Moabitis; Moabite, mo’abhi; Moabites, bene mo’abh):

1. The Land:

Moab was the district East of the Dead Sea, extending from a point some distance North of it to its southern end. The eastern boundary was indefinite, being the border of the desert which is irregular. The length of the territory was about 50 miles and the average width about 30. It is a high tableland, averaging some 3,000 ft. above the level of the Mediterranean and 4,300 ft. above that of the Dead Sea. The aspect of the land, as one looks at it from the western side of the Dead Sea, is that of a range of mountains with a very precipitous frontage, but the elevation of this ridge above the interior is very slight. Deep chasms lead down from the tableland to the Dead Sea shore, the principal one being the gorge of the river Arnon, which is about 1,700 ft. deep and 2 or more miles in width at the level of the tableland, but very narrow at the bottom and with exceedingly precipitous banks. About 13 miles back from the mouth of the river the gorge divides, and farther back it subdivides, so that several valleys are formed of diminishing depth as they approach the desert border. These are referred to in Nu 21:14 as the "valleys of the Arnon." The "valley of Zered" (Nu 21:12), which was on the southern border, drops down to the southern end of the Dead Sea, and although not so long or deep as the Arnon, is of the same nature in its lower reaches, very difficult to cross, dividing into two branches, but at a point much nearer the sea. The stream is not so large as the Arnon, but is quite copious, even in summer. These gorges have such precipitous sides that it would be very difficult for an army to cross them, except in their upper courses near the desert where they become shallow. The Israelites passed them in that region, probably along the present Hajj road and the line of the Mecca Railway. The tableland is fertile but lacks water. The fountains and streams in the valleys and on the slopes toward the Dead Sea are abundant, but the uplands are almost destitute of flowing water. The inhabitants supply themselves by means of cisterns, many of which are ancient, but many of those used in ancient times are ruined. The population must have been far greater formerly than now. The rainfall is usually sufficient to mature the crops, although the rain falls in winter only. The fertility of the country in ancient times is indicated by the numerous towns and villages known to have existed there, mentioned in Scripture and on the Moabite Stone, the latter giving some not found elsewhere. The principal of these were: Ar (Nu 21:15); Ataroth, Dibon, Jazer, Nimrah, Nebo (Nu 32:3); Beth-peor (De 3:29); Beth-diblaim, Bozrah, Kerioth (Jer 48:22-24); Kir (Isa 15:1); Medeba, Elealeh, Zoar (Isa 15:2,4,5); Kirheres (Isa 16:11); Sibmah (Jos 13:19); in all, some 45 place-names in Moab are known, most of the towns being in ruins. Kir of Moab is represented in the modern Kerak, the most important of all and the government center of the district. Madeba now represents the ancient Medeba, and has become noted for the discovery of a medieval map of Palestine, in mosaic, of considerable archaeological value. Rabbath-moab and Heshbon (modern

Rabba and Hesban) are miserable villages, and the country is subject to the raids of the Bedouin tribes of the neighboring desert, which discourages agriculture. But the land is still good pasture ground for cattle and sheep, as in ancient times (Nu 32:3,4).

2. The People:

The Moabites were of Semitic stock and of kin to the Hebrews, as is indicated by their descent from Lot, the nephew of Abraham (Ge 19:30-37), and by their language which is practically the same as the Hebrew. This is clear from the inscription on the Moabite Stone, a monument of Mesha, king of Moab, erected about 850 BC, and discovered among the ruins of Dibon in 1868. It contains 34 lines of about 9 words each, written in the old Phoenician and Hebrew characters, corresponding to the Siloam inscription and those found in Phoenicia, showing that it is a dialect of the Semitic tongue prevailing in Palestine. The original inhabitants of Moab were the Emim (De 2:10), "a people great .... and tall, as the Anakim." When these were deposed by the Moabites we do not know. The latter are not mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters and do not appear on the Egyptian monuments before the 14th century BC, when they seem to be referred to under the name of Ruten, or Luten or Lotan, i.e. Lot (Paton, Syria and Pal); Muab appears in a list of names on a monument of Rameses III of the XXth Dynasty. The country lay outside the line of march of the Egyptian armies, and this accounts for the silence of its monuments in regard to them.

3. Religion:

The chief deity of Moab was Chemosh (kemosh), frequently mentioned in the Old Testament and on the Moabite Stone, where King Mesha speaks of building a high place in his honor because he was saved by him from his enemies. He represents the oppression of Moab by Omri as the result of the anger of Chemosh, and Mesha made war against Israel by command of Chemosh. He was the national god of Moab, as Molech was of Ammon, and it is pretty certain that he was propitiated by human sacrifices (2Ki 3:27). But he was not the only god of Moab, as is clear from the account in Nu 25, where it is also clear that their idolatrous worship was corrupt. They had their Baalim like the nations around, as may be inferred from the place-names compounded with Baal, such as Bamoth-baal, Beth-baal-meon and Baal-peor.

4. History:

We know scarcely anything of the history of the Moabites after the account of their origin in Ge 19 until the time of the exodus. It would seem, however, that they had suffered from the invasions of the Amorites, who, under their king Sihon, had subdued the northern part of Moab as far as the Arnon (Nu 21:21-31). This conquest was no doubt a result of the movement of the Amorites southward, when they were pressed by the great wave of Hittite invasion that overran Northern Syria at the end of the 15th and the early part of the 14th centuries BC. The Amorites were forced to seek homes in Palestine, and it would seem that a portion of them crossed the Jordan and occupied Northern Moab, and here the Israelites found them as they approached the Promised Land. They did not at first disturb the Moabites

in the South, but passed around on the eastern border (De 2:8,9) and came into conflict with the Amorites in the North (Nu 21:21-26), defeating them and occupying the territory (Nu 21:31-32). But when Balak son of Zippor, king of Moab, saw what a powerful people was settling on his border, he made alliance with the Midianites against them and called in the aid of Balaam, but as he could not induce the latter to curse them he refrained from attacking the Israelites (Nu 22; 24). The latter, however, suffered disaster from the people of Moab through their intercourse with them (Nu 25). Some time before the establishment of the kingdom in Israel the Midianites overran Moab, as would appear from the passage in Ge 36:35, but the conquest was not permanent, for Moab recovered its lost territory and became strong enough to encroach upon Israel across the Jordan. Eglon of Moab oppressed Israel with the aid of Ammon and Amalek (Jud 3:13-14), but Eglon was assassinated by Ehud, and the Moabite yoke was cast off after 18 years. Saul smote Moab, but did not subdue it (1Sa 14:47), for we find David putting his father and mother under the protection of the king of Moab when persecuted by Saul (1Sa 22:3,4). But this friendship between David and Moab did not continue. When David became king he made war upon Moab and completely subjugated it (2Sa 8:2). On the division of the kingdom between Rehoboam and Jeroboam the latter probably obtained possession of Moab (1Ki 12:20), but it revolted and Omri had to reconquer it (M S), and it was tributary to Ahab (2Ki 1:1). It revolted again in the reign of Ahaziah (2Ki 1:1; 3:5), and Moab and Ammon made war on Jehoshaphat and Mt. Seir and destroyed the latter, but they afterward fell out among themselves and destroyed each other (2Ch 20). Jehoshaphat and Jehoram together made an expedition into Moab and defeated the Moabites with great slaughter (2Ki 3). But Mesha, king of Moab, was not subdued (2Ki 3:27), and afterward completely freed his land from the dominion of Israel (M S). This was probably at the time when Israel and Judah were at war with Hazael of Damascus (2Ki 8:28,29). Bands of Moabites ventured to raid the land of Israel when weakened by the conflict with Hazael (2Ki 13:20), but Moab was probably subdued again by Jeroboam II (2Ki 14:25), which may be the disaster to Moab recounted in Isa 15. After Mesha we find a king of the name of Salamanu and another called Chemosh-nadab, the latter being subject to Sargon of Assyria. He revolted against Sennacherib, in alliance with other kings of Syria and Palestine and Egypt, but was subdued by him, and another king, Mutsuri, was subject to Esarhaddon. These items come to us from the Assyrian monuments. When Babylon took the place of Assyria in the suzerainty, Moab joined other tribes in urging Judah to revolt but seems to have come to terms with Nebuchadnezzar before Jerusalem was taken, as we hear nothing of any expedition of that king against her. On the war described in Judith, in which Moab (1:12, etc.) plays a part.

See JUDITH.

At a later date Moab was overrun by the Nabathean Arabs who ruled in Petra and extended their authority on the east side of Jordan even as far as Damascus (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xv, 1,2). The Moabites lost their identity as a nation and were afterward confounded with the Arabs, as we see in the statement of Josephus (XIII, xiii, 5), where he says that Alexander (Janneus) overcame the Arabians, such as the Moabites and the Gileadites. Alexander built the famous stronghold of Macherus in Moab, on a hill overlooking the Dead Sea, which afterward became the scene of the imprisonment and tragical death of John the Baptist (Josephus, BJ, VII, vi, 2; Ant, XVIII, v, 2; Mr 6:21-28). It was afterward destroyed by the Romans. Kir became a fortress of the Crusaders under the name of Krak (Kerak), which held out against the Moslems until the time of Saladin, who captured it in 1188 AD.

LITERATURE.

Commentaries on the passages in the Old Testament relating to Moab, and histories of Israel; Paton, Early History of Syria and Palestine; Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, especially Assyria and Babylonia; Conder, Heth and Moab; G. A. Smith, HGHL; the Moabite Stone; Josephus.

H. Porter

MOABITE STONE

A monument erected at Dibon (Dhiban) by Mesha, king of Moab (2Ki 3:4,5), to commemorate his successful revolt from Israel and his conquest of Israelite territory. It was discovered, August 19, 1868, by a German missionary, V. Klein, who unfortunately took neither copy nor squeeze of it. It was 3 ft. 10 inches high and 2 ft. broad, with a semicircular top. The Berlin Museum entered into negotiations for the purchase of it, but while these were proceeding slowly, M. Clermont-Ganneau, then dragoman of the French consulate at Jerusalem, sent agents to take squeezes and tempt the Arabs to sell it for a large sum of money. This led to interference on the part of the Turkish officials, with the result that in 1869 the Arabs lighted a fire under the Stone, and by pouring cold water on it broke it into pieces which they carried away as charms. M. Clermont-Ganneau, however, succeeded in recovering a large proportion of these, and with the help of the squeezes was able to rewrite the greater part of the inscription. The last and most definitive edition of the text was published by Professors Smend and Socin in 1886 from a comparison of the fragments of the original (now in the Louvre) with the squeezes (in Paris and Bale) and photographs.

The following is (with some unimportant corrections) Dr. Neubauer’s translation of the inscription, based upon Smend and Socin’s text:

(1) I (am) Mesha, son of Chemosh-melech, king of Moab, the Dibonite.

(2) My father reigned over Moab 30 years and I reigned

(3) after my father. I have made this monument (or high place) for Chemosh at Qorchah, a monument of salvation,

(4) for he saved me from all invaders (or kings), and let me see my desire upon all my enemies. Omri

(5) was king of Israel, and he oppressed Moab many days, for Chemosh was angry with his

(6) land. His son (Ahab) followed him and he also said: I will oppress Moab. In my days (Chemosh) said:

(7) I will see (my desire) on him and his house, and Israel surely shall perish for ever. Omri took the land of

(8) Medeba (Nu 21:30), and (Israel) dwelt in it during his days and half the days of his son, altogether 40 years. But Chemosh (gave) it back

(9) in my days. I built Baal-Meon (Jos 13:17) and made therein the ditches (or wells); I built

(10) Kirjathaim (Nu 32:37). The men of Gad dwelt in the land of Ataroth (Nu 32:3) from of old, and the king of Israel built there

(11) (the city of) Ataroth; but I made war against the city and took it. And I slew all the (people of)

(12) the city, for the pleasure of Chemosh and of Moab, and I brought back from them the Arel (’-r-’-l of Dodah (d-w-d-h) and bore

(13) him before Chemosh in Qerioth (Jer 48:24). And I placed therein the men of Sharon and the men

(14) of Mehereth. And Chemosh said unto me: Go, seize Nebo of Israel and

(15) I went in the night and fought against it from the break of dawn till noon; and I took

(16) it, slew all of them, 7,000 men and (boys?), women and (girls?),

(17) and female slaves, for to Ashtar-Chemosh I devoted them. And I took from thence the Arels (’-r-’-l-y)

(18) of Yahweh and bore them before Chemosh. Now the king of Israel had built

(19) Jahaz (Isa 15:4), and he dwelt in it while he waged war against me, but Chemosh drove him out from before me. And

(20) I took from Moab 200 men, all chiefs, and transported them to Jahaz which I took

(21) to add to Dibon. I built Qorchah, the Wall of the Forests and the Wall

(22) of the Ophel, and I built its gates and I built its towers. And

(23) I built the House of Moloch, and I made sluices for the water-ditches in the midst

(24) of the city. And there was no cistern within the city of Qorchah, and I said to all the people: Make

for

(25) yourselves every man a cistern in his house. And I dug the canals (or conduits) for Qorchah by means of the prisoners

(26) from Israel. I built Aroer (De 2:36), and I made the road in Arnon. And

(27) I built Beth-Bamoth (Nu 26:19) for it was destroyed. I built Bezer (De 4:43), for in ruins

(28) (it was. And all the chiefs?) of Dibon were 50, for all Dibon is loyal, and I

(29) placed 100 (chiefs?) in the cities which I added to the land; I built

(30) (Beth)-Mede(b)a (Nu 21:30) and Beth-diblathaim (Jer 48:22), and Beth-Baal-Meon (Jer 48:23), and transported the shepherds (?)

(31) ....(with) the flock(s) of the land. Now in Choronaim (Isa 15:5) there dwelt (the children?) ....

(32) ....(and) Chemosh said unto me: Go down, make war upon Choronaim. So I went down (and made war

(33) upon the city, and took it, and) Chemosh dwelt in it during my days. And I went up (?) from thence; I made ....

(34) ... And I .... "

The Biblical character of the language of the inscription will be noticed as well as the use of "forty" to signify an indefinite period of time. As in Israel, no goddess seems to have been worshipped in Moab, since the goddess Ashtoreth is deprived of the feminine suffix, and is identified with the male Chemosh (Ashtar-Chemosh). Dodah appears to have been a female divinity worshipped by the side of Yahweh; the root of the name is the same as that of David and the Carthaginian Dido. The Arels were "the champions" of the deity (Assyrian qurart), translated "lion-like men" in the King James Version (2Sa 23:20; compare Isa 33:7). There was an Ophel in the Moabite capital as well as at Jerusalem.

The alphabet of the inscription is an early form of the Phoenician, and resembles that of the earliest Greek inscriptions. The words are divided from one another by dots, and the curved forms of some of the letters (b, k, l, margin, n) presuppose writing with ink upon papyrus, parchment or potsherds.

The revolt of Mesha took place after Ahab’s death (2Ki 3:5). At the battle of Qarqar in 854 BC, when the Syrian kings were defeated by Shalmaneser II, no mention is made of Moab, as it was included in Israel. It would seem from the inscription, however, that Medeba had already been restored to Mesha,

perhaps in return for the regular payment of his tribute of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams with their wool (2Ki 3:4).

LITERATURE.

Clermont-Ganneau, La stele de Mesa, 1870; Ginsburg, Moabite Stone, 1871; R. Sinend and A. Socin, Die Inschrift des Konigs Mesa von Moab, 1886; A. Neubauer in Records of the Past, 2nd series, II, 1889; Lidzbarski, Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik, 1898, 4-83, 415.

A. H. Sayce

MOABITESS

mo'-ab-it-es, mo-ab-i'-tes (mo'abhiyah): A woman, or in plural women, of Moab. The term is applied to Ru (1:22; 2:2,6,21; 4:5,10); to some of Solomon's wives (1Ki 11:1); and to Shimrith, whose son shared in the murder of King Joash (2Ch 24:26).

See MOAB.

MOADIAH

mo-a-di'-a.

See MAADIAH.

MOCHMUR, THE BROOK

mok'-mur, ho cheimarrhos Mochmour): The torrent bed in a valley on which stood Chusi, not far from Ekrebel (Judith 7:18). The latter may be identified with 'Aqrabeh, East of Nablus. Wady Makhfuriyeh runs to the South of 'Aqrabeh, and probably represents the ancient Mochmur.

MOCK; MOCKER; MOCKING

mok, mok'er, mok'-ing (hathal, la'agh, empaizo): To mock is the translation of hathal, "to play upon," "mock," "deride" (Jud 16:10,13,15; 1Ki 18:27, "Elijah mocked them"; Job 13:9 twice, the Revised Version (British and American) "deceiveth," "deceive," margin "mocketh," "mock"); of la'agh, "to stammer" or "babble in mimicry," "to mock" or "scorn" (2Ch 30:10; Ne 4:1; Job 11:3; 21:3; Pr 1:26; 17:5; 30:17; Jer 20:7). Other words are tsachaq, "to laugh," etc. (Ge 19:14; 21:9; , 39:14,17); qalac, "to call out," or "cry after," "to scoff" or "mock at" (2Ki 2:23; Eze 22:5); sachaq, "to laugh," "mock" (Job 39:22; La 1:7); luts, "to scorn" (Pr 14:9); sechoq, "laughter," "derision" (Job 12:4); empaizo, "to treat as a child," "mock" (Mt 2:16; 20:19; 27:29,31,41; Lu 14:29, etc.); diachleuazo, "to mock," "laugh," etc. (Ac

2:13; 17:32); mukterizo, "to sneer at," "mock," literally, "to turn up the nose" (Ga 6:7, "God is not mocked," "will not let himself be mocked"); epigelao, "laugh" (Job 2:8; RAPC 1Ma 7:34; compare RAPC 2Ma 7:39; 8:17).

Mocker, hathulim, "deceivers," "mockers" (Job 17:2); luts (Pr 20:1; Isa 28:22 the King James Version); la‘egh, "stammering," "mocking" (Ps 35:16; compare Isa 28:11); sachaq (Jer 15:17); empaiktes, "a mocker," "scoffer," literally, "sporting as children" (Jude 1:18; compare 2Pe 3:3).

Mocking is the translation of qallacah "mocking," "derision" (Eze 22:4); of empaigmos the Septuagint for qallacah) (Heb 11:36; RAPC Wis 12:25; Ecclesiasticus 27:28, "mockery"; RAPC 2Ma 7:7, "mocking-stock," the Revised Version (British and American) "the mocking"; 2 Macc 7:10, "made a mocking-stock" (empaizo)); of mokos (Ecclesiasticus 33:6).

For "mocked of" (Job 12:4) the Revised Version (British and American) has "a laughing-stock to"; for "mockers" (Isa 28:22), the English Revised Version "scorner," the American Standard Revised Version "scoffer"; for "the mockers" (Jer 15:17), "them that made merry"; for "scorneth" (Pr 19:28), "mocketh at"; for "As one man mocketh another, do ye so mock him?" (Job 13:9), "As one deceiveth a man will ye deceive him?" (margin, "mocketh," "mock"); "mock" for "laugh" (Job 9:23); for "There shall come in the last days scoffers" (2Pe 3:3), "In the last days (margin, "Greek in the last of the days") mockers shall come with mockery" (empaigmone empaiktai).

W. L. Walker

MODAD, BOOK OF ELDAD AND

See ELDAD AND MODAD, BOOK OF.

MODERATELY

mod’-er-at-li (litsedhaqah): "Moderately" is the King James Version translation of litsedhaqah, "righteousness" (Joe 2:23, "for he hath given you the former rain moderately," margin "according to righteousness," the Revised Version (British and American) "in just measure," margin "in (or for) righteousness"). In Php 4:5 the King James Version, toe pieikes is translated moderation: "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand," the Revised Version (British and American) "forbearance," margin "or gentleness"; compare 2Co 10:1. The proper meaning of this word has been the subject of considerable discussion; epieikeia is translated "clemency" (Ac 24:4), "gentleness" (of Christ) (2Co 10:1); epieikes is "gentle" (1Ti 3:3; Tit 3:2; Jas 3:17; 1Pe 2:18).

Trench says (Synonyms of the New Testament, 151): "It expresses exactly that moderation which recognizes the impossibility cleaving to formal law, of anticipating and providing for all cases that will emerge and present themselves to it for decision; which, with this, recognizes the danger that ever waits upon the assertion of legal rights, lest they should be pushed into moral wrongs, lest the ‘summum jus’

should in practice prove the ‘summa injuria,’ which therefore, pushes not its own rights to the uttermost, but going back in part or in the whole from these, rectifies and redresses the injustices of justice. It is thus more truly just than strict justice would have been; no Latin word exactly and adequately renders it; clementia sets forth one side of it, aequitas another, and perhaps modestia (by which the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translations it in 2Co 10:1) a third; but the word is wanting which should set forth all these excellences reconciled in a single and higher one." Its archetype and pattern, he points out, is found in God, who does not stand upon or assert strict rights in His relations to men.

Lightfoot has "forbearance": "Let your gentle and forbearing spirit be recognized by all men. The judgment is drawing nigh." Hastings prefers "considerateness" or "sweet reasonableness" (HDB, III, 413); "‘ Gentleness’ and ‘forbearance’ are too passive. The ‘considerateness’ of the Bible, whether applied to God or man, is an active virtue. It is the Spirit of the Messiah Himself, who will not break the bruised reed nor quench the smoking flax, and it is the spirit of every follower who realizes that ‘the Lord is at hand.’ " The want of this "considerateness" too often mars our religious life and spoils its influence.

W. L. Walker

MODERATION

mod-er-a’-shun (to epieikes): The word occurs once in the King James Version, Php 4:5.

MODIN

mo’-din (Modeein, Modein, Modeeim, and other forms; in the Talmud it is called modhi‘im, and modhi‘ith (Neubauer, Geographie du Talmud, 99)): This place owes its interest to the part it played in the history of the Maccabees. It was the ancestral home of their family (1 Macc 2:17,70). Hither Mattathias, a priest of the sons of Joarib, retired when he had seen with a burning heart "the blasphemies that were committed in Judah and in Jerus" under the orders of Antiochus Epiphanes. But the king’s officer followed him, and by offers of the king’s friendship and great rewards sought to seduce the people into idolatry. This only fed the indignation of Mattathias, and when a Jew went forward to sacrifice, Mattathias slew him on the altar together with the king’s officer. From such a step there could be no going back. Thus began the patriotic enterprise which, led by the old priest’s heroic sons, was destined to make illustrious the closing days of the nation’s life (1 Macc 2:1 ff; Ant, VI, i, 2; BJ, I, i, 3). Mattathias, his wife and sons were all buried in Modin (1 Macc 2:70; 9:19; 13:25-30; Ant, XII, xi, 2; XIII, vi, 6). Near Modin Judas pitched his camp, whence issuing by night with the watchword "Victory is God’s," he and a chosen band of warriors overwhelmed the army of Antiochus Eupator (2 Macc 13:14). In Modin Judas and John, the sons of Simon, slept before the battle in which they defeated Cendebaeus (1 Macc 16:4).

Of the impressive monument erected by Simon over the tombs of his parents and brethren Stanley (History of the Jewish Church, III, 318) gives the following account: "It was a square structure

surrounded by colonnades of monolith pillars, of which the front and back were of white polished stone. Seven pyramids were erected by Simon on the summit, for the father and mother and four brothers who now lay there, with the seventh for himself when his time should come. On the faces of the monuments were bas-reliefs, representing the accouterments of sword and spear and shield ‘for an eternal memorial’ of their many battles. There were also sculptures of ships—no doubt to record their interest in that long seaboard of the Philistine coast, which they were the first to use for their country’s good. A monument at once so Jewish in idea and so Gentilein execution was worthy of the combination of patriotic fervor and high philosophic enlargement of soul which raised the Maccabean heroes so high above their age." Guerin (La Samarie, II, 401; Galilee, I, 47) thought he had discovered the remains of this monument at Khirbet el-Gharbawi near Medyeh, in 1870. In this, however, he was mistaken, the remains being of Christian origin.

Various identifications have been proposed. Coba, about 6 miles West of Jerusalem, was for a time generally accepted. Robinson (BR, III, 151 f) suggested LaTrun. There is now a consensus of opinion in favor of el-Medyeh, a village to the East of Wady Mulaki, 13 miles West of Bethel. It occupies a strong position in the hills 6 miles East of Lydda, thus meeting the condition of Eusebius, Onomasticon, which places it near Lydda. The identification was suggested by Dr. Sandreczki of Jerusalem in 1869. From el-Medyeh itself the sea is not visible; but to the South rises a rocky height, er-Ras, which commands a wide view, including the plain and the sea. The latter is 16 miles distant. If the monument of Simon stood on er-Ras, which from the rock cuttings seems not improbable, it would be seen very clearly by overlooking from the sea, especially toward sunset (1 Macc 13:29). About 1/4 mile West of el-Medyeh are tombs known as Qubur el-Yehud, one bearing the name of Sheikh el-Gharbawi, whose name attaches to the ruins. This is the tomb referred to above.

W. Ewing

MOETH

mo’-eth (Moeth): Called "son of Sabannus," one of the Levites to whom, with the priest Mermoth, the silver and gold brought by Ezra from Babylon were committed (1 Esdras 8:63) =" Noadiah" of Ezr 8:33, but there styled "son of Binnui."

MOLADAH

mol’-a-da, mo-la’-da (moladhah; Molada): A place in the far south (Negebh) of Judah, toward Edom (Jos 15:26), reckoned to Simeon (Jos 19:2; 1Ch 4:28). It was repopulated after the captivity (Ne 11:26). It is mentioned always in close proximity to Beersheba. Moladah is probably identical with Malatha, a city in Idumea to which Agrippa at one time withdrew himself (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, vi, 2). The site of this latter city has by Robinson and others been considered to be the ruins and wells of Tell el-Milch, some 13 miles to the East of Beersheba and some 7 miles Southwest of Arad. The chief difficulty is the statement of Eusebius and Jerome that Malatha was "by Jattir," i.e. ‘Attir; if this is correct the Tell el-Milch is impossible, as it is 10 miles from ‘Attir, and we have no light at all on the site. See SALT,

CITY OF. For Tell el-Milch see PEF, III, 415-16, Sh XXV.

E. W. G. Masterman

MOLE

mol:

(1) tinshemeth, the King James Version "mole," the Revised Version (British and American) "chameleon"; Septuagint aspalax = spalax, "mole," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) talpa, "mole" (Le 11:30);

(2) choledh, English Versions of the Bible "weasel"; Septuagint gale, "weasel" or "pole-cat"; compare Arabic khuld, "mole-rat" (Le 11:29);

(3) chaphar-peroth, English Versions of the Bible "moles"; from chaphar, "to dig"; compare Arabic chafar, "to dig," and perah, "mole" or "rat," for pe’erah, from the root pa’ar, "to dig"; compare Arabic fa’rat, or farat, "rat," "mouse," from the root fa’ar, "to dig"; Septuagint tois mataiois, "vain, idle, or profane persons" (Isa 2:20):

(1) Tinshemeth is the last of 8 unclean "creeping things" in Le 11:29,30. The word occurs also in Le 11:18 and De 14:16, translated the King James Version "swan," the Revised Version (British and American) "horned owl," Septuagint porphurion, "coot" or "heron." See CHAMELEON.

(2) Choledh is the first in the same list. The word occurs nowhere else, and is translated "weasel" in English Versions of the Bible, but comparison with the Arabic khuld has led to the suggestion that "mole-rat" would be a better translation. See WEASEL.

(3) In Isa 2:20, "In that day men shall cast away their idols .... to the moles and to the bats," chaphar-peroth, variously written as one word or two, is translated "moles" in English Versions of the Bible, but has given rise to much conjecture.

The European "mole," Talpa europea, is extensively distributed in the temperate parts of Europe and Asia, but is absent from Syria and Palestine, its place being taken by the mole-rat, Spalax typhlus. The true mole belongs to the Insectivora, and feeds on earth-worms and insect larvae, but in making its tunnels and nests, it incidentally injures gardens and lawns. The mole-rat belongs to the Rodentia, and has teeth of the same general type as those of a rat or squirrel, large, chisel-shaped incisors behind which is a large vacant space, no canines, and praemolars and molars with grinding surfaces. It is larger than the mole, but of the same color, and, like the mole, is blind. It makes tunnels much like those of the mole. It is herbivorous and has been observed to seize growing plants and draw them down into its hole. In one of its burrows a central chamber has been found filled with entire plants of the chummuc or chick-pea, and two side chambers containing pods plucked from the plants in the central chamber. While the

mole digs with its powerful and peculiarly shaped front feet, the mole-rat digs with its nose, its feet being normal in shape.

See LIZARD.

Alfred Ely Day

MOLECH; MOLOCH

mo’-lek, mo’-lok (ha-molekh, always with the article, except in 1Ki 11:7; Septuagint ho Moloch, sometimes also Molchom, Melchol; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Moloch):

1. The Name

2. The Worship in Old Testament History

3. The Worship in the Prophets

4. Nature of the Worship

5. Origin and Extent of the Worship

LITERATURE

1. The Name:

The name of a heathen divinity whose worship figures largely in the later history of the kingdom of Judah. As the national god of the Ammonites, he is known as "Milcom" (1Ki 11:5,7), or "Malcam" ("Malcan" is an alternative reading in 2Sa 12:30,31; compare Jer 49:1,3; Ze 1:5, where the Revised Version margin reads "their king"). The use of basileus, and archon, as a translation of the name by the Septuagint suggests that it may have been originally the Hebrew word for "king," melekh. Molech is obtained from melekh by the substitution of the vowel points of Hebrew bosheth, signifying "shame." From the obscure and difficult passage, Am 5:26, the Revised Version (British and American) has removed "your Moloch" and given "your king," but Septuagint had here translated "Moloch," and from the Septuagint it found its way into the Ac (7:43), the only occurrence of the name in the New Testament.

2. The Worship in Old Testament History:

In the Levitical ordinances delivered to the Israelites by Moses there are stern prohibitions of Molech-worship (Le 18:21; 20:2-5). Parallel to these prohibitions, although the name of the god is not

mentioned, are those of the Deuteronomic Code where the abominations of the Canaanites are forbidden, and the burning of their sons and daughters in the fire (to Molech) is condemned as the climax of their wickedness (De 12:31; 18:10-13). The references to Malcam, and to David's causing the inhabitants of Rabbath Ammon to pass through the brick kiln (2Sa 12:30,31), are not sufficiently clear to found upon, because of the uncertainty of the readings. Solomon, under the influence of his idolatrous wives, built high places for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, and for Milcom, the abomination of the children of Ammon. See CHEMOSH. Because of this apostasy it was intimated by the prophet Ahijah, that the kingdom was to be rent out of the hand of Solomon, and ten tribes given to Jeroboam (1Ki 11:31-33). These high places survived to the time of Josiah, who, among his other works of religious reformation, destroyed and defiled them, filling their places with the bones of men (2Ki 23:12-14). Molech-worship had evidently received a great impulse from Ahaz, who, like Ahab of Israel, was a supporter of foreign religions (2Ki 16:12). He also "made his son to pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the nations, whom Yahweh cast out from before the children of Israel" (2Ki 16:3). His grandson Manasseh, so far from following in the footsteps of his father Hezekiah, who had made great reforms in the worship, reared altars for Baal, and besides other abominations which he practiced, made his son to pass through the fire (2Ki 21:6). The chief site of this worship, of which Ahaz and Manasseh were the promoters, was Topheth in the Valley of Hinnom, or, as it is also called, the Valley of the Children, or of the Son of Hinnom, lying to the Southwest of Jerusalem (see GEHENNA). Of Josiah's reformation it is said that "he defiled Topheth .... that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech" (2Ki 23:10).

3. The Worship in the Prophets:

Even Josiah's thorough reformation failed to extirpate the Molech-worship, and it revived and continued till the destruction of Jerusalem, as we learn from the prophets of the time. From the beginning, the prophets maintained against it a loud and persistent protest. The testimony of Amos (1:15; 5:26) is ambiguous, but most of the ancient versions for malkam, "their king," in the former passage, read milkom, the national god of Ammon (see Davidson, in the place cited.). Isaiah was acquainted with Topheth and its abominations (Isa 30:33; 57:5). Over against his beautiful and lofty description of spiritual religion, Micah sets the exaggerated zeal of those who ask in the spirit of the Molech-worshipper: "Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" (Mic 6:6). That Molech-worship had increased in the interval may account for the frequency and the clearness of the references to it in tile later Prophets. In Jeremiah we find the passing of sons and daughters through the fire to Molech associated with the building of "the high places of Baal, which are in the Valley of the Son of Hinnom" (32:35; compare 7:31 ff; 19:5 ff). In his oracle against the children of Ammon, the same prophet, denouncing evil against their land, predicts (almost in the very words of Amos above) that Malcam shall go into captivity, his priests and his princes together (Jer 49:1,3). Ezekiel, speaking to the exiles in Babylon, refers to the practice of causing children to pass through the fire to heathen divinities as long established, and proclaims the wrath of God against it (Eze 16:20 f; 20:26,31; 23:37). That this prophet regarded the practice as among the "statutes that were not good, and ordinances wherein they should not live" (Eze 20:25) given by God to His people, by way of deception and judicial punishment, as some hold, is highly improbable and inconsistent with the whole prophetic attitude toward it. Zephaniah, who prophesied to the men who saw the overthrow of the kingdom of

Judah, denounces God’s judgments upon the worshippers of false gods (Ze 1:5 f). He does not directly charge his countrymen with having forsaken Yahweh for Malcam, but blames them, because worshipping Him they also swear to Malcam, like those Assyrian colonists in Samaria who feared Yahweh and served their own gods, or like those of whom Ezekiel elsewhere speaks who, the same day on which they had slain their children to their idols, entered the sanctuary of Yahweh to profane it (Eze 23:39). The captivity in Babylon put an end to Molech-worship, since it weaned the people from all their idolatries. We do not hear of it in the post-exilic Prophets, and, in the great historical psalm of Israel’s rebelliousness and God’s deliverances (Ps 106), it is only referred to in retrospect (Ps 106:37,38).

4. The Nature of the Worship:

When we come to consider the nature of this worship it is remarkable how few details are given regarding it in Scripture. The place where it was practiced from the days of Ahaz and Manasseh was the Valley of Hinnom where Topheth stood, a huge altar-pyre for the burning of the sacrificial victims. There is no evidence connecting the worship with the temple in Jerusalem. Ezekiel’s vision of sun-worshippers in the temple is purely ideal (Eze 8). A priesthood is spoken of as attached to the services (Jer 49:3; compare Ze 1:4,5). The victims offered to the divinity were not burnt alive, but were killed as sacrifices, and then presented as burnt offerings. "To pass through the fire" has been taken to mean a lustration or purification of the child by fire, not involving death. But the prophets clearly speak of slaughter and sacrifice, and of high places built to burn the children in the fire as burnt offerings (Jer 19:5; Eze 16:20,21).

The popular conception, molded for English readers largely by Milton’s "Moloch, horrid king" as described in Paradise Lost, Book I, is derived from the accounts given in late Latin and Greek writers, especially the account which Diodorus Siculus gives in his History of the Carthaginian Kronos or Moloch. The image of Moloch was a human figure with a bull’s head and outstretched arms, ready to receive the children destined for sacrifice. The image of metal was heated red hot by a fire kindled within, and the children laid on its arms rolled off into the fiery pit below. In order to drown the cries of the victims, flutes were played, and drums were beaten; and mothers stood by without tears or sobs, to give the impression of the voluntary character of the offering (see Rawlinson’s Phoenicia, 113 f, for fuller details).

On the question of the origin of this worship there is great variety of views. Of a non-Sem origin there is no evidence; and there is no trace of human sacrifices in the old Babylonian religion. That it prevailed widely among Semitic peoples is clear.

5. Origin and Extent of the Worship:

While Milcom or Malcam is peculiarly the national god of the Ammonites, as is Chemosh of the Moabites, the name Molech or Melech was recognized among the Phoenicians, the Philistines, the Arameans, and other Semitic peoples, as a name for the divinity they worshipped from a very early time. That it was common among the Canaanites when the Israelites entered the land is evident from the fact

that it was among the abominations from which they were to keep themselves free. That it was identical at first with the worship of Yahweh, or that the prophets and the best men of the nation ever regarded it as the national worship of Israel, is a modern theory which does not appear to the present writer to have been substantiated. It has been inferred from Abraham's readiness to offer up Isaac at the command of God, from the story of Jephthah and his daughter, and even from the sacrifice of Hiel the Bethelite (1Ki 16:34), that human sacrifice to Yahweh was an original custom in Israel, and that therefore the God of Israel was no other than Moloch, or at all events a deity of similar character. But these incidents are surely too slender a foundation to support such a theory. "The fundamental idea of the heathen rite was the same as that which lay at the foundation of Hebrew ordinance: the best to God; but by presenting to us this story of the offering of Isaac, and by presenting it in this precise form, the writer simply teaches the truth, taught by all the prophets, that to obey is better than sacrifice—in other words that the God worshipped in Abraham's time was a God who did not delight in destroying life, but in saving and sanctifying it" (Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 254). While there is no ground for identifying Yahweh with Moloch, there are good grounds for seeing a community of origin between Moloch and Baal. The name, the worship, and the general characteristics are so similar that it is natural to assign them a common place of origin in Phoenicia. The fact that Moloch-worship reached the climax of its abominable cruelty in the Phoenician colonies of which Carthage was the center shows that it had found among that people a soil suited to its peculiar genius.

LITERATURE.

Wolf Baudissin, "Moloch" in PRE3; G. F. Moore, "Moloch" in EB; Robertson, Early Religion of Israel, 241-65; Robertson Smith, Religion of the Semites, 352 ff; Buchanan Gray, Hebrew Proper Names, 138 ff.

T. Nicol.

MOLI

mo'-li.

See MOOLI.

MOLID

mo'-lid (molidh): A Judahite (1Ch 2:29).

MOLLIFY

mol'-i-fi (from rakhakh, "to be soft"): "To make soft," used in modern English only figuratively, as "His anger was mollified." English Versions of the Bible, however, uses the word literally in its two

occurrences: Isa 1:6, "wounds, and bruises .... neither bound up, neither mollified with oil"; The Wisdom of Solomon 16:12, "mollifying plaister." Neither occurrence of the word is changed by the Revised Version (British and American).

MOLOCH

mo’-lok: A deity of the Ammonites, like the planet Saturn, a representative of the sun-god in the particular aspect of a god of time.

See ASTROLOGY, 8; MOLECH.

MOLTEN SEA

See LAVER.

MOLTEN, IMAGE

mol’-t’-n.

See IMAGES.

MOMDIS

mom’-dis (Codex Alexandrinus Momdeis; Codex Vaticanus Momdeios): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:34) equals "Maadai" in Ezr 10:34.

MOMENT

mo’-ment (regha‘, "a wink"; atomos, "an atom," stigme, "a point," parautika, immediately," "forthwith"): "Moment" is not used in Scripture for a division of time, but for an instant of time, as the wink or twinkling of the eye (Ex 33:5; Nu 16:21,45; La 4:6; 1Co 15:52), or for a short period of time (Job 20:5; Ps 30:5; Isa 26:20; 2Co 4:17). The division of the hour into sixty minutes was certainly known in Babylonia, and the Jews were made acquainted with it, at least during the captivity, but they do not seem to have adopted it very extensively.

H. Porter

MONEY

mun’-i: Various terms are used for money in the Bible, but the most common are the Hebrew keceph,

and Greek argurion, both meaning silver. We find also qesiTah, rendered by Septuagint "lambs," probably referring to money in a particular form; chalkos, is used for money in Mt 10:9; Mr 6:8; 12:41. It was the name of a small coin of Agrippa II (Madden, Coins of the Jews); chrema, "price," is rendered money in Ac 4:37; 8:18,20; 24:26; kerma, "piece," i.e. piece of money (Joh 2:15); didrachmon, "tribute money" (Mt 17:24 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "half-shekel"); kensos, "census," "tribute money" (Mt 22:19).

1. Material and Form:

Gold and silver were the common medium of exchange in Syria and Palestine in the earliest times of which we have any historical record. The period of mere barter had passed before Abraham. The close connection of the country with the two great civilized centers of antiquity, Egypt and Babylonia, had led to the introduction of a currency for the purposes of trade. We have abundant evidence of the use of these metals in the Biblical records, and we know from the monuments that they were used as money before the time of Abraham. The patriarch came back from his visit to Egypt "rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold" (Ge 13:2). There was no system of coinage, but they had these metals cast in a convenient form for use in exchange, such as bars or rings, the latter being a common form and often represented or mentioned on the monuments of Egypt. In Babylonia the more common form seems to have been the former, such as the bar, or wedge, that Achan found in the sack of Jericho (Jos 7:21). This might indicate that the pieces were too large for ordinary use, but we have indications of the use of small portions also (2Ki 12:9; Job 42:11). But the pieces were not so accurately divided as to pass for money without weighing, as we see in the case of the transaction between Abraham and the children of Heth for the purchase of the field of Machpelah (Ge 23). This transaction indicates also the common use of silver as currency, for it was "current money with the merchant," and earlier than this we have mention of the use of silver by Abraham as money: "He that is born in thy house and he that is bought with thy money" (Ge 17:13).

Jewels of silver and gold were probably made to conform to the shekel weight, so that they might be used for money in case of necessity. Thus Abraham’s servant gave to Rebecca a gold ring of half a shekel weight and bracelets of ten shekels weight (Ge 24:22). The bundles of money carried by the sons of Jacob to Egpyt for the purchase of grain (Ge 42:35) were probably silver rings tied together in bundles. The Hebrew for "talent," kikkar, signifies something round or circular, suggesting a ring of this weight to be used as money. The ordinary term for money was keceph, "silver," and this word preceded by a numeral always refers to money, either with or without "shekel," which we are probably to supply where it is not expressed after the numeral, at least wherever value is involved, as the shekel (sheqel) was the standard of value as well as of weight (see WEIGHTS AND MEASURES). Thus the value of the field of Ephron was in shekels, as was also the estimation of offerings for sacred purposes (Le 5:15; 27, passim). Solomon purchased chariots at 600 (shekels) each and horses at 150 (1Ki 10:29). Large sums were expressed in talents, which were a multiple of the shekel. Thus Menahem gave Pul 1,000 talents of silver (2Ki 15:19), which was made up by the exaction of 50 shekels from each rich man. Hezekiah paid the war indemnity to Sennacherib with 300 talents of silver and 30 of gold (2Ki 18:14). The Assyrian account gives 800 talents of silver, and the discrepancy may not be an error in the Hebrew text, as some would explain it, but probably a different kind of talent (see Madden, Coins of the Jews,

4). Solomon’s revenue is stated in talents (1Ki 10:14), and the amount (666 of gold) indicates that money was abundant, for this was in addition to what he obtained from the vassal states and by trade. His partnership with the Phoenicians in commerce brought him large amounts of the precious metals, so that silver was said to have been as plentiful in Jerusalem as stones (1Ki 10:27).

Besides the forms of rings and bars, in which the precious metals were cast for commercial use, some other forms were perhaps current. Thus the term qesiTah has been referred to as used for money, and the Septuagint translation has "lambs." It is used in Ge 33:19; Jos 24:32; Job 42:11, and the Septuagint rendering is supposed to indicate a piece in the form of a lamb or stamped with a lamb, used at first as a weight, later the same weight of the precious metals being used for money. We are familiar with lion weights and weights in the form of bulls and geese from the monuments, and it would not be strange to find them in the form of sheep. QesiTah is cognate with the Arabic qasaT, which means "to divide exactly" or "justly," and the noun qist means "a portion" or "a measure."

Another word joined with silver in monetary use is ‘aghorah, the term being translated "a piece of silver" in 1Sa 2:36. ‘Aghorah is cognate with the Arabic ujrat, "a wage," and it would seem that the piece of silver in this passage might refer to the same usage.

Another word used in a similar way is rats, from ratsats, "to break in pieces," hence, rats is "a piece" or "fragment of silver" used as money. These terms were in use before the introduction of coined money and continued after coins became common.

2. Coined Money:

After the exile we begin to find references to coined money. It was invented in Lydia or perhaps in Aegina. Herodotus assigns the invention to the Lydians (i.94). The earliest Lydian coins were struck by Gyges in the 7th century BC. These coins were of electrum and elliptical in form, smooth on the reverse but deeply stamped with incuse impressions on the obverse. They were called staters, but were of two standards; one for commercial use with the Babylonians, weighing about 164,4 grains, and the other of 224 grains (see Madden, op. cit.). Later, gold was coined, and, by the time of Croesus, gold and silver. The Persians adopted the Lydian type, and coined both gold and silver darics, the name being derived from Darius Hystaspis (521-485 BC) who is reputed to have introduced the system into his empire. But the staters of Lydia were current there under Cyrus (Madden, op. cit.), and it was perhaps with these that the Jews first became acquainted in Babylon. Ezra states (2:69) that "they (the Jews) gave after their ability into the treasury of the work threescore and one thousand darics (the Revised Version (British and American)) of gold, and five thousand pounds of silver." The term here rendered "daric" is darkemonim, and this word is used in three passages in Ne (7:70-72), and ‘adharkonim occurs in 1Ch 29:7 and Ezr 8:27. Both are of the same origin as the Greek drachma, probably, though some derive both from Darius (a Phoenician inscription from the Piraeus tells us that darkemon corresponds to drachma). At all events they refer to the gold coins which we know as darics. The weight of the daric was 130 grains, though double darics were struck.

Besides the gold daric there was a silver coin circulating in Persia that must have been known to the Jews. This was the siglos, supposed to be referred to in Ne 5:15, where it is translated "shekel." These were the so-called silver darics, 20 of which were equivalent to the gold daric. Besides these Persian coins the Jews must have used others derived from their intercourse with the Phoenician cities, which were allowed to strike coins under the suzerainty of the Persians. These coins were of both silver and bronze, the suzerain not permitting them to coin gold. We have abundant examples of these coins and trade must have made them familiar to the Jews.

The issues of Aradus, Sidon and Tyre were especially noteworthy, and were of various types and sizes suited to the commercial transactions of the Phoenicians. The Tyrian traders were established in Jerusalem as early as the time of Nehemiah (13:16), and their coins date back to about that period. Among the finest specimens we have of early coinage are the tetradrachms of Tyre and the double shekels or staters of Sidon. The latter represent the Persian king, on the obverse, as he rides in his chariot, driven by his charioteer and followed by an attendant. On the reverse is a Phoenician galley. The weight of these coins is from 380 to 430 grains, and they are assigned to the 4th and 5th centuries BC. From Tyre we have a tetradrachm which corresponds to the shekel of the Phoenician standard of about 220 grains, which represents, on the obverse, the god Melkarth, the Tyrian Hercules, tiding on a seahorse, and, beneath, a dolphin. The reverse bears an owl with the Egyptian crook and a flail, symbols of Osiris. The early coins of Aradus bear, on the obverse, the head of Baal or Dagon, and on the reverse a galley. The inscription has "M.A." in Phoenician letters, followed by a date. The inscription signifies "Melek Aradus," i.e. "king of Aradus."

When Alexander overthrew the Persian empire in 331 BC, a new coinage, on the Attic standard, was introduced, and the silver drachms and tetradrachms struck by him circulated in large numbers, as is attested by the large number of examples still in existence. After his death, these coins, the tetradrachms especially, continued to be struck in the provinces, with his name and type, in his honor. We have examples of these struck at Aradus, Tyre, Sidon, Damascus and Acre, bearing the mint marks of these towns. They bear on the obverse the head of Alexander as Hercules, and, on the reverse, Zeus seated on his throne holding an eagle in the extended right hand and a scepter in the left. The legend is BASILEOS ALEXANDROU, or ALEXANDROU, only, with various symbols of the towns or districts where they were struck, together with mint marks.

The successors of Alexander established kingdoms with a coinage of their own, such as the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Syria, and these coins, as well as those of Alexander, circulated among the Jews. The Ptolemies of Egypt controlled Palestine for about a century after Alexander, and struck coins, not only in Egypt, but in some of the Phoenician towns, especially at Acre, which was, from that time, known as Ptolemais. Their coins were based upon the Phoenician standard. But the Seleucid kings of Syria had the most influence in Phoenicia and Palestine, and their monetary issues are very various and widely distributed, bearing the names and types of the kings, and the symbols and mint marks of the different towns where they were struck, and are on the Alexandrine or Attic standard in contrast to those of the Ptolemies. They are both silver and bronze, gold being struck in the capital, Antioch, usually. The coins of Antiochus IV, Epiphanes, are especially interesting on account of his connection with Jewish affairs. It was he who made the futile attempt to hellenize the Jews, which led to the revolt that resulted,

under his successors, in the independence of the country of Syrian control, and the institution of a native coinage in the time of the Maccabees.

The struggle caused by the persecution of Antiochus commenced in 165 BC and continued more than 20 years. Judas, the son of Mattathias, defeated Antiochus, who died in 164, but the war was continued by his successors until dynastic dissensions among them led to treaties with the Jews to gain their support. At last Simon, who espoused the cause of Demetrius II, obtained from him, as a reward, the right to rule Judea under the title of high priest, with practical independence, 142-143 BC. Later Antiochus VII, his successor, confirmed Simon in his position and added some privileges, and among them the right to coin money (138-139 BC). Both silver and bronze coins exist ascribed to Simon, but some numismatists have recently doubted this, and have assigned them to another Simon in the time of the first revolt of the Jews under the Romans. The coins in question are the shekels and half-shekels with the legends, in Hebrew, sheqel yisra'el and yerushalem qedhoshah ("Jerusalem the holy"), bearing dates ranging from the 1st to the 5th year, as well as bronze pieces of the 4th.

The reason for denying the ascription of these coins to Simon the Maccabee is the difficulty in finding room for the years indicated in his reign which closed in 135 BC. He received the commission to coin in 139-138, which would allow only 4 years for his coinage, whereas we have coins of the 5th year. Moreover, no shekels and half-shekels of any of the Maccabees later than Simon have come to light, which is, at least, singular since we should have supposed that all would have coined them as long as they remained independent, especially since they coined in bronze, examples of the latter being quite abundant. The fact also that they bore the title of king, while Simon was high priest only, would seem to have furnished an additional reason for claiming the prerogative of coinage in silver as well as bronze. But this argument is negative only, and such coins may have existed but have not come to light, and there are reasons which seem to the present writer sufficient to assign them to Simon the Maccabee. In the first place, the chronological difficulty is removed if we consider that Simon was practically independent for three or four years before he obtained the explicit commission to coin money. We learn from Josephus (Ant., XIII, vi, 7) and from 1 Macc (13:41,42) that in the 170th year of the Seleucid era, that is, 143-142 BC, the Jews began to use the era of Simon in their contracts and public records. Now it would not have been strange if Simon, seeing the anarchy that prevailed in the kingdom of Syria, should have assumed some prerogatives of an independent ruler before they were distinctly granted to him, and among them that of coining money. If he had commenced in the latter part of 139 BC, he would have been able to strike coins of the 5th year before he died, and this would satisfy the conditions (see Madden's Jewish Coinage). There is a difficulty quite as great in attributing these coins to Simon of the first revolt under the Romans. That broke out in 66 AD, and was suppressed by the taking of Jerusalem in 70. This would allow a date of the 5th year, but it is hardly supposable that in the terrible distress and anarchy that prevailed in the city during that last year any silver coins would have been struck. There is another fact bearing upon this question which is worthy of notice. The coins of the first revolt bear personal appellations, such as "Eleazar the priest," and "Simon," while those assigned to Simon the Maccabee bear no personal designation whatever. This is significant, for it is not likely that Eleazar and Simon would have commenced coining silver shekels and half-shekels with their names inscribed upon them in the 1st year of their reign and then have omitted them on later issues. Another point which has some force is this: We find mention, in the New Testament, of money-changers in connection with the

temple, whose business it was to change the current coin, which was Roman or Greek, and bore heathen types and legends, for Jewish coins, which the strict Pharisaic rules then in force required from worshippers paying money into the temple treasury. It is inferred that they could furnish the shekels and half-shekels required for the yearly dues from every adult male (compare Mt 17:24-27). Now the only shekels and half-shekels bearing Jewish emblems and legends, at that time, must have been those issued by the Maccabean princes, that is, such as we have under discussion. In view of these facts the Maccabean origin of these pieces seems probable.

The shekels under discussion have on one side a cup, or chalice (supposed to represent the pot of manna), with the legend in Hebrew around the margin, sheqel yisra'el, with a letter above the cup indicating the year of the reign. The reverse bears the sprig of a plant (conjectured to be Aaron's rod) having three buds or fruits, and on the margin the legend, yerushalem ha-qedhoshah, "Jerusalem the holy." The half-shekel has the same type, but the reverse bears the inscription, chatsi sheqel (half-shekel). The letters indicating the year have the letter called "shin" (Shenath, "year") prefixed, except for the first. This also omits the Hebrew letter "waw" (w) from qedhoshah and the second letter, "yodh" (y) from yerushalem. The term "holy" for Jerusalem is found in Isa 48:2 and other passages of the Old Testament, and is still preserved in the Arabic qudus by which the city is known today in Syria.

Copper, or bronze, half-and quarter-shekels are also attributed to Simon, bearing date of the 4th year. The obverse of the half-shekel has two bundles of thick-leaved branches with a citron between, and on the reverse a palm tree with two baskets filled with fruit. The legend on the obverse is shenath 'arba' chatsi, "the fourth year a half," and on the reverse, li-ghe'ullath tsiyon, "the redemption of Zion." The quarter-shekel has a similar type, except that the obverse lacks the baskets and the reverse has the citron only. The legend has rebhia', "quarter," instead of "half." Another type is a cup with a margin of jewels on the obverse and a single bunch of branches with two citrons on the reverse.

The palm is a very common type on the coins of Judea and a very appropriate one, since it is grown there. Jericho was called the city of palms. The branches of trees in bundles illustrate the custom of carrying branches at the Feast of Tabernacles and the erection of booths made of branches for use during this feast (see Le 23:40). The baskets of fruit may refer to the offerings of first-fruits (De 26:2). One of the above series of coins published by Madden bears the countermark of an elephant, which was a symbol adopted by the Seleucid kings, and this is an evidence of its early date. But whatever doubts there may be as to the coins of Simon, there can be none as to those of his successor, John Hyrcanus, who reigned 135-106 BC, since they bear his name. They are all of bronze and bear the following inscription with a great number of variations, Yehochanan hacohen hagadel wachabar heyhudim, "Johanan the high priest and senate of the Jews." The reverse has a two-branched cornucopia with a poppy head rising from the center. There is some doubt as to the meaning of the word hebher in the above. It is commonly rendered "senate," taking it in the sense it seems to bear in Ho 6:9, "a company" or "band," here the company of elders representing the people. Judas Aristobulus (106-105 BC) issued similar coins with Hebrew legends, but with the accession of Alexander Janneus (105-78 BC) we find bilingual inscriptions on the coins, Hebrew and Greek. The obverse bears the words yehonathan ha-melekh, "Jehonathan the king," and the reverse, BASILEOS ALEXANDROU, "King Alexander." Most of his coins, however, bear Hebrew inscriptions only. All are of copper or bronze, like those of Hyrcanus

and Aristobulus, and are of the denomination known to us in the New Testament as "mites" weighing from 25 to 35 grains.

When the Romans took possession of Palestine in 63 BC, the independent rule of the Hasmoneans came to an end, but Pompey confirmed John Hyrcanus as governor of Judea under the title of high priest. Dissensions between him and other members of his family called for interference several times on the part of the Romans. Hyrcanus was again confirmed by Julius Caesar in 47 and continued in authority until 40. It is uncertain what coins he issued, but whatever they were, they bore the type found on those of Alexander Janneus. In 40 BC, the Parthians temporarily overthrew the Roman authority in Syria and Palestine, and set Antigonus on the throne of the latter, and he reigned until 37. The coins he issued bore bilingual inscriptions like the bilinguals of Alexander. He calls himself Antigonus in Greek, and Mattathias in Hebrew, the type being a wreath on the obverse and a double cornucopia on the reverse, though some have it single. They are much heavier coins than the preceding issues. The legends are: obverse, BASILEOS ANTIGONOU, "of King Antigonus"; reverse (mattithyah ha-kohen gadhol ha-yeh (udhim), "Mattathias the high priest of the Jews."

The Hasmonean dynasty ended with Antigonus and that of the Herods followed. Herod the Great was the first to attain the title of king, and his coins are numerous and bear only Greek legends and are all of bronze. The earliest have the type of a helmet with cheek pieces on the obverse and the legend: BASILEOS HRODOU, and in the field to the left gamma (year 3), and on the right, a monogram. The reverse has a Macedonian shield with rays. The coin here illustrated is another type: a rude tripod on the obverse, and a cross within a wreath on the reverse, the legend being the same as given above.

Herod Archelaus, who reigned from 4 BC to 6 AD, issued coins with the title of ethnarch, the only coins of Palestine to bear this title. They are all of small size and some of them have the type of a galley, indicating his sovereignty over some of the coast cities, such as Caesarea and Joppa.

The coins of Herod Antipas (4 BC-40 AD) bear the title of tetrarch, many of them being struck at Tiberias, which he founded on the Sea of Galilee and named after the emperor Tiberius. The following is an example: obverse HER. TETR. (HERODOU TETRACHOU), with the type of a palm branch; reverse, TIBERIAS, within a wreath. Others have a palm tree entire with the date lambda-gamma (LG) and lambda-delta (LD): 33 and 34 of his reign, 29-30 AD. There are coins of Herod Philip, 4 BC-34 AD, though somewhat rare, but those of Agrippa, 37-44 AD, are numerous, considering the shortness of his reign. The most common type is a small coin ("mite") with an umbrella having a tassel-like border, on the obverse, and three ears of wheat on one stalk on the reverse. The legend reads: Basileos Agrippa, and the date is LS (year 6). Larger coins of Agrippa bear the head of the emperor (Caligula or Claudius) with the title of Sebastos (Augustus) in Greek.

Agrippa II was the last of the Herodian line to strike coins (48-100 AD). They were issued under Nero, whose head they sometimes bear with his name as well as that of Agrippa. They are all of the denomination of the mite (lepton).

In 6 AD, Judea was made a Ro province and was governed by procurators, and their coins are numerous, being issued during the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius, Claudius and Nero. They are all small and bear on the obverse the legends: KAISAROS (Caesar), or IOULIA (Julia), or the emperor's name joined with Caesar. The coins of the Jews struck during the first and second revolts, 66-70 AD, and 132-135 AD, have already been alluded to with the difficulty of distinguishing them, and some have been described. They all have the types common to the purely Jewish issues; the date palm, the vine, bunches of fruit, the laurel or olive wreath, the cup or chalice, the lyre and a temple with columns. Types of animals or men they regarded as forbidden by their law. Most of them are bronze, but some are silver shekels and half-shekels, dated in the lat, 2nd and 3rd years, if we assign those of higher date to Simon the Maccabee. Those of the 1st year bear the name of Eleazar the priest, on the obverse, and on the reverse the date "first year of the redemption of Israel," shenath 'achath li-ghe'ullath yisra'el. Others bear the name of Simon and some that of "Simon Nesi' Israel" ("Simon Prince of Israel"). The coins of the 2nd and 3rd years are rare. They have the type of the cup and vine leaf, or temple and lulabh. Those supposed to belong to the second revolt bear the name of Simon without Nesi' Israel, and are therefore assigned to Simon Bar-Cochba. The example here given has the type of the temple on the obverse with what is thought to be a representation of the "beautiful gate," between the columns, and a star above. The name Simon is on the margin, the first two letters on the right of the temple and the others on the left. The legend of the reverse is: lecheruth yerushalem ("the deliverance of Jerusalem").

Some of the coins struck by the Romans to commemorate their victory over the Jews were struck in Palestine and some at Rome, and all bear the head of the Roman emperor on the obverse, but the reverse often exhibits Judea as a weeping captive woman, seated at the foot of a palm tree or of a Roman standard bearing a trophy. The legend is sometimes Judea capta and sometimes Judea devicta. The example given has the inscription in Greek: IOUDIAS EALOKUIAS, Judea capta.

There are coins of Agrippa II (the "king Agrippa" of Ac 25: 26, struck in the reign of Vespasian, with his name and title on the obverse and with a deity on the reverse, holding ears of wheat in the right hand and a cornucopia in the left. The inscription reads: ETOU KSBA AGRI PPA (year 26, King Agrippa) in two lines.

After the revolt of Bar-Cochba and the final subjugation of the Jews by Hadrian, Jerusalem was made a Roman colony and the name was changed to Aelia Capitolina. A series of coins was struck, having this title, which continued until the reign of Valerianus, 253-260 AD. These coins were all of copper or bronze, but silver pieces were in circulation, struck at Rome or at some of the more favored towns in Syria, such as Antioch. These were denarii and tetradrachms, the former being about one-fourth the weight of the latter which were known as staters (Mt 17:27). The piece referred to was the amount of tribute for two persons, and as the amount paid by one was the half-shekel (Mt 17:24), this piece must have been the equivalent of the shekel or tetradrachm.

H. Porter

MONEY, CURRENT

kur’-ent (‘obher, "passing," Ge 28:16; 2Ki 12:4 (Hebrew 5)): The text and translation in 2Ki 12:4 are uncertain and difficult. See the Revised Version margin. The reference is probably not to a money standard, but to a poll tax which was levied in addition to the free-will offering. Ge 23:16 implies the existence of a standard shekel and also probably the use of the precious metals in stamped bars or ingots of an approximately fixed weight or value, a primitive coinage. Code of Hammurabi presupposes these pieces, and records in cuneiform writing discovered in Cappadocia indicate that shekel pieces with a seal stamp were in use in Asia Minor in the time of Hammurabi (Sayce, Contemporary Review, August, 1907, XCII, 259 ff). The existence of these pieces did not do away with the custom of weighing money, a practice which obtained in Israel down to the time of the exile (Jer 32:10).

Walter R. Betteridge

MONEY, LOVE OF

(philarguria, 1Ti 6:10, literally, "love of silver"; compare corresponding "lovers of money" (Lu 16:14; 2Ti 3:2), equivalent to "avarice"): The vice that seeks to retain and hoard all that is acquired (Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, xxiv); described as "a root of all kinds of evil."

See also COVETOUSNESS.

MONEY, SIN

See SIN MONEY; SIN OFFERING.

MONEY-CHANGERS

chan’-jers (kollubistes, from kollubos, "a small coin," so "a money-changer," or "banker" (Mt 21:12; Mr 11:15; "changers" in Joh 2:15; compare Joh 2:14, where kermatistes, "a dealer in small bits," or "change," is also rendered "changers"); compare trapezites, "one who sits at a table," "a money-changer," "a banker" or "broker"; one who both exchanges money for a small fee and pays interest on deposits (Mt 25:27, the King James Version "exchangers," the American Standard Revised Version "bankers")): The profession of money-changer in Palestine was made necessary by the law requiring every male Israelite who had reached the age of 20 years to pay into the treasury of the sanctuary a half-shekel at every numbering of the people, an offering to Yahweh, not even the poor being exempt. It seems to have become an annual tax, and was to be paid in the regular Jewish half-shekel (Ex 30:11-15). Since the Jews, coming up to the feasts, would need to exchange the various coins in common circulation for this Jewish piece, there were money-changers who exacted a premium for the exchange. This fee was a kollubos (about 31 cents in U.S. money, i.e. in 1915), hence, the name kollubistes. The Jews of Christ’s day came from many parts of the world, and the business of exchanging foreign coins for various purposes became a lucrative one, the exchangers exacting whatever fee they might. Because of their greed and impiety, Jesus drove them from the courts of the temple.

Edward Bagby Pollard

MONSTER

mon’-ster.

See DRAGON; SEA-MONSTER.

MONTH

munth (chodhesh, yerach; men): Chodhesh is strictly the "new moon," the appearance of which marked the beginning of the month, commonly indicated by ro’sh ha-chodhesh. Yerach is derived from yareach, "moon," which comes from the verb that means "to wander," "to make a circuit." Thus the month was lunar, the period of the moon’s circuit. The Greek men also meant "moon," from the Sanskrit ma, "to measure," the Latin mensis and our "moon" being derived from the same root.

See CALENDAR; TIME; ASTRONOMY.

Chodhesh, or rather ro’sh ha-chodhesh, was observed as a festival (1Sa 20:5,18,24; Isa 1:14).

H. Porter

MONTHLY; PROGNOSTICATORS

munth’-li, prog-nos’-ti-ka-terz.

See ASTROLOGY, sec. I, 6.

MONUMENT

mon’-u-ment (Isa 65:4 the King James Version).

See VAULT.

MOOLI

mo’-o-li (Codex Alexandrinus Mooli; Codex Vaticanus Moolei; the King James Version Moli): Son of Merari and grandson of Levi (1 Esdras 8:47) equals "Mahli" in Ezr 8:18 (see Ex 6:16,19).

MOON

moon (yareach; meaning obscure—probably "wanderer"; by some given as "paleness"; selene): The moon was very early worshipped by the nations of the Far East as a divinity or the representative of one or more deities. These deities were both masculine and feminine. In Assyria and Babylonia the most common name for the moon-god was Sin or Sen. In Babylonia he was also called Aku and Nannara. In Egypt the moon was representative of several deities, all masculine. The chief of these was Thoth the god of knowledge, so called because the moon was the measurer of time. Babylonia has, also, Aa, the goddess of the moon, as the consort of the sun, while her equivalent was known in Phoenicia as Ashtaroth-karnaim. This personification and worship of the moon among the nations who were neighbors to Palestine was but part of an elaborate Nature-worship found among these people. Nor was this worship always separated from Palestine by geographical lines. It crept into the thought and customs of the Hebrews and in a sense affected their religious conceptions and ceremonies. They fell into the habit of making direct homage to sun, moon and stars, as is evidenced by Job 31:26,27; Jer 44:17, and even Isa 8:18 (see CRESCENTS). Moses seems to have forewarned his people against the danger of this form of worship (De 4:19).

The actual worship of the moon and the idolatry consequent thereon seems to have touched the Hebrews, though this is disputed by some. It would seem difficult to explain 2Ki 21:3 upon any other supposition, and in 2Ki 23:4,5 we have a clear statement that Josiah put down the worship of the moon among the people and silenced the priests of this form of worship.

Certain forms of the adoration of the moon, or superstitious fear of baneful influences as coming from the moon, still abound in some sections of the world. In fact in nearly all sections modified forms of old superstitions still hold sway and yield but slowly to scientific knowledge.

The eclipses of the moon were naturally given a religious significance inasmuch as the Hebrew knowledge of them did not rise much above awe and wonder (Isa 13:10; Joe 2:31; Mt 24:29; Mr 13:24). Other passages causing interference with the constancy of the moon to foreshadow great events can be found in Jer 13:16; Eze 32:7,8; Re 8:12. An interesting passage and most difficult of interpretation is Re 12:1. It is frequently interpreted as a revelation in symbolism of the glory of the church clothed with the light and radiating the truth of God.

See also ASTRONOMY; ASTROLOGY.

C. E. Schenk

MOON, NEW

See ASTROLOGY, sec. I, 6; ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 3, (1); FASTS AND FEASTS.

MOOSSIAS

mo-os’-i-as (Codex Vaticanus Moosseias; Codex Alexandrinus Moos Sias; the King James Version, Moosias, mo-o-si’as): One of those who had taken a "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:31) equals "Maaseiah" in Ezr 10:30.

MOPH

mof.

See MEMPHIS.

MORALITY

mo-ral’-i-ti.

See ETHICS.

MORASHTITE

mo-rash’-tit (hamorashti; the King James Version, Morasthite, mo-ras’-thit): Gentilic designation of the prophet Micah (Jer 26:18; Mic 1:1).

See also MORESHETH-GATH.

MORDECAI

mor’-de-ki, mor-de-ka’-i (mordekhay; Mardochaios): An Israelite of the tribe of Benjamin, whose fate it has been to occupy a distinguished place in the annals of his people. His great-grandfather, Kish, had been carried to Babylon along with Jeconiah, king of Judah (Es 2:5-6). For nearly 60 years before the scenes narrated in Esther, in which Mordecai was greatly concerned, took place, the way to Palestine had been open to the Israelites; but neither his father, Jair, nor afterward himself chose to return to the ancient heritage. This seems to have been the case also with the rest of his house, as it was with the vast majority of the Israelite people; for his uncle died in Persia leaving his motherless daughter, Hadassah, to the care of Mordecai. Employed in the royal palace at Susa, he attracted, through the timely discovery of a plot to assassinate the king, the favorable notice of Xerxes, and in a short time became the grand vizier of the Persian empire. He has been believed by many to have been the author of the Book of Esther; and in the earliest known notice of the Feast of Purim, outside of the book just mentioned, that festival is closely associated with his name. It is called "the day of Mordecai" (2 Macc 15:36). The apocryphal additions to Esther expatiate upon his greatness, and are eloquent of the deep impression which his personality and power had made upon the Jewish people. Lord Arthur Hervey has suggested the identification of Mordecai with Matacas, or Natacas, the powerful favorite and minister of Xerxes

who is spoken of by Ctesias, the Greek historian. Few have done more to earn a nation’s lasting gratitude than Mordecai, to whom, under God, the Jewish people owe their preservation.

John Urquhart

MOREH, HILL OF

mo’-re (gibh‘ath ha-moreh, "hill of the teacher"; Codex Vaticanus Gabaathamora; Codex Alexandrinus, tou bomou tou Abor): The Hebrew moreh is derived from the verb yarah, "to teach," "to direct," and indicates one who directs, or gives oracular answers. We might therefore read "hill of the teacher," the height being associated with such a person who had his seat here. The hill is named only in describing the position of the Midianites before Gideon’s attack (Jud 7:1). If the identification of the Well of Harod with ‘Ain Jalud is correct, Gideon must have occupied the slopes to the East of Jezreel. The Midianite camp was in the valley of Jezreel (Jud 6:33). The Hebrew text in Jud 7:1, which has probably suffered some corruption, seems to mean that the Midianites lay North of the position held by Gideon, their lines running from the hill of Moreh in the plain. The hill can hardly have been other than Jebel ed-Duchy, often called Little Hermon, which rises boldly from the northern edge of the vale of Jezreel, with Shunem (Solam) lying at its western foot. Moore ("Judges," ICC, 200) would lay the scene in the neighborhood of Shechem, but there is no good reason to doubt the accuracy of the tradition which places it at the eastern end of the plain of Esdraelon.

W. Ewing

MOREH, OAK OF

(’elon moreh, "terebinth of the teacher"; ten drun ten hupselen; the King James Version Plain of Moreh): It seems probable that the place here intended may be the same as that mentioned in De 11:30 (’elone moreh, "terebinths of Moreh," the King James Version "plains," the Revised Version (British and American) "oaks," the Revised Version margin "terebinths"). Both are defined as near to Shechem. The position cannot be identified today. The tree or trees were evidently a place of resort for those who wished to consult a moreh. See MOREH, HILL OF. To this day in Palestine trees are often regarded with a certain religious awe as the habitation of spirits. Isolated terebinths receive much veneration. The present writer has often seen such trees with multitudinous rags of all colors attached to them by the peasantry as evidence of their homage.

See MEONENIM.

W. Ewing

MORESHETH-GATH

mo’-resh-eth-gath, mo-resh’-eth-gath (moresheth gath, "inheritance or possession of Gath"; Septuagint kleronomias Geth): A place mentioned only in Mic 1:14. It must have been in the vicinity of Gath as the meaning of the name would indicate, and was the home of the prophet Micah (Mic 1:1; Jer 26:18). It was probably in the vicinity of Mareshah (Mic 1:15). Jerome, in his preface to his work on Micah, places it a little to the East of Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin), and it would be natural to find it there if the latter place was Gath as some think. Robinson (BR, II, 68) found ruins of a village between one and two miles East of Beit Jibrin. It must have been among the foot-hills of Judah between the hill country and the Philistine plain on the route from Jerusalem to Lachish, Gaza and Egypt. Mareshah was certainly in that region, and the prophecy of Micah mentions towns and villages in the Shephelah and the Philistine country as though they were familiar to him (see HGHL and G. A. Smith, "Micah," in his Minor Prophets).

H. Porter

MORIAH, LAND OF

mo-ri’-a (’erec ha-moriyah; eis ten genitive ten hupselen): Abraham was directed by God to take his son Isaac, to go into the land of Moriah, and there to offer him for a burnt offering (Ge 22:2) upon a mountain which God would show him. This land is mentioned only here, and there is little to guide us in trying to identify it. A late writer (2Ch 3:1) applies the name of Moriah to the mount on which Solomon’s Temple was built, possibly associating it with the sacrifice of Isaac. A similar association with this mountain may have been in the mind of the writer of Ge 22 (see 22:14), who, of course, wrote long after the events described (Driver). But in 22:2 no special mountain is indicated.

Abraham journeyed from the land of the Philistines, and on the 3rd day he saw the place afar off (Ge 22:4). This naturally suggests some prominent mountain farther North than Jerusalem. The description could hardly apply to Jerusalem in any case, as it could not be seen "afar off" by one approaching either from the South or the West. The Samaritans lay the scene of sacrifice on Mt. GERIZIM (which see).

Instead of "Moriah" in this passage Peshitta reads "Amorites." This suggests a possible emendation of the text, which, if it be accepted, furnishes a more definite ides of the land within which that memorable scene was enacted. Both Jerusalem and Gerizim, however, lay within the boundaries of the land of the Amorites. No doubt the enmity existing between the Jews and the Samaritans led them each to glorify their own holy places to the detriment of those of their rivals. Little stress can therefore be laid upon their identifications. With our present knowledge we must be content to leave the question open.

W. Ewing

MORNING

mor’-ning: There are several Hebrew and Greek words which are rendered "morning," the most common in Hebrew being boqer, which occurs 180 times. It properly means "the breaking forth of the light," "the

dawn," as in Ge 19:27; Jud 19:8,25,27. Another word with the same meaning is shachar (Ge 19:15; Ne 4:21; Isa 58:8). mishchar ("womb of the morning," Ps 110:3) is a poetical term derived from. the same root. See HIND OF THE MORNING. noghah, naghha' (Da 6:19 (Hebrew 20)), mean "brightness." hashkem, comes from hishkim, "to load an animal" (for a journey), and as the nomads are accustomed to do this early in the morning it came to mean early morning (1Sa 17:16).

See BETIMES.

In the New Testament orthros, is properly "dawn," and is used for early morning (Joh 8:2; Ac 5:21), and

proia signifies the same (Mt 27:1). proi, "early," is an adverb and means early in the morning (Mr 1:35). Morning as an adjective is orthrinos (Re 22:16), or proinos (1 Esdras 1:11; 5:50; Re 2:28; 22:16).

H. Porter

MORNING WATCH

'ash-moreth ha-boker (Ex 14:24; 1Sa 11:11); in Judith 12:5 for heothine phulake; compare Sirach 55:6; 1 Macc 5:30): The last portion of the night.

See WATCH.

MORNING, WINGS OF

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 4.

MORROW AFTER THE SABBATH

(mochorath, or mochoratham, "the morrow," or "tomorrow," "the day following"; mochorath ha-shabbath, "the day after the Sabbath," i.e. the first day of the week): The first day of the week was designated for the formal offering of the first-fruits in the form of wave-sheaves (Le 23:11), and of the wave-loaves 50 days later (Le 23:16,17). This recognition of an after-Sabbath during festive periods has its counterpart in the later ecclesiastical practice of celebrating not only Easter Sunday, but also Easter Monday, etc., and undoubtedly was a factor in establishing the custom which transferred the sanctity of the Sabbath to the first day of the week after the resurrection of our Lord.

Frank E. Hirsch

MORROW, TOMORROW

mor'-o, too-mor'-o: Two words are used in the Old Testament in this meaning: boqer, which properly

means "dawn," or "morning," and machar, properly the same, but used for the next morning and hence, "tomorrow," like the German morgen. The derivative mo-chorath, is "the following day," "all the next day," especially after yom ("day"), but usually coupled with a noun following, as in Le 23:11, mochorath ha-shabbath "day after the Sabbath." It is also used adverbially for "on the morrow," as in Ge 19:34.

In the Greek of the New Testament we find aurion (Mt 6:34, etc.), commonly used, but hexes, also occurs (Ac 25:17 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) renders more exactly "the next day"); epaurion, is "on the morrow" (Ac 10:9,23,24).

H. Porter

MORSEL

mor'-sel (brosis): Found only in Heb 12:16 the King James Version, "For one morsel of meat (the Revised Version (British and American) "mess of meat") sold his birthright," literally, "for one eating," i. e. one meal. The Great Bible (Cranmer's) has "for one mease of meat."

MORTAL; MORTALITY

mor'-tal, mor-tal'-i-ti (thnetos to thneton): The meaning is "subject to death" (Ro 6:12; 8:11; 1Co 15:53,54; in 2Co 5:4 the Revised Version (British and American) has "what is mortal"). In Job 4:17, the Hebrew word is 'enosh, "mortal man."

See IMMORTAL.

MORTAR

mor'-ter (medhokhah (Nu 11:8), makhtesh (Pr 27:22)): A hollowed stone or vessel in which grain or other substance was pounded or beaten with a pestle. The Israelites used a mortar in which to beat the manna in the wilderness (Nu 11:8), and Pr 27:22 declares, "Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar with a pestle .... yet will not his foolishness depart from him," i.e. it is inherent and ineradicable. Some have supposed an allusion to an oriental mode of punishment by pounding the criminal to death in a mortar, but this is unlikely. In illustration of Pr 27:22 such proverbs are quoted as "Though you beat that loose woman in a mortar, she will not leave her ways." See also BRAY. For "mortar" (the King James Version "morter").

See BITUMEN.

James Orr

MORTGAGE

mor’-gaj (arabh): To give or be security as a part of bartering, give pledges, become surety. In time of great need for food, "Some also there were that said, We are mortgaging (the King James Version "have mortgaged") our fields," etc. (Ne 5:3).

See SURETY.

MORTIFY

mor’-ti-fi (Ro 8:13 the King James Version and the English Revised Version, thanatoo, the English Revised Version margin "make to die," and Col 3:5, nekroo, the English Revised Version margin "make dead"): This sense of mortify is obsolete in modern English, and the American Standard Revised Version in both places substitutes "put to death," with great advantage. The context in both passages goes to the heart of Paul’s doctrine of the union of the believer with Christ. This union has given the soul a new life, flowing (through the Spirit) from Christ in the heavenly world, so that the remnants of the old corrupt life-principle are now dangerous excrescences. Hence, they are to be destroyed, just as a surgeon removes the remnants of a diseased condition after the reestablishment of healthy circulation. The interpreter must guard against weakening Paul’s language into some such phrase as "subdue all that is inconsistent with the highest ideals," for Paul views the union with Christ as an intensely real, quasi-physical relation.

Burton Scott Easton

MOSERAH

mo-se’-ra, mo’-se-ra (mocerah, "bond"): Perhaps Moser with the "he" of locale (direction), "to Moser" (De 10:6).

See MOSEROTH.

MOSEROTH

mo-se’-roth, mo’-se-roth, -roth (moceroth, "bonds"): A desert camp of the Israelites between Hashmonah and Bene-jaakan (Nu 33:30,31). It is probably the same as Moserah (De 10:6), though in that passage the name follows Bene-jaakan. There Aaron died and was buried.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

MOSES

mo’-zez, mo’-ziz (mosheh; Egyptian mes, "drawn out," "born"; Septuagint Mouse(s)). The great Hebrew national hero, leader, author, law-giver and prophet.

I. LIFE

1. Son of Levi

2. Foundling Prince

3. Friend of the People

4. Refuge in Midian

5. Leader of Israel

II. WORK AND CHARACTER

1. The Author

2. The Lawgiver

3. The Prophet

LITERATURE

The traditional view of the Jewish church and of the Christian church, that Moses was a person and that the narrative with which his life-story is interwoven is real history, is in the main sustained by commentators and critics of all classes.

It is needless to mention the old writers among whom these questions were hardly under discussion. Among the advocates of the current radical criticism may be mentioned Stade and Renan, who minimize the historicity of the Bible narrative at this point. Renan thinks the narrative "may be very probable." Ewald, Wellhausen, Robertson Smith, and Driver, while finding many flaws in the story, make much generally of the historicity of the narrative.

The critical analysis of the Pentateuch divides this life-story of Moses into three main parts, J, E, and the Priestly Code (P), with a fourth, D, made up mainly from the others. Also some small portions here and there are given to R, especially the account of Aaron’s part in the plagues of Egypt, where his presence in a J-document is very troublesome for the analytical theory. It is unnecessary to encumber this biography with constant cross-references to the strange story of Moses pieced together out of the rearranged fragments into which the critical analysis of the Pentateuch breaks up the narrative. It is

recognized that there are difficulties in the story of Moses. In what ancient life-story are there not difficulties? If we can conceive of the ancients being obliged to ponder over a modern life-story, we can easily believe that they would have still more difficulty with it. But it seems to very many that the critical analysis creates more difficulties in the narrative than it relieves. It is a little thing to explain by such analysis some apparent discrepancy between two laws or two events or two similar incidents which we do not clearly understand. It is a far greater thing so to confuse, by rearranging, a beautiful, well-articulated biography that it becomes disconnected—indeed, in parts, scarcely makes sense.

The biographical narrative of the Hebrew national hero, Moses, is a continuous thread of history in the Pentateuch. That story in all its simplicity and symmetry, but with acknowledgment of its difficulties as they arise, is here to be followed.

I. Life.

1. Son of Levi:

The recorded story of Moses' life falls naturally into five rather unequal parts: "And there went a man of the house of Levi, and took to wife a daughter of Levi" (Ex 2:1). The son of Levi born of that union became the greatest man among mere men in the whole history of the world. How far he was removed in genealogy from Levi it is impossible to know. The genealogical lists (Ge 46:11; Ex 6:16-20; Nu 3:14-28; 26:57-59; 1Ch 6:1-3) show only 4 generations from Levi to Moses, while the account given of the numbers of Israel at the exodus (Ex 12:37; 38:26; Nu 1:46; 11:21) imperatively demand at least 10 or 12 generations. The males alone of the sons of Kohath "from a month old and upward" numbered at Sinai 8,600 (Nu 3:27,28). It is evident that the extract from the genealogy here, as in many other places (1Ch 23:15; 26:24; Ezr 7:1-5; 8:1,2; compare 1Ch 6:3-14; Mt 1:1-17; Lu 3:23-38) is not complete, but follows the common method of giving important heads of families. The statement concerning Jochebed: "And she bare unto Amram Aaron and Moses, and Miriam their sister" (Nu 26:59) really creates no difficulty, as it is likewise said of Zilpah, after the mention of her grandsons, "And these she bare unto Jacob" (Ge 46:17,18; compare 46:24,25).

The names of the immediate father and mother of Moses are not certainly known. The mother "saw him that he was a goodly child" (Ex 2:2). So they defied the commandment of the king (Ex 1:22), and for 3 months hid him instead of throwing him into the river.

2. Foundling Prince:

The time soon came when it was impossible longer to hide the child (Josephus, Ant, II, ix, 3-6). The mother resolved upon a plan which was at once a pathetic imitation of obedience to the commandment of the king, an adroit appeal to womanly sympathy, and, if it succeeded, a subtle scheme to bring the cruelty of the king home to his own attention. Her faith succeeded. She took an ark of bulrushes (Ex 2:3,4; compare ARK OF BULRUSHES), daubed it with bitumen mixed with the sticky slime of the river, placed in this floating vessel the child of her love and faith, and put it into the river at a place

among the sedge in the shallow water where the royal ladies from the palace would be likely to come down to bathe. A sister, probably Miriam, stood afar off to watch (Ex 2:3,4). The daughter of Pharaoh came down with her great ladies to the river (Ex 2:5-10). The princess saw the ark among the sedge and sent a maid to fetch it. The expectation of the mother was not disappointed. The womanly sympathy of the princess was touched. She resolved to save this child by adopting him. Through the intervention of the watching sister, he was given to his own mother to be nursed (Ex 2:7-9). "And the child grew, and she brought him unto Pharaoh's daughter, and he became her son" (Ex 2:10). Thus, he would receive her family name.

Royal family names in Egypt then were usually compounded of some expression of reverence or faith or submission and the name of a god, e.g. "loved of," "chosen of," "born of," Thoth, Ptah, Ra or Amon. At this period of Egyptian history, "born of" (Egyptian mes, "drawn out") was joined sometimes to Ah, the name of the moon-god, making Ahmes, or Thoth, the scribe-god, so Thothmes, but usually with Ra, the sun-god, giving Rames, usually anglicized Rameses or Ramoses.

It was the time of the Ramesside dynasty, and the king on the throne was Rameses II. Thus the foundling adopted by Pharaoh's daughter would have the family name Mes or Moses. That it would be joined in the Egyptian to the name of the sungod Ra is practically certain. His name at court would be Ramoses. But to the oriental mind a name must mean something. The usual meaning of this royal name was that the child was "born of" a princess through the intervention of the god Ra. But this child was not "born of" the princess, so falling back upon the primary meaning of the word, "drawn out," she said, "because I drew him out of the water" (Ex 2:10). Thus, Moses received his name. Pharaoh's daughter may have been the eldest daughter of Rameses II, but more probably was the daughter and eldest child of Seti Merenptah I, and sister of the king on the throne. She would be lineal heir to the crown but debarred by her sex. Instead, she bore the title "Pharaoh's Daughter," and, according to Egyptian custom, retained the right to the crown for her first-born son. A not improbable tradition (Josephus, Ant, II, ix, 7) relates that she had no natural son, and Moses thus became heir to the throne, not with the right to supplant the reigning Pharaoh, but to supersede any of his sons.

Very little is known of Moses' youth and early manhood at the court of Pharaoh. He would certainly be educated as a prince, whose right it probably was to be initiated into the mysteries. Thus he was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" (Ac 7:22), included in which, according to many Egyptologists, was the doctrine of one Supreme God.

Many curious things, whose value is doubtful, are told of Moses by Josephus and other ancient writers (Josephus, Ant, II, ix, 3; xi; CAp, I, 31; compare DB; for Mohammedan legends, see Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus, Appendix; for rabbinical legends, see Jewish Encyclopedia). Some of these traditions are not incredible but lack authentication. Others are absurd. Egyptologists have searched with very indifferent success for some notice of the great Hebrew at the Egyptian court.

3. Friend of the People:

But the faith of which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks (Heb 11:23-28) was at work. Moses "refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter" (Ex 2:11-14; Ac 7:24). Whether he did so in word, by definite renunciation, or by his espousal of the cause of the slave against the oppressive policy of Pharaoh is of little importance. In either case he became practically a traitor, and greatly imperiled his throne rights and probably his civil rights as well. During some intervention to ameliorate the condition of the state slaves, an altercation arose and he slew an Egyptian (Ex 2:11,12). Thus, his constructive treason became an overt act. Discovering through the ungrateful reproaches of his own kinsmen (Ac 7:25) that his act was known, he quickly made decision, "choosing rather to share ill treatment with the people of God," casting in his lot with slaves of the empire, rather than "to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season," amid the riotous living of the young princes at the Egyptian court; "accounting the reproach of Christ" his humiliation, being accounted a nobody ("Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?") as "greater riches than the treasures of Egypt" (Heb 11:25,26; Ac 7:25-28). He thought to be a nobody and do right better than to be a tyrant and rule Egypt.

4. Refuge in Midian:

Moses fled, "not fearing the wrath of the king" (Heb 11:27), not cringing before it or submitting to it, but defying it and braving all that it could bring upon him, degradation from his high position, deprivation of the privileges and comforts of the Egyptian court. He went out a poor wanderer (Ex 2:15). We are told nothing of the escape and the journey, how he eluded the vigilance of the court guards and of the frontier-line of sentinels. The friend of slaves is strangely safe while within their territory. At last he reached the Sinaitic province of the empire and hid himself away among its mountain fastnesses (Ex 2:15). The romance of the well and the shepherdesses and the grateful father and the future wife is all quite in accord with the simplicity of desert life (Ex 2:16-22). The "Egyptian" saw the rude, selfish herdsmen of the desert imposing upon the helpless shepherd girls, and, partly by the authority of a manly man, partly, doubtless, by the authority of his Egyptian appearance in an age when "Egypt" was a word with which to frighten men in all that part of the world, he compelled them to give way. The "Egyptian" was called, thanked, given a home and eventually a wife. There in Midian, while the anguish of Israel continued under the taskmaster's lash, and the weakening of Israel's strength by the destruction of the male children went on, with what more or less rigor we know not, Moses was left by Providence to mellow and mature, that the haughty, impetuous prince, "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," might be transformed into the wise, well-poised, masterful leader, statesman, lawgiver, poet and prophet. God usually prepares His great ones in the countryside or about some of the quiet places of earth, farthest away from the busy haunts of men and nearest to the "secret place of the Most High." David keeping his father's flocks, Elijah on the mountain slopes of Gilead, the Baptist in the wilderness of Judea, Jesus in the shop of a Galilean carpenter; so Moses a shepherd in the Bedouin country, in the "waste, howling wilderness."

5. Leader of Israel:

(1) The Commission.

One day Moses led the flocks to "the back of the wilderness" (Ex 3:1-12; see BUSH, BURNING. Moses received his commission, the most appalling commission ever given to a mere man (Ex 3:10)—a commission to a solitary man, and he a refugee—to go back home and deliver his kinsmen from a dreadful slavery at the hand of the most powerful nation on earth. Let not those who halt and stumble over the little difficulties of most ordinary lives think hardly of the faltering of Moses' faith before such a task (Ex 3:11-13; 4:1,10-13). "Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you" (Ex 3:14), was the encouragement God gave him. He gave him also Aaron for a spokesman (Ex 4:14-16), the return to the Mount of God as a sign (Ex 3:12), and the rod of power for working wonders (Ex 4:17).

One of the curious necessities into which the critical analysis drives its advocates is the opinion concerning Aaron that "he scarcely seems to have been a brother and almost equal partner of Moses, perhaps not even a priest" (Bennett, HDB, III, 441). Interesting and curious speculations have been instituted concerning the way in which Israel and especially Pharaoh were to understand the message, "I AM hath sent me unto you" (Ex 3:13,14; compare 6:3). They were evidently expected to understand this message. Were they to so do by translating or by transliterating it into Egyptian? Some day Egyptologists may be able to answer positively, but not yet.

With the signs for identification (Ex 4:1-10), Moses was ready for his mission. He went down from the "holy ground" to obey the high summons and fulfill the great commission (Ex 4:18-23). After the perplexing controversy with his wife, a controversy of stormy ending (Ex 4:24-26), he seems to have left his family to his father-in-law's care while he went to respond to the call of God (Ex 18:6). He met Aaron, his brother, at the Mount of God (Ex 4:27,28), and together they returned to Egypt to collect the elders of Israel (Ex 4:29-31), who were easily won over to the scheme of emancipation. Was ever a slave people not ready to listen to plans for freedom?

(2) The Conflict with Pharaoh.

The next move was the bold request to the king to allow the people to go into the wilderness to hold a feast unto Yahweh (Ex 5:1). How did Moses gain admittance past the jealous guards of an Egyptian court to the presence of the Pharaoh himself? And why was not the former traitorous refugee at once arrested? Egyptology affords a not too distinct answer. Rameses II was dead (Ex 4:19); Merenptah II was on the throne with an insecure tenure, for the times were troubled. Did some remember the "son of Pharaoh's daughter" who, had he remained loyal, would have been the Pharaoh? Probably so. Thus he would gain admittance, and thus, too, in the precarious condition of the throne, it might well not be safe to molest him. The original form of the request made to the king, with some slight modification, was continued throughout (Ex 8:27; 10:9), though God promised that the Egyptians should thrust them out altogether when the end should come, and it was so (Ex 11:1; 12:31,33,39). Yet Pharaoh remembered the form of their request and bestirred himself when it was reported that they had indeed gone "from serving" them (Ex 14:5). The request for temporary departure upon which the contest was made put Pharaoh's call to duty in the easiest form and thus, also, his obstinacy appears as the greater heinousness. Then came the challenge of Pharaoh in his contemptuous demand, "Who is Yahweh?" (Ex 5:2), and Moses' prompt acceptance of the challenge, in the beginning of the long series of plagues (see

PLAGUE) (Ex 8:1 ff; 12:29-36; 14:31; compare Lamb, Miracle of Science). Pharaoh, having made the issue, was justly required to afford full presentation of it. So Pharaoh's heart was "hardened" (Ex 4:21; 7:3,13; 9:12,35; 10:1; 14:8; see PLAGUE) until the vindication of Yahweh as God of all the earth was complete. This proving of Yahweh was so conducted that the gods of Egypt were shown to be of no avail against Him, but that He is God of all the earth, and until the faith of the people of Israel was confirmed (Ex 14:31).

(3) Institution of the Passover.

It was now time for the next step in revelation (Ex 12; 13:1-16). At the burning bush God had declared His purpose to be a saviour, not a destroyer. In this contest in Egypt, His absolute sovereignty was being established; and now the method of deliverance by Him, that He might not be a destroyer, was to be revealed. Moses called together the elders (Ex 12:21-28) and instituted the Passover feast. As God always in revelation chooses the known and the familiar—the tree, the bow, circumcision, baptism, and the Supper—by which to convey the unknown, so the Passover was a combination of the household feast with the widespread idea of safety through blood-sacrifice, which, however it may have come into the world, was not new at that time. Some think there is evidence of an old Semitic festival at that season which was utilized for the institution of the Passover.

The lamb was chosen and its use was kept up (Ex 12:3-6). On the appointed night it was killed and "roasted with fire" and eaten with bitter herbs (Ex 12:8), while they all stood ready girded, with their shoes on their feet and their staff in hand (Ex 12:11). They ate in safety and in hope, because the blood of the lamb was on the door (Ex 12:23). That night the firstborn of Egypt were slain. Among the Egyptians "there was not a house where there was not one dead" (Ex 12:30), from the house of the maid-servant, who sat with her handmill before her, to the palace of the king that "sat on the throne," and even among the cattle in the pasture. If the plague was employed as the agency of the angel of Yahweh, as some think, its peculiarity is that it takes the strongest and the best and culminates in one great stunning blow and then immediately subsides (see PLAGUE). Who can tell the horror of that night when the Israelites were thrust out of the terror-stricken land (Ex 12:39)?

As they went out, they "asked," after the fashion of departing servants in the East, and God gave them favor in the sight of the over-awed Egyptians that they lavished gifts upon them in extravagance. Thus "they despoiled the Egyptians" (Ex 12:36). "Moreover the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of the people" (Ex 11:3; 12:35,36).

(4) The Exodus.

"At the end of 430 years, even the selfsame day it came to pass, that all the hosts of Yahweh went out from the land of Egypt" (Ex 12:41). The great oppressor was Rameses II, and the culmination and the revolution came, most probably, in connection with the building of Pithom and Raamses, as these are the works of Israel mentioned in the Bible narrative (Ex 1:11). Rameses said that he built Pithom at the "mouth of the east" (Budge, History of Exodus, V, 123). All efforts to overthrow that statement have

failed and for the present, at least, it must stand. Israel built Pithom, Rameses built Pithom; there is a synchronism that cannot in the present knowledge of Egyptian history even be doubted, much less separated. The troubled times which came to Egypt with the beginning of the reign of Merenptah II afforded the psychological moment for the return of the "son of Pharaoh's daughter" and his access to the royal court. The presence and power of Yahweh vindicated His claim to be the Lord of all the earth, and Merenptah let the children of Israel go. A little later when Israel turned back from the border of Khar (Palestine) into the wilderness and disappeared, and Merenptah's affairs were somewhat settled in the empire, he set up the usual boastful tablet claiming as his own many of the victories of his royal ancestors, added a few which he himself could truly boast, and inserted, near the end, an exultation over Israel's discomfiture, accounting himself as having finally won the victory:

"Tehennu is devastation, Kheta peace, the Canaan the prisoner of all ills;

"Asgalon led out, taken with Gezer, Yenoamam made naught;

"The People of Israel is ruined, his posterity is not; Khar is become as the widows of Egypt."

The synchronisms of this period are well established and must stand until, if it should ever be, other facts of Egyptian history shall be obtained to change them. Yet it is impossible to determine with certainty the precise event from which the descent into Egypt should be reckoned, or to fix the date BC of Moses, Rameses and Merenptah, and the building of Pithom, and so, likewise, the date of the exodus and of all the patriarchal movements. The ancients were more concerned about the order of events, their perspective and their synchronisms than about any epochal date. For the present we must be content with these chronological uncertainties. Astronomical science may sometimes fix the epochal dates for these events; otherwise there is little likelihood that they will ever be known.

They went out from Succoth (Egyptian "Thuku," Budge, History of Egypt, V, 122, 129), carrying the bones of Joseph with them as he had commanded (Ex 13:19; Ge 50:25). The northeast route was the direct way to the promised land, but it was guarded. Pithom itself was built at "the mouth of the East," as a part of the great frontier defenses (Budge, op. cit., V, 123). The "wall" on this frontier was well guarded (Ex 14), and attempts might be made to stop them. So they went not "by the way of the land of the Philistines .... lest peradventure the people repent when they see war" (Ex 13:17). The Lord Himself took the leadership and went ahead of the host of Israel in a pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night (Ex 13:21). He led them by "the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea" (Ex 13:18). They pitched before Pi-hahiroth, over against Baal-zephon between Migdol and the sea (Ex 14:2). Not one of these places has been positively identified. But the Journeys before and after the crossing, the time, and the configuration of the land and the coast-line of the sea, together with all the necessities imposed by the narrative, are best met by a crossing near the modern town of Suez (Naville, Route of the Exodus; Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus), where Ras 'Ataka comes down to the sea, upon whose heights a migdhol or "watch-tower," as the southern outpost of the eastern line of Egyptian defenses, would most probably be erected.

Word was carried from the frontier to Pharaoh, probably at Tanis, that the Israelites had "fled" (Ex 14:5), had taken the impassioned thrusting out by the frenzied people of Egypt in good faith and had gone never to return. Pharaoh took immediate steps to arrest and bring back the fugitives. The troops at hand (Ex 14:6) and the chariot corps, including 600 "chosen chariots," were sent at once in pursuit, Pharaoh going out in person at least to start the expedition (Ex 14:6,7). The Israelites seemed to be "entangled in the land," and, since "the wilderness (had) shut them in" (Ex 4:3), must easily fall a prey to the Egyptian army. The Israelites, terror-stricken, cried to Moses. God answered and commanded the pillar of cloud to turn back from its place before the host of Israel and stand between them and the approaching Egyptians, so that while the Egyptians were in the darkness Israel had the light (Ex 14:19,20). The mountain came down on their right, the sea on the left to meet the foot of the mountain in front of them; the Egyptians were hastening on after them and the pillar of cloud and fire was their rearward. Moses with the rod of God stood at the head of the fleeing host. Then God wrought. Moses stretched out the rod of God over the sea and "Yahweh caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night" (Ex 14:16-21). A pathway was before them and the sea on the right hand, and on the left was a "wall unto them," and they passed through (Ex 14:21,22). Such heaping up of the waters by the wind is well known and sometimes amounts to 7 or 8 ft. in Lake Erie (Wright, Scientific Confirmations of the Old Testament, 106). No clearer statement could possibly be made of the means used and of the miraculous timing of God’s providence with the obedience of the people to His command to Moses. The host of Israel passed over on the hard, sandy bottom of the sea. The Egyptians coming up in the dark and finding it impossible to tell exactly where the coastline had been on this beach, and where the point of safety would lie when the wind should abate and the tide come in again, impetuously rushed on after the fleeing slaves. In the morning, Yahweh looked forth and troubled the Egyptians "and took off their chariot wheels, and they drove them heavily" (Ex 14:24,25). The wind had abated, the tide was returning and the infiltration that goes before the tide made the beach like a quicksand. The Egyptians found that they had gone too far and tried to escape (Ex 14:27), but it was too late. The rushing tide caught them (Ex 14:28). When the day had come, "horse and rider" were but the subject of a minstrel’s song of triumph (Ex 15:1-19; Ps 106:9-12) which Miriam led with her timbrel (Ex 15:20). The Bible does not say, and there is no reason to believe, that Pharaoh led the Egyptian hosts in person further than at the setting off and for the giving of general direction to the campaign (Ex 15:4). Pharaoh and his host were overthrown in the Red Sea (Ps 136:15). So Napoleon and his host were overthrown at Waterloo, but Napoleon lived to die at Helena. And Merenptah lived to erect his boastful inscription concerning the failure of Israel, when turned back from Kadesh-barnea, and their disappearance in the wilderness of Paran. His mummy, identified by the lamented Professor Groff, lies among the royal mummies in the Cairo Museum. Thus at the Red Sea was wrought the final victory of Yahweh over Pharaoh; and the people believed (Ex 14:31).

(5) Special Providences.

Now proceeded that long course of special providences, miraculous timing of events, and multiplying of natural agencies which began with the crossing of the Red Sea and ended only when they "did eat of the fruit of the land" (Jos 5:12). God promised freedom from the diseases of the Egyptians (Ex 15:26) at the bitter waters of Marah, on the condition of obedience. Moses was directed to a tree, the wood of which should counteract the alkaline character of the water (Ex 15:23-25). A little later they were at Elim

(Wady Gharandel, in present-day geography), where were "twelve springs of water and three score and ten palm trees" (Ex 15:27). The enumeration of the trees signifies nothing but their scarcity, and is understood by everyone who has traveled in that desert and counted, again and again, every little clump of trees that has appeared. The course of least resistance here is to turn a little to the right and come out again at the Red Sea in order to pass around the point of the plateau into the wilderness of Sin. This is the course travel takes now, and it took the same course then (Ex 16:1). Here Israel murmured (Ex 16:2), and every traveler who crosses this blistering, dusty, wearisome, hungry wilderness joins in the murmuring, and wishes, at least a little, that he had stayed in the land of Egypt (Ex 16:3). Provisions brought from Egypt were about exhausted and the land supplied but little. Judging from the complaints of the people about the barrenness of the land, it was not much different then from what it is now (Nu 20:1-6). Now special providential provision began. "At even .... the quails came up, and covered the camp," and in the morning, after the dew, the manna was found (Ex 16:4-36).

See MANNA; QUAIL.

At Rephidim was the first of the instances when Moses was called upon to help the people to some water. He smote the rock with the rod of God, and there came forth an abundant supply of water (Ex 17:1-6). There is plenty of water in the wady near this point now. The Amalekites, considering the events immediately following, had probably shut the Israelites off from the springs, so God opened some hidden source in the mountain side. "Then came Amalek, and fought with Israel" (Ex 17:8). Whether the hand which Moses lifted up during the battle was his own hand or a symbolical hand (Ex 17:9-12), thought to have been carried in battle then, as sometimes even yet by the Bedouin, is of no importance. It was in either case a hand stretched up to God in prayer and allegiance, and the battle with Amalek, then as now, fluctuates according as the hand is lifted up or lowered (Ex 17:8-16).

Here Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, met him and brought his wife and children to him (Ex 18:5,6; compare Nu 10:29). A sacrificial feast was held with the distinguished guest (Ex 18:7-12). In the wise counsel of this great desert-priest we see one of the many natural sources of supply for Moses' legal lore and statesmanship. A suggestion of Jethro gave rise to one of the wisest and most far-reaching elements in the civil institutions of Israel, the elaborate system of civil courts (Ex 18:13-26).

(6) Receiving the Law.

At Sinai Moses reached the pinnacle of his career, though perhaps not the pinnacle of his faith. (For a discussion of the location of Sinai, see SINAI; EXODUS.) It is useless to speculate about the nature of the flames in theophany by fire at Sinai. Some say there was a thunderstorm (HDB); others think a volcanic eruption. The time, the stages of the journey, the description of the way, the topography of this place, especially its admirable adaptability to be the cathedral of Yahweh upon earth, and, above all, the collocation of all the events of the narrative along this route to this spot and to no other—all these exercise an overwhelming influence upon one (compare Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus). If they do not conclusively prove, they convincingly persuade, that here the greatest event between Creation and Calvary took place

Here the people assembled. "And Mount Sinai, the whole of it, smoked," and above appeared the glory of God. Bounds were set about the mountain to keep the people back (Ex 19:12,13). God was upon the mountain: "Under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the very heaven for clearness" (Ex 19:16-19; 24:10,16,17), "and God spake all these words" (Ex 20:1-17). Back over the summit of the plain between these two mountain ridges in front, the people fled in terror to the place "afar off" (Ex 20:18), and somewhere about the foot of this mountain a little later the tabernacle of grace was set up (Ex 40:17). At this place the affairs of Moses mounted up to such a pinnacle of greatness in the religious history of the world as none other among men has attained unto. He gave formal announcement of the perfect law of God as a rule of life, and the redeeming mercy of God as the hope through repentance for a world of sinners that "fall short." Other men have sought God and taught men to seek God, some by the works of the Law and some by the way of propitiation, but where else in the history of the world has any one man caught sight of both great truths and given them out?

Moses gathered the people together to make the covenant (Ex 24:1-8), and the nobles of Israel ate a covenant meal there before God (Ex 24:11). God called Moses again to the mountain with the elders of Israel (Ex 24:12). There Moses was with God, fasting 40 days (Ex 34:28). Joshua probably accompanied Moses into the mount (Ex 24:13). There God gave directions concerning the plan of the tabernacle: "See .... that thou make all things according to the pattern that was showed thee in the mount" (Heb 8:5-12, summing up Ex 25:40; 26:30; 27:8). This was the statement of the architect to the builder. We can only learn what the pattern was by studying the tabernacle (see TABERNACLE). It was an Egyptian plan (compare Bible Student, January, 1902). While Moses was engaged in his study of the things of the tabernacle on the mount, the people grew restless and appealed to Aaron (Ex 32:1). In weakness Aaron yielded to them and made them a golden calf and they said, "These are thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (Ex 32:2-6; compare CALF, GOLDEN). This was probably, like the later calf-worship at Bethel and Dan, ancient Semitic bull-worship and a violation of the second commandment Ex 20:5; compare Bible Student, August, 1902). The judgment of God was swift and terrible (32:7-35), and Levi was made the Divine agent (32:25-29). Here first the "tent of meeting" comes into prominence as the official headquarters of the leader of Israel (33:7-11). Henceforth independent and distinct from the tabernacle, though on account of the similarity of names liable to be confused with that building, it holds its place and purpose all through the wanderings to the plain of Moab by Jordan (De 31:14). Moses is given a vision of God to strengthen his own faith (Ex 33:12-23; 34:1-35). On his return from communion with God, he had such glory within that it shone out through his face to the terror of the multitude, an adumbration of that other and more glorious transfiguration at which Moses should also appear, and that reflection of it which is sometimes seen in the life of many godly persons (Mt 17:1-13; Mr 9:2-10; Lu 9:28-36).

Rationalistic attempts to account for the phenomena at Sinai have been frequent, but usually along certain lines. The favorite hypothesis is that of volcanic action. God has often used natural agencies in His revelation and in His miracles, and there is no necessary obstacle to His doing so here. But there are two seemingly insuperable difficulties in the way of this naturalistic explanation: one, that since geologic time this has not been a volcanic region; the other, that volcanic eruptions are not conducive to literary inspiration. It is almost impossible to get a sane account from the beholders of an eruption, much less has it a tendency to result in the greatest literature, the most perfect code of laws and the

profoundest statesmanship in the world. The human mind can easily believe that God could so speak from Sinai and direct the preparation of such works of wisdom as the Book of the Covenant. Not many will be able to think that Moses could do so during a volcanic eruption at Sinai. For it must be kept in mind that the historical character of the narrative at this point, and the Mosaic authorship of the Book of the Covenant, are generally admitted by those who put forward this naturalistic explanation.

(7) Uncertainties of History.

From this time on to the end of Moses' life, the materials are scant, there are long stretches of silence, and a biographer may well hesitate. The tabernacle was set up at the foot of the "mountain of the law" (Ex 40:17-19), and the world from that day to this has been able to find a mercy-seat at the foot of the mountain of the law. Nadab and Abihu presumptuously offered strange fire and were smitten (Le 10:1-7). The people were numbered (Nu 1:1). The Passover was kept (Nu 9:1-5).

(8) Journey to Canaan Resumed.

The journey to Canaan began again (Nu 10:11-13). From this time until near the close of the life of Moses the events associated with his name belong for the most part to the story of the wanderings in the wilderness and other subjects, rather than to a biography of Moses. (compare WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL; AARON; MIRIAM; JOSHUA; CALEB; BRAZEN SERPENT, etc.). The subjects and references are as follows:

The March (Nu 2:10-18; 9:15-23)

The Complaining (Nu 11:1-3)

The Lusting (Nu 11:4-6,18-35)

The Prophets (Nu 11:16)

Leprosy of Miriam (Nu 12:1-16)

(9) The Border of the Land:

Kadesh-barnea (Nu 13:3-26)

The Spies (De 1:22; Nu 13:2,21; 23:27,28-33; 14:1-38)

The Plagues (Nu 14:36,37,40-45)

(10) The Wanderings:

Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Nu 16:1-35)

The Plague (Nu 16:41-50; 17)

Death of Miriam (Nu 20:1)

Sin of Moses and Aaron (Nu 20:2-13; Ps 106:32)

Unfriendliness of Edom (Nu 20:14-21)

Death of Aaron (Nu 20:22-29)

Arad (Nu 21:1-3)

Compassing of Edom (Nu 21:4)

Murmuring (Nu 21:5-7)

Brazen Serpent (Nu 21:8,9; Joh 3:14)

(11) Edom:

The Jordan (Nu 21:10-20)

Sihon (Nu 21:21-32)

Og (Nu 21:33-35)

Balak and Balaam (Nu 22:4; 24:25)

Pollution of the People (Nu 25:6-15)

Numbering of the People (Nu 26)

Joshua Chosen (Nu 27:15-23)

Midianites Punished (Nu 31) (12) Tribes East of Jordan (Numbers 32)

(13) Moses' Final Acts.

Moses was now ready for the final instruction of the people. They were assembled and a great farewell address was given (De 1-30:20). Joshua was formally inducted into office (De 31:1-8), and to the priests was delivered a written copy of this last announcement of the Law now adapted to the progress made during 40 years (De 31:9-13; compare 31:24-29). Moses then called Joshua into the tabernacle for a final charge (De 31:14-23), gave to the assembled elders of the people "the words of this song" (De 31:30; 32:1-43) and blessed the people (De 33). And then Moses, who "by faith" had triumphed in Egypt, had been the great revelator at Sinai, had turned back to walk with the people of little faith for 40 years, reached the greatest triumph of his faith, when, from the top of Nebo, the towering pinnacle of Pisgah, he lifted up his eyes to the goodly land of promise and gave way to Joshua to lead the people in (De 34). And there Moses died and was buried, "but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day" (De 34:5,6), "and Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died" (De 34:7).

This biography of Moses is the binding-thread of the Pentateuch from the beginning of Exodus to the end of Deuteronomy, without disastrous breaks or disturbing repetitions. There are, indeed, silences, but they occur where nothing great or important in the narrative is to be expected. And there are, in the eyes of some, repetitions, so-called doublets, but they do not seem to be any more real than may be expected in any biography that is only incidental to the main purpose of the writer. No man can break apart this narrative of the books without putting into confusion this life-story; the one cannot be treated as independent of the other; any more than the narrative of the English Commonwealth and the story of Cromwell, or the story of the American Revolution and the career of Washington.

Later references to Moses as leader, lawgiver and prophet run all through the Bible; only the most important will be mentioned: Jos 8:30-35; 24:5; 1Sa 12:6-8; 1Ch 23:14-17; Ps 77:20; 99:6; 105; 106; Isa 63:11,12; Jer 15:1; Da 9:11-13; Ho 12:13; Mic 6:4; Mal 4:4.

The place held by Moses in the New Testament is as unique as in the Old Testament, though far less prominent. Indeed, he holds the same place, though presented in a different light. In the Old Testament he is the type of the Prophet to be raised up "like unto" him. It is the time of types, and Moses, the type, is most conspicuous. In the New Testament the Prophet "like unto Moses" has come. He now stands out the greatest One in human history, while Moses, the type, fades away in the shadow. It is thus he appears in Christ’s remarkable reference to him: "He wrote of me" (Joh 5:46). The principal thing which Moses wrote specifically of Christ is this passage: "Yahweh thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me" (De 18:15,18 f). Again in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which is the formal passing over from the types of the Old Testament to the fulfillment in the New Testament, Jesus is made to stand out as the Moses of the new dispensation (Heb 3; 12:24-29). Other most important New Testament references to Moses are Mt 17:3; Mr 9:4; Lu 9:30; Joh 1:17,45; 3:14; Ro 5:14; Jude 1:9; Re 15:3.

II. Work and Character.

So little is known of the private life of Moses that his personal character can scarcely be separated from the part which he bore in public affairs. It is the work he wrought for Israel and for mankind which fixes

his place among the great ones of earth. The life which we have just sketched as the life of the leader of Israel is also the life of the author, the lawgiver, and the prophet.

1. The Author:

It is not within the province of this article to discuss in full the great critical controversies concerning the authorship of Moses which have been summed up against him thus: "It is doubtful whether we can regard Moses as an author in the literary sense" (HDB, III, 446; see PENTATEUCH; DEUTERONOMY). It will only be in place here to present a brief statement of the evidence in the case for Moses. There is no longer any question concerning the literary character of the age in which Moses lived. That Moses might have written is indisputable. But did he write, and how much? What evidence bears at these points?

(1) "Moses Wrote."

The idea of writing or of writings is found 60 times in the Pentateuch It is definitely recorded in writing purporting to be by Moses. 7 times that Moses wrote or was commanded to write (Ex 17:14; 34:27; 39:30; Nu 17:2,3; De 10:4; 31:24) and frequently of others in his times (De 6:9; 27:3; 31:19; Jos 8:32). Joshua at the great convocation at Shechem for the taking of the covenant wrote "these words in the book of the law of God" (Jos 24:26). Thus is declared the existence of such a book but 25 years after the death of Moses (compare Bible Student, 1901, 269-74). It is thus clearly asserted by the Scriptures as a fact that Moses in the wilderness a little after the exodus was "writing" "books."

(2) Moses' Library.

There are many library marks in the Pentateuch, even in those portions which by nearly all, even the most radical, critics are allowed to be probably the writings of Moses. The Pentateuch as a whole has such library marks all over it.

On the one hand this is entirely consistent with the known literary character of the age in which Moses lived. One who was "instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" might have had in his possession Egyptian records. And the author of this article is of that class to whom Professor Clay refers, who believe "that Hebraic (or Amoraic) literature, as well as Aramaic, has a great antiquity prior to the 1st millennium BC" (Clay, Amurru, 32).

On the other hand, the use of a library to the extent indicated by the abiding marks upon the Pentateuch does not in the least militate against the claim of Moses for authorship of the same. The real library marks, aside from the passages which are assigned by the critics to go with them, are far less numerous and narrower in scope than in Gibbon or in Kurtz. The use of a library no more necessarily endangers authorship in the one case than in the other.

(3) The Moses-Tradition.

A tradition from the beginning universally held, and for a long time and without inherent absurdity, has very great weight. Such has been the Moses-tradition of authorship. Since Moses is believed to have been such a person living in such an age and under such circumstances as might suitably provide the situation and the occasion for such historical records, so that common sense does not question whether he could have written "a" Pentateuch, but only whether he did write "the" Pentateuch which we have, it is easier to believe the tradition concerning his authorship than to believe that such a tradition arose with nothing so known concerning his ability and circumstances. But such a tradition did arise concerning Moses. It existed in the days of Josiah. Without it, by no possibility could the people have been persuaded to receive with authority a book purporting to be by him. The question of the truthfulness of the claim of actually finding the Book of the Law altogether aside, there must have been such a national hero as Moses known to the people and believed in by them, as well as a confident belief in an age of literature reaching back to his days, else the Book of the Law would not have been received by the people as from Moses. Archaeology does not supply actual literary material from Israel much earlier than the time of Josiah, but the material shows a method of writing and a literary advancement of the people which reaches far back for its origin, and which goes far to justify the tradition in Josiah's day. Moreover, to the present time, there is no archaeological evidence to cast doubt upon that tradition.

(4) The Pentateuch in the Northern Kingdom.

The evidence of the Pentateuch in the Northern Kingdom before the fall of Samaria is very strong—this entirely aside from any evidence from the Sam Pentateuch. Although some few insist upon an early date for that book, it is better to omit it altogether from this argument, as the time of its composition is not absolutely known and is probably not very far from the close of the Babylonian exile of Judah. But the prophets supply indubitable evidence of the Pentateuch in the Northern Kingdom (Ho 1:10; 4:6; 8:1,13; 9:11; 12:9; Am 5:21,22; 8:5; compare Green, Higher Criticism and the Pentateuch, 56-58).

(5) Evidence for the Mosaic Age.

Beyond the limit to which historical evidence reaches concerning the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, internal evidence for the Mosaic age as the time of its composition carries us back to the very days of Moses. Egyptian words in the Pentateuch attest its composition in the Mosaic age, not because they are Egyptian words, for it is quite supposable that later authors might have known Egyptian words, but because they are Egyptian words of such marked peculiarities in meaning and history and of such absolutely accurate use in the Pentateuch, that their employment by later authors in such a way is incredible. The list of such words is a long one. Only a few can be mentioned here. For a complete list the authorities cited must be consulted. There is ye'or, for the streams of Egypt; achu, for the marshy pasture lands along the Nile; shesh, for the "fine white linen" of the priests; "the land of Rameses" for a local district in lower Egypt; tsaphenath pa'neach, Joseph's Egyptian name, and acenath, the name of Joseph's Egyptian wife, and many other Egyptian words (see Lieblein, in PSBA, May, 1898, 202-10; also The Bible Student, 1901, 36-40).

(6) The Obscurity of the Doctrine of the Resurrection in the Pentateuch.

This obscurity has been urged against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Because of the popular belief concerning the doctrine of the resurrection among the Egyptians, this objection to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch becomes the most forcible of all the objections urged by critics. If the Pentateuch was written by Moses when Israel had just come out of Egypt, why did he leave the doctrine of the resurrection in such obscurity? The answer is very simple. The so-called Egyptian doctrine of the resurrection was not a doctrine of resurrection at all, but a doctrine of resuscitation. The essential idea of resurrection, as it runs through Scripture from the first glimpse of it until the declaration of Paul: "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body" (1Co 15:35-45), is almost absolutely beyond the Egyptian vision of the future life. With the Egyptians the risen body was to live the same old life on "oxen, geese, bread, beer, wine and all good things" (compare for abundant illustration Maspero's Guide to Cairo Museum). The omission of the doctrine of the resurrection from the Pentateuch at the later date assigned by criticism is very hard to account for. In view of some passages from the Psalms and the Prophets, it appears inexplicable (Job 19:25-27; Ps 16:10; 49:15; Isa 26:19; Eze 37; Da 12:2). The gross materialism of the Egyptian doctrine of the rising from the dead makes the obscurity of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Pentateuch in Moses' day perfectly natural. Any direct mention of the subject at that time among a people just come out of Egypt would have carried at once into Israel's religion the materialism of the Egyptian conception of the future life. The only way by which the people could be weaned away from these Egyptian ideas was by beginning, as the Pentateuch does, with more spiritual ideas of God, of the other world and of worship. The obscurity of the doctrine of the resurrection in the Pentateuch, so far from being against the Mosaic authorship, is very cogent reason for believing the Pentateuch to have come from that age, as the only known time when such an omission is reasonably explicable. Lord, in his lectures, though not an Egyptologist, caught sight of this truth which later work of Egyptologists has made clear (Moses, 45). Warburton had a less clear vision of it (see Divine Legation).

(7) The Unity of the Pentateuch.

Unity in the Pentateuch, abstractly considered, cannot be indicative of particular time for its composition. Manifestly, unity can be given a book at any time. There is indisputably a certain appearance of unity in narrative in the Pentateuch, and when this unity is examined somewhat carefully, it is found to have such peculiarity as does point to the Mosaic age for authorship. The making of books which have running through them such a narrative as is contained in the Pentateuch which, especially from the end of Genesis, is entangled and interwoven with dates and routes and topographical notes, the history of experiences, all so accurately given that in large part to this day the route and the places intended can be identified, all this, no matter when the books were written, certainly calls for special conditions of authorship. A narrative which so provides for all the exigencies of desert life and so anticipates the life to which Israel looked forward, exhibits a realism which calls for very special familiarity with all the circumstances. And when the narrative adds to all this the life of a man without breaks or repetitions adverse to the purpose of a biography, and running through from beginning to end, and not a haphazard, unsymmetrical man such as might result from the piecing together of fragments, but a colossal and symmetrical man, the foremost man of the world until a greater than Moses should appear, it demands to be written near the time and place of the events narrated. That a work of fiction,

struck off at one time by one hand, might meet all these requirements at a later date, no one can doubt, but a scrap-book, even though made up of facts, cannot do so. In fact, the scraps culled. out by the analysis of the Pentateuch do not make a connected life-story at all, but three fragmentary and disconnected stories, and turn a biography, which is the binding-thread of the books, into what is little better than nonsense.

The unity of the Law, which also can be well sustained, is to the same effect as the unity of the narrative in certifying the narrative near to the time and place of the events narrated. The discussion of the unity of the Law, which involves nearly the whole critical controversy of the day, would be too much of a digression for an article on Moses (see LAW; LEVITICUS; DEUTERONOMY; also Green, Higher Criticism and the Pent; Orr, POT; Wiener, Biblical Sac., 1909—10).

Neither criticism nor archaeology has yet produced the kind or degree of evidence which rationalism demands for the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. No trace has yet been found either of the broken tablets at Mt. Sinai or of the autograph copy of the Law of the Lord "by the hand of Moses" brought out of the house of the Lord in the days of Josiah. Nor are these things likely to be found, nor anything else that will certify authorship like a transcription of the records in the copyright office. Such evidence is not reasonably demanded. The foregoing indications point very strongly to the production of the Pentateuch in the Mosaic age by someone as familiar with the circumstances and as near the heart of the nation as Moses was. That here and there a few slight additions may have been made and that, perhaps, a few explanations made by scribes may have slipped into the text from the margin are not unlikely (Nu 12:3; De 34), but this does not affect the general claim of authorship.

Ps 90 is also attributed to Moses, though attempts have been made to discredit his authorship here also (Delitzsch, Commentary on the Psalms). There are those who perhaps still hold to the Mosaic authorship of the Book of Job. But that view was never more than a speculation.

2. The Lawgiver:

The character of Moses as lawgiver is scarcely separable from that of Moses as author, but calls for some separate consideration.

(1) The extent of the Mosaic element in the Pentateuch legislation has been so variously estimated that for any adequate idea of the discussion the reader must consult not only other articles (LAW; COVENANT, BOOK OF THE; PENTATEUCH) but special works on this subject. In accord with the reasons presented above for the authorship of the Pentateuch in Mosaic times, the great statesman seems most naturally the author of the laws so interwoven with his life and leadership. Moses first gave laws concerning the Passover (Ex 13). At Sinai, after the startling revelation from the summit of the mountain, it is most reasonable that Moses should gather the people together to covenant with God, and should record that event in the short code of laws known as the Book of the Covenant (Ex 24:7). This code contains the Moral Law (Ex 20:1-17) as fundamental, the constitution of theocracy and of all ethical living. This is followed by a brief code suitable to their present condition and immediate

prospects (Ex 20:24-26; 21-23). Considering the expectations of both leader and people that they would immediately proceed to the promised land and take possession, it is quite in order that there should be laws concerning vineyards and olive orchards (Ex 23:11), and harvests (Ex 23:10-16) and the first-fruits (Ex 23:19). Upon the completion of the tabernacle, a priest-code became a necessity. Accordingly, such a code follows with great minutiae of directions. This part of the Law is composed almost entirely of "laws of procedure" intended primarily for the priests, that they might know their own duties and give oral instruction to the people, and probably was never meant for the whole people except in the most general way. When Israel was turned back into the wilderness, these two codes were quite sufficient for the simple life of the wanderings. But Israel developed. The rabble became a nation. Forty years of life under law, under the operation of the Book of the Covenant in the moralities of life, the Priestly Code in their religious exercises, and the brief statutes of Leviticus for the simple life of the desert, prepared the people for a more elaborate code as they entered the promised land with its more complex life. Accordingly, in Deuteronomy that code was recorded and left for the guidance of the people. That these various codes contain some things not now understood is not at all surprising. It would be surprising if they did not. Would not Orientals of today find some things in Western laws quite incomprehensible without explanation?

That some few items of law may have been added at a later time, as some items of history were added to the narrative, is not at all unreasonable, and does in no way invalidate the claim of Moses as the lawgiver, any more than later French legislation has invalidated the Corsican’s claim to the Napoleonic Code.

The essential value of the Mosaic legislation is beyond comparison. Some of the laws of Moses, relating as they did to passing problems, have themselves passed away; some of them were definitely abrogated by Christ and others explicitly fulfilled; but much of his legislation, moral, industrial, social and political, is the warp and woof of the best in the great codes of the world to this day. The morality of the Decalogue is unapproached among collections of moral precepts. Its divinity, like the divinity of the teachings of Jesus, lies not only in what it includes, but also in what it omits. The precepts of Ptah-hotep, of Confucius, of Epictetus include many things found in the Decalogue; the Decalogue omits many things found among the maxims of these moralists. Thus, in what it excludes, as in what it includes, the perfection of the Decalogue lies.

(2) It should be emphasized that the laws of Moses were codes, not a collection of court decisions known to lawyers as common law, but codes given abstractly, not in view of any particular concrete case, and arranged in systematic order (Wiener, Biblical Sac., 1909-10). This is entirely in harmony with the archaeological indications of the Mosaic and preceding ages. The Code of Hammurabi, given at least 5 centuries before, is one of the most orderly, methodical and logical codes ever constructed (Lyon, JAOS, XXV, 254).

3. The Prophet:

The career and the works and the character of Moses culminate in the prophetic office. It was as prophet

that Moses was essentially leader. It was as prophet that he held the place of highest eminence in the world until a greater than Moses came.

(1) The statesman-prophet framed a civil government which illustrated the kingdom of God upon earth. The theocracy did not simulate any government of earth, monarchy, republic or socialistic state. It combined the best elements in all of these and set up the most effective checks which have ever been devised against the evils of each.

(2) The lawgiver-prophet inculcated maxims and laws which set the feet of the people in the way of life, so that, while failing as a law of life in a sinful world, these precepts ever remain as a rule of conduct.

(3) The priest-prophet prepared and gave to Israel a ritual of worship which most completely typified the redemptive mercy of God and which is so wonderfully unfolded in the Epistle to the Hebrews, as it has been more wonderfully fulfilled in the life and atoning death of Christ.

(4) In all the multiform activities of the prophetic career he was a type of Christ, the type of Christ whose work was a "tutor unto Christ."

Moses' revelation of God ever transcends the speculations of theologians about God as a sunrise transcends a treatise on the solar spectrum. While the speculations are cold and lifeless, the revelation is vital and glorious. As an analysis of Raphael's painting of the transfiguration belittles its impression upon the beholder, while a sight of the picture exalts that scene in the mind and heart, so the attempts of theologians to analyze God and bring Him within the grasp of the human mind belittle the conception of God, dwarf it to the capacity of the human intellect, while such a vision of Him as Moses gives exalts and glorifies Him beyond expression. Thus, while theologians of every school from Athanasius to Ritschl come and go, Moses goes on forever; while they stand cold on library shelves, he lives warm in the hearts of men.

Such was the Hebrew leader, lawgiver, prophet, poet; among mere men, "the foremost man of all this world."

LITERATURE.

Commentaries on the Pentateuch; for rabbinical traditions, compare Lauterbach in Jewish Encyclopedia; for pseudepigraphical books ascribed to Moses, see Charles, Assumption of Moses; for Mohammedan legends, compare DB; Ebers, Egypten und die Bucher Mosis; for critical partition of books of Moses, compare the Polychrome Bible and Bennett in HDB; for comprehensive discussion of the critical problems, compare POT.

M. G. Kyle

MOSES, ASSUMPTION OF

a-sump’-shun.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

MOSES, SONG OF

The name given to the song of triumph sung by Moses and the Israelites after the crossing of the Red Sea and the destruction of the hosts of Pharaoh (Ex 15:1-18). The sublimity of this noble ode is universally admitted. In magnificent strains it celebrates the deliverance just experienced, extolling the attributes of Yahweh revealed in the triumph (Ex 15:1-12), then anticipates the astonishing effects which would flow from this deliverance in the immediate future and later (Ex 15:13-18). There seems no reason to doubt that at least the basis of the song—possibly the whole—is genuinely Mosaic. In the allusions to the guidance of the people to God’s holy habitation, and to the terror of the surrounding peoples and of the Canaanites (Ex 15:13-18), it is thought that traces are manifest of a later revision and expansion. This, however, is by no means a necessary conclusion.

Driver, who in LOT, 8th edition, 30, goes with the critics on this point, wrote more guardedly in the 1st edition (p. 27): "Probably, however, the greater part of the song is Mosaic, and the modification or expansion is limited to the closing verses; for the general style is antique. and the triumphant tone which pervades it is just such as might naturally have been inspired by the event which it celebrates."

The song of Moses is made the model in the Apocalypse of "the song of Moses the servant of God, and the song of the Lamb," which those standing by the sea of glass, who have "come off victorious from the beast, and from his image, and from the number of his name," sing to God’s praise, "Great and marvelous are thy works, O Lord God, the Almighty," etc. (Re 15:2-4). The church having experienced a deliverance similar to that experienced by Israel at the Red Sea, but infinitely greater, the old song is recast, and its terms are readapted to express both victories, the lower and the higher, at once.

James Orr

MOSOLLAMON

mo-sol’-a-mon.

See MOSOLLAMUS.

MOSOLLAMUS

mo-sol’-a-mus:

(1) the King James Version "Mosollam" (Mosollamos), one of the three "assessors" appointed to the two commissioners in the inquiry made about "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:14) =" Meshullam" in Ezr 10:15.

(2) the King James Version "Mosollamon," one of those sent by Ezra to the captain Loddeus to obtain men who could execute the priest's office (1 Esdras 8:44 (Septuagint 43)) =" Meshullam" in Ezr 8:16 (Codex Vaticanus reads also Mesolabon, in 1 Esdras 8:44).

MOST HIGH, MOST HOLY

See GOD, NAMES OF.

MOTE

mot (karphos): A minute piece of anything dry or light, as straw, chaff, a splinter of wood, that might enter the eye. Used by Jesus in Mt 7:3 ff; Lu 6:41 f in contrast with "beam," to rebuke officiousness in correcting small faults of others, while cherishing greater ones of our own.

MOTH

moth ('ash; compare Arabic 'uththat, "moth"; colloquial, 'itt; cac, "worm" (Isa 51:8); compare Arabic sus, "worm," especially an insect larva in flesh, wood or grain; ses, "moth" (Mt 6:19,20; Lu 12:33); setobrotos, "moth-eaten" (Jas 5:2)):

The moths constitute the larger division of the order Lepidoptera. Two of the points by which they are distinguished from butterflies are that they are generally nocturnal and that their antennae are not club-shaped. Further, the larva in many cases spins a cocoon for the protection of the pupa or chrysalis, which is never the case with butterflies. The Biblical references are to the clothes-moth, i.e. various species of the genus Tinea, tiny insects which lay their eggs in woolen clothes, upon which the larvae later feed. As the larva feeds it makes a cocoon of its silk together with fibers of the cloth on which it is feeding, so that the color of the cocoon depends upon the color of the fabric. The adult is only indirectly harmful, as it is only in the larval stage that the insect injures clothing. Therefore in Isa 51:8, "For the moth ('ash) shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm (cac) shall eat them like wool," both words must refer to the larva, the distich demanding such a word as cac to balance 'ash in the first half. The word "moth" occurs 7 times in the Old Testament, in Job, Psalms, Isaiah and Hosea, always in figurative expressions, typifying either that which is destructive (Job 13:28; Ps 39:11; Isa 50:9; 51:8; Ho 5:12) or that which is frail (Job 4:19; 27:18).

See INSECTS.

Alfred Ely Day

MOTHER

muth’-er (’em, "mother," "dam," "ancestress"; meter):

1. Her Position in the Old Testament:

In vain do we look in the Scriptures for traces of the low position which woman occupies in many eastern lands. A false impression has been created by her present position in the East, especially under Mohammedan rule. Her place as depicted in the Scriptures is a totally different one. Women there move on the same social plane with men. They often occupy leading public positions (Ex 15:20; Jud 4:4; 2Ki 22:14). The love of offspring was deeply imbedded in the heart of Hebrew women, and thus motherhood was highly respected. Among the patriarchs women, and especially mothers, occupy a prominent place. In Rebekah’s marriage, her mother seems to have had equal voice with her father and Laban, her brother (Ge 24:28,50,53,55). Jacob "obeyed his father and his mother" (Ge 28:7), and his mother evidently was his chief counselor. The Law places the child under obligation of honoring father and mother alike (Ex 20:12). The child that strikes father or mother or curses either of them is punished by death (Ex 21:15,17). The same fate overtakes the habitually disobedient (De 21:18-21).

In one place in the Law, the mother is even placed before the father as the object of filial reverence (Le 19:3). The Psalmist depicts deepest grief as that of one who mourneth for his mother (Ps 35:14). In the entire Book of Proverbs the duty of reverence, love and obedience of sons to their mothers is unceasingly inculcated. The greatest comfort imaginable is that wherewith a mother comforts her son (Isa 66:13).

2. Position in the New Testament:

And what is true of the Old Testament is equally true of the New Testament. The same high type of womanhood, the same reverence for one’s mother is in evidence in both books. The birth of Christ lifted motherhood to the highest possible plane and idealized it for all time. The last thing Jesus did on the Cross was to bestow His mother on John "the beloved" as his special inheritance. What woman is today, what she is in particular in her motherhood, she owes wholly to the position in which the Scriptures have placed her. Sometimes the stepmother is spoken of as the real mother (Ge 37:10). Sometimes the grandmother or other female relative is thus spoken of (Ge 3:20; 1Ki 15:10).

Tropically the nation is spoken of as a mother and the people are her children (Isa 50:1; Jer 50:12; Ho 2:4; 4:5). Large cities also are "mothers" (2Sa 20:19; compare Ga 4:26; 2 Esdras 10:7), and Job even depicts the earth as such (Job 1:21).

Henry E. Dosker

MOTHER-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

MOTION

mo’-shun: In 2 Esdras 6:14, the King James Version "motion" represents the Latin commotio, "commotion," "disturbance" (the Revised Version (British and American) has revised entirely here). In Ro 7:5, "the motions of sins, which were by the law," "motion" is used in the sense of "impulse," and "impulses" would probably give the best translation. But the Greek noun (pathemata) is hard to translate exactly, and the Revised Version (British and American) has preferred "passions," as in Ga 5:24. Sanday (ICC) paraphrases "the impressions of sense, suggestive of sin, stimulated into perverse activity by their legal prohibition." See PASSION. "Motion" is found also in The Wisdom of Solomon 5:11 (the King James Version and the Revised Version margin) and The Wisdom of Solomon 7:24 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) in a modern sense.

Burton Scott Easton

MOUND

mound.

See SIEGE, 4, (c).

MOUNT EPHRAIM

See EPHRAIM, MOUNT.

MOUNT OF CONGREGATION, THE

See CONGREGATION, MOUNT OF.

MOUNT OF CORRUPTION

See OLIVES, MOUNT OF.

MOUNT OF OLIVES

See OLIVES, MOUNT OF; JERUSALEM.

MOUNT OF THE AMALEKITES

("Hill-country of the Amalekites" (Jud 12:15)): The Amalekites are usually connected with the valley (Nu 14:25; Jud 7:12), but appear from this passage to have had a settlement in the hill country of Ephraim.

See AMALEKITE.

MOUNT OF THE AMORITES

("Hill-country of the Amorites" (De 1:7,20,24; compare Nu 13:29; Jos 10:6, etc.)): The region intended is that afterward known as the hill country of Judah and Ephraim, but sometimes "Amorites" is used as a general designation for all the inhabitants of Canaan (Ge 15:16; Jos 24:8,18, etc.).

See AMORITES.

MOUNT OF THE VALLEY

Zereth-shahar is said to be situated in or on the "mount of the valley" (behar ha‘emeq (Jos 13:19)). Cheyne (EB, under the word) says "i.e. on one of the mountains East of the Jordan valley (compare Josephus 13 27), and not impossibly on that described at length in BJ, VII, vi, 1-3." To the Northwest of this mountain is Wady ec-Cara, wherein there may be a reminiscence of Zereth-shahar. There is no certainty.

MOUNT; MOUNTAIN

mount, moun’-tin.

See HILL, MOUNT, MOUNTAIN.

MOURNING

morn’-ing.

See BURIAL; GRIEF.

MOUSE; MICE

mous, mis (‘akhbar; Septuagint mus, "mouse"; compare Arabic ‘akbar, "jerboa" not ‘akbar, "greater"; compare also proper noun, ‘akhbor, "Achbor" (Ge 36:38; 1Ch 1:49; also 2Ki 22:12,14; Jer 26:22; 36:12)): The word occurs in the list of unclean "creeping things" (Le 11:29), in the account of the golden mice and tumors (the King James Version and the American Revised Version margin "emerods") sent by the Philistines (1Sa 6:4-18), and in the phrase, "eating swine’s flesh, and the abomination, and the

mouse" (Isa 66:17). The cosmopolitan housemouse, Mus musculus, is doubtless the species referred to. The jerboa or jumping mouse, Arabic yarbu, is eaten by the Arabs of the Syrian desert, Northeast of Damascus. Possibly allied to ‘akhbar is the Arabic ‘akbar (generally in plural, ‘akabir), used for the male of the jerboa.

Alfred Ely Day

MOUTH

mowth (peh, chekh, garon (Ps 149:6); Aramaic pum, tera (Da 3:26); stoma, 71 times, once logos, i.e. "word of mouth," "speech" (Ac 15:27); once we find the verb epistomizo, "to silence," "to stop the mouth" (Tit 1:11)):

1. Literal Sense:

In addition to frequent references to man and animals, "Their food was yet in their mouths" (Ps 78:30); "And Yahweh opened the mouth of the ass" (Nu 22:28); "Save me from the lion’s mouth" (Ps 22:21), etc., the term is often used in connection with inanimate things: mouth of a sack (Ge 42:27); of the earth (Ge 4:11; Nu 26:10); of a well (Nu 29:2,3,8,10); of a cave (Jos 10:18,22,27); of Sheol (Ps 141:7); of the abyss (Jer 48:28); of furnace (Aramaic tera‘, Da 3:26); of idols (Ps 115:5; 135:16,17).

2. Figurative Sense:

(1) The "mouth" denotes language, speech, declaration (compare "lips," "tongue," which see): "By the mouth of" is "by means of," "on the declaration of" (Lu 1:70; Ac 1:16); "Whoso killeth any person, the murderer shall be slain at the mouth of witnesses" (Nu 35:30; compare De 17:6; Mt 18:16; Heb 10:28); "I will give you mouth and wisdom" (Lu 21:15); "fool’s mouth" (Pr 18:7).

(2) "Mouth" also denotes "spokesman": "He shall be to thee a mouth" (Ex 4:16).

Numerous are the idiomatic phrases which have, in part, been introduced into English by means of the language of the Bible. "To put into the mouth," if said of God, denotes Divine inspiration (De 18:18; Mic 3:5). "To have words put into the mouth" means to have instructions given (De 31:19; 2Sa 14:3; Jer 1:9; Ex 4:11-16). "The fruit of the mouth" (Pr 18:20) is synonymical with wisdom, the mature utterance of the wise. "To put one’s mouth into the dust" is equivalent with humbling one’s self (La 3:29; compare "to lay one’s horn in the dust," Job 16:15). Silent submission is expressed by "laying the hand upon the mouth" (Jud 18:19; Job 29:9; 40:4; Mic 7:16); compare "to refrain the lips"; see LIP. "To open the mouth wide" against a person is to accuse him wildly and often wrongfully (Ps 35:21; Isa 57:4), otherwise "to open one’s mouth wide," "to have an enlarged mouth" means to have great confidence and joy in speaking or accepting good things (1Sa 2:1; Eze 33:22; 2Co 6:11; Eph 6:19). "To gape upon one with the mouth" means to threaten a person (Job 16:10). Divine rebuke is expressed by the "rod of God’s mouth" (Isa 11:4), and the Messiah declares "He hath made my mouth like a sharp sword" (Isa 49:2;

compare Re 2:16; 19:15,21). Great anguish, such as dying with thirst, is expressed by "the tongue cleaving to the roof of the mouth" (Hebrew chekh, Job 29:10; Ps 137:6; compare 22:15).

H. L. E. Luering

MOWING; MOWN GRASS

mo’-ing, (gez, "a shearing," "cut grass"): In Ps 72:6 the good king’s rule is said to be "like rain upon the mown grass," to start the new growth (compare 2Sa 23:4; Ho 6:3). "The king’s mowings" (Am 7:1) were the portion of the spring herbage taken as tribute by the kings of Israel to feed their horses (compare 1Sa 8:15 ff; 18:5). "After the king’s mowings" would denote the time when everybody else might turn to reap their greenstuffs (BTP, II, 109). The term "mower" (qatsar, "to dock off," "shorten") in Ps 129:7 the King James Version is rendered "reaper" in the Revised Version (British and American), and in Jas 5:4 the Revised Version (British and American) has "mow" for amao (the King James Version "reap").

See HARVEST; REAPING.

M. O. Evans

MOZA

mo’-za (motsah):

(1) Son of Caleb and Ephah (1Ch 2:46).

(2) A descendant of Saul (1Ch 8:36,37; 9:42,43).

MOZAH

mo’-za (ha-motsah; Codex Vaticanus Amoke; Codex Alexandrinus Amosa): A town in the territory of Benjamin named after Mizpeh and Chephirah (Jos 18:26). It may be represented by the modern Beit Mizzeh, the heavy "ts" of the Hebrew letter (tsade) passing into the light "z" of the Arabic, a not unusual change. The name means "place of hard stone." The village lies to the North of Quloniyeh (possibly Emmaus), about 4 miles Northwest of Jerusalem.

MUFFLER

muf’-ler (re‘alah): The name given to an article of woman’s dress in Isa 3:19. It describes a veil more elaborate and costly than the ordinary. A cognate word in the sense of "veiled" is applied in the Mishna (Shabbath, vi.6) to Jewesses from Arabia.

See DRESS.

MULBERRY; TREES

mul'-ber-i, (bekha'im; Septuagint apioi, "pear trees" (2Sa 5:23 f; 1Ch 14:14 f, margin "balsam-trees"; Ps 84:6, the King James Version "Baca," margin "mulberry trees," the Revised Version (British and American) "weeping," margin "balsam-trees"): According to Arabic writers the Baca tree is similar to the balsam (Balsamodendron opobalsamum), and grows near Mecca; no such tree is, however, known in Palestine. The name may, in Hebrew, have been applied to some species of ACACIA (which see). The idea of "weeping" implied in the root, both in Hebrew and Arabic, may be explained by the exudation of gum. "The sound of marching in the tops of the mulberry trees" has been explained to refer to the quivering of the leaves of poplars, but there is not much to support this view (see POPLAR). The translation "mulberry trees" is, however, even more improbable, as this tree, though very plentiful today, had not been introduced into Palestine in Old Testament times.

Mulberry (moron, (1 Macc 6:34)): The Syrians at Bathzacharias "to the end they might provoke the elephants to fight, they, shewed them the blood of grapes and mulberries." This reference must be to the deep red juice of the black mulberry (Morus nigra), the tut shami of Palestine, a variety cultivated all over the land' for its luscious, juicy fruit.

See SYCOMORE.

E. W. G. Masterman

MULCTED

mulk'-ted ('anash, "to be punished," "fined"): "The simple pass on, and are mulcted" (Pr 22:3 the Revised Version margin, the Revised Version (British and American) "suffer for it," the King James Version "are punished").

MULE

mul (peredh (1Ki 10:25; 18:5; Ezr 2:66; Isa 66:20; Zec 14:15), the feminine pirdah (1Ki 1:33,38,44), rekhesh, "swift steeds," the King James Version "mules" (Es 8:10,14), 'achashteranim, "used in the king's service," the King James Version "camels," the Revised Version margin "mules" (Es 8:10,14), yemim, "hot springs," the King James Version "mules" (Ge 36:24); hemionos, "half-ass," "mule" (1 Esdras 5:43; Judith 15:11)): Mules are mentioned as riding animals for princes (2Sa 13:29; 18:9; 1Ki 1:33,38,44); in the tribute brought to Solomon (2Ch 9:24); as beasts of burden (2Ki 5:17; 1Ch 12:40); horses and mules are obtained from the "house of Togarmah" in the distant north (Eze 27:14). The injunction of Ps 32:9, "Be ye not as the horse, or as the mule, which have no understanding," need not be understood as singling out the horse and mule as more in need of guidance than the rest of the brute

creation, but rather as offering familiar examples to contrast with man who should use his intelligence.

At the present day mules are used as pack animals and for drawing freight wagons, rarely for riding. One does not often see in Palestine mules as large and fine as are common in Europe and America. This may be because most of the mares and many of the donkeys are small.

Alfred Ely Day

MULTITUDE; MIXED

mul’-ti-tud, mikst.

See MINGLED PEOPLE.

MUNITION

mu-nish’-un.

See SIEGE, 4, (b).

MUPPIM

mup’-im (muppim): A son of Benjamin (Ge 46:21), elsewhere called "Shuppim" (1Ch 7:12,15; 26:16), "Shephupham" (Nu 26:39), and "Shephuphan". (1Ch 8:5); compare separate articles on these names.

MURDER

1. Terms:

mur’-der (haragh, "to smite," "destroy," "kill," "slay" (Ps 10:8; Ho 9:13 AV]), ratsach, "to dash to pieces," "kill," especially with premeditation (Nu 35:16 and frequently; 3Job 24:14; Ps 94:6; Jer 7:9; Ho 6:9); phoneus, "criminal homicide," from phoneuo, "to kill," "slay"; phonos, from pheno, has the same meaning; anthropoktonos, "manslayer," "murderer," is used to designate Satan (Joh 8:44) and him that hates his brother (1 Joh 3:15); a matricide is designated as metraloas (1Ti 1:9); compare adelphokionos, "fratricidal" (The Wisdom of Solomon 10:3). The plural of phonos, "murders," occurs in Mt 15:19; Mr 7:21; Ga 5:21 the King James Version; Re 9:21; compare 2 Macc 4:3,18; 12:6):

2. The Hebrew Law:

The Hebrew law recognized the distinction between willful murder and accidental or justifiable homicide (Nu 25:16); but in legal language no verbal distinction is made. Murder was always subject to

capital punishment (Le 24:17; compare Ge 9:6). Even if the criminal sought the protection of the sanctuary, he was to be arrested before the altar, and to be punished (Ex 21:12,14; Le 24:17,21; Nu 35:16,18,21,31). The Mishna says that a mortal blow intended for another than the victim is punishable with death; but such a provision is not found in the Law. No special mention is made of

(a) child murder;

(b) parricide; or

(c) taking life by poison;

but the intention of the law is clear with reference to all these eases (Ex 21:15,17; 1Ti 1:9; Mt 15:4). No punishment is mentioned for attempted suicide (compare 1Sa 31:4 f; 1Ki 16:18; Mt 27:5); yet Josephus says (BJ, III, viii, 5) that suicide was held criminal by the Jews (see also Ex 21:23). An animal known to be vicious must be confined, and if it caused the death of anyone, the animal was destroyed and the owner held guilty of murder (Ex 21:29,31). The executioner, according to the terms of the Law, was the "revenger of blood"; but the guilt must be previously determined by the Levitical tribunal. Strong protection was given by the requirement that at least two witnesses must concur in any capital question (Nu 35:19-30; De 17:6-12; 19:12,17). Under the monarchy the duty of executing justice on a murderer seems to have been assumed to some extent by the sovereign, who also had power to grant pardon (2Sa 13:39; 14:7,11; 1Ki 2:34).

See MANSLAYER.

Frank E. Hirsch

MURDERERS

mur’-der-erz (Ac 21:38 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "assassins"): Represents a word only once mentioned in the New Testament, the Greek word sikarios, Latin sicarius from sica, "a small sword," or "dagger." The word describes the hired assassin, of whom there were bands in the pay of agitators in Rome in the last days of the Republic, who employed them to remove surreptitiously their political opponents. In the later days of the Jewish commonwealth, Judea became infested with the same type of ruffian, and it is natural that the Roman commandant at Jerusalem should describe them by the name so well known in the imperial city.

See ASSASSINS.

T. Nicol.

MURMUR; MURMURINGS

mur’-mur, mur’-mur-ingz: The Hebrew word (lun) denotes the semi-articulated mutterings of disaffected persons. It is used in connection with the complaints of the Israelites in the desert against Yahweh on the one hand, and against Moses and Aaron on the other hand (Ex 16:7,8; Nu 14:27,36; 16:11; 17:5). In three places (De 1:27; Ps 106:25; Isa 29:24), "murmur" translates a Hebrew word (raghan) which suggests the malicious whispering of slander.

In the New Testament "murmur" renders two different words, namely, gogguzo, and embrimaomai. The latter word suggests indignation and fault-finding (Mr 14:4 the King James Version). The former word (or a compound of it) is generally used in connection with the complainings of the Pharisees and scribes (Mt 20:11; Lu 5:30; 15:2; 19:7).

T. Lewis

MURRAIN

mur’-in, mur’-en, mur’-an] (debher): This name is given to a fatal cattle-disease, which was the fifth of the plagues of Egypt (Ex 9:3), and which affected not only the flocks and herds, but also the camels, horses and asses. The record of its onset immediately after the plague of flies makes it probable that it was an epizootic, whose germs were carried by these insects as those of rinderpest or splenic fever may be. Cattle plagues have in recent years been very destructive in Egypt; many writers have given descriptions of the great devastation wrought by the outbreak in 1842. In this case Wittmann noted that contact with the putrid carcasses caused severe boils, a condition also recorded in Exodus as following the murrain. The very extensive spread of rinderpest within the last few years in many districts of Egypt has not yet been completely stamped out, even in spite of the use of antitoxic serum and the most rigid isolation. The word "murrain" is probably a variant of the Old French morine. It is used as an imprecation by Shakespeare and other Elizabethan writers, and is still applied by herdsmen to several forms of epidemic cattle sickness. Among early writers it was used as well for fatal plagues affecting men; thus, Lydgate (1494) speaks of the people "slain by that moreyne."nt that at least two witnesses must concur in any capital question (Nu 35:19-30; De 17:6-12; 19:12,17). Under the monarchy the duty of executing justice on a murderer seems to have been assumed to some extent by the sovereign, who also had power to grant pardon (2Sa 13:39; 14:7,11; 1Ki 2:34).

Alexander Macalister

MUSE; MUSING

muz, muz’-ing: The word occurs twice in the Old Testament, in the sense of "meditate" (Ps 39:3, chaghigh; Ps 143:5, siach); in the New Testament once (Lu 3:15, dialogizomai, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads "reasoned").

MUSHI

mu’-shi (mushi): Son of Merari (Ex 6:19; Nu 3:20; 1Ch 6:19 (Hebrew 4); 23:21; 24:26). There is found also the patronymic "Mushites" (Nu 3:33; 26:58).

MUSIC

mu’-zik:

I. IMPORTANCE

1. The Sole Art Cultivated

2. A Wide Vocabulary of Musical Terms

3. Place in Social and Personal Life

4. Universal Language of Emotions

5. Use in Divine Service

6. Part at Religious Reformations

II. THEORY OF MUSIC

1. Dearth of Technical Information

2. Not Necessarily Unimpressive

III. MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

1. Strings

2. Winds

3. Percussion Instruments

LITERATURE

I. Importance.

That the Hebrews were in ancient times, as they are at the present day, devoted to the study and practice

of music is obvious to every reader of the Old Testament. The references to it are numerous, and are frequently of such a nature as to emphasize its importance. They occur not only in the Psalter, where we might expect them, but in the Historical Books and the Prophets, in narratives and in declamations of the loftiest meaning and most intense seriousness. And the conclusion drawn from a cursory glance is confirmed by a closer study.

1. The Sole Art Cultivated:

The place held by music in the Old Testament is unique. Besides poetry, it is the only art that Art seems to have been cultivated to any extent in ancient Israel. Painting is entirely, sculpture almost entirely, ignored. This may have been due to the prohibition contained in the Second Commandment, but the fidelity with which that was obeyed is remarkable.

2. A Wide Vocabulary of Musical Terms:

From the traces of it extant in the Old Testament, we can infer that the vocabulary of musical terms was far from scanty. This is all the more significant when we consider the condensed and pregnant nature of Hebrew. "Song" in our English Versions of the Bible represents at least half a dozen words in the original.

3. Place in Social and Personal Life:

The events, occasions, and occupations with which music was associated were extremely varied. It accompanied leave-taking with honored guests (Ge 31:27); celebrated a signal triumph over the nation’s enemies (Ex 15:20); and welcomed conquerors returning from victory (Jud 11:34; 1Sa 18:6). It was employed to exorcise an evil spirit (1Sa 18:10), and to soothe temper, or excite the inspiration, of a prophet (2Ki 3:15). The words "Destroy not" in the titles of four of the Psalms (compare Isa 65:8) most probably are the beginning of a vintage-song, and the markedly rhythmical character of Hebrew music would indicate that it accompanied and lightened many kinds of work requiring combined and uniform exertion. Processions, as e.g. marriages (1 Macc 9:39) and funerals (2Ch 35:25), were regulated in a similar way. The Psalms headed "Songs of Degrees" were probably the sacred marches sung by the pious as they journeyed to and from the holy festivals at Jerusalem.

4. Universal Language of Emotional:

It follows from this that the range of emotion expressed by Hebrew music was anything but limited. In addition to the passages just quoted, we may mention the jeering songs leveled at Job (Job 30:9). But the music that could be used to interpret or accompany the Psalms with any degree of fitness must have been capable of expressing a great variety of moods and feelings. Not only the broadly marked antitheses of joy and sorrow, hope and fear, faith and doubt, but every shade and quality of sentiment are found there. It is hardly possible to suppose that the people who originated all that wealth of emotional utterance should have been without a corresponding ability to invent diversified melodies, or should

have been content with the bald and colorless recitative usually attributed to them.

This internal evidence is confirmed by other testimony. The Babylonian tyrants demanded one of the famous songs of Zion from their Jewish captives (Ps 137:3), and among the presents sent by Hezekiah to Sennacherib there were included male and female musicians. In later times Latin writers attest the influence of the East in matters musical. We need only refer to Juvenal iii.62 ff.

5. Use in Divine Service:

By far the most important evidence of the value attached to music by the Hebrews is afforded by the place given to it in Divine service. It is true that nothing is said of it in the Pentateuch in connection with the consecration of the tabernacle, or the institution of the various sacrifices or festivals. But this omission proves nothing. It is not perhaps atoned for by the tradition (The Wisdom of Solomon 18:9) that at the first paschal celebration "the fathers already led the sacred songs of praise," but the rest of the history makes ample amends. In later days, at all events, music formed an essential part of the national worship of Yahweh, and elaborate arrangements were made for its correct and impressive performance. These are detailed in 1 Chronicles. There we are told that the whole body of the temple chorus and orchestra numbered 4,000; that they were trained and conducted, in 24 divisions, by the sons of Asaph, Heman and Jeduthun; and that in each group experts and novices were combined, so that the former preserved the correct tradition, and the latter were trained and fitted to take their place. This is, no doubt, a description of the arrangements that were carried out in the Second Temple, but it sheds a reflex, if somewhat uncertain, light on those adopted in the First.

6. Part at Religious Reformations:

We are told by the same authority that every reformation of religion brought with it a reconstruction of the temple chorus and orchestra, and a resumption of their duties. Thus when Hezekiah purged the state and church of the heathenism patronized by Ahaz, "he set the Levites in the house of Yahweh with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps" (2Ch 29:25). The same thing took place under Josiah (2Ch 34). After the restoration—at the dedication of the Temple (Ezr 3:10) and of the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 12:17)—music played a great part. In Nehemiah’s time the descendants of the ancient choral guilds drew together, and their maintenance was secured to them out of the public funds in return for their services.

II. Theory of Music.

1. Dearth of Technical Information:

It is disappointing after all this to have to confess that of the nature of Hebrew music we have no real knowledge. If any system of notation ever existed, it has been entirely lost. Attempts have been made to derive one from the accents, and a German organist once wrote a book on the subject. One tune in our hymnals has been borrowed from that source, but it is an accident, if not worse, and the ingenuity of the

German organist was quite misdirected. We know nothing of the scales, or tonal system of the Hebrew, of their intervals or of their method of tuning their instruments. Two terms are supposed by some to refer to pitch, namely, "upon," or "set to ‘Alamoth," (Ps 46), and "upon," or "set to the Sheminith" (Pss 6; 12; compare also 1Ch 15:19-21). The former has been taken to mean "in the manner of maidens," i.e. soprano; the latter "on the lower octave," i.e. tenor or bass. This is plausible, but it is far from convincing. It is hardly probable that the Hebrews had anticipated our modern division of the scale; and the word sheminith or "eighth" may refer to the number of the mode, while ‘alamoth is also translated "with Elamite instruments" (Wellhausen). Of one feature of Hebrew music we may be tolerably sure: it was rendered in unison. It was destitute of harmony or counterpoint. For its effect it would depend on contrast in quality of tone, on the participation of a larger or smaller number of singers, on antiphonal singing, so clearly indicated in many of the Psalms, and on the coloring imparted by the orchestra. That the latter occasionally played short passages alone has been inferred from the term celah, a word that occurs 71 times in the Psalms. It is rendered in the Septuagint by diapsalmos, which either means louder playing, forte, or, more probably, an instrumental interlude.

2. Not Necessarily Unimpressive:

Our knowledge is, therefore, very meager and largely negative. We need not, however, suppose that Hebrew music was necessarily monotonous and unimpressive, or, to those who heard it, harsh and barbarous. Music, more than any other of the arts, is justified of her own children, and a generation that has slowly learned to enjoy Wagner and Strauss should not rashly condemn the music of the East. No doubt the strains that emanated from the orchestra and chorus of the temple stimulated the religious fervor, and satisfied the aesthetic principles of the Hebrews of old, precisely as the rendering of Bach and Handel excites and soothes the Christian of today.

III. Musical Instruments.

The musical instruments employed by the Hebrews included representatives of the three groups: string, wind, and percussion. The strings comprised the kinnor, or nebhel or nebhel; the winds: the shophar, or qeren, chatsotserah, chalil, and ‘ughabh; percussion: toph, metsiltayim, tsltselim, mena‘an‘im, shalishim. Besides these, we have in Daniel: mashroqitha’, cabbekha’, pecanterin, cumponyah. Further, there are Chaldean forms of qeren and kithara.

1. Strings:

(1) When Used.

The chief of these instruments were the kinnor and nebhel (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the harp" and "the psaltery" or "viol"). They were used to accompany vocal music. In 1Sa 10:5, Saul meets a band of prophets singing inspired strains to the music of the nebhel, "drum," "flute," and kinnor. In the description of the removal of the ark, we are told that songs were sung with kinnoroth, nebhalim, etc. (2Sa 6:5). Again, in various passages (1Ch 15:16; 2Ch 7:6, etc.) we

meet with the expression keleshir, i.e. instruments of, or suitable for accompanying, song. It is evident that only the flute and strings could render melodies. The music performed on these instruments seems to have been mainly of a joyful nature. It entered into all public and domestic festivities. In Ps 81:2, the kinnor is called "pleasant," and Isa 24:8 speaks of the "joy" of the kinnor. Very striking is the invocation Ps 108:2: the poet in a moment of exhilarations calls upon the two kele shir to echo and share his enthusiasm for Yahweh. Only once (Isa 16:11) is the kinnor associated with mourning, and Cheyne infers from this passage "the kinnor was used at mourning ceremonies." But the inference is doubtful; the prophet is merely drawing a comparison between the trembling of the strings of the lyre and the agitation in his own bosom. Again, the Babylonian captives hang their kinnoroth on the willows in their dejection (Ps 137:2), and the prophets (Isa 24:8; Eze 26:13) threaten that as a punishment for sin the sound of the kinnor will cease.

(2) Materials.

We have no exact information as to the materials of which these instruments were made. In 2Sa 6:5 the King James Version, mention is made of "instruments made of fir wood" (the English Revised Version "cypress"), but the text is probably corrupt, and the reading in 1Ch 13:8 is preferable. According to 1Ki 10:11 f, Hiram’s fleet brought from Ophir quantities of ‘almugh (2Ch 2:8; 9:10, ‘algum) wood, from which, among other things, the kinnor and nebhel were made. Probably this was red sandal-wood. Josephus (Ant., VIII, iii) includes among articles made by Solomon for the temple nebhalim and kinnoroth of electrum. Whether we understand this to have been the mixed metal so named or amber, the frame of the instrument could not have been constructed of it. It may have been used for ornamentation.

We have no trace of metal strings being used by the ancients. The strings of the Hebrew (minnim) may have consisted of gut. We read of sheep-gut being employed for the purpose in the Odyssey, xxi. 407. Vegetable fiber was also spun into strings. We need only add that bowed instruments were quite unknown; the strings were plucked with the fingers, or struck with a plectrum.

(a) The Kinnor:

The Old Testament gives us no clue to the form or nature of the kinnor, except that it was portable, comparatively light, and could be played while it was carried in processions or dances. The earliest authority to which we can refer on the subject is the Septuagint. While in some of the books kinnor is rendered by kinnura, or kinura—evidently a transliteration—in others it is translated by kithara. We cannot discuss here the question of the trustworthiness of the Septuagint as an authority for Hebrew antiquities, but considering the conservatism of the East, especially in matters of ritual, it seems at least hasty to say offhand, as Wellhausen does, that by the date of its production the whole tradition of ancient music had been lost. The translation, at all events, supplies us with an instrument of which the Hebrews could hardly have been ignorant. The kithara, which in its general outlines resembled the lyre, consisted of a rectilinear-shaped sound box from which rose two arms, connected above by a crossbar; the strings ran down from the latter to the sound-box, to which, or to a bridge on which, they were attached.

The most ancient copy of a kithara in Egypt was found in a grave of the XIIth Dynasty. It is carried by one of a company of immigrant captive Semites, who holds it close to his breast, striking the strings with a plectrum held in his right hand, and plucking them with the fingers of the left. The instrument is very primitive; it resembles a schoolboy's slate with the upper three-fourths of the slate broken out of the frame; but it nevertheless possesses the distinctive characteristics of the kithara. In a grave at Thebes of a somewhat later date, three players are depicted, one of whom plays a kithara, also primitive in form, but with slenderer arms. Gradually, as time advanced, the simple board-like frame assumed a shape more like that afterward elaborated by the Greeks. Numerous examples have been found in Asia Minor, but further developed, especially as regards the sound-box. It may be noted that, in the Assyrian monuments, the kithara is played along with the harp, as the kinnor was with the nebhel.

The evidence furnished by Jewish coins must not be overlooked. Those stamped with representations of lyre-shaped instruments have been assigned to 142-135 BC, or to 66-70 AD. On one side we have a kithara-like instrument of 3 or more strings, with a sound-box resembling a kettle. It is true that these coins are of a late date, and the form of the instruments shown on them has obviously been modified by Greek taste, but so conservative a people as the Jews would hardly be likely to adopt an essentially foreign object for their coinage.

One objection raised by Wellhausen to the identification of the kithara with the kinnor may be noted. Josephus undoubtedly says (Ant., VII, xii) that the kinnura was played with a plectrum, and in 1Sa 16:23 David plays the kinnor "with his hand." But even if this excludes the use of the plectrum in the particular case, it need not be held to disprove the identity of kinnor and kinnura. Both methods may have been in use. In paintings discovered at Herculaneum there are several instances of the lyre being played with the hand; and there is no reason for supposing that the Hebrews were restricted to one method of showing their skill, when we know that Greeks and Latins were not.

Since the ancient VSS, then, render kinnor by kithara, and the kithara, though subsequently developed and beautified by the Greeks, was originally a Semitic instrument, it is exceedingly probable, as Riehm says, "that we have to regard the ancient Hebrew kinnor, which is designated a kithara, as a still simpler form of the latter instrument. The stringed instruments on the Jewish coins are later, beautified forms of the kinnor, intermediate stage Egyptian modifications represent the intermediate stage."

(b) The Nebhel:

The nebhel has been identified with many instruments. The literal meaning of the word, "wine-skin," has suggested that it was the bagpipe! Others have thought that it was the lute, and this is supported by reference to the Egyptian nfr, which denotes a lute-like instrument frequently depicted on the monuments. The derivation of "nbl" from "nfr" is, however, now abandoned; and no long-necked instrument has been found depicted in the possession of a Semite. The kissar was favored by Pfeiffer. Its resonance-box is made of wood, and, the upper side, being covered tightly by a skin, closely resembles a drum. From this rise two arms, connected toward the top by a crossbar; and to the latter the strings are attached. The kissar has, however, only 5 strings, as opposed to 12 ascribed by Josephus to the nebhel,

and the soundbox, instead of being above, as stated by the Fathers, is situated below the strings.

The supposition that the nebhel was a dulcimer is not without some justification. The dulcimer was well known in the East. An extremely interesting and important bas-relief in the palace at Kouyunjik represents a company of 28 musicians, of whom 11 are instrumentalists and 15 singers. The procession is headed by 5 men, 3 carrying harps, one a double flute, and one a dulcimer. Two of the harpists and the dulcimer-player appear to be dancing or skipping. Then follow 6 women; 4 have harps, one a double flute, and one a small drum which is fixed upright at the belt, and is played with the fingers of both hands. Besides the players, we see 15 singers, 9 being children, who clap their hands to mark the rhythm. One of the women is holding her throat, perhaps to produce the shrill vibrate affected by Persian and Arabian women at the present day. The dulcimer in this picture has been regarded by several Orientalists as the nebhel. Wettstein, e.g., says "This instrument can fairly be so designated, if the statement of so many witnesses is correct, that nablium and psalterium are one and the same thing. For the latter corresponds to the Arabic santir, which is derived from the Hebrew pecanterin, a transliteration of the Greek psalterion." And the santir is a kind of dulcimer.

This is not conclusive. The word psalterion was not always restricted to a particular instrument, but sometimes embraced a whole class of stringed instruments. Ovid also regarded the nabla as a harp, not a dulcimer, when he said (Ars Am. iii.329): "Learn to sweep the pleasant nabla with both hands." And, lastly, Josephus tells us (Ant., VII, xii) that the nebhel was played without a plectrum. The translation of nebhel by psalterion does not, therefore, shut us up to the conclusion that it was a dulcimer; on the contrary, it rather leads to the belief that it was a harp.

Harps of various sizes are very numerous on the Egyptian monuments. There is the large and elaborate kind with a well-developed sound-box, that served also as a pediment, at its base. This could not be the nebhel, which, as we have seen, was early portable. Then we have a variety of smear instruments that, while light and easily carried, would scarcely have been sonorous enough for the work assigned to the nebhel in the temple services. Berries, the more we learn of the relations of Egypt and Israel, the more dearly do we perceive how little the latter was influenced by the former. But the evidence of the Fathers, which need not be disregarded in a matter of this kind, is decisive against Egyptian harps of every shape and size. These have without exception the sound-box at the base, and Augustine (on Ps 42) says expressly that the psalterium had its sound-box above. This is confirmed by statements of Jerome, Isidore, and others, who contrast two classes of instruments according to the position above or below of the sound-box, Jerome, further, likens the nebhel to the captial Greek letter delta.

All the evidence points to the nebhel having been the Assyrian harp, of which we have numerous examples in the ruins. We have already referred at length to the bas-relief at Kouyunjik in which it is played by 3 men and 4 women. It is portable, triangular, or, roughly, delta-shaped; it has a sound-box above that slants upward away from the player, and a horizontal bar to which the strings are attached about three-fourths of their length down. The number of the strings on the Assyrian harp ranges from 16 upward, but there may quite well have been fewer in some cases.

(c) Nebhel ‘asor:

In Ps 33:2; 144:9, "the psaltery of ten strings" is given as the rendering of nebhel ‘asor; while in Ps 91:3 ‘asor is translated "instrument of ten strings." No doubt, as we have just said above, there were harps of less and greater compass—the mention of the number of strings in two or three instances does not necessarily imply different kinds of harps.

(d) Gittith:

The word gittith is found in the titles of Ps 8$; 81$; 84$. It is a feminine adjective derived from Gath, but its meaning is quite uncertain. It has been explained to denote (i) some Gittite instrument; the Targum, on Ps 8, gives "on the kithara which was brought from Gath"; or (ii) a melody or march popular in Gath. The Septuagint renders "concerning the vintage," and may have regarded these psalms as having been sung to a popular melody. See above.

(e) The Shalishim:

Shalishim occurs in 1Sa 18:6, where it is rendered "instruments of music," the Revised Version margin "triangles, or three stringed instruments." The word seems from the context to represent a musical instrument of some sort, but which is very uncertain. Etymology points to a term involving the number three. The small triangular harp, or trigon, has been suggested, but it would hardly have made its presence felt among a number of drums or tambourines. If the shalishim was a harp, it might very well be the nebhel, which was also triangular. There is no evidence that the triangle was used by Semitic people, or we might have taken it to be the instrument referred to. If it was a percussion instrument, it might possibly be a three-ringed or three-stringed sistrum.

(f) The Cabbekha’:

Among the instruments mentioned in Da 3:5,7,10 occurs the cabbekha’ translated in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "sackbut," i.e. a trombone, why, it is impossible to say. The Septuagint renders the word by sambuke, and this is an instrument frequently mentioned by Greek and Latin writers. Though it is nowhere described, it was no doubt a harp, probably of high pitch. It was a favorite of dissolute women, and we frequently see in their hands in mural pictures a small triangular harp, possibly of a higher range than the trigon.

(g) Neghinoth:

The word neghinoth occurs in the title of 6 psalms, and in the singular in two others; it is also found elsewhere in the Old Testament. Derived from naghan, "to touch," especially to play on a stringed instrument (compare Ps 68:25, where the players, noghenim, are contrasted with the singers, harim), it evidently means stringed instruments in general.

2. Winds:

(1) The ‘Ughabh.

The first mention of a wind instrument occurs in Ge 4:21, where we are told that Jubal was the "father of all such as handle the harp and pipe." The Hebrew word here translated "pipe" is ‘ughabh. It occurs in 3 other places: Job 21:12; 30:31; Ps 150:4. In the Hebrew version of Da 3:5 it is given as the rendering of sumponyah, i.e. "bagpipe." Jerome translations by organon. The ‘ughabh was probably a primitive shepherd’s pipe or panpipe, though some take it as a general term for instruments of the flute kind, a meaning that suits all the passages cited.

(2) The Chalil.

The chalil is first mentioned in 1Sa 10:5, where it is played by members of the band of prophets. It was used (1Ki 1:40) at Solomon’s accession to the throne; its strains added to the exhilaration of convivial parties (Isa 5:12), accompanied worshippers on their joyous march the sanctuary (Isa 30:29), or, in turn, echoed the feelings of mourners (Jer 48:36). In 1 Macc 3:45, one of the features of the desolation of the temple consisted in the cessation of the sound of the pipe. From this we see that Ewald’s assertion that the flute took no part in the music of the temple is incorrect, at least for the Second the Temple.

As we should expect from the simplicity of its construction, and the commonness of its material, the flute or pipe was the most ancient and most widely popular of all musical instruments.

Reeds, cane, bone, afterward ivory, were the materials; it was the easiest thing in the world to drill out the center, to pierce a few holes in the rind or bark, and, for the mouthpiece, to compress the tube at one end. The simple rustic pattern was soon improved upon. Of course, nothing like the modern flute with its complicated mechanism was ever achieved, but, especially on the Egyptian monuments, a variety of patterns is found. There we see the obliquely held flute, evidently played, like the Arabic nay, by blowing through a very slight paring of the lips against the edge of the orifice of the tube. Besides this, there are double flutes, which, though apparently an advance on the single flute, are very ancient. These double flutes are either of equal or unequal length, and are connected near the mouth by a piece of leather, or enter the frame of the mouthpiece.

Though the flutes of the East and West resembled each other more closely than the strings, it is to the Assyrian monuments that we must turn for the prototypes of the chalil. The Greeks, as their myths show, regarded Asia Minor as the birthplace of the flute, and no doubt the Hebrews brought it with them from their Assyrian home. In the Kouyunjik bas-relief we see players performing on the double flute. It is apparently furnished with a beaked mouthpiece; like that of the clarinet or flageolet. We cannot determine whether the Israelites used the flute with a mouthpiece, or one like the nay; and it is futile to guess. It is enough to say that they had opportunities of becoming acquainted with both kinds, and may have adopted both.

(3) Nechiloth.

Nechiloth occurs only in the title of Ps 5. The context suggests that it is a musical term, and we explain neginoth as a general term for strings, this word may comprehend the wood-winds. the Revised Version margin renders "wind instruments."

(4) Neqebh.

In Eze 28:13 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American), neqabhim is rendered pipes. This translation is supported by Fetis: the double flute; Ambros: large flutes; and by Jahn: the nay or Arab flute. It is now, however abandoned, and Jerome’s explanation that neqebh means the "setting" of precious stones is generally adopted.

(5) The Mashroqitha’.

Mashroqitha’, found in Da 3:5, etc., is also referred to the wood-winds. The word is derived from sharaq, "to hiss" (compare Isa 5:26, where God hisses to summon the Gentiles). The Septuagint translates surigx or panpipes, and this is most probably the meaning.

(6) The Cumponyah.

Cumponyah (in Chaldaic sumponia) is another name for a musical instrument found in Da 3:5, etc. It is generally supposed to have been the bagpipe, an instrument that at one time was exceedingly popular, even among highly civilized peoples. Nero is said to have been desirous of renown as a piper.

(7) The Shophar Qeren.

The shophar was a trumpet, curved at the end like a horn (qeren), and no doubt originally was a horn. The two words shophar and qeren are used synonymously in Jos 6:4,5, where we read shophar ha-yobhelim and qeren ha-yobhel. With regard to the meaning of hayobhel, there is some difference of opinion. The Revised Version (British and American) renders in text "ram’s horn," in the margin "jubilee." The former depends on a statement in the Talmud that yobhel is Arabic for "ram’s horn," but no trace of such a word has been found in Arabic. A suggestion of Pfeiffer’s that yobhel does not designate the instrument, but the manner of blowing, is advocated by J. Weiss. It gives a good sense in the passages in which yobhel occurs in connection with shophar or qeren. Thus in Jos 6:5, we would translate, "when the priests blow triumph on the horn."

The shophar was used in early times chiefly, perhaps exclusively, for warlike purposes. It gave the signal "to arms" (Jud 6:34; 1Sa 13:3; 2Sa 20:1); warned of the approach of the enemy (Am 3:6; Eze 33:6; Jer 4:5; 6:1); was heard throughout a battle (Am 2:2, etc.); and sounded the recall (2Sa 2:28). Afterward it played an important part in connection with religion. It was blown at the proclamation of the Law (Ex 19:13, etc.); and at the opening of the Year of Jubilee (Le 25:9); heralded the approach of

the Ark (2Sa 6:15); hailed a new king (2Sa 15:10); and is prophetically associated with the Divine judgment and restoration of the chosen people from captivity (Isa 18:3, and often).

(8) The Chatsotseroth.

We are told (Nu 10:2) that Moses was commanded to make two silver trumpets which should serve to summon the people to the door of the tabernacle; give the signal for breaking up the camp; or call to arms. These instruments were the hatsotseroth, which differed from the shophar in that they were straight, not curved, were always made of metal, and were only blown by the priests. They are shown on the Arch of Titus and on Jewish coins, and are described by Josephus (Ant., III, xii, 6). The latter says: "In length it was not quite a yard. It was composed of a narrow tube somewhat thicker than a flute, widened slightly at the mouth to catch the breath, and ended in the form of a bell, like the common trumpets."

3. Percussion Instruments:

(1) The Toph.

The principal percussion instrument, the toph, is represented in English Versions of the Bible by "tabret" and "timbre," two words of different origin. "Tabret" is derived from Arabic tanbur, the name of a sort of mandolin. "Timbre" comes from Latin-Greek tympanum, through the French timbre, a small tambourine. The Arabs of today possess an instrument called the duf, a name that corresponds to the Hebrew toph. The duf is a circle of thin wood 11 inches in diameter and 2 inches in depth. Over this is tightly stretched a piece of skim, and in the wood are 5 openings in which thin metal disks are hung loosely; these jingle when the duf is struck by the hand. The toph probably resembled the duf.

Other drums are shown on the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. In the Kouyunjik bas-relief the second last performer beats with his hands a small, barrel-like drum fixed at his waist. In the Old Testament the drum is used on festive occasions; it is not mentioned in connection with Divine service. It was generally played by women, and marked the time at dances or processions (Ex 15:20; Jud 11:34; 1Sa 18:6; Jer 31:4; Ps 150:4). At banquets (Isa 24:8; 30:32; Job 21:12) and at marriages (1 Macc 9:39) it accompanied the kinnor and nebhel. In solemn processions it was also occasionally played by men.

(2) Metsiltayim, Tseltselim.

In 1Ch 15:19 we read that "Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, were appointed, with cymbals of brass to sound aloud." These cymbals are the metsiltayim (in two places tseltselim). They were very popular in Egypt. A pair made of copper and silver has been found in a grave in Thebes. They are about 5 inches in diameter and have handles fixed in the center. In the Kouyunjik bas-relief we see cymbals of another pattern. These are conical, and provided with handles.

Cylindrical staves slightly bent at one end were also used in Egyptian processions. Villoteau, quoted by

J. Weiss, describes a bas-relief in which three musicians are seen, of whom one plays the harp, a second the double flute, while a third appears to be marking time by striking two short rods together; this was a method of conducting practiced regularly by other ancient nations.

(3) Mena‘an‘im.

Lastly in 2Sa 6:5 we meet with a word that occurs nowhere else, and whose meaning is quite uncertain. the King James Version translates "cornets," the Revised Version (British and American) "castanets," and in the margin "sistra." The mena‘an‘im may have been the sistrum, an instrument formed of two thin, longish plates, bent together at the top so as to form an oval frame, and supplied with a handle at the lower end. One or more bars were fixed across this frame, and rings or disks loosely strung on these made a jingling noise when the instrument was shaken. This interpretation is supported by the derivation of the word, the Vulgate, and the rabbins.

LITERATURE.

Pfeiffer, Uber die Musik der alten Hebraer; Saalschutz, Form der heb. Poesie, etc.; Leyrer in RE; Riehm, Handwort. des bibl. Alterthums; Histories of Music by Fetis, Ambros, Rowbotham, Naumann, and Chappell; Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt; Wettstein in Del. Commentary on Isaiah; Lane, Modern Egyptians; Stainer, The Music of the Bible; Edersheim, The Temple, etc.; Wellhausen, "The Pss" in Polychrome Bible; Benzinger, HA; Nowack, HA; J. Weiss, Die mus. Instr. des AT; C. Engel, Music of the Most Ancient Nations; Vigoureux, Lea instruments de musique de la Bible; Driver, Joe and Amos; Cornill, Music in the Old Testament; and the various Bible Dictionaries.

James Millar

MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS

mu’-zi-kal in’-stroo-ments (shiddah we-shiddoth): "I gat me .... musical instruments, and that of all sorts" (Ec 2:8). Thus the King James Version and the American Standard Revised Version; the English Revised Version and the American Revised Version margin "concubines very many." The word occurs only here; the meaning is not certain, but it has nothing to do with music.

MUSICIAN; CHIEF

mu-zish’-an.

See ASAPH; MUSIC; PSALMS.

MUSTARD

mus’-tard (sinapi (Mt 13:31; Mr 4:31; Lu 13:19; Mt 17:20; Lu 17:6)): The minuteness of the seed is referred to in all these passages, while in the first three the large size of the herb growing from it is mentioned. In Mt 13:32 it is described as "greater than the herbs, and becometh a tree" (compare Lu 13:19); in Mr 4:32 it "becometh greater than all the herbs, and putteth out great branches." Several varieties of mustard (Arabic, khardal) have notably small seed, and under favorable conditions grow in a few months into very tall herbs—10 to 12 ft. The rapid growth of an annual herb to such a height must always be a striking fact. Sinapis nigra, the black mustard, which is cultivated, Sinapis alba, or white mustard, and Sinapis arvensis, or the charlock (all of Natural Order Cruciferae), would, any one of them, suit the requirements of the parable; birds readily alight upon their branches to eat the seed (Mt 13:32, etc.), not, be it noted, to build their nests, which is nowhere implied.

Among the rabbis a "grain of mustard" was a common expression for anything very minute, which explains our Lord’s phrase, "faith as a grain of mustard seed" (Mt 17:20; Lu 17:6).

The suggestion that the New Testament references may allude to a tall shrub Salvadora persica, which grows on the southern shores of the Dead Sea, rests solely upon the fact that this plant is sometimes called khardal by the Arabs, but it has no serious claim to be the sinapi of the Bible.

E. W. G. Masterman

MUTH-LABBEN

muth-lab’-en (muth labben, "death of Ben," or "of the son"; Ps 9, title).

See PSALMS.

MUTILATION

mu-ti-la’-shun.

See PUNISHMENTS.

MUTTER

mut’-er (haghah (Isa 8:19; 59:3)): An onomatopoetic word, used of the growling of a lion (Isa 31:4), of the "mourning" of a dove (Isa 38:14), or of the human voice, whether speaking inarticulately (Isa 16:7) or articulately (Ps 37:30, "The mouth of the righteous talketh of wisdom" compare Job 27:4; Pr 8:7, etc.). Hence, it is only the context that can give to haghah the meaning "mutter." No such meaning can be gathered from the context of Isa 59:3, and, in fact, the open shamelessness of the sinners seems to be in point. So the verse should be rendered, "Your lips have spoken lies, your tongue uttereth wickedness." In Isa 8:19 haghah describes the tone of voice used by the necromancers in uttering their formulas, "that

chirp and that mutter." That this tone was subdued and indistinct is quite probable.

See PEEP.

Burton Scott Easton

MUZZLE

muz'l (chacam; phimoo) According to the Deuteronomic injunction (De 25:4), the ox was not to be muzzled while treading the grain, i.e. threshing. The muzzle was a guard placed on the mouth of the oxen to prevent them from biting or eating. The threshing ox would have ample opportunity of feeding (compare Ho 10:11). The Deuteronomic injunction is quite in accordance with the humane spirit which inspires it all through. Paul quotes this law in two places (1Co 9:9; 1Ti 5:18) to illustrate his view that the "laborer is worthy of his hire."

T. Lewis

MYNDUS

min'-dus (Mundos): A city of Asia Minor, situated at the extreme western end of a peninsula jutting into the sea (see CARIA). It seems that the city was independent at an early date and that many Jews lived there, for according to 1 Macc 15:23, it was one of the several places to which the Roman senate, in the year 139 BC, sent a letter in their behalf. The place was important only because of the silver mines in its vicinity. The mines were worked from a very early period, even to the Middle Ages, and have therefore given to the place the modern Turkish name, Gumushlu, meaning a silver mine.

E. J. Banks

MYRA

mi'-ra (Mura): A city of the ancient country of Lycia about 2 1/2 miles from the coast. Here, according to Ac 27:6, Paul found a grain ship from Alexandria. The city stood upon a hill formed by the openings of two valleys. At an early period Myra was of less importance than was the neighboring city Patara, yet later it became a prominent port for ships from Egypt and Cyprus, and Theodosius II made it the capital of the province. It was also famed as the seat of worship of an Asiatic deity whose name is no longer known. Nicholas, a bishop and the patron saint of sailors, is said to have been buried in a church on the road between Myra and Andraki, the port. Here an Arab fleet was destroyed in 807. In 808 Haroun al-Rashid, the renowned kalif of Bagdad, took the city, and here Saewulf landed on his return from Jerusalem. Dembre is the modern name of the ruins of Myra, which are among the most imposing in that part of Asia Minor. The elaborate details of the decoration of theater are unusually well preserved, and the rock-hewn tombs about the city bear many bas-reliefs and inscriptions of interest. On the road to

Andraki the monastery of Nicholas may still be seen.

E. J. Banks

MYRRH

mur:

(1) (mor or mowr; Arabic murr]): This substance is mentioned as valuable for its perfume (Ps 45:8; Pr 7:17; So 3:6; 4:14), and as one of the constituents of the holy incense (Ex 30:23; see also So 4:6; 5:1,5,13). Mor is generally identified with the "myrrh" of commerce, the dried gum of a species of balsam (Balsamodendron myrrha). This is a stunted tree growing in Arabia, having a light-gray bark; the gum resin exudes in small tear-like drops which dry to a rich brown or reddish-yellow, brittle substance, with a faint though agreeable smell and a warm, bitter taste. It is still used as medicine (Mr 15:23). On account, however, of the references to "flowing myrrh" (Ex 30:23) and "liquid myrrh" (So 5:5,13), Schweinfurth maintains that mor was not a dried gum but the liquid balsam of Balsamodendron opobalsamum.

See BALSAM.

Whichever view is correct, it is probable that the smurna, of the New Testament was the same. In Mt 2:11 it is brought by the "Wise men" of the East as an offering to the infant Saviour; in Mr 15:23 it is offered mingled with wine as an anesthetic to the suffering Redeemer, and in Joh 19:39 a "mixture of myrrh and aloes" is brought by Nicodemus to embalm the sacred body.

(2) (loT, stakte; translated "myrrh" in Ge 37:25, margin "ladanum"; 43:11): The fragrant resin obtained from some species of cistus and called in Arabic ladham, in Latin ladanum. The cistus or "rock rose" is exceedingly common all over the mountains of Palestine (see BOTANY), the usual varieties being the C. villosus with pink petals, and the C. salviaefolius with white petals. No commerce is done now in Palestine in this substance as of old (Ge 37:25; 43:11), but it is still gathered from various species of cistus, especially C. creticus in the Greek Isles, where it is collected by threshing the plants by a kind of flail from which the sticky mass is scraped off with a knife and rolled into small black balls. In Cyprus at the present time the gum is collected from the beards of the goats that browse on these shrubs, as was done in the days of Herodotus iii.112).

E. W. G. Masterman

MYRTLE

mur'-t'-l (hadhac; mursine (Isa 41:19; 55:13; Ne 8:15; Zec 1:8,10 f); also as a name in Hadassah in Es 2:7, the Jewish form of ESTHER (which see)): The myrtle, Myrtus communis (Natural Order Myrtaceae), is a very common indigenous shrub all over Palestine. On the bare hillsides it is a low bush,

but under favorable conditions of moisture it attains a considerable height (compare Zec 1:8,10). It has dark green, scented leaves, delicate starry white flowers and dark-colored berries, which are eaten. In ancient times it was sacred to Astarte. It is mentioned as one of the choice plants of the land (Isa 41:19). "Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree; and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree" (Isa 55:13), is one of the prophetic pictures of God's promised blessings. It was one of the trees used in the Feast of Tabernacles (Ne 8:15): "the branches of thick trees" (which see) are interpreted in the Talmud (Cuk. 3 4; Yer Cuk. 3, 53rd) as myrtle boughs; also (id) the "thick trees" of Ne 8:15 as "wild myrtle." Myrtle twigs, particularly those of the broadleaved variety, together with a palm branch and twigs of willow, are still used in the ritual of the Feast of Tabernacles. For many references to myrtle in Jewish writings see Jewish Encyclopedia, IX, 137.

E. W. G. Masterman

MYSIA

mish'-i-a (Musia): A country in the northwestern part of Asia Minor, which formed an important part of the Roman province of Asia. Though its boundaries were always vague, it may be said to have extended on the North to the Sea of Marmora on the East to Bithynia and Phrygia, on the South to Lydia, and on the West to Hellespont. According to some authors it included the Troad. Its history is chiefly that of important cities, of which Assos, Troas, and Adramyttium on the border of Lydia, are mentioned in the New Testament. When Mysia became a part of the Roman province of Asia in 190 BC, its old name fell into disuse, and it was then generally known as the Hellespontus. According to Ac 16:7,8, Paul passed through the country, but without stopping to preach, until he reached Troas on the coast, yet tradition says that he founded churches at Poketos and Cyzicus. Onesiphorus, who was martyred some time between 109 and 114 AD, during the proconsulate of Adrian, is supposed to have evangelized this part of Asia. See The Expository Times, IX, 495 f.

E. J. Banks

MYSTERY

mis'-ter-i (musterion; from mustes, "one initiated into mysteries"; mueo "to initiate," muo, "to close" the lips or the eyes; stem mu-, a sound produced with closed lips; compare Latin mutus, "dumb"): Its usual modern meaning (equals something in itself obscure or incomprehensible, difficult or impossible to understand) does not convey the exact sense of the Greek musterion, which means a secret imparted only to the initiated, what is unknown until it is revealed, whether it be easy or hard to understand. The idea of incomprehensibility if implied at all, is purely accidental. The history of the word in ancient paganism is important, and must be considered before we examine its Biblical usage.

1. In Ancient Pagan Religions:

In the extant classics, the singular is found once only (Menander, "Do not tell thy secret (musterion) to

thy friend"). But it is frequently found in the plural ta musteria, "the Mysteries," the technical term for the secret rites and celebrations in ancient religions only known to, and practiced by, those who had been initiated. These are among the most interesting, significant, and yet baffling religious phenomena in the Greek-Roman world, especially from the 6th century BC onward. In proportion as the public cults of the civic and national deities fell into disrepute, their place came more and more to be filled by secret cults open only to those who voluntarily underwent elaborate preliminary preparations. There was scarcely one of the ancient deities in connection with whose worship there was not some subsidiary cult of this kind. The most famous were the Mysteries celebrated in Eleusis, under the patronage and control of the Athenian state, and associated with the worship of Demeter and her daughter Persephone. But there were many others of a more private character than the Eleusinian, e.g. the Orphic Mysteries, associated with the name of Dionysus. Besides the Greek Mysteries, mention should be made of the Egyptian cults of Isis and Serapis, and of Persian Mithraism, which in the 3rd century AD was widely diffused over the whole empire.

It is difficult in a brief paragraph to characterize the Mysteries, so elaborate and varied were they, and so completely foreign to the modern mind. The following are some of their main features:

(1) Their appeal was to the emotions rather than to the intellect. Lobeck in his famous Aglaophamus destroyed the once prevalent view that the Mysteries enshrined some profound religious truth or esoteric doctrine. They were rather an attempt to find a more emotional and ecstatic expression to religious aspiration than the public ceremonies provided. Aristotle (as quoted by Synesius) declared that the initiated did not receive definite instruction, but were put in a certain frame of mind (ou mathein ti dein alla pathein). This does not mean that there was no teaching, but that the teaching was vague, suggestive and symbolic, rather than didactic or dogmatic.

(2) The chief purpose of the rites seems to have been to secure for the rotaries mystic union with some deity and a guaranty of a blissful immortality. The initiated was made to partake mystically in the passing of the deity through death to life, and this union with his saviour-god (theos soter) became the pledge of his own passage through death to a happy life beyond. This was not taught as an esoteric doctrine; it was well known to outsiders that the Mysteries taught the greater blessedness of the initiated in the under-world; but in the actual ceremony the truth was vividly presented and emotionally realized.

(3) The celebrations were marked by profuse symbolism of word and action. They were preceded by rites of purification through which all the mystae had to pass. The celebrations themselves were in the main a kind of religious drama, consisting of scenic representations illustrating the story of some deity or deities, on the basis of the old mythologies regarded as allegories of Nature’s productive forces and of human immortality; combined with the recital of certain mystic formulas by the hierophant (the priest). The culminating point was the epopteia, or full vision, when the hierophant revealed certain holy objects to the assembly.

(4) The cults were marked by a strict exclusiveness and secrecy. None but the initiated could be present at the services, and the knowledge of what was said and done was scrupulously kept from outsiders.

What they had seen and heard was so sacred that it was sacrilege to divulge it to the uninitiated.

(5) Yet the Mysteries were not secret societies, but were open to all who chose to be initiated (except barbarians and criminals). They thus stood in marked contrast to the old civic and national cults, which were confined to states or cities. They substituted the principle of initiation for the more exclusive principle of birthright or nationality; and so foreshadowed the disintegration of old barriers, and prepared the way for the universal religion. Thus the mystery-religions strangely combined a strict exclusiveness with a kind of incipient catholicity. This brief account will show that the Mysteries were not devoid of noble elements. They formed "the serious part of pagan religion" (Renan). But it must also be remembered that they lent themselves to grave extravagances and abuses. Especially did they suffer from the fact that they were withheld from the light of healthy publicity.

2. In the Old Testament and the Apocrypha:

The religion of the Old Testament has no Mysteries of the above type. The ritual of Israel was one in which the whole people partook, through their representatives the priests. There was no system of ceremonial initiation by which the few had privileges denied to the many. God has His secrets, but such things as He revealed belonged to all (De 29:29); so far from silence being enjoined concerning them, they were openly proclaimed (De 6:7; Neh 8:1). True piety alone initiated men into confidential intercourse with Yahweh (Ps 25:14; Pr 3:32). The term "mystery" never occurs in the English Old Testament. The Greek word musterion occurs in the Septuagint of the Old Testament. Only in Daniel, where it is found several times as the translation of raza’," a secret," in reference to the king’s dream, the meaning of which was revealed to Daniel (2:18,19,27-30,47).

In the Apocrypha, musterion is still used in the sense of "a secret" (a meaning practically confined to the Septuagint in extant Greek); of the secrets of private life, especially between friends (Sirach 22:22; 27:16,17,21), and of the secret plans of a king or a state (Tobit 12:7,11; Judith 2:2; 2 Macc 13:21). The term is also used of the hidden purpose or counsel of God or of Divine wisdom. The wicked "knew not the mysteries of God," i.e. the secret counsels that govern God’s dealings with the godly (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:22); wisdom "is initiated [mustis] into the knowledge of God "(The Wisdom of Solomon 8:4), but (unlike the pagan mystagogues) the writer declares he "will not hide mysteries," but will "bring the knowledge of her (wisdom) into clear light" (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:22). Hatch maintains that the analogy here is that of an oriental king’s secrets, known only to himself and his trusted friends (Essays in Biblical Greek, 58); but it is more likely that the writer here betrays the influence of the phraseology of the Greek Mysteries (without acquiescing in their teaching). In another passage, at any rate, he shows acquaintance with the secret rites of the Gentiles, namely, in The Wisdom of Solomon 14:15,23, where the "solemn rites" and "secret mysteries" of idolaters are referred to with abhorrence. The term "mystery" is not used in reference to the special ritual of Israel.

3. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament the word occurs 27 or (if we include the doubtful reading in 1Co 2:1) 28 times;

chiefly in Paul (20 or 21 times), but also in one passage reported by each of the synoptists, and 4 times in Revelation. It bears its ancient sense of a revealed secret, not its modern sense of that which cannot be fathomed or comprehended.

(1) In a few passages, it has reference to a symbol, allegory or parable, which conceals its meaning from those who look only at the literal sense, but is the medium of revelation to those who have the key to its interpretation (compare the rabbinic use of raza', and codh, "the hidden or mystic sense"). This meaning appears in Re 1:20; 17:5,7; probably also in Eph 5:32, where marriage is called "a mystery," i.e. a symbol to be allegorically interpreted of Christ and His church. It also seems implied in the only passage in which the word is attributed to our Lord, "Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables" (Mr 4:11; compare parallel Mt 13:11; Lu 8:10). Here parables are spoken of as a veiled or symbolic form of utterance which concealed the truth from those without the kingdom, but revealed it to those who had the key to its inner meaning (compare Mt 13:35; Joh 16:29 margin).

(2) By far the most common meaning in the New Testament is that which is so characteristic of Paul, namely, a Divine truth once hidden, but now revealed in the gospels. Ro 16:25 f might almost be taken as a definition of it, "According to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery which hath been kept in silence through times eternal, but now is manifested" (compare Col 1:26; Eph 3:3 ff).

(a) It should be noted how closely "mystery" is associated with "revelation" (apokalupsis), as well as with words of similar import, e.g. "to make known" (Eph 1:9; 3:3,5,10; 6:19), "to manifest" (Col 4:3,4; Ro 16:26; 1Ti 3:16). "Mystery" and "revelation" are in fact correlative and almost synonymous terms. The mysteries of Christianity are its revealed doctrines, in contrast to the wisdom of worldly philosophy (see especially 1Co 2:1-16; compare Mt 11:25 f); the point of contrast being, not that the latter is comprehensible while the former are obscure, but that the latter is the product of intellectual research, while the former are the result of Divine revelation and are spiritually discerned. (b) From this it follows that Christianity has no secret doctrines, for what was once hidden has now been revealed. But here arises a seeming contradiction. On the one hand, there are passages which seem to imply a doctrine of reserve. The mystery revealed to some would seem to be still concealed from others. The doctrines of Christ and of His Kingdom are hidden from the worldly wise and the prudent (Mt 11:25; 1Co 2:6), and from all who are outside the kingdom (Mt 13:11 and parallel), and there are truths withheld even from Christians while in an elementary stage of development (1Co 3:1 ff; Heb 5:11-14). On the other hand, there are many passages in which the truths of revelation are said to be freely and unreservedly communicated to all (e.g. Mt 10:27; 28:19; Ac 20:20,27; 2Co 3:12 f; Eph 3:9, "all men"; 6:19 f; Col 1:28; 1Ti 2:4). The explanation is that the communication is limited, not by any secrecy in the gospel message itself or any reserve on the part of the speaker, but by the receptive capacity of the hearer. In the case of the carnally-minded, moral obtuseness or worldliness makes them blind to the light which shines on them (2Co 4:2-4). In the case of the "babe in Christ," the apparent reserve is due merely to the pedagogical principle of adapting the teaching to the progressive receptivity of the disciple (Joh 16:12 f). There is no esoteric doctrine or intentional reserve in the New Testament. The strong language in Mt 13:11-15 is due to the Hebrew mode of speech by which an actual result is stated as if it were purposive.

(c) What, then, is the content of the Christian "mystery"? In a wide sense it is the whole gospel, God's world-embracing purpose of redemption through Christ (e.g. Ro 16:25; Eph 6:19; Col 2:2; 1Ti 3:9). In a special sense it is applied to some specific doctrine or aspect of the gospel, such as the doctrine of the Cross (1Co 2:1,7), of the Incarnation (1Ti 3:16), of the indwelling of Christ as the pledge of immortality (Col 1:27), of the temporary unbelief of the Jews to be followed by their final restoration (Ro 11:25), of the transformation of the saints who will live to see the Second Advent (1Co 15:51), and of the inclusion of the Gentiles in the gospel salvation (Eph 3:3-6). These are the Divine secrets now at last disclosed. In direct antithesis to the Divine mystery is the "mystery of lawlessness" (2Th 2:7) culminating in the coming of the Antichrist. Here, too, the word means a revealed secret, only in this case the revelation belongs to the future (2Th 2:8), though the evil forces which are to bring about its consummation are already silently operative. (Besides the references in this paragraph, the word occurs in 1Co 4:1; 13:2; 14:2; Re 10:7. It is interesting to note that the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) sometimes renders musterion by Latin sacramentum, namely, in Eph 1:9; 3:3,9; 5:32; 1Ti 3:16; Re 1:20. This rendering in Eph 5:32 led to the ecclesiastical doctrine that marriage is a "sacrament.")

4. The Pagan Mysteries and the New Testament:

The question is now frequently discussed, how far the New Testament (and especially Paul) betrays the influence of the heathen mystery-cults. Hatch maintains that the Pauline usage of the word musterion is dependent on the Septuagint, especially on the Apocrypha (op. cit.), and in this he is followed by Anrich, who declares that the attempt to trace an allusion to the Mysteries in the New Testament is wholly unsuccessful; but Lightfoot admits a verbal dependence on the pagan Mysteries (Commentary on Col 1:26).

At present there is a strong tendency to attribute to Paul far more dependence than one of phraseology only, and to find in the Mysteries the key to the non-Jewish side of Paulinism. A. Loisy finds affinity to the mystery-religions in Paul's conception of Jesus as a Saviour-God, holding a place analogous to the deities Mithra, Osiris, and Attis; in the place Paul assigns to baptism as the rite of initiation; and in his transformation of the Lord's Supper into a symbol of mystic participation in the flesh and blood of a celestial being and a guaranty of a share in the blissful immortality of the risen Saviour. "In its worship as in its belief, Christianity is a religion of mystery" (article in Hibbert Journal, October, 1911). Percy Gardner traces similar analogies to the Mysteries in Paul, though he finds in these analogies, not conscious plagiarism, but "the parallel working of similar forces" (Religious Experience of Paul, chapters iv, v). Kirsopp Lake writes, "Christianity has not borrowed from the mystery-religions, because it was always, at least in Europe, mystery-religion itself" (The Earlier Epistles of Paul, 215). On the other hand, Schweitzer wholly denies the hypothesis of the direct or indirect influence of the Mysteries on Paul's thought (Geschichte der Paulinischen Forschung).

The whole question is sub judice among scholars, and until more evidence be forthcoming from inscriptions, etc., we shall perhaps vainly expect unanimous verdict. It can hardly be doubted that at least the language of Paul, and perhaps to some extent his thought, is colored by the phraseology current among the cults. Paul had a remarkably sympathetic and receptive mind, by no means closed to

influences from the Greek-Roman environment of his day.

Witness his use of illustrations drawn from the athletic festivals, the Greek theater (1Co 4:9) and the Roman camp. He must have been constantly exposed to the contagion of the mystic societies. Tarsus was a seat of the Mithra religion; and the chief centers of Paul's activities, e.g. Corinth, Antioch and Ephesus, were headquarters of mystic religion. We are not surprised that he should have borrowed from the vocabulary of the Mysteries, not only the word musterion, but memuemai, "I learned the secret," literally, "I have been initiated" (Php 4:12); sphragizesthai, "to be sealed" (Eph 1:13, etc.); teleios, "perfect," term applied in the Mysteries to the fully instructed as opposed to novices (1Co 2:6,7; Col 1:28, etc.) (note, outside of Paul, epoptai, "eye-witnesses,"2Pe 1:16).

Further, the secret of Paul's gospel among the Gentiles lay, humanly speaking, in the fact that it contained elements that appealed to what was best and most vital in contemporary thought; and doubtless the Mysteries, by transcending all lines of mere citizenship, prepared the way for the universal religion. On the other hand, we must beware of a too facile acceptance of this hypothesis in its extreme form. Christianity can be adequately explained only by reference, not to what it had in common with other religions, but to what was distinctive and original in it. Paul was after all a Jew (though a broad one), who always retained traces of his Pharisaic training, and who viewed idolatry with abhorrence; and the chief formative factor of his thinking was his own profound religious experience. It is inconceivable that such a man should so assimilate Gentile modes of thought as to be completely colored by them. The characteristics which his teaching has in common with the pagan religions are simply a witness to the common religious wants of mankind, and not to his indebtedness to them. What turned these religions into Mysteries was the secrecy of their rites; but in the New Testament there are no secret rites. The gospel "mystery" (as we have seen) is not a secret deliberately withheld from the multitude and revealed only to a privileged religious aristocracy, but something which was once a secret and is so no longer. The perfect openness of Christ and His apostles sets them in a world apart from the mystic schools. It is true that later the Mysteries exercised a great influence on ecclesiastical doctrine and practice, especially on baptism and the Eucharist (see Hatch, Hibbert Lectures, chapter x). But in the New Testament, acts of worship are not as yet regarded as mystic rites. The most we can say is that some New Testament writers (especially Paul) make use of expressions and analogies derived from the mystery-religions; but, so far as our present evidence goes, we cannot agree that the pagan cults exercised a central or formative influence on them.

LITERATURE.

There is a large and growing literature on this subject. Its modern scientific study began with C.A. Lobeck's Aglaophamus (1829). The following recent works may be specially mentioned: Gustav Anrich, Das antike Mysterienwesen (1894); G. Wobbermin, Religiongeschichtliche Studien zur Frage, etc. (1896); E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (1889) and Hibbert Lectures, 1888 (published 1890); F. B. Jevons, An Introduction to the History of Religion (1896); S. Cheethara, The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian (1897); R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen (1910); P. Gardner, The Religious Experience of Paul (1911); K. Lake, The Earlier Epistles of Paul (1911); articles on "Mystery"

in Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), edition 9 (W.M. Ramsay), and edition 11 (L.R. Farnell), Encyclopedia Biblica (A. Julicher), Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes) (A. Stewart); 1-volume Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible; (G.G. Findlay); Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels (R.W. Bacon); articles on musterion in Cremer and Grimm-Thayer New Testament Lexicons; the commentaries, including J.B. Lightfoot on Colossians, J. Armitage Robinson on Ephesians, H. Lietzmann on 1 Corinthians; 9 articles in The Expositor on "St. Paul and the Mystery Religions" by Professor H.A.A. Kennedy (April, 1912, to February, 1913).

D. Miall Edwards

MYTHOLOGY

mi-thol’-o-ji.

See FABLE; BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF; GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT.

NAAM

na’-am (na‘am): A son of Caleb (1Ch 4:15)

NAAMAH (1)

na’-a-ma. (na‘amah, "pleasant"; Noema):

(1) Daughter of Lamech and Zillah, and sister of Tubal-cain (Ge 4:22; compare Josephus, Ant, I, ii, 2).

(2) An Ammonitish woman whom Solomon married, and who became the mother of Rehoboam (1Ki 14:21; 2Ch 12:13). According to an addition in the Septuagint following 1Ki 12:24, "her name was Naaman, the daughter of Ana (Hanun) son of Nahash, king of the sons of Ammon" (see Benzinger, Konige, in the place cited.).

NAAMAH (2)

(1) One of a group of 16 lowland (Shephelah) cities forming part of Judah’s inheritance (Jos 15:41).

(2) The home of Zophar, one of Job’s friends (Job 2:11, etc.).

See NAAMATHITE.

NAAMAN

na’-a-man (na‘aman, "pleasantness"; Septuagint; Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus Naiman; so Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek in the New Testament; Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Neeman) :

(1) A successful Syrian general, high in the confidence and esteem of the king of Syria, and honored by his fellow-countrymen as their deliverer (2Ki 5:1-27). Afflicted with leprosy, he heard from a Hebrew slave-maid in his household of the wonder-working powers of an Israelite prophet. Sent by his master with a letter couched in somewhat peremptory terms to the king of Israel, he came to Samaria for healing. The king of Israel was filled with suspicion and alarm by the demands of the letter, and rent his clothes; but Elisha the prophet intervened, and sent word to Naaman that he must bathe himself seven times in the Jordan. He at first haughtily resented the humiliation and declined the cure; but on the remonstrance of his attendants he yielded and obtained cleansing. At once he returned to Samaria, testified his gratitude by the offer of large gifts to the prophet, confessed his faith in Elisha’s God, and

sought leave to take home with him enough of the soil of Canaan for the erection of an altar to Yahweh.

The narrative is throughout consistent and natural, admirably and accurately depicting the condition of the two kingdoms at the time. The character of Naaman is at once attractive and manly. His impulsive patriotic preference for the streams of his own land does not lessen the reader's esteem for him, and the favorable impression is deepened by his hearty gratitude and kindness.

The Israelite king is most probably Jehoram, son of Ahab, and the Syrian monarch Ben-hadad II. Josephus (Ant., VIII, xv, 5) identifies Naaman with the man who drew his bow at a venture, and gave Ahab his death wound (1Ki 22:34). There is one reference to Naaman in the New Testament. In Lu 4:27, Jesus, rebuking Jewish exclusiveness, mentions "Naaman the Syrian."

(2) A son of Benjamin (Ge 46:21,6). Fuller and more precise is the description of Nu 26:38,40, where he is said to be a son of Bela and grandson of Benjamin (see also 1Ch 8:3 f).

John A. Lees

NAAMATHITE

na'-a-ma-thit, na-am'-a-thit (na'amdthi, "a dweller in Naaman"; ho M(e)inaion basileus): The description of Zophar, one of Job's friends (Job 2:11; 11:1; 20:1, etc.). Naamah is too common a place-name to permit of the identification of Zophar's home; the Septuagint renders it as "king of the Minaeans."

NAAMITE

na'-a-mit (ha-na'ami, "the Naamite"): A family which traced its descent from Naaman (Nu 26:40).

See NAAMAN, (2).

NAARAH (1)

na'-a-ra (na'arah, "a girl"): One of the two wives of Ashhur, father of Tekoa (1Ch 4:5).

NAARAH (2)

na'arah; Codex Vaticanus hai komai auton; Codex Alexandrinus Naaratha; the King James Version Naarath): A town in the territory of Ephraim (Jos 16:7). It appears as "Naaran" in 1Ch 7:28 (Codex Vaticanus Naarnan; Codex Alexandrinus Naaran). Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Noorath") places it 5 Roman miles from Jericho. The name has not been recovered, and no identification is certain. The position would agree with that of el-'Aujeh, about 5 miles Northeast of Jericho.

NAARAI

na’-a-ri (na‘aray): Son of Ezbai, one of David’s heroes (1Ch 11:37). In the parallel passage (2Sa 23:35), he is called "Paarai the Arbite." The true forms of the name and description are uncertain (see Budde, Richter u. Samuel, and Curtis, Chronicles).

NAARAN; NARATH

na’-a-ran, na’-a-rath (na‘aran, na‘arath). see NAARAH.

NAASHON; NAASON; NAASSON

na’-a-shon, na-ash’-on, na’-a-son, na-as’-on (Naasson): the King James Version Greek form of "Nahshon" (thus, the Revised Version (British and American)) (Mt 1:4; Lu 3:32).

NAATHUS

na’-a-thus (Naathos): One of the sons of Addi who put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:31). It apparently corresponds to "Adna" of Ezr 10:30, of which it is a transposition. Codex Vaticanus reads Lathos, probably confusing a capital Alpha and a capital Lambda.

NABAL

na’-bal (nabhal, "foolish" or "wicked"; Nabal): A wealthy man of Maon in the highlands of Judah, not far from Hebron, owner of many sheep and goats which he pastured around Carmel in the same district. He was a churlish and wicked man (1Sa 25:2). When David was a fugitive from Saul, he and his followers sought refuge in the wilderness of Paran, near the possessions of Nabal, and protected the latter’s flocks and herds from the marauding Bedouin. David felt that some compensation was due him for such services (1Sa 25:15, 25), so, at the time of sheep-shearing—an occasion of great festivities among sheep masters—he sent 10 of his young men to Nabal to solicit gifts of food for himself and his small band of warriors. Nabal not only refused any assistance or presents, but sent back insulting words to David, whereupon the latter, becoming very angry, determined upon the extermination of Nabal and his household and dispatched 400 men to execute his purpose. Abigail, Nabal’s wife, a woman of wonderful sagacity and prudence as well as of great beauty, having learned of her husband’s conduct and of David’s intentions, hurriedly proceeded, with a large supply of provisions, dainties and wine, to meet David and to apologize for her husband’s unkind words and niggardliness, and thus succeeded in thwarting the bloody and revengeful plans of Israel’s future king. Upon her return home she found her husband in the midst of a great celebration ("like the feast of a king"), drunken with wine, too intoxicated to realize his narrow escape from the sword of David. On the following morning, when sober, having heard the report of his wife, he was so overcome with fear that he never recovered from

the shock, but died 10 days later (1Sa 25:36-38). When David heard about his death, he sent for Abigail, who soon afterward became one of his wives.y Paul) make use of expressions and analogies derived from the mystery-religions; but, so far as our present evidence goes, we cannot agree that the pagan cults exercised a central or formative influence on them.

W. W. Davies

NABARIAS

nab-a-ri'-as (Nabarias B, Nabareias): One of those who stood upon Ezra's left hand as he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:44). Esdras (loc. cit.) gives only 6 names, whereas Nehemiah (8:4) gives 7. It is probable that the last (Meshullam) of Nehemiah's list is simply dropped and that Nabarias equals Hashbaddanah; or it may possibly be a corruption of Zechariah in Nehemiah's list.

NABATAEANS; NABATHAEANS

nab-a-te'-anz, nab-a-the'-anz (Nabataioi; in 1 Macc 5:25 Codex Sinaiticus reads anabatais hoi, V, Anabattaiois; the King James Version Nabathites, more correctly "Nabataeans"):

1. Locality and Early History:

A Semitic (Arabian rather than Syrian) tribe whose home in early Hellenistic times was Southeast of Palestine, where they had either supplanted or mingled with the Edomites (compare Mal 1:1-5). In Josephus' day they were so numerous that the territory between the Red Sea and the Euphrates was called Nabatene (Ant., I, xii, 4). They extended themselves along the East of the Jordan with Petra as their capital (Strabo xvi.779; Josephus, Ant, XIV, i, 4; XVII, iii, 2; BJ, I, vi, 2, etc.). Their earlier history is shrouded in obscurity. Jerome, Quaeat in Ge 25:13, following the hint of Josephus (Ant., I, xii, 4), asserts they were identical with the Ishmaelite tribe of Nebaioth, which is possible, though Nebaioth is spelled with the Hebrew letter taw ("t") and Nabateans is spelled with the Hebrew letter teth ("t). They were apparently the first allies of the Assyrians in their invasions of Edom (compare Mal 1:1 ff). They were later subdued by Sennacherib (Sayce, New Light from the Ancient Monuments, II, 430), but before long regained their independence and resisted Ashurbanipal (Rawlinson, note, at the place). According to Alexander Polyhistor (Fr. 18), they were included in the nomadic tribes reduced by David. Their history is more detailed from 312 BC (Diod. Sic. xix), when Antigonus I (Cyclops) sent his general Athenaeus with a force against them in Petra. After an initial advantage, the army of Athenaeus was almost annihilated. Demetrius, the son of Antigonus, was sent against them a few years later, with little success, though he arranged a friendship with them. The first prince mentioned is Aretas I, to whom the high priest Jason fled in 169 BC. They were friendly to the early Maccabees in the anti-Hellenistic struggle, to Judas in 164 BC (1 Macc 5:25) and to Jonathan in 160 BC (1 Macc 9:35).

2. A Strong Kingdom:

Toward the end of the 2nd century BC on the fall of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Dynasties, the Nabateans under King Erotimus founded a strong kingdom extending East of the Jordan (in 110 BC). Conscious now of their own strength, they resented the ambition of the Hasmonean Dynasty—their former allies—and opposed Alexander Janneus (96 BC) at the siege of Gaza (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xiii, 3). A few years later (90 BC) Alexander retaliated by attacking Obedas I, king of the Nabateans, but suffered a severe defeat East of the Jordan (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xiii, 5; BJ, I, iv, 4). Antiochus XII of Coele-Syria next led an expedition against the Nabateans, but was defeated and slain in the battle of Kana (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xv, 1-2; BJ, I, iv, 7-8). Consequently, Aretas III seized Coele-Syria and Damascus and gained another victory over Alexander Janneus at Adida (in 85 BC).

3. Conflicts:

The Nabateans, led by Aretas (III (?)), espoused the cause of Hyrcanus against Aristobulus, besieged the latter in Jerusalem and provoked the interference of the Romans, by whom under Scaurus they were defeated (Josephus, Ant, XIV, i, 4 f; BJ, I, vi, 2 f). After the capture of Jerusalem, Pompey attacked Aretas, but was satisfied with a payment (Josephus, ibid.), and Damascus was added to Syria, though later it appears to have again passed into the hands of Aretas (2Co 11:32). In 55 BC Gabinius led another force against the Nabateans (Josephus, ibid.). In 47 BC Malchus I assisted Caesar, but in 40 BC refused to assist Herod against the Parthians, thus provoking both the Idumean Dynasty and the Romans. Antony made a present of part of Malchus' territory to Cleopatra, and the Nabatean kingdom was further humiliated by disastrous defeat in the war against Herod (31 BC).

4. End of the Nation:

Under Aretas IV (9 BC-40 AD) the kingdom was recognized by Augustus. This king sided with the Romans against the Jews, and further gained a great victory over Herod Antipas, who had divorced his daughter to marry Herodias. Under King Abias an expedition against Adiabene came to grief. Malchus II (48-71 AD) assisted the Romans in the conquest of Jerusalem (Josephus, BJ, III, iv, 2). Rabel (71-106 AD) was the last king of the Nabateans as a nation. In 106 AD their nationality was broken up by the unwise policy of Trajan, and Arabia, of which Petra was the capital, was made a Roman province by Cornelius Palma, governor of Syria. Otherwise they might have at least contributed to protecting the West against the East. Diodorus (loc. cit.) represents the Nabateans as a wild nomadic folk, with no agriculture, but with flocks and herds and engaged in considerable trading. Later, however, they seem to have imbibed considerable Aramean culture, and Aramaic became at least the language of their commerce and diplomacy. They were also known as pirates on the Red Sea; they secured the harbor of Elah and the Gulf of 'Akaba. They traded between Egypt and Mesopotamia and carried on a lucrative commerce in myrrh, frankincense and costly wares (KGF, 4th edition (1901), I, 726-44, with full bibliography).

S. Angus

NABATHITES

nab’-a-thits: the King James Version equals the Revised Version (British and American) "Nabathaeans."

NABOTH

na’-both, na’-both (nabhoth, from nubh, "a sprout"; Nabouthai): The owner of a vineyard contiguous to the palace of King Ahab. The king desired, by purchase or exchange, to add the vineyard to his own grounds. Naboth, however, refused to part on any terms with his paternal inheritance. This refusal made Ahab "heavy and displeased" (1Ki 21:4). Jezebel, the king’s wife, then took the matter in hand, and by false accusation on an irrelevant charge procured the death of Naboth by stoning (1Ki 21:7-14). As Ahab was on his way to take possession of the vineyard he met Elijah the prophet, who denounced his vile act and pronounced judgment on king and royal house. A temporary respite was given to Ahab because of a repentant mood (1Ki 21:27-29); but later the blow fell, first upon himself in a conflict with Syria (1Ki 22:34-40); then upon his house through a conspiracy of Jehu, in which Jehoram, Ahab’s son, and Jezebel, his wife, were slain (2Ki 9:25-26,30). In both cases the circumstances recalled the foul treatment of Naboth.

Henry Wallace

NABUCHODONOSOR

nab-u-ko-don’-o-sor (Nabouchodonosor): Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) form of "Nebuchadnezzar" ("Nebuchadrezzar") found in the King James Version of the Apocrypha in 1 Esdras 1:40,41,45,48; 2:10; 5:7; 6:26; Additions to Esther 11:4; Baruch 1:9,11,12. It is the form used in the King James Version of the Apocrypha throughout. In the Revised Version (British and American) of Judith and Tobit 14:15, the form "Nebuchadnezzar" is given.

NACHOR

na’-kor (Nachor) the King James Version; Greek form of "Nahor" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)). Grandfather of Abraham (Lu 3:34).

NACON, THE THRESHING FLOOR OF

na’-kon, (nakhon; the King James Version Nachon): The place where Uzzah was smitten for putting forth his hand to steady the ark, hence, called afterward "Perezuzzah" (2Sa 6:8); in the parallel passage (1Ch 13:9) we have kidhon, and in Josephus (Ant., VII, iv, 2) Cheidon. In 1Sa 23:23 the word nakhon occurs, and is translated "of a certainty," margin "with the certainty" or "to a set place"; also in 1Sa 26:4 it is translated "of a certainty," margin "to a set place." It is uncertain whether in 1Sa 6:6 it is a place-name at all; and no successful attempt has been made to identify either Nacon or Chidon; possibly they are both personal names.

E. W. G. Masterman

NADAB

na’-dab (nadhabh, "noble"; Nadab):

(1) Aaron’s first-born son (Ex 6:23; Nu 3:2; 26:60; 1Ch 6:3 (Hebrew 5:29); 24:1). He was permitted with Moses, Aaron, the 70 elders, and his brother Abihu to ascend Mt. Sinai and behold the God of Israel (Ex 24:1,9). He was associated with his father and brothers in the priestly office (Ex 28:1). Along with Abihu he was guilty of offering "strange fire," and both "died before Yahweh" (Le 10:1,2; Nu 3:4; 26:61). The nature of their offense is far from clear. The word rendered "strange" seems in this connection to mean no more than "unauthorized by the Law" (see zur, in BDB, and compare Ex 30:9). The proximity of the prohibition of wine to officiating priests (Le 10:8,9) has given rise to the erroneous suggestion of the Midrash that the offense of the brothers was drunkenness.

(2) A descendant of Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:28,30).

(3) A Gibeonite (1Ch 8:30).

(4) Son of Jeroboam I and after him for two years king of Israel (1Ki 14:20; 15:25). While Nadab was investing Gibbethon, a Philistine stronghold, Baasha, who probably was an officer in the army, as throne-robbers usually were, conspired against him, slew him and seized the throne (1Ki 15:27-31). With the assassination of Nadab the dynasty of Jeroboam was extirpated, as foretold by the prophet Ahijah (1Ki 14). This event is typical of the entire history of the Northern Kingdom, characterized by revolutions and counter-revolutions.

John A. Lees

NADABATH

na’-da-bath (Nadabath; the King James Version Nadabatha, na-dab’-a-tha): A city East of the Jordan from which the wedding party of Jambri were coming when Jonathan and Simon attacked them and slew very many, designing to avenge the murder of their brother John (1 Macc 9:37 ff). Nebo and Nabathaea have been suggested as identical with Nadabath. Clermont-Ganneau would read rhabatha, and identify it with Rabbath-ammon. There is no certainty.

NAGGAI

nag’-i, nag’-a-i (Naggai; the King James Version Nagge): In Lu 3:25, the Greek form of the Hebrew name NOGAH (which see).

NAHALAL

na’-hal-al (nachalal; Codex Vaticanus, Baithman; Codex Alexandrinus Naalol, and other forms): A city in the territory of Zebulun assigned with its suburbs to the Merarite Levites, out of which the Canaanite inhabitants were not driven (Jos 19:15, the King James Version (incorrectly) "Nahallal"; Jos 21:35; Jud 1:30, "Nahalol"). In the Talmud Jerusalem (Meg., i.1) it is identified with Mahlul. This name might correspond either with ‘Ain Mahil, or with Ma‘lul. The former lies about 3 1/2 miles Northeast of Nazareth on a hill near the eastern boundary of Zebulun. The latter is situated about 3 1/2 miles West of Nazareth, near the southern border of Zebulun. The change of "n" to "m" is not unusual.

W. Ewing

NAHALIEL

na-ha’-li-el, na-hal’-i-el (nachali’el, "torrent valley of God"; Codex Vaticanus Manael; Codex Alexandrinus Naaliel): A place where Israel encamped on the way from Arnon to Jericho, named with Mattanah and Bamoth (Nu 21:19). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it near to the Arnon. It is natural to seek for this "torrent valley" in one of the tributaries of the Arnon. It may be Wady Waleh, which drains a wide area to the Northeast of the Arnon; or perhaps Wady Zerqa Ma‘in farther to the North.

NAHALLAL; NAHALOL

na-hal’-al, na’-ha-lol.

See NAHALAL.

NAHAM

na’-ham (nacham, "comfort"): A Judahite chieftain, father of Keilah the Garmite (1Ch 4:19); the passage is obscure.

NAHAMANI

na-ha-ma’-ni, na-ham’-a-ni (nachamani "compassionate"): One of the twelve heads who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 7:7). The name is wanting in the parallel list (Ezr 2:2). In 1 Esdras 5:8 he is called "Eneneus" (the Revised Version margin "Enenis").

NAHARAI; NAHARI

na’-ha-ri, (nacharay), na’-ha-ri (nachray): One of David’s heroes, Joab’s armor-bearer (2Sa 23:37, the

King James Version "Nahari"; 1Ch 11:39).

NAHASH

na’-hash (nachash, "serpent"; Naas):

(1) The father of Abigail and Zeruiah, the sisters of David (2Sa 17:25; compare 1Ch 2:16). The text in 2 S, where this reference is made, is hopelessly corrupt; for that reason there are various explanations. The rabbis maintain that Nahash is another name for Jesse, David’s father. Others think that Nahash was the name of Jesse’s wife; but it is not probable that Nahash could have been the name of a woman. Others explain the passage by making Nahash the first husband of Jesse’s wife, so that Abigail and Zeruiah were half-sisters to King David.

(2) A king of Ammon, who, at the very beginning of Saul’s reign, attacked Jabesh-gilead so successfully, that the inhabitants sued for peace at almost any cost, for they were willing to pay tribute and serve the Ammonites (1Sa 11:1). The harsh king, not satisfied with tribute and slavery, demanded in addition that the right eye of every man should be put out, as "a reproach upon Israel." They were given seven days to comply with these cruel terms. Before the expiration of this time, Saul, the newly anointed king, appeared on the scene with an army which utterly routed the Ammonites (1Sa 11:1), and, according to Josephus, killed King Nahash (Ant., VI, v, 3).

If the Nahash of 2Sa 10:2 be the same as the king mentioned in 1Sa 11, this statement of Josephus cannot be true, for he lived till the early part of David’s reign, 40 or more years later. It is, of course, possible that Nahash, the father of Hanun, was a son or grandson of the king defeated at Jabesh-gilead by Saul. There is but little agreement among commentators in regard to this matter. Some writers go so far as to claim that "all passages in which this name (Nahash) is found refer to the same individual."

(3) A resident of Rabbath-ammon, the capital of Ammon (2Sa 17:27). Perhaps the same as Nahash (2), which see. His son Shobi, with other trans-Jordanic chieftains, welcomed David at Mahanaim with sympathy and substantial gifts when the old king was fleeing before his rebel son Absalom. Some believe that Shobi was a brother of Hanun, king of Ammon (2Sa 10:1).

W. W. Davies

NAHATH

na’-hath (nachath):

(1) A grandson of Esau (Ge 36:13; 1Ch 1:37).

(2) A descendant of Levi and ancestor of Samuel (1Ch 6:26); also called "Toah" (1Ch 6:34) and

"Tohu" (1Sa 1:1).

(3) A Levite who, in the time of Hezekiah, assisted in the oversight of "the oblations and the tithes and the dedicated things" (2Ch 31:13).

NAHBI

na’-bi (nachbi): The representative of Naphtali among the 12 spies (Nu 13:14).

NAHOR

na’-hor (nachor; in the New Testament Nachor):e representative of Naphtali among the 12 spies (Nu 13:14).

(1) Son of Serug and grandfather of Abraham (Ge 11:22-25; 1Ch 1:26).

(2) Son of Terah and brother of Abraham (Ge 11:26,27,29; 22:20,23; 24:15,24,47; 29:5; Jos 24:2).

A city of Nahor is mentioned in Ge 24:10; the God of Nahor in Ge 31:53. In the King James Version Jos 24:2; Lu 3:34, the name is spelled "Nachor."

NAHSHON

na’-shon (nachshon; Septuagint and New Testament, Naasson): A descendant of Judah; brother-in-law of Aaron and ancestor of David and of Jesus Christ (Ex 6:23; Nu 1:7; 1Ch 2:10,11; Ru 4:20; Mt 1:4; Lu 3:32).

NAHUM

na’-hum (Naoum; the King James Version Naum): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy, the 9th before Joseph, the husband of Mary (Lu 3:25).

NAHUM; THE BOOK OF

na’-hum:

I. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

1. The Name

2. Life and Home of Nahum

The Four Traditions

3. Date, as Related to Assyrian History

(1) The Revolt of Shamash-shumukin

(2) The Invasion of 625 BC

(3) The Final Attack

(4) Probable Date

II. THE BOOK

1. Contents (Nahum 1-3)

2. Style

3. Integrity

III. TEACHING

1. The Character of Yahweh

2. Nahum’s Glee over the Ruin of Nineveh

3. Universality of Yahweh’s Rule

4. The Messianic Outlook

LITERATURE

I. Authorship and Date.

1. The Name:

The name Nahum (nachum; Septuagint and New Testament Naoum; Josephus, Naoumos) occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament; in the New Testament it is found in Lu 3:25. It is not uncommon in the Mishna, and it has been discovered in Phoenician inscriptions. It means "consolation," or "consoler,"

and is therefore, in a sense, symbolical of the message of the book, which is intended to comfort the oppressed and afflicted people of Judah.

2. Life and Home of Nahum:

Of the personal life of Nahum, practically nothing is known. In Na 1:1 he is called "the Elkoshite," that is, an inhabitant of Elkosh. Unfortunately, the location of this place is not known.

The Four Traditions

One tradition, which cannot be traced beyond the 16th century AD, identifies the home of Nahum with a modern village Elkush, or Alkosh, not far from the left bank of the Tigris, two days' journey North of the site of ancient Nineveh. A second tradition, which is at least as old as the days of Jerome, the latter part of the 4th century, locates Elkosh in Galilee, at a place identified by many with the modern El-Kauze, near Ramieh. Others identify the home of the prophet with Capernaum, the name of which means "Village of Nahum." A fourth tradition, which is first found in a collection of traditions entitled "Lives of the Prophets," says "Nahum was from Elkosh, beyond Bet Gabre, of the tribe of Simeon." A place in the South is more in harmony with the interest the prophet takes in the Southern Kingdom, so that the last-mentioned tradition seems to have much in its favor, but absolute certainty is not attainable.

3. Date, as Related to Assyrian History:

The Book of Nahum centers around the fall and destruction of Nineveh. Since the capture of the city is represented as still in the future, it seems evident that the prophecies were delivered some time before 607-606 BC, the year in which the city was destroyed. Thus the latest possible date of Nahum's activity is fixed. The earliest possible date also is indicated by internal evidence. In 3:8 ff the prophet speaks of the capture and destruction of No-amon, the Egyptian Thebes, as an accomplished fact. The expedition of Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, against Egypt, which resulted in the fall of Thebes, occurred about 663 BC. Hence, the activity of Nahum must be placed somewhere between 663 and 607.

As to the exact period between the two dates there is disagreement among scholars. One thing is made quite clear by the prophecy itself, namely, that at the time the words were spoken or written, Nineveh was passing through some grave crisis. Now we know that during the second half of the 7th century BC Assyria was threatened three times:

(1) The Revolt of Shamash-shumukin:

The revolt of Shamash-shumukin of Babylon against his brother, the king of Assyria, 650-648 BC.

(2) The Invasion of 625 BC:

The invasion of Assyria and threatened attack upon Nineveh by some unknown foe, perhaps the

Scythians, about 625 BC.

(3) The Final Attack:

The final attack, which resulted in the fall and destruction of Nineveh in 607-606 BC. (4) Probable Date:

The first crisis does not offer a suitable occasion for Nahum's prophecy, because at that time the city of Nineveh was not in any danger. Little is known concerning the second crisis, and it is not possible either to prove or to disprove that it gave rise to the book. On the other hand, the years immediately preceding the downfall of Nineveh offer a most suitable occasion. The struggle continued for about 2 years. The united forces of the Chaldeans and Scythians met determined resistance; at last a breach was made in the northeast corner of the wall, the city was taken, pillaged and burned. Judah had suffered much from the proud Assyrian, and it is not difficult to understand how, with the doom of the cruel oppressor imminent, a prophet-patriot might burst into shouts of exultation and triumph over the distress of the cruel foe. "If," says A.B. Davidson, "the distress of Nineveh referred to were the final one, the descriptions of the prophecy would acquire a reality and naturalness which they otherwise want, and the general characteristics of Hebrew prophecy would be more truly conserved." There seems to be good reason, therefore, for assigning Nahum's activity to a date between 610 and 607 BC.

II. The Book.

1. Contents (Nahum 1-3):

Nahum is the prophet of Nineveh's doom. Nahum 1 (plus 2:2) contains the decree of Nineveh's destruction. Yahweh is a God of vengeance and of mercy (1:2,3); though He may at times appear slack in punishing iniquity, He will surely punish the sinner. No one can stand before Him in the day of judgment (1:4-6). Yahweh, faithful to those who rely upon Him (1:7), will be terrible toward His enemies and toward the enemies of His people (1:8). Judah need not fear: the present enemy is doomed (1:9-14), which will mean the exaltation of Judah (1:15; 2:2). The army appointed to execute the decree is approaching, ready for battle (2:1-4). All efforts to save the city are in vain; it falls (2:5,6), the queen and her attendants are captured (2:7), the inhabitants flee (2:8), the city is sacked and left a desolation (2:9-13). The destruction of the bloody city is imminent (3:1-3); the fate is well deserved and no one will bemoan her (3:4-7); natural strength and resources will avail nothing (3:8-11); the soldiers turn cowards and the city will be utterly cut off (3:12-18); the whole earth will rejoice over the downfall of the cruel oppressor (3:19).

2. Style:

Opinions concerning the religious significance of the Book of Nahum may differ, but from the stand-point of language and style all students assign to Nahum an exalted place among the prophet-poets of the ancient Hebrews; for all are impressed with the intense force and picturesqueness of his language and style. "Each prophet," says Kirkpatrick, "has his special gift for his particular work. Nahum bears the

palm for poetic power. His short book is a Pindaric ode of triumph over the oppressor's fall." So also G. A. Smith: "His language is strong and brilliant; his rhythm rumbles and rolls, leaps and flashes, like the horsemen and chariots he describes."

3. Integrity:

Until recently no doubts were expressed concerning the integrity of the book, but within recent years scholars have, with growing unanimity, denied the originality of Na 1:2-2:2 (Hebrew 2:3), with the exception of 2:1, which is considered the beginning of Nahum's utterances. This change of opinion is closely bound up with the alleged discovery of distorted remnants of an old alphabetic poem in Nahum 1 (HDB, article "Nahum"; The Expositor, 1898, 207 ff; ZATW, 1901, 225 ff; Eiselen, Minor Prophets, 422 ff). Now, it is true that in 1:2-7 traces of alphabetic arrangement may be found, but even here the artistic arrangement is not carried through consistently; in the rest of the chapter the evidence is slight.

The artificial character of acrostic poetry is generally supposed to point to a late date. Hence, those who believe that Nahum 1 was originally an alphabetic poem consider it an exilic or post-exilic production, which was at a still later date prefixed to the genuine prophecies of Nahum. In support of this view it is pointed out further that the prophecy in Nahum 1 is vague, while the utterances in Nahum 2 and 3 are definite and to the point. Some derive support for a late date also from the language and style of the poem.

That difficulties exist in Nahum 1, that in some respects it differs from Nahum 2 and 3, even the students of the English text can see; and that the Hebrew text has suffered in transmission is very probable. On the other hand, the presence of an acrostic poem in Nahum 1 is not beyond doubt. The apparent vagueness is removed, if Nahum 1 is interpreted as a general introduction to the more specific denunciation in Nahum 2 and 3. And a detailed examination shows that in this, as in other cases, the linguistic and stylistic data are indecisive. In view of these facts it may safely be asserted that no convincing argument has been presented against the genuineness of 1:2-2:2. "Therefore," says G.A. Smith, "while it is possible that a later poem has been prefixed to the genuine prophecies of Nahum, and the first chapter supplies many provocations to belief in such a theory, this has not been proved, and the able essays of proof have much against them. The question is open."

III. Teaching.

1. The Character of Yahweh:

The utterances of Nahum center around a single theme, the destruction of Nineveh. His purpose is to point out the hand of God in the impending fall of the city, and the significance of this catastrophe for the oppressed Hebrews. As a result they contain little direct religious teaching; and what there is of it is confined very largely to the opening verses of Nahum 1. These verses emphasize the twofold manifestation of the Divine holiness, the Divine vengeance and the Divine mercy (1:2,3). The manifestation of the one results in the destruction of the wicked (1:2), the other in the salvation of the

oppressed (1:15; 2:2). Faith in Yahweh will secure the Divine favor and protection (1:7).

2. Nahum’s Glee over the Ruin of Nineveh:

The fierceness of Nahum, and his glee at the thought of Nineveh’s ruin, may not be in accord with the injunction, "Love thine enemy"; but it should be borne in mind that it is not personal hatred that prompts the prophet; he is stirred by a righteous indignation over the outrages committed by Assyria. He considers the sin and overthrow of Nineveh, not merely in their bearing upon the fortunes of Judah, but in their relation to the moral government of the whole world; hence, his voice gives utterance to the outraged conscience of humanity.

3. Universality of Yahweh’s Rule:

While Nahum’s message, in its direct teaching, appears to be less spiritual and ethical than that of his predecessors, it sets in a clear light Yahweh’s sway over the whole universe, and emphasizes the duty of nations as well as of individuals to own His sway and obey His will. This attitude alone will assure permanent peace and prosperity; on the other hand, disobedience to His purpose and disregard of His rule will surely bring calamity and distress. The emphasis of these ethical principles gives to the message of Nahum a unique significance for the present day and generation. "Assyria in his hands," says Kennedy, "becomes an object-lesson to the empires of the modern world, teaching, as an eternal principle of the Divine government of the world, the absolute necessity, for a nation’s continued vitality, of that righteousness, personal, civic, and national, which alone exalteth a nation."

4. The Messianic Outlook:

In a broad sense, Na 1:15 is of Messianic import. The downfall of Nineveh and Assyria prepares the way for the permanent redemption and exaltation of Zion: "the wicked one shall no more pass through thee."

LITERATURE.

Comms. on the Minor Prophets by Ewald, Pusey, Keil, Orelli; G.A. Smith (Expositor’s Bible); Driver (New Century); B.A. Davidson, commentary on "Nahum," "Habakkuk," "Zephaniah" (Cambridge Bible); A.F. Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the Prophets; Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets; F.W. Farrar, Minor Prophets ("Men of the Bible" series); Driver, Introduction to the Lit. of the Old Testament; HDB, article "Nahum"; EB, article "Nahum."

F. C. Eiselen

NAIDUS

na’-i-dus (Codex Alexandrinus Naeidos; Codex Vaticanus Naaidos): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:31), apparently equals "Benaiah" of Ezr 10:30, of which it is probably a

corruption or the latter part.

NAIL

nal: (1) As denoting the finger-nail, the Hebrew word is tsipporen (De 21:12), the captive woman "shall shave her head, and pare her nails." The latter was probably intended to prevent her from marring her beauty by scratching her face, an act of self-mutilation oriental women are repeatedly reported to have committed in the agony of their grief. Aramaic Tephar (Da 4:33, "his nails like birds' claws"). (2) As pin or peg (for tents, or driven into the wall) the word is yathedh (in Jud 4:21 the Revised Version (British and American), "tent-pin"); in Isa 22:23, "a nail in a sure place" is a peg firmly driven into the wall on which something is to be hung (22:24); compare Ec 12:11, where the word is masmeroth, cognate with macmer below. (3) For nails of iron (1Ch 22:3) and gold (2Ch 3:9), and in Isa 41:7 and Jer 10:4, the word is macmer. (4) In the New Testament the word is helos, used of the nails in Christ's hands (Joh 20:25), and "to nail" in Col 2:14 ("nailing it to the cross") is proseloo.

In a figurative sense the word is used of the hard point of a stylus or engraving tool: "The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron, and with the point (literally, "claw," "nail") of a diamond: it is graven upon the tablet of their heart, and upon the horns of your altars" (Jer 17:1).

James Orr

NAIN

na'-in (Navi): This town is mentioned in Scripture only in connection with the visit of Jesus and the miracle of raising the widow's son from the dead (Lu 7:11). The name persists to this day, and in the form of Nein clings to a small village on the northwestern slope of Jebel ed-Duchy ("Hill of Moreh"), the mountain which, since the Middle Ages, has been known as Little Hermon. The modern name of the mountain is derived from Neby Duchy whose wely crowns the height above the village. There are many ancient remains, proving that the place was once of considerable size. It was never enclosed by a wall, as some have thought from the mention of "the gate." This was probably the opening between the houses by which the road entered the town. Tristram thought he had found traces of an ancient city wall, but this proved to be incorrect. The ancient town perhaps stood somewhat higher on the hill than the present village. In the rocks to the East are many tombs of antiquity. The site commands a beautiful and extensive view across the plain to Carmel, over the Nazareth hills, and away past Tabor to where the white peak of Hermon glistens in the sun. To the South are the heights of Gilboa and the uplands of Samaria. The village, once prosperous, has fallen on evil days. It is said that the villagers received such good prices for simsum that they cultivated it on a large scale. A sudden drop in the price brought them to ruin, from which, after many years, they have not yet fully recovered.

W. Ewing

NAIOTH

na’-yoth, ni’-oth (nayoth; Codex Vaticanus Auath; Codex Alexandrinus Nauioth): This is the name given to a place in Ramah to which David went with Samuel when he fled and escaped from Saul (1Sa 19:18, etc.). The term has often been taken as meaning "houses" or "habitations"; but this cannot be justified. There is no certainty as to exactly what the word signified. Clearly, however, it attached to a particular locality in Ramah; and whatever its etymological significance, it denoted a place where the prophets dwelt together. On approaching it in pursuit of David, Saul was overcome by the Spirit of God, and conducted himself like one "possessed," giving rise to the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?"

W. Ewing

NAKED; NAKEDNESS

na’-ked, na’-ked-nes: "Naked" in the Old Testament represents various derivatives of ‘ur and ‘arah chiefly, ‘arom (adj.) and ‘erwah (noun); in the New Testament the adjective is gumnos, the noun gumnotes, with verb gumneteuo, in 1Co 4:11. In Ex 32:25; 2Ch 28:19, the King James Version adds para‘, "break loose," "cast away restraint." Both the Greek and Hebrew forms mean "without clothing," but in both languages they, are used frequently in the sense of "lightly clad" or, simply, "without an outer garment." So, probably, is the meaning in Joh 21:7—Peter was wearing only the chiton (see DRESS); and so perhaps in Mr 14:51,52 and Mic 1:8. In Isa 20:2-4, however, the meaning is literally (for the "three years" of Isa 20:3 see the commentaries). So in Ge 2:25; 3:7, where the act of sin is immediately followed by the sense of shame (see Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology, and Gunkel, at the place). A very common use of "naked" is also "without proper clothing" (Job 22:6; 1Co 4:11, etc.), whence, of course, the expression "clothe naked." "Nakedness," in addition, is used as an euphemism in 1Sa 20:30. A slightly different euphemistic usage is that of Le 18:19, which in Eze 16:36,37 is played off against the literal sense (compare Eze 22:10; 23:18,29). The point of Ge 9:22,23 is a little hard to grasp, but apparently there is here again an euphemism—this time for a particularly horrible act (see the commentaries and compare Hab 2:15). Possibly some of these euphemisms are due to the Massoretes (see TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). The Jews objected vigorously to exposure of the body (even athletes insisting on a loin-cloth (compare 2 Macc 4:12,13)), and compulsory nudity was the extreme of shame and humiliation (Isa 20:2-4; La 1:8; Ho 2:3; Na 3:5, etc.). The relation of this attitude to Israel’s high sexual morality needs no explanation.

Buroton Scott Easton

NAME

nam (shem; onoma; Latin nomen (2 Esdras 4:1); verbs onomazo; Latin nomino (2 Esdras 5:26)): A "name" is that by which a person, place or thing is marked and known. In Scripture, names were generally descriptive of the person, of his position, of some circumstance affecting him, hope entertained

concerning him, etc., so that "the name" often came to stand for the person. In Ac 1:15; Re 3:4, onoma stands for "persons"; compare Nu 26:53,55.

I. Old Testament Word and Use.

1. General:

The word for "name" in the Old Testament is shem (also the name of one of the sons of Noah). The etymology is uncertain, although it may be from shamah (obs.), "to set a mark"; shum is the Aramaic form. For the name as descriptive of the person see NAMES. Besides designating persons, the name also stands for fame, renown, reputation, character gained or expressed, etc. (Ge 6:4; 2Sa 7:9,23, etc.); it might be an "evil name" (De 22:14,19); the "name" is also equivalent to a "people" or "nation" (which might be "blotted out," i.e. destroyed (De 7:24, etc.)); to speak or write "in the name" signified authority (Ex 5:23; 1Ki 21:8, etc.); to "call one's name" over a place or people indicated possession or ownership (2Sa 12:28; Am 9:12, etc.); to act "in the name" was to represent (De 25:6); to be called or known "by name" indicated special individual notice (Ex 31:2; Isa 43:1; 45:3,4). Ge 2:19,20 even displays a conception of identity between the name and the thing.

"To name" is sometimes 'amar, "to say" (1Sa 16:3); dabhar, "to speak" (Ge 23:16); naqabh, "to mark out" (Nu 1:17); qara'," to call" (Ge 48:16; Isa 61:6).

2. The Divine Name:

Of special interest is the usage with respect to the name of God. (For the various Divine names and their significance see GOD, NAMES OF.) He revealed Himself to Israel through Moses by a new name (which was at the same time that of the God of their fathers)—JEHOVAH (which see) (Yahweh)—the nature of which should be shown by His manifestations on their behalf (Ex 3:13-16; 15:2,3). The "name of God was therefore not a mere word, but the whole of" the Divine manifestation, the character of God as revealed in His relations to His people and in His dealings with them (Ex 9:16; Jos 7:9; 9:9, etc.). The "name of Yahweh" was proclaimed to Moses on Mt. Sinai, "Yah, Yahweh, a God merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and abundant in lovingkindness and truth," etc. (Ex 34:6); the name Yahweh (so revealed) was (Ex 3:15) His "memorial Name" (so, often, in the American Standard Revised Version; see MEMORIAL). His sole Deity was such an important element in His name that De 6:4 f was termed the "Shema" (from shema', "hear," the first word in 6:4), the first article of Israelite faith, taught to all the children, written on the phylacteries, and still recited as the first act in public and private worship "twice a day by every adult male Jew." Where Yahweh is said to record His name, or to put His name in a place (or person), some special Divine manifestation is implied, making the place or person sacred to Him (Ex 20:24; 1Ki 8:16). His "name" was in the angel of His Presence (Ex 23:21); what He does is "for his great name's sake," in fidelity to and vindication of His revealed character and covenant relationship (2Ch 6:32; Ps 25:11); the great things He should do would be "for a name" (Isa 55:13); He would give His people a new name, "an everlasting name" (Isa 56:5); to be "called by" the name of Yahweh is "to be his people" (2Ch 7:14; Isa 43:7); it implies "protection," etc. (Isa 63:19; Jer 14:8,9); to "call upon" the name

of Yahweh was "to worship him" as God (Ge 21:33; 26:25, etc.); "to confess" His name, to "acknowledge him" (1Ki 8:33,35); to love, trust, act in, etc., "the name," was to love, trust, etc., Yahweh Himself (Ps 5:11; 7:17). Very frequently, especially in the Psalms and prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, "the name" of God stands for "God himself"; to "forget his name" was "to depart from him" (Jer 23:27); "to minister, prophesy, or speak" in His name signified Divine appointment, inspiration, authority (Jer 11:21; 14:14,15, etc.); we have "swearing by" or "in" the name of Yahweh (De 6:13); to take His name "in vain" was to swear falsely (Ex 20:7; Le 19:12); we have "blessing" in His name (De 10:8); "cursing" (2Ki 2:24). In Le 24:11, we have the case of one who "blasphemed the Name, and cursed," the penalty for which was death by stoning (24:13-16). In later Jewish usage (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 14:21) the sacred name Yahweh was not pronounced in reading the Scriptures, ‘Adhonay ("my Lord") being substituted for it (the vowels belonging to ‘Adhonay were written with the consonants of the Divine name), hence, the frequent term "the Lord" in the King James Version, for which the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "Yahweh."

II. New Testament Word and Use.

1. Character and Work of the Person:

In the New Testament onoma has frequently also the significance of denoting the "character," or "work" of the person, e.g. Mt 1:21, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus; for it is he that shall save," etc. (Lu 1:31; 2:21; 1:63, "His name is John"; compare the new names given to Simon, James and John; Saul’s new name of "Paul"). The "name" of God has the same relation to the character of God as in the Old Testament (Mt 6:9; "Father, glorify thy name," Joh 12:28); it is manifested by Christ (Joh 17:26; compare Joh 17:3); the name of Jesus, as manifesting God, takes the place of the name of Yahweh in the Old Testament (compare Jas 2:7 with Jer 14:9, and see below); to Him is given "the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow .... and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father," Php 2:9,10 (compare Isa 45:23); "It is not the name Jesus, but the name of Jesus" (Lightfoot), i.e. the name ("Lord,") received by Jesus; we have with reference to Jesus simply "the Name" (Ac 5:41, "worthy to suffer dishonor for the Name"; Jas 5:14 (probable text, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek), "in the Name"; 3 Joh 1:7, "for the sake of the Name"); the "name of Christ" is equivalent to "Christ himself" (Mt 10:22; 19:29); it is the same thing as "his manifestation" (Joh 20:31); therefore "to believe on his name" is to believe in Him as manifested in His life and work (Joh 1:12; 2:23); "in the name of God" means sent by God, as representing Him, with Divine authority (Mt 21:9; 23:39); in like manner, we have "prophesying" or "preaching" in the name of Jesus (Ac 4:18; 5:28). The "name of Jesus" represented His "authority" and "power," e.g. working miracles in His name (Mt 7:22; Mr 9:39; Ac 4:7, ‘by what name (or "power") have ye done this?’), and it is contrasted with casting out evil spirits by some other name or power (Ac 16:18; 19:17). The gospel, of salvation was to be preached "in his name," by His authority and as making it effectual (Lu 24:47); sinners were justified "through his name" (Ac 10:43; 1Co 6:11); sins were forgiven "for his name’s sake" (1 Joh 2:12); men "called upon the name" of Jesus, as they had done on that of Yahweh (Ac 9:14,21 (compare Ac 7:59); Ro 10:13,14).

"To name the name" of Christ was to belong to Him (2Ti 2:19); the calling of His name on the Gentiles

signified their acceptance as God’s people (Ac 15:17 (quoted from Am 9:12); compare Ro 1:5); to "hold fast his name" is to be true to Him as made known (Re 2:13; 3:8); to be "gathered together in his name," to "do all"things in his name," is as "acknowledging him" (Mt 18:20; Col 3:17); "to baptize in" or "into the name" of Jesus Christ (Ac 2:38; 22:16, "calling on his name," contrasted with baptizing into one’s own name in 1Co 13, eis) is "to call over them his name" (in the rite), as claiming them for Christ and as their acknowledgment of Him or of faith in Him—becoming His disciples; similarly, to baptize "into (eis) the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," represents "dedication to" God as He has been revealed in Christ.

"In the name of" means "as representing" (or as being), e.g. "in the name of a prophet," of "a righteous man," or of "a disciple" (Mt 10:41,42); to receive a little child "in Christ’s name," i.e. as belonging to Him, is to receive Himself (Mt 18:5; Mr 9:37; 9:41 to disciples, the Revised Version (British and American) "because ye are Christ’s," margin "Greek: in name that ye are (Christ’s)"; Lu 9:48; compare Mt 18:20; Mr 13:6, "Many shall come in my name"; Lu 21:8).

2. In Relation to Prayer:

The significance of the name of Jesus in relation to prayer deserves special notice. To pray in the name of Jesus, to ask anything in His name, according to His promises, "Whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do" (Joh 14:13; compare Joh 14:14; 15:16; 16:23); "Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name: ask .... that your joy may be made full" (Joh 16:24), is not merely to add to our prayers (as is so often unthinkingly done): "we ask all in the name of Jesus," or "through Jesus Christ our Lord," etc., but to pray or ask as His representatives on earth, in His mission and stead, in His spirit and with His aim; it implies union with Christ and abiding in Him, He in us and we in Him. The meaning of the phrase is, "as being one with me even as I am revealed to you." Its two correlatives are "in me" (Joh 6:56; 14:20; 15:4 ff; 16:33; compare 1Joh 5:20), and the Pauline "in Christ" (Westcott, The Gospel according to John).

W. L. Walker

NAMES OF GOD

See GOD, NAMES OF.

NAMES, PROPER

I. THE FORM OF HEBREW NAMES

1. Various Types

2. Vocalization

3. Transposition of Parts

4. Methods of Abbreviation

II. THE RANGE OF PROPER NAMES

1. Personal Names

(1) Not Exclusively Descriptive

(2) Drawn from a Wide Field

(3) Influences Leading to Choice

(4) Popularity of Names: Hard to Determine

2. Geographical Names

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF BIBLICAL REFERENCES

1. Derivation of Names Manifest

2. The Narrator’s Only Concern

3. Allusions Linked with Names

I. The Form of Hebrew Names.

1. Various Types:

The Hebrew proper name consists of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence.

(1) Where the name is a single word, other than a verb, it may be

(a) a common noun, concrete, as Barak, "lightning," Tola, "crimson worm," Elon, "oak," Achsah, "anklet," Deborah, "bee" or abstract, as Uzzah, "strength," Manoah, "rest," Hannah, "grace"; or either abstract or concrete, as Zebul, "habitation";

(b) a participle, as Saul, "asked," Zeruiah, "cleft";

(c) an adjective, as Ikkesh, "perverse," Maharai, "impetuous," Shimei, "famous"; or

(d) a word that may be either an adjective or an abstract noun according to circumstances. Such are formations after the norm of qaTTul, as shammua‘, which are generally adjectives; and formations by means of the ending -am or -on, as Adullam, Zalmon, Gideon, or, with the rejection of the final -n, Shilo (h) and Solomo(n).

(2) The name may be a phrase, consisting of

(a) two nouns, as Penuel, "face of God," Samuel, "name of God," Ish-bosheth, "man of shame"; or

(b) an adjective and a noun, as Jedidiah, "beloved of Yahweh" ; or

(c) a preposition and one or more nouns, as Besodeiah, "in the intimacy of Yahweh" (Ne 3:6).

When the name is a sentence, the predicate may be

(a) a noun, the copula being implied, as Abijah, "Yah is a father," Eliab, "God is a father," Elimelech, "God is king"; or

(b) an adjective, as Tobijah, "Yah is good" (Zec 6:10); or

(c) a participle, as Obed-edom, "Edom is serving"; or

(d) a finite verb. This last type exhibits five or six varieties: the subject stands before a perfect, as Jonathan, "Yahweh hath given," Jehoshaphat, "Yahweh hath judged," Eleazar, "God hath helped," Elkanah, "God hath formed"; or before an imperfect, as Eliahba, "God hideth Himself"; or the subject comes after a perfect, as Benaiah, "Yahweh hath built," Shephatiah, "Yahweh hath judged," Asahel, "God hath made; or after an imperfect, as Jezreel, "God doth sow." Very often the subject is the pronoun included or implied in the verbal form, as Nathan, "he hath given," Hillel, "he hath praised," Jair, "he enlighteneth," Jephthah, "he openeth." Occasionally the predicate contains an object of the verb, as Shealtiel, "I have asked God" (Ezr 3:2), or a prepositional phrase, as Hephzibah, "my delight is in her" (2Ki 21:1). The sentence-name is usually a declaration, but it may be an exhortation or a prayer, as Jerub-baal, "let Baal strive," and Hoshea, "save!" (Nu 13:16), or it may be a question, as Micaiah, "who is like Yahweh?" All of the foregoing illustrations have been taken from the Books of Judges and Samuel, unless otherwise noted.

2. Vocalization:

The proper name is treated as one word, whether on analysis it consists of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence; and as such it is subject to the laws of accent and quantity which govern the Hebrew word.

(1) A common noun used as a name undergoes the variations of pronunciation due to the custom of lengthening a short vowel in pause and to the laws which control the aspiration of certain labials, linguals, and palatals. Thus, the name Perez, "breach," which appears also as Pharez in the King James Version of the Old Testament, occurs in the Hebrew text in the four forms perets, parets, pherets and pharets (Ru 4:18; Ne 11:4,6).

(2) In a name consisting of a phrase the normal advance of the accent as usual causes the loss of a pretonic vowel, as is indicated by the suspended letter in Jedidiah, "beloved of Yahweh"; requires a short vowel in a closed unaccented syllable, as in Mahalal'el, "praise of God"; allows contraction, as in Beth-el, "house of God"; and occasions the return of a segholate noun to its primitive form, as in Abdiel, "servant of God," where the vowel i is an archaism which has lingered in compound names, but has generally disappeared elsewhere in speech.

(3) Names which consist of a sentence are also accented as one word, and the pronunciation is modified accordingly. The synonyms Eliam and Ammiel, "God is a kinsman," not only exhibit the common archaism in the retention of the vowel i, but the name Eliam also shows the characteristic lengthening of the vowel in the final accented syllable, so common in nouns. The four forms Eliphelet, Eliphalet, Elpelet and Elpalet, meaning "God is deliverance," represent the variations of the Hebrew due to the causes already mentioned (1Ch 3:8; 14:5,7; see the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)). The requirements regarding the ellsion and the quantity and quality of vowels, on the shifting of the accent, are also regularly met by the various types of sentence-names in which the predicate is a verb Thus, the personal names 'elishama' and 'elnathan (subject followed by verb in the perfect); 'elyaqim, 'elyahba', and yehoyakhin (subject and imperfect); gedhalyah, yekholyahu, barakh'el, in which the first vowel is protected by the implied reduplication of the Piel species, benayah, 'asah'el, and 'asah-'el, 'asi'el, chazah'el and chaza'-el and pedhah'el (perfect and subject); yigdalyahu, yibhneyah, ya'asi'el, yachdi'el, yehallel'el, yesimi'el (imperfect and subject); yerubba'al and yashobh'am (jussive and subject; u in sharpened, and o in closed, syllable; in Jashobeam the first long vowel is retained by a secondary accent, marked by metheg); nathan and yiphtach, i.e. Jephthah. Ibneiah shows the customary apocopation of the imperfect of Lamedh-he verbs; and the names Benaiah to Pedahel show the methods of combining the perfect of such verbs with a following element. The short vowel of the final closed syllable of the imperfect is elided, if the final consonant is permitted to begin the syllable of the next element of the name, as in Jezreel, Jekabzeel, Jerahmeel, Ezekiel, Jehizkiah (see the Hebrew form of these names); but it is not elided in Ishmael, although the consonant is attached to the following syllable; and elision is avoided, as in Jiphthah-el, by keeping the ultimate and penultimate syllables distinct. Jehucal, a Hophal imperfect, is peculiar in not lengthening the vowel in the accented final syllable, when the verb is used as a personal name.

3. Transposition of Parts:

When the name was a sentence in Hebrew, its constituent parts could be transposed without changing the meaning. Thus the father of Bathsheba was called Ammiel, "a kinsman is God," and Eliam, "God is a kinsman" (2Sa 11:3; 1Ch 3:5); and similarly, in letters written from Palestine to the king of Egypt in the 14th century BC, Ilimilki is also called Milkili, the name in either form signifying "God is king."

Ahaziah, king of Judah, is called Jehoahaz (compare 2Ch 21:17 with 22:1), a legitimate transposition of the verb and subject, and meaning in each case, "Yahweh hath laid hold."

Not only did transposition take place, but the substitution of a cognate root and even the use of a different part of the verb also occurred. Thus King Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:6; Jer 52:31) was known also as Jeconiah (Jer 24:1; 28:4) and Coniah (Jer 22:24,28; 37:1). The two names Jehoiachin and Jeconiah have exactly the same meaning, "Yahweh doth establish"; and Coniah is a synonym, "the establishing of Yahweh." The Divine name which begins Jehoiachin is transferred to the end in Jeconiah and Coniah; and the Hiphil imperfect of the verb kun, which is seen in Jehoiachin, has been replaced by the Qal imperfect of the verb kanan in Jeconiah, and by the construct infinitive of the same species in Coniah. Parallel cases occur in Assyrian and Babylonian literature, among which the two forms of the king's name, Zamama-shum-iddina and Zamama-nadin-shum, exhibit both the transposition of constituent parts and an interchange of preterite and participle.

4. Methods of Abbreviation:

Twin forms like Abiner and Abner, Abishalom and Absalom, Elizaphan and Elzaphan, are not the full name and its abbreviation by syncopation, but are merely two variant, equally legitimate, modes of combining the constituent parts. The common methods of shortening were:

(1) contraction by the rejection of a weak consonant or the apocopation of a final unaccented vowel, notably illustrated by the divine name (c)~yeho-] at the beginning and -yahu at the end of proper names: hence, Jehoash became Joash (2Ki 12:1,19), and Amaziahu became Amaziah (2Ki 14:1, 8 Hebrew text, and 8);

(2) abbreviation of composite geographical names by the omission of the generic noun or its equivalent: Jerusalem, which to the Hebrews meant "foundation of peace," was shortened to Salem, "peace" (Ps 76:2); Kiriath-baal, "city of Baal" (Jos 15:60), to Baal or Baalah (Jos 15:9,10; compare 2Sa 6:2); Beeshterah, "house or temple of Astarte," to Ashtaroth; Beth-lebaoth, "house of lionesses," to Lebaoth; Beth-azmaveth to Azmaveth; Beth-rehob to Rehob; Beth-bamoth to Bamoth (M S, l. 27, with Nu 21:19); Beth-baal-meon to Baal-meon (Nu 32:38; Jos 13:17); the same custom existed among the Moabites who spoke of this town indifferently as Beth-baal-meon and Baal-meon (M S, ll.9, 30);

(3) abbreviation by the omission of the divine name: thus the name of the idolater Micaiah, which means, "who is like Yahweh?" (Jud 17:1,4 (Hebrew)), was shortened to Micah, "who is like?" (Jud 17:5,8); and similarly in the case of three other men, namely the prophet (Micaiah, Jer 26:18 the English Revised Version, and Micah, Mic 1:1), the Levite musician (Ne 12:35 with Ne 11:17,22), and the father of Abdon (2Ki 22:12 with 2Ch 34:20).

The king of Judah, Yauhazi, as he was known to the Assyrians, i.e. Jehoahaz, "Yahweh hath laid hold," is called simply Ahaz, "he hath laid hold," in the Hebrew records. The town of Jabneel, "God doth cause to be built," was shortened to Jabneh, "he doth cause to be built" (Jos 15:11; 2Ch 26:6; compare RAPC

1Ma 4:15); Paltiel, "deliverance of God," was curtailed to Palti, "deliverance" (1Sa 25:44; 2Sa 3:15); Abijah, "Yahweh is father," to Abi (2Ch 29:1 with 2Ki 18:2); and Bamoth-baal, "high places of Baal," to Bamoth (Jos 13:17 with Nu 21:19). Abdi, Othni, Uzzi, and not a few other similar names, probably represent curtailment of this sort. The omission of the Divine title has parallels in Assyrian and Babylonian literature: thus Nabu-nadin-ziri and Nabu-shum-ukin were called Nadinu and Shum-ukin respectively (Dynastic Tablet number 2, col. iv, 4, 5, with Babylonian Chron., col. i, 13, 16).

(4) Abbreviation by the elision of the initial consonant, yet so that the remainder is a synonymous name of complete grammatical form. The name of King Hezekiah was written by the Hebrews both yechizchiyah, "Yahweh doth strengthen," and chizchiyah, "Yahweh is strength." The two forms interchange many times in 2Ch 29$, 30$, 31$, 32$, 33$. Similarly, Jeconiah was shortened to Coniah, as has already been noticed; the name of the town Jekabzeel, "God bringeth together," to Kabzeel, "God's bringing together" (Ne 11:25 with Jos 15:21; 2Sa 23:20); Meshelemiah, "Yahweh is recompensing," to Shelemiah, "Yahweh's recompensing" (1Ch 26:1,2 with 1Ch 26:14); Meshullam, "recompensed," to Shallum, "recompensed" (1Ch 9:11; Ne 11:11 with 1Ch 6:12; Ezr 7:2).

II. The Range of Proper Names.

1. Personal Names:

(1) Not Exclusively Descriptive.

Simonis in his Onomasticum, published in 1741, and Gesenius in his Thesaurus, issued during the years from 1835 to 1853, endeavored to interpret the proper names as though they were ordinarily intended to characterize the person who bore them. Embarrassed by theory, Gesenius translated Malchiel by "rex Dei, h. e. a Deo constitutus"; and Simonis translated Malchi-shua by "regis auxilium, i.e. auxilium s. salus regi patri praestita"; Ammizabad was rendered by Gesenius "famulus largitoris, h.e. Jehovae," and by Simonis "populum (i.e. copiosissimam liberorum turbam) donavit"; Gesenius translated Gedaliah "quem Jehova educavit vel roboravit," Zerahiah "cui Jehova ortum dedit," Jehozadak "quem Jehova justum fecit," and Joe "cui Jehova est deus, i.e. cultor Jehovae"; but Simonis rendered Joe by "Jehoua (eat) Deus .... vel (cui) Jehoua Deus (eat)." Now Malchiel means "God is king," Malchi-shua "the king, i. e. God, is salvation" (compare Joshua), Ammizabad "the Kinsman hath endowed," Gedaliah "Yah is great," Zerahiah "Yahweh hath risen in splendor," Jehozadak "Yahweh is righteous," and Joel, if a compound name, "Yah is God." A moment's reflection makes clear that these names do not describe the persons who bear them, but in every case speak of God. They emphasize the important facts that personal names might be, and often were, memorial and doctrinal, and that personal names were a part of the ordinary speech of the people, full of meaning and intelligible to all, subject to the phonetic laws of the Hebrews, and obedient to the rules of grammar.

(2) Drawn from a Wide Field.

Parents named their children, and contemporaries dubbed people, from physical and spiritual traits,

whether a beauty or a blemish; thus Hophni, "pertaining to the fist," Japhia, "gleaming," Ikkesh, "perverse," Ira, "watchful," Gareb, "rough-skinned," and Hiddai, "joyful." Children were called by the names of natural objects, as Peninnah, "coral," Rimmon, "pomegranate," Tamar, "palm tree," Nahash, "serpent," Eglah, "heifer," Aiah, "bird of prey," and Laish, "lion"; or after kinsfolk or remoter members of the clan, as Absalom's daughter Tamar bore the name of her father's beautiful sister, and as the priest Phinehas took his strange name from the noted Phinehas, who belonged to the same father's house in earlier days. Or the name given to the child furnished a memorial of events in the national history, like Ichabod, "the glory is not" (1Sa 4:21), and probably Obed-edom, "Edom is serving" (compare 1Sa 14:47; 21:7); or it told of circumstances attending the child's birth, as Saul, "asked," and Elishama, "God hath heard"; or it embodied an article of the parent's creed, as Joab and Abijah, "Yah is a father," Joel, "Yah is God"; or it expressed a hope concerning the child or bore witness to a prophecy, as Jedidiah, "beloved of Yahweh," and Solomon, "peaceable" (2Sa 12:25; 1Ch 22:9). Sometimes the name of the tribe or race to which a man belonged became his popular designation, as Cushi, "Cushite." All of these examples have been cited from the records of one period of Israel's history, the times of Samuel and David.

(3) Influences Leading to Choice.

The people in general gathered names for their children freely from all parts of this wide field, but in certain circles influences were at work which tended to restrict the choice to a smaller area. These influences were religious:

(a) In homes of piety conscious nearness to God on the part of the parents naturally prompted them to bestow religious names upon their children. The name may be without distinct religious mark in its form and meaning, as Ephraim, "double fruitfulness," Manasseh, "making to forget," and yet have been given in acknowledgment of God's grace and be a constant reminder of His goodness (Ge 41:51,52); or the name may be religious in form, as Shemaiah, "Yah hath heard," and publicly testify to the parents' gratitude to God.

(b) The covenant relation, which Yahweh entered into with Israel, made the name Yahweh, and that aspect of God's character which is denoted by this name, peculiarly precious to the people of God, and thenceforth the word Yahweh became a favorite element in the personal names of the Israelites, though not, of course, to the exclusion of the great name El, "God."

(c) Among the kings in the line of David, the consciousness of their formal adoption by Yahweh to be His vicegerents on the throne of Israel (2Sa 7; Ps 2) found expression in the royal names. Yahweh, the God of Israel, was acknowledged in the personal name Abijah, borne by the son and successor of Rehoboam. But his was an isolated case, unless the name Asa is an abbreviated form. But with Jehoshaphat, Abijah's grandson, early in the 9th century, the custom became established. Henceforth it was conventional for the king of Judah to have for his name a sentence with Yahweh as its subject. The only exceptions among the 16 successors of Asa on the throne were Manasseh and his son Amon, both of whom were notoriously apostate from Yahweh. The full name of Ahaz was Jehoahaz. Josiah's son

Shallum as king was known as Jehoahaz; and his brother Eliakim, when placed on the throne by Pharaoh-necoh, was given the name Jehoiakim.

(d) Akin to the influence exerted by the relation of the kings to the God of Israel, and manifesting almost equal power contemporaneously with it, was the influence of official connection with the sanctuary, either as priests or as subordinate ministers, and it frequently led to the choice of an ecclesiastical name containing the word God or Yahweh. During the five centuries and a half, beginning near the close of Solomon's reign and extending to the end of Nehemiah's administration, 22 high priests held office, so far as their names have been preserved in the records. Of these pontiffs 17 bear names which are sentences with Yahweh as subject, and another is a sentence with El as subject. The materials for investigation along this line are not complete, as they are in the case of the kings, and ratios derived from them are apt to be erroneous; but evidently the priests of Yahweh's temple at Jerusalem not only recognized the appropriateness for themselves and their families of names possessing a general religious character, but came to favor such as expressly mentioned God, especially those which mentioned God by His name of Yahweh.

(4) Popularity of Names: Hard to Determine.

Until abundant data come to light for all periods of the history, it is precarious to attempt to determine the relative popularity of the various kinds and types of names in any one generation, or to compare period with period with respect to the use or neglect of a particular class of names. For, first, in no period are the names which have been transmitted by the Hebrew records many as compared with the thousands in use at the time; and, secondly, the records deal with the historical event which was conspicuous at the moment, and rarely mention persons other than the actors in this event.

At one time men and women from the middle class of society are asserting themselves in the national life, and the personal names current in the families of farmers, shopkeepers and soldiers obtain place in the annals; at another time, when the activities of the court are of paramount importance, it is mainly names that were current in official circles which are chronicled; at yet another period, when matters of the national worship engaged the attention of the state, ecclesiastics and laymen from pious families, whose names were quite likely to have a religious meaning, receive mention. Very few names outside of the particular circle concerned are preserved in the records. It is unwarranted, therefore, to draw inferences regarding the relative use of particular names, secular names, for instance, at different periods of the history of Israel, by comparing the number of these names found in a record of political uprisings in the army with the number of similar names in the narrative of an episode which occurred at a later date and in which only priests took part. It is comparing things that differ. It is comparing the number of certain names current in military circles with the number of the same names among ecclesiastics, in order to learn whether these names were more common among the people as a whole in the one period than in the other.

2. Geographical Names:

The brine of its waters led the ancient Hebrews to call the Dead Sea the Salt Sea. Bethesda, "house of mercy," received its name from the belief in the healing virtue of its waters; Lebanon, "white," from the snows that cover its crest; Sidon on the Mediterranean Sea and Bethsaida on the Sea of Galilee, from their fisheries; Tyre, from the great rock in the sea on which it was built; the valley of Elah, from the terebinth tree; Luz, from the almond tree; Shittim, from the acacia groves on the eastern terrace of the Jordan valley; and Jericho, from the fragrance of its palms and balsams. The "crags of the wild goats" and En-gedi, "kid spring" (1Sa 24:1,2), were in a desolate, rocky region where the wild goats had their home; Aijalon signifies "place of harts," and Etam denotes a "place of beasts and birds of prey." The hopes of a people and pride in their town were expressed in names like Joppa, "beauty," Tirzah, "pleasantness," Janoah, "rest," Shiloh, "tranquillity," and Salem, "peace." The resemblance of the Sea of Galilee in shape to a harp secured for it its ancient name of Chinnereth. Poetic imagination saw in majestic Mt. Hermon likeness to a soldier’s breastplate, and forthwith the mountain was called Serion and Senir. The sanctuary of a deity might give name to a town, hence, Beth-dagon, Beth-anath, and Ashtaroth. Sometimes the name of a place commemorated a victory, as rock Oreb, rock Zeeb, and Eben-ezer (Jud 7:25; 1Sa 7:12); or enshrined a religious transaction or experience, Beth-el and Beracah (Ge 28:17-19; 2Ch 20:26); or told of a migration, as when colonists gave the name of their native town to their new settlement (Jud 1:23-26). Often the name of the founder or other famous inhabitant became attached to a town, and that for various reasons. It was often necessary to distinguish places of the same name from each other by this method; thus certain of the towns called Gibeah became Gibeath-saul and Gibeath-phinehas. The Jebusite stronghold captured by David was named by him the city of David, and was known by this name, as a quarter of Jerusalem, for many generations (2Sa 5:9; 2Ki 16:20). The practice was common among the Semitic contemporaries of Israel, as is illustrated by Dur-sharruken, "Sargonsburg," and Kar-shalmanasharidu, "Shalmaneser’s fortress." A town might also be named after the tribe which inhabited it or after the ancestor of the tribe, as Da (Jud 18:29), and possibly under not a few geographical designations a tribal name is hidden, even when the fact has escaped record and is not revealed by the form of the name. In an inquiry after the origin of a geographical designation the first consideration is due to the causes known to be ordinarily at work in giving rise to names of the same aspect as the one under scrutiny; and only when they fail to yield a suitable explanation are less obvious causes worthy of serious attention.

III. Characteristics of Biblical References.

1. Derivation of Names Manifest:

As a rule, Semitic words clearly reveal their origin and structure. The Semite might, indeed, err with respect to the particular meaning intended, where a word was current in several significations. Thus, the vale of bakha’, mentioned in Ps 84:7 (Eng. 6), is open to two interpretations: namely, "valley of Baca," so called from the balsam trees in it, and "valley of weeping," as the versions render the unusual form, regarding it as equivalent to a similar word meaning "weeping." The plural bekha’im, "mulberry or balsam trees" (2Sa 5:23,14), was understood by Josephus to denote a grove known by the name Weepers (Ant., VII, iv, 1; compare Septuagint). In those rare cases where several derivations were possible, the Israelite may not always have known which thought was intended to be embodied in the name which he heard. But he discerned the alternative possibilities; and a parent, in bestowing a name ambiguous in its

derivation, might be deliberately taking advantage of its power to be the vehicle for the suggestion and expression of two thoughts (Ge 30:23,24; Joseph being derivable from both yacaph and ‘acaph).

2. The Narrator’s Only Concern:

That the object of the Biblical writer was not to make known the derivation of the proper names is clear from cases like Esek, Rehoboth and Ishmael (Ge 16:11; 26:20,22): Isaac called the name of the well, Contention, because the herdsmen of Gerar "contended" with him; another well he called Broad Places (roomy places), because Yahweh had "made room" for him; and Hagar was directed to name the son that she was about to bear "God doth hear," because Yahweh had "heard" her affliction. The narrator’s purpose was not to declare that the Hebrew word for contention, ‘eceq, is derived from the Hebrew verb for "contend," ‘acaq, and that the name "God doth hear," yishma‘’el, signifies God doth hear, yishma‘ ‘el. These derivations and meanings were plain. The purpose was to state the circumstances which led to the choice of the name. There are instances also where no part of the name reappears in the words that state the reason for the use of the name. For example, the name Maher-shalal-hash-baz is not explained by citing the words which compose it. One noun of the composite name appears, indeed, in the exposition of the meaning, but accidentally as it were, and without prominence or significance of position (Isa 8:3,4). Samuel is a notable example of this method. Hannah called his name Samuel, saying, ‘Because of Yahweh, I asked him’ (1Sa 1:20). Simonis, Ewald and Nestle derive the name from shemua‘’el, "heard of God." This etymology would fully satisfy the reason given for the mother’s choice of the name; but the suggested derivation is far-fetched, for it is not customary for a Hebrew word to lose the strong guttural ‘ayin (‘). The guttural was not lost, but was distinctly heard, in Ishmael, where there is the same concurrence of sounds as in shemua‘’el. Qimchi, on the other hand, suggested that Samuel is a contraction of sha’ul me’el, "asked of God"; and Ewald asserts that this origin is theory of the narrator (Lehrbuch der hebraischen Sprache, 275, note 3). This is incredible. Such a contraction is "alien to the genius of the Hebrew language"(Driver, Text of Samuel, 13), and the absence of the two Hebrew consonants ‘aleph (’) and lamedh (l) before the letter "m" in the midst of the name Samuel would of itself prevent the Semite from imagining such an etymology. The derivation and meaning of Samuel were not obscure. The type was common, and was especially familiar by reason of the name Peniel, "face of God" (Ge 32:30 f). Samuel means "name of God" (Gesenius). As Jacob, upon his return from Paddan-aram, in fulfillment of his vow erected an altar at Beth-el as a memorial of God’s bestowal of the promised blessings and named the place thus consecrated "The God of Beth-el" (Ge 35:1,3,7), so Hannah having by vow dedicated to Yahweh the son for whose birth she was praying, now that her prayer has been answered and the son given, calls him "The name of God" in commemoration of the Giver. The Biblical narrator states the motive which led the mother to choose the name Samuel for her child. In this explanation no part of the name is used. Moreover, the slight assonance between shemu’el and she’iltiw in 1Sa 1:20 was unsought, for these words are separated in the Hebrew text, and the emphasis is placed on the gift’s being "from Yahweh." The history of the discussion concerning this name shows how far astray criticism has been led by the false theory that the purpose of the narrator was to analyze the name and declare its derivation.

Reuben affords evidence to the same effect. The name was known to the early Hebrews in this form exclusively. It is attested by their most ancient literature (Ge 29:32; 30:14; Jud 5:15,16), by the entire

Old Testament, by the Greek translation (Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus, and Lucian), by the Targums, and by the New Testament (Re 7:5). Yet in the 1st century Josephus, adding a Greek termination, wrote Roubelos; and later the Syriac version gave the name as Rubil, and the Ethiopic version as Robel and Rubel. The late variation is reasonably explained as a softening of the pronunciation, which had come into vogue in certain circles. The liquids, or, to speak particularly regarding Reuben, the liquids n and l, sometimes interchanged, giving rise to two forms for a word in the same language or in kindred languages (Gesenius, Thesaurus, 727; Wright, Comp. Grammar, 67; Zimmern, . Vergleichende Grammatik, section 11a). Notwithstanding the evidence furnished by the literature, preference has been given to Reubel as the original form on the ground that "the only plausible explanation of the etymology" given in Ge 29:32 "is that it is based on the form" Re'ubel equals Re'u ba'al (Skinner, Genesis, 386). An exhibition of the etymology was needless, however, and was not the end which the writer had in view. His purpose was to state the occasion for bestowing this particular name upon the child; and in stating it he does full justice to the clear meaning of the good, simple Hebrew of the name Reuben. The name signifies either "vision of a son" or "Behold ye, a son!" In either case the emphatic word is "son." As Hannah, taunted on account of her barrenness, besought God to look on her affliction and give her a man-child (1Sa 1:11), so Leah, using the same words, speaking of the same mercy already shown her, and with the same thought in mind, exclaimed: "Yahweh hath looked upon my affliction; for now my husband will love me," and she called the name of her son "Look ye! It's a son" (or, "vision of a son "). A male child was to her a proof of God's regard for her misery, and a guaranty of the future love of her husband for her. Moreover, the name kept the thought constantly before the mind of her husband. Gesenius remarks that Reuben means "properly, 'See ye, a son!' but the sacred writer in Ge 29:32 explains it as for ra'-ah (ra'uy) be'onyi, 'provided in my affliction' "(Lexicon, Thesaurus). This curious specimen of criticism may be regarded as the reductio ad absurdum of the hypothesis that the Hebrew writers intend to give the derivation of the proper names. The result of endeavoring to force the words of the explanation into an intentional etymology compels the assumption that the Hebrew writer misunderstood one of the simplest phrases of his own language and proposed a contraction impossible in itself and utterly foreign to the principles which underlie Hebrew speech.

3. Allusions Linked with Names:

Allusions to proper names are made for the purpose of stating the reason for the bestowal of the name, of pointing out a coincidence between the name and the character or experience of its bearer, or of attaching a prophecy; and it is common to link the allusion with the name by employing the root that underlies the name, or a cognate

root, or some other word that resembles the name in sound:

(1) Statement of the reason for the choice of the name: In the case of Simeon, the root of the name is used (Ge 29:33). Words of this type (with the termination on) are formed from nouns and verbs, and have the force of adjectives, diminutives, or abstract nouns, and are sometimes used as concrete nouns (Stade, Lehrbuch der hebraischen Grammatik, section 296). The Israelite at once recognized the root and formation of the name Simeon, which was a favorite with the Hebrews, and he knew that it could

express the abstract idea of hearing. In Ge 29:33 the narrator is not seeking to impart etymological information; but it is clear that he discerned the derivation when he gave the reason for the choice of this particular name for Leah's second son: "(Leah) said, Because Yahweh hath heard that I am hated, he hath therefore given me this son also: and she called his name Simeon." The root of the name is used as a verb in the statement of the motive. It was convenient and natural to do so, since the verb shama' was the proper word to express the idea and was one of the most common words in the language. There would be no reason to suppose that identity with the root of the name was intentional, except that care is taken by the narrator in the case of the other sons of Jacob to maintain a similar correspondence. Accordingly, that form of paronomasia is employed where a word is used that is one with the name in derivation, but differs from the name in form and grammatically is a different part of speech.

In the case of Cain a cognate root is used. The name is a segholate noun from the root qun, which means "to form," and then specifically to form at the anvil. Cain may accordingly be an abstract noun and denote formation, or a concrete noun denoting a forged weapon, or the agent in the work, namely a smith. In stating the reason for giving this name to the child, it was not feasible to use the verb qun, because of the technical meaning which had become attached to it. To avoid misunderstanding the cognate verb qanah is employed, which has radically the same significance, but is without the technical implications (Ge 4:1). The result is that kind of paronomasia which exists between words of similar sound and cognate origin, but difference of meaning.

In the case of Noah a root unrelated to the name in origin, but containing a similar sound, is used. The Biblical narrator does not state whether the name Noah is the transliteration of a foreign word or is its translation into Hebrew; he merely declares that as given it expressed the father's hope that through this child men were to have relief from the ancient curse upon the ground. If the name is Hebrew, its root may be nuach, "rest." At any rate it promptly suggested to the ear of the Hebrew the idea of rest. But the verb nuach, is used in Hebrew, as is the corresponding verb "rest" in English, to express the two ideas of relief and cessation. Lamech did not mean that his son would cause men to cease from work, but that he would secure for them restful relief from toil due to God's curse on account of sin (Ge 5:29, with a reference to Ge 3:17-19). The writer does not use the ambiguous word. To avoid ambiguity, yet with a view to preserving assonance with Noah, he employs the verb nacham, which has as one of its meanings the sense of comfort and relief.

(2) The indication of a coincidence between the character or experience of a person and his name: Naomi, returning to her home bereaved and in poverty, saw the contrast between her present condition and her name; and she played upon her name by using a word of opposite meaning, saying: 'Call me not Pleasant, call me Bitter; for the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me' (Ru 1:20). In whatever sense Nabal's name may have been bestowed upon him originally, at any rate his wife saw the correspondence between his name in its ordinary meaning and his conduct toward David, and she played upon it, saying: 'Fool is his name, and folly is with him' (1Sa 25:25). Likewise the agreement between Jacob's character and a meaning that his name has in Hebrew was seen, and called forth the bitter word-play: 'Is he not rightly named "He supplants"? for he hath supplanted me these two times' (Ge 27:36). Isaac, so far as the formation is concerned, may be an abstract noun meaning "laughter," or a concrete noun, "laughing one," or a verb in the imperfect, "he laughs" or "one laughs" (compare Stade, Lehrbuch der hebraischen

Grammatik, section 259a). Whichever specific meaning may have been in the mind of Abraham when he gave the name to his son, yet by reason of its ever speaking of laughter the name was a constant reminder to the parents of the laughter of unbelief with which they had listened to the promise of his birth (Ge 17:17; 18:12). But in due time the child of promise has been born. His name, as determined upon, is Isaac. This Sarah knows (Ge 17:19; 21:3). Accordingly, theme with which she greets his advent is laid in her mouth. She plays (puns) upon the name Isaac, using the root of the word in various forms, first as a noun and then as a verb, and giving to the verb a new subject and to the thought a new turn. Instead of the laughter of unbelief, with which the promise was received, ‘God,’ she says, ‘hath prepared for me laughter (of joy), everyone that heareth (of the event) will laugh (with joy) for me’ (Ge 21:6; compare Ps 126:2).

(3) Attachment of a prophecy to a name: Paronomasia in all of its forms is used for this purpose. A meaning of the name, or a sound heard in it, or a contrast suggested by it may be played upon. In these several ways the prophet Micah plays upon successive names in one paragraph (Mic 1:10-15). In answer to Abraham’s prayer in behalf of Ishmael, a promise is given concerning the lad, which is introduced by a play upon his name: ‘As for the boy (named) "God heareth," I have heard thee’ (Ge 17:18,20). To Gad a prophecy is attached in Ge 49:19. Two cognate roots are employed: gadhadh, which underlies the word rendered troop or marauding band, and gudh, which means "to press." In the use not only of the root of the name Gad, but of a different root also that is similar in sound, it is evident that the purpose is simply to play upon the name. The brief oracle is uttered almost exclusively by means of variations in the vocalization of the two roots, producing one of the most successful word-plays in Hebrew literature.

Judah is a noun corresponding to the Hophal imperfect, and means "thing being praised," "object of praise." In bestowing this name upon her child the mother signified that Yahweh was the object of her praise; for she said: "Now will I praise Yahweh" (Ge 29:35). In Ge 49:8 a prophecy is spoken concerning Judah. The same etymology and meaning are recognized as before, but the application is different. The birth of Judah had made God an object of praise, the great deeds of the tribe of Judah were destined to make that tribe an object of praise. To quote the oracle: ‘"Object of praise," thee shall thy brothers praise.’ In this difference of reference and in the repetition of the significant word consists the play upon the name.

Da is played upon in much the same way. The name may be a participle, used as a noun, and be rendered "judge"; but it probably belongs to that numerous class in which the names are verbs in the perfect, and signifies, "he hath judged." His adoptive mother had called his name Dan, because God had heard her complaint and decided the cause in her favor (Ge 30:6). In attaching the prophecy, the name is played upon by changing the subject, and, in order to refer to the future, by substituting the imperfect for the perfect of the verb.: ‘"He hath judged" shall judge his people, as one of the tribes of Israel’ (Ge 49:16).

See also GOD, NAMES OF; NAME.

John D. Davis

NANAEA

na-ne’-a (Nanaia; the King James Version Nanea): A female deity worshipped by the Assyrians, Babylonians and Persians and other Asiatic peoples, the Nana or Nanai of the Babylonians, known as "the lady of Babylon." The name means "the undefiled," and probably represented originally the productive powers of Nature (genetrix), and as such was the companion of the sun-god. She was identified with Ishtar in Assyria and Ashtoreth in Phoenicia, by the Greeks as Aphrodite (Clement of Alexandria Protr., 19), but sometimes as Artemis the huntress (Paus. iii.16,8; Plut. Artax. xxvii). Strabo (xv. 733) identifies her with Anaitis (equalsAnahita), the Asian Artemis. She was the Venus, but sometimes the Diana, of the Romans. There are many variants of the name: Anaea (Strabo xvi.738), Aneitis (Plut. Artax. xxvii), Tanais (Clement of Alexandria, loc. cit.), also Tanath, sometimes in Phoenician inscriptions, Tanata, Anta (Egyptian). In 2 Macc 1:13 ff, a fictitious account is given of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, in a temple of Nanaea in Persia, by the treachery of Nanaea’s priests. The public treasury was often placed in Nanaea’s temple; this, Epiphanes was anxious to secure under the pretext of marrying the goddess and receiving the money as dowry. The priests threw down great stones "like thunderbolts" from above, killed the king and his state and then cut off their heads. But 1 Macc 1 ff, which is more reliable, gives a different account of the death of Epiphanes after an attempt to rob a rich temple in Elymais. The account of 2 Macc 1:13 ff must be mere legend, as far as Epiphanes is concerned, but may have been suggested or colored by the story of the death of Antiochus the Great, who met his death while plundering a temple of Belus near Elymais (Strabo xvi.l.18; Diod. Sic. 573; Justin, xxxii.2). The temple of Nanaea referred to in 2 Macc 1:13 ff may be identified with that of Artemis (Polyb. xxxi.11; Josephus, Ant, XII, ix, 1) or Aphrodite (Appian, Syriac. 66; Rawlinson, Speaker’s Comm.).

S. Angus

NAOMI

na’-o-mi, na-o’-mi, na-o’-mi (no‘omi, probably equals "pleasantness"; Septuagint. Codex Vaticanus Noemein; Codex Alexandrinus Noemmei(n)): Wife of Elimelech and mother-in-law of Ru (Ru 1:2-4:17). She went with her husband to the land of Moab, and after his death returned to Bethlehem. When greeted on her return, she told the women of the town to call her, not no‘omi ("pleasantness"), but marah ("bitterness"), "for," she said, "the Almighty hath dealt very bitterly with me." She advised Ru in her dealings with Boaz, and afterward nursed their child.ith Anaitis (equalsAnahita), the Asian Artemis. She was the Venus, but sometimes the Diana, of the Romans. There are many variants of the name: Anaea (Strabo xvi.738), Aneitis (Plut. Artax. xxvii), Tanais (Clement of Alexandria, loc. cit.), also Tanath, sometimes in Phoenician inscriptions, Tanata, Anta (Egyptian). In 2 Macc 1:13 ff, a fictitious account is given of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, in a temple of Nanaea in Persia, by the treachery of Nanaea’s priests. The public treasury was often placed in Nanaea’s temple; this, Epiphanes was anxious to secure under the pretext of marrying the goddess and receiving the money as dowry. The priests threw down great stones "like thunderbolts" from above, killed the king and his state and then cut off their heads. But 1 Macc 1 ff, which is more reliable, gives a different account of the death of Epiphanes after

an attempt to rob a rich temple in Elymais. The account of 2 Macc 1:13 ff must be mere legend, as far as Epiphanes is concerned, but may have been suggested or colored by the story of the death of Antiochus the Great, who met his death while plundering a temple of Belus near Elymais (Strabo xvi.l.18; Diod. Sic. 573; Justin, xxxii.2). The temple of Nanaea referred to in 2 Macc 1:13 ff may be identified with that of Artemis (Polyb. xxxi.11; Josephus, Ant, XII, ix, 1) or Aphrodite (Appian, Syriac. 66; Rawlinson, Speaker's Comm.).

The name may mean "my joy," "my bliss," but is perhaps better explained according to the traditional interpretation as "the pleasant one."

David Francis Roberts

NAPHATH-DOR

na'-fath-dor (Jos 12:23 the Revised Version margin).

See DOR.

NAPHISH

na'-fish (naphish; Naphes, D, Napheth): A son of Ishmael (Ge 25:15; 1Ch 1:31). Naphish, along with other Hagrite clans, was overwhelmingly defeated by the Israelite tribes on the East of the Jordan (1Ch 5:19, the King James Version "Nephish"). Their descendants are mentioned among the Nethinim by the name "Nephisim," the King James Version and the Revised Version margin "Nephusim" (Ezr 2:50); "Nephushesim," the King James Version and the Revised Version margin "Nephishesim" (Ne 7:52); "Naphisi" (1 Esdras 5:31).

NAPHISI

naf'-i-si (Naphisi, Codex Vaticanus Napheisei): The name of one of the families which went up out of captivity with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31) equals "Nephushesim" of Ne 7:52; "Nephisim" of Ezr 2:50.

See NAPHISH.

NAPHOTH-DOR

na'-foth-dor (Jos 11:2 the Revised Version margin).

See DOR.

NAPHTALI

naf’-ta-li (naphtali; Nephthaleim):

I. THE PATRIARCH

1. Name

2. Circumstances of His Birth

3. Historical and Traditional Details

II. TRIBE OF NAPHTALI

1. Its Relative Position

2. Its Location in Palestine

3. Physical Features

4. Distinction of the Tribe

5. Sites and Inhabitants

6. Labors of Jesus in This District

I. The Patriarch.

1. Name:

The 5th son of Jacob, and the 2nd born to him by Rachel’s handmaid, Bilhah. He was full brother of Da (Ge 30:7).

At his birth Rachel is said to have exclaimed, naphtule ‘Elohim niphtalti, "wrestlings of God"—i.e. "mighty wrestlings"—"have I wrestled."

2. Circumstances of His Birth:

Her sister’s fruitfulness was a sore trial to the barren Rachel. By her artifice she had obtained children, the offspring of her maid ranking as her own; and thus her reproach of childlessness was removed. The name Naphtali given to this son was a monument of her victory. She had won the favor and blessing of God as made manifest in the way yearned for by the oriental heart, the birth of sons.

3. Historical and Traditional Details:

Personal details regarding the patriarch North are entirely wanting in Scripture; and the traditions have not much to say about him. According to Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, he was a swift runner. It also tells us that he was one of the 5 brethren whom Joseph chose to represent the family of Jacob in the presence of Pharaoh. He is said to have been 132 years old at his death (Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, viii, 1, 1). When Jacob and his family moved to Egypt, Naphtali had 4 sons (Ge 46:24). In Egypt, he died and was buried.

II. Tribe of Naphtali.

1. Its Relative Position:

When the first census was taken in the wilderness, the tribe numbered 53,400 fighting men (Nu 1:43; 2:30). At the second census, the numbers had shrunk to 45,400 (Nu 26:48); but see NUMBERS. The position of Naphtali in the desert was on the North of the tabernacle with the standard of the camp of Dan, along with the tribe of Asher (Nu 2:25). The standard, according to Jewish tradition, was a serpent, or basilisk, with the legend, "Return of Yahweh to the many thousands of Israel" (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan on Nu 2:25). When the host was on the march, this camp came in the rear (Nu 2:31). The prince of the tribe at Sinai was Ahira ben Enan (Nu 2:29). Among the spies the tribe was represented by Nahbi ben Vophsi (Nu 13:14). Prince Pedahel ben Ammihud was chosen from Naphtali to assist in the division of the land (Nu 34:28). Toward the end of David’s reign the ruler of the tribe was Jeremoth ben Azriel (1Ch 27:19). Hiram the Tyrian artificer is described as "the son of a widow of the tribe of Naphtali" (1Ki 7:14). But in 2Ch 2:14 he is called "the son of a woman of the daughters of Dan." Jud 5:15 does not definitely associate Barak with the tribe of Issachar; his residence was at Kedesh (Jud 4:6); it is therefore possible that he belonged to the tribe of Naphtali.

2. Its Location in Palestine:

In the allocation of the land, the lot of Naphtali was the last but one to be drawn (Jos 19:32-39). The boundaries are stated with great fullness. While it is yet impossible to trace them with certainty, the identification of sites in recent years, for which we are mainly indebted to the late Col. Conder, makes possible an approximation. The territory was bounded on the East by the Sea of Galilee and the upper reaches of the Jordan. Josephus makes it extend to Damascus (Ant., V, i, 22); but there is nothing to support this. The southern boundary probably ran from the point where Wady el-Bireh enters the Jordan, westward along the northern side of the valley to Mt. Tabor. The western border may have gone up by way of Chattin (Ziddim) and Yaquq (Hukkok) to Kerr ‘Anan (Hannathon), bending there to the West, including the land of er-Rameh (Ramah) until it reached the territory of Asher. Running northward again until nearly opposite Tyre, it bent eastward, and once more northward to the LiTany (Leontes), taking in the larger part of what is called by the Arabs Belad Beshdrah and Belad es-Shukif. Nineteen cities in Naphtali are named in Jos 19:32 ff. Among them was the famous city of refuge, KEDESH-NAPHTALI

(which see), on the heights to the West of the Waters of Merom, where extensive ruins are still to be seen (20:7). It, along with Hammoth-dor and Kartan, was assigned to the Gershonite Levites (21:23; 1Ch 6:76).

The land lying around the springs of the Jordan was included in the lot of Naphtali. It is clear that from this part, as well as from the cities named in Jud 1:33, Naphtali did not drive out the Canaanites. These the Danites found in possession at the time of their raid. There is no indication that Naphtali resented in any way this incursion of their kindred tribe into their territory (Jud 18).

3. Physical Features:

The district thus indicated includes much excellent land, both pastoral and arable. There are the broad, rich terraces that rise away to the North and Northwest of the Sea of Galilee, with the fertile plain of Gennesaret on the seashore. The mountains immediately North of the sea are rocky and barren; but when this tract is passed, we enter the lofty and spacious lands of upper Galilee, which from time immemorial have been the joy of the peasant farmer. Great breadths there are which in season yield golden harvests. The richly diversified scenery, mountain, hill and valley, is marked by a finer growth of trees than is common in Palestine. The terebinth and pine, the olive, mulberry, apricot, fig, pomegranate, orange, lemon and vine are cultivated to good purpose. Water is comparatively plentiful, supplied by many copious springs. It was one of the districts from which Solomon drew provisions, the officer in charge being the king’s son-in-law, Ahimaaz (1Ki 4:15).

4. Distinction of the Tribe:

The free life of these spacious uplands, which yielded so liberally to the touch of the hand of industry, developed a robust manhood and a wholesome spirit of independence among its inhabitants. According to Josephus, who knew them well (BJ, III, iii, 2), the country never lacked multitudes of men of courage ready to give a good account of themselves on all occasions of war. Its history, as far as we know it, afforded ample opportunity for the development of warlike qualities. In the struggle with Sisera, Naphtali was found on the high places of the field (Jud 5:18). To David’s forces at Hebron, Naphtali contributed a thousand captains "and with them with shield and spear thirty and seven thousand" (1Ch 12:34). Their position exposed them to the first brunt of attack by enemies from the North; and in the wars of the kings they bore an important part (1Ki 15:20; 2Ki 12:18; 13:22); and they were the first on the West of the Jordan to be carried away captive (2Ki 15:29).

See GALILEE.

5. Sites and Inhabitants:

The largest town in Mt. Naphtali today (in 1915) is Safed, on the heights due North of the Sea of Galilee, often spoken of as the "city set on a hill." It is built in the form of a horseshoe, open to the North, round the Castle Hill, on which are the ruins of the old fortress of the Templars. This is a position

of great strength, which could hardly fail to be occupied in ancient times, although, so far, it cannot be identified with any ancient city. It contains between 20,000 and 30,000 inhabitants. Over against it to the Northwest, beyond the deep gorge of Wady Leimun, rises Jebel Jermuk, the highest mountain in Palestine proper (circa 4,000 feet) which may be the scene of the TRANSFIGURATION (which see). The inhabitants of Safed were massacred by Sultan Bibars in 1266. The city suffered severely from earthquake in 1759; and it shared with Tibefias, also a city of Naphtali., the disaster wrought by the earthquake of 1837. It is one of the holy cities of the Jews.

6. Labors of Jesus in This District:

In the land of Naphtali Jesus spent a great part of his public life, the land of Gennesaret, Bethsaida, Capernaum and Chorazin all lying within its boundaries (compare Mt 4:15).

W. Ewing

NAPHTALI, MOUNT

(har naphtali; en to orei to Nephthalei): This was the most northerly of the three divisions of the Western Range, which derived their names from those of the tribes holding chief sway over them—Mt. Judah, Mt. Ephraim, and, Mt. Naphtali (Jos 20:7 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) replaces Mount" by the hill country of").

NAPHTHAR

naf’-thar (the King James Version): the Revised Version (British and American) "Nephthar."

NAPHTUHIM

naf-tu’-him (naphtuchim; Septuagint Nephthaleim): A son of Mizraim (Ge 10:13; 1Ch 1:11); but, according to most modern authorities, a district or a dependency of Egypt. Among the many efforts at identification the following deserve notice: Naphtuhim equals (1) Nephthys (Nephthus) in the Northeast of Egypt; (2) Na-ptah, i.e. the people of Ptah, the dwellers in the neighborhood of Memphis; (3) Nathu (according to Herodotus, Natho), which occurs in Assurbanipal’s Annals as the name of a part of Lower Egypt; (4) Erman (ZATW, X, 118), by the change of a letter, reads Petemhim, which signifies "The Northland"; (5) Spiegelberg sees in the word an old designation of the Delta, and would therefore render the name, "the people of the Delta" (compare Johns, HDB; Skinner and Holzinger on Genesis).

John A. Lees

NAPKIN

nap’-kin (soudarion; Latin sudarium): In Lu 19:20, the cloth in which the "unprofitable servant" wrapped the money of his lord; compare Joh 11:44; 20:7; see DRESS, sec. 7; HANDKERCHIEF.

NARCISSUS

nar-sis’-us (Narkissos): In Ro 16:11 Paul sends greetings to "them of the household of Narcissus, that are in the Lord." "The last words may suggest that, though only the Christians in this household have a greeting sent to them, there were other members of it with whom the church had relations" (Denney).

Narcissus is a common name, especially among freedmen and slaves. But, as in the case of Aristobulus, some famous person of this name must be meant. Conybeare and Howson mention two, one the wellknown favorite of Claudius, the other a favorite of Nero. The latter, who was put to death by Galba (Dio Cass. lxiv.3), they think to be the Narcissus meant here (Paul, chapter xix). On the other hand, Bishop Lightfoot (Phil, 175) holds that "the powerful freedman Narcissus, whose wealth was proverbial (Juv. Sat. xiv.329), whose influence with Claudius was unbounded, and who bore a chief part in the intrigues of this reign, alone satisfies this condition." Shortly after the accession of Nero, he had been put to death by Agrippina (Tac. Ann. xiii.1; . Dio Cass. lx.34) in 54 AD. As this occurred three or four years before the Epistle to the Romans was written, some think another Narcissus is meant. However, as was usual in such cases, his property would be confiscated, and his slaves, becoming the property of the emperor, would swell "Caesar’s household" as Narcissiani.

S. F. Hunter

NARD

nard.

See SPIKENARD.

NASBAS

nas’-bas (Nasbas, Codex Sinaiticus Nabad, read by Fritzsche): A name otherwise unknown. It occurs only in Tobit 11:18, "And Achiacharus, and Nasbas his brother’s son," came to Tobit’s wedding. Opinions are divided as to whether he was "brother’s son" of Tobit or Achiacharus. the King James Version margin gives the suggestion of Junius, "Achiacharus who is also called Nasbas," thus identifying Nasbas with Achiacharus, which might gain support from Tobit 1:22 where Achiacharus is mentioned as "brother’s son" of Tobit. See ACHIACHARUS; AMAN. Codex Sinaiticus reads "Achiacharus and Nabad his brother’s sons," which is corrected by another hand to "brother’s son" (exadelphos). The Itala gives "Nabal avunculus ("maternal uncle") illius"; the, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) "Nabath consobrini ("cousins") Tobiae"; Syriac "Laban his sister’s son." This person is probably identical with the "Aman" of Tobit 14:10 (see variety of readings under AMAN)

and the nephew in Harris' Story of Achiqar and His Nephew.

S. Angus

NASI

na'-se (Codex Vaticanus Nasei; Codex Alexandrinus Nasith; the King James Version, Nasith): The head of one of the families which went up with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:32) equals "Neziah" of Ezr 2:54; Ne 7:56.

NASOR

na'-sor.

See HAZOR.

NATHAN (1)

na'-than (nathan, "gift"; Nathan): A court prophet in David's reign and a supporter of Solomon at his accession. There are three main incidents in his career as depicted in the Old Testament.

1. Nathan and David's Temple-Plans:

The two parallel narratives, 2Sa 7:1-17 equals 1Ch 17:1-15, of which the former is the original, relate how David confided to Nathan his intention to build a house for Yahweh's ark. Nathan at first blesses the project, but that same night is given a Divine message, and returns to tell the king that instead of David building a house for Yahweh, Yahweh will build a house for David: "I will set up thy seed after thee, ... and I will establish his kingdom. .... I will be his father, and he shall be my son: if he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men" (2Sa 7:12-14). 2Sa 7:13 says that "He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever," but this disturbs the one great thought of the passage, . which is that God will build a house for David, and which is also the thought in David's prayer (7:18-29).

The word "seed" in 2Sa 7:12 is collective and so throughout the passage, so that the prophecy does not refer to any individual, but, like De 17:14-20; 18:15-22, belongs to the group of generic prophecies. Nor is it Messianic, for 2Sa 7:14 could not be reconciled with the sinlessness of Jesus. The message is rather a promise of the ever-merciful providence of God in dealing with David's family. (See, however, C.A. Briggs, Messianic Prophecy, 126 ff.) Budde, who says that the section belongs to the 7th century and is certainly pre-exilic in the leading thought of the passage, sees in the prophecy something of the idealism of Amos and Hosea, for the prophet teaches that Yahweh dwells, not in "a holy place made with hands" (Heb 9:11,24), but rather in the life of the nation as represented by the direct succession of

Davidic kings. This presents an extension of the teaching of Paul that the very body itself is a sanctuary unto God (1Co 6:19).

2. Nathan and David's Sin:

2Sa 12:1-25 narrates Nathan's rebuke of David for his adultery, and for causing the death of Uriah; and then comes an account of the death of Bathsheba's child. In 12:1-15a, we have Nathan's parable of the rich man and the poor man's ewe lamb, and the application of it to David's conduct. But several difficulties arise when we ask exactly what Nathan's message to David was: 12:13 f represent the prophet as saying that God has forgiven David but that the child will die, while 12:10-12 speak of a heavy punishment that is to come upon David and his family, and 12:16 does not show any indication of a prophecy as to the child's death. Commentators regard 12:1-15a as later in origin than 2Sa 11; 12 in the main, and hold 12:10-12 to be still later than the rest of 12:1-15a. Budde omits 12:9a, 10ab, 11,12, but regards even the rest of the story as interrupting the connection between 11:27b and 12:15b, and therefore of later date.

3. Nathan and Solomon's Accession:

1 Kings 1 is a part of "one of the best pieces of Hebrew narrative in our possession" (H.P. Smith, Old Testament History, 153, note 2). It narrates the part that Nathan played in the events that led to Solomon's accession. David was getting old and feeble, and the succession had not been settled. When Adonijah, who was probably the eldest son living, gave a banquet to some of his father's state officials, Nathan, who was one of those that had not been invited, incited Bathsheba, Solomon's mother, to remind David of his promise to her that Solomon should succeed to the throne. This she did, and in the middle of her audience with David, Nathan appears with the news of Adonijah's feast and proclamation as king. Solomon is then anointed king by David's command, Nathan being one of his chief supporters. It has been suggested that it is only Nathan who interprets Adonijah's feast as a claim to the throne, but this contradicts 1Ki 1:5. Yet, whereas in the two sections treated above Nathan is the prophet of Yahweh , he is represented in 1 Kings as an intriguing court politician, planning very cleverly an opportune entrance into David's presence at the very time that Bathsheba has an audience with the king. The parallel narrative of 1Ch 28 makes no mention of Nathan, Solomon being there represented as Divinely elected to succeed David.

1Ki 4:5 mentions a Nathan as father of Azariah and Zabud, two of the chief officers of Solomon. He is probably the prophet.

1Ch 29:29; 2Ch 9:29 refer to "the words" or rather "the acts of Nathan the prophet" as well as those of Samuel and Gad. "There can be no doubt that these are nothing more than references to the narratives in which Samuel, Nathan and Gad are mentioned in our Books of Samuel" (Curtis on 1Ch 29:29). In 2Ch 29:25, sanction is claimed for Levitical temple-music as being commanded by God through Nathan and Gad.

Curtis (on 1Ch 29:29) observes that Nathan is always called nabhi’ ("prophet") in Samuel and Kings and not ro’eh or chozeh, "seer."

David Francis Roberts

NATHAN (2)

(1) A prophet (2Sa 7$; Ps 51$, title). See preceding article.

(2) A son of King David (2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 3:5; 14:4).

(3) Father of Igal, one of David’s heroes (2Sa 23:36). In 1Ch 11:38, we have "Joe the brother of Nathan"; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus has "son" in this verse, but it is impossible to say whether Igal or Joe is the correct name.

(4) A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:36), whose son is called Zabad, whom some suppose to be the same as Zabud (1Ki 4:5). On this view this Nathan is the same as the prophet (see 1, above).

(5) A companion of Ezra from Babylon (Ezr 8:16 and RAPC 1Es 8:44).

(6) Nathanias (1 Esdras 9:34), one of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:39).

(7) Name of a family (Zec 12:12).

David Francis Roberts

NATHAN-MELECH

na’-than-mel’-ek (nethan-melekh, "king’s gift"): A Judean official, to whose chamber King Josiah removed "the horses of the sun" (2Ki 23:11). The Septuagint calls him "Nathan, the king’s eunuch" (Nathan basileos tou eunouchou).

NATHANAEL (1)

na-than’-a-el (Nathanael):

(1) One of the "captains over thousands" who furnished the Levites with much cattle for Josiah’s Passover (1 Esdras 1:9) equals "Nethanel" of 2Ch 35:9.

(2) (Nathanaelos, Codices Vaticanus and Alexandrinus omit): One of the priests who had married a "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:22) equals "Nethanel" of Ezr 10:22.

(3) An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

(4) One of the Twelve Apostles. See next article.

NATHANAEL (2)

(nethan'el, "God has given"; Nathanael): Nathanael, who was probably a fisherman, belonged to Cana in Galilee (Joh 21:2). According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50), Nathanael was the same as Simon, the son of Cleopas, and was one of the Twelve. He was among those who met and conversed with Jesus during the preaching of John the Baptist at Bethany beyond Jordan (compare Joh 1:28). From the manner of the invitation extended to him by Philip (Joh 1:45), it is evident that Nathanael was well versed in ancient Scripture, and that in him also the preaching of John had aroused a certain expectancy. His reply to Philip, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth? (Joh 1:46), was prompted, not by any ill repute of the place, but by its petty insignificance and familiarity in Nathanael's eyes. To this question Philip made no direct answer, but replied, "Come and see." It was the answer best fitted to the man and the occasion; it appealed to Nathanael's fair-mindedness and sincerity of purpose. He responded nobly to the call, and on approaching Jesus was received with the words: "Behold, an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!" (Joh 1:47). It was a tribute to that singleness of heart which enabled him to overcome his initial prejudice. The same candor and openness distinguished the after-interview of Nathanael with Jesus, as is evident by his question, "Whence knowest thou me?" (Joh 1:48). The reply of Jesus was not what he expected. It concerned the time he had spent under the fig tree, kneeling, no doubt, in silent prayer and communion with God, and brought to mind all the sacred hopes and aspirations of that hour. It taught him that here was One who read on the instant the inmost secrets of his heart, and was Himself the ideal for whom he was seeking; and it drew from him the confession, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art King of Israel" (Joh 1:49).

Although Nathanael is mentioned by name only once again in the New Testament, where he is one of the seven who witnessed the appearance of the risen Jesus at the Sea of Tiberias (Joh 21:2), it is evident that the connection and companionship of Nathanael with Jesus must have been much closer than those two incidents would lead us to suppose. Accordingly, attempts have been made to identify him with other New Testament characters, the most commonly accepted being Bartholomew (compare BARTHOLOMEW). The principal arguments in support of this identification are:

(1) Nathanael is never mentioned by the synoptists, and Bartholomew is never mentioned by John, who further implies that Nathanael was one of the twelve disciples (compare Joh 20:24-26; 21:2);

(2) in the Synoptists, Philip is closely connected with Bartholomew (compare lists of the apostles), and in John with Nathaniel (compare Joh 1:45 ff);

(3) the fact that most of the other apostles bear two names. Arguments are also adduced to identify him

wit h Simon the Cananean (compare SIMON). Nathanael has also been identified with Matthew and Mattbias (based on the similarity of name-meanings), with John the son of Zebedee, with Stephen, and even with Paul.

C. M. Kerr

NATHANIAS

nath-a-ni’-as (Nathanias): One of those who put away their foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:34) equals "Nathan" of Ezr 10:39.

NATIONS

na’-shunz.

See GENTILES; GOIIM; HEATHEN; TABLE OF NATIONS.

NATIVITY, OF MARY, GOSPEL OF THE

na-tiv’-i-ty.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

NATURAL FEATURES

fe’-turz: As has been pointed out by various authors (compare HGHL), the principal physical features of Palestine run in North and South lines, or rather about from South-Southwest to North-Northeast.

The lowland or Shephelah (the King James Version "vale, valley, plain, or low country") includes the maritime plain and the western foothills.

The hill country consists of the mountains of Judea, and its features are continued northward to the plain of Esdraelon and southward to the Sinaitic peninsula. It is rocky and has very little water. Except for the few fountains, the scanty population depends upon rain water collected during the winter months.

The Arabah (Revised Version) includes the Jordan valley from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, as well as the depression running from the Dead Sea to the Gulf of Akabah. It is to the latter depression that the name Wady-ul-‘Arabah] is now applied by the Arabs. It is bounded on the East by Mr. Seir or Edom, and on the West by the mountains of the Sinaitic peninsula. Its highest point, about halfway between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akabah, is a few hundred ft. higher than the level of the Mediterranean, but nearly 2,000 ft. above the level of the Dead Sea. From this point the valley slopes southward to the Gulf

of Akabah, and northward to the Dead Sea. The lower Jordan valley slopes from about 600 ft. below ocean-level at the Sea of Galilee to about 1,300 ft. below ocean-level at the Dead Sea.

To the East are the highlands of Gilead and Moab rising abruptly from the valley, as does the hill country of Judea on the West. The country to the East of the Jordan-Dead Sea-Arabah depression, to the whole of which the name Ghaur (Ghor) is applied by the Arabs, is a great table-land sloping gradually to the East from the sharp edge which overlooks the Ghaur. It has no conspicuous peaks. What appear to be peaks when viewed from the Ghaur are irregularities of its western contour, which are invisible or appear as slight mounds to the observer who looks westward from any point some miles to the East Mt. Nebo, for instance, when seen from Medeba is not readily distinguishable. This is because it really does not rise above the general level of the table-land. The small annual rainfall on the heights near the Ghaur diminishes eastward, and the desert begins within from 20 to 40 miles.

Another term much used by Old Testament writers is South or Negeb, which embraces the southernmost portion of the promised land, and was never effectively occupied by the Israelites. Its uttermost boundary was the "river of Egypt" (al-‘Arish), and coincides roughly with the present boundary between the Ottoman territory on the East and the Anglo-Egyptian territory of Sinai on the West.

The term slopes, ‘ashedhoth, the King James Version "springs," occurs in Jos 10:40, "So Joshua smote all the land, the hill country .... and the lowland, and the slopes, and all their kings"; and again in Jos 12:7,8, "And Joshua gave it .... for a possession according to their divisions; in the hill-country, and in the lowland, and in the Arabah, and in the slopes, and in the wilderness, and in the South." In the former passage, it seems to refer to the foothills which form the eastern or higher part of the lowland or Shephelah. In the latter passage, it might mean the same, or it might mean the descent from the Judean hills to the Ghaur. In De 3:17; 4:49; Jos 12:3; 13:20, we have "the slopes of Pisgah" (’ashdoth-ha-pisgah, "springs of Pisgah"), which denotes the descent from the heights of Moab to the Ghaur. The same word occurs in the sing in Nu 21:15, referring to the descent to the Arnon. "Slopes," therefore, does not seem to be a term applied to any particular region.

The wilderness is usually the desert of the wandering, including the central part of the Sinaitic peninsula, but it is by no means always used in this sense, . e.g. Jos 8:15,20,24, where it clearly refers to a region near Ai. "The wilderness" of Mt 4:1 is thought to be the barren portion of Judea between Jerusalem and the Jordan.

See CHAMPAIGN; COUNTRY; DESERT; EAST; HILL; LOWLAND; SOUTH.

Alfred Ely Day

NATURAL HISTORY

his’-to-ri.

See ANIMAL; BOTANY; BIRDS; FISH; INSECTS; ZOOLOGY.

NATURAL MAN, THE

See MAN, NATURAL.

NATURAL; NATURE

nat’-u-ral, na’-tur (leach; psuchikos, phusikos, phusis) :

1. As Used in the Old Testament:

"Natural" is the translation of leach, "freshness or vigor" (De 34:7). Of Moses it is said, "His eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated."

"Nature" in the sense of a system or constitution does not occur in the Old Testament. The world and men, each individual, were conceived as being the direct creation of a supra-mundane God, and conserved by His power and Spirit. The later conception of "nature" came in through Greek influences.

In the Apocrypha, we find "nature" in the sense of innate character or constitution (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:20, "the natures (phuseis) of living creatures"; The Wisdom of Solomon 13:1, "Surely vain are all men by nature" (phusei), 3 Macc 3:29, "mortal nature" (phusis)).

2. As Used in the New Testament:

In the New Testament "nature" (phusis) is frequently found in the latter sense (Ro 1:26, "against nature"; Ro 2:14, "by nature"; Ro 2:27; 11:24, also "contrary to nature"; 1Co 11:14, "Doth not even nature itself teach you?"; Ga 2:15; 4:8; Eph 2:3; in 2Pe 1:4, we have "that ye might be partakers of the divine nature," the Revised Version margin "or, a") ; phusis occurs also in Jas 3:7, "every kind of beasts," the Revised Version margin "Greek: nature," also "mankind" (3:7), the Revised Version margin "Greek: the human nature." "Natural" (Ro 11:21,24) is the translation of kata phusin, "according to nature." Paul in 1 Corinthians speaks of "the natural man" (2:14, the American Revised Version margin "or unspiritual, Greek: physical") and of a "natural body" (1Co 15:44 twice), the Greek word being psuchikos, "of the soul" (psuche), the animal, natural, principle, as contrasted with what pertains to the higher principle of the spirit (pneuma). In 1Co 15:46 the contrast is expressed, "Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural," the American Revised Version margin "Greek: physical." The "natural man" is the man in whom the spirit is unquickened, the "natural body" is that corresponding to the psychical or soul-nature, the "spiritual body" that corresponding to the Spirit as the dominant principle of the life. In Jude 1:10, we have phusikos, "naturally" "naturally, as brute beasts," the Revised Version (British and American) "naturally, like the creatures without reason"; genesis, "origin," "birth," is translated "natural" (Jas 1:23, "his natural face," the Revised Version margin "Greek: the face of his birth"); and "nature" (Jas 3:6, "the course of nature" the Revised Version (British and American) "the wheel of

nature" margin "or birth") ("wheel" probably means "circle of nature" (the whole creation; see COURSE)); gnesios, "genuine" ("true to right nature") "legitimate," "sincere," is translated "naturally" (Php 2:20, "who will naturally care for your state," the Revised Version (British and American) "truly," margin "Greek: genuinely").

W. L. Walker

NATURE

See NATURAL, NATURE.

NAUGHT; NAUGHTY; NAUGHTINESS

not, no'-ti, nes: In the sense of bad, worthless, worthlessness, the words in the King James Version represent the Hebrew ra', changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "bad" (2Ki 2:19; Pr 20:14; Jer 24:2), roa', retained in the Revised Version (British and American) "naughtiness" (1Sa 17:28), hawwah, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) in Pr 11:6 "iniquity," and in 17:4 "mischievous." In Pr 6:12, "naughty person," literally, "man of Belial," is in the Revised Version (British and American) "worthless person." In the New Testament, "superfluity of naughtiness" in Jas 1:21 (for kakia) becomes margin the Revised Version (British and American) overflowing of wickedness," margin "malice," and in The Wisdom of Solomon 12:10, the King James Version's "naughty generation" (poneros) is made into "by birth .... evil."

James Orr

NAUM

na'-um: the King James Version form, NAHUM (which see), the name of an ancestor of Jesus (Lu 3:25).

NAVE (1)

nav (1Ki 7:33).

See SEA, THE MOLTEN.

NAVE (2)

na'-ve (Naue): Greek form of the Hebrew proper name "Nun" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), found only in the King James Version of Sirach 46:1.

NAVEL

na’-v’l (shor. The Septuagint in Pr 3:8 suggests a different reading, namely, instead of shorrekha, sherekha equals she’erkha, "thy flesh")): The King James Version translates the Hebrew sharir in the description of Behemoth (Job 40:16) by "navel," where modern translators have substituted "muscles"; similarly in the translation of shorer (So 7:2) it has been replaced by "body.", There remain two passages of the Revised Version (British and American) where "navel" is retained as the translation of shor. Thus we find the word used, pars pro toto, for the whole being: "It (the fear of Yahweh) will be health to thy navel, and marrow to thy bones" (Pr 3:8). The uttermost neglect which a new-born babe can experience is expressed by Ezekiel: "In the day thou wast born thy navel (i.e. umbilical cord) was not cut neither wast thou washed in water to cleanse thee; thou wast not salted at all, nor swaddled at all" (Eze 16:4).

H. L. E. Luering

NAVY

na’-vi.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

NAZARENE

naz-a-ren; naz’-a-ren Nazarenos; Nazaraios in Matthew, John, Ac and Luke): A derivative of Nazareth, the birthplace of Christ. In the New Testament it has a double meaning: it may be friendly and it may be inimical.

1. An Honourable Title:

On the lips of Christ’s friends and followers, it is an honorable name. Thus Matthew sees in it a fulfillment of the old Isaiah prophecy (Isa 11:1 (Hebrew)): "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophets, that he should be called a Nazarene (Mt 2:23). According to an overwhelming array of testimony (see Meyer, Commentary, in loc.), the name Nazareth is derived from the same natsar, found in the text quoted from Isa. We have here undoubtedly to do with a permissible accommodation.

It is not quite certain that Matthew did not intend, by the use of this word, to refer to the picture of the Messiah, as drawn in Isa 53, on account of the low estimate in which this place was held (Joh 1:46). Nor is permissible, as has been done by Tertullian and Jerome, to substitute the word "Nazarite" for "Nazarene," which in every view of the case is contrary to the patent facts of the life of the Saviour.

Says Meyer, "In giving this prophetic title to the Messiah he entirely disregards the historical meaning of

the same Septuagint reading in Isa 11:1, anthos), keeps by the relationship of the name Nazareth to the word natsar, and recognizes by virtue of the same, in that prophetic Messianic name netser, the typical reference to this—that Jesus through His settlement in Nazareth was to become a Nazoraios, a 'Nazarene.'" This name clung to Jesus throughout His entire life. It became His name among the masses: "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by" (Mr 10:47; Lu 24:19). Perhaps Matthew, who wrote after the event, may have been influenced in his application of the Isaian prophecy by the very fact that Jesus was popularly thus known. Even in the realm of spirits He was known by this appellation. Evil spirits knew and feared Him, under this name (Mr 1:24; Lu 4:34), and the angels of the resurrection morning called Him thus (Mr 16:6), while Jesus applied the title to Himself (Ac 22:8). In the light of these facts we do not wonder that the disciples, in their later lives and work, persistently used it (Ac 2:22; 3:6; 10:38).

2. A Title of Scorn:

If His friends knew Him by this name, much more His enemies, and to them it was a title of scorn and derision. Their whole attitude was compressed in that one word of Nathanael, by which he voiced his doubt, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (Joh 1:46). In the name "Nazarene," the Jews, who opposed and rejected Christ, poured out all the vials of their antagonism, and the word became a Jewish heritage of bitterness. It is hard to tell whether the appellation, on the lips of evil spirits, signifies dread or hatred (Mr 1:24; Lu 4:34). With the gatekeepers of the house of the high priest the case is clear. There it signifies unadulterated scorn (Mt 26:71; Mr 14:67). Even in His death the bitter hatred of the priests caused this name to accompany Jesus, for it was at their dictation written above His cross by Pilate (Joh 19:19). The entire Christian community was called by the leaders of the Jewish people at Jerusalem, "the sect of the Nazarenes" (Ac 24:5). If, on the one hand, therefore, the name stands for devotion and love, it is equally certain that on the other side it represented the bitter and undying hatred of His enemies.

Henry E. Dosker

NAZARETH

naz'-a-reth (Nazaret, Nazareth, and other forms):

1. Notice Confined to the New Testament:

A town in Galilee, the home of Joseph. and the Virgin Mary, and for about 30 years the scene of the Saviour's life (Mt 2:23; Mr 1:9; Lu 2:39,51; 4:16, etc.). He was therefore called Jesus of Nazareth, although His birthplace was Bethlehem; and those who became His disciples were known as Nazarenes. This is the name, with slight modification, used to this day by Moslems for Christians, Nacara—the singular being Nacrany.

The town is not named in the Old Testament, although the presence of a spring and the convenience of the site make it probable that the place was occupied in old times. Quaresimus learned that the ancient name was Medina Abiat, in which we may recognize the Arabic el-Medinat el-baidtah, "the white

town." Built of the white stone supplied by the limestone rocks around, the description is quite accurate. There is a reference in Mishna (Menachoth viii.6) to the "white house of the hill" whence wine for the drink offering was brought. An elegy for the 9th of Abib speaks of a "course" of priests settled in Nazareth. This, however, is based upon an ancient midhrash now lost (Neubauer, Geogr. du Talmud, 82, 85, 190; Delitzsch, Ein Tag in Capernaum, 142). But all this leaves us still in a state of uncertainty.

2. Position and Physical Features:

The ancient town is represented by the modern en-Nacirah, which is built mainly on the western and northwestern slopes of a hollow among the lower hills of Galilee, just before they sink into the plain of Esdraelon. It lies about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Mediterranean at Haifa. The road to the plain and the coast goes over the southwestern lip of the hollow; that to Tiberias and Damascus over the heights to the Northeast. A rocky gorge breaks down southward, issuing on the plain between two craggy hills. That to the West is the traditional Hill of Precipitation (Lu 4:29). This, however, is too far from the city as it must have been in the days of Christ. It is probable that the present town occupies pretty nearly the ancient site; and the scene of that attempt on Jesus' life may have been the cliff, many feet in height, not far from the old synagogue, traces of which are still seen in the western part of the town. There is a good spring under the Greek Orthodox church at the foot of the hill on the North. The water is led in a conduit to the fountain, whither the women and their children go as in old times, to carry home in their jars supplies for domestic use. There is also a tiny spring in the face of the western hill. To the Northwest rises the height on which stands the sanctuary, now in ruins, of Neby Sa'in. From this point a most beautiful and extensive view is obtained, ranging on a clear day from the Mediterranean on the West to the Mountain of Bashan on the East; from Upper Galilee and Mt. Hermon on the North to the uplands of Gilead and Samaria on the South The whole extent of Esdraelon is seen, that great battlefield, associated with so many heroic exploits in Israel's history, from Carmel and Megiddo to Tabor and Mt. Gilboa.

3. Present Inhabitants:

There are now some 7,000 inhabitants, mainly Christian, of whom the Greek Orthodox church claims about 3,000. Moslems number about 1,600. There are no Jews. It is the chief market town for the pastoral and agricultural district that lies around it.

4. Labors of Jesus:

In Nazareth, Jesus preached His first recorded sermon (Lu 4:16), when His plainness of speech aroused the homicidal fury of His hearers. "He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief" (Mt 13:58). Finding no rest or security in Nazareth, He made His home in Capernaum. The reproach implied in Nathanael's question, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (Joh 1:46), has led to much speculation. By ingenious emendation of the text Cheyne would read, "Can the Holy One proceed from Nazareth?" (EB, under the word). Perhaps, however, we should see no more in this than the acquiescence of Nathanael's humble spirit in the lowly estimate of his native province entertained by the

leaders of his people in Judea.

5. Later History:

Christians are said to have first settled here in the time of Constantine (Epiphanius), whose mother Helena built the Church of the Annunciation. In crusading times it was the seat of the bishop of Bethscan. It passed into Moslem hands after the disaster to the Crusaders at Chattin] (1183). It was destroyed by Sultan Bibars in 1263. In 1620 the Franciscans rebuilt the Church of the Annunciation, and the town rose again from its ruins. Here in 1799 the French general Junot was assailed by the Turks. After his brilliant victory over the Turks at Tabor, Napoleon visited Nazareth. The place suffered some damage in the earthquake of 1837.

Protestant Missions are now represented in Nazareth by agents of the Church Missionary Society, and of the Edinburgh Medical Missionary Society.

W. Ewing

NAZIRITE

naz’-i-rit (nazir, connected with nadhar, "to vow"; nazeir, nazeiraios, as also various words indicating "holiness" or "devotion"; the King James Version, Nazarite):

1. Antiquity and Origin

2. Conditions of the Vow

3. Initiation

4. Restoration

5. Completion and Release

6. Semi-sacerdotal Character

7. Nazirites for Life

8. Samson’s Case

9. Samuel’s Case

10. Token of Divine Favor

11. Did Not Form Communities

12. Among Early Christians

13. Parallels among Other Peoples

The root-meaning of the word in Hebrew as well as the various Greek translations indicates the Nazirite as "a consecrated one" or "a devotee." In the circumstances of an ordinary vow, men consecrated some material possession, but the Nazirite consecrated himself or herself, and took a vow of separation and self-imposed discipline for the purpose of some special service, and the fact of the vow was indicated by special signs of abstinence. The chief Old Testament passages are Jud 13:5-7; 16:17; Nu 6; Am 2:11,12; compare Sirach 46:13 (Hebrew); 1 Macc 3:49-52.

1. Antiquity and Origin:

The question has been raised as to whether the Nazirite vow was of native or foreign origin in Israel.The idea of special separation, however, seems in all ages to have appealed to men of a particular temperament, and we find something of the kind in many countries and always linked with special abstinence of some kind; and from all that is said in the Pentateuch we should infer that the custom was already ancient in Israel and that Mosaism regulated it, bringing it into line with the general system of religious observance and under the cognizance of the Aaronic priests. The critics assign the section dealing with this matter (Nu 6:1-21) to the Priestly Code (P), and give it a late date, but there cannot be the least doubt that the institution itself was early. It seems not unlikely that on the settlement in Canaan, when the Israelites, having failed to overcome the native population, began to mix freely with them, the local worship, full of tempting Dionysiac elements, brought forth this religious protest in favor of Israel’s ancient and simpler way of living, and as a protection against luxury in settling nomads. It is worthy of note that among the Semites vine-growing and wine-drinking have ever been considered foreign to their traditional nomadic mode of life. It was in this same protest that the Rechabites, who were at least akin to the Nazirites, went still farther in refusing even in Canaan to abandon the nomadic state.

See RECHABITES.

2. Conditions of the Vow:

The Pentateuch, then, makes provision for the Nazirite vow being taken by either men or women, though the Old Testament does not record a single instance of a female Nazirite. Further, it provides only for the taking of the vow for a limited time, that is, for the case of the "Nazirite of days." No period of duration is mentioned in the Old Testament, but the Mishna, in dealing with the subject, prescribes a period of 30 days, while a double period of 60 or even a triple one of 100 days might be entered on. The conditions of Naziritism entailed:

(1) the strictest abstinence from wine and from every product of the vine;

(2) the keeping of the hair uncut and the beard untouched by a razor;

(3) the prohibition to touch a dead body; and

(4) prohibition of unclean food (Jud 13:5-7; Nu 6).

3. Initiation:

The ceremonial of initiation is not recorded, the Pentateuch treating it as well known. The Talmud tells us that it was only necessary for one to express the wish that he might be a Nazirite. A formal vow was, however, taken; and from the form of renewal of the vow, when by any means it was accidentally broken, we may judge that the head was also shorn on initiation and the hair allowed to grow during the whole period of the vow.

4. Restoration:

The accidental violation of the vow just mentioned entailed upon the devotee the beginning of the whole matter anew and the serving of the whole period. This was entered on by the ceremonial of restoration, in the undergoing of which the Nazirite shaved his head, presented two turtle-doves or two young pigeons for sin and burnt offerings, and re-consecrated himself before the priest, further presenting a lamb for a trespass offering (Nu 6:9-12).

5. Completion and Release:

When the period of separation was complete, the ceremonial of release had to be gone through. It consisted of the presentation of burnt, sin and peace offerings with their accompaniments as detailed in Nu 6:13-21, the shaving of the head and the burning of the hair of the head of separation, after which the Nazirite returned to ordinary life.

6. Semi-sacerdotal Character:

The consecration of the Nazirite in some ways resembled that of the priests, and similar words are used of both in Le 21:12 and Nu 6:17, the priest’s vow being even designated nezer. It opened up the way for any Israelite to do special service on something like semi-sacerdotal lines. The priest, like the Nazirite, dared not come into contact with the dead (Le 21:1), dared not touch wine during the period of service (Le 10:9), and, further, long hair was an ancient priestly custom (Eze 44:20).

7. Nazirites for Life:

The only "Nazirites for life" that we know by name are Samson, Samuel and John the Baptist, but to these Jewish tradition adds Absalom in virtue of his long hair. We know of no one voluntarily taking the vow for life, all the cases recorded being those of parents dedicating their children. In rabbinical times, the father but not the mother might vow for the child, and an interesting case of this kind is mentioned in the dedication of Rabbi Chanena by his father in the presence of Rabban Gamaliel (Nazir, 29b).

8. Samson's Case:

Samson is distinctly named a Nazirite in Jud 13:7 and 16:17, but it has been objected that his case does not conform to the regulations in the Pentateuch. It is said that he must have partaken of wine when he made a feast for his friends, but that does not follow and would not be so understood, say, in a Moslem country today. It is further urged that in connection with his fighting he must have come into contact with many dead men, and that he took honey from the carcass of the lion. To us these objections seem hypercritical. Fighting was specially implied in his vow (Jud 13:5), and the remains of the lion would be buy a dry skeleton and not even so defiling as the ass's jawbone, to which the critics do not object.

9. Samuel's Case:

Samuel is nowhere in the Old Testament called a Nazirite, the name being first applied to him in Sirach 46:13 (Hebrew), but the restrictions of his dedication seem to imply that he was. Wellhausen denies that it is implied in 1Sa 1:11 that he was either a Nathin ("a gift, (one) 'given' unto Yahweh"; compare Nu 3:9; 18:6) or a Nazirite. In the Hebrew text the mother's vow mentions only the uncut hair, and first in Septuagint is there added that he should not drink wine or strong drink, but this is one of the cases where we should not regard silence as final evidence. Rather it is to be regarded that the visible sign only is mentioned, the whole contents of the vow being implied.

10. Token of Divine Favor:

It is very likely that Nazirites became numerous in Israel in periods of great religious or political excitement, and in Jud 5:2 we may paraphrase, 'For the long-haired champions in Israel.' That they should be raised up was considered a special token of God's favor to Israel, and the tempting of them to break their vow by drinking wine was considered an aggravated sin (Am 2:11,12). At the time of the captivity they were looked upon as a vanished glory in Israel (La 4:7 margin), but they reappeared in later history.

11. Did Not Form Communities:

So far as we can discover, there is no indication that they formed guilds or settled communities like the "Sons of the Prophets." In some sense the Essenes may have continued the tradition, and James, the Lord's brother (Euseb., HE, II, xxiii, 3, following Hegesippus), and also Banns, tutor of Josephus (Vita, 2), who is probably the same as the Buni mentioned as a disciple of Jesus in Sanhedrin 43a, were devotees of a kind resembling Nazirites. Berenice's vow was also manifestly that of the Nazirite

(Josephus, B J, II, xv, 1).

12. Among Early Christians:

The case of John the Baptist is quite certain, and it was probably the means of introducing the custom among the early Christians. It was clearly a Nazirite's vow which Paul took, "having shorn his head in Cenchrea" (Ac 18:18), and which he completed at Jerusalem with other Christians similarly placed (Ac 21:23).

As the expenses of release were heavy for poor men, such were at times aided in this matter by their richer brethren. Thus, Agrippa, on his return from Rome, assisted many Nazirites (Josephus, Ant., XIX, vi, 1), and Paul was also at charges with others (Ac 21:23).

We come across something of the same kind in many countries, and we find special abstinence always emphasized. Thus we meet with a class of "votaries" as early as the days of Hammurabi, and his code devotes quite a number of sections to them. Among other restrictions they were prohibited from even entering a wineshop (Sect, 110).

13. Parallels among Other Peoples:

Then we are familiar with the hierodouloi of the Greeks, and the Vestal Virgins of the Romans. The word nezir also appears in Syriac and was applied to the maidens devoted to the service of Belthis. In the East, too, there have always been individuals and societies of ascetics who were practically Nazirites, and the modern dervish in nearly every way resembles him, while it is worthy of record in this connection that the Moslem (an abstainer by creed) while under the vow of pilgrimage neither cuts his hair nor pares his nails till the completion of his vow in Mecca.

W. M. Christie

NEAH

ne'-a (ha-ne'ah, "the neah"; Annoua): A town in the lot of Zebulun (Jos 19:13), mentioned along with Gath-hepher and Rimmon. It is possibly identical with "Neiel" (Jos 19:27). No name resembling either of these has yet been recovered, although the district in which the place must be sought is pretty definitely indicated. It may probably have lain to the North of Rimmon (Rummaneh), about 4 miles Northeast of Seffuriyeh.

NEAPOLIS

ne-ap'-o-lis (Neapolis; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Nea Polis): A town on the northern shore the Aegean, originally belonging to Thrace but later falling within the Roman province of

Macedonia. It was the seaport of Philippi, and was the first point in Europe at which Paul and his companions landed; from Troas they had sailed direct to Samothrace, and on the next day reached Neapolis (Ac 16:11). Paul probably passed through the town again on his second visit to Macedonia (Ac 20:1), and he certainly must have embarked there on his last journey from Philippi to Troas, which occupied 5 days (Ac 20:6). The position of Neapolis is a matter of dispute. Some writers have maintained that it lay on the site known as Eski (i.e. "Old") Kavalla (Cousinery, Macedoine, II, 109 ff), and that upon its destruction in the 6th or 7th century AD the inhabitants migrated to the place, about 10 miles to the East, called Christopolis in medieval and Kavalla in modern times. But the general view, and that which is most consonant with the evidence, both literary and archaeological, places Neapolis at Kavalla, which lies on a rocky headland with a spacious harbor on its western side, in which the fleet of Brutus and Cassius was moored at the time of the battle of Philippi (42 BC; Appian Bell. Civ. iv.106). The town lay some 10 Roman miles from Philippi, with which it was connected by a road leading over the mountain ridge named Symbolum, which separates the plain of Philippi from the sea.

The date of its foundation is uncertain, but it seems to have been a colony from the island of Thasos, which lay opposite to it (Dio Cassius xlvii.35). It appears (under the name Neopolis, which is also borne on its coins) as member both of the first and of the second Athenian confederacy, and was highly commended by the Athenians in an extant decree for its loyalty during the Thasian revolt of 411-408 BC (Inser. Graec., I, Suppl. 51). The chief cult of the city was that of "The Virgin," usually identified with the Greek Artemis. (See Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, III, 180; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Macedoine, II, 69 ff, 109 ff; Heuzey and Daumet, Mission archeol. de Macedoine, 11 ff.)

M. N. Tod

NEAR, NIGH

ner, ni (chiefly qarobh, "to draw near," qarabh; eggus): Used of proximity in place (Ge 19:20; 45:10; Ex 13:17; Ps 22:11; Joh 3:23, etc.), time (Jer 48:16; Eze 7:7; 30:3; Mr 13:28), or kinship (Le 21:2; Ru 3:12), but also employed of moral nearness. Yahweh is "nigh" to them that are of a broken heart (Ps 34:18). God draws nigh to His people, and they to Him (Jas 4:8). The antithesis is God’s "farness" from the wicked.

NEARIAH

ne-a-ri’-a (ne‘aryah):

(1) A descendant of David (1Ch 3:22 f).

(2) A descendant of Simeon (1Ch 4:42).

In both instances the Septuagint reads "Noadiah."

NEBAI

ne’-bi, ne-ba’-i, neb’-a-i (nebhay).

See NOBAI.

NEBAIOTH

ne-ba’-yoth, ne-bi’-oth (nabhayoth; Septuagint Nabaioth): Firstborn of Ishmael (Ge 25:13; 28:9; 36:3; 1Ch 1:29). Isa 60:7 mentions the tribe Nebaioth with Kedar, with an allusion to its pastoral nature: "the rams of Nebaioth" are to serve the ideal Zion as sacrificial victims. Again associated with Kedar, the name occurs frequently in Assyrian inscriptions. The tribe must have had a conspicuous place among the northern Arabs. Josephus, followed by Jerome, regarded Nebaioth as identical with the Nabateans, the great trading community and ally of Rome, whose capital and stronghold was Petra. This view is widely accepted, but the name "Nabatean" is spelled with a "T" (teth), and the interchange of "T" (teth) and "t" (taw), although not unparalleled, is unusual. If the name is Arabic, it is probably a feminine plural, and in that ease could have no connection with the Nabateans.

A. S. Fulton

NEBALLAT

ne-bal’-at (nebhallaT; Naballat): A town occupied by the Benjamites after the exile, named along with Lod and Ono (Ne 11:34). It is represented by the modern Belt Nebala, 4 miles Northeast of Lydda.

NEBAT

ne’-bat (nebhaT): Father of Jeroboam I (1Ki 11:26, and frequently elsewhere). The name occurs only in the phrase "Jeroboam the son of Nebat," and is evidently intended to distinguish Jeroboam I from the later son of Joash.

See JEROBOAM.

NEBO (1)

ne’-bo (nebho; Assyrian Nabu): The Babylonian god of literature and science. In the Babylonian mythology he is represented as the son and interpreter of Bel-merodach (compare Isa 46:1; Bel and Nebo there represent Babylon). His own special shrine was at Borsippo. His planet was Mercury. His name enters into Biblical names, as "Nebuchadnezzar," and perhaps "Abed-nego" (Da 1:7, for "Abed-nebo, servant of Nebo").

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

NEBO (2)

(nebho; Nabau):

(1) This town is named in Nu 32:3 between Sebam and Beon (which latter evidently represents Baal-meon of 32:38), after Heshbon and Elealeh, as among the cities assigned by Moses to Reuben. It was occupied by the Reubenite clan Bela (1Ch 5:8). Here it is named between Aroer and Baalmeon. In their denunciations of wrath against Moab, Isaiah names it along with Medeba (Isa 15:2) and Jeremiah with Kiriathaim (Jer 48:1), and again (Jer 48:22) between Dibon and Beth-diblathaim. Mesha (M S) says that by command of Chemosh he went by night against the city, captured it after an assault that lasted from dawn till noon, and put all the inhabitants to death. He dedicated the place to Ashtar-chemosh. Jerome (Commentary on Isa 15:2) tells us that at Nebo was the idol of Chemosh. The site which seems best to meet the requirements of the passages indicated is on the ridge of Jebel Neba to the Southwest of Hesban, where ruins of an ancient town bearing the name of en-Neba are found (Buhl, GAP, 266).

(2) (nebho; B, Nabou A, Nabo, and other forms): Fifty-two descendants of the inhabitants of Nebo returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:29; Ne 7:33). The place was in Judah and is named after Bethel and Ai. There is nothing, however, to guide us as to its exact position. It may be represented by either Belt Nuba, 12 miles Northwest of Jerusalem, or Nuba, which lies about 4 miles South-Southeast of ‘Id el-Ma’ (Adullam).

W. Ewing

NEBO, MOUNT

(har nebho; Nabau): A mountain in the land of Moab which Moses ascended at the command of God in order that he might see the Land of Promise which he was never to enter. There also he was to die. From the following passages (namely, Nu 33:47; De 32:49; 34:1), we gather that it was not far from the plain of Moab in which Israel was encamped; that it was a height standing out to the West of the mountains of Abarim; that it lay to the East of Jericho; and that it was a spot from which a wide and comprehensive view of Palestine could be obtained. None of these conditions are met by Jebel ‘Attarus, which is too far to the East, and is fully 15 miles South of a line drawn eastward from Jericho. Jebel ‘Osha, again, in Mt. Gilead, commands, indeed, an extensive view; but it lies too far to the North, being at least 15 miles North of a line drawn eastward from Jericho. Both of these sites have had their advocates as claimants for the honor of representing the Biblical Nebo.

The "head" or "top" of Pisgah is evidently identical with Mt. Nebo (De 34:1). After Moses’ death he was buried "in the valley in the land of Moab," over against Beth-peor.

The name Neba is found on a ridge which, some 5 miles Southwest of Hesban and opposite the northern end of the Dead Sea, runs out to the West from the plateau of Moab, "sinking gradually: at first a broad brown field of arable land, then a flat top crowned by a ruined cairn, then a narrower ridge ending in the summit called Siagbah, whence the slopes fall steeply on all sides. The name Nebo or Neba (the "knob" or "tumulus") applies to the flat top with the cairn, and the name Tal‘at es-Sufa to the ascent leading up to the ridge from the North. Thus we have three names which seem to connect the ridge with that whence Moses is related to have viewed the Promised Land, namely, first, Nebo, which is identically the same word as the modern Neba; secondly, Siaghah, which is radically identical with the Aramaic Se‘ath, the word standing instead of Nebo in the Targum of Onkelos (Nu 32:3), where it is called the burial place of Moses; thirdly, Tal‘at es-Sufa, which is radically identical with the Hebrew Zuph (tsuph), whence Mizpah (mitspah) and Zophim (tsophim. .... The name Pisgah is not now known, but the discovery of Zophim (compare Nu 23:14) confirms the view now generally held, that it is but another title of the Nebo range."

Neither Mt. Hermon nor Da (Tell el-Qady) is visible from this point; nor can Zoar be seen; and if the Mediterranean is the hinder sea, it also is invisible. But, as Driver says ("Dt," ICC, 419), the terms in De 34:1,3 are hyperbolical, and must be taken as including points filled in by the imagination as well as those actually visible to the eye. Mr. Birch argues in favor of Tal‘at el-Benat, whence he believes Da and Zoar to be visible, while he identifies "the hinder sea" with the Dead Sea (PEFS, 1898, 110 ff).

W. Ewing

NEBUCHADNEZZAR; NEBUCHADREZZAR

neb-u-kad-nez’-ar, -rez’-ar: Nebuchadnezzar, the second king of Babylon of that name, is best known as the king who conquered Judah, destroyed Jerusalem, and carried the people of the Jews captive to Babylon. Of all the heathen monarchs mentioned by name in the Scriptures, Nebuchadnezzar is the most prominent and the most important. The prophecies of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and the last chapters of Kings and Chronicles centered about his life, and he stands preeminent, along with the Pharaohs of the oppression and the exodus, among the foes of the kingdom of God. The documents which have been discovered in Babylon and elsewhere within the last 75 years have added much to our knowledge of this monarch, and have in general confirmed the Biblical accounts concerning him.

1. His Name:

His name is found in two forms in the Bible, Nebuchadnezzar and Nebuchadrezzar. In the Septuagint he is called Nabouchodonosor, and in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Nabuchodonosor. This latter form is found also in the King James Version Apocrypha throughout and in the Revised Version (British and American) 1 Esdras, Ad Esther and Baruch, but not Judith or Tobit. This change from "r" to "n" which is found in the two writings of the name in the Hebrew and the Aramaic of the Scriptures is a not uncommon one in the Semitic languages, as in Burnaburiyash and Burraburiyash, Ben-hadad and Bar-hadad (see Brockelmann’s Comparative Grammar, 136, 173, 220). It is possible,

however, that the form Nebuchadnezzar is the Aramaic translation of the Babylonian Nebuchadrezzar. If we take the name to be compounded of Nabu-kudurri-usur in the sense "O Nebo, protect thy servant," then Nabu-kedina-usur would be the best translation possible in Aramaic. Such translations of proper names are common in the old versions of the Scriptures and elsewhere. For example, in WAI, V, 44, we find 4 columns of proper names of persons giving the Sumerian originals and the Semitic translations of the same; compare Bar-hadad in Aramaic for Hebrew Ben-hadad. In early Aramaic the "S" had not yet become "T" (see Cooke, Text-Book of North-Sem Inscriptions, 188 f); so that for anyone who thought that kudurru meant "servant," Nebuchadnezzar would be a perfect translation into Aramaic of Nebuchadrezzar.

2. Family:

The father of Nebuchadnezzar was Nabopolassar, probably a Chaldean prince. His mother is not known by name. The classical historians mention two wives: Amytis, the daughter of Astyages, and Nitocris, the mother of Nabunaid. The monuments mention three sons: Evil-merodach who succeeded him, Marduk-shum-utsur, and Marduk-nadin-achi. A younger brother of Nebuchadnezzar, called Nabu-shum-lishir, is mentioned on a building-inscription tablet from the time of Nabopolassar.

3. Sources of Information:

The sources of our information as to the life of Nebuchadnezzar are about 500 contract tablets dated according to the days, months and years of his reign of 43 years; about 30 building and honorific inscriptions; one historical inscription; and in the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and Kings. Later sources are Chronicles, Ezra, and the fragments of Berosus, Menander, Megasthenes, Abydenus, and Alexander Polyhistor, largely as cited by Josephus and Eusebius.

4. Political History:

From these sources we learn that Nebuchadnezzar succeeded his father on the throne of Babylon in 604 BC, and reigned till 561 BC. He probably commanded the armies of Babylon from 609. BC. At any rate, he was at the head of the army which defeated Pharaoh-necoh at Carchemish on the Euphrates in 605 BC (see 2Ki 23:31; 2Ch 35:20 ff). After having driven Necoh out of Asia and settled the affairs of Syria and Palestine, he was suddenly recalled to Babylon by the death of his father. There he seems quietly to have ascended the throne. In the 4th year of Jehoiakim (or 3rd according to the Babylonian manner of reckoning (Da 1:1)), he came up first against Jerusalem and carried away part of the vessels of the temple and a few captives of noble lineage. Again, in Jehoiakim’s 11th year, he captured Jerusalem, put Jehoiakim, its king, into chains, and probably killed him. His successor, Jehoiachin, after a three months’ reign, was besieged in Jerusalem, captured, deposed, and carried captive to Babylon, where he remained in captivity 37 years until he was set free by Evil-merodach. In the 9th year of Zedekiah, Nebuchadnezzar made a 4th expedition against Jerusalem which he besieged, captured, and destroyed (see Jer 52). In addition to these wars with Judah, Nebuchadnezzar carried on a long siege of Tyre, lasting 13 years, from his 7th to his 20th year. He had at least three wars with Egypt. The first

culminated in the defeat of Necoh at Carchemish; the second in the withdrawal of Hophra (Apries) from Palestine in the 1st year of the siege of Jerusalem under Zedekiah; and the third saw the armies of Nebuchadnezzar entering Egypt in triumph and defeating Amasis in Nebuchadnezzar's 37th year. In the numerous building and honorific inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar he makes no mention by name of his foes or of his battles; but he frequently speaks of foes that he had conquered and of many peoples whom he ruled. Of these peoples he mentions by name the Hittites and others (see Langdon, 148-51). In the Wady-Brissa inscription, he speaks of a special conquest of Lebanon from some foreign foe who had seized it; but the name of the enemy is not given.

5. Buildings, etc.:

The monuments justify the boast of Nebuchadnezzar "Is not this great Babylon that I have built?" (Da 4:30). Among these buildings special emphasis is placed by Nebuchadnezzar upon his temples and shrines to the gods, particularly to Marduk, Nebo and Zarpinat, but also to Shamash, Sin, Gula, Ramman, Mah, and others. He constructed, also, a great new palace and rebuilt an old one of his father's. Besides, he laid out and paved with bricks a great street for the procession of Marduk, and built a number of great walls with moats and moat-walls and gates. He dug several broad, deep canals, and made dams for flooding the country to the North and South of Babylon, so as to protect it against the attack of its enemies. He made, also, great bronze bulls and serpents, and adorned his temples and palaces with cedars and gold. Not merely in Babylon itself, but in many of the cities of Babylonia as well, his building operations were carried on, especially in the line of temples to the gods.

6. Religion, etc.:

The inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar show that he was a very religious man, probably excelling all who had preceded him in the building of temples, in the institution of offerings, and the observance of all the ceremonies connected with the worship of the gods. His larger inscriptions usually contain two hymns and always close with a prayer. Mention is frequently made of the offerings of precious metals, stones and woods, of game, fish, wine, fruit, grain, and other objects acceptable to the gods. It is worthy of note that these offerings differ in character and apparently in purpose from those in use among the Jews. For example, no mention is made in any one of Nebuchadnezzar's inscriptions of the pouring out or sprinkling of blood, nor is any reference made to atonement, or to sin.

7. Madness:

No reference is made in any of these inscriptions to Nebuchadnezzar's insanity. But aside from the fact that we could scarcely expect a man to publish his own calamity, especially madness, it should be noted that according to Langdon we have but three inscriptions of his written in the period from 580 to 561 BC. If his madness lasted for 7 years, it may have occurred between 580 and 567 BC, or it may have occurred between the Egyptian campaign of 567 BC and his death in 561 BC. But, as it is more likely that the "7 times" mentioned in Da may have been months, the illness may have been in any year after 580 BC, or even before that for all we know.

8. Miracles, etc.:

No mention is made on the monuments

(1) of the dream of Nebuchadnezzar recorded in Da 2, or

(2) of the image of gold that he set up, or

(3) of the fiery furnace from which the three children were delivered (Da 3).

As to (1), it may be said, however, that a belief in dreams was so universal among all the ancient peoples, that a single instance of this kind may not have been considered as worthy of special mention. The annals of Ashur-banipal and Nubu-naid and Xerxes give a number of instances of the importance attached to dreams and their interpretation. It is almost certain that Nebuchadnezzar also believed in them. That the dream recorded in Da is not mentioned on the monuments seems less remarkable than that no dream of his is recorded.

As to (2) we know that Nebuchadnezzar made an image of his royal person (salam sharrutiya, Langdon, XIX, B, col. x, 6; compare the image of the royal person of Nabopolassar, id, p. 51), and it is certain that the images of the gods were made of wood (id, p. 155), that the images of Nebo and Marduk were conveyed in a bark in the New Year's procession (id, pp. 157, 159, 163, 165) and that there were images of the gods in all the temples (id, passim); and that Nebuchadnezzar worshipped before these images. That Nebuchadnezzar should have made an image of gold and put it up in the Plain of Dura is entirely in harmony with what we know of his other "pious deeds."

(3) As to "the fiery furnace," it is known that Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, says that his own brother, Shamash-shumukin, was burned in a similar furnace.

The failure of Nebuchadnezzar to mention any of the particular persons or events recorded in Da does not disprove their historicity, any more than his failure to mention the battle of Carchemish, or the siege of Tyre and Jerusalem, disproves them. The fact is, we have no real historical inscription of Nebuchadnezzar, except one fragment of a few broken lines found in Egypt.

LITERATURE.

T.G. Pinches, The New Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia; Stephen Langdon, Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire. See also, Rogers, History of Babylonia and Assyria; and McCurdy, History, Prophecy and the Monuments, III.

R. Dick Wilson

NEBUSHAZBAN

neb-u-shaz’-ban (nebhushazebhan equals Assyrian Nabusezib-anni, "Nebo delivers me"; the King James Version Nebushasban): An important officer (the Rab-saris, chief captain or "chief eunuch") of the Babylonian army, who with Nergal-sharezer and others was appointed to see to the safety of Jeremiah after the taking of Jerusalem (Jer 39:13).

NEBUZARADAN

neb-u-zar-a’-dan, -zar’-a-dan (nebhuzar’adhan equals Assyrian Nabu-zara-iddina, "Nebo has given seed"; Nebouzardan): Nebuchadnezzar’s general at the siege of Jerusalem (2Ki 25:8,11,20; Jer 52:12,15,26; 39:9,10,11,13). Under the title of "captain of the guard," he commanded the army, and, after the fall of the city, carried out his master’s policy with regard to the safety of Jeremiah, the transport of the exiles, and the government of those who were left in the land.

NECHO; NECHOH

ne’-ko.

See PHARAOH-NECOH.

NECK

nek (tsawwar, tsawwa’r, tsawwaron, tsawwa’rah, Aramaic tsawwar (Da 5:7,16,29), ‘oreph, miphreqeth (1Sa 4:18); nostos, "back" (Baruch 2:33); occasionally the words garon (Isa 3:16; Eze 16:11), and gargeroth, plural of gargarah, literally, "throat" (Pr 1:9; 3:3,12; 6:21), are translated "neck"): The neck is compared with a tower for beauty (So 4:4; 7:4) and is decorated with necklaces and chains (Pr 1:9; 3:3,12; 6:21, Hebrew gargeroth; Eze 16:11, Hebrew garon, "throat"; Da 5:7,16,29, Hebrew tsawwar). It is also the part of the body where the yoke, emblem of labor and hardship, dependence and subjection, is borne (De 28:48; Jer 27:8,11,12; 28:14; Ac 15:10). "To shake off the yoke," "to break the yoke," or "to take it off" is expressive of the regaining of independence and liberty, either by one’s own endeavors or through help from outside (Ge 27:40; Isa 10:27; Jer 28:11; 30:8). Certain animals which were not allowed as food (like the firstborn which were not redeemed) were to be killed by having their necks (‘oreph) broken (Ex 13:13; 34:20); the turtle-doves and young pigeons, which were sacrificed as sin offerings or as burnt offerings, had their heads wrung or pinched off from their necks (Le 5:8). In 1Sa 4:18 the Hebrew word miphreqeth signifies a fracture of the upper part of the spinal column caused by a fall.

It was a military custom of antiquity for the conqueror to place his foot upon the vanquished. This custom, frequently represented in sculpture on many an Egyptian temple wall, is referred to in Jos 10:24; Baruch 4:25 and probably in Ro 16:20 and Ps 110:1. Paul praises the devotion of Aquila and Priscilla,

"who for my life laid down their own necks" (Ro 16:4).

See FOOTSTOOL.

To "fall on the neck" of a person is a very usual mode of salutation in the East (Ge 33:4; 45:14; 46:29; RAPC Tob 11:9,13; Lu 15:20; Ac 20:37). In moments of great emotion such salutation is apt to end in weeping on each other's neck.

Readiness for work is expressed by "putting one's neck to the work" (Ne 3:5). Severe punishment and calamity are said to "reach to the neck" (Isa 8:8; 30:28).

The Lord Jesus speaks of certain persons for whom it were better to have had a millstone put around the neck and to have been drowned in the sea. The meaning is that even the most disgraceful death is still preferable to a life of evil influence upon even the little ones of God's household (Mt 18:6; Mr 9:42; Lu 17:2).

To "make the neck stiff," to "harden the neck" indicates obstinacy often mingled with rebellion (Ex 32:9; 33:3,5; 34:9; 2Ch 30:8; 36:13; Ne 9:16,17,29; Ps 75:5 (the Revised Version margin "insolently with a haughty neck"); Pr 29:1; Jer 7:26). Compare sklerotracholes, "stiffnecked" (Ac 7:51). Similarly Isaiah (48:4) speaks of the neck of the obstinate sinner as resembling an iron sinew.

H. L. E. Luering

NECKLACE

nek'-las (rabhidh, "chain"): A neck-chain ornament, worn either separately (Eze 16:11), or with pendants (Isa 3:19), such as crescents (Isa 3:18) or rings (Ge 38:25); sometimes made of gold (Ge 41:42; Da 5:29), or of strings of jewels (So 1:10). Even beasts of burden were sometimes so adorned by royalty (Jud 8:26). It was considered suggestive of pride (Ps 73:6) or of filial loyalty (Pr 1:9). The word does not occur in the King James Version, but such adornments have always been popular in all the Bible lands.

NECO

ne'-ko (nekho (2Ch 35:22; 36:4))., "chain"): A neck-chain ornament, worn either separately (Eze 16:11), or with pendants (Isa 3:19), such as crescents (Isa 3:18) or rings (Ge 38:25); sometimes made of gold (Ge 41:42; Da 5:29), or of strings of jewels (So 1:10). Even beasts of burden were sometimes so adorned by royalty (Jud 8:26). It was considered suggestive of pride (Ps 73:6) or of filial loyalty (Pr 1:9). The word does not occur in the King James Version, but such adornments have always been popular in all the Bible lands.

See PHARAOH-NECOH.

NECODAN

ne-ko’-dan.

See NEKODA.

NECROMANCY

nek’-ro-man-si.

See ASTROLOGY, 1; DIVINATION; WITCHCRAFT.

NEDABIAH

ned-a-bi’-a (nedhabhyah): A descendant of David (1Ch 3:18).

NEEDLE

ne’-d’-l (rhaphis): The word "needle" occurs only 3 times, namely, in the reference to Christ’s use of the proverb: "It is easier for a camel to go through a needle’s eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God" (Mt 19:24; Mr 10:25; Lu 18:25). This saying ought to be accepted in the same sense as Mt 23:24, "Ye blind guides, that strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel!" Christ used them to illustrate absurdities. A rabbinical parallel is cited, "an elephant through a needle’s eye." Some writers have attempted to show that rhaphis referred to a small gate of a walled oriental city. No evidence of such a use of the word exists in the terms applied today in Biblical lands to this opening. "Rich man" here has the connotation of a man bound up in his riches. If a man continues to trust in his earthly possessions to save him, it would be absurd for him to expect to share in the spiritual kingdom where dependence upon the King is a first requisite.

The fact that needles are not mentioned elsewhere in the Bible should not be taken to indicate that this instrument was not used. Specimens of bone and metal needles of ancient origin show that they were common household objects.

See CAMEL.

James A. Patch

NEEDLEWORK

ne’-d’-l-wurk.

See EMBROIDERY.

NEEDY

ned’-i (’ebhyon).

See POOR.

NEESING

ne’-zing (Job 41:18, the King James Version, the English Revised Version "by his neesings a light doth shine," the American Standard Revised Version "sneezings"): "Neese" in Elizabethan English (through two distinct derivations) could mean either "sneeze" or "snort," and it is impossible to say which force was intended by the King James Version editors. The Hebrew is ‘aTishah, a word found only here, but connected with a Semitic root meaning "sneeze," or, perhaps, "snort." Job 41:18 is part of the description of the "leviathan" or crocodile. This animal has a habit of inflating himself, and after this he discharges through his nostrils the moist, heated vapor, which sparkles in the sunlight. The act is neither a "sneeze" nor a "snort," but the latter word is sufficiently descriptive. There is no allusion to legendary "fire-spouting" monsters. Compare Job 39:20; Jer 8:16.

In the older editions of the King James Version "neesed" is found in 2Ki 4:35: "and the child neesed seven times" (later editions and the Revised Version (British and American) "sneezed").

Burton Scott Easton

NEGEB

neg’-eb (ha-neghebh, "the negeb" or simply, neghebh, from a root meaning "to be dry," and therefore in the first instance implying the "dry" or "parched regions," hence, in the Septuagint it is usually translated eremos, "desert," also nageb):

1. Meaning:

As the Negeb lay to the South of Judah, the word came to be used in the sense of "the South," and is so used in a few passages (e.g. Ge 13:14) and in such is translated lips (see GEOGRAPHY). The English translation is unsuitable in several passages, and likely to lead to confusion. For example, in Ge 13:1 Abram is represented as going "into the South" when journeying northward from Egypt toward Bethel; in Nu 13:22 the spies coming from the "wilderness of Zin" toward Hebron are described as coming "by the South," although they were going north. The difficulty in these and many other passages is at once obviated if it is recognized that the Negeb was a geographical term for a definite geographical region, just as Shephelah, literally, "lowland," was the name of another district of Palestine. In the Revised

Version (British and American) "Negeb" is given in margin, but it would make for clearness if it were restored to the text.

2. Description:

This "parched" land is generally considered as beginning South of edition Dahariyeb—the probable site of DEBIR (which see)—and as stretching South in a series of rolling hills running in a general direction of East to West until the actual wilderness begins, a distance of perhaps 70 miles (see NATURAL FEATURES). To the East it is bounded by the Dead Sea and the southern Ghor, and to the West there is no defined boundary before the Mediterranean. It is a land of sparse and scanty springs and small rainfall; in the character of its soil it is a transition from the fertility of Canaan to the wilderness of the desert; it is essentially a pastoral land, where grazing is plentiful in the early months and where camels and goats can sustain life, even through the long summer drought. Today, as through most periods of history, it is a land for the nomad rather than the settled inhabitant, although abundant ruins in many spots testify to better physical conditions at some periods (see I, 5, below). The direction of the valleys East or West, the general dryness, and the character of the inhabitants have always made it a more or less isolated region without thoroughfare. The great routes pass along the coast to the West or up the Arabah to the East. It formed an additional barrier to the wilderness beyond it; against all who would lead an army from the South, this southern frontier of Judah was always secure. Israel could not reach the promised land by this route, through the land of the Amalekites (Nu 13:29; 14:43-45).

3. Old Testament References:

The Negeb was the scene of much of Abram’s wanderings (Ge 12:9; 13:1,3; 20:1); it was in this district that Hagar met with the angel (Ge 16:7,14); Isaac (Ge 24:62) and Jacob (Ge 37:1; 46:5) both dwelt there. Moses sent the spies through this district to the hill country (Nu 13:17,22); the Amalekites then dwelt there (Nu 13:29) and apparently, too, in some parts of it, the Avvim (Jos 13:3,4). The inheritance of the children of Simeon, as given in Jos 19:1-9, was in the Negeb, but in Jos 15:21-32 these cities are credited to Judah (see SIMEON). Achish allotted to David, in response to his request, the city of ZIKLAG (q.v) in the Negeb (1Sa 27:5 f); the exploits of David were against various parts of this district described as the Negeb of Judah, the Negeb of the Jerahmeelites, and the Negeb of the Kenites, while in 1Sa 30:14 we have mention of the Negeb of the Cherethites and the Negeb of Caleb. To this we may add the Negeb of Arad (Jud 1:16). It is impossible to define the districts of these various clans (see separate articles under these names). The, Negeb, together with the "hill-country" and the "Shephelah," was according to Jeremiah (17:26; 32:44; 33:13) to have renewed prosperity after the captivity of Judah was ended.

4. Later History:

When Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem the Edomites sided with the Babylonians (compare La 4:21 f; Eze 35:3-15; Ob 1:10-16), and during the absence of the Jews they advanced north and occupied all the Negeb and Southern Judea as far as Hebron (see JUDAEA). Here they annoyed the Jews in Maccabean

times until Judas expelled them from Southern Judea (164 BC) and John Hyrcanus conquered their country and compelled them to become Jews (109 BC). It was to one of the cities here—Malatha—that Herod Agrippa withdrew himself (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, vi, 2).

The palmy days of this district appear to have been during the Byzantine period: the existing ruins, so far as they can be dated at all, belong to this time. Beersheba was an important city with a bishop, and Elusa (mentioned by Ptolemy in the 2nd century) was the seat of a bishop in the 4th, 5th and 6th centuries. After the rise of Mohammedanism the land appears to have lapsed into primitive conditions. Although lawlessness and want of any central control may account for much of the retrogression, yet it is probable that Professor Ellsworth Huntington (loc. cit.) is right in his contention that a change of climate has had much to do with the rise and fall of civilization and settled habitation in this district. The district has long been given over to the nomads, and it is only quite recently that the Turkish policy of planting an official with a small garrison at Beersheba and at ‘Aujeh has produced some slight change in the direction of a settled population and agricultural pursuits.

5. Its Ancient Prosperity:

It is clear that in at least two historic periods the Negeb enjoyed a very considerable prosperity. What it may have been in the days of the Patriarchs it is difficult to judge; all we read of them suggests a purely nomadic life similar to the Bedouin of today but with better pasturage. In the division of the land among the tribes mention is made of many cities—the Hebrew mentions 29 (Jos 15:21-32; 19:1-9; 1Ch 4:28-33)—and the wealth of cattle evidently was great (compare 1Sa 15:9; 27:9; 30:16; 2Ch 14:14 f). The condition of things must have been far different from that of recent times.

The extensive ruins at Bir es Seba‘ (Beersheba) Khalasa (Elusa), Ruheibeh (REHOBOTH, which see), ‘Aujeh and other cities, together with the signs of orchards, vineyards and gardens scattered widely around these and other sites, show how comparatively well populated this area was in Byzantine times in particular. Professor Huntington (loc. cit.) concludes from these ruins that the population of the large towns of the Negeb alone at this period must have amounted to between 45,000 and 50,000. The whole district does not support 1,000 souls today.

LITERATURE.

Robinson, BR (1838); Wilton, The Negeb, or "South Country" of Scripture (1863); E.H. Palmer, The Desert of the Exodus, II (1871); Trumbull, Kadesh-Barnea (1884); G. A. Smith, HGHL, chapter xiii (1894); E. Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation, chapter vi, etc.

E. W. G. Masterman

NEGINAH; NEGINOTH

ne-ge’-na (Ps 61$ the King James Version, title), ne-ge’-noth, neg’-i-noth (Ps 4 the King James Version,

title).

See MUSIC; PSALMS.

NEHELAMITE, THE

ne-hel’-a-mit, (ha-necheldmi): The designation of Shemaiah, a false prophet who opposed Jeremiah (Jer 29:24,31,32). The word means "dweller of Nehelam," but no such place-name is found in the Old Testament. Its etymology, however, suggests a connection with the Hebrew chalam, "to dream," and this has given rise to the rendering of the King James Version margin "dreamer."

NEHEMIAH

ne-he-mi’-a, ne-hem-i’-a (nechemyah, "comforted of Yah"):

1. Family

2. Youth

3. King’s Cupbearer

4. Governor of Judea

5. Death

LITERATURE

Nehemiah, the son of Hacaliah, is the Jewish patriot whose life is recorded in the Biblical work named after him. All that we know about him from contemporary sources is found in this book; and so the readers of this article are referred to the Book of Nehemiah for the best and fullest account of his words and deeds.

See EZRA-NEHEMIAH.

1. Family:

All that is known of his family is that he was the son of Hacaliah (Ne 1:1) and that one of his brothers was called Hanani (Ne 1:2; 7:2); the latter a man of sufficient character and importance to have been made a ruler of Jerusalem.

From Ne 10:1-8 some have inferred that he was a priest, since Nehemiah comes first in the list of names

ending with the phrase, "these were the priests." This view is supported by the Syriac and Arabic versions of 10:1, which read: "Nehemiah the elder, the son of Hananiah the chief of the priests"; and by the Latin Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) of 2 Macc 1:21, where he is called "Nehemiah the priest," and possibly by 2 Macc 1:18, where it is said that Nehemiah "offered sacrifices, after that he had builded the temple and the altar."

The argument based upon Ne 10:1-8 will fall to the ground, if we change the pointing of the "Seraiah" of the 3rd verse and read "its princes," referring back to the princes of 10:1. In this case, Nehemiah and Zedekiah would be the princes; then would come the priests and then the Levites.

Some have thought that he was of the royal line of Judah, inasmuch as he refers to his "fathers' sepulchres" at Jerusalem (Ne 2:3). This would be a good argument only if it could be shown that none but kings had sepulchers at Jerusalem.

It has been argued again that he was of noble lineage because of his position as cupbearer to the king of Persia. To substantiate this argument, it would need to be shown that none but persons of noble birth could serve in this position; but this has not been shown, and cannot be shown.

2. Youth:

From the fact that Nehemiah was so grieved at the desolation of the city and sepulchers of his fathers and that he was so jealous for the laws of the God of Judah, we can justly infer that he was brought up by pious parents, who instructed him in the history and law of the Jewish people.

3. King's Cupbearer:

Doubtless because of his probity and ability, he was apparently at an early age appointed by Artaxerxes, king of Persia, to the responsible position of cupbearer to the king. There is now no possible doubt that this King his king was Artaxerxes, the first of that name, commonly called Longimanus, who ruled over Persia from 464 to 424 BC. The mention of the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria, in a letter written to the priests of Jerusalem in 407 BC, among whom Johanan is especially named, proves that Sanballat must have ruled in the time of Artaxerxes I rather than in that of Artaxerxes II.

The office of cupbearer was "one of no trifling honor" (Herod. iii.34). It was one of his chief duties to taste the wine for the king to see that it was not poisoned, and he was even admitted to the king while the queen was present (Ne 2:6). It was on account of this position of close intimacy with the king that Nehemiah was able to obtain his commission as governor of Judea and the letters and edicts which enabled him to restore the walls of Jerusalem.

4. Governor of Judea:

The occasion of this commission was as follows: Hanani, the brother of Nehemiah, and other men of

Judah came to visit Nehemiah while he was in Susa in the 9th month of the 20th year of Artaxerxes. They reported that the Jews in Jerusalem were in great affliction and that the wall thereof was broken down and its gates burned with fire. Thereupon he grieved and fasted and prayed to God that he might be granted favor by the king. Having appeared before the latter in the 1st month of the 21st year of Artaxerxes, 444 BC, he was granted permission to go to Jerusalem to build the city of his fathers' sepulchers, and was given letters to the governors of Syria and Palestine and especially to Asaph, the keeper of the king's forest, ordering him to supply timber for the wall, the fortress, and the temple. He was also appointed governor of the province of which Jerusalem was the capital.

Armed with these credentials and powers he repaired to Jerusalem and immediately set about the restoration of the walls, a work in which he was hindered and harassed by Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, and others, some of them Jews dwelling in Jerusalem. Notwithstanding, he succeeded in his attempt and eventually also in providing gates for the various entrances to the city.

Having accomplished these external renovations, he instituted a number of social reforms. He appointed the officers necessary for better government, caused the people to be instructed in the Law by public readings, and expositions; celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles; and observed a national fast, at which the sins of the people were confessed and a new covenant with Yahweh was solemnly confirmed. The people agreed to avoid marriages with the heathen, to keep the Sabbath, and to contribute to the support of the temple. To provide for the safety and prosperity of the city, one out of every ten of the people living outside Jerusalem was compelled to settle in the city. In all of these reforms he was assisted by Ezra, who had gone up to Jerusalem in the 7th year of Artaxerxes.

5. Death:

Once, or perhaps oftener, during his governorship Nehemiah returned to the king. Nothing is known as to when or where he died. It is certain, however, that he was no longer governor in 407 BC; for at that time according to the Aramaic letter written from Elephantine to the priests of Jerusalem, Bagohi was occupying the position of governor over Judea. One of the last acts of Nehemiah's government was the chasing away of one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, because he had become the son-in-law to Sanballat, the governor of Samaria. As this Joiada was the father of Johanan (Ne 12:22) who, according to the Aramaic papyrus, was high priest in 407 BC, and according to Josephus (Ant., XI, viii.1) was high priest while Bagohi (Bogoas) was general of Artaxerxes' army, it is certain that Nehemiah was at this time no longer in power. From the 3rd of the Sachau papyri, it seems that Bagohi was already governor in 410 BC; and, that at the same time, Dalayah, the son of Sanballat, was governor in Samaria. More definite information on these points is not to be had at present.

LITERATURE.

The only early extra-Biblical data with regard to Nehemiah and the Judea of his times are to be found:

(1) in the Egyptian papyri of Elephantine ("Aramaische Papyri und Ostraka aus einer judischen Militar-

Kolonie zu Elephantine," Altorientalische Sprachdenkmaler des 5. Jahrhunderts vor Chr., Bearbeitet von Eduard Sachau. Leipzig, 1911);

(2)in Josephus, Ant, XI, vi, 6-8; vii, 1, 2;

(3) in Ecclesiasticus 49:13, where it is said: "The renown of Nehemiah is glorious; of him who established our waste places and restored our ruins, and set up the gates and bars"; (4) and lastly in 2 Macc 1:18-36 and 2:13; in the latter of these passages it speaks of ‘the writings and commentaries of Nehemiah; and how he, founding a library, gathered together the acts of the kings and the prophets and of David and the epistles of the kings concerning the holy gifts.’

R. Dick Wilson

NEHEMIAH, BOOK OF

See EZRA-NEHEMIAH.

NEHEMIAS

ne-he-mi’-as: Greek form of the Hebrew Nehemiah.

(1) Neemias, one of the leaders of the return under Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:8) equals "Nehemiah" of Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7.

(2) Neemias, Codex Vaticanus Naimias, the prophet Nehemiah (1 Esdras 5:40 where the King James Version margin reads "Nehemias who also is Atharias"). Neither Nehemias nor Attharias is found in the parallel Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:65, but ha-tirshatha’ equals Tirshatha, "the governor," by whom Zerubbabel must be intended. Thus, the Hebrew word for "governor" has been converted into a proper name and by some blunder the name Nehemiah inserted, perhaps because he also was known by the title of "governor."

S. Angus

NEHILOTH

ne-hil’-oth, ne’-hi-loth (Ps 5, title). See MUSIC.

NEHUM

ne’-hum (nechum): One of the twelve heads of the people who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 7:7). In the parallel passage (Ezr 2:2), the name appears as REHUM (which see), and in 1 Esdras 5:8 as "Roimus."

NEHUSHTA

ne-hush’-ta (nechushta’): Mother of King Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:8). She was the daughter of Elnathan of Jerusalem. After the fall of the city she was exiled with her son and his court (2Ki 24:12; Jer 29:2).

NEHUSHTAN

ne-hush’-tan (nechushtan; compare nechosheth, "brass," and nachash, "serpent"):

1. Traditional Interpretation:

The word occurs but once, namely, in 2Ki 18:4. In the account there given of the reforms carried out by Hezekiah, it is said that "he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan." According to the Revised Version margin the word means "a piece of brass." If this be correct, the sense of the passage is that Hezekiah not only breaks the brazen serpent in pieces but, suiting the word to the act, scornfully calls it "a (mere) piece of brass." Hezekiah thus takes his place as a true reformer, and as a champion of the purification of the religion of Israel. This is the traditional interpretation of the passage, and fairly represents the Hebrew text as it now stands.

2. Derivation: A Proper Noun:

There are at least three considerations, however, which throw doubt upon this interpretation. In the first place, the word Nehushtan is not a common noun, and cannot mean simply "a piece of brass." The point of the Biblical statement is entirely lost by such a construction. It is emphatically a proper noun, and is the special name given to this particular brazen serpent. As such it would be sacred to all worshippers of the brazen serpent, and familiar to all who frequented the Temple. In the second place, it is probable that Nehushtan is to be derived from nachash, "serpent," rather than from nechosheth, "brass,"

(1) because the Greek VSS, representing a form of the Hebrew text earlier than Massoretic Text, suggest this in their transliteration of Nehushtan (Codex Vaticanus Nesthalei; Codex Alexandrinus Nesthan);

(2) because the Hebrew offers a natural derivation of Nehushtan from nachash, "serpent"; and

(3) because the name of the image would more probably be based on its form than on the material out of which it was made. In the third place, the reading, "and it was called," which appears in the Revised Version margin, is decidedly preferable to that in the text. It not only represents the best reading of the Hebrew, but is confirmed by the similar reading, "and they called it," which appears in the Greek version referred to above. These readings agree in their indication that Nehushtan was the name by which the serpent-image was generally known during the years it was worshipped, rather than an expression used for the first time by Hezekiah on the occasion of its destruction.

Whichever derivation be adopted, however, the word must be construed as a proper name. If it be derived from "brass," then the translation must be, not "a piece of brass," but "The (great) Brass," giving the word a special sense by which it refers unequivocally to the well-known image made of brass. If it be derived from "serpent," then the translation must be, "The (great) Serpent," the word in this case referring in a special sense to the well-known image in serpent form. But the significance of the word probably lies far back of any etymological explanation of it that can now be given. It is not a term that can be adequately explained by reference to verbal roots, but is rather an epitome of the reverence of those who, however mistakenly, looked upon the brazen serpent as a proper object of worship.

In view of the foregoing it may be concluded,

(1) that Nehushtan was the (sacred) name by which the brazen serpent was known during the years "the children of Israel did burn incense to it";

(2) that the word is derived from nachash, "serpent"; and

(3) that it was used in the sense of "The Serpent," paragraph excellence.

See IMAGES, 6, (2); SERPENT, FIERY.

Lindsay B. Longacre

NEIEL

ne‘i’-el (ne‘i’el; Codex Vaticanus Inael; Codex Alexandrinus Aniel): A town on the boundary between Zebulun and Asher mentioned between Jiftah-el and Cabul (Jos 19:27). It may be the same as Neah (Jos 19:13), but the place is not identified.

NEIGH

na (tsahal, "to cry aloud," "neigh"): Figuratively used to indicate lustful desire (Jer 5:8; compare Jer 13:29).

NEIGHBOR

na’-ber (rea‘, ‘amith, "friend," qarobh, shakhen; ho plesion, "near" geiton, (compare 2 Macc 6:8; 9:25), "inhabitant"; Latin proximus (2 Esdras 15:19), civis (2 Esdras 9:45; 10:2, the Revised Version margin "townman")):

1. As Described in the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament, the relationship of neighborhood involves moral and social obligations which are frequently emphasized. These are in the main described in negative rather than positive terms; e.g. there are special injunctions not to bear false witness against a neighbor (Ex 20:16; De 5:20; Pr 25:18), or in any way to deal falsely with him, defraud him, frame malicious devices or harbor evil thoughts against him (Ex 20:17; Le 6:2; 19:13; De 23:24 f; Ps 15:3; 101:5; Pr 24:28; Jer 22:13; Zec 8:17), or to lead him into shameful conduct (Hab 2:15), or to wrong him by lying carnally with his wife (Le 18:20). But the supreme law that underlies these negative injunctions is stated positively. "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Le 19:18). In this verse the term "neighbor"is defined by the expression, "the children of my people." Here, and generally in the Old Testament, the term implies more than mere proximity; it means one related by the bond of nationality, a fellow-countryman, compatriot. Yahweh being regarded as a national God, there was no religious bond regulating the conduct of the Hebrews with other nations. Conduct which was prohibited between fellow-Jews was permitted toward a foreigner, e.g. the exaction of interest (De 23:19,20).

2. As Described in the New Testament:

In the New Testament, this limitation of moral obligation to fellow-countrymen is abolished. Christ gives a wider interpretation of the commandment in Le 19:18, so as to include in it those outside the tie of nation or kindred. This is definitely done in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lu 10:25-37), where, in answer to the question, "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus shows that the relationship is a moral, not a physical one, based not on kinship but on the opportunity and capacity for mutual help. The word represents, not so much a rigid fact, but an ideal which one may or may not realize (Lu 10:36, "Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved (literally, became, not was) neighbor," etc.). This larger connotation follows naturally as a corollary to the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God. The commandment to love one’s neighbor as one’s self must not be interpreted as if it implied that we are to hate our enemy (an inference which the jews were apt to make); human love should be like the Divine, impartial, having all men for its object (Mt 5:43). Love to one’s fellow-men in this broad sense to be placed side by side with love to God as the essence and sum of human duty (Mt 22:35-40 parallel Mr 12:28-31). Christ’s apostles follow His example in giving a central position to the injunction to love one’s neighbor as one’s self (Jas 2:8, where is is called the "royal law" i.e. the supreme or governing law; Ro 13:9; Ga 5:14).

D. Miall Edwards

NEKEB

ne’-keb: This name occurs only in combination with "Adami" (’adhami ha-neqebh, "Adami of the pass"); Septuagint reads the names of two places: kai Arme kai Nabok (B); kai Armai kai Nakeb (Jos 19:33), so we should possibly read "Adami and Nekeb." Neubauer says (Geog. du Talmud, 225) that later the name of Nekeb was Ciyadathah. It may therefore be represented by the modern Seiyadeh, not far from ed-Damieh to the East of Tabor, about 4 miles Southwest of Tiberias. The name of Nekeb, a town in Galilee, appears in the list of Thothmes III.

NEKODA

ne-ko’-da (neqodha’):

(1) Head of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2:48; Ne 7:50; compare RAPC 1Es 5:31).

(2) Head of a family which failed to prove its Israelite descent (Ezr 2:60; Ne 7:62; compare RAPC 1Es 5:31,37). In the parallel verses of 1 Esdras the names are given thus: NOEBA and NEKODAN (which see).

NEKODAN

ne-ko’-dan (Nekodan; the Revised Version margin "Nekoda"; the King James Version Necodan):

(1) Head of a family which returned from exile, but "could not show their families nor their stock" (1 Esdras 5:37) equals "Nekoda" of Ezr 2:60; Ne 7:62.

(2) See NOEBA.

NEMUEL

nem’-u-el, ne-mu’-el (nemu’el):ould not show their families nor their stock" (1 Esdras 5:37) equals "Nekoda" of Ezr 2:60; Ne 7:62.

(1) A Reubenite, brother of Dathan and Abiram (Nu 26:9).

(2) A son of Simeon (Nu 26:12; 1Ch 4:24). The name occurs also in the form "Jemuel" (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15). According to Gray (Studies in Hebrew Proper Names), either form is etymologically obscure; but Nemuel is probably correct, for it is easier to account for its corruption into Jemuel than vice versa. The patronymic Nemuelites occurs once (Nu 26:12).

NEMUELITES

nem’-u-el-its, ne-mu’-el-its (ha-nemu’eli).

See NEMUEL, (2).

NEPHEA

ne-fe’-a.

See MUSIC.

NEPHEG

ne’-feg (nephegh, "sprout," "shoot"):

(1) Son of Izhar, and brother of Korah of the famous trio, Korah, Dathan and Abiram (Ex 6:21).

(2) A son of David (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 3:7; 14:6).

NEPHEW

nef’-u, nev’-u.

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

NEPHI

ne’-fi.

See NEPHTHAI.

NEPHILIM

nef’-i-lim (nephilim): This word, translated "giants" in the King James Version, but retained in the Revised Version (British and American), is found in two passages of the Old Testament—one in Ge 6:4, relating to the antediluvians; the other in Nu 13:33, relating to the sons of Anak in Canaan. In the former place the Nephilim are not necessarily to be identified with the children said to be borne "the daughters of men" to "the sons of God" (Ge 6:2,4); indeed, they seem to be distinguished from the latter as upon the earth before this unholy commingling took place (see SONS OF GOD). But it is not easy to be certain as to the interpretation of this strange passage. In the second case they clearly represent men of gigantic stature, in comparison with whom the Israelites felt as if they were "grasshopers." This agrees with Ge 6:4, "the mighty men that were of old, the men of renow." Septuagint, therefore, was warranted in translating by gigantes.

James Orr

NEPHIS

ne’-fis.

See NIPHIS.

NEPHISH; NEPHISIM; NEPHISHESIM; NEPHUSIM

ne’-fish, ne-fi’-sim, ne-fish’-e-sim, ne-fusim (nephicim, nephucim): The former is the Kethibh (Hebrew: "written") form of the name adopted in the Revised Version (British and American); the latter the Qere (Hebrew "read") form, adopted in the King James Version and the Revised Version margin (Ezr 2:50).

See NAPHISH; NEPHUSHESIM.

NEPHTHAI

nef’-thi, nef’-tha-i.

See NEPHTHAR.

NEPHTHALIM

nef’-tha-lim (Mt 4:13): The Greek form of NAPHTALI (which see).

NEPHTHAR; NEPHTHAI

nef’-thar (Nephthar; Codex Alexandrinus and Swete, Nephthar, the King James Version and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Naphthar), (Nephthai, al. Nephthaei, Fritzsche, Nepha, the King James Version and Vulgate, following Old Latin, Nephi; Swete, following Codex Alexandrinus, gives Nephthar twice): According to 2 Macc 1:19-36, at the time of the captivity the godly priests took of the altar fire of the temple and concealed it "privily in the hollow of a well that was without water," unknown to all. "After many years" (upon Return), before offering the sacrifices, Nehemiah sent the descendants of the godly priests to fetch the hidden fire. They reported they could find no fire but only "thick water" hudor pachu), which he commanded them to draw up and sprinkle upon the wood and the sacrifices. After an interval the sun shone forth from behind a cloud and the liquid ignited and consumed the sacrifices. Nehemiah then commanded them to pour (katachein, al. katechein, and kataschein) the rest of the liquid upon great stones. Another flame sprang up which soon spent itself, "whereas the light from the altar shone still" (Revised Version margin, the exact meaning being doubtful). When the king of Persia investigated it, he enclosed the spot as sacred. Nehemiah and his friends called the thick liquid "Nephthar," "which is by interpretation ‘cleansing’ "(katharismos), "but most men call it Nephthai."

No satisfactory explanation is to hand of either name; one of which is probably a corruption of the other. And no word exists in the Hebrew like either of them with the meaning of "cleansing," "purification." The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) applies the name to the spot (hunc locum), not the

thing. The story probably originated in Persia, where naphtha was abundant. The ignition of the liquid by the hot rays of the sun and the appearance of the words render it highly probable that it was the inflammable rockoil naphtha, the combustible properties of which were quite familiar to the ancients (Pliny, NH, ii. 109; Plutarch, Alexander 35; Diosc., i.101; Strabo, Geogr. xvi.1, 15); the words then are probably corruptions of what the Greeks termed naphtha. Ewald (History, V, 163) says: "This is but one of the many stories which sought in later times to enhance the very high sanctity of the Temple, with reference even to its origin."

S. Angus

NEPHTOAH

nef-to'-a, nef'-to-a (nephtoach, occurs only in the expression ma'yan me nephtoach, "the fountain of the waters of Nephtoah"; Septuagint pege hudatos Naphtho): This spring was on the border line between Judah and Benjamin (Jos 15:9; 18:15). The place is usually identified with Lifta, a village about 2 miles Northwest of Jerusalem, on the east bank of the Wady beit Hanina]. It is a village very conspicuous to the traveler along the high road from Jaffa as he nears Jerusalem. There are ancient rock-cut tombs and a copious spring which empties itself into a large masonry reservoir. The situation of Lifta seems to agree well with the most probable line of boundary between the two tribes; the spring as it is today does not appear to be so abundant as to warrant such an expression as "spring of the waters," but it was, like many such sources, probably considerably more abundant in Old Testament times.

Conder would identify Lifta with the ancient ELEPH (which see) of Benjamin, and, on the ground that the Talmud (see Talmud Babylonian, Yom' 31a) identifies Nephtoah with ETAM (which see), he would find the site of Nephtoah at 'Ain 'Atan, South of Bethlehem. The Talmud is not a sufficiently trustworthy guide when unsupported by other evidence, and the identification creates great difficulty with the boundary line. See Palestine Exploration Fund, III, 18, 43, Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Mastermin

NEPHUSHESIM; NEPHISHESIM

ne-fush'-e-sim, ne-fish'-e-sim (nephushecim, nephishecim): The former is the Kethibh (Hebrew "written") form of the name adopted in the Revised Version (British and American); the latter the Qere (Hebrew "read") form adopted in the King James Version and the Revised Version margin (Ne 7:52).

See NAPHISH; NEPHISIM.

NER

ner (ner, "lamp"): Father of Abner (1Sa 14:50 f; 26:5,14, etc.); grandfather of Saul (1Ch 8:33). Other

references, though adding no further information are 2Sa 2:8,12; 3:23,25; 28; 37; 1Ki 2:5,32, etc.

NEREUS

ne’-rus, ne’-re-us (Nereus): The name of a Roman Christian to whom with his sister Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:15). Nereus and the others saluted with him (Ro 16:15) formed small community or "house church." The name of the sister is not given, but the name Nereis is found on an inscription of this date containing names of the emperor’s servants (Lightfoot, Phil, 176). Among the Acta Sanctorum connected with the early church in Rome are the "Ac of Nereus and Achilleus" which call them chamberlains of Domitilla, the niece of Vespasian, and relate their influence over her in persuading her to remain a virgin.

S. F. Hunter

NERGAL

nar’-gal (nereghal): A Babylonian deity, identified with the planet Mars, and worshipped at Cutha (compare 2Ki 17:30).

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

NERGAL-SHAREZER

nur-gal-sha-re’-zar (nereghal-shar’etser, Hebrew form of Assyrian Nergal-sar-usur, "O Nergal, defend the prince"): A Babylonian officer, the "Rab-mag," associated with Nebushazban in the care of Jeremiah after the fall of Jerusalem (Jer 39:3,13). According to Hommel (article "Babylon," Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes)) and Sayce (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, under the word), Nergal-sharezer is to be identified with Neriglissar who succeeded Evil-merodach on the throne of Babylon (compare Cheyne and Johns, Encyclopedia Biblica, under the word).

NERI

ne’-ri ((@Nerei (Tisch., Treg., Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek), Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Neri; for Hebrew neriyah): The name of an ancestor of Jesus, the grandfather of Zerubbabel (Lu 3:27).

See NERIAH.

NERIAH

ne-ri’-a (neriyah, "whose lamp is Yah"): The father of Seraiah and of Baruch, Jeremiah’s friend and

secretary (Jer 32:12,16; 36:4,8,32; 43:3). In Baruch 1:1 the Greek form of the name, Ner(e)ias, is given, and this shortened, Neri, occurs in the genealogy of Jesus Christ.

NERIAS

ne-ri’-as (Ner(e)ias): The Greek form of Hebrew Neriah found only in Baruch 1:1 as the father of Baruch equals "Neriah" of Jer 32:12; 36:4 ff; 43:3. To Baruch’s brother, Seraiah, the same genealogy is ascribed in Jer 51:59.

NERO

ne’-ro (Neron): I. NAME, PARENTAGE AND EARLY

II. AGRIPPINA’S AMBITION FOR NERO

Her Nine Measures for Bringing Him to the Throne

III. NERO’S REIGN

1. Quinquennium Nerohis

2. Poppea Sabina (58 AD)

3. Poppea and Tigellinus

4. Great Fire (July, 64)

5. Persecution of Christians

6. Conspiracy of Piso (65 AD)

7. Nero in Greece (66 AD)

8. Death of Nero

IV. DOWNFALL AND CHARACTER

1. Seven Causes of Downfall

2. Character

V. "NERO REDIVIVUS"

VI. NERO AND CHRISTIANITY

1. Nero and the New Testament

2. Neronian Policy and Christianity

LITERATURE

The fifth Roman emperor, born at Antium December 15, 37 AD, began to reign October 13, 54, died June 9, 68.

I. Name, Parentage and Early Training.

His name was originally Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus but after his adoption into the Claudian gens by the emperor Claudius, he became Nero Claudius Caesar Germanicus. His father was Enaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus ("Brazen-beard"), a man sprung from an illustrious family and of vicious character. His mother was Agrippina the younger, the daughter of Germanicus and the elder Agrippina, sister of the emperor Caius (Caligula) and niece of the emperor Claudius. On the birth of the child, his father predicted, amid the congratulations of his friends, that any offspring of himself and Agrippina could only prove abominable and disastrous for the public (Suet. Nero vi: detestabile et malo publico). At the age of three the young Domitius lost his father and was robbed of his estates by the rapacity of Caius. In 39 his mother was banished for supposed complicity in a plot against Caius. Nero was thus deprived of his mother and at the same time left almost penniless. His aunt, Domitia Lepida, now undertook the care of the boy and placed him with two tutors, a dancer and a barber (Suetonius vi). On the accession of Claudius, Agrippina was recalled, and Nero was restored to his mother and his patrimony (41 AD).

II. Agrippina’s Ambition for Nero.

She cared little for her son’s moral education, but began immediately to train him for high position. She aimed at nothing less than securing the empire for Nero. With a view to this she must gain influence over her uncle, the emperor Clandius, who was very susceptible to female charms. At first the path was by no means easy, while the licentious empress, Messalina, was in power. But on the fall and death of Messalina (48 AD)—for which Agrippina may have intrigued—the way seemed opened. With the assistance of the emperor’s freedman, Pallas, Agrippina proved the successful candidate for Claudius’ affections. She how felt secure to carry out the plans for the elevation of her son:

Her Nine Measures for Bringing Him to the Throne

(1) She secured his betrothal to Octavia, the daughter of Claudius, having previously, by the villainy of

Vitellius, broken off the engagement between Octavia and Lucius Silanus (ibid., xlviii). Later, Nero married this unfortunate lady.

(2) Vitellius again obliged by securing a modification of Roman law so as to permit a marriage with a brother's (not sister's) daughter, and in 49 Agrippina became empress.

(3) In the meantime she had caused Seneca to be recalled from banishment and had entrusted to him the education of Nero for imperial purposes.

(4) The adoption of her son by Claudius (50 AD).

(5) She next secured early honors and titles for Nero in order to mark him out as Clandins' successor.

(6) She caused Britannicus, Claudius' son, to be kept in the background and treated as a mere child, removing by exile or death suspected supporters of Britannicus.

(7) Agrippina was farsighted and anticipated a later secret of Roman imperialism—the influence of the armies in the nomination of emperors. For this cause she took an active interest in military affairs and gave her name to a new colony on the Rhine (modern Cologne). But she did not forget the importance of securing the praetorian guard and Burrus the prefect.

(8) She persuaded Clandins to make a will in favor of her son. All was now ready. But Claudius did not like the idea of excluding his son Britannicus from power, and murmurs were heard among the senate and people. Delay might prove fatal to Agrippina's plans, so

(9) Claudius must die. The notorious Locusta administered poison in a dish of mushrooms, and Xenophon, Agrippina's physician, thrust a poisoned feather down Claudius' throat on the pretense of helping him to vomit. Burrus then took Nero forth and caused him to be proclaimed imperator by the praetorians.

III. Nero's Reign.

1. Quinquennium Neronis:

Nero's reign falls into three periods, the first of which is the celebrated quinquennium, or first 5 years, characterized by good government at home and in the provinces and popularity with both senate and people. Agrippina, having seated her son on the throne, did not purpose to relinquish power herself; she intended to rule along with him. And at first Nero was very devoted to her and had given as watchword to the guard, "the best of mothers" (Tacitus, Annals xiii.2; Suetonius ix). This caused a sharp conflict with Seneca and Burrus, who could not tolerate Agrippina's arrogance and unbounded influence over her son. In order to detach him from his mother they encouraged him in an amour with a Greek freedwoman, Acre (Tac. Ann. xiii.12). This first blow to Agrippina's influence was soon followed by

the dismissal from court of her chief protector Pallas. She now threatened to bring forth Britannicus and present him as the rightful heir to the throne. This cost Britannicus his life, for Nero, feeling insecure while a son of Claudius lived, compassed his death at a banquet. A hot wine cup was offered Britannicus, and to cool it to taste, cold water was added which had been adulterated with a virulent poison. The victim succumbed immediately. All eyes fastened on Nero in suspicion, but he boldly asserted that the death was due to a fit of epilepsy—a disease to which Britannicus had been subject from childhood. Such was the fate of Agrippina's first protege. She next took up the cause of the despised and ill-treated Octavia, which so incensed her son that he deprived her of her guards and caused her to remove from the palace. Agrippina now disappears for the next few years to come into brief and tragic prominence later. Seneca and Burrus undertook the management of affairs, with results that justified the favorable impression which the first 5 years of Nero's reign made upon the Roman people. Many reforms were initiated, financial, social and legislative. These ministers treated Nero to counsels of moderation and justice, dictating a policy which left considerable activity to the senate. But perceiving the bent of his evil nature, they allowed him to indulge in low pleasures and excesses with the most profligate companions, thinking, perhaps, either that the young ruler would in this way prove less harmful to the public, or that, after sowing his wild oats, he would return to the serious business of government. But in both ways they were sorely disappointed, for Nero, having surrendered himself to the basest appetites, continued to go from excess to excess. He surrounded himself with the most dissolute companions, conspicuous among whom were Salvius Otho and Claudius Senecio.

2. Poppea Sabina (58 AD):

The former had a wife as ambitious as she was unprincipled, and endowed, according to Tacitus, with every gift of nature except an "honorable mind." Already divorced before marrying Otho, she was minded to employ Otho merely as a tool to enable her to become Nero's consort. With the appearance of Poppea Sabina, for such was her name, opens the second period of Nero's reign. She proved his evil star. Under her influence he shook off all restraints, turned a deaf ear to is best advisers and plunged deeper into immorality and crime. She allowed, if not persuaded, Nero to give her husband a commission in the distant province of Lusitania. Her jealousy could tolerate no possible rival. She plotted the death of Agrippina to which she easily persuaded Nero to consent. This foul crime was planned and carried out with the greatest cunning. Anicetus, admiral of the fleet, undertook to construct a vessel that would sink to order. Nero invited his mother to his villa at Baiae at the Quinquatrus celebration. After the banquet she was persuaded to return to Bauli by the vessel prepared. But the plan did not succeed, and Agrippina saved herself by swimming ashore. She pretended to treat the matter as an accident, sending a freedman to Nero to inform him of her escape. Anicetus, however, relieved Nero of the awkward position by pretending that Agrippina's freedman had dropped a dagger which was considered proof enough of her guilt. Deserted by her friends and slaves except one freedman, she was quickly dispatched by her murderers. Nero gave out that she died by suicide (Suetonius xxxiv; Tacitus, Annals cxli-cxlviii).

3. Poppea and Tigellinus:

Nero no longer made any secret of taking Poppea as his mistress, and, under her influence, bid defiance

to the best Roman traditions and plunged deeper into dissipation. In 62 AD matters grew much worse by the death of the praetorian prefect, Burrus. Seneca lost in him a powerful ally, and Poppea gained in one of the new prefects, Sofonius Tigellinus, a powerful ally. She succeeded in causing Seneca to retire from the court. Next she determined to remove Octavia. A charge of adultery was first tried, but as the evidence proved too leaky, Nero simply divorced her because of barrenness. Then Anicetus was persuaded to confess adultery with her, and the innocent Octavia was banished to the island of Pandateria, where a little later she was executed at Poppea's orders and her head brought to her rival (62 AD). Poppea was now empress, and the next year bore a daughter to Nero, but the child died when only three months old. Two years later Poppea herself died during pregnancy, of a cruel kick inflicted by Nero in a fit of rage (65 AD). He pronounced an eulogy over her and took a third wife, Statilia Messalina, of whom he had no issue.

Nero, having by his extravagance exhausted the well-filled treasury of Claudius (as Caius did that of Tiberius), was driven to fill his coffers by confiscations of the estates of rich nobles against whom his creature Tigellinus could trump the slightest plausible charge. But even this did not prevent a financial crisis—the beginning of the bankruptcy of the later Rein empire. The provinces which at first enjoyed good government were now plundered; new and heavy taxes were imposed. Worst of all, the gold and silver coinage was depreciated, and the senate was deprived of the right of copper coinage.

4. Great Fire (July, 64):

This difficulty was much increased by the great fire which was not only destructive to both private and state property, but also necessitated the providing thousands of homeless with shelter, and lowering the price of corn. On July 18, 64, this great conflagration broke out in Circus Maximus. A high wind caused it to spread rapidly over a large portion of the city, sweeping before it ill-built streets of wooden houses. At the end of six days it seemed to be exhausted for lack of material, when another conflagration started in a different quarter of the city. Various exaggerated accounts of the destruction are found in Roman historians: of the 14 city regions 7 were said to have been totally destroyed and 4 partially. Nero was at Antium at the time. He hastened back to the city and apparently took every means of arresting the spread of the flames. He superintended in person the work of the fire brigades, often exposing himself to danger. After the fire he threw open his own gardens to the homeless. The catastrophe caused great consternation, and, for whatever reasons, suspicion seemed to fix upon Nerio. Rumor had it that on hearing the Greek verse, "When I am dead let the earth be wrapped in fire," he interrupted, "Nay rather, while I live" (Suetonius xxxviii); that he had often deplored the ugliness of the city and wished an opportunity to rebuild it; that he purposely set it on fire in order to find room for his magnificent Domus Aurea ("Golden House"); that when the city was burning he gazed upon it from the tower of Maecenas delighted with what he termed "the beauty of the conflagration"; that he recited in actor's costume the sack of Troy (Suetonius xxxviii; Tacitus, Annals xv.38 ff). In spite of all these reports Nero must be absolved of the guilt of incendiarism.

5. Persecution of Christians:

Such public calamities were generally attributed to the wrath of the gods. In the present case everything was done to appease the offended deity. Yet, in spite of all, suspicion still clung to Nero "Wherefore in order to allay the rumor he put forward as guilty (subdidit reos), and afflicted with the most exquisite punishments those who were hated for their abominations (flagitia) and called ‘Christians’ by the populace. Christus, from whom the name was derived, was punished by the procurator Pontius Pilatus in the reign of Tiberius. This noxious form of religion (exitiabilis superstitio), checked for a time, broke out again not only in Judea its original home, but also throughout the city (Rome) where all abominations meet and find devotees. Therefore first of all those who confessed (i.e. to being Christians) were arrested, and then as a result of their information a large number (multitude ingens) were implicated (reading coniuncti, not convicti), not so much on the charge of incendiarism as for hatred of the human race. They died by methods of mockery; some were covered with the skins of wild beasts and then torn by dogs, some were crucified, some were burned as torches to give light at night .... whence (after scenes of extreme cruelty) commiseration was stirred for them, although guilty and deserving the worst penalties, for men felt that their destruction was not on account of the public welfare but to gratify the cruelty of one (Nero)" (Tacitus, Annals xv.44). Such is the earliest account of the first heathen persecution (as well as the first record of the crucifixion by a heathen writer). Tacitus here clearly implies that the Christians were innocent (subdidit reos), and that Nero employed them simply as scapegoats. Some regard the conclusion of the paragraph as a contradiction to this—"though guilty and deserving the severest punishment" (adversus sontes et novissima exempla meritos). But Tacitus means by sontes that the Christians were "guilty" from the point of view of the populace, and that they merited extreme punishment also from his own standpoint for other causes, but not for arson. Fatebantur does not mean that they confessed to incendiarism, but to being Christians, and qui fatebantur means there were some who boldly confessed, while others tried to conceal or perhaps even denied their faith.

But why were the Christians selected as scapegoats? Why not the Jews, who were both numerous and had already offended the Roman government and had been banished in great numbers? Or why not the many followers of the oriental religions, which had proved more than once obnoxious?

(1) Poppea was favorable to Judaism and had certainly enough influence over Nero to protect the Jews; she was regarded by them as a proselyte and is termed by Josephus (Ant., XX, viii, 11) theosebes, "god-fearing." When the populace and Nero were seeking victims for revenge, the Jews may have been glad of the opportunity of putting forward the Christians and may have been encouraged in this by Poppea. Farrar (Early Days of Christianity, I, chapter iv) sees "in the proselytism of Poppea, guided by Jewish malice, the only adequate explanation of the first Christian persecution."

(2) Closely connected with this was doubtless the observation by the Roman government that Christianity was an independent faith from Judaism. This may first have been brought home to the authorities by the trial of Paul before Nero, as suggested by Ramsay (Expositor, July, 1893). Judaism was a recognized and tolerated religion, a religio licita, and Christianity when divorced from Judaism became a religio illicita and punishable by the state, for Christianity first rose "under the shadow of licensed Judaism" (sub umbraculo licitae Judeorum religionis: Tertullian, Apol., xxi).

(3) As Christianity formed a society apart from Roman society, all kinds of crimes were attributed to its

followers, Thyestean feasts, nightly orgies, hostility to temples and images. These flagitia seemed summed up in odium humani generis, "hatred for the human race."

(4) They were easily selected as being so numerous and making most progress in a line opposed to Roman spirit; compare ingens multitudo (Tacitus, Annals xv.44; Clemens Rom., Cor 1:6, polu plethos; compare also "great multitude" of Re 7:9; 19:1).

(5) No doubt, too, early Christian enthusiasm was unequivocal in its expressions, especially in its belief of a final conflagration of the world and its serene faith amid the despair of others.

6. Conspiracy of Piso (65 AD):

In the meantime Tigellinus' tyranny and confiscations to meet Nero's expenses caused deep discontent among the nobles, which culminated in the famous conspiracy at the head of which was C. Calpurnius Piso. The plot was prematurely betrayed by Milichus. An inquisition followed in which the most illustrious victims who perished were Seneca the philosopher, Lucan the poet, Lucan's mother, and later Annaeus Mela, brother of Seneca and father of Lucan, T. Petronius Arbiter, "the glass of fashion." Finally, "Nero having butchered so many illustrious men, at last desired to exterminate virtue itself by the death of Thrasea Paetus and Barea Soranus" (Tacitus, Annals xvi.21 f).

7. Visit to Greece (66 AD):

Having cleared every suspected person out of the way, he abandoned the government in Rome to a freedman Helius, and started on a long visit to Greece (66-68 AD), where he took part in musical contests and games, himself winning prizes from the obsequious Greeks, in return for which Nero bestowed upon them "freedom." Nero was so un-Roman that he was perfectly at home in Greece, where alone he said he was appreciated by cultured people. In the meantime the revolt of Vindex in Gaul commenced (68 AD), but it was soon quelled by Verginius Rufus on account of its national Gaulic character. Galba of Hither Spain next declared himself legatus of the senate and the Roman people. Nero was persuaded to return to Rome by Helius; he confiscated Galba's property, but his weakness and hesitancy greatly helped the cause of the latter.

8. Death of Nero:

Nymphidius Sabinus, one of the prefects, won over the guard for Galba, by persuading the irresolute emperor to withdraw from Rome and then told the praetorians that Nero had deserted them. Nero was a coward, both in life and in death. While he had the means of easily crushing Galba, he was revolving plans of despair in his Servilian gardens, whether he should surrender himself to the mercies of the Parthians or to those of Galba; whether Galba would allow him the province of Egypt; whether the public would forgive his past if he showed penitence enough. In his distraction a comforter asked him in the words of Virgil, "Is it then so wretched to die?" He could not summon the courage for suicide, nor could he find one to inflict the blow for him: "Have I then neither friend nor foe?" Phaon a freedman

offered him the shelter of his villa a few miles from Rome. Here he prepared for suicide, but with great cowardice. He kept exclaiming, "What an artist I am to perish!" (Qualis artifex pereo, Suet. xlix). On learning that he was condemned to a cruel death by the senate, he put the weapon to his throat and was assisted in the fatal blow by Epaphroditus his secretary. A centurion entered pretending he had come to help: "Too late—this is fidelity," were Nero's last words. His remains were laid in the family vault of the Domitii by his two nurses Ecloge and Alexandria and his concubine Acte (Suetonius L). Thus perished on July 9, 68 AD the last of the line of Julius Caesar in his 31st year and in the 14th of his reign.

IV. Downfall and Character.

1. Seven Causes of Downfall:

The causes of his downfall were briefly:

(1) his lavish expenditure leading to burdensome taxation and financial insecurity;

(2) tyranny and cruelty of his favorites;

(3) the great fire which brought dissatisfaction to fasten suspicion on Nero and the consequent enlargement of his private abode at the expense of the city—especially the Golden House;

(4) the unpopular measure of the extension of Roman franchise to Greece and favored foreigners;

(5) the security engendered by the success with which the conspiracy of Piso was crushed;

(6) the discovery of another "secret of empire," that an emperor could be created elsewhere than at Rome, that the succession of emperors was not hereditary but rested with the great armies, and

(7) the cowardice and weakness which Nero displayed in the revolt which led to his death.

His reign is memorable for the activity of Seneca, the great fire, the persecution of Christians, the beginning of the bankruptcy of the later Roman empire, the Armenian disaster of Paetus (62 AD) retrieved by Corbulo and the humiliation of Parthia, the outbreak of the insurrection in Judea (66 AD), which ended in the destruction of Jerusalem.

2. Character:

Nero ranks with Gaius for folly and vice, while his cruelties recall the worst years of Tiberius. Very effeminate in his tastes, particular about the arrangement of his hair and proud of his voice, his greatest fault was inordinate vanity which courted applause for performances on non-Roman lines. He neglected his high office and degraded Roman gravitas by zeal for secondary pursuits. Nero, like his three

predecessors, was very susceptible to female charms. He was licentious in the extreme, even to guilt of that nameless vice of antiquity—love of a male favorite. His cruelty, both directly and through his instruments, made the latter part of his reign as detestable as the quinquennium had been golden. He loved the extravagant and luxurious in every exaggerated form. He was a weakling and a coward in his life, and especially in his death. Of his personal appearance we are told his features were regular and good; the expression of his countenance, however, was somewhat repelling. His frame was ill proportioned—slender legs and big stomach. In later years his face was covered with pimples.

V. "Nero Redivivus."

It seems as if there was something lovable even about this monster, which led a freedman to remain faithful to the last, and his two old nurses and cast-off concubine to care affectionately for his remains, and for a long time there were not wanting hands to strew his grave with spring and autumn flowers and to display his effigy (Suet. lvii). But, whether from the strange circumstances of his death, or the subsequent terrible confusion in the Roman world, or from whatever cause, there soon arose a belief that Nero had not really died, but was living somewhere in retirement or had fled among the Parthians, and that he was destined in a short time to return and bring great calamity upon his enemies or the world (quasi viventis et brevi magno inimicorum malo reversuri: Suetonius lvii). This belief was a force among the Parthians who were ready to take up arms at the report of a pseudo-Nero (Tacitus, History i.2). In the confusion of the year of the four emperors, Greece and Asia were disturbed by the report of the advent of Nero (Tac. Hist. ii.8), and the historian promises to mention the fortune and attempts of other pseudo-Neros. This belief was taken up by the Jews and amalgamated with their legend of Antichrist. In Ascension of Isaiah 4 (1st century AD), the Antichrist is clearly identified with Nero: "Belial shall appear in the shape of a man, the king of wickedness, the matricide." It occurs again and again in both the Jewish and Christian sections of the Sib Or (3:66 ff; 4:117 f, 135 ff; 5:100 f, 136 f, 216 f). How far Nero was regarded by the Christians as the historical personage of Antichrist is a disputed point. That the common belief of the revival or advent of Nero should influence contemporary Christian thought in days of social and political turmoil is highly probable. Bousset (Commentary) regards the beast of Re 13 as Rome, and the smitten head whose "deathstroke was healed" as Nero, and some scholars take Re 17:10 f as referring to Nero. The "scarlet-colored beast" of 17:3 may be intended either for the Roman government in general or for Nero in particular. That the number 666 (Re 13:18) represents in Hebrew letters the numerical equivalent of Neron Kesar is significant, for the Jewish Christians would be familiar with gemaTriya’ (the numerical equivalent of names). See NUMBER. Compare Farrar, Early Days, chapter xxviii, . section 5. In later times the idea of a twofold Antichrist seems to have arisen—one for the Jews and one for the Gentiles; compare especially Commodian, Carm. Apol. (926): "to us Nero became Antichrist, to the Jews the other" (nobis Nero factus Antichristus, ille Judaeis). There was an alternate theory that Nero had really been killed, but that he would rise again (Sib Or 5:216 f; Augustine, De Civ. Dei, xx.19: unde nonnulli ipsum resurrecturum et futurum Antichristum suspicantur).

VI. Nero and Christianity.

1. Nero and the New Testament:

The name Nero does not occur in the New Testament, but he was the Caesar to whom Paul appealed (Ac 25:11) and at whose tribunal Paul was tried after his first imprisonment. It is quite likely that Nero heard Paul's case in person, for the emperor showed much interest in provincial cases. It was during the earlier "golden quinquennium" of Nero's reign that Paul addressed his epistle to the Christians at Rome, and probably in the last year of Nero's reign (68 AD) Paul suffered death near the city, though Harnack (Chronologie) places his death in the first Neronian persecution of 64. Although the New Testament gives no hint of a possible visit or sojourn of Peter in Rome, such a sojourn and subsequent martyrdom are highly probable and almost certain from the early persistent tradition, especially in Clement of Rome, Ignatius and Papias, and later in Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and the Liber Pontificalis (catalogue of popes). His execution at Rome under Nero is practically certain.

2. Neronian Policy and Christianity:

The first persecution to which Christianity was subjected came from the Jews: the first heathen persecution took place under Nero. Up to this time the Roman government had been on friendly terms with Christianity, as Christianity was either not prominent enough to cause any disturbance of society or was confounded by the Romans with Judaism (sub umbraculo licitae Judeorum religionis: Tertullian, Apol., xxi). Paul, writing to the Christians of the capital, urged them to "be in subjection to the higher powers" as "ordained of God" (Ro 13:1), and his high estimation of the Roman government as power for the good of society was probably enhanced by his mild captivity at Rome which permitted him to carry on the work of preaching and was terminated by an acquittal on the first trial (accepting the view of a first acquittal and subsequent activity before condemnation at a second trial). But soon, whether because of the trial of Paul, a Roman citizen, at Rome (about 63), or the growing hostility of the Jews, or the increasing numbers and alarming progress of the new religion, the distinction between Christianity and Judaism became apparent to the Roman authorities. If it had not yet been proscribed as a religio illicita ("'unlicensed religion"), neither had it been admitted as a religio licita. Christianity was not in itself as yet a crime; its adherents were not liable to persecution "for the name." According to one view the Neronian persecution was a spasmodic act and an isolated incident in imperial policy: the Christians were on this occasion put forward merely to remove suspicion from Nero. They were not persecuted either as Christians or as incendiaries, but on account of flagitia and odium humani generis, i.e. Thyestean feasts, Oedipodean incest and nightly orgies were attributed to them, and their withdrawal from society and exclusive manners caused the charge of "hatred for society." The evidence of Tacitus (Ann. xv.44) would bear out this view of the Neronian persecution as accidental, isolated, to satisfy the revenge of the mob, confined to Rome and of brief duration. The other view is, however, preferable, as represented by Ramsay (Church in the Roman Empire, chapter xi) and E. G. Hardy (Studies in Roman History, chapter iv). Suetonius speaks of the persecution of Christians as a permanent police regulation in a list of other seemingly permanent measures (Nero xvi: afflicti suppliciis Christiani genus hominum superstitionis novae ac maleficae), which is not inconsistent with the account of Tacitus—who gives the initial step and Suetonius the permanent result. The Christians by these trials, though not convicted of incendiarism, were brought into considerable prominence; their unsocial and exclusive manners, their withdrawal from the duties of state, their active proselytism, together with the charges of immorality, established them in Roman eyes as the enemies of society. Christianity thus became a crime and was

banned by the police authorities. Suetonius gives a "brief statement of the permanent administrative principle into which Nero's action ultimately resolved itself" (Ramsay, op. cit., 232). No formal law needed to be passed, the matter could be left with the prefect of the city. A trial must be held and the flagitia proved before an order for execution, according to Ramsay, but Hardy holds that henceforth the name itself—nomen ipsum—was proscribed. A precedent was now established of great importance in the policy of the imperial government toward Christianity (see, further, ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY). There ls no reason to suppose that the Neronian persecution of 64 AD extended beyond Rome to the provinces, though no doubt the attitude of the home government must have had considerable influence with provincial officers. Paul seems to have gone undisturbed, or at least with no unusual obstacles, in his evangelization after his acquittal. The authorities for a general Neronian persecution and formal Neronian laws against Christianity are late; compare Orosius (History vii.7, "(Nero) was the first to put to death Christians at Rome and gave orders that they should be subjected to the same persecution throughout all the provinces").

LITERATURE.

(a) Ancient:

Tacitus Annals xii-xvi; Suetonius Nero; Dio Cassius in Epit. of Xiphilinus 61 ff; Zonaras xi.

(b) Modern:

Hermann Schiller, Geschichte des rom. Kaiserreichs unter der Regierung des Neron (Berlin, 1872); Merivale, Hist of the Romans under the Empire; Ramsay, Church in the Roman Empire and The Expositor, 1893; E.G. Hardy, Christianity and the Roman Government and Studies in Roman History; Mommsen, "Der Religionsfrevel nach rom. Recht," Histor. Zeitschr., 1890; C. F. Arnold, Die Neronische Christenverfolgung; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity; Baring-Gould, Tragedy of the Caesars: G.H. Lewes, "Was Nero a Monster?" in Cornhill Magazine, July, 1863; B.W. Henderson, Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero, with important bibliography of ancient and modern authorities (London, 1903); Lehmann, Claudius u. Nero.

S. Angus

NEST

(qen; neossia, nossia; in the New Testament kataskenosis; Latin nidus): A receptacle prepared by a bird for receiving its eggs and young. Nests differ with species. Eagles use a large heap of coarse sticks and twigs on the cleft of a mountain (Job 39:27 ff; Jer 49:16; Ob 1:4); hawks prefer trees; vultures, hollow trees or the earth; ravens, big trees; doves and pigeons, trees or rocky crevices (Jer 48:28); hoopoes, hollow trees; swallows, mud nests under a roof, on cliffs or deserted temples; owls, hollow trees, dark places in ruins or sand burrows (on the qippoz of Isa 34:15 see OWL); cranes, storks and herons, either trees (Ps 104:17) or rushes beside water (storks often choose housetops, as well).

Each nest so follows the building laws of its owner's species that any expert ornithologist can tell from a nest which bird builded it. Early in incubation a bird deserts a nest readily because it hopes to build another in a place not so easily discoverable and where it can deposit more eggs. When the young have progressed until their quickening is perceptible through the thin shells pressed against the breast of the mother, she develops a boldness called by scientists the "brooding fever." In this state the wildest of birds frequently will suffer your touch before deserting the nest. Especially is this the case if the young are just on the point of emerging. The first Biblical reference to the nest of a bird will be found in Balaam's fourth prophecy in Nu 24:21: "And he looked on the Kenite, and took up his parable and said, Strong is thy dwelling-place, and thy nest is set in the rock." Here Balaam was thinking of the nest of an eagle, hawk or vulture, placed on solid rock among impregnable crags of mountain tops. The next reference is among the laws for personal conduct in De 22:6: "If a bird's nest chance to be before thee in the way, in any tree or on the ground, with young ones or eggs, and the dam sitting upon the young, or upon the eggs, thou shalt not take the dam with the young." Beyond question this is the earliest law on record for the protection of a brooding bird. It is probable that it was made permissible to take the young, as the law demanded their use, at least in the case of pigeons and doves, for sacrifice. In Job 29:18, Job cries,

"Then I said, I shall die in my nest,

And I shall multiply my days as the sand:"

that is, he hoped in his days of prosperity to die in the home he had builded for his wife and children. In Ps 84:3 David sings,

"Yea, the sparrow hath found her a house,

And the swallow a nest for herself,

where she may lay her young,

Even thine altars, O Yahweh of hosts,

My King, and my God."

These lines are rich and ripe with meaning, for in those days all the world protected a temple nest, even to the infliction of the death penalty on anyone interfering with it. This was because the bird was supposed to be claiming the protection of the gods. Hebrew, Arab and Egyptian guarded all nests on places of worship. Pagan Rome executed the shoemaker who killed a raven that built on a temple, and Athens took the same revenge on the man who destroyed the nest of a swallow. Isaiah compared the destruction of Assyria to the robbing of a bird's nest: "And my hand hath found as a nest the riches of the peoples; and as one gathereth eggs that are forsaken, have I gathered all the earth: and there was

none that moved the wing, or that opened the mouth, or chirped" (Isa 10:14; compare Isa 16:2). Matthew quotes Jesus as having said, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head" (Mt 8:20 equals Lu 9:58). Gene Stratton-Porter

NET

See FISHING; FOWLER.

NETAIM

na'-ta-im, ne'-ta-im, ne-ta'-im neTa'im; Codex Vaticanus Azaeim; Codex Alexandrinus Ataeim): In 1Ch 4:23 the King James Version reads "those that dwell among plants and hedges," the Revised Version (British and American) "the inhabitants of Netaim and Gederah." The latter may be taken as correct. Gederah was in the Judean Shephelah. Here also we should seek for Netaim; but no likely identification has yet been suggested.

NETHANEL

ne-than'-el, neth'-a-nel (nethan'el, "God has given"; Nathanael; the King James Version Nethaneel, ne-than'-e-el):

(1) A chief or prince of Issachar (Nu 1:8; 2:5; 7:18,23; 10:15).

(2) The 4th son of Jesse (1Ch 2:14).

(3) One of the trumpet-blowers before the ark when it was brought up from the house of Obededom (1Ch 15:24).

(4) A Levite scribe, the father of Shemaiah (1Ch 24:6).

(5) The 5th son of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:4).

(6) One of the princes whom Jehoshaphat sent to teach in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:7).

(7) A Levite who gave cattle for Josiah's Passover (2Ch 35:9).

(8) One of the priests who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:22; compare RAPC 1Es 9:22).

(9) A priest registered under the high priest Joiakim (Ne 12:21).

(10) A Levite musician who assisted at the dedication of the walls (Ne 12:36).

John A. Lees

NETHANIAH

neth-a-ni’-a (nethanyahu, "Yah has given"; Nathanias):

(1) An Asaphite musician (1Ch 25:2,12).

(2) A Levite who accompanied the princes sent by Jehoshaphat to teach in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:8).

(3) The father of Jehudi (Jer 36:14).

(4) The father of Ishmael, the murderer of Gedaliah (Jer 40:8,14,15; 41:11; 2Ki 25:23,25). Some manuscripts of Septuagint read here Maththanias.

NETHINIM

neth’-i-nim (nethinim, "given"; Natheineim; the King James Version Nethinims):

1. Meaning:

A group of temple-servants (1Ch 9:2 and 16 times in Ezra and Nehemiah). The word has always the article, and does not occur in the singular. The Septuagint translators usually transliterate, but in one passage (1Ch 9:2) they render, "the given ones" (hoi dedomenoi). The Syriac (Peshitta) also, in Ezra, Nehemiah, transliterates the word, but in 1Ch 9:2 renders it by a word meaning "sojourners." The meaning "given" is suggestive of a state of servitude, and Josephus seems to confirm the suggestion by calling the Nethinim "temple-slaves" (hierodouloi) (Ant., XI, v, 1). It should, however, be noted that another form of this word is employed in the directions regarding the Levites: "Thou shalt give the Levites unto Aaron and to his sons: they are wholly given unto him on behalf of the children of Israel" (Nu 3:9; compare also Nu 8:16,19).

2. History:

Of the history of the Nethinim in earlier times there are but few and uncertain traces. When Joshua discovered that he had been beguiled by the Gibeonites into a covenant to let them live, he reduced their tribe to servitude, and declared, "Now therefore ye are cursed, and there shall never fail to be of you bondsmen, both hewers of wood and drawers of water for the house of my God" (Jos 9:23,27). It is no doubt tempting to see in the Gibeonites the earliest Nethinim, but another tradition traces their origin to a gift of David and the princes for the service of the Levites (Ezr 8:20). Their names, too, indicate

diversity of origin; for besides being mostly un-Hebrew in aspect, some of them are found elsewhere in the Old Testament as names of non-Israelitish tribes. The Meunim, for example (Ezr 2:50 equals Ne 7:52), are in all likelihood descended from the Meonites or Maonites who are mentioned as harassing Israel (Jud 10:12), as in conflict with the Simeonites (1Ch 4:41), and as finally overcome by Uzziah (2Ch 26:7). The next name in the lists is that of the children of Nephisim. These may be traced to the Hagrite clan of Naphish (Ge 25:15; 1Ch 5:19). In both Ezra and Nehemiah, the list is immediately followed by that of the servants of Solomon, whose duties were similar to, it may be even humbler than, those of the Nethinim. These servants of Solomon appear to be descendants of the Canaanites whom Solomon employed in the building of his temple (1Ki 5:15). All these indications are perhaps slight; but they point in the same direction, and warrant the assumption that the Nethinim were originally foreign slaves, mostly prisoners of war, who had from time to time been given to the temple by the kings and princes of the nation, and that to them were assigned the lower menial duties of the house of God.

3. Post-exilic History:

At the time of the return from the exile the Nethinim had come to be regarded as important. Their number was considerable: 392 accompanied Zerubbabel at the first Return in 538 BC (Ezr 2:58 equals Ne 7:60). When Ezra, some 80 years later, organized the second Return, he secured a contingent of Nethinim numbering 220 (Ezr 8:20). In Jerusalem they enjoyed the same privileges and immunities as the other religious orders, being included by Artaxerxes' letter to Ezra among those who should be exempt from toll, custom and tribute (Ezr 7:24). A part of the city in Ophel, opposite the Water-gate, was assigned them as an official residence (Ne 3:26,31), and the situation is certainly appropriate if their duties at all resembled those of the Gibeonites (see Ryle, "Ezra and Nehemiah," in Cambridge Bible, Intro, 57). They were also organized into a kind of guild under their own leaders or presidents (Ne 11:21).

The Nethinim are not again mentioned in Scripture. It is probable that they, with the singers and porters, became gradually incorporated in the general body of Levites; their name passed ere long into a tradition, and became at a later time a butt for the scorn and bitterness of the Talmudic writers against everything that they regarded as un-Jewish.

John A. Lees

NETOPHAH

ne-to'-fa (neTophah; Septuagint Netopha, Nephota, and other variants): The birthplace of two of David's heroes, Maharai and Heleb (2Sa 23:28,29), also of Seraiah the son of Tanhumeth the Netophathite, one of the captains who came to offer allegiance to Gedaliah (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:8). "The villages of the Netophathites" are mentioned (1Ch 9:16) as the dwellings of certain Levites and (Ne 12:28, the King James Version "Netophathi") of certain "sons of the singers."

The first mention of the place itself is in Ezr 2:22; Ne 7:26; RAPC 1Es 5:18 (the Revised Version

(British and American) "Netophas"), where we have parallel lists of the exiles returning from Babylon under Zerubbabel; the place is mentioned between Bethlehem and Anathoth and in literary association with other cities in the mountains of Judah, e.g. Gibeon, Kiriath-jearim, Chephereh and Beeroth. In this respect it is most plausible to identify it with NEPHTOAH (which see), although the disappearance of the terminal guttural in the latter creates a difficulty. Conder has suggested a site known as Khirbet UmmToba, Northeast of Bethlehem, an ancient site, but not apparently of great importance. Beit Nettif, an important village on a lofty site in the Shephelah near the "Vale of Elah," also appears to have an echo of the name, and indeed may well be the Beth Netophah of the Mishna (Shebhu‘oth, ix.5; Neubauer, Geogr., 128), but the position does not seem to agree at all with that of the Old Testament Netophah. For Khirbet Umm-Toba see Palestine Exploration Fund, III, 128; for Beit Nettif, Palestine Exploration Fund, III, 24; RBR, II, 17 f; both Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

NETOPHAS

ne-to’-fas (Codex Vaticanus Netebas; Codex Alexandrinus Netophae): A town named in 1 Esdras 5:18, identical with "Netophah" of Ezr 2:22; Ne 7:26.

NETOPHATHI; NETOPHATHITES

ne-tof’-a-thi, ne-tof’-a-thits.

See NETOPHAH.

NETTLES

net’-’lz: (1) charul, (Job 30:7; Pr 24:31; Ze 2:9 margin, in all, "wild vetches"); the translation "nettles" is due to the supposed derivations of charul from an (obsolete) charal, meaning "to be sharp" or "stinging," but a translation "thorns" (as in Vulgate) would in that case do as well. Septuagint has phrugana agria, "wild brushwood," in Job, and certainly the association with the "saltwort" and the retm, "broom," in the passage would best be met by the supposition that it means the low thorny bushes plentiful in association with these plants. "Vetch" is suggested by the Aramaic, but is very uncertain. (2) qimmosh (Isa 34:13; Ho 9:6), and plural qimmeshonim (Pr 24:31), translated (English Versions of the Bible) "thorns," because of the translation of charul as "nettles" in the same verse From Isa 34:13 qimmosh is apparently distinct from thorns, and the translation "nettle" is very probable, as such neglected or deserted places as described in the three references readily become overgrown with nettles in Palestine The common and characteristic Palestine nettle is the Urtica pilulifera, so called from the globular heads of its flowers.

E. W. G. Masterman

NETWORK

net’-wurk (sebhakhah): the Revised Version (British and American) in 2Ki 25:17; 2Ch 4:13 (also in the plural, 4:12,13), for "wreathen work" and "wreath" in the King James Version (of the adornment of the capitals of the pillars of Solomon’s temple; see JACHIN AND BOAZ). "Networks" in Isa 19:9 is in the Revised Version (British and American) correctly rendered "white cloth." In the American Standard Revised Version "network" is substituted for "pictures" in the King James Version (Pr 25:11), "baskets" in the English Revised Version margin "filigree work."

NEW BIRTH

See REGENERATION.

NEW COMMANDMENT

See BROTHERLY LOVE.

NEW COVENANT

See COVENANT, THE NEW.

NEW EARTH

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; HEAVENS, NEW.

NEW HEAVENS

See HEAVENS, NEW.

NEW JERUSALEM

See JERUSALEM, NEW; REVELATION OF JOHN.

NEW MAN

See MAN.

NEW MOON

See MOON, NEW; FASTS AND FEASTS.

NEW TESTAMENT

See BIBLE; CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; CRITICISM.

NEW TESTAMENT CANON

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE

See LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

See TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

NEW YEAR

See TIME; YEAR.

NEW; NEWNESS

nu, nu’-nes (chadhash; kainos, neos):

1. In the Old Testament:

The word commonly translated "new" in the Old Testament is chadhash, "bright," "fresh," "new" (special interest was shown in, and importance attached to, fresh and new things and events); Ex 1:8; De 20:5; 22:8; 24:5; 1Sa 6:7; 2Sa 21:16; Ps 33:3, "a new song"; Jer 31:31, "new covenant"; Eze 11:19, "a new spirit"; 18:31 "new heart"; 36:26, etc.; chodhesh is "the new moon," "the new-moon day," the first of the lunar month, a festival, then "month" (Ge 29:14, "a month of days"); it occurs frequently, often translated "month"; we have "new moon" (1Sa 20:5,18,24, etc.); tirosh is "new (sweet) wine" (Ne 10:39; Joe 1:5; 3:18, it is ‘asis, the Revised Version (British and American) "sweet wine"); in Ac 2:13, "new wine" is gleukos.

Other words in the Old Testament for "new" are chadhath, Aramaic (Ezr 6:4); Tari, "fresh" (Jud 15:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "a fresh jawbone of an ass"); beri’ah, a "creation" (Nu 16:30, "if Yahweh make a new thing," the Revised Version margin "create a creation"); bakhar, "to be first-fruits" (Eze 47:12; so the Revised Version margin); qum, "setting," is translated "newly" (Jud 7:19);

also miqqarobh, "recently" (De 32:17, the Revised Version (British and American) "of late "); news is shermu‘ah, "report," "tidings"; Pr 25:25, "good news from a far country."

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament "new" (mostly kainos, "new," "fresh," "newly made") is an important word. We have the title of the "New Testament" itself, rightly given by the American Standard Revised Version as "New Covenant," the designation of "the new dispensation" ushered in through Christ, the writings relating to which the volume contains. We have "new covenant" (kainos) in Lu 22:20, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (the English Revised Version margin "testament"; in Mt 26:28; Mr 14:24, "new" is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American), but in Matthew the margin "many ancient authorities insert new," and in Mark "some ancient authorities"); 1Co 11:25, the English Revised Version margin "or testament"; 2Co 3:6, the English Revised Version margin "or testament"; Heb 8:8, the English Revised Version margin "or testament"; in 8:13, "covenant" is supplied (compare Heb 12:24, neos).

Corresponding to this, we have (2Co 5:17, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), "The old things have passed away; behold, they are become new": ibid., "If any man is in Christ, he is a new creature," the Revised Version margin "there is a new creation"; Ga 6:15, margin "or creation," "new man" (Eph 2:15; 4:24; Col 3:10 (neos)); "new commandment" (Joh 13:34); "new doctrine" (Ac 17:19); "new thing" (Ac 17:21); "newness of life" (kainotes) (Ro 6:4); "newness of the spirit" (Ro 7:6; compare 2Co 5:17); "a new name," (Re 2:17; 3:12), "new heavens and a new earth" (2Pe 3:13); "new Jerusalem" (Re 3:12; 21:2); "new song" (Re 5:9); compare "new friend" and "new wine" (Sirach 9:10b, c); artigennetos, "newborn" (1Pe 2:2); prosphatos, "newly slain," "new" (Heb 10:20, the Revised Version (British and American) "a new and living way, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh"; compare Sirach 9:10a; Judith 4:3); "new" is the translation of neos, "new," "young" (1Co 5:7; Col 3:10; "new man"; Heb 12:24, "new covenant").

The difference in meaning between kainos and neos, is, in the main, that kainos denotes new in respect of quality, "the new as set over against that which has seen service, the outworn, the effete, or marred through age"; neos, "new (in respect of time), that which has recently come into existence," e.g. kainon mnemeion, the "new tomb" in which Jesus was laid, was not one recently made, but one in which no other dead had ever lain; the "new covenant," the "new man," etc., may be contemplated under both aspects of quality and of time (Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament, 209 f).

In Mt 9:16; Mr 2:21, agnaphos, "unsmoothed," "unfinished," is translated "new," "new cloth," the Revised Version (British and American) "undressed." For "new bottles" (Lu 5:38 and parallels), the Revised Version (British and American) has "fresh wine-skins."

W. L. Walker

NEZIAH

ne-zi’-a (netsiach): The head of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2:54; Ne 7:56), called in 1 Esdras 5:32, "Nasi" (the King James Version and the Revised Version margin "Nasith").

NEZIB

ne’-zib (netsibh; Codex Vaticanus Naseib; Codex Alexandrinus Nesib): A town in the Judean Shephelah, mentioned along with Keilah and Mareshah (Jos 15:43). Eusebius, Onomasticon, places it 7 miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin), on the road to Hebron. It is represented today by Beit Nasib, a village with ancient remains some 2 miles Southwest of Khirbet Kila (Keilah).

NIBHAZ

nib’-haz (nibhchaz): Given as the name of an idol of the Avvites, introduced by them into Samaria (2Ki 17:31), but otherwise unknown. The text is supposed to be corrupt.

NIBSHAN

nib’-shan (ha-nibhshan; Codex Vaticanus Naphlazon; Codex Alexandrinus Nebsan): A city in the Judean wilderness named between Secacah and the City of Salt (Jos 15:62). Eusebius, Onomasticon, knows the place but gives no clue to its identification. The site has not been recovered. Wellhausen suggests the emendation of nibhshan to kibhshan, "furnace" (Proleg. 2, 344).

NICANOR (1)

ni-ka’-nor, ni’-ka-nor (Nikanor): The son of Patroclus and one of the king’s "chief friends" (2 Macc 8:9), a Syrian general under Antiochus Epiphanes and Demetrius Soter. After the defeat of Seron by Judas, Epiphanes entrusted his chancellor Lysias with the reduction of Judea (1 Macc 3:34 ff). Nicanor was one of the three generals commissioned by Lysias—the others being Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, and Gorgias (1 Macc 3:38). The campaign began in 166 BC; the Syrians were defeated at Emmaus (1 Macc 3:57 ff), while Gorgias at a later stage gained a victory at Jamnia over a body of Jews who disobeyed Judas (1 Macc 5:58). The account given in 2 Macc differs considerably, both in omissions and in additions (2 Macc 8:9 ff). There Nicanor, not Gorgias, is the chief in command. The battle of Emmaus is not mentioned, but "the thrice-accursed Nicanor," having in overweening pride invited a thousand slavedealers to accompany him to buy the Jewish captives, was humiliated, and his host was destroyed, he himself escaping "like a fugitive slave" to Antioch (2 Macc 8:34 f). After the death of Epiphanes, Eupator and Lysias (the last two at the hands of Demetrius (1 Macc 7:2)), Nicanor appears again under King Demetrius in the struggle between Alcimus and Judas. Alcimus, having been seated in the priesthood by Demetrius’ officer Bacchides, could not hold it against Judas and the patriots. He appealed again to Demetrius, who this time selected Nicanor, now governor of Cyprus (2 Macc 12:2) and known for his deadly hatred of the Jews, to settle the dispute and slay Judas (2 Macc 14:12 ff; 1 Macc 7:26 ff). Nicanor was appointed governor of Judea on this occasion. Again 1 and 2 Maccabees differ. According

to 1 Maccabees, Nicanor sought in vain to seize Judas by treachery. Then followed the battle of Capharsalama ("village of peace"), in which the Syrians were defeated, though Josephus (Ant., XII, x, 5) says Judas was defeated. Nicanor retired to Jerusalem, insulted the priests and threatened the destruction of the temple unless they delivered up Judas. He then retired to Beth-horon to find Judas posted opposite him at Adasa (1 Macc 7:39 ff) 3 1/2 miles distant. Here on the 13th of the 12th month Adar (March), 161 BC, the Syrians sustained a crushing defeat, Nicanor himself being the first to fall. The Jews cut off his head and proud right hand and hanged them up beside Jerusalem. For a little while Adasa gave the land of Judah rest. The people ordained to keep this "day of great gladness" year by year—the 13th of Adar, "the day before the day of Mordecai" (Feast of Purim). 2 Maccabees mentions that Simon, Judas' brother, was worsted in a first engagement (14:17), omits the battle of Capharsalama, and represents Nicanor, struck with the manliness of the Jews, as entering into friendly relations with Judas, urging him to marry and lead a quiet life, forgetful of the king's command until Alcimus accused him to Demetrius. The latter peremptorily ordered Nicanor to bring Judas in all haste as prisoner to Antioch (14:27). The scene of the final conflict (Adasa) is given only as "in the region of Samaria" (15:1). According to this account, it was Judas who ordered the mutilation of Nicanor and in a more gruesome fashion (15:30 ff). It is possible that the Nicanor, the Cypriarch or governor of Cyprus of 2 Macc 12:2, is a different person from Nicanor, the son of Patroclus—a view not accepted in the above account.

S. Angus

NICANOR (2)

(Nikanor): One of "the seven" chosen to superintend "the daily ministration" of the poor of the Christian community at Jerusalem (Ac 6:5). The name is Greek.eral under Antiochus Epiphanes and Demetrius Soter. After the defeat of Seron by Judas, Epiphanes entrusted his chancellor Lysias with the reduction of Judea (1 Macc 3:34 ff). Nicanor was one of the three generals commissioned by Lysias—the others being Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, and Gorgias (1 Macc 3:38). The campaign began in 166 BC; the Syrians were defeated at Emmaus (1 Macc 3:57 ff), while Gorgias at a later stage gained a victory at Jamnia over a body of Jews who disobeyed Judas (1 Macc 5:58). The account given in 2 Macc differs considerably, both in omissions and in additions (2 Macc 8:9 ff). There Nicanor, not Gorgias, is the chief in command. The battle of Emmaus is not mentioned, but "the thrice-accursed Nicanor," having in overweening pride invited a thousand slavedealers to accompany him to buy the Jewish captives, was humiliated, and his host was destroyed, he himself escaping "like a fugitive slave" to Antioch (2 Macc 8:34 f). After the death of Epiphanes, Eupator and Lysias (the last two at the hands of Demetrius (1 Macc 7:2)), Nicanor appears again under King Demetrius in the struggle between Alcimus and Judas. Alcimus, having been seated in the priesthood by Demetrius' officer Bacchides, could not hold it against Judas and the patriots. He appealed again to Demetrius, who this time selected Nicanor, now governor of Cyprus (2 Macc 12:2) and known for his deadly hatred of the Jews, to settle the dispute and slay Judas (2 Macc 14:12 ff; 1 Macc 7:26 ff). Nicanor was appointed governor of Judea on this occasion. Again 1 and 2 Maccabees differ. According to 1 Maccabees, Nicanor sought in vain to seize Judas by treachery. Then followed the battle of Capharsalama ("village of peace"), in which the Syrians were defeated, though Josephus (Ant., XII, x, 5) says Judas was defeated. Nicanor retired to Jerusalem, insulted the priests and threatened the destruction of the temple unless they delivered up Judas. He then retired to

Beth-horon to find Judas posted opposite him at Adasa (1 Macc 7:39 ff) 3 1/2 miles distant. Here on the 13th of the 12th month Adar (March), 161 BC, the Syrians sustained a crushing defeat, Nicanor himself being the first to fall. The Jews cut off his head and proud right hand and hanged them up beside Jerusalem. For a little while Adasa gave the land of Judah rest. The people ordained to keep this "day of great gladness" year by year—the 13th of Adar, "the day before the day of Mordecai" (Feast of Purim). 2 Maccabees mentions that Simon, Judas' brother, was worsted in a first engagement (14:17), omits the battle of Capharsalama, and represents Nicanor, struck with the manliness of the Jews, as entering into friendly relations with Judas, urging him to marry and lead a quiet life, forgetful of the king's command until Alcimus accused him to Demetrius. The latter peremptorily ordered Nicanor to bring Judas in all haste as prisoner to Antioch (14:27). The scene of the final conflict (Adasa) is given only as "in the region of Samaria" (15:1). According to this account, it was Judas who ordered the mutilation of Nicanor and in a more gruesome fashion (15:30 ff). It is possible that the Nicanor, the Cypriarch or governor of Cyprus of 2 Macc 12:2, is a different person from Nicanor, the son of Patroclus—a view not accepted in the above account.

NICODEMUS

nik-o-de'-mus (Nikodemos): A Pharisee and a "ruler of the Jews," mentioned only by John. He

(1) interviewed Christ at Jerusalem and was taught by Him the doctrine of the New Birth (Joh 3:1-15),

(2) defended Him before the Sanhedrin (Joh 7:50-52), and

(3) assisted at His burial (Joh 19:39-42).

1. The Interview:

This meeting, which it has been surmised took place in the house of John (Joh 3:1-15), was one of the results of our Lord's ministry at Jerusalem during the first Passover (compare Joh 3:2 with Joh 2:23). Although Nicodemus had been thus won to believe in the divine nature of Christ's mission, his faith was yet very incomplete in that he believed Him to be inspired only after the fashion of the Old Testament prophets. To this faint-hearted faith corresponded his timidity of action, which displayed itself in his coming "by night," lest he should offend his colleagues in the Sanhedrin and the other hostile Jews (Joh 3:2). In answer to the veiled question which the words of Nicodemus implied, and to convince him of the inadequacy of mere intellectual belief, Christ proclaimed to him the necessity for a spiritual regeneration: "Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (Joh 3:3). This was interpreted by Nicodemus only in its materialistic sense, and therefore caused him bewilderment and confusion (Joh 3:4). But Christ, as on another occasion when dealing with His questioners on a similar point of doctrine (compare Joh 6:52,53), answered his perplexity only by repeating His previous statement (Joh 3:5). He then proceeded to give further explanation. The re-birth is not outward but inward, it is not of the body but of the soul (Joh 3:6). Just as God is the real agent in the birth of the body, so also is He the Creator of the New Spirit; and just as no one knoweth whence cometh the wind,

or "whither it goeth," yet all can feel its effects who come under its influence, so is it with the rebirth. Only those who have experienced it as a change in themselves, wrought by the Divine Power, are qualified to judge either of its reality or of its effects (Joh 3:7,8). But Nicodemus, since such experience had not yet been his, remained still unenlightened (Joh 3:9). Christ therefore condemned such blindness in one who yet professed to be a teacher of spiritual things (Joh 3:10), and emphasized the reality in His own life of those truths which He had been expounding (Joh 3:11). With this, Christ returned to the problem underlying the first statement of Nicodemus. If Nicodemus cannot believe in "earthly things," i. e. in the New Birth, which, though coming from above, is yet realized in this world, how can he hope to understand "heavenly things," i.e. the deeper mysteries of God's purpose in sending Christ into the world (Joh 3:12), of Christ's Divine sonship (Joh 3:13), of His relationship to the atonement and the salvation of man (Joh 3:14), and of how a living acceptance of and feeding upon Him is in itself Divine life (Joh 3:15; compare Joh 6:25-65)?

2. The Defense:

The above interview, though apparently fruitless at the time, was not without its effect upon Nicodemus. At the Feast of Tabernacles, when the Sanhedrin was enraged at Christ's proclamation of Himself as the "living water" (Joh 7:37,38), Nicodemus was emboldened to stand up in His defense. Yet here also he showed his natural timidity. He made no personal testimony of his faith in Christ, but sought rather to defend Him on a point of Jewish law (Joh 7:50-52; compare Ex 23:1; De 1:16,17; 17:6; 19:15).

3. The Burial:

By this open act of reverence Nicodemus at last made public profession of his being of the following of Christ. His wealth enabled him to provide the "mixture of myrrh and aloes, about a hundred pounds," with which the body of Jesus was embalmed (Joh 19:39).

The Gospel of Nicodemus and other apocryphal works narrate that Nicodemus gave evidence in favor of Christ at the trial before Pilate, that he was deprived of office and banished from Jerusalem by the hostile Jews, and that he was baptized by Peter and John. His remains were said to have been found in a common grave along with those of Gamaliel and Stephen.

Nicodemus is a type of the "well-instructed and thoughtful Jew who looked for the consummation of national hope to follow in the line along which he had himself gone, as being a continuation and not a new beginning" (Westcott). The manner in which the Gospel narrative traces the overcoming of his natural timidity and reluctant faith is in itself a beautiful illustration of the working of the Spirit, of how belief in the Son of Man is in truth a new birth, and the entrance into eternal life.

C. M. Kerr

NICODEMUS, GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, 3, (b).

NICOLAITANS

nik-o-la’-i-tanz Nikolaitai):

1. The Sect:

A sect or party of evil influence in early Christianity, especially in the 7 churches of Asia. Their doctrine was similar to that of Balaam, "who taught Balak to cast a stumblingblock before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols, and to commit fornication" (Re 2:14,15). Their practices were strongly condemned by John, who praised the church in Ephesus for "hating their works" (Re 2:6), and blamed the church in Pergamum for accepting in some measure their teaching (Re 2:15). Except that reference is probably made to their influence in the church at Thyatira also, where their leader was "the woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess" (Re 2:20; compare Re 2:14), no further direct information regarding them is given in Scripture.

2. References:

Reference to them is frequent in post-apostolic literature. According to Irenaeus (Adv. Haer., i.26,3; iii.10,7), followed by Hippolytus (Philos., vii.36), they were founded by Nicolaus, the proselyte of Antioch, who was one of the seven chosen to serve at the tables (Ac 6:5). Irenaeus, as also Clement of Alexandria (Strom., ii.20), Tertullian and others, unite in condemning their practices in terms similar to those of John; and reference is also made to their Gnostic tendencies. In explanation of the apparent incongruity of such an immoral sect being founded by one of "good report, full of the Spirit and of wisdom" (compare Ac 6:3), Simcox argues that their lapse may have been due to reaction from original principles of a too rigid asceticism. A theory, started in comparatively modern times, and based in part on the similarity of meaning of the Greek "Nikolaus," and the Hebrew "Balaam," puts forward the view that the two sects referred to under these names were in reality identical. Yet if this were so, it would not have been necessary for John to designate them separately.

3. Nicolaitan Controversy:

The problem underlying the Nicolaitan controversy, though so little direct mention is made of it in Scripture, was in reality most important, and concerned the whole relation of Christianity to paganism and its usages. The Nicolaitans disobeyed the command issued to the Gentilechurches, by the apostolic council held at Jerusalem in 49-50 AD, that they should refrain from the eating of "things sacrificed to idols" (Ac 15:29). Such a restriction, though seemingly hard, in that it prevented the Christian communities from joining in public festivals, and so brought upon them suspicion and dislike, was yet necessary to prevent a return to a pagan laxity of morals. To this danger the Nicolaitans were themselves a glaring witness, and therefore John was justified in condemning them. In writing to the Corinthians, Paul gives warning against the same evil practices, basing his arguments on consideration for the weaker

brethren (compare 1Co 8).

LITERATURE.

Simcox, "Revelation" in the Cambridge Bible; H. Cowan in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), article "Nicolaitans"; H.B. Swete, The Apocalypse of John, lxx ff, 27, 28, 37.

C. M. Kerr

NICOLAUS; NICOLAS

nik-o-la'-us (English Versions of the Bible), nik'-o-las (Nikolaos): One of "the seven" chosen to have the oversight of "the daily ministration" to the poor of the church in Jerusalem (Ac 6:5). He is called "a proselyte of Antioch"; the other 6 were therefore probably Jews by birth. This is the first recorded case of the admission of a proselyte into office in the Christian church. Some of the church Fathers (Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Pseudo-Tertullian) state that he was the founder of the sect called NICOLAITANS (which see) (Re 2:15). Other Fathers seem to suggest that this was a vain claim made by this sect in seeking apostolic authority for their opinions. It may be that the opinions of this sect were an antinomian exaggeration of the preaching of Nicolaus.

S. F. Hunter

NICOPOLIS

ni-kop'-o-lis (Nikopolis): A city in Palestine, half-way between Jaffa and Jerusalem, now called Ammas, mentioned in 1 Macc 3:40,57 and 9:50. The earlier city (Emmaus) was burnt by Quintilius Varus, but was rebuilt in 223 AD as Nicopolis.

The Nicopolis, however, to which Paul urges Titus to come (pros me eis Nikopolin, ekei gar kekrika paracheimasai (Tit 3:12)) is probably the city of that name situated on the southwest promontory of Epirus. If this view is correct, the statement made by some writers that from Eastern Greece (Athens, Thessalonica, Philippi, Corinth) Paul's labors extended to Italy, that he never visited Western Greece, requires modification. It is true that we do not hear of his preaching at Patras, Zacynthus, Cephallenia, Corcyra (the modern Corfu), which, as a way-station to and from Sicily, always held preeminence among the Ionian islands; but there can be little doubt that, if his plan of going to Nicopolis was carried out, he desired to evangelize the province of Epirus (as well Acarnania) in Western Greece. Indeed, it was in this very city of Nicopolis, probably, that he was arrested and taken to Rome for trial—during one of the winters between 64-67 AD.

Nicopolis was situated only a few miles North of the modern Prevesa, the chief city of Epirus today, the city which the Greeks bombarded in 1912 in the hope of wresting it from the Turks. The ancient city was founded by Augustus, whose camp happened to be pitched there the night before the famous fight

with Antony (31 BC). The gulf, called Ambracia in ancient times, is now known as Arta. On the south side was Actium, where the battle was fought. Directly across, only half mile distant, on the northern promontory, was the encampment of Augustus. To commemorate the victory over his antagonist, the Roman emperor built a city on the exact spot where his army had encamped ("Victory City"). On the hill now called Michalitzi, on the site of his own tent, he built a temple to Neptune and instituted games in honor of Apollo, who was supposed to have helped him in the sea-fight. Nicopolis soon became the metropolis of Epirus, with an autonomous constitution, according to Greek custom. But in the time of the emperor Julian (362) the city had fallen into decay, at least in part. It was plundered by the Goths, restored by Justinian, and finally disappeared entirely in the Middle Ages, so far as the records of history show. One document has Nikopolis he nun Prebeza, "Nicopolis], which is now Prebeza." In the time of Augustus, however, Nicopolis was a flourishing town. The emperor concentrated here the population of Aetolia and Acarnania, and made the city a leading member of the Amphictyonic Council. There are considerable ruins of the ancient city, including two theaters, a stadium, an aqueduct, etc.

LITERATURE.

Kuhn, Ueber die Entstehung der staate der Alten.

J. E. Harry

NIGER

ni’-jer (Niger).

See SIMEON, (5).

NIGH

ni.

See NEAR.

NIGHT

nit.

See DAY AND NIGHT for the natural usage and the various terms.

1. In the Old Testament:

Figurative uses: The word "night" (laylah or layil is sometimes used figuratively in the Old Testament.

Thus, Moses compares the brevity of time, the lapse of a thousand years, to "a watch in the night" (Ps 90:4). Adversity is depicted by it in such places as Job 35:10; compare Isa 8:20; Jer 15:9. Disappointment and despair are apparently depicted by it in the "burden of Dumah" (Isa 21:11,12); and spiritual blindness, coming upon the false prophets (Mic 3:6); again sudden and overwhelming confusion (Am 5:8; Isa 59:10 the King James Version, nesheph, "twilight" as in the Revised Version (British and American)).

2. In the New Testament:

On the lips of Jesus (Joh 9:4) it signifies the end of opportunity to labor; repeated in that touching little allegory spoken to His disciples when He was called to the grave of Lazarus (Joh 11:9,10). Paul also uses the figure in reference to the Parousia (Ro 13:12), where "night" seems to refer to the present aeon and "day" to the aeon to come. He also uses it in 1Th 5:5,7 where the status of the redeemed is depicted by "day," that of the unregenerate by "night," again, as the context shows, in reference to the Parousia. In Re 21:25 and 22:5, the passing of the "night" indicates the realization of that to which the Parousia looked forward, the establishment of the kingdom of God forever. See also Delitzsch, Iris, 35.

Henry E. Dosker

NIGHT HAWK

nit'-hok (tachmac, "tachmas"; glaux, but sometimes strouthos, and seirenos; Latin camprimulgus): The Hebrew tachmac means "to tear and scratch the face," so that it is very difficult to select the bird intended by its use. Any member of the eagle, vulture, owl or hawk families driven to desperation would "tear and scratch" with the claws and bite in self-defence. The bird is mentioned only in the lists of abominations (see Le 11:16; De 14:15). There are three good reasons why the night-hawk or night-jar, more properly, was intended. The lists were sweeping and included almost every common bird unfit for food. Because of its peculiar characteristics it had been made the object of fable and superstition. It fed on wing at night and constantly uttered weird cries. Lastly, it was a fierce fighter when disturbed in brooding or raising its young. Its habit was to lie on its back and fight with beak and claw with such ferocity that it seemed very possible that it would "tear and scratch the face." Some commentators insist that the bird intended was an owl, but for the above reasons the night-jar seems most probable; also several members of the owl family were clearly indicated in the list.

See HAWK.

Gene Stratton-Porter

NIGHT-MONSTER

nit'-mon-ster (lilith; Septuagint onokentauros; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) lamia):

I. THE ACCEPTED TRANSLATION

1. Professor Rogers’ Statement

2. Exception to the Statement

II. FOLKLORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Paucity of References

2. References in Highly Poetical Passages

3. The References Allusive

4. Possibility of Non-mythological Interpretation

5. The Term Lilith.

I. The Accepted Translation.

The term "night-monster"‘ is a hypothetical translation of the Hebrew term lilith, used once only, in Isa 34:14. The word is translated in the King James Version "screech-owl," margin "night monster," the Revised Version (British and American) "night-monster," margin "Lilith." The term "night-monster" is also an interpretation, inasmuch as it implies that the Hebrew word is a Babylonian loan-word, and that the reference indicates a survival of primitive folklore.

1. Professor Rogers’ Statement:

Concerning this weird superstition, and its strange, single appearance in the Book of Isaiah, Professor Rogers has this to say: "The lil, or ghost, was a night-demon of terrible and baleful influence upon men, and only to be cast out with many incantations. The lil was attended by a serving maid, the ardat lili ("maid of night"), which in the Semitic development was transferred into the feminine lilitu. It is most curious and interesting to observe that this ghost-demon lived on through the history of the Babylonian religion, and was carried out into the Hebrew religion, there to find one single mention in the words of one of the Hebrew prophets" (Religions of Assyria and Babylonia, 76, 77).

2. Exception to the Statement:

Exception is to be taken to this statement, admitting the etymological assumption upon which it rests, that "lilith" is a word in mythology, on the ground that the conception of a night-demon has no place in the religion of the Hebrews as exhibited in the Scriptures. It is certainly worthy of more than passing

notice that a conception which is very prominent in the Babylonian mythology, and is worked out with great fullness of doctrinal and ritualistic detail, has, among the Hebrews, so far receded into the background as to receive but one mention in the Bible, and that a bald citation without detail in a highly poetic passage.

The most that can possibly be said, with safety, is that if the passage in Isa is to be taken as a survival of folklore, it is analogous to those survivals of obsolete ideas still to be found in current speech, and in the literature of the modern world (see LUNATIC). There is no evidence of active participation in this belief, or even of interest in it as such, on the part of the prophetical writer. On the contrary, the nature of the reference implies that the word was used simply to add a picturesque detail to a vivid, imaginative description. All positive evidence of Hebrew participation in this belief belongs to a later date (see Buxtorf's Lexicon, under the word "Talmud").

II. Folklore in the Old Testament.

Attention has been called elsewhere to the meagerness, in the matter of detail, of Old Testament demonology (see DEMON, DEMONOLOGY; COMMUNION WITH DEMONS). A kindred fact of great importance should be briefly noticed here, namely, that the traces of mythology and popular folklore in the Bible are surprisingly faint and indistinct. We have the following set of items in which such traces have been discovered: "Rahab" (rachabh), mentioned in Job 9:13; 26:12; Isa 51:9; "Tanin" (tannin), Isa 27:1; "Leviathan" (liwyathan), Job 3:8; Ps 74:14; Isa 27:1; Eze 29:3; Job 41 passim; the "serpent in the sea," in Am 9:3; "Seirim" (se'irim), 2Ch 11:15; Le 17:7; 2Ki 23:8; Isa 13:21; 34:14; "Alukah" ('aluqah), Pr 30:15; "Azazel ('aza'zel) Le 16:8,10,26 "Lilith" (ut sup.), Isa 34:14,15. when disturbed in brooding or raising its young. Its habit was to lie on its back and fight with beak and claw with such ferocity that it seemed very possible that it would "tear and scratch the face." Some commentators insist that the bird intended was an owl, but for the above reasons the night-jar seems most probable; also several members of the owl family were clearly indicated in the list.

A review of these passages brings certain very interesting facts to light.

1. Paucity of References:

The references are few in number. Rahab is mentioned 3 times; Tannin (in this connection), once; Leviathan, 5 times; the serpent in the sea, once; Seirim, 5 times (twice with references to idols); Alukah, once; Azazel, 3 times in one chapter and in the same connection; Lilith, once.

2. References in Highly Poetical Passages:

These references, with the single exception of Azazel to which we shall return a little later, are all in highly poetical passages. On general grounds of common-sense we should not ascribe conscious and deliberate mythology to writers or speakers of the Bible in passages marked by imaginative description and poetic imagery, any more than we should ascribe such beliefs to modern writers under like

circumstances. Poetry is the realm of truth and not of matter of fact. In passages of this tenor, mythology may explain the word itself and justify its appropriateness, it does not explain the use of the term or disclose the personal view of the writer. 3. The References Allusive:

All these references are in the highest degree allusive. They exhibit no exercise of the mythological fancy and have received no embroidery with details. This is most significant. So far as our specific references are concerned, we are dealing with petrified mythology, useful as literary embellishment, but no longer interesting in itself.

4. Possibility of Non-mythological Interpretation:

Every one of these words is sufficiently obscure in origin and uncertain in meaning to admit the possibility of a non-mythological interpretation; indeed, in several of the parallels a non-mythological use is evident. Bible-Dict. writers are apt to say (e.g. concerning lilith) that there is no doubt concerning the mythological reference. The reader may discover for himself that the lexicographers are more cautious (see Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, in the place cited.). The use of "Rahab" in Job 26:12 is not mythological for the simple reason that it is figurative; the use of "Leviathan" in Isa 27:1 and Eze 29:3 comes under the same category. In Job 40 and 41, if the identification of behemoth and leviathan with hippopotamus and crocodile be allowed to stand and the mythological significance of the two be admitted, we have the stage where mythology has become a fixed and universal symbolism which can be used to convey truth apart from the belief in it as reality (see LEVIATHAN; "Job," New Century Bible, p. 335; Meth. Rev., May, 1913, 429 ff). The sea serpent of Am 9:3 is not necessarily the dragon or Tiamat, and the use of the term is merely suggestive. The term se‘ir is in literal use for "he-goat" (Nu 15:24, et al.) and is doubtful throughout. Ewald translates it "he-goat" in Isa 34:14 and "Satyr" in 13:21. It means literally "shaggy monster" (Vulgate, pilosus). We do not hesitate on the basis of the evidence to erase "Alukah" (Pr 30:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "horse-leech," by some translated "vampire") and "Azazel" (Le 16:8, etc.), interpreted as a "demon of the desert," from the list of mythological words altogether. As ripe a scholar as Perowne ("Proverbs," Cambridge Bible) combats the idea of vampire, and Kellogg ("Leviticus," Expositor’s Bible, in the place cited.) has simply put to rout the mythological-demonic interpretation of Azazel. Even in the case of lilith the derivation is obscure, and the objections urged against the demonic idea by Alexander have not altogether lost their force (see Commentary on Isaiah, in the place cited.). There is a close balance of probabilities in one direction or the other.

5. The Term Lilith:

One further fact with regard to lilith must be considered. The term occurs in a list of creatures, the greater part of which are matter-of-fact animals or birds. A comparative glance at a half-dozen translates of the passage Isa 34:11-14 will convince any reader that there are a great many obscure and difficult words to be found in the list. Following Delitzsch’s translation we have: "pelican," "hedge-hog," "horned-owl," "raven," "wild-dog," "ostrich," "forest-demon" (se‘ir), "night-monster." This is a curious mixture of real and imaginary creatures. Alexander acutely observes that there is too much or too little

mythology in the passage. One of two conclusions would seem to follow from a list so constructed: Either all these creatures are looked upon as more or less demonic (see Whitehouse, Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), article "Demon," with which compare West M. Alexander, Demonic Possession in the New Testament, 16), or, as seems to the present writer far more probable, none in the list is considered otherwise than as supposed literal inhabitants of the wilderness. The writer of Isa 34:14, who was not constructing a scientific treatise, but using his imagination, has constructed a list in which are combined real and imaginary creatures popularly supposed to inhabit unpeopled solitudes. There still remains a by no means untenable supposition that none of the terms necessarily are mythological in this particular passage.

Louis Matthews Sweet

NIGHT-WATCH

nit’-woch ‘ashmurah ba-laylah, "watch in the night"): One of the three or four divisions of the night.

See WATCH; TIME.

NILE

nil (Neilos, meaning not certainly known; perhaps refers to the color of the water, as black or blue. This name does not occur in the Hebrew of the Old Testament or in the English translation):

I. THE NILE IN PHYSICAL GEOGRAPHY

1. Description

2. Geological Origin

3. The Making of Egypt

4. The Inundation

5. The Infiltration

II. THE NILE IN HISTORY

1. The Location of Temples

2. The Location of Cemeteries

3. The Damming of the Nile

4. Egyptian Famines

III. THE NILE IN RELIGION

1. The Nile as a God

2. The Nile in the Osirian Myth

3. The Celestial Nile

A river of North Africa, the great river of Egypt. The name employed in the Old Testament to designate the Nile is in the Hebrew ye’or, Egyptian aur, earlier, atur, usually translated "river," also occasionally "canals" (Ps 78:44; Eze 29:3). In a general way it means all the water of Egypt. The Nile is also the principal river included in the phrase nahare kush, "rivers of Ethiopia" (Isa 18:1). Poetically the Nile is called yam, "sea" (Job 41:31; Na 3:8; probably Isa 18:2), but this is not a name of the river. shichor, not always written fully, has also been interpreted in a mistaken way of the Nile (see SHIHOR). Likewise nahar mitsrayim, "brook of Egypt," a border stream in no way connected with the Nile, has sometimes been mistaken for that river.

See RIVER OF EGYPT.

I. The Nile in Physical Geography.

1. Description:

The Nile is formed by the junction of the White Nile and the Blue Nile in latitude 15 degree 45’ North and longitude 32 degree 45’ East. The Blue Nile rises in the highlands of Abyssinia, latitude 12 degree 30’ North, long. 35 degree East, and flows Northwest 850 miles to its junction with the White North. The White Nile, the principal branch of the North, rises in Victoria Nyanza, a great lake in Central Africa, a few miles North of the equator, long. 33 degree East (more exactly the Nile may be said to rise at the headwaters of the Ragera River, a small stream on the other side of the lake, 3 degree South of the equator), and flows North in a tortuous channel, 1,400 miles to its junction with the Blue Nile. From this junction-point the Niles flows North through Nubia and Egypt 1,900 miles and empties into the Mediterranean Sea, in latitude 32 degree North, through 2 mouths, the Rosetta, East of Alexandria, and the Damietta, West of Port Said. There were formerly 7 mouths scattered along a coast-line of 140 miles.

2. Geological Origin:

The Nile originated in the Tertiary period and has continued from that time to this, though by the

subsidence of the land 220 ft. along the Mediterranean shore in the Pluvial times, the river was very much shortened. Later in the Pluvial times the land rose again and is still rising slowly.

3. The Making of Egypt:

Cultivable Egypt is altogether the product of the Nile, every particle of the soil having been brought down by the river from the heart of the continent and deposited along the banks and especially in the delta at the mouth of the river. The banks have risen higher and higher and extended farther and farther back by the deposit of the sediment, until the valley of arable land varies in width in most parts from 3 or 4 miles to 9 or 10 miles. The mouth of the river, after the last elevation of the land in Pluvial times, was at first not far from the latitude of Cairo. From this point northward the river has built up a delta of 140 miles on each side, over which it spreads itself and empties into the sea through its many mouths.

4. The Inundation:

The, watering of Egypt by the inundation from the Nile is the most striking feature of the physical character of that land, and one of the most interesting and remarkable physical phenomena in the world. The inundation is produced by the combination of an indirect and a direct cause. The indirect cause is the rain and melting snow on the equatorial mountains in Central Africa, which maintains steadily a great volume of water in the White Nile. The direct cause is torrential rains in the highlands of Abyssinia which send down the Blue Nile a sudden great increase in the volume of water. The inundation has two periods each year. The first begins about July 15 and continues until near the end of September. After a slight recession, the river again rises early in October in the great inundation. High Nile is in October, 25 to 30 ft., low Nile in June, about 12 1/2 ft. The Nilometer for recording the height of the water of inundation dates from very early times. Old Nilometers are found still in situ at Edfu and Assuan. The watering and fertilizing of the land is the immediate effect of the inundation; its ultimate result is that making of Egypt which is still in progress. The settling of the sediment from the water upon the land has raised the surface of the valley about 1 ft. in 300 to 400 years, about 9 to 10 ft. near Cairo since the beginning of the early great temples. The deposit varies greatly at other places. As the deposit of sediment has been upon the bottom of the river, as well as upon the surface of the land, though more slowly, on account of the swiftness of the current, the river also has been lifted up, and thus the inundation has extended farther and farther to the East, and the West, as the level of the valley would permit, depositing the sediment and thus making the cultivable land wider, as well as the soil deeper, year by year. At Heliopolis, a little North of Cairo, this extension to the East has been 3 to 4 miles since the building of the great temple there.

At Luxor, about 350 miles farther up the river, where the approach toward the mountains is much steeper, the extension of the good soil to the East and the West is inconsiderable.

5. The Infiltration:

The ancient Egyptians were right in calling all the waters of Egypt the Nile, for wherever water is

obtained by digging it is simply the Nile percolating through the porous soil. This percolation is called the infiltration of the Nile. It always extends as far on either side of the Nile as the level of the water in the river at the time will permit. This infiltration, next to the inundation, is the most important physical phenomenon in Egypt. By means of it much of the irrigation of the land during the dry season is carried on from wells. It has had its influence also in the political and religious changes of the country (compare below).

II. The Nile in History.

1. The Location of Temples:

Some of the early temples were located near the Nile, probably because of the deification of the river. The rising of the surface of the land, and at the same time of the bed of the river, from the inundation lifted both Egypt and its great river, but left the temples down at the old level. In time the infiltration of the river from its new higher level reached farther and farther and rose to a higher level until the floor of these old temples was under water even at the time of lowest Nile, and then gods and goddesses, priests and ceremonial all were driven out. At least two of the greatest temples and most sacred places, Heliopolis and Memphis, had to be abandoned. Probably this fact had as much to do with the downfall of Egypt's religion, as its political disasters and the actual destruction of its temples by eastern invaders. Nature's God had driven out the gods of Nature.

2. The Location of Cemeteries:

Some prehistoric burials are found on the higher ground, as at Kefr 'Amar. A thousand years of history would be quite sufficient to teach Egyptians that the Nile was still making Egypt. Thenceforth, cemeteries were located at the mountains on the eastern and the western boundaries of the valley. Here they continue to this day, for the most part still entirely above the waters of the inundation—and usually above the reach of the infiltration.

3. The Damming of the Nile:

The widening of the cultivable land by means of long canals which carried the water from far up the river to levels higher than that of the inundation, farther down the river was practiced from very early times. The substitution of dams for long canals was reserved for modern engineering skill. Three great dams have been made: the first a little Nile of Cairo, the greatest at Assuan, and the last near Asyut.

4. Egyptian Famines:

Famines in Egypt are always due to failure in the quantity of the waters of inundation. Great famines have not been frequent. The cause of the failure in the water of inundation is now believed to be not so much a lack of the water of inundation from the Blue Nile as the choking of the channel of the White Nile in the great marsh land of the Sudan by the sud, a kind of sedge, sometimes becoming such a

tangled mass as to close the channel and impede the flow of the regular volume of water so that the freshet in the Blue Nile causes but little inundation at the usual time, and during the rest of the year the Nile is so low from the same cause that good irrigation by canals and wells is impossible. A channel through the sud is now kept open by the Egyptian government.

III. The Nile in Religion.

One of the gods of the Egyptian pantheon was Hapi, the Nile. In early times it divided the honors with Ra, the sun-god. No wonder it was so.

1. The Nile as a God:

If the Egyptians set out to worship Nature-gods at all, surely then the sun and the Nile first.

2. The Nile in Osirian Myth:

The origin of the Osirian myth is still much discussed. Very much evidence, perhaps conclusive evidence, can be adduced to prove that it rose originally from the Nile; that Osiris was first of all the Nile, then the water of the Nile, then the soil, the product of the waters of the Nile, and then Egypt, the Nile and all that it produced.

3. The Celestial Nile:

Egypt was the Egyptian's little world, and Egypt was the Nile. It was thus quite natural for the Egyptians in considering the celestial world to image it in likeness of their own world with a celestial Nile flowing through it. It is so represented in the mythology, but the conception of the heavens is vague.

M. G. Kyle

NIMRAH; BETH-NIMRAH

nim'-ra (nimrah; Codex Vaticanus Nambra; Codex Alexandrinus Ambram), or (beth nimrah; Codex Vaticanus Namram; Codex Alexandria Ambran (Nu 32:36); Codex Vaticanus Baithanabra; Codex Alexandrinus Bethamna (Jos 13:27)): These two names evidently refer to the same place; but there is no reason to think, as some have done, from the similarity of the names, that it is identical with NIMRIM (which see). On the contrary, the indications of the passages cited point to a site East of the Jordan valley and Nimrah of the Dead Sea. About 11 miles Northeast of the mouth of the Jordan, where Wady Nimrin, coming down from the eastern up-lands, enters the plain, stands a hill called Tell Nimrin, with tombs and certain traces of ancient building. This may be certainly identified with Nimrah and Beth-nimrah; and it corresponds to Bethnambris of Eusebius, Onomasticon, which lay 5 Roman miles Nimrah of Livias.

W. Ewing

NIMRIM

nim’-rim (me nimrim; Codex Vaticanus Nebrein; Codex Alexandrinus Ebrim (Jer 48:34); to hudor tes Nimreim (Isa 15:6)): The meaning appears to be "pure" or "wholesome water." The name occurs only in Isa 15:6 and Jer 48:34 in oracles against Moab. In each case it is mentioned in association with Zoar and Horonaim. It is therefore probably to be sought to the Southeast of the Dead Sea. Eusebius, Onomasticon, places a town, Bennamareim, to the Nimrim of Zoar, and identifies it with the Old Testament "Nimrim," as it seems, correctly. The name is still found in Wady Numeireh, opening on the sea at Burj Numeirah, Nimrim of Ghor es-Safiyeh. The waters of Nimrim may be sought either in Moiyet Numeirah or in the spring higher up, where lie the ruins of a town in a well-watered and fruitful district (Buhl, GAP, 272).

W. Ewing

NIMROD

nim’-rod (nimrodh; Nebrod): A descendant of Ham, mentioned in "the generations of the sons of Noah" (Ge 10; compare 1Ch 1:10) as a son of Cush. He established his kingdom "in the land of Shinar," including the cities "Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh" (Ge 10:10), of which only Babel, or Babylon, and Erech, or Uruk, have been identified with certainty. "The land of Shinar" is the old name for Southern Babylonia, afterward called Chaldea (’erets kasdim), and was probably more extensive in territory than the Sumer of the inscriptions in the ancient royal title, "King of Shumer and Accad," since Accad is included here in Shinar. Nimrod, like other great kings of Mesopotamian lands, was a mighty hunter, possibly the mightiest and the prototype of them all, since to his name had attached itself the proverb: "Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Yahweh" (Ge 10:9). In the primitive days of Mesopotamia, as also in Palestine, wild animals were so numerous that they became a menace to life and property (Ex 23:29; Le 26:22); therefore the king as benefactor and protector of his people hunted these wild beasts. The early conquest of the cities of Babylonia, or their federation into one great kingdom, is here ascribed to Nimrod. Whether the founding and colonization of Assyria (Ge 10:11) are to be ascribed to Nimrod will be determined by the exegesis of the text. English Versions of the Bible reads: "Out of that land he (i.e. Nimrod) went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh," etc., this translation assigning the rise of Assyria to Nimrod, and apparently being sustained by Mic 5:5,6 (compare J. M. P. Smith, "Micah," ICC, in the place cited.); but American Revised Version, margin renders: "Out of that land went forth Asshur, and builded Nineveh," which translation is more accurate exegetically and not in conflict with Mic 5:6, if in the latter "land of Nimrod" be understood, not as parallel with, but as supplemental to, Assyria, and therefore as Babylon (compare commentaries of Cheyne, Pusey, S. Clark, in the place cited.).

Nimrod has not been identified with any mythical hero or historic king of the inscriptions. Some have sought identification with Gilgamesh, the flood hero of Babylonia (Skinner, Driver, Delitzsch); others

with a later Kassite king (Haupt, Hilprecht), which is quite unlikely; but the most admissible correspondence is with Marduk, chief god of Babylon, probably its historic founder, just as Asshur, the god of Assyria, appears in verse 11 as the founder of the Assyrian empire (Wellhausen, Price, Sayce). Lack of identification, however, does not necessarily indicate mythical origin of the name.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 11; BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF, IV, 7; MERODACH; ORION.

Edward Mack

NIMSHI

nim’-shi (nimshi): The grandfather of Jehu (2Ki 9:2,14). Jehu’s usual designation is "son of Nimshi" (1Ki 19:16).

NINEVEH

nin’-e-ve (nineweh; Nineue, Nineui; Greek and Roman writers, Ninos): I. BEGINNINGS, NAME, POSITION

1. First Biblical Mention

2. Etymology of the Name

3. Position on the Tigris

II. NINEVEH AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

1. Its Walls

2. Principal Mounds and Gateways

3. Extent and Population within the Walls

4. Extent outside the Walls

5. Calah, Resen and Rehoboth-Ir

6. Khorsabad

7. Sherif Khan and Selamieh

8. Nimroud

III. PALACES AT NINEVEH PROPER

1. The Palace of Sennacherib

2. The Palace of Assur-bani-apli

IV. SENNACHERIB’S DESCRIPTION OF NINEVEH

1. The Walls

2. The Gates—Northwest

3. The Gates—South and East

4. The Gates—West

5. The Outer Wall: the Plantations

6. The Water-Supply, etc.

7. How the Bas-Reliefs Illustrate the King’s Description

8. Nineveh the Later Capital

V. LAST DAYS AND FALL OF NINEVEH

LITERATURE

I. Beginnings, Name, Position.

1. First Biblical Mention:

The first Biblical mention of Nineveh is in Ge 10:11, where it is stated that NIMROD (which see) or Asshur went out into Assyria, and builded Nineveh and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah, with the addition, "the same is the great city." Everything indicates that these statements are correct, for Nineveh was certainly at one time under Babylonian rule, and was at first not governed by Assyrian kings, but by issake or viceroys of Assur, the old capital. To all appearance Nineveh took its name from the Babylonian Nina near Lagas in South Babylonia, on the Euphrates, from

which early foundation it was probably colonized. The native name appears as Ninua or Nina (Ninaa), written with the character for "water enclosure" with that for "fish" inside, implying a connection between Nina and the Semitic nun, "fish."

2. Etymology of the Name:

The Babylonian Nina was a place where fish were very abundant, and Ishtar or Nina, the goddess of the city, was associated with Nin-mah, Merodach's spouse, as goddess of reproduction. Fish are also plentiful in the Tigris at Mosul, the modern town on the other side of the river, and this may have influenced the choice of the site by the Babylonian settlers, and the foundation there of the great temple of Ishtar or Nina. The date of this foundation is unknown, but it may have taken place about 3OOO BC.

3. Position on the Tigris:

Nineveh lay on the eastern bank of the Tigris, at the point where the Khosr falls into that stream. The outline of the wall is rectangular on the West, but of an irregular shape on the East. The western fortifications run from Northwest to Southeast, following, roughly, the course of the river, which now flows about 1,500 yards from the walls, instead of close to them, as in ancient times.

II. Nineveh and Its Surroundings.

According to the late G. Smith, the southwestern wall has a length of about 2 1/2 miles, and is joined at its western corner by the northwestern wall, which runs in a northeasterly direction for about 1 1/3 miles.

1. Its Walls:

The northeastern wall, starting here, runs at first in a southeasterly direction, but turns southward, gradually approaching the southwestern wall, to which, at the end of about 3 1/4 miles, it is joined by a short wall, facing nearly South, rather more than half a mile long.

2. Principal Mounds and Gateways:

The principal mounds are Kouyunjik, a little Northeast of the village of 'Amusiyeh, and Nebi-Yunas, about 1,500 yards to the Southeast. Both of these lie just within the Southwest wall. Extensive remains of buildings occupy the fortified area. Numerous openings occur in the walls, many of them ancient, though some seem to have been made after the abandonment of the site. The principal gate on the Northwest was guarded by winged bulls (see Layard, Monuments of Nineveh, 2nd series, plural 3; Nineveh and Babylon, 120). Other gates gave access to the various commercial roads of the country, those on the East passing through the curved outworks and the double line of fortifications which protected the northeastern wall from attack on that side, where the Ninevites evidently considered that they had most to fear.

3. Extent and Population within the Walls:

According to G. Smith, the circuit of the inner wall is about 8 miles, and Captain Jones, who made a trigonometrical survey in 1854, estimated that, allotting to each inhabitant 50 square yards, the city may have contained 174,000 inhabitants. If the statement in Jon 4:11, that the city contained 120,000 persons who could not discern between their right hand and their left, be intended to give the number of the city's children only, then the population must have numbered about 600,000, and more than three cities of the same extent would have been needed to contain them.

4. Extent outside the Walls:

It has therefore been supposed—and that with great probability—that there was a large extension of the city outside its walls. This is not only indicated by Jon 3:3, where it is described as "an exceeding great city of three days' journey" to traverse, but also by the extant ruins, which stretch Southeast along the banks of the Tigris as far as Nimroud (Calah) while its northern extension may have been regarded as including Khorsabad.

5. Calah, Resen and Rehoboth-Ir:

Concerning the positions of two of the cities mentioned with Nineveh, namely, Calah and Resen, there can be no doubt, notwithstanding that Resen has not yet been identified—Calah is the modern Nimroud, and Resen lay between that site and Nineveh.

The name Rehoboth-Ir has not yet been found in the inscriptions, but Fried. Delitzsch has suggested that it may be the rebit Ninua of the inscriptions, Northeast of Nineveh. If this be the case, the Nineveh of Jonah contained within it all the places in Ge 10:11,12, and Khorsabad besides.

6. Khorsabad:

Taking the outlying ruins from North to South, we begin with Khorsabad (Dur-Sarru-kin or Dur-Sargina), 12 miles Northeast of Kouyunjik, the great palace mound of Nineveh proper. Khorsabad is a great enclosure about 2,000 yards square, with the remains of towers and gateways. The palace mound lies on its northwest face, and consists of an extensive platform with the remains of Sargon's palace and its temple, with a ziqqurat or temple-tower similar to those at Babylon, Borsippa, Calah and elsewhere. This last still shows traces of the tints symbolical of the 7 planets of which its stages were, seemingly, emblematic. The palace ruins show numerous halls, rooms and passages, many of which were faced with slabs of coarse alabaster, sculptured in relief with military operations, hunting-scenes, mythological figures, etc., while the principal entrances were flanked with the finest winged human-headed bulls which Assyrian art has so far revealed. The palace was built about 712 BC, and was probably destroyed by fire when Nineveh fell in 606 BC, sharing the same fate. Some of the slabs and winged bulls are in the Louvre and the British Museum, but most of the antiquarian spoils were lost in the Tigris by the sinking of the rafts upon which they were loaded after being discovered.

7. Sherif Khan and Selamieh:

Another outlying suburb was probably Tarbicu, now represented by the ruins at Sherif Khan, about 3 miles North of Kouyunjik. In this lay a temple—"palace" Sennacherib calls it—dedicated to Nergal. In ancient times it must have been a place of some importance, as Esarhaddon seems to have built a palace there, as well as a "seat" for his eldest son, Assur-bani-apli. The site of Resen, "between Nineveh and Calah," is thought to be the modern Selamieh, 12 miles South of Nineveh, and 3 miles North of Nimroud (Calah). It is in the form of an irregular enclosure on a high mound overlooking the Tigris, with a surface of about 400 acres. No remains of buildings, sculptures or inscriptions have, however, been found there.

8. Nimroud:

After Nineveh. itself (Kouyunjik), the ruins known as Nimroud, 14 or 15 miles Southeast, are the most important. They mark the site of the ancient Calah, and have already been described under that heading (see p. 539). As there stated, the stone-faced temple-tower seems to be referred to by Ovid, and is apparently also mentioned by Xenophon (see RESEN). The general tendency of the accumulated references to these sites supports theory that they were regarded as belonging to Nineveh, if not by the Assyrians themselves (who knew well the various municipal districts), at least by the foreigners who had either visited the city or had heard or read descriptions of it.

III. Palaces at Nineveh Proper.

The palaces at Nineveh were built upon extensive artificial platforms between 30 and 50 ft. high, either of sundried brick, as at Nimroud, or of earth and rubbish, as at Kouyunjik. It is thought that they were faced with masonry, and that access was gained to them by means of flights of deep steps, or sloping pathways. Naturally it is the plan of the basement floor alone that can at present be traced, any upper stories that may have existed having long since disappeared. The halls and rooms discovered were faced with slabs of alabaster or other stone, often sculptured with bas-reliefs depicting warlike expeditions, the chase, religious ceremonies and divine figures. The depth of the accumulations over these varies from a few inches to about 30 ft., and if the amount in some cases would seem to be excessive, it is thought that this may have been due either to the existence of upper chambers, or to the extra height of the room. The chambers, which are grouped around courtyards, are long and narrow, with small square rooms at the ends. The partition walls vary from 6 to 15 ft. in thickness, and are of sun-dried brick, against which the stone paneling was fixed. As in the case of the Babylonian temples and palaces, the rooms and halls open into each other, so that, to gain access to those farthest from the courtyard entrance, one or more halls or chambers had to be traversed. No traces of windows have been discovered, and little can therefore be said as to the method of lighting, but the windows were either high up, or light was admitted through openings in the roof.

1. The Palace of Sennacherib:

The palace of Sennacherib lay in the southeast corner of the platform, and consisted of a courtyard surrounded on all four sides by numerous long halls, and rooms, of which the innermost were capable of being rendered private. It was in this palace that were found the reliefs depicting the siege of Lachish, with the representation of Sennacherib seated on his "standing" throne, while the captives and the spoil of the city passed before him. The grand entrance was flanked by winged bulls facing toward the spectator as he entered. They were in couples, back to back, on each side of the doorway, and between each pair the ancient Babylonian hero-giant, carrying in one hand the "boomerang," and holding tightly with his left arm a struggling lion (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, 137) was represented, just as at his father Sargon's palace at Khorsabad. The upper part of these imposing figures had been destroyed, but they were so massive, that the distinguished explorer attributed their overthrow not to the act of man, but to some convulsion of Nature.

2. The Palace of Assur-bani-apli:

In the north of the mound are the ruins of the palace of Assur-bani-apli or Assur-bani-pal, discovered by Hormuzd Rassam. His latest plan (Asshur and the Land of Nimrod, Cincinnati and New York, 1897, plate facing p. 36) does not give the whole of the structure, much of the building having been destroyed; but the general arrangement of the rooms was upon the traditional lines. The slabs with which they were paneled showed bas-reliefs illustrating the Assyrian campaigns against Babylonia, certain Arab tribes, and Elam. As far as they are preserved, the sculptures are wonderfully good, and the whole decorative scheme of the paneled walls, of which, probably, the greater part is forever lost, may be characterized, notwithstanding their defects of perspective and their mannerisms, as nothing less than magnificent. The lion-hunts of the great king, despite the curious treatment of the animals' manes (due to the sculptors' ignorance of the right way to represent hair) are admirable. It would be difficult to improve upon the expressions of fear, rage and suffering on the part of the animals there delineated. The small sculptures showing Assur-bani-apli hunting the goat and the wild ass are not less noteworthy, and are executed with great delicacy.

IV. Sennacherib's Description of Nineveh.

1. The Walls:

In all probability the best description of the city is that given by Sennacherib on the cylinder recording his expedition to Tarsus in Cilicia. From ancient times, he says, the circuit of the city had measured 9,300 cubits, and he makes the rather surprising statement that his predecessors had not built either the inner or the outer wall, which, if true, shows how confident they were of their security from attack. He claims to have enlarged the city by 12,515 (cubits). The great defensive wall which he built was called by the Sumerian name of Bad-imgallabi-lu-susu, which he translates as "the wall whose glory overthrows the enemy." He made the brickwork 40 (cubits) thick, which would probably not greatly exceed the estimate of G. Smith, who reckoned it to have measured about 50 ft. The height of the wall he raised to 180 tipki, which, admitting the estimate of Diodorus, should amount to about 100 ft.

2. The Gates—Northwest:

In this enclosing wall were 15 gates, which he enumerates in full. Three of these were situated in the short northwest wall—the gate of Hadad; the gate of Uru or Hadad of Tarbisu (Sherif Khan), and the gate of the moon-god Nannar, Sennacherib's own deity. The plans show five openings in the wall on this side, any of which may have been the gate used when going to Tarbicu, but that adorned with winged bulls probably furnished the shortest route.

3. The Gates—South and East:

The gates looking toward the South and the East were the Assur-gate (leading to the old capital); Sennacherib's Halzi-gate; the gate of Samas of Gagal, the gate of the god Enlil of Kar-Ninlil, and the "covered gate," which seems to have had the reputation of letting forth the fever-demon. After this are mentioned the Sibaniba-gate, and the gate of Halah in Mesopotamia. This last must have been the extreme northeastern opening, now communicating with the road to Khorsabad, implying that Halah lay in that direction.

4. The Gates—West:

The gates on the west or river-side of the city were "the gate of Ea, director of my watersprings"; the quay-gate, "bringer of the tribute of my peoples"; the gate of the land of Bari, within which the presents of the Sumilites entered (brought down by the Tigris from Babylonia, in all probability); the gate of the tribute-palace or armory; and the gate of the god Sar-ur—"altogether 5 gates in the direction of the West." There are about 9 wide openings in the wall on this side, 2 being on each side of the Kouyunjik mound, and 2 on each side of that called Nebi-Yunus. As openings at these points would have endangered the city's safety, these 4 have probably to be eliminated, leaving 2 only North of Nebi-Yunus, 2 between that and Kouyunjik, and one North of Kouyunjik. Minor means of exit probably existed at all points where they were regarded as needful.

5. The Outer Wall: the Plantations:

To the outer wall of the city Sennacherib gave a Sumerian name meaning, "the wall which terrifies the enemy." At a depth of 54 gar, the underground water-level, its foundations were laid upon blocks of stone, the object of this great depth being to frustrate undermining. The wall was made "high like a mountain." Above and below the city he laid out plantations, wherein all the sweet-smelling herbs of Heth (Palestine and Phoenicia) grew, fruitful beyond those of their homeland. Among them were to be found every kind of mountain-vine, and the plants of all the nations around.

6. The Water-Supply, etc.:

In connection with this, in all probability, he arranged the water-supply, conducting a distant water-course to Nineveh by means of conduits. Being a successful venture, he seems to have watered therewith

all the people's orchards, and in winter 1,000 corn fields above and below the city. The force of the increased current in the river Khosr was retarded by the creation of a swamp, and among the reeds which grew there were placed wild fowl, wild swine, and deer(?). Here he repeated his exotic plantations, including trees for wood, cotton (apparently) and seemingly the olive.

7. How the Bas-Reliefs Illustrate the King's Description:

Sennacherib's bas-reliefs show some of the phases of the work which his cylinder inscriptions describe. We see the winged bulls, which are of colossal dimensions, sometimes lying on their sledges (shaped like boats or Assyrian ships), and sometimes standing and supported by scaffolding. The sledges rest upon rollers, and are dragged by armies of captives urged to action by taskmasters with whips. Others force the sledges forward from behind by means of enormous levers whose upper ends are held in position by guy-ropes. Each side has to pull with equal force, for if the higher end of the great lever fell, the side which had pulled too hard suffered in killed and crushed, or at least in bruised, workmen of their number. In the background are the soldiers of the guard, and behind them extensive wooded hills. In other bas-reliefs it is apparently the pleasure grounds of the palace which are seen. In these the background is an avenue of trees, alternately tall and short, on the banks of a river, whereon are boats, and men riding astride inflated skins, which were much used in those days, as now. On another slab, the great king himself, in his hand-chariot drawn by eunuchs, superintends the work.

8. Nineveh the Later Capital:

How long Nineveh had been the capital of Assyria is unknown. The original capital was Assur, about 50 miles to the South, and probably this continued to be regarded as the religious and official capital of the country. Assur-nacir-Apli seems to have had a greater liking for Calah (Nimroud), and Sargon for Khorsabad, where he had founded a splendid palace. These latter, however, probably never had the importance of Nineveh, and attained their position merely on account of the reigning king building a palace and residing there. The period of Nineveh's supremacy seems to have been from the beginning of the reign of Sennacherib to the end of that of Assur-bani-apli, including, probably, the reigns of his successors likewise—a period of about 98 years (704-606 BC).

V. Last Days and Fall of Nineveh.

Nineveh, during the centuries of her existence, must have seen many stirring historical events; but the most noteworthy were probably Sennacherib's triumphal entries, including that following the capture of Lachish, the murder of that great conqueror by his sons (the recent theory that he was killed at Babylon needs confirmation); and the ceremonial triumphs of Assur-bani-apli—the great and noble Osnappar (Ezr 4:10). After the reign of Assur-bani-apli came his son Assur-etil-ilani, who was succeeded by Sin-sarra-iskun (Saracos), but the history of the country, and also of the city, is practically non-existent during these last two reigns. The Assyrian and Babylonian records are silent with regard to the fall of the city, but Alexander Polyhistor, Abydenus and Syncellus all speak of it. The best account, however, is that of Diodorus Siculus, who refers to a legend that the city could not be taken until the river became its

enemy. Arbaces, the Scythian, besieged it, but could not make any impression on it for 2 years. In the 3rd year, however, the river (according to Commander Jones, not the Tigris, but the Khosr), being swollen by rains, and very rapid in its current, carried away a portion of the wall, and by this opening the besiegers gained an entrance. The king, recognizing in this the fulfillment of the oracle, gathered together his concubines and eunuchs, and, mounting a funeral pyre which he had caused to be constructed, perished in the flames. This catastrophe is supposed to be referred to in Na 1:8: "With an over-running flood he (the Lord) will make a full end of her place (i.e. of Nineveh)," and Na 2:6: "The gates of the rivers are opened, and the palace is dissolved." The destruction of the city by fire is probably referred to in 3:13,15. The picture of the scenes in her streets—the noise of the whip, the rattling wheels, the prancing horses, the bounding chariots (3:2 ff), followed by a vivid description of the carnage of the battlefield—is exceedingly striking, and true to their records and their sculptures.

LITERATURE.

The standard books on the discovery and exploration of Nineveh are Layard, Nineveh and Its Remains (two volumes, 1849); Nineveh and Babylon (1853); Monuments of Nineveh, 1st and 2nd series (plates) (1849 and 1853); and Hormuzd Hassam, Asshur and the Land of Nimrod (Cincinnati and New York, 1897).

T. G. Pinches

NINEVEH, LIBRARY OF

I. THE DISCOVERY

II. THE LIBRARY

III. WRITING-MATERIALS

IV. CONTENTS

1. Philology

2. Astronomy and Astrology

3. Religious Texts

4. Law

5. Science

6. Literature

7. History and Chronology

8. Commerce

9. Letters

I. The Discovery.

In the spring of 1850, the workmen of Sir A.H. Layard at Nineveh made an important discovery. In the ruins of the palace of Assur-bani-pal they found a passage which opened into two small chambers leading one into the other. The doorway was guarded on either side by figures of Ea, the god of culture and the inventor of letters, in his robe of fishskin. The walls of the chambers had once been paneled with bas-reliefs, one of which represented a city standing on the shore of a sea that was covered with galleys. Up to the height of a foot or more the floor was piled with clay tablets that had fallen from the shelves on which they had been arranged in order, and the larger number of them was consequently broken. Similar tablets, but in lesser number, were found in the adjoining chambers. After Layard's departure, other tablets were discovered by Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, and then the excavations ceased for many years. The discovery of the Babylonian version of the account of the Deluge, however, by Mr. George Smith in 1873 led the proprietors of the Daily Telegraph to send him to Nineveh in the hope that the missing portions of the story might be found. He had not been excavating there long before he came across a fragment of another version of the story, and then once more the excavations came to an end. Since then expeditions have been sent by the British Museum which have resulted in the recovery of further remains of the ancient library of Nineveh.

II. The Library.

The tablets formed a library in the true sense of the word. Libraries had existed in the cities of Babylonia from a remote date, and the Assyrian kings, whose civilization was derived from Babylonia, imitated the example of Babylonia in this as in other respects. The only true booklover among them, however, was Assur-bani-pal. He was one of the most munificent royal patrons of learning the world has ever seen, and it was to him that the great library of Nineveh owed its existence. New editions were made of older works, and the public and private libraries of Babylonia were ransacked in search of literary treasures.

III. Writing-Materials.

Fortunately for us the ordinary writing-material of the Babylonians and Assyrians was clay. It was more easily procurable than papyrus or parchment, and was specially adapted for the reception of the cuneiform characters. Hence, while the greater part of the old Egyptian literature, which was upon papyrus, has perished that of Babylonia and Assyria has been preserved. In Babylonia the tablets after being inscribed were often merely dried in the sun; in the damper climate of Assyria they were baked in

a kiln. As a large amount of text had frequently to be compressed into a small space, the writing is sometimes so minute as to need the assistance of a magnifying glass before it can be read. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the library-chambers of Nineveh Layard found a magnifying lens of crystal, which had been turned on the lathe.

IV. Contents.

1. Philology:

The subject-matter of the tablets included all the known branches of knowledge. Foremost among them are the philological works. The inventors of the cuneiform system of writing had spoken an agglutinative language, called Sumerian, similar to that of the Turks or Finns today; and a considerable part of the early literature had been written in this language, which to the later Semitic Babylonians and Assyrians was what Latin was to the European nations in the Middle Ages. The student was therefore provided with grammars and dictionaries of the two languages, as well as with reading-books and interlinear translates into Assyrian of the chief Sumerian texts. Besides this, long lists of the cuneiform characters were drawn up with their phonetic and ideographic values, together with lists of Assyrian synonyms, in which, for example, , all the equivalents are given of the word "to go." The Assyrian lexicographers at times attempted etymologies which are as wide of the mark as similar etymologies given by English lexicographers of a past generation. Sabattu, "Sabbath," for instance, is derived from the two Sumerian words sa "heart" and bat, "to end," and so is explained to mean "day of rest for the heart." It is obvious that all this implies an advanced literary culture. People do not begin to compile grammars and dictionaries or to speculate on the origin of words until books and libraries abound and education is widespread.

2. Astronomy and Astrology:

Astronomy occupied a prominent place in Assyrian literature, but it was largely mingled with astrology. The Babylonians were the founders of scientific astronomy; they were the first to calculate the dates of lunar and solar eclipses, and to give names to the signs of the Zodiac. Among the contents of the library of Nineveh are reports from the Royal Observatory, relating to the observation of eclipses and the like.

3. Religious Texts:

A knowledge of astronomy was needed for the regulation of the calendar, and the calendar was the special care of the priests, as the festivals of the gods and the payment of tithes were dependent upon it. Most of the religious texts went back to the Sumerian period and were accordingly provided with Assyrian translations. Some of them were hymns to the gods, others were the rituals used in different temples. There was, moreover, a collection of psalms, as well as numerous mythological texts.

4. Law:

The legal literature was considerable. The earliest law books were in Sumerian, but the great code compiled by Hammurabi, the contemporary of Abraham, was in Semitic Babylonian (see HAMMURABI). Like English law, Assyro-Babylonian law was case-made, and records of the cases decided from time to time by the judges are numerous.

5. Science:

Among scientific works we may class the long lists of animals, birds, fishes, plants and stones, together with geographical treatises, and the pseudo-science of omens. Starting from the belief that where two events followed one another, the first was the cause of the second, an elaborate pseudo-science of augury had been built up, and an enormous literature arose on the interpretation of dreams, the observation of the liver of animals, etc. Unfortunately Assur-bani-pal had a special predilection for the subject, and the consequence is that his library was filled with works which the Assyriologist would gladly exchange for documents of a more valuable character. Among the scientific works we may also include those on medicine, as well as numerous mathematical tables.

6. Literature:

Literature was largely represented, mainly in the form of poems on mythological, religious or historical subjects. Among these the most famous is the epic of the hero Gilgames in twelve books, the Babylonian account of the Deluge being introduced as an episode in the eleventh book. Another epic was the story of the great battle between the god Merodach and Tiamat, the dragon of chaos and evil, which includes the story of the creation.

7. History and Chronology:

Historical records are very numerous, the Assyrians being distinguished among the nations of antiquity by their historical sense. In Assyria the royal palace took the place of the Bah or Egyptian temple; and where the Babylonian or the Egyptian would have left behind him a religious record, the Assyrian adorned his walls with accounts of campaigns and the victories of their royal builders. The dates which are attached to each portion of the narrative, and the care with which the names of petty princes and states are transcribed, give a high idea of the historical precision at which the Assyrians aimed. The Assyrian monuments are alone sufficient to show that the historical sense was by no means unknown to the ancient peoples of the East, and when we remember how closely related the Assyrians were to the Hebrews in both race and language, the fact becomes important to the Biblical student. Besides historical texts the library contained also chronological tables and long lists of kings and dynasties with the number of years they reigned. In Babylonia time was marked by officially naming each year after some event that had occurred in the course of it; the more historically-minded Assyrian named the year after a particular official, called limmu, who was appointed on each New Year’s Day. In Babylonia the chronological system went back to a very remote date. The Babylonians were a commercial people, and for commercial purposes it was necessary to have an exact register of the time.

8. Commerce:

The library contained trading documents of various sorts, more especially contracts, deeds of sale of property and the like. Now and then we meet with the plan of a building. There were also fiscal documents relating to the taxes paid by the cities and provinces of the empire to the imperial treasury.

9. Letters:

One department of the library consisted of letters, some of them private, others addressed to the king or to the high officials. Nearly a thousand of these have already been published by Professor Harper.

The clay books, it need hardly be added, were all carefully numbered and catalogued, the Assyrian system of docketing and arranging the tablets being at once ingenious and simple. The librarians, consequently, had no difficulty in finding any tablet or series of tablets that might be asked for. We may gather from the inscription attached to the larger works copied from Babylonian originals as well as to other collections of tablets that the library was open to all "readers."

A. H. Sayce

NINEVITES

nin’-e-vits (Nineu(e)itai): Only in Lu 11:30. The parallel passage (Mt 12:41), with Lu 11:32, has the fuller form, "men of Nineveh," which gives the meaning.

NIPHIS

ni’-fis (Neipheis, Codex Alexandrinus Phineis; the King James Version Nephis): Given in 1 Esdras 5:21 margin as equals "Magbish" of Ezr 2:30, whose sons are the same in number (156) as those of Niphis, but it would seem rather to be the equivalent of Nebo in 2:29.

NISAN

ni’-san (nican): The first month of the Jewish year in which occurred the Passover and which corresponds to April. The month is the same as Abib, which occurs in the Pentateuch. Nisan occurs in Ne 2:1 and Es 3:7. It denotes "the month of flowers."

See CALENDAR.

NISROCH

nis’-rok, niz’-rok (nicrokh): The Assyrian god in whose temple Sennacherib was worshipping when put

to death by his sons (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). The name is not found elsewhere. Some identify him with Asshur, the national deity.

See BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF.

NITRE

ni’-ter (nether; nitron): Nitre as used in the King James Version does not correspond to the present use of that term. Nitre or niter is now applied to sodium or potassium nitrate. The writer has in his collection a specimen of sodium carbonate, called in Arabic naTrun, which was taken from the extensive deposits in Lower Egypt where it is found as a deposit underneath a layer of common salt. Similar deposits are found in Syria and Asia Minor. This is probably the "nitre" of the Bible. the American Standard Revised Version has rendered niter "lye" in Jer 2:22, and "soda" in Pr 25:20. Soda or lye has been used as a cleansing agent from earliest times. It effervesces energetically, when treated with an acid; hence, the comparison in Pr 25:20 of the heavy-hearted man roiled by the sound of singing to the sizzling of soda on which vinegar has been poured.

See VINEGAR.

James A. Patch

NO

no.

See NO-AMON.

NO-AMON

no-a’-mon (no’ ‘amon, Egyptian nut, "a city," with the feminine ending t, and Amon, proper name of a god, City Amon, i.e. the "City," paragraph excellence, of the god Amon; translated in the King James Version "populous No," following the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) in a misunderstanding of the word ‘amon; the Revised Version (British and American) "No-amon"): Occurs in this form only in Na 3:8, but ‘amon minno’," Amon of No," occurs in Jer 46:25. Compare also Eze 30:14-16, where no’, is undoubtedly the same city.

The description of No-amon in Na 3:8 seems to be that of a delta city, but yam, "sea" in that passage is used poetically for the Nile, as in Job 41:31 and in Isa 18:2. With this difficulty removed, the Egyptian etymology of the name leaves no doubt as to the correct identification of the place. The "City Amon" in the days of Nahum, Jeremiah and Ezekiel was Thebes (compare the article "Thebes" in any general encyclopedia).

M. G. Kyle

NOADIAH

no-a-di’-a (no‘adhyah, "tryst of Yah"; Noadei):

(1) Son of Binnui, one of the Levites to whom Ezra entrusted the gold and silver and sacred vessels which he brought up from Babylon (Ezr 8:33); also called MOETH (which see), son of Sabannus (1 Esdras 8:63).

(2) A prophetess associated with Tobiah and Sanballat in opposition to Nehemiah (Ne 6:14).

NOAH (1)

no’-a (noach, "rest"; Septuagint Noe; Josephus, Nochos): The 10th in descent from Adam in the line of Seth (Ge 5:28,29). Lamech here seems to derive the word from the nacham, "to comfort," but this is probably a mere play upon the name by Noah’s father. The times in which Noah was born were degenerate, and this finds pathetic expression in Lamech’s saying at the birth of Noah, "This same shall comfort us in our work and in the toil of our hands, which cometh because of the ground which Yahweh hath cursed." Concerning theory that Noah is the name of a dynasty, like Pharaoh or Caesar, rather than of a single individual, see ANTEDILUVIANS. In his 600th year the degenerate races of mankind were cut off by the Deluge. But 120 years previously (Ge 6:3) he had been warned of the catastrophe, and according to 1Pe 3:20 had been preparing for the event by building the ark (see ARK; DELUGE OF NOAH). In the cuneiform inscriptions Noah corresponds to "Hasisadra" (Xisuthrus). After the flood Noah celebrated his deliverance by building an altar and offering sacrifices to Yahweh (Ge 8:20), and was sent forth with God’s blessing to be "fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth" (Ge 9:1), as Adam had been sent forth at the beginning (Ge 1:28). In token of the certainty of God’s covenant not to destroy the race again by flood, a rainbow spanned the sky whose reappearance was ever after to be a token of peace. But Noah was not above temptation. In the prosperity which followed, he became drunken from the fruit of the vineyard he had planted. His son Ham irreverently exposed the nakedness of his father, while Shem and Japheth covered it from view (Ge 9:22,23). The curse upon Canaan the son of Ham was literally fulfilled in subsequent history when Israel took possession of Palestine, when Tyre fell before the arms of Alexander, and Carthage surrendered to Rome.

George Frederick Wright

NOAH (2)

(no‘ah, "movement"): One of the daughters of Zelophehad (Nu 26:33; 27:1; 36:11; Jos 17:3).

NOAH, BOOK (APOCALYPSE) OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

NOB

nob (nobh; Codex Vaticanus Nomba; Codex Alexandrinus Noba, and other forms): An ancient priestly town to which David came on his way South when he fled from Saul at Gibeah (1Sa 21:1). Here he found refuge and succor with Ahimelech. This was observed by Doeg the Edomite, who informed the king, and afterward became the instrument of Saul's savage vengeance on the priests, and on all the inhabitants of the city (1Sa 22). The name occurs in Ne 11:32 in a list of cities, immediately after Anathoth. In Isaiah's ideal account of the Assyrians' march against Jerusalem, Nob is clearly placed South of Anathoth. Here, says the prophet, the Assyrian shall shake his hand at the mount of the daughter of Zion, the hill of Jerusalem. It was a place, therefore, from which the Holy City and the temple were clearly visible.

The district in which the site must be sought is thus very definitely indicated; but within this district no name at all resembling Nob has been discovered, and so no sure identification is yet possible. 'Anata (Anathoth) is 2 1/2 miles Northeast of Jerusalem. Nob therefore lay between that and the city, at a point where the city could be seen, apparently on the great road from the Nob. Rather more than a mile North of Jerusalem rises the ridge Ras el-Mesharif (2,665 ft.), over which the road from the Nob passes; and here the traveler approaching from that direction obtains his first sight of the city. It is fittingly named "the look-out." Col. Conder states the case for identifying this height with Mt. Scopus where Titus established his camp at the siege of Jerusalem (PEFS, 1874, 111 ff). Immediately South of the ridge, to the East of the road, there is a small plateau, South of which there is a lower ridge, whence the slopes dip into Wady el-Joz. This plateau, on which Titus may have sat, is a very probable site for Nob. It quite suits the requirements of Isaiah's narrative, and not less those of David's flight. Gibeah lay not far to the North, and this lay in the most likely path to the South.

W. Ewing

NOBAH

no'-ba (nobhah; Codex Vaticanus Naboth, Nabai; Codex Alexandrinus Naboth, Nabeth):

(1) Nobah the Manassite, we are told, "went and took Kenath, and the villages thereof, and called it Nobah, after his own name" (Nu 32:42). There can be little doubt that the ancient Kenath is represented by the modern Qanawat, on the western slope of Jebel ed-Druze, the ancient name having survived that of Nobah.

(2) A city which marked-the course of Gideon's pursuit of the Midianites (Jud 8:11). It is possible that this may be identical with (1). Cheyne argues in favor of this (Encyclopaedia Biblica, under the word "Gideon"). But its mention along with Jogbehah points to a more southerly location. This may have been

the original home of the clan Nobah. Some would read, following the Syriac in Nu 21:30, "Nobah which is on the desert," instead of "Nophah which reacheth unto Medeba." No site with a name resembling this has yet been recovered. If it is to be distinguished from Kenath, then probably it will have to be sought somewhere to the Northeast of Rabbath-Ammon (‘Amman).

W. Ewing

NOBAI

no’-bi, nob’-a-i (nobhay, or nebhay): One of those who took part in sealing the covenant (Ne 10:19).

NOBLE; NOBLES; NOBLEMAN

no’-b’-l, no’-b’-lz, no’-b’-l-man (chorim, ‘addir; eugenes, Kratistos, basilikos): "Nobles" is the translation of the Hebrew chorim (occurring only in the plural), "free-born," "noble" (1Ki 21:8,11; Ne 2:16; 6:17, etc.); of ‘addir, "begirded," "mighty," "illustrious" or "noble" (Jud 5:13; 2Ch 23:20, etc.); of nadhibh, "liberal," "a noble" (Nu 21:18; Pr 8:16, etc.).

Other words are gadhol, "great" (Jon 3:7); yaqqir, Aramaic "precious" (Ezr 4:10); naghidh, "a leader" (Job 29:10); partemim, "foremost ones" (Es 1:3; 6:9); atsilim, "those near," "nobles" (Ex 24:11); bariah, "fugitive" (Isa 43:14); kabhedh, "weighty," "honored" (Ps 149:8); eugenes, "wellborn" (Ac 17:11; 1Co 1:26); kratistos, "strongest," "most powerful" (Ac 24:3; 26:25).

The Apocrypha, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), still further enlarges the list. In the Revised Version (British and American) we have megistanes, "great ones" (1 Esdras 1:38; 8:26, with entimos, "in honor"; The Wisdom of Solomon 18:12). Otherwise the Revised Version’s uses of "noble," and "nobleness" are for words containing the root genitive and referring to birth (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 8:3; 2 Macc 6:27,31; 12:42; 14:42 twice). The King James Version’s uses are wider (Judith 2:2, etc.).

Nobleman is, in Lu 19:12, the translation of eugenes anthropos, "a man well born," and in Joh 4:46,49 of basilikos, "kingly," "belonging to a king," a designation extended to the officers, courtiers, etc., of a king, the Revised Version margin "king’s officer"; he was probably an official, civil or military, of Herod Antipas, who was styled "king" (basileus).

For "nobles" (Isa 43:14), the King James Version "have brought down all their nobles," the Revised Version (British and American) has "I will bring down all of them as fugitives," margin "or, as otherwise read, all their nobles even," etc.; for "nobles" (Jer 30:21), "prince"; the English Revised Version has "worthies" for "nobles" (Na 3:18); the Revised Version (British and American) has "the noble" for "princes" (Pr 17:26): "nobles" for "princes" (Job 34:18; Da 1:3), for "Nazarites" (La 4:7, margin "Nazirites"); "her nobles" for "his fugitives," margin "or, as other otherwise read, fugitives" (Isa 15:5); the American Standard Revised Version has "noble" for "liberal" (Isa 32:5); for "The nobles held their

peace," the King James Version margin "The voice of the nobles was hid" (Job 29:10), the Revised Version (British and American) has "The voice of the nobles was hushed," margin "Hebrew: hid"; for "most noble" (Ac 24:3; 26:25), "most excellent."

W. L. Walker

NOD

nod (nodh): The land of Eden, to which Cain migrated after the murder of his brother and his banishment by Yahweh (Ge 4:16). Conjecture is useless as to the region intended. The ideas of China, India, etc., which some have entertained, are groundless. The territory was evidently at some distance, but where is now undiscoverable.

NODAB

no'-dab (nodhabh; Nadabaioi): A Hagrite clan which, along with Jetur and Naphish, suffered complete defeat at the hands of the trans-Jordanic Israelites (1Ch 5:19). It has been suggested that Nodab is a corruption of Kedemah or of Nebaioth, names which are associated with Jetur and Naphish in the lists of Ishmael's sons (Ge 25:15; 1Ch 1:31), but it is difficult to see how even the most careless copyist could so blunder. There is a possible reminiscence of the name in Nudebe, a village in the Chauran.

NOE

no'-e (Noe): the King James Version of Mt 24:37,38; Lu 3:36; 17:26,27; Tobit 4:12. Greek form of NOAH (which see) (thus the Revised Version (British and American)).

NOEBA

no'-e-ba (Noeba): Head of one of the families of temple-servants (1 Esdras 5:31) equals "Nekoda" of Ezr 2:48.

NOGAH

no'-ga (noghah, "splendor"): A son of David born at Jerusalem (1Ch 3:7; 14:6). In the parallel list (2Sa 5:14,15) this name is wanting. In its Greek form (Naggai) it occurs in the genealogy of Jesus (Lu 3:25).

NOHAH

no'-ha (nochah, "rest"): The fourth son of Benjamin (1Ch 8:2). It is probable that in Jud 20:43, instead of "a resting-place" we should read "Nohah," which may have been the settlement of the family.

NOISE

noiz (qol, hamon, sha’on; phone): "Noise" is most frequently the translation of qol, "voice," "sound," in the King James Version (Ex 20:18, "the noise of the trumpet," the Revised Version (British and American) "voice"; Ex 32:17 twice, 18; Jud 5:11, "(they that are delivered) from the noise of the archers," the Revised Version (British and American) "far from the noise," etc., margin "because of the voice of"; 1Sa 4:6, etc.); hamon, "noise," "sound" (1Sa 14:19); roghez, "anger," "rage" (Job 37:2); rea‘, "outcry" (Job 36:33); sha’on, "desolation," "noise" (Isa 24:8; 25:5); teshu’oth "cry," "crying" (Job 36:29); patsah, "to break forth" (Ps 98:4); shamea, "to hear," etc. (Jos 6:10; 1Ch 15:28); phone, "sound," "voice," is translated "noise" (Re 6:1, "I heard as it were the noise of thunder," the Revised Version (British and American) "saying as with a voice of thunder"); rhoizedon, "with a hissing or rushing sound" (2Pe 3:10, "with a great noise"); ginetai phone (Ac 2:6, the King James Version "when this was noised abroad," margin "when this voice was made," the Revised Version (British and American) "when this sound was heard") ; akouo, "to hear" ; dialaleo, "to talk or speak" throughout, are also translated "noised" (Mr 2:1; Lu 1:65). So the Revised Version (British and American) (compare Judith 10:18, "noised among the tents"). Otherwise in the Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha, throos "confused noise" (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:10); boe, "outcry" (Judith 14:19); echos,"sound" (The Wisdom of Solomon 17:18; compare Sirach 40:13); Latin vox, "voice" (2 Esdras 5:7).

For "noise" (Ps 65:7 twice), the Revised Version (British and American) has "roaring"; for "make a noise like the noise of the seas" (Isa 17:12), "the uproar (margin "multitude") of many peoples, that roar like the roaring of the seas"; for "a voice of noise from the city" (Isa 66:6), "a voice of tumult from the city"; for "noise" (Jer 10:22), "voice"; for "a noise" (1Ch 15:28), "sounding aloud," "voice" (Eze 43:2); for "every battle of the warrior is with confused noise" (Isa 9:5), "all the armor of the armed man in the tumult," margin "every boot of the booted warrior" ; for "make a noise," "moan" (Ps 55:2), "roar" (Isa 17:12); for "make a loud noise" (Ps 98:4), "break forth"; for "maketh a noise" (Jer 4:19), "is disquieted"; for "the noise of his tabernacle" (Job 36:29), "the thunderings of his pavilion"; for "make any noise with your voice (Jos 6:10), "let your voice be heard"; "joyful noise," for "shouting" (Isa 16:10); for "The Lord on high is mightier than the noise of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea" (Ps 93:4), "Above the voices of many waters, the mighty breakers of the sea, Yahweh on high is mighty."

W. L. Walker

NOISOME

noi’-sum (hawwah, ra‘; kakos): "Noisome" from "annoy" (annoysome) has in Bible English the meaning of "evil," "hurtful," not of "offensive" or "loathsome." It is the translation of hawwah, "mischief," "calamity" (Ps 91:3, "noisome pestilence," the Revised Version (British and American) "deadly"); of ra‘, a common word for "evil" (Eze 14:15,21), "noisome beasts" (the Revised Version (British and American) "evil"). It occurs also in Job 31:40 the King James Version margin as the translation of bo’shah, "noisome weeds," the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "cockle," as in the King James Version margin; of kakos, "evil," "bad" (Re 16:2), "a noisome and

grievous sore." "Noisome" also occurs in Apocrypha (2 Macc 9:9) as the translation of baruno, "to make heavy," "oppress," where it seems to have the meaning of "loathsome."

W. L. Walker

NON

non (non): 1Ch 7:27 the King James Version and the Revised Version margin.

See NUN.

NOOMA

no’-o-ma (Nooma, Codex Vaticanus Ooma; the King James Version Ethma): 1 Esdras 9:35 equals "Nebo" of Ezr 10:43, of which it is a corruption.

NOON; NOONDAY

noon, noon’-da (tsohorayim; mesembria): The word means light, splendor, brightness, and hence, the brightest part of the day (Ge 43:16,25; Ac 22:6).

See also MIDDAY; DAY AND NIGHT; TIME.

NOPH

nof (noph; in Ho 9:6 moph): A name for the Egyptian city Memphis (so the Septuagint), hence, thus rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (Isa 19:13; Jer 2:16; 44:1; Eze 30:13,16).

See MEMPHIS.

NOPHAH

no’-fa (nophach; the Septuagint does not transliterate): A city mentioned only in Nu 21:30 (see NOBAH). Septuagint reads: kai hai gunaikes eti prosexekausan pur epi Moab, "and the women besides (yet) kindled a fire at (against) Moab." The text has evidently suffered corruption.

NORTH; NORTH COUNTRY

north, (tsaphon, from tsaphan, "to hide," i.e. "the hidden," "the dark" (Gesenius); borrhas, boreas (Judith 16:4); septentrio (2 Esdras 15:43)): In addition to the many places where "north" occurs merely as a

point of the compass, there are several passages in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zephaniah, where it refers to a particular country, usually Assyria or Babylonia: Jer 3:18, "They shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I gave for an inheritance unto your fathers"; Jer 46:6, "In the north by the river Euphrates have they stumbled and fallen"; Eze 26:7, "I will bring upon Tyre Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, king of kings, from the north"; Ze 2:13, "He will stretch out his hand against the north, and destroy Assyria, and will make Nineveh a desolation."

While the site of Nineveh was Northeast of Jerusalem, and that of Babylon almost due East, it was not unnatural for them to be referred to as "the north," because the direct desert routes were impracticable, and the roads led first into Northern Syria and then eastward (compare however Ge 29:1, "Then Jacob went on his journey, and came to the land of the children of the east").

In Eze 38:6, we have, "Gomer, and all his hordes; the house of Togarmah in the uttermost parts of the north." It is uncertain what country is here referred to. Some have supposed Armenia (compare Ge 10:3; 1Ch 1:6; Eze 27:14).

The north border of the promised land, as outlined in Nu 34:7-9 and Eze 47:15-17, cannot be determined with certainty, because some of the towns named cannot be identified, but it was approximately the latitude of Mt. Hermon, not including Lebanon or Damascus. For North (mezarim) see ASTRONOMY.

Alfred Ely Day

NORTHEAST, SOUTHEAST

These words occur in Ac 27:12, "if by any means they could reach Phoenix, and winter there; which is a haven of Crete, looking north-east and south-east." the Revised Version margin has, "Greek, down the south-west wind and down the north-west wind," which is a literal translation of the Greek: eis Phoinika .... limena tes Kretes bleponta (looking) kata liba (the southwest wind) kai kata choron (the northwest wind). Choros does not appear to occur except here, but the corresponding Latin caurus or corus is found in Caesar, Vergil, and other classical authors. the King James Version has "lieth toward the south west and north west." kata, with a wind or stream, means, "down the wind or stream," i.e. in the direction that it is blowing or flowing, and this interpretation would indicate a harbor open to the East. If lips, and choros, are used here as names of directions rather than of winds, we should expect a harbor open to the West. There is good reason for identifying Phoenix (the King James Version "Phenice") with Loutro on the south shore of Crete (EB, under the word "Phenice"), whose harbor is open to the East. See PHOENIX.

Alfred Ely Day

NOSE-JEWELS

noz-ju’-elz, -joo’-elz (nezem (probably from nazam, "muzzle") a "nose-ring," or "nose-jewel," so

rendered in Isa 3:21; "jewel in a swine’s snout," Pr 11:22, the King James Version margin "ring"; "jewel on thy forehead," Eze 16:12, "ring upon thy nose"): In Ge 24:22, the King James Version rendered incorrectly "earring"; compare Ge 24:47. Indeed, the word had also a more generic meaning of "ring" or "jewelry," whether worn in the nose or not. See Ge 35:4; Ex 32:2, where the ornament was worn in the ear. There are several cases without specification, uniformly rendered, without good reason, however, "earring" in the King James Version (Ex 35:22; Jud 8:24,25; Job 42:11 ("ring"); Pr 25:12; Ho 2:13 (15)).

The nose-jewel was made of gold or of silver, usually, and worn by many women of the East. It was a ring of from an inch to about three inches (in extreme cases) in diameter, and was passed through the right nostril. Usually there were pendant from the metal ring jewels, beads or coral. Such ornaments are still worn in some parts of the East.

See also AMULET; JEWEL.

Edward Bagby Pollard

NOSE; NOSTRILS

noz, nos’-trilz (’aph, "nose," nechirayim, dual of nechir, "nostrils"): The former expression (’aph from ‘anph, like Arabic ‘anf) is often translated "face" (which see under the word) in the English Versions of the Bible. It is frequently referred to as the organ of breathing, in other words, as the receptacle of the breath or spirit of God: "Yahweh .... breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Ge 2:7; compare Ge 7:22); "My life is yet whole in me, and the spirit of God is in my nostrils" (Job 27:3). Therefore a life which depends on so slight a thing as a breath is considered as utterly frail and of no great consequence: "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?" (Isa 2:22; compare RAPC Wis 2:2).

In poetical language such a breath of life is ascribed even to God, especially with regard to the mighty storm which is thought to proceed from His nostrils (Ex 15:8; 2Sa 22:9; Ps 18:8,15).

The phrase, "a smoke in my nose, a fire that burneth all the day" (Isa 65:5), is equivalent to a perpetual annoyance and cause of irritation. A cruel custom of war, in which the vanquished had their noses and ears cut off by their remorseless conquerors, is alluded to in Eze 23:25. As a wild animal is held in check by having his nose pierced and a hook or ring inserted in it (Job 40:24; 41:2 (Hebrew 40:26)), so this expression is used to indicate the humbling and taming of an obstinate person (2Ki 19:28; Isa 37:29; compare Eze 29:4; 38:4). But men, and especially women, had their noses pierced for the wearing of jewelry (Ge 24:47; Isa 3:21; Eze 16:12). In one passage the meaning is not quite clear, namely, in the enumeration of blemishes which disable a "son of Aaron" from the execution of the priest’s office (Le 21:18), where English Versions of the Bible translates "flat (margin "slit") nose." The Hebrew word is charum, which is a hapax legomenon. It corresponds, however, to the Arabic charam, charman (kharam, kharman), which means "to open," "to pierce the nose," especially the bridge of the nose. We may accept this meaning as the one intended in the passage.

Another dark and much discussed passage must still be referred to: "And, lo, they put the branch to their nose" (Eze 8:17). The usual explanation (whereof the context gives some valuable hints) is that a rite connected with the worship of Baal (the sun) is here alluded to (see Smend and A.B. Davidson's commentaries on the passage). A similar custom is known from Persian sun-worship, where a bunch (baretsma) of dates, pomegranates or tamarisks was held to the nose by the worshipper, probably as an attempt to keep the Holy One (sun) from being contaminated by sinful breath (Spiegel, Eranische Altertamer, III, 571). Among modern Jews posies of myrtle and other fragrant herbs are held to the nose by the persons attending on the ceremony of circumcision, for the alleged reason of making the sight and smell of blood bearable. Another interpretation of the above passage would understand zemorah, in the sense of "male sexual member" (see Gesenius-Buhl, under the word; Levy, Nhb. Worterbuch, I, 544), and the whole passage as a reference to a sensuous Canaanite rite, such as is perhaps alluded to in Isa 57:8. In that case the 'appam, "their nose "of the Massoretic Text would have to be considered as tiqqun copherim (a correction of the scribes) for 'appi, "my face." Or read "They cause their stench (zemoratham) to come up to my face" (Kraetzschmar, at the place).

See BRANCH.

H. L. E. Luering

NOTABLE

no'-ta-b'-l (chazuth; gnostos): "Notable" is the translation of chazuth, "conspicuous" (chazah, "to see"), e.g. Da 8:5, "a notable horn," i.e. "conspicuous," the King James Version margin "a horn of sight"; Da 8:8, "notable (horns)"; of gnostos, "known" "knowledge" (Ac 4:16); of episemos, "noted," "notable" (Mt 27:16; in Ro 16:7 "of note" of epiphanes, "very manifest," "illustrious" (compare "Antiochus Epiphanes"); Ac 2:20, "that great and notable day," quoted from Joe 2:31; Septuagint for yare'," to be feared," the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "terrible" (compare Mal 4:5); "notable" occurs also in 2 Macc 3:26 (ekprepes); 2 Macc 14:33, the Revised Version (British and American) "for all to see"; 2 Macc 6:28 (gennaios), "a notable example," the Revised Version (British and American) "noble"; notably, only in 2 Macc 14:31 (gennaios), "notably prevented," the Revised Version (British and American) "bravely," margin "nobly."

W. L. Walker

NOTE

not (chaqaq, rasham; semeioo, episemos): "Note" (verb) is the translation of chaqaq, "to grave," "to inscribe," etc. (Isa 30:8, "note it in a book," the Revised Version (British and American) "inscribe"); of rasham, "to note down," etc. (Da 10:21, the Revised Version (British and American) "inscribed"); of semeioo, "to put a sign on" (2Th 3:14, "note that man").

"Note" (noun) is the translation of episemos, "marked upon," "distinguished" (Ro 16:7, "who are of note among the apostles").

"Notes" (musical) occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 19:18, "notes of a psaltery" (phthoggos).

W. L. Walker

NOTHING

nuth'-ing (lo', lo' @me'umah, etc.; medeis, oudeis): "Nothing" is represented by various words and phrases, often with lo', which is properly a substantive with the meaning of "nothing." Most frequently we have lo' me'umah, "not anything" (Ge 40:15; Jud 14:6).

Other forms are lo' dhabhar, "not anything"; (Ge 19:8); lo'khol, "not any(thing)" (Ge 11:6; Pr 13:7); la' (Aramaic), "no," "nothing" (Da 4:35, "as nothing"); 'ephec, "end," "cessation" (Isa 34:12); bilti, "without," "save," "not" (Isa 44:10; Am 3:4); 'ayin, "there is not" (Isa 41:24); once, tohu, "emptiness" (Job 6:18); bal mah, "not anything" (Pr 9:13); chinnam, "free," "gratis" (2Sa 24:24); ma'at, "to make small," "bring to nothing" (Jer 10:24); raq, "only" (Ge 26:29); le'al, "for nothing" (Job 24:25).

In 2 Macc 7:12, we have "nothing," adverbially (en oudeni), "he nothing regarded the pains" (compare 1Ki 15:21); 2 Macc 9:7 (oudamos), the Revised Version (British and American) "in no wise"; The Wisdom of Solomon 2:11, "nothing worth" (achrestos), the Revised Version (British and American) "of no service"; Baruch 6:17,26.

For "nothing" the Revised Version (British and American) has "none" (Ex 23:26; Joe 2:3), "never" (Ne 5:8), "not wherewith" (Pr 22:27), "vanity and nought" (Isa 41:29); for "answered nothing" (Mr 15:5), "no more answered anything"; "answered nothing" in Mr 15:3 is omitted; "anything" for "nothing" (1Ti 6:7), "not anything" (Ac 20:20), "not" (1Co 8:2), "no word" (Lu 1:37), "not wherewith" (Lu 7:42); for "to nothing" (Job 6:18), "up into the waste"; for "it is nothing with" (2Ch 14:11), "there is none besides," margin "like"; for "lacked nothing" (1Ki 4:27), "let nothing be lacking," for "nothing doubting" (Ac 11:12), "making no distinction"; for "hoping for nothing again" (Lu 5:35), "never despairing"; for "are nothing" (Ac 21:24), "no truth in"; for "nothing shall offend them" (Ps 119:165), "no occasion of stumbling"; for "bring to nothing" (1Co 1:19), the English Revised Version "reject," the American Standard Revised Version "bring to nought"; "nothing better" for "no good" (Ec 3:12), for "not" (Mt 13:34, different text), for "no man" (Ac 9:8), "for nothing," for "free" (Ex 21:11); "miss nothing" for "not sin" (Job 5:24), margin "shalt not err"; "and shall have nothing" for "and not for himself" (Da 9:26, margin "there shall be none belonging to him").

W. L. Walker

NOUGHT

not (chinnam; katargeo) "Nought" is to be distinguished from "naught" implying "badness" (see NAUGHT). "Nought" in the sense of "nothing," etc., is the translation of chinnam, "gratis" (Ge 29:15), and of various other words occurring once only, e.g. ‘awen, "vanity" (Am 5:5); tohu, "vacancy," "ruin" (Isa 49:4); ‘epha‘, "nothing" (Isa 41:24); nabhel, "to fade" (Job 14:18, margin "fadeth away"); pur, "to make void" (Ps 33:10); katargeo, "to make without effect" (1Co 1:28; 2:6); oudeis, "not even one" (Ac 5:36); apelegmos, "refutation" (Ac 19:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "come into disrepute"); dorean, "without payment" (2Th 3:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "for nought"); eremoo, "to desolate" (Re 18:17, the Revised Version (British and American) "made desolate"); kataluo, "to loose down" (Ac 5:38, the Revised Version (British and American) "be overthrown"). In Apocrypha we have "set at nought" and "come to nought," etc. (1 Esdras 1:56; 2 Esdras 2:33; 8:59).

For "nought" the Revised Version (British and American) has "perish" (De 28:63); for "come to nought" (Job 8:22), "be no more"; "nought" for "not ought" (Ex 5:11), for "no might" (De 28:32); for "brought to silence," twice (Isa 15:1), "brought to nought"; the American Standard Revised Version "bring to nought" (1Co 1:19) for "bring to nothing" (the English Revised Version "reject"); "nought but terror" (Isa 28:19) for "a vexation only"; "brought to nought" (Isa 16:4) for "is at an end"; "come to nought" for "taken none effect" (Ro 9:6); "set at nought" for "despise" (Ro 14:3).

W. L. Walker

NOURISH

nur’-ish (giddel, chiyyah, kilkel, ribbah; trepho, anatrepho, ektrepho, entrepho): While the word "nourish" was ordinarily an appropriate rendering in the time of the King James Version, the word has since become much less frequent, and some senses have largely passed out of ordinary use, so that the meaning would now in most cases be better expressed by some other word. Giddel means "to bring up," "rear (children)" (Isa 1:2, margin "made great"; Isa 23:4; Da 1:5); "cause (a tree) to grow" (Isa 44:14). Chiyyah means "to preserve alive" (with some implication of care) (2Sa 12:3; Isa 7:21, the American Standard Revised Version "keep alive"). Kilkal means "to support," "maintain" "provide for" (especially with food) (Ge 45:11; 47:12; 50:21). Ribbah means "to bring up," "rear (whelps)," in a figurative use Eze 19:2). Trepho means "to feed" (transitively) (Ac 12:20, the Revised Version (British and American) "feed"; Re 12:14); "to fatten" (Jas 5:5, the context indicating an unfavorable meaning). Anatrepho is "to bring up," "rear," like giddel (Ac 7:20,21); ektrepho is "to take care of" (Eph 5:29); entrepho means "to bring up in," "train in" (1Ti 4:6).

George Ricker Berry

NOVICE

nov’-is (neophutos, "newly planted"): In this sense it is found in Septuagint of Job 14:9 and Isa 5:7. In the New Testament it occurs once only (1Ti 3:6), where it means a person newly planted in the Christian

faith, a neophyte, a new convert, one who has recently become a Christian. This term occurs in the list which Paul gives of the qualifications which a Christian bishop must possess. The apostle instructs Timothy, that if any man desires the office of a bishop, he must not be "novice," must not be newly converted, or recently brought to the faith of Christ "lest he be lifted up with pride, and fall into the condemnation of the devil."

This means that a recent convert runs the very serious risk of being wise in his own eyes, of despising those who are still on the level from which, by his conversion, he has been lifted; and so he becomes puffed up with high ideas of his own importance. He has not yet had time to discover his limitations, he is newly planted, he does not fully understand his true position in the Christian community, he overestimates himself. For these reasons he is peculiarly liable to instability, and to the other weaknesses and sins connected with an inflated opinion of his own powers. His pride is a sure indication of a coming fall. A novice, therefore, must on no account be appointed to the office in question, for he would be sure to bring disgrace upon it.

John Rutherfurd

NUMBER

num’-ber:

I. NUMBER AND ARITHMETIC

II. NOTATION OF NUMBERS

1. By Words

2. By Signs

3. By Letters

III. NUMBERS IN OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

IV. ROUND NUMBERS

V. SIGNIFICANT NUMBERS

1. Seven and Its Multiples

(1) Ritual Use of Seven

(2) Historical Use of Seven

(3) Didactic or Literary Use of Seven

(4) Apocalyptic Use of Seven

2. The Number Three

3. The Number Four

4. The Number Ten

5. The Number Twelve

6. Other Significant Numbers

VI. GEMATRIA

LITERATURE

I. Number and Arithmetic.

The system of counting followed by the Hebrews and the Semites generally was the decimal system, which seems to have been suggested by the use of the ten fingers. Hebrew had separate words only for the first nine units and for ten and its multiples. Of the sexagesimal system, which seems to have been introduced into Babylonia by the Sumerians and which, through its development there, has influenced the measurement of time and space in the western civilized world even to the present day; there is no direct trace in the Bible, although, as will be shown later, there are some possible echoes. The highest number in the Bible described by a single word is 10,000 (ribbo or ribbo', murias). The Egyptians, on the other hand, had separate words for 100,000, 1,000,000, 10,000,000. The highest numbers referred to in any way in the Bible are: "a thousand thousand" (1Ch 22:14; 2Ch 14:9); "thousands of thousands" (Da 7:10; Re 5:11); "thousands of ten thousands" (Ge 24:60); "ten thousand times ten thousand" (Da 7:10; Re 5:11); and twice that figure (Re 9:16). The excessively high numbers met with in some oriental systems (compare Lubbock, The Decimal System, 17 ff) have no parallels in Hebrew. Fractions were not unknown. We find 1/3 (2Sa 18:2, etc.); 1/2 (Ex 25:10,17, etc.); 1/4 (1Sa 9:8); 1/5 (Ge 47:24); 1/6 (Eze 46:14); 1/10 (Ex 16:36); 2/10 (Le 23:13); 3/10 (Le 14:10), and 1/100 (Ne 5:11). Three other fractions are less definitely expressed: 2/3 by "a double portion," literally, "a double mouthful" by (De 21:17; 2Ki 2:9; Zec 13:8); 4/5 by "four parts" (Ge 47:24), and 9/10 by "nine parts" (Ne 11:1). Only the simplest rules of arithmetic can be illustrated from the Old Testament. There are examples of addition (Ge 5:3-31; Nu 1:20-46); subtraction (Ge 18:28); multiplication (Le 25:8; Nu 3:46), and division (Nu 31:27). In Le 25:50 ff is what has been said to imply a kind of rule-of-three sum. The old Babylonians had tables of squares and cubes intended no doubt to facilitate the measurement of land

(Sayce, Assyria, Its Princes, Priests, and People, 118; Bezold, Ninive und Babylon, 90, 92); and it can scarcely be doubted that the same need led to similar results among the Israelites, but at present there is no evidence. Old Hebrew arithmetic and mathematics as known to us are of the most elementary kind (Nowack, HA, I, 298).

II. Notation of Numbers.

1. By Words:

No special signs for the expression of numbers in writing can be proved to have been in use among the Hebrews before the exile. The Siloam Inscription, which is probably the oldest specimen of Hebrew writing extant (with the exception of the ostraca of Samaria, and perhaps a seal or two and the obscure Gezer tablet), has the numbers written in full. The words used there for 3,200, 1,000 are written as words without any abbreviation. The earlier text of the Moabite Stone which practically illustrates Hebrew usage has the numbers 30, 40, 50, 100, 200, 7,000 written out in the same way.

2. By Signs:

After the exile some of the Jews at any rate employed signs such as were current among the Egyptians, the Arameans, and the Phoenicians—an upright line for 1, two such lines for 2, three for 3, and so on, and special signs for 10, 20, 100. It had been conjectured that these or similar signs were known to the Jews, but actual proof was not forthcoming until the discovery of Jewish papyri at Assuan and Elephantine in 1904 and 1907. In these texts, ranging from 494 to circa 400 BC, the dates are stated, not in words, but in figures of the kind described. We have therefore clear evidence that numerical signs were used by members of a Jewish colony in Upper Egypt in the 5th century BC. Now, as the existence of this colony can be traced before 525 BC, it is probable that they used this method of notation also in the preceding century. Conjecture indeed may go as far as its beginning, for it is known that there were Jews in Pathros, that is Upper Egypt, in the last days of Jeremiah (Jer 44:1,15). Some of the first Jewish settlers in Elephantine may have known the prophet and some of them may have come from Jerusalem, bringing these signs with them. At present, however, that is pure hypothesis.

3. By Letters:

In the notation of the chapters and verses of the Hebrew Bible and in the expression of dates in Hebrew books the consonants of the Hebrew alphabet are employed for figures, i.e. the first ten for 1-10, combinations of these for 11-19, the following eight for 20-90, and the remainder for 100, 200, 300, 400. The letters of the Greek alphabet were used in the same way. The antiquity of this kind of numerical notation cannot at present be ascertained. It is found on Jewish coins which have been dated in the reign of the Maccabean Simon (143-135 BC), but some scholars refer them to a much later period. All students of the Talmud are familiar with this way of numbering the pages, or rather the leaves, but its use there is no proof of early date. The numerical use of the Greek letters can be abundantly illustrated. It is met with in many Greek papyri, some of them from the 3rd century BC (Hibeh Papyri, numbers 40-

43, etc.); on several coins of Herod the Great, and in some manuscripts of the New Testament, for instance, a papyrus fragment of Mt (Oxyrhynchus Pap., 2) where 14 is three times represented by iota-delta (I-D) with a line above the letters, and some codices of Re 13:18 where 666 is given by the three letters "chi" "xi" "vau" (or digaroma). It is possible that two of these methods may have been employed side by side in some cases, as in the Punic Sacrificial Tablet of Marseilles, where (l. 6) 150 is expressed first in words, and then by figures.

III. Numbers in Old Testament History.

Students of the historical books of the Old Testament have long been perplexed by the high numbers which are met with in many passages, for example, the number ascribed to the Israelites at the exodus (Ex 12:37; Nu 11:21), and on two occasions during the sojourn in the wilderness (Nu 1; 26)—more than 600,000 adult males, which means a total of two or three millions; the result of David's census 1,300,000 men (2Sa 24:9) or 1,570,000 (1Ch 21:5), and the slaughter of half a million in a battle between Judah and Israel (2Ch 13:17). There are many other illustrations in the Books of Chronicles and elsewhere. That some of these high figures are incorrect is beyond reasonable doubt, and is not in the least surprising, for there is ample evidence that the numbers in ancient documents were exceptionally liable to corruption. One of the best known instances is the variation of 1,466 years between the Hebrew text and the Septuagint (text of Codex Vaticanus) as to the interval from the creation of Adam to the birth of Abram. Other striking cases are 1Sa 6:19, where 50,070 ought probably to be 70 (Josephus, Ant., VI, i, 4); 2Sa 15:7, where 40 years ought to be 4 years; the confusion of 76 and 276 in the manuscripts of Ac 27:37, and of 616 and 666 in those of Re 13:18. Hebrew manuscripts furnish some instructive variations. One of them, number 109 of Kennicott, reads (Nu 1:23) 1,050 for 50,000; 50 for 50,000 (Nu 2:6), and 100 for 100,000 (Nu 2:16). It is easy to see how mistakes may have originated in many cases. The Hebrew numerals for 30, etc., are the plurals of the units, so that the former, as written, differ from the latter only by the addition of the two Hebrew letters yodh ("y") and mem ("m") composing the syllable -im. Now as the mem was often omitted, 3 and 30, 4 and 40, etc., could readily be confused. If signs or letters of the alphabet were made use of, instead of abbreviated words, there would be quite as much room for misunderstanding and error on the part of copyists. The high numbers above referred to as found in Ex and Nu have been ingeniously accounted for by Professor Flinders Petrie (Researches in Sinai) in a wholly different way. By understanding ‘eleph not as "thousand," but as "family" or "tent," he reduces the number to 5,550 for the first census, and 5,730 for the second. This figure, however, seems too low, and the method of interpretation, though not impossible, is open to criticism. It is generally admitted that the number as usually read is too high, but the original number has not yet been certainly discovered. When, however, full allowance has been made for the intrusion of numerical errors into the Hebrew text, it is difficult to resist the belief that, in the Books of Chronicles, at any rate, there is a marked tendency to exaggeration in this respect. The huge armies again and again ascribed to the little kingdoms of Judah and Israel cannot be reconciled with some of the facts revealed by recent research; with the following, for instance: The army which met the Assyrians at Karkar in 854 BC and which represented 11 states and tribes inclusive of Israel and the kingdom of Damascus, cannot have numbered at the most more than about 75,000 or 80,000 men (HDB, 1909, 65b), and the Assyrian king who reports the battle reckons the whole levy of his country at only 102,000 (Der alte Orient, XI, i, 14, note). In view of these figures it is not conceivable that the armies of Israel or Judah could number a

million, or even half a million. The contingent from the larger kingdom contributed on the occasion mentioned above consisted of only 10,000 men and 2,000 chariots (HDB, ib). The safest conclusion, therefore, seems to be that, while many of the questionable numbers in the present text of the Old Testament are due to copyists, there is a residuum which cannot be so accounted for.

IV. Round Numbers.

The use of definite numerical expressions in an indefinite sense, that is, as round numbers, which is met with in many languages, seems to have been very prevalent in Western Asia from early times to the present day. Sir W. Ramsay (Thousand and One Churches, 6) remarks that the modern Turks have 4 typical numbers which are often used in proper names with little or no reference to their exact numerical force—3, 7, 40, 1,001. The Lycaonian district which gives the book its name is called Bin Bir Kilisse, "The Thousand and One Churches," although the actual number in the valley is only 28. The modern Persians use 40 in just the same way. "Forty years" with them often means "many years" (Brugsch, cited by Konig, Stilistik, 55). This lax use of numbers, as we think, was probably very frequent among the Israelites and their neighbors. The inscription on the Moabite Stone supplies a very instructive example. The Israelite occupation of Medeba by Omri and his son for half the reign of the latter is there reckoned (II.7 f) at 40 years. As, according to 1Ki 16:23,29, the period extended to only 23 years at the most, the number 40 must have been used very freely by Mesha's scribe as a round number. It is probably often used in that way in the Bible where it is remarkably frequent, especially in reference to periods of days or years. The 40 days of the Flood (Ge 7:4,17), the arrangement of the life of Moses in three periods of 40 years each (Ac 7:23; Ex 7:7; De 34:7), the 40 years' rule or reign of Eli (1Sa 4:18), of Saul (Ac 13:21; compare Josephus, Ant, VI, xiv, 9), of David (1Ki 2:11), of Solomon (1Ki 11:42) and of Jehoash (2Ki 12:1), the 40 or 80 years of rest (Jud 3:11,30; 5:31; 8:28), the 40 years of Philistine oppression (Jud 13:1), the 40 days' challenge of Goliath (1Sa 17:16), the 40 days' fast of Moses (Ex 34:28), Elijah (1Ki 19:8), and Jesus (Mt 4:2 and parallel), the 40 days before the destruction of Nineveh (Jon 3:4), and the 40 days before the Ascension (Ac 1:3), all suggest conventional use, or the influence of that use, for it can hardly be supposed that the number in each of these cases, and in others which might be mentioned, was exactly 40. How it came to be so used is not quite certain, but it may have originated, partly at any rate, in the idea that 40 years constituted a generation or the period at the end of which a man attains maturity, an idea common, it would seem, to the Greeks, the Israelites, and the Arabs. The period of 40 years in the wilderness in the course of which the old Israel died out and a new Israel took its place was a generation (Nu 32:13, etc.). The rabbis long afterward regarded 40 years as the age of understanding, the age when a man reaches his intellectual prime (Ab, v, addendum). In the Koran (Sura 46) a man is said to attain his strength when he attains to 40 years, and it was at that age, according to tradition, that Muhammad came forward as a prophet. In this way perhaps 40 came to be used as a round number for an indefinite period with a suggestion of completeness, and then was extended in course of time to things as well as Seasons.

Other round numbers are:

(1) some of the higher numbers;

(2) several numerical phrases.

Under (1) come the following numbers. One hundred, often of course to be understood literally, but evidently a round number in Ge 26:12; Le 26:8; 2Sa 24:3; Ec 8:12; Mt 19:29 and parallel. A thousand (thousands), very often a literal number, but in not a few cases indefinite, e.g. Ex 20:6 parallel De 5:10; 7:9; 1Sa 18:7; Ps 50:10; 90:4; 105:8; Isa 60:22, etc. Ten thousand (Hebrew ribbo, ribboth, rebhabhah; Greek murids, murioi) is also used as a round number as in Le 26:8; De 32:30; So 5:10; Mic 6:7. The yet higher figures, thousands of thousands, etc., are, in almost all cases, distinctly hyperbolical round numbers, the most remarkable examples occurring in the apocalyptic books (Da 7:10; Re 5:11; 9:16; Ethiopic Enoch 40:1).

(2) The second group, numerical phrases, consists of a number of expressions in which numbers are used roundly, in some cases to express the idea of fewness. One or two, etc.: "a day or two" (Ex 21:21), "a heap, two heaps" (Jud 15:16 the Revised Version margin), "one of a city, and two of a family" (Jer 3:14), "not once, nor twice," that is "several times" (2Ki 6:10). Two or three: "Two or three berries in the (topmost) bough" (Isa 17:6; compare Ho 6:2), "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," etc. (Mt 18:20). Konig refers to Assyrian, Syrian, and Arabic parallels. Three or four: the most noteworthy example is the formula which occurs 8 times in Am 1:3,6,9,11,13; 2:1,4,6, "for three transgressions .... yea for four." That the numbers here are round numbers is evident from the fact that the sins enumerated are in most cases neither 3 nor 4. In Pr 30:15,18,21,29, on the other hand, where we have the same rhetorical device, climax ad majus, 4 is followed by four statements and is therefore to be taken literally. Again, Konig (same place) points to classical and Arabic parallels. Four or five: "Four or five in the outmost branches of a fruitful tree" (Isa 17:6). Five or six: "Thou shouldest have smitten (Syria) five or six times" (2Ki 13:19), an idiom met with also in Tell el-Amarna Letters (Konig, ib). Six and seven: "He will deliver thee in six troubles; yea, in seven there shall no evil touch thee" (Job 5:19). Seven and eight: "Seven shepherds, and eight principal men" (Mic 5:5), that is, "enough and more than enough" (Cheyne); "Give a portion to seven, yea, even unto eight" (Ec 11:2). In one remarkable phrase which occurs (with slight variations of form) 24 times in the Old Testament, two Hebrew words, meaning respectively "yesterday" and "third," are mostly used so as together to express the idea of vague reference to the past. the Revised Version (British and American) renders in a variety of ways: "beforetime" (Ge 31:2, etc.), "aforetime" (Jos 4:18), "heretofore" (Ex 4:10, etc.), "in time (or "times") past" (De 19:4,6; 2Sa 3:17, etc.).

V. Significant Numbers.

Numerical symbolism, that is, the use of numbers not merely, if at all, with their literal numerical value, or as round numbers, but with symbolic significance, sacred or otherwise, was widespread in the ancient East, especially in Babylonia and regions more or less influenced by Babylonian culture which, to a certain extent, included Canaan. It must also be remembered that the ancestors of the Israelites are said to have been of Babylonian origin and may therefore have transmitted to their descendants the germs at least of numerical symbolism as developed in Babylonia in the age of Hammurabi. Be that as it may, the presence of this use of numbers in the Bible, and that on a large scale, cannot reasonably be doubted,

although some writers have gone too far in their speculations on the subject. The numbers which are unmistakably used with more or less symbolic meaning are 7 and its multiples, and 3, 4, 10 and 12.

1. Seven and Its Multiples:

By far the most prominent of these is the number 7, which is referred to in one way or another in nearly 600 passages in the Bible, as well as in many passages in the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha, and later Jewish literature. Of course the number has its usual numerical force in many of these places, but even there not seldom with a glance at its symbolic significance. For the determination of the latter we are not assigned to conjecture. There is clear evidence in the cuneiform texts, which are our earliest authorities, that the Babylonians regarded 7 as the number of totality, of completeness. The Sumerians, from whom the Semitic Babylonians seem to have borrowed the idea, equated 7 and "all." The 7-storied towers of Babylonia represented the universe. Seven was the expression of the highest power, the greatest conceivable fullness of force, and therefore was early pressed into the service of religion. It is found in reference to ritual in the age of Gudea, that is perhaps about the middle of the 3rd millennium BC. "Seven gods" at the end of an enumeration meant "all the gods" (for these facts and the cuneiform evidence compare Hehn, Siebenzahl und Sabbath bei den Babyloniern und im Altes Testament, 4 ff). How 7 came to be used in this way can only be glanced at here. The view connecting it with the gods of the 7 planets, which used to be in great favor and still has its advocates, seems to lack ancient proof. Hehn (op. cit., 44 ff) has shown that the number acquired its symbolic meaning long before the earliest time for which that reference can be demonstrated. As this sacred or symbolic use of 7 was not peculiar to the Babylonians and their teachers and neighbors, but was more or less known also in India and China, in classical lands, and among the Celts and the Germans, it probably originated in some fact of common observation, perhaps in the four lunar phases each of which comprises 7 days and a fraction. Conspicuous groups of stars may have helped to deepen the impression, and the fact that 7 is made up of two significant numbers, each, as will be shown, also suggestive of completeness—3 and 4—may have been early noticed and taken into account. The Biblical use of 7 may be conveniently considered under 4 heads:

(1) ritual use;

(2) historical use;

(3) didactic or literary use;

(4) apocalyptic use.

(1) Ritual Use of Seven.

The number 7 plays a conspicuous part in a multitude of passages giving rules for worship or purification, or recording ritual actions. The 7th day of the week was holy (see SABBATH). There were 7 days of unleavened bread (Ex 34:18, etc.), and 7 days of the Feast of Tabernacles (Le 23:34). The 7th

year was the sabbatical year (Ex 21:2, etc.). The Moabite Balak built Balaam on three occasions 7 altars and provided in each case 7 bullocks and 7 rams (Nu 23:1,14,29). The Mosaic law prescribed 7 he-lambs for several festal offerings (Nu 28:11,19,27, etc.). The 7-fold sprinkling of blood is enjoined in the ritual of the Day of Atonement (Le 16:14,19), and elsewhere. Seven-fold sprinkling is also repeatedly mentioned in the rules for the purification of the leper and the leprous house (Le 14:7,16,27,51). The leprous Naaman was ordered to bathe 7 times in the Jordan (2Ki 5:10). In cases of real or suspected uncleanness through leprosy, or the presence of a corpse, or for other reasons, 7 days' seclusion was necessary (Le 12:2, etc.). Circumcision took place after 7 days (Le 12:3). An animal must be 7 days old before it could be offered in sacrifice (Ex 22:30). Three periods of 7 days each are mentioned in the rules for the consecration of priests (Ex 29:30,35,37). An oath seems to have been in the first instance by 7 holy things (Ge 21:29 and the Hebrew word for "swear"). The number 7 also entered into the structure of sacred objects, for instance the candlestick or lamp-stand in the tabernacle and the second temple each of which had 7 lights (Nu 8:2; Zec 4:2). Many other instances of the ritual use of 7 in the Old Testament and many instructive parallels from Babylonian texts could be given.

(2) Historical Use of Seven.

The number 7 also figures prominently in a large number of passages which occur in historical narrative, in a way which reminds us of its symbolic significance. The following are some of the most remarkable: Jacob's 7 years' service for Rachel (Ge 29:20; compare Ge 29:27 f), and his bowing down 7 times to Esau (Ge 33:3); the 7 years of plenty, and the 7 years of famine (Ge 41:53 f); Samson's 7 days' marriage feast (Jud 14:12 ; compare Ge 29:27), 7 locks of hair (Jud 16:19), and the 7 withes with which he was bound (Jud 16:7 f); the 7 daughters of Jethro (Ex 2:16), the 7 sons of Jesse (1Sa 16:10), the 7 sons of Saul (2Sa 21:6), and the 7 sons of Job (Job 1:2; compare Job 42:13); the 7 days' march of the 7 priests blowing 7 trumpets round the walls of Jericho, and the 7-fold march on the 7th day (Jos 6:8); the 7 ascents of Elijah's servant to the top of Carmel (1Ki 18:43 f); the 7 sneezes of the Shunammitish woman's son (2Ki 4:35); the heating of Nebuchadnezzar's furnace 7 times more than it was wont to be heated (Da 8:19), and the king's madness for 7 times or years (Da 4:16,23,25,32); Anna's 7 years of wedded life (Lu 2:36); the 7 loaves of the 4,000 (Mt 15:34-36 parallel) and the 7 baskets full of fragments (Mt 15:37 parallel); the 7 brothers in the conundrum of the Sadducees (Mt 22:25 parallel); the 7 demons cast out of Mary Magdalene (Mr 16:9 parallel Lu 8:2); the 7 ministers in the church at Jerusalem (Ac 6:3), and the 7 sons of Sceva (Ac 19:14, but the Western text represents them as only 2). The number must no doubt be understood literally in many of these passages, but even then its symbolic meaning is probably hinted at by the historian. When a man was said to have had 7 sons or daughters, or an action was reported as done or to be done 7 times, whether by design or accident, the number was noted, and its symbolic force remembered. It cannot indeed be regarded in all these cases as a sacred number, but its association with sacred matters which was kept alive among the Jews by the institution of the Sabbath, was seldom, if ever, entirely overlooked.

(3) Didactic or Literary Use of Seven.

The symbolic use of 7 naturally led to its employment by poets and teachers for the vivid expression of multitude or intensity. This use is sometimes evident, and sometimes latent. (a) Evident examples are the

7-fold curse predicted for the murderer of Cain (Ge 4:15); fleeing 7 ways (De 28:7,25); deliverance from 7 troubles (Job 5:19); praise of God 7 times a day (Ps 119:164); 7 abominations (Pr 26:25; compare Pr 6:16); silver purified 7 times, that is, thoroughly purified (Ps 12:6); 7-fold sin; 7-fold repentance, and 7-fold forgiveness (Lu 17:4; compare Mt 18:21); 7 evil spirits (Mt 12:45 parallel Lu 11:26). The last of these, as well as the previous reference to the 7 demons cast out of Mary Magdalene reminds us of the 7 spirits of Beliar (Testament to the Twelve Patriarchs, Reuben chapters 2 and 3) and of the 7 evil spirits so often referred to in Babylonian exorcisms (compare Hehn, op. cit., 26 ff), but it is not safe to connect our Lord's words with either. The Babylonian belief may indeed have influenced popular ideas to some extent, but there is no need to find a trace of it in the Gospels. The 7 demons of the latter are sufficiently accounted for by the common symbolic use of 7. For other passages which come under this head compare De 28:7,25; Ru 4:15; 1Sa 2:5; Ps 79:12. (b) Examples of latent use of the number 7, of what Zockler (RE3, "Sieben") calls "latent heptads," are not infrequent. The 7-fold use of the expression "the voice of Yahweh" in Ps 29, which has caused it to be named "The Psalm of the Seven Thunders," and the 7 epithets of the Divine Spirit in Isa 11:2, cannot be accidental. In both cases the number is intended to point at full-summed completeness. In the New Testament we have the 7 beatitudes of character (Mt 5:3-9); the 7 petitions of the Paternoster (Mt 6:9 f); the 7 parables of the Kingdom in Mt 13; the 7 woes pronounced on the Pharisees (Mt 23:13,15,16,23,25,27,29), perhaps the 7 sayings of Jesus, beginning with "I am" (ego eimi) in the Fourth Gospel (Joh 6:35; 8:12; 10:7,11; 11:25; 14:6; 15:1), and the 7 disciples at the Lake after the Resurrection (Joh 21:2). Several groups of 7 are found in the Epistles and in Revelation: 7 forms of suffering (Ro 8:35); 7 gifts or charismata (Ro 12:6-9); 7 attributes of the wisdom that is from above (Jas 3:17); 7 graces to be added to faith (2Pe 1:5); two doxologies each containing 7 words of praise (Re 5:12; 7:12), and 7 classes of men (Re 6:15). Other supposed instances of 7-fold grouping in the Fourth Gospel are pointed out by E.A. Abbott (Johannine Grammar, 2624 ff), but are of uncertain value.

(4) Apocalyptic Use of Seven.

As might be expected, 7 figures greatly in apocalyptic literature, although it is singularly absent from the apocalyptic portion of Daniel. Later works of this kind, however—the writings bearing the name of Enoch, the Testaments of Reuben and Levi, 2 Esd, etc.—supply many illustrations. The doctrine of the 7 heavens which is developed in the Slavonic Enoch and elsewhere and may have been in the first instance of Babylonian origin is not directly alluded to in the Bible, but probably underlies the apostle's reference to the third heaven (2Co 12:2). In the one apocalyptic writing in the New Testament, 7 is employed with amazing frequency. We read of 7 churches (Re 1:4, etc.); 7 golden candlesticks (Re 1:12, etc.); 7 stars (Re 1:16); 7 angels of the churches (Re 1:20); 7 lamps of fire (Re 4:5); 7 spirits of God (Re 1:4; 3:1; 4:5); a book with 7 seals (Re 5:1); a lamb with 7 horns and 7 eyes (Re 5:6); 7 angels with 7 trumpets (Re 8:2); 7 thunders (Re 10:3); a dragon with 7 heads and 7 diadems (Re 13:3); a beast with 7 heads (Re 18:1); 7 angels having the 7 last plagues (Re 15:1); and 7 golden bowls of the wrath of God (Re 15:7) and a scarlet-colored beast with 7 heads (Re 17:3) which are 7 mountains (Re 17:9) and 7 kings (Re 17:10). The writer, whoever he was, must have had his imagination saturated with the numerical symbolism which had been cultivated in Western Asia for millenniums. There cannot be a shadow of doubt that 7 for him expressed fullness, completeness. As this inquiry will have shown, the significance of the number is practically the same throughout the Bible. Although a little of it may have been rubbed

off in the course of ages, the main idea suggested by 7 was never quite lost sight of in Biblical times, and the number is still used in the life and song of the Holy Land and Arabia with at least an echo of its ancient meaning.

The significance of 7 extends to its multiples. Fourteen, or twice 7, is possibly symbolic in some cases. The stress laid in the Old Testament on the 14th of the month as the day of the Passover (Ex 12:6 and 16 other places), and the regulation that 14 lambs were to be offered on each of the 7 days of the Feast of Tabernacles (Nu 29:13,15) hint at design in the selection of the number, especially in view of the fact that 7 and 7 occur repeatedly in cuneiform literature—in magical and liturgical texts, and in the formula so often used in the Am Tab: "7 and 7 times at the feet of the king my lord .... I prostrate myself." The arrangement of the generations from Abraham to Christ in three groups of 14 each (Mt 1:17) is probably intentional, so far as the number in each group is concerned. It is doubtful whether the number has any symbolic force in Ac 27:27; 2Co 12:2; Ga 2:1. Of course it must be remembered that both the Hebrew and Greek words for 14 (’arba’ah asar; dekatessares) suggest that it is made up of 10 and 4, but constant use of 7 in the sense above defined will have influenced the application of its double, at least in some cases.

Forty-nine, or 7 X 7, occurs in two regulations of the Law. The second of the three great festivals took place on the 50th day after one of the days of unleavened bread (Le 23:15), that is, after an interval of 7 X 7 days; and two years of Jubilee were separated by 7 X 7 years (Le 25:8). The combination is met with also in one of the so-called Penitential Psalms of Babylonia: "Although my sins are 7 times 7, forgive me my sins."

Seven multiplied by ten, or 70, was a very strong expression of multitude which is met with in a large number of passages in the Old Testament. It occurs of persons: the 70 descendants of Jacob (Ex 15; De 10:22); the 70 elders of Israel (Ex 24:1,9; Nu 11:16,24 f); the 70 kings ill treated by Adoni-bezek (Jud 1:7); the 70 sons of Gideon (Jud 8:30; 9:2); the 70 descendants of Abdon who rode on 70 asscolts (Jud 12:14); the 70 sons of Ahab (2Ki 10:1,6 f); and the 70 idolatrous elders seen by Ezekiel (Eze 8:11). It is also used of periods: 70 days of Egyptian mourning for Jacob (Ge 50:3); 70 years of trial (Isa 23:15,17; Jer 25:11 f; Da 9:2; Zec 1:12; 7:5); the 70 weeks of Daniel (Da 9:24); and the 70 years of human life (Ps 90:10). Other noticeable uses of 70 are the 70 palm trees of Elim (Ex 15:27 parallel Nu 33:9); the offering of 70 bullocks in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:32), and the offering by the heads of the tribes of 12 silver bowls each of 70 shekels (Nu 7:13). In the New Testament we have the 70 apostles (Lu 10:1,17), but the number is uncertain with Codices Vaticanus and Bezae and some versions reading 72, which is the product, not of 7 and 10, but of 6 and 12. Significant seventies are also met with outside of the Bible. The most noteworthy are the Jewish belief that there were 70 nations outside Israel, with 70 languages, under the care of 70 angels, based perhaps on the list in Ge 10; the Sanhedrin of about 70 members; the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek by Septuagint (more exactly 72), and the 70 members of a family in one of the Aramaic texts of Sendschirli. This abundant use of 70 must have been largely due to the fact that it was regarded as an intensified 7.

Seventy and seven, or 77, a combination found in the words of Lamech (Ge 4:24); the number of the princes and elders of Succoth (Jud 8:14); and the number of lambs in a memorable sacrifice (Ezr 8:35),

would appeal in the same way to the oriental fancy.

The product of seven and seventy (Greek hebdomekontakis hepta) is met with once in the New Testament (Mt 18:22), and in the Septuagint of the above-quoted Ge 4:24. Moulton, however (Grammar of Greek New Testament Prolegomena, 98), renders in both passages 70 plus 7; contra, Allen, "Mt," ICC, 199. The number is clearly a forceful equivalent of "always."

Seven thousand in 1Ki 19:18 parallel Ro 11:4 may be a round number chosen on account of its embodiment of the number 7. In the Moabite Stone the number of Israelites slain at the capture of the city of Nebo by the Moabites is reckoned at 7,000.

The half of seven seems sometimes to have been regarded as significant. In Da 7:25; 9:27; 12:7; Lu 4:25 parallel 5:17; Re 11:2; 13:5 a period of distress is calculated at 3 1/2 years, that is, half the period of sacred completeness.

2. The Number Three:

The number three seems early to have attracted attention as the number in which beginning, middle and end are most distinctly marked, and to have been therefore regarded as symbolic of a complete and ordered whole. Abundant illustration of its use in this way in Babylonian theology, ritual and magic is given from the cuneiform texts by Hehn (op. cit., 63 ff), and the hundreds of passages in the Bible in which the number occurs include many where this special significance either lies on the surface or not far beneath it. This is owing in some degree perhaps to Babylonian influence, but will have been largely due to independent observation of common phenomena—the arithmetical fact mentioned above and familiar trios, such as heaven, earth, and sea (or "the abyss"); morning, noon and night; right, middle, and left, etc. In other words, 3 readily suggested completeness, and was often used with a glance at that meaning in daily life and daily speech. Only a selection from the great mass of Biblical examples can be given here.

(1) Three is often found of persons and things sacred or secular, e.g. Noah’s 3 sons (Ge 6:10); Job’s 3 daughters (Job 1:2; 42:13) and 3 friends (Job 2:11); Abraham’s 3 guests (Ge 18:2); and Sarah’s 3 measures of meal (Ge 18:6; compare Mt 13:33 parallel); 3 in military tactics (Jud 7:16,20; 9:43; 1Sa 11:11; 13:17; Job 1:17); 3 great feasts (Ex 23:14); the 3 daily prayers (Ps 55:17; Da 6:10,13); the 3 night watches (Jud 7:19); God’s 3-fold call of Samuel (1Sa 3:8); the 3 keepers of the temple threshold (Jer 52:24); the 3 presidents appointed by Darius (Da 6:2); the 3 temptations (Mt 4:3,5 f, 8 f parallel); the 3 prayers in Gethsemane (Mt 26:39,42,44 parallel); Peter’s 3 denials (Mt 26:34,75 parallel); the Lord’s 3-fold question and 3-fold charge (Joh 21:15); and the 3-fold vision of the sheet (Ac 10:16).

(2) In a very large number of passages 3 is used of periods of time: 3 days; 3 weeks; 3 months and 3 years. So in Ge 40:12,13,18; Ex 2:2; 10:22 f; 2Sa 24:13; Isa 20:3; Jon 1:17; Mt 15:32; Lu 2:46; 13:7; Ac 9:9; 2Co 12:8. The frequent reference to the resurrection "on the 3rd day" or "after 3 days" (Mt 16:21; 27:63, etc.) may at the same time have glanced at the symbolic use of the number and at the belief

common perhaps to the Jews and the Zoroastrians that a corpse was not recognizable after 3 days (for Jewish testimony compare Joh 11:39; Yebamoth xvi.3; Midrash, Genesis, chapter c; Semachoth viii; for Persian ideas compare The Expository Times, XVIII, 536).

(3) The number 3 is also used in a literary way, sometimes appearing only in the structure. Note as examples the 3-fold benediction of Israel (Nu 6:24); the Thrice Holy of the seraphim (Isa 6:3); the 3-fold overturn (Eze 21:27 (Hebrew 32)); the 3-fold refrain of Psalms 42—43 regarded as one psalm (Ps 42:5,11; 43:5); the 3 names of God (the Mighty One, God, Yahweh, Jos 22:22; compare Ps 50:1); the 3 graces of 1Co 13; the 3 witnesses (1 Joh 5:8); the frequent use of 3 and 3rd in Revelation; the description of God as "who is and who was and who is to come" (Re 1:4); and ‘the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit’ (Mt 28:19). In some of these cases 3-fold repetition is a mode of expressing the superlative, and others remind us of the remarkable association of 3 with deity alluded to by Plato and Philo, and illustrated by the triads of Egypt and Babylonia and the Far East. It cannot, however, be proved, or even made probable, that there is any direct connection between any of these triads and the Christian Trinity. All that can be said is, that the same numerical symbolism may have been operative in both cases.

3. The Number Four:

The 4 points of the compass and the 4 phases of the moon will have been early noticed, and the former at any rate will have suggested before Biblical times the use of 4 as a symbol of completeness of range, of comprehensive extent. As early as the middle of the 3rd millennium BC Bah rulers (followed long afterward by the Assyrians) assumed the title "king of the 4 quarters" meaning that their rule reached in all directions, and an early conqueror claimed to have subdued the 4 quarters. There are not a few illustrations of the use of 4 in some such way in the Bible. The 4 winds (referred to also in the cuneiform texts and the Book of the Dead) are mentioned again and again (Jer 49:36; Eze 37:9), and the 4 quarters or corners (Isa 11:12; Eze 7:2; Re 20:8). We read also of the 4 heads of the river of Eden (Ge 2:10), of 4 horns, 4 smiths, 4 chariots, and horses of 4 colors in the visions of Zechariah (1:8, Septuagint; 1:18 ff; 6:1 ff), the chariots being directly connected with the 4 winds; 4 punishments (Jer 15:3; Eze 14:21, the latter with a remarkable Assyrian parallel), the 4 kingdoms in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream as interpreted (Da 2:37) and Daniel’s vision (Da 7:3); the 4 living creatures in Eze (1:5 ff; compare 1:10), each with 4 faces and 4 wings, and the 4 modeled after them (Re 4:6, etc.). In most of these cases 4 is clearly symbolical, as in a number of passages in Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. Whether the frequent use of it in the structure of the tabernacle, Solomon’s temple, and Ezekiel’s temple has anything to do with the symbolic meaning is not clear, but the latter can probably be traced in proverbial and prophetic speech (Pr 30:15,18,21,24,29; Am 1:3,6, etc.). The 4 transgressions of the latter represent full-summed iniquity, and the 4-fold grouping in the former suggested the wide sweep of the classification. Perhaps it is not fanciful to find the idea in the 4 sets of hearers of the gospel in the parable of the Sewer (Mt 13:19-23 parallel). The rabbis almost certainly had it in mind in their 4-fold grouping of characters in six successive paragraphs (Ab v.16-21) which, however, is of considerably later date.

4. The Number Ten:

As the basis of the decimal system, which probably originated in counting with the fingers, 10 has been a significant number in all historical ages. The 10 antediluvian patriarchs (Ge 5; compare the 10 Babylonian kings of Berosus, and 10 in early Iranian and far-Eastern myths); the 10 righteous men who would have saved Sodom (Ge 18:32); the 10 plagues of Egypt; the 10 commandments (Ex 20:2-17 parallel De 5:6-21; the 10 commandments found by some in Ex 34:14-26 are not clearly made out); the 10 servants of Gideon (Jud 6:27); the 10 elders who accompanied Boaz (Ru 4:2); the 10 virgins of the parable (Mt 25:1); the 10 pieces of silver (Lu 15:8); the 10 servants entrusted with 10 pounds (Lu 19:13), the most capable of whom was placed over 10 cities (Lu 19:17); the 10 days' tribulation predicted for the church of Smyrna (Re 2:10); the use of "10 times" in the sense of "many times" (Ge 31:7; Ne 4:12; Da 1:20, etc., an idiom met with repeatedly in Tell el-Amarna Letters); and the use of 10 in sacred measurements and in the widely diffused custom of tithe, and many other examples show plainly that 10 was a favorite symbolic number suggestive of a rounded total, large or small, according to circumstances. The number played a prominent part in later Jewish life and thought. Ten times was the Tetragrammaton (YHWH) uttered by the high priest on the Day of Atonement; 10 persons must be present at a nuptial benediction; 10 constituted a congregation in the synagogue; 10 was the usual number of a company at the paschal meal, and of a row of comforters of the bereaved. The world was created, said the rabbis, by ten words, and Abraham was visited with 10 temptations (Ab v.1 and 4; several other illustrations are found in the context).

5. The Number Twelve:

The 12 months and the 12 signs of the zodiac probably suggested to the old Babylonians the use of 12 as a symbolic or semi-sacred number, but its frequent employment by the Israelites with special meaning cannot at present be proved to have originated in that way, although the idea was favored by both Josephus and Philo. So far as we know, Israelite predilection for 12 was entirely due to the traditional belief that the nation consisted of 12 tribes, a belief, it is true, entertained also by the Arabs or some of them, but with much less intensity and persistence. In Israel the belief was universal and ineradicable. Hence, the 12 pillars set up by Moses (Ex 24:4); the 12 jewels in the high priest's breast-plate (Ex 28:21); the 12 cakes of showbread (Le 24:5); the 12 rods (Nu 17:2); the 12 spies (Nu 13); the 12 stones placed by Joshua in the bed of Jordan (Jos 4:9); the 12 officers of Solomon (1Ki 4:7); the 12 stones of Elijah's altar (1Ki 18:31); the 12 disciples or apostles (26 t), and several details of apocalyptic imagery (Re 7:5 ff; 12:1; 21:12,14,16,21; 22:2; compare also Mt 14:20 parallel Mt 19:28 parallel Mt 26:53; Ac 26:7). The number pointed in the first instance at unity and completeness which had been sanctioned by Divine election, and it retained this significance when applied to the spiritual Israel. Philo indeed calls it a perfect number. Its double in Re 4:4, etc., is probably also significant.

6. Other Significant Numbers:

Five came readily into the mind as the half of 10. Hence, perhaps its use in the parable of the Virgins (Mt 25:2). It was often employed in literary division, e.g. in the Pentateuch, the Psalms, the part of the Hagiographa known as the Meghilljth, the Ethiopic Enoch and Matthew (7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1; compare Sir J. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae(2), 163 ff). It seems to have been occasionally suggestive of

relative smallness, as in Le 26:8, the 5 loaves (Mt 14:17 parallel), 1Co 14:19, and perhaps in Tell el-Amarna Letters. It has been remarked (Skinner, "Gen," ICC, 483) that the number occurs repeatedly in reference to matters Egyptian (Ge 41:34; 45:22; 47:2; Isa 19:18), but there seems to be no satisfactory explanation. Sixty: Although, as was before observed, there is no direct trace in the Bible of the numerical system based on 60, there are a few passages where there may be a distant echo. The 60 cities of Argob (De 3:4; Jos 13:30; 1Ki 4:13); the 60 mighty men and the 60 queens of So 3:7; 6:8, the double use of 60 of Rehoboam's harem and family (2Ch 11:21), the 3 sacrifices of 60 victims each (Nu 7:88), and the length of Solomon's temple, 60 cubits (1Ki 6:2 parallel 2Ch 3:3), may perhaps have a remote connection with the Babylonian use. It must be remembered that the latter was current in Israel and the neighboring regions in the division of the talent into 60 minas. A few passages in the Pseudepigrapha may be similarly interpreted, and the Babylonian Talmud contains, as might be expected, many clear allusions. In the Bible, however, the special use of the number is relatively rare and indirect. One hundred and ten, the age attained by Joseph (Ge 50:22), is significant as the Egyptian ideal of longevity (Smith, DB2, 1804 f; Skinner, "Gen," ICC, 539 f). One hundred and fifty-three: The Greek poet Oppian (circa 171 AD) and others are said to have reckoned the number of fishes in the world at this figure (compare Jerome on Eze 47), and some scholars find a reference to that belief in Joh 21:11 in which case the number would be symbolic of comprehensiveness. That is not quite impossible, but the suggestion cannot be safely pressed. Throughout this discussion of significant numbers it must be borne in mind that writers and teachers may often have been influenced by the desire to aid the memory of those they addressed, and may to that end have arranged thoughts and facts in groups of 3, or 4, or 7, or 10, and so on (Sir John Hawkins, Horae Synopticae2, 166 f). They will at the same time have remembered the symbolic force of these numbers, and in some cases, at least, will have used them as round numbers. There are many places in which the round and the symbolic uses of a number cannot be sharply distinguished.

VI. Gematria.

(GemaTriya'). A peculiar application of numbers which was in great favor with the later Jews and some of the early Christians and is not absolutely unknown to the Bible, is Gematria, that is the use of the letters of a word so as by means of their combined numerical value to express a name, or a witty association of ideas. The term is usually explained as an adaptation of the Greek word geometria, that is, "geometry," but Dalman (Worterbuch, under the word) connects it in this application of it with grammateia. There is only one clear example in Scripture, the number of the beast which is the number of a man, six hundred sixty and six (Re 13:18). If, as most scholars are inclined to believe, a name is intended, the numerical value of the letters composing which adds up to 666, and if it is assumed that the writer thought in Hebrew or Aramaic. Nero Caesar written with the consonants nun (n) equals 50, resh (r) equals 200, waw (w) equals 6, nun (n) equals 50, qoph (q) equals 100, camekh (c) equals 60, resh (r) equals 200: total equals 666, seems to be the best solution. Perhaps the idea suggested by Dr. Milligan that the 3-fold use of 6 which just falls short of 7, the number of sacred completeness, and is therefore a note of imperfection, may have been also in the writer's mind. Some modern scholars find a second instance in Ge 14:14 and 15:2. As the numerical value of the consonants which compose Eliezer in Hebrew add up to 318, it has been maintained that the number is not historical, but has been fancifully constructed by means of gematria out of the name. This strange idea is not new, for it is found in the

Midrash on Ge 43 in the name of a rabbi who lived circa 200 AD, but its antiquity is its greatest merit.

LITERATURE.

In addition to other books referred to in the course of the article: Hehn, Siebenzahl und Sabbath bei den Babyloniern und im Altes Testament; Konig, Stilistik, Rhetorik, Poetik, etc., 51-57, and the same writer’s article "Number" in HDB; Sir J. Hawkins, . Horae Synopticae2, 163-67; Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, 155-69; "Number" in HDB (1-vol); EB; Jewish Encyclopedia; Smith, DB; "Numbers" in DCG; "Zahlen" in the Dicts. of Wiener, Riehm2, Guthe; "Zahlen" and "Sieben" in RE3.

William Taylor Smith

NUMBER, GOLDEN

See GOLDEN NUMBER.

NUMBERING

See DAVID; QUIRINIUS.

NUMBERS, BOOK OF

num’-berz:

I. TITLE AND CONTENTS

1. Title

2. Contents

II. LITERARY STRUCTURE

1. Alleged Grounds of Distribution

2. Objections to Same

(1) Hypothesis Unproved

(2) Written Record Not Impossible

(3) No Book Ever Thus Constructed

(4) Inherent Difficulties of Analysis

(a) The Story of the Spies

(b) Rebellion of Korah

(c) Story of Balaam

III. HISTORICAL CREDIBILITY

1. Seeming Chronological Inaccuracies

(1) The Second Passover (Numbers 9:1-5)

(2) The Thirty-seven Years' Chasm

(3) Fortieth Year

2. So-called Statistical Errors

(1) Number of the Fighting Men

(2) Size of the Congregation

(a) Multiplication of People

(b) Exodus in One Day

(c) Support in Wilderness

(d) Room at Mt. Sinai

(e) Slow Conquest of Canaan

(3) Number of the Firstborn

3. Alleged Physical Impossibilities

(1) Duties of the Priests

(2) Assembling of the Congregation

(3) Marching of the Host

(4) Victory over Midian

IV. AUTHORSHIP

1. Against the Mosaic Authorship

(1) Alternating Use of Divine Names

(2) Traces of Late Authorship

2. For the Mosaic Authorship

(1) Certain Passages Have the Appearance of Having Been Written by Moses

(2) Acquaintance on the Part of the Author with Egyptian Manners and Customs

LITERATURE

I. Title and Contents.

1. Title:

Styled in the Hebrew Bible bemidhbar, "in the wilderness," from the 5th word in Nu 1:1, probably because of recording the fortunes of Israel in the Sinaitic desert. The 4th book of the Pentateuch (or of the Hexateuch, according to criticism) was designated Arithmoi in the Septuagint, and Numeri in the Vulgate, and from this last received its name "Numbers" in the King James Version, in all 3 evidently because of its reporting the 2 censuses which were taken, the one at Sinai at the beginning and the other on the plains of Moab at the close of the wanderings.

2. Contents:

Of the contents the following arrangement will be sufficiently detailed:

(1) Before leaving Sinai, Nu 1:1-10:10 (a period of 19 days, from the 1st to the 20th of the 2nd month after the exodus), describing:

(a) The numbering and ordering of the people, Numbers 1-4.

(b) The cleansing and blessing of the congregation, Numbers 5; 6.

(c) The princes' offerings and the dedication of the altar, Numbers 7; 8.

(d) The observance of a second Passover, Nu 9:1-14.

(e) The cloud and the trumpets for the march, Nu 9:15-10:10.

(2) From Sinai to Kadesh, Nu 10:11-14:45 (a period of 10 days, from the 20th to the 30th of the 2nd month), narrating:

(a) The departure from Sinai, Nu 10:11-35.

(b) The events at Taberah and Kibroth-hattaavah, Numbers 11.

(c) The rebellion of Miriam and Aaron, Numbers 12.

(d) The mission of the spies, Numbers 13; 14.

(3) The wanderings in the desert, Numbers 15-19 (a period of 37 years, from the end of the 2nd to the beginning of the 40th year), recording:

(a) Sundry laws and the punishment of a Sabbath breaker, Numbers 15.

(b) The rebellion of Korah, Numbers 16.

(c) The budding of Aaron's rod, Numbers 17.

(d) The duties and revenues of the priests and Levites, Numbers 18.

(e) The water of separation for the unclean, Numbers 19.

(4) From Kadesh to Moab, Numbers 20; 21 (a period of 10 months, from the beginning of the 40th year), reciting:

(a) The story of Balaam, Nu 22:2-24:25.

(b) The zeal of Phinehas, Numbers 25.

(c) The second census, Nu 26:1-51.

(d) Directions for dividing the land, Nu 26:52-27:11.

(e) Appointment of Moses' successor, Nu 27:12-23.

(f) Concerning offerings and vows, Numbers 28-30.

(g) War with Midian, Numbers 31.

(h) Settlement of Reuben and Gad, Numbers 32.

(i) List of camping stations, Nu 33:1-49.

(j) Canaan to be cleared of its inhabitants and divided, Nu 33:50-34:29.

(k) Cities of refuge to be appointed, Numbers 35.

(l) The marriage of heiresses, Numbers 36.

II. Literary Structure.

According to modern criticism, the text of Numbers, like that of the other books of the Pentateuch (or Hexateuch), instead of being regarded as substantially the work of one writer (whatever may have been his sources of information and whoever may have been its first or latest editor), should be distributed—not always in solid blocks of composition, but frequently in fragments, in sentences, clauses or words, so mysteriously put together that they cannot now with certainty be separated—among three writers, J, E and P with another D (at least in one part)—these writers, individuals and not schools (Gunkel), belonging, respectively: J to the 9th century BC (circa 830), E to the 8th century BC (circa 750), P to the 5th century BC (circa 444), and D to the 7th century BC (circa 621).

1. Alleged Grounds of Distribution:

The grounds upon which this distribution is made are principally these:

(1) the supposed preferential use of the Divine names, of Yahweh (Yahweh, "Lord") by J, and of Elohim ("God") by E and P—a theory, however, which hopelessly breaks down in its application, as Orr (POT, chapter vii), Eerdmans (St, 33 ff) and Wiener (EPC, I) have conclusively shown, and as will afterward appear;

(2) distinctions in style of composition, which are not always obvious and which, even if they were,

would not necessarily imply diversity of authorship unless every author’s writing must be uniform and monotonous, whatever his subject may be; and

(3) perhaps chiefly a preconceived theory of religious development in Israel, according to which the people in pre-Mosaic times were animists, totemists and polytheists; in Mosaic times and after, henotheists or worshippers of one God, while recognizing the existence of other gods; and latterly, in exilic and post-exilic times, monotheists or worshippers of the one living and true God—which theory, in order to vindicate its plausibility, required the reconstruction of Israel’s religious documents in the way above described, but which is now rejected by archaeologists (Delitzsch and A. Jeremias) and by theologians (Orr, Baentsch (though accepting the analysis on other grounds) and Konig) as not supported by facts.

2. Objections to Same:

Without denying that the text-analysis of criticism is on the first blush of it both plausible and attractive and has brought to light valuable information relative to Scripture, or without overlooking the fact that it has behind it the names of eminent scholars and is supported by not a few considerations of weight, one may fairly urge against it the following objections.

(1) Hypothesis Unproved.

At the best, theory is an unproved and largely imaginary hypothesis, or series of hypotheses —"hypothesis built on hypothesis" (Orr); and nothing more strikingly reveals this than

(a) the frequency with which in the text-analysis conjecture ("perhaps" and "probably") takes the place of reasoned proof

(b) the arbitrary manner in which the supposed documents are constructed by the critics who, without reason given, and often in violation of their own rules and principles, lift out of J (for instance) every word or clause they consider should belong to E or the Priestly Code (P), and vice versa every word or clause out of E or P that might suggest that the passage should be assigned to J, at the same time explaining the presence of the inconvenient word or clause in a document to which it did not belong by the careless or deliberate action of a redactor; and

(c) the failure even thus to construct the documents successfully, most critics admitting that J and E cannot with confidence be separated from each other—Kuenen himself saying that "the attempt to make out a Jehovistic and an Elohistic writer or school of writers by means of the Divine names has led criticism on a wrong way"; and some even denying that P ever existed as a separate document at all, Eerdmans (St, 33, 82), in particular, maintaining, as the result of elaborate exegesis, that P could not have been constructed in either exilic or post-exilic times "as an introduction to a legal work."

(2) Written Record Not Impossible.

It is impossible to demonstrate that the story of Israel's "wanderings" was not committed to writing by Moses, who certainly was not unacquainted with the art of writing, who had the ability, if any man had, to prepare such a writing, whose interest it was, as the leader of his people, to see that such writing, whether done by himself or by others under his supervision, was accurate, and who besides had been commanded by God to write the journeyings of Israel (Nu 33:2). To suppose that for 500 years no reliable record of the fortunes of Israel existed, when during these years writing was practiced in Egypt and Babylon; and that what was then fixed in written characters was only the tradition that had floated down for 5 centuries from mouth to mouth, is simply to say that little or no dependence can be placed upon the narrative, that while there may be at the bottom of it some grains of fact, the main body of it is fiction. This conclusion will not be readily admitted.

(3) No Book Ever Thus Constructed.

No reliable evidence exists that any book either ancient or modern was ever constructed as, according to criticism, the Pentateuch, and in particular Numbers, was. Volumes have indeed been composed by two or more authors, acting in concert, but their contributions have never been intermixed as those of J, E, D and P are declared to have been; nor, when joint authorship has been acknowledged on the title-page, has it been possible for readers confidently to assign to each author his own contribution. And yet, modern criticism, dealing with documents more than 2,000 years old and in a language foreign to the critics—which documents, moreover, exist only in manuscripts not older than the 10th century AD (Buhl, Canon and Text of the Old Testament, 28), and the text of which has been fixed not infallibly either as to consonant or vowel—claims that it can tell exactly (or nearly so) what parts, whether paragraphs, sentences, clauses or words, were supplied by J, E, P and D respectively. Credat Judaeus Apella!

(4) Inherent Difficulties of Analysis.

The critical theory, besides making of the text of Numbers, as of the other books of the Pentateuch, such a patchwork as is unthinkable in any document with ordinary pretension to historical veracity, is burdened with inherent difficulties which make it hard to credit, as the following examples taken from Numbers, will show.

(a) The Story of the Spies:

Numbers 13 and 14 are thus distributed by Cornill, Driver, Strack and E B:

JE, Nu 13:17 b-20,22-24,26b-31,32b, 33; 14:3,4,8,9,11-25,39-45.

P, Nu 13:1-17 a, 21,25,26a (to Paran), 32a; 14:1,2 (in the main), 5-7,10,26-38 (in the main).

Kautzsch generally agrees; and Hartford-Battersby in HDB professes ability to divide between J and E.

(i) According to this analysis, however, up to the middle of the 5th century BC, either JE began at Nu 13:17 b, in which case it wanted both the instruction to search the land and the names of the searchers, both of which were subsequently added from P (assuming it to have been a separate document, which is doubtful); or, if JE contained both the instruction and the names, these were supplanted by 13:1-17a from P. As the former of these alternatives is hardly likely, one naturally asks why the opening verses of JE were removed and those of P substituted? And if they were removed, what has become of them? Does not the occurrence of Yahweh in 13:1-17a, on the critical principles of some, suggest that this section is the missing paragraph of JE?

(ii) If the JE passages furnish a nearly complete narrative (Driver), why should the late compiler or editor have deemed it necessary to insert two whole verses, 13:21 and 25, and two halves, 13:26a and 32a, if not because without these the original JE narrative would have been incomplete? Nu 13:21 states in general terms that the spies searched the whole land, proceeding as far North as Hamath, after which 13:22 mentions that they entered the country from the South and went up to Hebron and Eshcol, without at all stating an incongruity (Gray) or implying (Driver) that they traveled no farther North—the reason for specifying the visit to Eshcol being the interesting fact that there the extraordinary cluster of grapes was obtained. Nu 13:25,26 a relate quite naturally that the spies returned to Kadesh after 40 days and reported what they had found to Moses and Aaron as well as to all the congregation. Without these verses the narrative would have stated neither how long the land had been searched nor whether Moses and Aaron had received any report from their messengers, although 13:26b implies that a report was given to some person or persons unnamed. That Moses and Aaron should not have been named in JE is exceedingly improbable. Nu 13:32 a is in no way inconsistent with 13:26b-31, which state that the land was flowing with milk and honey. What 13:32a adds is an expression of the exaggerated fears of the spies, whose language could not mean that the land was so barren that they would die of starvation, a statement which would have expressly contradicted 13:27 (JE)—in which case why should it have been inserted?—but that, notwithstanding its fruitfulness, the population was continually being wasted by internecine wars and the incursions of surrounding tribes. The starvation theory, moreover, is not supported by the texts (Le 26:38; Eze 36:13) usually quoted in its behalf.

(iii) To argue (Driver) for two documents because Joshua is not always mentioned along with Caleb is not strikingly convincing; while if Joshua is not included among the spies in JE, that is obviously because the passages containing his name have been assigned beforehand to P. But if Joshua's name did not occur in JE, why would it have been inserted in the story by a post-exilic writer, when even in De 1:36 Joshua is not expressly named as one of the spies, though again the language in De 1:38 tacitly suggests that both Caleb and Joshua were among the searchers of the land, and that any partition of the text which conveys the impression that Joshua was not among the spies is wrong?

(iv) If the text-analysis is as the critics arrange, how comes it that in JE the name Yahweh does not once occur, while all the verses containing it are allocated to P?

(b) Rebellion of Korah:

Numbers 16 and 17 are supposed to be the work of "two, if not three," contributors (Driver, Kautzsch)—the whole story being assigned to P (enlarged by additions about which the text analysts are not unanimous), with the exception of 16:1b, 2a, 12-15,25,26,27b-34, which are given to JE, though variations here also are not unknown.

It is admitted that the JE verses, if read continuously, make out a story of Dathan and Abiram as distinguished from Korah and his company; that the motives of Dathan and Abiram probably differed from those of Korah and his company, and that Dathan and Abiram were swallowed up by an earthquake, while the 250 incense-offerers were destroyed by fire. To conclude from this, however, that three or even two narratives have been intermixed is traveling beyond the premises.

(i) If JE contained more about the conspiracy of the Reubenites, Dathan and Abiram, than has been preserved in the verses assigned to it, what has become of the excised verses, if they are not those ascribed to P; and, if they are not, what evidence exists that P's verses are better than the lost verses of JE? And how comes it that in P the Divine name used throughout, with one exception, 16:22, is Yahweh, while in JE it occurs only 6 t? (ii) If JE contained only the parts assigned to it and nothing more happened than the Reubenite emeute, why should the Korahite rebellion have been added to it 4 centuries later, if that rebellion never happened? (iii) If the Korahite conspiracy did happen, why should it have been omitted in JE, and nothing whispered about it till after the exile? (iv) If the two conspiracies, ecclesiastical (among the princes) and civil (among the laymen), arose contemporaneously, and the conspirators made common cause with one another, in that there was nothing unusual or contrary to experience. (v) If Moses addressed himself now to Korah and again to Dathan and Abiram, why should not the same document say so? (vi) If Dathan and Abiram were engulfed by an earthquake, and the 250 princes were consumed by fire from the tabernacle, even that does not necessitate two documents, since both events might have occurred together. (vii) It is not certain that P (16:35-43) represents Korah as having been consumed by fire, while JE (16:31-33) declares he was swallowed up by the earth. At least P (26:10) distinctly states that Korah was swallowed up by the earth, and that only the 250 were consumed by fire.

Wherefore, in the face of these considerations, it is not too much to say that the evidence for more documents than one in this story is not convincing.

(c) Story of Balaam:

Numbers 22-24 fare more leniently at the hands of analysis, being all left with JE, except 22:1, which is generously handed over to P. Uncertainty, however, exists as to how to partition chapter 22 between J and E. Whether all should be given to E because of the almost uniform use of Elohim rather than of Yahweh, with the exception of 22:22-35a, which are the property of J because of the use of Yahweh (Driver, Kautzsch); or whether some additional verses should not be assigned to J (Cornill, HDB), critics are not agreed. As to Numbers 23 and 24, authorities hesitate whether to give both to J or to E, or chapter 23 to E and chapter 24 to J, or both to a late redactor who had access to the two sources—surely an unsatisfactory demonstration in this case at least of the documentary hypothesis. Comment on the use

of the Divine names in this story is reserved till later.

Yet, while declining to accept this hypothesis as proved, it is not contended that the materials in Nu are always arranged in chronological order, or that the style of composition is throughout the same, or that the book as it stands has never been revised or edited, but is in every jot and tittle the same as when first constructed. In Numbers 7, e.g., the narrative goes back to the 1st day of the 1st month of the 2nd year, and in chapter 9 to the 1st month of the 2nd year, though chapter 1 begins with the 1st day of the 2nd month of the 2nd year. There are also legislative passages interspersed among the historical, and poetical among the prosaic, but diversity of authorship, as already suggested, cannot be inferred from either of these facts unless it is impossible for a writer to be sometimes disorderly in the arrangement of his materials; and for a lawgiver to be also a historian, and for a prose writer occasionally to burst into song. Assertions like these, however, cannot be entertained. Hence, any argument for plurality of documents rounded on them must be set aside. Nor is it a fair conclusion against the literary unity of the book that its contents are varied in substance and form and have been subjected, as is probable, to revision and even to interpolations, provided always these revisions and interpolations have not changed the meaning of the book. Whether, therefore, the Book of Nu has or has not been compiled from preexisting documents, it cannot be justly maintained that the text-analysis suggested by the critics has been established, or that the literary unity of Nu has been disproved.

III. Historical Credibility.

Were the narrative in this book written down immediately or soon after the events it records, no reason would exist for challenging its authenticity, unless it could be shown either from the narrative itself or from extraneous sources that the events chronicled were internally improbable, incredible or falsified. Even should it be proved that the text consists of two or more preexisting documents interwoven with one another, this would not necessarily invalidate its truthfulness, if these documents were practically contemporaneous with the incidents they report, and were not combined in such a way as to distort and misrepresent the occurrences they related. If, however, these pre-existing documents were prepared 500 (JE) or 1,000 (P) years after the incidents they narrate, and were merely a fixing in written characters of traditions previously handed down (JE), or of legislation newly invented and largely imaginary (P), it will not be easy to establish their historical validity. The credibility of this portion of the Pentateuch has been assailed on the alleged ground that it contains chronological inaccuracies, statistical errors and physical impossibilities.

1. Seeming Chronological Inaccuracies:

(1) The Second Passover (Numbers 9:1-5)

The critical argument is that a contemporary historian would naturally have placed this paragraph before Nu 1:1. The answer is that possibly he would have done so had his object been to observe strict chronological order, which it manifestly was not (see Numbers 7 and 9), and had he when commencing the book deemed it necessary to state that the Israelites had celebrated a second Passover on the legally

appointed day, the 14th of the 1st month of the 2nd year. This, however, he possibly at first assumed would be understood, and only afterward, when giving the reason for the supplementary Passover, realized that in after years readers might erroneously conclude that this was all the Passover that had been kept in the 2nd year. So to obviate any such mistaken inference, he prefixed to his account of the Little Passover, as it is sometimes called, a statement to the effect that the statutory ordinance, the Great Passover, had been observed at the usual time, in the usual way, and that, too, in obedience to the express commandment of Yahweh.

(2) The Thirty-seven Years' Chasm.

Whether Nu 20:1 be considered the beginning of the 3rd or of the 40th year, in either case a period of 37 years is passed over—in the one case in almost unbroken silence; in the other with scarcely anything of moment recorded save Korah's rebellion and the publication of a few laws concerning offerings to be made when the people reached the land of their habitation. To pronounce the whole book unhistorical because of this long interval of absolute or comparative silence (Bleek) is unreasonable. Most histories on this principle would be cast into the wastebasket. Besides, a historian might have as good reason for passing over as for recording the incidents of any particular period. And this might have been the case with the author of Numbers. From the moment sentence of death was passed upon the old generation at Kadesh, till the hour when the new generation started out for Canaan, he may have counted that Israel had practically ceased to be the people of Yahweh, or at least that their fortunes formed no part of the history of Yahweh's kingdom; and it is noticeable that scarcely had the tribes reassembled at Kadesh in preparation for their onward march than Miriam and Aaron, probably the last of the doomed generation, died. Accordingly, from this point on, the narrative is occupied with the fortunes of the new generation. Whether correct or not, this solution of the 37 years' silence (Kurtz) is preferable to that which suggests (Ewald) that the late compiler, having found it impossible to locate all the traditions he had collected into the closing years of the wanderings, placed the rest of them in the first 2 years, and left the interval a blank—a solution which has not even the merit of being clever and explains nothing. It does not explain why, if the narrator was not writing history, there should have been an interval at all. A romancer would not have missed so splendid an opportunity for exercising his art, would not have left a gap of 37 years unfilled, but like the writers of the apocryphal Gospels would have crowded it with manufactured tales.

On the better theory, not only is the silence explained, but the items inserted are accounted for as well. Though the unbelieving generation had ceased to be the people of Yahweh, Aaron had not yet been sentenced to exclusion from the promised land, He was still one of the representatives of the kingdom of Yahweh, and Korah's rebellion practically struck a blow at that kingdom. As such it was punished, and the story of its breaking out and suppression was recorded, as a matter that vitally concerned the stability of the kingdom. For a like reason, the legislative sections were included in the narrative. They were Yahweh's acts and not the people's. They were statutes and ordinances for the new generation in the new land.

(3) Fortieth Year.

The events recorded as having taken place between the 1st of the 5th month (the date of Aaron's death) and the 1st of the 11th month (the date of Moses' address) are so numerous and important as to render it impossible, it is said, to maintain the credibility of this portion of the narrative. But

(a) it is not certain that all the events in this section were finished before Moses began his oration; neither

(b) is it necessary to hold that they all occurred in succession; while

(c) until the rapidity with which events followed one another is ascertained, it will not be possible to decide whether or not they could all have been begun and finished within the space of 6 months.

2. So-called Statistical Errors:

(1) Number of the Fighting Men.

This, which may be set down roughly at 600,000, has been challenged on two grounds:

(a) that the number is too large, and

(b) that the censuses at Sinai and in Moab are too nearly equal.

The first of these objections will be considered in the following section when treating of the size of the congregation. The second will not appear formidable if it be remembered

(a) that it is neither impossible nor unusual for the population of a country to remain stationary for a long series of years;

(b) that there was a special fitness in Israel's ease that the doomed generation should be replaced by one as nearly as possible equal to that which had perished;

(c) that had the narrative been invented, it is more than likely that the numbers would have been made either exactly equal or more widely divergent; and

(d) that so many variations occurring in the strength of the tribes as numbered at Sinai and again in Moab, while the totals so nearly correspond, constitutes a watermark of truthfulness which should not be overlooked.

(2) Size of the Congregation.

Taking the fighting men at 600,000 and the whole community at 4 1/2 times that number, or about 2 1/2

millions, several difficulties emerge which have led to the suggestion (Eerdmans, Conder, Wiener) that the 600,000 should be reduced (to, say, 6,000), and the entire population to less than 30,000. The following alleged impossibilities are believed to justify this reduction:

(a) that of 70 families increasing to 2 1/2 millions between the descent into, and the departure from, Egypt;

(b) that of 2 1/2 millions being led out of Egypt in one day;

(c) that of obtaining support for so large a multitude with their flocks in the Sinaitic desert;

(d) that of finding room for them either before the Mount at Sinai, or in the limited territory of Palestine; and

(e) that of the long time it took to conquer Palestine if the army was 600,000 strong.

(a) Multiplication of People:

As to the possibility of 70 souls multiplying in the course of 215 years or 7 generations (to take the shorter interval rather than the longer of 430 years) into 2 1/2 millions of persons giving 600,000 fighting men, that need not be regarded as incredible till the rate of increase in each family is exactly known. Allowing to each of Jacob's grandsons who were married (say 51 out of 53), 4 male descendants (Colenso allows 4 1/2), these would in 7 generations—not in 4 (Colenso)—amount to 835,584, and with surviving fathers and grandfathers added might well reach 900,000, of whom 600,000 might be above 20 years of age. But in point of fact, without definite data about the number of generations, the rates of birth and of mortality in each generation, all calculations are at the best problematical. The most that can be done is to consider whether the narrative mentions any circumstances fitted to explain this large number of fighting men and the great size of the congregation, and then whether the customary objections to the Biblical statement can be satisfactorily set aside.

As for corroborative circumstances, the Bible expressly states that during the years of the oppression the Hebrews were extraordinarily fruitful, and that this was the reason why Pharaoh became alarmed and issued his edict for the destruction of the male children. The fruitfulness of the Hebrews, however, has been challenged (Eerdmans, Verger schichte Israels, 78) on the ground that were the births so numerous as this presupposes, two midwives (Ex 1:15) would not have sufficed for the necessary offices. But if the two to whom Pharaoh spake were the superintendents of the midwives throughout Goshen, to whom the king would hardly address himself individually, or if they were the two officiating in Hellopolls, the statement in Ex 1:15 will appear natural enough, and not opposed to the statement in Ex 1:10 that Pharaoh was alarmed at the multiplication of the Hebrews in his land. And, indeed, if the Hebrews were only 30,000 strong, it is not easy to see why the whole might of Egypt could not have kept them in subjection. Then as to the congregation being 2 1/2 millions if the 2 fighting men were 600,000, that corresponds with the proportion which existed among the Helvetii, who had 92,000 men capable of

bearing arms out of a population, including children, old men and women, of 368,000 souls (Caesar, BG, i, 20). This seems to answer the objection (Eerdmans, Vorgeschichte Israels, 78) that the unschooled Oriental is commonly addicted to exaggeration where numbers are concerned.

(b) Exodus in One Day:

The second difficulty would be serious were it necessary to suppose that the Israelites had never heard about their projected journey till the 14th of the 1st month. But the idea of going forth from Egypt must have been before them since the day Moses went to Pharaoh to demand their liberation; and at least 4 days before the 14th they had begun to prepare for departure. In circumstances such as these, with a people thirsting for liberty and only waiting the signal to move, aware also of the hour at which that signal would be given, namely, at midnight, it does not appear so formidable a task as is imagined to get them all assembled in one day at a fore-appointed rendezvous, more especially as they were not likely to delay or linger in their movements. But how could there have been 2 1/2 millions of fugitives, it is asked (Eerdmans, Wiener), if Pharaoh deemed 600 chariots sufficient for pursuit? The answer is that Pharaoh did not reckon 600 chariots sufficient, but in addition to these, which were "chosen chariots," he took all the chariots of Egypt, his horsemen and his army (Ex 14:7,9), which were surely adequate to overcome a weaponless crowd, however big it might be. And that it was big, a vast horde indeed, Pharaoh’s host implies.

(c) Support in Wilderness:

The supposed difficulty of obtaining support for 2 1/2 millions of people with the flocks and herds in the Sinaitic desert takes for granted that the desert was then as barren a region as it is now, which cannot be proved, and is as little likely to be correct as it would be to argue that Egypt, which was then the granary of the world, was no more fertile than it was 10 years ago, or that the regions in which Babylon and Assyria were situated were as desolate then as they are now. This supposition disregards the fact that Moses fed the flocks of Jethro for 40 years in that same region of Sinai; that when the Israelites passed through it, it was inhabited by several powerful tribes. It overlooks, too, the fact that the flocks and herds of Israel were not necessarily all cooped up in one spot, but were most likely spread abroad in districts where water and vegetation could be found. And it ignores the statement in the narrative that the Israelites were not supplied exclusively by the produce of the desert, but had manna from heaven from the 1st day of the 2nd month after leaving Egypt till they reached Canaan. Rationalistic expositors may relegate this statement to the limbo of fable, but unless the supernatural is to be eliminated altogether from the story, this statement must be accorded its full weight. So must the two miraculous supplies of water at Horeb (Ex 17) and at Kadesh (Nu 20) be treated. It is sometimes argued that these supplies were quite insufficient for 2 1/2 millions of people with their flocks and herds; and that therefore the congregation could not have been so large. But the narrative in Nu states, and presumably it was the same in Exodus, that the smitten rock poured forth its water so copiously and so continuously that ‘the people drank abundantly with their flocks.’ Wherefore no conclusion can be drawn from this against the reported size of the congregation.

(d) Room at Mt. Sinai:

As to the impossibility of finding room for 2 1/2 millions of people either before the Mount at Sinai or within the land of Canaan (Conder), few will regard this as self-evident. If the site of their encampment was the Er-Rahab plain (Robinson, Stanley)—though the plain of Sebayeh, admittedly not so roomy, has been mentioned (Ritter, Kurtz, Knobel)—estimates differ as to the sufficiency of accommodation to be found there. Conder gives the dimensions of the plain as 4 square miles, which he deems insufficient, forgetting, perhaps, that "its extent is farther increased by lateral valleys receding from the plain itself" (Forty Days in the Desert, 73; compare Keil on Ex 19:1,2). Kalisch, though putting the size of the plain at a smaller figure, adds that "it thus furnished ample tenting ground for the hosts of Israel"—a conclusion accepted by Ebers, Riehm and others. In any case it seems driving literal interpretation to extreme lengths to hold that camping before the Mount necessarily meant that every member of the host required to be in full view of Sinai. As to not finding room in Canaan, it is doubtful if, after the conquest, the remnants of both peoples at any time numbered as many persons as dwelt in Palestine during the most flourishing years of the kingdom. It may well be that the whole population of Palestine today amounts to only about 600,000 souls; but Palestine today under Turkish rule is no proper gauge for judging of Palestine under David or even under Joshua.

(e) Slow Conquest of Canaan:

The long time it took to conquer Palestine (Eerdmans, Vorgeschichte Israels, 78) is no solid argument to prove the unreliable character of the statement about the size of the army, and therefore of the congregation. Every person knows that in actual warfare, victory does not always go with the big battalions; and in this instance the desert-trained warriors allowed themselves to be seduced by the idolatries and immoralities of the Canaanites and forgot to execute the commission with which they had been entrusted, namely, to drive out the Canaanites from the land which had been promised to their fathers. Had they been faithful to Yahweh, they would not have taken so long completely to possess the land (Ps 81:13,14). But if instead of having 600,000 stalwart soldiers they had only possessed 6,000, it is not difficult to see how they could not drive out the Canaanites. The difficulty is to perceive how they could have achieved as much as they did.

(3) Number of the Firstborn.

That the 22,273 firstborn males from 1 month old and upward (Nu 3:43) is out of all proportion to the 603,550 men of 20 years old and upward, being much too few, has frequently (Bleek, Bohlen, Colenso and others) been felt as a difficulty, since it practically involves the conclusion that for every firstborn there must have been 40 or 45 males in each family. Various solutions of this difficulty have been offered. The prevalence of polygamy has been suggested (Michaelis, Havernick). The exclusion of firstborn sons who were married, the inclusion only of the mother’s firstborn, and the great fruitfulness of Hebrew mothers have been called in to surmount the difficulty (Kurtz). But perhaps the best explanation is that only those were counted who were born after the Law was given on the night of the departure from Egypt (Ex 13:2; Nu 3:13; 8:17) (Keil, Delitzsch, Gerlach). It may be urged, of course,

that this would require an exceptionally large number of births in the 13 months; but in the exceptionally joyous circumstances of the emancipation this might not have been impossible. In any case, it does not seem reasonable on account of this difficulty, which might vanish were all the facts known, to impeach the historical accuracy of the narrative, even in this particular.

(NOTE.—In Scotland, with a population of nearly double that of the Israelites, namely, 4,877,648, the marriages in 1909 were 30,092, the lowest on record for 55 years. At this rate the births in Israel during the first 12 months after the exodus might have been 15,046, assuming each marriage to have had issue. As this marriage rate, however, is excessively low for Scotland in normal years, the number of marriages and therefore of births in Israel in the first year after the exodus may well have been twice, if not 3 times, 15,046, i.e. 30,092, or 45,138. Reckoning the half of these as males, namely, 15,046 or 22,569, it does not appear as if the number of the firstborn in the text were quite impossible, on the supposition made.)

3. Alleged Physical Impossibilities:

(1) Duties of the Priests.

These are supposed to have been so onerous that Aaron and his sons could not possibly have performed them. But

(a) the Levitical laws, though published in the desert, were not necessarily intended to receive full and minute observance there, but only in Canaan.

(b) In point of fact, as Moses afterward testified (De 12:8), the Levitical laws were not scrupulously kept in the wilderness.

(c) There is no reason to suppose that the Passover of the 2nd year was celebrated otherwise than it had been in Egypt before the exodus, the slaughtering of the lambs being performed by the heads of families. And

(d) as the Levites were set apart to minister to the tabernacle (Nu 1:50), they would be able in many ways to assist the priests.

(2) Assembling of the Congregation.

The assembling of the congregation at the door of the tabernacle (Nu 10:3,4) has been adduced as another physical impossibility; and no doubt it was if every man, woman and child, or even only every man was expected to be there; but not if the congregation was ordinarily represented by its "renowned" or "called" men, princes of the tribes of their fathers, heads of thousands of Israel (Nu 1:16). To suppose that anything else was meant is surely not required. When Moses called all Israel and spake unto them (De 5:1; 29:2), no intelligent person understands that he personally addressed every individual, or spoke

so as to be heard by every individual, though what he said was intended for all. An additional difficulty in the way of assembling the congregation, and by implication an argument against the size of the congregation, has been discovered in the two silver trumpets which, it is contended, were too few for summoning so vast a host as 2 1/2 millions of people. But it is not stated in the narrative either

(a) that it was absolutely necessary that every individual in the camp should hear the sound of the trumpets any more than it was indispensable that Balaam's curse should re-echo to the utmost bounds of Israel (Nu 23:13), or that a public proclamation by a modern state, though prefaced by means of an "Oyez," should be heard by all within the state or even within its capital; or

(b) if it was necessary that everyone should hear, that the trumpeters could not move about through the camp but must remain stationary at the tabernacle door; or

(c) that in the clear air of the desert the sound of the trumpets would not travel farther than in the noisy and murky atmosphere of modern cities; or

(d) that should occasion arise for more trumpets than two, Moses and his successors were forbidden to make them.

(3) Marching of the Host.

The marching of the host in four main divisions of about half a million each (Nu 2; 10:14-20) has also been pronounced a stumbling-block (Colenso, Eerdmans, Doughty), inasmuch as the procession formed (i.e. if no division began to fall into line till its predecessor had completed its evolutions) would require the whole day for its completion, and would make a column of unprecedented length—of 22 miles (Colenzo), of 600 miles (Doughty)—and would even on the most favorable hypothesis travel only a few miles, when the whole line would again need to reconstruct the camp. The simple statement of this shows its absurdity as an explanation of what actually took place on the march, and indirectly suggests that the narrative may be historical after all, as no romancer of a late age would have risked his reputation by laying down such directions for the march, if they were susceptible of no other explanation than the above. How precisely the march was conducted may be difficult or even impossible to describe in such a way as to obviate all objections. But some considerations may be advanced to show that the march through the desert was neither impossible nor incredible.

(a) The deploying of the four main divisions into line may have gone on simultaneously, as they were widely apart from each other, on the East (Judah), on the South (Reuben), on the West (Ephraim) and on the North (Dan).

(b) There is no ground for thinking that the march would be conducted, at least at first, with the precision of a modern army, or that each division would extend itself to the length of 22 miles. It is more than likely that they would follow their standards as best they could or with such order as could be arranged by their captains.

(c) If the camps of Judah and Reuben started their preparations together, say at 6 o'clock in the morning (which might be possible), and occupied 4 hours in completing these, they might begin to advance at 10 o'clock and cover 10 miles in another 4 hours, thus bringing them on to 2 PM, after which 4 hours more would enable them to encamp themselves for the night, if that was necessary. The other two divisions falling into line, say at 2 o'clock, would arrive at 6 PM, and by 10 PM would be settled for the night.

(d) It does not seem certain that every night upon the march they would arrange themselves into a regularly constructed camp; rather it is reasonable to conclude that this would be done only when they had reached a spot where a halt was to be made for some time.

(e) In any case, in the absence of more details as to how the march was conducted, arithmetical calculations are of little value and are not entitled to discredit the truthfulness of the narrative.

(4) Victory over Midian.

This has been objected to on moral grounds which are not now referred to. It is the supposed impossibility of 12,000 Israelites slaying all the male Midianites, capturing all their women and children, including 32,000 virgins, seizing all their cattle and flocks, with all their goods, and burning all their cities and castles without the loss of a single man (Nu 31:49), which occasions perplexity. Yet Scripture relates several victories of a similar description, as e.g. that of Abraham over the kings of the East (Ge 14:15), in which, so far as the record goes, no loss was incurred by the patriarch's army; that of Gideon's 300 over the Midianites at a later date (Jud 7:22); that of Samson single-handed over 1,000 Philistines (Jud 15:15); and that of Jehoshaphat at the battle of Tekoa (2Ch 20:24), which was won without a blow—all more or less miraculous, no doubt. But in profane history, Tacitus (Ann. xiii.39) relates an instance in which the Romans slaughtered all their foes without losing a single man; and Strabo (xvi.1128) mentions a battle in which 1,000 Arabs were slain by only 2 Romans; while the life of Saladin contains a like statement concerning the issue of a battle (Havernick, Intro, 330). Hence, Israel's victory over Midian does not afford sufficient ground for challenging its historic credibility.

IV. Authorship.

Restricting attention to evidence from Nu itself, it may be remarked in a general way that the question of authorship is practically settled by what has been advanced on its literary structure and historical credibility. For, if the materials of the book were substantially the work of one pen (whoever may have been their first collector or last redactor), and if these materials are upon the whole trustworthy, there will be little room to doubt that the original pen was in the hand of a contemporary and eyewitness of the incidents narrated, and that the contemporary and eyewitness was Moses, who need not, however, have set down everything with his own hand, all that is necessary to justify the ascription of the writing to him being that it should have been composed by his authority and under his supervision. In this sense it is believed that indications are not wanting in the book both against and for the Mosaic authorship; and these may now be considered.

1. Against the Mosaic Authorship:

(1) Alternating Use of Divine Names. This usage, after forming so characteristic a feature in Ge and largely disappearing in Exodus and Leviticus, reasserts itself in Numbers, and more particularly in the story of Balaam. If Numbers 23 and 24 can be explained only as late documents pieced together, because of the use of "God" in chapter 23 and of "Lord" in chapter 24, then Moses was not their author. But if the varying use of the divine names is susceptible of explanation on the assumption that the two chapters originally formed one document, then most distinctly the claim of Moses to authorship is not debarred. Now whether Balaam was a false or a true prophet, it is clear that he could hope to please Balak only by cursing Israel in the name of Yahweh, the God ‘Elohim of Israel; and so it is always Yahweh he consults or pretends to consult before replying to the messengers of Balak. Four times he did so (22:8,19; 23:3,15); and 3 times it was Elohim who met him (22:9,20; 23:14), while every time it was Yahweh who put the word in his mouth. Can any conclusion be fairer than that the historian regarded ‘Elohim and Yahweh as the same Divine Being, and represented this as it were by a double emphasis, which showed

(a) that the Yahweh whom Balaam consulted was Elohim or the supreme God, and

(b) that the God who met Balaam and supplied him with oracles was Israel’s Lord? Thus explained, the alternate use of the Divine names does not require the hypothesis of two single documents rolled into one; and indeed the argument from the use of the divine names is now generally abandoned.

(2) Traces of Late Authorship.

Traces of late authorship are believed to exist in several passages:

(a) Nu 15:32-36 seems to imply that the writer was no longer in the wilderness, which may well have been the case, if already he was in the land of Moab.

(b) 20:5 suggests, it is said, that the people were then in Canaan. But the language rather conveys the impression that they were not yet come to Canaan; and in point of fact the people were at Kadesh in the wilderness of Zin.

(c) In 21:14,15,17,18,27-30, certain archaic songs are cited as if the people were familiar with them, and the Arnon is mentioned as the border of Moab long before Israel reached the river. But that poets were among the people at the time of the exodus and probably long before, the song of Moses (Ex 15) shows, and that a Book of the Wars of the Lord was begun to be composed soon after the defeat of Amalek is not an unreasonable hypothesis (Ex 17:14). As for the statement that "Arnon leaneth upon the borders of Moab," that may have been superfluous as a matter of information to the contemporaries of Moses when they were about to cross the stream (Strack, Einl, 25), but it was quite in place in an old prophetic song, as showing that their present position had been long before anticipated and foretold.

(d) 24:7, according to criticism, could not have been composed before the rise of the monarchy; and certainly it could not, if prediction of future events is impossible. But if reference to a coming king in Israel was put into Balaam's mouth by the Spirit of God, as the narrator says, then it could easily have been made before the monarchy; and so could

(e) 24:17,18 have been written before the reign of David, though the conquest of the Edomites only then began (2Sa 8:14; 1Ki 11:1; 1Ch 18:12,13).

Examples such as these show that many, if not most, of the like objections against the Mosaic authorship of this book are capable of at least possible solution; and that Kuenen's caution should not be forgotten: "He who relies upon the impression made by the whole, without interrogation of the parts one by one, repudiates the first principles of all scientific research, and pays homage to superficiality" (Religion of Israel, I, 11).

2. For the Mosaic Authorship:

(1) Certain Passages Have the Appearance of Having Been Written by Moses.

These are:

(a) those which bear evidence of having been intended for a people not settled in cities but dwelling in tents and camps, as e.g. Numbers 1-4, describing the arrangements for the census and the formation of the camp; 6:24-26, the high-priestly benediction; 10:35,36, the orders for the marching and the halting of the host; 10:1-9, the directions about the silver trumpets; Numbers 19, the legislation which obviously presupposes the wilderness as the place for its observance (19:3,7,9,14). If criticism allows that these and other passages have descended from the Mosaic age, why should it be necessary to seek another author for them than Moses? And if Moses could have composed these passages, a presumption at least is created that the whole book has proceeded from his pen.

(b) The patriotic songs taken from the Book of the Wars of the Lord (Numbers 21), which some critics (Cornill, Kautzsch and others) hold cannot be later than 750 BC, are by equally competent scholars (Bleek, De Wette, E. Meyer, Konig and others) recognized as parts of Israel's inheritance from the Mosaic age, whenever they were incorporated in Numbers.

(c) The list of camping stations (Numbers 33) is expressly assigned to him. Whether "by the commandment of the Lord" should be connected with the "journeys" (Konig) or the "writing" makes no difference as to the authorship of this chapter, at least in the sense that it is based on a Mosaic document (Strack). It is true that even if this chapter as it stands was prepared by Moses, that does not amount to conclusive evidence of the Mosaic authorship of the whole book. Yet it creates a presumption in its favor (Drechsler, Keil, Zahn). For why should Moses have been specially enjoined to write so comparatively uninteresting and unprofitable a document as a list of names, many of which are now incapable of identification, if that was all? But if Moses was already writing up a journal or history of

the wanderings, whether by his own hand or by means of amanuenses, and whether by express command or without it (not an unreasonable supposition), there was no particular need to record that this was so. If, however, Moses was not thinking of preserving an itinerary, and God for reasons of His own desired that he should do so, then there was need for a special commandment to be given; and need that it should be recorded to explain why Moses incorporated in his book a list of names that in most people's judgment might have been omitted without imperiling the value of the book. Looked at in this way, the order to prepare this itinerary rather strengthens the idea of the Mosaic authorship of the whole book.

(2) Acquaintance on the Part of the Author with Egyptian Manners and Customs.

This points in the direction of Moses.

(a) The trial by jealousy (Nu 5:11-31) may be compared with the tale of Setnau, belonging probably to the 3rd century BC, but relating to the times of Rameses II, in which Ptahnefer-ka, having found the book which the god Thoth wrote with his own hand, copied it on a piece of papyrus, dissolved the copy in water and drank the solution, with the result that he knew all the book contained (RP, IV, 138). (b) The consecration of the Levites (Nu 8:7) resembled the ablutions of the Egyptian priests who shaved their heads and bodies every 3rd day, bathed twice during the day and twice during the night, and performed a grand ceremony of purification, preparatory to their seasons of fasting, which sometimes lasted from 7 to 40 days and even more (WAE, I, 181).

(c) Uncleanness from contact with the dead (Nu 19:11) was not unknown to the Egyptians, who required their priests to avoid graves, funerals and funeral feasts (Porphyry, De Abst. ii.50, quoted in Speaker's Comm.).

(d) The fish, cucumbers, melons, leeks, onions and garlic referred to in Nu 11:5 were articles of diet in Egypt (Herodotus ii.93):

(e) The antiquarian statement about Hebron (13:22) fits in well with a writer in Mosaic times. "A later writer could have had no authority for making the statement and no possible reason for inventing it" (Pulpit Commentary on Numbers). On a candid review of all the arguments pro and con, it is not too much to say that the preponderance of evidence lies on the side of the substantial Mosaicity of the Book of Numbers.

LITERATURE.

Comms. on Nu by Bertheau (ET), Knobel, Keil (ET), Dillmann, Strack, Lange (English translation); in Speaker's Comm., Pulpit Comm., ICC (Gray); Biblical Intros of De Wette, Hengstenberg, Havernick, Bleek, Konig, Strack, Cornill, Driver; in encs, etc., RE, HDB, EB, Sch-Herz; critical comms.: Reuss, Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften AT; Kuenen, The Religion of Israel (English translation); Wellhausen, Geschichte Israels and Prolegomena (English translation); Klostermann, Der Pentateuch;

Eerdmans, Alttest. Studien; Addis, Documents of Hexateuch; Olford Hexateuch; EPC.

T. Whitelaw

NUMENIUS

nu-me’-ni-us (Noumenios): The son of Antiochus, and Antipater were the two ambassadors whom Jonathan sent to the Romans, "to the Spartans, and to other places," after his victory in the plain of Hazor (Galilee) over the princes of Demetrius (1 Macc 12:1 ff) about 144 BC. Their mission was to confirm and renew the friendship and treaty which had existed from the days of Judas (1 Macc 8:17 ff). They were well received and successful, both at Rome (1 Macc 12:3 f) and at Sparta (1 Macc 12:19 ff; 14:22 f). After the death of Jonathan, the victories of Simon and the establishment of peace, Simon sent Numenius on a second embassy to Rome (1 Macc 14:24), again to confirm the treaty and present a golden shield weighing 1,000 minae—apparently just before the popular decree by which Simon was created high priest, leader and captain "for ever" (1 Macc 14:27 ff), September, 141 BC. The embassy returned in 139 BC, bearing letters from the senate to the kings of Egypt, Syria and "all the countries," confirming the integrity of Jewish territory, and forbidding these kings to disturb the Jews, and requiring them also to surrender any deserters (1 Macc 14:15 ff). See also LUCIUS; Schurer, Gesch. des judischen Volkes (3rd and 4th editions), I, 236, 250 f.

S. Angus

NUN (1)

noon ("n"): The 14th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "n". It came also to be used for the number 50.

See ALPHABET, for name, etc.

NUN (2)

nun (nun "fish," derivative meaning "fecundity"): Father of Joshua (referred to thus 29 t) (Ex 33:11; Nu 11:28, etc.; 1Ch 7:27, margin "Non"; Sirach 46:1, margin "Nave").

NURSE; NURSING

nurs, nurs’-ing: "Nurse" in the King James Version represents two different Hebrew words: In 8 passages (Ge 24:59; 35:8; Ex 2:7,9; 2Ki 11:2; 2Ch 22:11; Isa 49:23) the word—noun or verb—renders some form of the verb yanaq, "to suck." The feminine causative part. of this verb is commonly used to denote nurse or foster-mother. According to Ex 2:7 Moses’ mother—"a nurse of the Hebrew women"—became, at Pharaoh’s daughter’s request, the foster-mother of the foundling. Joash, the son of Ahaziah,

was in charge of a nurse until he was 7 years old (2Ki 11:2; 2Ch 22:11). But it is obvious that the term was used in a more general way, e.g. of a lady's maid or tire-woman. Rebekah was accompanied by her nurse when she left home to be married (Ge 24:59; 35:8). In 5 passages (Nu 11:12; Ru 4:16; 2Sa 4:4; Isa 49:23; 60:4 the King James Version) "nurse" represents the Hebrew word, 'aman, "to support," "be faithful," "nourish." The participle of this verb denoted a person who had charge of young children—a guardian or governess. Naomi took charge of Ruth's child "and became nurse unto it" (Ru 4:16). In Nu 11:12 Moses asks whether he has to take charge of the Israelites "as a nursing-father carrieth the sucking child." The same word is found in 2Ki 10:15 (the King James Version "them that brought up," i.e. "guardians of the sons of Ahab) and in Es 2:7 (the King James Version "and he brought up," i.e. he (Mordecai) adopted, his niece). Deutero-Isa uses both terms together (Isa 49:23) to describe the exalted position of Israel in the future when foreign kings and queens will offer their services and wait upon the chosen people.

In the solitary passage in the New Testament where "nurse" occurs, it renders the Greek word trophos. In this case the word does not mean a hired nurse, but a mother who nurses her own children (1Th 2:7).

T. Lewis

NURTURE

nur'-tur: The word occurs in the King James Version in Eph 6:4 as the translation of paideia, but the Revised Version (British and American) changes to "chastening," and uses "nurture" (verb) for the King James Version "bring up" (ektrepho) in the first part of the verse. Paideia has the idea of training and correction; in the Revised Version (British and American) 2 Esdras 8:12 for Latin erudio; and compare the King James Version The Wisdom of Solomon 3:11; Sirach 18:13 (paideuo), etc.

NUTS

nuts:

(1) ('eghoz; karua; Arabic jauz, "the walnut" (So 6:11)): This is certainly the walnut tree, Juglans regia, a native of Persia and the Himalayas which flourishes under favorable conditions in all parts of Palestine; particularly in the mountains. In such situations it attains the height of from 60 to 90 ft. A grove of such trees affords the most delightful shade.

(2) (boTnim; terebinthoi (Ge 43:11, margin "pistachio nuts")): The Hebrew is perhaps allied to the Arabic buTm, the "terebinth," which is closely allied to the Pistacia vera, Natural Order Anacardiaceae, which produces pistachio nuts. These nuts, known in Arabic as fistuq, are prime favorites with the people of Palestine. They are oblong, 3/4 inches long, with green, oily cotyledons. They are eaten raw and are also made into various sweets and confectionery. They are a product of Palestine, very likely to be sent as a present to Egypt (Ge 43:11).

E. W. G. Masterman

NYMPHAS

nim’-fas (Numphas; Lachmann, Tregelles (margin), Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek read Numpha, the name of a woman (Col 4:15)):

1. A Christian in Laodicea:

A Christian resident in Laodicea, to whom Paul sends salutations in the epistle which he wrote from Rome to the church in Colosse, the latter city being only a very few miles distant from Laodicea. Indeed, so near were they, that Paul directs that the Epistle to the Colossians be read also in Laodicea. Nymphas —or if Nympha be read, then it is a Christian lady who is meant—was a person of outstanding worth and importance in the church of Laodicea, for he had granted the use of his dwelling-house for the ordinary weekly meetings of the church. The apostle’s salutation is a 3-fold one—to the brethren that are in Laodicea, that is to the whole of the Christian community in that city, and to Nymphas, and to the church in his house.

2. The Church in His House:

This fact, that the church met there, also shows that Nymphas was a person of some means, for a very small house could not have accommodated the Christian men and women who gathered together on the first day of every week for the purposes of Christian worship. The church in Laodicea—judging not only from the Epistle to the Ephesians, which is really Paul’s Epistle to the Laodiceans, and which indicates that the church in Laodicea had a numerous membership, but also from what is said of it in Re 3:17 the King James Version—must have been large and influential: "Thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing." The house of Nymphas, therefore, must have possessed a large room or saloon sufficiently commodious to allow the meeting of a numerous company. Nymphas would he a person both of Christian character and of generous feeling, and of some amount of wealth. Nothing more is known regarding him, as this is the only passage in which he is named.

John Rutherfurd

OABDIUS

o-ab’-di-us (Codex Alexandrinus Oabdios; Codex Vaticanus eios, Fritzsche, Ioabdios, omitted in the King James Version): One of the sons of Ela who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:27) =" Abdi" of Ezr 10:26.

OAK

ok: Several Hebrew words are so translated, but there has always been great doubt as to which words should be translated "oak" and which "terebinth." This uncertainty appears in the Septuagint and all through English Versions of the Bible; in recent revisions "terebinth" has been increasingly added in the margin. All the Hebrew words are closely allied and may originally have had simply the meaning of "tree" but it is clear that, when the Old Testament was written, they indicated some special kind of tree.

1. Hebrew Words and References:

The words and references are as follows:

(1) ‘elah (in the Septuagint usually terebinthos. in Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) terebinthus, or, more commonly, quercus) (Ge 35:4; Jud 6:11,19; 2Sa 18:9,10,14; 1Ki 13:14; 1Ch 10:12; Isa 1:30; Eze 6:13—in all these margin "terebinth "). In Isa 6:13 (the King James Version "teil tree") and Ho 4:13 (the King James Version "elms") the translation is "terebinths" because of the juxtaposition of ‘allon, translated "oaks." "Vale of Elah" (margin "the Terebinth") is found in 1Sa 17:2,19; 21:9. The expression in Isa 1:30, "whose leaf fadeth," is more appropriate to the terebinth than the oak (see below).

(2) ‘allah (terebinthos, quercus (Vulgate)), apparently a slight variant for ‘elah; only in Jos 24:26; Ge 35:4 (’elah) and in Jud 9:6 (’elon).

(3) ‘elim or ‘eylim, perhaps plural of ‘elah occurs in Isa 1:29 (margin "terebinths"); Isa 57:5, margin "with idols," the King James Version "idols," margin "oaks"; Isa 61:3, "trees"; Eze 31:14 (text very doubtful), "height," the King James Version margin "upon themselves"; ‘el, in El-paran Septuagint terebinthos) (Ge 14:6), probably means the "tree" or "terebinth" of Paran. Celsius (Hierob. 1,34 ff) argues at length that the above words apply well to the TEREBINTH (which see) in all the passages in which they occur.

(4) ‘elon (usually drus, "oak"), in Ge 12:6; 13:18; 14:13; 18:1; De 11:30; Jos 19:33; Jud 4:11; 9:6,37; 1Sa 10:3 (the King James Version "plain"); in all these references the margin has "terebinth" or "terebinths." In Ge 12:6; De 11:30 we have "oak" or "oaks" "of the teacher" (Moreh); "oak in Zaanannim" in Jud 4:11; Jos 19:33; the "oak of Meonenim," margin "the augurs’ oak (or, terebinth)" in Jud 9:37.

(5) ‘allon (commonly drus, or balanos), in Ge 35:8 (compare 35:4); Ho 4:13; Isa 6:13, is contrasted with ‘elah, showing that ‘allon and ‘elah cannot be identical, so no marginal references occur; also in Isa 44:14; Am 2:9, but in all other passages, the margin "terebinth" or "terebinths" occurs. "Oaks of Bashan" occurs in Isa 2:13; Eze 27:6; Zec 11:2.

If (1) (2) (3) refer especially to the terebinth, then (4) and (5) are probably correctly translated "oak." If we may judge at all by present conditions, "oaks" of Bashan is far more correct than "terebinths" of Bashan.

2. Varieties of Oak:

There are, according to Post (Flora of Palestine, 737-41), no less than 9 species of oak (Natural Order Cupuliferae) in Syria, and he adds to these 12 sub-varieties. Many of these have no interest except to the botanist. The following species are widespread and distinctive: (1) The "Turkey oak," Quercus cerris, known in Arabic as Ballut, as its name implies, abounds all over European Turkey and Greece and is common in Palestine. Under favorable conditions it attains to great size, reaching as much as 60 ft. in height. It is distinguished by its large sessile acorns with hemispherical cups covered with long, narrow, almost bristly, scales, giving them a mossy aspect. The wood is hard and of fine grain. Galls are common upon its branches.

(2) Quercus lusitanica (or Ballota), also known in Arabic as Ballut, like the last is frequently found dwarfed to a bush, but, when protected, attains a height of 30 ft. or more. The leaves are denate or crenate and last late into the winter, but are shed before the new twigs are developed. The acorns are solitary or few in cluster, and the cupules are more or less smooth. Galls are common, and a variety of this species is often known as Q. infectoria, on account of its liability to infection with galls.

(3) The Valonica oak (Q. aceglops), known in Arabic as Mellut, has large oblong or ovate deciduous leaves, with deep serrations terminating in a bristle-like point, and very large acorns, globular, thick cupules covered with long reflexed scales. The cupules, known commercially as valonica, furnish one of the richest of tanning materials.

(4) The Evergreen oak is often classed under the general name "Ilex oak" or Holm (i.e. holly-like) oak. Several varieties are described as occurring in Palestine. Q. ilex usually has rather a shrublike growth, with abundant glossy, dark-green leaves, oval in shape and more or less prickly at the margins, though sometimes entire. The cupules of the acorns are woolly. It shows a marked predilection for the neighborhood of the sea. The Q. coccifera (with var. Q. pseudococcifera) is known in Arabic as Sindian. The leaves, like the last, usually are prickly. The acorns are solitary or twin, and the hemispherical cupules are more or less velvety. On the Q. coccifera are found the insects which make the well-known Kermes dye. These evergreen oaks are the common trees at sacred tombs, and the once magnificent, but now dying, "Abraham’s oak" at Hebron is one of this species.

3. Oaks in Modern Palestine:

Oaks occur in all parts of Palestine, in spite of the steady ruthless destruction which has been going on for centuries. All over Carmel, Tabor, around Banias and in the hills to the West of Nazareth, to mention well-known localities, there are forests of oak; great tracts of country, especially in Galilee and East of the Jordan, are covered by a stunted brushwood which, were it not for the wood-cutter, would grow into noble trees. Solitary oaks of magnificent proportions occur in many parts of the land, especially upon hilltops; such trees are saved from destruction because of their "sacred" character. To bury beneath such a tree has ever been a favorite custom (compare Ge 35:8; 1Ch 10:12). Large trees like these, seen often from great distances, are frequently landmarks (Jos 19:33) or places of meeting (compare "Oak of Tabor," 1Sa 10:3). The custom of heathen worship beneath oaks or terebinths (Ho 4:13; Eze 6:13, etc.) finds its modern counterpart in the cult of the Wely in Palestine. The oak is sometimes connected with some historical event, as e.g. Abraham’s oak of Mamre now shown at Hebron, and "the oak of weeping," Allon bacuth, of Ge 35:8.

E. W. G. Masterman

OAK OF TABOR

(’elon tabhor): Thus the Revised Version (British and American) in 1Sa 10:3 for the King James Version "plain of Tabor" (the Revised Version margin "terebinth"). Tabor was famous for its groves of oak, but what "oak" is meant here is not known. Ewald thinks that "Tabor" is a different pronunciation for "Deborah," and connects with Ge 35:8; but this is not likely.

See OAK, 3.

OAR

or.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3).

OATH

oth (shebhu‘ah, probably from shebha‘, "seven," the sacred number, which occurs frequently in the ritual of an oath; horkos; and the stronger word ‘alah, by which a curse is actually invoked upon the oath-breaker Septuagint ara)): In Mt 26:70-74 Peter first denies his Lord simply, then with an oath (shebhu‘ah), then invokes a curse (’alah), thus passing through every stage of asseveration.

1. Law Regarding Oaths:

The oath is the invoking of a curse upon one’s self if one has not spoken the truth (Mt 26:74), or if one

fails to keep a promise (1Sa 19:6; 20:17; 2Sa 15:21; 19:23). It played a very important part, not only in lawsuits (Ex 22:11; Le 6:3,5) and state affairs (Ant., XV, x, 4), but also in the dealings of everyday life (Ge 24:37; 50:5; Jud 21:5; 1Ki 18:10; Ezr 10:5). The Mosaic laws concerning oaths were not meant to limit the widespread custom of making oaths, so much as to impress upon the people the sacredness of an oath, forbidding on the one hand swearing falsely (Ex 20:7; Le 19:12; Zec 8:17, etc.), and on the other swearing by false gods, which latter was considered to be a very dark sin (Jer 12:16; Am 8:14). In the Law only two kinds of false swearing are mentioned: false swearing of a witness, and false asseveration upon oath regarding a thing found or received (Le 5:1; 6:2 ff; compare Pr 29:24). Both required a sin offering (Le 5:1). The Talmud gives additional rules, and lays down certain punishments for false swearing; in the case of a thing found it states what the false swearer must pay (Makkoth 2 3; Shebhu‘oth 8 3). The Jewish interpretation of the 3rd commandment is that it is not concerned with oaths, but rather forbids the use of the name of Yahweh in ordinary cases (so Dalman).

2. Forms of Swearing:

Swearing in the name of the Lord (Ge 14:22; De 6:13; Jud 21:7; Ru 1:17, etc.) was a sign of loyalty to Him (De 10:20; Isa 48:11; Jer 12:16). We know from Scripture (see above) that swearing by false gods was frequent, and we learn also from the newly discovered Elephantine papyrus that the people not only swore by Jahu (= Yahweh) or by the Lord of Heaven, but also among a certain class of other gods, e.g. by Herem-Bethel, and by Isum. In ordinary intercourse it was customary to swear by the life of the person addressed (1Sa 1:26; 20:3; 2Ki 2:2); by the life of the king (1Sa 17:55; 25:26; 2Sa 11:11); by one’s own head (Mt 5:36); by the earth (Mt 5:35); by the heaven (Mt 5:34; 23:22); by the angels (BJ, II, xvi, 4); by the temple (Mt 23:16), and by different parts of it (Mt 23:16); by Jerusalem (Mt 5:35; compare Kethubhoth 2:9). The oath "by heaven" (Mt 5:34; 23:22) is counted by Jesus as the oath in which God’s name is invoked. Jesus does not mean that God and heaven are identical, but He desires to rebuke those who paltered with an oath by avoiding a direct mention of a name of God. He teaches that such an oath is a real oath and must be considered as sacredly binding.

3. The Formula:

Not much is told us as to the ceremonies observed in taking an oath. In patriarchal times he who took the oath put his hand under the thigh of him to whom the oath was taken (Ge 24:2; 47:29). The most usual form was to hold up the hand to heaven (Ge 14:22; Ex 6:8; De 32:40; Eze 20:5). The wife suspected of unfaithfulness, when brought before the priest, had to answer "Amen, Amen" to his adjuration, and this was considered to be an oath on her part (Nu 5:22). The usual formula of an oath was either: "God is witness betwixt me and thee" (Ge 31:50), or more commonly: "As Yahweh (or God) liveth" (Jud 8:19; Ru 3:13; 2Sa 2:27; Jer 38:16); or "Yahweh be a true and faithful witness amongst us" (Jer 42:5). Usually the penalty invoked by the oath was only suggested: "Yahweh (or God) do so to me" (Ru 1:17; 2Sa 3:9,35; 1Ki 2:23; 2Ki 6:31); in some cases the punishment was expressly mentioned (Jer 29:22). Nowack suggests that in general the punishment was not expressly mentioned because of a superstitious fear that the person swearing, although speaking the truth, might draw upon himself some of the punishment by merely mentioning it.

Philo expresses the desire (ii.194) that the practice of swearing should be discontinued, and the Essenes used no oaths (BJ, II, viii, 6; Ant., XV, x, 4).

4. Oaths Permissible:

That oaths are permissible to Christians is shown by the example of our Lord (Mt 26:63 f), and of Paul (2Co 1:23; Ga 1:20) and even of God Himself (Heb 6:13-18). Consequently when Christ said, "Swear not at all" (Mt 5:34), He was laying down the principle that the Christian must not have two standards of truth, but that his ordinary speech must be as sacredly true as his oath. In the kingdom of God, where that principle holds sway, oaths become unnecessary.

Paul Levertoff

OBADIAH

o-ba-di'-a ('obhadhyah, more fully 'obhadhyahu, "servant of Yahweh"):

(1) The steward or prime minister of Ahab, who did his best to protect the prophets of Yahweh against Jezebel's persecution. He met Elijah on his return from Zarephath, and bore to Ahab the news of Elijah's reappearance (1Ki 18:3-16).

(2) The prophet (Ob 1:1).

See OBADIAH, BOOK OF.

(3) A descendant of David (1Ch 3:21).

(4) A chief of the tribe of Issachar (1Ch 7:3).

(5) A descendant of Saul (1Ch 8:38; 9:44).

(6) A Levite descended from Jeduthun (1Ch 9:16), identical with Abda (Ne 11:17).

(7) A chief of the Gadites (1Ch 12:9).

(8) A Zebulunite, father of the chief Ishmaiah (1Ch 27:19).

(9) One of the princes sent by Jehoshaphat to teach the law in Judah (2Ch 17:7).

(10) A Merarite employed by Josiah to oversee the workmen in repairing the temple (2Ch 34:12).

(11) The head of a family who went up with Ezra from Babylon (Ezr 8:9).

(12) One of the men who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Ne 10:5).

(13) A gate-keeper in the days of Nehemiah (Ne 12:25).

The name "Obadiah" was common in Israel from the days of David to the close of the Old Testament. An ancient Hebrew seal bears the inscription "Obadiah the servant of the King."

John Richard Sampey

OBADIAH, BOOK OF

Obadiah is the shortest book in the Old Testament. The theme of the book is the destruction of Edom. Consequent upon the overthrow of Edom is the enlargement of the borders of Judah and the establishment of the kingship of Yahweh. Thus far all scholars are agreed; but on questions of authorship and date there is wide divergence of opinion.

1. Contents of the Book:

(1) Yahweh summons the nations to the overthrow of proud Edom. The men of Esau will be brought down from their lofty strongholds; their hidden treasures will be rifled; their confederates will turn against them; nor will the wise and the mighty men in Edom be able to avert the crushing calamity (Ob 1:1-9).

(2) The overthrow of Edom is due to the violence and cruelty shown toward his brother Jacob. The prophet describes the cruelty and shameless gloating over a brother’s calamity, in the form of earnest appeals to Edom not to do the selfish and heartless deeds of which he had been guilty when Jerusalem was sacked by foreign foes (Ob 1:10-14).

(3) The day of the display of Yahweh’s retributive righteousness upon the nations is near. Edom shall be completely destroyed by the people whom he has tried to uproot, while Israel’s captives shall return to take possession of their own land and also to seize and rule the mount of Esau. Thus the kingship of Yahweh shall be established (Ob 1:15-21).

2. Unity of the Book:

The unity of Obadiah was first challenged by Eichhorn in 1824, 1:17-21 being regarded by him as an appendix attached to the original exilic prophecy in the time of Alexander Janneus (104-78 BC). Ewald thought that an exilic prophet, to whom he ascribed 1:11-14 and 19-21, had made use of an older prophecy by Obadiah in 1:1-10, and in 1:15-18 of material from another older prophet who was

contemporary, like Obadiah, with Isaiah. As the years went on, the material assigned to the older oracle was limited by some to 1:1-9 and by others to 1:1-6. Wellhausen assigned to Obadiah 1:1-5,7,10,11,13,14,15b, while all else was regarded as a later appendix. Barton's theory of the composition of Obadiah is thus summed up by Bewer: "Ob 1:1-6 are a pre-exilic oracle of Obadiah, which was quoted by Jeremiah, and readapted with additions (Ob 1:7-15) by another Obadiah in the early post-exilic days; 1:16-21 form an appendix, probably from Maccabean times" (ICC, 5). Bewer's own view is closely akin to Barton's. He thinks that Obadiah, writing in the 5th century BC, "quoted 1:1-4 almost, though not quite, literally; that he commented on the older oracle in 1:5-7, partly in the words of the older prophet, partly in his own words, in order to show that it had been fulfilled in his own day; and that in 1:8,9 he quoted once more from the older oracle without any show of literalness." He ascribes to Obadiah 1:10-14 and 15b. The appendix consists of two sections, 1:15a, 16-18 and 1:19-21, possibly by different authors, 1:18 being a quotation from some older prophecy. To the average Bible student all this minute analysis of a brief prophecy must seem hypercritical. He will prefer to read the book as a unity; and in doing so will get the essence of the message it has for the present day.

3. Date of the Book:

Certain preliminary problems require solution before the question of date can be settled.

(1) Relation of Obadiah and Jeremiah 49.

(a) Did Obadiah quote from Jeremiah? Pusey thus sets forth the impossibility of such a solution: "Out of 16 verses of which the prophecy of Jeremiah against Edom consists, four are identical with those of Obadiah; a fifth embodies a verse of Obadiah's; of the eleven which remain, ten have some turns of expression or idioms, more or fewer, which recur in Jer, either in these prophecies against foreign nations, or in his prophecies generally. Now it would be wholly improbable that a prophet, selecting verses out of the prophecy of Jeremiah, should have selected precisely those which contain none of Jeremiah's characteristic expressions; whereas it perfectly fits in with the supposition that Jeremiah interwove verses of Obadiah with his own prophecy, that in verses so interwoven there is not one expression which occurs elsewhere in Jer" (Minor Prophets, I, 347).

(b) Did Jeremiah quote from Obadiah? It is almost incredible that the vigorous and well-articulated prophecy in Obadiah could have been made by piecing together detached quotations from Jer; but Jeremiah may well have taken from Obadiah many expressions that fell in with his general purpose. There are difficulties in applying this view to one or two verses, but it has not been disproved by the arguments from meter advanced by Bewer and others.

(c) Did both Obadiah and Jeremiah quote from an older oracle? This is the favorite solution among recent scholars, most of whom think that Obadiah preserves the vigor of the original, while Jeremiah quotes with more freedom; but Bewer in ICC, after a detailed comparison, thus sums up: "Our conclusion is that Obadiah quoted in Ob 1:1-9 an older oracle, the original of which is better preserved in Jer 49." The student will do well to get his own first-hand impression from a careful comparison of

the two passages. With Ob 1:1-4 compare Jer 49:14-16; with Ob 1:5,6 compare Jer 49:9,10 a; with Ob 1:8 compare Jer 49:7; with Ob 1:9 a compare Jer 49:22 b. On the whole, the view that Jeremiah, who often quotes from earlier prophets, draws directly from Obadiah, with free working over of the older prophets, seems still tenable.

(2) Relation of Obadiah and Joel.

There seems to be in Joe 2:32 (Hebrew 3:5) a direct allusion to Ob 1:17. If Joe prophesied during the minority of the boy king Joash (circa 830 BC), Obadiah would be, on this hypothesis, the earliest of the writing prophets.

(3) What Capture of Jerusalem Is Described in Obadiah 1:10-14?

The disaster seems to have been great enough to be called "destruction" (Ob 1:12). Hence, most scholars identify the calamity described by Obadiah with the capture and destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans in 587 BC. But it is remarkable, on this hypothesis, that no allusion is made either in Obadiah or Jer 49:7-22 to the Chaldeans or to the destruction of the temple or to the wholesale transportation of the inhabitants of Jerusalem to Babylonia. We know, however, from Eze 35:1-15 and Ps 137:7 that Edom rejoiced over the final destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans in 587 BC, and that they encouraged the destroyers to blot out the holy city. Certain it is that the events of 587 accord remarkably with the language of Ob 1:10-14. Pusey indeed argues from the use of the form of the direct prohibition in Ob 1:12-14 that Edom had not yet committed the sins against which the prophet warns him, and so Jerusalem was not yet destroyed, when Obadiah wrote. But almost all modern scholars interpret the language of Ob 1:12-14 as referring to what was already past; the prophet "speaks of what the Edomites had actually done as of what they ought not to do." The scholars who regard Obadiah as the first of the writing prophets locate his ministry in Judah during the reign of Jehoram (circa 845 BC). Both 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles tell of the war of rebellion in the days of Jehoram when Edom, after a fierce struggle, threw off the yoke of Judah (2Ki 8:20-22; 2Ch 21:8-10). Shortly after the revolt of Edom, according to 2Ch 21:16 f, the Philistines and Arabians broke into Judah, "and carried away all the substance that was found in the king’s house, and his sons also, and his wives; so that there was never a son left him, save Jehoahaz, the youngest of his sons." Evidently the capital city fell into the hands of the invaders. It was a calamity of no mean proportions.

The advocates of a late date call attention to three points that weaken the case for an early date for Obadiah:

(a) The silence of 2 Kings as to the invasion of the Philistines and Arabians. But what motive could the author of Chronicles have had for inventing the story?

(b) The absence of any mention of the destruction of the city by the Philistines and Arabians. It must be acknowledged that the events of 587 BC accord more fully with the description in Ob 1:10-14, though the disaster in the days of Jehoram must have been terrible.

(c) The silence as to Edom in 2Ch 21:16 f. But so also are the historic books silent as to the part that Edom took in the destruction of Jerusalem in 587.

It is true that exilic and post-exilic prophets and psalmists speak in bitter denunciation of the unbrotherly conduct of Edom (La 4:21,22; Eze 25:12-14; 35:1-15; Ps 137:7; Mal 1:1-5; compare also Isa 34 and 63:1-6); but it is also true that the earliest Hebrew literature bears witness to the keen rivalry between Esau and Jacob (Ge 25:22 f; 27:41; Nu 20:14-21), and one of the earliest of the writing prophets denounces Edom for unnatural cruelty toward his brother (Am 1:11 f; compare Joe 3:19 (Heb 4:19)).

(4) The Style of Obadiah.

Most early critics praise the style. Some of the more recent critics argue for different authors on the basis of a marked difference in style within the compass of the twenty-one verses in the little roll. Thus Selbie writes in HDB: "There is a difference in style between the two halves of the book, the first being terse, animated, and full of striking figures, while the second is diffuse and marked by poverty of ideas and trite figures." The criticism of the latter part of the book is somewhat exaggerated, though it may be freely granted that the first half is more original and vigorous. The Hebrew of the book is classic, with scarcely any admixture of Aramaic words or constructions. The author may well have lived in the golden age of the Hebrew language and literature.

(5) Geographical and Historical Allusions.

The references to the different sections and cities in the land of Israel and in the land of Edom are quite intelligible. As to Sepharad (Ob 1:20) there is considerable difference of opinion. Schrader and some others identify it with a Shaparda in Media, mentioned in the annals of Sargon (722-705 BC). Many think of Asia Minor, or a region in Asia Minor mentioned in Persian inscriptions, perhaps Bithynia or Galatia (Sayce). Some think that the mention of "the captives of this host of the children of Israel" and "the captives of Jerusalem" (Ob 1:20) proves that both the Assyrian captivity and the Babylonian exile were already past. This argument has considerable force; but it is well to remember that Amos, in the first half of the 8th century, describes wholesale deportations from the land of Israel by men engaged in the slave trade (Am 1:6-10). The problem of the date of Obadiah has not been solved to the satisfaction of Biblical students. Our choice must be between a very early date (circa 845) and a date shortly after 587, with the scales almost evenly balanced.

4. Interpretation of the Book:

Obadiah is to be interpreted as prediction rather than history. In 1:11-14 there are elements of historic description, but 1:1-10 and 15-21 are predictive.

LITERATURE.

Comms.: Caspari, Der Prophet Obadjah ausgelegt, 1842; Pusey, The Minor Prophets, 1860; Ewald, Commentary on the Prophets of the Old Testament (English translation), II, 277 ff, 1875; Keil (ET), 1880; T.T. Perowne (in Cambridge Bible), 1889; von Orelli (English translation), The Minor Prophets, 1893; Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten, 1898; G.A. Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, II, 163 ff, 1898; Nowack, Die kleinen Propheten, 1903; Marti, Dodekapropheton, 1903; Eiselen, The Minor Prophets, 1907; Bewer, ICC, 1911. Miscellaneous: Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the Prophets, 33 ff; Intros of Driver, Wildeboer, etc.; Selbie in HDB, III, 577-80; Barton in JE, IX, 369-70; Cheyne in EB, III, 3455-62; Peckham, An Introduction to the Study of Obadiah, 1910; Kent, Students' Old Testament, III, 1910.

John Richard Sampey

OBAL

o'-bal.

See EBAL, 1.

OBDIA

ob-di'-a (Codex Alexandrinus Obdia; Codex Vaticanus Hobbeia): One of the families of usurping priests (1 Esdras 5:38) =" Habaiah" of Ezr 2:61; "Hobaiah" of Ne 7:63.

OBED o'-bed ('obhedh, "worshipper"; in the New Testament Iobed):

(1) Son of Boaz and Ru and grandfather of David (Ru 4:17,21,22; 1Ch 2:12; Mt 1:5; Lu 3:32).

(2) Son of Ephlal and descendant of Sheshan, the Jerahmeelite, through his daughter who was married to Jarha, an Egyptian servant of her father's (1Ch 2:37,38).

(3) One of David's mighty men (1Ch 11:47).

(4) A Korahite doorkeeper, son of Shemaiah, and grandson of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:7).

(5) Father of Azariah, one of the centurions who took part with Jehoiada in deposing Queen Athaliah and crowning Joash (2Ch 23:1; compare 2Ki 11:1-16).

David Francis Roberts

OBED-EDOM

o'-bed-e'-dom ('obhedh 'edhowm (2Ch 25:24), 'obhedd 'edhom (2Sa 6:10; 1Ch 13:13,14; 15:25), but

elsewhere without hyphen, "servant of (god) Edom"; so W. R. Smith, Religion of Semites (2), 42, and H. P. Smith, Samuel, 294 f, though others explain it as =" servant of man"): In 2Sa 6:10,11,12; 1Ch 13:13,14 a Philistine of Gath and servant of David, who received the Ark of Yahweh into his house when David brought it into Jerusalem from Kiriath-jearim. Because of the sudden death of Uzzah, David was unwilling to proceed with the Ark to his citadel, and it remained three months in the house of Obed-edom, "and Yahweh blessed Obed-edom, and all his house" (2Sa 6:11). According to 1Ch 13:14 the Ark had a special "house" of its own while there. He is probably the same as the Levite of 1Ch 15:25. In 1Ch 15:16-21 Obed-edom is a "singer," and in 1Ch 15:24 a "doorkeeper," while according to 1Ch 26:4-8,15 he is a Korahite doorkeeper, to whose house fell the overseership of the storehouse (26:15), while 1Ch 16:5,38 names him as a "minister before the ark," a member of the house or perhaps guild of Jeduthun (see 2Ch 25:24).

Obed-edom is an illustration of the service rendered to Hebrew religion by foreigners, reminding one of the Simon of Cyrene who bore the cross of Jesus (Mt 27:32, etc.). The Chronicler naturally desired to think that only Levites could discharge such duties as Obed-edom performed, and hence, the references to him as a Levite.

David Francis Roberts.

OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST

The "obedience" (hupakoe) of Christ is directly mentioned but 3 times in the New Testament, although many other passages describe or allude to it: "Through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous" (Ro 5:19); "He humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Php 2:8); "Though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered" (Heb 5:8). In 2Co 10:5, the phrase signifies an attitude toward Christ: "every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

1. As an Element of Conduct and Character:

His subjection to His parents (Lu 2:51) was a necessary manifestation of His loving and sinless character, and of His disposition and power to do the right in any situation. His obedience to the moral law in every particular is asserted by the New Testament writers: "without sin" (Heb 4:15); "who knew no sin" (2Co 5:21); "holy, guileless, undefiled, separated from sinners" (Heb 7:26), etc.; and is affirmed by Himself: "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" (Joh 8:46); and implicitly conceded by His enemies, since no shadow of accusation against His character appears. Of His ready, loving, joyful, exact and eager obedience to the Father, mention will be made later, but it was His central and most outstanding characteristic, the filial at its highest reach, limitless, "unto death." His usually submissive and law-abiding attitude toward the authorities and the great movements and religious requirements of His day was a part of His loyalty to God, and of the strategy of His campaign, the action of the one who would set an example and wield an influence, as at His baptism: "Thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Mt 3:15); the synagogue worship (Lu 4:16, "as his custom was"); the incident of the

tribute money: "Therefore the sons are free. But, lest we cause them to stumble," etc. (Mt 17:24-27). Early, however, the necessities of His mission as Son of God and institutor of the new dispensation obliged Him frequently to display a judicial antagonism to current prescription and an authoritative superiority to the rulers; and even to important details of the Law, that would in most eyes mark Him as insurgent, and did culminate in the cross, but was the sublimest obedience to the Father, whose authority alone He, as full-grown man, and Son of man, could recognize.

2. Its Christological Bearing:

Two Scriptural statements raise an important question as to the inner experience of Jesus. Heb 5:8 states that "though he was a Son, yet learned (he) obedience by the things which he suffered" (emathen aph' hon epathen ten hupakoen); Php 2:6,8 Existing in the form of God .... he humbled himself, becoming obedient, even unto death." As Son of God, His will was never out of accord with the Father's will. How then was it necessary to, or could He, learn obedience, or become obedient? The same question in another form arises from another part of the passage in Heb 5:9: "And having been made perfect, he became unto all them that obey him the author (cause) of eternal salvation"; also Heb 2:10: "It became him (God) .... to make the author (captain) of their salvation perfect through sufferings." How and why should the perfect be made perfect? Gethsemane, with which, indeed, Heb 5:8 is directly related, presents the same problem. It finds its solution in the conditions of the Redeemer's work and life on earth in the light of His true humanity. Both in His eternal essence and in His human existence, obedience to His Father was His dominant principle, so declared through the prophet-psalmist before His birth: Heb 10:7 (Ps 40:7), "Lo, I am come (in the roll of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God." It was His law of life: "I do always the things that are pleasing to him. I do nothing of myself, but as the Father taught me, I speak these things" (Joh 8:29,28); "I can of myself do nothing. .... I seek not mine own will, but the will of him that sent me" (Joh 5:30). It was the indispensable process of His activity as the "image of the invisible God," the expression of the Deity in terms of the phenomenal and the human. He could be a perfect revelation only by the perfect correspondence in every detail, of will, word and work with the Father's will (Joh 5:19). Obedience was also His life nourishment and satisfaction (Joh 4:34). It was the guiding principle which directed the details of His work: "I have power to lay it (life) down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment received I from my Father" (Joh 10:18); "The Father that sent me, he hath given me a commandment, what I should say, and what I should speak" (Joh 12:49; compare 14:31, etc.). But in the Incarnation this essential and filial obedience must find expression in human forms according to human demands and processes of development. As true man, obedient disposition on His part must meet the test of voluntary choice under all representative conditions, culminating in that which was supremely hard, and at the limit which should reveal its perfection of extent and strength. It must become hardened, as it were, and confirmed, through a definite obedient act, into obedient human character. The patriot must become the veteran. The Son, obedient on the throne, must exercise the practical virtue of obedience on earth. Gethsemane was the culmination of this process, when in full view of the awful, shameful, horrifying meaning of Calvary, the obedient disposition was crowned, and the obedient Divine-human life reached its highest manifestation, in the great ratification: "Nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done." But just as Jesus' growth in knowledge was not from error to truth, but from partial knowledge to completer, so His "learning obedience" led Him not from disobedience or debate to submission, but from obedience at the

present stage to an obedience at ever deeper and deeper cost. The process was necessary for His complete humanity, in which sense He was "made perfect," complete, by suffering. It was also necessary for His perfection as example and sympathetic High Priest. He must fight the human battles under the human conditions. Having translated obedient aspiration and disposition into obedient action in the face of, and in suffering unto, death, even the death of the cross, He is able to lead the procession of obedient sons of God through every possible trial and surrender. Without this testing of His obedience He could have had the sympathy of clear and accurate knowledge, for He "knew what was in man," but He would have lacked the sympathy of a kindred experience. Lacking this, He would have been for us, and perhaps also in Himself, but an imperfect "captain of our salvation," certainly no "file leader" going before us in the very paths we have to tread, and tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. It may be worth noting that He "learned obedience" and was "made perfect" by suffering, not the results of His own sins, as we do largely, but altogether the results of the sins of others.

3. In Its Soteriological Bearings:

In Ro 5:19, in the series of contrasts between sin and salvation ("Not as the trespass, so also is the free gift"), we are told: "For as through the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous." Interpreters and theologians, especially the latter, differ as to whether "obedience" here refers to the specific and supreme act of obedience on the cross, or to the sum total of Christ’s incarnate obedience through His whole life; and they have made the distinction between His "passive obedience," yielded on the cross, and His "active obedience" in carrying out without a flaw the Father’s will at all times. This distinction is hardly tenable, as the whole Scriptural representation, especially His own, is that He was never more intensely active than in His death: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished" (Lu 12:50); "I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again" (Joh 10:17,18). "Who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God" (Heb 9:14), indicates the active obedience of one who was both priest and sacrifice. As to the question whether it was the total obedience of Christ, or His death on the cross, that constituted the atonement, and

the kindred question whether it was not the spirit of obedience in the act of death, rather than the act itself, that furnished the value of His redemptive work, it might conceivably, though improbably, be said that "the one act of righteousness" through which "the free gift came" was His whole life considered as one act. But these ideas are out of line with the unmistakable trend of Scripture, which everywhere lays principal stress on the death of Christ itself; it is the center and soul of the two ordinances, baptism and the Lord’s Supper; it holds first place in the Gospels, not as obedience, but as redemptive suffering and death; it is unmistakably put forth in this light by Christ Himself in His few references to His death: "ransom," "my blood," etc. Paul’s teaching everywhere emphasizes the death, and in but two places the obedience; Peter indeed speaks of Christ as an ensample, but leaves as his characteristic thought that Christ "suffered for sins once .... put to death in the flesh" (1Pe 3:18). In Hebrews the center and significance of Christ’s whole work is that He "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself"; while John in many places emphasizes the death as atonement: "Unto him that .... loosed us from our sins by his blood" (Re 1:5), and elsewhere. The Scripture teaching is that "God set (him) forth to be a propitiation,

through faith, in his blood" (Ro 3:25). His lifelong obedience enters in chiefly as making and marking Him the "Lamb without blemish and without spot," who alone could be the atoning sacrifice. If it enters further, it is as the preparation and anticipation of that death, His life so dominated and suffused with the consciousness of the coming sacrifice that it becomes really a part of the death. His obedience at the time of His death could not have been atonement, for it had always existed and had not atoned; but it was the obedience that turned the possibility of atonement into the fact of atonement. He obediently offered up, not His obedience, but Himself. He is set forth as propitiation, not in His obedience, but in His blood, His death, borne as the penalty of sin, in His own body on the tree. The distinction is not one of mere academic theological interest. It involves the whole question of the substitutionary and propitiatory in Christ's redemptive work, which is central, vital and formative, shaping the entire conception of Christianity. The blessed and helpful part which our Lord's complete and loving obedience plays in the working out of Christian character, by His example and inspiration, must not be underestimated, nor its meaning as indicating the quality of the life which is imparted to the soul which accepts for itself His mediatorial death. These bring the consummation and crown of salvation; they are not its channel, or instrument, or price.

See also ATONEMENT. LITERATURE.

DCG, article "Obedience of Christ"; Denney, Death of Christ, especially pp. 231-33; Champion, Living Atonement; Forsythe, Cruciality of the Cross, etc.; works on the Atonement; Commentaries, in the place cited.

Philip Wendell Crannell

OBEDIENCE; OBEY

o-be'-di-ens, o-ba (shama'; hupakoe):

1. Meaning of Terms:

In its simpler Old Testament meaning the word signifies "to hear," "to listen." It carries with it, however, the ethical significance of hearing with reverence and obedient assent. In the New Testament a different origin is suggestive of "hearing under" or of subordinating one's self to the person or thing heard, hence, "to obey." There is another New Testament usage, however, indicating persuasion from, peithomai.

The relation expressed is twofold: first, human, as between master and servant, and particularly between parents and children. "If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, that, will not obey the voice of his father, or the voice of his mother, and, though they chasten him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place" (De 21:18,19; compare Pr 15:20); or between sovereign and subjects, "The foreigners shall submit themselves unto me: as soon as they hear of me, they shall obey me" (2Sa 22:45; 1Ch 29:23).

2. The Old Testament Conception:

The highest significance of its usage, however, is that of the relation of man to God. Obedience is the supreme test of faith in God and reverence for Him. The Old Testament conception of obedience was vital. It was the one important relationship which must not be broken. While sometimes this relation may have been formal and cold, it nevertheless was the one strong tie which held the people close to God. The significant spiritual relation is expressed by Samuel when he asks the question, "Hath Yahweh as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of Yahweh? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams" (1Sa 15:22). It was the condition without which no right relation might be sustained to Yahweh. This is most clearly stated in the relation between Abraham and Yahweh when he is assured "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice" (Ge 22:18).

In prophetic utterances, future blessing and prosperity were conditioned upon obedience: "If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land" (Isa 1:19). After surveying the glories of the Messianic kingdom, the prophet assures the people that "this shall come to pass, if ye will diligently obey the voice of Yahweh your God" (Zec 6:15). On the other hand misfortune, calamity, distress and famine are due to their disobedience and distrust of Yahweh.

See DISOBEDIENCE.

This obedience or disobedience was usually related to the specific commands of Yahweh as contained in the law, yet they conceived of God as giving commands by other means. Note especially the rebuke of Samuel to Saul: "Because thou obeyedst not the voice of Yahweh, ... therefore hath Yahweh done this thing unto thee this day" (1Sa 28:18).

3. The New Testament Conception:

In the New Testament a higher spiritual and moral relation is sustained than in the Old Testament. The importance of obedience is just as greatly emphasized. Christ Himself is its one great illustration of obedience. He "humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Php 2:8). By obedience to Him we are through Him made partakers of His salvation (Heb 5:9). This act is a supreme test of faith in Christ. Indeed, it is so vitally related that they are in some cases almost synonymous. "Obedience of faith" is a combination used by Paul to express this idea (Ro 1:5). Peter designates believers in Christ as "children of obedience" (1Pe 1:14). Thus it is seen that the test of fellowship with Yahweh in the Old Testament is obedience. The bond of union with Christ in the New Testament is obedience through faith, by which they become identified and the believer becomes a disciple.

Walter G. Clippinger

OBEISANCE

o-ba’-sans: It is used 9 times in the King James Version in the phrase "made (or did) obeisance" as a rendering of the reflexive form of (shachah), and denotes the bow or curtsey indicative of deference and respect. The same form of the verb is sometimes translated "to bow one’s self" when it expresses the deferential attitude of one person to another (Ge 33:6,7, etc.). Occasionally the vow of homage or fealty to a king on the part of a subject is suggested. In Joseph’s dream his brother’s sheaves made obeisance to his sheaf (Ge 43:28; compare also 2Sa 15:5; 2Ch 24:17). But in a large number of instances the verb denotes the prostrate posture of the worshipper in the presence of Deity, and is generally rendered, "to worship" in the King James Version. In all probability this was the original significance of the word (Ge 24:26, etc.). Obeisance (= obedience) originally signified the vow of obedience made by a vassal to his lord or a slave to his master, but in time denoted the act of bowing as a token of respect.

T. Lewis

OBELISK

ob’-e-lisk, ob’-el-isk: A sacred stone or matstsebhah. For matstsebhah the Revised Version (British and American) has used "pillar" in the text, with "obelisk" in the margin in many instances (Ex 23:24; Le 26:1; De 12:3; 1Ki 14:23; Ho 3:4; 10:1,2, etc.), but not consistently (e.g. Ge 28:18).

See PILLAR.

OBETH

o’-beth (Obeth; Codex Vaticanus Ouben): One of those who went up with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:32) =" Ebed" of Ezr 8:6.

OBIL

o’-bil (’obhil, "camel driver"): An Ishmaelite who was "over the camels" in David’s palace (1Ch 27:30).

OBJECT

ob-jekt’:Now used only in the sense "to make opposition," but formerly in a variety of meanings derived from the literal sense "to throw against." So with the meaning "to charge with" in The Wisdom of Solomon 2:12, the King James Version "He objecteth to our infamy the transgressing of our education" (the Revised Version (British and American) "layeth to our charge sins against our discipline"), or "to make charges against" in Ac 24:19, the King James Version "who ought to have been here before thee, and object, if they had ought against me" (the Revised Version (British and American) "and to make accusation").

OBLATION

ob-la’-shun: In Leviticus and Numbers, the King James Version occasionally uses "oblation," but generally "offering," as a rendering of qorban—a general term for all kinds of offering, but used only in Ezekiel, Leviticus and Numbers. the Revised Version (British and American) renders consistently "oblation." In Ezekiel (also Isa 40:20), "oblation" renders terumah, generally translated "heave offering." In some cases (e.g. Isa 1:13; Da 9:21) "oblation" in the King James Version corresponds to minchah, the ordinary word for "gift," in the Priestly Code (P) "grain offering."

See SACRIFICE.

OBOTH

o’-both, o’-both (’obhoth, "waterbags"): A desert camp of the Israelites, the 3rd after leaving Mt. Hor and close to the borders of Moab (Nu 21:10,11; 33:43,14).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

OBSCURITY

ob-sku’-ri-ti: In modern English generally denotes a state of very faint but still perceptible illumination, and only when preceded by some such adjective as "total" does it imply the absence of all light. In Biblical English, however, only the latter meaning is found. So in Isa 29:18 (’ophel, "darkness"); 58:10; 59:9 (choshekh, "darkness"); Additions to Esther 11:8 (gnophos, "darkness"). Compare Pr 20:20, the King James Version "in obscure darkness," the English Revised Version "in the blackest darkness," the American Standard Revised Version "in blackness of darkness."

OBSERVE

ob-zurv’ (representing various words, but chiefly shamar, "to keep," "to watch" etc.): Properly means "to take heed to," as in Isa 42:20, "Thou seest many things, but thou observest not" and from this sense all the usages of the word in English Versions of the Bible can be understood. Most of them, indeed are quite good modern usage (as "observe a feast," Ex 12:17, etc.; "observe a law" Le 19:37, etc.), but a few are archaic. So Ge 37:11, the King James Version "His father observed the saying" (the Revised Version (British and American) "kept the saying in mind"); Ho 13:7, "As a leopard .... will I observe them" (the Revised Version (British and American) "watch"); Jon 2:8, "observe lying vanities" (the Revised Version (British and American) "regard," but "give heed to" would be clearer; compare Ps 107:43). Still farther from modern usage is Ho 14:8, "I have heard him, and observed him" (the Revised Version (British and American) "will regard"; the meaning is "care for"); and Mr 6:20, "For Herod feared John .... and observed him" (the Revised Version (British and American) "kept him safe"). In the last case, the King James Version editors seem to have used "to observe" as meaning "to give reverence to."

Observation is found in Lu 17:20, "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" (meta paratereseos). The meaning of the English is, "so that it can be observed," but the exact force of the underlying Greek ("visibly"? "so that it can be computed in advance"?) is a matter of extraordinary dispute at the present time.

See KINGDOM OF GOD.

Burton Scott Easton

OBSERVER OF TIMES

ob-zur’-ver.

See DIVINATION.

OBSTINACY

ob’-sti-na-si.

See HARDEN.

OCCASION

o-ka’-zhun: The uses in English Versions of the Bible are all modern, but in Jer 2:24 "occasion" is employed (both in Hebrew and English) as a euphemism for "time of conception of offspring."

OCCUPY

ok’-u-pi: Is in the King James Version the translation of 7 different words:

(1) nathan;

(2) cachar;

(3) ‘arabh;

(4) ‘asah, either with or without the added word, mela’khah;

(5) anapleroun;

(6) peripatein;

(7) pragmateuein.

In almost every case the meanings of "to occupy" as used in the King James Version in harmony with the common usage of the time have become obsolete.

(1) In Eze 27:16,19,22, nathan meant "to trade," and the Revised Version (British and American) reads "traded."

(2) From cachar, "to go about," was derived a designation of "merchants" (Revised Version) (Eze 27:21).

(3) ‘Arabh (Eze 27:9) signifies "to exchange" (the English Revised Version and the American Revised Version margin, but the American Standard Revised Version "deal in").

(4) ‘asah (Ex 38:24) means simply "to use" (Revised Version), and the same word in Jud 16:11, with mela’khah ("work") added, signifies that work had been done (Revised Version).

(5) In 1Co 14:16, "occupy," the King James Version rendering of anapleroun, would still be as intelligible to most as the Revised Version (British and American) "fill."

(6) "Occupy" in Heb 13:9, in the sense of "being taken up with a thing," is the translation (both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) of peripatein, literally, "to walk." Finally

(7) pragmateuein (Lu 19:13) is rendered in the King James Version "occupy" in its obsolete sense of "trade" (Revised Version).

David Foster Estes

OCCURRENT

o-kur’-ent (King James Versions, the English Revised Version, 1Ki 5:4): An obsolete form of "occurrence" (so the American Standard Revised Version).

OCHIELUS

o-ki-e’-lus (Ochielos; Codex Vaticanus Ozielos; the King James Version Ochiel): One of the "captains over thousands" who furnished the Levites with much cattle for Josiah’s Passover (1 Esdras 1:9) =" Jeiel" of 2Ch 35:9.

OCHRAN

ok’-ran (‘okhran, from ‘akhar, "trouble"; the King James Version Ocran): The father of Pagiel, the prince of the tribe of Asher (Nu 1:13; 2:27; 7:72,77; 10:26).

OCHRE, RED

o’-ker, (Isa 44:13, "He marketh it out with a pencil," margin "red ochre," the King James Version "line"; seredh, a word found only here, and of unknown etymology): Designates the implement used by the carpenter to mark the wood after measuring and before cutting. "Red ochre" supposes this to have been a crayon (as does "pencil"), but a scratch-awl is quite as likely. Ochre is clay colored by an iron compound.

OCIDELUS

os-i-de’-lus, ok-i-de’-lus (Codex Alexandrinus Okeidelos; Codex Vaticanus and Swete, Okailedos, Fritzsche, Okodelos; the King James Version and Fritzsehe Ocodelus): One of the priests who had married a "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:22); it stands in the place of "Jozabad" in Ezr 10:22 of which it is probably a corruption.

OCINA

o-si’-na, os’-i-na, ok’-i-na (Okeina): A town on the Phoenician coast South of Tyre, mentioned only in Judith 2:28, in the account of the campaign of Holofernes in Syria. The site is unknown, but from the mention of Sidon and Tyre immediately preceding and Jemnaan, Azotus and Ascalon following, it must have been South of Tyre. One might conjecture that it was Sandalium (Iskanderuna) or Umm ul-’Awamid, but there is nothing in the name to suggest such an identification.

OCRAN

ok’-ran.

See OCHRAN.

ODED

o’-ded (‘owdhedh (2Ch 15), ‘odhedh (elsewhere), ‘odhedh, "restorer"):

(1) According to 2Ch 15:1, he was the father of Azariah who prophesied in the reign of Asa of Judah (c 918-877), but 15:8 makes Oded himself the prophet. The two verses should agree, so we should

probably read in 15:8, "the prophecy of Azariah, the son of Oded, the prophet," or else "the prophecy of Azariah the prophet."

See AZARIAH.

(2) A prophet of Samaria (2Ch 28:9) who lived in the reigns of Pekah, king of the Northern Kingdom, and Ahaz, king of Judah. According to 2Ch 28, Oded protested against the enslavement of the captives which Pekah had brought from Judah and Jerusalem on his return from the Syro-Ephraimitic attack on the Southern Kingdom (735 BC). In this protest he was joined by some of the chiefs of Ephraim, and the captives were well treated. After those who were naked (i.e. those who had scanty clothing; compare the meaning of the word "naked" in Mr 14:51) had been supplied with clothing from the spoil, and the bruised anointed with oil, the prisoners were escorted to Jericho.

The narrative of 2Ch 28 as a whole does not agree with that of 2Ki 15:37; 16:5 f, where the allied armies of Rezin of Damascus and Pekah besieged Jerusalem, but failed to capture it (compare Isa 7:1-17; 8:5-8 a). As Curtis points out (Chronicles, 459, where he compares Ex 21:2 ff; Le 25:29-43; De 15:12-18), wholesale enslavement of their fellow-countrymen was not allowed to the Hebrews, and this fact the passage illustrates. It seems to be a fulfillment in spirit of Isa 61:1-2, a portion which our Lord read in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lu 4:16-20).

David Francis Roberts

ODES OF SOLOMON

odz.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

ODOLLAM

o-dol’-am (Odollam): The Greek form of ADULLAM (which see), found only in 2 Macc 12:38.

ODOMERA

od-o-me’-ra (Odomera; Codex Vaticanus Odoaarres, Itala Odaren; the King James Version Odonarkes, margin Odomarra): It is not certain whether Odomera was an independent Bedouin chief, perhaps an ally of the Syrians, or an officer of Bacchides. He was defeated by Jonathan in his campaign against Bacchides (1 Macc 9:66) in 156 BC.

ODOR

o’-der: In the Old Testament the rendering of besem, "fragrance" (2Ch 16:14; Es 2:12; Jer 34:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "burnings"), and of one or two other words; in the New Testament of osme (Joh 12:3; Php 4:18; Eph 5:2 the Revised Version (British and American)); in Re 5:8; 18:13, of thumiama, where the Revised Version (British and American) (with the King James Version margin in former passage) has "incense."

See also SAVOR.

OF

ov:

(1) In Anglo-Saxon, had the meaning "from," "away from" (as the strengthened form "off" has still), and was not used for genitive or possessive relations, these being expressed by special case-forms. In the Norman period, however, "of" was taken to represent the French de (a use well developed by the time of Chaucer), and in the Elizabethan period both senses of "of" were in common use. But after about 1600 the later force of the word became predominant, and in the earlier sense (which is now practically obsolete) it was replaced by other prepositions. In consequence the King James Version (and in some cases the Revised Version (British and American)) contains many uses of "of" that are no longer familiar —most of them, to be sure, causing no difficulty, but there still being a few responsible for real obscurities.

(2) Of the uses where "of" signifies "from," the most common obscure passages are those where "of" follows a verb of hearing. In modern English "hear of" signifies "to gain information about," as it does frequently in the King James Version (Mr 7:25; Ro 10:14, etc.). But more commonly this use of "of" in the King James Version denotes the source from which the information is derived. So Joh 15:15, "all things that I have heard of my Father"; Ac 10:22, "to hear words of thee"; 28:22, "We desire to hear of thee"; compare 1Th 2:13; 2Ti 1:13; 2:2, etc. (similarly Mt 11:29, "and learn of me"; compare Joh 6:45). All of these are ambiguous and in modern English give a wrong meaning, so that in most cases (but not Mt 11:29 or Ac 28:22) the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "from." A different example of the same use of "of" is 2Co 5:1, "a building of God" (the Revised Version (British and American) "from"). So Mr 9:21, "of a child," means "from childhood" ("from a child," the Revised Version (British and American), is dubious English). A still more obscure passage is Mt 23:25, "full of extortion and excess." "Full of" elsewhere in the King James Version (and even in the immediate context, Mt 23:27,28) refers to the contents, but here the "of" represents the Greek ek, "out of," and denotes the source—"The contents of your cup and platter have been purchased from the gains of extortion and excess." the Revised Version (British and American) again substitutes "from," with rather awkward results, but the Greek itself is unduly compressed. In Mr 11:8, one of the changes made after the King James Version was printed has relieved an obscurity, for where the edition of 1611 read "cut down branches of the trees," the modern editions have "off" (the Revised Version (British and American) "from"). For clear examples of this use of "of," without the obscurities, compare Judith 2:21, "they went forth of Nineveh"; 2 Macc 4:34, "forth of the sanctuary"; and, especially, Mt 21:25, "The

baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men?" Here "from" and "of" represent exactly the same Greek preposition, and the change in English is arbitrary (the Revised Version (British and American) writes "from" in both cases).

(3) In a weakened sense this use of "of" as "from" was employed rather loosely to connect an act with its source or motive. Such uses are generally clear enough, but the English today seems sometimes rather curious: Mt 18:13, "rejoiceth more of that sheep" (the Revised Version (British and American) "over"); Ps 99:8, "vengeance of their inventions" (so the King James Version); 1Co 7:4, "hath not power of her own body" (the Revised Version (British and American) "over"), etc.

(4) A very common use of "of" in the King James Version is to designate the agent—a use complicated by the fact that "by" is also employed for the same purpose and the two interchanged freely. So in Lu 9:7, "all that was done by him .... it was said of some ....," the two words are used side by side for the same Greek preposition (the Revised Version (British and American) replaces "of" by "by," but follows a different text in the first part of the verse). Again, most of the examples are clear enough, but there are some obscurities. So in Mt 19:12, "which were made eunuchs of men," the "of men" is at first sight possessive (the Revised Version (British and American) "by men"). Similarly, 2 Esdras 16:30, "There are left some clusters of them that diligently seek through the vineyard" (the Revised Version (British and American) "by them"). So 1Co 14:24, "He is convinced of all he is judged of all," is quite misleading (the Revised Version (British and American) "by all" in both cases). Php 3:12, the King James Version "I am apprehended of Christ Jesus," seems almost meaningless (the Revised Version (British and American) "by").

(5) In some cases the usage of the older English is not sufficient to explain "of" in the King James Version. So Mt 18:23, "take account of his servants," is a very poor rendition of "make a reckoning with his servants" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). In Ac 27:5, the "sea of Cilicia" may have been felt to be the "sea which is off Cilicia" (compare the Revised Version (British and American)), but there are no other instances of this use. In 2Co 2:12, "A door was opened unto me of the Lord" should be "in the Lord" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). 2Sa 21:4, "We will have no silver nor gold of Saul, nor of his house," is very loose, and the Revised Version (British and American) rewrites the verse entirely. In all these cases, the King James Version seems to have looked solely for smooth English, without caring much for exactness. In 1Pe 1:11, however, "sufferings of Christ" probably yields a correct sense for a difficult phrase in the Greek (so the Revised Version (British and American), with "unto" in the margin), but a paraphrase is needed to give the precise meaning. And, finally, in Heb 11:18, the Greek itself is ambiguous and there is no way of deciding whether the preposition employed (pros) means "to" (so the Revised Version (British and American)) or "of" (so the King James Version, the Revised Version margin; compare Heb 1:7, where "of" is necessary).

Burton Scott Easton

OFFENCE; OFFEND

o-fens', o-fend' (mikhshol, 'asham, chaTa'; skandalon, skandalizo): "Offend" is either transitive or intransitive As transitive it is primarily "to strike against," hence, "to displease" "to make angry," "to do harm to," "to affront," in Scripture, "to cause to sin"; intransitive it is "to sin," "to cause anger," in Scripture, "to be caused to sin." "Offence" is either the cause of anger, displeasure, etc., or a sin. In Scripture we have the special significance of a stumbling-block, or cause of falling, sin, etc.

1. Old Testament Usage:

In the Old Testament it is frequently the translation of 'asham, "to be guilty," "to transgress": Jer 2:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "shall be held guilty"; 50:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "not guilty"; Eze 25:12, "hath greatly offended"; Ho 4:15, the Revised Version margin "become guilty"; 5:15, "till they acknowledge their offense," the Revised Version margin "have borne their guilt"; 13:1, "He offended in Baal," the Revised Version margin "became guilty"; Hab 1:11, "He shall pass over, and offend, (imputing) this his power unto his god," the Revised Version (British and American) "Then shall he sweep by (as) a wind, and shall pass over (margin "transgress"), and be guilty, (even) he whose might is his god."

In 2Ch 28:13, we have 'ashmath 'al, literally, "the offense against," the Revised Version (British and American) "a trespass (margin "or guilt") against Yahweh"; we have also chaTa'," to miss the mark," "to sin," "to err" (Ge 20:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "sinned against thee"; 40:1, "offended their lord"; 2Ki 18:14; Jer 37:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "sinned against thee"); baghadh, "to deal treacherously" (Ps 73:15, "offend against the generation of thy children," the Revised Version (British and American) "dealt treacherously with"); chabhal, "to act wickedly" (Job 34:31); mikhshol, "a stumbling block" (Le 19:14; translated in Isa 8:14, "a rock of offense"; compare Eze 14:3; 1Sa 25:31; Ps 119:165, "nothing shall offend," the Revised Version (British and American) "no occasion of stumbling"; compare Isa 57:14; Jer 6:21, etc.); pasha', "to be fractious," "to transgress" (Pr 18:19, "a brother offended," the Revised Version margin "injured"). "Offence" is mikhshol (see above, 1Sa 25:31; Isa 8:14); cheT'," sin," etc. (Ec 10:4, "Yielding pacifleth great offenses," the American Standard Revised Version "Gentleness (the English Revised Version "yielding") allayeth," the American Revised Version margin "Calmness (the English Revised Version "gentleness") leaveth great sins undone"). "Offender" is chaTTa' (1Ki 1:21, margin "Hebrew: sinners"; Isa 29:21, "that make a man an offender for a word," the American Standard Revised Version "that make a man an offender in his cause," margin "make men to offend by (their) words," or, "for a word," the English Revised Version "in a cause," margin "make men to offend by (their) words").

2. New Testament Usage:

The New Testament usage of these words deserves special attention. The word most frequently translated "offend" in the King James Version is skandalizo (skandalon, "offence"), very frequent in the Gospels (Mt 5:29, "if thy right eye offend thee"; 5:30; 11:6; 18:6, "whoso shall offend one of these little ones"; 13:41, "all things that offend"; Lu 17:1, "It is impossible but that offenses will come," etc.; Ro 14:21; 16:17, "Mark them which cause .... offenses"; 1Co 8:13 twice, "if meat make my brother to

offend," etc.). Skandalon is primarily "a trap-stick," "a bentstick on which the bait is fastened which the animal strikes against and so springs the trap," hence, it came to denote a "snare," or anything which one strikes against injuriously (it is Septuagint's word for moqesh, a "noose" or "snare," Jos 23:13; 1Sa 18:21); "a stumbling-block" Septuagint for mikhshol (see above), Le 19:14). For skandalizo, skandalon, translated in the King James Version, "offend," "offence," the Revised Version (British and American) gives "cause to stumble," "stumbling-block," etc.; thus, Mt 5:29, "if thy right eye causeth thee to stumble," i.e. "is an occasion for thy falling into sin"; Mt 16:23, "Thou art a stumbling-block unto me," an occasion of turning aside from the right path; in Mt 26:31,33 twice, "offended" is retained, margin, 26:33 twice, "Greek: caused to stumble" (same word in 26:31); Mr 9:42, "whosoever shall cause one of these little ones that believe on me to stumble," to fall away from the faith, or fall into sin; Lu 17:1, "It is impossible but that occasions of stumbling should come; but woe unto him, through whom they come"; in Ro 14:21; 16:17; in 1Co 8, Paul's language has the same meaning, and we see how truly he had laid to heart the Saviour's earnest admonitions—"weak brethren" with him answering to the master's "little ones who believe"; Ro 14:21, "It is good not to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor to do anything whereby thy brother stumbleth," i.e. "is led by your example to do that which he cannot do with a good conscience"; 14:20, "It is evil for that man who eateth with offense (dia proskommatos)," so as to place a stumbling-block before his brother, or, rather, 'without the confidence that he is doing right'; compare 14:23, "He that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith; and whatsoever is not of faith is sin"; so 1Co 8:13; Ro 16:17, "Mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine, (margin "teaching") which ye learned" (Is not the "teaching" of Christ Himself implied here?). Everything that would embolden another to do that which would be wrong for him, or that would turn anyone away from the faith, must be carefully avoided, seeking to please, not ourselves, but to care for our brother, "for whom Christ died," "giving no occasion of stumbling (proskope) in anything" (2Co 6:3).

Aproskopos, "not causing to stumble," is translated "void of offense" (Ac 24:16, "a conscience void of offense"; 1Co 10:32, the Revised Version (British and American) "occasion of stumbling"; Php 1:10, "void of offense"); hamartano, "to miss the mark," "to sin," "to err," is translated "offended" (Ac 25:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "sinned"); hamartia, "sin," "error" (2Co 11:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "Did I commit a sin?"); ptaio, "to stumble," "fall" (Jas 2:10; 3:2 twice, "offend," the Revised Version (British and American) "stumble," "stumbleth"); paraptoma, "a falling aside or away," is translated "offence" (Ro 4:25; 5:15,16,17,18,20, in each case the Revised Version (British and American) "trespass"); adikeo, "to be unrighteous" (Ac 25:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "wrongdoer," the King James Version "offender").

In the Apocrypha we have "offence" (skandalon, Judith 12:2), the Revised Version (British and American) "I will not eat thereof, lest there be an occasion of stumbling"; "offend" (hamartano, Ecclesiasticus 7:7), the Revised Version (British and American) "sin"; "greatly offended" (prosochthizo, Ecclesiasticus 25:2); "offended" (skandalizo, Ecclesiasticus 32:15), the Revised Version (British and American) "stumble."

W. L Walker

OFFER; OFFERING

of’-er, of’-er-ing.

See SACRIFICE.

OFFICE

of’-is: In the Old Testament the word is often used in periphrastic renderings, e.g. "minister .... in the priest’s office," literally, act as priest (Ex 28:1, etc.); "do the office of a midwife," literally, cause or help to give birth (Ex 1:16). But the word is also used as a rendering of different Hebrew words, e.g. ken, "pedestal," "place" (Ge 40:13, the King James Version "place"; Ge 41:13); ‘abhodhah, "labor," "work" (1Ch 6:32); pequddah, "oversight," "charge" (Ps 109:8); ma‘amadh, literally, "standing," e.g. waiting at table (1Ch 23:28); mishmar, "charge," observance or service of the temple (Ne 13:14 the King James Version).

Similarly in the New Testament the word is used in periphrastic renderings, e.g. priest’s office (Lu 1:8,9); office of a deacon (diakonia, 1Ti 3:10); office of a bishop (episkope, 1Ti 3:1). the Revised Version (British and American) uses other renderings, e.g. "ministry" (Ro 11:13); "serve as deacons" (1Ti 3:10). In Ac 1:20, the Revised Version (British and American) has "office" (margin "overseership") for the King James Version "bishoprick."

T. Lewis

OFFICER

of’-i-ser: In the King James Version the term is employed to render different words denoting various officials, domestic, civil and military, such as caric, "eunuch," "minister of state" (Ge 37:36); paqidh, "person in charge," "overseer" (Ge 41:34); necibh, "stationed," "garrison," "prefect" (1Ki 4:19); shoTer, "scribe" or "secretary" (perhaps arranger or organizer), then any official or overseer. In Es 9:3 for the King James Version "officers of the king" the Revised Version (British and American) has (more literal) "they that did the king’s business."

In the New Testament, "officer" generally corresponds to the Greek word huperetes, "servant," or any person in the employ of another. In Mt 5:25 the term evidently means "bailiff" or exactor of the fine imposed by the magistrate, and corresponds to praktor, used in Lu 12:58.

T. Lewis

OFFICES OF CHRIST

See CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

OFFSCOURING

of’-skour-ing: This strong and expressive word occurs only once in the Old Testament and once in the New Testament. The weeping prophet uses it as he looks upon his erstwhile fair and holy city, despoiled, defiled, derided by the profane, the enemies of God and of His people (La 3:45, cechi). The favored people, whose city lies in heaps and is patrolled by the heathen, are hailed and held up as the scrapings, the offscouring, the offal of the earth. They are humbled to earth, crushed into the dust, carried away to be the slaves of licentious idolaters. The haughty, cruel, cutting boastfulness of the victors covered Israel with contumely.

In 1Co 4:13 the greatest of the apostles reminds the prosperous and self-satisfied Corinthinns that they, the apostles, were "made as the filth of the world, the offscouring of all things." In such contempt were they held by the unbelieving world and by false apostles. The strange, strong word (peripsema) should remind us what it cost in former times to be a true servant of Christ.

G.H. Gerberding

OFFSPRING

of’-spring.

See CHILDREN.

OFTEN

of’-n (puknos, "thick," "close"): An archaic usage for "frequent": "Thine often infirmities" (1Ti 5:23); compare "by often rumination" (Shakespeare, As You Like It, IV, i, 18); "The often round" (Ben Jonson, The Forest, III); "Of wrench’d or broken limb—an often chance" (Tennyson, Gareth and Lynette).

OG

(‘ogh; Og): King of Bashan, whose territory, embracing 60 cities, was conquered by Moses and the Israelites immediately after the conquest of Sihon, king of the Amorites (Nu 21:33-35; De 3:1-12). The defeat took place at Edrei, one of the chief of these cities (Nu 21:33; Jos 12:4), and Og and his people were "utterly destroyed" (De 3:6). Og is described as the last of the REPHAIM (which see), or giant-race of that district, and his giant stature is borne out by what is told in De 3:11 of the dimensions of his "bedstead of iron" (‘eres barzel), 9 cubits long and 4 broad (13 1/2 ft. by 6 ft.), said to be still preserved at Rabbath of Ammon when the verse describing it was written. It is not, of course, necessary to conclude that Og’s own height, though immense, was as great as this. Some, however, prefer to suppose

that what is intended is "a sarcophagus of black basalt," which iron-like substance abounds in the Hauran. The conquered territory was subsequently bestowed on the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh (Nu 32:33; De 3:12,13). Other references to Og are De 1:4; 4:47; 31:4; Jos 2:10; 9:10; 13:12,30). The memory of this great conquest lingered all through the national history (Ps 135:11; 136:20). On the conquest, compare Stanley, Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, I, 185-87.

See ARGOB; BASHAN.

James Orr

OHAD

o'-had ('ohadh, meaning unknown): A son of Simeon, mentioned as third in order (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15). The name is not found in the list of Nu 26:12-14.

OHEL

o'-hel ('ohel, "tent"): A son of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:20).

OHOLAH

o-ho'-la ('oholah; the King James Version Aholah): The exact meaning is a matter of dispute. As written, it seems to mean a tent-woman, or the woman living in a tent. With a mappik in the last consonant it could mean "her tent." The term is used symbolically by Ezekiel to designate Samaria or the kingdom of Israel (Eze 23:4,5,36,44).

See OHOLIBAH.

OHOLIAB

o-ho'-li-ab ('oholi'abh, "father's tent"; the King James Version Aholiab): A Danite artificer, who assisted Bezalel in the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture (Ex 31:6; 35:34; 36:1 f; 38:23).

OHOLIBAH o-hol'-i-ba, o-ho'-li-ba ('oholibhah, "tent in her," or "my tent is in her"): An opprobrious and symbolical name given by Ezekiel to Jerusalem, representing the kingdom of Judah, because of her intrigues and base alliances with Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, just as the name OHOLAH (which see) was given to Samaria or the Northern Kingdom, because of her alliances with Egypt and Assyria. There is a play upon the words in the Hebrew which cannot be reproduced in English Both Oholah and Oholibah, or Samaria and Jerusalem, are the daughters of one mother, and wives of Yahweh, and both are guilty of religious and political alliance with heathen nations. Idolatry is constantly compared by the Hebrew prophets to marital unfaithfulness or adultery.

W. W. Davies

OHOLIBAMAH

o-hol-i-ba’-ma, o-hol-i-ba’-ma (’oholibhamah, "tent of the high place"):

(1) One of Esau’s wives, and a daughter of Anah the Hivite (Ge 36:2,5). It is strange that she is not named along with Esau’s other wives in either Ge 28:9 or 26:30. Various explanations have been given, but none of them is satisfactory. There is probably some error in the text.

(2) An Edomite chief (Ge 36:41; 1Ch 1:52).

OIL

oil (shemen; elaion):

1. Terms

2. Production and Storage

3. Uses

(1) As a Commodity of Exchange

(2) As a Cosmetic

(3) As a Medicine

(4) As a Food

(5) As an Illuminant

(6) In Religious Rites

(a) Consecration

(b) Offerings

(c) Burials

4. Figurative Uses

Shemen, literally, "fat," corresponds to the common Arabic senin of similar meaning, although now applied to boiled butter fat.

1. Terms:

Another Hebrew word, zayith (zeth), "olive," occurs with shemen in several passages (Ex 27:20; 30:24; Le 24:2). The corresponding Arabic zeit, a contraction of zeitun, which is the name for the olive tree as well as the fruit, is now applied to oils in general, to distinguish them from solid fats. Zeit usually means olive oil, unless some qualifying name indicates another oil. A corresponding use was made of shemen, and the oil referred to so many times in the Bible was olive oil (except Es 2:12). Compare this with the Greek elaion, "oil," a neuter noun from elaia, "olive," the origin of the English word "oil." yitshar, literally, "glistening," which occurs less frequently, is used possibly because of the light-giving quality of olive oil, or it may have been used to indicate fresh oil, as the clean, newly pressed oil is bright. meshach, a Chaldaic word, occurs twice: Ezr 6:9; 7:22. elaion, is the New Testament term.

2. Production and Storage:

Olive oil has been obtained, from the earliest times, by pressing the fruit in such a way as to filter out the oil and other liquids from the residue. The Scriptural references correspond so nearly to the methods practiced in Syria up to the present time, and the presses uncovered by excavators at such sites as Gezer substantiate so well the similarity of these methods, that a description of the oil presses and modes of expression still being employed in Syria will be equally true of those in use in early Israelite times.

The olives to yield the greatest amount of oil are allowed to ripen, although some oil is expressed from the green fruit. As the olive ripens it turns black. The fruit begins to fall from the trees in September, but the main crop is gathered after the first rains in November. The olives which have not fallen naturally or have not been blown off by the storms are beaten from the trees with long poles (compare De 24:20). The fruit is gathered from the ground into baskets and carried on the heads of the women, or on donkeys to the houses or oil presses. Those carried to the houses are preserved for eating. Those carried to the presses are piled in heaps until fermentation begins. This breaks down the oil cells and causes a more abundant flow of oil. The fruit thus softened may be trod out with the feet (Mic 6:15)—which is now seldom practiced—or crushed in a handmill. Such a mill was uncovered at Gezer beside an oil press. Stone mortars with wooden pestles are also used. Any of these methods crushes the fruit, leaving only the stone unbroken, and yields a purer oil (Ex 27:20). The method now generally practiced of crushing the fruit and kernels with an edgerunner mill probably dates from Roman times. These mills are of crude construction. The stones are cut from native limestone and are turned by horses or mules. Remains of huge stones of this type are found near the old Roman presses in Mt. Lebanon and other districts.

The second step in the preparation of the oil is the expression. In districts where the olives are plentiful and there is no commercial demand for the oil, the householders crush the fruit in a mortar, mix the

crushed mass with water, and after the solid portions have had time to settle, the pure sweet oil is skimmed from the surface of the water. This method gives a delicious oil, but is wasteful. This is no doubt the beaten oil referred to in connection with religious ceremonials (Ex 27:20). Usually the crushed fruit is spread in portions on mats of reeds or goats' hair, the corners of which are folded over the mass, and the packets thus formed are piled one upon another between upright supports. These supports were formerly two stone columns or the two sections of a split stone cylinder hollowed out within to receive the mats. Large hollow tree trunks are still similarly used in Syria. A flat stone is next placed on top, and then a heavy log is placed on the pile in such a manner that one end can be fitted into a socket made in a wall or rock in close proximity to the pile. This socket becomes the fulcrum of a large lever of the second class. The lever is worked in the same manner as that used in the wine presses (see WINE PRESS). These presses are now being almost wholly superseded by hydraulic presses. The juice which runs from the press, consisting of oil, extractive matter and water, is conducted to vats or run into jars and allowed to stand until the oil separates. The oil is then drawn off from the surface, or the watery fluid and sediment is drawn away through a hole near the bottom of the jar, leaving the oil in the container. (For the construction of the ancient oil presses, see The Excavations of Gezer, by Macalister.) The oil, after standing for some time to allow further sediment to settle, is stored either in huge earthenware jars holding 100 to 200 gallons, or in underground cisterns (compare 1Ch 27:28) holding a much larger quantity. Some of these cisterns in Beirut hold several tons of oil each (2Ch 11:11; 32:28; Ne 13:5,12; Pr 21:20). In the homes the oil is kept in small earthen jars of various shapes, usually having spouts by which the oil can be easily poured (1Ki 17:12; 2Ki 4:2). In 1Sa 16:13; 1Ki 1:39, horns of oil are mentioned.

3. Uses:

(1) As a Commodity of Exchange.

Olive oil when properly made and stored will keep sweet for years, hence, was a good form of merchandise to hold. Oil is still sometimes given in payment (1Ki 5:11; Eze 27:17; Ho 12:1; Lu 16:6; Re 18:13).

(2) As a Cosmetic.

From earliest times oil was used as a cosmetic, especially for oiling the limbs and head. Oil used in this way was usually scented (see OINTMENT). Oil is still used in this manner by the Arabs, principally to keep the skin and scalp soft when traveling in dry desert regions where there is no opportunity to bathe. Sesame oil has replaced olive oil to some extent for this purpose. Homer, Pliny and other early writers mention its use for external application. Pliny claimed it was used to protect the body against the cold. Many Biblical references indicate the use of oil as a cosmetic (Ex 25:6; De 28:40; Ru 3:3; 2Sa 12:20; 14:2; Es 2:12; Ps 23:5; 92:10; 104:15; 141:5; Eze 16:9; Mic 6:15; Lu 7:46).

(3) As a Medicine.

From early Egyptian literature down to late Arabic medical works, oil is mentioned as a valuable remedy. Many queer prescriptions contain olive oil as one of their ingredients. The good Samaritan used oil mingled with wine to dress the wounds of the man who fell among robbers (Mr 6:13; Lu 10:34.)

(4) As a Food.

Olive oil replaces butter to a large extent in the diet of the people of the Mediterranean countries. In Bible lands food is fried in it, it is added to stews, and is poured over boiled vegetables, such as beans, peas and lentils, and over salads, sour milk, cheese and other foods as a dressing. A cake is prepared from ordinary bread dough which is smeared with oil and sprinkled with herbs before baking (Le 2:4). At times of fasting oriental Christians use only vegetable oils, usually olive oil, for cooking. For Biblical references to the use of oil as food see Nu 11:8; De 7:13; 14:23; 32:13; 1Ki 17:12,14,16; 2Ki 4:2,6,7; 1Ch 12:40; 2Ch 2:10,15; Ezr 3:7; Pr 21:17; Eze 16:13,18; Ho 2:5,8,22; Hag 2:12; Re 6:6.

(5) As an Illuminant.

Olive oil until recent years was universally used for lighting purposes (see LAMP). In Palestine are many homes where a most primitive form of lamp similar to those employed by the Israelites is still in use. The prejudice in favor of the exclusive use of olive oil for lighting holy places is disappearing. Formerly any other illuminant was forbidden (compare Ex 25:6; 27:20; 35:8,14,28; 39:37; Mt 25:3,4,8).

(6) In Religious Rites.

(a) Consecration:

Consecration of officials or sacred things (Ge 28:18; 35:14; Ex 29:7,21 ff; Le 2:1 ff; Nu 4:9 ff; 1Sa 10:1; 16:1,13; 2Sa 1:21; 1Ki 1:39; 2Ki 9:1,3,1; Ps 89:20): This was adopted by the early Christians in their ceremonies (Jas 5:14), and is still used in the consecration of crowned rulers and church dignitaries.

(b) Offerings:

Offerings, votive and otherwise: The custom of making offerings of oil to holy places still survives in oriental religions. One may see burning before the shrines along a Syrian roadside or in the churches, small lamps whose supply of oil is kept renewed by pious adherents. In Israelite times oil was used in the meal offering, in the consecration offerings, offerings of purification from leprosy, etc. (Ex 29:2; 40:9 ff; Le 2:2 ff; Nu 4:9 ff; De 18:4; 1Ch 9:29; 2Ch 31:5; Ne 10:37,39; 13:5,12; Eze 16:18,19; 45; 46; Mic 6:7).

(c) Burials:

In connection with the burial of the dead: Egyptian papyri mention this use. In the Old Testament no direct mention is made of the custom. Jesus referred to it in connection with His own burial (Mt 26:12;

Mr 14:3-8; Lu 23:56; Joh 12:3-8; 19:40).

4. Figurative Uses:

Abundant oil was a figure of general prosperity (De 32:13; 33:24; 2Ki 18:32; Job 29:6; Joe 2:19,24). Languishing of the oil indicated general famine (Joe 1:10; Hag 1:11). Joy is described as the oil of joy (Isa 61:3), or the oil of gladness (Ps 45:7; Heb 1:9). Ezekiel prophesies that the rivers shall run like oil, i. e. become viscous (Eze 32:14). Words of deceit are softer than oil (Ps 55:21; Pr 5:3). Cursing becomes a habit with the wicked as readily as oil soaks into bones (Ps 109:18). Excessive use of oil indicates wastefulness (Pr 21:17), while the saving of it is a characteristic of the wise (Pr 21:20). Oil was carried into Egypt, i.e. a treaty was made with that country (Ho 12:1).

James A. Patch

OIL PRESS

See OIL; WINE PRESS.

OIL TREE

oil tre (’ets shemen (Isa 41:19), margin "oleaster," in Ne 8:15, translated "wild olive," the King James Version "pine"; ‘atse shemen, in 1Ki 6:23,31,32, translated "olive wood"): The name "oleaster" used to be applied to the wild olive, but now belongs to quite another plant, the silver-berry, Eleagnus hortensis (Natural Order Elaeagnaceae), known in Arabic as Zeizafan. It is a pretty shrub with sweet-smelling white flowers and silver-grey-green leaves. It is difficult to see how all the three references can apply to this tree; it will suit the first two, but this small shrub would never supply wood for carpentry work such as that mentioned in 1 Kings, hence, the translation "olive wood." On the other hand, in the reference in Ne 8:15, olive branches are mentioned just before, so the translation "wild olive" (the difference being too slight) is improbable. Post suggests the translation of ‘ets shemen by PINE (which see), which if accepted would suit all the requirements.

E. W. G. Masterman

OIL, ANOINTING

(shemen hamishchah): This holy oil, the composition of which is described in Ex 30:22-33, was designed for use in the anointing of the tabernacle, its furniture and vessels, the altar and laver, and the priest, that being thus consecrated, they might be "most holy." It was to be "a holy anointing oil" unto Yahweh throughout all generations (30:31). On its uses, compare Ex 37:29; Le 8:12; 10:7; 21:10. The care of this holy oil was subsequently entrusted to Eleazar (Nu 4:16); in later times it seems to have been prepared by the sons of the priests (1Ch 9:30). There is a figurative allusion to the oil on Aaron’s head in

Ps 133:2.

See OIL; ANOINTING.

James Orr

OIL, BEATEN

(Ex 27:20; Le 24:2; Nu 28:5).

See OIL; CANDLESTICK, THE GOLDEN.

OIL, HOLY

See OIL; ANOINTING.

OIL, OLIVE

See OIL; OLIVE TREE.

OIL-MAKING

See CRAFTS, II, 11.

OINTMENT

oint’-ment: The present use of the word "ointment" is to designate a thick unguent of buttery or tallow-like consistency. the King James Version in frequent instances translates shemen or meshach (see Ex 30:25) "ointment" where a perfumed oil seemed to be indicated. the American Standard Revised Version has consequently substituted the word "oil" in most of the passages. Merqachah is rendered "ointment" once in the Old Testament (Job 41:31 (Hebrew 41:23)). The well-known power of oils and fats to absorb odors was made use of by the ancient perfumers. The composition of the holy anointing oil used in the tabernacle worship is mentioned in Ex 30:23-25. Olive oil formed the base. This was scented with "flowing myrrh .... sweet cinnamon .... sweet calamus .... and .... cassia." The oil was probably mixed with the above ingredients added in a powdered form and heated until the oil had absorbed their odors and then allowed to stand until the insoluble matter settled, when the oil could be decanted. Olive oil, being a non-drying oil which does not thicken readily, yielded an ointment of oily consistency. This is indicated by Ps 133:2, where it says that the precious oil ran down on Aaron’s beard and on the collar of his outer garment. Anyone attempting to make the holy anointing oil would be cut off from his people (Ex 30:33). The scented oils or ointments were kept in jars or vials (not boxes) made of alabaster. These jars are frequently found as part of the equipment of ancient tombs.

The word translated "ointment" in the New Testament is muron, "myrrh." This would indicate that myrrh, an aromatic gum resin, was the substance commonly added to the oil to give it odor. In Lu 7:46 both kinds of oil are mentioned, and the verse might be paraphrased thus: My head with common oil thou didst not anoint; but she hath anointed my feet with costly scented oil.

For the uses of scented oils or ointments see ANOINTING; OIL.

James A. Patch

OLAMUS

ol’-a-mus (Olamos): One of the Israelites who had taken a "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:30) equals "Meshullam" of Ezr 10:29.

OLD

old.

See AGE, OLD.

OLD GATE

See JERUSALEM.

OLD MAN

(palaios, "old," "ancient"): A term thrice used by Paul (Ro 6:6; Eph 4:22; Col 3:9) to signify the unrenewed man, the natural man in the corruption of sin, i.e. sinful human nature before conversion and regeneration. It is theologically synonymous with "flesh" (Ro 8:3-9), which stands, not for bodily organism, but, for the whole nature of man (body and soul) turned away from God and devoted to self and earthly things.

The old man is "in the flesh"; the new man "in the Spirit." In the former "the works of the flesh" (Ga 5:19-21) are manifest; in the latter "the fruit of the Spirit" (Ga 5:22,23). One is "corrupt according to the deceitful lusts"; the other "created in righteousness and true holiness" (Eph 4:22-24 the King James Version).

See also MAN, NATURAL; MAN.

Dwight M. Pratt

OLD PROPHET, THE

(nabhi’ ‘echadh zaqen, "an old prophet" (1Ki 13:11), ha-nabhi’ ha-zaqen, "the old prophet" (1Ki 13:29)):

1. The Narrative:

The narrative of 1Ki 13:11-32, in which the old prophet is mentioned, is part of a larger account telling of a visit paid to Bethel by "a man of God" from Judah. The Judean prophet uttered a curse upon the altar erected there by Jeroboam I. When the king attempted to use force against him, the prophet was saved by divine intervention; the king then invited him to receive royal hospitality, but he refused because of a command of God to him not to eat or drink there. The Judean then departed (13:1-10). An old prophet who lived in Bethel heard of the stranger’s words, and went after him and offered him hospitality. This offer too was refused. But when the old prophet resorted to falsehood and pleaded a divine command on the subject, the Judean returned with him. While at table the old prophet is given a message to declare that death will follow the southerner’s disobedience to the first command. A lion kills him on his way home. The old prophet hears of the death and explains it as due to disobedience to God; he then buries the dead body in his own grave and expresses a wish that he also at death should be buried in the same sepulcher.

2. Critical:

There are several difficulties in the text. In 1Ki 13:11, the King James Version reads "his sons came" instead of "one of his sons came," and translation 1Ki 13:12 b: "And his sons shewed the way the man of God went." There is a gap in the Massoretic Text after the word "table" in 13:20; and 13:23 should be translated, "And it came to pass after he had eaten bread and drunk water, that he saddled for himself the ass, and departed again" (following Septuagint, B with W. B. Stevenson, HDB, III, 594a, note).

Benzinger ("Die Bucher der Konige," Kurz. Hand-Komm. zum Altes Testament, 91) holds that we have here an example of a midrash, i.e. according to LOT, 529, "an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, especially a didactic or homiletic exposition or an edifying religious story." 2Ch 24:27 refers to a "midhrash of the book of the kings," and 2Ch 13:22 to a "midrash of the prophet Iddo." In 2Ch 9:29 we have a reference to "the visions of Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam the son of Nebat." Josephus names the Judean prophet Jadon (Ant., VIII, viii, 5), and so some would trace this narrative to the midrash of Iddo, which would be a late Jewish work. There is a trace of late Hebrew in 1Ki 13:3, and evidence in several places of a later editing of the original narrative. Kittel and Benzinger think it possible that the section may be based on a historical incident. If the narrative is historical in the main, the mention of Josiah by name in 13:2 may be a later insertion; if not historical, the prophecy there is ex eventu, and the whole section a midrash on 2Ki 23:15-20.

3. Central Truths:

(1) Several questions are suggested by the narrative, but in putting as well as in answering these questions, it must be remembered that the old prophet himself, as has been pointed out, is not the chief character of the piece. Hence, it is a little pointless to ask what became of the old prophet, or whether he was not punished for his falsehood. The passage should be studied, like the parables of Jesus, with an eye on the great central truth, which is, here, that God punishes disobedience even in "a man of God." It is not inconsistent with this to regard the old prophet as an example of "Satan fashioning himself into an angel of light" (2Co 11:14), or of the beast which "had two horns like unto a lamb" (Re 13:11).

(2) It must also be remembered that the false prophets of the Old Testament are called prophets in spite of their false prophecies. So here the old prophet in spite of his former lie is given a divine message to declare that death will follow the other's disobedience.

(3) One other question suggests itself, and demands an answer. Why did the old prophet make the request that at death he should be buried in the same grave as the Judean (1Ki 13:31)? The answer is implied in 1Ki 13:32, and is more fully given in 2Ki 23:15-20, where King Josiah defiles the graves of the prophets at Bethel. On seeing a "monument" or grave-stone by one of the graves, he inquires what it is, and is told that it marks the grave of the prophet from Judah. Thereupon he orders that his bones be not disturbed. With these the bones of the old prophet escape. Perhaps no clearer instance of a certain kind of meanness exists in the Old Testament. The very man who has been the cause of another's downfall and ruin is base enough to plan his own escape under cover of the virtues of his victim. And the parallels in modern life are many.

David Francis Roberts

OLD TESTAMENT

See TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

OLD TESTAMENT CANON

See CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

OLD TESTAMENT LANGUAGES

See LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

OLEASTER

o-le-as'-ter (Isa 41:19 the Revised Version margin).

See OIL TREE.

OLIVE

See OLIVE TREE.

OLIVE BERRIES

ber’-iz.

See OLIVE TREE.

OLIVE TREE

ol’-iv tre (zayith, a word occurring also in Aramaic, Ethiopic and Arabic; in the last it means "olive oil," and zaitun, "the olive tree"; elaia):

1. The Olive Tree:

The olive tree has all through history been one of the most characteristic, most valued and most useful of trees in Palestine. It is only right that it is the first named "king" of the trees (Jud 9:8,9). When the children of Israel came to the land they acquired olive trees which they planted not (De 6:11; compare Jos 24:13). The cultivation of the olive goes back to the earliest times in Canaan. The frequent references in the Bible, the evidences (see 4 below) from archaeology and the important place the product of this tree has held in the economy of the inhabitants of Syria make it highly probable that this land is the actual home of the cultivated olive. The wild olive is indigenous there. The most fruitful trees are the product of bare and rocky ground (compare De 32:13) situated preferably at no great distance from the sea. The terraced hills of Palestine, where the earth lies never many inches above the limestone rocks, the long rainless summer of unbroken sunshine, and the heavy "clews" of the autumn afford conditions which are extraordinarily favorable to at least the indigenous olive.

The olive, Olea Europaea (Natural Order Oleaceae), is a slow-growing tree, requiring years of patient labor before reaching full fruitfulness. Its growth implies a certain degree of settlement and peace, for a hostile army can in a few days destroy the patient work of two generations. Possibly this may have something to do with its being the emblem of peace. Enemies of a village or of an individual often today carry out revenge by cutting away a ring of bark from the trunks of the olives, thus killing the trees in a few months. The beauty of this tree is referred to in Jer 11:16; Ho 14:6, and its fruitfulness in Ps 128:3. The characteristic olive-green of its foliage, frosted silver below and the twisted and gnarled trunks—often hollow in the center—are some of the most picturesque and constant signs of settled habitations. In some parts of the land large plantations occur: the famous olive grove near Beirut is 5 miles square; there are also fine, ancient trees in great numbers near Bethlehem.

In starting an oliveyard the fellah not infrequently plants young wild olive trees which grow plentifully over many parts of the land, or he may grow from cuttings. When the young trees are 3 years old they are grafted from a choice stock and after another three or four years they may commence to bear fruit, but they take quite a decade more before reaching full fruition. Much attention is, however, required. The soil around the trees must be frequently plowed and broken up; water must be conducted to the roots from the earliest rain, and the soil must be freely enriched with a kind of marl known in Arabic as chuwwarah. If neglected, the older trees soon send up a great many shoots from the roots all around the parent stem (perhaps the idea in Ps 128:3); these must be pruned away, although, should the parent stem decay, some of these may be capable of taking its place. Being, however, from the root, below the original point of grafting, they are of the wild olive type—with smaller, stiffer leaves and prickly stem—and need grafting before they are of use. The olive tree furnishes a wood valuable for many forms of carpentry, and in modern Palestine is extensively burnt as fuel.

2. The Fruit:

The olive is in flower about May; it produces clusters of small white flowers, springing from the axils of the leaves, which fall as showers to the ground (Job 15:33). The first olives mature as early as September in some places, but, in the mountain districts, the olive harvest is not till November or even December. Much of the earliest fruit falls to the ground and is left by the owner ungathered until the harvest. The trees are beaten with long sticks (De 24:20), the young folks often climbing into the branches to reach the highest fruit, while the women and older girls gather up the fruit from the ground. The immature fruit left after such an ingathering is described graphically in Isa 17:6: "There shall be left therein gleanings, as the shaking (margin "beating") of an olive-tree, two or three berries in the top of the uppermost bough, four or five in the outmost branches of a fruitful tree." Such gleanings belonged to the poor (De 24:20), as is the case today. Modern villages in Palestine allow the poor of even neighboring villages to glean the olives. The yield of an olive tree is very uncertain; a year of great fruitfulness may be followed by a very scanty crop or by a succession of such.

The olive is an important article of diet in Palestine. Some are gathered green and pickled in brine, after slight bruising, and others, the "black" olives, are gathered quite ripe and are either packed in salt or in brine. In both cases the salt modifies the bitter taste. They are eaten with bread.

More important commercially is the oil. This is sometimes extracted in a primitive way by crushing a few berries by hand in the hollow of a stone (compare Ex 27:20), from which a shallow channel runs for the oil. It is an old custom to tread them by foot (Mic 6:15).

3. Olive Oil:

Oil is obtained on a larger scale in one of the many varieties of oil mills. The berries are carried in baskets, by donkeys, to the mill, and they are crushed by heavy weights. A better class of oil can be obtained by collecting the first oil to come off separately, but not much attention is given to this in Palestine, and usually the berries are crushed, stones and all, by a circular millstone revolving upright

round a central pivot. A plenteous harvest of oil was looked upon as one of God’s blessings (Joe 2:24; 3:13). That the "labor of the olive" should fail was one of the trials to faith in Yahweh (Hab 3:17). Olive oil is extensively used as food, morsels of bread being dipped into it in eating; also medicinally (Lu 10:34; Jas 5:14). In ancient times it was greatly used for anointing the person (Ps 23:5; Mt 6:17). In Rome’s days of luxury it was a common maxim that a long and pleasant life depended upon two fiuids —"wine within and oil without." In modern times this use of oil for the person is replaced by the employment of soap, which in Palestine is made from olive oil. In all ages this oil has been used for illumination (Mt 25:3).

4. Greater Plenty of Olive Trees in Ancient Times:

Comparatively plentiful as olive trees are today in Palestine, there is abundant evidence that the cultivation was once much more extensive. "The countless rock-cut oil-presses and wine-presses, both within and without the walls of the city (of Gezer), show that the cultivation of the olive and vine was of much greater importance than it is anywhere in Palestine today. .... Excessive taxation has made olive culture unprofitable" ("Gezer Mem," PEF, II, 23). A further evidence of this is seen today in many now deserted sites which are covered with wild olive trees, descendants of large plantations of the cultivated tree which have quite disappeared.

5. Wild Olives:

Many of these spring from the old roots; others are from the fallen drupes. Isolated trees scattered over many parts of the land, especially in Galilee, are sown by the birds. As a rule the wild olive is but a shrub, with small leaves, a stem more or less prickly, and a small, hard drupe with but little or no oil. That a wild olive branch should be grafted into a fruitful tree would be a proceeding useless and contrary to Nature (Ro 11:17,24). On the mention of "branches of wild olive" in Ne 8:15, see OIL TREE.

E. W. G. Masterman

OLIVE YARD

ol’-iv yard.

See OLIVE TREE.

OLIVE, GRAFTED

See OLIVE TREE.

OLIVE, WILD

Figuratively used in Ro 11:17,24 for the Gentiles, grafted into "the good olive tree" of Israel.

See OLIVE TREE.

OLIVES, MOUNT OF

ol’-ivz, (har ha-zethim (Zec 14:4), ma‘aleh ha-zethim, "the ascent of the mount of Olives" (2Sa 15:30, the King James Version "the ascent of (mount) Olivet"); to oros ton elaion, "the Mount of Olives" (Mt 21:1; 24:3; 26:30; Mr 11:1; 13:3; 14:26; Lu 19:37; 22:39; Joh 8:1), to oros to kaloumenon elaion, "the mount that is called Olivet" (Lu 19:29; 21:37; in both references in the King James Version "the mount called (the mount) of Olives"), tou elaionos (Ac 1:12, English Versions of the Bible "Olivet" literally, "olive garden")):

1. Names

2. Situation and Extent

3. Old Testament Associations

(1) David’s Escape from Absalom

(2) The Vision of Ezekiel

(3) The Vision of Zechariah

4. High Places

5. Olivet and Jesus

6. View of the City from Olivet

7. Churches and Ecclesiastical Traditions

LITERATURE

Olivet comes to us through the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Oliverum, "an oliveyard."

1. Names:

Josephus frequently uses the expression "Mount of Olives" (e.g. Ant, VII, ix, 2; XX, viii, 6; BJ, V, ii, 3; xii, 2), but later Jewish writings give the name har ha-mishchah, "Mount of Oil"; this occurs in some

manuscripts in 2Ki 23:13, and the common reading har ha-mashchith, "Mount of Corruption," margin "destruction," may possibly be a deliberate alteration (see below). In later ages the Mount was termed "the mountain of lights," because here there used to be kindled at one time the first beacon light to announce throughout Jewry the appearance of the new moon.

To the natives of Palestine today it is usually known as Jebel et Tar ("mountain of the elevation," or "tower"), or, less commonly, as Jebel Tur ez zait ("mountain of the elevation of oil"). The name Jebel ez-zaitun ("Mount of Olives") is also well known. Early Arabic writers use the term Tur Zait, "Mount of Oil."

2. Situation and Extent:

The mountain ridge which lies East of Jerusalem leaves the central range near the valley of Sha‘phat and runs for about 2 miles due South. After culminating in the mountain mass on which lies the "Church of the Ascension," it may be considered as giving off two branches: one lower one, which runs South-Southwest, forming the southern side of the Kidron valley, terminating at the Wady en Nar, and another, higher one, which slopes eastward and terminates a little beyond el-‘Azareyeh (modern Bethany). The main ridge is considerably higher than the site of ancient Jerusalem, and still retains a thick cap of the soft chalky limestone, mixed with flint, known variously as Nari and Ka‘kuli, which has been entirely denuded over the Jerusalem site (see JERUSALEM, II, 1). The flints were the cause of a large settlement of paleolithic man which occurred in prehistoric times on the northern end of the ridge, while the soft chalky stone breaks down to form a soil valuable for the cultivation of olives and other trees and shrubs. The one drawback to arboriculture upon this ridge is the strong northwest wind which permanently bends most trees toward the Southeast, but affects the sturdy, slow-growing olive less than the quicker-growing pine. The eastern slopes are more sheltered. In respect of wind the Mount of Olives is far more exposed than the site of old Jerusalem.

The lofty ridge of Olivet is visible from far, a fact now emphasized by the high Russian tower which can be seen for many scores of miles on the East of the Jordan. The range presents, from such a point of view particularly, a succession of summits. Taking as the northern limit the dip which is crossed by the ancient Anathoth (‘anata) road, the most northerly summit is that now crowned by the house and garden of Sir John Gray Hill, 2,690 ft. above sea-level. This is sometimes incorrectly pointed out as Scopus, which lay farther to the Northwest. A second sharp dip in the ridge separates this northern summit from the next, a broad plateau now occupied by the great Kaiserin Augusta Victoria Stiftung and grounds. The road makes a sharp descent into a valley which is traversed from West to East by an important and ancient road from Jerusalem, which runs eastward along the Wady er Rawabeh. South of this dip lies the main mass of the mountain, that known characteristically as the Olivet of ecclesiastical tradition. This mass consists of two principal summits and two subsidiary spurs. The northern of the two main summits is that known as Karem es Sayyad, "the vineyard of the hunter," and also as "Galilee," or, more correctly, as Viri Galilaei (see below, 7). It reaches a height of 2,723 ft. above the Mediterranean and is separated from the southern summit by a narrow neck traversed today by the carriage road. The southern summit, of practically the same elevation, is the traditional "Mount of the Ascension," and for several years has been distinguished by a lofty, though somewhat inartistic, tower erected by the Russians. The

two subsidiary spurs referred to above are:

(1) a somewhat isolated ridge running Southeast, upon which lies the squalid village of el ‘Azareyeh—Bethany;

(2) a small spur running South, covered with grass, which is known as "the Prophets," on account of a remarkable 4th-century Christian tomb found there, which is known as "the tomb of the Prophets"—a spot much venerated by modern Jews.

A further extension of the ridge as Batn el Hawa, "the belly of the wind," or traditionally as "the Mount of Offence" (compare 1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 23:13), is usually included in the Mount of Olives, but its lower altitude—it is on a level with the temple-platform—and its position South of the city mark it off as practically a distinct hill. Upon its lower slopes are clustered the houses of Silwan (Siloam).

The notices of the Mount of Olives in the Old Testament are, considering its nearness to Jerusalem, remarkably scanty.

3. Old Testament Associations:

(1) David’s Escape from Absalom:

David fleeing before his rebellious son Absalom (2Sa 15:16) crossed the Kidron and "went up by the ascent of the mount of Olives, and wept as he went up; and he had his head covered, and went barefoot: and all the people that were with him covered every man his head, and they went up, weeping as they went (2Sa 15:30). .... And it came to pass, that, when David was come to the top of the ascent where he was wont to worship God, (m), behold, Hushai the Archite came to meet him with his coat rent, and earth upon his head (2Sa 15:32). And when David was a little past the top of the ascent, behold, Ziba the servant of Mephibosheth met him, with a couple of asses saddled, and upon them two hundred loaves of bread, and a hundred clusters of raisins, and a hundred of summer fruits, and a bottle of wine" (2Sa 16:1).

It is highly probable that David’s route to the wilderness was neither by the much-trodden Anathoth road nor over the summit of the mountain, but by the path running Northeast from the city, which runs between the Viri Galilaei hill and that supporting the German Sanatorium and descends into the wilderness by Wady er Rawabi.

See BAHURIM.

(2) The Vision of Ezekiel:

Ezekiel in a vision (11:23) saw the glory of Yahweh go up from the midst of the city and stand "upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city" (compare 43:2). In connection with this the Rabbi

Janna records the tradition that the shekhinah stood 3 1/2 years upon Olivet, and preached, saying, "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near"—a strange story to come from a Jewish source, suggesting some overt reference to Christ.

(3) The Vision of Zechariah:

In Zec 14:4 the prophet sees Yahweh in that day stand upon the Mount of Olives, "and the Mount of Olives shall be cleft in the midst thereof toward the east and toward the west, and there shall be a very great valley; and half of the mountain shall remove toward the north, and half of it toward the south."

In addition to these direct references, Jewish tradition associates with this mount—this "mount of Corruption"—the rite of the red heifer (Nu 19); and many authorities consider that this is also the mount referred to in Ne 8:15, whence the people are directed to fetch olive branches, branches of wild olive, myrtle branches, palm branches and branches of thick trees to make their booths.

4. High Places:

It is hardly possible that a spot with such a wide outlook—especially the marvelous view over the Jordan valley and Dead Sea to the lands of Ammon and Moab—should have been neglected in the days when Semitic religion crowned such spots with their sanctuaries. There is Old Testament evidence that there was a "high place" here. In the account of David’s flight mention is made of the spot on the summit "where he was wont to worship God" (2Sa 15:32 margin). This is certainly a reference to a sanctuary, and there are strong reasons for believing that this place may have been NOB (which see) (see 1Sa 21:1; 22:9,11,19; Ne 11:32; but especially Isa 10:32). This last reference seems to imply a site more commanding in its outlook over the ancient city than Ras el Musharif proposed by Driver, one at least as far South as the Anathoth road, or even that from Wady er Rawabi. But besides this we have the definite statement (1Ki 11:7): "Then did Solomon build a high place for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, in the mount that is before (i.e. East of) Jerusalem, and for Molech the abomination of the children of Ammon," and the further account that the "high places that were before (East of) Jerusalem, which were on the right hand (South) of the mount of corruption (margin "destruction") which Solomon the king of Israel had builded for Ashtoreth the abomination of the Sidonians, and for Chemosh the abomination of Moab, and for Milcom the abomination of the children of Ammon, did the king (Josiah) defile" (2Ki 23:13). That these high places were somewhere upon what is generally recognized as the Mount of Olives, seems clear, and the most probable site is the main mass where are today the Christian sanctuaries, though Graetz and Dean Stanley favor the summit known as Viri Galilaei. It is the recognition of this which has kept alive the Jewish name "Mount of Corruption" for this mount to this day. The term Mons offensionis, given to the southeastern extension, South of the city, is merely an ecclesiastical tradidition going back to Quaresmius in the 17th century, which is repeated by Burckhardt (1823 AD).

5. Olivet and Jesus:

More important to us are the New Testament associations of this sacred spot. In those days the mountain must have been far different from its condition today. Titus in his siege of Jerusalem destroyed all the timber here as elsewhere in the environs, but before this the hillsides must have been clothed with verdure—oliveyards, fig orchards and palm groves, with myrtle and other shrubs. Here in the fresh breezes and among the thick foliage, Jesus, the country-bred Galilean, must gladly have taken Himself from the noise and closeness of the over-crowded city. It is to the Passion Week, with the exception of Joh 8:1, that all the incidents belong which are expressly mentioned as occurring on the Mount of Olives; while there would be a special reason at this time in the densely packed city, it is probable that on other occasions also our Lord preferred to stay outside the walls. Bethany would indeed appear to have been His home in Judea, as Capernaum was in Galilee. Here we read of Him as staying with Mary and Martha (Lu 10:38-42); again He comes to Bethany from the wilderness road from Jericho for the raising of Lazarus (Joh 11), and later He is at a feast, six days before the Passover (Joh 12:1), at the house of Simon (Mt 26:6-12; Mr 14:3-9; Joh 12:1-9). The Mount of Olives is expressly mentioned in many of the events of the Passion Week. He approached Jerusalem, "unto Bethphage and Bethany, at the mount of Olives" (Mr 11:1; Mt 21:1; Lu 19:29); over a shoulder of this mount—very probably by the route of the present Jericho carriage road—He made His triumphal entry to the city (Mt 21; Mr 11; Lu 19), and on this road, when probably the full sight of the city first burst into view, He wept over Jerusalem (Lu 19:41). During all that week "every day he was teaching in the temple; and every night he went out, and lodged in the mount that is called Olivet" (Lu 21:37)—the special part of the mount being Bethany (Mt 21:17; Mr 11:11). It was on the road from Bethany that He gave the sign of the withering of the fruitless fig tree (Mt 21:17-19; Mr 11:12-14,20-24), and "as he sat on the mount of Olives" (Mt 24:3 f; Mr 13:3 f) Jesus gave His memorable sermon with the doomed city lying below Him.

On the lower slopes of Olivet, in the Garden of Gethsemane (see GETHSEMANE), Jesus endured His agony, the betrayal and arrest, while upon one of its higher points—not, as tradition has it, on the inhabited highest summit, but on the secluded eastern slopes "over against Bethany" (Lu 24:50-52)—He took leave of His disciples (compare Ac 1:12).

6. View of the City from Olivet:

The view of Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives must ever be one of the most striking impressions which any visitor to Jerusalem carries away with him. It has been described countless times. It is today a view but of ruin and departed glory compared with that over which Jesus wept. A modern writer with historic imagination has thus graphically sketched the salient features of that sight:

"We are standing on the road from Bethany as it breaks round the Mount of Olives and on looking northwest this is what we see. .... There spreads a vast stone stage, almost rectangular, some 400 yards. North and South by 300 East and West, held up above Ophel and the Kidron valley by a high and massive wall, from 50 to 150 ft. and more in height, according to the levels of the rock from which it rises. Deep cloisters surround this platform on the inside of the walls. .... Every gate has its watch and other guards patrol the courts. The crowds, which pour through the south gates upon the platform for the most part keep to the right; the exceptions, turning westward, are excommunicated or in mourning. But the crowd are not all Israelites. Numbers of Gentiles mingle with them; there are costumes and colors

from all lands. In the cloisters sit teachers with groups of disciples about them. On the open pavement stand the booths of hucksters and money-changers; and from the North sheep and bullocks are being driven toward the Inner Sanctuary. This lies not in the center of the great platform, but in the northwest corner. It is a separately fortified, oblong enclosure; its high walls with their 9 gates rising from a narrow terrace at a slight elevation above the platform and the terrace encompassed by a fence within which none but Israelites may pass. .... Upon its higher western end rises a house ‘like a lion broad in front and narrow behind.’ .... From the open porch of this house stone steps descend to a great block of an altar perpetually smoking with sacrifices. .... Off the Northwest of the Outer Sanctuary a castle (the Antonia) dominates the whole with its 4 lofty towers. Beyond .... the Upper City rises in curved tiers like a theater, while all the lower slopes to the South are a crowded mass of houses, girded by the eastern wall of the city. Against that crowded background the sanctuary with its high house gleams white and fresh. But the front of the house, glittering with gold plates, is obscured by a column of smoke rising from the altar; and the Priests’ Court about the latter is colored by the slaughterers and sacrifices—a splash of red, as our imagination takes it, in the center of the prevailing white. At intervals there are bursts of music; the singing of psalms, the clash of cymbals and a great blare of trumpets, at which the people in their court in the Inner Sanctuary fall down and worship" (extracts from G.A. Smith’s Jerusalem, II, 518-20).

7. Churches and Ecclesiastical Traditions:

To the Bible student the New Testament is the best guide to Olivet; tradition and "sites" only bewilder him. Once the main hilltop was a mass of churches. There was the "Church of the Ascension" to mark the spot whereby tradition (contrary to the direct statement of Luke) states that the Ascension occurred; now the site is marked by a small octagonal chapel, built in 1834, which is in the hands of the Moslems. There a "footprint of Christ" is shown in the rock. A large basilica of Helena was built over the place where it was said that Christ taught His disciples. In 1869 the Princess de Latour d’Auvergne, learning that there was a Moslem tradition that this site was at a spot called el Battaniyeh south of the summit, here erected a beautiful church known as the Church of the Pater Noster and around the courtyard she had the Lord’s Prayer inscribed in 32 languages. When the church was in course of erection certain fragments of old walls and mosaics were found, but, in 1911, as a result of a careful excavation of the site, the foundations of a more extensive mass of old buildings, with some beautiful mosaic in the baptistry, were revealed in the neighborhood; there is little doubt but that these foundations belonged to the actual Basilica of Helena. It is proposed to rebuild the church.

Mention has been made of the name Viri Galilaei or Galilee as given to the northern summit of the main mass of Olivet. The name "Mount Galilee" appears to have been first given to this hill early in the 4th century and in 1573 AD Rawolf explains the name by the statement that here was in ancient times a khan where the Galileans lodged who came up to Jerusalem. In 1620 Quaresmius applies the names "Galilee" and Viri Galilaei to this site and thinks the latter name may be due to its having been the spot where the two angels appeared and addressed the disciples as "Ye men of Galilee" (Ac 1:11). Attempts have been made, without much success, to maintain that this "Galilee" was the spot which our Lord intended (Mt 28:10,16) to indicate to His disciples as the place of meeting.

The Russian enclosure includes a chapel, a lofty tower—from which a magnificent view is obtainable—

a hospice and a pleasant pine grove. Between the Russian buildings to the North and the Church of the Ascension lies the squalid village of et tur, inhabited by a peculiarly turbulent and rapacious crowd of Moslems, who prey upon the passing pilgrims and do much to spoil the sentiment of a visit to this sacred spot. It is possible it may be the original site of BETHPHAGE (which see).

LITERATURE.

PEF, Memoirs, "Jerusalem" volume; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem; Robinson, BRP, I, 1838; Stanley, Sinai and Palestine; Baedeker's Palestine and Syria (by Socin and Bensinger); Tobler, Die Siloahquelle und der Oelberg, 1852; Porter, Murray's Palestine and Syria; R. Hofmann, Galilaea auf dem Oelberg, Leipzig, 1896; Schick, "The Mount of Olives," PEFS, 1889, 174-84; Warren, article "Mount of Olives," in HDB; Gauthier, in EB, under the word; Vincent (Pere), "The Tombs of the Prophets," Revue Biblique, 1901.

E. W. G. Masterman

OLIVET

ol'-i-vet.

See OLIVES, MOUNT OF.

OLYMPAS

o-lim'-pas (Olumpas): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:15). Olympas is an abbreviated form of Olympiadorus. The joining in one salutation of the Christians mentioned in 16:15 suggests that they formed by themselves a small community in the earliest Roman church.

OLYMPIUS

o-lim'-pi-us (Olumpios): An epithet of JUPITER or ZEUS (which see) from Mt. Olympus in Thessaly, where the gods held court presided over by Zeus. Antiochus Epiphanes, "who on God's altars dansed," insulted the Jewish religion by dedicating the temple of Jerusalem to Jupiter Olympius, 168 BC (2 Macc 6:2; 1 Macc 1:54 ff).

OMAERUS

om-a-e'-rus: the King James Version equals the Revised Version (British and American) "Ismaerus" (1 Esdras 9:34).

OMAR

o’-mar (omar, connected perhaps with ‘amar, "speak"; Septuagint Oman or Omar): Grandson of Esau and son of Eliphaz in Ge 36:11; 1Ch 1:36; given the title "duke" or "chief" in Ge 36:15.

OMEGA

o’-me-ga o-me’-ga o-meg’-a.

See ALPHA AND OMEGA.

OMENS

o’-menz.

See AUGURY; DIVINATION.

OMER

o’-mer (‘omer): A dry measure, the tenth of an ephah, equal to about 7 1/2 pints.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

OMNIPOTENCE

om-nip’-o-tens:

1. Terms and Usage:

The noun "omnipotence" is not found in the English Bible, nor any noun exactly corresponding to it in the original Hebrew or Greek

The adjective "omnipotent" occurs in Re 19:6 the King James Version; the Greek for this, pantokrator, occurs also in 2Co 6:18; Re 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7,14; 19:15; 21:22 (in all of which the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) render "almighty"). It is also found frequently in the Septuagint, especially in the rendering of the divine names Yahweh tsebha’oth and ‘El Shadday. In pantokrator, the element of "authority," "sovereignty," side by side with that of "power," makes itself more distinctly felt than it does to the modern ear in "omnipotent," although it is meant to be included in the latter also. Compare further ho dunatos, in Lu 1:49.

2. Inherent in Old Testament Names of God:

The formal conception of omnipotence as worked out in theology does not occur in the Old Testament. The substance of the idea is conveyed in various indirect ways. The notion of "strength" is inherent in the Old Testament conception of God from the beginning, being already represented in one of the two divine names inherited by Israel from ancient Semitic religion, the name ‘El. According to one etymology it is also inherent in the other, the name ‘Elohim, and in this case the plural form, by bringing out the fullness of power in God, would mark an approach to the idea of omnipotence.

See GOD, NAMES OF.

In the patriarchal religion the conception of "might" occupies a prominent place, as is indicated by the name characteristic of this period, ‘El Shadday; compare Ge 17:1; 28:3; 35:11; 43:14; 48:3; 49:24,25; Ex 6:3. This name, however, designates the divine power as standing in the service of His covenant-relation to the patriarchs, as transcending Nature and overpowering it in the interests of redemption.

Another divine name which signalizes this attribute is Yahweh tsebha’oth, Yahweh of Hosts. This name, characteristic of the prophetic period, describes God as the King surrounded and followed by the angelic hosts, and since the might of an oriental king is measured by the splendor of his retinue, as of great, incomparable power, the King Omnipotent (Ps 24:10; Isa 2:12; 6:3,5; 8:13; Jer 46:18; Mal 1:14).

Still another name expressive of the same idea is ‘Abhir, "Strong One," compounded with Jacob or Israel (Ge 49:24; Ps 132:2,5; Isa 1:24; 49:26; 60:16). Further, ‘El Gibbor, "God-Hero" (Isa 9:6 (of the Messiah); compare for the adjective gibbor, Jer 20:11); and the figurative designation of God as Tsur, "Rock," occurring especially in the address to God in the Psalter (Isa 30:29, the King James Version "Mighty One"). The specific energy with which the divine nature operates finds expression also in the name ‘El Chay, "Living God," which God bears over against the impotent idols (1Sa 17:26,36; 2Ki 19:4,16; Ps 18:46; Jer 23:36; Da 6:20,26 f). An anthropomorphic description of the power of God is in the figures of "hand," His "arm," His "finger."

See GOD.

3. Other Modes of Expression:

Some of the attributes of Yahweh have an intimate connection with His omnipotence. Under this head especially God’s nature as Spirit and His holiness come under consideration. The representation of God as Spirit in the Old Testament does not primarily refer to the incorporealness of the divine nature, but to its inherent energy. The physical element underlying the conception of Spirit is that of air in motion, and in this at first not the invisibility but the force forms the point of comparison. The opposite of "Spirit" in this sense is "flesh," which expresses the weakness and impotence of the creature over against God (Isa 2:22; 31:3).

The holiness of God in its earliest and widest sense (not restricted to the ethical sphere) describes the majestic, specifically divine character of His being, that which evokes in man religious awe. It is not a single attribute coordinated with others, but a peculiar aspect under which all the attributes can be viewed, that which renders them distinct from anything analogous in the creature (1Sa 2:2; Ho 11:9). In this way holiness becomes closely associated with the power of God, indeed sometimes becomes synonymous with divine power equals omnipotence (Ex 15:11; Nu 20:12), and especially in Ezk, where God's "holy name" is often equivalent to His renown for power, hence, interchangeable with His "great name" (Eze 36:20-24). The objective Spirit as a distinct hypostasis and the executive of the Godhead on its one side also represents the divine power (Isa 32:15; Mt 12:28; Lu 1:35; 4:14; Ac 10:38; Ro 15:19; 1Co 2:4).

4. Unlimited Extent of the Divine Power:

In all these forms of expression a great and specifically divine power is predicated of God. Statements in which the absolutely unlimited extent of this power is explicitly affirmed are rare. The reason, however, lies not in any actual restriction placed on this power, but in the concrete practical form of religious thinking which prevents abstract formulation of the principle. The point to be noticed is that no statement is anywhere made exempting aught from the reach of divine power. Nearest to a general formula come such statements as nothing is "too hard for Yahweh" (Ge 18:14; Jer 32:17); or "I know that thou canst do everything?" or "God .... hath done whatever he pleased" (Ps 115:3; 135:6), or, negatively, no one "can hinder" God, in carrying out His purpose (Isa 43:13), or God's hand is not "waxed short" (Nu 11:23); in the New Testament: "With God all things are possible" (Mt 19:26; Mr 10:27; Lu 18:27); "Nothing is impossible with God" (the Revised Version (British and American) "No word from God shall be void of power," Lu 1:37). Indirectly the omnipotence of God is implied in the effect ascribed to faith (Mt 17:20 "Nothing shall be impossible unto you"; Mr 9:23 "All things are possible to him that believeth"), because faith puts the divine power at the disposal of the believer. On its subjective side the principle of inexhaustible power finds expression in Isa 40:28: God is not subject to weariness. Because God is conscious of the unlimited extent of His resources nothing is marvelous in His eyes (Zec 8:6).

5. Forms of Manifestation:

It is chiefly through its forms of manifestation that the distinctive quality of the divine power which renders it omnipotent becomes apparent. The divine power operates not merely in single concrete acts, but is comprehensively related to the world as such. Both in Nature and history, in creation and in redemption, it produces and controls and directs everything that comes to pass. Nothing in the realm of actual or conceivable things is withdrawn from it (Am 9:2,3; Da 4:35); even to the minutest and most recondite sequences of cause and effect it extends and masters all details of reality (Mt 10:30; Lu 12:7). There is no accident (1Sa 6:9; compare with 1Sa 6:12; Pr 16:33). It need not operate through second causes; it itself underlies all second causes and makes them what they are.

It is creative power producing its effect through a mere word (Ge 1:3 ff; De 8:3; Ps 33:9; Ro 4:17; Heb

1:3; 11:30). Among the prophets, especially Isaiah emphasizes this manner of the working of the divine power in its immediateness and suddenness (Isa 9:8; 17:13; 18:4-6; 29:5). All the processes of nature are ascribed to the causation of Yahweh (Job 5:9 ff; 9:5 ff; 38$; 39$; Isa 40:12 ff; Am 4:13; 5:8,9; 9:5,6); especially God's control of the sea is named as illustrative of this (Ps 65:7; 104:9; Isa 50:2; Jer 5:22; 31:35). The Old Testament seldom says "it rains" (Am 4:7), but usually God causes it to rain (Le 26:4; De 11:17; 1Sa 12:17; Job 36:27; Ps 29$; 65$; Mt 5:45; Ac 14:17).

The same is true of the processes of history. God sovereignly disposes, not merely of Israel, but of all other nations, even of the most powerful, e.g. the Assyrians, as His instruments for the accomplishment of His purpose (Am 1-2:3; 9:7; Isa 10:5,15; 28:2; 45:1; Jer 25:9; 27:6; 43:10). The prophets ascribe to Yahweh not merely relatively greater power than to the gods of the nations, but His power extends into the sphere of the nations, and the heathen gods are ignored in the estimate put upon His might (Isa 31:3).

Even more than the sphere of Nature and history, that of redemption reveals the divine omnipotence, from the point of view of the supernatural and miraculous. Thus Ex 15 celebrates the power of Yahweh in the wonders of the exodus. It is God's exclusive prerogative to do wonders (Job 5:9; 9:10; Ps 72:18); He alone can make "a new thing" (Nu 16:30; Isa 43:19; Jer 31:22). In the New Testament the great embodiment of this redemptive omnipotence is the resurrection of believers (Mt 22:29; Mr 12:24) and specifically the resurrection of Christ (Ro 4:17,21,24; Eph 1:19); but it is evidenced in the whole process of redemption (Mt 19:26; Mr 10:27; Ro 8:31; Eph 3:7,20; 1Pe 1:5; Re 11:17).

6. Significance for Biblical Religion:

The significance of the idea may be traced along two distinct lines. On the one hand the divine omnipotence appears as a support of faith. On the other hand it is productlye of that specifically religious state of consciousness which Scripture calls "the fear of Yahweh." Omnipotence in God is that to which human faith addresses itself. In it lies the ground for assurance that He is able to save, as in His love that He is willing to save (Ps 65:5,6; 72:18; 118:14-16; Eph 3:20).

As to the other aspect of its significance, the divine omnipotence in itself, and not merely for soteriological reasons, evokes a specific religious response. This is true, not only of the Old Testament, where the element of the fear of God stands comparatively in the foreground, but remains true also of the New Testament. Even in our Lord's teaching the prominence given to the fatherhood and love of God does not preclude that the transcendent majesty of the divine nature, including omnipotence, is kept in full view and made a potent factor in the cultivation of the religious mind (Mt 6:9). The beauty of Jesus' teaching on the nature of God consists in this, that He keeps the exaltation of God above every creature and His loving condescension toward the creature in perfect equilibrium and makes them mutually fructified by each other. Religion is more than the inclusion of God in the general altruistic movement of the human mind; it is a devotion at every point colored by the consciousness of that divine uniqueness in which God's omnipotence occupies a foremost place.

LITERATURE.

Oehler, Theologie des A T (3), 131, 139 ff; Riehm, Alttestamentliche Theologie, 250 ff; Dillmann, Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie, 244; Davidson, Old Testament Theology, 163 ff; Konig, Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion, 127, 135 ff, 391, 475.

Geerhardus Vos

OMNIPRESENCE

om-ni-prez'-ens:

1. Non-Occurrence of the Term in Scripture:

Neither the noun "omnipresence" nor adjective "omnipresent" occurs in Scripture, but the idea that God is everywhere present is throughout presupposed and sometimes explicitly formulated. God's omnipresence is closely related to His omnipotence and omniscience: that He is everywhere enables Him to act everywhere and to know all things, and, conversely, through omnipotent action and omniscient knowledge He has access to all places and all secrets (compare Ps 139). Thus conceived, the attribute is but the correlate of the monotheistic conception of God as the Infinite Creator, Preserver and Governor of the universe, immanent in His works as well as transcendent above them.

2. Philosophical and Popular Ideas of Omnipresence:

The philosophical idea of omnipresence is that of exemption from the limitations of space, subjectively as well as objectively; subjectively, in so far as space, which is a necessary form of all created consciousness in the sphere of sense-perception, is not thus constitutionally inherent in the mind of God; objectively, in so far as the actuality of space-relations in the created world imposes no limit upon the presence and operation of God. This metaphysical conception of transcendence above all space is, of course, foreign to the Bible, which in regard to this, as in regard to the other transcendent attributes, clothes the truth of revelation in popular language, and speaks of exemption from the limitations of space in terms and figures derived from space itself. Thus, the very term "omnipresence" in its two component parts "everywhere" and "present" contains a double inadequacy of expression, both the notion of "everywhere" and that of "presence" being spacial concepts. Another point, in regard to which the popular nature of the Scriptural teaching on this subject must be kept in mind, concerns the mode of the divine omnipresence. In treating the concept philosophically, it is of importance to distinguish between its application to the essence, to the activity, and to the knowledge of God. The Bible does not draw these distinctions in the abstract. Although sometimes it speaks of God's omnipresence with reference to the pervasive immanence of His being, it frequently contents itself with affirming the universal extent of God's power and knowledge (De 4:39; 10:14; Ps 139:6-16; Pr 15:3; Jer 23:23,24; Am 9:2).

3. Theories Denying Omnipresence of Being:

This observation has given rise to theories of a mere omnipresence of power or omnipresence by an act of will, as distinct from an omnipresence of being. But it is plain that in this antithetical form such a distinction is foreign to the intent of the Biblical statements in question. The writers in these passages content themselves with describing the practical effects of the attribute without reflecting upon the difference between this and its ontological aspect; the latter is neither affirmed nor denied. That no denial of the omnipresence of being is intended may be seen from Jer 23:24, where in the former half of the verse the omnipresence of 23:23 is expressed in terms of omniscience, while in the latter half the idea finds ontological expression. Similarly, in Ps 139, compare verse 2 with verses 7 ff, and verses 13 ff. As here, so in other passages the presence of God with His being in all space is explicitly affirmed (1Ki 8:27; 2Ch 2:6; Isa 66:1; Ac 17:28).

4. Denial of the Presence of the Idea in the Earlier Parts of the Old Testament:

Omnipresence being the correlate of monotheism, the presence of the idea in the earlier parts of the Old Testament is denied by all those who assign the development of monotheism in the Old Testament religion to the prophetic period from the 8th century onward. It is undoubtedly true that the earliest narratives speak very anthropomorphically of God’s relation to space; they describe Him as coming and going in language such as might be used of a human person. But it does not follow from this that the writers who do so conceive of God’s being as circumscribed by space. Where such forms of statement occur, not the presence of God in general, but His visible presence in theophany is referred to. If from the local element entering into the description God’s subjection to the limitations of space were inferred, then one might with equal warrant, on the basis of the physical, sensual elements entering into the representation, impute to the writers the view that the divine nature is corporeal.

5. The Special Redemptive and Revelatory Presence of God:

The theophanic form of appearance does not disclose what God is ontologically in Himself, but merely how He condescends to appear and work for the redemption of His people. It establishes a redemptive and revelatory presence in definite localities, which does not, in the mind of the writer, detract from the divine omnipresence. Hence, it is not confined to one place; the altars built in recognition of it are in patriarchal history erected in several places and coexist as each and all offering access to the special divine presence. It is significant that already during the patriarchal period these theophanies and the altars connected with them are confined to the Holy Land. This shows that the idea embodied in them has nothing to do with a crude conception of the Deity as locally circumscribed, but marks the beginning of that gradual restoration of the gracious presence of God to fallen humanity, the completion of which forms the goal of redemption. Thus, God is said to dwell in the ark, in the tabernacle, on Mt. Zion (Nu 10:35; 2Sa 6:2; 2Ki 19:15; Ps 3:4; 99:1); in the temple (1Ki 8; Ps 20:2; 26:8; 46:5; 48:2; Isa 8:18; Joe 3:16,21; Am 1:2); in the Holy Land (1Sa 26:19; Ho 9:3); in Christ (Joh 1:14; 2:19; Col 2:9); in the church (Joh 14:23; Ro 8:9,11; 1Co 3:16; 6:19; Eph 2:21,22; 3:11; 2Ti 3:15; Heb 10:21; 1Pe 2:5); in the eschatological assembly of His people (Re 21:3). In the light of the same principle must be interpreted the presence of God in heaven. This also is not to be understood as an ontological presence, but as a presence of specific theocratic manifestation (1Ki 8:27; Ps 2:4; 11:4; 33:13 ff; 104:3; Isa 6:1 ff; 63:15;

66:1; Hab 2:20; Mt 5:34; 6:9; Ac 7:48; 17:28; Eph 1:20; Heb 1:3). How little this is meant to exclude the presence of God elsewhere may be seen from the fact that the two representations, that of God's self-manifestation in heaven and in the earthly sanctuary, occur side by side (1Ki 8:26-53; Ps 20:2-6; Am 9:6). It has been alleged that the idea of God's dwelling in heaven marks a comparatively late attainment in the religion of Israel, of which in the pre-prophetic period no trace can as yet be discovered (so Stade, Bibl. Theol. des Altes Testament, I, 103, 104). There are, however, a number of passages in the Pentateuch bearing witness to the early existence of this belief (Ge 11:1-9; 19:24; 21:17; 22:11; 28:12). Yahweh comes, according to the belief of the earliest period, with the clouds (Ex 14:19,20; 19:9,18; 24:15; Nu 11:25; 12:5). That even in the opinion of the people Yahweh's local presence in an earthly sanctuary need not have excluded Him from heaven follows also from the unhesitating belief in His simultaneous presence in a plurality of sanctuaries. If it was not a question of locally circumscribed presence as between sanctuary and sanctuary, it need not have been as between earth and heaven (compare Gunkel, Gen, 157).

6. Religious Significance:

Both from a generally religious and from a specifically soteriological point of view the omnipresence of God is of great practical importance for the religious life. In the former respect it contains the guaranty that the actual nearness of God and a real communion with Him may be enjoyed everywhere, even apart from the places hallowed for such purpose by a specific gracious self-manifestation (Ps 139:5-10). In the other respect the divine omnipresence assures the believer that God is at hand to save in every place where from any danger or foe His people need salvation (Isa 43:2).

LITERATURE.

Oehler, Theologie des A T (3), 174 ff; Riehm, Alttestamentliche Theologie, 262 ff; Dillmann, Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie, 246 ff; Davidson, Old Testament Theology, 180 ff; Konig, Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion, 197 ff.

Geerhardus Vos

OMNISCIENCE

om-nish'-ens: The term does not occur in Scripture, either in its nominal or in its adjectival form.

1. Words and Usage:

In the Old Testament it is expressed in connection with such words as da'ath, binah, tebhunah, chokhmah; also "seeing" and "hearing," "the eye" and "the ear" occur as figures for the knowledge of God, as "arm," "hand," "finger" serve to express His power. In the New Testament are found ginoskein, gnosis, eidenai, sophia, in the same connections.

2. Tacit Assumption and Explicit Affirmation:

Scripture everywhere teaches the absolute universality of the divine knowledge. In the historical books, although there is no abstract formula, and occasional anthropomorphic references to God'staking knowledge of things occur (Ge 11:5; 18:21; De 8:3), none the less the principle is everywhere presupposed in what is related about God's cognizance of the doings of man, about the hearing of prayer, the disclosing of the future (1Sa 16:7; 23:9-12; 1Ki 8:39; 2Ch 16:9). Explicit affirmation of the principle is made in the Psalter, the Prophets, the chokhmah literature and in the New Testament. This is due to the increased internalizing of religion, by which its hidden side, to which the divine omniscience corresponds, receives greater emphasis (Job 26:6; 28:24; 34:22; Ps 139:12; 147:4; Pr 15:3,11; Isa 40:26; Ac 1:24; Heb 4:13; Re 2:23).

3. Extends to All Spheres:

This absolute universality is affirmed with reference to the various categories that comprise within themselves all that is possible or actual. It extends to God's own being, as well as to what exists outside of Him in the created world. God has perfect possession in consciousness of His own being. The unconscious finds no place in Him (Ac 15:18; 1 Joh 1:5). Next to Himself God knows the world in its totality. This knowledge extends to small as well as to great affairs (Mt 6:8,32; 10:30); to the hidden heart and mind of man as well as to that which is open and manifest (Job 11:11; 34:21,23; Ps 14:2; 17:2 ff; 33:13-18; 102:19 f; 139:1-4; Pr 5:21; 15:3; Isa 29:15; Jer 17:10; Am 4:13; Lu 16:15; Ac 1:24; 1Th 2:4; Heb 4:13; Re 2:23). It extends to all the divisions of time, the past, present and future alike (Job 14:17; Ps 56:8; Isa 41:22-24; 44:6-8; Jer 1:5; Ho 13:12; Mal 3:16). It embraces that which is contingent from the human viewpoint as well as that which is certain (1Sa 23:9-12; Mt 11:22,23).

4. Mode of the Divine Knowledge:

Scripture brings God's knowledge into connection with His omnipresence. Ps 139 is the clearest expression of this. Omniscience is the omnipresence of cognition (Jer 23:23). It is also closely related to God's eternity, for the latter makes Him in His knowledge independent of the limitations of time (Isa 43:8-12). God's creative relation to all that exists is represented as underlying His omniscience (Ps 33:15; 97:9; 139:13; Isa 29:15). His all-comprehensive purpose forms the basis of His knowledge of all events and developments (Isa 41:22-27; Am 3:7).

This, however, does not mean that God's knowledge of things is identical with His creation of them, as has been suggested by Augustine and others. The act of creation, while necessarily connected with the knowledge of that which is to be actual, is not identical with such knowledge or with the purpose on which such knowledge rests, for in God, as well as in man, the intellect and the will are distinct faculties. In the last analysis, God's knowledge of the world has its source in His self-knowledge. The world is a revelation of God. All that is actual or possible in it therefore is a reflection in created form of what exists uncreated in God, and thus the knowledge of the one becomes a reproduction of the knowledge of the other (Ac 17:27; Ro 1:20). The divine knowledge of the world also partakes of the quality of the

divine self-knowledge in this respect, that it is never dormant. God does not depend for embracing the multitude and complexity of the existing world on such mental processes as abstraction and generalization.

The Bible nowhere represents Him as attaining to knowledge by reasoning, but everywhere as simply knowing. From what has been said about the immanent sources of the divine knowledge, it follows that the latter is not a posteriori derived from its objects, as all human knowledge based on experience is, but is exercised without receptivity or dependence. In knowing, as well as in all other activities of His nature, God is sovereign and self-sufficient. In cognizing the reality of all things He needs not wait upon the things, but draws His knowledge directly from the basis of reality as it lies in Himself. While the two are thus closely connected it is nevertheless of importance to distinguish between God's knowledge of Himself and God's knowledge of the world, and also between His knowledge of the actual and His knowledge of the possible. These distinctions mark off theistic conception of omniscience from the pantheistic idea regarding it. God is not bound up in His life with the world in such a sense as to have no scope of activity beyond it.

5. God's Omniscience and Human Freewill:

Since Scripture includes in the objects of the divine knowledge also the issue of the exercise of freewill on the part of man, the problem arises, how the contingent character of such decisions and the certainty of the divine knowledge can coexist. It is true that the knowledge of God and the purposing will of God are distinct, and that not the former but the latter determines the certainty of the outcome. Consequently the divine omniscience in such cases adds or detracts nothing in regard to the certainty of the event. God's omniscience does not produce but presupposes the certainty by which the problem is raised. At the same time, precisely because omniscience presupposes certainty, it appears to exclude every conception of contingency in the free acts of man, such as would render the latter in their very essence undetermined. The knowledge of the issue must have a fixed point of certainty to terminate upon, if it is to be knowledge at all. Those who make the essence of freedom absolute indeterminateness must, therefore, exempt this class of events from the scope of the divine omniscience. But this is contrary to all the testimony of Scripture, which distinctly makes God's absolute knowledge extend to such acts (Ac 2:23). It has been attempted to construe a peculiar form of the divine knowledge, which would relate to this class of acts specifically, the so-called scientia media, to be distinguished from the scientia necessaria, which has for its object God Himself, and the scientia libera which terminates upon the certainties of the world outside of God, as determined by His freewill. This scientia media would then be based on God's foresight of the outcome of the free choice of man. It would involve a knowledge of receptivity, a contribution to the sum total of what God knows derived from observation on His part of the world-process. That is to say, it would be knowledge a posteriori in essence, although not in point of time. It is, however, difficult to see how such a knowledge can be possible in God, when the outcome is psychologically undetermined and undeterminable. The knowledge could originate no sooner than the determination originates through the free decision of man. It would, therefore, necessarily become an a posteriori knowledge in time as well as in essence. The appeal to God's eternity as bringing Him equally near to the future as to the present and enabling Him to see the future decisions of man's free will as though they were present cannot remove this difficulty, for when once the observation and knowledge of

God are made dependent on any temporal issue, the divine eternity itself is thereby virtually denied. Nothing remains but to recognize that God's eternal knowledge of the outcome of the freewill choices of man implies that there enters into these choices, notwithstanding their free character, an element of predetermination, to which the knowledge of God can attach itself.

6. Religious Importance:

The divine omniscience is most important for the religious life. The very essence of religion as communion with God depends on His all-comprehensive cognizance of the life of man at every moment. Hence, it is characteristic of the irreligious to deny the omniscience of God (Ps 10:11,12; 94:7-9; Isa 29:15; Jer 23:23; Eze 8:12; 9:9). Especially along three lines this fundamental religious importance reveals itself:

(a) it lends support and comfort when the pious suffer from the misunderstanding and misrepresentation of men;

(b) it acts as a deterrent to those tempted by sin, especially secret sin, and becomes a judging principle to all hypocrisy and false security;

(c) it furnishes the source from which man's desire for self-knowledge can obtain satisfaction (Ps 19:12; 51:6; 139:23,24).

LITERATURE.

Oehler, Theologie des A T (3), 876; Riehm, Alttestamentliche Theologie, 263; Dillmann, Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie, 249; Davidson, Old Testament Theology, 180 if.

Geerhardus Vos

OMRI

om'-ri ('omri; Septuagint Ambri; Assyrian "Chumri" and "Chumria"):

(1) The 6th king of Northern Israel, and founder of the IIIrd Dynasty which reigned for nearly 50 years. Omri reigned 12 years, circa 887-876 BC. The historical sources of his reign are contained in 1Ki 16:15-28; 20:34, the Moabite Stone, Assyrian inscriptions, and in the published accounts of recent excavations in Samaria. In spite of the brief passage given to Omri in the Old Testament, he was one of the most important of the military kings of Northern Israel.

1. His Accession:

Omri is first mentioned as an officer in the army of Elah, which was engaged in the siege of the Philistine town of Gibbethon. While Omri was thus engaged, Zimri, another officer of Elah's army, conspired against the king, whom he assassinated in a drunken debauch, exterminating at the same time the remnant of the house of Baasha. The conspiracy evidently lacked the support of the people, for the report that Zimri had usurped the throne no sooner reached the army at Gibbethon, than the people proclaimed Omri, the more powerful military leader, king over Israel. Omri lost not a moment, but leaving Gibbethon in the hands of the Philistines, he marched to Tirzah, which he besieged and captured, while Zimri perished in the flames of the palace to which he had set fire with his own hands (1Ki 16:18). Omri, however, had still another opponent in Tibni the son of Ginath, who laid claim to the throne and who was supported in his claims by his brother Joram (1Ki 16:22 Septuagint) and by a large number of the people. Civil war-followed this rivalry for the throne, which seems to have lasted for a period of four years (compare 1Ki 16:15, with 16:23 and 29) before Omri gained full control.

Omri's military ability is seen from his choice of Samaria as the royal residence and capital of the Northern Kingdom. This step may have been suggested to Omri by his own easy conquest of Tirzah, the former capital. Accordingly, he purchased the hill Shomeron of Shemer for two talents of silver, about $4,352.00 in American money. The conical hill, which rose from the surrounding plain to the height of 400 ft., and on the top of which there was room for a large city, was capable of easy defense.

2. The Founding of Samaria:

The superior strategic importance of Samaria is evidenced by the sieges it endured repeatedly by the Syrians and Assyrians. It was finally taken by Sargon in 722, after the siege had lasted for 3 years. That the Northern Kingdom endured as long as it did was due largely to the strength of its capital. With the fall of Samaria, the nation fell.

Recent excavations in Samaria under the direction of Harvard University throw new light upon the ancient capital of Israel. The first results were the uncovering of massive foundation walls of a large building, including a stairway 80 ft. wide. This building, which is Roman in architecture, is supposed to have been a temple, the work of Herod. Under this Roman building was recovered a part of a massive Hebrew structure, believed to be the palace of Omri and Ahab. During the year 1910 the explorations revealed a building covering 1 1/2 acres of ground. Four periods of construction were recognized, which, on archaeological grounds, were tentatively assigned to the reigns of Omri, Ahab, Jehu, and Jeroboam II. See SAMAIAS and articles by David G. Lyon in Harvard Theological Review, IV, 1911; JBL, V, xxx, Part I, 1911; PEFS, 1911, 79-83.

3. His Foreign Policy:

Concerning Omri's foreign policy the Old Testament is silent beyond a single hint contained in 1Ki 20:34. Here we learn that he had to bow before the stronger power of Syria. It is probable that Ben-hadad I besieged Samaria shortly after it was built, for he forced Omri to make "streets" in the city for the Syrians. It is probable, too, that at this time Ramoth-gilead was lost to the Syrians. Evidently Omri,

was weakened in his foreign policy at the beginning of his reign by the civil conflict engendered by his accession. However, he showed strength of character in his dealings with foreign powers. At least he regained control over the northern part of Moab, as we learn from the Moabite Stone. Lines 4-8 tell us that "Omri was king of Israel and afflicted Moab many days because Chemosh was angry with his land. .... Omri obtained possession of the land of Medeba and dwelt therein during his days and half the days of his son, forty years. "

Omri was the first king of Israel to pay tribute to the Assyrians under their king Asurnacirpal III, in 876 BC. From the days of Shalmaneser II (860 BC) down to the time of Sargon (722 BC), Northern Israel was known to the Assyrians as "the land of the house of Omri." On Shalmaneser's black obelisk, Jehu, who overthrew the dynasty of Omri, is called Ja'uaabal Chumri, "Jehu son of Omri."

Omri entered into an alliance with the Phoenicians by the marriage of his son Ahab to Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of the Sidonians. This may have been done as protection against the powers from the East, and as such would have seemed to be a wise political move, but it was one fraught with evil for Israel.

4. His Religious Influence and Death:

Although Omri laid the foundation of a strong kingdom, he failed to impart to it the vitalizing and rejuvenating force of a healthy spiritual religion. The testimony of 1Ki 16:25,26, that he "dealt wickedly above all that were before him," coupled with the reference to "the statutes of Omri" in Mic 6:16, indicates that he may have had a share in substituting foreign religions for the worship of Yahweh, and therefore the unfavorable light in which he is regarded is justified. Upon his death, Omri was succeeded upon the throne by his son Ahab, to whom was left the task of shaking off the Syrian yoke, and who went beyond his father in making the Phoenician influence along with Baalism of prime importance in Israel, thus leading the nation into the paths that hastened its downfall.

(2) A Benjamite, son of Becher (1Ch 7:8).

(3) A Judahite, descendant of Perez, who lived at Jerusalem (1Ch 9:4).

(4) A prince of Issachar in the time of David (1Ch 27:18).

S. K. Mosiman

ON (1)

on ('on; Egyptian An, Ant, Annu, probably pronounced An only, as this is often all that is written, a "stone" or "stone pillars"): Later called Hellopolis. The name On occurs only in Ge 41:45,50; 46:20. It occurs in one other place in the Septuagint (Ex 1:11), where On is mentioned with Pithom and Raamses as strong cities which the Israelites built. Hebrew slaves may have worked upon fortifications here, but

certainly did not build the city. On is possibly referred to as ‘ir ha-herec, in Isa 19:18 (see IR-HA-HERES). On may also be mentioned by Jeremiah (43:13) under the name Beth-shemesh. Ezekiel speaks of an Aven (’awen) (Eze 30:17), where it is mentioned with Pibeseth (Bubastis). Aven in this passage is almost certainly the same as On in Ge 41:45; 46:20, as the letters of both words are the same in the Hebrew. Only the placing of the vowel-points makes any difference. If there is a mistake, it is a mistake of the Massoretes, not of the Hebrew writer.

1. Location and Description:

There were two Ons in Egypt: one in Upper Egypt, An-res (Hermonthis); the other in Lower Egypt, An-Meheet (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschr., 254, 255, numbers 1217, a, b, 1218, 8708, 1225). The latter is the On referred to in the Bible. It lay about 20 miles North of the site of old Memphis, about 10 miles Northeast of the location of modern Cairo. It has left until this time about 4 square miles of ruins within the old walls. Little or nothing remains outside the walls.

On was built at the edge of the desert, which has now retreated some 3 or 4 miles eastward, the result of the rising of the bed of the Nile by sediment from the inundation, and the broadening of the area of infiltration which now carries the water of the Nile that much to the East. The land around On has risen about 10 ft., and the waters of infiltration at the time of lowest Nile are now about 1 1/2 ft. above the floor-level of the temple.

2. History:

The history of On is very obscure, yet its very great importance is in no doubt. No clear description of the ancient city or sanctuary has come down to us, but there are so many incidental references, and so much is implied in ancient records, that it stands out as of the very first importance, both as capital and sanctuary. The city comes from the Ist Dynasty, when it was the seat of government, and indeed must have been founded by the Ist Dynasty or have come down to it from pre-historic time. From the IIIrd to the VIth Dynasty the seat of government was shifted from On to Memphis, and in the XIIth Dynasty to Diospolis. Throughout these changes On retained its religious importance. It had been the great sanctuary in the time of the Pyramid Texts, the oldest religious texts of Egypt, and judging from the evident great development of the temple of On at the time of the writing of the texts, the city must have antedated them by considerable time (Budge, History of Egypt, II, 83, 84, 108; Breasted, Development of Religion and Thought in Egypt, chapters i, ii). The myth of Osiris makes even the charge against Set for the murder of Osiris to have been preferred at Heliopolis (Breasted, op. cit., 34). This certainly implies a very great age for the sanctuary at On. It contained a temple of the sun under the name Ra, the sun, and also Atum, the setting sun, or the sun of the Underworld. There was also a Phoenix Hall and asacred object called a ben, probably a stone, and the origin of the name An, a "stone" or "pillar" (compare Breasted, op. cit., 76, 11, and 71). Though the XIIth Dynasty removed the capital to Diospolis, Usertsen I (Senwesret) of that Dynasty erected a great obelisk at On in front of the entrance to the temple. The situation of this obelisk in the templearea indicates that the great temple was already more than a half-mile in length as early as the XIIth Dynasty. The mate of this obelisk on the opposite

side of the entrance seems not to have been erected until the XVIIIth Dynasty. Its foundations were discovered in 1912 by Petrie. Some scraps of the granite of the obelisk bear inscriptions of Thothmes III. A great Hyksos wall, also discovered by Petrie in 1912, exactly similar to that of the fortified camp at Tel el Yehudiyeh, 4 miles North, makes it quite certain that these usurpers between the Old Empire and the New fortified On as the capital once more. The manifest subserviency of the priests of On in the story of Joseph makes it most probable that the old capital at On had already been subjugated in Joseph's time, and that within this old fortification still existing Joseph ruled as prime minister of Egypt. Merenptah in his 5th year began to fortify On. Sheshonk III called himself "divine prince of Annu," and seems to have made On one of the greatest sanctuaries of his long reign. On still figured in Egyptian history in the rebellion against Ashurbanipal. The city has been deserted since the Persian invasion of 525 BC. Tradition makes the dwelling-place of Joseph and Mary with the child Jesus, while in Egypt, to have been near Heliopolis.

The exploration of On was attempted by Schiaparelli, but was not carried out, and his work has not been published. In 1912 Petrie began a systematic work of excavation which, it is expected, will continue until the whole city has been examined. The only great discovery of the first season was the Hyksos wall of fortification. Its full import can only be determined by the continuance of the exploration.

M. G. Kyle

ON (2)

('on; Aun): A Reubenite, son of Peleth, who took part with Dathan and Abiram in their revolt against Moses (Nu 16:1).

ONAM

o'-na ('onam, "vigorous"; compare ONAN):

(1) "Son" of Shobal "son" of Seir the Horite (Ge 36:23; 1Ch 1:40).

(2) "Son" of Jerahmeel by Atarah; perhaps the name is connected with Onan son of Judah (1Ch 2:26,28).

ONAN

o'-nan ('onan, "vigorous"; compare ONAM, a "son" of Judah (Ge 38:4,8-10; 46:12; Nu 26:19; 1Ch 2:3); "The story of the untimely death of Er and Onan implies that two of the ancient clans of Judah early disappeared" (Curtis, Chron, 84). See Skinner, Gen, 452, where it is pointed out that in Ge 38:11 Judah plainly attributes the death of his sons in some way to Tamar herself. The name is allied to Onam.

ONE

wun.

See NUMBER.

ONESIMUS

o-nes’-i-mus (Onesimos, literally, "profitable," "helpful" (Col 4:9; Phm 1:10)):

1. With Paul in Rome:

Onesimus was a slave (Phm 1:16) belonging to Philemon who was a wealthy citizen of Colosse, and a prominent member of the church there. Onesimus was still a heathen when he defrauded his master and ran off from Colosse. He found his way to Rome, where evil men tended to flock as to a common center, as Tacitus tells us they did at that period. In Rome he came into contact with Paul, who was then in his own hired house, in military custody.

What brought him into contact with Paul we do not know. It may have been hunger; it may have been the pangs of conscience. He could not forget that his master’s house in Colosse was the place where the Christians met in their weekly assemblies for the worship of Christ. Neither could he forget how Philemon had many a time spoken of Paul, to whom he owed his conversion. Now that Onesimus was in Rome—what a strange coincidence—Paul also was in Rome.

The result of their meeting was that Onesimus was converted to Christ, through the instrumentality of the apostle ("my child, whom I have begotten in my bonds," Phm 1:10). His services had been very acceptable to Paul, who would gladly have kept Onesimus with him; but as he could not do this without the knowledge and consent of Philemon, he sent Onesimus back to Colosse, to his master there.

2. Paul’s Epistles to Colosse and to Philemon:

At the same time Paul wrote to the church in Colosse on other matters, and he entrusted the Epistle to the Colossians to the joint care of Tychicus and Onesimus. The apostle recommends Onesimus to the brethren in Colosse, as a "faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you," and he goes on to say that Tychicus and Onesimus will make known to them all things that have happened to Paul in Rome. Such a commendation would greatly facilitate’ Onesimus’s return to Colosse.

But Paul does more. He furnishes Onesimus with a letter written by himself to Philemon. Returning to a city where it was well known that he had been neither a Christian nor even an honest man, he needed someone to vouch for the reality of the change which had taken place in his life. And Paul does this for him both in the Epistle to the Colossians and in that to Philemon.

With what exquisite delicacy is Onesimus introduced! ‘Receive him,’ says the apostle, ‘for he is my own

very heart’ (Phm 1:12). "The man whom the Colossians had only known hitherto, if they knew him all, as a worthless runaway slave, is thus commended to them, as no more a slave but a brother, no more dishonest and faithless but trustworthy; no more an object of contempt but of love" (Lightfoot’s Commentary on Col, 235).

(1) Onesimus Profitable.

The apostle accordingly begs Philemon to give Onesimus the same reception as he would rejoice to give to himself. The past history of Onesimus had been such as to belie the meaning of his name. He had not been "profitable"—far from it. But already his consistent conduct in Rome and his willing service to Paul there have changed all that; he has been profitable to Paul, and he will be profitable to Philemon too.

(2) Paul Guarantees.

Onesimus had evidently stolen his master’s goods before leaving Colosse, but in regard to that the apostle writes that if he has defrauded Philemon in anything, he becomes his surety. Philemon can regard Paul’s handwriting as a bond guaranteeing payment: "Put that to mine account," are his words, "I will repay it." Had Philemon not been a Christian, and had Paul not written this most beautiful letter, Onesimus might well have been afraid to return. In the Roman empire slaves were constantly crucified for smaller offenses than those of which he had been guilty. A thief and a runaway had nothing but torture or death to expect.

(3) The Change Which Christ Makes.

But now under the sway of Christ all is changed. The master who has been defrauded now owns allegiance to Jesus. The letter, which is delivered to him by his slave, is written by a bound "prisoner of Jesus Christ." The slave too is now a brother in Christ, beloved by Paul: surely he will be beloved by Philemon also. Then Paul intimates that he hopes soon to be set free, and then he will come and visit them in Colosse. Will Philemon receive him into his house as his guest?

(4) The Result.

It cannot be imagined that this appeal in behalf of Onesimus was in vain. Philemon would do more than Paul asked; and on the apostle’s visit to Colosse he would find the warmest welcome, both from Philemon and from Onesimus.

John Rutherfurd

ONESIPHORUS

o-ne-sif’-o-rus (Onesiphoros, literally, "profit bringer" (2Ti 1:16; 4:19)):

1. The Friend of Paul:

Onesiphorus was a friend of the apostle Paul, who mentions him twice when writing to Timothy. In the former of the two passages where his name occurs, his conduct is contrasted with that of Phygellus and Hermogenes and others—all of whom, like Onesiphorus himself, were of the province of Asia—from whom Paul might well have expected to receive sympathy and help. These persons had "turned away" from him. Onesiphorus acted in a different way, for "he oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain; but, when he was in Rome, he sought me diligently, and found me."

Onesiphorus was one of the Christians of the church in Ephesus; and the second passage, where his name is found, merely sends a message of greeting from Paul, which Timothy in Ephesus is requested to deliver to "the household of Onesiphorus." (the King James Version).

2. Visits Paul in Rome:

Onesiphorus then had come from Ephesus to Rome. It was to Paul that the church at Ephesus owed its origin, and it was to him therefore that Onesiphorus and the Christians there were indebted for all that they knew of Christ. Onesiphorus gratefully remembered these facts, and having arrived in Rome, and learned that Paul was in prison, he "very diligently" sought for the apostle. But to do this, though it was only his duty, involved much personal danger at that particular time. For the persecution, inaugurated by Nero against the Christians, had raged bitterly; its fury was not yet abated, and this made the profession of the Christian name a matter which involved very great risk of persecution and of death.

Paul was not the man to think lightly of what his Ephesian friend had done. He remembered too, "in how many things he ministered at Ephesus." And, writing to Timothy, he reminded him that Onesiphorus’s kindly ministrations at Ephesus were already well known to him, from his residence in Ephesus, and from his position, as minister of the church there.

It should be observed that the ministration of Onesiphorus at Ephesus was not, as the King James Version gives it, "to me," that is, to Paul himself. "To me" is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American). What Onesiphorus had done there was a wide Christian ministry of kindly action; it embraced "many things," which were too well known—for such is the force of the word—to Timothy to require repetition.

The visits which Onesiphorus paid to Paul in his Roman prison were intensely "refreshing." And it was not once or twice that he thus visited the chained prisoner, but he did so ofttimes.

3. His Household:

Though Onesiphorus had come to Rome, his household had remained in Ephesus; and a last salutation is sent to them by Paul. He could not write again, as he was now ready to be offered, and his execution

could not long be delayed. But as he writes, he entertains the kindest feelings toward Onesiphorus and his household, and he prays that the Lord will give mercy to the household of Onesiphorus.

He also uses these words in regard to Onesiphorus himself: "The Lord grant unto him to find mercy of the Lord in that day." It is not clear whether Onesiphorus was living, or whether he had died, before Paul wrote this epistle. Different opinions have been held on the subject.

The way in which Paul refers twice to "the household (the Revised Version (British and American) "house") of Onesiphorus," makes it possible that Onesiphorus himself had died. If this is so—but certainty is impossible—the apostle's words in regard to him would be a pious wish, which has nothing in common with the abuses which have gathered round the subject of prayers for the dead, a practice which has no foundation in Scripture.

John Rutherfurd

ONIARES

o-ni'-a-rez, o-ni-a'-rez: 1 Macc 12:19 the King James Version equals the Revised Version (British and American) ARIUS (which see).

ONIAS

o-ni'-as (Onias): There were 3 high priests of the name of Onias, and a 4th Onias who did not become a high priest but was known as the builder of the temple of Leontopolis (Josephus, Ant, XIII, iii, 1-3). Only two persons of the name are mentioned in the Apocrypha—Onias I and Onias III.

(1) Onias I, according to Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 7), the son of Jaddua and father of Simon the Just (ibid., XII, ii, 5; Sirach 50), and, according to 1 Macc 12:7,20, a contemporary of Areus (Arius), king of Sparta, who reigned 309-265 BC (Diod. xx.29). This Onias was the recipient of a friendly letter from Areus of Sparta (1 Macc 12:7; see manuscripts readings here, and 12:20). Josephus (Ant., XII, iv, 10) represents this letter as written to Onias III, which is an error, for only two Areuses are known, and Areus II reigned about 255 BC and died a child of 8 years (Paus. iii.6,6). The letter—if genuine—exists in two copies (Josephus, Ant, XII, iv, 10, and 1 Macc 12:20 ff) (see Schurer, History of the Jewish People, 4th edition, I, 182 and 237).

(2) Onias III, son of Simon II (Josephus, Ant, XII, iv, 10), whom he succeeded, and a contemporary of Seleucus IV and Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 3:1; 4:7) and father of Onias IV. He was known for his godliness and zeal for the law, yet was on such friendly terms with the Seleucids that Seleucus IV Philopator defrayed the cost of the "services of the sacrifices." He quarreled with Simon the Benjamite, guardian of the temple, about the market buildings (Greek aedileship). Being unable to get the better of Onias and thirsting for revenge, Simon went to Apollonius, governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, and informed him of the "untold sums of money," lodged in the treasury of the temple. The governor told the

king, and Seleucus dispatched his chancellor, Heliodorus, to remove the money. Onias remonstrated in vain, pleading for the "deposits of widows and orphans." Heliodorus persisted in the object of his mission. The high priest and the people were in the greatest distress. But when Heliodorus had already entered the temple, "the Sovereign of spirits, and of all authority caused a great apparition," a horse with a terrible rider accompanied by two strong and beautiful young men who scourged and wounded Heliodorus. At the intercession of Onias, his life was spared. Heliodorus advised the king to send on the same errand any enemy or conspirator whom he wished punished. Simon then slandered Onias, and the jealousy having caused bloodshed between their followers, Onias decided to repair in person to the king to intercede for his country. Apparently before a decision was given, Seleucus was assassinated and Epiphanes succeeded (175 BC). Jason, the brother of Onias, having offered the new king larger revenue, secured the priesthood, which he held until he himself was similarly supplanted by Menelaus, Simon's brother (2 Macc 4:23; Josephus, Ant, XII, v, 1, says Jason's brother). Menelaus, having stolen golden vessels belonging to the temple to meet his promises made to the king, was sharply reproved by Onias. Menelaus took revenge by persuading Andronicus, the king's deputy, to entice Onias by false promises of friendship from his sanctuary at Daphne and treacherously slay him—an act which caused indignation among both the Jews and the Greeks (2 Macc 4:34 ff). Josephus (Ant., XII, v, 1) says that "on the death of Onias the high priest, Antiochus gave the high-priesthood to his brother Jesus (Jason)," but the account of 2 Macc given above is the more probable. Some see in Da 9:26; 11:22 reference to Onias III (Schurer, 4th edition, I, 194 ff; III, 144).

S. Angus

ONIONS

un'-yunz (betsalim; krommuon): One of the delicacies of Egypt for which the children of Israel pined in the wilderness (Nu 11:5). The onion, alllium cepa (Natural Order Liliaceae), is known in Arabic as bucal and is cultivated all over Syria and Egypt; it appears to be as much a favorite in the Orient today as ever.

ONLY BEGOTTEN

on'-li be-got-'-'n (monogenes): Although the English words are found only 6 times in the New Testament, the Greek word appears 9 times, and often in the Septuagint. It is used literally of an only child: "the only son of his mother" (Lu 7:12); "an only daughter" (Lu 8:42); "mine only child" (Lu 9:38); "Isaac .... his only begotten" (Heb 11:17). In all other places in the New Testament it refers to Jesus Christ as "the only begotten Son of God" (Joh 1:14,18; 3:16,18; 1 Joh 4:9). In these passages, too, it might be translated as "the only son of God"; for the emphasis seems to be on His uniqueness, rather than on His sonship, though both ideas are certainly present. He is the son of God in a sense in which no others are. "Monogenes describes the absolutely unique relation of the Son to the Father in His divine nature; prototokos describes the relation of the Risen Christ in His glorified humanity to man" (Westcott on Heb 1:6). Christ's uniqueness as it appears in the above passages consists of two things:

(a) He reveals the Father: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, who is in the

bosom of the Father, he hath declared him" (Joh 1:18). Men therefore behold His glory, "glory as of the only begotten from the Father" (1:14).

(b) He is the mediator of salvation: "God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him" (1 Joh 4:9; Joh 3:16); "He that believeth not (on him) hath been judged already" (Joh 3:18). Other elements in His uniqueness may be gathered from other passages, as His sinlessness, His authority to forgive sins, His unbroken communion with the Father, and His unique knowledge of Him. To say that it is a uniqueness of nature or essence carries thought no farther, for these terms still need definition, and they can be defined only in terms of His moral consciousness, of His revelation of God, and especially of His intimate union as Son with the Father.

See also BEGOTTEN; PERSON OF CHRIST; SON OF GOD.

The reading "God only begotten" in Joh 1:18 the Revised Version margin, though it has strong textual support, is improbable, and can well be explained as due to orthodox zeal, in opposition to adoptionism. See Grimm-Thayer, Lexicon; Westcott, at the place

T. Rees

ONO

o’-no (’ono; Codex Vaticanus Onan; Codex Alexandrinus Ono, and other forms): A town mentioned along with Lod as fortified by certain Benjamites (1Ch 8:12). The Mishna (Arakhin ix.6) says that Joshua fortified it, but there is no such early notice of it in Scripture. It was occupied by Benjamites after the return from exile (Ezr 2:33; Ne 7:37; 11:35). In one of the villages in the plain of Ono, Sanballat and his friends vainly tried to inveigle Nehemiah into a conference (6:2). It is represented by the modern Kefr ‘Ana, which lies to the Northwest of Lydda. In 1 Esdras 5:22, the name appears as "Onus."

W. Ewing

ONUS

o’-nus.

See ONO.

ONYCHA

on’i-ka (shecheleth; compare Arabic suchalat, "filings," "husks"): "Onycha" is a transliteration of the Septuagint onucha, accusative of onux, which means "nail," "claw," "hoof," and also "onyx," a precious stone. The form "onycha" was perhaps chosen to avoid confusion with "onyx," the stone. The Hebrew

shecheleth occurs only in Ex 30:34 as an ingredient of the sacred incense. It is supposed to denote the horny operculum found in certain species of marine gasteropod molluscs. The operculum is a disk attached to the upper side of the hinder part of the "foot" of the mollusc. When the animal draws itself into its shell, the hinder part of the foot comes last, and the operculum closes the mouth of the shell. The operculum, which may be horny or stony, is absent in some species. The horny opercula when burned emit a peculiar odor, and are still used in combination with other perfumes by the Arab women of Upper Egypt and Nubia. (See Sir S. Baker, The Nile Tributaries of Abyssinia, cited by EB, under the word "Onycha.")

Alfred Ely Day

ONYX

on’-iks o’-niks.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

OPEN

o’-p’-n: In the Old Testament represents chiefly pathach, but also other words, as galah, "to uncover"; of the opening of the eyes in vision, etc. (thus Balaam, Nu 22:31; 24:4; compare Job 33:16; 36:10; Ps 119:18; Jer 32:11,14). In the New Testament the usual word is anoigo (of opening of mouth, eyes, heavens, doors, etc.). A peculiar word, trachelizomai (literally, to have the neck bent back, to be laid bare), is used for "laid open" before God in Heb 4:13.

OPEN PLACE

(1) The "open place" of Ge 38:14 the King James Version, in which Tamar sat, has come from a misunderstanding of the Hebrew, the translators having taken bephethach ‘enayim to mean "in an opening publicly," instead of "in an opening (i.e. a gate) of Enaim" (compare Pr 1:21 in the Hebrew). The Revised Version (British and American) has corrected; see ENAIM.

(2) In 1Ki 22:10 parallel 2Ch 18:9 the Revised Version (British and American) relates that Ahab and Jehoshaphat sat "each on his throne, arrayed in their robes, in an open place (margin "Hebrew: a threshing-floor," the King James Version "a void place") at the entrance of the gate of Samaria." The Hebrew here is awkward, and neither the Septuagint nor the Syriac seems to have read the present text in 1Ki 22:10, the former having "in arms, at the gate of Samaria," and the latter "in many-colored garments." Consequently various attempts have been made to emend the text, of which the simplest is the omission of beghoren, "in an open place." If, however, the text is right—as is not impossible—the open place is a threshing-floor close to the gate. See the commentaries.

Burton Scott Easton

OPERATION

op-er-a’-shun (ma‘ashe, "work"; energeia, energema, "energy"): Twice used in the Old Testament of God’s creative work (Ps 28:4,5; Isa 5:12). The Holy Spirit’s inworking and power are manifest in the bestowal of spiritual gifts on individuals and on the church (1Co 12:6 the King James Version), and in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, through which energy or operation of God those dead in sins are, through faith, raised to newness of life (Col 2:12 the King James Version).

OPHEL

o’-fel (ha-‘ophel (2Ch 27:3; 33:14; Ne 3:26 f; 11:21; and without article, Isa 32:14 and Mic 4:8; also 2Ki 5:24)):

1. Meaning of Name:

There has been considerable divergence of opinion with regard to the meaning of this name. Thus, in all the references given above with the article, the Revised Version (British and American) has simply "Ophel," but the King James Version adds in margin "the tower"; in Isa 32:14, "the hill" with margin "Ophel," but the King James Version "the forts," margin "clifts"; Mic 4:8, "the hill," margin "Hebrew: Ophel," but the King James Version "the stronghold"; 2Ki 5:24, "the hill," margin "Hebrew: Ophel," but the King James Version "the tower," margin "secret place." It is true that the other occurrences of the word in 1Sa 5:9,12; 6:5 f, where it is translated "tumors," and Hab 2:4, where a verbal form is translated "puffed up," seem to imply that one meaning assigned to the root may be that of "swelling." Recently Dr. Burney (PEF, January, 1911) has produced strong arguments in favor of Ophel, when used as the name of a locality, meaning "fortress."

2. Three Ophels:

Three places are known to have received this name:

(1) A certain place on the east hill of Jerusalem, South of the temple; to this all the passages quoted above—except one—refer.

(2) The "Ophel," translated "hill," situated apparently in Samaria (compare 2Ki 5:3), where Gehazi took his ill-gotten presents from the hands of the servants of Naaman the Syrian. The translation "tower" would suit the sense at least as well. It was some point probably in the wall of Samaria, perhaps the citadel itself.

(3) The third reference is not Biblical, but on the Moabite Stone, an inscription of Mesha, king of Moab,

contemporary with Omri. He says: "I built Q-R-CH-H (? Karhah), the wall of ye‘arim, and the wall of ‘Ophel and I built its gates and I built its towers."

In comparing the references to (1) and (3), it is evident that if Ophel means a "hill," it certainly was a fortified hill, and it seems highly probable that it meant some "artificial swelling in a fortification, e.g. a bulging or rounded keep or enceinte" (Burney, loc. cit.). Isa 32:14 reads, "The palace shall be forsaken; the populous city shall be deserted; the hill (Ophel) and the watch-tower shall be for dens for ever." Here we have palace, city and watch-tower, all the handiwork of the builder. Does it not seem probable that the Ophel belongs to the same category?

3. The Ophel of Jerusalem:

The situation of the Ophel of Jerusalem is very definitely described. It was clearly, from the references (Ne 3:26,27; 2Ch 27:3; 33:14), on the east hill South of the temple. Josephus states (Josephus, Jewish Wars, V, iv, 2) that the eastern wall of the city ran from Siloam "and reaches as far as a certain place which they called Ophlas when it was joined to the eastern cloister of the temple." In BJ, V, vi, 1, it states that "John held the temple and the parts thereto adjoining, for a great way, as also ‘Ophla,’ and the Valley called the ‘Valley of the Cedron.’ " It is noticeable that this is not identical with the "Acra" and "Lower City" which was held by Simon. There is not the slightest ground for applying the name Ophel, as has been so commonly done, to the whole southeastern hill. In the days of Josephus, it was a part of the hill immediately South of the temple walls, but the Old Testament references suit a locality nearer the middle of the southeastern hill. In the article ZION (which see) it is pointed out that that name does not occur (except in reference to the Jebusite city) in the works of the Chronicler, but that "the Ophel," which occurs almost alone in these works, is apparently used for it. Mic 4:8 margin seems to confirm this view: "O tower of the flock, the Ophel of the daughter of Zion." Here the "tower of the flock" may well refer to the shepherd David’s stronghold, and the second name appears to be a synonym for the same place.

Ophel then was probably the fortified site which in earlier days had been known as "Zion" or "the City of David." King Jotham "built much" "on the wall of Ophel" (2Ch 27:3). King Manasseh "built an outer wall to the city of David, on the west side of Gihon, in the valley, even to the entrance at the fish gate; and he compassed Ophel about with it, and raised it up to a very great height" (2Ch 33:14). It was clearly a fortified place of great importance, and its situation must have been so near that of the ancient "Zion" that scarcely any other theory is possible except that it occupied the site of that ancient fortress.

E. W. G. Masterman

OPHIR

o’-fer, o’-fir (’owphiyr (Ge 10:29), ‘owphir (1Ki 10:11), ‘ophir):

1. Scriptural References:

The 11th in order of the sons of Joktan (Ge 10:29 equals 1Ch 1:23). There is a clear reference also to a tribe Ophir (Ge 10:30). Ophir is the name of a land or city somewhere to the South or Southeast of Palestine for which Solomon's ships along with Phoenician vessels set out from Ezion-geber at the head of the Gulf of Aqabah, returning with great stores of gold, precious stones and "almug"-wood (1Ki 9:28; 10:11; 2Ch 9:10; 1Ki 22:48; 2Ch 8:18). We get a fuller list of the wares and also the time taken by the voyage if we assume that the same vessels are referred to in 1Ki 10:22, "Once every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks." The other products may not have been native to the land of Ophir, but it is certain that the gold at least was produced there. This gold was proverbial for its purity, as is witnessed by many references in the Old Testament (Ps 45:9; Job 28:16; Isa 13:12; 1Ch 29:4), and, in Job 22:24, Ophir is used for fine gold itself. In addition to these notices of Ophir, it is urged that the name. occurs also in two passages under the form "Uphaz" (Jer 10:9; Da 10:5).

2. Geographical Position:

At all times the geographical position of Ophir has been a subject of dispute, the claims of three different regions being principally advanced, namely

(1) India and the Far East,

(2) Africa,

(3) Arabia.

(1) India and the Far East.

All the wares mentioned are more or less appropriate to India, even including the fuller list of 1Ki 10:22. "Almug"-wood is conjectured to be the Indian sandal-wood. Another argument is based on the resemblance between the Septuagint form of the word (Sophera) and the Coptic name for India (Sophir). A closer identification is sought with Abhira, a people dwelling at the mouths of the Indus. Supara, an ancient city on the west coast of India near the modern Goa, is also suggested. Again, according to Wildman, the name denotes a vague extension eastward, perhaps as far as China.

(2) Africa.

This country is the greatest gold-producing region of the three. Sofala, a seaport near Mozambique on the east coast of Africa, has been advanced as the site of Ophir, both on linguistic grounds and from the nature of its products, for there all the articles of 1Ki 10:22 could be procured. But Gesenius shows that Sofala is merely the Arabic form of the Hebrew shephelah. Interest in this region as the land of Ophir was renewed, however, by Mauch's discovery at Zimbabye of great ruins and signs of old Phoenician civilization and worked-out gold mines. According to Bruce (I, 440), a voyage from Sofala to Ezion-

geber would have occupied quite three years owing to the monsoons.

(3) Arabia.

The claim of Southeastern Arabia as the land of Ophir has on the whole more to support it than that of India or of Africa. The Ophir of Ge 10:29 beyond doubt belonged to this region, and the search for Ophir in more distant lands can be made only on the precarious assumption that the Ophir of Ki is not the same as the Ophir of Gen. Of the various products mentioned, the only one which from the Old Testament notices can be regarded as clearly native to Ophir is the gold, and according to Pliny and Strabo the region of Southeastern Arabia bordering on the Persian Gulf was a famous gold-producing country. The other wares were not necessarily produced in Ophir, but were probably brought there from more distant lands, and thence conveyed by Solomon's merchantmen to Ezion-geber. If the duration of the voyage (3 years) be used as evidence, it favors this location of Ophir as much as that on the east coast of Africa. It seems therefore the least assailable view that Ophir was a district on the Persian Gulf in Southeastern Arabia and served in old time as an emporium of trade between the East and West.

A. S. Fulton

OPHNI

of'-ni (ha-'ophni; Aphne): A place in the territory of Benjamin (Jos 18:24). The modern Jifneh, in a fine vale West of the road to Nablus and 2 1/2 miles Northwest of Bethel, might suit as to position; but the change in the initial letter from 'ain to jim is not easy. This is the Gophna of the rabbis (compare Josephus, Jewish Wars, III, iii, 5).

OPHRAH

of'-ra ('ophrah; Codex Vaticanus Aphra; Codex Alexandrinus Iephratha, etc.):

(1) A town in the territory allotted to Benjamin named between Parah and Chephar-ammoni (Jos 18:23). It is mentioned again in 1Sa 13:17. The Philistines who were encamped at Michmash sent out marauding bands, one of which went westward, another eastward, down "the valley of Zeboim toward the wilderness"; the third "turned unto the way that leadeth to Ophrah, unto the land of Shual." This must have been northward, as Saul commanded the passage to the South. Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 5 Roman miles East of Bethel. A site which comes near to fulfilling these conditions is eT-Taiyebeh, which stands on a conical hill some 5 miles Northeast of Beitin. This is possibly identical with "Ephron" (2Ch 13:19), and "Ephraim" (Jn. 11:54).

(2) A city in the tribal lot of Manasseh West of Jordan. It is mentioned only in connection with Gideon, whose native place it was, and with his son Abimelech (Jud 6:11, etc.). It was, indeed, family property, belonging to Joash the Abiezrite, the father of Gideon. It was apparently not far from the plain of Esdraelon (Jud 6:33 f), so that Gideon and his kinsmen smarted under the near presence of the

oppressing Midianites. Manasseh, of course, as bordering on the southern edge of the plain, was in close touch with the invaders. At Ophrah, Gideon reared his altar to Yahweh, and made thorough cleansing of the instruments of idolatry. After his great victory, he set up here the golden ephod made from the spoils of the enemy, which proved a snare to himself and to his house (Jud 8:27). Here he was finally laid to rest. It was at Ophrah that Abimelech, aspiring to the kingdom, put to death upon one stone three score and ten of his brethren, as possible rivals, Jotham alone escaping alive (Jud 9:5). Apparently the mother of Abimelech belonged to Shechem; this established a relationship with that town, his connection with which does not therefore mean that Ophrah was near it.

No quite satisfactory identification has yet been suggested. Conder (PEFS, 1876, 1971) quotes the Samaritan Chronicle as identifying Ferata, which is 6 miles West of Nablus, with an ancient Ophra, "and the one that suggests itself as most probably identical is Ophrah of the Abiezerite." But this seems too far to the South.

(3) A man of the tribe of Judah, son of Meonothai (1Ch 4:14).

W. Ewing

OPINION

o-pin'-yun (dea', ce'ippim): "Opinion" occurs only 5 times, thrice in Job (32:6,10,17) as the translation of dea', "knowledge," "opinion" (in the address of Elihu), and once of ce'ippim, from ca'aph, "to divide or branch out," hence, division or party, unsettled opinion (in the memorable appeal of Elijah, "How long halt ye between two opinions?" 1Ki 18:21, the American Standard Revised Version "How long go ye limping between the two sides?"). In Ecclesiasticus 3:24, we have, "For many are deceived by their own vain opinion" (hupolepsis, "a taking up," "a hasty judgment"), the Revised Version (British and American) The conceit of many hath led them astray.

W. L. Walker

OPOBALSAMUM

op-o-bal'-sa-mum: the Revised Version margin in Ex 30:34.

See STACTE.

OPPRESSION

o-presh'-un: Used in the King James Version to translate a variety of Hebrew words, all of which, however, agree in the general sense of wrong done by violence to others. There are a few cases where the reference is to the oppression of Israel by foreigners, as by their Egyptian masters (Ex 3:9; De 26:7),

or by Syria (2Ki 13:4), or by an unmentioned nation (Isa 30:20 King James Version, margin). In all these cases the Hebrew original is lachats. But in the vast number of cases the reference is to social oppression of one kind or another within Israel's own body. It is frequently theme of psalmist and prophet and wise man. The poor and weak must have suffered greatly at the hands of the stronger and more fortunate. The word lachats, various forms of the root 'ashaq, and other words are used by the writers as they express their sorrow and indignation over the wrongs of their afflicted brethren. In his own sorrow, Job remembers the suffering of the oppressed (Job 35:9; 36:15); it is a frequent subject of song in the Psalms (Ps 12:5; 42:9; 43:2; 44:24; 55:3; 119:134); the preacher observes and reflects upon its prevalence (Ec 4:1; 5:8; 7:7 the King James Version); the prophets Amos (3:9), Isaiah (5:7; 59:13), Jeremiah (6:6; 22:17) and Ezekiel (22:7,29) thundered against it. It was exercised toward strangers and also toward the Israelites themselves, and was never wholly overcome. In Jas 2:6, "oppress" is the rendering of katadunasteuo, "to exercise harsh control over one," "to use one's power against one."

William Joseph Mcglothlin

OR

or: The word is used once for either (1Sa 26:10), and is still in poetic use in this sense; as in, "Without or wave or wind" (Coleridge); "Or the bakke or some bone he breketh in his dzouthe" (Piers Plowman (B), VII, 93; compare Merchant of Venice, III, ii, 65). It is also used with "ever" for before (Ps 90:2; Ecclesiasticus 18:19), which the American Standard Revised Version substitutes in Ec 12:6 (compare 12:1,2); So 6:12; Da 6:24.

ORACLE

or'-a-k'-l:

(1) A divine utterance delivered to man, usually in answer to a request for guidance. So in 2Sa 16:23 for dabhar ("word," as in the Revised Version margin). The use in this passage seems to indicate that at an early period oracular utterances were sought from Yahweh by the Israelites, but the practice certainly fell into disuse at the rise of prophecy, and there are no illustrations of the means employed (1Sa 14:18,19,36-42, etc., belong rather to DIVINATION (which see)). In. the Revised Version margin of such passages as Isa 13:1, "oracle" is used in the titles of certain special prophecies as a substitute for BURDEN (which see) (massa'), with considerable advantage (especially in La 2:14).

(2) In heathen temples "oracle" was used for the chamber in which the utterances were delivered (naturally a most sacred part of the structure). This usage, coupled with a mistake in Hebrew philology (connecting debhir, "hinder part," with dibber, "speak"), caused English Versions of the Bible to give the title "oracle" to the Most Holy Place of the Temple, in 1Ki 6:5, etc., following the example of Aquila, Symmachus and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) But the title is very unfortunate, as the Most Holy Place had nothing to do with the delivery of oracles, and the Revised Version (British and American) should have corrected (compare Ps 28:2 margin).

(3) In the New Testament English Versions of the Bible employs "oracle" as the translation of logion, "saying," in four places. In all, divine utterances are meant, specialized in Ac 7:38 as the Mosaic Law ("living oracles" equals "commandments enforced by the living God"), in Ro 3:2 as the Old Testament in general, and in Heb 5:12 as the revelations of Christianity (Heb 6:2,3). In 1Pe 4:11 the meaning is debated, but probably the command is addressed to those favored by a supernatural "gift of speech." Such men must keep their own personality in the background, adding nothing of their own to the inspired message as it comes to them.

Burton Scott Easton

ORACLES, SIBYLLINE

sib’-i-lin, -lin.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. V.

ORATOR; ORTION

or’-a-ter, o-ra’-shun: The word "orator" occurs twice:

(1) As the King James Version rendering of lachash; only Isa 3:3, "the eloquent orator," the King James Version margin "skilful of speech," where the Revised Version (British and American) rightly substitutes "the skillful enchanter." The word lachash is probably a mimetic word meaning "a hiss," "a whisper" and is used in the sense of "incantation" "charm." Hence, nebhon lachash means "skillful in incantation," "expert in magic." See DIVINATION; ENCHANTMENT.

(2) As the rendering of rhetor, the title applied to Tertullus, who appeared as the advocate of the Jewish accusers of Paul before Felix (Ac 24:1). The proceedings, as was generally the case in the provincial Roman courts, would probably be conducted in Latin, and under Roman modes of procedure, in which the parties would not be well versed; hence, the need of a professional advocate. Rhetor is here the equivalent of the older Greek sunegoros, "the prosecuting counsel," as opposed to the sundikos, "the defendant’s advocate."

Oration occurs only in Ac 12:21: "Herod .... made an oration unto them" (edemegorei pros autous). The verb demegoreo, "to speak in an assembly" (from demos, "people," agoreuo, "to harangue"), is often found in classical Greek, generally in a bad sense (Latin concionari); here only in the New Testament.

D. Miall Edwards

ORCHARD

or’-cherd:

(1) pardec, from Old Persian, "a walled-in enclosure"; paradeisos, a word in classical Greek applied to the garden of Babylon (Diodorus Siculus xi.10) and to a game park (Xenophon, Anab. i.2, 7). See Ne 2:8, "forest," margin "park"; So 4:13, "orchard," margin "paradise" (of pomegranates); Ec 2:5, "parks," the King James Version "orchards"; see PARADISE.

(2) kepos, "garden" or "orchard": "a white thorn in an orchard" (Baruch 6:71).

ORDAIN; ORDINATION

or-dan’, or-di-na-shun (Latin ordinare, "to set in order" "to arrange"; in post-Augustan Latin "to appoint to office"; from ordo, gen. ordinis, "order," "arrangement"): In the King James Version the verb "to ordain" renders as many as 35 different words (11 Hebrew words in the Old Testament, 21 Greek words in Apocrypha and the New Testament, and 3 Latin words in Apocrypha). This is due to the fact that the English word has many shades of meaning (especially as used in the time the King James Version was made), of which the following are the chief:

(1) To set in order, arrange, prepare:

"All things that we ordained festival,

Turn from their office to black funeral."

—Shakespeare, Romeo and Juliet, IV, v, 84.

This meaning is now obsolete. It is found in the King James Version of Ps 132:17; Isa 30:33; Heb 9:6 (in each of which cases the Revised Version (British and American) or margin substitutes "prepare"); 1Ch 17:9 (the Revised Version (British and American) "appoint"); Ps 7:13 (the Revised Version (British and American) "maketh"); Hab 1:12 (also the Revised Version (British and American)).

(2) To establish, institute, bring into being: "When first this order (i.e. the Garter) was ordained, my Lord" (Shakespeare). So in 1Ki 12:32, "Jeroboam ordained a feast in the 8th month" (12:33); Nu 28:6; Ps 8:2,3; Isa 26:12; RAPC 2Es 6:49 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "preserve"); Sirach 7:15; Ga 3:19.

(3) To decree, give orders, prescribe:

"And doth the power that man adores

Ordain their doom "—Byron.

So Es 9:27, "The Jews ordained .... that they would keep these two days according to the writing thereof"; 1 Esdras 6:34; 2 Esdras 7:17; 8:14 the King James Version; Tobit 1:6; 8:7 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "command"); Additions to Esther 14:9; 1 Macc 4:59; 7:49; Ac 16:4; Ro 7:10 the King James Version; 1Co 2:7; 7:17; 9:14; Eph 2:10 the King James Version.

(4) To set apart for an office or duty, appoint, destine: "Being ordained his special governor" (Shakespeare). Frequent in EV. When the King James Version has "ordain" in this sense, the Revised Version (British and American) generally substitutes "appoint"; e.g. "He (Jesus) appointed (the King James Version "ordained") twelve, that they might be with him" (Mr 3:14). So 2Ch 11:15; Jer 1:5; Da 2:24; 1 Esdras 8:49; 1Ma 3:55; 10:20; Joh 15:16; Ac 14:23; 1Ti 2:7; Tit 1:5; Heb 5:1; 8:3. The Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "formedst" in The Wisdom of Solomon 9:2, "recorded" in Sirach 48:10, "become" in Ac 1:22, "written of" (margin "set forth") in Jude 1:4, but retains "ordain" in the sense of "appoint," "set apart," in 2Ki 23:5; 1Ch 9:22; 1 Esdras 8:23; Additions to Esther 13:6; Ac 10:42; 13:48; 17:31; Ro 13:1.

(5) To appoint ceremonially to the ministerial or priestly office, to confer holy orders on. This later technical or ecclesiastical sense is never found in English Versions of the Bible. The nearest approach is (4) above, but the idea of formal or ceremonial setting-apart to office (prominent in its modern usage) is never implied in the word.

Ordination: The act of arranging in regular order, especially the act of investing with ministerial or sacerdotal rank (ordo), the setting-apart for an office in the Christian ministry. The word does not occur in English Version of the Bible. The New Testament throws but little light on the origin of the later ecclesiastical rite of ordination. The 12 disciples were not set apart by any formal act on the part of Jesus. In Mr 3:14; Joh 15:16, the King James Version rendering "ordain" is, in view of its modern usage, misleading; nothing more is implied than an appointment or election. In Joh 20:21-23, we have indeed a symbolic act of consecration ("He breathed on them"), but "the act is described as one and not repeated. The gift was once for all, not to individuals but to the abiding body" (Westcott, at the place). In the Apostolic age there is no trace of the doctrine of an outward rite conferring inward grace, though we have instances of the formal appointment or recognition of those who had already given proof of their spiritual qualification.

(1) The Seven were chosen by the brethren as men already "full of the Spirit and of wisdom," and were then "appointed" by the Twelve, who prayed and laid their hands upon them (Ac 6:1-6).

(2) The call of Barnabas and Saul came direct from God (Ac 13:2, "the work whereunto I have called them"; Ac 13:4, they were "sent forth by the Holy Spirit"). Yet certain prophets and teachers were instructed by the Holy Spirit to "separate" them (i.e. publicly) for their work, which they did by fasting and praying and laying on of hands (Ac 13:3). But it was utterly foreign to Paul’s point of view to regard the church’s act as constituting him an apostle (compare Ga 1:1).

(3) Barnabas and Paul are said to have "ordained," the Revised Version (British and American) "appointed" (cheirotonesantes, "elect," "appoint," without indicating the particular mode of appointment), elders or presbyters in every city with prayers and fasting (Ac 14:23). So Titus was instructed by Paul to "appoint elders in every city" in Crete (Tit 1:5).

(4) The gift of Timothy for evangelistic work seems to have been formally recognized in two ways:

(a) by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery (1Ti 4:14),

(b) by the laying on of the hands of Paul himself (2Ti 1:6). The words "Lay hands hastily on no man" (1Ti 5:22) do not refer to an act of ordination, but probably to the restoration of the penitent. The reference in Heb 6:2 is not exclusively to ordination, but to all occasions of laying on of hands (see HANDS, IMPOSITION OF). From the few instances mentioned above (the only ones found in the New Testament), we infer that it was regarded as advisable that persons holding high office in the church should be publicly recognized in some way, as by laying on of hands, fasting, and public prayer. But no great emphasis was laid on this rite, hence, "it can hardly be likely that any essential principle was held to be involved in it" (Hort, The Christian Ecclesia, 216). It was regarded as an outward act of approval, a symbolic offering of intercessory prayer, and an emblem of the solidarity of the Christian community, rather than an indispensable channel of grace for the work of the ministry. (For the later ecclesiastical doctrine and rite see Edwin Hatch’s valuable article on "Ordination" in the Dictionary of Christian Antiquity)

D. Miall Edwards

ORDER

or’-der (‘arakh, "to arrange"; tassein (diatassein, taxis, tagma)): "Order" in Biblical phrases may indicate

(1) arrangement in rows,

(2) sequence in time,

(3) classification and organization,

(4) likeness or manner,

(5) regulation, direction or command, or

(6) the declaring of a will.

In many passages it is difficult if not impossible to determine from the English text alone in which of these senses the word is used.

1. Arrangement in Rows:

The fundamental idea suggested by the Hebrew, Greek and English words is that of arrangement in rows. Thus "order" is used in the Bible of arranging wood for an altar (Le 1:7; 1Ki 18:33; compare Hebrew Ge 22:9; Isa 30:33); of laying out flax-stalks for drying (Jos 2:6); of preparing offerings (Le 1:8,12; compare Lu 6:5; Jud 6:26); of arranging lamps (Ex 27:21; 39:37; Le 24:3,4; compare Ps 132:17); of placing the shewbread on the table (Ex 40:4,23; Le 6:12; 24:8; 2Ch 13:11); of drawing up the battle array (1Ch 12:38 (Hebrew 39, ‘adhar)); and of arranging weapons in order for battle (Jer 46:3, the American Standard Revised Version "prepare"). As a verb "to order" in the older versions usually has the obsolete sense "to arrange" and not the more usual English meanings, "to demand" or "to direct." Thus: "In the tent of meeting shall Aaron order it" (Le 24:4, the American Standard Revised Version "keep in order"); "Order ye the buckler and shield" (Jer 46:3; compare Ps 119:133; Job 23:4, the American Standard Revised Version "set in order"; Judith 2:16; The Wisdom of Solomon 8:1; 15:1; Ecclesiasticus 2:6). The Hebrew pa‘am (literally, "hoof-beat," "occurrence," "repetition") in the plural conveys the idea of an architectural plan (Eze 41:6). Another word, shalabh, literally, "to join," in connection with the tabernacle, has in some versions been translated as including the idea of orderly arrangement (Ex 26:17). The word "order" standing by itself may mean orderly or proper arrangement (1 Esdras 1:10; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:29; 1 Macc 6:40; Col 2:5). Akin to the idea of arranging things in a row is that of arranging words (Job 33:5; 37:19; Ps 5:3), of recounting things in order (Isa 44:7; Lu 1:1 the King James Version (diatassein); Lu 1:3; Ac 11:4 (kathexes)), of setting forth a legal case (Job 23:4; 13:18; compare Ps 50:21). From the idea of arranging in order for the purpose of comparison the Hebrew ‘arakh acquires the meaning "to compare" (Isa 40:18; Ps 89:7). This is clearly the meaning of ‘en ‘arokh ‘elekha (Ps 40:5 (Hebrew 6)), where "They cannot be set in order unto thee" must be interpreted to mean "There is nothing that can be compared unto thee."

2. Sequence in Time:

As the fundamental meaning of ‘arakh is arrangement in space, that of cadhar is order or sequence in time. In later Hebrew cedher was used in the sense of "program." In Job 10:22 lo’ cedharim, absence of regularity, in the description of the uncertain period that follows death probably means "confusion in time." (The Septuagint (pheggos) suggests, in the place of cedharim, a word for "light," possibly tsohorayim.) In the New Testament we find "order" used of time in connection with the resurrection of the dead (1Co 15:23 (tagma)) and of a succession of places visited (Ac 18:23 (kathexes)). The phrase "in order unto" (Ps 119:38) expresses causal sequence and hence, purpose.

3. Classification and Organization:

The idea of classification is present in the Hebrew taqan, translated "set in order," with reference to a collection of proverbs (Ec 12:9). The same stem is used with reference to the arranging of singers before

the altar (Hebrew Ecclesiasticus 47:9), The classification of priests according to their service is spoken of as "ordering" (1Ch 24:3,19, Hebrew paqadh). Next to the high priests ranked priests of the second order (mishneh, 2Ki 23:4; compare 25:18 parallel Jer 52:24). The related concept of organization is present where the Hebrew kun (literally, "to establish".) is translated "order" (Isa 9:7 the King James Version, "to establish" the American Standard Revised Version; Ps 119:133; 2Ch 29:35; compare 1 Macc 16:14). A similar use of the term "order" is found in the New Testament in connection with the organization of the affairs of the church (1Co 16:1 (diatassein); Tit 1:5 (epidiorthoo); 1Co 11:34).

4. Likeness or Manner:

"Order," in the sense of likeness or manner, is used in the phrase "after the order of Melchisedek" to translate the Hebrew ‘al dibherath, or rather the archaic form ‘al dibherathi (Ps 110:4), which in other passages is translated "because of" (compare Ec 3:18; 7:14; 8:2). This well-known phrase is rendered in Septuagint kata ten taxin, a translation adopted in Heb 5:6,10; 6:20; 7:11,17, where the passage from Psalm is made the basis of an extended argument, in the course of which "order" is taken in the sense of "likeness" (Heb 7:16).

5. Regulation, Direction, Command:

In the sense of regulation, we find "order" as a translation of mishpaT (which is literally, "the ruling of a shopheT," whether as a judicial decree or legislative act) in connection with the conduct of priests (1Ch 6:32 (Hebrew 17); 2Ch 30:16; compare Lu 1:8; 1 Esdras 1:6), and with reference to the Nazirite regulations in the story of Samson (Jud 13:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "manner"), church services (1Co 14:40) and, in the older English VSS, with reference to other ritual matters (1Ch 15:13; 23:31; 2Ch 8:14, the American Standard Revised Version "ordinance"). The phrase ‘al yadh, literally, "according to the hand of," translated in Ezr 3:10; 1Ch 25:2 b, 3,6 twice in various ways, means "under the direction of," or "under the order of," as translated in the last instance. The modern sense of "command" is suggested here and in several other instances (1 Esdras 8:10; 1 Macc 9:55). He "that ordereth his conversation aright" (sam derekh, Ps 50:23) is probably one who chooses the right path and directs his steps along it. "Who shall order the battle?" (1Ki 20:14) is corrected in the American Standard Revised Version: "Who shall begin the battle?" (compare 2Ch 13:3, Hebrew ‘acar, literally, "to bind," hence, "to join" or "begin"; compare proelium committere).

6. Declaring of Last Will:

The phrase "to set one’s house in order" (Isa 38:1 parallel 2Ki 20:1; 2Sa 17:23), used of Hezekiah and Ahithophel, in contemplation of death, means to give final instructions to one’s household or to make one’s will. The Hebrew tsawah used in this phrase is the stem found in the later Hebrew tsawwa’ah, "a verbal will" (Babha’ Bathra’ 147a, 151b; BDB). Great moral weight was attached in Biblical times to the charges laid upon a household by a deceased father or remoter ancestor, not only as to the disposition of property but also as to personal conduct. (Compare the case of the Rechabites, where the same Hebrew expression is used, tsiwwah ‘alenu, Jer 35:6.)

Nathan Isaacs

ORDINANCE

or’-di-nans:

1. Old Testament Use:

This word generally represents chuqqah, something prescribed, enactment, usually with reference to matters of ritual. In the King James Version the same word is frequently translated by "statute" or "statutes," which is also the rendering of a similar Hebrew word, namely, choq. the Revised Version (British and American) generally retains "ordinance," but sometimes substitutes "statute" (e.g. Ex 18:20; Ps 99:7). In one instance the Revised Version (British and American) renders "set portion" (Eze 45:14). The word generally has a religious or ceremonial significance. It is used for instance in connection with the Passover (Ex 12:43; Nu 9:14). According to Ex 12:14, the Passover was "an ordinance for ever," i.e. a permanent institution. In the plural the word is often employed, along with such terms as commandments, laws, etc., with reference to the different prescriptions of the Deuteronomic and Priestly codes (De 6:1,2; Le 18:4).

In 11 passages (Ex 15:25; Jos 24:25; 1Sa 30:25; 2Ki 17:34,37; 2Ch 33:8; 35:13; Ps 119:91; Isa 58:2 twice; Eze 11:20) "ordinance" is the rendering of mishpaT, judgment, decision or sentence by a judge or ruler. In the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20:22-23:33) the term "judgments" denotes civil, as contrasted with ritual, enactments. In 2Ki 17:34 the King James Version employs "manners" and "ordinances" as renderings of this word. In 3 passages (Le 18:30; 22:9; Mal 3:14) "ordinance" is the translation of mishmereth, "charge," which the Revised Version (British and American) restores. In one instance (Ne 10:32) ordinance renders mitswah, "commandment," while in Ezr 3:10 the King James Version the phrase "after the ordinance of David" represents a Hebrew phrase which literally means "upon the hands of David," i.e. under the guidance or direction of David.

2. New Testament Use:

In the New Testament, "ordinance" renders different Greek words, namely,

(1) dikaioma, in Lu 1:6 and Heb 9:1,10. The word means literally, "anything declared right"; but in these passages ceremonial and religious regulation;

(2) dogma, in Eph 2:15; Col 2:14. In the New Testament this word always means a decree or edict (Ac 17:7);

(3) paradosis, in 1Co 11:2 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "traditions";

(4) ktisis, "setting up," "institution" in 1Pe 2:13. The term is used exclusively of the action of God. Peter implies that institutions, apparently human, such as the family and the state, are of divine origin. The same doctrine is found in Ro 13:1.

T. Lewis

ORDINANCES OF HEAVEN

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 1.

ORDINATION

or-di-na’-shun.

See ORDAIN, ORDINATION.

OREB

In 2 Esdras 2:33 the King James Version for Mt. HOREB (which see; so the Revised Version (British and American)).

OREB; ZEEB

o’-reb, ze’-eb, zeb (‘orebh, "raven," especially "crow"), and (ze’ebh, "wolf") (Jud 7:25; 8:3; Ps 83:11, Isa 10:26 (Oreb only)): Two Midianite chieftains captured and beheaded by the Ephraimites, who brought their heads to Gideon.

1. Meaning of Names:

As to the meaning of the two names, both words are found in Arabic. Robertson Smith, Kinship, etc. (190 ff, 218 ff), says that the use of the names of animals as names of persons is a relic of totemism. But Noldeke (ZDMG, XL, 160 ff) and others hold that such a use shows a desire that those so named should be as disagreeable to their enemies as the plant or animal which the name denoted. Some again (e.g. Stade, Geschichte, 189 ff) maintain that the two names here are borrowed from localities and not vice versa, as Jud 7:25 implies. If so, we must take the names to be originally two places, apparently in Ephraim, for the words "beyond Jordan" in 7:25 contradict 8:4, where it is said that Gideon came to the Jordan and passed over. Moore (Jgs, 214) suggests that the two localities were near the junction with the Jordan of the stream that comes from Wady Far‘ah. The construction of the Hebrew allows of a translation "the rock (called) Oreb," and "the winepress (called) Zeeb."

2. The Battle of Oreb:

The account of a battle here is corroborated by Isa 10:26, a verse which mentions the "rock of Oreb," and suggests that the great defeat of the Midianites took place there (compare Isa 9:4). The passage in Isa 10:24-26 is prose, however, and is said to be late editing (see G.H. Box, Isa, 65). In Ps 83:11 (Hebrew 12) there is a prayer that God would make the "nobles" among the Psalmist's enemies as Oreb and Zeeb.

David Francis Roberts

OREN

o'-ren ('oren; Aram, Alex. Aran): A son of Jerahmeel, the firstborn of Hezron (1Ch 2:25).

ORGAN

or'-gan.

See MUSIC.

ORION

o-ri'-on: A brilliant constellation dedicated to Nimrod or Merodach.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 11.

ORNAMENT

or'-na-ment ('adhi, "adornment"): In common with all the Orientals, the Hebrews were very fond of wearing ornaments, and their tendency to extravagance of this kind often met with stern prophetic rebuke (Isa 3:16-24; Eze 13:18-20). On this subject, little is said in the New Testament apart from Jesus' (Lu 7:25; 12:23) and James' (Jas 2:2) invectives against meretricious estimates of moral character. Yet the employment of attractive attire receives sanction in the divine example of Eze 16:10-14.

Ornaments in general would include finely embroidered or decorated fabrics, such as the priest's dress or the high-priestly attire, and the richly wrought veil, girdle and turban used by the wealthier class. But the term may be limited here to the various rings, bracelets and chains made of precious metals and more or less jeweled (compare Jer 2:32).

These latter, described in detail under their own titles, may be summarized here as finger-rings,

particularly prized as seal-rings (Ge 38:18,25; Jer 22:24); arm-rings or bracelets (Ge 24:22; 2Sa 1:10); earrings (Ge 35:4; Ex 32:2); noserings (Ge 24:47; Eze 16:12); anklets or ankle-chains (Isa 3:16,18); head-bands or fillets or cauls (referred to in Isa 3:18 only), and necklaces or neck-chains (Ge 41:42; Eze 16:11).

Figurative: The universal devotion to ornament among the Orientals is the occasion for frequent Biblical allusions to the beauty and splendor of fine jewelry and attire. But everywhere, in divine injunctions, the emphasis of value is placed upon the beauty of holiness as an inward grace rather than on the attractions of outward ornament (Job 40:10; Ps 110:3; Joe 2:13; 1Ti 2:9,10; 1Pe 3:4). In grievous sorrow, all ornament was to be laid aside in token of mourning (Ex 33:4-6).

Leonard W. Doolan

ORNAN

or’-nan (1Ch 21:15).

See ARAUNAH.

ORPAH

or’-pa (‘orpah; for meaning see below): A Moabitess, wife of Mahlon, son of Elimelech and Naomi. Unlike her sister Ru she returned to her own people after escorting Naomi on her way to Judah (Ru 1:4). Her name is supposed to be derived from the Hebrew word for "neck" (‘oreph), and so to mean "stiff-necked" because of her turning-back from following her mother-in-law; others take it to mean "gazelle."

ORPHAN

or’-fan: This word occurs once only in the Old Testament (La 5:3, where it stands for yathom, elsewhere rendered "fatherless," and in the Septuagint always orphanos); in the Apocrypha it occurs 3 times (2 Esdras 2:20; Tobit 1:8; 2 Macc 8:28). There is no clear case where it means the loss of both parents. The Scriptures devote considerable attention to the widow and orphan, and the idea is that the child is fatherless. It is not found in the King James Version of the New Testament; but the Greek word orphanos occurs twice, Joh 14:18 (the King James Version "comfortless," the Revised Version (British and American) "desolate," margin "orphans") and Jas 1:27 ("fatherless").

See FATHERLESS.

D. Miall Edwards

ORTHOSIA

or-tho-si’-a (Orthosias; the King James Version Orthosias): The city to which Tryphon fled when he escaped from Dora, where he was besieged by Antiochus Sidetes (1 Macc 15:37). According to Pliny (NH, v.17) it lay South of the river Eleutherus, and North of the city of Tripolis. The Peutinger Tables place it 12 Roman miles North of Tripolis and 30 miles South of Antaradus on the Phoenician coast. Porter would place it on the southern bank of Nahr el-Barid.

OSAIAS

o-za’-yas, o-sa’-yas (Osaias; Codex Vaticanus omits): In 1 Esdras 8:48 a corruption of Jeshaiah (compare Ezr 8:19).

OSEA

o-ze’-a, o-se’-a: In 2 Esdras 13:40 equals HOSHEA, king of Israel (which see).

OSEAS

o-ze’-as, o-se’-as: "Osee" in 2 Esdras 1:39; the prophet Hosea.

OSEE

o’-ze, o’-se (Hosee): the King James Version in Ro 9:25; the prophet Hosea (thus the Revised Version (British and American)).

OSHEA

o-she’-a, o’-she-a (the Revised Version (British and American) "Hoshea" (Nu 13:8,16)): The original name of Joshua, the son of Nun, changed by Moses (Nu 13:16) from Hoshea (hoshea‘, "help") to Joshua (yehoshua‘, "help of Yahweh").

See JOSHUA.

OSNAPPAR

os-nap’-ar (Ezr 4:10).

See ASHURBANIPAL.

OSPRAY

os’-pra (‘ozniyah; haliaetos; Latin Pandion haliaetus): A large hawk preferring a diet of fish. The word is found in the list of abominations only. See Le 11:13; De 14:12. The osprey was quite similar in appearance to some of the smaller eagles, and by some it is thought that the short-toed eagle is intended. But the eagle and the gier-eagle had been specified, and on account of the osprey plunging into water for food and having feet bare to the lower leg-joint and plumage of brighter and more distinctive marking, it seems very probable that it was recognized as a distinctive species, and so named separately. Moreover, the osprey was not numerous as were other hawks and eagles. It was a bird that lived almost wholly on fish, and these were not plentiful in the waters of Palestine. This would tend to make it a marked bird, so no doubt the translation is correct as it stands, as any hawk that lived on fish would have been barred as an article of diet (see Tristram, Natural History of the Bible, 182; also Studers, Birds of North America, p. 16).

Gene Stratton-Porter

OSSIFRAGE

os’-i-fraj (perec; gups; Let Ossifraga): The great bearded vulture known as the lammer-geier (Le 11:13; De 14:12 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "gier-eagle"). The Hebrew name perec means "to break." Let oasis, "bone," and frangere, "to break," indicate the most noticeable habit of the bird. It is the largest of the vulture family, being 3 1/2 ft. in length and 10 in sweep. It has a white head, black beard on the chin, and the part of the eye commonly called the "white" in most animals, which is visible in but few birds, in this family is pronounced and of a deep angry red, thus giving the bird a formidable appearance. The back is grayish black, the feathers finely penciled, the shaft being white, the median line tawny. The under parts are tawny white and the feet and talons powerful. It differs from the vulture in that it is not a consistent carrion feeder, but prefers to take prey of the size captured by some of the largest eagles. It took its name from the fact that after smaller vultures and eagles had stripped a carcass to the last shred of muscle, the lammergeier then carried the skeleton aloft and dropped it repeatedly until the marrow from the broken bones could be eaten. It is also very fond of tortoise, the meat of which it secures in the same manner. As this bird frequents Southern Europe, it is thought to be the one that mistook the bald head of Aeschylus, the poet, for a stone and let fall on it the tortoise that caused his death. This bird also attacks living prey of the size of lambs, kids and hares. It is not numerous and does not flock, but pairs live in deep gorges and rocky crevices. It builds an enormous nest, deposits one pinkish or yellowish egg, and the young is black. It requires two years to develop the red eyes, finely penciled plumage and white head of the adult bird. It was included among the abominations because of its diet of carrion.

Gene Stratton-Porter

OSTRACA

os’-tra-ka: The word ostracon ("potsherd," Hebrew cheres) occurs in Job 2:8 (Septuagint), kai elaben

ostrakon, "and he took him a potsherd." Earthen vessels were in universal use in antiquity (they are twice mentioned in the New Testament: skeue ostrakina (2Co 4:7; 2Ti 2:20)), and the broken fragments of them, which could be picked up almost anywhere, were made to serve various purposes. Upon the smoothest of these pieces of unglazed pottery the poorest might write in ink his memoranda, receipts, letters or texts.

1. Hebrew Ostraca:

A fortunate discovery at Samaria (1910), made among the ruins of Ahab's palace, has brought to light 75 Hebrew ostraca inscribed with ink, in the Phoenician character, with accounts and memoranda relating to private matters and dating probably from the time of Ahab. Their historical contribution, aside from the mention of many names of persons and places, is slender, but for ancient Hebrew writing and to a less extent for Hebrew words and forms they are of value, while the fact that in them we possess documents actually penned in Israel in the 9th century BC gives them extraordinary interest. The nature of ostraca tends to their preservation under conditions which would quickly destroy parchment, skin or papyrus, and this discovery in Palestine encourages the hope of further and more significant finds.

2. Greek Ostraca:

Greek ostraca in large quantities have been found in Egypt, preserving documents of many kinds, chiefly tax receipts. The texts of some 2,000 of these have been published, principally by Wilcken (Griechische Ostraka, 2 volumes, 1899), and serve to illustrate in unexpected ways the everyday Greek speech of the common people of Egypt through the Ptolemaic, Roman and Byzantine periods. Like the papyri, they help to throw light on New Testament syntax and lexicography, as well as on ancient life in general.

3. New Testament Ostraca:

It is said that Cleanthes the Stoic, being too poor to buy papyrus, used to write on ostraca, but no remains of classical literature have been found on the ostraca thus far discovered. In some instances, however, Christian literary texts are preserved upon ostraca. Some years ago Bouriant bought in Upper Egypt 20 ostraca, probably of the 7th century, inscribed with the Greek text of parts of the Gospels. The ostraca are of different sizes, and preserve among others one long continuous passage (Lu 22:40-71), which runs over 10 of the pieces. The ostraca contain from 2 to 9 verses each, and cover Mt 27:31,32; Mr 5:40,41 (9:3); 9:17,18,22; 15:21; Lu 12:13-16; 22:40-71; Joh 1:1-9; 1:14-17; 18:19-25; 19:15-17. The texts are in 3 different hands, and attest the interest of the poor in the gospel in the century of the Arab conquest. Another late ostracon has a rough drawing labeled "St. Peter the evangelist," perhaps in allusion to the Gospel of Peter.

4. Coptic Ostraca:

Coptic ostraca, too, are numerous, especially from the Byzantine period, and of even more interest for Christian history than the Greek. A Sa‘idic ostracon preserves the pericope on the woman taken in

adultery (Joh 7:53-8:11), which is otherwise unattested in the Sa‘idic New Testament. A Christian hymn to Mary, akin to the canticles of Luke, and some Christian letters have been found. The work of W.E. Crum on the Coptic ostraca is of especial importance. See, further, Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 1910; Lyon, Harvard Theol. Review, January, 1911.

Edgar J. Goodspeed

OSTRICH

os’-trich (ya‘anah; strouthos; Latin Struthio camelus): The largest bird now living. The Hebrew words ya‘anah, which means "greediness," and bath ha-ya‘anah, "daughter of greediness," are made to refer to the indiscriminate diet of the ostrich, to which bird they apply; and again to the owl, with no applicability. The owl at times has a struggle to swallow whole prey it has taken, but the mere fact that it is a night hunter forever shuts it from the class of greedy and promiscuous feeders. The bodies of owls are proverbially lean like eagles. Neither did the owl frequent several places where older versions of Jer and Isa place it; so the translations are now correctly rendered "ostrich." These birds came into the Bible because of their desert life, the companions they lived among there, and because of their night cries that were guttural, terrifying groans, like the roaring of lions. The birds were brought into many pictures of desolation, because people dreaded their fearful voices. They horned on the trackless deserts that were dreaded by travelers, and when they came feeding on the fringe of the wilderness, they fell into company with vulture, eagle, lion, jackal and adder, and joined their voices with the night hawks and owls. For these reasons no birds were more suitable for drawing strong comparisons from.

1. Physical Peculiarities:

They attained a height ranging from 6 to 8 ft., and weighed from 200 to 300 lbs. The head was small with large eyes having powerful vision, and protected by lashes. The neck was long, covered with down, and the windpipe showed, while large bites could be seen to slide down the gullet. The legs were bare, long, and the muscles like steel from the long distances covered in desert travel. The foot was much like the cloven hoof of a beast. The inner toe was 7 inches long, with a clawlike hoof, the outer, smaller with no claw. With its length and strength of leg and the weight of foot it could strike a blow that saved it from attack by beasts smaller than a leopard. The wings were small, the muscles soft and flabby. They would not bear the weight of the bird, but the habit of lifting and beating them proved that this assisted in attaining speed in running (compare Xen. Anab. i.5,2, 3). The body was covered with soft flexible feathers, the wings and tail growing long plumes, for which the bird has been pursued since the beginning of time. These exquisite feathers were first used to decorate the headdress and shields of desert chieftains, then as decorations for royalty, and later for hat and hair ornaments. The badge of the Prince of Wales is three white ostrich plumes. The females are smaller, the colors gray and white, the males a glossy black, the wing and tail plumes white. The ostrich has three physical peculiarities that stagger scientists. It has eyelashes, developed no doubt to protect the eyes from the dust and sand of desert life. On the wings are two plumeless shafts like large porcupine quills. These may be used in resisting attack. It also has a bladder like a mammal, that collects uric acid, the rarest organ ever

developed in a feathered creature.

2. Eggs and Care of Young:

These birds homed on the deserts of Arabia and at the lower end of the great Salt Sea. Here the ostrich left her eggs on the earth and warmed them in the sand. That they were not hard baked was due to the fact that they were covered for protection during the day and brooded through the cooler nights. The eggs average 3 lbs. weight. They have been used for food in the haunts of the ostrich since the records of history began, and their stout shells for drinking-vessels. It is the custom of natives on finding a nest to take a long stick and draw out an egg. If incubation has advanced enough to spoil the eggs for use, the nest is carefully covered and left; if fresh, they are eaten, one egg being sufficient for a small family. No doubt these were the eggs to which Job referred as being tasteless without salt (Job 6:6). The number of eggs in the nest was due to the fact that the birds were polygamous, one male leading from 2 to 7 females, all of which deposited their eggs in a common nest. When several females wanted to use the nest at the same time, the first one to reach it deposited her egg in it, and the others on the sand close beside. This accounts for the careless habits of the ostrich as to her young. In this communal nest, containing from 2 to 3 dozen eggs, it is impossible for the mother bird to know which of the young is hers. So all of them united in laying the eggs and allowing the father to look after the nest and the young. The bird first appears among the abominations in Le 11:16 the Revised Version (British and American) the King James Version "owl"; De 14:16, the Revised Version (British and American) "little owl," the King James Version "owl." This must have referred to the toughness of grown specimens, since there was nothing offensive in the bird’s diet to taint its flesh and the young tender ones were delicious meat. In his agony, Job felt so much an outcast that he cried:

"I am a brother to jackals,

And a companion to ostriches" (Job 30:29).

Again he records that the Almighty discoursed to him about the ostrich in the following manner:

"The wings of the ostrich wave proudly;

But are they the pinions and plumage of love?" etc.

(Job 39:13-18).

3. Old Testament References:

The ostrich history previously given explains all this passage save the last two verses, the first of which is a reference to the fact that the Arabs thought that the ostrich was a stupid bird, because, when it had traveled to the point of exhaustion, it hid its head and thought its body safe, and because some of its eggs were found outside the nest. The second was due to a well-known fact that, given a straight course, the

ostrich could outrun a horse. The birds could attain and keep up a speed of 60 miles an hour for the greater part of half a day and even longer, hence, it was possible to capture them only by a system of relay riders (Xenophon, op. cit.) When Isaiah predicted the fall of Babylon, he used these words: "But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and ostriches shall dwell there, and wild goats shall dance there" (Isa 13:21). Because this was to be the destruction of a great city, located on the Euphrates River and built by the fertility and prosperity of the country surrounding it, and the ruins those of homes, the bird indicated by every natural condition would be the owl. The wild goats clambering over the ruins would be natural companions and the sneaking wolves—but not the big bird of daytime travel, desert habitation, accustomed to constant pursuit for its plumage. Exactly the same argument applies to the next reference by the same writer (Isa 34:13). "And the wild beasts of the desert shall meet with the wolves, and the wild goat shall cry to his fellow; yea, the night monster shall settle there, and shall find her a place of rest" (Isa 34:14). "The beasts of the field shall honor me, the jackals and the ostriches; because I give waters in the wilderness, and rivers in the desert, to give drink to my people, my chosen" (Isa 43:20). Here we find the ostrich in its natural location, surrounded by creatures that were its daily companions. The next reference also places the bird at home and in customary company: "Therefore the wild beasts of the desert with the wolves shall dwelI there, and the ostriches (the King James Version "owls") shall dwell therein: and it shall be no more inhabited forever; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation" (Jer 50:39).

"Even the jackals draw out the breast, they give suck to their young ones:

The daughter of my people is become cruel, like the ostriches in the wilderness" (La 4:3).

This reference is made to the supposed cruelty of the ostrich in not raising its young.

Gene Stratton-Porter

OTHNI

oth’-ni (‘othni, meaning unknown): A son of Shemaiah, a Korahite Levite (1Ch 26:7).

OTHNIEL

oth’-ni-el (‘othni’el): A hero in Israel, son of Kenaz, Caleb’s younger brother. He conquered Kiriath-sepher, later known as Debir, in the territory of Judah in the days of Joshua, and was given the daughter of Caleb, Achsah, to wife as a reward (Jos 15:17, parallel found in Jud 1:13). He later smote Cushan-rishathaim, king of Mesopotamia, whom the children of Israel had served 8 years, and thus not only saved the Israelites, but by reviving national sentiment among them (compare Ant, V, iv, 3), and reestablishing government, became the first of those hero-rulers known as "judges." The effects of his victory lasted an entire generation (40 years, Jud 3:9-11). He had a son named Hathath (1Ch 4:13) and probably another named Meonothai (compare recensio Luciana of Septuagint, at the place). In the days of David we find a family bearing the name of Othniel, from which came Heldai the Metophathite,

captain of the twelfth month (1Ch 27:15).

Nathan Isaacs

OTHONIAS

oth-o-ni’-as (Othonias): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:28) equals "Mattaniah" of Ezr 10:27.

OUCHES

ouch’-ez, -iz (mishbetsoth (Ex 28:11,13,14,25; 39:6,13,16,18) the American Standard Revised Version "settings," but in Ex 39:13, "inclosings"): The secondary meaning of this now archaic word is the gold or silver setting of a precious stone. In Exodus, where it occurs 8 times, it is clear that the gold settings of the engraved stones forming the breast-plate of the high priest are intended; the onyx stones forming the fibula or brooch for holding together the two sides of the breast-plate being said to be "enclosed in ouches (settings) of gold" (Ex 39:6). Not only were these two onyx or beryl stones so set, but the 12 stones forming the front of the breast-plate were "inclosed in gold in their settings" (Ex 28:20). The same word occurs in Ps 45:13, where the king’s daughter is said to have her clothing "in-wrought with gold," i.e. embroidered with gold thread or wire. Ex 39:3 tells us how this wire was produced. From this fact it may be inferred that the settings of the breast-plate were not solid pieces of gold, but were formed of woven wire wreathed round the stones, in a sort of filigree.

See also STONES, PRECIOUS.

W. Shaw Caldecott

OUTCAST

out’-kast: Represents some form of dachah, or nadhach, both meaning "thrust out." In Jer 30:17 "outcast" means "thrust out of society," "degraded person"; elsewhere it means "exile" (Ps 147:2; Isa 16:3 f; Jer 49:36).

OUTER

out’-er: This adjective is used 12 times by Ezekiel of the outside court of the temple. In Matthew we find it 3 times (8:12; 22:13; 25:30) in "outer darkness" (to skotos to exoteron), which typifies the utter darkness of the doom of the lost.

OUTGOING

out’-go-ing: In Ps 65:8, "Thou makest the outgoings of the morning and evening to rejoice," the Hebrew is motsa’. The word (from yatsa’," to go forth") refers to the "going forth" of the sun, and so means "east" (as in Ps 75:6). The connection of motsa’ with "evening" is therefore zeugmatic, but the meaning is clear and there are extra-Biblical parallels (compare "the two Orients"). In Jos 17:18, the King James Version uses "outgoings" for the Hebrew totsa’oth (also from yatsa’), where the meaning is "extremity" (the Revised Version (British and American) "goings out," as in Nu 34:5, etc.). "Outwent" occurs in the margin of Mr 6:33.

Burton Scott Easton

OUTLANDISH

out-land’-ish (Ne 13:26, the King James Version "Him did outlandish women cause to sin") "Outlandish" in modern English is colloquial only and with the sense "utterly extraordinary," but the King James Version uses it in the literal meaning "out of the land," "foreign," the English Revised Version "strange women," the American Standard Revised Version "foreign women," Hebrew nokhri, "foreign."

OUTRAGE; OUTRAGEOUS

out’-raj, out-ra’-jus: The noun (from the French outre plus age, "that which goes beyond") only in the heading to Ps 10 the King James Version; the adjective in Pr 27:4, the King James Version and the English Revised Version, for sheTeph, "flood." "Anger is overwhelming" (American Standard Revised Version), is much better.

OUTROADS

out’-rodz (exodeuo, "to go forth," "to make a military expedition"; the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in 1 Macc 15:41, "horsemen .... that they might make outroads upon the ways of Judah"; 1 Esdras 4:23, the Revised Version (British and American) "goeth forth to make outroads"): "Outroads" is obsolete, but its opposite, "inroads," is still good English.

OUTWARD MAN

out’-werd, (exo, "outside," "without," "out of doors"): The body, subject to decay and death, in distinction from the inner man, the imperishable spiritual life which "is renewed day by day" (2Co 4:16); also the body as the object of worldly thought and pride in external dress and adornment (1Pe 3:3).

See MAN, NATURAL; MAN.

OVEN

uv’-’-n.

See BREAD; FURNACE.

OVERCHARGE

o-ver-charj’:Lu 21:34, "lest haply your hearts be overcharged with drunkenness" (baruno, "burden," here with the force "be occupied with"); 2Co 2:5, the King James Version "that I may not overcharge you" (epibareo, "overload"), the Revised Version (British and American) "that I press not too heavily."

See CHARGES.

OVERPASS

o-ver-pas’:A special translation of the very common verb ‘abhar, "to pass over," found in English Versions of the Bible of Ps 57:1 and Isa 26:20 in the sense "to pass by," and in Jer 5:28 with the meaning "to overflow."

OVERPLUS

o’-ver-plus: Le 25:27, for ‘adhaph, "excess."

OVERSEER

o-ver-se’-er, or -ser’:One who overlooks, inspects; in the Old Testament from natsach (2Ch 2:18; in 2Ch 34:13 the Revised Version (British and American) changes to "set forward"), and paqadh (Ge 39:4,5; 2Ch 34:12,17; the Revised Version (British and American) has this word for the King James Version "officers" in Ge 41:34, and for "rulers" in 1Ch 26:32); in the New Testament once for episkopos, in Ac 20:28, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "bishops" (margin "overseers"; compare 1Pe 5:2).

See BISHOP.

OWL

oul (bath ha-ya‘anah; Latin Ulula): The name of every nocturnal bird of prey of the Natural Order Striges. These birds range from the great horned owl of 2 feet in length, through many subdivisions to the little screech-owl of 5 inches. All are characterized by very large heads, many have ear tufts, all have large eyes surrounded by a disk of tiny, stiff, radiating feathers. The remainder of the plumage has no aftershaft. So these birds make the softest flight of any creature traveling on wing. A volume could be

written on the eye of the owl, perhaps its most wonderful feature being in the power of the bird to enlarge the iris if it wishes more distinct vision. There is material for another on the prominent and peculiar auditory parts. With almost all owls the feet are so arranged that two toes can be turned forward and two back, thus reinforcing the grip of the bird by an extra toe and giving it unusual strength of foot. All are night-hunters, taking prey to be found at that time, of size according to the strength. The owl was very numerous in the caves, ruined temples and cities, and even in the fertile valleys of Palestine. It is given place in the Bible because it was considered unfit for food and because people dreaded the cries of every branch of the numerous family. It appeared often, as most birds, in the early versions of the Bible; later translators seem to feel that it was used in several places where the ostrich really was intended (see OSTRICH). It would appear to a natural historian that the right bird could be selected by the location, where the text is confusing. The ostrich had a voice that was even more terrifying, when raised in the night, than that of the owl. But it was a bird of the desert, of wide range and traveled only by day. This would confine its habitat to the desert and the greenery where it joined fertile land, but would not bring it in very close touch with civilization. The owl is a bird of ruins, that lay mostly in the heart of rich farming lands, where prosperous cities had been built and then destroyed by enemies. Near these locations the ostrich would be pursued for its plumage, and its nesting conditions did not prevail. The location was strictly the owl’s chosen haunt, and it had the voice to fit all the requirements of the text. In the lists of abominations, the original Hebrew yanshuph, derived from a root meaning twilight, is translated "great owl" (see Le 11:17 and De 14:16). It is probable that this was a bird about 2 ft. in length, called the eagle-owl. In the same lists the word koc (nuktikorax) refers to ruins, and the bird indicated is specified as the "little owl," that is, smaller than the great owl—about the size of our barn owl. This bird is referred to as the "mother of ruins," and the translations that place it in deserted temples and cities are beyond all doubt correct. Qippoz (echinos) occurs once (Isa 34:15), and is translated "great owl" in former versions; lately (in the American Standard Revised Version) it is changed to "dart-snake" (the English Revised Version "arrowsnake"). In this same description lilith (onokentauros), "a specter of night," was formerly screech-owl, now it reads "night monster," which is more confusing and less suggestive. The owls in the lists of abominations (Le 11:17,18; De 14:16) are the little owl, the great owl and the horned owl. The only other owl of all those that produced such impressions of desolation in the Books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Job, and Micah is referred to in Ps 102:6:

"I am like a pelican of the wilderness;

I am become as an owl of the waste places."

Here it would appear that the bird habitual to the wilderness and the waste places, that certainly would be desert, would be the ostrich—while in any quotation referring to ruins, the owl would be the bird indicated by natural conditions.

Gene Stratton-Porter

OWL, GREAT

(yanshuph; Septuagint ibis, or eibis): A member of the Palestine species of the family Strigidae. The great owl mentioned in the Bible was no doubt their largest specimen of the family, a bird fully 2 ft. in length, full feathered, with unusually large head and long ear tufts. It was a formidable and noble-appearing bird, with resounding voice. It was abundant among the ruins of temples, the tombs of Carmel, the caves of Gennesaret, and among the ruined cities of Southern Judah. It is included in the abomination lists of Le 11:17 and De 14:16.

See OWL.

Gene Stratton-Porter

OWL, LITTLE

(koc; nuktikorax; Latin Athene meridionalis): A night bird of prey distinguished by a round head, and extremely large eyes. The little owl is left in the Revised Version (British and American) only in the lists of abominations (see Le 11:17; De 14:16).

See OWL.

OWL, SCREECH

See NIGHT-MONSTER.

OWNER

on’-er.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

OX (1)

See ANTELOPE; CATTLE; WILD OX.

OX (2)

oks (Ox): One of the ancestors of Judith (Judith 8:1). The name is not Hebrew. Perhaps the Itala Ozi and the Syriac Uz point to the Hebrew Uzzi.

OX-GOAD

oks’-god.

See GOAD.

OZEM

o’-zem (’otsem, meaning unknown):

(1) The 6th son of David (1Ch 2:15). Septuagint (Asom) and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) suggest that the name should be pointed ‘atsom.

(2) A "son" of Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:25).

OZIAS

o-zi’-as:

(1) (Ozeias, Ozias, Codex Vaticanus a b): The son of Micah, a Simeonite, one of the 3 rulers of Bethulia in the days of Judith (Judith 6:15,16; 7:23; 8:9 ff; 10:6).

(2) (Ozeias, Codex Vaticanus and Swete; the King James Version has Ezias (1 Esdras 8:2), following Codex Alexandrinus Ezias): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2; 2 Esdras 1:2) equals "Uzzi" of Ezr 7:4; 1Ch 6:51.

(3) Head of a family of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31) equals "Uzza" of Ezr 2:49; Ne 7:51.

(4) Greek form of UZZIAH (which see) in Mt 1:8,9 the King James Version. A king of Judah.

S. Angus

OZIEL

o’-zi-el (Ozeiel): An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1); another form of the Old Testament name "Uzziel."

OZNI

oz’-ni (’ozni, "my hearing," or "my ear"): A "son" of Gad (Nu 26:16) equals "Ezbon" of Ge 46:16 (compare 1Ch 7:7).

OZNITES

oz’-nits (with the article ha’ozni (collective), "the Oznites"): Of the clan of Ozni (Nu 26:16).

See OZNI.

OZORA

o-zo’-ra.

See EZORA.

PAARAI

pa’-a-ri (pa‘aray, "devotee of Peor"): One of David’s 37 valiant men (2Sa 23:35). Doubtless the "Naarai" of 1Ch 11:37.

PACATIANA

pa-ka-ti-a’-na, pak-a-ti’-a-na (Pakatiane): About 295 AD, when the province of Asia was broken up, two new provinces were formed, Phrygia Prima (Pacatiana), of which Laodicea was "the chiefest city" (subscription to 1Ti the King James Version), and Phrygia Secunda (Salutaris).

See PHRYGIA, and HDB, III, 865.

PACE

pas (tsa‘adh): A step in 2Sa 6:13, hence, about one yard.

PACHON

pa’-kon (Pachon): The name of a month mentioned in 3 Macc 6:38.

PADDAN

pad’-an (Ge 48:7; the King James Version Padan, padan). See next article.

PADDAN-ARAM

pad’-an-a’-ram or p.-ar’-am (paddan ‘aram; Septuagint Mesopotamia tes Surias; the King James Version Padan-aram): In Ge 48:7, Paddan stands alone, but as the Septuagint, Sam, and Peshitta read "Aram" also, it must in this verse have dropped out of the Massoretic Text. In the time of Abraham, padanu occurs on the Babylonian contract-tablets as a land measure, to which we may compare the Arabic feddan or "ox-gang." In the Assyrian syllabaries it is the equivalent of iklu, "a field," so that Paddan-aram would mean "the field of Aram," and with this we may compare Ho 12:12 (Hebrew 12:13) and the use of the Hebrew sadheh in connection with Moab and Edom (Jud 5:4; Ru 1:6).

Furthermore, [‘padanu] and harranu are given as synonyms with the meaning of "road."

Paddan-aram occurs only in the Priestly Code (P), but it corresponds to the "Haran" of the older documents. The versions agree in translating both as Mesopotamia, and identify with the home of the

patriarchs and the scene of Jacob's exile the district of Haran to the East of the Upper Euphrates valley. More in harmony with the length of Jacob's flight, as indicated by the time given (Ge 31:22,23), is Harran-el-'Awamid, an ancient site 10 miles to the East of Damascus, which satisfies all the demands of history.

See ARAM.

W .M. Christie

PADDLE

pad'-'-l (yathedh): De 23:13 (Hebrew 14), the Revised Version margin "shovel."

PADON

pa'-don (padhon, "redemption"): One of the Nethinim (see NETHINIM) who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:44; Ne 7:47); the "Phaleas" of 1 Esdras 5:29 (margin "Padon").

PAGIEL

pa'-gi-el, pa'-ji-el, pa-gi'-el (pagh'i'el, "God's intervention"): Son of Ocran, of the tribe of Asher, among those enrolled by Moses at the numbering of Israel (Nu 1:13; 2:27). When the tabernacle was set up, the heads of the families of Israel "brought their offerings" in rotation, and Pagiel, as prince of his tribe, came on the 11th day (Nu 7:72). Nu 7:72-77 describes his offering. In the journeyings of Israel he was "over the host of the tribe of the children of Asher" (Nu 10:26), and possibly standard-bearer (compare Nu 10:14,22,25).

Henry Wallace

PAHATH-MOAB

pa'-hath-mo'-ab (pachath mo'abh, "sheik of Moab"; in I Esdras 5:11; 8:31, "Phaath Moab"): A Jewish clan probably named after an ancestor of the above title. Part of the clan returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:6; compare Ne 7:11) under two family names, Jeshua and Joab; and a part came back with Ezra (Ezr 8:4). Hashub, a "son of Pahath-moab," is named among the repairers of both the wall and the "tower of the furnaces" at Jerusalem (Ne 3:11). It is the name of one of the signatories "sealing" the "sure covenant" of Ne 9:38 (Ne 10:14). Some of the sons of this name had taken "strange wives" (Ezr 10:30)

Henry Wallace

PAI

pa’-i (pa‘i; Phogor): The royal city of Hadad or Hadar, king of Edom (1Ch 1:50). The name is given as "Pau" (pa‘u) in Ge 36:39. There is no indication of its position. It is not identified.

PAIN

pan (chul, chil, chebhel, chalah, chalchalah, ka’-ebh, ke’ebh, metsar, makh’obh, ‘amal, tsir; basanizo, ponos, odin): These words signifying various forms of bodily or mental suffering are generally translated "pain"; 28 out of the 34 passages in which the word is used are in the poetical or prophetical books and refer to conditions of mental disquiet or dismay due to the punishment of personal or national sin. There is only one instance where the word is used as a historic record of personal physical pain: the case of the wife of Phinehas (1Sa 4:19), but the same word tsir is used figuratively in Isa 13:8; 21:3; Da 10:16, and translated "pangs" or "sorrows." In other passages where we have the same comparison of consternation in the presence of God’s judgments to the pangs of childbirth, the word used is chebhel, as in Isa 66:7; Jer 13:21; 22:23; 49:24. In some of these and similar passages several synonyms are used in the one verse to intensify the impression, and are translated "pain," "pangs," and "sorrows," as in Isa 13:8.

The word most commonly used by the prophets is some form of chul or chil, sometimes with the addition "as of a woman in travail," as in Ps 48:6; Isa 26:18; Jer 6:24; 22:23; Mic 4:10. This pain is referred to the heart (Ps 55:4) or to the head (Jer 30:23; compare Jer 30:5,6). In Eze 30:4, it is the penal affliction of Ethiopia, and in 30:16, the King James Version "Sin (Tanis) shall have great pain" (the Revised Version (British and American) "anguish"); in Isa 23:5 Egypt is sorely pained at the news of the fall of Tyre. Before the invading host of locusts the people are much pained (Joe 2:6 the King James Version). Pain in the sense of toil and trouble in Jer 12:13 is the translation of chalah a word more frequently rendered grieving or sickness, as in 1Ki 14:1; Pr 23:35; So 2:5; Jer 5:3. The reduplicated form chalchalah is especially used of a twisting pain usually referred to the loins (Isa 21:3; Eze 30:4,9; Na 2:10).

Pain in the original meaning of the word (as it has come down to us through the Old French from the Latin poena) as a penalty inflicted for personal sin is expressed by the words ka’ebh or ke’abh in Job 14:22; 15:20, and in the questioning complaint of the prophet (Jer 15:18). As a judgment on personal sin pain is also expressed by makh’obh in Job 33:19; Jer 51:8, but this word is used in the sense of afflictions in Isa 53:3 in the expression "man of sorrows." The Psalmist (Ps 25:18) praying for deliverance from the afflictions which weighed heavily on him in turn uses the word ‘amal, and this word which primarily means "toil" or "labor," as in Ec 1:3, or "travail" as in Isa 53:11, is translated "painful" in Ps 73:16, as expressing Asaph’s disquiet due to his misunderstanding of the ways of Providence. The "pains of hell" (Ps 116:3 the King James Version), which got hold of the Psalmist in his sickness, is the rendering of the word metsar; the same word is translated "distress" in Ps 118:5. Most of these words have a primary physical meaning of twisting, rubbing or constricting.

In the New Testament, odin is translated "pain" (of death, the Revised Version (British and American)

"pang") in Ac 2:24. This word is used to express any severe pain, such as that of travail, or (as in Aeschylus, Choephori, 211) the pain of intense apprehension. The verb from this, odunomai, is used by the Rich Man in the parable to describe his torment (the Revised Version (British and American) "anguish") (Lu 16:24). The related verb sunodino is used in Ro 8:22 and is translated "travailing in pain together." In much the same sense, the word is used by Euripides (Helena, 727).

In Re 12:2 the woman clothed with the sun (basanizomene) was in pain to be delivered; the verb (basanizo) which means "to torture" is used both in Mt 8:6 in the account of the grievously tormented centurion's servant, and in the description of the laboring of the apostles' boat on the stormy Sea of Galilee (Mt 14:24). The former of these seems to have been a case of spinal meningitis. This verb occurs in Thucydides vii.86 (viii.92), where it means "being put to torture." In the two passages in Revelation where pain is mentioned the word is ponos, the pain which affected those on whom the fifth vial was poured (16:10), and in the description of the City of God where there is no more pain (21:4). The primary meaning of this word seems to be "toil," as in Iliad xxi.525, but it is used by Hippocrates to express disease (Aphorisma iv.44).

Alexander Macalister

PAINFULNESS

pan'-fool-nes (mochthos): In the summary of his missionary labors in 2Co 11:27 the King James Version, Paul uses this word. The Revised Version (British and American) renders it "travail," which probably now expresses its meaning more closely, as in modern usage "painfulness" is usually restricted to the condition of actual soreness or suffering, although we still use "painstaking" in the sense of careful labor. The Greek word is used for toil or excessive anxiety, as in Euripides (Medea, 126), where it refers to that care for her children which she had lost in her madness. Tyndale uses "painfulness" in 1 Joh 4:18 as the translation of kolasis, which the King James Version renders "torment" and the Revised Version (British and American) "punishment."

Alexander Macalister

PAINT

pant (from Old French peinctre, frequentative of peindre, Latin pingo, "to paint"):

(1) From Hebrew verb mashach, "to smear," "to anoint," "to paint," describing the painting of interiors with vermilion, perhaps resembling lacquer: "ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion" (Jer 22:14). The shields of the Ninevite soldiers were red, presumably painted (Na 2:3).

(2) From noun pukh, "paint," "antimon," "stibium," "black mineral powder" used as a cosmetic, to lend artificial size and fancied beauty to the eye, always spoken of as a meretricious device, indicating light or unworthy character. Jezebel "painted her eyes, and attired her head" (2Ki 9:30, literally, "put pukh

into her eyes"). To the harlot city Jerusalem, Jeremiah (4:30) says, "deckest thee ...., enlargest thine eyes with paint" (pukh). the King James Version renders "rentest thy face," as if the stain were a cut, or the enlarging done by violence.

(3) From verb kachal, "to smear," "to paint." Ezekiel says to Oholah-Oholibah (Judah-Israel), "didst wash thyself, paint (kachal) thine eyes," as the adulteress prepares herself for her paramour (Eze 23:40). The antimony, in an extremely fine powder (Arabic kuchl, from kachal), is placed in the eye by means of a very fine rod, bodkin, or probe, drawn between the edges of the eyelids. This distends the eye, and also increases its apparent size, the effect being increased by a line of stain drawn from the corner, and by a similar line prolonging the eyebrow.

See EYEPAINT; COLOR.

Philip Wendell Crannell

PAINTING

pan’-ting.

See CRAFTS, II, 12.

PAIR

par: The margin of So 4:2 (but not of the parallel 6:6) reads, "which are all of them in pairs," while the text has, "whereof every one hath twins." The Hebrew math’imoth, is from the root, ta’am, "to be double," and is perhaps susceptible of either meaning. But the description is of sheep, and the margin gives no comprehensible figure, while the text points to the exceedingly sleek and healthy appearance. "Pairs" seems to result from confusing the figure with the thing figured—the teeth, where each upper is paired with the corresponding lower.

PALACE

pal’-as: In Hebrew chiefly ‘armon, in the Revised Version (British and American) text translated "castle" in 1Ki 16:18; 2Ki 15:25; birah, hekhal, the same word often rendered "temple"; in Greek aule, in the Revised Version (British and American) translated "court" (Mt 26:3,18,69; Mr 14:54,66; Lu 11:21; Joh 18:15). On the other hand, "palace" takes the place in the Revised Version (British and American) of the King James Version "common hall" or "judgment hall" (praitorion, Mt 27:27; Joh 18:28,33; 19:9; Ac 23:35). See JUDGMENT HALL. A description of Solomon’s palace is given in 1Ki 7:1-12 (see TEMPLE). Archaeology has brought to light the remains of great palaces in Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria (Sargon, Sennacherib, Assurbanipal, etc.), Susa, etc.

See HOUSE.

James Orr

PALAESTRA, PALESTRA

pa-les’-tra.

See GAMES, II, 3, (i).

PALAL

pa’-lal (palal, "judge"): Son of Uzai, and one of the repairers of the wall (Ne 3:25).

PALANQUIN

pal-an-ken’:In So 3:9 occurs ‘appiryon, a word that has no Semitic cognates and is of dubious meaning. In form, however, it resembles the Sanskrit paryanka, and still more closely the Greek phoreion, both of which mean "litter bed." Hence, the Revised Version (British and American) "palanquin" (ultimately derived from paryanka). The margin "car of state" and the King James Version "chariot" are mere guesses.

PALESTINA

pal-es-ti’-na (pelesheth): Ex 15:14; Isa 14:29,31 the King James Version; changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to PHILISTIA (which see).

PALESTINE EXPLORATION, 1

(as of 1915)

Preliminary Consideration

I. ERA OF PREPARATION

1. Outside of Palestine

2. In Palestine

(1) Early Christian Period

(2) Period of Cursory Observation

(3) Beginning of Scientific Observation

II. ERA OF SCIENTIFIC EXPLORATION

1. Period of Individual Enterprise

(1) First Trained Explorers

(2) The Climax of Individual Exploration

2. Scientific Cooperative Surface Exploration

3. Most Recent Results in Surface Exploration

III. ERA OF SCIENTIFIC EXCAVATION

1. Southern Palestine

(1) Tell el-Chesy

(2) Excavations in Jerusalem

(3) Excavations in the Shephelah

(4) Painted "Tombs of Marissa"

2. Northern Palestine

(1) Tell Ta‘annek

(2) Tell el-Mutesellim

(3) Tell Chum

3. Eastern Palestine

Jericho

4. Central Palestine

(1) Jerusalem

(2) Samaria

(3) ‘Ain Shems

(4) Gezer

LITERATURE

Preliminary Consideration:

Previous to the last century, almost the entire stock of knowledge concerning ancient Palestine, including its races, laws, languages, history and manners, was obtained from Josephus and the Bible, with a few brief additional references given by Greek and Roman authors; knowledge concerning modern Palestine was limited to the reports of chance travelers. The change has been due largely to the compelling interest taken in sacred history and the "Holy Oracles." This smallest country in the world has aroused the spirit of exploration as no other country has or could. It has largely stimulated many of the investigations carried on in other lands.

I. Era of Preparation.

1. Outside of Palestine:

Much direct information concerning ancient Palestine, absolutely essential to the success of modern exploration in that land, has come through discoveries in other countries; but due in many cases to Biblical influence. All the most important Hebrew and Greek manuscripts and versions of the Bible and most of the Jewish Talmud and apocryphal and Wisdom books were found outside of Palestine. The pictures of its population, cities, fortresses and armies give a color and perspective to its ancient history far more vivid than can be found on any of its own contemporary monuments. The records of Thothmes III (15th century BC) describing the capture of Megiddo in the plain of Esdraelon with its vast stores of "chariots wrought with gold," bronze armor, silver and ebony statues, ivory and ebony furniture, etc., and of his further capture of 118 other Canaanite towns, many of which are well known from the Bible, and from which he takes an enormous tribute of war materials, golden ornaments and golden dishes, "too many to be weighed," find no parallel in any indigenous record—such records even if written having been doomed to perish because of the soil, climate and character of the rocks West of the Jordan. So circa 1400 BC, the Tell el-Amarna Letters (discovered in 1887) mention by name many Biblical cities, and give much direct information concerning the political and social conditions at that period, with at least 6 letters from the governor of Jerusalem, who writes to the Pharaoh news that the Egyptian fleet has left the coast, that all the neighboring cities have been lost to Egypt, and that Jerusalem will be

lost unless help can be had quickly against the invasion of the Khabiri. The literature of the XIXth Dynasty contains many Hebrew names with much information concerning Goshen, Pithom, Canaan, etc., while in one huge stele of Menephtah the Israelites are mentioned by name. Later Egyptian Pharaohs give almost equally important knowledge concerning Palestine, while the Assyrian texts are even more direct. The black obelisk of Shalmancser II (9th century) catalogues and pictures the tribute received from Jehu; almost every king of the 8th century tells something of his relations with the rulers of Jerusalem or Damascus, throwing immense light on local politics, and the later Bah records give vividly the conditions previous to and during the exile, while the edict of Cyrus gives the very decree by virtue of which the Jews could return to their native land. Later discoveries, like the Code of Hammurabi at Susa (1901), the Sendjirli and other Aramaic texts from Northern Syria (1890, 1908), and the Elephantine papyri, some of which are addressed to the "sons of Sanballat" and describe a temple in Egypt erected to Yahu (Yahweh) in the 5th century BC, may not give direct information concerning Palestine, but are important to present explorers because of the light thrown upon the laws of Palestine in patriarchal times; upon the thought and language of a neighboring Semitic community at the time of the Monarchy; upon the religious ritual and festivals of Nehemiah’s day, and upon the general wealth and culture of the Jews of the 5th century; opening up also for the first time the intimate relations which existed between Jerusalem and Samaria and the Jews of the Dispersion. So the vast amounts of Greek papyri found recently in the Fayyum not only have preserved the "Logia" and "Lost Gospels" and fragments of Scripture texts, early Christian Egyptian ritual, etc., but have given to scholars for the first time contemporaneous examples of the colloquial language which the Jews of Palestine were using in the 1st century AD, and in which they wrote the "memoirs" of the apostles and the Gospels of Jesus.

2. In Palestine:

(1) Early Christian Period.

At this time, during the first three or four centuries the ancient sites and holy places were identified, giving some valuable information as to the topographical memories of the earlier church. By far the most valuable of these carefully prepared summaries of ancient Bible places, with their modern sites, and the distances between them, was the Onomasticon of Eusebius, as it was enlarged by Jerome, which attempted seriously the identification of some 300 holy places, most of these being vitally important for the modern student of the Bible. While some of these identifications were "curiously incorrect" (Bliss) and the distances even at the best only approximate, yet few satisfactory additions were made to the list for 1,500 years; and it was certainly a splendid contribution to Palestinian topography, for the list as a whole has been confirmed by the scientific conclusions of recent investigators.

(2) Period of Cursory Observation.

The earliest traveler who has left a record of his journey into Palestine was Sinuhit, who, perhaps a century after Abraham, mentions a number of places known to us from the Bible and describes Canaan as a "land of figs and vines, ... where wine was more plentiful than Water, ... honey and oil in abundance .... all kinds of fruit upon its trees, barley and spelt in the fields, and cattle beyond number";

each day his table is laden with "bread, wine, cooked flesh and roasted fowl .... wild game from the hills and milk in every sort of cooked dish" (Breasted, Ancient Records, I, 496). A few other Egyptian visitors (1300-1000 BC) add little to our knowledge. The report of the Hebrew spies (Nu 13) records important observations, although they can only humorously be called "genuine explorers" (Bliss), and Joshua's list of cities and tribes, although their boundaries are carefully described (Joshua 13-21), are naturally excluded from this review.

The record of early Christian travel begins with the Bordeaux Pilgrim (332 AD), and during the next two centuries scores of others write out their observations in the Holy Land, but for 1,000 years there is scarcely a single visitor who looks at the country except through the eyes of the monks. A woman traveler of the 4th century reports some interesting facts about the early ritual of the Jerusalem church and the catechumen teaching, and surprises us by locating Pithom correctly (although the site was totally forgotten and only recovered in 1883), and the Epitome of Eucherius (5th century) gives a clear description of the holy places in Jerusalem; but almost the only other significant sign that anyone at this era ever made serious observations of value comes from the very large, fine mosaic of the 5th century recently discovered at Madeba, which gives a good impression of ancient Jerusalem with its buildings, and a careful bird's-eye view of the surrounding country (see below II, 3). By the middle of the 6th century the old "Holy Places" were covered by churches, while new ones were manufactured or discovered in dreams, and relics of martyrs' bones began to engross so much attention that no time was left in which to make any ordinary geographical or natural-history observations. A little local color and a few facts in regard to the plan of early churches and the persecution of Christians by Moslems constitute almost the sum total of valus to be gathered from the multitude of pilgrims between the 6th and 12th centuries. In the 12th century John of Wurzburg gives a few geographical notes of value; Theoderich notices certain inscriptions and tombs, describes accurately the churches and hospitals he visits, with their pictures and decorations, and outlines intelligently the boundaries of Judea and the salient features of the mountains encompassing Jerusalem; the Abbot Daniel notices the wild beasts in the Jordan forests and the customs at church feasts, and his account is important because of the light it throws on conditions in Palestine just after its conquest by the Crusaders, while in the 13th century Burchard of Mt. Zion makes the earliest known medieval map of Palestine, mentions over 100 Scripture sites, and shows unexpected interest in the plant and animal life of the country—but this practically exhausts the valuable information from Christian sources in these centuries. The Moslem pilgrims and writers from the 9th to the 15th centuries show far more regard to geographical realities than the Christians. It is a Moslem, Istakhri, who in the 10th century makes the first effort at a systematic geography of Palestine, and in the 10th and 13th centuries, respectively, Muqaddasi, after 20 years of preparation, and Yaqut, in a "vast work," publish observations concerning climate, native customs, geographical divisions, etc., which are yet valuable, while Nacir-i-Qhusran, in the 11th century, also gave important information concerning Palestinian botany, gave dimensions of buildings and gates, and even noticed to some extent the ancient arches and ruins—though in all these there are pitiful inaccuracies of observation and induction. One of the best Moslem writers thinks the water of Lake Tiberias is not fit to drink because the city sewerage has ceased to flow into it, and Christian writers from the 7th century down to modern times continually mention the Jor and Da as two fountains from which the Jordan rises, and continually report the most absurd stories about the Dead Sea and about its supernatural saltness never noticing the salt mountain near by and the other simple causes explaining this phenomenon.

See DEAD SEA.

In the 14th century Marino Sanuto gave a "most complete monograph" (Ritter) of Palestinian geography, his maps being really valuable, though, according to modern standards, quite inaccurate. The Jew, Estoai ben Moses ha-Phorhi, in this same century advanced beyond all Christian writers in a work of "real scientific knowledge" (Bliss), in which he correctly identified Megiddo and other ancient sites, though the value of his work was not recognized for 400 years. The great name of the 15th century is that of the Dominican, Father Felix Fabri, who in his large book, Wanderings in the Holy Land, was the first to notice monuments and ruins to which no Biblical traditions were attached (Bliss), and who, within a decade of the discovery of America, described most vividly the dangers and miseries of the sea voyages of that era, and in most modern fashion narrated his adventures among the Saracens; yet notwithstanding the literary value of the book and his better method of arranging his materials, Fabri actually explained the saltness of the Dead Sea as due to the sweat which flowed from the skin of the earth! In the 16th century travelers showed more interest in native customs, but the false traditional identification of sites was scarcely questioned; the route of travel was always the same, as it was absolutely impossible to get East of the Jordan, and even a short trip away from the caravan was dangerous.

(3) Beginning of Scientific Observation.

In the 17th century Michal Nau, for 30 years a missionary in Palestine, De la Roque and Hallifix showed a truly scientific veracity of observation and an increasing accuracy in the recording and verification of their notes, and Maundrell advanced beyond all his predecessors in noticing the antiquities on the seacoast, North of Beirut; but all of these, though possessing fine qualities as explorers, were forced to travel hastily and limit their study to a very narrow field.

II. Era of Scientific Exploration.

1. Period of Individual Enterprise:

(1) First Trained Explorers.

True scientific exploration opened with the 18th century, as men began to think of this as itself an important life-work and not merely as a short episode in a life devoted to more serious pursuits. Th. Shaw (1722) carefully fitted himself as a specialist in natural history and physical geography, and scientifically reported a number of new facts, e.g. conditions and results of evaporation, etc., in the Dead Sea. Bishop Pococke (1738) had been well trained, was free from the bondage of tradition, and did for the antiquities of Palestine what Maundrell had done for those of Syria, making a large number of successful identifications of sites and contributing much to the general knowledge of Palestine. Volney (1783) was a brilliant literary man, in full sympathy with the scientific spirit, who popularized results and made a considerable number of original researches, especially in the Lebanon. Seetzen (1800-1807) and Burckhardt (1810-1812) are called by Bliss "veritable pioneers in the exploration of the ruins of

Eastern and Southern Palestine." The former opened Caesarea Philippi to light, visited a large unexplored district and made important observations in almost every field of knowledge, zoology, meteorology, archaeology; the latter, having become an Arab in looks and language, was able to go into many places where no European had ventured, one of his chief triumphs being the discovery of Petra and the scientific location of Mt. Sinai.

(2) The Climax of Individual Exploration.

The climax of the era of scientific observation, unassisted by learned societies, was reached by the American clergyman and teacher, Edward Robinson. He spent parts of two years in Palestine (1838 and 1852) and in 1856 published 3 volumes of Biblical Researches. He strictly employed the scientific method, and showed such rare insight that scarcely one of his conclusions has been found incorrect. His knowledge was as extensive as minute, and although he gave, in all, only five months of steady labor to the specific task of exploration, yet in that time he "reconstructed the map of Palestine" (Bliss), and his conclusions henceforth "formed the ground work of modern research" (Conder). He studied Jerusalem, being the first to show that the ancient fragment of an arch (now "Robinson's") had been part of the bridge connecting the temple with Mt. Zion, and was the first to trace with accuracy the windings of the tunnel leading from the Virgin's Fount to the Pool of Siloam. All Judea, Galilee and Samaria were very well covered by him. He was the first to notice that the ruined building at Tell Chum was a synagogue; from the top of one hill he recognized seven Biblical sites which had been lost for at least 1,500 years; he identified correctly at least 160 new sites, almost all being Biblical places. Robinson's results were phenomenal in number and variety, yet necessarily these have been constantly improved upon or added to in each generation since, for no man can cover the entire field or be a specialist in every department. W.M. Thomson in his Thomson, The Land and the Book (new edition, 1910) and G.E. Post, Flora of Syria, Palestine, and Sinai (1896), gave a needed popular resume of the manners, customs and folklore of the people, as these illustrated the Bible, and many books and articles since have added to this material.

In 1848 the United States sent an expedition under Lieutenant Lynch to the Dead Sea, which ascertained the exact width, depth, currents, temperature, etc., and many parties since have added to this knowledge (see e.g. DEAD SEA; and also PEFS, 1911, XII, 7). From 1854 to 1862 De Vogue thoroughly examined the monuments of Central Syria and remained the sole authority on this section down to the American Archaeological Expedition of 1899. Tabler (1845-63) scientifically described Jerusalem and its environs, and the districts lying between Jaffa and the Jordan, and between Jerusalem and Bethel. Guerin who studied Palestine during periods covering 23 years (1852-75), though limited by lack of funds, covered topographically, with a minuteness never before attempted, almost the whole of Judea, Samaria and Galilee, gathering also many new records of monuments and inscriptions, the record of which was invaluable because many of these had been completely destroyed before the arrival of the next scientific party. A most sensational discovery was that of F. Klein in 1868, when he found at Dibon the huge basalt tablet set up by Mesha, king of Moab (9th century BC), on which in a language closely resembling the Hebrew, he gave honor to his god Chemosh by describing his successful revolt against a successor of Omri, the latter being mentioned by name with many well-known Biblical places. In style, thought and language this inscription greatly resembles the early Old Testament records.

2. Scientific Cooperative Surface Exploration:

With the foundation of the Palestine Exploration Fund (1865) the work of exploration took on an entirely new phase, since in this case, not a single individual, but a large company of specialists entered the work, having behind them sufficient funds for adequate investigation in each necessary line of research, and with the British War Office furnishing its expert Royal Engineers to assist the enterprise. Under the auspices of this society during the next 15 years Jerusalem was explored as never before, and all Western Palestine was topographically surveyed (see below); a geological survey (1883-1884) of Sinai, Wady ‘Arabah and the Dead Sea, and later of Mt. Seir (1885) was accomplished under Professor Edward Hull; the natural history of the country was treated with great thoroughness by several specialists; Palmer and Drake in the dress of Syrian natives, without servants, risked the dangerous journey through the Desert of the Tih in order to locate so far as possible the route of the Exodus; Clermont-Ganneau, who had previously made the discovery of the Jewish placard from the Temple, forbidding strangers to enter the sacred enclosure, added greatly to archaeological knowledge by gathering and deciphering many ancient inscriptions, uncovering buried cemeteries, rock-cut tombs and other monuments. He also laid down important criteria for the age of stone masonry (yet see PEFS, 1897, LXI); identified various sites including Adullam, found the "stone of Bethphage," "Zoheleth," etc., and made innumerable plans of churches, mosques, tombs, etc., and did an incredible amount of other important work. Capt., afterward Col., C.R. Conder did an equally important work, and as the head of the archaeological party could finally report 10,000 place-names as having been gathered, and 172 new Bible sites successfully identified, while the boundaries of the tribes had been practially settled and many vitally important Bible locations for the first time fixed. The excavations in Jerusalem under the same auspices had meanwhile been carried out as planned. After an introductory examination by Sir Charles Wilson, including some little excavating, Sir Charles Warren (1867-1870) and, later, Col. Conder (1872-1875) made thorough excavations over a large area, sinking shafts and following ancient walls to a depth of 80-150 ft. They uncovered the Temple-area from its countless tons of debris and traced its approximate outline; examined underground rock chambers; opened ancient streets; discovered many thousand specimens of pottery, glass, tools, etc., from Jewish to Byzantine periods; found the pier in the Tyropoeon Valley, where Robinson’s arch had rested, and also parts of the ancient bridge; traced the line of several important ancient walls, locating gates and towers, and fixed the date of one wall certainly as of the 8th century BC, and probably of the age of Solomon (G.A. Smith), thus accomplishing an epoch-making work upon which all more recent explorers have safely rested—as Maudslay (1875), in his masterly discovery and examination of the Great Scarp, and Guthe (1881), who made fine additional discoveries at Ophel, as well as Warren and Conder in their work afterward (1884), when they published plans of the whole city with its streets churches, mosques, etc., 25 inches to the mile, which in that direction remains a basis for all later work.

See JERUSALEM.

Perhaps, however, the greatest work of all done by this society was the Topographical Survey (1881-1886), accomplished for Judea and Samaria by Col. Conder, and for Galilee by Lord Kitchener, resulting in a great map of Western Palestine in 26 sheets, on a scale of an inch to the mile (with several abridged

additions), showing all previous identifications of ancient places. These maps, with the seven magnificent volumes of memoirs, etc., giving the other scientific work done by the various parties, marked such an epoch-making advance in knowledge that it has been called "the most important contribution to illustrate the Bible since its translation into the vulgar tongue."

In addition to the above the Palestine Exploration Fund established a Quarterly Statement and Society of Biblical Archaeology from which subscribers could keep in touch with the latest Biblical results, and published large quantities of translations of ancient texts and travels and of books reporting discoveries as these were made. Altogether more advance was made during these 15 years from 1865-1880 than in the 15 centuries before.

3. Most Recent Results in Surface Exploration:

The next ten years (1880-90) did not furnish as much new material from Palestine exploration, but in 1880 the Siloam Inscription (compare 2Ki 20:20; 2Ch 32:30) was accidentally found in Jerusalem, showing the accuracy with which the engineers of Hezekiah's day could, at least occasionally, cut long tunnels through the rock (see also Clermont-Ganneau, Archaeological Researches, 313); and in 1881-1885 Conder and Schumacher attempted their difficult task of making a scientific topographical map of Eastern Palestine. In 1881 H. Clay Trumbull rediscovered and properly described Kadesh-barnea, settling authoritatively its location and thus making it possible to fix previously obscure places mentioned in the account of the Exodus wanderings. Since 1890 continued investigations in small districts not adequately described previously have taken place, new additions to the zoological, botanical, geological and meteorological knowledge of Palestine have been frequent; studies of irrigation and the water-supply have been made, as well as investigations into the customs, proverbs, folklore, etc., of the Arabs; many districts East of the Jordan and through Petra down into Sinai have yielded important results, and many discoveries of surface tombs, ossuaries, mosaics, seals and manuscripts have been made in many parts of Palestine. This has been done perhaps chiefly by the Palestine Exploration Fund, but much by individuals and some by the newly organized excavation societies (see below). The most surprising discoveries made by this method of surface exploration (a method which can never become completely obsolete) have been the finding at different times of the four Boundary Stones of Gezer (1874, 1881, 1889) by Clermont-Ganneau, and, in 1896, of the very large mosaic at Madeba by Father Cleopas, librarian of the Greek Patriarch.

The latter proved to be part of the pavement of a 6th-century basilica and is a "veritable map of Palestine," showing its chief cities, the boundaries of the tribes, and especially the city of Jerusalem with its walls, gates, chief buildings, including the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and chief streets, notably one long straight street intersecting the city and lined with colonnades. As Madeba lies near the foot of Mt. Nebo, it is thought the artist may have intended to represent ideally a modern (6th-cent.) vision of Moses. George Adam Smith (HGHL, 7th edition, 1901); Jerusalem (2 volumes, 1910), and E. Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation (1911), have given fine studies illustrating the supreme importance of accurate topographical knowledge in order to understand correctly the Bible narratives and the social life and politics of the Hebrews.

PALESTINE EXPLORATION, 2A

III. Era of Scientific Excavation.

1. Southern Palestine:

(1) Tell el-Chesy.

(Palestine Exploration Fund).—Exploration must always continue, but excavation is a vast advance. The modern era in Palestinian study begins with Petrie at LACHISH (which see) in 1890. Though Renan was actually the first man to put a spade into the soil (1860), yet his results were practically confined to Phoenicia. From Renan's time to 1890 there had been no digging whatever, except some narrow but thorough work in Jerusalem, and a slight tickling of the ground at Jericho and at the so-called Tombs of the Kings. Nothing was more providential than this delay in beginning extensive excavations in Palestine, such as had been previously so profitably conducted in Egypt and elsewhere. The results could not have been interpreted even two years earlier, and even when these excavations were commenced, the only man living who could have understood what he found was the man who had been selected to do the work. Nearly two centuries before, a traveler in Palestine (Th. Shaw) had suggested the possibility of certain mounds ("tells") being artificial (compare Jos 8:28; Jer 30:18); but not even Robinson or Guerin had suspected that these were the cenotaphs of buried cities, but had believed them to be mere natural hills. The greatest hour in the history of exploration in Palestine, and perhaps in any land, was that in which on a day in April, 1890, W.M. Flinders Petrie climbed up the side of Tell el-Chesy, situated on the edge of the Philistine plain, circa 30 miles Southwest of Jerusalem, and 17 miles Northeast from Gaza, and by examining its strata, which had been exposed by the stream cutting down its side, determined before sunset the fact, from pieces of pottery he had seen, that the site marked a city covering 1,000 years of history, the limits of occupation being probably 1500 BC to 500 BC. This ability to date the several occupations of a site without any inscription to assist him was due to the chronological scale of styles of pottery which he had originated earlier and worked out positively for the Greek epochs at Naukratis a year or two before, and for the epochs preceding 1100 BC at Illahun in the Fayyum only a month or two before. The potsherds were fortunately very numerous at Tell el-Chesy, and by the end of his six weeks' work he could date approximately some eight successive occupations of the city, each of these being mutually exclusive in certain important forms of pottery in common use. Given the surface date, depth of accumulation and rate of deposit as shown at Lachish, and a pretty sure estimate of the history of other sites was available. Not only was this pottery scale so brilliantly confirmed and elaborated at Tell el-Chesy that all excavators since have been able accurately to date the last settlement on a mound almost by walking over it; but by observations of the methods of stone dressing he was able to rectify many former guesses as to the age of buildings and to establish some valuable architectural signs of age. He proved that some of the walls at this site were built by "the same school of masons which built the Temple of Solomon," and also that the Ionic volute, which the Greeks borrowed from the Asiatics, went back in Palestine at least to the 10th century BC, while on one pilaster he found the architectural motif of the "ram's horn" (compare Ps 118:27). He also concluded, contrary to former belief, that this mound marked the site of Lachish (Jos 10:31; 2Ki 18:14), as by a careful

examination he found that no other ruins near could fill the known historic conditions of that city, and the inscription found by the next excavator and all more recent research make this conclusion practically sure. Lachish was a great fortress of the ancient world. The Egyptian Pharaohs often mention it, and it is represented in a picture on an Assyrian monument under which is written, "Sennacherib .... receives the spoil of Lachish" (see 2Ki 18:14). It was strategically a strong position, the natural hill rising some 60 ft. above the valley and the fortification which Sennacherib probably attacked being over 10 ft. thick. The debris lay from 50-70 ft. deep on top of the hill. Petrie fixed the directions of the various walls, and settled the approximate dates of each city and of the imported pottery found in several of these. One of the most unexpected things was an iron knife dug up from a stratum indicating a period not far from the time when Israel must have entered Canaan, this being the earliest remnant of iron weapons ever found up to-this date (compare Jos 17:16).

The next two years of scientific digging (1891-1892), admirably conducted by Dr. F.G. Bliss on this site, wholly confirmed Petrie's general inductions, though the limits of each occupation were more exactly fixed and the beginning of the oldest city was pushed back to 1700 BC. The work was conducted under the usual dangers, not only from the Bedouin, but from excessive heat (104 degrees in the shade), from malaria which at one time prostrated 8 of the 9 members of the staff, scarcity of water, which had to be carried 6 miles, and from the sirocco (see my report, PEFS, XXI, 160-70 and Petrie's and Bliss's journal, XXI, 219-46; XXIII, 192, etc.). He excavated thoroughly one-third of the entire hill, moving nearly a million cubic feet of debris. He found that the wall of the oldest city was nearly 30 ft. thick, that of the next city 17 ft. thick, while the latest wall was thin and weak. The oldest city covered a space 1,300 ft. square, the latest one only about 200 ft. square. The oldest pottery had a richer color and higher polish than the later, and this art was indigenous, for at this level no Phoenician or Mycenaean styles were found. The late pre-Israelitish period (1550-800 BC) shows such importations and also local Cypriote imitations. In the "Jewish" period (800-300 BC) this influence is lost and the new styles are coarse and ungraceful, such degeneration not being connected with the entrance of Israel into Canaan, as many have supposed, but with a later period, most probably with the desolation which followed the exile of the ten tribes (Bliss and Petrie). In the pre-Israelite cities were found mighty towers, fine bronze implements, such as battle-axes, spearheads, bracelets, pins, needles, etc., a wine and treacle press, one very large building "beautifully symmetrical," a smelting furnace, and finally an inscribed tablet from Zimrida, known previously from the Tell el-Amarna Letters to have been governor of Lachish, circa 1400 BC. Many Jewish pit ovens were found in the later ruins and large quantities of pottery, some containing potters' marks and others with inscriptions. Clay figures of Astarte, the goddess of fertility, were found in the various layers, one of these being of the unique Cypriote type, with large earrings, and many Egyptian figures, symbols and animal forms.

See also LACHISH.

(2) Excavations in Jerusalem.

During 1894:1894-1897, notwithstanding the previously good work done in Jerusalem (see above) and the peculiar embarrassments connected with the attempt to dig in a richly populated town, Dr. Bliss, assisted by an expert architect, succeeded in adding considerably to the sum of knowledge. He excavated

over a large area, not only positively confirming former inductions, but discovering the remains of the wall of the empress Eudocia (450 AD), and under this the line of wall which Titus had destroyed, and at a deeper level the wall which surrounded the city in the Herodian age, and deeper yet that which must probably be dated to Hezekiah, and below this a construction "exquisitely dressed, with pointed masonry," which must be either the remains of a wall of Solomon or some other preexilic fortification not later than the 8th century. He found gates and in ancient times paved streets and manholes leading to ancient sewer systems, and many articles of interest, but especially settled disputed questions concerning important walls and the levels of the ancient hills, thus fixing the exact topography of the ancient city. H. G. Mitchell and others have also carefully examined certain lines of wall, identifying Nehemiah's Dung Gate, etc., and making a new surveyor certain parts of underground Jerusalem, the results of the entire work being a modification of tradition in a few particulars, but corroborative in most. The important springs and reservoirs, valleys and hills of the ancient Jerusalem have been certainly identified. It is now settled that modern Jerusalem "still sits virtually upon her ancient seat and at much the same slope," though not so large as the Jerusalem of the kings of Judah which certainly extended over the Southwestern Hill. Mt. Zion, contrary to tradition which located it on the Southwestern Hill where the citadel stands, probably lay on the Eastern Hill above the Virgin's Spring (Gihon). On this Eastern Hill at Ophel lay the Temple, and South of the Temple on the same hill "above Gihon" lay the old Jebusite stronghold (David's City). The ancient altar of burnt offering was almost surely at es-Sakhra. The evidence has not been conclusive as to the line of the second wall, so that the site of Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre cannot certainly be determined (see George Adam Smith's exhaustive work, Jerusalem, 2 volumes, 1907; Sir Charles Wilson, Golgotha and the Holy Sepulchre, 1906; and compare Selah Merrill, Ancient Jerusalem, 1908; C.R. Conder, City of Jerusalem, 1909; P.H. Vincent, Underground Jerusalem, 1911).

(3) Excavations in the Shephelah. (Palestine Exploration Fund).—During 1898-1900 important work was done by Bliss and Macalister at 4 sites on the border land between Philistia and Judea, while five other small mounds were tunneled, but without important results. The four chief sites were Tell Zakariya, lying about midway between Jerusalem and Tell el-Chesy; Tell ec Cafi, 5 miles W. of Tell Zakariya, and Tell Sandachannah, about 10 miles South; while Tell ej-Judeideh lay between Tell Zakariya and Tell Sandachannah. As Tell ej-Judeideh was only half-excavated and merely confirmed other results, not being remarkable except for the large quantity of jar inscriptions found (37), we omit further mention of it.

(a) Tell Zakariya:

From this height, 1,214 ft. above the sea, almost all Philistia could be seen. A pre-Israelitish town was found under some 20 ft. of debris, containing pre-Israelitish, Jewish and Seleucidan pottery. Many vaulted cisterns, partly hewn from the rock, were found in the lowest level. In later levels Jewish pit ovens were found and inscribed jar-handles with winged Egyptian symbols, implements of bronze, iron, bone and stone, and Egyptian images of Bes and the Horus eye, etc., besides a strange bronze figure of a woman with a fish's tail which seems to represent Atargatis of Ashkelon. The ancient rampart was strengthened, perhaps in Rehoboam's time, and towers were added in the Seleucidan era. Only half of this site was excavated.

(b) Tell es-Safi:

The camp was pitched near here in the Vale of Elah. From a depth of 21 ft. to the rock, was found the characteristic pre-Israelitish pottery and much imported pottery of the Mycenaean type. A high place was also found here, containing bones of camels, sheep, cows, etc., and several monoliths of soft limestone in situ, and near by a jar-burial. In an ancient rubbish heap many fragments of the goddess of fertility were found. Many old Egyptian and later Greek relics were also found, and four Babylonian seals and the usual pottery from Jewish and later periods. With strong probability this site was identified as Gath.

(c) Tell Sandachannah:

This was situated circa 1,100 ft. above sea-level. The town covered about 6 acres and was protected by an inner and outer wall and occasional towers. The strongest wall averaged 30 ft. thick. The work done here "was unique in the history of Palestinian excavation" (Bliss). At Tell el-Chesy only one-third of each stratum was excavated; at Tell Zakariya only one-half; at Jerusalem the work was confined to the enclosures of the temple, a few city walls and a few churches, pools, streets, etc., but at Tell Sandachannah "we recovered almost an entire town, probably the ancient Mareshah (Jos 15:44), with its inner and outer walls, its gates, streets, lanes, open places, houses, reservoirs, etc." (Bliss). Nearly 400 vessels absolutely intact and unbroken were found. It was a Seleucidan town of the 3rd and 2nd century BC, with no pre-Israelitish remains. The town was built with thin brick, like blocks of soft limestone, set with wide joints and laid in mud with occasionally larger, harder stones chisel-picked. The town was roughly divided into blocks of streets, some of the streets being paved. The houses were lighted from the street and an open court. Very few rooms were perfectly rectangular, while many were of awkward shape. Many closets were found and pit ovens and vaulted cisterns, reached by staircases, as also portions of the old drainage system. The cisterns had plastered floors, and sometimes two heavy coats of plaster on the walls; the houses occasionally had vaulted roofs but usually the ordinary roof of today, made of boards and rushes covered with clay. No religious building was found and no trace of a colonnade, except perhaps a few fragments of ornament. An enormous columbarium was uncovered (1906 niches). No less than 328 Greek inscriptions were found on the handles of imported wine jars. Under the Seleucidan town was a Jewish town built of rubble, the pottery of the usual kind including stamped jar-handles. An Astarte was found in the Jewish or Greek stratum, as also various animal forms. The Astarte was very curious, about 11 inches high, hollow, wearing a long cloak, but with breasts, body and part of right leg bare, having for headdress a closely fitting sunbonnet with a circular serrated top ornament in front and with seven stars in relief. A most striking find dating from about the 2nd century AD was that of 16 little human figures bound in fetters of lead, iron, etc., undoubtedly representing "revenge dolls" through which the owners hoped to work magic on enemies, and 49 fragments of magical tablets inscribed in Greek on white limestone, with exorcisms, incantations and imprecations. It ought to be added that the four towns as a whole supplement each other, and positively confirm former results. No royal stamps were found at Tell el-Chesy, but 77 were found in these 4 sites, in connection with 2- or 4-winged symbols (Egyptian scarabaeus or winged sundisk). Writing-materials (styli) were found in all strata, their use being "continuous from the earliest times into the Seleucidan period" (Bliss).

From the four towns the evolution of the lamp could be traced from the pre-Israelite, through the Jewish to the Greek period. Some 150 of the labyrinthine rock-cut caves of the district were also examined, some of which must be pre-Christian, as in one of these a million cubic feet of material had been excavated, yet so long ago that all signs of the rubbish had been washed away.

(4) Painted "Tombs of Marissa."

In 1902 John P. Peters and Hermann Thiersch discovered at Belt Jibrin (adjoining Tell Sandachannah) an example of sepulchral art totally different from any other ever found in Palestine. It was a tomb containing several chambers built by a Sidonian, the walls being brilliantly painted, showing a bull, panther, serpent, ibex, crocodile with ibis (?) on its back, hunter on horseback, etc., with dated inscriptions, the earliest being 196 BC (see John P. Peters, Painted Tombs in Necropolis of Marissa, 1905). The writer (April 18, 1913) found another tomb here of similar character, decorated with grapes, birds, two cocks (life size), etc. Perhaps most conspicuous was a wreath of beautiful flowers with a cross in its center. Nothing shows the interrelations of that age more than this Phoenician colony, living in Palestine, using the Greek language but employing Egyptian and Libyan characteristics freely in their funeral article

2. Northern Palestine:

(1) Tell Ta‘annek.

(Austrian Government and Vienna Academy).—During short seasons of three years (1902-4) Professor Ernst Sellin of Vienna made a rapid examination of this town (the Biblical Taanach), situated in the plain of Esdraelon in Northern Palestine, on the ancient road between Egypt and Babylon. Over 100 laborers were employed and digging was carried on simultaneously at several different points on the mound, the record being kept in an unusually systematic way and the official reports being minute and exhaustive. Only a general statement of results can be given, with an indication of the directions in which the "findings" were peculiar. The absence of Phoenician and Mycenaean influence upon the pottery in the earliest levels (100-1600 BC) is just as marked as at other sites, the kind of pottery and the presence of Semitic matstsebhoth (see IMAGES) in the Jewish periods are just as in previous sites, and the development in mason work and in pottery is identically the same in this first city to be excavated in Northern Palestine as in Southern Palestine. "The buildings and antiques might be interchanged bodily without any serious confusion of the archaeological history of Palestine. . . . Civilization over all Western Palestine is thus shown to have had the same course of development, whether we study it North or South" (Macalister). This is by far the most important result of this excavation, showing that, notwithstanding divergences in many directions, an equivalent civilization, proving a unity in the dominating race, can be seen over all parts of Palestine so far examined. Iron is introduced at the same time (circa 1000 BC), and even the toys and pottery decorations are similar, and this continues through all the periods, including the Jewish. Yet foreign intercourse is common, and the idols, even from the earliest period, "show religious syncretism" (Sellin). From almost the oldest layer comes a curious seal cylinder containing both Egyptian and Babylonian features. On one pre-Israelite tablet are pictures of

Hadad and Baal. The Astarte cult is not quite as prominent here as in Southern Palestine. No figures of the goddess come from the earliest strata, but from 1600 BC to circa 900-800 BC they are common; after this they cease. The ordinary type of Astarte found in Babylonia and Cyprus as well as in Palestine —with crown, necklace, girdle, anklets, and hands clasped on breasts—is found most frequently; but from the 12th to the 9th century other forms appear representing her as naked, with hips abnormally enlarged, to show her power of fecundity. One figure is of a peculiarly foreign type, wearing excessively large earrings, and this is in close connection with one of the most unique discoveries ever made in Palestine—a hollow terra cotta Canaanite or Israelite (2Ki 16:10) altar (800-600 BC), having no bottom but with holes in its walls which admitted air and insured draft when fire was kindled below; in its ornamentation showing a mixture of Babylonian and Egyptian motives, having on its right side winged animals with human heads by the side of which is a man (or boy) struggling with a serpent the jaws of which are widely distended in anger; at its top two ram's (?) horns, and between them a sacrificial bowl in which to receive the "drink offering"; on its front a tree (of life), and on each side of it a rampant ibex. A bronze serpent was found near this altar, as also. near the high place at Gezer. Continuous evidence of the gruesome practice of foundation sacrifices, mostly of little children, but in one case of an adult, was found between the 13th and 9th centuries BC, after which they seem to cease. In one house the skeletons of a lady and five children were found, the former with her rings and necklace of gold, five pearls, two scarabs, etc. Many jar-burials of new-born infants, 16 in one place, were found, and, close to this deposit, a rock-hewn altar with a jar of yellow incense (?). Egyptian and Babylonian images were found of different eras and curious little human-looking amulets (as were also found at Lachish) in which the parental parts are prominent, which Sellin and Bliss believe to be "teraphim" (Ge 31:19,34; but see Driver, Modern Research, 57, etc.), such as Rachel, being pregnant, took with her to protect her on the hard journey from Haran to Palestine (Macalister).

The high place, with one or more steps leading up to it, suggesting "elevation, isolation and mystery" (Vincent), is represented here as in so many other Palestinian ruins, and the evidence shows that it continued long after the entrance of Israel into Canaan. When Israel entered Palestine, no break occurred in the civilization, the art development continuing at about the same level; so probably the two races were at about the same culture-level, or else the Hebrew occupation of the land was very gradual. In the 8th century there seems to be an indication of the entrance of a different race, which doubtless is due to the Assyrian exile. A most interesting discovery was that of the dozen cuneiform tablets found in a terra cotta chest or jar (compare Jer 32:14) from the pre-Israelite city.

These few letters cannot accurately be called "the first library found in Palestine"; but they do prove that libraries were there, since the personal and comparatively unimportant character of some of these notes and their easy and flowing style prove that legal, business and literary documents must have existed. These show that letter-writing was used not only in great questions of state between foreign countries, but in local matters between little contiguous towns, and that while Palestine at this period (circa 1400 BC) was politically dependent on Egypt, yet Babylonia had maintained its old literary supremacy. One of these letters mentions "the finger of Ashirat," this deity recalling the ‘asherah or sacred post of the Old Testament (see IMAGES); another note is written by Ahi-Yawi, a name which corresponds to Hebrew Ahijah ("Yah is Brother"), thus indicating that the form of the Divine name was then known in Canaan, though its meaning (i.e. the essential name; compare Ex 6:3; 34:6; Ne 1:9; Jer 44:26), may not

have been known. Ahi-Yawi invokes upon Ishtar-washur the blessing of the "Lord of the Gods."

On the same level with these letters were found two subterranean cells with a rock-hewn chamber in front and a rock-hewn altar above, and even the ancient drain which is supposed to have conveyed the blood from the altar into the "chamber of the dead" below. It may be added that Dr. Sellin thinks the condition of the various walls of the city is entirely harmonious with the Bible accounts of its history (Jos 12:21; 17:11; Jud 1:27; 5:19-21; 1Ki 4:12; 9:15; 1Ch 7:29). So far as the ruins testify, there was no settled city life between circa 600 BC and 900 AD, i.e. it became a desolation about the time of the Babylonian captivity. An Arab castle dates from about the 10th century AD.

(2) Tell el-Mutesellim.

(Megiddo, Jos 12:21; Jud 5:19; 2Ki 9:27).—This great commercial and military center of Northern Palestine was opened to the world in 1903-1905 by Dr. Schumacher and his efficient staff, the diggings being conducted under the auspices of His Majesty the Kaiser and the German Palestine Society. The mound, about 5 miles Northwest from Ta‘anach, stood prominently 120 ft. above the plain, the ruins being on a plateau 1,020 X 750 ft. in area. An average of 70 diggers were employed for the entire time. The debris was over 33 ft. deep, covering some eight mutually excluding populations. The surrounding wall, 30 X 35 ft. thick, conformed itself to the contour of the town. The excavations reached the virgin rock only at one point; but the oldest stratum uncovered showed a people living in houses, having fire, cooking food and making sacrifices; the next city marked an advance, but the third city, proved by its Egyptian remains to go back as far as the 20th century BC, showed a splendid and in some directions a surprising civilization, building magnificent city gates (57 X 36 ft.), large houses and tombs with vaulted roofs, and adorning their persons with fine scarabs of white and green steatite and other jewelry of stone and bronze. It was very rich in colored pottery and little objects such as tools, seals, terra cotta figures and animals, including a bridled horse, and some worked iron is also said to have been found. In one pile of bodies were two children wearing beautiful bronze anklets. The city lying above this begins as early as the 15th century BC, as is proved by a scarab of Thothmes III and by other signs, although the scarabs, while Egyptian in form, are often foreign in design and execution. Anubis, Bes, Horus and other Egyptian figures appear, also 32 scarabs in one pot, much jewelry, including gold ornaments, and some very long, sharp bronze knives. One tomb contained 42 vessels, and one skeleton held 4 gold-mounted scarabs in its hand. One remarkable fragment of pottery contained a colored picture of pre-Israelite warriors with great black beards, carrying shields (?). A most interesting discovery was that of the little copper (bronze?) tripods supporting lamps, on one of which is the figure of a flute-player, being strikingly similar to pictures of Delphic oracles and to representations lately found in Crete (MNDPV, 1906, 46). This city was destroyed by a fearful conflagration, and is separated from the next by a heavy stratum of cinders and ashes. The fifth city is remarkable for a splendid palace with walls of stone from 3-5 ft. thick. This city, which probably begins as early as Solomon’s time, shows the best masonry. An oval, highly polished seal of jasper on which is engraved a Hebrew name in script closely resembling the Moabite Stone, suggests a date for the city, and casts an unexpected light upon the Hebrew culture of Palestine in the days of the monarchy. The seal is equal to the best Egyptian or Assyrian work, clearly and beautifully engraved, and showing a climax of article In the center is the Lion (of Judah), mouth wide open, tail erect, body tense. Upon the seal is carved: "To Shema, servant of Jeroboam." This name

may possibly not refer to either of the Biblical kings (10th or 8th century BC), but the stratum favors this dating. The seal was evidently owned by some Hebrew noble at a prosperous period when some Jeroboam was in power, and so everything is in favor of this being a relic from the court of one of these kings, probably the latter (Kautzsch, M u. N, 1904, 81). We have here, in any case, one of the oldest Hebrew inscriptions known, and one of the most elegant ever engraved (see MNDPV, 1906, 33). After seeing it the Sultan took it from the museum into his own private collection. A second seal of lapis lazuli, which Schumacher and Kautzsch date from about the 7th century BC, also contains in Old Hebrew the name "Asaph" (compare M u. N, 1906, 334; MNDPV, 1904, 147). There are several other remarkable works of art, as e.g. a woman playing the tambourine, wearing an Egyptian headdress; several other figures of women besides several Astartes, and especially a series of six terra cotta heads, one with a prominent Semitic nose, another with Egyptian characteristics, another quite un-Egyp, with regular features, vivacious eyes, curls falling to her shoulders and garlanded with flowers.

The sixth stratum might well be called the temple-city, for here were found the ruins of a sanctuary built of massive blocks in which remained much of the ceremonial furniture—sacrificial dishes, a beautiful basalt pot with three feet, a plate having a handle in the form of a flower, etc. Seemingly connected with the former town, three religious stones were found covered by a fourth, and one with a pyramidal top; so here several monoliths were found which would naturally be thought of as religious monuments—though, since they have been touched with tools, this is perhaps doubtful (Ex 20:25). One incense altar, carved out of gray stone, is so beautiful as to be worthy of a modern Greek cathedral. The upper dish rests on a support of carved ornamental leaves painted red, yellow and cobalt blue, in exquisite taste, the colors still as fresh as when first applied. A blacksmith’s shop was found in this stratum, containing many tools, including iron plowshares, larger than the bronze ones in the 3rd and 4th layers. Allegorical figures were found, which may possibly belong to the former town, representing a man before an altar with his hands raised in adoration, seemingly to a scorpion, above which are a 6-pointed star, crescent moon, etc. Another most wonderful seal of white hard stone is engraved with three lines of symbols, in the first a vulture chasing a rabbit; in the second a conventional palm tree, with winged creatures on each side; in the third a lion springing on an ibex (?) under the crescent moon. Near by was found a cylinder of black jasper, containing hieroglyphs, and much crushed pottery. The 7th city, which was previous to the Greek or Roman eras, shows only a complex of destroyed buildings. After this the place remains unoccupied till the 11th century AD, when a poor Arab tower was erected, evidently to protect the passing caravans.

These excavations were specially important in proving the archaeological richness of Palestine and the elegance of the native works of article They were reported with an unexampled minuteness—various drawings of an original design showing the exact place and altitude where every little fragment was found.

(3) Tell Chum.

(Capernaum), etc.—In April and May, 1905, the German Oriental Society excavated a Hebrew synagogue of the Roman era at Tell Chum. It was 78 ft. long by 59 ft. wide, was built of beautiful white limestone, almost equal to marble, and was in every way more magnificent than any other yet found in

Palestine, that in Chorazin being the next finest. Its roof was gable-shaped and it was surprisingly ornamented with fine carvings representing animals, birds, fruits, flowers, etc., though in some cases these ornamentations had been intentionally mutilated. In January, 1907, Macalister and Masterman proved that Khan Minyeh was not the ancient Capernaum, as it contained no pottery older than Arab time, thus showing Tell Chum to be the ancient site, so that the synagogue just excavated may be the one referred to in Lu 7:5. At Samieh, 6 hours North of Jerusalem, two important Canaanite cemeteries were discovered by the fellahin in 1906, consisting of circular or oval tomb chambers, with roofs roughly dome-shaped, as at Gezer (see below). A large quantity of pottery and bronze objects, much of excellent quality, was found (Harvard Theological Review, I, 70-96; Masterman, Studies in Galilee; Henson, Researches in Palestine).

3. Eastern Palestine:

Jericho

(German Oriental Society).—During 1908-9, Dr. E. Sellin, assisted by a specialist in pottery, (Watzinger) and a professional architect (Langenegger), with the help of over 200 workmen, opened to view this famous Biblical city (Jos 6:1-24). Jericho was most strategically situated at the eastern gateway of Palestine, with an unlimited water-supply in the ‘Ain es-Sultan, having complete control of the great commercial highway across the Jordan and possessing natural provisions in its palm forest (Smith, HGHL). It was also set prominently on a hill rising some 40 ft. above the plain. The excavations proved that from the earliest historic time these natural advantages had been increased by every possible artifice known to ancient engineers, until it had become a veritable Gibraltar. The oldest city, which was in the form of an irregular ellipse, somewhat egg-shaped, with the point at the Southwest, was first surrounded with a rampart following the contour of the hill, a rampart so powerful that it commands the admiration of all military experts who have examined it.

The walls even in their ruins are some 28 ft. high. They were built in three sections:

(a) a substratum of clay, gravel and small stones, making a deposit upon the rock about 3 or 4 ft. deep, somewhat analogous to modern concrete;

(b) a rubble wall, 6 to 8 ft. thick, of large stones laid up to a height of 16 ft. upon this conglomerate, the lowest layers of the stone being enormously large;

(c) upon all this a brick wall over 6 ft. thick, still remaining, in places, 8 ft. high. Not even Megiddo, famous as a military center throughout all the ancient world, shows such workmanship (compare Jos 2:1; Nu 13:28).

"These were masters in stone work and masonry" (The Builder); "Taken as a whole it may justly be regarded as a triumph of engineering skill which a modern builder, under the same conditions, could scarcely excel" (Langenegger); "It is as well done as a brilliant military engineer with the same materials

and tools could do today" (Vincent). All the centuries were not able to produce a natural crevice in this fortification. At the North, which was the chief point of danger, and perhaps along other sections also, a second wall was built about 100 ft. inside the first, and almost as strong, while still another defense ("the citadel"), with 265 ft. of frontage, was protected not only by another mighty wall but by a well-constructed glacis. The old pre-Israelite culture in Jericho was exactly similar to that seen in the southern and northern cities, and the idolatry also. In its natural elements Canaanite civilization was probably superior to that of the Hebrews, but the repugnant and ever-present polytheism and fear of magic led naturally to brutal and impure manifestations. It cannot be doubted that, at least in some cases, the infants buried in jars under the floors represent foundation sacrifices. Some of the pottery is of great excellence, comparing favorably with almost the best examples from Egypt; a number of decorative figures of animals in relief are specially fine; the bronze utensils are also good; especially notable are the 22 writing-tablets, all ready to be used but not inscribed. Somewhere near the 15th century the old fortifications were seriously damaged, but equally powerful ones replaced them. The German experts all believed that a break in the city's history was clearly shown about the time when, according to the pottery, Israel ought to have captured the city, and it was confidently said that the distinctively Canaanite pottery ceased completely and permanently at this point; but further research has shown that at least a portion of the old town had a practically continuous existence (so Jos 16:7; Jud 1:16; 3:13; 2Sa 10:5). No complete Israelite house was preserved, but the Israelite quarter was located close to the spring and no little furniture of the usual kind was found, including dishes, pots, grainmills, lamps, etc., many iron instruments and terra cotta heads of men and animals. The pottery is quite unlike the old Canaanite, being closely allied to the Greek-Phoenician ware of Cyprus. It is noticeable that, as in other Palestinian towns, in the Jewish era, little Babylonian influence is discernible; the Aegean and Egyptian influence is not as marked as in the cities dug up near the Mediterranean coast. One large edifice (60 by 80 ft.) is so like the dwellings of the 7th century BC at Sendjirli that "they seem to have been copied from Syrian plans" (Vincent). Absolutely unique was the series of 12 Rhodian jar-handles stamped in Aramaic, "To Yahweh" (Yah, Yahu). Vincent has suggested that as during the monarchy (7th to 6th century) "To the King" meant probably "For His Majesty's Service," so in post-exilic time the Divine name meant "For the Temple" (Rev. biblique). After the exile the city had about 3 centuries of prosperity; but disappears permanently in the Maccabean era (MNDPV, 1907; MDOG, 1908-9; PEFS, 1910; Rev. biblique, 1907-9).

PALESTINE EXPLORATION, 2B

4. Central Palestine:

(1) Jerusalem.

See above, III, 1, (2).

(2) Samaria.

(Harvard Expedition).—Although the ancient capital of the Northern Kingdom, yet Samaria was

Centrally located, being 20 miles from the Mediterranean coast and only about 30 miles North of Jerusalem. Ancient Samaria was very famous in Israel for its frivolity and wealth, special mention being made of its ointments, instruments of music, luxurious couches, and its "ivory palace" (Am 6:4-6; 1Ki 16:24). Its history is known so fully that the chronological sequences of the ruins can be determined easily. The citadel and town originated with Omri, circa 900 BC (1Ki 16:24); the Temple of Baal and palace were constructions of Ahab (1Ki 16:32; 22:39); it continued prosperous down to the Assyrian exile, 722 BC (1Ki 22 to 2Ki 17); Sargon and Esarhaddon established a Babylonian colony and presumably forrifled the town (720-670 BC); Alexander the Great captured it in 331 BC, and established there a Syrio-Maccabean colony; it was destroyed by John Hyrcanus in 109 BC, but rebuilt by Pompey in 60 BC, and again by Herod (30-1 BC). All of these periods are identified in the excavations, Herod's work being easily recognized, and Josephus' description of the town being found correct; the Greek work is equally well defined, so that the lower layers of masonry which contained the characteristic Jewish pottery, and which in every part of the ruin lay immediately under the Babylonian and Greek buildings, must necessarily be Hebrew, the relative order of underlying structures thus being "beyond dispute" (Reisner). During 1908-9 George A. Reisner with a staff of specialists, including David G. Lyon of the Harvard Semitic Museum, G. Schumacher, and an expert architect, undertook systematically and thoroughly to excavate this large detached "tell" lying 350 ft. above the valley and 1,450 ft. above sea-level, its location as the only possible strategic stronghold proving it to be the ancient Samaria. This was a "gigantic enterprise" because of the large village of 800 population (Sebastiyeh), and the valuable crops which covered the hill. Some $65,000 were spent during the two seasons, and the work finally ceased before the site was fully excavated. The following statement is an abridgment, in so far as possible in their words, of the official reports of Drs. Reisner and Lyon to the Harvard Theological Review: An average of 285 diggers were employed the first season and from 230-260 the second. Hundreds of Arabian lamps, etc., were found close to the surface, and then nothing more until the Roman ruins. Many fine Roman columns still remained upright, upon the surface of the hill. The road of columns leading to the Forum and ornamental gate (oriented unlike the older gates), the great outer wall "20 stadii in circuit" (Jos), the hippodrome, etc., were all found with inscriptions or coins and pottery of the early Roman Empire. Even the old Roman chariot road leading into the Forum was identified. Adjoining the Forum and connected with it by a wide doorway was a basilica, consisting of a large open stone-paved court surrounded by a colonnade with mosaic floor. An inscription in Greek on an architrave in the courtyard dates this to 12-15 AD. The plan of the Herodian temple consisted of a stairway, a portico, a vestibule and a cella with a corridor on each side. The staircase was about 80 ft. wide, composed of 17 steps beautifully constructed, the steps being quite modern in style, each tread overlapping the next lower by several inches. The roof was arched and the walls very massive and covered with a heavy coat of plaster still retaining traces of color. A few Greek graffiti were found near here, and 150 "Rhodian" stamped amphora handles and many fragments of Latin inscriptions. A complete inscription on a large stele proved to be a dedication from some Pannonian soldiers (probably 2nd or 3rd century AD) to "Jupiter Optimus Maximus." Near this was found a torso of heroic size carved in white marble, which is much finer than any ever before discovered in Palestine, the work "bringing to mind the Vatican Augustus" (Vincent), though not equal to it. Close to the statue was a Roman altar (presumably Herodian) circa 13 by 7 ft., rising in six courses of stone to a height of 6 ft. Beneath the Roman city was a Seleucid town (circa 300-108 BC), with its fortifications, gateway, temples, streets, and great public buildings and a complex of private houses, in connection with which was a large bath

house, with mosaic floor, hot and cold baths, water closet, etc., which was heated by a furnace. Underneseath the Greek walls, which were connected with the well-known red-figured Greek ware of circa 400 BC, were brick structures and very thick fortress walls built in receding courses of small stones in the Babylonian style. In the filling of the construction trench of this Babylonian wall were found Israelite potsherds and a Hebrew seal with seemingly Babylonian peculiarities, and one fragment of a cuneiform tablet. Below these Babylonian constructions "there is a series of massive walls beautifully built of large limestone blocks founded on rock and forming a part of one great building, which can be no other than the Jewish palace." It consisted of "great open courts surrounded by small rooms, comparable in plan and even in size with the Babylonian palaces and is certainly royal in size and architecture." Its massive outlines which for the first time reveal to the modern world the masonry of an Israelite palace show that unexpected material resources and technical skill were at the command of the kings of Israel. An even greater discovery was made when on the palace hill was found an alabaster vase inscribed with the cartouche of Osorkon II of Egypt (874-853 BC), Ahab's contemporary; and at the same level, about 75 fragments of pottery, not jar-handles but ostraca, inscribed with records or memorials in ancient Hebrew. The script is Phoenician, and according to such experts as Lyon and Driver, practically identical with that of the Siloam Inscription (circa 700 BC) and Moabite Stone (circa 850 BC). "The inscriptions are written in ink with a reed pen in an easy flowing hand and show a pleasing contrast to the stiff forms of Phoenician inscriptions cut in stone. The graceful curves give evidence of a skill which comes only with long practice" (Lyon). The ink is well preserved, the writing is distinct, the words are divided by dots or strokes, and with two exceptions all the ostraca are dated, the reigning king probably being Ahab. The following samples represent the ordinary memoranda: "In the 11th year. From ‘Abi‘ezer. For ‘Asa, ‘Akhemelek (and) Ba‘ala. From ‘Elnathan (?). .... In 9th yr. From Yasat. For ‘Abino‘am. A jar of old wine. .... In 11th yr. For Badyo. The vineyard of the Tell." Baal and El form a part of several of the proper names, as also the Hebrew Divine name, the latter occurring naturally not in its full form, YHWH, but as ordinarily in compounds YW (Lyon, Harvard Theol. Rev., 1911, 136-43; compare Driver, PEFS, 1911, 79-83). In a list of 30 proper names all but three have Biblical equivalents. "They are the earliest specimens of Hebrew writing which have been found, and in amount they exceed by far all known ancient Hebrew inscriptions; moreover, they are the first Palestinian records of this nature to be found" (see especially Lyon, op. cit., I, 70-96; II, 102-13; III, 136-38; IV, 136-43; Reisner, ib, III, 248-63; also Theol. Literaturblatt, 1911, III, 4; Driver, as above; MNOP, 1911, 23-27; Rev. Bibique, VI, 435-45).

(3) ‘Ain Shems

(Beth-shemesh, 1Sa 6:1-21; 2Ki 14:11).—In a short but important campaign, during 1911-12, in which from 36 to 167 workmen were employed, Dr. D. Mackenzie uncovered a massive double gate and primitive walls 12-15 ft. high, with mighty bastions, and found in later deposits Egyptian images, Syrian Astartes, imported Aegean vases and a remarkable series of inscribed royal jar-handles "dating from the Israelite monarchy" (Vincent), as also what seemed to be an ancient Semitic tomb with fatsade entrance. The proved Cretan relations here are especially important. The town was suddenly destroyed, probably in the era of Sennacherib (PEFS, 1911, LXIX, 172; 1912, XII, 145).

(4) Gezer

(Palestine Exploration Fund).—Tell ej-Jezer occupies a conspicuous position, over 250 ft. above the plain, and 750 ft. above the sea, on a ridge of hills some 20 miles Northwest of Jerusalem, overlooking the plain toward Jaffa, which is 17 miles distant. It is in plain sight of the two chief trade caravan roads of Southern Palestine which it controlled. The ancient Gezer was well known from many references to it on the Egyptian records, the names of several governors of Gezer being given in letters dating from circa 1400 BC and Menephtah (circa 1200 BC) calling himself "Binder of Gezer," etc. The discovery of the boundary stones of Gezer (see above) positively identified it. It was thoroughly excavated by R.A. Stewart Macalister in 1902-5, 1907-9, during which time 10,000 photographs were made of objects found. No explorations have been so long continued on one spot or have brought more unique discoveries or thrown more light upon the development of Palestinian culture and religion, and none have been reported as fully (Excavations of Gezer, 1912, 3 volumes; History of Civilization in Palestine, 1912). Ten periods-are recognized as being distinctly marked in the history of the mound—which broadly speaking represents the development in all parts of Pal:

(a) pre-Semitic period (circa 3000-2500 BC), to the entrance of the first Semites;

(b) first Semitic city (circa 2500-1800 BC), to the end of the XIIth Egyptian Dynasty;

(c) second Semitic city (circa 1800-1400 BC), to the end of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty;

(d) third Semitic city (circa 1400-1000 BC), to the beginning of the Hebrew monarchy;

(e) fourth Semitic city (circa 1000-550 BC), to the destruction of the monarchy and the Babylonian exile;

(f) Persian and Hellenistic period (550-100 BC), to the beginning of the Roman dominion;

(g) Roman (100 BC-350 AD);

(h) Byzantine (350-600 AD);

(i) and (j) early and modern Arabian (350 AD to the present).

The last four periods have left few important memorials and may be omitted from review.

(a) The aboriginal non-Semitic inhabitants of Gezer were troglodytes (compare Ge 14:6) living in the caves which honeycomb this district (compare ZDPV, 1909, VI, 12), modifying these only slightly for home purposes. They were a small race 5 ft. 4 inches to 5 ft. 7 in. in height, slender in form, with rather broad heads and thick skulls, who hunted, kept domestic animals (cows, sheep, goats); had fire and cooked food; possessed no metals; made by hand a porous and gritty soft-baked pottery which they decorated with red lines; and were capable of a rude art—the oldest in Palestine—in which drawings of

various animals are given. They prized certain bars of stone (possibly phallic); they probably offered sacrifices; they certainly cremated their dead, depositing with the ashes a few food vessels. The crematory found was 31 ft. long by 24 wide, and in it the bodies were burned whole, without regard to orientation. Many cup marks in the rocks suggest possible religious rites; in close connection with these markings were certain remains, including bones of swine (compare Le 11:7).

(b) The Semites who displaced this population were more advanced in civilization, having bronze tools and potter's wheels, with finer and more varied pottery; they were a heavier race, being 5 ft. 7 inches to 5 ft. 11 inches tall, larger-boned, thicker-skulled, and with longer faces. They did not burn but buried their dead carelessly upon the floor of the natural caves. The grave deposits are the same as before; occasionally some beads are found with the body. The former race had surrounded their settlement with a wall 6 ft. high and 8 ft. thick, mostly earth, though faced with selected stones; but this race built a wall of hammered stones, though irregularly cut and laid, the wall being 10 ft. thick, and one gateway being 42 ft. wide, flanked by two towers. While huts were always the common residences (as in later eras), yet some buildings of stone were erected toward the close of this period and one large palace was found, built of stone and having a row of columns down the center, and containing a complex of rooms, including one rectangular hall, 40 ft. long by 25 ft. wide. Most remarkable of all were their works of engineering. They hewed enormous constructions, square, rectangular and circular, out of the soft chalk and limestone rocks, one of which contained 60 chambers, one chamber being 400 by 80 ft. The supreme work, however, was a tunnel which was made circa 2000 BC, passing out of use circa 1450-1250 BC, and which shows the power of these early Palestinians. It was 200-250 ft. long and consisted of a roadway cut through the hill of rock some 47 1/2 ft. to an imposing archway 23 ft. high and 12 ft. 10 inches broad, which led to a long sloping passage of equal dimensions, with the arch having a vaulted roof and the sides well plumb. This led into a bed of much harder rock, where dimensions were reduced and the workmanship was poorer, but ultimately reached, about 130 ft. below the present surface of the ground, an enormous living spring of such depth that the excavators could not empty it of the soft mud with which it was filled. A well-cut but well-worn and battered stone staircase, over 12 ft. broad, connected the spring with the upper section of the tunnel 94 ft. above. Beyond the spring was a natural cave 80 by 25 ft. Dr. Macalister asks, "Did a Canaanite governor plan and Canaanite workmen execute this vast work? How did the ancient engineers discover the spring?" No one can answer; but certainly the tunnel was designed to bring the entrance of the water passage within the courtyard protected by the palace walls.

Another great reservoir, 57 by 46 ft., at another part of the city was quarried in the rock to a depth of 29 1/2 ft., and below this another one of equal depth but not so large, and narrowing toward the bottom. These were covered with two coats of cement and surrounded by a wall; they would hold 60,000 gals.

(c) The second Semitic city, built on the ruins of the first, was smaller, but more luxurious. There were fewer buildings but larger rooms. The potter's wheel was worked by the foot. Pottery becomes much finer, the styles and decoration reaching a climax of grace and refinement. Foreign trade begins in this period and almost or quite reaches its culmination. The Hyksos scarabs found here prove that under their rule (XVIth and XVIIth Dynastles) there was close intercourse with Palestine, and the multitudes of Egyptian articles show that this was also true before and after the Hyksos. The Cretan and the Aegean

trade, especially through Cyprus, introduced new art ideas which soon brought local attempts at imitation. Scribes' implements for writing in wax and clay begin here and are found in all strata hereafter.

While the pottery is elaborately painted, it is but little molded. The older "combed" ornament practically disappears, while burnished ornament reaches high-water mark. Animal figures are common, the eyes often being elaborately modeled and stuck on; but it is infantile article Burials still occur in natural caves, but also in those hewn artificially; the bodies are carelessly deposited on the floor without coffins, generally in a crouching position, and stones are laid around and over them without system. Drink offerings always and food offerings generally are placed with the dead. Scarabs are found with the skeletons, and ornaments of bronze and silver, occasionally gold and beads, and sometimes weapons. Lamps also begin to be deposited, but in small numbers.

(d) During this period Menephtah "spoiled Gezer," and Israel established itself in Canaan. The excavations have given no hint of Menephtah's raid, unless it be found in an ivory pectoral bearing his cartouche. About 1400 BC a great wall, 4 ft. thick, was built of large and well-shaped stones and protected later by particularly fine towers, perhaps, as Macalister suggests, by the Pharaoh who captured Gezer and gave it as a dowry to his daughter, wife of King Solomon. A curious fact, which seemingly illustrates Jos 16:10, is the large increase of the town shortly after the Hebrew invasion. "The houses are smaller and more crowded and the sacred area of the high place is built over." "There is no indication of an exclusively Israelite population around the city outside" (Macalister, v. Driver, Modern Research, 69). That land was taken for building purposes from the old sacred enclosure, and that new ideas in building plans and more heavily fortified buildings were now introduced have been thought to suggest the entrance among the ancient population of another element with different ideas. The finest palace of this period with very thick walls (3-9 ft.) carefully laid out at right angles, and certainly built near "the time of the Hebrew invasion," was perhaps the residence of Horam (Jos 10:33). At this period seals begin (10 being found here, as against 28 in the next period, and 31 in the Hellenistic) and also iron tools; the use of the carpenter's compass is proved, the bow drill was probably in use, bronze and iron nails appear (wrought iron being fairly common from circa 1000 BC); a cooking-pot of bronze was found, and spoons of shell and bronze; modern methods of making buttons and button holes are finest from this period, pottery buttons being introduced in the next city. One incidental Bible reference to the alliance between Gezer and Lachish (Jos 10:33) finds unexpected illustration from the fact that a kind of pottery peculiar to Lachish, not having been found in any other of the Southern Palestinian towns, was found at Gezer. The pottery here in general shows the same method of construction as in the 3rd stratum, but the decoration and shapes deteriorate, while there is practically no molding. It shows much the same foreign influence as before, the styles being affected from Egypt, Crete, the Aegean, and especially Cyprus. From this period come 218 scarabs, 68 from the period previous and 93 from the period following. Ornamental colored specimens of imported Egyptian glass also occur, clear glass not being found till the next period. Little intercourse is proved with Babylon at this era: as against 16 Babylonian cylinders found in the previous period, only 4 were found in this and 15 in the next period. There is no marked change in the method of disposing of the dead, but the food vessels are of smaller size and are placed in the graves in great numbers, most of these being broken either through the use of poor vessels because of economy or with the idea of liberating the spirit of the object that it might serve the deceased

in the spirit world. Lamps are common now in every tomb but there is a marked decrease in the quantity and value of ornamental objects. Religious emblems occur but rarely. The worship of Astarte (see ASHTORETH), the female consort of Baal, is most popular at this era, terra cotta figures and plaques of this goddess being found in many types and in large numbers. It is suggestive that these grow notably less in the next stratum. It is also notable that primitive idols are certainly often intentionally ugly (Vincent). So to this day Arabs ward off the evil eye.

(e) This period, during which almost the entire prophetic literature was produced, is of peculiar interest. Gezer at this time as at every other period was in general appearance like a modern Arab village, a huge mass of crooked, narrow, airless streets, shut inside a thick wall, with no trace of sanitary conveniences, with huge cisterns in which dead men could lie undetected for centuries, and with no sewers. Even in the Maccabean time the only sewer found ran, not into a cesspool, but into the ground, close to the governor’s palace. The mortality was excessively high, few old men being found in the cemeteries, while curvature of the spine, syphilis, brain disease, and especially broken, unset bones were common. Tweezers, pins and needles, kohl bottles, mirrors, combs, perfume boxes, scrapers (for baths) were common in this stratum and in all that follow it, while we have also here silver earrings, bracelets and other beautiful ornaments with the first sign of clear glass objects; tools also of many kinds of stone, bronze and iron, an iron hoe just like the modern one, and the first known pulley of bronze. The multitude of Hebrew weights found here have thrown much new light on the weight-standards of Palestine (see especially Macalister, Gezer, II, 287-92; E. J. Pilcher, PEFS, 1912; A. R. S. Kennedy, Expository Times, XXIV).

The pottery was poor in quality, clumsy and coarse in shape and ornament, except as it was imported, the local Aegean imitations being unworthy. Combed ornament was not common, and the burnished as a rule was limited to random scratches. Multiple lamps became common, and a large variety of styles in small jugs was introduced. The motives of the last period survive, but in a degenerate form. The bird friezes so characteristic of the 3rd Semitic period disappear. The scarab stamp goes out of use, but the impressions of other seals "now become fairly common as potter’s marks." These consist either of simple devices (stars, pentacles, etc.) or of names in Old Hebrew script. These Hebrew-inscribed stamps were found at many sites and consist of two classes, (i) those containing personal names, such as Azariah, Haggai, Menahem, Shebaniah, etc., (ii) those which are confined to four names, often repeated —Hebron, Socoh, Ziph, Mamshith—in connection with a reference to the king, e.g. "For (or Of) the king of Hebron." These latter date, according to Dr. Macalister’s final judgment, from the Persian period. He still thinks they represent the names of various potters or potters’ guilds in Palestine (compare 1Ch 2; 4; 5, and see especially Bible Side-Lights from Gezer, 150, etc.), but others suppose these names to represent the local measures of capacity, which differed in these various districts; others that these represented different tax-districts where wine jars would be used and bought. At any rate, we certainly have here the work of the king’s potters referred to in 1Ch 4:23. Another very curious Hebrew tablet inscription is the so-called Zodiacal Tablet, on which the signs of the Zodiac are figured with certain other symbols which were at first supposed to express some esoteric magical or religious meaning, but which seem only to represent the ancient agricultural year with the proper months indicated for sowing and reaping—being the same as the modern seasons and crops except that flax was cultivated in ancient times. An even more important literary memorial from this period consists of two

cuneiform tablets written about three-quarters of a century after the Ten Tribes had been carried to Assyria and foreign colonies had been thrown into Israelite territory. This collapse of the Northern Kingdom was not marked by any local catastrophe, so far as the ruins indicate, any more than the collapse of the Canaanite kingdom when Israel entered Palestine; but soon afterward we find an Assyrian colony settled in Gezer "using the Assyrian language and letters .... and carrying on business with Assyrian methods." In one tablet (649 BC), which is a bill of sale for certain property, containing description of the same, appeared the name of the buyer, seals of seller and signature of 12 witnesses, one of whom is the Egyptian governor of the new town, another an Assyrian noble whose name precedes that of the governor, and still another a Western Asiatic, the others being Assyrian. It is a Hebrew "Nethaniah," who the next year, as the other tablet shows, sells his field, his seal bearing upon it a lunar stellar emblem. Notwithstanding the acknowledged literary work of high quality produced in Palestine during this period, no other hint of this is found clear down to the Greek period except in one neo-Babylonian tablet.

The burials in this period were much as previously, except that the caves were smaller and toward the end of the period shelves around the walls received the bodies. In one Semitic tomb as many as 150 vessels were found. Quite the most astonishing discovery at this level was that of several tombs which scholars generally agree to be "Philistine." They were not native Canaanite, but certainly Aegean intruders with relations with Crete and Cyprus, such as we would expect the Philistines to have (see PHILISTINES). The tombs were oblong or rectangular, covered with large horizontal slabs, each tomb containing but a single body, stretched out with the head to the East or West One tomb was that of a girl of 18 with articles of alabaster and silver about her, and wearing a Cretan silver mouth plate; another was a man of 40 with agate seal of Assyrian design, a two-handled glass vessel, etc.; another was a woman surrounded by handsome ornaments of bronze, lead, silver and gold, with a basalt scarab between her knees. The richest tomb was that of a girl whose head had been severed from the body; with her was a hemispherical bowl, ornamented with rosette and lotus pattern, and a horde of beautiful things. The iron in these tombs was noticeable (compare 1Sa 17:7), and in one tomb were found two ingots of gold, one of these being of the same weight almost to a fraction as that of Achan (Jos 7:21). The most impressive discovery was the high place. This began as early as 2500-2000 BC, and grew by the addition of monoliths and surrounding buildings up to this era. The eight huge uncut pillars which were found standing in a row, with two others fallen (yet compare Benzinger, Hebrew Archaeology, 320), show us the actual appearance of this ancient worshipping-place so famous in the Bible (De 16:22; 2Ki 17:9,11; 23:8). The top of one of these monoliths had been worn smooth by kisses; another was an importation, being possibly, as has been suggested, a captured "Aril"; another stone, near by, had a large cavity in its top, nearly 3 ft. long and 2 ft. broad and 1 ft. 2 inches deep, which is differently interpreted as being the block upon which the ‘asherah, so often mentioned in connection with the matstsebhoth, may have been erected, or as an altar, or perhaps a layer for ritual ablutions. Inside the sacred enclosure was found a small bronze cobra (2Ki 18:4), and also the entrance to an ancient cave, where probably oracles were given, the excavators finding that this cave was connected with another by a small, secret passage—through which presumably the message was delivered. In the stratum underlying the high place was a cemetery of infants buried in large jars. "That the sacrificed infants were the firstborn, devoted in the temple, is indicated by the fact that none were over a week old" (Macalister). In all the Semitic strata bones of children were also found in corners of the houses, the deposits being identical

with infant burials in the high place; and examination showed that these were not stillborn children. At least some of the burials under the house thresholds and under the foundation of walls carry with them the mute proofs of this most gruesome practice. In one place the skeleton of an old woman was found in a corner where a hole had been left just large enough for this purpose. A youth of about 18 had been cut in two at the waist and only the upper part of his body deposited. Before the coming into Palestine of the Israelites, a lamp began to be placed under the walls and foundations, probably symbolically to take the place of human sacrifice. A lamp and bowl deposit under the threshold, etc., begins in the 3rd Semitic period, but is rare till the middle of that period. In the 4th Semitic period it is common, though not universal; in the Hellenic it almost disappears. Macalister suspects that these bowls held blood or grape juice. In one striking case a bronze figure was found in place of a body. Baskets full of phalli were carried away from the high place. Various types of the Astarte were found at Gezer. When we see the strength and popularity of this religion against which the prophets contended in Canaan, "we are amazed at the survival of this world-religion," and we now see "why Ezra and Nehemiah were forced to raise the ‘fence of the law’ against this heathenism, which did in fact overthrow all other Semitic religions" (George Adam Smith. PEFS, 1906, 288).

(f) During the Maccabean epoch the people of Gezer built reservoirs (one having a capacity of 4,000,000 gallons) used well-paved rooms, favored complex house plans with pillars, the courtyard becoming less important as compared with the rooms, though domestic fowls were now for the first time introduced. The architectural decorations have all been annihilated (as elsewhere in Pal) except a few molded stones and an Ionic volute from a palace, supposed to be that of Simon Maccabeus because of the references in Josephus and because of a scribbled imprecation found in the courtyard: "May fire overtake (?) Simon’s palace." This is the only inscription from all these post-exilic centuries, to which so much of the beautiful Bible literature is ascribed, except one grotesque animal figure on which is scrawled a name which looks a little like "Antiochus." Only a few scraps of Greek bowls, some Rhodian jar-handles, a few bronze and iron arrow heads, a few animal figures and a fragment of an Astarte, of doubtful chronology, remain from these four centuries. The potsherds prove that foreign imports continued and that the local potters followed classic models and did excellent work. The ware was always burnt hard; combed ornament and burnishing were out of style; molded ornament was usually confined to the rope design; painted decorations were rare; potter’s marks were generally in Greek, though some were in Hebrew, the letters being of late form, and no names appearing similar to those found in Scripture. The tombs were well cut square chambers, with shafts hewn in the rock for the bodies, usually nine to each tomb, which were run into them head foremost. The doorways were well cut, the covers almost always being movable flat slabs, though in one case a swinging stone door was found—circular rolling stones or the "false doors" so often found in the Jerusalem tombs being unknown here. Little shrines were erected above the forecourt or vestibule. When the body decayed, the bones in tombs having these kukhin, shafts, were collected into ossuaries, the inscriptions on these ossuaries showing clearly the transition from Old Hebrew to the square character. After the Maccabean time the town was deserted, though a small Christian community lived here in the 4th century AD.

See also GEZER.

LITERATURE.

Most Important Recent Monographs:

Publications of Palestine Exploration Fund, especially Survey of Western Palestine (9 volumes, 1884); survey of Eastern Palestine (2 Volumes, 1889); "Palestinian Pilgrim's Text Society's Library" (13 vols) and the books of W.M. Flinders Petrie, F.J. Bliss and R.A.S. Macalister; also Bliss, Development of Palestine Exploration (1906), and Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer (1906); Ernst Sellin, Tell Ta'annek (1904); Eine Nachlese auf dem Tell Ta'annek (1905); C. Steuernagel, Tell el-Mutesellim (1908); Mommert, Topog. des alten Jerusalem (1902-7); H. Guthe, Bibelatlas (1911).

Most Important Periodicals:

PEFS; ZDPV; Mitteilungen Und Nachrichten des deutschen Palastina-Vereins; Palastina-Jahrbuch (MNDPV); Revue Biblique.

Most Important General Works:

L.B. Paton, Early History of Syria and Palestine (1902); Cuinet, Syrie, Liban et Palestine (1896-1900); H.V. Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands during the 19th Century. (1903); P.H. Vincent, Canaan, d'apres l'exploration recente (1907); G.A. Smith, Jerusalem (1908); S. R. Driver, Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible (1909).

Camden M. Cobern

PALESTINE, 1

pal'-es-tin (pelesheth; Phulistieim, Allophuloi; the King James Version Joe 3:4 (the Revised Version (British and American) "Philistia"), "Palestina"; the King James Version Ex 15:14; Isa 14:29,31; compare Ps 60:8; 83:7; 87:4; 108:9):

I. PHYSICAL CONDITIONS

1. General Geographical Features

2. Water-Supply

3. Geological Conditions

4. Fauna and Flora

5. Climate

6. Rainfall

7. Drought and Famine

II. PALESTINE IN THE PENTATEUCH

1. Places Visited by Abraham

2. Places Visited by Isaac

3. Places Visited by Jacob

4. Mentioned in Connection with Judah

5. Review of Geography of Genesis

6. Exodus and Leviticus

7. Numbers

8. Deuteronomy

III. PALESTINE IN THE HISTORIC BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Book of Joshua

2. Book of Judges

3. Book of Ruth

4. Books of Samuel

5. Books of Kings

6. Post-exilic Historical Books

IV. PALESTINE IN THE POETIC BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. Book of Job

2. Book of Psalms

3. Book of Proverbs

4. So of Songs

V. PALESTINE IN THE PROPHETS

1. Isaiah

2. Jeremiah

3. Ezekiel

4. Minor Prophets

VI. PALESTINE IN THE APOCRYPHA

1. Book of Judith

2. Book of Wisdom

3. 1 Maccabees

4. 2 Maccabees

VII. PALESTINE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Synoptic Gospels

2. Fourth Gospel

3. Book of Acts

LITERATURE

The word properly means "Philistia," but appears to be first used in the extended sense, as meaning all the "Land of Israel" or "Holy Land" (Zec 2:12), by Philo and by Ovid and later Roman authors (Reland, Palestine Illustr., I, 38-42).

I. Physical Conditions.

The Bible in general may be said to breathe air of Palestine; and it is here intended to show how important for sound criticism is the consideration of its geography, and of the numerous incidental allusions to the natural features, fauna, flora, cultivation, and climate of the land in which most of the Bible books were written. With the later history and topography of Palestine, after 70 AD, we are not here concerned, but a short account of its present physical and geological conditions is needed for our purpose.

1. General Geographical Features:

Palestine West of the Jordan, between Da and Beersheba, has an area of about 6,000 square miles, the length from Hermon southward being nearly 150 miles, and the width gradually increasing from 20 miles on the North to 60 miles on the South. It is thus about the size of Wales, and the height of the Palestinian mountains is about the same as that of the Welsh. East of the Jordan an area of about 4,000 square miles was included in the land of Israel. The general geographical features are familiar to all.

(1) The land is divided by the deep chasm of the Jordan valley—an ancient geological fault continuing in the Dead Sea, where its depth (at the bottom of the lake) is 2,600 ft. below the Mediterranean.

(2) West of the valley the mountain ridge, which is a continuation of Lebanon, has very steep slopes on the East and long spurs on the West, on which side the foothills (Hebrew shephelah or "lowland") form a distinct district, widening gradually southward, while between this region and the sea the plains of Sharon and Philistia stretch to the sandhills and low cliffs of a harborless coast.

(3) In Upper Galilee, on the North, the mountain ridge rises to 4,000 ft. above the Mediterranean. Lower Galilee, to the South, includes rounded hills less than 1,000 ft. above the sea, and the triangular plain of Esdraelon drained by the River Kishon between the Gilboa watershed on the East and the long spur of Carmel on the West.

(4) In Samaria the mountains are extremely rugged, but a small plain near Dothan adjoins that of Esdraelon, and another stretches East of Shechem, 2,500 ft. above the level of the Jordan valley. In Judea the main ridge rises toward Hebron and then sinks to the level of the Beersheba plains about 1,000 ft. above the sea. The desert of Judah forms a plateau (500 ft. above sea-level), between this ridge and the Dead Sea, and is throughout barren and waterless; but the mountains—which average about 3,000 ft. above the sea—are full of good springs and suitable for the cultivation of the vine, fig and olive. The richest lands are found in the shephelah region—especially in Judea—and in the corn plains of Esdraelon, Sharon, and Philistia.

(5) East of the Jordan the plateau of Bashan (averaging 1,500 ft. above the sea) is also a fine corn country. South of this, Gilead presents a mountain region rising to 3,600 ft. above sea-level at Jebel Osha‘, and sloping gently on the East to the desert. The steep western slopes are watered by the Jabbok River, and by many perennial brooks. In North Gilead especially the wooded hills present some of the

most picturesque scenery of the Holy Land. South of Gilead, the Moab plateau (about 2,700 ft. above sea-level) is now a desert, but is fitted for raising grain, and, in places, for vines. A lower shelf or plateau (about 500 to 1,000 ft. above sea-level) intervenes between the main plateau and the Dead Sea cliffs, and answers to the Desert of Judah West of the lake.

2. Water-Supply:

The water-supply of Palestine is abundant, except in the desert regions above noticed, which include only a small part of its area. The Jordan runs into the Dead Sea, which has no outlet and which maintains its level solely by evaporation, being consequently very salt; the surface is nearly 1,300 ft. below the Mediterranean, whereas the Sea of Galilee (680 ft. below sea-level) is sweet and full of fish. The Jordan is fed, not only by the snows of Hermon, but by many affluent streams from both sides. There are several streams also in Sharon, including the Crocodile River under Carmel. In the mountains, where the hard dolomite limestone is on the surface, perennial springs are numerous. In the lower hills, where this limestone is covered by a softer chalky stone, the supply depends on wells and cisterns. In the Beersheba plains the water, running under the surface, is reached by scooping shallow pits—especially those near Gerar, to be noticed later.

3. Geological Conditions:

The fertility and cultivation of any country depends mainly on its geological conditions. These are comparatively simple in Palestine, and have undergone no change since the age when man first appeared, or since the days of the Hebrew patriarchs. The country was first upheaved from the ocean in the Eocene age; and, in the subsequent Miocene age, the great crack in the earth's surface occurred, which formed a narrow gulf stretching from that of the 'Aqabah on the South almost to the foot of Hermon. Further upheaval, accompanied by volcanic outbreaks which covered the plateaus of Golan, Bashan, and Lower Galilee with lava, cut off the Jordan valley from the Red Sea, and formed a long lake, the bottom of which continued to sink on the South to its present level during the Pleiocene and Pluvial periods, after which—its peculiar fauna having developed meanwhile—the lake gradually dried up, till it was represented only, as it now is, by the swampy Chuleh, the pear-shaped Sea of Galilee, and the Dead Sea. These changes all occurred long ages before the appearance of man. The beds upheaved include: (1) the Nubian Sandstone (of the Greensand period), which was sheared along the line of the Jordan fault East of the river, and which only appears on the western slopes of Hermon, Gilead, and Moab; (2) the limestones of the Cretaceous age, including the hard dolomite, and softer beds full of characteristic fossils; (3) the soft Eocene limestone, which appears chiefly on the western spurs and in the foothills, the angle of upheaval being less steep than that of the older main formation. On the shores of the Mediterranean a yet later sandy limestone forms the low cliffs of Sharon.

See GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE.

4. Fauna and Flora:

As regards fauna, flora and cultivation, it is sufficient here to say that they are still practically the same as described throughout the Bible. The lion and the wild bull (Bos primigenius) were exterminated within historic times, but have left their bones in the Jordan gravels, and in caves. The bear has gradually retreated to Hermon and Lebanon. The buffalo has been introduced since the Moslem conquest. Among trees the apple has fallen out of cultivation since the Middle Ages, and the cactus has been introduced; but Palestine is still a land of grain, wine and oil, and famous for its fruits. Its trees, shrubs and plants are those noticed in the Bible. Its woods have been thinned in Lower Galilee and Northern Sharon, but on the other hand the copse has often grown over the site of former vineyards and villages, and there is no reason to think that any general desiccation has occurred within the last 40 centuries, such as would affect the rainfall.

5. Climate:

The climate of Palestine is similar to that of other Mediterranean lands, such as Cyprus, Sicily or Southern Italy; and, in spite of the fevers of mosquito districts in the plains, it is much better than that of the Delta in Egypt, or of Mesopotamia. The summer heat is oppressive only for a few days at a time, when (espescially in May) the dry wind—deficient in ozone—blows from the eastern desert. For most of the season a moisture-laden sea breeze, rising about 10 AM, blows till the evening, and fertilizes all the western slopes of the mountains. In the bare deserts the difference between 90ø F. by day and 40ø F. by night gives a refreshing cold. With the east wind the temperature rises to 105ø F., and the nights are oppressive. In the Jordan valley, in autumn, the shade temperature reaches 120ø F. In this season mists cover the mountains and swell the grapes. In winter the snow sometimes lies for several days on the watershed ridge and on the Edomite mountains, but in summer even Hermon is sometimes quite snowless at 9,000 ft. above the sea. There is perhaps no country in which such a range of climate can be found, from the Alpine to the tropical, and none in which the range of fauna and flora is consequently so large, from the European to the African.

6. Rainfall:

The rainfall of Palestine is between 20 and 30 inches annually, and the rainy season is the same as in other Mediterranean countries. The "former rains" begin with the thunderstorms of November, and the "latter rains" cease with April showers. From December to February—except in years of drought—the rains are heavy. In most years the supply is quite sufficient for purposes of cultivation. The plowing begins in autumn, and the corn is rarely spoiled by storms in summer. The fruits ripen in autumn and suffer only from the occasional appearance of locust swarms. There appears to be no reason to suppose that climate or rainfall have undergone any change since the times of the Bible; and a consideration of Bible allusions confirms this view.

7. Drought and Famine:

Thus, the occurrence of drought, and of consequent famine, is mentioned in the Old Testament as occasional in all times (Ge 12:10; 26:2; 41:50; Le 26:20; 2Sa 21:1; 1Ki 8:35; Isa 5:6; Jer 14:1; Joe 1:10-

12; Hag 1:11; Zec 14:17), and droughts are also noticed in the Mishna (Ta‘anith, i. 4-7) as occurring in autumn, and even lasting throughout the rainy season till spring. Good rains were a blessing from God, and drought was a sign of His displeasure, in Hebrew belief (De 11:14; Jer 5:24; Joe 2:23). A thunderstorm in harvest time (May) was most unusual (1Sa 12:17,18), yet such a storm does still occur as a very exceptional phenomenon. By "snow in harvest" (Pr 25:13) we are not to understand a snowstorm, for it is likened to a "faithful messenger," and the reference is to the use of snow for cooling wine, which is still usual at Damascus. The notice of fever on the shores of the Sea of Galilee (Mt 8:14) shows that this region was as unhealthy as it still is in summer. The decay of irrigation in Sharon may have rendered the plain more malarious than of old, but the identity of the Palestinian flora with that of the Bible indicates that the climate, generally speaking, is unchanged.

II. Palestine in the Pentateuch.

1. Places Visited by Abraham:

The Book of Genesis is full of allusions to sites sacred to the memory of the Hebrew patriarchs. In the time of Abraham the population consisted of tribes, mainly Semitic, who came originally from Babylonia, including Canaanites ("lowlanders") between Sidon and Gaza, and in the Jordan valley, and Amorites ("highlanders") in the mountains (Ge 10:15-19; Nu 13:29). Their language was akin to Hebrew, and it is only in Egypt that we read of an interpreter being needed (Ge 42:23), while excavated remains of seal-cylinders, and other objects, show that the civilization of Palestine was similar to that of Babylonia.

(1) Shechem.

The first place noticed is the shrine or "station" (maqom) of Shechem, with the Elon Moreh, the Septuagint "high oak"), where Jacob afterward buried the idols of his wives, and where Joshua set up a stone by the "holy place" (Ge 12:6; 35:4; Jos 24:26). Samaritan tradition showed the site near BalaTa ("the oak") at the foot of Mt. Gerizim. The "Canaanite was then in the land" (in Abraham’s time), but was exterminated (Ge 34:25) by Jacob’s sons. From Shechem Abraham journeyed southward and raised an altar between Bethel (Beitin) and Hal (Chayan), East of the town of Luz, the name of which still survives hard-by at the spring of Lozeh (Ge 12:8; 13:3; 28:11,19; 35:2).

(2) The Negeb.

But, on his return from Egypt with large flocks (Ge 12:16), he settled in the pastoral region, between Beersheba and the western Kadesh (Ge 13:1; 20:1), called in Hebrew the neghebh, "dry" country, on the edge of the cultivated lands. From East of Bethel there is a fine view of the lower Jordan valley, and here Lot "lifted up his eyes" (Ge 13:10), and chose the rich grass lands of that valley for his flocks. The "cities of the Plain" (kikkar) were clearly in this valley, and Sodom must have been near the river, since Lot’s journey to Zoar (Ge 19:22) occupied only an hour or two (Ge 19:15,23) through the plain to the foot of the Moab mountains. These cities are not said to have been visible from near Hebron; but, from

the hilltop East of the city, Abraham could have seen "the smoke of the land" (Ge 19:28) rising up. The first land owned by him was the garden of Mamre (Ge 13:18; 18:1; 23:19), with the cave-tomb which tradition still points out under the floor of the Hebron mosque. His tent was spread under the "oaks of Mamre" (Ge 18:1), where his mysterious guests rested "under the tree" (Ge 18:8). One aged oak still survives in the flat ground West of the city, but this tree is very uncommon in the mountains of Judah. In all these incidental touches we have evidence of the exact knowledge of Palestine which distinguishes the story of the patriarchs.

(3) Campaign of Amraphel.

Palestine appears to have been an outlying province of the empire of. Hammurabi, king of Babylon in Abraham's time; and the campaign of Amraphel resembled those of later Assyrian overlords exacting tribute of petty kings. The route (Ge 14:5-8) lay through Bashan, Gilead and Moab to Kadesh (probably at Petra), and the return through the desert of Judah to the plains of Jericho. Thus Hebron was not attacked (see Ge 14:13), and the pursuit by Abraham and his Amorite allies led up the Jordan valley to Dan, and thence North of Damascus (Ge 14:15). The Salem whose king blessed Abraham on his return was thought by the Samaritans, and by Jerome, to be the city near the Jordan valley afterward visited by Jacob (Ge 14:18; 33:18).

See JERUSALEM.

(4) Gerar.

Abraham returned to the southern plains, and "sojourned in Gerar" (Ge 20:1), now Umm Jerrar, 7 miles South of Gaza. The wells which he dug in this valley (Ge 26:15) were no doubt shallow excavations like those from which the Arabs still obtain the water flowing under the surface in the same vicinity (SWP, III, 390), though that at Beersheba (Ge 21:25-32), to which Isaac added another (Ge 26:23-25), may have been more permanent. Three masonry wells now exist at Bir es Seba‘, but the masonry is modern. The planting of a "tamarisk" at this place (Ge 21:33) is an interesting touch, since the tree is distinctive of the dry lowlands. From Beersheba Abraham journeyed to "the land of Moriah" Septuagint "the high land") to sacrifice Isaac (Ge 22:2); and the mountain, according to Hebrew tradition (2Ch 3:1), was at Jerusalem, but according to the Samaritans was Gerizim near the Elon Moreh—a summit which could certainly have been seen "afar off" (2Ch 3:4) on "the third day."

2. Places Visited by Isaac:

Isaac, living in the same pastoral wilderness, at the western Kadesh (Ge 25:11) and at Gerar (Ge 26:2), suffered like his father in a year of drought, and had similar difficulties with the Philistines. At Gerar he sowed grain (Ge 26:12), and the vicinity is still capable of such cultivation. Thence he retreated Southeast to Rehoboth (Rucheibeh), North of Kadesh, where ancient wells like those at Beersheba still exist (Ge 26:22). To Beersheba he finally returned (Ge 26:23).

3. Places Visited by Jacob:

When Jacob fled to Haran from Beersheba (Ge 28:10) he slept at the "place" (or shrine) consecrated by Abraham's altar near Bethel, and like any modern Arab visitor to a shrine—erected a memorial stone (Ge 28:18), which he renewed twenty years later (Ge 35:14) when God appeared to him "again" (Ge 35:9).

(1) Haran to Succoth.

His return journey from Haran to Gilead raises an interesting question. The distance is about 350 miles from Haran to the Galeed or "witness heap" (Ge 31:48) at Mizpah—probably Suf in North Gilead. This distance Laban is said to have covered in 7 days (Ge 31:23), which would be possible for a force mounted on riding camels. But the news of Jacob's flight reached Laban on the 3rd day (Ge 31:22), and some time would elapse before he could gather his "brethren." Jacob with his flocks and herds must have needed 3 weeks for the journey. It is remarkable that the vicinity of Mizpah still presents ancient monuments like the "pillar" (Ge 31:45) round which the "memorial cairn" (yeghar-sahadhutha) was formed. From this place Jacob journeyed to Mahanaim (probably Machmah), South of the Jabbok river—a place which afterward became the capital of South Gilead (Ge 32:1 f; 1Ki 4:14); but, on hearing of the advance of Esau from Edom, he retreated across the river (Ge 32:22) and then reached Succoth (Ge 33:17), believed to be Tell Der'ala, North of the stream.

(2) From the Jordan to Hebron.

Crossing the Jordan by one of several fords in this vicinity, Jacob approached Shechem by the perennial stream of Wady Far'ah, and camped at Shalem (Salim) on the east side of the fertile plain which stretches thence to Shechem, and here he bought land of the Hivites (Ge 33:18-20). We are not told that he dug a well, but the necessity for digging one in a region full of springs can only be explained by Hivite jealousy of water rights, and the well still exists East of Shechem (compare Joh 4:5 f), not far from the Elon Moreh where were buried the teraphim (Ge 35:4) or "spirits" (Assyrian, tarpu) from Haran (Ge 31:30) under the oak of Abraham. These no doubt were small images, such as are so often unearthed in Palestine. The further progress of Jacob led by Bethel and Bethlehem to Hebron (Ge 35:6,19,27), but some of his elder sons seem to have remained at Shechem. Thus, Joseph was sent later from Hebron (Ge 37:14) to visit his brethren there, but found them at Dothan.

(3) Dothan.

Dothan (Ge 37:17) lay in a plain on the main trade route from Egypt to Damascus, which crossed the low watershed at this point and led down the valley to Jezreel and over Jordan to Bashan. The "well of the pit" (SWP, II, 169) is still shown at Tell Dothan, and the Ishmaelites, from Midian and Gilead, chose this easy caravan route (Ge 37:25,28) for camels laden with the Gilead balm and spices. The plain was fitted for feeding Jacob's flocks. The products of Palestine then included also honey, pistachio nuts, and almonds (Ge 43:11); and a few centuries later we find notice in a text of Thothmes III of honey and

balsam, with oil, wine, wheat, spelt, barley and fruits, as rations of the Egyptian troops in Canaan (Brugsch, Hist Egypt, I, 332).

4. Mentioned in Connection with Judah:

The episode of Judah and Tamar is connected with a region in the Shephelah, or low hills of Judea. Adullam (‘Aid-el-ma), Chezib (‘Ain Kezbeh), and Timnath (Tibneh) are not far apart (Ge 38:1,5,12), the latter being in a pastoral valley where Judah met his "sheep shearers." Tamar sat at "the entrance of Enaim" (compare Ge 38:14,22 the English Revised Version) or Enam (Jos 15:34), perhaps at Kefr ‘Ana, 6 miles Northwest of Timnath. She was mistaken for a qedheshah, or votary (sacred prostitute) of Ashtoreth (Ge 38:15,21), and we know from Hammurabi’s laws that such votaries were already recognized. The mention of Judah’s signet and staff (Ge 38:18) also reminds us of Babylonian customs as described by Herodotus (i.195), and signet-cylinders of Babylonian style, and of early date, have been unearthed in Palestine at Gezer and elsewhere (compare the "Babylonian garment," Jos 7:21).

5. Review of the Geography of Genesis:

Generally speaking, the geography of Ge presents no difficulties, and shows an intimate knowledge of the country, while the allusions to natural products and to customs are in accord with the results of scientific discovery. Only one difficulty needs notice, where Atad (Ge 50:10) on the way from Egypt to Hebron is described as "beyond the Jordan." In this case the Assyrian language perhaps helps us, for in that tongue Yaur-danu means "the great river," and the reference may be to the Nile itself, which is called Yaur in Hebrew (ye’or) and Assyrian alike.

6. Exodus and Leviticus:

Exodus is concerned with Egypt and the Sinaitic desert, though it may be observed that its simple agricultural laws (Exodus 21-23), which so often recall those of Hammurabi, would have been needed at once on the conquest of Gilead and Bashan, before crossing the Jordan. In Leviticus 11 we have a list of animals most of which belong to the desert—as for instance the "coney" or hyrax (Le 11:5; Ps 104:18; Pr 30:26), but others—such as the swine (Le 11:7), the stork and the heron (Le 11:19)—to the ‘Arabah and the Jordan valley, while the hoopoe (the King James Version "lapwing," Le 11:19) lives in Gilead and in Western Palestine. In Deuteronomy 14 the fallow deer and the roe (14:5) are now inhabitants of Tabor and Gilead, but the "wild goat" (ibex), "wild ox" (buball), "pygarg" (addax) and "chamois" (wild sheep), are found in the ‘Arabah and in the deserts.

7. Numbers:

In Numbers, the conquest of Eastern Palestine is described, and most of the towns mentioned are known (21:18-33); the notice of vineyards in Moab (21:22) agrees with the discovery of ancient rock-cut wine presses near Heshbon (SEP, I, 221). The view of Israel, in camp at Shittim by Balaam (22:41), standing on the top of Pisgah or Mt. Nebo, has been shown to be possible by the discovery of Jebel Neba, where

also rude dolmens recalling Balak’s altars have been found (SEP, I, 202). The plateau of Moab (32:3) is described as a "land for cattle," and still supports Arab flocks. The camps in which Israel left their cattle, women and children during the wars, for 6 months, stretched (33:49) from Beth-jeshimoth (Suweimeh), near the northeastern corner of the Dead Sea over Abel-shittim ("the acacia meadow"—a name it still bears) in a plain watered by several brooks, and having good herbage in spring.

8. Deuteronomy:

(1) Physical Allusions.

The description of the "good land" in Deuteronomy (8:7) applies in some details with special force to Mt. Gilead, which possesses more perennial streams than Western Palestine throughout—"a land of brooks of water, of fountains and springs, flowing forth in valleys and hills"; a land also "of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates, a land of olive-trees and honey" is found in Gilead and Bashan. Palestine itself is not a mining country, but the words (8:9), "a land whose stones are iron, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig copper," may be explained by the facts that iron mines existed near Beirut in the 10th century AD, and copper mines at Punon North of Petra in the 4th century AD, as described by Jerome (Onomasticon, under the word "Phinon"). In Deuteronomy also (11:29; compare 27:4; Jos 8:30) Ebal and Gerizim are first noticed, as beside the "oaks of Moreh." Ebal the mountain of curses (3,077 ft. above sea-level) and Gerizim the mountain of blessings (2,850 ft.) are the two highest tops in Samaria, and Shechem lies in a rich valley between them. The first sacred center of Israel was thus established at the place where Abraham built his first altar and Jacob dug his well, where Joseph was buried and where Joshua recognized a holy place at the foot of Gerizim (Jos 24:26). The last chapters of Deuteronomy record the famous Pisgah view from Mt. Nebo (34:1-3), which answers in all respects to that from Jebel Neba, except as to Dan, and the utmost (or "western") sea, neither of which is visible. Here we should probably read "toward" rather than "to," and there is no other hill above the plains of Shittim whence a better view can be obtained of the Jordan valley, from Zoar to Jericho, of the watershed mountains as far North as Gilboa and Tabor, and of the slopes of Gilead.

(2) Archaeology.

But besides these physical allusions, the progress of exploration serves to illustrate the archaeology of Deuteronomy. Israel was commanded (12:3) to overthrow the Canaanite altars, to break the standing stones which were emblems of superstition, to burn the ‘asherah poles (or artificial trees), and to hew down the graven images. That these commands were obeyed is clear. The rude altars and standing stones are now found only in Moab, and in remote parts of Gilead, Bashan, and Galilee, not reached by the power of reforming kings of Judah. The ‘asherah poles have disappeared, the images are found, only deep under the surface. The carved tablets which remain at Damascus, and in Phoenicia and Syria, representing the gods of Canaan or of the Hittites, have no counterpart in the Holy Land. Again when we read of ancient "landmarks" (De 19:14; Pr 22:28; 23:10), we are not to understand a mere boundary stone, but rather one of those monuments common in Babylonia—as early at least as the 12th century BC—on which the boundaries of a field are minutely described, the history of its grant by the king detailed,

and a curse (compare De 27:17) pronounced against the man who should dare to remove the stone.

See illustration under NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

PALESTINE, 2

III. Palestine in the Historic Books of the Old Testament.

1. Book of Joshua:

Joshua is the great geographical book of the Old Testament; and the large majority of the 600 names of places, rivers and mountains in Palestine mentioned in the Bible are to be found in this book.

(1) Topographical Accuracy.

About half of this total of names were known, or were fixed by Dr. Robinson, between 1838 and 1852, and about 150 new sites were discovered (1872-1878, 1881-1882) in consequence of the 1-in. trigonometrical survey of the country, and were identified by the present writer during this period; a few interesting sites have been added by M. Clermont-Ganneau (Adullam and Gezer), by A. Henderson (Kiriathjearim), by W.F. Birch (Zoar at Tell esh Shaghur), and by others. Thus more than three-quarters of the sites have been fixed with more or less certainty, most of them preserving their ancient names. It is impossible to study this topography without seeing that the Bible writers had personal knowledge of the country; and it is incredible that a Hebrew priest, writing in Babylonia, could have possessed that intimate acquaintance with all parts of the land which is manifest in the geographical chapters of Joshua. The towns are enumerated in due order by districts; the tribal boundaries follow natural lines—valleys and mountain ridges—and the character of various regions is correctly indicated. Nor can we suppose that this topography refers to conditions subsequent to the return from captivity, for these were quite different. Simeon had ceased to inhabit the south by the time of David (1Ch 4:24), and the lot of Da was colonized by men of Benjamin after the captivity (1Ch 8:12,13; Ne 11:34,35). Tirzah is mentioned (Jos 12:24) in Samaria, whereas the future capital of Omri is not. Ai is said to have been made "a heap forever" (Jos 8:28), but was inhabited apparently in Isaiah’s time (Isa 10:28 = Aiath) and certainly after the captivity (Ezr 2:28; Ne 7:32; 11:31 = Aija). At latest, the topography seems to be that of Solomon’s age, though it is remarkable that very few places in Samaria are noticed in the Book of Joshua.

(2) The Passage of the Jordan.

Israel crossed Jordan at the lowest ford East of Jericho. The river was in flood, swollen by the melting snows of Hermon (Jos 3:15); the stoppage occurred 20 miles farther up at Adam (ed-Damieh), the chalky cliffs at a narrow place being probably undermined and falling in, thus damming the stream. A Moslem writer asserts that a similar stoppage occurred in the 13th century AD, near the same point. (See JORDAN.) The first camp was established at Gilgal (Jilgulieh), 3 miles East of Jericho, and a "circle" of 12 stones was erected. Jericho was not at the medieval site (er Richa) South of Gilgal, or at the Herodian

site farther West, but at the great spring ‘Ain es SulTan, close to the mountains to which the spies escaped (Jos 2:16). The great mounds were found by Sir C. Warren to consist of sun-dried bricks, and further excavations (see Mitteil. der deutschen Orient-Gesell., December, 1909, No. 41) have revealed little but the remains of houses of various dates.

(3) Joshua’s First Campaign.

The first city in the mountains attacked by Israel was Ai, near Chayan, 2 miles Southeast of Bethel. It has a deep valley to the North, as described (Jos 8:22). The fall of Ai and Bethel (Jos 8:17) seems to have resulted in the peaceful occupation of the region between Gibeon and Shechem (Jos 8:30-9:27); but while the Hivites submitted the Amorites of Jerusalem and of the South attacked Gibeon (el Jib) and were driven down the steep pass of Beth-horon (Beit ‘Aur) to the plains (Jos 10:1-11). Joshua’s great raid, after this victory, proceeded through the plain to Makkedah, now called el Mughar, from the "cave" (compare Jos 10:17), and by Libnah to Lachish (Tell el Chesy), whence he went up to Hebron, and "turned" South to Debir (edh Dhaheriyeh), thus subduing the shephelah of Judah and the southern mountains, though the capital at Jerusalem was not taken. It is now very generally admitted that the six letters of the Amorite king of Jerusalem included in Tell el-Amarna Letters may refer to this war. The ‘Abiri or Chabiri are therein noticed as a fierce people from Seir, who "destroyed all the rulers," and who attacked Ajalon, Lachish, Ashkelon, Keilah (on the main road to Hebron) and other places.

See EXODUS, THE.

(4) The Second Campaign.

The second campaign (Jos 11:1-14) was against the nations of Galilee; and the Hebrew victory was gained at "the waters of Merom" (Jos 11:5). There is no sound reason for placing these at the Chuleh lake; and the swampy Jordan valley was a very unlikely field of battle for the Canaanite chariots (Jos 11:6). The kings noticed are those of Madon (Madin), Shimron (Semmunieh), Dor (possibly Tell Thorah), "on the west," and of Hazor (Chazzur), all in Lower Galilee. The pursuit was along the coast toward Sidon (Jos 11:8); and Merom may be identical with Shimron-meron (Jos 12:20), now Semmunieh, in which case the "waters" were those of the perennial stream in Wady el Melek, 3 miles to the North, which flow West to join the lower part of the Kishon. Shimron-meron was one of the 31 royal cities of Palestine West of the Jordan (Jos 12:9-24).

The regions left unconquered by Joshua (13:2-6) were those afterward conquered by David and Solomon, including the Philistine plains, and the Sidonian coast from Mearah (el Mogheiriyeh) northward to Aphek (Afqa) in Lebanon, on the border of the Amorite country which lay South of the "land of the Hittites" (Jos 1:4). Southern Lebanon, from Gebal (Jubeil) and the "entering into Hamath" (the Eleutherus Valley) on the West, to Baal-gad (probably at ‘Ain Judeideh on the northwestern slope of Hermon) was also included in the "land" by David (2Sa 8:6-10). But the whole of Eastern Palestine (Jos 13:7-32), and of Western Palestine, except the shore plains, was allotted to the 12 tribes. Judah and Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh), being the strongest, appear to have occupied the

mountains and the shephelah, as far North as Lower Galilee, before the final allotment.

Thus, the lot of Simeon was within that inherited by Judah (Jos 19:1), and that of Da seems to have been partly taken from Ephraim, since Joseph's lot originally reached to Gezer (Jos 16:3); but Benjamin appears to have received its portion early (compare Jos 15:5-11; 16:1,2; 18:11-28). This lot was larger than that of Ephraim, and Benjamin was not then the "smallest of the tribes of Israel" (1Sa 9:21), since the destruction of the tribe did not occur till after the death of Joshua and Eleazar (Jud 20:28).

The twelve tribes were distributed in various regions which may here briefly be described. Reuben held the Moab plateau to the Arnon (Wady Mojub) on the South, and to the "river of Gad" (Wady Na'aur) on the North, thus including part of the Jordan valley close to the Dead Sea. Gad held all the West of Gilead, being separated from the Ammonites by the upper course of the Jabbok. All the rest of the Jordan valley East of the river was included in this lot. Manasseh held Bashan, but the conquest was not completed till later. Simeon had the neghebh plateau South of Beersheba. Judah occupied the mountains South of Jerusalem, with the shephelah to their West, and claimed Philistia South of Ekron. Benjamin had the Jericho plains and the mountains between Jerusalem and Bethel. The border ran South of Jerusalem to Rachel's tomb (1Sa 10:2), and thence West to Kiriath-jearim ('Erma) and Ekron. Da occupied the lower hills West of Benjamin and Ephraim, and claimed the plain from Ekron to Rakkon (Tell er Raqqeit) North of Joppa. Manasseh had a large region, corresponding to Samaria, and including Carmel, Sharon and half the Jordan valley, with the mountains North of Shechem; but this tribe occupied only the hills, and was unable to drive the Cannanites out of the plains (Jos 17:11,16) Ephraim also complained of the smallness of its lot (Jos 17:15), which lay in rugged mountains between Bethel and Shechem, including however, the grain plateau East of the latter city. Issachar held the plains of Esdraelon and Dothan, with the Jordan valley to the East, but soon became subject to the Canaanites. Zebulun had the hills of Lower Galilee, and the coast from Carmel to Accho. Naphtali owned the mountains of Upper Galilee, and the rich plateau between Tabor and the Sea of Galilee. Asher had the low hills West of Naphtali, and the narrow shore plains from Accho to Tyre. Thus each tribe possessed a proportion of mountain land fit for cultivation of figs, olives and vines, and of arable land fit for corn. The areas allotted appear to correspond to the density of population that the various regions were fitted to support.

The Levitical cities were fixed in the various tribes as centers for the teaching of Israel (De 33:10), but a Levite was not obliged to live in such a city, and was expected to go with his course annually to the sacred center, before they retreated to Jerusalem on the disruption of the kingdom (2Ch 11:14). The 48 cities (Jos 21:13-42) include 13 in Judah and Benjamin for the priests, among which Beth-shemesh (1Sa 6:13,15) and Anathoth (1Ki 2:26) are early noticed as Levitical. The other tribes had 3 or 4 such cities each, divided among Kohathites (10), Gershonites (13), and Merarites (12). The six Cities of Refuge were included in the total, and were placed 3 each side of the Jordan in the South, in the center, and in the North, namely Hebron, Shechem and Kedesh on the West, and Bezer (unknown), Ramoth (Reimun) and Golan (probably Sachem el Jaulan) East of the river. Another less perfect list of these cities, with 4 omissions and 11 minor differences, mostly clerical, is given in 1Ch 6:57-81. Each of these cities had "suburbs," or open spaces, extending (Nu 35:4) about a quarter-mile beyond the wall, while the fields, to about half a mile distant, also belonged to the Levites (Le 25:34).

2. Book of Judges:

(1) Early Wars.

In Judges, the stories of the heroes who successively arose to save Israel from the heathen carry us to every part of the country. "After the death of Joshua" (Jud 1:1) the Canaanites appear to have recovered power, and to have rebuilt some of the cities which he had ruined. Judah fought the Perizzites ("villagers") at Berek (Berqah) in the lower hills West of Jerusalem, and even set fire to that city. Caleb attacked Debir (Jsg 1:12-15), which is described (compare Jos 15:15-19) as lying in a "dry" (the King James Version "south") region, yet with springs not far away. The actual site (edh Dhaheriyeh) is a village with ancient tombs 12 miles Southwest of Hebron; it has no springs, but about 7 miles to the Northeast there is a perennial stream with "upper and lower springs." As regards the Philistine cities (Jud 1:18), the Septuagint reading seems preferable; for the Greek says that Judah "did not take Gaza" nor Ashkelon nor Ekron, which agrees with the failure in conquering the "valley" (Jud 1:19) due to the Canaanites having "chariots of iron." The Canaanite chariots are often mentioned about this time in the Tell el-Amarna Letters and Egyptian accounts speak of their being plated with metals. Manasseh, Ephraim, Zebulun, Asher and Naphtali, were equally powerless against cities in the plains (Jud 1:27-33); and Israel began to mingle with the Canaanites, while the tribe of Da seems never to have really occupied its allotted region, and remained encamped in the borders of Judah till some, at least, of its warriors found a new home under Hermon (Jud 1:34; 18:1-30) in the time of Jonathan, the grandson of Moses.

(2) Defeat of Sisera.

The oppression of Israel by Jabin II of Hazor, in Lower Galilee, appears to have occurred in the time of Rameses II, who, in his 8th year, conquered Shalem (Salim, North of Taanach), Anem (‘Anin), Dapur (Deburieh, at the foot of Tabor), with Bethanath (‘Ainitha) in Upper Galilee (Brugsch, History of Egypt, II, 64). Sisera may have been an Egyptian resident at the court of Jabin (Jud 4:2); his defeat occurred near the foot of Tabor (Jud 4:14) to which he advanced East from Harosheth (el Charathiyeh) on the edge of the sea plain. His host "perished at Endor" (Ps 83:9) and in the swampy Kishon (Jud 5:21). The site of the Kedesh in "the plain of swamps" (Jud 4:11) to which he fled is doubtful. Perhaps Kedesh of Issachar (1Ch 6:72) is intended at Tell Qadeis, 3 miles North of Taanach, for the plain is here swampy in parts. The Canaanite league of petty kings fought from Taanach to Megiddo (Jud 5:19), but the old identification of the latter city with the Roman town of Legio (Lejjun) was a mere guess which does not fit with Egyptian accounts placing Megiddo near the Jordan. The large site at Mugedd‘a, in the Valley of Jezreel seems to be more suitable for all the Old Testament as well as for the Egyptian accounts (SWP, II, 90-99).

(3) Gideon’s Victory.

The subsequent oppression by Midianites and others would seem to have coincided with the troubles

which occurred in the 5th, year of Minepthah (see EXODUS, THE). Gideon's home (Jud 6:11) at Ophrah, in Manasseh, is placed by Samaritan tradition at Fer'ata, 6 miles West of Shechem, but his victory was won in the Valley of Jezreel (Jud 7:1-22); the sites of Beth-shittah (ShaTTa) and Abel-meholah ('Ain Chelweh) show how Midian fled down this valley and South along the Jordan plain, crossing the river near Succoth (Tell Der'ala) and ascending the slopes of Gilead to Jogbehah (Jubeichah) and Nobah (Jud 8:4-11). But Oreb ("the raven") and Zeeb ("the wolf") perished at "the raven's rock" and "the wolf's hollow" (compare Jud 7:25), West of the Jordan. It is remarkable (as pointed out by the present author in 1874) that, 3 miles North of Jericho, a sharp peak is now called "the raven's nest," and a ravine 4 miles farther North is named "the wolf's hollows." These sites are rather farther South than might be expected, unless the two chiefs were separated from the fugitives, who followed Zebah and Zalmunna to Gilead. In this episode "Mt. Gilead" (Jud 7:3) seems to be a clerical error for "Mt. Gilboa," unless the name survives in corrupt form at 'Ain Jalud ("Goliath's spring"), which is a large pool, usually supposed to be the spring of Harod (Jud 7:1), where Gideon camped, East of Jezreel.

The story of Abimelech takes us back to Shechem. He was made king by the "oak of the pillar" (Jud 9:6), which was no doubt Abraham's oak already noticed; it seems also to be called 'the enchanter's oak' (Jud 9:37), probably from some superstition connected with the burial of the Teraphim under it by Jacob. The place called Beer, to which Jotham fled from Abimelech (Jud 9:21), may have been Beeroth (Bireh) in the lot of Benjamin. Thebez, the town taken by the latter (Jud 9:50), and where he met his death, is now the village Tubas, 10 miles Northeast of Shechem.

The Ammonite oppression of Israel in Gilead occurred about 300 years after the Hebrew conquest (Jud 11:26), and Jephthah the deliverer returned to Mizpah (Jud 11:29), which was probably the present village Cuf (already noticed), from his exile in the "land of Tob" (Jud 11:3,6). This may have been near Taiyibeh, 9 miles South of Gadara, in the extreme North of Gilead—a place notable for its ancient dolmens and rude stone monuments, such as occur also at Mizpah. Jephthah's dispute with the men of Ephraim (Jud 12:1) indicates the northern position of Mizpah. Aroer (Jud 11:33) is unknown, but lay near Rabbath-ammon (Jos 13:25; 2Sa 24:5); it is to be distinguished from Aroer ('Ar'air) in the Arnon ravine, mentioned in Jud 11:26.

The scene of Samson's exploits lies in the shephelah of Judah on the borders of Philistia. His home at Zorah (Sur'ah) was on the hills North of the Valley of Sorek, and looked down on "the camp of Dan" (Jud 13:25 margin), which had been pitched in that valley near Beth-shemesh. Eshtaol (Eshu'a) was less than 2 miles East of Zorah on the same ridge. Timnath (Jud 14:1) was only 2 miles West of Beth-shemesh, at the present ruin Tibneh. The region was one of vineyards (Jud 14:5), and the name Sorek (Surik) still survives at a ruin 2 miles West of Zorah. Sorek signified a "choice vine," and a rock-cut wine press exists at the site (SWP, III, 126). These 5 places, all close together, were also close to the Philistine grain lands (Jud 15:5) in a region of vines and olives. Samson's place of refuge in the "cleft of the rock of Etam" (see Jud 15:8) was probably at Beit 'ATab, only 5 miles East of Zorah, but rising with a high knoll above the southern precipices of the gorge which opens into the Valley of Sorek. In this knoll, under the village, is a rock passage now called "the well of refuge" (Bur el Chasutah), which may have been the "cleft" into which Samson "went down." Lehi (Jud 15:9) was apparently in the valley

beneath, and the name ("the jaw") may refer to the narrow mouth of the gorge whence, after conference with the Philistines, the men of Judah "went down" (Jud 15:11) to the "cleft of the rock of Etam" (SWP, III, 83, 137), which was a passage 250 ft. long leading down, under the town, to the spring. All of Samson's story is connected with this one valley (for Delilah also lived in the "Valley of Sorek," Jud 16:4) except his visit to Gaza, where he carried the gates to the 'hill facing Hebron' (Jud 16:3), traditionally shown (SWP, III, 255) at the great mound on the East side of this town where he died, and where his tomb is (wrongly) shown. Another tomb, close to Zorah, represents a more correct tradition (16:31), but the legends of Samson at this village are of modern Christian origin.

The appendix to Judges includes two stories concerning Levites who both lived in the time of the 2nd generation after the Hob conquest (18:30; 20:28), and who both "sojourned" in Bethlehem of Judah (17:8; 19:2), though their proper city was one in Mt. Ephraim, In the first case Jonathan, the grandson of Moses, founded a family of idolatrous priests, setting up Micah's image at Da (Tell el Qadi) beside the sources of the Jordan, where ancient dolmen altars still exist. This image may have been the cause why Jeroboam afterward established a calf-temple at the same place. It is said to have stood there till the "captivity of the ark" (St. Petersburg MS, Jud 18:30), "all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh" (Jud 18:31). From this narrative we learn that the tribe of Da did not settle in its appointed lot (Jud 18:1), but pitched in the "camp of Dan," west of Kiriath-jearim (Jud 18:12). This agrees with the former mention of the site (Jud 13:25) as being near Zorah; and the open valley near Beth-shemesh is visible, through the gorges of Lehi, from the site of Kiriath-jearim at 'Erma.

(4) Appendix: The Defeat of Benjamin.

In the 2nd episode we trace the journey of the Levite from Bethlehem past Jerusalem to Gibeah (Jeba'), East of Ramah (er-Ram), a distance which could easily be traversed in an afternoon (compare Jud 19:8-14). Gibeah was no doubt selected as a halting-place by the Levite, because it was a Levitical city. The story of the great crime of the men of Gibeah was well known to Hosea (Jud 9:9). Israel gathered against them at Mizpah (Tell en Nacbeh) on the watershed, 3 miles to the Northwest, and the ark was brought by Phinehas to Bethel (compare Jud 20:1,31; 18:26,27), 3 miles Northeast of Mizpah. The defeat of Benjamin occurred where the road to Gibeah leaves the main north road to Bethel (Jud 18:31), West of Ramah. The survivors fled to the rock Rimmon (Rummon), 3 1/2 miles East of Bethel, on the edge of the "wilderness" which stretches from this rugged hill toward the Jordan valley. The position of Shiloh, 9 miles North of this rock, is very accurately described (Jud 21:19) as being North of Bethel (Beitin), and East of the main road, thence to Shechem which passes Lebonah (Lubban), a village 3 miles Northwest of Seilun or Shiloh. The "vineyards," in which the maidens of Shiloh used to dance (Jud 21:20) at the Feast of Tabernacles, lay no doubt where vineyards still exist in the little plain South of this site. It is clear that the writer of these two narratives had an acquaintance with Palestinian topography as exact as that shown throughout Jgs. Nor (if the reading "captivity of the ark" be correct) is there any reason to suppose that they were written after 722 BC.

3. Book of Ruth:

The Book of Ru gives us a vivid picture of Hebrew life "when the judges ruled" (1:1 the King James Version), about a century before the birth of David. Laws as old as Hammurabi's age allowed the widow the choice of remaining with the husband's family, or of quitting his house (compare 1:8). The beating out of gleanings (2:17) by women is still a custom which accounts for the rock mortars found so often scooped out on the hillside. The villager still sleeps, as a guard, beside the heap of winnowed grain in the threshing-floor (3:7); the head-veil, still worn, could well have been used to carry six measures of barley (3:15). The courteous salutation of his reapers by Boaz (2:4) recalls the common Arabic greeting (Allah ma'kum), "God be with you." But the thin wine (2:14) is no longer drunk by Moslem peasants, who only "dip" their bread in oil.

4. Books of Samuel:

(1) Samuel.

The two Books of Samuel present an equally valuable picture of life, and an equally real topography throughout. Samuel's father—a pious Levite (1Ch 6:27)—descended from Zuph who had lived at Ephratah (Bethlehem; compare 1Sa 9:4,5), had his house at Ramah (1Sa 1:19) close to Gibeah, and this town (er-Ram) was Samuel's home also (1Sa 7:17; 25:1). The family is described as 'Ramathites, Zuphites of Mt. Ephraim' (1Sa 1:1), but the term "Mt. Ephraim" was not confined to the lot of Ephraim, since it included Bethel and Ramah, in the land of Benjamin (Jud 4:5). As a Levite, Elkanah obeyed the law of making annual visits to the central shrine, though this does not seem to have been generally observed in an age when "every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jud 21:25). The central shrine had been removed by Joshua from Shechem to the remote site of Shiloh (Jos 22:9), perhaps for greater security, and here the tabernacle (Jos 22:19) was pitched (compare 1Sa 2:22) and remained for 4 centuries till the death of Eli. The great defeat of Israel, when the ark was captured by the Philistines, took place not far from Mizpah (1Sa 4:1), within an easy day's journey from Shiloh (compare 1Sa 4:12). Ekron, whence it was sent back (1Sa 6:16), was only 12 miles from Beth-shemesh ('Ainshems), where the ark rested on a "great stone" (Septuagint, 1Sa 6:18); and Beth-shemesh was only 4 miles West of Kiriath-jearim (1Sa 6:21), which was in the mountains, so that its inhabitants "came down" from "the hill" (1Sa 6:21; 7:1) to fetch the ark, which abode there for 20 years, till the beginning of Saul's reign (1Sa 14:18), when, after the war, it may have been restored to the tabernacle at Nob, to which place the latter was probably removed after Eli's death, when Shiloh was deserted. The exact site of Nob is not known, but probably (compare Isa 10:32) it was close to Mizpah, whence the first glimpse of Jerusalem is caught, and thus near Gibeon, where it was laid up after the massacre of the priests (1Sa 21:1; 22:9,18; 2Ch 1:3), when the ark was again taken to Kiriath-jearim (2Sa 6:2). Mizpah (Tell en-Nacbeh) was the gathering-place of Israel under Samuel; and the "stone of help" (Eben-ezer) was erected, after his victory over the Philistines, "between Mizpah and Shen" (1Sa 7:12)—the latter place (see Septuagint) being probably the same as Jeshanah ('Ain Sinai), 6 miles North of Mizpah which Samuel visited yearly as a judge (1Sa 7:16).

(2) Saul's Search.

The journey of Saul, who, "seeking asses found a kingdom," presents a topography which has often been misunderstood. He started (1Sa 9:4) from Gibeah (Jeba') and went first to the land of Shalisha through Mt. Ephraim. Baal-shalisha (2Ki 4:42) appears to have been the present Kefr Thilth, 18 miles North of Lydda and 24 miles Northwest from Gibeah. Saul then searched the land of Shalim—probably that of Shual (1Sa 13:17), Northeast of Gibeah. Finally he went south beyond the border of Benjamin (1Sa 10:2) to a city in the "land of Zuph," which seems probably to have been Bethlehem, whence (as above remarked) Samuel's family—descendants of Zuph—came originally. If so, it is remarkable that Saul and David were anointed in the same city, one which Samuel visited later (1Sa 16:1,2) to sacrifice, just as he did when meeting Saul (1Sa 9:12), who was probably known to him, since Gibeah and Ramah were only 2 miles apart. Saul's journey home thus naturally lay on the road past Rachel's tomb near Bethlehem, and along the Bethel road (1Sa 10:2,3) to his home at Gibeah (1Sa 10:5,10). It is impossible to suppose that Samuel met him at Ramah—a common mistake which creates great confusion in the topography.

(3) Saul's Coronation and First Campaign.

Saul concealed the fact of his anointing (1Sa 10:16) till the lot fell upon him at Mizpah. This public choice by lot has been thought (Wellhausen, History of Israel, 1885, 252) to indicate a double narrative, but to a Hebrew there would not appear to be any discrepancy, since "The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of Yahweh" (Pr 16:33). Even at Mizpah he was not fully accepted till his triumph over the Ammonites, when the kingdom was "renewed" at Gilgal (1Sa 11:14). This campaign raises an interesting question of geography. Only 7 days' respite was allowed to the men of Jabesh in Gilead (1Sa 11:3), during which news was sent to Saul at Gibeah, and messengers dispatched "throughout the borders of Israel" (1Sa 11:7), while the hosts gathered at Bezek, and reached Jabesh on the 7th or 8th day (1Sa 11:8-10) at dawn. Bezek appears to be a different place from that West of Jerusalem (Jud 1:4) and to have been in the middle of Palestine at Ibzik, 14 miles North of Shechem, and 25 miles West of Jabesh, which probably lay in Wady Yabis in Gilead. The farthest distances for the messengers would not have exceeded 80 miles; and, allowing a day for the news to reach Saul and another for the march from Bezek to Jabesh, there would have been just time for the gathering of Israel at this fairly central meeting-place.

The scene of the victory over the Philistines at Michmash is equally real. They had a 'post' in Geba (or Gibeah, 1Sa 13:3), or a governor (compare the Septuagint), whom Jonathan slew. They came up to Michmash (Mukhmas) to attack Jonathan's force which held Gibeah, on the southern side of the Michmash valley, hard by. The northern cliff of the great gorge was called Bozez ("shining") in contrast to the southern one (in shadow) which was named Seneh or "thorn" (1Sa 14:4). Josephus (BJ, V, ii, 2) says that Gibeah of Saul was by "the valley of thorns," and the ravine, flanked by the two precipitous cliffs East of Michmash, is still called Wady es SuweiniT, or "the valley of little thorn trees." Jonathan climbed the steep slope that leads to a small flat top (1Sa 14:14 the King James Version), and surprised the Philistine 'post.' The pursuit was by Bethel to the Valley of Aijalon, down the steep Beth-boron pass (1Sa 14:23,31); but it should be noted that there was no "wood" (1Sa 14:25,26) on this bare hilly ridge, and the word (compare So 5:1) evidently means "honeycomb." It is also possible that the altar raised by Saul, for fulfillment of the Law (Ge 9:4; Ex 20:25), was at Nob where the central shrine was then

established.

(4) David’s Early Life.

David fed his flocks in the wilderness below Bethlehem, where many a silent and dreadful "Valley of Shadows" (compare Ps 23:4) might make the stoutest heart fail. The lion crept up from the Jordan valley, and (on another occasion) the bear came down from the rugged mountains above (1Sa 17:34). No bears are now known South of Hermon, but the numerous references (2Ki 2:24; Isa 59:11; Ho 13:8; Pr 17:12; 28:15) show that they must have been exterminated, like the lion, in comparatively late times. The victory over Goliath, described in the chapter containing this allusion, occurred in the Valley of Elah near Shochoth (Shuweikeh); and this broad valley (Wady es SunT) ran into the Philistine plain at the probable site of Gath (Tell es Cafi) to which the pursuit led (1Sa 17:1,2,52). The watercourse still presents "smooth stones" (1Sa 17:40) fit for the sling, which is still used by Arab shepherds; and the valley still has in it fine "terebinths" such as those from which it took its name Elah. The bronze armor of the giant (1Sa 17:5,6) indicates an early stage of culture, which is not contradicted by the mention of an iron spearhead (1Sa 17:7), since iron is found to have been in use in Palestine long before David’s time. The curious note (1Sa 17:54) as to the head of Goliath being taken "to Jerusalem" is also capable of explanation. Jerusalem was not conquered till at least 10 years later, but it was a general practice (as late as the 7th century BC in Assyria) to preserve the heads of dead foes by salting them, as was probably done in another case (2Ki 10:7) when the heads of Ahab’s sons were sent from Samaria to Jezreel to be exposed at the gate.

David’s outlaw life began when he took refuge with Samuel at the "settlements" (Naioth) near Ramah, where the company of prophets lived. He easily met Jonathan near Gibeah, which was only 2 miles East; and the "stone of departure" ("Ezel," 1Sa 20:19) may have marked the Levitical boundary of that town. Nob also (1Sa 20:1) was, as we have seen, not far off, but Gath (1Sa 20:10) was beyond the Hebrew boundary. Thence David retreated up the Valley of Elah to Adullam (‘Aid-el-ma), which stood on a hill West of this valley near the great turn (southward) of its upper course. An inhabited cave still exists here (compare 1Sa 22:1), and the site meets every requirement (SWP, III, 311, 347, 361-67). Keilah (1Sa 23:1) is represented by the village Kila, on the east side of the same valley, 3 miles farther up; and Hereth (1Sa 22:5) was also near, but "in Judah" (1Sa 23:3), at the village Kharas on a wooded spur 7 miles Northwest of Hebron. Thence David went "down" (1Sa 23:4) to Keilah 2 miles away to the West. As there was no safety for the outlaws, either in Philistia or in Judah, they had to retreat to the wilderness of Ziph (Tell ez Zif), 4 miles Southeast of Hebron. The word "wood" (choresh) may more probably be a proper name, represented by the ruin of Khoreisa, rather more than a mile South of Ziph, while the hill Hachilah (1Sa 23:19) might be the long spur, over the Jeshimon or desert of Judah, 6 miles East of Ziph, now called el Kola. Maon (M‘ain) lay on the edge of the same desert still farther South, about 8 miles from Hebron. En-gedi (1Sa 23:29; 24:1,2) was on the precipices by the Dead Sea. The "wild goats" (ibex) still exist here in large droves, and the caves of this desert are still used as folds for sheep in spring (1Sa 24:3). The villagers South of Hebron are indeed remarkable for their large flocks which—by agreement with the nomads—are sent to pasture in the Jeshimon, like those of Nabal, the rich man of Carmel (Kurmul), a mile North of Maon (1Sa 25:2), who refused the customary present to David’s band which had protected his shepherds "in the fields" (1Sa 25:15) or pastures of the

wilderness. In summer David would naturally return to the higher ridge of Hachilah (1Sa 26:1) on the south side of which there is a precipitous gorge (impassable save by a long detour), across which he talked to Saul (1Sa 26:13), likening himself (1Sa 26:20) to the desert "partridge" still found in this region.

(5) The Defeat and Death of Saul.

The site of Ziklag is doubtful, but it evidently lay in the desert South of Beersheba (Jos 15:31; 19:5; 1Ch 4:30; 1Sa 27:6-12), far from Gath, so that King Achish did not know whether David had raided the South of Judah, or the tribes toward Shur. Saul's power in the mountains was irresistible; and it was for this reason perhaps that his fatal battle with the Philistines occurred far North in the plain near Jezreel. They camped (1Sa 28:4) by the fine spring of Shunem (Sulem), and Saul on Gilboa to the South. The visit to Endor (Andur) was thus a perilous adventure, as Saul must have stolen by night round the Philistine host to visit this place North of Shunem. He returned to the spur of Gilboa on which Jezreel stands (1Sa 29:1), and the spring noticed is a copious supply North of the village Zer'in. Beth-shan (1Sa 31:12) was at the mouth of the valley of Jezreel at Besian, and here the bodies of Saul and his sons were burned by the men of Jabesh-gilead; but, as the bones were preserved (1Sa 31:13; 2Sa 21:13), it is possible that the corpses were cremated in pottery jars afterward buried under the tree. Excavations in Palestine and in Babylonia show that this was an early practice, not only in the case of infants (as at Gezcr, and Taanach), but also of grown men. See PALESTINE EXPLORATION. The list of cities to which David sent presents at the time of Saul's death (1Sa 30:26-31) includes those near Ziklag and as far North as Hebron, thus referring to "all the places where David himself and his men were wont to haunt."

(6) Wellhausen's Theory of a Double Narrative.

The study of David's wanderings, it may be noted, and of the climatic conditions in the Jeshimon desert, does not serve to confirm Wellhausen's theory of a double narrative, based on the secret unction and public choice of Saul, on the double visit to Hachilah, and on the fact that the gloomy king had forgotten the name of David's father. The history is not a "pious make-up" without "a word of truth" (Wellhausen, Hist Israel, 248-49); and David, as a "youth" of twenty years, may yet have been called a "man of war"; while "transparent artifice" (p. 251) will hardly be recognized by the reader of this genuine chronicle. Nor was there any "Aphek in Sharon" (p. 260), and David did not "amuse himself by going first toward the north" from Gibeah (p. 267); his visit to Ramah does not appear to be a "worthless anachronistic anecdote" (p. 271); and no one who has lived in the terrible Jeshimon could regard the meeting at Hachilah as a "jest" (p. 265). Nor did the hill ("the dusky top") "take its name from the circumstance," but Wellhausen probably means the Sela'-ha-machleqoth ("cliff of slippings" or of "slippings away"), now Wady Malaqeh near Maon (compare 1Sa 23:19,24,28), which lay farther South than Ziph.

(7) Early Years of David's Reign.

David, till the 8th year of his reign, was king of Judah only. The first battle with Saul's son occurred at

Gibeon (2Sa 2:13), where the "pool" was no doubt the cave of the great spring at el Jib; the pursuit was by the ‘desert Gibeon road’ (2Sa 2:24) toward the Jordan valley. Gibeon itself was not in a desert, but in a fertile region. Abner then deserted to David, but was murdered at the "well of Sirah" (‘Ain Sarah) on the road a mile North of David’s capital at Hebron. Nothing more is said about the Philistines till David had captured Jerusalem, when they advanced on the new capital by the valley of Rephaim (2Sa 5:22), which apparently ran from South of Jerusalem to join the valley of Elah. If David was then at Adullam ("the hold," 2Sa 5:17 the King James Version; compare 1Sa 22:5), it is easy to understand how he cut off the Philistine retreat (2Sa 5:23), and thus conquered all the hill country to Gezer (2Sa 5:25). After this the ark was finally brought from Baale-judah (Kiriath-jearim) to Jerusalem (2Sa 6:2), and further wars were beyond the limits of Western Palestine, in Moab (2Sa 8:2) and in Syria (2Sa 8:3-12); but for "Syrians" (2Sa 8:13) the more correct reading appears to be Edomites (1Ch 18:12), and the "Valley of Salt" was probably South of the Dead Sea. Another war with the Syrians, aided by Arameans from East of the Euphrates, occurred East of the Jordan (2Sa 10:16-18), and was followed by the siege of Rabbath-ammon (‘Amman), East of Gilead, where we have notice of the "city of waters" (2Sa 12:27), or lower town by the stream, contrasted, it seems, with the citadel which was on the northern hill.

(8) Hebrew Letter-writing.

In this connection we find the first notice of a "letter" (2Sa 11:14) as written by David to Joab. Writing is of course noticed as early as the time of Moses when—as we now know—the Canaanites wrote letters on clay tablets in cuneiform script. These, however, were penned by special scribes; and such a scribe is mentioned early (Jud 8:14). David himself may have employed a professional writer (compare 2Sa 8:17), while Uriah, who carried his own fate in the letter, was probably unable to read. Even in Isaiah’s time the art was not general (Isa 29:12), though Hebrew kings could apparently write and read (De 17:18; 2Ki 19:14); to the present day the accomplishment is not general in the East, even in the upper class. It should be noted that the first evidence of the use of an alphabet is found in the early alphabetic Psalms, and the oldest dated alphabetic text yet known is later than 900 BC. The script used in the time of Moses may have been cuneiform, which was still employed at Gezer for traders’ tablets in 649 BC. The alphabet may have come into use first among Hebrews, through Phoenician influence in the time of David; and so far no script except this and the cuneiform has been unearthed in Palestine, unless it is to be recognized in signs of the Hittite syllabary at Lachish and Gezer. Another interesting point, as regards Hebrew civilization in David’s time, is the first mention of "mules" (2Sa 13:29; 18:9; 1Ki 1:33,38), which are unnoticed in the Pentateuch. They are represented as pack animals on an Assyrian bas-relief; but, had they been known to Moses, they would probably have been condemned as unclean. The sons of David fled on mules from Baal-hazor (Tell ‘Acur) "beside Ephraim" (now probably Taiyibeh), North of Bethel, where Absalom murdered Amnon.

(9) The Later Years of David’s Reign.

On the rebellion of Absalom David retreated to Mahanaim, apparently by the road North of the Mount of Olives, if the Targum of Jonathan (2Sa 16:5) is correct in placing Bahurim at Almon (‘Almit), Northeast of Jerusalem. It is not clear where the "wood of Ephraim," in which Absalom perished, may have been, but it was beyond Jordan in Gilead (2Sa 17:22; 18:6); and oak woods are more common there

than in Western Palestine. The latest revolt, after Absalom's death, was in the extreme north at Abel (Abil), in Upper Galilee (2Sa 20:14), after which Joab's journey is the last incident to be studied in the Books of Samuel. For census purposes he went East of the Jordan to Aroer (perhaps the city on the Arnon), to the "river of Gad" (Wady Na'aur) near Jazer, and through Gilead. Tahtim-hodshi (2Sa 24:6) is believed (on the authority of three Greek manuscripts) to be a corruption of "the Hittites at Kadesh" (Qades), the great city on the Orontes (see HITTITES), which lay on the northern boundary of David's dominions, South of the kingdom of Hamath. Thence Joab returned to Zidon and Tyre, and after visiting all Judah to Beersheba reached Jerusalem again within 10 months. The acquisition of the temple-site then closes the book.

5. Books of Kings:

(1) Solomon's Provinces.

The Books of Kings contain also some interesting questions of geography. Solomon's twelve provinces appear to answer very closely to the lots of the twelve tribes described in Josh. They included (1Ki 4:7-19) the following:

(a) Ephraim,

(b) Dan,

(c) Southern Judah (see Jos 12:17),

(d) Manasseh,

(e) Issachar,

(f) Northern Gilead and Bashan,

(g) Southern Gilead,

(h) Naphtali,

(i) Asher,

(j) part of Isaachar and probably Zebulun (the text is doubtful, for the order of 1Ki 4:17 differs in the Septuagint),

(k) Benjamin,

(1) Reuben.

The Septuagint renders the last clause (4:19), "and one Naseph (i.e. "officer"‘) in the land of Judah"—probably superior to the other twelve. Solomon’s dominions included Philistia and Southern Syria, and stretched along the trade route by Tadmor (Palmyra) to Tiphsah on the Euphrates (4:21,24; compare 9:18 = Tamar; 2Ch 8:4 = Tadmot). Another Tiphsah (now Tafsach) lay 6 miles Southwest of Shechem (2Ki 15:16). Gezer was presented to Solomon’s wife by the Pharaoh (1Ki 9:16).

(2) Geography of the Northern Kingdom.

Jeroboam was an Ephraimite (1Ki 11:26) from Zereda, probably Curdah, 2 miles Northwest of Bethel, but the Septuagint reads "Sarira," which might be Carra, 1 1/2 miles East of Shiloh. After the revolt of the ten tribes, "Shishak king of Egypt" (1Ki 11:40; 14:25) sacked Jerusalem. His own record, though much damaged, shows that he not only invaded the mountains near Jerusalem, but that he even conquered part of Galilee. The border between Israel and Judah lay South of Bethel, where Jeroboam’s calf-temple was erected (1Ki 12:29), Ramah (er-Ram) being a frontier town with Geba and Mizpah (1Ki 15:17,22); but after the Syrian raid into Galilee (1Ki 15:20), the capital of Israel was fixed at Tirzah (1Ki 15:21), a place celebrated for its beauty (So 6:4), and perhaps to be placed at Teiacir, about 11 miles Northeast of Shechem, in romantic scenery above the Jordan valley. Omri reigned here also for six years (1Ki 16:23) before he built Samaria, which remained the capital till 722 BC. Samaria appears to have been a city at least as large as Jerusalem, a strong site 5 miles Northwest of Shechem, commanding the trade route to its west. It resisted the Assyrians for 3 years, and when it fell Sargon took away 27,290 captives. Excavations at the site will, it may be hoped, yield results of value not as yet published: See next article.

The wanderings of Elijah extended from Zarephath (Curafend), South of Sidon, to Sinai. The position of the Brook Cherith (1Ki 17:3) where—according to one reading—"the Arabs brought him bread and flesh" (1Ki 17:6) is not known. The site of this great contest with the prophets of the Tyrian Baal is supposed to be at el Machraqah ("the place of burning") at the southeastern end of the Carmel ridge. Some early king of Israel perhaps, or one of the judges (compare De 33:19), had built an altar to Yahweh above the Kishon (1Ki 18:20,40) at Carmel; but, as the water (1Ki 18:33) probably came from the river, it is doubtful whether this altar was on the "top of Carmel," 1,500 ft. above, from which Elijah’s servant had full view of the sea (1Ki 18:42,43). Elijah must have run before Ahab no less than 15 miles, from the nearest point on Carmel (1Ki 18:46) to Jezreel, and the journey of the Shunammite woman to find Elisha (2Ki 4:25) was equally long. The vineyard of Naboth in Jezreel (1Ki 21:1) was perhaps on the east of the city (now Zer‘in), where rock-cut wine presses exist. In the account of the ascension of Elijah, the expression "went down to Bethel" (2Ki 2:2) is difficult, if he went "from Gilgal" (2Ki 2:1). The town intended might be Jiljilia, on a high hill 7 miles North of Bethel. The Septuagint, however, reads "they came."

(3) Places Connected with Elisha.

The home of Elisha was at Abel-meholah (1Ki 19:16) in the Jordan valley (Jud 7:22), probably at ‘Ain Chelweh, 10 miles South of Beth-shan. If we suppose that Ophel (2Ki 5:24 the Revised Version margin), where he lived, was the present ‘Afuleh, it is not only easy to understand that he would often "pass by" Shunem (which lay between Ophel and Abel-meholah), but also how Naaman might have gone from the palace of Jezreel to Ophel, and thence to the Jordan and back again to Ophel (2Ki 5:6,14,24), in the course of a single day in his chariot. The road down the valley of Jezreel was easy, and up it Jehu afterward drove furiously, coming from Ramoth in Gilead, and visible afar off from the wall of Jezreel (2Ki 9:20). The ‘top of the ascents’ (2Ki 9:13), at Ramoth, refers no doubt to the high hill on which this city (now Reimun) stood as a strong fortress on the border between Israel and the Syrians. The flight of Ahaziah of Judah, from Jezreel was apparently North by Gur (Qara), 4 miles West of Ibleam (Yebla), on the road to "the garden house" (Beit Jenn), and thence by Megiddo (Mujedda‘) down the Jordan valley to Jerusalem (2Ki 9:27,28). Of the rebellion of Moab (2Ki 1:1; 3:4) it is enough to point out here that King Mesha’s account on the Moabite Stone agrees with the Old Testament, even in the minute detail that "men of Gad dwelt in Ataroth from of old" (compare Nu 32:34), though it lay in the lot of Reuben.

6. Post-exilic Historical Books:

The topographical notices in the books written after the captivity require but short notice. The Benjamites built up Lod (Ludd), Ono (Kerr ‘Ana) and Aijalon (Yalo), which were in the lot of Da (1Ch 8:12; Ne 11:35), and it is worthy of note that Lod (Lydda) is not to be regarded as a new town simply because not mentioned in the earlier books; for Lod is mentioned (number 64) with Ono in the lists of Thothmes III, a century before the Hebrew conquest of Palestine The author of Chronicles had access to information not to be found elsewhere in the Old Testament. His list of Rehoboam’s fortresses (2Ch 11:6-10) includes 14 towns, most of which were on the frontiers of the diminished kingdom of Judah, some being noticed (such as Shoco and Adoraim) in the list of Shishak’s conquests. He speaks of the "valley of Zephathah" (2Ch 14:10), now Wady Cafieh, which is otherwise unnoticed, and places it correctly at Mareshah (Mer‘ash) on the edge of the Philistine plain. He is equally clear about the topography in describing the attack on Jehoshaphat by the Ammonites, Moabites and Edomites. They camped at En-gedi (‘Ain Jidi), and marched West toward Tekoa (Tequ‘a); and the thanksgiving assembly, after the Hebrew victory, was in the valley of Beracah (2Ch 20:1,20,26), which retains its name as Breikut, 4 miles West of Tekoa.

PALESTINE, 3

IV. Palestine in the Poetic Books of the Old Testament.

1. Book of Job:

In Job the scene is distinctively Edomite. Uz (Job 1:1; compare Ge 22:21 the English Revised Version; Jer 25:20; La 4:21) and Buz (Job 32:2; compare Ge 22:21) are the Assyrian Chazu and Bazu reached by Esarhaddon in 673 BC South of Edom. Tema and Sheba (Job 6:19) are noticed yet earlier, by Tiglath-

pileser III, and Sargon, who conquered the Thamudites and Nabateans. We have also the conjunction of snowy mountains and ice (Job 6:16) with notice of the desert and the ‘Arabah valley (24:5), which could hardly apply to any region except Edom. Again, we have a nomad population dwelling close to a city (29:4-7)—perhaps Petra, or Ma‘an in Edom. There were mines, not only in the Sinaitic desert, but at Punon in Northern Edom (compare 28:2-11). The white broom (30:4) is distinctive of the deserts of Moab and Edom. The wild donkey and the ostrich (39:5,13) are now known only in the desert East of Edom; while the stork (39:13 the Revised Version margin) could have been found only in the ‘Arabah, or in the Jordan valley. The wild ox (39:9 the Revised Version (British and American)), or Boa primigenius, is now extinct Septuagint "unicorn," Nu 23:22; De 33:17), though its bones occur in Lebanon caves. It was hunted about 1130 BC in Syria by Tiglath-pileser I (compare Ps 29:6), and is mentioned as late as the time of Isaiah (34:7) in connection with Edom; its Hebrew name (re’em) is the Assyrian rimu, attached to a representation of the beast. As regards the crocodile ("leviathan," Job 41:1), it was evidently well known to the writer, who refers to its strong, musky smell (Job 41:31), and it existed not only in Egypt but in Palestine, and is still found in the Crocodile River, North of Caesarea in Sharon. Behemoth (Job 40:15), though commonly supposed to be the hippopotamus, is more probably the elephant (on account of its long tail, its trunk, and its habit of feeding in mountains, Job 40:17,20,24); and the elephant was known to the Assyrians in the 9th century BC, and was found wild in herds on the Euphrates in the 16th century BC. The physical allusions in Job seem clearly, as a rule, to point to Edom, as do the geographical names; and though Christian tradition in the 4th century AD (St. Silvia, 47) placed Uz in Bashan, the Septuagint defines it as lying "on the boundary of Edom and Arabia." None of these allusions serves to fix dates, nor do the peculiarities of the language, though they suggest Aramaic and Arabic influences. The mention of Babylonians (Job 1:17) (Kasdim) as raiders may, however, point to about 600 BC, since they could not have reached Edom except from the North, and did not appear in Palestine between the time of Amraphel (who only reached Kadesh-barnea), and of Nebuchadnezzar. It is at least clear (Job 24:1-12) that this great poem was written in a time of general anarchy, and of Arab lawlessness.

2. Book of Psalms:

In the Psalms there are many allusions to the natural phenomena of Palestine, but there is very little detailed topography. "The mountain of Bashan" (Ps 68:15) rises East of the plateau to 5,700 ft. above sea-level; but Zalmon (Ps 68:14) is an unknown mountain (compare Zalmon, Jud 9:48). This psalm might well refer to David’s conquest of Damascus (2Sa 8:6), as Ps 72 refers to the time of Solomon, being the last in the original collection of "prayers of David". In Ps 83 (verses 6-8) we find a confederacy of Edom, Ishmael, Moab and the Hagarenes (or "wanderers" East of Palestine; compare 1Ch 5:18-22) with Gebal (in Lebanon), Ammon, Amalek, and Tyre, all in alliance with Assyria—a condition which first existed in 732 BC, when Tiglath-pileser III conquered Damascus. The reference to the "northern" ("hidden") tribes points to this date (Ps 83:3), since this conqueror made captives also in Galilee (2Ki 15:29; 1Ch 5:26; Isa 9:1).

3. Book of Proverbs:

In Proverbs the allusions are more peaceful, but not geographical. They refer to agriculture (3:10; 11:26;

12:11; 25:13), to trade (7:16; 31:14,24) and to flocks (27:23-27). The most remarkable passage (26:8) reads literally, "As he that packs a stone into the stone-heap, so is he that giveth honor to a fool." Jerome said that this referred to a superstitious custom; and the erection of stone heaps at graves, or round a pillar (Ge 31:45,46), is a widely spread and very ancient custom (still preserved by Arabs), each stone being the memorial of a visitor to the spot, who thus honors either a local ghost or demon, or a dead man —a rite which was foolish in the eyes of a Hebrew of the age in which this verse was written (see Expository Times, VIII, 399, 524).

4. So of Songs:

The geography of Canticles is specially important to a right understanding of this bridal ode of the Syrian princess who was Solomon's first bride. It is not confined, as some critics say it is, to the north, but includes the whole of Palestine and Syria. The writer names Kedar in North Arabia (So 1:5) and Egypt, whence horses came in Solomon's time (So 1:9; 1Ki 10:28,29). He knows the henna (the King James Version "camphire") and the vineyards of En-gedi (So 1:14), where vineyards still existed in the 12th century AD. He speaks of the "rose" of Sharon (So 2:1), as well as of Lebanon, with Shenir (Assyrian Saniru) and Hermon (So 4:8) above Damascus (So 7:4). He notices the pastoral slopes of Gilead. (So 6:5), and the brown pool, full of small fish, in the brook below Heshbon (So 7:4), in Moab. The locks of the "peaceful one" (So 6:13, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) pacifica) are like the thick copses of Carmel; 'the king is caught in the tangles' (So 7:5). See GALLERY. She is "beautiful as Tirzah (in Samaria), comely as Jerusalem, terrible to look at" (So 6:4 the King James Version). She is a garden and a "paradise" ("orchard") of spices in Lebanon, some of which spices (calamus, cinnamon, frankincense and myrrh) have come from far lands (So 4:12-15). Solomon's vineyard—another emblem of the bride—(So 1:6; 8:11) was in Baal-hamon, which some suppose to be Baal-hermon, still famous for its vineyards. He comes to fetch her from the wilderness (So 3:6); and the dust raised by his followers is like that of the whirlwind pillars which stalk over the dry plains of Bashan in summer. The single word "paradise" (So 4:13 margin) is hardly evidence enough to establish late date, since—though used in Persian—its etymology and origin are unknown. The word for "nuts" (Hebrew 'eghoz) is also not Persian (So 6:11), for the Arabic word jauz, is Semitic, and means a "pair," applying to the walnut which abounds in Shechem. The "rose of Sharon" (So 2:1), according to the Targum, was the white "narcisus; and the Hebrew word occurs also in Assyrian (chabacillatu), as noted by Delitzsch (quoting WAI, V, 32, number 4), referring to a white bulbous plant. Sharon in spring is covered still with wild narcissi, Arabic buceil (compare Isa 35:1,2). There is perhaps no period when such a poem is more likely to have been written than in the time of Solomon, when Israel "dwelt safely, every man under his vine and under his fig-tree" (1Ki 4:25); when the roe and the fallow deer (So 2:17; 1Ki 4:23) abounded; and when merchants (So 3:6) brought "powders" from afar; when also the dominion included Damascus and Southern Lebanon, as well as Western Palestine with Gilead and Moab.

See also SONG OF SONGS.

V. Palestine in the Prophets.

1. Isaiah:

Isaiah (1:8) likens Zion, when the Assyrian armies were holding Samaria, Moab and Philistia, to "a booth in a vineyard, a lodge in a garden of cucumbers." He refers no doubt to a "tower" (Mt 21:33), or platform, such as is to be found beside the rock-cut wine press in the deserted vineyards of Palestine; and such as is still built, for the watchman to stand on, in vineyards and vegetable gardens.

The chief topographical question (Isa 10:28-32) refers to the Assyrian advance from the north, when the outposts covered the march through Samaria (whether in 732, 722, or 702 BC) to Philistia. They extended on the left wing to Ai (Chayan), Michmash (Mukhmas), and Geba, South of the Michmash valley (Jeba‘), leading to the flight of the villagers, from Ramah (er-Ram) and the region of Gibeah—which included Ramah, with Geba (1Sa 22:6) and Migron (1Sa 14:2) or the precipice. They were alarmed also at Gallim (Beit Jala), and Anathoth (‘Anata), near Jerusalem; yet the advance ceased at Nob (compare Ne 11:32) where, as before noted, the first glimpse of Zion would be caught if Nob was at or near Mizpah (Tell en Nacbeh), on the main north road leading West of Ramah.

Another passage refers to the towns of Moab (Isa 15:1-6), and to Nimrim (Tell Nimrin) and Zoar (Tell esh Shaghur) in the valley of Shittim. The ascent of Luhith (Isa 15:5) is the present Tal‘at el Cheith, on the southern slope of Nebo (Jebel Neba). The curious term "a heifer of three years old" (compare Jer 48:34 margin) is taken from Septuagint, but might better be rendered "a round place with a group of three" (see EGLATH-SHELISHIYAH). It is noticed with the "high places" of Moab (Isa 15:2; Jer 48:35), and probably refers to one of those large and ancient stone circles, surrounding a central group of three rude pillars, which still remain in Moab (SEP, I, 187, 203,233) near Nobo and Zoar. Sibmah—probably Sumieh, 2 miles Southwest of Heshbon (Chesban)—is said to have had vines reaching to Jazer (Sa‘aur, 6 miles to the North); and rock-cut wine presses still remain at Sibmah (Isa 16:8; Jer 48:32). The Bozrah mentioned with Edom (Isa 34:6; 63:1; Jer 49:13,22; Mic 2:12) is probably Buceirah, near the southern border of Moab. In the last-cited passage there is a play on the words batsrah ("fortress") and botscah for "sheepfold."

2. Jeremiah:

In Jer 1:1, Anathoth (‘Anata) is mentioned as a priests’ city (compare 1Ki 2:26). The "place" or shrine of Shiloh was deserted (Jer 7:12), but the town seems still to have been inhabited (Jer 41:5). The "pit" at Mizpah (Jer 41:6-9) may have been the great rock reservoir South of Tell en-Nacbeh. The Moabite towns noticed (Jer 48:1-5,20-24,31-45; 49:3) with Rabbah (‘Amman) have been mentioned as occurring in the parallel passages of Isaiah. The numerous petty kings in Edom, Moab, Philistia, Phoenicia, and Arabia (Jer 25:20-24) recall those named in Assyrian lists of the same age. La 4:3 recalls Job 39:14 in attributing to the ostrich want of care for her young, because she endeavors (like other birds) to escape, and thus draws away the hunter from the nest. This verse should not be regarded as showing that the author knew that whales were mammals, since the word "sea-monsters" (the King James Version) is more correctly rendered "jackals" (Revised Version) or "wild beasts."

3. Ezekiel:

In Ezekiel (chapter 27), Tyre appears as a city with a very widespread trade extending from Asia Minor to Arabia and Egypt, and from Assyria to the isles (or "coasts") of the Mediterranean. The "oaks of Bashan" (27:6; Isa 2:13; Zec 11:2) are still found in the Southwest of that region near Gilead. Judah and Israel then provided wheat, honey, oil and balm for export as in the time of Jacob. Damascus sent white wool and the wine of Helbon (Chelbon), 13 miles North, where fine vineyards still exist. The northern border described (47:15-18) is the same that marked that of the dominions of David, running along the Eleutherus River toward Zedad (Cudud). It is described also in Nu 34:8-11 as passing Riblah (Riblah) and including Ain (el ‘Ain), a village on the western slopes of the Anti-Lebanon, East of Riblah. In this passage (as in Eze 47:18) the Hauran (or Bashan plain) is excluded from the land of Israel, the border following the Jordan valley, which seems to point to a date earlier than the time when the Havvoth-jair (Nu 32:41; De 3:14; Jos 13:30; Jud 10:4; 1Ki 4:13; 1Ch 2:23), in Gilead and Bashan were conquered or built—possibly after the death of Joshua. The southern border of the land is described by Ezekiel (47:19) as reaching from Kadesh (-barnea)—probably Petra—to Tamar, which seems to be Tamrah, 6 miles Northeast of Gaza.

4. Minor Prophets:

In the Minor Prophets there are fewer topographical notices. Hosea (12:11) speaks of the altars of Gilead and Gilgal as being "as heaps in the furrows of the fields." He perhaps alludes to the large dolmen fields of this region, which still characterize the country East of the Jordan. He also perhaps speaks of human sacrifice at Bethel (13:2). In Joe (1:12) the apple tree (Hebrew tappuach, Arabic tuffach) is noticed (compare So 2:3,5; 8:5), and there seems to be no reason to doubt that the apple was cultivated, since el Muqaddasi mentions "excellent apples" at Jerusalem in the 10th century AD, though it is not now common in Palestine. The sycamore fig (Am 7:14), which was common in the plains and in the shephelah (1Ki 10:27), grew also near Jericho (Lu 19:4), where it is still to be found. In Mic (1:10-15), a passage which appears to refer to Hezekiah’s reconquest of the shephelah towns and attack on Gaza before 702 BC (2Ki 18:8; 2Ch 28:18) gives a list of places and a play on the name of each. They include Gath (Tell es Cafi), Saphir (es Safir), Lachish (Tell el-Chesy), Achzib (‘Ain Kezbeh), and Mareshah (Mer‘ash): "the glory of Israel shall come even unto Adullam" (‘Aid-el-ma) perhaps refers to Hezekiah himself (Mic 1:15). After the captivity Philistia (Zec 9:5) was still independent. See PHILISTINES. The meaning of the "mourning of Hadadrimmon in the Valley of Megiddon" (Zec 12:11) is disputed. Jerome (see Reland, Palestine Illustr., II, 891) says that the former of these names referred to a town near Jezreel (Maximianopolis, now Rummaneh, on the western side of the plain of Esdraelon), but the mourning "for an only son" was probably a rite of the Syrian god called Hadad, or otherwise Rimmon, like the mourning for Tammuz (Eze 8:14).

VI. Palestine in the Apocrypha.

1. Book of Judith:

The Book of Judith is regarded by Renan (Evangiles, 1877, 29) as a Haggadha' (legend), written in Hebrew in 74 AD. It is remarkable, however, that its geographical allusions are very correct. Judith was apparently of the tribe of Manasseh (8:2,3); and her husband, who bore this name, was buried between Dothaim (Tell Dothan) and Balamon (in Wady Belameh), East of Dothan. Her home at Bethulia was thus probably at Mithilieh, on a high hill (6:11,12), 5 miles Southeast of Dothan (SWP, II, 156), in the territory of Manasseh. The requirements of the narrative are well met; for this village is supplied only by wells (7:13,10), though there are springs at the foot of the hill to the South (7:7,12), while there is a good view over the valley to the North (10:10), and over the plain of Esdraelon to Nazareth and Tabor. Other mountains surround the village (15:3). The camp of the invaders reached from Dothart to Belmaim (Balamon) from West to East, and their rear was at Cyamon (Tell Qeimun), at the foot of Carmel. The Babylonians were allied with tribes from Carmel, Gilead and Galilee on the North with the Samaritans, and with others from Betane (probably Beth-anoth, now Belt 'Ainun, North of Hebron), Chellus (Klalach —the later Elusa—8 miles Southwest of Beersheba), and Kades ('Ain Qadis) on the way to Egypt. Among Samaritan towns South of Shechem, Ekrebel ('Aqrabeh) and Chusi (Kuzah) are mentioned, with "the brook Mochmur" (Wady el Chumr) rising North of Ekrebel and running East into the Jordan.

2. Book of Wisdom:

The philosophical Book of Wisdom has no references to Palestine; and in Ecclesiasticus the only allusions are to the palm of En-gaddi (24:14), where palms still exist, and to the "rose plant in Jericho" (24:14; compare 39:13; 50:8); the description of the rose as "growing by the brook in the field" suggests the rhododendron (Tristram, NHB, 477), which flourishes near the Jordan and grows to great size beside the brooks of Gilead.

3. 1 Maccabees:

Judas Maccabeus.—The first Book of Maccabees is a valuable history going down to 135 BC, and its geographical allusions are sometimes important. Modin, the home of Judas-Maccabaeus (1 Macc 2:15), where his brother Simon erected seven monuments visible from the sea (1 Macc 9:19; 13:25-30), was above the plain in which Cedron (Qatrah, 5 miles East of Jamnia) stood (1 Macc 15:40,41; 16:4,9), and is clearly the present village el Midieh on the low hills with a sea view, 17 miles from Jerusalem and 6 miles East of Lydda, near which latter Eusebius (Onom under the word "Modeim") places Modin. The first victory of Judas (1 Macc 3:24) was won at Beth-horon, and the second at Emmaus ('Amwas) by the Valley of Aijalon—the scenes of Joshua's victories also.

The Greeks next attempted to reach Jerusalem from the South and were again defeated at Beth-zur (1 Macc 4:29), now Beit-cur, on the watershed, 15 miles South of Jerusalem, where the road runs through a pass. Judas next (after cleansing the temple in 165 BC) marched South of the Dead Sea, attacking the Edomites at Arabattine (perhaps Akrabbim) and penetrating to the Moab plateau as far North as Jazar (1 Macc 5:3-8). On his return to Judea the heathen of Gilead and Bashan rose against the Israelites of Tubias (1 Macc 5:13) or Tobit (Taiyibeh), and the Phoenicians against the Galilean Hebrews who were, for a time, withdrawn to Jerusalem until the Hasmoneans won complete independence (1 Macc 11:7,59).

In the regions of Northern Gilead and Southern Bashan (1 Macc 5:26,36,37) Judas conquered Bosor (Bucr), Alema (Kerr el-ma), Caphon (Khisfin), Maged (perhaps el Mejd, North of ‘Amman), and Carnaim (Ashteroth-karnaim), now Tell Ashterah. The notice of a "brook" at the last-named place (1 Macc 5:42) is an interesting touch, as a fine stream runs South from the west side of the town. In 162 BC Judas was defeated at Bathzacharias (1 Macc 6:32), now Beit Skaria 9 miles South of Jerusalem, but the cause was saved by a revolt in Antioch; and in the next year he defeated Nicanor near Caphar-salama (perhaps Selmeh, near Joppa), and slew him at Adasah (‘Adaseh), 8 miles Southeast of Beth-horon (1 Macc 7:31,40,45). The fatal battle in which Judas was killed (1 Macc 9:5,15) was fought also near Beth-horon. He camped at Eleasa (Il‘asa), close by, and defeated the Greeks on his right, driving them to Mt. Azotus (or Beth-zetho, according to Josephus (Ant., XII, xi, 2)), apparently near Bir-ez-Zeit, 4 miles Northwest of Bethel; but the Greeks on his left surrounded him during this rash pursuit.

On the death of Judas, Bacchides occupied Judea and fortified the frontier towns (1 Macc 9:50,51) on all sides. Simon and Jonathan were driven to the marshes near the Jordan, but in 159 BC the Greeks made peace with Jonathan who returned to Michmash (1 Macc 9:73) and 7 years later to Jerns (1 Macc 10:1,7). Three districts on the southern border of Samaria were then added to Judea (1 Macc 10:30; 11:34), namely Lydda, Apherema (or Ephraim) now Taiyibeh, and Ramathem (er-Ram); and Jonathan defeated the Greeks in Philistia (1 Macc 10:69; 11:6). Simon was "captain" from the "Ladder of Tyre" (Ras en Naqurah), or the pass North of Accho, to the borders of Egypt (1 Macc 11:59); and the Greeks in Upper Galilee were again defeated by Jonathan, who advanced from Gennesaret to the plateau of Hazor (Chazzur), and pursued them even to Kedesh Naphtali (Qedes), northward (1 Macc 11:63,73). He was victorious even to the borders of Hamath, and the Eleutherus River (Nahr el Kebir), North of Tripoils, and defeated the Arabs, called Zabadeans (probably at Zebdany in Anti-Lebanon), on his way to Damascus (1 Macc 12:25,30,32). He fortified Adida (Chadditheh) in the shephelah (1 Macc 12:38), West of Jerusalem, where Simon awaited the Greek usurper Tryphon (1 Macc 13:13,20), who attempted to reach Jerusalem by a long detour to the South near Adoraim (Dura), but failed on account of the snow in the mountains. After the treacherous capture of Jonathan at Accho, and his death in Gilead (1 Macc 12:48; 13:23), Simon became the ruler of all Palestine to Gaza (1 Macc 13:43), fortifying Joppa, Gezer and Ashdod (1 Macc 14:34) in 140 BC. Five years later he won a final victory at Cedron (Qatrah), near Jamnia (Yebnah), but was murdered at Dok (1 Macc 16:15), near Jericho, which site was a small fort at ‘Ain Duk, a spring North of the city.

4. 2 Maccabees:

The second Book of Maccabees presents a contrast to the first in which, as we have seen, the geography is easily understood. Thus the site of Caspis with its lake (2 Macc 12:13,16) is doubtful. It seems to be placed in Idumaea, and Charax may be the fortress of Kerak in Moab (2 Macc 12:17). Ephron, West of Ashteroth-karnaim (2 Macc 12:26,27), is unknown; and Beth-shean is called by its later name Scythopolis (2 Macc 12:29), as in the Septuagint (Jud 1:27) and in Josephus (Ant., XII, viii, 5; vi, 1). A curious passage (1 Macc 13:4-6) seems to refer to the Persian burial towers (still used by Parsees), one of which appears to have existed at Berea (Aleppo), though this was not a Greek custom.

See ASMONEANS.

VII. Palestine in the New Testament.

1. Synoptic Gospels:

We are told that our Lord was born in "Bethlehem of Judea"; and theory of Neubauer, adopted by Gratz, that Bethlehem of Zebulun (Jos 19:15)—which was the present Beit-Lachm, 7 miles Northwest of Nazareth—is to be understood, is based on a mistake. The Jews expected the Messiah to appear in the home of David (Mic 5:2); and the Northern Bethlehem was not called "of Nazareth," as asserted by Rix (Tent and Testament, 258); this was a conjectural reading by Neubauer (Geog. du Talmud, 189), but the Talmud (Talm Jerusalem, Meghillah 1 1) calls the place Bethlechem-ceridh (or "of balm"), no doubt from the storax bush (Styrax officinalis) or stacte (Ex 30:34), the Arabic ‘abhar, which still abounds in the oak wood close by.

(1) Galilean Scenery.

The greater part of the life of Jesus was spent at Nazareth in Zebulun, and the ministry at Capernaum in Naphtali (compare Mt 4:13-15; Isa 9:1), with yearly visits to Jerusalem. The Gospel narratives and the symbolism of the parables constantly recall the characteristic features of Galilean scenery and nature, as they remain unchanged today. The "city set on a hill" (Mt 5:14) may be seen in any part of Palestine; the lilies of the field grow in all its plains; the "foxes have holes" and the sparrows are still eaten; the vineyard with its tower; the good plowland, amid stony and thorny places, are all still found throughout the Holy Land. But the deep lake surrounded by precipitous cliffs and subject to sudden storms, with its shoals of fish and its naked fishers; the cast nets and drag nets and small heavy boats of the Sea of Galilee, are more distinctive of the Gospels, since the lake is but briefly noticed in the Old Testament.

(2) Nazareth.

Nazareth was a little village in a hill plateau North of the plain of Esdraelon, and l, 000 ft. above it. The name (Hebrew natsarah) may mean "verdant," and it had a fine spring, but it is connected (Mt 2:23) in the Gospels with the prophecy of the "branch" (netser, Isa 11:1) of the house of David. Its population was Hebrew, for it possessed a synagogue (Lu 4:16). The "brow of the hill whereon their city was built" (Lu 4:29) is traditionally the "hill of the leap" (Jebel Qafsi), 2 miles to the South—a cliff overlooking the plain. Nazareth was not on any great highway; and so obscure was this village that it is unnoticed in the Old Testament, or by Josephus, while even a Galilean (Joh 1:46) could hardly believe that a prophet could come thence. Jerome (Onomasticon, under the word) calls it a "village"; but today it is a town with 4,000 Christians and 2,000 Moslems, the former taking their Arabic name (Nacarah) from the home of their Master.

(3) Capernaum.

Capernaum (Mt 4:13; 9:1) lay on the shore of the Sea of Galilee, apparently (Mr 14:34; Joh 6:17) in the

little plain of Gennesaret, which stretches for 3 miles on the northwest side of the lake, and which has a breadth of 2 miles. It may have stood on a low cliff (though this is rendered doubtful by the Sinaiticus manuscript rendering of Mt 11:23—"Shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?"), and it was a military station where taxes were levied (Mt 9:9), and possessed a synagogue (Mr 1:21; Lu 4:33; Joh 6:59). Christian tradition, since the 4th century AD, has placed the site at Tell Chum, where ruins of a synagogue (probably, however, not older than the 2nd century AD) exist; but this site is not in the plain of Gennesaret, and is more probably Kephar ‘Achim (Babylonian Talmud, Menachoth 85a). Jewish tradition (Midrash, Qoheleth, vii.20) connects Capernaum with minim or "heretics"—that is to say Christians—whose name may yet linger at ‘Ain Minyeh at the north end of the plain of Gennesaret. Josephus states (BJ, III, x, 8) that the spring of Capernaum watered this plain, and contained the catfish (coracinus) which is still found in ‘Ain el Mudawwerah ("the round spring"), which is the principal source of water in the Gennesaret oasis.

(4) Chorazin.

The site of Chorazin (Kerazeh) has never been lost. The ruined village lies about 2 1/4 miles North of Tell Chum and possesses a synagogue of similar character. Bethsaida ("the house of fishing") is once said to have been in Galilee (Joh 12:21), and Reland (Palestine Illustr., II, 553-55) thought that there were two towns of the name. It is certain that the other notices refer to Bethsaida, called Julias by Herod Philip, which Josephus (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; iv, 6; BJ, III, x, 7) and Pliny (NH, v.15) place East of the Jordan, near the place where it enters the Sea of Galilee. The site may be at the ruin edition Dikkeh ("the platform"), now 2 miles North of the lake, but probably nearer of old, as the river deposit has increased southward. There are remains of a synagogue here also. The two miracles of feeding the 5,000 and the 4,000 are both described as occurring’ East of the Jordan, the former (Lu 9:10) in the desert (of Golan) "belonging to the city called Bethsaida" (the King James Version). The words (Mr 6:45 the King James Version), "to go to the other side before unto Bethsaida," may be rendered without any straining of grammar, "to go to the side opposite to Bethsaida." For the disciples are not said to have reached that city; but, after a voyage of at least 3 or 4 miles (Joh 6:17,19), they arrived near Capernaum, and landed in Gennesaret (Mr 6:53), about 5 miles Southwest of the Jordan.

(5) Country of the Gerasenes.

The place where the swine rushed down a steep place into the lake (Mt 8:32; Mr 5:1; Lu 8:26) was in the country of the Gerasenes (see Codex Vaticanus MS), probably at Qersa on the eastern shore opposite Tiberias, where there is a steep slope to the water. It should be noted that this was in Decapolis (Mr 5:20), a region of "ten cities" which lay (except Scythopolis) in Southwest Bashan, where a large number of early Greek inscriptions have been found, some of which (e.g. Vogue-Waddington, numbers 2412, 2413) are as old as the 1st century AD. There was evidently a Greek population in this region in the time of our Lord; and this accounts for the feeding of swine, otherwise distinctive of "a far country" (Lu 15:13,15); for, while no Hebrew would have tended the unclean beast in Palestine, the Greeks were swine-herds from the time at least of Homer.

(6) Magadan-Magdala.

The site of Magadan-Magdala (Mejdel) was on the west shore at the Southwest end of the Gennesaret plain (Mt 15:39). In Mr 8:10 we find Dalmanutha instead. Magdala was the Hebrew mighdol ("tower"), and Dalmanutha may be regarded as the Aramaic equivalent (De'almanutha) meaning "the place of high buildings"; so that there is no necessary discrepancy between the two accounts. From this place Jesus again departed by ship to "the other side," and reached Bethsaida (Mt 16:5; Mr 8:13,22), traveling thence up the Jordan valley to Caesarea Philippi (Mt 16:13; Mr 8:27), or Banias, at the Jordan springs. There can be little doubt that the "high mountain apart" (Mt 17:1) was Hermon. The very name signifies "separate," applying to its solitary dome; and the sudden formation of cloud on the summit seems to explain the allusion in Lu 9:34.

(7) Other Allusions in the Synoptic Gospels.

Other allusions in the Synoptic Gospels, referring to natural history and customs, include the notice of domestic fowls (Mt 23:37; 26:34), which are never mentioned in the Old Testament. They came from Persia, and were introduced probably after 400 BC. The use of manure (Lu 13:8) is also unnoticed in the Old Testament, but is mentioned in the Mishna (Shebi'ith, ii.2), as is the custom of annually whitening sepulchers (Mt 23:27; Sheqalim, i.1). The removal of a roof (Mr 2:4; compare Lu 5:19) at Capernaum was not difficult, if it resembled those of modern Galilean mud houses, though the Third Gospel speaks of "tiles" which are not now used. Finally, the presence of shepherds with their flocks (Lu 2:8) is not an indication of the season of the nativity, since they remain with them "in the field" at all times of the year; and the "manger" (Lu 2:7) may have been (as tradition affirmed even in the 2nd century AD) in a cave like those which have been found in ruins North and South of Hebron (SWP, III, 349, 369) and elsewhere in Palestine

2. Fourth Gospel:

(1) The topography of the Fourth Gospel is important as indicating the writer's personal knowledge of Palestine; for he mentions several places not otherwise noticed in the New Testament. Beth-abarah (Joh 1:28, the Revised Version (British and American) "Bethany"; 10:40), or "the house of the crossing," was "beyond the Jordan." Origen rejected the reading "Bethania," instead of Beth-abarah, common in his time, and still found in the three oldest uncial manuscripts in the 4th and 5th centuries AD. The place was a day's journey from Cana (compare Joh 1:29,35,43; 2:1), which may have been at 'Ain Qana, a mile North of Nazareth. It was two or three days' distance from Bethany near Jerusalem (Joh 10:40; 11:3,6,17), and would thus lie in the upper part of the Jordan valley where, in 1874, the surveyors found a ford well known by the name 'Abarah, North of Beisan, in the required situation. John, we are told, baptized in "all the region round about the Jordan" (Mt 3:5), including the waters of "AEnon near to Salim" (Joh 3:23). There is only one stream which answers to this description, namely that of Wady Far'ah, Northeast of Shechem, on the boundary of Judea and Samaria, where there is "much water." AEnon would be 'Ainun, 4 miles North, and Salim is Salim, 4 miles South of this perennial affluent of the Jordan.

(2) The site of Sychar (Samaritan: Iskar, Arabic: ‘Askar) near Jacob’s well (Joh 4:5,6) lay West of Salim, and just within the Samaritan border. The present village is only half a mile North of the well. Like the preceding sites, it is noticed only in the Fourth Gospel, as is Bethesda, while this Gospel also gives additional indications as to the position of Calvary. The town of Ephraim, "near to the wilderness" (Joh 11:54), is noticed earlier (2Sa 13:23; compare Ephraim, 2Ch 13:19 margin), and appears to be the same as Apherema (1 Macc 11:34), and as Ophrah of Benjamin (Jos 18:23; 1Sa 13:17). Eusebius (Onom under the word) places it 20 Roman miles North of Jerusalem, where the village Taiyibeh looks down on the desert of Judah.

3. Book of Acts:

In the Book of Ac the only new site, unnoticed before, is that of Antipatris (23:31). This stood at the head of the stream (Me-jarkon) which runs thence to the sea North of Joppa, and it was thus the half-way station between Jerusalem and the seaside capital at Caesarea. The site is now called Ras el ‘Ain ("head of the spring"), and a castle, built in the 12th century, stands above the waters. The old Ro road runs close by (SWP, II, 258). Caesarea was a new town, founded by Herod the Great about 20 BC (SWP, II, 13-29). It was even larger than Jerusalem, and had an artificial harbor. Thence we may leave Palestine with Paul in 60 AD. The reader must judge whether this study of the country does not serve to vindicate the sincerity and authenticity of Bible narratives in the Old Testament and the New Testament alike.

LITERATURE

Though the literature connected with Palestine is enormous, and constantly increasing, the number of really original and scientific sources of knowledge is (as in other cases) not large. Besides the Bible, and Josephus, the Mishna contains a great deal of valuable information as to the cultivation and civilization of Palestine about the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. The following 20 works are of primary importance. The Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome shows intimate acquaintance with Palestine in the 4th century AD, though the identification of Bible sites is as often wrong as right. The rabbinical geography is discussed by A. Neubauer (La geographie du Talmud, 1868), and the scattered notices by Greek and Roman writers were collected by H. Reland (Palaestina ex monumentis veteribus illustrata, 2 volumes, 1714). The first really scientific account of the country is that of Dr. E. Robinson (Biblical Researches, 1838, and Later Biblical Researches, 1852; in 3 volumes, 1856). The Survey of Western Palestine (7 volumes, 1883) includes the present writer’s account of the natural features, topography and surface remains of all ages, written while in command (1872-1878) of the 1-inch trigonometric survey. The Survey of Eastern Palestine (1 vol, 1889) gives his account of Moab and Southern Gilead, as surveyed in 1881-1882. The natural history is to be studied in the same series, and in Canon Tristram’s Natural History of the Bible, 1868. The geology is best given by L. Lartet (Essai sur la geologie de la Palestine) and in Professor Hull’s Memoir on the Geol. and Geog. of Arabia Petrea, etc., 1886. The Archaeological Researches of M. Clermont-Ganneau (2 volumes, 1896) include his discoveries of Gezer and Adullam. Much information is scattered through the PEFQ, (1864-1910) and in ZDPV. G. Schumacher’s Across the Jordan, 1885, Pella, 1888, and Northern ‘Ajlun, 1890, give detailed information for Northeast Palestine;

and Lachish, by Professor Flinders Petrie, is the memoir of the excavations which he began at Tell el-Chesy (identified in 1874 by the present writer), the full account being in A Mound of Many Cities by F. J. Bliss, 1894. Other excavations, at Gath, etc., are described in Excavations in Palestine (1898-1900), by F.J. Bliss, R.A.S. Macalister, and Professor Wunsch; while the memoir of his excavations at Gezer (2 volumes) has recently been published by Professor Macalister. For those who have not access to these original sources, The Historical Geography of the Holy Land by Professor G.A. Smith, 1894, and the essay (300 pp.) by Professor D.F. Buhl (Geographie des alten Palastina, 1896) will be found useful. The best guide book to Palestine is still that of Baedeker, written by Dr. A. Socin and published in 18765, 1912. This author had personal acquaintance with the principal routes of the country. Only standard works of reference have been herein mentioned, to which French, German, American, and British explorers and scholars have alike contributed.

See JERUSALEM.

C. R. Conder

PALLU, PALLUITES

pal’-u, pal’-u-its (pallu’," distinguished"): A son of Reuben (Ge 46:9 ("Phallu"); Ex 6:14; Nu 26:5,8; 1Ch 5:3). Perhaps Peleth of Nu 16:1 is the same. Palluites, the patronymic, occurs in Nu 26:5.

PALM (OF THE HAND)

pam (kaph): The Hebrew word which is used in a variety of senses (see HAND; PAW) is usually translated "hand" in English Versions of the Bible, but the translation "palm" is found in 5 passages of the Old Testament, in 3 of which the Hebrew text adds the word yadh ("hand," 1Sa 5:4; 2Ki 9:35; Da 10:10). It would properly mean the "hollow hand" (root kaphaph, "to bend," "to curve"), which receives or grasps things. It is therefore used in reference to filling the priest’s hands with sacrificial portions (Le 14:15,26). The palms of the hands of Dagon are mentioned as cut off, when the idol was found mutilated in the presence of the ark of Yahweh (1Sa 5:4), from which may be inferred that this idol probably was represented with hands spread out in blessing, as we find in numerous Babylonian representations of divinities.

In a beautiful metaphor God answers the repentant people of Jerusalem, who thought Yahweh had forgotten and forsaken them: "Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands" (Isa 49:16; see also Ecclesiasticus 18:3). Daniel is touched upon the palms of his hands to wake him from sleep (Da 10:10).

In the New Testament we find the phrase, "to smite with the palms of the hands," as a translation of the Greek verb rhapizo (Mt 26:67; see also 5:39 and Septuagint Ho 11:4; 1 Esdras 4:30), and, derived from the same verb, rhapisma, a blow of the palm on the cheek, etc. (Mr 14:65; Joh 18:22; 19:3, where, however, in English Versions of the Bible the word "palm" has not been given). The marginal translation

"to smite or strike with rods" (Mt 26:67; Joh 18:22; 19:3) and "strokes of rods" (Mr 14:65 margin) does not seem to be applicable to the Greek text of the Old Testament and New Testament, while it is a frequent meaning of the words in classical language. It would therefore be better to eliminate these marginal additions.

H. L. E. Luering

PALM TREE

pam'-tre (tamar, same as the Aramaic and Ethiopic, but in Arabic =" date"; phoinix (Ex 15:27; Le 23:40; Nu 33:9; De 34:3; Jud 1:16; 3:13; 2Ch 28:15; Ne 8:15; Ps 92:12; So 7:7 f; Joe 1:12); tomer, Deborah "dwelt under the palm-tree" (Jud 4:5); "They are like a palm-tree (margin "pillar"), of turned work" (Jer 10:5); timorah (only in the plural), the palm tree as an architectural feature (1Ki 6:29,32,35; 7:36; 2Ch 3:5; Eze 40:16); Greek only Ecclesiasticus 50:12; Joh 12:13; Re 7:9):

1. Palm Trees:

The palm, Phoenix dactylifera (Natural Order Palmeae), Arabic nakhl, is a tree which from the earliest times has been associated with the Semitic peoples. In Arabia the very existence of man depends largely upon its presence, and many authorities consider this to have been its original habitat. It is only natural that such a tree should have been sacred both there and in Assyria in the earliest ages. In Palestine the palm leaf appears as an ornament upon pottery as far back as 1800 BC (compare PEF, Gezer Mere., II, 172). In Egypt the tall palm stem forms a constant feature in early architecture, and among the Hebrews it was extensively used as a decoration of the temple (1Ki 6:29,32,35; 7:36; 2Ch 3:5). It is a symbol of beauty (So 7:7) and of the righteous man:

"The righteous shall flourish like the palm-tree:

He shall grow like a cedar in Lebanon.

They are planted in the house of Yahweh;

They shall flourish in the courts of our God.

They shall still bring forth fruit in old age;

They shall be full of sap and green" (Ps 92:12-14).

The palm tree or branch is used extensively on Jewish coinage and most noticeably appears as a symbol of the land upon the celebrated Judea Capta coins of Vespasian. A couple of centuries or so later it forms a prominent architectural feature in the ornamentation of the Galilean synagogues, e.g. at Tell Chum

(Capernaum). The method of artificial fertilization of the pistillate (female) flowers by means of the staminate (male) flowers appears to have been known in the earliest historic times. Winged figures are depicted on some of the early Assyrian sculptures shaking a bunch of the male flowers over the female for the same purpose as the people of modern Gaza ascend the tall trunks of the fruit-bearing palms and tie among the female flowers a bunch of the pollen-bearing male flowers.

2. Their Ancient Abundance in Palestine:

In Palestine today the palm is much neglected; there are few groves except along the coast, e.g. at the bay of Akka, Jaffa and Gaza; solitary palms occur all over the land in the courtyards of mosques (compare Ps 92:13) and houses even in the mountains. Once palms flourished upon the Mount of Olives (Ne 8:15), and Jericho was long known as the "city of palm-trees" (De 34:3; Jud 1:16; 3:13; 2Ch 28:15; Josephus BJ, IV, viii, 2-3), but today the only palms are scarce and small; under its name Hazazon-tamar (2Ch 20:2), En-gedi would appear to have been as much a place of palms in ancient days as we know it was in later history. A city, too, called Tamar ("date palm") appears to have been somewhere near the southwestern corner of the Dead Sea (Eze 47:19; 48:28). Today the numerous salt-encrusted stumps of wild palm trees washed up all along the shores of the Dead Sea witness to the existence of these trees within recent times in some of the deep valleys around.

3. Palm Branches:

Branches of palms have been symbolically associated with several different ideas. A palm branch is used in Isa 9:14; 19:15 to signify he "head," the highest of the people, as contrasted with the rush, the "tail," or humblest of the people. Palm branches appear from early times to have been associated with rejoicing. On the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles the Hebrews were commanded to take branches of palms, with other trees, and rejoice before God (Le 23:40; compare Ne 8:15; 2 Macc 10:7). The palm branch still forms the chief feature of the lulabh carried daily by every pious Jew to the synagogue, during the feast. Later it was connected with the idea of triumph and victory. Simon Maccabeus entered the Akra at Jerusalem after its capture, "with thanksgiving, and branches of palm trees, and with harps, and cymbals, and with viols, and hymns, and songs: because there was destroyed a great enemy out of Israel" (1 Macc 13:51 the King James Version; compare 2 Macc 10:7). The same idea comes out in the use of palm branches by the multitudes who escorted Jesus to Jerusalem (Joh 12:13) and also in the vision of the "great multitude, which no man could number .... standing before the .... Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands" (Re 7:9). Today palms are carried in every Moslem funeral procession and are laid on the new-made grave.

See also TAMAR as a proper name.

E. W. G. Masterman

PALMER-WORM

pam’-er-wurm (gazam; Septuagint kampe (Am 4:9; Joe 1:4; 2:25)): "Palmer-worm" means "caterpillar," but the insect meant is probably a kind of locust.

See INSECTS; LOCUST.

PALSY; PARALYSIS

pol’-zi, pa-ral’-i-sis (paralusis): The English word "palsy" is derived from the Old French paralesie, which in Middle English was shortened into palesie, the form in which it appears in Wycliff’s version. In the 16th century it appears as "palsy," the form used in the King James Version. This, however, is seldom used at the present day, the Latinized Greek form "paralysis" being more frequently employed, both in modern literature and in colloquial English "Sick of the palsy" is the translation either of the adjective paralutikos or of the participle of the verb paraluomai. The disease is one characterized by extreme loss of the power of motion dependent on some affection either of the motor centers of the brain or of the spinal cord. It is always serious, usually intractable, and generally sudden in onset (1 Macc 9:55 f). Miraculous cures by our Lord are related in general terms, as in Mt 4:24; Ac 8:7. Aeneas (Ac 9:33) was probably a paralytic eight years bedridden. Though the Lord addressed the paralytic let down through the roof (Mt 9:6; Mr 2:3; Lu 5:18) as "son," it was not necessarily a proof that he was young, and though He prefaces the cure by declaring the forgiveness of sin, we need not infer that the disease was the result of an evil life, although it may have been. Bennett conjectures that the centurion’s palsied servant grievously tormented was suffering from progressive paralysis with respiratory spasms (see PAIN). The substantive paralusis is only once used in the Septuagint in Eze 21:10, but here it refers to the loosing of the sword, not to the disease.

Alexander Macalister

PALTI

pal’-ti (palTi, "Yah delivers"):

(1) One of the "searchers" of Canaan sent by Moses (Nu 13:9), representing Benjamin in the expedition (13:9).

(2) The man to whom Saul gave Michal, David’s wife, after the estrangement (1Sa 25:44). He is "the captain of the people" of 2 Esdras 5:16 ("Phaltiel," margin "Psaltiel"). In 2Sa 3:15, he is named "Phaltiel" (the King James Version), "Paltiel" (the Revised Version), and is there mentioned in connection with David’s recovery of Michal.

PALTIEL

pal’-ti-el (palTi’el, "God’s deliverance"):

(1) A prince of Isaachar (Nu 34:26).

(2) Same as PALTI, (2) (which see).

PALTITE

pal’-tit (palTi (as Palti); The Septuagint has: Codex Vaticanus Kelothei; Codex Alexandrinus Phellonei): The description occurs but once in this form and is then applied to Helez, one of David’s 30 valiant men (2Sa 23:26). Helez’ name, however, occurs in 1Ch 11:27 and 27:10 as the "Pelonite." Doubtless there is some confusion of words. The word may be given as a patronymic of Palti, or it may designate a native of the village of Beth-pelet mentioned in Jos 15:27 and Ne 11:26 as being in Lower Judah. Helez, however, is described as "of the children of Ephraim" in 1Ch 27:10.

PAMPHYLIA

pam-fil’-i-a (Pamphulia): A country lying along the southern coast of Asia Minor, bounded on the North by Pisidia, on the East by Isauria, on the South by the Mediterranean Sea, and on the West by Lycia (Ac 2:10; 27:5).

1. Physical Features:

In the earliest time, Pamphylia was but a narrow strip of low-lying land between the base of the mountains and the sea, scarcely more than 20 miles long and half as wide. A high and imposing range of the Taurus Mountains practically surrounds it upon three sides, and, jutting out into the sea, isolates it from the rest of Asia Minor. Its two rivers, the Cestrus and the Cataractes, are said by ancient writers to have been navigable for several miles inland, but now the greater part of their water is diverted to the fields for irrigating purposes, and the general surface of the country has been constantly changed by the many rapid mountain streams. The level fertile coast land is therefore well watered, and the moist air, which is excessively hot and enervating, has always been laden with fever. Several roads leading from the coast up the steep mountain to the interior existed in ancient times; one of them, called the Kimax or the Ladder, with its broad stair-like steps 2,000 ft. high, may still be seen. Beyond the steps is the high land which was once called "Pisidia," but which the Romans, in 70 AD, made a part of Pamphylia.

2. Importance:

Pamphylia, unless in pre-historic times, was never an independent kingdom; it was subject successively to Lydia, Persia, Macedonia, Pergamos and Rome. Because of its comparatively isolated position, civilization there was less developed than in the neighboring countries, and the Asiatic influence was at most times stronger than the Greek As early as the 5th century BC a Greek colony settled there, but the Greek language which was spoken in some of its cities soon became corrupt; the Greek inscriptions, appearing upon the coins of that age, were written in a peculiar character, and before the time of

Alexander the Great, Greek ceased to be spoken. Perga then became an important city and the center of the Asiatic religion, of which the Artemis of Perga, locally known as Leto, was the goddess. Coins were struck also in that city. Somewhat later the Greek city of Attalia, which was rounded by Attalus III Philadelphus (159-138 BC), rose to importance, and until recent years has been the chief port of entry on the southern coast of Asia Minor. About the beginning of our era, Side became the chief city, and issued a long and beautiful series of coins, possibly to facilitate trade with the pirates who found there a favorable market for their booty. Pamphylia is mentioned as one of the recipients of the "letters" of 1 Macc 15:23.

3. Introduction of Christianity:

Christianity was first introduced to Pamphylia by Paul and Barnabas (Ac 13:13; 14:24), but because their stay in the country was brief, or because of the difficulty of communication with the neighboring countries, or because of the Asiatic character of the population, it was slow in being established.

See also ATTALIA; PERGA; SIDE, the chief cities of Pamphylia.

E. J. Banks

PAN

Name of a utensil used in the preparation or the serving of food, and representing several words in the original. Passing over the use of the word in connections like 1Ch 9:31, "things baked in pans," where the Hebrew word chabhittim refers, not to the pan itself, but to the cakes baked in the flat pan or griddle which was called machabhath (see below), and the "firepans" (machtah) (Ex 27:3; 1Ki 7:50, etc.) which seem to have been used to carry burning coals, we note the following words:

(1) machabhath, "pan" the King James Version, "baking-pan" the Revised Version (British and American), a dish of uncertain shape and size which was used in the preparation of the minchah or vegetable offering. See Le 2:5; 6:21; 7:9; 1Ch 23:29. On the basis of Eze 4:3 it might be assumed that the pan was rectangular in shape and of good size.

(2) kiyyor, rendered "pan" in 1Sa 2:14. The same word is used in the phrase, "pan of fire" the Revised Version (British and American), "hearth of fire" the King James Version (Zec 12:6); and it is also translated "laver" in the descriptions of the furnishing of tabernacle and temple (Ex 30:18; 1Ki 7:30, etc.). As it held water and was used for boiling meat and the like, it must have been a kind of pot or kettle.

(3) masreth, (2Sa 15:9). The connection gives no clue as to shape or size except that it must have been small enough to serve food in, and of the proper shape to hold a substance which could be poured out. Some authorities suggest a connection with the root se’or, "leaven," and think that this pan was like the kneading-trough in shape.

(4) sir, rendered "pan" in Ex 27:3 the King James Version, "pot" the Revised Version (British and American).

See POT.

(5) parur, "pan" in Nu 11:8 the King James Version, "pot" the Revised Version (British and American).

See POT.

(6) celachah (2Ch 35:13). Some kind of dish or pot. Slightly different forms of the same root are rendered "cruse" (2Ki 2:20 (tselochith), "dish" (2Ki 21:13 (tsallachath); and also in the Revised Version (British and American) in Pr 19:24; 26:15, instead of the probably incorrect "bosom" of the King James Version.

(7) lebes translated "pan" in 1 Esdras 1:12 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "cauldron").

(8) teganon, 2 Macc 7:3,5, with the verb teganizo, 7:5, is the usual Greek word for "frying-pan," but here a large sheet of metal must be meant (compare 4 Macc 8:13; 12:10,20).

LITERATURE.

Whitehouse, Primer of Hebrew Antiquities, 76, 77; Benzinger, Hebraische Archaologie, 70, 71; Nowack, Hebraische Archdologie, I, 144.

Walter R. Betteridge

PANNAG

pan’-ag (pannagh; kasia; Eze 27:17 margin, "Perhaps a kind of confection"): One of the articles of commerce of Judah and Israel. The kasia of the Septuagint is said to be a shrub similar to the laurel. Nothing is known of the nature of pannag. Cheyne (EB, 3555) thinks the Heb letters have got misplaced and should be gephen, "vine," and he would join to it the debhash, "honey," which follows in the verse, giving a translation "grape honey," the ordinary dibbs of Palestine—an extremely likely article of commerce.

See HONEY.

PANOPLY

pan’-o-pli: 1 Macc 13:29 the Revised Version margin.

See ARMOR.

PAP

(shadh, shodh, "breast" (Eze 23:21); mastos, "the breast" (Lu 11:27; 23:29; Re 1:13)): The English word, which goes back to Middle English "pappe" (see Skeat, Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, 327) and is now obsolete, has been replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by "breast." The Hebrew word signifies the "female breast"; the Greek word has a wider signification, including the male chest.

PAPER

pa’-per.

See CRAFTS, II, 13; PAPYRUS; REED; WRITING.

PAPER REEDS

redz: In Isa 19:7 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "meadows").

PAPHOS

pa’-fos:

1. Site:

The name of two towns, Old (Palaia Paphos, or Palaipaphos) and New Paphos Nea Paphos), situated at the southwestern extremity of Cyprus. Considerable confusion is caused by the use of the single name Paphos in ancient writers to denote now one, now the other, of these cities. That referred to in Ac 13:6,13 is strictly called New Paphos (modern Baffa), and lay on the coast about a mile South of the modern Ktima and some 10 miles Northwest of the old city. The latter (modern Kouklia) is situated on an eminence more than a mile from the sea, on the left bank of the Diarrizo, probably the ancient Bocarus.

2. History of Old Paphos:

It was founded by Cinyras, the father of Adonis, or, according to another legend, by Aerias, and formed the capital of the most important kingdom in Cyprus except that of Salamis. Its territory embraced a considerable portion of Western Cyprus, extending northward to that of Soli, southward to that of

Curium and eastward to the range of Troodus. Among its last kings was Nicocles, who ruled shortly after the death of Alexander the Great. In 310 BC Nicocreon of Salamis, who had been set over the whole of Cyprus by Ptolemy I of Egypt, was forced to put an end to his life at Paphos for plotting with Antigonus (Diodorus xx. 21, who wrongly gives the name as Nicocles; see Athenische Mitteilungen, XXII, 203 ff), and from that time Paphos remained under Egyptian rule until the Roman annexation of Cyprus in 58 BC. The growth of New Paphos brought with it the decline of the old city, which was also ruined by successive earthquakes. Yet its temple still retained much of its old fame, and in 69 AD Titus, the future emperor of Rome, turned aside on his journey to Jerusalem, which he was to capture in the following year, to visit the sacred shrine and to inquire of the priests into the fortune which awaited him (Tacitus History ii.2-4; Suetonius Titus 5).

3. History of New Paphos:

New Paphos, originally the seaport of the old town, was founded, according to tradition, by Agapenor of Arcadia (Iliad ii.609; Pausan. viii.5, 2). Its possession of a good harbor secured its prosperity, and it had several rich temples. According to Dio Cassius (liv.23) it was restored by Augustus in 15 BC after a destructive earthquake and received the name Augusta (Greek Sebaste). Under the Roman Empire it was the administrative capital of the island and the seat of the governor. The extant remains all date from this period and include those of public buildings, private houses, city walls and the moles of the harbor.

4. The Temple and Cult:

But the chief glory of Paphos and the source of its fame was the local cult, of which the kings and their descendants remained hereditary priests down to the Roman seizure of Cyprus. The goddess, identified with the Greek Aphrodite, who was said to have risen from the sea at Paphos, was in reality a Nature-goddess, closely resembling the Babylonian Ishtar and the Phoenician Astarte, a native deity of Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands. Her cult can be traced back at Paphos to Homeric times (Odyssey viii.362) and was repeatedly celebrated by Greek and Latin poets (Aeschylus Suppl. 555; Aristoph. Lys. 833; Virgil Aen. i.415; Horace Odes i.19 and 30; iii.26; Statius Silvae i.2, 101, etc.). The goddess was represented, not by a statue in human form, but by a white conical stone (Max. Tyr. viii.8; Tacitus History ii.3; Servius Ad Aen. i.724), of which models were on sale for the benefit of pilgrims (Athenaeus xv.18); her worship was sensuous in character and she is referred to by Athanasius as the deification of lust (Contra Genres 9). Excavation has brought to light at Old Paphos a complex of buildings belonging to Roman times and consisting of an open court with chambers or colonnades on three sides and an entrance on the East only, the whole forming a quadrilateral enclosure with sides about 210 ft. long. In this court may have stood the altar, or altars, of incense (Homer speaks of a single altar, Virgil of "a hundred altars warm with Sabean frankincense"); no blood might be shed thereon, and although it stood in the open it was "wet by no rain" (Tacitus, loc. cit.; Pliny, NH, ii.210). On the south side are the ruins of another building, possibly an earlier temple, now almost destroyed save for the western wall (Journal of Hellenic Studies, IX, 193-224). But the fact that no remains or inscriptions have been found here earlier than the Roman occupation of Cyprus militates against the view that the sanctuary stood at this spot from prehistoric times. Its site may be sought at Xylino, a short distance to the North of Kouklia (D.G. Hogarth, Times, August 5, 1910), or possibly on the plateau of Rhantidi,

some 3 miles Southeast of the village, where numerous inscriptions in the old Cyprian syllabic script were found in the summer of 1910 (M. Ohnefalsch-Richter, Times, July 29, 1910).

5. The Apostles' Visit:

After visiting Salamis and passing through the whole island, about 100 miles in length, Barnabas, Paul and Mark reached Paphos, the residence of the Roman proconsul, Sergius Paulus (for the title see CYPRUS). Here too they would doubtless begin by preaching in the synagogue, but the governor—who is probably the same Paulus whose name appears as proconsul in an inscription of Soli (D.G. Hogarth, Devia Cypria, 114)—hearing of their mission, sent for them and questioned them on the subject of their preaching. A Jew named Bar-Jesus or Elymas, who, as a Magian or soothsayer, "was with the proconsul," presumably as a member of his suite, used all his powers of persuasion to prevent his patron from giving his adherence to the new faith, and was met by Paul (it is at this point that the name is first introduced) with a scathing denunciation and a sentence of temporary loss of sight. The blindness which at once fell on him produced a deep impression on the mind of the proconsul, who professed his faith in the apostolic teaching. From Paphos, Paul and his companions sailed in a northwesterly direction to Perga in Pamphylia (Ac 13:6-13).

Paul did not revisit Paphos, but we may feel confident that Barnabas and Mark would return there on their 2nd missionary journey (Ac 15:39). Of the later history of the Paphian church we know little. Tychicus, Paul's companion, is said to have been marryred there, and Jerome tells us that Hilarion sought in the neighborhood of the decayed and almost deserted town the quiet and retirement which he craved (Vita Hilar. 42). The Acta Barnabae speak of a certain Rhodon, who was attached to the temple service at Old Paphos, as having accepted the Christian faith.

LITERATURE.

Besides the works already referred to, see Journal of Hellenic Studies, IX, 175-92 (citation of passages from ancient authors relating to Old Paphos, together with a list of medieval and modern authorities), 225-271 (inscriptions and tombs), and the bibliography appended to article CYPRUS.

Marcus N. Tod

PAPYRUS

pa-pi'-rus (Cyperus papyrus; bublos, biblos, whence biblion, a roll, ta biblia, "the Books" = the Bible):

1. Papyrus Paper

2. Egyptian Papyri

3. Aramaic Papyri

4. Greek Papyri

5. Their Discovery.

6. Classical Papyri

7. Septuagint Papyri

8. New Testament Papyri

9. Theological Papyri

10. Documentary Papyri

11. Contribution to New Testament Study

12. Chief Collections

13. Coptic, Arabic and Other Papyri

A marsh or water plant, abundant in Egypt in ancient times, serving many purposes in antiquity. The papyrus tuft was the emblem of the Northern Kingdom in Egypt. Like the lotus, it suggested one of the favorite capitals of Egyptian architecture. Ropes, sandals, and mats were made from its fibers (see Odyssey xxi.391; Herod. ii.37, 69), and bundles of the long, light stalks were bound together into light boats (Isa 18:2; Breasted, History of the Egyptians, 91).

1. Papyrus Paper:

Most importantly, from it was made the tough and inexpensive paper which was used from very ancient times in Egypt and which became the common writing-material of the ancient world. The white cellular pith of the long triangular papyrus stalk was stripped of its bark or rind and sliced into thin strips. Two layers of these strips were laid at right angles to each other, pasted together (Pliny says with the aid of Nile water), dried and smoothed. The sheets thus formed were pasted one to another to form a roll of any length desired. The process and the product are described by Pliny the EIder (NH, . xiii.11-13).

2. Egyptian Papyri:

Egyptian papyrus rolls are in existence dating from the 27th century BC, and no doubt the manufacture of papyrus had been practiced for centuries before. The Egyptian rolls were sometimes of great length

and were often beautifully decorated with colored vignettes (Book of the Dead). Egyptian documents of great historical value have been preserved on these fragile rolls. The Papyrus Ebers of the 16th century BC sums up the medical lore of the Egyptians of the time of Amenhotep I. The Papyrus Harris, 133 ft. long, in 117 columns, dates from the middle of the 12th century BC and records the benefactions and achievements of Ramses III. For the XIXth, XXth and XXIst dynasties, indeed, papyri are relatively numerous, and their contribution important for Egyptian history, life and religion. By the year 1000 BC, papyrus had doubtless come to be used for writing far beyond the limits of Egypt. The Wenamon Papyrus (11th century) relates that 500 rolls of papyrus were among the gifts sent from the Delta to the Prince of Biblus, but except in the rarest instances papyri have escaped destruction only in Upper Egypt, where climatic conditions especially favored their preservation.

3. Aramaic Papyri:

In very recent years (1898, 1904, 1907) several Aramaic papyri have been found on the Island of Elephantine, just below the First Cataract, dating from 494 to 400 BC. They show that between 470 and 408 BC a flourishing colony of Jews existed there, doing business under Persian sway, and worshipping their god Yahu, not in a synagogue, but in a temple, in which they offered meal offerings, incense and burnt offerings. In 408, the Egyptians had destroyed their temple at Yeb, and the Jews appealed for redress to the Persian governor. It is well known that some Jews had taken refuge in Egypt in 586 BC, taking the prophet Jeremiah with them, and with some such band of refugees the Yeb colony may have originated, although it may have been much older (compare Jer 44:1,15; Biblical World, XXIX, 1907, 305 ff; XXXI, 448 ff; chief publications by Euting, Sayce and Cowley, and especially Sachau, Drei aramdische Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine, 2nd edition, 1908; Aramaische Papyrus und Ostraka, 1911).

4. Greek Papyri:

With Alexander’s conquest of Egypt (332 BC), and the subsequent Ptolemaic dynasty, Greeks came more than ever before into Egypt, and from Greek centers like Alexandria and Arsinoe in the Faytum the Greek language began to spread. Through the Ptolemaic (323-30 BC), Roman (30 BC-292/93 AD), and Byzantine periods (292/93-640 AD), that is, from the death of Alexander to the Arab conquest, Greek was much used in Upper and Lower Egypt, and Greek papyri from these times are now abundant. The 300 Aphrodito Greek and Coptic papyri published by Bell and Crum (1910) date from 698-722 AD, and show how Greek persisted in the Arab period.

5. Their Discovery:

The first important discovery of Greek papyri made in modern times was among the ruins of Herculaneum, near Naples, where in 1752 in the ruins of the house of a philosopher which had been destroyed and buried by volcanic ashes from Vesuvius (79 AD) a whole library of papyrus rolls was found, quite charred by the heat. With the utmost pains many of these have been unrolled and deciphered, and the first part of them was published in 1793. They consist almost wholly of works of

Epicurean philosophy. In 1778 the first discovery of Greek papyri in Egypt was made. In that year some Arabs found 40 or 50 papyrus rolls in an earthen pot, probably in the Faytum, where Philadelphus settled his Greek veterans. One was purchased by a dealer and found its way into the hands of Cardinal Stefano Borgia; the others were destroyed as of no worth. The Borgia Papyrus was published 10 years later. It was a document of little value, recording the forced labor of certain peasants upon the Nile embankment of a given year.

In 1820 another body of papyri was found by natives, buried, it was said, in an earthen pot, on the site of the Serapeum at Memphis, just above Cairo. These came for the most part from the 2nd century BC. They fell into various hands, and are now in the museums of London, Paris, Leyden, Rome and Dresden. With them the stream of papyri began to flow steadily into the British and Continental museums. In 1821 an Englishman, Mr. W.J. Bankes, bought an Elephantine roll of the xxivth book of the Iliad, the first Greek literary papyrus to be derived from Egypt. The efforts of Mr. Harris and others in 1847-1850 brought to England considerable parts of lost orations of Hyperides, new papyri of the 17th book of the Iliad, and parts of Iliad ii, iii, ix. In 1855 Mariette purchased a fragment of Alcman for the Louvre, and in 1856 Mr. Stobart obtained the funeral oration of Hyperides.

The present period of papyrus recovery dates from 1877, when an immense mass of Greek and other papyri, for the most part documentary, not literary, was found in the Fayum, on the site of the ancient Arsinoe. The bulk of this collection passed into the hands of Archduke Rainer at Vienna, minor portions of it being secured by the museums of Paris, London, Oxford and Berlin. These belong largely to the Byzantine period. Another great find was made in 1892 in the Faytum; most of these went to Berlin some few to the British Museum, Vienna and Geneva. These were mostly of the Roman period.

It will be seen that most of these discoveries were the work of natives, digging about indiscriminately in the hope of finding antiquities to sell to tourists or dealers. By this time, however, the Egypt Exploration Fund had begun its operations in Egypt, and Professor Flinders Petrie was at work there. Digging among Ptolemaic tombs at Gurob in 1889-90, Professor Petrie found many mummies, or mummy-casings, adorned with breast-pieces and sandals made of papyri pasted together. The separation of these was naturally a tedious and delicate task, and the papyri when extricated were often badly damaged or mutilated; but the Petrie papyri, as they were called, were hailed by scholars as the most important found up to that time, for they came for the most part from the 3rd century BC. Startling acquisitions were made about this time by representatives of the British Museum and the Louvre. The British Museum secured papyri of the lost work of Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens, the lost Mimes of Herodas, a fragment of an oration of Hyperides, and extensive literary papyri of works already extant; while the Louvre secured the larger part of the Oration against Athenogenes, the masterpiece of Hyperides. In 1894 Bernard P. Grenfell, of Oxford, appeared in Egypt, working with Professor Petrie in his excavations, and securing papyri with Mr. Hogarth for England. In that year Pettie and Grenfell obtained from native dealers papyrus rolls, one more than 40 ft. in length, preserving revenue laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, dated in 259-258 BC. These were published in 1896 by Mr. Grenfell, the first of many important works in this field from his pen.

With Arthur S. Hunt, of Oxford, Mr. Grenfell excavated in 1896-1897, at Behnesa, the Roman

Oxyrhynchus, and unearthed the greatest mass of Greek papyri of the Roman period thus far found. In 9 large quarto volumes, aggregating 3,000 pages, only a beginning has been made of publishing these Oxyrhynchus texts, which number thousands and are in many cases of great importance. The story of papyrus digging in Egypt since the great find of 1896-1897 is largely the record of the work of Grenfell and Hunt. At Tebtunis, in the Faytum; in 1900, they found a great mass of Ptolemaic papyri, comparable in importance with their great discovery at Oxyrhynchus. One of the most productive sources of papyri at Tebtunis was the crocodile cemetery, in which many mummies of the sacred crocodiles were found rolled in papyrus. Important Ptolemaic texts were found in 1902 at Hibeh, and a later visit to Oxyrhynchus in 1903 produced results almost as astonishing and quite as valuable as those of the first excavations there. The work of Rubensohn at Abusir in 1908 has exceptional interest, as it developed the first considerable body of Alexandrian papyri that has been found. The soil and climate of Alexandria are destructive to papyri, and only to the fact that these had in ancient times been carried off into the interior as rubbish is their preservation due. Hogarth, Jouguet, Wilcken and other Continental scholars have excavated in Egypt for papyri with varying degrees of success. The papyri are found in graves a few feet below the surface, in house ruins over which sand has drifted, or occasionally in earthen pots buried in the ground. Despite government efforts to stop indiscriminate native digging, papyri in considerable quantities have continued to find their way into the hands of native dealers, and thence into English, Continental, and even American collections.

6. Classical Papyri:

Thus far upward of 650 literary papyri, great and small, of works other than Biblical have been published. The fact that about one-third of these are Homeric attests the great popularity enjoyed by the Homeric poems in Greek-Roman times. These are now so abundant and extensive as to make an important contribution to the Homeric text. Rather less than one-third preserve works of other ancient writers which were already known to us through later copies, medieval or modern. Among these are works of Plato, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Thucydides, Euripides, Sophocles, Aeschines, Herodotus and others. Rather more than one-third preserve works, or fragments of works, which have been either quite unknown or, oftener, regarded as lost. Such are portions of Alcman and Sappho, fragments of the comedies of Menander and the iambi of Callimachus, Mimes of Herodas, poems of Bacchylides, parts of the lost Antiope and Hypsipyle of Euripides, Aristotle On the Constitution of Athens, the Persac of Timotheus (in a papyrus of the 4th century BC, probably the oldest Greek book in the world), and six orations, one of them complete, of Hyperides. In 1906 Grenfell and Hunt discovered at Oxyrhynchus the unique papyrus of the lost Paeans of Pindar, in 380 fragments, besides the Hellenica of Theopompus (or Cratippus?), whose works were believed to have perished.

7. Septuagint Papyri:

Of the Greek Old Testament (Septuagint) more than 20 papyri have been discovered. Perhaps the most important of these is the Berlin Genesis (3rd or 4th century) (1) in a cursive hand, purchased at Akhmim in 1906. Other papyri preserving parts of Ge among the Amherst

(2), British Museum

(3), and Oxyrhynehus

(4), papyri date from the 3rd or 4th century. A Bodleian papyrus leaf

(5) (7th or 8th century) preserves So 1:6-9. An Amherst papyrus

(6) (7th century) contains Job 1:21 f; 2,3. There are several papyri of parts of the Psalms. An Amherst papyrus

(7) (5th or 6th century) has Ps 5:6-12. Brit. Mus. 37 (Fragmenta Londinensia, 6th or 7th century)

(8), of thirty leaves, contains Ps 10:2-18:6 and 20:14-34:6. This was purchased in 1836 and is one of the longest of Biblical papyri. Brit. Mus. 230

(9) (3rd century) preserves Ps 12:7-15:4. A Berlin papyrus

(10) contains Ps 40:26-41:4. Oxyrhynchus papyrus 845

(11) (4th or 5th century) contains parts of Psalms 68; 70. Another Amherst papyrus

(12) (7th century) shows parts of Psalms 108; 118; 135; 138-140. There is also a papyrus at Leipzig

(13) which contains part of the Psalms. Of the Prophets the chief papyrus is the Heidelberg codex

(14) (7th century), which contains Zec 4:6 through Mal 4:5. Oxyrhynchus 846

(15) (6th century) contains Am 2. A gainer papyrus

(16) (3rd century) preserves Isa 38:3-5,13-16, and a Bodleian

(17) (3rd century) shows Eze 5:12-6:3. The Rylands papyri include De 2; 3

(18) (4th century); Job 1; 5; 6

(19) (6th or 7th century); Ps 90

(20) (5th or 6th century). Recent Oxyrhynchus volumes supply parts of Ex 21; 22; 40

(21; 22) (3rd century, O.P. 1074, 1075); and of Ge 16

(23) (3rd century, O.P. 1166), and Ge 31

(24) (4th century, O.P. 1167). The great antiquity of some of these documents gives especial interest to their readings.

8. New Testament Papyri:

Twenty-three papyri containing parts of the Greek New Testament have thus far been published, nearly half of them coming from Oxyrhynchus (O.P. 2, 208, 209, 402, 657, 1008, 1009, 1078, 1079, 1170, 1171). The pieces range in date from the 3rd to the 6th century. Their locations, dates and contents are:

1. Philadelphia, Pa. 3rd or 4th century Mt 11-9,12,13,14-20 (O.P. 2).

2. Florence. 5th or 6th century Joh 12:12-15.

3. Vienna. 6th century Lu 7:36-45; 10:38-42.

4. Paris. 4th century Lu 1:74-80; 5:3-8; 5:30-6:4.

5. London. 3rd or 4th century Joh 1:23-31,33-41; 20:11-17,19-25 (O.P. 208).

6. Strassburg. ? century Joh 11:45.

7. Kiew. ? century Lu 4:1,2.

8. Berlin. 4th century Ac 4:31-37; 5:2-9; 6:1-6,8-15.

9. Cambridge, Mass. 4th or 5th century 1 Joh 4:11-13,15,17 (O.P 402).

10. Cambridge, Mass. 4th century Ro 1:1-7 (O.P. 209).

11. Petersburg. 5th century 1Co 1:17-20; 6:13,18; 7:3,4,10-14. 12. Didlington Hall. 3rd or 4th century Heb 1:1.

13. London. 4th century Heb 2:14-5:5; 10:8-11:13; 11:28-12:17 (O.P. 657). This is the most considerable papyrus of the New Testament, and doubly important because Codex Vaticanus breaks off with Heb 9:14.

14. Sinai. 5th century 1Co 1:25-27; 2:6-8; 3:8-10,20.

15. Oxford. 4th century 1Co 7:18-8:4 (O.P. 1008). Php 3:9-17; 4:2-8 (O.P. 1009).

16. Manchester (Rylands). 6th or 7th century Ro 12:3-8.

17. Manchester (Rylands). 3rd century Tit 1:11-15; 2:3-8.

18. Oxford. 4th century Heb 9:12-19 (O.P. 1078).

19. Oxford. 3rd or 4th century Re 1:4-7 (O.P. 1079).

20. Oxford. 5th century Mt 10:32-11:5 (O.P. 1170).

21. Oxford. 3rd century Jas 2:19-3:2,4-9 (O.P. 1171).

22. Florence. 7th century Mt 25:12-15,20-23.

23. Florence. ? century Joh 3:14-18,31,32.

Berlin Pap. 13,269 (7th century) is a liturgical paraphrase of Lu 2:8-14.

Further details as to numbers 1-14 may be found in Gregory, Textkritik, 1084-92, and for numbers 1-23 in Kenyon, Handbook to Text. Crit. 2, or Milligan, New Testament Documents, 249-54.

9. Theological Papyri:

Among other theological papyri, the Oxyrhynchus Sayings of Jesus (O.P. 1,654), dating from the 2nd and 3rd centuries, are probably the most widely known (see LOGIA). Other Oxyrhynchus pieces preserve parts of the Apocalypse of Baruch (chapters 12-14; 4th or 5th century; O.P. 403); the Gospel according to the Hebrews (? in its later form, if at all; 3rd century; O.P. 655); the Ac of John (4th century; O.P. 850, compare 851); the Shepherd of Hermas (3rd or 4th century; O.P. 404); Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., iii.9 (3rd century; O.P. 405). Other small fragments of the Shepherd and Ignatius are among the Amherst and Berlin papyri. Early Christian hymns, prayers and letters of interest have also been found.

10. Documentary Papyri:

We have spoken thus far only of literary papyri, classical and theological. The overwhelming jority of the papyri found have of course been documentary—private letters, accounts, wills, receipts, contracts, leases, deeds, complaints, petitions, notices, invitations, etc. The value of these contemporary and original documents for the illumination of ancient life can hardly be overestimated. The life of Upper Egypt in Ptolemaic and Roman times is now probably better known to us than that of any other period of history down to recent times. Many papyrus collections have no literary papyri at all, but are rich in

documents. Each year brings more of these to light and new volumes of them into print. All this vast and growing body of material contributes to our knowledge of Ptolemaic and imperial times, often in the most intimate ways. Among the most important of these documentary papyri from Ptolemaic times are the revenue laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus (259 BC) and the decrees of Ptolemy Euergetes II, 47 in number (118 BC, 140-139 BC). Very recently (1910) a Hamburg papyrus has supplied the Constitutio Antoniniana, by which Roman citizenship was conferred upon the peregrini of the empire. The private documents in ways even more important illustrate the life of the common people under Ptolemaic and Roman rule.

11. Contribution to New Testament Study:

It is not necessary to point out the value of all this for Biblical and especially New Testament study. The papyri have already made a valuable contribution to textual materials of both Old Testament and New Testament. For other early Christian literature their testimony has been of surprising interest (the Oxyrhynchus Logia and Gospel fragments). The discovery of a series of uncial manuscripts running through six centuries back of the Codex Vaticanus bridges the gap between what were our earliest uncials and the hand of the inscriptions, and puts us in a better position than ever before to fix the dates of uncial manuscripts. Minuscule or cursire hands, too, so common in New Testament manuscripts of the 10th and later centuries, appear in a new light when it is seen that such writing was not a late invention arising out of the uncial, but had existed side by side with it from at least the 4th century BC, as the ordinary, as distinguished from the literary, or book, hand. See WRITING. The lexical contribution of these documentary papyri, too, is already considerable, and is likely to be very great. Like the New Testament writings, they reflect the common as distinguished from the literary language of the times, and words which had appeared exceptional or unknown in Greek literature are now shown to have been in common use. The problems of New Testament syntax are similarly illuminated. Specific historical notices sometimes light up dark points in the New Testament, as in a British Museum decree of Gaius Vibius Maximus, prefect of Egypt (104 AD), ordering all who are out of their districts to return to their own homes in view of the approaching census (compare Lu 2:1-5). Most important of all is the contribution of the papyri to a sympathetic knowledge of ancient life. They constitute a veritable gallery of New Testament characters. A strong light is sometimes thrown upon the social evils of the time, of which Paul and Juvenal wrote so sternly. The child, the prodigal, the thief, the host with his invitations, the steward with his accounts, the thrifty householder, the soldier on service receiving his viaticum, or retired as a veteran upon his farm, the Jewish money-lender, the husbandman, and the publican, besides people in every domestic relation, we meet at first hand in the papyri which they themselves in many cases have written. The worth of this for the historical interpretation of the New Testament is very great.

12. Chief Collections:

The principal collections of Greek papyri with their editors are Schow, Herculaneurn Papyri; Peyron, Turin Papyri; Leemans, Leyden Papyri; Wessely, Rainer and Paris Papyri; Kenyon and Bell, British Museum Papyri; Mahaffy and Smyly, Pettie Papyri; Grenfell and Hunt, Oxyrhynchus, Amherst and Hibeh Papyri (with Hogarth), Faytum Papyri, and (with Smyly and Goodspeed) Tebtunis Papyri; Hunt, Rylands Papyri; Nicole, Geneva Papyri; Krebs, Wilcken, Viereck, Schubart and others, Berlin Papyri;

Meyer, Hamburg and Giessen Papyri; Deissmann, Heidelberg Papyri; Vitelli and Comparetti, Florence Papyri; Mitteis, Leipzig Papyri; Preisigke, Strassburg Papyri; Reinach, Paris Papyri; Jouguet and Lesquier, Lille Papyri; Rubensohn, Elephantine Papyri; Maspero, Cairo Papyri; Goodspeed, Cairo and Chicago Papyri. The Munich papyri have been described by Wilcken. Milligan's Greek Papyri, Kenyon's Paleography of Greek Papyri, and Deissmann's Light from the Ancient East are useful introductions to the general subject. Mayser has prepared a Grammatik der Ptolemaischen Papyri.

13. Coptic, Arabic, and Other Papyri:

Coptic, Arabic, Hebrew, and Demotic papyri are numerous; even Latin papyri are found. The Coptic have already made important contributions to early Christian literature. A considerable Coptic fragment of the Ac of Paul, and a Coptic (Akhmimic) codex of 1 Clement, almost complete, have recently been published by Carl Schmidt. Another much mutilated papyrus of 1 Clement, with James, complete, is at Strassburg. A Coptic text of Proverbs has been brought to Berlin from the same source which supplied the Clement codex (the White Convent, near Akhmim); indeed, Biblical papyri in Coptic are fairly numerous, and patristic literature is being rapidly enriched by such discoveries of Coptic papyri, e.g. the Deuteronomy, Jonah; Ac papyrus, 1912 (compare the Sahidic New Testament, Oxford, 1911).

Arabic papyri first began to appear from Egypt in 1825, when three Arabic pieces were brought to Paris and published by Silvestre de Sacy. Two others, from the 7th century, were published by him in 1827. It was not until the great papyrus finds of 1877-1878, however, that any considerable number of Arabic papyri found their way into Europe. The chief collections thus far formed are at Vienna (Rainer Collection), Berlin and Cairo. Becker has published the Schott-Reinhardt Arabic papyri at Heidelberg, and Karabacek has worked upon those at Vienna. They belong of course to the period after the Arabic conquest, 640 AD.

Edgar J. Goodspeed

PAPYRUS, VESSELS OF

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (1).

PARABLE

par'-a-b'-l:

1. Name

2. Historical Data

3. Christ's Use of Parables.

4. Purpose of Christ in Using Parables

5. Interpretation of the Parables

6. Doctrinal Value of the Parables

1. Name:

Etymologically the word "parable" (paraballo) signifies a placing of two or more objects together, usually for the purpose of a comparison. In this widest sense of the term there is practically no difference between parable and simile (see Thayer, Dictionary of New Testament Greek, under the word). This is also what substantially some of Christ's parables amount to, which consist of only one comparison and in a single verse (compare Mt 13:33,44-46). In the more usual and technical sense of the word, "parable" ordinarily signifies an imaginary story, yet one that in its details could have actually transpired, the purpose of the story being to illustrate and inculcate some higher spiritual truth. These features differentiate it from other and similar figurative narratives as also from actual history. The similarity between the last-mentioned and a parable is sometimes so small that exegetes have differed in the interpretation of certain pericopes. A characteristic example of this uncertainty is the story of Dives and Lazarus in Lu 16:19-31. The problem is of a serious nature, as those who regard this as actual history are compelled to interpret each and every statement, including too the close proximity of heaven and hell and the possibility of speaking from one place to the other, while those who regard it as a parable can restrict their interpretation to the features that constitute the substance of the story. It differs again from the fable, in so far as the latter is a story that could not actually have occurred (e.g. Jud 9:8 ff; 2Ki 14:9; Eze 17:2 f). The parable is often described as an extended metaphor. The etymological features of the word, as well as the relation of parables to other and kindred devices of style, are discussed more fully by Ed. Koenig, in HDB, III, 660 ff.

2. Histotical Data:

Although Christ employed the parable as a means of inculcating His message more extensively and more effectively than any other teacher, He did not invent the parable. It was His custom in general to take over from the religious and linguistic world of thought in His own day the materials that He employed to convey the higher and deeper truths of His gospels, giving them a world of meaning they had never before possessed. Thus, e.g. every petition of the Lord's Prayer can be duplicated in the Jewish liturgies of the times, yet on Christ's lips these petitions have a significance they never had or could have for the Jews. The term "Word" for the second person in the Godhead is an adaptation from the Logos-idea in contemporaneous religious thought, though not specifically of Philo's. Baptism, regeneration, and kindred expressions of fundamental thoughts in the Christian system, are terms not absolutely new (compare Deutsch, article "Talmud" Literary Remains) The parable was employed both in the Old Testament and in contemporaneous Jewish literature (compare e.g. 2Sa 12:1-4; Isa 5:1-6; 28:24-28, and for details see Koenig's article, loc. cit.). Jewish and other non-Biblical parables are discussed and illustrated by examples in Trench's Notes on the Parables of our Lord, introductory essay,

chapter iv: "On Other Parables besides Those in the Scriptures."

3. Christ's Use of Parables:

The one and only teacher of parables in the New Testament is Christ Himself. The Epistles, although they often employ rhetorical allegories and similes, make absolutely no use of the parable, so common in Christ's pedagogical methods. The distribution of these in the Canonical Gospels is unequal, and they are strictly confined to the three Synoptic Gospels. Mark again has only one peculiar to this book, namely, the Seed Growing in Secret (Mr 4:26), and he gives only three others that are found also in Mt and Lk, namely the Sower, the Mustard Seed, and the Wicked Husbandman, so that the bulk of the parables are found in the First and the Third Gospels. Two are common to Matthew and Luke, namely the Leaven (Mt 13:33; Lu 13:21) and the Lost Sheep (Mt 18:12; Lu 15:3). Of the remaining parables, 18 are found only in Luke and 10 only in Mt. Luke's 18 include some of the finest, namely, the Two Debtors, the Good Samaritan, the Friend at Midnight, the Rich Fool, the Watchful Servants, the Barren Fig Tree, the Chief Seats, the Great Supper, the Rash Builder, the Rash King, the Lost Coin, the Lost Son, the Unrighteous Steward, the Rich Man and Lazarus, the Unprofitable Servants, the Unrighteous Judge, the Pharisee and Publican, and the Pounds. The 10 peculiar to Matthew are the Tares, the Hidden Treasure, the Pearl of Great Price, the Draw Net, the Unmerciful Servant, the Laborers in the Vineyard, the Two Sons, the Marriage of the King's Son, the Ten Virgins, and the Talents. There is some uncertainty as to the exact number of parables we have from Christ, as the Marriage of the King's Son is sometimes regarded as a different recension of the Great Supper, and the Talents of the Pounds. Other numberings are suggested by Trench, Julicher and others.

4. Purpose of Christ in Using Parables:

It is evident from such passages as Mt 13:10 ff (compare Mr 4:10; Lu 8:9) that Christ did not in the beginning of His career employ the parable as a method of teaching, but introduced it later. This took place evidently during the 2nd year of His public ministry, and is closely connected with the changes which about that time He made in His attitude toward the people in general. It evidently was Christ's purpose at the outset to win over, if possible, the nation as a whole to His cause and to the gospel; when it appeared that the leaders and the great bulk of the people would not accept Him for what He wanted to be and clung tenaciously to their carnal Messianic ideas and ideals, Christ ceased largely to appeal to the masses, and, by confining His instructions chiefly to His disciples and special friends, saw the necessity of organizing an ecclesiola in ecclesia, which was eventually to develop into the world-conquering church. One part of this general withdrawal of Christ from a proclamation of His gospel to the whole nation was this change in His method of teaching and the adoption of the parable. On that subject He leaves no doubt, according to Mt 13:11 ff; Mr 4:12; Lu 8:10. The purpose of the parable is both to reveal and to conceal the truth. It was to serve the first purpose in the case of the disciples, the second in the case of the uncleserving Jews. Psychologically this difference, notwithstanding the acknowledged inferiority in the training and education of the disciples, especially as compared with the scribes and lawyers, is not hard to understand. A simple-minded Christian, who has some understanding of the truth, can readily understand figurative illustrations of this truth, which would be absolute enigmas even to an educated Hindu or Chinaman. The theological problem involved is more difficult. Yet it is evident that

we are not dealing with those who have committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, for whom there is no possibility of a return to grace, according to Heb 6:4-10; 10:26 (compare Mt 12:31,32; Mr 3:28-30), and who accordingly could no longer be influenced by an appeal of the gospel, and we have rather before us those from whom Christ has determined to withdraw the offer of redemption—whether temporarily or definitely and finally, remaining an open question—according to His policy of not casting pearls before the swine. The proper sense of these passages can be ascertained only when we remember that in Mr 4:12 and Lu 8:10, the hina, need not express purpose, but that this particle is used here to express mere result only, as is clear too from the passage in Mt 13:13, where the hoti, is found. The word is to be withheld from these people, so that this preaching would not bring about the ordinary results of conversion and forgiveness of sins. Hence, Christ now adopts a method of teaching that will hide the truth from all those who have not yet been imbued by it, and this new method is that of the parable.

5. Interpretation of the Parables:

The principles for the interpretation of the parables, which are all intended primarily and in the first place for the disciples, are furnished by the nature of the parable itself and by Christ's own method of interpreting some of them. The first and foremost thing to be discovered is the scope or the particular spiritual truth which the parable is intended to convey. Just what this scope is may be stated in so many words, as is done, e.g., by the introductory words to that of the Pharisee and the Publican. Again the scope may be learned from the occasion of the parable, as the question of Peter in Mt 18:21 gives the scope of the following parable, and the real purpose of the Prodigal Son parable in Lu 15:11 ff is not the story of this young man himself, but is set over against the murmuring of the Pharisees because Christ received publicans and sinners, in 15:1 and 2, to exemplify the all-forgiving love of the Father. Not the Son but the Father is in the foreground in this parable, which fact is also the connecting link between the two parts. Sometimes the scope can be learned only from an examination of the details of the parable itself and then may be all the more uncertain.

A second principle of the interpretation of the parables is that a sharp distinction must be made between what the older interpreters called the body (corpus) and the soul (anima) of the story; or, to use other expressions, between the shell or bark (cortex) and the marrow (medulla). Whatever serves only the purpose of the story is the "ornamentation" of the parable, and does not belong to the substance. The former does not call for interpretation or higher spiritual lesson; the latter does. This distinction between those parts of the parable that are intended to convey spiritual meanings and those which are to be ignored in the interpretation is based on Christ's own interpretation of the so-called parabolae perfectae. Christ Himself, in Mt 13:18 ff, interprets the parable of the Sower, yet a number of data, such as the fact that there are four, and not more or fewer kinds of land, and others, are discarded in this explanation as without meaning. Again in His interpretation of the Tares among the Wheat in Mt 13:36 ff, a number of details of the original parable are discarded as meaningless.

Just which details are significant and which are meaningless in a parable is often hard, sometimes impossible to determine, as the history of their exegesis amply shows. In general it can be laid down as a rule, that those features which illustrate the scope of the parable belong to its substance, and those which do not, belong to the ornamentation. But even with this rule there remain many exegetical cruces or

difficulties. Certain, too, it is that not all of the details are capable of interpretation. Some are added of a nature that indeed illustrate the story as a story, but, from the standpoint of Christian morals, are more than objectionable. The Unjust Steward in using his authority to make the bills of the debtors of his master smaller may be a model, in the shrewd use of this world's goods for his purpose, that the Christian may follow in making use of his goods for his purposes, but the action of the steward itself is incapable of defense. Again, the man who finds in somebody else's property a pearl of great price but conceals this fact from the owner of the land and quietly buys this ground may serve as an example to show how much the kingdom of God is worth, but from an ethical standpoint his action cannot be sanctioned. In general, the parable, like all other forms of figurative expression, has a meaning only as far as the tertium comparationis goes, that is, the third thing which is common to the two things compared. But all this still leaves a large debatable ground in many parables. In the Laborers in the Vineyard does the "penny" mean anything, or is it an ornament? The history of the debate on this subject is long. In the Prodigal Son do all the details of his sufferings, such as eating the husks intended for swine, have a spiritual meaning?

6. Doctrinal Value of the Parables:

The interpreters of former generations laid down the rule, theologia parabolica non eat argumentativa, i. e. the parables, very rich in mission thoughts, do not furnish a basis for doctrinal argument. Like all figurative expressions and forms of thought, the parables too contain elements of doubt as far as their interpretation is concerned. They illustrate truth but they do not prove or demonstrate truth. Omnia aimilia claudicunt, "all comparisons limp," is applicable here also. No point of doctrine can be established on figurative passages of Scripture, as then all elements of doubt would not be eliminated, this doubt being based on the nature of language itself. The argumentative or doctrinal value of parables is found in this, that they may, in accordance with the analogy of Scripture, illustrate truth already clearly expressed elsewhere. Compare especially Trench, introductory essay, in Notes on the Parables of our Lord, chapter iii., 30-43; and Terry, Biblical Hermeneutics, Part II, chapter vi: "Interpretation of Parables," 188-213, in which work a full bibliography is given. Compare also the article "Parabel" in Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche.

G.H. Schodde

PARACLETE

par'-a-klet:

1. Where Used:

This word occurs 5 times in the New Testament, all in the writings of John. Four instances are in the Gospel and one in the First Epistle. In the Gospel the in the Epistle, 1 Joh 2:1. "Paraclete" is simply the Greek word transferred into English. The translation of the word in English Versions of the Bible is "Comforter" in the Gospel, and "Advocate" in the Epistle. The Greek word is parakletos, froth the verb

parakaleo. The word for "Paraclete" is passive in form, and etymologically signifies "called to one's side." The active form of the word is parakletor, not found in the New Testament but found in Septuagint in Job 16:2 in the plural, and means "comforters," in the saying of Job regarding the "miserable comforters" who came to him in his distress.

2. General Meaning:

In general the word signifies:

(1) a legal advocate, or counsel for defense,

(2) an intercessor,

(3) a helper, generally.

The first, or technical, judicial meaning is that which predominates in classical usage, corresponding to our word "advocate," "counsel," or "attorney." The corresponding Latin word is advocatus, "advocate," the word applied to Christ in English Versions of the Bible in the translation of the Greek word parakletos, in 1 Joh 2:1. There is some question whether the translation "Comforter" in the passages of John's Gospel in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) is warranted by the meaning of the word. It is certain that the meaning "comforter" is not the primary signification, as we have seen. It is very probably, however, a secondary meaning of the word, and some of its cognates clearly convey the idea of comfort in certain connections, both in Septuagint and in the New Testament (Ge 37:35; Zec 1:13; Mt 5:4; 2Co 1:3,4). In the passage in 2 Corinthians the word in one form or another is used 5 times and in each means "comfort." In none of these instances, however, do we find the noun "Paraclete," which we are now considering.

3. In the Talmud and Targums:

Among Jewish writers the word "Paraclete" came to have a number of meanings. A good deed was called a paraclete or advocate, and a transgression was an accuser. Repentance and good works were called paracletes: "The works of benevolence and mercy done by the people of Israel in this world become agents of peace and intercessors (paracletes) between them and their Father in heaven." The sin offering is a paraclete; the paraclete created by each good deed is called an angel (Jewish Encyclopedia, IX, 514-15, article "Paraclete").

4. As Employed by Philo:

Philo employs the word in several instances. Usually he does not use it in the legal, technical sense. Joseph is represented as bestowing forgiveness on his brethren who had wronged him and declaring that they needed "no one else as paraclete," or intercessor (De Joseph c. 40). In his Life of Moses, iii.14, is a remarkable passage which indicates Philo's spiritualizing methods of interpreting Scripture as well as

reflects his philosophic tendency. At the close of a somewhat elaborate account of the emblematic significance of the vestments of the high priest and their jeweled decorations, his words are: "The twelve stones arranged on the breast in four rows of three stones each, namely, the logeum, being also an emblem of that reason which holds together and regulates the universe. For it was indispensable (anagkaion) that the man who was consecrated to the Father of the world should have, as a paraclete, his son, the being most perfect in all virtue, to procure the forgiveness of sins, and a supply of unlimited blessings." This is rather a striking verbal or formal parallel to the statement in 1 Joh 2:1 where Christ is our Advocate with the Father, although of course Philo's conceptions of the Divine "reason" and "son" are by no means the Christian conceptions.

5. The Best Translation:

If now we raise the question what is the best translation of the term "Paraclete" in the New Testament, we have a choice of several words. Let us glance at them in order. The translation "Comforter" contains an element of the meaning of the word as employed in the Gospels, and harmonizes with the usage in connection with its cognates, but it is too narrow in meaning to be an adequate translation. Dr. J. Hastings in an otherwise excellent article on the Paraclete in HDB says the Paraclete was not sent to comfort the disciples, since prior to His actual coming and after Christ's promise the disciples' sorrow was turned into joy. Dr. Hastings thinks the Paraclete was sent to cure the unbelief or half-belief of the disciples. But this conceives the idea of comfort in too limited a way. No doubt in the mind of Jesus the comforting aspect, of the Spirit's work applied to all their future sorrows and trials, and not merely to comfort for their personal loss in the going of Christ to the Father. Nevertheless there was more in the work of the Paraclete than comfort in sorrow. "Intercessor" comes nearer the root idea of the term and contains an essential part of the meaning. "Advocate" is a closely related word, and is also suggestive of the work of the Spirit. Perhaps there is no English word broad enough to cover all the significance of the word "Paraclete" except the word "Helper." The Spirit helps the disciples in all the above-indicated ways. Of course the objection to this translation is that it is too indefinite. The specific Christian conception is lost in the comprehensiveness of the term. Our conclusion, therefore, is that the term "Paraclete" itself would perhaps be the best designation of the Spirit in the passage in John's Gospel. It would thus become a proper name for the Spirit and the various elements of meaning would come to be associated with the words which are found in the context of the Gospel.

Christianity introduced many new ideas into the world for which current terms were inadequate media of expression. In some cases it is best to adopt the Christian term itself, in our translations, and let the word slowly acquire its own proper significance in our thought and life. If, however, instead of translating we simply transfer the word "Paraclete" as a designation of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel passages, we would need then to translate it in the passage in the Epistle where it refers to Christ. But this would offer no serious difficulty. For fortunately in the Epistle the word may very clearly be translated "Advocate" or "Intercessor."

6. Christ's Use of the Word:

We look next at the contents of the word as employed by Jesus in reference to the Holy Spirit. In Joh 14:16 the Paraclete is promised as one who is to take the place of Jesus. It is declared elsewhere by Jesus that it is expedient that He go away, for unless He go away the Paraclete will not come (Joh 16:7). Is the Paraclete, then, the successor or the substitute for Christ as He is sometimes called? The answer is that He is both and neither. He is the successor of Christ historically, but not in the sense that Christ ceases to act in the church. He is the substitute for Christ's physical presence, but only in order that He may make vital and actual Christ's spiritual presence. As we have seen, the Paraclete moves only in the range of truths conveyed in and through Christ as the historical manifestation of God. A "Kingdom of the Spirit," therefore, is impossible in the Christian sense, save as the historical Jesus is made the basis of the Spirit's action in history. The promise of Jesus in 14:18, "I come unto," is parallel and equivalent in meaning with the preceding promise of the Paraclete. The following are given as the specific forms of activity of the Holy Spirit:

(1) to show them the things of Christ,

(2) to teach them things to come,

(3) to teach them all things,

(4) to quicken their memories for past teaching,

(5) to bear witness to Christ,

(6) to dwell in believers,

(7) other things shown in the context such as "greater works" than those of Christ (see Joh 14:16,17),

(8) to convict of sin, of righteousness and judgment.

It is possible to range the shades of meaning outlined above under these various forms of the Spirit's activity. As Comforter His work would come under (1), (2), (3) and (6); as Advocate and Intercessor under (6), (7), (8); as Helper and Teacher under (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8).

The manner of the sending of the Paraclete is of interest. In Joh 14:16 the Paraclete comes in answer to Christ's prayer. The Father will give the Spirit whom the world cannot receive. In Joh 14:26 the Father will send the Spirit in Christ's name. Yet in 15:26 Christ says, "I will send (him) unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth," and in 16:7, "If I go, I will send him unto you."

See HOLY SPIRIT.

7. As Applied to Christ:

It remains to notice the passage in 1 Joh 2:1 where the term "Paraclete" is applied to Christ: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous"; 2:2 reads: "and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." Here the meaning is quite clear and specific. Jesus Christ the righteous is represented as our Advocate or Intercessor with the Father. His righteousness is set over against our sin. Here the Paraclete, Christ, is He who, on the basis of His propitiatory offering for the sins of men, intercedes for them with God and thus averts from them the penal consequences of their transgressions. The sense in which Paraclete is here applied to Christ is found nowhere in the passages we have cited from the Gospel. The Holy Spirit as Paraclete is Intercessor or Advocate, but not in the sense here indicated. The Spirit as Paraclete convicts the world of sin, of righteousness and judgment. Jesus Christ as Paraclete vindicates believers before God.

LITERATURE.

Grimm-Thayer, Gr-Eng. Lexicon of the New Testament; Cremer, Biblico-Theol. Lexicon; HDB, article "Paraclete"; DCG, article "Paraclete"; EB, article "Paraclete"; Jew Encyclopedia, article "Paraclete"; Hare, Mission of the Comforter; Pearson, On the Creed; Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers; various comms., Westcott, Godet and others.

See list of books appended to article on HOLY SPIRIT.

E. Y. Mulhns

PARADISE

par’-a-dis (pardec; paradeisos):

1. Origin and Meaning:

A word probably of Persian origin meaning a royal park. See GARDEN. The word occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures but 3 times: So 4:13, where it is translated "an orchard"; Ne 2:8, where it is translated "a forest" (the Revised Version margin "park"); Ec 2:5, where it is in the plural number (the King James Version "orchards," the Revised Version (British and American) "parks"). But it was early introduced into the Greek language, being made specially familiar by Xenophon upon his return from the expedition of Cyrus the Younger to Babylonia (see Anab. i.2, section 7; 4, section 9; Cyrop. i.3, section 14). In Septuagint the word is of frequent use in translating other terms of kindred significance. The Garden of Eden became "the paradise of pleasure or luxury" (Ge 2:15; 3:23; Joe 2:3). The valley of the Jordan became ‘the paradise of God’ (Ge 13:10). In Eze 31:8,9, according to Septuagint, there is no tree in the ‘paradise of God’ equal to that which in the prophet’s vision symbolizes the glory of Assyria. The figures in the first 9 verses of this chapter may well have been suggested by what the prophet had himself seen of parks in the Persian empire.

2. Use in Jewish Literatare:

In the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature the word is extensively used in a spiritual and symbolia sense, signalizing the place of happiness to be inherited by the righteous in contrast to Gehenna, the place of punishment to which the wicked were to be assigned. In the later Jewish literature "Sheol" is represented as a place where preliminary rewards and punishments are bestowed previous to the final judgment (see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; and compare 2 Esdras 2:19; 8:52). But the representations in this literature are often vague and conflicting, some holding that there were 4 divisions in Sheol, one for those who were marryred for righteousness' sake, one for sinners who on earth had paid the penalty for their sins, one for the just who had not suffered martyrdom, and one for sinners who had not been punished on earth (En 102:15). But among the Alexandrian Jews the view prevailed that the separation of the righteous from the wicked took place immediately after death (see The Wisdom of Solomon 3:14; 4:10; 5:5,17; Josephus, Ant, XVIII, i, 3; B J, II, viii, 14). This would seem to be the idea underlying the use of the word in the New Testament where it occurs only 3 times, and then in a sense remarkably free from sensuous suggestions.

3. Used by Christ:

Christ uses the word but once (Lu 23:43), when He said to the penitent thief, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise" (see ABRAHAM'S BOSOM (compare HADES)). This was no time to choose words with dialectical precision. The consolation needed by the penitent thief suffering from thirst and agony and shame was such as was symbolized by the popular conception of paradise, which, as held by the Essenes, consisted of "habitations beyond the ocean, in a region that is neither oppressed with storms of rain, or snow, or with intense heat, but that this place is such as is refreshed by the gentle breathin of a west wind, that is perpetually blowing from the ocean" (Josephus, BJ, II, viii, 11).

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

4. Other Forms and Uses:

Nowhere in His public teaching did Christ use the word "Paradise." He does indeed, when speaking in parables, employ the figure of the marriage supper, and of new wine, and elsewhere of Abraham's bosom, and of houses not made by hands, eternal in the heavens; but all these references are in striking contrast to the prevailing sensuous representations of the times (see 2 Esdras 2:19; 8:52), and such as have been introduced into Mohammedan literature. Likewise Paul (2Co 12:4) speaks of having been "caught up into Paradise" where he "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter." See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. But in 2Co 12:2 this is referred to more vaguely as "the third heaven." In Re 2:7 it is said to the members of the church at Ephesus who should overcome, "I (will) give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God," where the Eden of Ge 2:8 is made the symbol of the abode of the righteous, more fully described without the words in the last chapter of the book. The reticence of the sacred writers respecting this subject is in striking contrast to the profuseness and crudity both of rabbinical writers before Christ and of apocryphal writers and

Christian commentators at a later time. "Where the true Gospels are most reticent, the mythical are most exuberant" (Perowne). This is especially noticeable in the Gospel of Nicodemus, the Acta Philippi, the writings of Tertullian (De Idol. c. 13; De Anim. c. 55; Tertullian's treatise De Paradiso is lost), Clement of Alexandria (Frag. 51), and John of Damascus (De Orthod. Fid., ii, 11). In modern literature the conception of Paradise is effectually sublimated and spiritualized in Faber's familiar hymn:

"O Paradise, O Paradise,

I greatly long to see

The special place my dearest Lord

Is destining for me;

Where loyal hearts and true

Stand ever in the light,

All rapture thro' and thro',

In God's most holy sight."

LITERATURE.

The articles in the great Dicts., especially Herzog, RE; HDB; Alger, Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life; Schodde, Book of Enoch; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Lu 23:43; Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality, 346 ff. For a good account of Jewish and patristic speculation on Paradise, see Professor Plumptre's article in Smith's D.B, II, 704 ff.

G. F. Wright

PARAH

pa'-ra, par'-a (ha-parah; Codex Vaticanus Phara; Codex Alexandrinus Aphar): A city named as in the territory of Benjamin between Avvim and Ophrah (Jos 18:23). It may with some confidence be identified with Farah on Wady Farah, which runs into Wady Suweinit, about 3 miles Northeast of 'Anata.

PARALYSIS, PARALYTIC

pa-ral'-i-sis, par-alit'-ik.

See PALSY.

PARAMOUR

par’-a-moor (pilleghesh, "a concubine," masculine or feminine): A term applied in Eze 23:20 to the male lover, but elsewhere translated "concubine."

PARAN, EL-PARAN

pa’-ran, (pa’ran, ‘el-pa’ran; Pharan):

(1) El-paran (Ge 14:6) was the point farthest South reached by the kings. Septuagint renders ‘el by terebinthos, and reads, "unto the terebinth of Paran." The evidence is slender, but it is not unreasonable to suppose that this is the place elsewhere (De 2:8; 1Ki 9:26, etc.) called Elath or Eloth (’el with feminine termination), a seaport town which gave its name to the Aelanitic Gulf (modern Gulf of ‘Aqaba), not far from the wilderness of Paran (2).

(2) Many places named in the narrative of the wanderings lay within the Wilderness of Paran (Nu 10:12; 13:21; 27:14; compare 13:3,16, etc.). It is identified with the high limestone plateau of Ettih, stretching from the Southwest of the Dead Sea to Sinai along the west side of the Arabah. This wilderness offered hospitality to Ishmael when driven from his father’s tent (Ge 21:21). Hither also came David when bereaved of Samuel’s protection (1Sa 25:1).

(3) Mount Paran (De 33:2; Hab 3:3) may be either Jebel Maqrah, 29 miles South of ‘Ain Kadis (Kadesh-barnea), and 130 miles North of Sinai (Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, 510); or the higher and more imposing range of mountains West of the Gulf of ‘Aqaba. This is the more probable if El-paran is rightly identified with Elath.

(4) Some place named Paran would seem to be referred to in De 1:1; but no trace of such a city has yet been found. Paran in 1Ki 11:18 doubtless refers to the district West of the Arabah.

W. Ewing

PARBAR

par’-bar (parbar (1Ch 26:18), and parwarim, translated "precincts" (the King James Version "suburbs" in 2Ki 23:11); Septuagint pharoureim): In 1Ch 26:18 reference is made to the position of the gatekeepers, "for Parbar westward, four at the causeway, and two at Parbar." The word is supposed to be of Persian origin, connected with Parwar, meaning "possessing light," and hence, the meaning has been suggested of "colonnade" or "portico," some place open to the light. In the plural form (2Ki 23:11) the situation of

the house of "Nathan-melech" is described, and the translation, "in the colonnades," should, if the above origin is accepted, be more correct than English Versions of the Bible. It is difficult to understand the occurrence of a Persian word at this time, and it has been suggested (EB, col 3585) that the word is a description of the office of Nathan-melech, ba-parwarim being a misreading for ba-peradhim, meaning "who was over the mules."

E. W. G. Masterman

PARCEL

par'-sel: Properly "a little part," in Elizabethan English being used in almost any sense. In the King James Version of Ge 33:19; Jos 24:32; Ru 4:3; 1Ch 11:13,14 it is the translation of chelqah; Joh 4:5 of chorion—both the Greek and Hebrew words meaning a "piece of land." the Revised Version (British and American) writes "plot" in 1Ch 11:13,14, but if the change was needed at all, it should have been made throughout.

PARCHED

parcht: Four different root words have been translated "parched" in English Versions of the Bible:

(1) qalah, "roasted." This word is applied to corn or pulse. It is a common practice in Palestine and Syria to roast the nearly ripe wheat for eating as a delicacy. A handful of heads of fully developed grain, with the stalks still attached, are gathered and bound together and then, holding the bunch by the lower ends of the stalks, the heads are toasted over a fire of straw or thorn bush. By the time most of the sheaths are blackened the grain is toasted, and, after rubbing off the husks between the hands, is ready to eat (Le 2:14). A form of pulse is toasted in the same way and is more sought after than the grain. In the larger towns and cities, venders go about the streets selling bunches of toasted chick-peas. The Bible references, however, are probably to another form of roasted grain. The threshed wheat or pulse is roasted over a fire on an iron pan or on a fiat stone, being kept in constant motion with a stirrer until the operation is finished. The grain thus prepared is a marketable article. Parched grain is not now so commonly met with as the pulse, which either roasted or unroasted is called chommoc (from Arabic "to roast" or "parch"). Parched pulse is eaten not only plain, but is often made into confection by coating the seeds with sugar. In Bible times parched wheat or pulse was a common food, even taking the place of bread (Le 23:14; Jos 5:11; Ru 2:14). It was a useful food supply for armies, as it required no further cooking (1Sa 17:17). It was frequently included in gifts or hostages (1Sa 25:18; 2Sa 17:28).

(2) charer, "burned" or "parched" (compare Arabic chariq, "burned"), is used in the sense of dried up or arid in Jer 17:6.

(3) tsicheh, is used in Isa 5:13, the King James Version "dried up" the Revised Version (British and American) "parched" tsechichah in Ps 68:6, the King James Version "dry," the Revised Version (British and American) "parched."

(4) sharabh, rendered "parched" in the King James Version, is "glowing" in the Revised Version (British and American). The word implies the peculiar wavy effect of the air above parched ground, usually accompanied by mirages (compare Arabic serdb, "mirage") (Isa 35:7; 49:10). In predicting a happy future for Zion the prophet could have chosen no greater contrast than that the hot glowing sands which produce illusive water effects should be changed into real pools.

See MIRAGE.

James A. Patch

PARCHED CORN (GRAIN)

parcht.

See FOOD.

PARCHMENT

parch’-ment (membrana (2Ti 4:13)): The word "parchment "which occurs only once (2Ti 4:13), is derived from Latin pergamena (Greek Pergamene), i.e. pertaining to Pergamum, the name of an ancient city in Asia Minor where, it is believed, parchment was first used. Parchment is made from the skins of sheep, goats or young calves. The hair and fleshy portions of the skin are removed as in tanning by first soaking in lime and then dehairing, scraping and washing. The skin is then stretched on a frame and treated with powdered chalk, or other absorptive agent, to remove the fatty substances, and is then dried. It is finally given a smooth surface by rubbing with powdered pumice. Parchment was extensively used at the time of the early Christians for scrolls, legal documents, etc., having replaced papyrus for that purpose. It was no doubt used at even a much earlier time. The roll mentioned in Jer 36 may have been of parchment. Scrolls were later replaced by codices of the same material. After the arabs introduced paper, parchment was still used for centuries for the book bindings. Diplomas printed on "sheepskins," still issued by many universities, represent the survival of an ancient use of parchment. See following article.

James A. Patch

PARCHMENTS

parch’-ments (membranai, "membranes," "parchments," "vellum"): The skins, chiefly of sheep, lambs, goats and calves, prepared so as to be used for writing on (2Ti 4:13).

In Greek and Roman times parchment was much employed as a writing material. "At Rome, in the 1st

century BC, and the 1st and 2d centuries AD, there is evidence of the use of vellum, but only for notebooks and for rough drafts or inferior copies of literary works. .... A fragment of a vellum MS, which may belong to this period, is preserved in British Museum Add. manuscript 34,473, consisting of two leaves of Demosthenes, De Fals. Leg., in a small hand, which pears to be of the 2nd cent." (F. G. Kenyon in HDB, IV, 947).

Paul directs Timothy that, when he comes from Ephesus to Rome, he is to bring "the books, especially the parchments." These, as well as the "cloak," which is also mentioned, had evidently been "left at Troas with Carpus." What were these parchments? They are distinguished from "the books," which were probably a few choice volumes or rolls, some portions of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, some volumes of the Law of Moses or of the Prophets or of the Psalms. Among "the books" there might also be Jewish exegetical works, or heathen writings, with which, as is made evident by references in his Epistles, Paul was well acquainted.

The parchments were different from these, and were perhaps notebooks, in which the apostle had, from time to time, written what he had observed and wished to preserve as specially worthy of remembrance, facts which he had gathered in his study of the Old Testament or of other books. These notes may have been the result of many years' reading and study, and he wished Timothy to bring them to him.

Various conjectures have been made in regard to the contents of "the parchments." It has been suggested by Kenyon (HDB, III, 673) that they contained the Old Testament in Greek; by Farrar, that the parchments were a diploma of Paul's Roman citizenship; by Bull, that they were his commonplace books; by Latham, that the parchments were a copy of the Grundschrift of the Gospels, a volume containing the all-important narrative of the Saviour's life and cross and resurrection. Workman (Persecution in the Early Church, 39) writes: "By tas membranas I understand the proofs of his citizenship."

Whatever their contents may have been, they were of such value that Paul wished to have them with him in his prison at Rome, so that, if life were spared for even a few weeks or months, the books and parchments might be at hand for reference. Perhaps in the fact that the books and the parchments and the cloak had been left at Troas with Carpus, there may be a hint that his final arrest by the Roman authorities took place at that city, and that was the suddenness of his arrest that caused him to be unable to carry his books and parchments and the cloak with him. "The police had not even allowed him time to find his overcoat or necessary documents" (Workman, op. cit., 39; see p. 1886, 14).

Be this as it may, he desired to have them now. His well-disciplined mind, even in the near prospect of death by public execution, could find the most joyous labor in the work of the gospel, wherever his influence reached, and could also find relaxation among "the books, especially the parchments."

John Rutherfurd

PARDON

par’-d’n, par’-dun.

See FORGIVENESS.

PARE, (THE NAILS)

par (‘asah, "to fix," "manipulate"): The word, which in Hebrew has a very wide range of application, and which is of very frequent occurrence in the Hebrew Bible, is found in the above meaning in but one passage of English Versions of the Bible (De 21:12; see NAIL). In a similar sense it is found in 2Sa 19:24, where it is used to express the dressing of the feet anti the trimming of the beard.

PARENT

par’-ent.

See CHILDREN; CRIMES; EDUCATION; FAMILY; PUNISHMENTS.

PARK

park (pardec; Septuagint paradeisos; compare Arabic firdaus): "I made me gardens and parks," the King James Version "orchards" (Ec 2:5); "Asaph the keeper of the king’s forest," the Revised Version margin "park" (Ne 2:8). The same word occurs in So 4:13, "Thy shoots are an orchard (the Revised Version margin "paradise") of pomegranates." according to Liddell and Scott, paradeisos occurs first in Xenophon, who always uses it of the parks of Persian kings and noblemen. Like many other quadriliterals the word is undoubtedly of eastern origin. It seems to connote an enclosure. It is used in Septuagint of the Garden of Eden. Compare Lu 23:43; 2Co 12:4; Re 2:7.

See PARADISE.

Alfred Ely Day

PARLOR

par’-ler: This word in the King James Version, occurring in Jud 3:20-25; 1Sa 9:22; 1Ch 28:11, is in every instance changed in the Revised Version: in Judges into "upper room," in 1 Samuel into "guest-chamber," in 1 Chronicles into "chambers," representing as many Hebrew words.

See HOUSE.

PARMASHTA

par-mash’-ta (parmashta’; Septuagint Marmasima, or Marmasimna): One of the sons of Haman (Es 9:9).

PARMENAS

par’-me-nas (Parmenas): A Greek name, an abbreviated form of Parmenides. Parmenas was one of "the seven" chosen by the people and appointed by the apostles to superintend the daily distribution to the Christian poor of Jerusalem (Ac 6:5). Tradition states that he was martyred at Philippi, in the reign of Trajan, but his name does not appear again in Scripture.

PARNACH

par’-nak (parnakh, "gifted"): Father of Elizaphan, the prince of Zebulun (Nu 34:25).

PAROSH

pa’-rosh, par’-osh (par‘osh, "flea" (leap)): a family that in part returned under Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:3; Ne 7:8), and in part under Ezra (Ezr 8:3; there spelt "Pharosh," the King James Version). Some of the family had foreign wives (Ezr 10:25). One descendant, Pedaiah (see PEDAIAH, (3)), helped to rebuild the city walls (Ne 3:25), and others were among those who "sealed" the covenant of Nehemiah (Ne 10:1,14). In 1 Esdras 5:9; 8:30; 9:26, "Phoros."

PAROUSIA

pa-roo’-zhi-a:

I. THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE

1. Terms

2. Data and Sources

3. Consistency

4. Meaning of the Symbolism

II. THE TEACHING OF JESUS

1. Critical Problems

2. Summary

3. Fall of Jerusalem

4. Time

III. JOHN’S EVALUATION

1. Solution of Problem

2. The Church a Divine Quantity

LITERATURE

I. The Apostolic Doctrine.

1. Terms:

The Second Coming of Christ (a phrase not found in the Bible) is expressed by the apostles in the following special terms:

(1) "Parousia" (parousia), a word fairly common in Greek, with the meaning "presence" (2Co 10:10; Php 2:12). More especially it may mean "presence after absence," "arrival" (but not "return," unless this is given by the context), as in 1Co 16:17; 2Co 7:6,7; Php 1:26. And still more particularly it is applied to the Coming of Christ in 1Co 15:23; 1Th 2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23; 2Th 2:1,8; Jas 5:7,8; 2Pe 1:16; 3:4,12; 1Joh 2:28—in all 13 times, besides 2Th 2:9, where it denotes the coming of Anti-christ. This word for Christ’s Second Coming passed into the early Patristic literature (Diognetus, vii.6, e.g.), but its use in this sense is not invariable. For instance the word in Ignatius, Philadelphians, ix.2, means the Incarnation. Or the Incarnation is called the first Parousia, as in Justin, Trypho, xiv. But in modern theology it means invariably the Second Coming. Recent archaeological discoveries have explained why the word received such general Christian use in the special sense. In Hellenistic Greek it was used for the arrival of a ruler at a place, as is evidenced by inscriptions in Egypt, Asia Minor, etc. Indeed, in an Epidaurus inscription of the 3rd century BC (Dittenberger, Sylloge

(2), Number 803, 34), "Parousia" is applied to a manifestation of Aesculapius. Consequently, the adoption by the Greek-speaking Christians of a word that already contained full regal and even Divine concepts was perfectly natural. (The evidence is well summarized in Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East3, 372-78, German edition, 281-87.) (2) "Epiphany" epiphaneia), "manifestation," used of the Incarnation in 2Ti 1:10, but of the Second Coming in 2Th 2:8; 1Ti 6:14; 2Ti 4:1,8; Tit 2:13. The word was used like Parousia in Hellenistic Greek to denote the ceremonial arrival of rulers; compare Deissmann, as above.

(3) "Apocalypse" apokalupsis), "revelation," denotes the Second Coming in 1Co 1:7; 2Th 1:7; 1Pe 1:7,13; 4:13.

(4) "Day of the Lord, more or less modified, but referring to Christ in 1Co 1:8; 5:5; 2Co 1:14; Php 1:6,10; 2:16; 1Th 5:2; 2Th 2:2. The phrase is used of the Father in the strict Old Testament sense in Ac 2:20; 2Pe 3:12; Re 1:6-14, and probably in 2Pe 3:10. Besides, as in the Old Testament and the intermediate literature, "day of wrath," "last day," or simply "day" are used very frequently.

See DAY OF THE LORD.

Of the first three of the above terms, only Parousia is found in the Gospels, 4 times, all in Mt 24:3,17,37,39, and in the last three of these all in the set phrase "so shall be the Parousia of the Son of Man." As Christ spoke in Aramaic, the use of "Parousia" here is of course due to Matthew’s adoption of the current Greek word.

2. Data and Sources:

The last of the 4 terms above brings the apostolic doctrine of the Parousia into connection with the eschatology (Messianic or otherwise) of the Old Testament and of the intermediate writings. But the connection is far closer than that supplied by this single term only, for newly every feature in the apostolic doctrine can be paralleled directly from the Jewish sources. The following summary does not begin to give complete references to even such Jewish material as is extant, but enough is presented to show how closely allied are the eschatologies of Judaism and of early Christianity.

The end is not to be expected instantly. There are still signs to come to pass (2Th 2:3), and in especial the determined number of martyrs must be filled up (Re 6:11; compare 2 Esdras 4:35,36). There is need of patience (Jas 5:7, etc.; compare 2 Esdras 4:34; Baruch 83:4). But it is at hand (1Pe 4:7; Re 1:3; 22:10; compare 2 Esdras 14:17). "Yet a little while" (Heb 10:37), "The night is far spent" (Ro 13:12), "The Lord is at hand" (Php 4:5). "We that are alive" expect to see it (1Th 4:15; 1Co 15:51; compare Baruch 76:5); the time is shortened henceforth (1Co 7:29; compare Baruch 20:1; 2 Esdras 4:26, and the commentaries on 1 Corinthians). Indeed, there is hardly time for repentance even (Re 22:11, ironical), certainly there is no time left for self-indulgence (1Th 5:3; 1Pe 4:2; 2Pe 3:11; Re 3:3; compare Baruch 83:5), and watchfulness is urgently demanded (1Th 5:6; Re 3:3).

An outpouring of the Spirit is a sign of the end (Ac 2:17,18; compare Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Levi 18:11; Sib Or 4:46, always after the consummation in the Jewish sources). But the world is growing steadily worse, for the godly and intense trials are coming (passim), although those especially favored may be spared suffering (Re 3:10; compare Baruch 29:2). This is the beginning of Judgment (1Pe 4:17; compare Enoch 99:10). Iniquity increases and false teachers are multiplied (Jude 1:18; 2Pe 3:3; 2Ti 3$, especially 2Ti 3:13; compare Enoch 80:7; Baruch 70:5; 2 Esdras 5:9,10). Above all there is to be an outburst of diabolic malevolence in the antichrist (1 Joh 2:18,22; 4:3; 2 Joh 1:7; 2Th 2:8-10; Re 19:19; compare Baruch 36:8-10; Sib Or 3:63-70, and see ANTICHRIST), who will gather all

nations to his ensign (Re 19:19; 2Th 2:10 compare 2 Esdras 13:5; Enoch 56). Plagues fall upon men (Rev, passim; compare especially Philo, Execr.), and natural portents occur (Ac 2:19,20; Rev, passim; compare 2 Esdras 5:4,5; Enoch 80:5-8). But the conversion of the Jews (Ro 11:26) is brought about by these plagues (Re 11:13; in the Jewish sources, naturally, conversion of Gentiles, as in Sib Or 3:616-623; Enoch 10:21). Then Christ is manifested and Antichrist is slain or captured (2Th 2:8; Re 19:20; compare 2 Esdras 13:10,11). In Re 20:3 the Millennium follows (compare 2 Esdras 7:28; 12; 34; Baruch 40:3, and often in rabbinical literature; the millennium in Slavic Enoch, chapter 33, is of very dubious existence), but other traces of millennial doctrine in the New Testament are of the vaguest (compare the commentaries to 1Co 15:24, for instance, especially Schmiedel, J. Weiss, and Lietzmann, and see MILLENNIUM). The general resurrection follows (see RESURRECTION for details).

The Father holds the Judgment in Heb 10:30; 12:23; 13:4; Jas 4:11,12; 1Pe 1:17; Re 14:7; 20:11, and probably in Jude 1:14,15. Christ is Judge in Ac 10:42; 2Co 5:10; 2Ti 4:1. The two concepts are interwoven in Ro 14:9,10. God mediates judgment through Christ in Ac 17:31; Ro 2:16, and probably in Ro 2:2-6; 3:6. In 2 Thessalonians Christ appears as the executor of punishment. For similar uncertainties in the Jewish schemes, compare, for instance, 2 Esdras 7:33 and Enoch 45:3. For the fate of the wicked see ESCHATOLOGY; HELL; Paul, rather curiously, has very little to say about this (Ro 2:3; 1Co 3:17; 2Th 1:8,9). Then all Nature is renewed (Ro 8:21; Enoch 45:4,5) or completely destroyed (1Co 7:31; Heb 12:27; Re 21:1; compare Enoch 1:6; 2 Esdras 7:30); by fire in 2Pe 3:10 (compare Sib Or 4:172-177), so as to leave only the eternal verities (Heb 12:27; compare 2 Esdras 7:30(?)), or to be replaced with a new heaven and a new earth (Re 21:1; compare Slavic Enoch 33:1-2). And the righteous receive the New Jerusalem (Ga 4:26; Heb 12:22; Re 3:12; 21:2,10; compare Baruch 4:2-6; 2 Esdras 7:26).

3. Consistency:

It is of course possible, as in the older works on dogmatics, to reconcile the slight divergences of the above details and to fit them all into a single scheme. But the propriety of such an undertaking is more than dubious, for the traditional nature of these details is abundantly clear—a tradition that is not due solely to the fact that the Christian and the Jewish schemes have a common Old Testament basis. That the Jewish writers realized that the eschatological details were merely symbolic is made obvious by the contradictions that every apocalypse contains—the contradictions that are the despair of the beginner in apocalyptics. No writer seems to have thought it worth while to reconcile his details, for they were purely figures of dimly comprehended forces. And the Christian symbolism must be interpreted on the same principle. No greater injustice, for instance, could be done Paul’s thought than to suppose he would have been in the least disturbed by John’s interpretation of the Antichrist as many persons and all of them ordinary human beings (1 Joh 2:18,19).

4. Meaning of the Symbolism:

The symbolism, then, in which the Parousia is described was simply that held by the apostles in their pre-Christian days. This symbolism, to be sure, has been thoroughly purified from such puerilities as the feast on Leviathan and Behemoth of Baruch 29, or the "thousand children" of Enoch 10:17, a fact all the

more remarkable as 2nd-century Christianity has enough of this and to spare (e.g. Irenaeus, v.33). What is more important is that the symbolism of the Parousia is simply in the Jewish sources the symbolism of the coming of the Messiah (or of God in such schemes as have no Messiah). Now it is to be observed that among the apostles the Kingdom of God is almost uniformly regarded as a future quantity (1Co 6:9,10; 15:50; Ga 5:21; Eph 5:5; 2Ti 4:1,18; 2Pe 1:11; Re 11:15; 12:10), with a definitely present idea only in Col 1:13. Remembering again that the term "Messiah" means simply "the Bringer of the Kingdom," the case becomes entirely clear. No apostle, of course, ever thought of Christ as anything but the Messiah. But neither did they think of His Messianic work as completed, or, if the most exact terminology be pressed, of the strict Messianic work as done at all. Even the Atonement belonged to the preliminary acts, viewed perhaps somewhat as Enoch 39:6 views the preexistent Messiah's residence among the "church expectant." This could come to pass more readily as the traditions generally were silent as to what the Messiah was to do before He brought the Kingdom, while they all agreed that He was not to be created only at that moment. Into this blank, especially with the aid of Isa 53, etc., our Lord's earthly life and Passion fitted naturally, leaving the fact of His Second Coming to be identified with the coming of the Messiah as originally conceived.

II. The Teaching of Jesus.

1. Critical Problems:

It will be found helpful, in studying the bitter controversies that have raged around Christ's teaching about the future, to remember that the apostolic idea of the word "Messiah" is the only definition that the word has; that, for instance, "Messiah" and "Saviour of the world" are not quite convertible terms, or that a redefinition of the Messiah as a moral teacher or an expounder of the will of God does not rest on "spiritualizing" of the term, but on a destruction of it in favor of "prophet." Now the three expressions, "Messianic work," "coming of the Kingdom," and "Parousia" are only three titles for one and the same thing, while the addition of "Son of Man" to them merely involves their being taken in the most transcendental form possible. In fact, this is the state of affairs found in the Synoptists. Christ predicts the coming of the Kingdom. He claims the title of its king (or Regent under the Father). The realization of this expectation He placed on the other side of the grave, i.e. in a glorified state. And in connection with this evidence we find His use of the title Son of Man. From all this the doctrine of the Parousia follows immediately, even apart from the passages in which the regular apocalyptic symbolism is used. The contention may be made that this symbolism in the Gospels has been drawn out of other sources by the evangelists (the so-called "Little Apocalypse" of Mr 13:7-9,14-20,24-27,30-31 is the usual point of attack), but, even if the contention could be made out (and agreement in this regard is anything but attained), no really vital part of the case would be touched. Of course, it is possible to begin with the a priori assumption that "no sane man could conceive of himself as an apocalyptic being walking the earth incognito," and to refer to later tradition everything in the Gospels that contradicts this assumption. But then there are difficulties. The various concepts involved are mentioned directly so often that the number of passages to be removed grows alarmingly large. Then the concepts interlock in such a way as to present a remarkably firm resistance to the critical knife; the picture is much too consistent for an artificial product. Thus, there are a number of indirect references (the title on the Cross, the "Palm-Sunday" procession, etc.) that contradict all we know of later growths. And, finally, the most undeterred

critic finds himself confronted with a last stubborn difficulty, the unwavering conviction of the earliest church that Christ made the eschatological claims. It is conceivable that the apostles may have misunderstood Christ in other matters, but an error in this central point of all (as the apostles appraised things) is hardly in the realms of critical possibility. On the whole, such an attempt to force a way through the evidence of the documents would seem something surprisingly like the violence done to history by the most perverse of the older dogmatists.

2. Summary:

The number of relevant passages involved is so large and the critical problems so intricate that any detailed discussion is prohibited here. Moreover, the symbolism presents nothing novel to the student familiar with the usual schemes. Forces of evil increase in the world, the state of the righteous grows harder, distress and natural portents follow, at the climax Christ appears suddenly with His angels, bringing the Kingdom of God, gathers the elect into the Kingdom, and dismisses the wicked into outer darkness (or fire). The Father is the Judge in Mt 10:32,33, but the Son in the parallel Lu 12:8,9, and in Mt 13:41; 16:27; 25:32; probably in Mt 24:50 parallel Lu 12:46; Mr 8:38 and its parallel Lu 9:26 are uncertain. At all events, the eternal destiny of each man depends on Christ's attitude, possibly with the Father's (invariable) ratification considered.

3. Fall of Jerusalem:

How far Christ connected the Parousia and the fall of Jerusalem, it is not easy to say. Various sayings of Christ about the future were certainly grouped by the evangelists; compare Mt 24 with Mr 13 and Lu 17:20-37; or Lu 17:31 with Mr 13:15,16 (noting the inappropriateness of Lu 17:31 in its present context). The critical discussions of Mr 13 are familiar and those of Lu 21 (a still more complex problem) only less so. Remembering what the fall of Jerusalem or its immediate prospect would have meant to the apostles, the tendency to group the statements of Christ will be realized. Consequently, not too much stress should be laid on the connection of this with the Parousia, and in no case can the fall of Jerusalem be considered to exhaust the meaning of the Parousia.

4. Time:

The most debated question is that of the time of the Parousia. Here Mr 13:30 parallel Lu 21:32 parallel Mt 24:34 place it within Christ's generation, Mr 9:1 parallel Lu 9:27 parallel Mt 16:28 within the lifetime of some of His hearers, Mt 10:23 before all the cities of Judea are closed to Christ's apostles. (Only the first of these contains any reference to the fall of Jerusalem.) Then there is "ye shall see" of Mr 14:62; Lu 13:35 parallel Mt 23:39. Agreeing with this are the exhortations to watchfulness (Mr 13:33-37; Lu 12:40 parallel Mt 24:44, etc., with many parables, such as the Ten Virgins). Now Mr 13:32 parallel Mt 24:36 do not quite contradict this, for knowledge of the generation is quite consistent with ignorance of the day and hour; "It will be within your generation, but nothing more can be told you, so watch!" The real difficulty lies in Mr 13:10 parallel Mt 24:14, the necessity of all Gentiles hearing the gospel (Lu 21:24 is hardly relevant). To leave the question here, as most conservative scholars do, is

unsatisfactory, for Mr 13:10 is of no deep value for apologetic service and this value is far outweighed by the real contradiction with the other passages. The key, probably, lies in Mt 10:18, from which Mr 13:10 differs only in insisting on all Gentiles, perhaps with the apostles' thought that "world" and "Roman Empire" were practically coextensive. With this assumption the data yield a uniform result.

III. John's Evaluatlon.

1. Solution of Problem:

It appears, then, that Christ predicted that shortly after His death an event would occur of so transcendental a nature that it could be expressed only in the terms of the fullest eschatological symbolism. John has a clear interpretation of this. In place of the long Parousia discourses in the Synoptists, we have, in the corresponding part of the Fourth Gospel, John 13-17, dealing not only with the future in general but concretely with Christ's coming and the Judgment. Christ indeed came to His own (Joh 14:18), and not He only but the Spirit also (14:16), and even the Father (14:23). When the disciples are so equipped, their presence in the world subjects the world to a continual sifting process of judgment (16:11). The fate of men by this process is to be eternally fixed (3:18), while the disciples newly made are assured that they have already entered into their eternal condition of blessedness (11:25,26; 5:24; 10:28; 17:2,3). Equally directly the presence of Christ is conceived in Re 3:20. So in Paul, the glorified Christ has returned to His own to dwell in them (Ro 8:9,10, etc.), uniting them into a body vitally connected with Him (Col 1:18), so supernatural that it is the teacher of 'angels' (Eph 3:10), a body whose members are already in the Kingdom (Col 1:13), who even sit already in heavenly places (Eph 2:6). The same thought is found in such synoptic passages (Lu 7:28 parallel Mt 11:11; Lu 17:21(?); see KINGDOM OF GOD) as represent the Kingdom as present. Already the eschatological promises were realized in a small group of men, even though they still lacked the transforming influence of the Spirit. Compare the continuous coming of Mt 26:64 (Lu 22:69).

It is on these lines of the church as a supernatural quantity (of course not to be confused with any particular denomination) that the immediate realization of the Parousia promises is to be sought. Into human history has been "injected" a supernatural quantity, through which a Divine Head works, whose reaction on men settles their eternal destiny, and within which the life of heaven is begun definitely.

2. The Church a Divine Quantity:

The force in this body is felt at the crises of human history, perhaps especially after the catastrophe that destroyed Jerusalem and set Christianity free from the swaddling clothes of the primitive community. This conception of the church as a divine quantity, as, so to speak, a part of heaven extended into earth, is faithful to the essentials of the predictions. Nor is it a rationalization of them, if the idea of the church itself be not rationalized. With this conception all realms of Christian activity take on a transcendental significance, both in life and (especially) death, giving to the individual the confidence that he is building better than he knows, for even the apostles could not realize the full significance of what they were doing. Generally speaking, the details in the symbolism must not be pressed. The purpose of

revelation is to minister to life, not to curiosity, and, in teaching of the future, Christ simply taught with the formal language of the schools of the day, with the one change that in the supernatural process He Himself was to be the central figure. Still, the end is not yet. "The hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice" (Joh 5:28; compare Joh 6:40; 21:23; 1Joh 2:28). In Christ human destiny is drawing to a climax that can be expressed only in spiritual terms that transcend our conceptions.

See, further, ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

LITERATURE.

This is overwhelming. For the presuppositions, GJV4 (HJP is antiquated); Volz, Judische Eschatologie; Bousset, Religion des Judentums(2). General discussions: Mathews, The Messianic Hope in the New Testament (the best in English); Sanday, The Life of Christ in Recent Research; Holtzmann, Das messianische Bewusstein Jesu (a classic); von Dobschiitz, The Eschatology of the Gospels (popular, but very sound). Eschatological extreme: Schweitzer, The Quest of the Historical Jesus (Von Reimarus zu Wrede), is quite indispensable; Tyrrell, Christianity at the Cross Roads (perverse, but valuable in parts); Loisy, Gospel and the Church (compare his Evangiles synoptiques). Anti-eschatological: Sharman, The Teaching of Jesus about the Future (minute criticism, inadequate premises, some astounding exegesis); Bacon, The Beginnings of Gospel Story (based on Wellhausen). For the older literature see Schweitzer, Sanday, Holtzmann, as above, and compare Fairweather, The Background of the Gospels, and Brown, "Parousia," in HDB, III.

Burton Scott Easton

PARSHANDATHA

par-shan-da’-tha, par-shan’-da-tha (parshandatha; Septuagint Pharsan, or Pharsanestan; perhaps from the Persian fratsna-data, "given by prayer"): One of the sons of Haman (Es 9:7).

PART

part: "to part" as a verb is no longer in good use (except in a few special phrases, compare Ru 1:17), but is obscure only in Pr 18:18, where the meaning is "break up their quarrel" (compare 2Sa 14:6). the Revised Version (British and American) has not changed the King James Version’s usage, except (strangely) in 1Sa 30:24, where "share" is written. For the noun see PORTION.

PARTHIANS

par’-thi-anz (Parthoi):

1. Country and Early History:

A people mentioned in Ac 2:9 only, in connection with other strangers present at Jerusalem at Pentecost, from which we infer that they were Jews or proselytes from the regions included in the Parthian empire. This empire stretched from the Euphrates to the confines of India and the Oxus, and for centuries was the rival of Rome, and more than once proved her match on the battlefield. The Parthians are not mentioned in the Old Testament, but are frequently in Josephus, and they had an important connection with the history of the Jews, on account of the large colonies of the latter in Mesopotamia, and the interference of the Parthians in the affairs of Judea, once making it a vassal state.

Parthia proper was a small territory to the Southeast of the Caspian Sea, about 300 miles long by 120 wide, a fertile though mountainous region, bordering on the desert tract of Eastern Persia. The origin of the Parthians is rather uncertain, though the prevailing opinion is that they were of Scythic stock or of the great Tartar race. We have no reference to them earlier than the time of Darius the Great, but they were doubtless among the tribes subdued by Cyrus, as they are mentioned by Darius as being in revolt. They seem to have remained faithful to the Persians after that, and submitted to Alexander without resistance.

2. The Seleucid Kings:

Next they came under the rule of the Seleucid kings of Syria, but revolted about 250 BC, in the reign of Antiochus II (Theos), and gained their independence under the lead of Arsaces I who established the dynasty of the Arsacidae, which continued for nearly 5 centuries. His capital was Hecatompylos, but his reign continued only about 3 years, and his brother Tridates succeeded him as Arsaces II and he consolidated the kingdom. The war between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies freed him from interference from that quarter until 237 BC, when Seleucus II (Callinicus) marched against him, but was completely defeated, and Parthian independence was secured. Artabanus I, who followed him, extended his dominions westward to the Zagros Mountains, but Antiochus III would not permit such an encroachment with impunity, and led an expedition against him, driving him back and even invading his ancestral dominion. But after a struggle of some years the Parthians remained still unsubdued, and the difficulties of the contest led Antiochus to conclude peace with him in which he acknowledged the independence of Parthia. For about a quarter of a century the king of Parthia remained quiet, but Phraates I (181-174 BC) recommenced aggressions on the Seleucid empire which Were continued by Mithridates I (174-137), who added to his dominions a part of Bactria, on the East, and Media, Persia and Babylonia on the West. This was a challenge to Demetrius II, of Syria, to whose empire the provinces belonged, and he marched against him with a large force, but was defeated and taken prisoner. He remained in Parthia some years, well treated by Phraates II, whose sister he married, and, when Phraates wished to create a diversion against Antiochus Sidetes, he set Demetrius at liberty and sent him back to Syria. Antiochus was at first successful, as his force of 300,000 men far outnumbered the Parthians, but he was at last defeated and slain in 129 BC and his army destroyed. This was the last attempt of the Seleucid kings to subdue Parthia, and it was acknowledged as the dominant power in Western Asia. But Phraates fell in conflict with the Scyths, whom he called in to aid him in his war with Sidetes, and his successor likewise, and it was only on the accession of Mithridates in 124 BC that these barbarians were checked. The king then turned his attention toward Armenia, which he probably brought under his control, but its king Tigranes

recovered its independence and even attacked the Parthians, and took from them two provinces in Mesopotamia.

3. In Contact with Rome:

Not long after, the power of Rome came into contact with armenia and Parthia. In 66 BC when, after subduing Mithridates of Pontus, Pompey came into Syria, Phraates III made an alliance with him against Armenia, but was offended by the way in which he was treated and thought of turning against his ally, but refrained for the time being. It was only a question of time when the two powers would come to blows, for Parthia had become an empire and could ill brook the intrusion of Rome into Western Asia. It was the ambition and greed of Crassus that brought about the clash of Rome and Parthia. When he took the East as his share of the Roman world as apportioned among the triumvirs, he determined to rival Caesar in fame and wealth by subduing Parthia, and advanced across the Euphrates on his ill-fated expedition in 53 BC. The story of his defeat and death and the destruction of the army and loss of the Roman eagles is familiar to all readers of Roman history. It revealed Parthia to the world as the formidable rival of Rome, which she continued to be for nearly 3 centuries. After the death of Crassus, the Parthians crossed the Euphrates and ravaged Northern Syria, but retired the following year without securing any portion of the country, and thus ended the first war with Rome. In 40 BC, after the battle of Philippi, Pacorus, who was then king, invaded Syria a second time and took possession of it together with all Palestine, Tyre alone escaping subjection. He set Antigonus on the throne of Judea, deposing Hyrcanus for the purpose. Syria and Palestine remained in the hands of Parthia for 3 years, but the coming of Ventidius gave a new turn to affairs. He drove the Parthians out of Syria, and when they returned the following year, he defeated them again and Pacorus was slain. Parthia had to retire within her own borders and remain on the defensive. Antony’s attempt to subdue them proved abortive, and his struggle with Octavian compelled him to relinquish the project. The Parthians were unable to take advantage of the strife in the Roman empire on account of troubles at home. an insurrection led by Tiridates drove the king Phraates IV from the throne, but he recovered it by the aid of the Scyths, and Tiridates took refuge in Syria with the youngest son of the king. Augustus afterward restored him without ransom, and obtained the lost standards of Crassus, and thus peace was established between the rival empires. Each had learned to respect the power of the other, and, although contention arose regarding the suzerainty of armenia, peace was not seriously disturbed between them for about 130 years, or until the reign of Trajan. Parthia was not at peace with herself, however. Dynastic troubles were frequent, and the reigns of the kings short. Artabanus III, who reigned 16-42 AD, was twice expelled from his kingdom and twice recovered his throne. In his days occurred a terrible massacre of Jewish colonists in Mesopotamia, as narrated by Josephus (Ant., XVIII, ix). The contest with Rome over Armenia was settled in the days of Nero in a manner satisfactory to both parties, so that peace was not broken for 50 years. The ambition of Trajan led him to disregard the policy inaugurated by Augustus, adhered to, for the most part, by succeeding emperors, not to extend the limits of the empire. After the conquest of Dacia he turned his attention to the East and resolved on the invasion of Parthia. The Parthian king, Chosroes, endeavored to placate Trajan by an embassy bearing presents and proposals of peace, but Trajan rejected them and carried out his purpose. He subdued armenia, took Upper Mesopotamia, Adiabebe (Assyria), Ctesiphon, the capital, and reached the Pets Gulf, but was obliged to turn back by revolts in his rear and failed to reduce the fortress of Hatra. The conquered provinces were

restored, however, by Hadrian, and the Parthians did not retaliate until the reign of Aurelius, when they overran Syria, and in 162 AD Lucius Verus was sent to punish them. In the following year he drove them back and advanced into the heart of the Parthian empire, inflicting the severest blow it had yet received. It was evident that the empire was on the decline, and the Romans did not meet with the resistance they had experienced in former times. Severus and Caracalla both made expeditions into the country, and the latter took the capital and massacred the inhabitants, but after his assassination his successor, Macrinus, fought a three days' battle with the Parthians at Nisibis in which he was worsted and was glad to conclude a peace by paying an indemnity of some 1,500,000 British pounds (217 AD).

4. Fall of the Empire:

But this was the last achievement of the Parthians. It is evident that Artabanus had suffered severely in his conflict with the Romans, and was unable to put down the revolt of the Persians under the lead of Artaxerxes, who overthrew the Parthian empire and established the dynasty of the Sassanidae in its place (226 AD).

5. Culture:

The Parthians were not a cultured people, but displayed a rude magnificence, making use, to some extent, of remains of Greek culture which they found within the regions they seized from the empire of Alexander. They had no native literature, as far as known, but made use of Greek in writing and on their coins. They were familiar with Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic, and the later kings had Semitic legends on their coins. Josephus is said to have written his history of the Jewish War in his native tongue for Parthian readers. In their method of government they seem to have left the different provinces pretty much to themselves, so long as they paid tribute and furnished the necessary contingents.

H. Porter

PARTICULAR, PARTICULARLY

pir-tik'-u-lar, par-tik'-u-lar-li: The adverbial phrase "in particular" occurs twice in the King James Version (1Co 12:27, ek merous, the Revised Version (British and American) "severally," the Revised Version margin "each in his part"; and Eph 5:33, hoi kath' hena, the Revised Version (British and American) "severally"); in both cases it has the obsolete meaning of "severally," "individually." The adverb "particularly" occurs in the same sense in Ac 21:19 the King James Version, kath' hen hekaston, the Revised Version (British and American) "one by one," and Heb 9:5 the King James Version, kata meros, the Revised Version (British and American) "severally." We have the plural noun in the sense of "details" in 2 Macc 2:30: "to be curious in particulars"; 11:20, (the King James Version "Of the particulars I have given order," the Revised Version (British and American) I have given order in detail); and the adjective "particular" in the sense of "special" in the first Prologue to Sirach (King James Version, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) peculiares; the whole section was omitted in the Revised Version (British and American)).

D. Miall Edwards

PARTITION, THE MIDDLE WALL OF

par-tish’-un, par-tish’-un (to mesotoichon tou phragmou (Eph 2:14)):

1. The Barrier in the Temple

What Paul here asserts is that Christ is our peace, the peace of both Jewish and Gentile believers. He has made them both to be one in Himself, and has broken down the middle wall of partition which divided them from one another. Then the apostle regards Jew and Gentile as two, who by a fresh act of creation in Christ are made into one new man. In the former of these similes he refers to an actual wall in the temple at Jerusalem, beyond which no one was allowed to pass unless he were a Jew, the balustrade or barrier which marked the limit up to which a Gentile might advance but no farther. Curiously, this middle wall of partition had a great deal to do with Paul’s arrest and imprisonment, for the multitude of the Jews became infuriated, not merely because of their general hostility to him as an apostle of Christ and a preacher of the gospel for the world, but specially because it was erroneously supposed that he had brought Trophimus the Ephesian past this barrier into the temple (Ac 21:29), and that he had in this manner profaned the temple (Ac 24:6), or, as it is put in Ac 21:28, he had ‘brought Greeks into the temple and polluted this holy place.’ In the assault which they thereupon made on Paul they violently seized and dragged him out of the temple-dragged him outside the balustrade. The Levites at once shut the gates, to prevent the possibility of any further profanation, and Paul would have been torn in pieces, had not the Roman commander and his soldiers forcibly prevented.

2. Herod’s Temple; Its Divisions; the Courts:

In building the temple Herod the Great had enclosed a large area to form the various courts. The temple itself consisted of the two divisions, the Holy Place, entered by the priests every day, and the Holy of Holies into which the high priest entered alone once every year. Immediately outside the temple there was the Court of the Priests, and in it was placed the great altar of burnt offering. Outside of this again was the Court of the Sons of Israel, and beyond this the Court of the Women. The site of the temple itself and the space occupied by the various courts already mentioned formed a raised plateau or platform. "From it you descended at various points down 5 steps and through gates in a lofty wall, to find yourself overlooking another large court—the outer court to which Gentiles, who desired to see something of the glories of the temple and to offer gifts and sacrifices to the God of the Jews, were freely admitted. Farther in than this court they were forbidden, on pain of death, to go. The actual boundary line was not the high wall with its gates, but a low stone barrier about 5 ft. in height, which ran round at the bottom of 14 more steps" (J. Armitage Robinson, D.D., Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians, 59; see also Edersheim, The Temple, Its Ministry and Services as They Were at the Time of Jesus Christ, 46).

The middle wall of partition was called Coregh, and was built of marble beautifully ornamented.

3. The Court of the Gentiles:

The Court of the Gentiles formed the lowest and the outermost enclosure of all the courts of the sanctuary. It was paved with the finest variegated marble. Its name signified that it was open to all, Jews or Gentiles alike. It was very large, and is said by Jewish tradition to have formed a square of 750 ft. It was in this court that the oxen and sheep and the doves for the sacrifices were sold as in a market. It was in this court too that there were the tables of the money-changers, which Christ Himself overthrew when He drove out the sheep and oxen and them that bought and sold in His Father's house. The multitudes assembling in this court must have been very great, especially on occasions such as the Passover and Pentecost and at the other great feasts, and the din of voices must oftentimes have been most disturbing. As already seen, beyond this court no Gentile might go.

See TEMPLE.

In the year 1871, while excavations were being made on the site of the temple by the Palestine Exploration Fund, M. Clermont-Ganneau discovered one of the pillars which Josephus describes as having been erected upon the very barrier or middle wall of partition, to which Paul refers. This pillar is now preserved in the Museum at Constantinople and is inscribed with a Greek inscription in capital or uncial letters, which is translated as follows:

NO MAN OF ANOTHER NATION

TO ENTER WITHIN THE FENCE AND

ENCLOSURE ROUND THE TEMPLE,

AND WHOEVER IS CAUGHT WILL

HAVE HIMSELF TO BLAME THAT

HIS DEATH ENSUES

While Paul was writing the Epistle to the Ephesians at Rome, this barrier in the temple at Jerusalem was still standing, yet the chained prisoner of Jesus Christ was not afraid to write that Christ had broken down the middle wall of partition, and had thus admitted Gentiles who were far off, strangers and foreigners, to all the privileges of access to God in ancient times possessed by Israel alone; that separation between Jew and Gentile was done away with forever in Christ.

4. The Throwing Down of the Barrier:

If Paul wrote the Epistle to the Ephesians in 60 or 61 AD, then the actual barrier of stone remained in its position in the Court of the Gentiles not more than some 10 years, for it was thrown down in the burning of the temple by the Roman army. And out of those ruins a fragment has been excavated in our own day, containing the very inscription threatening death to the Gentileintruder, and reminding us that it is only in Christ Jesus that we now draw nigh unto God, and that we are thus one body in Christ, one new man. Christ has broken down the middle wall of partition, for He, in His own person, is our peace.

John Rutherfurd

PARTRIDGE

par'-trij (qore; Latin perdix; Septuagint, 1Sa 26:20, nuktikorax, "owl," Jer 17:11, perdix): a bird of the family Tetraonidae. The Hebrew word for this bird, qore', means "a caller," and the Latin perdix is supposed to be an imitation of its cry, and as all other nations base their name for the bird on the Latin, it becomes quite evident that it was originally named in imitation of its call. The commonest partridge of Palestine, very numerous in the wilderness and hill country, was a bird almost as large as a pheasant. It had a clear, exquisite cry that attracted attention, especially in the mating season. The partridge of the wilderness was smaller and of beautifully marked plumage. It made its home around the Dead Sea, in the Wilderness of Judea and in rocky caverns. Its eggs were creamy white; its cry very similar to its relatives'. The partridge and its eggs were used for food from time immemorial.

The first reference to it is found in 1Sa 26:20: "Now therefore, let not my blood fall to the earth away from the presence of Yahweh: for the king of Israel is come out to seek a flea, as when one doth hunt a partridge in the mountains." David in this dialogue with Saul clearly indicates that if he did not hunt the partridge himself, he knew how it was done. The birds were commonly chased up the mountains and stunned or killed with "throw sticks." David knew how deft these birds were at hiding beside logs and under dry leaves colored so like them as to afford splendid protection; how swiftly they could run; what expert dodgers they were; so he compared taking them with catching a flea. The other reference is found in Jer 17:11: "As the partridge that sitteth on eggs which she hath not laid, so is he that getteth riches, and not by right; in the midst of his days they shall leave him, and at his end he shall be a fool." If this reference is supposed to indicate that partridges are in the habit of brooding on the nest of their kind or of different birds, it fails wholly to take into consideration the history of the bird. Partridges select a location, carefully deposit an egg a day for from 10 to 15 days, sometimes 20, and then brood, so that all the young emerge at one time. But each bird knows and returns to its nest with unfailing regularity. It would require the proverbial "Philadelphia lawyer" to explain this reference to a "partridge sitting on eggs she had not laid." No ornithologist ever could reconcile it to the habits or characteristics of the birds. the King James Version translated these lines, "As the partridge sitteth on eggs, and hatcheth them not." This was easy to explain clearly. The eggs of the partridge were delicious food, and any brooding bird whose nest was discovered after only a few days of incubation did not hatch, because she lost her eggs. Also the eggs frequently fall prey to other birds or small animals. Again, they are at the mercy of the elements, sometimes being spoiled by extremely wet cold weather. Poultry fanciers assert that a heavy thunder storm will spoil chicken eggs when hatchingtime is close; the same might be true with

eggs of the wild. And almost any wild bird will desert its nest and make its former brooding useless, if the location is visited too frequently by man or beast.

There is also a partridge reference in the Book of Ecclesiasticus 11:29 ff the Revised Version (British and American)): "Bring not every man into thine house; for many are the plots of the deceitful man. As a decoy partridge in a cage, so is the heart of a proud man; and as one that is a spy, he looketh upon thy falling. For he lieth in wait to turn things that are good into evil; and in things that are praiseworthy he will lay blame." The reference is to confining a tame partridge in a hidden cage so that its calls would lure many of its family within range of arrows or "throw sticks" used by concealed hunters.

Gene Stratton-Porter

PARUAH

pa-roo’-a (paruach "blooming"): Father of Jehoshaphat, who was one of Solomon’s twelve victualers or providers, and had charge in Isaachar of this function (1Ki 4:17).

PARVAIM

par-va’-im (parwayim; Septuagint Pharouaim): The word occurs only in 2Ch 3:6, as the place from which Solomon obtained gold for the decoration of his Temple. A derivation is given from the Sanskrit purva, "eastern," so that the name might be a vague term for the East (Gesenius, Thesaurus, 1125). Whether there was such a place in arabia is doubtful. Farwa in Yemen has been suggested, and also Saq el Farwain in Yemamah. Some have considered the name a shortened form of Cepharvayim which occurs in the Syriac and Targum Jonathan for the "Sephar" of Ge 10:30.

A. S. Fulton

PAS-DAMMIM

pas-dam’-im.

See EPHES-DAMMIM.

PASACH

pa’-sak (pacakh, "divider"): Son of Japhlet, descendant of Asher (1Ch 7:33).

PASEAH

pa-se’-a, pas’-e-a (paceach "limping"):

(1) A son of Eshton, descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:12).

(2) The eponym of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2:49; Ne 7:51, the King James Version "Phaseah" equals "Phinoe" (1 Esdras 5:31).

(3) Father of Joiada, who helped to repair the old gate (Ne 3:6).

PASHHUR, PASHUR

pash’-hur, pash’-ur (pashchur, "splitter," "cleaver"): The name of several persons difficult to individuate:

(1) A priest, son of Immer, and "chief governor in the house of the Lord" (Jer 20:1), who persecuted Jeremiah, putting him in "the stocks" hard by the "house of Yahweh" in the "gate of Benjamin" (Jer 20:2). When released, Jeremiah pronounced Divine judgment on him and the people. Future captivity and an exile’s death are promised to Pashur whose name he changed from its masterful significance to a cowering one. "Terror on every side" (maghor miccabhibh) is to take the place of "stable strength" (Jer 20:3).

(2) Son of Melchiah, a prince of Judah, and one of the delegation sent by Zedekiah, the king, to consult Jeremiah (Jer 21:1). It looks like a larger and later deputation, similarly sent, to which this Pashur belongs, whose record is given in Jer 38:1-13. Accompanying them was one, Gedaliah, who was a son of (3).

(3) Another Pashur (Jer 38:1), who may be the person mentioned in 1Ch 9:12; Ne 11:12.

(4) A priest, of those who "sealed" Nehemiah’s covenant (Ne 10:1,3), who may, however, be the same as (5).

(5) The chief of a priestly family called "sons of Pashur" (Ezr 2:38; 10:22; Ne 7:41; 1 Esdras 5:25 ("Phassurus," margin "Pashhur"); 1 Esdras 9:22 ("Phaisur," margin "Pashhur")). Doubtless it is this Pashur, some of whose sons had "strange wives" (Ezr 10:22).

Henry Wallace

PASS, PASSAGE, PASSENGER

pas, pas’-aj, pas’-en-jer: "To pass" bears different meanings and corresponds to various words in Hebrew and Greek. It occurs frequently in the phrase "and it came to pass" (literally, "and it was"). This is simply a Hebrew idiom linking together the different paragraphs of a continuous narrative. As a rule "pass" renders the Hebrew word ‘abhar. This verb has various meanings, e.g. "to pass over" a stream

(Ge 31:21); "to cross" a boundary (Nu 20:17); "to pass through," or "traverse," a country (Nu 21:22); "to pass on" (Ge 18:5); "to pass away," "cease to exist" (Job 30:15). The word is used metaphorically, "to pass over," "overstep," "transgress" (Nu 14:41). In the causative form the verb is used in the phrase "to cause to pass through fire" (De 18:10; 2Ki 16:3). In the King James Version "pass" sometimes has the force of "surpass," "exceed," e.g. 2Ch 9:22, "King Solomon passed all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom"; compare also Eph 3:19, "the love of Christ which passeth knowledge," and Php 4:7, "the peace of God, which passeth all understanding."

Passage in the King James Version renders ma‘abhar, or ma‘abharah. The former word denotes (1) the ford of a river (Ge 32:23 King James Version margin); (2) the pass of a mountain range (1Sa 13:23). In the only other instance of the use of the shorter form (Isa 30:32 margin), the King James Version renders "where the grounded staff shall pass." A more correct translation would be, "and every sweep (or stroke) of the appointed staff." The longer form bears both meanings, namely, "ford" (e.g. Jos 2:7; Jud 3:28, etc.) and "pass" (1Sa 14:4; Isa 10:29). In Jos 22:11, the rendering ‘towards the region opposite the children of Israel’ would be more correct than the King James Version, "at the passage of the children of Israel." In English Versions of the Bible of Nu 20:21 "passage" seems to mean "right of way," and renders the infinitive of the Hebrew verb. In Jer 22:20 the King James Version the word rendered "passage" should be translated "from Abarim" (as in the Revised Version (British and American)), a mountain range in Moab, Northeast of the Dead Sea.

Passenger in the King James Version means a "passer-by." In Eze 39:11,14,15 where the word occurs 4 times in the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) translates "them that pass through."

T. Lewis

PASSING OF MARY, THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

PASSION, GOSPEL OF THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

PASSION, PASSIONS

pash’-un, pash’-unz: "Passion" is derived from Latin passio, which in turn is derived from the verb patior, with the root, pat-. The Latin words are connected with the Greek root, path-, which appears in a large number of derivatives. And in Greek, Latin, and English (with other languages in addition) words connected with this root, pat-, path-, are often susceptible of a great variety of meanings, for which the dictionaries must be consulted. For "passion," however, as it appears in English Versions of the Bible,

only three of these meanings need be considered.

(1) Close to what seems to be the primary force of the root is the meaning "suffer," and in this sense "passion" is used in Ac 1:3, "to whom he also showed himself alive after his passion." This translation is a paraphrase (Greek: "after he had suffered"), due to the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (post passionem suam), and in English is as old as Wycliff, whom the subsequent English Versions of the Bible has followed. This is the only case in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) where "passion" has this meaning, and it can be so used in modern English only when referring (as here) to the sufferings of Christ (compare "Passion play").

(2) "Suffering," when applied to the mind, came to denote the state that is controlled by some emotion, and so "passion" was applied to the emotion itself. This is the meaning of the word in Ac 14:15, "men of like passions," and Jas 5:17, "a man of like passions," Greek homoiopathes; the Revised Version margin "of like nature" gives the meaning exactly: "men with the same emotions as we."

(3) From "emotion" a transition took place to "strong emotion," and this is the normal force of "passion" in modern English the King James Version does not use this meaning, but in the Revised Version (British and American) "passion" in this sense is the translation of pathos, in its three occurrences: Ro 1:26 (the King James Version "affection"); Col 3:5 (the King James Version "inordinate affection"); 1Th 4:5 (the King James Version "lust").

It is used also for two occurrences of pathema (closely allied to pathos) in Ro 7:5 (the King James Version "motions," the King James Version margin "passions") and in Ga 5:24 (the King James Version "affection"). The fixing of the exact force in any of these cases is a delicate problem fully discussed in the commentaries. In Col 3:5 only does "passion" stand as an isolated term. The context here perhaps gives the word a slight sexual reference, but this must not be overstressed; the warning probably includes any violent over-emotion that robs a man of his self-control.

See AFFECTION; MOTION.

Burton Scott Easton

PASSOVER

pas'-o-ver (pecach, from pacach, "to pass" or "spring over" or "to spare" (Ex 12:13,23,17; compare Isa 31:5. Other conjectures connect the word with the "passing over" into a new year, with assyr pasahu, meaning "to placate," with Hebrew pacah, meaning "to dance," and even with the skipping motions of a young lamb; Aramaic [~paccha', whence Greek Pascha; whence English "paschal." In early Christian centuries folk-etymology connected pascha with Greek pascho, "to suffer" (see PASSION), and the word was taken to refer to Good Friday rather than the Passover):

1. Pecach and Matstsoth

2. Pecach mitsrayim

3. Pecach doroth

4. Matstsoth

5. The ‘Omer

6. Non-traditional Theories

7. The Higher Criticism

8. Historical Celebrations: Old Testament Times

9. Historical Celebrations: New Testament Times

10. The Jewish Passover

1. Pecach and Matstsoth:

The Passover was the annual Hebrew festival on the evening of the 14th day of the month of ‘Abhibh (Abib) or Nisan, as it was called in later times. It was followed by, and closely connected with, a 7 days’ festival of matstsoth, or unleavened bread, to which the name Passover was also applied by extension (Le 23:5). Both were distinctly connected with the Exodus, which, according to tradition, they commemorate; the Passover being in imitation of the last meal in Egypt, eaten in preparation for the journey, while Yahweh, passing over the houses of the Hebrews, was slaying the firstborn of Egypt (Ex 12:12 f; 13:2,12); the matstsoth festival being in memory of the first days of the journey during which this bread of haste was eaten (Ex 12:14-20).

2. Pecach mitsrayim:

The ordinance of pecach mitsrayim, the last meal in Egypt, included the following provisions:

(1) the taking of a lamb, or kid without blemish, for each household on the 10th of the month;

(2) the killing of the lamb on the 14th at even;

(3) the sprinkling of the blood on doorposts and lintels of the houses in which it was to be eaten;

(4) the roasting of the lamb with fire, its head with its legs and inwards—the lamb was not to be eaten

raw nor sodden (bashal) with water;

(5) the eating of unleavened bread and bitter herbs;

(6) eating in haste, with loins girded, shoes on the feet, and staff in hand;

(7) and remaining in the house until the morning;

(8) the burning of all that remained; the Passover could be eaten only during the night (Ex 12:1-23).

3. Pecach doroth:

This service was to be observed as an ordinance forever (Ex 12:14,24), and the night was to be lel shimmurim, "a night of vigils," or, at least, "to be much observed" of all the children of Israel throughout their generations (Ex 12:42). The details, however, of the pecach doroth, or later observances of the Passover, seem to have differed slightly from those of the Egyptian Passover (Mishna, Pesachim, ix.5). Thus, it is probable that the victim could be taken from the flock or from the herd (De 16:2; compare Eze 45:22). (3), (6) and (7) disappeared entirely, and judging from De 16:7, the prohibition against seething (Hebrew bashal) was not understood to apply (unless, indeed, the omission of the expression with water" gives a more general sense to the Hebrew word bashal, making it include roasting). New details were also added: for example, that the Passover could be sacrificed only at the central sanctuary (De 16:5); that no alien or uncircumcised person, or unclean person could partake thereof, and that one prevented by uncleanness or other cause from celebrating the Passover in season could do so a month later (Nu 9:9). The singing of the Hallel (Psalms 113-118), both while the Passover was being slaughtered and at the meal, and other details were no doubt added from time to time.

4. Matstsoth:

Unleavened bread was eaten with the Passover meal, just as with all sacrificial meals of later times (Ex 23:18; 34:25; Le 7:12), independently perhaps of the fact that the Passover came in such close proximity with the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Ex 12:8). Jewish tradition distinguishes, at any rate, between the first night and the rest of the festival in that the eating of matstsoth is an obligation on the first night and optional during the rest of the week (Pesachim 120a), although the eating of unleavened bread is commanded in general terms (Ex 12:15,18; 13:6,7; 23:15; 34:18; Le 23:6; Nu 28:17). The eating of leavened bread is strictly prohibited, however, during the entire week under the penalty of kareth, "excision" (Ex 12:15,19 f; 13:3; De 16:3), and this prohibition has been observed traditionally with great care. The 1st and 7th days are holy convocations, days on which no labor could be done except such as was necessary in the preparation of food. The festival of matstsoth is reckoned as one of the three pilgrimage festivals, though strictly the pilgrimage was connected with the Passover portion and the first day of the festival.

During the entire week additional sacrifices were offered in the temple: an offering made by fire and a

burnt offering, 2 young bullocks, 1 ram, 7 lambs of the first year without blemish, together with meal offerings and drink offerings and a goat for a sin offering.

5. The ‘Omer:

During the week of the matstsoth festival comes the beginning of the barley harvest in Palestine (Menachoth 65b) which lasts from the end of March in the low Jordan valley to the beginning of May in the elevated portions. The time of the putting-in of the sickle to the standing grain (De 16:9) and of bringing the sheaf of the peace offering is spoken of as the morrow after the Sabbath (Le 23:15), that is, according to the Jewish tradition, the day after the first day, or rest-day, of the Passover (Mend. 65b; Meg Ta‘an. 1; Josephus, Ant, III, x, 5), and according to Samaritan and Boethusian traditions and the modern Karites the Sunday after the Passover. At this time a wave offering is made of a sheaf, followed by an offering of a lamb with a meal and drink offering, and only thereafter might the new grain be eaten. From this day 7 weeks are counted to fix the date of Pentecost, the celebration connected with the wheat harvest. It is of course perfectly natural for an agricultural people to celebrate the turning-points of the agricultural year in connection with their traditional festivals. Indeed, the Jewish liturgy of today retains in the Passover service the Prayer of Dew (Tal) which grew up in Palestine on the basis of the needs of an agricultural people.

6. Non-traditional Theories:

Many writers, however, eager to explain the entire festival as originally an agricultural feast (presumably a Canaanitic one, though there is not a shred of evidence that the Canaanites had such a festival), have seized upon the ‘omer, or sheaf offering, as the basis of the hagh (festival), and have attempted to explain the matstsoth as bread hastily baked in the busy harvest times, or as bread quickly baked from the freshly exempted first-fruits. Wherein these theories are superior to the traditional explanation so consistently adhered to throughout the Pentateuch it is difficult to see. In a similar vein, it has been attempted to connect the Passover with the sacrifice or redemption of the firstborn of man and beast (both institutions being traditionally traced to the judgment on the firstborn of Egypt, as in Ex 13:11-13; 22:29,30; 23:19; 34:19,20), so as to characterize the Passover as a festival of pastoral origin. Excepting for the multiplication of highly ingenious guesses, very little that is positive has been added to our knowledge of the Passover by this theory.

7. The Higher Criticism:

The Pentateuch speaks of the Passover in many contexts and naturally with constantly varying emphasis. Thus the story of the Exodus it is natural to expect fewer ritual details than in a manual of temple services; again, according to the view here taken, we must distinguish between the pecach mitsrayim and the pecach doroth. Nevertheless, great stress is laid on the variations in the several accounts, by certain groups of critics, on the basis of which they seek to support their several theories of the composition of the Pentateuch or Hexateuch. Without entering into this controversy, it will be sufficient here to enumerate and classify all the discrepancies said to exist in the several Passover passages, together with

such explanations as have been suggested. These discrepancies, so called, are of three kinds:

(1) mere omissions,

(2) differences of emphasis, and

(3) conflicting statements.

The letters, J, E, D, P and H will here be used to designate passages assigned to the various sources by the higher criticism of today merely for the sake of comparison.

(1) There is nothing remarkable about the omission of the daily sacrifices from all passages except Le 23:8 (H) and Nu 28:19 (P), nor in the omission of a specific reference to the holy convocation on the first day in the contexts of De 16:8 and Ex 13:6, nor even in the omission of reference to a central sanctuary in passages other than De 16. Neither can any significance be attached to the fact that the precise day is not specified in Ex 23 (E) where the appointed day is spoken of, and in Le 23:15 (H) where the date can be figured out from the date of Pentecost there given.

(2) As to emphasis, it is said that the socalled Elohist Covenant (E) (Ex 23) has no reference to the Passover, as it speaks only of matstsh in Ex 23:15, in which this festival is spoken of together with the other reghalim or pilgrimage festivals. The so-called Jehovistic source (Jahwist) (Ex 34:18-21,25) is said to subordinate the Passover to matstsoth, the great feast of the Jehovistic history (JE) (Ex 12:21-27,29-36,38,39; 13:3-16); in De (D) the Passover is said to predominate over matstsoth, while in Le (P and H) it is said to be of first importance. JE and P emphasize the historical importance of the day. Whether these differences in emphasis mean much more than that the relative amount of attention paid to the paschal sacrifice, as compared with matstsoth, depends on the context, is of course the fundamental question of the higher criticism; it is not answered by pointing out that the differences of emphasis exist.

(3) Of the actual conflicts, we have already seen that the use of the words "flock" and "herd" in De and Hebrew bashal are open to explanation, and also that the use of the matstsoth at the original Passover is not inconsistent with the historical reason for the feast of matstsoth—it is not necessary to suppose that matstsoth were invented through the necessity of the Hebrews on their journey. There is, however, one apparent discrepancy in the Biblical narrative that seems to weaken rather than help the position of those critics who would ascribe very late dates to the passages which we have cited: Why does Ezekiel’s ideal scheme provide sacrifices for the Passover different from those prescribed in the so-called P ascribed to the same period (Eze 45:21)?

8. Historical Celebrations: Old Testament Times:

The children of Israel began the keeping of the Passover in its due season according to all its ordinances in the wilderness of Sinai (Nu 9:5). In the very beginning of their national life in Palestine we find them celebrating the Passover under the leadership of Joshua in the plains of Jericho (Jos 5:10). History

records but few later celebrations in Palestine, but there are enough intimations to indicate that it was frequently if not regularly observed. Thus Solomon offered sacrifices three times a year upon the altar which he had built to Yahweh, at the appointed seasons, including the Feast of Unleavened Bread (1Ki 9:25 equals 2Ch 8:13). The later prophets speak of appointed seasons for pilgrimages and sacrifices (compare Isa 1:12-14), and occasionally perhaps refer to a Passover celebration (compare Isa 30:29, bearing in mind that the Passover is the only night-feast of which we have any record). In Hezekiah's time the Passover had fallen into such a state of desuetude that neither the priests nor the people were prepared for the king's urgent appeal to observe it. Nevertheless, he was able to bring together a large concourse in Jerusalem during the 2nd month and institute a more joyful observance than any other recorded since the days of Solomon. In the 18th year of King Josiah, however, there was celebrated the most memorable Passover, presumably in the matter of conformity to rule, since the days of the Judges (2Ki 23:21; 2Ch 35:1). The continued observance of the feast to the days of the exile is attested by Ezekiel's interest in it (Eze 45:18). In post-exilic times it was probably observed more scrupulously than ever before (Ezr 6:19).

9. Historical Celebrations: New Testament Times:

Further evidence, if any were needed, of the importance of the Passover in the life of the Jews of the second temple is found in the Talmud, which devotes to this subject an entire tractate, Pecachim on which we have both Babylonian and Palestine gemara'. These are devoted to the sacrificial side and to the minutiae of searching out and destroying leaven, what constitutes leaven, and similar questions, instruction in which the children of Israel sought for 30 days before the Passover. Josephus speaks of the festival often (Ant., II, xiv, 6; III, x, 5; IX, iv, 8; XIV, ii, 2; XVII, ix, 3; BJ, II, i, 3; V, iii, 1; VI, ix, 3). Besides repeating the details already explained in the Bible, he tells of the innumerable multitudes that came for the Passover to Jerusalem out of the country and even from beyond its limits. He estimates that in one year in the days of Cestius, 256,500 lambs were slaughtered and that at least 10 men were counted to each. (This estimate of course includes the regular population of Jerusalem. But even then it is doubtless exaggerated.) The New Testament bears testimony, likewise, to the coming of great multitudes to Jerusalem (Joh 11:55; compare also Joh 2:13; 6:4). At this great festival even the Roman officers released prisoners in recognition of the people's celebration. Travel and other ordinary pursuits were no doubt suspended (Compare Ac 12:3; 20:6). Naturally the details were impressed on the minds of the people and lent themselves to symbolic and homiletic purposes (compare 1Co 5:7; Joh 19:34-36, where the paschal lamb is made to typify Jesus; and Heb 11:28). The best-known instance of such symbolic use is the institution of the Eucharist on the basis of the paschal meal. Some doubt exists as to Whether the Last Supper was the paschal meal or not. According to the Synoptic Gospels, it was (Lu 22:7; Mt 26:17; Mr 14:12); while according to John, the Passover was to be eaten some time following the Last Supper (Joh 18:28). Various harmonizations of these passages have been suggested, the most in genious, probably, being on theory that when the Passover fell on Friday night, the Pharisees ate the meal on Thursday and the Sadducees on Friday, and that Jesus followed the custom of the Pharisees (Chwolson, Das letzte Passahmal Jesu, 2nd edition, Petersburg, 1904). Up to the Nicene Council in the year 325, the church observed Easter on the Jewish Passover. Thereafter it took precautions to separate the two, condemning their confusion as Arianism.

10. The Jewish Passover:

After the destruction of the temple the Passover became a home service. The paschal lamb was no longer included. Only the Samaritans have continued this rite to this day. In the Jewish home a roasted bone is placed on the table in memory of the rite, and other articles symbolic of the Passover are placed beside it: such as a roasted egg, said to be in memory of the free-will offering; a sauce called charoceth, said to resemble the mortar of Egypt; salt water, for the symbolic dipping (compare Mt 26:23); the bitter herbs and the matstsoth. The cedher (program) is as follows: sanctification; washing of the hands; dipping and dividing the parsley; breaking and setting aside a piece of matstsah to be distributed and eaten at the end of the supper; reading of the haggadhah shel pecach, a poetic narrative of the Exodus, in answer to four questions asked by the youngest child in compliance with the Biblical command found 3 times in Exodus and once in Deuteronomy, "Thou shalt tell thy son on that day"; washing the hands for eating; grace before eating; tasting the matstsah; tasting the bitter herbs; eating of them together; the meal; partaking of the matstsah that had been set aside as ‘aphiqomen or dessert; grace after meat; Hallel; request that the service be accepted. Thereafter folk-songs are sung to traditional melodies, and poems recited, many of which have allegorical meanings. A cup of wine is used at the sanctification and another at grace, in addition to which two other cups have been added, the 4 according to the Mishna (Pecachim x.1) symbolizing the 4 words employed in Ex 6:6,7 for the delivery of Israel from Egypt. Instead of eating in haste, as in the Egyptian Passover, it is customary to recline or lean at this meal in token of Israel’s freedom.

The prohibition against leaven is strictly observed. The searching for hidden leaven on the evening before the Passover and its destruction in the morning have become formal ceremonies for which appropriate blessings and declarations have been included in the liturgy since the days when Aramaic was the vernacular of the Jews. As in the case of other festivals, the Jews have doubled the days of holy convocation, and have added a semi-holiday after the last day, the so-called ‘iccur chagh, in token of their love for the ordained celebration and their loathness to depart from it.

Nathan Isaacs

PASTOR

pas’-ter (ro‘eh; poimen; literally, a helper, or feeder of the sheep (the King James Version Jer 2:8; 3:15; 10:21; 12:10; 17:16; 22:22; 23:1,2, and in Eph 4:11, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American))): Besides the literal sense the word has now a figurative meaning and refers to the minister appointed over a congregation. This latter meaning is recognized in the translation of the King James Version.

See MINISTRY.

PASTORAL EPISTLES

pas’-tor-al,

I. GENUINENESS

1. External Evidence

2. Genuineness Questioned

II. ALLEGED DIFFICULTIES AGAINST PAULINE AUTHORSHIP

1. Relative to Paul’s Experiences

(1) Data in 1 Timothy

(2) Data in 2 Timothy

(3) Data in Titus

2. Subject-Matter Post-Pauline (1) Difficulty Regarding Church Organization

(2) The Doctrinal Difficulty

3. Difficulty Relative to Language

4. Is There "Another Gospel" in the Pastorals?

III. DATE AND ORDER

1. Date of the Epistles

2. Their Order

LITERATURE

The First and Second Epistles to Timothy, and the Epistle to Titus form a distinct group among the letters written by Paul, and are now known as the Pastoral Epistles because they were addressed to two Christian ministers. When Timothy and Titus received these epistles they were not acting, as they had previously done, as missionaries or itinerant evangelists, but had been left by Paul in charge of churches; the former having the oversight of the church in Ephesus, and the latter having the care of the churches in the island of Crete. The Pastoral Epistles were written to guide them in the discharge of the duties devolving upon them as Christian pastors. Such is a general description of these epistles. In each of

them, however, there is a great deal more than is covered or implied by the designation, "Pastoral"—much that is personal, and much also that is concerned with Christian faith and doctrine and practice generally.

I. Genuineness.

1. External Evidence:

In regard to the genuineness of the epistles there is abundant external attestation. Allusions to them are found in the writings of Clement and Polycarp. In the middle of the 2nd century the epistles were recognized as Pauline in authorship, and were freely quoted.

"Marcion indeed rejected them, and Tatian is supposed to have rejected those to Timothy. But, as Jerome states in the preface to his Commentary on Titus, these heretics rejected the epistles, not on critical grounds, but merely because they disliked their teaching. He says they used no argument, but merely asserted, This is Paul's, This is not Paul's. It is obvious that men holding such opinions as Marcion and Tatian held, would not willingly ascribe authority to epistles which condemned asceticism. So far, then, as the early church can guarantee to us the authenticity of writings ascribed to Paul, the Pastoral Epistles are guaranteed" (Marcus Dods, Introduction to the New Testament, 167).

The external evidence is all in favor of the reception of these epistles., which were known not only to Clement and Polycarp, but also to Irenaeus, Tertullian, the author of the Epistle to the churches of Vienne and Lyons, and Theophilus of Antioch. The evidence of Polycarp, who died in 167 AD, is remarkably strong. He says, "The love of money is the beginning of all trouble, knowing .... that we brought nothing into the world, neither can carry anything out" (compare 1Ti 6:7,10). It would be difficult to overthrow testimony of this nature.

2. Genuineness Questioned:

The decision of certain critics to reject the Pastoral Epistles as documents not from the hand of Paul, "is not reached on the external evidence, which is perhaps as early an attestation as can be reasonably expected. They are included in the Muratorian Canon, and quoted by Irenaeus and later writers as Paul's" (A.S. Peake, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament, 60). This admission is satisfactory. In recent times, however, the authenticity of these epistles has been called in question by Schmidt, Schleiermacher, Baur, Renan, and many others. Baur asserted that they were written for the purpose of combating the Gnosticism of the 2nd century, and of defending the church from it by means of ecclesiastical organization, and that the date of their composition was about the year 150 AD.

II. Alleged Difficulties against Pauline Authorship.

Various difficulties have been alleged against the reception of the Pastoral Epistles as Pauline. The chief of these are:

(1) the difficulty of finding any place for these letters in the life of Paul, as that is recorded in the Ac and in the Pauline Epistles written before the Pastorals;

(2) the fact that there are said to be in them indications of an ecclesiastical organization, and of a development of doctrine, both orthodox and heretical, considerably in advance of the Pauline age;

(3) that the language of the epistles is, to a large extent, different from that in the accepted epistles; (4) the "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship—so writes Dr. A.C. McGiffert (A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 402)—is that "the Christianity of the Pastoral Epistles is not the Christianity of Paul."

Where can a place be found for these epistles, in the life of Paul? The indications of the date of their composition given in the epistles themselves are these.

1. Relative to Paul’s Experiences:

(1) Data in 1 Timothy

In 1Ti 1:3 Paul had gone from Ephesus to Macedonia, and had left Timothy in Ephesus in charge of the church there. In the Ac and in the previously written Pauline epistles, it is impossible to find such events or such a state of matters as will satisfy these requirements. Paul had previously been in Ephesus, on several occasions. His 1st visit to that city is recorded in Ac 18:19-21. On that occasion he went from Ephesus, not into Macedonia, but into Syria. His 2nd visit was his 3 years’ residence in Ephesus, as narrated in Ac 19; and when he left the city, he had, previous to his own departure from it, already sent Timothy into Macedonia (19:22)—a state of matters exactly the reverse of that described in 1Ti 1:3. Timothy soon rejoined Paul, and so far was he from being left in Ephesus then, that he was in Paul’s company on the remainder of his journey toward Jerusalem (Ac 20:4; 2Co 1:1).

No place therefore in Paul’s life, previous to his arrest in Jerusalem, and his first Roman imprisonment, can be found, which satisfies the requirements of the situation described in 1Ti 1:3. "It is impossible, unless we assume a second Roman imprisonment, to reconcile the various historical notices which the epistle (2 Timothy) contains" (McGiffert, op. cit., 407).

In addition to this, the language used by the apostle at Miletus, when he addressed the elders of the Ephesian church (Ac 20:30) about the men speaking perverse things, who should arise among them, showed that these false teachers had not made their appearance at that time. There is, for this reason alone, no place for the Pastoral Epistles in Paul’s life, previous to his arrest in Jerusalem. But Paul’s life did not end at the termination of his first Roman imprisonment; and this one fact gives ample room to satisfy all the conditions, as these are found in the three Pastorals.

Those who deny the Pauline authorship of these epistles also deny that he was released from what, in

this article, is termed his 1st Roman imprisonment. But a denial of this latter statement is an assumption quite unwarranted and unproved. It assumes that Paul was not set free, simply because there is no record of this in the Acts. But the Ac is, on the very face of it, an incomplete or unfinished record; that is, it brings the narrative to a certain point, and then breaks off, evidently for the reason which Sir W.M. Ramsay demonstrates, that Luke meant to write a sequel to that book—a purpose, however, which he was unable, owing to some cause now unknown, to carry into execution. The purpose of the Acts, as Ramsay shows (St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, 23, 308), is to lead up to the release of Paul, and to show that the Christian faith was not a forbidden or illegal religion, but that the formal impeachment of the apostle before the supreme court of the empire ended in his being set at liberty, and thus there was established the fact that the faith of Jesus Christ was not, at that time, contrary to Roman law. "The Pauline authorship .... can be maintained only on the basis of a hypothetical reconstruction, either of an entire period subsequent to the Roman imprisonment, or of the events within some period known to us" (McGiffert, op. cit., 410). The one fact that Paul was set free after his 1st Roman imprisonment gives the environment which fits exactly all the requirements of the Pastoral Epistles.

Attention should be directed to the facts and to the conclusion stated in the article PRAETORIUM (which see), Mommsen having shown that the words, "My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole praetorian guard" (Php 1:13), mean that at the time when Paul wrote the Epistle to the Philippians, the case against him had already come before the supreme court of appeal in Rome, that it had been partly heard, and that the impression made by the prisoner upon his judges was so favorable, that he expected soon to be set free.

The indications to be drawn from other expressions in three of the epistles of the Roman captivity—Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon—are to the same effect. Thus, writing to the Philippians, he says that he hopes to send Timothy to them, so soon as he sees how matters go with him, and that he trusts in the Lord that he himself will visit them shortly. And again, writing to his friend Philemon in the city of Colosse, he asks him to prepare him a lodging, for he trusts that through the prayers of the Colossians, he will be granted to them.

These anticipations of acquittal and of departure from Rome are remarkable, and do not in any degree coincide with the idea that Paul was not set free but was condemned and put to death at that time. "It is obvious that the importance of the trial is intelligible only if Paul was acquitted. That he was acquitted follows from the Pastoral Epistles with certainty for all who admit their genuineness; while even they who deny their Pauline origin must allow that they imply an early belief in historical details which are not consistent with Paul’s journeys before his trial, and must either be pure inventions or events that occurred on later journeys. .... If he was acquitted, the issue of the trial was a formal decision by the supreme court of the empire that it was permissible to preach Christianity; the trial, therefore, was really a charter of religious liberty, and therein lies its immense importance. It was indeed overturned by later decisions of the supreme court; but its existence was a highly important fact for the Christians" (Ramsay, op. cit., 308). "That he was acquitted is demanded both by the plan evident in Ac and by other reasons well stated by others" (ibid., 360).

It should also be observed that there is the direct and corroborative evidence of Paul’s release, afforded

by such writers as Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephrem Syriac., Chrysostom and Theodoret, all of whom speak of Paul's going to Spain. Jerome (Vir. Ill., 5) gives it as a matter of personal knowledge that Paul traveled as far as Spain. But there is more important evidence still. In the Muratorian Canon, 1,37, there are the words, "profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis" ("the journey of Paul as he journeyed from Rome to Spain"). Clement also in the epistle from the church in Rome to the church in Corinth, which was written not later than the year 96 AD, says in reference to Paul, "Having taught righteousness to the whole world, and having gone to the extremity of the west (epi to terma tes duseos elthon) and having borne witness before the rulers, so was he released from the world and went to the holy place, being the greatest example of endurance." The words, "having gone to the extremity of the west," should be specially noticed. Clement was in Rome when he wrote this, and, accordingly, the natural import of the words is that Paul went to the limit of the western half of then known world, or in other words, to the western boundary of the lands bordering the Mediterranean, that is, to Spain.

Now Paul never had been in Spain previous to his arrest in Jerusalem, but in Ro 15:24,28 he had twice expressed his intention to go there. These independent testimonies, of Clement and of the Muratorian Canon, of the fact that after Paul's arrest in Jerusalem he did carry into execution his purpose to visit Spain, are entitled to great weight. They involve, of course, the fact that he was acquitted after his 1st Roman imprisonment.

Having been set free, Paul could not do otherwise than send Timothy to Philippi, and himself also go there, as he had already promised when he wrote to the Philippian church (Php 2:19,24). As a matter of course he would also resume his apostolic journeys for the purpose of proclaiming the gospel. There is now ample room in his life for the Pastoral Epistles, and they give most interesting details of his further labors. The historical and geographical requirements in 1 Timothy are, in this way, easily satisfied. It was no great distance to Ephesus from Philippi and Colosse, where he had promised that he would "come shortly."

(2) Data in 2 Timothy

The requirements in 2 Timothy are (a) that Paul had recently been at Troas, at Corinth, and at Miletus, each of which he mentions (2Ti 4:13,20); (b) that when he wrote the epistles he was in Rome (1:17); (c) that he was a prisoner for the cause of the gospel (1:8; 2:9), and had once already appeared before the emperor's supreme court (4:16,17); (d) that he had then escaped condemnation, but that he had reason to believe that on the next hearing of his case the verdict would be given against him, and that he expected it could not be long till execution took place (4:6); (e) that he hoped that Timothy would be able to come from Ephesus to see him at Rome before the end (4:9,21). These requirements cannot be made to agree or coincide with the first Roman captivity, but they do agree perfectly with the facts of the apostle's release and his subsequent second imprisonment in that city.

(3) Data in Titus

The data given in the Epistle to Titus are

(a) that Paul had been in Crete, and that Titus had been with him there, and had been left behind in that island, when Paul sailed from its shores, Titus being charged with the oversight of the churches there (Tit 1:5); and

(b) that Paul meant to spend the next winter at Nicopolis (3:12).

It is simply impossible to locate these events in the recorded life of Paul, as that is found in the other epistles, and in the Acts. But they agree perfectly with his liberation after his first Roman imprisonment. "As there is then no historical evidence that Paul did not survive the year 64, and as these Pastoral Epistles were recognized as Pauline in the immediately succeeding age, we may legitimately accept them as evidence that Paul did survive the year 64—that he was acquitted, resumed his missionary labors, was again arrested and brought to Rome, and from this second imprisonment wrote the Second Epistle to Timothy—his last extant writing" (Dods, Introduction to the New Testament, 172).

2. Subject-Matter, Post-Pauline:

The second difficulty alleged against the acceptance of these epistles as Pauline is that there are said to exist in them indications of an ecclesiastical organization and of a doctrinal development, both orthodox and heretical, considerably later than those of the Pauline age.

(1) Difficulty Regarding Church Organization

The first statement, that the epistles imply an ecclesiastical organization in advance of the time when Paul lived, is one which cannot be maintained in view of the facts disclosed in the epistles themselves. For directions are given to Timothy and to Titus in regard to the moral and other characteristics necessary in those who are to be ordained as bishops, elders, and deacons. In the 2nd century the outstanding feature of ecclesiastical organization was the development of monarchical episcopacy, but the Pastoral Epistles show a presbyterial administration. The office held by Timothy in Ephesus and by Titus in Crete was, as the epistles themselves show, of a temporary character. The directions which Paul gives to Timothy and Titus in regard to the ordaining of presbyters in every church are in agreement with similar notices found elsewhere in the New Testament, and do not coincide with the state of church organization as that existed in the 2nd century, the period when, objectors to the genuineness of the epistles assert, they were composed. "Everyone acquainted with ancient literature, particularly the literature of the ancient church, knows that a forger or fabricator of those times could not possibly have avoided anachronisms" (Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, II, 93). But the ecclesiastical arrangements in the Pastoral Epistles coincide in all points with the state of matters as it is found in the church in the time of the apostles, as that is described in the Ac and elsewhere in the New Testament.

It seems an error to suppose, as has often been done, that these epistles contain the germ of monarchical episcopacy; for the Christian church had already, from the day of Pentecost, existed as a society with special officers for the functions of extension, discipline and administration. The church in the Pastoral Epistles is a visible society, as it always was. Its organization therefore had come to be of the greatest

importance, and especially so in the matter of maintaining and handing down the true faith; the church accordingly is described as "the pillar and stay of the truth" (1Ti 3:15 margin), that is, the immovable depository of the Divine revelation.

(2) The Doctrinal Difficulty

The other statement, that the epistles show a doctrinal development out of harmony with the Pauline age is best viewed by an examination of what the epistles actually say.

In 1Ti 6:20, Paul speaks of profane and vain babblings and oppositions of gnosis (the Revised Version (British and American) "knowledge," the King James Version "science") falsely so called. In Tit 3:9, he tells Titus to avoid foolish questions and genealogies and contentions and strivings about the law. These phrases have been held to be allusions to the tenets of Marcion, and to those of some of the Gnostic sects. There are also other expressions, such as fables and endless genealogies (1Ti 1:3,4; 6:3), words to no profit but the subverting of the hearer (2Ti 2:14), foolish and unlearned questions which do gender strifes (2Ti 2:23), questions and strifes of words (1Ti 6:4,5), discussions which lead to nothing but word-battles and profane babbling. Such are the expressions which Paul uses. These, taken with what is even more clearly stated in the Epistle to the Colossians, certainly point to an incipient Gnosticism. But had the writer of the Pastoral Epistles been combating the Gnosticism of the 2nd century, it would not have been phrases like these that he would have employed, but others much more definite. Godet, quoted by Dods (Intro, 175), writes, "The danger here is of substituting intellectualism in religion for piety of heart and life. Had the writer been a Christian of the 2nd century, trying, under the name of Paul, to stigmatize the Gnostic systems, he would certainly have used much stronger expressions to describe their character and influence."

It should be observed that the false teachers described in 2Ti 3:6-9,13, as well as in other places in these epistles, were persons who taught that the Mosaic Law was binding upon all Christians. They laid stress upon rabbinic myths, upon investigations and disputations about genealogies and specific legal requirements of the Old Testament. What they taught was a form of piously sounding doctrine assuming to be Christian, but which was really rabbinism.

"For a pseudo-Paul in the post-apostolic age—when Christians of Jewish birth had become more and more exceptions in the Gentile Christian church—to have invented a description of and vigorously to have opposed the heterodidaskaloi, who did not exist in his own age, and who were without parallel in the earlier epistles of Paul, would have been to expose himself to ridicule without apparent purpose or meaning" (Zahn, Introduction, II, 117). "A comparison of the statements in these epistles about various kinds of false doctrine, and of those portions of the same that deal with the organization and officers of the church, with conditions actually existing in the church, especially the church of Asia Minor, at the beginning and during the course of the 2nd century, proves, just as clearly as does the external evidence, that they must have been written at latest before the year 100. But they could not have been written during the first two decades after Paul’s death, because of the character of the references to persons, facts and conditions in Paul’s lifetime and his own personal history, and because of the impossibility on

this assumption of discovering a plausible motive for their forgery. Consequently the claim that they are post-Pauline, and contain matter which is un-Pauline, is to be treated with the greatest suspicion" (Zahn, op. cit., II, 118).

3. Difficulty Relative to Language:

The third difficulty alleged against the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is connected with the language employed, which is said to be, to a large extent, different from that in the accepted epistles. The facts in regard to this matter are that in 1 Timothy there are 82 words not found elsewhere in the New Testament; in 2 Timothy there are 53 such words, and in Titus there are 33. But, while the total of such words in the three epistles is 168, this number, large though it appears, may be compared with the words used only once in the other Epistles of Paul. In Romans, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians and Philemon, the words of this description are 627 in number. So nothing can be built upon the fact of the 168 peculiar words in the Pastoral Epistles, that can safely be alleged as proof against their Pauline authorship. The special subjects treated in these epistles required adequate language, a requirement and a claim which would not be refused in the case of any ordinary author.

The objections to the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, based upon the dissimilarity of diction in them and in Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians, cease to exist when theory is no longer persisted in, that the nucleus of the Pastoral Epistles was composed during the Roman imprisonment, which, according to this theory ended, not in the apostle’s release, but in his execution. The fact that he was writing to intimate and beloved friends, both on personal matters and on the subject of church organization, and on that of incipient Gnosticism, which was troubling the churches of Asia Minor, made it essential that he should, to a large extent, use a different vocabulary.

4. Is There "Another Gospel" in the Pastorals?:

The "most decisive" of all the arguments against the Pauline authorship is that "the Christianity of the Pastoral Epistles is not the Christianity of Paul" (McGiffert, A History of Christianity, 402). "For the most part," Dr. McGiffert writes, "there is no trace whatever of the great fundamental truth of Paul’s gospel—death unto the flesh and life in the Spirit." Now this is not so, for the passages which Dr. McGiffert himself gives in a footnote (2Ti 1:9-11; 2:11 ff; Tit 3:4-7), as well as other references, do most certainly refer to this very aspect of the gospel. For example, the passage in 2Ti 2 contains these words, "If we died with him (Christ), we shall also live with him." What is this but the great truth of the union of the Christian believer with Christ? The believer is one with Christ in His death, one with Him now as He lives and reigns. The objection, therefore, which is "most decisive of all," is one which is not true in point of fact. Dr. McGiffert also charges the author of the Pastoral Epistles as being "one who understood by resurrection nothing else than the resurrection of the fleshly body" (p. 430). The body of our Lord was raised from the dead, but how very unjust this accusation is, is evident from such a passage as 1Ti 3:16, "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness;

He who was manifested in the flesh,

Justified in the Spirit,

Seen of angels,

Preached among the nations,

Believed on in the world,

Received up in glory."

Charges of this nature are unsupported by evidence, and are of the kind on which Dr. A.S. Peake (A Critical Introduction to the New Testament, 71) bases his rejection of the Pauline authorship—except for a Pauline nucleus—that he "feels clear." More than an ipse dixit of this sort is needed.

The theory that the Pastoral Epistles are based upon genuine letters or notes of Paul to Timothy and Titus is thus advocated by Peake, McGiffert, Moffatt and many others. It bears very hard upon 1 Timothy. "In 1 Timothy not a single verse can be indicated, which clearly bears the stamp of Pauline origin" (Peake, op. cit., 70). "We may fairly conclude then in agreement with many modern scholars that we have here, in the Pastoral Epistles, authentic letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus, worked over and enlarged by another hand" (McGiffert, op. cit., 405). In regard to 1 Timothy he writes, "It is very likely that there are scattered fragments of the original epistle in 1 Timothy, as for instance in 1:23. But it is difficult to find anything which we can be confident was written by Paul" (p. 407).

Dr. McGiffert also alleges that in the Pastoral Epistles, the word "faith" "is not employed in its profound Pauline sense, but is used to signify one of the cardinal virtues, along with love, peace, purity, righteousness, sanctification, patience and meekness." One of the Pauline epistles, with which he contrasts the Pastorals, is the Epistle to the Galatians; and the groundlessness of this charge is evident from Ga 5:22, where "faith" is included in the list there given of the fruit of the Spirit, along with love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, meekness and self-control.

If the Pastoral Epistles are the work of Paul, then, Dr. McGiffert concludes, Paul had given up that form of the gospel which he had held and taught throughout his life, and descended from the lofty religious plane upon which he had always moved, to the level of mere piety and morality (op. cit., 404). But this charge is not just or reasonable, in view of the fact that the apostle is instructing Timothy and Titus how to combat the views and practices of immoral teachers. Or again, in such a passage as 1Ti 1:12-17 the King James Version, the author of the epistle has not descended from the lofty plane of faith to that of mere piety and morality, when he writes, "The grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief."

If such be the "most decisive" objection against the Pauline authorship, the other difficulties, as already seen, need not cause alarm, for they resolve themselves into the equally groundless charges that the historical requirements of the epistles cannot be fitted into any part of Paul's life, and that the doctrine and ecclesiastical organization do not suit the Apostolic age. These objections have been already referred to.

The real difficulty, writes Dr. Peake (A Critical Introduction, 68), is that "the old energy of thought and expression is gone, and the greater smoothness and continuity in the grammar is a poor compensation for the lack of grip and of continuity in the thought." Dr. Peake well and truly says that this statement does not admit of detailed proof. Lack of grip and lack of continuity of thought are not the characteristics of such passages as 1Ti 1:9-17, a passage which will bear comparison with anything in the acknowledged Pauline Epistles; and there are many other similar passages, e.g. Tit 2:11-3:7.

What must be said of the dullness of the intelligence of Christian men and of the Christian church as a whole, if they could thus let themselves be imposed upon by epistles which purported to be Paul's, but which were not written by him at all, but were the enlargement of a Pauline nucleus? Can it be believed that the church of the 2nd century, the church of the martyrs, was in such a state of mental decrepitude as to receive epistles which were spurious, so far as the greater portion of their contents is concerned? And can it be believed that this idea, so recently originated and so destitute of proof, is andequate explanation of epistles which have been received as Pauline from the earliest times?

When placed side by side with sub-apostolic writings like the Didache, Clement of Rome, Polycarp, and Ignatius, "it is difficult to resist the idea which returns upon one with almost every sentence that .... the Pastorals are astonishingly superior" (Moffatt, The Historical New Testament, 556). Godet, quoted by R. D. Shaw (The Pauline Epistles, 441), writes, "When one has had enough of the pious amplifications of Clement of Rome, of the ridiculous inanities of Barnabas, of the general oddities of Ignatius, of the well-meant commonplaces of Polycarp, of the intolerable verbiage of Hermas, and of the nameless platitudes of the Didache, and, after this promenade in the first decade of the 2nd century, reverts to our Pastoral Epistles, one will measure the distance that separates the least striking products of the apostolic literature from what has been preserved to us as most eminent in the ancient patristic literature."

In the case of some modern critics, the interpolation hypothesis "is their first and last appeal, the easy solution of any difficulty that presents itself to their imaginations. Each writer feels free to give the kaleidoscope a fresh turn, and then records with blissful confidence what are called the latest results. .... The whole method postulates that a writer must always preserve the same dull monotone or always confine himself to the same transcendental heights. .... He must see and say everything at once; having had his vision and his dream, he must henceforth be like a star and dwell apart. .... To be stereotyped is his only salvation. .... On such principles there is not a writer of note, and there never has been a man in public life, or a student in the stream of a progressive science, large parts of whose sayings and doings could not be proved to be by some one else" (Shaw, The Pauline Epistles, 483).

III. Date and Order.

1. Date of the Epistles:

In regard to the date of these epistles, external and internal evidence alike go to show that they belong to practically the same period. The dates of their composition are separated from each other by not more than three or four years; and the dates of each and all of them must be close to the Neronic persecution (64 AD). If Paul was executed 67 AD (see Ramsay, Paul, 396), there is only a short interval of time between his release in 61 or 62, and his death in 67, that is a period of some 5 or 6 years, during which his later travels took place, and when the Pastoral Epistles were written. "Between the three letters there is an affinity of language, a similarity of thought, and a likeness of errors combated, which prevents our referring any of them to a period much earlier than the others" (Zahn, Introduction, II, 37).

2. Their Order:

The order in which they were written must have been 1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy. It is universally acknowledged that 2 Timothy is the very last of Paul's extant epistles, and the internal evidence of the other two seems to point out 1 Timothy as earlier than Titus.

To sum up, the evidence of the early reception of the Pastoral Epistles as Pauline is very strong. "The confident denial of the genuineness of these letters—which has been made now for several generations more positively than in the case of any other Pauline epistles—has no support from tradition. .... Traces of their circulation in the church before Marcion's time are clearer than those which can be found for Romans and 2 Corinthians" (Zahn, op. cit., II, 85). The internal evidence shows that all three are from the hand of one and the same writer, a writer who makes many personal allusions of a nature which it would be impossible for a forger to invent. It is generally allowed that the personal passages in 2Ti 1:15-18; 4:9-22 are genuine. But if this is so, then it is not possible to cut and carve the epistles into fragments of this kind. Objections dating only a century back are all too feeble to overturn the consistent marks of Pauline authorship found in all three epistles, corroborated as this is by their reception in the church, dating from the very earliest period. The Pastoral Epistles may be used with the utmost confidence, as having genuinely come from the hand of Paul.

LITERATURE.

R. D. Shaw, The Pauline Epistles; A. S. Peake, A Critical Introduction to the New Testament; A. C. McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age; Theodor Zahn, An Introduction to the New Testament; Marcus Dods, . Introduction to the New Testament; Weiss, Einleitung in das New Testament (English translation); C. J. Ellicott, A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles; Patrick Fairbairn, The Pastoral Epistles; John Ed. Huther, Critical and Exegetical Handbook of the Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus; George Salmon, A Historical Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament; James Moffatt, The Historical New Testament; Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament; Adolf Julicher, An Introduction to the New Testament; Caspar Rene Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament.

The "lives" of Paul may also be consulted, as they contain much that refers to these epistles, i.e. those by Conybeare and Howson, Lewin, Farrar and others. See also Ramsay’s Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen.

John Rutherfurd

PASTURAGE; PASTURE

pas’-tur-aj, pas’-tur.

See SHEEP TENDING.

PATARA

pat’-a-ra (ta Patara): A coast city of ancient Lycia, from which, according to Ac 21:1, Paul took a ship for Phoenicia. Because of its excellent harbor, many of the coast trading ships stopped at Patara, which therefore became an important and wealthy port of entry to the towns of the interior. As early as 440 BC autonomous coins were struck there; during the 4th and the 3rd centuries the coinage was interrupted, but was again resumed in 168 BC when Patara joined the Lycian league. Ptolemy Philadelphus enlarged the city, and changed its name to Arsinoe in honor of his wife. The city was celebrated not only as a trading center, but especially for its celebrated oracle of Apollo which is said to have spoken only during the six winter months of the year. Among the ruins there is still to be seen a deep pit with circular steps leading to a seat at the bottom; it is supposed that the pit is the place of the oracle. In the history of early Christianity, Patara took but little part, but it was the home of a bishop, and the birthplace of Nicholas, the patron saint of the sailors of the East. Though born at Patara, Nicholas was a bishop and saint of Myra, a neighboring Lycian city, and there he is said to have been buried. Gelemish is the modern name of the ruin. The walls of the ancient city may still be traced, and the foundations of the temple and castle and other public buildings are visible. The most imposing of the ruins is a triumphal arch bearing the inscription: "Patara the Metropolis of the Lycian Nation." Outside the city walls many sarcophagi may be seen, but the harbor, long ago choked by sand, has been converted into a useless swamp. another at grace, in addition to which two other cups have been added, the 4 according to the Mishna (Pecachim x.1) symbolizing the 4 words employed in Ex 6:6,7 for the delivery of Israel from Egypt. Instead of eating in haste, as in the Egyptian Passover, it is customary to recline or lean at this meal in token of Israel’s freedom.

See also MYRA.

E. J. Banks

PATE

pat (qodhqodh): The word usually translated "crown," "crown of the head" (Ge 49:26; De 28:35; 33:16,20; 2Sa 14:25; Job 2:7; Isa 3:17; Jer 2:16; 48:45) and "scalp" (Ps 68:21) is rendered "pate" in Ps 7:16 in agreement with earlier English translators since Coverdale: "His mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violence shall come down upon his own pate." The reason for the choice of the word lies evidently in the desire to make the Hebrew parallelism with "head" (ro'sh) apparent. The same object has, however, been achieved differently in another poetical passage (Ge 49:26 parallel De 33:16), namely, by the juxtaposition of "head" and "crown of the head."

H. L. E. Luering

PATH; PATHWAY

path, path'-wa (orach, nethibhah, etc.; tribos, trochia):

(1) In the Old Testament.—In addition to its obvious literal sense (e.g. Ge 49:17), it has very frequently a figurative meaning.

(a) As applied to man, a course or manner of life: (i) man's outward lot in life, his career or destiny, whether of the just man (Isa 26:7) or of the ungodly (Job 8:13); (ii) frequently in an ethical sense, of men's conduct or inward life-purpose, whether it be good or evil (e.g. Pr 2:15), generally accompanied by a term defining the moral quality of the conduct, either an abstract noun (e.g. "the paths of uprightness," Pr 2:13; 4:11; "the paths of justice," Pr 2:8; Isa 40:14; "the paths of life," Ps 16:11; Pr 2:19), or a concrete adjective or noun (e.g. "crooked paths," Isa 59:8; "the paths of the righteous," Pr 2:20; 4:18).

(b) The term is also applied to God either (i) of the methods of the Divine Providence, God's dealings with men (Ps 25:10; 65:11), or (ii) of the principles and maxims of religion and morality divinely revealed to man ("Show me thy ways, O Yahweh, teach me thy paths," Ps 25:4; compare Isa 2:3).

(2) In the Apocrypha we have the "paths" of Wisdom (tribos, Baruch 3:21,31); the "path" shown to men by the Law (semita, 2 Esdras 14:22); and a man's "paths" (tribos, Tobit 4:10).

(3) In the New Testament the word occurs only in Mt 3:3 and parallel passages Mr 1:3; Lu 3:4 (of the forerunner's work), and in Heb 12:13 (in the Old Testament ethical sense).

Pathway occurs in Pr 12:28 (derekh nethibhah) and The Wisdom of Solomon 5:10 (atrapos).

See WAY.

D. Miall Edwards

PATHEUS

pa-the'-us (Pathaios, Phathaios): One of the Levites who had married a foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:23) equals "Pethahiah" of Ezr 10:23.

PATHROS

path'-ros (pathros; Egyptian Pata resii, the "South land"; Septuagint ge Pathoures): The Hebrew form of the Egyptian name for Upper Egypt (Isa 11:11; Jer 44:1,15; Eze 29:14; 30:14).

PATHRUSIM

path-roo'-sim, path-ru'-sim (pathruci, "an inhabitant of Pathros"; Septuagint hoi Patrosonieim): The branch of the Egyptians who came from PATHROS (which see). They are represented as begotten of Mizraim, "Mizraim begat Zudim. .... and Pathrusim" (Ge 10:13 f; 1Ch 1:11 f).

PATIENCE

pa'-shens (hupomone, makrothumia): "Patience" implies suffering, enduring or waiting, as a determination of the will and not simply under necessity. As such it is an essential Christian virtue to the exercise of which there are many exhortations. We need to "wait patiently" for God, to endure uncomplainingly the various forms of sufferings, wrongs and evils that we meet with, and to bear patiently injustices which we cannot remedy and provocations we cannot remove.

The word "patience" does not occur in the Old Testament, but we have "patiently" in Ps 40:1 as the translation of qawah, "to wait," "to expect," which word frequently expresses the idea, especially that of waiting on God; in Ps 37:7, "patiently" ("wait patiently") is the translation of qul, one of the meanings of which is "to wait" or "to hope for" or "to expect" (of Job 35:14); "patient" occurs (Ec 7:8) as the translation of 'erekh ruach, "long of spirit," and (Job 6:11) "that I should be patient" (ha'arikh nephesh). Compare "impatient" (Job 21:4).

"Patience" occurs frequently in the Apocrypha, especially in Ecclesiasticus, e.g. 2:14; 16:13; 17:24; 41:2 (hupomone); 5:11 (makrothumia); 29:8 (makrothumeo, the Revised Version (British and American) "long suffering"); in The Wisdom of Solomon 2:19, the Greek word is anexikakia.

In the New Testament hupomone carries in it the ideas of endurance, continuance (Lu 8:15; 21:19; Ro 5:3,4, the American Standard Revised Version "stedfastness"; Ro 8:25, etc.).

In all places the American Revised Version margin has "stedfastness," except Jas 5:11, where it has "endurance"; makrothumia is translated "patience" (Heb 6:12; Jas 5:10); makrothumeo, "to bear long" (Mt 18:26,29; Jas 5:7; See LONGSUFFERING); the same verb is translated "be patient" (1Th

5:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "longsuffering"; Jas 5:7,8, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "patient"); makrothumos, "patiently" (Ac 26:3); hupomeno (1Pe 2:20); anexikakos is translated "patient" (2Ti 2:4, the Revised Version (British and American), the King James Version margin, "forbearing"); epieikes, "gentle" (1Ti 3:3, the Revised Version (British and American) "gentle"); hupomeno (Ro 12:12, "patient in tribulation"). For "the patient waiting for Christ" (2Th 3:5), the Revised Version (British and American) has "the patience of Christ."

Patience is often hard to gain and to maintain, but, in Ro 15:5, God is called "the God of patience" (the American Revised Version margin "stedfastness") as being able to grant that grace to those who look to Him and depend on Him for it. It is in reliance on God and acceptance of His will, with trust in His goodness, wisdom and faithfulness, that we are enabled to endure and to hope stedfastly.

See also GOD.

W. L. Walker

PATMOS

pat'-mos (Patomos; Italian: San Giovanni di Patino): A Turkish island of the group Sporades, Southwest of Samos, mentioned once in the Bible, Re 1:9, "I, John .... was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (dia ton logon tou theou kai ten marturian Iesou). The island is 10 miles long, and about 6 broad along the northern coast. It is for the most part rocky. The highest part is Mount Elias, which rises to a height of over 800 ft. As in Greece, and in the adjacent mainland of Asia Minor, the land is treeless. Near the city of Patmos there is a good harbor. A famous monastery, Christodulos, was founded on the island in 1088. Near this is a thriving school, attended by students from all parts of the Archipelago. The population of the island numbers 3,000, almost entirely Greek. The ancient capital was on an isthmus between the inlets of La Scala and Merika. Many ruins can still be seen. The huge walls of Cyclopean masonry, similar to those at Tiryns, attest their great age. In Roman times Patmos was one of the many places to which Rome banished her exiles. In 95 AD, according to a tradition preserved by Irenaeus, Eusebius, Jerome and others, John was exiled here—in the 14th year of the reign of Domitian—whence he returned to Ephesus under Nerva (96 AD). The cave in which he is said to have seen his visions is still pointed out to the traveler. Only a small part of the once valuable library in the monastery of Christodulos is left. Just 100 years ago (1814) Mr. E.D. Clark purchased here the manuscript of Plato which is now in the Bodleian Library, the celebrated Clarkianus, a parchment written in the year 895, and admittedly the best of all for the 1st of the 2 volumes into which the works of Plato were divided for convenience. Patmos is mentioned by Thucydides (iii.33), by Pliny (NH, iv.23), and by Strabo (x.5).

See also JOHN, THE APOSTLE; REVELATION OF JOHN.

LITERATURE.

Tozer, The Islands of the Aegean (1890), 178-95; Walpole, Turkey (London, 1820), II, 43; E.D. Clark, Travels (London, 1818), VI, 2; Ross, Reisen (Stuttgart, 1840), II; Guerin, Description de l'Ile de Patmos (Paris, 1856).

J. E. Harry

PATRIARCH; PATRIACHS

pa'-tri-ark, patriarches). The word occurs in the New Testament in application to Abraham (Heb 7:4), to the sons of Jacob (Ac 7:8,9), and to David (Ac 2:29). In Septuagint it is used as the equivalent of the head of the fathers' house, or of a tribe (1Ch 24:31; 27:32; 2Ch 26:12). Commonly now the term is used of the persons whose names appear in the genealogies and covenant-histories in the periods preceding Moses (Ge 5; 11, histories of Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, etc.; compare "patriarchal dispensation"). The problems connected with the longevity ascribed to the patriarchs in the genealogies and narratives in Ge are dealt with in special articles.

See ANTEDILUVIAN PATRIARCHS; ANTEDILUVIANS (GENEALOGY).

James Orr

PATRIARCHS, TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. IV, 1.

PATRIMONY

pat'-ri-mo-ni (ha-'abhoth, "the fathers"): A word occurring once in English Versions of the Bible (De 18:8), meaning literally, "the fathers," which, however, is obscure, probably by reason of abbreviation for some phrase, e.g. "house of the fathers." It may indicate "some private source of income possessed by the Levite (who has come up from a country district to the central sanctuary) distinct from what he receives as a priest officiating at the central sanctuary" (Driver, "Deuteronomy," ICC, in the place cited.). Beyond this one occurrence of the word the same idea is conveyed often by other words or phrases: "He divided unto them his living" (Lu 15:13); "Teacher, bid my brother divide the inheritance with me" (Lu 12:13). Full and specific directions were given in the Law for the division of the patrimony (Nu 27$; De 21$, etc.) and for its redemption (Ru 4:1-12). The idea was frequently used with figurative and spiritual application: the land of Canaan was Israel's patrimony, being inherited from Yahweh (Ps 105:11); salvation because of its origin in grace was the believer's patrimony (Ga 3:26-4:7). Contrariwise Israel was Yahweh's inheritance (Isa 19:25; 63:14; compare Ps 33:12; and the whole earth is the Messiah's patrimony, inherited from His Eternal Father (Ps 2:8).

See BIRTHRIGHT; FAMILY; INHERITANCE; PROPERTY.

Edward Mack

PATROBAS

pat’-ro-bas (Patrobas): The name of a member of the Christian community at Rome to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:14). The name is an abbreviated form of "Patrobius." There was a wealthy freedman of Nero of the same name who was put to death by Galba (Tacitus, History i.49; ii.95). The Patrobas of Paul may have been a dependent of his.

PATROCLUS

pa-tro’-klus (Patroklos): The father of the Syrian general Nicanor (2 Macc 8:9).

PATTERN

pat’-ern (tabhnith, "model," mar’eh, "a vision" or "view"): The Old Testament words translated "pattern" do not necessarily indicate a drawing such as a modern constructor begins with, or the patterns made from these drawings for the guidance of workmen. In Ex 25:9,40 the word "idea" or "suggestion" would possibly indicate more distinctly than "pattern" what Moses received in regard to the building of the tabernacle, etc. It is doubtful if any architect’s drawing was ever made of the temple. It is not the custom in Palestine and Syria today to work from any pattern more concrete than an idea. A man who wants a house calls the builder and says he wants to build so many rooms of such and such dimensions with, for example, a court 10 drahs (arm’s lengths) wide and 15 drahs long, made of sandstone and plastered inside and out. With these meager instructions the builder starts. The details are worked out as the building proceeds. When a piece of iron or brass work is to be made, the customer by gestures with his hands outlines the form the piece should take. "I want it haik wa haik" ("thus and thus"), he says, and leaves the metal worker to conceive the exact form. It is probable that directions similar to these were given by David to Solomon. "Then David gave Solomon his son the pattern (his conception) of the porch of the temple," etc. (1Ch 28:11). The above does not apply to Greek and Roman work in Syria. Their workmen, probably mostly native, were trained to work from models. Williams in the Architect, January, 1913, says of the works at Baalbek and Palmyra, "There is a machine-like resemblance betokening slavish copying." At the present time native workmen coming under the influence of foreigners are beginning to work from models and plans, but they show little tendency to create models of their own.

Three Greek words have been translated in the New Testament: tupos, "type," occurs in Tit 2:7 and Heb 8:5. In the first instance the Revised Version (British and American) reads "ensample." hupotuposis, "outline," has been similarly translated in 1Ti 1:16, but "pattern" in 2Ti 1:13. In Heb 9:24 the American Standard Revised Version. antitupos, is rendered "like in pattern." hupodeigma, the King James Version "pattern," is translated in the American Standard Revised Version "copy" (Heb 8:5), "copies" (Heb 9:23). At the time of the translation of the King James Version the word "pattern" meant either the thing to be copied or the copy.

James A. Patch

PAU

pa’u.

See PAI.

PAUL, THE APOSTLE, 1

pol,

I. Sources

1. The Acts

2. The Thirteen Epistles

(1) Pauline Authorship

(2) Lightfoot’s Grouping

(a) First Group (1 and 2 Thessalonians)

(b) Second Group (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, (c) Third Group-(Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians)

(d) Fourth Group (1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy)

(3) Paul’s Conception of His Epistles

(4) Development in Paul’s Epistles

II. MODERN THEORIES ABOUT PAUL

1. Criticism Not Infallible

2. The Tubingen Theory

3. Protest against Baur’s View

4. Successors to Baur

5. Appeal to Comparative Religion

6. The Eschatological Interpretation

III. CHRONOLOGY OF PAUL’S CAREER

1. Schemes

2. Crucial Points

(1) The Death of Stephen

(2) The Flight from Damascus

(3) The Death of Herod Agrippa I

(4) The First Mission Tour

(5) The First Visit to Corinth

(6) Paul at Troas according to Ac 20:6 f

(7) Festus Succeeding Felix

IV. EQUIPMENT

1. The City of Tarsus

2. Roman Citizenship

3. Hellenism

4. The Mystery-Religions

5. Judaism

6. Personal Characteristics

(1) Personal Appearance

(2) Natural Endowments

(3) Supernatural Gifts

7. Conversion

(1) Preparation

(2) Experience

(3) Effect on Paul

V. WORK

1. Adjustment

2. Opposition

3. Waiting

4. Opportunity

5. The First Great Mission Campaign

6. The Conflict at Jerusalem

7. The Second Mission Campaign

8. The Third Mission Campaign

9. Five Years a Prisoner

10. Further Travels

11. Last Imprisonment and Death

VI. GOSPEL

LITERATURE

I. Sources.

1. The Acts:

For discussion of the historical value of the Ac of the Apostles see the article on that subject. It is only necessary to say here that the view of Sir W.M. Ramsay in general is accepted as to the trustworthiness of Luke, whose authorship of the Ac is accepted and proved by Harnack (Die Apostelgeschichte, 1908; The Ac of the Apostles, translation by Wilkinson, 1909; Neue Untersuch. zur Ap., 1911; The Date of the Ac and of the Synoptic Gospels, translations by Wilkinson, 1911). The proof need not be given again. The same hand appears in the "we" sections and the rest of the book. Even Moffatt (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 311) admits the Lukan authorship though dating it in 100 AD instead of 60-62 AD, against Harnack. The Ac is written independently of the Epistles of Paul, whether early or late, and supplements in a wonderful way the incidental references in the epistles, though not without lacunae and difficulties.

2. The Thirteen Epistles:

(1) Pauline Authorship.

See the articles on each epistle for detailed criticism. It is here assumed that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not written by Paul, though Pauline in point of view. One cannot stop to prove every statement in an article like this, else a large book would be needed. Criticism is not an infallible science. One can turn easily from the Hatch-Van Manen article on "Paul" in Encyclopedia Biblica (1902) to the Maclean article on "Paul the Apostle" in the 1-vol HDB (1909). Van-Manen’s part of the one denies all the thirteen, while Maclean says: "We shall, in what follows, without hesitation use the thirteen epistles as genuine." It is certain that Paul wrote more epistles, or "letters," as Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 225) insists on calling all of Paul’s epistles. Certainly Philera is a mere "letter," but it is difficult to say as much about Romans. Deissmann (St. Paul, 22) admits that portions of Romans are like "an epistolary letter." At any rate, when Moffatt (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 64-82) carefully justifies the Pauline authorship of both 1 and 2 Thessalonians, it is clear that the case against them cannot be very strong, especially as Moffatt stands out against the genuineness of Ephesians (op. cit., 393) and the Pastoral Epistles (p. 414).

Bartlet, who was once at a loss to know what to do with the Pastorals on theory that Paul was not released from the Roman imprisonment (Apostolic Age, 1899, 200), is now quite willing to face the new facts set forth by Ramsay (Expos, VII, viii-ix, VIII, i), even if it means the admission of a second Roman imprisonment, a view that Bartlet had opposed. He now pleads for "the fresh approach from the side of experience, by men who are in touch with the realities of human nature in all its variety, as well as at home in the historical background of society in the early Roman empire, that has renovated the study of them and taken it out of the old ruts of criticism in which it has moved for the most part in modern

times" (Expos, January, 1913, 29). Here Bartlet, again, now eloquently presents the view of common-sense criticism as seen by the practical missionary better than by a life "spent amid the academic associations of a professor's chair," though he pauses to note as an exception Professor P. Gardner's The Religious Experience of Paul (1912). We may quote Bartlet once more (Expos, January, 1913, 30): "In the recovery of a true point of view a vital element has been the newer conception of Paul himself and so of Paulinism. Paul the doctrinaire theologian, or at least the prophet of a one-sided gospel repeated with fanatical uniformity of emphasis under all conditions, has largely given place to Paul the missionary, full indeed of inspired insight on the basis of a unique experience, but also of practical instinct, the offspring of sympathy with living men of other types of training. When the Pastorals are viewed anew in the light of this idea, half their difficulties disappear." One need not adopt Deissmann's rather artificial insistence on "letters" rather than "epistles," and his undue depreciation of Paul's intellectual caliber and culture as being more like Amos than Origen (St. Paul, 1912, 6), in order to see the force of this contention for proper understanding of the social environment of Paul. Against Van Manen's "historical Paul" who wrote nothing, he places "the historic Paul" who possibly wrote all thirteen. "There is really no trouble except with the letters to Timothy and Titus, and even there the difficulties are perhaps not quite so great as many of our specialists assume" (St. Paul, 15). See PASTORAL EPISTLES. Deissmann denies sharply that Paul was an "obscurantist" who corrupted the gospel of Jesus, "the dregs of doctrinaire study of Paul, mostly in the tired brains-of gifted amateurs" (p. 4). But A. Schweitzer boldly proclaims that he alone has the key to Paul and Jesus. It is the "exclusively Jewish eschatological" (Paul and His Interpreters, 1912, ix), conception of Christ's gospel that furnishes Schweitzer's spring-board (The Quest of the Historical Jesus). Thus he will be able to explain "the Hellenization of the gospel" as mediated through Paul. To do that Schweitzer plows his weary way from Grotius to Holtzmann, and finds that they have all wandered into the wilderness. He is positive that his eschatological discovery will rescue Paul and some of his epistles from the ruin wrought by Steck and Van Manen to whose arguments modern criticism has nothing solid to offer, and the meager negative crumbs offered by Schweitzer ought to be thankfully received (ibid, 249).

(2) Lightfoot's Grouping.

(Compare Biblical Essays, 224.) There is doubt as to the position of Galatians. Some advocates of the South-Galatian theory make it the very earliest of Paul's Epistles, even before the Jerusalem Conference in Ac 15. So Eramet, Commentary on Galatians (1912), ix, who notes (Preface) that his commentary is the first to take this position. But the North Galatian view still has the weight of authority in spite of Ramsay's powerful advocacy in his various books (see Historical Commentary on Galatians), as is shown by Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 90 ff. Hence, Lightfoot's grouping is still the best to use.

(a) First Group (1 and 2 Thessalonians):

1 and 2 Thessalonians, from Corinth, 52-53 AD. Harnack's view that 2 Thessalonians is addressed to a Jewish Christian church in Thessalonica while 1 Thessalonians is addressed to a Gentilechurch is accepted by Lake (Earlier Epistles of Paul, 1911, 83 ff) but Frame (ICC, 1912, 54) sees no need for this hypothesis. Milligan is clear that 1 Thessalonians precedes 2 Thessalonians (Commentary, 1908, xxxix)

and is the earliest of Paul's Epistles (p. xxxvi). The accent on eschatology is in accord with the position of the early disciples in the opening chapters of Acts. They belong to Paul's stay in Corinth recorded in Ac 18.

(b) Second Group (1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans):

1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, 55-58 AD. This is the great doctrinal group, the four chief epistles of Baur. They turn about the Judaizing controversy which furnishes the occasion for the expansion of the doctrine of justification by faith in opposition to the legalistic contention of the Judaizing Christians from Jerusalem (Ac 15:1-3; Ga 2:1-10). The dates of these epistles are not perfectly clear. 1 Corinthians was written shortly before the close of Paul's 3 years' stay at Ephesus (Ac 20:31; 1Co 16:8; Ac 20:1 f). 2 Corinthians was written a few months later while he was in Macedonia (2:13; 7:5,13; 8:16-24). Romans was written from Corinth (16:23; Ac 20:2 f) and sent by Phoebe of Cenchrea (Ro 16:1). The integrity of Romans is challenged by some who deny in particular that chapter 16 belongs to the epistle Moffatt (Intro, 134-38) gives an able, but unconvincing, presentation of the arguments for the addition of the chapter by a later hand. Deissmann (St. Paul, 19) calls Ro 16 "a little letter" addressed to the Christians at Ephesus. Von. Soden (History of Early Christian Literature, 78) easily justifies the presence of Ro 16 in the Epistle to the Romans: "These greetings, moreover, were certainly intended by Paul to create bonds of fellowship between the Pauline Christians and the Roman community, and to show that he had not written to them quite exclusively in his own name." A common-sense explanation of Paul's personal ties in Rome is the fact that as the center of the world's life the city drew people thither from all parts of the earth. So, today many a man has friends in New York or London who has never been to either city. A much more serious controversy rages as to the integrity of 2 Corinthians. Semler took 2Co 10-13 to be a separate and later ep., because of its difference in tone from 2Co 1-9, but Hausrath put it earlier than chapters 1-9, and made it the letter referred to in 2:4. He has been followed by many scholars like Schmiedel, Cone, McGiffert, Bacon, Moffatt, Kennedy, Rendall, Peake, Plummer. Von Soden (History of Early Christian Literature, 50) accepts the partition-theory of 2 Corinthians heartily: "It may be shown with the highest degree of probability that this letter has come down to us in 2Co 10:1-13:10." But the unity of the epistle on theory that the change in tone is a climax to the disobedient element of the church is still maintained with force and justice by Klopper, Zahn, Bachmann, Denhey, Bernard, A. Robertson, Weiss, Menzies. The place of the writing of Galatians turns on its date. Lightfoot (in loc.) argues for Corinth, since it was probably written shortly before Romans. But Moffatt (Introduction, 102) holds tentatively to Ephesus, soon after Paul's arrival there from Galatia. So he gives the order: Galatians, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans. In so much doubt it is well to follow Lightfoot's logical argument. Galatians leads naturally to Romans, the one hot and passionate, the other calm and contemplative, but both on the same general theme.

(c) Third group (Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians):

Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians. Date 61-63, unless Paul reached Rome several years earlier. This matter depends on the date of the coming of Festus to succeed Felix (Ac 24:27). It was once thought to be 60 AD beyond any doubt, but the whole matter is now uncertain. See "Chronology," III, 2, (2), below. At any rate these four epistles were written during the first Roman imprisonment, assuming

that he was set free.

But it must be noted that quite a respectable group of scholars hold that one or all of these epistles were written from Caesarea (Schultz, Thiersch, Meyer, Hausrath, Sabatier, Reuss, Weiss, Haupt, Spitta, McPherson, Hicks). But the arguments are more specious than convincing. See Hort, Romans and Ephesians, 101-10. There is a growing opinion that Philemon, Colossians and Ephesians were written from Ephesus during a possible imprisonment in Paul's stay of 3 years there. So Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 229; Paul, 16); Lisco (Vincula Sanctorum, 1900); M. Albertz (Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1910, 551 ff); B. W. Bacon (Journal of Biblical Lit., 1910, 181 ff). The strongest argument for this position is that Paul apparently did not know personally the readers of Eph (1:15); compare also Col 1:4. But this objection need not apply if the so-called Ephesian Epistle was a circular letter and if Paul did not visit Colosse and Laodicea during his 3 years at Ephesus. The theory is more attractive at first than on reflection. It throws this group before Romans—a difficult view to concede.

But even so, the order of these epistles is by no means certain. It is clear that Philemon, Colossians and Ephesians were sent together. Tychicus was the bearer of Colossians (4:7 f) and Ephesians (6:21 f). Onesimus carried the letter to Philemon (1:10,13) and was also the companion of Tychicus to Colosse (Col 4:9). So these three epistles went together from Rome. It is commonly assumed that Php was the last of the group of four, and hence later than the other three, because Paul is balancing life and death (Php 1:21) and is expecting to be set free (Php 1:25), but he has the same expectation of freedom when he writes Philemon (1:22). The absence of Luke (Php 2:20) has to be explained on either hypothesis. Moffatt (Introduction, 159) is dogmatic, "as Philippians was certainly the last letter that he wrote," ruling out of court Ephesians, not to say the later Pastoral Epistles. But this conclusion gives Moffatt trouble with the Epistle to the Laodiceans (Col 4:16) which he can only call "the enigmatic reference" and cannot follow Rutherford (St. Paul's Epistles to Colosse and Laodicea, 1908) in identifying the Laodicean Epistle with Ephesians, as indeed Marcion seems to have done. But the notion that Ephesians was a circular letter designed for more than one church (hence, without personalities) still holds the bulk of modern opinion.

Von Soden (History of Early Christian Literature, 294) is as dogmatic as Wrede or Van Manen: "All which has hitherto been said concerning this epistle, its form, its content, its ideas, its presuppositions, absolutely excludes the possibility of a Pauline authorship." He admits "verbal echoes of Pauline epistles"

Lightfoot puts Philippians before the other three because of its doctrinal affinity with the second group in chapter 3 as a reminiscence, and because of its anticipation of the Christological controversy with incipient Gnosticism in chapter 2. This great discussion is central in Colossians and Ephesians. At any rate, we have thus a consistent and coherent interpretation of the group. Philemon, though purely personal, is wondrously vital as a sociological document. Paul is in this group at the height of his powers in his grasp of the Person of Christ.

(d) Fourth Group (1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy):

1 Timothy, Titus, 2 Timothy. The Pastoral Epistles are still hotly disputed, but there is a growing willingness in Britain and Germany to make a place for them in Paul's life. Von Soden bluntly says: "It is impossible that these epistles as they stand can have been written by Paul" (History of Early Christian Literature, 310). He finds no room for the heresy here combated, or for the details in Paul's life, or for the linguistic peculiarities in Paul's style. But he sees a "literary nicety"—this group that binds them together and separates them from Paul. Thus tersely he puts the case against the Pauline authorship. So Moffatt argues for the "sub-Pauline environment" and "sub-Pauline atmosphere" of these epistles with the advanced ecclesiasticism (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 410 ff). Wrede thrusts aside the personal details and argues that the epistles give merely the tendency of early Christianity (Ueber Aufgabe und Metbode der Sogen. New Testament Theologie, 1897, 357). The Hatch-Van Manen article in Encyclopedia Biblica admits only that "the Pastoral Epistles occupy themselves chiefly with the various affairs of the churches within 'Pauline circles.' "

Moffatt has a vigorous attack on these letters in EB, but he "almost entirely ignores the external evidence, while he has nothing to say to the remarkable internal evidence which immediately demands our attention" (Knowling, Testimony of Paul to Christ, 3rd edition, 1911, 129). Moffatt (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 414) holds that the Pastoral Epistles came from one pen, but the personality and motives are very vague to him. The personal details in 2Ti 1:14-18; 4:9-22 are not on a paragraph with those in The Ac of Paul and Thekla in the 2nd century. Many critics who reject the Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles admit the personal details in 2 Timothy, but it is just in such matters that forgeries are recognizable. To admit these fragments is logically to admit the whole (Maclean in 1-vol HDB), as Moffatt sees (Intro, 414), however much he seeks to tone down the use of Paul's name as "a Christian form of suasoriae," and "a further and inoffensive development of the principle which sought to claim apostolic sanction for the expanding institutions and doctrines of the early church" (ibid., 415). The objection against these epistles from differences in diction has been grievously overdone. As a matter of fact, each of the four groups has words peculiar to it, and naturally so. Style is a function of the subject as well as a mark of the man. Besides, style changes with one's growth. It would have been remarkable if all four

groups had shown no change in no change in vocabulary and style. The case of Shakespeare is quite pertinent, for the various groups of plays stand more or less apart. The Pastoral Epistles belong to Paul's old age and deal with personal and ecclesiastical matters in a more or less reminiscential way, with less of vehement energy than we get in the earlier epistles, but this situation is what one would reasonably expect. The "ecclesiastical organization" argument has been greatly overdone. As a matter of fact, "the organization in the Pastoral Epistles is not apparently advanced one step beyond that of the church in Philippi in 61 AD" (Ramsay, The Expositor, VII, viii, 17). The "gnosis" met by these epistles (1Ti 6:20; Tit 1:14) is not the highly developed type seen in the Ignatian Epistles of the 2nd century. Indeed, Bartlet ("Historic Setting of the Pastoral Epistles," The Expositor, January, 1913, 29) pointedly says that, as a result of Hort's "Judaistic Christianity" and "Christian Ecclesia" and Ramsay's "Historical Commentary on the Epistles of Timothy" (Expos, VII, vii, ix, VIII, i), "one feels the subject has been lifted to a new level of reality and that much criticism between Baur and Julicher is out of date and irrelevant." It is now shown that the Pastoral Epistles are not directed against Gnosticism of advanced

type, but even of a more Jewish type (Tit 1:14) than that in Colossians. Ramsay (Expos, VIII, i, 263) sweeps this stock criticism aside as "from the wrong point of view." It falls to the ground. Lightfoot ("Note on the Heresy Combated in the Pastoral Epistles," Biblical Essays, 413) had insisted on the Jewish character of the Gnosticism attacked here. As a matter of fact, the main objection to these epistles is that they do not fit into the story in Acts, which breaks off abruptly with Paul in Rome. But it is a false premise to assume that the Pastoral Epistles have to fit into the events in Acts. Harnack turns the objection that Paul in Ac 20:26 predicted that he would never see the Ephesian elders again into a strong argument for the date of Luke's Gospel before 2Ti 4:21 (The Date of Ac and Synoptic Gospels, 103). Indeed, he may not have revisited Ephesus after all, but may have seen Timothy at Miletus also (1Ti 1:3). Harnack frankly admits the acquittal and release of Paul and thus free play for the Pastoral Epistles Blass (Acta Apostolorum, 24) acknowledges the Pastoral Epistles as genuine. So also Findlay, article "Paul," in HDB; Maclean in 1-vol HDB; Denney in Standard BD. Sanday (Inspiration, 364) comments on the strength of the external evidence for the Pastoral Epistles. Even Holtzmann (Einl(3), 291) appears to admit echoes of the Pastoral Epistles in the Ignatian Epistles Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, "Date of the Pastoral Epistles," 399-437) justifies completely the acceptance of the Pauline authorship. Deissman (St. Paul, 15) has a needed word: "The delusion is still current in certain circles that the scientific distinction of a Bible scholar may be estimated in the form of a percentage according to the proportion of his verdicts of spuriousness. .... The extant letters of Paul have been innocently obliged to endure again a fair share of the martyrdom suffered by the historic Paul." See further PASTORAL EPISTLES.

(3) Paul's Conception of His Epistles

Assuming, therefore, the Pauline authorship of the thirteen epistles, we may note that they, reveal in a remarkable way the growth in Paul's apprehension of Christ and Christianity, his adaptation to varied situations, his grasp of world-problems and the eternal values of life. Paul wrote other epistles, as we know. In 1Co 5:9 there is a clear reference to a letter not now known to us otherwise, earlier than 1 Corinthians. The use of "every epistle" in 2Th 3:17 naturally implies that Paul had written more than two already. It is not certain to what letter Paul refers in 2Co 2:4—most probably to one between 1 and 2 Corinthians, though, as already shown, some scholars find that letter in 2Co 10-13. Once more Paul (Col 4:16) mentions an epistle addressed to the church at Laodicea. This epistle is almost certainly that which we know as Ephesians. If not, here is another lost epistle. Indeed, at least two apocryphal Epistles to the Laodiceans were written to supply this deficiency. As early as 2Th 2:2 forgers were at work to palm, off epistles in Paul's name, "or by epistle as from us," to attack and pervert Paul's real views, whom Paul denounces. It was entirely possible that this "nefarious work" would be continued (Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament, 1907, 191), though, as Gregory argues, Paul's exposure here would have a tendency to put a stop to it and to put Christians on their guard and to watch for Paul's signature to the epistles as a mark of genuineness (2Th 3:17; 1Co 16:21; Ga 6:11; Col 4:18). This was all the more important since Paul evidently dictated his letters to amanuenses, as to Tertius in the case of Ro 16:22. In the case of Phm 1:19, Paul probably wrote the whole letter. We may be sure therefore that, if we had the other genuine letters of Paul, they would occupy the same general standpoint as the thirteen now in our possession. The point to note here is that the four groups of Paul's Epistles fit into the historical background of the Ac as recorded by Luke, barring the fourth group which is later than the events in Acts. Each group meets a specific situation in a definite region or regions, with problems of vital

interest. Paul attacks these various problems (theological, ecclesiastical, practical) with marvelous vigor, and applies the eternal principles of the gospel of Christ in such fashion as to furnish a norm for future workers for Christ. It is not necessary to say that he was conscious of that use. Deissmann (St. Paul, 12 f) is confident on this point: "That a portion of these confidential letters should be still extant after centuries, Paul cannot have intended, nor did it ever occur to him that they would be." Be that as it may, and granted that Paul's Epistles are "survivals, in the sense of the technical language employed by the historical method" (ibid., 12), still we must not forget that Paul attached a great deal of importance to his letters and urged obedience to the teachings which they contained: "I adjure you by the, Lord that this epistle be read unto all the brethren" (1Th 5:27). This command we find in the very first one preserved to us. Once more note 2Th 3:14: "And if any man obeyeth not our word by this ep., note that man, that ye have no company with him." Evidently therefore Paul does not conceive his epistles as mere incidents in personal correspondence, but authoritative instructions for the Christians to whom they are addressed. In 1Co 7:17, "And so ordain I in all the churches," he puts his epistolary commands on a paragraph with the words of Jesus quoted in the same chapter. Some indeed at Corinth (2Co 10:9 f) took his "letters" as an effort to "terrify" them, a thing that he was afraid to do in person. Paul (2Co 10:11) does not deny the authority of his letters, but claims equal courage when he comes in person (compare 2Co 13:2,10). That Paul expected his letters to be used by more than the one church to which they were addressed is clear from Col 4:16: "And when this epistle hath been read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea." If the letter to Laodicea is our Eph and a sort of circular letter (compare Galatians), that is clear. But it must be noted that Colossians, undoubtedly a specific letter to Colosse, is likewise to be passed on to Laodicea. It is not always observed that in 1Co 1:2, though the epistle is addressed "unto the church of God which is at Corinth," Paul adds, "with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours." Philemon is, of course, a personal letter, though it deals with a sociological problem of universal interest. The Pastoral Epistles are addressed to two young ministers and have many personal details, as is natural, but the epistles deal far more with the social aspects of church life and the heresies and vices that were threatening the very existence of Christianity in the Roman empire. Paul is eager that Timothy shall follow his teaching (2Ti 3:10), and "the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also" (2Ti 2:2). It is this larger view of the future of Christianity that concerns Paul very keenly. The very conception of his ministry to the Gentiles (Ro 15:16; Eph 3:7) led Paul to feel that he had a right to speak to all, "both to Greeks and to Barbarians" (Ro 1:14), and hence, even to Rome (Ro 1:15 f). It is a mistake to limit Paul's Epistles to the local and temporary sphere given them by Deissmann.

(4) Development in Paul's Epistles

For Paul's gospel or theology see later. Here we must stress the fact that all four groups of Paul's Epistles are legitimate developments from his fundamental experience of grace as conditioned by his previous training and later work. He met each new problem with the same basal truth that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, revealed to Paul on the way to Damascus. The reality of this great experience must here be assumed (see discussion later). It may be admitted that the Ac does not stand upon the same plane as the Pauline Epistles as a witness concerning Paul's conversion (Fletcher, The Conversion of Paul, 1910, 5). But even so, the Epistles amply confirm Luke's report of the essential fact that Jesus

appeared to Paul in the same sense that He did to the apostles and 500 Christians (1Co 15:4-9). The revelation of Christ to Paul and in Paul (en emoi, Ga 1:16) and the specific call connected therewith to preach to the Gentiles gave Paul a place independent of and on a paragraph with the other apostles (Ga 1:16 f; 2:1-10). Paul's first preaching (Ac 9:20) "proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God." This "primitive Paulinism" (Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, 1893, 113) lay at the heart of Paul's message in his sermons and speeches in Acts. Professor P. Gardner regards Luke as a "careless" historian ("The Speeches of Paul in Acts," Cambridge Biblical Essays, 1909, 386), but he quite admits the central place of Paul's conversion, both in the Ac and the Epistles (ib; compare also The Religious Experience of Paul).

We cannot here trace in detail the growth of Paulinism. Let Wernle speak (Beginnings of Christianity, 1903, I, 224) for us: "The decisive factor in the genius of Paul's theology was his personal experience, his conversion on the road to Damascus." This fact reappears in each of the groups of the Epistles. It is the necessary implication in the apostolic authority claimed in 1Th 2:4-6; 2Th 2:15; 3:6,14. "We might have claimed authority as apostles of Christ" (1Th 2:6). For the second group we need only refer to 1Co 9:1 f and 15:1-11, where Paul justifies his gospel by the fact of having seen the risen Jesus. His self-depreciation in 15:9 is amply balanced by the claims in 15:10. See also 2Co 10-13 and Galatians 1 and 2 for Paul's formal defense of his apostolic authority. The pleasantry in Ro 15:14 does not displace the claim in 15:16,23 f. In the third group note the great passage in Php 3:12-14, where Paul pointedly alludes to his conversion: "I was laid hold of by Jesus Christ," as giving him the goal of his ambition, "that I may lay hold"; "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." This concentration of effort to come up to Christ's purpose in him is the key to Paul's life and letters, "I press on toward the goal." So the golden cord reappears in Eph 3:2-13: "How that by revelation was made known unto me the mystery, as I wrote before in few words, whereby, when ye read, ye can perceive my understanding in the mystery of Christ." In the fourth group he still recalls how Christ Jesus took pity on him, the blasphemer, the persecutor, the chief of sinners, and put him into the ministry, "that in me as chief might Jesus Christ show forth all his longsuffering, for an ensample of them that should thereafter believe on him unto eternal life" (1Ti 1:16). He kept up the fight to the end (2Ti 4:6 f), for the Lord Jesus stood by him (2Ti 4:17), as on the road to Damascus. So the personal note of experience links all the epistles together.They reveal Paul's growing conception of Christ. Paul at the very start perceived that men are redeemed by faith in Jesus as the Saviour from sin through His atoning death, not by works of the Law (Ac 13:38 f). In the first group there are allusions to the "work of faith and labor of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ" (1Th 1:3). He speaks of "election" (1Th 1:4) and "our gospel" (1Th 1:5) and the resurrection of Jesus (1Th 1:10). The Father, Son and Spirit cooperate in the work of salvation (2Th 2:13 f), which includes election, belief, sanctification, glorification. It is not necessary to press the argument for the conception of salvation by faith in Christ, grace as opposed to works, in the second group. It is obviously present in the third and the fourth. We seem forced to the view therefore that Paul's experience was revolutionary, not evolutionary. "If we consider the whole history of Paul as it is disclosed to us in his letters, are we not forced to the conclusion that his was a catastrophic or explosive, rather than a slowly progressive personality?" (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 1911, 32). "His gospel was included in his conversion, and it was meditation that made explicit what was thus implicit in his experience" (same place) . This is not to say that there was no "spiritual development of Paul" (Matheson, 1890). There was, and of the richest kind, but it was a growth of expression in the

successive application of the fundamental Christian conception. The accent upon this or that phase of truth at different stages in Paul's career does not necessarily mean that the truth is a new one to him. It may simply be that the occasion has arisen for emphasis and elaboration.

In a broad generalization the first group of the epistles is eschatological, the second soteriological, the third Christological, and the fourth pastoral (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 22). But one must not get the notion that Paul did not have a full gospel of salvation in the first group, and did not come to the true motive of the person of Christ as Lord till the second, or understand the pastoral office till the fourth. See emphasis on Paul's work as pastor and preacher in 1Th 2 (first group), and the Lordship of Christ also (1Th 1:1,3; 2Th 1:1; 2:13 f), on a paragraph with the Father.

There was a change of accent in each group on questions of eschatology, but in each one Paul cherishes the hope of the second coming of Christ up to the very end when he speaks of his own death (2Ti 4:8,18). Paul has a whole gospel of grace in all his epistles, but he presses home the special phase of truth needed at the moment, always with proper balance and modification, though not in the form of a system of doctrine. In the first group he relieves the minds of the Thessalonian Christians from the misapprehension into which they had fallen concerning his position on the immediate coming of Christ. In the second group Paul vindicates the gospel of grace from the legalistic addition of the Judaizers who sought to rob the Gentiles of their freedom by insisting that they become Jews as well as Christians. This ringing battle is echoed in Ac 15 and is the mightiest conflict of Paul's career. We hear echoes of it in Php 3, but he had won his contention. In the third group the battle with error has shifted to the province of Asia, especially the Lycus Valley, where a mystic mixture of Judaism (Essenism) and heathen mystery-religions and philosophies (incipient Gnosticism) was so rife in the 2nd century (the various forms of Gnosticism which combined with some aspects of Christianity). It is possible also that Mithraism was already a foe of Christianity. The central position and essential deity of Jesus Christ was challenged by these new and world-old heresies, and Paul attacks them with marvelous skill in Col and Eph and works out in detail his teaching concerning the person of Christ with due emphasis on the soteriological aspects of Christ's work and on Christian life. Bruce (St. Paul's Conception of Christianity) conceives that Paul gives us his entire conception of Christianity in the four great epistles of the second group, while B. Weiss (Biblical Theology of the New Testament) sees a more developed doctrine in the third group. He is in his prime in both groups. In the fourth group the same struggle lingers on with variations in Crete and even in Ephesus. The Jewish phase of the heresy is more decided (perhaps Pharisaic), and recalls to some extent the Judaistic controversy in the second group. Paul is older and faces the end, and Christianity has enemies within and without. He turns to young ministers as the hope of the future in the propagation of the gospel of the happy God. The fires have burned lower, and there is less passion and heat. The tone is now fierce, now tender. The style is broken and reminiscent and personal, though not with the rush of torrential emotion in 2 Corinthians, nor the power of logic in Galatians and Romans. Each epistle fits into its niche in the group. Each group falls into proper relation to the stage in Paul's life and justly reveals the changes of thought and feeling in the great apostle. It is essential that one study Paul's Epistles in their actual historical order if one wishes to understand the mind of Paul. Scholars are not agreed, to be sure on this point. They are not agreed on anything, for that matter. See two methods of presenting Paul's Epistles in Robertson, Chronological New Testament (1904), and Moffatt, Historical New Testament (1901).

PAUL, THE APOSTLE, 2 II. Modern Theories about Paul.

1. Criticism Not Infallible:

Findlay (HDB, "Paul") utters a needed warning when he reminds us that the modern historical and psychological method of study is just as liable to prepossession and prejudice as the older categories of scholastic and dogmatic theology. "The focus of the picture may be displaced and its colors falsified by philosophical no less than by ecclesiastical spectacles" (same place). Deissmann (St. Paul, 4 f) sympathizes with this protest against the infallibility of modern subjective criticism: "That really and properly is the task of the modern student of Paul: to come back from the paper Paul of our western libraries, Germanized, dogmatised, modernized, to the historic Paul; to penetrate through the 'Paulinism' of our New Testament theologies to the Paul of ancient reality." He admits the thoroughness and the magnitude of the work accomplished in the 19th century concerning the literary questions connected with Paul's letters, but it is a "doctrinaire interest" that "has gone farther and farther astray." Deissmann conceives of Paul as a "hero of piety first and foremost," not as a theologian. "As a religious genius Paul's outlook is forward into a future of universal history." In this position of Deissmann we see a return to the pre-Baur time. Deissmann would like to get past all the schools of criticism, back to Paul himself.

2. The Tubingen Theory:

Baur started the modern critical attitude by his Pastoralbriefe (1835, p. 79), in which he remarked that there were only four epistles of Paul (Galatians 1 and 2 Corinthians, Romans) which could be accepted as genuine. In his Paulus (1845) he expounded this thesis. He also rejected the Acts. From the four great epistles and from the pseudo-Clementine literature of the 2nd century, Baur argued that Paul and Peter were bitter antagonists. Peter and the other apostles were held fast in the grip of the legalistic conception of Christianity, a sort of Christianized Pharisaism. Paul, when converted, had reacted violently against this view, and became the exponent of Gentile freedom. Christianity was divided into two factions, Jewish Christians (Petrinists) and Gentile Christians (Paulinists). With this "key" Baur ruled out the other Pauline epistles and Ac as spurious, because they did not show the bitterness of this controversy. He called them "tendency" writings, designed to cover up the strife and to show that peace reigned in the camp. This arbitrary theory cut a wide swath for 50 years, and became a fetich with many scholars, but it is now dead. "It has been seen that it is bad criticism to make a theory on insecure grounds, and then to reject all the literature which contradicts it" (Maclean in 1-vol HDB). Ramsay (The First Christian Century, 1911, 195) contends that the perpetuation of the Baur standpoint in Moffatt's Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament is an anachronism: "We are no longer in the 19th century with its negations, but in the 20th century with its growing power of insight and the power of belief that springs therefrom." Van Marten (Encyclopedia Biblica) calls the Baur view that of the "old guard" of liberal theology in Germany, Switzerland, France, Holland, and, to some extent, in Britain.

3. Protest against Baur's View:

But even in Germany the older conservative view of Paul has always had champions. The most consistent of the recent opponents of Baur's views in Germany is Th. Zahn (compare his Einlin das New Testament, 2 volumes, 1897-99; Introduction to the New Testament, 3 volumes, 1910). In Britain the true successor of Lightfoot as the chief antagonist of the Tubingen School is Sir W.M. Ramsay, whose numerous volumes (Church in the Roman Empire, 1893; Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, 1895; Paul the Traveler, 1896; Pauline and Other Studies, 1906; Cities of Paul, 1908; Luke the Physician and Other Studies, 1908; Pictures of the Apostolic Church, 1910; The First Christian Century, 1911) have given the finishing touches to the overthrow of Baur's contention.

4. Successors to Baur:

But even so, already the Baur school had split into two parts. The ablest representatives, like H. J. Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Harnack, Julicher, Lipsius, von Soden, were compelled to admit more of Paul's Epistles as genuine than the four principal ones, till there are left practically none to fight over but Eph and the Pastoral Epistles. This progress eliminated completely Baur's thesis and approached very nearly to the position of Lightfoot, Ramsay and Zahn. Von Soden (Early Christian Literature, 324) still stands out against 2 Thessalonians, but Harnack has deserted him on that point. But the old narrow view of Baur is gone, and von Soden is eloquent in his enthusiasm for Paul (ibid., 119): "As we gaze upon the great literary memorials of the Greeks we may well question whether these Pauline letters are not equal to them—indeed, do not surpass them—in spiritual significance, in psychological depths and loftiness of ideal, above all in the art of complete and forcible expression." The other wing of Baur's school Findlay (HDB) calls "ultra-Baurians." It is mainly a Dutch school with Loman and Van Manen as its main exponents, though it has support in Germany from Steck and Volter, and in America from W. B. Smith. These writers do not say that Paul is a myth, but that our sources (Acts and the 13 epistles) are all legendary. It is a relentless carrying of Baur's thesis to a reductio ad absurdum. Van Manen (Encyclopedia Biblica) says of "the historical, Paul" as distinct from "the legendary Paul": "It does not appear that Paul's ideas differed widely from those of the other disciples, or that he had emancipated himself from Judaism or had outgrown the law more than they." When one has disposed of all the evidence he is entirely free to reconstruct the pictures to suit himself. Quite arbitrarily, Van Manen accepts the "we"-sections in Ac as authoritative. But these give glimpses of the historical Jesus quite as truly as the Pauline Epistles, and should therefore be rejected by advocates of the mythical Jesus. So the pendulum swings back and forth. One school destroys the other, but the fact of Paul's personality remains. "The new start is one of such importance that we must distinguish the pre-Pauline from the post-Pauline Christianity, or, what amounts to the same thing, the Palestinian sect and the world-religion" (Wernle, Beginnings of Christianity, I, 159).

5. Appeal to Comparative Religion:

In his Paulus (1904), Wrede finds the explanation of Paul's theology in late Jewish apocalyptic views and in the oriental mystery religions. Bousset (Die Religion des Judenthums im New Testament Zeitalter, 1903) seeks to find in the "late Jewish apocalyptic" "conceptions from the Babylonian and the Irano-Zarathustrian religions" (Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, 173). According to Wrede's view,

Paul is one of the creators of "Christ" as distinct from the Jesus of history (compare "Jesus or Christ," HJ, suppl., January, 1909). "Wrede's object is to overthrow the view predominant in modern theology, that Paul loyally and consistently expounded and developed theology of Jesus" (J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, 1909, 2). J. Weiss in this book makes a careful reply to Wrede as others have done; compare A. Meyer, Jesus or Paul (1909), who concludes (p. 134) dramatically: "Paul—just one who points the way to Jesus and to God!" See also Julicher, Paulus und Jesus (1907); Kaftan, Jesus und Paulus (1906); Kolbing, Die geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesu und Paulus (1906). The best reply to Wrede's arguments about the mystery-religion is found in articles in the The Expositor for 1912-13 (now in book form) by H.A.A. Kennedy on "St. Paul and the Mystery-Religions." The position of Wrede is carried to its logical conclusion by Drews (Die Christus-Mythe, 1909), who makes Paul the creator of Christianity. W. B. Smith (Der vorchristliche Jesus, 1906) tries to show that "Jesus" was a pre-Christian myth or god. Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters, 235) sums the matter up thus: "Drews's thesis is not merely a curiosity; it indicates the natural limit at which the hypothesis advanced by the advocates of comparative religion, when left to its own momentum, finally comes to rest."

6. The Eschatological Interpretation:

Schweitzer himself may be accepted as the best exponent of the rigid application of this view to Paul (Paul and His Interpreters, 1912) that he had made to Jesus (The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910). He glories in the ability to answer the absurdities of Steck, Loman and Van Manen and Drews by showing that the eschatological conceptions of Paul in his epistles are primitive, not late, and belong to the 1st century, not to the 2nd (Paul and His Interpreters, 249). He thus claims to be the true pupil of Baur, though reaching conclusions utterly different. There is undoubtedly an element of truth in this contention of Schweitzer, but he loses his case, when he insists that nothing but eschatology must be allowed to figure. "The edifice constructed by Baur has fallen," he proclaims (p. viii), but he demands that in its place we allow the "exclusively Jewish-eschatological" (p. ix) interpretation. There he slips, and his theory will go the way of that of Baur. C. Anderson Scott ("Jesus and Paul," Cambridge Biblical Essays, 365) admits that Paul has the same eschatological outlook as Jesus, but also the same ethical interest. It is not "either ..... or," but both in each case. See a complete bibliography of the "Jesus and Paul" controversy in J. G. Machens' paper on "Jesus and Paul" in Biblical and Theological Studies (1912, 547 f). As Ramsay insists, we are now in the 20th century of insight and sanity, and Paul has come to his own. Even Wernle (Beginnings of Christianity, I, 163) sees that Paul is not the creator of the facts: "He merely transmits historical facts. God—Christ—Paul, such is the order." Saintsbury (History of Criticism, 152) says: "It has been the mission of the 19th century to prove that everybody's work was written by somebody else, and it will not be the most useless task of the 20th to betake itself to more profitable inquiries."

PAUL, THE APOSTLE, 3

III. Chronology of Paul's Career.

1. Schemes:

There is not a single date in the life of Paul that is beyond dispute, though several are narrowed to a fine point, and the general course and relative proportion of events are clear enough. Luke gave careful data for the time of the birth of Jesus (Lu 2:1 f), for the entrance of the Baptist on his ministry (Lu 3:1 f), and the age of Jesus when He began His work (Lu 3:23), but he takes no such pains in the Ac with chronology. But we are left with a number of incidental allusions and notes of time which call for some discussion. For fuller treatment see CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 1910, 181) gives a comparative table of the views of Harnack, Turner, Ramsay and Lightfoot for the events from the crucifixion of Christ to the close of Acts. The general scheme is nearly the same, differing from one to four years here and there. Shaw (The Pauline Epistles, xi) gives a good chronological scheme. Moffatt (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 62 f) gives theories of 23 scholars:

Turner, "Chronology," in HDB; Neteler, Untersuchung New Testament Zeitverhaltnisse, 1894; O. Holtzmann, New Testament Zeitgeschichte, 1895, changed in 2nd edition, 1906; Bartlet, Apostolic Age, xiii f; Cornely (compare Laurent), New Testament Studien; Harnack, Chron. d. altchristl. Lit. bis Eusebius, 233-329; McGiffert, Apostolic Age, 164, 172; Zahn, Intro, III, 450 f; Ramsay, "The Pauline Chronology," Pauline and Other Studies, 345 f; Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 213-33; Wendt, Acts, 53-60, Meyer, Commentary; Renan, Paul; Bornemann, Thess, 17 f, Meyer, Comm.; Clemen, Paulus, I, 411; Giffert, Student’s Life of Paul, 242-59; Weiss, Intro, I, 154 f; Sabatier, Paul, 13 f; Julicher, Einl6, 31 f; Findlay, "Paul" in HDB; Farrar, Paul, Appendix; Belser, Theol. Quartalschrift; Steinmann, Abfassungszeit d. Gal, 169; Hoennicke, Die Chronologie des Paulus.

Let us look at the dates given by ten of this list:

Turner Bartlet Harnack McGiffert Zahn

Conversion 35-36 31-32 30 31-32 35

1st visit to Jerusalem 38 34-35 33 34-45 38

2nd visit to Jerusalem 46 46 44 45 44

1st missionary tour 47 47 45 before 45 50-51

Meeting in Jerusalem 49 49 46-47 45 52

2nd missionary tour 49 49 46-47 46 52

3rd missionary tour 52 52 50 49 54

Arrest in Jerusalem 56 56 53-54 53 58

Arrival in Rome 59 59 56-57 56 61

Death of Paul 64-65 61-62 64 58 66-67

Ramsay Lightfoot Clemen Findlay Hoennicke

Conversion 32 34 31 36 33-35

1st visit to Jerusalem 34 37 34 39 36-38

2nd visit to Jerusalem 45 45 45-46

1st missionary tour 46-48 48 46 46 49?

Meeting in Jerusalem 50 51 48 49 50-52

2nd missionary tour 50-53 51 49-52 49 ..

3rd missionary tour 53-57 54 53-59 53 ..

Arrest in Jerusalem 57 58 59 57 ..

Arrival in Rome 60 61 62 60 60-62

Death of Paul 67 67 64 67 ..

This table shows very well the present diversity of opinion on the main points in Paul's life. Before expressing an opinion on the points at issue it is best to examine a few details. Paul himself gives some notes of time. He gives "after 3 years" (Ga 1:18) as the period between his conversion and first visit to Jerusalem, though he does not necessarily mean 3 full years. In Ga 2:1, Paul speaks of another visit to Jerusalem "after the space of 14 years." Then again Luke quotes him as saying to the Ephesian elders at Miletus that he had spent "3 years" at Ephesus (Ac 20:31). These periods of time all come before Paul's last visit and arrest in Jerusalem, and they do not embrace all the time between his conversion and arrest. There is also another note of time in 2Co 12:2, where he speaks in an enigmatic way of experiences of his "14 years" ago from the writing of this epistle from Macedonia on the third tour. This will take him back to Tarsus before coming to Antioch at the request of Barnabas, and so overlaps a bit the other "14" above, and includes the "3 years" at Ephesus. We cannot, therefore, add these figures together for the total. But some light may be obtained from further details from Ac and the Epistles.

2. Crucial Points:

(1) The Death of Stephen.

Saul is "a young man" (Ac 7:58) when this event occurs. Like other young Jews he entered upon his life as a rabbi at the age of thirty. He had probably been thus active several years, especially as he was now in a position of leadership and may even have been a member of the Sanhedrin (Ac 26:10). Pontius Pilate was not deposed from his procuratorship till 36 AD, but was in a state of uneasiness for a couple of years. It is more probable, therefore, that the stoning of Stephen would take place after his deposition in the interregnum, or not many years before, when he would be afraid to protest against the lawlessness of the Jewish leaders. He had shown timidity at the death of Jesus, 29 or 30 AD, but some of the forms of law were observed. So nothing decisive is here obtained, though 35 AD seems more probable than 32 or 33.

(2) The Flight from Damascus.

Paul locates this humiliating experience (2Co 11:32 f) when "the governor under Aretas the king guarded the city of the Damascenes." Aretas the Arabian, and not the Roman, has now control when Paul is writing. The likelihood is that Aretas did not get possession of Damascus till 37 AD, when Tiberius died and was succeeded by Caligula. It is argued by some that the expression "the city of the Damascenes" shows that the city was not under the control of Aretas, but was attacked by a Bedouin chieftain who lay in wait for Paul before the city. That to me seems forced. Josephus (Ant., XVIII, v, 3; vi, 3) at any rate is silent concerning the authority of Aretas over Damascus from 35-37 AD, but no coins or inscriptions show Roman rule over the city between 35 and 62 AD. Ramsay, however ("The Pauline Chronology," Pauline and Other Studies, 364), accepts the view of Marquardt (Romische Staatsalterth., I, 404 f) that it was possible for Aretas to have had possession of Damascus before 37 AD. The flight from Damascus is the same year as the visit to Jerusalem, Paul’s first after his conversion (Ac 9:26; Ga 1:18). If we knew the precise year of this event, we could subtract two or three years and reach the date of his conversion. Lightfoot in his Commentary on Ga gives 38 as the date of this first visit to Jerusalem, and 36 as the date of the conversion, taking "after 3 years" in a free way, but in his Biblical Essays, 221, he puts the visit in 37 and the conversion in 34, and says "‘ after 3 years’ must mean three whole years, or substantially so." Thus we miss a sure date again.

(3) The Death of Herod Agrippa I.

Here the point of contact between the Ac (12:1-4,19-23) and Josephus (Ant., XIX, viii) is beyond dispute, since both record and describe in somewhat similar vein the death of this king. Josephus says that at the time of his death he had already completed the 3rd year of his reign over the whole of Judea (Ant., XIX, viii, 2). He received this dignity soon after Claudius began to reign in 41 AD, so that makes the date 44 AD. He died after the Passover in that year (44), for Peter was imprisoned by him during that feast (Ac 12:3). But unfortunately Luke sandwiches the narrative about Herod Agrippa in between the visit of Barnabas and Saul to Jerusalem from Antioch (Ac 11:29 f) and their return to Antioch (Ac 12:25). He does not say that the events here recorded were exactly synchronous with this visit, for he says merely "about that time." We are allowed therefore to place this visit before 44 AD or after, just as

the facts require. The mention of "elders" in Ac 11:30 instead of apostles (compare both in 15:4) may mean that the apostles are absent when the visit is made. After the death of James (Ac 12:1 f) and release of Peter we note that Peter "went to another place" (Ac 12:17). But the apostles are back again in Jerusalem in Ac 15:4 ff. Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, 216) therefore places the visit "at the end of 44, or in 45." Once more we slip the connection and fail to fix a firm date for Paul. It is disputed also whether this 2nd visit to Jerusalem according to Ac (9:26; 11:29 f) is the same as the "again" in Ga 2:1. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 59) identifies the visit in Ga 2:1 with that in Ac 11:29 f, but Lightfoot (Biblical Essays, 221) holds that it "must be identified with the third of the Acts" (15:4 ff). In Ga 1 and 2 Paul is not recording his visits to Jerusalem, but showing his independence of the apostles when he met them in Jerusalem. There is no proof that he saw the apostles on the occasion of the visit in Ac 11:29 f. The point of Lightfoot is well taken, hut we have no point of contact with the outside history for locating more precisely the date of the visit of Ga 2:1 and Ac 15:4 ff, except that it was after the first missionary tour of Ac 13 and 14.

(4) The First Missionary Tour.

Sergius Paulus is proconsul of Cyprus when Barnabas and Saul visit the island (Ac 13:7). The proconsul Paulus is mentioned in a Greek inscription of Soloi (Hogarth, Devia Cypria, 1889, 114) and Lucius Sergius Paulus in CIL, VI, 31, 545, but, as no mention of his being proconsul is here made, it is probably earlier than that time. The Soloi inscription bears the date 53 AD, but Sergius Paulus was not proconsul in 51 or 52. Hence, he may have been proconsul in 50 or the early part of 51 AD.It could not be later and may have been earlier.

(5) The First Visit to Corinth.

The point to note here is that Gallio becomes proconsul of Achaia (Ac 18:12). Paul has been apparently in Corinth a year and six months when Gallio appears on the scene (Ac 18:11). Aquila and Priscilla had "lately come from Italy" (Ac 18:2) when Paul arrived there. They had been expelled from Rome by the emperor Claudius (Ac 18:2). On the arrival of Gallio the Jews at once accuse Paul before him; he refuses to interfere, and Paul stays on for a while and then leaves for Syria with Aquila and Priscilla (Ac 18:18). Deissmann (St. Paul, Appendix, I, "The Proconsulate of L. Junius Gallio") has shown beyond reasonable doubt that Gallio, the brother of Seneca, became proconsul of Achaia about July, 51 AD (or possibly 52). On a stone found at Delphi, Gallio is mentioned as proconsul of Achaia according to the probable restoration of part of the text. But the stone mentions the fact that Claudius had been acclaimed imperator 26 times. By means of another inscription we get the 27th proclamation as imperator in connection with the dedication of an aqueduct on August 1, 52 AD. So thus the 26th time is before this date, some time in the earlier part of the year. We need not follow in detail the turns of the argument (see Deissmann, op. cit.). Once more we do not get a certain date as to the year. It is either. the summer of 51 or 52 AD, when Gallio comes. And Paul has already been in Corinth a year and a half. But the terminus ad quem for the close of Paul’s two years’ stay in Corinth would be the early autumn of 52 AD, and more probably 51 AD. Hence, the 2 Thessalonian Epistles cannot be later than this date. Before the close of 52 AD, and probably 51, therefore must come the 2nd missionary tour, the conference at Jerusalem, the first missionary tour, etc. Deissmann is justified in his enthusiasm on this point. He is positive that

51 AD is the date of the arrival of Gallio.

(6) Paul at Troas according to Ac 20:6 f.

On this occasion Luke gives the days and the time of year (Passover). Ramsay figures (St. Paul the Traveler, 289 f) that Paul had his closing service at Troas on Sunday evening and the party left early Monday morning. Hence, he argues back to the Passover at Philippi and concludes that the days as given by Luke will not fit into 56, 58, or 59 AD, but will suit 57. If he is correct in this matter, then we should have a definite year for the last trip to Jerusalem. Lewin (Fasti Sacri, numbers 1856, 1857) reaches the same conclusion. The conclusion is logical if Luke is exact in his use of days in this passage. Yet Lightfoot insists on 58 AD but Ramsay has the advantage on this point. See Pauline and Other Studies, 352 f.

(7) Festus Succeeding Felix.

When was Felix recalled? He was appointed procurator in 52 AD (Schurer, Jewish People in the Time of Christ, I, ii, 174). He was already ruler "many years" (Ac 24:10) when Paul appears before him in Caesarea. He holds on "two years" when he is succeeded by Festus (Ac 24:27). But in the Chronicle of Eusebius (Armenian text) it is stated that the recall of Felix took place in the last year of Claudius, or 54 AD. But this is clearly an error, in spite of the support given to it by Harnack (Chronologie d. Paulus), since Josephus puts most of the rule of Felix in the reign of Nero (Ant., XX, viii, 1-9; BJ, II, xii, 8-14), not to mention the "many years" of Paul in Ac 24:10. But the error of Eusebius has now been explained by Erbes in his Todestage Pauli und Petri, and is made perfectly clear by Ramsay in Pauline and Other Studies, 349 ff. Eusebius over-looked the interregnum of 6 years between the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 AD and the first year of Herod Agrippa II in 50 AD. Eusebius learned that Festus came in the 10th year of Herod Agrippa II. Counting from 50 AD, that gives us 59 AD as the date of the recall of Felix. This date harmonizes with all the known facts. "The great majority of scholars accept the date 60 for Festus; but they confess that it is only an approximate date, and there is no decisive argument for it" (Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, 351). For minute discussion of the old arguments see Nash, article "Paul" in new Sch-Herz Enc; Schurer, Hist of the Jewish People, I, ii, 182 ff. But if Erbes and Ramsay are correct, we have at last a date that will stand. So then Paul sails for Rome in the late summer of 59 AD and arrives at his destination in the early spring ("had wintered," Ac 28:11) of 60 AD. He had been "two whole years in his own hired dwelling" (Ac 28:30) when Luke closes the Acts. On the basis of his release in 63 or early 64 and the journeyings of the Pastoral Epistles, Paul’s death would come by early summer of 68 before Nero’s death, and possibly in 67. On this point see later. We can now count back from 59 AD with reasonable clearness to 57 as the date of Paul’s arrest in Jerusalem. Paul spent at least a year and three months (Ac 19:8,10) in Ephesus (called in round numbers three years in Ac 20:31). It took a year for him to reach Jerusalem, from Pentecost (1Co 16:8) to Pentecost (Ac 20:16). From the spring of 57 AD we thus get back to the end of 53 as the time of his arrival in Ephesus (Ac 19:1). We have seen that Gallio came to Corinth in the summer of 51 AD (or 52), after Paul had been there a year and a half (Ac 18:11), leaving ample time in either case for the journeys from Corinth to Ephesus, to Caesarea, to Jerusalem apparently (Ac 18:21 f), and to Ephesus (Ac 19:1) from the summer of 51 (or 52) we go back two years to the beginning of the 2nd missionary tour (Ac 16:1-6) as 49 (or

50). The Jerusalem Conference was probably in the same year, and the first missionary tour would come in the two (or three) preceding years 47 and 48 (48-49). The stay at Antioch (Ac 14:28) may have been of some length. So we come back to the end of 44 or beginning of 45 for the visit to Jerusalem in Ac 11:29 f. Before that comes the year in Antioch with Barnabas (11:26), the years in Tarsus in Cilicia, the "three years" after the conversion spent mostly in Arabia (Ga 1:17 f), Paul's first appearance at the death of Stephen (Ac 7:58). These early dates are more conjectural, but even so the facts seem to indicate 35 AD as the probable year of Saul's conversion. The year of his birth would then be between 1 and 5 AD, probably nearer 1. If so, and if his death was in 67 or 68 AD, his age is well indicated. He was "Paul the Aged" (Phm 1:9) when he wrote to Philemon from Rome in 61-63 AD.

PAUL, THE APOSTLE, 4

IV. His Equipment.

Ramsay chooses as the title of chapter ii, in his Paul the Traveler, the words "The Origin of Paul." It is not possible to explain the work and teaching of Paul without a just conception of the forces that entered into his life. Paul himself is still woefully misunderstood by some. Thus, A. Meyer (Jesus or Paul, 1909, 119) says: "In spite of all that has been said, there is no doubt that Paul, with his peculiar personality, with his tendency to recondite Gnostic speculation and rabbinic argument, has heavily encumbered the cause of Christianity. For many simple souls, and for many natures that are otherwise constituted than himself, he has barred the way to the simple Christianity of Jesus." That is a serious charge against the man who claimed to have done more than all the other apostles, and rightly, so far as we can tell (1Co 15:10), and who claimed that his interpretation of Jesus was the only true one (Ga 1:7-9). Moffatt (Paul and Paulinism, 1910, 70) minimizes the effect of Paulinism: "The majority of Paul's distinctive conceptions were either misunderstood, or dropped, or modified, as the case might be, in the course of a few decades." "Paulinism as a whole stood almost as far apart from the Christianity that followed it as from that which preceded it" (ibid., 73). "The aim of some scholars seems to be to rob every great thinker of his originality" (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 1). Ramsay (Pauline and Other Studies, 3 ff) boldly challenges the modern prejudice of some scholars against Paul by asking, "Shall we hear evidence or not?" Every successive age must study afresh the life and work of Paul (ibid., 27) if it would understand him. Deissmann (St. Paul, 3 f) rightly sees that "St. Paul is spiritually the great power of the apostolic age." Hence, "the historian, surveying the beginnings of Christianity, sees Paul as first after Jesus." Feine (Jesus Christus und Paulus, 1902, 298) claims that Paul grasped the essence of the ministry of Christ "auf das tiefste." I own myself a victim to "the charm of Paul," to use Ramsay's phrase (Pauline and Other Studies, 27). In seeking to study "the shaping influences" in Paul's career (Alexander, The Ethics of Paul, 1910, 27), we shall be in error if we seek to explain everything by heredity and environment and if we deny any influence from these sources. He is what he is because of original endowments, the world of his day, and his experience of Christ Jesus. He had both essential and accidental factors in his equipment (Fairbairn, Studies in Religion and Theology, 1910, 469 f). Let us note the chief factors in his religious development.

1. The City of Tarsus:

Geography plays an important part in any life. John the Baptist spent his boyhood in the hill country of Judea in a small town (Lu 1:39) and then in the wilderness. Jesus spent His boyhood in the town of Nazareth and the country round. Both John and Jesus show fondness for Nature in all its forms. Paul grew up in a great city and spent his life in the great cities of the Roman empire. He makes little use of the beauties of Nature, but he has a keen knowledge of men (compare Robertson, Epochs in the Life of Paul, 12). Paul was proud of his great city (Ac 21:39). He was not merely a resident, but a "citizen" of this distinguished city. This fact shows that Paul's family had not just emigrated from Judea to Tarsus a few years before his birth, but had been planted in Tarsus as part of a colony with full municipal rights (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 31 f). Tarsus was the capital of Cilicia, then a part of the province of Syria, but it had the title of metropolis and was a free city, urbs libera (Pliny, NH, v.27). To the ancient Greek the city was his "fatherland" (Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 1908, 90). Tarsus was situated on the river Cydnus, and in a wide plain with the hill country behind and the snow-covered Taurus Mountains in the distance. It was subject to malaria. Ramsay (ibid., 117 ff) from Ge 10:4 f holds that the early inhabitants were Greeks mingled with Orientals. East and West flowed together here. It was a Roman town also with a Jewish colony (ibid., 169 ff), constituting a city tribe to which Paul's family belonged. So then Tarsus was a typical city of the Greek-Roman civilization.

The religions of the times all met there in this great mart of business. But it was one of the great seats of culture also. Strabo (xiv.6,73) even says that "Tarsus surpassed all other universities, such as Alexandria and Athens, in the study of philosophy and educational literature in general." "Its great preeminence," he adds, "consists in this, that the men of learning here are all natives." Accordingly, he and others have made up a long list of distinguished men who flourished at Tarsus in the late autumn of Greek learning: philosophers—of the Academy, of the Epicurean and Stoic schools—poets, grammarians, physicians. At Tarsus, one might say, "you breathed the atmosphere of learning" (Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 205). But Ramsay (Cities of Paul, 231 f) cautions us not to misunderstand Strabo. It was not even one of the three great universities of the world in point of equipment, fame, students from abroad, or general standing. It was not on a paragraph with Athens and Alexandria, except that "it was rich in what constitutes the true excellence and strength of a university, intense enthusiasm and desire for knowledge among the students and great ability and experience among some at least of the teachers" (ibid., 233). Strabo was very fond of Athenodorus, for instance. No students from abroad came to Tarsus, but they went from Tarsus elsewhere. But Philostratus represents Apollonius of Tyana as disgusted with the university and the town, and Dio Chrysostom describes Tarsus as an oriental and non-Hellenic town.

Ramsay speaks of Tarsus in the reign of Augustus as "the one example known in history of a state ruled by a university acting through its successive principals." "It is characteristic of the general tendency of university life in a prosperous and peaceful empire, that the rule of the Tarsian University was marked by a strong reaction toward oligarchy and a curtailment of democracy; that also belongs to the oriental spirit, which was so strong in the city. But the crowning glory of Tarsus, the reason for its undying interest to the whole world, is that it produced the apostle Paul; that it was the one city which was suited by its equipoise between the Asiatic and the Western spirit to mold the character of the great Hellenist Jew; and that it nourished in him a strong source of loyalty and patriotism as the citizen of no mean city" (Ramsay, op. cit., 235). The city gave him a schooling in his social, political, intellectual, moral,

and religious life, but in varying degrees, as we shall see. It was because Tarsus was a cosmopolitan city with "an amalgamated society" that it possessed the peculiar suitability "to educate and mold the mind of him who would in due time make the religion of the Jewish race intelligible to the Greek-Roman world" (ibid., 88). As a citizen of Tarsus Paul was a citizen of the whole world.

2. Roman Citizenship:

It was no idle boast with Paul when he said, "But I am a Roman born" (Ac 22:28). The chief captain might well be "afraid when he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him" (Ac 22:29). Likewise the magistrates at Philippi "feared when they heard that they were Romans" (Ac 16:39), and promptly released Paul and Silas and "asked them to go away from the city." "To the Roman his citizenship was his passport in distant lands, his talisman in seasons of difficulties and danger. It shielded him alike from the caprice of municipal law and the injustice of local magistrates" (Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 203). As a citizen of Rome, therefore, Paul stood above the common herd. He ranked with the aristocracy in any provincial town (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 31). He would naturally have a kindly feeling for the Roman government in return for this high privilege and protection. In its pessimism the Roman empire had come to be the world's hope, as seen in the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil (Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 49). Paul would seize upon the Roman empire as a fit symbol of the kingdom of heaven. "Our citizenship is in heaven" (Php 3:20); "Ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints" (Eph 2:19). So he interprets the church in terms of the body politic as well as in terms of the Israelite theocracy (Col 2:19). "All this shows the deep impression which the Roman institutions made on Paul" (Lightfoot, Biblical Essays, 205). Ramsay draws a striking parallel under the heading, "Paulinism in the Roman Empire" (Cities of Paul, 70 ff). "A universal Paulinism and a universal Empire must either coalesce, or the one must destroy the other." It was Paul's knowledge of the Roman empire that gave him his imperialism and statesmanlike grasp of the problems of Christianity in relation to the Roman empire. Paul was a statesman of the highest type, as Ramsay has conclusively shown (Pauline and Other Studies, 49-100). Moffatt (Paul and Paulinism, 66) does say: "His perspective was not imperialistic," but he shows thereby a curious inability to understand Paul. The vision of Paul saw that the regeneration of the empire could come only through Christianity. Ramsay strikingly shows how the emperor dreaded the spiritual upheaval in Paulinism and fought it steadily till the time of Constantine, when "an official Christianity was victorious, but Pauline Christianity had perished, and Paul was now a mere saint, no longer Paul but Paul, forgotten as a man or a teacher, but remembered as a sort of revivification of the old pagan gods" (Cities of Paul, 78). But, as Ramsay says, "it was not dead; it was only waiting its opportunity; it revived when freedom of thought and freedom of life began to stir in Europe; and it guided and stimulated the Protestants of the Reformation." Suffer Ramsay once more (Pauline and Other Studies, 100): "Barbarism proved too powerful for the Greek-Roman civilization unaided by the new religious bond; and every channel through which that civilization was preserved or interest in it maintained, either is now or has been in some essential part of its course Christian after the Pauline form." Paul would show the Roman genius for organizing the churches established by him. Many of his churches would be in Roman colonies (Antioch in Pisidia, Philippi, Corinth, etc.). He would address his most studied epistle to the church in Rome, and Rome would be the goal of his ministry for many years (Findlay, HDB). He would show his conversance with Roman law, not "merely in knowing how to take advantage of his rights as a citizen, but also in the use of legal terms like "adoption" (Ga 4:5

f), where the adopted heir becomes son, and heir and son are interchangeable. This was the obsolete Roman law and the Greek law left in force in the provinces (compare Ga 3:15). But in Ro 8:16 f the actual revocable Roman law is referred to by which "heirship is now deduced from sonship, whereas in Ga sonship is deduced from heirship; for at Rome a son must be an heir, but an heir need not be a son (compare Heb 9:15 ff which presupposes Roman law and the revocability of a will)" (Maclean in 1-vol HDB). So in Ga 3:24 the tutor or pedagogue presents a Greek custom preserved by the Romans. This personal guardian of the child (often a slave) led him to school, and was not the guardian of the child's property in Ga 4:2. See Ramsay, Gal, 337-93; Ball, Paul and the Roman Law, 1901, for further discussion. As a Roman, Paul would have "nomen and praenomen, probably taken from the Roman officer who gave his family civitas; but Luke, a Greek, had no interest in Roman names. Paulus, his cognomen, was not determined by his nomen; there is no reason to think he was an AEmilius" (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 31). It is probable, though not certain, that Paul spoke Latin (see Souter, The Expositor, April, 1911). He was at any rate a "Roman gentleman" (Findlay, HDB), as is shown by the dignity of his bearing before governors and kings and the respect accorded him by the proconsul Sergius Paulus, the procurator Porcius Festus, and the centurion Julius, whose prisoner he was in the voyage to Rome. His father, as a Roman citizen, probably had some means which may have come to Paul before the appeal to Rome, which was expensive (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 310 ff). Though a prisoner in Rome, he made Rome "his best vantage ground and his adoptive home," and it was here that he rose to "his loftiest conceptions of the nation and destiny of the universal church" (Findlay, HDB) as "an ambassador in chains" (Eph 6:20). As a Roman citizen, according to tradition, he was beheaded with the sword and not subjected to crucifixion, the traditional fate of Simon Peter. He saw the true pax Romana to be the peace that passeth all understanding (Php 4:7; compare Rostron, The Christology of Paul, 1912, 19).

3. Hellenism:

It is not possible "to specify all the influences that worked on Paul in his youth" (Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 79). We do not know all the life of the times. But he was subject to all that life in so far as any other Jewish youth was. "He was master of all the education and the opportunities of his time. He turned to his profit and to the advancement of his great purpose all the resources of civilization" (Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, 285). I heartily agree with this conception of Paul's ability to assimilate the life of his time, but one must not be led astray so far as Schramm who, in 1710, wrote De stupenda eruditione Pauli ("On the Stupendous Erudition of Paul"). This is, of course, absurd, as Lightfoot shows (Biblical Essays, 206). But we must not forget Paul lived in a Greek city and possessed Greek citizenship also (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 33). Certainly the Greek traits of adaptability, curiosity, alertness, the love of investigation were marked features of his character, and Tarsus afforded wide opportunity for the acquiring of these qualities (The Ethics of Paul, 39). He learned to speak the vernacular koine like a native and with the ease and swing displayed by no other New Testament writer save Luke and the author of He. He has a "poet's mastery of language," though with the passion of a soul on fire, rather than with the artificial rules of the rhetoricians of the day (Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 239 f). Blass (Die Rhythmen der asianischen und romischen Kunstprosa, 1905) holds that Paul wrote "rhythmically elaborated artistic prose—a singular instance of the great scholar's having gone astray" (Deissmann, Light, etc., 64). But there is evidence that Paul was familiar with the use of the

diatribe and other common rhetorical devices, though he was very far from being tinged with Atticism or Asianism. It is certain that Paul did not attend any of the schools of rhetoric and oratory. Heinrici (Vorrede to 1 Cor. in Meyer's Krit. exeget. Komm.) argues that Paul's methods and expressions conform more nearly to the cynic and Stoic diatribe than to the rabbinical dialectic; compare also Wendland und Kern Philo u. d. kynisch-stoische Diatribe, and Hicks, "St. Paul and Hellenism" in Stud. Biblical, IV. How extensive was his acquaintance with Greek literature is in doubt. Lightfoot says: "There is no ground for saying that Paul was a very erudite or highly-cultivated man. An obvious maxim of practical life from Menander (1Co 15:33), a religious sentiment of Cleanthes repeated by Aratus, himself a native of Tarsus (Ac 17:28), a pungent satire of Epimenides (Tit 1:12), with possibly a passage here and there which dimly reflects some classical writer, these are very slender grounds on which to build the supposition of vast learning" (Biblical Essays, 206); but Lightfoot admits that he obtained directly or indirectly from contact with Greek thought and learning lessons far wider and more useful for his work than a perfect style or a familiar acquaintance with the classical writers of antiquity. Even so, there is no reason to say that he made his few quotations from hearsay and read no Greek books (compare Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, 52). Certainly he knew the Greek Old Testament and the Jewish Apocrypha and apocalypses in Greek Garvie is only willing to admit that Paul had such knowledge of Greek literature and philosophy as any Jew, living among Greeks, might pick up (Life and Teaching of Paul, 2), and charges Ramsay with "overstating the influence of the Gentile environment on Paul's development" (Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 8). Ramsay holds that it is quite "possible that the philosophical school at Tarsus had exercised more influence on Paul than is commonly allowed" (St. Paul the Traveler, 354). Tarsus was the home of Athenodorus. It was a stronghold of Stoic thought. "At least five of the most eminent teachers of that philosophy were in the university" (Alexander, Ethics of Paul, 47). It is not possible to say whether Paul artended these or any lectures at the university, though it is hard to conceive that a brilliant youth like Saul could grow up in Tarsus with no mental stimulus from such a university. Carvie (ibid., 6) asks when Paul could have studied at the university of Tarsus. He was probably too young before he went to Jerusalem to study under Gamaliel. But it is not probable that he remained in Jerusalem continuously after completing his studies till we see him at the death of Stephen (Ac 7:58). He may have returned to Tarsus meanwhile and taken such studies. Another possibility is that he took advantage of the years in Tarsus after his conversion (Ac 9:30; Ga 1:21) to equip himself better for his mission to the Gentiles to which he had been called. There is no real difficulty on the score of time. The world was saturated with Greek ideas, and Paul could not escape them. He could not escape it unless he was innocent of all culture. Ramsay sees in Paul a love of truth and reality "wholly inconceivable in a more narrow Hebrew, and wholly inexplicable without an education in Greek philosophy" ("St. Paul and Hellenism," Cities of Paul, 34). Paul exhibited a freedom and universalism that he found in the Greek thought of the time which was not so decayed as some think. For the discussion between Garvie and Ramsay see The Expositor, April and December, 1911. Pfleiderer (Urchristenthum, Vorwort, 174-178) finds a "double root" of Paulinism, a Christianized Hellenism and a Christianized Pharisaism. Harnack is more nearly correct in saying that "notwithstanding Paul's Greek culture, his conception of Christianity is, in its deepest ground, independent of Hellenism." The Hellenistic influence on Paul was relative and subordinate (Wendland, Die hell.-rom. Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judenthum und Christenthum, 3te Aufl, 1912, 245), but it was real, as Kohler shows (Zum Verstandnis des Apostels Paulus, 9). He had a "Gr inheritance" beyond a doubt, and it was not all unconscious or subliminal as Rostron argues (Christology of Paul, 17). It is true that in Athens the Stoics

and Epicureans ridiculed Paul as a "picker up of learning's crumbs"—Browning's rendering (An Epistle) of spermologos. Paul shows a fine scorn of the sophistries and verbal refinements of the mere philosophers and orators in 1Co 1 and 2, but all the same he reveals a real apprehension of the true significance of knowledge and life. Dr. James Adam (The Religious Teachers of Greece, 360) shows instances of "the real kinship of thought between Plato and Paul." He does not undertake to say how it came about. He has a Platonic expression, ta dia tou somatos, in 2Co 5:10, and uses a Stoic and cynic word in 2Co 9:8, autarkeian. Indeed, there are so many similarities between Paul and Seneca in language and thought that some scholars actually predicate an acquaintance or dependence of the one on the other. It is far more likely that Paul and Seneca drew upon the common phrases of current Stoicism than that Seneca had seen Paul's Epistles or knew him personally. Lightfoot has a classic discussion of the matter in his essay on "St. Paul and Seneca" in the Commentary on Php (see also Carr, "St. Paul's Attitude to Greek Philosophy," The Expositor, V, ix). Alexander finds four Stoic ideas (Divine Immanence, Wisdom, Freedom, Brotherhood) taken and glorified by Paul to do service for Christ (Ethics of Paul, 49-55). Often Paul uses a Stoic phrase with a Christian content. Lightfoot boldly argues (Biblical Essays, 207) that the later Greek literature was a fitter handmaid for the diffusion of the gospel than the earlier.

Paul as the apostle to the Greek-Roman world had to "understand the bearings of the moral and religious life of Greece as expressed in her literature, and this lesson he could learn more impartially and more fully at Tarsus in the days of her decline than at Athens in the freshness of her glory" (same place). Ramsay waxes bold enough to discuss "the Pauline philosophy of history" (Cities of Paul, 10-13). I confess to sympathy with this notion and find it in all the Pauline Epistles, especially in Romans. Moffatt (Paul and Paulinism, 66) finds "a religious philosophy of history" in Ro 9-11, throbbing with strong personal emotion. Paul rose to the height of the true Christian philosopher, though not a technical philosopher of the schools. Deissmann (St. Paul, 53) admits his language assigns him "to an elevated class," and yet he insists that he wrote "large letters" (Ga 6:11) because he had "the clumsy, awkward writing of a workman's hand deformed by toil" (p. 51). I cannot agree that here Deissmann understands Paul. He makes "the world of Paul" on too narrow a scale.

4. The Mystery-Religions:

Was Paul influenced by Mithraism? H.A.A. Kennedy has given the subject very careful and thorough treatment in a series of papers in The Expositor for 1912-13, already mentioned (see II, 5, above). His arguments are conclusive on the whole against the wild notions of W.B. Smith, Der vorchristliche Jesus; J.M. Robertson, Pagan Christs; A. Drews, Die Christus-Mythe; and Lublinski, Die Entstehung des Christenrums aus der antiken Kultur. A magic papyrus about 300 AD has "I adjure thee by the god of the Hebrew Jesu" (ll. 3019 f), but Deissmann (Light from the Ancient East, 256) refuses to believe this line genuine: "No Christian, still less a Jew, would have called Jesus 'the god of the Hebrews.' " Clemen (Primitive Christianity and Its non-Jewish Sources, 1912, 336) endorses this view of Deissmann and says that in the 1st century AD "one cannot speak of non-Jewish influences on Christology." One may dismiss at once the notion that Paul "deified" Jesus into a god and made Him Christ under the influence of pagan myths. Certainly pagan idolatry was forced upon Paul's attention at every turn. It stirred his spirit at Athens to see the city full of idols (Ac 17:16), and he caught eagerly at the altar to an unknown god to give him an easy introduction to the true God (Ac 17:23); but no one can read Ro 1 and 2 and

believe that Paul was carried away by the philosophy of vain deceit of his time. He does use the words "wisdom" and "mystery" often in 1 Corinthians, Colossians, and Ephesians, and in Php 4:12, "I (have) learned the secret," he uses a word employed in the mystic cults of the time. It is quite possible that Paul took up some of the phrases of these mystery-religions and gave them a richer content for his own purposes, as he did with some of the Gnostic phraseology (pleroma, "fullness," for instance). But Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters, 191 f) deals a fatal blow against the notion that the mystery-religions had a formative influence on Paul. He urges, with point, that it is only in the 2nd century that these cults became widely extended in the Roman empire. The dates and development are obscure, but it "is certain that Paul cannot have known the mystery-religions in the form in which they are known to us, because in this fully developed form they did not exist." Cumont (Lea religions orientales dana le paganisme romain, 2nd edition, 1909 (ET)) insists repeatedly on the difficulties in the way of assuming without proof that Mithraism had any influence on Paul. But in particular it is urged that Paul drew on the "mysteries" for his notions of baptism and the Lord's Supper as having magical effects. Appeal is made to the magical use of the name of Jesus by the strolling Jewish exorcists in Ephesus (Ac 18:13). Kirsopp Lake (Earlier Epistles of Paul, 233) holds that at Corinth they all accepted Christianity as a mystery-religion and Jesus as "the Redeemer-God, who had passed through death to life, and offered participation in this new life to those who shared in the mysteries which He offered," namely, baptism and the Lord's Supper. But Kennedy (Expos, December, 1912, 548) easily shows how with Paul baptism and the Lord's Supper are not magical sacraments producing new life, but symbolic pictures of death to sin and new life in Christ which the believer has already experienced. The battle is still raging on the subject of the mystery-religions, but it is safe to say that so far nothing more than illustrative material has been shown to be true of Paul's teaching from this source.

There is nothing incongruous in the notion that Paul knew as much about the mystery-religions as he did about incipient Gnosticism. Indeed the two things may have been to some extent combined in some places. A passage in Col 2:18 has long bothered commentators: "dwelling in the things which he hath seen," or (margin) "taking his stand upon the things," etc. Westcott and Hort even suspected an early error in the text, but the same word, embateuo, has been found by Sir W.M. Ramsay as a result of investigations by Makridi Bey, of the Turkish Imperial Museum, in the sanctuary of Apollo at Claros, a town on the Ionian coast. Some of the initiates here record the fact and say that being "enquirers, having been initiated, they entered" (embateuo). The word is thus used of one who, having been initiated, enters into the life of the initiate (compare Independent, 1913, 376). Clearly, then, Paul uses the word in that sense in Col 2:18.

For further discussion see Jacoby, Die antiken Mysterienreligionen und das Christentum; Glover, Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire; Reitzenstein, Die hell. Mysterienreligionen; Friedlander, Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire, III; Thorburn, Jesus Christ, Historical or Mythical.

M. Bruckner (Der sterbende und auferstehende Gottheiland in den orientalischen Religionen und ihr Verhaltnis zum Christentum, 1908) says: "As in Christianity, so in many oriental religions, a belief in the death and resurrection of a Redeemer-God (sometimes as His Son), occupied a central place in the worship and cult." To this Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters, 193) replies: "What manipulations the

myths and rites of the cults in question must have undergone before this general statement could become possible! Where is there anything about dying and resurrection in Mithra?" There we may leave the matter. 5. Judaism:

Paul was Greek and Roman, but not "pan-Babylonian," though he was keenly alive to all the winds of doctrine that blew about him, as we see in Colossians, Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles. But he was most of all the Jew, that is, before his conversion. He remained a Jew, even though he learned how to be all things to all men (1Co 9:22). Even though glorying in his mission as apostle to the Gentiles (Eph 3:8), he yet always put the Jew first in opportunity and peril (Ro 2:9 f). He loved the Jews almost to the point of death (Ro 9:3). He was proud of his Jewish lineage and boasted of it (2Co 11:16-22; Ac 22:3 ff; 26:4 ff; Php 3:4-6). "His religious patriotism flickered up within his Christianity" (Moffatt, Paul and Paulinism, 66). Had he not been a Roman citizen with some Greek culture and his rich endowments of mind, he would probably not have been the "chosen vessel" for the work of Christ among the Gentiles (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 15). Had he not been the thorough Jew, he could not have mediated Christianity from Jew to Greek. "In the mind of Paul a universalized Hellenism coalesced with a universalized Hebraism" (Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 43). Ramsay strongly opposes the notion of Harhack and others that Paul can be understood "as purely a Hebrew." So in Paul both Hebraism and Hellenism meet though Hebraism is the main stock. He is a Jew in the Greek-Roman world and a part of it, not a mere spectator. He is the Hellenistic Jew, not the Aramaic Jew of Palestine (compare Simon Peter’s vision on the house-top at Joppa, for instance). But Paul is not a Hellenizing Jew after the fashion of Jason and Menelaus in the beginning of the Maccabean conflict. Findlay (HDB) tersely says: "The Jew in him was the foundation of everything that Paul became." But it was not the narrowest type of Judaism in spite of his persecution of the Christians. He belonged to the Judaism of the Dispersion. As a Roman citizen in a Greek city he had departed from the narrowest lines of his people (Ramsay, Cities of Paul, 47). His Judaism was pure, in fact, as he gives it to us in Php 3:5. He was a Jew of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin. He was a Hebrew, of the seed of Abraham (2Co 11:22). He shared in full all the covenant blessings and privileges of his people (Ro 9:1-5), whose crowning glory was, that of them came Jesus the Messiah. He was proud of the piety of his ancestors (2Ti 1:3), and made progress as a student of Judaism ahead of his fellows (Ga 1:14). His ancestry was pure, Hebrew of the Hebrews. (Php 3:5), and so his family preserved the native Palestinian traditions in Tarsus. His name Saul was a proof of loyalty to the tribe of Benjamin as his cognomen Paul was evidence of his Roman citizenship. In his home he would be taught the law by his mother (compare Ga 1:14), as was true of Timothy’s mother and grandmother (2Ti 1:5). In Tarsus he would go to the synagogue also. We know little of his father, save that he was a Roman citizen and so a man of position in Tarsus and possibly of some wealth; that he was a tent-maker and taught his son the same trade, as all Jewish fathers did, whatever their rank in life; that he was a Pharisee and brought up his son as a Pharisee (Ac 23:6), and that he sent the young Saul to Jerusalem to study at the feet of Gamaliel (Ac 22:3). Paul always considered himself a Pharisee as distinct from the Sadducaic scepticism (Ac 23:6). Many of the Pharisaic doctrines were identical with those of Christianity. That Paul did not consider himself a Pharisee in all respects is shown later by his conflict with the Judaizers (Ga 2; Ac 15; 2Co 10-13). Paul says that he was reared as a strict Pharisee (Ac 26:5), though the school of Gamaliel (grandson of Hillel) was not so hard and narrow as that of Shammai. But all Pharisees were stricter than the Sadducees. So Jerusalem played an important part in the training of Saul (Ac 22:3), as Paul recognized. He was known in Jerusalem as a student. He knew

Aramaic as well as Greek (and Latin), and could speak in it so as to attract the attention of a Jewish audience (Ac 22:2). Paul was fortunate in his great teacher Gamaliel, who was liberal enough to encourage the study of Greek literature. But his liberality in defending the apostles against the Sadducees in Ac 5:34-39 must not be misinterpreted in comparison with the persecuting zeal of his brilliant pupil against Stephen (7:58). Stephen had opened war on the Pharisees themselves, and there is no evidence that Gamaliel made a defense of Stephen against the lawless rage of the Sanhedrin. It is common for pupils to go farther than their teachers, but Gamaliel did not come to the rescue. Still Gamaliel helped Saul, who was undoubtedly his most brilliant pupil and probably the hope of his heart for the future of Judaism. Harnack (History of Dogma, I, 94) says: "Pharisaism had fulfilled its mission in the world when it produced this man." Unfortunately, Pharisaism did not die; in truth has never died, not even from Christianity. But young Saul was the crowning glory of Pharisaism. An effort has recently been made to restore Pharisaism to its former dignity. Herford (Pharisaism, Its Aim and Method, 1912) undertakes to show that the Gospels have slandered Pharisaism, that it was the one hope of the ancient world, etc. He has a chapter on "Pharisaism and Paul," in which he claims that Paul has not attacked the real Pharisaism, but has aimed his blows at an unreal creation of his own brain (p. 222). But, if Paul did not understand Pharisaism, he did not understand anything. He knew not merely the Old Testament in the Hebrew and the Septuagint translation, for he quotes from both, though usually from the Septuagint, but he also knew the Jewish Apocrypha and apocalypses, as is shown in various ways in his writings (see articles on these subjects). Schweitzer (Paul and His Interpreters) carries too far his idea that Paul and Jesus merely moved in the circle of Jewish eschatology. He makes it explain everything, and that it cannot do. But Paul does show acquaintance with some of these books. See Kennedy, Paul’s Conception of the Last Things (1904), for a sane and adequate discussion of this phase of the subject. Pfleiderer pursues the subject in his Paulinism, as does Kabisch in his Eschatologie. So Sanday and Headlam use this source in their Commentary on Romans. Paul knew Wisd, also, a book from the Jewish-Alexandrian theology with a tinge of Greek philosophy (see Goodrick, Book of Wisd, 398-403; compare also Jowett’s essay on "St. Paul and Philo" in his Epistles of Paul). Paul knew how to use allegory (Ga 4:24) in accord with the method of Philo. So then he knew how to use the Stoic diatribe, the rabbinical diatribe and the Alexandrian allegory. "In his cosmology, angelology, and demonology, as well as eschatology, he remains essentially Jewish" (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 17). When he becomes a Christian he will change many of his views, for Christ must become central in his thinking, but his method learned in the rabbinical schools remains with him (Kohler, Zum Verstandnis, etc., 7). Here, then, is a man with a wonderfully rounded culture. What of his mental gifts?

6. Personal Characteristics:

Much as we can learn about the times of Paul (compare Selden, In the Time of Paul, 1900, for a brief sketch of Paul’s world), we know something of the political structure of the Roman world, the social life of the 1st century AD, the religious condition of the age, the moral standards of the time, the intellectual tendencies of the period. New discoveries continue to throw fresh light on the life of the middle and lower classes among whom Paul chiefly labored. And, if Deissmann in his brilliant study (St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History) has pressed too far the notion that Paul the tent-maker ranks not with Origen, but with Amos the herdman (p. 6, on p. 52 he calls it a mistake "to speak of Paul the artisan as a proletarian in the sense which the word usually bears with us"), yet he is right in insisting that Paul

is "a religious genius" and "a hero of piety" (p. 6). It is not possible to explain the personality and work of a man like Paul by his past and to refer with precision this or that trait to his Jewish or Greek training (Alexander, Ethics of Paul, 58). "We must allow something to his native originality" (same place) . We are all in a sense the children of the past, but some men have much more the power of initiative than others. Paul is not mere "eclectic patchwork" (Bruce, Paul's Conception of Christ, 218). Even if Paul was acquainted with Philo, which is not certain, that fact by no means explains his use of Philo, the representative Jew of the Hellenistic age. "Both are Jews of the Dispersion, city-dwellers, with marked cosmopolitan traits. Both live and move in the Septuagint Bible. Both are capable of ecstatic and mystical experiences, and have many points of contact in detail. And yet they stand in very strong contrast to one another, a contrast which reminds us of the opposition between Seneca and Paul. .... Philo is a philosopher, Paul the fool pours out the vials of his irony upon the wisdom of the world" (Deissmann, Paul, 110). Deissmann, indeed, cares most for "the living man, Paul, whom we hear speaking and see gesticulating, here playful, gentle as a father, and tenderly coaxing, so as to win the hearts of the infatuated children—there thundering and lightning with the passionate wrath of a Luther, with cutting irony and bitter sarcasm on his lips" (ibid., 16 f).

(1) Personal Appearance.

We have no reliable description of Paul's stature and looks. The Ac of Paul and Thecla (section3) have a protraiture thus: "Baldheaded, bowlegged, strongly built, a man small in size, with meeting eyebrows, with a rather large nose, full of grace, for at times he looked like a man and at times he had the face of an angel," and Ramsay (Church in the Roman Empire, 32) adds: "This plain and unflattering account of the apostle's personal appearance seems to embody a very early tradition," and in chapter xvi he argues that this story goes back to a document of the 1st century. We may not agree with all the details, but in some respects it harmonizes with what we gather from Paul's Epistles Findlay (HDB) notes that this description is confirmed by "the lifelike and unconventional figure of the Roman ivory diptych, 'supposed to date not later than the 4th century.' "(Lewin's Life and Epistles of Paul, Frontispiece, and II, 211). At Lystra the natives took Barnabas for Jupiter and Paul for Hermes, "because he was the chief speaker" (Ac 14:12), showing that Barnabas had the more impressive appearance, while Paul was his spokesman. In Malta the natives changed their minds in the opposite direction, first thinking Paul a murderer and then a god because he did not die from the bite of the serpent (Ac 28:4-6). His enemies at Corinth sneered at the weakness of his bodily presence in contrast to the strength of his letters (2Co 10:9 f). The attack was really on the courage of Paul, and he claimed equal boldness when present (2Co 10:11 f), but there was probably also a reflection on the insignificance of his physique. The terrible bodily sufferings which he underwent (2Co 11:23-26) left physical marks (stigmata, Ga 6:17) that may have disfigured him to some extent. Once his illness made him a trial to the Galatians to whom he preached, but they did not scorn him (Ga 4:14). He felt the frailty of his body as an earthen vessel (2Co 4:7) and as a tabernacle in which he groaned (2Co 5:4). But the effect of all this weakness was to give him a fresh sense of dependence on Christ and a new influx of divine power (2Co 11:30; 12:9). But even if Paul was unprepossessing in appearance and weakened by illness, whether ophthalmia, which is so common in the East (Ga 4:15), or malaria, or recurrent headache, or epilepsy, he must have had a tough constitution to have endured such hardship to a good old age. He had one infirmity in particular that came upon him at Tarsus (2Co 12:1-9) in connection with the visions and revelations of the Lord then granted him. The

affliction seems to have been physical (skolops te sarki, "a stake in the flesh" or "for the flesh"), and it continued with him thereafter as a messenger of Satan to buffet Paul and to keep him humble. Some think that this messenger of Satan was a demon that haunted Paul in his nervous state. Others hold it to be epilepsy or some form of hysteria superinduced by the visions and revelations which he had had. Compare Krenkel, Beitrage (pp. 47-125), who argues that the ancients looked with such dread on epilepsy that those who beheld such attacks would "spit out so as to escape the evil (compare modern knocking on wood"); compare qui sputatur morbus in Plautus (Captivi, iii.4, 17). Reference is made to Ga 4:14, oude exeptusate, "nor did ye spit out," as showing that this was the affliction of Paul in Galatia. But epilepsy often affects the mind, and Paul shows no sign of mental weakness, though his enemies charged him with insanity (Ac 26:24; 2Co 5:13; 12:11). It is urged in reply that Julius Caesar, Alfred the Great, Peter the Great, and Napoleon all had epilepsy without loss of mental force. It is difficult to think headache or malaria could have excited the disgust indicated in Ga 4:14, where some trouble with the eyes seems to be indicated. The ministers of Satan (2Co 11:15) do not meet the requirements of the case, nor mere spiritual sins (Luther), nor struggle with lust (Roman Catholic, stimulus carnis). Garvie (Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 65, 80) thinks it not unlikely that "it was the recurrence of an old violent temptation," rather than mere bodily disease. "Can there be any doubt that this form of temptation is more likely to assail the man of intense emotion and intense affection, as Paul was?" But enough of what can never be settled. "St. Paul’s own scanty hints admonish to caution" (Deissmann, Paul, 63). It is a blessing for us not to know, since we can all cherish a close bond with Paul. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 37 ff) calls special attention to the look of Paul. He "fastened his eyes on" the man (Ac 13:9; 14:9). He argues that Paul had a penetrating, powerful gaze, and hence, no eye trouble. He calls attention also to gestures of Paul (Ac 20:24; 26:2). There were artists in marble and color at the court of Caesar, but no one of them cared to preserve a likeness of the poor itinerant preacher who turned out to be the chief man of the age (Deissmann, Paul, 58). "We are like the Christians of Colesage and Laodicea, who had not seen his face in the flesh" (Col 2:1).

(2) Natural Endowments.

In respect to his natural endowments we can do much better, for his epistles reveal the mind and soul of the man. He is difficult to comprehend, not because he conceals himself, but because he reveals so much of himself in his epistles. He seems to some a man of contradictions. He had a many-sided nature, and his very humanness is in one sense the greatest thing about him. There are "great polar contradictions" in his nature. Deissmann (St. Paul, 62 ff) notes his ailing body and his tremendous powers for work, his humility and his self-confidence, his periods of depression and of intoxication with victory, his tenderness and his sternness; he was ardently loved and furiously hated; he was an ancient man of his time, but he is cosmopolitan and modern enough for today. Findlay (HBD) adds that he was a man possessed of dialectical power and religious inspiration. He was keenly intellectual and profoundly mystical (compare Campbell, Paul the Mystic, 1907). He was a theologian and a man of affairs. He was a man of vision with a supreme task to which he held himself. He was a scholar, a sage, a statesman, a seer, a saint (Garvie, Studies in Paul and His Gospel, 68-84). He was a man of heart, of passion, of imagination, of sensibility, of will, of courage, of sincerity, of vivacity, of subtlety, of humor, of adroitness, of tact, of genius for organization, of power for command, of gift of expression, of leadership —"All these qualities and powers went to the making of Jesus Christ’s apostle to the nations, the master-

builder of the universal church and of Christian theology" (Findlay, HDB; see Lock, Paul the Master Builder, 1905; and M. Jones, Paul the Orator, 1910).

I cannot agree with Garvie's charge of cowardice (Life and Teaching of Paul, 173,) in the matter of the purifying rites (Ac 21:23) and the dividing of the Sanhedrin (Ac 23:6). The one was a mere matter of prudence in a nonessential detail, the other was justifiable skill in resisting the attack of unscrupulous enemies. One does not understand Paul who does not understand his emotional nature. He was "quick, impetuous, strenuous, impassioned" (Bevan, Paul in the Light of Today, 1912, 26). His heart throbs through his epistles, and he loves his converts like a mother or a lover (Findlay, HDB) rather than a pastor. We feel the surging emotion of his great spirit in 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, Philippians, 2 Timothy in particular. He had the spiritual temperament and reaches his highest flights in his moments of rhapsody. He has elasticity and rebound of spirit, and comes up with the joy of victory in Christ out of the severest trials and disappointments. His ambition is great, but it is to serve Christ his Lord. He is a man of faith and a man of prayer. For him to live is Christ. He has a genius for friendship and binds men to him with hooks of steel—men like Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Luke, Titus (Speer, The Man Paul, 1900, 111 ff). He is not afraid to oppose his friends when it is necessary for the sake of truth, as with Peter (Ga 2:11) and with Barnabas (Ac 15:35)." While God made Paul like the other apostles out of the clay whereof ordinary men are fashioned, yet we may say that He took extraordinary pains with his education" (Fairbairn, Studies in Religion and Theology, 471). If ever a man, full-blooded and open-eyed, walked the earth, it was Paul. It is a debatable question whether Paul was married or not. He certainly was not when he wrote (1Co 7:7; 9:5). But, if he was a member of the Sanhedrin when he cast his vote against the disciples (Ac 26:10), as his language naturally means, then he had been married.

There is in Paul the gift of leadership in a marked degree. He, though young, is already at the head of the opposition to Stephen (Ac 7:58), and soon drives the disciples out of Jerusalem.

(3) Supernatural gifts.

He had his share of them. He had all the gifts that others could boast of at Corinth, and which he lightly esteemed except that of prophecy (1Co 14:18-29). He had his visions and revelations, but would not tell what he had seen (2Co 12:1-9). He did the signs of an apostle (2Co 12:12-14). He had the power to work miracles (1Co 4:19-21) and to exercise discipline (1Co 5:4 f; 2Co 13:1-3). But what he cared for most of all was the fact that Jesus had appeared to him on the road to Damascus and had called him to the work of preaching to the Gentiles (1Co 15:8).

7. Conversion:

No other element in the equipment of Paul is comparable in importance to his conversion.

(1) Preparation.

It was sudden, and yet God had led Saul to the state of mind when it could more easily happen. True, Saul was engaged in the very act of persecuting the believers in Jerusalem. His mind was flushed with the sense of victory. He was not conscious of any lingering doubts about the truth of his position and the justice of his conduct till Jesus abruptly told him that it was hard for him to kick against the goad (Ac 26:14). Thus suddenly brought to bay, the real truth would flash upon his mind. In later years he tells how he had struggled in vain against the curse of the Law (Ro 7:7 f). It is probable though not certain, that Paul here has in mind his experience before his conversion, though the latter part of the chapter may refer to a period later. There is difficulty in either view as to the "body of this death" that made him so wretched (Ro 7:24). The Christian keeps up the fight against sin in spite of defeat (Ro 7:23), but he does not feel that he is "carnal, sold under sin" (Ro 7:14). But when before his conversion did Paul have such intensity of conviction? We can only leave the problem unanswered. His reference to it at least harmonizes with what Jesus said about the goad. The words and death of Stephen and the other disciples may have left a deeper mark than he knew. The question might arise whether after all the Nazarenes were right. His plea for his conduct made in later years was that he was conscientious (Ac 26:9) and that he did it ignorantly in unbelief (1Ti 1:13). He was not willfully sinning against the full light as he saw it. It will not do to say with Holsten that Saul was half convinced to join the disciples, and only needed a jolt to turn him over. He was "yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord" (Ac 9:1), and went to the high priest and asked for letters to Damascus demanding the arrest of the disciples there. His temper on the whole is distinctly hostile to Christ, and the struggle against his course was in the subconscious mind. There a volcano had gathered ready to burst out.

It is proper to ask whether Paul had known Jesus in the flesh, but it is not easy to give a categorical reply. It is possible, though hardly likely, that Paul had come to Jerusalem to study when Jesus as a boy of 12 visited the temple, and so heard Jesus and the doctors. That could be true only in case Paul was born 5 or 6 BC, which is quite unlikely. It is possible again that Paul may have remained in Jerusalem after his graduation the school of Gamaliel and so was present in Jerusalem at the trial and death of Jesus. Some of the ablest of modern scholars hold that Paul knew Jesus in the flesh. It will at once seem strange that we have no express statement to this effect in the letters of Paul, when he shows undoubted knowledge of various events in the life of Christ (compare Wynne, Fragmentary Records of Jesus of Nazareth, 1887). It is almost certain, as J. Weiss admits (Paul and Jesus, 41), that in 1Co 9:1 Paul refers to the Risen Jesus. The passage in 2Co 5:16 is argued both ways: "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more." J. Weiss (ibid., 41-55) argues strongly for the view that he knew Jesus in the flesh. But in the first clause of the sentence above Paul means by "after the flesh," not acquaintance, but standpoint. It is natural to take it in the same way as applied to Christ. He has changed his viewpoint of Christ and so of all men. Weiss pleads (ibid., p. 40), at any rate, that we have no word saying that "Paul had not seen Jesus in person." It may be said in reply that the fact that Jesus has to tell Paul who He is (Ac 9:5) shows that Paul did not have personal acquaintance with Him. But the question may be left in abeyance as not vitally important. He certainly had not understood Jesus, if he knew Him.

(2) Experience.

Space does not, permit a discussion of this great event of Paul’s conversion at all commensurate with its

significance. A literature of importance has grown up around it besides the lengthy discussions in the lives and theologies of Paul (see e.g. Lord Lyttleton's famous Observations on Saul's Conversion, 1774; Fletcher's A Study of the Conversion of Paul, 1910; Gardner, The Religious Experience of Paul, 1911; Maggs, The Spiritual Experience of Paul). All sorts of theories have been advanced to explain on naturalistic grounds this great experience of Christ in the life of Paul. It has been urged that Paul had an epileptic fit, that he had a sunstroke, that he fell off his horse to the ground, that he had a nightmare, that he was blinded by a flash of lightning, that he imagined that he saw Jesus as a result of his highly wrought nervous state, that he deliberately renounced Judaism because of the growing conviction that the disciples were right. But none of these explanations explains. Mere prejudice against the supernatural, such as is shown by Weinel in his Paulus, and by Holsten in his able book (Zum Evangelium d. Paulus und Petrus), cannot solve this problem. One must be willing to hear the evidence. There were witnesses of the bright light (Ac 26:13) and of the sound (Ac 9:7) which only Paul understood (Ac 22:9), as he alone beheld Jesus. It is claimed by some that Paul had a trance or subjective vision, and did not see Jesus with his eyes. Denney (Standard Bible Dictionary) replies that it is not a pertinent objection. Jesus (Joh 21:1) "manifested" Himself, and Paul says that he "saw" Jesus (1Co 9:1), that Jesus "appeared" (1Co 15:8) to him. Hence, it was both subjective and objective. But the reality of the event was as clear to Paul as his own existence. The account is given 3 times in Ac (chapters 9; 22; 26) in substantial agreement, with a few varying details. In Ac 9 the historical narrative occurs, in Ac 22 Paul's defense before the mob in Jerusalem is given, and in Ac 26 we have the apology before Agrippa. There are no contradictions of moment, save that in chapter 26 Jesus Himself is represented as giving directly to Paul the call to the Gentiles while in chapters 9 and 22 it is conveyed through Ananias (the fuller and more accurate account). There is no need to notice the apparent contradiction between Ac 9:7 and 22:9, for the difference in case in the Greek gives a difference in sense, hearing the sound, with the genitive, and not understanding the sense, with the accusative. Findlay (HBD) remarks that the conversion of Paul is a psychological and ethical problem which cannot be accounted for save by Paul's own interpretation of the change wrought in him. He saw Jesus and surrendered to Him.

(3) Effect on Paul.

His surrender to Jesus was instantaneous and complete: "What shall I do, Lord?" (Ac 22:10). He could not see for the glory of that light (Ac 22:11), but he had already seen "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (2Co 4:6). The god of this world could blind him no longer. He had seen Jesus, and all else had lost charm for Paul. There is infinite pathos in the picture of the blind Saul led by the hand (Ac 9:8) into Damascus. All the pride of power is gone, all the lust for vengeance. The fierceness of the name of Saul is well shown in the dread that Ananias has and the protest that he makes to the Lord concerning him (Ac 9:10-14). Ananias doubtless thought that the Lord had made a strange choice of a vessel to bear the message of Christ to the Gentiles, kings, and the children of Israel (Ac 9:15), but there was hope in the promise of chastisement to him (Ac 9:16). So he went, and calls him "Brother Saul." Saul was filled with the Holy Spirit, the scales fell from his eyes, he was baptized. And now what next? What did the world hold in store for the proud scion of Judaism who had renounced power, place, pride for the lowly Nazarene? He dared not go back to Jerusalem. The Jews in Damascus would have none of him now. Would the disciples receive him? They did. "And he was

certain days with the disciples that were at Damascus" (Ac 9:19). Ananias vouched for him by his vision. Then Saul took his courage in his hands and went boldly into the synagogues and "proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God" (Ac 9:20). This was a public committal and a proclamation of his new creed. There was tremendous pith and point in this statement from Saul. The Jews were amazed (Ac 9:21). This is the core of Paul's message as we see in his later ministry (Ac 13; 17:3). It rests at bottom on Paul's own experience of grace. "His whole theology is nothing but the explanation of his own conversion" (Stalker, Life of Paul, 45). We need not argue (Garvie, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 51) that Paul understood at once the full content of the new message, but he had the heart of it right.

PAUL, THE APOSTLE, 5

V. Work.

1. Adjustment:

There was evidently a tumult in Paul's soul. He had undergone a revolution, both intellectual and spiritual. Before he proceeded farther it was wise to think through the most important implications of the new standpoint. Luke gives no account of this personal phase of Paul's career, but he allows room for it between Ac 9:21 and 22. It is Paul who tells of his retirement to Arabia (Ga 1:17 f) to prove his independence of the apostles in Jerusalem. He did not go to them for instruction or for ecclesiastical authority. He did not adopt the merely traditional view of Jesus as the Messiah. He knew, of course, the Christian contention well enough, for he had answered it often enough. But now his old arguments were gone an4t he must work his way round to the other side, and be able to put his new gospel with clearness and force. He was done with calling Jesus anathema (1Co 12:3). Henceforth to him Jesus is Lord. We know nothing of Paul's life in Arabia nor in what part of Arabia he was. He may have gone to Mt. Sinai and thought out grace in the atmosphere of law, but that is not necessary. But it is clear that Paul grew in apprehension of the things of Christ during these years, as indeed he grew to the very end. But he did not grow away from the first clear vision of Christ. He claimed that God had revealed His Son in him that he might preach to the Gentiles (Ga 1:16). He claimed that from the first and to the very last. The undoubted development in Paul's Epistles (see Matheson, Spiritual Development of Paul, and Sabatier, The Apostle Paul) is, however, not a changing view of Christ that nullifies Paul's "original Christian inheritance" (Kohler, Zum Verstandnis des Apostels Paulus, 13). Pfieiderer (Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, 3rd edition, 1897, 217) rejects Colossians because of the advanced Christology here found. But the Christology of Col is implicit in Paul's first sermon at Damascus. "It is impossible to escape the conclusion that the significance and value of the Cross became clear to him almost simultaneously with the certainty of the resurrection and of the Messiahship of Jesus" (Garvie, Studies, etc., 57). The narrow Jew has surrendered to Christ who died for the sins of the world. The universal gospel has taken hold of his mind and heart, and it will work out its logical consequences in Paul. The time in Arabia is not wasted. When he reappears in Damascus (Ac 9:22) he has "developed faith" (Findlay, HDB) and energy that bear instant fruit. He is now the slave of Christ. For him henceforth to live is Christ. He is crucified with Christ. He is in Christ. The union of Paul with Christ is the real key to his life. It is far more than a doctrine about Christ. It is real fellowship with

Christ (Deissmann, Paul, 123). Thus it is that the man who probably never saw Christ in the flesh understands him best (Wernle, Beginnings of Christianity, I, 159).

2. Opposition:

Saul had "increased the more in strength, and confounded the Jews that dwelt in Damascus, proving that this is the Christ" (Ac 9:22). Now he not merely "proclaims" as before (Ac 9:20); he "proves." He does it with such marvelous skill that the Jews are first confounded, then enraged to the point of murder. Their former hero was now their foe. The disciples had learned to run from Saul. They now let him down in a basket through the wall by night and he is gone (Ac 9:23). This then is the beginning of the active ministry of the man who was called to be a chosen vessel to Gentiles, kings, and Jews, There was no need to go back to the wilderness. He had gotten his bearings clearly now. He had his message and it had his whole heart. He had not avoided Jerusalem because he despised flesh and blood, but because he had no need of light from the apostles since "the divine revelation so completely absorbed his interest and attention" (Garvie, Life and Teaching of Paul, 33). No door was open as yet among the Gentiles. Sooner or later he must go to Jerusalem and confer with the leaders there if he was to cooperate with them in the evangelization of the world. Saul knew that he would be an object of suspicion to the disciples in Jerusalem. That was inevitable in view of the past. It was best to go, but he did not wish to ask any favors of the apostles. Indeed he went in particular "to visit Cephas" (margin, "to become acquainted with" Ga 1:18). They knew each other, of course, as opponents. But Saul comes now with the olive branch to his old enemy. He expressly explains (Ga 1:19) that he saw no other apostle. He did see James, the Lord’s brother, who was not one of the Twelve. It seems that at first Peter and James were both afraid of Saul (Ac 9:26), "not believing that he was a disciple." If a report came 3 years before of the doings at Damascus, they had discounted it. All had been quiet, and now Saul suddenly appears in Jerusalem in a new role. It was, they feared, just a ruse to complete his work of old. But for Barnabas, Saul might not have had that visit of 15 days with Peter. Barnabas was a Hellenist of Cyprus and believed Saul’s story and stood by him. Thus, he had his opportunity to preach the gospel in Jerusalem, perhaps in the very synagogues in which he had heard Stephen, and now he is taking Stephen’s place and is disputing against the Grecian Jews (Ac 9:29). He had days of blessed fellowship (Ac 9:28) with the disciples, till the Grecian Jews sought to kill him as Saul had helped to do to Stephen (Ac 9:29). It was a repetition of Damascus, but Saul did not wish to run again so soon. He protested to the Lord Jesus, who spoke in a vision to him, and recalls the fate of Stephen, but Jesus bids him go: "For I will send thee forth far hence unto the Gentiles" (Ac 22:17-21). One martyr like Stephen is enough. So the brethren took him down to Caesarea (Ac 9:30). It was an ominous beginning for a ministry with so clear a call. Where can he go now?

3. Waiting:

They "sent him forth to Tarsus" (Ac 9:30). Who would welcome him there? At Jerusalem he apparently avoided Gamaliel and the Sanhedrin. He was with the Christians and preached to the Hellenistic Jews. The Jews regarded him as a turncoat, a renegade Jew. There were apparently no Christians in Tarsus, unless some of the disciples driven from Jerusalem by Saul himself went that far, as they did go to Antioch (Ac 11:19 f). But Saul was not idle, for he speaks himself of his activity in the regions of Syria

and Cilicia during this "period of obscurity" (Denney, Standard Bible Dict.) as a thing known to the churches of Judea (Ga 1:21 f). He was not idle then. The way was not yet opened for formal entrance upon the missionary enterprise, but Saul was not the man to do nothing at home because of that. If they would not hear him at Damascus and Jerusalem, they would in the regions of Syria and Cilicia, his home province. We are left in doubt at first whether Paul preached only to Jews or to Gentiles also. He had the specific call to preach to the Gentiles, and there is no reason why he should not have done so in this province, preaching to the Jews first as he did afterward. He did not have the scruples of Simon Peter to overcome. When he appears at Antioch with Barnabas, he seems to take hold like an old hand at the business. It is quite probable, therefore, that this obscure ministry of some 8 or 10 years may have had more results than we know. Paul apparently felt that he had done his work in that region, for outside of Antioch he gives no time to it except that in starting out on the second tour from Antioch "he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Ac 15:41), churches probably the fruit of this early ministry and apparently containing Gentiles also. The letter from the Jerusalem conference was addressed to "the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia" (Ac 15:23). Cilicia was now part of the Roman province of Syria. So then we conclude that Saul had a Gentileministry in this region. "Independently, under no human master, he learned his business as a missionary to the heathen" (Findlay, HDB). One can but wonder whether Saul was kindly received at home by his father and mother. They had looked upon him with pride as the possible successor of Gamaliel, and now he is a follower of the despised Nazarene and a preacher of the Cross. It is possible that his own exhortations to fathers not to provoke their children to wrath (Eph 6:4) may imply that his own father had cast him out at this time. Findlay (HDB) argues that Saul would not have remained in this region so long if his home relations had been altogether hostile. It is a severe test of character when the doors close against one. But Saul turned defeat to glorious gain.

4. Opportunity:

Most scholars hold that the ecstatic experience told by Paul in 2Co 12:1-9 took place before he came to Antioch. If we count the years strictly, 14 from 56 AD would bring us to 42 AD. Paul had spent a year in Antioch before going up to Jerusalem (Ac 11:29 f). Findlay (HDB) thinks that Paul had the visions before he received the call to come to Antioch. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 41) holds he received the call first. "Such a mood of exaltation would account for the vision to which he refers in 2Co 12:1-4." At any rate he had the vision with its exaltation and the thorn in the flesh with its humiliation before he came to Antioch in response to the invitation of Barnabas. He had undoubtedly had a measure of success in his work in Cilicia and Syria. He had the seal of the divine blessing on his work among the Gentiles. But there was a pang of disappointment over the attitude of the Jerusalem church toward his work. He was apparently left alone to his own resources. "Only such a feeling of disappointment can explain the tone of his references to his relations to the apostles (Ga 1:11-24)" (Garvie, Life and Teaching of Paul, 41). There is no bitterness in this tone—but puzzled surprise. It seems that the 12 apostles are more or less absent from Jerusalem during this period with James the brother of the Lord Jesus as chief elder. A narrow Pharisaic element in the church was active and sought to shape the policy of the church in its attitude toward the Gentiles. This is clear in the treatment of Peter, when he returned to Jerusalem after the experience at Caesarea with Cornelius (Ac 11:1-18). There was acquiescence, but with the notion that this was an exceptional case of the Lord’s doing. Hence, they show concern over the spread of the

gospel to the Greeks at Antioch, and send Barnabas to investigate and report (Ac 11:19-22). Barnabas was a Hellenist, and evidently did not share the narrow views of the Pharisaic party in the church at Jerusalem (Ac 11:2), for he was glad (Ac 11:23 f) of the work in Antioch. Probably mindful of the discipline attempted on Simon Peter, he refrained from going back at once to Jerusalem. Moreover, he believed in Saul and his work, and thus he gave him his great opportunity at Antioch. They had there a year's blessed work together (Ac 11:25). So great was the outcome that the disciples received a new name to distinguish them from the Gentiles and the Jews. But the term "Christian" did not become general for a long time. There was then a great Greek church at Antioch, possibly equal in size to the Jewish church in Jerusalem. The prophecy by Agabus of a famine gave Barnabas and Saul a good excuse for a visit to Jerusalem with a general collection—"every man according to his ability"—from the Greek church for the relief of the poverty in the Jerusalem church. Barnabas had assisted generously in a similar strain in the beginning of the work there (Ac 4:36 f), unless it was a different Barnabas, which is unlikely. This contribution would help the Jerusalem saints to understand now that the Greeks were really converted. It was apparently successful according to the record in Acts. The apostles seem to have been absent, since only "elders" are mentioned in 11:30.

The incidents in Ac 12, as already noted, are probably not contemporaneous with this visit, but either prior or subsequent to it. However, it is urged by some scholars that this visit is the same as that of Ga 2:1-10 since Paul would not have omitted it in his list of visits to Jerusalem. But then Paul is not giving a list of visits, but is only showing his independence of the apostles. If they were absent from Jerusalem at that time, there would be no occasion to mention it. Besides, Luke in Ac 15 does recount the struggle in Jerusalem over the problem of Gentileliberty. If that question was an issue at the visit in Ac 11:30, it is quite remarkable that he should have passed it by, especially if the matter caused as much heat as is manifest in Ga 2, both in Jerusalem and Antioch. It is much simpler to understand that in Ac 15 and Ga 2:1-10 we have the public and the private aspects of the same issue, than to suppose that Luke has slurred the whole matter over in Ac 11:30. The identification of the visit of Ga 2 with that in Ac 11:30 makes it possible to place Galatians before the conference in Jerusalem in Ac 15 and implies the correctness of the South Galatian theory of the destination of the epistle and of the work of Paul, a theory with strong advocates and arguments, but which is by no means established (see below for discussion at more length). So far as we can gather from Luke, Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem with John Mark (Ac 12:25)," when they had fulfilled their ministration" with satisfaction. The Pharisaic element was apparently quiescent, and the outlook for the future work among the Gentiles seemed hopeful. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 62 ff) argues strongly for identifying the revelation mentioned in Paul's speech in Ac 22:20 f with this visit in 11:30 (12:25), rather than with the one in Ac 9:29 f. There is a textual problem in 12:25, but I cannot concur in the solution of Ramsay.

5. The First Great Mission Campaign:

Ac 13 and 14, 47 and 48 AD:

Paul had already preached to the Gentiles in Cilicia and Syria for some 10 years. The work was not new to him. He had had his specific call from Jerusalem long ago and had answered it. But now an entirely new situation arises. His work had been individual in Cilicia. Now the Spirit specifically directs the

separation of Barnabas and Saul to this work (Ac 13:2). They were to go together, and they had the sympathy and prayers of a great church. The endorsement was probably not "ordination" in the technical sense, but a farewell service of blessing and good will as the missionaries went forth on the world-campaign (Ac 13:3). No such unanimous endorsement could have been obtained in Jerusalem to this great enterprise. It was momentous in its possibilities for Christianity. Hitherto work among the Gentiles had been sporadic and incidental. Now a determined effort was to be made to evangelize a large section of the Roman empire. There is no suggestion that the church at Antioch provided funds for this or for the two later Campaigns, as the church at Philippi came to do. How that was managed this time we do not know. Some individuals may have helped. Paul had his trade to fall back on, and often had resort to it later. The presence of John Mark "as their attendant" (Ac 13:5) was probably due to Barnabas, his cousin (Col 4:10). The visit to Cyprus, the home of Barnabas, was natural. There were already some Christians there (Ac 11:20), and it was near. They preach first in the synagogues of the Jews at Salamis (Ac 13:5). We are left to conjecture as to results there and through the whole island till Paphos is reached. There they meet a man of great prominence and intelligence, Sergius Paulus, the Roman proconsul, who had been under the spell of a sorcerer with a Jewish name—Elymas Bar-jesus (compare Peter’s encounter with Simon Magus in Samaria). In order to win and hold Sergius Paulus, who had become interested in Christianity, Paul has to punish Bar-jesus with blindness (Ac 13:10) in the exercise of that apostolic power which he afterward claimed with such vigor (1Co 5:4 f; 2Co 13:10). He won Sergius Paulus, and this gave him cheer for his work. From now on it is Paul, not Saul, in the record of Luke, perhaps because of this incident, though both names probably belonged to him from the first. Now also Paul steps to the fore ahead of Barnabas, and it is "Paul’s company" (Ac 13:13) that sets sail from Paphos for Pamphylia. There is no evidence here of resentment on the part of Barnabas at the leadership of Paul. The whole campaign may have been planned from the start by the Holy Spirit as the course now taken may have been due to Paul’s leadership. John Mark deserts at Perga and returns to Jerusalem (his home), not to Antioch (Ac 13:13). Paul and Barnabas push on to the tablelands of Pisidia. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 93) thinks that Paul had malaria down at Perga and hence desired to get up into higher land. That is possible. The places mentioned in the rest of the tour are Antioch in Pisidia (Ac 13:14), and Iconium (Ac 13:51), Lystra (Ac 14:8), and Derbe (Ac 14:20), cities of Lycaonia. These terms are ethnographic descriptions of the southern divisions of the Roman province of Galatia, the northern portion being Galatia proper or North Galatia. So then Paul and Barnabas are now at work in South Galatia, though Luke does not mention that name, using here only the popular designations. The work is wonderfully successful. In these cities, on one of the great Roman roads east and west, Paul is reaching the centers of provincial life as will be his custom. At Antioch Paul is invited to repeat his sermon on the next Sabbath (Ac 13:42), and Luke records at length the report of this discourse which has the characteristic notes of Paul’s gospel as we see it in his epistles. Paul may have kept notes of the discourse. There were devout Gentiles at these services. These were the first to be won, and thus a wider circle of Gentiles could be reached. Paul and Barnabas were too successful at Antioch in Pisidia. The jealous Jews opposed, and Paul and Barnabas dramatically turned to the Gentiles (Ac 13:45). But the Jews reached the city magistrate through the influential women, and Paul and Barnabas were ordered to leave (Ac 13:50 f). Similar success brings like results in Iconium. At Lystra, before the hostile Jews come, Paul and Barnabas have great success and, because of the healing of the impotent man, are taken as Mercury and Jupiter respectively, and worship is offered them. Paul’s address in refusal is a fine plea on the grounds of natural theology (Ac 14:15-18). The attempt on Paul’s life after the Jews came seemed

successful. In the band of disciples that "stood round about him," there may have been Timothy, Paul's son in the gospel. From Derbe they retrace their steps to Perga, in order to strengthen the churches with officers, and then sail for Seleucia and Antioch. They make their report to the church at Antioch. It is a wonderful story. The door of faith is now wide open for the Gentiles who have entered in great numbers (Ac 14:27). No report was sent to Jerusalem. What will the Pharisaic party do now?

6. The Conflict at Jerusalem:

Ac 15$; Ga 2$, 49 AD:

The early date of Galatians, addressed to these churches of Pisidia and Lycaonia before the Conference in Jerusalem does not allow time for a second visit there (Ga 4:13), and requires that the Judaizers from Jerusalem followed close upon the heels of Paul and Barnabas (Ga 1:6; 3:1) in South Galatia. Besides, there is the less likelihood that the matter would have been taken a second time to Jerusalem (Ac 15:2 f) if already the question had been settled in Paul's favor (Ac 11:30). It is strange also that no reference to this previous conference on the same subject is made in Ac 15, since Peter does refer to his experience at Caesarea (15:9) and since James in Ac 21:25 specifically ("we wrote") mentions the letter of Ac 15 in which full liberty was granted to the Gentiles. Once more, the attack on the position of Paul and Barnabas in Ac 15:1 is given as a new experience, and hence the sharp dissension and tense feeling. The occasion for the sudden outbreak at Antioch on the part of the self-appointed (Ac 15:24) regulators of Paul and Barnabas lay in the reports that came to Jerusalem about the results of this campaign on a large scale among the Gentiles. There was peril to the supremacy of the Jewish element. They had assumed at first, as even Peter did who was not a Judaizer (Ac 10), that the Gentiles who became disciples would also become Jews. The party of the circumcision had made protest against the conduct of Peter at Caesarea (11:1 f) and had reluctantly acquiesced in the plain work of God (11:18). They had likewise yielded in the matter of the Greeks at Antioch (11:19 ff) by the help of the contribution (11:29 f). But they had not agreed to a campaign to Hellenize Christianity. The matter had to stop. So the Judaizers came up to Antioch and laid down the law to Paul and Barnabas. They did not wait for them to come to Jerusalem. They might not come till it was too late (compare Barnabas in Ac 11). Paul and Barnabas had not sought the controversy. They had both received specific instructions from the Holy Spirit to make this great campaign among the Gentiles. They would not stultify themselves and destroy the liberty of the Gentiles in Christ by going back and having the Mosaic Law imposed on them by the ceremony of circumcision. They saw at once the gravity of the issue. The very essence of the gospel of grace was involved. Paul had turned away from this yoke of bondage. He would not go back to it nor would he impose it on his converts. The church at Antioch stood by Paul and Barnabas. Paul (Ga 2:2) says that he had a revelation to go to Jerusalem with the problem. Luke (Ac 15:3) says that the church sent them. Surely there is no inconsistency here. It is not difficult to combine the personal narrative in Ga 2 with the public meetings recorded in Ac 15. We have first the general report by Paul and Barnabas to the church in Jerusalem (Ac 15:4 f) to which instant exception was made by the Judaizing element. There seems to have come an adjournment to prepare for the conflict, since in 15:6 Luke says again that "the apostles and the elders were gathered together to consider of this matter." Between these two public meetings we may place the private conference of Paul and Barnabas with Peter, John and James and other teachers (Ga 2:1-10). In this private conference some of the timid brethren wished to persuade Paul

to have Titus, a Greek Christian whom Paul had brought down from Antioch (a live specimen!), offered as a sacrifice to the Judaizers ("false brethren") and circumcised. But Paul stood his ground for the truth of the gospel and was supported by Peter, John and James. They agreed all around for Paul and Barnabas to go on with their work to the Gentiles, and Peter, John and James would push the work among the Jews (a division in sphere of work, like home and foreign missions, not a denominational cleavage). Here, then, for the first time, Paul has had an opportunity to talk the matter over with the apostolic teachers, and they agree. The Judaizers will have no support from the apostles. The battle was really won in their private conference. In the second public meeting (Ac 15:6-29) all goes smoothly enough. Ample opportunity for free discussion is offered. Then Peter shows how God had used him to preach to the Romans, and how the Jews themselves had to believe on Christ in order to be saved. He opposed putting a yoke on the Gentiles that the Jews could not bear. There was a pause, and then Barnabas and Paul (note the order here: courtesy to Barnabas) spoke again. After another pause, James, the president of the conference, the brother of the Lord Jesus, and a stedfast Jew, spoke. He cited Am 9:11 f to show that God had long ago promised a blessing to the Gentiles. He suggests liberty to the Gentiles with the prohibition of pollution of idols, of fornication, things strangled, and blood. His ideas are embodied in an unanimous decree which strongly commends "our beloved Barnabas and Paul" and disclaims responsibility for the visit of the Judaizers to Antioch. The Western text omits "things strangled" from the decree. If this is correct, the decree prohibits idolatry, fornication and murder (Wilson, Origin and Aim of the Ac of the Apostles, 1912, 55). At any rate, the decision is a tremendous victory for Paul and Barnabas. If the other reading is correct, Jewish feelings about things strangled and blood are to be respected. The decision was received with great joy in Antioch (Ac 15:30-35). Some time later Peter appears at Antioch in the fullest fellowship with Paul and Barnabas in their work, and joins them in free social intercourse with the Gentiles, as he had timidly done in the home of Cornelius, till "certain came from James" (Ga 2:11 f), and probably threatened to have Peter up before the church again (Ac 11:2) on this matter, claiming that James agreed with them on the subject. This I do not believe was true in the light of Ac 15:24, where a similar false claim is discredited, since James had agreed with Paul in Jerusalem (Ac 15:19 ff; Ga 2:9 f). The new ground for complaint was that they had not settled the question of social relations with the Gentiles in the Jerusalem conference and that Peter had exceeded the agreement there reached. Peter quailed before the accusation, "fearing them that were of the circumcision" Ga 2:12) To make it worse, "even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation" (Ga 2:13). Under this specious plea Paul was about to lose the fruit of the victory already won, and charged Peter to his face with Judaizing hypocrisy (Ga 2:11-14). It was a serious crisis. Peter had not changed his convictions, but had once more cowered in an hour of peril. Paul won both Barnabas and Peter to his side and took occasion to show how useless the death of Christ was if men could be saved by mere legalism (Ga 2:21). But the Judaizers had renewed the war, and they would keep it up and harry the work of Paul all over the world. Paul had the fight of his life upon his hands.

7. The Second Mission Campaign:

Ac 15:36-18:22; 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 49-51 (or 52) AD:

The impulse to go out again came from Paul. Despite the difference in Ga 2:13, he wished to go again with Barnabas (Ac 15:36), but Barnabas insisted on taking along John Mark, which Paul was not willing

to do because of his failure to stick to the work at Perga. So they agreed to disagree after "sharp contention" (Ac 15:39 f). Barnabas went with Mark to Cyprus, while Paul took Silas, "being commended by the brethren to the grace of the Lord." Luke follows the career of Paul, and so Barnabas drops out of view (compare later 1Co 9:6). Paul and Silas go "through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (Ac 15:41). They pass through the Cilician gates to Derbe, the end of the first tour, and go to Lystra. Here they pick up Timothy, who more than takes Mark's place in Paul's life. Timothy's mother was a Jewess and his father a Greek. Paul decided therefore to have him circumcised since, as a half-Jew, he would be especially obnoxious to the Jews. This case differed wholly from that of Titus, a Greek, where principle was involved. Here it was a matter merely of expediency. Paul had taken the precaution to bring along the decrees of the Conference at Jerusalem in case there was need of them. He delivered them to the churches. It has to be noted that in 1Co 8-10 and in Ro 14 and 15, when discussing the question of eating meats offered to idols, Paul does not refer to these decrees, but argues the matter purely from the standpoint of the principles involved. The Judaizers anyhow had not lived up to the agreement, but Paul is here doing his part by the decision. The result of the work was good for the churches (Ac 16:4).

When we come to Ac 16:6, we touch a crucial passage in the South-Galatian controversy. Ramsay (Christianity in the Roman Empire, chapters iii through vi; History and Geography of Asia Minor; Paul the Traveler, chapters v, vi, viii, ix; The Expositor, IV, viii, ix, "replies to Chase"; "Galatia," HDB; Commentary on Gal; The Cities of Paul; The Expositor T, 1912, 1913) has become by his able advocacy the chief champion of the view that Paul never went to Galatia proper or North Galatia, and that he addressed his epistle to South Galatia, the churches visited in the first tour. For a careful history of the whole controversy in detail, see Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 90-106, who strongly supports the view of Lightfoot, H.J. Holtzmann, Blass, Schurer, Denney, Chase, Mommsen, Steinmann, etc. There are powerful names with Ramsay, like Hausrath, Zahn, Barrlet, Garvie, Weizsacker, etc. The arguments are too varied and minute for complete presentation here. The present writer sees some very attractive features in the South-Galatian hypothesis, but as a student of language finds himself unable to overcome the syntax of Ac 16:6. The minor difficulty is the dropping of kai, between "Phrygia" and "Galatic region" by Ramsay. It is by no means certain that this is the idea of Luke. It is more natural to take the terms as distinct and coordinated by kai. In Paul the Traveler, 212, Ramsay pleads for the aorist of subsequent time, but Moulton (Prolegomena, 133) will have none of it. With that I agree. The aorist participle must give something synchronous with or antecedent to the principal verb. In Expository Times for February, 1913, 220 f, Ramsay comes back to the "construction of Ac 16:6." He admits that the weight of authority is against the Textus Receptus of the New Testament and in favor of dielthon .... koluthentes. He now interprets the language thus: "Paul, having in mind at Lystra his plan of going on to Asia from Galatia, was ordered by the Spirit not to preach in Asia. He therefore made a tour through the Phrygio-Galatic region, which he had already influenced so profoundly from end to end (13:49)." But there is grave difficulty in accepting this interpretation as a solution of the problem. Ramsay here makes the narrative in 16:6 resumptive and takes us back to the standpoint of 16:1 at Lystra. The proper place for such a forecast was in 16:1, or at most before 16:4, which already seems to mark an advance beyond Lystra to Iconium and Antioch in Pisidia: "and as they went on their way through the cities."

Besides, "the Phrygio-Galatic region" lay between Lystra and Asia, and, according to Ramsay, after the prohibition in Lystra, he went straight on toward Asia. This is certainly very artificial and unlike the usual procedure. According to the other view, Paul had already visited the churches in Lycaonia and Pisidia on his former visit. He wished to go on west into Asia, probably to Ephesus, but was forbidden by the Holy Spirit, and as a result turned northward through Phrygia and the regions of Galatia, using both terms in the ethnographic sense. Paul was already in the province of Galatia at Derbe and Lystra. The matter has many "ins and outs" and cannot be argued further here. It is still in debate, but the present interpretation is in harmony with the narrative in Acts.

See also GALATIA; GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

By this view Paul had not meant to stop in Galatia proper and did so only because of an attack of illness (Ga 4:13). It is possible that Luke may have come to his rescue here. At any rate, he finally pushes on opposite Mysia and Bithynia in the extreme north and was forbidden by the Spirit from going on into Bithynia. So they came down to Troas (Ac 16:7 f) when Luke ("we," Ac 16:10) appears on the scene and the Macedonian call comes to Paul. Thus Paul is led out of Asia into Europe and carries the gospel successively to Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth. The gospel is finally planted in the great provinces of Macedonia and Achaia. In Philippi, a Roman colony and military outpost, Paul finds few Jews and has to go out to a prayer-place to find a few Jewish women to whom he can tell the story of Jesus. But he gains a start with Lydia and her household, and soon arouses the hostility of a company of men who were making money out of a poor girl’s powers of divination. But before Paul and Silas leave the jail, the jailer is himself converted, and a good church is established. At Thessalonica Paul has great success and arouses the jealousy of the Jews who gather a rabble and raise a disturbance and charge it up to Paul. At Philippi appeal was made to prejudice against Jews. At Thessalonica the charge is made that Paul preaches Jesus as a rival king to Caesar. In Berea Paul and Silas have even more success till the Jews come from Thessalonica and drive Paul out again. Timothy, who has come out from Philippi where Luke has remained, and Silas stay in Berea while Paul hurries on to Athens with some of the brethren, who return with the request for Timothy and Silas "to come to him with all speed." Apparently Timothy did come (1Th 3:1 f), but Paul soon sent him back to Thessalonica because of his anxiety about conditions there. Left alone in Athens, Paul’s spirit was stirred over the idolatry before his eyes. He preaches in the synagogues and argues with the Stoics and Epicureans in the Agora who make light of his pretensions to philosophy as a "babbler" (Ac 17:18). But curiosity leads them to invite him to speak on the Areopagus. This notable address, all alive to his surroundings, was rather rudely cut short by their indifference and mockery, and Paul left Athens with small results for his work. He goes over to Corinth, the great commercial city of the province, rich and with bizarre notions of culture. Paul determined (1Co 2:1-5) to be true to the cross, even after his experience in Athens. He gave them, not the flashy philosophy of the sophists, but the true Wisdom of God in simple words, the philosophy of the cross of Christ (1Co 1:17-3:4). In Corinth Paul found fellow-helpers in Aquila and Priscilla, just expelled from Rome by Claudius. They have the same trade of tentmakers and live together (Ac 18:1-4), and Paul preached in the synagogues. Paul is cheered by the coming of Timothy and Silas from Thessalonica (Ac 18:5) with supplies from Philippi, as they had done while in Thessalonica (Php 4:15 f). This very success led to opposition, and Paul has to preach in the house of Titus Justus. But the work goes on till Gallio comes and a renewed effort is made to have it stopped, but Gallio declines to interfere

and thus practically makes Christianity a religio licita, since he treats it as a variety of Judaism. While here, after the arrival of Timothy and Silas, Paul writes the two letters to Thessalonica, the first of his 13 epistles. They are probably not very far apart in time, and deal chiefly with a grievous misunderstanding on their part concerning the emphasis placed by him on the Man of Sin and the Second Coming. Paul had felt the power of the empire, and his attention is sharply drawn to the coming conflict between the Roman empire and the kingdom of God. He treats it in terms of apocalyptic eschatology. When he leaves Corinth, it is to go by Ephesus, with Aquila and Priscilla whom he leaves there with the promise to return. He goes down to Caesarea and "went up and saluted the church" (Ac 18:22), probably at Jetus (fourth visit), and "went down to Antioch." If he went to Jerusalem, it was probably incidental, and nothing of importance happened. He is back once again in Antioch after an absence of some 3 or 4 years.

8. The Third Mission Campaign:

Ac 18:23-21:14; 1 and 2 Corinthians; Galatians; Romans, 52 (or 53)-57 (or 58) AD:

The stay of Paul at Antioch is described as "sometime" (Ac 18:23). Denney (Standard Bible Dictionary) conjectures that Paul's brief stay at Jerusalem (see above) was due to the fact that he found that the Judaizers had organized opposition there against him in the absence of the apostles, and it was so unpleasant that he did not stay. He Suggests also that the Judaizers had secured letters of commendation from the church for their emissaries (2Co 3:1) to Corinth and Galatia, who were preaching "another Jesus" of nationalism and narrowness, whom Paul did not preach (Ga 1:6; 2Co 11:4). Both Denney and Findlay follow Neander, Wieseler, and Sabatier in placing here, before Paul starts out again from Antioch, the visit of certain "from James" (Ga 2:12), who overpowered Peter for the moment. But I have put this incident as more probably before the disagreement with Barnabas over Mark, and as probably contributing to that breach at the beginning of the second tour. It is not necessary to suppose that the Judaizers remained acquiescent so long.

Paul seems to have set out on the third tour alone—unless Timothy came back with him, of which there is no evidence save that he is with Paul again in Ephesus (Ac 19:22). What became of Silas? Paul "went through the region of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order, establishing all the disciples" (Ac 18:23), the opposite order to Ac 16:6, "through the region of Phrygia and Galatia." According to the North-Galatian view, here followed, he went through the northern part of the province, passing through Galatia proper and Phrygia on his way west to Ephesus. Luke adds, "Paul having passed through the upper country came to Ephesus" (Ac 19:1). The ministry of Apollos in Ephesus (Ac 18:24-28) had taken place before Paul arrived, though Aquila and Priscilla were still on hand. Apollos passed over to Corinth and innocently became the occasion of such strife there (1Co 1-4) that he left and refused to return at Paul's request (1Co 16:12). Paul has a ministry of 3 years, in round numbers, in Ephesus, which is full of excitement and anxiety from the work there and in Corinth. He finds on his arrival some ill-informed disciples of John the Baptist who are ignorant of the chief elements of John's teaching about repentance, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit (Ac 19:2-7), matters of which Apollos had knowledge, though he learned more from Priscilla and Aquila, but there is no evidence that he was rebaptized as was true of the 12 disciples of John (Robertson, John the Loyal, 290-303). The boldness of Paul in Ephesus led in 3 months

to his departure from the synagogue to the schoolhouse of Tyrannus, where he preached for 2 years (Ac 19:8-10) with such power that "all they that dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord." It is not strange later to find churches at Colosse and Hierapolis in the Lycus Valley (compare also Re 1:11). Paul has a sharp collision with the strolling Jewish exorcists that led to the burning of books of magic by the wholesale (Ac 19:11-20), another proof of the hold that magic and the mysteries had upon the Orient. Ephesus was the seat of the worship of Diana whose wonderful temple was their pride. A great business in the manufacture of shrines of Diana was carried on here by Demetrius, and "this Paul" had hurt his trade so much that he raised an insurrection under the guise of piety and patriotism and might have killed Paul with the mob, if he could have got hold of him (Ac 19:23-41). It was with great difficulty that Paul was kept from going to the amphitheater, as it was. But here, as at Corinth, the Roman officer (the town clerk) defended Paul from the rage of his enemies (there the jealous Jews, here the tradesmen whose business suffered). He was apparently very ill anyhow, and came near death (2Co 1:9). All this seems to have hastened his departure from Ephesus sooner than Pentecost, as he had written to the Corinthians (1Co 16:8). His heart was in Corinth because of the discussions there over him and Apollos and Peter, by reason of the agitation of the Judaizers (1Co 1:10-17). The household of Chloe had brought word of this situation to Paul. He had written the church a letter now lost (1Co 5:9). They had written him a letter (1Co 7:1). They sent messengers to Paul (1Co 16:17). He had sent Timothy to them (1Co 4:17; 16:10), who seems not to have succeeded in quieting the trouble. Paul wrote 1Co (spring of 56), and then sent Titus, who was to meet him at Troas and report results (2Co 2:12 f). He may also have written another letter and sent it by Titus (2Co 2:3 f). The sudden departure from Corinth brought Paul to Troas ahead of time, but he could not wait for Titus, and so pushed on with a heavy heart into Macedonia, where he met him, and he had good and bad news to tell (2Co 2:12 ff; 7:5-13). The effect on Paul was instantaneous. He rebounded to hope and joy (2Co 2:14) in a glorious defense of the ministry of Jesus (compare Robertson, The Glory of the Ministry; Paul’s Exultation in Preaching), with a message of cheer to the majority. of the church that had sustained Paul and with instructions (2Co 8$; 9 $) about the collection for the poor saints in Jerusalem, which must be pushed to a completion by Titus and two other brethren (possibly also Luke, brother of Titus, and Erastus). Timothy and Erastus had been sent on ahead to Macedonia from Ephesus (Ac 19:22), and Timothy sends greetings with Paul to the Corinthians in a letter (2 Corinthians) which Paul now forwards, possibly by Titus. The latter part of the epistle (1Co 10-13) deals with the stubborn minority who still resist the authority of Paul as an apostle. On the proposed treatment of these chapters as a separate epistle see the earlier part of this article. Paul seems to wait a while before going on to Corinth. He wishes the opposition to have time to repent. During this period he probably went round about to Illyricum (Ro 15:19). He spent three months in Greece (Ac 20:2 f), probably the winter of 56 and 57.

We have placed Galatians in the early part of this stay in Corinth, though it could have been written while at Ephesus. Romans was certainly written while here, and they both treat the same general theme of justification by faith. Ramsay (Expos, February, 1913, 127-45) has at last come to the conclusion that Ga belongs to the date of Ac 15:1 f. He bases this conclusion chiefly on the "absolute independence" of his apostleship claimed in Ga 1 and 2, which, he holds, he would not have done after the conference in Ac 15, which was "a sacrifice of complete independence." This is a curious interpretation, for in Ga 2:1-10 Paul himself tells of his recognition on terms of equality by Peter, John and James, and of his going to Jerusalem by "revelation," which was just as much "a sacrifice of complete independence" as we find

in Ac 15. Besides, in 2Co 11:5 and 12:11 Paul expressly asserts his equality (with all humility) with the very chiefest apostles, and in 1Co 15:10 he claims in so many words to have wrought more than all the apostles. Perhaps messengers from Galatia with the contributions from that region report the havoc wrought there by the Judaizers. Ga is a tremendous plea for the spiritual nature of Christianity as opposed to Jewish ceremonial legalism.

Paul had long had it in mind to go to Rome. It was his plan to do so while at Ephesus (Ac 19:21) after he had gone to Jerusalem with the great collection from the churches of Asia, Galatia, Achaia, and Macedonia. He hoped that this collection would have a mollifying effect on the Jerusalem saints as that from Antioch had (Ac 11:29 f). He had changed some details in his plans, but not the purpose to go to Jerusalem and then to Rome. Meanwhile, he writes the longest and most important letter of all to the Romans, in which he gives a fuller statement of his gospel, because they had not heard him preach, save his various personal friends who had gone there from the east (Ac 16). But already the shadow of Jerusalem is on his heart, and he asks their prayers in his behalf, as he faces his enemies in Jerusalem (Ro 15:30-32). He hopes also to go on to Spain (Ro 15:24), so as to carry the gospel to the farther west also. The statesmanship of Paul comes out now in great clearness. He has in his heart always anxiety for the churches that consumes him (2Co 11:28 f). He was careful to have a committee of the churches go with him to report the collection (2Co 8:19 f). Paul had planned to sail direct for Syria, but a plot on his life in Corinth led him to go by land via Macedonia with his companions (Ac 20:2-4). He tarried at Philippi while the rest went on to Troas. At Philippi Paul is joined again by Luke, who stays with him till Rome is reached. They celebrate the Passover (probably the spring of 57) in Philippi (Ac 20:6). We cannot follow the details in Ac at Troas, the voyage through the beautiful Archipelago, to Miletus. There Paul took advantage of the stop to send for the elders of Ephesus to whom he gave a wonderful address (Ac 20:17-38). They change ships at Patara for Phoenicia and pass to the right of Cyprus with its memories of Barnabas and Sergius Paulus and stop at Tyre, where Paul is warned not to go on to Jerusalem. The hostility of the Judaizers to Paul is now common talk everywhere. There is grave peril of a schism in Christianity over the question of Gentile liberty, once settled in Jerusalem, but unsettled by the Judaizers. At Caesarea Paul is greeted by Philip the evangelist and his four daughters (prophetesses). At Caesarea Paul is warned in dramatic fashion by Agabus (compare Ac 11:28) not to go on to Jerusalem (Ac 21:9), but Paul is more determined than ever to go, even if he die (Ac 20:13). He had had three premonitions for long (Ac 20:22), but he will finish his course, cost what it may. He finds a friend at Caesarea in Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple, who was to be the host of Paul in Jerusalem (Ac 21:16).

9. Five Years a Prisoner:

Ac 21:17-28:31; Philippians; Philemon; Colossians; Ephesians, 57-62 (or 63) AD:

Paul had hoped to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost (Ac 20:16). He seems to have done so. Luke gives the story of Paul in Jerusalem, Caesarea, and the voyage to Rome in much detail. He was with him and considered this period of his ministry very important. The welcome from the brethren in Jerusalem was surprisingly cordial (Ac 21:17). On the very next day Paul and his party made a formal call on James and all the elders (Ac 21:18 f), who gave a sympathetic hearing to the narrative of God’s dealings with

Paul and the Gentiles. He presented the alms (collection) in due form (Ac 24:17), though some critics have actually suggested that Paul used it to defray the expenses of the appeal to Caesar. Ramsay's notion that he may have fallen heir by now to his portion of his father's estate is quite probable. But the brethren wish to help Paul set himself right before the rank and file of the church in Jerusalem, who have been imposed upon by the Judaizers who have misrepresented Paul's real position by saying that he urged the Jewish Christians to give up the Mosaic customs (Ac 21:21). The elders understand Paul and recall the decision of the conference at which freedom was guaranteed to the Gentiles, and they have no wish to disturb that (Ac 21:25). They only wish Paul to show that he does not object to the Jewish Christians keeping up the Mosaic regulations. They propose that Paul offer sacrifice publicly in the temple and pay the vows of four men, and then all will know the truth (Ac 21:23 f). Paul does not hesitate to do that (Ac 21:26). He had kept the Jewish feasts (compare Ac 20:6) as Jesus had done, and the early disciples in Jerusalem. He was a Jew. He may have had a vow at Corinth (Ac 18:18). He saw no inconsistency in a Jew doing thus after becoming a Christian, provided he did not make it obligatory on Gentiles. The real efficacy of the sacrifices lay in the death of Jesus for sin. Garvie (Life and Teaching of Paul, 173) calls this act of Paul "scarcely, worthy of his courage as a man or his faith in God." I cannot see it in that light. It is a matter of practical wisdom, not of principle. To have refused would have been to say that the charge was true, and it was not. So far as the record goes, this act of Paul accomplished its purpose in setting Paul in a right light before the church in Jerusalem. It took away this argument from the Judaizers. The trouble that now comes to Paul does not come from the Judaizers, but from "the Jews from Asia" (Ac 21:27). If it be objected that the Jerusalem Christians seem to have done nothing to help Paul during his years of imprisonment, it can be said that there was little to be done in a legal way, as the matter was before the Roman courts very soon. The attack on Paul in the temple was while he was doing honor to the temple, engaged in actual worship offering sacrifices. But then Jews from Ephesus hated him so that they imagined that he had Greeks with him in the Jewish court, because they had seen him one day with Trophimus in the city (Ac 21:27). It is a splendid illustration of the blindness of prejudice and hate. It was absolutely untrue, and the men who raised the hue and cry in the temple against Paul as the desecrator of the holy place and the Law and the people disappear, and are never heard of more (Ac 24:18 f). But it will take Paul five years or more of the prime of his life to get himself out of the tangled web that will be woven about his head. Peril follows peril. He was almost mobbed, as often before, by the crowd that dragged him out of the temple (Ac 21:30 f). It would remind Paul of Stephen's fate. When the Roman captain rescued him and had him bound with two chains as a dangerous bandit, and had him carried by the soldiers to save his life, the mob yelled "Away with him" (Ac 21:36 f), as they had done to Jesus. After the captain, astonished that "Paul the Egyptian assassin" can speak Greek, grants him permission to stand on the steps of the tower of Antonia to speak to the mob that clamored for his blood, he held their rapt attention by an address in Aramaic (Ac 22:2) in which he gave a defense of his whole career. This they heard eagerly till he spoke the word "Gentiles," at which they raged more violently than ever (Ac 22:21). At this the captain has Paul tied with thongs, not understanding his Aramaic speech, and is about to scourge him when Paul pleads his Roman citizenship, to the amazement of the centurion (Ac 22:24). Almost in despair, the captain, wishing to know the charge of the Jews against Paul, brings him before the Sanhedrin. It is a familiar scene to Paul, and it is now their chance for settling old scores. Paul makes a sharp retort in anger to the high priest Ananias, for which he apologizes as if he was so angry that he had not noticed, but he soon divides the Sanhedrin hopelessly on the subject of the resurrection (compare the immunity of the

disciples on that issue when Gamaliel scored the Sadducees in Ac 5). This was turning the tables on his enemies, and was justifiable as war. He claimed to be a Pharisee on this point, as he was still, as opposed to the Sadducees. The result was that Paul had to be rescued from the contending factions, and the captain knew no more than he did before (Ac 23:1-10). That night "the Lord stood by him" and promised that he would go to Rome (Ac 23:11). That was a blessed hope. But the troubles of Paul are by no means over. By the skill of his nephew he escaped the murderous plot of 40 Jews who had taken a vow not to eat till they had killed Paul (Ac 23:12-24). They almost succeeded, but Claudius Lysias sent Paul in haste with a band of soldiers to Caesarea to Felix, the procurator, with a letter in which he claimed to have rescued Paul from the mob, "having learned that he was a Roman" (Ac 23:26-30). At any rate he was no longer in the clutches of the Jews. Would Roman provincial justice be any better? Felix follows a perfunctory course with Paul and shows some curiosity about Christianity, till Paul makes him tremble with terror, a complete reversal of situations (compare Pilate's meanness before Jesus). But love of money from Paul or the Jews leads Felix to keep Paul a prisoner for two years, though convinced of his innocence, and to hand him over to Festus, his successor, because the Jews might make things worse for him if he released him (Ac 24). The case of the Sanhedrin, who have now made it their own (or at least the Sadducean section), though pleaded by the Roman orator Tertullus, had fallen through as Paul calmly riddied their charges. Festus is at first at a loss how to proceed, but he soon follows the steps of Felix by offering to play into the hands of the Jewish leaders by sending Paul back to Jerusalem, whereupon Paul abruptly exercises his right of Roman citizenship by appealing to Caesar (Ac 25:1-12). This way, though a long one, offered the only ray of hope. The appearance of Paul before Agrippa and Bernice was simply by way of entertainment arranged by Festus to relieve his guests of ennui, but Paul seized the opportunity to make a powerful appeal to Agrippa that put him in a corner logically, though he wriggled out and declined to endorse Christianity, though confirming Paul's innocence, which Festus also had admitted (Ac 25:13-26:32). Paul was fortunate in the centurion Julius who took him to Rome, for he was kindly disposed to him at the start, and so it was all the way through the most remarkable voyage on record. Luke has surpassed his own record in Ac 27, in which he traces the voyage, stage by stage, with change of ship at Myra, delay at Fair Havens, Crete, and shipwreck on the island of Malta. More is learned about ancient seafaring from this chapter than from any other source (see the article PHOENIX, and Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul, 1866). In it all Paul is the hero, both on the ships and in Malta. In the early spring of 60 another ship takes Paul and the other prisoners to Puteoli. Thence they go on to Rome, and enter by the Appian Way. News of Paul's coming had gone on before (his epistle had come 3 years ago), and he had a hearty welcome. But he is now an imperial prisoner in the hands of Nero. He has more liberty in his own hired house (Ac 28:16,30), but he is chained always to a Roman soldier, though granted freedom to see his friends and to preach to the soldiers. Paul is anxious to remove any misapprehensions that the Jews in Rome may have about him, and tries to win them to Christ, and with partial success (Ac 28:17-28). And here Luke leaves him a prisoner for 2 years more, probably because at this point he finishes the Book of Acts. But, as we have seen, during these years in Rome, Paul wrote Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, and Ephesians. He still has the churches on his heart. They send messengers to him, and he writes back to them. The incipient Gnosticism of the East has pressed upon the churches at Colosse and Laodicea, and a new peril confronts Christianity. The Judaizing controversy has died away with these years (compare Php 3:1 ff for an echo of it), but the dignity and glory of Jesus are challenged. In the presence of the power of Rome Paul rises to a higher conception than even that of the person of Christ and the glory of the church

universal. In due time Paul's case was disposed of and he was once more set free. The Romans were proverbially dilatory. It is doubtful if his enemies ever appeared against him with formal charges.

10. Further Travels:

The genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles is here assumed. But for them we should know nothing further, save from a few fragments in the early Christian writings. As it is, some few who accept the Pastoral Epistles seek to place them before 64 AD, so as to allow for Paul's death in that year from the Neronian persecution. In that case, he was not released. There is no space here to argue the question in detail. We can piece together the probable course of events. He had expected when in Corinth last to go on to Spain (Ro 15:28), but now in Rome his heart turns back to the east again. He longs to see the Philippians (1:23 ff) and hopes to see Philemon in Colosse (Phm 1:22). But he may have gone to Spain also, as Clement of Rome seems to imply (Clement ad Cor 5), and as is stated in the Canon of Muratori. He may have been in Spain when Rome was burned July 19, 64 AD. There is no evidence that Paul went as far as Britain. On his return east he left Titus in Crete (Tit 1:5). He touched at Miletus when he left Trophimus sick (2Ti 4:20) and when he may have met Timothy, if he did not go on to Ephesus (1Ti 1:3). He stopped at Troas and apparently expected to come back here, as he left his cloak and books with Carpus (2Ti 4:13). He was on his way to Macedonia (1Ti 1:3), whence he writes Timothy in 65-67 a letter full of love and counsel for the future. Paul is apprehensive of the grave perils now confronting Christianity. Besides the Judaizers, the Gnostics, the Jews and the Romans, he may have had dim visions of the conflict with the mystery-religions. It was a syncretistic age, and men had itching ears. But Paul is full of sympathy and tender solicitude for Timothy, who must push on the work and get ready for it. Paul expects to spend the winter in Nicopolis (Tit 3:12), but is apparently still in Macedonia when he writes to Titus a letter on lines similar to those in 1 Timothy, only the note is sharper against Judaism of a certain type. We catch another glimpse of Apollos in Tit 3:13. Paul hits off the Cretans in 1:10 with a quotation from Epimenides, one of their own poetic prophets.

11. Last Imprisonment and Death:

68 (or 67) AD:

When Paul writes again to Timothy he has had a winter in prison, and has suffered greatly from the cold and does not wish to spend another winter in the Mamertine (probably) prison (2Ti 4:13,21). We do not know what the charges now are. They may have been connected with the burning of Rome. There were plenty of informers eager to win favor with Nero. Proof was not now necessary. Christianity is no longer a religio licita under the shelter of Judaism. It is now a crime to be a Christian. It is dangerous to be seen with Paul now, and he feels the desertion keenly (2Ti 1:15 ff; 4:10). Only Luke, the beloved physician, is with Paul (2Ti 4:11), and such faithful ones as live in Rome still in hiding (2Ti 4:21). Paul hopes that Timothy may come and bring Mark also (2Ti 4:11). Apparently Timothy did come and was put into prison (Heb 13:23). Paul is not afraid. He knows that he will die. He has escaped the mouth of the lion (2Ti 4:17), but he will die (2Ti 4:18). The Lord Jesus stood by him, perhaps in visible presence (2Ti 4:17). The tradition is, for now Paul fails us, that Paul, as a Roman citizen, was beheaded on the Ostian

Road just outside of Rome. Nero died June, 68 AD, so that Paul was executed before that date, perhaps in the late spring of that year (or 67). Perhaps Luke and Timothy were with him. It is fitting, as Findlay suggests, to let Paul's words in 2Ti 4:6-8 serve for his own epitaph. He was ready to go to be with Jesus, as he had long wished to be (Php 1:23).

PAUL, THE APOSTLE, 6

VI. Gospel.

I had purposed to save adequate space for the discussion of Paul's theology, but that is not now possible. A bare sketch must suffice. Something was said (see above on his epistles and equipment) about the development in Paul's conception of Christ and his message about Him. Paul had a gospel which he called his own (Ro 2:16). I cannot agree with the words of Deissmann (St. Paul, 6): "St. Paul theologian looks backward toward rabbinism. As a religious genius Paul's outlook is forward into a future of universal history." He did continue to use some rabbinical methods of argument, but his theology was not rabbinical. And he had a theology. He was the great apostle and missionary to the heathen. He was a Christian statesman with far-seeing vision. He was the loving pastor with the shepherd heart. He was the great martyr for Christ. He was the wonderful preacher of Jesus. But he was also "Paul theologian" (Garvie, Life and Teaching of Paul, chapter v) . There are two ways of studying his teaching. One is to take it by groups of the epistles, the purely historical method, and that has some advantages (compare Sabatier, The Apostle Paul). But at bottom Paul has the same message in each group, though with varying emphasis due to special exigencies. The same essential notes occur all through. The more common method, therefore, is to Study his gospel topically, using all the epistles for each topic. A measure of historical development may still be observed. Only the chief notes in Paul's gospel can be mentioned here. Even so, one must not turn to his epistles for a complete system of doctrine. The epistles are "occasional letters, pieces de circonstance" (Findlay, HDB), and they do not profess, not even Romans, to give a full summary of Christian doctrine. They are vital documents that throb with life. There is no theological manual in them. But Paul's gospel is adequately stated repeatedly. Paul's message is Christocentric. Jesus as Messiah he preached at once on his conversion (Ac 9:20,22). He knew already the current Jewish Messianism to which Jesus did not correspond. The acceptance of Jesus as He was (the facts about Him and teachings) revolutionized his Messianic conceptions, his view of God, and his view of man. "When he takes and uses the Messianic phraseology of his day, he fills it with a meaning new and rich" (Rostron, Christology of Paul, 31). Paul was not merely a new creature himself, but he had a new outlook: "Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more. Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation" (2Co 5:16-19). Perhaps no single passage in Paul's Epistles tells us more than this one of the change in Paul's theological conceptions wrought by his conversion. His view of Christ as the revealer of God (God in Christ) and the manifestation of love for men (of God, who reconciled us to Himself, reconciling the world to Himself) and the means (through Christ) by whom God is able to forgive our sins ("not

reckoning unto them their trespasses") on the basis of the atoning death of Christ ("wherefore"; for this see 2Co 5:14 f just before 5:16) with whom the believer has vital union ("in Christ") and who transforms the nature and views of the believer, is here thoroughly characteristic. Paul's passion is Christ (2Co 5:14; Php 1:21). To gain Christ (Php 3:8), to know Christ (Php 3:10), to be found in Christ (Php 3:9), to know Christ as the mystery of God (Col 2:2 f), to be hid with Christ in God (Col 3:3)—this with the new Paul is worth while. Thus Paul interprets God and man, by his doctrine of Christ. To him Jesus is Christ and Christ is Jesus. He has no patience with the incipient Cerinthian Gnosticism, nor with the docetic Gnosticism that denied the true humanity of Jesus. The real mystery of God is Christ, not the so-called mystery-religions. Christ has set us free from the bondage of ceremonial legalism. We are free from the curse of the law (Ga 3:13). Grace is the distinctive word for the gospel (Ro 3-5), but it must lead to sanctification (Ro 6-8), not license (Col 3). Paul's Christology is both theocentric and anthropocentric, but it is theocentric first. His notion of redemption is the love of God seeking a world lost in sin and finding love's way, the only way consonant with justice, in the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ His Son (Ro 3:21-31). The sinner comes into union with God in Christ by faith in Christ as Redeemer and Lord. Henceforth he lives to God in. Christ by the help of the Holy Spirit (Ro 8; Ga 5). Paul presents God as Father of all in one sense (Eph 4:6), but in a special sense of the believers in Christ (Ro 8:15 f). Jesus Christ is the incarnation of the pre-incarnate Son of God (2Co 8:9; Php 2:5-10), who is both God and man (Ro 1:3 f). With Paul the agent of creation is Jesus (Col 1:15 f), who is also the head of the church universal (Col 1:18; Eph 1:22 f). In the work of Christ Paul gives the central place to the cross (1Co 1:17 f; 2:2; Col 2:20; Eph 2:13-18). Sin is universal in humanity (Ro 1:18-3:20), but the vicarious death of Christ makes redemption possible to all who believe (Ro 3:21 ff; Ga 3:6-11). The redeemed constitute the kingdom of God or church universal, with Christ as head. Local bodies (churches) are the chief means for pushing the work of the kingdom. Paul knows two ordinances, both of which present in symbolic form the death of Christ for sin and the pledge of the believer to newness of life in Christ. These ordinances are baptism (Ro 6:1-11) and the Lord's Supper (1Co 11:17-34). If he knew the mystery-religions, they may have helped him by way of illustration to present his conception of the mystic union with Christ. Paul is animated by the hope of the second coming of Christ, which will be sudden (1Th 5:1-11) and not probably at once (2Th 2), but was to be considered as always imminent (1Th 5:2). Meanwhile, death brings us to Christ, which is a glorious hope to Paul (2Co 5:1-10; Php 1:21 ff; 2Ti 4:18). But, while Paul was a theologian in the highest and best sense of the term, the best interpreter of Christ to men, he was also an ethical teacher. He did not divorce ethics from religion. He insisted strongly on the spiritual experience of Christ as the beginning and the end of it all, as opposed to mere ritualistic ceremonies which had destroyed the life of Judaism. But all the more Paul demanded the proof of life as opposed to mere profession. See Ro 6-8 in particular. In most of the epistles the doctrinal section is followed by practical exhortations to holy living. Mystic as Paul was, the greatest of all mystics, he was the sanest of moralists and had no patience with hypocrites or licentious pietists or idealists who allowed sentimentalism and emotionalism to take the place of righteoushess. His notion of the righteousness demanded by God and given by God included both sanctification and justification. In the end, the sinner who for Christ's sake is treated as righteous must be righteous. Thus the image of God is restored in man by the regenerating work of the Spirit of God (2Co 3:18). Paul sees God in the face of Christ (2Co 4:6), and the vision of Christ brings God to all who see.

LITERATURE.

Out of the vast Pauline literature the following selections may be mentioned:

(1) General Works:

Addis, Christianity and the Roman Empire, 1893; Bartlet, The Apostolic Age, 1899; Bohlig, Die Geisteskultur yon Tarsos, 1913; Clemen, Primitive Christianity and Its Non-Jewish Sources, 1912; Cumont, Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism, 1911; Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 1910; Dewick, Primitive Christian Eschatology, 1912; Dollinger, Gentile and Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ, translation, 1862; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, 1882, Darkness and Dawn, 1893; Ferrero, Greatness and Decline of Rome, 1908; Friedlander, Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire; Glover, Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire, 1910; Gunkel, Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Verst. d. New Testament, 1903; Hausrath, Time of the Apostles, translation; Neander, Planting and Training of the Christian Church, translation; McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, 1897; Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 1893, Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia, 1895, The First Christian Century, 1911; Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 1910; Ropes, The Apostolic Age, 1906; Schurer, HJP; Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age in the Christian Church, 1894-95.

(2) Introductions:

E. Burton, Chronicle of Paul's Epistles; Clemen, Die Chron der Paulinischen Briefe, 1893, Die Einheitlichkeit der Paulinischen Briefe, 1894; Findlay, Epistles of Paul the Apostle, 1893; Gloag, Introduction to the Pauline Epistles, 1876; Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament, 1900; Herr, Prolegomena to Romans and Ephesians, 1895; Harnack, The Ac of the Apostles, 1909, Date of the Ac and the Synoptic Gospels, 1911, History of Early Christian Literature until Eusebius, 1897; Holtzmann, Einleitung3, 1892; James, Genuineness and Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles, 1906; Julicher, Introduction to the New Testament, 1903; Lake, Earlier Epistles of Paul, 1911; Moffatt, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 1911; Peake, Critical Introduction to the New Testament, 1909; Salmon, Introduction to the New Testament, 1892; R. Scott, Epistles of Paul, 1909; Shaw, The Pauline Epistles, 1903; von Soden, History of Early Christian Literature, 1906; B. Weiss, Present State of the Inquiry Concerning the Genuineness of Paul's Epistles, 1897; Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, 1909.

(3) Commentaries:

For exegetical commentaries on special epistles see special articles For the ancients see Chrysostom for the Greeks, and Pelagius for the Latins. For the Middle Ages see Thomas Aquinas. For the later time see Beza, Calvin, Colet, Estius, Grotius, Cornelius a Lapide, Wettstein, Bengel. Among the moderns note Alford, Beet (Romans-Colossians), Boise, Bible for Home and School, Cambridge Bible for Schools, Cambridge Greek Testament, New Century Bible; Drummond, Epistles of Paul, Ellicott (all but Romans and 2 Corinthians), Expositor's Bible, Expositor's Greek Testament; Holtzmann, Hand-Comm. zum New Testament; Jewett (1 and 2 Thessalonians, Romans, Galatians), Lightfoot (Galatians, Philippians,

Colossians, Philemon and Notes), Lietzmann, Handbuch zum New Testament; Meyer (translation, revised German editions), Zahn, Kommentar zum New Testament.

(4) Lives and Monographs:

Albrecht, Paulus der Apestel Jesu Christi, 1903; Bacon, The Story of Paul, 1904; Bartlet, article in Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition; Baring-Gould, A Study of Paul, 1897; Baur, The Apostle Paul(2), 1845; Bevan, Paul in the Light of Today, 1912; Bird, Paul of Tarsus, 1900; Campbell, Paul the Mystic, 1907; Chrysostom, Homiliae in Laude S. Pauli, Opera, volume II, edition Montf. (more critically in Field's edition); Clemen, Paulus, 1904; Cone, Paul the Man, the Missionary, 1898; Cohu, Paul in the Light of Recent Research, 1910; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul (many editions); Deissmann, Paul, 1912; Drescher, Das Leben Jesu bei Paulus, 1900; Drury, The Prison Ministry of Paul, 1910; Eadie, Paul the Preacher, 1859; Farrar, Life and Work of Paul (various editions); Erbes, Die Todestage der Apostel Paulus und Petrus, 1899; Fletcher, A Study of the Conversion of Paul, 1911; Forbes, Footsteps of Paul in Rome, 1899; Fouard, Paul and His Mission, 1894, Last Years of Paul, 1897; Gardner, Religious Experience of Paul, 1911; Garvie, Life and Teaching of Paul, 1909, Studies of Paul and His Gospel, 1911; Gilbert, Student's Life of Paul, 1899; Heim, Paulus, 1905; Honnicke, Chronologie des Lebens Pauli, 1904; Iverach, Paul, His Life and Time, 1890; Johnston, The Mission of Paul to the Roman Empire, 1909; M. Jones, Paul the Orator, 1910; Kennedy, Paul and the Mystery-Religions, 1913; Kohler, Zum Verstandnis d. Apostels Paulus, 1908; Lewin, Life and Epistles of Paul, 1875; Lock, Paul the Master Builder, 1905; Lyttleton, Observations on Saul's Conversion, 1774; Myers, Saint Paul (various editions); Matheson, Spiritual Development of Paul, 1891; Means, Paul and the Ante-Nicene Church, 1903; Noesgen, Paulus der Apostel der Heiden, 1908; Paley, Horae Paulinae, 1790; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 1896, Pauline and Other Studies, 1906, Cities of Paul, 1908, Luke the Physician and Other Studies, 1908, Pictures of the Apostolic Church, 1910; Renan, Paul, 1869; A. T. Robertson, Epochs in the Life of Paul, 1909, The Glory of the Ministry or Paul's Exultation in Preaching, 1911; Sabatier, The Apostle Paul, 1896; Selden, In the Time of Paul, 1900; Schweitzer, Paul and His Interpreters, 1912; Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul4, 1880; Speer, The Man Paul, 1900; Stalker, Life of Paul, 1889; Taylor, Paul the Missionary, 1882; Underhill, Divine Legation of Paul, 1889; Weinel, Paul (translation, 1906); Whyte, The Apostle Paul, 1903; Wilkinson, Epic of Saul, 1891, Epic of Paul, 1897; Wrede, Paulus(2), 1907 (translation); Wright, Cities of Paul, 1907; Wynne, Fragmentary Records of Jesus of Nazareth by a Contemporary, 1887.

(5) Teaching:

A.B.D. Alexander, The Ethics of Paul, 1910; S.A. Alexander, Christianity of Paul, 1899; Anonymous, The Fifth Gospel, 1906; R. Allen, Christelegy of Paul, 1912; M. Arnold, Paul and Protestantism, 1897; Ball, Paul and the Roman Law, 1901; Breitenstein, Jesus et Paul, 1908; Bruce, Paul's Conception of Christianity, 1898; Bruckner, Die Entstehung der Paulinischen Christologie, 1903; Bultmann, Der Stil der Paulin. Predigt und die kyn. Diatribe, 1910; Chadwick, Social Teaching of Paul, 1907, Pastoral Teaching of Paul, 1907; M. Dibelius, Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, 1909; Dickie, Culture of the Spiritual Life, 1905; Dickson, Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit, 1883; Du Bose, Gospel according to Paul, 1907; Dykes, Gospel according to Paul, 1888; Everett, Gospel of Paul, 1893; Feine,

Paul as Theologian (translation, 1908); Greenough, Mind of Christ in Paul; Goguel, L'Apotre Paul et Jesus Christ, 1904; Harford, The Gospel according to Paul, 1912; Hicks, "St. Paul and Hellenism," Stud. Bibl., IV; Holsten, Das Evangelium des Paulus, 1898; Julicher, Paulus und Jesus, 1907; Kaftan, Jesus und Paulus, 1906; Kennedy, Paul's Conceptions of Last Things, 1904; Knowling, Testimony of Paul to Christ (3rd edition, 1911); A. Meyer, Jesus or Paul? 1909; Moffatt, Paul and Paulinism, 1910; Montet, Essai sur la christologie de Saint Paul, 1906; Nageli, Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus, 1905; Oehler, Paulus und Jesus, 1908; Paterson, The Pauline Theology, 1903; Pfleidercr, Paulinismus, 1873, Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity, 1885; Prat, La theologie de Saint Paul, 1907; Ramsay, The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day, 1913; Resch, Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu, 1904; Rostron, The Christology of Paul, 1912; Simon, Die Psychologie des Apostels Paulus, 1897; Somerville, Paul's Conception of Christ, 1897; Stevens, The Pauline Theology, 1894; Thackeray, Relation of Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought, 1900; J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, 1909; Paul and Justification, 1913; Williams, A Plea for a Reconstruction of Paul's Doctrine of Justification, 1912; Wustmann, Jesus und Paulus, 1907; Zahn, Das Gesetz Gottes nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus(2), 1892.

A. T. Robertson

PAUL, VOYAGE AND SHIPWRECK OF

See PAUL, THE APOSTLE, V, 9; PHOENIX.

PAULINE THEOLOGY

pol'-in:

I. THE PREPARATION

1. The Pharisee

2. Saul and Sin

3. Primitive Christianity

II. THE CONVERSION

1. Christ

2. The Spirit

3. The Unio Mystica

4. Salvation

5. Justification

III. FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS

1. Abolition of the Law

2. Gentiles

3. Redemption

4. Atonement

5. Moral Example

6. Function of the Law

IV. SPECIAL TOPICS

1. The Church

2. The Sacraments

I. The Preparation.

In order to understand the development of Paul's theological system, it is necessary to begin with his beliefs as a Pharisee. The full extent of these beliefs, to be sure, is not now ascertainable, for Pharisaism was a rule of conduct rather than a system of dogmas, and great diversity of opinions existed among Pharisees. Yet there was general concurrence in certain broad principles, while some of Paul's own statements enable us to specify his beliefs still more closely.

1. The Pharisee:

Saul the Pharisee believed that God was One, the Creator of all things. In His relation to His world He was transcendent, and governed it normally through His angels. Certain of these angelic governors had been unfaithful to their trust and had wrought evil, although God still permitted them to bear rule for a time (Col 2:15; compare Enoch 89:65). And evil had come into humanity through the transgression of the first man (Ro 5:12; compare 2 Esdras 7:118). To lead men away from this evil God gave His Law, which was a perfect revelation of duty (Ro 7:12), and this Law was illumined by the traditions of the Fathers, which the Pharisees felt to be an integral part of the Law itself. God was merciful and would pardon the offender against the Law, if he completely amended his ways. But imperfect reformation brought no certain hope of pardon. To a few specially favored individuals God had given the help of His

Spirit, but this was not for the ordinary individual. The great majority of mankind (compare 2 Esdras 7:49-57), including all Gentiles, had no hope of salvation. In a very short time the course of the world would be closed. With God, from before the beginning of creation, there was existing a heavenly being, the Son of man of Da 7:13, and He was about to be made manifest. (That Saul held the transcendental Messianic doctrine is not to be doubted.) As the world was irredeemably bad, this Messiah would soon appear, cause the dead to rise, hold the Last Judgment and bring from heaven the "Jerus that is above" (Ga 4:26), in which the righteous would spend a blessed eternity.

See PHARISEES; MESSIAH; PAROUSIA.

2. Saul and Sin:

Ro 7:7-25 throws a further light on Saul's personal beliefs. The Old Testament promised pardon to the sinner who amended his ways, but the acute moral sense of Saul taught him that he could never expect perfectly to amend his ways. The 10th Commandment was the stumbling-block. Sins of deed and of word might perhaps be overcome, but sins of evil desires stayed with him, despite his full knowledge of the Law that branded them as sinful. Indeed, they seemed stimulated rather than suppressed by the divine precepts against them. With the best will in the world, Saul's efforts toward perfect righteousness failed continually and gave no promise of ever succeeding. He found himself thwarted by something that he came to realize was ingrained in his very nature and from which he could never free himself. Human nature as it is, the flesh (not "the material of the body"), contains a taint that makes perfect reformation impossible (Ro 7:18; compare Ro 8:3, etc.). Therefore, as the Law knows no pardon for the imperfectly reformed, Saul felt his future to be absolutely black. What he longed for was a promise of pardon despite continued sin, and that the Law precluded. (Any feeling that the temple sacrifices. would bring forgiveness had long since been obsolete in educated Judaism.)

There is every reason to suppose that Saul's experience was not unique at this period. Much has been written in recent years about the Jews' confidence in God's mercy, and abundant quotations are brought from the Talmud in support of this. But the surviving portions of the literature of the Daniel-Aqiba period (165 BC-135 AD) give a different impression, for it is predominantly a literature of penitential prayers and confessions of sin, of pessimism regarding the world, the nation and one's self. In 2 Esdras, in particular, Saul's experience is closely paralleled, and 2 Esdras 7 (of course not in the King James Version) is one of the best commentaries ever written on Ro 7.

3. Primitive Christianity:

Saul must have come in contact with Christianity very soon after Pentecost, at the latest. Some personal acquaintance with Christ is in no way impossible, irrespective of the meaning of 2Co 5:16. But no one in Jerusalem, least of all a man like Saul, could have failed tq learn very early that there was a new "party" in Judaism. To his eyes this "party" would have about the following appearance: Here was a band of men proclaiming that the Messiah, whom all expected, would be the Jesus who had recently been crucified. Him the disciples were preaching as risen, ascended and sitting on God's right hand. They

claimed that He had sent on all His followers the coveted gift of the Spirit, and they produced miracles in proof of their claim. A closer investigation would show that the death of Jesus was being interpreted in terms of Isa 53, as a ransom for the nation. The inquirer would learn also that Jesus had given teaching that found constant and relentless fault with the Pharisees. Moreover, He had swept aside the tradition of the Fathers as worthless and had given the Law a drastic reinterpretation on the basis of eternal spiritual facts.

This inwardness must have appealed to Saul and he must have envied the joyous enthusiasm of the disciples. But to him Pharisaism was divine, and he was in a spiritual condition that admitted of no compromxses. Moreover, the Law (Ga 3:13; compare De 21:23) cursed anyone who had been hanged on a tree, and the new party was claiming celestial Messiahship for a man who had met this fate. The system aroused Saul's burning hatred; he appointed himself (perhaps stimulated by his moral desperation) to exterminate the new religion, and in pursuit of his mission he started for Damascus.

Saul must have gained a reasonable knowledge of Christ's teachings in this period of antagonism. He certainly could not have begun to persecute the faith without learning what it was, and in the inevitable discussions with his victims he must have learned still more, even against his will. This fact is often overlooked.

II. The Conversion.

1. Christ:

The immediate content of Paul's conversion was the realization that the celestial Messiah was truly Jesus of Nazareth. This was simply the belief of the primitive church and was the truth for which Christ had died (Mr 14:62). But it involved much. It made Christ the Son of God (Ro 8:32; Ga 4:4, etc.), "firstborn of (i.e. "earlier than") all creation" (Col 1:15), "existing in the form of God" (Php 2:6) and "rich" (2Co 8:9). In the Messiah are "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge hidden" (Col 2:3), to be manifested at the end of time when the Messiah shall appear as the Judge of all (2Co 5:10, etc.), causing the resurrection of the dead (1Co 15:45, etc.). All this was given by Paul's former beliefs and had been claimed by Christ for Himself. That this Messiah had become man was a fact of the immediate past (the reality of the manhood was no problem at this period). As Messiah His sinlessness was unquestioned, while the facts of His life proved this sinlessness also. His teaching was wholly binding (1Co 7:10,11; that the writer of these words could have spared any effort to learn the teaching fully is out of the question). The conversion experience was proof sufficient of the resurrection, although for missionary purposes Paul used other evidence as well (1Co 15:1-11).

Faith in this Messiah brought the unmistakable experience of the Holy Spirit (Ro 8:2; Ga 3:2, etc.; compare Ac 9:17), demonstrating Christ's Lordship (1Co 12:3; compare Ac 2:33). So "the head of every man is Christ" (1Co 11:3; compare Col 1:18; Eph 1:22; 4:15), with complete control of the future (1Co 15:25), and all righteous men are His servants ("slaves," Ro 1:1, etc.). To Him men may address their prayers (2Co 12:8; 1Co 1:2, etc.; compare Ac 14:23).

Further reflection added to the concepts. As the Lordship of Christ was absolute, the power of all hostile beings must have been broken also (Ro 8:38; Php 2:9-11; Col 2:15; Eph 1:21-23, etc.). The Being who had such significance for the present and the future could not have been without significance for the past. "In all things" He must have had "the preeminence" (Col 1:18). It was He who ministered to the Israelites at the Exodus (1Co 10:4,9). In fact He was not only "before all things" (Col 1:17), but "all things have been created through him" (Col 1:16). Wisdom and Logos concepts may have helped Paul in reaching these conclusions, which in explicit statement are an advance on Christ's own words. But the conclusions were inevitable.

Fitting these data of religious fact into the metaphysical doctrine of God was a problem that occupied the church for the four following centuries. After endless experimenting the only conclusion was shown to be that already reached by Paul in Ro 9:5 (compare Tit 2:13, the English Revised Version, the American Revised Version margin), that Christ is God. To be sure, Paul's terminology, carried over from his pre-Christian days, elsewhere reserves "God" for the Father (and compare 1Co 15:28). But the fact of this theology admits only of the conclusion that was duly drawn.

2. The Spirit:

A second fact given directly by the conversion was the presence of the Spirit, where the actual experience transcended anything that had been dreamed of. Primarily the operation of the Spirit was recognized in vividly supernatural effects (Ro 15:19; 1Co 12:5-11, etc.; compare 2Co 12:12; Ac 2:4), but Paul must at first have known the presence of the Spirit through the assurance of salvation given him, a concept that he never wearies of expressing (Ro 8:16,23; Ga 4:6, etc.). The work of the Spirit in producing holiness in the soul needs no comment (see HOLY SPIRIT; SANCTIFICATION), but it is characteristic of Paul that it is on this part of the Spirit's activity, rather than on the miraculous effects, that he lays the emphasis. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace," etc. (Ga 5:22); the greatest miracles without love are more than useless (1Co 13:1-3); in such sayings Paul touched the depths of the purest teaching of Christ. To be sure, in the Synoptic Gospels the word "Spirit" is not often on Christ's lips, but there is the same conception of a life proceeding from a pure center (Mt 6:22; 7:17, etc.) in entire dependence on God.

Further reflection and observation taught Paul something of the greatest importance for Christian theology. In prayer the Spirit appeared distinguished from the Father as well as from the Son (Ro 8:26 f; compare 1Co 2:10 f), giving three terms that together express the plenitude of the Deity (2Co 13:14; Eph 1:3,6,13, etc.), with no fourth term ever similarly associated.

See TRINITY.

3. The Unio Mystica:

The indwelling of the divine produced by the Spirit is spoken of indifferently as the indwelling of the Spirit, or of the Spirit of Christ, or of Christ Himself (all three terms in Ro 8:9-11; compare 1Co 2:12;

Ga 4:6; Eph 3:17, etc.). The variations are in part due to the inadequacy of the Old terminology (so 2Co 3:17), in part to the nature of the subject. Distinctions made between the operations of the persons of the Trinity on the soul can never be much more than verbal, and the terms are freely interchangeable. At all events, through the Spirit Christ is in the believer (Ro 8:10; Ga 2:20; 4:19; Eph 3:17), or, what is the same thing, the believer is in Christ (Ro 6:11; 8:1; 16:7, etc.). "We have become united with him" (Ro 6:5, sumphutoi, "grown together with") in an union once and for all effected (Ga 3:27) and yet always to be made more intimate (Ro 13:14). The union so accomplished makes the man "a new creature" (2Co 5:17).

4. Salvation:

Paul now saw within himself a dual personality. His former nature, the old man, still persisted, with its impulses, liability to temptation, and inertnesses. The "flesh" still existed (Ga 5:17; Ro 8:12; 13:14; Eph 4:22; Php 3:12, etc.). On the other hand there was fighting in him against this former nature nothing less than the whole power of Christ, and its final victory could not be uncertain for a moment (Ro 6:12; 8:2,10; Ga 5:16, etc.). Indeed, it is possible to speak of the believer as entirely spiritual (Ro 6:11,22; 8:9, etc.), as already in the kingdom (Col 1:13), as already sitting in heavenly places (Eph 2:6). Of course Paul had too keen an appreciation of reality to regard believers as utterly sinless (Php 3:12, etc.), and his pages abound in reproofs and exhortations. But the present existence of remnants of sin had no final terrors, for the ultimate victory over sin was certain, even if it was not to be complete until the last day when the power of God would redeem even the present physical frame (Ro 8:11; Php 3:21, etc.).

As the first man to belong to’the higher order, and as the point from which the race could take a fresh start, Christ could justly be termed a new Adam (1Co 15:45-49; compare Ro 5:12-21). If Cor 15:46 has any relation to the PhiIonic doctrine of the two Adams, it is a polemic against it. Such a polemic would not be unlikely.

5. Justification:

A most extraordinary fact, to the former Pharisee, was that this experience had been gained without conscious effort and even against conscious effort (Php 3:7 f). After years of fruitless striving a single act of self-surrender had brought him an assurance that he had despaired of ever attaining. And this act of self-surrender is what Paul means by "faith," "faith without works." This faith is naturally almost anything in the world rather than a mere intellectual acknowledgment of a fact (Jas 2:19), and is an act of the whole man, too complex for simple analysis. It finds, however, its perfect statement in Christ’s reference to ‘receiving the kingdom of God as a little child’ (Mr 10:15). By an act of simple yielding Paul found himself no longer in dread of his sins; he was at peace with God, and confident as to his future; in a word, "justified." In one sense, to be sure, "works" were still involved, for without the past struggles the result would never have been attained. A desire, however imperfect, to do right is a necessary preparation for justification, and the word has no meaning to a man satisfied to be sunk in complete selfishness (Ro 6:2; 3:8, etc.). This desire to do right, which Paul always presupposes, and the content given "faith" are sufficient safeguards against antinomianism. But the grace given is in no way

commensurate with past efforts, nor does it grow out of them. It is a simple gift of God (Ro 6:23).

III. Further Developments.

1. Abolition of the Law:

The adoption by Paul of the facts given by his conversion (and the immediate conclusions that followed from them) involved, naturally, a readjustment and a reformation of the other parts of his belief. The process must have occupied some time, if it was ever complete during his life, and must have been affected materially by his controversies with his former co-religionists and with very many Christians.

Fundamental was the problem of the Law. The Law was perfectly clear that he—and only he—who performed it would live. But life was found through faith in Christ, while the Law was not fulfilled. There could be no question of compromise between the two positions; they were simply incompatible (Ro 10:5 f; Ga 2:16; 3:11 f; Php 3:7). One conclusion only was possible: "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth" (Ro 10:4). As far as concerned the believer, the Law was gone. Two tremendous results followed. One was the immense simplification of what we call "Christian ethics," which were now to be determined by the broadest general principles of right and wrong and no longer by an elaborate legalistic construing of God's commands (Ro 13:8-10; Ga 5:22 f, etc.; compare Mr 12:29-31). To be sure, the commandments might be quoted as convenient expressions of moral duty (Eph 6:2; 1Co 9:9, etc.; compare Mr 10:19), but they are binding because they are right, not because they are commandments (Col 2:16). So, in Paul's moral directions, he tries to bring out always the principle involved, and Ro 14 and 1Co 8 are masterpieces of the treatment of concrete problems by this method.

2. Gentiles:

The second result of the abolition of the Law was overwhelming. Gentiles had as much right to Christ as had the Jews, barring perhaps the priority of honor (Ro 3:2, etc.) possessed by the latter. It is altogether conceivable, as Ac 22:21 implies, that Paul's active acceptance of this result was long delayed and reached only after severe struggles. The fact was utterly revolutionary, and although it was prophesied in the Old Testament (Ro 9:25 f), yet 'the Messiah among you Gentiles' remained the hidden mystery that God had revealed only in the last days (Col 1:26 f; Eph 3:3-6, etc.). The struggles of the apostle in defense of this principle are the most familiar part of his career.

3. Redemption:

This consciousness of deliverance from the Law came to Paul in another way. The Law was meant for men in this world, but the union with Christ had raised him out of this world and so taken him away from the Law's control. In the Epistles this fact finds expression in an elaborately reasoned form. As Christ's nature is now a vital part of our nature, His death and resurrection are facts of our past as well. "Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God" (Col 3:3). But "the law hath dominion over a man"

only "for so long time as he liveth" (Ro 7:1). "Wherefore, my brethren, ye also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ" (Ro 7:4). Compare Col 2:11-13,20, where the same argument is used to show that ritual observance is no longer necessary. In Ro 6:1-14 this argument is made to issue in a practical exhortation. Through the death of Christ, which is our death (6:4), we, like Him, are placed in a higher world (6:5) where sin has lost its power (6:7), a world in which we are no longer under Law (6:14). Hence, the intensest moral effort becomes our duty (6:13; compare 2Co 5:14 f).

4. Atonement:

This release from the Law, however, does not solve the whole problem. Evil, present and past, is a fact, Law or no Law (on Ro 4:15 b; 5:13b; see the comms.), and a forbearance of God that simply "passes over" sins is disastrous for man as well as contrary to the righteous nature of God (Ro 3:25 f). However inadequate the Old Testament sacrifices were felt to have been (and hence, perhaps, Paul's avoidance of the Levitical terms except in Eph 5:2), yet they offered the only help possible for the treatment of this most complex of problems. The guilt of our sins is "covered" by the death of Christ (1Co 15:3, where this truth is among those which were delivered to converts "first of all"; Ro 3:25; 4:25; 5:6, etc.). This part of his theology Paul leaves in an incomplete form. He was accustomed, like any other man of his day, whether Jew or Gentile, to think naturally in sacrificial terms, and neither he nor his converts were conscious of any difficulty involved. Nor has theology since his time been able to contribute much toward advancing the solution of the problem. The fatal results of unchecked evil, its involving of the innocent with the guilty, and the value of vicarious suffering, are simple facts of our experience that defy our attempts to reduce them to intellectual formulas. In Paul's case it is to be noted that he views the incentive as coming from God (Ro 3:25; 5:8; 8:32, etc.), because of His love toward man, so that a "gift-propitiation" of an angry deity is a theory the precise opposite of the Pauline. Moreover, Christ's death is not a mere fact of the past, but through the "mystical union" is incorporated into the life of every believer.

Further developments of this doctrine about Christ's death find in it the complete destruction of whatever remained of the Law (Col 2:14), especially as the barrier between Jew and Gentile (Eph 2:15 f). The extension of the effects of the death to the unseen world (Col 2:15; compare Ga 4:9; Eph 4:8) was of course natural.

5. Moral Example:

The death of Christ as producing a subjective moral power in the believer is appealed to frequently (compare Ro 8:3; Ga 2:20; Eph 5:2,25; Php 2:5, etc.), while the idea is perhaps present to some degree even in Ro 3:26. From a different point of view, the Cross as teaching the vanity of worldly things is a favorite subject with Paul (1Co 1:22-25; 2Co 13:4; Ga 5:11; 6:14, etc.). These aspects require no explanation.

There are, accordingly, in Paul's view of the death of Christ at least three distinct lines, the "mystical," the "juristic," and the "ethical." But this distinction is largely only genetic and logical, and the lines tend

to blend in all sorts of combinations. Consequently, it is frequently an impossible exegetical problem to determine which is most prominent in any given passage (e.g. 2Co 5:14 f).

6. Function of the Law:

Regarding the Law a further question remained, which had great importance in Paul's controversies. If the Law was useless for salvation, why was it given at all? Paul replies that it still had its purpose. To gain righteousness one must desire it and this desire the Law taught (Ro 7:12,16; 2:18), even though it had no power to help toward fulfillment. So the Law gave knowledge of sin (Ro 3:20; 7:7). But Paul did not hesitate to go beyond this. Familiar in his own experience with the psychological truth that a prohibition may actually stimulate the desire to transgress it, he showed that the Law actually had the purpose of bringing out all the dormant evil within us, that grace might deal with it effectually (Ro 5:20 f; 7:8,25; compare 1Co 15:56). Thus the Law became our paidagogos "to bring us unto Christ" (Ga 3:24; see SCHOOLMASTER), and came in "besides" (Ro 5:20), i.e. as something not a primary part of God's plan. Indeed, this could be shown from the Law itself, which proved that faith was the primary method of salvation (Ro 4; compare Ga 3:17) and which actually prophesied its own repeal (Ga 4:21-31). With this conclusion, which must have required much time to work out, Paul's reversal of his former Pharisaic position was complete.

IV. Special Topics.

1. The Church:

As Christ is the central element in the life of the believer, all believers have this element in common and are so united with each other (Ro 12:5). This is the basis of the Pauline doctrine of the church. The use of the word "church" to denote the whole body of believers is not attained until the later Epistles (Col 1:18; Php 3:6; Eph 1:22, etc.)—before that time the word is in the plural when describing more than a local congregation (2Th 1:4; 1Co 7:17; Ro 16:16, etc.)—but the idea is present from the first. Indeed, the only terms in Judaism that were at all adequate were "the nation" or "Israel." Paul uses the latter term (Ga 6:16) and quite constantly expresses himself in a manner that suggests the Old Testament figures for the nation (e.g. compare Eph 5:25 with Ho 2:19 f), and time was needed in order to give ekklesia (properly "assembly") the new content.

The church is composed of all who have professed faith in Christ and the salvation of its members Paul takes generally for granted (1Th 1:4; Ro 1:7; 1Co 1:8, etc.), even in the case of the incestuous person of 1Co 5:5 (compare 3:15; 11:32). To be sure, 1Co 5:11-13 makes it clear that the excommunication of grave sinners had been found necessary, and one may doubt if Paul had much hope for the "false brethren" of 2Co 11:26; Ga 2:4 (compare 1Co 3:17, etc.). But on the whole Paul's optimism has little doubt that every member of the church is in right relations with God. These members, through their union with Christ, form a corporate, social organism of the greatest possible solidarity (1Co 12:26, etc.) and have the maximum of responsibility toward one another (Ro 14:15; 1Co 8:11; 2Co 8:13-15; Ga 6:2; Eph 4:25; Col 1:24, etc.). They are utterly distinct from the world around them (2Co 6:14-18; 1Co 5:12,

etc.), although in constant intercourse with it (1Co 5:10; 10:27, etc.). It was even desirable, in the conditions of the times, that the church should have her own courts like Jews in Gentilecities (1Co 6:5 f). The right of the church to discipline her members is taken for granted (1Co 5; 2Co 2:5-11). According to Ac 14:23 Paul made his own appointments of church officers, but the Epistles as a whole would suggest that this practice did not extend beyond Asia Minor. For further details see CHURCH GOVERNMENT; MINISTRY. A general obedience to Paul's own authority is presupposed throughout.

The church is, of course, the object of Christ's sanctifying power (Eph 5:25-30) and is so intimately united with Him as to be spoken of as His "body" (1Co 12:27; Col 1:18; Eph 1:23, etc.), or as the "complement" of Christ, the extension of His personality into the world (Eph 1:22 f). As such, its members have not only their duty toward one another, but also the responsibility of carrying Christ's message into the world (Php 2:15 f, and presupposed everywhere). And to God shall "be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations forever and ever" (Eph 3:21).

2. The Sacraments:

As the union with Christ's death is something more than a subjective impression made on the mind by the fact of that death, the references to the union with the death accomplished in baptism in Ro 6:1-7 and Col 2:11 f are not explained by supposing them to describe a mere dramatic ceremony. That Paul was really influenced by the mystery-religion concepts has not been made out. But his readers certainly were so influenced and tended to conceive very materialistic views of the Christian sacraments (1Co 10:5; 15:29). And historic exegesis is bound to construe Paul's language in the way in which he knew his readers would be certain to understand it, and no ordinary Gentile reader of Paul's day would have seen a purely "symbolic" meaning in either of the baptismal passages. Philo would have done so, but not the class of men with whom Paul had to deal. Similarly, with regard to the Lord's Supper, in 1Co 10:20 Paul teaches that through participation in a sacral meal it is possible to be brought into objective relations with demons of whom one is wholly ignorant. In this light it is hard to avoid the conclusion that through participation in the Lord's Supper the believer is objectively brought into communion with the Lord (1Co 10:16), a communion that will react for evil on the believer if he approach it in an unworthy manner (1Co 11:29-32): i.e. the union with Christ that is the center of Paul's theology he teaches to be established normally through baptism. And in the Lord's Supper this union is further strengthened. That faith on the part of the believer is an indispensable prerequisite for the efficacy of the sacraments need not be said.

See, further, GOD; PAROUSIA; PRAYER; PREDESTINATION; PROPITIATION, etc.

LITERATURE.

See under PAUL.

Burton Scott Easton

PAULUS, SERGIUS

po’-lus, sur’-ji-us (Sergios Paulos): The Roman "proconsul" (Revised Version) or "deputy" (the King James Version) of Cyprus when Paul, along with Barnabas, visited that island on his first missionary journey (Ac 13:4,7). The official title of Sergius is accurately given in Acts. Cyprus was originally an imperial province, but in 22 BC it was transferred by Augustus to the Senate, and was therefore placed under the administration of proconsuls, as is attested by extant Cyprian coins of the period. When the two missionaries arrived at Paphos, Sergius, who was a "prudent man" (the King James Version) or "man of understanding" (Revised Version), i.e. a man of practical understanding, "sought to hear the word of God" (Ac 13:7). Bar-Jesus, or Elymas, a sorcerer at the court of Sergius, fearing the influence of the apostles, sought, however, "to turn aside the proconsul from the faith," but was struck with blindness (Ac 13:8-11); and the deputy, "when he saw what was done, believed, being astonished at the teaching of the Lord" (Ac 13:12). The narrative indicates that not only the miracle but also the attention with which Sergius listened to the teaching of Paul (compare Ac 13:7) conduced to his conversion (Bengel). Attempts have been made to trace some connection between the name Sergius Paulus and the fact that Saul is first called Paul in Ac 13:9, but the joint occurrence of the two names is probably to be set down as only a coincidence.

C. M. Kerr

PAVEMENT

pav’-ment: In the Old Testament, with the exception of 2Ki 16:17, the Hebrew word is ritspah (2Ch 7:3; Es 1:6; Eze 40:17, etc.); in Sirach 20:18 and Bel and the Dragon verse 19 the word is edaphos; in Joh 19:13, the name "The Pavement" (lithostrotos, "paved with stone") is given to the place outside the Pretorium on which Pilate sat to give judgment upon Jesus. Its Hebrew (Aramaic) equivalent is declared to be GABBATHA (which see). The identification of the place is uncertain.

PAVILION

pa-vil’-yun: A covered place, booth, tent, in which a person may be kept hid or secret (cokh, Ps 27:5; cukkah—the usual term—Ps 31:20), or otherwise be withdrawn from view. The term is used with reference to God (2Sa 22:12; Ps 18:11); to kings drinking in privacy (1Ki 20:12,16); the Revised Version (British and American) gives "pavilion" for the King James Version "tabernacle" in Job 36:29; Isa 4:6; while in Nu 25:8 it substitutes this word, with the margin "alcove," for the King James Version "tent" (qubbah), and Jer 43:10, for "royal pavilion" (shaphrur), reads in the margin "glittering pavilion."

James Orr

PAW

po (kaph, literally, "palm," yadh, literally, "hand"): The former (kaph) is applied to the soft paws of animals in contradistinction to the hoofs (Le 11:27); the latter is thrice used in 1Sa 17:37: "Yahweh that delivered me out of the paw (yadh) of the lion, and out of the paw (yadh) of the bear, he will deliver me out of the hand (yadh) of this Philistine." The verb "to paw" (chaphar) is found in the description of the horse: "He paweth (margin "they paw") in the valley, and rejoiceth in his strength: he goeth out to meet the armed men (margin, "the weapons")" (Job 39:21). The word is usually translated "to delve into," "to pry into," "to explore."

H. L. E. Luering

PE

pa "p": The 17th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "p" with daghesh and "ph" (equals f) without. It came also to be used for the number 80. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

PEACE

pes (shalom; eirene):

1. In the Old Testament:

Is a condition of freedom from disturbance, whether outwardly, as of a nation from war or enemies, or inwardly, within the soul. The Hebrew word is shalom (both adjective and substantive), meaning, primarily, "soundness," "health," but coming also to signify "prosperity," well-being in general, all good in relation to both man and God. In early times, to a people harassed by foes, peace was the primary blessing. In Ps 122:7, we have "peace" and "prosperity," and in 35:27; 73:3, shalom is translated "prosperity." In 2Sa 11:7 the King James Version, David asked of Uriah "how Joab did" (margin "of the peace of Joab"), "and how the people did (the Revised Version (British and American) "fared," literally, "of the peace of the people"), and how the war prospered" (literally, "and of the peace (welfare) of the war").

(1) Shalom was the common friendly greeting, used in asking after the health of anyone; also in farewells (Ge 29:6, "Is it well with him?" ("Is there peace to him?"); 43:23, "Peace be to you"; 43:27, "He asked them of their welfare (of their peace)"; Jud 6:23, "Yahweh said unto him, Peace be unto thee"; 18:15 (the King James Version "saluted him," margin "Hebrew asked him of peace," the Revised Version (British and American) "of his welfare"); Jud 19:20, etc.). See also GREETING.

(2) Peace from enemies (implying prosperity) was the great desire of the nation and was the gift of God to the people if they walked in His ways (Le 26:6; Nu 6:26, "Yahweh lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace"; Ps 29:11; Isa 26:12, etc.). To "die in peace" was greatly to be desired (Ge 15:15; 1Ki 2:6; 2Ch 34:28, etc.).

(3) Inward peace was the portion of the righteous who trusted in God (Job 22:21, "Acquaint now thyself with him, and be at peace (shalam)"; Ps 4:8; 85:8, "He will speak peace unto his people, and to his saints"; 119:165; Pr 3:2,17; Isa 26:3, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace (Hebrew "peace, peace"), whose mind is stayed on thee; because he trusteth in thee"; Mal 2:5); also outward peace (Job 5:23,24; Pr 16:7, etc.).

(4) Peace was to be sought and followed by the righteous (Ps 34:14, "Seek peace, and pursue it"; Zec 8:16,19, "Love truth and peace").

(5) Peace should be a prominent feature of the Messianic times (Isa 2:4; 9:6, "Prince of Peace"; Isa 11:6; Eze 34:25; Mic 4:2-4; Zec 9:10).

In the New Testament, where eirene has much the same meaning and usage as shalom (for which it is employed in the Septuagint; compare Lu 19:42, the Revised Version (British and American) "If thou hadst known .... the things which belong unto peace"), we have still the expectation of "peace" through the coming of the Christ (Lu 1:74,79; 12:51) and also its fulfillment in the higher spiritual sense.

2. In the New Testament:

(1) The gospel in Christ is a message of peace from God to men (Lu 2:14; Ac 10:36, "preaching .... peace by Jesus Christ"). It is "peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," in Ro 5:1; the King James Version 10:15; peace between Jew and Gentile (Eph 2:14,15); an essential element in the spiritual kingdom of God (Ro 14:17).

(2) It is to be cherished and followed by Christians. Jesus exhorted His disciples, "Have salt in yourselves, and be at peace one with another" (Mr 9:50); Paul exhorts, "Live in peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you" (2Co 13:11; compare Ro 12:18; 1Co 7:15).

(3) God is therefore "the God of peace," the Author and Giver of all good ("peace" including every blessing) very frequently (e.g. Ro 15:33; 16:20; 2Th 3:16, etc., "the Lord of peace"). "Peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ" is a common apostolic wish or salutation (compare 1Co 1:3; 2Co 1:2, etc.).

(4) We have also "peace" as a greeting (Mt 10:13; Lu 10:5); "a son of peace" (Lu 10:6) is one worthy of it, in sympathy with it; the Lord’s own greeting to His disciples was "Peace be unto you" (Lu 24:36; Joh 20:19,21,26), and ere He left them He gave them specially His blessing of "Peace" (Joh 14:27); we have also frequently "Go in peace" (Mr 5:34; Lu 7:50). In Lu 19:38, we have "peace in heaven" (in the acclamation of Jesus on His Messianic entry of Jerusalem).

(5) The peace that Christ brought is primarily spiritual peace from and with God, peace in the heart, peace as the disposition or spirit. He said that He did not come "to send peace on the earth, but a sword," referring to the searching nature of His call and the divisions and clearances it would create. But, of

course, the spirit of the gospel and of the Christian is one of peace, and it is a Christian duty to seek to bring war and strife everywhere to an end. This is represented as the ultimate result of the gospel and Spirit of Christ; universal and permanent peace can come only as that Spirit rules in men's hearts.

"Peace" in the sense of silence, to hold one's peace, etc., is in the Old Testament generally the translation of charash, "to be still, or silent" (Ge 24:21; 34:5; Job 11:3); also of chashah, "to hush," "to be silent" (2Ki 2:3,5; Ps 39:2), and of other words. In Job 29:10 ("The nobles held their peace," the King James Version), it is qol, "voice."

In the New Testament we have siopao, "to be silent," "to cease speaking" (Mt 20:31; 26:63; Ac 18:9, etc.); sigao, "to be silent," "not to speak" (Lu 20:26; Ac 12:17); hesuchazo, "to be quiet" (Lu 14:4; Ac 11:18); phimoo, "to muzzle or gag" (Mr 1:25; Lu 4:35).

In Apocrypha eirene is frequent, mostly in the sense of peace from war or strife (Tobit 13:14; Judith 3:1; Ecclesiasticus 13:18; 1 Macc 5:54; 6:49; 2 Macc 14:6, eustatheia equals "tranquillity").

The Revised Version (British and American) has "peace" for "tongue" (Es 7:4; Job 6:24; Am 6:10; Hab 1:13); "at peace with me" for "perfect" (Isa 42:19, margin "made perfect" or "recompensed"); "security" instead of "peaceably" and "peace" (Da 8:25; 11:21,24); "came in peace to the city," for "came to Shalem, a city" (Ge 33:18); "it was for my peace" instead of "for peace" (Isa 38:17); "when they are in peace," for "and that which should have been for their welfare" (Ps 69:22).

W. L. Walker

PEACE OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

PEACEMAKER

pes'-mak-er: Occurs only in the plural (Mt 5:9, "Blessed are the peacemakers (eirenopoioi): for they shall be called sons of God" (who is "the God of peace")). We have also what seems to be a reflection of this saying in Jas 3:18, "The fruit of righteousness is sown in peace for (the Revised Version margin "by") them that make peace" (tois poiousin eirenen). In classical Greek a "peacemaker" was an ambassador sent to treat of peace. The word in Mt 5:9 would, perhaps, be better rendered "peace-workers," implying not merely making peace between those who are at variance, but working peace as that which is the will of the God of peace for men.

W. L. Walker

PEACOCK

pe’-kok (tukkiyim (plural); Latin Pavo cristatus): A bird of the genus Pavo. Japan is the native home of the plainer peafowl; Siam, Ceylon and India produce the commonest and most gorgeous. The peacock has a bill of moderate size with an arched tip, its cheeks are bare, the eyes not large, but very luminous, a crest of 24 feathers 2 inches long, with naked shafts and broad tips of blue, glancing to green. The neck is not long but proudly arched, the breast full, prominent and of bright blue green, blue predominant. The wings are short and ineffectual, the feathers on them made up of a surprising array of colors. The tail consists of 18 short, stiff, grayish-brown feathers. Next is the lining of the train, of the same color. The glory of this glorious bird lies in its train. It begins on the back between the wings in tiny feathers not over 6 inches in length, and extends backward. The quills have thick shafts of purple and green shades, the eye at the tip of each feather from one-half to 2 inches across, of a deep peculiar blue, surrounded at the lower part by two half-moon-shaped crescents of green. Whether the train lies naturally, or is spread in full glory, each eye shows encircled by a marvel of glancing shades of green, gold, purple, blue and bronze. When this train is spread, it opens like a fan behind the head with its sparkling crest, and above the wondrous blue of the breast. The bird has the power to contract the muscles at the base of the quills and play a peculiar sort of music with them. It loves high places and cries before a storm in notes that are startling to one not familiar with them. The bird can be domesticated and will become friendly enough to take food from the hand. The peahen is smaller than the cock, her neck green, her wings gray, tan and brown—but she has not the gorgeous train. She nests on earth and breeds with difficulty when imported, the young being delicate and tender. The grown birds are hardy when acclimated, and live to old age. By some freak of nature, pure white peacocks are at times produced. Aristophanes mentioned peafowl in his Birds, II. 102, 269. Alexander claimed that he brought them into Greece from the east, but failed to prove his contention. Pliny wrote that Hortensius was the first to serve the birds for food, and that Aufidius Lurco first fattened and sold them in the markets. It was the custom to skin the bird, roast and recover it and send it to the table, the gaudy feathers showing.

The first appearance of the bird in the Bible occurs in a summing-up of the wealth and majesty of Solomon (1Ki 10:22 "For the king had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram: once every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks"). (Here the Septuagint translates peleketoi (s.c. lithoi), equals "(stones) carved with an ax.") The same statement is made in 2Ch 9:21: "For the king had ships that went to Tarshish with the servants of Huram; once every three years came the ships of Tarshish, bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks" Septuagint omits). There is no question among scholars and scientists but that these statements are true, as the ships of Solomon are known to have visited the coasts of India and Ceylon, and Tarshish was on the Malabar coast of India, where the native name of the peacock was tokei, from which tukkiyim undoubtedly was derived (see GOLD, and The Expository Times, IX, 472). The historian Tennant says that the Hebrew names for "ivory" and "apes" were also the same as the Tamil. The reference to the small, ineffectual wing of the peacock which scarcely will lift the weight of the body and train, that used to be found in Job, is now applied to the ostrich, and is no doubt correct:

"The wings of the ostrich wave proudly;

But are they the pinions and plumage of love?" (Job 39:13).

While the peacock wing seems out of proportion to the size of the bird, it will sustain flight and bear the body to the treetops. The wing of the ostrich is useless for flight.

Gene Stratton-Porter

PEARL

purl.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

PECULIAR

pe-kul'-yar: The Latin peculium means "private property," so that "peculiar" properly equals "pertaining to the individual." In modern English the word has usually degenerated into a half-colloquial form for "extraordinary," but in Biblical English it is a thoroughly dignified term for "esp. one's own"; compare the "peculiar treasure" of the king in Ec 2:8 (the King James Version). Hence, "peculiar people" (the King James Version De 14:2, etc.) means a people especially possessed by God and particularly prized by Him. The word in the Old Testament (the King James Version Ex 19:5; De 14:2; 26:18; Ps 135:4; Ec 2:8) invariably represents ceghullah, "property," an obscure word which Septuagint usually rendered by the equally obscure periousios (apparently meaning "superabundant"), which in turn is quoted in Tit 2:14. In Mal 3:17, however, Septuagint has peripoiesis, quoted in 1Pe 2:9. the English Revised Version in the New Testament substituted "own possession" in the two occurrences, but in the Old Testament kept "peculiar" and even extended its use (De 7:6; Mal 3:17) to cover every occurrence of ceghullah except in 1Ch 29:3 ("treasure"). the American Standard Revised Version, on the contrary, has dropped "peculiar" altogether, using "treasure" in 1Ch 29:3; Ec 2:8, and "own possession" elsewhere. the King James Version also has "peculiar commandments" (idios, "particular," the Revised Version (British and American) "several") in The Wisdom of Solomon 19:6, and the Revised Version (British and American) has "peculiar" where the King James Version has "special" in The Wisdom of Solomon 3:14 for eklekte, "chosen out."

Burton Scott Easton

PEDAHEL

ped'-a-hel, pe-da'-el (pedhah'-el, "whom God redeems"): A prince of Naphtali; one of the tribal chiefs who apportioned the land of Canaan (Nu 34:28; compare Nu 34:17).

PEDAHZUR

pe-da’zur (pedhahtsur): Mentioned in Nu 1:10; 2:20; 7:54,59; 10:23 as the father of Gamaliel, head of the tribe of Manasseh, at the time of the exodus. See The Expository Times, VIII, 555 ff.

PEDAIAH

pe-da’-ya, pe-di’-a (pedhayahu, "Yah redeems"):

(1) Father of Joel, who was ruler of Western Manasseh in David’s reign (1Ch 27:20). Form pedhayah (see above).

(2) Pedaiah of Rumah (2Ki 23:36), father of Zebudah, Jehoiakim’s mother.

(3) A son of Jeconiah (1Ch 3:18); in 1Ch 3:19 the father of Zerubbabel. Pedaiah’s brother, Shealtiel, is also called father of Zerubbabel (Ezr 3:2; but in 1Ch 3:17 the King James Version spelled "Salathiel"). There may have been two cousins, or even different individuals may be referred to under Shealtiel and Salathiel respectively.

(4) Another who helped to repair the city wall (Ne 3:25), of the family of PAROSH (which see). Perhaps this is the man who stood by Ezra at the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4; 1 Esdras 9:44, called "Phaldeus").

(5) A "Levite," appointed one of the treasurers over the "treasuries" of the Lord’s house (Ne 13:13).

(6) A Benjamite, one of the rulers residing in Jerusalem under the "return" arrangements (Ne 11:7).

Henry Wallace

PEDESTAL

ped’-es-tal (ken): In two places (1Ki 7:29,31) the Revised Version (British and American) gives this word for the King James Version "base" (in Solomon’s "Sea").

PEDIAS

ped’-i-as, pe-di’-as (Pedias; Codex Alexandrinus Paideias; the King James Version by mistake Pelias): One of those who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:34) equals "Bedeiah" of Ezr 10:35.

PEDIGREE

ped’-i-gre (hithyalledh, "to show one’s birth"): The English word "pedigree" occurs only once in the Bible, according to the concordance. In Nu 1:18, it is said: "They declared their pedigrees"; that is, they

enrolled or registered themselves according to their family connections. The same idea is expressed frequently, employing a different term in the Hebrew, by the common phrase of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, "to reckon by genealogy," "to give genealogy," etc. (compare 1Ch 7:5,9; Ezr 2:62 ff; Ne 7:64). These last passages indicate the importance of the registered pedigree or genealogy, especially of the priests in the post-exilic community, for the absence of the list of their pedigrees, or their genealogical records, was sufficient to cause the exclusion from the priesthood of certain enrolled priests.

Walter R. Betteridge

PEEL; PILL

pel, pil: "Pill" (Ge 30:37,38; Tobit 11:13 (the Revised Version (British and American) "scaled")) and "peel" (Isa 18:2,7 (the King James Version and the Revised Version margin); Eze 29:18 (the King James Version and the English Revised Version)) are properly two different words, meaning "to remove the hair" (pilus) and "to remove the skin" (pellis), but in Elizabethan English the two were confused. In Isa 18:2,7, the former meaning is implied, as the Hebrew word here (marat) is rendered "pluck off the hair" in Ezr 9:3; Ne 13:25; Isa 50:6. The word, however, may also mean "make smooth" (so the Revised Version margin) or "bronzed." This last, referring to the dark skins of the Ethiopians, is best here, but in any case the King James Version and the Revised Version margin are impossible. In the other cases, however, "remove the skin" (compare "scaled," Tobit 11:13 the Revised Version (British and American)) is meant. So in Ge 30:37,38, Jacob "peels" (so the Revised Version (British and American)) off portions of the bark of his rods, so as to give alternating colors (compare 30:39). And in Eze 29:18, the point is Nebuchadrezzar’s total failure in his siege of Tyre, although the soldiers had carried burdens until the skin was peeled from their shoulders (compare the American Standard Revised Version "worn").

Burton Scott Easton

PEEP

pep (tsphaph; the King James Version Isa 8:19; 10:14 (the Revised Version (British and American) "chirp")): In 10:14, the word describes the sound made by a nestling bird; in 8:19, the changed (ventriloquistic?) voice of necromancers uttering sounds that purported to come from the feeble dead. The modern use of "peep" equals "look" is found in Sirach 21:23, as the translation of parakupto: "A foolish man peepeth in from the door of another man’s house."

PEKAH pe’-ka (peqach, "opening" (of the eyes) (2Ki 15:25-31); Phakee):

1. Accession:

Son of Remaliah, and 18th king of Israel. Pekah murdered his predecessor, Pekahiah, and seized the reins of power (2Ki 15:25). His usurpation of the throne is said to have taken place in the 52nd year of Uzziah, and his reign to have lasted for 20 years (2Ki 15:27). His accession, therefore, may be placed in 748 BC (other chronologies place it later, and make the reign last only a few years).

Pekah came to the throne with the resolution of assisting in forming a league to resist the westward advance of Assyria. The memory of defeat by Assyria at the battle of Karkar in 753, more than 100 years before, had never died out.

2. Attitude of Assyria:

Tiglath-pileser III was now ruler of Assyria, and in successive campaigns since 745 had proved himself a resistless conqueror. His lust for battle was not yet satisfied, and the turn of Philistia and Syria was about to come. In 735, a coalition, of which Pekah was a prominent member, was being formed to check his further advance. It comprised the princes of Comagene, Gebal, Hamath, Arvad, Ammon, Moab, Edom, Gaza, Samaria, Syria, and some minor potentates, the list being taken from a roll of the subject-princes who attended a court and paid tribute after the fall of Damascus. Ahaz likewise attended as a voluntary tributary to do homage to Tiglath-pileser (2Ki 16:10).

3. Judah Recalcitrant:

While the plans of the allies were in course of formation, an obstacle was met with which proved insurmountable by the arts of diplomacy. This was the refusal of Ahaz, then on the throne of David, to join the confederacy. Arguments and threats having failed to move him, resort was had to force, and the troops of Samaria and Damascus moved on Jerusalem (2Ki 16:5). Great alarm was felt at the news of their approach, as seen in the 7th and 8th chapters of Isa. The allies had in view to dispossess Ahaz of his crown, and give it to one of their own number, a son of Tabeel. Isaiah himself was the mainstay of the opposition to their projects. The policy he advocated, by divine direction, was that of complete neutrality. This he urged with passionate earnestness, but with only partial success. Isaiah (probably) had kept back Ahaz from joining the coalition, but could not prevent him from sending an embassy, laden with gifts to Tiglath-pileser, to secure his intervention. On the news arriving that the Assyrian was on the march, a hasty retreat was made from Jerusalem, and the blow soon thereafter fell, where Isaiah had predicted, on Rezin and Pekah, and their kingdoms.

4. Chronicles Ancillary to Kings:

The severely concise manner in which the writer of Kings deals with the later sovereigns of the Northern Kingdom is, in the case of Pekah, supplemented in Chronicles by further facts as to this campaign of the allies. The Chronicler states that "a great multitude of captives" were taken to Damascus and many others to Samaria. These would be countrymen and women from the outlying districts of Judah, which were ravaged. Those taken to Samaria were, however, returned, unhurt, to Jericho by the advice of the prophet Oded (2Ch 28:5-15).

5. Fall of Damascus; Northern and Eastern Palestine Overrun:

The messengers sent from Jerusalem to Nineveh appear to have arrived when the army of Tiglath-pileser was already prepared to march. The movements of the Assyrians being expedited, they fell upon Damascus before the junction of the allies was accomplished. Rezin was defeated in a decisive battle, and took refuge in his capital, which was closely invested. Another part of the invading army descended on the upper districts of Syria and Samaria. Serious resistance to the veteran troops of the East could hardly be made, and city after city fell. A list of districts and cities that were overrun is given in 2Ki 15:29. It comprises Gilead beyond Jordan—already partly depopulated (1Ch 5:26); the tribal division of Naphtali, lying to the West of the lakes of Galilee and Merom, and all Galilee, as far South as the plain of Esdraelon and the Valley of Jezreel. Cities particularly mentioned are Ijon (now ‘Ayun), Abel-beth-maacah (now ‘Abi), Janoah (now Yanun), Kedesh (now Kados) and Hazor (now Hadireh).

6. Deportation of the Inhabitants:

These places and territories were not merely attacked and plundered. Their inhabitants were removed, with indescribable loss and suffering, to certain districts in Assyria, given as Halah, Habor, Hara, and both sides of the river Gozan, an affluent of the Euphrates. The transplantation of these tribes to a home beyond the great river was a new experiment in political geography, devised with the object of welding the whole of Western Asia into a single empire. It was work of immense difficulty and must have taxed the resources of even so great an organizer as Tiglath-pileser. The soldiers who had conquered in the field were, of course, employed to escort the many thousands of prisoners to their new locations. About two-thirds of the Samarian kingdom, comprising the districts of Samaria, the two Galilees, and the trans-Jordanic region, was thus denuded of its inhabitants.

7. Death of Pekah:

Left with but a third of his kingdom—humbled but still defiant—Pekah was necessarily unpopular with his subjects. In this extremity—the wave of invasion from the North having spent itself—the usual solution occurred, and a plot was formed by which the assassination of Pekah should be secured, and the assassin should take his place as a satrap of Assyria. A tool was found in the person of Hoshea, whom Tiglath-pileser claims to have appointed to the throne. The Biblical narrative does not do more than record the fact that "Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead" (2Ki 15:30). The date given to this act is the 20th year of Jotham. As Jotham’s reign lasted but 16 years, this number is evidently an error.

8. References in Isaiah:

For the first time, the historian makes no reference to the religious conduct of a king of Israel. The subject was beneath notice. The second section of Isaiah’s prophecies (Isa 7:1-10:4) belongs to the reign of Ahaz and thus to the time of Pekah, both of whom are named in it. Pekah is named in Isa 7:1, and is often, in this and the next chapter, referred to as "the son of Remaliah." His loss of the territorial

divisions of Zebulun and Naphtali is referred to in 9:1, and is followed by prophecy of their future glory as the earthly home of the Son of Man. The wording of Isa 9:14 shows that it was written before the fall of Samaria, and that of Isa 10:9-11 that Damascus and Samaria had both fallen and Jerusalem was expected to follow. This section of Isaiah may thus be included in the literature of the time of Pekah.

W. Shaw Caldecott

PEKAHIAH

pek-a-hi’-a, pe-ka’-ya (peqachyah, "Yah hath opened" (the eyes) (2Ki 15:23-26); Phakesias; Codex Alexandrinus Phakeias):

1. Accession:

Son of Menahem, and 17th king of Israel. He is said to have succeeded his father in the "50th year of Azariah" (or Uzziah), a synchronism not free from difficulty if his accession is placed in 750-749 (see MENAHEM; UZZIAH). Most date lower, after 738, when an Assyrian inscription makes Menahem pay tribute to Tiglath-pileser (compare 2Ki 15:19-21).

2. Regicide in Israel:

Pekahiah came to the throne enveloped in the danger which always accompanies the successor of an exceptionally strong ruler, in a country where there is not a settled law of succession. Within two years of his accession he was murdered in a foul manner—the 7th king of Israel who had met his death by violence (the others were Nadab, Elah, Tibni, Jehoram, Zechariah and Shallum). The chief conspirator was Pekah, son of Remaliah, one of his captains, with whom, as agent in the crime, were associated 50 Gileadites. These penetrated into the palace (the Revised Version (British and American) "castle") of the king’s house, and put Pekahiah to death, his bodyguards, Argob and Arieh, dying with him. The record, in its close adherence to fact, gives no reason for the king’s removal, but it may reasonably be surmised that it was connected with a league which was at this time forming for opposing resistance to the power of Assyria. This league, Pekahiah, preferring his father’s policy of tributary vassalage, may have refused to join. If so, the decision cost him his life. The act of treachery and violence is in accordance with all that Hosea tells us of the internal condition of Israel at this time: "They .... devour their judges; all their kings are fallen" (Ho 7:7).

3. Pekahiah’s Character:

The narrative of Pekahiah’s short reign contains but a brief notice of his personal character. Like his predecessors, Pekahiah did not depart from the system of worship introduced by Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, "who made Israel to sin." Despite the denunciations of the prophets of the Northern Kingdom (Am 5:21-27; Ho 8:1-6), the worship of the calves remained, till the whole was swept away, a few years later, by the fall of the kingdom.

After Pekahiah’s murder, the throne was seized by the regicide Pekah.

W. Shaw Caldecott

PEKOD

pe’-kod (peqodh): A name applied in Jer 50:21 and Eze 23:23 to the Chaldeans. Various English Versions of the Bible (margins) in the former passage gives the meaning as "visitation."

PELAIAH

pe-la’-ya, pe-li’-a (pela’yah):

(1) A son of Elioenai, of the royal house of Judah (1Ch 3:24).

(2) A Levite who assisted Ezra by expounding the Law (Ne 8:7), and was one of those who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (10:10). He is called "Phalias" in 1 Esdras 9:48 (Revised Version).

PELALIAH

pel-a-li’-a (pelalyah, "Yahweh judges"): A priest, father of Jeroham, one of the "workers" in the Lord’s house (Ne 11:12).

PELATIAH

pel-a-ti’-a (pelatyah, "Yahweh delivers"):

(1) One who "sealed" the covenant (Ne 10:22).

(2) A descendant of Solomon, grandson of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:21).

(3) A Simeonite, one of the captains who cleared out the Amalekites and dwelt on the captured land (1Ch 4:42,43).

(4) A prince of the people whom Ezekiel (in Babylon) pictures as ‘devising mischief’ and giving ‘wicked counsel’ in Jerusalem. He is represented as falling dead while Ezekiel prophesies (Eze 11:1,13). His name has the "-u," ending.

PELEG

pe’-leg (pelegh, "watercourse," "division"): A son of Eber, and brother of Joktan. The derivation of the name is given: "for in his days was the earth divided" (niphleghah) (Ge 10:25; compare Lu 3:35, the King James Version "Phalec"). This probably refers to the scattering of the world’s population and the confounding of its language recorded in Ge 11:1-9. In Aramaic pelagh and Arabic phalaj mean "division"; in Hebrew pelegh means "watercourse." The name may really be due to the occupation by this people of some well-watered (furrowed), district (e.g. in Babylonia), for these patronymics represent races, and the derivation in Ge 10:25 is a later editor’s remark.

S. F. Hunter

PELET

pe’-let (peleT, "deliverance"):

(1) Son of Iahdai (1Ch 2:47).

(2) Son of Azmaveth, one of those who resorted to David at Ziklag while he was hiding from Saul (1Ch 12:3).

PELETH

pe’-leth (peleth, "swiftness"):

(1) Father of On, one of the rebels against Moses and Aaron (Nu 16:1); probably same as PALLU (which see).

(2) A descendant of Jerahmeel (1Ch 2:33).

PELETHITES

pel’-e-thits, pe’-leth-its (pelethi): A company of David’s bodyguard, like the CHERETHITES (which see) (2Sa 8:18; 15:18); probably a corrupt form of "Philistines."

PELIAS

pe-li’-as: the King James Version equals the Revised Version (British and American) "Pedias."

PELICAN

pel’-kan (qa’ath; Latin Pelecanus onocrotalus Septuagint reads pelekan, in Leviticus and Psalms, but has

3 other readings, that are rather confusing, in the other places)): Any bird of the genus Pelecanus. The Hebrew qi’ means "to vomit." The name was applied to the bird because it swallowed large quantities of fish and then disgorged them to its nestlings. In the performance of this act it pressed the large beak, in the white species, tipped with red, against the crop and slightly lifted the wings. In ancient times, people, seeing this, believed that the bird was puncturing its breast and feeding its young with its blood. From this idea arose the custom of using a pelican with lifted wings in heraldry or as a symbol of Christ and of charity. (See Fictitious Creatures in Art, 182-86, London, Chapman and Hall, 1906.) Palestine knew a white and a brownish-gray bird, both close to 6 ft. long and having over a 12 ft. sweep of wing. They lived around the Dead Sea, fished beside the Jordan and abounded in greatest numbers in the wildernesses of the Mediterranean shore. The brown pelicans were larger than the white. Each of them had a long beak, peculiar throat pouch and webbed feet. They built large nests, 5 and 6 ft. across, from dead twigs of bushes, and laid two or three eggs. The brown birds deposited a creamy-white egg with a rosy flush; the white, a white egg with bluish tints. The young were naked at first, then covered with down, and remained in the nest until full feathered and able to fly. This compelled the parent birds to feed them for a long time, and they carried such quantities of fish to a nest that the young could not consume all of them and many were dropped on the ground. The tropical sun soon made the location unbearable to mortals. Perching pelicans were the ugliest birds imaginable, but when their immense brown or white bodies swept in a 12 ft. spread across the land and over sea, they made an impressive picture. They are included, with good reason, in the list of abominations (see Le 11:18; De 14:17). They are next mentioned in Ps 102:6:

"I am like a pelican of the wilderness;

I am become as an owl of the waste places."

Here David from the depths of affliction likened himself to a pelican as it appears when it perches in the wilderness. See Isa 34:11: "But the pelican and the porcupine shall possess it; and the owl and the raven shall dwell therein: and he will stretch over it the line of confusion, and the plummet of emptiness." Here the bird is used to complete the picture of desolation that was to prevail after the destruction of Edom. The other reference concerns the destruction of Nineveh and is found in Ze 2:14: "And herds shall lie down in the midst of her, all the beasts of the nations: both the pelican and the porcupine shall lodge in the capitals thereof; their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be in the thresholds: for he hath laid bare the cedar-work."

Gene Stratton-Porter

PELISHTIM

pel’-ish-tim, pe-lish’-tim (pelishtim (the Revised Version margin of Ge 10:14)).

See PHILISTINES.

PELONITE

pel’-o-nit, pe’-lo-nit, pe-lo’-nit (peloni, a place-name): Two of David’s heroes are thus described: (1) "Helez the Pelonite" (1Ch 11:27) (see PALTITE); and (2) "Ahijah the Pelonite" (1Ch 11:36).

PEN

(‘et, cheret; kalamos): The first writing was done on clay, wax, lead or stone tablets by scratching into the material with some hard pointed instrument. For this purpose bodkins of bronze, iron, bone or ivory were used (Job 19:24; Isa 8:1; Jer 17:1). In Jer 17:1 a diamond is also mentioned as being used for the same purpose. In Jer 36 Baruch, the son of Neriah, declares that he recorded the words of the prophet with ink in the book. In Jer 36:23 it says that the king cut the roll with the penknife (literally, the scribe’s knife). This whole scene can best be explained if we consider that Baruch and the king’s scribes were in the habit of using reed pens. These pens are made from the hollow jointed stalks of a coarse grass growing in marshy places. The dried reed is cut diagonally with the penknife and the point thus formed is carefully shaved thin to make it flexible and the nib split as in the modern pen. The last operation is the clipping off of the very point so that it becomes a stub pen. The Arab scribe does this by resting the nib on his thumb nail while cutting, so that the cut will be clean and the pen will not scratch. The whole procedure requires considerable skill. The pupil in Hebrew or Arabic writing learns to make a pen as his first lesson. A scribe carries a sharp knife around with him for keeping his pen in good condition, hence, the name penknife. The word used in 3 Joh 1:13 is kalamos, "reed," indicating that the pen described above was used in John’s time (compare qalam, the common Arabic name for pen).

See INK; INK-HORN; WRITING.

Figurative: "Written with a pen of iron," i.e. indelibly (Jer 17:1). "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer" (Ps 45:1; compare Jer 36:18). As the trained writer records a speech, so the Psalmist’s tongue impresses or engraves on his hearers’ minds what he has conceived.

James A. Patch

PENCE; PENNY

pens.

See MONEY.

PENCIL

pen’-sil (Isa 44:13, margin "red ochre," the King James Version "line").

See LINE; OCHRE, RED.

PENDANT

pen’-dant (from French from Latin pendeo, "to hang"): Not in the King James Version. Twice in the Revised Version (British and American).

(1) netiphoth (the King James Version "collars"), ornaments of the Midianites captured by Gideon (Jud 8:26).

(2) netiphoth (the King James Version "chains"), an article of feminine apparel (Isa 3:19). The reference seems to be (Cheyne, "Isaiah" Polychrome Bible (HDB, III, 739)) to ear-drops, pearl or gold ornaments resembling a drop of Water, fastened, probably, to the lobe of the ear.

PENIEL

pe-ni’-el, pen’-i-el, pe’-ni-el (peni’el, "face of God"; Eidos theou): This is the form of the name in Ge 32:30. In the next verse and elsewhere it appears as "Penuel." The name is said to have been given to the place by Jacob after his night of wrestling by the Jabbok, because, as he said, "I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved." It was a height evidently close by the stream over which Jacob passed in the morning. Some have thought it might be a prominent cliff, the contour of which resembled a human face. Such a cliff on the seashore to the South of Tripoli was called theou prosopon, "face of God" (Strabo xvi.2,15 f). In later times a city with a strong tower stood upon it. This lay in the line of Gideon’s pursuit of the Midianites. When he returned victorious, he beat down the place because of the churlishness of the inhabitants (Jud 8:8,9,17). It was one of the towns "built" or fortified by Jeroboam (1Ki 12:25). Merrill would identify it with Telul edh-Dhahab, "hills of gold," two hills with ruins that betoken great antiquity, and that speak of great strength, on the South of the Jabbok, about 10 miles East of Jordan (for description see Merrill, East of the Jordan, 390 if). A difficulty that seems fatal to this identification is that here the banks of the Jabbok are so precipitous as to be impassable. Conder suggests Jebel ‘Osha. The site was clearly not far from Succoth; but no certainty is yet possible.

W. Ewing

PENINNAH

pe-nin’-a (peninnah, "coral," "pearl"): Second wife of Elkanah, father of Samuel (1Sa 1:2,4).

PENKNIFE

pen’-nif (Jer 36:23).

See PEN.

PENNY

pen’-i (denarion; Latin denarius (which see)): the American Standard Revised Version (Mt 18:28; 20:2,9,10,13, etc.) renders it by "shilling" except in Mt 22:19; Mr 12:15 and Lu 20:24, where it retains the original term as it refers to a particular coin.

See DENARIUS; MONEY.

PENSION

pen’-shun (1 Esdras 4:56, the King James Version "and he commanded to give to all that kept the city pensions and wages"; kleros, "allotted portion," usually (here certainly) of lands (the Revised Version (British and American) "lands")): Literally it means simply "payment," and the King James Version seems to have used the word in order to avoid any specialization of kleros. There is no reference to payment for past services.

See LOT.

PENTATEUCH, 1

pen’-ta-tuk:

I. TITLE, DIVISION, CONTENTS

II. AUTHORSHIP, COMPOSITION, DATE

1. The Current Critical Scheme 2. The Evidence for the Current Critical Scheme

(1) Astruc’s Clue

(2) Signs of Post-Mosaic Date

(3) Narrative Discrepancies

(4) Doublets

(5) The Laws

(6) The Argument from Style

(7) Props of the Development Hypothesis

3. The Answer to the Critical Analysis

(1) The Veto of Textual Criticism

(2) Astruc’s Clue Tested

(3) The Narrative Discrepancies and Signs of Post-Mosaic Date Examined

(4) The Argument from the Doublets Examined

(5) The Critical Argument from the Laws

(6) The Argument from Style

(7) Perplexities of the Theory

(8) Signs of Unity

(9) The Supposed Props of the Development Hypothesis

4. The Evidence of Date

(1) The Narrative of Genesis

(2) Archaeology and Genesis

(3) The Legal Evidence of Genesis

(4) The Professedly Mosaic Character of the Legislation

(5) The Historical Situation Required by Pentateuch

(6) The Hierarchical Organization in Pentateuch

(7) The Legal Evidence of Pentateuch

(8) The Evidence of D

(9) Later Allusions

(10) Other Evidence

5. The Fundamental Improbabilities of the Critical Case

(1) The Moral and Psychological Issues

(2) The Historical Improbability

(3) The Divergence between the Laws and Post-exilic Practice

(4) The Testimony of Tradition

6. The Origin and Transmission of the Pentateuch

III. SOME LITERARY POINTS

1. Style of Legislation

2. The Narrative

3. The Covenant

4. Order and Rhythm

IV. THE PENTATEUCH AS HISTORY

1. Textual Criticism and History

2. Hebrew Methods of Expression

3. Personification and Genealogies

4. Literary Form

5. The Sacred Numbers

6. Habits of Thought

7. National Coloring

8. How Far the Pentateuch Is Trustworthy

(1) Contemporaneous Information

(2) Character of Our Informants

(3) Historical Genius of the People

(4) Good Faith of Deuteronomy

(5) Nature of the Events Recorded

(6) External Corroborations

9. The Pentateuch as Reasoned History

V. THE CHARACTER OF THE PENTATEUCH

1. Hindu Law Books

2. Differences

3. Holiness

4. The Universal Aspect

5. The National Aspect

LITERATURE

I. Title, Division, Contents

(Torah, "law" or "teaching").—It has recently been argued that the Hebrew word is really the Babylonian tertu, "divinely revealed law" (e.g. Sayce, Churchman, 1909, 728 ff), but such passages as Le 14:54-57; De 17:11 show that the legislator connected it with horah (from yarah), "to teach." Also called by the Jews chamishshah chumeshi torah, "the five-fifths of the law": ho nomos, "the Law." The word "Pentateuch" comes from pentateuchos, literally "5-volumed (book)." The Pentateuch consists of the first five books of the Bible, and forms the first division of the Jewish Canon, and the whole of the

Samaritan Canon. The 5-fold division is certainly old, since it is earlier than the Septuagint or the Sam Pentateuch. How much older it may be is unknown. It has been thought that the 5-fold division of the Psalter is based on it.

The five books into which the Pentateuch is divided are respectively Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, and the separate articles should be consulted for information as to their nomenclature.

The work opens with an account of the Creation, and passes to the story of the first human couple. The narrative is carried on partly by genealogies and partly by fuller accounts to Abraham. Then comes a history of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, the collateral lines of descendants being rapidly dismissed. The story of Joseph is told in detail, and Genesis closes with his death. The rest of the Pentateuch covers the oppression of the Israelites in Egypt, their exodus and wanderings, the conquest of the trans-Jordanic lands and the fortunes of the people to the death of Moses. The four concluding books contain masses of legislation mingled with the narrative (for special contents, see articles on the several books).

PENTATEUCH, 2A

II. Authorship, Composition, Date.

1. The Current Critical Scheme:

The view that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, with the exception of the concluding verses of Deuteronomy, was once held universally. It is still believed by the great mass of Jews and Christians, but in most universities of Northern Europe and North America other theories prevail. An application of what is called "higher" or "documentary criticism" (to distinguish it from lower or textual criticism) has led to the formation of a number of hypotheses. Some of these are very widely held, but unanimity has not been attained, and recent investigations have challenged even the conclusions that are most generally accepted. In the English-speaking countries the vast majority of the critics would regard Driver’s, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament and Carpenter and Harford-Battersby’s Hexateuch as fairly representative of their position, but on the Continent of Europe the numerous school that holds some such position is dwindling alike in numbers and influence, while even in Great Britain and America some of the ablest critics are beginning to show signs of being shaken in their allegiance to cardinal points of the higher-critical case. However, at the time of writing, these latter critics have not put forward any fresh formulation of their views, and accordingly the general positions of the works named may be taken as representing with certain qualifications the general critical theory. Some of the chief stadia in the development of this may be mentioned.

After attention had been drawn by earlier writers to various signs of post-Mosaic date and extraordinary perplexities in the Pentateuch, the first real step toward what its advocates have, till within the last few years, called "the modern position" was taken by J. Astruc (1753). He propounded what Carpenter terms "the clue to the documents," i.e. the difference of the divine appellations in Genesis as a test of

authorship. On this view the word ‘Elohim ("God") is characteristic of one principal source and the Tetragrammaton, i.e. the divine name YHWH represented by the "LORD" or "GOD" of the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), shows the presence of another. Despite occasional warnings, this clue was followed in the main for 150 years. It forms the starting-point of the whole current critical development, but the most recent investigations have successfully proved that it is unreliable (see below, 3, (2)) Astruc was followed by Eichhorn (1780), who made a more thorough examination of Genesis, indicating numerous differences of style, representation, etc.

Geddes (1792) and Vater (1802-1805) extended the method applied to Genesis to the other books of the Pentateuch.

In 1798 Ilgen distinguished two Elohists in Genesis, but this view did not find followers for some time. The next step of fundamental importance was the assignment of the bulk of Deuteronomy to the 7th century BC. This was due to De Wette (1806). Hupfeld (1853) again distinguished a second Elohist, and this has been accepted by most critics. Thus, there are four main documents at least: D (the bulk of Deuteronomy), two Elohists (P and E) and one document (Jahwist) that uses the Tetragrammaton in Genesis. From 1822 (Bleek) a series of writers maintained that the Book of Joshua was compounded from the same documents as the Pentateuch (see HEXATEUCH).

Two other developments call for notice:

(1) there has been a tendency to subdivide these documents further, regarding them as the work of schools rather than of individuals, and resolving them into different strata (P1, Secondary Priestly Writers, P3, etc., J1, Later additions to J, etc., or in the notation of other writers Jj Je, etc.);

(2) a particular scheme of dating has found wide acceptance. In the first period of the critical development it was assumed that the principal Elohist (P) was the earliest document.

A succession of writers of whom Reuss, Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen are the most prominent have, however, maintained that this is not the first but the last in point of time and should be referred to the exile or later. On this view theory is in outline as follows: J and E (so called from their respective divine appellations)—on the relative dates of which opinions differ—were composed probably during the early monarchy and subsequently combined by a redactor (Rje) into a single document JE. In the 7th century D, the bulk of Deuteronomy, was composed. It was published in the 18th year of Josiah’s reign. Later it was combined with JE into JED by a redactor (Rjed). P or Priestly Code the last of all (originally the first Elohist, now the Priestly Code) incorporated an earlier code of uncertain date which consists in the main of most of Le 17:1-26:46 and is known as the Law of Holiness (H or Ph). P itself is largely postexilic. Ultimately it was joined with JED by a priestly redactor (Rp) into substantially our present Pentateuch. As already stated, theory is subject to many minor variations. Moreover, it is admitted that not all its portions are equally well supported. The division of JE into J and E is regarded as less certain than the separation of Pentateuch. Again, there are variations in the analysis, differences of opinion as to the exact dating of the documents, and so forth. Yet the view just sketched has been held by a very

numerous and influential school during recent years, nor is it altogether fair to lay stress on minor divergences of opinion. It is in the abstract conceivable that the main positions might be true, and that yet the data were inadequate to enable all the minor details to be determined with certainty.

See CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

This theory will hereafter be discussed at length for two reasons:

(1) while it is now constantly losing ground, it is still more widely held than any other; and

(2) so much of the modern literature on the Old Testament has been written from this standpoint that no intelligent use can be made of the most ordinary books of reference without some acquaintance with it.

Before 1908 the conservative opposition to the dominant theory had exhibited two separate tendencies. One school of conservatives rejected the scheme in toto; the other accepted the analysis with certain modifications, but sought to throw back the dating of the documents. In both these respects it had points of contact with dissentient critics (e.g. Delitzsch, Dillmann, Baudissin, Kittel, Strack, Van Hoonacker), who sought to save for conservatism any spars they could from the general wreckage. The former school of thought was most prominently represented by the late W.H. Green, and J.

Raven’s Old Testament Introduction may be regarded as a typical modern presentation of their view; the latter especially by Robertson and Orr. The scheme put forward by the last named has found many adherents. He refuses to regard J and E as two separate documents, holding that we should rather think (as in the case of the parallel Psalms) of two recensions of one document marked by the use of different divine appellations. The critical P he treats as the work of a supplemented, and thinks it never had an independent existence, while he considers the whole Pentateuch as early. He holds that the work was done by "original composers, working with a common aim, and toward a common end, in contrast with the idea of late irresponsible redactors, combining, altering, manipulating, enlarging at pleasure" (POT, 375).

While these were the views held among Old Testament critics, a separate opposition had been growing up among archaeologists. This was of course utilized to the utmost by the conservatives of both wings. In some ways archaeology undoubtedly has confirmed the traditional view as against the critical (see ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM); but a candid survey leads to the belief that it has not yet dealt a mortal blow, and here again it must be remembered that the critics may justly plead that they must not be judged on mistakes that they made in their earlier investigations or on refutations of the more uncertain portions of their theory, but rather on the main completed result. It may indeed be said with confidence that there are certain topics to which archaeology can never supply any conclusive answer. If it be the case that the Pentateuch contains hopelessly contradictory laws, no archaeological discovery can make them anything else; if the numbers of the Israelites are original and impossible, archaeology cannot make them possible. It is fair and right to lay stress on the instances in which archaeology has confirmed the Bible as against the critics; it is neither fair nor right to speak as if archaeology had done

what it never purported to do and never could effect.

The year 1908 saw the beginning of a new critical development which makes it very difficult to speak positively of modern critical views. Kuenen has been mentioned as one of the ablest and most eminent of those who brought the Graf-Wellhausen theory into prominence. In that year B.D. Eerdmans, his pupil and successor at Leyden, began the publication of a series of Old Testament studies in which he renounces his allegiance to the line of critics that had extended from Astruc to the publications of our own day, and entered on a series of investigations that were intended to set forth a new critical view. As his labors are not yet complete, it is impossible to present any account of his scheme; but the volumes already published justify certain remarks. Eerdmans has perhaps not converted any member of the Wellhausen school, but he has made many realize that their own scheme is not the only one possible. Thus while a few years ago we were constantly assured that the "main results" of Old Testament criticism were unalterably settled, recent writers adopt a very different tone: e.g. Sellin (1910) says, "We stand in a time of fermentation and transition, and in what follows we present our own opinion merely as the hypothesis which appears to us to be the best founded" (Einleitung, 18). By general consent Eerdmans' work contains a number of isolated shrewd remarks to which criticism will have to attend in the future; but it also contains many observations that are demonstrably unsound (for examples see BS, 1909, 744-48; 1910, 549-51). His own reconstruction is in many respects so faulty and blurred that it does not seem likely that it will ever secure a large following in its present form. On the other hand he appears to have succeeded in inducing a large number of students in various parts of the world to think along new lines and in this way may exercise a very potent influence on the future course of Old Testament study. His arguments show increasingly numerous signs of his having been influenced by the publications of conservative writers, and it seems certain that criticism will ultimately be driven to recognize the essential soundness of the conservative position. In 1912 Dahse (TMH, I) began the publication of a series of volumes attacking the Wellhausen school on textual grounds and propounding a new pericope hypothesis. In his view many phenomena are due to the influence of the pericopes of the synagogue service or the form of the text and not to the causes generally assigned.

2. The Evidence for the Current Critical Scheme:

The examination of the Graf-Wellhausen theory must now be undertaken, and attention must first be directed to the evidence which is adduced in its support. Why should it be held that the Pentateuch is composed mainly of excerpts from certain documents designated as J and E and P and D? Why is it believed that these documents are of very late date, in one case subsequent to the exile?

(1) Astruc's Clue.

It has been said above that Astruc propounded the use of the divine appellations in Genesis as a clue to the dissection of that book. This is based on Ex 6:3, 'And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as 'El Shadday (God Almighty); but by my name YHWH I was not known to them.' In numerous passages of Genesis this name is represented as known, e.g. 4:26, where we read of men beginning to call on it in the days of Enosh. The discrepancy here is very obvious, and in the view of the Astruc

school can be satisfactorily removed by postulating different sources. This clue, of course, fails after Ex 6:3, but other difficulties are found, and moreover the sources already distinguished in Genesis are, it is claimed, marked by separate styles and other characteristics which enable them to be identified when they occur in the narrative of the later books.

See CRITICISM OF THE BIBLE.

(2) Signs of Post-Mosaic Date.

Close inspection of the Pentateuch shows that it contains a number of passages which, it is alleged, could not have proceeded from the pen of Moses in their present form. Probably the most familiar instance is the account of the death of Moses (De 34). Other examples are to be found in seeming allusions to post-Mosaic events, e.g. in Ge 22 we hear of the Mount of the Lord in the land of Moriah; this apparently refers to the Temple Hill, which, however, would not have been so designated before Solomon. So too the list of kings who reigned over Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (36:31) presumes the existence of the monarchy. The Canaanites who are referred to as being "then in the land" (Ge 12:6; 13:7) did not disappear till the time of Solomon, and, accordingly, if this expression means "then still" it cannot antedate his reign. De 3:11 (Og’s bedstead) comes unnaturally from one who had vanquished Og but a few weeks previously, while Nu 21:14 (the King James Version) contains a reference to "the book of the Wars of the Lord" which would hardly have been quoted in this way by a contemporary. Ex 16:35 refers to the cessation of the manna after the death of Moses. These passages, and more like them, are cited to disprove Mosaic authorship; but the main weight of the critical argument does not rest on them.

(3) Narrative Discrepancies.

While the divine appellations form the starting-point, they do not even in Genesis constitute the sole test of different documents. On the contrary, there are other narrative discrepancies, antinomies, differences of style, duplicate narratives, etc., adduced to support the critical theory. We must now glance at some of these.

In Ge 21:14 f Ishmael is a boy who can be carried on his mother’s shoulder, but from a comparison of 16:3,16; 17, it appears that he must have been 14 when Isaac was born, and, since weaning sometimes occurs at the age of 3 in the East, may have been even as old as 17 when this incident happened. Again, "We all remember the scene (Ge 27) in which Isaac in extreme old age blesses his sons; we picture him as lying on his deathbed. Do we, however, all realize that according to the chronology of the Book of Genesis he must have been thus lying on his deathbed for eighty years (compare 25:26; 26:34; 35:28)? Yet we can only diminish this period by extending proportionately the interval between Esau marrying his Hittite wives (26:34) and Rebekah’s suggestion to Isaac to send Jacob away, lest he should follow his brother’s example (27:46); which, from the nature of the case, will not admit of any but slight extension. Keil, however, does so extend it, reducing the period of Isaac’s final illness by 43 years, and is conscious of no incongruity in supposing that Rebekah, 30 years after Esau had taken his Hittite

wives, should express her fear that Jacob, then aged 77, will do the same" (Driver, Contemporary Review, LVII, 221).

An important instance occurs in Numbers. According to 33:38, Aaron died on the 1st day of the 5th month. From De 1:3 it appears that 6 months later Moses delivered his speech in the plains of Moab. Into those 6 months are compressed one month's mourning for Aaron, the Arad campaign, the wandering round by the Red Sea, the campaigns against Sihon and Og, the missions to Balaam and the whole episode of his prophecies, the painful occurrences of Nu 25, the second census, the appointment of Joshua, the expedition against Midian, besides other events. It is clearly impossible to fit all these into the time.

Other discrepancies are of the most formidable character. Aaron dies now at Mt. Hor (Nu 20:28; 33:38), now at Moserah (De 10:6). According to De 1; 2:1,14, the children of Israel left Kadesh-barnea in the 3rd year and never subsequently returned to it, while in Nu they apparently remain there till the journey to Mt. Hor, where Aaron dies in the 40th year. The Tent of Meeting perhaps

provides some of the most perplexing of the discrepancies, for while according to the well-known scheme of Ex 25 ff and many other passages, it was a large and heavy erection standing in the midst of the camp, Ex 33:7-11 provides us with another Tent of Meeting that stood outside the camp at a distance and could be carried by Moses alone. The verbs used are frequentative, denoting a regular practice, and it is impossible to suppose that after receiving the commands for the Tent of Meeting Moses could have instituted a quite different tent of the same name. Joseph again is sold, now by Ishmaelites (Ge 37:27,28; 39:1), anon by Midianites (31:28a, 36). Sometimes he is imprisoned in one place, sometimes apparently in another. The story of Korah, Dathan and Abiram in Nu 16 is equally full of difficulty. The enormous numbers of the Israelites given in Nu 1-4, etc., are in conflict with passages that regard them as very few.

(4) Doublets.

Another portion of the critical argument is provided by doublets or duplicate narratives of the same event, e.g. Ge 16 and 21. These are particularly numerous in Genesis, but are not confined to that book. "Twice do quails appear in connection with the daily manna (Nu 11:4-6,31 ff; Ex 16:13) Twice does Moses draw water from the rock, when the strife of Israel begets the name Meribah ('strife')(Ex 17:1-7; Nu 20:1-13)" (Carpenter, Hexateuch, I, 30).

(5) The Laws.

Most stress is laid on the argument from the laws and their supposed historical setting. By far the most important portions of this are examined in SANCTUARY and PRIESTS AND LEVITES. These subjects form the two main pillars of the Graf-Wellhausen theory, and accordingly the articles in question must be read as supplementing the present article. An illustration may be taken from the slavery laws. It is claimed that Ex 21:1-6; De 15:12 ff permit a Hebrew to contract for life slavery after 6 years'

service, but that Le 25:39-42 takes no notice of this law and enacts the totally different provision that Hebrews may remain in slavery only till the Year of Jubilee. While these different enactments might proceed from the same hand if properly coordinated, it is contended that this is not the case and that the legislator in Le ignores the legislator in Exodus and is in turn ignored by the legislator in Deuteronomy, who only knows the law of Exodus.

(6) The Argument from Style.

The argument from style is less easy to exemplify shortly, since it depends so largely on an immense mass of details. It is said that each of the sources has certain characteristic phrases which either occur nowhere else or only with very much less frequency. For instance in Ge 1, where ‘Elohim is used throughout, we find the word "create," but this is not employed in 2:4b ff, where the Tetragrammaton occurs. Hence, it is argued that this word is peculiarly characteristic of P as contrasted with the other documents, and may be used to prove his presence in e.g. 5:1 f.

(7) Props of the Development Hypothesis.

While the main supports of the Graf-Wellhausen theory must be sought in the articles to which reference has been made, it is necessary to mention briefly some other phenomena to which some weight is attached. Jeremiah displays many close resemblances to Deuteronomy, and the framework of Kings is written in a style that has marked similarities to the same book. Ezekiel again has notable points of contact with P and especially with H; either he was acquainted with these portions of the Pentateuch or else he must have exercised considerable influence on those who composed them. Lastly the Chronicler is obviously acquainted with the completed Pentateuch. Accordingly, it is claimed that the literature provides a sort of external standard that confirms the historical stages which the different Pentateuchal sources are said to mark. Deuteronomy influences Jeremiah and the subsequent literature. It is argued that it would equally have influenced the earlier books, had it then existed. So too the completed Pentateuch should have influenced Kings as it did Chronicles, if it had been in existence when the earlier history was composed.

PENTATEUCH, 2B

3. Answer to the Critical Analysis:

(1) The Veto of Textual Criticism.

The first great objection that may be made to the higher criticism is that it starts from the Massoretic text (MT) without investigation. This is not the only text that has come down to us, and in some instances it can be shown that alternative readings that have been preserved are superior to those of the Massoretic Text. A convincing example occurs in Ex 18. According to the Hebrew, Jethro comes to Moses and says "I, thy father-in-law .... am come," and subsequently Moses goes out to meet his father-in-law. The critics here postulate different sources, but some of the best authorities have preserved a reading which

(allowing for ancient differences of orthography) supposes an alteration of a single letter. According to this reading the text told how one (or they) came to Moses and said "Behold thy father-in-law .... is come." As the result of this Moses went out and met Jethro. The vast improvement in the sense is self-evident. But in weighing the change other considerations must be borne in mind. Since this is the reading of some of the most ancient authorities, only two views are possible. Either the Massoretic Text has undergone a corruption of a single letter, or else a redactor made a most improbable cento of two documents which gave a narrative of the most doubtful sense. Fortunately this was followed by textual corruption of so happy a character as to remove the difficulty by the change of a single letter; and this corruption was so widespread that it was accepted as the genuine text by some of our best authorities. There can be little doubt which of these two cases is the more credible, and with the recognition of the textual solution the particular bit of the analysis that depends on this corruption falls to the ground. This instance illustrates one branch of textual criticism; there are others. Sometimes the narrative shows with certainty that in the transmission of the text transpositions have taken place; e.g. the identification of Kadesh shows that it was South of Hormah. Consequently, a march to compass Edom by way of the Red Sea would not bring the Israelites to Hormah. Here there is no reason to doubt that the events narrated are historically true, but there is grave reason to doubt that they happened in the present order of the narrative. Further, Deuteronomy gives an account that is parallel to certain passages of Numbers; and it confirms those passages, but places the events in a different order. Such difficulties may often be solved by simple transpositions, and when transpositions in the text of Nu are made under the guidance of Deuteronomy they have a very different probability from guesses that enjoy no such sanction. Another department of textual criticism deals with the removal of glosses, i.e. notes that have crept into the text. Here the ancient versions often help us, one or other omitting some words which may be proved from other sources to be a later addition. Thus in Ex 17:7 the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) did not know the expression, "and Meribah" (one word in Hebrew), and calls the place "Massah" simply. This is confirmed by the fact that Deuteronomy habitually calls the place Massah (6:16; 9:22; 33:8). The true Meribah was Kadesh (Nu 20) and a glossator has here added this by mistake (see further (4) below). Thus we can say that a scientific textual criticism often opposes a real veto to the higher critical analysis by showing that the arguments rest on late corruptions and by explaining the true origin of the difficulties on which the critics rely.

(2) Astruc’s Clue Tested.

Astruc’s clue must next be examined. The critical case breaks down with extraordinary frequency. No clean division can be effected, i.e. there are cases where the Massoretic Text of Genesis makes P or E use the Tetragrammaton (YHWH) or J Yahweh (Yahweh). In some of these cases the critics can suggest no reason; in others they are compelled to assume that the Massoretic Text is corrupt for no better reason than that it is in conflict with their theory. Again the exigencies of the theory frequently force the analyst to sunder verses or phrases that cannot be understood apart from their present contexts, e.g. in Ge 28:21 Carpenter assigns the words "and Yahweh will be my God" to J while giving the beginning and end of the verse to E; in Genesis 31, verse 3 goes to a redactor, though E actually refers to the statement of 31:3 in verse 5; in Genesis 32, verse 30 is torn from a J-context and given to E, thus leaving 32:31 (Jahwist) unintelligible. When textual criticism is applied, startling facts that entirely shatter the higher critical argument are suddenly revealed. The variants to the divine appellations in Genesis are very numerous,

and in some instances the new readings are clearly superior to the Massoretic Text, even when they substitute ‘Elohim for the Tetragrammaton. Thus, in 16:11, the explanation of the name Ishmael requires the word ‘Elohim, as the name would otherwise have been Ishmayah, and one Hebrew MS, a recension of the Septuagint and the Old Latin do in fact preserve the reading ‘Elohim. The full facts and arguments cannot be given here, but Professor Schlogl has made an exhaustive examination of the various texts from Ge 1:1 to Ex 3:12. Out of a total of 347 occurrences of one or both words in the Massoretic Text of that passage, there are variants in 196 instances. A very important and detailed discussion, too long to be summarized here will now be found in TMH, I. Wellhausen himself has admitted that the textual evidence constitutes a sore point of the documentary theory (Expository Times, XX, 563). Again in Ex 6:3, many of the best authorities read "I was not made known" instead of "I was not known" a difference of a single letter in Hebrew. But if this be right, there is comparative evidence to suggest that to the early mind a revelation of his name by a deity meant a great deal more than a mere knowledge of the name, and involved rather a pledge of his power. Lastly the analysis may be tested in yet another way by inquiring whether it fits in with the other data, and when it is discovered (see below 4, (1)) that it involves ascribing, e.g. a passage that cannot be later than the time of Abraham to the period of the kingdom, it becomes certain that the clue and the method are alike misleading (see further EPC, chapter i; Expository Times, XX, 378 f, 473-75, 563; TMH, I; PS, 49-142; BS, 1913, 145-74; A. Troelstra, The Name of God, NKZ, XXIV (1913), 119-48; The Expositor, 1913).

(3) The Narrative Discrepancies and Signs of Post-Mosaic Date Examined.

Septuagintal manuscripts are providing very illuminating material for dealing with the chronological difficulties. It is well known that the Septuagint became corrupt and passed through various recensions (see SEPTUAGINT). The original text has not yet been reconstructed, but as the result of the great variety of recensions it happens that our various manuscripts present a wealth of alternative readings. Some of these show an intrinsic superiority to the corresponding readings of the Massoretic Text. Take the case of Ishmael’s age. We have seen (above, 2, (3)) that although in Ge 21:14 f he is a boy who can be carried by his mother even after the weaning of Isaac, his father, according to 16:3,16, was 86 years old at the time of his birth, and, according to Genesis 17, 100 years old when Isaac was born. In 17:25 we find that Ishmael is already 13 a year before Isaac’s birth. Now we are familiar with marginal notes that set forth a system of chronology in many printed English Bibles. In this case the Septuagintal variants suggest that something similar is responsible for the difficulty of our Hebrew. Two manuscripts, apparently representing a recension, omit the words, "after Abram had dwelt ten years in the land of Canaan" in 16:3, and again, 16:16, while in 17:25 there is a variant making Ishmael only 3 years old. If these readings are correct it is easy to see how the difficulty arose. The narrative originally contained mere round numbers, like 100 years old, and these were not intended to be taken literally. A commentator constructed a scheme of chronology which was embodied in marginal notes. Then these crept into the text and such numbers as were in conflict with them were thought to be corrupt and underwent alteration. Thus the 3-year-old Ishmael became 13.

The same manuscripts that present us with the variants in Ge 16 have also preserved a suggestive reading in 35:28, one of the passages that are responsible for the inference that according to the text of Genesis Isaac lay on his deathbed for 80 years (see above, 2, (3)). According to this Isaac was not 180,

but 150 years old when he died. It is easy to see that this is a round number, not to be taken literally, but this is not the only source of the difficulty. In 27:41, Esau, according to English Versions of the Bible, states "The days of mourning for my father are at hand; then will I slay my brother Jacob." This is a perfectly possible rendering of the Hebrew, but the Septuagint translated the text differently, and its rendering, while grammatically correct, has the double advantage of avoiding Isaac's long lingering on a deathbed and of presenting Esau's hatred and ferocity far more vividly. It renders, "May the days of mourning for my father approach that I may slay my brother Jacob." Subsequent translators preferred the milder version, but doubtless the Septuagint has truly apprehended the real sense of the narrative. If we read the chapter with this modification, we see Isaac as an old man, not knowing when he may die, performing the equivalent of making his will. It puts no strain on our credulity to suppose that he may have lived 20 or 30 years longer. Such episodes occur constantly in everyday experience. As to the calculations based on Ge 25:26 and 26:34, the numbers used are 60 and 40, which, as is well known, were frequently employed by the ancient Hebrews, not as mathematical expressions, but simply to denote unknown or unspecified periods.

See NUMBER.

The other chronological difficulty cited above (namely, that there is not room between the date of Aaron's death and the address by Moses in the plains of Moab for all the events assigned to this period by Numbers) is met partly by a reading preserved by the Peshitta and partly by a series of transpositions. In Nu 33:38 Peshitta reads "first" for "fifth" as the month of Aaron's death, thus recognizing a longer period for the subsequent events. The transpositions, however, which are largely due to the evidence of Deuteronomy, solve the most formidable and varied difficulties; e.g. a southerly march from Kadesh no longer conducts the Israelites to Arad in the north, the name Hormah is no longer used (Nu 14:45) before it is explained (Nu 21:3), there is no longer an account directly contradicting De and making the Israelites spend 38 years at Kadesh immediately after receiving a divine command to turn "tomorrow" (Nu 14:25). A full discussion is impossible here and will be found in EPC, 114-38. The order of the narrative that emerges as probably original is as follows: Nu 12; 20:1,14-21; 21:1-3; 13; 14; 16-18; 20:2-13,12; 21:4b-9, then some missing vs, bringing the Israelites to the head of the Gulf of Akabah and narrating the turn northward from Elath and Ezion-geber, then 20:22b-29; 21:4a, and some lost words telling of the arrival at the station before Oboth. In Nu 33:40 is a gloss that is missing in Lagarde's Septuagint, and 33:36b-37a should probably come earlier in the chapter than they do at present.

Another example of transposition is afforded by Ex 33:7-11, the passage relating to the Tent of Meeting which is at present out of place (see above 2, (3)). It is supposed that this is E's idea of the Tabernacle, but that, unlike the Priestly Code (P), he places it outside the camp and makes Joshua its priest. This latter view is discussed and refuted in PRIESTS AND LEVITES, sec. 3, where it is shown that Ex 33:7 should be rendered "And Moses used to take a (or, the) tent and pitch it for himself," etc. As to theory that this is E's account of the Tabernacle, Ex 18 has been overlooked. This chapter belongs to the same E but refers to the end of the period spent at Horeb, i.e. it is later than 33:7-11. In 18:13-16 we find Moses sitting with all the people standing about him because they came to require of God; i.e. the business which according to Ex 33 was transacted in solitude outside the camp was performed within the

camp in the midst of the people at a later period. This agrees with the Priestly Code (P), e.g. Nu 27. If now we look at the other available clues, it appears that Ex 33:11 seems to introduce Joshua for the first time. The passage should therefore precede 17:8-15; 24:13; 32:17, where he is already known. Again, if Ex 18 refers to the closing scenes at Horeb (as it clearly does), Ex 24:14 providing for the temporary transaction of judicial business reads very strangely. It ought to be preceded by some statement of the ordinary course in normal times when Moses was not absent from the camp. Ex 33:7 ff provides such a statement. The only earlier place to which it can be assigned is after 13:22, but there it fits the context marvelously, for the statements as to the pillar of cloud in 33:9 f attach naturally to those in 13:21 f. With this change all the difficulties disappear. Immediately after leaving Egypt Moses began the practice of carrying a tent outside the camp and trying cases there. This lasted till the construction of the Tabernacle. "And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee" (Ex 25:22). After its erection the earlier tent was disused, and the court sat at the door of the Tabernacle in the center of the camp (see, further, EPC, 93-102, 106 f) .

Some other points must be indicated more briefly. In Nu 16 important Septuagintal variants remove the main difficulties by substituting "company of Korah" for "dwelling of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram" in two verses (see EPC, 143-46). Similarly in the Joseph-story the perplexities have arisen through corruptions of verses which may still be corrected by the versional evidence (PS, 29-48). There is evidence to show that the numbers of the Israelites are probably due to textual corruption (EPC, 155-69). Further, there are numerous passages where careful examination has led critics themselves to hold that particular verses are later notes. In this way they dispose of De 10:6 f (Aaron’s death, etc.), the references to the Israelirish kingdom (Ge 36:31) and the Canaanites as being "then" in the land (Ge 12:6; 13:7), the bedstead of Og (De 3:11) and other passages. In Ge 22, "the land of Moriah" is unknown to the versions which present the most diverse readings, of which "the land of the Amorite" is perhaps the most probable; while in 22:14 the Septuagint, reading the same Hebrew consonants as Massoretic Text, translates "In the Mount the Lord was seen." This probably refers to a view that God manifested Himself especially in the mountains (compare 1Ki 20:23,28) and has no reference whatever to the Temple Hill. The Massoretic pointing is presumably due to a desire to avoid what seemed to be an anthropomorphism (see further PS, 19-21) . Again, in Nu 21:14, the Septuagint knows nothing of "a book of the Wars of Yahweh" (see Field, Hexapla, at the place). It is difficult to tell what the original reading was, especially as the succeeding words are corrupt in the Hebrew, but it appears that no genitive followed wars" and it is doubtful if there was any reference to a "book of wars."

(4) The Argument from the Doublets Examined.

The foregoing sections show that the documentary theory often depends on phenomena that were absent from the original Pentateuch. We are now to examine arguments that rest on other foundations. The doublets have been cited, but when we examine the instances more carefully, some curious facts emerge. Ge 16 and 21 are, to all appearance, narratives of different events; so are Ex 17:1-7 and Nu 20:1-13 (the drawing of water from rocks). In the latter case the critics after rejecting this divide the passages into 5 different stories, two going to J, two to E and one to Pentateuch. If the latter also had a Rephidimnarrative (compare Nu 33:14 P), there were 6 tales. In any case both J and E tell two stories each. It is impossible to assign any cogency to the argument that the author of the Pentateuch could not

have told two such narratives, if not merely the redactor of the Pentateuch but also J and E could do so. The facts as to the manna stories are similar. As to the flights of quails, it is known that these do in fact occur every year, and the Pentateuch places them at almost exactly a year's interval (see EPC, 104 f, 109 f).

(5) The Critical Argument from the Laws.

The legal arguments are due to a variety of misconceptions, the washing out of the historical background and the state of the text. Reference must be made to the separate articles (especially SANCTUARY; PRIESTS AND LEVITES). As the slave laws were cited, it may be explained that in ancient Israel as in other communities slavery could arise or slaves be acquired in many ways: e.g. birth, purchase (Ge 14:14; 17:12, etc.), gift (Ge 20:14), capture in war (Ge 14:21; 34:29), kidnapping (Joseph). The law of Exodus and Deuteronomy applies only to Hebrew slaves acquired by purchase, not to slaves acquired in any other way, and least of all to those who in the eye of the law were not true slaves. Le 25 has nothing to do with Hebrew slaves. It is concerned merely with free Israelites who become insolvent. "If thy brother be waxed poor with thee, and sell himself" it begins (25:39). Nobody who was already a slave could wax poor and sell himself. The law then provides that these insolvent freemen were not to be treated as slaves. In fact, they were a class of free bondsmen, i.e. they were full citizens who were compelled to perform certain duties. A similar class of free bondsmen existed in ancient Rome and were called nexi. The Egyptians who sold themselves to Pharaoh and became serfs afford another though less apt parallel In all ancient societies insolvency led to some limitations of freedom, but while in some full slavery ensued, in others a sharp distinction was drawn between the slave and the insolvent freeman (see further SBL, 5-11).

(6) The Argument from Style.

Just as this argument is too detailed to be set out in a work like the present, so the answer cannot be given with any degree of fullness. It may be said generally that the argument too frequently neglects differences of subject-matter and other sufficient reasons (such as considerations of euphony and slight variations of meaning) which often provide far more natural reasons for the phenomena observed. Again, the versions suggest that the Biblical text has been heavily glossed. Thus in many passages where the frequent recurrence of certain words and phrases is supposed to attest the presence of the Priestly Code (P), versional evidence seems to show that the expressions in question have been introduced by glossators, and when they are removed the narrative remains unaffected in meaning, but terser and more vigorous and greatly improved as a vehicle of expression. To take a simple instance in Ge 23:1, "And the life of Sarah was a hundred and seven and twenty years: .... the years of the fife of Sarah," the italicized words were missing in the Septuagint. When they are removed the meaning is unaltered, but the form of expression is far superior. They are obviously mere marginal note. Again the critical method is perpetually breaking down. It constantly occurs that redactors have to be called in to remove from a passage attributed to some source expressions that are supposed to be characteristic of another source, and this is habitually done on no other ground than that theory requires it. One instance muse be given. It is claimed that the word "create" is a P-word. It occurs several times in Ge 1:1-2:4 a and 3 times in Ge 5:1,2, but in 6:7 it is found in a J-passage, and some critics therefore assign it to a redactor. Yet J

undoubtedly uses the word in Nu 16:30 and D in De 4:32. On the other hand, P does not use the word exclusively, even in Ge 1-2:4, the word "make" being employed in 1:7,25,26,31; 2:2, while in 2:3 both words are combined. Yet all these passages are given unhesitatingly to P.

(7) Perplexities of the Theory.

The perplexities of the critical hypothesis are very striking, but a detailed discussion is impossible here. Much material will, however, be found in POT and Eerd. A few general statements may be made. The critical analysis repeatedly divides a straightforward narrative into two sets of fragments, neither of which will make sense without the other. A man will go to sleep in one document and wake in another, or a subject will belong to one source and the predicate to another. No intelligible account can be given of the proceedings of the redactors who one moment slavishly preserve their sources and at another cut them about without any necessity, who now rewrite their material and now leave it untouched. Even in the ranks of the Wellhausen critics chapters will be assigned by one writer to the post-exilic period and by another to the earliest sources (e.g. Ge 14, pre-Mosaic in the main according to Sellin (1910), post-exilic according to others), and the advent of Eerdmans and Dahse has greatly increased the perplexity. Clue after clue, both stylistic and material, is put forward, to be abandoned silently at some later stage. Circular arguments are extremely common: it is first alleged that some phenomenon is characteristic of a particular source; then passages are referred to that source for no other reason than the presence of that phenomenon; lastly these passages are cited to prove that the phenomenon in question distinguishes the source. Again theory is compelled to feed on itself; for J, E, the Priestly Code (P), etc., we have schools of J’s, E’s, etc., subsisting side by side for centuries, using the same material, employing the same ideas, yet remaining separate in minute stylistic points. This becomes impossible when viewed in the light of the evidences of pre-Mosaic date in parts of Genesis (see below 4, (1) to (3)).

(8) Signs of Unity.

It is often possible to produce very convincing internal evidence of the unity of what the critics sunder. A strong instance of this is to be found when one considers the characters portrayed. The character of Abraham or Laban, Jacob or Moses is essentially unitary. There is but one Abraham, and this would not be so if we really had a cento of different documents representing the results of the labor of various schools during different centuries. Again, there are sometimes literary marks of unity, e.g. in Nu 16, the effect of rising anger is given to the dialogue by the repetition of "Ye take too much upon you" (16:3,7), followed by the repetition of "Is it a small thing that" (16:9,13). This must be the work of a single literary artist (see further SBL, 37 f).

(9) The Supposed Props of the Development Hypothesis.

When we turn to the supposed props of the development hypothesis we see that there is nothing conclusive in the critical argument. Jeremiah and the subsequent literature certainly exhibit the influence of Deuteronomy, but a Book of the Law was admittedly found in Josiah’s reign and had lain unread for at any rate some considerable time. Some of its requirements had been in actual operation, e.g. in

Naboth’s case, while others had become a dead letter. The circumstances of its discovery, the belief in its undoubted Mosaic authenticity and the subsequent course of history led to its greatly influencing contemporary and later writers, but that really proves nothing. Ezekiel again was steeped in priestly ideas, but it is shown in PRIESTS AND LEVITES, sec. 5b, how this may be explained. Lastly, Chronicles certainly knows the whole Pentateuch, but as certainly misinterprets it (see PRIESTS AND LEVITES). On the other hand the Pentateuch itself always represents portions of the legislation as being intended to reach the people only through the priestly teaching, and this fully accounts for P’s lack of influence on the earlier literature. As to the differences of style within the Pentateuch itself, something is said in III, below. Hence, this branch of the critical argument really proves nothing, for the phenomena are susceptible of more than one explanation.

4. The Evidence of Date:

(1) The Narrative of Genesis.

Entirely different lines of argument are provided by the abundant internal evidences of date. In Ge 10:19, we read the phrase "as thou goest toward Sodom and Gomorrah, and Admah and Zeboiim" in a definition of boundary. Such language could only have originated when the places named actually existed. One does not define boundaries by reference to towns that are purely mythical or have been overthrown many centuries previously. The consistent tradition is that these towns were destroyed in the lifetime of Abraham, and the passage therefore cannot be later than his age. But the critics assign it to a late stratum of J, i.e. to a period at least 1,000 years too late. This suggests several comments. First, it may reasonably be asked whether much reliance can be placed on a method which after a century and a half of the closest investigation does not permit its exponents to arrive at results that are correct to within 1,000 years. Secondly, it shows clearly that in the composition of the Pentateuch very old materials were incorporated in their original language. Of the historical importance of this fact more will be said in IV; in this connection we must observe that it throws fresh light on expressions that point to the presence, in Genesis of sources composed in Palestine, e.g. "the sea" for "the West" indicates the probability of a Palestinian source, but once it is proved that we have materials as old as the time of Abraham such expressions do not argue post-Mosaic, but rather pre-Mosaic authorship. Thirdly, the passage demolishes theory of schools of J’s, etc. It cannot seriously be maintained that there was a school of J’s writing a particular style marked by the most delicate and subjective criteria subsisting continuously for some 10 or 12 centuries from the time of Abraham onward, side by side with other writers with whom its members never exchanged terms of even such common occurrence as "handmaid."

Ge 10:19 is not the only passage of this kind. In 2:14 we read of the Hiddekel (Tigris) as flowing East of Assur, though there is an alternative reading "in front of." If the translation "east" be correct, the passage must antedate the 13th century BC, for Assur, the ancient capital, which was on the west bank of the Tigris, was abandoned at about that date for Kalkhi on the East.

(2) Archaeology and Genesis.

Closely connected with the foregoing are cases where Genesis has preserved information that is true of a very early time only. Thus in 10:22 Elam figures as a son of Shem. The historical Elam was, however, an Aryan people. Recently inscriptions have been discovered which show that in very early times Elam really was inhabited by Semites. "The fact," writes Driver, at the place, "is not one which the writer of this verse is likely to have known." This contention falls to the ground when we find that only three verses off we have material that goes back at least as far as the time of Abraham. After all, the presumption is that the writer stated the fact because he knew it, not in spite of his not knowing it; and that knowledge must be due to the same cause as the noteworthy language of Ge 10:19, i.e. to early date.

This is merely one example of the confirmations of little touches in Genesis that are constantly being provided by archaeology. For the detailed facts see the separate articles, e.g. AMRAPHEL; JERUSALEM, and compare IV, below.

From the point of view of the critical question we note

(a) that such accuracy is a natural mark of authentic early documents, and

(b) that in view of the arguments already adduced and of the legal evidence to be considered, the most reasonable explanation is to be found in a theory of contemporary authorship.

(3) The Legal Evidence of Genesis.

The legal evidence is perhaps more convincing, for here no theory of late authorship can be devised to evade the natural inference. Correct information as to early names, geography, etc., might be the result of researches by an exilic writer in a Babylonian library; but early customs that are confirmed by the universal experience of primitive societies, and that point to a stage of development which had long been passed in the Babylonia even of Abraham’s day, can be due to but one cause—genuine early sources. The narratives of Genesis are certainly not the work of comparative sociologists. Two instances may be cited. The law of homicide shows us two stages that are known to be earlier than the stage attested by Ex 21:12 ff. In the story of Cain we have one stage; in Ge 9:6, which does not yet recognize any distinction between murder and other forms of homicide, we have the other.

Our other example shall be the unlimited power of life and death possessed by the head of the family (Ge 38:24; 42:37, etc.), which has not yet been limited in any way by the jurisdiction of the courts as in Exodus-Deuteronomy. In both cases comparative historical jurisprudence confirms the Bible account against the critical, which would make e.g. Ge 9:6 post-exilic, while assigning Ex 21 to a much earlier period. (On the whole subject see further OP, 135 ff.)

(4) The Professedly Mosaic Character of the Legislation.

Coming now to the four concluding books of the Pentateuch, we must first observe that the legislation everywhere professes to be Mosaic. Perhaps this is not always fully realized. In critical editions of the

text the rubrics and an occasional phrase are sometimes assigned to redactors, but the representation of Mosaic date is far too closely interwoven with the matter to be removed by such devices. If e.g. we take such a section as De 12, we shall find it full of such phrases as "for ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance" etc.; "When ye go over Jordan," "the place which the Lord shall choose" (the King James Version), etc. It is important to bear this in mind throughout the succeeding discussion.

(5) The Historical Situation required by Pentateuch.

What do we find if we ignore the Mosaic dress and seek to fit P into any other set of conditions, particularly those of the post-exilic period? The general historical situation gives a clear answer. The Israelites are represented as being so closely concentrated that they will always be able to keep the three pilgrimage festivals. One exception only is contemplated, namely, that ritual uncleanness or a journey may prevent an Israelite from keeping the Passover. Note that in that case he is most certainly to keep it one month later (Nu 9:10 f). How could this law have been enacted when the great majority of the people were in Babylonia, Egypt, etc., so that attendance at the temple was impossible for them on any occasion whatever? With this exception the entire Priestly Code always supposes that the whole people are at all times dwelling within easy reach of the religious center. How strongly this view is embedded in the code may be seen especially from Le 17, which provides that all domestic animals to be slaughtered for food must be brought to the door of the Tent of Meeting. Are we to suppose that somebody deliberately intended such legislation to apply when the Jews were scattered all over the civilized world, or even all over Canaan? If so, it means a total prohibition of animal food for all save the inhabitants of the capital.

In post-exilic days there was no more pressing danger for the religious leaders to combat than intermarriage, but this code, which is supposed to have been written for the express purpose of bringing about their action, goes out of its way to give a fictitious account of a war and incidentally to legalize some such unions (Nu 31:18). And this chapter also contains a law of booty. What could be more unsuitable? How and where were the Jews to make conquests and capture booty in the days of Ezra?

"Or again, pass to the last chapter of Nu and consider the historical setting. What is the complaint urged by the deputation that waits upon Moses? It is this: If heiresses ‘be married to any of the sons of the other tribes of the children of Israel, then shall their inheritance be taken away from the inheritance of our fathers, and shall be added to the inheritance of the tribe whereunto they shall belong.’ What a pressing grievance for a legislator to consider and redress when tribes and tribal lots had long since ceased to exist for ever!" (OP, 121 f).

Perhaps the most informing of all the discrepancies between P and the post-exilic age is one that explains the freedom of the earlier prophets from its literary influence. According to the constant testimony of the Pentateuch, including the Priestly Code (P), portions of the law were to reach the people only through priestly teaching (Le 10:11; De 24:8; 33:10, etc.). Ezra on the other hand read portions of P to the whole people.

(6) The Hierarchical Organization in Pentateuch.

Much of what falls under this head is treated in PRIESTS AND LEVITES, sec. 2, (a), (b), and need not be repeated here. The following may be added: "Urim and Thummim were not used after the Exile. In lieu of the simple conditions—a small number of priests and a body of Levites—we find a developed hierarchy, priests, Levites, singers, porters, Nethinim, sons of Solomon's servants. The code that ex hypothesi was forged to deal with this state of affairs has no acquaintance with them. The musical services of the temple are as much beyond its line of vision as the worship of the synagogue. Even such an organization as that betrayed by the reference in 1Sa 2:36 to the appointment by the high priest to positions carrying pecuniary emoluments is far beyond the primitive simplicity of P" (OP, 122).

(7) The Legal Evidence of the Pentateuch.

As this subject is technical we can only indicate the line of reasoning. Legal rules may be such as to enable the historical inquirer to say definitely that they belong to an early stage of society. Thus if we find elementary rules relating to the inheritance of a farmer who dies without leaving sons, we know that they cannot be long subsequent to the introduction of individual property in land, unless of course the law has been deliberately altered. It is an everyday occurrence for men to die without leaving sons, and the question What is to happen to their land in such cases must from the nature of the case be raised and settled before very long. When therefore we find such rules in Nu 27, etc., we know that they are either very old or else represent a deliberate change in the law. The latter is really out of the question, and we are driven back to their antiquity (see further OP, 124 ff). Again in Nu 35 we find an elaborate struggle to express a general principle which shall distinguish between two kinds of homicide. The earlier law had regarded all homicide as on the same level (Ge 9). Now, the human mind only reaches general principles through concrete cases, and other ancient legislations (e.g. the Icelandic) bear witness to the primitive character of the rules of Numbers. Thus, an expert like Dareate can say confidently that such rules as these are extremely archaic (see further SBL and OP, passim).

(8) The Evidence of Deuteronomist.

The following may be quoted: "Laws are never issued to regulate a state of things which has passed away ages before, and can by no possibility be revived. What are we to think, then, of a hypothesis which assigns the code of Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah, or shortly before it, when its injunctions to exterminate the Canaanites (20:16-18) and the Amalekites (25:17-19), who had long since disappeared, would be as utterly out of date as a law in New Jersey at the present time offering a bounty for killing wolves and bears, or a royal proclamation in Great Britain ordering the expulsion of the Danes? A law contemplating foreign conquests (20:10-15) would have been absurd when the urgent question was whether Judah could maintain its own existence against the encroachments of Babylon and Egypt. A law discriminating against Ammon and Moab (23:3,4), in favor of Edom (23:7,8), had its warrant in the Mosaic period, but not in the time of the later kings. Jeremiah discriminates precisely the other way, promising a future restoration to Moab (48:47) and Ammon (49:6), which he denies to Edom (49:17,18), who is also to Joe (3:19), Obadiah, and Isaiah (63:1-6), the representative foe of the people

of God. .... The allusions to Egypt imply familiarity with and recent residence in that land .... And how can a code belong to the time of Josiah, which, while it contemplates the possible selection of a king in the future (De 17:14), nowhere implies an actual regal government, but vests the supreme central authority in a judge and the priesthood (De 17:8-12; 19:17); which lays special stress on the requirements that the king must be a native and not a foreigner (De 17:15), when the undisputed line of succession had for ages been fixed in the family of David, and that he must not 'cause the people to return to Egypt.' (De 17:16), as they seemed ready to do on every grievance in the days of Moses (Nu 14:4), but which no one ever dreamed of doing after they were fairly established in Canaan?" (Green, Moses and the Prophets, 63 f). This too may be supplemented by legal evidence (e.g. De 22:26 testifies to the undeveloped intellectual condition of the people). Of JE it is unnecessary to speak, for Ex 21 f are now widely regarded as Mosaic in critical circles. Wellhausen (Prolegomena (6), 392, note) now regards their main elements as pre-Mosaic Canaanitish law.

(9) Later Allusions.

These are of two kinds. Sometimes we have references to the laws, in other cases we find evidence that they were in operation.

(a) By postulating redactors evidence can be banished from the Biblical text. Accordingly, reference will only be made to some passages where this procedure is not followed. Eze 22:26 clearly knows of a law that dealt with the subjects of the Priestly Code (P), used its very language (compare Le 10:10 f), and like P was to be taught to the people by the priests. Ho 4:6 also knows of some priestly teaching, which, however, is moral and may therefore be Le 19; but in 8:11-13 he speaks of 10,000 written precepts, and here the context points to ritual. The number and the subject-matter of these precepts alike make it certain that he knew a bulky written law which was not merely identical with Ex 21$; 22$; 23$, and this passage cannot be met by Wellhausen who resorts to the device of translating it with the omission of the important word "write."

(b) Again, in dealing with institutions the references can often be evaded. It is possible to say, "Yes, this passage knows such and such a law, but this law does not really come into existence with D or the Priestly Code (P), but was an older law incorporated in these documents." That argument would apply, e. g. to the necessity for two witnesses in the case of Naboth. That is a law of D, but those who assign Deuteronomy to the reign of Josiah would assert that it is here merely incorporating older material. Again the allusions sometimes show something that differs in some way from the Pentateuch, and it is often impossible to prove that this was a development. The critics in such cases claim that it represents an earlier stage, and it frequently happens that the data are insufficient either to support or refute this view. "But fortunately there are in P certain institutions of which the critics definitely assert that they are late. Accordingly, references that prove the earlier existence of such institutions have a very different probative value. Thus it is alleged that before the exile there was but one national burnt offering and one national meal offering each day: whereas Nu 28 demands two. Now in 1Ki 18:29,36, we find references to the offering of the evening oblation, but 2Ki 3:20 speaks of 'the time of offering the oblation' in connection with the morning. Therefore these two oblations were actually in existence centuries before the date assigned to P—who, on the critical theory, first introduced them. So 2Ki 16:15 speaks of 'the

morning burnt-offering, and the evening meal-offering .... with the burnt-offering of all the people of the land, and their meal-offering.' This again gives us the two burnt offerings, though, on the hypothesis, they were unknown to pre-exilic custom. Similarly in other cases: Jer 32 shows us the land laws in actual operation; Ezekiel is familiar with the Jubilee laws—though, on the critical hypothesis, these did not yet exist. Jeroboam was acquainted with P's date for Tabernacles, though the critics allege that the date was first fixed in the Exile" (OP, 132 f) .

(10) Other Evidence.

We can only mention certain other branches of evidence. There is stylistic evidence of early date (see e. g. Lias, BS, 1910, 20-46, 299-334). Further, the minute accuracy of the narrative of Ex-Nu to local conditions, etc. (noticed below, IV, 8, (6)), affords valuable testimony. It may be said generally that the whole work—laws and narrative—mirrors early conditions, whether we regard intellectual, economic or purely legal development (see further below, IV, and OP, passim).

5. The Fundamental Improbabilities of the Critical Case:

(1) Moral and Psychological Issues.

The great fundamental improbabilities of the critical view have hitherto been kept out of sight in order that the arguments for and against the detailed case might not be prejudiced by other considerations. We must now glance at some of the broader issues. The first that occurs is the moral and psychological incredibility. On theory two great frauds were perpetrated—in each case by men of the loftiest ethical principles. Deuteronomy was deliberately written in the form of Mosaic speeches by some person or persons who well knew that their work was not Mosaic. P is a make-up—nothing more. All its references to the wilderness, the camp, the Tent of Meeting, the approaching occupation of Canaan, etc., are so many touches introduced for the purpose of deceiving. There can be no talk of literary convention, for no such convention existed in Israel. The prophets all spoke in their own names, not in the dress of Moses. David introduced a new law of booty in his own name; the Chronicler repeatedly refers temple ordinances to David and Solomon; Samuel introduced a law of the kingdom in his own name. Yet we are asked to believe that these gigantic forgeries were perpetrated without reason or precedent. Is it credible? Consider the principles inculcated, e.g. the Deuteronomic denunciations of false prophets, the prohibition of adding aught to the law, the passionate injunctions to teach children. Can it be believed that men of such principles would have been guilty of such conduct? Nemo repente fit turpissimus, says the old maxim; can we suppose that the denunciations of those who prophesy falsely in the name of the Lord proceed from the pen of one who was himself forging in that name? Or can it be that the great majority of Bible readers know so little of truth when they meet it that they cannot detect the ring of unquestionable sincerity in the references of the Deuteronomist to the historical situation? Or can we really believe that documents that originated in such a fashion could have exercised the enormous force for righteousness in the world that these documents have exercised? Ex nihilo nihil. Are literary forgeries a suitable parentage for Ge 1 or Leviticus or Deuteronomy? Are the great monotheistic ethical religions of the world, with all they have meant, really rooted in nothing better than folly and fraud?

(2) The Historical Improbability.

A second fundamental consideration is the extraordinary historical improbability that these frauds could have been successfully perpetrated. The narrative in Kings undoubtedly relates the finding of what was regarded as an authentic work. King and people, priests and prophets must have been entirely deceived if the critical theory be true. It is surely possible that Huldah and Jeremiah were better judges than modern critics. Similarly in the case of the Priestly Code (P), if e.g. there had been no Levitical cities or no such laws as to tithes and firstlings as were here contemplated, but entirely different provisions on the subjects, how came the people to accept these forgeries so readily? (See further POT, 257 f, 294-97.) It is of course quite easy to carry this argument too far. It cannot be doubted that the exile had meant a considerable break in the historical continuity of the national development; but yet once the two views are understood the choice cannot be difficult. On the critical theory elaborate literary forgeries were accepted as genuine ancient laws; on the conservative theory laws were accepted because they were in fact genuine, and interpreted as far as possible to meet the entirely different requirements of the period. This explains both the action of the people and the divergence between preexilic and post-exilic practice. The laws were the same but the interpretation was different.

(3) The Divergence between the Laws and Post-exilic Practice.

Thirdly, the entire perversion of the true meaning of the laws in post-exilic times makes the critical theory incredible. Examples have been given (see above, 4, (5), (6), and PRIESTS AND LEVITES, passim). It must now suffice to take just one instance to make the argument clear. We must suppose that the author of P deliberately provided that if Levites approached the altar both they and the priests should die (Nu 18:3), because he really desired that they should approach the altar and perform certain services there. We must further suppose that Ezra and the people on reading these provisions at once understood that the legislator meant the exact opposite of what he had said, and proceeded to act accordingly (1Ch 23:31). This is only one little example. It is so throughout Pentateuch. Everybody understands that the Tabernacle is really the second Temple and wilderness conditions post-exilic, and everybody acts accordingly. Can it be contended that this view is credible?

(4) The Testimony of Tradition.

Lastly the uniform testimony of tradition is in favor of Mosaic authenticity—the tradition of Jews, Samaritans and Christians alike. The national consciousness of a people, the convergent belief of Christendom for 18 centuries are not lightly to be put aside. And what is pitted against them? Theories that vary with each fresh exponent, and that take their start from textual corruption, develop through a confusion between an altar and a house, and end in misdating narratives and laws by 8 or 10 centuries! (see above 3 and 4; SANCTUARY; PRIESTS AND LEVITES).

6. The Origin and Transmission of the Pentateuch:

If anything at all emerges from the foregoing discussion, it is the impossibility of performing any such

analytical feat as the critics attempt. No critical microscope can possibly detect with any reasonable degree of certainty the joins of various sources, even if such sources really exist, and when we find that laws and narratives are constantly misdated by 8 or 10 centuries, we can only admit that no progress at all is possible along the lines that have been followed. On the other hand, certain reasonable results do appear to have been secured, and there are indications of the direction in which we must look for further light.

First, then, the Pentateuch contains various notes by later hands. Sometimes the versions enable us to detect and remove those notes, but many are pre-versional. Accordingly, it is often impossible to get beyond probable conjectures on which different minds may differ.

Secondly, Genesis contains pre-Mosaic elements, but we cannot determine the scope of these or the number and character of the sources employed, or the extent of the author's work.

Thirdly, the whole body of the legislation is (subject only to textual criticism) Mosaic. But the laws of De carry with them their framework, the speeches which cannot be severed from them (see SBL, II). The speeches of Deuteronomy in turn carry with them large portions of the narrative of Exodus-Numbers which they presuppose. They do not necessarily carry with them such passages as Ex 35$; 36$; 37$; 38$; 39$ or Nu 1$; 2$; 3$; 4$; 7$; 26$, but Nu 1-4 contains internal evidence of Mosaic date.

At this point we turn to examine certain textual phenomena that throw light on our problem. It may be said that roughly there are two great classes of textual corruption—that which is due to the ordinary processes of copying, perishing, annotating, etc. and that which is due to a conscious and systematic effort to fix or edit a text. In the case of ancient authors, there comes a time sooner or later when scholarship, realizing the corruption that has taken place, makes a systematic attempt to produce, so far as possible, a correct standard text. Instances that will occur to many are to be found in the work of the Massoretes on the Hebrew text, that of Origen and others on the Septuagint, and that of the commission of Peisistratos and subsequently of the Alexandrian critics on Homer. There is evidence that such revisions took place in the case of the Pentateuch. A very important instance is to be found in the chronology of certain portions of Genesis of which three different versions survive , the Massoretic, Samaritan and Septuagintal. Another instance of even greater consequence for the matter in hand is to be found in Ex 35$; 36$; 37$; 38$; 39$. It is well known that the Septuagint preserves an entirely different edition from that of Massoretic Text (supported in the main by the Samaritan and other VSS). Some other examples have been noticed incidentally in the preceding discussion; one other that may be proved by further research to possess enormous importance may be mentioned. It appears that in the law of the kingdom (De 17) and some other passages where the Massoretic and Samaritan texts speak of a hereditary king, the Septuagint knew nothing of such a person (see further PS, 157-68). The superiority of the Septuagint text in this instance appears to be attested by 1 Samuel, which is unacquainted with any law of the kingdom.

Thus, we know of at least three recensions, the M, the Samaritan and the Septuagint. While there are many minor readings (in cases of variation through accidental corruption) in which the two last-named

agree, it is nevertheless true that in a general way the Samaritan belongs to the same family as the M, while the Septuagint in the crucial matters represents a different textual tradition from the other two (see The Expositor, September 1911, 200-219). How is this to be explained? According to the worthless story preserved in the letter of Aristeas the Septuagint was translated from manuscripts brought from Jerusalem at a date long subsequent to the Samaritan schism. The fact that the Septuagint preserves a recension so different from both Samaritan and (i.e. from the most authoritative Palestinian tradition of the 5th century BC and its lineal descendants) suggests that this part of the story must be rejected. If so, the Septuagint doubtless represents the text of the Pentateuch prevalent in Egypt and descends from a Hebrew that separated from the ancestor of the M before the Samaritan schism. At this point we must recall the fact that in Jeremiah the Septuagint differs rom Massoretic Text more widely than in any other Biblical book, and the current explanation is that the divergence goes back to the times of Jeremiah, his work having been preserved in two editions, an Egyptian and a Babylonian. We may be sure that if the Jews of Egypt had an edition of Jeremiah, they also had an edition of that law to which Jeremiah refers, and it is probable that the main differences between Septuagint and Massoretic Text (with its allies) are due to the two streams of tradition separating from the time of the exile—the Egyptian and the Babylonian. The narrative of the finding of the Book of the Law in the days of Josiah (2Ki 22), which probably refers to Deuteronomy only, suggests that its text at that time depended on the single manuscript found. The phenomena presented by Genesis-Numbers certainly suggest that they too were at one time dependent on a single damaged MS, and that conscious efforts were made to restore the original order—in some cases at any rate on a wrong principle (see especially EPC, 114-38; BS, 1913, 270-90). In view of the great divergences of the Septuagint in Ex 35$; 36$; 37$; 38$; 39$, it may be taken as certain that in some instances the editing went to considerable lengths.

Thus, the history of the Pentateuch, so far as it can be traced, is briefly as follows: The backbone of the book consists of pre-Mosaic sources in Genesis, and Mosaic narratives, speeches and legislation in Exodus-Deuteronomy. To this, notes, archaeological, historical, explanatory, etc., were added by successive readers. The text at one time depended on a single manuscript which was damaged, and one or more attempts were made to repair this damage by rearrangemerit of the material. It may be that some of the narrative chapters, such as Nu 1-4; 7; 26, were added from a separate source and amplified or rewritten in the course of some such redaction, but on this head nothing certain can be said. Within a period that is attested by the materials that survive, Ex 35$; 36$; 37$; 38$; 39$ underwent one or more such redactions. Slighter redactions attested by Samaritan and Septuagint have affected the chronological data, the numbers of the Israelites and some references to post-Mosaic historical events. Further than this it is impossible to go on our present materials.

PENTATEUCH, 3

III. Some Literary Points.

1. Style of Legislation:

No general estimate of the Pentateuch as literature can or need be attempted. Probably most readers are

fully sensible to its literary beauties. Anybody who is not would do well to compare the chapter on Joseph in the Koran (12) with the Biblical narrative. A few words must be said of some of the less obvious matters that would naturally fall into a literary discussion, the aim being rather to draw the reader's attention to points that he might overlook.

Of the style of the legislation no sufficient estimate can now be formed, for the first requisite of legal style is that it should be clear and unambiguous to contemporaries, and today no judgment can be offered on that head. There is, however, one feature that is of great interest even now, namely, the prevalence in the main of three different styles, each marked by its special adaptation to the end in view. These styles are

(1) mnemonic,

(2) oratorical, and

(3) procedural.

The first is familiar in other early legislations. It is lapidary, terse in the extreme, pregnant, and from time to time marked by a rhythm that must have assisted the retention in the memory. Occasionally we meet with parallelism. This is the style of Ex 21 ff and occasional later passages, such as the judgment in the case of Shelomith's son (Le 24:10). No doubt these laws were memorized by the elders.

Secondly, the legislation of De forms part of a speech and was intended for public reading. Accordingly, the laws here take on a distinctly oratorical style. Thirdly, the bulk of the rest of the legislation was intended to remain primarily in the custody of the priests who could certainly write (Nu 6:23). This was taken into account, and the style is not terse or oratorical, but reasonably full. It was probably very clear to those for whom the laws were meant. There are minor varieties of style but these are the most important. (On the whole subject see especially PS, 170-224.)

2. The Narrative:

What holds good of the laws is also true with certain modifications of the narrative. The style varies with the nature of the subject, occasion and purpose. Thus, the itinerary in Nu 33 is intentionally composed in a style which undoubtedly possesses peculiar qualities when chanted to an appropriate tune. The census lists, etc., appear to be written in a formal official manner, and something similar is true of the lists of the spies in Nu 13. There is no ground for surprise in this. In the ancient world style varied according to the genre of the composition to a far greater extent than it does today.

3. The Covenant:

A literary form that is peculiar to the Pentateuch deserves special notice, namely, the covenant document as a form of literature. Many peoples have had laws that were attributed to some deity, but it is only here

that laws are presented in the form of sworn agreements entered into with certain formalities between the nation and God. The literary result is that certain portions of the Pentateuch are in the form of a sort of deed with properly articulated parts. This deed would have been ratified by oath if made between men, as was the covenant between Jacob and Laban, but in a covenant with God this is inapplicable, and the place of the jurat is in each case taken by a discourse setting forth the rewards and penalties attached by God to observance and breach of the covenant respectively. The covenant conception and the idea that the laws acquire force because they are terms in an agreement between God and people, and not merely because they were commanded by God, is one of extraordinary importance in the history of thought and in theology, but we must not through absorption in these aspects of the question fail to notice that the conception found expression in a literary form that is unknown elsewhere and that it provides the key to the comprehension of large sections of the Pentateuch, including almost the whole of De (see in detail SBL, chapter ii).

4. Order and Rhythm:

Insufficient attention has been paid to order and rhythm generally. Two great principles must be borne in mind:

(1) in really good ancient prose the artist appeals to the ear in many subtle ways, and

(2) in all such prose, emphasis and meaning as well as beauty are given to a great extent by the order of the words. The figures of the old Greek rhetoricians play a considerable part.

Thus the figure called kuklos, "the circle," is sometimes used with great skill. In this the clause or sentence begins and ends with the same word, which denotes alike the sound and the thought. Probably the most effective instance—heightened by the meaning, the shortness and the heavy boom of the word—is to be found in De 4:12, where there is an impressive "circle" with qol, "voice"—the emphasis conveyed by the sound being at least as marked as that conveyed by the sense. This is no isolated instance of the figure; compare e.g. in Nu 32:1, the "circle" with "cattle"; 14:2 that with "would that we had died." Chiasmus is a favorite figure, and assonances, plays on words, etc., are not uncommon. Such traits often add force as well as beauty to the narrative, as may be seen from instances like Ge 1:2: tohu wa-bhohu, "waste and void"; 4:12: na’ wa-nadh, "a fugitive and a wanderer"; 9:6: shophekh dam ha-’adham, ba-’adham damo, yishshaphekh, literally, "shedding blood-of man, by-man his-blood shall-be-shed"; Nu 14:45: wayyakkum-wayyakkethum, "and smote them and beat them down."

The prose of the Pentateuch, except in its more formal and official parts, is closely allied to poetry (compare e.g. the Aeschylean "Sin coucheth at the door" (Ge 4:7); "The fountains of the great deep (were) broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened" (Ge 7:11); "how I bare you on eagles’ wings" (Ex 19:4)). In the oratorical prose of Deuteronomy we find an imagery and a poetical imagination that are not common among great orators. Its rhythm is marked and the arrangement of the words is extraordinarily forcible, especially in such a chapter as Deuteronomy 28. It is difficult to convey any idea of how much the book loses in English Versions of the Bible from the changes of order.

Occasionally the rendering does observe the point of the original, e.g. in De 4:36: "Out of heaven he made thee to hear his voice," and if we consider how strikingly this contrasts with the fiat "He made thee to hear his voice out of heaven," some notion may perhaps be formed of the importance of retaining the order. More frequently, however, the English is false to the emphasis and spirit of the Hebrew. Sometimes, but not always, this is due to the exigencies of English idiom. This is the cardinal fault of the King James Version, which otherwise excels so greatly.

IV. The Pentateuch as History.

1. Textual Criticism and History:

Beyond all doubt, the first duty of any who would use the Pentateuch for historical purposes is to consider the light that textual criticism throws upon it. So many of the impossibilities that are relied upon by those who seek to prove that the book is historically worthless may be removed by the simplest operations of scientific textual criticism, that a neglect of this primary precaution must lead to disastrous consequences. After all, it is common experience that a man who sets out to produce a history—whether by original composition or compilation—does not intentionally make, e.g., a southward march lead to a point northward of the starting-place, or a woman carry an able-bodied lad of 16 or 17 on her shoulder, or a patriarch linger some 80 years on a deathbed. When such episodes are found, the rudiments of historical judgment require that we should first ask whether the text is in order, and if the evidence points to any easy, natural and well-supported solutions of the difficulties, we are not justified in rejecting them without inquiry and denying to the Pentateuch all historical value. It is a priori far more probable that narratives which have come down to us from a date some 3,000 years back may have suffered slightly in transmission than that the Pentateuch was in the first instance the story of a historical wonderland. It is far more reasonable, e.g., to suppose that in a couple of verses of Exodus a corruption of two letters (attested by Aquila) has taken place in the Massoretic Text than that the Pentateuch contains two absolutely inconsistent accounts of the origin of the priesthood (see PRIESTS AND LEVITES). Accordingly, the first principle of any scientific use of the Pentateuch for historical purposes must be to take account of textual criticism.

2. Hebrew Methods of Expression:

Having discovered as nearly as may be what the author wrote, the next step must be to consider what he meant by it. Here, unfortunately, the modern inquirer is apt to neglect many most necessary precautions. It would be a truism, but for the fact that it is so often disregarded, to say that the whole of a narrative must be carefully read in order to ascertain the author’s meaning; e.g. how often we hear that Ge 14 represents Abram as having inflicted a defeat on the enemy with only 318 men (14:14), whereas from 14:24 (compare 14:13) it appears that in addition to these his allies Aner, Eshcol and Mature (i.e. as we shall see, the inhabitants of certain localities) had accompanied him! Sometimes the clue to the precise meaning of a story is to be found near the end: e.g. in Jos 22 we do not see clearly what kind of an altar the trans-Jordanic tribes had erected (and consequently why their conduct was open to objection) till 22:28 when we learn that this was an altar of the pattern of the altar of burnt offering, and so bore not the

slightest resemblance to such lawful altars as those of Moses and Joshua (see ALTAR; SANCTUARY). Nor is this the only instance in which the methods of expression adopted cause trouble to some modern readers; e.g. the word "all" is sometimes used in a way that apparently presents difficulties to some minds. Thus in Ex 9:6 it is possible to interpret "all" in the most sweeping sense and then see a contradiction in 9:19,22, etc., which recognize that some cattle still existed. Or again the term may be regarded as limited by 9:3 to all the cattle in the field.

See ALL.

3. Personification and Genealogies:

At this point two further idiosyncrasies of the Semitic genius must be noted—the habits of personification and the genealogical tendency; e.g. in Nu 20:12-21, Edom and Israel are personified: "thy brother Israel," "Edom came out against him," etc. Nobody here mistakes the meaning. Similarly with genealogical methods of expression. The Semites spoke of many relationships in a way that is foreign to occidental methods. Thus the Hebrew for "30 years old" is "son of 30 years." Again we read "He was the father of such as dwell in tents" (Ge 4:20). These habits (of personification and genealogical expression of relationships) are greatly extended, e.g. "And Canaan begat Zidon his first-born" (Ge 10:15). Often this leads to no trouble, yet strangely enough men who will grasp these methods when dealing with Genesis 10 will claim that Genesis 14 cannot be historical because localities are there personified and grouped in relationships. Yet if we are to estimate the historical value of the narrative, we must surely be willing to apply. the same methods to one chapter as to another if the sense appears to demand this.

See, further, GENEALOGY.

4. Literary Form:

A further consideration that is not always heeded is the exigency of literary form; e.g. in Ge 24 there occurs a dialogue. Strangely enough, an attack has been made on the historical character of Genesis on this ground. It cannot be supposed—so runs the argument—that we have here a literal report of what was said. This entirely ignores the practice of all literary artists. Such passages are to be read as giving a literary presentation of what occurred; they convey a far truer and more vivid idea of what passed than could an actual literal report of the mere words, divorced from the gestures, glances and modulations of the voice that play such an important part in conversation.

5. The Sacred Numbers:

Another matter is the influence of the sacred numbers on the text; e.g. in Nu 33 the journeys seem designed to present 40 stations and must not be held to exclude camping at other stations not mentioned; Ge 10 probably contained 70 names in the original text. This is a technical consideration which must be borne in mind, and so, too, must the Hebrew habit of using certain round numbers to express an

unspecified time: When, for instance, we read that somebody was 40 or 60 years old, we are not to take these words literally. "Forty years old" often seems to correspond to "after he had reached man's estate".

See NUMBER.

6. Habits of Thought:

Still more important is it to endeavor to appreciate the habits of thought of those for whom the Pentateuch was first intended, and to seek to read it in the light of archaic ideas. One instance must suffice. Of the many explanations of names few are philologically correct. It is certain that Noah is not connected with the Hebrew for "to comfort" or Moses with "draw out"—even if Egyptian princesses spoke Hebrew. The etymological key will not fit. Yet we must ask ourselves whether the narrator ever thought that it did. In times when names were supposed to have some mystic relation to their bearers they might be conceived as standing also in some mystic relation to events either present or future; it is not clear that the true original meaning of the narratives was not to suggest this in literary form. How far the ancient Hebrews were from regarding names in the same light as we do may be seen from such passages as Ex 23:20 f; Isa 30:27; see further EPC, 47 ff.

See also NAMES, PROPER.

7. National Coloring:

The Pentateuch is beyond all doubt an intensely national work. Its outlook is so essentially Israelite that no reader could fail to notice the fact, and it is therefore unnecessary to cite proofs. Doubtless this has in many instances led to its presenting a view of history with which the contemporary peoples would not have agreed. It is not to be supposed that the exodus was an event of much significance in the Egypt of Moses, however important it may appear to the Egyptians of today; and this suggests two points. On the one hand we must admit that to most contemporaries the Pentateuchal narratives must have seemed out of all perspective; on the other the course of subsequent history has shown that the Mosaic sense of perspective was in reality the true one, however absurd it may have seemed to the nations of his own day. Consequently in using the Pentateuch for historical purposes we must always apply two standards—the contemporary and the historical. In the days of Moses the narrative might often have looked to the outsider like the attempt of the frog in the fable to attain to the size of an ox; for us, with the light of history upon it, the values are very different. The national coloring, the medium through which the events are seen, has proved to be true, and the seemingly insignificant doings of unimportant people have turned out to be events of prime historical importance.

There is another aspect of the national coloring of the Pentateuch to be borne in mind. If ever there was a book which revealed the inmost soul of a people, that book is the Pentateuch. This will be considered in V, below, but for the present we are concerned with its historical significance. In estimating actions, motives, laws, policy—all that goes to make history—character is necessarily a factor of the utmost consequence. Now here we have a book that at every point reveals and at the same t ime grips the

national character. Alike in contents and in form the legislation is adapted with the utmost nicety to the nature of the people for which it was promulgated.

8. How Far the Pentateuch Is Trustworthy:

When due allowance has been made for all the various matters enumerated above, what can be said as to the trustworthiness of the Pentateuchal history? The answer is entirely favorable.

(1) Contemporaneous Information.

In the first place the discussion as to the dating of the Pentateuch (above, II, 4) has shown that we have in it documents that are in many cases certainly contemporaneous with the matters to which they relate and have been preserved in a form that is substantially original. Thus we have seen that the wording of Ge 10:19 cannot be later than the age of Abraham and that the legislation of the last four books is Mosaic. Now contemporaneousness is the first essential of credibility.

(2) Character of Our Informants.

Given the fact (guaranteed by the contemporaneousness of the sources) that our informants had the means of providing accurate information if they so desired, we have to ask whether they were truthful and able. As to the ability no doubt is possible; genius is stamped on every page of the Pentateuch. Similarly as to truthfulness. The conscience of the narrators is essentially ethical. This appears of course most strongly in the case of the legislation (compare Le 19:11) and the attribution of truthfulness to God (Ex 34:6), but it may readily be detected throughout; e.g. in Ge 20:12 the narrative clearly shows that truthfulness was esteemed as a virtue by the ancient Hebrews. Throughout, the faults of the dramatis personae are never minimized even when the narrator’s sympathy is with them. Nor is there any attempt to belittle the opponents of Israel’s heroes. Consider on the one hand the magnanimity of Esau’s character and on the other the very glaring light that is thrown on the weaknesses of Jacob, Judah, Aaron. If we are taught to know the Moses who prays, "And if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written" (Ex 32:32), we are also shown his frequent complaints, and we make acquaintance with the hot-tempered manslayer and the lawgiver who disobeyed his God.

(3) Historical Genius of the People.

Strangely enough, those who desire to discuss the trustworthiness of the Pentateuch often go far afield to note the habits of other nations and, selecting according to their bias peoples that have a good or a bad reputation in the matter of historical tradition, proceed to argue for or against the Pentateuchal narrative on this basis. Such procedure is alike unjust and unscientific. It is unscientific because the object of the inquirer is to obtain knowledge as to the habits of this people, and in view of the great divergences that may be observed among different races the comparative method is clearly inapplicable; it is unjust because this people is entitled to be judged on its own merits or defects, not on the merits or defects of others. Now it is a bare statement of fact that the Jews possess the historical sense to a preeminent

degree. Nobody who surveys their long history and examines their customs and practices to this day can fairly doubt that fact. This is no recent development; it is most convincingly attested by the Pentateuch itself, which here, as elsewhere, faithfully mirrors the spirit of the race. What is the highest guaranty of truth, a guaranty to which unquestioning appeal may be made in the firm assurance that it will carry conviction to all who hear? "Remember the days of old, Consider the years of many generations: Ask thy father and he will show thee; Thine elders, and they will tell thee" (De 32:7). "For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth," etc. (De 4:32). Conversely, the due handing down of tradition is a religious duty: "And it shall come to pass, when your children shall say unto you, What mean ye by this service? that ye shall say," etc. (Ex 12:26 f). "Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy soul diligently, lest thou forget the things which thine eyes saw, and lest they depart from thy heart all the days of thy life; but make them known unto thy children, and thy children's children" (De 4:9). It is needless to multiply quotations. Enough has been said to show clearly the attitude of this people toward history.

(4) Good Faith of Deuteronomy.

Closely connected with the preceding is the argument from the very obvious good faith of the speeches in Deuteronomy. It is not possible to read the references to events in such a chapter as Deuteronomy 4 without realizing that the speaker most fully believed the truth of his statements. The most unquestionable sincerity is impressed upon the chapter. The speaker is referring to what he believes with all the faith of which he is capable. Even for those who doubt the Mosaic authenticity of these speeches there can be no doubt as to the writer's unquestioning acceptance of the historical consciousness of the people. But once the Mosaic authenticity is established the argument becomes overwhelming. How could Moses have spoken to people of an event so impressive and unparalleled as having happened within their own recollection if it had not really occurred?

(5) Nature of the Events Recorded.

Another very important consideration arises from the nature of the events recorded. No nation, it has often been remarked, would gratuitously invent a story of its enslavement to another. The extreme sobriety of the patriarchal narratives, the absence of miracle, the lack of any tendency to display the ancestors of the people as conquerors or great personages, are marks of credibility. Many of the episodes in the Mosaic age are extraordinarily probable. Take the stories of the rebelliousness of the people, of their complaints of the water, the food, and so on: what could be more in accordance with likelihood? On the other hand there is another group of narratives to which the converse argument applies. A Sinai cannot be made part of a nation's consciousness by a clever story-teller or a literary forger. The unparalleled nature of the events narrated was recognized quite as clearly by the ancient Hebrews as it is today (see De 4:32 ff). It is incredible that such a story could have been made up and successfully palmed off on the whole nation. A further point that may be mentioned in this connection is the witness of subsequent history to the truth of the narrative. Such a unique history as that of the Jews, such tremendous consequences as their religion has had on the fortunes of mankind, require for their explanation causal events of sufficient magnitude.

(6) External Corroborations.

All investigation of evidence depends on a single principle: "The coincidences of the truth are infinite." In other words, a false story will sooner or later become involved in conflict with ascertained facts. The Biblical narrative has been subjected to the most rigorous cross-examination from every point of view for more than a century. Time after time confident assertions have been made that its falsehood has been definitely proved, and in each case the Pentateuch has come out from the test triumphant. The details will for the most part be found enumerated or referred to under the separate articles. Here it must suffice just to refer to a few matters. It was said that the whole local coloring of the Egyptian scenes was entirely false, e.g. that the vine did not grow in Egypt. Egyptology has in every instance vindicated the minute accuracy of the Pentateuch, down to even the non-mention of earthenware (in which the discolored Nile waters can be kept clean) in Ex 7:19 and the very food of the lower classes in Nu 11:5. It was said that writing was unknown in the days of Moses, but Egyptology and Assyriology have utterly demolished this. The historical character of many of the names has been strengthened by recent discoveries (see e.g. JERUSALEM; AMRAPHEL). From another point of view modern observation of the habits of the quails has shown that the narrative of Numbers is minutely accurate and must be the work of an eyewitness. From the ends of the earth there comes confirmation of the details of the evolution of law as depicted in the Pentateuch. Finally it is worth noting that even the details of some of the covenants in Genesis are confirmed by historical parallels (Churchman, 1908, 17 f).

It is often said that history in the true sense was invented by the Greeks and that the Hebrew genius was so intent on the divine guidance that it neglected secondary causes altogether. There is a large measure of truth in this view; but so far as the Pentateuch is concerned it can be greatly overstated.

9. The Pentateuch as Reasoned History:

One great criticism that falls to be made is entirely in favor of the Hebrew as against some Greeks, namely, the superior art with which the causes are given. A Thucydides would have stated the reasons that induced Pharaoh to persecute the Israelites, or Abraham and Lot to separate, or Korah, Dathan and Abiram and their followers to rebel; but every reader would have known precisely what he was doing and many who can read the material passages of the Pentateuch with delight would have been totally unable to grapple with his presentation of the narrative. The audience is here more unsophisticated and the material presented in more artistic form. In truth, any historian who sat down to compose a philosophical history of the period covered by the Pentateuch would in many instances be surprised at the lavish material it offered to him. A second criticism is more obvious. The writer clearly had no knowledge of the other side of the case. For example, the secondary causes for the defeat near Hormah are plain enough so far as they are internal to the Israelites—lack of morale, discipline and leadership, division of opinion, discouragement produced by the divine disapproval testified by the absence from the army of Moses and the Ark, and the warnings of the former—but the secondary causes on the side of the Amalekites and Canaanites are entirely omitted. Thus it generally happens that we do not get the same kind of view of the events as might be possible if we could have both sides. Naturally this is largely the case with the work of every historian who tells the story from one side only and is not

peculiar to the Pentateuch. Thirdly, the object of the Pentateuch is not merely to inform, but to persuade. It is primarily statesmanship, not literature, and its form is influenced by this fact. Seeking to sway conduct, not to provide a mere philosophical exposition of history, it belongs to a different (and higher) category from the latter, and where it has occasion to use the same material puts it in a different way, e. g. by assigning as motives for obeying laws reasons that the philosophic historian would have advanced as causes for their enactment. To some extent, therefore, an attempt to criticize the Pentateuch from the standpoint of philosophic history is an attempt to express it in terms of something that is incommensurable with it.

V. The Character of the Pentateuch.

1. Hindu Law Books:

The following sentences from Maine's Early Law and Custom form a suggestive introduction to any consideration of the character of the Pentateuch:

"The theory upon which these schools of learned men worked, from the ancient, perhaps very ancient, Apastamba and Gautama to the late Manu and the still later Narada, is perhaps still held by some persons of earnest religious convictions, but in time now buried it affected every walk of thought. The fundamental assumption is that a sacred or inspired literature being once believed to exist, all knowledge is contained in it. The Hindu way of putting it was, and is, not simply that the Scripture is true, but that everything which is true is contained in the Scripture. .... It is to be observed that such a theory, firmly held during the infancy of systematic thought, tends to work itself into fact. As the human mind advances, accumulating observation and accumulating reflection, nascent philosophy and dawning science are read into the sacred literature, while they are at the same time limited by the ruling ideas of its priestly authors. But as the mass of this literature grows through the additions made to it by successive expositors, it gradually specializes itself, and subjects, at first mixed together under vague general conceptions, become separated from one another and isolated. In the history of law the most important early specialization is that which separates what a man ought to do from what he ought to know. A great part of the religious literature, including the Creation of the Universe, the structure of Heaven, Hell, and the World or Worlds, and the nature of the Gods, falls under the last head, what a man ought to know. Law-books first appear as a subdivision of the first branch, what a man should do. Thus the most ancient books of this class are short manuals of conduct for an Aryan Hindu who would lead a perfect life. They contain much more ritual than law, a great deal more about the impurity caused by touching impure things than about crime, a great deal more about penances than about punishments" (pp. 16-18).

It is impossible not to see the resemblances to the Pentateuch that these sentences suggest. Particularly interesting is the commentary they provide on the attitude of Moses toward knowledge: "The secret things belong unto Yahweh our God; but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law" (De 29:29).

But if the Pentateuch has significant resemblances to other old law books, there are differences that are even more significant.

2. Differences:

"By an act that is unparalleled in history a God took to Himself a people by means of a sworn agreement. Some words that are fundamental for our purpose must be quoted from the offer; ‘Now, therefore, if ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then ye shall be mine own possession from among all peoples: for all the earth is mine: and ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation.’ The views here expressed dominate the legislation. Holiness—the correlative holiness to which the Israelites must attain because the Lord their God is holy—embraces much that is not germane to our subject, but it also covers the whole field of national and individual righteousness. The duty to God that is laid upon the Israelites in these words is a duty that has practical consequences in every phase of social life. I have already quoted a sentence from Sir Henry Maine in which he speaks of the uniformity with which religion and law are implicated in archaic legislation. There is a stage in human development where life is generally seen whole, and it is to this stage that the Pentateuch belongs. But no other legislation so takes up one department of man’s life after another and impresses on them all the relationship of God and people. Perhaps nothing will so clearly bring out my meaning as a statement of some of the more fundamental differences between the Pentateuchal legislation and the old Indian law-books which often provide excellent parallels to it. Those to which I desire to draw particular attention are as follows: The Indian law-books have no idea of national (as distinct from individual) righteousness —a conception that entered the world with the Mosaic legislation and has perhaps not made very much progress there since. There is no personal God: hence, His personal interest in righteousness is lacking: hence, too, there can be no relationship between God and people: and while there is a supernatural element in the contemplated results of human actions, there is nothing that can in the slightest degree compare with the Personal Divine intervention that is so often promised in the Pentateuchal laws. The caste system, like Hammurabi’s class system, leads to distinctions that are always inequitable. The conception of loving one’s neighbour and one’s sojourner as oneself are alike lacking. The systematic provisions for poor relief are absent, and the legislation is generally on a lower ethical and moral level, while some of the penalties are distinguished by the most perverted and barbarous cruelty. All these points are embraced in the special relationship of the One God and the peculiar treasure with its resulting need for national and individual holiness" (PS, 330 f).

3. Holiness:

These sentences indicate some of the most interesting of the distinguishing features of the Pentateuch—its national character, its catholic view of life, its attitude toward the Divine, and some at any rate of its most peculiar teachings. It is worth noting that Judaism, the oldest of the religions which it has influenced, attaches particular importance to one chapter, Le 19. The keynote of that chapter is the command: ‘Holy shall ye be, for holy am I the Lord your God’—to preserve the order and emphasis of the original words. This has been called the Jew’s imitatio Dei, though a few moments’ reflection shows that the use of the word "imitation" is here inaccurate. Now this book with this teaching has exercised a unique influence on the world’s history, for it must be remembered that Judaism, Christianity and Islam

spring ultimately from its teachings, and it is impossible to sever it from the history of the "people of the book"—as Mohammed called them. It appears then that it possesses in some unique way both an intensely national and an intensely universal character and a few words must be said as to this.

4. The Universal Aspect:

The great literary qualities of the work have undoubtedly been an important factor. All readers have felt the fascination of the stories of Genesis. The Jewish character has also counted for much; so again have the moral and ethical doctrines, and the miraculous and unprecedented nature of the events narrated. And yet there is much that might have been thought to militate against the book's obtaining any wide influence. Apart from some phrases about all the families of the earth being blessed (or blessing themselves) in the seed of Abraham, there is very little in its direct teaching to suggest that it was ever intended to be of universal application. Possibly these phrases only mean that other nations will use Israel as a typical example of greatness and happiness and pray that they may attain an equal degree of glory and prosperity. Moreover, the Pentateuch provides for a sacrificial system that has long ceased to exist, and a corpus of jural law that has not been adopted by other peoples. Of its most characteristic requirement—holiness—large elements are rejected by all save its own people. Wherein then lies its universal element? How came this the most intensely national of books to exercise a world-wide and ever-growing influence? The reason lies in the very first sentence: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." This doctrine of the unity of an Almighty God is the answer to our question. Teach that there is a God and One Only All-powerful God, and the book that tells of Him acquires a message to all His creatures.

5. The National Aspect:

Of the national character of the work something has already been said. It is remarkable that for its own people it has in very truth contained life and length of days, for it has been in and through that book that the Jews have maintained themselves throughout their unique history. If it be asked wherein the secret of this strength lies, the answer is in the combination of the national and the religious. The course of history must have been entirely different if the Pentateuch had not been the book of the people long before the Jews became the people of the book.

LITERATURE.

The current critical view is set forth in vast numbers of books. The following may be mentioned: LOT; Cornill's Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament; Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's Hexateuch (a 2nd edition of the Introduction without the text has been published as The Composition of the Hexateuch); the volumes of the ICC, Westminster Comms. and Century Bible. Slightly less thoroughgoing views are put forward in the German Introductions of Konig (1893), Baudissin (1901), Sellin (1910); and Geden, Outlines of Introduction to the Hebrew Bible (1909); Kittel, Scientific Study of the Old Testament (English translation, 1910); Eerdm. has entirely divergent critical views; POT; TMH, I, and W. Moller, Are the Critics Right? and Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung; Robertson,

Early Religion of Israel; Van Hoonacker, Lieu du culte, and Sacerdoce levitique are all much more conservative and valuable. J.H. Raven, Old Testament Intro, gives a good presentation of the most conservative case. The views taken in this article are represented by SBL, EPC, OP, PS, Troelstra, The Name of God, and in some matters, TMH, I.

Harold M. Wiener

PENTATEUCH, THE SAMARITAN

sa-mar’-i-tan:

I. KNOWLEDGE OF SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH

1. In Older Times

2. Revived Knowledge

II. CODICES AND SCRIPT

1. Nablus Roll

2. The Script

3. Peculiarities of Writing

4. The Tarikh

5. The Mode of Pronunciation

6. Age of the Nablus Roll

III. RELATION OF THE SAMARITAN RECENSION TO THE MASSORETIC TEXT AND TO THE SEPTUAGINT

1. Relation to the Massoretic Text: Classification of Differences

(1) Examples of Accidental Variations

(a) Due to Mistakes of Sight

(b) Variations Due to Mistakes of Hearing

(c) Changes Due to Deficient Attention

(2) Intentional

(a) Grammatical

(b) Logical

(c) Doctrinal

2. Relation of Samaritan Recension to Septuagint

(1) Statement of Hypotheses

(2) Review of These Hypotheses

IV. BEARING ON THE PENTATEUCHAL QUESTION

V. TARGUMS AND CHRONICLE

LITERATURE

The existence of a Samaritan community in Nablus is generally known, and the fact that they have a recension of the Pentateuch which differs in some respects from the Massoretic has been long recognized as important.

I. Knowledge of Samaritan Pentateuch.

1. In Older Times:

Of the Greek Fathers Origen knew of it and notes two insertions which do not appear in the Massoretic Text—Nu 13:1 and 21:12, drawn from De 1:2 and 2:18. Eusebius of Caesarea in his Chronicon compares the ages of the patriarchs before Abraham in the Septuagint with those in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Massoretic Text. Epiphanius is aware that the Samaritans acknowledged the Pentateuch alone as canonical. Cyril of Jerusalem notes agreement of Septuagint and Samaritan in Ge 4:8. These are the principal evidences of knowledge of this recension among the Greek Fathers. Jerome notes some omissions in the Massoretic Text and supplies them from the Samaritan Text. The Talmud shows that the Jews retained a knowledge of the Samaritan Pentateuch longer, and speaks contemptuously of the points in which it differs from the Massoretic Text. Since the differences observed by the Fathers and the Talmudists are to be seen in the Samaritan Pentateuch before us, they

afford evidence of its authenticity.

2. Revived Knowledge:

After nearly a millennium of oblivion the Samaritan Pentateuch was restored to the knowledge of Christendom by Pietro de la Valle who in 1616 purchased a copy from the Samaritan community which then existed in Damascus. This copy was presented in 1623 to the Paris Oratory and shortly after published in the Paris Polyglot under the editorship of Morinus, a priest of the Oratory who had been a Protestant. He emphasized the difference between the Massoretic Text and Samaritan Pentateuch for argumentative reasons, in order to prove the necessity for the intervention of the church to settle which was Scripture. A fierce controversy resulted, in which various divines, Protestant and Catholic, took part. Since then copies of this recension have multiplied in Europe and America. All of them may be regarded as copies ultimately of the Nablus roll. These copies are in the form, not of rolls, but of codices or bound volumes. They are usually written in two columns to the page, one being the Targum or interpretation and this is sometimes in Aramaic and sometimes in Arabic. Some codices show three columns with both Targums. There are probably nearly 100 of these codices in various libraries in Europe and America. These are all written in the Samaritan script and differ only by scribal blunders.

II. Codices and Script.

1. Nablus Roll:

The visitor to the Samaritans is usually shown an ancient roll, but only rarely is the most ancient exhibited, and when so exhibited still more rarely is it in circumstances in which it may be examined.

Dr. Mills, who spent three months in the Samaritan community, was able to make a careful though interrupted study of it. His description (Nablus and the Modern Samaritans, 312) is that "the roll is of parchment, written in columns, 13 inches deep, and 7 1/2 inches wide. The writing is in a fair hand, rather small; each column contains from 70 to 72 lines, and the whole roll contains 110 columns. The name of the scribe is written in a kind of acrostic, running through these columns, and is found in the Book of Deuteronomy The roll has the appearance of very great antiquity, but is wonderfully well preserved, considering its venerable age. It is worn out and torn in many places and patched with re-written parchment; in many other places, where not torn, the writing is unreadable. It seemed to me that about two-thirds of the original is still readable. The skins of which the roll is composed are of equal size and measure each 25 inches long by 15 inches wide." Dr. Rosen’s account on the authority of Kraus (Zeitschr. der deulschmorgenl. Gesellsch., XVIII, 582) agrees with this, adding that the "breadth of the writing is a line and the space between is similar." Both observers have noted that the parchment has been written only on the "hair" side. It is preserved in a silk covering enclosed in a silver case embossed with arabesque ornaments.

2. The Script:

The reader on opening one of the codices of the Samaritan Pentateuch recognizes at once the difference of the writing from the characters in an ordinary Hebrew Bible. The Jews admit that the character in which the Samaritan Pentateuch is written is older than their square character. It is said in the Talmud (Sanhedhrin 21b): "The law at first was given to Israel in ‘ibhri letters and in the holy tongue and again by Ezra in the square (’ashurith) character and the Aramaic tongue. Israel chose for themselves the ‘ashurith character and the holy tongue: they left to the hedhyoToth ("uncultured") the ‘ibhri character and the Aramaic tongue—‘the Cuthaeans are the hedhyoToth,’ said Rabbi Chasda." When Jewish hatred of the Samaritans, and the contempt of the Pharisees for them are remembered, this admission amounts to a demonstration. The Samaritan script resembles that on the Maccabean coins, but is not identical with it. It may be regarded as between the square character and the angular, the latter as is seen in the manuscript and the Siloam inscription. Another intermediate form, that found on the Assouan papyri, owes the differences it presents to having been written with a reed on papyrus. As the chronology of these scripts is of importance we subjoin those principally in question.

The study of these alphabets. will confirm the statement above made that the Samaritan alphabet is, in evolution, between the square character and the angular, nearer the latter than the former, while the characters of the Assouan papyri are nearer the former than the latter. Another point to be observed is that the letters which resemble each other in one alphabet do not always resemble in another. We can thus, from comparison of the letters liable to be confused, form a guess as to the script in which the document containing the confusion written.

3. Peculiarities in Writing:

In inscriptions the lapidary had no hesitation, irrespective of syllables, in completing in the next line any word for which he had not sufficient room. Thus, the beginnings and endings of lines were directly under each other, as on the MS. In the papyri the words are not divided, but the scribe was not particular to have the ends of lines directly under each other. The scribe of the square character by use of literae dilatabiles secured this without dividing the words. The Samaritan secured this end by wider spacing. The first letter or couple of letters of each line are placed directly under the first letter or letters of the preceding line—so with the last letters—two or three—of the line, while the other words are spread out to fill up the space. The only exception to this is a paragraph ending. Words are separated from each other by dots; sentences by a sign like our colon. The Torah is divided into 966 qisam or paragraphs. The termination of these is shown by the colon having a dot added to it, thus:. Sometimes this is reinforced by a line and an angle. These qisam are often enumerated on the margin; sometimes, in later manuscripts in Arabic numerals. A blank space sometimes separates one of these qisam from the next.

4. The Tarikh:

When the scribe wished to inform the reader of his personality and the place where he had written the manuscript he made use of a peculiar device. In copying he left a space vacant in the middle of a column. The space thus left is every now and then bridged by a single letter. These letters read down the column form words and sentences which convey the information. In the case of the Nablus roll this

tarikh occurs in Deuteronomy and occupies three columns. In this it is said, "I Abishua, son of Pinhas (Phinehas), son of Eleazar, son of Aharun (Aaron) the priest, have written this holy book in the door of the tabernacle of the congregation in Mt. Gerizim in the 13th year of the rule of the children of Israel in the land of Canaan." Most of the codices in the libraries of Europe and America have like information given in a similar manner. This tarikh is usually Hebrew, but sometimes it is in the Samaritan Aramaic. Falsification of the date merely is practically impossible; the forgery must be the work of the first scribe.

5. The Mode of Pronunciation:

Not only has the difference of script to be considered, but also the different values assigned to the letters. The names given to the letters differ considerably from the Hebrew, as may be seen above. There are no vowel points or signs of reduplication. Only B and P of the BeGaDH-KePHaTH letters are aspirated. The most singular peculiarity is that none of the gutturals is pronounced at all—a peculiarity which explains some of the names given to the letters. This characteristic appears all the more striking when it is remembered how prominent gutturals are in Arabic, the everyday language of the Samaritans. The Genesis 1:1-5 are subjoined according to the Samaritan pronunciation, as taken down by Petermann (Versuch einer hebr. Formenlehre, 161), from the reading of Amram the high priest: Barashet bara Eluwem it ashshamem wit aarets. Waarets ayata-te'u ube'u waashek al fani .... turn uru Eluwem amra, efet al fani ammem waya'mer Eluwem ya'i or way'ai or wayere Eluwem it a' or ki tov wayabdel Eluwem bin a'ir ubin aashek uyikra Eluwem la'or yom ula 'ashek qara lila. Uyai 'erev uyai beqar yom a'ad.

6. Age of the Nablus Roll:

There is no doubt that if the inscription given above is really in the manuscript it is a forgery written on the skin at the first. Of its falsity also there is no doubt. The Tell el-Amarna Letters sent from Canaan and nearly contemporary with the Israelite conquest of the land were impressed with cuneiform characters and the language was Babylonian. Neglecting the tarikh, we may examine the matter independently and come to certain conclusions. If it is the original from which the other manuscripts have been copied we are forced to assume a date earlier at least than the 10th century AD, which is the date of the earliest Hebrew MS. The script dates from the Hasmoneans. The reason of this mode of writing being perpetuated in copying the Law must be found in some special sanctity in the document from which the copies were made originally. Dr. Mills seems almost inclined to believe the authenticity of the tarikh. His reasons, however, have been rendered valueless by recent discoveries. Dr. Cowley, on the other hand, would date it somewhere about the 12th century AD, or from that to the 14th. With all the respect due to such a scholar we venture to think his view untenable. His hypothesis is that an old manuscript was found and the tarikh now seen in it was afterward added. That, however, is impossible unless a new skin—the newness of which would be obvious—had been written over and inserted. Even the comparatively slight change implied in turning Ishmael into Israel in the tarikh in the Nablus roll necessitates a great adjustment of lines, as the letters of the tarikh must read horizontally as well as perpendicularly. If that change were made, the date would then be approximately 650 AD, much older than Cowley's 12th century. There is, however, nothing in this to explain the sanctity given to this MS. There is a tradition that the roll was saved from fire, that, it leaped out of the fire in the presence of

Nebuchadnezzar. If it were found unconsumed when the temple on Mt. Gerizim was burned by John Hyrcanus I, this would account for the veneration in which it is held. It would account also for the stereotyping of the script. The angular script prevailed until near the time of Alexander the Great. In it or in a script akin to it the copy of the Law must have been written which Manasseh, the son-in-law of Sanballat, brought to Samaria. The preservation of such a copy would be ascribed to miracle and the script consecrated.

III. Relation of the Samaritan Recension to the Massoretic Text and to the Septuagint.

1. Relation to Massoretic Text: Classification of Differences:

While the reader of the Samaritan Pentateuch will not fail to observe its practical identity with the Massoretic Text, closer study reveals numerous, if minor, differences.

These differences were classified by Gesenius. Besides being illogical, his classification is faulty, as founded on the assumption that the Samaritan Pentateuch text is the later. The same may be said of Kohn's. We would venture on another classification of these variations, deriving the principle of division from their origin. These variations were due either to

(1) accident or

(2) intention.

(1) The first of these classes arose from the way in which books were multiplied in ancient days. Most commonly one read and a score of scribes, probably slaves, wrote to this dictation. Hence, errors might arise

(a) when from similarity of letters the reader mistook one word for another.

(b) If the reader's pronunciation was not distinct the scribes might mis-hear and therefore write the word amiss.

(c) Further, if the reader began a sentence which opened in a way that generally was followed by certain words or phrases, he might inadvertently conclude it, not in the way it was written before him, but in the customary phrase. In the same way the scribe through defective attention might also blunder. Thus the accidental variations may be regarded as due to mistakes of sight, hearing and attention.

(2) Variations due to intention are either

(a) grammatical, the removal of peculiarities and conforming them to usage, or

(b) logical, as when a command having been given, the fulfillment is felt to follow as a logical necessity and so is narrated, or, if narrated, is omitted according to the ideas of the scribe;

(c) doctrinal changes introduced into the text to suit the doctrinal position of one side or other. Questions of propriety also lead to alterations—these may be regarded as quasi-doctrinal.

(1) Examples of Accidental Variations.

(a) Due to Mistakes of Sight:

The cause of mistakes of sight is the likeness of differing letters. These, however, differ in different scripts, as may be proved by consideration of the table of alphabets. Some of these mistakes found in connection with the Samaritan Pentateuch appear to be mistakes due to the resemblance of letters in the Samaritan script. Most of these are obvious blunders; thus, in Ge 19:32, we have the meaningless tabhinu instead of ‘abhini, "our father," from the likeness of the Samaritan "t" to "a." In Ge 25:29 we have tsazedh instead of yazedh, "to seethe," because of the likeness of a Samaritan "ts", to "y" or "i". These, while in Blayney’s transcription of Walton’s text, are not in Petermann or the Samaritan Targum. The above examples are mistakes in Samaritan manuscripts, but there are mistakes also in the Massoretic Text. In Ge 27:40 the Revised Version (British and American) rendering is "When thou shalt break loose, thou shalt shake his yoke from off thy neck." This rendering does violence to the sense of both verbs and results in a tautology. In the Hiphil the first verb rudh ought to mean "to cause to wander," not "to break loose," and the second verb paraq means "to break," not "to shake off." The Samaritan has "When thou shalt be mighty, thou shalt break his yoke from off thy neck." The Massoretic Text mistake may be due to the confounding of the Samaritan "a" with a "t", and the transposition of a Samaritan "d" and "b". The verb ‘adhar, "to be strong," is rare and poetic, and so unlikely to suggest itself to reader or scribe. The renderings of the Septuagint and Peshitta indicate confusion. There are numerous cases, however, where the resembling letters are not in the Samaritan script, but sometimes in the square character and sometimes in the angular. Some characters resemble each other in both, but not in the Samaritan. The cases in which the resemblance is only in letters in the square script may all be ascribed to variation in the Massoretic Text. Cases involving the confusion of waw and yodh are instances in point. It may be said that every one of the instances of variation which depends on confusion of these letters is due to a blunder of a Jewish scribe, e.g. Ge 25:13, where the Jewish scribe has written nebhith instead of nebhdyoth (Nebaioth) as usual; 36:5, where the Jewish scribe has ye‘ish instead of ye‘ush (Jeush), as in the Qere. In Ge 46:30, by writing re’othi instead of ra’ithi, the Jewish scribe in regard to the same letters has made a blunder which the Samaritan scribe has avoided. When d and r are confused, it must not be ascribed to the likeness in the square script, for those letters are alike in the angular also. As the square is admitted to be later than the date of the Samaritan script, these confusions point to a manuscript in angular. There are, however, confusions which apply only to letters alike in angular. Thus, binyamim, invariably in the Samaritan Pentateuch Benjamin, binyamin, is written Benjamin; also in Ex 1:11 pithon instead of pithom, but "m" and "n" are alike only in the script of the Siloam inscription. In De 12:21, the Samaritan has leshakken, as the Massoretic Text has in 12:11, whereas the Massoretic Text has lasum. A study of the alphabets on p. 2314 will show the close resemblance between waw (w) and kaph (k) in the Siloam script, as well as the likeness above

mentioned between "m" and "n". This points to the fact that the manuscripts from which the Massoretic Text and the Samaritan were transcribed in some period of their history were written in angular of the type of the Siloam inscription, that is to say of the age of Hezekiah.

(b) Variations Due to Mistakes of Hearing:

The great mass of these are due to one of two sources, either on the one hand the insertion or omission of waw and yodh, so that the vowel is written plenum or the reverse, or, on the other hand, to the mistake of the gutturals. Of the former class of variations there are dozens in every chapter. The latter also is fairly frequent, and is due doubtless to the fact that in the time when the originals of the present manuscripts were transcribed the gutturals were not pronounced at all. Ge 27:36 shows ‘aleph (’) and he (h) interchanged, he (h) and cheth (ch) in Ge 41:45, cheth (ch) for ‘ayin (‘) in Ge 49:7, and ‘aleph (’) and ‘ayin (‘) in Ge 23:18, in many Samaritan manuscripts, but the result is meaningless. This inability to pronounce the gutturals points to a date considerably before the Arab domination. Possibly this avoidance of the gutturals became fashionable during the Roman rule, when the language of law was Latin, a language without gutturals. A parallel instance may be seen in Aquila, who does not transliterate any gutturals. This loss of the gutturals may be connected with the fact that in Assyrian ‘aleph (’) is practically the only guttural. The colonists from Assyria might not unlikely be unable to pronounce the gutturals.

(c) Changes Due to Deficient Attention:

Another cause of variation is to be found in reader or scribe not attending sufficiently to the actual word or sentence seen or heard. This is manifested in putting for a word its equivalent. In Ge 26:31 the Samaritan has lere‘ehu, "to his friend," instead of as the Massoretic Text le’achiw, "to his brother," and in Ex 2:10 Samaritan has na‘ar for yeledh in Massoretic Text. In such cases it is impossible to determine which represents the original text. We may remark that the assumption of Gesenius and of such Jewish writers as Kohn that the Massoretic Text is always correct is due to mere prejudice. More important is the occasional interchange of YHWH and ‘Elohim, as in Ge 28:4, where Samaritan has YHWH and the Massoretic Text ‘Elohim, and Ge 7:1 where it has ‘Elohim against YHWH in the Massoretic Text. This last instance is the more singular, in that in the 9th verse of the same chapter the Massoretic Text has ‘Elohim and the Samaritan YHWH. Another class of instances which may be due to the same cause is the completion of a sentence by adding a clause or, it may be, dropping it from failure to observe it to be incomplete, as Ge 24:45. If the Massoretic Text be the original text, the Samaritan adds the clause "a little water from thy pitcher"; if the Samaritan, then the Massoretic Text has dropped it.

(2) Intentional.

(a) Grammatical:

The variations from the Massoretic Text most frequently met with in reading the Samaritan Pentateuch are those necessary to conform the language to the rules of ordinary grammar. In this the Samaritan

frequently coincides with the Qere of the Massoretic Text. The Kethibh of the Massoretic Text has no distinction in gender between hu' in the 3rd personal pronoun singular—in both masculine and feminine it is hu'. The Samaritan with the Qere corrects this to hi'. So with na'ar, "a youth"—this is common in the Kethibh, but in the Qere when a young woman is in question the feminine termination is added, and so the Samaritan writers also. It is a possible supposition that this characteristic of the Torah is late and due to blundering peculiar to the manuscript from which the Massoretes copied the Kethibh. That it is systematic is against its being due to blunder, and as the latest Hebrew books maintain distinction of gender, we must regard this as an evidence of antiquity. This is confirmed by another set of variations between the Samaritan and the Massoretic Text. There are, in the latter, traces of case-endings which have disappeared in later Hebrew. These are removed in the Samaritan. That case terminations have a tendency to disappear is to be seen in English and French The sign of the accusative, 'eth, frequently omitted in the Massoretic Text, is generally supplied in Samaritan. A short form of the demonstrative pronoun plural ('el instead of 'ellah) is restricted to the Pentateuch and 1Ch 20:8. The syntax of the cohortative is different in Samaritan from that in the Massoretic Hebrew. It is not to be assumed that the Jewish was the only correct or primitive use. There are cases where, with colloquial inexactitude, the Massoretic Text has joined a plural noun to a singular verb, and vice versa; these are corrected in Samaritan. Conjugations which in later Hebrew have a definite meaning in relation to the root, but are used in the Massoretic Text of the Torah in quite other senses, are brought in the Samaritan Pentateuch into harmony with later use. It ought in passing to be noted that these pentateuchal forms do not occur in the Prophets; even in Jos 2:15 we have the feminine 3rd personal pronoun; in Jud 19:3 we have na'arah.

(b) Logical:

Sometimes the context or the circumstances implied have led to a change on one side or another. This may involve only the change of a word, as in Ge 2:2, where the Samaritan has "sixth" instead of "seventh" (Massoretic Text), in this agreeing with the Septuagint and Peshitta, the Jewish scribe thinking the "sixth day" could only be reckoned ended when the "seventh' had begun. In Ge 4:8, after the clause, "And Cain talked with (said to) Abel his brother," the Samaritan, Septuagint and Peshitta add, "Let us go into the field." From the evidence of the VSS, from the natural meaning of the verb 'amar, "to say," not "to speak," from the natural meaning also of the preposition 'el, "to," not "with" (see Gesenius), it is clear that the Massoretic Text has dropped the clause and that the Samaritan represents the true text. If this is not the case, it is a case of logical completion on the part of the Samaritan. Another instance is the addition to each name in the genealogy in Ge 11:10-24 of the sum of the years of his life. In the case of the narrative of the plagues of Egypt a whole paragraph is added frequently. What has been commanded Moses and Aaron is repeated as history when they obey.

(c) Doctrinal:

There are cases in which the text so suits the special views of the Samaritans concerning the sanctity of Gerizim that alteration of the original in that direction may be supposed to be the likeliest explanation. Thus there is inserted at Ge 20:6, 7 a passage from De 27:2 slightly modified: Gerizim being put for Ebal, the object of the addition being to give the consecration of Gerizim the sanction of the Torah. Kennicott, however, defends the authenticity of this passage as against the Massoretic Text. Insertion or

omission appears to be the result of doctrinal predilection. In Nu 25:4,5 the Samaritan harmonizes the command of Yahweh with the action of Moses. The passage removed has a bloodthirsty Moloch-like look that might seem difficult to defend. On the other hand, the Jewish hatred of idolatry might express itself in the command to "take all the heads of the people and hang them up before the Lord against the sun," and so might be inserted. There are cases also where the language is altered for reasons of propriety. In these cases the Samaritan agrees with the Qere of the Massoretic Text.

These variations are of unequal value as evidences of the relative date of the Samaritan recension of the Pentateuch. The intentional are for this purpose of little value; they are evidence of the views prevalent in the northern and southern districts of Palestine respectively. Only visual blunders are of real importance, and they point to a date about the days of Hezekiah as the time at which the two recensions began to diverge. One thing is obvious, that the Samaritan, at least as often as the Massoretic Text, represents the primitive text.

2. Relation of Samaritan Recension to Septuagint:

(1) Statement of Hypotheses.

The frequency with which the points in which the Samaritan Pentateuch differs from the Massoretic Text agree with those in which the Septuagint also differs has exercised scholars. Castelli asserts that there are a thousand such instances. It may be noted that in one instance, at any rate, a passage in which the Samaritan and the Septuagint agree against the Massoretic Text has the support of the New Testament. In Ga 3:17, the apostle Paul, following the Samaritan and Septuagint against the Massoretic Text, makes the "430 years" which terminated with the exodus begin with Abraham. As a rule the attention of Biblical scholars has been so directed to the resemblances between the Samaritan and the Septuagint that they have neglected the more numerous points of difference. So impressed have scholars been, especially when Jews, by these resemblances that they have assumed that the one was dependent on the other. Frankel has maintained that the Samaritan was translated from the Septuagint. Against this is the fact that in all their insulting remarks against them the Talmudists never assert that the "Cuthaeans" (Samaritans) got their Torah from the Greeks. Further, even if they only got the Law through Manasseh, the son-in-law of Sanballat, and even if he lived in the time of Alexander the Great, yet this was nearly half a century before the earliest date of the Septuagint. Again, while there are many evidences in the Septuagint that it has been translated from Hebrew, there are none in the Samaritan that it has been translated from Greek The converse hypothesis is maintained by Dr. Kohn with all the emphasis of extended type. His hypothesis is that before the Septuagint was thought of a Greek translation was made from a Samaritan copy of the Law for the benefit of Samaritans resident in Egypt. The Jews made use of this at first, but when they found it wrong in many points, they purposed a new translation, but were so much influenced by that to which they were accustomed that it was only an improved edition of the Samaritan which resulted. But it is improbable that the Samaritans, who were few and who had comparatively little intercourse with Egypt, should precede the more numerous Jews with their huge colonies in Egypt, in making a Greek translation. It is further against the Jewish tradition as preserved to us by Josephus. It is against the Samaritan tradition as learned by the present writer from the Samaritan high priest. According to him, the Samaritans had no independent translation, beyond the

fact that five of the Septuagint were Samaritan. Had there been any excuse for asserting that the Samaritans were the first translators, that would not have disappeared from their traditions.

(2) Review of These Hypotheses.

The above unsatisfactory explanations result from deficient observation and unwarranted assumption. That there are many cases where the Samaritan variations from the Massoretic Text are identical with those of the Septuagint is indubitable. It has, however, not been observed by those Jewish scholars that the cases in which the Samaritan alone or the Septuagint alone (one or the other) agrees with the Massoretic Text against the other, are equally numerous. Besides, there are not a few cases in which all three differ. It ought to be observed that the cases in which the Septuagint differs from the Massoretic Text are much more numerous than those in which the Samaritan differs from it. One has only to compare the Samaritan, Septuagint and Massoretic Text of any half a dozen consecutive chapters in the Pentateuch to prove this. Thus neither is dependent on the others. Further, there is the unwarranted assumption that the Massoretic Text represents the primitive text of the Law. If the Massoretic Text is compared with the VSS, it is found that the Septuagint, despite the misdirected efforts of Origen to harmonize it to the Palestinian text, differs in very many cases from the Massoretic Text. Theodotion is nearer, but still differs in not a few cases. Jerome is nearer still, though even the text behind the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is not identical with the Massoretic Text. It follows that the Massoretic Text is the result of a process which stopped somewhere about the end of the 5th century AD. The origin of the Massoretic Text appears to have been somewhat the result of accident. A manuscript which had acquired a special sanctity as belonging to a famous rabbi is copied with fastidious accuracy, so that even its blunders are perpetuated. This supplies the Kethibh. Corrections are made from other manuscripts, and these form the Qere. If our hypothesis as to the age of the Nablus roll is correct, it is older than the Massoretic Text by more than half a millennium, and the manuscript from which the Septuagint was translated was nearly a couple of centuries older still. So far then from its being a reasonable assumption that the Septuagint and Samaritan differ from the Massoretic Text only by blundering or willful corruption on the part of the former, the converse is at least as probable. The conclusion then to which we are led is that of Kennicott (State of Hebrew Text Dissertation, II, 164) that the Samaritan and Septuagint being independent, "each copy is invaluable—each copy demands our pious veneration and attentive study." It further ought to be observed that though Dr. Kohn points to certain cases where the difference between the Massoretic Text and the Septuagint is due to confusion of letters only possible in Samaritan character, this does not prove the Septuagint to have been translated from a Samaritan MS, but that the manuscripts of the Massoretic Text used by the Septuagint were written in that script. Kohn also exhibits the relation of the Samaritan to the Peshitta. While the Peshitta sometimes agrees with the Samaritan where it differs from the Massoretic Text, more frequently it supports the Massoretic Text against the Samaritan.

IV. Bearing on the Pentateuchal Question.

Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 2) makes Sanballat contemporary with Alexander the Great, and states that his son-in-law Manasseh came to Samaria and became the high priest. Although it is not said by Josephus, it

is assumed by critics that he brought the completed Torah with him. This Manasseh is according to Josephus the grandson of Eliashib the high priest, the contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah, and therefore contemporary with Artaxerxes Longimanus. Nehemiah (13:28) mentions, without naming him, a grandson of Eliashib, who was son-in-law of Sanballat, whom he chased from him. It is clear that Josephus had dropped a century out of his history, and that the migration of Manasseh is to be placed not circa 335 BC, but circa 435 BC. Ezra is reputed to be, if not the author of the Priestly Code in the Pentateuch, at all events its introducer to the Palestinians, and to have edited the whole, so that it assumed the form in which we now have it. But he was the contemporary of Manasseh, and had been, by his denunciation of foreign marriages, the cause of the banishment of Manasseh and his friends. Is it probable that he, Manasseh, would receive as Mosaic the enactments of Ezra, or convey them to Samaria? The date of the introduction of the Priestly Code (P), the latest portion of the Law, must accordingly be put considerably earlier than it is placed at present. We have seen that there are visual blunders that can be explained only on the assumption that the manuscript from which the mother Samaritan roll was copied was written in some variety of angular script. We have seen, further, that the peculiarities suit those of the Siloam inscription executed in the reign of Hezekiah, therefore approximately contemporary with the priest sent by Esarhaddon to Samaria to teach the people "the manner of the God of the land." As Amos and Hosea manifest a knowledge of the whole Pentateuch before the captivity, it would seem that this "Book of the Law" that was "read (Am 4:5, the Septuagint) without," which would be the source from which the priest sent from Assyria taught as above "the manner of the God of the land," would contain all the portions—J, E, D, and P—of the Law. If so, it did not contain the Book of Josh; notwithstanding the honor they give the conqueror of Canaan, the Samaritans have not retained the book which relates his exploits. This is confirmed by the fact that the archaisms in the Massoretic Text of the Pentateuch are not found in Josh. It is singular, if the Prophets were before the Law, that in the Law there should be archaisms which are not found in the Prophets. From the way the divine names are interchanged, as we saw, sometimes ‘Elohim in the Samaritan represents YHWH in the Massoretic Text, sometimes vice versa, it becomes obviously impossible to lay any stress on this. This conclusion is confirmed by the yet greater frequency with which this interchange occurs in the Septuagint. The result of investigation of the Samaritan Pentateuch is to throw very considerable doubt on the validity of the critical opinions as to the date, origin and structure of the Pentateuch

V. Targums and Chronicle.

As above noted, there are two Targums or interpretations of the Samaritan Pentateuch, an Aramaic and an Arabic. The Aramaic is a dialect related to the Western Aramaic, in which the Jewish Targums were written, sometimes called Chaldee. It has in it many strange words, some of which may be due to the language of the Assyrian colonists, but many are the result of blunders of copyists ignorant of the language. It is pretty close to the original and is little given to paraphrase. Much the same may be said of the Arabic Targum. It is usually attributed to Abu Said of the 13th century, but according to Dr. Cowley only revised by him from the Targum of Abulhassan of the 11th century. There is reference occasionally in the Fathers to a Samaritikon which has been taken to mean a Greek version. No indubitable quotations from it survive—what seem to be so being really translations of the text of the Samaritan recension. There is in Arabic a wordy chronicle called "The Book of Joshua." It has been edited by

Juynboll. It may be dated in the 13th century. More recently a "Book of Joshua" in Hebrew and written in Samaritan characters was alleged to be discovered. It is, however, a manifest forgery; the characters in which it is written are very late. It is partly borrowed rom the canonical Josh, and partly from the older Samaritan Book of Joshua with fabulous additions. The Chronicle of Abulfatach is a tolerably accurate account of the history of the Samaritans after Alexander the Great to the 4th century AD.

LITERATURE.

The text in the Samaritan script is found in the polyglots—Paris and London. Walton's text in the London Polyglot is transcribed in square characters by Blayney, Oxford, 1790. The English works of importance of recent times are Mills, Nablus and the Samaritans, London, 1864; Nutt, Fragments of a Samaritan Targum, London, 1874; Montgomery, The Samaritans, Philadelphia, 1907 (this has a very full bibliography which includes articles in periodicals); Iverach Munro. The Samaritan Pentateuch and Modern Criticism, 1911, London. In Germany, Gesenius' dissertation, De Pentateuchi Samaritani origine, etc., Jena, 1815, has not quite lost its value; Kohn, De Pentateucho Samaritano, Leipzig, 1865; Petermann, Versuch einer hebr. Formenlehre nach der Aussprache der heutigen Samaritaner, Leipzig, 1868. There are besides articles on this in the various Biblical Dictionaries and Encyclodedias. In the numerous religious and theological periodicals there have been articles on the Samaritan Pentateuch of varying worth. The Aramaic Targum has been transcribed in square characters and edited by Brull (Frankfort, 1875).

J. E. H. Thompson

PENTECOST

pen'-te-kost:

1. In the Old Testament:

As the name indicates (pentekoste), this second of the great Jewish national festivals was observed on the 50th day, or 7 weeks, from the Paschal Feast, and therefore in the Old Testament it was called "the feast of weeks." It is but once mentioned in the historical books of the Old Testament (2Ch 8:12,13), from which reference it is plain, however, that the people of Israel, in Solomon's day, were perfectly familiar with it: "offering according to the commandment of Moses, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the set feasts, three times in the year, even in the feast of unleavened bread, and in the feast of weeks, and in the feast of tabernacles." The requirements of the three great festivals were then well understood at this time, and their authority was founded in the Mosaic Law and unquestioned. The festival and its ritual were minutely described in this Law. Every male in Israel was on that day required to appear before the Lord at the sanctuary (Ex 34:22,23). It was the first of the two agrarian festivals of Israel and signified the completion of the barley-harvest (Le 23:15,16; De 16:9,10), which had begun at the time of the waving of the first ripe sheaf of the first-fruits (Le 23:11). Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, therefore fell on the 50th day after this occurrence. The wheat was then also nearly everywhere

harvested (Ex 23:16; 34:22; Nu 28:26), and the general character of the festival was that of a harvest-home celebration. The day was observed as a Sabbath day, all labor was suspended, and the people appeared before Yahweh to express their gratitude (Le 23:21; Nu 28:26). The central feature of the day was the presentation of two loaves of leavened, salted bread unto the Lord (Le 23:17,20; Ex 34:22; Nu 28:26; De 16:10). The size of each loaf was fixed by law. It must contain the tenth of an ephah, about three quarts and a half, of the finest wheat flour of the new harvest (Le 23:17). Later Jewish writers are very minute in their description of the preparation of these two loaves (Josephus, Ant, III, x, 6). According to the Mishna (Menachoth, xi.4), the length of the loaf was 7 handbreadths, its width 4, its depth 7 fingers. Le 23:18 describes the additional sacrifices required on this occasion. It was a festival of good cheer, a day of joy. Free-will offerings were to be made to the Lord (De 16:10), and it was to be marked by a liberal spirit toward the Levite, the stranger, and orphans and widows (De 16:11,14). Perhaps the command against gleaning harvest-fields has a bearing on this custom (Le 23:22).

The Old Testament does not give it the historical significance which later Jewish writers have ascribed to it. The Israelites were admonished to remember their bondage on that day and to reconsecrate themselves to the Lord (De 16:12), but it does not yet commemorate the giving of the Law at Sinai or the birth of the national existence, in the Old Testament conception (Ex 19). Philo, Josephus, and the earlier Talmud are all ignorant of this new meaning which was given to the day in later Jewish history. It originated with the great Jewish rabbi Maimonides and has been copied by Christian writers. And thus a view of the Jewish Pentecost has been originated, which is wholly foreign to the scope of the ancient institution.

2. In the New Testament:

The old Jewish festival obtained a new significance, for the Christian church, by the promised outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Joh 16:7,13). The incidents of that memorable day, in the history of Christianity, are told in a marvelously vivid and dramatic way in the Ac of the Apostles. The old rendering of sumplerousthai (Ac 2:1) by "was fully come" was taken by Lightfoot (Her. Heb.) to signify that the Christian Pentecost did not coincide with the Jewish, just as Christ’s last meal with His disciples was considered not to have coincided with the Jewish Passover, on Nisan 14. The bearing of the one on the other is obvious; they stand and fall together. the Revised Version (British and American) translates the obnoxious word simply "was now come." Meyer, in his commentary on the Acts, treats this question at length. The tradition of the ancient church placed the first Christian Pentecost on a Sunday. According to John, the Passover that year occurred on Friday, Nisan 14 (18:28). But according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the Passover that year occurred on Thursday, Nisan 14, and hence, Pentecost fell on Saturday. The Karaites explained the shabbath of Le 23:15 as pointing to the Sabbath of the paschal week and therefore always celebrated Pentecost on Sunday. But it is very uncertain whether the custom existed in Christ’s day, and moreover it would be impossible to prove that the disciples followed this custom, if it could be proved to have existed. Meyer follows the Johannic reckoning and openly states that the other evangelists made a mistake in their reckoning. No off-hand decision is possible, and it is but candid to admit that here we are confronted with one of the knottiest problems in the harmonizing of the Gospels.

See CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The occurrences of the first pentecostal day after the resurrection of Christ set it apart as a Christian festival and invested it, together with the commemoration of the resurrection, with a new meaning. We will not enter here upon a discussion of the significance of the events of the pentecostal day described in Ac 2. That is discussed in the article under TONGUES (which see). The Lutherans, in their endeavor to prove the inherent power of the Word, claim that "the effects then exhibited were due to the divine power inherent in the words of Christ; and that they had resisted that power up to the day of Pentecost and then yielded to its influence." This is well described as "an incredible hypothesis" (Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, 484). The Holy Spirit descended in answer to the explicit promise of the glorified Lord, and the disciples had been prayerfully waiting for its fulfillment (Ac 1:4,14). The Spirit came upon them as "a power from on high." God the Holy Spirit proved on Pentecost His personal existence, and the intellects, the hearts, the lives of the apostles were on that day miraculously changed. By that day they were fitted for the arduous work that lay before them. There is some difference of opinion as to what is the significance of Pentecost for the church as an institution. The almost universal opinion among theologians and exegetes is this: that Pentecost marks the rounding of the Christian church as an institution. This day is said to mark the dividing line between the ministry of the Lord and the ministry of the Spirit. The later Dutch theologians have advanced the idea that the origin of the church, as an institution, is to be found in the establishment of the apostolate, in the selection of the Twelve. Dr. A. Kuyper holds that the church as an institution was founded when the Master selected the Twelve, and that these men were "qualified for their calling by the power of the Holy Spirit." He distinguishes between the institution and the constitution of the church. Dr. H. Bavinck says: "Christ gathers a church about Himself, rules it directly so long as He is on the earth, and appoints twelve apostles who later on will be His witnesses. The institution of the apostolate is an especially strong proof of the institutionary character which Christ gave to His church on the earth" (Geref. Dogm., IV, 64).

Whatever we may think of this matter, the fact remains that Pentecost completely changed the apostles, and that the enduement with the Holy Spirit enabled them to become witnesses of the resurrection of Christ as the fundamental fact in historic Christianity, and to extend the church according to Christ’s commandment. Jerome has an especially elegant passage in which Pentecost is compared with the beginning of the Jewish national life on Mt. Sinai (Ad Tabiol, section 7): "There is Sinai, here Sion; there the trembling mountain, here the trembling house; there the flaming mountain, here the flaming tongues; there the noisy thunderings, here the sounds of many tongues; there the clangor of the ramshorn, here the notes of the gospel-trumpet." This vivid passage shows the close analogy between the Jewish and Christian Pentecost.

3. Later Christian Observance:

In the post-apostolic Christian church Pentecost belonged to the so-called "Semestre Domini," as distinct from the "Semestre Ecclesiae" the church festivals properly so called. As yet there was no trace of Christmas, which began to appear about 360 AD. Easter, the beginning of the pentecostal period, closed the "Quadragesima," or "Lent," the entire period of which had been marked by self-denial and humiliation. On the contrary, the entire pentecostal period, the so-called "Quinquagesima," was marked by joyfulness, daily communion, absence of fasts, standing in prayer, etc. Ascension Day, the 40th day

of the period, ushered in the climax of this joyfulness, which burst forth in its fullest volume on Pentecost. It was highly esteemed by the Fathers. Chrysostom calls it "the metropolis of the festivals" (De Pentec., Hom. ii); Gregory of Nazianzen calls it "the day of the Spirit" (De Pentec., Orat. 44). All the Fathers sound its praises. For they fully understood, with the church of the ages, that on that day the dispensation of the Spirit was begun, a dispensation of greater privileges and of a broader horizon and of greater power than had hitherto been vouchsafed to the church of the living God. The festival "Octaves," which, in accordance with the Jewish custom, devoted a whole week to the celebration of the festival, from the 8th century, gave place to a two days' festival, a custom still preserved by the Roman church and such Protestant bodies as follow the ecclesiastical year. The habit of dressing in white and of seeking baptism on Pentecost gave it the name "Whitsunday," by which it is popularly known all over the world.

Henry E. Dosker

PENUEL

pe-nu'-el, pen'-u-el.

See PENIEL.

PENURY

pen'-u-ri (machcor): In Pr 14:23, with sense of "poverty," "want": "The talk of the lips tendeth only to penury." In the New Testament the word in Lu 21:4 (husterema) is in the Revised Version (British and American) translated "want" (of the widow's mites).

PEOPLE

pe'-p'-l: In English Versions of the Bible represents something over a dozen Hebrew and Greek words. Of these, in the Old Testament, 'am, is overwhelmingly the most common (about 2,000 times), with le'om, and goy, next in order; but the various Hebrew words are used with very little or no difference in force (e.g. Pr 14:28; but, on the other hand, in Ps 44 contrast verses 12 and 14). Of the changes introduced by the Revised Version (British and American) the only one of significance (cited explicitly in the Preface to the English Revised Version) is the frequent use of the plural "peoples" (strangely avoided in the King James Version except Re 10:11; 17:15), where other nations than Israel are in question. So, for instance, in Ps 67:4; Isa 55:4; 60:2, with the contrast marked in Ps 33:10 and 12; Ps 77:14 and 15, etc. In the New Testament, laos, is the most common word, with ochlos, used almost as often in the King James Version. But in the Revised Version (British and American) the latter word is almost always rendered "multitude," "people" being retained only in Lu 7:12; Ac 11:24,26; 19:26, and in the fixed phrase "the common people" (ho polus ochlos) in Mr 12:37; Joh 12:9,12 margin (the retention of "people" would have been better in Joh 11:42, also), with "crowd" (Mt 9:23,25; Ac 21:35). The only

special use of "people" that calls for attention is the phrase "people of the land." This may mean simply "inhabitants," as Eze 12:19; 33:2; 39:13; but in 2Ki 11:14, etc., and the parallel in 2 Chronicles, it means the people as contrasted with the king, while in Jer 1:18, etc., and in Eze 7:27; 22:29; 46:3,9, it means the common people as distinguished from the priests and the aristocracy. A different usage is that for the heathen (Ge 23:7,12,13; Nu 14:9) or half-heathen (Ezr 9:1,2; 10:2,11; Ne 10:28-31) inhabitants of Palestine. From this last use, the phrase came to be applied by some rabbis to even pure-blooded Jews, if they neglected the observance of the rabbinic traditions (compare Joh 7:49 the King James Version). For "people of the East" see CHILDREN OF THE EAST.

Burton Scott Easton

PEOR

pe'-or (ha-pe'or; Phogor):

(1) A mountain in the land of Moab, the last of the three heights to which Balaam was guided by Balak in order that he might curse Israel (Nu 23:28). It is placed by Eusebius, Onomasticon on the way between Livias and Heshbon, 7 Roman miles from the latter. Buhl would identify it with Jebel el-Mashaqqar, on which are the ruins of an old town, between Wady A'yun Musa and Wady Chesban.

(2) A town in the Judean uplands added by Septuagint (Phagor) to the list in Jos 15:9. It may be identical with Khirbet Faghur to the South of Bethlehem.

(3) Peor, in Nu 25:18; 31:16; Jos 22:17, is a divine name standing for "Baal-peor."

(4) In Ge 36:39, Septuagint reads Phogor for "Pau" (Massoretic Text), which in 1Ch 1:50 appears as "Pai."

W. Ewing

PERAEA

pe-re'-a (he Peraia, Peraios, Peraites):

1. The Country:

This is not a Scriptural name, but the term used by Josephus to denote the district to which the rabbis habitually refer as "the land beyond Jordan." This corresponds to the New Testament phrase peran tou Iordanou (Mt 4:15; 19:1, etc.). The boundaries of the province are given by Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 3). In length it reached from Pella in the North to Macherus in the South, and in breadth from the Jordan on the West to the desert on the East. We may take it that the southern boundary was the Arnon . The natural

boundary on the North would be the great gorge of the Yarmuk. Gadara, Josephus tells us (BJ, IV, vii, 3, 6), was capital of the Peraea. But the famous city on the Yarmuk was a member of the Decapolis, and so could hardly take that position. More probably Josephus referred to a city the ruins of which are found at Jedur—a reminiscence of the ancient name—not far from es-SalT. The northern Gadara then holding the land on the southern bank of the Yarmuk, the northern boundary of the Peraea would run, as Josephus says, from Pella eastward. For the description of the country thus indicated see GILEAD, 2.

In the time of the Maccabees the province was mainly gentile, and Judas found it necessary to remove to Judea the scattered handful of Jews to secure their safety (1 Macc 5:45).

2. History:

Possibly under Hyrcanus Jewish influence began to prevail; and before the death of Janneus the whole country owned his sway (HJP, I, i, 297, 306). At the death of Herod the Great it became part of the tetrarchy of Antipas (Ant., XVII, vii, 1). The tetrarch built a city on the site of the ancient Beth-haram (Jos 13:27) and called it Julias in honor of the emperor's wife (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, II, ix 1). Here Simon made his abortive rising (Ant., XVII, x, 6; BJ, II, iv, 2). Claudius placed it under the government of Felix (BJ, II, xii, 8). It was finally added to the Roman dominions by Placidus (BJ, IV, vii, 3-6). Under the Moslems it became part of the province of Damascus.

Peraea, "the land beyond Jordan," ranked along with Judea and Galilee as a province of the land of Israel. The people were under the same laws as regarded tithes, marriage and property.

Peraea lay between two Gentileprovinces on the East, as Samaria between two Jewish provinces on the West of the Jordan. The fords below Beisan and opposite Jericho afforded communication with Galilee and Judea respectively. Peraea thus formed a link connecting the Jewish provinces, so that the pilgrims from any part might go to Jerusalem and return without setting foot on Gentilesoil. And, what was at least of equal importance, they could avoid peril of hurt or indignity which the Samaritans loved to inflict on Jews passing through Samaria (Lu 9:52 f; Ant, XX, vi, 1; Vita, 52).

It seems probable that Jesus was baptized within the boundaries of the Peraea; and hither He came from the turmoil of Jerusalem at the Feast of the Dedication (Joh 10:40). It was the scene of much quiet and profitable intercourse with His disciples (Mt 19; Mr 10:1-31; Lu 18:15-30). These passages are by many thought to refer to the period after His retirement to Ephraim (Joh 11:54). It was from Peraea that He was summoned by the sisters at Bethany (Joh 11:3).

Peraea furnished in Niger one of the bravest men who fought against the Romans (BJ, II, xx, 4; IV, vi, 1). From Bethezob, a village of Peraea, came Mary, whose story is one of the most appalling among the terrible tales of the siege of Jerusalem (BJ, VI, iii, 4). Josephus mentions Peraea for the last time (BJ, VI, v, 1), as echoing back the doleful groans and outcries that accompanied the destruction of Jerusalem.

W. Ewing

PERAZIM, MOUNT

per’-a-zim, pe-ra’-zim (har-peratsim): "Yahweh will rise up as in mount Perazim" (Isa 28:21). It is usually considered to be identical with BAAL-PERAZIM (which see), where David obtained a victory over the Philistines (2Sa 5:20; 1Ch 14:11).

PERDITION

per-dish’-un (apoleia, "ruin" or "loss," physical or eternal): The word "perdition" occurs in the English Bible 8 times (Joh 17:12; Php 1:28; 2Th 2:3; 1Ti 6:9; Heb 10:39; 2Pe 3:7; Re 17:11,18). In each of these cases it denotes the final state of ruin and punishment which forms the opposite to salvation. The verb apolluein, from which the word is derived, has two meanings:

(1) to lose;

(2) to destroy.

Both of these pass over to the noun, so that apoleia comes to signify:

(1) loss;

(2) ruin, destruction.

The former occurs in Mt 26:8; Mr 14:4, the latter in the passages cited above. Both meanings had been adopted into the religious terminology of the Scriptures as early as the Septuagint. "To be lost" in the religious sense may mean "to be missing" and "to be ruined," The former meaning attaches to it in the teaching of Jesus, who compares the lost sinner to the missing coin, the missing sheep, and makes him the object of a seeking activity (Mt 10:6; 15:24; 18:11; Lu 15:4,6,8,24,32; 19:10). "To be lost" here signifies to have become estranged from God, to miss realizing the relations which man normally sustains toward Him. It is equivalent to what is theologically called "spiritual death." This conception of "loss" enters also into the description of the eschatological fate of the sinner as assigned in the judgment (Lu 9:24; 17:33), which is a loss of life. The other meaning of "ruin" and "destruction" describes the same thing from a different point of view. Apoleia being the opposite of soteria, and soteria in its technical usage denoting the reclaiming from death unto life, apoleia also acquires the specific sense of such ruin and destruction as involves an eternal loss of life (Php 1:28; Heb 10:39). Perdition in this latter sense is equivalent to what theology calls "eternal death." When in Re 17:8,11 it is predicated of "the beast," one of the forms of the world-power, this must be understood on the basis of the Old Testament prophetic representation according to which the coming judgment deals with powers rather than persons.

The Son of Perdition is a name given to Judas (Joh 17:12) and to the Antichrist (2Th 2:3). This is the well-known Hebrew idiom by which a person typically embodying a certain trait or character or destiny

is called the son of that thing. The name therefore represents Judas and the Antichrist (see MAN OF SIN) as most irrecoverably and completely devoted to the final apoleia.

Geerhardus Vos

PERES

pe’-rez.

See MENE.

PERESH

pe’-resh (peresh, "dung"): Son of Machir, grandson of Manasseh through his Aramitish concubine (1Ch 7:14,16).

PEREZ-UZZA

pe-rez-uz’-za.

See UZZA.

PEREZ; PHAREZ

pe’-rez, fa’-rez (perets, "breach"): One of the twins born to Judah by Tamar, Zerah’s brother (Ge 38:29,30). In the King James Version Mt 1:3 and Lu 3:33, he is called "Phares," the name in 1 Esdras 5:5. He is "Pharez" in the King James Version Ge 46:12; Nu 26:20,21; Ru 4:12,18; 1Ch 2:4,5; 4:1; 9:4. In the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) 1Ch 27:3; Neh 11:4,6, he is "Perez." He is important through the fact that by way of Ru and Boaz and so through Jesse and David his genealogy comes upward to the Saviour. The patronymic "Pharzite" occurs in Nu 26:20 the King James Version.

Perezites (Nu 16:20, the King James Version "Pharzites"). The patronymic of the name Perez.

Henry Wallace

PERFECT; PERFECTION

pur’-fekt, per-fek’-shun (shalem, tamim; teleios, teleiotes):

1. In the Old Testament:

"Perfect" in the Old Testament is the translation of shalem, "finished," "whole," "complete," used (except in De 25:15, "perfect weight") of persons, e.g. a "perfect heart," i.e. wholly or completely devoted to Yahweh (1Ki 8:61, etc.; 1Ch 12:38; Isa 38:3, etc.); tamim, "complete," "perfect," "sound or unblemished," is also used of persons and of God, His way, and law ("Noah was a just man and perfect," the Revised Version margin "blameless" (Ge 6:9); "As for God, his way is perfect" (Ps 18:30); "The law of Yahweh is perfect" (Ps 19:7), etc.); tam, with the same, meaning, occurs only in Job, except twice in Psalms (Job 1:1,8; 2:3, etc.; Ps 37:37; 64:4); kalil, "complete," and various other words are translated "perfect."

Perfection is the translation of various words so translated once only: kalil (La 2:15); mikhlal, "completeness" (Ps 50:2); minleh, "possession" (Job 15:29, the King James Version "neither shall the prolong the perfection thereof upon the earth," the American Standard Revised Version "neither shall their possessions be extended on the earth," margin "their produce bend to the earth"; the English Revised Version reverses this text and margin); tikhlah, "completeness," or "perfection (Ps 119:96); takhlith (twice), "end," "completeness" (Job 11:7, "Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection?" 28:3, "searcheth out all the Revised Version (British and American) the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "to the furthest bound"; compare Job 26:10, "unto the confines of light and darkness"); tom, "perfect," "completeness" (Isa 47:9, the King James Version "They shall come upon thee in their perfection," the Revised Version (British and American) "in their full measure"). the Revised Version margin gives the meaning of "the Urim and the Thummim" (Ex 28:30 etc.) as "the Lights and the Perfections."

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament "perfect" is usually the tr of teleios, primarily, "having reached the end," "term," "limit," hence, "complete," "full," "perfect" (Mt 5:48, "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect"; Mt 19:21, "if thou wouldst be perfect; Eph 4:13, the King James Version "till we all come .... unto a perfect man," the Revised Version (British and American) "full-grown"; Php 3:15, "as many as are perfect," the American Revised Version margin "full-grown"; 1Co 2:6; Col 1:28, "perfect in Christ"; 4:12; Jas 3:2 margin, etc.).

Other words are teleioo. "to perfect," "to end," "complete" (Lu 13:32, "The third day I am perfected," the Revised Version margin "end my course"; Joh 17:23, "perfected into one"; 2Co 12:9; Php 3:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "made perfect"; Heb 2:10, etc.); also epiteleo, "to bring through to an end" (2Co 7:1, "perfecting holiness in the fear of God"; Ga 3:3, "Are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "perfected in the flesh," margin "Do ye now make an end in the flesh?"); katartizo "to make quite ready," "to make complete," is translated "perfect," "to perfect" (Mt 21:16, "perfected praise"; Lu 6:40, "Every one when he is perfected shall be as his teacher"; 1Co 1:10; 2Co 13:11, "be perfected"; 1Th 3:10; 1Pe 5:10, the Revised Version margin "restore"); akribos, "accurately," "diligently," is translated "perfect" (Lu 1:3, "having had perfect

understanding," the Revised Version (British and American) "having traced .... accurately"; Ac 18:26 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "more accurately"). We have also artios, "fitted," "perfected" (2Ti 3:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "complete"); pleroo, "to fill," "to make full" (Re 3:2, the American Standard Revised Version "perfected," the English Revised Version "fulfilled"); katartismos, "complete adjustment," "perfecting" (Eph 4:12, "for the perfecting of the saints").

Perfection is the translation of katartisis "thorough adjustment," "fitness" (2Co 13:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "perfecting"); of teleiosis (Heb 7:11); of teleiotess (Heb 6:1, the Revised Version margin "full growth"); it is translated "perfectness" (Col 3:14); "perfection" in Lu 8:14 is the translation of telesphoreo, "to bear on to completion or perfection." In Apocrypha "perfect," "perfection," etc., are for the most part the translation of words from telos, "the end," e.g. The Wisdom of Solomon 4:13; Ecclesiasticus 34:8; 44:17; 45:8, suntelia "full end"; 24:28; 50:11.

The Revised Version (British and American) has "perfect" for "upright" (2Sa 22:24,26 twice); for "sound" (Ps 119:80); for "perform" (Php 1:16); for "undefiled" (Ps 119:1, margin "upright in way"); for "perfect peace, and at such a time" (Ezr 7:12), "perfect and so forth"; for "He maketh my way perfect" (2Sa 22:33), "He guideth the perfect in his way," margin "or, ‘setteth free.’ According to another reading, ‘guideth my way in perfectness’";" shall himself perfect," margin "restore," for, "make you perfect" (1Pe 5:10); "perfecter" for "finisher" (Heb 12:2); "perfectly" is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 14:36); "set your hope perfectly on" for the King James Version "hope to the end for" (1Pe 1:13).

3. The Christian Ideal:

Perfection is the Christian ideal and aim, but inasmuch as that which God has set before us is infinite —"Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Mt 5:48)—absolute perfection must be forever beyond, not only any human, but any finite, being; it is a divine ideal forever shining before us, calling us upward, and making endless progression possible. As noted above, the perfect man, in the Old Testament phrase, was the man whose heart was truly or wholly devoted to God. Christian perfection must also have its seat in such a heart, but it implies the whole conduct and the whole man, conformed thereto as knowledge grows and opportunity arises, or might be found. There may be, of course, a relative perfection, e.g. of the child as a child compared with that of the man. The Christian ought to be continually moving onward toward perfection, looking to Him who is able to "make you perfect in every good thing (or work) to do his will, working in us that which is well-pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ to whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen (Heb 13:21).

W. L. Walker

PERFORM

per-form’ (Fr. parfournir, "to furnish completely," "to complete" "finish entirely"): In modern English,

through a mistaken connection with "form," "perform" usually suggests an act in its continuity, while the word properly should emphasize only the completion of the act. the King James Version seems to have used the word in order to convey the proper sense (compare Ro 15:28; 2Co 8:11; Php 1:6, where the Revised Version (British and American) has respectively "accomplish," "complete," "perfect"), but usually with so little justification in the Hebrew or Greek that "do" would have represented the original even better. the Revised Version (British and American) has rarely changed the word in the Old Testament, and such changes as have been made (De 23:23; Es 1:15, etc.) seem based on no particular principle. In the New Testament the word has been kept only in Mt 5:33 and Ro 4:21, but in neither verse does the Greek accent the completion of the act, in the former case apodidomi, literally, "to give back," in the latter poieo, "to make," "to do," being used.

Performance is found in the King James Version Sirach 19:20 (the Revised Version (British and American) "doing"); 2 Macc 11:17 (inserted needlessly and omitted by the Revised Version (British and American)); Lu 1:45 (the Revised Version (British and American) "fulfilment"); 2Co 8:11 (the Revised Version (British and American) "completion").

Burton Scott Easton

PERFUME-MAKING

See CRAFTS, II, 14.

PERFUME; PERFUMER

pur'-ium, per-fum' (qeToreth qaTar literally, "incense"): The ancients were fond of sweet perfumes of all kinds (Pr 27:9), and that characteristic is still especially true of the people of Bible lands. Perfumed oils were rubbed on the body and feet. At a feast in ancient Egypt a guest was anointed with scented oils, and a sweet-smelling water lily was placed in his hand or suspended on his forehead. In their religious worship the Egyptians were lavish with their incense. Small pellets of dried mixed spices and resins or resinous woods were burned in special censers. In the preparation of bodies for burial, perfumed oils and spices were used. Many Biblical references indicate the widespread use of perfumes. So 7:8 suggests that the breath was purposely scented; clothing as well as the body was perfumed (Ps 45:8; So 3:6; 4:11); couches and beds were sprinkled with savory scents (Pr 7:17); ointments were used in the last rites in honor of the dead (2Ch 16:14; Lu 24:1; Joh 19:39). The writer has in his collection a lump of prepared spices and resins taken from a tomb dating from the lst or 2nd century AD, which was apparently fused and run into the thoracic cavity, since an impression of the ribs has been made on the perfume. Its odor is similar to that of the incense used today, and it perfumes the whole case where it is kept. The above collection also contains a small glass vial in which is a bronze spoon firmly held in some solidified ointment, probably formerly perfumed oil. Perfumes were commonly kept in sealed alabaster jars or cruses (Lu 7:38). Thousands of these cruses have been unearthed in Palestine and Syria.

Perfumes were mixed by persons skilled in the article In the King James Version these are called

"apothecaries" (raqqach). The Revised Version (British and American) "perfumer" is probably a more correct rendering, as the one who did the compounding was not an apothecary in the same sense as is the person now so designated (Ex 30:25,35; 37:29; Ec 10:1).

Today incense is used in connection with all religious services of the oriental Christian churches. Although there is no direct mention of the uses of incense in the New Testament, such allusions as Paul's "a sacrifice to God for an odor of a sweet smell" (Eph 5:2; Php 4:18) would seem to indicate that it was used by the early Christians.

The delight of the people of Syria in pleasant odors is recorded in their literature. The attar of roses (from Arabic 'iTr, "a sweet odor") was a wellknown product of Damascus. The guest in a modern Syrian home is not literally anointed with oil, but he is often given, soon after he enters, a bunch of aromatic herbs or a sweet-smelling flower to hold and smell. During a considerable portion of the year the country air is laden with the odor of aromatic herbs, such as mint and sage. The Arabic phrase for taking a walk is shemm el-hawa', literally, "smell the air."

See INCENSE; OIL; OINTMENT.

James A. Patch

PERGA

pur'-ga (Perge):

1. Location and History:

An important city of the ancient province of Pamphylia, situated on the river Cestris, 12 miles Northeast of Attalia. According to Ac 13:13, Paul, Barnabas and John Mark visited the place on their first missionary journey, and 2 years later, according to Ac 14:24,25, they may have preached there. Though the water of the river Cestris has now been diverted to the fields for irrigating purposes, in ancient times the stream was navigable, and small boats from the sea might reach the city. It is uncertain how ancient Perga is; its walls, still standing, seem to come from the Seleucidan period or from the 3rd century BC. It remained in the possession of the Seleucid kings until 189 BC, when Roman influence became strong in Asia Minor. A long series of coins, beginning in the 2nd century BC, continued until 286 AD, and upon them Perga is mentioned as a metropolis. Though the city was never a stronghold of Christianity, it was the bishopric of Western Pamphylia, and several of the early Christians were martyred there. During the 8th century under Byzantine rule the city declined; in 1084 Attalia became the metropolis, and Perga rapidly fell to decay. While Attalia was the chief Greek and Christian city of Pamphylia, Perga was the seat of the local Asiatic goddess, who corresponded to Artemis or Diana of the Ephesians, and was locally known as Leto, or the queen of Perga. She is frequently represented on the coins as a huntress, with a bow in her hand, and with sphinxes or stags at her side.

2. The Ruins:

The ruins of Perga are now called Murtana. The walls, which are flanked with towers, show the city to have been quadrangular in shape. Very broad streets, running through the town, and intersecting each other, divided the city into quarters. The sides of the streets were covered with porticos, and along their centers were water channels in which a stream was always flowing. They were covered at short intervals by bridges. Upon the higher ground was the acropolis, where the earliest city was built, but in later times the city extended to the South of the hill, where one may see the greater part of the ruins. On the acropolis is the platform of a large structure with fragments of several granite columns, probably representing the temple of the goddess Leto; others regard it as the ruin of an early church. At the base of the acropolis are the ruins of an immense theater which seated 13,000 people, the agora, the baths and the stadium. Without the walls many tombs are to be seen. E. J. Banks

PERGAMOS; PERGAMUM

pur'-ga-mos, or pur'-ga-mum (he Pergamos, or to Pergamon):

1. History:

Pergamos, to which the ancient writers also gave the neuter form of the name, was a city of Mysia of the ancient Roman province of Asia, in the Caicus valley, 3 miles from the river, and about 15 miles from the sea. The Caicus was navigable for small native craft. Two of the tributaries of the Caicus were the Selinus and the Kteios. The former of these rivers flowed through the city; the latter ran along its walls. On the hill between these two streams the first city stood, and there also stood the acropolis, the chief temples, and theaters of the later city. The early people of the town were descendants of Greek colonists, and as early as 420 BC they struck coins of their own. Lysimachus, who possessed the town, deposited there 9,000 talents of gold. Upon his death, Philetaerus (283-263 BC) used this wealth to found the independent Greek dynasty of the Attalid kings. The first of this dynasty to bear the title of king was Attalus I (241-197 BC), a nephew of Philetaerus, and not only did he adorn the city with beautiful buildings until it became the most wonderful city of the East, but he added to his kingdom the countries of Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Pamphylia and Phrygia. Eumenes II (197-159 BC) was the most illustrious king of the dynasty, and during his reign the city reached its greatest height. Art and literature were encouraged, and in the city was a library of 200,000 volumes which later Antony gave to Cleopatra. The books were of parchment which was here first used; hence, the word "parchment," which is derived from the name of the town Pergamos. Of the structures which adorned the city, the most renowned was the altar of Zeus, which was 40 ft. in height, and also one of the wonders of the ancient world. When in 133 BC Attalus III, the last king of the dynasty, died, he gave his kingdom to the Roman government. His son, Aristonicus, however, attempted to seize it for himself, but in 129 he was defeated, and the Roman province of Asia was formed, and Pergamos was made its capital. The term Asia, as here employed, should not be confused with the continent of Asia, nor with Asia Minor. It applied simply to that part of Asia Minor which was then in the possession of the Romans, and formed into the province of which Pergamos was the capital. Upon the establishment of the province of Asia there began a new series of

coins struck at Pergamos, which continued into the 3rd century AD. The magnificence of the city continued.

2. Religions:

There were beautiful temples to the four great gods Zeus, Dionysus, Athena and Asklepios. To the temple of the latter, invalids from all parts of Asia flocked, and there, while they were sleeping in the court, the god revealed to the priests and physicians by means of dreams the remedies which were necessary to heal their maladies. Thus opportunities of deception were numerous. There was a school of medicine in connection with the temple. Pergamos was chiefly a religious center of the province. A title which it bore was "Thrice Neokoros," meaning that in the city 3 temples had been built to the Roman emperors, in which the emperors were worshipped as gods. Smyrna, a rival city, was a commercial center, and as it increased in wealth, it gradually became the political center. Later, when it became the capital, Pergamos remained the religious center. As in many of the towns of Asia Minor, there were at Pergamos many Jews, and in 130 BC the people of the city passed a decree in their favor. Many of the Jews were more or less assimilated with the Greeks, even to the extent of bearing Greek names.

3. Christianity:

Christianity reached Pergamos early, for there one of the Seven Churches of the Book of Re stood, and there, according to Re 2:13, Antipas was marryred; he was the first Christian to be put to death by the Roman state. The same passage speaks of Pergamos as the place "where Satan’s throne is," probably referring to the temples in which the Roman emperors were worshipped. During the Byzantine times Pergamos still continued as a religious center, for there a bishop lived. However, the town fell into the hands of the Seljuks in 1304, and in 1336 it was taken by Suleiman, the son of Orkhan, and became Turkish.

The modern name of the town, which is of considerable size, possessing 15 mosques, is Bergama, the Turkish corruption of the ancient name. One of its mosques is the early Byzantine church of Sophia. The modern town is built among the ruins of the ancient city, but is far less in extent. From 1879 to 1886 excavations among the ruins were conducted by Herr Humann at the expense of the German government. Among them are still to be seen the base of the altar of Zeus, the friezes of which are now in the Pergamon Museum, Berlin; theater, the agora, the gymnasium and several temples. In ancient times the city was noted for its ointments, pottery and parchment; at present the chief articles of trade are cotton, wool, opium, valonia, and leather.

E. J. Banks

PERIDA

pe-ri’-da (peridha’ "recluse"): A family of "Solomon’s servants" (Ne 7:57). In Ezr 2:55, a difference in the Hebrew spelling gives "Peruda" for the same person, who is also the "Pharida" of 1 Esdras 5:33.

PERIZZITE

per’-i-zit, pe-riz’-it (perizzi; Pherezaios): Signifies "a villager," and so corresponds with the Egyptian fellah. Hence, the Perizzite is not included among the sons of Canaan in Ge 10, and is also coupled with the Canaanite (Ge 13:7; 34:30; Jud 1:4). We hear, accordingly, of Canaanites and Perizzites at Shechem (Ge 34:30), at Bezek in Judah (Jud 1:4) and, according to the reading of the Septuagint, at Gezer (Jos 16:10). In De 3:5 and 1Sa 6:18, where the King James Version has "unwalled towns" and "country villages," the Septuagint has "Perizzite," the literal translation of the Hebrew being "cities of the Perizzite" or "villager" and "village of the Perizzite." The same expression occurs in Es 9:19, where it is used of the Jews in Elam. In Jos 17:15,18, where the Manassites are instructed to take possession of the forest land of Carmel, "Perizzites and Rephaim" are given as the equivalent of "Canaanite."

A. H. Sayce

PERJURY

pur’-ju-ri.

See CRIMES; OATH; PUNISHMENTS.

PERPETUAL; PERPETUALLY; PERPETUITY

per-pet’-u-al, per-pet’-u-al-i, pur-pe-tu’-i-ti (‘olam, netsach, [~tamidh):

Perpetual is usually the translation of ‘olam, properly, "a wrapping up" or "hiding," used often of time indefinitely long, and of eternity when applied to God; hence, we have, "for perpetual generations" (Ge 9:12); "the priesthood by a perpetual statute" (Ex 29:9; compare Ex 31:16; Le 3:17; 24:9, etc.); "placed the sand for the bound of the sea, by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it" (Jer 5:22, the Revised Version margin "an everlasting ordinance which it cannot pass"); "sleep a perpetual sleep" (Jer 51:39,57); "Moab shall be .... a perpetual desolation" (Ze 2:9), etc.; netsach, "preeminence," "perpetuity," "eternity" (often translated "for ever," Ps 9:6), is translated "perpetual" (Ps 74:3; Jer 15:18); natsach (participle) (Jer 8:5); tamidh, "continuance," generally rendered "continually," but sometimes "perpetual" or "perpetually" (Ex 30:8; Le 6:20).

"Perpetually" is the rendering of ‘adh, properly "progress," "duration," hence, long or indefinite time, eternity (usually in the King James Version rendered "for ever "), in Am 1:11, "His anger did tear perpetually"; and of kol ha-yamim, "all the days" (1Ki 9:3; 2Ch 7:16, "my heart shall be there perpetually"; compare Mt 28:20, pasas tas hemeras, literally, "all the days").

Perpetuity occurs in the Revised Version (British and American) of Le 25:23,30, "The land shall not be

sold in perpetuity," "The house .... shall be made sure in perpetuity."

Perpetual is frequent in the Apocrypha, most often as the translation of aionios and kindred words, e.g. Judith 13:20, "a perpetual praise"; The Wisdom of Solomon 10:14, "perpetual glory," the Revised Version (British and American) "eternal"; Ecclesiasticus 11:33, "a perpetual blot," the Revised Version (British and American) "blame for ever"; 1 Macc 6:44, "a perpetual name," the Revised Version (British and American) "everlasting"; aenaos, "ever-flowing," occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 11:6 (so the Revised Version); endeleches, "constant" (Ecclesiasticus 41:6, "perpetual reproach").

For "perpetual" (Jer 50:5; Hab 3:6) the Revised Version has "everlasting"; for "the old hatred" (Eze 25:15), "perpetual enmity"; for "perpetual desolation" (Jer 25:12) "desolate forever," margin "Hebrew ‘everlasting desolations.’"

W. L. Walker

PERSECUTION

pur-se-ku’-shun (@diogmos] (Mt 13:21; Mr 4:17; 10:30; Ac 8:1; 13:50; Ro 8:35; 2Co 12:10; 2Th 1:4; 2Ti 3:11)):

1. Persecution in Old Testament Times

2. Between the Testaments

3. Foretold by Christ

4. A Test of Discipleship

5. A Means of Blessing

6. Various Forms

7. In the Case of Jesus

8. Instigated by the Jews

9. Stephen

10. The Apostles James and Peter

11. Gentile Persecution

Christianity at First Not a Forbidden Religion

12. The Neronic Persecution

(1) Testimony of Tacitus

(2) Reference in 1 Peter

(3) Tacitus Narrative

(4) New Testament References

13. Persecution in Asia

14. Rome as Persecutor

15. Testimony of Pliny, 112 AD

16. 2nd and 3rd Centuries

17. Best Emperors the Most Cruel Persecutors

18. Causes of Persecution

19. 200 Years of Persecution

20. Persecution in the Army

21. Tertullian’s Apology

22. "The Third Race"

23. Hatred against Christians

24. The Decian Persecution

25. Libelli

26. The Edict of Milan

27. Results of Persecution

The importance of this subject may be indicated by the fact of the frequency of its occurrence, both in the Old Testament and New Testament, where in the King James Version the words "persecute," "persecuted," "persecuting" are found no fewer than 53 times, "persecution" 14 times, and "persecutor" 9 times.

1. Persecution in Old Testament Times:

It must not be thought that persecution existed only in New Testament times. In the days of the Old Testament it existed too. In what Jesus said to the Pharisees, He specially referred to the innocent blood which had been shed in those times, and told them that they were showing themselves heirs—to use a legal phrase—to their fathers who had persecuted the righteous, "from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah" (Mt 23:35).

2. Between the Testaments:

In the period between the close of the Old Testament and the coming of Christ, there was much and protracted suffering endured by the Jews, because of their refusal to embrace idolatry, and of their fidelity to the Mosaic Law and the worship of God. During that time there were many patriots who were true martyrs, and those heroes of faith, the Maccabees, were among those who "know their God .... and do exploits" (Da 11:32). ‘We have no need of human help,’ said Jonathan the Jewish high priest, ‘having for our comfort the sacred Scriptures which are in our hands’ (1 Macc 12:9).

In the Epistle to the Hebrews, persecution in the days of the Old Testament is summed up in these words: "Others had trial of mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover of bonds and imprisonment: they were stoned, they were sawn asunder, they were tempted, they were slain with the sword: they went about in sheepskins, in goatskins; being destitute, afflicted, illtreated (of whom the world was not worthy)" (Heb 11:36-38).

3. Foretold by Christ:

Coming now to New Testament times, persecution was frequently foretold by Christ, as certain to come to those who were His true disciples and followers. He forewarned them again and again that it was inevitable. He said that He Himself must suffer it (Mt 16:21; 17:22,23; Mr 8:31).

4. A Test of Discipleship:

It would be a test of true discipleship. In the parable of the Sower, He mentions this as one of the causes of defection among those who are Christians in outward appearance only. When affliction or persecution ariseth for the word’s sake, immediately the stony-ground hearers are offended (Mr 4:17).

5. A Means of Blessing:

It would be a sure means of gaining a blessing, whenever it came to His loyal followers when they were in the way of well-doing; and He thus speaks of it in two of the Beatitudes, "Blessed are they that have been persecuted for righteousness' sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven"; "Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you .... for my sake" (Mt 5:10,11; see also Mt 5:12).

6. Various Forms:

It would take different forms, ranging through every possible variety, from false accusation to the infliction of death, beyond which, He pointed out (Mt 10:28; Lu 12:4), persecutors are unable to go. The methods of persecution which were employed by the Jews, and also by the heathen against the followers of Christ, were such as these:

(1) Men would revile them and would say all manner of evil against them falsely, for Christ's sake (Mt 5:11).

(2) Contempt and disparagement: "Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon?" (Joh 8:48); "If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!" (Mt 10:25).

(3) Being, solely on account of their loyalty to Christ, forcibly separated from the company and the society of others, and expelled from the synagogues or other assemblies for the worship of God: "Blessed are ye, when men shall hate you, and when they shall separate you from their company, and reproach you, and cast out your name as evil, for the Son of man's sake" (Lu 6:22); "They shall put you out of the synagogues" (Joh 16:2).

(4) Illegal arrest and spoliation of goods, and death itself.

All these various methods, used by the persecutor, were foretold, and all came to pass. It was the fear of apprehension and death that led the eleven disciples to forsake Jesus in Gethsemane and to flee for their lives. Jesus often forewarned them of the severity of the persecution which they would need to encounter if they were loyal to Him: "The hour cometh, that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God" (Joh 16:2); "I send unto you prophets .... some of them shall ye kill and crucify; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city" (Mt 23:34).

7. In the Case of Jesus:

In the case of Christ Himself, persecution took the form of attempts to entrap Him in His speech (Mt 22:15); the questioning of His authority (Mr 11:28); illegal arrest; the heaping of every insult upon Him as a prisoner; false accusation; and a violent and most cruel death.

8. Instigated by the Jews:

After our Lord’s resurrection the first attacks against His disciples came from the high priest and his party. The high-priesthood was then in the hands of the Sadducees, and one reason which moved them to take action of this kind was their ‘sore trouble,’ because the apostles "proclaimed in Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Ac 4:2; 5:17). The gospel based upon the resurrection of Christ was evidence of the untruth of the chief doctrines held by the Sadducees, for they held that there is no resurrection. But instead of yielding to the evidence of the fact that the resurrection had taken place, they opposed and denied it, and persecuted His disciples. For a time the Pharisees were more moderate in their attitude toward the Christian faith, as is shown in the case of Gamaliel (Ac 5:34); and on one occasion they were willing even to defend the apostle Paul (Ac 23:9) on the doctrine of the resurrection. But gradually the whole of the Jewish people became bitter persecutors of the Christians. Thus, in the earliest of the Pauline Epistles, it is said, "Ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen, even as they (in Judea) did of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men" (1Th 2:14,15).

9. Stephen:

Serious persecution of the Christian church began with the case of Stephen (Ac 7:1-60); and his lawless execution was followed by "a great persecution" directed against the Christians in Jerusalem. This "great persecution" (Ac 8:1) scattered the members of the church, who fled in order to avoid bonds and imprisonment and death. At this time Saul signalized himself by his great activity, persecuting "this Way unto the death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women" (Ac 22:4).

10. The Apostles, James and Peter:

By and by one of the apostles was put to death—the first to suffer of "the glorious company of the apostles"—James the brother of John, who was slain with the sword by Herod Agrippa (Ac 12:2). Peter also was imprisoned, and was delivered only by an angel (Ac 12:7-11).

11. Gentile Persecution:

During the period covered by the Ac there was not much purely Gentilepersecution: at that time the persecution suffered by the Christian church was chiefly Jewish. There were, however, great dangers and risks encountered by the apostles and by all who proclaimed the gospel then. Thus, at Philippi, Paul and Silas were most cruelly persecuted (Ac 16:19-40); and, even before that time, Paul and Barnabas had suffered much at Iconium and at Lystra (Ac 14:5,19). On the whole the Roman authorities were not actively hostile during the greater part of Paul’s lifetime. Gallio, for instance, the deputy of Achaia, declined to go into the charge brought by the Jews at Corinth against Paul (Ac 18:14,15,16). And when Paul had pleaded in his own defense before King Herod Agrippa and the Roman governor Festus, these two judges were agreed in the opinion, "This man doeth nothing worthy of death or of bonds" (Ac 26:31). Indeed it is evident (see Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, 308) that the purpose

of Paul’s trial being recorded at length in the Ac is to establish the fact that the preaching of the gospel was not forbidden by the laws of the Roman empire, but that Christianity was a religio licita, a lawful religion.

Christianity at First Not a Forbidden Religion.

This legality of the Christian faith was illustrated and enforced by the fact that when Paul’s case was heard and decided by the supreme court of appeal at Rome, he was set free and resumed his missionary labors, as these are recorded or referred to in the Pastoral Epistles "One thing, however, is clear from a comparison of Philippians with 2 Timothy. There had been in the interval a complete change in the policy toward Christianity of the Roman government. This change was due to the great fire of Rome (July, 64). As part of the persecution which then broke out, orders were given for the imprisonment of the Christian leaders. Poppea, Tigellinus and their Jewish friends were not likely to forget the prisoner of two years before. At the time Paul was away from Rome, but steps were instantly taken for his arrest. The apostle was brought back to the city in the autumn or winter of 64. .... That he had a trial at all, instead of the summary punishment of his brethren. witnesses to the importance attached by the government to a show of legality in the persecution of the leader" (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 38).

See PASTORAL EPISTLES; PAUL, THE APOSTLE.

12. The Neronic Persecution:

The legal decisions which were favorable to the Christian faith were soon overturned on the occasion of the great fire in Rome, which occurred in July, 64. The public feeling of resentment broke out against the emperor to such a degree that, to avoid the stigma, just or unjust, of being himself guilty of setting the city on fire, he made the Christians the scapegoats which he thought he needed. Tacitus (Annals xv.44) relates all that occurred at that time, and what he says is most interesting, as being one of the very earliest notices found in any profane author, both of the Christian faith, and of Christ Himself.

(1) Testimony of Tacitus.

What Tacitus says is that nothing that Nero could do, either in the way of gifts to the populace or in that of sacrifice the Roman deities, could make the people believe that he was innocent of causing the great fire which had consumed their dwellings. Hence, to relieve himself of this infamy he falsely accused the Christians of being guilty of the crime of setting the city on fire. Tacitus uses the strange expression "the persons commonly called Christians who were hated for their enormities." This is an instance of the saying of all manner of evil against them falsely, for Christ’s sake. The Christians, whose lives were pure and virtuous and beneficent, were spoken of as being the offscouring of the earth.

(2) Reference in 1 Peter.

The First Epistle of Peter is one of the parts of the New Testament which seem to make direct reference to the Neronic persecution, and he uses words (1Pe 4:12) which may be compared with the narrative of Tacitus: "Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial among you, which cometh upon you to prove you, as though a strange thing happened unto you: but insomuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings, rejoice. .... If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye; because the Spirit of glory and the Spirit of God resteth upon you. For let none of you suffer as a murderer, or a thief, or an evil-doer, or as a meddler in other men's matters: but if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name. For the time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God. .... Wherefore let them also that suffer according to the will of God commit their souls in well-doing unto a faithful Creator."

(3) Tacitus' Narrative.

How altogether apposite and suitable was this comforting exhortation to the case of those who suffered in the Neronic persecution. The description which Tacitus gives is as follows: "Christus, the founder of that name, was put to death as a criminal by Pontius Pilate, procurator in the reign of Tiberius. But the pernicious superstition, repressed for a time, broke out again not only through Judea, where the mischief originated, but through the city of Rome also, whither all things horrible and disgraceful flow from all quarters as to a common sink, and where they are encouraged. Accordingly, first, those were seized who confessed they were Christians; next, on their information, a vast multitude were convicted, not so much on the charge of setting the city on fire, as of hating the human race. And in their deaths they were made the subject of sport, for they were covered with the skins of wild beasts and were worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined were burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero offered his own gardens for that spectacle, and exhibited circus games, indiscriminately mingling with the common people dressed as a charioteer, or else standing in his chariot. Whence a feeling of compassion arose toward the sufferers, though guilty and deserving to be made examples of by capital punishment, because they seemed not to be cut off for the public good, but to be victims to the ferocity of one man."

See NERO.

(4) New Testament References.

Three of the books of the New Testament bear the marks of that most cruel persecution under Nero, the Second Epistle to Timothy, the First Epistle of Peter—already referred to—and the Revelation of John. In 2 Timothy, Paul speaks of his impending condemnation to death, and the terror inspired by the persecution causes "all" to forsake him when he is brought to public trial (2Ti 4:16).

The "fiery trial" is spoken of in 1 Peter, and Christians are exhorted to maintain their faith with patience; they are pleaded with to have their "conversation honest" (1Pe 2:12 the King James Version), so that all accusations directed against them may be seen to be untrue, and their sufferings shall then be, not for ill-doing, but only for the name of Christ (1Pe 3:14,16). "This important epistle proves a general

persecution (1Pe 1:6; 4:12,16) in Asia Minor North of the Taurus (1Pe 1:1; note especially Bithynia) and elsewhere (1Pe 5:9). The Christians suffer ‘for the name,’ but not the name alone (1Pe 4:14). They are the objects of vile slanders (1Pe 2:12,15; 3:14-16; 4:4,15), as well as of considerable zeal on the part of officials (1Pe 5:8 (Greek 3:15)). As regards the slanders, the Christians should be crcumspect (1Pe 2:15,16; 3:16,17; 4:15). The persecution will be short, for the end of all things is at hand (1Pe 4:7,13; 5:4)" (Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 354).

13. Persecution in Asia:

In Re the apostle John is in "Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (Re 1:9). Persecution has broken out among the Christians in the province of Asia. At Smyrna, there is suffering, imprisonment and prolonged tribulation; but the sufferers are cheered when they are told that if they are faithful unto death, Christ will give them the crown of life (Re 2:10). At Pergamum, persecution has already resulted in Antipas, Christ’s faithful martyr, being slain (Re 2:13). At Ephesus and at Thyatira the Christians are commended for their patience, evidently indicating that there had been persecution (Re 2:2,19). At Philadelphia there has been the attempt made to cause the members of the church to deny Christ’s name (Re 3:8); their patience is also commended, and the hour of temptation is spoken of, which comes to try all the world, but from which Christ promised to keep the faithful Christians in Philadelphia. Strangely enough, there is no distinct mention of persecution having taken place in Sardis or in Laodicea.

14. Rome as Persecutor:

As the book proceeds, evidences of persecution are multiplied. In Re 6:9, the apostle sees under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held; and those souls are bidden to rest yet for a little season "until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, who should be killed even as they were, should have fulfilled their course" (Re 6:11). The meaning is that there is not yet to be an end of suffering for Christ’s sake; persecution may continue to be as severe as ever. Compare Re 20:4 "I saw the souls of them that had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and such as worshipped not the beast," for the persecution had raged against all classes indiscriminately, and Roman citizens who were true to Christ had suffered unto death. It is to these that reference is made in the words "had been beheaded," decapitation being reserved as the most honorable form of execution, for Roman citizens only. So terrible does the persecution of Christians by the imperial authorities become, that Rome is "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (Re 17:6; 16:6; see also Re 18:24; 19:2).

Paul’s martyrdom is implied in 2 Timothy, throughout the whole epistle, and especially in 4:6,7,8. The martyrdom of Peter is also implied in Joh 21:18,19, and in 2Pe 1:14. The abiding. impression made by these times of persecution upon the mind of the apostle John is also seen in the defiance of the world found throughout his First Epistle (1 Joh 2:17; 5:19), and in the rejoicing over the fall of Babylon, the great persecuting power, as that fall is described in such passages as Re 14:8; 15:2,3; 17:14; 18:24.

Following immediately upon the close of the New Testament, there is another remarkable witness to the continuance of the Roman persecution against the Christian church. This is Pliny, proconsul of Bithynia.

15. Testimony of Pliny, 112 AD:

In 111 or 112 AD, he writes to the emperor Trajan a letter in which he describes the growth of the Christian faith. He goes on to say that "many of all ages and of all ranks and even of both sexes are being called into danger, and will continue to be so. In fact the contagion of this superstition is not confined to the cities only, but has spread to the villages and country districts." He proceeds to narrate how the heathen temples had been deserted and the religious rites had been abandoned for so long a time: even the sacrificial food—that is, the flesh of the sacrificial victims—could scarcely find a purchaser.

But Pliny had endeavored to stem the tide of the advancing Christian faith, and he tells the emperor how he had succeeded in bringing back to the heathen worship many professing Christians. That is to say, he had used persecuting measures, and had succeeded in forcing some of the Christians to abandon their faith. He tells the methods he had used. "The method I have observed toward those who have been brought before me as Christians is this. I asked them whether they were Christians. If they admitted it, I repeated the question a second and a third time, and threatened them with punishment. If they persisted I ordered them to be punished. For I did not doubt, whatever the nature of that which they confessed might be, that a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy ought to be punished. There were others also, possessed with the same infatuation, whom, because they were Roman citizens, I ordered to be sent to Rome. But this crime spreading, as is usually the case, while it was actually under legal prosecution, several cases occurred. An anonymous information was laid before me, containing the names of many persons. Those who denied that they were Christians, or that they had ever been so, repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and offered prayer, with wine and incense, to your statue, which I had ordered to be brought in for this very purpose, along with the statues of the gods, and they even reviled the name of Christ; whereas there is no forcing, it is said, those who are really Christians into any of these compliances: I thought it proper to discharge them. Others who were accused by a witness at first confessed themselves Christians, but afterward denied it. Some owned indeed that they had been Christians formerly, but had now, some for several years, and a few above 20 years ago, renounced it. They all worshipped your statue and the images of the gods. .... I forbade the meeting of any assemblies, and therefore I judged it to be so much the more necessary to endeavor to extort the real truth by putting to the torture two female slaves, who were called deaconesses, yet I found nothing but an absurd and extravagant superstition."

In Trajan’s reply to Pliny he writes, "They (the Christians) ought not to be searched for. If they are brought before you and convicted, they should be punished, but this should be done in such a way, that he who denies that he is a Christian, and when his statement is proved by his invoking our deities, such a person, although suspected for past conduct, must nevertheless be forgiven, because of his repentance."

These letters of Pliny and Trajan treat state-persecution as the standing procedure—and this not a

generation after the death of the apostle John. The sufferings and tribulation predicted in Re 2:10, and in many other passages, had indeed come to pass. Some of the Christians had denied the name of Christ and had worshipped the images of the emperor and of the idols, but multitudes of them had been faithful unto death, and had received the martyr's crown of life.

16. 2nd and 3rd Centuries:

Speaking generally, persecution of greater or less severity was the normal method employed by the Roman empire against the Christian church during the 2nd and the 3rd centuries It may be said to have come to an end only about the end of the 3rd or the beginning of the 4th century, when the empire became nominally Christian. When the apostolic period is left, persecution becomes almost the normal state in which the church is found. And persecution, instead of abolishing the name of Christ, as the persecutors vainly imagined they had succeeded in doing, became the means of the growth of the Christian church and of its purity. Both of these important ends, and others too, were secured by the severity of the means employed by the persecuting power of the Roman empire.

Under Trajan's successor, the emperor Hadrian, the lot of the Christians was full of uncertainty: persecution might break out at any moment. At the best Hadrian's regime was only that of unauthorized toleration.

17. Best Emperors the Most Cruel Persecutors:

With the exception of such instances as those of Nero and Domitian, there is the surprising fact to notice, that it was not the worst emperors, but the best, who became the most violent persecutors. One reason probably was that the ability of those emperors led them to see that the religion of Christ is really a divisive factor in any kingdom in which civil government and pagan religion are indissolubly bound up together. The more that such a ruler was intent on preserving the unity of the empire, the more would be persecute the Christian faith. Hence, among the rulers who were persecutors, there are the names of Antoninus Pius. Marcus Aurelius the philosopher-emperor, and Septimius Severus (died at York, 211 Ad).

18. Causes of Persecution:

Persecution was no accident, which chanced to happen, but which might not have occurred at all. It was the necessary consequence of the principles embodied in the heathen Roman government, when these came into contact and into conflict with the essential principles of the Christian faith. The reasons for the persecution of the Christian church by the Roman empire were

(1) political;

(2) on account of the claim which the Christian faith makes, and which it cannot help making, to the exclusive allegiance of the heart and of the life.

That loyalty to Christ which the martyrs displayed was believed by the authorities in the state to be incompatible with the duties of a Roman citizen. Patriotism demanded that every citizen should united in the worship of the emperor, but Christians refused to take pat in the worship on any terms, and so they continually lived under the shadow of a great hatred, which always slumbered, and might break out at any time. The claim which the Christian faith made to the absolute and exclusive loyalty of all who obeyed Christ was such that it admitted of no compromise with heathenism. To receive Christ into the pantheon as another divinity, as one of several—this was not the Christian faith. To every loyal follower of Christ compromise with other faiths was an impossibility. An accommodated Christianity would itself have been false to the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He had sent, and would never have conquered the world. To the heathen there were lords many and gods many, but to the Christians there was but one God the Father and one Lord Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the world (1Co 8:5,6). The essential absoluteness of the Christian faith was its strength, but this was also the cause of its being hated.

"By a correct instinct paganisms of all sorts discerned in the infant church their only rival. So, while the new Hercules was yet in the cradle, they sent their snakes to kill him. But Hercules lived to cleanse out the Augean stables" (Workman, op. cit., 88).

19. 200 Years of Persecution:

"For 200 years, to become a Christian meant the great renunciation, the joining a despised and persecuted sect, the swimming against the tide of popular prejudice, the coming under the ban of the Empire, the possibility at any moment of imprisonment and death under its most fearful forms. For 200 years he that would follow Christ must count the cost, and be prepared to pay the same with his liberty and life. For 200 years the mere profession of Christianity was itself a crime. Christianus sum was almost the one plea for which there was Persecution no forgiveness, in itself all that was necessary as a ‘title’ on the back of the condemned. He who made it was allowed neither to present apology, nor call in the aid of a pleader. ‘Public hatred,’ writes Tertullian, ‘asks but one thing, and that not investigation into the crimes charged, but simply the confession of the Christian name.’ For the name itself in periods of stress, not a few, meant the rack, the blazing shirt of pitch, the lion, the panther, or in the case of maidens an infamy worse than death" (Workman, 103).

20. Persecution in the Army:

Service in the Roman army involved, for a Christian, increasing danger in the midst of an organized and aggressive heathenism. Hence, arose the persecution of the Christian soldier who refused compliance with the idolatrous ceremonies in which the army engaged, whether those ceremonies were concerned with the worship of the Roman deities or with that of Mithraism. "The invincible saviour," as Mithra was called, had become, at the time when Tertullian and Origen wrote, the special deity of soldiers. Shrines in honor of Mithra were erected through the entire breadth of the Roman empire, from Dacia and Pannonia to the Cheviot Hills in Britain. And woe to the soldier who refused compliance with the religious sacrifices to which the legions gave their adhesion! The Christians in the Roman legions

formed no inconsiderable proportion of "the noble army of martyrs," it being easier for the persecuting authorities to detect a Christian in the ranks of the army than elsewhere.

21. Tertullian’s Apology:

In the 2nd and 3rd centuries, Christians were to be found everywhere, for Tertullian, in an oftentimes quoted passage in his Apology, writes, "We live beside you in the world, making use of the same forum, market, bath, shop, inn, and all other places of trade. We sail with you, fight shoulder to shoulder, till the soil, and traffic with you"; yet the very existence of Christian faith, and its profession, continued to bring the greatest risks. "With the best will in the world, they remained a peculiar people, who must be prepared at any moment to meet the storm of hatred" (Workman, 189). For them it remained true that in one way or another, hatred on the part of the world inevitably fell to the lot of those who walked in the footsteps of the Master; "All that would live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution" (2Ti 3:12).

22. "The Third Race":

The strange title, "the third race," probably invented by the heathen, but willingly accepted by the Christians without demur, showed with what a bitter spirit the heathen regarded the faith of Christ. "The first race" was indifferently called the Roman, Greek, or Gentile. "The second race" was the Jews; while "the third race" was the Christian. The cry in the circus of Carthage was Usque quo genus tertium? "How long must we endure this third race?"

23. Hatred against Christians:

But one of the most powerful causes of the hatred entertained by the heathen against the Christians was, that though there were no citizens so loyal as they, yet in every case in which the laws and customs of the empire came into conflict with the will of God, their supreme rule was loyalty to Christ, they must obey God rather than man. To worship Caesar, to offer even one grain of incense on the shrine of Diana, no Christian would ever consent, not even. when this minimum of compliance would save life itself.

The Roman empire claimed to be a kingdom of universal sway, not only over the bodies and the property of all its subjects, but over their consciences and their souls. It demanded absolute obedience to its supreme lord, that is, to Caesar. This obedience the Christian could not render, for unlimited obedience of body, soul and spirit is due to God alone, the only Lord of the conscience. Hence, it was that there arose the antagonism of the government to Christianity, with persecution as the inevitable result.

These results, hatred and persecution, were, in such circumstances, inevitable; they were "the outcome of the fundamental tenet of primitive Christianity, that the Christian ceased to be his own master, ceased to have his old environment, ceased to hold his old connections with the state; in everything he became the bond-servant of Jesus Christ, in everything owing supreme allegiance and fealty to the new empire and the Crucified Head. ‘We engage in these conflicts,’ said Tertullian, ‘as men whose very lives are not

our own. We have no master but God’"(Workman, 195).

24. The Decian Persecution:

The persecution inaugurated by the emperor Decius in 250 AD was particularly severe. There was hardly a province in the empire where there were no martyrs; but there were also many who abandoned their faith and rushed to the magistrates to obtain their libelli, or certificates that they had offered heathen sacrifice. When the days of persecution were over, these persons usually came with eagerness to seek readmission to the church. It was in the Decian persecution that the great theologian Origen, who was then in his 68th year, suffered the cruel torture of the rack; and from the effects of what he then suffered he died at Tyre in 254.

25. Libelli:

Many libelli have been discovered in recent excavations in Egypt. In the The Expository Times for January, 1909, p. 185, Dr. George Milligan gives an example, and prints the Greek text of one of these recently discovered Egyptian libelli. These libelli are most interesting, illustrating as they do the account which Cyprian gives of the way in which some faint-hearted Christians during the Decian persecution obtained certificates—some of these certificates being true to fact, and others false—to the effect that they had sacrificed in the heathen manner. The one which Dr. Milligan gives is as follows: "To those chosen to superintend the sacrifices at the village of Alexander Island, from Aurelius Diogenes, the son of Sarabus, of the village of Alexander Island, being about 72 years old, a scar on the right eyebrow. Not only have I always continued sacrificing to the gods, but now also in your presence, in accordance with the decrees, I have sacrificed and poured libations and tasted the offerings, and I request you to countersign my statement. May good fortune attend you. I, Aurelius Diogenes, have made this request."

(2nd Hand) "I, Aurelius Syrus, as a participant, have certified Diogenes as sacrificing along with us."

(1st Hand) "The first year of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajan Decius Plus Felix Augustus, Epiph. 2" (equals June 25, 250 AD).

Under Valerian the persecution was again very severe, but his successor, Gallienus, issued an edict of toleration, in which he guaranteed freedom of worship to the Christians. Thus Christianity definitely became a religio licita, a lawful religion. This freedom from persecution continued until the reign of Diocletian.

26. The Edict of Milan:

The persecution of the Christian church by the empire of Rome came to an end in March, 313 AD, when Constantine issued the document known as the "Edict of Milan," which assured to each individual freedom of religious belief. This document marks an era of the utmost importance in the history of the world. Official Roman persecution had done its worst, and had failed; it was ended now; the Galilean

had conquered.

27. Results of Persecution:

The results of persecution were:

(1) It raised up witnesses, true witnesses, for the Christian faith. Men and women and even children were among the martyrs whom no cruelties, however refined and protracted, could terrify into denial of their Lord. It is to a large extent owing to persecution that the Christian church possesses the testimony of men like Quadratus and Tertullian and Origen and Cyprian and many others. While those who had adopted the Christian faith in an external and formal manner only generally went back from their profession, the true Christian, as even the Roman proconsul Pliny testifies, could not be made to do this. The same stroke which crushed the straw—such is a saying of Augustine's—separated the pure grain which the Lord had chosen.

(2) Persecution showed that the Christian faith is immortal even in this world. Of Christ's kingdom there shall be no end. "Hammer away, ye hostile bands, your hammers break, God's altar stands." Pagan Rome, Babylon the Great, as it is called by the apostle John in the Apocalypse tried hard to destroy the church of Christ; Babylon was drunk with the blood of the saints. God allowed this tyranny to exist for 300 years, and the blood of His children was shed like water. Why was it necessary that the church should have so terrible and so prolonged an experience of suffering? It was in order to convince the world that though the kings of the earth gather themselves against the Lord and against His Christ, yet all that they can do is vain. God is in the midst of Zion; He shall help her, and that right early. The Christian church, as if suspended between heaven and earth, had no need of other help than that of the unseen but divine hand, which at every moment held it up and kept it from falling. Never was the church more free, never stronger, never more flourishing, never more extensive in its growth, than in the days of persecution.

And what became of the great persecuting power, the Roman empire? It fell before the barbarians. Rome is fallen in its ruins, and its idols are utterly abolished, while the barbarians who overwhelmed the empire have become the nominally Christian nations of modern Europe, and their descendants have carried the Christian faith to America and Australia and Africa and all over the world.

(3) Persecution became, to a large extent, an important means of preserving the true doctrines of the person and of the work of Christ. It was in the ages of persecution that Gnosticism died, though it died slowly. It was in the ages of persecution that Arianism was overthrown. At the Council of Nicea in 325 AD, among those who were present and took part in the discussion and in the decision of the council, there were those who "bore in their bodies the branding-marks of Jesus," who had suffered pain and loss for Christ's sake.

Persecution was followed by these important results, for God in His wisdom had seen fit to permit these evils to happen, in order to change them into permanent good; and thus the wrath of man was overruled

to praise God, and to effect more ultimate good, than if the persecutions had not taken place at all. What, in a word, could be more divine than to curb and restrain and overrule evil itself and change it into good ? God lets iniquity do what it pleases, according to its own designs; but in permitting it to move on one side, rather than on another, He overrules it and makes it enter into the order of His providence. So He lets this fury against the Christian ith be kindled in the hearts of persecutors, so that they afflict the saints of the Most High. But the church remains safe, for persecution can work nothing but ultimate good in the hand of God. "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church." So said Tertullian, and what he said is true.

Persecution has permanently enriched the history of the church. It has given us the noble heritage of the testimony and the suffering of those whose lives would otherwise have been unrecorded. Their very names as well as their careers would have been unknown had not persecution "dragged them into fame and chased them up to heaven."

Persecution made Christ very near and very precious to those who suffered. Many of the martyrs bore witness, even when in the midst of the most cruel torments, that they felt no pain, but that Christ was with them. Instances to this effect could be multiplied. Persecution made them feel how true Christ’s words were, that even as He was not of the world, so they also were not of it. If they had been of the world, the world would love its own, but because Christ had chosen them out of the world, therefore the world hated them. They were not greater than their Lord. If men had persecuted Jesus, they would also persecute His true disciples. But though they were persecuted, they were of good cheer, Christ had overcome the world; He was with them; He enabled them to be faithful unto death. He had promised them the crown of life.

Browning’s beautiful lines describe what was a common experience of the martyrs, how Christ "in them" and "with them," "quenched the power of fire," and made them more than conquerors:

"I was some time in being burned,

But at the close a Hand came through

The fire above my head, and drew

My soul to Christ, whom now I see.

Sergius, a brother, writes for me

This testimony on the wall—

For me, I have forgot it all."

John Rutherfurd

PERSEPOLIS

per-sep’-o-lis (2 Macc 9:2; Persepolis, Persaipolis, in Ptolemy Persopolis; original Persian name unknown; Pahlavi Stakhr, now Ictakhr and Shihil Minar, "Forty Turrets"):

1. Location:

The ruins of Persepolis lie about 35 miles Northeast of Shiraz and some 40 miles South of the ruins of Pasargadae.

2. History:

The magnificent palace of which such striking remains are still visible (Takht i Jamshid) was built by Darius and Xerxes of white marble and black stone. The city was captured, pillaged and burnt by Alexander in 324 BC, most of the inhabitants being massacred or enslaved. Much of the treasure of the Persian kings was found there. Curtius says the palace was never rebuilt. Antioehus Epiphanes (166 BC) tried but failed to plunder the temple (of Anaitis, Anihita?) there (2 Macc 9:2; perhaps this is the incident referred to in 1 Macc 6:1 ff, and Polyb. xxxi.11). At Persepolis were the sepulchers of the Achemenian kings (except Cyrus). Long and important inscriptions of Darius and Xerxes are found at Persepolis and the neighboring Naqsh i Rustam, in cuneiform characters and in the Aehaemenian Persian, Assyrian and neo-Susian tongues (published by Spiegel, Rawlinson and Weisbaeh). Clitarehus first among Europeans mentions the city. The writer of this article visited it in 1892. Not now inhabited.

LITERATURE.

Inscriptions (as above), Arrian, Curtius, Polybius, Pliny, Diod. Siculus, medieval and modern travelers.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

PERSEUS

pur’-sus, pur’-se-us (Perseus): In 1 Macc 8:5 the conquest of "Perseus, king of the Citims" (the Revised Version (British and American) "king of Chittim") was part of the "fame of the Romans" which reached the ears of Judas. This Perseus, the son and successor of Philip III of Macedonia, came to the throne in 178 BC and was the last king of Maccedonia. In 171 BC began the war with Rome which ended in his disastrous defeat and capture at Pydna, 168 BC (to which 1 Macc 8:5 refers), by L. Aemilius Paulus. Macedonia soon became a Roman province. Perseus was led to Rome to grace the triumph of his conqueror, by whose clemency he was spared, and died in captivity at Rome (Polyb. xxix. 17; Livy xliv. 40 ff).

Kittim or Chittim, properly of the people of the town of Citium in Cyprus, then signifying Cyprians, and extended by Jewish writers (Ge 10:4; Nu 24:24; Isa 23:1; Jer 2:10; Eze 27:6; Da 11:30; Josephus, Ant, I, vi) to include the coasts of Greece generally, is here applied to Maccdonia. In 1 Macc 1:1 Macedonia (or Greece) is called "the land of Chittim."

S. Angus

PERSEVERANCE

pur-se-ver'-ans: The word occurs only once in the King James Version (Eph 6:18), where it refers quite simply to persistence in prayer. In theology (especially in the phrase "final perseverance") the word has come to denote a special persistency, the undying continuance of the new life (manifested in faith and holiness) given by the Spirit of God to man. It is questioned whether such imparted life is (by its nature, or by the law of its impartation) necessarily permanent indestructible so that the once regenerate and believing man has the prospect of final glory infallibly assured. This is not the place to trace the history of a great and complex debate. It is more fitting here to point to the problem as connected with that supreme class of truths in which, because of our necessary mental limits, the entire truth can only be apprehended as the unrevealed but certain harmony of seeming contradictions. Scripture on the one hand abounds with assurances of "perseverance" as a fact, and largely intimates that an exulting anticipation of it is the intended experience of the believer (see Joh 10:28 above all, and compare among other passages Ro 8:31-37; 1Pe 1:8,9). On the other hand, we find frequent and urgent warnings and cautions (see e.g. 1Co 8:11; 9:27). The teacher dealing with actual cases, as in pastoral work, should be ready to adopt both classes of utterances, each with its proper application; applying the first, e.g., to the true but timid disciple, the latter to the self-confident. Meanwhile Scripture on the whole, by the manner and weight of its positive statements, favors a humble belief of the permanence, in the plan of God, of the once-given new life. It is as if it laid down perseverance" as the divine rule for the Christian, while the negative passages came in to caution the man not to deceive himself with appearances, nor to let any belief whatever palliate the guilt and minimize the danger of sin. In the biographies of Scripture, it is noteworthy that no person appears who, at one time certainly a saint, was later certainly a castaway. The awful words of Heb 6:4-6; 10:26,27 appear to deal with cases (such as Balaam's) of much light but no loving life, and so are not precisely in point. Upon the whole subject, it is important to make "the Perseverance of the Saviour" our watchword rather than "the Perseverance of the saint."

Handley Dunelm

PERSIA

pur'-sha, (parats; Persia; in Assyrian Parsu, Parsua; in Achemenian Persian Parsa, modern Fars): In the Bible (2Ch 36:20,22,23; Ezr 1:1,8; Es 1:3,14,18; 10:2; Eze 27:10; 38:5; Da 8:20; 10:1; 11:2) this name denotes properly the modern province of Fars, not the whole Persian empire. The latter was by its people called Airyaria, the present Iran (from the Sanskrit word arya, "noble"); and even now the Persians never call their country anything but Iran, never "Persia." The province of Persis lay to the East of Elam

(Susiana), and stretched from the Persian Gulf to the Great Salt Desert, having Carmania on the Southeast. Its chief cities were Persepolis and Pasargadae. Along the Persian Gulf the land is low, hot and unhealthy, but it soon begins to rise as one travels inland. Most of the province consists of high and steep mountains and plateaus, with fertile valleys. The table-lands in which lie the modern city of Shiraz and the ruins of Persepolis and Pasargadae are well watered and productive. Nearer the desert, however, cultivation grows scanty for want of water. Persia was doubtless in early times included in Elam, and its population was then either Semitic or allied to the Accadians, who founded more than one state in the Babylonian plain. The Aryan Persians seem to have occupied the country in the 8th or 9th century BC.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

PERSIAN LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE (ANCIENT)

pur'-shan, pur'-zhan, RATURE (ANCIENT):

I. LANGUAGE (Introductory)

Dialects

II. OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS

III. MEDIC DIALECT

1. Ordinary Ayestic

2. Gathic

IV. ZOROASTER

1. His Date, etc.

2. Date of Avesta

3. Divisions of the present Avesta

(1) The Yasna

(2) The Vispered

(3) The Vendidad

(4) The Yashts

(5) The Khorda Avesta

V. PAHLAVI

1. Literature

2. Comparison

LITERATURE.

I. Language: (Introductory).

The Persian language, ancient and modern alike, is an Aryan tongue. In its ancient forms it is more closely connected with Vedic Sanskrit than with any other language except Armenian. Most of its roots are to be found also in Slavonic, Greek, Latin and other tongues of the same stock.

Dialects:

There were two main dialects in the ancient language of Iran (Airyanem),

(1) that of the Persians proper, and

(2) that of the Medes.

The former is known to us from the inscriptions of the Achemenian kings, the latter from the Avesta, and a few Median words preserved for us by Herodotus and other Greek writers.

II. Old Persian Inscriptions.

These fall between 550 and 330 BC, and contain about 1,000 lines and 400 words. They are carved upon the rocks in a cuneiform character, simplified from that of the neo-Susian, which again comes from the neo-Babylonian syllabary. In Old Persian inscriptions only 44 characters are employed, of which 7 are ideographs or contractions. The remaining 37 phonetic signs are syllabic, each consisting of an open syllable and not merely of a single letter, except in case of separate vowels. The syllabary, though much simpler than any other cuneiform system, does not quite attain therefore to being an alphabet. It was written from left to right, like the other cuneiform syllabaries. Of Cyrus the Great only one Persian sentence has been found: Adam Kurush Khshayathiya Hakhamanishiya, "I am Cyrus the King, the Achemenian." Darius I has left us long inscriptions, at Behistan (Besitun), Mt. Alvand, Persepolis, Naqsh i Rustam, etc., and one at Suez, the latter mentioning his conquest of Egypt and the construction

of the first (?) Suez canal:

Adam niyashtayam imam yuviyam kantanaiy haca Pirava nama rauta tya Mudrayaiy danauvatiy abiy daraya tya haca Parsa aiti.

("I commanded to dig this canal from the river named the Nile, which flows through Egypt, to the sea which comes from Persia.")

We have also inscriptions of Xerxes at Persepolis and many short ones of Artaxerxes I, Artaxerxes Mnemon, and Artaxerxes Ochus. From them all taken together we learn much concerning the history and the religion of the Achemenian period. It is from Achemenian or Old Persian, and not from the Medic or Avestic, that modern Persian has sprung through Pahlavi and Dari as intermediate stages. This is probably due to the political supremacy which the Persians under the Achaemenides gained over the Medes. The few words in the inscriptions which might otherwise be doubtful can be understood through comparison with Armenian and even with the modern Pets, e.g. yuviya in the above inscription is the modern vulgar Pets jub.

III. Medic Dialect.

1. Ordinary Avestic:

The Medic dialect is represented in literature by the Avesta or sacred books of the Zoroastrians (Parsis). The word Avesta does not occur in the book itself and is of uncertain meaning and signification. It is probably the Abashta of Beh. Inscr., IV, 64, and means either

(1) an interview, meeting (Sanskrit avashta, "appearance before a judge"; At. ava-sta, "to stand near"), or (2) a petition (Pahl. apastan, "petition"; Arm. apastan, "refuge," "asylum"),

in either case deriving its name from Zoroaster’s drawing near to Ahura Mazda in worship.

This dialect represents a much greater decadence in grammar and vocabulary than does the Old Persian. Many of its consonants and most of its vowels are weakened. Its verbs have almost entirely lost the augment; its declensional system shows extreme confusion. It stands to Old Persian grammatically somewhat as English does to German Its alphabet, consisting of 43 letters, is derived from the Syriac (probably the Estrangela), and is written from right to left. As a specimen of the language of most of the Avesta we give the following extract (Yasna LXIV, 15(61)):

Daidi moi, ye gam tasho apasca urvarwsca

Ameretata, haurvata, Spenista Mainyu Mazda,

Tevishi, utayuiti, Mananha Vohu, senhe.

"Give me, O thou who didst make the bull (earth),

and the waters and the plants, immortality, health—

O most Bountiful Spirit, Mazda

—strength, might, through Vohu Mano, I say.")

2. Gathic:

There is a sub-dialect of Medic (Avestic) known as the Gatha-dialect, from the fact that the Gathas or "Hymns" (Yasna XXVIII-XXXIV, XLII-L, LII), and also the prayers (Yatha Ahu Vairyo, Ashem Vohu, Airyama Ishyo, and originally Yenhe Halam, and a few scattered passages elsewhere) are composed in it. This represents, speaking generally, an older form of the Avestic. It is probably the old language of Bactria or of Margiana Gatha I, 2, runs thus:

Ye vw, Mazda Ahura, pairijasai Vohu Mananha,

Maibyo davoi ahvw (astivatasca hyaTca mananho)

Ayapta AshaT haca, yais rapento daidiT hvathre.

"To me, O Ahura Mazda, who approach you two through Vohu Mano,

grant the benefits from Asha, (those) of both worlds,

both of the material (world)

and of that which is of the spirit, through which (benefits)

may (Asha) place in glory those who please him.")

The meter of the Gathas, like that of the other Avestic poems, is based on the number of syllables in a line, with due regard to the caesura. But the condition of the text is such that there is great difficulty in recovering the original reading with sufficient accuracy to enable us to lay down rules on the subject with any certainty. The first Gatha is composed of strophes of 3 lines each (as above). Each line contains 16 syllables, with a caesura after the 7th foot.

IV. Zoroaster.

1. His Date, etc.:

Many of the Gathas are generally ascribed to Zoroaster himself, the rest to his earliest disciples. They compose the most ancient part of the Avesta. It is now becoming a matter of very great probability that Zoroaster lived at earliest in the middle of the 7th century BC, more probably a century later. The Arta Viraf Namak says that his religion remained pure for 300 years, and connects its corruption with the alleged destruction of much of the Avesta in the palace burned by Alexander at Persepolis, 324.BC. This traditional indication of date is confirmed by other evidence. Zoroaster's prince Vishtaspa (in Greek Hustaspes) bears the same name as the father of Darius I, and was probably the same person. Vishtaspa's queen Hutaosa, who also protected and favored Zoroaster, bears the same name (in Greek Atossa) as Cambyses' sister who afterward married Darius, and probably belonged to the same family. Zoroastrianism comes to the fore under Darius, whereas Cyrus in his inscriptions speaks as a decided polytheist. Hence, we conclude that the earliest part of the Avesta belongs to circa 550 BC. Of Zoroaster himself we learn much from the Avesta, which traces his genealogy back for 10 generations. It mentions his wife's name (Hvovi), and tells of his 3 sons and 3 daughters. His first disciple was Frashaostra, his wife's natural uncle. His own name means "Owner of the yellow camel," and has none of the higher meanings sometimes assigned to it by those who would deny his existence. Tradition says he was born at Ragha (Raga, Rai) about 5 1/2 miles South of the present Tehran, though some think his native place was Western Atropatene (Azarbaijan). Rejected by his own tribe, the Magi, he went to Vishtispa's court in Bactria. The faith which he taught spread to the Persian court (very naturally, if Vishtispa was identical with Darius' father) and thence throughout the country. Tradition (Yasht XIX, 2, etc.) says that the Avesta was revealed to Zoroaster on Mt. Ushi-darena ("intellect-holding") in Sistan. But it is not the composition of one man or of one age.

2. Date of Avesta:

Herodotus makes no mention of Zoroaster, but speaks of the Magi (whom he calls a Median tribe (i.101)) as already performing priestly functions. His description of their repetition of charms and theological compositions (i.132) would agree very well with recitation of the Gathas and Yasna. Mention of controversies with Gautama, Buddha's disciples (Yasht XIII, 16) who probably reached Persia in the 2nd century BC, is another indication of date. The fact that in both the Yasna and the Vendidad heretics (zanda) are mentioned who preferred the commentary (zand) on the Avesta to the Avesta itself, is a sign of late date. Names of certain persons found in the Avesta (e.g. Atare-pata, a Dastur who lived under Hormuzd I, 273 AD, and Rastare-Yaghenti, whom the Dinkarl identifies with the chief Mobed of Sapor II, 309-379 AD, Aderpad Marespand, and who, according to the Patet, section 28, "purified" the revelation made to Zoroaster, i.e. revised the text of the earlier parts of the Avesta) enable us to prove that certain portions of the work as we now have it were composed as late as near the end of the 4th century of our era. It is said that the text was in confusion in the time of Vologases I (51-78 (?) AD). A reccnsion was then begun, and continued with much zeal by Ardashir Papakan, 226-240 AD. According to Geldner (Prolegomena, xlvi) the final recension took place some considerable time after Yezdigird III (overthrown 642 AD). In the times of the Sasanides there were, it is said, 21 Naskas or volumes of the Avesta, and the names of these are given in the Dinkart (Book IX). Of these we now possess only one entire Naska, the Vendidad, and portions of three others.

3. Divisions of the Present Avesta:

The present Avesta is divided into 5 parts:

(1) The Yasna

The Yasna root yaz, Sanskrit yaj, "to invoke," "to praise") contains 72 chapters of hymns for use at sacrifices, etc., including the "Older Yasna" or Gathas.

(2) The Vispered

The Vispered (vispa, "every," "all," and radha, "a lord") is divided into 24 chapters in Geldner's edition; it is supplementary to the Yasna.

(3) The Vendidad

The Vendidad (van plus daea plus data, "law for " vanquishing the demons") contains 22 chapters. The first chapter contains the Iranian myth about the order in which the provinces of the Iranian world were created by Ahura Mazda. It tells how the Evil Spirit, Anro Mainyus, created plagues, sins and death, to destroy the good creatures of the Good Spirit. The greater part of the book contains ceremonial laws and formulas, some of them loathsome and all rather petty and superstitious in character.

(4) The Yashts

The Yashts, 21 in all, are hymns, telling many mythological tales about Mithra, Tishtriya, etc.

(5) The Khorda Avesta

The Khorda Avesta ("Little Avesta") consists of a number of short compositions, hymns, etc., compiled by the Aderpad Marespand (Adharpadh Mahraspand, Atarobat Mansarspendan) already mentioned, in Sapor II's reign.

Much of the Avesta is said to have been destroyed by the Khalffah 'Umar's orders when Persia was conquered by the Arabs after the battle of Nahavand (642 AD). Certainly 'Umar ordered the destruction of Persian libraries, as we learn from the Kashfu'z Zunun (p.341).

V. Pahlavi.

1. Literature:

Under ancient Persian literature may be classed the Pahlavi

(a) inscriptions of Sapor at Hajiabad and elsewhere,

(b) legends on Sasanian coins,

(c) translations of certain parts of the Avesta, made under the Sasanides for the most part,

(d) such books as the Arta Viraf Namak, the Zad Sparam, Dinkart, Ormazd Yasht, Patet, Bundishnih, etc.

These are mostly of religious import. The Arta Viraf Namak gives a description of the visit of the young dastur Arta Viraf, to the Zoroastrian heaven. The Bundihishnih ("creation") tells how Ormazd and Ahriman came into being, and treats of the 9,000 years' struggle between them. Pahlavi, as written (the so-called Huzvaresh), contains an immense number of Aramaic words, but the Persian terminations attached to these show that they were read as Persian: thus yehabunt-ano is written, and dat-ano ("to give") is read. Pahlavi works that are no longer extant are the sources of the Vis o Ramin, Zaratusht Namah, Shahnamah, etc.

2. Comparison:

In order to understand the relation in which the Persian dialects and stages in the history of the language stand to one another, it may be well to subjoin a list of words in Old Persian, Avestic, Pahlavi and modern Persian. It will be seen that Ayestic is not the source of the Aryan part of the present tongue.

MEANING AVESTIC OLD PERSIAN PAHLAVI MODERN PERSIAN

Friend.... zusta daushta dost dust

Hand..... zasta dasta dast dast

Bactreia.. Bakhdhi Bakhtri Bahr Balkh

Straight.. drva(sta)@@ duruva(sta) drust durust

Greatest.. mazista@@ mathishta mahist mahin Most right razista@@ rasta rast rast

Abode..... nmana maniya man man-dan ("to remain")

(Gathic

demana)

@@superlatives

LITERATURE.

Achaemenian inscriptions, Korsowitz, Spiegel, Rawlinson: Geiger and Kuhn (editors), Grundriss der iranischen Philologie; Darmesteter, Etudes iraniennes; Spiegel, Eranische Altertumskunde; Noldeke, Aufsatze zur persischen Geschichte; W. Geiger, Ostiranische Kultur im Alterium; Geldner's edition of Avesta; Professor Browne, Literary History of Persia; De Harlez, Manuel de la langue de l' Avesta, Manuel de la langue Pehlevie, and Introduction to the Avesta; Haug, Book of Artd Viraf; Cook, Origins of Religion and Language.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

PERSIAN RELIGION (ANCIENT)

I. BEFORE ZOROASTER

1. Early Aryan Religion

2. Avesta and Rig-Veda

3. The Creator

II. ZOROASTRIANISM

1. Leading Principle

2. Not Monotheistic

(1) Darius and Xerxes

(2) Ahura Mazda

3. Objects of Worship

4. Anro Mainyus and His Creatures

5. Production versus Destruction Fertility

6. Contest between Ormazd and Ahriman

7. Ethics

8. Sacred Thread

9. Early Traditions

10. The Earth

11. Heaven and Hell

12. Interment

13. Worship

14. The Magi

15. Eschatology

16. Hebrew and Christian Influence

17. No Virgin Birth

LITERATURE

I. Before Zoroaster.

1. Early Aryan Religion:

There are clear indications in the Avesta that the religion of the Medes and Persians before Zoroaster's time agreed in most respects with that of the Indian Aryans, and in a less degree with the beliefs of the Aryans in general. All the Aryan tribes in very ancient times showed great respect for the dead, though they carefully distinguished them from the gods (compare Rig-Veda X, 56, 4). The latter were principally the powers of Nature, the wind, fire, water, the sky, the sun, the earth, and a host of personifications. The procreative powers in Nature, animate and inanimate, seeming to be the source of animal and vegetable life, received adoration, which ultimately led to unspeakable corruption. Herodotus tells us that the Persians in his time worshipped the sun, moon, sky, earth, fire, wind and water (i.131). Offerings to the gods were laid on a mass of pomegranate twigs (baresman; Sanskrit, barhis), and the flesh of victims was boiled, not burnt. Libations of haoma-juice were poured out, just as in India the soma was the drink of both gods and their worshippers.

2. Avesta and Rig-Veda:

A comparison between the spiritual beings mentioned in the Avesta and those spoken of in the Rig-Veda is most instructive in two ways. It shows that the original religion of the Iranians and of the Indian Aryans agreed very closely; and it also enables us to realize the immensity of the reformation wrought by Zoroaster. Many of the names of supernatural beings are practically the same; e.g. Indra (Indra, Andra), Mitra (Mithra), Aryaman (Airyaman), Asura (Ahura), Apam Napat (Apam Napat), Tvashtri (? Tishtrya), Rama (Raman), Vayu (Vayu), Vata (Vata). So are many words of religious import, as Soma (Haoma), Mantra (Mathra), Hotra (Zaotar). The Yama of India is the Yima of Persia, and the father of the one is Vivasvat and that of the other Vivanhat, which is the same word with dialectic change. The Holy River of the Avesta, Aredhvi Sura, the Unstained (Anahita), is represented by the Sarasvati, the Ganga (Ganges) and other sacred streams worshipped in India. In Persia Atar (or Fire) is a son of Ahura Mazda (Yasna LXIV, 46-53), as Agni (equals Ignis) is of Tvashtri in the Rig-Veda. Armaiti is Ahura Mazda's daughter, as Saranyu in the Rig-Veda is the daughter of Tvashtri, the "Creator." The use of gomez (bovis urina) for purification is common to both India and Persia. Though the soma-plant is not now the same as the haoma, the words are the same, and no doubt they at one time denoted one and the same plant. Many of the myths of the Avesta have a great resemblance to those of the Rig-Veda. This comparison might be extended almost indefinitely.

In another respect also there is an important agreement between the two. Though some 33 deities are adored in the Vedic Hymns, yet, in spite of polytheism and low ideas of the divine, traces of something higher may be found. Varuna, for instance, represents a very-lofty conception. In the closest connection with him stands Asura, who is a being of great eminence, and whose sons are the gods, especially the Adityas.

3. The Creator:

Tvashtri again is creator of heaven and earth and of all beings, though his worship was ultimately in Vedic times displaced by that of Indra. It is clear then that the Indian Aryans were worshippers of the Creator and that they knew something of Him long before they sank into polytheism. In the Avesta and in the Persian cuneiform inscriptions alike, Ahura Mazda occupies much the same position as Varuna, Asura (the same word as Ahura), or Tvashtri in the Rig-Veda, or rather in the ancient belief of which traces are retained in the latter work. Hence, as the Avesta teaches, Zoroaster was not for the first time preaching the existence of Ahura Mazda, but he was rather endeavoring to recall his people to the belief of their ancestors, the doctrine which Ahura Mazda had taught Yima in primeval time in his first revelation (Vendidad II, 1-16,42). The great truth of the existence of the Creator, testified to by tradition, reason and conscience, undoubtedly contributed largely to Zoroaster's success, just as a similar proclamation of the God Most High (Allah ta'ala'), worshipped by their ancestors, helped the thoughtful among the Arabs in later years to accept Muhammad's teaching. The consciousness in each case that the doctrine was not new but very ancient, materially helped men to believe it true.

II. Zoroastrianism.

1. Leading Principle:

The reformation wrought by Zoroaster was a great one. He recognized—as Euripides in Greece did later—that "if the gods do aught shameful, they are not gods." Hence, he perceived that many of the deities worshipped in Iran were unworthy of adoration, being evil in character, hostile to all good and therefore to the "All-Wise" Spirit (Ahura Mazda) and to men. Hence, his system of dualism, dividing all beings, spiritual or material, into two classes, the creatures of Ahura Mazda and those of the "Destroying Mind" (Anro Mainyus). So many of the popular deities were evil that Zoroaster used the word daeva (the same as deva, deus, and Aramaic di) to denote henceforth an evil spirit, just as Christianity turned the Greek daimones and daimonia (words used in a good sense in classical authors) into "demons." Instead of this now degraded word daeva, he employed baga (Old Persian; Av. bagha, Vedic bhaga, "distribution," "natron" "lord") for "God."

2. Not Monotheistic:

But, it must be remembered that Zoroaster did not teach monotheism. Darius says that "Auramazda and the other gods that there are" brought him aid (Beh. Inscr., IV, 60-63), and both he and Xerxes speak of Auramazda as "the greatest of the gods." So, even in the first Gatha, Zoroaster himself invokes Asha, Vohu-Mano, maiti, Sraosha, and even Geus-urvan ("the Soul of the Bull"), as well as Ahura Mazda.

(1) Darius and Xerxes.

Darius mentions the "clan-gods," but does not name any of them. He and Xerxes ascribe the creation of heaven and earth to Auramazda, and say that the latter, "Who made this earth, who made yon sky, who made man, who made happiness for man," has appointed each of them king. It is "by the grace of Auramazda" (vashna Auramazdaha) that Darius conquers his enemies. But both Artaxerxes Mnemon and Artaxerxes Ochus couple Mithra and Anahata (Anahita) with Auramazda (Ahura Mazda) in praying for the protection of the empire.

(2) Ahura Mazda.

In the Avesta, Ahura Mazda is one of the seven Amesha spentas or "Bountiful Immortals." He is the father of one of them, Spentas Armaiti, who is also his spouse. He is primus inter pares among them, their chief, but by no means the only god. Monotheism is distinctly taught in later Zoroastrian works, for instance, in the Zaratusht-Namah, composed 1278 AD, but it is due to Christian and Islamic influence.

3. Objects of Worship:

The modern Zoroastrian view, clearly stated in the Dasatir i Asmani and elsewhere, that all the good creatures of Ormazd (Ahura Mazda) are entitled to adoration, undoubtedly rests upon the Avesta. There we find, in the first place, the Amesha Spentas, who occupy in regard to Mazda the same position as do

the Vedic Adityas toward Varuna, though not one of the Adityas is identical with any of the Amesha Spentas.

The names of these are: (1) Ahura Mazda (otherwise called Spento Mainyus or "Bountiful Mind");

(2) Vohu Mano ("Good Mind");

(3) Asha Vahista ("Best Righteousness");

(4) Khshathra Vairya ("Excellent Ruler");

(5) Spenta Amaiti ("Bounteous Piety");

(6) Haurvatat ("Health");

(7) Ameretat ("Immortality").

Each has a special province: thus Armaiti is the general spirit of earth and presides over its fruitfulness. She is the troness of virtuos matrons. Khshathra is the guardian of metals. Vohu Mano guards sheep and cattle and introduces to Ahura Mada the spirits of the just. Next in rank come the Yazatas ("Worshipful Ones"), of whom there are a large number. Three of them, Mithra, Rashnu and Sraosha, preside at the judgment of the dead on the 4th day from death. Rashnu holds the scales in which a man’s deeds are weighed. Sraosha guards the soul during the first three nights after death. Airyaman Ishya ("the longed-for comrade") is the protector of mankind, the bestower of peace and happiness. On one occasion (Vend., Farg. XXII, 23-29) Ahura Mazda sends his messenger Nairyo Sanha ("male instructor") to ask his aid against overwhelming odds. Riman Hvastra, the bosom friend of Mithra, presides over the atmosphere and also gives its taste to food. Mithra is the genius of truth, possessed of 1,000 ears, and riding in a single-wheeled chariot (the sun), while darting golden darts and driving fiery steeds. Tishtrya, identified with the dog-star Sirius, sends rain and is by Ahura Mazda endowed with his own power and dignity (Yasht VIII, 52 ff). This is true of Mithra also (Yasht X, 1) Atar ("Fire"), Vayu ("Air"), Vata ("Wind"), Verethraghna ("Mars"), Saoka ("Prosperity"), Aratat (genius of Justice), Vizista ("Lightning"), Fradatfshu (the guardian of cattle), Berejya (genius of grain), Cista and Daena ("Knowledge" and "Religion"), who are others of the Yazatas. All these are entitled to worship at the hands of the true adorer of Mazda (Mazdayasna, opposed to Daevayasna, or worshipper of the demons).

4. Anro Mainyus and His Creatures:

In opposition to the creatures of Ahura Mazda are those of Anro Mainyus, who is the source of all moral and material evil. The first chapter of the Vendidad tells how he created something bad in opposition to everything good made by Ahura Mazda.

A demon is the adversary of each Amesha Spenta: Aka Mano ("Evil Mind") that of Vohu Mano, and so

in order: Indra (or Andra, "demon of untruthfulness"), Saurva ("evil government") Nonhaithya ("discontent"), Tauru ("who poisons water") and Zairi ("poison"), being antagonistic to the other Bountiful Immortals. Aeshma-Daeva ("Demon of Wrath")—the Asmodeus of Tobit 3:8—is the special foe of Sraosha, the genius of obedience. Apaosha, demon of drought, is the enemy of Tishtrya. Buiti (or Buidhi) teaches men to worship idols, and also causes death. Bushyasta is the demon of sloth. Vidhatus or Astuvidhstus causes death by destroying the body. Other evil beings, Drujes, Pairikas, Jainis, Yatus, are so numerous in the later parts of the Avesta that a pious Zoroastrian must have lived in continual dread of their assaults. He had even to conceal the parings of his nails, lest they should be used as darts to his injury by these his spiritual foes.

5. Production versus Destruction:

Holiness does not enter into Zoroaster’s conception of the divine nature. This is a point to which attention has not yet been properly directed, though its importance can hardly be exaggerated. The epithet Spenta, often applied to Ahura Mazda and mistranslated "Holy," is by the Zoroastrians themselves in Pahlavi rendered afzunik, i.e. "that causes increase." Its (?) span or spen equals (Sanskrit) svi, "to swell," "to grow," "to increase." The opposite to this is the term anro (angro, from (?) angh; compare German eng, "narrow") to the Evil Spirit, and denoting "narrowing," "decreasing," "destroying." Hence, as the Destroyer, he is styled pourumahrka, "full of death."

Fertility.

Ahura Mazda and his assistants promote life, fertility in man, beast and plant, agriculture, increase; while Ahro Mainyus and his creatures cause destruction and death. Atar ("Fire"), also styled Apam Napat ("Offspring of the Waters"), is the vital flame and the male energy in the world; Aredhvi Sura Anahita is the female. As a river the latter flows from Mt. Hukairya, a peak in the Elburz Range (Yasna LXIV), into the Caspian Sea (Vourukasha) in the midst of which grows the tree Hvapa ("well watered") which bears the seeds of all plants. Anahita means "‘undefiled," but it is applied to purity of water (to defile any of the four "elements" was, for later Zoroastrians, a grievous sin) and not to any moral purity in the goddess. Her association with Mithra was close, even in Herodotus time, for he falls into the mistake of saying (i.131) that the Persians called Aphrodite Mithra, when he should have said Anaitis (Anahita). Though god of truth and righteousness Mithra is not associated with moral purity (chastity). On the contrary, he was said to fertilize the earth with his rays, as sun-god, and Anahita as goddess of fruitfulness represented the female principle in conjunction with him. The vileness which led to the identification of Anahita with the Babylonian Mylitta was doubtless of later date than Zoroaster’s time, yet there was little or nothing in Zoroastrianism to check it. Something similar asserts itself in Armenia, as well as in Iran, and in fact in all Nature-worship everywhere. Associated with this was the form of incest known as next-of-kin marriage (Av. Hvaetva-datha, Pahl. Khvetukdas), which permitted and encouraged marriages between brothers and sisters.

6. Contest between Ormazd and Ahriman:

According to later Zoroastrian belief, the contest between Ormazd (Ahura Mazda) and Ahriman (Anro Mainyus), after continuing for 9,000 years, is to be decided in favor of the former only through his possessing foreknowledge and Ahriman's lacking it (Bund., I). Both came into existence independently in limitless time (Av. Zrvana Akarana; Vend., Farg. XIX, 13; Pahl. Daman i Akandrakhom-and, Bund., I), which, personified in the Vendidad, is called "Self-created," and is there by Ahura Mazda's command invoked by Zoroaster in conjunction with Vayu, the Air, the Winds, "the bountiful, beauteous daughter of Ahura Mazda" (Armaiti), the Earth, and other objects of worship (loc. cit.). No creature of Ahriman is to be worshipped; hence, Indra, though in later Vedic times rising in India to a leading position in the Pantheon, is in the Avesta accounted a fiend, the very impersonation of the Lie which the Avesta so firmly denounces and which Darius mentions as the cause of all the rebellions, which produced so much bloodshed in his time. No virtue was valued so highly as truth in ancient Iran, as Herodotus agrees with the Avesta in testifying.

7. Ethics:

Avestic morality encourages the destruction of all hurtful things, as being of Anro Mainyus' creation, and the propagation of everything good. Hence, agriculture is especially commended, together with the rearing of cattle and sheep. Somewhat later the whole duty of man was said to consist in good thoughts, good words, good deeds. Fierce opposition to every other religion was enjoined as a religious duty, and, under the Sasanides especially, this led to fearful and repeated persecutions of Christians throughout the empire.

8. Sacred Thread:

The Sacred Thread (Av. Aiwyonhana; Skt. Upavitam, etc., now by the Parsis styled the Kushti) plays as important a part in Zoroastrianism as in Hinduism. So do charms, mathras (Sanskrit, mantras), consisting in repetitions of the verses of the Avesta. The latter is even adored.

9. Early Traditions:

The first thing created by Ahura Mazda was a Bull, which may represent the earth, and reminds us of the Cow Audhumla in the Edda (Gylfaginning VI). This was killed Traditions by Anro Mainyus (in a later version, by Mithra). His spirit (Geus Urvan) went to heaven and became the guardian of cattle. The first man was Gaya-maretan ("Mortal Life"); hence, the phrase Haca Gayat Marethnat a Saosh-yantat, "from Gaya-maretan (Gayomard), Kayomarth) to Saoshyant" (Yasna XXVI, 10; Yasht XIII, 145), means "from the beginning to the end of the world." From the Airyanem Vaejo ("Aryan germ"), the first home of the Iranians, men were compelled to migrate because Anro Mainyus so altered the climate that the winter became ten months long and the summer only two. Yima Khshaeta ("Yima the Brilliant," Persian, Jamshid), son of Vivanhat, though he twice refused Ahura Mazda's commission to guard his creatures, and though by three lies he lost the "Royal Light" (Chvareno Kavaem) which he originally possessed, was yet directed to prepare a very extensive enclosure (Vara), in which he preserved "the seeds of sheep and cattle, of men, of dogs, of birds, and of red, glowing fires" from some terribly severe winters which

came upon the earth (Vendidad II; Yasht XIX). The Bundihishnih tale of a flood differs from this, preserving an independent narrative. Ahura Mazda's law was preached to men within Yima's enclosure.

10. The Earth:

The earth consists of seven divisions, called Karshvares (compare the Sanskrit dvipas). Only one of these, Chvaniratha, is inhabited by men; the others are separated from it by impassable abysses. Sun, moon, and stars revolve round Mt. Taera, a peak in the Elburz Mountains (Demavend?). A later legend says that the Elburz Range surrounds the earth.

11. Heaven and Hell:

Each god and man possesses a fravashi, which has been compared to a guardian spirit and seems to differ from the soul (urvan). After judgment by Mithra, Rashnu and Sraosha, the souls of the dead must cross the Chinvat-bridge ("Bridge of the Judge"), which is guarded by two dogs and is narrow and difficult for the unjust, but wide and easy for the just. The righteous man then advances through three Paradises, those of Good Thoughts, Good Words and Good Works (Humata, Hukhta, Hvarsta: Yasht XVI; Arta Viraf Namak, VII IX), until, led by Sraosha, Atar, and Vohu Mano, he finally reaches Ahura Mazda's abode of light and glory, Garo-nmana (in Gathas, Garo-demana; Pahl. Garotman), where Ahura Mazda himself receives him with the words: "Greeting to thee; well hast thou come; from that mortal world hast thou come to this pure, bright place" (A. V. Namak, XI, 8, 9). But the soul of the wicked man, passing through regions of Evil Thoughts, Evil Words and Evil Deeds, finally reaches a dark and gloomy Hell (Duzhanh). In later times it was believed that those not yet fit for heaven waited in Misvana Gatus, an intermediate place where the extra merits of the just were stored up for the benefit of the less fortunate (Vend., Farg. XIX). A later name was Hamistakan. But De Harlez is of the opinion that this idea was borrowed from medieval Christianity.

12. Interment:

In primeval times the Persians buried or burned their dead. Zoroastrianism may have introduced the dakhma (Vendidad, passim) or Tower of Silence, on which bodies are exposed to be eaten by vultures. Those of which the ruins have been discovered at Al Hibbah are very ancient. But in Herodotus' time it was usual, after permitting the flesh to be devoured by dogs and birds, to cover the bones with wax and bury them (Herodotus i.140). This was done to prevent them from coming in contact with and so polluting the earth. The custom of burial is proved by the tombs of the Achemenian kings near Persepolis, and that of Cyrus, a stone chamber raised high above the ground, at Pasargadae.

13. Worship:

Zoroastrianism permits no idol-worship and no temples, fire-altars only being used. These were served by Atharvans or fire-priests, who fed the fire with costly wood and poured into it libations of haomajuice, taking care to cover their mouths with a cloth (paiti-dhana) to keep the sacred fire from

being polluted by their breath. Sacrifices were often offered on the tops of the highest mountains under the open sky (Herodotus i.132; Xen. Cyrop. viii).

14. The Magi:

The Magi doubtless owed their monopoly of priestly functions to their being Zoroaster's own tribe. They are not mentioned as priests in the Persian cuneiform inscriptions. Only once does the word. "Magus" occur in the Avesta, and then in composition (Moghu-tbish, a Magus-hater, Yasna LXV, 7). It is not necessary to trace to Babylonian influence the decay of Zoroastrianism and its degradation in late Achemenian times. This was at least in large measure due to a revival of the ideas and practices forbidden by Zoroaster, which reassert themselves in some parts of the Avesta, and which afterward gave rise to Mithraism.

15. Eschatology:

The Avesta states that, 1,000 years after Zoroaster's death, a prophet named Ukhshyat-ereta will arise from his seed to restore his religion. After another 1,000 years another, Ukhshyat-nemanh, will appear for the same purpose. The end of the world will come 1,000 years later. Then a third prophet, Saoshyant, will be born, and will usher in the Restoration (frasho-kereti) of the world to its primitive happiness and freedom from the evil creatures of Anro Mainyus. This process will be completed in 57 years, during which 6 other prophets will perform in the other 6 Karshvares the work which will here be accomplished by Saoshyant. But mention of this Restoration occurs only in very late parts of the Avesta (e.g. Vend., Farg. XVIII, 51). It does not mean Resurrection, as De Harlez has shown. Later still, something of the kind was believed, and in the Bundihishnih (chapter v) and the Patet (section 28) we have the word ristakhiz (from Av. irista, "departed," and chvis,"to rise"), which does mean "rising of the dead." But it can hardly be doubted that the doctrine is due to Hebrew and Christian influence, especially when we consider the late and uncertain date of the books in which the idea occurs.

16. Hebrew and Christian Influence:

Israelites settled in Media in large numbers in or about 730-728 BC under Sargon (2Ki 17:6), long before Zoroaster's birth. It is possible that his reformation may have owed much therefore to Hebrew influence.

See, further, ZOROASTRIANISM.

The idea of virgin birth has been asserted to occur in Zoroastrianism, both with reference to Zoroaster himself and to the last three great prophets of whom mention has been made. This is an error. The Avesta and all later Zoroastrian books speak of Zoroaster's birth as quite natural, his father being Pourushaspa. Nor is virgin birth referred to in the case of Saoshyant and the rest.

17. No Virgin Birth:

(Mater cuiusque ex iis, sese in lacu quodam lavans, Zoroastris semine illic reposito grayida facta filium pariet: Vend., Farg. XIX, 4-6; Yasht XIII, 128, 142; Bund., XXXII, 8, 9.) Virginity is not highly esteemed in the Avesta, though fornication is condemned.

LITERATURE.

Geldner's edition of text of Avesta; De Harlez, Avesta; Achemenian Inscriptions; Sacred Books of the East, volumes IV, XXIII, XXXI; Grassmann, Worterbuch zum Rig Veda; Haug and West, Arta Viraf Namak; Spiegel, Einleitung in die trad. Schriften der Parsen; Eranische Altertumskunde; Darmesteter, Etudes iraniennes; Haug, Essays on .... Religion of Parsis; De Harlez, Manuel du Pehlavi; Cook, Origins of Religion and Language.

See also ZOROASTRIANISM.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

PERSIANS

pur'-shanz, -zhanz (parac, also equals PERSIA, PERSIS (which see); adjective parci Hebrew, and parcay, Aramaic.; Persai, adjective only in Ne 12:22; Da 6:28; Achaem. Persian Parsa, name of both country and people; does not occur in Avesta):

I. AFFINITY

1. Three Classes

2. Tribal and Clan Divisions

3. Achemenian Dynasty

II. CIVILIZATION

1. Writing

2. Institutions and Customs

III. HISTORY

1. Cyrus

2. Capture of Babylon

3. Cambyses

4. Pseudo-Smerdis

5. Darius I

6. Darius' Suez Canal

7. Xerxes I

8. Artaxerxes II

9. Xerxes II

10. Later Persian Kings

IV. FIRST MENTION IN INSCRIPTIONS

LITERATURE

The Persians are not mentioned in the Bible until the exilic books (2Ch 36:20,22,23; Ezr 1:1,2,8; 3:7; Es 1:19, etc.; Da 5:28; 6:8,12,15,28), being previously included under the Medes (Ge 10:2), as they were by Thucydides, and even by Xenophon often.

Archaemenes (Hakhamanish)

Teispes (Chaishpish, Sispis)

Cyrus Ariaramnes (Ariyaramna)

Cambyses Arsames (Arshama)

Cyrus the Great Hystaspes (Vishtaspa)

Cambyses Darius I

Xerxes I (Ahasuerus)

Artaxerxes I (Longimanus)

Xerxes II Sogdianus Darius II

(Nothos, Ochos)

Artaxerxes III (Ochos) (Sisygambis, a daughter)

Arses

Darius III (Codomannus)

(Neh. 12:22; 1 Macc. 1:1)

I. Affinity.

Being of the same stock as the Medes they shared the name Aryans (Achaem. ariya; Av. airya; Sanskrit, arya, "noble"); compare the Naqsh i Rustam Inscription, where Darius I calls himself "a Persian, son of a Persian, an Aryan, of Aryan descent" (II. 13, 14). Tradition assigns as their earliest known habitat the so-called Airyanem Vaejo ("Aryan germ"), a district between the Jaxartes and the Oxus (Vendidad I), whence they migrated gradually to what was afterward known as Persis (modern Fars), including probably part of Elam.

1. Three Classes:

The Avesta shows that the Medo-Pers community was divided into 3 classes (zantu): the Athravans or fire-priests, the Rathaestars or charioteers, and the Vastryafshuyans or cattle-rearers (compare the three original Hindu castes, the Brahmans, the Kshattriyas and the Vaisyas). A fourth class, the artisans or Hutis, came later. But these were classes, not castes.

2. Tribal and Clan Divisions:

They were also divided into tribes, clans (Achaem. vith; Av. vis; compare vicus) and families or households (Achaem. tauma; Av. nmana). Herodotus (i.125) mentions ten Persian tribes, the chief being the Pasargadae, to which belonged the Achemenian clan (phretre) which included the royal family. This dynasty traced its origin to Achaemenes (Chakhamanish) according to Darius and Herodotus.Oxus (Vendidad I), whence they migrated gradually to what was afterward known as Persis (modern Fars), including probably part of Elam.

3. Achemenian Dynasty:

The following scheme will serve to show the descent of the line of Persian kings mentioned in the Bible

and in secular history up to the time of the fall of the dynasty in 331 BC.

II. Civilization.

1. Writing:

The Persians had indulged less in luxury than the Medes, until their conquest of Media and other lands under Cyrus the Great gave them the opportunity, which they were not slow to embrace, being famed for their readiness to adopt foreign customs. Writing was introduced from Babylonia through Elam.

2. Institutions and Customs:

This cuneiform character was afterward superseded by one derived from Syria, from which came the Avestic writing, which, in its corrupt Pahlavi form, lasted until the Arabian conquest imposed the Arabic character on the people. The Achemenian kings probably borrowed from Babylon and further developed their system of royal posts (Es 8:14) or messengers (and even the words aggaroi, and astandai, used to denote them, are almost certainly Babylonian). Of these men’s pace it was said, "No mortal thing is quicker." The custom of showing special honor to the "Benefactors of the King" (Herodotos viii.85: orosaggai equals Av. uru plus sanh, "widely renowned") is referred to in Es 6:1,2,3, and that of covering the (head and) face of a criminal condemned to death (with a large black cap) (Es 7:8,9) occurs in the Shahnamah also.

(1) The King.

The king was an arbitrary ruler with unlimited power, the council of seven princes who stood nearest to the throne (Es 1:14; compare Herodotos iii. 70-84) having no share in the government.

(2) The Army.

As soldiers, the Persians were famous as archers and javelin-throwers; they were also skilled in the use of the sling, and above all in riding. Boys were taken from the women’s into the men’s part of the house at the age of 5, and were there trained in "riding, archery and speaking the truth" until 20 years old. In Darius’ inscriptions, as well as in the Avesta, lying is regarded as a great crime.

(3) Marriage.

The Persians practiced polygamy, and marriages between those next of kin were approved of. Pride and garrulity are mentioned as distinctive of the Persian character.

III. History.

1. Cyrus:

Persian history, as known to us, begins with Cyrus the Great. His ancestors, for at least some generations, seem to have been chiefs or "kings" of Anshan, a district in Persia or Elam. Cyrus himself (Western Asiatic Inscriptions, V, plate 35) gives his genealogy up to and including Teispes, entitling all his ancestors whom he mentions, kings of Anshan. Phraortes, king of the Medes, is said to have first subjugated the Persians to that kingdom about 97 years before Cyrus (Herodotus i.102). Cyrus himself headed his countrymen's revolt against Astyages, who advanced to attack Pasargadae (549 BC). His army mutinied and surrendered him to Cyrus, whom the Greeks held to be his grandson on the mother's side. Cyrus, becoming supreme ruler of both Medes and Persians, advanced to the conquest of Lydia. He defeated and captured Croesus, overran Lydia, and compelled the Greek colonies in Asia Minor to pay tribute (547 BC).

2. Capture of Babylon:

He overthrew the Sute (Bedouin) across the Tigris the following year, and was then invited by a large party in Babylonia to come to their help against the usurper Nabunahid, whose religious zeal had led him to collect as many as possible of the idols from other parts of Babylonia and remove them to Babylon, thereby increasing the sacredness and magnificence of that city but inflicting injury on neighboring and more ancient sanctuaries. Defeating Nabunahid's army and capturing the king, Cyrus sent his own forces under Gobryas (Gubaru, Gaubaruva)to take possession of Babylon. This he did in June, 538, "without opposition and without a battle." The citadel, however, where Belshazzar "the king's son" was in command, held out for some months, and was then taken in a night attack in which "the king's son" was slain. Cyrus made Gobryas viceroy of Chaldea, and he "appointed governors in Babylonia (Cyrus' "Annalistic Tablet"). When Gobryas died within the year, Cyrus' son Cambyses was made viceroy of the country, now become a province of the Persian empire. Cyrus restored the gods to their sanctuaries, and this doubtless led to permission being given to the Jews to return to Jerusalem, taking with them their sacred vessels, and to rebuild their temple. Cyrus was killed in battle against some frontier tribe (accounts differ where) in 529 BC. His tomb at Murghab, near the ruins of Pasargadae, is still standing.

3. Cambyses:

Cyrus' son and successor, Cambyses, invaded Egypt and conquered it after a great battle near Pelusium (525 BC). During his absence, a Magian, Gaumata, who pretended to be Smerdis (Bardiya), Cambyses' murdered brother, seized the throne. Marching against him, Cambyses committed suicide.

4. Pseudo-Smerdis:

After a reign of 7 months, the usurper was overthrown and slain by Darius and his 6 brother-nobles (their names in Herodotus iii.70 are confirmed with one exception in Darius' Besitun Inscription, column iv, 80-86). Darius became king as the heir of Cambyses (521 BC). But in nearly every part of

the empire rebellions broke out, in most cases headed by real or pretended descendants of the ancient kings of each country.

5. Darius I:

After at least 3 years' struggle Darius' authority was firmly established everywhere. He then divided the empire into satrapies, or provinces (dahyava), of which there were at first 23 (Beh. Inscription, column i, 13-17), and ultimately at least 29 (Naqsh i Rustam Inscription, 22-30). Over these he placed satraps of noble Persian or Median descent, instead of representatives of their ancient kings. His empire extended from the Indus to the Black Sea, from the Jaxartes to beyond the Nile.

6. Darius' Suez Canal:

Darius united the latter river with the Red Sea by a canal, the partly obliterated inscription commemorating which may perhaps be thus restored and rendered: "I am a Persian; with Persia I seized Egypt. I commanded to dig this canal from the river named the Nile (Pirava), which flows through Egypt, to this sea which comes from Persia. Then this canal was dug, according as I commanded. And I said, 'Come ye from the Nile through this canal to Persia.' " Darius' expedition into Scythia, his success in subduing the rebellion among the Asiatic Greeks, his attempts to conquer Greece itself and his overthrow at Marathon (499-490 BC) are part of the history of Greece. A rebellion in Egypt had not been repressed when Darius died in 485 BC.

7. Xerxes I:

Xerxes I, who succeeded his father, regained Egypt, but his failure in his attempts to conquer Greece largely exhausted his empire. In 464 BC he was murdered. His son Artaxerxes I, surnamed "the longarmed," succeeded him, being himself succeeded in 424 BC by his son Xerxes II, who was murdered the following year. This ended the legitimate Achemenian line, the next king, Darius II (styled Nothos, or "bastard," as well as Ochos), being one of Artaxerxes' illegitimate sons (we pass over Sogdianus' brief reign).

8. Artaxerxes II:

Artaxerxes II, Mnemon, succeeded his father and left the throne to his son Artaxerxes III, Ochos. The latter was murdered with all his sons but the youngest, Arses, by an Egyptian eunuch Bagoas, probably in revenge for Artaxerxes' conduct in Egypt (338 BC).

9. Xerxes II:

Arses was murdered by Bagoas 3 years later, when Darius III, Codomannus, the son of Sisygambis, daughter of Artaxerxes II, and her husband, a Persian noble, ascended the throne.

10. Later Persian Kings:

Darius was completely overthrown by Alexander the Great in the battle of Gaugamela or Arbela, 331 BC, and shortly after fell by an assassin’s hand. This ended the Persian empire of the Achaemenides, the whole of the lands composing it becoming part of the empire of Macedon.

IV. First Mention in Inscriptions.

Persia (Parsua) is first mentioned as a country in an inscription of Rammanu Nirari III (WAI, I, plate 35, number 1, l. 8), who boasts of having conquered it and other lands (he reigned from 812 to 783 or from 810 to 781 BC).

LITERATURE.

Besides the main authorities mentioned in the text, we learn much from Spiegel, Die Altper-sischen Keilinschriften, Arrian, Thucydides, Polybius, Strabo, Curtius.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

PERSIS

pur’-sis (Persis): The name of a female member of the Christian community at Rome, to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:12). Paul designates her "the beloved, who labored much in the Lord." The name is not found in inscriptions of the imperial household, but it occurs as the name of a freedwoman (CIL, VI, 23, 959).

PERSON OF CHRIST, 1-3

Method of the Article

I. THE TEACHING OF PAUL 1. Philippians 2:5-9

(1) General Drift of Passage

(2) our Lord’s Intrinsic Deity

(3) No Examination

(4) our Lord’s Humanity

2. Other Pauline Passages

II. THE TEACHING OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Hebrews 2:1 ff

(1) Background of Express Deity

(2) Completeness of Humanity

(3) Continued Possession of Deity

III. THE TEACHING OF OTHER EPISTLES

IV. THE TEACHING OF JOHN

1. The Epistles

2. Prologue to the Gospel

(1) The Being Who Was Incarnated

(2) The Incarnation

(3) The Incarnated Person

3. The Gospel

V. THE TEACHING OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

VI. THE TEACHING OF JESUS

1. The Johannine Jesus

(1) His Higher Nature

(2) His Humiliation

2. The Synoptic Jesus

(1) His Deity

(a) Mark 13:32

(b) Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God

(c) Matthew 11:27; 28:19

(2) His Humanity

(3) Unity of the Person

VII. THE TWO NATURES EVERYWHERE PRESUPPOSED

VIII. FORMULATION OF THE DOCTRINE

LITERATURE

Method of the Article:

It is the purpose of this article to make as clear as possible the conception of the Person of Christ, in the technical sense of that term, which lies on—or, if we prefer to say so, beneath—the pages of the New Testament. Were it its purpose to trace out the process by which this great mystery has been revealed to men, a beginning would need to be taken from the intimations as to the nature of the person of the Messiah in Old Testament prophecy, and an attempt would require to be made to discriminate the exact contribution of each organ of revelation to our knowledge. And were there added to this a desire to ascertain the progress of the apprehension of this mystery by men, there would be demanded a further inquiry into the exact degree of understanding which was brought to the truth revealed at each stage of its revelation. The magnitudes with which such investigations deal, however, are very minute; and the profit to be derived from them is not, in a case like the present, very great. It is, of course, of importance to know how the person of the Messiah was represented in the predictions of the Old Testament; and it is a matter at least of interest to note, for example, the difficulty experienced by our Lord's immediate disciples in comprehending all that was involved in His manifestation. But, after all, the constitution of our Lord's person is a matter of revelation, not of human thought; and it is preeminently a revelation of the New Testament, not of the Old Testament. And the New Testament is all the product of a single movement, at a single stage of its development, and therefore presents in its fundamental teaching a common character. The whole of the New Testament was written within the limits of about half a century; or, if we except the writings of John, within the narrow bounds of a couple of decades; and the entire body of writings which enter into it are so much of a piece that it may be plausibly represented that they all bear the stamp of a single mind. In its fundamental teaching, the New Testament lends itself, therefore, more readily to what is called dogmatic than to what is called genetic treatment; and we shall penetrate most surely into its essential meaning if we take our start from its clearest and fullest statements, and permit their light to be thrown upon its more incidental allusions. This is peculiarly the case with such a matter as the person of Christ, which is dealt with chiefly incidentally, as a thing

already understood by all, and needing only to be alluded to rather than formally expounded. That we may interpret these allusions aright, it is requisite that we should recover from the first the common conception which underlies them all.

I. Teaching of Paul.

1. Philippians 2:5-9:

(1) General Drift of the Passage.

We begin, then, with the most didactic of the New Testament writers, the apostle Paul, and with one of the passages in which he most fully intimates his conception of the person of his Lord, Php 2:5-9. Even here, however, Paul is not formally expounding the doctrine of the Person of Christ; he is only alluding to certain facts concerning His person and action perfectly well known to his readers, in order that he may give point to an adduction of Christ's example. He is exhorting his readers to unselfishness, such unselfishness as esteems others better than ourselves, and looks not only on our own things but also on those of others. Precisely this unselfishness, he declares, was exemplified by our Lord. He did not look upon His own things but the things of others; that is to say, He did not stand upon His rights, but was willing to forego all that He might justly have claimed for Himself for the good of others. For, says Paul, though, as we all know, in His intrinsic nature He was nothing other than God, yet He did not, as we all know right well, look greedily on His condition of equality with God, but made no account of Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and, being found in fashion as a man, humbled Himself, becoming obedient up to death itself, and that, the death of the cross. The statement is thrown into historical form; it tells the story of Christ's life on earth. But it presents His life on earth as a life in all its elements alien to His intrinsic nature, and assumed only in the performance of an unselfish purpose. On earth He lived as a man, and subjected Himself to the common lot of men. But He was not by nature a man, nor was He in His own nature subject to the fortunes of human life. By nature He was God; and He would have naturally lived as became God—'on an equality with God.' He became man by a voluntary act, 'taking no account of Himself,' and, having become man, He voluntarily lived out His human life under the conditions which the fulfillment of His unselfish purpose imposed on Him.

(2) Our Lord's Intrinsic Deity.

The terms in which these great affirmations are made deserve the most careful attention. The language in which our Lord's intrinsic Deity is expressed, for example, is probably as strong as any that could be devised. Paul does not say simply, "He was God." He says, "He was in the form of God," employing a turn of speech which throws emphasis upon our Lord's possession of the specific quality of God. "Form" is a term which expresses the sum of those characterizing qualities which make a thing the precise thing that it is. Thus, the "form" of a sword (in this case mostly matters of external configuration) is all that makes a given piece of metal specifically a sword, rather than, say, a spade. And "the form of God" is the sum of the characteristics which make the being we call "God," specifically God, rather than some other being—an angel, say, or a man. When our Lord is said to be in "the form of God," therefore,

He is declared, in the most express manner possible, to be all that God is, to possess the whole fullness of attributes which make God God. Paul chooses this manner of expressing himself here instinctively, because, in adducing our Lord as our example of self-abnegation; his mind is naturally resting, not on the bare fact that He is God, but on the richness and fullness of His being as God. He was all this, yet He did not look on His own things but on those of others.

It should be carefully observed also that in making this great affirmation concerning our Lord, Paul does not throw it distinctively into the past, as if he were describing a mode of being formerly our Lord's, indeed, but no longer His because of the action by which He became our example of unselfishness. our Lord, he says, "being," "existing," "subsisting" "in the form of God"—as it is variously rendered. The rendering proposed by the Revised Version margin, "being originally," while right in substance, is somewhat misleading. The verb employed means "strictly 'to be beforehand,' 'to be already' so and so" (Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek, English translation, 244), "to be there and ready," and intimates the existing circumstances, disposition of mind, or, as here, mode of subsistence in which the action to be described takes place. It contains no intimation, however, of the cessation of these circumstances or disposition, or mode of subsistence; and that, the less in a case like the present, where it is cast in a tense (the imperfect) which in no way suggests that the mode of subsistence intimated came to an end in the action described by the succeeding verb (compare the parallels: Lu 16:14,23; 23:50; Ac 2:30; 3:2; 2Co 8:17; 12:16; Ga 1:14). Paul is not telling us here, then, what our Lord was once, but rather what He already was, or, better, what in His intrinsic nature He is; he is not describing a past mode of existence of our Lord, before the action he is adducing as an example took place—although the mode of existence he describes was our Lord's mode of existence before this action—so much as painting in the background upon which the action adduced may be thrown up into prominence. He is telling us who and what He is who did these things for us, that we may appreciate how great the things He did for us are.

(3) No Examination.

And here it is important to observe that the whole of the action adduced is thrown up thus against this background—not only its negative description to the effect that our Lord (although all that God is) did not look greedily on His (consequent) being on an equality with God; but its positive description as well, introduced by the "but ...." and that in both of its elements, not merely that to the effect (Php 2:7) that 'he took no account of himself' (rendered not badly by the King James Version, He "made himself of no reputation"; but quite misleading by the Revised Version (British and American), He "emptied himself"), but equally that to the effect (Php 2:8) that "he humbled himself." It is the whole of what our Lord is described as doing in Php 2:6-8, that He is described as doing despite His "subsistence in the form of God." So far is Paul from intimating, therefore, that our Lord laid aside His Deity in entering upon His life on earth, that he rather asserts that He retained His Deity throughout His life on earth, and in the whole course of His humiliation, up to death itself, was consciously ever exercising self-abnegation, living a life which did not by nature belong to Him, which stood in fact in direct contradiction to the life which was naturally His. It is this underlying implication which determines the whole choice of the language in which our Lord's earthly life is described. It is because it is kept in mind that He still was "in the form of God," that is, that He still had in possession all that body of

characterizing qualities by which God is made God, for example, that He is said to have been made, not man, but "in the likeness of man," to have been found, not man, but "in fashion as a man"; and that the wonder of His servanthood and obedience, the mark of servanthood, is thought of as so great. Though He was truly man, He was much more than man; and Paul would not have his readers imagine that He had become merely man. In other words, Paul does not teach that our Lord was once God but had become instead man; he teaches that though He was God, He had become also man.

An impression that Paul means to imply, that in entering upon His earthly life our Lord had laid aside His Deity, may be created by a very prevalent misinterpretation of the central clause of his statement—a misinterpretation unfortunately given currency by the rendering of English Revised Version: "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God, but emptied himself," varied without improvement in the American Standard Revised Version to: "counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself." The former (negative) member of this clause means just: He did not look greedily upon His being on an equality with God; did not "set supreme store" by it (see Lightfoot on the clause). The latter (positive) member of it, however, cannot mean in tithesis to this, that He therefore "emptied himself," divested Himself of this, His being on an equality with God, much less that He "emptied himself," divested Himself of His Deity ("form of God") itself, of which His being on an equality with God is the manifested consequence. The verb here rendered "emptied" is in constant use in a metaphorical sense (so only in the New Testament: Ro 4:14; 1Co 1:17; 9:15; 2Co 9:3) and cannot here be taken literally. This is already apparent from the definition of the manner in which the "emptying" is said to have been accomplished, supplied by the modal clause which is at once attached: by "taking the form of servant." You cannot "empty" by "taking"—adding. It is equally apparent, however, from the strength of the emphasis which, by its position, is thrown upon the "himself." We may speak of our Lord as "emptying Himself" of something else, but scarcely, with this strength of emphasis, of His "emptying Himself" of something else. This emphatic "Himself," interposed between the preceding clause and the verb rendered "emptied," builds a barrier over which we cannot climb backward in search of that of which our Lord emptied Himself. The whole thought is necessarily contained in the two words, "emptied himself," in which the word "emptied" must therefore be taken in a sense analogous to that which it bears in the other passages in the New Testament where it occurs. Paul, in a word, says here nothing more than that our Lord, who did not look with greedy eyes upon His estate of equality with God, emptied Himself, if the language may be pardoned, of Himself; that is to say, in precise accordance with the exhortation for the enhancement of which His example is adduced, that He did not look on His own things. ‘He made no account of Himself,’ we may fairly paraphrase the clause; and thus all question of what He emptied Himself of falls away. What our Lord actually did, according to Paul, is expressed in the following clauses; those now before us express more the moral character of His act. He took "the form of a servant," and so was "made in the likeness of men." But His doing this showed that He did not set overweening store by His state of equality with God, and did not account Himself the sufficient object of all the efforts. He was not self-regarding: He had regard for others. Thus, He becomes our supreme example of self-abnegating conduct.

See also KENOSIS.

(4) Our Lord’s Humanity.

The language in which the act by which our Lord showed that He was self-abnegating is described, requires to be taken in its complete meaning. He took "the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men," says Paul. The term "form" here, of course, bears the same full meaning as in the preceding instance of its occurrence in the phrase "the form of God." It imparts the specific quality, the whole body of characteristics, by which a servant is made what we know as a servant, our Lord assumed, then, according to Paul, not the mere state or condition or outward appearance of a servant, but the reality; He became an actual "servant" in the world. The act by which He did this is described as a "taking," or, as it has become customary from this description of it to phrase it, as an "assumption." What is meant is that our Lord took up into His personality a human nature; and therefore it is immediately explained that He took the form of a servant by "being made in the likeness of men." That the apostle does not say, shortly, that He assumed a human nature, is due to the engagement of his mind with the contrast which he wishes to bring out forcibly for the enhancement of his appeal to our Lord's example, between what our Lord is by nature and what He was willing to become, not looking on His own things but also on the things of others. This contrast is, no doubt, embodied in the simple opposition of God and man; it is much more pungently expressed in the qualificative terms, "form of God" and "form of a servant." The Lord of the world became a servant in the world; He whose right it was to rule took obedience as His life-characteristic. Naturally therefore Paul employs here a word of quality rather than a word of mere nature; and then defines his meaning in this word of quality by a further epexegetical clause. This further clause—"being made in the likeness of men"—does not throw doubt on the reality of the human nature that was assumed, in contradiction to the emphasis on its reality in the phrase "the form of a servant." It, along with the succeeding clause—"and being found in fashion as a man"—owes its peculiar form, as has already been pointed out, to the vividness of the apostle's consciousness, that he is speaking of one who, though really man, possessing all that makes a man a man, is yet, at the same time, infinitely more than a man, no less than God Himself, in possession of all that makes God God. Christ Jesus is in his view, therefore (as in the view of his readers, for he is not instructing his readers here as to the nature of Christ's person, but reminding them of certain elements in it for the purposes of his exhortation), both God and man, God who has assumed man into personal union with Himself, and has in this His assumed manhood lived out a human life on earth.

2. Other Pauline Passages:

The elements of Paul's conception of the person of Christ are brought before us in this suggestive passage with unwonted fullness. But they all receive endless illustration from his occasional allusions to them, one or another, throughout his Epistles. The leading motive of this passage, for example, reappears quite perfectly in 2Co 8:9, where we are exhorted to imitate the graciousness of our Lord Jesus Christ, who became for our sakes (emphatic) poor—He who was (again an imperfect participle, and therefore without suggestion of the cessation of the condition described) rich—that we might by His (very emphatic) poverty be made rich. Here the change in our Lord's condition at a point of time perfectly understood between the writer and his readers is adverted to and assigned to its motive, but no further definition is given of the nature of either condition referred to. We are brought closer to the precise nature of the act by which the change was wrought by such a passage as Ga 4:4. We read that "When the fullness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that

he might redeem them that were under the law." The whole transaction is referred to the Father in fulfillment of His eternal plan of redemption, and it is described specifically as an incarnation: the Son of God is born of a woman—He who is in His own nature the Son of God, abiding with God, is sent forth from God in such a manner as to be born a human being, subject to law. The primary implications are that this was not the beginning of His being; but that before this He was neither a man nor subject to law. But there is no suggestion that on becoming man and subject to law, He ceased to be the Son of God or lost anything intimated by that high designation. The uniqueness of His relation to God as His Son is emphasized in a kindred passage (Ro 8:3) by the heightening of the designation to that of God's "own Son," and His distinction from other men is intimated in the same passage by the declaration that God sent Him, not in sinful flesh, but only the likeness of sinful flesh." The reality of our Lord's flesh is not thrown into doubt by this turn of speech, but His freedom from the sin which is associated with flesh as it exists in lost humanity is asserted (compare 2Co 5:21). Though true man, therefore (1Co 15:21; Ro 5:21; Ac 17:31), He is not without differences from other men; and these differences do not concern merely the condition (as sinful) in which men presently find themselves; but also their very origin: they are from below, He from above—'the first man is from the earth, earthy; the second man is from heaven' (1Co 15:47). This is His peculiarity: He was born of a woman like other men; yet He descended from heaven (compare Eph 4:9; Joh 3:13). It is not meant, of course, that already in heaven He was a man; what is meant is that even though man He derives His origin in an exceptional sense from heaven. Paul describes what He was in heaven (but not alone in heaven)—that is to say before He was sent in the likeness of sinful flesh (though not alone before this)—in the great terms of "God's Son," "God's own Son," "the form of God," or yet again in words whose import cannot be mistaken, 'God over all' (Ro 9:5). In the last cited passage, together with its parallel earlier in the same epistle (Ro 1:3), the two sides or elements of our Lord's person are brought into collocation after a fashion that can leave no doubt of Paul's conception of His twofold nature. In the earlier of these passages he tells us that Jesus Christ was born, indeed, of the seed of David according to the flesh, that is, so far as the human side of His being is concerned, but was powerfully marked out as the Son of God according to the Spirit of Holiness, that is, with respect to His higher nature, by the resurrection of the dead, which in a true sense began in His own rising from the dead. In the later of them, he tells us that Christ sprang indeed, as concerns the flesh, that is on the human side of His being, from Israel, but that, despite this earthly origin of His human nature, He yet is and abides (present participle) nothing less than the Supreme God, "God over all (emphatic), blessed forever." Thus Paul teaches us that by His coming forth from God to be born of woman, our Lord, assuming a human nature to Himself, has, while remaining the Supreme God, become also true and perfect man. Accordingly, in a context in which the resources of language are strained to the utmost to make the exaltation of our Lord's being clear—in which He is described as the image of the invisible God, whose being antedates all that is created, whom, through whom and to whom all things have been created, and in whom they all subsist—we are told not only that (naturally) in Him all the fulhess dwells (Col 1:19), but, with complete explication, that 'all the fullness of the Godhead dwells in him bodily' (Col 2:9); that is to say, the very Deity of God, that which makes God God, in all its completeness, has its permanent home in our Lord, and that in a "bodily fashion," that is, it is in Him clothed with a body. He who looks upon Jesus Christ sees, no doubt, a body and a man; but as he sees the man clothed with the body, so he sees God Himself, in all the fullness of His Deity clothed with the humanity. Jesus Christ is therefore God "manifested in the flesh" (1Ti 3:16), and His appearance on earth is an "epiphany" (2Ti 1:10), which is the technical term for manifestations on earth of a God.

Though truly man, He is nevertheless also our "great God" (Tit 2:13).

II. Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The conception of the person of Christ which underlies and finds expression in the Epistle to the Hebrews is indistinguishable from that which governs all the allusions to our Lord in the Epistles of Paul. To the author of this epistle our Lord is above all else the Son of God in the most eminent sense of that word; and it is the divine dignity and majesty belonging to Him from His very nature which forms the fundamental feature of the image of Christ which stands before his mind. And yet it is this author who, perhaps above all others of the New Testament writers, emphasizes the truth of the humanity of Christ, and dwells with most particularity upon the elements of His human nature and experience.

Hebrews 2:1 ff:

(1) Background of Express Deity.

The great Christological passage which fills Hebrews 2 of the Epistle to the Hebrews rivals in its richness and fullness of detail, and its breadth of implication, that of Philippians 2. It is thrown up against the background of the remarkable exposition of the divine dignity of the Son which occupies Hebrews 1 (notice the "therefore" of 2:1). There the Son had been declared to be "the effulgence of his (God’s) glory, and the very image of his substance," through whom the universe has been created and by the word of whose power all things are held in being; and His exaltation above the angels, by means of whom the Old Covenant had been inaugurated, is measured by the difference between the designations "ministering spirits" proper to the one, and the Son of God, nay, God itself (1:8,9), proper to the other. The purpose of the succeeding statement is to enhance in the thought of the Jewish readers of the epistle the value of the salvation wrought by this divine Saviour, by removing from their minds the offense they were in danger of taking at His lowly life and shameful death on earth. This earthly humiliation finds its abundant justification, we are told, in the greatness of the end which it sought and attained. By it our Lord has, with His strong feet, broken out a pathway along which, in Him, sinful man may at length climb up to the high destiny which was promised him when it was declared he should have dominion over all creation. Jesus Christ stooped only to conquer, and He stooped to conquer not for Himself (for He was in His own person no less than God), but for us.

(2) Completeness of Humanity.

The language in which the humiliation of the Son of God is in the first instance described is derived from the context. The establishment of His divine majesty in chapter 1 had taken the form of an exposition of His infinite exaltation above the angels, the highest of all creatures. His humiliation is described here therefore as being "made a little lower than the angels" (Heb 2:9). What is meant is simply that He became man; the phraseology is derived from Ps 8 the King James Version, from which had just been cited the declaration that God had made man (despite his insignificance) "but a little lower than the angels," thus crowning him with glory and honor. The adoption of the language of the psalm to

describe our Lord's humiliation has the secondary effect, accordingly, of greatly enlarging the reader's sense of the immensity of the humiliation of the Son of God in becoming man: He descended an infinite distance to reach man's highest conceivable exaltation. As, however, the primary purpose of the adoption of the language is merely to declare that the Son of God became man, so it is shortly afterward explained (Heb 2:14) as an entering into participation in the blood and flesh which are common to men: "Since then the children are sharers in flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner partook of the same." The voluntariness, the reality the completeness of the assumption of humanity by the Son of God, are all here emphasized.

The proximate end of our Lord's assumption of humanity is declared to be that He might die; He was "made a little lower than the angels .... because of the suffering of death" (Heb 2:9); He took part in blood and flesh in order that through death ...."(Heb 2:14). The Son of God as such could not die; to Him belongs by nature an "indissoluble life" (Heb 7:16 margin). If He was to die, therefore, He must take to Himself another nature to which the experience of death were not impossible (Heb 2:17). Of course it is not meant that death was desired by Him for its own sake. The purpose of our passage is to save its Jewish readers from the offense of the death of Christ. What they are bidden to observe is, therefore, Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels because of the suffering of death, 'crowned with glory and honor, that by the grace of God the bitterness of death which he tasted might redound to the benefit of every man' (Heb 2:9), and the argument is immediately pressed home that it was eminently suitable for God Almighty, in bringing many sons into glory, to make the Captain of their salvation perfect (as a Saviour) by means of suffering. The meaning is that it was only through suffering that these men, being sinners could be brought into glory. And therefore in the plainer statement of Heb 2:14 we read that our Lord took part in flesh and blood in order "that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil; and might deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage"; and in the still plainer statement of 2:17 that the ultimate object of His assimilation to men was that He might "make propitiation for the sins of the people." It is for the salvation of sinners that our Lord has come into the world; but, as that salvation can be wrought only by suffering and death, the proximate end of His assumption of humanity remains that He might die; whatever is more than this gathers around this.

The completeness of our Lord's assumption of humanity and of His identification of Himself with it receives strong emphasis in this passage. He took part in the flesh and blood which is the common heritage of men, after the same fashion that other men participate in it (Heb 2:14); and, having thus become a man among men, He shared with other men the ordinary circumstances and fortunes of life, "in all things" (Heb 2:17). The stress is laid on trials, sufferings, death; but this is due to the actual course in which His life ran—and that it might run in which He became man—and is not exclusive of other human experiences. What is intended is that He became truly a man, and lived a truly human life, subject to all the experiences natural to a man in the particular circumstances in which He lived.

(3) Continued Possession of Deity.

It is not implied, however, that during this human life—"the days of his flesh" (Heb 5:7)—He had ceased to be God, or to have at His disposal the attributes which belonged to Him as God. That is

already excluded by the representations of Hebrews 1. The glory of this dispensation consists precisely in the bringing of its revelations directly by the divine Son rather than by mere prophets (1:1), and it was as the effulgence of God's glory and the express image of His substance, upholding the universe by the word of His power, that this Son made purification of sins (1:3). Indeed, we are expressly told that even in the days of the flesh, He continued still a Son (5:8), and that it was precisely in this that the wonder lay: that though He was and remained (imperfect participle) a Son, He yet learned the obedience He had set Himself to (compare Php 2:8) by the things which He suffered. Similarly, we are told not only that, though an Israelite of the tribe of Judah, He possessed "the power of an indissoluble life" (Heb 7:16 margin), but, describing that higher nature which gave Him this power as an "eternal Spirit" (compare "spirit of holiness," Ro 1:4), that it was through this eternal Spirit that He could offer Himself without blemish unto God, a real and sufficing sacrifice, in contrast with the shadows of the Old Covenant (Heb 9:14). Though a man, therefore, and truly man, sprung out of Judah (Heb 7:14), touched with the feeling of human infirmities (Heb 4:15), and tempted like as we are, He was not altogether like other men. For one thing, He was "without sin" (Heb 4:15; 7:26), and, by this characteristic, He was, in every sense of the words, separated from sinners. Despite the completeness of His identification with men, He remained, therefore, even in the days of His flesh different from them and above them.

III. Teaching of Other Epistles.

It is only as we carry this conception of the person of our Lord with us—the conception of Him as at once our Supreme Lord, to whom our adoration is due, and our fellow in the experiences of a human life—that unity is induced in the multiform allusions to Him throughout, whether the Epistles of Paul or the Epistle to the Hebrews, or, indeed, the other epistolary literature of the New Testament. For in this matter there is no difference between those and these. There are no doubt a few passages in these other letters in which a plurality of the elements of the person of Christ are brought together and given detailed mention. In 1Pe 3:18, for instance, the two constitutive elements of His person are spoken of in the contrast, familiar from Paul, of the "flesh" and the "spirit." But ordinarily we meet only with references to this or that element separately. Everywhere our Lord is spoken of as having lived out His life as a man; but everywhere also He is spoken of with the supreme reverence which is due to God alone, and the very name of God is not withheld from Him. In 1Pe 1:11 His pre-existence is taken for granted; in Jas 2:1 He is identified with the Shekinah, the manifested Yahweh—'our Lord Jesus Christ, the Glory'; in Jude verse 4 He is "our only Master (Despot) and Lord"; over and over again He is the divine Lord who is Yahweh (e.g. 1Pe 2:3,13; 2Pe 3:2,18); in 2Pe 1:1, He is roundly called "our God and Saviour." There is nowhere formal inculcation of the entire doctrine of the person of Christ. But everywhere its elements, now one and now another, are presupposed as the common property of writer and readers. It is only in the Epistles of John that this easy and unstudied presupposition of them gives way to pointed insistence upon them.

PERSON OF CHRIST, 4-5

IV. Teaching of John.

1. The Epistles:

In the circumstances in which he wrote, John found it necessary to insist upon the elements of the person of our Lord—His true Deity, His true humanity and the unity of His person—in a manner which is more didactic in form than anything we find in the other writings in form than anything we find in the other writings of New Testament. The great depository of his teaching on the subject is, of course, the prologue to his Gospel. But it is not merely in this prologue, nor in the Gospel to which it forms a fitting introduction, that these didactic statements are found. The full emphasis of John's witness to the twofold nature of the Lord is brought out, indeed, only by combining what he says in the Gospel and in the Epistles. "In the Gospel," remarks Westcott (on Joh 20:31), "the evangelist shows step by step that the historical Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God (opposed to mere 'flesh'); in the Epistle he reaffirms that the Christ, the Son of God, was true man (opposed to mere 'spirit'; 1 Joh 4:2)." What John is concerned to show throughout is that it was "the true God" (1 Joh 5:20) who was "made flesh" (Joh 1:14); and that this 'only God' (Joh 1:18, the Revised Version margin "God only begotten") has truly come "in .... flesh" (1 Joh 4:2). In all the universe there is no other being of whom it can be said that He is God come in flesh (compare 2 Joh 1:7, He that "cometh in the flesh," whose characteristic this is). And of all the marvels which have ever occurred in the marvelous history of the universe, this is the greatest—that 'what was from the beginning' (1 Joh 2:13,14) has been heard and gazed upon, seen and handled by men (1 Joh 1:1).

2. Prologue to the Gospel:

From the point of view from which we now approach it, the prologue to the Gospel of John may be said to fall into three parts. In the first of these, the nature of the Being who became incarnate in the person we know as Jesus Christ is described; in the second, the general nature of the act we call the incarnation; and in the third, the nature of the incarnated person.

See JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, III; JOHN, GOSPEL OF, IV, 1, (3), 2.

(1) The Being Who Was Incarnated.

John here calls the person who became incarnate by a name peculiar to himself in the New Testament—the Logos or "Word." According to the predicates which he here applies to Him, he can mean by the "Word" nothing else but God Himself, "considered in His creative, operative, self-revealing, and communicating character," the sum total of what is divine (C.F. Schmid). In three crisp sentences he declares at the outset His eternal subsistence, His eternal intercommunion with God, His eternal identity with God: 'In the beginning the Word was; and the Word was with God; and the Word was God' (Joh 1:1). "In the beginning," at that point of time when things first began to be (Ge 1:1), the Word already "was." He antedates the beginning of all things. And He not merely antedates them, but it is immediately added that He is Himself the creator of all that is: 'All things were made by him, and apart from him was not made one thing that hath been made' (Joh 1:3). Thus He is taken out of the category of creatures altogether. Accordingly, what is said of Him is not that He was the first of existences to come into being

—that ‘in the beginning He already had come into being’—but that ‘in the beginning, when things began to come into being, He already was.’ It is express eternity of being that is asserted: "the imperfect tense of the original suggests in this relation, as far as human language can do so, the notion of absolute, supra-temporal existence" (Westcott). This, His eternal subsistence, was not, however, in isolation: "And the Word was with God." The language is pregnant. It is not merely coexistence with God that is asserted, as of two beings standing side by side, united in a local relation, or even in a common conception. What is suggested is an active relation of intercourse. The distinct personality of the Word is therefore not obscurely intimatead. From all eternity the Word has been with God as fellow: He who in the very beginning already "was," "was" also in communion with God. Though He was thus in some sense a second along with God, He was nevertheless not a separate being from God: "And the Word was"—still the eternal "was"—"God." In some sense distinguishable from God, He was in an equally true sense identical with God. There is but one eternal God; this eternal God, the Word is; in whatever sense we may distinguish Him from the God whom He is "with," He is yet not another than this God, but Himself is this God. The predicate "God" occupies the position of emphasis in this great declaration, and is so placed in the sentence as to be thrown up in sharp contrast with the phrase "with God," as if to prevent inadequate inferences as to the nature of the Word being drawn even momentarily from that phrase. John would have us realize that what the Word was in eternity was not merely God’s coeternal fellow, but the eternal God’s self.

(2) The Incarnation.

Now, John tells us that it was this Word, eternal in His subsistence, God’s eternal fellow, the eternal God’s self, that, as "come in the flesh," was Jesus Christ (1 Joh 4:2). "And the Word became flesh" (Joh 1:14), he says. The terms he employs here are not terms of substance, but of personality. The meaning is not that the substance of God was transmuted into that substance which we call "flesh." "The Word" is a personal name of the eternal God; "flesh" is an appropriate designation of humanity in its entirety, with the implications of dependence and weakness. The meaning, then, is simply that He who had just been described as the eternal God became, by a voluntary act in time, a man. The exact nature of the act by which He "became" man lies outside the statement; it was matter of common knowledge between the writer and the reader. The language employed intimates merely that it was a definite act, and that it involved a change in the life-history of the eternal God, here designated "the Word." The whole emphasis falls on the nature of this change in His life-history. He became flesh. That is to say, He entered upon a mode of existence in which the experiences that belong to human beings would also be His. The dependence, the weakness, which constitute the very idea of flesh, in contrast with God, would now enter into His personal experience. And it is precisely because these are the connotations of the term "flesh" that John chooses that term here, instead of the more simply denotative term "man." What he means is merely that the eternal God became man. But he elects to say this in the language which throws best up to view what it is to become man. The contrast between the Word as the eternal God and the human nature which He assumed as flesh, is the hinge of the statement. Had the evangelist said (as he does in 1 Joh 4:2) that the Word ‘came in flesh,’ it would have been the continuity through the change which would have been most emphasized. When he says rather that the Word became flesh, while the continuity of the personal subject is, of course, intimatead, it is the reality and the completeness of the humanity assumed which is made most prominent.

(3) The Incarnated Person.

That in becoming flesh the Word did not cease to be what He was before entering upon this new sphere of experiences, the evangelist does not leave, however, to mere suggestion. The glory of the Word was so far from quenched, in his view, by His becoming flesh, that he gives us at once to understand that it was rather as "trailing clouds of glory" that He came. "And the Word became flesh," he says, and immediately adds: "and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father), full of grace and truth" (Joh 1:14). The language is colored by reminiscences from the Tabernacle, in which the Glory of God, the Shekinah, dwelt. The flesh of our Lord became, on its assumption by the Word, the Temple of God on earth (compare Joh 2:19), and the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord. John tells us expressly that this glory was visible, that it was precisely what was appropriate to the Son of God as such. "And we beheld his glory," he says; not divined it, or inferred it, but perceived it. It was open to sight, and the actual object of observation. Jesus Christ was obviously more than man; He was obviously God. His actually observed glory, John tells us further, was a "glory as of the only begotten from the Father." It was unique; nothing like it was ever seen in another. And its uniqueness consisted precisely in its consonance with what the unique Son of God, sent forth from the Father, would naturally have; men recognized and could not but recognize in Jesus Christ the unique Son of God. When this unique Son of God is further described as "full of grace and truth," the elements of His manifested glory are not to be supposed to be exhausted by this description (compare Joh 2:11). Certain items of it only are singled out for particular mention. The visible glory of the incarnated Word was such a glory as the unique Son of God, sent forth from the Father, who was full of grace and truth, would naturally manifest.

That nothing should be lacking to the declaration of the continuity of all that belongs to the Word as such into this new sphere of existence, and its full manifestation through the veil of His flesh, John adds at the close of his exposition the remarkable sentence: ‘As for God, no one has even yet seen him; God only begotten, who is in the bosom of the Father—he hath declared him’ (Joh 1:18 margin). It is the incarnate Word which is here called ‘only begotten God.’ The absence of the article with this designation is doubtless due to its parallelism with the word "God" which stands at the head of the corresponding clause. The effect of its absence is to throw up into emphasis the quality rather than the mere individuality of the person so designated. The adjective "only begotten" conveys the idea, not of derivation and subordination, but of uniqueness and consubstantiality: Jesus is all that God is, and He alone is this. Of this ‘only begotten God’ it is now declared that He "is"—not "was," the state is not one which has been left behind at the incarnation, but one which continues uninterrupted and unmodified —"into"—not merely "in"—"the bosom of the Father"—that is to say, He continues in the most intimate and complete communion with the Father. Though now incarnate, He is still "with God" in the full sense of the external relation intimated in Joh 1:1. This being true, He has much more than seen God, and is fully able to "interpret" God to men. Though no one has ever yet seen God, yet he who has seen Jesus Christ, "God only begotten," has seen the Father (compare Joh 14:9; 12:45). In this remarkable sentence there is asserted in the most direct manner the full Deity of the incarnate Word, and the continuity of His life as such in His incarnate life; thus He is fitted to be the absolute revelation of God to man.

3. The Gospel:

This condensed statement of the whole doctrine of the incarnation is only the prologue to a historical treatise. The historical treatise which it introduces, naturally, is written from the point of view of its prologue. Its object is to present Jesus Christ in His historical manifestation, as obviously the Son of God in flesh. "These are written," the Gospel testifies, "that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God" (Joh 20:31); that Jesus who came as a man (Joh 1:30) was thoroughly known in His human origin (Joh 7:27), confessed Himself man (Joh 8:40), and died as a man dies (Joh 19:5), was, nevertheless, not only the Messiah, the Sent of God, the fulfiller of all the divine promises of redemption, but also the very Son of God, that God only begotten, who, abiding in the bosom of the Father, is His sole adequate interpreter. From the beginning of the Gospel onward, this purpose is pursued: Jesus is pictured as ever, while truly man, yet manifesting Himself as equally truly God, until the veil which covered the eyes of His followers was wholly lifted, and He is greeted as both Lord and God (Joh 20:28). But though it is the prime purpose of this Gospel to exhibit the divinity of the man Jesus, no obscuration of His manhood is involved. It is the Deity of the man Jesus which is insisted on, but the true manhood of Jesus is as prominent in the representation as in any other portion of the New Testament. Nor is any effacement of the humiliation of His earthly life involved. For the Son of man to come from heaven was a descent (Joh 3:13), and the mission which He came to fulfill was a mission of contest and conflict, of suffering and death. He brought His glory with Him (Joh 1:14), but the glory that was His on earth (Joh 17:22) was not all the glory which He had had with the Father before the world was, and to which, after His work was done, He should return (Joh 17:5). Here too the glory of the celestial is one and the glory of the terrestrial is another. In any event, John has no difficulty in presenting the life of our Lord on earth as the life of God in flesh, and in insisting at once on the glory that belongs to Him as God and on the humiliation which is brought to Him by the flesh. It is distinctly a duplex life which he ascribes to Christ, and he attributes to Him without embarrassment all the powers and modes of activity appropriate on the one hand to Deity and on the other to sinless (Joh 8:46; compare Joh 14:30; 1Joh 3:5) human nature. In a true sense his portrait of our Lord is a dramatization of the God-man which he presents to our contemplation in his prologue. V. Teaching of the Synoptic Gospels.

The same may be said of the other Gospels. They are all dramatizations of the God-man set forth in thetical exposition in the prologue to John’s Gospel. The Gospel of Luke, written by a known companion of Paul, gives us in a living narrative the same Jesus who is presupposed in all Paul’s allusions to Him. That of Mark, who was also a companion of Paul, as also of Peter, is, as truly as the Gospel of John itself, a presentation of facts in the life of Jesus with a view to making it plain that this was the life of no mere man, human as it was, but of the Son of God Himself. Matthew’s Gospel differs from its fellows mainly in the greater richness of Jesus’ own testimony to His Deity which it records. What is characteristic of all three is the inextricable interlacing in their narratives of the human and divine traits which alike marked the life they are depicting. It is possible, by neglecting one series of their representations and attending only to the other, to sift out from them at will the portrait of either a purely divine or a purely human Jesus. It is impossible to derive from them the portrait of any other than a divine-human Jesus if we surrender ourselves to their guidance and take off of their pages the portrait they have endeavored to draw. As in their narratives they cursorily suggest now the fullness of His Deity

and now the completeness of His humanity and everywhere the unity of His person, they present as real and as forcible a testimony to the constitution of our Lord's person as uniting in one personal life a truly divine and a truly human nature, as if they announced this fact in analytical statement. Only on the assumption of this conception of our Lord's person as underlying and determining their presentation, can unity be given to their representations; while, on this supposition, all their representations fall into their places as elements in one consistent whole. Within the limits of their common presupposition, each Gospel has no doubt its own peculiarities in the distribution of its emphasis. Mark lays particular stress on the divine power of the man Jesus, as evidence of His supernatural being; and on the irresistible impression of a veritable Son of God, a Divine Being walking the earth as a man, which He made upon all with whom He came into contact. Luke places his Gospel by the side of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the prominence it gives to the human development of the Divine Being whose life on earth it is depicting and to the range of temptation to which He was subjected. Matthew's Gospel is notable chiefly for the heights of the divine self-consciousness which it uncovers in its report of the words of Him whom it represents as nevertheless the Son of David, the Son of Abraham; heights of divine self-consciousness which fall in nothing short of those attained in the great utterances preserved for us by John. But amid whatever variety there may exist in the aspects on which each lays his particular emphasis, it is the same Jesus Christ which all three bring before us, a Jesus Christ who is at once God and man and one individual person. If that be not recognized, the whole narrative of the Synoptic Gospels is thrown into confusion; their portrait of Christ becomes an insoluble puzzle; and the mass of details which they present of His life-experiences is transmuted into a mere set of crass contradictions.

See also GOSPELS, THE SYNOPTIC.

PERSON OF CHRIST, 4-8

VI. Teaching of Jesus.

1. The Johannine Jesus:

The Gospel narratives not only present us, however, with dramatizations of the God-man, according to their authors' conception of His composite person. They preserve for us also a considerable body of the utterances of Jesus Himself, and this enables us to observe the conception of His person which underlay and found expression in our Lord's own teaching. The discourses of our Lord which have been selected for record by John have been chosen (among other reasons) expressly for the reason that they bear witness to His essential Deity. They are accordingly peculiarly rich in material for forming a judgment of our Lord's conception of His higher nature. This conception, it is needless to say, is precisely that which John, taught by it, has announced in the prologue to his Gospel, and has illustrated by his Gospel itself, compacted as it is of these discourses. It will not be necessary to present the evidence for this in its fullness. It will be enough to point to a few characteristic passages, in which our Lord's conception of His higher nature finds especially clear expression.

(1) His Higher Nature.

That He was of higher than earthly origin and nature, He repeatedly asserts. "Ye are from beneath," he says to the Jews (Joh 8:23), "I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world" (compare Joh 17:16). Therefore, He taught that He, the Son of Man, had "descended out of heaven" (Joh 3:13), where was His true abode. This carried with it, of course, an assertion of pre-existence; and this pre-existence is explicitly affirmed: "What then," He asks, "if ye should behold the Son of man ascending where he was before?" (Joh 6:62). It is not merely pre-existence, however, but eternal pre-existence which He claims for Himself: "And now, Father," He prays (Joh 17:5), "glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (compare Joh 17:24); and again, as the most impressive language possible, He declares (Joh 8:58 the King James Version): "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am," where He claims for Himself the timeless present of eternity as His mode of existence. In the former of these two last cited passages, the character of His pre-existent life is intimated; in it He shared the Father's glory from all eternity ("before the world was"); He stood by the Father's side as a companion in His glory. He came forth, when He descended to earth, therefore, not from heaven only, but from the very side of God (Joh 8:42; 17:8). Even this, however, does not express the whole truth; He came forth not only from the Father's side where He had shared in the Father's glory; He came forth out of the Father's very being—"I came out from the Father, and am come into the world" (Joh 16:28; compare Joh 8:42). "The connection described is inherent and essential, and not that of presence or external fellowship" (Westcott). This prepares us for the great assertion: "I and the Father are one" (Joh 10:30), from which it is a mere corollary that "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father" (Joh 14:9; compare Joh 8:19; 12:45).

(2) His Humiliation

In all these declarations the subject of the affirmation is the actual person speaking: it is of Himself who stood before men and spoke to them that our Lord makes these immense assertions. Accordingly, when He majestically declared, "I and the Father are" (plurality of persons) "one" (neuter singular, and accordingly, singleness of being), the Jews naturally understood Him to be making Himself, the person then speaking to them, God (Joh 10:33; compare Joh 5:18; 19:7). The continued sameness of the person who has been, from all eternity down to this hour, one with God, is therefore fully safeguarded. His earthly life is, however, distinctly represented as a humiliation. Though even on earth He is one with the Father, yet He "descended" to earth; He had come out from the Father and out of God; a glory had been left behind which was yet to be returned to, and His sojourn on earth was therefore to that extent an obscuration of His proper glory. There was a sense, then, in which, because He had "descended," He was no longer equal with the Father. It was in order to justify an assertion of equality with the Father in power (Joh 10:25,29) that He was led to declare: "I and my Father are one" (Joh 10:30). But He can also declare "The Father is greater than I" (Joh 14:28). Obviously this means that there was a sense in which He had ceased to be equal with the Father, because of the humiliation of His present condition, and in so far as this humiliation involved entrance into a status lower than that which belonged to Him by nature. Precisely in what this humiliation consisted can be gathered only from the general, implication of many statements. In it He was a "man": 'a man who hath told you the truth, which I have heard from God' (Joh 8:40), where the contrast with "God" throws the assertion of humanity into emphasis (compare Joh 10:33). The truth of His human nature is, however, everywhere assumed and endlessly

illustrated, rather than explicitly asserted. He possessed a human soul (Joh 11:27) and bodily parts (flesh and blood, Joh 6:53 ff; hands and side, 20:27); and was subject alike to physical affections (weariness, Joh 4:6, and thirst, 19:28, suffering and death), and to all the common human emotions—not merely the love of compassion (Joh 13:34; 14:21; 15:8-13), but the love of simple affection which we pour out on "friends" (Joh 11:11; compare Joh 15:14,15), indignation (Joh 11:33,38) and joy (Joh 15:11; 17:13). He felt the perturbation produced by strong excitement (Joh 11:33; 11:27; 13:21), the sympathy with suffering which shows itself in tears (Joh 11:35), the thankfulness which fills the grateful heart (Joh 6:11,23; 11:41; 16:27). Only one human characteristic was alien to Him: He was without sin: "the prince of the world," He declared, "hath nothing in me" (Joh 14:30; compare Joh 8:46). Clearly our Lord, as reported by John, knew Himself to be true God and true man in one indivisible person, the common subject of the qualities which belong to each.

2. The Synoptic Jesus:

(1) His Deity.

(a) Mark 13:32:

The same is true of His self-consciousness as revealed in His sayings recorded by the synoptists. Perhaps no more striking illustration of this could be adduced than the remarkable declaration recorded in Mr 13:32 (compare Mt 24:36): ‘But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, nor yet the Son, but the Father.’ Here Jesus places Himself, in an ascending scale of being, above "the angels in heaven," that is to say, the highest of all creatures, significantly marked here as supramundane. Accordingly, He presents Himself elsewhere as the Lord of the angels, whose behests they obey: "The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling, and them that do iniquity" (Mt 13:41), "And he shall send forth his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other" (Mt 24:31; compare Mt 13:49; 25:31; Mr 8:38). Thus the "angels of God" (Lu 12:8,9; 15:10) Christ designates as His angels, the "kingdom of God" (Mt 12:28; 19:24; 11:31,43; Mark and Luke often) as His Kingdom, the "elect of God" (Mr 13:20; Lu 18:7; compare Ro 8:33; Col 3:12; Tit 1:1) as His elect. He is obviously speaking in Mr 13:22 out of a divine self-consciousness: "Only a Divine Being can be exalted above angels" (B. Weiss). He therefore designates Himself by His divine name, "the Son," that is to say, the unique Son of God (Mr 9:7; 1:11), to claim to be whom would for a man be blasphemy (Mr 14:61,64). But though He designates Himself by this divine name, He is not speaking of what He once was, but of what at the moment of speaking He is: the action of the verb is present, "knoweth." He is claiming, in other words, the supreme designation of "the Son," with all that is involved in it, for His present self, as He moved among men: He is, not merely was, "the Son." Nevertheless, what He affirms of Himself cannot be affirmed of Himself distinctively as "the Son." For what He affirms of Himself is ignorance—"not even the Son" knows it; and ignorance does not belong to the divine nature which the term "the Son" connotes. An extreme appearance of contradiction accordingly arises from the use of this terminology, just as it arises when Paul says that the Jews "crucified the Lord of glory" (1Co 2:8), or exhorts the Ephesian elders to "feed the church of God which he purchased with his own blood" (Ac 20:28 margin); or John Keble praises our Lord for the blood of

souls by Thee redeemed." It was not the Lord of Glory as such who was nailed to the tree, nor have either "God" or "souls" blood to shed.

We know how this apparently contradictory mode of speech has arisen in Keble's case. He is speaking of men who are composite beings, consisting of souls and bodies, and these men come to be designated from one element of their composite personalities, though what is affirmed by them belongs rather to the other; we may speak, therefore, of the "blood of souls" meaning that these "souls," while not having blood as such, yet designate persons who have bodies and therefore blood. We know equally how to account for Paul's apparent contradictions. We know that he conceived of our Lord as a composite person, uniting in Himself a divine and a human nature. In Paul's view, therefore, though God as such has no blood, yet Jesus Christ who is God has blood because He is also man. He can justly speak, therefore, when speaking of Jesus Christ of His blood as the blood of God. When precisely the same phenomenon meets us in our Lord's speech of Himself, we naust presume that it is the outgrowth of precisely the same state of things. When lie speaks of "the Son" (who is God) as ignorant, we must understand that tie is designating Himself as "the Son" because of His higher nature, and yet has in mind the ignorance of His lower nature; what He means is that the person properly designated "the Son" is ignorant, that is to say with respect to the human nature which is as intimate an element of His personality as is His Deity.

When our Lord says, then, that "the Son knows not," He becomes as express a witness to the two natures which constitute His person as Paul is when he speaks of the blood of God, or as Keble is a witness to the twofold constitution of a human being when he speaks of souls shedding blood. In this short sentence, thus, our Lord bears witness to His divine nature with its supremacy above all creatures, to His human nature with its creaturely limitations, and to the unity of the subject possessed of these two natures.

(b) Other Passages: Son of Man and Son of God:

All these elements of His personality find severally repeated assertions in other utterances of our Lord recorded in the Synoptics. There is no need to insist here on the elevation of Himself above the kings and prophets of the Old Covenant (Mt 12:41), above the temple itself (Mt 12:6), and the ordinances of the divine law (Mt 12:8); or on His accent of authority in both His teaching and action, His great "I say unto you" (Mr 5:21,22), 'I will; be cleansed' (Mr 1:41; 2:5; Lu 7:14); or on His separation of Himself from men in His relation to God, never including them with Himself in an "Our Father," but consistently speaking distinctively of "my Father" (e.g. Lu 24:49) and "your Father" (e.g. Mt 5:16); or on His intimation that He is not merely David's Son but David's Lord, and that a Lord sitting on the right hand of God (Mt 22:44); or on His parabolic discrimination of Himself a Son and Heir from all "servants" (Mt 21:33); or even on His ascription to Himself of the purely divine functions of the forgiveness of sins (Mr 2:8) and judgment of the world (Mt 25:31), or of the purely divine powers of reading the heart (Mr 2:8; Lu 9:47), omnipotence (Mt 24:30; Mr 14:62) and omnipresence (Mt 18:20; 28:10). These things illustrate His constant assumption of the possession of divine dignity and attributes; the claim itself is more directly made in the two great designations which He currently gave Himself, the Son of Man and the Son of God. The former of these is His favorite self-designation. Derived from Da 7:13,14, it

intimates on every occasion of its employment our Lord's consciousness of being a supramundane being, who has entered into a sphere of earthly life on a high mission, on the accomplishment of which He is to return to His heavenly sphere, whence He shall in due season come back to earth, now, however, in His proper majesty, to gather up the fruits of His work and consummate all things. It is a designation, thus, which implies at once a heavenly preexistence, a present humiliation, and a future glory; and He proclaims Himself in this future glory no less than the universal King seated on the throne of judgment for quick and dead (Mr 8:31; Mt 25:31). The implication of Deity imbedded in the designation, Son of Man, is perhaps more plainly spoken out in the companion designation, Son of God, which our Lord not only accepts at the hands of others, accepting with it the implication of blasphemy in permitting its application to Himself (Mt 26:63,65; Mr 14:61,64; Lu 22:29,30), but persistently claims for Himself both, in His constant designation of God as His Father in a distinctive sense, and in His less frequent but more pregnant designation of Himself as, by way of eminence, "the Son." That His consciousness of the peculiar relation to God expressed by this designation was not an attainment of His mature spiritual development, but was part of His most intimate consciousness from the beginning, is suggested by the sole glimpse which is given us into His mind as a child (Lu 2:49). The high significance which the designation bore to Him is revealed to us in two remarkable utterances preserved, the one by both Matthew (11:27 ff) and Luke (10:22 ff), and the other by Matthew (28:19).

(c) Matthew 11:27; 28:19:

In the former of these utterances, our Lord, speaking in the most solemn manner, not only presents Himself, as the Son, as the sole source of knowledge of God and of blessedness for men, but places Himself in a position, not of equality merely, but of absolute reciprocity and interpenetration of knowledge with the Father. "No one," He says, "knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son ...."" varied in Luke so as to read: "No one knoweth who the Son is, save the Father; and who the Father is, save the Son ...." as if the being of the Son were so immense that only God could know it thoroughly; and the knowledge of the Son was so unlimited that He could know God to perfection. The peculiarly pregnant employment here of the terms "Son" and "Father" over against one another is explained to us in the other utterance (Mt 28:19). It is the resurrected Lord's commission to His disciples. Claiming for Himself all authority in heaven and on earth—which implies the possession of omnipotence—and promising to be with His followers 'alway, even to the end of the world'—which adds the implications of omnipresence and omniscience—He commands them to baptize their converts 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' The precise form of the formula must be carefully observed. It does not read: 'In the names' (plural)—as if there were three beings enumerated, each with its distinguishing name. Nor yet: 'In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit,' as if there were one person, going by a threefold name. It reads: 'In the name (singular) of the Father, and of the (article repeated) Son, and of the (article repeated) Holy Spirit,' carefully distinguishing three persons, though uniting them all under one name. The name of God was to the Jews Yahweh, and to name the name of Yahweh upon them was to make them His. What Jesus did in this great injunction was to command His followers to name the name of God upon their converts, and to announce the name of God which is to be named on their converts in the threefold enumeration of "the Father" and "the Son" and 'the Holy Spirit.' As it is unquestionable that He intended Himself by "the Son," He here places Himself by the side of the Father and the Spirit, as together with them constituting

the one God. It is, of course, the Trinity which He is describing; and that is as much as to say that He announces Himself as one of the persons of the Trinity. This is what Jesus, as reported by the Synoptics, understood Himself to be.

See TRINITY.

(2) His Humanity.

In announcing Himself to be God, however, Jesus does not deny that He is man also. If all His speech of Himself rests on His consciousness of a divine nature, no less does all His speech manifest His consciousness of a human nature. He easily identifies Himself with men (Mt 4:4; Lu 4:4), and receives without protest the imputation of humanity (Mt 11:19; Lu 7:34). He speaks familiarly of His body (Mt 26:12,26; Mr 14:8; 14:22; Lu 22:19), and of His bodily parts—His feet and hands (Lu 24:39), His head and feet (Lu 7:44-46), His flesh and bones (Lu 24:39), His blood (Mt 26:28; Mr 14:24; Lu 22:20). We chance to be given indeed a very express affirmation on His part of the reality of His bodily nature; when His disciples were terrified at His appearing before them after His resurrection, supposing Him to be a spirit, He reassures them with the direct declaration: "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having" (Lu 24:39). His testimony to His human soul is just as express: "My soul," says He, "is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death" (Mt 26:38; Mr 14:34). He speaks of the human dread with which He looked forward to His approaching death (Lu 12:50), and expresses in a poignant cry His sense of desolation on the cross (Mt 27:46; Mr 15:34). He speaks also of His pity for the weary and hungering people (Mt 15:32; Mr 8:2), and of a strong human desire which He felt (Lu 22:15). Nothing that is human is alien to Him except sin. He never ascribes imperfection to Himself and never betrays consciousness of sin. He recognizes the evil of those about Him (Lu 11:13; Mt 7:11; 12:34,39; Lu 11:29), but never identifies Himself with it. It is those who do the will of God with whom He feels kinship (Mt 12:50), and He offers Himself to the morally sick as a physician (Mt 9:12). He proposes Himself as an example of the highest virtues (Mt 11:28) and pronounces him blessed who shall find no occasion of stumbling in Him (Mt 11:6).

(3) Unity of the Person.

These manifestations of a human and divine consciousness simply stand side by side in the records of our Lord’s self-expression. Neither is suppressed or even qualified by the other. If we attend only to the one class we might suppose Him to proclaim Himself wholly divine; if only to the other we might equally easily imagine Him to be representing Himself as wholly human. With both together before us we perceive Him alternately speaking out of a divine and out of a human consciousness; manifesting Himself as all that God is and as all that man is; yet with the most marked unity of consciousness. He, the one Jesus Christ, was to His own apprehension true God and complete man in a unitary personal life.

VII. The Two Natures Everywhere Presupposed.

There underlies, thus, the entire literature of the New Testament a single, unvarying conception of the

constitution of our Lord's person. From Matthew where He is presented as one of the persons of the Holy Trinity (28:19)—or if we prefer the chronological order of books, from the Epistle of James where He is spoken of as the Glory of God, the Shekinah (2:1)—to the Apocalypse where He is represented as declaring that He is the Alpha and the Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End (Re 1:8,17; 22:13), He is consistently thought of as in His fundamental being just God. At the same time from the Synoptic Gospels, in which He is dramatized as a man walking among men, His human descent carefully recorded, and His sense of dependence on God so emphasized that prayer becomes almost His most characteristic action, to the Epistles of John in which it is made the note of a Christian that He confesses that Jesus Christ has come in flesh (1 Joh 4:2) and the Apocalypse in which His birth in the tribe of Judah and the house of David (Re 5:5; 22:16), His exemplary life of conflict and victory (Re 3:21), His death on the cross (Re 11:8) are noted, He is equally consistently thought of as true man. Nevertheless, from the beginning to the end of the whole series of books, while first one and then the other of His two natures comes into repeated prominence, there is never a question of conflict between the two, never any confusion in their relations, never any schism in His unitary personal action; but He is obviously considered and presented as one, composite indeed, but undivided personality. In this state of the case not only may evidence of the constitution of our Lord's person properly be drawn indifferently from every part of the New Testament, and passage justly be cited to support and explain passage without reference to the portion of the New Testament in which it is found, but we should be without justification if we did not employ this common presupposition of the whole body of this literature to illustrate and explain the varied representations which meet us cursorily in its pages, representations which might easily be made to appear mutually contradictory were they not brought into harmony by their relation as natural component parts of this one unitary conception which underlies and gives consistency to them all. There can scarcely be imagined a better proof of the truth of a doctrine than its power completely to harmonize a multitude of statements which without it would present to our view only a mass of confused inconsistencies. A key which perfectly fits a lock of very complicated wards can scarcely fail to be the true key.

VIII. Formulation of the Doctrine.

Meanwhile the wards remain complicated. Even in the case of our own composite structure, of soul and body, familiar as we are with it from our daily experience, the mutual relations of elements so disparate in a single personality remain an unplumbed mystery, and give rise to paradoxical modes of speech which would be misleading, were not their source in our duplex nature well understood. We may read, in careful writers, of souls being left dead on battlefields, and of everybody's immortality. The mysteries of the relations in which the constituent elements in the more complex personality of our Lord stand to one another are immeasurably greater than in our simpler case. We can never hope to comprehend how the infinite God and a finite humanity can be united in a single person; and it is very easy to go fatally astray in attempting to explain the interactions in the unitary person of natures so diverse from one another. It is not surprising, therefore, that so soon as serious efforts began to be made to give systematic explanations of the Biblical facts as to our Lord's person, many onesided and incomplete statements were formulated which required correction and complementing before at length a mode of statement. was devised which did full justice to the Biblical data. It was accordingly only after more than a century of controversy, during which nearly every conceivable method of construing and misconstruing the

Biblical facts had been proposed and tested, that a formula was framed which successfully guarded the essential data supplied by the Scriptures from destructive misconception. This formula, put together by the Council of Chalcedon, 451 AD, declares it to have always been the doctrine of the church, derived from the Scriptures and our Lord Himself, that our Lord Jesus Christ is "truly God and truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; consubstantial with the Father according to the Godhead, and consubstantial with us according to the manhood; in all things like unto us, without sin; begotten before all ages of the Father according to the Godhead, and in these latter days, for us and for our salvation, born of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, according to the manhood; one and the same Christ, Son, . Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures-inconfusedly, unchangeably, indivisibly, inseparably; the distinction of natures being by no means taken away by the union, but rather the property of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one Person and one subsistence, not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, and Only-begotten, God, the Word, the Lord Jesus Christ." There is nothing here but a careful statement in systematic form of the pure teaching of the Scriptures; and therefore this statement has stood ever since as the norm of thought and teaching as to the person of the Lord. As such, it has been incorporated, in one form or another, into the creeds of all the great branches of the church; it underlies and gives their form to all the allusions to Christ in the great mass of preaching and song which has accumulated during the centuries; and it has supplied the background of the devotions of the untold multitudes who through the Christian ages have been worshippers of Christ.

LITERATURE.

The appropriate sections in the treatises on the Biblical theology of the New Testament; also A. B. Bruce, The Humiliation of Christ, 2nd edition, Edinburgh, 1881; R. L. Ottley, The Doctrine of the Incarnation, London, 1896; H. C. Powell, The Principle of the Incarnation, London, 1896; Francis J. Hall, The Kenotic Theory, New York, 1898; C. A. Briggs, The Incarnation of the Lord, New York, 1902; G. S. Streatfeild, The Self-Interpretation of Jesus Christ, London, 1906; B. B. Warfield, The Lord of Glory, New York, 1907; James Denhey, Jesus and the Gospel, London, 1909; M. Lepin, Christ and the Gospel: or, Jesus the Messiah and Son of God, Philadelphia, 1910; James Stalker, The Christology of Jesus, New York, 1899; D. Somerville, Paul’s Conception of Christ, Edinburgh, 1897; E.H. Gifford, The Incarnation: a Study of Philippians 2:5-11, London, 1897; S.N. Rostron, The Christology of Paul, London, 1912; E. Digges La Touche, The Person of Christ in Modern Thoughts, London, 1912.

(NOTE.—In this article the author has usually given his own translation of quotations from Scripture, and not that of any particular version.)

Benjamin B. Warfield

PERSON, PERSONALITY

pur’-sun, pur’-s’n, pur-un-al’-ti (nephesh, ‘ish, ‘adham, panim, prosopon, hupostasis): The most frequent word for "person" in the Old Testament is nephesh, "soul" (Ge 14:21, "Give me the persons, and take the goods"; Ge 36:6, the King James Version "all the persons" Nu 5:6 the King James Version "that person,"

etc.) ‘ish "a man," "an individual," Is also used (Jud 9:2, "threescore and ten persons"; 1Sa 16:18, "a comely person," etc.); ‘adham, "a man," "a human being" (Nu 31:28, "of the persons, and of the oxen"; Pr 6:12, "a worthless person," etc.); ‘enosh, "a man," "a weak, mortal man," occurs twice (Jud 9:4, the King James Version "vain and light persons"; Ze 3:4); ba‘al, "owner," "lord," is once translated "person" (Pr 24:8, the King James Version "a mischievous person"), and methim, "men," once (Ps 26:4, the King James Version "vain persons"); panim "face," is frequently translated "person" when the reference is to the external appearance, as of persons in high places, rich persons who could favor or bribe, etc., chiefly in the phrases "regarding the person," "accepting the person" (De 10:17; Mal 1:8).

In the New Testament prosopon, "face," "countenance," stands in the same connection (Mt 22:16,"thou regardest not the person of men"; Ga 2:6, "God accepteth not man’s person"; Ac 10:34, "God is no respecter of persons"; Ro 2:11, "there is no respect of persons with God"; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; Jas 2:1,9); in 2Co 1:11 we have "persons" (prosopon), absolute as in the later Greek, "the gift bestowed .... by many persons," the only occurrence in the New Testament; in 2Co 2:10 prosopon may stand for "presence," as the Revised Version (British and American) "in the presence of Christ," but it might mean "as representing Christ"; in Heb 1:3, the King James Version hupostasis, "that which lies under," substratum, is rendered "person," "the express image of his person," i.e. of God, which the Revised Version (British and American) renders "the very image of his substance," margin "the impress of his substance," i.e. the manifestation or expression of the invisible God and Father. "Person" is also frequently supplied as the substantive implied in various adjectives, etc., e.g. profane, perjured, vile.

In the Apocrypha we have prosopon translated "person" (Judith 7:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "face"; Ecclesiasticus 10:5, etc.); the "accepting of persons" is condemned (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:7; Ecclesiasticus 4:22,27; 7:6; 20:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "by a foolish countenance"; 35:13; 42:1; "With him (God) is no respect of persons, Ecclesiasticus 35:12).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "soul" for "person" (Nu 5:6), "face" (Jer 52:25), "man" (Mt 27:24); "reprobate" for "vile person" (Ps 15:4), the American Standard Revised Version, the English Revised Version margin "fool" (Isa 32:5,6); the American Standard Revised Version "men of falsehood" for "vain persons" (Ps 26:4); for "a wicked person," the Revised Version (British and American) has "an evil thing" (Ps 101:4); "back to thee in his own person" (auton, different text) for "again thou therefore receive him" (Phm 1:12); "take away life" for "respect any person" (2Sa 14:14); "with seven others" for "the eighth person" (2Pe 2:5); "false swearers" for "perjured persons" (1Ti 1:10); "seven thousand persons" for "of men seven thousand" (Re 11:13).

Personality is that which constitutes and characterizes a person. The word "person" (Latin, persona) is derived from the mask through which an actor spoke his part (persona). "From being applied to the mask, it came next to be applied to the actor, then to the character acted, then to any assumed character, then to anyone having any character or station"; lastly, it came to mean an individual, a feeling, thinking and acting being. For full personality there must be self-consciousness, with the capability of free thought and action—self-determination—hence, we speak of personal character, personal action, etc. A person is thus a responsible being, while an animal is not. Personality is distinctive of man. The personality is the unit of the entire rational being, perhaps most clearly represented by "the will"; it is

that which is deepest in man, belonging, of course, not to the realm of space or the region of the visible, but existing as a spiritual reality in time, with a destiny beyond it. It is the substance (hupostasis) of the being, that which underlies all its manifestations; hence, the rendering "the express image of his person" in Heb 1:3 the King James Version. Hupostasis was employed by the early Greek Fathers to express what the Latins intended by persona; afterward prosopon was introduced.

Recent psychology has brought into prominence elements in the subconscious realm, the relation of which to the personality is obscure. There seems to be more in each individual than is normally expressed in the personal consciousness and action. The real, responsible personality, however, is something which is always being formed. The phenomenon of double personality is pathological, as truly the result of brain disease as is insanity.

In the Bible man is throughout regarded as personal, although it was only gradually that the full importance of the individual as distinct from the nation was realized. The use of prosopon for "person" indicates also a more external conception of personality than the modern. With the Hebrews the nephesh was the seat of personality, e.g. "Thou wilt not leave my soul (nephesh) to Sheol" (Ps 16:10); "Thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol" (Ps 30:3). God is also always regarded as personal (who has created man in His own image), and although the representations seem often anthropomorphic they are not really such. The divine personality could only be conceived after the analogy of the human, as far as it could be definitely conceived at all; but God was regarded as transcending, not only the whole of Nature, but all that, is human, e.g. "God is not a man, that he should lie" (Nu 23:19; 1Sa 15:29); "Canst thou by searching find out God?" (Job 11:7; Isa 40:28; compare Ec 3:11; 8:17, etc.). In the New Testament the personality of God is, on the warrant of Jesus Himself, conceived after the analogy of human fatherhood, yet as transcending all our human conceptions: "How much more?" (Mt 7:11); "Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counselor?" (Ro 11:34). Man is body, soul and spirit, but God in Himself is Spirit, infinite, perfect, ethical Spirit (Mt 5:48; Joh 4:24). He is forever more than all that is created, "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things" (Ro 11:36). The human personality, being spiritual, survives bodily dissolution and in Christ becomes clothed again with a spiritual body (Php 3:21; 1Co 15:44).

W. L. Walker

PERSONALITY

See PERSON.

PERSUADE; PERSUASION

per-swad’, per-swazhun: (1) In the older English "persuade" need not mean "convince" (although this is its usual sense in the King James Version: Mt 27:20, etc.), but may mean only "attempt to convince," "argue with." This is well brought out in Ac 26:28, where the Greek is literally "In little thou ‘persuadest’ peitheis to make me a Christian." the King James Version took peitheis as

"convince" ("almost thou persuadest me ...."), but this is impossible, and so the Revised Version (British and American) rendered peitheis by "thou wouldest fain." To keep something of the language of the King James Version, "persuasion" was supplied after "little," but it should have been italicized, for it is merely conjectural, as the American Revised Version margin recognizes by giving "time" as an alternative for "persuasion." The text of the passage, however, is suspected. See ALMOST. Similarly in Ac 13:43, the Revised Version (British and American) replaces "persuade" by "urge," and the same change should have been made also in 2Ki 18:32 and its parallels. (2) The "popular persuasions" of 1 Esdras 5:73 are "efforts to persuade the people" (uncertain text, however). Ac 19:8 the King James Version writes "persuading the things" (the Revised Version (British and American) "as to the things") for "present the things persuasively." And in Ga 1:10 (the English Revised Version and the King James Version, not in the American Standard Revised Version) and 2Co 5:11, there is a half-ironic force in the word: Paul’s enemies have accused him of using unworthy persuasion in making his conversions.

Burton Scott Easton

PERUDA

pe-roo’-da (perudha’).

See PERIDA.

PERVERSE

per-vurs’:The group "perverse, -ly, -ness," "act perversely" in the King James Version represents nearly 20 Hebrew words, of which, however, most are derivatives of the stems ‘awah, luz, ‘aqash. The Revised Version (British and American) has made few changes. In Job 6:30, the Revised Version (British and American) "mischievous" is better for the taste of a thing, and in Isa 59:3 greater emphasis is gained by the Revised Version (British and American) "wickedness." In Eze 9:9, "wresting of judgment" is perhaps too concrete, and "perverseness" is kept in the margin (inverted in the King James Version). the Revised Version margin "headlong" in Nu 22:32 is over-literal, but in 23:21 the American Standard Revised Version margin’s "trouble" is a distinct improvement.

PESTILENCE

pes’-ti-lens (debher; loimos): Any sudden fatal epidemic is designated by this word, and in its Biblical use it generally indicates that these are divine visitations. The word is most frequently used in the prophetic books, and it occurs 25 times in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, always associated with the sword and famine. In 4 other passages it is combined with noisome or evil beasts, or war. In Am 4:10 this judgment is compared with the plagues of Egypt, and in Hab 3:5 it is a concomitant of the march of God from the Arabian mountain. There is the same judicial character associated with pestilence in Ex 5:3; 9:15; Le 26:25; Nu 14:12; De 28:21; 2Sa 24:21; 1Ch 21:12; Eze 14:19,21. In the dedication prayer of Solomon, a special value is besought for such petitions against pestilence as may be presented toward the temple

(2Ch 6:28). Such a deliverance is promised to those who put their trust in God (Ps 91:6). Here the pestilence is called noisome, a shortened form of "annoysome," used in the sense of "hateful" or that which causes trouble or distress. In modern English it has acquired the sense of loathsome. "Noisome" is used by Tyndale where the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "hurtful" in 1Ti 6:9.Ac 19:8 the King James Version writes "persuading the things" (the Revised Version (British and American) "as to the things") for "present the things persuasively." And in Ga 1:10 (the English Revised Version and the King James Version, not in the American Standard Revised Version) and 2Co 5:11, there is a half-ironic force in the word: Paul's enemies have accused him of using unworthy persuasion in making his conversions.

The Latin word pestilentia is connected with pestis, "the plague," but pestilence is used of any visitation and is not the name of any special disease; debher is applied to diseases of cattle and is translated "murrain."

In the New Testament pestilence is mentioned in our Lord's eschatological discourse (Mt 24:7 the King James Version; Lu 21:11) coupled with famine. The assonance of loimos and limos in these passages (loimos is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American) passage for Mt) occurs in several classical passages, e.g. Herodotus vii.171. The pestilence is said to walk in darkness (Ps 91:6) on account of its sudden onset out of obscurity not associated with any apparent cause.

Alexander Macalister

PESTLE

pes'-'l ('eli): A rounded implement of wood or stone used for pounding, bruising, or powdering materials in a mortar. Used only in Pr 27:22. The assonance of Cs:greekIt+loimosIT-/ CS and Cs:greekIt +limosIT-/ CS in these passages (Cs:greekIt+loimosIT-/ CS is omitted in the Revised Version (British and American) passage for Mt) occurs in several classical passages, e.g. Herodotus vii.171. The pestilence is said to walk in darkness (Ps 91:6) on account of its sudden onset out of obscurity not associated with any apparent cause.

See MORTAR.

PETER, APOCALYPSE OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, II, 4; LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC (Introduction).

PETER, EPISTLES OF

see PETER, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF; PETER, THE SECOND EPISTLE OF

PETER, GOSPEL ACCORDING TO

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC.

PETER, SIMON

pe’-ter, si’-mon): 1. Name and Early Career

2. First Appearance in Gospel History

3. Life-Story

(1) First Period

(2) Second Period

4. Character

5. Writings

(1) First Epistle

(2) Second Epistle

6. Theology

(1) Messianic Teaching

(2) Justification

(3) Redemption

(4) Future Life

(5) Holy Scripture

(6) Apostasy and Judgment

(7) Second Coming of Christ

LITERATURE

The data for this article are found chiefly in the four Gospels; in Ac 1-15; in Ga 1 and 2; and in the two Epistles of Peter.

1. Name and Early Career:

Simon (or Simeon) was the original name of Peter, the son of Jonas (or John), and brother of Andrew, a disciple of John the Baptist, as Peter also may have been. A fisherman by occupation, he was an inhabitant of Bethsaida on the Sea of Galilee, though subsequently he dwelt with his family at Capernaum (Mt 4:18; 8:14; 10:2; 16:16,17; 17:25; Mr 1:16,29,30,36; Lu 5:3,4,5,8,10; 22:31; 24:34; Joh 1:40-44).

2. First Appearance in Gospel History:

His first appearance in Gospel history is in Joh 1:35-42, when Andrew, having discovered Jesus to be the Messiah, "first findeth his own brother Simon," and "brought him unto Jesus"; on which occasion it was that the latter, beholding him, said, "Thou shalt be called Cephas," an Aramaic surname whose Greek synonym is Petros, or Peter, meaning "a rock" or "stone" At this time also he received his first call to the discipleship of Jesus, although, in common with that of others of the Twelve, this call was twice repeated. See Mt 4:19; Mr 1:17; Lu 5:3 for the second call, and Mt 10:2; Mr 3:14,16; Lu 6:13,14 for the third. Some interpret the second as that when he was chosen to be a constant companion of Jesus, and the third when he was at length selected as an apostle.

3. Life-Story:

The life-story of Peter falls into two parts: first, from his call to the ascension of Christ; secondly, from that event to the close of his earthly career.

(1) First Period:

The first period again may be conveniently divided into the events prior to the Passion of Christ and those following. There are about ten of the former: the healing of his wife’s mother at Capernaum (Mt 8:14); the great draught of fishes, and its effect in his self-abasement and surrender of his all to Jesus (Lu 5:1-11); his call to the apostolic office and his spiritual equipment therefor (Mt 10:2); his attachment to his Master, as shown in his attempt to walk upon the waves (Mt 14:28); the same attachment as shown at a certain crisis, in his inquiry "Lord, to whom shall we go?" (Joh 6:68); his noble confession of Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God, and, alas, the rebuke that followed it (Mt 16:13-23); the exalted privileges he enjoyed with James and John as witness of the raising of Jairus’ daughter (Mr 5:37) and the transfiguration of his Lord (Mt 17:1-5); and finally, the incident of the tribute money, found only in Mt 17:24.

The events beginning at the Passion are more easily recalled, because to so large an extent are they found in all the Gospels and about in the same order. They commence with the washing of his feet by the Master at the time of the last Passover, and the two mistakes he made as to the spiritual import of that act (Joh 13:1-10); the first of his presumptuous boastings as to the strength of his devotion to his Master, and the warning of the latter as to Satan's prospective assault upon him (Lu 22:31-34), twice repeated before the betrayal in Gethsemane (Mt 26:31-35); the admission to the garden to behold the Saviour's deepest distress, the charge to watch and pray, and the failure to do so through sleepiness (Mt 26:36-46); the mistaken courage in severing the ear of Malchus (Joh 18:10-12); the forsaking of his Lord while the latter was being led away as a prisoner, his following Him afar off, his admission into the high priest's palace, his denial "before them all," his confirmation of it by an oath, his remembrance of the warning when "the Lord turned and looked upon Peter," and his tears of bitterness as he went out (Mt 26:56-58; Mr 14:66-72; Lu 22:54-62; Joh 18:15-27).

It will be seen that the story of Peter's fall is thus related by all the evangelists, but, to quote another, "None have described it in a more heinous light, than Mark; and if, as is generally supposed, that Gospel was reviewed by Peter himself and even written under his direction this circumstance may be considered as an evidence of his integrity and sincere contrition."

Nothing more is heard of Peter until the morning of the resurrection, when, on the first tidings of the event, he runs with John to see the tomb (Joh 20:1-10); his name is especially mentioned to the women by the angel (Mr 16:7); and on the same day he sees Jesus alive before any of the rest of the Twelve (Lu 24:34; 1Co 15:5). Subsequently, at the Sea of Tiberias, Peter is given an opportunity for a threefold confession of Jesus whom he had thrice denied, and is once more assigned to the apostolic office; a prediction follows as to the kind of death he should die, and also a command to follow his Lord (Joh 21).

(2) Second Period:

The second period, from the ascension of Christ to the conversion of Paul, is more briefly sketched. After the ascension, of which Peter was doubtless a witness, he "stood up in the midst of the brethren" in the upper room in Jerusalem to counsel the choice of a successor to Judas (Ac 1:15-26). On the day of Pentecost he preaches the first gospel sermon (Ac 2), and later, in company with John, instrumentally heals the lame man, addresses the people in the Temple, is arrested, defends himself before the Sanhedrin and returns to his "own company" (Ac 3; 4). He is again arrested and beaten (Ac 5); after a time he is sent by the church at Jerusalem to communicate the Holy Spirit to the disciples at Samaria (Ac 8). Returning to Jerusalem (where presumably Paul visits him, Ga 1:18), he afterward journeys "throughout all parts," heals Aeneas at Lydda, raises Dorcas from the dead at Joppa, sees a vision upon the housetop which influences him to preach the gospel to the Gentile centurion at Caesarea, and explains this action before "the apostles and the brethren that were in Judea" (Ac 9:32-41; 11$; chapter 11).

After a while another persecution arose against the church, and Herod Agrippa, having put James to death, imprisons Peter with the thought of executing him also. Prayer is made by the church on his

behalf, however, and miraculous deliverance is given him (Ac 12). Retiring for a while from public attention, he once more comes before us in the church council at Jerusalem, when the question is to be settled as to whether works are needful to salvation, adding his testimony to that of Paul and Barnabas in favor of justification by faith only (Ac 15).

Subsequently, he is found at Antioch, and having fellowship with GentileChristians until "that certain came from James," when "he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision," for which dissembling Paul "resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned" (Ga 2:11-14).

Little more is authentically known of Peter, except that he traveled more or less extensively, being accompanied by his wife (1Co 9:5), and that he wrote two epistles, the second of which was penned as he approached the end of his life (2Pe 1:12-15).

The tradition is that he died a martyr at Rome about 67 AD, when about 75 years old. His Lord and Master had predicted a violent death for him (Joh 21:18,19), which it is thought came to pass by crucifixion under Nero. It is said that at his own desire he was crucified head downward, feeling himself unworthy to resemble his Master in his death.

It should be observed, however, that the tradition that he visited Rome is only tradition and nothing more, resting as it does partly upon a miscalculation of some of the early Fathers, "who assume that he went to Rome in 42 AD, immediately after his deliverance from prison" (compare Ac 11:17). Schaff says this "is irreconcilable with the silence of Scripture, and even with the mere fact of Paul’s Epistle to the Romans, written in 58, since the latter says not a word of Peter’s previous labors in that city, and he himself never built on other men’s foundations" (Ro 15:20; 2Co 10:15,16).

4. Character:

The character of Peter is transparent and easily analyzed, and it is doubtless true that no other "in Scriptural history is drawn for us more clearly or strongly." He has been styled the prince of the apostles, and, indeed, seems to have been their leader on every occasion. He is always named first in every list of them, and was their common spokesman. He was hopeful, bold, confident, courageous, frank, impulsive, energetic, vigorous, strong, and loving, and faithful to his Master notwithstanding his defection prior to the crucifixion. It is true that he was liable to change and inconsistency, and because of his peculiar temperament he sometimes appeared forward and rash. Yet, as another says, "His virtues and faults had their common root in his enthusiastic disposition," and the latter were at length overruled by divine grace into the most beautiful humility and meekness, as evinced in his two Epistles.

The leadership above referred to, however, should not lead to the supposition that he possessed any supremacy over the other apostles, of which there is no proof. Such supremacy was never conferred upon him by his Master, it was never claimed by himself, and was never conceded by his associates. See in this Connection Mt 23:8-12; Ac 15:13,14; 2Co 12:11; Ga 2:11.

It is true that when Christ referred to the meaning of his name (Mt 16:18), He said, "Upon this rock I will build my church," but He did not intend to teach that His church would be built upon Peter, but upon Himself as confessed by Peter in Mt 16:16. Peter is careful to affirm this in the first of his two Epistles (1Pe 2:4-9). Moreover, when Christ said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. (Mt 16:19), He invested him with no power not possessed in common with his brethren, since they also afterward received the same commission (Mt 18:18; Joh 20:23). A key is a badge of power or authority, and, as many Protestant commentators have pointed out, to quote the language of one of them, "the apostolic history explains and limits this trust, for it was Peter who opened the door of the gospel to Israel on the day of Pentecost (Ac 2:38-42) and to the Gentiles in the house of Cornelius (Ac 10:34-46)." Some, however, regard this authority as identical with the great commission (Mt 28:19).

See KEYS, POWER OF THE.

5. Writings:

The two Epistles of Peter were written presumably late in life, as appears especially of the Second (2Pe 1:12-15). Both were addressed to the same class of persons, chiefly Jewish Christians scattered abroad in the different provinces of Asia Minor, among whom Paul and his associates had planted the gospel (1Pe 1:1,2; 2Pe 3:1). The First was written at Babylon (1Pe 5:13), doubtless the famous Babylon on the Euphrates, which, though destroyed as a great capital, was still inhabited by a small colony of people, principally Jews (see Weiss, Introduction, II, 150).

See also PETER, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF.

(1) First Epistle.

The theme of the First Epistle seems to be the living hope to which the Christian has been begotten, and the obligations it lays upon him. The living hope is expounded in the earlier part of 1Pe 1:1-13, where the obligations begin to be stated, the first group including hope, godly fear, love to the brethren, and praise (1:13-2:10).

The writer drops his pen at this point, to take it up again to address those who were suffering persecution for righteousness' sake, upon whom two more obligations are impressed, submission to authority, and testimony to Christ (1Pe 2:11-4:6). The third group which concludes the book begins here, dealing with such themes as spiritual hospitality in the use of heavenly gifts, patience in suffering, fidelity in service, and humility in ministering to one another. The letter was Sent to the churches "by Silvanus, our faithful brother," the author affirming that his object in writing was to exhort and testify concerning "the true grace of God" (1Pe 5:12).

The genuineness of this First Epistle has never been doubted, except of course by those who in these latter days have doubted everything, but the same cannot be said of the Second. It is not known to whom

the latter was entrusted; as a matter of fact it found no place in the catalogues of the New Testament Scriptures of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. The first church employing it was at Alexandria, but subsequently the church at large became satisfied from internal evidence of its genuineness and inspiration, and when the Canon was pronounced complete in the 4th century, it was without hesitancy received.

(2) Second Epistle.

The Second Epistle claims to have been written by Peter (2Pe 1:1; 3:1,2), to doubt which would start more serious difficulties than can be alleged against its genuineness, either because of its late admission to the Canon or its supposed diversity of style from Peter's early writing.

See PETER, THE SECOND EPISTLE OF.

His object is the same in both Epistles, to "stir up your sincere mind by putting you in remembrance" (2Pe 3:1). Like Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, he foresees the apostasy in which the professing church will end, the difference being that Paul speaks of it in its last stage when the laity have become infected (2Ti 3:1-5; 4:3,4), while Peter sees it in its origin as traceable to false teachers (2Pe 2:1-3,15-19). As in the First Epistle he wrote to exhort and to testify, so here it is rather to caution and warn. This warning was, as a whole, against falling from grace (2Pe 3:17,18), the enforcement of which warning is contained in 2Pe 1:2-11, the ground of it in 1:12-21, and the occasion of it in the last two chapters. To speak only of the occasion: This, as was stated, was the presence of false teachers (2:1), whose eminent success is predicted (2:2), whose punishment is certain and dreadful (2:3-9), and whose description follows (2:10-22). The character of their false teaching (2Pe 3) forms one of the most interesting and important features of the Epistle, focusing as it does on the Second Coming of Christ.

6. Theology:

The theology of Peter offers an interesting field of study because of what may be styled its freshness and variety in comparison with that of Paul and John, who are the great theologians of the New Testament.

(1) Messianic Teaching.

In the first place, Peter is unique in his Messianic teaching as indicated in the first part of the Acts, where he is the chief personage, and where for the most part his ministry is confined to Jerusalem and the Jews. The latter, already in covenant relations with Yahweh, had sinned in rejecting Jesus as the Messiah, and Peter's preaching was directed to that point, demanding repentance or a change of mind about Him. The apparent failure of the Old Testament promises concerning the Davidic kingdom (Isa 11:10-12; Jer 23:5-8; Eze 37:21-28) was explained by the promise that the kingdom would be set up at the return of Christ (Ac 2:25-31; 15:14-16); which return, personal and corporeal, and for that purpose, is presented as only awaiting their national repentance (Ac 3:19-26). See Scofield, Reference Bible, at the places named.

(2) Justification.

But Peter’s special ministry to the circumcision is by no means in conflict with that of Paul to the Gentiles, as demonstrated at the point of transition in Ac 10. Up until this time the gospel had been offered to the Jews only, but now they have rejected it in the national sense, and "the normal order for the present Christian age" is reached (Ac 13:44-48). Accordingly, we find Peter, side by side with Paul, affirming the great doctrine of justification by faith only, in the words, "We believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we (Jews) shall be saved, even as they (Gentiles)" (Ac 15:11 the King James Version). Moreover, it is clear from Peter’s Second Epistle (2Pe 1:1) that his conception of justification from the divine as well as the human side is identical with that of Paul, since he speaks of justifying faith as terminating on the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. As we understand it, this is not the righteousness which God is, but the righteousness which God gives (compare Ro 1:16,17; 3:21-25; 2Co 5:20,21).

(3) Redemption.

Passing from his oral to his written utterances, Peter is particularly rich in his allusions to the redemptive work of Christ. Limiting ourselves to his First Epistle, the election of the individual believer is seen to be the result of the sprinkling of Christ’s blood (1Pe 1:1); his obedience and godly fear are inspired by the sacrifice of the "lamb without blemish and without spot: Who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world" (1Pe 1:17-20 the King James Version). But most interesting are the manner and the connection in which these sublime truths are sometimes set before the reader. For example, an exhortation to submission on the part of household slaves is the occasion for perhaps the most concise and yet comprehensive interpretation of Christ’s vicarious sufferings anywhere in the New Testament (1Pe 2:18-25, especially the last two verses; compare also in its context 1Pe 3:18-22).

(4) Future Life.

Next to the redemptive work of Christ, the Petrine teaching about the future life claims attention. The believer has been begotten again unto "a lively (or living) hope" (1Pe 1:3); which is "an inheritance" "reserved in heaven" (1Pe 1:4); and associated with "praise, and glory and honor at the revelation (Second Coming) of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 1:7,13; 4:13; 5:4,10; 2Pe 1:11,16; 3:13, etc.). This "hope" or "inheritance" is so real and so precious as to cause rejoicing even in times of heaviness and trial (1Pe 1:6); to stimulate to holiness of living (1Pe 1:13-16); to patience in persecution (1Pe 4:12,13); fidelity in service (1Pe 5:1-4); stedfastness against temptation (5:8-10); and growth in grace (2Pe 1:10,11). It is a further peculiarity that the apostle always throws the thought of the present suffering forward into the light of the future glory. It is not as though there were merely an allotment of suffering here, and an allotment of glory by and by, with no relation or connection between the two, but the one is seen to be incident to the other (compare 1Pe 1:7,11; 4:13; 5:1; 2Pe 3:12,13). It is this circumstance, added to others, that gives Peter the title of the apostle of hope, as Paul has been called the apostle of faith, and John the apostle of love.

(5) Holy Scripture.

Considering their limitations as to space, Peter's Epistles are notable for the emphasis they lay upon the character and authority of the Holy Scriptures. 1Pe 1:10-12 teaches a threefold relation of the Holy Spirit to the Holy Word as its Author, its Revealer, and its Teacher or Preacher. The same chapter (1:22-25) speaks of its life-giving and purifying power as well as its eternal duration. 1 Peter 2 opens with a declaration of its vital relation to the Christian's spiritual growth. In 4:11, it is shown to be the staple of the Christian's ministry. Practically the whole of the Second Epistle is taken up with the subject. Through the "exceeding great and precious promises" of that Word, Christians become "partakers of the divine nature" (2Pe 1:4 the King James Version); that they may be kept "always in remembrance" is Peter's object in writing (2Pe 1:12-15 the King James Version); the facts of that Word rest on the testimony of eyewitnesses (2Pe 1:16-18); its origin is altogether divine (2Pe 1:20,21); which is as true of the New Testament as of the Old Testament (2Pe 3:2); including the Epistles of Paul (2Pe 3:15,16).

(6) Apostasy and Judgment.

This appreciation of the living Word of God finds an antithesis in the solemn warning against apostate teachers and teaching forming the substance of 2 Peter 2 and 3. The theology here is of judgment. It is swift and "lingereth not" (2:1-3); the Judge is He who "spared not" in olden time (2:4-7); His delay expresses mercy, but He "will come as a thief" (3:9,10); the heavens "shall pass away," the earth and its works shall be burned up (3:10); "What manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy living and godliness?" (3:11).

(7) Second Coming of Christ.

Peter's theology concerning judgment is a further illustration of the Messianic character of his instruction. For example, the Second Coming of Christ of which he speaks in the closing chapter of the Second Epistle is not that aspect of it associated with the translation of His church, and of which Paul treats (1Th 4:13-18), but that pertaining to Israel and the day of Yahweh spoken of by the Old Testament prophets (Isa 2:12-22; Re 19:11-21, etc.).

LITERATURE.

The history of Peter is treated more or less at length in the introductions to the commentaries on his Epistles, and in works on the life of Christ. But particular reference is made to the following: E. W. Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, London, 1882; J. S. Howson, Studies in the Life of Peter, London, 1883; H. A. Birks, Life and Character of Peter, London, 1887; W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, London, 1893; Mason Gallagher, Was Peter Ever at Rome? Philadelphia, 1895; A. C. McGiffert, The Apostolic Age, New York, 1897; W. H. Griffith Thomas, The Apostle Peter, London, 1904; G. Matheson, Representative Men of the New Testament, London, 1905; A. J. Southhouse, The Making of Simon Peter) New York, 1906; A. C. Gaebtelein, The Gospel of Matthew, New York, 1907; The Ac of the Apostles, New York, 1912; Edmundson, Church in Rome in the 1st Century, 1913; Smith,

The Days of His Flesh, New York, 1911.

On theology of Peter, consult the subject in works on Systematic or Biblical, Theology, and see also R. W. Dale The Atonement, 97-148. London 1875: C. A. Briggs, Messiah of the Apostles, 21-41, New York, 1895; Scofield, Reference Bible, where pertinent.

Among commentaries on 1 and 2 Peter may be mentioned: Brown, 3 volumes, Edinburgh, 1848-56; Demarest, 2 volumes, New York, 1851-65; Leighton, republished, Philadelphia, 1864; Lillie, New York, 1869; G. F. C. Fronmuller, in Lange's Comm., English translation, New York, 1874; Plumptre, Cambridge Bible, 1883; Spitta, Der zweite Brief des Petrus, Halle, 1885; F. B. Meyer, London, 1890; Lumby, Expositor's Bible, London, 1894; J. H. Jowett, London, 1905; Bigg, ICC, 1901.

James M. Gray

PETER, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF

I. CANONICITY OF 1 PETER

1. External Evidence

2. Internal Evidence

II. THE ADDRESS

Silvanus

III. PLACE AND TIME OF COMPOSITION

1. Babylon: Which?

2. Babylon Not Rome

IV. DESIGN

1. Persecution

2. Example of Christ

3. Relation to State

V. CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE EPISTLE

1. Freedom in Structure

2. Hope

3. Inheritance

4. Testimony of Prophets

(1) Salvation

(2) Spirit of Christ

(3) Prophetic Study

5. The Christian Brotherhood

6. Spirits in Prison

VI. ANALYSIS

LITERATURE

Simon Peter was a native of Galilee. He was brought to the Saviour early in His ministry by his brother Andrew (Joh 1:40,41). His call to the office of apostle is recorded in Mt 10:1-4; Mr 3:13-16.

He occupied a distinguished place among the Lord's disciples. In the four lists of the apostles found in the New Testament his name stands first (Mt 10:2-4; Mr 3:16-19; Lu 6:14-16; Ac 1:13). He is the chief figure in the first twelve chapters of the Acts. It is Peter that preaches the first Christian sermon (Ac 2), he that opens the door of the gospel to the Gentileworld in the house of the Roman soldier, Cornelius, and has the exquisite delight of witnessing scenes closely akin to those of Pentecost at Jerusalem (Ac 10:44-47). It was given him to pronounce the solemn sentence on the guilty pair, Ananias and Sapphira, and to rebuke in the power of the Spirit the profane Simon Magus (Ac 5:1-11; 8:18-23). In these and the like instances Peter exhibited the authority with which Christ had invested him (Mt 16:19)—an authority bestowed upon all the disciples (Joh 20:22,23)—the power to bind and to loose.

Two Epistles are ascribed to Peter. Of the Second doubt and uncertainty have existed from the early ages to the present. The genuineness and authenticity of the First are above suspicion.

I. Canonicity of 1 Peter.

1. External Evidence:

The proof of its integrity and trustworthiness is ample and altogether satisfactory. It falls into parts: external and internal. The historical attestation to its authority as an apostolic document is abundant. Polycarp, disciple of the apostle John, martyed in 156 AD at 86 or more years of age, refers to the Epistle in unmistakable terms. Irenaeus, a man who may well be said to represent both the East and the West, who was a disciple of Polycarp, quotes it copiously, we are assured. Clement of Alexandria, born circa 150 AD, died circa 216 AD, cites it many times in his Stromata, one passage (1Pe 4:8) being quoted five times by actual count. "The testimony of the early-church is summed up by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, xxiii, 3). He places it among those writings about which no question was ever raised, no doubt ever entertained by any portion of the catholic church" (Professor Lumby in Bible Comm.).

2. Internal Evidence:

The internal evidence in favor of the Epistle is as conclusive as the external. The writer is well acquainted with our Lord’s teaching, and he makes use of it to illustrate and enforce his own. The references he makes to that teaching are many, and they include the four Gospels. He is familiar likewise with the Epistles, particularly James, Romans, and Ephesians. But what is especially noteworthy is the fact that 1 Peter in thought and language stands in close relation with the apostle’s discourses as recorded in Acts. By comparing 1Pe 1:17 with Ac 10:34; 1Pe 1:21 with Ac 2:32-36 and 10:40,41; 1Pe 2:7,8 with Ac 4:10,11; 1Pe 2:17 with Ac 10:28, and 1Pe 3:18 with Ac 3:14, one will perceive how close the parallel between the two is. The inference from these facts appears legitimate, namely, 1 Peter in diction and thought belongs to the same period of time and moves in the same circle of truth as do the other writings of the New Testament. The writer was an apostle, and he was Simon Peter.

II. The Address.

Peter writes to the "elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion." James employs the term "Dispersion" to designate believing Hebrews of the Twelve Tribes who lived outside the land (Jas 1:1). The Jews included in it the whole body of Israelites scattered among the Gentilenations (Joh 7:35). But we must not conclude from this that the Epistle is directed to Christian Jews alone. Gentile believers are by no means excluded, as 1Pe 1:14,18,20; 2:10; 3:6; 4:3,4 abundantly attest. Indeed, the Gentile element in the churches of Asia Minor largely predominated at the time. The term "sojourners" represents a people away from home, strangers in a strange land; the word is translated "pilgrims" in 2:11 and Heb 11:13—an appropriate name for those who confess that they have here no continuing city, but who seek one to come. While no doubt Peter had believing Israelites in mind when he wrote, for he never forgot that his ministry belonged primarily to the circumcision (Ga 2:7,8), he did not neglect the more numerous Gentileconverts, and to these he speaks as earnestly as to the others; and these also were "sojourners."

Three of the four provinces Peter mentions, namely, Pontus, Cappadocia, and Asia, had representatives at the memorable Pentecost in Jerua (Ac 2:9; 1Pe 1:1). Many of these "sojourners of the Dispersion"

may have believed the message of the apostle and accepted salvation through Jesus Christ, and returned home to tell the good news to their neighbors and friends. This would form a strong bond of union between them and Peter, and would open the way for him to address them in the familiar and tender manner of the Epistle.

Silvanus:

Silvanus appears to have been the bearer of the letter to the Christians of Asia Minor: "By Silvanus, our faithful brother, as I account him, I have written unto you briefly" (1Pe 5:12). It is an assumption to assert from these words that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the letter. The statement denotes rather the bearer than the writer or secretary. Silvanus was Paul's companion in the ministry to the Asiatic churches, and since we do not read of him as going with Paul to Jerusalem or to Rome, it is probable he returned from Corinth (Ac 18:5) to Asia Minor and labored there. He and Peter met, where no one knows, though not a few think in Rome; as likely a guess perhaps is in Palestine. At any rate, Silvanus gave Peter an account of the conditions in the provinces, the afflictions and persecutions of believers, and the deep need they had for sympathy and counsel. He would, accordingly, be of the greatest assistance to the apostle. This seems to account for the peculiarity of language which Peter uses: "By Silvanus, our faithful brother, I have written unto you," as if he had some share in furnishing the contents of the Epistle.

III. Place and Time of Composition.

1. Babylon: Which?:

According to 1Pe 5:13 the Epistle was written in Babylon. But what place is meant? Two cities having this name were known in apostolic times. One was in Egypt, probably on or near the present site of Cairo, and we are told that it was a "city of no small importance." Epiphanius calls it "great Babylon" (Zahn). The absence, however, of all tradition that would tend to identify this place with the Babylon of the Epistle seems to shut it out of the problem. Babylon on the Euphrates is regarded by many as the place here designated. Jews in considerable numbers still dwelt in Babylon, notwithstanding the massacre of thousands in the reign of Claudius and the flight of multitudes into other countries. There is much to be said in favor of this city as the place meant, and yet the absence of tradition in its support is a very serious difficulty. A third view regards it as symbolical of Rome. Roman Catholics thus interpret it, and not a few Protestants so understand it. Tradition which runs back into the first half of the 2nd century appears to favor it, though much uncertainty and obscurity still surround the earliest ages of our era, in spite of the unwearied researches of modern scholars. Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, who lived in the first half of the 2nd century, appears to have had no doubt that Peter was martyred in Rome, and that the Babylon of the Epistle designates the Imperial City. There are very serious objections to this interpretation. One is, that it is totally out of keeping with Peter's manner of writing. Preeminently he is direct and matter-of-fact in his style. The metaphorical language he employs is mostly drawn from the Old Testament, or, if from himself, it is so common of use as to be well understood by all readers. It is altogether improbable that this man, plain of speech almost to bluntness, should interject in the midst of

his personal explanations and final salutations such a mystical epithet with no hint of what he means by it, or why he employs such a mode of speech.

2. Babylon Not Rome:

Besides, there is no evidence that Rome was called Babylon by the Christians until the Book of Revelation was published, i.e. circa 90-96 AD. But if 1 Peter is dependent on the Apocalypse for this name of Babylon as Rome, Peter could not have been its author, for he died years before that date. The Epistle was written about 64 AD, at the time when persecutions under the infamous Nero were raging, at which time also the apostle himself bore his witness and went to his heavenly home, even as his Master had forewarned him (Joh 21:18,19). While not unmindful of the great difficulties that beset the view, nevertheless we are reclined to the opinion that the Babylon of 1Pe 5:13 is the ancient city on the Euphrates.

See PETER, (SIMON).

IV. Design.

The apostle had more than one object in view when he addressed the "elect" in Asia Minor. The Lord Jesus had charged him, "Feed my lambs" "Tend my sheep"—"Feed my sheep" (Joh 21:15-17). His two Epistles certify how faithfully he obeyed the charge. With loving and tender hand he feeds the lambs and tends the whole flock, warns against foes, guards from danger, and leads them into green pastures and beside still waters. He reminds them of the glorious inheritance they are to possess (1Pe 1:3-9); he exhorts them to walk in the footsteps of the uncomplaining Christ (1Pe 2:20-25); to be compassionate, loving, tender-hearted, humble-minded, and circumspect in their passage through this unfriendly world (1Pe 3:8-12). He sums up the main duties of Christian life in the short but pregnant sentences, "Honor all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honor the king" (1Pe 2:17). But his supreme object is to comfort and encourage them amid the persecutions and the sufferings to which they were unjustly subjected, and to fortify them against the heavier trials that were impending.

1. Persecution:

From the beginning the Christian church was the object of suspicion and of hatred, and many of its adherents had suffered even unto death at the hands of both hostile Jews and fanatical Gentiles. But these afflictions were generally local and sporadic. There were churches of large membership and wide influence which were unmolested (1Co 4:8-10), and which seem to have been able to get fair treatment in heathen courts (1Co 6:1-6). But the condition brought to view in 1 Peter is altogether different. Trials and afflictions of the severest sort assail them, and an enmity and hostility, bent on their destruction, pursue them with tireless energy. The whole Christian body shared in the persecutions (5:9). The trial was a surprise (4:12), both in its intensity, for Peter calls it "fiery," and for its unexpectedness. The apostle represents it as a savage beast of prey, a roaring lion, prowling about them to seize and devour (5:8,9).

A variety of charges were brought against the Christians, but they were calumnies and slanders, without any foundation in fact. They were spoken against as evil-doers (1Pe 2:12 kakopoion; malefici, Tacitus calls them). Their adversaries railed against them (1Pe 3:9); reviled them (1Pe 3:16); spake evil of them (1Pe 4:4); reproached them for the name of Christ (1Pe 4:14). These are ugly epithets. They show how bitter was the hatred and how intense the hostility felt by the heathen toward the Christians who dwelt among them. If there had been any justification for such antagonism in the character and the conduct of Christ's people, if they were evil-doers, "haters of the human race," to be classed with thieves and murderers and meddlers in other men's matters (1Pe 4:14-16), as they were accused of being and doing, we could understand the fierce opposition which assailed them and the savage purpose to suppress them altogether, but the only ground for the enmity felt against them was the refusal of the Christians to join their heathen neighbors in their idolatries, their feasts, winebibbings, revelings, carousings, lasciviousness and lusts in which once they freely shared (1Pe 4:2-4). The Asian saints had renounced all such wicked practices, had separated themselves from their old companions in riotous living and revolting debaucheries; they were witnesses against their immoralities, and hence, became the objects of intense dislike and persecuting animosity. Peter bears testimony to the high character, the purity of life and the self-sacrificing devotion of these believers. In all Asia Minor no better company of men and women could be found than these disciples of Jesus Christ; none more submissive to constituted authority, none more ready to help their fellow-men in their distress and trouble. The head and front of their offending was their separation from the ungodly world about them, and their solemn witness against the awful sins done daily before their eyes.

2. Example of Christ:

How mightily does the apostle minister to his suffering friends! He bids them remember the uncomplaining Christ when He was unjustly afflicted by cruel men (1Pe 2:19-25). He tells them how they may effectively put to silence their accusers, and refute the calumnies and the slanders that are so cruelly circulated against them, namely, by living such pure and godly lives, by being so meek, docile, patient, stedfast, true and faithful to God, that none can credit the false accusations (1Pe 2:1-5; 2:13-17; 3:8,9,13-17; 5:6-11).

3. Relation to State:

There is little or no evidence in the Epistle that the persecutions were inflicted by imperial authority or that the state was dealing with the Christians as enemies who were dangerous to the peace of society. In the provinces to which the letter was sent there seems to have been complete absence of formal trial and punishment through the courts. Peter does not speak of Iegal proceedings against the Christians by the magistrates. On the contrary, he urges them to be subject to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as sent by him for vengeance on evil-doers and for praise to them that do well (1Pe 2:13). They are to honor all men, to honor the king (1Pe 2:17). This submission would scarcely be pressed if the state had already proscribed Christianity and decreed its total suppression. This the imperial government did later on, but there is no evidence furnished by the apostle that in 64 AD—the date of the Epistle—the government formally denounced Christians and

determined to annihilate them.

Peter exhorts his fellow-believers to silence their persecutors by their upright conduct (1Pe 2:15); they are thus to put them to shame who falsely accuse them (1Pe 3:16); and they are not to combat evil with evil nor answer reviling with reviling, but contrariwise with blessing (1Pe 3:9). The antagonism here indicated obviously springs from the heathen populace; there is no hint of arraignment before magistrates or subjection to legal proceedings. It is unbelievers who revile and slander and denounce the people of God in the provinces.

Everything in the Epistle points to the time of Nero, 64 AD, and not to the time of Domitian or Trajan, or even Titus. In Rome vast multitudes of Christians were put to death in the most brutal fashion, so Tacitus relates, but the historian asserts that there was a sinister report to the effect that Nero himself instigated the burning of the city (July 19, 64), and "he (Nero) falsely diverted the charge on to a set of people to whom the vulgar gave the name of Christians (or Chrestians), and who were detested for the abominations which they perpetrated." See NERO. Certain facts are clear from Tacitus' statements, namely, that at the time the Christians were well known as a distinct sect; and that they were subjected to the dreadful sufferings inflicted upon them because they were Christians; and the persecutions at the time were instigated by the fear and the brutality of the tyrant. Peter likewise recognizes the fact that believers were disliked and calumniated by their heathen neighbors for the same reason—they were Christians: "If ye are reproached for the name of Christ, blessed are ye" (1Pe 4:14); "But if a man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this name" (1Pe 4:16). But the imperial government at the time does not appear to have taken formal action for the overthrow of Christianity as a system inimical to the empire. Of course, where direct charges of a criminal nature were made against Christians, judicial inquiry into them would be instituted. But in the Epistle what believers had to endure and suffer were the detraction, the vituperation, the opprobrium and the vile and malignant slanders with which the heathen assailed them.

V. Characteristic Features of the Epistle.

It has certain very distinct marks, some of which may be noticed.

1. Freedom in Structure:

It does not observe a close logical sequence in its structure, as those of Paul so prominently display. There is truth in Dean Alford's statement, although perhaps he pushes it rather far: "The link between one idea and another is found, not in any progress of unfolding thought or argument, but in the last word of the foregoing sentence which is taken up and followed out in the new one" (see 1Pe 1:5,6,7,9,10, etc.). This peculiarity, however, does not interfere with the unity of the epistle, it rather adds to it, and it gives to it a vividness which it otherwise might not possess.

2. Hope:

It is the epistle of hope. How much it makes of this prime grace! Peter seems never to grow weary of describing it and exalting its radiant beauty and desirableness. He calls it a living hope (1Pe 1:3). It is born by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, and it calmly awaits the glorious inheritance that soon will be enjoyed. It is a hope that will be perfected at the advent of Christ (1Pe 1:13), and it is set on God, hence, cannot fail (1Pe 1:21). With sickly, dying hope we are quite familiar. The device which a certain state (South Carolina) has inscribed on its Great Seal is, dum spiro spero ("while I live I hope"). Such a hope may serve for a commonwealth whose existence is limited to this world, but a man needs something more enduring, something imperishable. "It is a fearful thing when a man and his hopes die together" (Leighton). A Christian can confidently write, "when I am dying I hope," for his is a living hope that fills and thrills the future with a blessed reality.

3. Inheritance:

The Christian's glorious inheritance (1Pe 1:3-5) is depicted in one of the most comprehensive and suggestive descriptions of the believer's heritage found in the Bible. It is declared to be "incorruptible." The word points to its substance. It is imperishable. In it there is no element of decay. It holds in its heart no germ of death. Like its author, the living God, it is unchangeable and eternal. It is "undefiled." It is not stained by sin nor polluted by crime, either in its acquisition or its possession. Human heritages generally are marred by human wrongs. There is hardly an acre of soil that is not tainted by fraud or violence. The coin that passes from hand to hand is in many instances soiled by guilt. But this of Peter is absolutely pure and holy. It "fadeth not away." It never withers. Ages do not impair its beauty or dim its luster. Its bloom will remain fresh, its fragrance undiminished, forever. Thus our inheritance "is glorious in these respects: it is in its substance, incorruptible: in its purity, undefiled: in beauty, unfading" (Alford).

Now why does the apostle in the very opening of his Epistle give so lofty a place to the saints' inheritance? He does so in order to comfort and encourage his fellow-believers with the consolations of the Lord Himself, that they may bear stedfastly their manifold sufferings and triumph over their weighty afflictions. Hence, he writes: "Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a little while, if need be, ye have been put to grief in manifold trials, that the proof of your faith .... may be found unto praise and glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 1:6-9). He lifts their thoughts and their gaze up far above the troubles and distresses around them to Him whose they are, whom they serve, who will by and by crown them with immortal bliss.

4. Testimony of Prophets:

The prophets and their study are described in 1Pe 1:10,11: "Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you," etc. With Peter and his fellow-apostles the testimony of the prophets was authoritative and final. Where they had a clear word from the Old Testament Scriptures, they felt that every question was settled and controversy was at an end.

(1) Salvation.

The burden of the prophetic communications was salvation. The prophets spoke on many subjects; they had to exhort, rebuke and entreat their wayward contemporaries; to denounce sin, to announce judgment on the guilty and to recall them to repentance and reformation. But ever and anon their vision was filled with the future and its blessedness, their voices would swell with rapture as they saw and foretold the great salvation to be brought to the world and the grace that would then so copiously go out unto men; for the Messiah was to appear and to suffer, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.

(2) Spirit of Christ.

The prophet’s messages were the messages of the Spirit of Christ. It was He who testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow. The prophets always disclaim any part in the origination of their messages. They affirm in the most positive and solemn manner that their predictions are not their own, but God’s. Hence, they are called the Lord’s "spokesmen," the Lord’s "mouth" (Ex 4:15,16; 7:1,2; 2Pe 1:21).

(3) Prophetic Study.

They "sought and searched diligently." These terms are strong and emphatic. They pored over the predictions which the Spirit had revealed through themselves; they scrutinized them with eager and prolonged inquiry. Two points engaged their attention: "What time or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto." The first "what" relates to the time of the Messiah’s advent; the second "what" to the events and circumstances which would attend His appearing—a fruitful theme, one that engages the inquiry of nobler students—"which things angels desire to look into."

5. The Christian Brotherhood:

The Christian brotherhood is described in 1Pe 2:9,10: "But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God’s own possession, that ye may show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." The brotherhood is the new Israel. The apostle describes it in terms which were applied to the old Israel, but which include more than the ancient Israel ever realized. The exalted conception is by one who was a strict Jew, the apostle of the circumcision, and who held somewhat closely to the Mosaic institutions to the end of his life. All the more significant on this account is his testimony. The descriptive titles which he here gathers together and places on the brow of the Christian brotherhood are of the most illustrious sort. A distinguished man, a noble, a general, a statesman, will sometimes appear in public with his breast covered with resplendent decorations which mark his rank or his achievements. But such distinctions sink into insignificance alongside of this dazzling cluster. This is the heavenly nobility, the royal family of the Lord of glory, decorated with badges brighter far than ever glittered on the breast of king or emperor. But even in this instance Peter reminds Christians of the glorious destiny awaiting them that they may be strengthened and stimulated to stedfastness and loyalty in the midst of the trials and afflictions to which they are

subjected (1Pe 2:11,12)

6. Spirits in Prison:

A study of 1Pe 3:18-20—"preached unto the spirits in prison"—should here follow in the present cursory review of the characteristic features of the Epistle, but anything like an adequate examination of this difficult passage would require more space than could be given it. Suffice it to quote a sentence from Professor Zahn (New Testament, II, 289) with which the writer agrees: "That interpretation of 1Pe 3:19 is in all probability correct, according to which a preaching of Christ at the time of the Flood is referred to, i.e. a preaching through Noah, so that Noah is here represented as a preacher of righteousness, as in 2Pe 2:5."

See PRISON, SPIRITS IN.

VI. Analysis.

A very general analysis of the Epistle is the following:

(1) Christian privileges, 1Pe 1-2:10.

(2) Christian duties, 1Pe 2:11-4:11.

(3) Persecutions and trials, 1Pe 4:12-5:11.

(4) Personal matters and salutations, 1Pe 5:12-14.

The chief doctrines of Christianity are found in 1 Peter. The vicarious suffering and death of the Lord Jesus Christ (2:24; 3:18); the new birth (1:3,13); redemption by the blood of Christ (1:18,19), faith, hope, patient endurance under unjust suffering, and holiness of life, are all pressed upon Christians with great earnestness and force.

LITERATURE.

Bible Dicts., DB, HDB, Davis, DB, EB, Sch-Herz, volume VIII; Intros: Westcott, Salmon, Zahn; Vincent, Word Studies; Commentaries: Bible Commentary, Cambridge Bible for Schools; Lillie, Jameson, Fausett and Brown, Alford, Bigg, Mayor (on 2 Peter), Johnstone (homiletical), New York, 1888; Hort, 1Pe 1:1-2:17, New York, 1898.

William G. Moorehead

PETER, THE SECOND EPISTLE OF

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE IN FAVOR OF ITS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY

1. Ancient Opinion

2. Modern Opinion

3. Dr. Chase’s View

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF ITS APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY

1. Style and Diction

2. Reason of Dissimilarities

3. Claim to Petrine Authorship

4. Christian Earnestness

5. Relation to Apostles

6. Autobiographical Allusions

7. Quoted by Jude

III. DOCTRINAL TEACHINGS OF THE EPISTLE

1. Saving Knowledge

(1) Basis

(2) Growth

(3) Inerrancy of Sources

2. The Three Worlds

(1) The Old World

(2) The Present World

(3) The New World

The Second Epistle of Peter comes to us with less historical support of its genuineness than any other book of the New Testament. In consequence, its right to a place in the Canon is seriously doubted by some and denied by others. There are those who confidently assign it to the Apostolic age and to the apostle whose name it bears in the New Testament, while there are those who as confidently assign it to post-apostolic times, and repudiate its Petrine authorship. It is not the aim of this article to trace the history of the two opinions indicated above, nor to cite largely the arguments employed in the defense of the Epistle, or those in opposition to it; nor to attempt to settle a question which for more than a thousand years the wisest and best men of the Christian church have been unable to settle. Such a procedure would in this case be the height of presumption. What is here attempted is to point out as briefly as may be some of the reasons for doubting its canonicity, on the one hand, and those in its support, on the other.

I. External Evidence in Favor of Its Apostolic Authority.

1. Ancient Opinion:

It must be admitted at the very outset that the evidence is meager. The first writer who mentions it by name is Origen (circa 240 AD). In his homily on Josh, he speaks of the two Epistles of Peter. In another place he quotes 2Pe 1:4: "partakers of the divine nature," and gives it the name of Scripture. But Origen is careful to say that its authority was questioned: "Peter has left one acknowledged Epistle, and perhaps a second, for this is contested." Eusebins, bishop of Caesarea, regarded it with even more suspicion than did Origen, and accordingly he placed it among the disputed books (Antilegomena). Jerome knew the scruples which many entertained touching the Epistle, but notwithstanding, he included it in his Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Version. The main reason for Jerome’s uncertainty about it he states to be "difference of style from 1 Peter." He accounts for the difference by supposing that the apostle "made use of two different interpreters." As great teachers and scholars as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, e.g. Athanasius, Augustine, Epiphanius, Rufinus and Cyril, received it as genuine. At the Reformation Erasmus rejected 2 Peter; Luther seems to have had no doubt of its genuineness; while Calvin felt some hesitancy because of the "discrepancies between it and the First." In the 4th century, two church councils (Laodicea, circa 372, and Carthage, 397) formally recognized it and placed it in the Canon as equal in authority with the other books of the New Testament.

2. Modern Opinion:

The opinion of modern scholars as to references in post-apostolic literature to 2 Peter is not only divided, but in many instances antagonistic. Salmon, Warfield, Zahn and others strongly hold that such references are to be found in the writings of the 2nd century, perhaps in one or two documents of the 1st. They insist with abundant proof in support of their contention that Irenaeus, Justin Martyr, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Didache, and Clement of Rome, were all acquainted with the Epistle and made allusions to it in their writings. Weighing as honestly and as thoroughly as one can the citations made

from that literature, one is strongly disposed to accept the evidence as legitimate and conclusive.

3. Dr. Chase's View:

On the other side, Professor Chase (HDB) has subjected all such references and allusions in the primitive writings to a very keen and searching criticism, and it must be frankly confessed that he has reduced the strength of the evidence and argument very greatly. But Professor Chase himself, from the remains of the ancient literature, and from the internal evidence of the Epistle itself, arrives at the conclusion that 2 Peter is not at all an apostolic document, that it certainly was not written by Peter, nor in the 1st century of our era, but about the middle of the 2nd century, say 150 AD. If this view is accepted, we must pronounce the Epistle a forgery, pseudonymous and pseudepigraphic, with no more right to be in the New Testament than has the Apocalypse of Peter or the romance of the Shepherd of Hermas.

II. Internal Evidence in Support of Its Apostolic Authority.

1. Style and Diction:

At first sight, this seems to be not altogether reassuring, but looking deeper into the letter itself we arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Difference of style between the two Epistles attributed to Peter is given as one prominent reason for questioning the validity of the Second. It is mainly if not entirely on this ground that Jerome, Calvin and others hesitated to receive it. It is noteworthy that in the earlier times objections were not urged because of its relation to Jude—its borrowing from Jude, as is often charged in our days. Its alleged dissimilarity to 1 Peter in diction, structure, and measurably in its contents, explains why it was discredited. Admitting that there is substantial ground for this criticism, nevertheless there are not a few instances in which words rarely found in the other Biblical books are common to the two Epistles. Some examples are given in proof: "precious" (1Pe 1:7,19; 2Pe 1:1) (a compound), occurring often in Rev, not often in other books; "virtue" (1Pe 2:9, the King James Version margin; 2Pe 1:3), found elsewhere only in Php 4:8; "supply" (1Pe 4:11; 2Pe 1:5), rare in other books; "love of brethren" (1Pe 1:22; 2Pe 1:7 margin), only in three places besides; "behold" (1Pe 2:12; 3:2 (verbal form); 2Pe 1:16) (eyewitnesses), not found elsewhere in the New Testament; "without blemish," "without spot" (1Pe 1:19; 2Pe 3:14) (order of words reversed); also positive side (2Pe 2:13), "spots and blemishes"; the words do not occur elsewhere; "ungodly" (1Pe 4:18; 2Pe 2:5; 3:7) occurs in but three other places, except Jude, which has it three times.

2. Reason of Dissimilarities:

Besides, there are many striking similarities in thought and diction in the two Epistles. Two instances are given. In the First the saved are described as the "elect" (1Pe 1:1), and as "called" (1Pe 2:21). In the Second, the two great truths are brought together (2Pe 1:10). Likewise, in both stress is laid upon prophecy (1Pe 1:10-12; 2Pe 1:19-21). Now, all this tends to prove that the writer of the Second Epistle was well acquainted with the peculiarity of diction employed in the First, and that he made use

purposely of its uncommon terms, or, if the Second was written by another than the apostle, he succeeded surprisingly well in imitating his style. The latter alternative does not merit discussion. The differences arise mainly out of the subjects treated in the two, and the design which the writer seems to have kept constantly in view. In the First, he sought to comfort, strengthen and sustain his persecuted brethren; this is his supreme aim. In the Second he is anxious to warn and to shield those whom he addresses as to impending dangers more disastrous and more to be feared than the sufferings inflicted by a hostile world. In the First, judgment had begun at the house of God (1Pe 4:17,18), and believers were to arm, not to resist their persecutors, but for martyrdom (1Pe 4:1). But in the Second, a very different condition of things is brought to view. Ungodly men holding degrading principles and practicing shocking immoralities were threatening to invade the Christian brotherhood. Evil of a most vicious sort was detected by the watchful eye of the writer, and he knew full well that if suffered to continue and grow, as assuredly it would, utter ruin for the cause he loved would ensue. Therefore he forewarns and denounces the tendency with the spirit and energy of a prophet of God.

3. Claim to Petrine Authorship:

2 Peter opens with the positive statement of Peter’s authorship: "Simon ["Symeon," Nestle, Weymouth] Peter, a servant .... of Jesus Christ." The insertion of "Symeon," the old Hebrew name, in the forefront of the document is significant. If a forger had been writing in Peter’s name he would have begun his letter almost certainly by copying the First Epistle and simply written, "Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ." Note also that "servant" is introduced into the Second Epistle, but absent from the First. He designates himself as a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ. "Although several pseudonymous writings appear in early Christian literature, there is no Christian document of value written by a forger who uses the name of an apostle" (Dods, SBD). If this important statement is accepted at its full worth, it goes far to settle the question of authorship. Both "servant" and "apostle" appear in the opening sentence, and the writer claims both for himself.

4. Christian Earnestness:

Furthermore, the writer is distinctively a Christian; he addresses those who "have obtained a like precious faith with us in the righteousness of our God and the Saviour Jesus Christ" (2Pe 1:1). His is the same precious faith which all the saints enjoy; his also the exceeding great and precious promises of God, and he expects with all other believers to be made a partaker of the divine nature (2Pe 1:3,4). Is it at all probable that one with such a faith and such expectations would deliberately forge the name of Simon Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ? The writer is unsparing in his denunciations of false teachers, corrupters of others, and perverters of the truth. He instances the fall of the angels, the destruction of Sodom, the rebuke of Balaam, as examples of the doom of those who know the truth and yet live in shameful sin and crime. Would a Christian and servant of Jesus Christ be at all likely to commit in the most flagrant manner the things he so vehemently condemns? If the writer was not the apostle Peter, he was a false teacher, a corrupter of others, and a hypocrite, which seems incredible to us.

5. Relation of Apostles:

Moreover, he associates himself with the other apostles (2Pe 3:2), is in full sympathy with Paul and is acquainted with Paul's Epistles (2Pe 3:15,16), and he holds and teaches the same fundamental truth. An apostolic spirit breathes through this document such as is generally absent from spurious writings and such as a forger does not exhibit. He is anxiously concerned for the purity of the faith and for the holiness and fidelity of believers. He exhorts them to give "diligence that ye may be found in peace, without spot and blameless in his sight," and that they "grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ" (2Pe 3:14,18). All this and much more of like devout teaching is apostolic in tone and betokens genuineness and reality.

6. Autobiographical Allusions:

Still further, the writer appeals to certain facts in the life of Peter that are almost autobiographical. For example, he speaks of "putting off of my tabernacle .... even as our Lord Jesus Christ signified unto me" (2Pe 1:13,14). The reference undoubtedly is to Joh 13:36; 21:18,19. He claims to have been a witness of the Transfiguration (2Pe 1:16-18). He indirectly claims the inspiration without which true prophecy is impossible (2Pe 1:19-21). He asserts that this is his "second epistle" (2Pe 3:1). This testimony on the part of the writer is personal, emphatic and direct. It reads much like Peter's plain way of speaking of himself at the Council of Jerusalem, "Ye know that a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel, and believe" (Ac 15:7).

7. Quoted by Jude:

Once more, Jude appears to quote from 2 Peter (see JUDE). The question of the priority of the two Epistles is by no means settled. Many recent writers give the precedence to Jude, others to Peter. One of the highest authority, by Zahn (New Testament, II, 238 ff), argues with great force in support of the view that Peter's is the older and that Jude cites from it. The arguments in favor of this latter belief are here only summarized:

(1) Jude cites from writings other than Scripture, as the apocryphal Book of Enoch and perhaps also from the Assumption of Moses. Peter scarcely quotes from any source. The former would be more likely to cite 2Pe 2-3:3 than the latter from Jude 1:4-16. The resemblance between these two sections of the Epistles is so close that one must have drawn both thoughts and language from the other, or both availed themselves of the same documentary source. Of this latter supposition antiquity furnishes no hint. The differences are as marked as the resemblances, and hence, the one who cites from the other is no servile copyist. The real difference between the two is that between prediction and fulfillment.

(2) Peter predicts the advent of the "false teachers" (2Pe 2:1). His principal verbs are in the future tense (2Pe 2:1,2,3,12,13). He employs the present tense indeed in describing the character and the conduct of the libertines (2Pe 2:17,18), but their presence and their disastrous teaching he puts in the future (2Pe 2:13,14). The deadly germs were there when he wrote, the rank growth would speedily follow. Jude, on the contrary, throughout his short letter, speaks of the same corrupters as already come; his objects are present, they are in the midst of the people of God and actively doing their deadly work.

(3) Jude twice refers to certain sources of information touching these enemies, with which his readers were acquainted and which were designed to warn them of the danger and keep them from betrayal. The two sources were

(a) a writing that spoke of "ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ," 1:4;

(b) the prediction of Peter that "in the last days mockers shall come with mockery, walking after their own lusts" (2Pe 3:3). Jude urges his readers to remember the words which the apostles of Christ had before spoken, and then he cites this prediction of Peter in almost the exact terms: "In the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their ungodly lusts." He applies the prediction to the libertines then and there practicing their unholy deeds: "These are they, who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit." The conclusion is inevitable. Jude quotes from Peter.

(4) Chronology gives the priority to Peter. The apostle died between 63-67 AD, probably in 64 AD. The vast majority of recent interpreters date the Epistle of Jude at 75-80 AD. There is no doubt but that it was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, 70 AD. Accordingly, it is later than Peter’s death by from 5 to 10 years. Jude quoted from 2 Peter. This being so, it follows that his Epistle endorses that of Peter as being apostolic and likewise canonical, for he recognizes Peter as an apostle and gifted with the prophetic spirit.

See JUDE; PETER (SIMON).

III. Doctrinal Teachings of the Epistle.

Only some of the more important features of the Epistle are here noticed. If all were treated as they deserve to be, this article would expand into the proportions of a commentary.

1. Saving Knowledge:

The key-word of 1 Peter is Hope; of 2 Peter Knowledge. The apostle gives to this gift of grace a prominent place (1:2,3,5,6,8; 2:20,21; 3:18). The term he uses is largely in the intensified form, namely, "full knowledge"; that is, knowledge that rests on fact, knowledge that comes to the believer as something supernatural, as being communicated by the Spirit of God, and therefore is true and complete. The grace and peace Peter asks for the saints should issue in the knowledge of God and of Jesus our Lord, who has granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness through the knowledge of Him (1:2,3).

(1) Basis:

The basis of saving knowledge rests on the "exceeding great and precious promises" which He has made

us, and which become ours by faith in Him. It leads us into acquaintance with the righteousness of God, into the realization of our calling as saints, and of the glorious destiny that awaits them who know and trust God (2Pe 1:2-4 the King James Version).

(2) Growth:

The growth in true knowledge (2Pe 1:5-11): "In your faith supply virtue," etc. He does not ask that faith be supplied, that these believers already had. But starting with faith as the foundation of all, let the other excellencies and virtues be richly and abundantly furnished. The original word for "supply" is derived from the Greek "chorus," in behalf of the members of which the manager supplied all the equipments needed. And Peter appropriating that fact urges Christians to give all diligence to furnish themselves with the gifts and grace he mentions, which are far more needful to the Christian than were the equipments for the ancient chorus.

See SUPPLY.

What a magnificent cluster Peter here gives! Each springs out of the other; each is strengthened by the other. "In your faith supply virtue," or fortitude, manliness; and let virtue supply "knowledge." Knowledge by itself tends to puff up. But tempered by the others, by self-control, by patience, by godliness, by love, it becomes one of the most essential and powerful forces in the Christian character. Paul begins his list of the "fruits of the Spirit" with love (Ga 5:22); Peter ends his with love. It is like a chain, each link holds fast to its fellow and is a part of the whole. It matters little at which end of the chain we begin to count, for the links form a unity, and to touch one is to touch all. God freely gives what we need and all we need; we are to "add all diligence" to supply the need richly.

(3) Inerrancy of Sources:

Inerrancy of the sources of saving knowledge (2Pe 1:16-21). The apostle rests his teaching on two trustworthy facts:

(a) the fact and meaning of the Saviour’s Transfiguration;

(b) the fact of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit.

Taken together these two facts invest his teaching with infallible certainty. "For we did not follow cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we were eyewitnesses of his majesty." Pagan mythology, so widely prevailing at the time in Asia Minor, indeed over the whole heathen world, was composed of "myths" (Peter’s word) skillfully framed and poetically embellished. Jewish cabalism, and the wild vagaries springing up in the Christian brotherhood itself had no place in the gospel message nor in apostolic teaching. What Peter and his fellow-disciples taught was the very truth of God, for at the Transfiguration they saw the outshining glory of the Son of God, they heard the Divine Voice, they beheld the two visitants from the unseen

world, Moses and Elijah. Of the majestic scene they were eyewitnesses. Peter adds, "And we have the word of prophecy made more sure." The Transfiguration has confirmed what the prophets say touching the future and God's purpose to fill the earth with His glory; every word He has spoken is to be made good.

Moreover, the apostle appeals to the inspiration of the prophets in confirmation of his teaching: "No prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit." He recognizes this as primary truth, that prophecy is not of one's own origination, nor is it to be tied up to the times of the prophet. The prophecy was brought to him, as it is brought to us. Peter and his fellow-believers did not follow "cunningly devised fables"; they were borne along in their prophetic utterances by the Spirit.

2. The Three Worlds:

Of course in 2Pe 3:5-13, where the three worlds are spoken of, three globes are not meant, but three vast epochs, three enormous periods in earth's history. The apostle divides its history into three clearly defined sections, and mentions some of the characteristic features of each.

(1) The Old World.

"The world that then was" (2Pe 3:6): this is his first world. It is the antediluvian world that is meant, the world which the Flood overwhelmed. Scoffers in Peter's time asked, no doubt with a sneer, "Where is the promise of his coming? for, from the day that the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation" (2Pe 3:4). This is a surprisingly modern inquiry. Mockers then as now appealed to the continuity of natural processes, and to the inviolability of Nature's laws. Nature keeps her track with unwavering precision. There is no sign of any change; no catastrophe is likely, is possible. The promise of His coming fails. Peter reminds the skeptics that a mighty cataclysm did once overwhelm the world. The Flood drowned every living thing, save those sheltered within the ark. As this is a historical fact, the query of the mockers is foolish.

(2) The Present World.

Peter's second world is "the heavens that now are, and the earth" (2Pe 3:7). It is the present order of things in sky and earth that is meant. He asserts that this world is "stored up for fire, being reserved against the day of judgment and destruction of ungodly men." The margin reads, "stored with fire," i.e., it contains within itself the agency by which it may be consumed. The world that now is, is held in strict custody, reserved, not for a second deluge, but for fire. The advent of Christ and the judgment are associated in Scripture with fire: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence: a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him" (Ps 50:3 the King James Version; compare Isa 66:15,16; Da 7:10,11). Nor is the New Testament silent on this point: "the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire" (2Th 1:7).

Ample materials are stored up in the earth for its consumption by fire. The oils and the gases so inflammable and destructive in their energy can, when it may please God to release these forces, speedily reduce the present order of things to ashes. Peter’s language does not signify earth’s annihilation, nor its dissolution as an organic body, nor the end of time. He speaks of cosmical convulsions and physical revolutions of both sky and earth, such as shall transform the planet into something glorious and beautiful.

(3) The New World.

The third world is this: "But, according to his promise, we look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2Pe 3:13). This is Paradise restored. We have sure ground for the expectancy; the last two chapters of Re contain the prophetic fulfillment: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more." The accomplishment of these sublime predictions will involve a fundamental change in the constitution of the globe. Life would be impossible if the sea was no more. But He who made the world can surely recreate it, clearing it of every vestige of sin and misery and imperfection, fitting it for the dwelling of perfect beings and of His supreme glory. Immanuel will dwell with the holy inhabitants of the new earth and in the new Jerusalem which is to descend into the glorified planet. John is bidden, "Write, for the predictions are faithful and true; they shall not fail to come to pass."

"Earth, thou grain of sand on the shore of the Universe of God,

On thee has the Lord a great work to complete."

LITERATURE.

See at end of PETER, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF; PETER (SIMON).

William G. Moorehead

PETHAHIAH

peth-a-hi’-a (Pethachyah, "Yah opens up"):

(1) Chief of the 19th course of priests (1Ch 24:16).

(2) One of the Levites having "foreign wives" (Ezr 10:23; Ne 9:5; "Patheus" in 1 Esdras 9:23).

(3) Son of Meshezabeel, descendant of Judah, who was "at the king’s hand in all matters concerning the people" (Ne 11:24).

PETHOR

pe’-thor (pethor; Phathoura, Bathoura): The dwelling-place of Balaam, situated on "the river" (the Euphrates) (Nu 22:5).13). This is Paradise restored. We have sure ground for the expectancy; the last two chapters of Re contain the prophetic fulfillment: "And I saw a new heaven and a new earth: for the first heaven and the first earth are passed away; and the sea is no more." The accomplishment of these sublime predictions will involve a fundamental change in the constitution of the globe. Life would be impossible if the sea was no more. But He who made the world can surely recreate it, clearing it of every vestige of sin and misery and imperfection, fitting it for the dwelling of perfect beings and of His supreme glory. Immanuel will dwell with the holy inhabitants of the new earth and in the new Jerusalem which is to descend into the glorified planet. John is bidden, "Write, for the predictions are faithful and true; they shall not fail to come to pass."

1. Possibly the Asyrian Pitru:

In De 23:4, it is further described as being in Mesopotamia (Aram-naharaim). Pethor is identified with the Pedru(i) of the geographical lists of Thothmes III (circa 1500 BC) and the Pitru (Pithru) of the Assyrian king Shalmaneser II, who states that in his 3rd year (857 BC) he took the city Ana-Assur-utir-acbat (meaning: "I founded (it) anew for Assur"), which the Hattaa (Hittites) called Pitru. He says that it lay on the farther (western) bank of the Euphrates, by the Sagurru or Sagura River, the modern Sajur. The importance of Pitru is indicated by the fact that he received there the tribute of the kings of Carchemish, Comagene, Melitene and other districts.

2. Difficulties of Identification:

As Pitru is about 400 miles from Moab, this meant for Balaam a three or four weeks’ journey, but the messengers sent to fetch him, though they had to travel that distance twice, could naturally, by pressing their mounts, have performed it much less time. Doubt may likewise be entertained as to the identity of Pethor with Pitru by the absence in the latter of the o, which would lead one to expect rather the Assyrian form Pit(h)uru. Shalmaneser, however, says that Pitru was the Hittite name, and that may account for it. With regard to the derivation, nothing can at present be said, except that, as a Hittite name, Tomkins (Records of the Past, V (London, 1891), 38) has compared the name Pitru with the Pteria of Herodotus i.76 (identified with Bog-haz-keui, the great Hittite capital in Cappadocia, in ancient times called Hattu).

T. G. Pinches

PETHUEL

pe-thu’-el (pethu’el, "God’s opening"): Father of Joe the prophet (Joe 1:1).

PETITION

pe-tish’-un: Used in English Versions of the Bible only as a noun, usually as representing the Hebrew she’elah (Ps 20:5, mish’alah), from the common verb [~sha’al, "to ask." The noun, consequently, has no technical meaning, and may be used indifferently in the active (Es 7:2) or passive (1Sa 1:27) sense, or for a petition addressed to either God (1Sa 1:17) or man (1Ki 2:16), while in Jud 8:24; Job 6:8; Ps 106:15, it is rendered simply "request." Otherwise "petition" represents the Aramaic ba‘u (Da 6:7,13), the Greek aitema (1 Joh 5:15), and deesis (1 Macc 7:37, the Revised Version (British and American) "supplication"), and the Latin oratio (2 Esdras 8:24).ru with the Pteria of Herodotus i.76 (identified with Bog-haz-keui, the great Hittite capital in Cappadocia, in ancient times called Hattu).

Burton Scott Easton

PETRA

pe’-tra.

See SELA.

PEULTHAI; PEULLETHAI

pe-ul’-thi, pe-ul’-e-thi (pe‘ullethay, "Yah’s seed"): One of the "porters," 8th son of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:5).

PHAATH MOAB

fa’-ath, mo’-ab (Codex Alexandrinus Phaath Moab; Codex Vaticanus followed by Swete, Phthaleimoab (1 Esdras 5:11); 1 Esdras 8:31 (the King James Version "Pahath Moab"), Codex Vaticanus followed by Swete reads Maathmoab; Fritzsche in both places reads Phaath Moab): One of the families, part of which, consisting "of the sons of Jesus and Joab 2,812," went up out of captivity with Zerubbabel and Joshua (1 Esdras 5:11), and part of which, namely, "Eliaonias the son of Zaraias and with him 200 men," went up with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:31 equals "Pahath-moab" of Ezr 2:6; 8:4; (10:30); and Ne 7:11 (3:11; 10:14)). As the name of a Jewish clan or family the name Phaath or Pahath Moab presents difficulties of which explanations are offered, though none is convincing. It is generally taken as "ruler of Moab," which may refer to the Israelite conquest of Moab in which this family may have distinguished itself, or it may have arisen from the settlement and incorporation of a Moabite family in Hebrew territory, or from the settlement of an Israelite family in Moabite territory (compare 1Ch 4:22); or it may be the corruption of some unknown word or name. Instances of such corruption are quite common in these apocryphal Hebrew proper names.

See PAHATH-MOAB.

S. Angus

PHACARETH

fak’-a-reth (Phakareth, but Codex Vaticanus, followed by Swete, correctly reads Sabeie, together, Codex Alexandrinus followed by the King James Version reading "sons of Sabie," as a distinct family, 1 Esdras 5:34): The same as "Pochereth-hazzebaim" of Ezr 2:57.

PHAISUR

fa’-sur, fa-i’-sur (Codex Vaticanus Phaisour; Codex Alexandrinus Phaisou): Head of one of the families of priests some of whom had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:22) equals "Pashhur" of Ezr 10:22; styled "Phassurus" in 1 Esdras 5:25.

PHALDEUS

fal-de’-us (Codex Alexandrinus (Fritzsche) Phaldaios; Codex Vaticanus (Swete) Phaladaios; the King James Version Phaldaius): One of those who stood on Ezra’s left hand when he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:44) equals "Pedaiah" of Ne 8:4.

PHALEAS

fa-le’-as (Phalaias): A family of "temple-servants" who went up with Zerubbabel from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:29) =" Padon" of Ezr 2:44.CS>; the King James Version Phaldaius): One of those who stood on Ezra’s left hand when he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:44) =" Pedaiah" of Ne 8:4.

PHALEC

fa’-lek (Phalek, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, Phalek): the King James Version; Greek form of "Peleg" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Lu 3:35).

PHALIAS

fa-li’-as (Phalias Codex Alexandrinus Phiathas; the King James Version, Biatas, following Aldine Biatas): One of the Levites who read and explained the Law to the multitude (1 Esdras 9:48) =" Pelaiah" of Ne 8:7.Ezra’s left hand when he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:44) =" Pedaiah" of Ne 8:4.

PHALLU

fal’-oo (pallu’).

See PALLU.

PHALTI

fal’-ti (palTi).>.

See PALTI.

PHALTIEL

fal’-ti-el (palTi’el; Syriac "Psaltiel"; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the King James Version Salathiel): "The captain of the people" who came to Esdras between his first and second vision (2 Esdras 5:16). Fritzsche (Libri Apocrypha vet. test.) reads "Phalthiel."

See PALTIEL.

PHANUEL

fan-u’-el, fan’-u-el (penu’el, "vision of God"; Phanouel): Parent of Anna (Lu 2:36).

See PENIEL.

PHARAKIM

far’-a-kim (Pharakeim Codex Vaticanus Pharakem; the King James Version Pharacim): One of the families of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31; not found in Ezra or Nehemiah).

PHARAOH

fa’-ro, fa’-ra-o (par‘oh; Pharao); Egyptian per aa, "great house"):em; the King James Version Pharacim): One of the families of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31; not found in Ezra or Nehemiah).

1. The Use of Name in Egypt:

Many and strange differences of opinion have been expressed concerning the use of this name in Egypt and elsewhere, because of its importance in critical discussions (see below). Encyclopaedia Biblica says "a name given to all Egyptian kings in the Bible"; it also claims that the name could not have been received by the Hebrews before 1000 BC. HDB (III, 819) says that a letter was addressed to Amenhotep

as "Pharaoh, lord of," etc. According to Winckler's theory of a North Arabian Musri, it was the Hebrews alone in ancient times who adopted the term Pharaoh from the Egyptians, the name not being found even in the Tell el-Amarna Letters or anywhere else in cuneiform literature for the king of Egypt. Such a result is obtained according to Winckler's theory by referring every reference in cuneiform to "Pir'u, king of Musri" to the North Arabian country.

In Egyptian inscriptions the term "Pharaoh" occurs from the Pyramid inscriptions onward. At first it is used with distinct reference to its etymology and not clearly as an independent title. Pharaoh, "great house," like Sublime Porte, was applied first as a metaphor to mean the government. But as in such an absolute monarchy as Egypt the king was the government, Pharaoh was, by a figure of speech, put for the king. Its use in Egypt clearly as a title denoting the ruler, whoever he might be, as Caesar among the Romans, Shah among Persians, and Czar among Russians, belongs to a few dynasties probably beginning with the XVIIIth, and certainly ending not later than the XXIst, when we read of Pharaoh Sheshonk, but the Bible does not speak so, but calls him "Shishak king of Egypt" (1Ki 14:25). This new custom in the use of the title Pharaoh does not appear in the Bible until we have "Pharaoh-necoh." Pharaoh is certainly used in the time of Rameses II, in the "Tale of Two Brothers" (Records of the Past, 1st series, II, 137; Recueil de Travaux, XXI, 13, l. 1).

2. Significance of Use in the Bible:

It appears from the preceding that Biblical writers use this word with historical accuracy for the various periods to which it refers, not only for the time of Necoh and Hophra, but for the time of Rameses II, and use the style of the time of Rameses II for the time of Abraham and Joseph, concerning which we have not certain knowledge of its use in Egypt. It is strongly urged that writers of the 7th or 5th century BC would not have been able to make such historical use of this name, while, to a writer at the time of the exodus, it would have been perfectly natural to use Pharaoh for the king without any further name; and historical writers in the time of the prophets in Palestine would likewise have used Pharaoh-necoh and Pharaoh Hophra. This evidence is not absolutely conclusive for an early authorship of the Pentateuch and historical books, but is very difficult to set aside for a late authorship (compare Ge 12:14-20; 41:14; Ex 1:11; 3:11; 1Ki 3:1; 14:25; 2Ki 23:29; Jer 44:30; also 1Ki 11:19; 2Ki 18:21; 1Ch 4:18).

M. G. Kyle

PHARAOH HOPHRA

hof'-ra (par'oh chophra'; Houaphre):

1. Sole King, 589-570 BC:

He is so called in Scripture (Jer 44:30); Herodotus calls him Apries (ii.169). He is known on the monuments as Uah 'ab 'ra]. He was the son of Psammetichus II, whose Greek mercenaries have left in scriptions upon the rocks of Abu-Sim-bel, and the grandson of Pharaoh-necoh. He reigned alone from

589 BC to 570 BC, and jointly, by compulsion of his people, with his son-in-law Aahmes (Greek Amasis) for some years longer.

2. Alliance with Zedekiah:

No sooner had he mounted the throne than he yielded to the overtures of Zedekiah of Judah, who thought Hophra's accession a good opportunity for throwing off the yoke of Babylon. So, as Ezekiel says (17:15), "he rebelled against him (Nebuchadrezzar) in sending his ambassadors into Egypt, that they might give him horses and much people." Zedekiah had entered into the intrigue against the advice of Jeremiah, and it proved fatal to Zedekiah and the kingdom. Nebuchadrezzar was not slow to punish the disloyalty of his vassal, and in a brief space his armies were beleaguering Jerusalem. The Egyptians did indeed march to the relief of their allies, and the Chaldeans drew off their forces from Jerusalem to meet them. But the Egyptians returned without attempting to meet the Chaldeans in a pitched battle, and Jerusalem was taken, the walls broken down and the temple burnt up with fire.

3. Reception of Jeremiah and Jewish Captives:

When Jerusalem had fallen and Nebuchadrezzar's governor, Gedaliah, had been assassinated, the dispirited remnant of Judah, against the advice of Jeremiah, fled into Egypt, carrying the prophet with them. They settled at Tahpanhes, then Daphnae (modern Tell Defenneh), now identified with a mound bearing the significant name of Qatsr Bint el Yahudi, "the palace of the Jew's daughter." Here Pharaoh had a palace, for Jeremiah took great stones and hid them in mortar in the brickwork "which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house at Tahpanhes," and prophesied that Nebuchadrezzar would spread his royal pavilion over them (Jer 43:8-13). The Pharaoh of that day was Hophra, and when the fortress of Tahpanhes was discovered and cleared in 1886, the open-air platform before the entrance was found. "Here the ceremony described by Jeremiah took place before the chiefs of the fugitives assembled on the platform, and here Nebuchadrezzar spread his royal pavilion. The very nature of the site is precisely applicable to all the events" (Flinders Petrie, Nebesheh and Defenneh, 51). It was in 568 BC that the prophecy was fulfilled when Nebuchadrezzar marched into the Delta.

4. Palace of Memphis:

More recently, in 1909, in the course of excavations carried on by the British School of Archaeology in Egypt, the palace of King Apries, Pharaoh Hophra, has been discovered on the site of Memphis, the ancient capital of Egypt. Under the gray mud hill, close to the squalid Arab village of Mitrahenny, which every tourist passes on the way to Sakkhara, had lain for centuries Hophra's magnificent palace, 400 ft. long by 200 ft., with a splendid pylon, an immense court, and stonelined halls, of which seven have been found intact. With many other objects of value there was found a fitting of a palanquin of solid silver, decorated with a bust of Hathor with a gold face. It is said to be of the finest workmanship of the time of Apries, a relic of the fire, which, Jeremiah predicted at Tahpanhes, the Lord of Hosts was to kindle "in the houses of the gods of Egypt" (Jer 43:12).

Pharaoh Hophra, as Jeremiah prophesied (44:29 f), became the victim of a revolt and was finally strangled.

LITERATURE.

Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 344 f; Wiedemann, Geschichte von Alt-Aegypten, 190 ff; Flinders Petrie and J. H. Walker, Memphis, I, II ("The Palace of Apries"); Herodotus ii.161-69.

T. Nicol.

PHARAOH'S DAUGHTER

(bath-par'oh): The princess who rescued Moses (Ex 2:5-10; Heb 11:24). This is probably a title as well as an appellation, indicating not only one of the daughters of a Pharaoh, but also some very distinguished rank, thought to be most probably that of the heir to the throne by birth; though she was debarred from reigning by reason of sex, she still possessed the right to entail the scepter and crown to her oldest son. Positive identification of the "Pharaoh's daughter" mentioned in the Bible is not possible yet. All attempts toward identification are, of course, guided by the particular theory of the oppressor accepted. If the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Rameses II, as is most likely, then Pharaoh's daughter was probably the daughter of Seti I, an older sister of Rameses II. If, as many think, the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Thothmes III, then Pharaoh's daughter was some unknown princess. Some have thought she was Hatshepsut, the "Queen Elizabeth of Egypt."

M. G. Kyle

PHARAOH-NECOH

ne'-ko (par'oh nekhoh, also nekho; Nechao (2Ki 23:29,33,34; 2Ch 35:22; 36:4, the King James Version, Necho, the Revised Version (British and American) NECO; Jer 46:2; 2Ch 35:20, the King James Version Necho, the Revised Version (British and American) NECO)):

1. Pharaoh-Necoh, 610-594 BC:

Nekau II of the monuments—Greek Nekos—was the 2nd king of the XXVIth Dynasty, being the son of Psammetichus I, famous in Greek contemporary history, whose long reign has left so many memorials both in Upper and Lower Egypt (Herodotus ii.153, 158, 169). The great event of his reign (610-594 BC) was his expedition across Syria to secure for himself a share in the decaying empire of Assyria. In the days of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal, Egypt had been tributary to Assyria, and, when it began to break up, Egypt and other subject kingdoms saw their opportunity to throw off its yoke. Psammetichus had turned back the Scythian hordes which had reached his border on their western march, and now his son Necoh was to make a bold stroke for empire.

2. Battle of Megiddo, 608 BC:

On his expedition toward the East, he had to pass through the territory of Judah, and he desired to have Josiah its king as an ally. Whatever may have been his reasons, Josiah remained loyal to his Assyrian suzerain, declined the Egyptian alliance, and threw himself across the path of the invader. The opposing armies met on the battlefield of Megiddo, 608 BC, where Josiah was mortally wounded and soon after died amid the lamentations of his people. Necoh marched northward, captured Kadesh, and pressed on to the Euphrates. Not having met an enemy there, he seems to have turned back and established himself for a time at Riblah in Syria. To Riblah he summoned Jehoahaz whom the people had anointed king in room of his father Josiah, deposed him after a brief reign of 3 months, and set his brother Jehoiakim on the throne as the vassal of Egypt. Jehoiakim paid up the tribute of a hundred talents of silver and a talent of gold which Necoh had imposed upon the land, but he recovered it by exactions which he made from the people (2Ki 23:35).

3. Battle of Carchemish, 604 BC:

The Egyptian monarch still kept some hold upon Syria, and his presence there had attracted the attention of the newly established power at Babylon. The Chaldeans under Nebuchadrezzar set out for the Euphrates, and, meeting the army of Pharaoh-necoh at Carchemish, inflicted upon him a signal defeat. The Chaldeans were now undisputed masters of Western Asia, and the sacred historian relates that "the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken, from the brook of Egypt unto the river Euphrates, all that pertained to the king of Egypt" (2Ki 24:7).

4. Commercial Development of Egypt:

While Pharaoh-necoh II was ambitious to extend his empire, he was bent also upon the commercial development of Egypt. For this he set himself to collect a navy. He had two fleets built, composed of triremes, one of them to navigate the Mediterranean, the other to navigate the Red Sea. In order to secure a combination of his fleets, he conceived the idea of reopening the canal between the Nile and the Red Sea which had been originally constructed by Seti I and Rameses II, two Pharaohs of the days of the Israelite oppression, but had become silted up by desert sands. He excavated this old canal, following the line of the former cutting, and widening it so that two triremes might meet and pass each other in it. According to Herodotus he was obliged to desist from the undertaking in consequence of the mortality among the laborers, and it was left to Darius to complete. He also resolved to try whether it was possible to circumnavigate Africa, and, manning his ships with Phoenician sailors, he sent them forth with instructions to keep the coast of Africa on their right and to return to Egypt by way of the Mediterranean. They succeeded, and, rounding the Cape of Good Hope from the East, anticipated by two millenniums the feat which Vasco da Gama accomplished from the West. The enterprise took more than two years, and the result of it was of no practical value. Herodotus, when he visited Egypt in 450 BC, saw still remaining the docks which Necoh had built for the accommodation of his fleet.

LITERATURE.

Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 335 ff; Wiedemann, Geschichte von Alt-Aegypten, 179-90; Rawlinson, Egypt ("Story of the Nations"), 354 ff; Herodotus ii.158, 159.

T. Nicol.

PHARATHON

far’-a-thon (Pharathon): One of the strong cities of Judea fortified by Bacchides during the Maccabean war (1 Macc 9:50). Septuagint reads "Thamnatha-pharathon" as the name of one city. Josephus, however (Ant., XIII, i, 3), and Syriac supply the "and" between them. The name represents a Hebrew pir‘athon. If it is to be taken strictly as in Judean territory, it cannot be identified with PIRATHON (which see) of Jud 12:15. In that case we should probably seek for it with Dr. G.A. Smith in some fortress covering the top of Wady Far‘ah.

W. Ewing

PHARES

fa’-rez (Phares): the King James Version; Greek form of "Perez" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Mt 1:3; Lu 3:33).

PHAREZ

fa’-rez (King James Version 1 Esdras 5:9; 8:30): The same as Revised Version PHOROS (which see).

PHARIDA

fa-ri’-da (Phareida, A, Pharida; King James Version Pharira): The clan name of one of the families of "the servants of Solomon" who came up from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:33) =" Peruda" of Ezr 2:55 =" Perida" of Ne 7:57.

PHARIRA

fa-ri’-ra: King James Version = Revised Version PHARIDA (which see).

PHARISEES

far’-i-sez (perushim; Pharisaioi):

1. Name and General Character

2. Authorities—Josephus—New Testament—Talmud

I. HISTORY OF THE SECT

1. Associated at First with Hasmoneans, but Later Abandon Them

2. Change of Name

3. Later Fortunes of the Sect

4. In New Testament Times

5. In Post-apostolic Times

II. DOCTRINES OF THE PHARISEES

1. Josephus’s Statements Colored by Greek Ideas

2. Conditional Reincarnation

3. New Testament Presentation of Pharisaic Doctrines—Angels and Spirits—Resurrection

4. Traditions Added to the Law

5. Traditional Interpretations of the Law by Pharisees (Sabbath, etc.)

6. Close Students of the Text of Scripture

(1) Messianic Hopes

(2) Almsgiving

III. ORGANIZATION OF THE PHARISAIC PARTY

The Chabherim—Pharisaic Brotherhoods

IV. CHARACTER OF THE PHARISEES

1. Pharisees and People of the Land

2. Arrogance toward Other Jews

3. Regulations for the Chabher

4. The New Testament Account

(1) Their Scrupulosity

(2) Their Hypocrisy

5. Talmudic Classification of the Pharisees

V. OUR LORD'S RELATION TO THE PHARISEES

1. Pharisaic Attempts to Gain Christ Over

2. Reasons for Pharisaic Hatred of Christ

3. our Lord's Denunciation of the Pharisees

LITERATURE

1. Name and General Character:

A prominent sect of the Jews. The earliest notice of them in Josephus occurs in connection with Jonathan, the high priest. Immediately after the account of the embassy to the Lacedaemonians, there is subjoined (Josephus, Ant, XIII, v, 9) an account of the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, therefore implying that then and in this connection they had been prominent, although no notice of any of these parties is to be found that confirms that view. Later (XIII, x, 5), the Pharisees are represented as envious of the success of John Hyrcanus; Eleazar, one of them, insults him at his own table. From the fact that earlier in the history the Assideans occupy a similar place to that occupied later by the Pharisees, it may be deduced that the two parties are in a measure one. See HASIDAEANS; ASMONEANS. It would seem that not only the Pharisees, but also the Essenes, were derived from the Assideans or chacidhim.

2. Authorities—Josephus—New Testament—Talmud:

In considering the characteristics and doctrines of the Pharisees we are in some difficulty from the nature of our authorities. The writers of the New Testament assume generally that the character and tenets of the Pharisees are well known to their readers, and only lay stress on the points in which they were in antagonism to our Lord and His followers. The evidence of Josephus, a contemporary and

himself a Pharisee, is lessened in value by the fact that he modified his accounts of his people to suit the taste of his Roman masters. The Pharisees, with him, are a philosophic sect, and not an active political party. Their Messianic hopes are not so much as mentioned. Although the Talmud was written, both Mishna and Gemara, by the descendants of the Pharisees, the fact that the Gemara, from which most of our information is derived, is so late renders the evidence deduced from Talmudic statements of little value. Even the Mishna, which came into being only a century after the fall of the Jewish state, shows traces of exaggeration and modification of facts. Still, taking these deficiencies into consideration, we may make a fairly consistent picture of the sect. The name means "separatists," from parash, "to separate"—those who carefully kept themselves from any legal contamination, distinguishing themselves by their care in such matters from the common people, the ‘am ha’arets, who had fewer scruples. Like the Puritans in England during the 17th century, and the Presbyterians in Scotland during the same period, the Pharisees, although primarily a religious party, became ere long energetically political. They were a closely organized society, all the members of which called each other chabherim, "neighbors"; this added to the power they had through their influence with the people.

I. History of the Sect.

The Assideans (chacidhim) were at first the most active supporters of Judas Maccabeus in his struggle for religious freedom. A portion of them rather than fight retired to the desert to escape the tyranny of Epiphanes (1 Macc 2:27 f). The followers of these in later days became the Essenes. When Judas Maccabeus cleansed the temple and rededicated it with many sacrifices, it is not expressly said, either in the Books of Maccabees or by Josephus, that he acted as high priest, but the probability is that he did so. This would be a shock to the Assidean purists, as Judas, though a priest, was not a Zadokite; but his actions would be tolerated at that time on account of the imminent necessity for the work of reconsecration and the eminent services of Judas himself and his family.

1. Associated at First with Hasmoneans, but Later Abandon Them:

When Bacchides appeared against Jerusalem with Alcimus in his camp, this feeling against Judas took shape in receiving the treacherous Alcimus into Jerusalem and acknowledging him as high priest, a line of action which soon showed that it was fraught with disaster, as Alcimus murdered many of the people. They had to betake themselves anew to Judas, but this desertion was the beginning of a separating gulf which deepened when he made a treaty with the idolatrous Romans. As is not infrequently the case with religious zealots, their valor was associated with a mystic fanaticism. The very idea of alliance with heathen powers was hateful to them, so when Judas began to treat with Rome they deserted him, and he sustained the crushing defeat of Eleasa. Believing themselves the saints of God and therefore His peculiar treasure, they regarded any association with the heathen as faithlessness to Yahweh. Their attitude was much that of the Fifth Monarchy men in the time of Cromwell, still more that of the Cameronians in Scotland at the Revolution of 1688 who, because William of Orange was not a "covenanted" king, would have none of him. As the later Hasmoneans became more involved in worldly politics, they became more and more alienated from the strict Assideans, yet the successors of Judas Maccabeus retained their connection with the party in a lukewarm fashion, while the Sadducean sect was gaining in influence.

About this time the change of name seems to have been effected. They began to be called Pharisees, perushim, instead of chacidhim—"separatists" instead of saints. A parallel instance is to be found in the religious history of England.

2. Change of Name:

The Puritans of the 17th century became in the 19th "Non-conformists." The earliest instance of the Pharisees' intervening in history is that referred to in Josephus (Ant., XIII, x, 5), where Eleazar, a Pharisee, demanded that John Hyrcanus should lay down the high-priesthood because his mother had been a captive, thus insinuating that he—Hyrcanus—was no true son of Aaron, but the bastard of some nameless heathen to whom his mother had surrendered herself. This unforgivable insult to himself and to the memory of his mother led Hyrcanus to break with the Pharisaic party definitely. He seems to have left them severely alone.

3. Later Fortunes of the Sect:

The sons of Hyrcanus, especially Alexander Janneus, expressed their hostility in a more active way. Alexander crucified as many as 800 of the Pharisaic party, a proceeding that seems to intimate overt acts of hostility on their part which prompted this action. His whole policy was the aggrandizement of the Jewish state, but his ambition was greater than his military abilities. His repeated failures and defeats confirmed the Pharisees in their opposition to him on religious grounds. He scandalized them by calling himself king, although not of the Davidic line, and further still by adopting the heathen name "Alexander," and having it stamped in Greek characters on his coins. Although a high priest was forbidden to marry a widow, he married the widow of his brother. Still further, he incurred their opposition by abandoning the Pharisaic tradition as to the way in which the libation water was poured out. They retaliated by rousing his people against him and conspiring with the Syrian king. On his deathbed he advised his wife, Alexandra Salome, who succeeded him on the throne, to make peace with the Pharisees. This she did by throwing herself entirely into their hands. On her death a struggle for the possession of the throne and the high-priesthood began between her two sons, John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II. The latter, the more able and energetic, had the support of the Sadducees; the former, the elder of the two brothers, had that of the Pharisees. In the first phase of the conflict, Hyrcanus was defeated and compelled to make a disadvantageous peace with his brother, but, urged by Antipater, the Idumean, he called in Aretas, who inclined the balance at once to the side of Hyrcanus. The Romans were appealed to and they also, moved partly by the astuteness of Antipater, favored Hyrcanus. All this resulted ultimately in the supremacy of the Herodians, who through their subservience to Rome became inimical to the Pharisees and rivals of the Sadducees.

4. In New Testament Times:

When the New Testament records open, the Pharisees, who have supreme influence among the people, are also strong, though not predominant, in the Sanhedrin. The Herodians and Sadducees, the one by

their alliance with the Ro authorities, and the other by their inherited skill in political intrigue, held the reins of government. If we might believe the Talmudic representation, the Pharisees were in the immense majority in the Sanhedrin; the nasi', or president, and the 'abh-beth-din, or vice-president, both were Pharisees. This, however, is to be put to the credit of Talmudic imagination, the relation of which to facts is of the most distant kind.

Recently Buchler (Das grosse Synedrion in Jerusalem) has attempted to harmonize these Talmudic fables with the aspect of things appearing in the New Testament and Josephus. He assumes that there were two Sanhedrins, one civil, having to do with matters of government, in which the Sadducees were overwhelmingly predominant, and the other scholastic, in which the Pharisees were equally predominant —the one the Senate of the nation, like the Senate of the United States, the other the Senate of a university, let us say, of Jerusalem. Although followed by Rabbi Lauterbach in the Jewish Encyclopedia, this attempt cannot be regarded as successful. There is no evidence for this dual Sanhedrin either in the New Testament or Josephus, on the one hand, or in the Talmud on the other.

Outside the Sanhedrin the Pharisees are ubiquitous, in Jerusalem, in Galilee, in Peraea and in the Decapolis, always coming in contact with Jesus. The attempts made by certain recent Jewish writers to exonerate them from the guilt of the condemnation of our Lord has no foundation; it is contradicted by the New Testament records, and the attitude of the Talmud to Jesus.

The Pharisees appear in the Book of Ac to be in a latent way favorers of the apostles as against the high-priestly party. The personal influence of Gamaliel, which seems commanding, was exercised in their favor. The anti-Christian zeal of Saul the Tarsian, though a Pharisee, may have been to some extent the result of the personal feelings which led him to perpetuate the relations of the earlier period when the two sects were united in common antagonism to the teaching of Christ. He, a Pharisee, offered himself to be employed by the Sadducean high priest (Ac 9:1,2) to carry on the work of persecution in Damascus. In this action Saul appears to have been in opposition to a large section of the Pharisaic party. The bitter disputes which he and the other younger Pharisees had carried on with Stephen had possibly influenced him.

5. In Post-apostolic Times:

When Paul, the Christian apostle, was brought before the Sanhedrin at Jerusalem, the Pharisaic party were numerous in the Council, if they did not even form the majority, and they readily became his defenders against the Sadducees.

From Josephus we learn that with the outbreak of the war with the Romans the Pharisees were thrust into the background by the more fanatical Zealots, Simon ben Gioras and John of Gischala (BJ, V, i). The truth behind the Talmudic statements that Gamaliel removed the Sanhedrin to Jabneh and that Johanan ben Zakkai successfully entreated Vespasian to spare the scholars of that city is that the Pharisees in considerable numbers made peace with the Romans. In the Mishna we have the evidence of their later labors when the Sanhedrin was removed from Jabneh, ultimately to Tiberias in Galilee. There

under the guidance of Jehuda ha-Qadhosh ("the Holy") the Mishna was reduced to writing. It may thus be said that Judaism became Pharisaism, and the history of the Jews became that of the Pharisees. In this later period the opposition to Christianity sprang up anew and became embittered, as may be seen in the Talmudic fables concerning Jesus.

II. Doctrines of the Pharisees.

1. Josephus' Statements Colored by Greek Ideas:

The account given of the doctrines of the Pharisees by Josephus is clearly influenced by his desire to parallel the Jewish sects with the Greek philosophical schools. He directs especial attention to the Pharisaic opinion as to fate and free will, since on this point the Stoic and Epicurean sects differed very emphatically. He regards the Pharisaic position as mid-way between that of the Sadducees, who denied fate altogether and made human freedom absolute, and that of the Essenes that "all things are left in the hand of God." He says "The Pharisees ascribe all things to fate and God, yet allow that to do what is right or the contrary is principally in man's own power, although fate cooperates in every action." It is to be noted that Josephus, in giving this statement of views, identifies "fate" with "God," a process that is more plausible in connection with the Latin fatum, "something decreed," than in relation to the impersonal moira, or heimarmene, of the Greeks. As Josephus wrote in Greek and used only the second of these terms, he had no philological inducement to make the identification; the reason must have been the matter of fact. In other words, he shows that the Pharisees believed in a personal God whose will was providence.

2. Conditional Reincarnation:

In connection with this was their doctrine of a future life of rewards and punishments. The phrase which Josephus uses is a peculiar one: "They think that every soul is immortal; only the souls of good men will pass into another body, but the souls of the evil shall suffer everlasting punishment" (aidia timoria kolazesthai). From this it has been deduced that the Pharisees held the transmigration of souls. In our opinion this is a mistake. We believe that really it is an attempt of Josephus to state the doctrine of the resurrection of the body in a way that would not shock Hellenic ideas. The Greek contempt for the body made the idea of the resurrection abhorrent, and in this, as in most philosophical matters, the Romans followed the Greeks. It would seem that Josephus regarded the Pharisees as maintaining that this resurrection applied only to the righteous. Still even this restriction, though certainly the natural interpretation, is not absolutely necessary. This is confirmed by the corresponding section in the Antiquities (XVIII, i, 3): "They also believe .... that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life, and the latter are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the former shall have power to revive and live again." Josephus also declares the Pharisees to be very attentive students of the law of God: "they interpret the law with careful exactitude."

3. New Testament Presentation of Pharisaic Doctrines—Angels and Spirits—Resurrection:

Nothing in the Gospels or the Ac at all militates against any part of this representation, but there is much to fill it out. They believed in angels and spirits (Ac 23:8). From the connection it is probable that the present activity of such beings was the question in the mind of the writer. In that same sentence belief in the resurrection is ascribed to the Pharisees.

4. Traditions Added to the Law:

Another point is that to the bare letter of the Law they added traditions. While the existence of these traditions is referred to in Gospels, too little is said to enable us to grasp their nature and extent (Mt 15:2 ff; 16:5 ff; Mr 7:1-23). The evangelists only recorded these traditional glosses when they conflicted with the teaching of Christ and were therefore denounced by Him. We find them exemplified in the Mishna. The Pharisaic theory of tradition was that these additions to the written law and interpretations of it had been given by Moses to the elders and by them had been transmitted orally down through the ages. The classical passage in the Mishna is to be found in Pirqe' Abhoth: "Moses received the (oral) Law from Sinai and delivered it to Joshua and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the prophets and the prophets to the men of the great synagogue." Additions to these traditions were made by prophets by direct inspiration, or by interpretation of the words of the written Law. All this mass, as related above, was reduced to writing by Jehuda ha-Qadhosh in Tiberias, probably about the end of the 2nd century AD. Jehuda was born, it is said, 135 AD, and died somewhere about 220 AD.

The related doctrines of the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and the final judgment with its consequent eternal rewards and punishments formed a portion and a valuable portion of this tradition.

5. Traditional Interpretations of the Law by Pharisees (Sabbath, etc.):

Less valuable, at times burdensome and hurtful, were the minute refinements they introduced into the Law. Sometimes the ingenuity of the Pharisaic doctors was directed to lighten the burden of the precept as in regard to the Sabbath. Thus a person was permitted to go much farther than a Sabbath day's journey if at some time previous he had deposited, within the legal Sabbath day's journey of the place he wished to reach, bread and water; this point was now to be regarded as the limit of his house, and consequently from this all distances were to be ceremonially reckoned (Jewish Encyclopedia, under the word "Erub"): The great defect of Pharisaism was that it made sin so purely external. An act was right or wrong according as some external condition was present or absent; thus there was a difference in bestowing alms on the Sabbath whether the beggar put his hand within the door of the donor or the donor stretched his hand beyond his own threshold, as may be seen in the first Mishna in the Tractate Shabbath. A man did not break the Sabbath rest of his ass, though he rode on it, and hence did not break the Sabbath law, but if he carried a switch with which to expedite the pace of the beast he was guilty, because he had laid a burden upon it.

6. Close Students of the Text of Scripture:

Along with these traditions and traditional interpretations, the Pharisees were close students of the sacred text. On the turn of a sentence they suspended many decisions. So much so, that it is said of them later the Text of that they suspended mountains from hairs. This is especially the case with regard to the Sabbath law with its burdensome minutiae. At the same time there was care as to the actual wording of the text of the Law; this has a bearing on textual criticism, even to the present day. A specimen of Pharisaic exegesis which Paul turns against their followers as an argumentum ad hominem may be seen in Ga 3:16: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

(1) Messianic Hopes.

It is also to be said for them, that they maintained the Messianic hopes of the nation when their rivals were ready to sacrifice everything to the Romans, in order to gain greater political influence for themselves. Their imagination ran riot in the pictures they drew of these future times, but still they aided the faith of the people who were thus in a position to listen to the claims of Christ. They were led by Rabbi Aqiba in the reign of Hadrian to accept Bar-Cochba about a century after they had rejected Jesus. They were fanatical in their obedience to the Law as they understood it, and died under untold tortures rather than transgress.

(2) Almsgiving.

They elevated almsgiving into an equivalent for righteousness. This gave poverty a very different place from what it had in Greece or among the Romans. Learning was honored, although its possessors might be very poor. The story of the early life of Hillel brings this out. He is represented as being so poor as to be unable sometimes to pay the small daily fee which admitted pupils to the rabbinic school, and when this happened, in his eagerness for the Law, he is reported to have listened on the roof to the words of the teachers. This is probably not historically true, but it exhibits the Pharisaic ideal.

III. Organization of the Pharisaic Party.

We have no distinct account of this organization, either in the Gospels, in Josephus, or in the Talmud. But the close relationship which the members of the sect sustained to each other, their habit of united action as exhibited in the narratives of the New Testament and of Josephus are thus most naturally explained. The Talmudic account of the chabherim affords confirmation of this. These were persons who primarily associated for the study of the Law and for the better observance of its precepts. No one was admitted to these chabhuroth without taking an oath of fidelity to the society and a promise of strict observance of Levitical precepts.

The Chabherim—Pharisaic Brotherhoods:

One of the elements of their promise has to be noted. The chabher promised not to pay ma‘asroth, "tithe," or terumah, "heave offering," to a priest who was not a chabher. They were only permitted to take this oath when their associates in the brotherhood certified to their character. Even then the

candidate had to pass through a period of probation of 30 days, according to the "house of Hillel," of a year, according to the "house of Shammai." This latter element, being quite more Talmudico, may be regarded as doubtful. Association with any not belonging to the Pharisaic society was put under numerous restrictions. It is at least not improbable that when the lawyer in Lu 10:29 demanded "Who is my neighbor?" he was minded to restrict the instances of the command in Le 19:18 to those who were, like himself, Pharisees. A society which thus had brotherhoods all over Palestine and was separated from the rest of the community would naturally wield formidable power when their claims were supported by the esteem of the people at large. It is to be observed that to be a chabher was a purely personal thing, not heritable like priesthood, and women as well as men might be members. In this the Pharisees were like the Christians. In another matter also there was a resemblance between them and the followers of Jesus; they, unlike the Sadducees, were eager to make proselytes. "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte" (Mt 23:15). Many members of Roman society, especially women, were proselytes, as, for instance, Poppea Sabina.

IV. Character of the Pharisees.

1. Pharisees and People of the Land:

Because the ideal of the Pharisees was high, and because they reverenced learning and character above wealth and civil rank they had a tendency to despise those who did not agree with them. We see traces of this in the Gospels; thus Joh 7:49: "This multitude that knoweth not the law are accursed." The distinction between the Pharisees, the Puritans and the ‘am ha-’arets, "the people of the land," began with the distinction that had to be kept between the Jews and the Gentiles who had entered the land as colonists or intruders. These would, during the Babylonian captivity, almost certainly speak Western Aramaic, and would certainly be heathen and indulge in heathen practices. They were "the people of the land" whom the returning exiles found in possession of Judea.

2. Arrogance toward Other Jews:

Mingled with them were the few Jews that had neither been killed nor deported by the Babylonians, nor carried down into Egypt by Johanan, the son of Kareah. As they had conformed in a large measure to the habits of their heathen neighbors and intermarried with them, the stricter Jews, as Ezra and Nehemiah, regarded them as under the same condemnation as the heathen, and shrank from association with them. During the time of our Lord’s life on earth the name was practically restricted to the ignorant Jews whose conformity to the law was on a broader scale than that of the Pharisees. Some have, however, dated the invention of the name later in the days of the Maccabean struggle, when the ceremonial precepts of the Law could with difficulty be observed. Those who were less careful of these were regarded as ‘am ha-’arets.

3. Regulations for the Chabher:

The distinction as exhibited in the Talmud shows an arrogance on the part of the Pharisaic chabher that

must have been galling to those who, though Jews as much as the Pharisees, were not Puritans like them. A chabher, that is a Pharisee, might not eat at the table of a man whose wife was of the ‘am ha-’arets, even though her husband might be a Pharisee. If he would be a full chabher, a Pharisee must not sell to any of the ‘am ha-’arets anything that might readily be made unclean. If a woman of the ‘am ha-’arets was left alone in a room, all that she could touch without moving from her place was unclean. We must, however, bear in mind that the evidence for this is Talmudic, and therefore of but limited historical value.

4. The New Testament Account;

(1) Their Scrupulosity.

We find traces of this scrupulosity in the Gospels. The special way in which the ceremonial sanctity of the Pharisees exhibited itself was in tithing, hence the reference to their tithing "mint and anise and cummin" (Mt 23:23). In the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, one of the things that the Pharisee plumes himself on is that he gives tithes of all he possesses (Lu 18:12). He is an example of the Pharisaic arrogance of those "who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and set all others at nought." Their claiming the first seats in feasts and synagogues (Mt 23:6) was an evidence of the same spirit.

(2) Their Hypocrisy.

Closely akin to this is the hypocrisy of which the Pharisees were accused by our Lord. When we call them "hypocrites," we must go back to the primary meaning of the word. They were essentially "actors," poseurs. Good men, whose character and spiritual force have impressed themselves on their generation, have often peculiarities of manner and tone which are easily imitated. The very respect in which they are held by their disciples leads those who respect them to adopt unconsciously their mannerisms of voice and deportment. A later generation unconsciously imitates, "acts the part." In a time when religion is persecuted, as in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, or despised as it was in the Hellenizing times which preceded and succeeded, it would be the duty of religious men not to hide their convictions. The tendency to carry on this public manifestation of religious acts after it had ceased to be protest would be necessarily great. The fact that they gained credit by praying at street corners when the hour of prayer came, and would have lost credit with the people had they not done so, was not recognized by them as lessening the moral worth of the action. Those who, having lived in the period of persecution and contempt, survived in that when religion was held in respect would maintain their earlier practice without any arriere-pensee. The succeeding generation, in continuing the practice, consciously "acted." They were poseurs. Their hypocrisy was none the less real that it was reached by unconscious stages. Hypocrisy was a new sin, a sin only possible in a spiritual religion, a religion in which morality and worship were closely related. Heathenism, which lay in sacrifices and ceremonies by which the gods could be bribed, or cajoled into favors, had a purely casual connection with morality; its worship was entirely a thing of externals, of acting, "posing." Consequently, a man did not by the most careful attention to the ceremonies of religion produce any presumption in favor of his trustworthiness. There

was thus no sinister motive to prompt to religion. The prophets had denounced the insincerity of worship, but even they did not denounce hypocrisy, i.e. religion used as a cloak to hide treachery or dishonesty. Religion had become more spiritual, the connection between morality and worship more intimate by reason of the persecution of the Seleucids.

5. Talmudic Classification of the Pharisees:

The Talmud to some extent confirms the representation of the Gospels. There were said to be seven classes of Pharisees:

(1) the "shoulder" Pharisee, who wears his good deeds on his shoulders and obeys the precept of the Law, not from principle, but from expediency;

(2) the "wait-a-little" Pharisee, who begs for time in order to perform a meritorious action;

(3) the "bleeding" Pharisee, who in his eagerness to avoid looking on a woman shuts his eyes and so bruises himself to bleeding by stumbling against a wall; (4) the "painted" Pharisee, who advertises his holiness lest any one should touch him so that he should be defiled;

(5) the "reckoning" Pharisee, who is always saying "What duty must I do to balance any unpalatable duty which I have neglected?";

(6) the "fearing" Pharisee, whose relation to God is one merely of trembling awe;

(7) the Pharisee from "love." In all but the last there was an element of "acting," of hypocrisy. It is to be noted that the Talmud denounces ostentation; but unconsciously that root of the error lies in the externality of their righteousness; it commands an avoidance of ostentation which involves equal "posing."

V. Our Lord’s Relationship to the Pharisees.

1. Pharisaic Attempts to Gain Christ Over:

The attitude of the Pharisees to Jesus, to begin with, was, as had been their attitude to John, critical. They sent representatives to watch His doings and His sayings and report. They seem to have regarded it as possible that He might unite Himself with them, although, as we think, His affinities rather lay with the Essenes. Gradually their criticism became opposition. This opposition grew in intensity as He disregarded their interpretations of the Sabbatic law, ridiculed their refinements of the law of tithes and the distinctions they introduced into the validity of oaths, and denounced their insincere posing. At first there seems to have been an effort to cajole Him into compliance with their plans. If some of the Pharisees tempted Him to use language which would compromise Him with the people or with the Ro authorities, others invited Him to their tables, which was going far upon the part of a Pharisee toward

one not a chabher. Even when He hung on the cross, the taunt with which they greeted Him may have had something of longing, lingering hope in it: "If he be the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him" (Mt 27:42 King James Version). If He would only give them that sign, then they would acknowledge Him to be the Messiah.

2. Reasons for Pharisaic Hatred of Christ:

The opposition of the Pharisees to Jesus was intensified by another reason. They were the democratic party; their whole power lay in the reputation they had with the people for piety. our Lord denounced them as hypocrites; moreover He had secured a deeper popularity than theirs. At length when cajolery failed to win Him and astute questioning failed to destroy His popularity, they combined with their opponents, the Sadducees, against Him as against a common enemy.

3. Our Lord’s Denunciation of the Pharisees:

On the other hand, Jesus denounced the Pharisees more than He denounced any other class of the people. This seems strange when we remember that the main body of the religious people, those who looked for the Messiah, belonged to the Pharisees, and His teaching and theirs had a strong external resemblance. It was this external resemblance, united as it was with a profound spiritual difference, which made it incumbent on Jesus to mark Himself off from them. All righteousness with them was external, it lay in meats and drinks and divers washings, in tithing of mint, anise and cummin. He placed religion on a different footing, removed it into another region. With Him it was the heart that must be right with God, not merely the external actions; not only the outside of the cup and platter was to be cleansed, but the inside first of all. It is to be noted that, as observed above, the Pharisees were less antagonistic to the apostles when their Lord had left them. The after-history of Pharisaism has justified Our Lord’s condemnation.

LITERATURE.

Histories of Israel:

Ewald, V, 365 ff, English translation; Herzfeld, III, 354 ff; Jost, I, 197 ff; Gratz, V, 91 ff; Derenbourg, 75-78, 117-44, 452-54; Holtzmann, II, 124 ff; Renan, V, 42 ff; Stanley, III, 376 ff; Cornill, 145 ff, English translation; Schurer, II, ii, 4 ff, English translation (GJV4, II. 447 ff); Kuenen, III, 233 ff. ET.

Life and Times of Christ:

Hausrath, I, 135 ff, English translation; Edersheim, I, 310 ff; Lange, I, 302 ff, English translation; Farrar, II. 494 ff; Geikie, II, 223. ff; Keim, I, 250 ff; Thomson. Books Which Influenced our Lord, 50 ff; Weiss. I, 285 ff. English translation; de Pressense, 116 ff.

Articles in Encyclopedias, Bible Dictionaries, Lexicons, etc.:

Ersch and Gruber, Allg. Eric (Daniel); Winer, Realworterbuch; Herzog, RE, edition 1 (Reuss), editions 2, 3 (Sieffert); Hamburger, Realenic.; Smith's DB (Twisleton); Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Lit. (Ginsburg); HDB (Eaton); Encyclopedia Biblica (Cowley. Prince); Schenkel, Bibel-Lexicon (Hausrath); Jew Encyclopedia (Kohler); Temple Dict. of the Bible (Christie); Hastings, DCG (Hugh Scott, Mitchell).

Monographs:

Wellhausen, Montet, Geiger, Baneth, Muller, Hanne, Davaine, Herford; Weber, System der altsynagogen Palestinischen Theologie, 10 ff, 44 ff; Keil, Biblical Archaeology, II, 1680; Ryle and James, Psalms of Solomon. xliv ff; Nicolas. Doctrines religieuses des juifs, 48 ff.

J. E. H. Thomson

PHAROSH

fa'-rosh (par'osh).

See PAROSH.

PHARPAR

far'-par (parpar; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Apharpha; Codex Alexandrinus Pharphara): A river of Damascus, mentioned in 2Ki 5:12, along with the Abana or Amana.e and James, Psalms of Solomon. xliv ff; Nicolas. Doctrines religieuses des juifs, 48 ff. See ABANAH.

PHARZITES

far'-zits (ha-partsi).parpar; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Apharpha; Codex Alexandrinus Pharphara): A river of Damascus, mentioned in 2Ki 5:12, along with the Abana or Amana.e and James, Psalms of Solomon. xliv ff; Nicolas. Doctrines religieuses des juifs, 48 ff.

See PEREZ.

PHASEAH, PASEAH fa-se'-a, pa-se'-a (paceach, "lame"):

(1) A descendant of Judah, son of Eshton (1Ch 4:12).

(2) Name of a family of Nethinim (Ezr 2:49; Ne 7:51 (King James Version "Phaseah"); "Phinoe" of 1 Esdras 5:31 Revised Version).

(3) Father of Joiada (King James Version "Jehoiada"), the repairer of the "old gate" in Jerusalem (Ne 3:6).

PHASELIS

fa-se’-lis (Phaselis): A city of Lycia in Southern Asia Minor, on the seacoast, near the boundary of Pamphylia, to which country some ancient writers have assigned it. Situated on the extreme end of a promontory which projected into the sea, and with high mountains in the rear, it was separated both politically and geographically from the rest of Lycia. Hence it may be understood how it early became the favorite haunt of pirates. Already in the 6th century BC, when trade was carried on with Egypt, the city struck coins of its own; upon them the prow and the stern of a war galley were commonly represented. The coinage ceased in 466 BC, but it was resumed about 400 BC, when the city again became practically independent. For a time Phaselis was under the control of the Seleucid kings of Syria, but in 190 BC it again regained its independence or continued as a member of the league of Lycian cities (1 Macc 15:23). Before the beginning of the Christian era it had lost considerable of its earlier importance, yet it was still famed for its temple of Athene in which it was said that the sword of Achilles was preserved, and also for the attar of roses which was produced there. It figures little in early Christian history, yet in Byzantine times it was the residence of a bishop. Its site, now marked by the ruins of the stadium, temples and theater, bears the Turkish name of Tekir Ova.

See also LYCIA.

E. J. Banks

PHASIRON

fas’-i-ron (Codex Alexandrinus Phasiron; Codex Vaticanus Phaseiron, V, [@Pharison): The name of an unknown Arab tribe whom Jonathan overcame in the wilderness near Bethbasi; or possibly the name of an Arab chief (1 Macc 9:66).

PHASSARON

fas’-a-ron: King James Version = Revised Version PHASSURUS (which see).

PHASSURUS

fas-su’-rus, fas’-u-rus (Phassouros; Codex Vaticanus Phassoros King James Version Phassaron, after Aldine): The name of one of the families which went up from exile with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:25)=" Pashhur" of Ezr 2:38; Ne 7:41; according to Ezra and Nehemiah and Revised Version numbering, 1,247; according to King James Version following A, 1,047.

PHEBE

febe (Phoibe).

See PHOEBE.

PHENICE

fe-ni’-se.

See PHOENICIA; PHOENIX.

PHENICIA

fe-nish’-i-a (Phoinike).

See PHOENICIA.

PHERESITES

fer’-e-sits: King James Version= Revised Version "Pherezites" (1 Esdras 8:69; 2 Esdras 1:21) =" Perizzite."

PHEREZITE

fer’-e-zit: King James Version form in Judith 5:16 for Revised Version "Perizzite" and both King James Version and Revised Version in 2 Esdras 1:21 for "Perizzite"; one of the Canaanitish tribes.

PHI-BESETH

fi’-be-seth, fib’-e-seth (pi-bheceth).

See PI-BESETH.

PHICOL

fi’-kol (pikhol, Phikol; King James Version Phichol): The captain of the host of the Philistine king Abimelech of Gerar (Ge 21:22; 26:26).

PHILADELPHIA

fil-a-del-’fi-a (Philadelphia: A city of ancient Lydia in Asia Minor on the Cogamus River, 105 miles from Smyrna. It stood upon a terrace 650 ft. above the sea. Behind it are the volcanic cliffs to which the Turks have given the name of Devitt, or "inkwells"; on the other side of the city the land is exceedingly fertile, and there was produced a wine of whose excellence the celebrated Roman poet Virgil wrote. Philadelphia is not so ancient as many of the other cities of Asia Minor, for it was founded after 189 BC on one of the highways which led to the interior. Its name was given to it in honor of Attalus II, because of his loyalty to his elder brother, Eumenes II, king of Lydia. Still another name of the city was Decapolis, because it was considered as one of the ten cities of the plain. A third name which it bore during the 1st century. AD was Neo-kaisaria; it appears upon the coins struck during that period. During the reign of Vespasian, it was called Flavia. Its modern name, Ala-shehir, is considered by some to be a corruption of the Turkish words Allah-shehir, "the city of God," but more likely it is a name given it from the reddish color of the soil. In addition to all of these names it sometimes bore the title of "Little Athens" because of the magnificence of the temples and other public buildings which adorned it. Philadelphia quickly became an important and wealthy trade center, for as the coast cities declined, it grew in power, and retained its importance even until late Byzantine times. One of the Seven Churches of the Book of Revelation (Re 3:7) was there, and it was the seat of a bishop. As in most Asia Minor cities, many Jews lived there, and they possessed a synagogue. During the reign of Tiberius the city was destroyed by an earthquake, yet it was quickly rebuilt. Frederick Barbarossa entered it while on his crusade in 1190. Twice, in 1306 and 1324, it was besieged by the Seljuk Turks, but it retained its independence until after 1390, when it was captured by the combined forces of the Turks and Byzantines. In 1403 Tamerlane captured it, and, it is said, built about it a wall of the corpses of his victims.

Ala-shehir is still a Christian town; one-fourth of its modern population is Greek, and a Greek bishop still makes his home there. One of the chief modern industries is a liquorice factory; in the fields about the city the natives dig for the roots. On the terrace upon which the ancient city stood, the ruins of the castle and the walls may still be seen, and among them is pointed out the foundation of the early church. The place may now best be reached by rail from Smyrna.

E. J. Banks

PHILARCHES

fi-lar’-kez.

See PHYLARCHES.

PHILEMON

fi-le’-mon, fi-le’-mun (Philemon): Among the converts of Paul, perhaps while at Ephesus, was one whom he calls a "fellow-worker," Philemon (Phm 1:1). He was probably a man of some means, was

celebrated for his hospitality (Phm 1:5-7) and of considerable importance in the ecclesia at Colosse. It was at his house (Phm 1:2) that the Colossian Christians met as a center. It is more than probable that this was a group of the Colossian church rather than the entire ekklesia. His wife was named Apphia (Phm 1:2); and Archippus (Phm 1:2) was no doubt his son. From Col 4:17 we learn that Archippus held an office of some importance in Colosse, whether he was a presbyter (Abbott, ICC), or an evangelist, or perhaps the reader (Zahn), we cannot tell. He is called here (Phm 1:2) Paul's "fellow-soldier."

The relation between the apostle and Philemon was so close and intimate that Paul does not hesitate to press him, on the basis of it, to forgive his slave, Onesimus, for stealing and for running away.

See PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO.

Tradition makes Philemon the bishop of Colosse (Apostolical Constitutions, vii, 46), and the Greek Martyrology (Menae) for November 22 tells us that he together with his wife and son and Onesimus were martyred by stoning before Androcles, the governor, in the days of Nero. With this the Latin Martyrology agrees (compare Lightfoot, Ignatius, II, 535). This evidence, however, is unsatisfactory and cannot be trusted as giving unquestionable facts as to Philemon. The only sure information is that in the epistle bearing his name.

Charles Smith Lewis

PHILEMON, EPISTLE TO

This most beautiful of all Paul's Epistles, and the most intensely human, is one of the so-called Captivity Epistles of which Ephesians, Colossians, and Philippians are the others. Of these four PHILIPPIANS (which see) stands apart, and was written more probably after the other three. These are mutually interdependent, sent by the same bearer to churches of the same district, and under similar conditions.

1. Place of Writing:

There is some diversity of opinion as to the place from which the apostle wrote these letters. Certain scholars (Reuss, Schenkel, Weiss, Holtzmann, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath and Meyer) have urged Caesarea in opposition to the traditional place, Rome. The arguments advanced are first that Onesimus would have been more likely to have escaped to Caesarea than to Rome, as it is nearer Colosse than Rome is, to which we may reply that, though Caesarea is nearer, his chance of escape would have been far greater in the capital than in the provincial city. Again it is said that as Onesimus is not commended in Ephesians, he had already been left behind at Colosse; against which there are advanced the precarious value of an argument from silence, and the fact that this argument assumes a particular course which the bearers of the letters would follow, namely, through Colosse to Ephesus. A more forcible argument is that which is based on the apostle's expected visit. In Php 2:24 we read that he expected to go to Macedonia on his release; in Phm 1:22 we find that he expected to go to Colosse. On the basis of this latter reference it is assumed that he was to the south of Colosse when writing and so at Caesarea. But it is quite as probable

that he would go to Colosse through Philippi as the reverse; and it is quite possible that even if he had intended to go direct to Colosse when he wrote to Philemon, events may have come about to cause him to change his plans. The last argument, based on the omission of any reference to the earthquake of which Tacitus (Ann. xiv.27) and Eusebius (Chron., O1, 207) write, is of force as opposed to the Ro origin of the letters only on the assumption that these writers both refer to the same event (by no means sure) and that the epistles. were written after that event, and that it was necessary that Paul should have mentioned it. If the early chronology be accepted it falls entirely, as Tacitus' earlier date would be after the epistles. were written. In addition we have the further facts, favorable to Rome, that Paul had no such freedom in Cuesarea as he is represented in these epistles as enjoying; that no mention is made of Philip who was in Caesarea and a most important member of that community (Ac 21:8), and finally that there is no probability that so large a body of disciples and companions could have gathered about the apostle in his earlier and more strict imprisonment, at Caesarea. We may therefore conclude that the Captivity Epistles were written from Rome, and not from Caesarea.

2. Authenticity:

The external evidence for the epistle is less extensive than that of some of the other epp., but it is abundantly strong. The play on the word Onesimus which Paul himself uses (Phm 1:11) is found in Ignatius, Ephesians, ii. This may not mean necessarily a literary connection, but it suggests this. The epistle is known to Tertullian, and through him we know that Marcion accepted it (Adv. Marc., v.21). It is in the list in the Muratorian Fragment (p. 106, l. 27), and is quoted by Origen as Pauline (Hom. in Jer., 19) and placed by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, xxv) among the acknowledged books.

It has twice been the object of attack. In the 4th and 5th centuries it was opposed as unworthy of Paul's mind and as of no value for edification. This attack was met successfully by Jerome (Commentary on Philemon, praef.), Chrysostom (Argum. in Philem) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (Spicil. in Solesm, I, 149), and the epistle. was finally established in its earlier firm position. The later attack by Baur was inspired by his desire to break down the corroborative value of Phm to the other Captivity Epistles, and has been characterized by Weiss as one of Baur's worst blunders. The suggestions that it is interpolated (Holtzmann), or allegorical (Weizsacker and Pfleiderer), or based on the letter of Pliny (Ep. IX, 21) to Sabinianus (Steck), are interesting examples of the vagaries of their authors, but "deserve only to be mentioned" (Zahn). In its language, style and argument the letter is clearly Pauline.

3. Date:

The date will, as is the case with the other Captivity Epistles, depend on the chronology. If the earlier scheme be followed it may be dated about 58, if the later about 63, or 64.

4. Argument:

The apostle writes in his own and Timothy's name to his friend PHILEMON (which see) in behalf of Onesimus, a runaway slave of the latter. Beginning with his usual thanksgiving, here awakened by the

report of Philemon’s hospitality, he intercedes for his ‘son begotten in his bonds’ (Phm 1:10), Onesimus, who though he is Philemon’s runaway slave is now "a brother." It is on this ground that the apostle pleads, urging his own age, and friendship for Philemon, and his present bonds. He pleads, however, without belittling Onesimus’ wrongdoing, but assuming himself the financial responsibility for the amount of his theft. At the same time the apostle quietly refers to what Philemon really owes him as his father in Christ, and begs that he will not disappoint him in his expectation. He closes with the suggestion that he hopes soon to visit him, and with greetings from his companions in Rome.

5. Value:

The charm and beauty of this epistle have been universally recognized. Its value to us as giving a glimpse of Paul’s attitude toward slavery and his intimacy with a man like Philemon cannot be over-estimated. One of the chief elements of value in it is the picture it gives us of a Christian home in the apostolic days; the father and mother well known for their hospitality, the son a man of position and importance in the church, the coming and going of the Christian brethren, and the life of the brotherhood centering about this household.

LITERATURE.

Lightfoot, Col and Philem; Vincent, "Phil" and "Philem" (ICC); yon Soden, Hand Commentar; Alexander, in Speaker’s Commentary.

Charles Smith Lewis

PHILETUS

fi-le’-tus (Philetos (2Ti 2:17)):

1. The Nature of His Error:

This person is mentioned by Paul, who warns Timothy against him as well as against his associate in error, Hymeneus. The apostle speaks of Hymeneus and Philetus as instances of men who were doing most serious injury to the church by their teaching, and by what that teaching resulted in, both in faith and morals. The specific error of these men was that they denied that there would be any bodily resurrection. They treated all Scriptural references to such a state, as figurative or metaphorical. They spiritualized it absolutely, and held that the resurrection was a thing of the past. No resurrection was possible, so they taught, except from ignorance to knowledge, from sin to righteousness. There would be no day when the dead would hear the voice of Christ and come forth out of the grave. The Christian, knowing that Christ was raised from the dead, looked forward to the day when his body should be raised in the likeness of Christ’s resurrection. But this faith was utterly denied by the teaching of Hymeneus and Philetus.

2. How It Overthrew Faith:

This teaching of theirs, Paul tells us, had overthrown the faith of some. It would also overthrow Christian faith altogether, for if the dead are not raised, neither is Christ risen from the dead, and "ye are yet in your sins" (1Co 15:17).

The denial of the resurrection of the body, whether of mankind generally or of Christ, is the overthrow of the faith. It leaves nothing to cling to, no living Christ, who saves and leads and comforts His people. The apostle proceeds to say that teaching of this kind "eats as doth a gangrene," and that it increases unto more ungodliness. As a canker or gangrene eats away the flesh, so does such teaching eat away Christian faith. Paul is careful to say, more than once, that the teaching which denies that there will be a resurrection of the dead leads inevitably to "ungodliness" and to "iniquity."

See HYMENAEUS.

John Rutherfurd

PHILIP (1)

fil’-ip (Philippos, "lover of horses"):

(1) The father of Alexander the Great (1 Macc 1:1; 6:2), king of Macedonia in 359-336 BC. His influence for Greece and for mankind in general lay in hastening the decadence of the Greek city-state and in the preparations he left to Alexander for the diffusion throughout the world of the varied phases of Greek intellectual life.

(2) A Phrygian left by Antiochus Epiphanes as governor at Jerusalem (circa 170 BC) and described in 2 Macc 5:22 as "more barbarous" than Antiochus himself, burning fugitive Jews who had assembled in caves near by "to keep the sabbath day secretly" (2 Macc 6:11) and taking special measures to check the opposition of Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 8:8). There is some ground for identifying him with—

(3) A friend or foster-brother of Antiochus (2 Macc 9:29), appointed by Antiochus on his deathbed as regent. Lysias already held the office of regent, having brought up the son of Antiochus from his youth, and on the death of his father set him up as king under the name of Eupator. The accounts of the rivalries of the regents and of the fate of Philip as recorded in 1 Macc 6:56; 2 Macc 9:29; Josephus, Ant, XII, ix, 7, are not easily reconciled.

(4) Philip V, king of Macedonia in 220-179 BC. He is mentioned in 1 Macc 8:5 as an example of the great power of the Romans with whom Judas Maccabeus made a league on conditions described (op. cit.). The conflict of Philip with the Romans coincided in time with that of Hannibal, after whose defeat at Zama the Romans were able to give undivided attention to the affairs of Macedonia. Philip was defeated by the Romans under Flaminius, at Cynoscephalae (197 BC), and compelled to accept the

terms of the conquerors. He died in 179, and was succeeded by his son Perseus, last king of Macedonia, who lost his crown in his contest with the Romans.

See PERSEUS.

J. Hutchison

PHILIP (2)

(Philippos):

1. New Testament References:

One of the Twelve Apostles. Philip belonged to Bethsaida of Galilee (Joh 1:44; 12:21). Along with Andrew and other fellow-townsmen, he had journeyed to Bethany to hear the teaching of John the Baptist, and there he received his first call from Christ, "Follow me" (Joh 1:43). Like Andrew, Philip immediately won a fresh follower, Nathanael, for Jesus (Joh 1:45). It is probable that he was present at most of the events recorded of Jesus' return journey from Bethany to Galilee, and that the information relating to these was supplied to John by him and Andrew (compare ANDREW). His final ordination to the Twelve is recorded in Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:14; Ac 1:13. At the feeding of the 5,000, Philip was asked the question by Jesus, "Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?" (Joh 6:5-7). He was appealed to by the Greeks when they desired to interview Jesus at the Passover (Joh 12:20-33). During the address of Jesus to His disciples after the Last Supper, Philip made the request, "Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us" (Joh 14:8).

2. Apocryphal References:

According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles," Philip was of the house of Zebulun (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50). Clement of Alexandria (Strom., iii.4, 25, and iv.9, 73) gives the tradition identifying him with the unknown disciple who asked permission to go and bury his father ere he followed Jesus (compare Mt 8:21; Lu 9:59), and says that he died a natural death. Owing to confusion with Philip the evangelist, there is much obscurity in the accounts of Apocrypha literature concerning the earlier missionary activities of Philip the apostle. The "Ac of Philip" tell of a religious controversy between the apostle and a Judean high priest before the philosophers of Athens. Later Latin documents mention Gaul (Galatia) as his field. As to his sending Joseph of Arimathea thence to Britain, see JOSEPH OF ARIMATHAEA. The evidence seems conclusive that the latter part of his life was spent in Phrygia. This is supported by Polycrates (bishop of Ephesus in the 2nd century), who states that he died at Hierapolis, by Theodoret, and by the parts of the Contendings of the Apostles dealing with Philip. Thus, according to "The Preaching of Philip and Peter" (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 146), Phrygia was assigned to Philip as a mission field by the risen Christ when He appeared to the disciples on the Mount of Olives, and "The Martyrdom of Philip in Phrygia" (Budge, II, 156) tells of his preaching, miracles and crucifixion there.

Philip was regarded in early times as the author of "The Gospel of Philip," a Gnostic work of the 2nd century, part of which was preserved by Epiphanius (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 40, 41).

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

3. Character:

As with Andrew, Philip's Greek name implies he had Greek connections, and this is strengthened by the fact that he acted as the spokesman of the Greeks at the Passover. Of a weaker mold than Andrew, he was yet the one to whom the Greeks would first appeal; he himself possessed an inquirer's spirit and could therefore sympathize with their doubts and difficulties. The practical, strong-minded Andrew was naturally the man to win the impetuous, swift-thinking Peter; but the slower Philip, versed in the Scriptures (compare Joh 1:45), appealed more to the critical Nathanael and the cultured Greeks. Cautious and deliberate himself, and desirous of submitting all truth to the test of sensuous experience (compare Joh 14:8), he concluded the same criterion would be acceptable to Nathanael also (compare Joh 1:46). It was the presence of this materialistic trend of mind in Philip that induced Jesus, in order to awaken in His disciple a larger and more spiritual faith, to put the question in Joh 6:6, seeking "to prove him." This innate diffidence which affected Philip's religious beliefs found expression in his outer life and conduct also. It was not merely modesty, but also a certain lack of self-reliance, that made him turn to Andrew for advice when the Greeks wished to see Jesus. The story of his later life is, however, sufficient to show that he overcame those initial defects in his character, and fulfilled nobly the charge that his risen Lord laid upon him (compare Mt 28:16-20).

C. M. Kerr

PHILIP (3)

("tetrarch," Lu 3:1).

See HEROD.

PHILIP, THE EVANGELIST

One of "the seven" chosen to have the oversight of "the daily ministration" of the poor of the Christian community in Jerusalem (Ac 6:5). Whether Philip, bearing a Greek name, was a Hellenist, is not known, but his missionary work reveals to us one free from the religious prejudices of the strict Hebrew.

The martyrdom of Stephen was the beginning of a systematic persecution of the church in Jerusalem, and all except the apostles were scattered over Judea and Samaria (Ac 8:1), and even as far as Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch (Ac 11:19). Thus, the influence of the new teaching was extended, and a beginning

made to the missionary movement. The story of Philip's missionary labors is told in Ac 8:5 ff. He went to the chief city of Samaria, called Sebaste in honor of Augustus (Greek Sebastos). The Samaritans, of mixed Israelite and Gentile blood, had, in consequence of their being rigidly excluded from the Jewish church since the return from exile, built on Mt. Gerizim a rival sanctuary to the temple. To them Philip proclaimed the Christ and wrought signs, with the result that multitudes gave heed, and "were baptized, both men and women." They had been under the influence of a certain sorcerer, Simon, who himself also believed and was baptized, moved, as the sequel proved, by the desire to learn the secret of Philip's ability to perform miracles (see SIMON MAGUS). The apostles (Ac 8:14) at Jerusalem sanctioned the admission of Samaritans into the church by sending Peter and John, who not only confirmed the work of Philip, but also themselves preached in many Samaritan villages.

The next incident recorded is the conversion of a Gentile, who was, however, a worshipper of the God of Israel, a eunuch under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians. As he was returning from worshipping in the temple at Jerusalem, he was met by Philip on the road to Gaza. Philip expounded to him that portion of Isa 53 which he had been reading aloud as he sat in his chariot, and preached unto him Jesus. It is another sign of Philip's insight into the universality of Christianity that he baptized this eunuch who could not have been admitted into full membership in the Jewish church (De 23:1).

See ETHIOPIAN EUNUCH.

After this incident, Philip went to Azotus (Ashdod), and then traveled north to Caesarea, preaching in the cities on his way. There he settled, for Luke records that Paul and his company abode in the house of Philip, "the evangelist," "one of the seven," for some days (Ac 21:8). This occurred more than 20 years after the incidents recorded in Ac 8. Both at this time and during Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, Luke had the opportunity of hearing about Philip's work from his own lips. Luke records that Philip had 4 daughters who were preachers (Ac 21:9).

The Jewish rebellion, which finally resulted in the fall of Jerusalem, drove many Christians out of Palestine, and among them Philip and his daughters. One tradition connects Philip and his daughters with Hierapolis in Asia, but in all probability the evangelist is confounded with the apostle. Another tradition represents them as dwelling at Tralles, Philip being the first bishop of the Christian community.

S. F. Hunter

PHILIP, THE GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS; PHILIP.

PHILIPPI

fi-lip'-i (Philippoi, ethnic Philippesios, Php 4:15):

1. Position and Name:

A city of Macedonia, situated in 41ø 5’ North latitude and 24ø 16’ East longitude. It lay on the Egnatian Road, 33 Roman miles from Amphipolis and 21 from Acontisma, in a plain bounded on the East and North by the mountains which lie between the rivers Zygactes and Nestus, on the West by Mt. Pangaeus, on the South by the ridge called in antiquity Symbolum, over which ran the road connecting the city with its seaport, NEAPOLIS (which see), 9 miles distant. This plain, a considerable part of which is marshy in modern, as in ancient, times, is connected with the basin of the Strymon by the valley of the Angites (Herodotus vii.113), which also bore the names Gangas or Gangites (Appian, Bell. Civ. iv.106), the modern Anghista. The ancient name. of Philippi was Crenides (Strabo vii.331; Diodorus xvi.3, 8; Appian, Bell. Civ. iv.105; Stephanus Byz. under the word), so called after the springs which feed the river and the marsh; but it was refounded by Philip II of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great, and received his name.

2. History:

Appian (Bell. Civ. iv.105) and Harpocration say that Crenides was afterward called Daton, and that this name was changed to Philippi, but this statement is open to question, since Daton, which became proverbial among the Greeks for good fortune, possessed, as Strabo tells us (vii.331 fr. 36), "admirably fertile territory, a lake, rivers, dockyards and productive gold mines," whereas Philippi lies, as we have seen, some 9 miles inland. Many modern authorities, therefore, have placed Daton on the coast at or near the site of Neapolis. On the whole, it seems best to adopt the view of Heuzey (Mission archeologique, 35, 62 ff) that Daton was not originally a city, but the whole district which lay immediately to the East of Mt. Pangaeus, including the Philippian plain and the seacoast about Neapolis. On the site of the old foundation of Crenides, from which the Greek settlers had perhaps been driven out by the Thracians about a century previously, the Thasians in 360 BC founded their colony of Daton with the aid of the exiled Athenian statesman Callistratus, in order to exploit the wealth, both agricultural and mineral, of the neighborhood. To Philip, who ascended the Macedonian throne in 359 BC, the possession of this spot seemed of the utmost importance. Not only is the plain itself well watered and of extraordinary fertility, but a strongly-fortified post planted here would secure the natural land-route from Europe to Asia and protect the eastern frontier of Macedonia against Thracian inroads. Above all, the mines of the district might meet his most pressing need, that of an abundant supply of gold. The site was therefore seized in 358 BC, the city was enlarged, strongly fortitled, and renamed, the Thasian settlers either driven out or reinforced, and the mines, worked with characteristic energy, produced over 1,000 talents a year (Diodorus xvi.8) and enabled Philip to issue a gold currency which in the West soon superseded the Persian darics (G.F. Hill, Historical Greek Coins, 80 ff). The revenue thus obtained was of inestimable value to Philip, who not only used it for the development of the Macedonian army, but also proved himself a master of the art of bribery. His remark is well known that no fortress was impregnable to whose walls an ass laden with gold could be driven. Of the history of Philippi during the next 3 centuries we know practically nothing. Together with the rest of Macedonia, it passed into the Roman hands after the battle of Pydna (168 BC), and fell in the first of the four regions into which the country was then divided (Livy xlv.29). In 146 the whole of Macedonia was formed into a single Roman province. But the

mines seem to have been almost, if not quite, exhausted by this time, and Strabo (vii. 331 fr. 41) speaks of Philippi as having sunk by the time of Caesar to a "small settlement" (katoikia mikra). In the autumn of 42 BC it witnessed the death-struggle of the Roman republic. Brutus and Cassius, the leaders of the band of conspirators who had assassinated Julius Caesar, were faced by Octavian, who 15 years later became the Emperor Augustus, and Antony. In the first engagement the army of Brutus defeated that of Octavian, while Antony's forces were victorious over those of Cassius, who in despair put an end to his life. Three weeks later the second and decisive conflict took place. Brutus was compelled by his impatient soldiery to give battle, his troops were routed and he himself fell on his own sword. Soon afterward Philippi was made a Roman colony with the title Colonia Iulia Philippensis. After the battle of Actium (31 BC) the colony was reinforced, largely by Italian partisans of Antony who were dispossessed in order to afford allotments for Octavian's veterans (Dio Cassius li.4), and its name was changed to Colonia Augusta Iulia (Victrix) Philippensium: It received the much-coveted iusItalicum (Digest L. 15, 8, 8), which involved numerous privileges, the chief of which was the immunity of its territory from taxation.

3. Paul's First Visit:

In the course of his second missionary journey Paul set sail from Troas, accompanied by Silas (who bears his full name Silvanus in 2Co 1:19; 1Th 1:1; 2Th 1:1), Timothy and Luke, and on the following day reached Neapolis (Ac 16:11). Thence he journeyed by road to Philippi, first crossing the pass some 1,600 ft. high which leads over the mountain ridge called Symbolum and afterward traversing the Philipplan plain. Of his experiences there we have in Ac 16:12-40 a singularly full and graphic account. On the Sabbath, presumably the first Sabbath after their arrival, the apostle and his companions went out to the bank of the Angites, and there spoke to the women, some of them Jews, others proselytes, who had come together for purposes of worship.

One of these was named Lydia, a Greek proselyte from Thyatira, a city of Lydia in Asia Minor, to the church of which was addressed the message recorded in Re 2:18-29. She is described as a "seller of purple" (Ac 16:14), that is, of woolen fabrics dyed purple, for the manufacture of which her native town was famous. Whether she was the agent in Philippi of some firm in Thyatira or whether she was carrying on her trade independently, we cannot say; her name suggests the possibility that she was a freedwoman, while from the fact that we hear of her household and her house (Ac 16:15; compare 16:40), though no mention is made of her husband, it has been conjectured that she was a widow of some property. She accepted the apostolic message and was baptized with her household (Ac 16:15), and insisted that Paul and his companions should accept her hospitality during the rest of their stay in the city.

See further LYDIA.

All seemed to be going well when opposition arose from an unexpected quarter. There was in the town a girl, in all probability a slave, who was reputed to have the power of oracular utterance. Herodotus tells us (vii. III) of an oracle of Dionysus situated among the Thracian tribe of the Satrae, probably not far from Philippi; but there is no reason to connect the soothsaying of this girl with that worship. In any

case, her masters reaped a rich harvest from the fee charged for consulting her. Paul, troubled by her repeatedly following him and those with him crying, "These men are bondservants of the Most High God, who proclaim unto you a way of salvation" (Ac 16:17 margin), turned and commanded the spirit in Christ's name to come out of her. The immediate restoration of the girl to a sane and normal condition convinced her masters that all prospect of further gain was gone, and they therefore seized Paul and Silas and dragged them into the forum before the magistrates, probably the duumviri who stood at the head of the colony. They accused the apostles of creating disturbance in the city and of advocating customs, the reception and practice of which were illegal for Ro citizens. The rabble of the market-place joined in the attack (Ac 16:22), whereupon the magistrates, accepting without question the accusers' statement that Paul and Silas were Jews (Ac 16:20) and forgetting or ignoring the possibility of their possessing Ro citizenship, ordered them to be scourged by the attendant lictors and afterward to be imprisoned. In the prison they were treated with the utmost rigor; they were confined in the innermost ward, and their feet put in the stocks. About midnight, as they were engaged in praying and singing hymns, while the other prisoners were listening to them, the building was shaken by a severe earthquake which threw open the prison doors. The jailer, who was on the point of taking his own life, reassured by Paul regarding the safety of the prisoners, brought Paul and Silas into his house where he tended their wounds, set food before them, and, after hearing the gospel, was baptized together with his whole household (Ac 16:23-34).

On the morrow the magistrates, thinking that by dismissing from the town those who had been the cause of the previous day's disturbance they could best secure themselves against any repetition of the disorder, sent the lictors to the jailer with orders to release them. Paul refused to accept a dismissal of this kind. As Ro citizens he and Silas were legally exempt from scourging, which was regarded as a degradation (1Th 2:2), and the wrong was aggravated by the publicity of the punishment, the absence of a proper trial and the imprisonment which followed (Ac 16:37). Doubtless Paul had declared his citizenship when the scourging was inflicted, but in the confusion and excitement of the moment his protest had been unheard or unheeded. Now, however, it produced a deep impression on the magistrates, who came in person to ask Paul and Silas to leave the city. They, after visiting their hostess and encouraging the converts to remain firm in their new faith, set out by the Egnatian Road for Thessalonica (Ac 16:38-40). How long they had stayed in Philippi we are not told, but the fact that the foundations of a strong and flourishing church had been laid and the phrase "for many days" (Ac 16:18) lead us to believe that the time must have been a longer one than appears at first sight. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 226) thinks that Paul left Troas in October, 50 AD, and stayed at Philippi until nearly the end of the year; but this chronology cannot be regarded as certain.

Several points in the narrative of these incidents call for fuller consideration.

(1) We may notice, first, the very small part played by Jews and Judaism at Philippi.

There was no synagogue here, as at Salamis in Cyprus (Ac 13:5), Antioch in Pisidia (Ac 13:14,43), Iconium (Ac 14:1), Ephesus (Ac 18:19,26; 19:8), Thessalonica (Ac 17:1), Berea (Ac 17:10), Athens (Ac 17:17) and Corinth (Ac 18:4). The number of resident Jews was small, their meetings for prayer took place on the river's bank, the worshippers were mostly or wholly women (Ac 16:13), and among them

some, perhaps a majority, were proselytes. Of Jewish converts we hear nothing, nor is there any word of Jews as either inciting or joining the mob which dragged Paul and Silas before the magistrates. Further, the whole tone of the epistle. to this church seems to prove that here at least the apostolic teaching was not in danger of being undermined by Judaizers. True, there is one passage (Php 3:2-7) in which Paul denounces "the concision," those who had "confidence in the flesh"; but it seems "that in this warning he was thinking of Rome more than of Philippi; and that his indignation was aroused rather by the vexatious antagonism which there thwarted him in his daily work, than by any actual errors already undermining the faith of his distant converts" (Lightfoot).

(2) Even more striking is the prominence of the Ro element in the narrative. We are here not in a Greek or Jewish city, but in one of those Ro colonies which Aulus Gellius describes as "miniatures and pictures of the Ro people" (Noctes Atticae, xvi.13).

In the center of the city is the forum (agora, Ac 16:19), and the general term "magistrates" (archontes, English Versions of the Bible, "rulers," Ac 16:19) is exchanged for the specific title of praetors (stratagoi, English Versions of the Bible "magistrates," Ac 16:20,22,35,36,38); these officers are attended by lictors (rhabdouchoi, English Versions "sergeants," Ac 16:35,38) who bear the fasces with which they scourged Paul and Silas (rhabdizo, Ac 16:22). The charge is that of disturbing public order and introducing customs opposed to Roman law (Ac 16:20,21), and Paul's appeal to his Roman civitas (Ac 16:37) at once inspired the magistrates with fear for the consequences of their action and made them conciliatory and apologetic (Ac 16:38,39). The title of praetor borne by these officials has caused some difficulty. The supreme magistrates of Roman colonies, two in number, were called duoviri or duumviri (iuri dicundo), and that this title was in use at Philippi is proved by three inscriptions (Orelli, Number 3746; Heuzey, Mission archeologique, 15, 127). The most probable explanation of the discrepancy is that these magistrates assumed the title Of praetor, or that it was commonly applied to them, as was certainly the case in some parts of the Roman world (Cicero De lege agraria ii.34; Horace Sat. i.5, 34; Orelli, Number 3785).

(3) Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 200 ff) has brought forward the attractive suggestion that Luke was himself a Philippian, and that he was the "man of Macedonia" who appeared to Paul at Troas with the invitation to enter Macedonia (Ac 16:9).

In any case, the change from the 3rd to the 1st person in Ac 16:10 marks the point at which Luke joined the apostle, and the same criterion leads to the conclusion that Luke remained at Philippi between Paul's first and his third visit to the city (see below). Ramsay's hypothesis would explain (a) the fullness and vividness of the narrative of Ac 16:11-40; (b) the emphasis laid on the importance of Philippi (16:12); and (c) the fact that Paul recognized as a Macedonian the man whom he saw in his vision, although there was nothing either in the language, features or dress of Macedonians to mark them out from other Greeks. Yet Luke was clearly not a householder at Philippi (Ac 16:15), and early tradition refers to him as an Antiochene (see, however, Ramsay, in the work quoted 389 f).

(4) Much discussion has centered round the description of Philippi given in Ac 16:12. The reading of

Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Ephraemi, etc., followed by Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, the Revised Version (British and American), etc., is: hetis estin prote tes meridos Makedonias polis kolonia. But it is doubtful whether Makedonias is to be taken with the word which precedes or with that which follows, and further the sense derived from the phrase is unsatisfactory. For prote must mean either

(1) first in political importance and rank, or

(2) the first which the apostle reached. But the capital of the province was Thessalonica, and if tes meridos be taken to refer to the easternmost of the 4 districts into which Macedonia had been divided in 168 BC (though there is no evidence that that division survived at this time), Amphipolis was its capital and was apparently still its most important city, though destined to be outstripped by Philippi somewhat later. Nor is the other rendering of prote (adopted, e.g. by Lightfoot) more natural.

It supposes that Luke reckoned Neapolis as belonging to Thrace, and the boundary of Macedonia as lying between Philippi and its seaport; moreover, the remark is singularly pointless; the use of estin rather than en is against this view, nor is prote found in this sense without any qualifying phrase. Lastly, the tes in its present position is unnatural; in Codex Vaticanus it is placed after, instead of before, meridos, while D (the Bezan reviser) reads kephale tes Makedonias. Of the emendations which have been suggested, we may notice three:

(a) for meridos Hort has suggested Pieridos, "a chief city of Pierian Macedonia";

(b) for prote tes we may read protes, "which belongs to the first region of Macedonia";

(c) meridos may be regarded as a later insertion and struck out of the text, in which case the whole phrase will mean, "which is a city of Macedonia of first rank" (though not necessarily the first city).

4. Paul’s Later Visits:

Paul and Silas, then, probably accompanied by Timothy (who, however, is not expressly mentioned in Ac between 16:1 and 17:14), left Philippi for Thessalonica, but Luke apparently remained behind, for the "we" of Ac 16:10-17 does not appear again until 20:5, when Paul is once more leaving Philippi on his last journey to Jerusalem. The presence of the evangelist during the intervening 5 years may have had much to do with the strength of the Philippian church and its stealfastness in persecution (2Co 8:2; Php 1:29,30). Patti himself did not revisit the city until, in the course of his third missionary journey, he returned to Macedonia, preceded by Timothy and Erastus, after a stay of over 2 years at Ephesus (Ac 19:22; 20:1). We are not definitely told that he visited Philippi on this occasion, but of the fact there can be little doubt, and it was probably there that he awaited the coming of Titus (2Co 2:13; 7:5,6) and wrote his 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians (2Co 8:1 ff; 9:2-4). After spending 3 months in Greece, whence he intended to return by sea to Syria, he was led by a plot against his life to change his plans and return through Macedonia (Ac 20:3). The last place at which he stopped before crossing to Asia was Philippi,

where he spent the days of unleavened bread, and from (the seaport of) which he sailed in company with Luke to Troas where seven of his companions were awaiting him (Ac 20:4-6). It seems likely that Paul paid at least one further visit to Philippi in the interval between his first and second imprisonments. That he hoped to do so, he himself tells us (Php 2:24), and the journey to Macedonia mentioned in 1Ti 1:3 would probably include a visit to Philippi, while if, as many authorities hold, 2Ti 4:13 refers to a later stay at Troas, it may well be connected with a further and final tour in Macedonia. But the intercourse between the apostle and this church of his founding was not limited to these rare visits. During Paul's first stay at Thessalonica he had received gifts of money on two occasions from the Philippian Christians (Php 4:16), and their kindness had been repeated after he left Macedonia for Greece (2Co 11:9; Php 4:15). Again, during his first imprisonment at Rome the Philippians sent a gift by the hand of one of their number, Epaphroditus (Php 2:25; 4:10,14-19), who remained for some time with the apostle, and finally, after a serious illness which nearly proved fatal (Php 2:27), returned home bearing the letter of thanks which has survived, addressed to the Philippian converts by Paul and Timothy (Php 1:1). The latter intended to visit the church shortly afterward in order to bring back to the imprisoned apostle an account of its welfare (Php 2:19,23), but we do not know whether this plan was actually carried out or not. We cannot, however, doubt that other letters passed between Paul and this church besides the one which is extant, though the only reference to them is a disputed passage of Polycarp's Epistle to the Philippians (iii.2), where he speaks of "letters" (epistolai) as written to them by Paul (but see Lightfoot's note on Php 3:1).

5. Later History of the Church:

After the death of Paul we hear but little of the church or of the town of Philippi. Early in the 2nd century Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, was condemned as a Christian and was taken to Rome to be thrown to the wild beasts. After passing through Philadelphia, Smyrna and Troas, he reached Philippi. The Christians there showed him every mark of affection and respect, and after his departure wrote a letter of sympathy to the Antiochene church and another to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, requesting him to send them copies of any letters of Ignatius which he possessed. This request Polycarp fulfilled, and at the same time sent a letter to the Philippians full of encouragement, advice and warning. From it we judge that the condition of the church as a whole was satisfactory, though a certain presbyter, Valens, and his wife are severely censured for their avarice which belied their Christian profession. We have a few records of bishops of Philippi, whose names are appended to the decisions of the councils held at Sardica (344 AD), Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451), and the see appears to have outlived the city itself and to have lasted down to modern times (Le Quien, Oriens Christ., II, 70; Neale, Holy Eastern Church, I, 92). Of the destruction of Philippi no account has come down to us. The name was perpetuated in that of the Turkish hamlet Felibedjik, but the site is now uninhabited, the nearest village being that of Raktcha among the hills immediately to the North of the ancient acropolis. This latter and the plain around are covered with ruins, but no systematic excavation has yet been undertaken. Of the extant remains the most striking are portions of the Hellenic and Hellenistic fortification, the scanty vestiges of theater, the ruin known among the Turks as Derekler, "the columns," which perhaps represents the ancient thermae, traces of a temple of Silvanus with numerous rock-cut reliefs and inscriptions, and the remains of a triumphal arch (Kiemer).

LITERATURE.

The fullest account of the site and antiquities is that of Heuzey and Daumet, Mission archeologique de Macedoine, chapters i through v and Plan A; Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, III, 214-25; Cousinery, Voyage dana la Macedoine, II, 1 ff; Perrot, "Daton. Neapolis. Les ruines de Philippos," in Revue archeologique, 1860; and Hackett, in Bible Union Quarterly, 1860, may also be consulted. For the Latin inscriptions see Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum, III, 1, numbers 633-707; III, Suppl., numbers 7337-7358; for coins, B.V. Head, Historia Numorum, 192; Catalogue of Coins in the British Museum: Macedonia, etc., 96. For the history of the Philippian church and the narrative of Ac 16:12-40 see Lightfoot, Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, 47-65; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen, 202-26; Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Paul, chapter ix; Farrar, Life and Work of Paul, chapter xxv; and the standard commentaries on the Acts—especially Blass, Acta Apostolorum—and on Philippians.

M. N. Tod

PHILIPPIANS, THE EPISTLE TO THE

fi-lip'-i-anz

I. PAUL AND THE CHURCH AT PHILIPPI

II. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE CHURCH AT PHILIPPI

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EPISTLE

1. A Letter

2. A Letter of Love

3. A Letter of Joy

4. Importance Theologically

IV. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLE

V. PLACE, DATE AND OCCASION OF WRITING

VI. CONTENTS OF THE EPISTLE

LITERATURE

I. Paul and the Church at Philippi.

Paul was on his second missionary journey in the year 52 AD. He felt that he was strangely thwarted in many of his plans. He had had a most distressing illness in Galatia. The Spirit would not permit him to preach in Asia, and when he essayed to enter Bithynia the Spirit again would not suffer it. Baffled and perplexed, the apostle with his two companions, Silas and Timothy, went on to the seacoast and stopped in Troas. Here at last his leading became clear. A vision of a man from Macedonia convinced him that it was the will of God that he should preach in the western continent of Europe. The way was opened at once. The winds were favorable. In two days he came to Neapolis. At once he took the broad paved way of the Via Egnatia up to the mountain pass and down on the other side to Philippi, a journey of some 8 miles. There was no synagogue at Philippi, but a little company of Jews gathered for Sabbath worship at "a place of prayer" (proseuche, Ac 16:13), about a mile to the West of the city gate on the shore of the river Gangites (see PROSEUCHA). Paul and his companions talked to the women gathered there, and Lydia was converted. Later, a maid with the spirit of divination was exorcised. Paul and Silas were scourged and thrown into prison, an earthquake set them free, the jailer became a believer, the magistrates repented their treatment of men who were Roman citizens and besought them to leave the city (Ac 16:6-40). Paul had had his first experience of a Roman scourging and of lying in the stocks of a Roman prison here at Philippi, yet he went on his way rejoicing, for a company of disciples had been formed, and he had won the devotion of loyal and loving hearts for himself and his Master (see PHILIPPI). That was worth all the persecution and the pain. The Christians at Philippi seem to have been Paul’s favorites among all his converts. He never lost any opportunity of visiting them and refreshing his spirit with their presence in the after-years. Six years later he was resident in Ephesus, and having sent Titus to Corinth with a letter to the Corinthians and being in doubt as to the spirit in which it would be received, he appointed a meeting with Titus in Macedonia, and probably spent the anxious days of his waiting at Philippi. If he met Titus there, he may have written 2 Corinthians in that city (2Co 2:13; 7:6). Paul returned to Ephesus, and after the riot in that city he went over again into Macedonia and made his third visit to Philippi. He probably promised the Philippians at this time that he would return to Philippi to celebrate the Easter week with his beloved converts there. He went on into Greece, but in 3 months he was back again, at the festival of the resurrection in the year 58 AD (Ac 20:2,6). We read in 1Ti 1:3 that Paul visited Macedonia after the Roman imprisonment. He enjoyed himself among the Philippians. They were Christians after his own heart. He thanks God for their fellowship from the first day until now (Php 1:5). He declares that they are his beloved who have always obeyed, not in his presence only, but much more in his absence (Php 2:12). With fond repetition he addresses them as his brethren, beloved and longed for, his joy and crown, his beloved (Php 4:1). This was Paul’s favorite church, and we can gather from the epistle good reason for this fact.

II. Characteristics of the Church at Philippi.

(1) It seems to be the least Jewish of all the Pauline churches. There were few Jews in Philippi. No Hebrew names are found in the list of converts in this church mentioned in the New Testament. The Jewish opponents of Paul seem never to have established themselves in this community.

(2) Women seem to be unusually prominent in the history of this church, and this is consistent with what we know concerning the position accorded to woman in Macedonian society. Lydia brings her whole family with her into the church. She must have been a very influential woman, and her own fervor and devotion and generosity and hospitality seem to have been contagious and to have become characteristic of the whole Christian community. Euodia and Syntyche are mentioned in the epistle, two women who were fellow-laborers with Paul in the gospel, for both of whom he has great respect, of both of whom he is sure that their names are written in the book of life, but who seem to have differed with each other in some matter of opinion. Paul exhorts them to be of the same mind in the Lord (Php 4:2). The prominence of women in the congregation at Philippi or the dominance of Lydia's influence among them may account for the fact that they seem to have been more mindful of Paul's comfort than any of his other converts were. They raised money for Paul's support and forwarded it to him again and again. They were anxious that he should have all that was needful. They were willing to give of their time and their means to that end. There seem to have been no theological differences in their company. That may testify to the fact that the most of them were women.

(3) There were splendid men in the church membership too. Some of them were Macedonians and some of them were Roman veterans.

Hausrath declares that the Macedonians represented the "noblest and soundest part of the ancient world. .... Here was none of the shuffling and the indecision of the Asiatics, none of the irritable vanity and the uncertain levity of the Greek communities. .... They were men of sterner mold than could be fouund in Asia Minor or languorous Syria. The material was harder to work in, and offered more stubborn resistance; but the work, once done, endured. A new Macedonian phalanx was formed here, a phalanx of Pauline Christians. .... Manliness, loyalty, firmness, their characteristics in general history, are equally their characteristics in the history of the Christian church. .... They were always true to Paul, always obedient, always helpful" (Time of the Apostles, III, 203-4).

Paul rejoiced in them. They were spirits congenial with his own. The Roman veterans had been trained in the Roman wars to hardness and discipline and loyalty. They were Roman citizens and proud of the fact. In the epistle Paul exhorts them to behave as citizens worthy of the gospel of Christ (Php 1:27), and he reminds them that though they were proud of their Roman citizenship, as was he, they all had become members of a heavenly commonwealth, citizenship in which was a much greater boon than even the jus Italicum had been. In Php 3:20 Paul states the fact again, "Our citizenship is in heaven"; and he goes on to remind them that their King is seated there upon the throne and that He is coming again to establish a glorious empire, for He has power to subject all things unto Himself.

It is to these old soldiers and athletes that Paul addresses his military and gymnastic figures of speech. He informs them that the whole praetorian guard had heard of the gospel through his imprisonment at Rome (Php 1:13). He sends them greeting from the saints that are in Caesar's household (Php 4:22). He prays that he may hear of them that they stand fast like an immovable phalanx, with one soul striving athletically for the faith of the gospel (Php 1:27). He knows that they will be fearless and brave, in nothing affrighted by the adversaries (Php 1:28). He speaks of his own experience as a wrestling-match, a conflict or contest (Php 1:30). He joys in the sacrifice and service of their faith (Php 2:17). He calls

Epaphroditus not only his fellow-worker but his fellow-soldier (Php 2:25). He likens the Christian life to a race in which he presses on toward the goal unto the prize (Php 3:14). He asks the Philippians to keep even, soldierly step with him in the Christian walk (Php 3:16). These metaphors have their appeal to an athletic and military race, and they bear their testimony to the high regard which Paul had for this type of Christianity and for those in whose lives it was displayed. We do not know the names of many of these men, for only Clement and Epaphroditus are mentioned here; but we gather much concerning their spirit from this epistle, and we are as sure as Paul himself that their names are all written in the book of life (Php 4:3).

(4) If the constituent elements of the church at Philippi fairly represented the various elements of the population of the city, they must have been cosmopolitan in character. Philippi was an old Macedonian city which had been turned into a Roman colony. It was both Greek and Roman in its characteristics. Christianity had been introduced here by two Jews, who were Roman citizens, and a Jewish son of a Gentile father. In the account given of the rounding of the church in Ac 16 three converts are mentioned, and one is a Jewish proselyte from Asia, one a native Greek, and one a Roman official. The later converts doubtless represented the same diversity of nationality and the same differences in social position. Yet, apart from those two good women, Euodia and Syntyche, they were all of one mind in the Lord. It is a remarkable proof of the fact that in Christ all racial and social conditions may be brought into harmony and made to live together in peace. (5) They were a very liberal people. They gave themselves to the Lord and to Paul (2Co 8:5), and whenever they could help Paul or further the work of the gospel they gave gladly and willingly and up to the limit of their resources; and then they hypothecated their credit and gave beyond their power (2Co 8:3). Even Paul was astonished at their giving. He declares that they gave out of much affliction and deep poverty, that they abounded in their bounty, and that they were rich only in their liberality (2Co 8:2).

Surely these are unusual encomiums. The Philippians must have been a very unusual people. If the depth of one’s consecration and the reality of one’s religion are to be measured by the extent to which they affect the disposition of one’s material possessions, if one measure of Christian love is to be found in Christian giving, then the Philippians may well stand supreme among the saints in the Pauline churches. Paul seems to have loved them most. He loved them enough to allow them to contribute toward his support. Elsewhere he refused any help of this sort, and stedfastly adhered to his plan of self-support while he was preaching the gospel. He made the single exception in the case of the Philippians. He must have been sure of their affection and of their confidence. Four times they gave Paul pecuniary aid. Twice they sent him their contributions just after he had left them and gone on to Thessalonica (Php 4:15,16). When Paul had proceeded to Corinth and was in want during his ministry there his heart was gladdened by the visitation of brethren from Philippi, who supplied the measure of his want (2Co 11:8,9). It was not a first enthusiasm, forgotten as soon as the engaging personality of the apostle was removed from their sight. It was not merely a personal attachment that prompted their gifts. They gave to their own dear apostle, but only that he might minister to others as he had ministered to them. He was their living link with the work in the mission field.

Eleven years passed by, and the Philippians heard that Paul was in prison at Rome and again in need of their help. Eleven years are enough to make quite radical changes in a church membership, but there

seems to have been no change in the loyalty or the liberality of the Philippian church in that time. The Philippians hastened to send Epaphroditus to Rome with their contributions and their greetings. It was like a bouquet of fresh flowers in the prison cell. Paul writes this epistle to thank them that their thought for him had blossomed afresh at the first opportunity they had had (Php 4:10). No wonder that Paul loved them and was proud of them and made their earnestness and sincerity and affection the standard of comparison with the love of others (2Co 8:8).

III. Characteristics of the Epistle.

1. A Letter:

It is a letter. It is not a treatise, as Romana, Hebrews, and 1 John are. It is not an encyclical full of general observations and exhortations capable of application at any time and anywhere, as the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Epistle of James and the Epistles of Peter are. It is a simple letter to personal friends. It has no theological discussions and no rigid outline and no formal development. It rambles along just as any real letter would with personal news and personal feelings and outbursts of personal affection between tried friends. It is the most spontaneous and unaffected of the Pauline Epistles. It is more epistolary than any of the others addressed to the churches.

2. A Letter of Love:

It is a letter of love. All of the other epistles have mixed feelings manifest in them. Sometimes a feeling of grief and of indignation is dominant, as in 2 Corinthians. Sometimes the uppermost desire of Paul in his writing seems to be the establishment of the truth against the assault of its foes, as in Galatians and Romans. Always more or less fault is suggested in the recipients of the warnings and the exhortations Paul feels compelled to write to them. In Philippi alone there is no fault to be found. The only suggestion of such a thing is in the reference to the difference of opinion between Euodia and Syntyche, and while Paul thinks this ought to be harmonized, he does not seem to consider it any very serious menace to the peace of the church. Aside from this Paul has nothing but praise for his beloved brethren and prayer that their love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all discernment (Php 1:9). He is full of thankfulness upon all his remembrance of them (Php 1:3). He rejoices in the privilege of being offered upon the sacrifice and service of their faith (Php 2:17). The church at Philippi may not have been conspicuous in charisms as the church at Corinth was, but it had the fruits of the Spirit in rich measure. Paul seems to think that it needed only to rejoice in its spiritual possessions and to grow in grace and in the mind of Christ. His heart is full of gratitude and love as he writes. He rejoices as he thinks of them. His peace and his hope are triumphant over present affliction and the prospect of persecution and death. If this is his last will and testament to his beloved church, as Holtzmann calls it, he has nothing to bequeath them but his unqualified benediction. Having loved them from the first, he loves them to the end.

3. A Letter of Joy:

It is a letter of joy. It was Bengel who said, Summa epistolae: gaudeo, gaudete, "The sum of the epistle is, I rejoice; rejoice ye." Paul was a man whose spirits were undaunted in any circumstances. He might be scourged in one city and stoned in another and imprisoned in a third and left for dead in a fourth, but as long as he retained consciousness and as soon as he regained conscioushess he rejoiced. Nothing could dampen his ardor. Nothing could disturb his peace. In Philippi he had been scourged and cast into the inner prison and his feet had been made fast in the stocks, but at midnight he and Silas were singing hymns of praise to God. He is in prison now in Rome, but he is still rejoicing. Some men would have been discouraged in such circumstances. Wherever Paul had gone his preaching had been despised, and he had been persecuted. The Jews had slandered him and harassed him, and so many of his converts had proved to be fickle and false. The years had gone by and the breach between him and his brethren had widened rather than lessened, and at last they had succeeded in getting him into prison and keeping him there for years. Prison life is never pleasant, and it was far less so in that ancient day than it is now.

Paul was such an ardent spirit. It was more difficult for him to be confined than it would be for a more indolent man; He was a world-missionary, a restless cosmopolite ranging up and down through the continents with the message of the Christ. It was like putting an eagle into a cage to put him into prison. Many eagles mope and die in imprisonment. Paul was not moping. He was writing this Epistle to the Philippians and saying to them, "The things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel .... therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (Php 1:12,18). His enemies were free to do and to say hat they pleased, and they were making the most of the opportunity. He could no longer thwart or hinder them. Some men would have broken out into loud lamentations and complaints. Some men would have worried about the conditions and would have become nervous about the outcome of the cause. The faith of even John the Baptist failed in prison. He could not believe that things were going right if he were not there to attend to them. Paul’s faith never wavered. His hope never waned. His joy was inexhaustible and perennial. He was never anxious. Did he hear the sentry’s step pacing up and down the corridor before his prison door? It reminded him of the peace of God which passeth all understanding, guarding his heart and his thoughts in Christ Jesus (Php 4:7), standing sentry there night and day. The keynote of this epistle is "Rejoice in the Lord always: again I will say, Rejoice" (Php 4:4).

Paul is old and worn and in prison, but some 20 times in the course of this short letter to the Philippians he uses the words, joy, rejoice, peace, content, and thanksgiving. It is a letter full of love and full of joy.

4. Importance Theologically:

It is of great importance theologically. It is one of the paradoxes to which we become almost accustomed in Paul’s writings that this simplest of his letters, most epistolary and most personal throughout should yet contain the fullest and most important putting of theology of the incarnation and exaltation that came from his pen. He has only a practical end in view. He is exhorting the Philippians to humility, and he says to them, Have the mind which was in Christ who emptied himself and then was exalted (Php 2:5-11). It is the most theological passage in the epistle. It is one of the most doctrinally important in the New Testament. It is Paul’s final contribution to the solution of the great mystery of the coming of the Saviour and the economy of salvation. It is his last word, at any length, on this subject. He states plainly the fact of the kenosis, the morale of the redemption, the certainty of the exaltation, and the

sure hope of the universal adoration in the end. The most vital truths of Christology are here clearly stated and definitely formulated for all time. Jesus was a real man, not grasping at any of the attributes of Deity which would be inconsistent with real and true humanity, but in whole-hearted surrender of sacrifice submitting to all the disabilities and limitations necessary to the incarnate conditions. He was equal with God, but He emptied Himself of the omnipotence and the omniscience and the omnipresence of His pre-incarnate state, and was found in form as a man, a genuine man obedient to God in all His life. He always maintained that attitude toward God which we ought to maintain and which we can maintain in our humanity, in which He was on an equality with us. We ought to have the mind which was in Christ. He humbled Himself and became obedient. He was obedient through life and obedient unto death, yea, even unto the death of the cross. It is a great passage, setting forth profoundest truths in the tersest manner. It is the crowning revelation concerning Jesus in the Pauline Epistles. It represents Paul's most mature thought upon this theme.

See KENOSIS.

IV. Genuineness of the Epistle.

The genuineness of the epistle is very generally admitted today. It was in the Canon of Marcion. Its name occurs in the list on the Muratorian Fragment. It is found in both the Peshitta and the Old Latin versions. It is mentioned by Polycarp and quoted in the letter of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, in the Epistle of Diognetus, and in the writings of Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. Baur made a determined attack upon its authenticity. He declared that it was not doctrinal and polemical like the other Pauline Epistles, but that it was full of shallow imitations of these. He said it had no apparent motive and no connected argument and no depth of thought. He questioned some of the historical data and suspected Gnostic influence in certain passages. Bleek said of Baur's arguments that they were partly derived from a perverted interpretation of certain passages in the epistle; they partly rested upon arbitrary istorical presuppositions; and some of them were really so weak that it was hard to believe that he could have attached any importance to them himself. It is not surprising that few critics have been found willing to follow Baur's leadership at this point. Biederman, Kneucker, Hinsch, Hitzig, Hoekstra, and Holsten may be mentioned among them. The genuineness of the epistle has been defended by Weizsacker, Weiss, Pfleiderer, Julicher, Klopper, Schenkel, Reuss, Hilgenfeld, Harnack, Holtzmann, Mangold, Lipsius, Renan, Godet, Zahn, Davidson, Lightfoot, Farrar, McGiffert, and practically all of the English writers on the subject. Weizsacker says that the reasons for attributing the epistle to the apostle Paul are "overwhelming." McGiffert declares: "It is simply inconceivable that anyone else would or could have produced in his name a letter in which no doctrinal or ecclesiastical motive can be discovered, and in which the personal element so largely predominates and the character of the man and the apostle is revealed with so great vividness and fidelity. The epistle deserves to rank alongside of Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans as an undoubted product of Paul's pen, and as a coordinate standard by which to test the genuineness of other and less certain writings" (The Apostolic Age, 393). This is the practically unanimous conclusion of modern scholarship.

V. Place, Date, and Occasion of Writing.

This is one of the prison epistles (see PHILEMON). Paul makes frequent reference to his bonds (Php 1:7,13,14,17). He was for 2 years a prisoner in Caesarea (Ac 24:27). Paulus and others have thought that the epistle was written during this imprisonment; but the references to the praetorian guard and the members of Caesar's household have led most critics to conclude that the Roman imprisonment was the one to which the epistle refers. Philemon, Colossians and Ephesians were also written during the Roman imprisonment, and these three form a group by themselves. Philippians is evidently separated from them by some interval. Was it written earlier or later than they? Bleek, Lightfoot, Sanday, Herr, Beet and others think that the Epistle to the Philippians was written first. We prefer, however, to agree with Zahn, Ramsay, Findlay, Shaw, Vincent, Julicher, Holtzmann, Weiss, Godet, and others, who argue for the writing of Php toward the close of the Roman imprisonment.

Their reasons are as follows:

(1) We know that some considerable time must have elapsed after Paul's arrival at Rome before he could have written this epistle; for the news of his arrival had been carried to Philippi and a contribution to his needs had been raised among his friends there, and Epaphroditus had carried it to Rome. In Rome, Epaphroditus had become seriously sick and the news of this sickness had been carried back to Philippi and the Philippians had sent back a message of sympathy to him. At least four trios between Rome and philippi are thus indicated, and there are intervals of greater or less length between them. The distance between the two cities was some 700 miles. Communication was easy by the Appian Way and Trajan's Way to Brundusium and across the narrow straits there to the Egnatian Way, which led directly to Philippi. There were many making the trip at all times, but the journey would occupy a month at least, and the four journeys suggested in the epistle were not in direct succession.

(2) Paul says that through him Christ had become known throughout the whole praetorian guard (Php 1:13). It must have taken some time for this to become possible.

(3) The conditions outside the prison, where Christ was being preached, by some in a spirit of love, and by others in a spirit of faction, cannot be located in the earliest months of Paul's sojourn in Rome (Php 1:15-17). They must belong to a time when Christianity had developed in the city and parties had been formed in the church.

(4) Luke was well known at Philippi. Yet he sends no salutation to the Philippians in this epistle. He would surely have done so if he had been with Paul at the time of its writing. He was with the apostle when he wrote to the Colossians, and so was Demas (Col 4:14). In this epistle Paul promises to send Timothy to Philippi, and says, "I have no man likeminded, who will care truly for your state" (Php 2:20). This must mean that Aristarchus, Demas and Luke were all gone. They had all been with him when he wrote the other epistles

(5) His condition as a prisoner seems to have changed for the worse. He had enjoyed comparative liberty for the first 2 years of his imprisonment at Rome, living in his own hired house and accessible to all his friends. He had now been removed, possibly to the guardroom of the praetorian cohort. Here he was in

more rigorous confinement, in want and alone.

(6) Paul writes as if he thought that his case would be decided soon (Php 2:23,14). He seems to be facing his final trial. He is not sure of its outcome. He may die a martyr's death, but he expects to be acquitted and then to be at liberty to do further missionary work. This was not his immediate expectation when he wrote the other epistles., and therefore they would seem to be earlier than this.

(7) The epistle is addressed to all the saints in Philippi, with the bishops and deacons (Php 1:1). These official titles do not occur in any earlier epistles, but they are found in the Pastoral Epistles, which were written still later. Therefore they link the Epistle to the Philippians with the later rather than the earlier epistles

From these indications we conclude that this is the last of Paul's Epistles to the churches. Hilgenfeld calls this the swan song of the great apostle. In it Paul has written his last exhortations and warnings, his last hopes and prayers for his converts to the Christian faith. Its date must be somewhere toward the close of the Roman imprisonment, in the year 63 or 64 AD. Epaphroditus had brought the contribution of the Philippians to Paul in Rome. He had plunged into the work there in rather reckless fashion, risking his life and contracting a malarial fever or some other serious sickness; but his life had been spared in answer to the prayers of Paul and his friends. Now Paul sends him back to Philippi, though he knows that he will be very lonely without him; and he sends with him this letter of acknowledgment of their gift, filled with commendation and encouragement, gratitude and love.

VI. Contents of the Epistle.

The epistle is not capable of any logical analysis. Its succession of thought may be represented as follows:

(1) Address (Php 1:1,2).

(2) Thanksgiving and prayer (Php 1:3-11): Paul is thankful for their fellowship and confident of their perfection. He longs for them and prays that their love may be wise to discriminate among the most excellent things and that they may be able to choose the very best, until they are filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and the praise of God.

(3) Information concerning his own experience (Php 1:12-30):

(a) His evangelism (Php 1:12-14): Everything had turned out well. Paul is in prison, but he has been indefatigable in his evangelism. He has been chained to a soldier, but that has given him many an opportunity for personal and private and prolonged conversation. When the people have gathered to hear, the guard has listened perforce; and when the crowd was gone, more than once the soldier has seemed curious and interested and they have talked on about the Christ. Paul has told his experience over and over to these men, and his story has been carried through the whole camp.

(b) His tolerance (Php 1:15-18): Not only has the gospel found unexpected furtherance inside the prison walls, but through the whole city the brethren have been emboldened by Paul's success to preach Christ, some through faction and envy and strife, and some through love. Paul rejoices that Christ is preached, whether by his enemies or by his friends. He would much prefer to have the gospel presented as he himself preached it, but he was great-souled and broadminded enough to tolerate differences of opinion and method among brethren in Christ. "In every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed; and therein I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice" (Php 1:18). This is one of the noblest utterances of one of the greatest of men. Paul is sorry that everybody does not see things just exactly as he does, but he rejoices if they glorify Christ and would not put the least hindrance in their way.

(c) His readiness for life or death (Php 1:19-26): Paul says, Give me liberty or give me death; it will be Christ either way. To live is to work for Christ; to die is to be with Christ. "To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain." Here is Paul's soliloquy in the face of possible martyrdom or further missionary labors.

We are reminded of Hamlet's soliloquy in Shakespeare. "To be or not to be"—that is the question with both Hamlet and Paul. Hamlet weighs evils against evils and chooses the lesser evils in sheer cowardice in the end. Paul weighs blessings against blessings, the blessings of life for Christ and the blessings of death with Christ, and chooses the lesser blessings in pure unselfishness in the end. They both choose life, but the motives of their choice are radically different; and Paul lives with rejoicing while Hamlet lives in despair and in shame. The aged apostle would rather die than live, but he would rather live than die before his work was done.

(d) His example (Php 1:27-30): Paul was a Roman citizen and so were they. He tried to live worthy of his citizenship and so must they. He had a still higher ambition, that he and they might live as citizens worthy of the gospel of Christ. He fought as a good soldier. He stood fast in the faith. He was in nothing affrighted by the adversaries. Let them follow his example. They were engaged in the same conflict. To them it had been granted to believe and to suffer in the behalf of Christ. Their faith was not of themselves; it was the gift of God. Their suffering was not self-chosen; it too was a gift of God. (4) Exhortation to follow the example of Christ (Php 2:1-18): Let the Philippians have the mind and spirit of Jesus, and Paul will rejoice to pour out his life as a libation upon the sacrifice and service of their faith. (5) Reasons for sending Timothy, and Epaphroditus to them (Php 2:19-30). (6) Paul's example (Php 3:1-21):

(a) In the repudiation of all confidence in the flesh (Php 3:1-7): There are certain dogs and evil workers who belong to the old Jewish persuasion who glory in the flesh. Paul does not. He glories in Christ Jesus and has no confidence in the flesh. He has much reason to be proud of his past, for he would rank high on his record among them. He was of the stock of Israel, the prince with God. He belonged to the race of those who wrestled with God and got the victory. He was of the tribe of Benjamin, the only one of the patriarchs born in the Chosen Land. The first king of Israel had been chosen from this tribe. It alone had been faithful to the house of David at the time of the Great Schism. It held the place of honor in the militant host of the Israelites (Jud 5:14; Ho 5:8). It was a matter of pride to belong to this singly faithful and signally honored tribe. He was a Hebrew of Hebrews, and he belonged to that sect among the

Hebrews that was notorious for its scrupulous observance of all the religious ritual, for its patriotism and zeal, for its piety. and devotion. Among these Pharisees he was conspicuous for his enthusiasm. He was the chosen instrument of the Sanhedrin to persecute and annihilate the Christian church. No one could find fault with his legal righteousness. He claimed to be blameless as judged by their standard. That was his record. Who has any better one, in pedigree or in piety? All of these things Paul counts but loss for Christ.

(b) In the maintenance and pursuit of spiritual perfection (Php 3:8-16): The word "perfect" is used twice in this paragraph. We read: "Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect: but I press on." Many of the authorities quote these words as indicative of Paul's humility in disclaiming any present perfection of character while he avows his purpose to strive on toward perfection as long as he lives. Such an interpretation is wholly aside from Paul's thought. He is not talking about perfection in patience and peace and devotion and character. That perfection he claims for himself and for the Philippians in this paragraph toward the close: "Let us therefore, as many as are perfect, be thus minded." The perfection of which he speaks earlier is the perfection possible in the resurrection life of the saints in bliss. He has not attained unto the resurrection from the dead and is not perfect with the perfection of heaven. That is the goal of his endeavor. He presses on to that mark. In the meantime he maintains that perfection of consecration and of faith that results in present Christian perfection of character and which is the only guaranty of that perfection to be revealed to those who attain unto the resurrection from the dead.

(c) In heavenly citizenship (Php 3:17-21): Paul walks with his mind on heavenly things. There are those who mind earthly things. They are enemies of the cross, but he has sworn eternal allegiance to the cross. Their end is perdition, while his end is sure salvation. Their god is the belly, while his goal is the perfection of the spirit. Their glory is in their shame, while his glory is in Christ alone. "Brethren, be ye imitators together of me, and mark them that so walk even as ye have us for an ensample." Then "The Lord .... shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation," the body of our earthly pilgrimage, the body that so often fails the racer to the goal and cannot keep up with the desire of his spirit, and will conform it "to the body of his glory," the perfect body of those who have attained to the resurrection of the dead. It is not "our vile body" that is to be changed. That gives a false sense in modern English. The body is not vile, and the Bible nowhere says that it is. It was Manichean or neo-Platonic heresy that matter was evil and the body vile. Plotinus blushed that he had a body; Jesus never did. The Christian will honor the body as the temple of the Holy Spirit. It was the vehicle of the incarnation, and he honors it for that. Yet the body prepared for Jesus was the body of His humiliation. It bound Him to the earth. It wearied when He was most anxious to work. It failed Him when He most needed strength. Paul says that our bodies are like the body of Jesus of Nazareth now, and they shall be like the body of our risen Lord in due time.

(7) A series of short exhortations (Php 4:1-9): This series ends with the command, "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do: and the God of peace shall be with you." All these exhortations, then, are based upon his own conduct and experience and example. They had seen the embodiment of these things in him. They were to be imitators of him in their obedience to them. Therefore as we read them we have side-lights thrown upon the character of the apostle who had taught and preached and practiced these things.

What do they tell us concerning the apostle Paul?

(a) His stedfastness and his love for his friends (Php 4:1): He had a genius for friendship. He bound his friends to him with cords of steel. They were ready to sacrifice anything for him. The reason for that was that he sacrificed everything for them, and that he had such an overflowing love for them that his love begot love in them. They could depend upon him.

(b) His sympathy with all good men and all good women and his desire that they live in peace (Php 4:2,3): The true yokefellow mentioned here cannot be identified now. He has been variously named by the critics, as Epaphroditus, Barnabas, Luke, Silas, Timothy, Peter, and Christ. There may be a proper name in the phrase, either Genisius or Syzygus. We are wholly ignorant as to whom Paul meant.

(c) His constant rejoicing in the Lord (Php 4:4).

(d) His sweet reasonableness ("moderation," the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "forbearance," Php 4:5).: So Matthew Arnold translates the Greek noun here. Tyndale called it courtesy. It is a combination of forbearance and graciousness, of modesty and courtesy, of consideration and esteem such as was characteristic of Christ. Paul had it. There was a sweet reasonableness about him that made his personality a most winning and attractive one.

(e) His freedom from anxiety (Php 4:6,7): Paul’s fearless confidence was born on the one hand from his assurance that the Lord was near, and on the other from his faith in prayer. It passed all understanding how Paul was kept from all anxiety. It was the power of prayer that did it. It was the peace of God that did it. It was the Lord at hand who did it.

(f) His habitual high thinking (Php 4:8): All that was worthy in the ideals of the Greek philosophers Paul made the staple of his thought. He delighted in things true and honorable and just and pure and lovely and of good report. He knew that virtue was in these things and that all praise belonged to them. He had learned that while his mind was filled with these things he lived in serenity and peace. (8) Thanks for their gift (Php 4:10-20).

(9) Salutations (Php 4:21,22).

(10) Benediction (Php 4:23).

This is not a theological epistle and therefore it is not an especially Christological one. Yet we count the name of Christ 42 times in this short letter, and the pronouns referring to Him are many more. Paul cannot write anything without writing about Christ. He ends: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit." The spirit of Christ and the grace of Christ are in the entire epistle.

LITERATURE:

Works on Introduction: Zahn, Weiss, Julicher, Salmon, Dods, Bacon, Bennett and Adeney; McClymont, The New Testament and Its Writers; Farrar, The Messages of the Books; Fraser, Synoptical Lectures on Books of the Holy Scripture; Godet, Studies on the Epistles Works on the Pauline Epistles: Findlay, Shaw. Commentaries: Lightfoot, Vincent, Weiss, Beet, Ellicott, Haupt, Moule. Devotional studies: Moule, Meyer, Jowett, Noble.

Doremus Almy Hayes

PHILISTIA

fi-lis'-ti-a: The country is referred to under various designations in the Old Testament: namely, pelesheth (Philistia) (Ps 60:8 (Hebrew 10); 87:4), 'erets pelishtim, "land of the Philistines" (Ge 21:32,34), geloth hapelishtim; Septuagint ge ton Phulistieim, "the regions of the Philistines" (Jos 13:2). The Egyptian monuments have Puirsatha, Pulsath (Budge), Peleset (Breasted) and Purasati (HGHL), according to the different voweling of the radicals; the Assyrian form is Palastu or Pilistu, which corresponds very closely to the Egyptian and the Hebrew. The extent of the land is indicated in Jos 13:2 as being from the Shihor, or Brook of Egypt (Revised Version), to the border of Ekron, northward. The eastern border was along the Judean foothills on the line of Beth-shemesh (1Sa 6:9) with the sea on the West. It was a very small country, from 25 to 30 miles in length and with an average width of about half the length, but it was fertile, being an extension of the plain of Sharon, except that along the coast high sand dunes encroached upon the cultivated tract. It contained many towns and villages, the most important being the five so often mentioned in Scripture: Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath and Ekron. The population must have been large for the territory, which enabled them to contend successfully with the Israelites, notwithstanding the superiority of position in the hills to the advantage of the latter.

H. Porter

PHILISTIM

fi-lis'-tim, fil'-is-tim (pelishtim (Ge 10:14, the King James Version)).

See PHILISTINES.

PHILISTINES

fi-lis'-tinz, fil'-is-tinz, fil'-is-tinz (pelishtim; Phulistieim, allophuloi):

I. OLD TESTAMENT NOTICES

1. Race and Origin

2. Religion

3. Individual Philistines Mentioned

4. Title of Ruler and Circumcision

5. History in the Old Testament to Death of Saul

6. History Continued to Time of Ahaz

7. Later Notices

II. MONUMENTAL NOTICES

1. Palestinian Excavations

2. Egyptian Monuments

3. Assyrian Texts

III. THE CRETAN THEORY

1. Cherethim and Kretes

2. Caphtor and Keft

IV. DAVID’S GUARDS

1. The "Cherethi" and the "Pelethi" Not Mercenaries

2. Meaning of These Terms

3. Native Hebrews

4. Review

LITERATURE

I. Old Testament Notices.

1. Race and Origin:

The Philistines were an uncircumcised people inhabiting the shore plain between Gezer and Gaza in Southwestern Palestine (see PHILISTIA). The name Palestine itself (Hebrew pelesheth) refers to their country. The word means "migrants," and they came from another country. They are noticed 286 times in the Old Testament, and their country 8 times. The question of their race and origin is of great importance as affecting the genuine character and reliability of the Bible notices. In Ge 10:14 (1Ch 1:12) they are reckoned with other tribes in Mizraim (Egypt) as descendants of Ham, and as cousins of the old inhabitants of Babylonia (Ge 10:6). They are said to be a branch of the Casluhim—an unknown people—or, according to Septuagint, of the Casmanim, which would mean "shavers of the head"—a custom of the Phoenicians (forbidden to Hebrews as a rule), as known from a picture of the time of Thothmes III in the 16th century BC. They are also connected with the Caphtorim or people of Caphtor, whence indeed they are said to have come (Jer 47:4; Am 9:7). Caphtor was a "shoreland," but its position is doubtful (see De 2:23); the Caphtorim found an earlier race of Avim living in "enclosures" near Gaza, and destroyed them. In the Septuagint of this passage (and in Am 9:7) Cappadocia stands for Caphtor (Kaphtor), and other versions have the same reading. Cappadocia was known to the Assyrians as kat-pat-uka (probably an Akkadian term—"land of the Kati"), and the Kati were a people living in Cilicia and Cappadocia, which region had a Semitic population side by side with Mengels (see HITTITES) at least as early as the time of Moses. It is very likely therefore that this reading is correct.

2. Religion:

According to the Old Testament and monuments alike, the Philistines were a Semitic people, and they worshipped two Babylonian gods, Dagon (1Sa 5:2) and Ashtaroth (1Sa 31:10), both of whom were adored very early in Babylonia, both, however, having names of Akkadian and not of Semitic origin. In Semitic speech Dagon meant "grain," and was so understood in the time of Philo of Gebal, a Greek-Phoenician writer who attributes the art of grain-growing to this deity. But the original name was Da-gan, and in Akkadian da is "the upper part of a man," and gan (Turkish qaan) probably means "a large fish." The new man deity was well known to the Assyrians, and is represented in connection with Sennacherib’s worship of Ea, the sea-god, when he embarked on the Persian Gulf. Thus Dagon was probably a title of Ea ("the water spirit"), called by Berosus Oannes (u-ha-na, "lord of the fish"), and said to have issued from this same gulf. We consequently read that when the statue of Dagon at Ashdod fell (1Sa 5:4), its head and hands were broken off, and only "the great fish" was left. In 1874 the present writer found a seal near Ashdod representing a bearded god (as in Babylonia) with a fish tail (see DAGON). As to Ashtoreth, who was adored in Philistia itself, her name is derived from the Akkadian Ishtar ("light maker"), a name for the moon-goddess and—later—for the planet Venus.

See ASHTORETH.

3. Individual Philistines Mentioned:

The Philistines had reached Gerar by the time of Abraham, and it was only in the age of the Hyksos

rulers of the Delta that Canaanite tribes could be described as akin, not only to Babylonians, but also to certain tribes in Egypt, a circumstance which favors the antiquity of the ethnic chapter, Ge 10. We have 9 Philistine names in the Old Testament, all of which seem to be Semitic, including Abimelech —"Moloch is my father"—(Ge 20:2-18; 21:22-32; 26:8-11) at Gerar, Southeasat of Gaza, Ahuzzath ("possession," Ge 26:26), and Phicol (of doubtful meaning), with Delilah ("delicate," Jud 16:4), Goliath (probably the Babylonian galu, "great"), and Saph (2Sa 21:18), perhaps meaning "increase." These two brothers were sons of Raphah ("the tall"); but Ishbi-benob (2Sa 21:16), another of the family, perhaps only means "the dweller in Nob" (Beit Nuba, North of Gezer). The king of Gath in David's time was Achish ("the gift" in Bah), who (1Sa 27:2) was the son of Maoch, "the oppressor." According to Septuagint, Jonathan killed a Philistine named Nasib (1Sa 13:3,4, where the King James Version reads "a garrison"). If this is correct the name (meaning "a pillar") would also be Semitic.

4. Title of Ruler and Circumcision:

Besides these personal names, and those of the cities of Philistia which are all Semitic, we have the title given to Philistine lords, ceren, which Septuagint renders "satrap" and "ruler," and which probably comes from a Semitic root meaning "to command." It constantly applies to the rulers of Gaza, Ashdod, Ashkelon, Gath and Ekron, the 5 chief cities of Philistia. The fact that the Philistines were uncircumcised does not prove that they were not a Semitic people. Herodotus (ii.104) says that the Phoenicians acknowledged that they took this custom from the Egyptians, and the Arabs according to this passage were still uncircumcised, nor is it known that this was a custom of the Babylonians and Assyrians. The Septuagint translators of the Pentateuch always render the name Phulistieim, and this also is found in 8 passages of Joshua and Judges, but in the later books the name is translated as meaning "strangers" throughout, because they were not the first inhabitants of Philistia.

5. History in the Old Testament until Death of Saul:

The Philistines conquered the "downs" (geliloth, Joe 3:4) near the seacoast, and were so powerful at the time of the Hebrew conquest that none of their great towns were taken (Jos 13:3; Jud 3:3). By the time of Samson (about 1158 BC) they appear as oppressors of Israel for 40 years (Jud 13:1; 15:20), having encroached from their plains into the Shephelah (or low hills) of Judah, at the foot of the mountains. Delilah was a Philistine woman, living in the valley of Sorek, close to Samson's home. In the last year of Eli (1Sa 4:1) we find the Philistines attacking the mountains near Mizpeh, where they captured the ark. Samuel drove them back and placed his monument of victory between Mizpeh and Jeshanah (Shen; see the Septuagint; 1Sa 7:12) on the mountain ridge of Benjamin. He even regained towns in the Shephelah as far as Ekron and Gath (1Sa 7:14); but at the opening of Saul's reign (1Sa 10:5) the Philistines had a "garrison" at Gibeah—or a chief named Hasib according to Septuagint. They raided from this center (1Sa 13:17-23) in all directions, and prevented the Hebrews from arming themselves, till Jonathan drove them from Michmash (1Sa 14:1-47). David's victory (1Sa 17:2) was won in the Valley of Elah East of Gath, and the pursuit (1Sa 17:52) was as far as Ekron. We here read that the Philistine champion wore armor of bronze (1Sa 17:4-7), his spear head being of iron. They still invaded the Shephelah after this defeat, robbing the threshing-floors of Keilah (1Sa 23:1) near Adullam at the foot of the Hebron Mountains (see 1Sa 23:27; 24:1). David's band of outlaws gradually increasing from

400 to 600 men (1Sa 22:2; 27:2), being driven from the Hebrew lands, accompanied him to Gath, which is usually placed at Tell es-Safi, at the point where the Valley of Elah enters the Philistine plain. It appears that Achish, king of Gath, then ruled as far South as Ziklag (Jos 15:31; 1Sa 27:6) in the Beersheba plains; but he was not aware of the direction of David's raids at this distance. Achish supposed David to be committed to his cause (1Sa 27:12), but the Philistine lords suspected him and his Hebrew followers (1Sa 29:3) when going up to Jezreel.

6. History Continued to Time of Ahaz:

After they had killed Saul, we hear no more of them till the 8th year of David, when, after taking Jerusalem, he apparently went down to Adullam (2Sa 5:17) and fell upon them in their rear as they advanced on his capital. He then destroyed their supremacy (2Sa 8:1) as far as Gezer (1Ch 20:4), and the whole of Philistia was subject to Solomon (1Ki 4:21), though not long after his death they seem to have held the town of Gibbethon (1Ki 15:27; 16:15) in the hills of Dan. Hezekiah smote the Philistines as far as Gaza (2Ki 18:8) before 702 BC, in which year (according to the Taylor cylinder) Sennacherib made Hezekiah deliver up Padii, king of Ekron, who had been carried prisoner to Jerusalem. The accounts in Chronicles refer to David's taking Gath (1Ch 18:1), which was recovered later, and again taken by Uzziah (2Ch 26:6). The Philistines sent gifts to Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:11), but invaded the Shephelah (2Ch 28:18) in the time of Ahaz.

7. Later Notices:

In this age the "lords" of the 5 cities of Philistia are called "kings," both in the Bible and on Assyrian monuments. Isaiah (2:6) speaks of Philistine superstitions, Ezekiel (25:15,16) connects them with the Cherethim on the seacoast. They still held Gath in the time of Amos (6:2), and Gaza, Ashdod and Ekron in that of Zephaniah (2:5), who again mentions the Cherethim with Philistines, as inhabitants of Canaan or the "lowlands." The last notice (Zec 9:6) still speaks of kings in Ashkelon, Gaza, Ekron and Ashdod at a time when the Ionians had become known in Judah (Zec 9:13); but the Philistines are unnoticed by Ezra or Nehemiah, unless we suppose that the "speech of Ashdod" (Ne 13:24) was their old dialect, which appears—like the language of the Canaanites in general in earlier times—to have resembled that of the Babylonians and Assyrians, and to have thus differed—though Semitic—from the Hebrews.

Their further history is embraced in that of the various cities to which reference can be made under the articles pertaining to them.

II. Monumental Notices.

1. Palestinian Excavations:

These are of great importance, because they confirm the Old Testament statements from a time at least as early as that of Moses, and down to 670 BC. Recent excavations at Gezer show the early presence of two races at this Philistine city, one being Semitic, the other probably Egyptian Scarabs as old as the

XIIth Dynasty were found, and in the 15th century BC Gezer was held by Amenophis III. At Lachish also seals of this king and his queen have been found, with a cuneiform letter to Zimridi, who was ruler of the city under the same Pharaoh. At Gaza a temple was built by Amenophis II. The names of places in Philistia noticed yet earlier by Thothmes III are all Semitic, including Joppa, Saphir, Gerar, Gezer, etc. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters we have also (about 1480 BC) letters from chiefs subject to Amenophis III at Joppa, Ashkelon, Gezer, Lachish and Keilah which show us a Semitic population, not only by the language of these letters, but also by the names of the writers. In the case of Ashkelon especially the Semitic rulers are found to have worshipped Dagon; and, though the name "Philistine" does not occur, the race was clearly the same found by the Assyrians in 800 BC in the land of Palastan beside the Great Sea. These names include Yamir-Dagdn ("Dagon sees"), Dagantakala ("Dagon is a protection") and Yadaya (the "grateful") at Ashkelon; Bua ("asked for"), son of the woman Gulata, at Joppa; Yabnilu ("God made"), at Lachish, with Zimridi—a name found also in Sabean Arabic; while, at Gezer, Yapa’a represents the Biblical Japhia (Jos 10:3), and Milkilu ("Moloch is king") the Hebrew Malchiel. Others might be added of the same character, but these examples are enough to show that, in the time of Moses and Joshua, the population of Philistia was the same that is noticed in the Old Testament as early as Abraham’s age.

2. Egyptian Monuments:

When therefore scholars speak of the Philistines as being non-Semitic—and probably Aryan—invaders of the country, arriving about 1200 BC, they appear not only to contradict the Bible, but also to contradict the monumental evidence of the earlier existence of Semitic Dagon- worshippers at Ashkelon. In this later age Rameses III was attacked, in Egypt, by certain northern tribes who came by sea, and also by land, wasting first the country of the Hittites and Amorites. Among them were the Danau, who were probably Greek Danai. They were exterminated in the Delta, and in the subsequent advance of Rameses III to the Euphrates. On a colored picture they are represented as fair people; and two of the tribes were called Purstau and Takarri, whom Chabas supposed to be Pelasgi (since "l" and "r" are not distinguished in Egyptian) and Teucrians. These two tribes wear the same peculiar headdress. Brugsch supposed the former to be Philistines (Geog., I, 10), but afterward called them Purosata (Hist Egypt, II, 148). The inscriptions accompanying the picture on the temple walls say that they came from the north, and "their home was in the land of the Purstau, the Takarri," etc. There is thus no reason at all to suppose that they were Philistines, nor did they ever settle in Philistia.

3. Assyrian Texts:

The Assyrian texts agree with those already mentioned in making the inhabitants of Philistia Semitic. Rimmon-nirari, about 800 BC, was the first Assyrian conqueror in Palastau ("by the great sea"). In 734 and 727 BC, Tiglath-pileser attacked the Pilisti, and mentions a king of Ashkelon named Mitinti ("my gift"), and his son Rukufti whose name resembles that of the Kenite called Rechab in the Old Testament. The name of the king of Gaza was Chanun, or "merciful." In 711 BC Sargon took Ashdod, and speaks of its king Azuri, whose name recalls the Amorite Aziru, and of Achimiti ("a brother is sent"), and the usurper Yamanu ("stedfast"), who fled before him. Sennacherib, in 702 BC, gives the names of cities in Philistia (including Eltekeh and Beneberak near Joppa) which are Semitic. He notices Sidqa (Zadok) of

Ashkelon, and also Sarludari ("the Lord be praised"), son of Rukubti in the same city, with Mitinti of Ashdod, and Padii ("redeeming") of Ekron, while Cil-b'el ("Baal is a protection") was king of Gaza. In 679 BC Esarhaddon speaks of Silli-b'el ("Baal is my protection") of Gaza, with Mitinti of Ashkelon, Ika-samsu ("the sun-god is manifest") of Ekron, and Abi-milki of Ashdod, who bore the ancient Philistine name Abimelech. In 670 BC, when Assur-bani-pal set up many tributary kings in Egypt, we find again the name Sarludari applied to a ruler of Pelusium, who may have been a Philistine. It is thus abundantly clear that the monumental notices all agree with the Old Testament as to the names and nationality of the Philistines, and as to their worship of Baal and Dagon; the conjecture that they were Aryan foreigners, arriving in 1200 BC, is not based on any statement of the monuments, but merely rests on a guess which Brugsch subsequently abandoned. It resembles many other supposed discrepancies between Biblical and contemporary records due to the mistakes of modern commentators.

III. The Cretan Theory.

1. Cherethim and Kretes:

This strange theory, which is apparently of Byzantine origin, would make the Philistines come from Crete. It still finds supporters, though it does not rest on any Biblical or monumental evidence. The Cherethim (Eze 25:16; Ze 2:5) were a Semitic people named with the Philistines in Canaan. The Septuagint renders the word with Kretes or Kretoi; and, about 1770 AD, Michaelis (Spicil., I, 292-308) argued that this meant "Cretans," and that the Philistines therefore came from Caphtor, which must be Crete. The passages, however, refer to Philistia and not to any island, and the Septuagint translators, as we have seen, placed Caphtor in Cappadocia. The Cherethi—in the singular—is mentioned (1Sa 30:14) as a people of Philistia (1Sa 30:16), near Ziklag, and their name probably survives at the present town called Keratiyeh in the Philistine plain.

Yet, many theories are founded on this old idea about the Cherethites. Some suppose that Tacitus confused the Jews with the Philistines as having come from Crete; but what he actually says (History v.11) is that "the Jews ran away from Crete," and "the inhabitants are named Idaci (from Mount Ida), which, with a barbarous augment, becomes the name of the Judaei." This absurd derivation shows at least that Tacitus did not mean the Philistines. Stephen of Byzantium said that the god Marna at Gaza was like the Cretan Jove. Probably he had seen the huge statue of a seated Jove found near Gaza, and now at Constantinople, but this is late Greek work, and the name Marna ("our lord") is Semitic. Stephen also thought that Minois—the port of Gaza—was named from the Cretan Minos, but it is an Arabic word Mineh, for "harbor," still applying to the same place.

2. Caphtor and Keft:

No critical student is likely to prefer these later speculations to our present monumental information, even without reference to the contradiction of the Bible. Yet these blunders have given rise to the supposition that Caphtor is to be identified with a region known to the Egyptians as Keft, with inhabitants called Kefau. The latter are represented in a tomb of the XVIIIth Dynasty near Thebes. They

are youths of brown color, with long black hair, and the same type is found in a Cypriote figure. They are connected with islanders of the "green sea," who may have lived in Arvad or in Cyprus; but there is no evidence in any written statement that they were Cretans, though a figure at Knossos in Crete somewhat resembles them. There are many indications that this figure—painted on the wall of the later palace—is not older than about 500 BC, and the Sidonians had colonies in Crete, where also pottery is found just like that marked by a Phoenician inscription in Cyprus. The Kefau youths bring vases as presents, and these—in all their details—are exactly the same as those represented in another picture of the time of Thothrues III, the bearers in this case being Harri from North Syria, represented with black beards and Semitic features. Moreover, on the bilingual inscription called the Decree of Canopus (238 BC), the Keft region is said to be "Phoenicia," and the Greek translator naturally knew what was meant by his Egyptian colleague. Keft in fact is a Semitic word for "palm," occurring in Hebrew (Isa 9:14; 19:15), and thus applicable to the "palm"-land, Phoenicia. Thus, even if Keft were related to Caphtor, the evidence would place the Philistine home on the Phoenician shores, and not in Crete. There is indeed no evidence that any European race settled near the coasts of Palestine before about 680 BC, when Esarhaddon speaks of Greek kings in Cyprus. The Cretan theory of Michaelis was a literary conjecture, which has been disproved by the results of exploration in Asia.

IV. David’s Guards.

1. The "Cherethi" and the "Pelethi" Not Mercenaries:

Another strange theory, equally old, represents David as being surrounded with foreign mercenaries—Philistines and Carians—as Rameses II employed mercenaries called Shairtanau from Asia Minor. The suggestion that the Cherethites were of this race is scarcely worth notice, since the Hebrew letter kaph (k) is never represented by "sh" in Egyptian David’s band of Hebrew exiles, 400 in number, followed him to Gath where 200 Gittites joined him (2Sa 15:18). In later times his army consisted of "the Cherethi" (kerethi, in the singular) and "the Pelethi" (pelethi), commanded by the Hebrew leader Benaiah, son of Jehoiada (2Sa 8:18; 15:18; 20:7; 1Ki 1:38,44), together with the Gittites under Ittai of Gath. These guards are never said to have been Philistines, but "the Cherethi" is supposed to mean one of the Cherethim tribe, and "the Pelethi" to be another name for the Philistine. As regards the Gittites, the fact that they came from Gath does not prove that they were Philistines, any more than was David himself because he came back from this city. David calls Ittai an "enemy" and an "exile," but it is probable that he was the same hero, so named (2Sa 23:29), who was the son of Ribai from Gibeah of Benjamin. He had himself not long joined David, being no doubt in exile at Gath, and his tribe at first opposed David, taking the side of their tribesman Saul. Even when Ittai’s men joined the Cherethi and Pelethi against Absalom, they were naturally suspected; for David still had enemies (2Sa 15:5-13) among Benjamites of Saul’s house. It is also surely impossible to suppose that David would have left the ark in charge of a Phili; and Obed-edom the Gittite (2Sa 6:10) was a Levite, according to a later account (1Ch 15:18), bearing a Hebrew name, meaning perhaps "servant of men," or "humble worshipper." It seems equally unlikely that, in later times, a pious priest like Jehoiada (2Ki 11:4) would have admitted foreign mercenaries into the temple. In this passage they are called kari, as also in 2Sa 20:23, where the Septuagint has Cherethi. The suggestion of Wellhausen that they were Carians does not seem probable, as Carians had not even reached Egypt before about 600 BC.

2. Meaning of These Terms:

The real explanation of these various words for soldiers seems simple; and David—being a very popular king—is not likely to have needed foreign mercenaries; while the Philistines, whom he had so repeatedly smitten, were very unlikely to have formed trusty guards. The word "Cherethi" (kerethi) means a "smiter" or a "destroyer," and "Pelethi" (pelethi) means "a swift one" or "pursuer." In the time of Joash the temple-guards are called kari (2Ki 11:4,19, Carites), which the Septuagint treats as either singular or plural, and ratsim or "runners" (see 1Sa 22:17; 1Ki 14:27,28; 2Ki 10:25), these two bodies perhaps answering to the Cherethi and Pelethi of David's time; for kari means "stabber." The term ratsim, or "runners," is however of general application, since Jehu also had troops so called (2Ki 10:25). Evidently we have here two classes of troops—as among the Romans—the heavier regiment of "destroyers," or "stabbers," being armed with swords, daggers or spears; while the "swift ones" or "runners" pursued the defeated foe. Thus, in Egypt we find, yet earlier, the ax-man supported by the bow-man in regular regiments; and in Assyria the spear-man with heavy shields defending the bow-man. We have also a picture of the time of Tiglath-pileser II representing an Assyrian soldier on a camel. The Pelethi or "pursuers" may have been "runners" on foot, but perhaps more probably mounted on camels, or on horses like the later Assyrians; for in the time of Solomon (1Ki 4:28) horses and riding camels were in use—the former for chariots. It is clear that David's band, leaving the vicinity of Jezreel (1Sa 29:1; 30:1), could not have reached Ziklag "on the third day" (a distance of 120 miles) on foot; so that the camel corps must have existed even before the death of Saul.

3. Native Hebrews:

These considerations seem to make it evident that David's guards were native Hebrews, who had been with him as exiles and outlaws at Adullam and Gath, and that the Cherethi or "destroyer" only accidentally had a title like that of the Philistine tribe of "destroyers" or Cherethim, who were not Cretans, it would seem, any more than the "stabbers" were Carians.

4. Review:

The general result of our inquiry is, that all monumental notices of the Philistines agree with the Old Testament statements, which make them to be a Semitic people who had already migrated to Philistia by the time of Abraham, while the supposed discrepancies are caused by the mistakes made by a commentator of the 18th century, and by archaeologists of later times.

LITERATURE

Paton, Early History of Syria and Palestine; Smith, HGHL; Budge, History of Egypt; Breasted, History of Egypt; Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies; Herodotus with most histories of Egypt, Babylon, and Assyria for the period from the 13th century BC to the time of Alexander.

C. R. Conder

PHILISTINES, LORDS OF THE

See PHILISTIA.

PHILISTINES, SEA OF THE

(Ex 23:31).

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

PHILO, JUDAEUS

fi-’lo, joo-de’-us:

1. His Life

2. Importance of the Period

3. The Task of Philo

4. Changes and New Problems

5. Three Subjects of Inquiry

(1) The Conception of God

(2) God’s Relation to the World

(3) Doctrine of Man

6. Philo’s Works

LITERATURE

1. His Life:

Born probably in the first decade of Augustus Caesar, who became emperor in 27 BC. He died possibly in the last years of Claudius (41-54 AD), more likely in the early years of Nero (54-65 AD). We have no

exact information about either date. He was a native of Alexandria, Egypt. His relatives were wealthy and prominent, probably sacerdotal, Jews. He received the best Jewish education, and was trained also in Gentilelearning—grammar, rhetoric, philosophy, geometry, poetry, music. Enjoying ample means, he was enabled to devote his career to scholarship. The Alexandrian Jews wielded great influence in the contemporary Roman empire, and the prominence of Philo's family is attested by the fact that his brother, Alexander Lysimachus, was Alabarch of Alexandria. The single date in Philo's life which we know accurately is connected with their leadership. In the winter of 39-40 AD, he was spokesman of the deputation sent to Rome to protest against imposition of emperor-worship upon fellow-citizens of his faith. The mission failed, Philo, with his two colleagues, meeting rebuff, even insult. It was little likely that Caligula would heed grievances which included specifically dissent from worship of himself. Philo records his distaste for political activity, and, so far as we know, the Roman incident excepted, he devoted himself principally to letters. As a young man probably, he had undertaken a journey to Jerusalem, almost in the nature of a pilgrimage to the ancient shrine of his religion. He paid a second visit to Rome possibly after 50 AD, at all events, in the reign of Claudius. For the rest, our knowledge of his life is scanty and, sometimes, legendary.

2. Importance of the Period:

The period covered by his career coincides with one of the most momentous epochs in history. For it witnesses, not only the foundation of the Roman imperial system, but also the beginning of the end of ancient classical civilization in its dominant ideas, and the plantation of Christianity. Preeminently an era of transition, it was marked by significant displacements in culture, the effects of which continue to sway mankind even yet. Minor phenomena aside, three principal movements characterized the time: the Pagan reaction, or reversion to forms of religion that had sufficed the peoples of the Ro empire hitherto —this manifested itself strongly with Augustus, and entered its decline perhaps with the death of Plutarch (circa 120 AD); the appearance of Christianity; and what is known as Syncretism, or interfusion between the conceptions of different races, especially in religion, philosophy and morals—a circumstance which affected the fortunes of Christianity deeply, found its chief exponent in Philo, and maintained itself for several centuries in theosophical systems of the Gnostics and neo-Platonists. Thus, to understand Philo, and to realize his importance, it is essential to remember the internal spirit of his age. The "universalism" of the Roman empire has been so named because, within the political framework, various peoples and divergent civilizations commingled and came eventually to share something of a common spirit, even of a common language. Philo's prominence as a figure in the world of thought, and as an authority for the general culture of New Testament times, is out of all proportion to the fragmentary information available about his external career. Contemporary currents, subtle as they were, perplexing as they still remain, met and fused in his person. Hence, his value as an index to the temperament of the period cannot well be overrated.

3. The Task of Philo:

A Jew by nature and nurture, an oriental mystic by accident of residence, a Greek humanist by higher education and professional study, an ally of the Ro governing classes, familiar with their intellectual perspective, Philo is at once rich in suggestion and blurred in outline. Moreover, he addressed himself to

two tasks, difficult to weld into a flawless unity. On the one hand, he wrote for educated men in Greek-Roman society, attempting to explain, often to justify, his racial religion before them. The ancient state religion having fallen upon inanition, he enjoyed unusual opportunity to point the merits of the Jewish faith as the "desire of all nations," the panacea of which the need was everywhere felt. On the other hand, he had to confront his orthodox coreligionists, with their separatist traditions and their contempt for paganism in all its works. He tried to persuade them that, after all, Greek thought was not inimical to their cherished doctrines, but, on the contrary, involved similar, almost identical, principles. He thus represented an eclectic standpoint, one in which Greek philosophy blended with historical and dogmatic deductions from the Jewish Scriptures. The result was Philo's peculiar type of theosophy—we cannot call it a system. Taking the Old Testament for text, he applied the "allegorical" method, with curious consequences. He taught that the Scriptures contain two meanings: a "lower" meaning, obvious in the literal statements of the text; and a "higher," or hidden meaning, perceptible to the "initiate" alone. In this way he found it possible to reconcile Greek intellectualism with Jewish belief. Greek thought exhibits the "hidden" meaning; it turns out to be the elucidation of the "allegory" which runs through the Old Testament like a vein of gold. Moses, and the rest, are not merely historical figures, the subjects of such and such vicissitudes, but representative types of reason, righteousness, the virtues, and so forth. The tendency to fusion of this kind was no new thing. It is traceable for some three centuries before Philo, who may be said to complete the process. It had been familiar to the rabbis, and to the Hellenistic philosophers, particularly the Stoics, who applied this method to the Greek poetical myths. Philo reduces it to an expert art, and uses it as an instrument to dissipate all difficulties. He believed himself to be thoroughly true to the Old Testament. But, thanks to his method, he rendered it malleable, and could thus adjust its interpretation to what he considered to be the intellectual necessities of his generation. Nay more, he felt that, when at his best in this process, he became a vehicle of Divine possession. He says, "Through the influence of divine inspiration I have become excited profoundly .... then I have been conscious of a richness of interpretation, an enjoyment of light, a most penetrating sight, a most manifest energy in all that was to be done." Again "I am irradiated with the light of wisdom," and, "all intellect is a divine inspiration." Little wonder, then, that we have a strange mixture of philosophy and religion, of rationalism and piety, of clear Greek intellectualism with hazy oriental mysticism. Hence, too, the philosophy of Philo is subordinate to his explanation of the Scriptures, and compromise, rather than logical thinking, marks his leading positions.

4. Changes and New Problems:

After the death of Cicero (43 BC) a change, long preparing, asserted itself in ancient thought. Mixture of national, or racial, characteristics was consummated, and thoughtful men, irrespective of race-origin, became persons to each other. A reorganization of standards of ethical judgment was thus rendered inevitable, and Judaism came to interfuse more freely with Greek philosophy as one consequence. While it is true that "reason" preserved its traditional supremacy as the means to solve all problems, the nature of the chief quest underwent transformation. The old association of man with Nature gave way to a dualism or opposition between the world-order and another existence lying behind it as its originator or sustainer. The system of Nature having disappointed expectation, thinkers asked how they could escape it, and assure themselves of definite relations with the Divine Being. They sought the desiderated connection within their own souls, but as a distant ideal. This was the problem that confronted Philo,

who attacked it from the Jewish side. Now Judaism, like Greek thought, had also experienced a change of heart. Yahweh had been the subject of an idealizing process, and tended, like the Stoic deity, to lose specific relation with the world and man. Accordingly, a new religious question was bringing the philosophy and the faith into closer contact. Could they join forces? Philo's consequent embarrassment rooted, not simply in this fresh problem, but in the difficulties inseparable from the adjustment of his available methods and materials. For, while the Jewish Messiah had passed over into the Greek Logos, the two systems preserved their separation in no small measure, Philo being the most conspicuous mediator. He was familiar with the mystic, transcendent concept of Deity extracted, thanks to long misinterpretation, from Plato's cosmogonic dialogue, Timaeus. Here God was elevated above the world. His conception of the presence, or immanence, of the Deity in the world came from the Stoics. The Jewish religion gave him the doctrine of a righteous (pure) Deity, whose moral inwardness made relations with men possible. Moreover, contemporary angelology and demonology enabled him to devise a scheme whereby the pure Deity could be linked with the gross world, notwithstanding its ineradicable evil. Little wonder, then, that he compassed an amalgamation only, and this in consonance with theosophical drift of the age. Nevertheless, he counteracted the deistic tendencies of rabbinical speculation by reference to Hellenistic pantheism, and, at the same time, counteracted this pantheism by the inward moralism of his national faith. The logical symmetry of the Greek mind was reinforced by Hebraic religious intuition. The consequence was a ferment rather than a system, but a ferment that cast up the clamant problem in unmistakable fashion. The crux was this: Man must surmount his own fragmentary experience and rise to an absolute Being; but, its absoluteness notwithstanding, this Being must be brought into direct contact with the finite. Philo was unable to reconcile the two demands, because he could not rise above them; but the effort after reconciliation controls all his thought. As a result, he concentrated upon three main subjects of inquiry:

(1) the conception of God;

(2) the manner of God's relation to the world;

(3) human nature.

5. Three Subjects of Inquiry:

(1) The Conception of God:

Philo's doctrine of God, like that of the neo-Platonic school, which he heralded, is thoroughly dualistic. No doubt, it is determined largely by certain human analogies. For example, God's existence is necessary for the control of the world, just in the same way as man's mind must exist to furnish the principle of all human action; and, as matter is not self-determined, a principle, analogous to mind, is demanded, to be its first cause. Further, as the permanent soul remains unchanged throughout the vicissitudes of a human life, so, behind the ceaseless play of phenomena, there must reside a self-existent Being. Nevertheless, the human analogy never extends to God in His actual Being. No human traits can attach to the Deity. Language may indicate such parallelism, nay the Scriptures are full of

instances, but we must view them as concessions to mortal weakness. These accommodations eliminated, it becomes evident that man can never know God positively. Any adjective used to describe Him can do no more than point the contrast between His relationless Being and the dependence of finite things. That God is, Philo is fully persuaded; what He is, no man can ever tell. He is one and immutable, simple and immeasurable and eternal, just as man is not. "For he is unchangeable, requiring nothing else at all, so that all things belong to Him, but He, speaking strictly, belongs to nothing." This doctrine of the transcendence of Deity was an essential postulate of Philonic thought. For, seeing that He expels all the imperfections of the world, God is precisely in that condition of Being for which the whole creation then yearned. In a word, the dualism, so far from being a bar to salvation, was rather a condition without which the problem of salvation could neither be stated nor solved. Men stood in necessary relation to this Being, but, as yet, He stood in no relation whatever to them. Yet, men must return to God, but He abides so remote, in the realm of pure contemplation and completion, that He cannot approach them. Philo's familiarity with logical Greek thought debarred him from surmounting the difficulty after the manner of Jewish religion. An otiose reference to "God's choice," as distinct from His nature, could not suffice a mind trained in Hellenic methods. The question therefore was, How could mediation be effected?

(2) God's Relation to the World.

At this point Philo's thought assumes a phase of great interest to readers of the New Testament. God, being above created things, is incomprehensible and immaterial. Accordingly, He cannot be connected with the world directly. Therefore He created it and sustains it by intermediate powers. These agencies were suggested to Philo by the Platonic Ideas. But he personalized them more or less and, as a characteristic addition, included them in the Logos. He substituted the term "Logos" for the Platonic term "Idea" on the basis of the Scripture phrase, "Word of God." The conception was influenced further by his Hellenistic psychological notion, that a word is a "shadow" of a deed. Accordingly, the Logos is the "shadow of God"—God being the "deed" whereby the "shadow" is cast. As a direct issue, the Logos presents two aspects. On the one side it is internal and indwelling; on the other, it is external and mediating. The scope of this distinction is indicated very well by the epithets which Philo applies to each aspect respectively. The internal Logos is the "Firstborn," the "Second God," the "Mediator" the "Ransom," the "Image of God" "Member of the Trinity," "High Priest." The external Logos "abides in man," is the "Prophet," "Shepherd," "Ambassador," "Artist," "EIder," "Interpreter," "Shadow of God." The former represents Philo's conception of the unity of the Logos with God, the latter his provision for the manifestation of the Logos in created things. He thus tries to preserve the transcendence of God equally with His immanence. No doubt, in previous times, the mysteriousness of the Divine nature had impressed itself upon men with at least as much force as now. But with one of two consequences. Either the particular finites and the Deity were mixed in inextricable confusion, as by oriental pantheism, or God was banished from the world, as by the extreme developments within Greek dualism. Philo attempted to combine the two tendencies, and was able consequently to face the obvious contradiction between the idea of an absolute Being and the cloudy conception of a multiplicity of phenomena in which this Being ought to be present somehow, despite transcendence. He demands a God who, in His exaltation, shall be a worthy Deity; this is the Jew in him. But he also demands a definite relation between this God and His creation; this is the Greek and, in part, the Oriental, in him. Thanks to the

former, he could not be satisfied with mere naturalism; thanks to the latter, no fable or picture could suffice. A real mediator was required, who would link the world and its heart's desire. But Philo could not surmount one difficulty peculiar to contemporary thought. He was unable to connect God directly with creation and preserve His purity unsullied. Hence, the obscurity which surrounds his conception of the Logos, likewise his vacillation with respect to its personality. So we find the different intellectual forces which he inherited playing upon him—now one, now another. Sometimes the Platonic theory of Ideas dominates him; sometimes he leans to Stoicism, with its immanent world-reason; and here he even seems to foreshadow the doctrine of the Trinity; again, the ramifications of rabbinical lore cause him to bestow upon the Logos a priestly function or an atoning office. No single aspect achieves supremacy, although on the whole mystical Platonism may be said to predominate. Thus, "The world of Ideas has its place in the Divine Logos, just as the plan of a city is in, the soul of the master-builder." Accordingly, God's thought may take its place in the world by being impressed upon things; yet, on account of its subjective nature, it must be apprehended subjectively, that is, by one who is capable of entering this sphere. The Logos thus seems to exist entirely in the same realm as Deity; thus, it can mediate between Him and creation only if an element proper to Deity be discernible in mundane things. In other words, the Logos mediates between God and the world, but partakes of the Divine nature only. This, in any case, is the inner logic of Philo's view. It accounts for creation, but has no power to persuade man to overpass the limitations placed upon him by his bodily prison. Thus the question of the personality of the Logos is never cleared. In so far as Philo needs Logos to connect God with the world, he inclines to a doctrine of personality. In so far as he makes it the principle of all activities within the world, he inclines away from personality. In short, we have a "world-soul." And, as a consequence, there is an inherent tendency to reduce all finite being to illusion. Indeed, one might term the Logos a reply in some sort to Aristotle's question—which of the Platonic Ideas could connect the other Ideas with sensible things? Salvation is conceived as wrought out, not by a person, but by an abstract essence flowing from Deity, an essence that found due expression rather in the cosmic order than in a person. While, therefore, Philo thinks in a cultural perspective akin to that characteristic of the author of the Fourth Gospel, two vast differences sway his doctrine. On the one hand, it is speculative, not ethically personal. On the other hand, it fails completely to determine the nature of his mediator in itself, vacillating in a manner which shows how vague and fluid the conception really was.

(3) Doctrine of Man.

This appears further in the doctrine of man. Following current interpretations of Plato, Philo makes man partake in the rational nature of God, but denies that he embodies the highest species of reason. That is, the ideal man and the man known to us in common experience are distinguished. The former is rational as God is. The latter is partly rational, partly irrational. The body vitiates the original angelic purity of the soul and, similarly, reason is alloyed. And yet, although the higher nature becomes more and more debased as the years lapse, a seed of Divinity is present, ready to burst forth. Thus man must crush the flesh and its desires. At this point we note the effect of the Stoic ideal of imperturbability. When he has attained this apathy, man can enjoy the life of contemplation. This, in its turn, culminates in ecstasy, when the human soul attains sudden and momentary union with the Divine. For a "fair moment" man escapes the thralldom of sense. Yet the doctrine remains intellectual even here. He "who escapes from his own mind flies to the mind of the universe, confessing that all the things of the human mind are vain

and unreal, and attributing everything to God." Philo's anthropology therefore ends in contempt for this life, which is in no wise worth while, and in a counsel of perfection available only for a select elite. Accordingly, the conclusion of the whole matter is, that he never saw how the divine and the human can be united, although he stated the factors of the problem with great clearness, and felt profoundly the urgency of a solution. His gospel was for the children of culture. He saw the eternal in the temporal, and hoped that good might lurk in evil. But he never understood that "love for a Divine Person" might be so diffused throughout a human soul as to render evil and unreality the means to the attainment of good and to the revelation of truth. The salvation he contemplated was from self, not in self. Hence, as he asserts himself, harmony with God "is an incomprehensible mystery to the multitude, and is to be imparted to the instructed only." Nor is this wonderful. For a God who is the reasonable "form" of the world; a "matter" which begins as an indistinguishable mass and ends as a "second principle"; and objects of sense rendered apparent by the operation of many curious intermediate forces, ranging from "angel-words" to the human soul, constitute a combination beyond the reach of any save the "initiate." More practicable is Philo's conception of the moral life—as a warfare of the soul against passion, pleasure and sensuality. Yet, even this contest is hopeless unless it be waged with the equipment of the "philosopher athlete." Escape from the "prison-house" of flesh would seem to be consequent only upon profound knowledge.

6. Philo's Works:

The probability is that Philo's works were written previous to his Roman embassy. They show how he tried to apply Greek philosophical conceptions to Jewish beliefs, history, and usages exclusively. The voluminous remains which have come down to us appear to belong to three commentaries on the Pentateuch and the Mosaic Law. In all likelihood, they are portions of Philo's popular presentation, written for the instruction and information of educated Hellenistic circles rather than for the trained "initiate." The treatises most important for Philo's religio-philosophical views are as follows: On the Creation of the World; On the Allegories of the Sacred Laws; On the Unchangeableness of God; On the Confusion of Languages; On the Migration of Abraham; On the Meeting for the Sake of Receiving Instruction; On the Life of the Wise Man Made Perfect by Instruction; The Unwritten Law; Abraham; On Special Laws; On Rewards and Punishments; That Every Man Who Is Virtuous Is Also Free; Concerning the World; and the Fragments. Some 8 works attributed to Philo are in dispute. Most conspicuous of these is Concerning the Contemplative Life, with its ascetic view of morality, and its description of the ideal community of the Therapeutae.

LITERATURE.

E. Schurer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, Division II, Volume III, pp. 321 f (Edinburgh, 1886); E. Schurer, "Philo" in EB; James Drummond, Philo Judaeus, or, The Jewish-Alexandrian Philosophy in Its Development and Completion (2 volumes, London, 1888); R. M. Wenley, Socrates and Christ: a Study in the Philosophy of Religion, chapters vii, viii (Edinburgh, 1889); H. Ewald, The History of Israel, VII, 194 f (London, 1885); A. Haursrath, A History of New Testament Times, division II, volume I, chapters iv through vi (London, 1885); H. Graetz, History of the Jews from the Earliest Times to the Present Day, II, 183 f, 206 f (London, 1891); E. Caird, The Evolution of

Theology in the Greek Philosophers, II, lectures xx-xxi, xxvii (Glasgow, 1904); article "Philo" in Jewish Encyclopedia; Ernest F. Scott, The Fourth Gospel, Its Purpose and Theology, 54 f, 145 f (2nd edition, Edinburgh, 1908); F.C. Conybeare, Philo: About the Contemplative Life (Oxford, 1895). An English translation has been made by C.D. Yonge in the Bohn Library (London, G. Bell and Sons). The text cited usually is that of T. Mangey. The best modern text is that of Cohn and Wendland.

R. M. Wenley

PHILOLOGUS

fi-lol’-o-gus (Philologos, "fond of learning," "learned"): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:15). His name is coupled with that of Julia, who was probably his wife or sister. Philologus and those united with him in this salutation formed by themselves one of the "house churches" or groups in the Christian community. The name is found in inscriptions connected with the imperial household, with reference to one of which Bishop Lightfoot has the following note: "It has been supposed that the name Philologus was given by the master to the freedman mentioned in this inscription, as being appropriate to his office (Friedlander I, 89, 160). .... If so, some light is thrown on the probable occupation of the Philologus of Paul" (Phil, 177, note 1).

S. F. Hunter

PHILOMETOR

fil-o-me’-tor.

See PTOLEMY, VI.

PHILOSOPHY

fi-los’-o-fi (philosophia):

1. Definition and Scope

(1) Intuitive Philosophy Is Universal

(2) Speculative Philosophy Belongs Mainly to Western Thought

2. Greek Philosophy

3. Philosophy in Old Testament and Judaism

(1) Of Nature

(2) Of History

(3) Post-exilic

(4) Alexandrian

4. Philosophy in the New Testament

(1) The Teaching of Jesus Christ

(2) Apostolic Teaching

(3) Attitude of New Testament Writers toward Philosophy

LITERATURE

1. Definition and Scope: Only found in Col 2:8; literally, the love and pursuit of wisdom and knowledge. In its technical sense, the term is now used for the conscious endeavor of thought, by speculative process, to interpret the whole of human experience, as a consistent and systematic unity, which would be the ultimate truth of all that may be known. The term is also used, in a wider sense, of all interpretations of experience, or parts of experience, however obtained, whether by revelation, intuition or unconscious speculation. No hard-and-fast line can be drawn between the two kinds of philosophy. Some of the ruling conceptions of speculation, such as God, spirit, order, causation, true and false, good and evil, were not discovered by reason, but given in experience.

(1) Intuitive Philosophy Is Universal.

The human mind has always and everywhere furnished itself with some kind of explanation of the universe. From the lowest animism and fetishism up to the higher religions, ideas are found which served men as explanations of those features of experience which attracted their attention. They were often regarded as given by vision, intuition or some other method of revelation. In the higher religions, the mind reflected upon these ideas, and elaborated them into systems of thought that bear some resemblance to the speculative theories of western thought. In China, both Confucianism and Taoism developed theories of human life and destiny that bear some resemblance to Stoicism. The religions of Assyria and Babylonia enshrined in their legends theories of the world and of man and his institutions. In India, men’s belief in the Nature-gods gradually developed into pantheistic Brahmanism, which reduced the multiplicity of experience into one ultimate being, Brahma. But the desire for moral salvation and the sense of pain and evil produced a reaction, and led to the pessimistic and nihilistic philosophy of Buddhism. In Persia, the moral consciousness awoke earlier, and the attempt to systematize the multiplicity of polytheism issued in the dualistic philosophy of later Zoroastrianism. The

whole realm of being was divided into two kingdoms, created and ruled by two lords: Ahura Mazda, the creator of light and life, law, order and goodness, and Anro Mainyus, the author of darkness, evil and death. Each was surrounded by a court of spiritual beings kindred to himself, his messengers and agents in the world (see PERSIAN RELIGION (ANCIENT)). Of all these religious philosophies, only those of Assyria and Babylonia, and of Persia, are likely to have come into any contact with Biblical thought. The former have some affinity with the accounts of creation and the flood in Genesis; and the influence of the latter may be traced in the dualism and angelology and demonology of later Judaism, and again in the Gnostic systems that grew up in the Christian church, and through both channels it was perpetuated, as a dualistic influence, in the lower strata of Christian thought down through the Middle Ages.

(2) Speculative Philosophy Belongs Mainly to Western Thought.

It arose in Greece about the beginning of the 6th century BC. It began with the problem of the general nature of being, or ontology. But it was soon forced to consider the conditions of knowing anything at all, or to epistemology. These two studies constitute metaphysics, a term often used as synonymous with philosophy in the stricter sense. Speculation about ideal truth again led to inquiries as to the ultimate nature of the kindred ideas of the good (ethics) and the beautiful (aesthetics). And as these ideas were related to society as well as to the individual, the Greeks developed theories of the ideal organization of society on the basis of the true, the good and the beautiful, or politics and pedagogics. The only branch of speculation to which the Greeks made no appreciable contribution was the philosophy of religion, which is a modern development.

The progress of philosophy in history divides itself naturally into three main periods: (a) ancient, from the 6th century BC to the 3rd century AD, when it is almost exclusively Greek, with some practical adaptations of Greek thought by Roman writers; (b) medieval, from the 3rd to the 16th century, where some of the ruling conceptions of Greek thought were utilized for the systematization of Christian dogma, but speculation was mainly confined within the limits of ecclesiastical orthodoxy; there were, however, some independent Arabian and Jewish speculations; (c) modern, from the 16th century to the present time, in which thought becomes free again to speculate upon all the problems presented by experience, though it only realized its liberty fully in the hands of Locke, Hume and Kant.

2. Greek Philosophy:

Greek philosophy was the only speculative system that could have had any influence upon Biblical thought. Its main development was contemporaneous with the later Old Testament writers, but the two peoples were in every way so remote one another that no interchange of ideas was probable.

During the last two centuries BC, Greek thought spread so widely that it came to dominate the cultured thought of the world into which Christianity entered, and it would have been strange if no trace of its influence were found in the New Testament. In the first stage of its development, from Thales to Socrates, it was concerned almost entirely with attempts to explain the nature of reality by reducing the phenomenal world into some one of its elements. Socrates changed its center of gravity, and definitely

raised the problems of morality and knowledge to the position of first importance. His principles were developed by Plato into a complex and many-sided system which, more than any other, has influenced all subsequent thought. He united ultimate reality and the highest good into one supreme principle or idea which he called the Good, and also God. It was the essence, archetype and origin of all wisdom, goodness and beauty. It communicated itself as intermediary archerypal ideas to produce all individual things. So that the formative principles of all existence were moral and spiritual. But it had to make all things out of preexisting matter, which is essentially evil, and which therefore was refractory and hostile to the Good. That is why it did not make a perfect world. Plato's system was therefore rent by an irreconcilable dualism of mind and body, spirit and matter, good and evil. And his mediating ideas could not bridge the gulf, because they belonged only to the side of the ideal. Aristotle was Plato's disciple, and he started from Plato's idealistic presuppositions, but endeavored to transcend his dualism. He thus applied himself to a closer and more accurate study of actual experience, and added much to the knowledge of the physical world. He organized and classified the methods and contents of knowledge and created the science of logic, which in the Christian Middle Ages became the chief instrument of the great systematic theologians of the church. He tried to bring Plato's ideas "down from heaven," and to represent them as the creative and formative principles within the world, which he conceived as a system of development, rising by spiritual gradations from the lower to the higher forms, and culminating in God, who is the uncaused cause of all things. But underneath all the forms still remained matter as an antithetical element, and Aristotle rather concealed than solved the dualism of Plato.

Meanwhile, the moral principles of Socrates were being developed with a more directly ethical interest, by the Cyrenaics and Epicureans, into a system of Hedonism, and, by the Cynics and Stoics, into a doctrine of intuitive right and duty, resting inconsistently upon a pantheistic and materialistic view of the universe. But the spiritual and ethical elements in Stoicism became only second to Platonism in the preparation of the Greek world for Christianity. During the last two and a half centuries BC, Greek philosophy showed signs of rapid decline. On the one hand, Pyrrho and his school propounded a thoroughgoing skepticism which denied the possibility of all knowledge whatsoever. On the other hand, the older schools, no longer served by creative minds, tended to merge their ideas into a common eclecticism which its teachers reduced into an empty and formal dogmatism. The most fruitful and fateful product of Greek thought in this period was its amalgamation with Jewish and oriental ideas in the great cosmopolitan centers of the Greek world. There are evidences that this process was going on in the cities of Asia, Syria and Egypt, but the only extensive account of it remaining is found in the works of Philo, the Jewish philosopher of Alexandria (see PHILO, JUDAEUS). He tried to graft Plato's idealism upon Hebrew monotheism.

He starts with Plato's two principles, pure being or God, and preexisting matter. In his endeavor to bridge the gulf between them, he interposed between God and the world the powers of God, goodness and justice; and to gather these into a final unity, he created his conception of the Loges of God. In the formation of this conception, he merged together the Platonic idea of the good, the Stoic world-reason, and a number of Jewish ideas, the glory, the word, the name, of God, the heavenly man and the great high priest, and personified the whole as the one mediator between God and the world. Christian thought laid hold of this idea, and employed it as its master-category for the interpretation of the person of Christ.

See LOGOS.

3. Philosophy in Old Testament and Judaism:

There is no speculative philosophy in the Old Testament nor any certain trace of its influence. Its writers and actors never set themselves to pursue knowledge in the abstract and for its own sake. They always wrought for moral purposes. But moral activity proceeds on the intellectual presuppositions and interpretations of the experiences within which it acts. Hence, we find in the Old Testament accounts of the origin and course of nature, a philosophy of history and its institutions, and interpretations of men's moral and religious experiences. They all center in God, issue from His sovereign will, and express the realization of His purpose of righteousness in the world.

See GOD.

(1) Of Nature:

All nature originated in God's creative act (Ge 2) or word (Ge 1). In later literature the whole course and order of Nature, its beauty and bounty, as well as its wonders and terrors, are represented as the acts of God's will (Isa 40; 41; 42; 43; 44; 45; Ps 8:19; 29; 50; 65; 68; 104, etc.). But His action in Nature is always subordinated to His moral ends.

(2) Of History:

Similarly, the course and events of the history of Israel and her neighbors are the acts of Yahweh's will (Am 1; 2; Isa 41:2; 43:3; 45:9,10,14) In the historical books of Samuel and Kings, and still more of Chronicles, all the events of history are represented as the acts of God's moral government. In a more general way, the whole of history is set forth as a series of covenants that God, of His free grace, made with man (see COVENANT). The Noachic covenant fixed the order of Nature. The covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob accounted for the origin and choice of Israel. The covenants with Moses and Aaron established the Law and the priesthood, and that with David, the kingship. And the hope of the future lies in the new covenant (Jer 31:31-35). God's covenants were all acts of His sovereign and gracious will.

(3) Post-exilic:

In post-exilic times, new experiences, and perhaps new intellectual influences, drove the Jews to probe deeper into the problem of existence. They adhered to the cardinal principle of He thought, that God's sovereign will, working out His purpose of righteousness, was the first cause of all things (see RIGHTEOUSNESS). But they found it difficult to coordinate this belief with their other ideas, in two ways. Ethical monotheism tended to become an abstract deism which removed God altogether out of the world. And the catastrophes that befell the nation, in the exile and after, raised the problem of suffering

and evil over against God's goodness and righteousness. Therefore in the Wisdom literature we find some conscious speculation on these subjects.

See WISDOM.

(a) The Book of Job discusses the problem of evil, and repudiates the idea that life and history are the process of God's rewards and punishments.

(b) Ecclesiastes comes to the conclusion that all phenomenal experience is vanity. Yet its ultimate philosophy is not pessimistic, for it finds an abiding reality and hope in the fear of God and in the moral life (12:13,14). The same type of thought appears in Ecclesiasticus. Both books have been attributed to the circle of the Sadducees. Some would find in them traces of the influence of Epicureanism.

(c) In Proverbs a more optimistic side prevails. Wisdom is gathered up into a conception or personification which is at once God's friend, His agent in creation, His vicegerent in the world, and man's instructress and guide (chapter 8).

(d) The teaching of the Pharisees especially reveals the tendency to dualism or deism in later Judaism; they interposed between God and the world various agents of mediation, the law, the word, the name, the glory of God and a host of angels, good and bad. They also fostered a new hope of the future, under the double form of the Messianic kingdom, and of resurrection and immortality. How far these tendencies were due to the influence of Persian dualism cannot here be considered.

(e) Essenism represents another effort to get from the world to God by a crude kind of mysticism and asceticism, combined with an extensive angelology.

(4) Alexandrian:

Among the Hellenistic Jews in Alexandria, Aristobulus, the authors of The Wisdom of Solomon and 4 Maccabees, and preeminently Philo, all deal with the two chief problems of Judaism, dualism and evil. But they approach them under the direct influence of Greek thought. The Hebrew idea of wisdom was merged into the Greek conception of the Logos, and so it becomes the mediator of God's thought and activity in the world.

4. Philosophy in the New Testament:

Philosophy appears in the New Testament as intuitive, speculative and eclectic.

(1) The Teaching of Jesus Christ:

Jesus Christ came to fulfill the law and the prophets, and, out of His filial consciousness of God, He propounded answers to the practical demands of His time. His doctrine of God the Father was a

philosophy of Nature and life which transcended all dualism. In the kingdom of heaven, the good would ultimately prevail over the evil. The law of love expressed the ideal of conduct for man as individual, and in his relation to society and to God, the supreme and ultimate reality. This teaching was given in the form of revelation, without any trace of speculation.

(2) Apostolic Teaching:

The apostolic writings built upon the teaching and person of Jesus Christ. Their ruling ideas are the doctrines which He taught and embodied. In Paul and John, they are realized as mystical experiences which are expressed in doctrines of universal love. But we may also discover in the apostolic writings at least three strands of speculative philosophy.

(a) Paul employed arguments from natural theology, similar to those of the Stoics (Ac 14:15-17; 17:22-31; Ro 1:19), which involved the principles of the cosmological and teleological arguments.

(b) John employs the Philonic term "Logos" to interpret the person of Christ in His universal relation to God, man and the world; and the main elements of Philo's scheme are clearly present in his doctrine, though here it is no abstract conception standing between God and man, but a living person uniting both (Joh 1:1-18). Although the term "Logos" is not mentioned, in this sense, in Paul or Hebrews, the Philonic conception has been employed by both writers (Ro 5:8; 8:29; 1Co 15:24,25; 2Co 5:18,19; Php 2:6; Col 1:15-17; 2:9,10; Heb 1:1-3,5,6). Paul also expresses his conception of Christ as the manifestation of God under the category of wisdom (1Co 1:20; 2:7; Eph 1:8; Col 2:3).

(c) Both in Paul and He appear original speculations designed to interpret individual experience and human history as they culminate in Christ. Paul's interpretation consists of a series of parallel antitheses, flesh and spirit, sin and righteousness, law and grace, works and faith, Adam and Christ. But the author of He adopts the Platonic view that the world of history and phenomena is but the shadow or suggestion of the spiritual and eternal reality which lies behind it, and which partially expresses itself through it.

(3) Attitude of New Testament Writers toward Philosophy:

In the one place in which the term philosophy appears in the New Testament (Col 2:8), it seems to mean "subtle dialectics and profitless speculation .... combined with a mystic cosmogony and angelology" (Lightfoot, at the place), the first beginnings of Gnosticism in the Christian church. Paul warns his readers against it, as he also does the Corinthians against the "wisdom" of the Greeks (1Co 1:19 ff; 2:5,6). A similar tendency may be in view in the warning to Timothy against false doctrines (1Ti 1:4; 4:3; 2Ti 1:14,16). But with the true spirit of philosophy, as the pursuit of truth, and the endeavor to express more fully and clearly the nature of reality, the spirit and work of the New Testament writers were in complete accord.

LITERATURE.

Introductions to philosophy by Kulpe, Paulsen, Hoffding, Watson and Mackenzie. Histories of Greek philosophy by Ritter and Preller, Burnet, and Zeller, and of general philosophy by Erdmann, Ueberweg, Windelband and Rogers; E. Caird, The Evolution of Theology in the Greek Philosophies; Hists of the Jews by Schurer, Graetz and Kent; Old Testament Theologies by Schultz and Davidson; New Testament Theologies by Beyschlag and Weinel; Philo's works and treatises thereon by Dahne, Gfrorer and Drummond; Harnack, What Is Christianity? Bigg, The Christian Platonists of Alexandria; Lightfoot, Colossians.

T. Rees

PHINEES

fin'-e-es (Phinees; Codex Vaticanus (Swete), Pheinees (1 Esdras 8:2)):

(1) Phinehas, son of Eleazar, son of Aaron (1 Esdras 5:5; 8:2,29; 2 Esdras 1:2; 1 Macc 2:26; Sirach 45:23).

(2) The father of Achias and son of Hell (Eli), a descendant of (1), and one of Ezra's progenitors (2 Esdras 1:2); but this link is not found in Ezra's genealogy (1 Esdras 8:1 f), nor in Ezr 7:1 ff; 1Ch 6, and its insertion in 2 Esdras 1:2 is a mistake, since Ezra's descent was from Eleazar, while this Phinees (Phinehas) was a descendant of Ithamar, the youngest son of Aaron.

(3) A Levite, the father of Eleazar (1 Esdras 8:63) equals "Phinehas" of Ezr 8:33. But it is just possible that the well-known Eleazar (1) is referred to here, and so not another and different Phinees.

(4) The King James Version equals the Revised Version (British and American) "Phinoe" (1 Esdras 5:31).

S. Angus

PHINEHAS

fin'-e-as, -az, fin'-e-has, -haz (pinechac, "mouth of brass"):

(1) Son of Eleazar and grandson of Aaron (Ex 6:25; compare 1Ch 6:4; Ezr 7:5, where he is seen to be an ancestor of Ezra). He took a leading part in cleansing Israel from whoredom at Shittim. He there punished the brazen licentiousness of Zimri, prince of Sirecon, by slaying both him and the Midianite woman he had brought into camp (Nu 25:6-18). This incident is referred to in Ps 106:30,31 (compare 1 Macc 2:26,54; Sirach 45:23,24). As priest he accompanied the expedition sent by Moses against Midjan (Nu 31:6). He was chief of the Korahite Levites (1Ch 9:20), and succeeded his father as high priest. While he was in that office the civil war with Benjamin occurred, and it was he who delivered the

oracle’s decision to fight Benjamin (Jud 20:28). His faithful services secured to his house the succession of the priesthood (Nu 25:11-13). He was sent as ambassador to inquire into the reported idolatry of Reuben, Gad and part of Manasseh (Jos 22:13 ff, 30-32). According to Septuagint he was buried with his father in Ephraim on the hill Gibeah Phinehas (see Jos 24:33). His character was marked with strong moral indignation and fine integrity.

(2) The younger son of Eli (1Sa 1:3; 2 Esdras 1:2, "Phinees").

See HOPHNI AND PHINEHAS.

(3) Father of a priest named Eleazar (Ezr 8:33; compare Ezr 8:2; 1 Esdras 8:63, "Phinees").

Henry Wallace

PHINOE

fin’-o-e (Phinoe; the King James Version Phinees): Name of one of the families of temple-servants who went up from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:31) equals "Paseah" of Ezr 2:49; Ne 7:51.

PHLEGON

fle’-gon, fleg’-on (Phlegan): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings (Ro 16:14). Of him nothing is known.

PHOEBE

fe’-be (Phoibe; the King James Version Phebe): Described by Paul as (1) "our sister," (2) "who is a servant of the church that is at Cenchrea," (3) "a helper of many, and of mine own self" (Ro 16:1,2).

(1) "Our (Christian) sister": Paul calls the believing husband and wife "the brother or the sister" (1Co 7:15), and also asks, "Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a sister?" (1Co 9:5 margin). The church was a family.

(2) The Greek word translated "servant" is diakonos. "Servant" is vague, and "deaconess" is too technical. In the later church there was an order of deaconesses for special work among women, owing to the peculiar circumstances of oriental life, but we have no reason to believe there was such an order at this early period. If Phoebe had voluntarily devoted herself "to minister unto the saints" by means of charity and hospitality, she would be called diakonos.

(3) The Greek word prostatis translated "helper" is better "patroness." The masculine is "the title of a citizen in Athens who took charge of the interests of clients and persons without civic rights" (Denney).

Many of the early Christian communities had the appearance of clients under a patron, and probably the community of Cenchrea met in the house of Phoebe. She also devoted her influence and means to the assistance of "brethren" landing at that port. Paul was among those whom she benefited. Gifford thinks some special occasion is meant, and that Paul refers to this in Ac 18:18. The vow "seems to point to a deliverance from danger or sickness" in which Phoebe may have attended on him.

It is generally assumed that this letter was taken to Rome by Phoebe, these verses introducing her to the Christian community. In commending her, Paul asks that the Roman Christians "receive her in the Lord," i.e. give her a Christian welcome, and that they "assist her in whatsoever matter she may have need" of them (Ro 16:1,2).

S. F. Hunter

PHOENICE

fe-ni’-se (Phoinix).

See PHOENIX.

PHOENICIA; PHOENICIANS

fe-nish’-i-a, fe-nish’-anz:

1. The Land

2. The Colonies

3. The People

4. Arts and Manufactures

5. Commerce and Trade

6. Language and Culture

7. Religion

8. History

LITERATURE

1. The Land:

The term "Phoenicia" is Greek (Phoinike, "land of dates, or palm trees," from phoinix, "the date-palm"). It occurs in the Bible only in Ac (11:19; 15:3; 21:2), the land being generally designated as the "coast" or "borders of Tyre and Sidon" (Mt 15:21; Mr 7:24,31; Lu 6:17). In the Old Testament we find it included in the land belonging to the Canaanites or to Sidon (Ge 10:19; 49:13; Jos 11:8; 1Ki 17:9). The limits of Phoenicia were indefinite also. It is sometimes used by classic writers as including the coast line from Mt. Cassius on the North to Gaza or beyond on the South, a distance of some 380 miles, or about 400 miles if we include the sweep of indentations and bays and the outstretching of the promontories. But in the stricter sense, it did not extend beyond Gabala (modern Jebleh) on the North, and Mt. Carmel on the South, or some 150 miles. The name was probably first applied to the region opposite Cyprus, from Gabala to Aradus and Marathus, where the date-palm was observed, and then, as it was found in still greater abundance farther South, it was applied to that region also. The palm tree is common on the coins of both Aradus and Tyre, and it still grows on the coast, though not in great abundance. The width of the land also was indefinite, not extending inland beyond the crest of the two ranges of mountains, the Bargylus (Nusairi Mountains) and the Lebanon, which run parallel to the coast and leave but little space between them and the sea for the greater portion of their length. It is doubtful whether the Phoenicians occupied the mountain tracts, but they must have dominated them on the western slopes, since they derived from them timber for their ships and temples. The width of the country probably did not exceed 25 or 30 miles at the most, and in many places it was much less, a very small territory, in fact, but one that played a distinguished role in ancient times.

There are few harbors on the whole coast, none in the modern sense, since what few bays and inlets there are afford but slight shelter to modern ships, but those of the ancients found sufficient protection in a number of places, especially by means of artificial harbors, and the facility with which they could be drawn out upon the sandy beach in winter when navigation was suspended. The promontories are few and do not project far into the sea, such as Theu-prosopon South of Tripolis, Ras Beirut and the broad projection South of Tyre including Ras el-‘Abyadh and Ras en-Naqura and Ras el-Musheirifeh (see LADDER OF TYRE). The promontory of Carmel is rather more marked than the others, and forms quite an extensive bay, which extends to Acre. The promontory rises to a height of 500 ft. or more near the sea and to more than double that elevation in its course to the Southeast.

Mt. Lebanon, which forms the background of Phoenicia for about 100 miles, is a most striking feature of the landscape. It rises to a height of 10,200 ft. in the highest point, East of Tripolis, and to 8,500 in Jebel Sunnin, East of Beirut, and the average elevation is from 5,000 to 6,000 ft. It is rent by deep gorges where the numerous streams have cut their way to the sea, furnishing most varied and picturesque scenery. It was originally heavily wooded with cedar, oak, and pine trees, which are still found in considerable numbers, but by far the larger part of the mountain has been denuded of forests, and the slopes have been extensively terraced for the cultivation of vines and fruit trees and the mulberry for silk culture. The plains along the coast are not extensive, but generally very fertile and bear abundant crops of wheat, barley and other cereals, where not given to the culture of the mulberry, orange, lemon, fig, apricot and other small fruits. In its greatest extent Phoenicia included the broad plain of Sharon and that of Acre, between Carmel and that city, and a portion of the region watered by the Kishon, but the plains

of Phoenicia, strictly speaking, are much more restricted. They are: the plain of Tyre, long but narrow, extending from Ras el-‘Abyadh to Sarepta; the plain of Sidon extending from Sarepta to the Bostrenus (Nahr el-’Auly); the plain of Beirut (Berytus) between the extensive sand dunes along the shore and the rocky cape on the West and the foot of Lebanon, 10 or 12 miles long but only one or two wide, containing one of the largest olive groves in Syria; the very small plain of Tripolis, including that city and its port; and, the most extensive of all, the plain of Marathus, extending from Arka to Aradus or even beyond, including the river Eleutherus (Nahr el-Kebir). These plains furnished only a portion of the food needed by the inhabitants who were more or less dependent on their neighbors for it (1Ki 5:11; Ac 12:20).

The rivers of Phoenicia are comparatively short and small; the Litany rises in the Buka’, between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon, and finds its way in a deep and narrow gorge between Lebanon and Mt. Hermon to the South, and finally turns westward and reaches the sea a few miles North of Tyre, where it is called the Kasimiyeh. About 12 miles North of Beirut is the Dog River (Lycus), a very short stream but noted for the famous pass at its mouth, where Egyptian Assyrian and Babylonian kings engraved their monuments; and a few miles South of Jebail (Gebal) is the Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim), which comes down from ‘Afqa (Apheca equals Aphek, Jos 13:4), noted for the rites of Venus and Adonis (see TAMMUZ); and the Eleutherus, already mentioned, which runs through the valley between Bargylus and Lebanon and provides the pass between these two mountains into the interior. The other rivers are very short, but furnish a perennial water-supply to the coast dwellers.

The products of the land, as well as the climate, are very varied on account of the difference in elevation of the tracts suitable to culture, ranging in temperature from the semi-tropical to Alpine. How far the ancients cultivated the mountain sides we do not know, but they certainly profited largely by the forests of cedar and pine, especially the former, which was the most valuable for shipbuilding and architectural purposes, and was highly prized, not only by the Phoenicians, but by Egyptians, Assyrians and Babylonians, who transported it to their own countries for buildings. The mineral products are few, and the Phoenicians depended on their colonies and other lands for what they needed of these.

2. The Colonies:

The narrowness of the land and the difficulty of expansion on account of the lofty mountain ranges and the hostility of the tribes of the interior led the Phoenicians to turn seaward for an outlet to their increasing population. We have only one instance of their attempt to colonize the Hinterland, and that ended in disaster (Jud 18). Hiram, king of Tyre, was not pleased with Solomon’s gift of 20 cities in Galilee, probably not desiring to assume responsibility for their defense. The people early became mariners, and the dominion of the sea was more inviting to them, and they found room for expansion in the islands and on the coast of the Mediterranean, where they established colonies far and wide. Their first over-sea possessions were in Cyprus, the coasts of which they occupied in the 2nd millennium BC, probably about 1500. On the southern coast they planted various colonies, such as Citium (Larnaca), Amathus, Curium and Paphos, and on the eastern, Salamis, Ammachosta and Soli, and, in the interior, Idalium and Golgi, besides other less important settlements. The evidences of the Phoenician occupation of Cyprus are numerous. The southern portion of Asia Minor also attracted them at an early date,

especially the rich plains of Cilicia, and Tarsus became the most important of their colonies there. Its coins bear Phoenician types and legends, among which Baal is conspicuous. Other points along the coast were occupied, and the island of Rhodes as well as certain ports on the south coast of Crete, and most of the islands of the Aegean. Their presence in Attica is vouched for by inscriptions, and legend connects Thebes with them in the person of Cadmus, the reputed son of Agenor, king of Phoenicia. But it is doubtful whether they really colonized the mainland of Greece. They were more attracted by the lands farther to the West.

The greatest of their colonies was in Africa. They occupied Utica first, probably in the 12th century BC, and others in the same region until in the 9th century. Great Carthage was founded, which was destined to become the richest and most powerful of all and the dreaded rival of Rome. All are familiar with the story of Elisa, or Dido, the reputed Tyrian queen who led her followers to the place and founded the city. The story is perhaps legendary, but that Carthage was a colony of Tyre there is no reason to doubt. Other colonists occupied portions of Sicily, such as Motya, Erix, Soli and Panormus (Palermo). They also crossed over to Sardinia and the Balearic Isles, and planted colonies on the south coast of Spain and the northwestern coast of Africa, within and beyond the straits of Gibraltar. Of their settlements in Spain Gades (Cades) and Tartessus were the most noted, the latter being probably the Tarshish of Scripture (1Ki 10:22). Malaca (Malaga) and Abdera, within the straits, were likewise important settlements, and there were others of less note.

The colonial enterprise of the Phoenicians was remarkable for the age, and was only surpassed in ancient times by the Greeks who came later, the former being the pioneers. The energy and daring of the Phoenicians in pushing out into unknown seas, with the imperfect means at their disposal, is evidence of the enterprise of this people. Their chief object, however, was trade. Their colonies were mostly factories for the exchange of their manufactured articles for the products of the lands they visited. They cared little about building up new states or for extending their civilization and molding barbarous tribes and imparting to them their culture. In this they were far surpassed by the Greeks whose colonies profoundly modified the peoples and lands with which they came in contact.

3. The People:

The Phoenicians were the same as the Canaanites, under which name they are known in the Old Testament, as well as Sidonians (Ge 10:19; Nu 13:29). They were of Semitic stock, if we may judge by their language and characteristics. It is true that in Ge 10:6 Canaan is called a son of Ham, but it is also true that the language of Canaan is identified with Hebrew (Isa 19:18). If the early Phoenicians spoke a different tongue, they entirely lost it before their contact with the Hebrews. Their writings and all the references to them in ancient authorities show that their language was purely Semitic. As to their origin and the time of their migration to the Syrian coast, it is more difficult to determine. Herodotus (i.2; vii.89) says that they lived at first on the Erythraean Sea, which is identified with the Persian Gulf, and modern authorities have not found evidence to refute the statement. It is quite certain that they were not the aborigines of the country, and must have come in with some of the various migrations from the East, which we know, from Egyptian and Babylonian monuments, occurred in the 3rd, perhaps in the 4th, millennium BC. Semites are found in Syria as early as the IVth Egyptian Dynasty, about 3000 BC, and

we may fairly conjecture that the Canaanites were in possession of the seacoast as early as 2500 BC. It is possible that they were among the Hyksos invaders of Egypt (Paton, Syria and Palestine, 67).

That the Phoenicians took to the sea at a very early date and became the most skillful mariners of the ancient world is certain. Their enterprise in this direction is attested by classic writers, and the references to it in the Old Testament are numerous. This was coupled with great industry and skill in the manufacture of the various articles which furnished the materials of their extended commerce. They exhibited a boldness and audacity in braving the perils of the sea in their little ships, which, for the age, demands our admiration. They were the first who dared to push out of sight of land in their voyages and sail beyond the Pillars of Hercules into the ocean. But in their commercial dealings they were often unscrupulous, and their greed of gain often led them to take unfair advantage of the barbarous races with whom they came in contact. The purchase of the land on which the citadel of Carthage was built may illustrate the opinion of the ancients regarding them, but we ought to remember that trickery and deceit are charged against them by their enemies, who alone have handed down accounts of them. The Hebrew prophets speak of their pride and vanity (Eze 28:17), and violence (Eze 28:16), and Amos hints at a traffic in captives taken in war, but whether of Hebrews or not is not clear (Am 1:9). Slaves were among the articles of merchandise in which they traded (Eze 27:13; Joe 3:6), but this could hardly be charged against them as a great sin when slavery was universal. The chief reason for their being denounced by the prophets was their corrupt practices in worship and the baleful influence of the Baal and Astarte cult introduced by them into Israel through Ahab’s marriage with Jezebel (1Ki 16:31-33). This evil influence was felt even after the captivity when the rites of the Phoenician Tammuz were practiced in Jerusalem (Eze 8:14). But the earlier relations of the Phoenicians with Israel in the days of David and Solomon were friendly and mutually beneficial. On the whole the judgment of history assigns to this people a high position for their enterprise and skill in carrying on their trade, and in being the pioneers of civilization in many of the Mediterranean lands, especially by their introduction of alphabetical writing, which was by far the most valuable of all their contributions to the culture of the ancient world.

4. Arts and Manufactures:

(1) Textile Fabrics:

The Phoenicians were celebrated for their textile fabrics of silk, wool, linen and cotton. The materials of the last three were obtained from Syria and Egypt, but the silk came from the Far East through Persia. The dyeing of these fabrics was by a process invented by the Phoenicians, and the luster and permanence of color were unequaled by the ancients and made the Tyrian purple famous throughout the world. The finer qualities of it were so precious that only the very wealthy, or kings and princes, could obtain it, and it became at last a synonym of royalty. This dye was obtained from the shell-fish which was abundant in the Mediterranean, especially along the Phoenician coast, species of the Murex and the Buccinum. The mode of manufacture is not definitely known and was probably kept a secret by the Phoenicians. At least they had a monopoly of the business.

(2) Glass:

Glass was another well-known product of the country, and although not invented by the Phoeniclans as formerly supposed, it was made in large quantities and exported to all countries about the sea.

See GLASS.

(3) Pottery:

Pottery was also an article of manufacture and export, and some of the examples of their work found in Cyprus show considerable skill in the art of decoration as well as making. In this, however, they were far surpassed by the Greeks.

(4) Bronze:

Bronze was a specialty of the Phoenicians, and they were for centuries the leading producers, since they controlled the sources of supply of the copper and tin used in its manufacture. The remains of their bronze manufactures are numerous, such as arms for offense and defense, knives, toilet articles, axes, sickles, cups, paterae, and various other household utensils. Articles for artistic purposes are not of high value, although the pillars named Jachin and Boaz, the molten sea, the bases, layers and other articles cast by Hiram of Tyre for the temple of Solomon must have exhibited considerable artistic merit. Their bronze was of good quality and was tempered so as to serve well for edged tools. The composition was about 9 parts copper to 1 part of tin. They seem also to have made iron (2Ch 2:14), and some specimens have come down to us, but we cannot judge from their scarcity as to the extent of their manufactures in this metal, since most of the articles have perished by corrosion.

Aesthetic art among the Phoenicians was of low grade, as it was among the Semites generally, and where we find some works of moderate merit they undoubtedly manifest the influence of Greek art, such as those found in Cyprus by General Di Cesnola and others. In Phoenicia proper very little of artistic value has come to light that can be ascribed to native artists. In sculpture the style is stiff and conventional, much of it exceedingly rude, and lacks expression. The animal forms are generally grotesque, often absurd, reminding one of children’s attempts at plastic article The anthropoid sarcophagi discovered at Sidon were modeled after the Egyptian and the magnificent ones, of different design, from the same place, now in the Museum of Constantinople, were certainly the work of Greek artists of the age of Alexander the Great.

The architecture of the Phoenicians was characterized by massiveness, rather than elegance. The substructures of some of their temples and castles are cyclopean, like those of the temple at Jerusalem (1Ki 7:10), and other examples are found at Sidon, Gebal, Marathus and other places in Phoenicia itself. Their work seems lacking in symmetry and grace, showing a want of aesthetic taste.

5. Commerce and Trade:

Trade was the very life of Phoenicia. The contracted limits of the land forbade any extensive agriculture, and the people were forced to get their living by other means. They applied themselves to industrial arts, and this led them to seek the means for distributing their wares. Trade was essential to them, and they sought outlets for it by sea and land. Their position was especially favorable for commerce. In the very center of the ancient world, with the great rich and populous nations of antiquity at their back and on either side, they faced the young, vigorous and growing nations of the West, and they served them all as carriers and producers. Their caravans threaded all the well-beaten routes of the East, the deserts of Arabia and the mountain defiles of Armenia and Asia Minor, and their ships pushed boldly out to sea and explored the Mediterranean and the Euxine and did not hesitate to brave the unknown dangers of the Atlantic and perhaps even penetrated to the Baltic, emulating the mariners of a later day in their zeal for discovery and search for new avenues of trade. Could we find a detailed account of their voyages and discoveries, it would be a most interesting document, but we have little except what others have written about them, which, however, gives us a pretty fair idea of the extent of their commercial enterprise. The prophet Ezekiel has given us a remarkable catalogue of the wares of Tyre and of the countries with which she traded (Eze 27). There we have mention of nearly all the regions of Western Asia, Egypt, Greece and the islands, and Spain, indicated by the names of races, tribes and countries. The materials of their traffic include the most important known to the ancient world, the products of agriculture, such as wool, linen, oil, balm, spices, frankincense, wine, corn, etc.; of metals, such as gold, silver, copper (brass), tin, iron, lead, etc.; precious stones and the articles of manufacture, the "multitude of handiworks," which they were so skillful in producing. They traded in animals also, horses, mules, lambs, rams and goats, and, what is less to their credit, in the persons of men (Eze 27:13). The range of their trade was much wider than is indicated by Ezekiel. We know they reached the Scilly Isles in Britain, and probably the Baltic, whither they went for amber, though this might have been brought overland to the Adriatic and received into their ships there. They passed along the western coast of Africa as far as Cape Non, and perhaps farther, for Herodotus tells us that Pharaohnecoh dispatched a crew of Phoenician sailors to circumnavigate Africa, which they accomplished in 3 years.

We know that they had a fleet in the Red Sea sailing from Elath or Ezion-geber (1Ki 9:26,27), and it is quite possible that they were allowed by some of the kings of Egypt to avail themselves of ports on the other branch of the Red Sea. They must have visited the eastern shore of Africa and perhaps struck across the Indian Ocean, after skirting the coast of Arabia, and thus carried on trade with India. The Ophir mentioned in connection with these voyages has not been definitely located, but was perhaps in Southern Arabia, though possibly in Southeast Africa.

See GOLD.

The ships in which the Phoenicians made these voyages were small as compared with the great vessels of the present day, but the largest known in their age, as we may infer from the long voyages they made. Their superiority is testified to by classical writers. In the famous expedition of Xerxes to Greece the Phoenician ships excelled all others in speed, and the king chose one of them when he embarked upon the sea (Herodotus vii.100). These ships were impelled both by sails and oars, as we know from illustrations upon the coins.

See COINS.

6. Language and Culture:

The ancients attributed the invention of the alphabet to the Phoenicians. This is now regarded as doubtful, and there are no reliable data for determining what people first analyzed speech to its ultimate elements, but to the Phoenicians belongs the merit of bringing the invention to the knowledge of the western world. It is quite certain that the alphabets of Western Asia and those of Europe were derived from the Phoenician characters. This is what we should have expected from their wide commercial relations. The alphabetic writing was in fact one of their exports and was by far, the most important of them all. The world owes a great debt to this people for this invaluable aid to literature, science and culture.

See ALPHABET.

The Phoenician alphabet comprises 22 letters and is deficient in signs to indicate vowels, which were left to be supplied by the reader. This defect is common to the Semitic alphabets, but was soon remedied when the Greeks adopted the Phoenician. Some of the letters have to serve for two sounds, such as the signs for "s" and "sh", for "p" and "ph", for "t" and "th"; besides, there is a redundant sign for the sound of "s". Also the sounds of "y" and "w" are unrepresented. The origin of the letters is probably to be found in the hieroglyphic signs for words and syllables used by the Egyptians and others, since the similarity of some of them to these signs is evident, but in some cases it is more likely that the Phoenicians adopted hieroglyphics of their own. Thus the first letter, ‘aleph, which means "ox," was evidently derived from the picture of an ox’s head and then reduced to a conventional form.

The Phoenician alphabet and language were common to the Canaanitish tribes and the Hebrews, as we know from the many inscriptions found in Western Asia. The Moabite Stone testifies to their use East of the Jordan, and the Siloam Inscription likewise for Israel, and the same characters have been found in North Syria. This would be natural, for people of these regions had become largely Semitic by the 9th century BC, when we suppose that the Phoenician alphabet was in general use.

It is strange that the Phoenicians, who had an alphabet so early, and made it so widely known to the world, made so little use of it for literature. The remains of their language are very scanty, mostly inscriptions, and these generally very brief. The longest ones in Phoenician proper are those from Sidon, the most famous of which is that of Esmunazer, king of Sidon, comprising 298 words. Some few others, pertaining to the same dynasty, have been discovered in tombs and on the walls of the temple of Asmun, and show the Phoenician character and style in its best form. Only two works of any length are known to us by translation or references in Greek authors. The first is the Phoenician History of Sanchoniathon, of Beirut, which Philo of Byblus claims to have translated from the Phoenician original. This, however, is doubted, and both the author and the history are suspected to be mythical. The other work is genuine; the short account of the voyage of a Carthaginian king beyond the Pillars of Hercules, called the Periplus of Hanno, is not without merit as a narrative, and indicates that the Carthaginian branch of the Phoenician

race, at least, may have had a literature of some value, but it is unfortunately lost. We cannot suppose, however, that it was very extensive or very important, as more of it would then have been preserved. The conclusion is natural that the Phoenicians were so absorbed in commercial enterprise and the pursuit of wealth that they neglected the nobler uses of the invaluable instrument of culture they had found in alphabetic writing.

7. Religion:

A very prominent role was assigned to religion in the life of the Phoenicians. As a Semitic people, such a characteristic was but natural and they seem to have possessed it in large measure. Their religious ideas are important on account of the influence they had on the Hebrews, which is so apparent in the Old Testament. The worship of the Canaanitish Baal and Ashtoreth, or Astarte, led the Israelites astray and produced most disastrous results.

There can be little doubt that the chief deities of the Phoenicians, as well as the forms of their cult, were derived from Babylonia, brought with them probably when they migrated to the West, but afterward modified by contact with Egypt and Greece. Some regard the earliest conception of the deity among the Semites to have been monotheism, and we find traces of this in the attributes ascribed by the Phoenicians to their chief god. He is Baal, "lord" or "master"; Baal-samin, "lord of heaven"; Eliun, "supreme," etc. These terms imply either one God or one who is supreme among the gods and their ruler. But this belief was changed before the Phoenicians came into contact with the Hebrews, and polytheism took its place, though their gods were less numerous than among most polytheistic races. One of the most corrupting tendencies we notice was the ascription of sexual characteristics to the chief deities of their pantheon, such as Baal and Ashtoreth, which led to licentious rites of the most abominable character.

Baal ba‘al; the Phoenician Baal was the chief deity and was universally worshipped, being usually designated by the locality in each place: Baal of Tyre or Baal-Tsur, Baal-Sidon, Baal-Tars (Tarsus), Baal-bek, etc. He was regarded as the god of the generative principle in Nature, and his statues were sometimes flanked by bulls. He was identified with Zeus, and he appears on the coins under the Greek type of Zeus, seated on a throne, holding an eagle in the outstretched right hand and a scepter in the left. Sometimes his head is encircled with rays showing him to be the sun-god.

Ashtoreth (Phoenician ‘ashtoreth) was the great Nature-goddess, the Magna Mater, queen of heaven (Jer 7:18), and as Baal was the solar deity, so she was often represented under the lunar aspect, Ashteroth-karnaim, "Ashteroth of the two horns" (Ge 14:5). Sometimes she is represented holding the dove, the symbol of fecundity, of which she was the goddess. She was commonly identified with Aphrodite or Venus. She, like Baal, had temples everywhere, and kings were sometimes her high priests, and her worship was too often accompanied with orgies of the most corrupt kind, as at Apheca.

See ASHTORETH; TAMMUZ.

Among the other gods we may mention: El, or Il (’el originally the designation of the supreme God, but afterward a subordinate deity who became the special divinity of Byblus (Gebal), and was regarded by the Greeks as the same as Kronos. Melqarth (melqarth, "king of the city") originally was the same as Baal, representing one aspect of that god, but later a separate deity, the patron god of Tyre whose head appears on many of its coins, as well as his symbol, the club, since he was identified with Hercules. Herodotus describes his temple at Tyre to which he attributes great antiquity, 2,300 years before his time. Dagon (daghon) seems to have been the tutelary deity of Aradus, his head appearing on the early autonomous coins of that city. He seems to have been regarded as the god of agriculture by the Phoenicians, rather than of fishing as generally supposed. Adonis (’adhon, "lord") was regarded as the son of Cinyras, a mythic king of Gebal and the husband of Ashtoreth. The myth of his death by the wild boar led to the peculiar rites celebrating it, instituted by the women of Gebal at Apheca and on the river named after him (see TAMMUZ). Esmun (’esmun) one of the sons of Siddik, the father of the Cabiri, was especially honored at Sidon and Beirut. At Sidon a great temple was built in his honor, the ruins of which have been recently explored and various inscriptions found dedicating it to him. His name signifies "the eighth," i.e. the eighth son of Siddik, the others being the Cabiri, or Great Ones, who were regarded as presiding over ships and navigation, and as such were worshipped in many places, although their special seat was Beirut. Although they were called "Great" they are represented as dwarfs, and an image of one of them was placed on the prow, or stern, of each Phoenician war galley. The goddess Tanith (tanith) occupied a lofty place in the pantheon, since in inscriptions she takes the precedence over Baal when the two names occur together. She was especially honored at Carthage and to her most exalted names are given, such as "the parent of all"; "the highest of the gods"; "the mistress of the elements," etc. Besides some other gods of less note originally worshipped by the Phoenicians, they introduced some foreign deities into their pantheon. Thus Poseidon appears frequently on the coins of Beirut and became its patron deity in Roman times; Isis and her temple at Gebal are likewise represented on its coins, the Dioscuri or their symbols on those of Tripolis and Beirut, etc. The corrupt nature of the Phoenician worship has been referred to. It was also cruel, the custom of human sacrifices being common and carried to an extent unheard of among other peoples, such as the horrible sacrifice of 200 noble youths at Carthage when besieged by Agathocles. The sacrifice was by burning, the victim being placed in the arms of the statue of the god, heated for the purpose. In Phoenicia this god was Melqarth, or Molech, and the custom is denounced in the Old Testament (Le 20:2-5), but other gods were also honored in this way. The religious feeling of the Phoenicians was undoubtedly deep, but sadly corrupt and depraved.

8. History:

The political history of Phoenicia is that of the towns and cities belonging to it. The country as a whole had no centralized government, but the chief towns exercised a sort of hegemony, at times, over some of the lesser ones. This was especially the case with Sidon and Tyre, but every city had its king and its local government. The land is never referred to in ancient documents, but the people are designated by their cities. Thus, we find in Ge 10:17 f the mention of Sidon, the Arvadite, the Arkite, etc., and, in Jos 13:4, the Gebalites and the Sidonians in connection with the land of the Canaanites. In the same way the inscriptions of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria refer to the people of the different cities, but not to the land as a political unit, which it never was.

The cities first come into notice in the period of the Egyptian domination, beginning in the 16th century BC under Thothmes III. This king subdued most of the Phoenician cities, or received their submission, in his numerous campaigns to Syria, and the Egyptian rule continued with more or less interruption until the decline of Egypt under the XXth Dynasty, or about 300 years. During this time Arvad seems to have exercised the hegemony in the North, and Sidon in the South, with Gebal controlling the middle region. The Tell el-Amarna Letters reveal many facts concerning the condition of things while the Egyptian power was declining in the latter part of the XVIIIth Dynasty, especially in the reign of Amenhotep IV (Ikhnaton). The rise of the Amorite and Hittite power in the North threatened these cities, which were under Egyptian governors, and they called upon their suzerain for aid, which was not given, and they fell, one after another, into the hands of the enemy. Rameses II restored Egyptian rule, but his successors of the XXth Dynasty could not maintain it, and the invasion of tribes from the West and North, called the Peleset, or Philistines, by land and sea, though repelled by Rameses III, continued to increase until the Egyptian domination was broken, and the coast towns resumed their independence about the middle of the 12th century BC. Sidon came to the front as the chief city of Phoenicia, and it is referred to by Joshua as "Great Sidon" (Jos 11:8). Homer also mentions Sidon frequently, but makes no reference to Tyre. The latter city was certainly in existence in his day, but had not come to the front as the leading city in the mind of the Greeks. Yet it was a fortified city in the time of Joshua (19:29), and the king of Tyre is among the correspondents mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. It seems to have taken precedence of Sidon when the latter was attacked by the Philistines of Askelon, and the inhabitants were compelled to flee for safety to Tyre. At all events Tyre exercised the hegemony in Phoenicia by the time David came to the throne, and had probably obtained it a century or two before, and held it until Phoenicia became subject to Assyria in the 9th century BC. Asshur-nazir-pal first came into contact with Phoenicia, which submitted to tribute, between 877 and 860 BC, and this subjection continued until the downfall of Assyria in the latter part of the 7th century BC. The subjection was nominal only for more than a century, the cities retaining their kings and managing their own affairs with no interference from the Assyrians as long as they paid the tribute. But with the advent of Tiglath-pileser in Syria, about 740 BC, conditions changed, and the Phoenician towns were subjected to severe treatment, and some of the dynasties were driven from their cities and Assyrian governors appointed in their places. Their oppression caused revolts, and Elulaeus of Tyre united Sidon and the cities to the South in a league to resist the encroachments of Tiglath-pileser and his successor Shalmaneser IV, whom he successfully resisted, although the Assyrian gained over to his side Sidon, Acre, and some other towns and had the assistance of their fleets to make an attack upon the island city. The attack failed completely, and Shalmaneser left Elulaeus to his independence, which he maintained for a quarter of a century, regaining control of the towns that had fallen away and also of Cyprus. Sargon (722-705 BC) let Phoenicia alone, but Sennacherib (705-681) determined to punish the king of Tyre and prepared an army of 200,000 men for the war with Phoenicia. Elulaeus was afraid and fled to Cyprus, but his towns dared to resist and Sennacherib had to reduce them one after another, but did not succeed in taking Tyre itself. He set over the conquered territory a certain Tubaal, probably a Phoenician who paid him tribute. He also took tribute from Gebal and Aradus, which indicates that all of Phoenicia was subject to him, as these two cities probably controlled all that was not under Tyre. In the reign of Esarhaddon (681-668) Sidon revolted under Abd-Melkarth, who was caught and beheaded, the city sacked, and the inhabitants either killed or carried into captivity, and it was re-peopled by captives from the East. At a later date (672),

when Esarhaddon was preparing to invade Egypt, Baal, the vassal king of Tyre, revolted and refused to aid him, but afterward submitted either to Esarhaddon or to his son Ashurbanipal and assisted the latter in his invasion of Egypt, 668 BC. Four years later, however, we find the Assyrian king besieging Tyre and punishing Baal by making him give his daughter to be a member of the Assyrian's harem. Baal himself was left on his throne. The same fate was the lot of the king of Aradus, and Accho (Acre) was also punished.

The frequent rebellions of the Phoenician towns show their love of independence and a sturdy resistance to oppression. They became freed from the yoke of Assyria probably about 630 BC, when the Medes attacked Nineveh and the Scythic hordes overran all Western Asia. The Phoenician cities were fortitled and did not suffer very much from the barbarian invasion, and, as Assyria was broken, they resumed their independence. In the struggle which followed between Egypt and Babylon for the mastery of Syria, Phoenicia fell, for a time, under the sway of Egypt, but was not oppressed, and her towns prospered, and it was in this period that Tyre attained great wealth and renown as reflected in the Book of Ezk. When Nebuchadnezzar laid siege to it, a resistance of 13 years showed its strength and resources, and although the town on the mainland was destroyed, it is doubtful whether the king of Babylon took the island city, but it must have submitted to pay tribute (585 BC). Phoenicia remained subject to Babylon until that empire fell into the hands of the Persians (538), and then accepted the yoke of the latter in the days of Cambyses, if not earlier, but the Persian king does not seem to have used force to gain the adherence of the Phoenicians. He needed their fleets to assist in the attack upon Egypt and secured them without difficulty. They aided him in the conquest of Egypt, but when he asked them to proceed against Carthage they refused, and he had to desist. The navy of Phoenicia was too necessary for him to run any risk of alienating it.

This navy was the strongest sea power of the Persians in all their coming wars with Greece. Without its assistance Darius and his successors could with difficulty have invaded that country or held in subjection the western coasts of Asia Minor. Phoenicia remained faithful to her Persian rulers about 150 years, but when the general revolt of the western satraps occurred in 362 BC, Phoenicia seems to have favored them, but no open rebellion broke out until 351, when Sidon, under her king Tabnit II (Tennes), boldly declared her independence and induced most of the Phoenician cities to do the same. The Persian garrisons were massacred or driven out. Ochus, the king of Persia, marched with an army of 300,000 infantry and 30,000 horse to punish the rebels, and Tabnit, in cowardly alarm, betrayed Sidon into his hands, but the citizens set fire to the city and destroyed themselves rather than fall into the hands of Ochus, who, as treacherous as Tabnit, slew the traitor (see SIDON). The other cities then submitted, and Phoenicia remained subject to Persia until the time of Alexander the Great. When this conqueror invaded the dominions of Persia and had defeated Darius at Issus, 333 BC, he demanded the submission of the Phoenician towns, and all yielded save Tyre. Alexander was obliged to lay siege to it, which cost him 7 months of the severest labor, such was the valor and skill of the Tyrians. The capture of Tyre is reckoned as one of the greatest exploits of this mighty conqueror who stained his record by his cruel treatment of the brave defenders. He massacred the male prisoners and sold the remainder of the inhabitants, to the number of 30,000, into slavery (see TYRE). After the death of Alexander the Phoenician cities were subject to the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Seleucids of Syria, the latter finally obtaining control of all by the victory of Antiochus III over Scopas in 198 BC. From this time on

Phoenicia formed a part of the Seleucid kingdom until it passed, together with Syria and Palestine, into the hands of the Romans. Its cities became the home of many Greeks and its language became largely Greek, as inscriptions and coins testify. The Romans had also much to do in modifying the character of the people, and some towns, Berytus, especially, became largely Roman. Phoenicia can hardly be said to have had a separate existence after the Greek invasion.

LITERATURE.

Rawlinson, History of Phoenicia; Kenrick, Phoenicia; Movers, Phonizier; Breasted, History of Egypt, and Ancient Records; Budge, History of Egypt; Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies; Rogers, Babylonia and Assyria; Bevan, House of Seleucus; Tell el-Amarna Letters; Perrot and Chipiez, Art in Phoenicia.

H. Porter

PHOENIX

fe’-niks (Phoinix; the King James Version Phenice): A harbor in Crete (Ac 27:12). The Alexandrian corn ship carrying Paul and the author of Acts, after it left Myra in Lycia, was prevented by adverse winds from holding a straight course to Italy, and sailed under the lee of Crete, off the promontory of Salmone (kata Salmonen). The ship was then able to make her way along the South shore of Crete to a harbor called Fair Havens (Kaloi Limenes), near a city Lasea (Lasaia). Thence, in spite of Paul’s advice to winter in Fair Havens, it was decided to sail to Phoenix (eis Phoinika, limena tes Kretes) bleponta kata liba kai kata choron, a description which has been translated in two ways:

(1) "looking toward the Southwest wind and toward the Northwest wind, i.e. looking Southwest and Northwest";

(2) "looking down the Southwest wind and down the Northwest wind, i.e. looking Northeast and Southeast" On the way thither, they were struck by a wind from the Northeast, called Euraquilo, and ran before it under the lee of an island, called Cauda or Clauda (Kauda (Codex Sinaiticus (corrected) and Codex Vaticanus and the Old Latin) or Klauda (Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus, etc.)) in Ac 27:7-17. It will be convenient to discuss those places together. The following account is based on Smith’s elaborate study in his Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul, which has been followed by all later writers.

The ship, when it left Myra was obviously making for Italy (Puteoli or Ostia) by the shortest route, round Cape Malea, but off Cnidus it encountered a Northwest wind and had to sail for shelter under the lee of Crete. Salmone, now called Cape Sidero, was the promontory which forms the Northeast corner of the island. Thence along the South shore of Crete, as far as Cape Matala, a sailing ship is sheltered by the mountains from the violence of the Northwest wind; West of Cape Matala, where the coast turns toward the Northwest, there is no such shelter. Fair Havens must therefore be looked for to the East of Cape Matala, and there is a harbor, lying 6 miles East of Cape Matala, which is called Fair Havens by

the modern Greek inhabitants of the island. There is no doubt that this is the harbor in which the Alexandrian ship took shelter. It is sheltered only from the North and Northwest winds.

The ruins of a city which has been identified with Lasea have been found 5 miles East from Fair Havens, and 12 miles South of the important city of Gortyna. It has been suggested that Paul's desire to winter at Fair Havens (Ac 27:10) may have been due to its proximity to Gortyna, and the opportunity which the latter city afforded for missionary work. There were many Jews in Gortyna.

See CRETE.

From Fair Havens, against the advice of Paul, it was decided to sail to Phoenix, there to pass the winter. While the ship was on its way thither, it was struck by a violent Northeast wind from the mountains, called Euraquilo, and carried under the lee of an islet called Cauda or Clauda. When this happened, the ship was evidently crossing the Bay of Messariah, and from this point a Northeast wind must have carried her under the lee of an island now called Gaudho in Greek and Gozzo in Italian, situated about 23 miles Southwest of the center of the Gulf of Messariah. The modern name of the island shows that Cauda (Caudas in the Notitiae Episcopatuum), and not Clauda is the true ancient form.

The writer of Ac never saw Phoenix, which must have been a good harbor, as the nautical experts decided to winter there (Ac 27:11). Now the only safe harbor on the South coast of Crete in which a ship large enough to carry a cargo of corn and 268 souls could moor is the harbor beside Loutro, a village on the South coast of Crete, directly North of Cauda. All the ancient authorities agree in placing Phoenix in this neighborhood. The harbor at Loutro affords shelter from all winds, and its identification with Phoenix seems certain. But a serious difficulty arises on this view. The words describing the harbor of Phoenix ordinarily mean "looking toward the Southwest and the Northwest," but the harbor beside Loutro looks eastward. This led Bishop Wordsworth to identify Phoenix with an open roadstead on the western side of the isthmus on which Loutro stands. But this roadstead is not a suitable place for wintering in, and it is better either to take the words to mean, in sailor's language, "looking down the Southwest and Northwest winds"—a description which exactly fits the harbor at Loutro—or to assume that the reporter of the discussion referred to in Ac 27:10-12 or the writer of Ac made a mistake in describing a place which he had never seen. An inscription belonging to the reign of Trajan found at Loutro shows that Egyptian corn ships were wont to lie up there for the winter.

W. M. Calder

PHOROS

fo'-ros (Phoros; Codex Vaticanus (Swete) Phares (1 Esdras 8:30, where the King James Version Pharez)): Name of one of the families, part of whom went up from the exile with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:9) and part with Ezra (8:30 the Revised Version (British and American)) equals "Parosh" of Ezr 2:3; 8:3, and some members of which had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:26).

PHRURAI

fru’-ri, fru’-ra-i (Phrourai; also in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus as Phrouraia and Phrourim; the King James Version Phurim): In Additions to Esther 11:1, "the epistle of Phrurai" means the preceding Book of Esther.

See PURIM.

PHRYGIA

frij’-i-a (Phrugia): A large ancient country of Central Asia Minor, very mountainous and with table-lands reaching 4,000 ft. in height. Its name is derived from Phryges, a tribe from Thrace, which in early times invaded the country and drove out or absorbed the earlier Asiatic inhabitants, among whom were the Hittites. Thus, the Phrygians borrowed much of oriental civilization, especially of art and mythology which they transferred to Europe. To define the boundaries of Phrygia would be exceedingly difficult, for as in the case of other Asia Minor countries, they were always vague and they shifted with nearly every age. The entire country abounds with ruins of former cities and with almost countless rock-hewn tombs, some of which are of very great antiquity. Among the most interesting of the rock sculptures are the beautiful tombs of the kings bearing the names Midas and Gordius, with which classical tradition has made us familiar. It seems that at one period the country may have extended to the Hellespont, even including Troy, but later the Phrygians were driven toward the interior. In Roman times, however, when Paul journeyed there, the country was divided into two parts, one of which was known as Galatian Phrygia, and the other as Asian Phrygia, because it was a part of the Roman province of Asia, but the line between them was never sharply drawn. The Asian Phrygia was the larger of the two divisions, including the greater part of the older country; Galatian Phrygia was small, extending along the Pisidian Mountains, but among its important cities were Antioch, Iconium and Apollonia. About 295 AD, when the province of Asia was no longer kept together, its different parts were known as Phrygia Prima and Phrygia Secunda. That part of Asia Minor is now ruled by a Turkish wall or governor whose residence is in Konia, the ancient Iconium. The population consists not only of Turks, but of Greeks, Armenians, Jews, Kurds and many small tribes of uncertain ancestry, and of peculiar customs and religious practices. The people live mostly in small villages which are scattered throughout the picturesque country. Sheep and goat raising are the leading industries; brigandage is common. According to Ac 2:10, Jews from Phrygia went to Jerusalem, and in Ac 18:23 we learn that many of them were influential and perhaps fanatical. According to Ac 16:6, Paul traversed the country while on his way from Lystra to Iconium and Antioch in Galatian Phrygia. Twice he entered Phrygia in Asia, but on his 2nd journey he was forbidden to preach there. Christianity was introduced into Phrygia by Paul and Barnabas, as we learn from Ac 13:4; 16:1-6; 18:23, yet it did not spread there rapidly. Churches were later founded, perhaps by Timothy or by John, at Colosse, Laodicea and Hierapolis.

E. J. Banks

PHURAH

fu’-ra (purah, "branch").

See PURAH.

PHUT

fut (puT).

See PUT.

PHUVAH

fu’-va.

See PUAH.

PHYGELUS; PHYGELLUS

fi-je’-lus, fi-jel’-us (Phugellos; Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek, with others, read Phugelos, Phygellus or Phygelus (2Ti 1:15); the King James Version): One of the Christians who deserted Paul at the time of his 2nd imprisonment at Rome. Paul mentions him, along with Hermogenes, as being among those "that are in Asia," who turned away from him then. What is meant may be that Phygelus and Hermogenes, along with other native Christians from proconsular Asia, were in Rome when he was brought before the emperor’s tribunal the second time, and that they had not merely taken no measures to stand by and support him, but that they had deserted him.

The meaning, however, may be that the turning away of Phygelus and Hermogenes from Paul took place, not in Rome, but in Asia itself.

The times during and immediately following the Neronic persecution were more dreadful than can easily be conceived, and the temptation was strong to forsake the Christian name, and to do so in a wholesale fashion. A great community like the Christian church in Ephesus or in Rome felt the terrible pressure of those times, when for a mere word—a word, however, denying the Lord who bought them—men were at once set free from persecution, from the loss of property or of home, and from death. 1 Peter records how the aftermath of the Neronic persecution had extended far indeed from Rome, where it had originated. Peter asks the Christians not to give way under "the fiery trial" which is trying them (1Pe 4:12), and those whom he thus addresses were the members of the church throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia (1Pe 1:1). The epistles to the seven churches in Asia in the Apocalypse also show how sorely persecution had raged throughout that province.

See PERSECUTION.

But in addition to the temptation to deny Christ’s name and to go back to heathenism or to Judaism, there was also another which pressed upon some of the churches, the temptation to repudiate the authority of Paul. Many passages in the New Testament show how the name of Paul was sometimes very lightly esteemed, and how his authority was repudiated, e.g. by persons in Corinth, and in the churches of Galatia.

What is said here is, that among the Christians of proconsular Asia, i.e. of Ephesus and the churches in the valley of the Cayster, there was a widespread defection from that loyalty to Paul which was to be expected from those who owed to him all that they possessed of the knowledge of Christ’s salvation. "All that are in Asia turned away from me; of whom are Phygelus and Hermogenes." On the whole, all the necessary conditions of these words are satisfied by a reference to Rome and to Paul’s environment there, and perhaps this is the more probable meaning.

See HERMOGENES.

John Rutherfurd

PHYLACTERY

fi-lak’-ter-i (phulakterion, "guard"):

1. Bible References:

This word is found only in Mt 23:5 in our Lord’s denunciation of the Pharisees, who, in order that their works might "be seen of men," and in their zeal for the forms of religion, "make broad their phylacteries and enlarge the borders of their garments." The corresponding word in the Old Testament, ToTaphoth (Kennedy in HDB suggests pointing as the segholate feminine singular, ToTepheth), is fonnd in three passages (Ex 13:16; De 6:8; 11:18), where it is translated "frontlets." This rendering, however, is not at all certain, and may have been read into the text from its later interpretation. In Ex 13:9 the corresponding word to the Totaphoth of 13:16 is zikkaron, "memorial" or "reminder"; and in the parallel clauses of both verses the corresponding word is ‘oth, "a sign" upon the hand, also used for the "sign" which Yahweh appointed for Cain (Ge 4:15). It may be rendered then as a mark or ornament or jewel, and used figuratively of Yahweh’s Law as an ornament or jewel to the forehead of the Israelite, a reference to the charm or amulet worn by the pagan. The word used in the Talmud for the phylactery is tephillah, "prayer," or "prayer-band" (plural tephillin), indicating its use theoretically as a reminder of the Law, although practically it might be esteemed as an automatic and ever-present charm against evil: an aid within toward the keeping of the Law, a guard without against the approach of evil; a degradation of an Old Testament figurative and idealistic phrase to the materialistic and superstitious practices of the pagans.

2. Description:

The phylactery was a leather box, cube-shaped, closed with an attached flap and bound to the person by a leather band. There were two kinds:

(1) one to be bound to the inner side of the left arm, and near the elbow, so that with the bending of the arm it would rest over the heart, the knot fastening it to the arm being in the form of the Hebrew letter yodh (y), and the end of the string, or band, finally wound around the middle finger of the hand, "a sign upon thy hand" (De 6:8). This box had one compartment containing one or all of the four passages given above. The writer in his youth found one of these in a comparatively remote locality, evidently lost by a Jewish peddler, which contained only the 2nd text (Ex 13:11-16) in unpointed Hebrew.

(2) Another was to be bound in the center of the forehead, "between thine eyes" (De 6:8), the knot of the band being in the form of the Hebrew letter daleth (d), with the Hebrew letter shin (sh) upon each end of the box, which was divided into four compartments with one of the four passages in each.

These two Hebrew letters, with the yodh (y) of the arm-phylactery (see (1) above), formed the divine name shadday, "Almighty." Quite elaborate ceremonial accompanied the "laying" on of the phylacteries, that of the arm being bound on first, and that of the head next, quotations from Scripture or Talmud being repeated at each stage of the binding. They were to be worn by every male over 13 years old at the time of morning prayer, except on Sabbaths and festal days, such days being in themselves sufficient reminders of "the commandment, the statutes, and the ordinances" of Yahweh (De 6:1).

3. Interpretation of Old Testament Passages:

The passages on which the wearing of the phylacteries is based are as follows: "It (i.e. the feast of unleavened bread) shall be for a sign unto thee upon thy hand, and for a memorial between thine eyes, that the law of Yahweh may be in thy mouth" (Ex 13:9); "And it (i.e. sacrifice of the firstborn) shall be for a sign upon thy hand, and for frontlets between thine eyes" (Ex 13:16); "thou shalt bind them (i.e. the words of Yahweh) for a sign upon thy hand, and they shall be for frontlets between thine eyes" (De 6:8); "therefore shall ye lay up these my words in your heart and in your soul; and ye shall bind them for a sign upon your hand, and they shall be for frontlets between your eyes" (De 11:18). It is evident that the words in Exodus are beyond all question used figuratively; a careful reading of the verses in Deuteronomy in close relation to their contexts, in which are other figures of speech not to be taken literally, is sufficient proof of their purely figurative intention also. Only the formalism of later ages could distort these figures into the gross and materialistic practice of the phylactery. Just when this practice began cannot accurately be determined. While the Talmud attempts to trace it back to the primitive, even Mosaic, times, it probably did not long antedate the birth of Christ. In conservative Jewish circles it has been maintained through the centuries, and at present is faithfully followed by orthodox Judaism. Every male, who at the age of 13 becomes a "son of the Law" (bar mitswah), must wear the phylactery and perform the accompanying ceremonial.

In the New Testament passage (Mt 23:5) our Lord rebukes the Pharisees, who make more pronounced the un-Scriptural formalism and the crude literalism of the phylacteries by making them obtrusively large, as they also seek notoriety for their religiosity by the enlarged fringes, or "borders."

See FRINGES; FRONTLETS; PHARISEES.

LITERATURE.

The various commentaries. on Ex and Dt: tractate Tephillin; the comprehensive article by A. R. S. Kennedy in HDB; articles in Encyclopedia Biblica and Jewish Encyclopedia.

Edward Mack

PHYLARCH

fi'-lark (phularches): Given in the King James Version of 2 Macc 8:32 as a proper name "Philarches," but in the Revised Version (British and American) "the phylarch of Timotheus's forces"; "probably the captain of an irregular auxiliary force" (Revised Version margin), rather than a cavalry officer.

PHYLARCHES

fi-lar'-kez (the King James Version Philarches).

See PHYLARCH.

PHYSICIAN

fi-zish'-an (rophi; iatros): To the pious Jew at all times God was the healer (De 32:39): "It was neither herb nor mollifying plaister that cured them, but thy word, O Lord, which healeth all things" (The Wisdom of Solomon 16:12). The first physicians mentioned in Scripture are those of Egypt. Long before the sojourn of the Hebrews in that land, Egypt had a priestly class of physicians (snu) and a god of healing (Imchtp). From the ancient medical papyri which have been preserved, the largest of which is the Papyrus Ebers, we know that the medical knowledge of these physicians was purely empirical, largely magical and wholly unscientific. In spite of their ample opportunities they knew next to nothing of human anatomy, their descriptions of diseases are hopelessly crude, and three-fourths of the hundreds of prescriptions in the papyri are wholly inert. Even their art of embalming was so imperfect that few of their mummies would have remained in any other climate than that of Egypt. Physicians of this kind who were Joseph's servants embalmed Jacob (Ge 50:2) and Joseph (Ge 50:26). It was not until the foundation of the School of Alexandria, which was purely Greek, that Egypt became a place of medical education and research.

There is no evidence that at any time the priests of Israel were reputed to be the possessors of medical knowledge or tradition. In the ceremonial law they had explicit instructions as to the isolation of those suffering from skin eruptions, so that they might recognize certain obstinate and infectious forms which caused ceremonial uncleanness, but with this duty as sanitary police their function ended and they used no means to cure these diseases. There is, as far as I know, no record or tradition of a priest-physician in Bible times. The records of cure by the prophets, especially Elisha, are mostly recorded as miracles, not as cures by treatment. The salt which cured the noxious water at Jericho and the meal by which the poisonous gourds were rendered innoxious, like the manipulation of the Shunammite's son, can scarcely be regarded as adequate remedies. There is an implied reference to a healer of wounds in Ex 21:19, as also in Isa 3:7, and it is recorded in Pesachim, iv.9 that there was in existence in the time of the monarchy a book of cures, cepher rephu'oth, supposed to have been written by Solomon, but withdrawn from public use by Hezekiah. The first specific mention of Hebrew physicians is 2Ch 16:12, but Asa is obviously regarded by the Chronicler as reprehensible in trusting to their skill. In 2Ki 8:29 Joram, king of Israel, is said to have gone to Jezreel to be healed. Not far from this, across the Jordan, was Gilead, which possibly may also have been a place resorted to by those needing medical treatment, as indicated by Jeremiah's query: "Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?" (Jer 8:22). Job, irritated by the platitudes of his friends, calls them physicians of no value (13:4).

In the New Testament our Lord's saying, "They that are whole have no need of a physician," etc., shows that there were physicians in Galilee (Mt 9:12; Mr 2:17; Lu 5:31), and in Nazareth He quotes what seems to have been a proverb: "Physician, heal thyself" (Lu 4:23). There were physicians in Galilee who received fees from the woman of Caesarca Philippi who had the issue of blood (Mr 5:26; Lu 8:43). Of her there is a curious story told in Eusebius (VII, 18).

There are several Talmudic references to physicians; in Sheqalim ii 1, it is said that there was a physician at the temple to attend to the priests. A physician was appointed in every city (Gittin 12b) who was required to have a license from the local authorities (Babha' Bathra' 21a). The familiar passage in Ecclesiasticus 38:1-15 the Revised Version (British and American) in praise of the physician gives him but limited credit for his skill: "There is a time when in their very hands is the issue for good," and later, "He that sinneth before his Maker, Let him fall into the hands of the physician."

Luke, called "the beloved physician" in Col 4:14, is said by Eusebius to have been a native of Antioch and a physician by profession. According to Origen he was the unnamed "brother whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches" (2Co 8:18). There are evidences of his professional studies in the language of his writings, though of this probably more has been made by Hobart and others than it really merits. Had we not known of his profession it is doubtful whether it could have been conjectured from his choice of words. Sir W. Ramsay calls attention to the two words used of the healings at Melita in Ac 28:8-10: for the cure of Publius' father the word used is iasato, but for the healing of those who came later it is etherapeuonto, which he renders "received medical treatment." From this he infers that Luke helped Paul with these (Ramsay, Luke the Physician, 1908).

Alexander Macalister

PI-BESETH

pi-be’-seth (pi-be’seth; (pi-bheceth; Septuagint Bubastos; Egyptian Pi-Basht, "the house of Basht," the cat-headed goddess; the Egyptian form is usually Ha-Basht; it is doubtful if the form Pi-Basht has yet been found): A city of ancient Egypt. The only occurrence of the name of this place in the Old Testament is in Eze 30:17; where it is coupled with Aven, i.e. On (Heliopolis).

1. Location:

Pi-beseth was on the western bank of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, about 40 miles North of Memphis, about 15 miles Northeast of On. Herodotus found the city of Bubastis very beautiful in his day. The annual festival of the goddess, Basht, was celebrated here with revolting license, similar to that of the festival of Syyid el-Bedawer now kept in TanTa.

2. Exploration:

Pi-beseth was explored by Professor Naville under the Egyptian Exploration Society in 1887-90. There were uncovered ruins of Egypt from the IVth Dynasty of the Old Empire, from the Middle Empire, an important Hyksos settlement, and ruins from the New Empire down to the end, and even from Roman times. The most unique discovery at Pi-beseth, one of the most unique in all Egypt, is the cemetery of cats. These cats, the animal sacred to Basht, were mummified at other places in Egypt, but at Pibeseth they were burned and the ashes and bones gathered and buried in great pits lined with brick or hardened clay. Bones of the ichneumon were also found mixed with those of the cats in these pits (Egypt Exploration Fund Report, 1891).

M. G. Kyle

PI-HAHIROTH

pi-ha-hi’-roth (pi-ha-chiroth (Ex 14:2-9; Nu 33:7-8)):

1. Meaning of Name:

Nothing is known of the meaning of the name. Pi-Hahiroth Some attempts toward an Egyptian etymology for it have been made, but without much success. Since the meaning of the name is unknown and no description of the place or its use is given, it is impossible to determine anything concerning the character of Pi-Hahiroth, whether a city, a sanctuary, a fortress, or some natural feature of the landscape.

2. Location:

Neither Pi-Hahiroth nor any other place mentioned with it can be exactly located. A recent discovery of

manuscripts in Egypt furnishes a mention of this place, but affords very little assistance in locating it, nothing comparable to the account in the Bible itself. If any one of the places mentioned in connection with the crossing of the Red Sea could be located approximately, all the others could, also, be similarly located by the description given in the account in Exodus. The route beyond the Sea has been made out with almost positive certainty. A journey along the way is so convincing that hardly anything can shake the conviction which it produces. This identification of the route of the exodus beyond the Sea requires the place of the crossing to be within 3 days' journey of Marah, which puts it somewhere near the modern Suez. It may be anywhere within 10 miles of that point. This approximately locates all the other places mentioned in connection with the crossing: Migdol must be Ras 'Ataqah, or some other high point in the mountains of the western deserts, where might be placed a watchtower. Pi-Hahiroth is between this point and the Sea and Baal-zephon near the opposite eastern shore. This puts Pi-Hahiroth at some point along the old shore line of the Sea within 10 miles of the site of modern Suez.

M. G. Kyle

PICTURE

pik'-tur: This word (in the plural) is found 3 times in the King James Version, namely, Nu 33:52; Isa 2:16; Pr 25:11. In Numbers and Proverbs "pictures" represents the Hebrew word maskith, "showpiece" "figure." The context in Numbers suggests that the "pictures" or "carved figures" (the Revised Version (British and American) "figured stones") which the Israelites were to destroy were symbols of Canaanite worship and therefore foreign to the religion of Yahweh. In Proverbs for the King James Version "pictures of silver," the English Revised Version has "baskets (the American Standard Revised Version "network") of silver," but a more probable translation is "carvings of silver." "Pictures" stands for a slightly different word (but from the same root) in Isaiah, namely, sekhuyoth; the Revised Version (British and American) renders "imagery" (the Revised Version margin "watchtowers"). The prophet probably alludes to carved figures (of gods in animal or human shapes) on the prows of vessels.

T. Lewis

PIECE

pes: In the King James Version the word (singular and plural) represents a large number of different Hebrew words, many of which have more or less the same significance, e.g. piece of meat or flesh (Ge 15:10; 2Sa 6:19; Eze 24:4); of bread or cake (1Sa 2:36; 30:12; Jer 37:21); of ground or land (2Sa 23:11); of wall (Ne 3:11,19); of an ear (Am 3:12); of cloth or garment (1Ki 11:30); of millstone (Jud 9:53). It is used frequently in paraphrastic renderings of various Hebrew verbs: "break," "tear," "cut," etc., in pieces (Ge 44:28, etc.).

In the New Testament "piece" renders epiblema, "piece" or "patch of cloth" (Mt 9:16; Mr 2:21; Lu 5:36). It is also found in paraphrastic renderings—broken in pieces (Mr 5:4), pulled in pieces (Ac 23:10).

T. Lewis

PIECE OF GOLD

The word "pieces" is supplied in 2Ki 5:5 (story of Naaman), "6,000 pieces of gold," where the Revised Version margin more correctly suggests "shekels" (compare 1Ki 10:16).

See MONEY.

PIECE OF MONEY

Two words are thus rendered in the King James Version (qesiTah; stater). the Revised Version (British and American) gives only the first this rendering (Job 42:11). It is supposed to be from Arabic qassaT, "to divide equally by weight," and hence, something weighed; a piece of silver weighed for money, and perhaps stamped with its weight. The stater is the well-known Greek weight and coin (Mt 17:27 the King James Version, margin, "stater," the Revised Version (British and American) "shekel"). In gold it was equal to about a guinea or five dollars, but in silver only to about 66 cents (in 1915).

PIECE OF SILVER

Two words are thus rendered in the Old Testament (ratstse-khaceph, and qesiTah) and two in the New Testament argurion, and drachme). The first expression means pieces of silver broken off from bars or larger pieces (Ps 68:30). The second is used for money in Jos 24:32, and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). The pieces were not coins, but perhaps bore a stamp. See MONEY. In other passages of the Old Testament where pieces of silver are mentioned, the Hebrew has simply a numeral joined with keTeph, "silver," as in the account of the selling of Joseph (Ge 37:28). In Isa 7:23 the word silverlings means small pieces of silver, and they were no doubt shekels. In the New Testament the Greek arguria (Mt 26:15; 27:3-9), is translated as pieces of silver, but probably means shekels. In Ac 19:19 the same word occurs, but in this case the reference is probably to the denarius or drachma (compare Lu 15:8 f). Thus, the 30 pieces of Matthew would be equal to about 4 British pounds or $20 (in 1915), and the 50,000 of Ac to about 2,000 British pounds or $10,000 (in 1915).

H. Porter

PIETY

pi’-e-ti: Only in 1Ti 5:4: "Let them learn first to show piety toward their own family," where "let them show piety" represents a single Greek verb (eusebeo), in its only other occurrence (Ac 17:23) being rendered "worship." In Elizabethan English "piety" (like the Latin pietas) could be used of devotion to one’s parents (as still in the phrase "filial piety"), as well as of devotion to God. Hence, there is no explicit statement here that filial devotion is one form of divine worship.

PIGEON pij’-un (yonah; peristera; Latin pipire): A bird of the family Columbidae. See DOVE. The Hebrew yonah seems to be translated either pigeon or dove, yet almost every reference made to these birds proves that there were distinct branches of the family recognized, and one or the other or both are designated. On the other hand, some of the translations read doves, where the remainder of the text makes it very clear that pigeons were the birds intended, The Latin pipire means "to cheep," and refers to the unusually clamorous young in the nest. The old birds coo, moan and wail as doves. The birds are almost 12 inches long, have full, plump bodies that are delicious food, and beautifully marked and shaded plumage. They feed principally on grain, seeds, small buds and fruit. Beyond question wild pigeons were the first birds domesticated and taught to home with man. They appeared in a state of such complete domestication, that they flew free, yet homed and bred in places provided by man at the time of the very first attempts at keeping records of history. At the time the earliest Biblical accounts were written, pigeons were so domesticated that in all known countries of the East they were reckoned when an estimate was made of a man’s wealth.

The rich provided large and expensive cotes of molded pottery for their birds, each section big enough for the home of one pair of birds, the regular rows of openings resembling lattice work, so that Isaiah refers to them as "windows" (Isa 60:8). Septuagint reads sun nossois, literally, "with young" or "fledglings" (see below). The middle classes modeled cotes of oven-baked clay, and the very poor cut holes in the walls, over the doors, and allowed the birds to enter and live with the family.

In wild estate, rock and wood pigeons swarmed in countless numbers through rocky caves and caverns and over the plains of Gennesaret, the forests of Gilead and the woody slopes of Carmel. They remained throughout the season, breeding at all times. The doves were migratory, and were kept in confinement only as caged pets or to be held for sale for sacrifice. For these purposes, it appears that the dove was slightly preferred. When only one bird was to be used, a dove is always specified; where two, almost in every case the dove is mentioned first. Where one or the other will suffice, the dove seems to have been given preference. This may have been because it required greater effort to procure a dove, and so it was considered a greater sacrifice. Everyone having a home of any sort had pigeons they could use, or they could be taken wild at any time. The dove is first mentioned in Ge 15:9: "And he said unto him, Take me a heifer three years old, and a she-goat three years old, and a ram three years old, and a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon."

It will be observed that the dove is mentioned first, and it is specified that the pigeon was to be young. It is probable that the people protected their domesticated pigeons by using the wild for sacrifice, whenever possible. Young birds could be taken from a nest at almost any time. The old birds, among the wild, were shy creatures and far more difficult to capture in nets or snares than doves that came close to cities and villages to live, and exhibited much less fear of man than the wild pigeons. The next reference is in Le 5:7: "And if his means suffice not for a lamb, then he shall bring his trespass-offering for that wherein he hath sinned, two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, unto Yahweh; one for a sin-offering, and the other for a burnt-offering." Here two birds of each kind were to be offered, if the person making the sacrifice could not afford a lamb. Again in Le 12:6: "And when the days of her purifying are fulfilled, for a son, or for a daughter, she shall bring a lamb a year old for a burnt-offering, and a young

pigeon, or a turtledove, for a sinoffering, unto the door of the tent of meeting, unto the priest." Here is a rare instance where the text or the translators place the pigeon first.

"And on the eighth day he shall bring two turtle-doves, or two young pigeons, to the priest, to the door of the tent of meeting" (Nu 6:10). In So 2:14:

"O my dove, that art in the clefts of the rock,

In the covert of the steep place,

Let me see thy countenance,

Let me hear thy voice;

For sweet is thy voice, and thy countenance is comely."

Here the text reads "dove," but the description of the location and the implication of the text prove the bird to have been a rock pigeon—a tender, loving thing, yet shy and timid, that peeps with eyes of bright concern over the rocks of its chosen home, down at the intruder. Isa 60:8: "Who are these that fly as a cloud, and as the doves to their windows?" Here is another place where the wrong bird is used. Doves were wild and migratory. They had no "windows." But the tile pots massed in one diamond-shaped cote appeared at a little distance, like latticed windows. This should read "pigeons" instead of "doves." For the same reason see Jer 48:28: "O ye inhabitants of Moab, leave the cities and dwell in the rock; and be like the dove that maketh her nest over the mouth of the abyss." Again the bird intended is the rock pigeon. Lu 2:24: "A sacrifice according to that which is said in the law of the Lord, A pair of turtledoves, or two young pigeons." This describes the sacrifice offered in the temple by Mary following the birth of Jesus.

Gene Stratton-Porter

PILATE, ACTS OF

See following article, 4, and APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

PILATE; PONTIUS

pi’-lat, pi’-lat, pon’-shi-us (Pontios Peilatos):

1. Name and Office

2. Pilate’s Procuratorship

3. Pilate and Jesus Christ

4. Pilate in Tradition and Legend

5. Character of Pilate

LITERATURE

1. Name and Office:

The nomen Pontius indicates the stock from which Pilate was descended. It was one of the most famous of Samnite names; it was a Pontius who inflicted on a Roman army the disgrace of the Caudine Forks. The name is often met with in Roman history after the Samnites were conquered and absorbed. Lucius Pontius Aquila was a friend of Cicero and one of the assassins of Julius Caesar. The cognomen Pilatus indicates the familia, or branch of the gens Pontius, to which Pilate belonged. It has been derived from pileus, the cap worn by freedmen; this is improbable, as Pilate was of equestrian rank. It has also been derived from pilum, a spear. Probably the name was one that had descended to Pilate from his ancestors, and had long lost its meaning. The praenomen is nowhere mentioned. Pilate was 5th procurator of Judea. The province of Judea had formerly been the kingdom of Archclaus, and was formed when he was deposed (6 AD) Speaking roughly, it took in the southern half of Palestine, including Samaria. Being an imperial province (i.e. under the direct control of the emperor), it was governed by a procurator (see PROCURATOR; PROVINCE). The procurator was the personal servant of the emperor, directly responsible to him, and was primarily concerned with finance. But the powers of procurators varied according to the appointment of the emperor. Pilate was a procurator cum porestate, i.e. he possessed civil, military, and criminal jurisdiction. The procurator of Judea was in some way subordinate to the legate of Syria, but the exact character of the subordination is not known. As a rule a procurator must be of equestrian rank and a man of certain military experience. Under his rule, the Jews were allowed as much self-government as was consistent with the maintenance of imperial authority. The Sanhedrin was allowed to exercise judicial functions, but if they desired to inflict the penalty of death, the sentence had to be confirmed by the procurator.

2. Pilate’s Procuratorship:

We have no certain knowledge of Pilate except in connection with his time of rule in Judea. We know nothing of his birth, his origin, or his earlier years. Tacitus, when speaking of the cruel punishments inflicted by Nero upon the Christians, tells us that Christ, from whom the name "Christian" was derived, was put to death when Tiberius was emperor by the procurator Pontius Pilate (Annals xv.44). Apart from this reference and what is told us in the New Testament, all our knowledge of him is derived from two Jewish writers, Josephus the historian and Philo of Alexandria.

Pilate was procurator of Judea, in succession to Gratus, and he held office for 10 years. Josephus tells

(Ant., XVIII, iv, 2) that he ruled for 10 years; that he was removed from office by Vitellius, the legate of Syria, and traveled in haste to Rome to defend himself before Tiberius against certain complaints. Before he reached Rome the emperor had passed away. Josephus adds that Vitellius came in the year 36 AD to Judea to be present at Jerusalem at the time of the Passover. It has been assumed by most authorities (so HDB and EB) that Pilate had departed before this visit of Vitellius. They accordingly date the procuratorship of Pilate as lasting from 26 to 36 AD. As against this view, yon Dobschutx points out (RE under the word "Pilate") that by this reckoning Pilate must have taken at least a year to get to Rome; for Tiberius died on March. 16, 37 AD. Such delay is inconceivable in view of the circumstances; hence, von Dobschutz rightly dates the period of his procuratorship 27-37 AD. The procurator of Judea had no easy task, nor did Pilate make the task easier by his actions. He was not careful to conciliate the religious prejudices of the Jews, and at times this attitude of his led to violent collisions between ruler and ruled.

On one occasion, when the soldiers under his command came to Jerusalem, he caused them to bring with them their ensigns, upon which were the usual images of the emperor. The ensigns were brought in privily by night, put their presence was soon discovered. Immediately multitudes of excited Jews hastened to Caesarea to petition him for the removal of the obnoxious ensigns. For five days he refused to hear them, but on the sixth he took his place on the judgment seat, and when the Jews were admitted he had them surrounded with soldiers and threatened them with instant death unless they ceased to trouble him with the matter. The Jews thereupon flung themselves on the ground and bared their necks, declaring that they preferred death to the violation of their laws. Pilate, unwilling to slay so many, yielded the point and removed the ensigns (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iii, 1; BJ, II, ix, 2, 3).

At another time he used the sacred treasure of the temple, called corban (qorban), to pay for bringing water into Jerusalem by an aqueduct. A crowd came together and clamored against him; but he had caused soldiers dressed as civilians to mingle with the multitude, and at a given signal they fell upon the rioters and beat them so severely with staves that the riot was quelled (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iii, 2; BJ, II, ix, 4).

Philo tells us (Legatio ad Caium, xxxviii) that on other occasion he dedicated some gilt shields in the palace of Herod in honor of the emperor. On these shields there was no representation of any forbidden thing, but simply an inscription of the name of the donor and of him in whose honor they were set up. The Jews petitioned him to have them removed; when he refused, they appealed to Tiberius, who sent an order that they should be removed to Caesarea.

Of the incident, mentioned in Lu 13:1, of the Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, nothing further is known.

Josephus (Ant., XVIII, iv, 1, 2) gives an account of the incident which led to Pilate’s downfall. A religious pretender arose in Samaria who promised the Samaritans that if they would assemble at Mt. Gerizim, he would show them the sacred vessels which Moses had hidden there. A great multitude assembled in readiness to ascend the mountain, but before they could accomplish their aim they were attacked by Pilate’s cavalry, and many of them were slain. The Samaritans thereupon sent an embassy to

Vitellius, the legate of Syria, to accuse Pilate of the murder of those who had been slain. Vitellius, who desired to stand well with the Jews, deposed Pilate from office, appointed Marcellus in his place, and ordered Pilate to go to Rome and answer the charges made against him before the emperor. Pilate set out for Rome, but, before he could reach it, Tiberius had died; and it is probable that, in the confusion which followed, Pilate escaped the inquisition with which he was threatened. From this point onward history knows nothing more of Pilate.

3. Pilate and Jesus Christ:

The shortest and simplest account of Pilate's dealings with Jesus Christ is given in the Gospel of Mark. There we are told that Jesus was delivered to Pilate; that Pilate asked Him if He was the king of the Jews, receiving an affirmative answer; that, to Pilate's surprise, Jesus answered nothing to the accusations of the chief priests; that Pilate tried to release Jesus according to an ancient custom; that the multitude, in spite of the protest of Pilate, demanded the release of Barabbas, and cried out that Jesus should be crucified; that Pilate scourged Jesus and delivered Him to be crucified; and that Jesus, when He had been scourged and mocked, was led away to be crucified. Mark tells further how Joseph of Arimathea begged of Pilate the body of Jesus. Pilate was surprised that Jesus died so quickly, and questioned the centurion about it. Pilate's surprise and question are peculiar to Mark. Being satisfied on this point, Pilate granted the body to Joseph. Matthew adds the dream and message of Pilate's wife (27:19); it also tells how Pilate washed his hands before the people, disclaiming responsibility for the death of Jesus, and how the people accepted the responsibility (27:24 f); also how Pilate granted a guard for the tomb (27:62-66). Luke alone narrates the sending of Jesus to Herod (23:6-12), and reports Pilate's three times repeated asseveration that he found no fault in Jesus (23:4,14,22). John gives by far the fullest narrative, which forms a framework into which the more fragmentary accounts of the Synoptics can be fitted with perfect ease. Some critics, holding that Mark alone is trustworthy, dismiss the additional incidents given in Matthew and Luke as apologetic amplifications; and many dismiss the narrative of Joh as wholly unworthy of credence. Such theories are based on preconceived opinions as to the date, authorship and reliability of the various Gospels. The reader who holds all the Gospels to be, in the main, authentic and trustworthy narratives will have no difficulty in perceiving that all four narratives, when taken together, present a story consistent in all its details and free from all difficulty. See GOSPELS. It should be noted that John evidently had special opportunities of obtaining exacter knowledge than that possessed by the others, as he was present at every stage of the trial; and that his narrative makes clear what is obscure in the accounts of the Synoptics.

The parts may be fitted together thus: Jesus is brought to Pilate (Mt 27:2; Mr 15:1; Lu 23:1; Joh 18:28). Pilate asks for a specific accusation (Joh 18:29-32). Pilate enters the praetorium, questions Jesus about His alleged kingship, and receives the answer that He rules over the kingdom of truth, and over the hearts of men who acknowledge the truth. Pilate asks: "What is truth?" (reported briefly in Mt 27:11; Mr 15:2; Lu 23:3, and with more detail Joh 18:33-38). Pilate brings Him forth (this is the only detail that needs to be supplied in order to make the harmony complete, and in itself it is probable enough), and many accusations are made against Him, to which, to Pilate's surprise, He makes no reply (Mt 27:12-14; Mr 15:3-5). Pilate affirms His innocence, but the charges are repeated (Lu 23:4 f). Pilate sends Him to Herod, who in mockery clothes Him in shining raiment, and sends Him back (Lu 23:6-12). Pilate

declares that neither Herod or himself can find any fault in Him, and offers to scourge Him and let Him go (Lu 23:13-16; Joh 18:38). Pilate offers to release Jesus in accordance with an ancient custom (Mt 27:15-18; Mr 15:6-10; Joh 18:39). Pilate's wife sends him a message warning him not to harm Jesus because she has suffered many things in a dream because of Him (Mt 27:19). The people, persuaded thereto by the chief priests and elders, choose Barabbas, and, in spite of the repeated protests of Pilate, demand that Jesus shall be crucified (Mt 27:20-23; Mr 15:11-14; Lu 23:18-23; Joh 18:40). Pilate washes his hands before the people, and they take the guilt of the deed upon themselves and their children (Mt 27:24 f). Pilate releases Barabbas and orders Jesus to be scourged (Mt 27:26; Mr 15:15; Lu 23:24 f). Jesus is scourged and mocked, buffered and spit upon (Mt 27:27-31; Mr 15:16-20; Joh 19:1-3). Pilate again declares the innocence of Jesus, brings Him out, and says: "Behold the man!" The chief priests and officers cry out: "Crucify him!" They accuse Him of making Himself the Son of God. Pilate, becoming more afraid at this saying, once more interviews the prisoner in the praetorium. He again tries to release Him, but is accused of treachery to the emperor. Overborne by this, Pilate sits on the judgment seat (see GABBATHA), and says: "Behold your King!" Again the cry goes up: "Away with him, crucify him!" Pilate says: "Shall I crucify your King?" The chief priests answered with a final renunciation of all that God had given them, saying: "We have no king but Caesar" (Joh 19:4-15). Pilate sentences Jesus and gives Him up to be crucified, and He is led away (Mt 27:31; Mr 15:20; Lu 23:26; Joh 19:16). Pilate writes a title for the cross, and refuses to alter it (Joh 19:19-22). The Jews ask of Pilate that the legs of the three who were crucified might be broken (Joh 19:31). Joseph of Arimathea begs the body of Jesus from Pilate (Mt 27:57,58; Mr 15:42 f; Lu 23:50-52; Joh 19:38). Pilate is surprised that Jesus has died so soon, and questions the centurion (Mr 15:44). He gives up to Joseph the body of Jesus (Mt 27:58; Mr 15:45; Joh 19:38). The chief priests and the Pharisees obtain permission from Pilate to take precautions against any theft of the body of Jesus (Mt 27:62-66).

Pilate is mentioned three times in Acts: in a speech of Peter (3:13), in a thanksgiving of the church (4:27), and in a speech of Paul (13:28). He is also mentioned in 1 Timothy (6:13) as the one before whom Christ Jesus witnessed the good confession.

4. Pilate in Tradition and Legend:

Eusebius, who lived in the 4th centuries, tells us (Historia Ecclesiastica, II) on the authority of certain Greek historians that Pilate fell into such calamities that he committed suicide. Various apocryphal writings have come down to us, written from the 3rd to the 5th centuries, with others of a later date, in which legendary details are given about Pilate. In all these a favorable view is taken of his character; hence, the Coptic church came to believe that he became a Christian, and enrolled him among the number of its saints. His wife, to whom tradition gives the name of Claudia Procula, or Procla, is said to have been a Jewish proselyte at the time of the death of Jesus, and afterward to have become a Christian. Her name is honored along with Pilate's in the Coptic church, and in the calendar of saints honored by the Greek church her name is found against the date October 27.

We find not unkindly references to Pilate in the recently discovered fragment of the Gospel of Peter, which was composed in the 2nd century. In the so-called Gospel of Nicodemus, which belongs to the 4th or 5th century, we find in the first part, called the Ac of Pilate, a long account of the trial of Jesus. It tells

how the standards in the hall of judgment bowed down before Jesus, in spite of the efforts of the standard-bearers, and others who attempted it, to hold them erect. It tells also how many of those who had been healed by Jesus bore testimony to Him at the trial (see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS). There has also come down to us, in various forms (e.g. in the Ac of Peter and Paul), a letter, supposed to be the report of Pilate to Tiberius, narrating the proceedings of the trial, and speaking of Jesus in the highest terms of praise. Eusebius, when he mentions this letter, avers that Tiberius, on perusing it, was incensed against the Jews who had sought the death of Jesus (Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 2). Elsewhere (Historia Ecclesiastica, IX, 5) he recounts that under Maximin forged Ac of Pilate, containing blasphemies against Christ, were circulated with consent of the emperor. None of these, if they ever existed, have come down to us. In the Paradosis Pilati we read that Caesar, being angry with Pilate for what he had done, brought him to Rome as a prisoner, and examined him. When the Christ was named, all the gods in the senate-chamber fell down and were broken. Caesar ordered war to be made on the Jews, and Pilate, after praying to Jesus, was beheaded. The head was taken away by an angel, and Procla, seeing this, died of joy. Another narrative, of late date, recounts that Pilate, at his trial, wore the seamless robe of Jesus; for this reason Caesar, though filled with anger, could not so much as say a harsh word to Pilate; but when the robe was taken off, he condemned Pilate to death. On hearing this, Pilate committed suicide. The body was sunk in the Tiber, but such storms were raised by demons on account of this that it was taken up and sunk in the Rhone at Vienne. The same trouble recurred there, and the body was finally buried in the territory of Losania (Lausanne). Tradition connects Mt. Pilatus with his name, although it is probable that the derivation is from pileatus, i.e. the mountain with a cloud-cap.

5. Character of Pilate:

Philo (Legatio ad Caium, xxxviii) speaks of Pilate in terms of the severest condemnation. According to him, Pilate was a man of a very inflexible disposition, and very merciless as well as obstinate. Philo calls him a man of most ferocious passions, and speaks of his corruption, his acts of insolence, his rapine, his habit of insulting people, his cruelty, his continual murders of people untried and uncondemned, and his never-ending and most grievous inhumanity. This is very highly colored and probably much exaggerated; certainly the instances given do not bear out this description of the man. Much of what he says of Pilate is in direct opposition to what we learn of him in the Gospels. There he appears to us as a man who, in spite of many undoubted faults, tries hard to conduct the trial with fairness. Pilate had the ethics of his class, and obviously tried to act up to the standard which he had formed. There was in him, however, no deep moral basis of character, as is shown by the utter skepticism of his question, "What is truth?" When he found that the doing of strict justice threatened to endanger his position, he reluctantly and with a great deal of shame gave way to the demands of the Jews. He sent Jesus to the cross, but not before he had exhausted every expedient for saving Him, except the simple and straightforward one of dismissing the case. He had the haughtiness of the dominant race, and a profound contempt for the people over which he ruled. This contempt, as we have seen, continually brought him into trouble. He felt deeply humiliated at having to give way to those whom he utterly despised, and, in the manner of a small mind, revenged himself on them by calling Christ their king, and by refusing to alter the mocking inscription on the cross. It is certain that Pilate, in condemning Jesus, acted, and knew that he acted against his conscience. He knew what was right, but for selfish and cowardly reasons refused to do it. He was faced by a great moral emergency, and he failed. We rest on the judgment of our Lord, that he was

guilty, but not so guilty as the leaders of the chosen people.

LITERATURE.

The Gospels; Philo, Legatio ad Caium; Josephus, Josephus, Antiquities and BJ; the Annals of Tacitus; Eusebius, HE; Walker, Apocryphal Gospels, Acts, and Revelations in the "Ante-Nicene Christian Library," and for the Gospel according to Peter, volume IX of the same series err, New Testament Apocryphal Writings ("Temple Bible Series"), gives the text of the Gospel of Nicodemus and the Gospel of Peter.

There is a great mass of literature on the subject, but there is no English monograph on Pontius Pilate. In German there is G.A. Muller, Pontius Pilatus der funfe Prokurator von Judaa (Stuttgart, 1888). See also the various articles on Pilate in books of reference on the New Testament, notably RE (von Dobschiitz), HDB (G. T. Purves), DCG (A. Souter), and Encyclopedia Biblica (W. J. Woodhouse). For the name of-Pilate see the articles on "Pontius Pilatus et les Pontii" by Ollivier in Review Biblical, volume V. For the Apocryphal Gospels see article on "Gospel of Nicodemus" in HDB, also article "Apocryphal Gospels," in the supplementary volume of HDB; Orr, New Testament Apocryphal Writings; Zahn, Geschichte des New Testament Kanons; Harnack, Altchristliche Litteraturgeschichte. For the trial of Jesus see Lives of Christ by Keim, Edersheim, Stalker, Andrews and others; Taylor Innes, Trial of Jesus Christ, a Legal Monograph, 1899; and for the historical background, Schurer, HJP.

J. Macartney Wilson

PILDASH

pil’-dash (pildash, "steely"): Nephew of Abram (Ge 22:22).

PILE

pil (medhurah, from dur, "heap up"): Isa 30:33, "The pile thereof is fire and much wood"; Eze 24:9,10, "I also will make the pile great. Heap on the wood, make the fire hot." Isa 30:33 may be paraphrased, ‘the pyre thereof is of much wood, burning fiercely.’

See TOPHETH.

PILEHA

pil’-e-ha, pi’-le-ha.

See PILHA.

PILGRIM; PILGRIMAGE

pil’-grim, pil’-grimaj: "Pilgrim" in English Versions of the Bible for parepidemos (Heb 11:13; 1Pe 2:11). "Pilgrimage" for maghor (Ge 47:9 (the Revised Version margin "sojournings"); Ps 119:54; and (the King James Version) Ex 6:4 (the Revised Version (British and American) "sojournings")). Both the Hebrew (see GER) and Greek words contain the idea of foreign residence, but it is the residence and not travel that is implied. Consequently "pilgrim" is a poor translation, and "sojourner," "sojourning" should have been used throughout. In the New Testament passages heaven is thought of as the contrasted permanent dwelling-place, while the Old Testament usages seem to be without a contrast definitely in mind.

PILHA

pil’-ha (pilcha’," ploughman" (plowman); the King James Version Pileha): One of those who signed Nehemiah’s covenant (Ne 10:24).

PILL

See PEEL.

PILLAR

pil’-ar (matstsebhah, ‘ammudh; stulos): In a good many cases the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "pillars" for the King James Version "images" (matstsebhoth, Ex 34:13; De 7:5; 1Ki 14:23, etc.). In Ge 19:26, where "pillar of salt" is given, the word is netsibh; in 1Sa 2:8 it is matsuq; while in most other single uses the Revised Version margin gives variant renderings, as in Jud 9:6 (mutstsabh), the Revised Version margin "garrison"; in 1Ki 10:12 (mic‘adh), the Revised Version margin "‘a railing,’ Hebrew ‘a prop’"; in 2Ki 18:16 (’omenoth), the Revised Version margin "doorposts." The matstsebhoth were (1) memorial pillars, as in the "pillars" of Jacob at Bethel (Ge 28:18,22; compare Ge 31:13; 35:14), in covenant with Laban (Ge 31:45), at Rachel’s grave (Ge 35:20); Absalom’s pillar (2Sa 18:18). Such pillars were legitimate (theory of a fetishistic character is not grounded); it is predicted in Isa 19:19 that such a pillar would be set up to Yahweh at the border of Egypt. (2) Idolatrous pillars, in Canaanitish and other heathen worships. These were to be ruthlessly broken down (the King James Version "images," see above; Ex 23:24; 34:13; De 7:5, etc.; compare Le 26:1). See IMAGES. The other word, ‘ammudh, is used of the pillar of cloud and fire (see below); of the pillars of the tabernacle and temple (see under the word); of the two pillars JACHIN AND BOAZ (which see); poetically of the "pillars" of heaven, of earth (Job 9:6; 26:11; Ps 75:3; 99:7), etc. In the few instances of the word in the New Testament, the use is figurative. James, Cephas and John were reputed to be pillars" of the church at Jerusalem (Ga 2:9); the church is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1Ti 3:15); he that overcomes is made "a pillar" in the temple of God (Re 3:12); a strong angel had feet "as pillars of fire" (Re 10:1).

Pillar of Cloud and Fire:

The visible manifestation of the divine presence in the journeyings of Israel at the time of the Exodus. Yahweh, it is narrated, went before the people "by day in a pillar of cloud, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light ..... The pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, departed not from before the people" (Ex 13:21,22; compare Ex 14:19,24; Nu 14:14). When the congregation was at rest, the cloud abode over the tabernacle (Ex 40:36; Nu 9:17; 14:14). When Yahweh wished to communicate His will to Moses, the pillar descended to the door of the Tent of Meeting (Ex 33:9-11; Nu 12:5; De 31:15). These descriptions are not to be rationalistically explained; what is depicted is a true theophany. Criticism has sought to establish discrepancies between the allusions to the cloud in the JE and the P parts of the narrative, but these are not made out without straining; e.g. it is not the case that JE alone represents Yahweh as speaking with Moses in the cloud at the door of the tabernacle. The same representation is found in Ex 29:42,43, ascribed to Pillar. An acute discussion of the alleged discrepancies may be seen in H.M. Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, 82 ff.

James Orr

PILLAR OF SALT

See SLIME; LOT.

PILLAR, PLAIN OF THE

See PLAIN OF THE PILLAR.

PILLARS OF THE EARTH

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 2.

PILLOW

pil’-o.

See BOLSTER; CUSHION.

PILOT

pi’-lot.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

PILTAI

pil’-ti, pil-ta’-i (pilTay, probably "Yahweh delivers"): One of the priests, described as "the chiefs of the fathers," in the days of Joiakim (Ne 12:17).

PIN

(yathedh, from yathadh, "to drive in a peg"(?)): A cylindrical piece of wood or metal (e.g. brass, Ex 27:19) such as that used by weavers in beating up the woof in the loom (Jud 16:14, where Delilah fastened Samson’s hair with the "pin"); or as a peg for hanging (Eze 15:3; compare Isa 22:23 f; Ezr 9:8); or as a tent-pin, such as those used in the tabernacle (Ex 27:19; 35:18; 38:20,31; 39:40; Nu 3:37; 4:32; Jud 4:21, where the King James Version translates "nail," the Revised Version (British and American) "tent-pin"; compare Jud 5:26, where Hebrew has the same word, English Versions of the Bible "nail"). The tent-pin, like that of today, was probably sharpened at one end (Jud 4:21) and so shaped at the other as to permit the attaching of the cords so frequently mentioned in the same connection (Ex 35:18; 39:40; Nu 3:37; 4:32; compare Isa 33:20). From the acts of driving in the tent-pin (Taqa‘) and pulling it out (nasa’) are derived the technical Hebrew terms for pitching a tent and for breaking camp.

See also CRISPING PINS (Isa 3:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "satchels"); STAKE.

Nathan Isaacs

PINE

pin.

See PINING SICKNESS.

PINE TREE

pin tre: (1) ‘ets shemen, translated the Revised Version (British and American) "wild olive," the King James Version "pine" (Ne 8:15); the Revised Version (British and American) "oil-tree," m "oleaster" (Isa 41:19); "olive-wood" (1Ki 6:23,31-33). See OIL TREE. (2) tidhhar (Isa 41:19, margin "plane"; Isa 60:13); peuke, "fir." Lagarde, from similarity of tidhhar to the Syriac deddar, usually the "elm," considers this the best translation. Symmachus also translated tidhhar (Isa 41:19) by ptelea, the "elm." The elm, Ulmus campestris, is rare in Palestine and the Lebanon, though it is found today N. of Aleppo. Post (HDB, III, 592-93) considers that

(1) should be translated as "pine," which he describes as a "fat wood tree"; it is perhaps as probably a correct translation for

(2), but great uncertainty remains.

Two species of pine are plentiful in the Lebanon and flourish in most parts of Palestine when given a chance. These are the stone pine, Pinus pinea, and the Aleppo pine, P. halepensis; all the highlands looking toward the sea are suited to their growth.

E. W. G. Masterman

PINING SICKNESS

pin’-ing, sik’-nes: In the account of the epileptic boy in Mr 9:18 it is said that "he pineth away." The verb used here (xeraino) means "to dry up," and is the same which is used of the withering of plants, but seldom used in this metaphorical sense. The English word is from the Anglo-Saxon pinjan and is often found in the Elizabethan literature, occurring 13 times in Shakespeare. In the Old Testament it is found in Le 26:39 (bis) and in Eze 24:23 and 33:10. In the Revised Version (British and American) it replaces "consume" in Eze 4:17. In all these passages it is the rendering of the Hebrew maqaq, and means expressly being wasted on account of sin. In Le 26:16 "pine away" is used in the Revised Version (British and American) to replace "cause sorrow of heart," and is the translation of the Hebrew dubh; and in De 28:65 "sorrow of mind" is also replaced in the Revised Version (British and American) by "pining of soul," the word so rendered being de’abhon, which in these two passages is expressive of homesickness. In Isa 24:16 the reduplicated exclamation, "my leanness," of the King James Version is changed into "I pine away," the word being razi. The starving people in La 4:9 are said to pine away, the word so translated being zubh. All these Hebrew words have a general meaning of to dry or to waste or wear away, or to be exhausted by morbid discharges.

Pining sickness in Isa 38:12 the King James Version is a mistranslation, the word so rendered, dallah, meaning here the thrum by which the web is tied to the loom. The figure in the verse is that Hezekiah’s life is being removed from the earth by his sickness as the web is removed from the loom by having the thrums cut, and being then rolled up. Both the King James Version margin and the Revised Version margin have the correct reading, "from the thrum." Septuagint has erithou eggizouses ektemein, and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) dum adhuc ordirer, succidit me. The other reading is due to another interpretation of the word which in a few passages, as Jer 52:15, like its root dal, means something small, poor, and decaying or weak, such as the lean kine of Pharaoh’s dream (Ge 41:19).

Alexander Macalister

PINION

pin’-yun (’ebher, ‘ebhrah): the Revised Version (British and American) has translated these Hebrew words uniformly by "pinion," where the King James Version uses either "wing" or "feathers," with which words they stand in parallelism in all passages. The shorter Hebrew word is found only once, in Yahweh’s parable to Ezekiel: "A great eagle with great wings and long pinions (the King James Version

"longwinged"), full of feathers, which had divers colors, came unto Lebanon, and took the top of the cedar" (Eze 17:3). The feminine form (’ebhrah) is used of the wings of the dove (Ps 68:13), of the ostrich (Job 39:13) and of the eagle (De 32:11). Once (Ps 91:4) it stands in a figurative expression for the protective care of Yahweh, which is bestowed on those that trust in Him.

H. L. E. Luering

PINNACLE

pin’-a-k’-l (pterugion (Mt 4:5; Lu 4:9, the Revised Version margin "wing")) "The pinnacle of the temple" is named as the place to which the devil took Jesus, and there tempted Him to cast Himself down. It is not known what precise elevated spot is meant, whether a part of the roof of the temple itself, or some high point in the adjacent buildings overlooking the deep ravine. It was more probably the latter.

PINON

pi’-non (pinon, "darkness"): One of the "chiefs of Edom" (Ge 36:41; 1Ch 1:52).

PIPE

pip.

See CANDLESTICK; LAMP; MUSIC.

PIRA

pi’-ra (hoi ek Peirds (1 Esdras 5:19)): Thought to be a repetition of CAPHIRA (which see) earlier in the verse.

PIRAM

pi’-ram (pir’am, "indomitable"): King of Jarmuth, one of the five Amorite kings who leagued themselves against Joshua’s invasion (Jos 10:3).

PIRATHON; PIRATHONITE

pir’-a-thon, pir’-a-thon-it (pir‘athon, pir‘athoni; Codex Vaticanus Pharathom; Codex Alexandrinus Phraathom, Pharathuneites): The home of Abdon the son of Hillel the Pirathonite (Jud 12:13 the King James Version), where also he was buried, "in the land of Ephraim in the mount of the Amalekites." The

latter name may have clung to a district which at some former time had been held by the Amalekites. From this town also came Benaiah, one of David's chief captains (2Sa 23:30; 1Ch 11:31; 27:14). It is probably to be identified with Fer'ata, about 6 miles Southwest of Nablus. A possible rival is Fir'on, 15 miles West of Nablus. G.A. Smith suggests a position at the head of Wady Far'ah (HGHL, 355). Moore thinks it may have been in Benjamin, Abdon being a Benjamite family (1Ch 8:23,30; 9:36). It is just possible that the place may be identical with Pharathon, one of the towns fortified by Bacchides (1 Macc 9:50).

W. Ewing

PISGAH

piz'-ga (ha-picgah; Phasga, to lelaxeumenon, he laxeute): This name, which has always the definite article, appears only in combination either with ro'sh, "head," "top," or 'ashdoth, not translated in the King James Version save in De 4:49, where it is rendered "springs" the Revised Version (British and American) uniformly "slopes," the Revised Version margin "springs."

Pisgah is identified with Nebo in De 34:1; compare 3:27. "The top of Pisgah, which looketh down upon the desert" marks a stage in the march of the host of Israel (Nu 21:20). Hither Balak brought Balaam to the field of Zophim (Nu 23:14). Here Moses obtained his view of the Promised Land, and died. See NEBO. Many scholars (e.g. Buhl, GAP, 122; Gray, "Numbers," ICC, 291) take Pisgah as the name applying to the mountain range in which the Moab plateau terminates to the West, the "top" or "head" of Pisgah being the point in which the ridge running out westward from the main mass culminates. The summit commands a wide view, and looks down upon the desert. The identification is made surer by the name Tal'at es-Sufa found here, which seems to correspond with the field of Zophim.

'Ashdoth is the construct plural of 'ashedhah (singular form not found), from 'eshedh, "foundation," "bottom," "lower part" (slope); compare Assyrian ishdu, "foundation." Some would, derive it from Aramaic 'ashadh, "to pour," whence "fall" or "slope" (OHL, under the word). Ashdoth-pisgah overlooked the Dead Sea from the East (De 3:17; 4:49; Jos 12:3; 13:20). There can be no reasonable doubt that Ashdoth-pisgah signifies the steep slopes of the mountain descending into the contiguous valleys.

It is worthy of note that Septuagint does not uniformly render Pisgah by a proper name, but sometimes by a derivative of laxeuo, "to hew" or "to dress stone" (Nu 21:20; 23:14; De 3:27; 4:49). Jerome (Onomasticon, under the word Asedoth) gives abscisum as the Latin equivalent of Fasga. He derives Pisgah from pacagh, which, in new Hebrew, means "to split," "to cut off." This suggests a mountain the steep sides of which give it the appearance of having been "cut out." This description applies perfectly to Jebel Neba as viewed from the Dead Sea.

W. Ewing

PISHON; PISON

pi’-shon pi’-son (pishon; the King James Version): A river of EDEN (which see), said to compass the whole land of Havilah where there is gold, bdellium and onyx stone (Ge 2:11), most probably identified with the Karun River which comes down from the mountains of Media and formerly emptied into the Persian Gulf.

PISIDIA

pi-sid’-i-a (ten Pisidian (Ac 14:24); in Ac 13:14, Codices Sinaitica, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Ephraemi give Antiocheian ten Pisidian, "the Pisidian Antioch," the other manuscripts, Antiocheian tes Pisidias, "Antioch of Pisidia." The former, but not the latter, reading correctly describes the condition of affairs at the time when Paul traveled in the country; see below):

1. Situation and History:

Pisidia, as a strict geographical term, was the name given to the huge block of mountain country stretching northward from the Taurus range where the latter overlooked the Pamphylian coast land, to the valleys which connected Apamea with Antioch, and Antioch with Iconium. It was bounded by Lycia on the West, by the Phrygian country on the North, and by Isauria on the East; but there is no natural boundary between Pisidia and Isauria, and the frontier was never strictly drawn. The name is used in its geographical sense in the Anabasis of Xenophon, who informs us that the Pisidians were independent of the king of Persia at the end of the 5th century BC. Alexander the Great had difficulty in reducing the Pisidian cities, and throughout ancient history we find the Pisidian mountains described as the home of a turbulent and warlike people, given to robbery and pillage. The task of subjugating them was entrusted by the Romans to the Galatian king Amyntas, and, at his death in 25 BC, Pisidia passed with the rest of his possessions into the Roman province Galatia. Augustus now took seriously in hand the pacification of Pisidia and the Isaurian mountains on the East Five military colonies were founded in Pisidia and the eastern mountains—Cremna, Comama, Olbasa, Parlais and Lystra—and all were connected by military roads with the main garrison city Antioch, which lay in Galatian Phrygia, near the northern border of Pisidia. An inscription discovered in 1912 shows that Quirinius, who is mentioned in Lu 2:2 as governor of Syria in the year of Christ’s birth, was an honorary magistrate of the colony of Antioch; his connection with Antioch dates from his campaign against the Homonades—who had resisted and killed Amyntas—about 8 BC (see Ramsay in The Expositor, November, 1912, 385 ff, 406). The military system set up in Pisidia was based on that of Antioch, and from this fact, and from its proximity to Pisidia, Antioch derived its title "the Pisidian," which served to distinguish it from the other cities called Antioch. It is by a mistake arising from confusion with a later political arrangement that Antioch is designated "of Pisidia" in the majority of the manuscripts.

Pisidia remained part of the province Galatia till 74 AD, when the greater (southern) part of it was assigned to the new double province Lycia-Pamphylia, and the cities in this portion of Pisidia now ranked as Pamphylian. The northern part of Pisidia continued to belong to Galatia, until, in the time of

Diocletian, the southern part of the province Galatia (including the cities of Antioch and Iconium), with parts of Lycaonia and Asia, were formed Into a province called Pisidia, with Antioch as capital. Antioch was now for the first time correctly described as a city "of Pisidia," although there is reason to believe that the term "Pisidia" had already been extended northward in popular usage to include part at least of the Phrygian region of Galatia. This perhaps explains the reading "Antioch of Pisidia" in the Codex Bezae, whose readings usually reflect the conditions of the 2nd century of our era in Asia Minor. This use of the term was of course political and administrative; Antioch continued to be a city of Phrygia in the ethnical sense and a recently discovered inscription proves that the Phrygian language was spoken in the neighborhood of Antioch as late as the 3rd century of our era (see also Calder in Journal of Roman Studies, 1912, 84).

2. Paul in Pisidia:

Paul crossed Pisidia on the journey from Perga to Antioch referred to in Ac 13:14, and again on the return journey, Ac 14:24. Of those journeys no details are recorded in Acts, but it has been suggested by Conybeare and Howson that the "perils of rivers" and "perils of robbers" mentioned by Paul in 2Co 11:26 refer to his journeys across Pisidia, and Ramsay has pointed out in confirmation of this view that a considerable number of Pisidian inscriptions refer to the armed policemen and soldiers who kept the peace in this region, while others refer to a conflict with robbers, or to an escape from drowning in a river (The Church in the Roman Empire, 23 f; compare Journal of Roman Studies, 1912, 82 f). Adada, a city off Paul’s route from Perga to Antioch, is called by the Turks Kara Baulo; "Baulo" is the Turkish pronunciation of "Paulos," and the name is doubtless reminiscent of an early tradition connecting the city with Paul. Pisidia had remained unaffected by Hellenic civilization, and the Roman occupation at the time of Paul was purely military. It is therefore unlikely that Paul preached in Pisidia. Except on the extreme Northwest, none of the Christian inscriptions of Pisidia—in glaring contrast with those of Phrygia—date before the legal recognition of Christianity under Constantine.

LITERATURE.

Murray, Handbook of Asia Minor, 150 ff; Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, 18 ff; Lanckoronski, Stadte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens; Sterrett, Epigraphical Journey and Wolfe Expedition. A few inscriptions containing Pisidian names with native inflections have been published by Ramsay in Revue des universites du midi, 1895, 353 ff.

W. M. Calder

PISON

pi’-son.

See PISHON.

PISPA

pis’-pa (picpa’," dipersion," the King James Version Pispah): A son of Jether, an Asherite (1Ch 7:38).

PIT

The word translates different Hebrew words of which the most important are:

(1) bor, "pit" or "cistern," made by digging, (Ge 37:20); hence, "dungeon" (Jer 38:6, margin "pit");

(2) be’er, "pit" or "well" made by digging (Ge 21:25);

(3) she’ol, generally rendered "hell" in the King James Version (see HELL);

(4) shachath, a pit in the ground to catch wild animals. (1), (2) and (4) above are used metaphorically of the pit of the "grave" or of "sheol" (Ps 28:1; 30:3; Job 33:24). the King James Version sometimes incorrectly renders (4) by "corruption."

(5) pachath, "pit," literally (2Sa 17:9), and figuratively (Jer 48:43).

In the New Testament "pit" renders bothunos (Mt 15:14), which means any kind of hole in the ground. In the corresponding passage Lu (14:5 the King James Version) has phrear, "well," the same as (2) above. For "bottomless pit" (Re 9:1, the King James Version, etc.).

See ABYSS.

T. Lewis

PITCH

pich: The translation of the noun kopher, and the verb kaphar, in Ge 6:14 and of the noun zepheth, in Ex 2:3; Isa 34:9. In Ge 6:14 the words are the ordinary forms for "covering," "cover," so that the translation "pitch" is largely guesswork, aided by the Septuagint, which reads asphaltos, "bitumen," here, and by the fact that pitch is a usual "covering" for vessels. The meaning of zepheth, however, is fixed by the obvious Dead Sea imagery of Isa 34:9-15—the streams and land of Edom are to become burning bitumen, like the sites of Sodom and Gomorrah. In Ex 2:3 zepheth is combined with chemar, which also means bitumen (Ge 14:10; see SLIME), and the distinction between the words (different consistencies of the same substance?) is not clear.

Burton Scott Easton

PITCHER

pich’-er (kadh; keramion): The word is found chiefly in the Old Testament in the story of Rebekah in Ge 24:13 ff; but Gideon’s men also had their lamps in pitchers (Jud 7:16,19). Ecclesiastes speaks of the pitcher broken at the fountain (12:6). The single use in the New Testament is in Mr 14:13 parallel Lu 22:10. The pitcher was an earthenware vessel (compare La 4:2, nebhel), with one or two handles, used for carrying water, and commonly borne upon the head or shoulder (compare Ge 24).

PITHOM

pi’-thom (pithom; Peitho (Ex 1:11)):

1. Meaning of Name:

Champollion (Gesenius, Lexicon, under the word) considered this name to mean "a narrow place" in Coptic, but it is generally explained to be the Egyptian Pa-tum, or "city of the setting sun." It was one of the cities built by the Hebrews (see RAAMSES), and according to Wessel was the Thoum of the Antonine Itinerary.

Brugsch (History of Egypt, 1879, II, 343) says that it was identical with "Heracleopolis Parva, the capital of the Sethroitic nome in the age of the Greeks and Romans .... half-way on the great road from Pelusium to Tanis (Zoan), and this indication given on the authority of the itineraries furnishes the sole means of fixing its position." This is, however, disputed. Tum was worshipped at Thebes, at Zoan, and probably at Bubastis, while Heliopolis (Brugsch, Geogr., I, 254) was also called Pa-tum.

There were apparently several places of the name; and Herodotus (ii.158) says that the Canal of Darius began a little above Bubastis, "near the Arabian city Patournos," and reached the Red Sea.

2. Situation:

(1) Dr. Naville’s Theory.

In 1885 Dr. E. Naville discovered a Roman milestone of Maximian and Severus, proving that the site of Heroopolis was at Tell el MachuTah ("the walled mound") in Wady Tumeilat. The modern name he gives as Tell el Maskhutah, which was not that heard by the present writer in 1882. This identification had long been supposed probable. Excavations at the site laid bare strong walls and texts showing the worship of Tum. None was found to be older than the time of Rameses II—who, however, is well known to have defaced older inscriptions, and to have substituted his own name for that of earlier builders. A statue of later date, bearing the title "Recorder of Pithom," was also found at this same site. Dr. Naville concluded that this city must be the Old Testament Pithom, and the region round it Succoth —the Egyptian T-k-u (but see SUCCOTH). Brugsch, on the other hand, says that the old name of Heropolis was Qes (see GOSHEN), which recalls the identification of the Septuagint (Ge 46:28); and

elsewhere (following Lepsius) he regards the same site as being "the Pa-Khetam of Rameses II" (see ETHAM), which Lepsius believed to be the Old Testament Rameses (see RAAMSES) mentioned with Pithom (Brugsch, Geogr., I, 302, 262). Silvia in 385 AD was shown the site of Pithom near Heroopolis, but farther East, and she distinguishes the two; but in her time, though Heroopolis was a village, the site of Pithom was probably conjectural. In the time of Minepthah, son of Rameses II (Brugsch, History, II, 128), we have a report that certain nomads from Aduma (or Edom) passed through "the Khetam (or fort) of Minepthah-Hotephima, which is situated in T-k-u, to the lakes (or canals) of the city Pi-tum of Minepthah-Hotephima, which are situated in the land of T-k-u, in order to feed themselves and to feed their herds."

(2) Patoumos of Herodotus.

These places seem to have been on the eastern border of Egypt, but may have been close to the Bitter Lakes or farther North (see SUCCOTH), whereas Tell el MachuTah is about 12 miles West of Ism'ailieh, and of Lake Timsah. The definition of the Pithom thus noticed as being that of Minepthah suggests that there was more than one place so called, and the Patoumos of Herodotus seems to have been about 30 miles farther West (near Zagazig and Bubastis) than the site of Heropolis, which the Septuagint indentifies with Goshen and not with Pithom. The latter is not noticed as on the route of the Exodus, and is not identified in the Old Testament with Succoth. In the present state of our knowledge of Egyptian topography, the popular impression that the Exodus must have happened in the time of Minepthah, because Pithom was at Heropolis and was not built till the time of Rameses II, must be regarded as very hazardous. See EXODUS. The Patoumos of Herodotus may well have been the site, and may still be discovered near the head of Wady Tumeildt or near Bubastis.

C. R. Conder

PITHON

pi'-thon (pithon): A grandson of Meribbaal, or Mephibosheth (1Ch 8:35; 9:41).

PITIFUL

pit'-i-fool: As found in Scripture, means "full of pity"; it is expressed by rachamani, from rachamim (plural of racham), "bowels," "compassion" (La 4:10 the King James Version, its only occurrence in the Old Testament), "The hands of the pitiful women have sodden their own children." In Jas 5:11, we have the beautiful saying, The Lord is very pitiful (the Revised Version (British and American) "full of pity") and of tender mercy," where "very pitiful" is the translation of polusplagchnos, literally, "of many bowels," a word which does not occur elsewhere; it might be translated "large-hearted" or "tender-hearted." In Ecclesiasticus 2:11, we have "The Lord, is .... very, pitiful" (oiktirmon); eusplagchnos, well-hearted," "compassionate," "full of pity," occurs in 1Pe 3:8, "Love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous," the Revised Version (British and American) "loving as brethren, tenderhearted, humble-minded." The word is found in The Prayer of Manasseh 7; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Zeb 8 2.

W. L. Walker

PITY

pit’-i (chamal, chuc; eleeo): "Pity," probably contracted from "piety," is tender feeling for others in misery or distress. It is allied to compassion (which see), but differs in respect of the object that causes the distress (or feeling). The feeling of pity is excited chiefly by the weakness, miserable or degraded condition of the object; compassion by his uncontrollable and inevitable misfortunes: "We pity a man of weak understanding who exposes his weakness; we compassionate the man who is reduced to a state of beggary and want" (Crabb, English Synonyms). Pity often becomes allied to contempt; "a pity" is something to be regretted. See PITIFUL. In the Old Testament "pity" is closely akin to "mercy." It is most frequently the translation of chamal, "to pity," "to spare," e.g. in Nathan’s parable of the poor man’s one lamb, it is said that the rich man was worthy to die because he had "no pity" (2Sa 12:6).

In Jer 13:14 we have, "I will not pity nor spare, nor have mercy," the Revised Version (British and American) "compassion"; compare 21:7; La 2:2; Eze 5:11; 7:4, in all of which passages "pity" stands in a negative connection; we have it positively attributed to God in Eze 36:21, "I had pity for mine holy name," the Revised Version (British and American) "regard"; Joe 2:18; chuc, probably meaning, primarily, "to cover," "protect," hence, to pity, to spare, is translated "pity" (De 7:16; 13:8; Eze 16:5, etc., all negative; Jon 4:10, positive: "Thou hast had pity on the gourd (the Revised Version (British and American) "regard for") and should not I spare (the Revised Version (British and American) "have regard for," chuc) Nineveh," etc.); chanan, "to incline, toward," "be gracious," "pity," is thrice rendered "pity" (Job 19:21, "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me"; Pr 19:17; 28:8, "he that hath pity upon the poor"); racham, "to feel warm," "to love," twice (Ps 103:13, "like as a father pitieth his children"; Isa 13:18, "no pity"); once in plural rachamim (Am 1:11); other words once so translated are chemlah, "pity" (Isa 63:9); checedh, "loving-kindness" (Job 6:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "kindness"); machmal, "object of pity" (Eze 24:21); nudh," to move," "bemoan" (Ps 69:20). In the New Testament "pity" occurs once only as the translation of eleeo, "to be kind," "tender" (Mt 18:33, the Revised Version (British and American) "mercy"). In 2 Macc 3:21 we have (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) "pitied" in the obsolete sense of exciting pity, "Then it would have pitied (eleein) a man to see the multitude," etc.

The Revised Version (British and American) has "pity" for "mercy" (Pr 14:21); "have pity on" for "spare" (Ps 72:13); for "favour" (Ps 109:12; 102:13,14), "Have pity upon her dust."

See MERCY; COMPASSION.

W. L. Walker

PLACE

plas: Normally for maqom, Old Testament, and topos, New Testament, but in the King James Version "place" represents a great number of Hebrew and Greek words, often used with no difference in force (e. g. 2Ch 35:10,15). the Revised Version (British and American) has made few changes, but occasionally has attempted to specialize the meaning (Ge 40:13; Job 37:8; Ac 8:32; Jas 3:11, etc.).

PLACE, BROAD; HIGH

See CITY, II, 3, 2; HIGH PLACE; OPEN PLACE.

PLAGUE

plag (negha‘, makkah, maggephah; mastix, plege): This word which occurs more than 120 times is applied, like pestilence, to such sudden outbursts of disease as are regarded in the light of divine visitations. It is used in the description of leprosy about 60 times in Le 13 and 14, as well as in De 24:8. In the poetical, prophetic and eschatological books it occurs about 20 times in the general sense of a punitive disaster. The Gospel references (Mr 3:10; 5:29,34; Lu 7:21) use the word as a synonym for disease.

The specific disease now named "plague" has been from the earliest historic times a frequent visitant to Palestine and Egypt. Indeed in the Southeast between Gaza and Bubastis it has occurred so frequently that it may almost be regarded as endemic. The suddenness of its attack, the shortness of its incubation period and the rapidity of its course give it the characters which of old have been associated with manifestations of divine anger. In the early days of an epidemic it is no infrequent occurrence that 60 per cent of those attacked die within three days. I have seen a case in which death took place ten hours after the first symptoms. In the filthy and insanitary houses of eastern towns, the disease spreads rapidly. In a recent epidemic in one village of 534 inhabitants 311 died within 21 days, and I once crossed the track of a party of pilgrims to Mecca of whom two-thirds died of plague on the road. Even with modern sanitary activity, it is very difficult to root it out, as our recent experiences in Hong Kong and India have shown.

Of the Biblical outbreaks that were not improbably bubonic plague, the first recorded is the slaughter of the firstborn in Egypt—the 10th plague. We have too little information to identify it (Ex 11:1). The Philistines, however, used the same name, negha‘, for the Egyptian plagues (1Sa 4:8) as is used in Ex. The next outbreak was at Kibroth-hataavah (Nu 11:33). This was synchronous with the phenomenal flight of quails, and if these were, as is probable, driven by the wind from the plague-stricken Serbonian region, they were equally probably the carriers of the infection. Experience in both India and China has shown that animals of very diverse kinds can carry germs of the disease. A third visitation fell on the spies who brought back an evil report (Nu 14:37). A fourth destroyed those who murmured at the destruction of Korah and his fellow-rebels (Nu 16:47). These may have been recrudescences of the infection brought by the quails. The fifth outbreak was that which followed the gross religious and moral defection at, Baal-peor (Nu 25:8,9,18; 26:1; 31:16; Jos 22:17; Ps 106:29,30). Here the disease was probably conveyed by the Moabites.

A later epidemic, which was probably of bubonic plague, was that which avenged the capture of the ark (1Sa 5:6). We read of the tumors which were probably the glandular enlargements characteristic of this disease; also that at the time there was a plague of rats (1Sa 6:5)—"mice," in our version, but the word is also used as the name of the rat. The cattle seem to have carried the plague to Beth-shemesh, as has been observed in more than one place in China (1Sa 6:19). Concerning the three days' pestilence that followed David's census (2Sa 24:15; 1Ch 21:12), see Josephus, Ant, VII, xiii, 3. The destruction of the army of Sennacherib may have been a sudden outbreak of plague (2Ki 19:35; Isa 37:36). It is perhaps worthy of note that in Herodotus' account of the destruction of this army (ii.141) he refers to the incursion of swarms of mice.

One of the latest prophetic mentions of plague is Ho 13:14, where the plague (debher, Septuagint dike) of death and the destruction (qaTabh, Septuagint kentron) of the grave are mentioned. From this passage Paul quotes his apostrophe at the end of 1Co 15:55, but the apostle correlates the sting (kentron) with death, and changes the dike into nikos.

Alexander Macalister

PLAGUES OF EGYPT

plagz (niphle'oth, "wonders "from pala'," to be separate," i.e. in a class by themselves; also called negheph, "plague," from naghaph, "to smite" (Ex 9:14), and negha', "a stroke," from nagha', "to touch" (Ex 11:1; compare Jos 24:10)):

INTRODUCTION

I. NATURAL PHENOMENA

1. Water Turned to Blood

2. The Plague of Frogs

3. The Plague of Lice

4. The Plague of Flies

5. The Plague of Murrain

6. The Plague of Boils

7. The Plague of Hail

8. The Plague of Locusts

9. The Plague of Darkness

10. Death of the Firstborn

II. MIRACULOUS USE OF THE PHENOMENA

1. Intensification

2. Prediction

3. Discrimination

4. Orderliness and Increasing Severity

5. Arrangement to Accomplish Divine Moral Purpose

III. DIVINE MORAL PURPOSE

1. Discrediting of the gods of Egypt

2. Pharaoh Made to Know that Yahweh Is Lord

3. Revelation of God as Saviour

4. Exhibition of the Divine Use of Evil

LITERATURE

Introduction:

The Hebrew words are so used as to give the name "plagues" to all the "wonders" God did against Pharaoh. Thus, it appears that the language in the account in Exodus puts forward the wondrous character of these dealings of Yahweh with Pharaoh. The account of the plagues is found in Ex 7:8-12:31; Ps 78:42-51; 105:27-36. These poetical accounts of the plagues have a devotional purpose and do not give a full historical narrative. Ps 78 omits plagues 4, 6, 9; Ps 105 omits plagues 5 and 6. Both psalms change the order of the plagues. Account of the preparation which led up to the plagues is found in the narrative of the burning bush (see BUSH, BURNING), the meeting of Aaron with Moses, the gathering together of the elders of Israel for instruction and the preliminary wonders before Pharaoh (Ex 3; 4). This preparation contemplated two things important to be kept in view in considering the plague,

namely, that the consummation of plagues was contemplated from the beginning (Ex 4:22,23), and that the skepticism of Israel concerning Moses authority and power was likewise anticipated (Ex 4:1). It was thus manifestly not an age of miracles when the Israelites were expecting such "wonders" and ready to receive anything marvelous as a divine interposition. This skepticism of Israel is a valuable asset for the credibility of the account of the "wonders." The immediate occasion of the plagues was the refusal of Pharaoh to let the people have liberty for sacrifice, together with the consequent hardening of Pharaoh's heart. No indication of any localizing of the plagues is given except in Ps 78:12,43, where the "field of Zoan" is mentioned as the scene of the contest between Yahweh and the Egyptians. But this is poetry, and the "field of Zoan" means simply the territory of the great capital Zoan. This expression might be localized in the Delta or it might extend to the whole of Egypt. Discussion of the plagues has brought out various classifications of them, some of which are philosophical, as that of Philo, others fanciful, as that of Origen. Arrangements of the order of the plagues for the purpose of moralizing are entirely useless for historical consideration of the plagues. The only order of any real value is the order of Nature, i.e. the order in which the plagues occurred, which will be found to be the order of the natural phenomena which were the embodiment of the plagues.

Much elaborate effort has been made to derive from the description of the plagues evidence for different documents in the narrative. It is pointed out that Moses (E) declared to Pharaoh that he would smite the waters (Ex 7:17), and then the account, as it proceeds, tells us that Aaron smote the waters (Ex 7:19,20). But this is quite in accord with the preceding statement (Ex 4:16) that Aaron was to be the spokesman. Moses was to deal with God, Aaron with Pharaoh. Again it is noticed that some of the plagues are ascribed to the immediate agency of Yahweh, some are represented as coming through the mediation of Moses, and still others through the mediation of Moses and Aaron. Certainly this may be an exact statement of facts, and, if the facts were just so, the record of the facts affords no evidence of different documents.

An examination of the account of the plagues as it stands will bring them before us in a most graphic and connected story.

I. The Natural Phenomena.

All the "wonders" represented anywhere in Scripture as done by the power of God are intimately associated with natural phenomena, and necessarily so. Human beings have no other way of perceiving external events than through those senses which only deal with natural phenomena. Accordingly, all theophanies and miraculous doings are embodied in natural events.

The presence of Yahweh with the sacrifice by Abraham was manifested by the passing of a "smoking furnace and a burning lamp" between the pieces of the offerings (Ge 15:17 the King James Version). The majesty and power of God at Sinai were manifested in the "cloud" and the "brightness," the "voice" and the "sound of a trumpet" (Heb 12:19). The Holy Spirit descended "as a dove" (Mt 3:16). The Deity of Jesus was attested on the mountain by a "voice" (Mt 17:5). Jesus Himself was "God .... manifest in the flesh" (1Ti 3:16 the King James Version). He was "found in fashion as a man' (Php 2:8). And all the

miracles of Jesus were coupled with sensible phenomena: He spoke to the sea and it was calm; He touched the leper and he was clean; He called to Lazarus and he came forth.

Yet in all these natural events, the miraculous working of God was as clearly seen as the natural phenomena. It is thus to be expected that the "wonders" of God in the land of Pharaoh should also be associated with natural events as well as manifest miraculous elements. The "blood" in the river, the "frogs" hopping about on the land, the "lice," the "flies," the "murrain," the "boils," the "hail," the "locusts," the "darkness," and the "pestilence" are all named as natural phenomena. Long familiarity with the land of Egypt has made it perfectly plain to many intelligent people, also, that nearly, if not quite, all the plagues of Egypt are still in that land as natural phenomena, and occur, when they do occur, very exactly in the order in which we find them recorded in the narrative in Exodus. But natural events in the plagues as in other "wonders" of God embodied miraculous doings.

1. Water Turned to Blood:

The first of the plagues (dam, from ‘adham, "to be red" (Ex 7:19-25)) was brought about by the smiting of the water with the rod in the hand of Aaron, and it consisted in the defilement of the water so that it became as "blood." The waters were polluted and the fish died. Even the water in vessels which had been taken from the river became corrupt. The people were forced to get water only from wells in which the river water was filtered through the sand. There are two Egyptian seasons when, at times, the water resembles blood. At the full Nile the water is sometimes of a reddish color, but at that season the water is quite potable and the fish do not die. But a similar phenomenon is witnessed sometimes at the time of the lowest Nile just before the rise begins. Then also the water sometimes becomes defiled and very red, so polluted that the fish die (Bib. Sacra, 1905, 409). This latter time is evidently the time of the first plague. It would be some time in the month of May. The dreadful severity of the plague constituted the "wonder" in this first plague. The startling character of the plague is apparent when it is remembered that Egypt is the product of the Nile, the very soil being all brought down by it, and its irrigation being constantly dependent upon it. Because of this it became one of the earliest and greatest of the gods (Breasted, Development of Religion and Thought in Egypt, 3-47; "Hymn to the Nile," Records of the Past, New Series, III, 46-54). The magicians imitated this plague with their enchantments. Their success may have been by means of sleight of hand or other devices of magic, as may be seen in the East today, with claim of supernatural aid, and as used in western lands for entertainment, as mere cleverness. Or it may be, as has been suggested, that they counted upon the continuance of the plague for at least a time, and so took advantage of the materials the "wonder" had provided.

2. The Plague of Frogs:

Frogs (tsphardeim, probably "marsh-leapers" (Ex 8:1-15)) are very abundant just after the high Nile when the waters begin to recede. Spawn in the mud is hatched by the sun, and the marshes are filled with myriads of these creatures. The frog was the hieroglyph for myriads. The frogs usually remain in the marshes, but in this case they came forth to the horror and disgust of the people. "Frogs in the houses, frogs in the beds, frogs baked with the food in the ovens, frogs in the kneading troughs worked

up with the flour; frogs with their monotonous croak, frogs with their cold slimy skins, everywhere—from morning to night, from night to morning—frogs." The frog was also associated with Divinity, was the symbol of Heqt, a form of Hathor, and seems also at times to have been worshipped as divinity. This plague created such horror that thus early Pharaoh came to an agreement (Ex 8:8-10). A time was set for the disappearance of the frogs that he might know that "there is none like unto Yahweh our God," but when the frogs were dead, Pharaoh hardened his heart (Ex 8:15). In this plague "the magicians did in like manner with their enchantments" (Ex 8:7). Frogs were plentiful, and it would not seem to be difficult to claim to have produced some of them.

3. The Plague of Lice:

It is impossible to determine what particular troublesome insect pest of Egypt is meant by the 3rd plague, whether body-lice or mosquitoes or sandflies or ticks or fleas (kinnim, "gnats" (Ex 8:16)). Those who have experience of these pests in Egypt are quite ready to accept any of them as adequate for the plague. Lice seem rather to be ruled out, unless different kinds of lice were sent, as there is no one kind that torments both man and beast. All the other insect pests appear in incredible numbers out of the "dust" when the pools have dried up after the receding of the waters. The assertion that the account of this plague is not complete, because it is not recorded that Pharaoh asked its removal or that Moses secured it, is amazing. Perhaps Pharaoh did not, in fact, ask its removal. There seems also at this time some difficulty in Moses having access to Pharaoh after this plague (Ex 8:20). Perhaps the plague was not removed at all. The Egyptians are disposed to think it was not! Certainly that season of the year spent in Egypt, not in a dahabiyeh on the Nile, but in a native village, will furnish very satisfying evidence that stinging and biting insects are a very real plague in Egypt yet. The magicians failed with their enchantments and acknowledged that divine power was at work, and seem to have acknowledged that Yahweh was supreme (Ex 8:19), but Pharaoh would not heed them.

4. The Plague of Flies:

As the seasons pass on, after the recession of the waters, the flies (‘arobh, "swarms," probably of flies (Ex 8:20-32)) become more and more numerous until they are almost a plague every year. The increased severity of this plague, and the providential interference to separate between Israel and the Egyptians, drove Pharaoh and his people to such desperation that Pharaoh gave a half-promise of liberty for Israel to sacrifice "in the land." This called out the statement that they would sacrifice the "abomination of the Egyptians." This may have referred to the sacrifice of sheep, which were always held in more or less detestation by Egyptians, or it may have had reference to the sacrifice of heifers, the cow being the animal sacred to the goddess Hathor. The new element of separation between the Israelites and the Egyptians introduced into this plague was another step toward establishing the claims of Yahweh to be the God of all the earth and to have taken Israel under His especial care.

5. The Plague of Murrain:

In addition to the separation established between Israel and the Egyptians, a definite time is now set for

the coming of the 5th plague. It is to be noticed also that diseases of cattle (debher, "destruction" (Ex 9:1-7)) and of men follow quickly after the plague of insects. This is in exact accord with the order of Nature as now thoroughly understood through the discovered relation of mosquitoes and flies to the spread of diseases. Rinderpest is still prevalent at times in Egypt, so that beef becomes very scarce in market and is sometimes almost impossible to obtain. It is a fact, also, that the prevalence eft cattle plague, the presence of boils among men (see 6, below) and the appearance of bubonic plague are found to be closely associated together and in this order. The mention of camels as affected by this plague is interesting. It is doubtful if any clear indication of the presence of the camel in Egypt so early as this has yet been found among the monuments of Egypt. There is in the Louvre museum one small antiquity which seems to me to be intended for the camel. But Professor Maspero does not agree that it is so. It would seem likely that the Hyksos, who were Bedouin princes, princes of the desert, would have introduced the beasts of the desert into Egypt. If they did so, that may have been sufficient reason that the Egyptians would not picture it, as the Hyksos and all that was theirs were hated in Egypt.

6. The Plague of Boils:

In the plague of boils (shechin, and ‘abha‘bu‘oth, "boils" (Ex 9:8-17)) ashes were used, probably in the same way and to the same end as the clay was used in opening the eyes of the blind man (Joh 9:6), i.e. to attract attention and to fasten the mind of the observer upon what the Lord was doing. This plague in the order of its coming, immediately after the murrain, and in the description given of it and in the significant warning of the "pestilence" yet to come (Ex 9:15), appears most likely to have been pestis minor, the milder form of bubonic plague. Virulent rinder-pest among cattle in the East is regarded as the precursor of plague among men and is believed to be of the same nature. It may well be, as has been thought by some, that the great aversion of the ancient Egyptians to the contamination of the soil by decaying animals was from the danger thereby of starting an epidemic of plague among men (Dr. Merrins, Biblical Sacra, 1908, 422-23).

7. The Plague of Hail:

Hail (baradh, "hail" (Ex 9:18-35)) is rare in Egypt, but is not unknown. The writer has himself seen a very little, and has known of one instance when a considerable quantity of hail as large as small marbles fell. Lightning, also, is not as frequent in Egypt as in many semi-tropical countries, yet great electric storms sometimes occur. This plague is quite accurately dated in the seasons of the year (Ex 9:31,32). As the first plague was just before the rising of the Nile, so this one is evidently about 9 months later, when the new crops after the inundation were beginning to mature, January-February. This plague also marks another great step forward in the revelation of Yahweh to Israel and to the Egyptians. First only His power was shown, then His wisdom in the timing of the plagues, and now His mercy appears in the warning to all godly-disposed Egyptians to save themselves, their herds and their servants by keeping all indoors (Ex 9:19-21). Pharaoh also now distinctly acknowledged Yahweh (Ex 9:27).

The plague of locusts (’arbeh, "locust" (Ex 10:1-20)) was threatened, and so frightened were the servants of Pharaoh that they persuaded him to try to make some agreement with Moses, but the attempt of

Pharaoh still to limit in some way the going of Israel thwarted the plan (Ex 10:7-10).

8. The Plague of Locusts:

Then devouring swarms of locusts came up over the land from the eastern desert between the Nile and the Red Sea. They devoured every green thing left by the hail. The desperate situation created by the locusts soon brought Pharaoh again to acknowledgment of Yahweh (Ex 10:16). This was the greatest profession of repentance yet manifested by Pharaoh, but he soon showed that it was deceitful, and again he would not let the people go. When the wind had swept the locusts away, he hardened his heart once more.

9. The Plague of Darkness:

The progress of the seasons has been quite marked from the first plague, just before the rising of the waters, on through the year until now the khamsin period (choshekh, "darkness" from any cause (Ex 10:21-29)) has come. When this dreadful scourge comes with its hot sand-laden breath, more impenetrable than a London fog, it is in very truth a "darkness which may be felt." The dreadful horror of this monster from the desert can hardly be exaggerated. Once again Pharaoh said "Go," but this time he wished to retain the flocks and herds, a hostage for the return of the people (Ex 10:24). Upon Moses' refusal to accept this condition, he threatened his life. Why had he not done so ere this? Why, indeed, did he let this man Moses come and go with such freedom, defying him and his people in the very palace? Probably Moses' former career in Egypt explains this. If, as is most probable, he had grown up at court with this Merenptah, and had been known as "the son of Pharaoh's daughter," heir to the throne and successor to Rameses II, instead of Merenptah, then this refugee had undoubtedly many friends still in Egypt who would make his death a danger to the reigning Pharaoh.

10. Death of the Firstborn:

No intimation is given of the exact character of the death inflicted on the firstborn (bekhor, "firstborn," "chief" or "best"; compare Job 18:13; Isa 14:30 (Ex 11-12:36)) by the angel of the Lord, or its appearance. But it is already foretold as the "pestilence" (Ex 9:15). The pestis major or virulent bubonic plague corresponds most nearly in its natural phenomena to this plague. It culminates in a sudden and overwhelming virulence, takes the strongest and best, and then subsides with startling suddenness.

Thus, it appears that probably all the plagues were based upon natural phenomena which still exist in Egypt in the same order, and, when they do occur, find place somewhere during the course of one year.

II. Miraculous Use of the Phenomena.

The miraculous elements in the plagues are no less distinctly manifest than the natural phenomena themselves.

1. Intensification:

There was an intensification of the effect of the various plagues so much beyond all precedent as to impress everyone as being a special divine manifestation, and it was so. There was national horror of the blood-like water, disgust at the frogs, intolerable torture by the stinging insects and flies, utter ruin of the farmers in the loss of the cattle, the beating down of the crops by the hail, and the devouring of every green thing by the locusts, the sufferings and dread of the inhabitants by reason of the boils, the frightful electric storm, the suffocating darkness and, finally, the crushing disaster of the death of the firstborn. All these calamities may be found in Egypt to the present day, but never any of them, not to say all of them, in such overwhelming severity. That all of them should come in one year and all with such devastation was plainly a divine arrangement. Merely natural events do not arrange themselves so systematically. In this systematic severity were seen miracles of power.

2. Prediction:

The prediction of the plagues and the fulfillment of the prediction at the exact time to a day, sometimes to an hour (as the cessation of the thunder and lightning): There was first a general prediction (Ex 3:19,20; 7:3; 9:14,15) and an indication as the plagues went on that the climax would be pestilence (Ex 9:15). Then several of the plagues were specifically announced and a time was set for them; e.g. the flies (Ex 8:23), the murrain (Ex 9:5), the hail (Ex 9:18), the locusts (Ex 10:4), the death of the firstborn (Ex 11:4). In some cases a time for the removal of the plague was also specified: e.g. the frogs (Ex 8:10), the thunder and lightning (Ex 9:29). In every instance these predictions were exactly fulfilled. In some instances careful foresight might seem to supply in part this ability to predict. Perhaps it was by means of such foresight that the magicians "did so with their enchantments" for the first two plagues. The plague being in existence, foresight might safely predict that it would continue for a little time at least, so that, if the magicians sought for bloody water or called for frogs, they would seem to be successful. But the evidence which Yahweh produced went beyond them, and, at the third plague, they were unable to do anything. These things postulate, on the part of Moses and Aaron, knowledge far beyond human ken. Not only magicians could not do so with their enchantments, but modern science and discoveries are no more able so to predict events. Even meteorological phenomena are only predicted within the limits of reasonable foresight. Such wonders as the plagues of Egypt can in no wise be explained as merely natural. The prediction was a miracle of knowledge.

3. Discrimination:

The discrimination shown in the visitation by the plagues presents another miraculous element more significant and important than either the miracles of power or the miracles of knowledge. God put a difference between the Egyptians and the Israelites, beginning with the plague of flies and continuing, apparently, without exception, until the end. Such miracles of moral purpose admit of no possible explanation but the exercise of a holy will. Merely natural events make no such regular, systematic discriminations.

4. Orderliness and Increasing Severity:

The orderliness and gradually increasing severity of the plagues with such arrangement as brought "judgment upon the gods of Egypt," vindicating Yahweh as Ruler over all, and educating the people to know Yahweh as Lord of all the earth, present an aspect of events distinctly non-natural. Such method reveals also a divine mind at work.

5. Arrangement to Accomplish Divine Moral Purpose:

Last of all and most important of all, the plagues were so arranged as to accomplish in particular a great divine moral purpose in the revelation of God to the Israelites, to the Egyptians and to all the world. This is the distinctive mark of every real miracle. And this leads us directly to the consideration of the most important aspect of the plagues.

III. Divine Moral Purpose.

1. Discrediting of the gods of Egypt:

This discrediting of the gods of Egypt is marked at every step of the progress of the plagues, and the accumulated effect of the repeated discrediting of the gods must have had, and, indeed, had, a great influence upon the Egyptians. The plagues did ‘execute judgment against the gods of Egypt’ (Ex 12:12), and the people and princes brought great pressure to bear upon Pharaoh to let the people go (Ex 10:7). The magicians who claimed to represent the gods of Egypt were defeated, Pharaoh himself, who was accounted divine, was humbled, the great god, the Nile, was polluted, frogs defiled the temples and, at last, the sun, the greatest god of Egypt, was blotted out in darkness.

2. Pharaoh Made to Know that Yahweh Is Lord:

Pharaoh was made to know that Yahweh is Lord, and acknowledged it (Ex 9:27; 10:16). To this end the issue was clearly drawn. Pharaoh challenged the right of Yahweh to command him (Ex 5:2), and God required him then to "stand" to the trial until the evidence could be fully presented, in accordance with the fundamental principle that he who makes a charge is bound to stand to it until either he acknowledges its utter falsity or affords opportunity for full presentation of evidence. So we see God made Pharaoh to "stand" (Ex 9:16) (while the Bible, which speaks in the concrete language of life, calls it the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart) until the case was tried out (compare Lamb, Miracle of Science, 126-49).

3. Revelation of God as Saviour:

A more blessed and gracious moral purpose of the plagues was the revelation of God as the Saviour of the world. This began in the revelation at the burning bush, where God, in fire, appeared in the bush, yet the bush was not consumed, but saved. This revelation, thus given to the people, was further evidenced

by the separation between Israel and the Egyptians; was made known even to the Egyptians by the warning before the plague of hail, that those Egyptians who had been impressed with the power of God might also learn that He is a God that will save those who give heed unto Him; and, at last, reached its startling climax when the angel of the Lord passed over the blood-marked door the night of the death of the firstborn and the institution of the Passover.

4. Exhibition of the Divine Use of Evil:

Last of all, the plagues had a great moral purpose in that they embodied the divine use of evil in the experience of men in this world. As the experience of Job illustrates the use of evil in the life of the righteous, so the plagues of Egypt illustrate the same great problem of evil in the lot of the wicked. In the one case, as in the other, the wonders of God are so arranged as "to justify the ways of God to men."

The minutely accurate knowledge of life in Egypt displayed by this narrative in the Book of Exodus is inconceivable in an age of so little and difficult intercommunication between nations, except by actual residence of the author in Egypt. This has an important bearing upon the time of the composition of this narrative, and so upon the question of its author.

LITERATURE.

The literature of this subject is almost endless. It will suffice to refer the reader to all the general comms., and the special commentaries on Ex, for discussion of doctrinal and critical questions. Two admirable recent discussions of the plagues, in English, are Lamb, Miracle of Science, and Merrins, "The Plagues of Egypt," in Bibliotheca Sacra, 1908, July and October.

M. G. Kyle

PLAIN

plan

(1) kikkar, "circle" "talent," or "round loaf";

(2) mishor, from yashar, "to be level"; compare Arabic maisur, "that which is easy";

(3) biqah; compare Arabic baqʻat, "a plot of ground" or "a wet meadow";

(4) ʻarabhah;

(5) shephelah;

(6) topos pedinos (Lu 6:17);

(7) ‘elon; compare elah, and ‘allon "oak" (Ge 35:4,8, etc.); also ‘elah, "Elah" (1Sa 17:2);

(8) ‘abhel):

See NATURAL FEATURES.

(1) Kikkar, when meaning "plain" usually refers to the alluvial plain about Jericho near the north end of the Dead Sea: "Plain (the Revised Version margin "circle") of the Jordan" (Ge 13:10,11; 1Ki 7:46; 2Ch 4:17); "Plain of the valley of Jericho" (De 34:3); "cities of the Plain" (Ge 13:12; 19:29); "all the Plain" (Ge 19:17,25); "by the way of the Plain" (2Sa 18:23); but "the plain round about Jerusalem" (Ne 12:28).

See CICCAR; CIRCLE.

(2) Mishor, English Versions of the Bible "plain," the Revised Version margin usually "table-land," clearly refers in most places to the highlands of Gilead and Moab, East of the Jordan and the Dead Sea; e. g. Jos 13:9, "the plain (the Revised Version margin "table-land") of Medeba."

(3) Biq‘ah is more often translated "valley" (which see).

(4) ‘Arabhah is in the Revised Version (British and American) often translated "the Arabah," denoting the whole Jordan-Dead-Sea-Arabah depression equals Arabic Ghaur (Ghor). In De 11:30, the King James Version has "champaign" (which see). The "plains of Moab" (Nu 22:1; 26:3,13; 31:12; 33:48,49,50; 35:1; 36:13; De 34:1,8; Jos 13:32) and "plains of Jericho" (Jos 4:13; 5:10; 2Ki 25:5; Jer 39:5; 52:8) are the low plain or ghaur North of the Dead Sea. ‘Arabhah is here equivalent to kikkar (see above). Note the distinction between mishor used of the highlands, and kikkar and ‘arabhah used of the ghaur.

See ARABAH.

(5) Shephelah is by the Revised Version (British and American) throughout translated "lowland" (which see), and includes the western slopes of the Judean hills and the maritime plain.

(6) Topos pedinos occurs only in Lu 6:17.

(7) ‘Elon is translated "plain" in the King James Version: "plain of Moreh" (Ge 12:6; De 11:30); "plain (or plains) of Mamre" (Ge 13:18; 14:13; 18:1); "plain of Zaanaim" (Jud 4:11); "plain of the pillar" (Jud 9:6); "plain of Meonenim" (Jud 9:37); "plain of Tabor" (1Sa 10:3). the Revised Version (British and American) has throughout "oak," the Revised Version margin "terebinth"; compare "oak" (Ge 35:4,8, etc.) and "vale of Elah" (1Sa 17:2,19; 21:9).

(8) [’Abhel keramim] (Jud 11:33) is in the King James Version "the plain of the vineyards," the Revised Version (British and American) "Abel-cheramim," the Revised Version margin "the meadow of vineyards." Elsewhere in English Versions of the Bible ‘abhel is "Abel" or "Abel."

See ABEL-CHERAMIM; MEADOW.

Alfred Ely Day

PLAIN OF MOAB

In De 1:1; 2:8, "plain" is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "Arabah," and explained, "the deep valley running North and South of the Dead Sea." It was here that Moses delivered his last addresses. Ususally the word is plural (‘arebhoth), the "plains" or steppes of Moab (Nu 22:1, etc.; De 34:1,8). An interesting description is given in an article on "The Steppes of Moab" by Professor G. B. Gray in The Expositor, January, 1905.

See MOAB.

PLAIN OF THE PILLAR

(’elon mutstsbh; Codex Vaticanus reads pros te balano te heurete tes staseos tes en Sikimois; Codex Alexandrinus omits te heurete, and the second tes): With the Revised Version margin we must read "terebinth of the pillar," the place where the men of Shechem and Beth-millo made Abimelech king (Jud 9:6). This was one of the sacred trees of which there seem to have been several near Shechem. See MEONENIM, OAK OF. "The pillar" may possibly have been the great stone which Joshua set up "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of Yahweh" (Jos 24:26).

W. Ewing

PLAIN OF THE VINEYARDS

See ABEL-CHERAMIM.

PLAIN, CITIES OF THE

See CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

PLAIN; PLAINLY

plan, plan’-li: In Ge 25:27, the King James Version "plain" represents tam. If a contrast between the vocations of Jacob and Esau is meant, the Revised Version (British and American) ("quiet," margin "harmless") may be right. But elsewhere (Job 1:1; Ps 37:37, etc.) the word means "perfect," and so probably here; the failings of the great patriarch did not detract from the general estimate of him (Mt 8:11). In Ezr 4:18 "translated" (Revised Version margin) is better than "plainly read."

PLAISTER

plas’-ter.

See PLASTER.

PLAITING

plat’-ing, plat’-ing (from the Old French, pleit, which is from the Latin plicatum, "fold"): An interweaving, a braiding, a knot; an elaborate gathering of the hair into knots; emploke, "outward adorning of plaiting the hair" (1Pe 3:3). Compare "platted" (crown of thorns) (Mt 27:29 parallel Mr 15:17; Joh 19:2).

See BRAIDED, BRAIDING.

PLANE

plan (Isa 44:13).

See TOOLS.

PLANE TREE

plan’-tre (’armon; platanos (Ge 30:37), elate ("pine" or "fir") (Eze 31:8); the King James Version chestnut): ‘Armon is supposed to be derived from the root aram, meaning "to be bare" or "naked"; this is considered a suitable term for the plane, which sheds its bark annually. The chestnut of the King James Version is not an indigenous tree, but the plane (Planus orientalis) is one of the finest trees in Palestine, flourishing especially by water courses (compare Ecclesiasticus 24:14).

PLANETS

plan’-ets (mazzaloth).

See ASTROLOGY, sec. II, 3.

PLANK

plank: Thick beams or pieces of wood, for which several Hebrew words are used. The Revised Version (British and American) changes "planks" (of fir) into "boards" in 1Ki 6:15, and in a few instances substitutes "planks" where the King James Version has "boards" (Ex 27:8; 38:7, the altar; Eze 27:5). So in the New Testament in Ac 27:44, for sanis.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3).

PLANT, PLANTS

See BOTANY.

PLASTER (1)

plas'-ter (sidh): In Egypt, now as in ancient times, the buildings are plastered inside and out. The poor quality of the stone commonly used makes this necessary if a smooth attractive surface is desired. Among the poorer classes, clay mixed with straw is used. In Palestine and Syria, where there is a rainy season, the coating on the outside walls, if made of clay, must be frequently renewed. In Egypt burnt gypsum, and in Palestine and Syria burnt limestone (lime) are the commonest materials for making mortar. For the first coat of plastering the lime is mixed with "fat" red sand or with the ash from the bathhouse fires, and the finishing coat is composed of white sand and slaked lime with or without chopped flax straw. The plaster on some of the ancient Egyptian ruins seems to indicate that milk or some similar substance was added to the mortar to give a better surface.

The ancients preferred plastered surfaces for decorating, and even the finest granite was covered with stucco on which to paint or carve the decorations (De 27:2; Da 5:5). Columns were often first stuccoed and then painted.

The Arabic word for mortar is Tin, which really means "clay." The Hebrew sidh, literally, "to boil up," refers to the boiling of the water with which the lime is slaked, because of the heat generated during the slaking process. In Da 5:5 occurs gir, i.e. "burned in a kiln," which might mean either lime or gypsum. In Le 14:42 occurs Tuach, "to smear."

James A. Patch

PLASTER (2)

plas'-ter (marach): Only used in Isa 38:21 of the application of the cake of figs to the boil from which Hezekiah suffered. In Papyrus Ebers, figs are used as the ingredient in a plaster (xxxv, lxxix, lxxxiii). Dioscorides also recommends figs with other substances as a poultice in some skin diseases.

PLASTERING

plas’-ter-ing.

See CRAFTS, II, 15.

PLATE

plat: A term seemingly not used in the Bible for a dish as it is so commonly used at present, but always for a tablet or sheet of metal.

(1) tsits (Ex 28:36; 39:30; Le 8:9), a plate of gold on the front of the mitre of the high priest. The name seems to have been given because of the radiance of the object.

(2) pach (Ex 39:3; Nu 16:38), of plates or sheets of metal produced by hammering.

(3) luach, used for tablets or tables of stone (Ex 24:12, etc.), but in 1Ki 7:36 for the metal plates on the bases of the lavers in the temple. The word ceren, is rendered "plate" in 1Ki 7:30 the King James Version, manifestly incorrectly, the Revised Version (British and American) "axle."

Walter R. Betteridge

PLATTER

plat’-er:

(1) qe‘arah, "a deep dish" (Nu 7:13 f, 84,85). In the King James Version and the English Revised Version "charger," the American Standard Revised Version "platter" (compare Ex 25:29; 37:16); the Septuagint trublion, and in the New Testament rendered "dish" (Mt 26:23; Mr 14:20). In Ezr 1:9, the American Standard Revised Version agharTal, rendered "platter," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "chargers"; probably a deep dish or basin used in sacrificial slaughter.

(2) paropsis, originally a side dish, for relishes, entrees, but of dishes for food, in general, especially meats, fish, etc., used with poterion, "cup" or "drinking vessel" (Mt 23:25 f); also pinax, originally a large wooden dish or plate (Lu 11:39); rendered "charger" in Mt 14:8,11 the King James Version, and Mr 6:25,28 the King James Version and the English Revised Version.

Edward Bagby Pollard

PLAY

pla.

See GAMES.

PLEAD

pled: In modern non-legal English is a synonym of "pray" or "beseech," but in legal phraseology "plea," "plead," and "pleading" have a great variety of technical meanings, with "present a case before the court" as the idea common to all. All the uses of "plead" in English Versions of the Bible are connected with this legal sense, so that outside of the set phrase "plead a cause" (1Sa 24:15, etc.) there is hardly a use of the word in the King James Version, the English Revised Version, or the American Standard Revised Version that is clear modern English The most obscure instances are due to The King James Version's employment of "plead" to translate the niphal of shaphaT. ShaphaT means "judge," so its niphal means "bring oneself into a case to be judged," "enter into controversy with," and so "plead" in the legal sense. Hence, "None pleadeth in truth" (Isa 59:4) means "none of their lawsuits are honest." Accordingly, when God is said to "plead with" man (Isa 66:16 the King James Version, the English Revised Version, etc.), the meaning is that God states His side of the case and not at all that He supplicates man to repent. And this statement by God is a judicial act that of course admits of no reply. Hence, the Revised Version (British and American) has changed "plead with" into "enter into judgment with" in Jer 2:35, and the American Standard Revised Version has carried this change into all the other passages (Jer 25:31; Eze 17:20; 20:35,36; 38:22), with "execute judgment" in Isa 66:16; Joe 3:2. The same verb form occurs also in Isa 43:26: "Let us plead together," where "Let us present our arguments on both sides" would be a fair paraphrase. Otherwise "plead" usually represents ribh, for which the Revised Version (British and American) gives "strive" in place of "plead" in Ps 35:1, and "contend" in Job 13:19; 23:6 (the American Standard Revised Version also in Jud 6:31,32; Isa 3:13; Jer 2:9; 12:1; Ho 2:2, retaining "plead" only in Isa 1:17 and in the phrase "plead a cause"). yakhach, is rendered "plead" in Job 19:5 ("plead against me my reproach," where the meaning is "convict me of"), in Mic 6:2 the King James Version and the English Revised Version (the American Standard Revised Version "contend"), and Job 16:21 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "maintain the right"). "Plead" is used also for din, in Jer 30:13 and Pr 31:9 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "minister justice to"), and Jer 5:28 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "judge"; compare Jer 22:16, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "judge"). the Revised Version (British and American) would have done vastly better if the use of "plead" had been avoided altogether.

Pleadings (i.e. "arguments") occurs in Job 13:6 (for ribh), and "plea" (din, in a specific legal sense) in De 17:8. the King James Version uses "implead" in Ac 19:38 for egkaleo, the Revised Version (British and American) "accuse," literally, "call into court"; compare also "pleaded the cause" in 2 Macc 4:44 (literally, "argued the case") and 4:47, the Revised Version (British and American) "pleaded" (literally, "spoken," the King James Version "told their cause").

Burton Scott Easton

PLEASURE

plezh’-ur (chephets, ratson; eudokia, hedone: "Pleasure" is the translation of various Hebrew words, chiefly of chephets, "inclination," hence, "pleasure," "delight" (Job 21:21, "What pleasure hath he in his house?" the American Standard Revised Version "what careth he for"; Job 22:3, "Is it any pleasure to the Almighty?"; Ps 111:2; Ec 5:4; 12:1; in Isa 44:28; 46:10; 48:14; 53:10, it has the sense of will or purpose, "He shall perform all my pleasure," etc.); of ratson, "delight," "acceptance," "good will" (Ezr 10:11; Ne 9:37; Es 1:8; Ps 51:18; 103:21, etc.); nephesh, "soul," "desire" is translated "pleasure" (De 23:24; Ps 105:22; Jer 34:16).

In the New Testament "pleasure" is the translation of eudokia, "good thought or will," "good pleasure" (Lu 2:14 the Revised Version margin; Eph 1:5,9; Php 2:13; 2Th 1:11 the Revised Version (British and American) "every desire of goodness," margin "Greek: ‘good pleasure of goodness.’ Compare Ro 10:1").

"To take pleasure or to have pleasure" is eudokeo (2Co 12:10; 2Th 2:12; Heb 10:6,8,38); eudokeo is once translated "good pleasure" (Lu 12:32, "It is your father’s good pleasure to give you the kingdom"); the neuter participle of dokeo, "to think," etc.—meaning "it seems good to me"—to dokoun, is translated "pleasure" (Heb 12:10, "after their pleasure," the Revised Version (British and American) "as seemed good to them"); hedone, "sweetness," "pleasure," occurs in Lu 8:14; Tit 3:3; 2Pe 2:13 (referring to the lower pleasures of life); thelema, "wish," "will" (Re 4:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "because of thy will"); charis, "favor" (Ac 24:27; 25:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "favor"); spatalao "to live voluptuously" (1Ti 5:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "she that giveth herself to pleasure"); suneudokeo, "to think well with," "to take pleasure with others" (Ro 1:32, the Revised Version (British and American) "consent with"); truphao, "to live luxuriously" (Jas 5:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "lived delicately").

The verb "to pleasure" occurs in 2 Macc 2:27 as the translation of eucharistia, the Revised Version (British and American) "gratitude"; 12:11, ophelesein, the Revised Version (British and American) "to help."

W. L. Walker

PLEDGE

plej (verbs chabhal (10 times), ‘arabh (2Ki 18:23 equals Isa 36:8); nouns chahal (Eze 18:12,16; 33:15), chabcholah (Eze 18:7), ‘arubbah), (1Sa 17:18), erabhon (Ge 38:17,18,20); also abhoT (De 24:10-13) and (the Revised Version (British and American) only) abhTiT (Hab 2:6)): All these words have about the same meaning.

(1) The "pledge" is, as in modern English, security given for future payment (Ge 38:17-24) or conduct (Hab 2:6, where the conquered nations have given guaranties of their subserviency to the Chaldeans; the King James Version's "thick clay" here rests on a misreading of the Hebrew). In 2Ki 18:23 (equals Isa 36:8) the "pledge" is a wager (so the Revised Version margin). Rabshakeh mockingly dares Hezekiah to stake a "pledge" that he can produce 2,000 men for the defense of Jerusalem, although the mighty Assyrian host has that number of horses alone. The general point of the obscure passage Pr 20:16 (equals 27:13) is that he who guarantees strangers needs a guaranty himself. 1Sa 17:18 is uncertain and the text may be corrupt. If not, the "pledge" is some (prearranged?) token of the welfare of David's brethren.

(2) Most of the occurrences of "pledge," however, deal with the debts of the very poor, who had no property that they could spare even temporarily. Consequently, the exaction of a pledge from such persons worked genuine hardship, and to take a pledge at all was a cruel act (Job 24:3), although of course the dishonesty of withholding a pledge (Eze 18:7; 33:15) was worse. Lowest in the scale was the creditor who took the garment the borrower was wearing (Am 2:8; Job 22:6; 24:9 margin), and special legislation controlled this practice. A garment (the outer "cloak" (see DRESS) not worn while doing manual labor) so taken must be restored at night (Ex 22:26; De 24:12,13), for it was the usual covering of the sleeper. (Apparently, though, the creditor regained custody of it in the daytime until the debt was paid.) A widow's clothing, however, was entirely exempt (De 24:17), as was the handmill used for bread-making (De 24:6). The lender had no right of entry into the borrower's house to obtain the pledge (De 24:10,11), but it is not said that he could not dictate what he would accept; indeed, the contrary is inconceivable.

(3) the American Standard Revised Version gives "pledge" for the King James Version and the English Revised Version "faith" in 1Ti 5:12.

See also EARNEST.

Burton Scott Easton

PLEIADES

pli'-a-dez, ple'-ya-dez, ple'-a-dez.

See ASTROLOGY, 10; ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 10.

PLEROMA

ple-ro'-ma.

See FULLNESS.

PLOW

plou (charash; arotrioo): No implement of the Bible is more frequently illustrated today than the plow. This is partly because there is every reason to believe that the plows still used throughout Egypt, Palestine, and Syria are counterparts of the ancient ones. The first plows were probably an adaptation of the ancient Egyptian hoe, where the handle was lengthened in order that animals might be hitched to it. To make it easier to break up the ground, it was pointed, and handles were added by which it could be guided. The ancient plow probably varied in type in different sections of the country, as it does today. In one form a young tree Of oak or other strong wood of a diameter of 3 or 4 inches is cut off just below a good-sized branch and again 15 or 20 inches above. The upper end of the severed trunk is pointed and forms the share. Between this and the side branch is fitted a brace. The branch is cut off 10 or 12 ft. from the trunk and forms the pole. A lighter stick, about 3 ft. long, projects upward from the share and forms the handle. The plow used in Syria is of slightly different construction. The handle and share are one continuous piece, so cut that there is a slight bend at the middle. The share is pointed and is used bare in the plains, or in more stony regions is shod with iron. The pole is of 2 pieces joined end to end. The thicker end of the pole is notched, so that it may be attached firmly to the share. The whole plow is so light that it can be easily carried on a man’s shoulder. These plows literally scratch the soil, as the Hebrew word implies. They do not turn over the ground as the modern implement does. The plowman guides the plow with one hand, and with the other sometimes goads the oxen, and at other times with the chisel end of his goad breaks away the lumps of earth or other material which impedes the progress of his plow.

See YOKE.

In addition to the words which are found above, the following terms occur: ‘abhadh (literally, "to serve"), "worked" or "plowed" (De 21:4); palach (literally, "to break open," Ps 141:7).

One special law is mentioned in connection with plowing, namely that an ox and an ass should not be yoked together (De 22:10), a prohibition which is utterly disregarded today. Oxen were principally used for plowing (Job 1:14). Often several yokes of oxen followed each other plowing parallel furrows across the field, a sight still common on the plains of Syria (1Ki 19:19). Plowing was done by bond servants (Lu 17:7; compare ‘abhadh, De 21:4). Plowing cannot be done before the rains (Jer 14:4); on the other hand the soil is too sticky to plow in the winter time (Pr 20:4). The law requiring one day of rest in every seven days included plowing time (Ex 34:21).

Figurative: "The plowers plowed upon my back" typified deep affliction (Ps 129:3; compare Ps 141:7). "Plow iniquity" is urged in the sense of "plant iniquity." Doing evil was sure to bring evil consequences (Job 4:8; compare Mic 3:12). As surely as planting comes after plowing, so surely will Yahweh carry out His decree of destruction (Isa 28:23-25). "Judah shall plow," i.e. become enslaved (Ho 10:11); compare "Foreigners shall be your plowmen" (Isa 61:5). "Will one plow there with oxen?" (Am 6:12), "neither plowing nor harvest" (Ge 45:6) are figures of desolation. Zion plowed as a field, i.e. utterly destroyed (Jer 26:18). The plowman shall overtake the reaper, i.e. the soil shall be so fertile as to require

no rest—typical of great abundance (Am 9:13). No opportunity to plow because of lack of rain is a desolate picture of drought (Jer 14:4). As the plowman expects to share in the fruits of the harvest, so might an apostle expect his temporal needs to be provided for (1Co 9:10). "If ye had not plowed with my heifer," i.e. used my wife, was Samson's reply to those who had secured the answer to his riddle from her (Jud 14:18). "Beat their swords into plowshares" (or hoes) (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3) typified peace; "beat your plowshares into swords"—war (Joe 3:10). "Having put his hand to the plow, and looking back," i.e. longing for evil things when one has set his face toward doing what is right, unfits a man for the kingdom of God (Lu 9:62; compare Ge 19:26; Php 3:13).

James A. Patch

PLUCKING OFF THE HAIR

pluk'-ing.

See HAIR, 7; PUNISHMENTS.

PLUMB-LINE; PLUMMET

plum'-lin, plum'-et, plum'-it.

See TOOLS.

POCHERETH-HAZZEBAIM

pok'-e-reth, po'-ke-reth, po-ke'-reth, -ha-ze-ba'-im (pokhereth hatstsebhayim (Ezr 2:57), or pokhereth ha-tsebhayim (Ne 7:59), "binder (feminine) of the gazelles"): Name of the head of a post-exilic family. The first word is a feminine Kal participle; compare qoheleth ("preacher"), the Hebrew title of the Book of Eccl. BDB suggests that the feminine is that of office. King James Version has "Pochereth of Zebaim" in Ezr, but Ryle (Cambridge Bible, 235) notes that "of" is not in the 1611 edition

POET

po'-et (poietes, "a maker"): Occurs in this sense only in Ac 17:28, where Paul quotes from the general expression of Greek mythology. The quotation if intended to be exact is probably from Aratus, as the words of Paul in his speech at Athens precisely agree with the opening words of the Phaenomena by Aratus. A similar but not identical expression is found in the Hymn to Zeus by Cleanthes. Aratus in his poem endeavors to posit Jupiter as the father and controller of all things, and worthy to be worshipped. In both his poem and that of Cleanthes, but especially in the latter, there is a true and lofty note of spiritual devotion. Paul takes this praise and devotion offered by the Greek poets to their unknown or fictitious gods and bestows it upon the one true God whom he declared unto the people of Athens.

C. E. Schenk

POETRY, HEBREW

po’-et-ri:

I. IS THERE POETRY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT?

Poetry Defined:

1. In Matter, Concrete and Imaginative

2. In Form, Emotional and Rhythmical

II. NEGLECT OF HEBREW POETRY: CAUSES

III. CHARACTERISTICS OF HEBREW POETRY, EXTERNAL AND INTERNAL

1. External or Formal Characteristics

(1) Vocabulary

(2) Grammar

(3) Rhythm

(4) Parallelism

(5) Other Literary Devices

(6) Units of Hebrew Poetry

(7) Classification of Stichs or Verses

2. Internal or Material Characteristics

(1) Themes of Hebrew Poetry

(2) Species of Hebrew Poetry

IV. POETICAL WRITINGS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. The Poetical Books in the Narrow Sense

2. Customary Division of the Poetical Books

3. Poetry in Non-poetical Books

LITERATURE

By Hebrew poetry in the present article is meant that of the Old Testament. There is practically no poetry in the New Testament, but, in the Old Testament Apocrypha, Sirach is largely poetical and Wisdom only less so. Post-Biblical Hebrew poetry could not be discussed here.

I. Is There Poetry in the Old Testament?

Poetry Defined:

It is impossible to answer this question without first of all stating what poetry really is. The present writer submits the following as a correct definition: "Poetry is verbal composition, imaginative and concrete in matter, and emotional and rhythmic in form." This definition recognizes two aspects of poetry, the formal and the material.

1. In Matter Concrete and Imaginative

The substance of poetry must be concrete—it is philosophy that deals with the abstract; and it has to be the product more or less of the creative imagination.

2. In Form Emotional and Rhythmical

It is of the essence of poetry that, like music, it should be expressed in rhythmical but not necessarily in metrical form. Moreover, the language has to be such as will stir up the aesthetic emotions. Adopting this account of poetry as criticism, it may unhesitatingly be affirmed that the Hebrew Scriptures contain a goodly amount of genuine poetry; compare the Psalms, Job, Canticles, etc. It is strange but true that poetical is older than prose written composition. An examination of the literature of the ancient Indians, Babylonians, Hebrews, Greeks and Arabs makes this quite certain.

II. Neglect of Hebrew Poetry: Causes.

Notwithstanding the undoubted fact that poetry is largely represented in the Bible, it is noteworthy that this species of Bible literature was almost wholly ignored until the 18th century. We may perhaps

ascribe this fact mainly to two causes:

(1) Since the Bible was regarded as preeminently, if not exclusively, a revelation of the divine mind, attention was fixed upon what it contained, to the neglect of the literary form in which it was expressed. Indeed it was regarded as inconsistent with its lofty, divine function to look upon it as literature at all, since in this last the appeal is made, at least to a large extent, to the aesthetic and therefore carnal man. The aim contemplated by Bible writers was practical—the communication of religious knowledge—not literary, and still less artistic. It was therefore regarded as inconsistent with such a high purpose that these writers should trouble themselves about literary embellishment or beautiful language, so long as the sense was clear and unambiguous. It was in this spirit and animated by this conception that toward the middle of the 19th century. Isaac Taylor of Ongar (The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, 1861, 56 ff) and Keil of Dorpat (Introduction to the Old Testament, 1881, I, 437) denied on a priori grounds the presence of epic and dramatic poetry in the Bible. How, they exclaimed, could God countenance the writing of fiction which is untruth—and the epic and the drama have both? Matthew Arnold rendered invaluable service to the cause of Bible science when he fulminated against theologians, Jewish and Christian, for making the Bible a mere collection of proof texts, an arsenal whence religious warriors might get weapons with which to belabor their opponents. "The language of the Bible is fluid .... and literary, not rigid, fixed, scientific" (Preface to the first edition of Literature and Dogma). The Bible contains literature, poetical and prose, equal as literature to the best, as Matthew Arnold, Carlyle, and Froude (on Job) held. The neglect of this aspect of the Scriptures made theologians blind to the presence and therefore ignorant of the character of Bible poetry.

(2) Another factor which led to the neglect of the poetical element in the Old Testament is the undoubted fact that Biblical Hebrew poets were less conscious as poets than western poets, and thought much less of the external form in which they expressed themselves. Bible poetry lacks therefore such close adherence to formal rules as that which characterizes Greek, Arabic or English poetry. The authors wrote as they felt and because they felt, and their strong emotions dictated the forms their words took, and not any objective standards set up by the schools. Hebrew poetry is destitute of meter in the strict sense, and also of rhyme, though this last occurs in some isolated cases (see below, III, 1, (4), c and e) . No wonder then that western scholars, missing these marks of the poetry which they knew best, failed for so long to note the poetry which the Old Testament contains.

III. Characteristics of Hebrew Poetry: External and Internal.

The definition of poetry accepted in I, above, implies that there are marks by which poetry can be distinguished from prose. This is equally true of Hebrew poetry, though this last lacks some of the features of the poetry of western nations.

1. External or Formal Characteristics:

(1) Vocabulary.

There are several Hebrew words which occur most frequently and in some cases exclusively in poetry. In the following list the corresponding prose word is put in parenthesis: millah, "word" (= dabhar); enosh, "man" (=’ ish); orach, "way" (= derekh); chazah, "to see" (= ra’ah); the prepositions ele, "to," adhe, "unto," ale, "upon," and minni, "from," instead of the shorter forms el, adh, al, and min. The pronoun zu, rare in prose, has in poetry the double function of a demonstrative and a relative pronoun in both genders. The negative bal, is used for lo’. For the inseparable prepositions "b", "k", "l" ("in," "as," "to") the separate forms bemo, kemo and lemo are employed.

(2) Grammar.

(a) Accidence:

The pronominal suffixes have peculiar forms in poetry. For -m, -am, -em ("their," "them") we find the longer forms -mo, -amo, -emo. For the plural ending of nouns -n (-in) takes the place of -m (-im), as in Aramaic (compare Job 4:2; 12:11), and frequently obsolete case endings are preserved, but their functions are wholly lost. Thus, we have the old nominative ending -o in Ps 50:10, etc.; the old genitive ending -i in Isa 1:21, and the accusative -ah in Ps 3:3.

(b) Syntax:

The article, relative pronoun, accusative singular ‘eth and also the "waw-consecutive" are frequently omitted for the sake of the rhythm. There are several examples of the last in Ps 112:10 ff. The construct state which by rule immediately precedes nouns has often a preposition after it. The jussive sometimes takes the place of the indicative, and the plural of nouns occurs for the singular.

(3) Rhythm.

Rhythm (from rhuthmos) in literary composition denotes that recurrence of accented and unaccented syllables in a regular order which we have in poetry and rhetorical prose. Man is a rhythmic animal; he breathes rhythmically, and his blood circulates—outward and inward—rhythmically. It may be due to these reflex rhythms that the more men are swayed by feeling and the less by reflection and reasoning, the greater is the tendency to do things rhythmically. Man walks and dances and sings and poetizes by the repetition of what corresponds to metrical feet: action is followed by reaction. We meet with a kind of rhythm in elevated and passionate prose, like that of John Ruskin and other writers. Preachers when mastered by their theme unconsciously express themselves in what may be called rhythmic sentences. Though, however, rhythm may be present in prose, it is only in poetry as in music that it recurs at intervals more or less the same. In iambic poetry we get a repetition of a short and long syllable, as in the following lines:

"With ravished ears

The monarch hears,

Assumes the gods,

Affects the nods."

—Dryden.

(4) Parallelism.

What is so called is a case of logical rhythm as distinguished from rhythm that is merely verbal. But as this forms so important a feature of Bible poetry, it must be somewhat fully discussed. What since Bishop Lowth's day has been called parallelism may be described as the recurring of symetrically constructed sentences, the several members of which usually correspond to one another. Lowth (died 1787), in his epochmaking work on Hebrew poetry (De Sacra poesi Hebraeorum prelectiones, English translation by G. Gregory), deals with what he (following Jebb) calls Parallelismus membrorum (chapter X). And this was the first serious attempt to expound the subject, though Rabbi Asariah (Middle Ages), Ibn Ezra (died 1167 AD), D. Kimchi (died 1232) and A. de Rossi (1514-1578) called attention to it. Christian Schoettgen (died 1751) (see Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae) anticipated much of what Lowth has written as to the nature, function and value of parallelism. The first to use the word itself in the technical sense was Jebb (Sacred Lit., 1820). For the same thing Ewald used the expression Sinnrhythmus, i.e. sense rhythm, a not unsuitable designation.

(a) Kinds of Parallelism: Lowth distinguished three principal species of parallelism, which he called synonymous, antithetic and synthetic.

(i) The Synonymous:

In this the same thing is repeated in different words, e.g. Ps 36:5:

'Yahweh, (i.) Thy lovingkindness (reaches) to the heavens,

(ii.) Thy faithfulness (reaches) to the clouds.'

Omitting "Yahweh," which belongs alike to both members, it will be seen that the rest of the two half-lines corresponds word for word: "thy lovingkindness" corresponding to "thy faithfulness," and "to the heavens" answering to "to the clouds" (compare Ps 15:1; 24:1-3; 25:5; 1Sa 18:7; Isa 6:4; 13:7).

(ii) Antithetic Parallelism:

In which the second member of a line (or verse) gives the obverse side of the same thought, e.g. Pr 10:1:

'A wise son gladdens his father,

But a foolish son grieves his mother’

(See Pr 11:3; Ps 37:9; compare Pr 10:1 ff; Ps 20:8; 30:6; Isa 54:7 ff). Sometimes there are more than two corresponding elements in the two members of the verse, as in Pr 29:27; compare 10:5; 16:9; 27:2.

(iii) Synthetic Parallelism:

Called also constructive and epithetic. In this the second member adds something fresh to the first, or else explains it, e.g. Ps 19:8 f:

‘The precepts of Yahweh are right, rejoicing the heart:

The commandments of Yahweh are pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of Yahweh is clean, enduring forever:

The judgments of Yahweh are true and righteous altogether.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold;

Sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb’

(See Pr 1:7; compare 3:5,7; Ps 1:3; 15:4). In addition to the three principal species of parallelism noticed above, other forms have been traced and described.

(iv) Introverted Parallelism:

(Jebb, Sacred Lit., 53): in which the hemistichs of the parallel members are chiastically arranged, as in the scheme ab ba. Thus, Pr 23:15 f:

(a) ‘My son, if thy heart be wise

(b) My heart shall be glad, even mine:

(b) Yea, my reins shall rejoice

(a) When thy lips speak right things’

(Compare Pr 10:4,12; 13:24; 21:17; Ps 51:3).

(v) Palilogical Parallelism:

In which one or more words of the first member are repeated as an echo, or as the canon in music, in the second. Thus, Na 1:2:

‘Yahweh is a jealous God and avenges:

Yahweh avenges and is full of wrath;

Yahweh takes vengeance upon His adversaries,

And He reserves wrath for his enemies’

(Compare Jud 5:3,6 f, 11 f, 15 f, 23,17; Ps 72:2,12,17; 121$; 124$; 126$; Isa 2:7; 24:5; Ho 6:4).

(vi) Climactic or Comprehensive Parallelism:

In this the second line completes the first. Thus, Ps 29:1:

"Give unto Yahweh, O ye mighty ones,

Give unto Yahweh glory and strength"

(see Ex 15:6; Ps 29:8).

(vii) Rhythmical Parallelism:

(De Wette, Franz Delitzsch): thus, Ps 138:4:

"All the kings of the earth shall give thee thanks ....

For they have heard the words of thy mouth."

See Pr 15:3; compare 16:7,10; 17:13,15; 19:20; 21:23,25.

Perfect parallelism is that in which the number of words in each line is equal. When unequal, the parallelism is called imperfect. Ewald (see Die poetischen Bucher des alten Bundes, I, 57-92; Die Dichter des alten Bundes, I, 91 ff, 2d edition of the former) aimed at giving a complete list of the relations which can be expressed by parallelism, and he thought he had succeeded. But in fact every kind of relation which can be indicated in words may be expressed in two or more lines more or less parallel. On the alleged parallelism of strophes see below.

(b) Parallelism as an Aid to Exegesis and Textual Criticism:

If in Lowth's words parallelism implies that "in two lines or members of the same period things for the most part shall answer to things, and words to words," we should expect obscure or unknown words to derive some light from words corresponding to them in parallel members or clauses. In not a few cases we are enabled by comparison of words to restore with considerable confidence an original reading now lost. The formula is in a general way as follows: ab: cx. We know what a, b and c mean, but are wholly in the dark as to the sense of x. The problem is to find out what x means. We have an illustration in Jud 5:28, which may be thus literally translated:

"Through the window she looked,

And Sisera's mother x through the x."

Here we have two unknown, each, however, corresponding to known terms. The Hebrew verb accompanying "Sisera's mother" is watteyabbebh, English Versions of the Bible "and .... cried." But no such verb (yabhabh) is known, for the Talmud, as usually, follows the traditional interpretation. We want a verb with a meaning similar to "looked." If we read wattabbeT, we have a form which could easily be corrupted into the word in the Massoretic Text, which gives a suitable sense and moreover has the support of the Targums of Onqelos and Jonathan, and even of the Septuagint (Codex Alexandrinus and Lucian). What about the other Hebrew word untranslated above (*'eshnabh*)? This occurs in but one other passage (Pr 7:6), where it stands as in the present passage in parallelism with challon, "window" (probably Pr 7:6 is dependent). We get no help from etymology or in this case from the VSS, but parallelism had suggested to our translators the meaning "lattice," a kind of Eastern window, and something of the kind must be meant. The verb shanabh, "to be cool," may possibly suggest the rendering "window," i.e. a hole in the wall to secure coolness in the house. Glass windows did not exist in Palestine, and are rare even now. There are innumerable other examples in the Old Testament of the use of parallelism in elucidating words which occur but once, or which are otherwise difficult to understand, and frequently a textual emendation is suggested which is otherwise supported.

(c) Prevalence and Value of Parallelism:

Two statements anent parallelism in the Old Testament may be safely made:

(i) That it is not a characteristic of all Old Testament poetry. Lowth who had so much to do with its discovery gave it naturally an exaggerated place in his scheme of Hebrew poetry, but it is lacking in the largest part of the poetry of the Old Testament, and it is frequently met with in elevated and rhetorical prose.

(ii) That it pervades other poetry than that of the Old Testament. It occurs in Assyria (see A. Jeremias, Die bab-assyr. Vorstellung vom Leben nach dem Tode), in Egypt (Georg Ebers, Nord u. Sud, I), in

Finnish, German and English Indeed, A. Wuttke (Der deutsche Volks-Aberglaube der Gegenwart, 1869, 157) and Eduard Norden (Die antike Kunstprosa, 1898, II, 813) maintain that parallelism is the most primitive form of the poetry of all nations. It must nevertheless be admitted that in the Old Testament parallelism has in proportion a larger place than in any other literature and that the correspondence of the parts of the stichs or verses is closer.

(5) Other Literary Devices.

Old Testament poetry has additional features which it shares with other oriental and with western poetry. Owing to a lack of space these can be hardly more than enumerated.

(a) Alliteration:

E.g. "Round and round the rugged rocks." We have good examples in the Hebrew of Ps 6:8 and 27:17.

(b) Assonance:

E.g. "dreamy seamy" (see for Bible examples the Hebrew of Ge 49:17; Ex 14:14; De 3:2).

(c) Rhyme:

There are so few examples of this in the Hebrew Scriptures that no one can regard it as a feature in Hebrew poetry, though in Arabic and even in post-Biblical Hebrew poetry it plays a great part. We have Biblical instances in the Hebrew text of Ge 4:23; Job 10:8-11; 16:12.

(d) Acrostics:

In some poems of the Old Testament half-verses, verses, or groups of verses begin with the successive letters of the Hebrew alphabet. We have such alphabetical acrostics in Psalms 9 f; 34; 37; Pr 31:10 ff; La 1-4; compare La 5, where the number of verses agrees with that of the Hebrew alphabet, though the letters of that alphabet do not introduce the verses.

(e) Meter:

The view of the present writer may be stated as follows: That the poetry of the Hebrew is not in the strict sense metrical, though the writers under the influence of strong emotion express themselves rhythmically, producing often the phenomena which came later to be codified under metrical rules. Thinking and reasoning and speaking preceded psychology, logic, and grammar, and similarly poetry preceded prosody. In the Old Testament we are in the region of the fact, not of the law. Poets wrote under strong impulse, usually religious, and without recognizing any objective standard, though all the time they were supplying data for the rules of prosody. Those who think that Old Testament poets had in their minds objective rules of meter have to make innumerable changes in the text. Instead of basing

their theory on the original material, they bring their a priori theory and alter the text to suit it. It can be fearlessly said that there is not a single poem in the Old Testament with the same number of syllables, or feet, or accents in the several stichs or hemistichs, unless we introduce violent changes into the Massoretic Text, such as would be resented in classical and other ancient literature. It is important, before coming to any definite conclusion, to take into consideration the fact that the poetry of the Old Testament belongs to periods separated by many centuries, from the So of Deborah (Jud 5), the earliest Hebrew poem, down to the last hymns in the Psalter. In the oldest specimens of Hebrew poetry there is a naive simplicity which excludes the idea of conscious article In the latest the poet is much more conscious, and his poetry more artistic. It would be manifestly unfair to propound a theory of poetry based on the poetry of Keats and Tennyson and to apply it to the productions of Anglo-Saxon and Old English poetry. Bound up in the one volume called the Bible there is a literature differing widely in age, aim and authorship, and it needs care in educing a conception of Heb poetry that will apply to all the examples in the Old Testament. The later psalm-acrostic, etc., many of them made up of bits of other psalms, seem to have sprung from a more conscious effort at imitation. If, however, there were among the ancient Hebrews, as there was among the ancient Greeks, a code of prosody, it is strange that the Mishna and Gemara' should be wholly silent about it. And if some one system underlies our Hebrew Bible, it is strange that so many systems have been proposed. It should be remembered too that the oldest poetry of every people is nonmetrical.

The following is a brief statement of the views advocated:

(i) Philo and Josephus, under the influence of Greek models and desiring to show that Hebrew was not inferior to pagan literature, taught that Hebrew poetry had meter, but they make no attempt to show what kind of meter this poetry possesses.

(ii) Calmet, Lowth, and Carpzov held that though in the poetry of the Hebrew Bible as originally written and read there must have been metrical rules which the authors were conscious of following, yet, through the corruption of the text and our ignorance of the sounds and accentuation of primitive Hebrew, it is now impossible to ascertain what these metrical rules were.

(iii) In their scheme of Hebrew meter Bickell and Merx reckon syllables as is done in classical poetry, and they adopt the Syriac law of accentuation, placing the tone on the penultimate. These writers make drastic changes in the text in order to bolster up their theories.

(iv) The dominant and by far the least objectionable theory is that advocated by Ley, Briggs, Duhm, Buhl, Grimme, Sievers, Rothstein and most modern scholars, that in Hebrew prosody the accented syllables were alone counted. If this principle is applied to Job, it will be found that most of the Biblical verses are distichs having two stichs, each with three main accents. See, for an illustration, Job 12:16: (immo 'oz wethushiyah: lo shoghegh umashgeh':'Strength and effectual working belong to (literally, "are with") him, he that errs and he that causes to err'). Man's rhythmical instincts are quite sufficient to account for this phenomenon without assuming that the poet had in mind an objective standard. Those who adopt this last view and apply it rigidly make numerous textual changes. For an examination of the

metrical systems of Hubert Grimme, who takes account of quantity as well as accent, and of Eduard Sievers who, though no Hebrew scholar, came to the conclusion after examining small parts of the Hebrew Bible that Hebrew poetry is normally anapaestic, see W.H. Cobb, Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre, 152 ff, 169 ff. Herder, De Wette, Hupfeld, Keil, Nowack, Budde, Doller, and Toy reject all the systems of Hebrew meter hitherto proposed, though Budde has a leaning toward Ley's system.

(f) Budde's Qinah Measure:

Though Budde takes up in general a negative position in regard to Hebrew meter, he pleads strenuously for the existence of one specific meter with which his name is associated. This is what he calls the qinah measure (from qinah, "a lamentation"). In this each stich is said to consist of one hemistich with three beats or stress syllables and another having two such syllables, this being held to be the specific meter of the dirge (see La 1:1, etc.). Ley and Briggs call it "pentameter" because it is made up of five (3 plus 2) feet (a foot in Hebrew prosody being equal to an accented syllable and the unaccented syllables combined with it). See Budde's full treatment of the subject in ZATW, 60, 152, "Das heb. Klagelied." It must, however, be borne in mind that even Herder (died 1803) describes the use in elegies of what he calls, anticipating Ley and Briggs, the "pentameter" (see Geist der ebraischen Poesie, 1782, I, 32 f, English translation. The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, 1833, I, 40). But the present writer submits the following criticisms: (i) Budde is inconsistent in rejecting all existing theories of meter and yet in retaining one of his own, which is really but part of the system advocated by Bellermann, Ley and Briggs. (ii) He says, following Herder, that it is the measure adopted by mourning women (Jer 9:16), but we have extremely few examples of the latter, and his statement lacks proof. (iii) There are dirges in the Old Testament not expressed in the qinah measure. David's lament over Saul and Jonathan is more hexametric and tetrametric than pentametric, unless we proceed to make a new text (2Sa 1:19).(iv) The qinah measure is employed by Hebrew poets where theme is joyous or indifferent; see Ps 119, which is a didactic poem.

(6) Units of Hebrew Poetry.

In western poetry the ultimate unit is usually the syllable, the foot (consisting of at least two syllables) coming next. Then we have the verse-line crowned by the stanza, and finally the poem.

According to theory of Hebrew poetry adopted by the present writer, the following are the units, beginning with the simplest:

(a) The Meter:

This embraces the accented (tone) syllable together with the unaccented syllable preceding or succeeding it. This may be called a "rhythmic foot."

(b) The Stich or Verse:

In Job and less regularly in Psalms and Canticles and in other parts of the Old Testament (Nu 23:19-24) the stich or verse consists commonly of three toned syllables and therefore three meters (see above for sense of "meter"). It is important’ to distinguish between this poetical sense of "verse" and the ordinary meaning—the subdivision of a Bible chapter. The stich in this sense appears in a separate line in some old manuscripts.

(c) Combinations of Stichs (Verses):

In Hebrew poetry a stich hardly ever stands alone. We have practically always a distich (couplet, Job 18:5), a tristich (triplet, Nu 6:24-26), a tetrastich (Ge 24:23), or the pentastich.

(d) Strophe:

Kosters (Stud. Krit., 1831, 40-114, "Die Strophen," etc.) maintained that all poems in the Hebrew Scriptures are naturally divisible into strophes (stanzas) of similar, if not equal, length. Thus Ps 119 is arranged in strophes named after the letters of the Hebrew alphabet, each one containing eight Scripture verses, or sixteen metrical verses or stichs, most of the stichs having three meters or rhythmical feet. But though several Biblical poems are composed in strophes, many are not.

(e) Song:

This (shirah) is made up of a series of verses and in some cases of strophes.

(f) Poem:

We have examples of this (shir) in the books of Job and Canticles which consist of a combination of the song.

(7) Classification of Stichs or Verses.

Stichs may be arranged as follows, according to the number of meters (or feet) which they contain:

(a) the trimeter or tripod with three meters or feet; Bickell holds that in Job this measure is alone used;

(b) the tetrameter or tetrapod, a stich with four meters or feet;

(c) the pentameter or pentapod, which has five meters or feet: this is Budde’s qinah measure (see III, 1, (4));

(d) the hexameter or hexapod: this consists of six meters or feet, and is often hard to distinguish from two separate trimeters (or tripods).

2. Internal or Material Characteristics:

Our first and most original authority on the internal characteristics of Hebrew poetry is that great German theologian and man of letters, J.G. Herder, the pastor and friend of Goethe and Schiller at Weimar. In his Vom Geist der ebraischen Poesie, 1782 (The Spirit of Poetry, translated by James Marsh, U.S.A., 1833), he discusses at length and with great freshness those internal aspects of the poetry of the Old Testament (love of Nature, folklore, etc.) which impressed him as a literary man. Reference may be made also to George Gilfillian's Bards of the Bible, 1851 (popular), and Isaac Taylor's Spirit of Hebrew Poetry. It is a strange but striking and significant coincidence that not one of these writers professed much if any knowledge of the Hebrew language. They studied the poetry of the Old Testament mainly at least in translations, and were not therefore diverted from the literary and logical aspects of what is written by the minutiae of Hebrew grammar and textual criticism, though only a Hebrew scholar is able to enter into full possession of the rich treasures of Hebrew poetry.

(1) Themes of Hebrew Poetry.

It is commonly said that the poetry of the ancient Hebrews is wholly religious. But this statement is not strictly correct.

(a) The Old Testament does not contain all the poetry composed or even written by the Hebrews in Bible times, but only such as the priests at the various sanctuaries preserved. We do not know of a literary caste among the Hebrews who concerned themselves with the preservation of the literature as such.

(b) Within the Bible Canon itself there are numerous poems or snatches of poems reflecting the everyday life of the people.

We have love songs (Canticles), a wedding song (Ps 45), a harvest song (Ps 65), parts of ditties sung upon discovering a new well (Nu 21:17 f), upon drinking wine, and there are references to war songs (Nu 21:14; Jos 10:13; 2Sa 1:18).

(2) Species of Hebrew Poetry.

Biblical poetry may be subsumed under the following heads: (a) folklore, (b) prophetical, (c) speculative, (d) lyrical.

(a) Folklore:

"Poetry," said J. G. Hamann (died 1788), "is the mother tongue of the human race." In both folk-music and folk-poetry, each the oldest of its class, the inspiration is immediate and spontaneous. We have examples of folk-songs in Ge 11:1-9; 19:24 f.

(b) Prophetic Poetry:

This poetry is the expression of the inspiration under which the seer wrote. One may compare the oracular utterances of diviners which are invariably poetical in form as well as in matter. But one has to bear in mind that the heathen diviner claimed to have his messages from jinns or other spirits, and the means he employed were as a rule omens of various kinds. The Old Testament prophet professed to speak as he was immediately inspired by God (see DIVINATION, VIII). Duhm thinks that the genuine prophecies of Jeremiah are wholly poetical, the prose parts being interpolations. But the prophet is not merely or primarily a poet, though it cannot be doubted that a very large proportion of the prophecies of the Old Testament are poetical in form and substance.

(c) Philosophical Poetry:

This expression is intended to include such poetry as is found in the Wisdom literature of the Old Testament and the Apocrypha (see WISDOM LITERATURE). The so-called didactic poetry, that of the proverbs or parables (mashal), also comes in here.

(d) Lyrical Poetry:

This includes the hymns of the Psalter, the love songs of Canticles and the many other lyrics found in the historical and prophetical writings. In these lyrics all the emotions of the human soul are expressed.

Does the Old Testament contain specimens of epic and dramatic poetry? The answer must depend on which definition of both is adopted.

(a) Epic Poetry:

The present writer would define an epic poem as a novel with its plot and development charged, however, with the passion and set out in the rhythmic form of poetry. There is no part of the Old Testament which meets the requirements of this definition, certainly not the Creation, Fall and Deluge stories, which De Wette (Beitrage, 228 ff, Einleitung, 147) and R.G. Moulton (Literary Study of the Bible, chapter ix) point to as true epics, and which Ewald (Dichter des alten Bundes, I, 87 ff) held rightly to have in them the stuff of epics, though not the form.

(b) Dramatic Poetry:

Defining dramatic poetry as that which can be acted on a stage, one may with confidence say that there is no example of this in the Old Testament. Even the literary drama must have the general characteristics of that which is actable. Franz Delitzsch and other writers have pointed to Job and Canticles as dramatic poems, but the definition adopted above excludes both.

IV. Poetical Writings of the Old Testament.

1. The Poetical Books in the Narrow Sense:

According to the Massoretes or editors of our present Hebrew Bible, there are but three poetical books in the Old Testament, Job, Proverbs, and Psalms, known in Jewish circles by the mnemonic abbreviation ‘emeth, the three consonants forming the initial letters of the Hebrew names of the above books. These three books have been supplied by the Massoretes with a special system of accents known as the poetical accents, and involving a method of intoning in the synagogue different from that followed when the prose books are read. But these accentual marks cannot be traced farther back than the 7th or 8th century of our era.

2. Customary Division of the Poetical Books:

It is customary to divide the poetical books of the Old Testament into two classes, each containing three books:

(1) those containing lyrical poetry (shir , or shirah), i.e. Psalms, Canticles, Lamentations;

(2) those containing for the most part didactic poetry (mashal), i.e. Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes.

3. Poetry in Non-poetical Books:

There is a large amount of poetry in the Old Testament outside the books usually classed as poetical:

(a) poetry in the prophetical books (see above, III, 2);

(b) poetry in the historical books including the Pentateuch (see Michael Heilprin, The Historical Poetry of the Hebrews, 2 volumes, 1879-80).

We have examples in Ge 4:23 f; 49; Ex 15; Nu 21:14 f, 27-30 (JE); Nu 23 f (Balaam’s songs); De 32 f (song and blessing of Moses); Jos 10:12-14 (JE); Jud 5 (Deborah’s Song); 9:8-15; 1Sa 2:1-10; 2Sa 1; 3:33 f; 2Sa 23 (= Ps 18), etc.

LITERATURE.

The most important books and articles on the subject have been mentioned during the course of the foregoing article. There is a full list of works dealing with Hebrew meter in W.H. Cobb, Criticism o.f Systems of Hebrew Metre, 19 ff. The first edition of Ewald’s still valuable "Essay on Hebrew Poetry" prefixed to his commentary on the Psalms was published in English in the Journal of Sacred Literature (1848), 74 ff, 295 ff. In 1909 J.W. Rothstein issued a suggestive treatise on Hebrew rhythm (Grundzuge des heb. Rhythmus .... nebst lyrischen Texten mit kritischem Kommentar, 8vo plus vi plus 398),

reviewed by the present writer in Review of Theology and Philosophy (Edinburgh), October, 1911. Early Religious Poetry of the Hebrews by E.G. King (Cambridge University Press) contains a good, brief, popular statement of the subject, though it makes no pretense to originality. In The Poets of the Old Testament, 1912, Professor A.R. Gordon gives an excellent popular account of the poetry and poetical literature of the Old Testament.

T. Witton Davies

POETRY, NEW TESTAMENT

No one questions the presence of poetry of a high order in the Old Testament. The Study of the Old Testament as the literature of the ancient Hebrews has been critically made, and the attention of even the ordinary reader of the Scriptures called to the beauty and wealth of its poetic passages. The message of the New Testament is so vitally spiritual and concerned with religion that but little attention has been paid to it as literature. Naturally it would be strange if the poetic inspiration which runs like a tide through the prophetic and post-exilic periods of the Old Testament should altogether cease under the clearer spiritual dispensation of the New Testament. The fact is that it does not cease, but that under every fundamental rule for poetic utterance, save that of rhyme, the New Testament is seen to be rich in imaginative vision, in religion touched by emotion, and in poetic expression. The Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, and the Epistle of James, all afford examples of lofty poetic utterance, while the message of Jesus is saturated with words which readily lend themselves to song. In fact it is thought by some that Jesus was no less careful of the form than of the content of His message, and that all the finer types of Hebrew poetry found in the Old Testament can be matched from His sayings, even when tested by the same rules.

In the Gospels that of Luke gives us our best examples of poetry. "No sooner have we passed through the vestibule of his Gospel than we find ourselves within a circle of harmonies" (Burton, in the Expositor’s Bible). From the poetic utterances of Mary, Elisabeth, Zacharias, Simeon, and the Angels, the church gains her Magnificat, Beatitude, Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis and Glorias.

The utterances of John the Baptist are filled with a rugged desert vision and an expression which reveals a form of poesy in no wise to be mistaken for prose.

Paul presents many of his ideas in harmonious and beautiful forms. He knew the secular poets of his day, and has immortalized Cleanthes’ Hymn to Zeus (Ac 17:28). He also quotes from Epimenides and the Athenian dramatist Menander (1Co 15:33). Paul knew the poetry of the Hebrews, and enriches his own message with many quotations from it. He was acquainted with the Christian hymnology of his own times, as is seen in Eph 5:14 and 1Ti 3:16. He offers also original flashes of poetic inspiration and utterance, a good example of which is found in Ro 8:31-37.

Who could doubt the poetic imagery of James? He might almost be called the poet of social justice and of patient waiting under affliction for the will of God to come to men.

When one comes to the words of Jesus he discovers that in a very true sense His speech answers to the requirements for Hebrew poetry. Examples of synonymous, antithetic, synthetic and causal parallelism are the rule rather than the exception in the utterances of Jesus. For the synonymous form see Mt 10:24; for the antithetic see Lu 6:41; for the synthetic and causal forms see Lu 9:23 and Mt 6:7. Not alone are these forms of Hebrew poetry found in the words of Jesus, but also the more involved and sustained poetic utterances (Lu 7:31-32).

No one can question the deep emotional quality, the vivid imagination and spiritual idealism of Jesus. That the form of His speech is adequately set to poetic inspiration and conforms to the laws for Hebrew poetry has not been so freely acknowledged. Independently of theory advanced in Did Jesus Write His Own Gospel? (William Pitt MacVey), every student of the literature of the New Testament must be grateful for the chapter on "The Poems of Jesus."

Spirituality and poetry have a kinship, and the interpretation of any message is aided by the adequate knowledge of its form. When the New Testament has thus been carefully studied as literature, it will be seen, not only that Jesus was a poet, but that the entire New Testament, if not as rich as the Old Testament in poetic passages, is sufficiently poetic to receive treatment as such in religious encyclopedias.

See also FAITHFUL SAYINGS; POETRY, HEBREW.

C. E. Schenk

POINTS

points: The word occurs in Ec 5:16, "In all points (‘ummah) as he came, so shall he go"—a man leaves the world in all regards as helpless as he entered it, no matter what he may have gained or accomplished during his life.

Also in Heb 4:15, "In all points (kata panta, "in all things," as in His human nature (Heb 2:14), so in His human experience (compare Heb 2:17,18)) tempted like as we are, yet without sin." He successfully resisted temptation at all points of His nature, in body, soul, and spirit. See TEMPTATION OF CHRIST. Westcott (in loc.) thinks that the reference is not so much to Christ issuing out of all His trials without the least stain of sin, as to "a limitation of His temptation. Man’s temptations come in many cases from previous sin. Such temptations had necessarily no place in Christ. He was tempted as we are, sharing our nature, yet with this exception, that there was no sin in Him to become the spring of trial." Whichever interpretation is adopted there is profound insight into the things of the soul in joining sinlessness with fullness of experience of temptation.

M. O. Evans

POISON

poi’-z’-n (chemah, ro’-sh; thumos, ios): Residents in Palestine must, from the first, have been acquainted with venomous serpents. Six species of these are widely diffused in the land, and at least three of them are fairly common in places. Besides, there are scorpions, centipedes and the large spider, which are as much dreaded by the fellahin as are the serpents, not to speak of the minor but very serious discomforts of mosquitoes, sandflies and ticks, some of which were credited with lethal powers. In The Wisdom of Solomon 16:9 the Revised Version (British and American) we read that "the bites of locusts and flies did slay, and there was not found a healing for their life." There are also many poisonous plants, such as belladonna, henbane, thorn apple, and the opium poppy. None of these is mentioned in the Bible; the only names found there are the hemlock (Conium maculatum) of Ho 10:4, the poisonous gourd (Citrullus colocynthis) of 2Ki 4:39, and the grapes of gall, probably the fruit of Calotropis procera, the apples of Sodom of Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4). Some, however, believe that these are poppyheads. Poisonous waters are referred to at Marah (Ex 15:23) and Jericho (2Ki 2:19). There are no direct records of any person dying of poison except in 2 Macc 10:13, where the suicide of Ptolemy Macron is related. our Lord’s promise in the appendix to Mr 16:18 shows, however, that poisons were known and might be administered by way of ordeal, as was the unknown "water of jealousy" (Nu 5:17). In this connection the story in Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39) is interesting, that "Justus surnamed Barsabbas, though he drank a deadly poison, suffered no injury, through the grace of the Lord." The passages in which poisonous serpents are mentioned are De 32:24, where serpents (the Revised Version (British and American) "crawling things") of the dust, probably Cerastes hasselquistii, the little horned vipers, are mentioned, and in De 32:33: "poison of serpents, and the cruel venom of asps." The asp may be the cobra Naia haje, not uncommon on the borders of the wilderness to the South. Ps 58:4 mentions the poison of serpents. Ps 140:3, "They have sharpened their tongue like a serpent; adders’ poison is under their lips," indicates, what is still a common belief, that the forked tongue of the snake is the poison-bearer. This is referred to in Jas 3:8. That it was the fang and not the tongue which carried the poison was known to Pliny (xi.62). This verse of Ps 140 is given in Paul’s composite quotation in Ro 3:13. There may be a reference to the giving of an intoxicant poison in Hab 2:15, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads "that addest thy venom." The prophets speak in several places of God’s wrath as a cup of trembling (the Revised Version (British and American) "staggering"), e.g. Isa 51:17,22, probably suggested by the fact that chemah primarily means "fury" and is used in that sense in more than a hundred passages. In Zec 12:2 Jerusalem is to be such a "cup of reeling unto all the peoples round about."

The semamith, "lizard" (the King James Version "spider"), mentioned in Pr 30:28 Septuagint kalabotes) was formerly regarded as poisonous and it is still much disliked by the fellahin, as they believe that it makes mocking gestures mimicking them at their prayers. They are really not poisonous. It is doubtful whether the lizard mentioned by Agur is really this stellion; the description better fits the gecko.

Alexander Macalister

POLE

pol: Nu 21:8,9 the King James Version for nes, Revised Version "standard."

POLICY

pol’-i-si: Literally "method of government," and so "ability to manage affairs." In a bad sense, "cunning," "craft," in Da 8:25 (sekhel, "understanding"); in a good sense in 1 Macc 8:4 (boule, "counsel"); also in the King James Version 2 Macc 13:18; 14:29,31 (methodos, strategema, strategeo), where the Revised Version has "stratagem." Policies occurs in Judith 11:8 the King James Version for panourgema, lit. "readiness for anything," here in a good sense; Revised Version "subtil devices."

POLISHED

pol’-isht.

See CORNER-STONE, (2).

POLL

pol: The word (on the derivation of which see Skeat, Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, 360) has been eliminated as a verb in the American Standard Revised Version. In the King James Version and English Revised Version it represents the Hebrew verbs kacam, literally "to shear" (Eze 44:20), gazaz, literally, "to pull out," "to uproot," thence "to shear the sheep," figuratively, "to destroy an enemy" (Mic 1:16), galach, in Piel, literally, "to make bald or roundheaded" (2Sa 14:26) and qatsats, "to cut off" (Jer 9:26; 25:23; 49:32). The Hebrew noun is gulgoleth. As will be seen from the above enumeration, the Hebrew verb differ considerably in etymology, while Revised Version has not tried to distinguish. In Mic 1:16 we have a reference to the oriental custom of cutting or tearing one’s hair as a sign of mourning for one’s relatives. "Make thee bald, and cut off thy hair (King James Version and English Revised Version "poll thee," Hebrew gazaz) for the children of thy delight: enlarge thy baldness as the eagle (margin "vulture"); for they are gone into captivity from thee." The priests, the sons of Zadok, are instructed to abstain from outward resemblance to heathen patterns of priesthood: "Neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long; they shall only cut off the hair (the King James Version and the English Revised Version, "poll," Hebrew kacam) of their heads" (Eze 44:20). The Piel form of galach is employed in the description of the annual hair-cutting of Absalom (2Sa 14:26). Thrice we find the verb "to poll" as the translation of Hebrew qatsats, where the American Standard Revised Version materially improves the translation by adopting the marginal version of the King James Version (Jer 9:26; 25:23; 49:32).

See HAIR.

The noun (gulgoleth, lit. "head") is translated "poll" in the phrase "by the poll," "by their polls" (Nu 1:2,18,20,22; 3:47; 1Ch 23:3,14). The expression has its origin in the numbering of persons by their

heads, in the same way in which we speak of head-tax, etc.

H. L. E. Luering

POLLUTION

po-lu’-shun (ga’al, "to pollute"; alisgema, "contamination"): In Mal 1:7, "Ye offer polluted bread," i.e. not actually unclean, but worthless, common (compare Ezr 2:62), bread here being used metonymically for sacrificial offerings generally (compare Le 21:6; Mt 6:11). The phrase in Ac 15:20, "the pollutions of idols," is explained in 15:29 by "things sacrificed (the King James Version "meats offered") to idols."

POLLUX

pol’-uks.

See CASTOR AND POLLUX.

POLYGAMY

po-lig’-a-mi:

1. Meaning of the Term

2. Origin of Polygamy

3. The Old Testament and Polygamy

4. Polygamy Unnatural

The Eunuch

5. Weakness of Polygamy

1. Meaning of the Term:

Polygamy has been and is the open blazon by the human race of sex vice. The very term is a misnomer. Since man became moralized he has apprehended that the proper marriage relation between the sexes is monogamy. Whatever may have been the practice, since man could ask himself, What is right? he has known that ap’ arches ("from the beginning," Mt 19:4), au fond, at bottom, marriage is the choice of one man and one woman of each other for a life family relation. La Rochefoucauld said: "Hypocrisy is a sort of homage which vice pays to virtue." There is hypocrisy beneath the word polygamy. It is an attempt to

cover up by the term "plural marriage" what is not marriage and cannot be marriage. There is no particular need of defining what the condition is, so long as we can look upon it as a violation and negation of the marriage relation. The very use of the term from any language covering a like condition is attempt—

"To steal the livery of the court of heaven

To serve the Devil in."

Polygamy is a general term and might mean a multiplicity of partners in the family relation by one of either sex. But it does not. Polygamy practically means exactly "polygyny" (gune), i.e. it describes a many-wived man. The correlative term "polyandry" describes the condition of a woman who has many men in family relation with herself. They are all husbands to her, as in polygamy all the women are wives to one man. But polyandry in historic times has had so little illustration that it may be dismissed as so exceptional as to be worthy of no further notice here.

Why polygamy has captured the whole position philologically covered by polygyny is readily apparent. The might of the physically strongest has dictated the situation. Man has on the average one-fourth more muscular force than woman. When it comes to wrong in sex relation, man has that advantage, and it has given him the field covered by the word "polygamy." There he is master and woman is the victim.

2. Origin of Polygamy:

It is plainly evident that polygamy is primarily largely the outcome of tribal wars. When men had separated into clans and had taken up different places of abode, collisions would soon occur between them. What would happen in such cases would be what we know did happen in North America soon after its first settlement by Europeans, to wit, the destruction of the Hurons by the Iroquois. The great majority of the men were massacred; the women and children, driven to the abode of the conquerors, disappearing there mainly in concubinage and slavery. What shall be done with this surplus of women? Here again the might of the strongest comes to the front. The chief or the most heroic fighter would assert his right to choice of captives, and thus concubinage or what is the same thing—polygamy—would be set up. Successes in further wars come and add other women to be distributed. Of course to the sheik or king there soon comes the seraglio and the harem. Polygamous practices will come in in other ways. The prisoner of war becomes property and passes from hand to hand by gift or sale. So woman—the weaker party—endures what comes to her as slave, concubine. We have now no longer the "helpmeet" originally destined for man—"bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh"—for whom he would "leave his father and his mother" and to whose single self he would "cleave" for life (Ge 2:18,24; Mt 19:5,6). Monogamy, with its unity in labor, thought and feeling, with its immeasurable modifying influences of moral, ideal and spiritual cast, is gone. Woman is reduced to the position of ministrant to man’s unmodified sensuality.

3. The Old Testament and Polygamy:

The complications introduced into morals by polygamy are not often considered. But the Bible sets them forth in plainness. The marriage of Abraham and Sarah seems to have been an original love match, and even to have preserved something of that character through life. Still we find Sarah under the influence of polygamous ideas, presenting Abraham with a concubine. Yet afterward, when she herself had a son, she induced Abraham to drive out into the wilderness this concubine and her son. Now Abraham was humane and kind, and it is said "The thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight" (Ge 21:11). But he was in the toils of polygamy, and it brought him pain and retribution. A Divine direction may be hard to bear.

The conditions of Jacob's marriages were such that it is hard to say whether any of his children were of any other than of polygamous origin (Ge 35:22-26). Where the family idea and affection went, in such mixed condition, is evidenced by the unblushing sale, for slavery in Egypt, of one of the brothers by the others (Ge 37:28).

David was a singer of sweet and noble songs and wanted to be a righteous man with his whole heart. Yet, probably in common with all the military leaders and kings of the earth of his day, he had a polygamous career. His retributions ran along an extended line. There was a case of incest and murder among his children (2Sa 13). The son in whom he had most hope and pride organized treason against his throne, and lost his life in the attempt. David left his kingdom to Solomon, of whom much might be said, but of whom this can be said—evidently originally a man bright, keen-witted, wise, yet in his old age he went to pieces by the wiles of the women with whom he had loaded his harem. Partly by his extravagance in his polygamous life, and partly in attempt to build temples in distant places for the religions represented by the inmates of his harem, he bankrupted his nation. As a consequence his kingdom was divided at his death, and there was never again a united Israel (1Ki 11:12). Polygamy may be justly charged with these untoward results.

4. Polygamy Unnatural:

It can be demonstrated scientifically, even mathematically, that polygamy is a moral wrong. Statistics show that births are substantially equally divided between the sexes. Excess seems slightly on the side of males. When this fact is considered and also the fact of the wide prevalence of polygamy, it would seem that polygamy (polygyny) is a greater crime against Nature than polyandry. To put out of view for a moment the wrong to woman in denying to her the rights and privileges of monogamous marriage, the interference with the rights of man to such marriage looms up in vast proportion. Every harem is the denial to men of the right to seek among its inmates wives according to the dictates of their own hearts.

The Eunuch.

But we are not done with the crime against man. Given a harem, and he who set it up has made, or there brought, the eunuch. The lord of the harem must be served by emasculated men. A search in history will reveal an amount of this wickedness that is past belief. The eunuch has been everywhere among all nations and peoples and tongues. They have not only been servitors to women in harems, but they have

acquired such influence with their masters that they have sometimes even dictated the policy of government. They have been the secret cabinet that has had the last word in public affairs. They have sometimes held public positions and shown therein astonishing ability. Witness Narses, the brilliant general of the emperor Justinian.

See EUNUCH.

5. Weakness of Polygamy:

Gibbon noticed the fact that nations began to decline in power when their policies were dictated and managed by eunuchs. But that is taking a symptom for the disease. There are weaknesses behind that weakness. We have found woman in muscular strength equal to three-fourths of a man. If we claim nothing more for woman than that ratio through the whole scale of her potencies, what would be thought of a nation that should try to reduce that three-fourths of potency as nearly to zero as it could? This is what polygamy has done—reduced woman as nearly to a cipher as it could in all the departments of her being. She has been held to the lowest and most primitive industrial pursuits. She has been deprived of intellectual development. She has been debarred from society, permitted to look at it only through a home lattice, or, if abroad, through a swathod face. The harem of sheik or sultan has fixed the condition of woman in province or nation—set the bounds to her life. The highest office assigned her has been breeder of children, and for one-half of them—the daughters—she could have no possible hope or ambition.

See WOMAN.

Where in such degradation is the "helpmeet" for man in all his problems? This condition is reflected back over man. What possible appeal can there be to him for thought and energy except to repeat the same dull round exhibited in his daily life? Polygamous nations have never been industrial inventors, have contributed little to science. They have usually ruined the fertility of the lands they have occupied. They have been heavily weighted with the lethargy of a system that appeals to nothing but the most primitive instincts and vices of man.

The monogamous have been the forceful nations. Rome conquered the world while she was monogamous, and lost control of it when she dropped to the moral level of the sex corruption of the peoples that she had conquered. The Teuton trundled into and over Europe in ox-carts mounted on solid wood trucks. But his cart carried one wife, and now all polygamy is held under the trained guns of the Tenton.

There may seem to be two exceptions—the establishment of the Mogul empire in India and the subjugation of Western Asia and Eastern Europe by the Turk. That in both cases there was great success in war is granted. They were authorized by their religion to exhibit the frenzy of bloodshed and indulge in lust. Indeed, enjoyment of the latter was a bright hope for the life to come. But when they had possession of a country, and massacres and ravishing were over, what then? For what is mankind

indebted to them?

A Lyric.

A lyric has been put in the hand of the present writer by a friend who wrote it at the last date of the title. It is one of the lyrics of the centuries in its synthesis of history and in its insight into the forces physical, moral and immoral at work in the Mogul empire of India. Notice the dates. The text will show what took place between.

THE MOGUL 1525-1857

A war steed coursed out the wind-swept north,

Jarring the crags with hoofs of fire,

Snuffing far battle with nostril wide,

Neighing the joy of fierce desire.

The crisping herbage of arid plains

Had toughened his sinews like bands of steel;

The snow-fed waters of Zarafshan

Had nerved the might of a northern will.

The war steed grazed in the fertile meads,

Drinking the waters of indolent streams:

He rested at eve on bloom-dight beds,

Toyed with by maidens in the goldening gleams.

They charmed his ear with dalliant song:

They closed his eyes in witchery’s glee:

They fed him the vineyards’ wildering draught—

He slept in the breath of the lotus tree.

White bones lie strewn on the flowering mead,

In flesh-rank grass grown high and dark.

The carrion bird hath flown—hath died—

Riseth the war-horse? Neigheth? Hark!

—JOSIAH TORREY READE, Amherst, 1856.

The above lyric may be taken as the epitaph of any polygamous nation. The last words are significant —"Neigheth? Hark!" Would the old war steed arise? "Hark!" The Sepoy rebellion was on! We "hearkened," but the rebellion went to pieces and an end was put to the Mogul empire. We have listened for half a century and heard no sound. We hear mutterings now, but the end will be as before—even if the "war-horse" riseth and is victorious. He will then again lie down in "flesh-rank grass grown high and dark," and the "carrion bird" will fly from his "white bones." Streams cannot rise higher than their fountains. The causes remaining, the same effects will follow.

See DIVORCE; FAMILY; MARRIAGE.

C. Caverno

POMEGRANATE

pom’-gran-at, pom-gran’-at, pum’-gran-at (rimmon (tree and fruit); the Hebrew name is similar to the Arabic, Aramaic and Ethiopic; rhoa):

1. A Tree Characteristic of Palestine: One of the most attractive and most characteristic of the fruit trees of Syria, probably indigenous to Persia, Afghanistan and the neighborhood of the Caucasus, but introduced to Palestine in very ancient times. The spies brought specimens of figs and pomegranates, along with grapes, from the Vale of Eshcol (Nu 13:23). Vines, figs and pomegranates are mentioned (Nu 20:5) as fruits the Israelites missed in the wilderness; the promised land was to be one "of wheat and barley, and vines and fig-trees and pomegranates" (De 8:8), a promise renewed in Hag 2:19. In the lamentation in Joe 1:11,12 we have the pomegranate, the palm tree and the apple tree represented as withered, "for joy is withered away from the sons of men."

2. The Fruit:

The pomegranate tree, Punica granatum (Natural Order, Granateae) occurs usually as a shrub or small

tree 10-15 ft. high, and is distinguished by its fresh green, oval leaves, which fall in winter, and its brilliant scarlet blossoms (compare So 7:12). The beauty of an orchard of pomegranates is referred to in So 4:13. The fruit which is ripe about September is apple-shaped, yellow-brown with a blush of red, and is surmounted by a crown-like hard calyx; on breaking the hard rind, the white or pinkish, translucent fruits are seen tightly packed together inside. The juicy seeds are sometimes sweet and sometimes somewhat acid, and need sugar for eating. The juice expressed from the seeds is made into a kind of syrup for flavoring drinks, and in ancient days was made into wine: "I would cause thee to drink of spiced wine, of the juice (margin "sweet wine") of my pomegranate" (So 8:2). The beauty of a cut section of pomegranate—or one burst open naturally, when fully ripe—may have given rise to the comparison in So 4:3; 6:7: "Thy temples are like a piece of a pomegranate." The rind of the pomegranate contains a very high percentage of tannic acid, and is employed both as a medicine and for tanning, particularly in making genuine morocco leather.

Whether the pomegranate tree in Migron under which Saul is said (1Sa 14:2) to have abode with his 600 men was really a tree or a place, Rimmon, is doubtful.

See RIMMON.

3. The Pomegranate in Art:

A large number of references to the pomegranate are to the use of the form of the fruit in ornamentation, in which respect it appears among the Hebrews to have something of the position of the lotus bud as a decorative motive in Egypt. It was embroidered in many colors on the skirts of Aaron’s garments, together with golden bells (Ex 28:33 f; 39:24-26 compare Ecclesiasticus 45:9). Hiram of Tyre introduced the pomegranate into his brass work ornamentation in the temple: "So he made the pillars; and there were two rows round about upon the one network, to cover the capitals that were upon the top of the pillars" (margin "So the Syriac The Hebrew has ‘pomegranates’")(1Ki 7:18). "And the pomegranates were two hundred, in rows round about upon the other capital" (1Ki 7:20 compare also Ps 7:42; 2Ki 25:17; 2Ch 3:16; 4:13).

E. W. G. Masterman

POMMEL

pum’-el (2Ch 4:12,13): the Revised Version (British and American) reads "bowl" (which see).

POND

See CISTERN; POOL.

PONDER

pon’-der: Occurs in the King James Version 5 times in the Book of Proverbs and nowhere else in the Old Testament. In each case it means "to consider carefully," "to weigh mentally." In Pr 4:26 and 5:21, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "make level." In Pr 5:6, it drops out entirely in the Revised Version (British and American). In Pr 21:2 and 24:12, "weigh" is substituted for "ponder." The one New Testament passage is Lu 2:19; here the Revised Version (British and American) has "pondering" where the King James Version has "and pondered."

PONTIUS

pon’-shi-us, pon’-ti-us.

See PILATE.

PONTUS

pon’-tus (Pontos): Was an important province in the northeastern part of Asia Minor, lying along the south shore of the Black Sea. The name was geographical, not ethnical, in origin, and was first used to designate that part of Cappadocia which bordered on the "Pontus," as the Euxine was often termed. Pontus proper extended from the Halys River on the West to the borders of Colchis on the East, its interior boundaries meeting those of Galatia, Cappadocia and Armenia. The chief rivers besides the Halys were the Iris, Lycus and Thermodon. The configuration of the country included a beautiful but narrow, riparian margin, backed by a noble range of mountains parallel to the coast, while these in turn were broken by the streams that forced their way from the interior plains down to the sea; the valleys, narrower or wider, were fertile and productive, as were the wide plains of the interior such as the Chiliokomon and Phanaroea. The mountain slopes were originally clothed with heavy forests of beech, pine and oak of different species, and when the country was well afforested, the rainfall must have been better adequate than now to the needs of a luxuriant vegetation.

The first points in the earliest history of Pontus emerge from obscurity, much as the mountain peaks of its own noble ranges lift their heads above a fog bank. Thus, we catch glimpses of Assyrian culture at Sinope and Amisus, probably as far back as the 3rd millennium BC. The period of Hittite domination in Asia Minor followed hard after, and there is increasing reason to suppose that the Hittites occupied certain leading city sites in Pontus, constructed the artificial mounds or tumuli that frequently meet the eyes of modern travelers, hewed out the rock tombs, and stamped their character upon the early conditions. The home of the Amazons, those warrior priestesses of the Hittites, was located on the banks of the Thermodon, and the mountains rising behind Terme are still called the "Amazon Range"; and the old legends live still in stories about the superior prowess of the modern women living there.

See ASIA MINOR, ARCHAEOLOGY OF.

As the Hittite power shrunk in extent and force, by the year 1000 BC bands of hardy Greek adventurers

appeared from the West sailing along the Euxine main in quest of lands to exploit and conquer and colonize. Cape Jason, which divides the modern mission fields of Trebizond and Marsovan, preserves the memory of the Argonants and the Golden Fleece. Miletus, "greatest of the Ionic towns," sent out its colonists, swarm after swarm, up through the Bosphorus, and along the southern shore of the Black Sea. They occupied Sinope, the northern-most point of the peninsula with the best harbor and the most commanding situation. Sinope was in Paphlagonia, but politically as well as commercially enjoyed intimate relations with the Pontic cities. Settlers from Sinope, reinforced by others from Athens direct, pressed on and founded Amisus, the modern Samsoun, always an important commercial city. Another colony from Sinope founded Trebizond, near which Xenophon and the Ten Thousand reached the sea again after they had sounded the power of Persia and found it hollow at Cunaxa. Among the cities of the interior, picturesque Amasia in the gorge of the Iris River witnessed the birth of Strabo in the 1st century BC, and to the geographer Strabo, more than to any other man, is due our knowledge of Pontus in its early days. Zille, "built upon the mound of Semiramis," contained the sanctuary of Anaitis, where sacrifices were performed with more pomp than in any other place. Comana, near the modern Tokat, was a city famous for the worship of the great god Ma. Greek culture by degrees took root along the coast; it mixed with, and in turn was modified by, the character of the older native inhabitants.

When the Persians established their supremacy in Asia Minor with the overthrow of Lydia, 546 BC, Pontus was loosely joined to the great empire and was ruled by Persian satraps. Ariobarzanes, Mithradates and Pharnaces are the recurring names in this dynasty of satraps which acquired independence about 363 and maintained it during the Macedonian period. The man that first made Pontus famous in history was Mithradates VI, surnamed Eupator. Mithradates was a typical oriental despot, gifted, unscrupulous, commanding. Born at Sinope 136 BC and king at Amasia at the age of twelve, Mithradates was regarded by the Romans as "the most formidable enemy the Republic ever had to contend with." By conquest or alliance he widely extended his power, his chief ally being his son-in-law Dikran, or Tigranes, of Armenia, and then prepared for the impending struggle with Rome. The republic had acquired Pergamus in 133 BC and assumed control of Western Asia Minor. There were three Roman armies in different parts of the peninsula when war broke out, 88 BC. Mithradates attacked them separately and over-threw them all. He then planned and executed a general massacre of all the Romans in Asia Minor, and 80,000 persons were cut down. Sulla by patient effort restored the fortunes of Rome, and the first war ended in a drawn game; each party had taken the measure of its antagonist, but neither had been able to oust the other. The second war began in the year 74, with Lucullus as the Roman general. Lucullus took Amisus by siege, chased Mithradates to Cabira, modern Niksar, scattered his army and drove the oriental sultan out of his country. Subsequently on his return to Rome, Lucullus carried from Kerasoun the first cherries known to the western world. In the third war the hero on the Roman side was the masterful Pompey, appointed in 66 BC. As a result of this war, Mithradates was completely vanquished. His dominions were finally and permanently incorporated in the territories of the Roman republic. The aged king, breathing out wrath and forming impossible plans against his lifelong enemies, died in exile in the Crimea from poison administered by his own hand.

Most of Pontus was for administrative purposes united by the Romans with the province of Bithynia, though the eastern part subsisted as a separate kingdom under Polemon and his house, 36 BC to 63 AD, and the southwestern portion was incorporated with the province of Galatia. It was during the Roman

period that Christianity entered this province. There were Jews dwelling in Pontus, devout representatives of whom were in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 2:9). Paul's associates, Aquila and Priscilla, were originally from here (Ac 18:2). The sojourners of the Dispersion are included in the address of the first Epistle of Peter together with the people of four other provinces in Asia Minor (1Pe 1:1). Local traditions connect the apostles Andrew and Thaddeus with evangelistic labors in this region. They are said to have followed the great artery of travel leading from Caesarea Mazaca to Sinope. Pliny, governor of Bithynia and Pontus 111-113 AD, found Christians under his authority in great numbers (see BITHYNIA), and Professor Ramsay argues that Pliny's famous letters, Numbers 96 and 97, written to the emperor Traian on the subject of the treatment of Christians under his government (see PERSECUTION), were composed in view of conditions in Amisus (Church in Roman Empire, 224, 225).

The Roman empire in the East was gradually merged into the Byzantine, which is still known to the local inhabitants as the empire of "Roum," i.e. Rome. Pontus shared the vicissitudes of this rather unfortunate government until, in 1204, a branch of the Byzantine imperial family established in Pontus a separate small state with its capital at Trebizond. Here the house of the Grand Comneni, sheltered between the sea and the mountain ranges, maintained its tinsel sovereignty to and beyond the fall of Constantinople. In 1461 Trebizond was taken by Mohammed the Conqueror, since which date Pontus, with its conglomerate population of Turks, Armenians, Greeks and fragments of other races, has been a part of the Ottoman empire.

G. E. White

POOL; POND; RESERVOIR

pool, pond, rez'-er-vwar, rez'-er-vwar ((1) berekhah, "pool"; compare Arabic birkat, "pool"; compare berakhah, "blessing," and Arabic barakat, "blessing"; (2) agham, "pool," "marsh," "reeds"; compare Arabic 'ajam, "thicket," "jungle"; (3) miqwah, "reservoir," the King James Version "ditch" (Isa 22:11); (4) miqweh, "pond," the King James Version "pool" (Ex 7:19); miqweh ha-mayim, English Versions of the Bible "gathering together of the waters" (Ge 1:10); miqweh-mayim, "a gathering of water," the King James Version "plenty of water" (Le 11:36); (5) kolumbethra, "pool," literally, "a place of diving," from kolumbao, "to dive"): Lakes (see LAKE) are very rare in Syria and Palestine, but the dry climate, which is one reason for the fewness of lakes, impels the inhabitants to make artificial pools or reservoirs to collect the water of the rain or of springs for irrigation and also for drinking. The largest of these are made by damming water courses, in which water flows during the winter or at least after showers of rain. These may be enlarged or deepened by excavation. Good examples of this are found at Diban and Madeba in Moab. Smaller pools of rectangular shape and usually much wider than deep, having no connection with water courses, are built in towns to receive rain from the roofs or from the surface of the ground. These may be for common use like several large ones in Jerusalem, or may belong to particular houses. These are commonly excavated to some depth in the soil or rock, though the walls are likely to rise above the surface. Between these and cylindrical pits or cisterns no sharp line can be drawn.

The water of springs may be collected in large or small pools of masonry, as the pool of Siloam (Joh 9:7). This is commonly done for irrigation when the spring is so small that the water would be lost by absorption or evaporation if it were attempted to convey it continuously to the fields. The pool (Arabic, birkat) receives the trickle of water until it is full. The water is then let out in a large stream and conducted where it is needed. (In this way by patient labor a small trickling spring may support much vegetation.)

‘Agham does not seem to be used of artificial pools, but rather of natural or accidental depressions containing water, as pools by the Nile (Ex 7:19; 8:5), or in the wilderness (Ps 107:35; 114:8; Isa 14:23; 35:7; 41:18; 42:15). In Isa 19:10 the rendering of the King James Version, "all that make sluices and ponds for fish," would be an exception to this statement, but the Revised Version (British and American) has "all they that work for hire shall be grieved in soul." Miqweh occurs with ‘agham in Ex 7:19 of the ponds and pools by the Nile. Berekhah is used of "the pool of Gibeon" (2Sa 2:13), "the pool in Hebron" (2Sa 4:12), "the pool of Samaria" (1Ki 22:38), "the pools in Heshbon" (So 7:4), "the pool of Shelah," the King James Version "Shiloah" (Ne 3:15); compare "the waters of Shiloah" (Isa 8:6). We read in Ec 2:6, "I made me pools of water, to water therefrom the forest where trees were reared." There is mention of "the upper pool" (2Ki 18:17; Isa 7:3; 36:2), "the lower pool" (Isa 22:9), "the king’s pool" (Ne 2:14). Isa 22:11 has, "Ye made also a reservoir (miqwah) between the two walls for the water of the old pool (berekhah)." Kolumbethra is used of the pool of Bethesda (Joh 5:2,4,7) and of the pool of Siloam (Joh 9:7,11).

See also CISTERN; NATURAL FEATURES; BJ, V, iv, 2.

Alfred Ely Day

POOLS OF SOLOMON

poolz.

See CISTERN; POOL.

POOR

poor (’ebhyon, dal, ‘ani, rush; ptochos):

I. In the Old Testament.

The poor have great prominence in the Bible; it is said, indeed, that there should be no poor among the Hebrews because Yahweh should so greatly bless them (De 15:4 the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version margin); but this was only to be realized on certain conditions of obedience (De 15:5), and in De 15:11 it is Said,"the poor will never cease out of the land"; but they were to see to it that none was left in destitution. The very foundation of the Hebrew religion was God’s pity

on a poor and oppressed people.

1. The Terms Employed:

The words for "poor" are chiefly ‘ebhyon, "desirous," "needy," "poor" (Ex 23:6, etc.); dal, "moving," "swaying," hence, weak, poor, lowly (Ex 23:3, etc.); dallah, "poverty," "weakness" (2Ki 25:12, etc.); rush, perhaps "to shake," "tremble," "to be poor," "impoverished" (1Sa 18:23, etc.); ‘ani, also ‘anaw, "poor," "oppressed," from ‘anah, "to bend" or "bow down (Ex 22:25, etc.); ‘aneh, Aramaic (Da 4:27), chelekhah, "wretchedness" (Av Ps 10:8,14); yarash, "to make poor" (1Sa 2:7); machsor, "want" (Pr 21:17); micken, "a needy one" (Ec 4:13; 9:15 bis, 16).

2. Representations:

(1) Generally.—God (Yahweh and ‘Elohim) is represented as having a special care for "the poor," which was illustrated in the deliverance of the nation from Egyptian poverty and bondage and was never to be forgotten by them (De 24:22); as punishing the oppressors of the poor and rewarding those who were kind to them; God Himself was the Protector and Saviour of the poor (Ex 22:23): "If thou afflict them at all, and they cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry; and my wrath shall wax hot," etc. (De 15:9; 24:15; 1Sa 2:8; Job 31:16; Ps 9:18; 12:5; Pr 19:17; Isa 25:4; Ec 5:8, "one higher than the high regardeth," etc.).

(2) Liberality to the poor is specially enjoined (De 15:7 f), and they were to beware of self-deception and grudging in this (De 15:9,10).

(3) Special provisions were made on behalf of the poor:

(a) Every third year a tithe was to be given "unto the Levite, to the sojourner, to the fatherless and to the widow" that Yahweh might bless them (De 14:28,29; 26:12 f);

(b) the poor were to have the free use of all that grew spontaneously in field or vineyard during the Sabbatic year (Ex 23:10 f; Le 25:5,6);

(c) each year the gleanings of the fields and vineyards should belong to the poor, the corners of fields were to be left for them, and if a sheaf was forgotten it should remain (Le 19:9,10; 23:22; De 24:19);

(d) fruit and ripe grain in a field might be eaten by any hungry person, but none should be carried away (De 23:24,25);

(e) in the Feast of Weeks the poor were to participate (De 16:9-12);

(f) every seventh year there should be a "release" of debts (De 15:1 f) ; in the seventh year of servitude

the Hebrew bond-servant should go free (Ex 21:2), or in the Jubilee, if that came first, on which occasion —the fiftieth year—property that had been sold returned to its owner or his family (Le 25:8-17);

(g) they were to lend readily to the poor, and no interest or increase was to be taken from their brethren (Ex 22:25; Le 25:35-37; De 15:7 f); in Le 25:39, no poor Hebrew was to be made a bond-servant, and, if a hired servant, he was not to be ruled with rigor (25:43); his hire was to be given him daily (Le 19:13; De 24:15); no widow's raiment was to be taken in pledge (De 24:17), nor the handmill, nor the upper millstone so essential for daily life (De 24:6), a man's garment should be returned to him before sundown, and no house should be entered to seize or fetch any pledge (De 24:10-13); breach of these laws should be sin and their observance righteousness (De 24:13,15, etc.; see ALMS, ALMSGIVING);

(h) justice was to be done to the poor (Ex 23:6; De 27:19, "Cursed be he that wresteth the justice due to the sojourner, fatherless, and widow"); (i) offerings were graduated according to means (Le 5:7; 12:8).

(4) Definite penalties were not always attached to those laws, and the prophets and psalmists have many complaints of the unjust treatment and oppression of the poor, contrary to the will of God, and frequent exhortations to justice and a due regard for them (Ps 10:2,9; 12:5; 14:6; Isa 3:14,15; Jer 2:34; Eze 16:49, "the iniquity of .... Sodom"; Eze 18:12,17; 22:29; Am 2:7; 4:1; Hab 3:14; compare Job 20:19; 24:9,14, etc.; Pr 14:31).

(5) The duty of caring for the poor is frequently and strongly set forth and divine promises attached to its fulfillment (Ps 41:1; 72:12 ff; Pr 17:5; 22:9; 28:3,17; Isa 58:7; Jer 22:16; Eze 18:17; Da 4:27; Zec 7:10, etc.; compare Job 29:12,16; 30:25; 31:19; Ps 112:9).

(6) The day of the divine manifestation, the times of the Messiah, should bring deliverance and rejoicing to the poor (Ps 72:12-15; Isa 11:4, "With righteousness shall he judge the poor," etc.; Isa 14:30; 29:19; 61:1 the Revised Version margin).

(7) The equality of rich and poor before God and the superiority of the righteous poor to the ungodly rich, etc., are maintained (Pr 19:1,22; 22:1,2; Ec 4:13).

(8) Ways in which men can willfully make themselves poor are mentioned (Pr 6:11; 10:4; 12:24; 13:4,18; 14:23; 20:13; 21:5,17; 23:21; 28:19).

3. The Godly Poor:

The chief words given above all mean poor, literally, but ‘ani (rendered also "afflicted") may also denote Israel as a nation in its afflictions and low estate, e.g. Ps 68:10; Isa 41:17; 49:13; 51:21; 54:11; in Ze 3:12, it is "the ideal Israel of the future." Dr. Driver remarks (art. "Poor," HDB) that such passages show that ‘ani (as also its frequent parallel ‘ebhyon, and, though somewhat less distinctly, dal) came gradually "to denote the godly poor, the suffering righteous, the persons who, whether ‘bowed down’ or ‘needy’ or ‘reduced,’ were the godly servants of Yahweh." The humble poor became in fact distinguished as the

line in which faithfulness to Yahweh was maintained and spiritual religion developed. The less frequent word ‘anaw, often translated "meek," "humble," is regarded (see Driver in the place cited.) as having from the first a moral and religious significance. It is used of Moses (Nu 12:3) and occurs in Ps 10:12,17; 22:26; 25:9, etc.; Pr 3:34; 16:19; Isa 29:19; 32:7; 61:1; Am 2:7; Ze 2:3.

II. In the New Testament.

In the New Testament ptochos, "trembling," "poor," "beggar," is almost exclusively the word translated "poor." It does not occur very frequently, but we see the same regard for the poor maintained as we have in the Old Testament; besides, the new principle of love and the example of Him who "though he was rich, yet for your sakes .... became poor" (ptocheuo, 2Co 8:9) necessarily carry in them this regard even more fully than in the Old Testament. Jesus announced His mission (Lu 4:18) by quoting Isa 61:1, "to preach good tidings (the King James Version "the gospel") to the poor" (or meek or humble); He gave as a proof of His Messiahship the fact that "the poor have the gospel (or good news of the Kingdom) preached to them" (Mt 11:5; Lu 7:22); according to Lu 6:20, He pronounced a beatitude on the pious "poor" because the kingdom of God was theirs; in Mt 5:3 it is "the poor in spirit" (the humble); we have the injunction to "give to the poor" (Mt 19:21; Mr 10:21; Lu 18:22) who are "always with you" (Mt 26:11; Mr 14:7; Joh 12:8), which does not mean that there must always be "the poor," but that, in contrast with Himself who was soon to leave them, the poor should remain and kindness could be shown to them at any time, which was His own practice (Joh 13:29); we are enjoined to call not the rich or well-to-do to our entertainments, but the poor (Lu 14:13; compare Lu 14:21); Zaccheus cited in his favor the fact that he gave ‘half of his goods to the poor’ (Lu 19:8); special notice was taken by Jesus of the poor widow’s contribution (Lu 21:3). The first church showed its regard for the poor in the distribution of goods "according as any man had need" (Ac 2:45; 4:32; 6:1); when the council at Jerusalem freed the Gentiles from the yoke of Judaism, they made it a condition, Paul says, "that we should remember the poor; which very thing I was also zealous to do" (Ga 2:10); contributions were accordingly made "for the poor among the saints that are at Jerus" (Ro 15:26), and it was in conveying such contributions that Paul got into the circumstances that led to his arrest. God’s ability and will to provide for those who give to the poor is quoted from Ps 112:9 (2Co 9:9); James specially rebukes certain Christians of his day for their partiality for the rich and their dishonor of the poor (Jas 2:5-9), and John asks how, in the man who "hath the world’s goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him," the love of God can dwell (1 Joh 3:17,18).

Ptochos is translated "beggar" (Lu 16:20,22) and "beggarly" (Ga 4:9); penes, "one who works for his daily bread," "a poor man," is the word in 2Co 9:9; the poor widow of Mr 12:42 is described in Lu 21:2 as penichros, "very poor."

III. In the Apocrypha.

In the Apocrypha the poor are often mentioned; God’s regard for them (Ecclesiasticus 21:5 (ptochos); 35:12,13); their oppression and wrongs (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:10 (penes); Ecclesiasticus 13:3,19,23 (ptochos); Baruch 6:28); the duty of care for and of giving to the poor (Tobit 4:7 (ptochos);

Ecclesiasticus 29:8 (tapeinos); 29:9 (penes); 34:20-22); of justice and kindness to such (Ecclesiasticus 4:1,5,8; 7:32; 10:23 (ptochos)); "poor" in the sense of pitiable occurs in 2 Macc 4:47 (talaiporos), the Revised Version (British and American) "hapless."

IV. The Revised Version (British and American) Changes.

For "the poor of this world" (Jas 2:5) the Revised Version (British and American) has "them that are poor as to the world"; for "The poor .... shall trust in it" (Isa 14:32), "In her shall the afflicted .... take refuge"; instead of "Whereas also he that is born in his kingdom becometh poor" (Ec 4:14), "Yea, even in his kingdom he was born poor"; "poor" for "humble" (Ps 9:12; 10:12, margin "meek"), for "lowly" (Pr 16:19, margin "meek").

W. L. Walker

POPLAR

pop'-lar (libhneh, "whiteness"; sturakinos, "storax" (Ge 30:37), leuke, "poplar" (Ho 4:13) (libhneh is so similar to the Arabic libna, the storax, that the latter certainly has the first claim to be the true translation)): "Jacob took him rods of fresh poplar," margin "storax tree" (Ge 30:37). "They .... burn incense upon the hills, under oaks and poplars and terebinths, because the shadow thereof is good" (Ho 4:13). In the latter reference the conjunction of the shrub, storax, with two great trees like the oak and terebinth—even though they all grow in the mountains—is strange. The storax cannot give a shade comparable with these trees. Had we other evidence of the storax being a sacred tree among the Hebrews, it might explain the difficulty.

The storax, Styrax officinalis (Natural Order Styraceae), is a very common shrub in Palestine which occasionally attains the height of 20 feet. The under surfaces of its oval leaves are covered with whitish hairs, and it has many beautiful pure-white flowers like orange blossoms—hence, its name "whiteness."

The poplar, the traditional translation in Ho 4:13, flourishes in many parts of Palestine. The white poplar, Populus alba, Arabic Haur, is common everywhere; Euphratica occurs especially in the Jordan valley; the black poplar, P. nigra, and the Lombardy poplar, P. pyramidalis—probably an importation—are both plentiful in the plain of Coele-Syria, around Damascus and along the river banks of Syria.

E. W. G. Masterman

PORATHA

po-ra'-tha, por'-a-tha (pora-tha'): One of the sons of Haman (Es 9:8). The etymology is uncertain; perhaps from the Persian purdata, "given by fate."

PORCH

porch: Chiefly in the Old Testament ‘alam, used of the temples of Solomon and Ezekiel (see TEMPLE); once micderon, a "vestibule," in Jud 3:23. In the New Testament, the word occurs in connection with the high priest’s palace (Mt 26:71, pulon; Mr 14:68, proaulion), and as the rendering of stoa, a "portico," in Joh 5:2 (pool of Bethesda); and Joh 10:23; Ac 3:11; 5:12.

See PORCH, PORTICO, SOLOMON’S.

PORCH, PORTICO, SOLOMON’S

por’-ti-ko, (he stoa he kaloumene Solomontos): This important element of Herod’s temple, preserving in its name a traditional connection with Solomon, is thrice referred to in the New Testament, namely, in Joh 10:23; Ac 3:11, "the porch that is called Solomon’s"; and Ac 5:12. In these passages the Greek word stoa is translated "porch" but in the Revised Version margin of Ac 3:11 more correctly "portico". In architecture a "porch" is strictly an exterior structure forming a covered approach to the entrance of a building; a "portico" is an ambulatory, consisting of a roof supported by columns placed at regular intervals—a roofed colonnade. The portico bearing Solomon’s name was that running along the eastern wall in the Court of the Gentiles of Herod’s temple. It had double columns, while that on the South known as the Royal Portico had four rows (compare Josephus, Ant, XV, xi, 3; BJ, V, v, and see TEMPLE, HEROD’S). The portico was the scene of Christ’s teaching at the Feast of the Dedication (Joh 10:23), and was flocked to by the multitude after the healing of the lame man (Ac 3:11). There the apostles preached and wrought other miracles (Ac 5:12).

W. Shaw Caldecott

PORCIUS FESTUS

por’-shus.

See FESTUS.

PORCUPINE

por’-ku-pin (qippodh (Isa 14:23; 34:11; Ze 2:14) the King James Version "bittern," the Revised Version (British and American) "porcupine"; Septuagint echinos "hedgehog"; qippoz (Isa 34:15), the King James Version "great owl," the English Revised Version "arrow-snake," the American Standard Revised Version "dart-snake"; Septuagint echinos; compare Arabic qunfud, or qunfudh, "hedgehog" or "porcupine." qippodh, is referred to the root qaphadh, "to draw one’s self together" or "to roll oneself up," while qipoz is referred to the root qaphaz, and the root qaphats, "to draw together in order to spring." The resemblance between all these words, including the Arabic is obvious, and it is to be noted

that the Septuagint has echinos in all the places cited):

The Greek echinos is the hedgehog. The Arabic kunfudh is used in some localities for the hedgehog and in others for the porcupine, which is also called nis. The hedgehog is also called kibbabat-ush-shauk, or "ball of spines." These two animals are both found in Syria and Palestine, and, while both have spines, they are very different animals, though often confounded. The hedgehog, Erinaceus europeus, is one of the Insectivora. It eats not only insects but also snakes and other small animals, as well as fruits and roots. It is about 10 inches long, covered with short spines, and rolls itself into a ball when attacked. It inhabits the countries bordering the Mediterranean. The porcupine, Hystrix cristata, is a rodent, about 26 inches long, having long spines. It is herbivorous. It backs rapidly at its foes, thrusting its sharp spines into their flesh, not shooting its spines, as is often stated. It inhabits most of Europe and Asia. It is very different from the Canadian porcupine, Erethizon dorsatus, as well as from the tree porcupines of Mexico and Central and South America.

As to the rendering "bittern" for qippodh (Isa 14:23; 34:15; Ze 2:14), while the etymology favors "hedgehog," the context favors a bird, especially in Isa 34:11, though it cannot be said that in any of the passages the context makes "hedgehog" an impossible rendering.

In Isa 34:15, for qippoz, most modern authorities (compare the Revised Version (British and American)) have some sort of serpent, referring to the Arabic root qafaz, "to spring." (See notes above on qaphaz and qaphats.) In this passage also the context is not unfavorable to a bird (compare the King James Version "great owl").

See BITTERN; OWL; SERPENT.

Alfred Ely Day

PORPHYRY

por’-fi-ri (in Es 1:6, the Revised Version margin has "porphyry" (the King James Version margin "porphyre") for bahaT, English Versions of the Bible "red (marble)"; the Septuagint has smaragdtes, which was a green stone): Porphyry is an igneous rock containing distinct crystals of feldspar in a feldspathic matrix. It may be purple or of other colors, as green. "Porphyry" is from porphureos, "purple."

PORPOISE

por’-pus (the Revised Version margin has "porpoise-skin" for ‘or tachash, the Revised Version (British and American) "sealskin," the King James Version "badgers’ skins" (Ex 25:5; 26:14; 35:7,23; 36:19; 39:34; Nu 4:6,8,10,11,12,14,25; Eze 16:10)): The word denotes leather used in the furnishings of the tabernacle (for shoes in Eze 16:10), and was probably the skin of the dugong, Halichore dugong, Arabic tukhas, which is found in the Red Sea.

See BADGER.

PORT; PORTER

port, por’-ter: "Port" in the sense of "gate" (of a city or building) is obsolete in modern English, and even in the King James Version is found only in Ne 2:13. "Porter," as "gate-keeper," however, is still in some use, but "porter" now (but never in the English Versions of the Bible) generally means a burden-carrier. In the Old Testament, except in 2Sa 18:26; 2Ki 7:10,11, the porter (sho‘er) is a sacred officer of the temple or tabernacle, belonging to a particular family of the Levites, with a share in the sacred dues (Ne 13:5; 12:47). The "porters" are mentioned only in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and Chronicles has a special interest in them, relating that their duties were settled as far back as the time of David (1Ch 26:1-19), and that the office extended further to the first settlement of Palestine and even to Moses’ day (1Ch 9:17-26). The office was evidently one of some dignity, and the "chief-porters" (1Ch 9:26) were important persons. For some inscrutable reason the Revised Version (British and American) renders sho‘er by "doorkeeper" in 1Ch 15-26, but not elsewhere.

See DOORKEEPER.

Burton Scott Easton

PORTION; PART

por’-shun: As far as a distinction between these words is possible in English, it lies in the fact that a "portion" is a "part" about whose destiny something is implied (Ps 142:5, etc.). The Hebrew has no two synonyms similarly related, and in consequence the use of the words in English Versions of the Bible is settled either by rather arbitrary considerations (menah, is always "portion" in the Revised Version (British and American), but is "part" in the King James Version, Ex 29:26; Le 7:33; 8:29) or by the context, irrespective of the Hebrew word used. So "part" and "portion" both represent dabhar, 1Ki 6:38; Ne 12:47; peh, Zec 13:8; De 21:17; chebhel, Jos 17:5 (Revised Version); Eze 47:13; meros, Lu 11:36; 12:46. And in the vast majority of cases in the Old Testament both words represent simply some derivative of chalaq, normally the noun cheleq.

Burton Scott Easton

POSIDONIUS

pos-i-do’-ni-us (Posidonios, al. Posidonios and Poseidon): One of the three envoys sent by the Syrian general Nicanor to treat with the Jews under Judas during his invasion of Judea, 161 BC (2 Macc 14:19). In 1 Macc 7:27 ff, proposals are sent by Nicanor to Judas, but no envoys are named, and it is there asserted in contradiction to 2 Maccabees that Judas broke off the negotiation because of the treacherous

designs of Nicanor.

POSSESS; POSSESSION

po-zes’, po-zesh’-un: "Possess" in modern English means normally only "keep in one’s possession." But in Elizabethan English it means also "take into possession," and, in fact, the word in the Old Testament always represents Hebrew verbs with the latter as their primary meaning (yarash, in nearly all cases, otherwise nachal, qanah, ‘achaz; Aramaic chacan). Consequently, in almost every case "take possession of" could be substituted advantageously for "possess," but the Revised Version (British and American) has not thought the change worth carrying through. In the Apocrypha and New Testament, however, the distinction has been made, the King James Version’s "possess" being retained for katecho, in 1Co 7:30; 2Co 6:10, but the same translation for ktaomai, is changed into "take us for a possession (Judith 8:22), "get" (Lu 18:12), "win" (Lu 21:19), and "possess himself of" (1Th 4:4, a very obscure passage). In the noun possession, on the other hand, no such ambiguity exists, and attention need be called only to the following passages. In De 11:6, the King James Version has, "all the substance that was in their possession," Hebrew "all that subsisted at their feet," the Revised Version (British and American) "every living thing that followed them." the King James Version uses "possession" loosely in Ac 28:7 for chorion, the Revised Version (British and American) "lands." peripoiesis, from peripoieo, "cause to remain over," "gain," rendered "God’s own possession" in Eph 1:14 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version "possession") and 1Pe 2:9 (the King James Version "peculiar," the King James Version margin "purchased"). "God’s own" is a gloss but is implied in the context.

Burton Scott Easton

POSSESSION, DEMONIACAL

de-mo-ni’-a-kal (Mt 4:24; 8:16, etc.).

See DEMON, DEMONIAC, DEMONOLOGY.

POST

post (ruts, "to run," ratsim, "runners"): The "runners" formed the royal guard (1Sa 22:17; 1Ki 14:27; 2Ki 11:4,13; see GUARD). From them were chosen the couriers who carried royal letters and dispatches throughout the kingdom (2Ch 30:6,10; Es 3:13,15; Jer 51:31). In the Persian service they were mounted on the swiftest horses (Es 8:10,14; compare Xenophon, Cyrop. viii.6,17; Herodotus viii.98). They had the right to command the service of either men or animals in order to expedite their progress (compare Mt 5:41; Mr 15:21, "compel," "impress").

Used in Job 9:25 and the King James Version The Wisdom of Solomon 5:9 (aggelia, the Revised Version (British and American) "message") of the swift passage of time.

See also HOUSE, II, 1, (4), (7).

M. O. Evans

POT

pot: A term used as the translation of a number of Hebrew and Greek words whose fundamental meaning seems to describe them as intended for the most part to hold liquid or semi-liquid substances, but the pots of Ex 27:3 are intended to hold ashes.

(1) cir, the most common word for "pot." It designates most frequently some household utensil, probably a pot or kettle for boiling. So 2Ki 4:38 ff; Ex 16:3; Jer 1:13 the King James Version; Eze 11:3,7,11, "caldron"; 24:3,6 the King James Version; Mic 3:3; Zec 14:21, etc. It is also used as the name of some vessel of the sanctuary. So Ex 27:3, where the context shows it was intended to hold ashes; 1Ki 7:45; 2Ch 4:16; 2Ki 25:14. In Ps 60:8; 108:9, it is a pot for washing.

(2) parur (Nu 11:8; 1Sa 2:14), a vessel for boiling; in Jud 6:19, a vessel for holding broth.

(3) dudh, rendered "pot" in Ps 81:6 in the King James Version, "basket" in the Revised Version (British and American); "pot" both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in Job 41:20.

(4) tsintseneth (Ex 16:33), the jar in which the manna was placed. This jar or pot is mentioned in Heb 9:4 under the name stamnos.

(5) ‘acon (2Ki 4:2), some kind of jar for holding oil.

(6) xestes (Mr 7:4), some kind of household utensil.

Mention may also be made of the word rendered "pot" in Le 6:28 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) renders more correctly by the general term "vessel"; for the King James Version "pots" (Ps 68:13) the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "sheepfolds." The root is uncertain. Those who render "sheepfolds" connect with the related root in Ge 49:14; Jud 5:16. Others render "fireplaces" or "ash heaps." See also "range for pots," in Le 11:35; "pots," Jer 35:5 the King James Version, correctly "bowls" the Revised Version (British and American); "refining pots" in Pr 17:3; 27:21.

See also FOOD.

Walter R. Betteridge

POTENTATE

po’-ten-tat (dunastes, "mighty one," from dunamai, "to be able"): A person who possesses great power and authority. Only in 1Ti 6:15, "the blessed and only Potentate" (= God). The same Greek word is used of Zeus in Sophocles (Ant. 608), and of God in Apocrypha (e.g. Sirach 46:5; 2 Macc 15:3,13). It is used of men in Lu 1:52 (the King James Version "the mighty," the Revised Version (British and American) "princes") and Ac 8:27 ("of great authority").

POTI-PHERA

po-tif’-e-ra (poTi phera‘; Egyptian Padipara, "the (one) given of the sun-god"; compare Hebrew Nathaniel, "the gift of God," Ge 41:45,50; 46:20): There is no certain evidence from Egypt that this name was in existence until the XXIInd Dynasty, about 950 BC. But names of the Hyksos period, and, indeed, any kind of Hyksos inscriptions, are so scarce on account of the destruction of Hyksos monuments by the Egyptians of later times that the absence of such names is really no evidence on the subject. The fact that this name has not been discovered earlier than 950 BC does not give any warrant for the claim that the narrative is of a late date.

M. G. Kyle

POTIPHAR

pot’-i-far (poTiphar; compare Egyptian Potiphera (Ge 39:1 f)): A high Egyptian official who became the master of Joseph. It is particularly mentioned that he was an Egyptian, i.e. one of the native Egyptian officials at the Hyksos court.

POTSHERD

pot’-shurd (cheres): A piece of earthenware (Job 2:8; Ps 22:15; Isa 45:9). the Revised Version (British and American) renders the word in Pr 26:23, "an earthen vessel," and in Job 41:30 substitutes "sharp potsherds" for "sharp stones." Sirach 22:7 refers to the art of "gluing a potsherd (ostrakon) together."

See HARSITH; OSTRACA.

POTSHERD GATE

(Jer 19:2).

See HARSITH.

POTTAGE

pot’-aj.

See FOOD, III.

POTTER’S FIELD

pot’-erz.

See ACELDAMA.

POTTER; POTTERY

pot’-er, pot’-er-i:

1. Historical Development

2. Forms

3. Methods of Production

4. Uses

5. Biblical Terms

6. Archaeological Significance

LITERATURE

1. Historical Development:

(1) Prehistoric.

The making of pottery ranks among the very oldest of the crafts. On the rocky plateaus of Upper Egypt, overlooking the Nile valley, are found the polished red earthenware pots of the prehistoric Egyptians. These are buried in shallow oval graves along with the cramped-up bodies of the dead and their chipped flint weapons and tools. These jars are the oldest examples of the potter’s article It is inconceivable that in the country of Babel, Egypt’s great rival in civilization, the ceramic arts were less developed at the same period, but the difference in the nature of the country where the first Mesopotamian settlement probably existed makes it unlikely that relics of the prehistoric dwellers of that country will ever be

recovered from under the debris of demolished cities and the underlying deposits of clay and silt.

(2) Babylonia.

The oldest examples of Babylonian ceramics date from the historical period, and consist of baked clay record tablets, bricks, drainage pipes, household shrines, as well as vessels for holding liquids, fruits and other stores. (See Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria, I, figures 159, 160, II, figures 163, 168.) Examples of pottery of this early period are shown in the accompanying figures. By the 9th to the 7th century BC the shaping of vessels of clay had become well developed. Fragments of pottery bearing the name of Esarhaddon establish the above dates.

(3) Egypt.

With the close of the neolithic period in Egypt and the beginning of the historical or dynastic period (4500-4000 BC) there was a decline in the pottery article The workmanship and forms both became bad, and not until the IVth Dynasty was there any improvement. In the meantime the process of glazing had been discovered and the art of making beautiful glazed faience became one of the most noted of the ancient Egyptian crafts. The potter’s wheel too was probably an invention of this date.

(4) Palestine.

The making of pottery in the land which later became the home of the children of Israel began long before this people possessed the land and even before the Phoenicians of the coast cities had extended their trade inland and brought the earthenware vessels of the Tyrian or Sidonian potters. As in Egypt and Babylonia, the first examples were hand-made without the aid of the wheel.

It is probable that Jewish potters learned their art from the Phoenicians. They at least copied Phoenician and Mycenaean forms. During their wanderings the children of Israel were not likely to make much use of earthenware vessels, any more than the Arabs do today. Skins, gourds, wooden and metal vessels were less easily broken.

To illustrate this, a party, of which the writer was a member, took on a desert trip the earthenware water jars specially made for travel, preferring them to the skin bottles such as the Arab guides carried, for the bottles taint the water. At the end of six days only one out of eight earthenware jars was left. One accident or another had broken all the others.

When the Israelites became settled in their new surroundings they were probably not slow in adopting earthenware vessels, because of their advantages, and their pottery gradually developed distinctive though decadent types known as Jewish.

Toward the close of the Hebrew monarchy the pottery of the land again showed the effect of outside influences. The red and black figured ware of the Greeks was introduced, and still later the less artistic

Roman types, and following these by several centuries came the crude glazed vessels of the Arabic or Saracenic period—forms which still persist.

2. Forms:

It is not within the limits of this article to describe in detail the characteristics of the pottery of the various periods. The accompanying illustrations taken from photographs of pottery in the Archaeological Museum of the Syrian Protestant College, Beirut, give a general idea of the forms. Any attempt at classification of Palestinian pottery must be considered more or less provisional, due to the uncertainty of origin of many forms. The classification of pre-Roman pottery here used is that adopted by Bliss and Macalister and based upon Dr. Petrie’s studies.

(1) Early Pre-Israelite, Called also "Amorite" (before 1500 BC).

Most of the vessels of this period are handmade and often irregular in shape. A coarse clay, turning red or black when burned, characterizes many specimens. Some are brick red. Specimens with a polished or burnished surface are also found.

(2) Late Pre-Israelite or Phoenician (1500-1000 BC).

From this period on, the pottery is all wheel-turned. The clay is of a finer quality and burned to a brown or red. The ware is thin and light. Water jars with pointed instead of fiat bases appear. Some are decorated with bands or lines of different colored meshes. Cypriote ware with its incised decorations was a like development of the period.

(3) Jewish (1000-300 BC).

Foreign influence is lost. The types which survive degenerate. New forms are introduced. Ordinary coarse clay burning red is used. Cooking pots are most characteristic. Many examples bear Hebrew stamps, the exact meaning of which is uncertain.

(4) Seleucidan.

Foreign influence again appears. Greek and other types are imported and copied. Ribbed surfaces are introduced. The old type of burnishing disappears.

(5) Roman and Saracenic.

Degenerate forms persisting till the present time.

(6) Present-day Pottery.

3. Methods of Production:

The clay as found in the ground is not suitable for use. It is dug out and brought to the vicinity of the pottery (the "potter's field," Mt 27:7) and allowed to weather for weeks. The dry material is then dumped into a cement-lined tank or wooden trough and covered with water. When the lumps have softened they are stirred in the water until all have disintegrated and a thin slimy mud or "slip" has been formed. In coast cities-the potteries are all near the sea, as the sea-water is considered better for the "slipping" process. The slip is drawn off into settling tanks. All stones and lumps remain behind. When the clay has settled, the water is drawn off and the plastic material is worked by treading with the feet (compare Isa 41:25; The Wisdom of Solomon 15:7). The clay used on the Syrian coast is usually a mixture of several earths, which the potters have learned by experience gives the right consistency. The prepared clay is finally packed away and allowed to stand another six months before using, during which time the quality, especially the plasticity, is believed to improve.

Before the invention of the potter's wheel the clay was shaped into vessels by hand. In all of the countries previously mentioned the specimens representing the oldest work are all hand-made. Chopped straw was usually added to the clay of these early specimens. This material is omitted in the wheel-shaped objects. In a Mt. Lebanon village which is noted for its pottery the jars are still made by hand. Throughout the country the clay stoves are shaped by hand out of clay mixed with straw.

The shaping of vessels is now done on wheels, the use of which dates back to earliest history. Probably the Egyptians were the first to use such a machine (IVth Dynasty). In their original form they were stone disks arranged to be turned by hand on a vertical axis. The wheel stood only a few inches above the ground, and the potter sat or squatted down on the ground before it as he shaped his object (see Wilkinson, Ancient Egypt, II, figure 397). The wheels used in Palestine and Syria today probably differ in no respect from those used in the potter's house visited by Jeremiah (Jer 18:1-6). The wheel or, to be more exact, wheels (compare Jer 18:3) are fitted on a square wooden or iron shaft about 3 ft. long. The lower disk is about 20 inches in diameter, and the upper one 8 inches or 12 inches. The lower end of the shaft is pointed and fits into a stone socket or bearing in which it rotates. A second bearing just below the upper disk is so arranged that the shaft inclines slightly away from the potter. The potter leans against a slanting seat, bracing himself with one foot so that he will not slide off, and with the sole of his other foot he kicks the upper face of the lower wheel, thus making the whole machine rotate. The lower wheel is often of stone to give greater momentum. With a marvelous dexterity, which a novice tries in vain to imitate, he gives the pieces of clay any shape he desires.

After the vessel is shaped it is dried and finally fired in a furnace or kiln. The ancient Egyptian kiln was much smaller than the one used today (Wilkhinson, II, 192). Most of the kilns are of the crudest form of the "up-draught" variety, i.e. a large chamber with perforated bottom and a fireplace beneath. The fire passes up through the holes, around the jars packed in tiers in the chamber, and goes out at the top. An interesting survival of an early Greek form is still used in Rachiyet-el-Fakhar in Syria. In this same village the potters also use the lead dross, which comes from the parting of silver, for glazing their jars (compare Pr 26:23). In firing pottery there are always some jars which come out imperfect. In unpacking

the kiln and storing the product others get broken. As a consequence the ground in the vicinity of a pottery is always strewn with potsherds (see also separate article). The ancient potteries can frequently be located by these sherds. The potter's field mentioned in Mt 27:7,10 was probably a field near a pottery strewn with potsherds, thus making it useless for cultivation although useful to the potter as a place in which to weather his clay or to dry his pots before firing.

4. Uses:

Pottery was used in ancient times for storing liquids, such as wine or oil, fruits, grains, etc. The blackened bottoms of pots of the Jewish period show that they were used for cooking. Earthenware dishes were also used for boiling clothes. Every one of these uses still continues. To one living in Bible lands today it seems inconceivable that the Hebrews did not readily adopt, as some writers disclaim, the porous earthen water jars which they found already in use in their new country. Such jars were used for carrying live coals to start a fire, and not only for drawing water, as they are today, but for cooling it (Isa 30:14). The evaporation of the water which oozes through the porous material cools down the contents of a jar, whereas a metal or leathern vessel would leave it tepid or tainted. They were also used for holding shoemaker's glue or wax; for filling up the cracks of a wall before plastering; ground up they are used as sand in mortar.

5. Biblical Terms:

Only a few of the Hebrew words for vessels of different sorts, which in all probability were made of pottery, have been translated by terms which indicate that fact (For cheres, and yatsar, see EARTHEN VESSELS; OSTRACA.) kadh, is translated "pitcher" in Ge 24:14 ff; Jud 7:16 ff; Ec 12:6 (compare keramion, Mr 14:13; Lu 22:10); "jar" in 1Ki 17:12 (compare hudria, Joh 4:28). The kadh corresponded in size and use to the Arabic jarrah (compare English derivative "jar"). The jarrah is used for drawing and storing water and less frequently for holding other liquids or solids. It is used as an proximate standard of measure. For example, a man estimates the capacity of a cistern in jirar (plural of jarrah). baqbuq, "a bottle," usually leathern, but in Jer 19:1,10 of pottery. This may have been like the Arabic ibriq, which causes a gurgling sound when liquid is turned from it. Baqbuq is rendered "cruse" in 1Ki 14:3.

keli "vessel," was of wood, metal or earthen-ware in Le 6:28; Ps 2:9; 31:12; Isa 30:14; Jer 19:11, etc.; compare ostrakinos, 2Co 4:7, etc.

pakh, is translated "vial" in 1Sa 10:1; 2Ki 9:1; see so-called pilgrim bottles.

koc also qasah "cup" or "bowl," translated "cup" in many passages, like Arabic ka's, which was formerly used for drinking instead of modern cups.

gabhia, translated "bowl" in Jer 35:5.

parur, translated "pots" in Nu 11:8; compare Jud 6:19; 1Sa 2:14; compare chutra, which is similar to Arabic.

kidr, commonly used for cooking today.

‘etsebh, "pot," Jer 22:28 the American Revised Version margin.

6. Archaeological Significance:

The chemical changes wrought in clay by weathering and firing render it practically indestructible when exposed to the weather and to the action of moisture and the gaseous and solid compounds found in the soil. When the sun-baked brick walls of a Palestinian city crumbled, they buried, often intact, the earthenware vessels of the period. In the course of time, perhaps after decades or centuries, another city was built on the debris of the former. The brick walls required no digging for foundations, and so the substrata were left undisturbed. After long periods of time the destruction, by conquering armies or by neglect, of succeeding cities, produced mounds rising above the surrounding country, sometimes to a height of 60 or 100 ft. A typical example of such a mound is Tell el-Chesy (? Lachish). Dr. Flinders Petrie, as a result of the study of the various strata of this mound, has formed the basis of a classification of Palestinian pottery (see 2, above). With a knowledge of the forms of pottery of each period, the excavator has a guide, though not infallible, to the date of the ruins he finds.

See also CRAFTS, II, 4.

Figurative: The shaping of clay into pottery typified the molding of the characters of individuals or nations by a master mind (Jer 18:1-6; Isa 29:16; 45:9; 64:8; Ro 9:20); commonplace (La 4:2; 2Ti 2:20); frailness (Ps 2:9; Isa 30:14; Jer 19:11; Da 2:41; 2Co 4:7; Re 2:27).

LITERATURE.

Publications of PEF, especially Bliss and Macalister, Excavations in Palestine; Excavations of Gezer; Bliss, A Mound of Many Cities; Flinders Petrie, Tell el-Ghesy; Bliss and Dickie, Excavations at Jerusalem; Perrot and Chipiez, History of Art (i) in Chaldea and Assyria, (ii) Sardinia and Judea, (iii) Cyprus and Phoenicia, (iv) Egypt; King and Hall, Egypt and Western Asia in Light of Modern Discoveries; S. Birch, History of Ancient Pottery; Wilkinson, The Ancient Egyptians; PEFQ; EB; HDB.

James A. Patch

POUND

pound (maneh; mna, litra; Latin, libra): Pound does not correctly represent the Hebrew maneh, which was more than a pound (see MANEH). The litra of Joh 12:3 and 19:39 is the Roman pound (libra) of 4,950 grains, which is less than a pound troy, being about 10 1/3 oz. In a monetary sense (its use in Lu

19:13-25) it is the mna, or maneh, which was either of silver or gold, the former, which is probably the one referred to by Luke, being equal to 6,17 British pounds, or about $33 (in 1915); the latter 102,10 British pounds or $510 (in 1915).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

Figurative: "Pound," like "talent," is used in the New Testament for intellectual gifts and spiritual endowments, as in the passage given above.

H. Porter

POVERTY

pov’-er-ti:

1. Old Testament References:

This word, found but once in the Old Testament (Ge 45:11) outside of the Book of Proverbs in which it occurs 11 times (6:11; 10:15; 11:24 the King James Version; 13:18; 20:13; 23:21; 24:34; 28:19,22 the King James Version; 30:8; 31:7), is a translation of yiwaresh, "to be poor," "to come to poverty" (Ge 45:11). Four different Hebrew words are used in the 11 references in Prov, all bearing the idea of being in need of the necessities of life, although a distinction is made between being in want and being in extreme want. Pr 18:23 well illustrates the general meaning of "poverty" as found in this book: "The poor (rush, "to be impoverished," "destitute") useth entreaties; but the rich answereth roughly."

2. New Testament References

"Poverty" occurs 3 times in the New Testament (2Co 8:2,9; Re 2:9) and is the translation of ptocheia, "to be reduced to a state of beggary or pauperism."

The teaching of the Bible on this subject would, however, be incomplete unless all the references to the "poor" were considered in this connection. Indeed the word for "poverty" has its root in the word for "poor" (ptochos; ‘ani, or dal).

See POOR.

3. Two Degrees of Poverty:

At least two degrees of poverty are recognized. The Old Testament does not distinguish between them as clearly as does the New Testament. The New Testament, for example, by its use of two words for "poor" sets forth this distinction. In 2Co 9:9, "he hath given to the poor," the word used is penes, which does

not indicate extreme poverty, but simply a condition of living from hand to mouth, a bare and scant livelihood, such as that made by the widow who cast her two mites into the treasury (Lu 21:2); while in such passages as 2Co 6:10: "As poor, yet making many rich," and Lu 6:20: "Blessed are ye poor" (ptochoi, a condition is indicated of abject beggary, pauperism, such as that in which we find Lazarus who was laid at the gate of the rich man's palace, begging even the crumbs which fell from the table of the rich man (Lu 16:20,21). It was into this latter condition that Christ voluntarily entered for our sakes: "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor (a mendicant, a beggar), that ye through his poverty might become rich" (2Co 8:9). Between 30 and 40 times in the New Testament this latter word is used.

4. Causes of Poverty:

The causes of poverty are failure of harvest and poor crops (Ne 5:1-3); devastation caused by enemies sweeping through the land; the oppression of the people by their own rulers (Isa 5:8); excessive interest, usury (Ne 5:1-5); persecution because of the faith (2Co 6; 8). Widows and orphans by reason of their desolate condition were in a special sense subject to poverty. Gluttony brings poverty (Pr 23:21), as does indolence (Pr 28:19).

God commanded His people to care for the poor. The exhortations to relieve poverty are numerous, especially in the Pentateuch. Those in poverty must be treated with kindness (De 15:7-11); must be allowed to glean in the vineyards (Le 19:10); to reap the harvest (Le 23:22; compare Ru 2:14-16); must not be neglected (Pr 28:27); nor dealt with harshly (Am 8:4-6); must be treated as equal before God (Pr 22:2); are to share in our hospitality (Lu 14:13,21). Indeed, the truth or falsity of a man's religion is to be tested, in some sense at least, by his relation to those in need (Jas 1:27). The year of Jubilee was intended to be of great benefit to the poor by restoring to them any possessions which they, by reason of their poverty, had been compelled to deed over to their creditors (Le 25:25-54; De 15:12-15). God required certain tithes from His people which were to be devoted to the helping of the poor and needy (De 14:28; 26:12,13). So in the New Testament the apostles lay special emphasis upon remembering the poor in the matter of offerings. Paul, especially, inculcated this duty upon the churches which he had rounded (Ro 15:26; Ga 2:10). The attitude of the early Christian church toward its poor is amply illustrated in that first attempt at communism in Ac 2; 4. James, in his Epistle, stingingly reminds his readers of the fact that they had grossly neglected the important matter of caring for the poor (chapter 2). Indeed, so strong is he in his plea for the care of the poor that he claims that the man who willfully neglects the needy thereby proves that the love of God has no place in his heart, and that he has consequently no real faith in God (2:14-26). Christians are exhorted to abound in the grace of hospitality, which, of course, is nothing less than kindness to those in need (Ro 12:13; 1Ti 6:18; 1 Joh 3:17).

See POOR.

The happiest mother and the noblest and holiest son that ever lived were among the poor. Jesus was born of poor parents, and had not where to lay His head (Mt 8:20), no money with which to pay tribute (Mt

17:27), no home to call His own (Joh 7:53; compare Joh 8:1), and was buried in a borrowed grave (Mt 27:57-61).

Figurative: Of course there is also a spiritual poverty indicated by the use of this word—a poverty in spiritual things: "Blessed are the poor in spirit." By this is meant, Blessed are they who feel that they have no self-righteousness, no worth of their own to present to Christ as a ground of their salvation, who feel their utter bankruptcy of spirit, who say "Nothing in my hand I bring." It is to this state of spirit that Christ refers in Re 3:17: "Because thou sayest, I am rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art the wretched one and miserable and poor and blind and naked."

William Evans

POWDERS

pou'-derz ('abheqath rokhel): The "powders of the merchant" in So 3:6 were probably perfumes, as they are associated with myrrh and frankincense in the account of the festal procession of the litter of Solomon. They may have been some sweet-scented wood in powder, or else some form of incense.

POWER

pou'-er: This word, indicative of might, strength, force, is used in the Old Testament to render very many Hebrew terms, the translation in numerous instances being varied in the Revised Version (British and American) to words like "valor," "rule," "strength," "might," "dominion." The principal words for "power" in the New Testament are dunamis, and exousia. In the latter case the Revised Version (British and American) frequently changes to "authority" (Mr 3:15; 6:7; Eph 1:21, etc.) or "right" (Ro 9:21; 1Co 9:6; 2Th 3:9, etc.). Power is attributed preeminently to God (1Ch 29:11; Job 26:14; Ps 66:7; 145:11; Re 7:12, etc.). On this attribute of power of God, see OMNIPOTENCE. The supreme manifestation of the power, as of the wisdom and love of God, is in redemption (1Co 1:18,24). The preaching of the gospel is accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit (1Co 2:4; 1Th 1:5, etc.). Miracles, as "mighty works," are denoted by the term "powers" (so Mt 11:21,23 the Revised Version margin, etc.). The end of all time's developments is that God takes to Him His great power and reigns (Re 11:17).

James Orr

POWER OF KEYS

See KEYS, POWER OF THE.

PRAETORIAN GUARD

pre-to'-ri-an: "My bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other, places" (Php 1:13 the

King James Version). This verse is translated in the Revised Version (British and American), "My bonds became manifest in Christ throughout the whole praetorian guard, and to all the rest," and is noteworthy.

1. Pretorium in Philippians—Usual View:

It has been usual to connect the words, "the soldier that guarded him," Ac 28:16, with this statement in Php 1:13, that the apostle's bonds were manifest in the whole praetorium, and to understand that the former was the cause of the latter; that the result of Paul's making the gospel known in his own hired house to those soldiers to one of whom he was chained by the wrist day and night, was that it became known in all the praetorian regiment that his bonds were endured for Christ's sake, that it was for conscience' sake that he was suffering wrongfully, that he was no wrongdoer but a prisoner of Jesus Christ. In this way the gospel would spread through the whole of the praetorian guard in that regiment's headquarters which were situated in a permanent camp established by Tiberius in Rome, outside the Colline Gate, at the Northeast of the city. This verse would also mean that the gospel had been proclaimed in the same way to those members of the praetorian guard who were on duty as the bodyguard of the emperor and who were lodged in one of the buildings which adjoined the emperor's palace on the Palatine Hill.

2. Lightfoot on Interpretations:

Thus, Lightfoot, discussing the meaning of the phrase "in the whole praetorium" (Commentary on Philippians, 99 ff), reviews the different interpretations which have been given of the word, and shows

(1) that no instance is to be found of its signifying Nero's palace on the Palatine Hill;

(2) that there is no authority for the interpretation which would make it mean the praenterinn barracks on the Palatine;

(3) that neither is there any authority for making it mean the praetorian camp outside the walls of Rome. In Lightfoot's words (op. cit., 101), "All attempts to give a local sense to 'praetorium' thus fail for want of evidence." Lightfoot accordingly defends the interpretation, "the praetorian guard," and the Revised Version (British and American), above cited, follows him in this.

3. View of Mommsen and Ramsay:

One of the meanings of "praetorium" is a council of war, the officers who met in the general's tent (see PRAETORIUM). Lightfoot is very decided in interpreting "praetorium" to mean the praetorian regiment, the imperial guards, and he adds, "in this sense and in this alone can it be safely affirmed that the apostle would hear the word praetorium used daily," and that this sense is in all respects appropriate. But the other meaning, though not appropriate here, namely, a council of war composed of the officers and their general, is much nearer to that which is now accepted by such authorities as Mommsen and Sir W.M. Ramsay, who hold that in this passage "praetorium" means a council, not of war, however, but the

council of judgment, the emperor’s court of appeal in which he was assisted by his legal assessors (see Mommsen, Berlin Akad. Sitzungsber., 1895, 501; Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and the Rein Citizen, 357; Workman, Persecution in the Early Church, 35). Over this court there presided the emperor or his delegate, the prefect of the praetorian guard, and associated with him were twenty assessors selected from the senators. Formerly their votes were taken by ballot, but Nero preferred to receive from each a written opinion and on the next day to deliver his judgment in person. Such, it is now believed, is the praetorium to which Paul refers.

The meaning, therefore, of the words, "My bonds in Christ are manifest in the whole praetorium," will be that when Paul wrote the Epistle to the Philippians his first Roman trial was already so far advanced that he had been able to impress upon his judges, the twenty assessors and their president, the fact that he was no evildoer, but that the sole cause of his imprisonment was his loyalty to Christ. It was manifest to all the members of the emperor’s court of appeal that Paul was enduring his long imprisonment, suffering wrongfully, but only for the sake of Jesus Christ.

4. Bearing on Paul’s Captivity and Trial:

The important bearing will be seen which this signification of "praetorium" in this passage has on the question of the order in which Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians and Philemon—the epistles of Paul’s captivity in Rome—were written. On subjective evidence Lightfoot concludes that Philippians is the earliest of them, basing his opinion largely on the resemblance which exists in many particulars between the thoughts and expressions in Philippians and in the Epistle to the Romans, making Philippians, as it were, a connecting link between Paul’s earlier and his later epistles. See Lightfoot, Philipplans, 42 f; he writes: "These resemblances suggest as early a date for the Epistle to the Philippians as circumstances will allow," earlier, that is, than Colossians and Ephesians. But Lightfoot’s argument is set aside by the new light which has been thrown upon the real meaning of "praetorium." Sir W.M. Ramsay (St. Paul the Traveler, 357) writes: "The trial seems to have occurred toward the end of AD 61. Its earliest stages were over before Paul wrote to the Philipplans, for he says, ‘The things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the Good News; so that my bonds became manifest in Christ in the whole Pretorium, and to all the rest; and that most of the Brethren in the Lord, being confident in my bonds, are more abundantly bold to speak the word of God without fear.’ This passage has been generally misconceived and connected with the period of imprisonment; and here again we are indebted to Mommsen for the proper interpretation. The Praetorum is the whole body of persons connected with the sitting in judgment, the supreme Imperial Court, doubtless in this case the Prefect or both Prefects of the Praetorian Guard, representing the emperor in his capacity as the fountain of justice, together with the assessors and high officers of the court. The expression of the chapter as a whole shows that the trial is partly finished, and the issue as yet is so favorable that the Brethren are emboldened by the success of Paul’s courageous and freespoken defense and the strong impression which he evidently produced on the court; but he himself, being entirely occupied with the trial, is for the moment prevented from preaching as he had been doing when he wrote to the Colossians and the Asian churches generally."

5. Bearing on Date of Epistle:

Thus, the correct meaning of "praetorium" enables us to fix the date of the Epistle to the Philippians as having been written close to the end of Paul's first Roman imprisonment. That this inference is correct is confirmed by various other facts, such as his promise to visit that city, and the fact that in Php 2:20 f the King James Version he says regarding Timothy, "I have no man likeminded, who will naturally care for your state. For all seek their own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's." We could not conceive of Paul writing like this if Mark, Tychicus, Aristarchus, and especially if Luke had been with him then, and yet we know (Col 4:7,10,14) that each and all of these companions of the apostle were with him in Rome when he wrote the Epistle to the Colossians. They had evidently, along with others, been sent on missions to Asia or other places, so that Paul now had only Timothy "likeminded" when he wrote to Philippi.

See PAUL, THE APOSTLE; PHILIPPIANS, THE EPISTLE TO THE.

All these facts and considerations confirm us in accepting the signification of "praetorium" as the emperor's supreme court of appeal, before which Paul when he wrote the Epistle to the Philippians had so conducted his defense as to produce a most favorable impression, from which he inferred that he might soon be liberated from imprisonment. And his liberation, as the event proved, soon followed.

John Rutherfurd

PRAETORIUM

pre-to'-ri-um praitorion, Mt 27:27 (the King James Version "common hall"); Mr 15:16; Joh 18:28,33; 19:9 (in all margins "palace," and in the last three the King James Version "judgment hall"); Ac 23:35, (Herod's) "palace," margin "Praetorium," the King James Version "judgment hall"; Php 1:13, "praetorian guard" (margin "Greek 'in the whole Pretorium,' " the King James Version "palace," margin "Caesar's court"):

1. Governor's Official Residence:

The Pretorium was originally the headquarters of a Roman camp, but in the provinces the name became attached to the governor's official residence. In order to provide residences for their provincial governors, the Romans were accustomed to seize and appropriate the palaces which were formerly the homes of the princes or kings in conquered countries. Such a residence might sometimes be in a royal palace, as was probably the case in Caesarea, where the procurator used Herod's palace (Ac 23:35).

2. In Gospels Herod's Palace:

The Pretorium where Jesus was brought to trial has been traditionally located in the neighborhood of the present Turkish barracks where once stood the Antonia and where was stationed a large garrison (compare Ac 21:32-35), but the statements of Josephus make it almost certain that the headquarters of the procurator were at Herod's palace. This was a building whose magnificence Josephus can hardly

sufficiently appraise (Wars, I, xxi, 1; V, iv, 4). It was in this palace that "Florus, the procurator took up his quarters, and having placed his tribunal in front of it, held his sessions and the chief priests, influential persons and notables of the city appeared before the tribunal" (Wars II, xiv, 8). Later on, "Florus .... brought such as were with him out of the king's palace, and would have compelled them to get as far as the citadel (Antonia); but his attempt failed" (II, xv, 5). The word translated "palace" here is aule, the same word as is translated "court" in Mr 15:16, "the soldiers led him away within the court (aule), which is the Pretorium." There is no need to suppose that Herod Antipas was in the same palace (Lu 23:4); it is more probable he went to the palace of the Hasmoneans which lay lower down on the eastern slope of this southwest hill, where at a later time Josephus expressly states that Herod Agrippa II and his sister Bernice were living (Wars, II, xvi, 3).

The palace of Herod occupied the highest part of the southwest hill near the northwest angle of the ancient city, now traditionally called Zion, and the actual site of the Pretorium cannot have been far removed from the Turkish barracks near the so-called "Tower of David." It is interesting to note that the two stations of the Turkish garrison of Jerusalem today occupy the same spots as did the Roman garrison of Christ's time. It is needless to point out how greatly this view of the situation of the Pretorium must modify the traditional claims of the "Via Dolorosa," the whole course of which depends on theory that the "Way of Sorrow" began at the Antonia, the Pretorium of late ecclesiastical tradition.

See also GABBATHA.

3. Philippians 1:13:

With regard to the expression en holo to praitorio in Php 1:13, there is now a general consensus of opinion that "Praetorium" here means, not a place, but the imperial praetorian guard, ten thousand in number, which was instituted by Augustus. Paul was allowed to reside in his private house in the custody of a praetorian soldier. As these were doubtless constantly changed, it must have become "manifest" to the whole guard that his bonds were for the sake of Christ. See also preceding article.

E. W. G. Masterman

PRAISE

praz (tehillah, "psalm," "praise," todhah, "confession" "thanksgiving," shabhach, "to praise" "glorify," zamar, yadhah, "to stretch out the hand," "confess"; aineo, epaineo, (epainos):

1. Its Meaning:

The word comes from the Latin pretium, "price," or "value," and may be defined generally as an ascription of value or worth. Praise may be bestowed upon unworthy objects or from improper motives, but true praise consists in a sincere acknowledgment of a real conviction of worth. Its type may be seen in the representation given in the Apocalypse of the adoration of God and of the Lamb, which is inspired

by a sense of their worthiness to be adored (Re 4:11; 5:12).

2. With Man as Its Object:

Man may be the object of praise, and may receive it either from God or from his fellow-men. In the former case (Ro 2:29; 1Co 4:5) the praise is inevitably just, as resting on a divine estimate of worth; in the latter case its value depends upon the grounds and motives that lie behind it. There is a praise which is itself a condemnation (Lu 6:26), an honor which seals the eyes in unbelief (Joh 5:44), a careless use of the epithet "good" which is dishonoring to God (Lu 18:19). This is the "praise of men" which Jesus warned His followers to shun as being incompatible with the "praise of God" (Mt 6:1-4; compare Joh 12:43; Ga 1:10; 1Th 2:6). On the other hand, there is a praise that is the instinctive homage of the soul to righteousness (Lu 23:47), the acknowledgment given to well-doing by just government (Ro 13:3; 1Pe 2:14), the tribute of the churches to distinguished Christian service (2Co 8:18). Such praise, so far from being incompatible with the praise of God, is a reflection of it in human consciousness; and so Paul associates praise with virtue as an aid and incentive to holy living on which the mind should dwell (Php 4:8).

3. With God as Its Object:

In the Bible it is God who is especially brought before us as the object of praise. His whole creation praises Him, from the angels of heaven (Ps 103:20; Re 5:11) to those lower existences that are unconscious or even inanimate (Ps 19:1-4; 148:1-10; Re 5:13). But it is with the praises offered to God by man, and with the human duty of praising God, that the Scriptures are principally concerned. In regard to this subject the following points may be noticed:

(1) The Grounds of Praise.

Sometimes God is praised for His inherent qualities. His majesty (Ps 104:1) or holiness (Isa 6:3) fills the mind, and He is "glorified as God" (Ro 1:21) in view of what He essentially is. More frequently He is praised for His works in creation, providence, and redemption. References may be dispensed with here, for the evidence meets us on almost every page of the sacred literature from Genesis to Revelation, and the Book of Psalms in particular, from beginning to end, is occupied with these themes. When God’s operations under these aspects present themselves, not simply as general effects of His power and wisdom, but as expressions of His personal love to the individual, the nation, the church, His works become benefits, and praise passes into blessing and thanksgiving (Pss 34; 103; Eph 1:3; 1Pe 1:3).

(2) The Modes of Praise.

True praise of God, as distinguished from false praise (Isa 29:13; Mt 15:8), is first of all an inward emotion—a gladness and rejoicing of the heart (Ps 4:7; 33:21), a music of the soul and spirit (Ps 103:1; Lu 1:46 f) which no language can adequately express (Ps 106:2; 2Co 9:15). But utterance is natural to strong emotion, and the mouth instinctively strives to express the praises of the heart (Ps 51:15 and

passim). Many of the most moving passages in Scripture come from the inspiration of the spirit of praise awakened by the contemplation of the divine majesty or power or wisdom or kindness, but above all by the revelation of redeeming love. Again, the spirit of praise is a social spirit calling for social utterance. The man who praises God desires to praise Him in the hearing of other men (Ps 40:10), and desires also that their praises should be joined with his own (Ps 34:3). Further, the spirit of praise is a spirit of song. It may find expression in other ways—in sacrifice (Le 7:13), or testimony (Ps 66:16), or prayer (Col 1:3); but it finds its most natural and its fullest utterance in lyrical and musical forms. When God fills the heart with praise He puts a new song into the mouth (Ps 40:3). The Book of Psalms is the proof of this for the Old Testament. And when we pass to the New Testament we find that, alike for angels and men, for the church on earth and the church in heaven, the higher moods of praise express themselves in bursts of song (Lu 2:14; Eph 5:19; Col 3:16; Re 5:9; 14:3; 15:3). Finally, both in the Old Testament and New Testament, the spirit of song gives birth to ordered modes of public praise. In their earlier expressions the praises of Israel were joyful outbursts in which song was mingled with shouting and dancing to a rude accompaniment of timbrels and trumpets (Ex 15:20 ff; 2Sa 6:5,14). In later times Israel had its sacred Psalter, its guilds of trained singers (Ezr 2:41; Ne 7:44), its skilled musicians (Pss 42; 49, etc.); and the praise that waited for God in Zion was full of the solemn beauty of holiness (Ps 29:2; 96:9). In the New Testament the Psalter is still a manual of social praise. The "hymn" which Jesus sang with His disciples after the Last Supper (Mt 26:30) would be a Hebrew psalm, probably from the Hallel (Pss 113-118) which was used at the Passover service, and various references in the Epistles point to the continued employment of the ancient psalms in Christian worship (1Co 14:26; Eph 5:19; Col 3:16; Jas 5:13). But the Psalter of the Jewish church could not suffice to express the distinctive moods of Christian feeling. Original utterance of the spirit of Christian song was one of the manifestations of the gift of tongues (1Co 14:15-17). Paul distinguishes hymns and spiritual songs from psalms (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16); and it was hymns that he and Silas sang at midnight in the prison of Philippi (Ac 16:25 the Revised Version (British and American)). But from hymns and songs that were the spontaneous utterance of individual feeling the development was natural, in New Testament as in Old Testament times, to hymns that were sung in unison by a whole congregation; and in rhythmic passages like 1Ti 3:16; Re 15:3 f, we seem to have fragments of a primitive Christian hymnology, such as Pliny bears witness to for the early years of the 2nd century, when he informs Trajan that the Christians of Bithynia at their morning meetings sang a hymn in alternate strains to Christ as God (Ep. x.97).

See PERSECUTION.

(3) The Duty of Praise.

Praise is everywhere represented in the Bible as a duty no less than a natural impulse and a delight. To fail in this duty is to withhold from God’s glory that belongs to Him (Ps 50:23; Ro 1:20 f); it is to shut one’s eyes to the signs of His presence (Isa 40:26), to be forgetful of His mercies (De 6:12), and unthankful for His kindness (Lu 6:35). If we are not to fall into these sins, but are to give to God the honor and glory and gratitude we owe Him, we must earnestly cultivate the spirit and habit of praise. From holy men of old we learn that this may be done by arousing the soul from its slothfulness and sluggishness (Ps 57:8; 103:1), by fixing the heart upon God (Ps 57:7; 108:1), by meditation on His works and ways (Ps 77:11), by recounting His benefits (Ps 103:2), above all, for those to whom He has

spoken in His Son, by dwelling upon His unspeakable gift (2Co 9:15; compare Ro 8:31, 1Joh 3:1).

See also WORSHIP.

J. C. Lambert

PRAYER

prar (deesis, proseuche, (enteuxis; for an excellent discussion of the meaning of these see Thayer's Lexicon, p. 126, under the word deesis; the chief verbs are euchomai, proseuchomai, and deomai, especially in Luke and Acts; aiteo, "to ask a favor" distinguished from erotao, "to ask a question," is found occasionally): In the Bible "prayer" is used in a simpler and a more complex a narrower and a wider signification. In the former case it is supplication for benefits either for one's self (petition) or for others (intercession). In the latter it is an act of worship which covers all soul in its approach to God. Supplication is at the heart of it, for prayer always springs out of a sense of need and a belief that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him (Heb 11:6). But adoration and confession and thanksgiving also find a It place, so that the suppliant becomes a worshipper. It is unnecessary to distinguish all the various terms for prayer that are employed in the Old Testament and the New Testament. But the fact should be noticed that in the Hebrew and Greek aloe there are on the one hand words for prayer that denote a direct petition or short, sharp cry of the heart in its distress (Ps 30:2; 2Co 12:8), and on the other "prayers" like that of Hannah (1Sa 2:1-10), which is in reality a song of thanksgiving, or that of Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ, in which intercession is mingled with doxology (Eph 3:14-21).

1. In the Old Testament:

The history of prayer as it meets us here reflects various stages of experience and revelation. In the patriarchal period, when 'men began to call upon the name of the Lord' (Ge 4:26; compare Ge 12:8; 21:33), prayer is naive, familiar and direct (Ge 15:2 ff; 17:18; 18:23 ff; 24:12). It is evidently associated with sacrifice (Ge 12:8; 13:4; 26:25), the underlying idea probably being that the gift or offering would help to elicit the desired response. Analogous to this is Jacob's vow, itself a species of prayer, in which the granting of desired benefits becomes the condition of promised service and fidelity (Ge 28:20). In the pre-exilic history of Israel prayer still retains many of the primitive features of the patriarchal type (Ex 3:4; Nu 11:11-15; Jud 6:13 ff; 11:30 f; 1Sa 1:11; 2Sa 15:8; Ps 66:13 f). The Law has remarkably little to say on the subject, differing here from the later Judaism (see Schurer, HJP, II, i, 290, index-vol, p. 93; and compare Mt 6:5 ff; 23:14; Ac 3:1; 16:13); while it confirms the association of prayer with sacrifices, which now appear, however, not as gifts in anticipation of benefits to follow, but as expiations of guilt (De 21:1-9) or thank offerings for past mercies (De 26:1-11). Moreover, the free, frank access of the private individual to God is more and more giving place to the mediation of the priest (De 21:5; 26:3), the intercession of the prophet (Ex 32:11-13; 1Sa 7:5-13; 12:23), the ordered approach of tabernacle and temple services (Ex 40; 1Ki 8). The prophet, it is true, approaches God immediately and freely—Moses (Ex 34:34; De 34:10) and David (2Sa 7:27) are to be numbered among the prophets —but he does so in virtue of his office, and on the ground especially of his possession of the Spirit and

his intercessory function (compare Eze 2:2; Jer 14:15).

A new epoch in the history of prayer in Israel was brought about by the experiences of the Exile. Chastisement drove the nation to seek God more earnestly than before, and as the way of approach through the external forms of the temple and its sacrifices was now closed, the spiritual path of prayer was frequented with a new assiduity. The devotional habits of Ezra (Ezr 7:27; 8:23), Nehemlab (Ne 2:4; 4:4,9, etc.) and Daniel (Da 6:10) prove how large a place prayer came to hold in the individual life; while the utterances recorded in Ezr 9:6-15; Ne 1:5-11; 9:5-38; Da 9:4-19; Isa 63:7-64:12 serve as illustrations of the language and spirit of the prayers of the Exile, and show especially the prominence now given to confession of sin. In any survey of the Old Testament teaching the Psalms occupy a place by themselves, both on account of the large period they cover in the history and because we are ignorant in most cases as to the particular circumstances of their origin. But speaking generally it may be said that here we see the loftiest flights attained by the spirit of prayer under the old dispensation—the intensest craving for pardon, purity and other spiritual blessings (Ps 51$; 130$), the most heartfelt longing for a living communion with God Himself (Ps 42:2; 63:1; 84:2).

2. In the New Testament:

Here it will be convenient to deal separately with the material furnished by the Gospel narratives of the life and teaching of Christ and that found in the remaining books. The distinctively Christian view of prayer comes to us from the Christ of the Gospels. We have to notice His own habits in the matter (Lu 3:21; 6:12; 9:16,29; 22:32,39-46; 23:34-46; Mt 27:46; Joh 17), which for all who accept Him as the revealer of the Father and the final authority in religion immediately dissipate all theoretical objections to the value and efficacy of prayer. Next we have His general teaching on the subject in parables (Lu 11:5-9; 18:1-14) and incidental sayings (Mt 5:44; 6:5-8; 7:7-11; 9:38; 17:21; 18:19; 21:22; 24:20; 26:41 and the parallels), which presents prayer, not as a mere energizing of the religious soul that is followed by beneficial spiritual reactions, but as the request of a child to a father (Mt 6:8; 7:11), subject, indeed, to the father's will (Mt 7:11; compare Mt 6:10; 26:39,42; 1Joh 5:14), but secure always of loving attention and response (Mt 7:7-11; 21:22). In thus teaching us to approach God as our Father, Jesus raised prayer to its highest plane, making it not less reverent than it was at its best in Old Testament times, while far more intimate and trustful. In the LORD'S PRAYER (which see). He summed up His ordinary teaching on the subject in a concrete example which serves as a model and breviary of prayer (Mt 6:9-13; Lu 11:2-4). But according to the Fourth Gospel, this was not His final word upon the subject. On the night of the betrayal, and in full view of His death and resurrection and ascension to God's right hand, He told His disciples that prayer was henceforth to be addressed to the Father in the name of the Son, and that prayer thus offered was sure to be granted (Joh 16:23,24,26). The differentia of Christian prayer thus consists in its being offered in the name of Christ; while the secret of its success lies on the one hand in the new access to the Father which Christ has secured for His people (Joh 17:19; compare Heb 4:14-16; 10:19-22), and on the other in the fact that prayer offered in the name of Christ will be prayer in harmony with the Father's will (Joh 15:7; compare 1Joh 3:22; 5:13).

In the Ac and Epistles we see the apostolic church giving effect to Christ's teaching on prayer. It was in a praying atmosphere that the church was born (Ac 1:14; compare Ac 2:1); and throughout its early

history prayer continued to be its vital breath and native air (Ac 2:42; 3:1; 6:4,6 and passim). The Epistles abound in references to prayer. Those of Paul in particular contain frequent allusions to his own personal practice in the matter (Ro 1:9; Eph 1:16; Php 1:9; 1Th 1:2, etc.), and many exhortations to his readers to cultivate the praying habit (Ro 12:12; Eph 6:18; Php 4:6; 1Th 5:17, etc.). But the new and characteristic thing about Christian prayer as it meets us now is its connection with the Spirit. It has become a spiritual gift (1Co 14:14-16); and even those who have not this gift in the exceptional charismatic sense may "pray in the Spirit" whenever they come to the throne of grace (Eph 6:18; Jude 1:20). The gift of the Spirit, promised by Christ (Joh 14:16 ff, etc.), has raised prayer to its highest power by securing for it a divine cooperation (Ro 8:15,26; Ga 4:6). Thus Christian prayer in its full New Testament meaning is prayer addressed to God as Father, in the name of Christ as Mediator, and through the enabling grace of the indwelling Spirit.

See PRAYERS OF CHRIST.

J. C. Lambert

PRAYER OF HABAKKUK

See HABAKKUK; BETH-HORON, THE BATTLE OF.

PRAYER OF JOSEPH

See JOSEPH, PRAYER OF.

PRAYER OF MANASSES

See MANASSES, THE PRAYER OF.

PRAYER, HOURS OF

See HOURS OF PRAYER.

PRAYER, LORD’S

See LORD’S PRAYER, THE.

PRAYERS OF CHRIST prarz:

1. The Lord’s Prayer

2. Christ’s Doctrine of Prayer: Sacredness, Importunity, Conditions

3. Prayers Offered by Christ

(1) The High-priestly Prayer

(2) The Prayer in Gethsemane

(3) The Prayers on the Cross

(4) Prayer after the Resurrection

(5) General Conclusions

In the history and doctrine of prayer, nothing is more important than the light shed upon the subject by the prayers of Jesus. These are to be studied in connection with His teaching concerning prayer found in the model of the Lord’s Prayer, and general statements and hints to His disciples.

1. The Lord’s Prayer:

This model of prayer is given in two forms (Mt 6:9-13; Lu 11:2-4). The differences of form show that exactness of similarity in words is not essential. The prayer includes adoration, supplication for the Kingdom, for personal needs, for forgiveness, for deliverance from temptation and the ascription of glory. It is at once individual and universal; it sets the recognition of divine things first, and yet clearly asserts the ethical and social relations of life.

See LORD’S PRAYER, THE.

2. Christ’s Doctrine of Prayer: Sacredness, Importunity, Conditions:

That men should pray is taken for granted (Mt 6:5). Its sacredness is involved in the command for privacy (Mt 6:6); its importunity (Lu 11:5-9; 18:1-8); its necessary conditions of humility, absence of self righteousness (Lu 18:9-14), of display and repetition (Mt 6:7); necessity of faith and a forgiving spirit (Mr 11:24-26); of agreement in social prayer (Mt 18:19); submission to the will of Christ, "in my name" (Joh 14:13).

3. Prayers Offered by Christ:

In Mt 11:25,26 the King James Version, Christ thanks God: "Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed good in thy sight." This language shows the essence of prayer to be not the mere expression of need and request for what is

required, but resort to God. The prayer gives us insight into the deeper experience of the Son with the Father, and His perfect submission to the Father's will, with thanksgiving even for what might seem inexplicable. It thus illustrates the truth that the highest form of prayer is found in the serenity of the soul.

Mt 14:23 narrates the retirement of the Lord to a "mountain apart to pray." No word of what the prayer was is given, but the record is suggestive. Following a day of severe toil and probably excitement, Jesus betakes Himself to prayer. The reality, the true humanity of the Christ, are here revealed. The former prayer may almost be regarded as that of the Son of God addressed to the Father in the sublime communion of the Godhead. This passage emphatically is a prayer-scene of the Son of Man. The association of this incident of prayer in Christ's life with the miracle of walking on the sea (an example of miracle in the person of the Lord Himself, and not performed on another) opens up an interesting question of the relation of the supernatural and the natural. Here perhaps lies an explanation of the true significance of the miraculous. The communion of the Lord with a supreme Father had filled the physical nature of Jesus with spiritual forces which extended the power of the spirit over the material world beyond the limits by which man is bound in his normal and sinful condition (see Lange, Commentary on Mt; Mt 15:36; compare 14:19). Christ's recognition of God as the Giver of food, in thanks at the meal, or "asking a blessing," should be noted as an example which in modern times is largely ignored or followed as a mere formality. But it is significant; it expresses that intense and all-compelling sense of the divine which ever dwelt in Him; of which prayer is an expression, and which is evoked so naturally and becomingly at a social meal. In Mt 17:21, our Lord's reference to prayer as a necessary condition of miraculous power, in the light of Mr 7:34, where "looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him (the deaf man), Ephphatha," may imply His own prayer in connection with the exercise of miraculous energy. This is apparently indicated in Joh 11:41,42, although, as above, it is the expression of the intimate relation between Christ and the Father, which is the essence of prayer, and in which relation He ever exercised the fullest power of God Himself. Mt 19:13 records that little children were brought to Him that He should put His hands on them and pray. That He prayed is not related, but 19:15 relates that He laid His hands on them and, presumably, with the imposition, prayed. The scene is most suggestive, in the light of our Lord's words. In Mt 19:14 and in 26:26 Our Lord blesses the bread or gives thanks at the institution of the Supper, and has set the mode of celebration universally adopted, even giving the term Eucharist ("giving of thanks") to the service.

(1) The High-priestly Prayer.

This prayer (Joh 17) is the special prayer of the Lord, and may be regarded as the sole example furnished by the evangelists of our Lord's method of prayer. The thanksgiving in Mt 11:25 is the only other instance of any extent in the report of the prayers of Jesus, but even that is brief compared to what is here furnished. The fullness of this prayer clearly shows that it was uttered in the hearing of the disciples. Their relation to it is remarkable. Auditors, they yet could not share in it. At the same time, it was a profound revelation to them both of the relation of the Master to God, and the character of the work which He had come to perform, and the part which they were to take in it. John gives us no hint as to the place in which it was spoken; 14:31 indicates a departure from the upper room. But apparently the prayer was offered where the discourses of John 15 and 16 were delivered. It has been suggested by

Westcott that some spot in the temple courts was the scene of John 15; 16 and 17. It has been generally supposed that the ornament of the Golden Vine would naturally suggest the figure of the Vine and Branches which our Lord employs. Joh 18:1 shows that the prayer was offered before the Lord and His disciples had passed over the brook Kidron. The determination of the exact spot is certainly impossible, except the probability that the words were spoken in the vicinity of the temple.

The first part of the prayer (Joh 17:1-5) is an expression of profound communion between the Son and the Father, and the prayer that the Father should glorify the Son, but with the supreme end of the Father's own glory. The absolutely unique character of Christ's relation to God is the calm assertion of Joh 17:4. Its consciousness of completeness in the work which He had received from God, impossible for the children of men, marks the supreme nature of the Son of God.

In the second part of the prayer (Joh 17:6-19), our Lord prays for His disciples, to whom He has revealed Himself and His relation to God (Joh 17:7,8). He prays that they may be kept by the Father, and for their unity. Their separation from the world is declared (Joh 17:14), and our Lord prays that they may be kept from the evil that is in the world, which is alien from them as it is from Him.

In the third portion of the prayer Christ's relation to His ultimate followers is referred to. Their unity is sought, not an external unity, but the deep, spiritual unity found by the indwelling of Christ in them and God in Christ. The prayer closes by the declaration that Christ's knowledge of the Father is revealed to His people, and the end and crown of all is to be the indwelling of God's love in man by the dwelling of Christ in him.

This prayer is unique, not merely among the prayers of our Lord, but also among the prayers of humanity. While it is distinctly a petition, it is at the same time a communion. In one or two places our Lord expresses His will, thus setting Himself upon a level with God. The fact of this prayer of triumph in which every petition is virtually a declaration of the absolute certainty of its realization, immediately preceding the prayer of Gethsemane, is both difficult and suggestive. The anomaly is a powerful argument for the historic reality. The explanation of these contrasted moods is to be found in the depth of our Lord's nature, and especially in the complete consistency of His dual nature with the spheres to which each nature belongs. He is most divine; He is most human. In the fullness of the reach of the prayer and its calm confidence, the believer may find a ceaseless and inexhaustible source of comfort and encouragement. Attention might be called to the remarkable forecast of the history and experience of the church which the prayer furnishes.

(2) The Prayer in Gethsemane.

This is recorded by the three Synoptics (Mt 26:36-44; Mr 14:22-40; Lu 22:39-46), and is probably referred to in Heb 5:7. Brief though the prayer is, it exhibits most clearly recognition of God's infinite power, a clear object sought by the prayer, and perfect submission to God's will. All the elements of prayer, as it can be offered by man, are here except the prayer for forgiveness. It is to be noted that the prayer was three times repeated. This is not to be regarded as inconsistent with our Lord's prohibition of

repetition. It was vain repetition which was forbidden. The intensity of the prayer is expressed by its threefold utterance (compare Paul's prayer in regard to the thorn in 2Co 12:8).

(3) The Prayers on the Cross.

In Mt 27:46; Mr 15:34, Christ uses the prayer of Ps 22:1. In the moment of complete desolation, the Sufferer claimed His unbroken relationship with God. This is the victory of the atoning sacrifice. Lu 23:34 records the prayer of intercession for those who crucified Him; in 23:46 is the calm committal of His spirit to the Father. Prayer here again assumes its highest form in the expression of recognition and trust. Thus the three prayers on the cross not only reveal the intimate relation of our Lord to the Father, but they also illustrate prayer such as man may offer. They represent supplication, intercession, communion. Prayer thus expresses our relation to God, to others, to ourselves; our trust, our love, our need. In all things He was made like unto His brethren, except without sin (see POINTS). His prayers on the cross illustrate His high-priestly office. It rises at that intense crisis to its supreme manifestation and activity.

(4) Prayer after the Resurrection.

It is to be observed that after His resurrection there is no record of any prayer, offered by Christ. In the supper at Emmaus He "blessed" the bread (Lu 24:30); and the ascension took place in the midst of blessing (Lu 24:51), suggestive of the course of the church as ever beneath the benediction of the Lord, to be ended only at the final consummation. The act of eating the fish and honeycomb (Lu 24:43) seems to have been unaccompanied by any act of specifically religious form. Mark, with characteristic regard to details, records Christ's "looking up to heaven" (Mr 6:41; 7:34); Joh 11:41 refers to a similar act, and adds the Lord's words of thanksgiving that God had heard Him (see also Joh 17:1). The gesture was usual in association with Christ's prayers; it is appropriate and suggestive. Luke narrates that Christ prayed at His baptism (Lu 3:21); that He spent a night in prayer before choosing the Twelve (Lu 6:12,13); that the transfiguration was preceded by prayer (Lu 9:29); and records the prayer in the garden (Lu 22:41-45). The third evangelist thus in addition to the notes of our Lord's prayers in retirement, which the other evangelists record, adds these instances of the special relation of prayer to events of critical importance.

(5) General Conclusions.

The following conclusions as to prayer may be drawn from the records of Christ' prayers:

(1) Prayer is the highest exercise of man's spiritual nature.

(2) It is natural to the soul even in perfect accord with God.

(3) It is not only the expression of need, the supply of which is sought of God, but by the example of Christ it is the highest expression of trust, submission and union with God.

(4) It is to be used both in solitude and in society; it is personal and intercessory.

(5) It may be accompanied by the plea of Christ’s name, and for Christ’s sake.

These are the laws which should direct it; that is to say, it should be based upon the merit and the intercession of Christ, and should be addressed to God under the limitations of the Kingdom of the Lord and His purposes for good, both for the interest of the suppliant and others, under the conditions of the interest of the whole Kingdom.

L. D. Bevan

PREACHER; PREACHING

prech’-er, prech’-ing (qoheleth, "preacher" (Ec 1:1), basar, "to bring or tell good tidings" (Ps 40:9; Isa 61:1), qara’," to call," "proclaim" (Ne 6:7; Jon 3:2), qeri’ah, "cry," "preaching" (Jon 3:2); kerux, "crier," "herald" (1Ti 2:7), kerusso, "to cry or proclaim as a herald" (Mt 3:1; Ro 10:14), euaggellizo, "to announce good news" (Mt 11:5)):

1. Definition

2. The Preacher’s Limitations

3. A Man with a Message

4. Preaching a Necessary Agency

5. Biblical Terms and Their Meanings

6. The Hebrew Prophets

7. Christ as a Preacher

8. The Apostles as Preachers

9. Fundamental Postulates

(1) Preach the Word

(2) "We Are Ambassadors"

1. Definition:

In the New Testament sense a preacher is a man who has the inner call from the Holy Spirit and the external call from the church the witnessing body of Christ on earth, and has been duly set apart as an accredited and qualified teacher of the Christian religion. His vocation is that of addressing the popular mind and heart on religious truth, as that truth is set forth in the sacred Scripture, for the spiritual profit of the hearer as its end. The preacher, recognized as such by the church, speaks as a personal witness of God’s saving truth, explaining it and applying it as the circumstances of the people and the time may require. The gravity and importance of this vocation, as set forth in the sacred Scriptures and amply illustrated in the history of the church, surpass those of any other calling among men. Luther said, "The Devil does not mind the written word but he is put to flight whenever it is preached aloud."

2. The Preacher’s Limitations:

The preacher, in the sense indicated above, is with all other Christians a sharer in the freedom that is in Christ. But as a recognized teacher and leader of the church, he is not an unattached and entire unrestricted teacher. He is not to speak as his own, but as the mouthpiece of the church whose apprehension of the gospel he has voluntarily confessed. The faith of the church is, by his own assent, his faith, and her doctrine is his doctrine. He is not expected to give his own, as distinct from or opposed to the faith of the church in whose name he has been set apart to proclaim the gospel. Both the personal and the representative or official are united in him and his preaching.

3. A Man with a Message:

His work is always to be related to the Old Testament and New Testament. His sermon is under the creed of his church as the creed is under the word. The preacher is a man with a message, and the preacher who has no message of the particular kind indicated above is in no true sense a preacher. It has been well expressed in one of the valuable Yale series of lectures on the subject, "Every living preacher must receive his communication direct from God, and the constant purpose of his life must be to receive it uncorrupted and to deliver it without addition or subtraction." When he presents the message of his divinely-appointed ambassadorship in its integrity, he speaks with that peculiar kind of "authority" which has been pronounced "the first and indispensable requisite" in giving a message from God. He manifests thereby a "high celestial dogmatism," and "human weakness becomes immortal strength." The true preacher preaches from a divine impulsion. He says with Paul, "Necessity is laid upon me; for woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel" (1Co 9:16; compare Jer 20:9). He says with Peter, "Whether it is right in the sight of God to hearken unto you rather than unto God, judge ye: for we cannot but speak the things which we saw and heard" (Ac 4:19,20). The message of the preacher is greater than the man, because it is from God. It largely makes the man who preaches it in its fullness and power. Whatever be his own gifts or whatever the alleged gift conferred in the laying on of hands, without the sense of the message he is not chosen of God to proclaim His word. Destitute of that, he does not have the sustaining impulse of his vocation to enlist his entire personality in his work and give him mastery over the minds and hearts of men.

4. Preaching a Necessary Agency:

No agency of religion is older than preaching. It is as old as the Bible itself (2Pe 2:5). It is a necessary adjunct of a religion that is communicated to man by means of an objective and authoritative revelation, such as we have in the sacred Scriptures. It is an entirely natural agency of the forms of religion revealed in the Old Testament and New Testament. It is strictly in harmony with those ideas that obtain in both testaments regarding the method of propagating the faith, set forth through the agency of holy men who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. That faith is disseminated by means of teaching through argument, explanation, motive and exhortation. The agency for the spread of a religion of persuasion must be preaching.

5. Biblical Terms and Their Meanings:

In the Biblical usage of the terms which have reference to the subject, preaching means the proclamation of religious truth. It is that continuous and public testimony which the church is always giving, through discourses by men set apart for such work, to her own living faith as that faith is rooted in and sustained by the written word of God. In this sense "to call," "proclaim," "cry aloud" are used frequently of the prophetic message under the various aspects of denunciation, as in Jon 1:2; of the relation of the divine, as in Jer 11:6, and of Messianic promise, as in Isa 61:1. The term for "preaching" is also used to designate a political propagandism set forth by the prophet (Ne 6:7). In two passages (Ps 68:11, "publish"; Isa 61:1) another word for preaching means "to declare good news." In the case of Jonah’s preaching at Nineveh, the word used to designate what it was means strictly "proclamation" and corresponds to the New Testament word used to define our Lord’s "proclamation" as a herald of the advent of the Kingdom of God (Mt 4:17), which in its initial stages particularly was closely associated with the preaching of John the Baptist (Mt 3:1,2).

6. The Hebrew Prophets:

Thus, while preaching belongs especially to Christianity, it has well-defined antecedents in the Old Testament. Under both the old and the new dispensations the subject takes the church for granted and utters the testimony, not simply of a solitary believer, but of a divinely-founded society, whether it be of Jews or Christians. The older books in the Canon have in them the beginnings and some of the features of the preacher’s office and of the high function of preaching. In them we find a special class of men set apart and separated unto that particular work, as we find in the Christian church, from its beginnings, the same divinely instituted office. The Hebrew prophet had a message direct from God, which frequently came with supernatural knowledge in the power of prediction. The mission of the prophet, however, was simply or chiefly to forecast the future, but to declare a present message from the Lord to the people. The prophet of the Old Testament was the forerunner in office and the prototype of the ambassador of Christ. With the development of the synagogue as the center of Hebrew worship, application as well as interpretation of the Law became essential.

Moses, the most commanding figure in Hebrew history, was a prophet, and no messages in the Old

Testament are more imbued with power, sublimity and pathos than those uttered by the great lawgiver. He became the guide Israel, not so much by his rod as by the word he delivered to the people. There are numerous indications that after Moses there was a continuous class of religious teachers whose work it was to instruct men and inspire the people, as is indicated in the cases of Joshua, in the history of Deborah and Barak, and in the days of solemn assembly which are inconceivable without men who spoke and other men who listened. In the time of Samuel there was a distinct advance made in the work of the prophets, and the prophetic office had become a fixed institution. There were schools of the prophets at Bethel, Jericho and Gilgal, the very seats of heathen idolatry. Under the Old Testament dispensation the whole course of progress was toward presenting divine truth in its simplicity and power, by bringing it to bear upon the popular mind and heart. One of the marks of the new era beginning with John the Baptist was a revival of prophetic preaching (Mt 11:9), which again resumed its old character and meaning.

See PROPHECY, PROPHETS.

7. Christ as a Preacher:

The words meaning "to proclaim as a herald" and "preaching," are frequent in the New Testament. The mission of our Lord was essentially one of proclaiming good tidings concerning the Kingdom of God (Mt 4:17). He at once, on His entrance upon His ministry, gave to preaching a spiritual depth and practical range which it never had before. At that time preaching had manifestly become a fixed part of the synagogue worship, and was made one of the chief instruments in the spread of the gospel. our Lord constantly taught in the synagogue (Mt 4:23; Mr 1:21; Joh 6:59). He thus read and interpreted and applied the Law and the Prophets (Mr 1:39; Lu 4:16). Christ’s testimony about Himself was that He came "to bear witness to the truth." The spoken word became His great power in His life and ministry. Throughout His life Jesus was above all things a preacher of the truths of His kingdom. Telling men what He was in Himself, what in His relation to man and his salvation and what to God the Father, formed a large part of His public work.

8. The Apostles as Preachers:

The preaching of the apostles was essentially prophetic in character, and bore testimony concerning the resurrection of Jesus and His early return to judgment (Ac 2:24,32,36; 1Co 15:15). The sermons of the apostles which are reported with much fullness are those of Peter on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 2), his address in the house of Cornelius at Caesarea (Ac 10), and the counsels of James to the brethren at Jerusalem, as to what ordinances should be imposed on Gentile Christians. In the early church preachers were first of all witnesses to what Jesus had said and done, and to the significance to be attached to the great facts of the redemptive history. With the spread of the gospel and the passing of time, this office was taken up by others, especially such as were endued with "the word of wisdom" and "of knowledge" (1Co 12:8).

9. Fundamental Postulates:

Upon the basis of what is taught in the word of God there are two fundamentally important postulates concerning preaching and the preacher.

(1) Preach the Word.

The first note of preaching is that it be the word of God (2Ti 4:2). Out of the Bible must the life of every generation of Christians be fed. To Holy Scripture, therefore, ought the pulpit to abide faithful, for out of its treasures the preacher fulfils his double office of edifying believers and subjugating the world to Christ. There must always be an organic connection between the word in the text and the sermon.

(2) "We Are Ambassadors."

The work of preaching is the fulfillment of a divinely instituted ambassadorship (2Co 5:20). The gospel is put into the hands of men for a distinct purpose, and is to be administered in accordance with the plan of its author. The preacher is in a very distinct sense a trustee. "But even as we have been approved of God to be entrusted with the gospel, so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God who proveth our hearts" (1Th 2:4). Those who have accepted the responsibility imposed upon them by this divine commission are enjoined to exercise their office so as to warrant the approbation of Him who has appointed them to a specific work. The homiletic practice of taking theme of every sermon from a passage of Holy Writ has been an almost invariable rule in the history of the church. It is the business of the preacher to present the truth embodied in the text in its integrity. In the exercise of his divinely-appointed ambassadorship he is to administer God’s word revealed to Christian faith, not human opinions or speculations.

David H. Bauslin

PRECEPT

pre’-sept: A commandment, an authoritative rule for action; in the Scriptures generally a divine injunction in which man’s obligation is set forth (Latin praeceptum, from praecipere, "to instruct").

Four words are so rendered in the King James Version:

(1) mitswah, very frequently (168 times) translated "commandment," but 4 times "precept" (in the Revised Version (British and American) only Jer 35:18; Da 9:5);

(2) from the same root is tsaw, or tsaw (Isa 28:10,13);

(3) piqqudhim, only in the Psalms (21 times in Ps 119, e.g. verses 4,15,27; also the Revised Version (British and American) Ps 19:8; 103:18; 111:7);

(4) in the New Testament, entole, generally in the King James Version translated "commandment" (68 times), but twice "precept" (Mr 10:5; Heb 9:19; in both cases the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "commandment").

See COMMANDMENT.

D. Miall Edwards

PRECIOUS

presh’-us (stands for 17 different words, chief of which are yaqar; timios):

(1) Generally in the literal sense, "of great price," "costly," "expensive," of material things (e.g. Pr 1:13; Jer 20:5; Mr 14:3 the King James Version), especially of precious stones (2Sa 12:30; 2Ch 3:6; 1Co 3:12 the King James Version, etc.).

(2) Sometimes "of great moral (non-material) value." "Precious in the sight of Yahweh is the death of his saints" (Ps 116:15); "his precious and exceeding great promises" (2Pe 1:4); compare Ps 139:17; 2Pe 1:1.

The literal and the moral senses are both involved in the expression, "knowing that ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, ... but with precious blood" (1Pe 1:18,19). "Preciousness" (time) occurs in 1Pe 2:7 the American Standard Revised Version, the English Revised Version, for the King James Version "precious."

D. Miall Edwards

PRECIOUS STONES

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

PRECIPITATION

pre-sip-i-ta’-shun.

See PUNISHMENTS, III, (5).

PREDESTINATION

pre-des-ti-na’-shun (prothesis, prognosis proorismos):

1. Predestination as a Biblical Question

2. Its Fundamental Importance

3. The Nature of Predestination

4. The Doctrine in Scripture

5. Historic Rise and Development of the Doctrine

6. The Doctrine in the Middle Ages

7. Predestination in the Reformed Theology

8. Predestination in Lutheranism

9. The Arminian View

10. Wesleyanism on Predestination

11. Present Needs and Values of the Doctrine

LITERATURE

1. Predestination as a Biblical Question:

Predestination can be, and has sometimes been, regarded as a philosophical question rather than a Biblical one. It is with predestination as a Biblical question, however, that we are here mainly concerned. It is possible to urge, and it has been urged, that the philosophical question—whether all that occurs is foreordained—is not discussed and decided by Scripture. Theology, starting from God in its interpretation of all things, has arrived at universal foreordination by a species of deductive reasoning. But we must not argue the matter from any abstract principles, but deal with the actual facts as set forth in Scripture and as found, inductively, in the experience of man.

2. Its Fundamental Importance:

It must first be asserted, however, in view of much loose modern thinking, that predestination is a category of religious thought of fundamental importance. No category of religious thought could go deeper, for it reaches down to the Infinite Will in relation to the universe of finite wills, and lays stress on will as the core of reality. The philosophy of our time may be said to have received, from the time of Schopenhauer, an impact toward will-emphasis, alike in respect of will in the universe and in man. But

the relation of the Absolute Will to the universe, and to mankind, is precisely that with which we are concerned in predestination.

3. Nature of Predestination:

Predestination is that aspect of foreordination Whereby the salvation of the believer is taken to he effected in accordance with the will of God, who has called and elected him, in Christ, unto life eternal. The divine plan of salvation must certainly be conceived under this aspect of individual reference. To understand and set forth the nature, and ethically justifiable character, of such a foreordaining to life eternal, is our purpose. For doctrine has need to be purged of the historic inconsistencies, and fatal illogicalities, with which, in its older forms of presentation, it was often infected. This, especially, in order that the doctrine may appear as grounded in reason and righteousness, not in arbitrariness and almighty caprice.

4. The Doctrine in Scripture:

To begin with, it must be said that there seems to be no evading the doctrine of an election by grace, as found both in the letter and the spirit of Scripture. The idea of predestination is set forth, with great power and clearness, in Ro 8:29,30, and with its elements or parts articulated in natural and striking form. The idea recurs in Eph 1, where it is finely said (1:4,5) that God hath chosen us in Christ "before the foundation of the world," having predestinated or "foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ"; and where it is said, further, that our salvation imports "the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure" (1:9), which He purposed in Christ. This "eternal purpose" to save men through Christ is again referred to in Eph 3:11. This helpful mode of viewing predestination as in Christ, and never outside Him, had a place in religious thought at the Reformation time, as the famous "Formula of Concord," to be referred to below, shows. The predestined certainty of God’s gracious work in Christ was not meant to perplex men, but to encourage and reassure all who trust in His grace. In Ro 9:14-25, the absolute sovereignty of God is put in a form whereby election is made to originate in the divine will apart from all human merit, whether actual or foreseen. But from this assertion of God’s free supremacy we can derive no concrete theodicy, or do more than infer that God is just and wise in His exercise of free grace, even when His doings are most perplexing to us.

5. Historic Rise and Development of the Doctrine:

The needful thing is to understand, so far as may be, the nature of the cooperation that takes place between the divine and the human factors or elements, which latter factors include natural capacity, disposition and development, working under grace. It must be carefully observed that nothing in Scripture points to any personal and inexorable predestination to reprobation, in any sense corresponding to the personal election to salvation just spoken of. A non-election there may be, of course, but not in any sense that annuls full personal responsibility for coming short of life everlasting. The appeal of Scripture from first to last is to men as free. Calvin’s strange way of putting the matter was, "Man therefore falls, God’s Providence so ordaining, but he falls by his own fault." This idea of

reprobation was first introduced by Gottschalk, a monk of the 9th century, long after the predestination doctrine had received its first full and positive exposition by Augustine. Augustine, following upon the indecision shown by the fathers in the first three centuries of the church, made the doctrine of a special predestination his foundation for special grace, in opposition to Pelagius. Augustine gave new prominence in his theory to the absolute will of God: he made divine grace the only ground of man's salvation; it was to him the irresistible power working faith within the heart, and bringing freedom as its result. It was to him God's absolute predestination that determined who were believers. But Augustine held predestination as an inference from his conception of the Fall and of grace, rather than as a metaphysical principle.

6. The Doctrine in the Middle Ages:

In the Middle Ages, Anselm, Peter Lombard, and Aquinas, followed the Augustinian views only to a certain extent. Aquinas admits that predestination implies a relation to grace, but holds that grace is not of the essence of predestination. Predestination is, to Aquinas, a part of Providence, and it presupposes election in the order of reason. Though divine goodness in general be without election, Aquinas thinks the communication of a particular good cannot be without election. Predestination has, for him, its foundation in the goodness of God, which is its reason. Aquinas thinks predestination most surely takes effect, but not as from necessity; the effect takes place under the working of contingency. From such views we are recalled to the idea of a rigorous predestination, by Thomas Bradwardine and John Wycliff, in pre-Reformation times. We are thus brought up to the decretal system—so called from Calvin's making predestination consist of the eternal decree of God—which became, in its metaphysical principle, the fundamental position of the whole Reformed theology after the Reformation.

7. Predestination in the Reformed Theology:

The theology of the Reformed church adopted the Calvinistic doctrine of the decree of predestination and election. Calvin, however, simply carried the Augustinian theory to its logical and necessary conclusion, and he was the first to adopt the doctrine as the cardinal point or primordial principle of a theological system. Zwingli, it must be remembered, was, even before Calvin, of consistent deterministic leanings, as part of his large speculative views, which were not without a tendency to universalism. Salvation was, to Calvin, the execution of a divine decree, which was supposed to fix the extent and conditions of such salvation.

(1) Calvin's Definition.

Reprobation was, for Calvin, involved in election, and divine foreknowledge and foreordination were taken to be identical. Calvin's mode of defining predestination was as the eternal decree of God, by which He has decided with Himself what is to become of each and every individual. For all, he maintains, are not created in like condition; but eternal life ordained for some, eternal condemnation for others. Calvin confesses that this is a "horrible decree," and it is not surprising to find competent theologians in our time denying such a form of predestinarianism any place in the teachings of Paul,

who never speaks of reprobation.

(2) Theology Advanced by Calvin.

It is generally overlooked, however, that theological advance registered by Calvin is to be seen by study of the views of the Middle Ages, and on to the Reformation, not by viewing Calvinism in our post-Reformation lights. It was love—"the fatherly love of God," as he terms it—the efficiency of saving love—which Calvin insisted upon, above all, in his teaching about God. But Calvin also heightened men's ideas as to the certitude of personal salvation. It is but fair to Calvin to remember—for superficial acquaintance with his teachings is far from rare—that he, in the strongest manner, maintained divine sovereignty to be that of divine wisdom, righteousness, and love, and expressly rejected the notion of absolute power as, in this connection, a heathenish idea. The Calvinistic doctrine was not absolute, but mediated in Christ, and conditioned upon faith.

8. Predestination in Lutheranism:

Luther and the Lutheran church at first shared the doctrine of predestination and election, Luther in his treatment of free will reproducing the Augustinian form of the doctrine in a strict manner. The predestination of Luther and Melanchthon proceeded, not from their conception of God, but rather from the doctrine of sin and grace. Melanchthon was less disposed than Luther to press the doctrine of absolute predestination, and, in his "synergistic" tendencies, laid increasing stress on human freedom, until he at length rejected the doctrine of absolute predestination. He was blamed by strict Lutheranism for yielding too much to Pelagianism. But the Lutheran "Formula of Concord," prepared in 1577, was not a very logical and consistent presentation of the case, for, opposed at points to Augustinianism, it fell back, in the end, on election in the Augustinian spirit. Or, to put the matter in another form, the "Formula of Concord" may be said to have held with Augustinianism, but to have differed by maintaining a Universal call along witha particular election, and it rejected the decree of reprobation. Later Lutheranism adopted a moderate form of doctrine, wherein predestination was often identified with prescience. But Lutheranism ought not, in strictness, to be identified, as is sometimes done, with the Arminian theory. The Lutheran doctrine of predestination was further developed by Schleiermacher, who emphasized the efficiency of grace, while adopting its universality in the Lutheran sense.

9. The Arminian View:

Arminianism, in its earliest assertion, maintained simply universal grace and conditional election. But in the five articles it formulated its opposition to Calvinism, although Arminius does not appear to have been more than moderately Calvinistic, as we would account it. Arminius gave grace supreme place, and made it, when welcome, pass into saving grace. He made election depend on faith, which latter is the condition of universal grace. Arminianism rejects the so-called common grace of the predestination theory, and its effectual grace for the elect, for, in the Arminian view, saving grace can in no case be missed save by resistance or neglect. Arminianism holds the awakened human will to cooperate with divine grace, in such wise that it rests with the human will whether the divine grace is really accepted or

rejected. It is the claim of Arminianism to do more justice than Calvinism to faith and repentance, as conditions of personal salvation, and precedent thereto. The Arminian standpoint admits the foreknowledge of God, but denies foreordination, though it must seem difficult to reduce the foreknowledge of God to such a bare knowledge of the future. But it is, of course, freely to be granted that foreknowledge in God, simply as knowledge, does not carry any causal energy or efficiency with it. But it may still be doubted whether the prescience of God can be nothing more fruitful and creative than such a position implies, and whether its relation to predestination may not be a more necessary one. The theory seems to fail of giving satisfactory account of the divine activity in its relation to human activity, in the sphere of grace. The shortcoming of Arminianism lies in its failing also to do justice to the spirit of Scripture with its emphatic assertion of the doctrine of God as the one absolute will, which, in its expression, is the sole originative power of the universe.

See also PROVIDENCE.

10. Wesleyanism on Predestination:

Wesleyanism, or Methodist Arminianism, maintains, like Calvinism, the will of God to be supreme. But it distinguishes between the desires and the determinations of God. It takes divine foreknowledge to precede the divine volitions. It makes God’s prescience purely intuitional, and regards that which He knows as nowise necessitated by such knowledge, a conception of God which differentiates the Wesleyan type of thought from Calvinism. God is held to have left events in the moral sphere contingent, in an important sense, upon the human will. Hence, human probation is based upon this position, as to man’s free choice. Influence of God upon man’s will is postulated, for its right guidance and direction, but not in any coercive sense, as Augustinianism seems to Wesleyanism to imply. Thus, it is hoped to preserve just balance, and maintain proper responsibility, between the divine and the human factors in this spiritual cooperation.

When we come to the present needs and values of the predestination doctrine, we have to remark the primal need of a thoroughly ethicized conception of God. The past few decades have witnessed a lessened interest in this doctrine, largely because of the increasingly ethical conceptions of Deity.

11. Present Needs and Values of the Doctrine:

That is to say, the doctrine of the sovereignty of God’s will has ceased to be taken, as often in the older presentations, as mere almightiness, or arbitrary and resistless will. Calvin expressly taught that no cause or ground but God’s unconditioned will was to be sought; but he feebly tried to save divine will from sheer omnipotence by saying that God is law to Himself; and the notion of sovereignty continued to be presented in ways quite absolute and irresponsible. But God we now regard as the absolute and eternal reason, no less than the supreme will, and as both of these in the one indivisible and absolute personality. We have passed from an abstract predestinationism to maintain God in living and ethical relations to the world and to man. Such an ethical sovereignty we hold to be necessary, over against that lax humanitarian spirit, which, in its recoil from the older Calvinism, invests the Deity with no greater

powers of moral determination than may be implied in His love, when viewed as a mere golden haze of good will.

See ELECTION; FOREORDAIN.

LITERATURE.

The relative works of Augustine, Aquinas, Zwingli, Calvin, Luther, Melanchthon, Arminius, Wesley, Rothe, Dorner, Luthardt; W. Cunningham, The Reformers, and the Theology of the Reformation, 1862; James Orr, article "Calvinism," in Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics; and the various Histories of Christian Doctrine.

James Lindsay

PREEMINENCE

pre-em'-i-nens: Superiority, especially in noble or excellent qualities. The word stands for: (1) mothar, "what is over and above," "excellence"; "Man hath no preeminence above the beasts" (Ec 3:19); (2) proteuo, "to be first"; "That in all things he (= Christ) might have the preeminence" (Col 1:18); (3) ho philoproteuon, is translated "who loveth to have the preeminence," literally "who loveth to be first" (of Diotrephes, 3 Joh 1:9).

PREFER

pre-fur':Does not always have the general meaning "to choose before another." In Ps 137:6, it does have this sense and the two versions agree; in Es 2:9, the Revised Version (British and American) has "removed" where the King James Version has "preferred"; in Da 6:3, "distinguished" takes its place; in Joh 1:15,30, "become" is substituted for "preferred"; in 1:27, "preferred" drops out entirely; in Ro 12:10, the versions agree.

PREPARATION

prep-a-ra'-shun: The concordances indicate that the word "preparation" occurs only twice in the Old Testament, once in 1Ch 22:5, where it is used in the ordinary sense "to make preparation," and once in Na 2:3, "in the day of his preparation," both of them translating the same Hebrew root and requiring no special elucidation. In Eph 6:15 the apostle speaks of the equipment of the Christian as including the "feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace," which means, according to Thayer, "with the promptitude and alacrity which the gospel produces."

The word occurs with technical significance ("the Preparation") in the gospel narratives of the crucifixion, translating the Greek paraskeue (Mt 27:62; Mr 15:42; Lu 23:54; Joh 19:14,31,42). It is used

as a technical term indicating the day of the preparation for the Sabbath, that is, the evening of Friday. This is its use in Josephus, Ant, XVI, vi, 2, and presumably in the Synoptics. Later its use seems to have been extended to denote regularly the 6th day (Friday) of each week. So in the Didache, viii and the Martyrdom of Polycarp, vii.

The addition of the phrase tou pascha, "of the passover," in Joh 19:14, and of the phrase "for the day of that sabbath was a high day," in 19:31, seems to indicate that the author of the Fourth Gospel regarded the Passover as occurring on the Sabbath in the year of the crucifixion. This is clearly the natural interpretation of the words of John's Gospel, and if it were not for the seeming contradiction to the narrative of the Synoptics it is very doubtful whether any other interpretation would ever have been put upon them. This question is discussed in the articles on the date of the crucifixion and the Lord's Supper, and it will be necessary only to allude to it here.

It is possible that the phrase the "Preparation of the passover" in Joh 19:14 may mean it was the preparation day (Friday) of the Passover week (see Andrews, Life of our Lord, 451 ff; and most recently Zahn, Das Evangelium des Johannes, 1908, 637 ff). This method of harmonizing seems to the present writer to be forced, and it therefore seems wiser to give to the words of Joh 19:14 their natural interpretation, and to maintain that, according to the author of the Fourth Gospel, the Passover had not been celebrated at the time of the crucifixion. There seems to be reason to believe that the ordinary view that the Lord's Supper was instituted in connection with the Passover, based upon the narrative in Mark (14:12 ff), does not have the unanimous support of the Synoptic Gospels.

LITERATURE.

In addition to references in the body of the article, the commentaries, especially Plummer, Cambridge Bible, "St. John," Appendix A; Allen, ICC, "St. Matthew," 270-74; Godet, Commentary on the New Testament; Gospel of John, English translation, New York, 1886, II, 378, 379; and the significant articles on the interpretation of Lu 22:15,16 by Burkitt and Brooke, Journal of Theological Studies, IX, 569 ff, and by Box, ib, X, 106.

Walter R. Betteridge

PRESBYTER; PRESBYTERY prez'-bi-ter, pres'-bi-ter, prez'-bi-ter-i, pres'-bi-ter-i (presbuteros, presbuterion):

1. Words Used in the New Testament:

This latter word occurs in the New Testament once (1Ti 4:14), so rendered in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American). But the original Greek occurs also in Lu 22:66, in the Revised Version (British and American) translated "the assembly of the elders," in the King James Version simply "the elders"; and in Ac 22:5, translated in English Versions of the Bible "the estate of the elders"; in both of which occurrences the word might more accurately be translated "the

presbytery," just as it is in 1Ti 4:14. Besides these three occurrences of the neuter singular presbuterion, the masculine plural presbuteroi, always translated "elders," is often used to indicate the same organization or court as the former, being applied earlier in New Testament history to the Jewish Sanhedrin (Mt 27:1; 28:12; Lu 9:22; Ac 4:5,8), and later in the development of the church to its governing body, either in general (Ac 15:2,4,6,22 f), or locally (Ac 14:23; 16:4; 20:17; 1Ti 5:17; Tit 1:5, etc.). It is sometimes used of the body, or succession, of religious teachers and leaders of the nation's past (Mt 15:2; Heb 11:2). The word "presbyter" has been contracted by later ecclesiastical usage into the title "priest," although in the New Testament they are by no means identical, but on the contrary are often explicitly distinguished (Mr 14:43; Ac 23:14).

2. Based on the Synagogue Plan:

The local synagogue of the Jewish church was under the care and control of a body of representative men called "the elders" (Lu 7:3). Naturally the Christian church, beginning at Jerusalem and formed on the lines of the synagogue, took over the eldership into its own organization (Ac 11:30; 15:2; 1Pe 5:1, etc.); so also in all the cities in which the missionary activities of the apostles made church organization necessary, the local synagogues readily suggested and supplied a feasible plan for such organization (Ac 14:23; Tit 1:5). The mother-church at Jerusalem, formed after the pattern of the synagogue, might well have offered to the churches formed elsewhere under apostolic preaching the only conceivable plan. We do not know from the New Testament passages how these elders were selected; we must infer that they were elected by the membership of the churches, as under the synagogue plan; they were then installed into their office by apostles (Ac 14:23), or by apostolic helpers (Tit 1:5), or by "the presbytery" (1Ti 4:14), or by both together (2Ti 1:6; compare 1Ti 4:14). So early as the Pauline letters the office of presbyter seems already to have borne the distinction of two functions: teaching and ruling (1Ti 5:17; compare Ac 20:17,28; 1Th 5:12,13; 1Pe 5:2).

3. Principle Found in the New Testament:

In the New Testament history and epistles it does not appear that the various churches of a district were already organized into an ecclesiastical body known as "the presbytery," having some basis of representation from the constituent churches. But the absence of such mention is far from being final proof that such district organizations did not exist; little dependence can be placed on mere negative arguments. Moreover, the council of apostles and elders in Jerusalem, to which Paul and Barnabas appealed (Ac 15), is positive evidence of the principle of representation and central authority. The various district organizations would quickly follow as administrative and judicial needs demanded; such development came early in the growth of the church, so early that it is unmistakably present in the post-apostolic age.

In Revelation the 24 elders occupy a conspicuous place in the ideal church (Re 4:4,10; 5:6, etc.), sitting for those they represent, as an exalted presbytery, close to the throne of the Eternal One. "The four and twenty elders occupying thrones (not seats) around the throne are to be regarded as representatives of the glorified church; and the number, twice twelve, seems to be obtained by combining the number of the

patriarchs of the Old Testament with that of the apostles of the New Testament" (Milligan on Re 4:4 in the Expositor's Bible).

4. In the Presbyterian Church:

Presbytery is the court, or representative body, in the Presbyterian Church next above the Session of the local church. The Session is composed of the ruling elders, elected by the membership of a particular church, with the minister as moderator or presiding officer. The Presbytery is composed of all the ordained ministers, or teaching elders, and one ruling elder from the Session of each church in a given district or community. To it now, as in New Testament times (1Ti 4:14), is committed the power of ordination; as also of installation and removal of ministers. It has supervision of the affairs which are general to the churches in its jurisdiction, and the power of review in all matters concerning the local churches (see Form of Government, Presbyterian Church in U.S.A., chapter x). The Presbytery elects the representatives composing the General Assembly, which is the highest court of the Presbyterian Church.

5. In Architecture:

In ecclesiastical architecture the presbytery is that part of the church structure which is set apart for the clergy, usually the space between altar and apse; sometimes used of the whole choir space, but ordinarily the word is more restricted in its meaning.

See further, BISHOP; CHURCH; ELDER; GOVERNMENT.

Edward Mack

PRESENCE

prez'-ens: In the Old Testament nearly always the rendition of panim, "face" (Ge 3:8; Ex 33:14 f; Ps 95:2; Isa 63:9, etc.); occasionally of 'ayin, "eye" (Ge 23:11; De 25:9; Jer 28:1,11, etc.); and in 1Ki 8:22; Pr 14:7, "the presence of" represents the preposition neghedh, "before"; compare also Aramaic qodham, in Da 2:27 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "before"). In Greek, "presence" has an exact equivalent in parousia, but this word is rendered "presence" only in 2Co 10:10; Php 2:12; the Revised Version (British and American); Php 1:26 (the King James Version "coming"). Elsewhere parousia is rendered "coming," but always with "presence" in the margin. Otherwise in the New Testament "presence" represents no particular word but is introduced where it seems to suit the context (compare e.g. Ac 3:13 the King James Version and Ac 3:19).

See PAROUSIA.

Burton Scott Easton

PRESENT

prez’-ent.

See GIFT.

PRESENTLY

prez’-ent-li: The strict meaning is of course "at the present moment," "instantly," and the modern force "after a short interval" is due simply to the procrastinating habits of mankind; hence, the Revised Version (British and American) modifications of the King James Version use of the word into "immediately" (Mt 21:19), "even now" (Mt 26:53), and "forthwith" (Php 2:23). In Pr 12:16, the uncertainty of the meaning (margin "openly," Hebrew "in the day") has led to the retention of the King James Version word.

PRESIDENT

prez’-i-dent (carakh): Used only in Da 6:2-7. Probably a Persian derivative from sar, "head," and the Aramaic equivalent for Hebrew shoter. The meaning is self-evident and refers to the appointment of Daniel by Darius to be one of the three princes who had rule over the satraps of the empire.

PRESS

pres: As a verb is used in the Revised Version (British and American) as a translation of no less than 13 Greek and Hebrew words (rather more in the King James Version). All the Revised Version (British and American) uses are modern. In the King James Version may be noted The Wisdom of Solomon 17:11, "pressed with conscience" (the Revised Version (British and American) "pressed hard by"); 2 Macc 14:9, "pressed on every side" (the Revised Version (British and American) "surrounded by foes"); Ac 18:5, "pressed in the spirit" (the Revised Version (British and American) "constrained by"). As a noun, the King James Version uses "press" in Mr 2:4 for ochlos, "crowd" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). For wine press see VINE; WINE.

PRESSFAT

pres’-fat (Hag 2:16 in the King James Version, the English Revised Version "winefat," the American Standard Revised Version "winevat").

See WINE.

PRESUME; PRESUMPTUOUS; PRESUMPTUOUSLY

pre-zum', pre-zump'-tu-us, pre-zump'-tu-us-li: "To presume" ("to take or go beforehand") is to speak or act without warrant or proudly. In the Old Testament the words are for the most part the translation of zudh, and zidh, "to boil up" (as water), and derivatives; hence, to act proudly, to speak unauthorizedly, etc. (De 18:20,22, of the prophet; Ex 21:14; De 1:43; 17:12,13; Ps 19:13, "presumptuous sins" (zedh, "proud"); compare Ps 86:14; 119:21, etc.; Pr 21:24, etc.). Other words are male',' to fill," "to be full" (Es 7:5, "presume"); 'aphal, "to lift oneself up" (Nu 14:44); beyadh ramah, "with a high hand" (Nu 15:30, the Revised Version (British and American) "with a high hand"); in 2Pe 2:10 tolmetes, "bold," "daring," is translated "presumptuous," the Revised Version (British and American) "daring"; in 2 Macc 3:24; 5:15 we have katatolmao; thrasus, is rendered "presumption" in 2 Macc 5:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "daring deed."

W. L. Walker

PREVENT

pre-vent' (qadham; prophthano, phthano): "Prevent" occurs in the King James Version in the literal but obsolete sense of "to come or go before," "to anticipate," not in the sense of "to hinder." It is the translation of qadham, "to be sharp," "to be in front," "to be beforehand" (2Sa 22:6,19, the Revised Version (British and American) "came upon" Job 3:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "receive"; 30:27, "are come upon"; 41:11, "first given"; Ps 18:5,18, "came upon"; 21:3, the American Standard Revised Version "meetest"; 59:10, the American Standard Revised Version "meet"; 79:8, the American Standard Revised Version "meet"; 88:13, "come before"; 119:147,148, the American Standard Revised Version "anticipated"; Isa 21:14, "did meet"; Am 9:10, the American Standard Revised Version "meet"). In the New Testament prophthano, with same meaning, is translated "prevent" (Mt 17:25, "Jesus prevented him," the Revised Version (British and American) "spake first to him"); phthano (1Th 4:15, "shall not prevent," the Revised Version (British and American) "shall in no wise precede"). "Prevent" in the above sense occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 6:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "forestalleth" (phthano); 16:28, "we must prevent the sun to give thee thanks," the Revised Version (British and American) "rise before."

W. L. Walker

PREY

pra (baz, Tereph, shalal): "Prey" is frequent in the Old Testament, chiefly as the translation of baz, "spoil," "plunder" (Nu 14:3,11; De 1:39; Isa 10:6, etc.); of Tereph, "prey of wild beasts," "torn thing" (Ge 49:9; Nu 23:24; Job 4:11, etc.); of malqoah, "a taking" (Nu 31:11, etc.; Isa 49:24,25); of shalal, "spoil" or "booty" (Jud 5:30 twice; Jud 8:24,25; Isa 10:2, etc.). Maher-shalal-chash-baz (the Revised Version margin "The spoil speedeth, the prey hasteth") was the symbolical name given to a son of Isaiah (Isa 8:1,3). "Prey" does not occur in the New Testament, but is found in the Apoc: 1 Esdras 8:77, "for our sins .... were given up .... for a prey" (pronome); Judith 9:4; 16:5; 1 Macc 7:47; Ecclesiasticus 27:10 (thera); Judith 5:24 (katabroma).

In the Revised Version (British and American) shalal is generally translated "spoil" (Jud 5:30; 8:24,25; Isa 10:2, etc.), while, conversely, "prey" (noun and verb) is occasionally substituted for "spoil," "booty" (Nu 31:32, ere).

See BOOTY; SPOIL.

W. L. Walker

PRICE

pris: Represents various words in the Old Testament; time, is the usual Greek word for "price" in the New Testament. "Of great price" is polutimos, in Mt 13:46, and poluteles, in 1Pe 3:4. The verb occurs in Zec 11:13 the King James Version and the English Revised Version as "prised." The spelling "prized" in the American Standard Revised Version and some editions of the King James Version is due to a confusion with "prize." For "price of a dog" (De 23:18 the King James Version) see DOG.

PRICK

prik: As a noun (= any slender pointed thing, a thorn, a sting) it translates two words:

(1) sekh, a "thorn" or "prickle." Only in Nu 33:55, "those that ye let remain of them be as pricks in your eyes," i.e. "shall be a source of painful trouble to you."

(2) kentron "an iron goad" for urging on oxen and other beasts of burden: "It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks" (the King James Version of Ac 9:5, where the Revised Version (British and American) omits the whole phrase, following the best manuscripts, including Codices Sinaiticus, A, B, C, E; the King James Version of Ac 26:14, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "goad," margin "Greek: ‘goads’ "), i.e. to offer vain and perilous resistance. See GOAD. As a verb (=" to pierce with something sharply pointed," "to sting"), it occurs once in its literal sense: "a pricking brier" (Eze 28:24); and twice in a figurative sense: "I was pricked in my heart" (Ps 73:21); "They were pricked in their heart" (Ac 2:37, katanusso, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) compungo; compare English word "compunction").

D. Miall Edwards

PRIEST

prest (kohen, "priest," "prince," "minister"; hiereus archiereus; for hiereus megas, of Heb 10:21, see Thayer’s Lexicon, under the word hiereus:

I. NATURE OF THE PRIESTLY OFFICE

1. Implies Divine Choice

2. Implies Representation

3. Implies Offering Sacrifice

4. Implies Intercession

II. THE TWO GREAT PRIESTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, MELCHIZEDEK AND AARON

III. PRIESTLY FUNCTIONS AND CHARACTER

1. A Strictly Religious Order

2. Priestism Denied

3. The High Priest's Qualifications

4. Symbolism of Aaron's Rod

IV. CONSECRATION OF AARON AND HIS SONS (EXODUS 29; LEVITICUS 8)

1. Symbolism of Consecration

2. Type and Archetype

LITERATURE

A priest is one who is duly authorized to minister in sacred things, particularly to offer sacrifices at the altar, and who acts as mediator between men and God. In the New Testament the term is applied to priests of the Gentiles (Ac 14:13), to those of the Jews (Mt 8:4), to Christ (Heb 5:5,6), and to Christians (1Pe 2:9; Re 1:6). The office of priest in Israel was of supreme importance and of high rank. The high priest stood next the monarch in influence and dignity. Aaron, the head of the priestly order, was closely associated with the great lawgiver, Moses, and shared with him in the government and guidance of the nation. It was in virtue of the priestly functions that the chosen people were brought into near relations with God and kept therein. Through the ministrations of the priesthood the people of Israel were instructed in the doctrine of sin and its expiation, in forgiveness and worship. In short, the priest was the indispensable source of religious knowledge for the people, and the channel through which spiritual life was communicated.

I. Nature of the Priestly Office.

1. Implies Divine Choice:

The Scriptures furnish information touching this point. To them we at once turn. Priesthood implies choice. Not only was the office of divine institution, but the priest himself was divinely-appointed thereto. "For every high priest, being taken from among men, is appointed for men in things pertaining to God. .... And no man taketh the honor unto himself, but when he is called of God, even as was Aaron" (Heb 5:1,4). The priest was not elected by the people, much less was he self-appointed. Divine selection severed him from those for whom he was to act. Even our Great High Priest, Jesus Christ, came not into the world unsent. He received His commission and His authority from the fountain of all sovereignty. At the opening of His earthly ministry He said, "He anointed me. .... He hath sent me" (Lu 4:18). He came bearing heavenly credentials.

2. Implies Representation:

It implies the principle of representation. The institution of the office was God's gracious provision for a people at a distance from Him, who needed one to appear in the divine presence in their behalf. The high priest was to act for men in things pertaining to God, "to make propitiation for the sins of the people" (Heb 2:17). He was the mediator who ministered for the guilty. "The high priest represented the whole people. All Israelites were reckoned as being in him. The prerogative held by him belonged to the whole of them (Ex 19:6), but on this account it was transferred to him because it was impossible that all Israelites should keep themselves holy as became the priests of Yahweh" (Vitringa). That the high priest did represent the whole congregation appears, first, from his bearing the tribal names on his shoulders in the onyx stones, and, second, in the tribal names engraved in the twelve gems of the breastplate. The divine explanation of this double representation of Israel in the dress of the high priest is, he "shall bear their names before Yahweh upon his two shoulders for a memorial" (Ex 28:12,19). Moreover, his committing heinous sin involved the people in his guilt: "If the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people" (Le 4:3). The Septuagint reads, "If the anointed priest shall sin so as to make the people sin." The anointed priest, of course, is the high priest. When he sinned the people sinned. His official action was reckoned as their action. The whole nation shared in the trespass of their representative. The converse appears to be just as true. What he did in his official capacity, as prescribed by the Lord, was reckoned as done by the whole congregation: "Every high priest .... is appointed for men" (Heb 5:1).

3. Implies Offering Sacrifice:

It implies the offering of sacrifice. Nothing is clearer in Scripture than this priestly function. It was the chief duty of a priest to reconcile men to God by making atonement for their sins; and this he effected by means of sacrifice, blood-shedding (Heb 5:1; 8:3). He would be no priest who should have nothing to offer. It was the high priest who carried the blood of the sin offering into the Most Holy Place and who sprinkled it seven times on and before the mercy-seat, thus symbolically covering the sins of the people

from the eyes of the Lord who dwelt between the cherubim (Ps 80:1). It was he also who marked the same blood on the horns of the altar of burnt offering in the Court of the Tabernacle, and on those of the golden altar, that the red sign of propitiation might thus be lifted up in the sight of Yahweh, the righteous Judge and Redeemer.

4. Implies Intercession:

It implies intercession. In the priestly ministry of Aaron and his sons this function is not so expressly set forth as are some of their other duties, but it is certainly included. For intercession is grounded in atonement. There can be no effective advocacy on behalf of the guilty until their guilt is righteously expiated. The sprinkling of the blood on the mercy-seat served to cover the guilt from the face of God, and at the same time it was an appeal to Him to pardon and accept His people. So we read that after Aaron had sprinkled the blood he came forth from the sanctuary and blessed Israel (Le 9:22-24; Nu 6:22-27).

II. The Two Great Priests of the Old Testament, Melchizedek and Aaron:

These were Melchizedek and Aaron. No others that ever bore the name or discharged the office rank with these, save, of course, the Lord Jesus Christ, of whom they were distinguished types. Of the two, Melchizedek was the greater. There are two reasons why they are to be considered chiefs: first, because they are first in their respective orders. Melchizedek was not only the head of his order, but he had no successor. The office began and terminated with him (Heb 7:3). The ordinary priests and the Levites depended for their official existence on Aaron. Apart from him they would not be priests. Second, the priesthood of Christ was typified by both. The office is summed up and completed in Him. They were called and consecrated that they might be prophecies of Him who was to come and in whom all priesthood and offering and intercession would find its ample fulfillment. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the priesthood of both these men is combined and consummated in Christ. But let it be noted that while He is of the order of Melchizedek He exercises the office after the pattern of Aaron. He perfects all that Aaron did typically, because He is the true and the real Priest, while Aaron is but a figure.

III. Priestly Functions and Character.

1. A Strictly Religious Order:

These are minutely prescribed in the Law. In the institution of the office the Lord’s words to Moses were, "Take thou unto thee Aaron thy brother, and his sons with him, from among the children of Israel, that he may minister unto me in the priest’s office" (Ex 28:1 the King James Version). Their duties were strictly religious. They had no political power conferred upon them. Their services, their dependent position, and the way in which they were sustained, i.e. by the free gifts of the people, precluded them from exercising any undue influence in the affairs of the nation. It is true that in process of time the high office degenerated, and became a thing of barter and sale in the hands of unscrupulous and corrupt men, but as originally appointed the priesthood in Israel was not a caste, nor a hierarchy, nor a political factor,

but a divinely-appointed medium of communication between God and the people.

2. Priestism Denied:

The Hebrew priests in no wise interfered with the conscience of men. The Hebrew worshipper of his own free will laid his hand on the head of his sacrifice, and confessed his sins to God alone. His conscience was quite free and untrammeled.

3. The High Priest’s Qualifications:

There were certain duties which were peculiar to the high priest. He alone could wear the "garments for glory and for beauty." To him alone it pertained to enter the Most Holy Place and to sprinkle the blood of the sin offering on the mercy-seat. To him alone it pertained to represent the congregation before the Lord as mediator, and to receive the divine communications. He was to be ceremonially pure and holy. He must be physically perfect. Any defect or deformity disqualified a member of the priestly family from performing the duties of the office (Le 21:17-21). The Law spoke with the utmost precision as to the domestic relations of the high priest. He could marry neither a widow, nor a divorced woman, nor one polluted, nor a harlot; only a virgin of his own people, a Hebrew of pure extraction, could become his wife (Le 21:14,15). Nor was he to come in contact with death. He must not rend his clothes, nor defile himself, even for his father or his mother (Le 21:10,11). His sons might defile themselves for their kin, but the high priest must not. For he was the representative of life. Death did not exist for him, in so far as he was a priest. God is the Ever-Living, the Life-Giving; and His priest, who had "the crown of the anointing oil of his God upon him," had to do with life alone.

4. Symbolism of Aaron’s Rod:

Adolph Saphir believes there is deep significance in the miracle of Aaron’s rod that budded and bare almonds (Nu 17). It was a visible sign of the legitimacy of Aaron’s priesthood and a confirmation of it, and a symbol of its vitality and fruitfulness. The twelve rods of the tribes were dead sticks of wood, and remained dead; Aaron’s alone had life and produced blossoms and fruit. It was the emblem of his office which correlated itself with life, and had nothing to do with death.

IV. Consecration of Aaron and His Sons (Exodus 29; Leviticus 8).

The process of the consecration is minutely described and is worthy of a more detailed and careful study than can here be given it. Only the more prominent features are noticed.

(1) Both the high priest and his sons were together washed with water (Ex 29:4). But when this was done, the high priest parted company with his sons.

(2) Next, Aaron was arrayed in the holy and beautiful garments, with the breastplate over his heart, and the holy crown on his head, the mitre, or turban, with its golden plate bearing the significant inscription,

"Holy to Yahweh." This was Aaron’s investiture of the high office.

(3) He was then anointed with the precious oil. It is noteworthy that Moses poured the oil on his head. When he anointed the tabernacle and its furniture he sprinkled the oil, but in Aaron’s case there was a profusion, an abundance in the anointing (Ps 133:2).

(4) After the anointing of the high priest the appointed sacrifices were offered (Ex 29:10). Up to this point in the ceremony Aaron was the principal figure, the sons having no part save in the bathing. But after the offerings had been made the sons became prominent participants in the ceremonies, sharing equally with the high priest therein.

(5) The blood of the offering was applied to the person of father and sons alike (Ex 29:20,21). On the tip of the right ear, on the thumb of the right hand, and on the great toe of the right foot was the consecrating blood-mark set.

1. Symbolism of Consecration:

The significance of this action should not escape the reader. The whole person and career of the priest were thus brought under power of the blood. He had a blood-stained ear that he might hear and obey the divine injunctions, that he might understand the word of Yahweh and interpret it to the people. His will was brought into subjection to the will of His Lord that he might be a faithful minister in things pertaining to God. He had a blood-stained hand that he might execute, rightly and efficiently, the services of the sanctuary and the duties of his great office. He had likewise a blood-stained foot that he might walk in the statutes and commandments of the Lord blameless, and tread the courts of the Lord’s house as the obedient servant of the Most High. Sacrificial blood, the blood of atonement, is here, as everywhere else, the foundation for saints and sinners, for priests and ministers alike, in all their relations with God.

2. Type and Archetype:

The priests of Israel were but dim shadows, obscure sketches and drafts of the one Great Priest of God, the Lord Jesus Christ. Without drawing out at length the parallelism between the type and the archetype, we may sum up in a few brief sentences the perfection found in the priestly character of Christ:

(1) Christ as Priest is appointed of God (Heb 5:5). (2) He is consecrated with an oath (Heb 7:20-22).

(3) He is sinless (Heb 7:26).

(4) His priesthood is unchangeable (Heb 7:23,24).

(5) His offering is perfect and final (Heb 9:25-28; 10:12).

(6) His intercession is all-prevailing (Heb 7:25).

(7) As God and man in one Person He is a perfect Mediator (Heb 1; 2).

See CHRIST, OFFICES OF, sec. V.

LITERATURE.

Smith, DB; HDB; P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, II; Soltau, Exposition of the Tabernacle; the Priestly Garments and the Priesthood; Martin, Atonement; A.B. Davidson, Hebrews; Moorehead, Mosaic Institutions.

William G. Moorehead

PRIEST, CHRIST AS

See CHRIST, OFFICES OF.

PRIEST, HIGH

(ha-kohen, ho hiereus; ha-kohen ha-mashiach, ho hiereus ho christos; ha-kohen ha-gadhol, ho hiereus ho megas; kohen ha-ro’sh, ho hiereus hegoumenos; New Testament archiereus):

I. INSTITUTION OF THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD

1. The Family

2. The Consecration

3. The Dress

4. The Duties of High-Priesthood

5. Special Regulations

6. The Emoluments

7. Importance of the Office

II. HISTORY OF THE HIGH-PRIESTHOOD IN ISRAEL

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the New Testament

LITERATURE

I. Institution of the High-Priesthood.

Temples with an elaborate ritual, a priesthood and a high priest were familiar to Moses. For a millennium or two before his time these had flourished in Egypt. Each temple had its priest or priests, the larger temples and centers having a high priest. For centuries the high priest of Amon at Thebes stood next to the king in power and influence. Many other high-priesthoods of less importance existed. Moses' father-in-law was priest of Midian, doubtless the chief or high priest. In founding a nation and establishing an ecclesiastical system, nothing would be more natural and proper for him than to institute a priestly system with a high priest at the head. The records give a fairly full account of the institution of the high-priesthood.

1. The Family:

Aaron, the brother of Moses, was chosen first to fill the office. He was called "the priest" (ha-kohen) (Ex 31:10). As the office was to be hereditary and to be preserved in perpetuity in the family of Aaron (Ex 29:9,29), he is succeeded by his son Eleazar (Nu 20:28; De 10:6), and he in turn by his son Phinehas (Nu 25:11). In his time the succession was fixed (Nu 25:12,13). In Le 4:3,5,16; 6:22 he is called "the anointed priest." Three times in the Pentateuch he is spoken of as "great priest" or "high priest" (Le 21:10; Nu 35:25,28). The first of these passages identifies him with the anointed priest.

2. The Consecration:

The ceremonies by which he was installed in his office are recorded in Ex 29:29 ff. Seven days of special solemnities were spent. The first consecration was by Moses; it is not said who performed the others. There was special washing and anointing with oil (Ps 133:2). Each new high priest must wear the holy garments, as well as be specially anointed (Le 21:10). Every day a bullock for a sin offering must be offered for atonement; the altar also must be cleansed, atoned for, and anointed, the high priest offering a sacrifice or minchah for himself (Le 6:24).

3. The Dress:

Besides the regularly prescribed dress of the priests, the high priest must wear the robe of the ephod, the ephod, the breastplate and the mitre or head-dress (Le 8:7-9). The robe of the ephod seems to have been a sleeveless tunic, made of blue, fringed with alternate bells and pomegranates (Ex 28:31-35; 39:22-26). The ephod seemed to be a variegated dress of the four colors of the sanctuary, blue, purple, scarlet and

fine linen interwoven with gold (Ex 28:6-8; 39:2-5). This distinguishing ephod of the high priest was fastened at the shoulders by two clasps of shoham stone, upon each of which was engraved the names of six tribes of Israel (Ex 28:9-14; 39:6,7). Over the ephod and upon his breast he wore the breastplate, a four-cornered choshen suspended by little chains. Set in this in four rows were twelve precious stones, having engraved upon them the names of the twelve tribes of Israel. This breastplate must have contained a pocket of some kind inside, for in it were deposited the Urim and Thummim, which seemed to be tangible objects of some kind (Ex 28:15-30; 39:8-21). The mitre or head-dress was of fine linen, the plate of the crown of pure gold, and inscribed upon it the words, "Holy to Yahweh" (Ex 28:36-38; 39:30,31). When entering the Holy of Holies he must be dressed wholly in linen, but in his ordinary duties in the dress of the priests; only when acting as high priest he must wear his special robes.

See PRIEST.

4. The Duties of the High-Priesthood:

In addition to his regular duties as a priest, the high priest was to enter the Holy of Holies on the Day of Atonement (Le 16:3,15,33,34). He must also officiate at the ceremony of the two goats, when one is sent into the wilderness to Azazel, and the other slain to make atonement for the sanctuary (Ex 30:10; Le 16:8-10). He alone could make atonement for the sins of the people, the priests and his own house (Le 4:3 ff; 9:8 ff; 16:6; Nu 15:25). He must offer the regular meal offering (Le 6:14,15). He must share with the priests in the caring for the lamp that burned continually (Ex 27:21), He must assist in arranging the shewbread (Ex 25:30). When he carried the breastplate with the names of the tribes inscribed thereon he acted as mediator between Israel and God (Ex 28:29). He alone could consult the Urim and Thummim before Yahweh, and according to his decision Israel must obey (Nu 27:21).

5. Special Regulations:

An office so important required certain special regulations. He must be free from every bodily defect (Le 21:16-23). He must marry only a virgin of Israel, not a widow, nor a divorced woman, nor a profane one (Le 21:14). He must not observe the external signs of mourning for any person, and not leave the sanctuary when news came of the death of even a father or mother (Le 21:10-12). He must not defile himself by contact with any dead body, even father or mother (Le 21:11); and is forbidden to let his hair grow long or rend his clothes as a sign of mourning (Le 21:10). If he should bring guilt upon the people, he must present a special offering (Le 4:3). Sins affecting the priesthood in general must be expiated by the other priests as well as himself (Nu 18:1). He must eat nothing that died of itself or was torn by beasts (Le 22:8). He must wash his feet and hands when he went to the tabernacle of the congregation and when he came near to the altar to minister (Ex 30:19-21). At first Aaron was to burn incense on the golden altar every morning when he dressed the lamps and every evening when he lighted them (Ex 27:21), but in later times the common priests performed this duty. He must abstain from holy things during his uncleanness (Le 22:1-3), or if he should become leprous (Le 22:4,7). He was to eat the people’s meat offering with the inferior priests in the holy place (Le 6:16). He must assist in judging the leprosy in the human body and garments (Le 13:2-59), and in adjudicating legal questions (De 17:12).

When there was no divinely-inspired leader, the high priest was the chief ruler till the time of David and again after the captivity.

See PRIEST; PRIESTHOOD.

6. The Emoluments:

The emoluments were not much greater than those of the priests in general. He received no more inheritance among the tribes than any other Levite, but he and his family were maintained upon certain fees, dues and perquisites which they enjoyed from the common fund. In Nu 18:28 the priests were to receive a tithe of the tithe paid in to the Levites. Josephus says this was a common fund (Ant., IV, iv, 4), but the high priest was probably charged with the duty of distributing it. In general the family of the high priest was well-to-do, and in the later period became very wealthy. The high priest and his family were among the richest people of the land in the time of Christ, making enormous profits out of the sacrifices and temple business.

7. Importance of the Office:

The importance of the high priest's office was manifest from the first. The high priest Eleazar is named in the first rank with Joshua, the prince of the tribes and successor of Moses (Nu 34:17 f; Jos 14:1). He with others officiated in the distribution of the spoils of the Midianites (Nu 31:21,26). His sins were regarded as belonging to the people (Le 4:3,12). He acted with Moses in important matters (Nu 26:1; 31:29). The whole congregation must go or come according to his word (Nu 27:20). His death was a national event, for then the manslayer was free to leave the City of Refuge (Nu 35:25,28). He had no secular authority, but was regarded generally as the leading religious authority. Later, he became also the leading secular as well as religious authority.

II. History of the High-Priesthood in Israel.

1. In the Old Testament:

In general the present writer accepts the historical records of the Old Testament as true and rejects the critical views of a fictitious or falsified history. Such views have only subjective reasons to support them and are based upon a naturalistic evolutionary view of the development of Israel's religion. As Moses was the founder of the high-priesthood in Israel he anticipated a perpetuation of the office throughout the history (De 26:3). The high priest appears frequently. Eleazar officiated with Joshua in the division of the land among the twelve tribes (Jos 14:1). The law of the manslayer shows that he was an important personage in the life of Israel (Jos 20:6). He seemed to have the power to distribute the offices of the priests to those whom he would, and poor priests would appeal to him for positions (1Sa 2:36). The office seems to have remained in the family of Eleazar until the days of Eli, when, because of the wickedness of his sons, the family was destroyed and the position passed into the family of Ithamar (1Sa 2:31-36). A descendant of that family officiated at Nob in the times of Saul, whose name was Ahimelech

(1Sa 21:2; 22:11). His son, Abiathar, escaped from the slaughter, and later seems to have succeeded his father and to have been chief priest throughout David's reign (1Sa 22:20-23; 23:9; 30:7). Zadok seems to have had almost equal privilege (2Sa 8:17; 1Ch 18:16; 24:6 almost certainly by copyist's error, transpose Abiathar and Ahimelech; Mr 2:26 may be based on this reading. See ABIATHAR, etc.). Because he joined the party of Adonijah rather than that of Solomon, Abiathar was deposed and banished to Anathoth, where he spent the rest of his days (1Ki 2:26,27). Zadok was put in his place (1Ki 2:35). He seems to have been a descendant of Eleazar. Under Jehoshaphat, Amariah was high priest (2Ch 19:11) and was the leading authority in all religious matters. In the time of Athaliah, during the minority of Joash and almost his entire reign Jehoiada was high priest and chief adviser. He seems to have been the most influential man in the kingdom for more than half a century (2Ki 11:4 ff; 11:2-16; 2Ch 24$ passim). Azariah officiated in the days of Uzziah and Hezekiah (2Ch 26:20; 31:10); Urijah in the reign of Ahaz (2Ki 16:10-16), and the latter priest seems to have been a friend of Isaiah (Isa 8:2). Hilkiah held the office in the days of Josiah when the Book of the Law was discovered (2Ki 22:4 f; 23:4; 2Ch 34:9); Zephaniah in the time of Jeremiah (Jer 29:25 f); Seraiah in the days of Zedekiah, who was put to death at Riblah by Nebuchadnezzar (2Ki 25:18 f; Jer 52:24). At the time, mention is made of a priest of the second rank (2Ki 23:4; 25:18) and Zephaniah fills that office (Jer 52:24). It is doubtful whether this is the same Zephaniah mentioned in Jer 29:25. This "second priest" was doubtless a deputy, appointed to take the high priest's place in case anything should prevent his performing the duties of the office. Lists of high priests are given in 1Ch 6:1-15; 6:50-53. The first of these gives the line from Levi to Jehozadak who was carried away in the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar. The second traces the line from Aaron to Ahimaaz, and is identical so far with the first list.

There could have been no place for the functions of the high priest during the captivity, but the family line was preserved and Joshua the son of Jehozadak was among those who first returned (Ezr 3:2). From this time the high priest becomes more prominent. The monarchy is gone, the civil authority is in the hands of the Persians, the Jews are no longer independent, and hence, the chief power tends to center in the high-priesthood. Joshua appears to stand equal with Zerubbabel (Hag 1:1,12,14; 2:2,4; Zec 3:1,8; 4:14; 6:11-13).

He is distinctly known as high priest (ha-kohen ha-gadhol). He takes a leading part in establishing the ecclesiastico-civil system, particularly the building of the temple. In the vision of Zechariah (Zec 3:1-5) Satan accuses the high priest who is here the representative proper of the nation. The consummation of the Messianic age cannot be completed without the cooperation of the high priest who is crowned with Zerubbabel, and sits with him on the throne (Zec 6:13). The prophet also describes Joshua and his friends as "men of the sign," alluding to the coming Messiah under whom the sin of the land was to be taken away in one day (Zec 3:9 f). The promise is made to Joshua that if he will walk in Yahweh's ways and keep His house, he shall judge Yahweh's house, i.e. Israel, keep His court and have a place to walk among those who stand before Yahweh (Zec 3:7). He is anointed equally with the prince of the royal line, for the two sons of oil (Zec 4:14) almost certainly refer to the royal Zerubbabel and priestly Joshua who are to be joint inspirers of Israel in rebuilding the temple.

This exaltation of the high priest is very different from the state of things pictured by Ezekiel (Eze 40$, 41$, 42$). In that picture no place is left for a high priest; the prince seemed to be the chief personage in

the ecclesiastical system. Ezekiel's vision was ideal, the actual restoration was very different, and the institutions and conditions of the past were carried out rather than the visions of the prophet. In the time of Nehemiah, Eliashib was high priest (Ne 3:1,20). For abusing his office by using a temple chamber in the interests of his family he was reprimanded (Ne 13:4-9). The list of high priests from Jeshua to Jaddua is given in Ne 12:10. According to Josephus (Ant., XI, viii, 5) Jaddua was priest at the time of Alexander the Great (332 BC), but it is practically certain that it was Jaddua's grandson, Simon, who was then priest (see W.J. Beecher, Reasonable Biblical Criticism, chapter xviii). Thus is preserved the unbroken line from Aaron to Jaddua, the office still being hereditary. No essential change can be found since the days of Ezra. The Book of Chronicles, compiled some time during this period, uses the three names, ha-kohen, ha-kohen ha-ro'sh, ha-kohen ha-gadhol. The word naghidh ("prince") is also used, and he is called "the ruler of the house of God" (1Ch 9:11). This seems to imply considerable power invested in him. Usually the Chronicler in both books of Chronicles and Nehemiah uses the term "the priest."

The line of Eleazar doubtless continued until the time of the Maccabees, when a decided change took place. The Syrian Antiochus deposed Onias III and put his brother Jason in his place (174 BC), who was soon displaced by Menelaus. About 153 BC Jonathan the Hasmonean was appointed by King Alexander, and thus the high-priesthood passed to the priestly family of Joiarib (1 Macc 10:18-21). Whether the family of Joiarib was a branch of the Zadokites or not cannot be determined. After the appointment of Jonathan, the office became hereditary in the Hasmonean line, and continued thus until the time of Herod the Great. The latter set up and deposed high priests at his pleasure. The Romans did the same, and changed so frequently that the position became almost an annual appointment. Though many changes were thus made, the high priest was always chosen from certain priestly families. From this group of deposed priests arose a class known as "chief priests." The anointing prescribed in the law of Moses was not always carried out in later times, and in fact was generally omitted. The Mishna speaks of high priests who were installed in office simply by clothing them with their special robes (Schurer, II, i, p. 217, note 24).

2. In the New Testament:

In New Testament times the high priest was the chief civil and ecclesiastical dignitary among the Jews. He was chairman of the Sanhedrin, and head of the political relations with the Roman government. It is not clear just how far he participated in the ceremonies of the temple. No doubt he alone entered the Holy of Holies once a year on the Day of Atonement, and also offered the daily offerings during that week. What other part he took in the work was according to his pleasure. Josephus says that he officiated at the Sabbath, the New Moon and yearly festivals. The daily minchah (Le 6:12) which he was required to offer was not always offered by the high priest in person, but he was required to defray the expense of it. This was a duty which, according to Ezekiel's vision, was to be performed by the prince. The Jews had many contentions with the Romans as to who should keep the garments of the high priest. When Jerusalem fell into the hands of the Romans, the robe of state also fell into their hands.

In the time of Christ, Annas and Caiaphas were high priests (Lu 3:2), though, as appears later in the Gospel, Caiaphas alone acted as such. Annas had probably been deposed, yet retained much of his influence among the priestly families. For particulars see ANNAS; CAIAPHAS; JESUS CHRIST.

These two were also the chief conspirators against Jesus. As president of the council Caiaphas deliberately advised them to put Jesus to death to save the nation (Joh 11:51). He was also chairman of the council which tried and condemned Jesus (Mt 26:57,58,63,65; Mr 14:53,60,61,63; Lu 22:54; Joh 18:12-14,19,24,28). They were also leaders in the persecution of the apostles and disciples after Pentecost (Ac 4:6; 5:17,21); Saul sought letters from the high priest to Damascus to give him authority to bring any Christians he might find there bound to Jerusalem (Ac 9:2). He presided at the council which tried Paul (Ac 22:5; 23:4).

See PAUL, THE APOSTLE.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the doctrine of the priesthood of Jesus is fully and carefully elaborated. Jesus is here called the great High Priest, as well as priest. The opening words of the Epistle contain the essential thought: "when he had made purification of sins" (1:3). The title of high priest is first introduced in 2:17, "a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God"; also in 3:1, "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession." Having thus fairly introduced his great theme, the writer strikes the keynote of his great argument: "Having then a great high priest," etc. (4:14,15). From 4:14 to 7:28 the argument deals with the high-priestly work of Jesus. His qualifications are not only those which distinguish all priesthood, but they are also unique. He is named after the order of Melchizedek. The general qualifications are:

(1) He is appointed by God to His office (5:1).

(2) He is well fitted for the office by His experiences and participation in human temptations (5:2-6; 2:18).

(3) He undergoes a divine preparation (5:8,9).

The special qualifications of His priesthood are: It is after the order of Melchiezedek (5:10). This is an eternal one (6:20); royal or kingly (7:1-3); independent of birth or family (7:3); it is timeless (7:8); superior to that of Levi (7:4-10); new and different from that of Aaron (7:11,12). It is also indissoluble (7:16); immutable (7:21); inviolable (7:24). Thus, with all these general and special qualifications, He is completely fitted for His work (7:26). That work consists in offering up Himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the people (7:27); entering within the veil as a forerunner (6:20); presenting the sacrificial blood in heaven itself (8:3; 9:7,24); thus obtaining eternal redemption (9:12); ratifying the new covenant (9:15-22). The result of this high-priestly work is a cleansing from all sin (9:23); a possibility of full consecration to God and His service (10:10); an ultimate perfection (10:14); and full access to the throne of grace (10:21,22).

See CHRIST, OFFICES OF; PRIEST; PRIESTHOOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

LITERATURE.

Articles on the priesthood in general, with references to the high priest in HDB, HCG, EB, Jew Encyclopedia, Kitto, Smith, Fallows, Schaff-Herzog, etc.; no article on "High Priest" only. For the history, Breasted, History of Egypt; Schurer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, II, i, 207-99; Josephus, Ant, XV, XVIII, XX. For works on the priesthood from the radical viewpoint, see Graf, S.I. Curtiss, Jost, Graetz, Kautzsch, Budde, Baentsch, Benzinger, Buchler, Meyer, Wellhausen. For a more moderate position see Baudissin, Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums untersucht. For a more conservative position see A. Van Hoonacker, Le sacerdoce levitique dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hebreux. On the high-priesthood subsequent to the return from Babylon, see B. Pick, Lutheran Church Review, 1898, I, 127-41; II, 370-74; III, 555-56; IV, 655-64; and the commentaries on the passages cited.

James Josiah Reeve

PRIESTHOOD

prest'-hood:

1. Priesthood Is an Office

2. In the Old Testament

3. Hereditary Priesthood

4. In the New Testament

5. Conclusions

LITERATURE

All worship is based on priesthood, for the priestly office is an essential part of salvation. Christianity itself has its glorious Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is through His one supreme offering that we are brought into saved relations with God and enjoy fellowship with Him. The priesthood of Christ and its mighty effects in sacrifice and intercession on behalf of the people of God are the chief and fundamental theme of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

1. Priesthood an Office:

Priesthood is a real office, definite and specific. It is needful to insist on this fact, for the noble word "priest" has been misappropriated and misapplied, so that its intrinsic import has been impaired. There is a certain literary slang indulged in by some who talk of the "priests of science," "priests of art," and similar absurdities. The idea of priesthood, if priesthood is to have any definite meaning, can have no

place in literature or science or art or in anything of the kind. For it belongs to the realm of grace, presupposing as it does sin and the divine purpose to remove it. Hugh Martin writes that he "would as soon think of transferring the language of geometry and of algebra to botany and talk of the hypothenuse of a flower and the square root of a tree, or the differential coefficient of a convolvulus, as to speak of the priesthood of nature or letters." Priesthood is an office, embracing very specific duties and functions.

2. In the Old Testament:

Priesthood in some form appears to have existed from the earliest times, even from the beginning of the history of our race. In patriarchal times the office was held and its duties were discharged by those who occupied some sort of headship, and particularly by the father or the chief of the family and of the tribe. Thus, Noah in his capacity of priest and in behalf of his household "builded an altar unto Yahweh, and took of every clean beast, and of every clean bird, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar" (Ge 8:20). Abraham offered the ram "for a burnt-offering in the stead of his son" (Ge 22:13). In like manner Job offered burnt offerings for his children, and likewise by divine direction for the three "comforters" when the great trial had passed (Job 1:5; 42:8). In these and the like instances there was priestly action no less certainly than in that of Aaron or of any regularly appointed priest in Israel. Melchizedek was "priest of God Most High" (Ge 14:18). Isaac "builded an altar there and called upon the name of Yahweh" (Ge 26:25), as did Jacob (Ge 33:20). In these cases priestly acts were performed by the patriarchs in their capacity as fathers of the family or heads of clans. From the beginning, priesthood with its acts of expiation and of worship was thus recognized as a divinely-instituted office. But in pre-Mosaic times there was no special class of priests recognized.

3. Hereditary Priesthood:

Regular priestly succession in a single family was established by Moses (Ex 28:1-3). From this point of time onward the priesthood in Israel was confined to the family of Aaron. No hereditary priesthood seems to have prevailed in patriarchal times. According to the Epistle to the Hebrews, Melchizedek, a priest of the highest rank, had neither predecessor nor successor in his great office. By divine direction Moses designated the Aaronic family as the priestly family in Israel, and he prescribed the garments they should wear, the sacrifices they should offer both for themselves and for the congregation, their maintenance, their domestic relations, and their conduct toward their fellow Hebrews.

In the appointment of the priesthood there is no trace of Egyptian influence. Yet we know that Joseph married the daughter of the priest of On (Ge 41:50). But this fact had no bearing on the selection of Israel’s priestly family. The Aaronic priesthood had nothing in common with that of Egypt; it claimed to be of divine origin, and its duties, functions and powers in no way contradict the claim. The witness of an Egyptian archaeologist (Dr. M.G. Kyle) may be here introduced touching one essential element in the duties of the priestly office, namely, sacrifice: "The entire absence from the offerings of old Egyptian religion of any of the great Pentateuchal ideas of sacrifice, substitution, atonement, dedication, fellowship, and indeed of almost every essential idea of real sacrifice, as clearly established by recent very exhaustive examination of the offering scenes, makes for the element of revelation in the Mosaic

system by delimiting the field of rationalistic speculation on the Egyptian side. Egypt gave nothing to that system, for it had nothing to give." As much may be said respecting the priesthood; Israel took little or nothing of its powers and functions from Egyptian sources.

Although the office was limited to the Aaronic family, nevertheless in certain exigencies and emergencies others beside the regular priest offered sacrifices to the Lord and were accepted by Him. Thus did Gideon in a time of great straits in Israel (Jud 6:24,26); thus the men of Beth-shemesh (1Sa 6:14,15); the prophet Samuel (1Sa 7:9); David (2Sa 6:13,17); Elijah (1Ki 18:23,32-38), etc. The chosen people appear to have felt free to offer sacrifices and to engage in priestly functions when occasion required, until the central sanctuary was established on Mt. Moriah. When the Temple was built and dedicated, priestly action was confined to Jerusalem and to the regular priestly household. When Pharisaism, with its rigid legalism, with its intolerable burdens, became dominant, all liberty of worship and spontaneous service largely disappeared. The religious life of Israel stiffened into a dreadful monotony.

4. In the New Testament:

All priesthood reaches its climax in that of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is because of the perfection of His priesthood that the office as represented by Melchizedek and Aaron was effective, and fulfilled the end for which it was appointed. The one answers to the other as type and antitype, as prediction and fulfillment. Christ’s priesthood is opened to us in the Epistle to the Hebrews (2:14-18; 4:14-16; 5:1-10; 7:9,10,18). Two fundamental truths touching His priesthood are made very prominent in the Epistle to the Hebrews. These are its order and its duties. By the order is meant the rank or grade of the Priest, and by the duties the various functions of His ministry. Christ’s order as Priest is that of Melchizedek, not at all that of Aaron; Heb 7 makes this fact perfectly clear. Like Melchizedek, and infinitely above Melchizedek, He is Priest, having no predecessor in the great office, and no successor; herein He stands absolutely alone, peerless and perfect forever. He executes the duties or functions of it after the pattern of Aaron, as Heb 9 clearly exhibits. These two priesthoods, Melchizedek’s and Aaron’s, are gloriously accomplished in the person and Work of Jesus Christ.

The point is raised and discussed with some keenness in our day, Did Christ execute the office of priest during His sojourn on earth, or does He exercise the office only in heaven? A full discussion of this interesting subject would be inappropriate. However, let it be noted (1) that the Lord Jesus was appointed a Priest no less certainly than was Aaron (Heb 5:4,5). In the words, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," there appears to be a reference both to His incarnation (Lu 1:32; Heb 1:5) and also to His resurrection (Ac 13:33). In Heb 2:17 we are told that it "behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." The assumption of human nature was needful that He might be such a priest. John the Baptist saw this truth, and said, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world" (Joh 1:29).

There was certainly priestly action in His death. Twice we are told that He "offered up himself" (Heb

7:27), "For this he did once for all, when he offered up himself." This strong term, "offered," is sacrificial and points to His death as an offering made for the sins of the people. His own action in it must not be overlooked; it was He Himself who presented the offering; He was not, therefore, a struggling victim, a martyr, who could not escape the doom that came upon Him—nay, He voluntarily offered Himself.

In Heb 9:14 we find these significant words: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" It was as Priest that He made this stupendous offering, and this He did when still on earth. He was at once both sacrifice and priest. Never was He more active than when He offered Himself to God.

It is worthwhile to remind ourselves that the words employed in Scripture to express the act of His dying are never used to denote the death of a creature, a man. Matthew has, He "yielded up (dismissed), his spirit" (Mt 27:50). John has, He "gave up his spirit" (Joh 19:30); Mr 15:37 and Lu 23:46 both have the same words: He "gave up the ghost." He died, not because He was mortal as we are, nor because He could not deliver Himself, but because He gave Himself for our sins that we might be forgiven and saved (Joh 10:17,18). The voluntariness of His offering is the very essence of His priestly atonement.

See CHRIST, OFFICES OF, V; PRIESTHOOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

5. Conclusions:

Priesthood springs out of the deepest need of the human soul. Men universally feel that somehow they have offended the Power to whom they are responsible, to whom they must give account of their deeds. They long to appease their offended Lord, and they believe that one who is authorized and qualified to act in their behalf may secure for them the abrogation of penalty and the pardon they seek. Hence, priesthood connects itself most closely with sin, with guilt and its removal. The heart craves the intervention and intercession on their behalf of one who has liberty of access to God, and whose ministry is acceptable. In short, the priest is the representative of the sinner in things pertaining to God. He is the mediator whose office it is to meet and satisfy the claims of God upon those for whom he acts, and who secures the pardon and the favor which the offender must have, if he is to enjoy fellowship with God. And this, and more than this, we have in our Great High Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ.

LITERATURE.

P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, II; Soltau, Exposition of the Tabernacle, the Priestly Garments and the Priesthood; Martin, Atonement; Moorehead, Mosaic Institutions, article "Priest."

William G. Moorehead

PRIESTHOOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. The Jewish Priesthood

2. The Priesthood and High-Priesthood of Jesus Christ

3. The Priesthood of Believers

1. The Jewish Priesthood:

In the New Testament hierateuma (1Pe 2:5,9), "priesthood," is not found with reference to the Jewish priesthood, but hiereus, and archiereus, "high priest," frequently occur. As until the fall of Jerusalem the activities of the priests were carried on in careful accordance with the prescriptions of the Old Testament, there naturally is nothing new or striking in the numerous New Testament references to their work. Perhaps the information of the greatest interest is found in Lu 1:5-9 to the effect that Zacharias was of the course of Abijah, the 8th of the 24 courses into which the priests were divided (compare 1Ch 24:7-18), and that in these courses the priests divided their work by lot. In the Gospels the archiereis are mentioned oftener than are the hiereis, the power of the priesthood seeming to have been absorbed by a sort of priestly aristocracy. As under the political pressure of that time the office of high priest could seldom be retained until the death of the holder, there might even be several living at the same time who had for a longer or shorter time held this office which made a man the head of the nation, not only ritually, but also politically, since the high priest was ex officio presiding officer of the Sanhedrin. Not only would these ex-high priests naturally retain the title belonging to their former dignity, but probably the name had come to include as well other members of the same families or of families of equal position, so that it seems that "chief priests" is a more exact translation of archiereis than high priests. In the singular, however, the reference of archiereus is usually, if not invariably, to the individual who at the time given was holding the unique office of high priest. The word hiereus is of course employed in its ordinary signification on the rare occasions when reference is made in the New Testament to corresponding ministers of other religions, as to the priest of Zeus (Ac 14:13) and also to Melchizedek (Heb 7:1).

2. The Priesthood and High-Priesthood of Jesus Christ:

Only in Hebrews is the activity of Jesus set forth as priestly and high-priestly, but in this Epistle great emphasis is laid on these aspects of His work. Interpreters seldom distinguish between these two aspects of His work, and it is plain that sometimes at least the author himself made no effort sharply to distinguish them. But certain considerations make it probable that they were not really confused or combined in the mind of the author himself. For example, it is to be noted that the priesthood of Jesus is declared to be after the order of Melchizedek, and consequently radically unlike that of the Levitical priests. On the other hand, the Aaronic high-priesthood is regarded as having been analogous to that of Jesus, so that in spite of its inferiority, comparison is frequently made with it. It is readily seen that the work of the high priest, both because of his entry into the Most Holy Place and because he bore the names of the children of Israel in the breastplate of judgment for a memorial before Yahweh continually,

far more suitably than that of the ordinary priests typified the atoning and intercessory work of Jesus (Ex 28:12,15).

Attempting then to treat separately the priestly and high-priestly functions of Jesus, we note that most of what is said of the priestly functions is involved in the declaration that He is a priest after the order of Melchizedek, and this thought is handled in Heb 7 in such a way as to make plain the superiority of a priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, and thus to confirm the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, the great theme of the book. Historically, the blessing bestowed upon Abraham and the reception of tithes from him prove the superiority of Melchizedek to Levi, and still more to the priestly descendants of Levi (7:4-10). Further, Jesus became priest not on the ground of a "carnal commandment," i.e. in an order based on descent and inheritance, but by "the power of an endless life" (7:16), of which fact Melchizedek reminds us, since Scripture is silent alike as to his birth and his death. Again, unlike the Levitical priests, Christ is inducted into His office by the oath of God (7:20,21; compare Ps 110:4). Finally, while the priests of the Levitical line were hindered from permanence in office by their death, Jesus holds His priesthood untransmitted and untransmissible (7:23,14). This discussion of the priesthood of Christ "after the order of Melchizedek" occupies almost all of Heb 7, but at 7:26 His high-priesthood is suddenly introduced, and after that point, while His work is more than once contrasted with that of the temple priests (8:4,5; 9:6; 10:11 f), no further reference is in any way made to Melchizedek.

After having twice merely given the title of high priest to Jesus (Heb 2:17; 3:1), the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews at 4:14 begins a statement of the resemblance between Jesus and the Jewish high priest, such "as was Aaron," finding the resemblance to reside

(1) in His divine appointment to His work (5:4,5), (2) in His experience of suffering (5:7,8; compare 4:15; 5:2), and (3) in His saving work suggested by the sacrificial activity of the ordinary high priest (5:9), which, however, it far transcends in value and effect. But

(4) later the work of the high priest and that of Jesus are contrasted as to place where done, the high priest going into the second tabernacle, i.e. the Holy of Holies (9:7), while Christ passes through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, "heaven itself" (9:11,24). A similar contrast is

(5) drawn between the sacrifices respectively offered, the ancient sacrifices being the blood of goats and calves (9:12), Christ’s being "himself" (9:14), "his own blood" (9:12), "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish unto God" (9:14). The author also accepts and urges without argument or even explanation

(6) the truly sacrificial character of this self-immolation of Jesus. Nor is this fact nullified by the emphasis which once is laid on doing God’s will in an antithesis copied from the Ps (10:5-9; compare Ps 40:6 ff), for here the contrast drawn is not between sacrifice on one side and obedience on the other, but rather between the sacrifice of animals dying involuntarily and wholly unconscious of the sacrificial significance of their death, and the offering of Himself on the part of Jesus in intelligent purpose to carry

out the will of God, by which will the body of Jesus Christ is the only acceptable offering (Heb 10:10). Further the author urges

(7) the actual effectiveness of Christ's work, his argument being that it would already have been repeatedly performed if this single offering had not been sufficient for all time, "once for all" (Heb 7:27; 9:26). Finally is asserted

(8) the intercessory work of Christ, which, though not explained, seems to be a figurative presentation of his idea that men are blessed because Christ died, i.e. that this was an indispensable condition of God's manifestation of His merciful love, and that the grace consequent on the death of Christ does not merely grow out of a fact, but that the divine love and providence for believers are exercised, neither automatically or impersonally, but in virtue of a constant personal sympathy for varying temptations and needs, a sympathy intensified by the earthly experience, temptation, suffering of Him who had been and is, not only the Divine Son, but also the Son of Man. Thus, the salvation of the believer is certain and complete, and the priestly and high-priestly work of Jesus reaches its consummation.

3. The Priesthood of Believers:

The priesthood of believers is an idea which finds formal expression less frequently in the New Testament than has been the case in Protestant theology. But it does not follow that there has been a corresponding divergence from the thought of the apostles. It only shows that a thought which according to apostolic conception was one of the invariable privileges of every Christian, and which found, if not constant, yet sufficiently clear expression in this figurative fashion, has come, in consequence of errors which have developed, to receive in the controversies of later centuries stronger emphasis than it did at first. It may well be noted first that this conception of the priesthood of believers, standing by itself, is in no way related to the various priestly activities which are also figuratively attributed to them. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who does not speak of the priesthood of believers, knowing no Christian priesthood but that of Jesus Himself, yet calls "praise," "to do good and to communicate," sacrifices (13:15,16). So Paul bids the Romans present their bodies "a living sacrifice" (Ro 12:1), and Peter calls Christians "a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices" (1Pe 2:5). But this figurative usage is entirely distinct from the subject of the present paragraph. Also the conception of the Christian priesthood never in the New Testament attaches itself merely to the ministry of the Christian church, whatever may be held as to its orders or tasks. In no sense has the church or any church an official priesthood. Nor is it any part of the New Testament conception of the priesthood of believers that any individual should act in any respect for any other. Though the intercessory supplication of believers in behalf of other persons has of late often been represented as a priestly act, as being, indeed, that activity which is essential to any real priesthood of believers, the New Testament thought is quite different, and is to be thus conceived: In ancient times it was held that men in general could not have direct access to God, that any approach to Him must be mediated by some member of the class of priests, who alone could approach God, and who must accordingly be employed by other men to represent them before Him. This whole conception vanishes in the light of Christianity. By virtue of their relation to Christ all believers have direct approach to God, and consequently, as this right of approach was formerly a priestly privilege, priesthood may now be predicated of every Christian. That none needs another to

intervene between his soul and God; that none can thus intervene for another; that every soul may and must stand for itself in personal relation with God—such are the simple elements of the New Testament doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. (Consult treatises on New Testament theology, and commentaries on the Epistle to the Hebrews.)

David Foster Estes

PRIESTS AND LEVITES

(kohen, "priest"; nothing is definitely known as to the origin of the word; Lewi, "Levite," on which see LEVI):

I. DIFFERENT VIEWS OF THE HISTORY

1. The Old View

2. The Graf-Wellhausen View

3. Mediating Views

4. An Alternative View

II. THE DATA OF THE PRIESTLY CODE (P) IN THE PENTATEUCH

1. The Levites

2. Aaron and His Sons

III. THE OTHER PORTIONS OF THE PENTATEUCH

IV. FROM MOSES TO MALACHI

1. The Sources Other than Ezekiel

(1) The Custody of the Ark

(2) On Its Return from the Philistines

(3) In Abinadab’s House

2. Ezekiel

V. EZRA, NEHEMIAH, CHRONICLES

1. Estimates of the Chronicler

2. His Data

VI. LEGAL PROVISIONS

LITERATURE

In some Minaean inscriptions found at El-‘Ola, dating back about 1200-800 BC (Hommel in Hilprecht, Explorations in Bible Lands, 719), certain "priests and priestesses of the god Wadd are designated by the term lawi, feminine lawi‘at" (op. cit., 749). It is not known whether this is due to Israelite influence.

I. Different Views of the History.

1. The Old View:

There are great divergences of opinion among modern writers as to the true course of history and the dating of the different documents. It will therefore be best to sketch these views in rough outline, and then give the evidence of the various authorities, together with the reasons that in each case arise naturally from the consideration of that evidence.

The old belief was that the whole of the Pentateuchal laws were the work of Moses, that the account of the subsequent history given in the Books of Chronicles was correct, that Ezekiel’s vision, if taken literally, could not be reconciled with the other known facts and was inexplicable, and that in the case of all other discrepancies harmonistic explanations should be adopted.

2. The Graf-Wellhausen View:

The modern critical school have traversed every one of these doctrines. The Chronicler is declared to be in constant and irreconcilable conflict with the older authorities, harmonistic explanations are uniformly rejected, the Pentateuch is denied to Moses and split up into a variety of sources of different ages, and Ezekiel gains a place of honor as representing a stage in a continuous and normal development. The subject is thus inextricably linked with the Pentateuchal problem, and reference must be made to the article PENTATEUCH for an explanation of the supposed documents and a consideration of the analysis with its nomenclature. On the other hand the present article and the article SANCTUARY (which see) explain and discuss the most widely held theory of the historical development into which the history of the supposed Pentateuchal sources has been fitted.

The dominant theory is that of Wellhausen. According to this, "Levite" was originally a term denoting professional skill, and the early Levites were not members of the tribe of Levi, but professional priests. Anybody could sacrifice. "For a simple altar no priest was required, but only for a house which contained a sacred image; this demanded watching and attendance" (Wellhausen, Prolegomena, 130). The whole Levitical Law was unknown and the distinction between priests and Levites unheard of. There were a few great sanctuaries and one influential priesthood, that of Shiloh (afterward at Nob). With the monarchy the priesthood became more important. The royal priests at Jerusalem grew in consequence and influence until they overshadowed all the others. Deuteronomy recognized the equal priestly right of all Levites, and Josiah's reformation placed the sons of Zadok, who were the priests of Jerusalem and not descendants of Aaron, in a position of decisive superiority. Then Eze drew a new and previously unknown distinction between "the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok" who are "keepers of the charge of the altar," and the other Levites who were made "keepers of the charge of the house" as a punishment for having ministered in the high places. The Priestly Code takes up this distinction and represents it as being of Mosaic origin, making of the sons of Zadok "sons of Aaron." "In this way arose as an illegal consequence of Josiah's reformation, the distinction between priests and Levites. With Ezekiel this distinction is still an innovation requiring justification and sanction; with the Priestly Code it is a 'statute forever,' although even yet not absolutely undisputed, as appears from the priestly version of the story of Korah's company. For all Judaism subsequent to Ezra, and so for Christian tradition, the Priestly Code in this matter also has been authoritative. Instead of the Deuteronomic formula 'the priests the Levites,' we henceforward have 'the priests and the Levites,' particularly in Chronicles" (op. cit., 147). From that time onward the priests and Levites are two sharply distinguished classes. It is an essential part of this theory that the Chronicler meant his work to be taken as literal history, correctly representing the true meaning of the completed law.

See CRITICISM.

3. Mediating Views:

There have been various attempts to construct less thoroughgoing theories on the same data. As a rule, these views accept in some form the documentary theory of the Pentateuch and seek to modify the Wellhausen theory in two directions, either by attributing earlier dates to one or more of the Pentateuchal documents—especially to the Priestly Code—or else by assigning more weight to some of the statements of Chronicles (interpreted literally). Sometimes both these tendencies are combined. None of these views has met with any great measure of success in the attempt to make headway against the dominant Wellhausen theory, and it will be seen later that all alike make shipwreck on certain portions of the evidence.

4. An Alternative View:

The independent investigations on which the present article is based have led the writer to a view that diverges in important particulars from any of these, and it is necessary to state it briefly before proceeding to the evidence. In one respect it differs from all the rival schemes, not merely in result, but

also in method, for it takes account of versional evidence as to the state of the texts. Subject to this it accepts the Mosaic authenticity of all the Pentateuchal legislation and the clear and consentient testimony of the Law and the Prophets (i.e. of the two earlier and more authoritative portions of the Hebrew Canon), while regarding Chronicles as representing a later interpretation, not merely of the history, but also of the legal provisions. In outline the story of the priesthood is then as follows: Moses consecrated Aaron and his sons as the priests of the desert tabernacle. He purified the rest of the tribe of Levi as a body of sacred porters for the period of wanderings, but in the legislation of Numbers he made no provision whatever for their performing any duties after the sanctuary obtained a permanent location. At the same time he gave a body of priestly teaching requiring for its administration in settled conditions a numerous and scattered body of priests, such as the house of Aaron alone could not have provided immediately after the entry into Canaan. To meet this, Deuteronomy—the last legislative work of Moses—contains provisions enlarging the rights and duties of the Levites and conferring on them a priestly position. The earlier distinction was thus largely obliterated, though the high-priestly dignity remained in the house of Aaron till the time of Solomon, when it was transferred from the house of Eli to that of Zadok, who, according to Ezekiel's testimony, was a Levite (but see below, IV, 1). So matters remained till the exile, when Ezekiel put forward a scheme which together with many ideal elements proposed reforms to insure the better application of the Mosaic principle of the distinction between holy and profane to greatly altered circumstances. Taking his inspiration from the wilderness legislation, he instituted a fresh division in the tribe of Levi, giving to the sons of Zadok a position similar to that once held by the sons of Aaron, and degrading all other Levites from the priesthood conferred on them by De to a lower rank. The duties now assigned to this class of "keepers of the charge of the house" were never even contemplated by Moses, but Ezekiel applies to them the old phrases of the Pentateuch which he invests with a new significance. As a result of his influence, the distinction between priests and Levites makes its appearance in post-exilic times, though it had been unknown to all the writers of the second division of the Hebrew Canon. At the same time a meaning was read into the provisions of the Law which their original author could not have contemplated, and it was this interpretation which is presented (at any rate to some extent) in Chronicles, and has given us the current tradition. Many of the Chronicler's statements are, however, not meant to be taken literally, and could not have been so taken by his original public.

II. The Data of the Priestly Code (P) in the Pentateuch.

1. The Levites:

To arrive at an objective conclusion it is necessary, in the first instance, to examine the facts without such bias as any view put forward by any other author, ancient or modern, sacred or profane, might impart. Every legislator is entitled to be judged on his own language, and where he has, so to speak, made his own dictionary, we are compelled to read his meaning into the terms used. The very first of the material references to the Levites drives this truth home. "But appoint thou the Levites over the tabernacle of the testimony, and over all the furniture thereof" (Nu 1:50). It is necessary to consider whether such expressions are to be read in a wide or a narrow sense. We learn from Nu 18:3 that death would be the result of a Levite's touching any of these vessels, and it therefore appears that these words are meant to be construed narrowly. "They shall bear the tabernacle, and all the furniture thereof; and

they shall minister unto it," are the next words (1:50); but yet we read later of the Kohathites who were to bear it that "they shall not touch the sanctuary, lest they die" (4:15). This shows that the service in question is strictly limited to a service of porterage after the articles have been wrapped up by Aaron and his sons. By no possibility could it include such a task as cleaning the vessels. It is then further directed that the Levites are to take down and set up the dwelling and camp round about it. All these are desert services and desert services only. Then we read that "the Levites shall keep the charge of the tabernacle (dwelling) of the testimony. This concludes the first material passage (Nu 1:50-53). The other passages of Nu only amplify these directions; they never change them. But some phrases are used which must be more particularly considered.

(1) Technical Phrases.

We hear that the Levites are "to serve the service of the tent of meeting," and this looks as if it might refer to some general duties, but the context and the kindred passages always forbid this interpretation. Nu 7:5 ff is an admirable instance. Six wagons are there assigned to the Levites for this service, two to the Gershonites and four to the Merarites. "But unto the sons of Kohath he gave none, because the service of the sanctuary belonged unto them; they bare it upon their shoulders." Here service is transport and nothing else. Again we read of the charge of the Levites in the tent of meeting, e.g. 4:25 f. If we look to see what this was, we find that it consisted of transporting portions of the tent that had been packed up. The "in" of English Versions of the Bible does not represent the meaning of the Hebrew fairly; for the context makes it clear that the legislator means "in respect to." "But they shall not go in to see the sanctuary even for a moment, lest they die" (4:20). In English idiom we cannot speak of the transport of portions of a dismantled tent as service in that tent. One other expression requires notice, the phrase "keep the charge" which is distinguished in 8:26 from "doing service." The exact meaning cannot be determined. It appears to denote something kindred to service, but of a less exacting nature, perhaps the camping round the tent and the guardianship of the articles on the march. We shall see hereafter by comparison with other books that in P it does not bear the same meaning as elsewhere.

(2) Other Legal Provisions.

The Levites were to act under the orders of Aaron and his sons, who were to assign to each man his individual functions (Nu 3$; 4$, etc.). They were to undergo a special rite of purification (Nu 8), but not of consecration. They were taken in place of the firstborn (Nu 3). The age for beginning service is given in Nu 4 as 30 years, but in Nu 8:24 as 25 years, if the text is sound. The age for ceasing to serve was 50. In many passages the versions suggest that a good many phrases are textually doubtful, and it is probable that when a critical text of the Pentateuch is formed on scientific principles, a good many superfluous expressions will be found not to be original; but there is no reason to suppose that any real difference in the meaning of the passages would be revealed by such a text.

The story of Korah is easily misunderstood. It appears from Nu 16:3 that his real object was to put himself on an equality with Moses and Aaron, and this is the "priesthood" referred to in 16:10. Nu 18 reinforces the earlier passages. It is noteworthy as showing that in the conception of the legislator the

Levites were not to come near the vessels or the altar (18:3). The penalty is death for both Levites and priests.

(3) Contrast with Ezekiel and Chronicles.

The impression as to the meaning of P which may be gathered from an examination of its statements is powerfully reinforced when they are tested by reference to Ezekiel and Chronicles, Eze 44:9-14 seems to demand of the Levites some service as gatekeepers, the slaying of burnt offering and sacrifice for the people and a keeping of "the charge of the house, for all the service thereof," which in the light of 44:7 f appears to mean in his terminology, not a service of transport, but an entry into the house and the performance of certain duties there. The Priestly Code (P), on the contrary, knows nothing of gatekeepers, regards the slaying of the burnt offering and sacrifice as the duty of the individual sacrificant (Le 1; 3), and—if, as Wellhausen thinks, it refers to the temple—it would have visited with death a Levite who was present in the places in which Ezekiel requires him to minister. Similarly with the Chronicler. For instance, he the Levites being ‘for the service of the .... in the courts and over the chambers, and over the cleansing of every holy thing’ (1Ch 23:28), but P knows nothing of any chambers, would not have allowed the Levites to touch (much less clean) many of the holy things, and regarded service simply as porterage. In 1Ch 23:31 the Levites are to offer burnt offerings on certain occasions; in P their approach to the altar would have meant death both to themselves and the priests (Nu 18:3). Other instances will be found in PS, 238 f.

(4) What the Foregoing Proves.

In view of these facts it is impossible to hold that the Levites in P represent a projection of the Levites of the second temple or any post-Mosaic age into the desert period. To P they are a body of sacred porters. The temple of course could not be carried about, and it cannot be held that in this respect the legislation mirrors later circumstances. "Secondly, the net result of such a scheme would be to create a body of Levites for use during the period of wanderings and never thereafter. As soon as the desert age was over the whole tribe would find their occupation gone. How can we conceive that any legislator deliberately sat down and invented such a scheme centuries after the epoch to which it relates, well knowing that in so far as his scheme purported to be a narrative of events it was fictitious from beginning to end, and in so far as it might be regarded as a legislation applicable to his own or any future day, there was not a line in it that could conceivably be put into practice? If any theorist can be conceived as acting in this way, how are we to suppose that his work would meet with acceptance? .... Thirdly, P neither embodies the views of Ezekiel nor finds an accurate reflection in Chronicles. The facts are such as to enable us to say definitely that P is not in line with them. It is impossible to assume that he appointed the death penalty for certain acts if performed by Levites because he really wished the Levites to perform those acts" (PS, 241 f).

2. Aaron and His Sons:

Priests and Levites also speaks of Aaron the priest and the sons of Aaron the priest. It is doubtful

whether the expression "the sons of Aaron the priests," which occurs frequently in the Massoretic Text, is ever original; the Massoretic expression is nowhere supported by all the authorities. "The phrase ‘Aaron the high priest’ is entirely unknown to Priests and Levites. Where the high priest’s name is given the only qualifying apposition possible in his usage is ‘the priest.’ " Aaron and his sons, unlike the Levites, were consecrated, not merely purified.

At this point two features only of the legislation need be noticed: the inadequacy of the staff to post-conquest conditions and the signs of date. For example, the leprosy laws (Le 13 f) postulate the presence of priests to inspect and isolate the patient. "Remembering that on the critical theory P assumes the capital at Jerusalem as self-evident, we must ask how such provisions were to work after the conquest. During the desert period nothing could have been simpler, but what was to happen when the Israelites dwelt all over Canaan from Beersheba to Dan?" (PS, 246). The difficulty is immensely increased if we postulate an exilic or post-exilic date, when the Jewish center of gravity was in Babylonia and there were large colonies in Egypt and elsewhere. And "What are we to say when we read of leprous garments (Le 13:47)? Was a man to make the pilgrimage from Babylonia to Jerusalem to consult a priest about a doubtful garment? And what about the leper’s offerings in Le 14? Could they conceivably have been meant to apply to such circumstances?" (PS, 247). The case is no better with the law of leprous houses, which is expressed to apply to the post-conquest period (Le 4:33-5:3). The notification to the priest and his inspections require a priesthood scattered all over the country, i.e. a body far more numerous than the house of Aaron at the date of the conquest. Such instances could easily be multiplied from the legislation; one more only will be cited on account of its importance to the history of the priesthood. According to Leviticus, the individual sacrificant is to kill the victims and flay the burnt offerings. How could such procedure be applied to such sacrifices as those of Solomon (1Ki 8:63)? With the growth of luxury the sacrifices would necessarily become too large for such a ritual, and the wealthy would grow in refinement and object to performing such tasks personally. This suggests the reason for later abuses and for the modifications of Ezekiel and the representations of the Chronicler.

Result of the Evidence.

Thus, the evidence of P is unfavorable alike to the Wellhausen and the mediating views. The indications of date are consistently Mosaic, and it seems impossible to fit the laws into the framework of any other age without reading them in a sense that the legislator can be shown not to have contemplated. On the other hand P is a torso. It provides a large body of Levites who would have nothing to do after the conquest, and a corpus of legislation that could not have been administered in settled conditions by the house of Aaron alone.

III. The Other Portions of the Pentateuch.

In Ex 19:22,24 we read of priests, but a note has come down to us that in the first of those verses Aquila had "elders," not "priests," and this appears to be the correct reading in both places, as is shown by the prominence of the elders in the early part of the chapter. In Hebrew the words differ by only two letters. It is said by Wellhausen that in Ex 33:7-11 (E) Joshua has charge of the ark. This rests on a

mistranslation of Ex 33:7, which should be rendered (correcting English Versions of the Bible), ‘And Moses used to take a (or the) tent and pitch it for himself without the camp.’ It is inconceivable that Moses should have taken the tent of the ark and removed it to a distance from the camp for his private use, leaving the ark bared and unguarded. Moreover, if he had done so, Joshua could not have been in charge of the ark, seeing that he was in this tent while the ark (ex hypothesi) remained in the camp. Nor had the ark yet been constructed. Nor was Joshua in fact a priest or the guardian of the ark in E:

(1) in the Book of Joshua E knows of priests who carry the ark and are quite distinct from Joshua (3 ff);

(2) in De 31:14 (E) Joshua is not resident in the tent of meeting;

(3) in E, Aaron and Eleazar are priests (De 10:6), and the Levitical priesthood is the only one recognized (De 33:10);

(4) there is no hint anywhere of Joshua’s discharging any priestly duty whatsoever.

The whole case rests on his presence in the tent in Ex 33:7-11, and, as shown in the article PENTATEUCH (which see), this passage should stand after Ex 13:22.

Then it is said that in Ex 4:14; Jud 17:7, "Levite" denotes profession, not ancestry. In the latter passage the youth whom Micah made a priest was of Levitical descent, being the grandson of Moses (Jud 17:13), and the case rests on the phrase, "of the family of Judah." Neither of the Septuagintal translations had this text (Field, Hexapla, at the place), which therefore cannot be supported, since it cannot be suggested that Moses belonged to the tribe of Judah. As to Ex 4:14, the phrase "Aaron thy brother the Levite" is merely an adaptation of the more usual, "Aaron, son of Amram, the Levite," rendered necessary by the fact that his brother Moses is the person addressed. The Wellhausen theory here is shown to be untenable in PS, 250 and RE3, XI, 418.

Ex 32:26-29 foreshadows the sacred character of Levi, and De 10:6 (E) knows the hereditary Aaronic priesthood. In D the most important passage is De 18:6-8. In 18:7 three Septuagintal manuscripts omit the words "the Levites," and if this be a gloss, the whole historic sense of the passage is changed. It now contains an enactment that any Levite coming to the religious capital may minister there "as all his brethren do, who stand there," etc., i.e. like the descendants of Aaron. "The Levites" will then be the explanation of a glossator who was imbued with the latest post-exilic ideas, and thought that "his brethren" must mean those of his fellow-Levites who were not descended from Aaron. The passage is supplemented by 21:5, giving to the Levites judicial rights, and 24:8 assigning to them the duty of teaching the leprosy regulations. Together with 33:10 (E), ‘they shall teach thy judgments to Jacob and thy law to Israel: they shall put incense in thy nostrils and whole burnt-offering on thine altar,’ these passages complete the provisions of P in giving to the Levites an occupation in place of their transport duties, and providing the necessary staff for administering the legislation when the Israelites were no longer massed together in a single camp, but scattered over the country. We shall see in the next section that this view of the meaning of the Law was taken by every writer of the second part of the Canon who

touches on the subject. Everywhere we are confronted with the legitimacy of a Levitical priesthood; nowhere is there any mention of an exclusive Aaronic right. Smaller points which cannot be discussed here are examined in PS. It only remains to notice that these provisions fully explain the frequent Deuteronomic locution, "the priests the Levites." One other remark must be made. Though it is not expressly stated, we may assume that consecration would be necessary in the case of any Levite acting on the provisions of De 18:6-8, and was not mentioned because in Hebrew antiquity it went without saying that every priest must be consecrated (compare Jud 17).

IV. From Moses to Malachi.

1. The Sources Other than Ezekiel:

Joshua adds but little to our information. In 18:7 the priesthood is called the inheritance of the Levites, and it is singular that the Wellhausen critics attribute this to a priestly redactor, though such a writer should ex hypothesi have been jealous to withhold the priesthood from the Levites. It is very interesting to find that in Jos 3; 4, all the different critical documents speak in exactly the same terms of "the priests that bare the ark." The priestly writer ought, on the Wellhausen theory, to have said "the Levites." The expression "the priests the Levites" is found alternating with the expression "the priests." All this points to the construction put upon the provisions of the Law in the preceding section, and finds fresh confirmation in Judges, where we see Micah rejoicing at having a Levite as a priest (Jud 17:13), thus showing that the sacred character of the tribe was recognized in the earliest post-Mosaic times. The lay sacrifices in this and the following books are explained under SANCTUARY; SACRIFICE (which see).

The period of the early kings shows us kings blessing the people (e.g. 2Sa 6:18). It is claimed that this is the priestly blessing, but without evidence, and there seems no more reason to see special priestly rights here than in David’s blessing his household (2Sa 6:20), or the frequent blessings of the Bible (e.g. Genesis passim, especially "in thee will Israel bless," Ge 48:20), while in 1Ki 8:55 ff we actually have the words of the blessing delivered on one of those occasions by Solomon, and it is quite unlike the blessing of the priests (Num 6:22 ff).

Textual criticism disposes of the supposed priesthood of certain non-Levitical persons. In 2Sa 8:18 the Massoretic Text makes David’s sons "priests," but this reading was unknown to the Septuagint, Symmachus, and Theodotion (Field, ad. loc.). The Septuagint has "aularches," i.e. chamberlains. That this represents a different Hebrew word is proved by the Septuagintal list of 3 Ki 2:46 (not extant in Hebrew), where we read that Benaiah, son of Jehoiada, was "over the aularchy and over the brick-making." It cannot be suggested that this represents an original Hebrew "over the priesthood and over the brick-making," and accordingly we must concede the existence of some secular court office which was rendered by this Greek phrase. Hitzig and Cheyne conjecture that tsokhenim should be read for kohanim. This word gives the sense required (see Isa 22:15) Revised Version margin "steward"). In 2Sa 20:26 we read that Ira, ha-ya’iri ("the Jairite"), was a priest, but the Syriac version supported by Lucian and 23:38 reads ha-yattiri ("the Jattirite"). Jattir was a priestly city. In 1Ki 4:5 Nathan’s son is described as ‘priest friend of the king,’ but the Septuagint reads only "friend of the king" (compare especially 1Ch

27:33 f; 2Sa 15:32), and at another period Nathan's son held the kindred secular office of king's counselor (the Septuagint 3 Ki 2:46, a fact that is certainly unfavorable to the view that he ever held priestly office). There can therefore be no doubt that the word "priest," kohen has arisen through dittography of the preceding word nathan, Nathan.

Various dealings with the ark and the age of Samuel require notice. As a boy, Samuel himself is given into the service of Eli. It has been argued that he really officiated as a priest, though probably (if the Chronicler's data is rejected) not of the Levitical descent. The answer is to be found in his age. Weaning sometimes took place at as late an age as three, and accordingly, the boy may have been as much as four years old when he was taken to Shiloh (1Sa 1:24). His mother used to bring him a little cloak (1Sa 2:19) every year, and this notice also shows his extreme youth. In view of this, it cannot be seriously contended that he performed any priestly service. He must have been something like a page, and he performed some duties of a porter, opening the door-valves of the temple at Shiloh (1Sa 3:15).

(1) The Custody of the Ark

When the ark was captured by the Philistines, it was in the charge of priests. When David brought it to Jerusalem, it was again placed in priestly custody, but there is an interregnum of some 20 years (1Sa 7:2).

It must be remembered that whatever may have happened during this period of great national confusion, the practice of all the rest of history, extending over some 600 or 700 years, is uniform and would far outweigh any irregularities during so short and troubled a period.

(2) On Its Return from the Philistines

The first difficulty arises on 1Sa 6:14,15. In the second of these verses the Levites come up after the Beth-shemites have finished, and, in Wellhausen's words, "proceed as if nothing had happened, lift the ark from the now-no-longer-existent cart, and set it upon the stone on which the sacrifice is already burning" (Prolegomena, 128). It is therefore suggest that 6:15 is a gloss. But there is difficulty in 6:14 which tells of the breaking up of the cart, etc., without explaining what happened to the ark. The trouble may be met by a slight transposition, thus: '14a and the cart came into the field, ... and stood there, and there was there a great stone: 15a and the Levites took down the ark, etc. and put them on the great stone: 14b and clave the wood of the cart,' etc., followed by 15b. This makes perfect sense.

(3) In Abinadab's House

The second difficulty is made by 1Sa 7:1, where we read that the ark was brought to the house of Abinadab 'and Eleazar his son they sanctified to guard' it. Its old abode, the house at Shiloh, had apparently been destroyed (Jer 7:12,14; 26:6,9). There it enjoyed considerable importance, for Poels is unquestionably right in identifying the Gibeah of God (1Sa 10:5) with the Gibeah (hill) of the ark. Thus, there was a high place there and a Philistine garrison (compare 1Sa 13:3, where Septuagint and Targum

have "Gibeah"). There remains the difficulty caused by the guardianship of Eleazar. Poels may be right in reading we'eth bene' El'azar, "and the sons of Eleazar," for we'eth 'El'azar beno, "and Eleazar his son"; but in the entire absence of information, alike as to Eleazar's functions and as to his tribe, nothing definite can be said. The narratives of the slaughter among the Beth-shemites and the fate of Uzzah make it certain that Eleazar's custody of the ark kept him at a respectful distance from it.

When David at the end of this period removed the ark, it was first taken in a cart. This proved fatal to Uzzah, and the ark was deposited in the house of Obededom the Gittite. The text of Samuel knows nothing of any guardianship of the ark by Obed-edom. Probably he took very good care not to go near it in view of Uzzah's fate. Then it was transported to Jerusalem by bearers (2Sa 6:13)—presumably of Levitical descent. No further irregularities are urged.

More important is the change of priesthood; 1Sa 2:27-36 clearly threatens Eli, whose house had been chosen in Egypt, with a transference of the high-priesthood to another line. Careful comparison with 1Ki 2:27 makes it certain that the prophecy was fulfilled when Zadok was placed by Solomon in the place of Abiathar. Who was Zadok? According to Chronicles (1Ch 6:8,53; 24:3; 27:17) he was descended from Aaron through Eleazar, and this is accepted by Orr, Van Hoonacker and many others, who take Chronicles in a literal sense. According to Ezekiel he was a Levite (40:46, etc.). It is noteworthy that throughout the prophetical books we always hear of the Levitical priesthood, not the Aaronic (see especially 1Ki 12:31; Jer 33:18-22; Mal 2$), and the "father's house" of 1Sa 2:27-36 that was chosen in Egypt could only be the house of

Aaron, not of Ithamar, if the passage is to be taken in its natural sense. On this view Zadok's appointment could only have fulfilled the prophecy if it terminated the Aaronic succession. It would seem therefore that the high-priesthood was transferred to a family of non-Aaronic Levites. For the alternative view see ZADOK.

The prophet's speech in 1Sa 2:27-36 is also important for the light it throws on the organization of the priesthood. The high priest has in his gift a number of priestly offices with pecuniary and other emoluments. This postulates a far more advanced hierarchy than that of Priest.

The reference to "the priests and the Levites" in 1Ki 8:4 was unknown to the Septuagint, but in other passages the Books of Kings show further advances in hierarchical organization. There is not merely the high priest—generally like Aaron in the Priestly Code (P) called "the priest," but sometimes the high priest—but also the second priest (2Ki 25:18; Jer 52:24; 2Ki 23:4, according to the Targum), three keepers of the threshold (ubi supra, and 2Ki 12:10) and "elders of the priests" (2Ki 19:2; Isa 37:2; perhaps also Jer 19:1). See also Jer 20:1 f; 29:26 for priestly organization and jurisdiction in the temple precincts. All this contrasts strikingly with the simplicity of the Pentateuchal organization.

2. Ezekiel:

Ezekiel is entirely in line with the other sources for this period, but he seeks to institute certain reforms.

He writes, "Her priests have done violence to my law, and have profaned my holy things: they have made no distinction between the holy and the common, neither have they caused men to discern between the unclean and the clean," etc. (Eze 22:26). If these words have any meaning they signify that he was acquainted with a law which followed the very words of Le 10 and other passages of the Priestly Code (P), and was intended to reach the people through the teaching of the priests. In Ezekiel 40-48, there is a vision of the future which stands in the closest relation to the Pentateuch. Three views have been held of this. The old view was that Ezekiel could not be reconciled with the Pentateuch at all, and that the difficulties presented were insoluble. Wellhausen and his followers maintain that the prophet is prior to the Priestly Code (P), and here introduces the distinction between priests and Levites for the first time. The third alternative is to hold that Ezekiel was familiar with P and drew from it the inspiration to make a fresh division among the Levites, giving the sons of Zadok a position similar to that occupied by the sons of Aaron in the wilderness period, and reenacting with slight modifications the legislation applicable to the sons of Aaron, this time applying it to the sons of Zadok. The crucial passage is 44:6-16, from which it clearly appears that in Solomon's temple aliens had performed sundry tasks that should have been executed by more holy persons, and that Ezekiel proposes to degrade Levites who are not descended from Zadok to perform such tasks in the future as a punishment for their ministrations to idols in high places. Either of the two latter views would explain the close connection that evidently exists between the concluding chapters of Ezekiel and the Priestly Code (P), and, accordingly, in choosing between them, the reader must consider four main points: (1) Is P shown on the internal evidence to be early or late? Is it desert legislation, or is it accurately reflected in Chronicles? This point has already been discussed in part and is further treated in PENTATEUCH (which see).

(2) Is theory of the late composition of P psychologically and morally probable? On this see PENTATEUCH and POT, 292-99.

(3) Is it the case that the earlier history attests the existence of institutions of P that are held by Wellhausen and his followers to be late—e.g. more national offerings than the critics allow? On this see EPC 200 ff, and passim; POT, 305-15, and passim; SBL and OP passim, and article PENTATEUCH.

(4) Does Ezekiel himself show acquaintance with P (e.g. in 22:26), or not? On this too see SBL, 96; PS, 281 f.

With regard to the non-mention of the high-priesthood and certain other institutions in Ezekiel's vision, the natural explanation is that in the case of these the prophet did not desire to institute any changes. It is to be noted that Ezekiel does not codify and consolidate all existing law. On the contrary, he is rather supplementing and reforming. In his ideal temple the prince is to provide the statutory national offerings (45:17), i.e. those of Nu 28; 29. Apparently the king had provided these earlier (2Ki 16:13). But in addition to these there had grown up a "king's offering," and it is probably to this only that Eze 45:22 ff; 46:2-15 relate. In 46:13 Septuagint, Syriac, Vulgate, and some Hebrew manuscripts preserve the reading "he" for "thou."

V. Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles.

Whatever the course of the earlier history, there is general agreement that in these books a distinction between priests and Levites is established (see e.g. Ne 10:37 f (38 f); 12:1 f). We also find singers and porters (Ne 13:5, etc.), Nethinim and the sons of Solomon's servants (Ezr 7:7,24; 10:23 f; Ne 10:28 (29); 11:3, etc.). It must not be assumed that these classes were new. The story of the Gibeonites (Jos 9) gives us the origin of some of these grades, and the non-mention of them in many of the earlier books is easily explained by the character of those books. We know from such passages as Am 5:23 that there were musical services in far earlier times (compare Ne 12:42). 1. Estimates of the Chronicler:

Chronicles presents an account of the earlier history of the priests and Levites that in many respects does not tally with the older sources. Many modern writers think that the author's views of the past were colored by the circumstances of his own day, and that he had a tendency to carry back later conditions to an earlier period. On the other hand it is impossible to deny fairly that he used some sources which have not been preserved to us elsewhere. Again, there is evidence to show that his work was not intended to be taken for history and would not have been so regarded by his contemporaries. Talmudical authorities held some such view as this. The historical value of his work has yet to be appraised in a more critical and impartial spirit than is exhibited in any of the current discussions. For the present purpose it is only possible to notice the effect of some of his statements, if interpreted literally. As there are passages where he has clearly substituted Levites for the less holy personages of the older sources (contrast e.g. 2Ki 11:4-12 with 2Ch 23:1-11), it may be that Levites have also been substituted by him for other persons in notices of which no other version has survived.

2. His Data:

David and Solomon recognized the hierarchy. The former king instituted the musical services (1Ch 6:3 ff; 16:4 ff; 25). The Levites were divided into courses (1Ch 23:6) and were rendered liable to service from the age of twenty by his enactment (1Ch 23:27). There were also 24 courses or divisions of priests, 16 of the sons of Eleazar and 8 of the sons of Ithamar (1Ch 23:24). The courses were divided by lot. In Ne 12:1-7 we read of "chiefs of the priests," but these are only 22 in number, while 12:12-21 give us 21 in the time of Joiakim (12:26). But not much importance can be attached to such lists, as names could easily fall out in transmission. According to 1Ch 9:26 the four chief porters were Levites, and Levites were also over the things baked in pans and the shewbread (9:31 f). This of course is not in accordance with the Law, but is found elsewhere in Chronicles. In 1Ch 23 the Levites from 30 years old and upward number 38,000, of whom 24,000 oversee the work of the house of the Lord, 6,000 were officers and judges, 4,000 were doorkeepers and 4,000 were musicians. David altered the age of beginning service to 20, and an account of their functions is given in 1Ch 23:27-32 (see, further, MUSIC). All these arrangements were confirmed and enforced by Solomon (2Ch 8:14). There is often uncertainty as to whether the Chronicler identifies priests and Levites in particular cases or not, e.g. in 2Ch 30:27, "the priests the Levites" bless the people according to the ordinary text, but many authorities read "the priests and the Levites." Hezekiah appears to have undertaken some reorganization (2Ch 29$, 30$, 31$), but the details are not clear. Jehoshaphat established in Jerusalem a court composed partly of Levites and priests (19:8-11). Previously he had sent priests and Levites and others to teach the Law in Judah (2Ch 17). In 2Ch 29:34 it is clearly the duty of the priests to flay burnt offerings (contrast Le 1). It is impossible to

draw any consistent picture from the Chronicler because he gives different data for different periods; it is doubtful whether he meant his statements to be taken as historical, e.g. in 1Ch 25 we find Levites whose names Giddalti (=" I have magnified"), etc., are really words forming part of a prayer, and it is difficult to believe that either the Chronicler or his public intended this chapter to be interpreted in any but a spiritual sense (see PS, 284-86).

In Ezr 2:40 the number of Levites who returned with Zerubbabel is given as 74, as against 973 priests (2:36), 128 singers (2:41), 139 children of the porters (2:42), 392 Nethinim and children of Solomon's servants (2:58), and the figures are the same in Ne 7, except that there the singers number 148 (7:44) and the porters 138 (7:45). When Ezra went up, he was at first joined by no Levites (8:15), but subsequently gathered 38 Levites and 220 Nethinim (8:18-20). We get glimpses of the organization in Ne 12:44-47 and 13:10 ff. It appears that in this period genealogies were carefully scrutinized in the case of doubtful claims to priestly descent (Ezr 2:61 ff; Ne 7:63). In Ezr 6:19 ff the Levites are represented as killing the Passover.

Of these books no satisfactory account can be given in the present state of textual criticism and Biblical science generally. Some writers, e.g., hold that the Chronicler had before him a source to which the Levites were entirely unknown, others that he invented freely, others again that he reproduces trustworthy pre-exilic information. The student has only an assortment of theories from which to choose. The bedrock fact is that the statements of these books, if taken in their natural meaning, convey an entirely different impression from the statements of the earlier books construed similarly. Modern research has not yet been seriously addressed to the question whether all the statements were really intended to be interpreted as mere history.

VI. Legal Provisions.

Aaron and his sons underwent consecration to fit them for their duties. Ex 28 f prescribes their garments and consecration (see DRESS; BREASTPLATE; EPHOD; ROBE; COAT; MITRE; GIRDLE; URIM AND THUMMIM), and the account of the latter may be read in Le 8 f. In individual sacrifices brought to the religious capital the priests performed the part of the ritual which related to the altar (sprinkling, burning, etc.) (Le 1-4). See SACRIFICE. A principal function was the duty of teaching the people the law of God (Le 10:11; 14:54-57; De 24:8; 33:10; compare Eze 44:23; Ho 4:1-6; Hag 2:11 ff, and many passages in the Prophets).

The priests were subject to special laws designed to maintain their purity (Le 21$ f; compare Eze 44). The rules aim at preventing defilement through mourning (save in the case of ordinary priests for a near relation) and at preventing those who were physically unfitted from performing certain functions, and those who were for any reason unclean from approaching the holy things. See further STRANGER AND SOJOURNER. They performed several semi-judicial functions (Nu 5:5 ff, 11 ff, etc.; see JUDGE). They also blessed the people (Nu 6:22; compare De 10:8, etc.).

See BLESSING. On their dues see SACRIFICE; TITHE; FIRSTLING; FIRST-FRUITS; LEVITICAL

CITIES; AGRARIAN LAWS; see further CHEMARIM; NETHINIM; SOLOMON'S SERVANTS; SINGERS; DOORKEEPER; SERVING-WOMEN; JUDGE.

LITERATURE.

Wellhausen, Prolegomena, chapter iv, for the Graf-Wellhausen view; Wiener, Wiener, Pentateuchal Studies, 230-89, for the view taken above; S.I. Curtiss, Levitical Priests, for the conservative view. This writer afterward changed to the critical view. James Orr, POT; A. Van Hoonacker, Le sacerdoce levitique (important); W. Baudissin, article "Priests and Levites" in HDB, IV, for mediating views. The best account in English of the details of the priestly duties is contained in Baudissin's article, where a further bibliography will be found.

Harold M. Wiener

PRIMOGENITURE pri-mo-jen'-i-tur (bekhorah, from bekhor, "firstborn," from bakhar, "to act early"; prototokia):

1. Recognition of Doctrine:

The right of the firstborn to inherit the headship of the family, carrying with it certain property rights and usually such titles as those of the high-priesthood or kingship. The writings of the Hebrews take for granted the recognition of a doctrine of primogeniture from the earliest times. In the most ancient genealogies a distinction is drawn between the firstborn and the other son (Ge 10:15; 22:21; 25:13; 35:23; 36:15). In the bestowal of parental blessings in patriarchal times great importance was attached to preferring the firstborn (Ge 25:31; 27:29; 48:13; 49:3). The feud between Jacob and Esau (Ge 27:1-28:21) grew out of the stealing of the firstborn's blessing by the younger brother. Joseph was displeased when, in his blessing, Jacob seemed to prefer Ephraim to Manasseh, his firstborn (Ge 48:18). The father in such cases seems to have had the right to transfer the birthright from one son to another, from the days of Abraham in the case of Ishmael and Isaac, through those of Jacob in the matter of Reuben and Joseph and in the matter of Ephraim and Manasseh, down to the days of David in the selection of a successor to the kingship. Nevertheless, the Mosaic code, which declared (rather than enacted) the law of primogeniture, prohibited the abuse of this parental privilege in the case of a younger son by a favorite wife (De 21:16 f).

2. The Double Portion:

The manner of acknowledging the firstborn incidentally referred to in De is "by giving him a double portion of all that he hath" (De 21:17), that is to say, double the share of each of the other brothers. Jewish tradition (Bekho. 46a, 47b, 51a, 51b; Babha' Bathra' 122a, 122b, 123a, 124a, 142b) accepts and elaborates on this right of the firstborn son. Thus, it applies only to the firstborn and not the eldest surviving son; it does not apply to daughters; it has reference only to the paternal estate, and not to the inheritance left by a mother or other relative, nor to improvements or accessions made to an estate after

the death of the father.

3. Reasons for the Custom:

The object of the doctrine may be that the eldest son might be enabled to preside over the affairs of family with proper dignity, or that he might assume additional responsibilities, such as the support of unmarried sisters. Hence, one's birthright could be waived or sold (Ge 25:31,34). On the other hand it may be based in the ultimate analysis on the primitive feeling of favoritism for the firstborn reflected in the disappointment of Jacob, when he speaks of Reuben as his firstborn, his might, and the beginning of his strength (re'shith 'on, Ge 49:3; compare De 21:17). This theory would be in accord with the right of the parent to transfer the right to a younger son. The suggestion of favoritism conveyed by the Hebrew bekhor is manifested in its figurative use: of Israel (Ex 4:22), of Ephraim (Jer 31:9), of one dearly beloved (Zec 12:10); (compare figurative usage in the New Testament: Ro 8:29; Heb 12:23; 1:6; Re 1:5).

4. The Firstborn in Ancient Society; Sacrifice and Redemption:

Light is thrown on the attitude of the ancient world toward the firstborn, and hence, on the history of primogeniture, by the language used in connection with the plague of the firstborn: "from the first-born of Pharaoh that sitteth upon his throne, even unto the first-born of the maidservant that is behind the mill" or "the captive that was in the dungeon." Apparently no more dreadful catastrophe for all classes of society could be thought of than this slaying of the firstborn (Ex 11:5; 12:29). The misguided fervor of the ancient Semites who offered their firstborn as the thing most dearly beloved as a sacrifice to their gods must be considered in this light, whether it appears among the Moabites, the Phoenicians or the Hebrews themselves (Jer 32:35; Eze 20:26,31; 2Ch 28:3). It is difficult to predicate a connection between the basis of the doctrine of primogeniture and that of the Redemption of the First-born, other than that both are ultimately based on the importance of a firstborn son and the fondness of his parents for him. It is interesting to note, however, that the tradition of redemption and the law of primogeniture are kept so distinct that, while the latter has reference only to the firstborn of a father, the former has reference only to the firstborn of a mother (Bekho, viii. l, 46a; compare peTer rechem, "whatsoever openeth the womb," Ex 13:2). In a polygamous society such as that presupposed in De 21 it is natural to suppose that the distinction between paternal and maternal primogeniture would be clearly before the minds of the people.

See BIRTHRIGHT; FIRSTBORN.

Nathan Isaacs

PRINCE

prins: This word occurs quite frequently in our English Bible, mostly in the Old Testament. While it is never used to denote royal parentage (compare 1Ch 29:24), it often indicates actual royal or ruling

power, together with royal dignity and authority. As a rule, the name is given to human beings; in a few instances it is applied to God and Christ, the angels and the devil.

In Mt 2:6 the word rendered "princes" might be translated "princely cities"; at least, this seems to be implied. Here the term hegemon, "leader," "ruler," "prince," is used, undoubtedly to hint at the fact that Bethlehem was the native city of a great prince. In the other New Testament passages the word archon, "a potentate," "a person in authority," "a magistrate," occurs most frequently (compare Mt 9:34; 12:24; 20:25 (the Revised Version (British and American) "ruler"); Mr 3:22; Joh 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; 1Co 2:6,8 the King James Version; Eph 2:2; Re 1:5 (the Revised Version (British and American) "ruler")). In most of these instances the term "prince" refers to the devil.

In Ac 3:15; 5:31, the word archegos, "leader," is employed referring to Christ as the author of life and salvation (compare Heb 12:2, where the term archegos is rendered "author" (Revised Version) or "captain" (Revised Version margin)).

The Old Testament contains a number of different words mostly rendered "prince" or "princes" in the English Versions of the Bible.

(1) sar: In Jos 5:14 the mysterious armed stranger seen by Joshua near Jericho calls himself the "prince of the host of Yahweh": a high military title applied to a superhuman being. In Isa 9:6, the name is given to the child representing the future Messiah. The term "Prince of Peace" denotes the eminent position and the peaceful reign of the Messianic king: the highest human title in its most ideal sense. Da 8:11: here, again, as in Jos 5:14, occurs the phrase "prince of the host." In Da 8:25 "the prince of princes" refers to God Himself: the highest human title in its absolute sense applied to God. Da 10:21: "Michael your prince." Michael the archangel is here called the prince of the Jewish people. He is the princely representative of God’s people in the sight of God, a royal title suggesting high power and alliance with God in the great struggle going on between Him and the powers of darkness. Da 12:1: here Michael is called "the great prince" who standeth for the children of Israel; supplementing Da 10:21. In Da 10:13: "the prince of the kingdom of Persia" (compare 10:20, "the prince of Persia," "the prince of Greece"), the expression is used in the same general sense as in Da 10:21. Each individual nation is represented as guided by a spiritual being that may or may not be an ally of God in His combat with the devil. In the majority of cases, though, the term sar is applied

(a) to men exercising royal or ruling power: Pr 8:16: "By me princes (margin "or rulers") rule" Isa 32:1: "Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in justice." Judicial power is included (compare Ex 2:14: "Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?" and Ps 148:11: "princes and all judges of the earth"). In some passages the word sar, having been rendered "prince," stands for "chief"; so Jud 7:25: "They took the two princes of Midian" (compare Jud 8:14; 1Sa 29:4; 2Sa 10:3, etc.).

(b) To royal officers of a high rank: Ge 12:15: "the princes of Pharaoh" (compare 2Ki 24:14: "Jerus and all the princes"; 1Ch 29:24; 2Ch 24:23; Jer 36:21; 52:10; Ho 5:10, etc.). "Ambassadors" (Jer 36:14); "governors" (1Ki 20:14 "By the young men (margin "or, servants") of the princes of the provinces";

compare Es 1:3,14, "the seven princes"); "the chief of the eunuchs" (Da 1:7); a "quartermaster" (Jer 51:59 "Seraiah was chief chamberlain" (margin "or, quartermaster")). The King James Version renders it "a quiet prince," i.e. a prince having rest, instead of procuring rest (sar menuchah, "a sar of rest"). In post-exilic times: Ezr 9:1: "The princes drew near unto me." They were the political leaders of the people (compare Ezr 10:8: "the princes and the elders"; Ne 9:38: "our princes, our Levites, and our priests"; Ne 11:1: "The princes of the people dwelt in Jerus"; Ne 12:31: "the princes of Judah"). Of course, they were all subject to the authority of the Persian kings.

(c) To the priesthood: 1Ch 24:5: "princes of the sanctuary, and princes of God" (of Isa 43:28).

(d) On account of great achievements: 2Sa 3:38: "Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?"—an honorary title. Generally speaking, a prince is a wealthy man (compare Job 34:19: "That respecteth not the persons of princes, nor regardeth the rich more than the poor"), and he is a prominent man embodying true, although mortal, manhood (compare Ps 82:7: "Nevertheless ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes).

(2) nasi’:usually derived from nasa’," to lift," hence, "exalted"; otherwise: a "speaker."

(a) An honorary title (compare Ge 23:6: "Thou art a prince of God among us." The distinction is conferred upon Abraham by the children of Heth).

(b) A name given to the heads of the Israelite tribes, families and fathers’ houses: Nu 3:24: "the prince of the fathers’ house of the Gershonites" (compare 3:30,35); 3:32: "Eleazar .... shall be prince of the princes of the Levites, and have the oversight of them that keep the charge of the sanctuary"; Nu 4:34: "the princes of the congregation." They seem to be identical with the "rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens" (compare Ex 18:21; Nu 16:2). Nu 7:2: "the princes of Israel, the heads of their fathers’ houses .... the princes of the tribes" (compare 17:2,6; 34:18; Jos 22:14; 1Ch 4:38).

(c) Equivalent to chief or king: Ge 17:20: "Twelve princes shall he beget" (compare 25:16); Ge 34:2: "Shechem the son of Hamor the Hivite, the prince of the land"; Nu 25:18: "Cozbi, the daughter of the prince of Midian" (compare Jos 13:21); 1Ki 11:34: "I will make him prince all the days of his life." This was said of Solomon, which shows the term equivalent to king. Of special interest is the use of the word nasi’ in Ezekiel. The name is given to the Jewish king (compare 12:10: "This burden concerneth the prince in Jerusalem"). Then, again, it is applied to the future theocratic king (compare 34:24; 37:25, etc., and especially chapters 45; 46). It is also used of foreign potentates and high officers (compare 26:16: "the princes of the sea"; 28:2: "the prince of Tyre"; 30:13: "a prince from the land of Egypt"); 32:29: "Edom, her kings and all her princes"; and, likewise, of high Jewish officers (21:12).

(d) A title bestowed upon Sheshbazzar (Ezr 1:8).

(3) nadhibh: 1Sa 2:8: "To make them sit with princes" (compare Ps 113:8). The original meaning of the term is willing or obliging; then generous ("liberal"; compare Pr 19:6: "Many will entreat the favor of

the liberal man"; yet, it might safely be rendered here "prince", margin) or noble-minded; a gentleman, a nobleman, a person of rank, a prince. Job 12:21: "He poureth contempt upon princes" (compare Ps 107:40); Job 21:28: "Where is the house of the prince? And where is the tent wherein the wicked dwelt?" The context here suggests the thought of a wicked prince, a tyrant. Ps 47:9: "The princes of the peoples are gathered together" (compare Ps 118:9; 146:3; Pr 17:7; 25:7; So 7:1).

(4) naghidh: According to Gesenius, this term denotes originally either a high-minded person (compare the preceding word, nadhibh) or a speaker, a spokesman; then a prince, a king. 1Sa 13:14: "Yahweh hath appointed him to be prince over his people" (compare 2Sa 5:2: "Thou shalt be prince (the Revised Version margin "leader") over Israel"; 6:21; 7:8; 1Ki 1:35; 14:7; 16:2; Job 29:9; 31:37; Ps 76:12; Pr 28:16; Eze 28:2: "prince of Tyre"; Da 9:25: "the anointed one, the prince," the King James Version the "Messiah the Prince"; Da 9:26: "the prince that shall come" (the Roman emperor?); 11:22: "the prince of the covenant" (either a high priest or some Egyptian king, Ptolemeus Philometor?).

(5), (6) razon, and rozen, "a high official," "a prince," usually associated with the word "king" or "judge." Pr 14:28: "In the multitude of people is the king's glory; but in the want of people is the destruction of the prince" (razon); Jud 5:3: "Hear, O ye kings; give ear, O ye princes" (rozenim); Pr 8:15: "By me kings reign, and princes (rozenim) decree justice" (compare 31:4; Hab 1:10); Isa 40:23: "that bringeth princes (rozenim) to nothing; that maketh the judges of the earth as vanity."

(7) nacikh, derived from nacakh, "to install a king" (compare Ps 2:6); hence, a prince: Jos 13:21: "the princes of Sihon" (compare Ps 83:11); Eze 32:30: "the princes of the north"; Mic 5:5: the Revised Version (British and American) "principal men," the Revised Version margin "princes among men"; Da 11:8: the Revised Version (British and American) "molten images," the Revised Version margin "princes."

(8) qatsin, "a judge," "a military leader," "a prince"; Da 11:18: "A prince (the Revised Version margin "captain") shall cause the reproach .... to cease" (probably a Roman consul; a Roman general?).

(9) shalish: The usual explanation, "one of the three men on a war-chariot" is highly improbable; Gesenius suggests that it is a loan-word, and renders it "hero." Eze 23:15: "All of them princes to look upon" ("picked men," Gesenius).

(10) chashmannim: Ps 68:31: "Princes shall come out of Egypt." Septuagint renders it presbeis, "ambassadors," Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) legati. But the meaning is uncertain.

See also GOVERNOR, 1, (8).

William Baur

PRINCES, THE SEVEN

prin’-sez, -siz.

See PRINCE, (1), (b).

PRINCESS

prin’-ses: The Hebrew term is sarah (compare sar, prince, and "Sarah"); it means

(1) a queen (Isa 49:23, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) both "queen");

(2) the consort of a king contrasted with his concubines (1Ki 11:3, "He had seven hundred wives. princesses, and three hundred concubines");

(3) the wife of a prince (Es 1:18 the "princesses of Persia and Media");

(4) it is metaphorically used of the city of Jerusalem (La 1:1).

PRINCIPAL

prin’-si-pal: Appears in the King James Version as a translation of nine Hebrew words (fewer in the Revised Version (British and American)), in one case (Isa 28:25) being used quite wrongly and in 2Ki 25:19 (Jer 52:25); 1Ch 24:31 gives a wrong sense (all corrected in the Revised Version (British and American)). In 1Ki 4:5, "principal officer" (the American Standard Revised Version "chief minister") is an arbitrary translation of kohen to avoid "priest" (so the English Revised Version; compare 2Sa 8:18).

PRINCIPALITY

prin-si-pal’-i-ti: In the Old Testament the word occurs but once (Jer 13:18, "your principalities shall come down"). Here the King James Version margin "head tires" is properly preferred by the Revised Version (British and American) for mera’ashoth (from ro’sh, "head"), "head-parts."

In the New Testament "principality" occurs for arche, "rule," generally in the plural, referring

(a) to men in authority (Tit 3:1, "Put them in mind to be subject (the King James Version; "in subjection," the Revised Version (British and American)) to principalities (the King James Version; "rulers," the Revised Version (British and American)), and powers" (the King James Version; "to authorities," the Revised Version (British and American));

(b) to superhuman agencies, angelic or demonic (Ro 8:38; Eph 3:10; 6:12; Col 1:16; 2:10,15). Paul was keenly sensible of the dualism of mind and body and of the law in his members warring against the law

of his mind (Ro 7:23), and of the temporary victory of the evil, residing in the flesh, over the good of the spirit (Ro 7:14).

This dualism was objectified in Zoroastrianism, and among the Babylonians the several heavenly bodies were regarded as ruled by spirits, some good, some evil. The same belief, appropriated by the Jews during the captivity, appears also in Greek thought, as e.g. in Plato and later in the Stoics. The higher spheres, which hold the even tenor of their way, were in general regarded as ruled by good spirits; but in the sublunar sphere, to which the earth belongs, ill-regulated motions prevail, which must be due to evil spirits. The perversities of human conduct, in particular, thwarting, as was thought, the simple, intelligible divine plan, were held to be subject to rebellious powers offering defiance to God. While Paul clearly recognized a hierarchy of such powers (Col 1:16, "thrones or dominions or principalities or powers"), it is not certain that he had elaborated a system of eons to serve the purposes of metaphysical theology and ethics, such as appears among the Gnostics, although they evidently believed they were developing his thought. In 1Co 2:6 he repudiates the wisdom of this world (aion) and of the rulers of this world aion), and declares (Eph 6:12) that the Christian has to contend with "the world-rulers of this darkness," and proclaims the triumph of Christ over "the principalities and the powers" in the forgiveness of sins (Col 2:15). The same personification of such agencies or powers appears also in another passage, where the rendering of English Versions of the Bible obscures it (Eph 1:20,21 "when he raised him (Christ) from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all (read "every") rule (Revised Version; "principality," the King James Version), and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named not only in this world (aion), but also in that which is to come"). Not the least interesting passage is Eph 3:10, where the church is said to be the means of revealing to "the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places" "the manifold wisdom of God." One naturally inquires what was the purpose of this revelation. Was it to effect a redemption and reconciliation of these demonic powers to God? To this question Paul supplies no answer.

See ANGEL; SATAN.

William Arthur Heidel

PRINCIPLES

prin’-si-p’-lz: Found twice (Heb 5:12; 6:1). The Greek word (stoicheion) is also translated in the King James Version as "elements" and "rudiments." As rendered in He, its meaning is clearly related to the elementary knowledge of Christian truth or doctrine.

See ELEMENTS; RUDIMENTS.

PRINT; PRINTING; PRINTED

print, prin’-ting, prin’-ted: Printing is the art of multiplying records—the "art of writing with many pens" (Jewish Encyclopedia, XII, 295), or wholesale writing.

The art of making original records is writing. This, however, is a slow process. It involves tracing each letter and part of a letter through from beginning to end by the moving point of chisel, pen, or other instrument, and this process must be repeated with every copy. As soon, therefore, as occasion arose for frequently repeating the record, many ways were devised to save the labor of forming each symbol separately. All these ways involve making a character or a series of characters on a single surface and transferring as a whole to another surface. Neither "pressure," as some say, nor "ink," as others, is essential to the process, for printing from a photographic negative takes no pressure, and printing for the blind takes no ink. Any process which transfers a whole surface is printing.

The earliest use of printing seems to have been for painting the face or body with ownership, tribal, trophy, or ceremonial marks for worship, war, mourning, etc. This paint might be temporary or pricked in by the tattoo process. Tattooing itself is rather a writing than a printing process, but may be either, according as the color is laid on by drawing or by the "pintadera." The "pintadera" or "stamp used to impress patterns upon the skin" is best known from the Mexican and South American examples, but in recent years it has been found in deposits all over the Mediterranean region (North Italy, Austria, Hungary, Mycenae, Crete, Egypt) and in Borneo at least. Many of these specimens are from the Neolithic or Copper age. Both in South America and in Neolithic Liguria, some of these stamps were cylindrical and "were used like a printer’s roller" (Mosso, The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization, 254-61, with many illustrations, and Frobenius, Childhood of Man, figure 31, "Dayak block for painting the body").

The injunction of Le 19:28, which is translated "print," is commonly, and probably rightly, in view of the Hebrew word, supposed to refer to the permanent marks of tattooing which may or may not have been made by this printing process. Job 13:27 the King James Version, which speaks of printing upon the heels or soles of the feet, has been quite changed in the Revised Version (British and American), and, if the idea is one of printing at all, it refers rather to branding than stamping with color.

The use of the inkhorn in setting the mark upon the forehead (Eze 9:3,4,6) certainly points to marking with color rather than branding. See INK-HORN. This may, of course, have been drawing rather than printing, but, on the other hand, the sealing of the servants of God on their foreheads (Re 7:4; 9:4) necessarily means printing rather than drawing, and probably printing rather than branding, for the use of the seal with color had long been common. The marks of the beast upon the forehead and upon the hand in Re 13$; 14$; 15$; 16$; 19$; 20$, more likely refer to branding, as the Greek word points more or less in this direction, while the stigmata of Ga 6:17 may also point to branding. Branding was at all events also a common method of printing characters on the flesh in Biblical times (Isa 3:24; perhaps Ex 21:25; a branding on the forehead, Code of Hammurabi section 127; branding of a slave sections 226, 227). The reference in Joh 20:25 is, of course, to the clearly visible marks or scars left by the nails in the hands.

See MARK.

The use of seals is a true printing process, whether they are used with color, as they were both in Crete and Egypt almost from the beginning of history, or impressed on clay, wax, or other plastic substances. Mention of seals is frequent in the Bible (see SEAL). A new interest has been given to this aspect of the matter by the sealings discovered in Ahab’s palace and other excavations throughout Palestine, which are forming one of the most useful classes of modern inscriptions.

Both stamp and seal were used throughout the Middle Ages, the latter abundantly, and the stamp at least occasionally, for stamping the capital letters in Biblical and other manuscripts, as well as for various other purposes.

Modern printing begins with the carving of whole pages and books on blocks of wood (xylography), or metal plates for printing (chalcography). This method was quite early practiced by the Chinese, and began to be common in Europe in the early 15th century, most of the books printed by it having to do with Biblical topics (Biblia pauperum, etc.).

It was only with the invention of movable type about the middle of the 15th century that the multiplying of books by writing began to come to an end. The printing with movable type is also closely associated with Biblical study, the Gutenberg Psalter and the Gutenberg Bible standing with most for the very beginning of modern printing.

For the printed editions of the Hebrew and Greek originals, and the various versions, see articles on TEXTUAL CRITICISM and allied topics in this encyclopedia, with their literature. The article on "Typography" in Jewish Encyclopedia is of unusual excellence, and the general literature of printing given in Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition), at the end of the first part of the article on "Typography," is full and good. Compare also Book in this encyclopedia and its literature, especially Hortzschansky, supplementing the bibliography of Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition). E. C. Richardson

PRISCA; PRISCILLA

pris’-ka, pri-sil’-a.

See AQUILA.

PRISON GARMENTS

See preceding article.

PRISON, SPIRITS IN

The phrase occurs in the much-disputed passage, 1Pe 3:18-20, where the apostle, exhorting Christians to

endurance under suffering for well-doing, says: "Because Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God; being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit; in which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, that aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved through water." It is plain that in this context "the spirits in prison" (tois en phulake pneumasin) denote the generation who were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the words "spirits" and "in prison" refer to their present disembodied condition in a place of judgment in the unseen world (compare 2Pe 2:4-9). The crucial point in the passage lies in what is said of Christ's preaching to these spirits in prison. The interpretation which strikes one most naturally is that Christ, put to death in the flesh, and made alive again in the spirit, went in this spiritual (disembodied) state, and preached to these spirits, who once had been disobedient, but are viewed as now possibly receptive of His message This is the idea of the passage taken by the majority of modern exegetes, and it finds support in what is said in 1Pe 4:6, "For unto this end was the gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." On this basis is now often reared a mass of doctrine or conjecture respecting "second probation," "restoration," etc.—in part going back to patristic times—for which the passage, even so taken, affords a very narrow foundation (see on this view, Plumptre, The Spirits in Prison; Dorner, System of Christian Doctrine, IV, 130-32; E. White, Life in Christ, chapter xxii). It must be admitted, however, that, on closer examination, the above plausible explanation is compassed with many difficulties. A preaching of Christ in Hades is referred to in no other passage of Scripture, while Peter appears to be speaking to his readers of something with which they are familiar; it seems strange that these antediluvians should be singled out as the sole objects of this preaching in the spiritual world; the word "made alive" does not exegetically refer to a disembodied state, but to the resurrection of Christ in the body, etc. Another line of interpretation is therefore preferred by many, who take the words "in which also he went," to refer, not to a disembodied manifestation, but to the historical preaching to the antediluvian generation through Noah while they yet lived. In favor of this view is the fact that the apostle in 1Pe 1:11 regards the earlier prophetic preaching as a testifying of "the Spirit of Christ," that God's long-suffering with Noah's generation is described in Ge 6:5, which Peter has doubtless in his mind, as a striving of God's Spirit, and that in 2Pe 2:5 there is another allusion to these events, and Noah is described as "a preacher of righteousness." The passage, 1Pe 4:6, may have the more general meaning that Christians who have died are at no disadvantage in the judgment as compared with those who shall be alive at the Parousia (compare 1Th 4:15-18). (For an exposition of this view, with a full account of the interpretations and literature on the subject, compare Salmond's Christian Doctrine of Immortality, 4th edition, 364-87.)

See also ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

James Orr

PRISON; PRISONER

priz'-n, priz'-'-n-er, priz'-ner (there are various Hebrew words which are rendered "prison" in the King James Version, among them:

1. Hebrew Words:

(1) cohar, "round house," "fortress" (8 times in Genesis), (2) kele' "restraint," "confinement" (12 times: in historic books, Isaiah, Jeremiah, with "house"), (3) maTTarah, "guard," "sentry" (13 times in Jeremiah and Nehemiah), (4) mahaphekheth, "distorting," i.e. stocks or pillory (4 times), (5) 'ecur, "bond," "fetters" (Ec 4:14; Jer 37:15); "ward" in the King James Version is usually the rendering for mishmar):

2. In Early Times:

The earliest occurrence of the word "prison" in the King James Version is found in the narrative of Joseph's life in Egypt (the Jahwist). The term used, namely, cohar, means perhaps "round house" or "tower." It seems probable that among the Hebrews there were no special buildings erected as "jails" in the premonarchical period, and perhaps not before the post-exilic period, when the adoption of the civic institutions and customs of surrounding nations prevailed. In Egypt and Assyria, on the contrary, there were probably public buildings corresponding to our modern jails. Among the Hebrews, rooms in connection with the royal palace or the residence of prominent court officials would be used for the purpose.

3. Joseph in Egypt:

According to one narrative (Jahwist) in Genesis the prison in which Joseph was confined had a "keeper," while according to another narrative (the Elohist) the offending members of the royal household, namely, the royal butler and the royal baker, were placed "in ward" with the "captain of the guard" in charge, i.e. in some part of the royal palace. This is still more probable if, instead of "captain of the guard," we should translate "chief of the cooks" i.e. superintendent of the royal kitchen.

4. Causes of Imprisonment:

It was often necessary to restrict the liberty of individuals who for various causes were a menace to those in authority, without inflicting any corporal punishment, e.g. Joseph's brethren were kept "in ward" three days (Ge 42:19); Shimei was forbidden to pass beyond the boundary of Jerusalem (1Ki 2:36); the person who was caught gathering sticks on the Sabbath was put "in ward" pending his trial (Nu 15:34). In the monarchical period, prophets who criticized the throne were put in prison, e.g. Micaiah by Ahab (1Ki 22:27), Hanani by Asa (2Ch 16:10). Hoshea, after his abortive effort to institute an alliance with So or Seve, king of Egypt, was shut up in prison by Shalmaneser (2Ki 17:4); compare also 2Ki 25:27 (Jehoiachin in Babylon); Jer 52:11 (Zedekiah in Babylon).

5. Under the Monarchy:

The Book of Jeremiah throws considerable light on the prison system of Jerusalem in the later monarchical period. The prophet was put "in the stocks that were in the upper gate of Benjamin, which was in the house of Yahweh" (20:2). Mere imprisonment was not adequate punishment for the prophet's

announcement of Judah’s doom; it was necessary to have recourse to the pillory. During the siege of Jerusalem Jeremiah was confined in the "court of the guard, which was in the king of Judah’s house" (32:2, etc.). The "court of the guard" was evidently the quarters of the sentry who guarded the royal palace. According to the narrative of Jeremiah 37, the prophet was arrested on a charge of treachery and put in prison "in the house of Jonathan the scribe" (37:15). This verse does not necessarily mean that a private house was used as a prison. The words are capable of another interpretation, namely, that a building known as the "house of Jonathan the scribe" had been taken over by the authorities and converted into a jail. We read in the following verse that the house had a "dungeon" (literally, "house of the pit") and "cabins" or "cells."

6. The Treatment of Prisoners:

The data are not sufficient to enable us to give any detailed description of the treatment of prisoners. This treatment varied according to the character of the offense which led to incarceration. Samson during the period of his imprisonment was compelled to do hard labor (Jud 16:21). Grinding was the occupation of women, and marked the depth of Samson’s humiliation. Dangerous persons were subjected to various kinds of physical mutilation, e.g. Samson was deprived of his sight. This was a common practice in Assyria (2Ki 25:7). The thumbs and great toes of Adonibezek were cut off to render him incapable of further resistance (Jud 1:6).

Various forms of torture were in vogue. Hanani the seer was put into the pillory by Asa (for "in a prison house" we should render "in the stocks"; see the Revised Version margin). In Jer 29:26 for "prison," we should render "stocks" (so the Revised Version (British and American)) or "pillory," and for "stocks," "collar" (as in the Revised Version margin). the King James Version renders a different Hebrew word by "stocks" in Job (13:27; 33:11). There was a special prison diet (1Ki 22:27), as well as a prison garb (2Ki 25:29).

7. Other Hebrew Words:

There are other Hebrew words rendered "prison" (sometimes incorrectly) in the King James Version. In Ps 142:7, the word which is translated "prison" means a "place of execution," and is derived from a root which denotes, for instance, the isolation of the leper (Le 13:5; compare $Isa 24:22; 42:7). In Isa 53:8 "oppression" not "prison" is the correct translation while in Isa 61:1 the Hebrew denotes "opening of the eyes," rather than "opening of the prison." Prisoners are promised "light after darkness, gleam after gloom."

8. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament "prison" generally occurs for the Greek word phulake, which corresponds to the Hebrew word mishmar, referred to above (Mt 5:25; Mr 6:17; Lu 3:20; Ac 5:19; 1Pe 3:19). In Re 18:2, the King James Version renders this word by two different words, namely, "hold" and "cage"; the Revised Version (British and American) employs "hold" in each case (the Revised Version margin

"prison"). In one passage "ward" is the rendering in the King James Version (Ac 12:10). In connection with the imprisonment of John the term used is desmoterion, "place of bonds" or "fetters" (Mt 11:2); the same word is used in the case of Peter and John (Ac 5:21,23), and of Paul and Silas (Ac 16:26). But the more common term is also found in these narratives. In Ac 12:17 "prison" renders a Greek word which means "dwelling." In Ac 5:18 the King James Version, "prison" is the rendering for another Greek word, namely, teresis, "watching" or "ward" (the Revised Version (British and American) "ward"). In Ac 4:3, the King James Version employs "hold" as the rendering for the same word. This would correspond to the modern "police station" or "lockup."

See also PUNISHMENTS.

T. Lewis

PRIVY; PRIVILY

priv’-i, priv’-i-li: These words are obsolete in modern English and are replaced by "secret," "secretly," rather than by the cognates "private," "privately." the Revised Version (British and American) usually has not altered the King James Version’s use of the word, but in Ps 11:2 has substituted "in darkness" and in Jud 9:31 uses "craftily," margin "in Tormah" (see TORMAH). In Eze 21:14, the King James Version "entereth into their privy chambers," "privy" is a gloss, omitted in the Revised Version (British and American). "To be privy to a thing" (1Ki 2:44; Ac 5:2) is simply "to know" it; in The Wisdom of Solomon 8:4, the Revised Version (British and American) has changed the phrase into "be initiated into."

PRIZE

priz: Two Greek words are so rendered in English Versions of the Bible:

(1) brabeion, the award to the victor in the Greek games, consisting of a garland of bay, olive, or pine; so called because it was given by the brabeus, the adjudicator who assigned the prize at the games (Vulgate bravium, from which may be derived the English "brave" = originally gaily dressed, handsome). Used literally in 1Co 9:24, and figuratively of the heavenly reward for Christian character in Php 3:14.

(2) harpagmos, in the English Revised Version of Php 2:6, "counted it not a prize to be on an equality with God." The termination -uos, -mos, would lead us to expect the active sense: "an act of grasping," "plundering" (the King James Version "robbery"), which would imply that Christ did not deem it an act of usurpation to claim equality with God, for such equality was His inherent right. But the context demands a reference "not to the right which He claimed, but to the dignity which He renounced" (Lightfoot); hence, the majority of modern expositors take the word in a passive sense (= harpagma): "a thing to be seized, prized, retained at all costs as a booty" (the English Revised Version "a prize," the American Standard Revised Version "a thing to be grasped"), implying that Christ did not regard equality with God as a thing to be clutched greedily, but waived His rights (see Lightfoot on Php

2:6). The verb "to prize" occurs only in Zec 11:13.

See GRASP; HUMILIATION OF CHRIST; KENOSIS.

D. Miall Edwards

PROBATION, SECOND

pro-ba’-shun, sek’-und.

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

PROCHORUS

prok’-o-rus (Prochoros) :One of "the seven" chosen by the Christian community in Jerusalem to superintend the dispensing of charity to the widows and other poor (Ac 6:5). The name is Greek, and he may have been a Hellenist. According to tradition he became bishop of Nicomedia and died a martyr at Antioch.

PROCONSUL

pro-kon’-sul (anthupatos (Ac 13:7; 18:12); the King James Version deputy).

See PROVINCE.

PROCURATOR

prok’-u-ra-ter (epitropos): This word signified in a general sense a steward or bailiff of a private estate, or a financial agent with power of attorney, and the development of the special usage of the word to denote an imperial functionary or official is characteristic of the origin of many departments of administration under the Roman Empire which sprang from the emperor’s household. At the time of Augustus, when the domestic quality of these offices had not been entirely lost, the procurators were mostly imperial freedmen. But after the systematic organization of the administration in the 2nd century, the title of procurator was reserved for functionaries of the equestrian class. In fact, the term is so intimately connected with the sphere of official activity of the Roman knights that the expressions "procuratorial career" and "equestrian career" are used synonymously (compare Hirschfeld, Die kaiserlichen Verwaltungsbeamten bib auf Diocletian, 410-65).

During the last century of the Republic, the class of knights (equites) embraced in general all citizens of wealth who were not magistrates or members of the senate. The Roscian Law (67 BC) established 400,000 sesterces (about $18,000 (in 1915), or 3,600 British pounds (in 1915)) as the minimum census

rating for membership in this class. The gold ring, tunic with narrow purple border, and privilege of sitting in the first 14 rows at theater were the tokens of knighthood. Augustus added to these the public horse which was conferred henceforth by the emperor and recalled the original military significance of the order. From the time of Augustus the first three decuriae of jurors (judices), each containing 1,000 persons, were filled with knights.

Under the Republic the influence of the equestrian class was chiefly exerted in the financial transactions of the companies which farmed the variable revenues. The importance of the publicani was greatly reduced under the Empire, but the emperors recompensed the knights for this loss of opportunity by entrusting them with a great variety of administrative functions. Military service as prefect or tribune was the preliminary step in the official equestrian career. The highest positions held by members of the equestrian class were called prefectures, and included the prefecture of the guard, of Egypt, of the grain-supply, of the watchmen in Rome, and of the fleet. But between these extremes the title procurator was applied generally to the functionaries whose positions were of imperial origin.

The administration of the fiscus or imperial treasury at Rome and of the finances in the imperial provinces, as well as the collection of fiscal revenues in the senatorial provinces, was in the hands of procurators. They occupied many positions which, on account of their intimate relationship with the person of the monarch, could be safely entrusted only to those whose limited prestige precluded inordinate ambition (Friedlaender, Sittengeschichte Roms 7th edition, Part I, 132-43). Finally, several provinces, where the conditions were unfavorable to the introduction of the ordinary administrative system and Roman public law, were governed as imperial domains by officials of the equestrian class as the emperor’s representatives. In Egypt the title prefect (praefectus) was employed permanently as the appellation of the viceroy, and while the same term may have been used originally to denote the governors of this class generally, when their military outweighed their civil functions, yet the designation procurator became at an early date the term of common usage to designate them (Hirschfeld, 382).

Mauretania, Rhaetia, Noricum, Thrace, Cappadocia, Judea and some smaller districts were all, for a time at least, governed by procurators (Tacitus, History i.11; Dio Cassius lvii.17).

The question concerning the original title of the Roman governors of Judea has arisen because the New Testament employs the word hegemon (Mt 27:2,11,14,15,21,27; 28:14; Lu 3:1; 20:20; Ac 23:24; 24:1; 26:30), which corresponds with the Latin term, praeses, which might be considered synonymous with either procurator or praefectus (Hirschfeld, 384). There is no inscriptional evidence to establish the nomenclature of the rulers of Palestine before the time of Vespasian, and Hirschfeld is of the opinion that a certain passage in Tacitus (Ann. xv.44) where Pilate is called procurator is not sufficient proof in view of this writer’s carelessness in details of this sort. Josephus (Ant., XX, i, 2), however, employs epitropos (procurator) for the time of Claudius, and it is convenient to follow common usage and assume that this title was current from the first.

It was evidently the intention of Augustus that membership in the equestrian class should be a necessary

qualification for the procurators who were appointed to govern provinces. But Claudius appointed a freedman, Antonius Felix, brother of the famous minister of finance, Pallas, as procurator of Judea (Suetonius, Claudius xxviii; Tacitus, History v.9). This remained, however, an isolated instance in the annals of Palestine (Hirschfeld, 380), and it is probable, moreover, that Felix was raised to equestrian rank before the governorship was conferred upon him.

The following list of the procurators of Judea is based on Marquardt (Romische Staatsverwaltung, I, 409, 412) and Schurer (Geschichte des judischen Volkes(4), I, 485-585):

Coponius (6 AD to circa 10 AD)

M. Ambibulus (circa 10-13)

Annius Rufus (circa 13-15)

Valerius Gratus (circa 15-26)

Pontius Pilatus (26-35)

Marcellus (probably 35-38)

Maryllus (38-44)

C. Cuspins Fadus (44-46)

Tiberius Alexander (46-48)

Ventidius Cumanus (48-52) M. Antonius Felix (52-60 or 61)

NOTE.—Marquardt gives his name as Claudius Felix, supposing that he was a freedman of Claudius and therefore took his nomen (Suetonius, Claudius xxviii; Victor, epitome iv, 8); but there is stronger evidence in support of the belief that Felix was a freedman of Antonia, Claudius' mother, like his brother Pallas (Tacitus, Annals xii.54; Josephus, Ant, XVII1, vi, 4; XX, vii, 1, 2; XX, viii, 9; BJ, II, xii, 8), and accordingly had received the praenomen and nomen of Antonia's father (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, vi, 6).

Portius Festus (61)

Albinus (62-64)

Gessius Florus (65-66)

See, further, GOVERNOR.

George H. Allen

PROFANE

pro-fan’ (verb chalal, adjective chalal, chol; bebeloo, bebelos): From profanus, "before (i.e. outside) the temple," therefore unholy, polluted, secular, is of frequent occurrence (verb and adjective) in both the Old Testament and the New Testament. It occurs as the translation of chol in the King James Version only in Eze (22:26, the Revised Version (British and American) "common"; 42:20; 44:23; 48:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "for common use"); as the translation of chalal in Le 21:7,14, the Revised Version margin "polluted"; and Eze 21:25, where, for the King James Version "thou profane wicked prince of Israel," the Revised Version (British and American) has "thou, O deadly wounded wicked one, the prince of Israel." "To profane" (chalal) is seen in Le 18:21; 19:8; Ne 13:17,18; Ps 89:39; Isa 43:28; Eze 22:8,26, etc. "Profaneness" in Jer 23:15 (chanuppah) is in the American Standard Revised Version "ungodliness." In the New Testament "profane" occurs in the sense of unholy, godless, regardless of God and divine things (1Ti 1:9; 4:7; 6:20; 2Ti 2:16; Heb 12:16), and "to profane," or violate, in Mt 12:5; Ac 24:6. The verb is frequent in Apocrypha in 1 Macc (1:43,45,63; 2:34, etc.; also in 2 Macc 8:2; 10:5; compare 2 Esdras 15:8; Judith 4:3,12; 1 Macc 1:48; 2 Macc 4:13). In numerous cases the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "profane" for other words and phrases in the King James Version, as for "to prostitute" (Le 19:29), "an hypocrite" (Isa 9:17), "pollute" (Nu 18:32; Eze 7:21), etc.

W. L. Walker

PROFESS; PROFESSION

pro-fes’, pro-fesh’-un (naghadh; homologeo, homologia): "Profess" means literally "to own before," hence, to make open or public announcement; it occurs only once in the Old Testament as the translation of naghadh, "to put before," often "to tell," "to show," "to declare" (De 26:3); in the New Testament it is the translation of homologeo, "to speak or say together in common," "to assent," "to confess publicly" (Mt 7:23, "Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you"; 1Ti 6:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "didst confess the good confession"; Tit 1:16, "They profess that they know God"); of epaggellomai, "to announce one’s self," "to make profession" (1Ti 2:10; 6:21); of phasko, "to say," "to assert" (Ro 1:22). "Profession" is the translation of homologia (2Co 9:13; 1Ti 6:12; Heb 3:1, the King James Version "the High Priest of our profession" (of our professed faith); Heb 4:14; 10:23; in each instance the Revised Version (British and American) has "confession"). "Profess" occurs in the King James Version of Ecclesiasticus 3:25, but the verse is omitted by the Revised Version (British and American); margin "Most authorities omit verse 25."

W. L. Walker

PROGNOSTICATORS, MONTHLY

prog-nos’-ti-ka-terz.

See ASTROLOGY, 6.

PROLOGUE

pro’-log, prol’-og (prologos, "foreword," "preface," "introduction"): The word occurs in the preface to Ecclesiasticus (Sirach), and is commonly applied to Joh 1:1-18.

See ECCLESIASTICUS; JOHN, GOSPEL OF.

PROLONG

pro-long’ (’arakh, mashakh): "Prolong," "prolonged" are the translations of ‘arakh, "to stretch," "to make long" (De 4:26, and frequently, "prolong days"; De 4:40, etc.; Job 6:11 the King James Version; Pr 28:16; Ec 7:15; 8:13; Isa 53:10); of mashakh, "to draw out" (Isa 13:22; Eze 12:25,28 the King James Version); of yacaph, "to add," "to increase" (Ps 61:6; Pr 10:27); of naTah, "to stretch out," "to incline to" (Job 15:29, "neither shall he prolong the perfection thereof upon the earth," the American Standard Revised Version "neither shall their possessions be extended on the earth," margin "their produce bend to the earth"; the English Revised Version reverses text and margin); of ‘arekhah (Aramaic) (Da 7:12, "Yet their lives were prolonged," the King James Version margin "A prolonging in life was given them"). "Prolong" occurs in Ecclesiasticus 29:5, "prolong the time" (parelkuo); 38:14, "prolong life," the Revised Version (British and American) "maintenance of life" (embiosis); 30:22, "prolongeth his days," the Revised Version (British and American) "length of days" (makroemereusis); 37:31, the Revised Version (British and American) "shall prolong" (prostithemi).

W. L. Walker

PROMISE

prom’-is (most frequently in the Old Testament dabhar, "speaking," "speech," and dabhar, "to speak" also ‘amar, "to say," once in Ps 77:8, ‘omer, "speech"; in the New Testament epaggelia, and the verbs epaggellomai, and compounds): Promise holds an important place in the Scriptures and in the development of the religion that culminated in Christ. The Bible is indeed full of "precious and exceeding great promises" (2Pe 1:4), although the word "promise" is not always used in connection with them. Of the more outstanding promises of the Old Testament may be mentioned:

(1) the proto-evangelium (Ge 3:15);

(2) the promise to Noah no more to curse the ground, etc. (Ge 8:21,22; 9:1-17);

(3) most influential, the promise to Abraham to make of him a great nation in whom all families of the earth should be blessed, to give to him and his seed the land of Canaan (Ge 12:2,7, etc.), often referred to in the Old Testament (Ex 12:25; De 1:8,11; 6:3; 9:28, etc.);

(4) the promise to David to continue his house on the throne (2Sa 7:12,13,18; 1Ki 2:24, etc.);

(5) the promise of restoration of Israel, of the Messiah, of the new and everlasting kingdom, of the new covenant and outpouring of the Spirit (Isa 2:2-5; 4:2; 55:5; 66:13; Jer 31:31-34; 32:37-42; 33:14; Eze 36:22-31; 37:11 f; 39:25 f, etc.).

In the New Testament these promises are founded on, and regarded as having their true fulfillment in, Christ and those who are His (2Co 1:20; Eph 3:6). The promise of the Spirit is spoken of by Jesus as "the promise of my Father" (Lu 24:49; Ac 1:4), and this was regarded as fulfilled at Pentecost. The promise of a Saviour of the seed of David is regarded as fulfilled in Christ (Ac 13:23,32, 26:6; Ro 1:2; 4:13; 9:4). Paul argues that the promise to Abraham that he should be "heir of the world," made to him before circumcision, is not confined to Israel, but is open to all who are children of Abraham by faith (Ro 4:13-16; compare Ga 3:16,19,29). In like manner the writer to the Hebrews goes back to the original promises, giving them a spiritual and eternal significance (4:1; 6:17; 11:9, etc.). The New Testament promises include manifold blessings and hopes, among them "life," "eternal life" (1Ti 4:8; 6:19; 2Ti 1:1; Jas 1:12), the "kingdom" (Jas 2:5), Christ’s "coming" (2Pe 3:9, etc.), "new heavens and a new earth" (2Pe 3:13), etc. For "promise" and "promised" in the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) has frequently other terms, as "word" (Ps 105:42), "spake," "spoken" (De 10:9; Jos 9:21; 22:4; 23:5,15, etc.), "consented" (Lu 22:6), etc. References to the promises occur repeatedly in the Apocrypha (Baruch 2:34; 2 Macc 2:18; The Wisdom of Solomon 12:21; compare 2 Esdras 3:15; 5:29).

W. L. Walker

PROPER

prop’-er: For the King James Version "proper" (child), in Heb 11:23, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "goodly"; in 1Ch 29:3; 1Co 7:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "own" is employed, and for the too emphatic "their proper tongue" in Ac 1:19 "their language" is written. But none of the King James Version forms are really obsolete.

PROPER NAMES

See NAMES, PROPER.

PROPERTY

prop’-er-ti.

See AGRARIAN LAWS; JUBILEE; POOR; PORTION; PRIMOGENITURE; WEALTH.

PROPHECY, GIFT OF

See SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

PROPHECY; PROPHETS, 1

prof’-e-si, prof’-e-si, prof’-ets:

I. THE IDEA OF BIBLICAL PROPHECY

1. The Seer and Speaker of God

2. Prophetical Inspiration

3. Relation to Dreams

4. Freedom of Inspiration

5. Supernatural Visions of the Future

6. The Fulfillment

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROPHETIC OFFICE

1. Abraham

2. Moses

3. Period of the Judges

4. Schools of Prophets

5. Period of the Kings

6. Literary Prophets, Amos, Hosea

7. Poetical Form of Prophecy

8. Prophets of Judah, Isaiah, and Others Down to Jeremiah

9. During the Exile, Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, Daniel

10. After the Exile, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi

11. Cessation of Prophecy

12. Prophecy in the New Testament

III. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF PROPHECY

1. Contents of Prophecy

2. Conception of the Messiah

3. Before the Exile (through Judgment to Deliverance)

4. Analogous Ideas among Heathen Peoples

5. During the Exile (Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah)

6. After the Exile (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi)

7. Contemporaneous Character of Prophecy

8. Partial Character of Prophecy

9. Perspective Character of Prophecy

IV. ANALOGOUS PHENOMENA AMONG THE GENTILES

1. Necromancy and Technical Witchcraft

2. The Mantle Art

3. Contents of Extra-Biblical Oracles

LITERATURE

I. The Idea of Biblical Prophecy.

1. The Seer and Speaker of God:

According to the uniform teaching of the Bible the prophet is a speaker of or for God. His words are not the production of his own spirit, but come from a higher source. For he is at the same time, also, a seer, who sees things that do not lie in the domain of natural sight, or who hears things which human ears do not ordinarily receive; compare 1Sa 9:9, where nabhi'," speaker," and ro'eh, "seer," are used as synonymous terms. Jer 23:16 and Eze 13:2 f are particularly instructive in this regard. In these passages a sharp distinction is made between those persons who only claim to be prophets but who prophesy "out of their own heart," and the true prophets who declare the word which the Lord has spoken to them. In the latter case the contents of the prophecy have not originated in their own reflection or calculation; and just as little is this prophecy the product of their own feelings, fears or hopes, but, as something extraneous to man and independent of him, it has with a divine certainty entered the soul of the prophet. The prophet has seen that which he prophesies, although he need not have seen it in the form of a real vision. He can also "see" words with his inner eyes (Isa 2:1, and often). It is only another expression for this when it is frequently said that God has spoken to the prophet. In this case too it is not necessary that there must have been a voice which he could hear phonetically through his natural ear. The main thing is that he must have been able sharply to distinguish the contents of this voice from his own heart, i.e. from his personal consciousness. Only in this way is he capable of speaking to the people in the name of God and able to publish his word as that of Yahweh. In this case he is the speaker of Yahweh (nabhi'), or the mouth of the Lord (compare Eze 7:1 with 4:16). Under these conditions he then regards it as absolute compulsion to speak, just as a person must be filled with fear when he hears a lion roar nearby (Am 3:8). The words burn in his soul until he utters them (Jer 20:7,9).

2. Prophetical Inspiration:

The divine power, which comes over a human being and compels him to see or to hear things which otherwise would be hidden from him, is called by various terms expressive of inspiration. It is said that the Spirit of God has come over someone (Nu 24:2); or has fallen upon him (Eze 11:5); or that the hand of Yahweh has come over him and laid hold of him (2Ki 3:15; Eze 1:3; 3:14,22, and often); or that the Holy Spirit has been put on him as a garment, i.e. has been incorporated in him (1Ch 12:18; 2Ch 24:20); or that the Spirit of revelation has permanently descended upon him (Nu 11:25 f; 2Ki 2:15; Isa 11:2; 61:1); or that God has given this Spirit of His (Nu 11:29; Isa 42:1); or pours Him out upon man (Joe 2:28 f; Heb 3:1 f). But this inspiration is not such that it suppresses the human consciousness of the recipient, so that he would receive the word of God in the state of sleep or trance. But rather the recipient is in possession of his full consciousness, and is able afterward to give a clear account of what happened. Nor is the individuality of the prophet eliminated by this divine inspiration; unconsciously this individuality cooperates in the formal shaping of that which has been seen and heard. In accordance

with the natural peculiarity of the prophet and with the contents of the message, the psychological condition of the recipient may be that of intense excitement or of calmness. As a rule the inspiration that takes possession of the prophets is evidenced also by an exalted and poetical language, which assumes a certain rhythmical character, but is not bound to a narrow and mechanical meter. It is, however, also possible that prophetical utterances find their expression in plain prose. The individual peculiarity of the prophet is a prime factor also in the form in which the revelation comes to him. In the one prophet we find a preponderance of visions; another prophet has no visions. But the visions of the future which he sees are given in the forms and the color which have been furnished by his own consciousness. All the more the form in which the prophet gives expression to his word of God is determined by his personal talents and gifts as also by his experiences.

3. Relation to Dreams:

In a certain respect the dream can be cited as an analogous phenomenon, in which also the ideas that are slumbering in the soul uninvited put in their appearance without being controlled by consciousness and reason. On the other hand, prophecy differs pecifically from dreams, first, because the genuine prophetical utterance is received when the prophet is clearly conscious, and, secondly, because such an utterance brings with it a much greater degree of certainty and a greater guaranty of its higher origin than is done even by a dream that seems to be prophetical. In Jer 23:25 ff it is declared that these two are entirely dissimilar, and the relation between the two is compared to straw and wheat. The Moslem Arabs also put a much lower estimate on the visionary dream than on the prophetic vision in a waking condition.

4. Freedom of Inspiration:

Because this Spirit of God acts with full freedom, He can select His organs at will from among every station, age, or sex. The Spirit is not confined to any priestly class or organization. It indeed was the case at times that a prophet gathered disciples around himself, who could themselves in turn also be seized by his spirit, although the transmission of this spirit was a difficult matter (2Ki 2:10). Yet genuine prophecies continued to be at all times a free gift of the sovereign God. Amos (7:14 f) appeals expressly to this fact, that he did not himself choose the prophet’s calling nor was the pupil of a prophetic school, but that he had been directly called by Yahweh from his daily occupation as a shepherd and workman. In the same way we indeed find prophets who belonged to the priestly order (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others), but equally great is the number of those who certainly did not so belong. Further, age made no difference in the call to the prophetic office. Even in his earliest youth Samuel was called to be a prophet (1Sa 3:1), and it did not avail Jeremiah anything when he excused himself because of his youth (Jer 1:6). Then, too, a woman could be seized by this Spirit. From time to time prophetesses appeared, although the female sex is by no means so prominent here as it is in the sorcery of the heathen. See PROPHETESS. As an exceptional case the Spirit of God could lay hold even of a person who inwardly was entirely estranged from Him and could make an utterance through him (compare Saul, 1Sa 10:11; 19:24; Balaam, Nu 23 f; Caiaphas, Joh 11:51). As a rule, however, God has selected such prophetic organs for a longer service. These persons are called and dedicated for this purpose by Him through a special act (compare Moses Ex 3:1 ff; 1Ki 19:16,19 ff; Isa 6$; Jer 1$; Eze 1$). This moment was

decisive for their whole lives and constituted their authorization as far as they themselves and others were concerned. Yet for each prophetic appearance these men receive a special enlightenment. The prophet does not at all times speak in an inspired state; compare Nathan (2Sa 7:3), who afterward was compelled to take back a word which he had spoken on his own authority. Characteristic data on the mental state of the prophets in the reception and in the declaration of the divine word are found in Jer 15:16 f; 20:7 ff. Originally Jeremiah felt it as a joy that Yahweh spoke to him (compare Eze 3:3), but then he lost all pleasure in life and would have preferred not to have uttered this word, but he could not do as he desired.

5. Supernatural Visions of the Future:

The attempt has often been made to explain prophecy as a natural product of purely human factors. Rationalistic theologians regarded the prophets as enthusiastic teachers of religion and morals, as warm patriots and politicians, to whom they ascribed nothing but a certain ability of guessing the future. But this was no explanation of the facts in the case. The prophets were themselves conscious of this, that they were not the intellectual authors of their higher knowledge. This consciousness is justified by the fact that they were in a condition to make known things which lay beyond their natural horizon and which were contrary to all probability. Those cases are particularly instructive in this respect which beyond a doubt were recorded by the prophets themselves. Ezekiel could indeed, on the basis of moral and religious reflections, reach the conviction that Zedekiah of Jerusalem would not escape his punishment for his political treachery and for his disobedience to the word of Yahweh; but he could never from this source have reached the certainty that this king, as the prophet describes the case in 12:8 ff, was to be taken captive while trying to escape from the besieged city and was then to be blinded and taken to Babylon. Just as little could he in Babylon know the exact day when the siege of Jerusalem began (24:2). If this prophet had learned of these things in a natural way and had afterward clothed them in the form of prophecy, he would have been guilty of a deception, something unthinkable in the case of so conscientious a preacher of morality. But such cases are frequently met with. Jeremiah predicts to Hananiah that he would die during the year (28:16), but it is not only such matters of detail that presuppose an extraordinary vision of the prophet. The whole way also in which Jeremiah predicts the destruction of Jerusalem as inevitable, in direct contrast to the hopes of the Jerusalemites and to the desires of his own heart, shows that he was speaking under divine compulsion, which was more powerful than his own reflections and sympathies. On any other presupposition his conduct would have been reprehensible cowardice. The case of Isaiah is exactly the same. When he gives to Ahaz the word of God as a guaranty that the Syrians and the Ephraimites would not capture Jerusalem (7:4 ff), and when he promises Hezekiah that the Assyrians would not shoot an arrow into the city, but would return without having accomplished their purpose (37:22,33), these things were so much in contradiction to all the probabilities of the course events would take that he would have been a frivolous adventurer had he not received his information from higher sources. Doubtless it was just these predictions which established and upheld the influence of the prophets. Thus in the case of Amos it was his prediction of a great earthquake, which did occur two years later (1:1); in the case of Elijah, the prediction of the long dearth (1Ki 17:1); in the case of Elisha the undertakings of the enemies (2Ki 6:12), and in other cases. It is indeed true that the contents of the prophetic discourses are not at all confined to the future. Everything that God has to announce to mankind, revelations concerning His will, admonitions,

warnings, He is able to announce through the mouth of the prophet. But His determinations with reference to the future as a rule are connected with prophetical utterances of the latter kind. The prophets are watchmen, guardians of the people, who are to warn the nation, because they see the dangers and the judgments approaching, which must put in their appearance if the divine will is disregarded. The prophets interpret also for the people that which is happening and that which has occurred, e.g. the defeats which they have suffered at the hands of their enemies, or the grasshopper plague (Joel), or a famine. They lay bare the inner reason for external occurrences and explain such events in their connection with the providential government of God. This gives to prophecy a powerful inner unity, notwithstanding the great differences of times and surrounding circumstances. It is prophecy which the Hebrew people must thank for their higher conception of history. This people know of a Highest Author of all things and of a positive end, which all things that transpire must serve. God’s plan has for its purpose to bring about the complete supremacy of His will among the children of men.

6. The Fulfillment:

In genuine prophecy, according to Biblical conceptions, the fulfillment constitutes an integral part. This is set up by De 18:21 f as a proof of the genuineness of a prophetic utterance. The prophetic word "falls to the ground" (1Sa 3:19) if it is not "raised up" (heqim, "fulfil," for which we more rarely find mille’, but regularly in the New Testament plerousthai "being fulfilled") by the course of events. It would remain an empty word if it did not attain to its full content through its realization. In fact, in the word spoken by the prophet itself there dwells a divine power, so that at the moment when he speaks the event takes place, even if it is not yet visible to man. This realization is also not infrequently represented symbolically by the prophet in confirmation of his prediction. Thus in a certain sense it is the prophet himself who through his word builds up and pulls down, plants and roots out (Jer 1:10; 25:15). But the fulfillment can be judged by the contemporaries in the sense of De 18:22 only when this fulfillment refers to the near future and when special emphasis is laid on external events. In these cases the prediction of certain events assumes the significance of a "sign" (compare Jer 28:16; Isa 8:1 ff; 37:30, and elsewhere). In other cases it is only later generations who can judge of the correctness of a prediction or of a threat. In this way in Zec 1:6 the fulfillment of a threat is declared, and in the New Testament often the fulfillment of a promise is after a long time pointed out. But it is not the case that a genuine prophecy must be fulfilled like an edict of fate. Such prophecy is not an inevitable decree of fate, but is a word of the living God to mankind, and therefore conditioned ethically, and God can, if repentance has followed, withdraw a threat (Jer 18:2 ; case of Jonah), or the punishment can be mitigated (1Ki 21:29). A prediction, too, Yahweh can recall if the people prove unworthy (Jer 18:9 f) . A favorable or an unfavorable prediction can also be postponed, as far as its realization is concerned, to later times, if it belongs to the ultimate counsels of God, as e.g. the final judgment and deliverance on the last day. This counsel also may be realized successively. In this case the prophet already collects into one picture what is realized gradually in a longer historical development. The prophet in general spoke to his hearers in such a way as could be understood by them and could be impressed on them. It is therefore not correct to demand a fulfillment pedantically exact in the form of the historical garb of the prophecy. The main thing is that the divine thought contained in the prophecy be entirely and completely realized. But not infrequently the finger of God can be seen in the entirely literal fulfillment of certain prophecies. This is especially the case in the New Testament in the appearance of the Son of Man, in

whom all the rays of Old Testament prophecy have found their common center.

PROPHECY; PROPHETS, 2

II. Historical Development of the Prophetic Office.

1. Abraham:

It is a characteristic peculiarity of the religion of the Old Testament that its very elementary beginnings are of a prophetical nature. The fathers, above all Abraham, but also Isaac and Jacob, are the recipients of visions and of divine revelations. Especially is this true of Abraham, who appeared to the foreigners, to whom he was neither kith or kin, to be indeed a prophet (nabhi')(Ge 20:7; compare Ps 105:15), although in his case the command to preach the word was yet absent.

2. Moses:

Above all, the creative founder of the Israelite national religion, Moses, is a prophet in the eminent sense of the word. His influence among the people is owing neither to his official position, nor to any military prowess, but solely and alone to the one circumstance, that since his call at the burning bush God has spoken to him. This intercourse between God and Moses was ever of a particularly intimate character. While other men of God received certain individual messages only from time to time and through the mediation of dreams and visions, Yahweh spoke directly and "face to face" with Moses (Nu 12:6 ff; De 34:10; compare Ex 33:11). Moses was the permanent organ through whom Yahweh brought about the Egyptian plagues and through whom He explained what these meant to His people, as also through whom He led and ruled them. The voice of Moses too had to explain to them the divine signs in the desert and communicate to them the commandments of God. The legislation of Moses shows that he was not only filled with the Spirit of God occasionally, but that he abode with God for longer periods of time and produced something that is a well-ordered whole. A production such as the Law is the result of a continuous association with God.

3. Period of the Judges:

Since that time revelation through prophecy was probably never entirely wanting in Israel (De 18:15). But this fountain did not always flow with the same fullness or clearness. During the period of the Judges the Spirit of God urged the heroes who served Yahweh rather to deeds than to words. Yet Deborah enjoyed a high rank as a prophetess, and for a long time pronounced decisions of justice in the name of the Lord before she, through her prophetical utterances, aroused the people to rise up against their oppressors. What is said in 1Sa 3:1 concerning the times of Eli can be applied to this whole period, namely that the word and vision of the prophet had become rare in the land. All the more epoch-making was the activity of Samuel, who while yet a boy received divine revelations (1Sa 3:1). He was by the whole people regarded as a "seer" whose prophecies were always fulfilled (3:19 f). The passage 1Sa 9:6 ff shows that the people expected of such a man of God that he should also as a clairvoyant come to the

assistance of the people in the troubles of life. Such a professional clairvoyant, indeed, Samuel was not, as he was devoted entirely to the service of his God and of his people and obeyed the Divine Spirit, even in those cases when he was compelled to act contrary to his personal inclinations, as was the case when the kingdom was established in Israel (8:6 ff).

4. Schools of Prophets:

Since the days of Samuel we hear of schools of prophets, or "sons of prophets." These associations probably originated in this way, that an experienced prophet attracted to himself bands of youths, who sought to receive a measure of his spirit. These disciples of the prophets, together with their families, lived in colonies around the master. Possibly Samuel was the first who founded such a school of prophets. For in or near the city of Ramah we first find nayoth, or colonies of such disciples (1Sa 19:18 f; 20:1). Among these pupils is found to a much greater extent than among the teachers a certain ecstatic feature. They arouse their feelings through music and induce a frantic condition which also affects others in the same way, in which state they "prophesy" and, throwing off their garments, fall to the ground. In later times too we find traces of such ecstatic phenomena. Thus e.g. in Zec 13:6; 1Ki 20:37,38, the "wounds" on the breast or on the forehead recall the self-mutilation of the priests of Baal (1Ki 18:28). The deeds, suggestive of what the dervishes of our own day do, probably were phenomena quite similar to the action of the prophets of the surrounding tribes. But that prophecy in Israel was not, as is now not infrequently claimed, merely a less crude form of the heathen prophetic institution, is proved by such men as Moses and Samuel, who even in their times represent something much higher. Also in the colonies of prophets there was assuredly not to be found merely an enthusiasm without the Spirit of God. Proof for this is Samuel, the spiritual father of this colony, as Elijah was for the later colonies of this kind. These places were rather the centers of a religious life, where communion with God was sought by prayer and meditation, and where the recollection of the great deeds of God in the past seemed to prepare for the reception of new revelations. From such centers of theocratic ideas and ideals without a doubt there came forth also corresponding influences that affected the people. Perhaps not only was sacred music cultivated at these places but also sacred traditions, which were handed down orally and in writing. Certain it is that at these colonies the religion of Yahweh prevailed.

5. Period of the Kings:

During the period of the kings prophetically inspired men frequently appeared, who demanded even of the kings that they should submit to their divinely-inspired word. Saul, who refused such submission, perished as the result of this conflict. David owed much to the support of the prophets Samuel, Nathan, Gad (1Sa 16:1 ff; 2Sa 7$; 2Ch 29:25, and elsewhere). But David also bowed in submission when these prophets rebuked him because of his transgression of the divine commands (2Sa 12; 24). His son Solomon was educated by the prophet Nathan. But the destruction of his kingdom was predicted by the prophet Abijah, the Shilonite (1Ki 11:29). Since Yahweh, as the supreme Sovereign, has the right to enthrone or to dethrone kings, this is often done through the mouths of the prophets (compare 1Ki 14:7 ff; 16:1 ff). After the division of the kingdom we find Shemaiah forbidding Rehoboam to begin a war with his brethren of Israel (1Ki 12:21; compare 2Ch 11:2 ; compare another mission of the same prophet, 2Ch 12:5). On the other hand in the Northern Kingdom the prophetic word is soon turned

against the untheocratic rule of Jeroboam (1Ki 13; 14). It is in this very same Northern Kingdom that the prophets unfolded their full activity and generally in opposition to the secular rulers, although there was no lack of accommodating "prophets," who were willing to sanction everything that the king wanted. The opposition of the true prophets to these false representatives of prophecy is illustrated in the story of Micaiah, the son of Imlah (1Ki 22). But a still higher type of prophecy above the ordinary is found in Elijah, whose historic mission it was to fight to the finish the battle between the followers of Yahweh and the worship of the Tyrian Baal. He was entirely a man of action; every one of his words is a deed on a grand scale (compare concerning Elijah and Elisha the article ISRAEL, RELIGION OF). His successor Elisha inherited from him not only his mantle, but also a double measure of his spiritual gifts. He exhibits the prophetic office more from its loving side. He is accustomed to visit the schools of prophets found scattered throughout the land, calls the faithful together around himself on the Sabbaths and the new moons (2Ki 4:23), and in this way establishes centers of a more spiritual culture than was common elsewhere among the people. We read that first-fruits were brought to him as to the priests (2Ki 4:42). But while the activity of Elijah was entirely in antagonism to the ruling house in the kingdom, this feature is not entirely lacking in the work of Elisha also. He has even been charged with wicked conspiracies against the dynasty of Omri and the king of Syria (2Ki 8; 9). His conduct in connection with these events can be excused only on the ground that he was really acting in the name of a higher Master. But in general it was possible for Elisha, after the radical change in public sentiment that had followed upon the work of Elijah, in later time to assume a more friendly attitude toward the government and the people. He often assisted the kings in their arduous contests with the Syrians (compare 2Ki 6:8 ff; 13:14 ff). His deeds are generally of a benevolent character. In connection with these he exhibits to a remarkable degree the gift of prophetic foresight (2Ki 4:16; 5:26; 6:8 ff; 7:1 ff; 8:10,12; 9:6 ff; 13:19). Jonah, too, the son of Amittai, had at that time a favorable message for the Northern Kingdom (2Ki 14:25).

6. Literary Prophets, Amos, Hosea:

However, the flourishing condition of the kingdom under Jeroboam II had an unfavorable influence on its spiritual development. Soon Amos and Hosea were compelled to announce to this kingdom its impending destruction through a great world-power. These two prophets have left us books. To put prophetic utterances into written form had already been introduced before this. At any rate, many scholars are of the conviction that the prophecies of Obadiah and Joe belong to an earlier period, although others place them in the post-exilic period. In any case, the expectation of a day of settlement by Yahweh with His people was already in the days of Amos common and current (5:18 ff). As the writing of individual prophecies (Isa 8:1 f; 30:8; Hab 2:2 f) had for its purpose the preserving of these words in permanent authentic form and later to convince the reader of their wonderful fulfillment, thus too the writing down of larger collections of prophecies had for its purpose to intensify the power of the prophetic word and to secure this as a permanent possession of the people (Jer 30:2; 36:1). Pupils of the prophets assisted them in this writing and in preserving their books (compare Jer 36:4; Isa 8:16).

7. Poetical Form of Prophecy:

It is to this custom that we owe our knowledge of the very words of the utterances of many of the

prophets of a later period. In addition to the larger books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, we have a number of smaller prophetical books, which have been united into the Book of the Twelve Prophets. These utterances as a rule exhibited an elevated form of language and are more or less poetical. However, in modern times some scholars are inclined to go too far in claiming that these addresses are given in a carefully systematized metrical form. Hebrew meter as such is a freer form of expression than is Arabic or Sanskrit meter, and this is all the more the case with the discourses of the prophets, which were not intended for musical rendering, and which are expressed in a rhythmically-constructed rhetoric, which appears now in one and then in another form of melody, and often changes into prose.

8. Prophets in Judah Isaiah, and Others Down to Jeremiah:

In the kingdom of Judah the status of the prophets was somewhat more favorable than it was in Ephraim. They were indeed forced in Jerusalem also to contend against the injustice on the part of the ruling classes and against immorality of all kinds. But in this kingdom there were at any rate from time to time found kings who walked more in the footsteps of David. Thus Asa followed the directions of the prophet Azariah (2Ch 15:1). It is true that the prophet Hanani censured this king, but it was done for a different reason. Jehoshaphat also regularly consulted the prophets. Among those who had dealings with him Elisha is also mentioned (2Ki 3:14), as also some other prophets (compare 2Ch 19:2; 20:14-37). The greatest among the prophets during the period of the Assyrian invasions was Isaiah, who performed the duties of his office for more than 40 years, and under the kings Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, and possibly too under Manasseh, through his word exercised a powerful influence upon the king and the nation. Although a preacher of judgments, he at critical times appeared also as a prophet of consolation. Nor did he despise external evidences of his prophetic office (compare Isa 7:11; 38:22,8). His contemporary Micah is in full agreement with him, although he was not called to deal with the great of the land, with kings, or statesmen, as was the mission of Isaiah. Nahum, Zephaniah and Habakkuk belong rather to the period of transition from the Assyrian to the Chaldean periods. In the days of Josiah the prophetess Huldah had great influence in Jerusalem (2Ki 22:14). Much more important under this same king was the prophet Jeremiah, who was called by God for a great mission. This prophet during the siege and destruction of Jerusalem and after that time spoke as an unyielding yet deeply feeling exponent of God, and was compelled again and again to dash to the ground the false hopes of the patriots, whenever these arose. Not so firm was his contemporary and fellow-sufferer Uriah (Jer 26:20).

9. During the Exile, Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, Daniel:

In the time of the exile itself we find the period of the activity of Ezekiel. It was significant that this prophet became the recipient of divine revelations while on Babylonian territory. His work was, in accordance with the condition of affairs, more that of a pastor and literary man. He seems also to have been a bodily sufferer. His abnormal conditions became symbolical signs of that which he had to proclaim. Deutero-Isaiah, too (Isa 40), spoke during the Babylonian period, namely at its close, and prepared for the return. The peculiar prophecies of Daniel are also accorded to a prophet living during the exile, who occupied a distinguished position at the court of the heathen rulers, and whose apocalyptic utterances are of a kind different from the discourses of the other prophets, as they deal

more with the political condition of the world and the drama of history, in so far as this tends toward the establishment of the supremacy of Yahweh. These prophecies were collected in later times and did not receive their final and present form until the Greek period at the beginning of the 2nd century BC.

10. After the Exile, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi:

After the return from Babylon the Jews were exhorted by Haggai and Zechariah to rebuild their temple (about 520 BC). At that time there were still to be found prophets who took a hostile attitude to the men of God. Thus Nehemiah (Ne 6:6-14) was opposed by hostile prophets as also by a prophetess, Noadiah. In contrast with these, Malachi is at all times in accord with the canonical prophets, as he was an ardent advocate for the temple cult of Yahweh, not in the sense of a spiritless and senseless external worship, but as against the current indifference to Yahweh. His style and his language, too, evidence a late age. The lyrical form has given way to the didactic. This is also probably the time when the present Book of Jonah was written, a didactic work treating of an older tradition.

11. Cessation of Prophecy:

Malachi is regarded by the Jews as the last really canonical prophet. While doubtless there was not a total lack of prophetically endowed seers and speakers of God also in the closing centuries of the pre-Christian era, nevertheless the general conviction prevailed that the Spirit of God was no longer present, e.g. in the times of the Maccabees (compare 1 Macc 4:46; 9:27; 14:41). It is true that certain modern critics ascribe some large sections of the Book of Isa, as well as of other prophets, even to a period as late as the Greek. But this is refuted by the fact mentioned in Ecclesiasticus (beginning of the 2nd century BC) that in the writer's time the prophetical Canon appeared already as a closed collection. Daniel is not found in this collection, but the Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets is. It was during this period that apocalyptic literature began to flourish, many specimens of which are foundamong the Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha. These books consist of eschatological speculations, not the product of original inspiration, but emanating from the study of the prophetic word. The very name Pseudepigrapha shows that the author issued his work, not under his own name, but under the pseudonym of some man of God from older times, such as Enoch, Ezra, Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, and others. This fact alone proves the secondary character of this class of literature.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE.

12. Prophecy in the New Testament:

Malachi finds a successor in John the Baptist, whose coming the former had predicted. John is the greatest of the prophets, because he could directly point to Him who completed the old covenant and fulfilled its promises. All that we know in addition concerning the times of Jesus shows that the prophetical gift was yet thought of as possibly dwelling in many, but that prophecy was no longer the chief spiritual guide of the people (compare e.g. Josephus, Ant, XIII, xi, 2; XV, x, 5, among the Essenes, or in the case of Hyrcanus, op. cit., XIII, x, 7). Josephus himself claims to have had prophetic gifts at

times (compare BJ, III, viii, 9). He is thinking in this connection chiefly of the prediction of some details. Such "prophets" and "prophetesses" are reported also in the New Testament. In Jesus Christ Himself the prophetic office reached its highest stage of development, as He stood in a more intimate relation than any other being to His Heavenly Father and spoke His word entirely and at all times. In the Christian congregation the office of prophecy is again found, differing from the proclamation of the gospel by the apostles, evangelists, and teachers. In the New Testament the terms prophetes, propheteia, propheteuo, signify speaking under the extraordinary influence of the Holy Ghost. Thus in Ac 11:27 f (prophecy of a famine by Agabus); 21:10 f (prediction of the sufferings of Paul); 13:1 f (exhortation to mission work); 21:9 ff (prophetical gift of the daughters of Philip). Paul himself also had this gift (Ac 16:6 ff; 18:9; 22:17 ff; 27:23 f). In the public services of the church, prophecy occupied a prominent position (see especially 1Co 14). A prophetical book in a special sense is the Apocalypse of John. The gift of prophecy was claimed by many also in later times. But this gift ceased more and more, as the Christian church more and more developed on the historical basis of revelation as completed in Christ. Especially in spiritually aroused eras in the history of the church, prophecy again puts in its appearance. It has never ceased altogether, but on account of its frequent misuse the gift has become discredited. Jesus Himself warned against false prophets, and during the apostolic times it was often found necessary to urge the importance of trying spirits (1 Joh 4:1; 1Co 12:10; 14:29).

PROPHECY; PROPHETS, 3

III. Historical Development of Prophecy.

1. Contents of Prophecy:

The contents of prophecy are by no means merely predictions concerning the future. That which is given by the Spirit to the prophet can refer to the past and to the present as well as to the future. However, that which is revealed to the prophet finds its inner unity in this, that it all aims to establish the supremacy of Yahweh. Prophecy views also the detailed events in their relation to the divine plan, and this latter has for its purpose the absolute establishment of the supremacy of Yahweh in Israel and eventually on the entire earth. We are accustomed to call those utterances that predict this final purpose the Messianic prophecies. However, not only those that speak of the person of the Messiah belong to this class, but all that treat of the coming of the kingdom of God.

2. Conception of the Messiah:

The beginnings of the religion of Israel, as also the chief epoch in its development, emanated from prophetical revelations. The prophet Moses elevated the tribal religion into a national religion, and at the same time taught the people to regard the religion of the fathers more ethically, spiritually and vitally. Samuel crowned the earthly form of the concrete theocracy by introducing an "Anointed of Yahweh" in whom the covenant relation between Yahweh and Israel was concentrated personally. The Anointed of the Lord entered into a much more intimate relationship to Yahweh as His Son or Servant than it was possible for the whole people of Israel to do, although as a people they were also called the servant or

the son of God (compare Ps 2:7 f; 110). The Psalms of David are a proof of this, that this high destiny of the kingdom was recognized. David himself became a prophet in those hymns in which he describes his own unique relation to Yahweh. But the actual kings of history as a rule corresponded too imperfectly to this idea. For this reason the word "prophetic" already in David's time directs to the future, when this relationship shall be more perfectly realized (2Sa 7:12 ; compare David's own words, 2Sa 23:4).

See MESSIAH.

3. Before the Exile (through Judgment to Deliverance):

Solomon completed the external equipment of theocracy by the erection of the temple. But it was just his reign that constituted the turning-point, from which time on the prophets begin to emphasize the judgment to come, i.e. the dissolution of the external existence of the kingdom of Yahweh. Yet prophecy at all times does this in such a manner, that a kernel of the divine establishment on Zion remains intact. The divine establishment of the sanctuary and the kingdom cannot be destroyed; all that is necessary is that they be restored in greater purity and dignity. This can be seen also in Amos, who predicts that the fallen tabernacle of David shall be raised up again (Am 9:11), which shall then be followed by a condition of undisturbed blessing. The same is found in Hosea, who sees how all Israel is again united under "David" the king of the last times, when between God and the people, between heaven and earth, an unbroken covenant of love shall be made (Ho 2:1 f, 18); and also in Isaiah, who predicts that during the time of the conquest and subjection of the country by the Gentiles a Son of David shall be born in a miraculous manner and attain supremacy (Isa 7:14; 9:2 ff; 11:1), and who speaks constantly of that divine establishment on Zion (compare the quiet waters of Shiloah, 8:6), the foundation stone that has been laid by Yahweh (Isa 28:16, etc.). Micah, his contemporary, does the same, and in an entirely similar manner predicts that the radical judgment of destruction which shall come over the temple and the royal palace shall be followed by the wondrous King of Peace from Bethlehem (Mic 5:1). Possibly even at a somewhat earlier date Zec 9:9 described this future ruler in similar terms. In general it is not probable that Isaiah and Micah were the first to speak so personally of this King. They seem to presuppose that their contemporaries were acquainted with this idea.

4. Analogous Ideas among Heathen Peoples:

In recent times scholars have pointed to the fact that in the old Orient, among the Egyptians, the Babylonians and elsewhere, the expectation of a miraculously-born King of the future, who was to bring to His own people and to all nations salvation and peace, was entertained at an early period. Yet so much is certain, that Isaiah and Micah did not base their hopes on the vague dreams of the Gentileworld, but upon the prophetic establishment of a divine sanctuary and kingdom of Zion. The personal figure of this Son of David is not so much in the foreground in the other prophets down to the period of the exile. These prophets mention only casually the Good Shepherd, as e.g. Jer 23:1 ff; 33:12 ff; Eze 34:23 f. But after that time this Messianic expectation became a permanent element in the hopes of Israel.

In the meanwhile, prophecy had thrown much light on the ways of God, which prepare for His kingdom

on earth. Even long before Amos (5:18 ff) the idea of a "day of Yahweh," which was to be a day of revelation, on which God makes a settlement with the nations, must have been generally known, since Amos is already compelled to protest against the abuse of this expectation. But hand in hand with this settlement we find also and at all times the expectation of the exaltation and of the salvation of Israel. Yet the prophets have all emphasized that Israel and Judah must first be thoroughly purified by a judgment, before the land could, through God's grace, be glorified and richly blessed. The judgment which the preexilic prophets are continually predicting is, however, only a means to an end. This judgment is not the final word of the Lord, as Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah and Habakkuk constantly teach. They announce that return to Yahweh and obedience to His commandments is the way to salvation (Ho 6:1; Isa 1:18; Jer 4:1, and often). However, the prophets know that the people will not turn again to God, but that first the Jewish state must be entirely overthrown (Isa 6). It is particularly deserving of notice, that believing trust in Yahweh is regarded as the positive means for deliverance (Isa 7:9; 30:15; Hab 2:4). It is through this that the "remnant" of the faithful, "the kernel" of the people, is saved. Also in the case of Jeremiah, whose work it was to predict the immediate destruction of Judah, there is not absent a kind of an esoteric book of consolation. His battle cry for the future is "Yahweh our righteousness" (Jer 23:6; 33:16). In his case we find a rich spiritualization of religion. The external customs, circumcision and the like, he declares, do no good, if the true state of the heart is lacking. Even the ark of the covenant is unnecessary and is discarded in the enlargement of the sanctuary. Ezekiel, who lays more stress on the external ordinances, nevertheless agrees with Jeremiah in this, that Jerusalem together with the temple must fall. Only after this destruction the prophet in his spirit builds the sanctuary again; notwithstanding the external character of his restoration, there is yet found in his picture a further development of its spiritual character. The ethical rights and the responsibility of the individual are strongly emphasized (Ezekiel 18; 33). The land becomes transformed; the Gentiles are received into the covenant of God.

5. During the Exile (Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah):

Deutero-Isaiah (Isa 40:1-66:24), during the time of the Babylonian captivity, enriches prophecy in an extraordinary manner, through the figure of the true "Servant of Yahweh," who in a peaceful way, through his words of instruction and especially through his innocent sufferings and his vicarious deeds, converts Israel, the undeserving servant, and also wins over the Gentileworld to Yahweh. It was not possible that the picture of a suffering man of God, who through his death as a martyr attains to exaltation, should be suggested to the Jews by the altogether different figure of a death and resurrection of a Babylonian god (Thammuz-Adonis!). Since the unjust persecutions of Joseph and David they were acquainted with the sufferings of the just, and Jeremiah's life as a prophet was a continuous martyrdom. But the writer of the second part of Isaiah had before his eyes a vision that far excelled all of these types in purity and in greatness to such a degree as did David's Son in Isaiah and Micah surpass His great ancestor. He brings to a completion the kingdom of God through teaching, suffering and death, and attains to the glory of rulership. In this way He unites the offices of prophet, priest and king.

6. After the Exile (Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi):

After the exile prophecy continues its work. The Messianic expectations, too, are developed further by

Haggai, and still more by Zechariah. Malachi announces the advent of the Day of Yahweh, but expects before this a complete purification of the people of God. God Himself will come, and His angel will prepare the way for Him. The visions of Daniel picture the transformation of the world into a kingdom of God. The latter will mark the end of the history of the world. It comes from above; the earthly kingdoms are from below, and are pictured as beasts; the Ruler of the kingdom of God is a Son of man. The latter comes with the clouds of the heaven to take possession of His kingdom (Da 7:13). Then the judgment of the world will take place and include also each human being, who before this will bodily arise from the dead, in order to enter upon blessedness or condemnation. Here we find indicated a universal expansion of the kingdom of God extending over the whole world and all mankind.

7. Contemporaneous Character of Prophecy:

If we survey this prophecy of the kingdom of God and its divinely-blessed Ruler, the Messiah, from a Christian standpoint, we find that a grand divine unity connects its different elements. The form of this prophecy is indeed conditioned by the views and ideas of the time of utterance. The prophets were compelled to speak so that their hearers could understand them. Only gradually these limitations and forms become spiritualized, e.g. the kingdom of God is still pictured by the prophets as established around the local center of Zion. Mt. Zion is in a concrete manner exalted, in order to give expression to its importance, etc. It is the New Testament fulfillment that for the first time gives adequate form to divine revelation. At least in the person of Jesus Christ this perfection is given, although the full unfolding of this kingdom is yet a matter of the future.

8. Partial Character of Prophecy:

A second characteristic feature of prophecy is the partial nature of the individual prophetical utterances and prophetical pictures. One picture must be supplemented by the others, in order not to be misunderstood. Thus, e.g. according to Isa 11:14; Zec 9:13 ff, we might expect that the kingdom of God was to be established by force of arms. But the same prophets show in other utterances (Isa 9:6 f; Zec 9:9 f) that these warlike expressions are to be understood figuratively, since the Messianic King is more than all others a Prince of Peace.

9. Perspective Character of Prophecy:

A third feature that deserves attention is the perspective character of prophecy. The prophet sees together and at once upon the surface of the pictures things which are to be fulfilled only successively and gradually. Thus, e.g. Deutero-Isaiah sees in the near future the return from captivity, and directly connected with this a miraculous glorification of the city of God. The return did as a matter of fact take place soon afterward, but the glorification of the city in which Yahweh Himself had promised to dwell was yet in the distant future. The succeeding prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, predict that this consummation shall take place in the future.

Also in the predictions concerning the future made by Jesus and in the Apocalypse of John these

characteristics of prophecy, its contemporaneous and perspective and at times symbolical features, are not disregarded. The firm prophetic word is intended to give the congregation certain directive lines and distinctive work. But an adequate idea of what is to come the Christian church will become compelled to form for itself, when the fulfillment and completion shall have taken place.

PROPHECY; PROPHETS, 4

IV. Analogous Phenomena among the Gentiles. 1. Necromancy and Technical Witchcraft:

The uniqueness of Biblical prophecy is grasped fully only when we try to find analogies among the Gentile peoples. Here we find everywhere indeed the art of sooth-saying, the headquarters for which was Babylon. But with this art the prophecy of the Old Testament stands out in bold contrast (compare the prohibitions in Le 19:26,31; 20:6,27; De 18:10 ff, prohibitions that refer to necromancy for the purpose of discovering the future). This art was practiced through a medium, a person who had an ‘obh (Babylonian, ubi), i.e. a spirit that brought forth the dead in order to question them. The spirits were thought to speak in murmurings or piping sounds (Isa 8:19), which could be imitated by the medium (ventriloquist). According to the Law, which forbade this under penalty of death, Saul had tried to destroy those who practiced incantations, who generally were women (1Sa 28:9). This practice, however, continued to flourish. In addition, the Babylonians and other peoples had also a developed art of interpretation in order to find omens for the future. Especially was the examination of intestines practiced by them. The liver of sacrificial animals particularly was carefully examined, and, from this, predictions, good or bad, were inferred (compare Eze 21:21). See DIVINATION. This art passed over from the Babylonions to the seafaring Etruscans, and through these came to the Romans. But other phenomena also were by the different nations interpreted as prophetically significant and were by those skilled in this art interpreted accordingly. Among these were miscarriages by human beings and animals, the actions of hens, horses, the flight of birds, earthquakes, forms of the clouds, lightning, and the like. Further, mechanical contrivances were used, such as casting of lots, stones, sticks, etc.

2. The Mantic Art:

More spiritual and popular was the interpretation of dreams. It also was the case that mediums intentionally would convert themselves into a semi-waking trance. In this way the suitable mediums attained to a certain kind of clairvoyance, found among various peoples. This approaches the condition of an ecstatically aroused pseudo-prophet, of whom mention is made above. In Greece, too, oracles were pronounced by the Pythian prophetess, who by vapors and the like was aroused to a practice of the mantic article In Dodona it was the voice of the divinity in Nature, which they sought to read in the rustling of the trees and the murmuring of the water. How uncertain these sources were was well known to heathen antiquity. The ancients complain of the enigmatical character of the Sibylline utterances and the doubtful nature of what was said. See GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT. In contrast to this, Israel knows that it possesses in prophecy a clear word (Nu 23:23).

3. Contents of Extra-Biblical Oracles:

But the contents also of the Biblical prophecies are unique through their spiritual uniformity and greatness. The oracle at Delphi, too, at times showed a certain moral elevation and could be regarded as the conscience of the nation. But how insignificant and meager was that which it offered to those who questioned it, in comparison with the spontaneous utterances of the prophets of Israel! Also what has in recent times been said concerning the "prophetical texts" from ancient Egypt (Gressmann, Texte und Bilder, I, 20 ff) may indeed show some external similarity to the prophecies of Israel; but they lack the spiritual and religious depth and the strictly ethical dignity of the prophets of the Scriptures, as also the consistency with which these from century to century reveal the thoughts of God and make known with constantly increasing clearness their purposes and goal.

LITERATURE

Witsius, De prophetis et prophetia, 1731; Chr. A. Crusius, Hypomnemata ad theologiam propheticam, Part I, 1764; A. Knobel, Der Prophetismus der Hebraer, 1837; F. B. Koester, Die Propheten des Altes Testament und New Testament, 1838; B. Duhm, Die Theologie der Propheten; Kuenen, The Prophets and Prophecy in Israel; F. E. Koenig, Der Offenbarungsbegriff des Altes Testament, 1882; C. von Orelli, Die alttestamentliche Weissagung von der Vollendung des Gottesreiches, 1882; W. Robertson Smith, The Prophets of Israel and Their Place in History, 1882; E. Riehm, Die messianische Weissagung, English translation, 1885; Delitzsch, Messianic Prophecy, 1891; A. T. Kirkpatrick, The Doctrine of the Prophets, 1892; G. French Oehler, Theologie des A T, 1891; Ed. Koenig, Dos Berufungsbewusstsein der alttestamentlichen Propheten, 1900; F. H. Woods, The Hope of Israel, 1896; R. Kraetzschmar, Prophet und Seher im alten Israel, 1902; A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, 1903; Eb. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und dos A T, 1902; C. von Orelli, Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte; M. Jastrow, Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens, 1903; Gressmann, Ursprung der israelitisch-judischen Eschatologie, 1905; W. J. Beecher, The Prophets and the Promise, 1905; C. S. Macfarland, Jesus and the Prophets, 1905; G. G. Findlay, The Books of the Prophets in Their Historical Succession, 1906-7; Gressmann, Alt-orientalische Texte und Bilder zum A T, 1909; Selwyn, Christian Prophets.

C. von Orelli

PROPHESYINGS, FALSE

prof’-e-si-ingz: The distinction between the true and the false prophecy and prophets is very difficult to state. Broadly speaking, the false prophesying related itself to the national ideal independently of any spiritual quality, while the true prophesying ever kept uppermost the spiritual conception of the national life. Among those given to false prophesying were the ones who spoke after "the deceit of their own heart" (Jer 14:13,14); those who without real prophetic gift borrowed a message and assumed the speech of prophecy (Jer 23:28,31); and those who sought the prophet’s role in order to gain the material gifts which came from the people to their prophets (Mic 3:5). These, when discovered, were counted worthy of punishment and even death. There were, however, false prophesyings from men who honestly believed themselves to have a message from Yahweh. These prophecies from self-deceived prophets often led the people astray. The dream of national greatness was substituted for the voice of Yahweh. It

was against such prophesying that the true prophets had to contend. The only test here was the spiritual character of the utterance, and this test demanded a certain moral or spiritual sense which the people did not always possess. Consequently, in times of moral darkness the false prophets, predicting smooth things for the nation, independent of repentance, consecration and the pursuit of spiritual ideals, were honored above the true prophets who emphasized the moral greatness of Yahweh and the necessity of righteousness for the nation. In New Testament times false prophesying did much injury in the church.

See PROPHECY.

C. E. Schenk

PROPHET, THE OLD

See OLD PROPHET, THE.

PROPHETESS

prof’-et-es (nebhi’ah; prophetis): Women were not excluded from the prophetic office in the Old Testament, and were honored with the right of prophetic utterance in the New Testament. It should be noted, however, that women like Miriam (Ex 15:20), Deborah (Jud 4:4) and Huldah (2Ki 22:14) were not credited with the seer’s insight into the future, but were called "prophetesses" because of the poetical inspiration of their speech. Among others mentioned as having the prophetic gift we find Hannah (1Sa 2:1), Anna (Lu 2:36) and the four daughters of Philip (Ac 21:8,9).

See PROPHET.

C. E. Schenk

PROPITIATION

pro-pish-i-a’-shun:

1. Terms and Meaning:

The word is Latin and brings into its English use the atmosphere of heathen rites for winning the favor, or averting the anger, of the gods. In the Old Testament it represents a number of Hebrew words—ten, including derivatives—which are sufficiently discussed under ATONEMENT (which see), of which propitiation is one aspect. It represents in Septuagint the Greek stems hilask- (hile-), and katallag-, with derivatives; in the New Testament only the latter, and is rarely used. Propitiation needs to be studied in connection with reconciliation, which is used frequently in some of the most strategic sentences of the New Testament, especially in the newer versions In Heb 2:17, the English Revised Version and the

American Standard Revised Version have both changed "reconciliation" of the King James Version to "propitiation," to make it correspond with the Old Testament use in connection with the sacrifice on the DAY OF ATONEMENT (which see). Lu 18:13 ("God, be thou merciful (margin "be propitiated") to me the sinner" (the American Standard Revised Version margin)); Heb 8:12 (quoted from the Septuagint); and Mt 16:22 (an idiomatic asseveration like English "mercy on us") will help in getting at the usage in the New Testament. In Septuagint hilasterion is the term for the "mercy-seat" or "lid of the ark" of the covenant which was sprinkled with blood on the Day of Atonement. It is employed in exactly this sense in Heb 9:5, where later versions have in the margin "the propitiatory."

Elsewhere in the New Testament this form is found only in Ro 3:25, and it is here that difficulty and difference are found extensively in interpreting. Greek fathers generally and prominent modern scholars understand Paul here to say that God appointed Christ Jesus to be the "mercy-seat" for sinners. The reference, while primarily to the Jewish ceremonial in tabernacle and temple, would not depend upon this reference for its comprehension, for the idea was general in religious thought, that some place and means had to be provided for securing friendly meeting with the Deity, offended by man’s sin. In Hebrews particularly, as elsewhere generally, Jesus Christ is presented as priest and sacrifice. Many modern writers (compare Sanday and Headlam), therefore, object that to make Him the "mercy-seat" here complicates the figure still further, and so would understand hilasterion as "expiatory sacrifice." While this is not impossible, it is better to take the word in the usual sense of "mercy-seat." It is not necessary to complicate the illustration by bringing in the idea of priest at all here, since Paul does not do so; mercy-seat and sacrifice are both in Christ. hilasmos, is found in the New Testament only in 1 Joh 2:2; 4:10. Here the idea is active grace, or mercy, or friendliness. The teaching corresponds exactly with that in Romans. "Jesus Christ the righteous" is our "Advocate (margin "Helper") with the Father," because He is active mercy concerning (peri) our sins and those of the whole world. Or (Ro 4:10), God "loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for (active mercy concerning) our sins." This last passage is parallel with Ro 3:25, the one dealing with the abstract theory, and so Christ is set forward as a "mercy-seat," the other dealing with experience of grace, and so Christ is the mercy of God in concrete expression.

2. Theological Implication:

The basal idea in Hebrew terms is that of covering what is offensive, so restoring friendship, or causing to be kindly disposed. The Greek terms lack the physical reference to covering but introduce the idea of friendliness where antagonism would be natural; hence, graciousness. Naturally, therefore, the idea of expiation entered into the concept. It is especially to be noted that all provisions for this friendly relation as between God and offending man find their initiation and provision in God and are under His direction, but involve the active response of man. All heathen and unworthy conceptions are removed from the Christian notion of propitiation by the fact that God Himself proposed, or "set forth," Christ as the "mercy-seat," and that this is the supreme expression of ultimate love. God had all the while been merciful, friendly, "passing over" man’s sins with no apparently adequate, or just, ground for doing so. Now in the blood of Christ sin is condemned and expiated, and God is able to establish and maintain His character for righteousness, while He continues and extends His dealing in gracious love with sinners who exercise faith in Jesus. The propitiation originates with God, not to appease Himself, but to justify

Himself in His uniform kindness to men deserving harshness. Compare also as to reconciliation, as in Ro 5:1-11; 2Co 5:18 ff.

See also JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, V, 2.

LITERATURE.

Besides the comms., the literature is the same as for ATONEMENT, to recent works on which add Stalker, The Atonement; Workman, At Onement, or Reconciliation with God; Moberly, in Foundations, Christian Belief in Terms of Modern Thought.

William Owen Carver

PROPORTION

pro-por'-shun: Occurs once in the sense of "space" as the translation of ma'-ar, "void or open space" (1Ki 7:36 the King James Version margin "Hebrew 'nakedness,' " the Revised Version (British and American) "space"); once in the obsolete sense of "form" as the translation of 'erekh, "array," or "row" (Job 41:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "frame"); and once in the sense of "measure" as the translation of analogia, "proportion" "equality" (Ro 12:6, "the proportion of faith," the Revised Version (British and American) "the proportion of our faith"). "Proportionally" occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 13:5, analogos, the Revised Version (British and American) "in like proportion," margin "correspondently."

PROSELYTE

pros'-e-lit (proselutos, from proserchomai, "I approach"): Found 4 times in the New Testament. In the Septuagint it often occurs as the translation of ger. The Hebrew verb gur means "to sojourn"; ger accordingly means a stranger who has come to settle in the land, as distinguished on the one hand from 'ezrach, "a homeborn" or "native," and on the other from nokhri or ben-nekhar, which means a stranger who is only passing through the country. Yet it is to be noted that in 2Ch 2:17 those of the native tribes still living in the land as Amorites, Hittites, etc., are also called gerim. In two places, (Ex 12:19; Isa 14:1) the Septuagint uses g(e)ioras, which is derived from giyor, the Aramaic equivalent for ger. Septuagint uses paroikos (the Greek equivalent for the Hebrew toshabh, "a settler") for ger when Israel or the triarchs are indicated (Ge 15:13; 23:4; Ex 2:22; 18:3; De 23:7; 1Ch 29:15; Ps 39:12; 119:19; Jer 14:8), and in a few other cases. In Talmudical literature ger always stands for proselyte in the New Testament sense, i.e. a Gentile who has been converted to Judaism. Onkelos, who was himself a proselyte, always translates the word in this way.

1. Ger in the Old Testament:

No difficulties were put in the way of those strangers who wished to settle down in the land of Israel. All

strangers, the third generation of Egyptians and Edomites included, and only Ammonites and Moabites excluded, could enter "the congregation of God" without circumcision and without the obligation to keep the ceremonial law.

‘The stranger within the gate’ was free to eat meat which was prohibited to the Israelite (De 14:21). If, however, the stranger wished to take part in the Passover, a feast permeated with national ideals, he must be circumcised. The keeping of the Sabbath and other feasts was regarded rather as a privilege than as a duty (Ex 23:12; De 16:11,14); but according to Le 16:29 the ger was obliged to keep the fast of Atonement. He was forbidden on pain of death to blaspheme (Le 24:16) or to offer children to Molech (Le 20:2). If he desired to bring a burnt offering, the same law applied to him as to the Israelites (Le 17:8; 22:18). Though the law of circumcision was not forced upon the ger, it seems that the Mosaic Law endeavored to bring him nearer to the cult of Israel, not from any proselytizing motives, but in order to preserve theocracy from admixture of foreign elements, which would speedily have proved fatal to its existence.

Though the God of Israel, when He is thought of only as such, ceases to be God; though Israel was chosen before all nations for all nations; though Israel had been again and again reminded that the Messiah would bring a blessing to all nations; and though there were instances of pagans coming to believe in Yahweh, yet it did not belong to the economy of Old Testament religion to spread the knowledge of God directly among the Gentiles (the Book of Jonah is an exception to this). There was certainly no active propagandism. Though we read in Ne 10:28 of those who "separated themselves from the peoples of the lands unto the law of God" (compare Isa 56:3, "the foreigner, that hath joined himself to Yahweh"—the only and exact description of a proselyte proper in the Old Testament), the spirit of exclusiveness prevailed; the doubtful elements were separated (Ezr 4:3): mixed marriages were prohibited by the chiefs, and were afterward disapproved of by the people (Ezr 9; 10; Ne 13:23). Direct proselytism did not begin till about a century later.

2. Proselytizing:

The preaching of the gospel was preceded and prepared for by the dispersion of the Jews, and a world-wide propagandism of Judaism. In the 5th century BC the Jews had a temple of their own at Syene. Alexander the Great settled 8,000 Jews in the Thebais, and Jews formed a third of the population of Alexandria. Large numbers were brought from Palestine by Ptolemy I (320 BC), and they gradually spread from Egypt along the whole Mediterranean coast of Africa. After the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes (170 BC) they scattered themselves in every direction, and, in the words of the Sibylline Oracles (circa 160 BC), "crowded with their numbers every ocean and country." There was hardly a seaport or a commercial center in Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, or the Islands of the AEgean, in which Jewish communities were not to be found. Josephus (Ant., XIV, vii, 2) quotes Strabo as saying: "It is hard to find a place in the habitable earth that hath not admitted this tribe of men, and is not possessed by them." Thus, in spite of the hatred and contempt which Judaism everywhere excited, its lofty, austere and spiritual religious aspirations and conceptions became known to the pagan world and exercised a profound attraction upon many souls that were deeply dissatisfied with contemporary

religions. Judaism was at that period filled with missionary zeal and aspired to world-mastery. Many books on Judaism (e.g. the Sibylline Oracles) were written anonymously by Jews in order to influence pagan readers. The synagogue, which had become the center of Jewish worship, now opened its doors widely to the pagan world (compare Ac 15:21), and many of the sermons delivered there were directly aimed at the conversion of pagans. The Jews began to feel that they were "a guide of the blind, a fight of them that are in darkness" (Ro 2:19).

Not only Josephus (Apion, II; BJ, VII, iii, 3), but also Seneca (Apud Aug. De Civit. Dei vi.11), Dio Cassius (xxxvii.17), Tacitus (Ann. ii.85; Hist. v.5), Horace (Sat. i.4, 142), Juvenal (Sat. xiv.96 ff), and other Greek and Roman writers testify to the widespread effects of the proselytizing propaganda of the Jews.

Many gladly frequented the synagogues and kept some of the Jewish laws and customs. Among those were to be found the "men who feared God," spoken of in Acts. They were so called to distinguish them from full proselytes; and it was probably for this class that tablets of warning in the temple were inscribed in Greek and Latin

Another class kept practically all the Jewish laws and customs, but were not circumcised. Some again, though not circumcised, had their children circumcised (Juvenal Sat. xiv.96 ff). Such Jewish customs as fasting, cleansings, abstaining from pork, lighting the candles on Friday evening, and keeping the Sabbath (Josephus, Apion, II, 29, etc.) were observed by these Gentile sympathizers. Schurer holds that there were congregations of Greeks and Romans in Asia Minor, and probably in Rome, which, though they had no connection with the synagogue, formed themselves into gatherings after the pattern of the synagogue, and observed some of the Jewish customs. Among the converts to Judaism there were probably few who were circumcised, and most of those who were circumcised submitted to the rite in order to marry Jewesses, or to enjoy the rights and privileges granted to the Jews by Syrian, Egyptian and Roman rulers (Josephus, Ant, XIV, vii, 2; XX, vii, 1; compare XVI, vii, 6). It would appear from Christ’s words ("one proselyte") that the number of full proselytes was not large. Hyrcanus forced the Edomites to adopt Judaism by circumcision (129 BC); and on other occasions the same policy of propagandism by force was followed. Josephus tells an interesting story (Ant., XX, ii, 1) of the conversion of Queen Helena of Adiabene and her two sons. The conversion of the sons was due to the teaching of a merchant called Ananias, who did not insist on circumcision. Later, another Jew, Eliezer of Galilee, told the young princes that it was not enough to read the Law, but that they must keep it too, with the result that both were circumcised. From this it is evident that Jewish teachers of the Gentileconverts varied in the strictness of their teaching.

3. Proselytes in the New Testament:

The word "proselyte" occurs 4 times in the New Testament; once in Mt (23:15), where our Lord refers to the proselytizing zeal of the Pharisees, and to the pernicious influence which they exerted on their converts; and 3 times in Acts. Proselytes were present at Pentecost (Ac 2:10); Nicolas, one of the deacons appointed by the primitive church at Jerusalem, was a proselyte (Ac 6:5); and after Paul had

spoken in the synagogue at Antioch of Pisidia, many devout proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas (Ac 13:43). It is to be noted in this last case that the proselytes are called sebomenoi, a word generally reserved for another class. Certain people are spoken of in Ac as phoboumenoi ton theon, "fearing God" (10:2,22,35; 13:16,26), and as sebomenoi ton theon, "reverencing God," or simply sebomenoi (13:50; 16:14; 17:4,17; 18:7). These seem (as against Bertholet and EB) to have been sympathizers with Judaism, who attended the worship of the synagogue, but were not circumcised. It was among this class that the gospel made its first converts among the Gentiles. Those who were fully proselytes were probably as fanatical opponents of Christianity as were the Jews.

4. Ger in the Talmud:

From the old strict Pharisaic-Palestinian point of view, circumcision, with the addition of baptism and the offering of sacrifice, was indispensable (so to Paul every circumcised person was a Jew; compare Ga 5:3); and thus their converts had to submit to the whole burden of the Mosaic and traditional Law. The rabbinic distinction between ger toshabh, "a settler," and ger tsedheq, "a proselyte of righteousness," is, according to Schurer, only theoretical, and arose at a later date (Babha' Metsi'a' 5 6,9,12; Makkoth 2 3; Negha'im 3 1, et al.).

While the ger tsedheq (or ger ha-berith, "proselyte of the covenant") was considered as being in every respect a "perfect Israelite," the ger toshabh (or ger sha'ar, "proselyte of the gate"; compare Ex 20:10) only professed his faith in the God of Israel, and bound himself to the observance of the 7 Noachic precepts, abstinence from blasphemy, idolatry, homicide, fornication, robbery, eating the flesh of an animal that had died a natural death, and disobedience to (Jewish) authority (Sanh. 56a; compare Ac 15:20,29; 21:25). He was considered more of a Gentile than a Jew.

Three things were required for the admission of a proselyte, circumcision, . baptism, and the offering of sacrifice (Ber. 47b; Yebham. 45b, 46a, 48b, 76a; 'Abhoth 57a, et al.). In the case of women only baptism and the offering of sacrifice were required; for that reason there were more women converts than men. Josephus (BJ, II, xx, 2) tells how most of the women of Damascus were addicted to the Jewish religion. Doubt has been expressed as to the necessity of proselytes being baptized, since there is no mention of it by Paul or Philo or Josephus, but it is probable that a Gentile, who was unclean, would not be admitted to the temple without being cleansed.

The proselyte was received in the following manner. He was first asked his reason for wishing to embrace Judaism. He was told that Israel was in a state of affliction; if he replied that he was aware of the fact and felt himself unworthy to share these afflictions, he was admitted. Then he received instruction in some of the "light" and "heavy" commandments, the rules concerning gleaning and tithes, and the penalties attached to the breach of the commandments. If he was willing to submit to all this, he was circumcised, and after his recovery he was immersed without delay. At this latter ceremony two "disciples of the wise" stood by to tell him more of the "light" and "heavy" commandments. When he came up after the immersion, those assembled addressed him saying: "Unto whom hast thou given thyself? Blessed art thou, thou hast given thyself to God; the world was created for the sake of Israel,

and only Israelites are called the children of God. The afflictions, of which we spoke, we mentioned only to make thy reward the greater." After his baptism he was considered to be a new man, "a little child newly born" (Yebham. 22a, 47a, 48b, 97b); a new name was given him; either he was named "Abraham the son of Abraham," or the Scriptures were opened at hazard, and the first name that was read was given to him. Thenceforth he had to put behind him all his past; even his marriage ties and those of kinship no longer held good (compare Yebham. 22a; Sanhedrin 58b).

Although he was thus juridically considered a new man, and one whose praises were sung in the Talmudical literature, he was yet on the whole looked down on as inferior to a born Jew (Kidd. 4 7; Shebhu‘oth 10 9, et al.). Rabbi Chelbo said: "Proselytes are as injurious to Israel as a scab" (Yebham. 47b; Kidd. 70b; compare Php 3:5).

See also STRANGER AND SOJOURNER.

LITERATURE.

See articles on "Proselyte" and "Ger." in EB, HDB, Jew Encyclopedia, and RE; Slevogt, De proselytis Judeorum, 1651; A. Bertholet, Die Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden, 1896; Schurer, HJP, 1898; Huidekoper, Judaism at Rome, 1887; Harnack, Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums, 1906, English translation; Allen, "On the Meaning of proselutos in the Septuagint," The Expositor, 1894; A. B. Davidson, "They That Fear the Lord," Expository Times, III (1892), 491 ff.

Paul Levertoff

PROSEUCHE; PROSEUCHA

pro-su’-ke, prosu’-ka (proseuche): "A place in the open air where the Jews were wont to pray, outside of those cities where they had no synagogue," Ac 16:13,16 (Thayer, Lexicon of the New Testament).

See PHILIPPI.

PROSTITUTION

pros-ti-tu’-shun.

See CRIMES; HARLOT; PUNISHMENTS.

PROSTRATION pros-tra’-shun. See ATTITUDES.

PROTEVANGELIUM, OF JAMES

pro-te-van-jel’-i-um.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, 1, (a).

PROVE

proov (bachan, nacah; dokimazo, peirazo): Means (1) to test or try; (2) to establish, demonstrate; (3) to find by experience. It is for the most part in the first (original) sense that the word is found in Scripture. In the Old Testament it is most frequently the translation of nacah, primarily "to lift," hence, to weigh (Ge 42:15,16, etc.). God is said to "prove" His people, i.e. to test or try them for their good (Ge 22:1; Ex 15:25; De 8:16, etc.). The Psalmist prays that God may prove him (Ps 26:2). The word is frequently rendered "tempt." See TEMPT. The word bachan, primarily "to try by heat," has a similar meaning (Ps 17:3, the heart, like metal, purified from dross; compare Job 23:10; Ps 7:9; Mal 3:2, etc.). In the New Testament the word most frequently rendered "prove" (sometimes "try") is dokimazo (Lu 14:19; Ro 12:2; 2Co 8:8,22; 13:5; Eph 5:10; 1Th 5:21). Peirazo, "to tempt," "to prove," used in both a good and a bad sense, frequently translated "tempt" (which see), is rendered "prove" in Joh 6:6, "This he said to prove him." Both Greek words occur frequently in Apocrypha (Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus). the Revised Version (British and American) has "prove" for "tempt" (Ge 22:1); for, "make" (Job 24:25; Ga 2:18); for "manifest" (Ec 3:18); for "examine" (1Co 11:28); for "try" (1Co 3:13; 1 Joh 4:1), etc.

W. L. Walker

PROVENDER

prov’-en-der

(1) micpo’, from obsolete capha’," to feed," fodder for cattle in general (Ge 24:25,32; 42:27; Jud 19:19,21);

(2) belil, from balal, "to mix": "Loweth the ox over his fodder?" (Job 6:5); belil chamits: "The young asses that till the ground shall eat savory (Hebrew "salted") provender" (Isa 30:24); this is fodder mixed with salt or aromatic herbs): The ordinary provender in Palestine, besides fresh pasturage, is tibn, i.e. straw broken on the threshing floor, kursenneh (Vetch, Vicia errilia), given especially to camels and milch cows; bran, for fattening and especially in cold weather; and, occasionally, hay made from the dried mixed grass and herbs which spring up luxuriously after the rains. The Circassian colonists East of the Jordan are teaching their neighbors the value of this food, so long neglected.

E. W. G. Masterman

PROVERB

prov’-erb (mashal, chidhah; parabole (Lu 4:23), paroimia (Joh 16:25,29)):

I. FOLK MEANING AND USE

1. The Primitive Sense

2. The Communal Origin

3. Animus of Proverbs

II. LITERARY DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROVERB

1. Discovery of Literary Value

2. The Differentiation

III. AS UNIT OF A STRAIN OF LITERATURE

1. From Detachment to Continuity

2. The Conception of Wisdom

3. In Later Times

By this term mainly, but sometimes by the term "parable" (e.g. Nu 23:7,18; 24:3,15; Job 27:1; 29:1), is translated the Hebrew word (mashal), which designates the formal unit or vehicle of didactic discourse. The mashal was an enunciation of truth, self-evident and self-illustrative, in some pointed or concentrated form adapted to arrest attention, awaken responsive thought, and remain fixed in memory. Its scope was broader than that of our word "proverb," taking in subject matter as well as form. The mashal broadened indeed in the course of its history, until it became the characteristic idiom of Hebrew philosophy, as distinguished from the dialectic method of the Greeks. The Hebrew mind was not inductive but intuitive; it saw and asserted; and the word mashal is the generic term for the form in which its assertion was embodied.

I. Folk Meaning and Use.

1. The Primitive Sense:

The mashal, nearly in our sense of proverb, traces back to the heart and life of the common folk; it is a native form reflecting in a peculiarly intimate way the distinctive genius of the Hebrew people. As to the primitive sense of the word, it is usually traced to a root meaning "likeness," or "comparison," as if the

first sense of it were of the principle of analogy underlying it; but this derivation is a guess. The word is just as likely to be connected with the verb mashal, "to rule" or "master"; so by a natural secondary meaning to denote that statement which gives the decisive or final verdict, says the master word. The idea of how the thing is said, or by what phrasing, would be a later differentiation, coming in with literary refinement.

2. The Communal Origin:

The earliest cited proverb (1Sa 10:12, repeated with varied occasion, 1Sa 19:24) seems to have risen spontaneously from the people's observation. That Saul, the son of Kish, whose very different temperament everybody knew, should be susceptible to the wild ecstasy of strolling prophets was an astonishing thing, as it were a discovery in psychology; "Therefore it became a proverb, Is Saul also among the prophets?" A few years later David, explaining his clemency in sparing the life of the king who has become his deadly foe, quotes from a folk fund of proverbs: 1Sa 24:13, "As saith the proverb of the ancients, Out of the wicked cometh forth wickedness; but my hand shall not be upon thee." The prophet Ezekiel quotes a proverb which evidently embodies a popular belief: "The days are prolonged, and every vision faileth"; which he corrects to, "The days are at hand, and the fulfillment of every vision" (Eze 12:22,23). Both Ezekiel and Jeremiah (Eze 18:2; Jer 31:29) quote the same current proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," in order to announce that the time has come for its discontinuance. These last two examples are very instructive. They show how the body of the people put the inwardness of their history into proverb form, as it were a portable lesson for the times; they show also how the prophets availed themselves of these floating sayings to point their own message. Ezekiel seems indeed to recognize the facility with which a situation may bring forth a proverb: Eze 16:44, "Every one that useth proverbs shall use this proverb against thee (literally every one that mashals shall mashal against thee), saying, As is the mother, so is her daughter."

3. Animus of Proverbs:

One element of the proverb, which a wide-awake people like the Hebrews would soon discover, was its adaptability for personal portrayal or satire, like a home thrust. Hence, the popular use of the name mashal came to connote its animus, generally of sarcasm or scorn. The taunting verse raised against Heshbon, Nu 21:27-30, is attributed to them "that speak in proverbs" (meshalim); and Isaiah's taunt in his burden of Babylon (Isa 14:4-20) is composed in the proverb measure: "Thou shalt take up this parable (mashal, the King James Version "proverb") against the king of Babylon." Answering to this prevailing animus of proverbs was a corresponding susceptibility to their sting and rankle; they were the kind of utterance that most surely found the national and individual self-consciousness. To be a proverb —to be in everybody's mouth as a subject of laughter, or as a synonym for some awful atrocity—was about the most dreadful thing that could befall them. To be "a reproach and a proverb, a taunt and a curse" (Jer 24:9) was all one. That this should be the nation's fate was held as a threat over them by lawgiver and prophet (De 28:37; 1Ki 9:7); and in adversities of experience, both individual and collective, the thing that was most keenly felt was to have become a byword (mashal) (Ps 44:14; 69:11).

II. Literary Development of the Proverb.

1. Discovery of Literary Value:

The rank of proverb was by no means attributed to every popular saying, however the people might set store by it. If its application was merely local (e.g. 2Sa 20:18; Ge 22:14) or temporary (note how Jeremiah and Ezekiel announce popular sayings as obsolete), it remained in its place and time. About the proverb, on the other hand, there was the sense of a value universal and permanent, fitting it for literary immortality. Nor was the proverb itself a run-wild thing, at the shaping of the crowd; from the beginning it was in the hands of "those who speak in meshalim," whose business it was to put it into skillful wording. The popular proverb, however, and the literary proverb were and continued two different things. There came a time, in the literary development of Israel, when the value of the mashal as a vehicle of instruction came to be recognized; from which time a systematic cultivation of this type of discourse began. That time, as seems most probable, was the reign of King Solomon, when in a special degree the people awoke to the life and industry and intercourse and wealth of the world around them. The king himself was ‘large hearted’ (1Ki 4:29), versatile, with literary tastes; "spake three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five"; and his whole generation, both in Israel and surrounding nations, was engaged in a vigorous movement of thought and "wisdom" (see the whole passage, 1Ki 4:29-34). For the unit and vehicle of this new thought the old native form of the mashal or proverb was chosen; it became the recognized medium of popular education and counsel, especially of the young; and the mashal itself was molded to the classic form, condensed, pointed, aphoristic, which we see best exemplified in the Book of Proverbs 10-22:16—probably the earliest collection of this kind of literature. In this body of proverbs we see also that instead of retaining the unbalanced single assertion of the popular proverb, as it appears in 1Sa 10:12; 24:13, these composers of literary proverbs borrowed the poetic parallelism, or couplet, which in two lines sets two statements over against each other by antithesis or repetition, and cultivated this to its most condensed and epigrammatic construction. Thus the mashal took to itself a literary self-consciousness and became a work of art.

2. The Differentiation:

Up to the time of this literary development a proverb was recognized simply as a proverb, with little sense of its various phases, except that there was a strong popular tendency to identify it with satire, and with less thought of the elements of its life and power. With the refinement of form, however, came a recognition of its inwardness. Under the generic term mashal, certain elements were differentiated; not, however, as we are wont to distinguish—parable, fable, apologue, allegory—these remained undifferentiated. The most fundamental distinction of classes, perhaps, is given in Pr 1:6: "To understand a proverb, and a figure, the words of the wise, and their dark sayings." Here it seems the word "proverb" (mashal) and "words of the wise," paired off with each other, are the generic terms; the other two, the differentiating terms, name respectively the two fundamental directions of the mashal, toward the clear and toward the enigmatic. Both are essential elements. The word translated "figure" (melitsah) is rather "interpretation," and seems to refer to the illuminative element of the mashal, and this was mainly analogy. Natural objects, phases of experience, contrasts were drawn into the mashal to furnish analogies for life; Solomon’s use of plants and animals in his discourses (1Ki 4:33)

was not by way of natural history, but as analogies to illustrate his meshalim. The word translated "dark sayings" (chidhoth) is the word elsewhere translated "riddle" (Samson's riddle, for instance, was a [~chidhah, Jud 14:13,14), and refers to that quality of the proverb which, by challenging the hearer's acumen, gives it zest; it is due to an association of things so indirectly related that one must supply intermediate thoughts to resolve them. All of this of course. goes to justify the proverb as a capital vehicle for instruction and counsel; it has the elements that appeal to attention, responsive thought, and memory, while on the other hand its basis of analogy makes it illuminative.

III. As Unit of a Strain of Literature.

1. From Detachment to Continuity:

Until it reached its classic perfection of phrasing, say during the time from Solomon to Hezekiah, the formal development of the proverb was concentrative; the single utterance disposed of its whole subject, as in a capsule. But the development of the mashal form from the antithetic to the synonymous couplet gave rise to a proverb in which the explanatory member did not fully close the case; the subject craved further elucidation, and so a group of several couplets was sometimes necessary to present a case (compare e.g. about the sluggard, Pr 26:13-16). From this group of proverbs the transition was easy to a continuous passage, in which the snappy parallelism of the proverb yields to the flow of poetry; see e.g. Pr 27:23-27. This is due evidently to a more penetrative and analytic mode of thinking, which can no longer satisfy its statement of truth in a single illustration or maxim.

2. The Conception of Wisdom:

As the store of detached utterances on various phases of practical life accumulated and the task of collecting them was undertaken, it was seen that they had a common suffusion and bearing, that in fact they constituted a distinctive strain of literature. The field of this literature was broad, and recognized (see Pr 1:1-5) as promotive of many intellectual virtues; but the inclusive name under which it was gathered was Wisdom (chokhmah). Wisdom, deduced thus from a fund of maxims and analogies, became the Hebrew equivalent for philosophy. With the further history of it this article is not concerned, except to note that the mashal or proverb form held itself free to expand into a continuous and extended discourse, or to hold itself in to the couplet form. As to illustrative quality, too, its scope was liberal enough to include a fully developed parable; see for instance Eze 17:1-10, where the prophet is bidden to "put forth a riddle, and speak a parable (literally, mashal a mashal) unto the house of Israel."

3. In Later Time:

The existence of so considerable a body of proverbs is a testimony to the Hebrew genius for sententious and weighty expression, a virtue of speech which was held in special esteem. From the uses of practical wisdom the mashal form was borrowed by the later scribes and doctors of the law; we see it for instance in loose and artificial use in such books as Pirqe ‘Abhoth, which gives the impression that the utterance so grandly represented in the Solomonic proverbs had become decadent. It is in another direction rather

that the virtues of the mashal reach their culmination. In the phrasal felicity and illustrative lucidity of our Lord’s discourses, and not less in His parables, employed that the multitude "may see and yet not see" (Mr 4:12), we have the values of the ancient mashal in their perfection, in a literary form so true to its object that we do not think of its artistry at all.

See also GAMES, I, 6.

John Franklin Genung

PROVERBS, THE BOOK OF

prov’-erbz:

I. THE BOOK’S ACCOUNT OF ITSELF

1. Title and Headings

2. Authorship or Literary Species?

II. THE SUCCESSIVE COMPILATIONS

1. The Introductory Section

2. The Classic Nucleus

3. A Body of Solicited Counsel

4. Some Left-over Precepts

5. The Hezekian Collection

6. Words of Agur

7. Words of King Lemuel

8. An Acrostic Eulogy of Woman

III. MOVEMENT TOWARD A PHILOSOPHY

1. Liberation of the Mashal

2. Emergence of Basal Principles

3. The Conception of Wisdom

IV. CONSIDERATIONS OF AGE AND LITERARY KINSHIP

1. Under the Kings

2. The Concentrative Point

3. Its Stage in Progressive Wisdom

The Scripture book which in both the Hebrew and the Greek arrangements of the Old Testament Canon immediately succeeds the Psalms. In the Hebrew Canon it stands second in the final or supplementary division called kethubhim Septuagint Paroimiai), "writings"; placed there probably because it would be most natural to begin this section with standard collections nearest at hand, which of course would be psalms and proverbs. This book is an anthology of sayings or lessons of the sages on life, character, conduct; and as such embodies the distinctively educative strain of Hebrew literature.

I. The Book’s Account of Itself.

1. Title and Headings:

At the beginning, intended apparently to cover the whole work, stands the title: "The proverbs of Solomon the son of David, king of Israel." It seemed good to the compilers, however, to repeat, or perhaps retain an older heading, "The proverbs of Solomon" at Pr 10, as if in some special sense the collection there beginning deserved it; and at Pr 25 still another heading occurs: "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out." All these ascribe the proverbs to Solomon; but the heading (30:1), "The words of Agur the son of Jakeh; the oracle," and the heading (31:1), "The words of king Lemuel; the oracle which his mother taught him," indicate that authorship other than that of Solomon is represented; while the mention of "the words of the wise" (1:6; 22:17), as also the definite heading, "These also are sayings of the wise" (24:23), ascribe parts of the book to the sages in general. The book is confessedly a series of compilations made at different times; confessedly, also, to a considerable extent at least, the work of a number, perhaps a whole guild, of writers.

2. Authorship or Literary Species?:

It is hazardous to argue either for or against a specific authorship; nor is it my intention to do so. The question naturally arises, however, in what sense this book, with its composite structure so outspoken, can lay claim to being the work of Solomon. Does the title refer to actual personal authorship, or does it

name a species and type of literature of which Solomon was the originator and inspirer—as if it meant to say "the Solomonic proverbs"? We may work toward the answer of this question by noting some literary facts.

Outside of the prophets only three of the Old Testament books are provided in the original text with titles; and these three are all associated with Solomon—two of them, Proverbs and the So of Songs, directly; the third, Ecclesiastes, by an assumed name, which, however, personates Solomon. This would seem to indicate in the composition of these books an unusual degree of literary finish and self-consciousness, a sense on the part of writers or compilers that literature as an art has its claims upon them. The subject-matter of the books, too, bears this out; they are, relatively speaking, the secular books of the Bible and do not assume divine origin, as do law and prophecy. For the original impulse to such literary culture the history directs us to the reign of King Solomon; see 1Ki 4:29-34, where is portrayed, on the part of king and court, an intense intellectual activity for its own sake, the like of which occurs nowhere else in Scripture. The forms then especially impressed upon the literature were the mashal (proverb) and the song, in both of which the versatile young king was proficient; compare 1Ki 4:32. For the cultivation of the mashal these men of letters availed themselves of a favorite native form, the popular proverb; but they gave to it a literary mold and finish which would thenceforth distinguish it as the Solomonic mashal (see PROVERB). This then was the literary form in which from the time of Solomon onward the sages of the nation put their counsels of life, character, conduct; it became as distinctively the mold for this didactic strain of literature as was the heroic couplet for a similar strain in the age of Dryden and Pope.

It is reasonable therefore to understand this title of the Book of Proverbs as designating rather a literary species than a personal authorship; it names this anthology of Wisdom in its classically determined phrasing, and for age and authorship leaves a field spacious enough to cover the centuries of its currency. Perhaps also the proverb of this type was by the term "of Solomon" differentiated from mashal of other types, as for instance those of Balaam and Job and Koheleth.

II. The Successive Compilations.

1. The Introductory Section:

That the Book of Proverbs is composed of several collections made at different times is a fact that lies on the surface; as many as eight of these are clearly marked, and perhaps subdivisions might be made. The book was not originally conceived as the development of a theme, or even as a unity; whatever unity it has was an afterthought. That it did come to stand, however, for one homogeneous body of truth, and to receive a name and a degree of articulation as such, will be maintained in a later section (see III, below). Meanwhile, we will take the sections in order and note some of the salient characteristics of each. The introductory section, Proverbs 1-9, has the marks of having been added later than most of the rest; and is introductory in the sense of concentrating the thought to the concept of Wisdom, and of recommending the spiritual attitude in which it is to be received. Its style—and in this it is distinguished from the rest of the book—is hortatory; it is addressed to "my son" (1:8 and often) or "my sons" (4:1;

5:7; 7:24; 8:32), in the tone of a father or a sage, bringing stores of wisdom and experience to the young. The first six verses are prefatory, giving the purpose and use of the whole book. Then Pr 1:7 lays down as the initial point, or spiritual bedrock of Wisdom, the fear of Yahweh, a principle repeated toward the end of this introductory section (9:10), and evidently regarded as very vital to the whole Wisdom system; compare Job 28:28; Ps 111:10; Sirach 1:14. The effect of this prefatory and theme-propounding matter is to launch the collection of proverbs much after the manner of modern literary works, and the rest of the section bears this out fairly well. The most striking feature of the section, besides its general homiletic tone, is its personification of Wisdom. She is represented as calling to the sons of men and commending to them her ways (Pr 1:20-33; 8:1-21,32-36); she condescends, for right and purity's sake, to enter into rivalry with the "strange woman," the temptress, not in secret, but in open and fearless dealing (Pr 7:6-8:9; 9:1-6,13-18); and, in a supremely poetic passage (Pr 8:22-31), she describes her relation from the beginning with God and with the sons of men. It represents the value that the Hebrew mind came to set upon the human endowment of Wisdom. The Hebrew philosopher thought not in terms of logic and dialectics, but in symbol and personality; and to this high rank, almost like that of a goddess, his imagination has exalted the intellectual and spiritual powers of man.

See WISDOM.

2. The Classic Nucleus:

The section Pr 10:1-22:16, with the repeated heading "The proverbs of Solomon", seems to have been the original nucleus of the whole collection. All the proverbs in this, the longest section of the book, are molded strictly to the couplet form (the one triplet, 19:7, being only an apparent exception, due probably to the loss of a line), each proverb a parallelism in condensed phrasing, in which the second line gives either some contrast to or some amplification of the first. This was doubtless the classic art norm of the Solomonic mashal.

The section seems to contain the product of that period of proverb-culture during which the sense of the model was a little rigid and severe, not venturing yet to limber up the form. Signs of a greater freedom, however, begin to appear, and possibly two strata of compilation are represented. In Proverbs 10-15 the prevailing couplet is antithetic, which embodies the most self-closed circuit of the thought. Out of 184 proverbs only 19 do not contain some form of contrast, and 10 of these are in Proverbs 15. In Pr 16-22:16, on the other hand, the prevailing form is the so-called synonymous or amplified couplet, which leaves the thought-circuit more open to illustrative additions. Out of 191 proverbs only 18 are antithetic, and these contain contrasts of a more subtle and hidden suggestion. As to subject-matter, the whole section is miscellaneous; in the first half, however, where the antithesis prevails, are the great elemental distinctions of life, wisdom and folly, righteousness and wickedness, industry and laziness, wise speech and reticence, and the like; while in the second half there is a decided tendency to go farther afield for subtler and less obvious distinctions. In this way they seem to reflect a growing and refining literary development, the gradual shaping and accumulation of materials for a philosophy of life; as yet, however, not articulated or reduced to unity of principle.

3. A Body of Solicited Counsel:

In the short section Pr 22:17-24:22, the proverb literature seems for the first time to have become as it were self-conscious—to regard itself as a strain of wise counsel to be reckoned with for its educative value. The section is introduced by a preface (22:17-21), in which these "words of the wise" are recommended to some person or delegation, "that thou mayest carry back words of truth to them that send thee" (22:21). The counsels seem intended for persons in responsible position, perhaps attached to the court (compare 23:1-3), who, as they are to deal officially with men and affairs, need the prudence, purity, and temperance which will fit them for their duties. As to form, the detached couplet appears only occasionally; the favorite form is the quatrain; but proverbs of a greater number of lines are freely used, and one, the counsel on wine drinking (23:29-35), runs to 17 lines. In tone and specific counsel the section has many resemblances to the introductory section (Proverbs 1-9), and provokes the conjecture that this latter section, as the introduction to a compiled body of Wisdom, was composed not long after it.

4. Some Left-over Precepts:

The little appendix (Pr 24:23-34) is headed, "These also are sayings of the wise." They refer to wise intercourse and ordered industry. The little poem on the sluggard (Pr 24:30-34), with its refrain (Pr 24:33,14), is noteworthy as being apparently one stanza of a poem which is completed with the same refrain in the introductory section (Pr 6:6-11). The stanzas are of the same length and structure; and it would seem the latter named was either discovered later or composed as a supplement to the one in this section.

5. The Hezekian Collection:

The long section (Proverbs 25-29) is headed, "These also are proverbs of Solomon, which the men of Hezekiah king of Judah copied out." The collection claims to be only a compilation; but if, as already suggested, we understand the term "proverbs of Solomon" as equivalent to "Solomonic proverbs," referring rather to species than personal authorship, the compilation may have been made not merely from antiquity, but from the archives of the Wisdom guilds. If so, we have a clue to the state of the Wisdom literature in Hezekiah’s time. The collection as a whole, unlike secs. 3 and 4, returns predominantly to the classic form of the couplet, but with a less degree of compression and epigram. There is a tendency to group numbers of proverbs on like subjects; note for instance the group on the king (Pr 25:2-7). The most striking-feature of the collection is the prevalence of simile and analogy, and in general the strong figurative coloring, especially in Proverbs 25-27; it reads like a new species of proverb when we note that in all the earlier Solomonic sections there are only two clearly defined similes (10:26; 11:22). In Proverbs 25-27 are several proverbs of three, four, or five lines, and at the end (27:23-27) a charming little poem of ten lines on husbandry. Proverbs 28; 29 are entirely of couplets, and the antithetic proverb reappears in a considerable number. As to subject-matter, the thought of this section makes a rather greater demand on the reader’s culture and thinking powers, the analogies being less obvious, more subtle. It is decidedly the reflection of a more literary age than that of section 2.

6. Words of Agur:

Proverbs 30 is taken up with "the words of Agur the son of Jakeh," a person otherwise unknown, who disclaims expert knowledge of Wisdom lore (30:3), and avows an agnostic attitude toward theological speculations, yet shows a tender reverence before the name and unplumbed mystery of Yahweh (30:6,9,32). His words amount to a plea against a too adventurous, not to say presumptuous, spirit in the supposed findings of human Wisdom, and as such supply a useful makeweight to the mounting pride of the scholar. Yet over this peculiar plea is placed the word "Massa" (ha-massa');" burden" or "oracle," the term used for prophetic disclosures; and the word for "said" ("the man said," ne'-um ha-genjer) is the word elsewhere used for mystic or divine utterance. This seems to mark a stage in the self-consciousness of Wisdom when it was felt that its utterances could be ranked by the side of prophecy as a revelation of truth (compare what Wisdom says of herself, 8:14), and could claim the authoritative term "oracle." For the rest, apart from the humble reverence with which they are imbued, these words of Agur do not rise to a high level of spiritual thinking; they tend rather to the riddling element, or "dark sayings" (compare 1:6). The form of his proverbs is peculiar, verging indeed on the artificial; he deals mostly in the so-called numerical proverb ("three things .... yea, four"), a style of utterance paralleled elsewhere only in 6:16-19, but something of a favorite in the later cryptic sayings of the scribes, as may be seen in Pirqe 'Abhoth.

7. Words of King Lemuel:

Proverbs 31:1-9 (possibly the whole chapter should be included) is headed, "The words of king Lemuel; the oracle which his mother taught him." Here occurs again the mysterious Word "oracle," which would seem to be open to the same interpretation as the one given in the previous paragraph, though some would make this otherwise unknown monarch a king of Massa, and refer to the name of one of the descendants of Ishmael (Ge 25:14), presumably a tribal designation. The Hebrew sages from the beginning were in rivalry and fellowship with the sages of other nations (compare 1Ki 4:30,31); and in the Book of Job, the supreme reach of Wisdom utterance, all of the sages, Job included, are from countries outside of Palestine. King Lemuel, if an actual personage, was not a Jew; and probably Agur was not. The words of Lemuel are a mother's plea to her royal son for chastity, temperance and justice, the kingly virtues. The form is the simple Hebrew parallelism, not detached couplets, but continuous.

8. An Acrostic Eulogy of Woman:

The Book of Proverbs ends in a manner eminently worthy of its high standard of sanity and wisdom. Without any heading (it may possibly belong to the "oracle" that the mother of Lemuel taught her son) the last 22 verses (31:10-31) constitute a single poem in praise of a worthy woman, extolling especially her household virtues. In form these verses begin in the original with the successive 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet; a favorite form of Hebrew verse, as may be seen (in the original) in several of the psalms, notably Ps 119, and in Lamentations 1-4.

III. Movement toward a Philosophy.

It has been much the fashion with modern critics to deny to the Hebrews a truly philosophic mind; this they say was rather the distinctive gift of the Greeks; while for their solution of the problem of life the Hebrews depended on direct revelation from above, which precluded that quasi-abeyance of concepts, that weighing of cosmic and human elements, involved in the commonly received notion of philosophy. This criticism takes account of only one side of the Hebrew mind. It is true they believed their life to be in direct contact with the will and word of Yahweh, revealed to them in terms which could not be questioned; but in the findings and deliverance of their own intellectual powers, too, they had a reliance and confidence which merits the name of an authentic philosophy. But theirs was a philosophy not of speculative world-making, but of conduct and the practical management of life; and it was intuitive and analogical, not the result of dialectical reasoning. Hence, its name wisdom, the solution itself, rather than philosophy, the love of wisdom, the search for solution. This Book of Proverbs, beginning with detached maxims on the elements of conduct, reveals in many suggestive ways the gradual emergence of a philosophy, a comprehensive wisdom, as it were, in the making; it is thus the pioneer book of that Hebrew Wisdom which we see developed to maturer things in the books of Job and Ecclesiastes. Some of its salient stages may here be traced.

1. Liberation of the Mashal:

We may first note it, or the literary preparation for it, in the opening up of the mashal, or proverb unit, toward added elements of illustration, explanation, amplitude, a development that begins to appear, in the oldest section (the classic nucleus, section 2) at about Proverbs 16. The primitive antithetic mashal contrasted two aspects of truth in such a way as to leave the case closed; there was nothing for it but to go on to a new subject. This had the good effect of setting over against each other the great elemental antagonisms of life: righteousness and wickedness, obedience and lawlessness, teachableness and perversity, industry and laziness, prudence and presumption, reticence and prating, etc., and so far forth it was a masterly analysis of the essentials of individual and social conduct. As soon, however, as the synonymous and illustrative mashal prevails, we are conscious of a limbering up and greater penetrativeness of the range of thought; it is open to subtler distinctions and remoter discoveries, and the analogies tend to employ the less direct relationships of cause and effect. This is increased as we go on, especially by the greater call upon the imagination in the figurative tissue of the Hezekian section, and by the decidedly greater tendency to the riddling and paradox element. The mashal increases in length and amplitude, both by the grouping of similar subjects and by the enlargement from the couplet to the quatrain and the developed poem. All this, while not yet a self-conscious philosophy, is a step on the way thereto.

2. Emergence of Basal Principles:

One solid presupposition of the sages, like an axiom, was never called in question: namely, that righteousness and wisdom are identical, that wickedness of any sort is folly. This imparts at once a kind of prophetic coloring to the Wisdom precepts, well represented by the opening proverb in the original section (after the prefatory one about the wise son), "Treasures of wickedness profit nothing; but righteousness delivereth from death" (Pr 10:2). Thus from the outset is furnished an uncompromising

background on which the fascinating allurements of vice, the crooked ways of injustice and dishonesty, the sober habits of goodness and right dealing, show for what they are and what they tend to. The sages thus put themselves, too, in entire harmony with what is taught by priests and prophets; there is no quarrel with the law or the word; they simply supply the third strand in the threefold cord of instruction (compare Jer 18:18). From this basal presumption other principles, scarcely less axiomatic, come in view: that the fount and spring of wise living is reverence, the fear of Yahweh; that the ensuring frame of mind is teachableness, the precluding attitude perverseness; that it is the mark of wisdom, or righteousness, to be fearless and above board, of wickedness, which is folly, to be crooked and secretive. These principles recur constantly, not, as a system, but in numerous aspects and applications in the practical business of life. For their sanctions they refer naively to the Hebrew ideal of rewards on the one hand—wealth, honor, long life, family (compare Pr 11:31)—and of shame and loss and destruction on the other; but these are emphasized not as direct bestowments or inflictions from a personal Deity, rather as in the law of human nature. The law that evil works its own destruction, good brings its own reward, is forming itself in men's reason as one of the fundamental concepts out of which grew the Wisdom philosophy.

3. The Conception of Wisdom:

From times long before Solomon sagacity in counsel, and. skill to put such counsel into maxim or parable, gave their possessor, whether man or woman, a natural leadership and repute in the local communities (compare 2Sa 14:2; 20:16); and Solomon's exceptional endowment showed itself not merely in his literary tastes, but in his ability, much esteemed among Orientals, to determine the merits of cases brought before him for judgment (1Ki 3:16-28), and to answer puzzling questions (1Ki 10:1,6,7). It was from such estimate of men's intellectual powers, from the recognition of mental alertness, sagacity, grasp, in their application to the practical issues of life (compare Pr 1:1-5), that the conception of Wisdom in its larger sense arose. As, however, the cultivation of such sagacity of utterance passed beyond the pastime of a royal court (compare 1Ki 4:29-34) into the hands of city elders and sages it attained to greatly enhanced value; note how the influence of such sage is idealized (Job 29:7-25). The sages had definite calling and mission of their own, more potent perhaps than belonged to priests and prophets; the frequent reference to the young and the "simple" or immature in the Book of Pr would indicate that they were virtually the schoolmasters and educators of the nation. As such, working as they did in a fellowship and collaboration with each other, the subject-matter with which they dealt would not remain as casual and miscellaneous maxims, but work toward a center and system of doctrine which could claim the distinction of an articulated philosophy of life, and all the more since it was so identified with the great Hebrew ideal of righteousness and truth. We have already noted how this sense of the dignity and value of their calling manifested itself in the body of precepts sent in response to solicitation (3 above), with its appendix (4 above) (Pr 22:17-24:34). It was not long after this stage of Wisdom-culture, I think, that a very significant new word came into their vocabulary, the word (tushiyah, a puzzle to the translators, variously rendered "sound wisdom," "effectual working," and called by the lexicographers "a technical term of the Wisdom literature," BDB, under the word). Its earliest appearance, and the only one except in the introductory section (Pr 18:1), is where the man who separates himself from others' opinions and seeks his own desire is said to quarrel with all tushiyah. The word seems to designate Wisdom in its subjective aspect, as an authentic insight or intuition of truth, the

human power to rise into the region of true revelation from below, as distinguished from the prophetic or legal word spoken directly from above. Outside of Proverbs and Job the word occurs only twice: once in Mic 6:9, and once in Isa 28:29, in which latter case the prophet has deliberately composed a passage (28:23-29) in the characteristic mashal idiom, and attributed that strain of insight to Yahweh. Evidently there came a time in the culture of Wisdom when its utterances attained in men's estimate to a parity with utterances direct from the unseen; perhaps this explains why Agur's and Lemuel's words could be boldly ranked as oracles (see above, 6 and 7). At any rate, such a high distinction, an authority derived from intimacy with the creative work of Yahweh (Pr 8:30,31), is ascribed to Wisdom (chokhmah, in the introductory section; "counsel is mine," Wisdom is made to say, "and tushiyah" (Pr 8:14). Thus the Book of Proverbs reveals to us a philosophy, as it were, in the making and from scattered counsels attaining gradually to the summit where the human intellect could place its findings by the side of divine oracles.

IV. Considerations of Age and Literary Kinship.

To get at the history of the Book of Proverbs, several inquiries must be raised. When were the proverbs composed? The book, like the Book of Psalms, is confessedly an anthology, containing various accumulations, and both by style and maturing thought bearing the marks of different ages. When were the successive compilations made? And, finally, when did the strain of literature here represented reach that point of self-conscious unity and coordination which justified its being reckoned with as a strain by itself and choosing the comprehensive name Wisdom? What makes these inquiries hard to answer is the fact that these proverbs are precepts for the common people, relating to ordinary affairs of the village, the market, and the field, and move in lines remote from politics and dynastic vicissitudes and wars. They are, to an extent far more penetrative and pervasive than law or prophecy, the educative literature on which the sturdy rank and file of the nation was nourished. 'Where there is no vision, the people let loose,' says a Hezekian proverb (Pr 29:18); but so they are also when there is no abiding tonic of social convention and principle. Precisely this latter it is which this Book of Prey in a large degree reveals; and in course of time its value was so felt that, as we have seen, it could rank itself as an asset of life by the side of vision. It represents, in a word, the human movement toward self-directiveness and self-reliance, without supine dependence on ruler or public sentiment (compare Pr 29:25,26). When and how was this sane and wholesome communal fiber developed?

1. Under the Kings:

When Solomon and his court made the mashal an elegant fad, they builded better than they knew. They gave to the old native form of the proverb and parable, as reduced to epigrammatic mold and polish, the eclat of a popular literature. This was done orally at first (Solomon spoke his proverbs, 1Ki 4:32,33); but the recording of such carefully expressed utterances could not be long delayed; perhaps this brief style coupe was the most natural early exercise in the new transition from the unwieldly cuneiform to the use of papyrus and a more flexible alphabet, which probably came in with the monarchy. At any rate, here was the medium for a practical didactic literature, applied to the matters of daily life and intercourse to which in Solomon's time the nation was enthusiastically awake. There is no valid reason for denying to Solomon, or at least to his time, the initiation of the Solomonic mashal; and if, as has been suggested,

the name "proverbs of Solomon" designates rather literary species than personal authorship, the title of the whole book (Pr 1:1), as well as the headings of sections (Pr 10:1; 25:1), may be given in entire good faith, whatever the specific time or personal authorship of the utterances. Nor is there anything either in recorded history or the likelihood of the case to make improbable that the activity of the "men of Hezekiah" means just what is said; these men of letters were adding this supplementary collection (Pr 25-29) to a body of proverbs that already existed and were recognized as Solomon's. This would put the composition of the main body of the Proverbs (chapters 10-29) prior to the reign of Hezekiah. They represent therefore the chief literary instruction available to the people in the long period of the Kings from Solomon onward, a period which otherwise was very meagerly supplied. The Mosaic Law, as we gather from the finding of the Law in the time of Josiah (2Ki 22), was at best a sequestered thing in the keeping—or neglect—of priests and judges; the prophetic word was a specific message for great national emergencies; the accumulations of sacred song were the property of the temple and the cult; what then was there for the education of the people? There were indeed the folk-tales and catechetical legends of their heroic history; but there were also, most influential of all, these wise sayings of the sages, growing bodies of precept and parable, preserved in village centers, published in the open places by the gate (compare Job 29:7), embodying the elements of a common-sense religion and citizenship, and representing views of life which were not only Hebrew, but to a great extent international among the neighbor kingdoms. Understood so, these Solomonic proverbs furnish incomparably the best reflection we have of the religious and social standards of the common people, during a period otherwise meagerly portrayed. And from it we can understand what a sterling fiber of character existed after all, and how well worth preserving for a unique mission in the world, in spite of the idolatrous corruptions that invaded the sanctuaries, the self-pleasing unconcern of the rulers and the pessimistic denunciations of the prophets.

2. The Concentrative Point:

For the point in the Hebrew literary history when these scattered Solomonic proverbs were recognized as a homogeneous strain of thought and the compilations were made and recommended as Wisdom, we can do no better, I think, than to name the age of Israel's literary prime, the age of Hezekiah. The "men of Hezekiah" did more than append their supplementary section (Proverbs 25-29); the words "these also" (gam ‘elleh) in their heading imply it.

See HEZEKIAH, THE MEN OF.

I apprehend the order and nature of their work somehow thus: Beginning with the classic nucleus (Pr 10-22:16) (see above, II, 2), which may have come to them in two subsections (Proverbs 10-15; 16-22:16), they put these together as the proverbs most closely associated with Solomon, without much attempt at systematizing, substantially as these had accumulated through the ages in the rough order of their developing form and thought; compiling thus, in their zeal for the literary treasures of the past, the body of educational literature which lay nearest at hand, a body adapted especially, though not exclusively, to the instruction of the young and immature. This done, there next came to their knowledge a remarkable body of "words of the wise" (Pr 22:17-24:22), which had evidently been put together by request as a vade mecum for some persons in responsible position, and which were prefaced by a recommendation of

them as "words of truth" designed to promote "trust in Yahweh" (Pr 22:19-21)—which latter, as we know from Isaiah, was the great civic issue of Hezekiah's time. With this section naturally goes the little appendix of "sayings of the wise" (Pr 24:23-34), added probably at about the same time. These two sections, which seem to open the collection to matter beyond the distinctive Solomonic mashal, are, beyond the rest of the book, in the tone of the introductory section (Proverbs 1-9), which latter, along with the Hezekian appendix (Proverbs 25-29), was added, partly as a new composition, partly as incorporating some additional findings (compare for instance the completion of the poem on the sluggard, Pr 6:6-11). Thus, by the addition of this introductory section, the Book of Proverbs was recognized as a unity, provided with a preface and initial proposition (1:1-6,7), and launched with such hortatory material as had already, on a smaller scale, introduced the third section. This part not only contains the praise of Wisdom as a human endowment, sharing in the mind and purpose of the divine (8:22-31), but it has become aware also of the revelatory value of tushiyah (2:7; 3:21; 8:14), or chastened intuition (see above, III, 3), and dares to aspire, in its righteous teachableness, to the intimacy or secret friendship of Yahweh (codho, 3:32). All this indicates the holy self-consciousness to which Wisdom has attained.

I see no cogent reason for postponing the substantial completion of the Book of Proverbs beyond the time of Hezekiah. The words of Agur and of King Lemuel, with the final acrostic poem, may be later additions; but their difference in tone and workmanship is just as likely to be due to the fact that they are admitted, in the liberal spirit of the compilers, from foreign stores of wisdom. For spiritual clarity and intensity they do not rise to the height of the native Hebrew consciousness; and they incline to an artificial structure which suggests that the writer's interest is divided between sincere tushiyah and literary skill. For the sake of like-minded neighbors, however, something may be forgiven.

3. Its Stage in Progressive Wisdom:

It is too early in the history of Wisdom to regard this Book of Proverbs as an articulated and coordinated system. It is merely what it purports to be, a collected body of literature having a common bearing and purpose; a literature of reverent and intelligent self-culture, moving among the ordinary relations of life, and not assuming to embody any mystic disclosures of truth beyond the reach of human reason. As such, it has a vocabulary and range of ideas of its own, which distinguishes it from other strains of literature. This is seen in those passages outside of the Book of Proverbs which deliberately assume, for some specific purpose, the Wisdom dialect. In Isa 28:23-29, the prophet, whom the perverse rulers have taunted with baby-talk (28:9,10), appeals to them with the characteristic Wisdom call to attention (28:23), and in illustrations drawn from husbandry proves to them that this also is from Yahweh of hosts, 'who is transcendent in counsel, preeminent in tushiyah' (28:29)—teaching them thus in their own vaunted idiom. In Mic 6:9-15, similarly, calling in tushiyah to corroborate prophecy ("the voice of Yahweh," qol Yahweh, wethushiyah, 6:9), the prophet speaks of the natural disasters that men ought to deduce from their abuse of trade relations, evidently appealing to them in their own favorite strain of thinking. Both these passages seem to reflect a time when the Wisdom dialect was prevalent and popular, and both are concerned to call in sound human intuition as an ally of prophecy. At the same time, as prophets have the right to do, they labor to give revelation the casting vote; the authentic disclosure of truth from Yahweh is their objective, not the mere luxury of making clever observations on

practical life. All this coincides, in the Wisdom sphere, with what in Isaiah's and Micah's time was the supreme issue of state, namely trust in Yahweh, rather than in crooked human devices (compare Isa 28:16; 29:15); and it is noteworthy that this is the venture of Wisdom urged by the editors of Proverbs in their introductory exhortations (compare 22:19; 3:5-8). In other words, these editors are concerned with inducing a spiritual attitude; and so in their literary strain they make their book an adjunct in the movement toward spirituality which Isaiah is laboring to promote. As yet, however, its findings are still in the peremptory stage, stated as absolute and unqualified truths; it has not reached the sober testing of fact and interrogation of motive which it must encounter in order to become a seasoned philosophy of life. Its main pervading thesis—that righteousness in the fear of God is wisdom and bound for success, that wickedness is fatuity and bound for destruction—is eternally sound; but it must make itself good in a world where so many of the enterprises of life seem to come out the other way, and where there is so little appreciation of spiritual values. Nor is the time of skepticism and rigid test long in coming. Two psalms of this period (as I apprehend) (Psalms 73 and 49) concern themselves with the anomaly of the success of the wicked and the trials of the righteous; the latter pointedly adopting the Wisdom or mashal style of utterance (Ps 49:3,4), both laboring to induce a more inward and spiritual attitude toward the problem. It remains, however, for the Book of Job to take the momentous forward step of setting wisdom on the unshakable foundation of spiritual integrity, which it does by subjecting its findings to the rigid test of fact and its motives to a drastic Satanic sifting. It is thus in the Book of Job, followed later by the Book of Ecclesiastes, that the Wisdom strain of literature, initiated by the Proverbs of Solomon, finds its Old Testament culmination.

John Franklin Genung

PROVIDENCE, 1

prov'-i-dens:

I. PROVIDENCE DEFINED

II. DIFFERENT SPHERES OF PROVIDENTIAL ACTIVITY DISTINGUISHED

III. BIBLICAL PRESENTATION OF THE DOCTRINE OF PROVIDENCE

1. Divine Providence in the Old Testament Scriptures

(1) Providence in the Pentateuch

(2) The Historical Books of the Old Testament

(3) The Psalms

(4) The Wisdom Literature

(5) The Book of Job

(6) The Prophetical Writings

2. Divine Providence in the New Testament

(1) The Synoptic Gospels

(2) The Johannine Writings

(3) The Book of Ac and Other New Testament History

(4) The Pauline Epistles

(5) The Petrine Epistles, and Other New Testament Writings

3. Old Testament and New Testament Doctrines of Providence Compared

(1) The New Emphasis on the Fatherhood and Love of God

(2) The Place of Christ and the Holy Spirit in Providence

(3) The New Emphasis upon Moral and Spiritual Blessings

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE CONTENTS OF THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE

1. Different Views of Providence Compared

(1) The Atheistic or Materialistic View

(2) The Pantheistic View

(3) The Deistic View

(4) The Theistic or Biblical View

(5) The Divine Immanence

2. The Divine Purpose and Final End of Providence

3. Special Providence

(1) Spiritual, Not Material, Good to Man the End Sought in Special Providence

(2) Special Providence and "Accidents"

(3) Special Providence as Related to Piety and Prayer

(4) Special Providence as Related to Human Cooperation

(5) General and Special Providence Both Equally Divine

4. Divine Providence and Human Free Will

(1) Divine Providence as Related to Willing Wills

(2) Divine Providence as Related to Sinful Free Will

5. Divine Providence as Related to Natural and Moral Evil

6. Evil Providentially Overruled for Good

7. Interpreting Providence

8. Conclusion

LITERATURE

I. Providence Defined.

The word "provide" (from Latin providere) means etymologically "to foresee." The corresponding Greek word, pronoia, means "forethought." Forethought and foresight imply a future end, a goal and a definite purpose and plan for attaining that end. The doctrine of final ends is a doctrine of final causes, and means that that which is last in realization and attainment is first in mind and thought. The most essential attribute of rational beings is that they act with reference to an end; that they act not only with thought but with forethought. As, therefore, it is characteristic of rational beings to make preparation for every event that is foreseen or anticipated, the word "providence" has come to be used less in its original etymological meaning of foresight than to signify that preparation care and supervision which are necessary to secure a desired future result. While all rational beings exercise a providence proportioned to their powers, yet it is only when the word is used with reference to the Divine Being who is possessed

of infinite knowledge and power that it takes on its real and true significance. The doctrine of divine providence, therefore, has reference to that preservation care and government which God exercises over all things that He has created in order they may accomplish the ends for which they were created.

"Providence is the most comprehensive term in the language of theology. It is the background of all the several departments of religious truth, a background mysterious in its commingled brightness and darkness. It penetrates and fills the whole compass of the relations of man with his Maker. It connects the unseen God with the visible creation, and the visible creation with the work of redemption, and redemption with personal salvation, and personal salvation with the end of all things. It carries our thoughts back to the supreme purpose which was in the beginning with God, and forward to the foreseen end and consummation of all things, while it includes between these the whole infinite variety of the dealings of God with man" (W. B. Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology, I, 456).

II. Different Spheres of Providential Activity Distinguished.

The created universe may be conveniently divided, with reference divine providence, into three departments: first, the inanimate or physical universe, which is conserved or governed by God according to certain uniform principles called the laws of Nature; secondly, animate existence, embracing the vegetable and animal world, over which God exercises that providential care which is necessary to sustain the life that He created; and thirdly, the rational world, composed of beings who, in addition to animate life, are possessed of reason and moral free agency, and are governed by God, not necessitatively, but through an appeal to reason, they having the power to obey or disobey the laws of God according to the decision of their own free wills. This widespread care and supervision which God exercises over His created universe is commonly designated as His general providence which embraces alike the evil and the good, in addition to which there is a more special and particular providence which He exercises over and in behalf of the good, those whose wills are in harmony with the divine will. III. Biblical Presentation of the Doctrine of Providence.

The word "providence" is used only once in the Scriptures (Ac 24:2), and here it refers, not to God, but to the forethought and work of man, in which sense it is now seldom used. (See also Ro 13:14, where the same Greek word is translated "provision.") While, however, the Biblical use of the word calls for little consideration, the doctrine indicated by the term "providence" is one of the most significant in the Christian system, and is either distinctly stated or plainly assumed by every Biblical writer. The Old Testament Scriptures are best understood when interpreted as a progressive revelation of God’s providential purpose for Israel and the world. Messianic expectations pervade the entire life and literature of the Hebrew people, and the entire Old Testament dispensation may not improperly be regarded as the moral training and providential preparation of the world, and especially of the chosen people, for the coming Messiah. In the apocryphal "Book of Wisdom" the word "providence" is twice used (Wisd 14:3; 17:2) in reference to God’s government of the World. Rabbinical Judaism, according to Josephus, was much occupied with discussing the relation of divine providence to human free will. The Sadducees, he tells us, held an extreme view of human freedom, while the Essenes were believers in absolute fate; the Pharisees, avoiding these extremes, believed in both the overruling providence of God and in the freedom and responsibility of man (Ant., XIII, v, 9; XVIII, i, 3; BJ, II, viii, 14). See

PHARISEES. The New Testament begins with the announcement that the "kingdom of heaven is at hand," which declaration carries along with it the idea of a providential purpose and design running through the preceding dispensation that prepared for the Messiah's coming. But the work of Christ is set forth in the New Testament, not only as the culmination of a divine providence that preceded it, but as the beginning of a new providential order, a definite and far-reaching plan, for the redemption of the world, a forethought and plan so comprehensive that it gives to the very idea of divine providence a new, larger and richer meaning, both intensively and extensively, than it ever had before. The minutest want of the humblest individual and the largest interests of the world-wide kingdom of God are alike embraced within the scope of divine providence as it is set forth by Christ and the apostles.

1. Divine Providence in the Old Testament Scriptures:

(1) Providence in the Pentateuch.

The opening sentence of the Scriptures, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," is a noble and majestic affirmation of God's essential relationship to the origin of all things. It is followed by numerous utterances scattered throughout the sacred volume that declare that He who created also preserves and governs all that He created. But the Israelite nation was from the beginning of its history, in the Hebrew conception, the special object of God's providence and care, though it was declared that Yahweh's lordship and government extended over all the earth (Ex 8:22). The Deuteronomist (De 10:14) uses language which implies that divine possession of all things in heaven and earth carries along with it the idea of divine providence and control; and he also regards Israel as Yahweh's peculiar possession and special care (De 32:8).

This special providence that was over the elect nation as a whole was also minute and particular, in that special individuals were chosen to serve a providential purpose in the making of the nation, and were divinely-guided in the accomplishment of their providential mission. Thus Abraham's providential place in history is set forth in Ne 9:7,8. Jacob acknowledges the same providential hand in his life (Ge 31:42; 48:15). The life of Joseph abounds in evidences of a divine providence (Ge 45:5,7; 50:20). The whole life-history of Moses as it is found in the Pentateuch is a study in the doctrine of divine providence. Other lives as set forth in these early narratives may be less notable, but they are not less indebted to divine providence for what they are and for what they accomplish for others. Indeed, as Professor Oehler remarks, "The whole Pentateuchal history of revelation is nothing but the activity of that divine providence which in order to the realization of the divine aim, is at once directed to the whole, and at the same time proves itself efficacious in the direction of the life of separate men, and in the guiding of all circumstances" (Old Testament Theology).

(2) The Historical Books of the Old Testament.

In a sense all the books of the Old Testament are historical in that they furnish material for writing a history of the people of Israel. See ISRAEL, HISTORY OF. The Pentateuch, the Poetical Books, the Wisdom Literature, the Prophets, all furnish material for writing Old Testament history; but there is still

left a body of literature, including the books from Joshua to Esther that may with peculiar fitness designated as historical. These books are all, in an important sense, an interpretation and presentation of the facts of Hebrew history in their relation to divine providence. The sacred historians undertake to give something of a divine philosophy of history, to interpret in a religious way the facts of history, to point out the evils of individual and national sin and the rewards and blessings of righteousness, and to show God’s ever-present and ever-guiding hand in human history—that He is not a silent spectator of human affairs, but the supreme moral Governor of the universe, to whom individuals and nations alike owe allegiance. To the Hebrew historian every event in the life of the nation has a moral significance, both because of its relation to God and because of its bearing on the providential mission and testing of Israel as the people of God. The Book of Judges, which covers the "dark ages" of Bible history, and is an enigma to many in the study of God’s hand in history, shows how far God must needs condescend at times in His use of imperfect and even sensual men through whom to reveal His will and accomplish His work in the world. While therefore He condescends to use as instruments of His providence such men as Samson and Jephthah, it is never through these that He does His greatest work, but through an Abraham, a Joseph, a Moses, an Isaiah, through men of lofty moral character. And this is one of the most notable lessons of Old Testament history if it be studied as a revelation of God’s providential methods and instrumentalities. Among these historical writers none has given clearer and stronger expression to God’s providential relation to the physical world as its preserver and to the moral world as its Divine Governor than the author of Nehemiah. "Thou, even thou, art Lord alone; thou hast made heaven, the heaven of heavens, with all their host, the earth, and all things that are therein, the seas, and all that is therein, and thou preservest them all. .... Yet thou in thy manifold mercies forsookest them not in the wilderness: the pillar of the cloud departed not from them by day, to lead them in the way; neither the pillar of fire by night, to shew them light, and the way wherein they should go. Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them" (Ne 9:6,19,20 the King James Version). His words reflect the views that were entertained by all the Old Testament historains as to God’s hand in the government and guidance of the nation. Hebrew history, because of the divine promises and divine providence, is ever moving forward toward the Messianic goal.

(3) The Psalms.

The poets are among the world’s greatest religious teachers, and theology of the best poets generally represents the highest and purest faith that is found among a people. Applying this truth to the Hebrew race, we may say that in the Psalms and the Book of Job we reach the high-water mark of the Old Testament revelation as to the doctrine of divine providence. The Psalmist’s God is not only the Creator and Preserver of all things, but is a prayer-hearing and prayer-answering God, a Being so full of tender mercy and loving-kindness that we cannot fail to identify Him with the God whom Christ taught us to call "our Father." Nowhere else in the entire Scriptures, except in the Sermon on the Mount, can we find such a full and clear exhibition of the minute and special providence of God over His faithful and believing children as in the Psalms—notably such as Psalms 91; 103; 104 and 139. Ps 105 traces God’s hand in providential and gracious guidance through every stage of Israel’s wondrous history. Thanksgiving and praise for providential mercies and blessings abound in Psalms 44; 66; 78; 85; 138. While the relation of God’s power and providence to the physical universe and to the material and temporal blessings of life is constantly asserted in the Psalms, yet it is the connection of God’s

providence with man’s ethical and spiritual nature, with righteousness and faith and love, that marks the highest characteristic of the Psalmist’s revelation of the doctrine of providence. That righteousness and obedience are necessary conditions and accompaniments of divine providence in its moral aspects and results is evidenced by numerous declarations of the psalmists (1:6; 31:19,20; 74:12; 84:11; 91:1; 125:2). This thought finds happiest expression in Ps 37:23 the King James Version: "The steps of a good man are ordered of the Lord, and he delighteth in his way." The inspired poets make it plain that the purpose of divine providence is not merely to meet temporal wants and bring earthly blessings, but to secure the moral good of individuals and nations.

(4) The Wisdom Literature.

The doctrine of providence finds ample and varied expression in the wisdom Lit. of the Old Testament, notably in the Book of Proverbs. The power that preserves and governs and guides is always recognized as inseparable from the power that creates and commands (Pr 3:21-26; 16:4). Divine providence does not work independently of man’s free will; providential blessings are conditioned on character and conduct (Pr 26:10 the King James Version; Pr 2:7,8; 12:2,21). There cannot be, in Old Testament terms of faith, any stronger statement of the doctrine of divine providence than that given by the Wise Men of Israel in the following utterances recorded in the Book of Proverbs: "In thy ways acknowledge him and he will direct thy paths" (3:6); "A man’s heart deviseth his way, but Yahweh directeth his steps" (16:9) "The lot is cast into the lap; but the whole disposing thereof is of Yahweh" (16:33); "A man’s goings are of Yahweh" (20:24); "The king’s heart is in the hand of Yahweh as the watercourses: He turneth it whithersoever he will" (21:1); "The horse is prepared against the day of battle; but victory is of Yahweh" (21:31). See also 3:21-26; 12:2,21. The conception of providence that is presented in the Book of Ecclesiastes seems to reflect the views of one who had had experience in sin and had come into close contact with many of life’s ills. All things have their appointed time, but the realization of the providential purposes and ends of creaturely existence is, wherever human free agency is involved, always conditioned upon man’s exercise of his free will. The God of providence rules and overrules, but He does not by His omnipotence overpower and override and destroy man’s true freedom. Things that are do not reflect God’s perfect providence, but rather His providence as affected by human free agency and as marred by man’s sin (Ec 3:1-11). "I know that there is nothing better for them, than to rejoice, and to do good so long as they live: And also that every man should eat and drink and enjoy good in all his labor, is the gift of God" (Ec 3:12,13; see also Ec 3:14); "The righteous, and the wise, and their works, are in the hand of God" (Ec 9:1); "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong" (Ec 9:11). The same conclusion that the author of Ecclesiastes reached as to how human life is affected by divine providence and man’s sin has found expression in the oft-quoted lines of the great poet:

"There’s a Divinity that shapes our ends,

Rough-hew them how we will."

(5) The Book of Job.

The greatest of all the inspired contributions to the Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament, the Book of Job, demands special consideration. It is the one book in the Bible that is devoted wholly to a discussion of divine providence. The perplexities of a thoughtful mind on the subject of divine providence and its relation to human suffering have nowhere in the literature of the world found stronger and clearer expression than in this inspired drama which bears the name of its unique and marvelous hero, Job. Job represents not only a great sufferer, but an honest doubter: he dared to doubt theology of his day, a theology which he had himself doubtless believed until experience, the best of all teachers, taught him its utter inadequacy to explain the deepest problems of human life and of divine providence. The purpose of this book in the inspired volume seems to be to correct the prevailing theology of the day with regard to the subject of Sin and suffering in their relation to divine providence. There is no more deplorable and hurtful error that a false theology could teach than that all suffering in this world is a proof of sin and a measure of one's guilt (see AFFLICTION). It is hard enough for the innocent to suffer. To add to their suffering by them that it is all because they are awful sinners, even though their hearts assure them that they are not, is to lay upon the innocent a burden too grievous to be borne. The value in the inspired Canon of a book written to reveal the error of such a misleading doctrine as this cannot easily be over-estimated. The invaluable contribution which this book makes to the Biblical doctrine of providence is to be found, not in individual and detached sayings, striking and suggestive as some of these may be, but rather in the book as a whole. Statements concerning God's general abound in this inspired drama—such these, for example: "Who knoweth not in all these, that the hand of Yahweh hath wrought this, in whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind?" (Job 12:9,10) ;" Who hath given him a charge over the earth? or who hath disposed the whole world? .... He shall break in pieces mighty men without number, and set others in their stead" (Job 34:13,14 the King James Version).

But the special contribution of the Book of Job to the doctrine of divine providence, as already indicated, is to set forth its connection with the fact of sin and suffering. Perplexed souls in all ages have been asking: If God be all-powerful and all-good, why should there be any suffering in a world which He created and over which He rules? If He cannot prevent suffering is He omnipotent? If He can, but will not prevent suffering, is He infinitely good? Does the book solve the mystery? We cannot claim that it does. But it does vindicate the character of God, the Creator, and of Job, the moral free agent under trial. It does show the place of suffering in a moral world where free agents are forming Character; it does show that perfect moral character is made, not by divine omnipotence, but by trial, and that physical suffering serves a moral end in God's providential government of men and nations. While the book does not clear the problem of mystery, it does show how on the dark background of a suffering world the luminous holiness of divine and human character may be revealed. The picture of this suffering man of Uz, racked with bodily pains and irritated by the ill-spoken words of well-meaning friends, planting himself on the solid rock of his own conscious rectitude, and defying earth and hell to prove him guilty of wrong, and knowing that his Vindicator liveth and would come to his rescue—that is an inspired picture that will make every innocent sufferer who reads it stronger until the end of time.

See also JOB, BOOK OF.

(6) The Prophetical Writings.

Nowhere in all literature is the existence and supremacy of a moral and providential order in the world more clearly recognized thin in the writings of the Old Testament prophets. These writings are best understood when interpreted as the moral messages and passionate appeals of men who were not only prophets and preachers of righteousness to their own times, but students and teachers of the moral philosophy of history for all time, seers, men of vision, who interpreted all events in the light of their bearing on this moral and providential order, in which divine order the Israelite nation had no small part, and over which Israel's God was sovereign, doing "according to his will in the army of heaven and among the inhabitants of earth." While each prophetic message takes its coloring from the political, social and moral conditions that called it forth, and therefore differs from every other message, the prophets are all one in their insistence upon the supremacy and divine authority of this moral order, and in their looking forward to the coming of the Messiah and the setting up of the Messianic kingdom as the providential goal and consummation of the moral order. They all describe in varying degrees of light and shade a coming time when One born of their own oppressed and down-trodden race should come in power and glory, and set up a kingdom of righteousness and love in the earth, into which kingdom all nations shall be ultimately gathered; and of His kingdom there shall be no end. God's providential government of the nation was always and everywhere directed toward this Messianic goal. The language which an inspired writer puts into the mouth of Nebuchadnezzar, the heathen king, is an expression, not so much of the Gentileconception of God and His government, as it is of the faith of a Hebrew prophet concerning God's relationship to men and nations: "He doeth according to his will in army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Da 4:35). The providential blessings which the prophets promise to the people, whether to individuals or to the nation, are never a matter of mere omnipotence or favoritism, but are inseparably connected with righteous conduct and holy character. The blessings promised are mainly spiritual, but whether spiritual or material, they are always conditioned on righteousness. The Book of Isaiah is especially rich in passages that emphasize the place of moral conduct and character in God's providential government of the world, the supreme purpose and end of which are to establish a kingdom of righteousness in the earth (Isa 33:13-16; 35:8-10; 43:2; 46:4; 54:14-17). Divine providence is both personal and national, and of each it is declared in varying terms of assurance that "Yahweh will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your rearward" (Isa 52:12). Each of the major and minor prophets confirms and re-enforces the teachings of this greatest and most truly representative of all the Old Testament prophets.

2. Divine Providence in the New Testament:

(1) The Synoptic Gospels.

The Synoptic Gospels furnish the richest possible material for a study of the doctrine of divine providence. They recognize in the advent of Christ the fulfillment of a long line of Messianic prophecies and the culmination of providential purposes and plans that had been in the divine mind from the beginning and awaited the fullness of time for their revelation in the Incarnation (Mt 1:22; 2:5,15; 3:3). In His private and personal life of service and prayer Christ is a model of filial trust in the providence of the heavenly Father (Mt 11:25; 26:39; Mr 1:35; 6:46; Lu 3:21; 11:1). His private and public utterances

abound in declarations concerning God’s ever-watchful and loving care for all His creatures, but above all for those creatures who bear His own image; while His teachings concerning the Kingdom of God reveal a divine providential plan for the world’s redemption and education extending of necessity far into the future; and still beyond that, in His vision of divine providence, comes a day of final judgment, of retribution and reward, followed by a new and eternal order of things, in which the destiny of every man will be determined by his conduct and character in this present life (see our Lord’s parables concerning the Kingdom: Mt 13:24-50; Mr 4:26 ff; Lu 14:16 ff; also Mt 24 and 25). The many familiar utterances of our Lord, found in the Synoptic Gospels, contain the most essential and precious of all the New Testament revelations concerning the providence of the heavenly Father (Mt 5:45; 6:26-34; 10:29-31; Lu 21:16-18).

(2) The Johannine Writings.

John’s Gospel differs from the Synoptic Gospels in its mode of presenting the doctrine of providence chiefly in that it goes back to the mind and purpose of God in the very beginning (Joh 1:1-5), whereas the Synoptic Gospels simply go back to the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament. Both the Gospel and the Epistles of John in their presentation of divine providence place the greatest possible emphasis on divine love and filial trust, the latter rising in many places to the point of positive assurance. The Book of Revelation is a prophetic vision, in apocalyptic form, of God’s providential purpose for the future, dealing not so much with individuals as with nations and with the far-reaching movements of history extending through the centuries. God is revealed in John’s writings, not as an omnipotent and arbitrary Sovereign, but as an all-loving Father, who not only cares for His children in this life but is building for them in the world to come a house of many mansions (Joh 14:1-20).

(3) The Book of Ac and Other New Testament History.

The historical portions of the New Testament, as contained in the Acts, and elsewhere, while not eliminating or depreciating the element of human freedom in individuals and nations, yet recognize in human life and history the ever-present and all-controlling mind of that God in whom, it is declared, "we live, and move, and have our being" (Ac 17:28). The career of the first distinctive New Testament character begins with these words: "There came a man, sent from God, whose name was John" (Joh 1:6). But not only John, the forerunner, but every other individual, according to the New Testament conceptions, is a man "sent from God." The apostles conceive themselves to be such; Stephen, the martyr, was such; Paul was such (Ac 22:21). New Testament biography is a study in providentially guided lives, not omitting references to those who refuse to be so guided—for such is the power of human free agency, many who are "sent from God" refuse to go upon their divinely-appointed mission. The Day of Pentecost is the revelation of a new power in history—a revelation of the place and power which the divine-human Christ and the Holy Spirit are to have henceforth in making history—in making the character of the men and the nations whose deeds are to make history. The most potent moral force in history is to be, from the day of Pentecost on, the ascended incarnate Christ, and He is to be all the more influential in the world after His ascension, when His work shall be done through the Holy Spirit. This is the historical view of providence as connected with the person of Christ, which the New Testament historians present, and which we, after 19 centuries of Christian history, are warranted in

holding more confidently and firmly even than the Christians of the 1st century could hold it; for the Christian centuries have proved it true. What God is in Nature Christ is in history. All history is becoming Christian history, thus realizing the New Testament conception of divine providence in and through Christ.

(4) The Pauline Writings.

No character of whom we have any account in Christian literature was providentially prepared for his life-work and providentially guided in accomplishing that life-work more truly than was the apostle Paul. We find, there. fore, as we would antecedently expect, that Paul's speeches and writings abound in proofs of his absolute faith in the overruling providence of an all-wise God. His doctrine of predestination and foreordination is best understood when interpreted, not as a divine power predetermining human destiny and nullifying the human will, but as a conception of divine providence as the eternal purpose of God to accomplish an end contemplated and foreseen from the beginning, namely, the redemption of the world and the creation in and through Christ of a new and holy humanity. Every one of the Pauline Epistles bears witness to the author's faith in a divine providence that overrules and guides the life of every soul that works in harmony with the divine will; but this providence is working to secure as its chief end, not material and temporal blessings, but the moral and spiritual good of those concerned. Paul's teachings concerning divine providence as it concerns individuals and is conditioned on character may be found summed up in what is perhaps the most comprehensive single sentence concerning providence that was ever written: "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Ro 8:28 the King James Version). Any true exposition of the New Testament doctrine of divine providence that may be given can only be an unfolding of the content of this brief but comprehensive statement. The greatest of the Pauline Epistles, that to the Romans, is a study in the divine philosophy of history, a revelation of God's providential purpose and plan concerning the salvation, not merely of individuals, but of the nations. These purposes, as Paul views them, whether they concern individuals or the entire race, are always associated with the mediatorial ministry of Christ: "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory for ever" (Ro 11:36).

(5) The Petrine Epistles, and Other New Testament Writings.

The Epistles of Peter, James, and Jude, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, are all in entire accord with the teachings of the other New Testament writings already considered. Peter, who at first found it so hard to see how God's providential purpose in and for the Messiah could be realized if Christ should suffer and die, came later to see that the power and the glory of Christ and His all-conquering gospel are inseparably connected with the sufferings and death of the Messiah (1Pe 1:11,12). No statement concerning God's providence over the righteous can be clearer or stronger than the following utterance of Peter: "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, And his ears unto their supplication: But the face of the Lord is upon them that do evil. And who is he that will harm you, if ye be zealous of that which is good?" (1Pe 3:12,13). The purpose and end of divine providence as viewed in the Epistle of James are always ethical: as conduct and character are the end and crown of Christian effort, so they are the end and aim of divine providence as it cooperates with men to make them perfect (Jas 1:5,17,27; 2:5; 5:7).

The apologetic value of the Epistle to the Hebrews grows out of the strong proof it presents that Christ is the fulfillment, not only of the Messianic prophecies and expectations of Israel, but of the providential purposes and plans of that God who at sundry times and in divers manners had spoken in times past unto the fathers by a long line of prophets (Heb 1:1,2; 11:7-40; 13:20,21). It would be difficult to crowd into one short chapter a more comprehensive study of the lessons of history that illustrate the workings and the retributions of the moral law under divine providence than is found in the Epistle of Jude (see especially 1:5,7,11,14,15,24).

3. Old Testament and New Testament Doctrines of Providence Compared:

From this brief survey of the teachings of the Old Testament and New Testament Scriptures concerning the doctrine of divine providence, it will be seen that, while the New Testament reaffirms in most particulars the doctrine of divine providence as set forth in the Old Testament Scriptures, there are three particulars in which the points of emphasis are changed, and by which new and changed emphasis the doctrine is greatly enriched in the New Testament.

(1) The New Emphasis on the Fatherhood and Love of God.

The God of providence in the Old Testament is regarded as a Sovereign whose will is to be obeyed, and His leading attributes are omnipotence and holiness, whereas in the New Testament God is revealed as the heavenly Father, and His providence is set forth as the forethought and care of a father for his children. His leading attributes here are love and holiness—His very omnipotence is the omnipotence of love. To teach that God is not only a righteous Ruler to be feared and adored, but a tender and loving Father who is ever thinking of and caring for His children, is to make God lovable and turn His providence into an administration of Almighty love.

(2) The Place of Christ and the Holy Spirit in Providence.

The doctrine of providence in the New Testament is connected with the person of Christ and the administration of the Holy Spirit, in a manner that distinguishes it from the Old Testament presentation of providence as the work of the one God who was there revealed in the simple unity of His nature without distinction of persons. If it be true, as some theologians have taught, that "God the Father plans, God the Son executes, and God the Holy Ghost applies," then it would follow that providence is the work exclusively of Christ and the Holy Spirit; but this theological formula, while it has suggestive value, cannot be accepted as an accurate statement of Biblical doctrine with reference to divine providence. Christ constantly refers creation and providence to the Father. But He also said, "My Father worketh even until now, and I work" (Joh 5:17), and the New Testament writers attribute to Christ the work both of creation and providence. Thus Paul: "For by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: and he is before all things, and by him all things consist" (Col 1:16,17 the King James Version). Although this and other passages refer to Christ’s relation to general providence, including the government of the physical universe, yet it is only when the

divine government is concerned with the redemption of a lost world and the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the hearts and lives of men, that the full extent of Christ's part in divine providence can be realized. The saving and perfecting of men is the supreme purpose of providence, if it be viewed from the New Testament standpoint, which is that of Christ's mediatorial ministry.

(3) The New Emphasis upon Moral and Spiritual Blessings.

The New Testament not only subordinates the material and temporal aspects of providence to the spiritual and eternal more than does the Old Testament, but Christ and the apostles, to an extent that finds no parallel in the Old Testament, place the emphasis of their teaching concerning providence upon man's moral needs and eternal interests, and upon the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, the establishment of which in the hearts and lives of men is the one great object for which both the heavenly Father and His children are ceaselessly working. To be free from sin, to be holy in heart and useful in life, to love and obey God as a Father, to love and serve men as brothers—this is the ideal and the end for which, according to the New Testament, men should work and pray, and this is the end toward which God is working by His ceaseless cooperative providence.

PROVIDENCE, 2

IV. Discussion of the Contents of the Biblical Doctrine.

1. Different Views of Providence Compared:

There are four distinct conceptions of providence as it concerns God's relation to the ongoing of the world and to man, the rational and moral free agent whom He has placed upon it, namely, the atheistic, the deistic, the pantheistic, and theistic or Biblical view. See also GOD, I, 4. The last named view can best be understood only when stated in comparison and contrast with these opposing views.

(1) The Atheistic or Materialistic View:

Atheism or materialism, stands at one extreme, affirming that there is no God, that the material universe is eternal, and that from material atoms, eternally endowed with certain properties, there have come, by a process of evolution, all existing forms of vegetable, animal and rational life. As materialism denies the existence of a personal Creator, it, of course, denies any and every doctrine of divine providence.

(2) The Pantheistic View:

Pantheism stands at the other extreme from atheism, teaching that God is everything and everything is God. The created universe is "the living garment" of God—God is the soul of the world, the universe His existence form. But God is an infinite It, not a personal Being who can express His existence in terms of selfconsciousness—I, Thou, He, Providence, according to pantheism, is simply the evolution of impersonal deity, differing from materialism only in the name which it gives to the infinite substance

from which all things flow.

(3) The Deistic View:

Deism teaches that there is a God, and that He created the world, but created things do not need His presence and the exercise of His power in order to continue in existence and fulfill their functions. The material world is placed under immutable law; while man, the rational and moral free agent, is left to do as he wills. God sustains, according to deism, very much the same relation to the universe that the clock-maker does to his timepiece. Having made his clock, and wound it up, he does not interfere with it, and the longer it can run without the maker's intervention the greater the evidence of wisdom and skill on the part of the maker. God according to deism has never wrought a miracle nor made a supernatural revelation to man. The only religion that is possible to man is natural religion; he may reason from Nature up to Nature's God. The only value of prayer is its subjective influence; it helps us to answer our own prayers, to become and be what we are praying to be. If the Divine Being is a prayer-hearing God, He is least not a prayer-answering God. The laws of Nature constitute God's general providence; but there is no other personal and special providence than this, according to deism. God, the deists affirm, is too great, too distant, too transcendent a Being to concern Himself with the details of creaturely existence.

(4) The Theistic or Biblical View:

The theistic or Biblical conception of providence teaches that God is not only the Creator but the Preserver of the universe, and that the preservation of the universe, no less than its creation, implies and necessitates at every moment of time an omnipotent and omnipresent personal Being. This world is not "governed by the laws of Nature," as deism teaches, but it is "governed by God according to the laws of Nature." "Law," in itself, is an impotent thing, except as it is the expression of a free will or person back of it; "the laws of Nature" are meaningless and impotent, except as they are an expression of the uniform mode, according to which God preserves and governs the world. It is customary to speak of the laws of Nature as if they were certain self-existent forces or powers governing the world. But shall we not rather say that there is no real cause except personal will—either the divine will or created wills? If this be true, then it is inconsistent to say that God has committed the government of the physical universe to "secondary causes"—that is, to the laws of Nature—and that these laws are not immediately dependent upon Him for their efficiency. The omnipresent and ever-active God is the only real force and power and cause in the universe, except as created wills may be true and real causes within their limited bounds. This view of God's relation to the created universe serves to distinguish the Biblical doctrine of divine providence from the teachings of materialists and deists, who eliminate entirely the divine hand from the ongoing of the universe, and in its stead make a god of the "laws of Nature," and hence, have no need for a divine preserver. Biblical theism makes ample room for the presence of the supernatural and miraculous, but we must not be blind to a danger here, in that it is possible to make so much of the presence of God in the supernatural (revelation, inspiration, and miracle) as to overlook entirely His equally important and necessary presence in the natural—which would be to encourage a deistical conception of God's relation to the world by exaggerating His transcendence at the expense of His immanence. That is the true theistic doctrine of providence which, while not undervaluing the

supernatural and miraculous, yet stedfastly maintains that God is none the less present in, and necessary to, what is termed the "natural."

(5) The Divine Immanence.

This idea of God's essential relation to the continuation of all things in existence is perhaps best expressed by the term "immanence." Creation emphasizes God's transcendence, while providence emphasizes His immanence. Pantheism affirms God's immanence, but denies His transcendence. Deism affirms His transcendence, but denies His immanence. Biblical theism teaches that God is both transcendent and immanent. By the term "transcendence," when applied to God, is meant that the Divine Being is a person, separate and distinct from Nature and above Nature—"Nature" being used here in its largest signification as including all created things. By the Divine Immanence is meant that God is in Nature as well as over Nature, and that the continuance of Nature is as directly and immediately dependent upon Him as the origin of Nature—indeed, by some, God's preservation of the created universe is defined as an act of "continuous creation." By the Divine Immanence is meant something more than omnipresence, which term, in itself alone, does not affirm any causal relation between God and the thing to which He is present, whereas the term "immanence" does affirm such causal relation. By asserting the Divine Immanence, therefore, as the mode of God's providential efficiency, we affirm that all created things are dependent upon Him for continued existence, that the laws of Nature have no efficiency apart from their Creator and Preserver, that God is to be sought and seen in all forms and phases of creaturely existence, in the natural as well as the supernatural and miraculous, that He is not only omnipresent but always and everywhere active both in the natural and the spiritual world, and that without Him neither the material atom, nor the living organism, nor the rational soul could have any being. He not only created all things, but "by him all things consist," that is, by Him all things are preserved in being.

2. The Divine Purpose and Final End of Providence:

What, then, let us ask, do the Scriptures teach as to the purpose and end of God's providential goverment of the world? Back of this question is another: What was the divine motive and supreme thought in the creation of the universe, and what the final cause and end of all things in the mind and purpose of God? If we can think God's thoughts after Him and discover this "final cause" of creation, with even approximate accuracy, then we shall find a principle that will illuminate at least, if it does not fully explain, the methods and mysteries of providence. We venture to affirm that the controlling thought in the mind of God in establishing this order of things, of which we are a conscious part, was to create a race of beings who should find their highest happiness by being in the highest degree holy, and who should, in proportion as they attain their highest holiness and happiness, thereby in the highest degree glorify their Creator. The Creator's highest glory can be promoted only by such beings as are at once rational, moral, free, holy. There are unconscious, unthinking, unmoral forms of existence, but the motive and meaning of the universe is to be found, not in the lower, the physical and animal, but in the highest, in the rational and moral. The lower exists for the higher, the material and animal for the spiritual and moral. A being whose character is formed under the conditions and laws of intellectual and moral freedom is higher than any being can be that is what it is necessitatively, that is, by virtue of

conditions over which it has no control. Character that is formed freely under God’s government and guidance will glorify the Creator more than anything can which is made to be what it is wholly by divine omnipotence. These things being true, it follows that God’s providence in the world will be directed primarily and ceaselessly toward developing character in free moral agents, toward reducing sin to the minimum and developing the maimum of holiness, in every way and by every means compatible with perfect moral freedom in the creature.

The possibility of sin in a world of free agents and in a state of probation is unavoidable, but to say that sin is possible does not mean that it is necessary. See CHOICE; WILL. The final cause and end, the purpose and motive, of divine providence, then, are not the temporal, material and earthly happiness of men, but the highest ultimate moral good of free beings whose highest happiness is secured through their highest holiness—which means first, their obedience to the holy will of God as their Father, and secondly, loving and self-sacrificing service to their fellow-men. This ever-present and all-dominating moral purpose of divine providence determines its methods and explains, in part at least, what would otherwise be its mysteries. With this conception of divine providence the general trend of Biblical thought is in entire accord. In the light of Christ’s revelation of God as a holy and loving Father who regards all men as His children and whose chief concern is to develop holiness and love in those whom He loves, we may define divine providence as Infinite Wisdom, using infinite power to accomplish the ends of infinite holiness and love. The originating and determining cause of divine providence is, in the New Testament conception of it, always to be found in the love of God, while the final cause is the glory of the Father as realized in the holiness and happiness of His children.

3. Special Providence:

By the doctrine of special providence, according to the best use of that term in theological literature, is meant as already indicated, that minute care and ever-watchful supervision which God exercises over His obedient and believing children in things, both small and great, which are designed to secure their ever-increasing holiness and usefusness. God’s general providence is and must be special, in that it descends to particulars—to the minute details of creaturely existence—and is always and everywhere active. But the Scriptures teach that there is a more special care over and ordering of the lives of the spiritually good than pertains to the wicked, who have not the fear of God before their eyes. The following Scriptures set forth in unmistakable terms the doctrine of a special providence exercised by the heavenly Father over and in behalf of the righteous: "A man’s goings are established of Yahweh; and he delighteth in his way" (Ps 37:23); "In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he will direct thy paths" (Pr 3:6); "There shall no mischief happen to the righteous" (Pr 12:21); "But seek ye first his kingdom, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (Mt 6:33); "To them that love God all things work together for good" (Ro 8:28). The following points seem to be plainly involved in any statement of the doctrine of special providence that can claim to be faithful to the teachings of the Scriptures;

(1) Spiritual, Not Material, Good to Man the End Sought in Special Providence.

A mistaken and hurtful notion has long been prevalent to the effect that special providence is designed to secure the secular and earthly good, the material and temporal prosperity, of God's children. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Material blessings may indeed come as a special providence to the child of God (Mt 6:33 et al.), but that "good" which all things work together to secure for them that love God is mainly spirtual good, and not financial or social, or intellectual, or temporal good, except as these may secure ultimate spiritual good. Indeed, God's special providence make take away wealth and bring poverty in its stead in order to impart the "true riches." It may defeat rather than further one's worldly hopes and ambitions; may bring sickness rather than health, and ever death instead of life—for sometimes a Christian can do more good by sickness or death than by health or continued life—and when that is the case, his sickness or death may well be interpreted as a special providence. "Every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit." Many of the Old Testament promises do, it is true, seem to have special reference to material and temporal blessings, but we should remember that the best interpretation of these is to be found in the New Testament, where they are (as, for example, when quoted by Christ in the Temptation) interpreted as having mainly a spiritual signifigcance. When our Lord speaks of the very hairs of our heads being numbered, and declares that if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without the Father's notice, surely we, who are of more value than many sparrows, cannot drift beyond His love and care, His words might be interpreted as teaching that God will save us from physical suffering and death; but such is not His meaning, for, in the very same context He speaks of how they to whom He thus pledges His love and care shall be persecuted and hated for His name's sake, and how some of them shall be put to death; and yet His promise was true. God was with them in their physical sufferings, but the great blessing wherewith He blessed them was not physical, but moral and spiritual.

(2) Special Providence and "Accidents."

Another still more mistaken and hurtful notion concerning special providence is the association of it with, and the limitation of it largely to, what are called "accidents," those irregular and occasional occurrences which involve more than ordinary danger and risk to life. The popular notion of special providence associates it with a happy escape from visible dangers and serious injury, as when the house catches on fire, or the horses run away, or the train is wrecked, or the ship encounters an awful storm, or one comes in contact with contagious disease or the terrible pestilence that walketh in darkness. A happy escape from injury and death on such an occasion is popularly designated as a "special providence," and this regardless of whether the individual thus escaping is a saint or a sinner. We cannot too strongly emphasize the fact that God's special providence is not a capricious, occasional, and irregular intervention of His love and power in behalf of His children, but involves ceaseless—yea infinite—thought and care for those that love Him, everywhere and in all the experiences of life.

(3) Special Providence as Related to Piety and Prayer.

God's special providence is conditioned upon piety and prayer though it far transcends, in the blessings it brings, the specific requests of His children. While we may properly pray for things pertaining to our temporal and physical life with the assurance that God will answer such prayers in so far as He deems best; yet the Scriptures encourage us to make spiritual blessings the main object of our prayers. "Seek ye

first his kingdom, and his righteousness," is the essence of the New Testament teaching on this subject; but we should not overlook the fact that this divine injunction is both preceded and followed by the strongest assurances of the most minute and ceaseless provision for all our temporal and physical wants by the loving heavenly Father. "Therefore take no thought saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed? .... For your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things. But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you," the King James Version. In keeping with this Scripture, the poet has written:

"Make you His service your delight;

Your wants shall be His care."

But while it is true that God has promised to make our wants His care, we should remember that He has promised this only to that devout and godly number of pious, praying souls who "seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness." His general providence is alike to all, by which "he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." But it is only "to them that love God" that it is promised that "all things work together for good"—and the proof of love is not in one's profession, but in his obedience and service.

(4) Special Providence as Related to Human Cooperation.

The words of Christ concerning the heavenly Father's watchful and loving providence do not mean that the children of God are not in any sense to take thought for food and raiment, and labor daily to obtain the necessities of life. Labor, both mental and physical, is as much a duty as prayer. The prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," does not render it unnecessary that they who offer it should work for their own daily bread. Nothing could be more hurtful to healthful Christian activity than to interpret our Lord's insistence, in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, upon trust in the heavenly Father's watchful providence as a justification of thoughtlessness, idleness, and improvidence; seeing that its purpose is simply to warn us against that needless and hurtful anxiety about the future which is not only inconsistent with trust in God, but which is utterly destructive of man's best efforts in his own behalf.

(5) General and Special Providence Both Equally Divine. While the Scriptures appear to us to make a real and true distinction between God's natural and His supernatural order, and between His general and His special providence, yet to truly pious and wisely discerning souls all is alike divine, the natural as well as the supernatural, general as well as special providence. So far as God's faithful and loving children are concerned, general and special providence blend into one. The only real and important distinction between the two is that made by the free wills of men, by virtue of which some are in loving accord with the divine plans concerning them, and others are at enmity with God and oppose the purpose of His love concerning them. If all men were and had always been, alike trustful and loving children of the heavenly Father, there would perhaps never have been any occasion for making a distinction between the general and the special providence of God. The only distinction we should have needed to recognize in that case would have been as to the varieties of divine providence, in view of the fact that

the all-loving Father would cause widely different events to happen to His different children. If anyone, therefore, is inclined to deny the distinction which we have here made between general and special providence, and prefers to affirm that there is but one general providential order over mankind in the world, that the distinction is in man and not in God's providence, his position cannot be seriously objected to, provided he does not thereby mean that the world is governed by impersonal and immutable laws, but will affirm with clearness and confidence that the world is governed by the all-loving, all-wise, omnipresent, and everywhere-active God. For, indeed, the only thing that is really "special" and out of order is the limitation which sin imposes upon the workings of divine providence in so far as the self-will and opposition of men prevent the realization of the providential purposes of God concerning them. But, unfortunately, sin is now, and has long been, so prevalent and dominant in the world that we have come to regard God's providence as affected and limited by it, as that which is regular and general, and His more perfect and complete providence in behalf of and over the good as the exceptional and special. But whether we call divine providence, as related to believers, "general" or "special," is of little consequence, provided we believe that "the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord" (Ps 37:23 the King James Version), that "all things work together for (spiritual) good to them that love God," and that to those who, duly subordinating the temporal to the spiritual, seek "first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," all things needful "shall be added" by the heavenly Father.

4. Divine Providence and Human Free Will:

The problem of divine providence has its utmost significance, not in its bearing on the laws of physical nature, but in that phase of it which concerns God's dealings with moral agents, those creatures who may, and often do, act contrary to His will. God governs men as a father governs his children, as a king governs his free subjects; not as a machinist works his machine, or as a hypnotist controls his mesmerized victims. A father in his family and a sovereign in his realm may each do as he pleases within certain limits, and God infinitely more: "He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou?" (Da 4:35). He setteth up one and putteth down another. Nevertheless, even God acts within limits; He limited Himself when He created free agents. As a mere matter of power God can predetermine man's volitions and necessitate his acts, but He can do so only by making of him a kind of rational machine, and destroying his true freedom. But Scripture, reason and consciousness all unite in teaching man that he is morally free, that he is an agent, and not something merely acted on. God's providential government of men, therefore, is based on their freedom as rational and moral beings, and consists in such an administration and guidance by the Holy Spirit of the affairs of men as shall encourage free moral agents to virtue, and discourage them from sin. God's providence must needs work upon and with two kinds of wills—willing wills and opposing wills.

(1) Divine Providence as Related to Willing Wills.

The apostle declares that God works in believers "both to will and to do of his good pleasure." If God's special providence over and in behalf of His children may involve an intervention of His Divine power within the realm of physical law, much more, it would seem, will it involve a similar intervention within the realm of the human mind and the human will. Spiritual guidance is one of the most precious

privileges of believers, but it is difficult to conceive how the Holy Spirit can effectively guide a believer without finding some way of controlling his will and determining his volitions that is compatible with free agency. While most of man's thoughts, emotions and volitions are self-determined in their origin, being due to the free and natural workings of his own mind and heart and will, yet there are also thoughts, emotions and volitions that are divinely produced. Even a sinner under conviction of sin has thoughts and emotions that are produced by the Holy Spirit. Much more has the believer divinely-produced thoughts and feelings; and if divinely-produced thoughts and feelings, there may be, in like manner, it would seem, Divinely produced volitions. Does this seem irreconcilable with the fact of moral free agency? We think not; it is no more subversive of human free agency for God to influence effectively a man's volitions and secure a certain course of action than it is for one man effectively to influence another. No volition that is divinely necessitated can be a free moral volition; for moral volitions are such as are put forth freely, in view of motives and moral ends. The element of necessity and compulsion would destroy all true freedom in, and moral accountability for, any particular volition, so that it could not be either virtuous or vicious. But—and here is the crucial point—when a man, by an act of his own will, freely commits the ordering of his life to God, and prays God to choose for him what is best, working in him both to will and to do, that act of self-commitment to God involves the very essence of moral freedom, and is the highest exercise of free agency. "Our wills are ours to make them Thine," the poet has truly said. In other words, the highest moral act of man's free will is the surrender of itself to the divine will; and whatever control of man's will on God's part results from and follows this free act of self-surrender is entirely consistent with perfect moral freedom, even though it should involve divinely-produced volitions. Does a perplexed child cease to be free when in the exercise of his freedom he asks a wise and loving father to decide a matter for him, and be his guide in attaining a certain desired end? Surely not; and this intervention of parental wisdom and love is none the less effective if it should work, as far as possible, through the mind and will of the child, rather than allow the child to be entirely passive. So God works effectively through the mind and will of every soul who unreservedly commits himself to the divine will—commits himself not once simply, but continually. God cannot under the divinely-appointed laws of freedom work in and through the sinner "both to will and to do," because the sinner's will is bent on evil, and hence, opposed to the divine will. God's will can work, not with, but only against, a sinful will; and if it should so work and necessitate his volitions, that would destroy his true freedom. But, if God should work in and through an obedient and acquiescent will that is seeking divine guidance, THAT would be an exercise of divine power in no way incompatible with the true moral freedom of men. Such is the influence, as we conceive it, of the divine will upon the human will in providence. God's providence works effectively only through willing wills.

(2) Divine Providence as Related to Sinful Free Will.

But God's providence encounters opposing as well as willing wills. Not every unconverted man, however, represents an equally antagonistic will—there are different degrees of opposition. That God's gracious and special providence in behalf of an individual often antedates his forsaking sin and his acceptance of Christ as a personal Saviour is manifest to every student of Christian biography. Much of the best training that many a "chosen vessel" ever receives for his life-work turns out to be that unconscious providential preparation which he was receiving under a Father's guidance before he consciously consecrated himself to his divine Master. "I girded thee, though thou hast not known me,"

said God to Cyrus—and on this text Horace Bushnell preached one of the greatest of modern sermons on divine providence, taking as his theme, "Every man's life is a plan of God." If this be true of a Christian man, that, even before his conversion, the Holy Spirit was seeking him, and even preparing him, as far as was then possible, for fulfilling the "plan of God" in his life, is it not in all probability equally true that the Holy Spirit and the good providence of God were working in behalf of other sinners who persisted to the end in rebellion against God? Such is the power of moral free agency with which God has endowed man that the created free agent can defeat the plan of Infinite Love concerning his life, and frustrate the workings of providence in his behalf (Jer 18). Whether a free moral agent, then, shall allow God's providential plans to be worked out for him or not, depends upon his own free will. It is said of the divine Christ that He could not do many mighty works in a certain city because of their unbelief and opposition. In like manner divine providence is conditioned and limited by a sinful free will.

5. Divine Providence as Related to Natural and Moral Evil:

That the Biblical writers do not regard the existence of evil as a valid objection to divine providence is evident to every student of the Scriptures. Indeed, it is in working good out of what the world accounts evil that divine providence accomplishes many of its most salutary and beneficent ends in behalf of the good. That natural or physical evil (poverty, sickness, suffering, etc.) is one of the mightiest agencies in the hands of God for restraining and correcting moral evil and for working out moral and spiritual good to fallen and sinful men, admits of easy demonstration. For the existence in the world of moral evil (sin), man, the moral free agent, is wholly responsible. God could prevent moral free agents from sinning only by not creating them, or else by placing their wills under irresistible divine restraint and compulsion. But the latter method of controlling them would virtually destroy their real and true freedom; and if this were done, then not only all sin, but all virtue and holiness as attributes of free beings would be thereby rendered impossible in men; for only such beings can put forth free holy volitions as can put forth free sinful volitions. If man had never sinned, there would probably have never been such a large providential use of natural or physical evil as prevails at present; and this because of the fact that an unfallen and holy race of beings would not have needed the presence of natural evil to secure their highest moral development. But a fallen and sinful race does need such an agency to bring it back to God and to develop holy character and the highest moral service. It is not true that sin is now always or even generally the immediate cause of an individual's suffering physical evil, or that extraordinary suffering is a proof of extraordinary sin. "Master, who did sin," asked the disciples, "this man, or his parents, that he was born blind? Jesus answered, "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him" (Joh 9:2,3 King James Version). Human suffering is for man's spiritual good and for the divine glory, as shown in working good out of evil—this is the explanation which the Master gives as to why natural evil is permitted or sent by God. It is not only a powerful, but, in a world like ours, a necessary agency for the correction and cure of moral evil and for the spiritual development of fallen man. "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now I observe thy word .... It is good for me that I have been afflicted; that I may learn thy statutes" (Ps 119:67,71); "Every branch that beareth fruit, he cleanseth it, that it may bear more fruit" (Joh 15:2). The saintly and eminently useful men and women of history have, as a rule, had to undergo a severe discipline and to endure many and severe trials, and were made perfect only by their sufferings. Divine providence thus turns much of the world's natural and physical evil into moral good.

6. Evil Providentially Over-ruled for Good:

Many of the things that befall the children of God are directly due to the sins of other men. That good men, even the very best of men, suffer many things at the hands of wicked men admits of no question; and yet these ills are among the "all things" which are declared by the apostle to work together for good to them that love God. The good that may ensue to good men from the evil conduct of the wicked is certainly not due to the intrinsic power in sin to work good to those against whom it is maliciously directed; it can only be due to the fact that God overrules it for the good of the innocent. "As for you," said Joseph, "ye meant evil against me; but God meant it for good" (Ge 50:20); "The things which happened unto me," said Paul, "have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel" (Php 1:12). God, though foreknowing the evil that wicked men are planning to work against His children, may not prevent it; and this because He can and will overrule it for His glory and for their good, if they abide faithful. But, suppose a good man is not simply injured, but killed by the wicked, as in the case of the martyrs that died at the stake—does the principle still hold good? It does, we answer; the saint who dies in the discharge of duty and because of is fidelity to duty is not only assured, by all the promises of revelation, of a happy immortality, but he has the rare privilege of serving to advance the kingdom of God by his death as well as by his life. God's kingdom is advanced in manifold ways by the death of good men. Is not "the blood of the martyrs the seed of the church"? But we need here again to remark that it is not material and temporal, but moral and spiritual good, that God has guaranteed to His holy, loving and faithful children. If sin had an intrinsic power to work good, they would be right who maintain that "the end justifies the means, and one may do evil when good will come of it" (compare Ro 3:8); and they also would be right who maintain that God is the Author of evil, seeing that evil is, on that supposition, only disguised good—propositions which are thoroughly vicious and subversive of all that is good in man or God. The Scriptures, rightly interpreted, nowhere lend themselves to such false and misleading ethics (compare Isa 45:7). 7. Interpreting Providence:

To what extent may we, having studied God's providential methods as revealed in the Scriptures, in Nature, in human history, and in personal experience, venture to interpret providence as it applies to current events in our own lives and in the lives of others? Experience and observation will warn us both against haste and against too great confidence in our interpretations of providence. Hasty misinterpretations of providence in its bearing on present passing events frequently become fruitful sources of skepticism for the future. Some people are much given to interpreting providence. Certain ills or misfortunes come to a bad man; they are quick to assert that it is a divine judgment sent upon him in view of his sin. Certain blessings come to a good man; they are sure the blessings are heaven-sent in view of his extraordinary piety. A whiskey merchant's store burns down: it is, say they, a divine judgment, in view of his ill-gotten gains. But presently the property of an unquestionably pious and consecrated man is swept away by the flames: where now is the providence? The "oracles" fail to explain; and so they do in innumerable other cases: as, for example, when two men, a saint and a sinner, are prostrated on beds of sickness. The former, in spite of prayer and piety, continues to grow worse, and perhaps dies; while the other, without piety or prayer, is restored to health. God has not made us interpreters of His providences except for ourselves; and even much of that which we sincerely believe comes to us in a graciously providential manner we can well afford to keep as a sacred secret between

ourselves and our God, seeing that God has not furnished us with any means of absolutely proving that what has happened to us might not have happened, under similar circumstances, even to sinful men. Many a Christian man comes to see that the ill that has happened to him—the loss of property, the terrible spell of sickness, and the like—things that, at the time, he would not interpret as providential—are among the best things that were ever sent upon him, in that they made him holier and more useful (compare Joh 13:7):

"Blind unbelief is sure to err,

And scan His work in vain;

God is His own interpreter

And He will make it plain."

There are, however, many evident truths written large on the pages of history, in the rise, decline and fall of kingdoms and nations, which he who runs may read. And to him who truly believes in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and who will duly consider all the facts and lessons of life, in himself and others, in individuals and in nations, and not for a day merely but patiently as the years come and go, it will be made plain that "God's in His heaven—All's right with the world," and that all things work together for the spiritual good of those who love God and who prove their love for Him by serving their fellow-men.

8. Conclusion:

We conclude, then, that there is, according to the Scriptures, an ever-watchful providence exercised by the heavenly Father over His faithful and loving children, which is ceaselessly working to secure their ever-increasing holiness and usefulness here, an their perfect happiness in a future state of existence. To prepare rational and immortal free agents through holiness and usefulness here for happiness hereafter is the aim and end of this all-embracing providence of God, which includes within its loving care every human being except such as exclude themselves therefrom by their own willful and persistent sinning. And in the accomplishment of this end, what the world counts as the misfortunes and ills of life often contribute far more than what, in the estimation of men, are accounted the greatest earthly blessings. There is no providential highway to a state here that is free from life's ills, and that abounds in temporal and earthly blessings to the good. But there is a royal and holy highway, along which moves a providential pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night, leading the children of the covenant, through lives of loving service and sacrifice, to a holy land of promise, the goal of a gracious providence; and they who journey along this highway bear this seal: "The Lord knoweth them that are his: And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (2Ti 2:19 the King James Version). They who bear this seal are the divinely-chosen instruments and agents of that larger and wider providence that is ever working to establish a perfect kingdom of righteousness in the whole earth, that kingdom of God, to inaugurate which, in its Messianic form, our Lord became incarnate, and to

consummate which, in its final and perfect form, He reigns from heaven and will continue to reign until, having "put all enemies under his feet," He shall "deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father"—when the poet’s vision shall be realized of:

"That God who ever lives and loves;

One God, one law, one element,

And one far-off Divine event,

To which the whole creation moves."

LITERATURE.

James Orr, The Christian View of God and the World; A. B. Bruce, The Providential Order of the World; James McCosh, The Method of Divine Government; James Hinton, The Mystery of Pain; John Telford, Man’s Partnership with Divine Providence; W. N. Clarke, The Christian Doctrine of God, and, An Outline of Christian Theology; W. B. Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology; A. L. Lilley, Adventus Regni; Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament; Wendt, The Teaching of Jesus; George B. Stevens, The Pauline Theology; E. P. Gould, The Biblical Theology of the New Testament; T. Jackson, The Providence of God Viewed in the Light of the Holy Scripture; H. M. Gwatkin, The Knowledge of God; Lux Mundi: Preparation in History for Christ; J. Flavell, Divine Conduct, or the Mystery of Providence; O. D. Watkins, The Divine Providence; Borden P. Bowne, The Immanence of God.

Wilbur F. Tillett

PROVINCE

prov’-ins (medhinah, "jurisdiction"; eparchia (English Versions of the Bible, province) (Ac 23:34; 25:1)):

1. Meaning of the Term

2. Roman Provincial Administration

(1) First Period

(2) Second Period

(3) Third Period

3. Division of Provinces

4. Province of Judea

5. Revenue

LITERATURE

1. Meaning of the Term:

Province (provincia) did not originally denote a territorial circumscription in Roman usage, since the employment of the word was much more ancient than any of the conquests of the Romans outside of Italy. In the most comprehensive official sense it signified a magistrate's sphere of administrative action, which in one instance might be the direction of jurisdiction at Rome, in another the management of military operations against a particular hostile community. When the imperium was conferred upon two consuls at the beginning of the Republic, and upon a praetor in 367 BC, and finally upon a second praetor in 241 BC, it became necessary in practice to define their individual competence which was unlimited in theory. When the Romans extended their control over lands situated outside of Italy, it became expedient to fix territorial limits to the exercise of authority by the magistrates who were regularly sent abroad, so that provincia signified henceforth in an abstract sense the rule of the governor, and in a concrete sense the specified region entrusted to his care; and with the development and consolidation of the Roman system of administration, the geographical meaning of the word became more and more significant.

2. Roman Provincial Administration:

The history of Roman provincial administration in the more definite sense commences in 227 BC, when four praetors were elected for the first time, of whom two were assigned to the government of the provinces. Three periods may be distinguished in the history of the system of provincial administration:

(1) from 227 BC to Sulla,

(2) from Sulla to Augustus, and

(3) the Empire.

(1) First Period.

During the first period, provision was made for the government of the provinces by means of special praetors, or, in exceptional circumstances, by consuls, during their term of office. Accordingly, the number of praetors was increased from four in 227 BC to eight at the time of Sulla.

(2) Second Period.

In accordance with the reforms of Sulla all the consuls and praetors remained at Rome during their year of office, and were entrusted with the administration of provinces a subsequent year with the title proconsul (pro consule) or propraetor (pro praetore). The proconsuls were sent to the more important provinces. The senate determined the distinction between consular and praetorian provinces and generally controlled the assignment of the provinces to the ex-magistrates. Julius Caesar increased the praetors to sixteen, but Augustus reduced them to twelve.

(3) Third Period.

In 27 BC, Augustus as commander-in-chief of the Roman army definitely assumed the administration of all provinces which required the presence of military forces and left the other provinces to the control of the senate. There were then twelve imperial and ten senatorial provinces, but all provinces added after 27 BC came under imperial administration. The emperor administered his provinces through the agency of personal delegates, legati Augusti of senatorial, and praefecti or procuratores of equestrian, rank. The term of their service was not uniform, but continued usually for more than a single year. The senatorial administration was essentially a continuation of the post-Sullan, republican regime. The senatorial governors were called proconsuls generally, whether they were of consular or praetorian rank; but Africa and Asia alone were reserved for exconsuls, the eight remaining senatorial provinces being attributed to ex-praetors. The financial administration of each imperial province was entrusted to a procurator, that of each senatorial province to a quaestor.

3. Division of Provinces:

The provinces were divided into smaller circumscriptions (civitates) for the purposes of local government. In the older provinces these districts corresponded generally with the urban communities which had been the units of sovereignty before the advent of the Romans. Under Roman rule they were divided into different classes on the basis of their dignity and prerogatives, as follows:

(1) Coloniae:

Roman or Latin colonies established after the model of the Italian commonwealths.

(2) Civitates Foederatae:

Communities whose independence had been guaranteed by a formal treaty with Rome.

(3) Civitates Liberae:

Communities whose independence the Romans respected, although not bound to do so by a formal

obligation.

(4) Civitates Stipendiariae:

Communities which had surrendered to the discretion of the Romans and to which limited powers of local government were granted by the conquerors as a matter of convenience.

The civitates stipendiariae, and in some cases the colonies, paid taxes to the Roman government, the greater part of which was in the form either of a certain proportion of the annual products of the soil, such as a fifth or tenth, or a fixed annual payment in money or kind.

4. Province of Judea:

Judaea became a part of the province of Syria in 63 BC, but was assigned in 40 BC as a kingdom to Herod the Great, whose sovereignty became effective three years later. The provincial regime was reestablished in 6 AD, and was broken only during the years 41-44 AD, when Herod Agrippa was granted royal authority over the land (Josephus, Josephus, Antiquities XIX, viii, 2). The Roman administration was in the hands of the procurators (see PROCURATOR) who resided at Caesarea (Josephus, BJ, II, xv, 6; Ac 23:23,33; 25:1) in the palace of Herod the Great (Ac 23:1-35). The procurators of Judea were subject to the authority of the imperial governors of Syria, as is evident from the deposition of Pontius Pilate by Vitellius (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, iv, 2; Tacitus, Annals vi.32). The procurator was competent to exercise criminal jurisdiction over the provincials in cases involving a capital sentence (Josephus, BJ, II, viii, 1), but he was bound to grant an appeal by Roman citizens for trial at Rome (Ac 25:11). A death sentence by the Sanhedrin required the sanction of the procurator, as appears in the process against the Saviour. Under Roman rule cities like Caesarea, Sebaste, and Jerusalem became organs for local government, like the urban communities in other parts of the Empire.

5. Revenue:

The revenue of Palestine under Claudius is said to have been 12,000,000 denarii (about $2,400,000, or 500,000 British pounds (in 1915); compare Josephus, Ant XIX, viii, 2). In addition to the ground tax, the amount of which is not known, a variety of indirect contributions were collected on auctions, salt, highways, bridges, etc., which constituted, no doubt, the field of activity in which the publicans gained their unenviable reputation.

LITERATURE.

The reader may be directed to Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, I, 497-502, 517-57, for a general discussion of the Roman system of provincial administration, and to the same volume, pp. 405-12, for the provincial government of Palestine.

George H. Allen

PROVOCATION; PROVOKE

prov-o-ka’-shun, pro-vok’:"Provoke," literally, "to call forth," hence, to excite or stir up, whether in a good or bad sense, appears frequently in the Old Testament as the translation of Piel, or Hiphil of ka‘ac (noun, ka‘ac), in the sense of "to make angry" (De 4:25; 9:18; 1Ki 14:9,15, etc.); sometimes of marah (Isa 3:8), and of other words. In the New Testament we have parazeloo, "to make jealous" (Ro 10:19; 11:11,14); parorgizo, "to make angry" (Eph 6:4; compare Col 3:21); with parapikraino, "to embitter" (Heb 3:16; compare in RAPC 1Es 6:15), and other Greek words. "Provocation" in Heb 3:8,15 (quoting Ps 95:8) is parapikrasmos, the Septuagint for the Hebrew meribhah. An example of the good sense of the word is in Heb 10:24, "Consider one another to provoke (literally, "to the provoking," here paroxusmos) unto love and good works."

For "provoke" the Revised Version (British and American) has "despise" (Nu 14:11; 31:20), "rebel against" (Ps 78:40); for "provoked," "despised" (Nu 14:23; 16:30; Isa 1:4), "moved" (De 32:16; 1Ch 21:1), "rebelled against" (Ps 78:56), "were rebellious" (106:33,43); for "provoking" (Ps 78:17), "to rebel against"; for "provoked" (2Co 9:2), "stirred up"; "provoked within" for "stirred in" (Ac 17:16); "provoked" for "limited" (Ps 78:41 margin, "limited"); "provoketh" for "emboldeneth" (Job 16:3); instead of "Provoke not your children to anger" (Col 3:21), "Provoke not your children."

W. L. Walker

PRUDENCE; PRUDENT

proo’-dens, proo’-dent: In the Old Testament "prudence" is the translation of ‘ormah (Pr 8:12); also in the King James Version of sekhel (2Ch 2:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "discretion"); and "prudent" is the translation of ‘arum, "subtle" (Pr 12:16,23; 13:16, etc.; compare Ge 3:1; Job 5:12), and of bin (1Sa 16:18, the Revised Version margin "skillful"; Pr 16:21; 18:15; Isa 5:21; 10:13, the American Standard Revised Version "understanding," etc.), with other words. In the New Testament "prudence" occurs once as the translation of phronesis (Eph 1:8); "prudent" is in the King James Version the translation of sunetos, changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "understanding" (Mt 11:25; Ac 13:7); in 1Co 1:19, the American Standard Revised Version has "the discerning," the English Revised Version retains "prudent." In its etymological sense of seeing beforehand (contraction of "providence"), "prudence" does not occur in the New Testament. As forethought, foresight, prudence was reckoned one of the cardinal virtues by the ancient ethical writers. See the remarks of Coleridge on its lower and higher character in his Aids to Reflection, Aphor. 29.

W. L. Walker

PRUNING-HOOK

proon’-ing-hook.

See HOOK, (3); VINE.

PSALMS, BOOK OF

samz, (tehillim, "praises," cepher tehillim, "book of praises"; Psalmoi, Psalterion):

I. INTRODUCTORY TOPICS

1. Title

2. Place in the Canon

3. Number of Psalms

4. Titles in the Hebrew Text

II. AUTHORSHIP AND AGE OF THE PSALMS

1. David as a Psalmist

2. Psalmody after David

III. GROWTH OF THE PSALTER

1. Division into Five Books

2. Smaller Groups of Psalms

IV. POETRY OF THE PSALTER

V. THE SPEAKER IN THE PSALMS

VI. THE GOSPEL IN THE PSALTER

1. The Soul’s Converse with God

2. The Messiah

3. Problem of Sin

4. Wrestling with Doubts

5. Out of the Depths

6. Ethical Ideals

7. Praying against the Wicked

8. The Future Life

LITERATURE

I. Introductory Topics.

1. Title:

The Hebrew title for the Psalter is cepher tehillim, "book of praises." When we consider the fact that more than 20 of these poems have praise for their keynote, and that there are outbursts of thanksgiving in many others, the fitness of the Hebrew title dawns upon us. As Ker well says, "The book begins with benediction, and ends with praise—first, blessing to man, and then glory to God." Hymns of praise, though found in all parts of the Psalter, become far more numerous in Books IV and V, as if the volume of praise would gather itself up into a Hallelujah Chorus at the end. In the Greek version the book is entitled in some manuscripts Psalmoi, in others Psalterion, whence come our English titles "Psalms," and "Psalter." The Greek word psalmos, as well as the Hebrew mizmor, both of which are used in the superscriptions prefixed to many of the separate psalms, indicates a poem sung to the accompaniment of stringed instruments. The title mizmor is found before 57 psalms. The Psalter was the hymnal of the Jewish nation. To individual psalms other titles are sometimes prefixed, such as shir, "song"; tehillah, "praise"; tephillah, "prayer," etc. The Psalter was both prayerbook and hymnal to the Jewish people. It was also a manual for the nurture of the spiritual life in private as well as public worship.

2. Place in the Canon:

The Psalms were placed in the kethubhim or "Writings," the third group of the Hebrew Scriptures. As the chief book of the kethubhim, the Psalter appears first in the great majority of German manuscripts, though the Spanish manuscripts place Psalms after Chronicles, and the Talmud puts Ru before Psalms. There has never been any serious question as to the right of the Psalter to a place in the Canon of Scripture. The book is possibly more highly esteemed among Christians than by the Jews. If Christians were permitted to retain only one book in the Old Testament, they would almost certainly choose Psalms. By 100 BC, and probably at a much earlier date, the Book of Psalms was completed and recognized as part of the Hagiographa, the 3rd division of the Hebrew Bible.

3. Number of Psalms:

According to the Hebrew text, followed by modern VSS, there are 150 separate poems in the Psalter. The Greek version has an additional psalm, in which David describes his victory over Goliath; but this is expressly said to be "outside the number." The Septuagint, followed by Vulgate, combined Psalms 9 and 10, and also 114 and 115, into a single psalm. On the other hand, they divide Psalms 116 and 147 each into two poems. Thus, for the greater part of the Psalter the Hebrew enumeration is one number in advance of that in the Greek and Latin Bibles.

The existing division in the Hebrew text has been called in question at various points. Psalms 42 and 43 are almost certainly one poem (see refrain in 42:5,11; 43:5); and it is probable that Psalms 9 and 10 were originally one, as in Septuagint. On the other hand, it is thought by some that certain psalms were composed of two psalms which were originally separate. We may cite as examples Ps 19:1-6,7-14; 24:1-6,7-10; 27:1-6,7-14; 36:1-4,5-12. It is evident that such combinations of two different poems into one may have taken place, for we have an example in Ps 108, which is composed of portions of two other psalms (57:7-11; 60:5-12).

4. Titles in the Hebrew Text:

(1) Value of the Superscriptions.

It is the fashion among advanced critics to waive the titles of the psalms out of court as wholly worthless and misleading. This method is as thoroughly unscientific as the older procedure of defending the superscriptions as part of an inspired text. These titles are clearly very old, for the Septuagint, in the 2nd century BC, did not understand many of them. The worst that can be said of the superscriptions is that they are guesses of Hebrew editors and scribes of a period long prior to the Greek version. As to many of the musical and liturgical titles, the best learning of Hebrew and Christian scholars is unable to recover the original meaning. The scribes who prefixed the titles had no conceivable reason for writing nonsense into their prayerbook and hymnal. These superscriptions and subscriptions all had a worthy meaning, when they were first placed beside individual psalms. This indisputable fact of the great antiquity of these titles ought forever to make it impossible for scientific research to ignore them. Grant for the sake of argument, that not one of them came from the pen of the writers of the Psalms, but only from editors and compilers of exilic or post-exilic days, it would still be reasonable to give attention to the views of ancient Hebrew scholars, before considering the conjectures of modern critics on questions of authorship and date. Sources of information, both oral and written, to which they had access, have long since perished. In estimating the value of their work, we have a right to use the best critical processes known to us; but it is unscientific to overlook the fact that their proximity to the time of the composition of the Psalms gave them an advantage over the modern scholar. If it be said by objectors that these ancient scribes formed their conclusions by the study of the life of David as portrayed in the historical books of Kings and Chronicles, the reply is ready that several historical notices in the titles cannot be thus explained. Who was Cush? Who was Abimelech? (Psalms 7 and 34). A careful weighing of the facts concerning the superscriptions will make it seem highly improbable that the earliest of these

titles does not reach back into pre-exilic times. We almost certainly have in them the results of the labors of Hebrew scribes and compilers stretching over several centuries. Some of the titles may have been appended by the psalmists themselves.

We are far from claiming that the titles are always intelligible to us, or that, when understood, they are always correct. The process of constructing titles indicative of authorship had not ceased in the 2nd century BC, the Septuagint adding many to psalms that were anonymous in the Hebrew. The view expressed nearly 50 years ago by Perowne is eminently sane: "The inscriptions cannot always be relied on. They are sometimes genuine, and really represent the most ancient tradition. At other times, they are due to the caprice of later editors and collectors, the fruits of conjecture, or of dimmer and more uncertain traditions. In short, the inscriptions of the Psalms are like the subscriptions to the Epistles of the New Testament. They are not of any necessary authority, and their value must be weighed and tested by the usual critical processes."

(2) Thirtle’s Theory.

J. W. Thirtle (The Titles of the Psalms, 1904) advances the hypothesis that both superscriptions and subscriptions were incorporated in the Psalter, and that in the process of copying the Psalms by hand, the distinction between the superscription of a given psalm and the subscription of the one immediately preceding it was finally lost. When at length the different psalms were separated from one another, as in printed editions, the subscriptions and superscriptions were all set forth as superscriptions. Thus it came about that the musical subscription of a given psalm was prefixed to the literary superscription of the psalm immediately following it. The prayer of Habakkuk (Hab 3) was taken by Thirtle as a model or normal psalm; and in this instance the superscription was literary. "A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet, upon Shigionoth," while the subscription is musical, "For the Chief Musician, on my stringed instruments." The poem of Hezekiah in celebration of his recovery (Isa 38:9-20) seems to support Thirtle’s thesis, the superscription stating the authorship and the occasion that gave birth to the psalm, while Isa 38:20 hints at the musical instruments with which the psalm was to be accompanied in public worship. If now the musical notes be separated from the notes of authorship and date that follow them, the musical notes being appended as subscriptions, while the literary notes are kept as real superscriptions, the outcome of the separation is in many instances a more intelligible nexus between title and poem. Thus the subscript to Ps 55, "The dove of the distant terebinths," becomes a pictorial title of 55:6-8 of the psalm. The application of the rule that the expression "for the Chief Musician" is always a subscript removes the difficulty in the title of Ps 88. The superscription of Ps 88, on Thirtle’s hypothesis, becomes "Maschil of Heman the Ezrahite." Ps 87 thus has a subscript that repeats the statement of its superscription, but with an addition which harmonizes with the content of the poem. "Mahalath Leannoth," with a slight correction in vocalization, probably means "Dancings with Shoutings," and 87:7 speaks of both singing and dancing. The tone of Ps 87 is exceedingly cheerful; but Ps 88 is the saddest in the entire Psalter. The application of Thirtle’s hypothesis also leaves Ps 88 with a consistent literary title, whereas the usual title ascribes the psalm first to the sons of Korah and then to Heman the Ezrahite.

(3) Meaning of the Hebrew Titles.

Scholars have not been able to come to agreement as to the meaning and application of a goodly number of words and phrases found in the titles of the Psalms. We append an alphabetical list, together with hints as to the probable meaning:

(a) ‘Ayeleth ha-Shachar (Ps 22) means "the hind of the morning," or possibly "the help of the morning." Many think that the words were the opening line of some familiar song.

(b) ‘Alamoth (Ps 46) means "maidens." The common view is that the psalm was to be sung by soprano voices. Some speak of a female choir and compare 1Ch 15:20; Ps 68:11,24 f. According to Thirtle, the title is a subscript to Ps 45, which describes the marriage of a princess, a function at which it would be quite appropriate to have a female choir.

(c) ‘Al-tashcheth (Psalms 57-59; 75) means "destroy not;" and is quite suitable as a subscript to Psalms 56-58 and 74 (compare De 9:26). Many think this the first word of a vintage song (compare Isa 65:8).

(d) Ascents, So of" (Psalms 120-184): the Revised Version (British and American) translates the title to 15 psalms "A So of Ascents," where the King James Version has "A So of Degrees." The most probable explanation of the meaning of the expression is that these 15 psalms were sung by bands of pilgrims on their way to the yearly feasts in Jerusalem (Ps 122:4). Psalms 121-123; 125; 127; 128 and 132-134 are well suited for use on such occasions (see, however, Expository Times, XII, 62).

(e) "For the Chief Musician": 55 psalms are dedicated to the precentor or choir leader of the temple. "To the Chief Musician" might mean that the precentor was the author of certain psalms, or that there was a collection of hymns compiled by him for use in temple worship, or that certain psalms were placed in his hands, with suggestions as to the character of the poems and the music which was to accompany them. It is quite likely that there was an official collection of psalms for public worship in the custody of the choir master of the temple.

(f) "Dedication of the House" (Ps 30): The title probably refers to the dedication of Yahweh’s house; whether in the days of David, in connection with the removal of the ark to Jerusalem, or in the days of Zerubbabel, or in the time of Judas Maccabeus, it is impossible to say positively. If Ps 39 was used on any one of these widely separated occasions, that fact might account for the insertion of the caption, "a So at the Dedication of the House."

(g) "Degrees": see "Ascents" above.

(h) Gittith (Psalms 8; 81; 84) is commonly supposed to refer to an instrument invented in Gath or to a tune that was used in the Philistine city. Thirtle emends slightly to gittoth, "wine presses," and connects Psalms 7; 80 and 83 with the Feast of Tabernacles.

(i) Higgayon: This word is not strictly a title, but occurs in connection with Celah in Ps 9:16. the

Revised Version (British and American) translates the word in Ps 92:3, "a solemn sound," and in Ps 19:14, "meditation." It is probably a musical note equivalent to largo.

(j) Yedhuthun: In the title of Ps 39, Jeduthun might well be identical with the Chief Musician. In Psalms 62 and 77 the Revised Version (British and American) renders "after the manner of Jeduthun." We know from 1Ch 16:41; 25:3 that JEDUTHUN (which see) was a choir leader in the days of David. He perhaps introduced a method of conducting the service of song which ever afterward was associated with his name. (k) Yonath ‘elem rechoqim (Ps 56): We have already called attention to the fact that as a subscript to Ps 55 "the dove of the distant terebinths," or "the silent dove of them that are afar off," would have a point of contact with Ps 55:6-8.

(l) Machalath (Ps 53), Machalath le‘annoth (Ps 88): Perhaps Thirtle’s vocalization of the Hebrew consonants as mecholoth, "dancings," is correct. As a subscript to Ps 87; mecholoth may refer to David’s joy at the bringing of the ark to Zion (2Sa 6:14,15).

(m) Maskil (Psalms 32; 42-45; 52-55; 74; 78; 88; 89; 142): The exact meaning of this common term is not clear. Briggs suggests "a meditation," Thirtle and others "a psalm of instruction," Kirkpatrick "a cunning psalm." Some of the 13 psalms bearing this title are plainly didactic, while others are scarcely to be classed as psalms of instruction.

(n) Mikhtam (Psalms 16; 56-60): Following the rabbinical guess, some translate "a golden poem." The exact meaning is unknown.

(o) Muth labben: The title is generally supposed to refer to a composition entitled "Death of the Son." Possibly the melody to which this composition was sung was the tune to which Ps 9 (or 8) was to be sung. Thirtle translates "The Death of the Champion," and regards it as a subscription to Ps 8, in celebration of the victory over Goliath.

(p) On "Neghinoth"occurs 6 times (Psalms 4; 6; 54; 55; 67; 76), and means "with stringed instruments." Neghinath (Ps 61) may be a slightly defective writing for Neghinoth. Perhaps stringed instruments alone were used with psalms having this title. According to Thirtle’s hypothesis, the title was originally a subscript to Psalms 3; 5; 53; 54; 60; 66; 75.

(q) Nechiloth (Ps 5), possibly a subscript to Ps 4, is supposed by some to refer to "wind instruments," possibly flutes.

(r) Celah, though not strictly a title, may well be discussed in connection with the superscriptions. It occurs 71 times in the Psalms and 3 times in Habakkuk. It is almost certainly technical term whose meaning was well known to the precentor and the choir in the temple. The Septuagint always, Symmachus and Theodotion generally, render diapsalma, which probably denotes an instrumental interlude. The Targum Aquila and some other ancient versions render "forever." Jerome, following Aquila, translates it "always." Many moderns derive Celah from a root meaning "to raise," and suppose

it to be a sign to the musicians to strike up with a louder accompaniment. Possibly the singing ceased for a moment. A few think it is a liturgical direction to the congregation to "lift up" their voices in benediction. It is unwise to dogmatize as to the meaning of this very common word.

See SELAH.

(s) Sheminith (Psalms 6; 12), meaning "the eighth," probably denotes the male choir, as distinguished from ‘Alamoth, the maidens’ choir. That both terms are musical notes is evident from 1Ch 15:19-21.

(t) Shiggayon (Ps 7) is probably a musical note. Some think it denotes "a dithyrambic poem in wild ecstatic wandering rhythms, with corresponding music."

(u) Shoshannim (Psalms 45; 69) means "lilies." Shoshannim ‘edhuth (Ps 80) means "lilies, a testimony." Shushah ‘edhuth (Ps 60) may be rendered "the lily of testimony." Thirtle represents these titles as subscripts to Psalms 44; 59; 68; 79, and associates them with the spring festival, Passover. Others regard them as indicating the melody to which the various psalms were to be sung.

(v) "So of Loves" (Ps 45) is appropriate as a literary title to a marriage song.

(4) Testimony of the Titles as to Authorship.

(a) Ps 90 is ascribed to Moses.

(b) To David 73 psalms are ascribed, chiefly in Books I and II.

(c) Two are assigned to Solomon (Psalms 72; 127).

(d) 12 are ascribed to Asaph (Psalms 50; 73-83).

(e) 11 are assigned to the sons of Korah (Psalms 42-49; 84; 85; 87).

(f) Ps 88 is attributed to Heman the Ezrahite.

(g) Ps 89 bears the name of Ethan the Ezrahire.

In most cases it is plain that the editors meant to indicate the authors or writers of the psalms. It is possible that the phrase "to David" may sometimes have been prefixed to certain psalms, merely to indicate that they were found in a collection which contained Davidic psalms. It is also possible that the titles "to Asaph" and’ "to the sons of Korah" may have originally meant that the psalms thus designated belonged to a collection in the custody of these temple singers. Ps 72 may also be a prayer for Solomon rather than a psalm BY Solomon. At the same time, we must acknowledge, in the light of the titles

describing the occasion of composition, that the most natural interpretation of the various superscriptions is that they indicate the supposed authors of the various poems to which they are prefixed. Internal evidence shows conclusively that some of these titles are incorrect. Each superscription should be tested by a careful study of the psalm to which it is appended.

(5) Titles Describing the Occasion of Writing.

There are 13 of these, all bearing the name of David. (a) Psalms 7; 59; 56; 34; 52; 57; 142; 54 are assigned to the period of his persecution by Saul. (b) During the period of his reign over. all Israel, David is credited with Psalms 18; 60; 51; 3; and 63.

II. Authorship and Age of the Psalms.

Ps 90 is ascribed to Moses. It is the fashion now to deny that Moses wrote anything. A careful study of Ps 90 has brought to light nothing inconsistent with Mosaic authorship. The dignity, majesty and pathos of the poem are worthy of the great lawgiver and intercessor.

1. David as a Psalmist:

(1) The Age of David Offered Fruitful Soil for the Growth of Religious Poetry.

(a) The political and religious reforms of Samuel created a new sense of national unity, and kindled the fires of religious patriotism. (b) Music had a large place in the life of the prophetic guilds or schools of the prophets, and was used in public religious exercises (1Sa 10:5 f). (c) The victories of David and the internal expansion of the life of Israel would inevitably stimulate the poetic instinct of men of genius; compare the Elizabethan age and the Victorian era in English literature. (d) The removal of the ark to the new capital and the organization of the Levitical choirs would stimulate poets to compose hymns of praise to Yahweh (2Sa 6; 1Ch 15; 16; 25).

It is the fashion in certain critical circles to blot out the Mosaic era as unhistoric, all accounts of it being considered legendary or mythical. It is easy then to insist on the elimination of all the higher religious teaching attributed to Samuel. This leaves David "a rude king in a semi-barbaric age," or, as Cheyne puts it, "the versatile condottiere, chieftain, and king." It would seem more reasonable to accept as trustworthy the uniform tradition of Israel as to the great leaders, Moses, Samuel and David, than to rewrite Israel’s history out of the tiny fragments of historical material that are accepted by skeptical critics as credible. It is often said that late writers read into their accounts of early heroes their own ideas of what would be fitting. James Robertson’s remark in reply has great weight: "This habit of explaining the early as the backward projection of the late is always liable to the objection that it leaves the late itself without explanation" (Poetry and Religion of the Psalms, 332).

(2) David’s Qualifications for Composing Psalms

(a) He was a skillful musician, with a sense of rhythm and an ear for pleasing sounds (1Sa 16:15-23). He seems to have invented new instruments of music (Am 6:5). (b) He is recognized by critics of all schools as a poet of no mean ability. The genuineness of his elegy over Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:19-27) is commonly accepted; also his lament over Abner (2Sa 3:33 f). In the elegy over Saul and Jonathan, David displays a magnanimity and tenderness that accord with the representations of S as to his treatment of Saul and of Jonathan. No mere rough border chieftain could have composed a poem full of the tenderest sentiment and the most exemplary attitude toward a persecutor. The moral elevation of the elegy has to be accounted for. If the author was a deeply religious man, a man enjoying the friendship of God, it is easy to account for the moral dignity of the poem. Surely it is only a step from the patriotism and magnanimity and devoted friendship of the elegy to the religious fervor of the Psalms. Moreover, the poetic skill displayed in the elegy removes the possible objection that literary art in the days of David had not attained a development equal to the composition of poems such as the Psalms. There is nothing more beautiful and artistic in the entire Psalter.

Radical critics saw the David of the Bible asunder. They contrast the rough border chieftain with the pious Psalmist. Though willing to believe every statement that reflects upon the moral character of David, they consider the references to David as a writer of hymns and the organizer of the temple choirs as the pious imaginings of late chroniclers. Robertson well says: "This habit of refusing to admit complexity in the capacities of Biblical characters is exceedingly hazardous and unsafe, when history is so full of instances of the combination in one person of qualities the most diverse. We not only have poets who can harp upon more than one string, but we have religious leaders who have united the most fervent piety with the exercise of poorly developed virtue, or the practice of very questionable policy. A critic, if he has not a single measure of large enough capacity for a historical character, should not think himself at liberty to measure him out in two halfbushels, making one man of each" (Poetry and Religion of the Psalms, 332). Among kings, Charlemagne and Constantine the Great have been likened to David; and among poets, Robert Burns. There were contradictory elements in the moral characters of all these gifted men. Of Constantine it has been said that he "was by turns the docile believer and the cruel despot, devotee and murderer, patron saint and avenging demon." David was a many-sided man, with a character often at war with itself, a man with conflicting impulses, the flesh lusting against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh. Men of flesh and blood in the midst of life’s temptations have no difficulty in understanding the David of the Bible.

(c) David was a man of deep feeling and of imperial imagination. Think of his love for Jonathan, his grateful appreciation of every exploit done in his behalf by his mighty men, his fondness for Absalom. His successful generalship would argue for imagination, as well as the vivid imagery of the elegy. (d) David was an enthusiastic worshipper of Yahweh. All the records of his life agree in representing him as devoted to Israel’s God. In the midst of life’s dangers and disappointments, "David strengthened himself in Yahweh his God" (1Sa 30:6). We should have been surprised had no trace of religious poetry come from his pen. It would be difficult to imagine Milton or Cowper or Tennyson as confining himself to secular poetry. "Comus," "John Gilpin," and the "Charge of the Light Brigade" did not exhaust their genius; nor did the elegy over Saul and Jonathan and the lament over Abner relieve David’s soul of the poetry that clamored for expression. The known facts of his life and times prepare us for an outburst of psalmody under his leadership. (e) The varied experiences through which David passed were of a

character to quicken any latent gifts for poetic expression.

James Robertson states this argument clearly, and yet with becoming caution: "The vicissitudes and situations in David's life presented in these narratives are of such a nature that, though we may not be able to say precisely that such and such a psalm was composed at such and such a time and place, yet we may confidently say, Here is a man who has passed through certain experiences and borne himself in such wise that we are not surprised to hear that, being a poet, he composed this and the other psalms. It is very doubtful whether we should tie down any lyric to a precise set of circumstances, the poet being like a painter who having found a fit landscape, sits down to transfer it to canvas. I do not think it likely that David, finding himself in some great perplexity or sorrow, called for writing materials in order to describe the situation or record his feelings. But I do think it probable that the vicissitudes through which he passed made such an impression on his sensitive heart, and became so inculcated withn an emotional nature, that when he soothed himself in his retirement with his lyre, they came forth spontaneously in the form of a psalm or song or prayer, according as the recollection was sad or joyful, and as his singing mood moved him" (Poetry and Religion of the Psalms, 343 f).

The Biblical writers, both early and late, agree in affirming that the Spirit of Yahweh rested upon David, empowering him for service of the highest order (1Sa 16:13; 2Sa 23:1-3; Mt 22:43; Ac 2:29-31). The gift of prophetic inspiration was bestowed upon Israel's chief musician and poet.

(3) External Evidence for Davidic Psalms

(a) In the New Testament David is named as the author of certain psalms. Thus Ps 110 is ascribed to David by Jesus in His debate with the Pharisees in the Temple (Mt 22:41-45; Mr 12:35-37; Lu 20:41-44). Peter teaches that David prophesied concerning Judas (Ac 1:16), and he also refers Psalms 16 and 110 to David (Ac 2:25-34). The whole company of the disciples in prayer attribute Ps 2 to David (Ac 4:25 f). Paul quotes Psalms 32 and 69 as Davidic (Ro 4:6-8; 11:9 f). The author of He even refers Ps 95 to David, following the Septuagint (Heb 4:7). From the last-named passage many scholars infer that any quotation from the Psalms might be referred to David as the chief author of the Psalms. Possibly this free and easy method of citation, without any attempt at rigorous critical accuracy, was in vogue in the 1st century AD. At the same time, it is evident that the view that David was the chief author of the Psalms was accepted by the New Testament writers.

(b) In 2 Macc 2:13 (the Revised Version), in a letter purporting to have been written by the Jews of Palestine to their brethren in Egypt, about 144 BC, occurs the following: "And the same things were related both in the public archives and in the records that concern Nehemiah; and how he, rounding a library, gathered together the books about the kings and prophets, and the books of David, and letters of kings about sacred gifts." We do not know the exact date of 2 Maccabees, but it was almost certainly in the 1st century BC. The author regards David as the author of books in the sacred library gathered together by Nehemiah.

(c) Jesus the Son of Sirach, who wrote not later than 180 BC, and possibly a good deal earlier, thus

describes David's contribution to public worship: "In every work of his he gave thanks to the Holy One Most High with words of glory; with his whole heart he sang praise, and loved him that made him" (Ecclesiasticus 47:8 f the Revised Version (British and American)). David's fame as a psalmist and the organizer of choirs for the sanctuary was well known to Ben Sira at the beginning of the 2nd century BC.

(d) The author of Chronicles, writing not later than 300 BC, and probably much earlier, represents David as making provision for a service of song before the ark of God and in connection with its removal to the city of David (1Ch 15; 16). It seems to be imagined by some scholars that the Chronicler, whose historical accuracy is severely attacked by certain critics, is responsible for the idea that David was a great writer of hymns. On the contrary, he has less to say about David as a poet and psalmist than the author of Samuel. Only in 2Ch 29:30 is there explicit mention of David as the author of praises to Yahweh. The Chronicler speaks repeatedly of the instruments of David and of his organization of the choirs. And so in the kindred books of Ezra and Nehemiah there is mention of the style of worship introduced by David (Ezr 3:10; Ne 12:24,36). The author of the Book of Kings refers repeatedly to David as a model king (1Ki 11:4; 2Ki 14:3; 20:5 f, etc.). He becomes a witness for the high reputation of David for uprightness and religious zeal.

(e) Amos refers incidentally to David's great skill as an inventor of musical instruments (Am 6:5). The same prophet is a witness to the fact that songs were sung in worship at Bethel to the accompaniment of harps or viols (Am 5:23).

(f) The earliest witness, or witnesses, if the narrative be composite, we find in 1 and 2 Samuel. David is described as a wonderful musician and as one on whom the Spirit of Yahweh rested mightily (1Sa 16:13-23). He is credited with the beautiful elegy oyer Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:17-27) and the brief lament over Abner (2Sa 3:33 f) . He is said to have danced with joy before the ark, and to have brought it up to Jerusalem with shouting and with sound of trumpet (2Sa 6:12). He is credited with the pious wish that he might build a temple for Yahweh and the ark, and is said to have poured forth a prayer of thanksgiving to Yahweh for the promise of a perpetual throne (2Sa 7). David dedicated to Yahweh much wealth taken from his enemies. (2Sa 8:11). Both the good and the bad in David's life and character are faithfully set forth in the vivid narrative.

We come next to two statements that would settle the question of David's psalms, if critics would only accept them as the work of an author living within a generation or so of the time of David. Unfortunately 2Sa 21-24 is regarded by most critical scholars as an appendix to the early narrative of David's career. There is no agreement as to the exact date of the composition of these chapters. Naturally the burden of proof is on the critic who tries to disintegrate a document, and suspicion of bias is inevitable, if by the disintegration he is able to escape the force of a disagreeable argument. Happily, we live in a free country, every man having a right to hold and to express his own opinion, for whatever it may be worth. It seems to the present writer that 2Sa 21-24 may well have come from the pen of the early narrator who told the story of David's reign in such a masterly fashion. Even if these chapters were added by a later editor as an appendix, there is no sufficient reason for putting this writer so late as the exile. His statements cannot be set aside as unreliable, simply because they run counter to the current theory as to

the date of the Psalms. 2Sa 22 purports to give the words of a song which David spake to Yahweh, when he had been delivered from Saul and from all his enemies. Ps 18 is evidently a different recension of the same poem. The differences between 2Sa 22 and Ps 18 are not much greater than the differences in the various odd of "Rock of Ages." Only the most advanced critics deny that David wrote this glorious song. 2Sa 23:1-7 must not be omitted, for here David claimed prophetic inspiration as the sweet Psalmist of Israel. This original and striking poem is worthy of the brilliant royal bard. (g) The titles of the Psalms are external evidence of real value for determining the date and authorship of the Psalms; and these ascribe 73 to David. A sweeping denial of all the forms of external evidence for Davidic psalms ought to be buttressed by convincing arguments from internal evidence. Unverified conjectures will not answer.

(4) Internal Evidence for Davidic Psalms

The fact that many of the psalms ascribed to David correspond in tone and temper and in historical allusions with incidents in his life, while not in itself convincing proof that David wrote them, certainly re-enforces the external evidence in favor of Davidic psalms. We must refer the reader to the commentaries of Delitzsch, Kirkpatrick, Perowne and others for the evidence discovered in individual psalms. In many psalms the evidence is strongly in favor of the superscriptions, in which David is named as the writer. See especially Psalms 18; 23; 32; 3.

(5) Number of Davidic Psalms

Opinion varies among conservative scholars all the way from 3 or 4 to 44 or 45. It has come to pass that a critic who acknowledges even Ps 18 to be David’s is called conservative. In fact, the more radical critics regard a scholar as conservative if he assigns even a small group of psalms to the period before the exile. We must not allow ourselves to be deterred from ascribing to David any psalm that seems to us, on the basis of both external and internal evidence, to come from his pen. Delitzsch and Kirkpatrick are safer guides than Cheyne and Duhm. Maclaren also has made a close and sympathetic study of David’s life and character, and accepts the results of sane criticism. W. T. Davison (HDB, IV) speaks out clearly and strongly for Davidic authorship of Psalms 7; 11; 17; 18; 19 (first half), 24 and a few other psalms or parts of psalms, though he makes large concessions to the present tendency to bring the psalms down to a later date. He stands firmly for a large body of pre-exilic psalms. Ewald assigned to David Psalms 3; 4; 7; 8; 11; 18; 19; 24; 29; 32; 101; also 60:8-11 and 68:14-19. Hitzig ascribed to David Psalms 3-19, with the exception of Ps 5; 6 and 14. If one follows the titles in the Hebrew text, except where internal evidence clearly contradicts the superscriptions, it will be easy, to follow Delitzsch in attributing 44 or 45 psalms to David.

2. Psalmody after David:

(1) Psalms of Asaph (Psalms 73-83, also 50).

The prophetic spirit throbs in most of the psalms ascribed to ASAPH (which see). God is pictured as a righteous Judge. He is also pictured as the Shepherd of Israel. Ps 73 holds fast to God’s righteous rule of

mankind, in spite of the prosperity of the wicked. Ps 50, which is assigned by many to the time of Hosea and Isaiah, because of its powerful prophetic message, may well have come from Asaph, the contemporary of David and of Nathan. Some of the Asaph group, notably 74 and 79, belong to the period of the exile or later. The family of Asaph continued for centuries to lead in the service of song (2Ch 35:15; Ne 7:44). Inspired poets were raised up from age to age in the Asaph guild.

(2) Psalms of the Sons of Korah (Psalms 42-49; 84; 85; 87).

This family of singers was prominent in the temple-worship in the days of David and afterward. Several of the most beautiful poems in the Psalter are ascribed to members of this guild (see Psalms 42; 43; 45; 46; 49; 84). We are not to think of these poems as having been composed by a committee of the sons of Korah; no doubt each poem had an individual author, who was willing to sink his personality in the psalm that he was composing. The privileges and blessings of social worship in the sanctuary are greatly magnified in this group of psalms

(3) Psalms of Solomon (Psalms 72; 127).

Even conservative critics are in doubt as to the Solomonic authorship of the two psalms ascribed to him by the titles. Perhaps assurance is not attainable in the present state of inquiry. Delitzsch well says: "Under Solomon psalmody already began to decline; all the productions of the mind of that period bear the stamp of thoughtful contemplation rather than of direct feeling, for restless yearning for higher things had given place to sensuous enjoyment, national concentration to cosmopolitan expansion."

(4) The Era of Jehoshaphat.

Delitzsch and others regard the period of Jehoshaphat as one of literary productivity. Possibly Psalms 75 and 76 celebrate the deliverance from the great eastern invasion toward the close of Jehoshaphat’s reign.

(5) The Era of Hezekiah.

The latter half of the 8th century BC was one of literary vigor and expansion, especially in Judah. Perhaps the great deliverance from Sennacherib’s invasion is celebrated in Psalms 46 and 48.

(6) The Period of Jeremiah.

Ehrt and some other scholars are inclined to attribute to Jeremiah a considerable number of psalms. Among those which have been assigned to this prophet may be named Psalms 31; 35; 38; 40; 55; 69; 71. Those who deny the Davidic authorship of Ps 22 also assign this great poem to Jeremiah. Whether we are able to name definitely any psalms of Jeremiah, it seems thoroughly reasonable that he should have been the author of certain of the plaintive poems in the Psalter.

(7) During the Exile.

Ps 102 seems to have been composed during the exile. The poet pours out his complaint over the present distress, and reminds Yahweh that it is time to have pity upon Zion. Ps 137 pictures the distress of the captives by the rivers of Babylon. The fire and fervor of the poem bespeak an author personally involved in the distress. No doubt other psalms in our collection were composed during the captivity in Babylon.
(8) Post-exilic Psalms

As specimens of the joyous hymns composed after the return from exile, we may name Psalms 85 and 126. Many of the liturgical hymns in the Psalter were no doubt prepared for use in the worship of the second temple. Certain recent critics have extended this class of hymns so as to include the greater part of the Psalter, but that is surely an extreme view. No doubt, the stirring times of Ezra and Nehemiah stimulated poets in Jerusalem to pour forth thanksgiving and praise to Israel's God. Ewald taught, that the latest psalms in our collection were composed at this time.

(9) Are There Maccabean Psalms?

Calvin, assigned Psalms 44; 74 and 79 to the Maccabean period. If there are Maccabean psalms, Calvin has perhaps hit upon three of them. Hitzig assigns to the Maccabean period all the psalms from 73 to 150, together with a few psalms in the earlier half of the Psalter. Among moderns, Duhm puts practically the whole Psalter in the period from 170 to 70 BC. Gesenius, Ewald, Hupfeld and Dillmann, four of the greatest names in Old Testament criticism, oppose the view that the Psalter contains Maccabean psalms. Most recent students admit the possibility of Maccabean psalms. The question may well be left open for further investigation. III. Growth of the Psalter.

1. Division into Five Books:

In the Hebrew text as well as in the Revised Version (British and American), the Psalms are grouped into five books, as follows: Book I, Psalms 1-41; Book II, Psalms 42-72; Book III, Psalms 73-89; Book IV, Psalms 90-106; Book V, Psalms 107-150. It is possible that this division into five books may have been already made before the Chronicler composed his history of Judah (compare 1Ch 16:36 with Ps 106:48). At the end of Book II appears a subscript which is significant in the history of the Psalter. It is said in Ps 72:20: "The prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended." It would seem from this note that the editor who appended it meant to say that in his collection he had included all the psalms of David known to him. Singularly enough, the subscript is attached to a psalm ascribed to Solomon. Psalms 51-70, however, lie near at hand, all of which are attributed to David. Ps 71 is anonymous, and Ps 72 might possibly be considered a prayer for Solomon. There is a further difficulty in the fact that the Second Book of Psalms opens with nine poems ascribed to the sons of Korah and to Asaph. It is a very natural conjecture that these nine psalms were at one time united with Psalms 73-83. With these removed, it would be possible to unite Psalms 51-70 with Book I. Then the subscript to Ps 72 would be a fitting close to a roll made up of psalms ascribed to David. It is impossible at this late date to trace fully and accurately the history of the formation of the Psalter.

2. Smaller Groups of Psalms:

Within the Psalter there lie certain groups of psalms which have in a measure retained the form in which they probably once circulated separately. Among these groups may be named the Psalms of Ascents (Psalms 120-134), the Asaph group (Psalms 73-83), the sons of Korah groups (Psalms 42-49; 84-87, except 86), a Mikhtam group (Psalms 56-60), a group praising Yahweh for His character and deeds (Psalms 93-100), to which Psalms 90-92 form a fitting introduction. Psalms 103-107 constitute another group of praise psalms, and Psalms 145-150 make a closing Hallelujah group.

The Psalter has had a long and varied history. No doubt the precentor of the temple choir had his own collection of hymns for public worship. Small groups of psalms may have been issued also for private use in the home. As time went on, collections were made on different organizing principles. Sometimes hymns attributed to a given author were perhaps brought into a single group. Possibly psalms of a certain type, such as Maskil and Mikhtam psalms, were gathered together in small collections. How these small groups were partly preserved and partly broken up, in the history of the formation of our present Psalter, will, perhaps, never be known.

IV. Poetry of the Psalter.

For general discussion of the form of Hebrew poetry, see POETRY. In the Psalms almost all known varieties of poetic parallelism are exemplified. Among moderns, C.A. Briggs has made extensive research into the poetical structure of the Psalms. In summing up the result of his study of the various measures employed in the Psalms, he classes 89 psalms or parts of psalms as trimeters, that is, the lines have three main accents; 22 psalms or parts he regards as tetrameters, each of the lines having four accented syllables; 25 psalms or portions are classed as pentameters, and an equal number as hexameters. He recognizes some variety of measure in certain psalms. There is coming to be agreement among Hebrew scholars that the rhythm of Hebrew poetry is largely determined by the number of accented syllables to the line. Some critics insist rigorously on perfect regularity, and therefore are compelled to resort to conjectural emendation.

See POETRY, HEBREW.

Nine psalms are known as alphabetical poems, namely, Psalms 9; 10; 25; 34; 37; 111; 112; 119; 145. The most elaborate of these is Ps 119, which is divided into 22 sections of 8 verses each. Each letter of the Hebrew alphabet occurs 8 times in succession as the initial letter of the verses in its section.

As to strophical structure or stanza formation, there is evidence in certain psalms of such organization of the poems. The refrains with which strophes often close form an easy guide to the strophical divisions in certain psalms, such as Psalms 42; 43; 46; 107. Among English commentators, Briggs pays most attention to strophical structure. There is some evidence of antiphonal singing in connection with the Psalter. It is thought by some that Psalms 20 and 21 were sung by responsive choirs. Psalms 24 and 118 may each be antiphonal.

V. The Speaker in the Psalms.

Smend, in ZATW, 1888, undertook to establish thesis that the speaker in the Psalms is not an individual, but a personification of the Jewish nation or church. At first he was inclined to recognize an individual speaker in Psalms 3; 4; 62 and 73, but one year later he interpreted these also as collective. Thus, at one stroke individual religious experience is wiped out of the Psalter, A few scholars have accepted Smend's thesis; but the great majority of critics of every school have withheld their assent, and some of the best commentators have shown that theory is wholly untenable.

Perhaps the best monograph on the subject, for the German student, is one by Emil Balla, Das Ich der Psalmen. Balla's thesis is that the "I" psalms, both in the Psalter and in the other books of the Old Testament, are always to be understood as individual, with the exception of those in which from plain data in the text another interpretation of the "I" is necessary. Of 100 psalms in which "I" occurs, Balla classes 80 as easy to interpret; in the remaining 20 there might be reasonable room for difference of opinion whether the psalm was individual or collective.

Personification is largely used in all parts of the Old Testament. There is no room for doubt that Ps 129, though using "I," "my" and "me," is the language of Israel as a people. The same is true of Ps 124. The author of Ps 126 likewise associates himself with his brethren. The author of Ps 122, however, is evidently speaking for himself individually, when he says in 122:8, "For my brethren and companions' sakes, I will now say, Peace be within thee." The intelligent reader usually has no difficulty in deciding, after a careful reading of a psalm, whether the "I" refers to an individual Israelite or to the congregation of Israel. Sane views on this subject are important, inasmuch as Smend's theory does violence to the strength and power of the individual religious experience of Old Testament believers. In many portions of the Old Testament, national duties are urged, and Israel is addressed as a whole. At the same time, it would be easy to exaggerate the relatively small place that individual religion occupies in the prophetic writings and in the Law. The Psalter absolutely refuses to be shut up in the molds of a rigid nationalism.

VI. The Gospel in the Psalms

Christians love the Psalter as much as the ancient Jew could possibly have done. On every page they discover elements of religious life and experience that are thoroughly Christian. In this respect the earlier dispensation came nearer to the perfection of Christian standards than in political and social organization. Along with the New Testament, the aged Christian saint desires a copy of the Psalms. He passes easily from the Gospels to the Psalter and back again without the sense of shifting from one spiritual level to another. Religious experience was enjoyed and was portrayed by the ancient psalmists so well that no Christian book in the apostolic period was composed to displace the Psalter.

1. The Soul's Converse with God:

(1) The Psalmists Are Always Reverent in Their Approach to Deity.

Yahweh is infinitely holy (Ps 99:3,5,9). Psalms 95-100 are models of adoration and worship.

(2) Thirsting for God.

Psalms 42 and 43, which were originally one psalm, voice the longing of the individual soul for God as no other human composition has been able to express it. Ps 63 is a worthy companion psalm of yearning after God.

(3) Praising God.

More than 20 psalms have for their keynote praise to God. See especially Ps 8:1,9; 57:7-11; 71:22-24; 95:1-7. The first three verses of Psalms 33; 34; 40; 92 and 105 reveal a rich vocabulary of praise for stammering human lips.

(4) Joy in God’s house.

Psalms 84 and 122 are classic hymns expressive of joy in public worship in the sanctuary. Religious patriotism has never received a more striking expression than is found in Ps 137:5 f.

(5) Practicing the Presence of God.

In Psalms 91 and 23 the worshipping saint delights his soul with the sense of God’s protecting presence. The Shepherd, tender and true, is ever present to shield and to comfort. The shadow of the Almighty is over the saint who dwells in the secret place of the Most High.

(6) God in Nature.

The Psalmist did not go "through Nature up to Nature’s God"; for he found God immanent in all things. He heard God’s voice in the thunder; felt His breath in the twilight breeze; saw the gleam of His sword in the lightning’s flash, and recognized His hand in every provision for the wants of man and the lower animals. See Ps 104, "Hymn of Creation"; Ps 29, "Yahweh, the God of the storm"; and the first half of Ps 19, "the heavens are telling."

(7) Love for God’s word.

Ps 119 is the classic description of the beauty and power and helpfulness of the Word of God. The second half of Ps 19 is also a gem. Ps 119 was happily named by one of the older commentators "a holy alphabet for Zion’s scholars." The Psalmist sings the glories of God’s Word as a lamp to guide, as a spring of comfort, and as a fountain of hope.

(8) God’s Care of All Things.

Faith in Divine Providence—both general and special—was a cardinal doctrine with the psalmists; yea more, the very heart of their religion. Ps 65 sings of God's goodness in sunshine and shower, which clothes the meadows with waving grain. The river of God is always full of water. Ps 121, "Yahweh thy Keeper," was read by David Livingstone at family worship on the morning when he left home to go out to Africa as a missionary.

(9) God Our Refuge.

The psalmists were fond of the figure of "taking refuge in God." Yahweh was to them a rock of refuge, a stronghold, a high tower, an impregnable fortress. Psalms 46; 61 and 62 exalt God as the refuge of His saints. His help is always easy to find. The might and wisdom of God do not overwhelm the inspired singers, but become a theme of devout and joyous contemplation.

Our Lord Jesus found in the Psalms prophecies concerning Himself (Lu 24:44-47).

2. The Messiah:

(1) The Suffering Saviour.

While hanging on the cross, the mind of our Lord turned to the Psalter. He voiced the terrible anguish of His soul in the opening words of Ps 22, and breathed out His spirit at the end with the trustful words of Ps 31:5. He also invited the fulfillment of a Messianic prediction in Ps 69:21 by saying, "I thirst." Isa and the Psalms did not fail Him in the hour of His shame, when reproach broke His heart, and there was none to comfort Him. Only Isa 52:13-53:12 surpasses Ps 22 as a picture of Calvary and an interpretation of the significance of the cross. Whether Ps 22 is a direct prophecy of Christ, or only a typically Messianic psalm, is in dispute. Every sentence can be applied to Jesus without straining its meaning. If David or some other sufferer took up his harp to sing of his own sorrows, the Spirit of God guided him to describe those of a greater.

Rationalistic critics insist that to apply part of a psalm to David and part to Christ introduces confusion. They ridicule theory of a "double sense," and contend that the language refers to the Psalmist and to him alone, and that the application of certain verses to our Lord Jesus is only by way of accommodation. This theory ignores the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit altogether; and when men talk of "psychological impossibilities," they may be talking nonsense; for who of us can us can understand fully the psychological experience of men while receiving revelations from God? The real author of inspired prophecies is the Holy Spirit. His meaning is that which the reverent interpreter most delights to find; and we have evidence that the Old Testament writers did not fully comprehend their own predictions concerning Christ (1Pe 1:10-12). We ought not to be surprised that we should be unable to explain fully the method of the Holy Spirit's activity in guiding the thought of prophets and psalmists in their predictions of the sufferings of Christ and the glories that should follow them.

(2) The Conquering King.

Psalms 2 and 110 (with which Ps 72 may be compared) describe the Messiah as Yahweh's Son, a mighty. Conqueror, who shall overwhelm all foes and reign supported by Yahweh. Some will oppose the Messiah, and so perish; others will enter His army as volunteers, and in the end will enjoy the fruits of victory. "It is better to sit on His throne than to be His footstool."

(3) The Growing Kingdom.

There is room in the earth for no god other than Yahweh, the Creator and Redeemer of mankind. Psalms 47; 67; 96-100 and 117 are proofs of the glorious missionary outlook of the Psalter. All nations are exhorted to forsake idols and worship Yahweh. Ps 47 closes with a picture of the whole world united in the worship of the God of Israel. Ps 67 is a bugle call to all nations to unite in the worship of the true God. Psalms 96-100 paint the character of Yahweh as a basis of appeal to all nations to turn from idols and worship the God of Abraham. Psalms 96 and 98 exalt His righteousness; Ps 97 His power and dominion; Ps 99 His holiness and His fidelity to Israel, while Ps 100 tells of His goodness. Idols will finally go down before a God worthy of men's reverence and love.

3. Problem of Sin:

The Psalter deals with man as a sinner. Seven of the best known poems in the collection are so charged with a sense of sin and of its deadly fruits that they have been known for centuries as the Penitential Psalms (6; 32; 38; 51; 102; 130; 143). Besides these poems of penitence and confession, there are many passages elsewhere in the Psalter which depict the sinfulness of men. And yet there are assertions of personal innocence and righteousness in the Psalter that sound like the claims of self-righteous persons (7:3-9; 17:1-5; 18:20-24; 35:11-17; 44:17-22). The psalmists do not mean to affirm that they are sinless before God, but rather that they are righteous in comparison with their foes who are seeking to destroy them. Sometimes they plead for mercy in the same context. The honest exegete does not find the Pharisaic temper in these noble hymns, though he is quite willing to admit that the Christian cannot well employ some of the expressions concerning his own experiences. Jesus requires a humility deeper than that which was attained in Old Testament times.

(1) Confessing Sin.

(a) Individual confession: Psalms 32 and 51 are notable examples of individual confession. The cries of the penitent in Ps 51 have been repeated by thousands on bended knee as the best expression of their own sense of sin and yearning for forgiveness. (b) National confession (see especially 78; 95 and 106). Ps 105 celebrates the praises of Yahweh for His unfailing kindness to Israel; Ps 106 tells the tale of Israel's repeated rebellion.

(2) Seeking Forgiveness.

Ps 51 is the penitent's cry for mercy. Never did the soul of man plead more powerfully for forgiveness. God cannot despise a heart broken and crushed with the sense of sin and pleading like a lost child for home and mother.

(3) Conquering Sin.

Psalms 130 begins with a cry out of the depths and ends with a note of joy over redemption from sin. The plenteous redemption of which the poet speaks includes triumph over sin in one's heart and life. The cries of the Old Testament saints for victory over sin were not unheeded (139:23 f; 19:13; 119:133). The author of Ps 84 truthfully depicts the life of Yahweh's worshippers, "They go from strength to strength." Victory over sin is sure in the end.

4. Wrestling with Doubts:

The ancient Hebrew seems to have had no temptation to atheism or pantheism. The author of Ecclesiastes felt the pull of agnosticism and materialism (Ec 3:19-21; 9:2-10), but in the end he rejected both (12:7,13 f). The ancient Hebrew found in the world about him one difficulty which seemed almost insuperable. He believed in the wisdom and power and justice of God. How then could it be possible, in a world over which a wise and just God presides, that the wicked should prosper and the righteous suffer? This is the question which is hotly debated by Job and his three friends. A partial solution of the difficulty may be seen in Ps 37, theme of which is 'the brevity of godless prosperity, and the certainty that well-doing will lead to well-being.' A better solution is attained in Ps 73, which depicts God's attitude toward the wicked and toward the righteous. The wicked will be suddenly overthrown, while the righteous will live forever in the enjoyment of communion with God. Not even death can sever him from God. The fleeting pleasures of proud scoffers pale into insignificance before the glories of everlasting fellowship with God.

5. Out of the Depths:

(1) Out of the depths of persecution and slander the author of Ps 31 climbed into his refuge, as he exclaimed, "In the covert of thy presence wilt thou hide them from the plottings of man: Thou wilt keep them secretly in a pavilion from the strife of tongues."

(2) Ps 77 is a stairway out of depths of suspense and the anxiety. The experience of the author well illustrates Maclaren's epigram, "If out of the depths we cry, we shall cry ourselves out of the depths."

(3) The author of Ps 116 looked into the jaws of death. Perhaps no other psalm has so much to say of physical death. The singer is filled with gratitude as he reviews the deadly peril from which Yahweh has saved him.

(4) Ps 88 is unique, because it is sad and plaintive from beginning to end. The singer has long cried for deliverance from bodily weakness and from loneliness.

(5) Out of the depths of disaster and defeat the authors of Psalms 60; 74; 79 and 89 cry to God. The Babylonian exile was a sore trial to patriotic Jews. They mourned over the destruction of their beautiful temple and the holy city in which their fathers had worshipped. The author of Ps 60 closes with hope and confidence (60:12).

6. Ethical Ideals:

"Unquestionably in the Psalms we reach the high-water mark of Old Testament practical piety, the best that, the Old Testament can exhibit of heart-religion."

(1) What Sort of Man, Then, Would the Psalms Acclaim as Good?

Ps 1 opens with a vivid contrast between the righteous and the wicked. Ps 15 is the most complete description of a good man to be found in the Psalter. The picture is drawn in answer to the question, What sort of man will Yahweh receive as an acceptable worshipper? The morality of the Bible is rooted in religion, and the religion of the Bible blossoms and bears fruit in the highest ethics known to man. Ps 131 makes humility a prime quality in real goodness. Ps 133 magnifies the spirit of brotherly love. The social virtues had a large place in the psalmists' ideals of goodness. Humility and brotherly love are a guaranty of peace in the home, the church and the nation. Ps 24:4 is a compend of ethics in a single sentence.

(2) The Ethics of Speech.

Even a casual reading of the Psalms must impress one with the fact that the psalmists felt very keenly the lies and slanders and boastings of the wicked. Stirred with righteous indignation, they call upon God to awake and confront the blatant foes of truth and righteousness (see especially Psalms 12; 52 and 120).

(3) Ministering to the Needy.

Bible readers are familiar with the ideal of the good man in Job 29:12-16; 31:13-22. Ps 82 is a plea for justice. Venal judges are one day to confront the great Judge. Men need fair play first. Perhaps there will then be no occasion for the exercise of almsgiving. Ps 41 is a plea for kindness. The Christian reader is reminded of the words of Jesus, "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." The Ideal Ruler is both just and beneficent (Ps 72:2,12-14).

7. Praying against the Wicked:

To be a good lover one must know how to hate. The excitement of battle throbs in many of the Psalms. The enemies of righteousness are victorious and defiant. Their taunts drive the psalmists to importunate prayer. Yahweh's honor is at stake and His cause in peril. More than 20 psalms contain prayer for the defeat and overthrow of the wicked. Warlike imagery of the boldest kind is found in many of the

imprecatory psalms. To the Christian reader some of the curses pronounced against the wicked are startling and painful. Many are led to wonder how such imprecations ever found a place in the Bible. The most severe curses are found in Psalms 35; 69 and 109. Maclaren's words are well worth reading as an introduction to Ps 109: "For no private injuries, or for those only in so far as the suffering singer is a member of the community which represents God's cause, does he ask the descent of God's vengeance, but for the insults and hurts inflicted on righteousness. The form of these maledictions belongs to a lower stage of revelation; the substance of them, considered as passionate desires for the destruction of evil, burning zeal for the triumph of truth, which is God's cause, and unquenchable faith that He is just, is a part of Christian perfection." Two remarks may be made, as suggestions to the student of the Psalter:

(1) We ought to study the psalms of imprecation in the light of their origin. They are poetry and not prose; and De Witt reminds us that the language of oriental poetry is that of exaggerated passion. Some of these imprecations pulse with the throb of actual battle. Swords are drawn, and blood is flowing. The champion of Yahweh's people prays for the overthrow of His foes. The enemies cursed are men who break every moral law and defy God. The Psalmist identifies himself with Yahweh's cause. "Do not I hate them, O Yahweh, that hate thee? And am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred: They are become mine enemies" (Ps 139:21 f). Thus the psalmists pray with God's glory in view.

(2) We ought to use the imprecatory psalms in the light of our Lord's teaching. We cannot pronounce curses on our personal enemies. This heavenly artillery may be turned upon the saloon, the brothel and the gambling hell, though we must not forget to pray for the conversion of the persons who are engaged in these lines of business.

8. The Future Life:

"If a man die, shall he live again?" What answer do the Psalms give to Job's cry for light? There are expressions in the Psalter which seem to forbid hope of a blessed immortality (Ps 6:5; 30:9; 39:13; 115:17). The psalmists are tempted to fear that fellowship with God would cease at death. Let this fact, however, be borne in mind, that not one of the poets or prophets of Israel settled down to a final denial of immortality. Some of them had moments of joyous assurance of a blessed life of fellowship with God in the world to come. Life everlasting in the presence of Yahweh is the prospect with which the author of Ps 16 refreshes himself (16:8-11). The vision of God's face after the sleep of death is better than worldly prosperity (17:13-15). The author of Ps 73 wins rest for his distressed mind in the assurance of a fellowship with God that cannot be broken (73:23-26). God will finally take the singer to Himself. It has been well said that Ps 49 registers the high-water mark of Old Testament faith in a future life. Death becomes the shepherd of the wicked who trusted in riches, while God redeems the righteous from the power of Sheol and takes the believing soul to Himself.

LITERATURE.

One of the most elaborate and informing articles on the history of the exposition of the Psalms is found

in the Introduction to Delitzsch's Commentary (pp. 64-87, English translation). Among the Fathers, Jerome, Chrysostom and Augustine are most helpful. Among the Reformers, Calvin, the prince of expositors, is most valuable. Among modern commentators, Ewald and Delitzsch are scholarly and sane. Their commentaries are accessible in English translation Hupfeld is strong in grammatical exegesis. Baethgen (1904) is very thorough. Among recent English and American commentators, the most helpful are Perowne (6th edition, 1866), Maclaren in Expositor's Bible (1890-92), and Kirkpatrick in Cambridge Bible (1893-95). Briggs in ICC (1906) is learned; Davison, New Century Bible, is bright and attractive. Spurgeon, Treasury of David, is a valuable compilation, chiefly from the Puritan divines. Cheyne, The Book of Psalms (1888) and The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter (1891), is quite radical in his critical views. Binnie, The Psalms: Their Origin, Teachings and Use (1886), is a fine introduction to the Psalter. Robertson, The Poetry and Religion of the Psalms (1898), constructs an able argument against recent radical views.

John Richard Sampey

PSALMS, IMPRECATORY

im'-pre-ka-to-ri, im-pre-ka'-ter-i.

See PSALMS, VI, 7.

PSALTER, (PSALMS), OF SOLOMON

sol'-ter.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. III, 1; BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS, sec. IV, 1, (1), (b).

PSALTERY

sol'-ter-i.

See MUSIC.

PSALTIEL

sol'-ti-el: Syriac and the Revised Version margin =" Phaltiel" of 2 Esdras 5:16.

PSEUDO-MATTHEW, GOSPEL OF

su'-do-math'-u.

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, 1, (b).

PSYCHOLOGY

si-kol’-o-ji:

1. Introduction: Scope of Biblical Psychology

2. Nature and Origin of the Soul

3. False Theories

4. Creationism and Traducianism

5. Trichotomy

6. Scriptural Terms

7. Pauline Expressions

8. Monism and Other Theories

9. The Fall of Man

10. Effects of the Fall

11. Death as a Problem

12. Immortality of the Soul

LITERATURE

1. Introduction: Scope of Biblical Psychology:

The extravagant claims made by some writers for a fully developed system of Biblical psychology has brought the whole subject into disrepute. So much so, that Hofmann (Schriftbeweis) has boldly asserted that "a system of Biblical psychology has been got together without any justification for it in Scripture." At the outset, therefore, it must be borne in mind that the Bible does not present us with a systematized philosophy of man, but gives in popular form an account of human nature in all its various relationships. A reverent study of Scripture will undoubtedly lead to the recognition of a well-defined system of

psychology, on which the whole scheme of redemption is based. Great truths regarding human nature are presupposed in and accepted by the Old Testament and the New Testament; stress is there laid on other aspects of truth, unknown to writers outside of revelation, and presented to us, not in the language of the schools, but in that of practical life. Man is there described as fallen and degraded, but intended by God to be raised, redeemed, renewed. From this point of view Biblical psychology must be studied, and our aim should be "to bring out the views of Scripture regarding the nature, the life and life-destinies of the soul, as they are determined in the history of salvation" (Delitzsch, Biblical Psychology, 15).

2. Nature and Origin of the Soul:

As to the origin of the soul, Scripture is silent. It states very clearly that life was inbreathed into man by God (wayyippah; Septuagint enephusesen; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) inspiravit). The human being thus inspired by God was thereby constituted a nephesh chayyah ("living soul"), because the nishmath chayyim ("breath of lives") had been imparted to him (Ge 2:7). Beyond this the first book of the Bible does not go. In later books the doctrine is taught with equal clearness. Thus, in the Book of Job: "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life" (Job 33:4). The difference in expression should be carefully noted. The "living soul" Septuagint psuche zosa) is made to depend upon, as it has its origin in, the "breath of lives" the Septuagint pnoe zoes). The neshamah ("breath") is characteristic of man—though it is very rarely, if ever, attributed to animals; man is described as a being 'in whose nostrils is but a breath' (neshamah) (Isa 2:22). That "breath" is 'God's breath in man' (Job 32:8; 34:14), or, as it is represented in Pr 20:27, "The spirit of man (nishmath) is the lamp of Yahweh." In the New Testament Paul evidently refers to this view of man's origin in the statement that "the first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam .... a life-giving (quickening) spirit" (1Co 15:45). This too agrees with what Christ has said: "It is the spirit, that giveth life (quickeneth)" (Joh 6:63), and with what Paul himself has stated elsewhere in the Epistle to the Romans (8:2): "The Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and of death."

3. False Theories:

Scripture therefore repudiates all doctrines of emanation, by which is meant a natural, forth-flowing life from God into the human sphere; it teaches a doctrine of creation, whereby it declares that the Almighty acts with deliberation and design, in free choice, and not of necessity. "Let us make man" is the sublime utterance of divine wisdom and power. Nor does Scripture teach the pre-existence of the soul—a doctrine found in the extra-canonical, platonically-inspired Book of Wisdom (Wisd 8:19,20), For I was a child of parts, and a good soul fell to my lot; nay rather, being good, I came into a body undefiled." This doctrine was well known to Jewish writers, and was taught in Talmud and Kabbalah.

"All souls were, according to the Talmud, created and kept in secret from the first moment of creation. As creatures of the highest sphere they are omniscient; but at the moment of birth in a human body an angel touches the lips of the child, so that he forgets whatever has been" (Emanuel Deutsch, The Talmud). The doctrine, however, must be a later importation into Jewish theology through Plato and Philo. It reminds us of Vergil (AEneid vi.713), who makes the souls—destined by the Fates to inhabit

new bodies on earth—drink of the waters of Lethe (forgetfulness), so as to remove all remembrance of the joys of Elysium:

"The souls that throng the flood,

Are those to whom by Fate are other bodies owed;

In Lethe's lake they long oblivion taste

Of future life secure, forgetful of the past."

According to the Kabbalah, souls are supposed to have an ideal as well as a real pre-existence: "ideal as emanations from the cephiroth, which are themselves emanations from the infinite real, as having been 'created' at a definite time" (compare Eric Bischoff, De Kabbala).

The doctrine with some modifications passed into the Christian church, was accepted by Justin Martyr, Theodoretus, Origen and others of the church Fathers, but became obsolete by the latter part of the 4th century (compare Shedd, History of Christian Doctrine, II, 9). It was formally condemned by a synod held at Constantinople in the 6th century. In later times it was accepted in modified form by Kant, Schelling and others, and was specially defended by Julius Muller, who held that the soul had a timeless preexistence and underwent a fall before the final act, whereby it was united in time to the body as its temporary home (Ein ausserzeitlicher Urzustand und Urfall). Reference is sometimes made to Jer 1:5, where Yahweh addresses His servant: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations." But this text gives no warrant to the doctrine as taught by the writers mentioned. All that may be conceded is, what Delitzsch has termed "an ideal pre-existence," i.e. "a pre-existence, not only of man as such, but also of the individual and of all: a preexistence in the divine knowledge, which precedes the existence in the individual consciousness" (Biblical Psychology, 46).

4. Creationism and Traducianism:

A new question arises at this point, namely, Is the soul a special creation? Is it derived from the parents? Opinions are and have been divided on this point. Many have supported theory of Creationism, by which is meant that in every instance where a new individual comes into being a soul is specially created by God, de nihilo, to inhabit the new-formed body. This view of the soul's birth found great favor in the early church. It was dominant in the East and was advocated in the West. "Jerome asserts that God quotidie fabricatur animas, and cites Scripture in proof" (Shedd, op. cit., II, 11). Scholastic theologians in the Middle Ages, Roman Catholic divines, Reformed orthodoxy upheld theory. Though finding little support in Scripture, they appealed to such texts as the following: "He fashioneth their hearts alike" (Ps 33:15 the King James Version); Yahweh "formeth the spirit of man within him" (Zec 12:1); "The spirit returneth unto God who gave it" (Ec 12:7; compare Nu 16:22; Heb 12:9); "God, the God of the spirits of all flesh" (Nu 27:16)—of which Delitzsch declared: "There can hardly be a more classical proof-text for

creationism" (Bibl. Psych., 137).

Traducianism again has found equal support in the Christian church. It declared that the parents were responsible, not merely for the bodies, but also for the souls of their offspring—per traducem vel per propaginem (i.e. by direct derivation, in the ordinary way of propagation). Tertullian was a strong supporter of this view: "The soul of man, like the shoot of a tree, is drawn out (deducta) into a physical progeny from Adam, the parent stock" (Shedd, History of Doctrine, II, 14). Jerome remarked that in his day it was adopted by maxima pars occidentalium ("the large majority of western theologians"). Leo the Great (died 461) asserted that "the Catholic faith teaches that every man with reference to the substance of his soul as well as of his body is formed in the womb" (Shedd). Augustine, however, though doctrinally inclined to support the claims of Traducianists, kept an open mind on the subject: "You may blame, if you will, my hesitation," he wrote, "because I do not venture to affirm or deny that of which I am ignorant." And, perhaps, this is the safest attitude to assume; for there is little Scriptural warrant for either theory. Birth is a mystery which baffles investigation, and Scripture throws no light upon that mystery. Yet some who have discussed this subject have tried actually to calculate the very day on which the soul is created or infused into the body, as it is being formed in the mother’s womb—in boys on the 40th day after pregnancy and in girls on the 80th day. This indeed is the reductio ad absurdum of Creationism.

Whichever theory we accept, the difficulties are great either way. For if God creates a soul, that soul must be pure and sinless and stainless at birth. How then can it be said that man is "conceived" as well as "born in sin"? If the impure, sin-stained body contaminates the pure, unstained soul by contact, why cannot the stainless soul disinfect the contaminated body? And again, if every individual soul is a special creation by direct interposition of the Almighty, what becomes of the unity and solidarity of the race? Is its connection with Adam then purely one of physical or corporeal generation? Creationism cannot account for the birth of the soul. Nor can Traducianism. For it can account neither for the origin, nor for the hereditary taint of the soul. It lands us in a hopeless dilemma. In the one case we fall back upon Creationism with its difficulties; in the other, we plunge into a materialism which is equally fatal to theory (compare Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatiek, II, 626). Perhaps the words of Petrus Lombardus, though frequently misunderstood and misapplied, throw most light on the subject—a light, however, which is little more than "darkness visible"—creando infundit eas Deus, et infundendo creat ("in creating God infused (the soul); and in infusing He creates"). The problem is and remains insoluble.

Passing allusion may be made to another very curious theory, to which reference is made by Martensen (Christliche Ethik, I, 107). It bears upon human individuality, as impressed not only upon the soul, but also upon the body. The soul and the body are represented as arising at the same moment, but the latter (not in regard to its physico-chemical composition, but in other respects) is the resultant of soul-influences, whatever these may be. The soul therefore exercises a formative influence upon the body, with which it is united. This theory is attributed by Martensen to G.E. Stahl, who died in Berlin in 1734, as physician to the royal family. We are here in a region where the way is barred—"a palpable obscure" without the light of day.

5. Trichotomy:

The next important question which has occupied many minds is equally difficult of solution—theory of Tripartition. Is man composed of "body" and "soul" (dichotomy) only, or is a third to be added to the two, so that "spirit" is another element in the constitution of human nature (trichotomy)? Either theory is supposed to be supported by Scripture, and both have had their defenders in all ages of the church. Where the tripartite division has found favor, soul and spirit have been distinguished from each other, as man's lower is distinguished from his higher nature; where dichotomy prevailed, soul and spirit were represented as manifestations of the same spiritual essence. Under the influence of Platonic philosophy, trichotomy found favor in the early church, but was discredited on account of the Apollinarian heresy. The threefold division of human nature into soma ("body"), psuche ("soul"), pneuma ("spirit") had been accepted by many when Apollinaris, bishop of Laodicea (died 382), attempted to explain the mystery of Christ's person by teaching that the Logos (or second person of the Trinity) had taken the place of the rational soul in Christ, so that the person of Christ on earth consisted of the Divine Logos, a human body, and a soul (psuche) as the link between the two.

For the tripartite division of human nature two texts are specially brought into the discussion: namely, 1Th 5:23, "May your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame"—a text which is popularly interpreted as conveying that "soul" stands for "our powers natural—those we have by nature," and that by "spirit" is meant "that life in man which in his natural state can scarcely be said to exist at all, but which is to be called out into power and vitality by regeneration" (F.W. Robertson, Sermons). There is very little warrant in Scripture for such interpretation. "The language does not require a distinction of organs or substances, but may be accounted for by a vivid conception of one substance in different relations and under different aspects. The two terms are used to give exhaustive expression to the whole being and nature of man" (Davidson, Old Testament Theology, 135). There is evidently no distinction of essence here—namely, of a soul distinct from the spirit, and a body distinct from either. In his "fervid desire for the complete and perfect sanctification of his disciples, the apostle accumulates these terms" in order to emphasize the doctrine of an entire renewal of the whole man by the working of the Holy Spirit. It has been pointed out (A. Kuyper, Het werk v. d. Heiligen Geest, III, 101)—and this must be carefully borne in mind—that "the apostle does not use the word holomereis, 'in all your parts,' and then summarize these parts in body, soul and spirit, but holoteleis, a word that has no reference to the parts, but to the telos, the end or aim. Calvin interprets 'soul' and 'spirit' here as referring to our rational and moral existence, as thinking, willing beings, both modes of operation of the one, undivided soul."

The next text to which an appeal is made is Heb 4:12: "The word of God is living, and active, and sharper than any two-edged sword, and piercing even to the dividing of soul and spirit, of both joints and marrow, and quick to discern the thoughts and intents of the heart." Here spirit, soul and heart are brought into close correspondence, with heart evidently as the center of personality, manifesting itself in soul and spirit. The only question is, whether the dividing which takes place by the piercing word of God is one within the soul and spirit, causing a complete exposure of the inner man, a cutting asunder of all that composes his nature, or one between the soul and spirit, causing a division between them as separate parts of human nature. The probability lies with the first of these two contradictory views. The writer evidently meant that, as a sharp two-edged sword pierces to the very marrow in its sundering

process, so the sword of the spirit cuts through all obstacles, pierces the very heart, lays bare what hitherto was hidden to all observers, even to the man himself, and "discerns" the "thoughts and intents," which in the unity of soul and spirit have hitherto been kept in the background. "The meaning is rather, that the word of God pierces and dissects both the soul and spirit, separates each into its parts, subtle though they may be, and analyzes their thoughts and intents" (Davidson, op, cit., 187). At any rate, to found a doctrine of Trichotomy on an isolated, variously interpreted text is dangerous in the extreme. The language of metaphor is not the language of literal speech; and here evidently we are in the region of metaphor.

The ground is now cleared for a fuller investigation of the meaning of these terms:

6. Scriptural Terms:

(1) The terms are used inter changeably, though they are not synonymous. Lebhabh ("heart"), nephesh ("soul"), ruach ("spirit") are very closely connected in the Old Testament. The heart is there represented as "the organ, the spirit as the principle, the soul as the subject of life" (Cremer, Lexicon). Hence, we read that "out of it (the heart) are the issues of life" (Pr 4:23). Dying is represented as the surrender of soul (Ge 35:18; Job 11:20), but also of spirit (Ps 31:5; 146:4). The dead are called souls (Re 6:9; 20:4), and also spirits (Heb 12:23; 1Pe 3:19). In the last mentioned text the "spirits in prison" are also called "souls." The living are described as "disturbed" or "grieved" in soul (Jud 10:16), "vexed" (Jud 16:16), "discouraged" (Nu 21:4), "weary" (Zec 11:8); but also as in "anguish of spirit" (Ex 6:9), "impatient in spirit" (Job 21:4, in the Hebrew), ‘straitened in spirit’ (Mic 2:7). At death the "spirit" departs (Ps 146:4, in the Hebrew), but also the "soul" (Ge 35:18). As in the Old Testament so in the New Testament, our Lord "sighed" or "was troubled in the spirit" (Joh 13:21)?, but we also read that His soul was "exceeding sorrowful," or troubled (Mt 26:38; Joh 12:27).

See SPIRIT; SOUL; HEART. (2) And yet there is a distinction, whatever the real nature of it may be. In Mary’s Magnificat, e.g., we find the two combined in an interesting manner: "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour" (Lu 1:46,47), the one clause "referring to the personal emotions of Mary, to her feelings as a woman and a mother, all of which find an outlet in adoration," the second clause "appearing to indicate the moment when, in the profoundest depths of her being, by the touch of the divine spirit, the promise of the angel was accomplished in her" (Godet, in the place cited.). A like contrast meets us in the story of Gethsemane. The Master was ‘exceeding sorrowful in soul’ (i.e. the emotional, sensitive center of His being was in deep sorrow), the disciples were ‘willing in spirit,’ but ‘weak in the flesh’ (Mt 26:38,41). In the Old Testament we find that when a man dies his "soul" departs, and when he is restored to life his "soul" returns (1Ki 17:22); but when consciousness or lifepower returns to one not dead, "spirit" is used (Ge 45:27; Jud 15:19; 1Sa 30:12; 1Ki 10:5). Even in popular language the distinction is recognized: we speak of so many "souls," not "spirits," as having perished.

(3) From all this it would appear that philosophic distinction or scientific accuracy of expression is not met with in Scripture. Man is there represented as a unity, and the various terms employed to indicate

that unity in its diversity of activities or passivities do not necessarily imply the existence of different essences, or of separate organs, through which these are realized. Psychical action is sometimes ascribed to the body, as well as to the soul, for soul and body are inseparably united to each other. It is the possession of a soul which makes the body what it is; and on the other hand, a soul without a body is unthinkable. The resurrection of the body therefore is no mere figment of the creeds. The body is God's work (Job 10:8), inseparable from the life of the soul. In the New Testament it is spoken of as "the house on earth" (epigeios oikia), the "tabernacle" or tent prepared for the occupant (skenos) (1Co 12:18; 2Co 4:7; 5:1). In the Old Testament "we have such metaphorical expressions as 'houses of clay'; or, as in post-Biblical writings, 'earthly tabernacle.' In the latest, we have words which suggest a hollow, a framework, or a sheath, favoring the Greek idea of the body as the husk or clothing of the soul" (Laidlaw). Hence, in Scripture, spirit and soul are interchangeably used with body for human nature in general, not as though indicating three separate entities, but as denoting a parallelism which brings out the full personality of man. Soul and body are threatened with destruction (Mt 10:28); body without spirit is a corpse (Jas 2:26); soul and spirit are interchangeably united: "Stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving," etc. (Php 1:27).

(4) Gathering all together, the Scriptural position seems to be as follows: The Divine Spirit is the source of all life, and its power is communicated in the physical, intellectual and moral sphere. That Spirit, as the spiritus spirans, the inspiring spirit, by its very breath makes man a living soul: "The spirit (or breath) of God is in my nostrils" (Job 27:3); "Thou takest away their breath (ruach, "spirit"], they die, and return to their dust" (Ps 104:29). Hence, God is called "God of the spirits of all flesh" (Nu 16:22; 27:16). Soul, though identical with spirit, has shades of meaning which spirit has not; it stands for the individual. "Man is spirit, because he is dependent upon God. Man is soul, because, unlike the angels, he has a body, which links him to earth. He is animal as possessing anima, but he is a reasoning animal, which distinguishes him from the brute" (Bavinck, German Dogm., II, 628).

(5) In this connection stress may be laid upon some of Paul's expressions. He exhorts the Philippians to "stand fast in one spirit (pneuma), with one soul (psuche) striving for the faith" (Php 1:27).

7. Pauline Expressions:

He exhorts them to be "of the same mind" (sumpsuchoi, Php 2:2); he hopes to be "of good comfort" (eupsucho, Php 2:19); he knows of 'no man likeminded, (isopsuchon), who (would) care truly for (their) state (Php 2:20). Everywhere therefore we have "soul" in various combinations to indicate the mental attitude, which in the "fellowship of the Spirit" he would assume toward his readers, and his readers would adopt toward himself. There cannot be therefore that subtle distinction which men have found in the terms "spirit" and "soul," as though two separate essences were housed in one body. The text in Job (33:4), "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty giveth me life," is the key to the whole problem. The spiritus spirans becomes the spiritus spiratus—the inspiring spirit becomes in man the life which is expired, outbreathed by man, in both soul and spirit. "Soul," therefore, may well stand for the personal, living, animated being—the suffering, acting, thinking, reasoning, dying creature, "whose breath is in his nostrils." Christ gave His 'soul' (psuche) for His sheep (Joh 10:11). On the cross He Himself exclaimed: "Into thy hands I commend my spirit" (pneuma) (Lu 23:46).

Spirit may therefore indicate the all-embracing power, guiding the inward and the outward life—principium illud internum ex quo fluunt actiones, is Bengel's comment on Eph 2:2 (compare Lu 9:55 the King James Version; Lu 4:36). Hence, by an easy gradation it may stand for the abysmal depths of personality; while "soul" would express man's individuality in general.

See SOUL; SPIRIT.

Pauline phraseology has somewhat confused the issue; at any rate, new meanings, not obvious to the reader, have been assigned to various terms. Paul contrasts the psychical and the pneumatic, the man under the influence of the divine pneuma, and the man as influenced by his own psuche. The psychical man is man in his natural, unregenerate state, psychical in this connection being almost equivalent to carnal; while the pneumatic man would be the man guided and directed by the Spirit from on high. Nature and grace are contrasted in the two terms as the first and second Adam are contrasted in 1Co 15:45—the first Adam being described as a living psuche ("soul"), the second as a life-giving pneuma ("spirit"). Even so the psychical body is the body intended, fitted to bear the psuche, while the pneumatic body is evidently the body capable of bearing the pneuma. Hence, the one is corruptible and weak, the other incorruptible and full of power. The soul confined to the carnal body uses it as an organ, till it falls into decay and no longer lends itself to such use. The spirit, in constant fellowship with the Divine Spirit, communicates its energy to a body fitted to be the bearer of this renewed life, spiritualizes that organ, makes that body its docile instrument, enables the body to fulfill its wishes and thoughts, with inexhaustible power of action, "as we even now see the artist using his voice or his hand with marvelous freedom and thus foreshadowing the perfect spiritualizing of the body."

8. Monism and Other Theories:

Other questions call for discussion here: they may be briefly touched upon. Scripture acknowledges a dualism, which recognizes the separate existence of Soul and body. It rejects a monism, which makes man but "a doublefaced unity" (Bain); or considers mind and body as equally unreal, and as "aspects," "appearances," "sides" of one and the same reality (scientific monism). It knows nothing of mere idealism, which makes mind the only reality, of which matter is but a manifestation, nor of materialism, which considers matter as that which alone is substantial, while mind is a mere product of the brain (Haeckel). It does not support theory of harmonia praestabilita—pre-established harmony, whereby

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting,"

because soul and body were united in harmonious action before the individual was called into active being, body and soul acting in harmony after creation like two clocks accurately regulated, pointing to the same hour on the dial plate, though driven by different springs (Leibnitz). Scripture has no theory. It deals with facts and facts only in so far as they bear upon the history of man's sin and man's redemption. It throws no light on many problems raised by science or philosophy. It does not discuss origins—the origin of evil, of matter, of mind. "All is of God" is the Scriptural answer to many questions. Thus, the relation of mind to body is and remains a mystery—as great as the relation between the forces in Nature,

to which the names of light and electricity have been given. Science has attempted to explain that mystery and has failed. The words of Shenstone (Cornhill Magazine, 1907) may be applied to all psychical problems, outside of Holy Writ, which by him were applied to those scientific questions which remain unanswered in spite of all our efforts at solution: "We are still very far from knowing definitely that atoms are composed entirely of electrons or that electrons are nothing else than electric charges; and though electrons have been shown to exhibit electric inertia, it has not been proved that the inertia of atoms also is electrical." The mystery of matter is great; that of soul is greater still.

9. The Fall of Man:

The next question which falls to be discussed is the influence of the fall of man upon his soul. Scripture is clear upon the point. Man's fall from a primeval state of innocence is there told in unambiguous terms, though the word itself is not found in the narrative, except perhaps in Ro 11:11,12, where allusion is made to the fall (paraptoma) of Israel. With the origin of evil Scripture apparently does not concern itself, though it clearly states that man's sinful condition stands in direct connection with the transgression of Adam, as in Ro 5:12, where the introduction of sin (hamartia) into the world (kosmos) is spoken of as the act of one man (s.c. Adam), hamartia being evidently taken as a power of evil working in the world of men. The Old Testament allusion in Ho 6:7 can hardly be referred to Adam's transgression; at any rate the reference is doubtful. the King James Version renders the passage: "They like men have transgressed the covenant," though the revisers have translated: "But they like Adam have transgressed the covenant." The German and Dutch versions give the same interpretation to the verse: "like Adam." The Septuagint takes the term as an appellative (hos anthropos, "as man"), but the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) refers the transgression to Adam (sicut Adam transgressi sunt). The other allusions in the Old Testament to this event are slight, as in Job 31:33; Eze 28:13,15. In the New Testament, however, the references are much more frequent, especially in the writings of John and of Paul (compare Joh 8:44; 1 Joh 3:8; 2Co 11:3; 1Ti 2:14). The strong parallelism between Adam and Christ in Ro 5:12-21, the obedience of the one bringing freedom, while that of the other brought woe, and the contrast in 1Co 15:22 between Adam and Christ throw sufficient light on the question at issue.

Modern science, under the influence of the evolutionary hypothesis, has eliminated or at least has attempted to eliminate the factor of the Fall. That "fall" has been interpreted as a "rise," the "descent" is supposed to have been a real "ascent." Far down the ages, millenniums ago, "a miserable, half-starved, naked wretch, just emerged from the bestial condition, torn with fierce passions, and fighting his way among his compeers with low-browed cunning" (Orr, Christian View of God, 180) must have emerged somehow out of darkness into light. "We are no longer," says Professor J. A. Thomson, "as those who look back to a paradise in which man fell; we are as those 'who, rowing hard against the stream, see distant gates of Eden gleam, and do not dream it is a dream' "(Bible of Nature, 226). If science definitely teaches that man has arisen by slow, insensible gradations from the brute, and no further word may be said on the subject, then indeed the problem of human sin is utterly inexplicable. There can then be no agreement between the Biblical conception and the evolutionary theory as so presented. For primitive man's transgression would under such circumstances be but the natural expression of brute passion, to which the name of sin in the Christian sense can hardly be applied. But if for "minute" and "insensible" gradations in the evolutionary process be substituted the "mutations," "leaps" or "lifts," to

which an increasing number of evolutionists are appealing; if primitive man be not pictured as a semi-animal, subject to brutish impulse and passion; if with man a new start was made, a "lift" occurred in the process of development under the guiding and directing influence of Almighty power, the problem assumes a different shape. A sinless creature, transgressing the moral law, is then not an unscientific assumption; conscience asserting itself as the voice divine within the human soul is then not only possible, but actual and real, in the history of man's earliest progenitors. The Biblical narrative will after all remain as the most reasonable explanation of man's original condition and his terrible fall. In that narrative will be found enshrined the "shadowing tradition" of a real, historic event, which has influenced the human race through all the ages. Professor Driver, writing under the strong influence of the evolutionary theory, and accepting as "the law stamped upon the entire range of organic nature, progress, gradual advance from lower to higher, from the less perfect to the more perfect," has wisely remarked that "man failed in the trial to which he was exposed, that sin has entered into the world .... and that through the whole course of the race it has been attended by an element of moral disorder, and thus it has been marred, perverted, impeded or drawn back" (Driver, Genesis, 57).

See FALL, THE.

10. Effects of the Fall:

An equally serious question arises as to the effects of the fall of man. Shame, corruption, death is the answer given by the Old Testament and New Testament. "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (Ge 2:17) was the judgment pronounced upon man. By this was evidently meant "death" as a physical and as a spiritual fact. Man was doomed. The posse non mori, which according to older theologians was man's privilege, was lost and was succeeded by a punishment of which the non posse non mori was the doom, i.e. the possibility of immortal life was followed by the impossibility of not suffering death. Not as though immortality was absolutely lost; for with sin came decay, degeneration, death, not of the inbreathed spirit, but of the body into which the soul was breathed by God. But even the body is imperishable. It undergoes change, but not extinction. The resurrection-body has become a possibility through the atonement and resurrection of Christ. The tabernacle is removed, but renewed. The body is not a prison house, but a temple; not an adjunct but an integral part of the human being. The Bible teaches not only a resurrection-body, but a transformed body (Ro 12:1). It speaks not only of a soul to be saved, but of a body to be redeemed. Scripture alone accounts for death and explains it.

11. Death as a Problem:

With modern evolutionists death is an unsolved problem. Weissmann (Essays on Heredity) maintains on the one hand that "death is not an essential attitude of matter" (p. 159), and on the other, "it is only from the point of view of utility that we can understand the necessity of death" (p. 23), and again "death is to be looked upon as an occurrence which is advantageous to the species as a concession to the outer conditions of life, and not as an absolute necessity, essentially inherent in life." He even speaks of "the immortality of the protozoa," because "an immense number of the lower organisms" are not subject to death (ibid., 26). Death therefore according to him has been "acquired secondarily as an adaptation," and

must in a certain sense be unnatural. It is indeed "one of the most difficult problems in the whole range of physiology." If this be so, we may safely turn to Scripture for an explanation of the problem, which has a value peculiarly its own. "By man came death" is the authoritative declaration, because by man came sin. "In Adam all die," because through Adam came sin. Here we may safely leave the problem, because "by man" will come "resurrection from the dead."

See DEATH.

12. Immortality of the Soul:

But if the body is mortal, is the soul immortal? On this point the New Testament gives no uncertain sound, and though the doctrine be not as clearly expressed in the Old Testament, yet even there kinship with God is man’s guaranty for everlasting communion with Him (compare Ps 73). Job longed for such fellowship, which to him and to the Old Testament saints before and after him was life. In memorable words he gave utterance to the hope which was in him: ‘I know that my Redeemer liveth .... and after my skin (read "body") .... has been destroyed, yet from my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold and not another’ (Job 19:25). Hosea, the mourner, is responsible for that sublime utterance, which in its New Testament form is recited at the graveside of those who die in the Lord: "I will ransom them from the power of Sheol; I will redeem them from death: O death, where are thy plagues? O Sheol, where is thy destruction?" (Ho 13:14). Reference may also be made to the words of Isaiah (26:19): "Thy dead shall live; my dead bodies shall arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust." Still clearer is the note sounded by Daniel (12:2,3): "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. And they that are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars forever and ever." In one word, the Old Testament saint based all his hope and fellowship on God. That hope strengthened his soul when he shuddered at the darkness of Sheol. "It overleaps Sheol in the vigor of his faith." In the Psalms we find the same hope expressed on almost every page: "As for me, I shall behold thy face in righteousness; I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with beholding thy form" (the King James Version "with thy likeness," Ps 17:15); and again: "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption. .... In thy presence is fullness of joy; in thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore" (Ps 16:10,11). Whatever the ultimate verdict of science may be regarding the "utility" of death in regard to the human race, Scripture considers it abnormal, unnatural, a punishment, an infliction, the result of man’s wrongdoing and his transgression of the law of God. But death in Holy Writ is not a hopeless separation of body and soul. The New Testament sounds a note even clearer than the Old Testament; for Christ has brought "life and immortality to light." "We know," says Paul, "that we have a building from God," after the dissolution of our tabernacle (2Co 5:1); and that is but the necessary corollary to Christ’s great utterance: "I AM THE RESURRECTION, AND THE LIFE" (Joh 11:25).

LITERATURE.

Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, English translation; Hofmann, Schriftbeweis; Delitzsch,

System of Biblical Psychology; Oehler, Old Testament Theology; Wendt, Die Begriffe Fleisch u. Geist, etc.; Dickson, Paul's Use of the Flesh and Spirit; Cremer, Bibl.-theol. Worterbuch, etc.; Herzog, RE, articles "Geist" and "Seele"; Laid-law, Bible Doctrine of Man; Orr, God's Image in Man; Davidson, Old Testament Theology.

J. I. Marais

PTOLEMAIS

tol-e-ma'-is (Ptolemais): Same as "Acco" in Jud 1:31. Ptolemais was the most prominent town on the Phoenician seacoast in Maccabean times (1 Macc 5:15,55; 10:1,58,60; 12:48), and is once mentioned in the New Testament in Ac 21:7 as a seaport at which Paul landed for one day, visiting the "brethren" in the place.

See ACCO; PHOENICIA.

PTOLEMY

tol'-e-mi (Ptolemaios, but usually called Ptolemy—"the Warlike"): The name Ptolemy is rather common from the days of Alexander the Great, but is best known as the dynastic name of the 13 (14) Macedonian kings of Egypt (323-43 BC) (as Pharaoh in the Old Testament). Those of interest to the Biblical student are:

(1) Ptolemy I, surnamed Soter, (Soter, "Savior"), called also Ptolemy Lagi, was born circa 366 BC, the son of Lagus and Arsinoe, a concubine of Philip of Macedon. He was prominent among the officers of Alexander the Great, whom he accompanied in his eastern campaigns. On the death of Alexander, Ptolemy seized the satrapy of Egypt as his share (1 Macc 1:6 ff). Now commenced the long hostilities between Egypt and Syria, Ptolemy on more than one occasion invading Syria. In 316 he joined in a war against Antigonus during which Coele-Syria and Phoenicia were lost, but in 312 regained from Demetrius the son of Antigonus. It was most probably in this year (312) that Ptolemy captured Jerusalem on a Sabbath day (Josephus, Ant, XII, i, 1), and by force or persuasion induced many Jews to accompany him to Egypt as colonists or mercenaries. His kind treatment of them induced others to leave Syria for Egypt. In 306 Ptolemy was defeated in the great naval fight off Salamis in Cyprus by which Cyprus was lost to Egypt. About this date Ptolemy assumed the title of "king," following the example of the Syrian ruler. In 305-304 he defended the Rhodians against Demetrius Poliorcetes, forcing the latter to raise the siege—hence, the title "Savior." In 285 BC Ptolemy abdicated in favor of his youngest son Philadelphus—the son of his favorite wife Berenice—and died in 283 BC. According to the usual interpretation this Philadelphus is "the king of the south" in Da 11:5. This Ptolemy shares with his son and successor the honor of rounding the famous Alexandrian Museum and Library.

(2) Ptolemy II, surnamed Philadelphus (Philadelphos, "Brother(sister?)-loving"), the youngest son of Ptolemy I; born 309 BC in Cos; succeeded his father in 285 BC and died 247. Like his father, he was

actively engaged in two Syrian wars until peace was made about 250 BC, Berenice, the daughter of Philadelphus, being given in marriage to Antiochus II. This Ptolemy planted numerous colonies in Egypt, Syria and Palestine, among which were several of the name of Arsinoe (his sister-wife), Philadelphia on the ruins of old Rabbah, Philotera south of the Sea of Galilee, and Ptolemais on the site of Acco. He devoted great attention to the internal administration of his kingdom, endowed the Museum and Alexandrian Library in which his father had taken much interest; in general he followed his father's example as a liberal patron of art, science and literature. According to one tradition it was Philadelphus who was instrumental in starting the Septuagint translation (see SEPTUAGINT). At any rate, he was favorably disposed toward his Jewish subjects, and in his reign Jewish wisdom and Greek philosophy began to blend. Philadelphus is supposed to be "the king of the south" of Da 11:6, whose daughter "shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement."

(3) Ptolemy III, surnamed Euergetes (Euergetes, "Benefactor"), son of Philadelphus, whom he succeeded in 247 BC. In 246 he was provoked to a Syrian war to avenge the murder of his sister Berenice at Antioch; in the course of this campaign he met with remarkable success, overran Syria, plundered Susa and Babylonia, penetrated to the shores of India and captured the important stronghold of Seleucia (1 Macc 11:8). Euergetes was, however, prevented from reaping the fruits of his victories by being recalled by internal troubles in Egypt. He brought back with him from the East the Egyptian gods that Cambyses had carried away 300 years before, thus earning from the Egyptians the title of "Benefactor." Two traditions obtain as to his death: the more probable is that of Polybius (ii.71), according to which he died a natural death (222 BC), or, according to another (Justin xxix.1), he was murdered by his son. Some regard this king as the Euergetes mentioned in the Prologue to Sir, but the reference must rather be to Euergetes II (Ptolemy VII). The "shoot" who "shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north" and prevail is Euergetes I (Da 11:7-9), Da 11:8 referring to the act by which he won his title.

(4) Ptolemy IV, surnamed Philopator (Philopator, "Lover of his father"), or Tryphon (Truphon), the eldest son of Euergetes whom he succeeded in 222 BC. Antiochus the Great of Syria declared war against Egypt about 219 BC, but, after conquering Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, he was defeated by Philopator at the battle of Raphia near Gaza (217 BC). On his victorious return to Alexandria, Philopator assumed a very anti-Jewish attitude, and indeed caused discontent generally among his subjects. In spite of the victory of Raphia, Egypt began to decline under his weakness. He was as dissolute as Nero, while his domestic tragedies are as dark as those of Herod the Great. He died in 205 BC. Da 11:10-12 refers to the reign of Philopator. He was most probably the oppressor of 3 Macc.

(5) Ptolemy V, surnamed Epiphanes (Epiphanes, "Illustrious"). He was only 5 years old when his father Philopator died. Taking advantage of the king's minority, Antiochus the Great leagued with Philip of Macedon against Egypt. Philip took the Cyclades and some cities in Thrace, while Antiochus defeated the Egyptian general Scopas at Paneas on the Jordan in 198 BC, and thus Palestine passed to the Seleucid dynasty. The Romans now interfered to make Antiochus surrender his conquests. Not daring to disobey Rome, Antiochus compromised by making peace with Ptolemy and betrothing to him his daughter Cleopatra, who was to receive as her dower the revenues of the conquered provinces Coele-Syria, Palestine and Phoenicia (Josephus, Ant, XII, iv, 1; Polyb. xxviii.17), but the control of these

provinces seems to have been retained by Antiochus. The marriage took place in 193 BC. After the dismissal of his faithful minister, Aristomenes, Epiphanes' character and reign deteriorated. At last he bestirred himself to recover the lost provinces from Seleucus, the successor of Antiochus, but was poisoned before his plans materialized, in 182 (181) BC (Josephus, Ant, XII, iv, 11). Da 11:14-17 is to be interpreted as referring to the relations between Ptolemy V and Antiochus III, "the Great."

(6) Ptolemy VI, surnamed Philometor (Philometor, "Fond of his mother"), eider son of Ptolemy V whom he succeeded in 182 (181) BC. For the first 7 years of his reign his mother Cleopatra acted as queen-regent, and peace was maintained with Syria till 173 BC. Antiochus IV Epiphanes then invaded Egypt, defeated the Egyptians at Pelusium and secured the person of Philometor, whom he spared, hoping to employ him as a tool to gain the ascendancy over Egypt. Philometor's brother was now proclaimed king by the Alexandrians, with the title of Euergetes (II). When Antiochus retired, Philometor made peace with his brother, conceding him a share in the government (170 BC). This displeased Antiochus, who marched against Alexandria, but was stopped beneath the walls by a Roman embassy (168 BC), in obedience to which he withdrew. The brothers quarreled again, and Philometor, expelled by Euergetes, went to Rome to seek assistance (164 BC). The Romans seated him again on his throne, assigning Cyrenaica to Euergetes. The next, quarrel was about Cyprus. Philometor this time secured his brother as a prisoner, but sent him back to his province. Philometor was later drawn into Syrian politics in the conflict between Alexander Balas and Demetrius. The Egyptian king espoused the cause of the former, to whom he also betrothed his daughter Cleopatra. But on discovering Balas' treachery, he took away his daughter from him and gave her to his opponent, Demetrius Nikator, whom he now supported against Balas. Balas was defeated in a decisive battle on the Oenoparas and killed, but Ptolemy himself died in 146 BC from the effects of a fall from his horse in the battle (1 Macc 1:18; 10:51 ff; 2 Macc 1:10; 4:21). Da 11:25-30 refers to the events of this reign. Philometor seems to have taken a friendly attitude toward the Jews. In his reign the Jewish temple of Leontopolis near Hellopolis was founded in 154 BC (Josephus, Ant, XIII, iii, 1 f), and two Jewish generals, Onias and Dositheus, were at the head of his armies and had a large share in the government (Josephus, Apion II, 5). The Jewish-Alexandrine philosopher Aristobulus probably lived in this reign.

(7) (On the death of Philometor his young son was proclaimed king as Ptolemy Eupator ("of a noble father"), but after reigning but a few months was put to death by his uncle Euergetes II (Just. xxxviii.8). His reign being so brief he need hardly be numbered among the Ptolemies.)

(8) Ptolemy VII (VIII), surnamed Euergetes (II) and called also Physcon (Phuskon, "Big-paunch"), became sole ruler in succession to his brother Philometor (or to his murdered nephew) in 146 BC, and reigned till 117 BC. His reign was characterized by cruelty, tyranny and vice, so that he was hated by his subjects, especially by the people of Alexandria, who on one occasion expelled him during an insurrection. It is uncertain whether Physcon was an enemy and persecutor of the Jews or their patron. Some authorities refer the persecutions mentioned in 3 Maccabees to this reign, but most modern authorities are disposed to date them in the reign of the anti-Jewish Ptolemy IV Philopator. The statement, "in the 38th year of King Euergetes," in the Prologue to Sirach refers to Physcon Euergetes II and = 132 BC, since he dated his reign from the year of joint kingship with his brother (170 BC).

The other Ptolemies of Egypt require no mention here.

The following are the apocryphal Ptolemies:

(1) Ptolemy Macron.

See MACRON.

(2) Ptolemy, son of Abubus, son-in-law of Simon the Maccabee. He treacherously assassinated Simon and two of his sons in the stronghold of Dok near Jericho, 135 BC (1 Macc 16:15).

(3) Ptolemy, the father of Lysimachus (Apocrypha) (Additions to Esther 11:1).

(4) Ptolemy, son of a Dositheus; he and his father were bearers of the "epistle of Phrurai" (Additions to Esther 11:1).

LITERATURE.

J. P. Mahaffy, Empire of the Ptolemies, is the best account for English readers. A long list of Ptolemies will be found, e.g. in Smith's Classical Dictionary. The ancient authorities are Josephus, Polybius, Justin, Pausanias, Plutarch (Cleom.), Livy, Diodorus, Jerome (Commentary to Da 11).

S. Angus

PUAH; PUVAH

pu'-a, pu'-va: (1) pu'ah: One of the Hebrew midwives whom the king of Egypt commanded to kill all male children of the Hebrews at birth. The midwives, fearing God, refused to obey, pretending that the children of the Hebrew women were usually born before they arrived. Their act is spoken of as being meritorious in the eyes of the Lord, who is said to have rewarded them by making "houses" for them (Ex 1:15-20). In the Midrash, Ex Rabba', Puah is identified with Miriam, and Shiphrah, the other midwife, with her mother Jochebed. According to another tradition Puah was a proselyte.

(2) pu'ah, in 1Ch 7:1; puwwah, in Ge 46:13; Nu 26:23; written also "Pua" the King James Version, and "Puvah" Revised Version: Second son of Issachar, ancestor of the Punites, enumerated in the desert census taken by Moses and Eleazar.

(3) pu'ah: Member of the tribe of Issachar, mentioned (Jud 10:1) as the son of Dodo and the father of Tola, the judge.

Ella Davis Isaacs

PUBLICAN

pub’-li-kan.

See TAX, TAXING.

PUBLIUS

pub’-li-us (Poplios, from the Latin praenomen Publius, derived from populus, "popular"; according to Ramsay it is the Greek form of the Latin nomen Popilius; the Greek title meaning "first," applied to Publius in Ac 28:7, was an official one, and has been found on an inscription from the island of Gaulus near Malta (compare Bockh, Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum, number 5, 754)): Publius held office under the governor of Sicily. As the leading official in Malta, he was responsible for any Roman soldiers and their prisoners who might land there, but the account in Ac 28:7 implies that he displayed more than ordinary solicitude for Paul and his shipwrecked company, for, according to the writer, he "received us, and lodged us three days courteously" (the King James Version). The Apocryphal "Ac of Paul" (see APOCRYPHAL ACTS, sec. B, I) states also that "he did for them many acts of great kindness and charity" (compare Budge, Centendings of the Apostles, II, 605). On this occasion Paul miraculously healed the father of Publius, who "lay sick of fever and dysentery" (Ac 28:8). The exactitude of the medical terms here employed forms part of the evidence that the writer of Ac was a physician. Tradition relates that Publius was the first bishop of Malta and that he afterward became bishop of Athens.

C. M. Kerr

PUDENS

pu’-denz, pu’-dens (Poudes, literally, "bashful" (2Ti 4:21)):

1. Faithful to Paul:

One of the Christians in Rome who remained loyal to Paul during his second and last imprisonment there, when most of the members of the church "forsook him." The pressure under which they acted must have been very great, as the apostle’s final trial before the supreme court of the empire followed quickly after the Neronic persecution. Their defection from their loyalty to Paul must not be taken as implying that they had also proved untrue to Christ. At this time, however, there were some of the Christians who risked their earthly all, and their lives too, in order to prove their adherence to Paul, and Pudens was one of these.

2. Pudens and Claudia:

Writing the last of all his letters, the Second Epistle to Timothy, Paul sends greeting from "all the brethren" who were then with him. Among these he names Pudens. There are three other names associated by the apostle with that of Pudens: Eubulus, Linus and Claudia. There is an interesting conjecture regarding Pudens and Claudia, that their were husband and wife, and that Claudia was of British birth, a daughter of a British king, called Cogidunus. King Cogidunus was an ally of the Romans, and assumed the name of the emperor Tiberius Claudius, who was his patron. In this way his daughter would be named Claudia. But this identification of the British princess with the Claudia who sends salutation to Timothy is only a supposition; it lacks both evidence and proof.

See CLAUDIA and Code of Hammurabi (St. P), chapter xxvii.

In modern Rome, however, the tourist is still shown a building which is called the house of Pudens, in the same way as "Paul’s hired house" is also shown. The authenticity in both cases is lacking.

Pudens is not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament.

John Rutherfurd

PUHITES

pu’-hits (puthi).

See PUTHITES.

PUL

pul:

(1) An Assyrian king (2Ki 15:19).

See TIGLATH-PILESER.

(2) An African country and people (Isa 66:19).

See PUT.

PULPIT

pool’-pit: Ne 8:4, "Ezra the scribe stood upon a mighdol of wood." Mighdol is one of the commonest words in the Old Testament and means simply a high object—here a scaffolding or platform (bema, 1 Esdras 9:42). "Tower" (so the Revised Version margin) gives an entirely wrong picture.

PULSE

puls (zero’-im (Da 1:12 margin, "herbs"), zere’onim (Da 1:16); compare zerua‘, "sowing seed" (Le 11:37), and zeru’im, "things sown" (Isa 61:11)):

(1) In Da 1:12,16, it must mean herbs or vegetables grown from seeds; a vegetable diet is what is implied.

(2) In 2Sa 17:28, "pulse" after "parched" is not in the original, but is probably more correct than the translation in (1), as "pulse" usually implies leguminous plants, peas, beans, etc.

PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING

pun’-ish-ment:

I. PRELIMINARY ASSUMPTIONS

1. Survival after Death

2. Retribution for Sin

3. Conscious Suffering in Future

II. SCRIPTURAL SUPPORT

1. Old Testament and Jewish Conceptions

2. New Testament Teaching

(1) "Eternal"

(2) Equivalent Expressions

(3) The Last Judgment

3. Teaching of Analogy

III. DIFFICULTIES AND OBJECTIONS—RIVAL HYPOTHESES

1. Universal Salvation

2. Annihilation

3. Second Probation

IV. NATURE, CONDITIONS AND ISSUES

1. Mystery of the Future

2. Nature of Punishment

3. Range of Divine Mercy

4. Gradation of Punishment

5. God "All in All"

LITERATURE

I. Preliminary Assumptions.

(For "everlasting," where used in the King James Version as the rendering of aionios, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "eternal.") It is assumed in this article that Scripture teaches the survival of the soul after death, the reality of retribution and of judgment to come, and a shorter or longer period of suffering for sin in the case of the unredeemed in the world beyond. Only a few words need be said, therefore, in preliminary remark on these assumptions.

1. Survival after Death:

Whatever view may be taken of the development of the doctrine of immortality in the Old Testament (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT), it will scarcely be doubted that it is throughout assumed in the New Testament that the souls of men, good and bad, survive death (see IMMORTALITY). Two passages only need be referred to in proof: one, Christ’s saying in Mt 10:28: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Gehenna); the other, the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus in Lu 16:19-31: Lazarus is carried by the angels to Abraham’s bosom; the rich man lifts up his eyes in Hades, being in torments. The whole doctrine of the future judgment in the New Testament presupposes survival after death.

2. Retribution for Sin:

Retribution for sin is a cardinal point in the teaching of both the Old Testament and New Testament. The doctrine of judgment, again, in the New Testament, with Christ as judge, turns on this point. The following passages are decisive: Isa 3:10,11; Mt 11:22,24; 12:41,42; Ro 2:5,12; 2Co 5:10; Ga 6:7,8, etc.

See RETRIBUTION.

3. Conscious Suffering in Future:

The conscious endurance of punishment for sin in the future state is already implied in the preceding. The parable of the Rich Man speaks of it as following immediately on death in Hades; all the descriptions of the judgment imply pain and anguish as the result of condemnation (compare Ro 2:5,12). This does not settle the nature or duration of the punishment; but it excludes the idea that physical death is the extinction of being, or that annihilation follows immediately upon death or judgment.

These things being assumed, the questions that remain are: Is the period of suffering for sin eternal, or is it terminable? May it be cut short by repentance or by annihilation? Is there any final solution of the discord it implies in the universe? It is maintained here that the punishment of sin, in the case of the finally impenitent, is everlasting.

II. Scriptural Support.

The doctrine that the punishment of sin is everlasting is sustained by many plain testimonies of Scripture.

1. Old Testament and Jewish Conceptions:

The doctrine of future punishment is not prominent in the Old Testament, where rewards and punishments are chiefly connected with the present life. In a few passages (Ps 49:14,15; 73:18,19; compare Isa 24:21,22; 66:24), Dr. Charles thinks that "Sheol appears as the place of punishment of the wicked" (Eschatology, 73-76, 156). If so, there is no suggestion of escape from it. In Da 12:2, some that sleep in the dust are represented as awaking to "shame and everlasting contempt" (the word for "everlasting" is the usual one, ‘olam). In the Jewish literature of the century before Christ, "Sheol is regarded," says Dr. Charles, "as the place of final eternal punishment, that is, it has become hell" (op. cit., 236).

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. 2. New Testament Teaching:

In the New Testament, the strongest language is used by Jesus and the apostolic writers on the certainty and severity of the punishment of sin in the future state, and always in a manner which suggests that the doom is final.

(1) "Eternal."

The word "eternal" (aionios) is repeatedly applied to the punishment of sin, or to the fire which is its symbol. A principal example is Mt 25:41,46, "eternal fire," "eternal punishment" (kolasis aionios). Here precisely the same word is applied to the punishment of the wicked as to the blessedness of the righteous. Other instances are Mt 18:8; Jude 1:7; compare Re 14:11; 19:3; 20:10. In 2Th 1:9, we have, "eternal destruction." The kindred word aidios, "everlasting," is in Jude 1:6 applied to the punishment of the fallen angels.

The reply made by Maurice (Theological Essays, 442 ff) that aionios in such passages denotes quality, not duration, cannot be sustained. Whatever else the term includes, it connotes duration. More pertinent is the criticism of other writers (e.g. Cox, Salvator Mundi, 96 ff; Farrar, Eternal Hope, Pref., xxxiv, pp. 78 ff, 197 ff; compare his Mercy and Judgment, passim) that aionios does not necessarily mean "eternal" (according to Cox it does not mean this at all), but is strictly "age-long," is therefore compatible with, if it does not directly suggest, a terminable period. Cox allows that the term is "saturated through and through with the element of time" (p. 100,), but he denies its equivalence with "everlasting." The sense, no doubt, is to be determined by the context, but it can hardly be questioned that "the eons of the eons" and similar phrases are the practical New Testament equivalents for eternity, and that aionios in its application to God and to life ("eternal life") includes the idea of unending duration (compare Joh 10:28,29 for express assertion of this). When, therefore, the term is applied in the same context to punishment and to life (Mt 25:46), and no hint is given anywhere of limitation, the only reasonable exegesis is to take the word in its full sense of "eternal."

(2) Equivalent Expressions.

The meaning "eternal" is confirmed by the use of equivalent expressions and of forms of speech which convey in the strongest manner the idea of finality. Such are the expressions, "the unquenchable fire," the "worm" that "dieth not" (Mt 3:12; Mr 9:43-48; compare Mt 13:42,50), with those numerous references to "death," "destruction," "second death," on which the advocates of conditional immortality build their arguments for final extinction. Such is the dictum of Jesus: "He that obeyeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth (remains) on him" (Joh 3:36; the opposite of "life" is "perishing," 3:16); or that in Re 22:11, "He that is unrighteous, let him do unrighteousness still: and he that is filthy, let him be made filthy still." Finality is the note in all Christ’s warnings—"the outer darkness" (Mt 8:12; 22:13); "The door was shut .... I know you not" (Mt 25:10,12; compare 7:23), as in those of the Epistles (e.g. Heb 2:3; 6:6,8; 10:27,31; 12:25,29). Jesus speaks of the blasphemy against the Spirit as a sin which shall not be forgiven, "neither in this world, nor in that which is to come" (Mt 12:32; not as implying that other sins, unforgiven in this life, may be forgiven in the next), a passage which Mark gives in the remarkable form, "hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin" (Mr 3:29). The Rich Man in Hades found an impassable gulf fixed between himself and Lazarus (Lu 16:26). See GULF. It adds to the terribleness of these sayings that, as before remarked, there is nothing to put against them; no hint or indication of a termination of the doom. Why did Jesus not safeguard His words from misapprehension, if behind them there lay an assurance of restoration and mercy? One may ask with Oxenham, in a reply to Jukes, "whether if Christ had intended to teach the doctrine of eternal

punishment, He could possibly have taught it in plainer terms."

(3) The Last Judgment.

The New Testament doctrine of the last judgment leads to the same conclusion. Two things seem plainly taught about this judgment: the first, that it proceeds on the matter of the present life—"the things done in the body" (Mt 25:31-46; 2Co 5:10; Re 20:12); and the second, that it is decisive in its issues. Not a single suggestion is given of a reversal of its decisions in any future age. Such silence is inexplicable if the Scriptures meant to teach what the opponents of this doctrine so confidently maintain.

3. Teaching of Analogy:

In corroboration of this Scriptural view analogy might be pleaded. How constantly even in this life is the law illustrated of the tendency of character to fixity! The present is the season of grace (2Co 6:2), yet what powers of resistance to God and goodness are seen to lie in human nature, and how effectually, often, does it harden itself under the influences that seem most fitted to break down its rebellion! What likelihood is there that eternity will alter this tendency, or make conversion more easy? Eternity can hardly be thought of as more really a scene of grace than time is for those to whom the gospel has already come. Its characteristic mark is said to be "judgment" (Heb 9:27). Like the photographer’s bath, may its effect not be to develop and fix existing character, rather than to change it? If so, the state in which judgment finds the soul may be presumed to be one that will remain.

III. Difficulties and Objections—Rival Hypotheses.

What, it will now be asked, of the tremendous difficulties which inhere in this doctrine, with their undeniable effect in alienating many generous minds from it and from Christianity? The lurid rhetorical picturings of the sufferings of the lost, too frequent in the teaching of the past, may be discounted; it is not necessary to go beyond the inexpressibly solemn words of Christ Himself and His apostles. But even with this limitation, does it not seem as if, by this doctrine, a reflection was cast on the righteousness and mercy of God in creating such multitudes of the human race, as, on any showing, are outside the pale of Christ’s salvation—the countless generations of the heathen, with the masses even in Christian lands who have not received or do not obey the light—only to doom them to endless misery? Before attempting a positive answer, it is proper that a glance be taken at the rival theories put forth in alleviation of the difficulty.

1. Universal Salvation:

The most comprehensive solution propounded is that of universal salvation—of a final restitution of all souls to God’s favor and to blessedness. This tempting speculation—for it is no more—advocated by Origen in the early church, by Schleiermacher in the last century, has been urged by many writers in modern times. One of its best known advocates was Samuel Cox, in his book Salvator Mundi. It is noticeable that not a few who favor this theory (e.g. Maurice, Farrar) decline to commit themselves to it

as more than a "hope," and admit the possibility of human souls continuing to resist God endlessly (Maurice, Theological Essays, 476; Farrar, Eternal Hope, Pref., xv, xvi; Mercy and Judgment, I, 485, "In this sense there may be for some souls an endless hell"). It must, however, be evident that, be the number greater or smaller—and who shall give assurance of its smallness?—if there are any such souls, the difficulty in principle remains, and the passages alleged as teaching universal restoration are equally contradicted. The deeper objection to this theory is that, springing, not from real knowledge, but from men's hopes and wishes, it has, as already shown, the tremendous stress of Scripture testimony against it; nor do the passages commonly adduced as favoring it really bear the weight put upon them. We read, e.g., of a restoration of all things"—the same that Christ calls the palingenesia—but, in the same breath, we are told of those who will not hearken, and will be destroyed (Mt 19:28; Ac 3:21,23). We read of Christ drawing all men unto Him (Joh 12:32); but we are not less clearly told that at His coming Christ will pronounce on some a tremendous condemnation (Mt 7:23; 25:41); we read of all things being gathered, or summed up, in Christ, of Christ subduing all things to Himself, etc.; but representative exegetes like Meyer and Weiss show that it is far from Paul's view to teach an ultimate conversion or annihilation of the kingdom of evil (compare Meyer on 1Co 15:21,28 and Eph 1:10; Weiss, Biblical Theology, II, 723, 107, 109, English translation). We confess, however, that the strain of these last passages does seem to point in the direction of some ultimate unity, be it through subjugation, or in some other way, in which active opposition to God's kingdom is no longer to be reckoned with.

2. Annihilation:

The view favored by another class is that of the annihilation of the finally impenitent. The type of doctrine called "conditional immortality" includes other elements which need not here be discussed (see IMMORTALITY). The annihilation theory takes different forms. So far as the annihilation is supposed to take place at death, it is contradicted by the Scriptures which support the soul's survival after death; so far as it is believed to take place after a longer or shorter period of conscious suffering (which is White's theory), it involves its advocates in difficulties with their own interpretations of "death," "destruction," "perishing," seeing that in Scripture this doom is uniformly represented as overtaking the ungodly at the day of judgment, and not at some indefinite period thereafter. The theory conflicts also with the idea of gradation of punishment, for which room has to be sought in the period of conscious suffering, and rests really on an unduly narrowed conception of the meaning of the Scriptural terms "life" and "death." Life is not bare existence, nor is "death" necessarily extinction of being. Assaid earlier, the language of many parts of Scripture implies the continued existence of the subjects of the divine wrath.

3. Second Probation:

It is significant that on the side alike of the advocates of restoration and of those of annihilation (e.g. E. White), refuge from the difficulties is frequently sought in the hypothesis of an extended probation and work of evangelization beyond death. This theory labors under the drawback that, in marked contrast with Scripture, it throws immensely the larger part of the work of salvation into the future state of being. It is, besides, apart from the dubious and limited support given to it by the passage on Christ's preaching to "the spirits in prison" (1Pe 3:19,20); destitute of Scriptural support. It has already been pointed out

that the final judgment is uniformly represented as proceeding on the matter of this life. The theory is considered elsewhere.

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, sec. X.

IV. Nature, Conditions and Issues.

1. Mystery of the Future:

While dogmatisms like the above, which seem opposed to Scripture, are to be avoided, it is equally necessary to guard against dogmatisms of an opposite kind, as if eternity must not, in the nature of the case, have its undisclosed mysteries of which we here in time can frame no conception. The difficulties connected with the ultimate destinies of mankind are truly enormous, and no serious thinker will minimize them. Scripture does not warrant it in negative, any more than in positive, dogmatisms; with its uniformly practical aim, it does not seek to satisfy an idle curiosity (compare Lu 13:23,24). Its language is bold, popular, figurative, intense; the essential idea is to be held fast, but what is said cannot be taken as a directory to all that is to transpire in the ages upon ages of an unending duration. God’s methods of dealing with sin in the eternities may prove to be as much above our present thoughts as His dealings now are with men in grace. In His hands we must be content to leave it, only using such light as His immediate revelation yields.

2. Nature of Punishment:

As respects the nature of the punishment of sin, it cannot be doubted that in its essence it is spiritual. Everything can be adopted here which is said by Maurice and others—"The eternal punishment is the punishment of being without the knowledge of God, who is love, and of Jesus Christ who has manifested it; even as eternal life is declared to be the having the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ" (Theological Essays, 450). The supreme penalty of sin is unquestionably the loss of God’s life and love—the being sinful. Environment, indeed, may be expected to correspond with character, but the hell is one the sinner essentially makes for himself, and, like the kingdom of God, is within. The fire, the worm, the stripes, that figure its severity, are not physical. Even should the poena sensus (were that conceivable) be utterly removed, the poena damni would eternally remain.

3. Range of Divine Mercy:

It is a sound principle that, in His dealing with sin in the world to come, God’s mercy will reach as far as ever it can reach. This follows from the whole Scriptural revelation of the character of God. What may be included in it, it is impossible for anyone to say. It should be noticed that those of whom it is said that they shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them, are those who "obey not" the truth (Joh 3:36)—who actively and consciously disregard and oppose it. But all do not belong to this class. It may be assumed that none will be lost who can in consistency with holiness and love be saved. The most germinal goodness, which is the implantation of His own Spirit, God will acknowledge and develop.

The problem of undeveloped character may receive a solution we do not wot of with the entrance into the eternal light—not in change of character, but rather, as said before, in the revelation of character's inmost bent. In this sense, the entrance into eternity may be to many the revelation of a love and grace which had not been understood or appreciated as it should have been on earth, but with which it is in essential kinship. There are at least many shades and degrees of character, and God may be entrusted to take the most just, yet most merciful, account of all.

4. Gradation of Punishment:

The fullest weight must further be given to what the Scripture so expressly says of gradation of punishment, even of the unsaved. It is not the case that the lot of all who fail of the eternal life in Christ is all of one grade. There are the "few stripes" and the "many stripes" (Lu 12:47,48); those for whom it will be "more tolerable" than for others in the day of judgment (Mt 11:20,24). Even "Sodom and her daughters" will be mercifully dealt with in comparison with others (Eze 16:48,49,53,55,61). There will be for everyone the most exact weighing of privilege, knowledge and opportunity. There is a vast area here for the divine administration on which no light at all is afforded us.

5. God "All in All":

There remain those passages already alluded to which do seem to speak, not, indeed, of conversion or admission into the light and fellowship of Christ's kingdom, but still of a final subjugation of the powers of evil, to the extent, at least, of a cessation of active opposition to God's will, of some form of ultimate unification and acknowledgment of Christ as Lord. Such passages are Eph 1:10; Php 2:9-11; above all, 1Co 15:24-28. God, in this final vision, has become "all in all." Here, again, dogmatism is entirely out of place, but it is permissible to believe that these texts foreshadow such a final persuasion of God's righteousness in His judgment and of the futility of further rebellion as shall bring about an outward pacification and restoration of order in the universe disturbed by sin, though it can never repair that eternal loss accruing from exclusion from Christ's kingdom and glory.

LITERATURE.

Against: Maurice, Theological Essays, "Eternal Life and Eternal Death"; S. Cox, Salvator Mundi; F. W. Farrar, Eternal Hope; Mercy and Judgment; A. Jukes, The Second Death and the Restitution of All Things; E. White, Life in Christ; H. Constable, Duration and Nature of Future Punishment. For: Pusey, What Is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment, H. N. Oxenham, Catholic Eschatology; C. Clemance, Future Punishment; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, the Messiah, Appendix, xix, "On Eternal Punishment, according to the Rabbis and the New Testament "; The Future Life, A Defence of the Orthodox View, by the Most Eminent American Scholars; S. D. F. Salmond, The Christian Doctrine of Immortality, Book VI; Orr, Christian View of God, lecture ix; Luthardt, Saving Truths (English translations), lecture x. See also the various works on Dogmatic and Biblical Theology.

James Orr

PUNISHMENTS

pun’-ish-ments (’awon, "fault," "iniquity," "punishment for iniquity," "sin" (Ge 4:13; Le 26:41; Job 19:29; Ps 149:7; La 4:22; Eze 14:10 margin; Am 1:3,6,9,11,13; 2:1,4,6), ‘onesh, "tribute," "fine," "punishment" (La 3:39), chaTa’ah, or chaTTa’th, "sin" and its retribution, "penalty," "expiation" (Zec 14:19); kolasis, "punishment," "torment" (Mt 25:46), epitimia, "poll tax," hence, "penalty" (2Co 2:6), timoria, "vindication," hence, "penalty" (Heb 10:29), ekdikesis, "vindication," "retribution" (1Pe 2:14 the King James Version)): A court could inflict for a crime against the person, a sentence of

(1) death in the form of stoning, burning, beheading, or strangling, etc.;

(2) exile to one of the cities of refuge in case of manslaughter (Nu 35); or

(3) stripes, not to exceed 40, in practice 39 or less (De 25:3; 2Co 11:24).

Offences against property (theft, fraudulent conversion of deposit, embezzlement, robbery) were punished by exacting more than the value of the things taken (Lu 19:8), the excess going to the injured party, thus differing from a fine, which goes into the treasury of the community. The housebreaker was liable to be slain with impunity (Ex 22:2). A fine in the modern sense is unknown in the Scriptures, unless Le 5:6-19 be interpreted as referring to such.

1. History of the Hebrew Law concerning Punishment:

The earliest theory of punishment seems to have been that of retaliation—"blood for blood"—and to some extent this principle appears even in the Law of Moses (Le 21:19,20; Mt 5:38). Early in the history of the race, punishment was administered for sin and crime. Adam and Eve were driven from the Garden, and Cain, the first murderer, though not executed in retaliation for his deed, had a mark set on him. The words of Lamech (Ge 4:24) indicate that death was regarded as the fitting punishment for murder, and the same thought apparently was in the minds of the brethren of Joseph (Ge 42:21). Judah, as head of his family, seems to have had power of life and death (Ge 38:24), and Abimelech threatens his people with the extreme punishment in case they injure or insult Isaac or his wife (Ge 26:11). Similar power is ascribed to Pharaoh (Ge 41:13).

2. The Mosaic Law concerning Punishment:

Under the Law of Moses, the murderer was to be put to death without mercy. Even if he took refuge at the altar in a sanctuary or in an asylum city, he would not be immune from arrest and execution, and the same principle was applied in the case of an animal (Ex 21:12,14,23,28,36 parallel). But punishment under the Mosaic Law was not to be entailed or transmitted (De 24:16), as was the case among the Chaldeans (Da 6:24) and the kings of Israel (1Ki 21; 2Ki 9:26).

It has been noted that capital punishment is extensively prescribed by the Mosaic Law, and undoubtedly the Law was carried out. This circumstance has been explained by reference to the fact that the nation consisted of newly emancipated slaves, and therefore required harsh measures to keep them in check.

Under the Mosaic Law, the offenses that made one liable to the punishment of death were:

(1) striking or reviling a parent (Ex 21:15,17);

(2) blasphemy (Le 24:14,16,23; 1Ki 21:10; Mt 26:65,66);

(3) Sabbath-breaking (Ex 31:14; 35:2; Nu 15:32-36);

(4) witchcraft and false pretension to prophecy (Ex 22:18; Le 20:27; De 13:5; 18:20; 1Sa 28:9);

(5) adultery (Le 20:10; De 22:22);

(6) unchastity:

(a) before marriage, but detected afterward (De 22:21),

(b) in case of a woman with someone other than her betrothed (De 22:23),

(c) in a priest's daughter (Le 21:9);

(7) rape (De 22:25);

(8) incestuous and unnatural connections (Ex 22:19; Le 20:11,14,16);

(9) man-stealing (Ex 21:16);

(10) idolatry, actual or virtual, in any form (Le 20:2; De 13:6; 17:2-7);

(11) false witness in capital cases (De 19:16,19).

A large number of offenses come under the law of punishment by cutting off from the people, the meaning of which expression has led to some controversy. It may signify excommunication or death, and occurs in connection with the following offenses:

(1) breach of morals, such as willful sin in general (Nu 15:30,31); incestuous or unclean connections (Le 18:29; 29:9-21);

(2) breach of covenant, brought about through uncircumcision (Ge 17:14; Ex 4:24), neglect of Passover (Nu 9:13), Sabbath-breaking (Ex 31:14), neglect of Atonement Day (Le 23:29), work done on the Atonement Day (Le 23:30), children offered to Molech (Le 20:3), witchcraft (Le 20:6), anointing an alien with holy oil (Ex 30:33);

(3) breach of ritual, committed by eating leavened bread during Passover (Ex 12:15,19), eating fat of sacrifices (Le 7:25), eating blood (Le 7:27; 17:14), eating sacrifices while unclean (Le 7:20,21; 22:3,4,9), offering too late (Le 19:8), making holy ointment for private use (Ex 30:32,33), making perfume for private use (Ex 30:38), general neglect of purification (Nu 19:13,20), not bringing offering after slaying a beast for food (Le 17:9), slaying the animal at a place other than the tabernacle door (Le 17:4), touching holy things illegally (Nu 4:15,18,20).

Of capital punishments that are properly regarded as of Hebrew origin, we note:

(1) Stoning

Stoning, which was the ordinary mode of execution (Ex 19:13; Le 20:27; Jos 7:25; Lu 20:6; Ac 7:58; 14:5). The witnesses, of whom there were at least two, were required to cast the first stone (De 13:9 f; Joh 8:7). If these failed to cause death, the bystanders proceeded to complete the sentence, whereupon the body was to be suspended until sunset (De 21:23).

(2) Hanging

Hanging is mentioned (Nu 25:4; De 21:22), probably not as a mode of execution, but rather of exposure after death. It may have been a Canaanitish punishment, since it was practiced by the Gibeonites on the sons of Saul (2Sa 21:6,9).

(3) Burning

Burning, before the age of Moses, was the punishment of unchastity (Ge 38:24). The Law prescribes it as a punishment in the case of a priest’s daughter (Le 21:9), and in case of incest (Le 20:14), but it is also mentioned as following death by other means (Jos 7:25), and some believe it was never used except after death. That it was sometimes used as a punishment on living persons among the heathen is shown by Da 3.

(4) The Sword or Spear

The sword or spear as an instrument of punishment is named in the Law (Ex 19:13; 32:27; Nu 25:7). It occurs frequently in monarchic and post-Bab times (Jud 9:5; 1Sa 15:33; 2Sa 20:22; 1Ki 19:1; Jer 26:23; Mt 14:8,10), but among these cases, there are some of assassination rather than of punishment.

(5) Strangling

Strangling as a form of punishment has no Scripture authority, but according to tradition was frequently employed, and is said to have been performed by immersing the convict in clay or mud, and then strangling him by a cloth tied around the neck.

3. Punishments of Foreign Origin: Besides these, which are to be regarded as the ordinary capital punishments, we read of some that were either of foreign introduction or of an irregular kind, such as:

(1) crucifixion (which see);

(2) drowning (Mt 18:6 parallel);

(3) sawing asunder or crushing (2Sa 12:31; Heb 11:37);

(4) torturing (1Ch 20:3; Heb 11:35);

(5) precipitation (2Ch 25:12; Lu 4:29);

(6) suffocation (2 Macc 13:4-8).

The Persians are said to have filled a high tower a great way up with ashes, and then to have thrown the criminal into it, and continually stirred up the ashes by means of a wheel till he was suffocated (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchy, III, 246).

See also HEROD, II, 100.

Secondary forms of punishment not heretofore mentioned are to be noted as follows:

(1) Blinding or Putting Out of Eyes

Blinding or putting out of eyes in the case of captives (Jud 16:21; 1Sa 11:2; 2Ki 25:7).

(2) Chaining

Chaining by means of manacles or fetters of copper or iron, similar to our handcuffs fastened on the wrists and ankles and attached to each other by a chain (Jud 16:21; 2Sa 3:34; 2Ki 25:7); also alluded to in the life of Paul (Ac 28:20; Eph 6:20; 2Ti 1:16); and in the case of Peter (Ac 12:6).

(3) Confiscation of Property

Confiscation of property that had fallen under the ban, i.e. had been singled out for destruction by the

special decree of Yahweh, as in Nu 21:2; Jos 6:17; or had been reserved for the use of the army (De 2:35; 20:14; Jos 22:8); or given over to the priesthood (Jos 6:19). The term may be extended to include all things vowed or sanctified and those irrevocably devoted or consecrated to God (Le 27:21,28). The idea is applied with special emphasis to those things which, because of their uncleanness, must not be used by the Israelites, though, through their warfare with the heathen, they might have come into possession of them (De 7:26; 1Sa 15:16-23).

(4) Dashing in Pieces (Psalms 2:9; Isaiah 13:18).

(5) Divine Visitation.

See VISITATION.

(6) Exposure to Wild Beasts (Leviticus 26:22; 1 Samuel 17:46; Daniel 6).

(7) Flaying

(Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchy, I, 478; Nineveh and Babylon; mentioned figuratively in Mic 3:3).

(8) Forfeiture (Ezra 10:8).

(9) Gallows

Gallows in the modern sense probably were unknown to the ancients. Where the word occurs in Es 5:14; 6:4; 7:9,10; 9:13,15, it probably refers to a beam or pole on which the body was impaled and then elevated to a height of 50 cubits as an object of warning to the people (see "Hanging").

(10) Imprisonment

Imprisonment is frequently referred to in both the Old Testament and the New Testament, indicating that this was a common mode of punishment among both the Israelites and other nations (Ge 40:3; 42:17; Le 24:12; Nu 15:34; 1Ki 22:27; Jer 37:15,21; Lu 3:20; Ac 4:3,10; 23:10; and the Epistles of Paul).

See PRISON.

(11) Indignities.

In this term may be included all those outbursts of vengeance or other evil dispositions that were practiced in times or under circumstances when liberties with the prisoner were permitted on the part of bystanders or those who had charge beyond the execution of the judicial decree. Instances are found in the life of Christ (Mt 26:59,67; Lu 22:63 ff; Joh 18:22); also in the life of Paul (Ac 23:2).

(12) Mutilation (Judges 1:6,7; Ezekiel 23:25; 2 Maccabees 7).

The Law was opposed to thus treating any Israelite, and Samuel, when referring to the arbitrary power of the future king (1Sa 8:10), does not say that he would thus treat "their sons." It was a barbarous custom of the East (see EUNUCH; POLYGAMY), evidently regarded, among the Hebrews, as a heinous practice (De 23:1). The only act authorizing mutilation (except in retaliation) is mentioned in De 25:11.

(13) Plucking Off the Hair

Plucking off the hair is alluded to as a mode of punishment in Ne 13:25; Isa 50:6.

(14) Prison Garments

Prison garments were in vogue to mark the convicts (Jer 52:33).

(15) Restitution

Restitution has been alluded to in the general introduction to this topic.

(16) Retaliation

Retaliation was recognized by Moses as a principle, but the application of it was left to the judge (Le 24:19-22). A fine example of it is found in the law of De 19:19.

(17) Scorpions, Chastising with.

Probably the use of thongs armed with pointed pieces of lead or other metal (1Ki 12:11; 2Ch 10:14).

See SCORPIONS.

(18) Scourging.

See separate article.

(19) Slavery.

See separate article.

(20) Stocks.

See PRISON.

Frank E. Hirsch

PUNITES

pu’-nits (puni, probably "dark"): Descendants of Puvah, of the tribe of Issachar (Nu 26:23; compare Ge 46:13; Jud 10:1; 1Ch 7:1).

PUNON

pu’-non (punon): A desert camp of the Israelites, the second after leaving Mt. Hor (Nu 33:42,43). Eusebius (Onom 299 85; 123 9) mentions an Idumean village, North of Petra, in the desert, where convicts were mining copper, called Phinon or Phainon. These are doubtless identical.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

PUR

pur (Es 3:7; 9:26).

See PURIM.

PURAH

pu’-ra (purah, "branch"): Gideon’s "servant," literally, "young man," i.e. armor-bearer (Jud 7:10 f, the King James Version "Phurah").

PURCHASE

pur’-chats: In modern English, "to acquire by payment," in Elizabethan English, "to acquire" by any means. In the Old Testament, the King James Version has used "purchase" to represent qanah, and its derivatives (verb and noun), except in Le 25:33, where the word is ga’al (the Revised Version (British and American) "redeem"). In the New Testament the noun does not occur and the verb is used for ktaomai, in Ac 1:18; 8:20, and peripoieo, in Ac 20:28; 1Ti 3:13. But none of these words connotes the payment of a price, so that the Revised Version (British and American) has kept the word only in Ac 20:28 (margin "acquired"), changing it into "obtain" in Ac 1:18; 8:20, and "gain" in 1Ti 3:13. In the Old Testament, the Revised Version margin has "gotten" in Ex 15:16 and the American Standard Revised Version has (very properly) introduced the same word into the text of Ps 74:2; 78:54.

Burton Scott Easton

PURE; PURELY; PURITY

pur, pur'-li, pu'-ri-ti: This group of words has in the Old Testament and the New Testament an almost exclusively ethical significance, though the word "pure" is of course used also in its literal sense of freedom from alloy or other alien matter (Ex 25:11, etc.). "Pure" in the Old Testament represents many Hebrew words, most frequently Tahor; "purely," occurs once only in the King James Version, as the translation of bor, properly "that which cleanses" (compare Job 9:30, the Revised Version margin "Hebrew 'cleanse my hands with lye,' " i.e. alkali for soap) in Isa 1:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "thoroughly (margin "as with lye," the King James Version "purely") purge away thy dross"; "pureness" is the King James Version translation of the same word in Job 22:30, the Revised Version (British and American) "cleanness." In the New Testament "pure" is the translation chiefly of katharos (Mt 5:8, Blessed are the pure in heart," etc.), but also of hagnos (Php 4:8; 1Ti 5:22; Jas 3:17; 1 Joh 3:3—always in an ethical sense). A different word (eilikrines) is used in 2Pe 3:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "sincere." "Purity" (hagneia) occurs only in the King James Version in 1Ti 4:12; 5:2; in the Revised Version (British and American) in 2Co 11:3 (as the translation of tes hagnotelos).

See CLEAN; PURITY.

W. L. Walker

PURGE

purj: A number of words in both the Old Testament and the New Testament are so rendered in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), although frequently in the Revised Version (British and American) the older English word "purge" is displaced by the more applicable modern terms "cleanse" and "purify," since the emphatic and medical senses of the word, as we now use it, are not justified by some of the Hebrew and Greek originals. In older English the word was broader in meaning, today it is specific. Occurrences in the King James Version, with the changes made in the Revised Version (British and American), are as follows:

1. In the Old Testament:

(1) Taber, literally, "to be clean," used of the putting-away of idolatry from Judah by Josiah (2Ch 34:3,8), is translated "purge" in all VSS, but, in Eze 24:13, the American Standard Revised Version changes to "cleanse."

(2) chaTa', literally, "to make a sin offering" (Ps 51:7): is changed without improvement to "purify" in the American Standard Revised Version, while "purge" is retained in the English Revised Version.

(3) kaphar, "to cover" or "to make atonement," occurs in Ps 65:3; 79:9; Eze 43:20,26; in the two

passages in Psalms, the Revised Version (British and American) has "forgive" (the "expiate" of the margin is still better), and in Ezekiel the even more accurate "make atonement." In both

(4) tsaraph, "to refine" (Isa 1:25), and

(5) duach, literally, "to rinse" (Isa 4:4), "purge" is well retained in the Revised Version (British and American).

(6) barar, literally, "to be shining," the Revised Version (British and American) retains in Eze 20:38, but in Da 11:35 changes to "purify."

(7) zaqaq, "to pour down" as molten metal (Mal 3:3), also becomes "purify" in the Revised Version (British and American).

These occurrences are all in the figurative sense, and apply to sin, uncleanness, idolatry, etc. Most noteworthy is the American Standard Revised Version change of the familiar Ps 51:7.

2. In the New Testament:

The Greek words rendered "purge" in the King James Version of the Apocrypha and New Testament are kathairo, and katharizo, and their compounds and derivatives. In all passages except four, the Revised Version (British and American) more properly translates "cleanse" (Mt 3:12; Mr 7:19; Lu 3:17; Joh 15:2; Heb 9:14,22; 10:2). In Heb 1:3 "when he had by himself purged our sins" is changed to "had made purification of." But in the case of the verb compounded with the preps. apo and ek, i.e. apokathairo and ekkathairo (Job 12:9; 1Co 5:7; 2Ti 2:21), with strong signification to "cleanse out," the Revised Version (British and American) properly retains "purge." Most worthy of note is the change of the familiar verse in John, "Every branch, that beareth fruit, he purgeth" to "Every branch .... he cleanseth" (15:2).

Edward Mack

PURIFICATION

pu-ri-fi-ka’-shun.

See PURGE; PURITY; UNCLEANNESS.

PURIM; PUR

pur’-rim, pur (purim, "lots"; Septuagint Phrourai): The name of a Jewish festival celebrated on the 14th and 15th days of the month Adar, the final month of the Biblical year, corresponding to February-March.
1. Scripture References:

The origin of the festival is narrated in the Book of Esther, and indeed is the motive of the book, as the time, reason and manner of its celebration are given in detail (Es 3:7; 9:24). Reference also is made to it in apocryphal literature (Additions to Esther 10:10-13; 2 Macc 15:36) and in Josephus (Ant., XI, vi, 13). No reference is made to this feast in the New Testament, as it was celebrated locally, and is therefore not to be connected with any of the festal pilgrimages to Jerusalem. For this reason the supposition of some that the feast of Joh 5:1 was Purim is to be rejected, mention of it being immediately followed by the words, "And Jesus went up to Jerusalem."

2. History of Institution:

For the complete account of the institution of Purim reference must be made to the Book of Esther. Only a brief statement is possible here. Haman, son of Hammedatha the AGAGITE (q.v.; compare 1Sa 15:8,32), who had been made prime minister by King Ahasuerus (Xerxes), bitterly hated the Jews, some of whom, as Mordecai, were rising to prominence in the empire. After Queen Vashti had been put away from her royal position for cause (Es 1:9-12), a Jewess named Esther, kinswoman and adopted daughter of Mordecai, was chosen to become the royal consort. This only increased the hatred of Haman, who in his jealous fury soon began to seek an opportune day to work his hate upon Mordecai and the whole Jewish people, and therefore resorted to the casting of the lots for the auspicious time: "They cast Pur, that is, the lot, before Haman from day to day, and from month to month, to the twelfth month, which is the month Adar" (3:7). Beginning with the 1st month, all the days and months were tried with unfavorable result, until the last. At Haman’s request Ahasuerus caused his scribes to send into all the realm on the 13th day of the 1st month a decree that all Jews should be put to death on the 13th day of the 12th month (3:12 ff). As the narrative shows, the wisdom of Mordecai, Esther’s heroism, and fasting and prayer availed to foil the dastardly scheme of Haman, who had already built the gallows on which his hated rival should be hanged. Haman was himself hanged on this gallows, while Mordecai was honored yet more (7:10; 8:1,2). A second decree was issued on the 23rd day of the 3rd month that on the 13th day of the 12th month (8:9,12), the day appointed in the first decree for their extermination, the Jews should gather together and defend themselves against their foes. On that fateful day not only did the Jews successfully resist the malice of their enemies, but the public officials also, seeing that the royal favor was with the Jews, espoused their cause. In Shushan, the royal city, a second day, the 14th, was granted the Jews for vengeance on their foes (9:11-16). In view of so great a deliverance "Mordecai wrote these things .... unto all the Jews .... to enjoin them that they should keep the fourteenth day of the month Adar, and the fifteenth day of the same, yearly, as the days wherein the Jews had rest from their enemies (9:20-22).

3. Manner of Observance:

Already as early as the times of the Maccabees (2 Macc 15:36), the festival was observed, the 14th day being called "Mordecai’s day." Josephus refers to it as continuously and widely observed down to his time: "For this cause the Jews still keep the forementioned days, and call them days of Purim" (Ant., XI, vi, 13). In succeeding centuries as the Jews have passed from one civilization or empire to another, so many causes have arisen to remind them of the persecutions of Haman as to make the festival of a

triumph over such persecutions both attractive and most significant to them. Experiences in Syria, Egypt, Rome, Russia and elsewhere have not been lacking in suggestion of the original occasion of Purim. The 13th day has been observed by fasting in commemoration of Esther's prayer and fasting before she approached the king; in the evening, at the beginning of the 14th day, the Jews repair to the synagogues where the Book of Esther, one of the meghilloth, is read with interpretations, execrations bursting out at the reading of Haman's name, accompanied by noise of rattles and stamping of feet, other persecutors and foes also sometimes coming in for a share of execration. The names of Mordecai and Esther receive blessings. On the following morning of the 14th synagogue services are again held, at which, in addition to the repetition of the Esther reading, Ex 17:8-16, which records the destruction of the Amalekites (compare Es 3:1), is also read as the lesson from the Law, presents are given to the poor and to friends, and the rest of the day, as also the 15th, observed with feasting and rejoicing, even excesses being condoned in the exuberance of national spirit.

4. Theories of Origin:

Many attempts have been made to trace the origin of Purim in pagan or cosmic festivals, but to the present time without success, without approach even to probability. Supposed connections with nature myths, national festivals, polytheistic legends have all found advocates. The word itself has suggested the possibility of identification with words of similar form or sound in other languages. But the ease of finding such similarities for any word casts doubt upon the reliability of any identification.

(1) It has been traced to the Assyrian puru, and identified with the Assyrian New Year when officials entered upon their term of service.

(2) The Babylonian puhru, new year festival, has also been claimed as the origin of Purim; Mordecai becomes Marduk, Esther is Ishtar, while Haman, Vashti and Zeresh are Median gods.

(3) The most popular attempts at identification are in the Persian field, where bahr, "lot," is claimed as the source of Pur, or purdighan, "new year," or farwardighan, the feast of departed souls.

(4) Origin also in a Greek bacchanalian occasion has been sought.

(5) Others suggest origin in other Jewish experiences than that claimed by the Book of Esther itself, such as a captivity in Edom, or a persecution under the Ptolemies in Egypt, or the victory of Judas Maccabeus over Nicanor in 161 BC (1 Macc 7:49).

No one of all these theories has sufficient probability to secure for itself anything like general acceptance; the Book of Es remains as the most reasonable account; the difficulties met in it are not so great as those of the explanations sought in other languages and religions.

LITERATURE.

Bible dicts., especially HDB, Encyclopedia Biblica and Jewish Encyclopedia; Paton, commentary on "Est" in ICC, particularly pp. 77-94.

Edward Mack

PURITY

pu’-ri-ti: The Bible bears witness to the long struggle over and in man to secure physical, mental, and moral cleanliness. The various forms of purity have relation to each other.

We have a common proverb that "cleanliness is akin to godliness." Cleanliness and aesthetics are certainly nigh neighbors. But cleanliness and ethics do not dwell farther apart. When one realizes that by uncleanness of person or property he may endanger the health or life of family, or even of society about him—as in keeping conditions that develop typhoid fever—he begins to realize that there is, a close tie between cleanliness and morals. "Ought" comes in on the sphere of cleanliness, and then the whole realm of ethics is open. So near are the departments of physical and ethical cleanliness that now if one hears the word "slum" without explanation, he cannot tell whether it relates to filth or sin.

The perception of this relationship is of very ancient date. Though it is Isaiah who says (52:11) "Cleanse yourselves, ye that bear the vessels of Yahweh," and Mr 7:3,4, "All the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders; and when they come from the marketplace, except they bathemselves, they eat not; and many other things there are, which they have received to hold, washings of cups, and pots, and brasen vessels," yet such statements are but summaries of directions distributed here and there throughout the whole Levitical Law. We can read therein what sounds like the hygienic orders of a general to his soldiers on the march, or like the rules of the board of health to preserve a city from pestilence. And these Levitical directions for cleanliness are connected inseparably with the worship of Yahweh, as though physical purity were to that an essential. The Psalmist blends these two elements, the physical and the ethical, in the familiar question and answer (Ps 24:3-5), "Who shall ascend into the hill of Yahweh? And who shall stand in his holy place? He that hath clean hands, and a pure heart; who hath not lifted up his soul unto falsehood, and hath not sworn deceitfully. He shall receive a blessing from Yahweh, and righteousness from the God of his salvation."

The ceremonial cleansings called for by the Law had meaning and influence. They were interpretative of something spiritual—were a parable way of illustrating the necessity of purity of heart in order to gain acceptance with God. If in after-days the thing symbolized was forgotten in the symbol, that was owing to "blindness of mind." The darkness was not necessary.

1. The Sex Relation:

But the main subject in respect to which we shall in this article seek light on purity from the Bible will not be hygiene or aesthetics, but morals. When we turn to that department we shall at once realize the fact that the sex relation is the most primitive and comprehensive of all the human relations.

The Family.

The attitude of the Bible in respect to that relation is unmistakable. From the vision of the Garden of Eden to that of the New Jerusalem, the Bible rings true to the ideal of purity in family life and in the relations of the sexes to each other. This is remarkable, for it is a vast history over which its narrative sweeps, and in it every species of literature is represented. It sets forth the acts and views of a people in all the stages of civilization, from wandering nomads to dwellers in cities embellished by architecture and every device of man to set forth riches and splendor. It sets forth their crime, shame and sin, as well as their virtues, but its tone is approbative of the virtues and reprobative of the crime, shame and sin. In the Magna Charta of the Hebrew people—the Ten Commandments—there stands in equal rank with any other principle, "Thou shalt not commit adultery." The sanction of religion and law was thus given to the integrity and purity of family life. The minute regulations against marriage with relatives, and the severe punishments inflicted for disregard of the restrictions (Le 18 and 20), were a powerful force in the same direction. The adultery of married persons was to be punished by the death of both the parties (Le 20:10; De 22:22).

Such laws may sometimes seem severe. Doubtless they are primitive and date from the time of nomadism. In primitive conditions, penalties for infraction of law are to be severe and swift. Pioneers the world over and through time, for very self-preservation’s sake, could show little favor or tolerance to lawlessness. Be these laws severe, they show the intense earnestness of a people to have a pure family life in which children born should be genuine to it. These Levitical restrictions upon intermarriage with relatives fit the sense of propriety and right of civilized people, even to this day.

2. The Prophets:

There is no question about the attitude of the prophets on purity. They were in harmony with the Law. They had no tolerance for corrupt morals or manners leading to impurity or suggesting it. An illustration sometimes has the light of the sun in it. What it is that is illustrated is frequently best seen by looking at the illustration itself. The prophets were passionate monotheists. They wanted above all things that Israel should be true to Yahweh and to Him alone. To the prophets, worship of other gods was treason to Yahweh. One prophet after another, and over and over again, illustrates this highest of crimes by infidelity in the marriage relation. That shows in what estimate the family was held. To put any other in the place of Yahweh was "to go a-whoring after other gods," or "to play the harlot." That shows as nothing else could how deep in the heart was sunk regard for pure family life. Infidelity was high treason there, or it never would have furnished language to describe high treason to God.

3. The Proverbs:

Pr 5 and 7 indicate the attitude of the book on purity. We may let the book make its own case. The wiles of "the strange woman" and the stupid folly and destruction of her victim are specially set forth in the chapters mentioned. In the last chapter of the book we have a portraiture of a "virtuous woman" in

whom domesticity in purity has reached a high stage. "Let her own works praise her in the gates."

4. The So of Songs:

It is pleasant to turn from the tense severity of law, since it must deal largely with crime and sin, to the idealism of poetry. In the Psalms and the Prophets the relation of husband and wife, of bridegroom and bride, of lover and loved are always treated with tenderness and reverence. Here is familiar Scripture (Ps 19): "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork. .... In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run his course." That does not betray any lack of sympathy with the exuberant spirit of a lover. So Isa 62:4,5: "For Yahweh delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married. For as a young man marrieth a virgin, so shall thy sons marry thee; and as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee." Language cannot more clearly disclose delight in the joy of those who are adjusting themselves under the "primal eldest" rule over sex: "Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh" (Ge 2:24).

It is sometimes thought strange that the So of Songs should be in the Scripture Canon. But why should there be such doubt? It is but a more particular elaboration of what is boldly brought to notice in the quotations above. There is no more necessity of reading impurity into it than there is of reading it into the quotations above. The poem is illustrative of an experience as widely known as any in the life of the human race—an experience in which sin is no necessity. One must go out of his way who imputes sin to a single act or thought that comes to expression in the poem. The maiden is guileless and the lover is manly. The poem is said to be erotic. But the eros is idealized. It may be sensuous, but it is not sensual. It is not selfish. The passion of each finds expression in careful thoughtfulness for the other. It does not turn back to itself in coarse brute craving of lust for its own self-indulgence. The refrain of the poem is —

"I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem

That ye stir not up, nor awake my love."—So 2:7; 3:5; 8:4.

The watchfulness is as tender as that for an infant. Where will the law lay its indictment of sin against such thoughts and feelings? The lovers are under the charm that has been and is to be from everlasting to everlasting with the human race upon the earth.

Christ at His strictest did not set Himself against the charm of love. He said it should be eternally single and true in spirit. The maiden in the song goes forth in the night, in the simplicity of her heart, to find her beloved (So 3:2). In the same simplicity, Evangeline wandered all the night of her life to find the object of her affection. From the same charm in the beginning came the faithfulness of Enoch Arden. Out of the love that springs from purity has come the integrity that has endured to the end. The exuberance of the charm, like every other spring of life and action, needs regulation, but the charm itself is not to be treated as sin.

5. Christ and Purity:

Paul has said, "Ye are not under law, but under grace" (Ro 6:14). But that depends upon the conditions to which it is applied. We may not be under the Levitical, ceremonial Law, but we are under the wide realm of ethical law always, even when we are under grace. What grace does is to idealize and spiritualize and make attractive and beautiful what before was perhaps hard, repellent statute and rule. Christ is sometimes thought to have relaxed the severity of "the reign of law." But six times even in the Sermon on the Mount He added to its strictness. Take the idea of the purity of the family as secured by its unity. Under the Mosaic legislation, certain not onerous forms of legal proceeding intervening, the termination of marriage might be said to be optional with the parties. All this liberty is swept away in one sentence: "I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery" (Mt 19:9). That is a law sentence. It was uttered in the realm of law. It was intended to have effect in law. No wonder, considering the liberty that had been allowed in the Law up to that time, that the disciples as soon as they got breath said, "If the case of a man is so with his wife, it is not expedient to marry." They knew that a new law for Christ's disciples was put over marriage. Even the exception confirmed His rule. If the exception is not allowed, polyandry or polygamy is established. No other sentence of human speech has done more for the purity of family life (see DIVORCE). But Christ did not stop with the utterance of law protective of purity physically; He went behind all acts and laid down law for the thoughts and intents of the heart: "But I say unto you, that every one that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart" (Mt 5:28).

Sometimes it may be thought that there is a look of moral indifference about the way in which Jesus disposed of the woman's case who was taken in adultery (Joh 8:1-11): "Did no man condemn thee? And she said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee; go thy way; from henceforth sin no more." But it must first be remembered that it was not her case but that of her accusers that was immediately before the mind of Jesus. They brought her before Him to trap Him, but He turned and put them on trial. He made their moral condition the main issue. Hers was but an incident. But then, Jesus did not leave her without impressing on her mind that she was a sinner. The last words left ringing in her ears were, "Sin no more." And she was left, as all in sin are left, to wrestle out adjustment with the Holy Spirit who leaves no soul without conviction of "sin, righteousness and judgment." The words of Jesus no more than the words of anyone else can explain all things at once. They can cover a point in view, but much must always be left to the understanding that comes from known experience under the moral government of God.

The subsequent psychology of a sinner after the words of Scripture leave him is of deepest interest. Psychological action he must have had; what is it? The question arises, Had the prodigal son completed his repentance till he had asked the forgiveness of his mother and his elder brother? What is the subsequent psychology of a sinner as he disappears from our view? We can interpret here by what we know to be the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul; just as we know a material object that diappears from view is still under the law of gravitation. Few who have thought on this subject have expressed the truth so well as Whittier in "Our Master," or in "John Underhill" in these words:

"And men took note of his gloomy air

The shame in his eye, the halt in his prayer,

The signs of a battle lost within,

The pain of a soul in the coils of sin.

Into the desert alone rode he,

Alone with the Infinite Purity;

And bowing his soul to its tender rebuke,

As Peter did to the Master's look,

He measured his path with prayer of pain

For peace with God and nature again."

There is a recognition of the burning with fire that is infolded in the word "purity."

6. Paul:

Paul is like his Master. He seeks for purity in this relation after marriage as well as before—purity of mind. In 1Co 7 we see how carefully and kindly Paul discoursed about all the complications in matters pertaining to sex. Then again, if Paul has exhorted wives to obedience to husbands, he has also called for equal self-surrender on the part of husbands (Eph 5:22-32): "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." Can there be any self-surrender greater than that which Christ made? Here let attention rest on the fact that in his catalogue of the fruits of the Spirit (Ga 5:22), if he has put "love" in the first place of emphasis among the nine, he has put "self-control" in the last.

We have only space for a glance at a few departments of action and thought to see what the world has gained in purity from the religion of the Bible. The age of chivalry ought to have a word put to its credit. The knights took the vow of chastity before the tribunals of the church. Take art—compare a Venus and a Madonna. Not only spirituality, but even intellectuality is wanting in a Venus. There is not a suggestion in a Venus that does not inhere in flesh and sense. Of what would she or could she speak if she were to open her mouth? To judge from her. appearance, the utterance would be so "flat, stale and unprofitable" that even the charm of her physical beauty would disappear. In the Madonna you scarce see the physical. If she were to speak, her words would picture the peace and calm joy of a heavenly

realm. If her countenance is suggestive of something far away, it is of something far above.

But art is not dead, and spiritual art did not die with the creation of the Madonna. Take Gaudens' "Puritan." Compare that with an Apollo. Again we have the contrast there is between a Madonna and a Venus. We have the physical and the aesthetic in an Apollo, but there is not a gleam of the intellectual. That Apollo thinks is not indicated, much less what he might be thinking about. There is not the faintest suggestion of the ethical. There is no intent and purpose in him. But in the Puritan there is intent and purpose. He means much. He is ethical. That determined bearing can only come from a spirit alive with the sense of right. When it comes to that, you will warrant that the Puritan carries more physical guns than the Apollo, and that if they were to clinch in a tug of wrestling Apollo would fall underneath. That ethical intent and purpose is masterly. You may look through a whole pantheon of Greek gods and meet not a trace of the force concentrated in the Puritan. He is forceful because right makes might. He is in the majority because he knows Who is with him. He is conscious of power because he has subdued the kingdom within. He has won the greatest of all victories—self-control.

C. Caverno

PURLOINING

pur-loin'-ing: Lit. "for far off," hence, to carry away or steal; the word is the translation of nosphizomai, "to take away for oneself," "to secrete," "to steal," a word appropriate to those in the position of slaves in a master's service (Tit 2:10, "not purloining").

PURPLE

pur'-p'-l ('argaman; Chaldaic 'argewan (2Ch 2:7); compare Arabic 'urjuwan, and Persian 'arghawan; porphura, porphureos Septuagint and New Testament)):

Purple dye was manufactured by the Phoenicians from a marine mollusk, Murex trunculus. The shell was broken in order to give access to a small gland which was removed and crushed. The crushed gland gives a milky fluid that becomes red or purple on exposure to the air. Piles of these broken shells still remain on the coast at Sidon and Tyre. The purple gland is found in various species of Murex and also of Purpura.

Purple cloth was used in the furnishings of the tabernacle (Ex 25:4, etc.) and of Solomon's temple (2Ch 2:14; 3:14); in the palanquin of Solomon (So 3:10); and in the hangings of the palace of Ahasuerus (Es 1:6). The kings of Midian had purple raiment (Jud 8:26); the worthy woman of Pr 31:22 has clothing of fine linen and purple. Mordecai was clothed with purple by Ahasuerus (Es 8:15); Jesus by the Roman soldiers (Mr 15:17,20; Joh 19:2,5). The rich man of Lu 16:19 and the scarlet woman of Re 18:12,16 were arrayed in purple. In So 7:5 the bride has hair like purple. Purple is in the merchandise of Babylon (Re 18:12). It is surprising that Ezekiel speaks of the Tyrians as obtaining purple from the isles of Elisha (Eze 27:7) and from Syria (Eze 27:16).

See COLORS; DYE, DYEING.

Alfred Ely Day

PURPOSE, OF GOD

pur’-pus (prothesis (Ro 9:11; Eph 1:11)): The word "purpose" seems to be an equivalent of the word "decree" as used in regard to man’s relation to eternity. More correctly stated, it softens the word "decree" and refers back to the cause of the decree as lodged in an intelligent design and forward to an aim consistent with the character of God.

See FOREORDAIN; PREDESTINATION.

PURSE

purs.

See BAG.

PURSLAIN; JUICE

purs’-lan, joos, jus.

See JUICE.

PURTENANCE

pur’-te-nans: With the significance of "belongings," this word occurs in the King James Version of Ex 12:9 as the translation of qerebh, "within" "inward," "roast .... with the purtenance thereof," the Revised Version (British and American) "inwards" (compare Le 1:9; 3:3, etc.).

PUT

put (puT; Phoud, in Genesis and Chronicles, variant for Genesis Phout, for Chronicles, Phouth):

1. Renderings:

In consequence of the identification at the time, the prophets have "Libya" (Libues), except Nab 3:9, where the Greek renders the word as phuge, "flight." The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

has "Phut," "Phuth," and in the Prophets "Libyes" and "Libya"; the King James Version "Phut."

2. Son of Ham:

In the "Table of Nations" Put is the third son of Ham (Ge 10:6), the first and second being Cush and Misraim, and the fourth Canaan. Put is the only one of the sons of Ham who is not credited with descendants.

3. As Nationality:

In the Prophets, warriors from Put are referred to, principally in connection with the forces of Egypt. They appear as shield-bearers (Jer 46:9: "Cush and Put, that handle the shield; and the Ludim, that handle and bend the bow"). See also Eze 30:5, where the order in the Hebrew is Cush, Put and Lud. In Na 3:9 Put is the helper of No-amon (Thebes in Egypt), and in Eze 27:10 Put appears with Persia and Lydia (Lud) as being in the army of Tyre.

4. Identified with Punt:

The common identification of Put is the Egyptian Punt (or Pwent) proposed by Ebers. The assimilation of n to a following consonant is common in the Semitic languages, and would occasion no difficulty if the vocalization be found to agree. The final "t" of Punt, however, seems to be the Egyptian feminine ending, whereas the "T" of Put is radical.

5. Somaliland and Yemen:

Nevertheless, the district would seem to be rightly identified with the tract to the East of Abyssinia (Somaliland), and as it is described as being on both sides of the sea (the Red Sea), Yemen would seem to be included. In connection with this, it is worthy of note that a fragment of a Babylonian tablet referring to Nebuchadrezzar’s campaign in Egypt in his 37th year mentions, as though in the neighborhood, the city (here, apparently, standing for the district) of Putu-yaman—probably not "Ionian (Greek) Put" (Lesbos, according to Winckler), but "Put of Yemen." If this be in contra-distinction to the district of Put (Punt) on the African mainland, the latter would be the Putu referred to in the Persian inscription of Naqsh-i-Rustem, which mentions, among the tributary-countries, Kushiya, Putiya and Masiya, in Babylonian (mat) PuTa, ((mat) K)usu, (mat) Massu(?), "the land Put, the land Kush (Ethiopia), the land Massu(?)." The soldiers of Put in the army of Tyre may have been either from the African or the Yemenite Put, in which case there was no northern tract of that name, unless settlements had been made at any time from the original district. See W. Max Muller, Asien und Europa, Leipzig, 1893, 106 ff.

T. G. Pinches

PUTEOLI

pu-te’-o-li (Potioloi, "sulphur springs" (Ac 28:13, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek), the modern Pozzuoli): A maritime city of Campania, which occupied a central position on the northern shore of a recess in the Gulf of Naples, protected on the West by the peninsula of Baiae and Cape Misenum. It was originally a colony of the neighboring Greek city Cumae.

The earliest event in the history of Puteoli which can be dated definitely was the repulse of Hannibal before its walls by a Roman garrison in 214 BC. The design of the Carthaginian to secure a seaport as base of supplies and communication was thus thwarted (Livy xxiv. 7, 12, 13). A Roman colony was established here in 194 BC, and Puteoli thus became the first Roman port on the Gulf of Naples (Livy xxxiv. 45; Strabo v.245; Velleius, i.15). Its subsequent remarkable prosperity and commercial activity are to be attributed to the safety of the harbor and the inhospitable character of the coast nearer Rome. For Puteoli became the chief seaport of the capital before the creation of an artificial harbor at Portus Augusti by Claudius, and before Trajan made the mouth of the Tiber the principal converging point for the over-sea carrying trade. The imports at Puteoli consisted mainly of Egyptian grain and oriental wares, dispatched from Alexandria and other cities of the Levant (Cicero Pro Rabirio 40; Suetonius, Augustus 98; Strabo xvii. 793; Cicero Pro Caelio 10). The eastern element in the population was very numerous (Petronius 81;

CIL, X, 1797). The harbor was rendered doubly safe by a mole, which is known to have been at least 418 yards in length, consisting of massive piers connected by means of arches constructed in solid masonry (Strabo v.245). Extensive remains of this mole still exist. The shore line devoted to purposes of commerce (emporium) extended for a distance of about 1 1/4 miles westward from the mole. At the height of its prosperity under Claudius and Nero, the town is thought to have contained a population of nearly 100,000.

The region in which the town was situated is of volcanic formation, the name Puteoli being due to the odor of the sulphureous springs or to the wells of a volcanic nature which abound in the vicinity. The volcanic dust, called pozzolana today, was mixed with lime to form a cement of the greatest durability, which was weatherproofing against the influence of seawater.

Extensive remains of an amphitheater, whose axes measure 160 and 126 yards across the space enclosed by the outer facade and 75 and 45 yards within the arena, bear testimony to the former affluence of Puteoli.

The region about Puteoli together with Baiae became the favorite resort of the Roman nobility, and the foundations of many ancient villas are still visible, although partly covered by the sea. Cicero’s villa in the territory of Puteoli (Cicero Ad Fam. v.15, 2; Ad Att. xiv. 16, 1; 20, 1) was afterward selected as the place of burial of Hadrian (Spartianus Had. 25). The portion of the bay between Puteoli and Baiae was the scene of the attempt made at the instigation of Nero upon the life of his mother by means of a vessel so contrived that it was to break to pieces while conveying Agrippina toward her villa near the Lucrine Lake (Tacitus, Annals xiv.8).

See NERO.

The apostle Paul found a Christian community at Puteoli, when he arrived there on his way to Rome, and stopped 7 days with them (Ac 28:13,14). At that time the ordinary route to Rome, following the Via Appia from Capua, was 155 Roman, or about 142 1/3 English miles (Nissen, Italische Landeskunde, II, 739). Later, Domitian reduced the distance to 139 Roman miles (about 129 English miles) by laying out the Via Domitia along the coast, joining the Via Appia at Sinuessa (Geog. Raven., IV, 32; Itin. Ant., 122; Tab. Peut.).

George H. Allen

PUTHITES

pu’-thits (puthi, "simple"; the King James Version Puhites): One of the families of Kiriath-jearim, grandchildren of Caleb (1Ch 2:50,53).

PUTIEL

pu’-ti-el (puTi’el, "contemned by El"): Father of the wife of Eleazar, Aaron’s son, and thus grandfather of Phinehas, Eleazar’s son (Ex 6:25).

See PHINEHAS, (3).

PUVAH

pu’-va.

See PUAH.

PYGARG

pi’-garg (dishon; Septuagint pugargos; compare proper nouns, "Dishon" and "Dishan" (Ge 36:21-30; 1Ch 1:38-42); according to BDB, Hommel, Saugethiere, derives ... from dush, Arabic das, "to tread," and compare Assyrian dashshu, "mountain-goat"): Dishon as the name of an animal occurs only in De 14:5 in the list of clean beasts. Both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "pygarg," which is not the recognized name of any animal whatever. The Septuagint pugargos (from puge, "rump," and argos, "white") was used by Herodotus (iv.192) as the name of an antelope. A white rump is a very common feature of deer and antelopes, and is commonly explained as enabling the fleeing herd easily to keep in sight of its leaders. It has been used as a specific name of Cervus pygargus, the Tartarian roe, and Bubalis pygargus, a small South African antelope. The Arabic

Bible has ri’m, "a white gazelle," a kindred word to re’em, the King James Version "unicorn," the Revised Version (British and American) "wild-ox." Tristram, Tristram, Natural History of the Bible, considers dishon to be the addax, Antilope addax or Addax nasomaculatus. There is excellent reason, however, for believing that the range of this African antelope does not extend into Palestine, Sinai or Arabia. For a discussion of the animal names in De 14:4,5, see ZOOLOGY.

Alfred Ely Day

PYRAMID

pir’-a-mid puramis: Pyramids are mentioned in connection with the splendid monument reared by Simon Maccabeus in memory of his parents and brethren at Modin (1 Macc 13:28; compare Ant, XIII vi, 6). Josephus describes them as "very surprising, both for their largeness and beauty." There is nothing to show how the pyramid allotted to each was distinguished, whether by difference in size or by inscriptions. It is remarkable that in Scripture there is no allusion to the giant structures in Egypt; but these may have supplied the suggestion to Simon’s mind.

W. Ewing

PYRRHUS

pir’-us (Purros, "fiery-red"): The name is inserted in the text of the Revised Version (British and American) in Ac 20:4 as that of the father of SOPATER (which see).

PYTHON

pi’-thon: Occurs only in Ac 16:16, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "a certain maid having a spirit of divination (margin "a spirit, a Python") met us." Puthon, or Putho, is the oldest name of Delphi (or the country about Delphi), in which was situated the famous Delphic Oracle. Consequently "Pythian spirit" came to be the generic title of the supposed source of inspiration of diviners, including the slave-girl of the account in Acts. Exactly what facts underlie the narrative it is rather hard to say, but it is evident that the girl was sincere in her conviction that she spoke with Pythian inspiration. Probably she represents some hysterical type, of none too strong mentality, whose confused utterances were taken as coming from some supernatural power. Impressed by Paul’s personality, she followed him about, and, when his command came, was in a state of mind that had prepared her to obey it. The narrative, incidentally, gives an interesting sidelight on a society in which a girl with hysteria had a greater commercial value than she had after her cure.

See DIVINATION.

Burton Scott Easton

QIR-HARESETH; KIR-HERES

kur-har'-seth, -ha-re'-seth> (qir-charesh, Isa 16:7; in 2Ki 3:25 the King James Version reads Kir-haraseth (pausal form)); (qir cheres, Jer 48:31,36; in Isa 16:11 the King James Version reads Kir-haresh (pausal form)): Modern scholars unanimously identify this city with Kir of Moab. In Jehoram's invasion of Moab it alone withstood his attack; and on the city wall the king of Moab sacrificed his son (2Ki 3:25). It was obviously the capital, i.e. Kir Moab. The name is generally taken to mean "city of the sun." Cheyne, however, points out (EB, under the word):

(1) that this explanation was unknown to the ancients;

(2) that"kir" is nowhere suposed to mean "city," except in the compound names Kir-heres, Kir-hareseth, and Kir Moab;

(3) that cheres, "sun," nowhere has a feminine ending, and

(4) that Isa 16:7 Septuagint and Aquila.) indicates "d" and not "r" in the second part of the name (Deseth). He suggests, therefore, that we should possibly read qiryath chadhdshah, "new city."

W. Ewing

QOPH

kof (qoph): The 19th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as q (intense k). It came also to be used for the number 100. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

QUAIL

kwal (selaw; ortugometra; Latin Coturnix vulgaris): A game bird of the family Coturnix, closely related to "partridges" (which see). Quail and partridges are near relatives, the partridge a little larger and of brighter color. Quail are like the gray, brown and tan of earth. Their plumage is cut and penciled by markings, and their flesh juicy and delicate food. Their habits are very similar. They nest on the ground and brood on from 12 to 20 eggs. The quail are more friendly birds and live in the open, brooding along roads and around fields. They have a longer, fuller wing than the partridge and can make stronger flight. In Palestine they were migratory. They are first mentioned in Ex 16:13: "And it came to pass at even, that the quails came up, and covered the camp: and in the morning the dew lay round about the camp." This describes a large flock in migration, so that they passed as a cloud. Nu 11:31-33: "And there went forth a wind from Yahweh, and brought quail from the sea, and let them fall by the camp, about a day's journey on this side, and a day's journey on the other side, round about the camp, and about two cubits above the face of the earth. And the people rose up all that day, and all the night, and all the next day,

and gathered the quail: he that gathered least gathered ten homers: and they spread them all abroad for themselves round about the camp"; compare Ps 78:26-30:

"He caused the east wind to blow in the heavens;

And by his power he guided the south wind.

He rained flesh also upon them as the dust,

And winged birds as the sand of the seas:

And he let it fall in the midst of their camp,

Round about their habitations.

So they did eat, and were well filled;

And he gave them their own desire."

Again the birds are mentioned in migration. Those that fell around the camp and the bread that was sent from heaven are described in Ps 105:39-42. Commentators have had trouble with the above references. They cause the natural historian none—they are so in keeping with the location and the laws of Nature. First the Hebrew selaw means "to be fat." That would be precisely the condition of the quail after a winter of feeding in the South. The time was early spring, our April, and the quail were flocking from Africa and spreading in clouds—even to Europe. They were birds of earth, heavy feeders and of plump, full body. Migration was such an effort that when forced to cross a large body of water they always waited until the wind blew in the direction of their course, lest they tire and fall. Their average was about 16 birds to each nest. If half a brood escaped, they yet multiplied in such numbers as easily to form clouds in migration. Pliny writes of their coming into Italy in such numbers, and so exhausted with their long flight, that if they sighted a sailing vessel they settled upon it by hundreds and in such numbers as to sink it. Taking into consideration the diminutive vessels of that age and the myriads of birds, this does not appear incredible. Now compare these facts with the text. Israelites were encamped on the Sinai Peninsula. The birds were in migration. The quail followed the Red Sea until they reached the point of the peninsula where they selected the narrowest place, and when the wind was with them they crossed the water. Not far from the shore arose the smoke from the campfires of the Israelites. This bewildered them, and, weary from their journey, they began to settle in confused thousands over and around the camp. Then the Israelites arose and, with the ever-ready "throw sticks," killed a certain number for every soul of the camp and spread the bodies on the sand to dry, just as Herodotus (ii. 77) records that the Egyptians always had done (see Rawlinson, Herodotus, II, for an illustration of catching and drying quail). Nature and natural history can account for this incident, with no need to call in the miraculous.

Gene Stratton-Porter

QUARREL

kwor’-el: Originally (1) "a complaint" (compare "querulous"), or (2) "a cause of complaint," and so (3) "a contention."

(1) In the King James Version Mr 6:19 (the Revised Version (British and American) "set herself"; the colloquial "had it in for him" is an exact translation) and Col 3:13 (momphe, "complaint"; so the Revised Version (British and American)).

(2) In 2Ki 5:7 (’anah, "be opportune," the Revised Version margin "an occasion").

(3) In the King James Version Le 26:25 (loose translation of naqam, "vengeance"; so the Revised Version (British and American)).

Compare Sirach 31:29 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "conflict") and Pr 20:3 the Revised Version (British and American) (the King James Version, "meddling").

QUARRIES

kwor’-iz (pecilim (Jud 3:19,26, "graven images"), shebharim (Jos 7:5, "Shebarim," the Revised Version margin "the quarries")):

Pesilim is elsewhere translated "graven images" (De 7:5; Ps 78:58; Isa 10:10; Mic 5:13, etc.) and is a plural form of pecel, "graven image" (Ex 20:4, etc.), from pacal, "to carve." It occurs in the story of Ehud and Eglon and refers to images or hewn stones in the vicinity of Gilgal, Shebharim is plural of shebher, "breach," "fracture," more often "destruction" (e.g. Pr 16:18), from shabhar, "to break." The form shebarim is also found in Job 41:25, "consternation," the King James Version "breakings." In Jos 7:5 Shebarim is the point to which the Israelites were chased after their first attack upon Ai.

See SHEBARIM.

Quarries in Palestine are not usually very deep because there is plenty of good stone to be found at the surface. The quarryman seeks a thick stratum of firm limestone which has a favorable exposure. The vertical joint-planes divide the stratum into large blocks which the quarryman dislodges with the aid of crowbars. These great blocks he skillfully cleaves by inserting several wedges in a line in holes made by a pick, and driving the wedges in with a heavy hammer. In these days gunpowder is occasionally used, especially when there are not favorable joint-planes producing blocks capable of being moved by the crowbar.

Another method, which is employed where stones of great size are wanted, is to carve the stones out of

the rock by cutting channels around them with the pick. In the limestone quarries of Ba‘albek and the granite quarries of Acwan at the first cataract of the Nile, enormous stones may be seen which were abandoned while in process of being removed by this method. The channels are wide enough to admit the body of the workman, and the marks of the picks on the sides of the channels are plainly visible.

Alfred Ely Day

QUARTER

kwor’-ter: Literally, of course, "the fourth part," and so of the four "ends" (qatsah) in Jer 49:36, and the King James Version of the four "corners" (so the Revised Version (British and American), gonia) in Re 20:8. Hence, "any part" and in this sense used freely for various words by the King James Version. the Revised Version (British and American) has usually dropped "quarter," but unfortunately has retained it in Nu 34:3; Jos 15:5; 18:14,15, and introduced it in Jos 18:12,14,20 for pe’ah, usually rendered "side." The result is very obscure. Elsewhere in the Revised Version (British and American) only in the phrase "from every quarter" (Ge 19:4; Isa 56:11; Mr 1:45).

Compare BORDER; COAST.

QUARTUS

kwor’-tus (Kouartos): A Christian in Corinth who with "Erastus the treasurer of the city" sent greetings to the Christian community in Rome (Ro 16:23). He is known to Paul only as a Christian, "the brother."

QUATERNION

kwa-tur’-ni-un (tetradion): The name given to a company of four soldiers of Herod’s army (Ac 12:4). To four such companies Peter had been handed over, who would take their turn of acting as guard over the prisoner, each of the four watches of the night according to Roman reckoning, which Herod Agrippa I would follow. In the castle of Antonia Peter was thus closely secured, in order that Herod, who had already killed James, the brother of John, with the sword (Ac 12:2), might, after the solemnities of the Passover, make sure of his death likewise. On the night before his intended execution he was sleeping in his cell between two soldiers, "bound with two chains," his left hand chained to one and his right to the other. The other two soldiers of the quaternion mounted guard before the door, and are spoken of as "the first and the second guard" (Ac 12:10) whom Peter and his angel guide had to pass on the way to liberty. The Greek word thus rendered is not found in the Septuagint or anywhere else in the New Testament.

T. Nicol.

QUEEN

kwen: The Bible applies this term:

(1) To the wife of a king ("queen consort") (malkah). In the Book of Esther it is the title given to Vashti (1:9) and Esther (2:22); compare So 6:8 f. Another Hebrew word for queen consort is gebhirah, literally "mistress" (compare 1Ki 11:19, the wife of Pharaoh; 2Ki 10:13, "the children of the king and the children of the queen"). In Ne 2:6 and Ps 45:9 we find the expression sheghal, which some trace back to shaghal, "to ravish," a rather doubtful derivation. Still another term is sarah, literally, "princess" (Isa 49:23). The Septuagint sometimes uses the word basilissa; compare Ps 45:9.

(2) To a female ruler or sovereign ("queen regnant"). The only instances are those of the queen (malkah) of Sheba (1Ki 10:1-13; compare 2Ch 9:1-12) and of Candace, the queen (basilissa) of the Ethiopians (Ac 8:27). In Mt 12:42 (compare Lu 11:31) Christ refers to the queen of the south (basilissa notou), meaning, of course, the queen of Sheba.

(3) To a heathen deity, melekheth ha-shamayim, "the queen of heaven" (Jer 7:18; 44:17).

See QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

(4) Metaphorically, to the city of Babylon (Rome) (Re 18:7): an expression denoting sovereign contempt and imaginary dignity and power.

William Baur

QUEEN MOTHER

(gebhirah, literally, "mistress," then a female ruler, and sometimes simply the wife of a king ("queen," 1Ki 11:19); in Da 5:10 the term malketha' "queen," really means the mother of the king): It stands to reason that among a people whose rulers are polygamists the mother of the new king or chief at once becomes a person of great consequence. The records of the Books of Kings prove it. The gebhirah, or queen mother, occupied a position of high social and political importance; she took rank almost with the king. When Bath-sheba, the mother of Solomon, desired "to speak unto him for Adonijah," her son "rose up to meet her, and bowed himself unto her, and sat down on his throne, and caused a throne to be set for the king's mother; and she sat on his right hand" (1Ki 2:19). And again, in 2Ki 24:15, it is expressly stated that Nebuchadnezzar carried away the king's mother into captivity; Jeremiah calls her gebhirah (29:2). The king was Jehoiachin (Jeconiah, Jer 29:2), and his mother's name was Nehushta (2Ki 24:8). This was the royal pair whose impending doom the prophet was told to forecast (Jer 13:18). Here again the queen mother is mentioned with the king, thus emphasizing her exalted position. Now we understand why Asa removed Maacah his (grand?)mother from being queen (queen mother), as we are told in 1Ki 15:13 (compare 2Ch 15:16). She had used her powerful influence to further the cause of idolatry. In this connection Athaliah's coup d'etat may be briefly mentioned. After the violent death of her son Ahaziah (2Ki 9:27), she usurped the royal power and reigned for some time in her own name (2Ki 11:3; compare 2Ch 22:12). This was, of course, a revolutionary undertaking, being a radical departure from the usual

traditions.

And finally, the political importance of the gebhirah is illustrated by the fact that in the Books of Kings, with two exceptions, the names of the Jewish kings are recorded together with those of their respective mothers; they are as follows: Naamah, the Ammonitess, the mother of Rehoboam (1Ki 14:21; compare 14:31, and 2Ch 12:13); Maacah, the daughter of Abishalom (1Ki 15:2) or Absalom (2Ch 11:20) the mother of Abijah; Maacah, the daughter of Abishalom, the mother (grandmother?) of Asa (1Ki 15:10; compare 2Ch 15:16); Azubah, the daughter of Shilhi, the mother of Jehoshaphat (1Ki 22:42; compare 2Ch 20:31); Athaliah, the grand-daughter of Omri, the mother of Ahaziah (2Ki 8:26; compare 2Ch 22:2); Zibiah of Beersheba, the mother of Jehoash (2Ki 12:1; compare 2Ch 24:1); Jehoaddin (Jehoaddan, 2Ch 25:1) of Jerusalem, the mother of Amaziah (2Ki 14:2); Jecoliah (Jechiliah, 2Ch 26:3) of Jerusalem, the mother of Azariah (2Ki 15:2) or Uzziah (2Ki 15:13,30, etc.; compare 2Ch 26:3); Jerusha (Jerushah, 2Ch 27:1), the daughter of Zadok, the mother of Jotham (2Ki 15:33); Abi (Abijah, 2Ch 29:1), the daughter of Zechariah, the mother of Hezekiah (2Ki 18:2); Hephzibah, the mother of Manasseh (2Ki 21:1); Meshullemeth, the daughter of Haruz of Jotbah, the mother of Amon (2Ki 21:19); Jedidah, the daughter of Adaiah of Bozkath, the mother of Josiah (2Ki 22:1); Hamutal, the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, the mother of Jehoahaz (2Ki 23:31); Zebidah, the daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah, the mother of Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:36); Nehushta, the daughter of Elnathan of Jerusalem, the mother of Jehoiachin (2Ki 24:8); Hamutal (Hamital), the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah, the mother Of Zedekiah (2Ki 24:18). The exceptions are Jehoram and Ahaz.

William Baur

QUEEN OF HEAVEN

(melekheth ha-shamayim, although there is another reading, mele’kheth, "worship" or "goddess"): Occurs only in two passages: Jer 7:18; 44:17-19,25, where the prophet denounces the wrath of God upon the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem who have given themselves up to the worship of the host of heaven. This is no doubt a part of the astral worship which is found largely developed among the Jews in the later period of their history in Canaan. It is first mentioned in 2Ki 17:16 as practiced by the men of the Northern Kingdom when Samaria had fallen and the ten tribes were being carried away into captivity. Moses is represented as warning the Israelites against the worship of the sun and moon and stars and all the host of heaven, practiced by the people of Canaan (De 4:19; 17:3) and the existence of such worship among the Canaanites and neighboring nations is attested from an early period (compare Job 31:26-28). The worship of the heavenly bodies was widely spread in the East and in Arabia; and the Babylonian pantheon was full of astral deities, where each divinity corresponded either to an astral phenomenon or to some circumstance or occurrence in Nature which is connected with the course of the stars (Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, I, 100). From the prophets we gather that before the exile the worship of the host of heaven had become established among all classes and in all the towns of Israel (Jer ubi supra; Eze 8:16). In that worship the queen of heaven had a conspicuous place; and if, as seems probable from the cakes which were offered, she is to be identified with the Assyrian Ishtar and the Canaanite Astarte, the worship itself was of a grossly immoral and

debasing character. That this Ishtar cult was of great antiquity and widely spread in ancient Babylonia may be seen from the symbols of it found in recent excavations (see Nippur, II, 236). How far the astral theorists like Winckler and Jeremias are entitled to link up with this worship the mourning for Josiah, the lamentations over Tammuz, the story of Jephthah's daughter, and even—the narrative of the misfortunes and the exaltation of Joseph, is questionable. But that the people of Judah in the days before the exile had given themselves over to the worst and vilest forms of heathen worship and incurred the grievous displeasure of Yahweh is made clear by the denunciation of the worship of the queen of heaven by Jeremiah.

T. Nicol.

QUEEN OF SHEBA

she'-ba (1Ki 10:1-13; 2Ch 9:1-12, called in Mt 12:42; Lu 11:31, "the queen of the south" (basilissa notou)):

1. Old Testament Accounts:

The two Old Testament accounts of the coming of the queen of Sheba (see SHEBA) to Solomon differ slightly from one another, and, of the two, that in 1 Kings is the older. (1) The words "concerning the name of Yahweh" (1Ki 10:1) are lacking in 2 Chronicles; while the Septuagint in 1 Kings has "and the name of Yahweh," apparently a correction of the Massoretic Text. (2) For 1Ki 10:9, "because Yahweh loved Israel for ever," 2Ch 9:8 has "because thy God loved Israel, to establish them for ever"; the Septuagint in 1 Kings has "because Yahweh loved Israel, to establish it forever." (3) In the last verse of each account we find another difference: 2Ch 9:12 says that Solomon gave to the queen all her desire, "besides that which she had brought unto the king." i.e. according to some, besides the equivalent of what she had brought to him; 1Ki 10:13 margin has" besides that which he gave her according to the hand of king Solomon," i.e. besides gifts commensurate with his own wealth and power (SBOT), or be sides gifts which he gave her qua king.

2. The Narrative:

The narrative tells of the queen of Sheba, on hearing of Solomon's great wisdom, coming to test him with perplexing questions or riddles (compare Jud 14:12). She brought presents to the king, and interviewed him: "And when the queen of Sheba had seen all the wisdom of Solomon, and the house that he had built" (i.e. the palace, not the temple) as well as its arrangements, "and his burnt-offering which he offered in the house of Yahweh (so read and translate with the Revised Version margin in 1Ki 10:5, and also in 2Ch 9:4); there was no more spirit in her": the half of Solomon's wisdom had not been told her. "Happy," she said to him, "are thy wives (so read with Septuagint, Syriac and Old Latin versions), happy are these thy servants." She then exchanged gifts with him and returned to her own land.

The narrative is a complement of that in 1Ki 3:16-28, where the king’s justice is exemplified; here his wisdom.

3. Employed by Jesus:

The narrative is referred to by Jesus in Mt 12:42; Lu 11:31, where He refuses to accede to the request of the scribes and Pharisees for a sign from Him. He tells them that no sign will be given them except that of Jonah, whose sign was his preaching, one that proved sufficient to the Ninevites; and ‘behold something greater than Jonah is here.’ The men of Nineveh will be a living condemnation of them "in the judgment" (compare Lu 16:31); and so will the "queen of the south" who came from the ends of the earth after hearing of Solomon’s wisdom, ‘and behold something greater than Solomon is here.’ The only sign to be given is that of the wisdom of Jesus, a wisdom far greater than that of Solomon (see D. Smith, Days of His Flesh, 176 ff).

4. Eastern Literature:

Eastern literature has much to say about the queen of Sheba. The Arabs called her Bilqis. Abyssinian legend declares that she came from Ethiopia, her name being Maqeda, and that she had a son by Solomon. See Delitzsch, Iris, 116-27; ZDMG, X, 19 f; J Pr T, VI, 524 ff (1880). Gressmann (in Schriften des Altes Testament, II, 1,203) has further references to Wilhelm Hertz, Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 1905, 413 ff; Bezold, Kebra Nagast, 1905, and also ZDMG, 60, 666 ff. For the Mohammedan story, see Koran xxvii, with notes in Sale’s translation.

David Francis Roberts

QUENCH

kwench, kwensh: Where the word is used of fire or of thirst it has the usual meaning: "to allay," "to extinguish," "to suppress," "to cool." In the Old Testament it is frequently applied to the affections and passions (see 2Ki 22:17; So 8:7; Isa 42:3; Jer 4:4; 21:12). Quenching the coal or the light of Israel may mean slaying a dear one or a brilliant leader. In the New Testament it is also used figuratively, as in Eph 6:16 the shield of faith quenches the fiery darts of the evil one. In Mr 9:48, sbennumi, and its derivative are applied with reference to Gehenna (translated "hell"). The same word is also used of resisting the gifts of the Holy Spirit in 1Th 5:19.

G. H. Gerberding

QUESTION

kwes’-chun: The noun for dabhar, "word," in 1Ki 10:3 parallel 2Ch 9:2, with "hard question" for chidhah, "dark saying," "riddle," in 1Ki 10:1 parallel 2Ch 9:1. In the New Testament for zetema, the synonym zetesis (and 1Ti 1:4, ekzetesis), being rendered "questionings" by the Revised Version (British

and American) (the King James Version does not distinguish). In Mr 11:29 for logos, "word" (so the Revised Version margin). The verb in the sense "ask a question" in 2Ch 31:9 for darash, and Lu 2:46; 23:9 for eperotao (compare the American Standard Revised Version, the English Revised Version margin Joh 16:23). Elsewhere the verb is for suzeteo, "dispute" (Mr 1:27, etc.; compare Ac 6:9; 9:29). "Called in question," Ac 19:40 the King James Version, represents egkaleo, "call into court," but in Ac 23:6; 24:21, "I am called in question" is for krinomai, "I am being judged."

Burton Scott Easton

QUICK; QUICKEN

kwik, kwik'-'n: Translates in the King James Version four different words:

(1) chayah,

(2) michyah,

(3) ruach, and

(4) zao.

Of these words (1) and (4) had simply the sense of life, and this idea was in 1611 adequately given, by the word "quick," although this sense of the word has long been somewhat obscured. As the translation of ruach (Isa 11:3) "quick" as found in the King James Version signified "acute." In this passage the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "delight" for "quick understanding." In Le 13:10,24 the Revised Version (British and American) retains the rendering "quick," although originally the word michyah must in some way have involved the conception of life, which no longer belongs to the English word "quick." It is not clear exactly in what sense the flesh in the sore or scar was thought of as living, especially as it was plainly regarded as in an unhealthy condition. Possibly the condition under consideration resembled what is sometimes idiomatically styled in English "proud flesh," and was thought of as a peculiar manifestation of life.

To quicken also means a reviving, a refreshing, an increasing of life (Ps 71:20; 85:6; 119:37,40,88; Isa 57:10). It often has reference to the resurrection from the dead (1Co 15:36) and is so used in many places in the King James Version. Where it refers to the giving of spiritual life the American Standard Revised Version has changed it in every case (Eph 2:1,5; Col 2:13; compare Joh 5:21).

David Foster Estes

QUICKSANDS

kwik’-sandz.

See SYRTIS.

QUIET

kwi’-et: Verb or adjective only in English Versions of the Bible, "quietness" being used for the noun. No special Hebrew or Greek words are represented, but in the Old Testament usually for some form or derivative of shaqaT, "be undisturbed" (Jud 18:7; compare Pr 1:33, sha’ar, "to loll," "be at ease"; Ec 9:17, nachath, "quiet," "be set on"). For "them that are quiet in the land", in Ps 35:20, see MEEKNESS; POOR. For "quiet prince in Jer 51:59, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "chief chamberlain," margin "quartermaster." "Jacob was a quiet (tam, "gentle"] man" (Ge 25:27, the King James Version "plain"). In the New Testament, it is the translation of hesuchazo, "to refrain from gossip or meddlesomehess": "that ye study to be quiet": (1Th 4:11), and of hesuchios, "gentle": "a meek and quiet spirit" (1Pe 3:4; compare 1Ti 2:2).

M. O. Evans

QUINTUS MEMMIUS

kwin’-tus mem’-us.

See MEMMIUS, QUINTUS.

QUIRINIUS

kwi-rin’-i-us.

See CHRONOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, sec. I, 1, (2); LUKE, THE GOSPEL OF, sec. 5.

QUIT

kwit: Same derivation as "quiet," so that "to be quit" (Ex 21:19,28; Jos 2:20 the King James Version) is "to be relieved of responsibility," naqah, naqi, "guiltless" (so the Revised Version (British and American) Jos 2:20). Hence, "to quit one’s self" means "to be freed by discharging a duty." The phrase in English Versions of the Bible, however, is a gloss for in 1Sa 4:9 it is used for hayah, "to be," while in 1Co 16:13 andrizomai, means "to behave like a man."

QUIVER

kwiv’-er (ashpah, teli; pharetra (Sirach 26:12)): A case or sheath for carrying arrows, a part of the

ordinary equipment of the warrior, both foot-soldier and charioteer (Job 39:23; Isa 22:6), and also of the huntsman (Ge 27:3). Figuratively of a group in passages where children (Ps 127:5) or prophets of Yahweh (Isa 49:2) are spoken of as arrows. Arrows are called bene ‘ashpah, "sons of the quiver" (La 3:13). By identifying the arrows with the death they produce, the quiver is likened to an open grave (Jer 5:16).

QUOTATIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

kwo-ta’-shunz,

I. INTRODUCTORY

Limitation of the Discussion

II. CONSTRUCTIVE PRINCIPLES OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATION

1. Unity of the Two Dispensations

2. Biblical Movement Planned from the Beginning

3. The Old Testament Accepted as Authoritative

4. Issue Involved in Foregoing Principles of Reference

III. TYPICAL INSTANCES OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATION

1. Introductory Formulas

2. Unity of the Two Dispensations

3. Prevision of Christianity in the Old Testament

4. Argumentative Quotations

5. Catena of Passages, Illustrating Principles of Quotation

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

Limitation of the Discussion:

There are, all told, approximately 300 direct quotations from the Old Testament in the New Testament. The presence of so many citations, each of one of which involves an interpretation of the passage given a new context in quotation, opens many avenues of discussion and propounds many difficult and far-reaching problems. In every separate instance, in the long list of New Testament quotations, the principle of accommodation (see ACCOMMODATION) in some form is involved and, consequently, the question of historical and exegetical accuracy is unavoidably raised. In the present article we shall concentrate attention upon that which is of far greater importance than the question whether the writer is incidentally correct, according to modern scientific principles, in any specific citation. This more important and vital issue we take to be the general, guiding principles adopted by the New Testament writers in their use of the book of the older covenant. A review of these principles, together with certain outstanding and typical instances in which these principles are used and applied, will form the substance of the discussion.

II. Constructive Principles of New Testament Quotation.

1. Unity of the Two Dispensations:

In the first place, the New Testament writers regard the Christian religion as having its roots in the Old Testament. From the call of Abraham to the founding and expansion of the Christian church the men of the New Testament recognize a single organic movement. In their use of the ancient oracles in new setting they constantly and confidently rely upon the unity of the two dispensations, that recorded in the Old Testament and that in which they themselves were participants. Such a unity, taking for granted its existence, would remove to a degree the very distinction implied in the terms Old and New Testaments, and would involve a definite and organic relationship of all the books to each other. There are no longer two separate groups of books standing apart from each other and having bonds of union only within the group, but, on the contrary, two related sub-groups outwardly corresponding to contrasted phases of the historical movement, but inwardly conformed to the deep-lying principles which make the entire movement one. According to this idea the Book of Genesis is as really related to the Gospel of Matthew as it is to the Book of Exodus. On the surface, and historically speaking, the Book of Genesis leads immediately to the Book of Exodus, which is its companion volume and complement, but go more deeply into Genesis and just as really and just as directly it leads to Matthew, which is also its fellow and complement. And so throughout. The unifying medium is, of course, the history which is one in that it involves the same organic principles applied to successive areas of human experience. The books of the Bible are, therefore, like any group of books on a common subject, phases of each other, contrasted and yet intimately cognate. In quoting from the Old Testament the New Testament writers were simply obeying an impulse common to all thoughtful writers and accounting for all quotations, seeking for diversified expression of the same truths.

2. Biblical Movement Planned from the Beginning:

The second great constructive principle of New Testament quotation, and manifestly in close harmony with the first one, is that the movement from Abraham to Christ was not only organically one, but that it was from the beginning planned and prepared for. The Bible is one because the history out of which it grew is one. The history is one because God is in the history and God is one. According to the writers of the New Testament in this history as a whole we have the unfolding of an all-embracing plan of God, stretching out into the remotest future and coming to its culmination in the person and the kingdom of the Messiah. They maintain also that this plan was disclosed in part beforehand, by way of anticipation and preparation, in order that men might intelligently cooperate with God in the fulfillment of His purpose. This is the idea involved in prophecy and its fulfillment, and in the closely related idea of promise and its realization. One mind, one will, and one central purpose are operating throughout the entire history which is, on the divine side, the fulfillment of a plan complete in thought before it takes shape in events. On the basis of this conception, of the foreseen plan of God and its gradual revelation to men through messages of hope and warning set in the key of the great future and pointing the way thither, the greater part of the structure of New Testament quotation is reared.

3. The Old Testament Accepted as Authoritative:

A third principle which really involves a combination of the other two and is prominently brought forward in the use of quotation for purposes of argument is the recognition and acceptance of the Old Testament as authoritative, a real Word of God, in form occasional, but essentially applicable to all experiences, and hence, good for all time. It is evident that the belief in the continued authority of the Scripture of the old covenant over the men of the new, rests upon the unity of the two dispensations and the acceptance of the same divine mind and will as operating throughout all outward and historical changes. This is admirably expressed by Paul when he speaks of ‘the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure which he purposed in him unto an economy of the fullness of the periods, to sum up all things in Christ’ (Eph 1:9,10), and by the author of He when he says: ‘God, having of old spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by various portions and in various ways, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son’ (Eph 1:1,2).

4. Issue Involved in Foregoing Principles of Reference:

The justification of these accepted principles of reference on the part of the New Testament writers lies beyond the scope of the present discussion. It is sufficient to emphasize the fact that any detailed discussion of New Testament quotations seriatim is meaningless and futile except upon the basis of an explicit and consistent determination of these antecedent questions. To the present writer the validity of these principles is beyond question. The denial of any one of the three involves one in difficulties of interpretation, both critical and historical, from which there is no escape. It is to be noted, therefore, that the establishment of the principles, in accordance with which the New Testament writers quote, carries with it in a general way the justification of their usage.

III. Typical Instances of New Testament Quotation.

1. Introductory Formulas:

With these constructive principles in mind we are prepared to pass in review typical instances in which general principles are embodied. At this point we shall be greatly assisted in the analysis and distribution of the complex material before us by giving careful heed to the formulas, more or less fixed and uniform, by which the writers introduce quotations and indicate their sense of the value and significance of that which is quoted. While these formulas exhibit certain verbal variations, they are practically reducible to three, which correspond with substantial accuracy to the three constructive principles already noted: the unity of the Old Testament and New Testament; the prevision of the New Testament in the Old Testament; the authority of the Old Testament as the Word of God intended for all time.

2. Unity of the Two Dispensations:

The unity of the two dispensations is asserted in all those passages introduced by a formula, in which fulfillment is asserted as a fact, and in which the operation of identical principles in two or more separate events in the field of history is implied. A suggestive example is in Mt 13:14, where our Lord asserts, in connection with the parable of the Sower, that in the unbelief of the people of His day "the prophecy of Isaiah" is fulfilled. The prophetic words here quoted (Isa 6:9,10) are not predictive in any immediate sense, but are susceptible of repeated application and realization because of the general principle which they contain. They apply to the prophet’s own day; they also apply—and in that sense are fulfilled—to the time of Jesus, and by a legitimate extension of meaning, to stubborn unbelief in any age (compare Joh 6:45).

Another passage in which the same formula is used in a very exceptional way clearly sets forth the fundamental principle upon which this usage rests. Jas 2:23 asserts that the justification of Abraham in the offering of Isaac "fulfilled" the passage which affirms that his belief was counted to him for righteousness (Ge 15:6). This passage is not predictive in any sense, nor is there in the narrative any hint of a connection between the passage and the episode on Mt. Moriah. This use of the formula of fulfillment by James involves the principle that any event which realizes the meaning and truth of a Scriptural statement fulfils it. A vast number of quotations in the New Testament come under this head. Persons, events, doctrines, illustrate and confirm, or embody and concretely realize, principles which are taught in the Old Testament or implied in its history. We are warned by this passage and many others like it against a too rigid and literal interpretation of any formula implying fulfillment. While it may certainly be intended to imply literal prediction and an equally literal fulfillment, it may, on the contrary, be intended to intimate nothing more than a harmony of principle, fitting the passage to the person or event with which it is connected. In this connection it is to be remembered that a harmony of principle may extend all the way from a comparatively superficial illustrative resemblance to a profound assonance of thought. Not a few Old Testament quotations were made for purposes of illustration and literary embellishment. Herein lies the significance of Matthew’s use (Mt 2:17 f) of Jer 31:15. A glance at this quoted passage indicates that it is a figurative and poetic expression in which Rachel (already for many years in her tomb) is represented as weeping for her exiled children and refusing to be comforted except by their return. There is no strictly predictive element in the passage, save only the promise of return, which is not used by Matthew. Its applicability to the massacre of the children of Bethlehem lies

in its poetical appositeness, and there alone. Once again the voice of wailing motherhood is heard in Israel. The tender and beautiful imagery is applicable in this sense and is used with true insight, but with no intention of justifying a claim of prediction and fulfillment in the literal sense.

3. Prevision of Christianity in the Old Testament:

The prevision of events in the life of Jesus and in the history of Christianity is involved in all the quotations in which a necessary connection between the passage as predictive and the event is asserted, or in which a prophet is said to have been speaking or writing concerning the event or person in question. An examination of the Old Testament without reference to its use in the New Testament seems to justify the conclusion that its bearing upon the future may be particularized under four heads, which in turn, with sufficient accuracy and exhaustiveness will classify the pertinent New Testament quotations.

(1) The prophetic teaching of Israel embodied not only in the messages of the prophets, but also in laws, institutions, and rites, has a twofold dispensational application. Reference is made here only to those explicit references to a future era of especial blessing. For example, in Ac 2:17 ff Peter interprets the Pentecostal experience in the terms of prophecy, referring to Joe (2:28 ff), who promises an outpouring of God’s Spirit in a "great and notable day" of the Lord. The promise through Joe is an undeniable prediction (every promise is such), which in a measure would be fulfilled in any exceptional manifestation of God’s Spirit among men. The only question which can possibly be raised in connection with Peter’s use of this passage is whether the Pentecostal outpouring was the climactic realization of the promise: that is, the establishment of the era of blessing foretold by the prophet. Later in the same book (3:20-26) the same apostle sweeps the whole field of prophecy as centering in certain promises fulfilled in Christ and the Christian community.

He gives two instances: the prophet like Moses (De 18:15) and the promised inclusive blessing through Abraham (Ge 12:3). He also includes (Ac 3:26) a hint of the Servant passages of Isa. This identification of the New Testament movement through two specific predictive promises is wholly justified by the prophetic character of Jesus, the range and richness of the blessings brought from Abraham through Him, and by the fact elsewhere emphasized that no other has measured up to the standard of the ideal servant. Negatively, it may be urged that if these promises were not fulfilled in Christ, history affords no possibility of discovering any fulfillment measurably adequate, either in the past or future. In Hebrews 8:8-12 reference is made to the promise of a new covenant in Jeremiah (31:31 ff) as a justification for believing that the Old Testament dispensation was not complete in itself and that in its very constitution it pointed forward to Christianity as its fulfillment. Combining this passage with that quoted above (Ac 2:17) taken from Joel, the strength of the case for this use of the Old Testament is at once seen. Distinctively Jeremiah’s "new covenant" was to be inward and gracious rather than outward and legal. The promise through Joe is an awakening of prophecy through the free outpouring of God’s Spirit. The distinctive feature of the gospel is its idea of justification by faith, through grace revealed in Christ and imparted by the Holy Spirit given according to promise at Pentecost. The "new covenant" foretold by Jeremiah was established at Pentecost through the outpouring of the Spirit promised through Joel. To deny this as fulfillment is to nullify the meaning of Christian history and to erase both promises from the

page of credible prophecy.

(2) Contemporary persons or institutions are sometimes interpreted, not in the terms of present actuality, but on the basis of the ideal not revealed or realized until the coming of Christ. One striking example of this method is to be found in the so-called "Immanuel passage" (Mt 1:23, quoting Isa 7:14). Undoubtedly the message of the prophet to Ahaz had an immediate and contemporary significance. But, like many another notable prophetic message it is set in the key of the Messianic King whose unworthy predecessor Ahaz was. "The Messiah comes, but the willfulness of Ahaz has rendered His reign impossible" (G. A. Smith, "Isa," Expositor's Bible, I, 134).

In Ac 2:24-36, passages representative of many others quoted, both the resurrection and ascension of Jesus are interpreted in the light of two quotations from the Psalms (16:8 ff; 110:1) as predetermined and therefore certain events in the plan and purpose of God. In both instances the argument is that the promises nominally made to David, or claimed by him, were couched in terms too vast to find fulfillment in his own experience, but were spoken of the greater King who was to come and in whose experience alone they were realized. In the former instance, a triumph over death was anticipated with assurance which not the Psalmist but only Christ attained; in the latter a royal ascendancy was promised that only Christ's ascension to the place of power could satisfy. An examination of the passages shows that Peter's interpretation is justified not merely by the wording of the promises, which point to a fullness of experience not realized by any Old Testament man, but still more clearly by the descriptive titles which identify the person who is the subject of the experience. In the first instance he is spoken of as Yahweh's "Holy One," in the second as "My Lord." The triumph over death which the speaker anticipates is grounded in a unity of purpose and will with God—a holiness which was ideal and still unrealized until Christ came. The logic of the psalm is: God's "Holy One" must not see corruption. The logic of history is: Christ is God's Holy One and He did not see corruption. The principle that triumph over death is the logical issue of holiness found its justification and proof not directly in the experience of the singer who first glimpsed it as a truth, but in the career of Christ who first realized it as a fact.

NOTE—The argument here is not affected if one accepts the variant reading "Holy Ones" for the preceding passage.

The second passage is particularly interesting because our Lord Himself first pointed out its implications as to the place and work of the Messiah. Such a passage as this entire psalm (Ps 110) would have been impossible had not the powers and responsibilities of the Davidic King been keyed from the beginning at the Messianic level. The logic here is the same as in Ps 16. The Messianic kingdom over all nations awaited the coming of the true Messianic King. The long-delayed triumph followed hard upon the coming of the long-expected King (compare Ps 2:1,2; Ac 13:32-34).

The same principle is involved in our Lord's use of the Servant passage (Isa 61:1) in His sermon at Nazareth. Here the issue as to Messianic prophecy is fairly joined at the center. It is central because it occurs in the Lord's own teaching and also because it concerns, not any external or incidental happenings in the life of Jesus, but the whole trend and movement of prophetic thought, together with

the entire meaning and interpretation of His career.

Interpreted altogether apart from the New Testament, the passage has an unmistakable bearing upon the future. As one of the series concerned with the Servant (Isa 42:1), the quoted passage focuses attention upon the mission of Israel to the world, still to be carried out. "Ye are my witnesses, saith Yahweh, and my servant whom I have chosen" (Isa 43:10), "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant, and Israel, whom I have chosen" (Isa 44:1). It also involves the entire scope and meaning of the prophetic office through which Yahweh's will was made known to Israel and through Israel to the world. Both these considerations sweep out into the prophet's future and both point unerringly to Christ as the historical fulfillment of Israel's mission and as the actual realization of the ideal and ministry of prophethood. The very ambiguity of the reference in this chapter (Isaiah 61), whether to the Servant or to the prophet, and the questions raised as to whether Israel idealized is referred to or some person or personification, serve to make more clear and unmistakable the central fact that only in Christ is the conception embodied in the entire series of passages altogether realized. It thus becomes for sober thought a distinct revelation and portraiture in advance of what Jesus was in His person and work.

(3) In the course of Israel's training to receive the Messiah, certain external items were given as bearing upon the identification of Him when He should come. We shall instance three items, closely related to each other, and each intensely interesting in itself. These three items are

(a) His sonship to David (Ac 2:30,31),

(b) His birth from a Virgin (Mt 1:22 f),

(c) His birth at Bethlehem (Mt 2:5).

Objection is offered at once to the interpretation of these Old Testament passages as predictive, and to the alleged fulfillments in the life of Jesus, on the ground mainly that being definite events (compare Mt 2:15) they are not included within the legitimate scope of prediction; and, secondarily, that being items of this external kind it would be an easy matter to invent fulfillments. It may be granted at once that incidents of this kind could be indefinitely multiplied by fabricating coincidences, but the fact remains that, in the absence of any visible check upon invention, very few such instances are alleged by New Testament writers. Furthermore, there are suggestive variations between the events recorded and the natural interpretations of the Old Testament passages connected with them; that is, the fuifilments arrive by such devious routes as to make it difficult to suppose them to be due to the imaginative stimulation of the passages. For example, the birth at Bethlehem was brought about by circumstances not at all to the liking of Jewish patriots; and was obscured to contemporaries by the previous and subsequent residence at Nazareth. The kinship of Jesus to the house of David was made adoptive (unless Mary was of that house) by the virgin birth. The interpretation of Isa 7:14 as intimating a virgin birth was not compulsory to one familiar with the Hebrew text of the passage and would have been thought of in that connection only by one assured of the fact. The virgin birth (see IMMANUEL; VIRGIN BIRTH) is not an etymological but a providential commentary on Isa 7:14. One other consideration of primary importance

remains. In the one point where the identification of Jesus with the Messiah by His followers can be tested most severely, they are most completely triumphant. It would be comparatively easy to invent incidents suggested by Old Testament prophecies, and to take dignities and titles wholesale from the same source—but given all these, to find one capable of realizing and fulfilling the expectations so aroused is the chief problem. Here fabrication is impossible. And here too the New Testament meets and answers the challenge of truth. In view of these considerations it is safe to assert that even in matters of historical detail the career of Jesus was foreseen and predicted. Such passages belong to the philosophy of preparation as a whole and should be studied in that connection.

(4) In certain instances the original passage and its reappearance in quotation indicate a process New Testament which is continuous throughout all history. For example, the use of Zec 13:7 (Mr 14:27) suggests a deeper view of the connection between prophecy and history, immediate and more remote, than we are often aware of. On the face of them such passages as those concerning the Smitten Shepherd and the scattered sheep are predictions, and the life of Christ stands as fulfillment. It simply cannot be contended that such passages as these do not find fulfillment and explanation in the career of Jesus as nowhere else in the history. Nevertheless, the connection is far deeper than mere foresight of an isolated event and its occurrence. We may well say that, in a sense, the event is foreseen because it is already a fact. The allegory of the Smitten Shepherd is, as has well been said, "a summary of the history of Israel." But it is more than that. The relationship of God with Israel, which involved a dealing of divine grace with men, their rejection of it and the consequent vicarious immolation of the Divine Friend and Shepherd, which came to its climax in the tragedy of the cross, was established in all essential factors in the early days. Therefore, Christ can say, as the outcome of the profoundest insight into the meaning of history, ‘That which concerneth me hath fulfillment’ (compare Lu 24:44). He was more deeply concerned in the doings of an earlier time than being there foreseen. In a real sense, "the Lamb" was "slain from the foundation of the world," (Re 13:8). In this allegory of the rejected Shepherd and in the successive delineations of the Servant passages, we have the portrait of the Christ as He was—not merely as He was to be. In these quotations deep answers to deep. The only satisfactory interpretation of the tragedy of the cross is that in accordance with principles long operative in human history, "it must needs be." The only satisfactory interpretation of the passages cited is that they disclose the actual operation of the forces which in their culmination issued in the tragedy of the cross. This brings the passages in the original and in quotation into the framework of the same course of events. Peter in his sermon in Solomon’s porch thus sums up the whole process: "But the things which God foreshowed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled" (Ac 3:18).

4. Argumentative Quotations:

The argumentative use of the Old Testament involves exactly the same principles which have been dealt with in the foregoing discussion. These principles coalesce in the conception of the Old Testament as authoritative.

(1) Throughout the New Testament, in the teaching of our Lord Himself and in the apostolic writings, a clear-cut distinction is drawn between the temporary and permanent offices of the Old Testament. It is recognized that in essential principles the Old Testament is for all time, while in its outward form and in

its actualization of underlying and essential truths it is preliminary and preparatory. There are different dispensations, but one economy. Whenever our Lord uses the Old Testament for purposes of argument (see Mt 4:4,7; 12:17 ff; 19:18 f; Mr 10:19; Lu 19:46) it is on the basis of essential truth which is permanent and unchanging (Mt 5:17-19). On the other hand, He never hesitates to annul that which had a merely temporary or preliminary value (Mt 5:21,33,38; compare by way of contrast Mt 5:27). He came not to destroy, but to fulfil, but fulfillment implies a new era—a new and higher stage in the delivery of truth.

(2) In like manner Paul and the other New Testament writers argue on the basis of an identity of principle which binds the two eras together. Paul contends for three great principles, the Messiahship of Jesus, justification by faith, the inclusion of the Gentiles in the plan of salvation (the doctrine of election is a detail of this last argument; see Ro 9:7,9,12,13,15,17). We shall consider typical examples of Paul's use of the Old Testament in argumentation. Choice has been made of those which have provoked adverse criticism. Among these is the use of Ge 13:15; 17:8 in Ga 3:16. This is a leading example of Paul's alleged "rabbinical" method: "He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." The Hebrew word "seed" as applied to offspring (zera‘) is singular. This, of course, means that a man's descendants are looked upon as organically one, inasmuch as they continue his life. The word would apply to any one of the family, but only by virtue of his belonging to the family. Etymologically Paul's argument would apply to Isaac as well as to Jesus—provided only the promise is looked upon as being fulfilled in him. But the promise which was fulfilled in Isaac, was fulfilled in a larger way in Israel as a whole, and was fulfilled in the largest way of all in Christ. The use of the singular word indicates that Abraham's children were looked upon as one in him—they are also one in Christ. The true children of Abraham are such in Christ. Historically the argument is fully justified. "The personality of Christ is in some sense coextensive with the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham" (Beet). "Christ is the organ of fulfillment" (Meyer).

The classical passage in the discussion of justification based upon an Old Testament quotation is Ro 1:17, quoting Hab 2:4. The quoted passage seems to fail the argument because the literal translation would appear to be that "the righteous shall live by their faithfulness." A deeper view, however, amply justifies the quotation; first, because the stedfasthess demanded by the prophet is a persistent trust in God in view of the delay of the promised vision; second, the deepest principle common to the Old Testament and New Testament is that stability of character has its root in trust in Yahweh (Isa 28:16; compare Isa 26:1-3). Nothing could be more foreign to the thought of the Old Testament than that a man could be righteous without trust in God.

One further quotation argumentatively used by Paul may fitly close this section of our discussion. In Ro 11:26,27 he quotes Isa 59:20,21 as indicating the divine purpose to include the Gentiles within the scope of salvation. This passage is doubly significant because it is attacked by Kuenen (Prophets and Prophecy in Israel) on the ground that it is uncritically taken from the Septuagint version which in this instance does not correctly represent the Hebrew text. It may be remarked that a large percentage of the New Testament quotations are taken from the Septuagint. (For estimates of the number see Johnson, Quotations of the New Testament, chapter i.) This prevalent habit is amply justifiable by, and in large consideration of, the fact that the New Testament was written for the purpose of being read and

understood by those to whom the Septuagint was often the only version available, and the familiarity of that version was ample compensation for any slight loss in verbal accuracy. The only reasonable qualification of this general statement is that we should call in question any deviation which is depended upon for a point in argument. Kuenen, the severest critic of the New Testament writers in this particular, alleges very few instances, and Professor Johnson has satisfactorily dealt with these in detail (as above). In the case immediately before us the deviations in the version used by Paul do not in the least modify, in the way of strengthening, the reference to the Gentiles (beginning in Ro 11:19 and continuing throughout) which is the point upon which Paul is laying stress. It is not too much to say that Paul's argument would be unimpaired had he used the Hebrew text, upon which our the Revised Version (British and American) rests (compare Heb 2:6-8). In general, it may be premised that no stringent rule of verbal accuracy should be considered binding upon writers who address a popular audience beyond that which guards the substantial cogency of their argument. From the fair application of this reasonable rule the New Testament writers have nothing to fear.

For the most part the New Testament writers confine their quotations to the Old Testament. In a single instance an extracanonical saying of Jesus (Ac 20:35), and, in at least two instances (Jude 1:9,14), non-canonical books are referred to. In addition to this Paul uses in the letter to Titus (1:12) and in his sermon at Athens (Ac 17:28) lines from native poets to illustrate and enforce his discussion (see POETRY, NEW TESTAMENT). In these latter instances the difference in usage from his ordinary habit of quoting authoritative Scripture is sufficiently obvious. In the case of the saying attributed to Christ, it is enough to say that it is so obviously Christlike that we need not hesitate to accept it as genuine, while in the case of Jude nothing is made to depend upon the quotations except certain accepted Christian truths (see Plummer, Expositor's Bible. "James and Jude," 434 f).

5. Catena of Passages Illustrating Principles of Quotation:

(1) Based on Unity of Dispensations.

Mt 2:18; 13:14; 27:9; Mr 7:6; Lu 4:21; 20:17; Joh 4:37; 6:45; 7:38; 12:14 f; Ac 2:31,39; 3:25; 4:25; 8:23,12 f; 13:22,32,33,34; 28:26,27; 1Co 15:54,55; Heb 8:8-12; Jas 2:23.

(2) Based on Prevision.

Mt 1:22; 2:5,15; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 26:31; Mr 14:27; Lu 22:37; Joh 7:38,42; 12:38,40,49; 13:18; 15:25; 19:24,28,36; 20:9; Ac 1:20; 2:25-28; 3:25; 4:11,25,26; 13:32-34.

(3) Based on Authority of the Old Testament.

Mt 4:4; 5:38,43; 9:13; 19:4,18; 21:1,3,16,42; 22:24,31,32,43; Mr 4:12; 7:10; 10:19; 11:17; 12:19; Lu 2:22,23; 4:10; 19:46; Ac 15:16,17; Ro 1:17; 4:3,7,8; 9:25,26; 10:5,6,8,11,13,16; 12:19; 15:21; 1Co 1:19 (identity of principle); 1:31; 15:45; 2Co 4:13; 6:2,16; 8:15; Ga 3:6,8,10,11,12,13,16; 4:27; Eph 4:8; 6:2; 1Ti 5:18.

See also CHRONICLES, BOOKS OF, 5, 7, 10.

LITERATURE.

The literature is voluminous. Beside the standard commentaries and dictionaries, the reader will do well to consult C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament; Franklin Johnson, Quotations of the New Testament; Cambridge Biblical Essays ("Our Lord’s Use of the Old Testament" by McNeile); Westcott, Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, Appendix A.

Louis Matthews Sweet

RAAMA

ra’-a-ma (ra‘ma’): Thus spelled only in 1Ch 1:9; elsewhere "Raamah" (ra‘mah). A son of Cush and father of Sheba and Dedan (Ge 10:7 = 1Ch 1:9). In Ezekiel’s lament over Tyre (Eze 27:22) the tribe of Raamah is mentioned along with Sheba as a mercantile people who provided the inhabitants of Tyre with spices, precious stones and gold. It has generally been identified with Regina, mentioned by Ptolemy and Steph. Byzantr. as a city in Southeastern Arabia on the shores of the Persian Gulf. The Septuagint (Rhegma) itself supposes this site. But the Arabic name of the city here indicated is spelled with a "g" and so gives rise to a phonological difficulty. A more probable identification has been found in the Sabean ra‘mah in Southwestern Arabia near Me‘in in the north of Marib. Me‘in was the capital of the old Minaean kingdom.

A. S. Fulton

RAAMIAH

ra-a-mi’-a (ra‘amyah; Codex Vaticanus Naamia; Codex Alexandrinus, Rheelma): One of the leading men who returned with Zerubbabel from captivity (Ne 7:7). In the corresponding passage in Ezr 2:2, where the same list is named, a slight variation in form is given. "Reelaiah" is the name found in this passage. Doubtless, one is a corruption of the other. Both have the same root meaning.s generally been identified with Regina, mentioned by Ptolemy and Steph. Byzantr. as a city in Southeastern Arabia on the shores of the Persian Gulf. The Septuagint (Rhegma) itself supposes this site. But the Arabic name of the city here indicated is spelled with a "g" and so gives rise to a phonological difficulty. A more probable identification has been found in the Sabean ra‘mah in Southwestern Arabia near Me‘in in the north of Marib. Me‘in was the capital of the old Minaean kingdom.

RAAMSES; RAMESES

ra-am’-sez, ram’-e-sez (Ex 1:11), (Ge 47:11; Ex 12:37; Nu 33:3,5) (ra‘mecec, ra‘amcec; Rhamesse; Egyptian Ra-messu, "Ra created him" (or "it")):

1. The Meaning of "Store-Cities":

One of the two "settlements" (mickenoth) built, or "built up," by the Hebrews for the Pharaoh, the other being Pithom, to which the Septuagint adds a third, namely, "On which is Heliopolis," a town near Cairo (Ex 1:11). The Hebrew term mickenoth comes from a root meaning "to settle down" (Arabic sakan, "settlement," Assyrian sakanu or shakanu, "to set"), but it is rendered "strong cities" in Septuagint, "treasure cities" in the King James Version, and (incorrectly) "store-cities" in the Revised Version: The "land of Rameses," where Jacob and his sons settled, was apparently the "field of Zoan" (see ZOAN), thus lying in the Delta East of the Bubastic branch of the Nile.

2. The Meaning of the Name:

It is often assumed that no city called Rameses would have existed before the time of Rameses II, or the 14th century BC, though even before Rameses I the name occurs as that of a brother of Horemhib under the XVIIIth Dynasty. The usual translation "Child of Ra" is grammatically incorrect in Egyptian and as Ra was an ancient name for the "sun" it seems possible that a town may have borne the title "Ra created it" very early. The mention of Rameses in Ge (47:11) is often regarded as an anachronism, since no scholar has supposed that Jacob lived as late as the time of Rameses II. This would equally apply to the other notices, and at most would serve to mark the age of the passages in the Pentateuch where Rameses is mentioned, but even this cannot be thought to be proved (see EXODUS). According to De Rouge (see Pierret, Vocab. Hieroglyph., 1875, 143) there were at least three towns in Lower Egypt that bore the name Pa Rames-ses ("city of Rameses"); but Brugsch supposes that the place mentioned in the Old Testament was Zoan, to which Rameses II gave this name when making it his capital in the Delta. Dr. Budge takes the same view, while Dr. Naville and others suppose that the site of Raamses has still to be found.

3. Situation:

There appears to have been no certain tradition preserving the site, for though Silvia (about 385 AD) was told that it lay 4 miles from the town of Arabia (see GOSHEN), she found no traces of such a place. Brugsch ("A New City of Rameses, 1876," Aegyptische Zeitschrift, 69) places one such city in the southern part of Memphis itself. Goodwin (Rec. of Past, Old Series, VI, 11) gives an Egyptian letter describing the "city of Rameses-Miamun," which appears to be Zoan, since it was on the seacoast. It was a very prosperous city when this letter was written, and a pa-khennu or "palace city." It had canals full of fish, lakes swarming with birds, fields of lentils, melons, wheat, onions and sesame, gardens of vines, almonds and figs. Ships entered its harbor; the lotus and papyrus grew in its waters. The inhabitants greeted Rameses II with garlands of flowers. Besides wine and mead, of the "conqueror’s city," beer was brought to the harbor from the Kati (in Cilicia), and oil from the "Lake Sagabi." There is no reason to suppose that Zoan was less prosperous in the early Hyksos age, when the Hebrews dwelt in its plain, whatever be the conclusion as to the date when the city Rameses received that name. The description above given agrees with the Old Testament account of the possession given by Joseph to his family "in the best of the land, in the land of Rameses" (Ge 47:11).

C. R. Conder

RAB-MAG

rab’-mag (rabh-magh; . Septuagint has it as a proper noun, Rhabamath): The name of one of the Babylonian princes who were present at the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, during the reign of Zedekiah, king of Judah (Jer 39:3,13). The word is a compound, the two parts seemingly being in apposition and signifying tautologically the same thing. The last syllable or section of the word, magh, was the designation among the Medes, Persians and Babylonians for priests and wise men. Its

original significance was "great" or "powerful"; Greek megas, Latin magis, magnus. The first syllable, rabh, expresses practically the same idea, that of greatness, or abundance in size, quantity, or power. Thus it might be interpreted the "allwise" or "all-powerful" prince, the chief magician or physician. It is, therefore, a title and not a name, and is accordingly put in appositive relations to the proper name just preceding, as "Nergal-sharezer, the Rab-mag," translated fully, "Nergal-sharezer the chief prince or magician."

See NERGAL-SHAREZER.

In harmony with the commonly accepted view, the proper rendering of the text should be, "All the princes of the king of Babylon came in, and sat in the middle gate, to wit, Nergal-sharezer, Samgarnebo, Sarsechim, (the) Rab-saris, Nergal-sharezer, (the) Rab-mag" (Jer 39:3); and "so Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard sent, and Nebushazban, (the) Rab-saris, and Nergal-sharezer, (the) Rab-mag, and all the chief officers of the king of Babylon" (Jer 39:13).

Walter G. Clippinger

RAB-SARIS

rab’-sa-ris (rabh-caric): As with Rab-mag, which is not regarded as a name, but a title, so this is to be regarded as a descriptive title for the person whose name precedes it (see RAB-MAG). The first part, rabh, signifies "great" or "chief," the second, caric, is the title for eunuch or chamberlain. The translation then would be chief eunuch or the chief of the eunuchs (or chamberlains).

The oriental custom was for the king to surround himself with a number of eunuchs, who performed varied kinds of services, both menial and dignified. They usually had charge of his harem; sometimes they occupied court positions. Frequently they superintended the education of the youth. The term itself was sometimes used to designate persons in places of trust who were not emasculated. The above title describes the highest or chief in rank of these eunuchs.

See EUNUCH.

The full title is used 3 times, once in connection with the titles of other important officers who were sent by the king of Assyria with a large army to demand the surrender of Jerusalem. The passage would be translated properly, ‘And the king of Assyria sent the Tartan and the Rab-saris (the chief eunuch) and the Rabshakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah’ (2Ki 18:17). Again, it refers to a Babylonian whose real name was Sarsechim, who with the other Babylonian princes sat in the middle gate during the capture of Jerusalem. This event is described as having occurred in the 11th year of Zedekiah, king of Judah (Jer 39:3). The third use is in connection with the name Nebushazban, who, with the other chief officers of the king of Babylon, sent and took Jeremiah out of the court of the guard and committed him to Gedaliah, who was to take him home to dwell with his own people (Jer 39:13).

Thus, it is seen that based upon this accepted theory the three titles would be in their connections as follows:

(1) simply "the chief eunuch,"

(2) Sarsechim, the Rab-saris (or chief eunuch), and

(3) Nebushazban, the Rab-saris (or chief eunuch).

See also ASSYRIA, sec. X.

Walter G. Clippinger

RABBAH

rab’-a:

(1) (rabbah; Rhabba, Rhabbath, Rhabban. The full name is rabbath bene ‘ammon; he akra ton huion Ammon, Rhabbath huion Ammon, "Rabbah of the children of Ammon"): This alone of the cities of the Ammonites is mentioned in Scripture, so we may take it as the most important. It is first named in connection with the "bed" or sarcophagus of Og, king of Bashan, which was said to be found here (De 3:11). It lay East of the territory assigned to Gad (Jos 13:25). Whatever may have been its history in the interval, it does not appear again in Scripture till the time of David. This monarch sent an embassy of sympathy to King Hanun when his father Nahash died. The kindness was met by wanton insult, which led to the outbreak of war. The Ammonites, strengthened by Aramean allies, were defeated by the Israelites under Joab, and took refuge in Rabbah. After David’s defeat of the Arameans at Helam a year later, the Ammonites were exposed alone to the full-force of Israel, the ark of the covenant being carried with the troops. The country was ravaged and siege was laid to Rabbah. It was during this siege that Uriah the Hittite by David’s orders was exposed "in the forefront of the hottest battle" (2Sa 11:15), where, treacherously deserted by his comrades, he was slain. How long the siege lasted we do not know; probably some years; but the end was in sight when Joab captured "the city of waters" (2Sa 12:27). This may mean that he had secured control of the water supply. In the preceding verse he calls it the "royal city." By the chivalry of his general, David was enabled in person to enjoy the honor of taking the city. Among the booty secured was the crown of Melcom, the god of the Ammonites. Such of the inhabitants as survived he treated with great severity (2Sa 12:26-31; 1Ch 20:1).

In the utterances of the prophets against Ammon, Rabbah stands for the people, as their most important, or perhaps their only important, city (Jer 49:2,3; Eze 21:20; 25:5; Am 1:14). Jer 49:4 speaks of the "flowing valley"—a reference perhaps to the abundance of water and fruitfulness—and the treasures in which she gloried. Eze 21:21 represents the king of Babylon at "the head of the two ways" deciding by means of the divining arrows whether he should march against Jerusalem or against Rabbah. Amos seems to have been impressed with the palaces of Rabbah.

The city retained its importance in later times. It was captured by Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 BC), who called it Philadelphia. It was a member of the league of ten cities. Antiochus the Great captured it by means of treachery (Polyb. v.71). Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 3) names it as lying East of Peraea. In the 4th century AD, it ranked with Bostra and Gerasa as one of the great fortified cities of Coele-Syria (Ritter, Erdkunde, XV, ii, 1154 f). It became the seat of a bishop. Abulfeda (1321 AD) says that Rabbah was in ruins at the time of the Moslem conquest.

Rabbah is represented by the modern ‘Amman, a ruined site with extensive remains, chiefly from Roman times, some 14 miles Northeast of Heshbon, and about 22 miles East of the Jordan. It lies on the northern bank of Wady ‘Amman, a tributary of the upper Jabbok, in a well-watered and fruitful valley. Possibly the stream which rises here may be "the waters" referred to in 2Sa 12:27. Ancient Rabbah may have stood on the hill now occupied by the citadel, a position easy of defense because of its precipitous sides. The outer walls of the citadel appear to be very old; but it is quite impossible to say that anything Ammonite is now above ground. The citadel is connected by means of an underground passage with a large cistern or tank to the North, whence probably it drew its watersupply. This may be the passage mentioned in the account of the capture of the city by Antiochus. "It is," says Conder (Heth and Moab, 158), "one of the finest Roman towns in Syria, with baths, a theater, and an odeum, as well as several large private masonry tombs built in the valley probably in the 2nd century. The fortress on the hill, now surrounding a considerable temple, is also probably of this same date. The church with two chapels farther North, and perhaps some of the tombs, must belong to a later age, perhaps the 4th century. The fine mosque and the fine Moslem building on the citadel hill cannot be earlier than the 7th, and are perhaps as late as the 11th century; and we have thus relics of every building epoch except the Crusading, of which there appears to be no indication."

The place is now occupied by Arabs and Circassians who profit by the riches of the soil. It is brought into contact with the outside world by means of the Damascus-Hejaz Railway, which has a station here.

(2) (ha-rabbah; Codex Vaticanus Sotheba; Codex Alexandrinus Arebba): An unidentified city of Judah named along with Kiriath-jearim (Jos 15:60).

W. Ewing

RABBI

rab’-i, rab’-i (rabbi; rhabbi, or rhabbei): A term used by the Jews of their religious teachers as a title of respect, from rabh, "great," so "my great one" (compare Latin magister), once of masters of slaves, but later of teachers (Mt 23:7); therefore translated by didaskalos, "teacher" (Mt 23:8; Joh 1:38; compare Joh 1:49). In the King James Version frequently rendered "Master" (Mt 26:25,49; Mr 9:5; 11:21; 14:45; Joh 4:31; 9:2; 11:8). John the Baptist (Joh 3:26), as well as Christ, is addressed with the title (Joh 1:49; 6:25), both by disciples and others. Jesus forbade its use among His followers (Mt 23:8). Later (Galilean) form of same, RABBONI (which see).

See TALMUD for Rabbinical literature.

Edward Bagby Pollard

RABBITH

rab’-ith (ha-rabbith; Codex Vaticanus Dabeiron; Codex Alexandrinus Rhabboth): A town in the territory of Issachar (Jos 19:20) which is probably represented today by Raba, a village in the southern part of the Gilboa range and North of Ibzaq. The "ha" is, of course, the definite article.

RABBLE

rab’-l: This word is not found in the King James Version. the Revised Version (British and American) has it once as the translation of agoraios (literally, "lounger in the market place"), in Ac 17:5, where it replaces "baser sort" of the King James Version. It has the common meaning of an unruly, lawless set who are ready to join a mob.

RABBONI

rab-o’-ni, rab-o’-ni (rhabboni, "my great master" (Mr 10:51); rhabbouni (Westcott-Hort rhabbounei), (Joh 20:16)).of agoraios (literally, "lounger in the market place"), in Ac 17:5, where it replaces "baser sort" of the King James Version. It has the common meaning of an unruly, lawless set who are ready to join a mob.

See RABBI.

RABSHAKEH

rab’-sha-ke, rab-sha’-ke (rabhshaqeh): A compound word, the first part, rabh, indicating "head" or "chief" (see RAB-MAG; RAB-SARIS). The second part, which in the Aramaic, probably meant "cupbearer," had in this connection and elsewhere, according to later discoveries, an extended significance, and meant chief officer, i.e. chief of the heads or captains.

Rabshakeh was one of the officers sent by Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, with the Tartan and the Rabsaris to demand the surrender of Jerusalem, which was under siege by the Assyrian army (2Ki 18:17,19,26,27,28,37; 19:4,8; Isa 36:2,4,11,12,13,22; 37:4,8). The three officers named went from Lachish to Jerusalem and appeared by the conduit of the upper pool. Having called upon King Hezekiah, his representatives Eliakim, the son of Hilkiah, Shebnah, the scribe, and Joah, the recorder, appeared. Rabshakeh sent through them a message to the king in which he represented himself as the spokesman for the king of Assyria. He derided King Hezekiah in an insolent fashion in representing his trust in

Egypt as a bruised reed which would pierce the hand. Likewise his confidence in Yahweh was vain, for He also would be unable to deliver them. Then the officers of the king replied, requesting him to speak in the Syrian language-which they understood, and not in the Jews' language which the people on the wall understood. This he refused to do, speaking still more loudly in order that they might hear and be persuaded. By bribery and appeal, by promise and by deception he exhorted them to turn traitor to Hezekiah and surrender to him. The people, however, true to the command of Hezekiah (2Ki 18:36), "held their peace, and answered him not a word." Afterward Rabshakeh returned and "found the king of Assyria warring against Libnah". (2Ki 19:8). From this description it is inferred that Rabshakeh was a man of considerable literary attainment, being able, in all probability, to speak in three languages. He had, in addition to his official power, dauntless courage, an insolent spirit and a characteristic oriental disregard for veracity.

Walter G. Clippinger

RACA

ra'-ka, ra-ka'>(rhaka, Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek with Codices Sinaiticus (corrected), Vaticanus, Codex E, etc.; rhacha, Tischendorf with Codices Sinaiticus (original hand) and Bezae; Aramaic reqa', from req, "empty"): Vain or worthless fellow; a term of contempt used by the Jews in the time of Christ. In the Bible, it occurs in Mt 5:22 only, but John Lightfoot gives a number of instances of the use of the word by Jewish writers (Hot. Hebrew., edition by Gandell, Oxford, 1859, II, 108). Chrysostom (who was acquainted with Syriac as spoken in the neighborhood of Antioch) says it was equivalent to the Greek su, "thou," used contemptuously instead of a man's name. Jerome rendered it inanis aut vacuus absque cerebro. It is generally explained as expressing contempt for a man's intellectual capacity (=" you simpleton!"), while more (translated "thou fool"), in the same verse is taken to refer to a man's moral and religious character (=" you rascal!" "you impious fellow!"). Thus we have three stages of anger, with three corresponding grades of punishment:

(1) the inner feeling of anger (orgizomenos), to be punished by the local or provincial court (te krisei, "the judgment");

(2) anger breaking forth into an expression of scorn (Raca), to be punished by the Sanhedrin (to sunedrio, "the council");

(3) anger culminating in abusive and defamatory language (More), to be punished by the fire of Gehenna.

This view, of a double climax, which has been held by foremost English and Gor. commentators, seems to give the passage symmetry and gradation. But it is rejected among others by T. K. Cheyne, who, following J. P. Peters, rearranges the text by transferring the clause "and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council" to the end of the preceding verse (Encyclopaedia Biblica, IV, cols. 4001 f). There certainly does not seem to be trustworthy external evidence to prove

that the terms "the judgment," "the council," "the Gehenna of fire" stand to each other in a relation of gradation, as lower and higher legal courts, or would be so understood by Christ's hearers. What is beyond dispute is that Christ condemns the use of disparaging and insulting epithets as a supreme offense against the law of humanity, which belongs to the same category as murder itself. It should be added, however, that it is the underlying feeling and not the verbal expression as such that constitutes the sin. Hence, our Lord can, without any real inconsistency, address two of His followers as "foolish men" (Lu 24:25, anoetoi, practically equivalent to Raca, as is also James's expression, "O vain man," Jas 2:20).

D. Miall Edwards

RACAL

ra'-kal (rakhal, "trader"): A place in Judah, enumerated among "the places where David himself and his men were wont to haunt," to the elders of which he sent a share of his spoils (1Sa 30:29). The Septuagint reading "Carmel" has been adopted, by many, because of the similarity of the words in Hebrew (rakal and karmel) and because there was a Carmel in the neighborhood of Hebron (Jos 15:55; 1Sa 15:12), which figures in the story of David's adventures when pursued by Saul (1Sa 25) in a manner that makes it improbable that he would overlook the place in his good fortune (the King James Version "Rachal").

Nathan Isaacs

RACE

ras (merox; agon, dromos).

See GAMES, I, 2; II, 3.

RACES

ras'-iz.

See TABLE OF NATIONS.

RACHAB

ra'-kab (Rhachab): the King James Version; Greek form of "Rahab" (thus Mt 1:5 the Revised Version (British and American)).

RACHAL

ra’-kal.

See RACAL.

RACHEL

ra’-chel (rachel, "ewe"; Rhachel (Ge 29:6; Jer 31:15, the King James Version "Rahel")):

1. Biography:

An ancestress of Israel, wife of Jacob, mother of Joseph and Benjamin. Rachel was the younger daughter of Laban, the Aramean, the brother of Jacob’s mother; so Rachel and Jacob were cousins. They met for the first time upon the arrival of Jacob at Haran, when attracted by her beauty he immediately fell in love with her, winning her love by his chivalrous act related in Ge 29:10 ff. According to the custom of the times Jacob contracted with Laban for her possession, agreeing to serve him 7 years as the stipulated price (29:17-20). But when the time had passed, Laban deceived Jacob by giving him Leah instead of Rachel. When Jacob protested, Laban gave him Rachel also, on condition that Jacob serve 7 years more (29:21-29). To her great dismay "Rachel was barren" (Ge 29:30,31), while Leah had children. Rachel, envious of her sister, complained to Jacob, who reminded her that children are the gift of God. Then Rachel resorted to the expedient once employed by Sarah under similar circumstances (16:2 ff); she bade Jacob take her handmaid Bilhah, as a concubine, to "obtain children by her" (30:3). Da and Naphtali were the offspring of this union. The evil of polygamy is apparent from the dismal rivalry arising between the two sisters, each seeking by means of children to win the heart of Jacob. In her eagerness to become a mother of children, Rachel bargained with Leah for the mandrakes, or love-apples of her son Reuben, but all to no avail (Ge 30:14). Finally God heard her prayer and granted her her heart’s desire, and she gave birth to her firstborn whom she named Joseph (Ge 30:22-24).

Some years after this, when Jacob fled from Laban with his wives, the episode of theft of the teraphim of Laban by Rachel, related in Ge 31:19,34,35, occurred. She hoped by securing the household gods of her father to bring prosperity to her own new household. Though she succeeded by her cunning in concealing them from Laban, Jacob later, upon discovering them, had them put away (35:2-4). In spite of all, she continued to be the favorite of Jacob, as is clearly evidenced by 33:2, where we are told that he assigned to her the place of greatest safety, and by his preference for Joseph, her son. After the arrival in Canaan, while they were on the way from Beth-el to Ephrath, i.e. Bethlehem, Rachel gave birth to her second son, Benjamin, and died (35:16 ff).

2. Character:

In a marked manner Rachel’s character shows the traits of her family, cunning and covetousness, so evident in Laban, Rebekah and Jacob. Though a believer in the true God (Ge 30:6,8,22), she was yet given to the superstitions of her country, the worshipping of the teraphim, etc. (Ge 31:19). The futility of her efforts in resorting to self-help and superstitious expedients, the love and stronger faith of her

husband (Ge 35:2-4), were the providential means of purifying her character. Her memory lived on in Israel long after she died. In Ru 4:11, the names of Rachel and Leah occur in the nuptial benediction as the foundresses of the house of Israel.

RACHEL'S TOMB

(matstsebheth qebhurath rachel): In Ge 35:20 we read: "Jacob set up a pillar upon her grave: the same is the Pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day," i.e. the time of the writer. Though the pillar, i.e sepulchral monument, has long disappeared, the spot is marked until this day, and Christians, Jews and Mohammedans unite in honoring it. The present tomb, which, apparently, is not older than the 15th century, is built in the style of the small-domed buildings raised by Moslems in honor of their saints. It is a rough structure of four square walls, each about 23 ft. long and 20 ft. high; the dome rising 10 ft. higher is used by Mohammedans for prayer, while on Fridays the Jews make supplication before the empty tomb within. It is doubtful, but probable, that it marks the exact spot where Rachel was buried. There are, apparently, two traditions as to the location of the place. The oldest tradition, based upon Ge 35:16-20; 48:7, points to a place one mile North of Bethlehem and 4 miles from Jerusalem. Mt 2:18 speaks for this place, since the evangelist, reporting the slaughter of the innocents of Bethlehem, represents Rachel as weeping for her children from her neighboring grave. But according to 1Sa 10:2 ff, which apparently represents another tradition, the place of Rachel's grave was on the "border of Benjamin," near Beth-el, about 10 miles North of Jerusalem, at another unknown Ephrath. This location, some believe, is corroborated by Jer 31:15, where the prophet, in relating the leading away of the people of Ramah, which was in Benjamin, into captivity, introduces Rachel the mother of that tribe as bewailing the fate of her descendants. Those that believe this northern location to be the place of Rachel's grave take the words, "the same is Beth-lehem," in Ge 35:19; 48:7, to be an incorrect gloss; but that is a mere assumption lacking sufficient proof.o, following J. P. Peters, rearranges the text by transferring the clause "and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council" to the end of the preceding verse (Encyclopaedia Biblica, IV, cols. 4001 f). There certainly does not seem to be trustworthy external evidence to prove that the terms "the judgment," "the council," "the Gehenna of fire" stand to each other in a relation of gradation, as lower and higher legal courts, or would be so understood by Christ's hearers. What is beyond dispute is that Christ condemns the use of disparaging and insulting epithets as a supreme offense against the law of humanity, which belongs to the same category as murder itself. It should be added, however, that it is the underlying feeling and not the verbal expression as such that constitutes the sin. Hence, our Lord can, without any real inconsistency, address two of His followers as "foolish men" (Lu 24:25, anoetoi, practically equivalent to Raca, as is also James's expression, "O vain man," Jas 2:20).

Mr. Nathan Strauss, of New York City, has purchased the land surrounding Rachel's grave for the purpose of erecting a Jewish university in the Holy Land.

S. D. Press

RADDAI

rad’-a-i, ra-da’-i (radday, "beating down"(?)): The 5th of the 7 sons of Jesse, father of David, according to 1Ch 2:14 Septuagint, Codex Alexdrinus, "Rhaddai"; Lucian, "Rhedai"; others, "Zaddai".epulchral monument, has long disappeared, the spot is marked until this day, and Christians, Jews and Mohammedans unite in honoring it. The present tomb, which, apparently, is not older than the 15th century, is built in the style of the small-domed buildings raised by Moslems in honor of their saints. It is a rough structure of four square walls, each about 23 ft. long and 20 ft. high; the dome rising 10 ft. higher is used by Mohammedans for prayer, while on Fridays the Jews make supplication before the empty tomb within. It is doubtful, but probable, that it marks the exact spot where Rachel was buried. There are, apparently, two traditions as to the location of the place. The oldest tradition, based upon Ge 35:16-20; 48:7, points to a place one mile North of Bethlehem and 4 miles from Jerusalem. Mt 2:18 speaks for this place, since the evangelist, reporting the slaughter of the innocents of Bethlehem, represents Rachel as weeping for her children from her neighboring grave. But according to 1Sa 10:2 ff, which apparently represents another tradition, the place of Rachel’s grave was on the "border of Benjamin," near Beth-el, about 10 miles North of Jerusalem, at another unknown Ephrath. This location, some believe, is corroborated by Jer 31:15, where the prophet, in relating the leading away of the people of Ramah, which was in Benjamin, into captivity, introduces Rachel the mother of that tribe as bewailing the fate of her descendants. Those that believe this northern location to be the place of Rachel’s grave take the words, "the same is Beth-lehem," in Ge 35:19; 48:7, to be an incorrect gloss; but that is a mere assumption lacking sufficient proof.o, following J. P. Peters, rearranges the text by transferring the clause "and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council" to the end of the preceding verse (Encyclopaedia Biblica, IV, cols. 4001 f). There certainly does not seem to be trustworthy external evidence to prove that the terms "the judgment," "the council," "the Gehenna of fire" stand to each other in a relation of gradation, as lower and higher legal courts, or would be so understood by Christ’s hearers. What is beyond dispute is that Christ condemns the use of disparaging and insulting epithets as a supreme offense against the law of humanity, which belongs to the same category as murder itself. It should be added, however, that it is the underlying feeling and not the verbal expression as such that constitutes the sin. Hence, our Lord can, without any real inconsistency, address two of His followers as "foolish men" (Lu 24:25, anoetoi, practically equivalent to Raca, as is also James’s expression, "O vain man," Jas 2:20).

RADIANT

ra’-di-ant (nahar, "to sparkle" i.e. (figurative) be cheerful; hence (from the sheen of a running stream), to flow, i.e. (figurative) assemble; flow (together), be lightened): the American Standard Revised Version substitutes the active "radiant" for the passive "were lightened" in Ps 34:5; Isa 60:5 (English Revised Version, the King James Version "flow together"). As the earth and moon, both being dark, face a common sun and lighten each other, they are not only lightened, but radiant. So with the believers, "They looked unto him (Yahweh), and were radiant." Thus nahar combines the two ideas of being lightened and flowing together. This appears, also, in a different connection, in Isa 60:5, "Then thou shalt see and be radiant." "It is liquid light—light that ripples and sparkles and runs across the face; .... the light which a face catches from sparkling water" (G.A. Smith, Isaiah, II, 430).

M. O. Evans

RAFT

raft.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

RAFTER

raf’-ter (So 1:17).

See GALLERY; HOUSE.

RAG

Plural in Pr 23:21, "Drowsiness will clothe a man with rags" (qera’im "torn garment"; compare 1Ki 11:30), and figuratively in Isa 64:6 the King James Version, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags," in the sense of "tattered clothing" (beghedh, the Revised Version (British and American) "garment"). In Jer 38:11,12 the American Standard Revised Version translates cechabhah, as "rag" (the King James Version, the English Revised Version "old cast clout"), while the King James Version, the English Revised Version use "rotten rag" for melach (the American Standard Revised Version "worn-out garment"). Both cechabhah and melach mean "worn out."

RAGAU

ra’-go (Rhagau (Westcott-Hort): the King James Version; Greek form of "Reu" (thus, the Revised Version (British and American)) (Lu 3:35).

RAGES; RAGAU

ra’-jez, ra’-go

1. Location:

("Rages," Tobit 1:14; 4:1,20; 5:5; 6:9,12; 9:2; "Ragau," Judith 1:5,15; Rhagai, Rhaga, Rhage, Rhagau; in Darius’ Behistun Inscriptions, II, 71, 72, Raga, a province; in Avesta, Vend. I, 15, Ragha, city and province; perhaps, "the excellent"): In Eastern Media, one forced march from Caspian Gates, 11 days’ journey from Ecbatana, 5 1/2 miles South of present Tehran; the capital of the province of the same name, though by Ptolemy called Rhagiana.

2. History:

(1) Ancient.

A very ancient city, the traditional birthplace of Zoroaster (Zarathustra; Pahlavi Vendidad, Zad sparad XVI, 12, and Dabistan i Mazahib). In Yasna XIX, 18, of the Avesta, it is thus mentioned: "The Zoroastrian, four-chief-possessing Ragha, hers are the royal chiefs, both the house-chief, the village-chief, and the town-chief: Zoroaster is the fourth." In Vend. I, 15: "As the tenth, the best of both districts and cities, I, who am Ahura Mazda, did create Ragha, which possesses the three classes," i.e. fire-priests, charioteers, husbandmen. Later it was the religious center of magism. A large colony of captive Israelites settled there. Destroyed in Alexander's time, it was rebuilt by Seleucus Nicator (circa 300 BC), who named it Europos. Later, Arsaces restored it and named it Arsacia.

(2) Medieval.

In the early Middle Ages Ragha, then called Rai, was a great literary and often political center with a large population. It was the birthplace of Harun'al Rashid (763 AD). It was seized and plundered (1029 AD) by Sultan Machmud, but became Tughril's capital. In the Vis o Roman (circa 1048 AD) it is an important place, 10 days journey across the Kavir desert from Merv. It was a small provincial town in about 1220 AD. It was sacked by Mongols in 1220 AD and entirely destroyed under Ghazan Khan circa 1295. A Zoroastrian community lived there in 1278 AD, one of whom composed the Zardtusht-Namah.
(3) Present Condition.

Near the ruins there now stands the village of Shah Abdu'l 'Acim, connected with Tehran by the only railway in Persia (opened in 1888).

LITERATURE

Ptolemy, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, Strabo; Ibnu'l Athir, Jami'u t Tawarikh, Tarikh i Jahan-gusha Yaqut; Justi, Iranisches Namenbuch; E.G. Browne, Literary Hist of Persia; modern travelers.

W. St. Clair Tisdall

RAGUEL (1)

ra-gu'-el, rag'-u-el (Rhagouel): "The friend of God," of Ecbatana, the husband of Edna, father of Sarah, and father-in-law of Tobias (Tobit 3:7,17; 6:10; 7:2 f; 14:12). In Tobit 7:2 he is called cousin of Tobit, and in Tobit 6:10 the King James Version he is erroneously represented as "cousin" of Tobias =" kinsman" in the Revised Version (British and American). In Enoch 20:4 Raguel appears as one of the archangels, perhaps by confusion for Raphael (Tobit 3:17). Another form of the name is REUEL (which see). one of whom composed the Zardtusht-Namah.

RAGUEL (2)

ra-gu’-el, rag’-u-el (re‘u’-el; Septuagint: Rhagouel): The Midianite chothen, i.e. either father-in-law or brother-in-law of Moses (Nu 10:29 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Reuel"), the father of Hobab, called a Kenite, who is likewise described as a chothen of Moses (Jud 4:11). See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY. Moses’ wife’s father is called re‘u’el in Ex 2:18 where Lucian reads "Iothor" and English Versions of the Bible "Reuel," which transliteration is adopted in the Revised Version (British and American) in Nu 10:29 also. In other passages the chothen of Moses is called "Jether" or "Jethro." Among the harmonizations suggested the following are worthy of consideration:

(a) that all are names or perhaps titles of one man (Rashi);

(b) that Reuel was the father of Hobab and Jethro, that Jethro was the father-in-law of Moses, and that the word "father" is used for grandfather in Ex 2:18;

(c) that Reuel was the father-in-law and Jethro and Hobab brothers-in-law;

(d) that either Reuel or Hobab is to be identified with Jethro.

None of these views is free from difficulty, nor is the view of those who would give Jethro as the name in the Elohist (E) and Reuel as that in the Jahwist (Jahwist) and (J-E).

See also REUEL.

Nathan Isaacs

RAHAB

ra’-hab:

(1) (rachabh, "broad"; in Josephus, Ant, V, i, 2, 7, Rhachab; Heb 11:31 and Jas 2:25, Rhaab): A zonah, that is either a "harlot," or, according to some, an "innkeeper" in Jericho; the Septuagint porne, "harlot"). The two spies sent by Joshua from Shittim came into her house and lodged there (Jos 2:1). She refused to betray them to the king of Jericho, and when he demanded them, she hid them on the roof of her house with stalks of flax that she had laid in order to dry. She pretended that they had escaped before the shutting of the gate, and threw their pursuers off their track. She then told the spies of the fear that the coming of the Israelites had caused in the minds of the Canaanites—"Our hearts did melt .... for Yahweh your God, he is God in heaven above, and on earth beneath"—and asked that the men promise to spare her father, mother, brothers and sisters, and all that they had. They promised her to spare them provided they would remain in her house and provided she would keep their business secret. Thereupon she let them down by a cord through the window, her house being built upon the town wall, and gave them

directions to make good their escape (Jos 2:1-24). True to their promise, the Israelites under Joshua spared Rahab and her family (Jos 6:16 the King James Version); "And," says the author of Josh, "she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day." Her story appealed strongly to the imagination of the people of later times. Heb 11:31 speaks of her as having been saved by faith; James, on the other hand, in demonstrating that a man is justified by works and not by faith only, curiously chooses the same example (Jas 2:25). Jewish tradition has been kindly disposed toward Rahab; one hypothesis goes so far as to make her the wife of Joshua himself (Jew Encyclopedia, under the word). Naturally then the other translation of zonah, deriving it from zun, "to feed," instead of zanah, "to be a harlot," has been preferred by some of the commentators.

(2) (@Rhachab): Josephus, Ant, V, 1, 2, 7, so spells the name of (1) Septuagint and New Testament contra). The wife of Salmon and mother of Booz (Boaz) according to the genealogy in Mt 1:5. Query, whether there was a tradition identifying (1) and (2); see Lightfoot, Horae Hob on Mt 1:5.

(3) (rahabh, literally, "storm," "arrogance"): A mythical sea-monster, probably referred to in several passages where the word is translated as a common noun "pride" (Job 9:13), "the proud" (Job 26:12; compare Ps 89:10). It is used in parallelism with tannin, "the dragon" (Isa 51:9). It is most familiar as an emblem of Egypt, ‘the boaster that sitteth still’ (Isa 30:7; Ps 87:4; compare Ps 89:10). The Talmud in Babha’ Bathra’ speaks of rahabh as sar ha-yam, "master of the sea."

See also ASTRONOMY.

Nathan Isaacs

RAHAM

ra’-ham (racham, "pity," "love"): Son of Shema, and father of Jorkeam (1Ch 2:44).

RAHEL

ra’-hel (Jer 31:15 the King James Version).

See RACHEL.

RAID

rad (1Sa 27:10).

See WAR, 3.

RAIL; RAILING; RAILER,

ral, ral’-ing, ral’-er: To "rail" on (in modern usage "against") anyone is to use insolent or reproachful language toward one. It occurs in the Old Testament as the translation of charaph (2Ch 32:17, "letters to rail on Yahweh"), and of ‘it (1Sa 25:14, of Nabal, "he railed at them," the English Revised Version "flew upon them," margin "railed on"). In the New Testament "to rail" is the translation of blasphemeo (Mr 15:29; Lu 23:39; "railing," 1Ti 6:4; 2Pe 2:11; Jude 1:9). The word loidoria, rendered railing" in 1Pe 3:9 the King James Version, is in the Revised Version (British and American) "reviling," and loidoros, "railor," in 1Co 5:11 is in the Revised Version (British and American) "reviler."

See also RACA.

W. L. Walker

RAIMENT

ra’-ment.

See DRESS.

RAIMENT, SOFT

(malakos): In Mt 11:8 English Versions of the Bible, where Jesus, speaking of John the Baptist, asks "What went ye out to see? a man clothed in soft raiment?" where "raiment," though implied, is not expressed in the best text, but was probably added from Lu 7:25 parallel. It is equivalent to "elegant clothing," such as courtiers wore, as shown by the words following, "Behold, they that wear soft raiment are in kings’ houses." John had bravely refused to play courtier and had gone to prison for it. In the early days of Herod the Great some scribes who attached themselves to him laid aside their usual plain clothing and wore the gorgeous raiment of courtiers (Jost, in Plumptre).

George B. Eager

RAIN

ran (maTar, Arabic (?), maTar, "rain" geshem, "heavy rain" moreh, "early rain," yoreh, "former rain," malqosh, "latter rain"; brecho, huetos):

1. Water-Supply in Egypt and Palestine:

In Egypt there is little or no rainfall, the water for vegetation being supplied in great abundance by the river Nile; but in Syria and Palestine there are no large rivers, and the people have to depend entirely on the fall of rain for water for themselves, their animals and their fields. The children of Israel when in

Egypt were promised by Yahweh a land which "drinketh water of the rain of heaven" (De 11:11). Springs and fountains are found in most of the valleys, but the flow of the springs depends directly on the fall of rain or snow in the mountains.

2. Importance of Rain in Season:

The cultivation of the land in Palestine is practically dry farming in most of the districts, but even then some water is necessary, so that there may be moisture in the soil. In the summer months there is no rain, so that the rains of the spring and fall seasons are absolutely essential for starting and maturing the crops. The lack of this rain in the proper time has often been the cause of complete failure of the harvest. A small difference in the amount of these seasonal rains makes a large difference in the possibility of growing various crops without irrigation. Ellsworth Huntington has insisted on this point with great care in his very important work, Palestine and Its Transformation. The promise of prosperity is given in the assurance of "rain in due season" (Le 26:4 the King James Version). The withholding of rain according to the prophecy of Elijah (1Ki 17:1) caused the mountain streams to dry up (1Ki 17:7), and certain famine ensued. A glimpse of the terrible suffering for lack of water at that time is given us. The people were uncertain of another meal (1Ki 17:12), and the animals were perishing (1Ki 18:5).

3. Amount of Rainfall:

Palestine and Syria are on the borderland between the sea and the desert, and besides are so mountainous, that they not only have a great range of rainfall in different years, but a great variation in different parts of the country.

The amount of rain on the western slopes is comparable with that in England and America, varying from 25 to 40 inches per annum, but it falls mostly in the four winter months, when the downpour is often very heavy, giving oftentimes from 12 to 16 inches in a month. On the eastern slopes it is much less, varying from 8 to 20 inches per annum. The highest amount falls in the mountains of Lebanon where it averages about 50 inches. In Beirut the yearly average is 35,87 inches. As we go South from Syria, the amount decreases (Haifa 27,75, Jaffa 22,39, Gaze 17,61), while in the Sinaitic Peninsula there is little or none. Going from West to East the change is much more sudden, owing to the mountains which stop the clouds. In Damascus the average is less than 10 inches. In Jerusalem the average for 50 years is 26,16 in., and the range is from 13,19 in 1870 to 41,62 in 1897. The yearly records as given by J. Glaisher and A. Datzi in Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly from 1861 to 1910, 50 years, are given in the accompanying table.

RAINBOW

ran’-bo (qesheth, translated "a bow"; iris, "rainbow"): As most of the rainfall in Palestine is in the form of short heavy showers it is often accompanied by the rainbow. Most beautiful double bows are often seen, and occasionally the moon is bright enough to produce the bow. It is rather remarkable that there are so few references to the rainbow in the Bible. The Hebrew qesheth is the ordinary word for a bow,

there being no special word for rainbow.

The interpretation of the significance of the bow in the sky is given at the close of the story of the flood, where it is called "the token of the covenant" of Yahweh with Noah that there should be no more flood: "I do set my bow in the cloud, ... and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh" (Ge 9:13,15). This addition to the story of the flood is not found in other mythical accounts. The foundation for the interpretation of the bow in this way seems to be that while His bow is hung in the sky God must be at peace with His people. The glory of God is likened to "the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain" (Eze 1:28). The rainbow forms a striking part of the vision in Re 4:3: "And there was a rainbow round about the throne."

Alfred H. Joy

RAINFALL IN JERUSALEM IN INCHES

Year Amount

1861 27.30"

1862 21.86"

1863 26.54"

1864 15.51"

1865 18.19"

1866 18.55"

1867 29.42"

1868 29.10"

1869 18.61"

1870 13.19"

1871 23.17"

1872 22.26"

1873 22.72"

1874 29.75"

1875 27.01"

1876 14.41"

1877 26.00"

1878 32.21"

1879 18.04"

1880 32.11"

1881 16.50"

1882 26.72"

1883 31.92" 1884 23.16"

1885 29.47"

1886 31.69"

1887 29.81"

1888 37.79"

1889 13.16"

1890 35.51"

1891 34.72"

1892 31.23"

1893 30.54"

1894 35.38"

1895 23.15"

1896 32.90"

1897 41.62"

1898 28.66"

1899 22.43"

1900 21.20"

1901 17.42"

1902 25.51"

1903 18.04"

1904 34.48"

1905 34.22"

1906 28.14"

1907 27.22"

1908 31.87"

1909 21.13"

1910 24.64"

The amount of rainfall in ancient times was probably about the same as in present times, though it may have been distributed somewhat differently through the year, as suggested by Huntington. Conder maintains that the present amount would have been sufficient to support the ancient cities (Tent-Work in Palestine). Trees are without doubt fewer now, but meteorologists agree that trees do not produce rain.

4. Dry and Rainy Seasons;

The rainfall is largely on the western slopes of the mountains facing the sea, while on the eastern slopes there is very little. The moisture-laden air comes up from the sea with the west and southwest wind. When these currents strike the hills they are thrown higher up into the cooler strata, and the moisture condenses to form clouds and rain which increases on the higher levels. Having passed the ridge of the hills, the currents descend on the other side to warmer levels, where the moisture is easily held in the form of vapor so that no rain falls and few clouds are seen, except in the cold mid-winter months.

The summer months are practically rainless, with very few clouds appearing in the sky. From May 1 to the middle of October one can be sure of no rain; "The winter is past; the rain is over" (So 2:11), so many sleep on the roofs of the houses or in tents of leaves and branches in the fields and vineyards throughout the summer. The continuous hot droughts make the people appreciate the springs and fountains of fresh running water and the cool shade of rock and tree.

The rainy season from October to May may be divided into three parts, the former, the winter, and the latter rains, and they are often referred to under these names in the Old Testament.

The "former rains" are the showers of October and the first part of November. They soften the parched ground so that the winter grain may be sown before the heavy continuous rains set in. The main bulk of the rain falls in the months of December, January and February. Although in these months the rains are frequent and heavy, a dark, foggy day is seldom seen. The "latter rains" of April are the most highly appreciated, because they ripen the fruit and stay the drought of summer. They were considered a special blessing: Yahweh "will come .... as the latter rain that watereth the earth" (Ho 6:3); "They opened their mouth wide as for the latter rain" (Job 29:23); and as a reason for worshipping Yahweh who sent them, "Let us now fear Yahweh our God, that giveth rain, both the former and the latter, in its season" (Jer 5:24).

The rain storms always come from the sea with a west or southwest wind. The east wind is a hot wind and the "north wind driveth away rain" (Pr 25:23, the King James Version). "Fair weather cometh out of the north" (Job 37:22, the King James Version).

5. Biblical Uses:

The Psalmist recognizes that the "showers that water the earth" (Ps 72:6) are among the choicest blessings from the hand of Yahweh: "The early rain covereth it with blessings" (Ps 84:6). The severest punishment of Yahweh was to withhold the rain, as in the time of Ahab and Elijah, when the usual rain did not fall for three years (1Ki 17); "the anger of Yahweh be kindled against you, and he shut up the heavens, so that there shall be no rain, and the land shall not yield its fruit; and ye perish quickly" (De 11:17). Too much rain is also a punishment, as witness the flood (Ge 7:4) and the plague of rain and hail (Ezr 10:9). Sending of rain was a reward for worship and obedience: "Yahweh will open unto thee his good treasure, the heavens, to give the rain of thy land in its season, and to bless all the work of thy hand" (De 28:12). Yahweh controls the elements and commands the rain: "He made a decree for the rain" (Job 28:26); "For he saith to the snow, Fall thou on the earth; likewise to the shower of rain" (Job

37:6). LITERATURE

Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly; meteorological observations from the Dead Sea, Jerusalem, Jaffa and Tiberias; various observers; Zeitschrift des deutschen Paldstina-Vereins; H. Hilderscheid, Die Niederschlagsverhdltnisse Paldstinas in alter and neuer Zeit; C. R. Conder, Tent-Work in Palestine; Edward Hull, Mount Seir, Sinai and Western Palestine; Ellsworth Huntington, Palestine and Its Transformation; bulletin of the Syrian Protestant College Observatory, Meteorological Observations in Beirut and Syria.

Alfred H. Joy

RAISE

raz: "To raise" in the Old Testament is most frequently the translation of the Hiphil form of qum, "to cause to arise," e.g. raising up seed (Ge 38:8), a prophet (De 18:18), judges (Jud 2:16,18), etc.; also of ‘ur, "to awake," "stir up" (Ezr 1:5 the King James Version; Isa 41:2, etc.), with other words. In the New Testament the chief words are egeiro, "to awaken," "arouse" (Mt 3:9; Lu 1:69; 3:8, etc.), frequently of raising the dead; and anistemi (Mt 22:24; Joh 6:39, etc.; Ac 2:24 (30 the King James Version), etc.), with compounds of the former. Among the Revised Version (British and American) changes may be noted, "to stir the fire" for "from raising" (Ho 7:4); "raiseth high his gate" for "exalteth his gate" (Pr 17:19); the American Standard Revised Version, "can it be raised from the roots thereof" for "pluck it up by the roots thereof" (Eze 17:9 the King James Version and the English Revised Version); "raised up" for "rise again" (Mt 20:19; compare Mt 26:32; Ro 8:34; Col 3:1).

W. L. Walker

RAISIN-CAKES

ra’-z’-n-kaks: the Revised Version (British and American) gives this rendering for the King James Version "foundations" in Isa 16:7 (Hebrew ‘ashishah from ‘ashash, "to found," "make firm," "press"). The trade in these would cease through the desolation of the vineyards. For the King James Version "flagons of wine" in Ho 3:1, the Revised Version (British and American) gives "cakes of raisins," such as were offered to the gods of the land, the givers of the grape (compare So 2:5). See next article.

RAISINS

ra’-z’-nz:

(1) cimmuqim; staphides, translated "dried grapes," Nu 6:3; mentioned in all other references as a portable food for a march or journey. Abigail supplied David with "a hundred clusters of raisins," among other things, in the wilderness of Paran (1Sa 25:18); David gave two clusters of raisins to a starving

Egyptian slave of the Amalekites at Besor (1Sa 30:12); raisins formed part of the provision brought to David at Hebron for his army (1Ch 12:40); Ziba supplied David, when flying from Absalom, with a hundred clusters of raisins (2Sa 16:1).

(2) ‘ashishah, something "pressed together," hence, a "cake." In Ho 3:1, mention is made of ‘ashishe ‘anabhim (pemmata meta staphidos), "cakes of raisins": "Yahweh loveth the children of Israel, though they turn unto other gods, and love (margin "or them that love") cakes of raisins." These are supposed to have been cakes of dried, compressed grapes offered to false gods. Gratz considers that the Hebrew words are a corruption of ‘asherim and chammanim ("sun images"). Compare Isa 17:8; 27:9. In other passages "cakes" stands alone without "raisins," but the translation "cakes of raisins" is given in 2Sa 6:19; 1Ch 16:3; So 2:5 (the King James Version "flagons"); Isa 16:7 margin "foundations."

Raisins are today, as of old, prepared in considerable quantities in Palestine, especially at es-Salt, East of the Jordan. The bunches of grapes are dipped in a strong solution of potash before being dried.

E. W. G. Masterman

RAKEM

ra’-kem (raqem, the pausal form of reqem): The eponym of a clan of Machir (1Ch 7:16).

See REKEM.

RAKKATH

rak’-ath (raqqath; Codex Vaticanus Omathadaketh; Codex Alexandrinus Rhekkath): The Greek is obviously the result of confusing the two names Rakkath and Hammath, taking "r" in the former for "d". Rakkath was one of the fortified cities in Naphtali (Jos 19:35). It is named between Hammath and Chinnereth. Hammath is identified with the hot baths to the South of Tiberias. There are traces of ancient fortifications here. The rabbis think that Tiberias was built on the site of Rakkath. Certain it is that Herod’s town was built upon an ancient site, the graves of the old inhabitants being disturbed in digging the new foundations (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 208).

W. Ewing

RAKKON

rak’-on (ha-raqqon; Hierakon).

See ME-JARKON.

RAM (1)

ram (ram, "high," "exalted"):

(1) An ancestor of David (Ru 4:19 (Arran); Mt 1:3,4 (Aram); in 1Ch 2:9 he is called the "brother," but in 2:25, the "son of Jerahmeel" (compare 2:27). Ram as the son of Hezron appears more likely than Ram the son of Jerahmeel, since, according to the narratives of 1 and 2 Samuel, David cannot have been a Jerahmeelite.

(2) Name of Elihu's family (Job 32:2). It is an open question as to whether Ram should be taken as a purely fictitious name, invented by the author of the Elihu speeches, or whether it is that of some obscure Arab tribe. In Ge 22:21 Aram is a nephew of Buz (compare Elihu the Buzite), and the conjecture was at one time advanced that Ram was a contraction of Aram; but this theory is no longer held to be tenable. The suggestion that the initial "a" (the Hebrew letter, 'aleph) has been changed by a scribal error into "h" (the Hebrew letter, he) is more acceptable. Rashi, the rabbinical commentator, takes the quaint position that Ram is identical with Abraham.

Horace J. Wolf

RAM (2)

ram:

(1) The ordinary word is 'ayil, which is remarkably near to 'ayyal, "deer" (compare Latin caper, capra, "goat," and capreolus, "wild goat" or "roe-buck"; also Greek dorkas, "roe-buck" or "gazelle").

(2) dekhar, literally, "male" (Ezr 6:9,17; 7:17).

(3) kar, "battering ram" (Eze 4:2; 21:22); elsewhere "lamb" (De 32:14, etc.).

(4) 'attudh, properly "he-goat" ("ram," Ge 31:10,12 the King James Version).

See SHEEP.

RAM'S HORN

See MUSIC.

RAM, BATTERING

See SIEGE.

RAMA

ra’-ma (Rhama): the King James Version; Greek form of RAMAH (which see) (Mt 2:18).

RAMAH

ra’-ma (ha-ramah, without the definite article only in Ne 11:33; Jer 31:15): The name denotes height, from root rum, "to be high," and the towns to which it applied seem all to have stood on elevated sites.

(1) Codex Vaticanus Arael; Codex Alexandrinus Rhama: A fenced city in the lot assigned to Naphtali (Jos 19:36). Only in this passage is the place referred to. It is probably identical with the modern er-Rameh, a large Christian village on the highway from Cafed to the coast, about 8 miles West-Southwest of that city. To the North rises the mountain range which forms the southern boundary of Upper Galilee. In the valley to the South there is much rich land cultivated by the villagers. The olives grown here are very fine, and fruitful vineyards cover many of the surrounding slopes. No remains of antiquity are to be seen above ground; but the site is one likely to have been occupied in ancient times.

(2) Rhama: A city that is mentioned only once, on the boundary of Asher (Jos 19:29). The line of the boundary cannot be followed with certainty; but perhaps we may identify Ramah with the modern Ramiyeh, a village situated on a hill which rises in the midst of a hollow, some 13 miles Southeast of Tyre, and 12 miles East of the Ladder of Tyre. To the Southwest is a marshy lake which dries up in summer. Traces of antiquity are found in the cisterns, a large reservoir and many sarcophagi. To the West is the high hill Belat, with ancient ruins, and remains of a temple of which several columns are still in situ.

(3) Codex Vaticanus Rhama; Codex Alexandrinus Iama, and other forms: A city in the territory of Benjamin named between Gibeon and Beeroth (Jos 18:25). The Levite thought of it as a possible resting-place for himself and his concubine on their northward journey (Jud 19:13). The palm tree of Deborah was between this and Bethel (Jud 4:5). Baasha, king of Samaria, sought to fortify Ramah against Asa, king of Judah. The latter frustrated the attempt, and carried off the materials which Bassha had collected, and with them fortified against him Geba of Benjamin and Mizpah (1Ki 15:17; 2Ch 16:5). Here the captain of Nebuchadnezzar’s guard released Jeremiah after he had been carried in bonds from Jerusalem (Jer 40:1). It figures in Isaiah’s picture of the Assyrians’ approach (Isa 10:29). It is named by Hosea in connection with Gibeah (5:8), and is mentioned as being reoccupied after the exile (Ezr 2:26; Ne 7:30). It was near the traditional tomb of Rachel (Jer 31:15; compare 1Sa 10:2; Mt 2:18, the King James Version "Rama").

From the passages cited we gather that Ramah lay some distance to the North of Gibeah, and not far from Gibeon and Beeroth. The first is identified with Tell el-Ful, about 3 miles North of Jerusalem. Two miles farther North is er-Ram. Gibeon (el-Jib) is about 3 miles West of er-Ram, and Beeroth (el-Bireh) is about 4 miles to the North Eusebius, Onomasticon places Ramah 6 Roman miles North of Jerusalem;

while Josephus (Ant., VIII, xii, 3) says it lay 40 furlongs from the city. All this points definitely to identification with er-Ram. The modern village crowns a high limestone hill to the South of the road, a position of great strength. West of the village is an ancient reservoir. In the hill are cisterns, and a good well to the South.

(4) Aramathaim: The home of Elkanah and Hannah, and the birthplace of Samuel (1Sa 1:19; 2:11, etc.). In 1Sa 1:1 it is called "Ramathaim-zophim" (ha-ramathayim-tsophim). The phrase as it stands is grammatically incorrect, and suggests tampering with the text. It might possibly be translated "Ramathaim of the Zuphites." It was in Mt. Ephraim, within accessible distance of Shiloh, whither Samuel's parents went up from year to year to worship and to sacrifice (1:3). From Ramah as a center Samuel went on circuit annually, to judge Israel, to Bethel, Gilgal and Mizpah (7:16 f). It is very probable that this is the city in which, guided by his servant, Saul first made the acquaintance of Samuel (9:6,10), where there was a high place (9:12). Hither at all events came the elders of Israel with their demand that a king should be set over them (8:4 f). After his final break with Saul, Samuel retired in sorrow to Ramah (15:34 f). Here, in Naioth, David found asylum with Samuel from the mad king (19:18, etc.), and hence, he fled on his ill-starred visit to Nob (20:1). In his native city the dust of the dead Samuel was laid (25:1; 28:3). In 1 Macc 11:34 it is named as one of the three toparchies along with Aphaerema and Lydda, which were added to Judea from the country of Samaria in 145 BC. Eusebius, Onomasticon places it near Diospolis (Euseb.) in the district of Timnah (Jerome).

There are two serious rivals for the honor of representing the ancient Ramah.

(a) Beit Rima, a village occupying a height 13 miles East-Northeast of Lydda (Diospolis), 12 miles West of Shiloh, and about the same distance Northwest of Bethel. This identification has the support of G. A. Smith (Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 254), and Buhl (Geographic des Alten Palestina, 170).

(b) Ramallah, a large and prosperous village occupying a lofty position with ancient remains. It commands a wide prospect, especially to the West. It lies about 8 miles North of Jerusalem, 3 West of Bethel, and 12 Southwest of Shiloh. The name meaning "the height" or "high place of God" may be reminiscent of the high place in the city where Saul found Samuel. In other respects it agrees very well with the Biblical data.

Claims have also been advanced on behalf of Ramleh, a village 2 miles Southwest of Lydda, in the plain of Sharon. This, however, is out of the question, as the place did not exist before Arab times. Others support identification with Neby Samwil, which more probably represents the ancient MIZPAH (which see).

(5) Ramah of the South, the King James Version "Ramath of the South": Ramath is the construct form of Ramah (Jos 19:8) (ra'math neghebh; Bameth kata liba). A city in that part of the territory of Judah which was allotted to Simeon. It stands here in apposition to Baalath-beer, and is probably a second name for the same place. It seems to correspond also with "Ramoth (plural) of the South" (1Sa 30:27), a place to which David sent a share of the spoil taken from the Amalekites. In this passage Septuagint retains the

singular form, Rhama notou. Identification has been suggested with Qubbet el-Baul, about 37 miles South of Hebron; and with Kurnub a little farther South. There is no substantial ground for either identification.

(6) Codex Vaticanus Rhemmoth; Codex Alexandrinus Rhamoth: Ramah in 2Ki 8:29; 2Ch 22:6, is a contraction of Ramoth-gilead.

W. Ewing

RAMATH OF THE SOUTH

ra’-math, (Jos 19:8 the King James Version).

See RAMAH, (5).

RAMATH-LEHI

ra’-math-le’-hi (ramath lechi, "the hill" or "height of Lehi"; Anairesis siagonos): So the place is said to have been called where Samson threw away the jaw-bone of an ass, with which he had slain 1,000 Philistines (Jud 15:17). The Septuagint seems to have supposed that the name referred to the "heaving" or throwing up of the jaw-bone. The Hebrew, however, corresponds to the form used in other placenames, such as Ramath-mizpeh, and must be read as "Ramah of Lehi." The name Lehi may have been given because of some real or imagined likeness in the place to the shape of a jaw-bone (Jud 15:9,14,19). It may have been in Wady es-Sarar, not far from Zorah and Timnath; but the available data do not permit of certain identification.

See JAWBONE; LEHI.

W. Ewing

RAMATH-MIZPEH

ra’-math-miz’-pe (ramath ha-mitspeh; Codex Vaticanus Araboth kata ten Massepha, Codex Alexandrinus Ramoth kata ten Maspha: A place mentioned in Jos 13:26 in a statement of the boundary of Gad, between Heshbon and Betonim. It may possibly be identical with MIZPAH, (1).

RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM

ra-ma-tha’-im-zo’-fim.

See RAMAH, (4).

RAMATHAIM; RAMATHEM

ra-ma-tha’-im, ram’-a-them (1 Macc 11:34; the King James Version).

See RAMAH, (4).

RAMATHITE

ra’-math-it (ha-ramathi; Codex Vaticanus ho ek Rhael; Codex Alexandrinus ho Rhamathaios): So Shimei is called who was set by David over the vineyards (1Ch 27:27). There is nothing to show to which Ramah he belonged.

RAMESES

ram’-e-sez, ra-me’-sez.

See RAAMSES.

RAMIAH

ra-mi’-a (ramyah, "Yah has loosened" or "Yah is high"): One of the Israelites, of the sons of Parosh, mentioned in the register of those who had offended in the matter of foreign marriages (Ezr 10:25). The form of the name in 1 Esdras (9:26), "Hiermas," presupposes a Hebrew form yeremyah or possibly yirmeyah =" Jeremiah."

RAMOTH (1)

ra’-moth:

(1) ra’moth; he Rhamoth: A city in the territory of Issachar assigned to the Gershonite Levitea (1Ch 6:73), mentioned between Daberath and Anem. It seems to correspond to "Remeth" in Jos 19:21, and to "Jarmuth" in 21:29, and is possibly identical with er-Rameh about 11 miles Southwest of Jenin.

(2) Ramoth of the South.

See RAMAH, (5).

(3) Ramoth in Gilead.

See RAMOTH-GILEAD.

RAMOTH (2)

ra’-moth (ramoth, Qere for yeremoth (Ezr 10:29 the King James Version); the Revised Version margin Kethibh makes the name similar to those in Ezr 10:26,27): One of the offenders in the matter of foreign marriages. The English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version, adopting Kethibh, read JEREMOTH (which see).

RAMOTH (3)

(Job 28:18 King James Version margin).

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

RAMOTH-GILEAD

ra’-moth-gil’-e-ad (ramoth gil’adh; Codex Vaticanus Rhemmath Galadd; Codex Alexandrinus Rhammoth, and other forms): A great and strong city East of the Jordan in the territory of Gad, which played an important part in the wars of Israel. It is first mentioned in connection with the appointment of the Cities of Refuge (De 4:43; Jos 20:8). It was assigned to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:38; 1Ch 6:80). In these four passages it is called "Ramoth in Gilead" (ramoth ba-gil’adh). This form is given wrongly by the King James Version in 1Ki 22:3. In all other places the form "Ramoth-gilead" is used.e to the shape of a jaw-bone (Jud 15:9,14,19). It may have been in Wady es-Sarar, not far from Zorah and Timnath; but the available data do not permit of certain identification.

1. History:

Here Ben-geber was placed in charge of one of Solomon’s administrative districts (1Ki 4:13), which included Havvoth-jair and "the region of Argob, which is in Bashan." The city was taken from Omri by the Syrians under Ben-hadad I (Ant., VIII, xv, 3 ff), and even after the defeat of Ben-hadad at Aphek they remained masters of this fortress. In order to recover it for Israel Ahab invited Jehoshaphat of Judah to accompany him in a campaign. Despite the discouragement of Micalab, the royal pair set out on the disastrous enterprise. In their attack on the city Ahab fought in disguise, but was mortally wounded by an arrow from a bow drawn "at a venture" (1Ki 22:1-40; 2Ch 18). The attempt was renewed by Ahab’s son Joram; but his father’s ill fortune followed him, and, heavily wounded, he retired for healing to Jezreel (2Ki 8:28 ff; 2Ch 22:5 f). During the king’s absence from the camp at Ramoth-gilead Jehu was there anointed king of Israel by Elisha (2Ki 9:1 ff; 2Ch 22:7). He proved a swift instrument of vengeance against the doomed house of Ahab. According to Josephus (Ant., IX, vi, 1) the city was taken before Joram’s departure. This is confirmed by 2Ki 9:14 ff. The place is not mentioned again, unless, indeed, it be identical with "Mizpeh" in 1 Macc 5:35.

2. Identification:

It is just possible that Ramoth-gilead corresponds to MIZPAH, (1), and to RAMATH-MIZPEH. The spot where Laban and Jacob parted is called both Galeed and Mizpah. Ramath may become Ramoth, as we see in the case of Ramah of the South.

Merrill identifies the city with Jerash, the splendid ruins of which lie in Wady ed-Deir, North of the Jabbok. He quotes the Bah Talmud (Makkoth 9b) as placing the Cities of Refuge in pairs, so that those on the East of the Jordan are opposite those on the West Shechem, being the middle one of the three West of the Jordan, should have Ramorb-gilead nearly opposite to it on the East, and this would place its site at Gerasa, the modern Jerash (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, under the word). But the words of the Talmud must not be interpreted too strictly. It seems very probable that Golan lay far South of a line drawn due East from Qedes (Kedesh-naphtali). No remains have been discovered at Jerash older than Greek- Roman times, although the presence of a fine perennial spring makes occupation in antiquity probable. The place could be approached by chariots along Wady ‘Ajlun, and the country adjoining was not unsuitable for chariot evolutions.

Conder and others have suggested Reimun, an ancient site to the West of Jerash. The absence of any source of good water-supply is practically fatal to this identification. Buhl (Geographic des Alten Palestina, 261 ff) favors el-Jil‘ad, a ruined site on a hill South of the Jabbok; see GILEAD, (1). Eusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon, under the word) contradict each other, the former placing Ramoth-gilead 15 miles West, and the latter 15 miles East of Philadelphia. It is clear, however, that this is a mere slip on Jerome’s part, as both say it is near the Jabbok. Many have identified it with es-Salt, which is indeed 15 miles West of ‘Amman (Philadelphia), but it is 10 miles South of the Jabbok, and so can hardly be described as near that river. It is also no place for chariot warfare. The case against identification with Ramoth-gilead is conclusively stated by G.A. Cooke in Driver’s Deuteronomy, xx.

In suggesting these sites sufficient attention has not been given to what is said in 1Ki 4. The authority of the king’s officer in Ramoth-gilead extended over the land of Argob in Bashan, as well as over the towns of Jair in Gilead. A situation therefore to the North of Mahanaim must be sought. Guthe would find it at er-Remtheh, on the pilgrim road, about 10 miles South of Mezerib (compare Smith, Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 586 ff). Cheyne’s suggestion of Salkhad, away on the crest of the mountain of Bashan, is out of the question. Caleb Hauser (Palestine Exploration Fund Statement, 1906, 304 f) argues in favor of Beit Ras, over 11 miles Southeast of Gadara, a position commanding all Northern Gilead and as favorably situated as Jerash for chariot warfare and communication with the West of Jordan. "Here we have the heights of Northern Gilead. Ramoth, Capitolias, and Beit Ras are in their respective languages idiomatic equivalents. It is improbable that a large city like Capitolins should have superseded anything but a very important city of earlier times." We must be content to leave the question open meantime.

W. Ewing

RAMPART

ram’-part (La 2:8; Na 3:8).

See FORTIFICATION.

RAMS’ SKINS

The skin of the sheep, roughly tanned with all the wool on, is the common winter jacket of the shepherd or peasant, the ram’s being considered especially desirable (compare Heb 11:37). Hence, the appropriateness of these skins in the covering of the tabernacle (Ex 25:5, etc.).

See TABERNACLE; DYE, DYEING.

RANGE

ranj: "Range" and "rank" have the same derivation, and in the sense of a "row" (of men, etc.) they were formerly interchangeable. "Range" with this meaning is found in 2Ki 11:8,15 the King James Version parallel 2Ch 23:14 (the Revised Version (British and American) "rank"; sedherah, "row"). Hence, "to range" is "to set in a line" (Judith 2:16; 2 Macc 12:20, diatasso) or "to move in a line" or, simply, "to roam," whence "a ranging bear" (Pr 28:15; shaqaq, "run to and fro"). A cooking "range" is a stove on which pots, etc., can be set in a row, but the kirayim of Le 11:35 is a much more primitive affair, composed, probably, of two plates (kirayim is a dual). In Job 39:8 "range of the mountains" is good modern use, but ythr, should be pointed yathur (not yethur as in Massoretic Text) and connected with tur, "search." So translate. "He searcheth out the mountains as his pasture."

Burton Scott Easton

RANK

rank:

(1) ‘orach, used in Joe 2:7 of the advance of the locust army which marched in perfect order and in straight lines, none crossing the other’s track.

(2) ma‘arakhah, "battle array" (1Ch 12:38 the King James Version; compare 1Sa 4:16; 17:22,48).

See ARMY.

RANKS

ranks (prasid, "a square plot of ground," "a garden-bed"): "They sat down in ranks" (Mr 6:40); the several reclining ranks formed, as it were, separate plots or "garden-beds."

RANSOM

ran’-sum (the noun occurs in the English Bible 12 times (Ex 21:30 the King James Version pidhyon; Ex 30:12; Job 33:24; 36:18; Pr 6:35; 13:8; 21:18; Isa 43:3, kopher; Mt 20:28; Mr 10:45, lutron; 1Ti 2:6, antilutron); the verbal form occurs 4 times (Isa 35:10; Ho 13:14, padhah; Isa 51:10 the King James Version; Jer 31:11, ga’al; these two Hebrew verbs are generally rendered in other passages by the English "redeem"))

1. Usage by Christ

2. Old Testament Usage—the Law

(1) General Cases

(2) Redemption Money—the Firstborn

(3) Connection with Sacrifice

(4) Typical Reference to the Messiah

3. The Psalms and Job

4. Apostolic Teaching

5. To Whom Was the Ransom Paid?

(1) Not to Satan

(2) To Divine Justice

(a) Redemption by Price

(b) Redemption by Power

LITERATURE

1. Usage by Christ:

The supremely important instance is the utterance of the Lord Jesus Christ as reported by Matthew and Mark (Mt 20:28; Mr 10:45), and in looking at it we shall be able, by way of illustration, to glance at the Old Testament passages. The context refers to the dispute among the disciples concerning position in the Kingdom, with their misconception of the true nature of Christ's Kingdom. Christ makes use of the occasion to set forth the great law of service as determining the place of honor in that Kingdom, and illustrates and enforces it by showing that its greatest exemplification is to be found in His own mission: "For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister" (Mr 10:45). His ministry, however, was to pass into the great act of sacrifice, of which all other acts of self-sacrifice on the part of His people would be but a faint reflection—"and to give his life (soul) a ransom for many" (same place). He thus gives a very clear intimation of the purpose and meaning of His death; the clearest of all the intimations reported by the synoptists. The word He uses bears a well-established meaning, and is accurately rendered by our word "ransom," a price paid to secure the freedom of a slave or to set free from liabilities and charges, and generally the deliverance from calamity by paying the forfeit. The familiar verb luo, "to loose," "to set free," is the root, then lutron, that which secures the freedom, the payment or forfeit; thence come the cognate verb lutroo, "to set free upon payment of a ransom," "to redeem"; lutrosis, "the actual setting free," "the redemption," and lutrotes, "the redeemer." The favorite New Testament word for "redemption" is the compound form, apolutrosis.

2. Old Testament Usage—the Law:

The word lutron was common in Greek classical literature, constantly bearing the sense of "ransom price," and was frequently connected with ritual usage, with sacrifice and expiation. But for the full explanation of our Lord's great thought we have to look to the Old Testament usage. The two leading Hebrew verbs translated in our version by "redeem," are generally rendered in the Septuagint by lutroo, and derivatives of these words conveying the idea of the actual price paid are translated by this very word lutron.

(1) General Cases.

In Ex 21:30 we have the law concerning the case of the person killed by an ox; the ox was to be killed and the owner of it was also liable to death but the proviso was made, "If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him" (the King James Version). The Hebrew for "sum of money" is kopher, literally, "atonement" (the Revised Version (British and American) "ransom"); the word for "ransom" (the Revised Version (British and American) "redemption") is pidhyon (from padhah); the Septuagint renders both by lutron (rather by the plural form lutra). In Le 25, among the directions in relation to the Jubilee, we have the provision (25:23) that the land was not to be sold "in perpetuity," but where any portion has been sold, opportunity is to be given for re-purchase: "Ye shall grant a redemption for the land" (25:24). The Hebrew is ge'ullah, a derivative of ga'al, the Septuagint lutra. In 25:25,26, the case is mentioned of a man who through poverty has sold part of his land; if a near kinsman is able to redeem it he shall do so; if there is no one to act this brotherly part, and the man himself is able to redeem it, then a certain scale of price is arranged. In the Hebrew it is again ga'al that is used with the cognate go'el for "kinsman." The last clause rendered in the

King James Version, "and himself be able to redeem it" (in the Revised Version (British and American) "and he be waxed rich and find sufficient to redeem it"), is literally, "and his hand shall acquire and he find sufficient for its redemption"; the Septuagint has the verb lutroo in the first part, and renders the clause pretty literally, "and there be furnished to his hand and there be found with him the sufficient price (lutra) of it." In Le 25:51,52, in reference to the redemption of the Jew sold into slavery, we have twice in the Hebrew the word ge'ullah, rendered in English accurately "the pricen of his redemption"; and by Septuagint with equal accuracy, in both cases, lutra, "the ransom-price." In Le 27:31 the King James Version, the phrase "if a man will at all redeem aught of his tithes" is intended to represent the emphatic Hebrew idiom, "if a man redeeming will redeem," which is rendered by Septuagint ean de lutrotai lutro anthropos.

(2) Redemption Money—the Firstborn.

But perhaps the most important passage is the law concerning the half-shekel to be paid by every Israelite from 20 years old and upward when a census was taken. It was to be the same for rich and poor, and it was called "atonement money," "to make atonement for their souls." In the opening words of the law, as given in Ex 30:12 (the King James Version), we read "Then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord"—the Hebrew kopher; the Septuagint rendering is lutra tes psuches autou, "a ransom price for his soul." All the people were thus considered as doomed and needing atonement, and it is significant that this atonement money paid at the first census furnished the silver for the sockets of the tabernacle boards, intimating that the typical tabernacle was built upon atonement. The same thought, that the people's lives were forfeited, comes out in the provision for the consecration of the Levites, recorded in full in Nu 3:40-51. The firstborn represented the people. God claimed all the firstborn as forfeited to Himself, teaching that Israel deserved the same punishment as the Egyptians, and was only spared by the grace of Yahweh, and in virtue of the sprinkled blood. Now He takes to Himself for His services the Levites as the equivalent of the firstborn, and when it was found that the number of the firstborn exceeded the number of the Levites, equivalence was maintained by ransoming at a certain price the surplus of the firstborn males. In the Septuagint account, lutra occurs 4 times, twice for the phrase "those to be redeemed," and twice for "redemption money." Thus the idea of ransom for the forfeited life became familiar to the people as educated by the typical system, and redemption expressed the sum total of their hopes for the future, however faulty might be their conception of the nature of that redemption.

(3) Connection with Sacrifice.

It is also clear in the typical teaching that sacrifice and ransom were closely related. Even in classical Greek, as we have noted, the two conceptions were connected, and it is not surprising to find it so in the Old Testament. Kopher, we have seen, is literally, "atonement" and comes from kaphar, literally, "to cover," and thence by covering to make atonement, or to cover by making atonement; and so it is in the Piel form, the most common and technical Hebrew word for making atonement, or expiation, or propitiation, and is frequently rendered in the Greek by hilaskomai, often too by the compound exilaskomai. In Ex 21:30, kopher, we noted, is used interchangeably with pidhyon, both being represented in the Septuagint by lutra, and so in Ex 30:12; Nu 35:31,32; the Hebrew kopher is lutra in

the Greek In the latter place, where it is twice stated that no satisfaction shall be taken for the life of a murderer, the Hebrew is kopher, the Septuagint has lutra; the Revised Version (British and American) has "ransom;" the King James Version has "satisfaction."

(4) Typical Reference to the Messiah.

Sacrifice was thus linked with ransom. Sacrifice was the divinely-appointed covering for sin. The ransom for the deliverance of the sinner was to be by sacrifice. Both the typical testimony of the Law and the prophetic testimony gave prominence to the thought of redemption. The Coming One was to be a Redeemer. Redemption was to be the great work of the Messiah. The people seem to have looked for the redemption of the soul to God alone through the observance of their appointed ritual, while redemption, in the more general sense of deliverance from all enemies and troubles, they linked with the advent of the Messiah. It required a spiritual vision to see that the two things would coincide, that the Messiah would effect redemption in all its phases and fullness by means of ransom, of sacrifice, of expiation.

Jesus appeared as the Messiah in whom all the old economy was to be fulfilled. He knew perfectly the meaning of the typical and prophetic testimony; and with that fully in view, knowing that His death was to fulfill the Old Testament types and accomplish its brightest prophetic anticipations, He deliberately uses this term lutron to describe it (Mt 20:28); in speaking of His death as a ransom, He also regarded it as a sacrifice, an expiatory offering. The strong preposition used intensifies the idea of ransom and expiation, even to the point of substitution. It is anti, "instead of," and the idea of exchange, equivalence, substitution cannot be removed from it. In Nu 3:45, "Take the Levites instead of all the first-born," the Septuagint uses anti, which, like the English "instead of," exactly represents the Hebrew tachath; and all three convey most unmistakably the idea of substitution. And as the Levites were to be substituted for the firstborn, so for the surplus of the firstborn the "ransom money" was to be substituted, that idea, however, being clearly enough indicated by the use of the genitive. Indeed the simpler way of describing a ransom would be with the genitive, the ransom of many; or as our version renders, "a ransom for many"; but just because the ransom here is not simply a money payment, but is the actual sacrifice of the life, the substitution of His soul for many, He is appropriately said "to give his soul a ransom instead of many." The Kingdom of God which Christ proclaimed was so diverse in character from that which Salome and her sons anticipated that, so far from appearing in dazzling splendor, with distinguished places of power for eager aspirants, it was to be a spiritual home for redeemed sinners. Men held captive by sin needed to be ransomed that they might be free to become subjects of the Kingdom, and so the ransom work, the sufferings and death of Christ, must lie at the very foundation of that Kingdom. The need of ransom supposes life forfeited; the ransom paid secures life and liberty; the life which Christ gives comes through His ransoming death.

3. The Psalms and Job:

Besides the passages in the Pentateuch which we have noted, special mention should be made of the two great passages which bear so closely upon the need of spiritual redemption, and come into line with this

great utterance of Christ. Ps 49:7,8, "None of them can by any means redeem (padhah; lutroo) his brother, nor give to God a ransom (kopher; exilasma) for him (for the redemption of their life is costly, and it faileth forever)." (The Hebrew gives pidhyon for "redemption"; the Greek has "the price of the redemption of his soul.") No human power or skill, no forfeit in money or service or life can avail to ransom any soul from the doom entailed by sin. But in Ps 49:15 the triumphant hope is expressed, "But God will redeem (padhah; lutroo) my soul from the power of Sheol." In Job 33:24, "Deliver him from going down to the pit, I have found a ransom": God is the speaker, and whatever may be the particular exegesis of the passage in its original application, it surely contains an anticipation of the gospel redemption. This divine eureka is explained in the light of Christ's utterance; it finds its realization through the cross: "I have found a ransom," for "the Son of Man" has given "his soul a ransom for many."

4. Apostolic Teaching:

This great utterance of the Saviour may well be considered as the germ of all the apostolic teaching concerning redemption, but it is not for us to show its unfolding beyond noting that in apostolic thought the redemption was always connected with the death, the sacrifice of Christ.

Thus, Paul (Eph 1:7), "In whom we have our redemption through his blood." Thus Peter (1Pe 1:18,19), "Ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things .... but with precious blood, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, even the blood of Christ." So in Heb 9:12 it is shown that Christ "through his own blood, entered in once for all into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption"; and in the Apocalypse (Re 5:9) the song is, "Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with thy blood men of every tribe," etc. In all but the last of these passages there is an echo of the very word used by Christ, apolutrosis and lutrosis, both being connected with lutron. In 1Ti 2:5,6 Paul has a still closer verbal coincidence when he says, "Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all" (antilutron). The word used in the Apocalypse is agorazo, to buy in the open market, and is frequently used of the redeeming work of Christ (Re 14:3,4; 2Pe 2:1; 1Co 6:20; 7:23). In the two places where Paul uses it he adds the means of purchase: "Ye were bought with a price," which from his point of view would be equivalent to ransom. In the passage in Ga 3:13; 4:5, Paul uses the compound exagorazo, which is equivalent to "redeem, buy off, deliver by paying the price."

5. To Whom Was the Ransom Paid?:

The question "Who receives the ransom?" is not directly raised in Scripture, but it is one that not unnaturally occurs to the mind, and theologians have answered it in varying ways.

(1) Not to Satan.

The idea entertained by some of the Fathers (Irenaeus, Origen) that the ransom was given to Satan, who is conceived of as having through the sin of man a righteous claim upon him, which Christ recognizes and meets, is grotesque, and not in any way countenanced by Scripture.

(2) To Divine Justice.

But in repudiating it, there is no need to go so far as to deny that there is anything answering to a real ransoming transaction. All that we have said goes to show that, in no mere figure of speech, but in tremendous reality, Christ gave "his life a ransom," and if our mind demands an answer to the question to whom the ransom was paid, it does not seem at all unreasonable to think of the justice of God, or God in His character of Moral Governor, as requiring and receiving it. In all that Scripture asserts about propitiation, sacrifice, reconciliation in relation to the work of Christ, it is implied that there is wrath to be averted, someone to be appeased or satisfied, and while it may be enough simply to think of the effects of Christ's redeeming work in setting us free from the penal claims of the Law—the just doom of sin—it does not seem going beyond the spirit of Scripture to draw the logical inference that the ransom price was paid to the Guardian of that holy law, the Administrator of eternal justice. "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us" (Ga 3:13). This essential, fundamental phase of redemption is what theologians, with good Scripture warrant, have called redemption by blood, or by price, as distinguished from the practical outcome of the work of Christ in the life which is redemption by power.

(a) Redemption by Price:

As to Satan's claims, Christ by paying the ransom price, having secured the right to redeem, exercises His power on behalf of the believing sinner. He does not recognize the right of Satan. He is the "strong man" holding his captives lawfully, and Christ the "stronger than he" overcomes him and spoils him, and sets his captives free (Lu 11:21,22). In one sense men may be said to have sold themselves to Satan, but they had no right to sell, nor he to buy, and Christ ignores that transaction and brings "to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the devil" (Heb 2:14), and so is able to "deliver all them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage" (Heb 2:15).

(b) Redemption by Power:

Many of the Old Testament passages about the redemption wrought on behalf of God's people illustrate this redemption by power, and the redemption by power is always founded on the redemption by price; the release follows the ransom. In the case of Israel, there was first the redemption by blood—the sprinkled blood of the Paschal Lamb which sheltered from the destroying angel (Ex 12)—and then followed the redemption by power, when by strength of hand Yahweh brought His people out from Egypt (Ex 13:14), and in His mercy led forth the people which He had redeemed (Ex 15:13).

So under the Gospel when "he hath visited and wrought redemption for his people" (Lu 1:68), He can "grant unto us that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies should serve him without fear" (Lu 1:74). It is because we have in Him our redemption through His blood that we can be delivered out of the power of darkness (Col 1:13,14).

See further, REDEEMER, REDEMPTION.

LITERATURE.

See works on New Testament Theology (Weiss, Schmid, Stevens, etc.); articles in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes); Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. Archibald M’Caig

RAPE

rap. See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

RAPHA, RAPHAH

ra’-fa (rapha’):

(1) In the Revised Version margin these names are substituted for "the giant" in 1Ch 20:4,6,8 and in 2Sa 21:16,18,20,22. The latter passage states that certain champions of the Philistines who were slain by David’s warriors had been born to the raphah in Gath. The text is corrupt; Raphah is probably an eponym. Originally the name of one of the Philistines who was of the body "Rephaites" stood in the text. The plural of this word, or at least a plural of this stem, is REPHAIM (which see).

(2) Raphah (the King James Version "Rapha"), a descendant of Saul (1Ch 8:37).

See REPHAIAH.

Horace J. Wolf

RAPHAEL

ra’-a-el, ra’-fa-el (repha’el, from rapha’ ‘el, "God has healed"; Rhaphael): The name of the angel who, as Azarias, guides Tobias to ECBATANA and RAGES (which see). The purpose of his mission is, in accordance with his name, to cure Tobit of blindness, and to deliver Sarah, the daughter of Raguel, from the power of the evil spirit Asmodaeus (Tobit 3:8; 12:14). Later, in addition, when he reveals himself (Tobit 12:15), he declares that he is "one of the seven holy angels, which present the prayers of the saints, and go in before the glory of the Holy One." These seven angels are derived, according to Dr. Kohut, from the seven Am-shaspands (Amesha-spentas) of Zoroastrianism (compare Re 4:5). At the head of the elaborate angelology of the Enoch books there are "four presences," and Raphael is one of them (En 40:9; 54:6). In the first of these passages Raphael is the healer; in the second, he with Michael, Gabriel and Phanuel lead the wicked away to punishment. These four presences seem related to the four "living creatures" of Ezekiel (1:5) and of the Apocalypse (Re 4:6). While this is the general representation of Raphael’s position in Enoch, in 20:3 he is named among the angels who "watch," whose number according to the Greek text is seven. Raphael shared in the function assigned to the

archangels, in the Oracula Sibyllina, of leading souls to the judgment seat of God (II, 215, Alexandre's text). He occupies a prominent place in Jewish medieval writings; he with Michael and Gabriel cured Abraham (Yoma' 37a); according to the book Zohar, Raphael conveyed to Adam a book containing 72 kinds of wisdom in 670 writings. The painters of the Renaissance frequently depicted Raphael.

J. E. H. Thomson

RAPHAIM

raf'-a-im, ra-fa'-im (Codex Vaticanus omits; Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus have Rhapha(e) in): An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

RAPHON

ra'-fon (@Rhapheion]): The place where in his campaign East of Jordan Judas inflicted disastrous defeat on the host of Timotheus, the fugitives fleeing for refuge to the temple at Carnaim (1 Macc 5:37 ff; Ant, XII, viii, 4). The same place is doubtless referred to by Pliny as "Raphana" (NH, v.16). It may possibly be represented by the modern Rafeh, on the East of the pilgrimage road, about 17 miles North of Der'ah, and 11 miles Northeast of Tell el-'Ash'ary. It is a mile and a half North of Wady Kanawat, which would thus be the "brook" mentioned in the narrative. It is perhaps far enough away from Carnaim, if this is rightly placed at Tell el-'Ash'ary.

W. Ewing

RAPHU

ra'-fu (raphu'," one healed"): The father of Palti, the spy selected from the tribe of Benjamin (Nu 13:9).

RASSES

ras'-ez (Rhaasseis, Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus, Rhasseis; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Tharsis; Old Latin Thiras et Rasis): The children of Rasses are mentioned with Put, Lud and the children of Ishmael as having been subdued by Holofernes (Judith 2:23).

Their identity is a matter of conjecture only. Some think Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Tharsis (= Tarsus) is meant, others Rosh (Eze 38:2,3; 39:1), others Rhosos, a mountain range and city South from Anunus, on the Gulf of Issus. Most probably a district, not a town, is named, situated in the eastern part of Asia Minor.

S. F. Hunter

RATHUMUS

ra-thu’-mus (Rhathumos): One of those who joined in writing a letter to protest to Artaxerxes against the Jews (1 Esdras 2:16 ff). In 1 Esdras 2:17 he is styled "story-writer," the Revised Version margin "recorder" (ho ta prospiptonta sc. (graphon) =" Rehum the chancellor" of Ezr 4:8, Rathumus being a Greek form of Rehum. In 1 Esdras 2:16 his title appears as an independent proper name, BEELTETHMUS (which see) (here the King James Version margin gives "Bahumus," a misprint), and in 1 Esdras 2:25 R. and Beeltethmus are given as distinct persons.

RAVEN

ra’-vn (‘orebh; korax; Latin Corvus corax): A large family of the smaller birds of prey belonging to the genus Corvus corax. A bird of such universal distribution that it is known from Iceland to Japan, all over Asia, Europe and Africa, but almost extinct and not of general distribution in our own country. In no land is it more numerous than in Palestine In general appearance it resembles the crow, but is much larger, being almost two feet long, of a glossy black, with whiskers around the beak, and rather stiff-pointed neck feathers. A bird exhibiting as much intelligence as any, and of a saucy, impudent disposition, it has been an object of interest from the beginning. It has been able to speak sentences of a few words when carefully taught, and by its uncanny acts has made itself a bird surrounded by superstition, myth, fable, and is connected with the religious rites of many nations. It is partially a carrion feeder, if offal or bodies are fresh; it also eats the young of other birds and very small animals and seeds, berries and fruit, having as varied a diet as any bird. It is noisy, with a loud, rough, emphatic cry, and its young are clamorous feeding time.

Aristotle wrote that ravens drove their young from their location and forced them to care for themselves from the time they left the nest. This is doubtful. Bird habits and characteristics change only with slow ages of evolution. Our ravens of today are, to all intents, the same birds as those of Palestine in the time of Moses, and ours follow the young afield for several days and feed them until the cawing, flapping youngsters appear larger than the parents. In Pliny’s day, ravens had been taught to speak, and as an instance of their cunning he records that in time of drought a raven found a bucket containing a little water beside a grave and raised it to drinking level by dropping in stones.

Palestine has at least 8 different species of ravens. This bird was the first sent out by Noah in an effort to discover if the flood were abating (Ge 8:6-8). Because it partially fed on carrion it was included among the abominations (see Le 11:15; De 14:14). On 1Ki 17:4-6, see ELIJAH and the present writer’s Birds of the Bible, 401-3. Among the marvels of creation and providence in Job 38:41, we have this mention of the raven,

"Who provideth for the raven his prey,

When his young ones cry unto God,

And wander for lack of food?"

The answer to this question is in Ps 147:9:

"He giveth to the beast his food,

And to the young ravens which cry."

Both these quotations point out the fact that the young are peculiarly noisy. In Pr 30:17 it is indicated that the ravens, as well as eagles, vultures and hawks, found the eye of prey the vulnerable point, and so attacked it first. The Hebrew ‘orebh means "black," and for this reason was applied to the raven, so the reference to the locks of the bridegroom in the So of Solomon becomes clear (So 5:11). The raven is one of the birds indicated to prey upon the ruins of Edom (Isa 34:11). The last reference is found in Lu 12:24: "Consider the ravens, that they sow not, neither reap; which have no store-chamber nor barn; and God feedeth them." This could have been said of any wild bird with equal truth.

Gene Stratton-Porter

RAVEN; RAVIN

rav’-n, rav’-in: "Raven" (verb) is from "rapine," "violent plundering, used for Taraph, in Ge 49:27; Ps 22:13; Eze 22:25,27, while "ravin" (noun) is the object ravened, in Na 2:12 the torn carcasses (Terephah). So "ravenous bird" (Isa 46:11; Eze 39:4) is a bird of prey (not a "hungry bird"), ‘ayiT, literally, "a screecher." "Ravenous beast" in Isa 35:9 is for parits, "violent one." In the New Testament harpax, "rapacious," is translated "ravening" in Mt 7:15, while for the cognate harpage (Lu 11:39), the King James Version gives "ravening," the Revised Version (British and American) "extortion."

RAZIS

ra’-zis (Rhazeis): "An elder of Jerusalem," "lover of his countrymen," and for his good will toward them called "father of the Jews," accused before the Syrian general Nicanor as an opponent of Hellenism. In order to escape falling into the hands of Nicanor’s soldiers he committed suicide with the greatest determination in a rather revolting manner (2 Macc 14:37 ff), in his death calling upon "the Lord of life" in the hope of a resurrection. His suicide—contrary to Jewish sentiment—was regarded with approbation by the author of 2 Macc (14:42,43).

RAZOR

ra’-zer (ta‘ar, "knife" (Nu 6:5; Ps 52:2; Isa 7:20; Eze 5:1), morah, "razor" (Jud 13:5; 16:17; 1Sa 1:11)).

See BARBER; HAIR.

READING

red’-ing (miqra’; anagnosis): As a noun occurs once in the Old Testament (Ne 3:8) and 3 times in the New Testament (Ac 13:15; 2Co 3:14; 1Ti 4:13), each time with reference to the public reading of the Divine Law. The verb "to read" (qara’; anaginosko) occurs frequently both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament: (1) often in the sense of reading aloud to others, especially of the public reading of God’s Law or of prophecy, as by Moses (Ex 24:7), Ezra (Ne 8:3,18), Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth (Lu 4:16), of the regular reading of the Law and the Prophets in the synagogues (Ac 13:27; 15:21), and of the reading of apostolic epistles in the Christian church (Col 4:16; 1Th 5:27); (2) also in the sense of reading to one’s self, whether the divine word in Law or prophecy (De 17:19; Ac 8:28-30, etc.), or such things as private letters (2Ki 5:7; 19:14; Ac 23:34, etc.).

D. Miall Edwards

READY

red’-i (]~mahir]): Occurs twice in the sense of apt, skillful (Ezr 7:6; Ps 45:1). the Revised Version (British and American) gives "ready" for "fit" (Pr 24:27), for "asketh" (Mic 7:3), for "prepared" (Mr 14:15), for "not be negligent" (2Pe 1:12).

REAIAH

re-a’-ya, re-i’-a (re’ayah, "Yah has seen"; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus, Rhada, A, Rheia):

(1) The eponym of a Calebite family (1Ch 4:2). The word "Reaiah" should probably be substituted for "Haroeh" in 1Ch 2:52, but both forms may be corruptions.

(2) A Reubenite (1Ch 5:5, the King James Version "Reaia").

See JOEL.

(3) The family name of a company of Nethinim (Ezr 2:47; Ne 7:50 = RAPC 1Es 5:31).

REAPING

rep’-ing (qatsar; therizo): Reaping in ancient times, as at present, consisted in either pulling up the grain by the roots or cutting it with a sickle (see SICKLE), and then binding the stalks into bundles to be carried to the threshing-floor. If the Egyptian sculptures are true to life, reaping was sometimes divided into two operations, the heads of grain and the stalks being reaped separately. In Palestine and Syria both pulling and cutting are still practiced, the former when the ground is stony and the spears scarce. Even

where the sickle is used, much of the grain comes up by the roots, owing to the toughness of the dried stalks or the dullness of the sickle. The reaper sometimes wears pieces of cane on the fingers of the hand which gathers the grain in order to protect them from injury by the sharp grasses or the sickle. There were definite laws established by the Hebrews in regard to reaping (Le 19:9; 23:10; 25:5,11; De 16:9). Samuel mentions the task of reaping the harvest as one of the requirements which would be made by the king for whom the people were clamoring (1Sa 8:12).

Figurative:

The certainty of the consequences of good and evil doing were often typified by the sowing and the reaping of harvests (Job 4:8; Pr 22:8; Ho 8:7; 10:12,13; 2Co 9:6; Ga 6:7,8). "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy" is found in the liberated captives' song (Ps 126:5). "He that regardeth the clouds shall not reap," i.e. a lack of faith in God's care will be punished (Ec 11:4); compare also the lesson of trust drawn from the birds (Mt 6:26; Lu 12:24). Sowing and not reaping the harvest is mentioned as a punishment for disobedience (Job 31:8; Jer 12:13; Mic 6:15). Reaping where he sowed not, showed the injustice of the landlord (Mt 25:26), as did also the withholding of the reapers' wages (Jas 5:4). In God's Kingdom there is a division of labor: "He that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together" (Joh 4:36-38). In John's vision he saw an angel reap the earth (Re 14:15,16).

See AGRICULTURE; GLEANING.

James A. Patch

REARWARD

rer'-word ('acaph, "to gather," Nu 10:25; Jos 6:9 (the King James Version margin "gathering host"); Isa 52:12).

See ARMY; DAN, TRIBE OF; WAR, 3.

REASON; REASONABLE; REASONING

re'-z'n, re'-z'n-a-b'l, re'-z'n-ing (yakhach, etc.; logos, dialogizomai, -ismos, etc.): "Reason" with related terms, has a diversity of meanings, representing a large number of Hebrew and Greek words and phrases. In the sense of "cause" or "occasion" it stands in 1Ki 9:15 for dabhar, "a word" (the Revised Version margin "account"), but in most cases renders prepositional forms as "from," "with," "because of," "for the sake," etc. As the ground or argument for anything, it is the translation of ta'am (Pr 26:16, the Revised Version margin "answers discreetly"), of yakhach, as in Isa 1:18, "Come now, and let us reason together" (compare Job 13:3; 15:3); in 1Sa 12:7, the word is shaphaT, the Revised Version (British and American) "that I may plead," etc. The principal Greek words for "reason," "reasoning," are those given above. The Christian believer is to be ready to give a reason (logos) for the hope that is in him (1Pe 3:15 the King James Version). "Reason" as a human faculty or in the abstract sense appears in

Apocrypha in The Wisdom of Solomon 17:12 (logismos); Ecclesiasticus 37:16, "Let reason (logos) go before every enterprise," the Revised Version (British and American) "be the beginning of every work." In Ac 18:14, "reason would" is literally, kata logon, "according to reason"; in Ro 12:1, for "reasonable (logikos) service," the Revised Version (British and American) has "spiritual," and in the margin "Greek ‘belonging to the reason.’ " In the Revised Version (British and American) "reason," etc., occurs much oftener than in the King James Version (compare Le 17:11; De 28:47; Jud 5:22; Job 20:2; 23:7, etc.; Lu 3:15; 12:17; Ac 17:17, etc.).

W. L. Walker

REBA

re-bek’-a (rebha‘, "fourth part"; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Rhobe; Codex Alexandrinus Rhebek): One of the five chieftains of Midian who were slain by the Israelites, under Moses (Nu 31:8; Jos 13:21). Like his comrades, he is termed a "king" in Numbers, but a "chief" or "prince" in Joshua.

REBEKAH

re-bek’-a (ribhqah; Septuagint and New Testament Rhebekka, whence the usual English spelling Rebecca): Daughter of Bethuel and an unknown mother, grand-daughter of Nahor and Milcah, sister of Laban, wife of Isaac, mother of Esau and Jacob.

Her name is usually explained from the Arabic, rabqat, "a tie-rope for animals," or, rather, "a noose" in such a rope; its application would then by figure suggest the beauty (?) of her that bears it, by means of which men are snared or bound; The root is found in Hebrew only in the noun meaning "hitching-place" or "stall," in the familiar phrase "fatted calf" or "calf of the stall," and in view of the meaning of such names as Rachel and Eglah the name Rebekah might well mean (concrete for abstract, like riqmah, chemdah, etc.) a "tied-up calf" (or "lamb"?), one therefore peculiarly choice and fat.

Rebekah is first mentioned in the genealogy of the descendants of Nahor, brother of Abraham (Ge 22:20-24). In fact, the family is there carried down just so far as is necessary in order to introduce this woman, for whose subsequent appearance and role the genealogy is obviously intended as a preparation. All this branch of the family of Terah had remained in Aram when Abraham and Lot had migrated to Canaan, and it is at Haran, "the city of Nahor," that we first meet Rebekah, when in Genesis 24 she is made known to Abraham’s servant at the well before the gate.

That idyllic narrative of the finding of a bride for Isaac is too familiar to need rehearsal and too simple to require comment. Besides, the substance both of that story and of the whole of Rebekah’s career is treated in connection with the sketches of the other actors in the same scenes. Yet we note from the beginning the maiden’s decision of character, which appears in every line of the narrative, and prepares the reader to find in subsequent chapters the positive, ambitious and energetic woman that she there shows herself.

Though the object of her husband's love (Ge 24:67), Rebekah bore him no children for 20 years (Ge 25:20,26). Like Sarah, she too was barren, and it was only after that score of years and after the special intercession of Isaac that God at length granted her twin sons. "The purpose of God according to election," as Paul expresses the matter in Ro 9:11, was the cause of that strange oracle to the wondering, inquiring parents, "The elder shall serve the younger" (Ge 25:23).

Whether because of this oracle or for some other reason, it was that younger son, Jacob, who became the object of his mother's special love (Ge 25:28). She it was who led him into the deception practiced upon Isaac (Ge 27:5-17), and she it was who devised the plan for extricating Jacob from the dangerous situation into which that deception had brought him (Ge 27:42-46). When the absence of Jacob from home became essential to his personal safety, Rebekah proposed her own relations in Aram as the goal of his journey, and gave as motive the desirability of Jacob's marrying from among her kindred. Probably she did not realize that in sending her favorite son away on this journey she was sending him away from her forever. Yet such seems to have been the case. Though younger than Isaac, who was still living at an advanced age when Jacob returned to Canaan a quarter of a century later, Rebekah seems to have died during that term. We learn definitely only this, that she was buried in the cave of Machpelah near Hebron (Ge 49:31).

Outside of Genesis, Rebekah is alluded to in Scripture only in the passage from Romans (9:10-12) already cited. Her significance there is simply that of the wife of Isaac and the mother of two sons of such different character and destiny as Esau and Jacob. And her significance in Gen, apart from this, lies in her contribution to the family of Abraham of a pure strain from the same eastern stock, thus transmitting to the founders of Israel both an unmixed lineage and that tradition of separateness from Canaanite and other non-Hebrew elements which has proved the greatest factor in the ethnological marvel of the ages, the persistence of the Hebrew people.

J. Oscar Boyd

REBUKE

re-buk':As a verb "rebuke" is in the Old Testament the translation of ga'ar and yakhach; another word, ribh, in Ne 5:7, is in the Revised Version (British and American) translated "contended with." "Rebuke" (noun) is most frequently the translation of ge'arah; also in the King James Version of cherpah (Isa 25:8; Jer 15:15, the Revised Version (British and American) "reproach"), and of a few other words signifying reproach, etc. "Rebuker" (mucar, literally, "correction," "chastisement") in Ho 5:2 has the Revised Version margin "Hebrew 'rebuke.'" In the New Testament "to rebuke" is most often the translation of epitimao (Mt 8:26; 16:22; 17:18, etc.); also in the King James Version of elegcho, always in the Revised Version (British and American) rendered "reprove" (1Ti 5:20; Tit 1:13; 2:15; Heb 12:5; Re 3:19). Another word is epipletto (once, 1Ti 5:1); "without rebuke" in Php 2:15 is in the Revised Version (British and American) "without blemish." On the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American) has "rebuke" for several words in the King James Version, as for "reprove" (2Ki 19:4; Isa

37:4), "reproof" (Job 26:11; Pr 17:10), "charged" (Mr 10:48). In Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3, the English Revised Version has "reprove" for "rebuke," and in the margin "decide concerning," which is text in the American Standard Revised Version. In Ecclesiasticus 11:7 we have the wise counsel: "Understand first, and then rebuke" (epitimao).

W. L. Walker

RECAH

re'-ka (rekhah; Codex Vaticanus Rhechab; Codex Alexandrinus Rhepha; the King James Version Rechah): In 1Ch 4:12 certain persons are described as "the men of Recah," but there is absolutely no information either about the place or its position.

RECEIPT OF CUSTOM

re-set.

See CUSTOM.

RECEIVER

re-sev'-er: Found in the King James Version (Isa 33:18); but the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "he that weighed the tribute." The Hebrew is shoqel, which means "one who weighs," "a weigher."

RECHAB; RECHABITES

re'-kab, rek'-a-bits (rekhabh, rekhabhim): Rechab is the name of two men of some prominence in the Old Testament records:

(1) A Benjamite of the town of Beeroth, son of Rimmon (2Sa 4:2); he and his brother Baanah were "captains" of the military host of Ish-bosheth. On the death of Abner (2Sa 3:30) the two brothers treacherously entered Ish-bosheth's house, when at noon he was resting and helpless, beheaded him, and escaped with the head to David at Hebron (2Sa 4:6-8). They expected to receive reward and honor from David for the foul deed, which left him without a rival for the throne of all Israel. But the just and noble-minded king ordered their immediate execution (2Sa 4:9-12), as in the case of the Amalekite, who asserted that he had killed Saul (2Sa 1). For some reason the Beerothites left their own town and fled to Gittaim, another town in Benjamin, where they were still living when the Books of Samuel were written (2Sa 4:3).

(2) The more prominent of the men bearing this name was a Kenite (see KENITES), a descendant of

Hammath (1Ch 2:55). A part of the Kenite tribe joined the Israelites during the wilderness wanderings (Nu 10:29-32; Jud 1:16; 4:17), becoming identified with the tribe of Judah, although Heber and Jael his wife were settled in Northern Palestine (Jud 4:17). Rechab was the ancestor or founder of a family, or order, in Israel known as the Rechabites, who at various times were conspicuous in the religious life of the nation. The most notable member of this family was Jehonadab (2Ki 10:15 ff, 23), or Jonadab, as he is called in Jer 35. Jehonadab was a zealous Yahweh-worshipper and took part with Jehu in the extirpation of Baal-worship and the house of Ahab. He set for his descendants a vow of asceticism: that they should drink no wine, nor plant fields or vineyards, nor build nor live in houses throughout their generations (Jer 35:6,7). That must have been a singular feature in Palestinian life: the simple, nomadic life of this family from generation to generation in the midst of settled agricultural and industrial conditions! They followed this simple life in order to guard against the enervating tendencies of sensualism, and as a covenant of fidelity to Yahweh, to whom they wholly devoted themselves when they joined themselves to Israel. Jeremiah used the Rechabites, who had been driven into Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar’s investment of the land, as an object-lesson to covenant-breaking Judah. The Rechabites, hungry and thirsty, refused wine when it was set before them, because of the command of their ancestor Jonadab (Jer 35:8-10); but Judah refused to heed Yahweh’s commands or to keep His covenant (Jer 35:14,15).

If the Rechab of Ne 3:14 is the same as this Kenite, then his descendant Malchijah, who assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding the wall of Jerusalem, may have abandoned the vow of his ancestors, for he was "ruler of the district of Beth-haccherem" (i.e. "house of the vineyard").

Edward Mack

RECHAH

re’-ka (rekhah).

See RECAH.

RECLINING

re-klin’-ing (Joh 13:23).

See MEALS, III; TRICLINIUM.

RECONCILE; RECONCILIATION

rek’-on-sil, rek-on-sil-i-a’-shun (@katallasso], katallage, also the compound form apokatallasso; once the cognate diallassomai is used in Mt 5:24):

1. The Terms

(1) New Testament Usage

(2) Old Testament Usage

(3) Special Passage in 1 Samuel 29:4

(4) Usage in the Apocrypha

2. Non-doctrinal Passage—Matthew 5:24

3. Doctrinal Passages (1) Romans 5

(2) 2 Corinthians 5:18-20

(3) Ephesians 2:16

(4) Colossians 1:20-22

LITERATURE

1. The Terms:

(1) New Testament Usage.

In the last case, Mt 5:24, the word is not used in a doctrinal sense, though its use is very helpful in considering the force of the other terms. All the other instances are in Paul’s Epistles (Ro 5:10; 1Co 7:11; 2Co 5:18-20, the verb; Ro 5:11; 11:15; 2Co 5:18,19, the noun; Eph 2:16; Col 1:22, the compound). The word "reconcile" has a double meaning and usage, and the context must in each case determine how it is to be taken. The great doctrine is the reconciliation of God and men, but the question to be decided is whether it is God who is reconciled to men, or men who are reconciled to God, and different schools of theology emphasize one side or the other. The true view embraces both aspects. The word "to reconcile" means literally to exchange, to bring into a changed relationship. Some maintain that it is only a change in the sinner that is intended, a laying aside of his enmity, and coming into peaceful relations with God. But that manifestly does not exhaust the meaning, nor is it in the great Pauline passages the primary and dominant meaning.

(2) Old Testament Usage.

The Old Testament usage does not materially help in the elucidation of the New Testament terms, for

though the word occurs in a number of passages in the King James Version, it is in the Revised Version (British and American) generally changed to "atonement," which more accurately represents the Hebrew kaphar, which is generally rendered by "atonement," and by hilaskomai or exilaskomai in the Greek (In one passage of the New Testament (Heb 2:17), the phrase "to make reconciliation" represents the Greek hilaskomai, and is better rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) by "to make propitiation.") The making atonement or propitiation is the basis of the reconciliation, the means of its accomplishment, and the fact that the translators of the King James Version sometimes rendered kaphar by "reconcile" shows that they understood reconciliation to have the Godward aspect. Whatever may be said of the nature of the atonement or propitiation in the old dispensation, it was something contemplated as appeasing or satisfying, or at least in some way affecting God so as to make Him willing, or render it possible for Him, to enter into, or abide in, gracious relations with men. In one passage in the Old Testament where "reconciliation" occurs (2Ch 29:24) it represents a different Hebrew word, but here the Revised Version (British and American) has changed it into "sin-offering," which is in harmony with the general meaning and usage of the Hebrew.

(3) Special Passage in 1 Samuel 29:4.

There is yet another Hebrew word rendered "reconcile" in 1Sa 29:4, and inasmuch as this passage in the Septuagint has as the equivalent of the Hebrew the Greek word diallasso, it is of some importance in guiding to the New Testament meaning. On one occasion when the Philistines gathered together to battle against Israel, David and his band of men accompanied Achish king of Gath to the muster-place. "The princes of the Philistines" did not at all appreciate the presence of "these Hebrews," and although Achish testified in favor of David’s fidelity, they were very indignant, and demanded that David and his men be sent back, "lest in the battle he become an adversary to us: for wherewith should this fellow reconcile himself unto his lord? should it not be with the heads of these men?" The Hebrew is ratsah, which means "to be pleased with" or "to accept favorably," and the Hithpael form here used is "to make himself pleasing or acceptable," "to reconcile himself." But assuredly the Philistines’ idea of David reconciling himself to Saul was not that he should lay aside his enmity against Saul, and so become friends with him. The enmity was on Saul’s side, and the thought of the princes was that David by turning against them in the battle would gratify Saul, and lead him to lay aside his enmity against David.

(4) Usage in the Apocrypha.

It may be noted that in 2 Macc 5:20, katallage is used evidently of the Godward side: "And the place which was forsaken in the wrath of the Almighty was, at the reconciliation of the great Sovereign, restored again with all glory." The verb occurs in 2 Macc 1:5 when again the Godward side seems intended, though not perhaps so certainly: "May God .... hearken to your supplications, and be reconciled with you," and in 7:33: "If for rebuke and chastening our living Lord has been angered a little while, yet shall he again be reconciled with his own servants," and 8:29: "They besought the merciful Lord to be wholly reconciled with his servants." In these two, especially the last, it is unquestionably the laying aside of the divine displeasure that is meant.

2. Non-doctrinal Passage—Matthew 5:24:

Before passing on to look at the great utterances in the Epistles, we may now look at the non-doctrinal passage referred to at the beginning. There is, indeed, another non-doctrinal instance in 1Co 7:11, where the wife who has departed from her husband is enjoined either to "remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband." But as it is indeterminate whether the wife or the husband is the offending party, and so which is the one to be influenced, the passage does not help us much. But Mt 5:24 is a very illuminating passage. Here as in the passage from 1 Samuel, the word used is diallasso, but it is practically identified in meaning with katallasso. The injunction is given by Christ to the one who is at variance with his brother, not to complete his offering until first he has been reconciled to his brother. But the whole statement shows that it is not a question of the one who is offering the gift laying aside his enmity against his brother, but the reverse. Christ says, "If therefore thou art offering thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest (not that thou hast a grudge against thy brother but) that thy brother hath aught against thee"—the brother was the offended one, he is the one to be brought round—"leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." Plainly it means that he should do something to remove his brother’s displeasure and so bring about a reconciliation.

3. Doctrinal Passages:

(1) Romans 5.

Turning now to Ro 5, how stands the matter? Paul has been speaking of the blessed results of justification; one of these results is the shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart. Then he dwells upon the manifestation of that love in the death of Christ, a love that was displayed to the loveless, and he argues that if in our sinful and unloving state we were embraced by the love of God, a fortiori that love will not be less now that it has already begun to take effect. If He loved us when we were under His condemnation sufficiently to give His Son to die for our salvation, much more shall His love bestow upon us the blessings secured by that death. "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him" (Ro 5:9).

(a) The Fact of Divine Wrath:

It is well to note, then, that there is "wrath" on the part of God against sin and sinners. One of the key-thoughts of the apostle in this epistle is that "the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Ro 1:18), and the coming day of judgment is "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Ro 2:5). And because of this stern fact, the gospel is a revelation not only of love, but specifically "a righteousness of God" (Ro 1:17). And he shows that the essence of the gospel is found in the propitiatory death of the Lord Jesus Christ (Ro 3:24,25,26), through whom alone can men who have been "brought under the judgment of God" (Ro 3:19) find justification, salvation, deliverance from the wrath of God (Ro 4:25; 5:1-6). Of course it is not necessary to add that the wrath of God is not to be thought of as having any unworthy or capricious

element in it—it is the settled opposition of His holy nature against sin.

(b) Reconciliation, Godward, as Well as Manward:

The apostle proceeds (Ro 5:10): "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life." Now if, as many maintain, it is only the reconciliation on the manward side that is meant, that the manifested love led to the sinner laying aside his enmity, it would entirely reverse the apostle's argument. He is not arguing that if we have begun to love God we may reckon upon His doing so and so for us, but because He has done so much, we may expect Him to do more. The verse is parallel to the preceding, and the being reconciled is on the same plane as being justified; the being justified was God's action, and so is the reconciling. Justification delivers from "the wrath of God"; reconciliation takes effect upon enemies.

(c) The Meaning of the Word "Enemies":

The word "enemies" is important. By those who take the manward aspect of reconciliation as the only one, it is held that the word must be taken actively—those who hate God. But the passive meaning, "hatred of God," seems far the preferable, and is indeed demanded by the context. Paul uses the verb echthroi, "enemies," in Ro 11:28, in antithesis to "beloved" of God, and that is the consistent sense here. The enemies are those who are the objects of the wrath of the previous verse. And when we were thus hated of God, the objects of His just displeasure on account of our sin, "we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son." God laid aside His enmity, and in the propitiatory death of Christ showed Himself willing to receive us into His favor.

(d) The Manward Side:

By this propitiation, therefore, the barrier was removed, and, God having assumed a gracious attitude toward the sinner, it is possible for the sinner now, influenced by His love, to come into a friendly relationship with God. And so in the second phrase, the two meanings, the Godward and the manward, may coalesce: "being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." The reconciliation becomes mutual, for there is no kind of doubt that sinners are enemies to God in the active sense, and require to lay aside their hostility, and so be reconciled to Him. But the first step is with God, and the reconciliation which took place in the death of His Son could only be the Godward reconciliation, since at that time men were still uninfluenced by His love. But, perhaps, just because that first reconciliation is brought about through the divine love which provides the propitiation, the apostle avoids saying "God is reconciled," but uses the more indirect form of speech. The manward aspect is emphasized in the next verse, although the Godward is not lost sight of: "We also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (Ro 5:11). It is therefore something that comes from God and does not proceed from man. God is the first mover; He makes the reconciliation as already indicated, and then the fruit of it is imputed to the believing sinner, and the very fact that our receiving the reconciliation, or being brought into a state of reconciliation; follows the being reconciled of Ro 5:10, shows that the other is divine reconciliation as the basis of the human.

(2) 2 Corinthians 5:18-20.

(a) The Godward Aspect Primary:

In the same way the great passage in 2Co 5:18-20 cannot be understood apart from the conception that there is a reconciliation on the divine side. There is unquestionably reference to the human side of the matter as well, but, as in Romans, the Godward aspect is primary and dominating: "All things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation." It might be possible to argue from the King James Version that this describes the process going on under gospel influences, men being brought into gracious relations with God, but the aorist of the Greek rightly rendered by the Revised Version (British and American), "who reconciled us to himself," points back to the historic time when the transaction took place. It cannot be simply the surrender of the sinner to God that is meant, though that comes as a consequence; it is a work that proceeds from God, is accomplished by God, and because of the accomplishment of that work it is possible for a ministry of reconciliation to be entrusted to men. To make this mean the human aspect of the reconciliation, it would be necessary unduly to confine it to the reconciliation of Paul and his fellow-workers, though even then it would be a straining of language, for there is the other historic act described, "and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation." The plain meaning is that through Jesus Christ, God established the basis of agreement, removed the barrier to the sinner’s approach to Himself, accomplished the work of propitiation, and, having done so, He entrusts His servants with the ministry of reconciliation, a ministry which, basing itself upon the great propitiatory, reconciling work of Christ, is directed toward men, seeking to remove their enmity, to influence them in their turn to be reconciled with God. This is more clearly set forth in the verse which follows, which in explaining the ministry of reconciliation says: "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." Here there can be no question that the historic Incarnation is meant, and the reconciling of the world can be nothing other than the objective work of atonement culminating in the cross. And in that transaction there can be no thought of the sinner laying aside his hostility to God; it is God in Christ so dealing with sin that the doom lying upon the guilty is canceled, the wrath is averted, propitiation is made.

(b) The Manward Side also Prominent:

God, in a word, enters into gracious relations with a world of sinners, becomes reconciled to man. This being done, gracious influences can be brought to bear upon man, the chief of which is the consideration of this stupendous fact of grace, that God has in Christ dealt with the question of sin. This is the substance of the "word of reconciliation" which is preached by the apostle. So he continues, "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: we beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." Here is the human side. The great matter now is to get the sinner to lay aside his enmity, to respond to the gracious overtures of the gospel, to come into harmony with God. But that is only possible because the reconciliation in the Godward aspect has already been accomplished. If the first reconciliation, "the reconciliation of the world unto himself," had been the laying aside of human enmity, there could now be no point in the exhortation, "Be ye reconciled to

God."

(3) Ephesians 2:16.

The two passages where the compound word occurs are in complete harmony with this interpretation. Eph 2:16: "And might reconcile them both (Jew and Gentile) in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby," is the outcome of Christ "making peace" (2:15), and the reconciling work is effected through the cross, reconciliation both Godward and manward, and, having made peace, it is possible for Christ to come and preach peace to them that are far off—far off even though the reconciling work of the cross has been accomplished.

(4) Colossians 1:20-22.

So in Col 1:20, "And through him to reconcile all things unto himself, having made peace through the blood of his cross; through him, I say, whether things upon the earth, or things in the heavens." Here the thought of the apostle trembles away into infinity, and there seems a parallel to the thought of Heb 9:23, that according to the typical teaching even "the things in the heavens" in some way stood in need of cleansing. May it be that the work of Christ in some sense affected the angelic intelligence, making it possible for harmony to be restored between redeemed sinners and the perfect creation of God? In any case, the reconciling all things unto Himself is not the laying aside of the creaturely hostility, but the determining of the divine attitude. Then comes the specific reference to the human side, "And you, being in time past alienated and enemies in your mind in your evil works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death"; there, as in Romans, the two phases coalescing, God appearing gracious through the work of Christ, sinners coming into gracious relation with Him. "Having made peace through the blood of his cross," the ground of peace has been established. Christ has done something by His death which makes it possible to offer peace to men. God has laid aside His holy opposition to the sinner, and shows Himself willing to bring men into peace with Himself. He has found satisfaction in that great work of His Son, has been reconciled, and now calls upon men to be reconciled to Him—to receive the reconciliation.

See ATONEMENT; PROPITIATION; WRATH.

LITERATURE.

See the works on New Testament Theology of Weiss, Schmid, Stevens, etc.; Denney, Death of Christ; articles on "Reconciliation" in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), Hastings, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, etc.

Archibald M’Caig

RECORD

rek’-ord, rek’-ord:

(1) The English word, where it occurs in the Old Testament and the New Testament in the sense of testimony, is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "witness" (De 30:19; 31:28; Joh 1:19,32; 8:13,14; Ro 10:2, etc.). See WITNESS. But in Job 16:19 for the King James Version "my record," the Revised Version (British and American) has "he that voucheth for me."

(2) In Ezr 4:15; 6:2 (dokhran, dikhron), and Es 6:1 (zikkaron), the word denotes Persian state chronicles; compare 1 Macc 14:23; 2 Macc 2:1.

RECORDER

re-kor’-der (mazkir; the Revised Version margin "chronicler"): A high functionary in the court of the Jewish kings, part of whose duty seems to have been to chronicle the events of the reign, but who also occupied a position corresponding with that of the modern vizier (2Sa 8:16; 20:24; 1Ch 18:15, etc.). His high rank is shown by the facts that, with other officers, he represented Hezekiah in speaking with Rabshakeh (2Ki 18:18), and, in the reign of Josiah, superintended the repairs of the temple (2Ch 34:8).

RECOVER

re-kuv’-er: "Recover" has

(1) the transitive meaning of "to retake" or "regain" (anything); and

(2) the intransitive sense of "to regain health" or "become well."

In Judith 14:7 it means "restore to consciousness." In the former sense it is in the Old Testament the translation of natsal, "to snatch away" (Jud 11:26; 1Sa 30:8,22; in Ho 2:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "pluck away"); also of shubh (Qal and Hiphil 1Sa 30:19 the King James Version; 2Sa 8:3, etc.), and of various other words in single instances. In 2Ki 5:3,6,7,11, "to restore to health" is ‘acaph. In its intransitive sense "recover" is chiefly the translation of chayah, "to live," "revive" (2Ki 1:2, etc.; Isa 38:9,21). "Recover" appears only twice in the King James Version of the New Testament; Mr 16:18 (for kalos hexousin) and 2Ti 2:26 (from ananepho, the Revised Version margin "Greek: ‘return to soberness’ "); but the Revised Version (British and American) has "recover" for "do well" in Joh 11:12 (sothesetai; margin "Greek: ‘be saved’")." Recovering" (of sight) (anablepsis) occurs in Lu 4:18.

W. L. Walker

RED

See COLORS, (10).

RED DRAGON

See REVELATION OF JOHN.

RED HEIFER

See HEIFER, RED.

RED HORSE

See HORSE, RED; REVELATION OF JOHN.

RED SEA

(yam-cuph (Ex 10:19 and often), but in many passages it is simply hayam, "the sea"‘ Septuagint with 2 or 3 exceptions renders it by he eruthra thalassa, "the Red Sea"; Latin geographers Mare Rubrum):

1. Name

2. Peculiarities

3. Old Testament References

4. Passage through the Red Sea by the Israelites

Objections

(1) Steep Banks of the Channel

(2) Walls Formed by the Water

(3) The East Winds

(4) The Miraculous Set Aside

LITERATURE

1. Name:

The Hebrew name yam-cuph has given rise to much controversy. Yam is the general word for sea, and when standing alone may refer to the Mediterranean, the Dead Sea, the Red Sea, or the Sea of Galilee. In several places it designates the river Nile or Euphrates. Cuph means a rush or seaweed such as abounds in the lower portions of the Nile and the upper portions of the Red Sea. It was in the cuph on the brink of the river that the ark of Moses was hidden (Ex 2:3,5). But as this word does not in itself mean red, and as that is not the color of the bulrush, authorities are much divided as to the reason for this designation. Some have supposed that it was called red from the appearance of the mountains on the western coast, others from the red color given to the water by the presence of zoophytes, or red coral, or some species of seaweed. Others still, with considerable probability, suppose that the name originated in the red or copper color of the inhabitants of the bordering Arabian peninsula. But the name yam-cuph, though applied to the whole sea, was especially used with reference to the northern part, which is alone mentioned in the Bible, and to the two gulfs (Suez and Aqabah) which border the Sinaitic Peninsula, especially the Gulf of Suez.

2. Pecularities:

The Red Sea has a length of 1,350 miles and an extreme breadth of 205 miles. It is remarkable that while it has no rivers flowing into it and the evaporation from its surface is enormous, it is not much salter than the ocean, from which it is inferred that there must be a constant influx of water from the Indian Ocean through the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb, together with an outflow of the more saline water beneath the surface. The deepest portion measures 1,200 fathoms. Owing to the lower land levels which prevailed in recent geological times, the Gulf of Suez formerly extended across the lowland which separates it from the Bitter Lakes, a distance of 15 or 20 miles now traversed by the Suez Canal, which encountered no elevation more than 30 ft. above tide. In early historic times the Gulf ended at Ismailia at the head of Lake Timsah. North of this the land rises to a height of more than 50 ft. and for a long time furnished a road leading from Africa into Asia. At a somewhat earlier geological (middle and late Tertiary) period the depression of the land was such that this bridge was also submerged, so that the Red Sea and the Mediterranean were connected by a broad expanse of water which overflowed the whole surface of Lower Egypt.

The evidence of the more recent depression of the land surface in all Lower Egypt is unmistakable. Raised beaches containing shells and corals still living in the Red Sea are found at various levels up to more than 200 ft. above tide. One of the most interesting of these is to be seen near the summit of the "Crow’s Nest," a half-mile South of the great pyramids, where, near the summit of the eminence, and approximately 200 ft. above tide, on a level with the base of the pyramids, there is a clearly defined recent sea beach composed of water-worn pebbles from 1 inches to 1 or 2 ft. in diameter, the interstices of which are filled with small shells loosely cemented together. These are identified as belonging to a variable form, Alectryonia cucullata Born, which lives at the present time in the Red Sea. On the opposite side of the river, on the Mokattam Hills South of Cairo, at an elevation of 220 ft. above tide, similar deposits are found containing numerous shells of recent date, while the rock face is penetrated by numerous borings of lithodomus mollusks (Pholades rugosa Broc.). Other evidences of the recent general depression of the land in this region come from various places on the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. According to Lartet at Ramleh, near Jaffa, a recent beach occurs more than 200 ft. above

sea-level containing many shells of Pectunculus violascens Lamk, which is at the present time the most abundant mollusk on the shore of the adjoining Mediterranean. A similar beach has been described by Dr. Post at Lattakia, about 30 miles North of Beirut; while others, according to Hull, occur upon the island of Cyprus. Further evidence of this depression is also seen in the fact that the isthmus between Suez and the Bitter Lakes is covered with recent deposits of Nile mud, holding modern Red Sea shells, showing that, at no very distant date, there was an overflow of the Nile through an eastern branch into this slightly depressed level. The line of this branch of the Nile overflow was in early times used for a canal, which has recently been opened to furnish fresh water to Suez, and the depression is followed by the railroad. According to Dawson, large surfaces of the desert North of Suez, which are now above sea-level, contain buried in the sand "recent marine shells in such a state of preservation that not many centuries may have elapsed since they were in the bottom of the sea" (Egypt and Syria, 67).

3. Old Testament References:

The Red Sea is connected with the children of Israel chiefly through the crossing of it recorded in Exodus (see 4, below); but there are a few references to it in later times. Solomon is said (1Ki 9:26) to have built a navy at "Ezion-geber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom." This is at the head of the Gulf of Aqabah, the eastern branch of the Red Sea. Here his ships were manned by Hiram king of Tyre with "shipmen that had knowledge of the sea" (1Ki 9:27). And (1Ki 9:28) "they came to Ophir, and fetched from thence gold." But Eloth was evidently lost to Israel when Edom successfully revolted in the time of Joram (2Ki 8:20). For a short time, however, it was restored to Judah by Amaziah (2Ki 14:22); but finally, during the reign of Ahaz, the Syrians, or more probably, according to another reading, the Edomites, recovered the place and permanently drove the Jews away. But in 1Ki 22:48 Jehoshaphat is said to have "made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold: but they went not; for the ships were broken at Ezion-geber"; while in 2Ch 20:36 Jehoshaphat is said to have joined with Ahaziah "to make ships to go to Tarshish; and they made the ships in Ezion-geber."

Unless there is some textual confusion here, "ships of Tarshish:" is simply the name of the style of the ship, like "East Indiaman," and Tarshish in Chronicles may refer to some place in the East Indies. This is the more likely, since Solomon’s "navy" that went to Tarshish once every 3 years came "bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks," which could hardly have come from any other place than India.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

4. Passage through the Red Sea by the Israelites:

Until in recent times it was discovered that the Gulf of Suez formerly extended 30 miles northward to the site of the present Ismailia and the ancient Pithom, the scene of the Biblical miracle was placed at Suez, the present head of the Gulf. But there is at Suez no extent of shoal water sufficient for the east wind mentioned in Scripture (Ex 14:21) to have opened a passage-way sufficiently wide to have permitted the host to have crossed over in a single night. The bar leading from Suez across, which is

now sometimes forded, is too insignificant to have furnished a passage-way as Robinson supposed (BR (3), I, 56-59). Besides, if the children of Israel were South of the Bitter Lakes when there was no extension of the Gulf North of its present limits, there would have been no need of a miracle to open the water, since there was abundant room for both them and Pharaoh's army to have gone around the northern end of the Gulf to reach the eastern shore, while South of Suez the water is too deep for the wind anywhere to have opened a passage-way. But with an extension of the waters of the Gulf to the Bitter Lakes and Lake Timsah, rendered probable by the facts cited in the previous paragraph, the narrative at once so perfectly accords with the physical conditions involved as to become not only easily credible, but self-evidencing.

The children of Israel were at Rameses (Ex 12:37) in the land of Goshen, a place which has not been certainly identified, but could not have been far from the modern Zagazig at the head of the Fresh Water Canal leading from the Nile to the Bitter Lakes. One day's journey eastward along Wady Tumilat, watered by this canal brought them to Succoth, a station probably identical with Thuket, close upon the border line separating Egypt from Asia. Through the discoveries of Naville in 1883 this has been identified as Pithom, one of the store-cities built by Pharaoh during the period of Hebrew oppression (Ex 1:11). Here Naville uncovered vast store pits for holding grain built during the reign of Rameses II and constructed according to the description given in Ex 1: the lower portions of brick made with straw, the middle with stubble, and the top of simple clay without even stubble to hold the brick together (see Naville, "The Store-City Pithom and the Route of the Exodus," Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1885; M. G. Kyle, "A Re-examination of Naville's Works," Records of the Past, VIII, 1901, 304-7). The next day's journey brought them to Etham on the "edge of the wilderness" (Ex 13:20; Nu 33:6), probably in the vicinity of the modern Ismailia at the head of Lake Timsah. From this point the natural road to Palestine would have been along the caravan route on the neck of land referred to above as now about 50 ft. above sea-level. Etham was about 30 miles Southeast of Zoan or Tanis, the headquarters at that time of Pharaoh, from which he was watching the movements of the host. If they should go on the direct road to Palestine, his army could easily execute a flank movement and intercept them in the desert of Etham. But by divine command (Ex 14:2) Moses turned southward on the west side of the extension of the Red Sea and camped "before Pihahiroth, between Migdol and the sea, before Baal-zephon" (Ex 14:22 Nu 33:5-7). At this change of course Pharaoh was delighted, seeing that the children of Israel were "entangled in the land" and "the wilderness" had "shut them in." Instead of issuing a flank movement upon them, Pharaoh's army now followed them in the rear and "overtook them encamping by the sea, beside Pi-hahiroth," the location of which is essential to a proper understanding of the narrative which follows.

In Ex 14:2, Pi-hahiroth is said to be "between Migdol and the sea, before Baal-zephon." Now though Migdol originally meant "watch-tower," it is hardly supposable that this can be its meaning here, otherwise the children of Israel would have been moving directly toward a fortified place. Most probably, therefore, Migdol was the tower-like mountain peak marking the northeast corner of Jebel Geneffeh, which runs parallel with the Bitter Lakes, only a short distance from their western border. Baal-zephon may equally well be some of the mountain peaks on the border of the Wilderness of Paran opposite Cheloof, midway between the Bitter Lakes and Suez. In the clear atmosphere of the region this line of mountains is distinctly visible throughout the whole distance from Ismailia to Suez. There would

seem to be no objection to this supposition, since all authorities are in disagreement concerning its location. From the significance of the name it would seem to be the seat of some form of Baal worship, naturally a mountain. Brugsch would identify it with Mr. Cassius on the northern shore of Egypt. Naville (see Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary, "Red Sea, Passage of") would connect it with the hill called Tussum East of Lake Timsah, where there is a shrine at the present day visited every year about July 14 by thousands of pilgrims to celebrate a religious festival; but, as this is a Mohammedan festival, there seems no reason to connect it with any sanctuary of the Canaanites. Dawson favors the general location which we have assigned to Pi-hahiroth, but would place it beside the narrow southern portion of the Bitter Lakes.

Somewhere in this vicinity would be a most natural place for the children of Israel to halt, and there is no difficulty, such as Naville supposes, to their passing between Jebel Geneffeh and the Bitter Lakes; for the mountain does not come abruptly to the lake, but leaves ample space for the passage of a caravan, while the mountain on one side and the lake on the other would protect them from a flank movement by Pharaoh and limit his army to harassing the rear of the Israelite host. Protected thus, the Israelites found a wide plain over which they could spread their camp, and if we suppose them to be as far South as Cheloof, every condition would be found to suit the narrative which follows. Moses was told by the Lord that if he would order the children of Israel to go forward, the sea would be divided and the children of Israel could cross over on dry ground. And when, in compliance with the divine command, Moses stretched out his hand over the sea, "Yahweh caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left. And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them into the midst of the sea, all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen" (Ex 14:21-30). But when the children of Israel were safely on the other side the waters returned and overwhelmed the entire host of Pharaoh. In the So of Moses which follows, describing the event, it is said that the waters were piled up by the "blast of thy (God's) nostrils" (Ex 15:8), and again, verse 10, "Thou didst blow with thy wind, the sea covered them." Thus 3 times the wind is mentioned as the means employed by God in opening the water. The competency of the wind temporarily to remove the water from the passage connecting the Gulf of Suez with the Bitter Lakes, provided it was only a few feet deep, is amply proved by facts of recent observation. Major General Tullock of the British army (Proc. Victoria Inst., XXVIII, 267-80) reports having witnessed the driving off of the water from Lake Menzaleh by the wind to such an extent as to lower the level 6 ft., thus leaving small vessels over the shallow water stranded for a while in the muddy bottom. According to the report of the Suez Canal Company, the difference between the highest and the lowest water at Suez is 10 ft. 7 inches, all of which must be due to the effect of the wind, since the tides do not affect the Red Sea. The power of the wind to affect water levels is strikingly witnessed upon Lake Erie in the United States, where according to the report of the Deep Waterways Commission for 1896 (165, 168) it appears that strong wind from the Southwest sometimes lowers the water at Toledo, Ohio, on the western end of the lake to the extent of more than 7 ft., at the same time causing it to rise at Buffalo at the eastern end a similar amount; while a change in the wind during the passage of a single storm reverses the effect, thus sometimes producing a change of level at either end of the lake of 14 ft. in the course of a single day. It would require far less than a tornado to lower the water at Cheloof sufficiently to lay bare the shallow channel which we have supposed at that time to separate Egypt from the Sinaitic

Peninsula.

See EXODUS, THE.

Objections:

Several objections to this theory, however, have been urged which should not pass without notice.

(1) Steep Banks of the Channel:

Some have said that the children of Israel would have found an insuperable obstacle to their advance in the steep banks on either side of the supposed channel. But there were no steep banks to be encountered. A gentle sag leads down on one side to the center of the depression and a correspondingly gentle rise leads up on the other.

(2) Walls Formed by the Water:

Much has also been made of the statement (Ex 14:22) that "the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand, and on their left"; but when we consider the rhetorical use of this word "wall" it presents no difficulty. In Pr 18:11 we are told that "The rich man’s wealth is his strong city, And as a high wall in his own imagination." In Isa 26:1 we are told that God will appoint salvation "for walls and bulwarks." Again Nahum (3:8) says of Egypt that her "rampart was the sea (margin "the Nile"), and her wall was of the sea." The water upon either side of the opening served the purpose of a wall for protection. There was no chance for Pharaoh to intercept them by a flank movement. Nor is there need of paying further attention to the poetical expressions in the So of Moses, where among other things it is said "that the deeps were congealed in the heart of the sea," and that the "earth (instead of the water) swallowed them."

(3) The East Winds:

Again it is objected that an east wind does not come from the right direction to produce the desired result. On the other hand it is an east wind only which could have freed the channel from water. A north wind would have blown the water from the Bitter Lakes southward, and owing to the quantity of water impounded would have increased the depth of the water in the narrow passage from the southern end of Suez. An east wind, however, would have pressed the water out from the channel both ways, and from the contour of the shore lines would be the only wind that could have done so.

(4) The Miraculous Set Aside:

Again, it is objected that this explanation destroys the miraculous character of the event. But it should be noted that little is said in the narrative about the miraculous. On the other hand, it is a straightforward statement of events, leaving their miraculous character to be inferred from their nature. On the

explanation we have given the transaction it is what Robinson felicitously calls a mediate miracle, that is, a miracle in which the hand of God is seen in the use of natural forces which it would be impossible for man to command. If anyone should say that this was a mere coincidence, that the east wind blew at the precise time that Moses reached the place of crossing, the answer is that such a coincidence could have been brought about only by supernatural agency. There was at that time no weather bureau to foretell the approach of a storm. There are no tides on the Red Sea with regular ebb and flow. It was by a miracle of prophecy that Moses was emboldened to get his host into position to avail themselves of the temporary opportunity at exactly the right time. As to the relation of the divine agency to the event, speculation is useless. The opening of the sea may have been a foreordained event in the course of Nature which God only foreknew, in which case the direct divine agency was limited to those influences upon the human actors that led them to place themselves where they could take advantage of the natural opportunity. Or, there is no a priori difficulty in supposing that the east wind was directly aroused for this occasion; for man himself produces disturbances among the forces of Nature that are as far-reaching in their extent as would be a storm produced by direct divine agency. But in this case the disturbance is at once seen to be beyond the powers of human agency to produce.

It remains to add an important word concerning the evidential value of this perfect adjustment of the narrative to the physical conditions involved. So perfect is this conformity of the narrative to the obscure physical conditions involved, which only recent investigations have made clear, that the account becomes self-evidencing. It is not within the power of man to invent a story so perfectly in accordance with the vast and complicated conditions involved. The argument is as strong as that for human design when a key is found to fit a Yale lock. This is not a general account which would fit into a variety of circumstances. There is only one place in all the world, and one set of conditions in all history, which would meet the requirements; and here they are all met. This is scientific demonstration. No higher proof can be found in the inductive sciences. The story is true. It has not been remodeled by the imagination, either of the original writers or of the transcribers. It is not the product of mythological fancy or of legendary accretion.

LITERATURE.

Dawson, Egypt and Syria; Hull, Mt. Seir, Sinai and Western Palestine; Naville, "The Store-City Pithom and the Route of the Exodus," Egyptian Exploration Fund, 1885; Kyle, "Bricks without Straw at Pithom: A Re-examination of Naville’s Works," Records of the Past, VIII, 1901, 304-7; Wright, Scientific Confirmations of Old Testament History, 83-117.

George Frederick Wright

REDEEMER; REDEMPTION

re-dem’-er, re-demp’-shun (paraq, "to tear loose," "to rescue," padhah, ga’al; agorazo, referring to purchase, lutroumai, from lutron, "a ransom"):

1. Gradual Moralizing of Idea of Redemption

2. Redemption as Life in Individual

3. Redemption as Social

4. Redemption as Process

5. Moral Implications in Scriptural Idea of Redeemer

6. Uniqueness of Son of God as Redeemer

LITERATURE

The idea of redemption in the Old Testament takes its start from the thought of property (Le 25:26; Ru 4:4). Money is paid according to law to buy back something which must be delivered or rescued (Nu 3:51; Ne 5:8). From this start the word "redemption" throughout the Old Testament is used in the general sense of deliverance. God is the Redeemer of Israel in the sense that He is the Deliverer of Israel (De 9:26; 2Sa 7:23; 1Ch 17:21; Isa 52:3). The idea of deliverance includes deliverance from all forms of evil lot, from national misfortune (Isa 52:9; 63:9; compare Lu 2:38), or from plague (Ps 78:35,52), or from calamity of any sort (Ge 48:16; Nu 25:4,9). Of course, the general thought of the relation of Israel to God was that God had both a claim upon Israel (De 15:15) and an obligation toward Israel (1Ch 17:21; Ps 25:22). Israel belonged to Him, and it was by His own right that He could move into the life of Israel so as to redeem Israel. On the other hand, obligation was upon Him to redeem Israel.

In the New Testament the idea of redemption has more a suggestion of ransom. Men are held under the curse of the law (Ga 3:13), or of sin itself (Ro 7:23 f). The Redeemer purchases their deliverance by offering Himself as payment for their redemption (Eph 1:7; 1Pe 1:18).

1. Gradual Moralizing of Idea of Redemption:

Throughout both the Old Testament and the New Testament there is to be observed a gradual moralizing of the meaning of redemption. The same process of moralizing has continued throughout all the Christian ages. Starting with the idea of redemption price, conceived almost in material terms, religious thought has advanced to conceptions entirely moral and spiritual. Through the Scriptures, too, the idea of redemption becomes more specffic with the progress of Christian revelation. In the beginning God is the Redeemer from distresses of all kinds. He redeems from calamity and from sorrows. This general idea, of course, persists throughout the revelation and enters largely into our thinking of today, but the growing moral discernment of the Biblical writers comes to attach more and more importance to sin as the chief disturber of man’s welfare. We would not minimize the force of the Scriptural idea that God is the Deliverer from all misfortune to which man falls heir, but the Scriptural emphasis moves more and more to deliverance from sin. Paul states this deliverance as a deliverance from the law which brings sin

out into expression, but we must not conceive his idea in any artificial fashion. He would have men delivered not only from the law, but also from the consequences of evil doing and from the spirit of evil itself (Ro 8:2).

2. Redemption as Life in the Individual:

In trying to discern the meaning of redemption from sin, toward which the entire progress of Biblical and Christian thought points, we may well keep in mind the Master's words that He came that men might have life and might have it more abundantly (Joh 10:10). The word "life" seems to be the final New Testament word as a statement of the purpose of Christ. God sent His Son to bring men to life. The word "life,"‘ however, is indefinite. Life means more at one period of the world's history than at another. It has the advantage, nevertheless, of always being entirely intelligible in its essential significance. Our aim must be to keep this essential significance in mind and at the same time to provide for an increasing fullness and enlargement of human capacity and endeavor. The aim of redemption can only be to bring men to the fullest use and enjoyment of their powers. This is really the conception implicit even in the earliest statements of redemption. The man redeemed by money payment comes out of the prison to the light of day, or he comes out of slavery into freedom, or he is restored to his home and friends. The man under the law is redeemed from the burden and curse of the law. Paul speaks of his experience under the law as the experience of one chained to a dead body (Ro 7:24). Of course, relief from such bondage would mean life. In the more spiritual passages of the New Testament, the evil in men's hearts is like a blight which paralyzes their higher activities (Joh 8:33-51). In all redemption, as conceived of in Christian terms, there is a double element. There is first the deliverance as from a curse. Something binds a man or weights him down: redemption relieves him from this load. On the other hand, there is the positive movement of the soul thus relieved toward larger and fuller life. We have said that the Biblical emphasis is always upon deliverance from sin as the essential in redemption, but this deliverance is so essential that the life cannot progress in any of its normal activities until it is redeemed from evil. Accordingly in the Scriptural thought all manner of blessings follow deliverance. The man who seeks first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness finds all other things added unto him (Mt 6:33). Material, intellectual and social blessings follow as matters of course from the redemption of the inner spirit from evil. The aim of redemption, to beget in men's hearts the will to do right, once fulfilled, leads men to seek successfully along all possible avenues for life. This, of course, does not mean that the redeemed life gives itself up to the cultivation of itself toward higher excellencies. It means that the redeemed life is delivered from every form of selfishness. In the unselfish seeking of life for others the redeemed life finds its own greatest achievement and happiness (Mt 16:25).

3. Redemption as Social:

Just as the idea of redemption concerned itself chiefly with the inner spirit; so also it concerns itself with the individual as the object of redemption. But as the redemption of the inner spirit leads to freedom in all realms of life, so also the redemption of the individual leads to large social transformations. It is impossible to strike out of the Scriptures the idea of a redeemed humanity. But humanity is not conceived of in general or class terms. The object of redemption is not humanity, or mankind, or the masses. The object of redemption is rather men set in relation to each other as members of a family. But

it would do violence to the Scriptural conception to conceive of the individual's relations in any narrow or restricted fashion (1Co 12:12-27).

An important enlargement of the idea of redemption in our own time has come as men have conceived of the redemption of individuals in their social relationships. Very often men have thought of redemption as a snatching of individuals from the perils of a world in itself absolutely wicked. Even the material environment of men has at times been regarded as containing something inherently evil. The thought of redemption which seems most in line with Scriptural interpretation would seem to be that which brings the material and social forces within reach of individual wills. Paul speaks of the whole creation groaning and travailing in pain waiting for the revelation of the sons of God (Ro 8:22). This graphic figure sets before us the essentially Christian conception of the redemption of the forces in the midst of which men are placed. Those redeemed for the largest life, by the very force of their life, will seize all powers of this world to make them the servants of divine purposes. The seer saw a great multitude which no man could number, of every kindred and nation and tongue, shouting the joys of salvation (Re 7:9), yet the implication nowhere appears that these were redeemed in any other fashion than by surrendering themselves to the forces of righteousness.

4. Redemption as Process:

We have said that the aim of redemption is to bring men to the largest and fullest life. We have also said that "life" is a general term. To keep close to the Scriptural conceptions we would best say that the aim of redemption is to make men like Christ (Ro 8:9). Otherwise, it might be possible to use the word "life" so as to imply that the riotous exercise of the faculties is what we mean by redemption. The idea of redemption, as a matter of fact, has been thus interpreted in various times in the history of Christian thinking. Life has been looked upon as sheer quantitative exuberance—the lower pleasures of sense being reckoned as about on the same plane with the higher. We can see the moral and spiritual anarchy which would thus be brought about. In Christ's words to His disciples He once used the expression, "Ye are clean because of the word which I have spoken unto you" (Joh 15:3). In this particular context the idea does not seem to be that of an external washing. Christ seems rather to mean that His disciples are cleansed as a vineyard is cleansed by pruning away some of the branches that others may bear fruit. In other words, the redemption of life is to be interpreted so that stress is laid upon the qualitative rather than the quantitative. Christ indeed found place in His instructions and in His own life for the normal and healthy activities of human existence. He was not an ascetic; He went to feasts and to weddings, but His emphasis was always upon life conceived of in the highest terms. We can say then that the aim of redemption is to beget in men life like that in Christ.

5. Moral Implications in the Scriptural Idea of Redeemer:

Moreover, redemption must not be conceived of in such fashion as to do away with the need of response upon the part of the individual will. The literal suggestion of ransom has to do with paying a price for a man's deliverance, whether the man is willing to be delivered or not. Of course, the assumption in the mind of the Biblical writers was that any man in prison or in slavery or in sickness would be overjoyed

at being redeemed; but in dealing with men whose lives are set toward sin we cannot always make this assumption. The dreadfulness of sin is largely in the love of sinning which sinning begets. Some thinkers have interpreted redemption to mean almost a seizing of men without regard to their own will. It is very easy to see how this conception arises. A man who himself hates sin may not stop to realize that some other men love sin. Redemption, to mean anything, must touch this inner attitude of will. We cannot then hold to any idea of redemption which brings men under a cleansing process without the assent of their own wills. If we keep ourselves alive to the growing moral discernment which moves through the Scriptures, we must lay stress always upon redemption as a moral process. Not only must we say that the aim of redemption is to make men like Christ, but we must say also that the method of redemption must be the method of Christ, the method of appealing to the moral will. There is no Scriptural warrant for the idea that men are redeemed by fiat. The most we can get from the words of Christ is a statement of the persistence of God in His search for the lost: '(He goeth) after that which is lost, until he finds it' (Lu 15:4). Some would interpret these words to mean that the process of redemption continues until every man is brought into the kingdom. We cannot, in the light of the New Testament, limit the redeeming love of God; but we cannot, on the other hand, take passages from figurative expressions in such sense as to limit the freedom of men. The redemption must be conceived of as respecting the moral choices of men. In our thought of the divine search for the control of inner human motive we must not stop short of the idea of men redeemed to the love of righteousness on its own account. This would do away with the plan of redeeming men by merely relieving them of the consequences of their sins. Out of a changed life, of course, there must come changed consequences. But the Scriptural teaching is that the emphasis in redemption is always moral, the turning to life because of what life is.

Having thus attempted to determine, at least in outline, the content of the Christian idea of redemption, it remains for us to point out some implications as to the work of the Redeemer. Throughout the entire teaching on redemption in the Scriptures, redemption is set before us primarily as God's own affair (Joh 3:16). God redeems His people; He redeems them out of love for them. But the love of God is not to be conceived of as mere indulgence, partiality, or good-humored affection. The love of God rests down upon moral foundations. Throughout the Scriptures, therefore, we find implied often, if not always clearly stated, the idea that God is under obligations to redeem His people. The progress of later thinking has expanded this implication with sureness of moral discernment. We have come to see the obligations of power. The more powerful the man the heavier his obligations in the discharge of this power. This is a genuinely Christian conception, and this Christian conception we apply to the character of God, feeling confident that we are in line with Scriptural teaching. Hence, we may put the obligations of God somewhat as follows: God is the most obligated being in the universe. If a man is under heavy obligations to use aright the power of controlling the forces already at work in the world, how much heavier must be the obligations on the Creator who started these forces! The obligation becomes appalling to our human thought when we think that creation includes the calling of human beings into existence and endowing them with the unsolicited boon of freedom. Men are not in the world of their own choice. Vast masses of them seem to be here as the outworking of impulses almost blind. The surroundings of men make it very easy for them to sin. The tendencies which at least seem to be innate are too often tragically inclined toward evil. Men seem, of themselves, utterly inadequate for their own redemption. If there is to be redemption it must come from God, and the Christian thought of a moral

God would seem to include the obligation on the part of God to redeem those whom He has sent into the world. Christ has made clear forever the absolutely binding nature of moral considerations. If the obligation to redeem men meant everything to Christ, it must also mean everything to the God of Christ. So we feel in line with true Christian thinking in the doctrine that redemption comes first as a discharge of the obligations on the part of God Himself.

If we look for the common thought in all the Christian statements of God's part in redemption we find it in this: that in all these statements God is conceived of as doing all that He can do for the redemption of man. If in earlier times men conceived of the human race as under the dominion of Satan, and of Satan as robbed of his due by the deliverance of man and therefore entitled to some compensation, they also conceived of God Himself as paying the ransom to Satan. If they thought of God as a feudal lord whose dignity had been offended by sin, they thought of God as Himself paying the cost due to offended dignity. If their idea was that a substitute for sinners must be furnished, the idea included the thought of God as Himself providing a substitute. If they conceived of the universe as a vast system of moral laws—broken by sin—whose dignity must be upheld, they thought of God Himself as providing the means for maintaining the dignity of the laws. If they conceived of men as saved by a vast moral influence set at work, they thought of this influence as proceeding, not from man, but from God. The common thought in theories of redemption then, so far as concerns God's part, is that God Himself takes the initiative and does all He can in the discharge of the obligation upon Himself. Each phrasing of the doctrine of redemption is the attempt of an age of Christian thinking to say in its own way that God has done all that He can do for men.

6. Uniqueness of the Son of God as Redeemer:

It is from this standpoint that we must approach the part played by Christ in redemption. This is not the place for an attempt at formal statement, but some elements of Christian teaching are, at least in outline, at once clear. The question is, first, to provide some relation between God and Christ which will make the redemptive work of Christ really effective. Some have thought to find such a statement in the conception that Christ is a prophet. They would empty the expression, "Son of God," of any unique meaning; they would make Christ the Son of God in the same sense that any great prophet could be conceived of as a son of God. Of course, we would not minimize the teaching of the Scripture as to the full humanity of Christ, and yet we may be permitted to voice our belief that the representation of Christ as the Redeemer merely in the same sense in which a prophet is a redeemer does not do justice to the Scripture teaching; and we feel, too, that such a solution of the problem of Christ would be inadequate for the practical task of redemption. If Christ is just a prophet giving us His teaching we rejoice in the teaching, but we are confronted with the problem as to how to make the teaching effective. If it be urged that Christ is a prophet who in Himself realized the moral ideal, we feel constrained to reply that this really puts Christ at a vast distance from us. Such a doctrine of Christ's person would make Him the supreme religious genius, but the human genius stands apart from the ordinary mass of men. He may gather up into Himself and realize the ideals of men; He may voice the aspirations of men and realize those aspirations; but He may not be able to make men like unto Himself. Shakespeare is a consummate literary genius. He has said once and for all many things which the common man thinks or half thinks. When the common man comes upon a phrase of Shakespeare he feels that Shakespeare has said for all

time the things which he would himself have said if he had been able. But the appreciation of Shakespeare does not make the ordinary man like Shakespeare; the appreciation of Christ has not proved successful in itself in making men like unto Christ.

If, on the contrary, without attempting formal theological construction, we put some real meaning into the idea of Christ as the Son of God and hold fast to a unique relationship between Christ and God which makes Christ the greatest gift that God can give us, we find indeed that Christ is lifted up to essentially divine existence; but we find also that this divinity does not estrange Him from us. Redemption becomes feasible, not merely when we have a revelation of how far up man can go, but when we have also a revelation of how far down God can come. If we can think of God as having in some real way come into the world through His Son Jesus Christ, that revelation makes Christ the Lord who can lead us to redemption.

Such a conception furnishes the dynamic which we must have in any real process of redemption. We need not only the ideal, but we need power by which to reach the ideal. If we can feel that the universe is under the sway of a moral God, a God who is under obligations to bear the burdens of men, and who willingly assumes these obligations, we really feel that moral life at its fullest and best is the greatest fact in the universe. Moreover, we must be true to the Scriptures and lift the entire conception of redemption beyond the realm of conscience to the realm of the heart. What the conscience of God calls for, the love of God willingly discharges. The Cross of Christ becomes at once the revelation of the righteousness of God and the love of God. Power is thus put back of human conscience and human love to move forward toward redemption (Ro 8:35-39).

The aim of the redemption in Christ then is to lift men out of death toward life. The mind is to be quickened by the revelation of the true ideals of human life. The conscience is to be reenforced by the revelation of the moral God who carries on all things in the interests of righteousness. The heart is to be stirred and won by the revelation of the love which sends an only begotten Son to the cross for our redemption. And we must take the work of Christ, not as a solitary incident or a mere historic event, but as a manifestation of the spirit which has been at work from the beginning and works forever. The Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world (Re 13:8); the spirit of God revealed in the cross of Christ is the same yesterday, today and forever. We have in the cross a revelation of holy love which, in a sense, overpowers and at the same time encourages. The cross is the revelation of the length to which God is willing to go in redemption rather than set aside one jot or tittle of His moral law. He will not redeem men except on terms which leave them men. He will not overwhelm them in any such manner as to do away with their power of free choice. He will show men His own feeling of holiness and love. In the name of a holy love which they can forever aspire after, but which they can never fully reach, men call to Him for forgiveness and that forgiveness men find forever available.

It remains to add one further item of Scriptural teaching, namely that redemption is a continuous process. If we may again use the word "life," which has been the key to this discussion, we may say that the aim of redemption is to make men progressively alive. There are not limits to the development of human powers touched by the redemptive processes of God. The cross is a revelation of divine willingness to bear with men who are forever being redeemed. Of course, we speak of the redeemed man

as redeemed once and for all. By this we mean that he is redeemed once and for all in being faced about and started in a right direction, but the progress toward full life may be faster or slower according to the man and the circumstances in the midst of which he is placed. Still the chief fact is the direction in which the man is moving. The revelation of God who aids in redemption is of the God who takes the direction as the chief fact rather than the length of the stride or the rate of the movement. Every man is expected to do his best. If he stumbles he is supposed to find his way to his feet; if he is moving slowly, he must attempt to move faster; if he is moving at a slower rate than he can attain, he must strive after the higher rate, but always the dynamic force is the revelation of the holy love of God.

The Scriptures honor the prophets in whatever land or time they appear. The Scriptures welcome goodness under any and all circumstances. They have a place for a "light that lighteneth every man that cometh into the world," but they still make it clear that the chief force in the redemption of men is the revelation of holy love in Jesus Christ. The redemption, we repeat, is never conceived of in artificial or mechanical terms. If any man hath not the spirit of Christ he does not belong to Christ (Ro 8:9). The aim of redemption is to beget this spirit, and this spirit is life.

LITERATURE.

H. C. Sheldon, Systematic Theology; Clarke, Outline of Christian Theology; Brown, Christian Theology in Outline; Mackintosh, Doctrine of Person of Christ; Bowne, Studies in Christianity; Tymms, The Christian Atonement.

Francis J. McConnell

REDNESS OF EYES

red’-nes.

See DRUNKENNESS, II.

REDOUND

re-dound’ (from re-," back," and undare, "to surge as a wave"): To be sent back as a reaction, to overflow; occurs only as the translation of perisseuo, "to be over and above," "to superabound" (frequent in the New Testament); in 2Co 4:15, "might through the thanksgiving of many redound to the glory of God," the Revised Version (British and American) "may cause the thanksgiving to abound."

REED

red:

(1) achu, translated "reed-grass" (Ge 41:2,18; Job 8:11 margin). See FLAG.

(2) ‘ebheh, translated "swift," margin "reed" (Job 9:26). The "ships of reed" are the light skiffs made of plaited reeds used on the Nile; compare "vessels of papyrus" (Isa 18:2).

(3) ‘aghammim, translated "reeds," margin "marshes," Hebrew "pools" (Jer 51:32); elsewhere "pools" (Ex 7:19; 8:5; Isa 14:23, etc.). See POOL.

(4) ‘aroth; achi, translated "meadows," the King James Version "paper reeds" (Isa 19:7). See MEADOW.

(5) qaneh; kalamos (the English "cane" comes from Hebrew via Latin and Greek canna), "stalk" (Ge 41:5,22); "shaft" (Ex 37:17, etc.); "reed," or "reeds" (1Ki 14:15; 2Ki 18:21; Isa 36:6; 42:3; Ps 68:30, the King James Version "spearman"); "calamus" (Ex 30:23; So 4:14; Eze 27:19); "sweet cane," margin "calamus" (Isa 43:24; Jer 6:20); "bone" (Job 31:22); used of the cross-beam of a "balance" (Isa 46:6); "a measuring reed" (Eze 40:3); "a staff of reed," i.e. a walking-stick (Isa 36:6; Eze 29:6); the "branches" of a candlestick (Ex 37:18).

(6) kalamos, "a reed shaken with the wind" (Mt 11:7; Lu 7:24); "a bruised reed" (Mt 12:20); they put "a reed in his right hand" (Mt 27:29,30); "They smote his head with a reed" (Mr 15:19); "put it on a reed" (Mt 27:48; Mr 15:36); "a measuring reed" (Re 11:1; 21:15,16); "a pen" (3 Joh 1:13).

It is clear that qaneh and its Greek equivalent kalamos mean many things. Some refer to different uses to which a reed is put, e.g. a cross-beam of a balance, a walking-stick, a measuring rod, and a pen (see above), but apart from this qaneh is a word used for at least two essentially different things:

(1) an ordinary reed, and

(2) some sweet-smelling substance.

(1) The most common reed in Palestine is the Arundo donax (Natural Order Gramineae), known in Arabic as qacabfarasi, "Persian reed." It grows in immense quantities in the Jordan valley along the river and its tributaries and at the oases near the Dead Sea, notably around ‘Ain Feshkhah at the northwest corner. It is a lofty reed, often 20 ft. high, of a beautiful fresh green in summer when all else is dead and dry, and of a fine appearance from a distance in the spring months when it is in full bloom and the beautiful silky panicles crown the top of every reed. The "covert of the reed" (Job 40:21) shelters a large amount of animal and bird life. This reed will answer to almost all the requirements of the above references.

(2) Qaneh is in Jer 6:20 qualified qaneh ha-Tobh, "sweet" or "pleasant cane," and in Ex 30:23, qeneh bhosem, "sweet calamus," or, better, a "cane of fragrance." So 4:14; Isa 43:24; Eze 27:19 all apparently refer to the same thing, though in these passages the qaneh is unqualified. It was an ingredient of the

holy oil (Ex 30:23); it was imported from a distance (Jer 6:20; Eze 27:19), and it was rare and costly (Isa 43:24). It may have been the "scented calamus" (Axorus calamus) of Pliny (NH, xii.48), or some other aromatic scented reed or flag, or, as some think, some kind of aromatic bark. The sweetness refers to the scent, not the taste.

See also BULRUSH; PAPYRUS.

E. W. G. Masterman

REED, MEASURING

mezh'-ur-ing (qeneh ha-middah): In Ezekiel's vision of the temple a "man" (an angel) appears with a "measuring reed" to measure the dimensions of the temple (Eze 40:3 ff; 42:16). The reed is described as 6 cubits long, "of a cubit and a handbreadth each," i.e. the cubit used was a handbreadth longer than the common cubit (see CUBIT; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES; TEMPLE). In the Apocalypse this idea of a measuring reed reappears for measuring the temple (Re 11:1) and the holy city (Re 21:15,16, "a golden reed"). The thought conveyed is exactitude in the dimensions of these edifices, symbolic of the symmetry and perfection of God's church.

James Orr

REED-GRASS

(Ge 41:2,18; Job 8:11 margin).

See FLAG, (2); REED, (1).

REELAIAH

re-el-a'-ya, re-el-i'-a (re'elyah): One of the 12 chiefs who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2 parallel Ne 7:7). In the passage in Ne the name is Raamiah" (ra'amyah), and in 1 Esdras 5:8 "Resaias." Which is the original, it is almost impossible to decide; "Reelaiah" seems preferable.

REELIAS

re-el'-i-as (Codex Alexandrinus Rheelias (Fritzschel); Codex Vaticanus followed by Swete, Boroleias; the King James Version Reelius): One of the "leaders" with Zerubbabel in the return from exile (1 Esdras 5:8, margin "Reelaiah"). It occupies the place of "Bigvai" in Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7, but in form it must be the equivalent of "Reelaiah" of Ezr and "Raamiah" of Nehemiah. It is perhaps a duplicate of "Resaias."

REESAIAS

re-e-sa’-yas, re-e-si’-as: the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American) RESAIAS (which see).

REFINER; REFINING

re-fin’-er, re-fin’-ing: Two Hebrew words have been translated "refine": (1) tsaraph, literally, to "fuse" (Zec 13:9; Isa 48:10; Mal 3:2,3, etc.). The same word is rendered also "tried" (Ps 66:10); "melt" (Jer 6:29 the King James Version); "purge" (Isa 1:25). (2) zaqaq, literally, to "strain" or "sift." In the case of silver and gold the term probably referred to some washing process in connection with refining, as in Mal 3:3 both tsaraph and zaqaq are used (1Ch 28:18; 29:4; Job 28:1). The same word in Isa 25:6 referred to the straining of wine. Greek puroo, in the passive, literally, "to be ignited," is translated "refined," in Re 1:15; 3:18.

The ancient process of refining gold has already been described under METALLURGY (which see). Most of the Bible references are to the refining of silver (Pr 25:4; Zec 13:9; Isa 48:10). The silver used by the ancients was probably obtained by smelting lead sulfide ore, rich in silver (argentiferous galena). After the ore had been reduced to a metallic condition, the lead was separated from the silver by blowing hot air over the surface of the melted metal. The lead was thus changed to lead oxide which, in a powdered condition, was driven away by the air blast. The resulting lead oxide, called in the Bible silver dross, was used for glazing pottery (Pr 26:23), a use to which it is still put by Syrian potters. The description of refining in Eze 22:18-22 may indicate that a flux (compare "as with lye," Isa 1:25 the American Revised Version margin) was sometimes added to the melted metal to dissolve the oxides of copper, lead, tin and iron as they formed, thus leaving the silver pure. Crude processes similar to those described above are used in the Taurus Mountains today.

Figurative:

In the various Bible references the refining of precious metals is used figuratively to illustrate the kind of trial God’s children are called upon to go through. If they are of the right metal the dross will finally be blown away, leaving pure, clear, shining silver. If of base metal they will be like the dross described in Jer 6:29,30. The refiner may blow fiercely, but in vain, for nothing but lead dross appears.

James A. Patch

REFORM

re-form’ (yacar): The word in the Revised Version (British and American) is found only in Le 26:23, in the phrase "ye will not be reformed." The meaning is, "to be instructed," or, more fully, "to let one’s self be chastened," i.e. by God’s discipline to learn the lessons of this chastening.

The Hebrew word is the same in a similar connection in Jer 6:8, where it is rendered, "Be thou instructed," and in Jer 31:18, "I was chastised." Ps 2:10 ("instructed"); Pr 29:19 ("corrected") use the Hebrew term of admonition by the words of man.

The King James Version also has "reform" in 2 Esdras 8:12; The Wisdom of Solomon 9:18.

REFORMATION

ref-or-ma'-shun: The word is found only in Heb 9:10, being the translation of diorthosis, in its only occurrence. This Greek word means etymologically "making straight," and was used of restoring to the normally straight condition that which is crooked or bent. In this passage it means the rectification of conditions, setting things to rights, and is a description of the Messianic time.

REFRESH; REFRESHING

re-fresh', re-fresh'-ing: "Refresh" occurs a few times in the Old Testament as the translation of naphash, "to take breath," figurative "to be refreshed" (Ex 23:12; 31:17; 2Sa 16:14); of rawach, "to have room (1Sa 16:23; Job 32:20, margin "find relief," the King James Version margin "may breathe"); of ca'adh, "to support" (1Ki 13:7); and in the New Testament as the translation of anapauo, "to give rest" (1Co 16:18; 2Co 7:13; Phm 1:7,20; in compound middle, Ro 15:32 the King James Version); also of anapsucho, "to invigorate," "revive" (2Ti 1:16), and other words. "Refreshing" is in Isa 28:12 marge'ah, "rest" or "quiet"; and in Ac 3:19, anapsuxis, "seasons of refreshing," through the coming of Jesus, the Christ; compare 2 Esdras 11:46 and the King James Version, Sirach 43:22 hilaroo).

W. L. Walker

REFUGE

ref'-uj: A place of resort and safety. The principal words in the Old Testament are machceh (Ps 14:6; 46:1; 62:7,8; Isa 4:6, etc.), and manoc (2Sa 22:3; Ps 59:16, etc.), both applied chiefly to God as a "refuge" for His people. For the King James Version "refuge" in De 33:27, the Revised Version (British and American) has "dwelling-place," and in Ps 9:9, "high tower." Conversely, the Revised Version (British and American) has "refuge" for the King James Version "shelter" in Ps 61:3, and "hope" in Jer 17:17.

REFUGE, CITIES OF

'are ha-miqlaT; poleis ton phugadeuterion (compare 1 Macc 10:28), and other forms):

1. Location:

Six cities, three on each side of the Jordan, were set apart and placed in the hands of the Levites, to serve as places of asylum for such as might shed blood unwittingly. On the East of the Jordan they were Bezer in the lot of Reuben, Ramoth-gilead in the tribe of Gad, and Golan in the territory of Manasseh. On the West of the Jordan they were Hebron in Judah, Shechem in Mt. Ephraim, and Kedesh in Naphtali (Nu 35:6,14; Jos 20:2,7 ff; 21:13,21,27,32,38; Bezer is named in Jos 21:36, but not described as a City of Refuge). An account of these cities is given in separate articles under their names. De 19:2 speaks of three cities thus to be set apart, referring apparently to the land West of the Jordan.

2. Purpose:

From time immemorial in the East, if a man were slain the duty of avenging him has lain as a sacred obligation upon his nearest relative. In districts where more primitive conditions prevail, even to this day, the distinction between intentional and unintentional killing is not too strictly observed, and men are often done to death in revenge for what was the purest accident. To prevent such a thing where possible, and to provide for a right administration of justice, these cities were instituted. Open highways were to be maintained along, which the manslayer might have an unobstructed course to the city gate.

3. Regulations:

The regulations concerning the Cities of Refuge are found in Nu 35; De 19:1-13; Jos 20. Briefly, everything was to be done to facilitate the flight of the manslayer, lest the avenger of blood, i.e. the nearest of kin, should pursue him with hot heart, and, overtaking him, should smite him mortally. Upon reaching the city he was to be received by the elders and his case heard. If this was satisfactory, they gave him asylum until a regular trial could be carried out. They took him, apparently, to the city or district from which he had fled, and there, among those who knew him, witnesses were examined. If it were proved that he was not a willful slayer, that he had no grudge against the person killed, and had shown no sign of purpose to injure him, then he was declared innocent and conducted back to the city in which he had taken refuge, where he must stay until the death of the high priest. Then he was free to return home in safety. Until that event he must on no account go beyond the city boundaries. If he did, the avenger of blood might slay him without blame. On the other hand, if he were found guilty of deliberate murder, there was no more protection for him. He was handed over to the avenger of blood who, with his own hand, took the murderer’s life. Blood-money, i.e. money paid in compensation for the murder, in settlement of the avenger’s claim, was in no circumstances permitted; nor could the refugee be ransomed, so that he might "come again to dwell in the land" until the death of the high priest (Nu 35:32).

A similar right of refuge seems to have been recognized in Israel as attaching to the altar in the temple at Jerusalem (1Ki 1:50; 2:28; compare Ex 21:12 f). This may be compared with the right of asylum connected with the temples of the heathen.

W. Ewing

REFUSE

re-fuz’:Formerly used with the additional meaning "reject," and hence, the change from the King James Version to the Revised Version (British and American) in 1Sa 16:7; Eze 5:6; 1Ti 4:4; 1Pe 2:7, etc.

REFUTE

re-fut’:Only in Jude 1:22, the American Revised Version margin "And some refute while they dispute with you," where the Revised Version (British and American) in the text reads "And on some have mercy, who are in doubt."

The Greek text of Jude 1:22,23 is very uncertain, being given very differently in the various manuscripts. the Revised Version (British and American) text follows the two oldest manuscripts, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus. Instead of eleate, "have mercy," the reading elegchete, "refute," "convict," has the powerful support of Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Ephraemi, the best cursives, Vulgate, Memphitic, Armenian and Ethiopian versions, and is placed in the text by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles (Westcott-Hort in list of "Suspected Readings" says: "Some primitive error probable: perhaps the first eleate an interpolation"). Compare Jude 1:15, where the same Greek word occurs in the same sense (the King James Version "convince," the Revised Version (British and American) "convict"); compare also 1Ti 5:20; Tit 1:9, where the same idea of refuting the sinful occurs.

D. Miall Edwards

REGEM

re’-gem (reghem, "friend" (?)): A Calebite, the son of Jahdai (1Ch 2:47), mentioned as the eponym of a Calebite family or clan.

REGEM-MELECH

re’-gem-me’-lek, re’-gem-mel’-ek (reghem melekh): One of a deputation sent to inquire concerning the propriety of continuing the commemoration of the destruction of the temple by holding a fast (Zec 7:2). The text of the passage is in disorder. The name may mean "friend of the king"; hence, some have sought to remove the difficulty by interpreting reghem melekh as a title, not a personal name, reading the clause, "They of Beth-el had sent SHAREZER (q.v. (2)), the friend of the king."

REGENERATION

re-jen-er-a’-shun, re-:

I. THE TERM EXPLAINED

1. First Biblical Sense (Eschatological)

2. Second Biblical Sense (Spiritual)

II. THE BIBLICAL DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the Teaching of Jesus

3. In Apostolic Teaching

III. LATER DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

IV. PRESENT SIGNIFICANCE

LITERATURE

I. The Term Explained.

The theological term "regeneration" is the Latin translation of the Greek expression palingenesia, occurring twice in the New Testament (Mt 19:28; Tit 3:5). The word is usually written paliggenesia, in classical Greek. Its meaning is different in the two passages, though an easy transition of thought is evident.

1. First Biblical Sense (Eschatological):

In Mt 19:28 the word refers to the restoration of the world, in which sense it is synonymical to the expressions apokatastasis panton, "restoration of all things" (Ac 3:21; the verb is found in Mt 17:11, apokatastsei panta, "shall restore all things"), and anapsuxis, "refreshing" (Ac 3:19), which signifies a gradual transition of meaning to the second sense of the word under consideration. It is supposed that regeneration in this sense denotes the final stage of development of all creation, by which God’s purposes regarding the same are fully realized, when "all things (are put) in subjection under his feet" (1Co 15:27). This is a "regeneration in the proper meaning of the word, for it signifies a renovation of all visible things when the old is passed away, and heaven and earth are become new" (compare Re 21:1). To the Jew the regeneration thus prophesied was inseparably connected with the reign of the Messiah.

We find this word in the same or very similar senses in profane literature. It is used of the renewal of the world in Stoical philosophy. Josephus (Ant., XI, iii, 9) speaks of the anaktesis kai paliggenesia tes

patridos, "a new foundation and regeneration of the fatherland," after the return from the Babylonian captivity. Philo (ed. Mangey, ii.144) uses the word, speaking of the post-diluvial epoch of the earth, as of a new world, and Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (xi.1), of a periodical restoration of all things, laying stress upon the constant recurrence and uniformity of all happenings, which thought the Preacher expressed by "There is no new thing under the sun" (Ec 1:9). In most places, however, where the word occurs in philosophical writings, it is used of the "reincarnation" or "subsequent birth" of the individual, as in the Buddhistic and Pythagorean doctrine of the transmigration of souls (Plut., edition Xylander, ii.998c; Clement of Alexandria, edition Potter, 539) or else of a revival of life (Philo i.159). Cicero uses the word in his letters to Atticus (vi.6) metaphorically of his return from exile, as a new lease of life granted to him.

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, IX.

2. Second Biblical Sense (Spiritual):

This sense is undoubtedly included in the full Biblical conception of the former meaning, for it is unthinkable that a regeneration in the eschatological sense can exist without a spiritual regeneration of humanity or the individual. It is, however, quite evident that this latter conception has arisen rather late, from an analysis of the former meaning. It is found in Tit 3:5 which, without absolute certainty as to its meaning, is generally interpreted in agreement with the numerous nouns and verbs which have given the dogmatical setting to the doctrine of regeneration in Christian theology. Clement of Alexandria is the first to differentiate this meaning from the former by the addition of the adjective pneumatike, "spiritual" (compare anapsuxis, Ac 3:20; see REFRESHING). In this latter sense the word is typically Christian, though the Old Testament contains many adumbrations of the spiritual process expressed thereby.

II. The Biblical Doctrine of Regeneration.

1. In the Old Testament:

It is well known that in the earlier portions of the Old Testament, and to a certain degree all through the Old Testament, religion is looked at and spoken of more as a national possession, the benefits of which are largely visible and tangible blessings. The idea of regeneration here occurs therefore—though no technical expression has as yet been coined for the process—in the first meaning of the word elucidated above. Whether the divine promises refer to the Messianic end of times, or are to be realized at an earlier date, they all refer to the nation of Israel as such, and to individuals only as far as they are partakers in the benefits bestowed upon the commonwealth. This is even true where the blessings prophesied are only spiritual, as in Isa 60:21,22. The mass of the people of Israel are therefore as yet scarcely aware of the fact that the conditions on which these divine promises are to be attained are more than ceremonial and ritual ones. Soon, however, great disasters, threatening to overthrow the national entity, and finally the captivity and dispersion which caused national functions to be almost, if not altogether, discontinued, assisted in the growth of a sense of individual or personal responsibility before God. The sin of Israel is

recognized as the sin of the individual, which can be removed only by individual repentance and cleansing. This is best seen from the stirring appeals of the prophets of the exile, where frequently the necessity of a change of attitude toward Yahweh is preached as a means to such regeneration. This cannot be understood otherwise than as a turning of the individual to the Lord. Here, too, no ceremony or sacrifice is sufficient, but an interposition of divine grace, which is represented under the figure of a washing and sprinkling from all iniquity and sin (Isa 1:18; Jer 13:23). It is not possible now to follow in full the development of this idea of cleansing, but already in Isa 52:15 the sprinkling of many nations is mentioned and is soon understood in the sense of the "baptism" which proselytes had to undergo before their reception into the covenant of Israel. It was the symbol of a radical cleansing like that of a "new-born babe," which was one of the designations of the proselyte (compare Ps 87:5; see also the tractate Yebhamoth 62a). Would it be surprising that Israel, which had been guilty of many sins of the Gentiles, needed a similar baptism and sprinkling? This is what Eze 36:25 suggests: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." In other passages the cleansing and refining power of fire is alluded to (e.g. Mal 3:2), and there is no doubt that John the Baptist found in such passages the ground for his practice of baptizing the Jews who came to him (Joh 1:25-28 and parallel’s).

The turning of Israel to God was necessarily meant to be an inward change of attitude toward Him, in other words, the sprinkling with clean water, as an outward sign, was the emblem of a pure heart. It was Isaiah and Jeremiah who drew attention to this (Isa 57:15; Jer 24:7; 31:33-35; 32:38-40, et passim). Here again reference is made to individuals, not only to the people in general (Jer 31:34). This promised regeneration, so lovingly offered by Yahweh, is to be the token of a new covenant between God and His people (Jer 31:31; Eze 11:19-21; 18:31,32; 37:23,24).

The renewing and cleansing here spoken of is in reality nothing else than what De 30:6 had promised, a circumcision of the heart in contradistinction to the flesh, the token of the former (Abrahamic) covenant (of circumcision, Jer 4:4). As God takes the initiative in making the covenant, the conviction takes root that human sin and depravity can be effectually eliminated only by the act of God Himself renewing and transforming the heart of man (Ho 14:4). This we see from the testimony of some of Israel’s best sons and daughters, who also knew that this grace was found in the way of repentance and humiliation before God. The classical expression of this conviction is found in the prayer of David: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right (margin "stedfast") spirit within me. Cast me not away from thy presence; and take not thy holy Spirit from me. Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation; and uphold me with a willing spirit" (Ps 51:10-12). Jeremiah puts the following words into the mouth of Ephraim: "Turn thou me, and I shall be turned" (Jer 31:18). Clearer than any passages of the Old Testament, John the Baptist, forerunner of Christ and last flaming torch of the time of the earlier covenant, spoke of the baptism, not of water, but of the Holy Spirit and of fire (Mt 3:11; Lu 3:16; Joh 1:33), leading thus to the realization of Old Testament foreshadowings which became possible by faith in Christ.

2. In the Teaching of Jesus:

In the teaching of Jesus the need of regeneration has a prominent place, though nowhere are the reasons given. The Old Testament had succeeded—and even the Gentile conscience agreed with it—in

convincing the people of this need. The clearest assertion of it and the explanation of the doctrine of regeneration is found in the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus (Joh 3). It is based upon

(1) the observation that man, even the most punctilious in the observance of the Law, is dead and therefore unable to "live up" to the demands of God. Only He who gave life at the beginning can give the (spiritual) life necessary to do God's will.

(2) Man has fallen from his virginal and divinely-appointed sphere, the realm of the spirit, the Kingdom of God, living now the perishing earthly life. Only by having a new spiritual nature imparted to him, by being "born anew" (Joh 3:3, the Revised Version margin "from above," Greek anothen), by being "born of the Spirit" (Joh 3:6,8), can he live the spiritual life which God requires of man.

These words are a New Testament exegesis of Ezekiel's vision of the dead bones (Eze 37:1-10). It is the "breath from Yahweh," the Spirit of God, who alone can give life to the spiritually dead.

But regeneration, according to Jesus, is more than life, it is also purity. As God is pure and sinless, none but the pure in heart can see God (Mt 5:8). This was always recognized as impossible to mere human endeavor. Bildad the Shuhite declared, and his friends, each in his turn, expressed very similar thoughts (Job 4:17; 14:4): "How then can man be just with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman? Behold, even the moon hath no brightness, and the stars are not pure in his sight: how much less man, that is a worm! and the son of man, that is a worm!" (Job 25:4-6).

To change this lost condition, to impart this new life, Jesus claims as His God-appointed task: "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Lu 19:10); "I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly" (Joh 10:10). This life is eternal, imperishable: "I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand" (Joh 10:28). This life is imparted by Jesus Himself: "It is the spirit that giveth life; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life" (Joh 6:63). This life can be received on the condition of faith in Christ or by coming to Him (Joh 14:6). By faith power is received which enables the sinner to overcome sin, to "sin no more" (Joh 8:11).

The parables of Jesus further illustrate this doctrine. The prodigal is declared to have been "dead" and to be "alive again" (Lu 15:24). The new life from God is compared to a wedding garment in the parable of the Marriage of the King's Son (Mt 22:11). The garment, the gift of the inviting king, had been refused by the unhappy guest, who, in consequence, was 'cast out into the outer darkness' (Mt 22:13).

Finally, this regeneration, this new life, is explained as the knowledge of God and His Christ: "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ" (Joh 17:3). This seems to be an allusion to the passage in Hosea (4:6): "My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me."

3. In Apostolic Teaching:

It may be said in general that the teaching of the apostles on the subject of regeneration is a development of the teaching of Jesus on the lines of the adumbrations of the Old Testament. Considering the differences in the personal character of these writers, it is remarkable that such concord of views should exist among them. Paul, indeed, lays more stress on the specific facts of justification and sanctification by faith than on the more comprehensive head of regeneration. Still the need of it is plainly stated by Paul. It is necessary to salvation for all men. "The body is dead because of sin" (Ro 8:3-11; Eph 2:1). The flesh is at enmity with God (Eph 2:15); all mankind is "darkened in their understanding, alienated from the life of God" (Eph 4:18). Similar passages might be multiplied. Paul then distinctly teaches that thus is a new life in store for those who have been spiritually dead. To the Ephesians he writes: "And you did he make alive, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins" (2:1), and later on: "God, being rich in mercy, ... made us alive together with Christ" (2:4,5). A spiritual resurrection has taken place. This regeneration causes a complete revolution in man. He has thereby passed from under the law of sin and death and has come under "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" (Ro 8:2). The change is so radical that it is possible now to speak of a "new creature" (2Co 5:17; Ga 6:15, margin "new creation"), of a "new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth" (Eph 4:24), and of "the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him" (Col 3:10). All "old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2Co 5:17).

Paul is equally explicit regarding the author of this change. The "Spirit of God," the "Spirit of Christ" has been given from above to be the source of all new life (Ro 8); by Him we are proved to be the "sons" of God (Ga 4:6); we have been adopted into the family of God (huiothesia, Ro 8:15; Ga 4:5). Thus Paul speaks of the "second Adam," by whom the life of righteousness is initiated in us; just as the "first Adam" became the leader in transgression, He is "a life-giving spirit" (1Co 15:45). Paul himself experienced this change, and henceforth exhibited the powers of the unseen world in his life of service. "It is no longer I that live," he exclaims, "but Christ liveth in me: and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me" (Ga 2:20).

Regeneration is to Paul, no less than to Jesus, connected with the conception of purity and knowledge. We have already noted the second New Testament passage in which the word "regeneration" occurs (Tit 3:5): "According to his mercy he saved us, through the washing (margin "laver") of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour." In 1Co 12:13 such cleansing is called the baptism of the Spirit in agreement with the oft-repeated promise (Joe 2:28 (in the Hebrew text 3:1); Mt 3:11; Mr 1:8; Lu 3:16; Ac 1:5; 11:16). There is, of course, in these passages no reference to mere water baptism, any more than in Eze 36:25. Water is but the tertium comparationis. As water cleanseth the outer body, so the spirit purifies the inner man (compare 1Co 6:11; 1Pe 3:21).

The doctrine that regeneration redounds in true knowledge of Christ is seen from Eph 3:15-19 and 4:17-24, where the darkened understanding and ignorance of natural man are placed in contradistinction to the enlightenment of the new life (see also Col 3:10). The church redeemed and regenerated is to be a

special "possession," an "heritage" of the Lord (Eph 1:11,14), and the whole creation is to participate in the final redemption and adoption (Ro 8:21-23).

James finds less occasion to touch this subject than the other writers of the New Testament. His Epistle is rather ethical than dogmatical in tone, still his ethics are based on the dogmatical presuppositions which fully agree with the teaching of other apostles. Faith to him is the human response to God's desire to impart His nature to mankind, and therefore the indispensable means to be employed in securing the full benefits of the new life, i.e. the sin-conquering power (1:2-4), the spiritual enlightenment (1:5) and purity (1:27). There seems, however, to be little doubt that James directly refers to regeneration in the words: "Of his own will he brought us forth by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of firstfruits of his creatures" (1:18). It is supposed by some that these words, being addressed "to the twelve tribes which are of the Dispersion" (1:1), do not refer to individual regeneration, but to an election of Israel as a nation and so to a Christian Israel. In this case the aftermath would be the redemption of the Gentiles. I understand the expression "first-fruits" in the sense in which we have noticed Paul's final hope in Ro 8:21-32, where the regeneration of the believing people of God (regardless of nationality) is the first stage in the regeneration or restoration of all creation. The "implanted (the Revised Version margin "inborn") word" (Jas 1:21; compare 1Pe 1:23) stands parallel to the Pauline expression, "law of the Spirit" (Ro 8:2).

Peter uses, in his sermon on the day of Pentecost, the words "refreshing" (Ac 3:19) and "restoration of all things" (Ac 3:21) of the final completion of God's plans concerning the whole creation, and accordingly looks here at God's people as a whole. In a similar sense he says in his Second Epistle, after mentioning "the day of God": "We look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness" (2Pe 3:13). Still he alludes very plainly to the regeneration of individuals (1Pe 1:3,13). The idea of a second birth of the believers is clearly suggested in the expression, "newborn babes" (1Pe 2:2), and in the explicit statement of 1Pe 1:23: "having been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God, which liveth and abideth." It is in this sense that the apostle calls God "Father" (1Pe 1:17) and the believers "children of obedience" (1Pe 1:14), i.e. obedient children, or children who ought to obey. We have seen above that the agent by which regeneration is wrought, the incorruptible seed of the word of God, finds a parallel in Paul's and James's theology. All these expressions go back probably to a word of the Master in Joh 15:3. We are made partakers of the word by having received the spirit. This spirit (compare the Pauline "lifegiving spirit," 1Co 15:45), the "mind" of Christ (1Pe 4:1), is the power of the resurrected Christ active in the life of the believer. Peter refers to the same thought in 1Pe 3:15,21. By regeneration we become "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" in whom divine virtues, "the excellencies of him who called you" (1Pe 2:9), are manifested. Here the apostle uses well-known Old Testament expressions foreshadowing New Testament graces (Isa 61:6; 66:21; Ex 19:6; De 7:6), but he individualizes the process of regeneration in full agreement with the increased light which the teaching of Jesus has brought. The theology of Peter also points out the contact of regeneration with purity and holiness (1Pe 1:15,16) and true knowledge (1Pe 1:14) or obedience (1Pe 1:14; 3:16). It is not surprising that the idea of purity should invite the Old Testament parallel of "cleansing by water." The flood washed away the iniquity of the world "in the days of Noah," when "eight souls were saved through water: which also after a true likeness (the Revised Version margin "in the antitype") doth now save you, even baptism,

not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation (the Revised Version margin "inquiry," "appeal") of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection (-life) of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 3:20,21).

The teaching of John is very closely allied with that of Jesus, as we have already seen from the multitude of quotations we had to select from John's Gospel to illustrate the teaching of the Master. It is especially interesting to note the cases where the apostle didactically elucidates certain of these pronouncements of Jesus. The most remarkable apostolic gloss or commentary on the subject is found in Joh 7:39. Jesus had spoken of the change which faith in Him ("coming to him") would cause in the lives of His disciples; how divine energies like "rivers of water" should issue forth from them; and the evangelist continues in explanation: "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified." This recognition of a special manifestation of divine power, transcending the experience of Old Testament believers, was based on the declaration of Christ, that He would send "another Comforter (the Revised Version (British and American) "advocate," "helper," Greek Parakletos), that he may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth" (Joh 14:16,17).

In his Epistles, John shows that this Spirit bestows the elements of a Godlike character which makes us to be "sons of God," who before were "children of the devil" (1 Joh 3:10,24; 4:13, etc.). This regeneration is "eternal life" (1 Joh 5:13) and moral similarity with God, the very character of God in man. As "God is love," the children of God will love (1 Joh 5:2). At the same time it is the life of God in man, also called fellowship with Christ, victorious life which overcomes the world (1 Joh 5:4); it is purity (1 Joh 3:3-6) and knowledge (1 Joh 2:20).

The subject of regeneration lies outside of the scope of the Epistle to the Hebrews, so that we look in vain for a clear dogmatical statement of it. Still the epistle does in no place contradict the dogma, which, on the other hand, underlies many of the statements made. Christ, "the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises" (8:6), has made "purification of sins" (1:3). In contradistinction to the first covenant, in which the people approached God by means of outward forms and ordinances, the "new covenant" (8:13) brought an "eternal redemption" (9:12) by means of a divine cleansing (9:14). Christ brings "many sons unto glory" and is "author of their salvation" (2:10). Immature Christians are spoken of (as were the proselytes of the Old Testament) as babies, who were to grow to the stature, character and knowledge of "full-grown men" (5:13,14).

III. Later Development of the Doctrine.

Very soon the high spiritual meaning of regeneration was obscured by the development of priestcraft within the Christian church. When the initiation into the church was thought of as accomplished by the mediation of ministers thereto appointed, the ceremonies hereby employed became means to which magic powers were of necessity ascribed. This we see plainly in the view of baptismal regeneration, which, based upon half-understood passages of Scripture quoted above, was taught at an early date. While in the post-apostolic days we frequently find traces of a proper appreciation of an underlying

spiritual value in baptism (compare Didache vii) many of the expressions used are highly misleading. Thus Gregory Nazianzen (Orations, xi.2) calls baptism the second of the three births a child of God must experience (the first is the natural birth, the third the resurrection). This birth is "of the day, free, delivering from passions, taking away every veil of our nature or birth, i.e. everything hiding the divine image in which we are created, and leading up to the life above" (Ullmann, Gregor v. Nazienz, 323). Cyril of Jerusalem (Cat., xvii, c. 37) ascribes to baptism the power of absolution from sin and the power of endowment with heavenly virtues. According to Augustine baptism is essential to salvation, though the baptism of blood (martyrdom) may take the place of water baptism, as in the case of the thief at the cross (Augustine, De Anima et Eius Origine, i.11, c. 9; ii.14, c. 10; ii.16, c. 12). Leo the Great compares the spirit-filled water of baptism with the spirit-filled womb of the virgin Mary, in which the Holy Spirit engenders a sinless child of God (Serm. xxiv.3; xxv.5; see Hagenbach, Dogmengeschichte, section 137).

In general this is still the opinion of pronounced sacrmentarians, while evangelical Christianity has gone back to the teaching of the New Testament.

IV. Present Significance.

Although a clear distinction is not always maintained between regeneration and other experiences of the spiritual life, we may summarize our belief in the following theses:

(1) Regeneration implies not merely an addition of certain gifts or graces, a strengthening of certain innate good qualities, but a radical change, which revolutionizes our whole being, contradicts and overcomes our old fallen nature, and places our spiritual center of gravity wholly outside of our own powers in the realm of God’s causation.

(2) It is the will of God that all men be made partakers of this new life (1Ti 2:4) and, as it is clearly stated that some fall short of it (Joh 5:40), it is plain that the fault thereof lies with man. God requires all men to repent and turn unto Him (Ac 17:30) before He will or can effect regeneration. Conversion, consisting in repentance and faith in Christ, is therefore the human response to the offer of salvation which God makes. This response gives occasion to and is synchronous with the divine act of renewal (regeneration). The Spirit of God enters into union with the believing, accepting spirit of man. This is fellowship with Christ (Ro 8:10; 1Co 6:17; 2Co 5:17; Col 3:3).

(3) The process of regeneration is outside of our observation and beyond the scope of psychological analysis. It takes place in the sphere of subconsciousness. Recent psychological investigations have thrown a flood of light on the psychic states which precede, accompany and follow the work of the Holy Spirit. "He handles psychical powers; He works upon psychical energies and states; and this work of regeneration lies somewhere within the psychical field." The study of religious psychology is of highest value and greatest importance. The facts of Christian experience cannot be changed, nor do they lose in value by the most searching psychological scrutiny.

Psychological analysis does not eliminate the direct workings of the Holy Spirit. Nor can it disclose its

process; the "underlying laboratory where are wrought radical remedial processes and structural changes in the psychical being as portrayed in explicit scriptural utterances: ‘Create in me a clean heart’ (Ps 51:10); ‘Ye must be born again’ (Joh 3:7 the King James Version); ‘If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold all things are become new’ (2Co 5:17 the King James Version), is in the region of subconsciousness. To look in the region of consciousness for this Person or for His work is fruitless and an effort fraught with endless confusion. Christian psychology thus traces to its deep-lying retreat the divine elaboration of the regenerated life. Here God works in the depths of the soul as silently and securely as if on the remotest world of the stellar universe" (H. E. Warner, Psychology of the Christian Life, 117).

(4) Regeneration manifests itself in the conscious soul by its effects on the will, the intelligence and the affections. At the same time regeneration supplies a new life-power of divine origin, which enables the component parts of human nature to fulfill the law of God, to strive for the coming of God’s kingdom, and to accept the teachings of God’s spirit. Thus regenerate man is made conscious of the facts of justification and adoption. The former is a judicial act of God, which frees man from the law of sin and absolves him from the state of enmity against God; the latter an enduement with the Spirit, which is an earnest of his inheritance (Eph 1:14). The Spirit of God, dwelling in man, witnesses to the state of sonship (Ro 8:2,15,16; Ga 4:6).

(5) Regeneration, being a new birth, is the starting-point of spiritual growth. The regenerated man needs nurture and training. He receives it not merely from outside experiences, but from an immanent power in himself, which is recognized as the power of the life of the indwelling Christ (Col 1:26,27). Apart from the mediate dealings of God with man through word and sacraments, there is therefore an immediate communication of life from God to the regenerate.

(6) The truth which is mentioned as the agent by whom regeneration is made possible (Joh 8:32; Jas 1:18; 1Pe 1:23), is nothing else than the Divine Spirit, not only the spoken or written word of God, which may convince people of right or wrong, but which cannot enable the will of man to forsake the wrong and to do the right, but He who calls Himself the Truth (Joh 14:6) and who has become the motive power of regenerated life (Ga 2:20).

(7) Recent philosophy expressive of the reaction from the mechanical view of bare materialism, and also from the depreciation of personality as seen in socialism, has again brought into prominence the reality and need of personal life. Johannes Muller and Rudolf Eucken among others emphasize that a new life of the spirit, independent of outward conditions, is not only possible, but necessary for the attainment of the highest development. This new life is not a fruit of the free play of the tendencies and powers of natural life, but is in sharp conflict with them. Man as he is by nature stands in direct contrast to the demands of the spiritual life. Spiritual life, as Professor Eucken says, can be implanted in man by some superior power only and must constantly be sustained by superior life. It breaks through the order of causes and effects; it severs the continuity of the outer world; it makes impossible a rational joining together of realities; it prohibits a monastic view of the immediate condition of the world. This new life derives its power not from mere Nature; it is a manifestation of divine life within us (Hauptprobleme der Religionsphilosophie, Leipzig, 1912, 17 ff; Der Kampf um einen geistigen Lebensinhalt, Leipzig, 1907;

Grundlinien einer neuen Lebensanschauung, Leipzig, 1907; Johannes Muller, Bausteine fur personliche Kultur, 3 volumes, Munchen, 1908). Thus the latest development of idealistic philosophy corroborates in a remarkable way the Christian truth of regeneration.

See also CONVERSION.

LITERATURE

New Testament Theologies by Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Schlatter, Feine, Stevens, Sheldon, Weinel. Textbooks on Systematic Theology: articles "Bekehrung" by R. Seeberg; "Wiedergeburt" by O. Kirn in Hauck-Herzog RE3; "Regeneration" by J. V. Bartlett in HDB; "Conversion" by J. Strachan in ERE; George Jackson, The Fact of Conversion, London, 1908; Newton H. Marshall, Conversion; or, the New Birth, London, 1909; J. Herzog, Der Begriff der Bekehrung, Giessen, 1903; P. Feine, Bekehrung im New Testament und in der Gegenwart, Leipzig, 1908; P. Gennrich, Die Lehre yon der Wiedergeburt, Leipzig, 1907. Psychological: W. James, Varieties of Religious Experience, 189-258; G. Stanley Hall, Adolescence, II, 281-362; G. A. Coe, The Spiritual Life, New York, 1900; E. D. Starbuck, Psychology of Religion, New York, 1911; G. B. Cutten, Psychological Phenomena of Christianity, London, 1909; H. E. Warner, The Psychology of the Christian Life, New York, 1910; H. W. Clark, The Philosophy of Christian Experience, London, 1906; Harold Begbie, Broken Earthenware, or Twice-Born Men, London, 1909; M. Scott Fletcher, The Psychology of the New Testament, London, 1912.

John L. Nuelsen

REGENERATION, BAPTISMAL

See BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

REGION

re’-jun: A "district," as in modern English. The word "region" is used by English Versions of the Bible interchangeably with "country," "coasts," etc., for various Hebrew and Greek terms, but "region round about" is usually in the King James Version and invariably in the Revised Version (British and American) the translation of perichoros, "surrounding country." For a possible technical use of "region" in Ac 16:6 and the Revised Version (British and American) 18:23.

See GALATIA.

REGISTER

rej’-is-ter.

See GENEALOGY; QUIRINIUS.

REHABIAH

re-ha-bi’-a (rechabhyah, rechabhyahu, "Yah is wide"): Son of Eliezer, and grandson of Moses. Eponym of a Levitical family (1Ch 23:17; 24, 21; 26:25).

REHEARSE

re-hurs’ (sum, dabhar, naghadh, tanah; anaggello): Usually means simply "to relate," "to tell," "to declare" (Ex 17:14; Jud 5:11; 1Sa 8:21; 17:31; Ac 14:27); with "rehearse from the beginning" in Ac 11:4 for archomai, "begin" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). the Revised Version (British and American) has preserved uniformity by translating anaggello by "rehearse" also in Ac 15:4, and has introduced "rehearse" as the translation of exegeomai, throughout (Lu 24:35; Ac 10:8; 15:12,14; 21:19), except in Joh 1:18 ("declare"). Sirach 19:7, the King James Version has "rehearse" for deuteroo, "repeat" (so the Revised Version (British and American)).

REHOB

re’-hob (rechobh; Rhoob, Rhaab):

(1) Etymologically the word means "broad" and might be applied either to a road or a plain. Rehob is given (Nu 13:21) as the northern limit of Israel as reached by the spies. This agrees with the position assigned to Beth-rehob in the narrative of the settlement of the Danites (Jud 18:28). It is mentioned again along with the kingdom of Zobah in connection with the wars of Saul (1Sa 14:47 Septuagint Lag.), and as having been associated with, Zobah and Maacah against David in the Ammonite war and as having been defeated by him (2Sa 10:6). Robinson sought to identify it with Hunin, but it hardly suits the references. Buhl (GAP, 240) following Thomson (LB, II, 547) seeks it at Paneas (modern Banias). This would suit all the requirements of the capital, Beth-rehob, which might then be the second Rehob, assigned as part of the territory of Sidon to the tribe Asher (Jos 19:28,30; Jud 18:28). We must, however, assign to the kingdom of Rehob a territory extending from the settlements of the Danites to the "entering in of Hamath" or to Libo (modern Leboue), i.e. the Great Plain of Coele-Syria bounded by Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon and within the limits indicated.

(2) Two separate towns belonging to Asher (Jos 19:28; 19:30). One of them was given to the Gershonite Levites (Jos 21:31), and one is mentioned as remaining in the hands of the Canaanites (Jud 1:31).

(3) Father of Hadadezer, king of Aram Zobah, who was overwhelmed by David at the Euphrates (2Sa 8:3,12).

(4) One of the Levites who sealed Nehemiah’s covenant on the 24th Tishri, 444 BC (Ne 10:11).

W. M. Christie

REHOBOAM

re-ho-bo’-am (rechabh‘am, "the people is enlarged," or perhaps "Am is wide" Rhoboam; "Roboam," Mt 1:7 the King James Version):

1. The Disruption of the Kingdom

2. Underlying Causes of Disruption

3. Shemaiah Forbids Civil War

4. Rehoboam’s Prosperity

5. Shishak’s Invasion

6. His Death

The son and successor of Solomon, the last king to claim the throne of old Israel and the first king of Judah after the division of the kingdom. He was born circa 978 BC. His mother was Naamah, an Ammonitess. The account of his reign is contained in 1Ki 14:21-31; 2Ch 10-12. The incidents leading to the disruption of the kingdom are told in 1Ki 11:43-12:24; 2Ch 9:31-11:4.

1. The Disruption of the Kingdom:

Rehoboam was 41 years old (2Ch 12:13) when he began to reign Septuagint 1Ki 12:24 a says 16 years). He ascended the throne at Jerusalem immediately upon his father’s death with apparently no opposition. North Israel, however, was dissatisfied, and the people demanded that the king meet them in popular assembly at Shechem, the leading city of Northern Israel. True, Israel was no longer, if ever, an elective monarchy. Nevertheless, the people claimed a constitutional privilege, based perhaps on the transaction of Samuel in the election of Saul (1Sa 10:25), to be a party to the conditions under which they would serve a new king and he become their ruler: David, in making Solomon his successor, had ignored this wise provision, and the people, having lost such a privilege by default, naturally deemed their negligence the cause of Solomon’s burdensome taxes and forced labor. Consequently, they would be more jealous of their rights for the future, and Rehoboam accordingly would have to accede to their demand. Having come together at Shechem, the people agreed to accept Rehoboam as their king on condition that he would lighten the grievous service and burdensome taxes of his father. Rehoboam asked for three days’ time in which to consider the request. Against the advice of men of riper judgment, who assured him that he might win the people by becoming their servant, he chose the counsel of the younger men, who were of his own age, to rule by sternness rather than by kindness, and returned the people a rough answer, saying: "My father made your yoke heavy, but I will add to your yoke: my father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions" (1Ki 12:14). Rehoboam, however,

misjudged the temper of the people, as well as his own ability. The people, led by Jeroboam, a leader more able than himself, were ready for rebellion, and so force lost the day where kindness might have won. The threat of the king was met by the Marseillaise of the people: "What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: to your tents, O Israel: now see to thine own house, David" (1Ki 12:16). Thus the ten tribes dethroned Rehoboam, and elected Jeroboam, their champion and spokesman, their king (see JEROBOAM). Rehoboam, believing in his ability to carry out his threat (1Ki 12:14), sent Adoram, his taskmaster, who no doubt had quelled other disturbances, to subdue the populace, which, insulted by indignities and enraged by Rehoboam's renewed insolence, stoned his messenger to death. Realizing, for the first time, the seriousness of the revolt, Rehoboam fled ignominiously back to Jerusalem, king only of Judah and of the adjacent territory of the tribe of Benjamin. The mistake of Rehoboam, was the common mistake of despots. He presumed too much on privilege not earned by service, and on power for which he was not willing to render adequate compensation.

2. Underlying Causes of Disruption:

It is a mistake, however, to see in the disruption the shattering of a kingdom that had long been a harmonious whole. From the earliest times the confederation of tribes was imperfectly cemented. They seldom united against their common foe. No mention is made of Judah in the list of tribes who fought with Deborah against Sisera. A chain of cities held by the Canaanites, stretching across the country from East to West, kept the North and the South apart. Different physical characteristics produced different types of life in the two sections. Old jealousies repeatedly fanned into new flame intensified the divisions due to natural and artificial causes. David labored hard to break down the old antagonisms, but even in his reign Israel rebelled twice. Northern Israel had produced many of the strongest leaders of the nation, and it was not easy for them to submit to a ruler from the Judean dynasty. Solomon, following David's policy of unification, drew the tribes closely together through the centralization of worship at Jerusalem and through the general splendor of his reign, but he, more than any other, finally widened the gulf between the North and the South, through his unjust discriminations, his heavy taxes, his forced labor and the general extravagances of his reign. The religion of Yahweh was the only bond capable of holding the nation together. The apostasy of Solomon severed this bond. The prophets, with their profound knowledge of religious and political values, saw less danger to the true worship of Yahweh in a divided kingdom than in a united nation ruled over by Rehoboam, who had neither political sagacity nor an adequate conception of the greatness of the religion of Yahweh. Accordingly, Ahijah openly encouraged the revolution, while Shemaiah gave it passive support.

3. Shemaiah Forbids Civil War:

Immediately upon his return to Jerusalem, Rehoboam collected a large army of 180,000 men (reduced to 120,000 in the Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus), for the purpose of making war against Israel. The expedition, however, was forbidden by Shemaiah the prophet on the ground that they should not fight against their brethren, and that the division of the kingdom was from God. Notwithstanding the prohibition, we are informed that "there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam continually" (1Ki 14:30; 2Ch 12:15).

4. Rehoboam’s Prosperity:

Rehoboam next occupied himself in strengthening the territory which still remained to him by fortifying a number of cities (2Ch 11:5-12). These cities were on the roads to Egypt, or on the western hills of the Judean Shephelah, and were doubtless fortifled as a protection against Egypt. According to 2Ch 11:13-17, Rehoboam’s prosperity was augmented by an immigration of priests and Levites from Israel, who came to Jerusalem because of their opposition to the idolatrous worship instituted by Jeroboam. All who were loyal to Yahweh in the Northern Kingdom are represented as following the example of the priests and Levites in going to Jerusalem, not simply to sacrifice, but to reside there permanently, thus strengthening Rehoboam’s kingdom. In view of the fact that Rehoboam added to the innovations of his father, erected pillars of Baal in Jerusalem long before they were common in Northern Israel, and that he permitted other heathen abominations and immoralities, it seems that the true worship of Yahweh received little encouragement from the king himself. As a further evidence of his prosperity, Chronicles gives an account of Rehoboam’s family. Evidently he was of luxurious habit and followed his father in the possession of a considerable harem (2Ch 11:18-23). He is said to have had 18 wives and 60 concubines, (2Ch 11:21; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus and Josephus, Ant, VIII, x, 1 give "30 concubines").

5. Shishak’s Invasion:

One of the direct results of the disruption of the kingdom was the invasion of Palestine by Shishak, king of Egypt, in the 5th year of Rehoboam. Shishak is Sheshonk. I, the first king of the XXIId or Bubastite Dynasty. He is the same ruler who granted hospitality to Jeroboam when he was obliged to flee from Solomon (1Ki 11:40). The Septuagint (1Ki 12:24 e) informs us that Jeroboam married Ano, the sister of Shishak’s wife, thus becoming brother-in-law to the king of Egypt. It is therefore easy to suppose that Jeroboam, finding himself in straits in holding his own against his rival, Rehoboam, called in the aid of his former protector. The results of this invasion, however, are inscribed on the temple at Karnak in Upper Egypt, where a list of some 180 (Curtis, "Chronicles," ICC) towns captured by Shishak is given. These belong to Northern Israel as well as Judah, showing that Shishak exacted tribute there as well as in Judah, which seems scarcely reconcilable with the view that he invaded Palestine as Jeroboam’s ally. However, the king of Israel, imploring the aid of Shishak against his rival, thereby made himself vassal to Egypt. This would suffice to make his towns figure at Karnak among the cities subjected in the course of the campaign. The Chronicler saw in Shishak an instrument in the hand of God for the punishment of R. and the people for the national apostasy. According to 2Ch 12:3, Shishak had a force of 1,200 chariots and 60,000 horsemen to which Josephus adds 400,000 foot-soldiers, composed of Lubim, Sukkum and Ethiopians. No resistance appears to have been offered to the advance of the invading army. Not even Jerusalem seems to have stood a siege. The palace and the temple were robbed of all their treasures, including the shields of gold which Solomon had made. For these Rehoboam later substituted shields of brass (2Ch 12:9,10).

6. His Death:

Rehoboam died at the age of fifty-eight, after having reigned in Jerusalem for 17 years. His son Abijah became his successor. He was buried in Jerusalem. Josephus says that in disposition he was a proud and foolish man, and that he "despised the worship of God, till the people themselves imitated his wicked actions" (Ant., VIII, x, 2).

S. K. Mosiman

REHOBOTH

re-ho'-both, re-ho'-both (rehobhoth, "broad places"; Euruchoria): One of the wells dug by Isaac (Ge 26:22). It is probably the Rubuta of the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Petrie, numbers 256, 260; see also The Expository Times, XI, 239 (Konig), 377 (Sayce)), and it is almost certainly identical with the ruin Ruchaibeh, 8 hours Southwest of Beersheba. Robinson (BR, I, 196-97) describes the ruins of the ancient city as thickly covering a "level tract of 10 to 12 acres in extent"; "many of the dwellings had each its cistern, cut in the solid rock"; "once this must have been a city of not less than 12,000 or 15,000 inhabitants. Now it is a perfect field of ruins, a scene of unutterable desolation, across which the passing stranger can with difficulty find his way." Huntington (Palestine and Its Transformation, 124) describes considerable remains of a suburban population extending both to the North and to the South of this once important place.

E. W. G. Masterman

REHOBOTH BY THE RIVER

(rehobhoth ha-nahar; Codex Vaticanus Rhooboth (Rhoboth in Chronicles) he para potamon; Codex Alexandrinus Rhoboth): This city is mentioned only as the residence of Shaul, one of the rulers of Edom (Ge 36:37; 1Ch 1:48). There is nothing to guide us with certainty as to the situation of the city. Eusebius (Onomasticon) places it in Idumaea (Gebalene), but no trace of a name resembling this has been found in the district. "The river" usually means the Euphrates. If the city could have been so far from Edom, it might be identified with Rahaba on the West of the river, 8 miles South of its confluence with the Khabur. Winckler thinks it might possibly be on the boundary between Palestine and Egypt, "the river" being Wady el-'Arish, "the brook of Egypt" (Nu 5; Jos 15:4, etc.).

W. Ewing

REHOBOTH-IR

r.-ur, r.-ir (rehobhoth 'ir, "Rehoboth City"; Septuagint he Rhohbos (Rhooboth) polis, "the city Rhoobos, Rhooboth"):

1. Probably Rebit Ninua:

The second of the cities built by Asshur (the Revised Version (British and American) by Nimrod) in Assyria (Ge 10:11,12). Unlike the other three, the exact equivalent of this name is not found in Assyrian literature Fried. Delitzsch points out (Wo lag das Paradies? 260 f) that rechobhoth is the equivalent of the Assyrian rebite, "streets," and suggests that the site referred to may be the Rebit Ninua, "streets of Nineveh," mentioned by Sargon of Assyria in connection with the peopling of Maganubba (Khorsabad or Dur-Sarru-kin; see NINEVEH); and it was through this tract that Esar-haddon, his grandson, caused the heads of the kings of Kundi and Sidon to be carried in procession when he returned from his expedition to the Mediterranean.

2. Or, Possibly, the Old Capital, Assur:

Though the probabilities in favor of Rebit Ninua are great, it is doubtful whether a suburb could have been regarded as a foundation worthy of a primitive ruler, and that a very important city, Assur, the old capital of Assyria, would rather be expected. One of the groups expressing its name is composed of the characters Sag-uru, or, dialectically, Sab-eri, the second element being the original of the Hebrew ‘ir. As the "center-city," Assur may have been regarded as the city of broad spaces (rechobhoth)—its ruins are of considerable extent. The German explorers there have made many important discoveries of temples, temple- towers, palaces and streets, the most picturesque in ancient times being the twin tower-temples of Anu (the sky) and Adad (Hadad). The ruins lie on the Tigris, about 50 miles South of Nineveh. It practically ceased to be the capital about the middle of the 8th century BC.

See NINEVEH.

T. G. Pinches

REHUM

re’-hum (rechum, or rechum):

(1) One of the twelve heads of the Jewish community returning from captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7 (by a copyist’s error "Nehum"); Ne 12:3; RAPC 1Es 5:8, "Roimus").

(2) A Persian officer of high rank (literally, "master of judgment, taste, reason") who with others wrote a letter against Jerusalem to King Artaxerxes (Ezr 4:8,9,17,23).

(3) Son of Bani, a Levite, one of the wall-builders under Nehemiah (Ne 3:17).

(4) One of the signers of the covenant in Ne 10:25.

(5) In Ne 12:3 (omitted in the Septuagint) one Rehum is mentioned with those who went up with Zerubbabel. It is probable that we should read here "Harim" (charim for rechum of Ne 12:15).

W. N. Stearns

REI

re’-i (re‘i, "friendly"; Rhesei): Rei, Shimei and the Gibborim who belonged to David are listed among those who did not join Adonijah in his attempt on the throne (1Ki 1:8). The name is very uncertain. Winckler (Geschichte, II, 247) identifies him with Ira, the Jairite, who was a "priest to David" (2Sa 20:26 the Revised Version margin); he tries to prove that this Ira (or Jair) was a priest of Bethlehem. Stade (GVI, I, 293, note 1) holds that Shimei and Rei were two officers of David’s bodyguard. Josephus (Ant., VII, xiv, 4) has ho Daouidou philos, thus making Shimei a "friend," the courtier of 2Sa 15:37; 16:16, and omitting Rei entirely. This would call for an original reading re‘h ha-melekh, or re‘eh ha-melekh, and is too wide a variant from the Massoretic Text. Assuming that Rei belongs in the text, it is safe to conjecture that he was an officer of the royal guard.

Horace J. Wolf

REIGN

ran: The Hebrew word malekhuth, may be rendered "kinghood," "royal dignity," "kingdom," "government" ("reign"). The verb is malakh, "to be king" ("to reign as king"), "to become king," "to accede to the throne," "to assume royal power publicly" and, generally speaking, "to become powerful." In the New Testament hegemonia, basileia, basileuein. The word is used, either as a noun or as a verb, of Yahweh (God), the Messiah (Christ) and men (kings, etc.); then of such terms as sin, death, grace; of the woman in Revelation and, conditionally, of the Christians; once, ironically, of the Corinthians. "Reign" as a noun referring to the time of reigning occurs in 1Ki 6:1 (Solomon); 2Ki 24:12 (Nebuchadnezzar); 1Ch 4:31 (David; compare 1Ch 29:30); 2Ch 36:20 ("until the reign of the kingdom of Persia"); Ne 12:22 (Darius); Es 2:16 (Ahasuerus); Lu 3:1 (Tiberius Caesar). More often occurs the verb "to reign," malakh, basileuein. It is applied to:

(1) Yahweh at the close of the song of Moses (Ex 15:18); "Yahweh reigneth" (1Ch 16:31; compare Ps 93:1; 96:10; 99:1; Re 19:6); "God reigneth over the nations" (Ps 47:8); "Yahweh of hosts will reign in mount Zion" (Isa 24:23; compare Mic 4:7); "Thy God reigneth" (Isa 52:7); "Thou hast taken thy great power and didst reign" (Re 11:17, meaning probably "thou didst assume thy might");

(2) the Messiah (Christ) as a just and righteous king (Jer 23:5); an eternal king (Lu 1:33; compare Re 11:15); punishing and subduing His enemies (Lu 19:14,27; 1Co 15:25).

(3) Men (kings, etc.), in regard to the source of their power ("By me (i.e. the wisdom of God), kings reign" (Pr 8:15)); respecting legitimate succession (2Ch 23:3); meaning "to have power or dominion" (Ge 37:8 and Job 34:30); in regard to an essential characteristic (Isa 32:1); in connection with the covenant of Yahweh with David (Jer 33:21); then the word is used in 1Sa 12:12, where Samuel

reminds the children of Israel of their demanding a king of him (compare verse 14); of Saul (1Sa 13:1; compare 1Sa 11:12); of Saul's son Ish-bosheth (2Sa 2:10); of David (2Sa 5:4 f; compare 2Sa 3:21); of Adonijah (1Ki 1:11,24; compare 1Ki 2:15); of Solomon (1Ki 1:13); quite frequently of the kings of Judah and Israel (in the Books of Kings and Chronicles); of the kings of Edom (Ge 36:31); of Jabin, king of Canaan, in Razor (Jud 4:2); of Abimelech, Jerubbaal's son, in Jotham's fable (Jud 9:8-15); of Hanun, king of the Ammonites (2Sa 10:1); of Rezon and his men in Damascus (1Ki 11:24); of Hazael and Ben-hadad, kings of Syria (2Ki 8:15, 13:24); of Esar-haddon, king of Assyria (2Ki 19:37); of Ahasuerus, king of Persia (Es 1:1); of Archelaus (Mt 2:22).

(4) In the New Testament the term basileuein, "to reign," is used to illustrate and emphasize the power of sin, death and grace (Ro 5:14,17,21; 6:12). Sin, the vitiating mental factor, is to be looked upon as being constantly and resolutely bent on maintaining or regaining its hold upon man, its power being exercised and reinforced by the lusts of the body. Death, the logical outcome of sin, at once testifies to the power of sin and its inherent corruption, while grace is the restoring spiritual factor following up and combating everywhere and always the pernicious influence of sin. It strives to dethrone sin, and to establish itself in man as the only dominating force.

(5) In describing the future glorious state of the believers, the New Testament uses the expression of those who endure (in faith; compare 2Ti 2:12); of those 'purchased unto God with the blood of the Lamb' (Re 5:10); of those partaking in the first resurrection (Re 20:6); of the servants of God, "they shall reign for ever and ever" (Re 22:5); on the other hand, it teaches us not to anticipate the privileges of heaven, while our Christian life is anything but satisfactory (1Co 4:8), and Re 17:18 shows us the terrible fate of the woman, the great city (the corrupt church), "which reigneth over the kings of the earth."

See further KING, KINGDOM.

William Baur

REINS

ranz (kilyah; nephros, words promiscuously translated "heart," "inward parts," "kidneys" or "reins." The latter word, which is derived from Latin "renes" through Old French "reins", has given place in modern English to the word "kidneys" (see Skeat, Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language, 398). the Revised Version (British and American) has, however, retained the older word, at least in the margin, in all passages in which it is found in the King James Version): According to Hebrew psychology the reins are the seat of the deepest emotions and affections of man, which God alone can fully know. Thus the Revised Version (British and American) has substituted "heart" for "reins" in the text of Job 19:27; Ps 7:9; 16:7; 26:2; 73:21; Pr 23:16; Jer 11:20; 12:2; 17:10; 20:12; the translation "inward parts" is found but once (Ps 139:13). In one passage the King James Version has translated the Hebrew [~halac ("loins") with "reins" (Isa 11:5), where the Revised Version (British and American) has rightly substituted "waist" (which see). The Greek word nephros (which is etymologically allied to the

Middle English nere, Get. Niere; see Skeat, ibid, 231, under the word "Kidney") is found in 1 Macc 2:24; Re 2:23.

See KIDNEYS.

H. L. E. Luering

REKEM

re’-kem (rekem, "friendship"):

(1) One of the five kings of Midian slain by the Israelites under Moses (Nu 31:8; Jos 13:21 (Codex Vaticanus Rhobok; Codex Alexandrinus Rhokom)). Like his companions, he is called a "king" in Numbers, but a "prince" or "chieftain" in the passage in Josh. The two references are hardly related; both are based on an earlier tradition.glish Language, 398). the Revised Version (British and American) has, however, retained the older word, at least in the margin, in all passages in which it is found in the King James Version): According to Hebrew psychology the reins are the seat of the deepest emotions and affections of man, which God alone can fully know. Thus the Revised Version (British and American) has substituted "heart" for "reins" in the text of Job 19:27; Ps 7:9; 16:7; 26:2; 73:21; Pr 23:16; Jer 11:20; 12:2; 17:10; 20:12; the translation "inward parts" is found but once (Ps 139:13). In one passage the King James Version has translated the Hebrew halac ("loins") with "reins" (Isa 11:5), where the Revised Version (British and American) has rightly substituted "waist" (which see). The Greek word nephros (which is etymologically allied to the Middle English nere, Get. Niere; see Skeat, ibid, 231, under the word "Kidney") is found in 1 Macc 2:24; Re 2:23. compare Mic 4:7); "Thy God reigneth" (Isa 52:7); "Thou hast taken thy great power and didst reign" (Re 11:17, meaning probably "thou didst assume thy might"); (2) the Messiah (Christ) as a just and righteous king (Jer 23:5); an eternal king (Lu 1:33; compare Re 11:15); punishing and subduing His enemies (Lu 19:14,27; 1Co 15:25).

(2) Eponym of a Calebite family (1Ch 2:43 (Rhekom). Probably a town in Southern Judah. A town of this name is given as belonging to Benjamin (Jos 18:27).

(3) A city of Benjamin, mentioned with Irpeel and Taralah (Jos 18:27); the site is unknown.

See also RAKEM.

Horace J. Wolf

RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY

re-la’-shun-ships:

I. CONSANGUINITY

1. In General

2. Parents and Children

3. Brothers and Sisters

4. Uncles, Aunts, Cousins, Kinsmen

II. AFFINITY

1. Husband and Wife

2. Father-in-Law, etc.

3. Brother-in-Law, etc.

III. OTHER DOMESTIC RELATIONS

1. Foster-Father

2. Master and Servants

3. Host and Guest

4. The Dependent Stranger

The family or domestic relations of the Bible include

(1) those of consanguinity or blood relationship,

(2) affinity or marriage relationship, and

(3) legal convention.

Those of consanguinity may be divided into lineal and collateral groups; the former are those of parents and children, grandparents and grandchildren, and ancestors and descendants in general; the latter are those of brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts in relation to nephews and nieces, cousins of various degrees, including mere tribesmen and even remoter kinsfolk. The relations of affinity include besides that of husband and wife or concubine, the relations among rival wives, and their children, those of

father-in-law and mother-in-law in relation to son-in-law and daughter-in-law, and those of brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law. The domestic relations based on legal convention are either legal fictions or the results of agreement: among the former we must include those of foster-father or mother and foster-children; among the latter the relations between master and the various classes of servants and slaves held by the ancient Hebrews, those between host and guest, especially where they became covenant brothers, and between the citizen and the stranger who had attached himself to him for his protection.

I. Consanguinity.

1. In General:

Genealogies were carefully kept by the ancient Hebrews (compare those of Genesis, Numbers, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Matthew, Luke), not only because they formed the basis of a man's title to his property (Nu 27:8-11; exceptional case, Nu 36:1-12), but also because on one's pedigree depended the right of his family to intermarry with the priestly caste. Descent was traced through the father; a man's closest association was therefore with his father's family, and he was ordinarily referred to as the son of his father, thus Isaac the son of Abraham (Ge 25:19), Joshua the son of Nun, Caleb the son of Jephunneh (Nu 14:6). Still there are instances of men named for their mothers (Joab the son of Zeruiah), and a man's relation with his mother's family was fully recognized in the laws forbidding incest. No lineal relatives were permitted to intermarry (Le 18:7,10). The relations of ancestors and descendants were considered so close that the ordinary terms of relationship between children and parents are used constantly in relation to grandparents and remoter ancestors. The wishes of a great-grandfather are respected long after his death as the wishes of a father (Jer 35:16).

2. Parents and Children:

The father (’abh; pater) was the head of the family (mishpachah) or household (bayith), which was a religious (1Sa 20:6,29; Ex 12:3; Job 1:5) as well as a social and political unit, consisting usually of a combination of families in the modern sense. As long as polygamy prevailed a family would include at least the several groups of children of the wives and concubines. The Bible represents the Hebrew father as commanding (Ge 50:16; Jer 35:6 ff; Pr 6:20), instructing (Pr 1:8; 4:1), and rebuking (Ge 37:10; Nu 12:14); at the same time, as loving (Ge 25:28; 37:4; 44:20), pitying (Ps 103:13), and blessing his household (Ge 27:41), rejoicing over its triumphs (Pr 10:1; 15:20), or grieving over its misfortunes (Ge 37:35). The mother, too (’em; meter), naturally displays love and care (Ge 25:28; Pr 4:3; Isa 49:15; 66:13). To the Hebrew woman childlessness was considered the greatest of misfortunes (1Sa 1:10 , of Hannah; Ge 30:23, of Rachel). Children were looked upon as a blessing from God (Ps 127:3) and the defenders of the home (Ps 127:4,5). In early life a child was more directly under the control of the mother than the father; the mother was its first teacher (Pr 1:8). Thereafter the father was expected to direct the training of the son (ben; huios, teknon) (Ge 18:19; Ex 12:26; 13:8,14,15; De 6:7), while the daughter (bath; thugater) probably remained with the mother until her marriage (Mic 7:6). Both parents are looked upon in the Law as objects of honor (Ex 20:12 parallel De 5:16 (the Fifth Commandment); Ex 21:15; Le 20:9; De 27:16; Pr 20:20; Eze 22:7; Mic 7:6), obedience (Ge 28:7; Le 19:3; De 21:18 ff; Pr

1:8; 30:17) and love (1Ki 19:20; Pr 28:24; 30:11). The control of parents was so great as to include the right to sell daughters in marriage, but not, without restrictions, into slavery (Ex 21:7-11; compare Ex 22:16 ff; Ne 5:5), and never into a life of shame (Le 19:29); they could chastise children (De 8:5; 21:18; Pr 13:24; compare Ecclesiasticus 30:1-13), and in the early days even exerted the power of life and death over them (Ge 22; Jud 11:39; Le 18:21; 20:2-5; 2Ki 23:10; compare Mt 15:4). This power, at least for sacrificial purposes, was entirely removed by the Law, and changed, even for punishment, in the case of a stubborn, rebellious, gluttonous and disobedient son to a mere right of complaint to the proper authorities (De 21:18-21), who were to put him to death. Infanticide by exposure, such as was common among other ancient peoples, seems never to have been practiced by the Hebrews. That the children were nevertheless the chattels of the parents seems to be attested from the fact that they could be seized for the debts of the father (2Ki 4:1). The father could annul the vows of his daughter (Nu 30:3-5), and damages for wrongs done to her were paid to him, as in English law "for loss of services" (De 22:29). A widowed or divorced daughter could return to her father (Ge 38:11; Le 22:13; Ru 1:15). At his death the mother would become the actual, if not the legal, head of the household (2Ki 8:1-6, the Shunammite woman; RAPC Tob 1:8, Tobit’s grandmother; compare the position of the mother of Jesus). This was especially true of the queen mother (gebhirah), whose name is usually given in the accounts of the kings of Judah (1Ki 1:11; 2:19, where a throne at the king’s right hand was set for the king’s mother; 1Ki 11:26; 14:21,31; 15:2,10,13; 22:42; 2Ki 8:26; 10:13; 14:2; 15:2,33; 18:2; 21:1,19; 22:1; 23:31,36; 24:8,12,15,18; 2Ch 22:2; Jer 13:18; 22:26; see QUEEN MOTHER). While it is true that the position of the widowed mother depended to some extent on the will of her son (1Ki 2:18), it must be remembered that the sense of filial duty was highly developed among all classes in Palestine (Jos 2:13,18; 6:23; 1Sa 22:3; 2Sa 19:37; 1Ki 19:20). The rebellion of children marked the acme of social degeneration (Mic 7:6; Pr 30:11); on the other hand the "great day" according to Malachi (4:5 (Hebrew 3:23)) is one of conciliation of parents and children.

3. Brothers and Sisters:

The terms "brother" (’ach; adelphos) and "sister" (’ahoth; adelphe) apply to children of the same father and mother (Ge 4:2), and also to children of one father (Ge 20:12) or of one mother (Ge 43:7; Le 18:9; 20:17). The brother as well as the father was the natural protector of the honor of his sister; thus, the sons of Jacob speak of Dinah as "our daughter" (Ge 34:17). Absalom feels more deeply aggrieved over the crime against Tamar than does David himself (2Sa 13:21). The brother’s other duties toward a sister were very much like those of a father (So 8:8). The Law strictly forbids the intermarriage of brother and sister, whether of the same father and mother or not, whether born at home or born abroad, as a "disgraceful thing" (chesedh, a different word from checedh, "kindness" (Le 18:9,11; 20:17). In earlier times marriage between half-brother and sister was allowable (Ge 20:12; compare 2Sa 13:13). In fact, we are expressly told that the laws against incest were not obeyed by the Egyptians or the Canaanites (Le 18:3 ff; 20:23). Brotherly sentiment was highly developed (Ge 24:60; Jos 2:13; Pr 17:17; compare Le 25:35; De 15:11 f; 25:3); the dwelling of brothers together in unity is considered good and pleasant (Ps 133:1). Brothers were ever ready to protect or avenge each other (2Sa 3:27). Indeed, it is part of the unwritten, common law, recognized though not necessarily approved in the Bible, that the brother or next of kin, the go’el, is expected to avenge a death (Nu 35:19 ff; De 19:6; Jos 20:3; 2Sa 14:11), and no punishment is meted out to prevent such self-help, unless it occurs in a refuge-city. A brother was also

expected to ransom a captive or slave (Le 25:48; Ps 49:7). Half-brothers were of course not so near as brothers of the full blood (compare Joseph and his brothers), and it is not surprising to find the sons of a wife despising and driving out the son of a harlot (Jud 11:1, Jephthah). The words "brother" and "sister" are used frequently of more distant relationships (see below) and figuratively of a friend.

4. Uncles, Aunts, Cousins, Kinsmen:

The Hebrew dodh (Le 10:4, "uncles"; Nu 36:11, "cousins"; 1Sa 14:50), coming from a primitive caressing word, possibly indicating "dandle" "fondle" "love" means both "uncle" and "beloved." It is used of the father's and also of the mother's brother, and the corresponding feminine form (dodhah) is used of the father's sister (Ex 6:20; compare Nu 26:59) and even of the father's brother's wife (Le 18:14; 20:20). Intermarriage between nephew and aunt (i.e. father's sister, mother's sister, or father's brother's wife, or, in general, uncle's wife) was prohibited (Le 18:12,13,14; 20:19,20), though nothing is said of intermarriage between uncle and niece nor between cousins (compare Nu 36:11). On the relations between uncle and nephew compare the Bible accounts of Jacob and Laban, Abraham and Lot, David and Joab, etc. In a more general sense the word [~dodh is used of kinsmen, Am 6:10 (where the dodh, "even he that burneth him" (mecarepho, perhaps "maternal uncle"; the Jewish Encyclopedia, under the word "Cremation"), takes charge of a dead body); ben dodh is used of cousin (compare ben 'ahi 'immo, brother of his mother," etc.) and bath dodh of a female cousin. For other relations of this and remoter degrees the word for brother is loosely used (e.g. of nephews, Ge 13:8; 14:14, etc.; of tribesmen, Le 21:10; and of more distant relatives, De 2:4,8; 23:7).

II. Affinity.

1. Husband and Wife:

The husband ('ish; compare ba'al, Ho 2:16; aner), though in a sense leaving father and mother for his wife ('ishshah; gune) (Ge 2:24), under normal conditions remained a member of his father's family. If such passages as Ge 2:24; 21:10; 24:5,67; 30:3; 31:31; Jud 4:17 ff; 5:24 ff; 8:19; 9:3, indicate the existence in pre-Biblical times of a matriarchate, the allusions are at least too vague to justify the predication of its persistence in Biblical times. The wife was "taken" by her husband, or "given" by her father or, in the case of a servant, by her master or mistress (Ge 2:22; 16:3; 34:9,21), and although the contract was between the men (Ge 29; 34:16; Ex 22:16; De 22:29; Ru 4:10) or the parents (Ge 21:21; 24), it is probable that the consent of the girl was usually asked (Ge 24:58). Love between the young people was given due consideration (as in the case of Samson, Shechem, Jacob and Rachel (Ge 29:18), David and Michal (1Sa 18:20)); at least it developed among married people, so that Hosea could compare the attitude of husband toward wife to that of Yahweh toward Israel. As a matter of legal right, it is probable that throughout the Orient long before the events narrated in the Book of Esther, every man did "bear rule in his own house" (Es 1:22). In fact a precedent for the Persian decree has been traced as far back as the first human pair (Ge 3:16). Nevertheless, we find many instances in which the wife seems to take the lead in the affairs of the household, as in the case of Samson's parents (Jud 13:23), of the Shunammite woman (2Ki 4), of Jael (Jud 4:18 ff; 5:24), of Achsah (Jos 15:18 f; Jud 1:12 f), and in

less pleasant matters of Jezebel (1Ki 18:4; 21), Sapphira (Ac 5:2), and Zeresh (Es 5:14), who were at least consulted in the affairs of their several households. Abraham is even commanded by the voice of God, "In all that Sarah saith unto thee, hearken unto her voice" (Ge 21:12). That most women were not so fortunate is probably best attested by the fact that at least in the earlier times the best of them had to resort to stratagem to accomplish their purposes (as in the cases of Rebekah (Ge 27:6), Rachel (Ge 31:34), Leah (Ge 30:16) and Abigail (1Sa 25:18), and even to get information as to their husband's affairs (Sarah, Ge 18:10; Rebekah, Ge 27:5)). Perhaps their humbler sisters in later days accomplished their ends by being so contentious as to attract the notice of two proverb-collectors (Pr 21:9; 25:24). Though we have no instance of the exercise of the right of life and death over the wife by the husband, and though it is clear that the Hebrew husband had no power of sale (compare Ex 21:8), it is frequently asserted on the basis of the one-sided divorce doctrine of the Old Testament (De 24:1), and on the basis of analogy with other ancient laws, as well as because the wife is spoken of in conjunction with property (Ex 20:17) and because the husband exercised the right to annul the wife's vows (Nu 30:6), that the wife occupied in the ordinary Hebrew home a very subordinate position. It must not be forgotten, however, that the husband owed duties to the wife (Ex 21:10). It must also be borne in mind that great divergence existed at different times and places, and in different stations of society. Most of our Old Testament evidence pertains to the wealthier classes. The two extremes of the women that are "at ease in Zion" (Isa 32:9-20; compare Am 4:1 ff; 6:1) and the busy "good wife" described in Pr 31:10 ff are hardly exceeded in the most complex society today. The latter probably gives the fairer as well as the more wholesome picture of the functions of the wife in the home, and it is significant that her husband as well as her sons are expected to call her blessed (Pr 31:28).

It is difficult to estimate the extent to which polygamy and concubinage were practiced in ancient Palestine, but it is clear that the former practice was discouraged even among kings (De 17:17), and the latter, an outgrowth of slavery, was not held in high repute (compare De 21:10-14). The position of a less-favored wife (De 21:15, "hated") was naturally unpleasant, and her relations with other wives of her husband decidedly bitter—they were called each other's tsaroth, literally, "vexers" (the Revised Version (British and American) "rivals," Le 18:18; 1Sa 1:6, the King James Version "adversary"; compare Ecclesiasticus 37:11)—even when they were sisters (as in the case of Rachel and Leah, Ge 30:1). Hence, the Law forbade the marrying of two sisters (Le 18:18). On the other hand so strong was the desire of a Hebrew mother for children that the childless wife welcomed the children of a maidservant born to her husband as her own (Ge 30:1-12, etc.).

2. Father-in-Law, etc.:

In normal Hebrew society, for reasons already explained, the relations of a family with the husband's parents (cham, from chamoth) were closer than those with the wife's parents (chothen, feminine chotheneth; pentheros, penthera. Where under special conditions a man remained with his wife's tribe after marriage, as in the case of Jacob, serving out his mohar, or Moses fleeing from the wrath of the Egyptians, or the sons of Elimelech sojourning in the land of Moab because of the famine in Palestine, his identity with his own tribe was not destroyed, and at the first opportunity the natural impulse was to return to his own country. The bride, on the other hand, leaving her people, would become a member of her husband's family, with all the rights and duties of a daughter (Mic 7:6). Thus Judah can order Tamar

burned for violation of the obligations of a widow (Ge 38:24). No doubt the position of the daughter-in-law varied in the Hebrew home between the extremes of those who vexed their parents-in-law unto-the death (Ge 26:35; 27:46; 28:8) and the one who said to her mother-in-law, "Yahweh do so to me .... if aught but death part thee and me" (Ru 1:17). Parents-in-law and children-in-law were considered too closely related to intermarry (Le 18:15; 20:12,14).

3. Brother-in-Law, etc.:

A woman's brother acting in loco parentis might perform all the offices of a father-in-law and possibly be called chothen (Ge 24:50,55; 34:11). Naturally, brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law would be considered too closely related to intermarry (Le 18:16,18; 20:21). Nevertheless the husband's brother (yabham) was expected to marry the childless widow to establish the name of the deceased on his inheritance (De 25:5-10). This custom dated back to Canaanitic practice (Ge 38:8), and from the connection between marrying the childless widow and the redemption of land may be called a part of the land law of Palestine (Ru 4:1-12; compare Jer 32:6). In practice the Levirate was probably considered more in the nature of a moral duty than a privilege (De 25:7; Ru 4:6), and devolved not only on the brother, but on other members of a deceased husband's family in the order of the nearness of their relationship to him (Ru 3:12). In the Hebrew family brothers-in-law and sisters-in-law would form part of the same household. In this relation as in others we find both ideal friendship (David and Jonathan, 1Sa 18:3; 2Sa 1:26) and petty jealousies (in the matter of Moses' wife, Nu 12:1).

III. Other Domestic Relations.

1. Foster-father:

The Hebrew 'omen, feminine 'omeneth (participle of 'aman), literally, "nourishing," is translated "nursing father" (Nu 11:12; Isa 49:23), nursing mother" (Isa 49:23), "nurse" (Ru 4:16; 2Sa 4:4), or simply as the equivalent of "bringing up" (2Ki 10:1,5; Es 2:7). In the case of Esther and of Ahab's children, and possibly in the other instances referred to, the relation of foster-parents is suggested. The foster-children under such conditions obeyed the words of the foster-father as the words of a father (Es 2:20). Michal is spoken of as the mother of Merab's two children (2Sa 21:8) because she reared them (Sanhedhrin 19b). Adoption in the Roman sense was, however, hardly to be expected in a polygamous society where the childless father could remarry. Nevertheless, Jacob adopts Manasseh and Ephraim (Ge 48:5), and thereby makes them the fathers of tribes. According to Josephus, while Abraham was childless he adopted Lot (Ant., I, vii, 1), and the daughter of Pharaoh adopted Moses (Ant., II, ix, 7; compare Ex 2:10). In New Testament times the notion of adoption was so familiar that Paul uses the word figuratively of conversion (huiothesia, Ro 8:15; 9:4; Ga 4:5; Eph 1:5).

2. Master and Servants:

The "family" as the word is used of ancient peoples included dependents. The Hebrew mishpachah is connected with the word shiphchah, "maidservant," as the Latin familia is connected with famulus,

"servant." For a discussion of the various classes of servants and slaves, Hebrew and foreign, male and female, see SLAVERY.

3. Host and Guest:

When Lot protested against betraying his visitors to the men of Sodom, forasmuch as they had come under the shadow of his roof, and he even preferred to give his daughters to the mob rather than fail in his duties as a host (Ge 19:8), he was acting on the ancient principle of guest-friendship (compare Greek xenia), which bound host and guest by sacred ties. In the light of this principle the act of Jael, who receives Sisera as a guest, and then betrays him, becomes startling and capable of explanation only on the basis of the intense hatred existing at the time, and justifiable, if at all, only on theory that all is fair in war (Jud 4:18-21; 5:24-27). The nomads of ancient times and even the post-exilic Hebrews, like the Arabs of today, were bound by a temporary covenant whenever there was "salt between them," that is, in the relation of host and guest (Ezr 4:14; compare the expression "covenant of salt," 2Ch 13:5; Nu 18:19). In the early Christian church breaking bread together served as a sort of a berith ‘ahim, or covenant of brothers. In large households such as those of a king, those that ate at the table were members of the household (2Sa 9:11, compared to sons; compare also 2Sa 9:7,10,13; 19:28; 1Ki 2:7; 4:27; 18:19).

See HOSPITALITY.

4. The Dependent Stranger:

The ger or stranger (as indicated by the expression "thy stranger" (Ex 20:10; Le 25:6; De 5:14; 29:11; 31:12; compare De 1:16), Hebrew gero, literally, "his stranger") attached himself to an influential Hebrew for protection. Thus we read of a "sojourner of the priest’s" (Le 22:10, toschabh; compare Le 25:6) who was in many respects a dependent, but still to be distinguished from a servant (Le 22:11). The Mosaic Law commands that such strangers be treated with consideration (Ex 12:49; 20:10; 22:21 ff; 23:9; Le 19:33; De 1:16; 10:18; 14:21, etc.; Ps 146:9) and even with love (De 16:14; Le 19:34).

See STRANGER AND SOJOURNER.

Nathan Isaacs and Ella Davis Isaacs

RELEASE

re-les’:(1) The forgiveness of a debt (shemiTTah (De 15:1,2,9; 31:10; see JUBILEE YEAR)), with verb shamaT, "to release," De 31:2,3. (2) To exempt from taxation or military service (hanachah, "release," "rest" (Es 2:18)). Some would render "granted a holiday." (3) To set a prisoner or slave at liberty (apoluo, "to let go free" (Mt 27:15 parallel Joh 19:10), etc.).

RELIGION

re-lij’-un: "Religion" and "religious" in Elizabethan English were used frequently to denote the outward expression of worship. This is the force of threskeia, translated "religion" in Ac 26:5; Jas 1:26,27 (with adjective threskos, "religious"), while the same noun in Col 2:18 is rendered "worshipping" ("cult" would give the exact meaning). And in the same external sense "religion" is used by the King James Version for latreia, "worship" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), in I Macc 1:43; 2:19,22. Otherwise "Jews’ religion" (or "religion of the Jews") appears in 2 Macc 8:1; 14:38 (the Revised Version (British and American) bis); Ga 1:13,14 (Ioudaismos, "Judaism"); and "an alien religion" in 2 Macc 6:24 (allophulismos, "that belonging to another tribe"). The neglect of the external force of "religion" has led to much reckless misquoting of Jas 1:26,27. Compare Ac 17:22.

See SUPERSTITION.

Burton Scott Easton

RELIGION, COMPARATIVE

See COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

RELIGION, SCIENCE OF

See COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

REMAINDER

re-man’-der (yathar, "to be left," she’erith, "remnant"): In 2Sa 14:7 "residue" would have been clearer (compare Ps 76:10), but the changes of the Revised Version (British and American) in Le 6:16; 7:16,17 are pointless (contrast Ex 29:34).

REMALIAH

rem-a-li’-a (remalyahu, "whom Yahweh has adorned"): The father of Pekah (2Ki 15:25 ff; Isa 7:4 ff; 8:6). The contemptuous allusion to Pekah as "the son of Remaliah" in Isa 7:4 (similarly "the son of Kish," 1Sa 10:11) may be a slur on Remaliah’s humble origin.

REMEMBER; REMEMBRANCE

re-mem’-ber, re-mem’-brans: "Remember" is mostly the translation, in the Old Testament, of zakhar, and in the New Testament of mnaomai (Mt 5:23; 26:75; Joh 2:17, etc.), and of [@mnemoneuo (Mt 16:9; Mr 8:18; Lu 17:32, etc.), and "remembrance" the translation of derivatives of these (zekher, anamnesis, etc.). There are a few other words. "To remember" is used of God in remembering persons (Ge 8:1;

19:29, etc.), His covenant (Ge 9:15; Ex 2:24; Eze 16:60, etc.), in answering prayer (Jud 16:28; Ne 13:14,22; Ps 20:3, etc.), and in other ways. Men are exhorted to "remember" God's dealings with them, His commandments (De 8:2,18; Jud 8:34; 1Ch 16:12, etc.), the Sabbath (Ex 20:8), etc. A specially solemn command is that relating to the Lord's Supper in Lu 22:19; 1Co 11:24,25, "This do in remembrance of me." "Remembrancer" (writer of chronicles) occurs in the King James Version margin of 2Sa 8:16; 20:24; 1Ki 4:3; 1Ch 18:15 (text "recorder," the Revised Version margin "chronicler"). In Isa 62:6, the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "ye that are Yahweh's remembrancers." the Revised Version (British and American) has frequent changes on the King James Version text, as "have marked" (1Sa 15:2); "make mention of" (Ps 20:7; 77:11; So 1:4); "remember" for "be ye mindful of" (1Ch 16:15); "memorial" for "remembrance" (Isa 57:8); in the American Standard Revised Version, "to his holy memorial name" (Ps 30:4; 97:12, the English Revised Version "to his holy name," margin "Hebrew 'memorial' "); in 2Ti 1:5, "having been reminded of" for the King James Version "call to remembrance," etc.

W. L. Walker

REMETH

re'-meth, rem'-eth (remeth; Codex Vaticanus Rhemmas; Codex Alexandrinus Rhamath): A place in the territory of Issachar named with En-gannim (Jos 19:21). It is probably identical with Ramoth of 1Ch 6:73, and Jarmuth of Jos 21:29. It is represented today by the village er-Rameh, situated on a hill which rises abruptly from the green plain about 11 miles Southwest of Jenin (Engannim). While the southern boundary of Issachar was, roughly, the southern edge of the plain of Esdraelon, the possessions of the tribes seem sometimes to have overlapped.

See JARMUTH; RAMOTH.

REMISSION OF SINS

re-mish'-un (aphesis, paresis): The two Greek words, of which the latter occurs only in Ro 3:25, were translated by the same English word in the King James Version. In the Revised Version (British and American), paresis is translation "passing over." It is contrasted with the other term as pretermission with remission. Remission is exemption from the consequences of an offense, forgiveness; pretermission is the suspension of the penalty (Philippi, Ellicott, Trench (Synonyms, XXXIII), Weiss; compare Ac 17:30). Cremer (Lexicon of N T Gr) regards the meaning of the two words as identical, except that the one refers to the Old Testament and the other to the New Testament. Sins are remitted when the offender is treated as though the offense had never been committed. Remission is restricted to the penalty, while forgiveness refers more particularly to the person, although it may be used also of the sin itself. Remission also is used of offenses against God's law; forgiveness, against either divine or human law.

See ABSOLUTION; FORGIVENESS.

H. E. Jacobs

REMMON

rem’-on (rimmon, Jos 19:7).

See RIMMON.

REMMON-METHOAR

rem’-on-meth’-o-ar, rem’-on-me-tho’-ar (rimmon ha-metho’-ar (Jos 19:13)).

See RIMMON, (3).

REMNANT

rem’-nant: Remnant is the translation of yether, "what is left over" (De 3:11; 28:54; Jos 12:4, etc.); of she’-ar, "the rest" (Ezr 3:8 the King James Version; Isa 10:20,21,22; 11:16, etc.; Ze 1:4); more frequently of she’-erith, "residue," etc. (2Ki 19:4,31; 2Ch 34:9; Ezr 9:14; Isa 14:30, etc.). As the translation of the last-mentioned two words, "remnant" has a special significance in the prophecies of Isaiah, as denoting "a holy seed," or spiritual kernel, of the nation which should survive impending judgment and become the germ of the people of God, being blessed of God and made a blessing (compare Mic 2:12; 4:7; 5:7,8; 7:18; also Ze 2:7; 3:13; Hag 1:12,14; Zec 8:6; Joe 2:32). Paul, in Ro 9:27, quotes from Isa 10:22 f, "the remnant (kataleimma, "what is left over"] shall be saved"; compare also Ro 11:5 (where the word is leimma) with 2Ki 19:4. Several other Hebrew words are less frequently translated "remnant": ‘ahar, "after"; yathar, "to be left over," etc.; in the New Testament (the King James Version) we have also loipos, "left," "remaining" (Mt 22:6; Re 11:13, etc.).

For "remnant" the Revised Version (British and American) has "overhanging part" (Ex 26:12), "rest" (Le 14:18, etc.); on the other hand gives "remnant" for "posterity" (Ge 45:7), for "rest" (Jos 10:20; 1Ch 4:43; Isa 10:19), for "residue" (Hag 2:2; Zec 8:11), etc.

W. L. Walker

REMPHAN

rem’-fan.

See REPHAN.

RENDING OF GARMENTS

ren’-ding.

See BURIAL, IV; DRESS.

RENEW

re-nu’:The word is used in various senses:

(1) of material things, e.g. Ps 104:30; here it means to give a new appearance, to refresh, to restore the face of the earth;

(2) in 1Sa 11:14, to establish more firmly the kingdom by reinstalling King Saul;

(3) in 2Ch 15:8, to rebuild or repair the broken altar;

(4) in La 5:21, "renew our days," restore the favors of former days;

(5) in Isa 41:1, ‘let them gather together, or marshal their strongest arguments for answer’;

(6) in Ps 103:5; Isa 40:31, it refers to the restoring of spiritual strength;

(7) in the New Testament it invariably refers to spiritual renewal, e.g. Ro 12:2; 2Co 4:16; Eph 4:23; Col 3:10; Tit 3:5; Heb 6:6; all derivatives of kainos, "new."

G. H. Gerberding

REPAIR

re-par’ (machceh, "refuge"): In Joe 3:16, for the King James Version The Lord will be the hope of his people" the King James Version margin renders "place of repair," or, "harbour" = haven of repair. the Revised Version (British and American) gives "refuge." Other words are chazaq, "to strengthen," "harden," "fix" (2Ki 12:5 and often; Ne 3$); rapha’ "to heal" (1Ki 18:30); ‘amadh, "to cause to stand still" (Ezr 9:9); chayah, "to revive" (1Ch 11:8); caghar, "to close up" (1Ki 11:27).

In the Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha for huporrapto, "to patch up" (Sirach 50:1); episkeuazo, "to get ready" (1 Macc 12:37). In 1 Macc 14:34 occurs "reparation" (modern English "repairs") for epanorthosis, "straightening up."

M. O. Evans

REPENTANCE

re-pen’-tans:

I. OLD TESTAMENT TERMS

1. To Repent—"to Pant," "to Sigh"

2. To Repent—"to Turn" or "Return"

II. NEW TESTAMENT TERMS

1. Repent—"to Care," "Be Concerned"

2. Repent—"to Change the Mind"

3. Repent—"to Turn Over," "to Turn Upon," "to Turn Unto"

III. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL ELEMENTS

1. The Intellectual Element

2. The Emotional Element

3. The Volitional Element

LITERATURE

To get an accurate idea of the precise New Testament meaning of this highly important word it is necessary to consider its approximate synonyms in the original Hebrew and Greek The psychological elements of repentance should be considered in the light of the general teaching of Scripture.

I. Old Testament Terms.

1. To Repent—"to Pant," "to Sigh":

The Hebrew word naham, is an onomatopoetic term which implies difficulty in breathing, hence, "to pant," "to sigh," "to groan." Naturally it came to signify "to lament" or "to grieve," and when the emotion was produced by the desire of good for others, it merged into compassion and sympathy, and when incited by a consideration of one’s own character and deeds it means "to rue," "to repent." To adapt language to our understanding, God is represented as repenting when delayed penalties are at last

to be inflicted, or when threatened evils have been averted by genuine reformation (Ge 6:6; Jon 3:10). This word is translated "repent" about 40 times in the Old Testament, and in nearly all cases it refers to God. The principal idea is not personal relation to sin, either in its experience of grief or in turning from an evil course. Yet the results of sin are manifest in its use. God's heart is grieved at man's iniquity, and in love He bestows His grace, or in justice He terminates His mercy. It indicates the aroused emotions of God which prompt Him to a different course of dealing with the people. Similarly when used with reference to man, only in this case the consciousness of personal transgression is evident. This distinction in the application of the word is intended by such declarations as God "is not a man, that he should repent" (1Sa 15:29; Job 42:6; Jer 8:6).

2. To Repent—"to Turn" or "Return":

The term shubh, is most generally employed to express the Scriptural idea of genuine repentance. It is used extensively by the prophets, and makes prominent the idea of a radical change in one's attitude toward sin and God. It implies a conscious, moral separation, and a personal decision to forsake sin and to enter into fellowship with God. It is employed extensively with reference to man's turning away from sin to righteousness (De 4:30; Ne 1:9; Ps 7:12; Jer 3:14). It quite often refers to God in His relation to man (Ex 32:12; Jos 7:26). It is employed to indicate the thorough spiritual change which God alone can effect (Ps 85:4). When the term is translated by "return" it has reference either to man, to God, or to God and man (1Sa 7:3; Ps 90:13 (both terms, nacham and shubh; Isa 21:12; 55:7). Both terms are also sometimes employed when the twofold idea of grief and altered relation is expressed, and are translated by "repent" and "return" (Eze 14:6; Ho 12:6; Jon 3:8).

II. New Testament Terms.

1. Repent—"to Care," "Be Concerned":

The term metamelomai, literally signifies to have a feeling or care, concern or regret; like nacham, it expresses the emotional aspect of repentance. The feeling indicated by the word may issue in genuine repentance, or it may degenerate into mere remorse (Mt 21:29,32; 27:3). Judas repented only in the sense of regret, remorse, and not in the sense of the abandonment of sin. The word is used with reference to Paul's feeling concerning a certain course of conduct, and with reference to God in His attitude toward His purposes of grace (2Co 7:8 the King James Version; Heb 7:21).

2. Repent—"to Change the Mind":

The word metanoeo, expresses the true New Testament idea of the spiritual change implied in a sinner's return to God. The term signifies "to have another mind," to change the opinion or purpose with regard to sin. It is equivalent to the Old Testament word "turn." Thus, it is employed by John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles (Mt 3:2; Mr 1:15; Ac 2:38). The idea expressed by the word is intimately associated with different aspects of spiritual transformation and of Christian life, with the process in which the agency of man is prominent, as faith (Ac 20:21), and as conversion (Ac 3:19); also with those

experiences and blessings of which God alone is the author, as remission and forgiveness of sin (Lu 24:47; Ac 5:31). It is sometimes conjoined with baptism, which as an overt public act proclaims a changed relation to sin and God (Mr 1:4; Lu 3:3; Ac 13:24; 19:4). As a vital experience, repentance is to manifest its reality by producing good fruits appropriate to the new spiritual life (Mt 3:8).

3. Repent—"to Turn Over," "to Turn Upon," "to Turn Unto":

The word epistrepho, is used to bring out more clearly the distinct change wrought in repentance. It is employed quite frequently in Ac to express the positive side of a change involved in New Testament repentance, or to indicate the return to God of which the turning from sin is the negative aspect. The two conceptions are inseparable and complementary. The word is used to express the spiritual transition from sin to God (Ac 9:35; 1Th 1:9); to strengthen the idea of faith (Ac 11:21); and to complete and emphasize the change required by New Testament repentance (Ac 26:20).

There is great difficulty in expressing the true idea of a change of thought with reference to sin when we translate the New Testament "repentance" into other languages. The Latin version renders it "exercise penitence" (poenitentiam agere). But "penitence" etymologically signifies pain, grief, distress, rather than a change of thought and purpose. Thus Latin Christianity has been corrupted by the pernicious error of presenting grief over sin rather than abandonment of sin as the primary idea of New Testament repentance. It was easy to make the transition from penitence to penance, consequently the Romanists represent Jesus and the apostles as urging people to do penance (poenitentiam agite). The English word "repent" is derived from the Latin repoenitere, and inherits the fault of the Latin, making grief the principal idea and keeping it in the background, if not altogether out of sight, the fundamental New Testament conception of a change of mind with reference to sin. But the exhortations of the ancient prophets, of Jesus, and of the apostles show that the change of mind is the dominant idea of the words employed, while the accompanying grief and consequent reformation enter into one’s experience from the very nature of the case.

III. The Psychological Elements.

1. The Intellectual Element:

Repentance is that change of a sinner’s mind which leads him to turn from his evil ways and live. The change wrought in repentance is so deep and radical as to affect the whole spiritual nature and to involve the entire personality. The intellect must function, the emotions must be aroused, and the will must act. Psychology shows repentance to be profound, personal and all-pervasive. The intellectual element is manifest from the nature of man as an intelligent being, and from the demands of God who desires only rational service. Man must apprehend sin as unutterably heinous, the divine law as perfect and inexorable, and himself as coming short or falling below the requirements of a holy God (Job 42:5,6; Ps 51:3; Ro 3:20).

2. The Emotional Element:

There may be a knowledge of sin without turning from it as an awful thing which dishonors God and ruins man. The change of view may lead only to a dread of punishment and not to the hatred and abandonment of sin (Ex 9:27; Nu 22:34; Jos 7:20; 1Sa 15:24; Mt 27:4). An emotional element is necessarily involved in repentance. While feeling is not the equivalent of repentance, it nevertheless may be a powerful impulse to a genuine turning from sin. A penitent cannot from the nature of the case be stolid and indifferent. The emotional attitude must be altered if New Testament repentance be experienced. There is a type of grief that issues in repentance and another which plunges into remorse. There is a godly sorrow and also a sorrow of the world. The former brings life; the latter, death (Mt 27:3; Lu 18:23; 2Co 7:9,10). There must be a consciousness of sin in its effect on man and in its relation to God before there can be a hearty turning away from unrighteousness. The feeling naturally accompanying repentance implies a conviction of personal sin and sinfulness and an earnest appeal to God to forgive according to His mercy (Ps 51:1,2,10-14).

3. The Volitional Element:

The most prominent element in the psychology of repentance is the voluntary, or volitional. This aspect of the penitent’s experience is expressed in the Old Testament by "turn", or "return," and in the New Testament by "repent" or "turn." The words employed in the Hebrew and Greek place chief emphasis on the will, the change of mind, or of purpose, because a complete and sincere turning to God involves both the apprehension of the nature of sin and the consciousness of personal guilt (Jer 25:5; Mr 1:15; Ac 2:38; 2Co 7:9,10). The demand for repentance implies free will and individual responsibility. That men are called upon to repent there can be no doubt, and that God is represented as taking the initiative in repentance is equally clear. The solution of the problem belongs to the spiritual sphere. The psychical phenomena have their origin in the mysterious relations of the human and the divine personalities. There can be no external substitute for the internal change. Sackcloth for the body and remorse for the soul are not to be confused with a determined abandonment of sin and return to God. Not material sacrifice, but a spiritual change, is the inexorable demand of God in both dispensations (Ps 51:17; Isa 1:11; Jer 6:20; Ho 6:6).

Repentance is only a condition of salvation and not its meritorious ground. The motives for repentance are chiefly found in the goodness of God, in divine love, in the pleading desire to have sinners saved, in the inevitable consequences of sin, in the universal demands of the gospel, and in the hope of spiritual life and membership in the kingdom of heaven (Eze 33:11; Mr 1:15; Lu 13:1-5; Joh 3:16; Ac 17:30; Ro 2:4; 1Ti 2:4). The first four beatitudes (Mt 5:3-6) form a heavenly ladder by which penitent souls pass from the dominion of Satan into the Kingdom of God. A consciousness of spiritual poverty dethroning pride, a sense of personal unworthiness producing grief, a willingness to surrender to God in genuine humility, and a strong spiritual desire developing into hunger and thirst, enter into the experience of one who wholly abandons sin and heartily turns to Him who grants repentance unto life.

LITERATURE.

Various theological works and commentaries Note especially Strong, Systematic Theology, III, 832-36;

Broadus on Mt 3:2, American Comm.; article "Busse" (Penance). Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche.

Byron H. Dement

REPETITIONS

rep-e-tish'-unz: In Mt 6:7 only, "Use not vain repetitions," for battalogeo (so Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus), a word found nowhere else and spelled variously in the manuscripts, battologeo in Codices K, L, M; etc., batologeo in Codices F G, blattologeo in Codex Bezae (probably influenced by the Latin blatero, "talk idly"); presumably connected with battarizo, "stammer," and perhaps formed under the influence of the Aramaic beta'," speak carelessly," or baTel, "useless." Whether, however battalogeo means the constant repetition of the same phrase or the mechanical recitation of a long series of obscure or meaningless formulas (if, indeed, a distinction between the acts was thought of) cannot be determined. Either practice is abundantly evidenced as a "heathen" custom of the day, and either can be classed as "much speaking."

See PRAYER.

Burton Scott Easton

REPHAEL

re'-fa-el, ref'-a-el (repha'el, "God has healed"; Rhaphael): The eponym of a family of gatekeepers (1Ch 26:7). The name occurs in Tobit and Enoch ("Raphael"); it probably belongs to a group of late formations. See Gray, HPN, 225, 311.

REPHAH

re'-fa (rephach (the form is corrupt); Rhaphe): The eponym of an Ephraimite family (1Ch 7:25).

REPHAIAH

re-fa'-ya, re-fi'-a (rephayah, probably "Yah is healing"; Septuagint Rhaphaia(s)) :

(1) In David's family, Septuagint also Rhaphal (1Ch 3:21).

(2) A captain of Simeon (1Ch 4:42).

(3) A grandson of Issachar, Septuagint also Rhaphara (1Ch 7:2).

(4) A descendant of Saul (1Ch 9:43; in 1Ch 8:37 called "Raphah" (raphah); Septuagint also Raphai).

(5) One of the repairers of the wall under Nehemiah (Ne 3:9).

REPHAIM

ref’-a-im, re-fa’-im (repha’-im, from rapha’," a terrible one "hence "giant," in 1Ch 20:4, yelidhe ha-rapha’," sons of the giant"; the King James Version, Rephaims): A race of aboriginal or early inhabitants East of the Jordan in Ashterothkarnaim (Ge 14:5) and in the valley of Rephaim Southwest of Jerusalem (Jos 15:8). They associated with other giant races, as the Emim and Anakim (De 2:10,11) and the Zamzummim (De 2:20). It is probable that they were all of the same stock, being given different names by the different tribes who came in contact with them. The same Hebrew word is rendered "the dead," or "the shades" in various passages (Job 26:5 margin; Ps 88:10 margin; Pr 2:18 margin; Pr 9:18 margin; Pr 21:16 margin; Isa 14:9 margin; Isa 26:14,19 margin). In these instances the word is derived from rapheh, "weak," "powerless," "a shadow" or "shade."

H. Porter

REPHAIM, VALE OF

(‘emeq repha’-im; koilas Rhaphaeim, koilas ton Titanon): This was a fertile vale (Isa 17:5), to the Southwest of Jerusalem (Jos 15:8; 18:16; the King James Version "Valley of the Giants"), on the border between Judah and Benjamin. Here David repeatedly defeated the invading Philistines (2Sa 5:18,22; 23:13; 1Ch 11:15; 14:9). It is located by Josephus between Jerusalem and Bethlehem (Ant., VII, iv, i; xii, 4). It corresponds to the modern el-Biqa‘, which falls away to the Southwest from the lip of the valley of Hinnom. The name in ancient times may perhaps have covered a larger area, including practically all the land between Jerusalem and Bethlehem, where the head-waters of Nahr Ruben are collected.

W. Ewing

REPHAN

re’-fan: A name for Chiun, the planet Saturn.

See ASTROLOGY, 7; CHIUN.

REPHIDIM

ref’-i-dim (rephidhim, "rests"; Rhaphidin): A station in the Wanderings, between the wilderness of Sin and the wilderness of Sinai (Ex 17:1,8; 19:2; Nu 33:14). The host expected to find water here; to their

distress the streams were dry, and water was miraculously provided. Palmer (Desert of the Exodus, 158 ff) states cogent reasons for identifying Rephidim with Wady Feiran. It is the most fertile part of the peninsula, well watered, with a palm grove stretching for miles along the valley. Palmer speaks of passing through the palm grove as a "most delightful" walk; "the tall, graceful trees afforded a delicious shade, fresh water ran at our feet, and, above all, bulbuls flitted from branch to branch uttering their sweet notes." His camp was pitched at "the mouth of Wady ‘Aleyat, a large open space completely surrounded by steep, shelving mountains of gneiss, the fantastic cleavage of which added greatly to the beauty of the scene. Palms and tamarisks were dotted all around, and on every knoll and mountain slope were ruined houses, churches, and walls, the relics of the ancient monastic city of Paran. Behind our tents rose the majestic mass of Serbal, and beneath the rocky wall opposite ran a purling brook, only a few inches in depth, but still sufficiently cool, clear, and refreshing."

Such a place as this the Amalekites would naturally wish to preserve for themselves against an invading people. For these desert dwellers, indeed, the possession of this watered vale may well have been a matter of life and death.

If this identification is correct, then Jebel Tachuneh, "Mount of the mill," a height that rises on the North of the valley, may have been the hill from which Moses, with Aaron and Hur, viewed the battle.

W. Ewing

REPROBATE rep’-ro-bat: This word occurs in the English Bible in the following passages: Jer 6:30 (the Revised Version (British and American) "refuse"); Ro 1:28; 2Co 13:5,6,7; 2Ti 3:8; Tit 1:16. In all these cases the Greek has adokimos. The same Greek word, however, is found with other renderings in Isa 1:22 ("dross"); Pr 25:4 ("dross"); 1Co 9:27 ("castaway," the Revised Version (British and American) "rejected"). The primary meaning of adokimos is "not-received," "not-acknowledged." This is applied to precious metals or money, in the sense of "not-current," to which, however, the connotation "not-genuine" easily attaches itself. It is also applied to persons who do not or ought not to receive honor or recognition. This purely negative conception frequently passes over into the positive one of that which is or ought to be rejected, either by God or men. Of the above passages 1Co 9:27 uses the word in this meaning. Probably Ro 1:28, "God gave them up unto a reprobate mind" must be explained on the same principle: the nous of the idolatrous heathen is permitted by God to fall into such extreme forms of evil as to meet with the universal rejection and reprobation of men. Wettstein’s interpretation, "an unfit mind," i.e. incapable of properly performing its function of moral discrimination, has no linguistic warrant, and obliterates the wordplay between "they refused to have God in their knowledge (ouk edokimasan)," and "God gave them up to a reprobate (= unacknowledged, adokimos) mind." Even Tit 1:16, "unto every good work reprobate," affords no instance of the meaning unfit, but belongs to the following rubric.

The close phonetic resemblance and etymological affinity of dokimos to the verb dokimazo, "to try," "test," has caused the notion of "being tested," "tried," and its opposite of "being found wanting in the test" to associate itself more or less distinctly with the adjectives dokimos and adokimos. Thus the more

complex meaning results of that which is acknowledged or rejected, because it has approved or not approved itself in testing. This connotation is present in 2Co 13:5,6,7; 2Ti 3:8; Tit 1:16; Heb 6:8. In the first two of these passages the word is used of Christians who ostensibly were in the true faith, but either hypothetically or actually are represented as having failed to meet the test. "Reprobate unto every good work" (Tit 1:16) are they who by their life have disappointed the expectation of good works. The "reprobate (rejected) land" of Heb 6:8 is land that by bearing thorns and thistles has failed to meet the test of the husband man. It should be noticed, however, that adokimos, even in these cases, always retains the meaning of rejection because of failure in trial; compare in the last-named passage: "rejected and nigh unto cursing."

LITERATURE.

Cremer, Biblisch-theologisches Worterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gracitat(10), 356-57.

Geerhardus Vos

REPROOF; REPROVE

re-proof', re-proov':"Reprove" in Elizabethan English had a variety of meanings ("reject" "disprove" "convince," "rebuke"), with "put to the proof" (see 2Ti 4:2 the Revised Version margin) as the force common to all, although in modern English the word means only "rebuke" (with a connotation of deliberateness). the King James Version uses the word chiefly (and the Revised Version (British and American) exclusively, except in 2 Esdras 12:32; 14:13; 2 Macc 4:33) for yakhach, and elegcho, words that have very much the same ambiguities of meaning. Hence, a fairly easy rendition into English was possible, but the result included all the ambiguities of the original, and to modern readers such a passage as "But your reproof, what doth it reprove? Do ye think to reprove words" (Job 6:25,26 the American Standard Revised Version) is virtually incomprehensible. The meaning is, approximately: "What do your rebukes prove? Are you quibbling about words?" In Joh 16:8 no single word in modern English will translate elegcho, and "reprove" (the King James Version), "convince" (King James Version margin), and "convict" (Revised Version) are all unsatisfactory. The sense is: "The Spirit will teach men the true meaning of these three words: sin, righteousness, judgment."

Burton Scott Easton

REPTILE

rep'-til, -til: Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) in Mic 7:17 has reptilis for zohale, "crawling things," the American Standard Revised Version "worms of the earth," the King James Version margin "creeping things."

See LEVIATHAN; LIZARD; SERPENT; TORTOISE.

REPUTATION

rep-u-ta’-shun: the King James Version uses "reputation" where modern English would use "repute," as connoting prominence rather than moral character. Hence, the Revised Version’s change to "repute" in Ga 2:2 (for dokeo, "seem," perhaps with a slightly sarcastic touch). The Revised Version’s alteration of "reputation" into "have in honor" (Ac 5:34; Php 2:29) is to secure uniformity of translation for the derivatives of time, "honor," but the Revised Version (British and American) retains "reputation" in Susanna, verse 64. The King James Version’s "made himself of no reputation" in Php 2:7 is a gloss. See KENOSIS. On Ec 10:1 see the commentaries.

REQUIRE

re-kwir’:"Require" meant originally "seek after," whence "ask," and so (as in modern English) "demand." All meanings are common in the King James Version (e.g. 1Sa 21:8; Ec 3:15; Ezr 8:22; 1Co 4:2), and the Revised Version (British and American) has made little change.

REREWARD

rer’-word.

See REARWARD.

RESAIAS

re-sa’-yas, re-si’-as (Rhesaias; the King James Version Reesaias): One of the "leaders" with Zerubbabel in the return (1 Esdras 5:8) =" Reelaiah" in Ezr 2:2, "Raamiah" in Ne 7:7. The name is apparently duplicated in 1 Esdras 5:8 in the form "Reelias."

RESEN

re’-sen (recen; Septuagint Dasen, Dasem):

1. The Name and Its Native Equivalent:

The Greek forms show that the Septuagint translators had "d", for "r", but the reading of the Massoretic Text is to be preferred. Resen—the last of the four cities mentioned in Ge 10:11,12 as having been founded by Nimrod (the King James Version by Asshur)—probably represents the Assyrian pronunciation of the place-name Res-eni, "fountainhead." The only town so named in the inscriptions is one of 18 mentioned by Sennacherib in the Bavian inscription as places from which he dug canals connecting with the river Khosr—in fact, it was one of the sources of Nineveh’s water supply. It probably lay too far North, however, to be the city here intended. Naturally the name "Resen" could

exist in any place where there was a spring.

2. Possibly the Modern Selamiyeh:

As the Biblical text requires a site lying between Nineveh and Calah (Kouyunjik and Nimroud), it is generally thought to be represented by the ruins at Selamiyeh, about 3 miles North of the latter city. It is noteworthy that Xenophon (Anab. iii.4) mentions a "great" city called Larissa as occupying this position, and Bochart has suggested that it is the same place. He supposes that when the inhabitants were asked to what city the ruins belonged, they answered la Resen, "to Resen," which was reproduced by the Greeks as Larissa. Xenophon describes its walls as being 25 ft. wide, 100 ft. high, and 2 parasangs in circuit. Except for the stone plinth 20 ft. high, they were of brick. He speaks of a stone-built pyramid near the city—possibly the temple-tower at Nimroud.

See CALAH; NINEVEH, 10.

T. G. Pinches

RESERVOIR

rez’-er-vwor, -vwar (miqwah; the King James Version ditch (Isa 22:11)).

See DITCH; CISTERN; POOL.

RESH

resh, rash "r": The 20th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "r". It came also to be used for the number 200. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

RESHEPH

re’-shef (resheph, "flame" or "fire-bolt"): Personal name found in Phoenician as a divine name. In the Old Testament the name of a descendant of Ephraim, the eponym of an Ephraimite family or clan (1Ch 7:25).

RESIDUE

rez’-i-du.

See REMNANT.

RESPECT OF PERSONS

re-spekt’:The phrase nasa’ phanim, means literally, "lift up the face," and, among other translations, is rendered indifferently "accept" or "respect the person" in the King James Version (contrast Pr 18:5 and 24:23). As applied to a (prostrate) suppliant, the phrase means "receive him with favor," and is so used in 1Sa 25:35; Mal 1:8,9 (compare Ge 19:21, etc.). By a shift in force the phrase came to mean "accept the person instead of the cause" or "show partiality" (Job 13:8,10 the American Standard Revised Version), and is so used commonly. A literal translation into Greek gave lambano prosopon (Sirach 35:13 (32:16); Lu 20:21; Ga 2:6), with the noun prosopolempsia, "face-taking" (Ro 2:11; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; Jas 2:1), rendered uniformly "respect of persons" in English Versions of the Bible. A noun prosopolemptes, "respecter of persons," and a verb prosopolempteo, are found Ac 10:34; Jas 2:9. God’s judgment rests solely on the character of the man and will be influenced by no worldly (Eph 6:9) or national (Ro 2:11) considerations.

See also ACCEPT.

Burton Scott Easton

REST

(nuach, menuchah, "cessation from motion," "peace," "quiet," etc.; anapausis, [@katapausis): "Rest" in the above sense is of frequent occurrence, and is the translation of several words with various applications and shades of meaning, chiefly of the words given above. It is applied to God as ceasing from the work of creating on the 7th day (Ge 2:2 f) ; as having His place of rest in the midst of His people in the temple (1Ch 28:2; Ps 132:8,14); as resting in His love among His people (Ze 3:17, the Revised Version margin "Hebrew, ‘be silent’ "). The 7th day was to be one of rest (Ex 16:23; 31:15; see SABBATH); the land also was to have its rest in the 7th year (Le 25:4 f). Yahweh promised His people rest in the land He should give them; this they looked forward to and enjoyed (De 12:9; Jos 11:23). "To rest on" often means to come upon to abide, as of the Spirit of Yahweh (Nu 11:25 f; Isa 11:2), of wisdom (Pr 14:33), of anger (Ec 7:9). There is again the "rest" of the grave (Job 3:13,17,18; Isa 57:2; Da 12:13). Rest is sometimes equivalent to trust, reliance (2Ch 14:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "rely"). Hence, rest in Yahweh (Ps 37:7, etc.); "rest" in the spiritual sense is not, however, prominent in the Old Testament. In the New Testament Christ’s great offer is rest to the soul (Mt 11:28). In Heb 4:1 ff, it is argued from God’s having promised His people a "rest"—a promise not realized in Canaan (4:8)—that there remains for the people of God "a Sabbath rest" (sabbatismos, 4:9). For "rest" the Revised Version (British and American) has "solemn rest" (Ex 16:23; 31:15, etc.), "resting-place" (Ps 132:8,14; Isa 11:10), "peace" (Ac 9:31), "relief" (2Co 2:13; 7:5), etc.

See also REMNANT.

W. L. Walker

RESTITUTION; RESTORATION

res-ti-tu’-shun.

See PUNISHMENTS.

RESTORATION

res-to-ra’-shun: The idea of a restoration of the world had its origin in the preaching of the Old Testament prophets. Their faith in the unique position and mission of Israel as the chosen people of God inspired in them the conviction that the destruction of the nation would eventually be followed by a restoration under conditions that would insure the realization of the original divine purpose. When the restoration came and passed without fulfillment of this hope, the Messianic era was projected into the future. By the time of Jesus the conception became more or less spiritualized, and the anticipation of a new order in which the consequences of sin would no longer appear was a prominent feature of the Messianic conception. In the teaching of Jesus and the apostles such a restoration is taken for granted as a matter of course.

In Mt 17:11 (compare Mr 9:12), the moral and spiritual regeneration preached by John the Baptist is described as a restoration and viewed as a fulfillment of Mal 4:6. It is "to be observed, however, that the work of John could be characterized as restoration only in the sense of an inception of the regeneration that was to be completed by Jesus. In Mt 19:28 Jesus speaks of a regeneration (palingenesia) of the world in terms that ascribe to the saints a state of special felicity. Perhaps the most pointed expression of the idea of restoration as a special event or crisis is found in the address of Peter (Ac 3:21), where the restoration is described as an apokatastasis panton, and is viewed as a fulfillment of prophecy.

In all the passages cited the restoration is assumed as a matter with which the hearers are familiar, and consequently its nature is not unfolded. The evidence is, therefore, too limited to justify any attempt to outline its special features. Under such circumstances there is grave danger of reading into the language of the Scriptures one’s own conception of what the restoration is to embody. We are probably expressing the full warrant of the Scripture when we say that the reconstruction mentioned in these passages contemplates the restoration of man, under the reign of Christ, to a life in which the consequences of sin are no longer present, and that this reconstruction is to include in some measure a regeneration of both the physical and the spiritual world.

Whether the benefits of the restoration are to accrue to all men is also left undefined in the Scriptures. In the passages already cited only the disciples of Christ appear in the field of vision. Certain sayings of Jesus are sometimes regarded as favorable to the more inclusive view. In Joh 12:32 Jesus speaks of drawing all men to Himself, but here, as in Joh 3:14,15, it is to be observed that while Christ’s sacrifice includes all men in its scope, its benefits will doubtless accrue to those only who respond willingly to His drawing power. The saying of Caiaphas (Joh 11:52) is irrelevant, for the phrase, "the children of God that are scattered abroad," probably refers only to the worthy Jews of the dispersion. Neither can

the statements of Paul (Ro 11:32; 1Co 15:22; Eph 1:9,10; Col 1:20; 1Ti 2:4; 4:10; Tit 2:11) be pressed in favor of the restorationist view. They affirm only that God’s plan makes provision for the redemption of all, and that His saving will is universal. But men have wills of their own, and whether they share in the benefits of the salvation provided depends on their availing themselves of its privileges. The doctrine of the restoration of all can hardly be deduced from the New Testament.

See also PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING.

Russell Benjamin Miller

RESURRECTION

rez-u-rek’-shun (in the New Testament anastasis, with verbs anistemi, "stand up," and egeiro, "raise." There is no technical term in the Old Testament, but in Isa 26:19 are found the verbs chayah, "live," kum "rise," kic "awake").

I. ISRAEL AND IMMORTALITY

1. Nationalism

2. Speculation

3. Religious Danger

4. Belief in Immortality

5. Resurrection

6. Greek Concepts

II. RESURRECTION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND INTERMEDIATE LITERATURE

1. The Old Testament

2. The Righteous

3. The Unrighteous 4. Complete Denial

III. TEACHING OF CHRIST

1. Mark 12:18-27

2. In General

IV. THE APOSTOLIC DOCTRINE

1. References

2. Pauline Doctrine

3. Continuity

4. 2 Corinthians 5

V. SUMMARY

1. New Testament Data

2. Interpretation

LITERATURE

I. Israel and Immortality.

1. Nationalism:

It is very remarkable that a doctrine of life after death as an essential part of religion was of very late development in Israel, although this doctrine, often highly elaborated, was commonly held among the surrounding nations. The chief cause of this lateness was that Israel’s religion centered predominantly in the ideal of a holy nation. Consequently the individual was a secondary object of consideration, and the future of the man who died before the national promises were fulfilled either was merged in the future of his descendants or else was disregarded altogether.

2. Speculation:

Much speculation about life after death evidently existed, but it was not in direct connection with the nation’s religion. Therefore, the Old Testament data are scanty and point, as might be expected, to non-homogeneous concepts. Still, certain ideas are clear. The living individual was composed of "flesh" and nephesh, or ruach (a trichotomy appears to be post-Biblical, despite 1Th 5:23; see PSYCHOLOGY). In the individual nephesh and ruach seem to be fairly synonymous words, meaning primarily "breath," as the animating principle of the flesh (so for the lower animals in Ps 104:29,30). But nephesh came to be used to denote the "inner man" or "self" (De 12:20, etc.; see HEART), and so in English Versions of the

Bible is usually rendered "soul." But there are only a very few cases where nephesh is used for the seat of the personality after death (Ps 30:3; compare Ps 16:10; 38:17; Job 33:18, etc.), and nearly all of such passages seem quite late. Indeed, in some 13 cases the nephesh of a dead man is unmistakably his corpse (Le 19:28; Nu 5:2; Hag 2:13, etc.). It seems the question of what survives death was hardly raised; whatever existed then was thought of as something quite new. On the one hand the dead man could be called a "god" (1Sa 28:13), a term perhaps related to ancestor-worship. But more commonly the dead are thought of as "shades," repha'im (Job 26:5 margin, etc.), weak copies of the original man in all regards (Eze 32:25). But, whatever existence such "shades" might have, they had passed out of relation to Yahweh, whom the "dead praise not" (Ps 115:17,18; Isa 38:18,19), and there was no religious interest in them.

3. Religious Danger:

Indeed, any interest taken in them was likely to be anti-religious, as connected with necromancy, etc. (De 14:1; 26:14; Isa 8:19; Ps 106:28, etc.; see SORCERY), or as connected with foreign religions. Here, probably, the very fact that the surrounding nations taught immortality was a strong reason for Israel's refusing to consider it. That Egypt held an elaborate doctrine of individual judgment at death, or that Persia taught the resurrection of the body, would actually tend to render these doctrines suspicious, and it was not until the danger of syncretism seemed past that such beliefs could be considered on their own merits. Hence, it is not surprising that the prophets virtually disregard the idea or that Ecclesiastes denies any immortality doctrine categorically.

4. Belief in Immortality:

Nonetheless, with a fuller knowledge of God, wider experience, and deeper reflection, the doctrine was bound to come. But it came slowly. Individualism reaches explicit statement in Eze 14$; 18$; 33$ (compare De 24:16; Jer 31:29,30), but the national point of view still made the rewards and punishments of the individual matters of this world only (Eze 14:14; Ps 37$, etc.), a doctrine that had surprising vitality and that is found as late as Sirach (1:13; 11:26). But as this does not square with the facts of life (Job), a doctrine of immortality, already hinted at (II, 1, below), was inevitable. It appears in full force in the post-Maccabean period, but why just then is hard to say; perhaps because it was then that there had been witnessed the spectacle of martyrdoms on a large scale (1 Macc 1:60-64).

5. Resurrection:

Resurrection of the body was the form immortality took, in accord with the religious premises. As the saint was to find his happiness in the nation, he must be restored to the nation; and the older views did not point toward pure soul-immortality. The "shades" led a wretched existence at the best; and Paul himself shudders at the thought of "nakedness" (2Co 5:3). The nephesh and ruach were uncertain quantities, and even the New Testament has no consistent terminology for the immortal part of man ("soul," Re 6:9; 20:4; "spirit," Heb 12:23; 1Pe 3:19; Paul avoids any term in 1Co 15, and in 2Co 5 says: "I"). In the Talmud a common view is that the old bodies will receive new souls (Ber. R. 2 7; 6 7; Vayy.

R. 12 2; 15 1, etc.; compare Sib Or 4:187).

6. Greek Concepts:

Where direct Greek influence, however, can be predicated, pure soul-immortality is found (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 8:19,20; 9:15 (but Wisd's true teaching is very uncertain); Enoch 102:4-105; 108; Slavonic Enoch; 4 Macc; Josephus, and especially Philo). According to Josephus (BJ, II, viii, 11) the Essenes held this doctrine, but as Josephus graecizes the Pharisaic resurrection into Pythagorean soul-migration (II, viii, 14; contrast Ant, XVIII, i, 3), his evidence is doubtful. Note, moreover, how Lu 6:9; 9:25; 12:4,5 has re-worded Mr 3:4; 8:36; Mt 10:28 for Greek readers. In a vague way even Palestinian Judaism had something of the same concepts (2 Esdras 7:88; 2Co 4:16; 12:2), while it is commonly held that the souls in the intermediate state can enjoy happiness, a statement first appearing in Enoch 22 (Jubilees 23:31 is hardly serious).

II. Resurrection in the Old Testament and Intermediate Literature.

1. The Old Testament:

For the reasons given above, references in the Old Testament to the resurrection doctrine are few. Probably it is to be found in Ps 17:15; 16:11; 49:15; 73:24, and in each case with increased probability, but for exact discussions the student must consult the commentaries. Of course no exact dating of these Psalm passages is possible. With still higher probability the doctrine is expressed in Job 14:13-15; 19:25-29, but again alternative explanations are just possible, and, again, Job is a notoriously hard book to date (see JOB, BOOK OF). The two certain passages are Isa 26:19 margin and Da 12:2. In the former (to be dated about 332 (?)) it is promised that the "dew of light" shall fall on the earth and so the (righteous) dead shall revive. But this resurrection is confined to Palestine and does not include the unrighteous. For Da 12:2 see below.

2. The Righteous:

Indeed, resurrection for the righteous only was thought of much more naturally than a general resurrection. And still more naturally a resurrection of martyrs was thought of, such simply receiving back what they had given up for God. So in Enoch 90:33 (prior to 107 BC) and 2 Macc 7:9,11,23; 14:46 (only martyrs are mentioned in 2 Macc); compare Re 20:4. But of course the idea once given could not be restricted to martyrs only, and the intermediate literature contains so many references to the resurrection of the righteous as to debar citation. Early passages are Enoch 91:10 (perhaps pre-Maccabean); Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Judah 25:4 (before 107). A very curious passage is Enoch 25:6, where the risen saints merely live longer than did their fathers, i.e. resurrection does not imply immortality. This passage seems to be unique.

3. The Unrighteous:

For a resurrection of unrighteous men (Da 12:2; Enoch 22:11; Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Benj. 10:7,8, Armenian text—in none of these cases a general resurrection), a motive is given in Enoch 22:13: for such men the mere condition of Sheol is not punishment enough. For a general resurrection the motive is always the final judgment, so that all human history may be summed up in one supreme act. The idea is not very common, and Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Benj. 10:7,8 (Greek text); Baruch 50:2; Enoch 51:1; Sib Or 4:178-90; Life of Adam (Greek) 10, and 2 Esdras 5:45; 7:32; 14:35 about account for all the unequivocal passages. It is not found in the earliest part of the Talmud, Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Benj. 10:7,8 (Greek) has two resurrections.

4. Complete Denial:

Finally, much of the literature knows no immortality at all. Eccl, Sirach and 1 Maccabees are the most familiar examples, but there are many others. It is especially interesting that the very spiritual author of 2 Esdras did not think it worth while to modify the categorical denial in the source used in 13:20. Of course, the Jewish party that persisted most in a denial of any resurrection was the Sadducees (Mt 22:23 and parallel's; Ac 23:8), with an extreme conservatism often found among aristocrats.

III. Teaching of Christ.

1. Mark 12:18-27:

The question is discussed explicitly in the familiar passage Mr 12:18-27 parallel Mt 22:23-33 parallel Lu 20:27-38. The Sadducees assumed that resurrection implies simply a resuscitation to a resumption of human functions, including the physical side of marriage. Their error lay in the low idea of God. For the Scriptures teach a God whose ability and willingness to care for His creatures are so unlimited that the destiny He has prepared for them is caricatured if conceived in any terms but the absolutely highest. Hence, there follows not only the truth of the resurrection, but a resurrection to a state as far above the sexual sphere as that of the angels. (The possibility of mutual recognition by husband and wife is irrelevant, nor is it even said that the resurrection bodies are asexual) Luke (20:36) adds the explanation that, as there are to be no deaths, marriage (in its relation to births) will not exist. It may be thought that Christ's argument would support equally well the immortality of the soul only, and, as a matter of fact, the same argument is used for the latter doctrine in 4 Macc 7:18,19; 16:25. But in Jerusalem and under the given circumstances this is quite impossible. And, moreover, it would seem that any such dualism would be a violation of Christ's teaching as to God's care.

2. In General:

However, the argument seems to touch only the resurrection of the righteous, especially in the form given in Lu (compare Lu 14:14). (But that Luke thought of so limiting the resurrection is disproved by Ac 24:15.) Similarly in Mt 8:11 parallel Lu 13:28; Mr 13:27 parallel Mt 24:31. But, as a feature in the Judgment, the resurrection of all men is taught. Then the men of sodom, Tyre, Nineveh appear (Mt 11:22,24; 12:41,42 parallel Lu 10:14; 11:32), and those cast into Gehenna are represented as having a

body (Mr 9:43-47; Mt 5:29,30; 10:28; 18:8,9). And at the great final assize (Mt 25:31-46) all men appear. In the Fourth Gospel a similar distinction is made (Joh 6:39,40,44,54; 11:25), the resurrection of the righteous, based on their union with God through Christ and heir present possession of this union, and (in Joh 5:28,29) the general resurrection to judgment. Whether these passages imply two resurrections or emphasize only the extreme difference in conditions at the one cannot be determined.

The passages in 4 Maccabees referred to above read: "They who care for piety with their whole heart, they alone are able to conquer the impulses of the flesh, believing that like our patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, they do not die to God but live to God" (7:18,19); and "They knew that dying for God they would live to God, even as Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the patriarchs" (16:25). It is distinctly possible that our Lord's words rnay have been known to the author of 4 Maccabees, although the possibility that Christ approved and broadened the tenets of some spiritually-minded few is not to be disregarded. More possible is it that 4 Maccabees influenced Luke's Greek phraseology.

See MACCABEES, BOOKS OF, IV.

IV. The Apostolic Doctrine.

1. References:

For the apostles, Christ's victory over death took the resurrection doctrine out of the realm of speculative eschatology. Henceforth, it is a fact of experience, basic for Christianity. Direct references in the New Testament are found in Ac 4:2; 17:18,32; 23:6; 24:15,21; Ro 4:17; 5:17; 6:5,8; 8:11; 11:15; 1Co 6:14; 15; 2Co 1:9; 4:14; 5:1-10; Php 3:10,11,21; Col 1:18; 1Th 4:13-18; 2Ti 2:18; Heb 6:2; 11:19,35; Re 20:4,5 (martyrs only); 20:12,13. Of these only Ac 24:15; Re 20:12,13, refer to a general resurrection with absolute unambiguity, but the doctrine is certainly contained in others and in 2Ti 4:1 besides.

2. Pauline Doctrine:

A theology of the resurrection is given fully by Paul. Basic is the conception of the union of the believer with Christ, so that our resurrection follows from His (especially Ro 6:5-11; Php 3:10,11). Every deliverance from danger is a foretaste of the resurrection (2Co 4:10,11). Indeed so certain is it, that it may be spoken of as accomplished (Eph 2:6). From another standpoint, the resurrection is simply part of God's general redemption of Nature at the consummation (Ro 8:11,18-25). As the believer then passes into a condition of glory, his body must be altered for the new conditions (1Co 15:50; Php 3:21); it becomes a "spiritual" body, belonging to the realm of the spirit (not "spiritual" in opposition to "material"). Nature shows us how different "bodies" can be—from the "body" of the sun to the bodies of the lowest animals the kind depends merely on the creative will of God (1Co 15:38-41). Nor is the idea of a change in the body of the same thing unfamiliar: look at the difference in the "body" of a grain of wheat at its sowing and after it is grown! (1Co 15:37). Just so, I am "sown" or sent into the world (probably not "buried") with one kind of body, but my resurrection will see me with a body adapted to my life with Christ and God (1Co 15:42-44). If I am still alive at the Parousia, this new body shall be

clothed upon my present body (1Co 15:53,54; 2Co 5:2-4) otherwise I shall be raised in it (1Co 15:52). This body exists already in the heavens (2Co 5:1,2), and when it is clothed upon me the natural functions of the present body will be abolished (1Co 6:13). Yet a motive for refraining from impurity is to keep undefiled the body that is to rise (1Co 6:13,14).

3. Continuity:

The relation of the matter in the present body to that in the resurrection body was a question Paul never raised. In 1Co 6:13,14 it appears that he thought of the body as something more than the sum of its organs, for the organs perish, but the body is raised. Nor does he discuss the eventual fate of the dead body. The imagery of 1Th 4:16,17; 1Co 15:52 is that of leaving the graves, and in the case of Christ's resurrection, the type of ours, that which was buried was that which was raised (1Co 15:4). Perhaps the thought is that the touch of the resurrection body destroys all things in the old body that are unadapted to the new state; perhaps there is an idea that the essence of the old body is what we might call "non-material," so that decay simply anticipates the work the resurrection will do. At all events, such reflections are "beyond what is written."

4. 2 Corinthians 5:

A partial parallel to the idea of the resurrection body being already in heaven is found in Slavonic Enoch 22:8,9, where the soul receives clothing laid up for it (compare Ascension of Isaiah 7:22,23 and possibly Re 6:11). But Christ also speaks of a reward being already in heaven (Mt 5:12). A more important question is the time of the clothing in 2Co 5:1-5. A group of scholars (Heinrici, Schmiedel, Holtzmann, Clemen, Charles, etc.) consider that Paul has here changed his views from those of 1 Corinthians; that he now considers the resurrection body to be assumed immediately at death, and they translate 2Co 5:2,3 "'we groan (at the burdens of life), longing to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven': because, when we shall be clothed with it, we shall have no more nakedness to experience" (Weizsacker's translation of the New Testament). But 2 Corinthians would have been a most awkward place to announce a change of views, for it was written in part as a defense against inconsistency (1:17, etc.). The willingness to be absent from the body (5:8) loses all its point if another and better body is to be given at once. The grammatical reasons for the interpretation above (best stated by Heinrici) are very weak. And the translation given reads into the verse something that simply is not there. Consequently it is far better to follow the older interpretation of Meyer (B. Weiss, Bousset, Lietzmann, Bachmann, Menzies, etc.; Bachmann is especially good) and the obvious sense of the passage: Paul dreads being left naked by death, but finds immediate consolation at the thought of being with Christ, and eventual consolation at the thought of the body to be received at the Parousia. (In Php 1:21-24 this dread is overcome.)

Of a resurrection of the wicked, Paul has little to say. The doctrine seems clearly stated in 2Co 5:10 (and in 2Ti 4:1, unless the Pauline authorship of 2 Timothy is denied). But Paul is willing to treat the fate of the unrighteous with silence.

V. Summary.

1. New Testament Data:

The points in the New Testament doctrine of the resurrection of the righteous, then, seem to be these: The personality of the believer survives after death and is with Christ. But it is lacking in something that will be supplied at the consummation, when a body will be given in which there is nothing to hinder perfect intercourse with God. The connection of this body with the present body is not discussed, except for saying that some connection exists, with the necessity of a transformation for those alive at the end. In this state nothing remains that is inconsistent with the height to which man is raised, and in particular sexual relations (Mr 12:25) and the processes of nutrition (1Co 6:13) cease. For this end the whole power of God is available. And it is insured by the perfect trust the believer may put in God and by the resurrection of Christ, with whom the believer has become intimately united. The unrighteous are raised for the final vindication of God's dealings in history. Two resurrections are found in Re 20:5,13 and quite possibly in 1Th 4:16; 1Co 15:23,24. Hence, the phrase first resurrection.

See JUDGMENT, LAST.

2. Interpretation:

Into the "blanks" of this scheme the believer is naturally entitled to insert such matter as may seem to him best compatible with his other concepts of Christianity and of philosophy. As is so often the case with passages in the Bible, the student marvels at the way the sacred writers were restrained from committing Christianity to metaphysical schemes that growth in human knowledge might afterward show to be false. But theologian must take care to distinguish between the revealed facts and the interpretation given them in any system that he constructs to make the doctrine conform to the ideas of his own time or circle—a distinction too often forgotten in the past and sometimes with lamentable results. Especially is it well to remember that such a phrase as "a purely spiritual immortality" rests on a metaphysical dualism that is today obsolete, and that such a phrase is hardly less naive than the expectation that the resurrection body will contain identically the material of the present body. We are still quite in the dark as to the relations of what we call "soul" and "body," and so, naturally, it is quite impossible to dogmatize. A. Meyer in his RGG article ("Auferstehung, dogmatisch") has some interesting suggestions. For an idealistic metaphysic, where soul and body are only two forms of God's thought, the resurrection offers no difficulties. If the body be regarded as the web of forces that proceed from the soul, the resurrection would take the form of the return of those forces to their center at the consummation. If "body" be considered to embrace the totality of effects that proceed from the individual, at the end the individual will find in these effects the exact expression of himself (Fechner's theory). Or resurrection may be considered as the end of evolution—the reunion in God of all that has been differentiated and so evolved and enriched. Such lines must be followed cautiously, but may be found to lead to results of great value.

In recent years the attention of scholars has been directed to the problem of how far the teachings of

other religions assisted the Jews in attaining a resurrection doctrine. Practically only the Persian system comes into question, and here the facts seem to be these: A belief among the Persians in the resurrection of the body is attested for the pre-Christian period by the fragments of Theopompus (4th century BC), preserved by Diogenes Laertius and Aeneas of Gaza. That this doctrine was taught by Zoroaster himself is not capable of exact proof, but is probable. But on the precise details we are in great uncertainty. In the Avesta the doctrine is not found in the oldest part (the Gathas), but is mentioned in the 19th Yasht, a document that has certainly undergone post-Christian redaction of an extent that is not determinable. The fullest Persian source is the Bundahesh (30), written in the 9th Christian century. It certainly contains much very ancient matter, but the age of any given passage in it is always a problem. Consequently the sources must be used with great caution. It may be noted that late Judaism certainly was affected to some degree by the Persian religion (see Tob, especially), but there are so many native Jewish elements that were leading to a resurrection doctrine that familiarity with the Persian belief could have been an assistance only. Especially is it to be noted that the great acceptance of the doctrine lies in the post-Maccabean period, when direct Persian influence is hardly to be thought of.

See ZOROASTRIANISM.

LITERATURE.

The older works suffer from a defective understanding of the presuppositions, but Salmond, Christian Doctrine of Immortality, is always useful. Brown, The Christian Hope, 1912, is excellent and contains a full bibliography. Charles, Eschatology, and article "Eschatology" in Encyclopedia Biblica are invaluable, but must be used critically by the thorough student, for the opinions are often individualistic. Wotherspoon’s article "Resurrection" in DCG is good; Bernard’s in HDB is not so good. On 1 Corinthians, Findlay or (better) Edwards; on 2 Corinthians, Menzies. In German the New Testament Theologies of Weiss, Holtzmann, Feine; Schaeder’s "Auferstehung" in PRE3. On 1 Cor, Heinrici and J. Weiss in Meyer (editions 8 and 9); on 2 Corinthians, Bachmann in the Zahn series. On both Corinthian epistles Bousset in the Schriften des New Testament of J. Weiss (the work of an expert in eschatology), and Lietzmann in his Handbuch.

See BODY; ESCHATOLOGY (OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT); FLESH; SOUL; SPIRIT.

Burton Scott Easton

RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST, THE

1. First Proof: The Life of Jesus

2. Second Proof: The Empty Grave

3. Third Proof: Transformation of the Disciples

4. Fourth Proof: Existence of the Primitive Church

5. Fifth Proof: The Witness of Paul

6. Sixth Proof: The Gospel Record

7. Summary and ConClusion

8. Theology of the Resurrection

LITERATURE

The Resurrection has always been felt to be vital in connection with Christianity. As a consequence, opponents have almost always concentrated their attacks, and Christians have centered their defense, upon it. It is therefore of the utmost importance to give attention to the subject, as it appears in the New Testament. There are several converging lines of evidence, and none can be overlooked. Each must have its place and weight. The issues at stake are so serious that nothing must be omitted.

1. First Proof: The Life of Jesus:

The first proof is the life of Jesus Christ Himself. It is always a disappointment when a life which commenced well finishes badly. We have this feeling even in fiction; instinct demands that a story should end well. Much more is this true of Jesus Christ. A perfect life characterized by divine claims ends in its prime in a cruel and shameful death. Is that a fitting close? Surely death could not end everything after such a noble career. The Gospels give the resurrection as the completion of the picture of Jesus Christ. There is no real doubt that Christ anticipated His own resurrection. At first He used only vague terms, such as, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up." But later on He spoke plainly, and whenever He mentioned His death, He added, "The Son of man .... must be raised the third day." These references are too numerous to be overlooked, and, in spite of difficulties of detail, they are, in any proper treatment of the Gospels, an integral part of the claim made for Himself by Jesus Christ (Mt 12:38-40; 16:21; 17:9,23; 20:19; 27:63; Mr 8:31; 9:9,31; 10:34; 14:58; Lu 9:22; 18:33; Joh 2:19-21). His veracity is at stake if He did not rise. Surely the word of such a One must be given due credence. We are therefore compelled to face the fact that the resurrection of which the Gospels speak is the resurrection of no ordinary man, but of Jesus—that is of One whose life and character had been unique, and for whose shameful death no proper explanation was conceivable (Denhey, Jesus and the Gospel, 122 f). Is it possible that, in view of His perfect truthfulness of word and deed, there should be such an anti-climax as is involved in a denial of His assurance that He would rise again (C.H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection, 30)? Consider, too, the death of Christ in the light of His perfect life. If that death was the close of a life so beautiful, so remarkable, so Godlike, we are faced with an insoluble mystery—the permanent triumph of wrong over right, and the impossibility of believing in truth or justice in the world (C.H. Robinson, op. cit., 36). So the resurrection is not to be regarded as an isolated

event, a fact in the history of Christ separated from all else. It must be taken in close connection with what precedes. The true solution of the problem is to be found in that estimate of Christ which "most entirely fits in with the totality of the facts" (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 14).

2. Second Proof: The Empty Grave:

Another line of proof is the fact of the empty grave and the disappearance of the body. That Jesus died and was buried, and that on the third morning the tomb was empty, is not now seriously challenged. The theory of a swoon and a recovery in the tomb is impossible, and to it Strauss "practically gives its deathblow" (Orr, op. cit., 43). At Christ's burial a stone was rolled before the tomb, the tomb was sealed, and a guard was placed before it. Yet on the third morning the body had disappeared, and the tomb was empty. There are only two alternatives. His body must have been taken out of the grave by human hands or else by superhuman power. If the hands were human, they must have been those of His friends or of His foes. If His friends had wished to take out His body, the question at once arises whether they could have done so in the face of the stone, the seal and the guard. If His foes had contemplated this action, the question arises whether they would seriously have considered it. It is extremely improbable that any effort should have been made to remove the body out of the reach of the disciples. Why should His enemies do the very thing that would be most likely to spread the report of His resurrection? As Chrysostom said, "If the body had been stolen, they could not have stolen it naked, because of the delay in stripping it of the burial clothes and the trouble caused by the drugs adhering to it" (quoted in Day, Evidence for the Resurrection, 35). Besides, the position of the grave-clothes proves the impossibility of the theft of the body (see Greek of Joh 20:6,7; 11:44; Grimley, Temple of Humanity, 69, 70; Latham, The Risen Master; The Expository Times, XIII, 293 f; XIV, 510). How, too, is it possible to account for the failure of the Jews to disprove the resurrection? Not more than seven weeks afterward Peter preached in that city the fact that Jesus had been raised. What would have been easier or more conclusive than for the Jews to have produced the dead body and silenced Peter forever? "The silence of the Jews is as significant as the speech of the Christians" (Fairbairn, Studies in the Life of Christ, 357).

The fact of the empty tomb with the disappearance of the body remains a problem to be faced. It is now admitted that the evidence for the empty tomb is adequate, and that it was part of the primitive belief (Foundations, 134, 154). It is important to realize the force of this admission, because it is a testimony to Paul's use of the term "third day" (see below) and to the Christian observance of the first day of the week. And yet in spite of this we are told that a belief in the empty tomb is impossible. By some writers the idea of resurrection is interpreted to mean the revival of Christ's spiritual influence on the disciples, which had been brought to a close by His death. It is thought that the essential idea and value of Christ's resurrection can be conserved, even while the belief in His bodily rising from the grave is surrendered (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 23). But how can we believe in the resurrection while we regard the basis of the primitive belief in it as a mistake, not to say a fraud? The disciples found the tomb empty, and on the strength of this they believed He had risen. How can the belief be true if the foundation be false? Besides, the various forms of the vision-theory are now gradually but surely being regarded as inadequate and impossible. They involve the change of almost every fact in the Gospel history, and the invention of new scenes and conditions of which the Gospels know nothing (Orr, op. cit., 222). It has never been satisfactorily shown why the disciples should have had this abundant experience of visions;

nor why they should have had it so soon after the death of Christ and within a strictly limited period; nor why it suddenly ceased. The disciples were familiar with the apparition of a spirit, like Samuel's, and with the resuscitation of a body, like Lazarus', but what they had not experienced or imagined was the fact of a spiritual body, the combination of body and spirit in an entirely novel way. So the old theory of a vision is now virtually set aside, and for it is substituted theory of a real spiritual manifestation of the risen Christ. The question at once arises whether this is not prompted by an unconscious but real desire to get rid of anything like a physical resurrection. Whatever may be true of unbelievers, this is an impossible position for those who believe Christ is alive.

Even though we may be ready to admit the reality of telepathic communication, it is impossible to argue that this is equivalent to the idea of resurrection. Psychical research has not proceeded far enough as yet to warrant arguments being built on it, though in any case it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain material from this quarter which will answer to the conditions of the physical resurrection recorded in the New Testament. "The survival of the soul is not resurrection." "Whoever heard of a spirit being buried?" (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 229).

In view of the records of the Gospels and the general testimony of the New Testament, it is impossible to be "agnostic" as to what happened at the grave of Jesus, even though we are quite sure that He who died now lives and reigns. It is sometimes said that faith is not bound up with, holding a particular view of the relations of Christ's present glory with the body that was once in Joseph's tomb, that faithis to be exercised in the exalted Lord, and that belief in a resuscitation of the human body is no vital part of it. It is no doubt true that faith today is to be exercised solely in the exalted and glorified Lord, but faith must ultimately rest on fact, and it is difficult to understand how Christian faith can really be "agnostic" with regard to the facts about the empty tomb and the risen body, which are so prominent in the New Testament, and which form an essential part of the apostolic witness. The attempt to set faith and historical evidence in opposition to each other, which is so marked a characteristic of much modern thought will never satisfy general Christian intelligence, and if there is to be any real belief in the historical character of the New Testament, it is impossible to be "agnostic" about facts that are writ so large on the face of the records. When once the evidence for the empty tomb is allowed to be adequate, the impossibility of any other explanation than that indicated in the New Testament is at once seen. The evidence must be accounted for and adequately explained. And so we come again to the insuperable barrier of the empty tomb, which, together with the apostolic witness, stands impregnable against all the attacks of visional and apparitional theories. It is becoming more evident that these theories are entirely inadequate to account for the records in the Gospels, as well as for the place and power of those Gospels in the early church and in all subsequent ages. The force of the evidence for the empty grave and the disappearance of the body is clearly seen by the explanations suggested by various modern writers (those of Oscar Holtzmann, K. Lake, and A. Meyer can be seen in Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, chapter viii, and that of Reville in C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection of Christ, 69; see also the article by Streeter in Foundations). Not one of them is tenable without doing violence to the Gospel story, and also without putting forth new theories which are not only improbable in themselves, but are without a shred of real historical or literary evidence. The one outstanding fact which baffles all these writers is the empty grave.

Others suggest that resurrection means a real objective appearance of the risen Christ without implying any physical reanimation, that the "resurrection of Christ was an objective reality, but was not a physical resuscitation" (C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection of Christ, 12). But the difficulty here is as to the meaning of the term "resurrection." If it means a return from the dead, a rising again (re-), must there not have been some identity between that which was put in the tomb and the "objective reality" which appeared to the disciples? Wherein lies the essential difference between an objective vision and an objective appearance? If we believe the apostolic testimony to the empty tomb, why may we not accept their evidence to the actual resurrection? They evidently recognized their Master, and this recognition must have been due to some familiarity with His bodily appearance. No difficulty of conceiving of the resurrection of mankind hereafter must be allowed to set aside the plain facts of the record about Christ. It is, of course, quite clear that the resurrection body of Jesus was not exactly the same as when it was put in the tomb, but it is equally clear that there was definite identity as well as definite dissimilarity, and both elements must be faced and accounted for. There need be no insuperable difficulty if we believe that in the very nature of things Christ's resurrection must be unique, and, since the life and work of Jesus Christ transcend our experience (as they certainly should do), we must not expect to bring them within the limitations of natural law and human history. How the resurrection body was sustained is a problem quite outside our ken, though the reference to "flesh and bones," compared with Paul's words about "flesh and blood" not being able to enter the kingdom of God, may suggest that while the resurrection body was not constituted upon a natural basis through blood, yet that it possessed "all things appertaining to the perfection of man's nature" (Church of England Article IV). We may not be able to solve the problem, but we must hold fast to all the facts, and these may be summed up by saying that the body was the same though different, different though the same. The true description of the resurrection seems to be that "it was an objective reality, but, that it was not merely a physical resuscitation." We are therefore brought back to a consideration of the facts recorded in the Gospels as to the empty tomb and the disappearance of the body, and we only ask for an explanation which will take into consideration all the facts recorded, and will do no violence to any part of the evidence. To predicate a new resurrection body in which Christ appeared to His disciples does not explain how in three days' time the body which had been placed in the tomb was disposed of. Does not this theory demand a new miracle of its own (Kennett, Interpreter, V, 271)?

3. Third Proof: Transformation of the Disciples:

The next line of proof to be considered is the transformation of the disciples caused by the resurrection. They had seen their Master die, and through that death they lost all hope. Yet hope returned three days after. On the day of the crucifixion they were filled with sadness; on the first day of the week with gladness. At the crucifixion they were hopeless; on the first day of the week their hearts glowed with certainty. When the message of the resurrection first came they were incredulous and hard to be convinced, but when once they became assured they never doubted again. What could account for the astonishing change in these men in so short a time? The mere removal of the body from the grave could never have transformed their spirits and characters. Three days are not enough for a legend to spring up which should so affect them. Time is needed for a process of legendary growth. There is nothing more striking in the history of primitive Christianity than this marvelous change wrought in the disciples by a belief in the resurrection of their Master. It is a psychological fact that demands a full explanation. The

disciples were prepared to believe in the appearance of a spirit, but they never contemplated the possibility of a resurrection (see Mr 16:11). Men do not imagine what they do not believe, and the women's intention to embalm a corpse shows they did not expect His resurrection. Besides, a hallucination involving five hundred people at once, and repeated several times during forty days, is unthinkable. 4. Fourth Proof: Existence of the Primitive Church:

From this fact of the transformation of personal life in so incredibly short a space of time, we proceed to the next line of proof, the existence of the primitive church. "There is no doubt that the church of the apostles believed in the resurrection of their Lord" (Burkitt, The Gospel History and Its Transmission, 74).

It is now admitted on all hands that the church of Christ came into existence as the result of a belief in the resurrection of Christ. When we consider its commencement, as recorded in the Book of the Ac of the Apostles, we see two simple and incontrovertible facts:

(1) the Christian society was gathered together by preaching;

(2) the substance of the preaching was the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ was put to death on a cross, and would therefore be rejected by Jews as accursed of God (De 21:23).

Yet multitudes of Jews were led to worship Him (Ac 2:41), and a great company of priests to obey Him (Ac 6:7). The only explanation of these facts is God's act of resurrection (Ac 2:36), for nothing short of it could have led to the Jewish acceptance of Jesus Christ as their Messiah. The apostolic church is thus a result of a belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ. The early chapters of Ac bear the marks of primitive documents, and their evidence is unmistakable. It is impossible to allege that the early church did not know its own history, that myths and legends quickly grew up and were eagerly received, and that the writers of the Gospels had no conscience for principle, but manipulated their material at will, for any modern church could easily give an account of its history for the past fifty years or more (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 144). And it is simply absurd to think that the earliest church had no such capability. In reality there was nothing vague or intangible about the testimony borne by the apostles and other members of the church. "As the church is too holy for a foundation of rottenness, so she is too real for a foundation of mist" (Archbishop Alexander, The Great Question, 10).

5. Fifth Proof: The Witness of Paul:

One man in the apostolic church must, however, be singled out as a special witness to the resurrection. The conversion and work of Saul of Tarsus is our next line of proof. Attention is first called to the evidence of his life and writings to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Some years ago an article appeared (E. Medley, The Expositor, V, iv, 359). inquiring as to the conception of Christ which would be suggested to a heathen inquirer by a perusal of Paul's earliest extant writing, 1 Thessalonians. One point at least would stand out clearly—that Jesus Christ was killed (2:15; 4:14) and was raised from the dead (4:14). As this Epistle is usually dated about 51 AD—that is, only about 22 years after the resurrection—

and as the same Epistle plainly attributes to Jesus Christ the functions of God in relation to men (1:1,6; 2:14; 3:11), we can readily see the force of this testimony to the resurrection. Then a few years later, in an epistle which is universally accepted as one of Paul's, we have a much fuller reference to the event. In the well-known chapter (1Co 15) where he is concerned to prove (not Christ's resurrection, but) the resurrection of Christians, he naturally adduces Christ's resurrection as his greatest evidence, and so gives a list of the various appearances of Christ, ending with one to himself, which he puts on an exact level with the others: "Last of all he was seen of me also." Now it is essential to give special attention to the nature and particularity of this testimony. "I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (1Co 15:3 f). This, as it has often been pointed out, is our earliest authority for the appearances of Christ after the resurrection, and dates from within 30 years of the event itself. But there is much more than this: "He affirms that within 5 years of the crucifixion of Jesus he was taught that 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures' "(Kennett, Interpreter, V, 267). And if we seek to appreciate the full bearing of this act and testimony we have a right to draw the same conclusion: "That within a very few years of the time of the crucifixion of Jesus, the evidence for the resurrection of Jesus was, in the mind of at least one man of education, absolutely irrefutable" (Kennett, op. cit., V, 267).

Besides, we find this narrative includes one small but significant statement which at once recalls a very definite feature of the Gospel tradition—the mention of "the third day." A reference to the passage in the Gospels where Jesus Christ spoke of His resurrection will show how prominent and persistent was this note of time. Why, then, should Paul have introduced it in his statement? Was it part of the teaching which he had "received"? What is the significance of this plain emphasis on the date of the resurrection? Is it not that it bears absolute testimony to the empty tomb? From all this it may be argued that Paul believed the story of the empty tomb at a date when the recollection was fresh, when he could examine it for himself, when he could make the fullest possible inquiry of others, and when the fears and opposition of enemies would have made it impossible for the adherents of Jesus Christ to make any statement that was not absolutely true. "Surely common sense requires us to believe that that for which he so suffered was in his eyes established beyond the possibility of doubt" (Kennett, op. cit., V, 271).

In view, therefore, of Paul's personal testimony to his own conversion, his interviews with those who had seen Jesus Christ on earth before and after His resurrection, and the prominence given to the resurrection in the apostle's own teaching, we may challenge attention afresh to this evidence for the resurrection. It is well known that Lord Lyttelton and his friend Gilbert West left Oxford University at the close of one academic year, each determining to give attention respectively during the long vacation to the conversion of Paul and the resurrection of Christ, in order to prove the baselessness of both. They met again in the autumn and compared experiences. Lord Lyttelton had become convinced of the truth of Paul's conversion, and Gilbert West was convinced of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. If, therefore, Paul's 25 years of suffering and service for Christ were a reality, his conversion was true, for everything he did began with that sudden change. And if his conversion was true, Jesus Christ rose from the dead, for everything Paul was and did he attributed to the sight of the risen Christ.

6. Sixth Proof: The Gospel Record:

The next line of proof of the resurrection is the record in the Gospels of the appearances of the risen Christ, and it is the last in order to be considered. By some writers it is put first, but this is in forgetfulness of the dates when the Gospels were written. The resurrection was believed in by the Christian church for a number of years before our Gospels were written, and it is therefore impossible for these records to be our primary and most important evidence. We must get behind them if we are to appreciate fully the force and variety of the evidence. It is for this reason that, following the proper logical order, we have reserved to the last our consideration of the appearances of the risen Christ as given in the Gospels. The point is one of great importance (Denney, Jesus and the Gospel, 111).

Now, with this made clear, we proceed to consider the evidence afforded by the records of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ. Modern criticism of the Gospels during recent years has tended to adopt the view that Mark is the earliest, and that Matthew and Luke are dependent on it. This is said to be "the one solid result" (W. C. Allen, "St. Matthew," International Critical Commentary, Preface, vii; Burkitt, The Gospel History, 37) of the literary criticism of the Gospels. If this is so, the question of the records of the resurrection becomes involved in the difficult problem about the supposed lost ending of Mark, which, according to modern criticism, would thus close without any record of an appearance of the risen Christ. On this point, however, two things may be said at the present juncture: (1) There are some indications that the entire question of the criticism of the Gospels is to be reopened (Ramsay, Luke the Physician, chapter ii; see also Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 63 ff). (2) Even if the current theory be accepted, it would not seriously weaken the intrinsic force of the evidence for the resurrection, because, after all, Mark does not invent or "doctor" his material, but embodies the common apostolic tradition of his time (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 62).

We may, therefore, meanwhile examine the record of the appearances without finding them essentially affected by any particular theory of the origin and relations of the Gospels. There are two sets of appearances, one in Jerusalem and the other in Galilee, and their number, and the amplitude and weight of their testimony should be carefully estimated. While we are precluded by our space from examining each appearance minutely, and indeed it is unnecessary for our purpose to do so, it is impossible to avoid calling attention to two of them. No one can read the story of the walk to Emmaus (Lu 24), or of the visit of Peter and John to the tomb (Joh 20), without observing the striking marks of reality and personal testimony in the accounts. As to the former incident: "It carries with it, as great literary critics have pointed out, the deepest inward evidences of its own literal truthfulness. For it so narrates the intercourse of ‘a risen God’ with commonplace men as to set natural and supernatural side by side in perfect harmony. And to do this has always been the difficulty, the despair of imagination. The alternative has been put reasonably thus: Luke was either a greater poet, a more creative genius, than Shakespeare, or—he did not create the record. He had an advantage over Shakespeare. The ghost in Hamlet was an effort of laborious imagination. The risen Christ on the road was a fact supreme, and the Evangelist did but tell it as it was" (Bishop Moule, Meditations for the Church’s Year, 108). Other writers whose attitude to the Gospel records is very different bear the same testimony to the impression of truth and reality made upon them by the Emmaus narrative (A. Meyer and K. Lake, quoted in Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 176 f).

It is well known that there are difficulties connected with the number and order of these appearances, but they are probably due largely to the summary character of the story, and certainly are not sufficient to invalidate the uniform testimony to the two facts: (1) the empty grave, (2) the appearances of Christ on the third day. These are the main facts of the combined witness (Orr, op. cit., 212).

The very difficulties which have been observed in the Gospels for nearly nineteen centuries are a testimony to a conviction of the truth of the narratives on the part of the whole Christian church. The church has not been afraid to leave these records as they are because of the facts that they embody and express. If there had been no difficulties men might have said that everything had been artificially arranged, whereas the differences bear testimony to the reality of the event recorded. The fact that we possess these two sets of appearances—one in Jerusalem and one in Galilee—is really an argument in favor of their credibility, for if it had been recorded that Christ appeared in Galilee only, or Jerusalem only, it is not unlikely that the account might have been rejected for lack of support. It is well known that records of eyewitnesses often vary in details, while there is no question as to the events themselves. The various books recording the story of the Indian mutiny, or the surrender of Napoleon III at Sedan are cases in point, and Sir William Ramsay has shown the entire compatibility of certainty as to the main fact with great uncertainty as to precise details (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 29). We believe, therefore, that a careful examination of these appearances will afford evidence of a chain of circumstances extending from the empty grave to the day of the ascension.

7. Summary and Conclusion:

When we examine carefully all these converging lines of evidence and endeavor to give weight to all the facts of the case, it seems impossible to escape from the problem of a physical miracle. That the prima facie view of the evidence afforded by the New Testament suggests a miracle and that the apostles really believed in a true physical resurrection are surely beyond all question. And yet very much of present-day thought refuses to accept the miraculous. The scientific doctrine of the uniformity and continuity of Nature bars the way, so that from the outset it is concluded that miracles are impossible. We are either not allowed to believe (see Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 44), or else we are told that we are not required to believe (C. H. Robinson, Studies in the Resurrection of Christ, chapter ii), margin, the reanimation of a dead body. If we take this view, "there is no need, really, for investigation of evidence: the question is decided before the evidence is looked at" (Orr, op. cit., 46).

We challenge the tenableness of this position. It proves too much. We are not at all concerned by the charge of believing in the abnormal or unusual. New things have happened from the beginning of the present natural order, and the Christian faith teaches that Christ Himself was a "new thing," and that His coming as "God manifest in the flesh" was something absolutely unique. If we are not allowed to believe in any divine intervention which we may call supernatural or miraculous, it is impossible to account for the Person of Christ at all. "A Sinless Personality would be a miracle in time." Arising out of this, Christianity itself was unique, inaugurating a new era in human affairs. No Christian, therefore, can have any difficulty in accepting the abnormal, the unusual, the miraculous. If it be said that no amount of evidence can establish a fact which is miraculous, we have still to account for the moral miracles which

are really involved and associated with the resurrection, especially the deception of the disciples, who could have found out the truth of the case; a deception, too, that has proved so great a blessing to the world. Surely to those who hold a true theistic view of the world this a priori view is impossible. Are we to refuse to allow to God at least as much liberty as we possess ourselves? Is it really thinkable that God has less spontaneity of action than we have? We may like or dislike, give or withhold, will or not will, but the course of Nature must flow on unbrokenly. Surely God cannot be conceived of as having given such a constitution to the universe as limits His power to intervene if necessary and for sufficient purpose with the work of His own hands. Not only are all things of Him, but all things are through Him, and to Him. The resurrection means the presence of miracle, and "there is no evading the issue with which this confronts us" (Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 53). Unless, therefore, we are prepared to accept the possibility of the miraculous, all explanation of the New Testament evidence is a pure waste of time.

Of recent years attempts have been made to account for the resurrection by means of ideas derived from Babylonian and other Eastern sources. It is argued that mythology provides the key to the problem, that not only analogy but derivation is to be found. But apart from the remarkable variety of conclusions of Babylonian archaeologists there is nothing in the way of historical proof worthy of the name. The whole idea is arbitrary and baseless, and prejudiced by the attitude to the supernatural. There is literally no link of connection between these oriental cults and the Jewish and Christian beliefs in the resurrection.

And so we return to a consideration of the various lines of proof. Taking them singly, they must be admitted to be strong, but taking them altogether, the argument is cumulative and sufficient. Every effect must have its adequate cause, and the only proper explanation of Christianity today is the resurrection of Christ. Thomas Arnold of Rugby, no ordinary judge of historical evidence, said that the resurrection was the "best-attested fact in human history." Christianity welcomes all possible sifting, testing, and use by those who honestly desire to arrive at the truth, and if they will give proper attention to all the facts and factors involved, we believe they will come to the conclusion expressed years ago by the Archbishop of Armagh, that the resurrection is the rock from which all the hammers of criticism have never chipped a single fragment (The Great Question, 24).

8. Theology of the Resurrection:

The theology of the resurrection is very important and calls for special attention. Indeed, the prominence given to it in the New Testament affords a strong confirmation of the fact itself, for it seems incredible that such varied and important truths should not rest on historic fact. The doctrine may briefly be summarized: (1) evidential: the resurrection is the proof of the atoning character of the death of Christ, and of His Deity and divine exaltation (Ro 1:4); (2) evangelistic: the primitive gospel included testimony to the resurrection as one of its characteristic features, thereby proving to the hearers the assurance of the divine redemption (1Co 15:1-4; Ro 4:25); (3) spiritual: the resurrection is regarded as the source and standard of the holiness of the believer. Every aspect of the Christian life from the beginning to the end is somehow associated therewith (Ro 6); (4) eschatological: the resurrection is the guaranty and model of the believer’s resurrection (1Co 15). As the bodies of the saints arose (Mt 27:52), so ours are to be

quickened (Ro 8:11), and made like Christ's glorified body (Php 3:21), thereby becoming spiritual bodies (1Co 15:44), that is, bodies ruled by their spirits and yet bodies. These points offer only the barest outline of the fullness of New Testament teaching concerning the doctrine of the resurrection of Christ.

LITERATURE.

Orr, The Resurrection of Jesus, 1908; W. J. Sparrow Simpson, The Resurrection and Modern Thought; Westcott, The Historic Faith and The Gospel of the Resurrection. Very full literary references in Bowen, The Resurrection in the New Testament, 1911, which, although negative in its own conclusions, contains a valuable refutation of many negative arguments.

W. H. Griffith Thomas

RESURRECTION, GOSPEL OF THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

RETAIN

re-tan':Several Hebrew words are thus translated: chazaq, "to hold fast" (Jud 7:8; 19:4; Job 2:9 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "hold fast"); Mic 7:18); 'atsar, "to shut up" (only in Da 10:8,16; 11:6); tamakh, "to hold" (Pr 3:18; 4:4; 11:16 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "obtain")); in one case kala' (Ec 8:8). In the New Testament krateo, is used in Joh 20:23 of the "retaining" of sins by the apostles (see RETENTION OF SINS); in Ro 1:28, the Revised Version (British and American) has "refused to have," margin "Greek, 'did not approve,' " for the King James Version "did not like to retain" (echo); and in Phm 1:13, substitutes "fain have kept" for "retained" (katecho). Sirach 41:16 has "retain" for diaphulasso, "keep."

RETALIATION

re-tal-i-a'-shun, re-.

See LAW IN THE NEW TESTAMENT; PUNISHMENTS; RETRIBUTION.

RETENTION OF SINS

re-ten'-shun, (krateo, "to lay fast hold of" (Joh 20:23)): The opposite of "the remission of sins." Where there was no evidence of repentance and faith, the community of believers were unauthorized to give assurance of forgiveness, and, therefore, could only warn that the guilt of sin was retained, and that the sinner remained beneath God's judgment.

While such retention has its place in connection with all preaching of the gospel, since the offers of grace are conditional, it is especially exercised, like the absolution, in the personal dealing of a pastor with a communicant, preparatory to the reception of the Lord’s Supper. As the absolution is properly an assurance of individual forgiveness, so the retention is an assurance of individual non-forgiveness. That the retention is exercised by the ministry, not as an order, but as the representatives of the congregation of believers to which Christ gave the power of the keys, is shown by Alford, Greek Testament, on above passage. See also Melanchthon, Appendix to the "Schmalkald Articles."

H. E. Jacobs

RETRIBUTION

ret-ri-bu’-shun:

1. New Testament Terms

2. A Revelation of Wrath as Well as Grace

3. Witness of Natural Theology

4. Retribution the Natural Consequence of Sin

5. Also the Positive Infliction of Divine Wrath

6. Instances of Use of Orge and Thumos

7. Instances of Use of Greek Words for "Vengeance"

8. Words Meaning "Chastisement" Not Used of the Impenitent

9. Judgment Implies Retribution

10. Moral Sense Demands Vindication of God’s Righteousness

11. Scripture Indicates Certainty of Vindication

LITERATURE

1. New Testament Terms:

The word as applied to the divine administration is not used in Scripture, but undoubtedly the idea is

commonly enough expressed. The words which come nearest to it are orge, and thumos wrath attributed to God; ekdikeo, ekdikesis, ekdikos, and dike, all giving the idea of vengeance; kolasis, and timoria, "punishment"; besides krino, and its derivatives, words expressive of judgment.

2. A Revelation of Wrath as Well as Grace:

Romans 2 is full of the thought of retribution. The apostle, in 2:5,6, comes very near to using the word itself, and gives indeed a good description of the thing: the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God, "who will render to every man according to his works." It is well in approaching the subject to remind ourselves that there is undoubtedly, as the apostle says, a Revelation of wrath. We are so accustomed to think of the gracious revelation which the gospel brings us, and to approach the subject of the doom of the impenitent under the influence of the kindly sentiments engendered thereby, and with a view of God's gracious character as revealed in salvation, that we are apt to overlook somewhat the sterner facts of sin, and to misconceive the divine attitude toward the impenitent sinner. It is certainly well that we should let the grace of the gospel have full influence upon all our thinking, but we must beware of being too fully engrossed with one phase of the divine character. It is an infirmity of human nature that we find it difficult to let two seemingly conflicting conceptions find a place in our thought. We are apt to surrender ourselves to the sway of one or the other of them according to the pressure of the moment.

3. Witness of Natural Theology:

Putting ourselves back into the position of those who have only the light of natural theology, we find that all deductions from the perfections of God, as revealed in His works, combined with a consideration of man's sin and want of harmony with the Holy One, lead to the conclusion announced by the apostle: "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Ro 1:18). Wrath implies punishment, punishment is decreed, punishment is denounced. The word of God but confirms the verdict which conscience forecasts. Nature teaches that punishment, retribution, must follow sin. Within the sphere of physical law this is clearly exemplified. No breach of the so-called laws of Nature is tolerated. Strictly speaking, the laws of Nature cannot be broken, but let a man fail to keep in harmony with them, and the natural consequences will be trouble, punishment, retribution. Harmony with law is blessing; collision with law is loss. Thus law in Nature "worketh wrath" to the neglecters of it. Punishment necessarily results. So we may well expect that in the higher sphere, God's moral laws cannot be neglected or violated with impunity, and Scripture fully justifies the expectation and shows that sin must be punished. All things considered, the fact of punishment for sinners need not surprise; the fact of pardon is the surprising thing. The surprise of pardon has ceased to surprise us because we are so familiar with the thought. We know the "how" of it because of the revelation of grace. Grace, however, saves on certain conditions, and there is no such thing known in Scripture as indiscriminate, necessary, universal grace. It is only from the Bible that we know of the salvation by grace. That same revelation shows that the grace does not come to all, in the sense of saving all; though, of course, it may be considered as presented to all. Those who are not touched and saved by grace remain shut up in their sins. They are, and must be, in the nature of the case, left to the consequences of their sins, with the added guilt of rejecting the offered grace. "Except ye believe that I am he," said Incarnate Grace, "ye

shall die in your sins" (Joh 8:24).

4. Retribution the Natural Consequence of Sin:

Another conclusion we may draw from the general Scriptural representation is that the future retribution is one aspect of the natural consequence of sin, yet it is also in another aspect the positive infliction of divine wrath. It is shown to be the natural outcome of sin in such passages as "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap" (Ga 6:7); "He that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption" (Ga 6:8). It is not without suggestiveness that the Hebrew word ‘awon means both iniquity and punishment, and when Cain said "My punishment is greater than I can bear" (Ge 4:13), he really said "My iniquity is greater than I can bear"; his iniquity became his punishment. A due consideration of this thought goes a long way toward meeting many of the objections brought against the doctrine of future punishment.

5. Also the Positive Infliction of Divine Wrath:

The other statement, however, remains true and must be emphasized, that there is an actual infliction of divine wrath. All the great statements about the divine judgment imply this, and while it is wrong not to take account of the natural working out of sin in its terrible consequences, it is equally wrong, perhaps more so, to refuse to recognize this positive divine infliction of punishment. This, indeed, is the outstanding feature of retribution as it assumes form in Scripture. Even the natural consequences of sin, rightly viewed, are part of the divine infliction, since God, in the nature of things, has conjoined sin and its consequences, and part of the positive infliction is the judicial shutting up of the sinner to the consequences of his sin. So in the case of Cain, his iniquity became his punishment, inasmuch as God sentenced him to bear the consequences of that iniquity. On the other hand, we might say that even the terribly positive outpourings of God’s wrath upon the sinner are the natural consequences of sin, since sin in its very nature calls down the divine displeasure. Indeed, these two phases of future punishment are so very closely connected that a right view of the matter compels us to keep both before us, and no full explanation of the punishment is possible when either phase is ignored.

6. Instances of the Use of Orge and Thumos:

The terms in Scripture applied to the doom of sinners all imply divine displeasure, punitive action, retribution. The two outstanding Greek words for "wrath," orge and thumos, are both freely applied to God. Orge indicates settled displeasure, whereas thumos is rather the blazing out of the anger. The former is, as we should expect, more frequently applied to God, and, of course, all that is capricious and reprehensible in human wrath must be eliminated from the word as used of God. It indicates the settled opposition of His holy nature against sin. It was an affection found in the sinless Saviour Himself, for "he looked round about on them with anger" (Mr 3:5). In the Baptist’s warning "to flee from the wrath to come" (Mt 3:7; Lu 3:7), it is unquestionably the wrath of God that is meant, the manifestation of that being further described as the burning of the chaff with unquenchable fire (Mt 3:12). In Joh 3:36 it is said of the unbeliever that "the wrath of God" abideth on him. In Romans it is used at least 9 times in

reference to God, first in Ro 1:18, the great passage we have already quoted about "the wrath of God revealed from heaven." The connection is a suggestive one and is often overlooked. In the passage Paul has quite a chain of reasons; he is ready to preach the gospel at Rome for he is not ashamed of the gospel; he is not ashamed of the gospel for it is the power of God unto salvation; it is the "power of God" for therein is revealed the righteousness of God by faith; and this salvation by faith is a necessity "for the wrath of God is revealed," etc. Thus the divine wrath on account of sin is the dark background of the gospel message. Had there been no such just wrath upon men, there had been no need for the divine salvation. The despising of God's goodness by the impenitent means a treasuring up of "wrath in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God" (Ro 2:3-5). God "visiteth with wrath" (Ro 3:5).

In Ro 4:15 the apostle shows that "the law worketh wrath" (i.e. brings down the divine displeasure), while in 5:9 he shows that believers are saved from wrath—undoubted wrath of God. The other two instances are in 9:22. Men are "by nature children of wrath" (Eph 2:3); surely not "wrathful children," but liable to the wrath of God, and because of evil deeds cometh "the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience" (Eph 5:6; Col 3:6). Christ "delivereth us from the wrath to come" (1Th 1:10); wrath has come upon the opposing Jews (1Th 2:16); but believers are not appointed unto wrath (1Th 5:9). With all these specific passages in view, to say nothing of the general teaching of the apostle on the question of coming judgment and punishment, it is utterly impossible to eliminate the idea of the divine displeasure against sinners, and His consequent retributive action toward them. Even Ritschl, who absolutely denies the great principle of retribution, of positive displeasure, admits that Paul teaches it; hence, the only way for him out of the difficulty is to reject Paul's teaching as unauthoritative. Other references to the "wrath of God" are in Heb 3:11; 4:3; and 6 passages in the Apocalypse—Re 6:16 f; 11:18; 14:10; 16:19; 19:15. Two of these refer to the "wrath of the Lamb," one of the most terrible phrases in the whole of the New Testament. Thumos is only used in the Apocalypse concerning God (Re 14:10-19; 15:1-7; 16:1-19; 19:15). In each case it refers to the manifestation, the blazing forth of the wrath; in the last two passages it is used in combination with orge, and is rendered "fierceness," the fierceness of His wrath.

7. Instances of Use of Greek Words for "Vengeance":

Ekdikeo, which means to avenge, is twice used of God (Re 6:10; 19:2); and ekdikesis, "vengeance," 6 times Lu 18:7 ff; Ro 12:19; 2Th 1:8; Heb 10:30). In the first two instances it is used by Jesus concerning the divine action; ekdikos, "avenger," occurs once in application to God (1Th 4:6); dike, "judgment" or "vengeance" is twice used of God (2Th 1:9; Jude 1:7). The use of these terms shows that the punishment inflicted on sinful men is strictly punishment of the vindicatory sort, the vindication of outraged justice, the infliction of deserved penalty. Very significant is the passage in 2Th 1:6, "It is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict you." There is no question of bettering the offender.

8. Words Meaning "Chastisement" Not Used of the Impenitent:

It is very remarkable that the terms in Greek which would carry the meaning of punishment for the good of the offender are never used in the New Testament of the infliction which comes upon the impenitent;

these are paideia and paideuo, and they are frequently used of the "chastisement" of believers, but not of the impenitent. It is often claimed that the word kolasis used in Mt 25:46 carries the meaning of chastisement for the improvement of the offender, but although Aristotle, in comparing it with timoria, may seem to suggest that it is meant for the improvement of the offender (what he really says is that it is tou paschontos heneka, "on account of the one suffering it," "has the punished one in view," whereas timoria is tou poiountos, "on account of the one inflicting" "that he may be satisfied"), the usage even in classical Greek is predominantly against making the supposed distinction. Both words are used interchangeably by the leading classical authors, including Aristotle himself, and kolasis is continually employed where no thought of betterment can be in question, while all admit that in Hellenistic Greek the distinction is not maintained, and in any case timoria is also used of the punishment of the sinner (Heb 10:29).

9. Judgment Implies Retribution:

All the representations of the coming day of judgment tell of the fact of retribution, and Christ Himself distinctly asserts it. Apart from His great eschatological discourses, concerning which criticism still hesitates and stammers, we have the solemn close of the Sermon on the Mount, and the pregnant statement of Mt 16:27, "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds," and all the apostolic teaching upon the solemn theme is but the unfolding of the same great thought.

10. Moral Sense Demands Vindication of God’s Righteousness:

The conception of God as a perfect moral governor demands that His righteousness shall be fully vindicated. Looking at the course of history as it unfolds itself before us, we cannot fail to be struck with the anomalies which are presented. Righteousness does not always triumph, goodness is often put to shame, wickedness appears to be profitable, and wicked men often prosper while good men are under a cloud. Sometimes signal divine interpositions proclaim that God is indeed on the side of righteousness, but too often it seems as if He were unmindful, and men are tempted to ask the old question, "How doth God know? And is there knowledge in the Most High?" (Ps 73:11), while the righteous say in their distress, "Yahweh, how long shall the wicked, how long shall the wicked triumph?" (Ps 94:3). The moral sense cries out for some divine vindication, and the Scriptures, in harmony with this feeling, indicate that the final judgment will bring such vindication.

11. Scripture Indicates Certainty of Vindication:

In the Old Testament it is frequently presented as the solution of the baffling problems which beset the ethical sphere, as for instance in that fine utterance of religious philosophy in Ps 73; the Psalmist has before him all the puzzling elements of the problem; the prosperity, the insolent and aggressive prosperity of the wicked, the non-success, the oppression, the misery of the righteous; he is well-nigh overwhelmed by the contemplation, and nearly loses his footing on the eternal verities, until he carries the whole problem into the light of God’s presence and revelation, and then he understands that the end

will bring the true solution.

So too the somber ruminations of the Preacher upon the contradictions arid anomalies and mysteries of human life, "under the sun," close in the reflection which throws its searchlight upon all the blackness: "This is the end of the matter: .... Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man. For God will bring every work into judgment, with every hidden thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil" (Ec 12:13 f). In the light of the same truth, the apostles labored, believing that when the Lord comes He "will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts" (1Co 4:5). The more fully the subject is considered, the more we must feel that for the vindication of righteousness, the justification of the divine procedure, the rectification of wrongs, the explanation of mysteries, the reward and triumph of the righteous and the confession and punishment of the wicked, a great final, retributive judgment is Scriptural, reasonable, necessary.

LITERATURE.

See the articles on PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING; JUDGMENT; SHEOL, etc., and the works cited there.

Archibald M'Caig

REU

re'-u, roo (re'u, Rhagau): A son of Peleg, a descendant of Shem (Ge 11:18 ff; 1Ch 1:25; Lu 3:35).

REUBEN

roo'-ben, ru'-ben (re'ubhen; Rhouben): The eldest son of Jacob, born to him by Leah in Paddan-aram (Ge 29:32).

1. Jacob's Oldest Son:

This verse seems to suggest two derivations of the name. As it stands in Massoretic Text it means "behold a son"; but the reason given for so calling him is "The Lord hath looked upon my affliction," which in Hebrew is ra'ah be'onyi, literally, "He hath seen my affliction." Of his boyhood we have only the story of the mandrakes (Ge 30:14). As the firstborn he should really have been leader among his father's sons. His birthright was forfeited by a deed of peculiar infamy (Ge 35:22), and as far as we know his tribe never took the lead in Israel. It is named first, indeed, in Nu 1:5,20, but thereafter it falls to the fourth place, Judah taking the first (Nu 2:10, etc.). To Reuben's intervention Joseph owed his escape from the fate proposed by his other brethren (Ge 37:29). Some have thought Reuben designed to set him free, from a desire to rehabilitate himself with his father. But there is no need to deny to Reuben certain noble and chivalrous qualities. Jacob seems to have appreciated these, and, perhaps, therefore all the more deeply lamented the lapse that spoiled his life (Ge 49:3 f). It was Reuben who felt that their

perils and anxieties in Egypt were a fit recompense for the unbrotherly conduct (Ge 42:22). To assure his father of Benjamin's safe return from Egypt, whither Joseph required him to be taken, Reuben was ready to pledge his own two sons (Ge 42:37). Four sons born to him in Canaan went down with Reuben at the descent of Israel into Egypt (Ge 46:8 f).

The incidents recorded are regarded by a certain school of Old Testament scholars as the vague and fragmentary traditions of the tribe, wrought into the form of a biography of the supposed ancestor of the tribe. This interpretation raises more difficulties than it solves, and depends for coherence upon too many assumptions and conjectures. The narrative as it stands is quite intelligible and self-consistent. There is no good reason to doubt that, as far as it goes, it is an authentic record of the life of Jacob's son.

2. Tribal History:

At the first census in the wilderness Reuben numbered 46,500 men of war (Nu 1:21); at the second they had fallen to 43,730; see NUMBERS. The standard of the camp of Reuben was on the south side of the tabernacle; and with him were Simeon and Gad; the total number of fighting men in this division being 151,450. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan says that the standard was a deer, with the legend "Hear O Israel, the Lord thy God is one Lord." On the march this division took the second place (Nu 2:10). The prince of the tribe was Elizur ben Shedeur, whose oblation is described in Nu 7:30 ff. The Reubenite among the spies was Shammua ben Zaccur (13:4). It is possible that the conspiracy against Moses, organized by the Reubenites Dathan and Abiram, with the assistance of Korah the Levite (Nu 16), was an attempt on the part of the tribe to assert its rights as representing the firstborn. It is significant that the children of Korah did not perish (26:11). May not the influence of this incident on Moses' mind be traced in his "blessing," wishing for the continuance of the tribe, indeed, but not in great strength (De 33:6)? This was a true forecast of the tribal history.

When the high plateau East of the Dead Sea and the Jordan fell into the hands of the Israelite invaders, these spacious pastoral uplands irresistibly attracted the great flock-masters of Reuben and Gad, two tribes destined to be neighbors during succeeding centuries. At their earnest request Moses allowed them their tribal possessions here subject to one condition, which they loyally accepted. They should not "sit here," and so discourage their brethren who went to war beyond the Jordan. They should provide for the security of their cattle, fortify cities to protect their little ones and their wives from the inhabitants of the land, and their men of war should go before the host in the campaign of conquest until the children of Israel should have inherited every man his inheritance (Nu 32:1-27). Of the actual part they took in that warfare there is no record, but perhaps "the stone of Bohan the son of Reuben" (Jos 15:6; 18:17) marked some memorable deed of valor by a member of the tribe. At the end of the campaign the men of Reuben, having earned the gratitude of the western tribes, enriched by their share of the spoils of the enemy, returned with honor to their new home. Along with their brethren of Gad they felt the dangers attaching to their position of isolation, cut off from the rest of their people by the great cleft of the Jordan valley. They reared therefore the massive altar of Ed in the valley, so that in the very throat of that instrument of severance there might be a perpetual witness to themselves and to their children of the essential unity of Israel. The western tribes misunderstood the action and, dreading religious schism, gathered in force to

stamp it out. Explanations followed which were entirely satisfactory, and a threatening danger was averted (Jos 22). But the instincts of the eastern tribes were right, as subsequent history was to prove. The Jordan valley was but one of many causes of sundering. The whole circumstances and conditions of life on the East differed widely from those on the West of the river, pastoral pursuits and life in the open being contrasted with agricultural and city life.

The land given by Moses to the tribe of Reuben reached from the Arnon, Wady el-Mojib, in the South, to the border of Gad in the North. In Nu 32:34 cities of Gad are named which lay far South, Aroer being on the very lip of the Arnon; but these are probably to be taken as an enclave in the territory of Reuben. From Jos 13:15 ff it is clear that the northern border ran from some point North of the Dead Sea in a direction East-Northeast, passing to the North of Heshbon. The Dead Sea formed the western boundary, and it marched with the desert on the East. No doubt many districts changed hands in the course of the history. At the invasion of Tiglath-pileser, e.g., we read that Aroer was in the hands of the Reubenites, "and eastward .... even unto the entrance of the wilderness from the river Euphrates" (1Ch 5:8 f). Bezer the city of refuge lay in Reuben’s territory (Jos 20:8, etc.). A general description of the country will be found under MOAB; while the cities of Reuben are dealt with in separate articles.

Reuben and Gad, occupying contiguous districts, and even, as we have seen, to some extent overlapping, are closely associated in the history. Neither took part in the glorious struggle against Sisera (Jud 5:15). Already apparently the sundering influences were taking effect. They are not excepted, however, from "all the tribes of Israel" who sent contingents for the war against Benjamin (Jud 20:10; 21:5), and the reference in Jud 5:15 seems to show that Reuben might have done great things had he been disposed. The tribe therefore was still powerful, but perhaps absorbed by anxieties as to its relations with neighboring peoples. In guarding their numerous flocks against attack from the South, and sudden incursions from the desert, a warlike spirit and martial prowess were developed. They were "valiant men, men able to bear buckler and sword, and to shoot with bow, and skillful in war" (1Ch 5:18). They overwhelmed the Hagrites with Jetur and Naphish and Nodab, and greatly enriched themselves with the spoil. In recording the raid the Chronicler pays a compliment to their religious loyalty: "They cried to God in the battle, and he was entreated of them, because they put their trust in him" (1Ch 5:19). Along with Gad and Manasseh they sent a contingent of 120,000 men "with all manner of instruments of war for the battle, ... men of war, that could order the battle array," men who "came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king" (1Ch 12:37 f). Among David’s mighty men was Adina, "a chief of the Reubenites, and thirty with him" (1Ch 11:42). In the 40th year of David’s reign overseers were set over the Reubenites "for every matter pertaining to God, and for the affairs of the king" (1Ch 26:32). Perhaps in spite of the help given to David the Reubenites had never quite got over their old loyalty to the house of Saul. At any rate, when disruption came they joined the Northern Kingdom (1Ki 11:31).

The subsequent history of the tribe is left in much obscurity. Exposed as they were to hostile influences of Moab and the East, and cut off from fellowship with their brethren in worship, in their isolation they probably found the descent into idolatry all too easy, and the once powerful tribe sank into comparative insignificance. Of the immediate causes of this decline we have no knowledge. Moab established its authority over the land that had belonged to Reuben; and Mesha, in his inscription (M S), while he speaks of Gad, does not think Reuben worthy of mention. They had probably become largely absorbed

in the northern tribe. They are named as suffering in the invasion of Hazael during the reign of Jehu (2Ki 10:32 f). That "they trespassed against the God of their fathers, and played the harlot after the gods of the peoples of the land" is given as the reason for the fate that befell them at the hands of Pul, king of Assyria, who carried them away, "and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river of Gozan" (1Ch 5:25 f).

The resemblance of Reuben's case to that of Simeon is striking, for Simeon also appears to have been practically absorbed in the tribe of Judah. The prestige that should have been Reuben's in virtue of his birthright is said to have passed to Joseph (1Ch 5:1). And the place of Reuben and Simeon in Israel is taken by the sons of Joseph, a fact referred to in the blessing of Jacob (Ge 48:5).

Ezekiel finds a place for Reuben in his picture of restored Israel (48:6). He appears also—in this case preceded by Judah only—in Re 7:5.

W. Ewing

REUBENITES

roo'-ben-its (ha-re'ubheni; demoi Rhouben): Members of the tribe of Reuben (Nu 26:7, etc.). Adina, one of David's mighty men, was a Reubenite (1Ch 11:42).

REUEL

roo'-el (re'u'el, "God is his friend"; the Septuagint Rhagouel):

(1) In the genealogical system Reuel is both a son of Esau by Basemath (Ge 36:4,10,13,17; 1Ch 1:35,37) and the father of the father-in-law of Moses, Hobab (Nu 10:29). In the account of the marriage of Zipporah to Moses (Ex 2:16-21) Jethro seems to be called Reuel (compare HOBAB). The various names of Jethro perplexed the Talmudists, too; some held that his real name was "Hobab," and that Reuel was his father. Reuel is probably a clan name (Gray, "Nu," ICC), and Hobab is a member of the clan ("son") of Reuel (Nu 10:29, the King James Version reads "Raguel").

(2) The father of Eliasaph, the prince of Gad (Nu 2:14), called (by some copyist's mistake) "Deuel" in Nu 1:14; 7:42,47; 10:20. The Septuagint has uniformly Rhagouel.

(3) A Benjamite (1Ch 9:8). Horace J. Wolf

REUMAH

roo'-ma (re'umah): The concubine of Nahor (Ge 22:24).

REVELATION OF JOHN

I. TITLE AND GENERAL CHARACTER OF BOOK

1. Title

2. Uniqueness and Reality of Visions

II. CANONICITY AND AUTHORSHIP

1. Patristic Testimony

2. Testimony of Book Itself

3. Objections to Johannine Authorship—Relation to Fourth Gospel

III. DATE AND UNITY OF THE BOOK

1. Traditional Date under Domitian

2. The Nero-Theory

3. Composite Hypotheses—Babylonian Theory

IV. PLAN AND ANALYSIS OF THE BOOK

1. General Scope

2. Detailed Analysis

V. PRINCIPLES OF INTERPRETATION

1. General Scheme of Interpretation

2. The Newer Theories

3. The Book a True Prophecy

VI. THEOLOGY OF THE BOOK

LITERATURE

The last book of the New Testament. It professes to be the record of prophetic visions given by Jesus Christ to John, while the latter was a prisoner, "for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus" (Re 1:9), in PATMOS (which see), a small rocky island in the Aegean, about 15 miles West of Ephesus. Its precursor in the Old Testament is the Book of Dnl, with the symbolic visions and mystical numbers of which it stands in close affinity. The peculiar form of the book, its relation to other "apocalyptic" writings, and to the Fourth Gospel, likewise attributed to John, the interpretation of its symbols, with disputed questions of its date, of worship, unity, relations to contemporary history, etc., have made it one of the most difficult books in the New Testament to explain satisfactorily.

I. Title and General Character of Book.

1. Title:

"Revelation" answers to apokalupsis, in Re 1:1. The oldest form of the title would seem to be simply, "Apocalypse of John," the appended words "the divine" (theologos, i.e. "theologian") not being older than the 4th century (compare the title given to Gregory of Nazianzus, "Gregory theologian"). The book belongs to the class of works commonly named "apocalyptic," as containing visions and revelations of the future, frequently in symbolical form (e.g. the Book of Enoch, the Apocalypse of Bar, the Apocalypse of Ezr; see APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE), but it is doubtful if the word here bears this technical sense. The tendency at present is to group the New Testament Apocalypse with these others, and attribute to it the same kind of origin as theirs, namely, in the unbridled play of religious fantasy, clothing itself in unreal visional form.

2. Uniqueness and Reality of Visions:

But there is a wide distinction. These other works are pseudonymous—fictitious; on the face of them products of imagination; betraying that this is their origin in their crude, confused, unedifying character. The Apocalypse bears on it the name of its author—an apostle of Jesus Christ (see below); claims to rest on real visions; rings with the accent of sincerity; is orderly, serious, sublime, purposeful, in its conceptions; deals with the most solemn and momentous of themes. On the modern Nerotheory, to which most recent expositors give adherence, it is a farrago of baseless fantasies, no one of which came true. On its own claim it is a product of true prophecy (Re 1:3; 22:18 f), and has or will have sure fulfillment. Parallels here and there are sought between it and the Book of Enoch or the Apocalypse of Ezra. As a rule the resemblances arise from the fact that these works draw from the same store of the ideas and imagery of the Old Testament. It is there the key is chiefly to be sought to the symbolism of John. The Apocalypse is steeped in the thoughts, the images, even the language of the Old Testament (compare the illustrations in Lightfoot, Galatians, 361, where it is remarked: "The whole book is saturated with illustrations from the Old Testament. It speaks not the language of Paul, but of Isaiah and Ezekiel and Daniel"). These remarks will receive elucidation in what follows.

II. Canonicity and Authority.

1. Patristic Testimony:

The two questions of canonicity and authorship are closely connected. Eusebius states that opinion in his day was divided on the book, and he himself wavers between placing it among the disputed books or ranking it with the acknowledged (homologoumena). "Among these," he says, "if such a view seem correct, we must place the Apocalypse of John" (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 25). That it was rightly so placed appears from a survey of the evidence. The first to refer to the book expressly is Justin Martyr (circa 140 AD), who speaks of it as the work of "a certain man, whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ" (Dial, 81). Irenaeus (circa 180 AD) repeatedly and decisively declares that the Apocalypse was written by John, a disciple of the Lord (Adv. Haer., iv.20, 11; 30, 4; v.26, 1; 35, 2, etc.), and comments on the number 666 (v.30, 1). In his case there can be no doubt that the apostle John is meant. Andreas of Cappadocia (5th century) in a Commentary on the Apocalypse states that Papias (circa 130 AD) bore witness to its credibility, and cites a comment by him on Re 12:7-9. The book is quoted in the Epistle on the martyrs of Vienne and Lyons (177 AD); had a commentary written on it by Melito of Sardis (circa 170 AD), one of the churches of the Apocalypse (Euseb., HE, IV, 26); was used by Theophilus of Antioch (circa 168 AD) and by Apollonius (circa 210 AD; HE, V, 25)—in these cases being cited as the Apocalypse of John. It is included as John’s in the Canon of Muratori (circa 200 AD). The Johannine authorship (apostolic) is abundantly attested by Tertullian (circa 200 AD; Adv. Mar., iii.14, 24, etc.); by Hippolytus (circa 240 AD), who wrote a work upon it; by Clement of Alexandria (circa 200 AD); by Origen (circa 230 AD), and other writers. Doubt about the authorship of the book is first heard of in the obscure sect of the Alogi (end of the 2nd century), who, with Caius, a Roman presbyter (circa 205 AD), attributed it to Cerinthus. More serious was the criticism of Dionysius of Alexandria (circa 250 AD), who, on internal grounds, held that the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse could not have come from the same pen (Euseb., HE, VII, 25). He granted, however, that it was the work of a holy and inspired man—another John. The result was that, while "in the Western church," as Bousset grants, "the Apocalypse was accepted unanimously from the first" (EB, I, 193), a certain doubt attached to it for a time in sections of the Greek and Syrian churches. It is not found in the Peshitta, and a citation from it in Ephraim the Syrian (circa 373) seems not to be genuine. Cyril of Jerusalem (circa 386 AD) omits it from his list, and it is unmentioned by the Antiochian writers (Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret). The Canon attributed to the Council of Laodicea (circa 360 AD) does not name it, but it is doubtful whether this document is not of later date (compare Westcott; also Bousset, Die Offenb. Joh., 28). On the other hand, the book is acknowledged by Methodius, Pamphilus, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril Alex., Epiphanius, etc.

2. Testimony of Book Itself:

The testimony to the canonicity, and also to the Johannine authorship, of the Apocalypse is thus exceptionally strong. In full accordance with it is the claim of the book itself. It proclaims itself to be the work of John (Re 1:1,4,9; 22:8), who does not, indeed, name himself an apostle, yet, in his inspired character, position of authority in the Asian churches, and selection as the medium of these revelations, can hardly be thought of as other than the well-known John of the Gospels and of consentient church

tradition. The alternative view, first suggested as a possibility by Eusebius, now largely favored by modern writers, is that the John intended is the "presbyter John" of a well-known passage cited by Eusebius from Papias (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 39). Without entering into the intricate questions connected with this "presbyter John"—whether he was really a distinct person from the apostle (Zahn and others dispute it), or whether, if he was, he resided at Ephesus (see JOHN, GOSPEL OF)—it is enough here to say that the reason already given, viz: the importance and place of authority of the author of the Apocalypse in the Asian churches, and the emphatic testimony above cited connecting him with the apostle, forbid the attribution of the book to a writer wholly unknown to church tradition, save for this casual reference to him in Papias. Had the assumed presbyter really been the author, he could not have dropped so completely out of the knowledge of the church, and had his place taken all but immediately by the apostle.

3. Objections to Johannine Authorship—Relation to Fourth Gospel:

One cause of the hesitancy regarding the Apocalypse in early circles was dislike of its millenarianism; but the chief reason, set forth with much critical skill by Dionysius of Alexandria (Euseb., HE, VII, 25), was the undoubted contrast in character and style between this work and the Fourth Gospel, likewise claiming to be from the pen of John. Two works so diverse in character—the Gospel calm, spiritual, mystical, abounding in characteristic expressions as "life," "light," "love," etc., written in idiomatic Greek; the Apocalypse abrupt, mysterious, material in its imagery, inexact and barbarous in its idioms, sometimes employing solecisms—could not, it was argued, proceed from the same author. Not much, beyond amplification of detail, has been added to the force of the arguments of Dionysius. There were three possibilities—either first, admitting the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse, to assail the genuineness of the Gospel—this was the method of the school of Baur; or, second, accepting the Gospel, to seek a different author for the Apocalypse—John the presbyter, or another: thus not a few reverent scholars (Bleek, Neander, etc.); or, third, with most moderns, to deny the Johannine authorship of both Gospel and Apocalypse, with a leaning to the "presbyter" as the author of the latter (Harnack, Bousset, Moffatt, etc.). Singularly there has been of late in the advanced school itself a movement in the direction of recognizing that this difficulty of style is less formidable than it looks—that, in fact, beneath the surface difference, there is a strong body of resemblances pointing to a close relationship of Gospel and Apocalypse. This had long been argued by the older writers (Godet, Luthardt, Alford, Salmon, etc.), but it is now more freely acknowledged. As instances among many may be noted the use of the term "Logos" (Re 19:13), the image of the "Lamb," figures like "water of life" words and phrases as "true," "he that overcometh," "keep the commandments," etc. A striking coincidence is the form of quotation of Zec 12:10 in Joh 19:37 and Re 1:7. If the Greek in parts shows a certain abruptness and roughness, it is plainly evidenced by the use of the correct constructions in other passages that this is not due to want of knowledge of the language. "The very rules which he breaks in one place he observes in others" (Salmon). There are, besides, subtle affinities in the Greek usage of the two books, and some of the very irregularities complained of are found in the Gospel (for ample details consult Bousset, op. cit.; Godet, Commentary on John, I, 267-70, English translation; Alford, Greek Test., IV, 224-28; Salmon, Introduction to the New Testament, 233-43, 2nd edition; the last-named writer says: "I have produced instances enough to establish decisively that there is the closest possible affinity between the Revelation and the other Johannine books"). Great differences in character and style no doubt still remain. Some, to

leave room for these, favor an early date for the Apocalypse (68-69 BC; on this below); the trend of opinion, however, now seems, as will be shown, to be moving back to the traditional date in the reign of Domitian, in which case the Gospel will be the earlier, and the Apocalypse the later work. This, likewise, seems to yield the better explanation. The tremendous experiences of Patmos, bursting through all ordinary and calmer states of consciousness, must have produced startling changes in thought and style of composition. The "rapt seer" will not speak and write like the selfcollected, calmly brooding evangelist.

III. Date and Unity of the Book.

1. Traditional Date under Domitian:

Eusebius, in summing up the tradition of the Church on this subject, assigns John's exile to Patmos, and consequently the composition of the Apocalypse, to the latter part of the reign of Domitian (81-96 AD). Irenaeus (circa 180 AD) says of the book, "For it was seen, not a long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the end of the reign of Domitian" (Adv. Haer., v.30, 3). This testimony is confirmed by Clement of Alexandria (who speaks of "the tyrant"), Origen, and later writers. Epiphanius (4th century), indeed, puts (Haer., li.12, 233) the exile to Patmos in the reign of Claudius (41-54 AD); but as, in the same sentence, he speaks of the apostle as 90 years of age, it is plain there is a strange blunder in the name of the emperor. The former date answers to the conditions of the book (decadence of the churches; widespread and severe persecution), and to the predilection of Domitian for this mode of banishment (compare Tacitus, History i.2; Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, III, 18).

2. The Nero-Theory:

This, accordingly, may be regarded as the traditional date of composition of the Apocalypse, though good writers, influenced partly by the desire to give time for the later composition of the Gospel, have signified a preference for an earlier date (e.g. Westcott, Salmon). It is by no means to be assumed, however, that the Apocalypse is the earlier production. The tendency of recent criticism, it will be seen immediately, is to revert to the traditional date (Bousset, etc.); but for a decade or two, through the prevalence of what may be called the "Nero-theory" of the book, the pendulum swung strongly in favor of its composition shortly after the death of Nero, and before the destruction of Jerusalem (held to be shown to be still standing by Re 11), i.e. about 68-69 AD. This date was even held to be demonstrated beyond all question. Reuss may be taken as an example. According to him (Christian Theology of the Apostolic Age, I, 369 ff, English translation), apart from the ridiculous preconceptions of theologians, the Apocalypse is "the most simple, most transparent book that prophet ever penned." "There is no other apostolical writing the chronology of which can be more exactly fixed." "It was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, under the emperor Galba—that is to say, in the second half of the year 68 of our era." He proceeds to discuss "the irrefutable proofs" of this. The proof, in brief, is found in the beast (not introduced till Re 13) with seven heads, one of which has been mortally wounded, but is for the present healed (Re 13:3). "This is the Roman empire, with its first 7 emperors, one of whom is killed, but is to live again as Antichrist" (compare Re 17:10 f). The key to the whole book is said to be given in

Re 13:18, where the number of the beast is declared to be 666. Applying the method of numerical values (the Jewish Gematria), this number is found to correspond with the name "Nero Caesar" in Hebrew letters (omitting the yodh, the Hebrew letter "y"). Nero then is the 5th head that is to live again; an interpretation confirmed by rumors prevalent at that time that Nero was not really dead, but only hidden, and was soon to return to claim his throne. As if to make assurance doubly sure, it is found that by dropping the final "n" in "Neron," the number becomes 616—a number which Irenaeus in his comments on the subject (v.30,1) tells us was actually found in some ancient copies. The meaning therefore is thought to be clear. Writing under the emperor Galba, the 6th emperor (reckoning from Augustus), the author anticipates, after a short reign of a 7th emperor (Re 17:10), the return of the Antichrist Nero—an 8th, but of the 7, with whom is to come the end. Jerusalem is to be miraculously preserved (Re 11), but Rome is to perish. This is to happen within the space of 3 1/2 years. "The final catastrophe, which was to destroy the city and empire, was to take place in three years and a half. .... The writer knows .... that Rome will in three years and a half perish finally, never to rise again." It does not matter for this theory that not one of the things predicted happened—that every anticipation was falsified. Nero did not return; Jerusalem was not saved; Rome did not perish; 3 1/2 years did not see the end of all things. Yet the Christian-church, though the failure of every one of these predictions had been decisively demonstrated, received the book as of divine inspiration, apparently without the least idea that such things had been intended (see the form of theory in Renan, with a keen criticism in Salmon’s Introduction to the New Testament, lecture xiv).

3. Composite Hypotheses—Babylonian Theory:

What is to be said with reference to this "Nero-theory" belongs to subsequent sections: meanwhile it is to be observed that, while portions of theory are retained, significant changes have since taken place in the view entertained of the book as a whole, and with this of the date to be assigned to it. First, after 1882, came a flood of disintegrating hypotheses, based on the idea that the Apocalypse was not a unity, but was either a working up of one or more Jewish apocalypses by Christian hands, or at least incorporated fragments of such apocalypses (Uslter, Vischer, Weizsacker, Weyland, Pfieiderer, Spitta, etc.). Harnack lent his influential support to the form of this theory advocated by Vischer, and for a time the idea had vogue. Very soon, however, it fell into discredit through its own excesses (for details on the different views, see Bousset, or Moffatt’s Introduction to the New Testament, 489 ff), and through increasing appreciation of the internal evidence for the unity of the book. Gunkel, in his Schopfung und Chaos (1895), started another line of criticism in his derivation of the conceptions of the book, not from Jewish apocalypse, but from Babylonian mythology. He assailed with sharp criticism the "contemporary history" school of interpretation (the "Nero-theory" above), and declared its "bankruptcy." The number of the beast, with him, found its solution, not in Nero, but in the Hebrew name for the primeval chaos. This theory, too, has failed in general acceptance, though elements in it are adopted by most recent interpreters. The modified view most in favor now is that the Apocalypse is, indeed, the work of a Christian writer of the end of the 1st century, but embodies certain sections borrowed from Jewish apocalypse (as Re 7:1-8, the 144,000; Re 11, measuring of the temple and the two witnesses; especially Re 12, the woman and red dragon—this, in turn, reminiscent of Babylonian mythology). These supposed Jewish sections are, however, without real support in anything that is known, and the symbolism admits as easily of a Christian interpretation as any other part of the book. We are left, therefore, as before, with

the book as a unity, and the tide of opinion flows back to the age of Domitian as the time of its origin. Moffatt (connecting it mistakenly, as it seems to us, with Domitian's emphasis on the imperial cult, but giving also other reasons) goes so far as to say that "any earlier date for the book is hardly possible" (Expository Greek Testament, V, 317). The list of authorities for the Domitianie date may be seen in Moffatt, Introduction, 508.

IV. Plan and Analysis of the Book.

1. General Scope:

The method of the book may thus be indicated. After an introduction, and letters to the seven churches (Re 1-3), the properly prophetic part of the book commences with a vision of heaven (Re 4; 5), following upon which are two series of visions of the future, parallel, it would appear, to each other—the first, the 7 seals, and under the 7th seal, the 7 trumpets (Re 6:1-11:19, with interludes in Re 7$ and again in Re 10$; 11:1-12:1); the second, the woman and her child (Re 12), the 2 beasts (Re 13), and, after new interludes (Re 14), the bowls and 7 last plagues (Re 15$; 16$). The expansion of the last judgments is given in separate pictures (the scarlet woman, doom of Babylon, Har-Magedon, Re 17-19); then come the closing scenes of the millennium, the last apostasy, resurrection and judgment (Re 20), followed by the new heavens and new earth, with the descending new Jerusalem (Re 21; 22). The theme of the book is the conflict of Christ and His church with anti-Christian powers (the devil, the beast, the false prophet, Re 16:13), and the ultimate and decisive defeat of the latter; its keynote is in the words, "Come, Lord Jesus" (Re 22:20; compare Re 1:7); but it is to be noticed, as characteristic of the book, that while this "coming" is represented as, in manner, ever near, the end, as the crisis approaches, is again always postponed by a fresh development of events. Thus, under the 6th seal, the end seems reached (Re 6:12-17), but a pause ensues (Re 7), and on the opening of the seventh seal, a new series begins with the trumpets (Re 8:2). Similarly, at the sounding of the 6th trumpet, the end seems at hand (Re 9:12-21), but a new pause is introduced before the last sounding takes place (Re 11:15). Then is announced the final victory, but as yet only in summary. A new series of visions begins, opening into large perspectives, till, after fresh interludes, and the pouring out of 6 of the bowls of judgment, Har-Magedon itself is reached; but though, at the outpouring of the 7th bowl, it is proclaimed, "It is done" (Re 16:17), the end is again held over till these final judgments are shown in detail. At length, surely, in Re 19, with the appearance of the white horseman—"The Word of God" (19:13)—and the decisive overthrow of all his adversaries (19:18-21), the climax is touched; but just then, to our surprise, intervenes the announcement of the binding of Satan for 1,000 years, and the reign of Jesus and His saints upon the earth (the interpretation is not here discussed), followed by a fresh apostasy, and the general resurrection and judgment (Re 20). Precise time-measures evidently fail in dealing with a book so constructed: the 3 1/2 years of the Nero-interpreters sink into insignificance in its crowded panorama of events. The symbolic numbers that chiefly rule in the book are "seven," the number of completeness (7 spirits, seals, trumpets, bowls, heads of beasts); "ten," the number of worldly power (10 horns); "four," the earthly number (4 living creatures, corners of earth, winds, etc.); 3 1/2 years—42 months—"time, and times, and half a time" (Re 12:14) = 1,260 days, the period, borrowed from Da (7:25; 12:7), of anti-Christian ascendancy.

2. Detailed Analysis:

The following is a more detailed analysis:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Title and Address (Re 1:1-8)

2. Vision of Jesus and Message to the Seven Churches of the Province of Asia (Re 1:9-20)

3. The Letters to the Seven Churches (Re 2; 3)

(1) Ephesus (Re 2:1-7)

(2) Smyrna (Re 2:8-11)

(3) Pergamos (Re 2:12-17)

(4) Thyatira (Re 2:18-29)

(5) Sardis (Re 3:1-6)

(6) Philadelphia (Re 3:7-13)

(7) Laodicea (Re 3:14-22)

II. THE THINGS TO COME. FIRST SERIES OF VISIONS: THE SEALS AND TRUMPETS

1. The Vision of Heaven

(1) Adoration of the Creator (Re 4)

(2) The 7-Sealed Book; Adoration of God and the Lamb (Re 5)

2. Opening of Six Seals (Re 6)

(1) The White Horse (Re 6:1,2)

(2) The Red Horse (Re 6:3,4)

(3) The Black Horse (Re 6:5,6)

(4) The Pale Horse (Re 6:7,8)

(5) Souls under the Altar (Re 6:9-11)

(6) The Wrath of the Lamb (Re 6:12-17)

3. Interludes (Re 7)

(1) Sealing of 144,000 on Earth (Re 7:1-8)

(2) Triumphant Multitude in Heaven (Re 7:9-17)

4. Opening of Seventh Seal: under This Seven Trumpets, of Which Six Now Sounded (Re 8; 9)

(1) Hail and Fire on Earth (Re 8:7)

(2) Burning Mountain in Sea (Re 8:8,9)

(3) Burning Star on Rivers and Fountains (Re 8:10,11)

(4) One-third Sun, Moon, and Stars Darkened (Re 8:12). "Woe"—Trumpets (Re 8:13)

(5) The Fallen Star-Locusts (Re 9:1-11)

(6) Angels Loosed from Euphrates—the Horseman (Re 9:12-21)

5. Interludes—

(1) Angel with Little Book (Re 10)

(2) Measuring of Temple and Altar—the Two Witnesses (Re 11:1-13)

6. Seventh Trumpet Sounded—Final Victory (Re 11:14-19)

III. SECOND SERIES OF VISIONS: THE WOMAN AND THE RED DRAGON; THE TWO BEASTS; THE BOWLS AND LAST PLAGUES

1. The Woman and Child; the Red Dragon and His Persecutions (Re 12)

2. The Beast from the Sea, Seven-headed, Ten-horned (Re 13:1-10); the Two-horned Beast (Re 13:11-18)

3. Interludes (Re 14)

(1) The Lamb on Mt. Zion; the 144,000 (Re 14:1-5)

(2) The Angel with "an Eternal Gospel" (Re 14:6,7)

(3) Second Angel—(Anticipatory) Proclamation of Fall of Babylon (Re 14:8)

(4) Third Angel—Doom of Worshippers of the Beast (Re 14:9-12)

(5) Blessedness of the Dead in the Lord (Re 14:13)

(6) The Son of Man and the Great Vintage (Re 14:14-20)

4. The Seven Last Plagues—the Angels and Their Bowls: the Preparation in heaven (Re 15)—the Outpouring (Re 16)

(1) On Earth (Re 16:2)

(2) On Sea (Re 16:3)

(3) On Rivers and Fountains (Re 16:4-7)

(4) On Sun (Re 16:8,9)

(5) On Seat of Beast (Re 16:10,11)

(6) On Euphrates—Har-Magedon (Re 16:12-16)

(7) In the Air—Victory and Fall of Babylon (Re 16:17-21)

IV. EXPANSION OF LAST JUDGMENTS (Re 17-19)

1. The Scarlet Woman on Beast—Her Judgment (Re 17)

2. Doom of Babylon and Lament over Her (Re 18)

3. Interlude—Announcement of Marriage of the Lamb (Re 19:1-10)

4. Rider on White Horse ("The Word of God") and His Armies—Last Battle and Doom of Beast, False Prophet, and Their Followers (Re 19:11-21)

V. THE MILLENNIUM—NEW HEAVENS AND NEW EARTH (Re 20$, 21$, 22$)

1. Satan Bound; First Resurrection and Reign of Saints for 1,000 Years (Re 20:1-6)

2. Loosing of Satan and Final Conflict—Doom of Adversaries and of the Devil (Re 20:7-10)

3. General Resurrection and Last Judgment (Re 20:11-15)

4. New Heavens and New Earth

(1) The New Jerusalem from Heaven (Re 21:1-9)

(2) Description of the City (Re 21:10-27)

(3) Blessedness of Its Citizens (Re 22:1-7)

(4) Epilogue (Re 22:8-21)

V. Principles of Interpretation.

1. General Scheme of Interpretation:

As a book intended for the consolation of the church under present and future afflictions, the Apocalypse is meant by its author to be understood (Re 1:3; 22:7). He must have been aware, however, that, while its general scope might be apprehended, mystery must rest upon many of its symbols, till the time of their actual fulfillment. The book relates to "things which must shortly come to pass" (Re 1:1)—in their beginnings at least—and the divers interpretations since put upon its prophecies are the best evidence of the difficulties attaching to them. Schemes of interpretation have generally been grouped into praeterist (the prophecies being regarded as already fulfilled), futurist (the fulfillment being thrown wholly into the future), and the historical (the fulfillment being looked for in the continuous history of the church from John’s day till the end).

(1) The older praeterist view may be taken as represented by Moses Stuart, who finds the fulfillment of Re 6-11 in the destruction of Jerusalem (Commentary, 520 ff), and of Re 13-19 in the reign of Nero (690 ff). Even he, however, has to interpret the chapter on the last things of the future.

(2) The futurist view connects the whole with the times of the second advent and the millennium. The beast is an individual who shall then appear as Antichrist. This rejects the plain intimations of the book that the events predicted lay, in their beginnings at least, immediately in the future of the writer.

(3) The historical view connects the various symbols with definite occurrences—as the invasions which overthrew the Roman Empire (the first 4 trumpets), the Saracens (first woe-trumpet), the Turks (second woe-trumpet), the papacy (the beast, Re 13; the scarlet woman, Re 17), etc. A day-year principle is applied to the periods (1,260 days—1,260 years). As representatives of this view may be mentioned Mode, Vitringa, Sir Isaac Newton, Elliott in Horae Apocalypticae, A. Barnes.

2. The Newer Theories:

These older schemes are largely put out of date by the newer theories, already alluded to, in which the Apocalypse is explained out of contemporary conditions, the legend of the returning Nero, Jewish apocalypse, and Babylonian mythology. These are praeterist theories also, but differ from the older in that in them all real prophecy is denied. A mainstay of such theories is the declaration of the book that the events announced are close at hand (Re 1:1,3; 22:20). When, however, it is remembered that, on any view, this nearness includes a period of 1,000 years before the judgment and descent of the new Jerusalem, it will be felt that it will not do to give these expressions too restricted a temporal significance. The horizon is wider. The coming of Christ is ever near—ever approaching—yet it is not to be tied down to "times and seasons"; it is more of the nature of a process and has anticipatory exemplifications in many crises and providential events forecasting the end (see above). The "coming," e. g. to the church at Ephesus (Re 2:5), or to the church at Pergamos (Re 9:16)—contingent events—can hardly exhaust the full meaning of the Parousia. The Nero-theory demands a date at latest under Galba, but that date we have seen to be generally abandoned. Those who place it under Vespasian (omitting three short reigns) sacrifice the advantage of dating the book before the destruction of Jerusalem, and have to fall back on a supposititious Jewish fragment in Re 11, which those who incorporated it must have known had never been fulfilled. The attempt to give a "contemporary historical" interpretation to the symbols of the successive churches, as Gunkel has acutely shown, completely breaks down in practice, while Gunkel’s own attempt at a Babylonian explanation will be judged by most to be overstrained. "Dragon" in the Old Testament and elsewhere may be associated with widespread oriental ideas, but the definite symbolism of the Apocalypse in Re 12 has no provable connection with Babylonian myths. There is the widest disagreement in theories of "composite" origin (from Jewish apocalypse). What seems simple and demonstrable to one has no plausibility to others. A form of "Nero Caesar," indeed, yields the mystic 666, but so do 1,000 other names—almost any name, with proper manipulation (compare Salmon, lecture xiv). Lastly, the returning-Nero legend yields no satisfactory explanation of the language in Re 13:3,12,14; 17:11. The theory is that these words allude to the belief that Nero would return from the dead and become Antichrist (see above). Tacitus attests that there were vague rumors that Nero had not really died (Hist. ii.8), and later a pretender arose in Parthia taking advantage of this feeling (Suet. Nero. 57). The idea of Nero returning from the dead is categorically stated in Sib Or 5:363-70 (circa 120 AD); compare Sib Or 4:119-22 (circa 80 AD). Augustine mentions the idea (City of God, xx.19, 3), but without connection with the Apocalypse. By Domitian’s time, however, it was perfectly certain that Nero had not returned, and there was no longer, on this

interpretation, any appositeness in speaking of a "head" the "deathstroke" of which was healed (Re 13:3), which became the "eighth head" of Re 17:11—if, indeed, the apostle could be conceived capable of being influenced by such vagaries. The events predicted lay, evidently, still in the future. It may be added that neither Irenaeus, nor any early interpreter, seems to have heard of the connection of 666 with "Nero." Ireneus himself suggests the solution Lateinos (compare Salmon, ut supra).

3. The Book a True Prophecy:

It is not proposed here to attempt the lines of a positive interpretation. If it is once recognized that the Apocalypse is a book of true prophecy, that its symbols stand for something real, and that its perspective is not to be limited to a brief period like 3 1/2 years, the way is opened, not, indeed, for a reading into it of a series of precise historical occurrences, but still for doing justice to the truth which lies at the basis of the historical interpretation, namely, that there are here prefigured the great crises in the age-long conflict of Christ and His church with pagan and anti-Christian adversaries. Events and tendencies may be grouped, or under different forms may relate to the same subject (e.g. the 144,000 sealed on earth—a spiritual Israel—in Re 7:1-8, and the triumphant multitude in heaven, 7:9-17); successions of events may be foreshortened; different pictures may overlap; but, shining through the symbols, great truths and facts which have historical realization appear. There is no need for supposing that, in a drama of this range, the "heads" of the beast of Re 13 and 17 (behind whom is the Dragon-enemy, Satan, of Re 12) stand, in contrariety to the analogy of Daniel, for seven individual emperors, and that "the image of the beast," which has life given to it and "speaks" (Re 13:14,15), is the statue of the emperor; or that such tremendous events as the fall of the Roman Empire, or the rise of the papacy—with which, however, must be combined all ecclesiastical anti-Christianism—or the false prophecy of later intellectual anti-Christianism have no place in the symbolism of the book. Sane, reverent thought will suggest many lines of correspondence with the course of God’s providence, which may serve to illuminate its dark places. More than this need not be said here.

VI. Theology of the Book.

On this it is hardly necessary to dwell, for expositors are now well agreed that in its great doctrines of God, Christ, man, sin, redemption, the teaching of the Apocalypse does not vary essentially from the great types in the Epistles. The assonances with John’s mode of thinking have already been alluded to. It is granted by all writers that the Christology is as high as anywhere in the New Testament. "It ought unhesitatingly to be acknowledged," says Reuss, "that Christ is placed in the Apocalypse on a paragraph with God" (op. cit., I, 397-98; compare Re 1:4,17; 2:8; 5:12-14; 22:13, etc.). Not less striking are the correspondences with the teaching of Paul and of Peter on redemption through the blood of Christ (Re 1:5; 5:9; 7:14; 14:4, etc.). The perverted conception of the school of Baur that we have in the book an anti-Pauline manifesto (thus also Pfleiderer; compare Hibbert Lectures, 178), is now practically dead (see the criticism of it by Reuss, op. cit., I, 308-12). The point in which its eschatology differs from that of the rest of the New Testament is in its introduction of the millennium before the final resurrection and judgment. This enlarges, but does not necessarily contradict, the earlier stage of thought.

LITERATURE.

Moses Stuart, Commentary on Apocalypse; Alford, Greek Testament, IV, "The Revelation"; S. Davidson, Introduction to the New Testament (3rd edition), 176 ff; G. Salmon, Introduction to the New Testament (2nd edition), lects xiii, xiv; Elliott, Horae Apocalypticae, with literature there mentioned; Farrar, Early Days of Christianity, chapter xxviii; Milligan, Discussions on the Apocalypse; H. Gunkel, Schopfung und Chaos; W. Bousset, Die Offenbarung Johannis, and article "Apocalypse" in EB, I; C. Anderson Scott, "Revelation" in Century Bible; J. Moffatt, Introduction to Literature of the New Testament (with notices of literature); also "Revelation" in Expositor’s Bible; Trench, Epistles to the Seven Churches; W. M. Rarnsay, Letters to the Seven Churches; H. B. Swete, The Apocalypse of John.

James Orr

REVELATION, 1-2

rev-e-la’-shun:

I. THE NATURE OF REVELATION

1. The Religion of the Bible the Only Supernatural Religion

2. General and Special Revelation

(1) Revelation in Eden

(2) Revelation among the Heathen

II. THE PROCESS OF REVELATION

1. Place of Revelation among the Redemptive Ac of God

2. Stages of Material Development

III. THE MODES OF REVELATION

1. The Several Modes of Revelation

2. Equal Supernaturalness of the Several Modes

3. The Prophet God’s Mouthpiece

4. Visionary Form of Prophecy

5. "Passivity" of Prophets

6. Revelation by Inspiration

7. Complete Revelation of God in Christ

IV. BIBLICAL TERMINOLOGY

1. The Ordinary Forms

2. "Word of Yahweh" and "Torah"

3. "The Scriptures"

LITERATURE

I. The Nature of Revelation.

1. The Religion of the Bible the Only Supernatural Religion:

The religion of the Bible is a frankly supernatural religion. By this is not meant merely that, according to it, all men, as creatures, live, move and have their being in God. It is meant that, according to it, God has intervened extraordinarily, in the course of the sinful world's development, for the salvation of men otherwise lost. In Eden the Lord God had been present with sinless man in such a sense as to form a distinct element in his social environment (Ge 3:8). This intimate association was broken up by the Fall. But God did not therefore withdraw Himself from concernment with men. Rather, He began at once a series of interventions in human history by means of which man might be rescued from his sin and, despite it, brought to the end destined for him. These interventions involved the segregation of a people for Himself, by whom God should be known, and whose distinction should be that God should be "nigh unto them" as He was not to other nations (De 4:7; Ps 145:18). But this people was not permitted to imagine that it owed its segregation to anything in itself fitted to attract or determine the Divine preference; no consciousness was more poignant in Israel than that Yahweh had chosen it, not it Him, and that Yahweh's choice of it rested solely on His gracious will. Nor was this people permitted to imagine that it was for its own sake alone that it had been singled out to be the sole recipient of the knowledge of Yahweh; it was made clear from the beginning that God's mysteriously gracious dealing with it had as its ultimate end the blessing of the whole world (Ge 12:2,3; 17:4,5,6,16; 18:18; 22:18; compare Ro 4:13), the bringing together again of the divided families of the earth under the glorious reign of Yahweh, and the reversal of the curse under which the whole world lay for its sin (Ge 12:3). Meanwhile, however, Yahweh was known only in Israel. To Israel God showed His word and made known His statutes and judgments, and after this fashion He dealt with no other nation; and therefore

none other knew His judgments (Ps 147:19 f). Accordingly, when the hope of Israel (who was also the desire of all nations) came, His own lips unhesitatingly declared that the salvation He brought, though of universal application, was "from the Jews" (Joh 4:22). And the nations to which this salvation had not been made known are declared by the chief agent in its proclamation to them to be, meanwhile, "far off," "having no hope" and "without God in the world" (Eph 2:12), because they were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenant of the promise.

The religion of the Bible, thus announces itself, not as the product of men's search after God, if haply they may feel after Him and find Him, but as the creation in men of the gracious God, forming a people for Himself, that they may show forth His praise. In other words, the religion of the Bible presents itself as distinctively a revealed religion. Or rather, to speak more exactly, it announces itself as the revealed religion, as the only revealed religion; and sets itself as such over against all other religions, which are represented as all products, in a sense in which it is not, of the art and device of man.

It is not, however, implied in this exclusive claim to revelation—which is made by the religion of the Bible in all the stages of its history—that the living God, who made the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that in them is, has left Himself without witness among the peoples of the world (Ac 14:17). It is asserted indeed, that in the process of His redemptive work, God suffered for a season all the nations to walk in their own ways; but it is added that to none of them has He failed to do good, and to give from heaven rains and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness. And not only is He represented as thus constantly showing Himself in His providence not far from any one of them, thus wooing them to seek Him if haply they might feel after Him and find Him (Ac 17:27), but as from the foundation of the world openly manifesting Himself to them in the works of His hands, in which His everlasting power and divinity are clearly seen (Ro 1:20). That men at large have not retained Him in their knowledge, or served Him as they ought, is not due therefore to failure on His part to keep open the way to knowledge of Him, but to the darkening of their senseless hearts by sin and to the vanity of their sin-deflected reasonings (Ro 1:21), by means of which they have supplanted the truth of God by a lie and have come to worship and serve the creature rather than the ever-blessed Creator. It is, indeed, precisely because in their sin they have thus held down the truth in unrighteousness and have refused to have God in their knowledge (so it is intimated); and because, moreover, in their sin, the revelation God gives of Himself in His works of creation and providence no longer suffices for men's needs, that God has intervened supernaturally in the course of history to form a people for Himself, through whom at length all the world should be blessed.

2. General and Special Revelation:

It is quite obvious that there are brought before us in these several representations two species or stages of revelation, which should be discriminated to avoid confusion. There is the revelation which God continuously makes to all men: by it His power and divinity are made known. And there is the revelation which He makes exclusively to His chosen people: through it His saving grace is made known. Both species or stages of revelation are insisted upon throughout the Scriptures. They are, for example, brought significantly together in such a declaration as we find in Ps 19: "The heavens declare the glory of God .... their line is gone out through all the earth" (19:1,4); "The law of Yahweh is perfect, restoring

the soul" (19:7). The Psalmist takes his beginning here from the praise of the glory of God, the Creator of all that is, which has been written upon the very heavens, that none may fail to see it. From this he rises, however, quickly to the more full-throated praise of the mercy of Yahweh, the covenant God, who has visited His people with saving instruction. Upon this higher revelation there is finally based a prayer for salvation from sin, which ends in a great threefold acclamation, instinct with adoring gratitude: "O Yahweh, my rock, and my redeemer" (19:14). "The heavens," comments Lord Bacon, "indeed tell of the glory of God, but not of His will according to which the poet prays to be pardoned and sanctified." In so commenting, Lord Bacon touches the exact point of distinction between the two species or stages of revelation. The one is adapted to man as man; the other to man as sinner; and since man, on becoming sinner, has not ceased to be man, but has only acquired new needs requiring additional provisions to bring him to the end of his existence, so the revelation directed to man as sinner does not supersede that given to man as man, but supplements it with these new provisions for his attainment, in his new condition of blindness, helplessness and guilt induced by sin, of the end of his being.

These two species or stages of revelation have been commonly distinguished from one another by the distinctive names of natural and supernatural revelation, or general and special revelation, or natural and soteriological revelation. Each of these modes of discriminating them has its particular fitness and describes a real difference between the two in nature, reach or purpose. The one is communicated through the media of natural phenomena, occurring in the course of nature or of history; the other implies an intervention in the natural course of things and is not merely in source but in mode supernatural. The one is addressed generally to all intelligent creatures, and is therefore accessible to all men; the other is addressed to a special class of sinners, to whom God would make known His salvation. The one has in view to meet and supply the natural need of creatures for knowledge of their God; the other to rescue broken and deformed sinners from their sin and its consequences. But, though thus distinguished from one another, it is important that the two species or stages of revelation should not be set in opposition to one another, or the closeness of their mutual relations or the constancy of their interaction be obscured. They constitute together a unitary whole, and each is incomplete without the other. In its most general idea, revelation is rooted in creation and the relations with His intelligent creatures into which God has brought Himself by giving them being. Its object is to realize the end of man’s creation, to be attained only through knowledge of God and perfect and unbroken communion with Him. On the entrance of sin into the world, destroying this communion with God and obscuring the knowledge of Him derived from nature, another mode of revelation was necessitated, having also another content, adapted to the new relation to God and the new conditions of intellect, heart and will brought about by sin. It must not be supposed, however, that this new mode of revelation was an ex post facto expedient, introduced to meet an unforeseen contingency. The actual course of human development was in the nature of the case the expected and the intended course of human development, for which man was created; and revelation, therefore, in its double form was the divine purpose for man from the beginning, and constitutes a unitary provision for the realization of the end of his creation in the actual circumstances in which he exists. We may distinguish in this unitary revelation the two elements by the cooperation of which the effect is produced; but we should bear in mind that only by their cooperation is the effect produced. Without special revelation, general revelation would be for sinful men incomplete and ineffective, and could issue, as in point of fact it has issued wherever it alone has been accessible, only in leaving them without excuse (Ro 1:20). Without general revelation, special

revelation would lack that basis in the fundamental knowledge of God as the mighty and wise, righteous and good maker and ruler of all things, apart from which the further revelation of this great God's interventions in the world for the salvation of sinners could not be either intelligible, credible or operative.

(1) Revelation in Eden.

Only in Eden has general revelation been adequate to the needs of man. Not being a sinner, man in Eden had no need of that grace of God itself by which sinners are restored to communion with Him, or of the special revelation of this grace of God to sinners to enable them to live with God. And not being a sinner, man in Eden, as he contemplated the works of God, saw God in the unclouded mirror of his mind with a clarity of vision, and lived with Him in the untroubled depths of his heart with a trustful intimacy of association, inconceivable to sinners. Nevertheless, the revelation of God in Eden was not merely "natural." Not only does the prohibition of the forbidden fruit involve a positive commandment (Ge 2:16), but the whole history implies an immediacy of intercourse with God which cannot easily be set to the credit of the picturesque art of the narrative, or be fully accounted for by the vividness of the perception of God in His works proper to sinless creatures. The impression is strong that what is meant to be conveyed to us is that man dwelt with God in Eden, and enjoyed with Him immediate and not merely mediate communion. In that case, we may understand that if man had not fallen, he would have continued to enjoy immediate intercourse with God, and that the cessation of this immediate intercourse is due to sin. It is not then the supernaturalness of special revelation which is rooted in sin, but, if we may be allowed the expression, the specialness of supernatural revelation. Had man not fallen, heaven would have continued to lie about him through all his history, as it lay about his infancy; every man would have enjoyed direct vision of God and immediate speech with Him. Man having fallen, the cherubim and the flame of a sword, turning every way, keep the path; and God breaks His way in a round-about fashion into man's darkened heart to reveal there His redemptive love. By slow steps and gradual stages He at once works out His saving purpose and molds the world for its reception, choosing a people for Himself and training it through long and weary ages, until at last when the fullness of time has come, He bares His arm and sends out the proclamation of His great salvation to all the earth.

(2) Revelation among the Heathen.

Certainly, from the gate of Eden onward, God's general revelation ceased to be, in the strict sense, supernatural. It is, of course, not meant that God deserted His world and left it to fester in its iniquity. His providence still ruled over all, leading steadily onward to the goal for which man had been created, and of the attainment of which in God's own good time and way the very continuance of men's existence, under God's providential government, was a pledge. And His Spirit still everywhere wrought upon the hearts of men, stirring up all their powers (though created in the image of God, marred and impaired by sin) to their best activities, and to such splendid effect in every department of human achievement as to command the admiration of all ages, and in the highest region of all, that of conduct, to call out from an apostle the encomium that though they had no law they did by nature (observe the word "nature") the things of the law. All this, however, remains within the limits of Nature, that is to say, within the sphere of operation of divinely-directed and assisted second causes. It illustrates merely

the heights to which the powers of man may attain under the guidance of providence and the influences of what we have learned to call God's "common grace." Nowhere, throughout the whole ethnic domain, are the conceptions of God and His ways put within the reach of man, through God's revelation of Himself in the works of creation and providence, transcended; nowhere is the slightest knowledge betrayed of anything concerning God and His purposes, which could be known only by its being supernaturally told to men. Of the entire body of "saving truth," for example, which is the burden of what we call "special revelation," the whole heathen world remained in total ignorance. And even its hold on the general truths of religion, not being vitalized by supernatural enforcements, grew weak, and its knowledge of the very nature of God decayed, until it ran out to the dreadful issue which Paul sketches for us in that inspired philosophy of religion which he incorporates in the latter part of the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

Behind even the ethnic development, there lay, of course, the supernatural intercourse of man with God which had obtained before the entrance of sin into the world, and the supernatural revelations at the gate of Eden (Ge 3:8), and at the second origin of the human race, the Flood (Ge 8:21,22; 9:1-17). How long the tradition of this primitive revelation lingered in nooks and corners of the heathen world, conditioning and vitalizing the natural revelation of God always accessible, we have no means of estimating. Neither is it easy to measure the effect of God's special revelation of Himself to His people upon men outside the bounds of, indeed, but coming into contact with, this chosen people, or sharing with them a common natural inheritance. Lot and Ishmael and Esau can scarcely have been wholly ignorant of the word of God which came to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob; nor could the Egyptians from whose hands God wrested His people with a mighty arm fail to learn something of Yahweh, any more than the mixed multitudes who witnessed the ministry of Christ could fail to infer something from His gracious walk and mighty works. It is natural to infer that no nation which was intimately associated with Israel's life could remain entirely unaffected by Israel's revelation. But whatever impressions were thus conveyed reached apparently individuals only: the heathen which surrounded Israel, even those most closely affiliated with Israel, remained heathen; they had no revelation. In the sporadic instances when God visited an alien with a supernatural communication—such as the dreams sent to Abimelech (Ge 20) and to Pharaoh (Ge 40$; 41$) and to Nebuchadnezzar (Da 2:1) and to the soldier in the camp of Midian (Jud 7:13)—it was in the interests, not of the heathen world, but of the chosen people that they were sent; and these instances derive their significance wholly from this fact. There remain, no doubt, the mysterious figure of Melchizedek, perhaps also of Jethro, and the strange apparition of Balaam, who also, however, appear in the sacred narrative only in connection with the history of God's dealings with His people and in their interest. Their unexplained appearance cannot in any event avail to modify the general fact that the life of the heathen peoples lay outside the supernatural revelation of God. The heathen were suffered to walk in their own ways (Ac 14:16).

II. The Process of Revelation.

Meanwhile, however, God had not forgotten them, but was preparing salvation for them also through the supernatural revelation of His grace that He was making to His people. According to the Biblical representation, in the midst of and working confluently with the revelation which He has always been giving of Himself on the plane of Nature, God was making also from the very fall of man a further

revelation of Himself on the plane of grace. In contrast with His general, natural revelation, in which all men by virtue of their very nature as men share, this special, supernatural revelation was granted at first only to individuals, then progressively to a family, a tribe, a nation, a race, until, when the fullness of time was come, it was made the possession of the whole world. It may be difficult to obtain from Scripture a clear account of why God chose thus to give this revelation of His grace only progressively; or, to be more explicit, through the process of a historical development. Such is, however, the ordinary mode of the Divine working: it is so that God made the worlds, it is so that He creates the human race itself, the recipient of this revelation, it is so that He builds up His kingdom in the world and in the individual soul, which only gradually comes whether to the knowledge of God or to the fruition of His salvation. As to the fact, the Scriptures are explicit, tracing for us, or rather embodying in their own growth, the record of the steady advance of this gracious revelation through definite stages from its first faint beginnings to its glorious completion in Jesus Christ.

1. Place of Revelation among the Redemptive Ac of God:

So express is its relation to the development of the kingdom of God itself, or rather to that great series of divine operations which are directed to the building up of the kingdom of God in the world, that it is sometimes confounded with them or thought of as simply their reflection in the contemplating mind of man. Thus it is not infrequently said that revelation, meaning this special redemptive revelation, has been communicated in deeds, not in words; and it is occasionally elaborately argued that the sole manner in which God has revealed Himself as the Saviour of sinners is just by performing those mighty acts by which sinners are saved. This is not, however, the Biblical representation. Revelation is, of course, often made through the instrumentality of deeds; and the series of His great redemptive acts by which He saves the world constitutes the pre-eminent revelation of the grace of God—so far as these redemptive acts are open to observation and are perceived in their significance. But revelation, after all, is the correlate of understanding and has as its proximate end just the production of knowledge, though not, of course, knowledge for its own sake, but for the sake of salvation. The series of the redemptive acts of God, accordingly, can properly be designated "revelation" only when and so far as they are contemplated as adapted and designed to produce knowledge of God and His purpose and methods of grace. No bare series of unexplained acts can be thought, however, adapted to produce knowledge, especially if these acts be, as in this case, of a highly transcendental character. Nor can this particular series of acts be thought to have as its main design the production of knowledge; its main design is rather to save man. No doubt the production of knowledge of the divine grace is one of the means by which this main design of the redemptive acts of God is attained. But this only renders it the more necessary that the proximate result of producing knowledge should not fail; and it is doubtless for this reason that the series of redemptive acts of God has not been left to explain itself, but the explanatory word has been added to it. Revelation thus appears, however, not as the mere reflection of the redeeming acts of God in the minds of men, but as a factor in the redeeming work of God, a component part of the series of His redeeming acts, without which that series would be incomplete and so far inoperative for its main end. Thus, the Scriptures represent it, not confounding revelation with the series of the redemptive acts of God, but placing it among the redemptive acts of God and giving it a function as a substantive element in the operations by which the merciful God saves sinful men. It is therefore not made even a mere constant accompaniment of the redemptive acts of God, giving their explanation that they may be

understood. It occupies a far more independent place among them than this, and as frequently precedes them to prepare their way as it accompanies or follows them to interpret their meaning. It is, in one word, itself a redemptive act of God and by no means the least important in the series of His redemptive acts.

This might, indeed, have been inferred from its very nature, and from the nature of the salvation which was being worked out by these redemptive acts of God. One of the most grievous of the effects of sin is the deformation of the image of God reflected in the human mind, and there can be no recovery from sin which does not bring with it the correction of this deformation and the reflection in the soul of man of the whole glory of the Lord God Almighty. Man is an intelligent being; his superiority over the brute is found, among other things, precisely in the direction of all his life by his intelligence; and his blessedness is rooted in the true knowledge of his God—for this is life eternal, that we should know the only true God and Him whom He has sent. Dealing with man as an intelligent being, God the Lord has saved him by means of a revelation, by which he has been brought into an evermore and more adequate knowledge of God, and been led ever more and more to do his part in working out his own salvation with fear and trembling as he perceived with ever more and more clearness how God is working it out for him through mighty deeds of grace.

2. Stages of Material Development:

This is not the place to trace, even in outline, from the material point of view, the development of God's redemptive revelation from its first beginnings, in the promise given to Abraham—or rather in what has been called the Protevangelium at the gate of Eden—to its completion in the advent and work of Christ and the teaching of His apostles; a steadily advancing development, which, as it lies spread out to view in the pages of Scripture, takes to those who look at it from the consummation backward, the appearance of the shadow cast athwart preceding ages by the great figure of Christ. Even from the formal point of view, however, there has been pointed out a progressive advance in the method of revelation, consonant with its advance in content, or rather with the advancing stages of the building up of the kingdom of God, to subserve which is the whole object of revelation. Three distinct steps in revelation have been discriminated from this point of view. They are distinguished precisely by the increasing independence of revelation of the deeds constituting the series of the redemptive acts of God, in which, nevertheless, all revelation is a substantial element. Discriminations like this must not be taken too absolutely; and in the present instance the chronological sequence cannot be pressed. But, with much interlacing, three generally successive stages of revelation may be recognized, producing periods at least characteristically of what we may somewhat conventionally call theophany, prophecy and inspiration. What may be somewhat indefinitely marked off as the Patriarchal age is characteristically "the period of Outward Manifestations, and Symbols, and Theophanies": during it "God spoke to men through their senses, in physical phenomena, as the burning bush, the cloudy pillar, or in sensuous forms, as men, angels, etc. ..... In the Prophetic age, on the contrary, the prevailing mode of revelation was by means of inward prophetic inspiration": God spoke to men characteristically by the movements of the Holy Spirit in their hearts. "Prevailingly, at any rate from Samuel downwards, the supernatural revelation was a revelation in the hearts of the foremost thinkers of the people, or, as we call it, prophetic inspiration, without the aid of external sensuous symbols of God" (A.B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, 1903, p. 148;

compare pp. 12-14, 145 ff). This internal method of revelation reaches its culmination in the New Testament period, which is preeminently the age of the Spirit. What is especially characteristic of this age is revelation through the medium of the written word, what may be called apostolic as distinguished from prophetic inspiration. The revealing Spirit speaks through chosen men as His organs, but through these organs in such a fashion that the most intimate processes of their souls become the instruments by means of which He speaks His mind. Thus, at all events there are brought clearly before us three well-marked modes of revelation, which we may perhaps designate respectively, not with perfect discrimination, it is true, but not misleadingly,

(1) external manifestation,

(2) internal suggestion, and

(3) concursive operation.

REVELATION, 3-4

III. The Modes of Revelation.

1. Modes of Revelation:

Theophany may be taken as the typical form of "external manifestation"; but by its side may be ranged all of those mighty works by which God makes Himself known, including express miracles, no doubt, but along with them every supernatural intervention in the affairs of men, by means of which a better understanding is communicated of what God is or what are His purposes of grace to a sinful race. Under "internal suggestion" may be subsumed all the characteristic phenomena of what is most properly spoken of as "prophecy": visions and dreams, which, according to a fundamental passage (Nu 12:6), constitute the typical forms of prophecy, and with them the whole "prophetic word," which shares its essential characteristic with visions and dreams, since it comes not by the will of man but from God. By "concursive operation" may be meant that form of revelation illustrated in an inspired psalm or epistle or history, in which no human activity—not even the control of the will—is superseded, but the Holy Spirit works in, with and through them all in such a manner as to communicate to the product qualities distinctly superhuman. There is no age in the history of the religion of the Bible, from that of Moses to that of Christ and His apostles, in which all these modes of revelation do not find place. One or another may seem particularly characteristic of this age or of that; but they all occur in every age. And they occur side by side, broadly speaking, on the same level. No discrimination is drawn between them in point of worthiness as modes of revelation, and much less in point of purity in the revelations communicated through them. The circumstance that God spoke to Moses, not by dream or vision but mouth to mouth, is, indeed, adverted to (Nu 12:8) as a proof of the peculiar favor shown to Moses and even of the superior dignity of Moses above other organs of revelation: God admitted him to an intimacy of intercourse which He did not accord to others. But though Moses was thus distinguished above all others in the dealings of God with him, no distinction is drawn between the revelations given through

him and those given through other organs of revelation in point either of Divinity or of authority. And beyond this we have no Scriptural warrant to go on in contrasting one mode of revelation with another. Dreams may seem to us little fitted to serve as vehicles of divine communications. But there is no suggestion in Scripture that revelations through dreams stand on a lower plane than any others; and we should not fail to remember that the essential characteristics of revelations through dreams are shared by all forms of revelation in which (whether we should call them visions or not) the images or ideas which fill, or pass in procession through, the consciousness are determined by some other power than the recipient's own will. It may seem natural to suppose that revelations rise in rank in proportion to the fullness of the engagement of the mental activity of the recipient in their reception. But we should bear in mind that the intellectual or spiritual quality of a revelation is not derived from the recipient but from its Divine Giver. The fundamental fact in all revelation is that it is from God. This is what gives unity to the whole process of revelation, given though it may be in divers portions and in divers manners and distributed though it may be through the ages in accordance with the mere will of God, or as it may have suited His developing purpose—this and its unitary end, which is ever the building up of the kingdom of God. In whatever diversity of forms, by means of whatever variety of modes, in whatever distinguishable stages it is given, it is ever the revelation of the One God, and it is ever the one consistently developing redemptive revelation of God.

2. Equal Supernaturalness of the Several Modes:

On a prima facie view it may indeed seem likely that a difference in the quality of their supernaturalness would inevitably obtain between revelations given through such divergent modes. The completely supernatural character of revelations given in theophanies is obvious. He who will not allow that God speaks to man, to make known His gracious purposes toward him, has no other recourse here than to pronounce the stories legendary. The objectivity of the mode of communication which is adopted is intense, and it is thrown up to observation with the greatest emphasis. Into the natural life of man God intrudes in a purely supernatural manner, bearing a purely supernatural communication. In these communications we are given accordingly just a series of "naked messages of God." But not even in the Patriarchal age were all revelations given in theophanies or objective appearances. There were dreams, and visions, and revelations without explicit intimation in the narrative of how they were communicated. And when we pass on in the history, we do not, indeed, leave behind us theophanies and objective appearances. It is not only made the very characteristic of Moses, the greatest figure in the whole history of revelation except only that of Christ, that he knew God face to face (De 34:10), and God spoke to him mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches (Nu 12:8); but throughout the whole history of revelation down to the appearance of Jesus to Paul on the road to Damascus, God has shown Himself visibly to His servants whenever it has seemed good to Him to do so and has spoken with them in objective speech. Nevertheless, it is expressly made the characteristic of the Prophetic age that God makes Himself known to His servants "in a vision," "in a dream" (Nu 12:6). And although, throughout its entire duration, God, in fulfillment of His promise (De 18:18), put His words in the mouths of His prophets and gave them His commandments to speak, yet it would seem inherent in the very employment of men as instruments of revelation that the words of God given through them are spoken by human mouths; and the purity of their supernaturalness may seem so far obscured. And when it is not merely the mouths of men with which God thus serves Himself in the delivery of His messages, but their

minds and hearts as well—the play of their religious feelings, or the processes of their logical reasoning, or the tenacity of their memories, as, say, in a psalm or in an epistle, or a history—the supernatural element in the communication may easily seem to retire still farther into the background. It can scarcely be a matter of surprise, therefore, that question has been raised as to the relation of the natural and the supernatural in such revelations, and, in many current manners of thinking and speaking of them, the completeness of their supernaturalness has been limited and curtailed in the interests of the natural instrumentalities employed. The plausibility of such reasoning renders it the more necessary that we should observe the unvarying emphasis which the Scriptures place upon the absolute supernaturalness of revelation in all its modes alike. In the view of the Scriptures, the completely supernatural character of revelation is in no way lessened by the circumstance that it has been given through the instrumentality of men. They affirm, indeed, with the greatest possible emphasis that the Divine word delivered through men is the pure word of God, diluted with no human admixture whatever.

3. The Prophet God’s Mouthpiece:

We have already been led to note that even on the occasion when Moses is exalted above all other organs of revelation (Nu 12:6), in point of dignity and favor, no suggestion whatever is made of any inferiority, in either the directness or the purity of their supernaturalness, attaching to other organs of revelation. There might never afterward arise a prophet in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face (De 34:10). But each of the whole series of prophets raised up by Yahweh that the people might always know His will was to be like Moses in speaking to the people only what Yahweh commanded them (De 18:15,18,20). In this great promise, securing to Israel the succession of prophets, there is also included a declaration of precisely how Yahweh would communicate His messages not so much to them as through them. "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee," we read (De 18:18), "and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him." The process of revelation through the prophets was a process by which Yahweh put His words in the mouths of the prophets, and the prophets spoke precisely these words and no others. So the prophets themselves ever asserted. "Then Yahweh put forth his hand, and touched my mouth," explains Jeremiah in his account of how he received his prophecies, "and Yahweh said unto me, Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth" (Jer 1:9; compare Jer 5:14; Isa 51:16; 59:21; Nu 22:35; 23:5,12,16). Accordingly, the words "with which" they spoke were not their own but the Lord’s: "And he said unto me," records Ezekiel, "Son of man, go, get thee unto the house of Israel, and speak with my words unto them" (Eze 3:4). It is a process of nothing other than "dictation" which is thus described (2Sa 14:3,19), though, of course, the question may remain open of the exact processes by which this dictation is accomplished. The fundamental passage which brings the central fact before us in the most vivid manner is, no doubt, the account of the commissioning of Moses and Aaron given in Ex 4:10-17; 7:1-7. Here, in the most express words, Yahweh declares that He who made the mouth can be with it to teach it what to speak, and announces the precise function of a prophet to be that he is "a mouth of God," who speaks not his own but God’s words. Accordingly, the Hebrew name for "prophet" (nabhi’), whatever may be its etymology, means throughout the Scriptures just "spokesman," though not "spokesman" in general, but Spokesman by way of eminence, that is, God’s spokesman; and the characteristic formula by which a prophetic declaration is announced is: "The word of Yahweh came to me," or the brief "saith Yahweh" (ne’um Yahweh). In no case does a prophet put his words forward as his own words. That he

is a prophet at all is due not to choice on his own part, but to a call of God, obeyed often with reluctance; and he prophesies or forbears to prophesy, not according to his own will but as the Lord opens and shuts his mouth (Eze 3:26 f) and creates for him the fruit of the lips (Isa 57:19; compare Isa 6:7; 50:4). In contrast with the false prophets, he strenuously asserts that he does not speak out of his own heart ("heart" in Biblical language includes the whole inner man), but all that he proclaims is the pure word of Yahweh.

4. Visionary Form of Prophecy:

The fundamental passage does not quite leave the matter, however, with this general declaration. It describes the characteristic manner in which Yahweh communicates His messages to His prophets as through the medium of visions and dreams. Neither visions in the technical sense of that word, nor dreams, appear, however, to have been the customary mode of revelation to the prophets, the record of whose revelations has come down to us. But, on the other hand, there are numerous indications in the record that the universal mode of revelation to them was one which was in some sense a vision, and can be classed only in the category distinctively so called. The whole nomenclature of prophecy presupposes, indeed, its vision-form. Prophecy is distinctively a word, and what is delivered by the prophets is proclaimed as the "word of Yahweh." That it should be announced by the formula, "Thus saith the Lord," is, therefore, only what we expect; and we are prepared for such a description of its process as: "The Lord Yahweh .... wakeneth mine ear to hear," He "hath opened mine ear" (Isa 50:4,5). But this is not the way of speaking of their messages which is most usual in the prophets. Rather is the whole body of prophecy cursorily presented as a thing seen. Isaiah places at the head of his book: "The vision of Isaiah .... which he saw" (compare Isa 29:10,11; Ob 1:1); and then proceeds to set at the head of subordinate sections the remarkable words, "The word that Isaiah .... saw" (2:1); "the burden (margin "oracle") .... which Isaiah .... did see" (13:1). Similarly there stand at the head of other prophecies: "the words of Amos .... which he saw" (Am 1:1); "the word of Yahweh that came to Micah .... which he saw" (Mic 1:1); "the oracle which Habakkuk the prophet did see" (Hab 1:1 margin); and elsewhere such language occurs as this: "the word that Yahweh hath showed me" (Jer 38:21); "the prophets have seen .... oracles" (La 2:14); "the word of Yahweh came .... and I looked, and, behold" (Eze 1:3,4); "Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing" (Eze 13:3); "I .... will look forth to see what he will speak with me, ... Yahweh .... said, Write the vision" (Hab 2:1 f). It is an inadequate explanation of such language to suppose it merely a relic of a time when vision was more predominantly the form of revelation. There is no proof that vision in the technical sense ever was more predominantly the form of revelation than in the days of the great writing prophets; and such language as we have quoted too obviously represents the living point of view of the prophets to admit of the supposition that it was merely conventional on their lips. The prophets, in a word, represent the divine communications which they received as given to them in some sense in visions.

It is possible, no doubt, to exaggerate the significance of this. It is an exaggeration, for example, to insist that therefore all the divine communications made to the prophets must have come to them in external appearances and objective speech, addressed to and received by means of the bodily eye and ear. This would be to break down the distinction between manifestation and revelation, and to assimilate the mode of prophetic revelation to that granted to Moses, though these are expressly distinguished (Nu 12:6-8). It

is also an exaggeration to insist that therefore the prophetic state must be conceived as that of strict ecstasy, involving the complete abeyance of all mental life on the part of the prophet (amentia), and possibly also accompanying physical effects. It is quite clear from the records which the prophets themselves give us of their revelations that their intelligence was alert in all stages of their reception of them. The purpose of both these extreme views is the good one of doing full justice to the objectivity of the revelations vouchsafed to the prophets. If these revelations took place entirely externally to the prophet, who merely stood off and contemplated them, or if they were implanted in the prophets by a process so violent as not only to supersede their mental activity but, for the time being, to annihilate it, it would be quite clear that they came from a source other than the prophets' own minds. It is undoubtedly the fundamental contention of the prophets that the revelations given through them are not their own but wholly God's. The significant language we have just quoted from Eze 13:3: "Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing," is a typical utterance of their sense of the complete objectivity of their messages. What distinguishes the false prophets is precisely that they "prophesy out of their own heart" (Eze 13:2-17), or, to draw the antithesis sharply, that "they speak a vision of their own heart, and not out of the mouth of Yahweh" (Jer 23:16,26; 14:14). But these extreme views fail to do justice, the one to the equally important fact that the word of God, given through the prophets, comes as the pure and unmixed word of God not merely to, but from, the prophets; and the other to the equally obvious fact that the intelligence of the prophets is alert throughout the whole process of the reception and delivery of the revelation made through them.

See INSPIRATION; PROPHECY.

That which gives to prophecy as a mode of revelation its place in the category of visions, strictly so called, and dreams is that it shares with them the distinguishing characteristic which determines the class. In them all alike the movements of the mind are determined by something extraneous to the subject's will, or rather, since we are speaking of supernaturally given dreams and visions, extraneous to the totality of the subject's own psychoses. A power not himself takes possession of his consciousness and determines it according to its will. That power, in the case of the prophets, was fully recognized and energetically asserted to be Yahweh Himself or, to be more specific, the Spirit of Yahweh (1Sa 10:6,10; Ne 9:30; Zec 7:12; Joe 2:28,29). The prophets were therefore 'men of the Spirit' (Ho 9:7). What constituted them prophets was that the Spirit was put upon them (Isa 42:1) or poured out on them (Joe 2:28,29), and they were consequently filled with the Spirit (Mic 3:8), or, in another but equivalent locution, that "the hand" of the Lord, or "the power of the hand" of the Lord, was upon them (2Ki 3:15; Eze 1:3; 3:14,22; 33:22; 37:1; 40:1), that is to say, they were under the divine control. This control is represented as complete and compelling, so that, under it, the prophet becomes not the "mover," but the "moved" in the formation of his message. The apostle Peter very purely reflects the prophetic consciousness in his well-known declaration: 'No prophecy of scripture comes of private interpretation; for prophecy was never brought by the will of man; but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God' (2Pe 1:20,21).

5. "Passivity" of Prophets:

What this language of Peter emphasizes—and what is emphasized in the whole account which the

prophets give of their own consciousness—is, to speak plainly, the passivity of the prophets with respect to the revelation given through them. This is the significance of the phrase: ‘it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God.’ To be "borne" (pherein) is not the same as to be led (agein), much less to be guided or directed (hodegein): he that is "borne" contributes nothing to the movement induced, but is the object to be moved. The term "passivity" is, perhaps, however, liable to some misapprehension, and should not be overstrained. It is not intended to deny that the intelligence of the prophets was active in the reception of their message; it was by means of their active intelligence that their message was received: their intelligence was the instrument of revelation. It is intended to deny only that their intelligence was active in the production of their message: that it was creatively as distinguished from receptively active. For reception itself is a kind of activity. What the prophets are solicitous that their readers shall understand is that they are in no sense coauthors with God of their messages. Their messages are given them, given them entire, and given them precisely as they are given out by them. God speaks through them: they are not merely His messengers, but "His mouth." But at the same time their intelligence is active in the reception, retention and announcing of their messages, contributing nothing to them but presenting fit instruments for the communication of them—instruments capable of understanding, responding profoundly to and zealously proclaiming them.

There is, no doubt, a not unnatural hesitancy abroad in thinking of the prophets as exhibiting only such merely receptive activities. In the interests of their personalities, we are asked not to represent God as dealing mechanically with them, pouring His revelations into their souls to be simply received as in so many buckets, or violently wresting their minds from their own proper action that He may do His own thinking with them. Must we not rather suppose, we are asked, that all revelations must be "psychologically mediated," must be given "after the mode of moral mediation," and must be made first of all their recipients’ "own spiritual possession"? And is not, in point of fact, the personality of each prophet clearly traceable in his message, and that to such an extent as to compel us to recognize him as in a true sense its real author? The plausibility of such questionings should not be permitted to obscure the fact that the mode of the communication of the prophetic messages which is suggested by them is directly contradicted by the prophets’ own representations of their relations to the revealing Spirit. In the prophets’ own view they were just instruments through whom God gave revelations which came from them, not as their own product, but as the pure word of Yahweh. Neither should the plausibility of such questionings blind us to their speciousness. They exploit subordinate considerations, which are not without their validity in their own place and under their own limiting conditions, as if they were the determining or even the sole considerations in the case, and in neglect of the really determining considerations. God is Himself the author of the instruments He employs for the communication of His messages to men and has framed them into precisely the instruments He desired for the exact communication of His message. There is just ground for the expectation that He will use all the instruments He employs according to their natures; intelligent beings therefore as intelligent beings, moral agents as moral agents. But there is no just ground for asserting that God is incapable of employing the intelligent beings He has Himself created and formed to His will, to proclaim His messages purely as He gives them to them; or of making truly the possession of rational minds conceptions which they have themselves had no part in creating. And there is no ground for imagining that God is unable to frame His own message in the language of the organs of His revelation without its thereby ceasing to be, because expressed in a fashion natural to these organs, therefore purely His

message. One would suppose it to lie in the very nature of the case that if the Lord makes any revelation to men, He would do it in the language of men; or, to individualize more explicitly, in the language of the man He employs as the organ of His revelation; and that naturally means, not the language of his nation or circle merely, but his own particular language, inclusive of all that gives individuality to his self-expression. We may speak of this, if we will, as "the accommodation of the revealing God to the several prophetic individualities." But we should avoid thinking of it externally and therefore mechanically, as if the revealing Spirit artificially phrased the message which He gives through each prophet in the particular forms of speech proper to the individuality of each, so as to create the illusion that the message comes out of the heart of the prophet himself. Precisely what the prophets affirm is that their messages do not come out of their own hearts and do not represent the workings of their own spirits. Nor is there any illusion in the phenomenon we are contemplating; and it is a much more intimate, and, we may add, a much more interesting phenomenon than an external "accommodation" of speech to individual habitudes. It includes, on the one hand, the "accommodation" of the prophet, through his total preparation, to the speech in which the revelation to be given through him is to be clothed; and on the other involves little more than the consistent carrying into detail of the broad principle that God uses the instruments He employs in accordance with their natures.

No doubt, on adequate occasion, the very stones might cry out by the power of God, and dumb beasts speak, and mysterious voices sound forth from the void; and there have not been lacking instances in which men have been compelled by the same power to speak what they would not, and in languages whose very sounds were strange to their ears. But ordinarily when God the Lord would speak to men He avails Himself of the services of a human tongue with which to speak, and He employs this tongue according to its nature as a tongue and according to the particular nature of the tongue which He employs. It is vain to say that the message delivered through the instrumentality of this tongue is conditioned at least in its form by the tongue by which it is spoken, if not, indeed, limited, curtailed, in some degree determined even in its matter, by it. Not only was it God the Lord who made the tongue, and who made this particular tongue with all its peculiarities, not without regard to the message He would deliver through it; but His control of it is perfect and complete, and it is as absurd to say that He cannot speak His message by it purely without that message suffering change from the peculiarities of its tone and modes of enunciation, as it would be to say that no new truth can be announced in any language because the elements of speech by the combination of which the truth in question is announced are already in existence with their fixed range of connotation. The marks of the several individualities imprinted on the messages of the prophets, in other words, are only a part of the general fact that these messages are couched in human language, and in no way beyond that general fact affect their purity as direct communications from God.

6. Revelation by Inspiration:

A new set of problems is raised by the mode of revelation which we have called "concursive operation." This mode of revelation differs from prophecy, properly so called, precisely by the employment in it, as is not done in prophecy, of the total personality of the organ of revelation, as a factor. It has been common to speak of the mode of the Spirit’s action in this form of revelation, therefore, as an assistance, a superintendence, a direction, a control, the meaning being that the effect aimed at—the discovery and

enunciation of divine truth—is attained through the action of the human powers—historical research, logical reasoning, ethical thought, religious aspiration—acting not by themselves, however, but under the prevailing assistance, superintendence, direction, control of the Divine Spirit. This manner of speaking has the advantage of setting this mode of revelation sharply in contrast with prophetic revelation, as involving merely a determining, and not, as in prophetic revelation, a supercessive action of the revealing Spirit. We are warned, however, against pressing this discrimination too far by the inclusion of the whole body of Scripture in such passages as 2Pe 1:20 f in the category of prophecy, and the assignment of their origin not to a mere "leading" but to the "bearing" of the Holy Spirit. In any event such terms as assistance, superintendence, direction, control, inadequately express the nature of the Spirit's action in revelation by "concursive operation." The Spirit is not to be conceived as standing outside of the human powers employed for the effect in view, ready to supplement any inadequacies they may show and to supply any defects they may manifest, but as working confluently in, with and by them, elevating them, directing them, controlling them, energizing them, so that, as His instruments, they rise above themselves and under His inspiration do His work and reach His aim. The product, therefore, which is attained by their means is His product through them. It is this fact which gives to the process the right to be called actively, and to the product the right to be called passively, a revelation. Although the circumstance that what is done is done by and through the action of human powers keeps the product in form and quality in a true sense human, yet the confluent operation of the Holy Spirit throughout the whole process raises the result above what could by any possibility be achieved by mere human powers and constitutes it expressly a supernatural product. The human traits are traceable throughout its whole extent, but at bottom it is a divine gift, and the language of Paul is the most proper mode of speech that could be applied to it: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth" (1Co 2:13); "The things which I write unto you .... are the commandment of the Lord" (1Co 14:37).

See INSPIRATION.

7. Complete Revelation of God in Christ:

It is supposed that all the forms of special or redemptive revelation which underlie and give its content to the religion of the Bible may without violence be subsumed under one or another of these three modes —external manifestation, internal suggestion, and concursive operation. All, that is, except the culminating revelation, not through, but in, Jesus Christ. As in His person, in which dwells all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, He rises above all classification and is sui generis; so the revelation accumulated in Him stands outside all the divers portions and divers manners in which otherwise revelation has been given and sums up in itself all that has been or can be made known of God and of His redemption. He does not so much make a revelation of God as Himself is the revelation of God; He does not merely disclose God's purpose of redemption, He is unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption. The theophanies are but faint shadows in comparison with His manifestation of God in the flesh. The prophets could prophesy only as the Spirit of Christ which was in them testified, revealing to them as to servants one or another of the secrets of the Lord Yahweh; from Him as His Son, Yahweh has no secrets, but whatsoever the Father knows that the Son knows also. Whatever truth men have been made partakers of by the Spirit of truth is His (for all things

whatsoever the Father hath are His) and is taken by the Spirit of truth and declared to men that He may be glorified. Nevertheless, though all revelation is thus summed up in Him, we should not fail to note very carefully that it would also be all sealed up in Him—so little is revelation conveyed by fact alone, without the word—had it not been thus taken by the Spirit of truth and declared unto men. The entirety of the New Testament is but the explanatory word accompanying and giving its effect to the fact of Christ. And when this fact was in all its meaning made the possession of men, revelation was completed and in that sense ceased. Jesus Christ is no less the end of revelation than He is the end of the law.

IV. Biblical Terminology.

1. The Ordinary Forms:

There is not much additional to be learned concerning the nature and processes of revelation, from the terms currently employed in Scripture to express the idea. These terms are ordinarily the common words for disclosing, making known, making manifest, applied with more or less heightened significance to supernatural acts or effects in kind. In the English Bible (the King James Version) the verb "reveal" occurs about 51 times, of which 22 are in the Old Testament and 29 in the New Testament. In the Old Testament the word is always the rendering of a Hebrew term galah, or its Aramaic equivalent gelah, the root meaning of which appears to be "nakedness." When applied to revelation, it seems to hint at the removal of obstacles to perception or the uncovering of objects to perception. In the New Testament the word "reveal" is always (with the single exception of Lu 2:35) the rendering of a Greek term apokalupto (but in 2Th 1:7; 1Pe 4:13 the corresponding noun apokalupsis), which has a very similar basal significance with its Hebrew parallel. As this Hebrew word formed no substantive in this sense, the noun "revelation" does not occur in the English Old Testament, the idea being expressed, however, by other Hebrew terms variously rendered. It occurs in the English New Testament, on the other hand, about a dozen times, and always as the rendering of the substantive corresponding to the verb rendered "reveal" (apokalupsis). On the face of the English Bible, the terms "reveal," "revelation" bear therefore uniformly the general sense of "disclose," "disclosure." The idea is found in the Bible, however, much more frequently than the terms "reveal" "revelation" in English Versions of the Bible. Indeed, the Hebrew and Greek terms exclusively so rendered occur more frequently in this sense than in this rendering in the English Bible. And by their side there stand various other terms which express in one way or another the general conception.

In the New Testament the verb phaneroo, with the general sense of making manifest, manifesting, is the most common of these. It differs from apokalupto as the more general and external term from the more special and inward. Other terms also are occasionally used: epiphaneia, "manifestation" (2Th 2:8; 1Ti 6:14; 2Ti 1:10; 4:1; Tit 2:13; compare epiphaino, Tit 2:11; 3:4); deiknuo (Re 1:1; 17:1; 22:1,6,8; compare Ac 9:16; 1Ti 4:15); exegomai (Joh 1:18), of which, however, only one perhaps—chrematizo (Mt 2:12,22; Lu 2:20; Ac 10:22; Heb 8:5; 11:7; 12:25); p chrematismos (Ro 11:4)—calls for particular notice as in a special way, according to its usage, expressing the idea of a divine communication.

In the Old Testament, the common Hebrew verb for "seeing" (ra’ah) is used in its appropriate stems,

with God as the subject, for "appearing," "showing": "the Lord appeared unto .... ";" the word which the Lord showed me." And from this verb not only is an active substantive formed which supplied the more ancient designation of the official organ of revelation: ro'eh, "seer"; but also objective substantives, mar'ah, and mar'eh, which were used to designate the thing seen in a revelation—the "vision." By the side of these terms there were others in use, derived from a root which supplies to the Aramaic its common word for "seeing," but in Hebrew has a somewhat more pregnant meaning, chazah. Its active derivative, chozeh, was a designation of a prophet which remained in occasional use, alternating with the more customary nabhi', long after ro'eh, had become practically obsolete; and its passive derivatives chazon, chizzayon, chazuth, machazeh provided the ordinary terms for the substance of the revelation or "vision." The distinction between the two sets of terms, derived respectively from ra'ah and chazah, while not to be unduly pressed, seems to lie in the direction that the former suggests external manifestations and the latter internal revelations. The ro'eh is he to whom divine manifestations, the chozeh he to whom divine communications, have been vouchsafed; the mar'eh is an appearance, the chazon and its companions a vision. It may be of interest to observe that mar'ah is the term employed in Nu 12:6, while it is chazon which commonly occurs in the headings of the written prophecies to indicate their revelatory character. From this it may possibly be inferred that in the former passage it is the mode, in the latter the contents of the revelation that is emphasized. Perhaps a like distinction may be traced between the chazon of Da 8:15 and the mar'eh of the next verse. The ordinary verb for "knowing," yadha', expressing in its causative stems the idea of making known, informing, is also very naturally employed, with God as its subject, in the sense of revealing, and that, in accordance with the natural sense of the word, with a tendency to pregnancy of implication, of revealing effectively, of not merely uncovering to observation, but making to know. Accordingly, it is paralleled riot merely with galah (Ps 98:2 'The Lord hath made known his salvation; his righteousness hath he displayed in the sight of the nation'), but also with such terms as lamadh (Ps 25:4 'Make known to me thy ways, O Lord: teach me thy paths'). This verb yadha' forms no substantive in the sense of "revelation" (compare da'ath, Nu 24:16; Ps 19:3). 2. "Word of Yahweh" and "Torah":

The most common vehicles of the idea of "revelation" in the Old Testament are, however, two expressions which are yet to be mentioned. These are the phrase, "word of Yahweh," and the term commonly but inadequately rendered in the English Versions of the Bible by "law." The former (debhar Yahweh, varied to debhar 'Elohim or debhar ha-'Elohim; compare ne'um Yahweh, massa' Yahweh) occurs scores of times and is at once the simplest and the most colorless designation of a divine communication. By the latter (torah), the proper meaning of which is "instruction," a strong implication of authoritativeness is conveyed; and, in this sense, it becomes what may be called the technical designation of a specifically divine communication. The two are not infrequently brought together, as in Isa 1:10: "Hear the word of Yahweh, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law (margin "teaching") of our God, ye people of Gomorrah"; or Isa 2:3 margin; Mic 4:2: "For out of Zion shall go forth the law (margin "instruction"), and the word of Yahweh from Jerusalem." Both terms are used for any divine communication of whatever extent; and both came to be employed to express the entire body of divine revelation, conceived as a unitary whole. In this comprehensive usage, the emphasis of the one came to fall more on the graciousness, and of the other more on the authoritativeness of this body of divine revelation; and both passed into the New Testament with these implications. "The word of God," or simply "the word," comes thus to mean in the New Testament just the gospel, "the word of the

proclamation of redemption, that is, all that which God has to say to man, and causes to be said" looking to his salvation. It expresses, in a word, precisely what we technically speak of as God's redemptive revelation. "The law," on the other hand, means in this New Testament use, just the whole body of the authoritative instruction which God has given men. It expresses, in other words, what we commonly speak of as God's supernatural revelation. The two things, of course, are the same: God's authoritative revelation is His gracious revelation; God's redemptive revelation is His supernatural revelation. The two terms merely look at the one aggregate of revelation from two aspects, and each emphasizes its own aspect of this one aggregated revelation.

Now, this aggregated revelation lay before the men of the New Testament in a written form, and it was impossible to speak freely of it without consciousness of and at least occasional reference to its written form. Accordingly we hear of a Word of God that is written, (Joh 15:25; 1Co 15:54), and the Divine Word is naturally contrasted with mere tradition, as if its written form were of its very idea (Mr 7:10); indeed, the written body of revelation—with an emphasis on its written form—is designated expressly 'the prophetic word' (2Pe 1:19).

3. "The Scriptures":

More distinctly still, "the Law" comes to be thought of as a written, not exactly, code, but body of Divinely authoritative instructions. The phrase, "It is written in your law" (Joh 10:34; 15:25; Ro 3:19; 1Co 14:21), acquires the precise sense of, "It is set forth in your authoritative Scriptures, all the content of which is 'law,' that is, divine instruction." Thus, "the Word of God," "the Law," came to mean just the written body of revelation, what we call, and what the New Testament writers called, in the same high sense which we give the term, "the Scriptures." These "Scriptures" are thus identified with the revelation of God, conceived as a well-defined corpus, and two conceptions rise before us which have had a determining part to play in the history of Christianity—the conception of an authoritative Canon of Scripture, and the conception of this Canon of Scripture as just the Word of God written. The former conception was thrown into prominence in opposition to the Gnostic heresies in the earliest age of the church, and gave rise to a richly varied mode of speech concerning the Scriptures, emphasizing their authority in legal language, which goes back to and rests on the Biblical. usage of "Law." The latter it was left to the Reformation to do justice to in its struggle against, on the one side, the Romish depression of the Scriptures in favor of the traditions of the church, and on the other side the Enthusiasts' supercession of them in the interests of the "inner Word." When Tertullian, on the one hand, speaks of the Scriptures as an "Instrument," a legal document, his terminology has an express warrant in the Scriptures' own usage of torah, "law," to designate their entire content. And when John Gerhard argues that "between the Word of God and Sacred Scripture, taken in a material sense, there is no real difference," he is only declaring plainly what is definitely implied in the New Testament use of "the Word of God" with the written revelation in mind. What is important to recognize is that the Scriptures themselves represent the Scriptures as not merely containing here and there the record of revelations —"words of God," toroth—given by God, but as themselves, in all their extent, a revelation, an authoritative body of gracious instructions from God; or, since they alone, of all the revelations which God may have given, are extant—rather as the Revelation, the only "Word of God" accessible to men, in all their parts "law," that is, authoritative instruction from God.

LITERATURE.

Herman Witsius, "De Prophetis et Prophetia" in Miscell. Sacr., I, Leiden, 1736, 1-318; G. F. Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, English translation, Edinburgh, 1874, I, part I (and the appropriate sections in other Biblical Theologies); H. Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatiek(2), I, Kampen, 1906, 290-406 (and the appropriate sections in other dogmatic treatises); H. Voigt, Fundamentaldogmatik, Gotha, 1874, 173 ff; A. Kuyper, Encyclopedia of Sacred Theology, English translation, New York, 1898, Division III, Chapter ii; A. E. Krauss, Die Lehre von der Offenbarung, Gotha, 1868; C. F. Fritzsche, De revelationis notione biblica, Leipzig, 1828; E. W. Hengstenberg, The Christology of the O T, ET2, Edinburgh, 1868, IV, Appendix 6, pp. 396-444; E. Konig, Per Offenbarungsbegriff des Altes Testament, Leipzig, 1882; A. B. Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, 1903; W. J. Beecher, The Prophets and the Promise, New York, 1905; James Orr, The Christian View of God and the World, 1893, as per Index, "Revelation," and Revelation and Inspiration, London and New York, 1910. Also: T. Christlieb, Modern Doubt and Christian Belief, English translation, New York, 1874; G. P. Fisher, The Nature and Method of Revelation, New York, 1890; C. M. Mead, Supernatural Revelation, 1889; J. Quirmbach, Die Lehre des h. Paulus von der naturlichen Gotteserkenntnis, etc., Freiburg, 1906. Benjamin B. Warfield

REVELLINGS

rev'-el-ingz (komos): The word is found both in the King James Version and in the Revised Version (British and American) in The Wisdom of Solomon 14:23 (the Revised Version (British and American) "revels," orgiastic heathen worship is in point); 2 Macc 6:4; Ga 5:21; 1Pe 4:3. In Ga 5:21 it is classed with fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, etc., as one of the works of the flesh. In 1Pe 4:3 it is spoken of the Gentiles and is classcd with drunkenness and carousings and such like. In Ro 13:13 the Revised Version has "revelling" instead of the King James Version "rioting," and in 2Pe 2:13, "revel" replaces "riot." Similarly in Am 6:7, "revelry" replaces "banquet." The obvious meaning of the word is excessive and boisterous intemperance and lustful indulgence.

G. H. Gerberding

REVENGE; REVENGER

re-venj', re-venj'-er: The same Hebrew and Greek words are used to express the idea of "to avenge" and "to revenge" (naqam, or derivative; ekdikeo, or derivative). In English these words are synonymous in that they are both used to express the infliction of punishment upon the wrongdoer, but "to take revenge" may also imply a spiteful, wrong or malignant spirit. In the latter case, the Revised Version (British and American) preserves "revenge" (compare Jer 20:10; Eze 25:15; 25:17 is an anthropomorphism), but, wherever it is synonymous with "avenge," this word is used (compare Nu 31:2,3; Ps 79:10; Na 1:2; RAPC Jdt 13:20; Ro 13:4; 2Co 7:11; 10:6 the Revised Version (British and American); the King James Version has "revenge" in all these cases). In De 32:42, the King James Version "revenge" is a wrong translation. Read with the Revised Version (British and American) "from the head of the leaders of the

enemy" or the Revised Version margin "the hairy head of the enemy."

Compare AVENGE, AVENGER; BLOOD; GOEL.

A. L. Breslich

REVENUE

rev’-e-nu:

(1) appethom, "revenue or income" (Ezr 4:13 the King James Version);

(2) tebhu’ah, "increase," "revenue" (Pr 8:19; 15:6; Isa 23:3; Jer 12:13); prosodos, "income" (2 Macc 3:3; 4:8 (the Revised Version (British and American) "fund"); 9:16).

REVERENCE

rev’-er-ens: In the Old Testament, "reverence" occurs as the translation of two Hebrew words, yare’ and shachah. The root idea of the former is "fear." It is used to express the attitude toward God Himself, as in Ps 89:7 the King James Version; or toward His sanctuary, as in Le 19:30; 26:2. So the group of ideas there would be "fear," "awe," "reverence." The root idea of the second is "falling down," as prostration of the body. It is used to express the bearing toward another who is considered superior, as in 2Sa 9:6 the King James Version; 1Ki 1:31 the King James Version; Es 3:2,5. The group of ideas here, therefore, is "honor," "obeisance," "reverence."

In the New Testament "reverence" occurs as the translation of three Greek words, aidos, phobeomai, and entrepomai. In the first, the idea is "modesty" (Heb 12:28; compare 1Ti 2:9). In the second, "fear" (Eph 5:33 the King James Version), though here it is used to set forth the attitude of proper subjection on the part of a wife toward her husband (compare 1Pe 3:2,5). In the third, the idea is that of the "self-valuation of inferiority," and so sets forth an attitude toward another of doing him honor (Mt 21:37; Mr 12:6; Lu 20:13; Heb 12:9).

In the Apocrypha entrepomai occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 2:10; Sirach 4:22. In addition, proskuneo, "make obeisance," occurs in Judith 10:23; 14:7; thaumazo, "wonder," Sirach 7:29, and aischunomai, "be ashamed," Baruch 4:15.

"Reverend" occurs in the Old Testament in Ps 111:9, of the name of God (yare’), and in the Apocrypha in 2 Macc 15:12, "a man reverend (aidemon, "modest") in bearing," and in the New Testament the Revised Version (British and American) has "reverent in demeanor" (hieroprepes) in Tit 2:3 and "reverend" in Php 4:8 margin (semnos).

E. J. Forrester

REVILE

re-vil’.

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

REVIVE; REVIVING

re-viv’, reviv’-ing: revive is the translation of chayah, "to live," "cause to live," used of restoration to life (Ge 45:27; Jud 15:19, etc.); of rebuilding (Ne 4:2); of restoration to well-being (Ps 85:6 (the Revised Version (British and American) "quicken"); Ps 138:7; Isa 57:15; Ho 6:2; 14:7); of Yahweh’s gracious work for His people (Hab 3:2, "revive thy work in the midst of the years," etc.); "reviving" is the translation of michydh "preservation" or "means of life" (Ezr 9:8,9). "Revive" occurs in the New Testament as the translation of anazao, "to live again" (Ro 7:9, 14:9, the King James Version "Christ both died, and rose, and revived," the Revised Version (British and American) (omitting "and rose") "Christ died and lived again" zao).

In 1 Macc 13:7 the Revised Version (British and American) we have "And the spirit of the people revived," anazopureo, "to stir or kindle up as a fire," the same word as in 2Ti 1:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "stir up the gift of God, which is in thee," margin "Greek: ‘stir into flame.’"

In view of the frequent modern use of "revive" and "revival," it is worthy of notice that it is to Timothy himself the exhortation is addressed. We too often merely pray for "revivals," forgetting that it is for us to "stir into flame" the gift of the Spirit which we have already received of God. It is ours from Him, but we let it lie dormant, as a slumbering ember merely.

W. L. Walker

REWARD

re-word’:In modern English (except when influenced by the Biblical forms) a "reward" is something given in recognition of a good act. In English Versions of the Bible, however, "reward" is used quite generally for anything given, and the term covers the recompense of evil (Ps 91:8), wages (1Ti 5:18 the King James Version), bribes (Mic 7:3), and gifts (Jer 40:5 the King James Version). The Revised Version (British and American) has specialized the meaning in a number of cases (Ps 94:2; Eze 16:34; Jer 40:5, etc.), but not systematically.

REZEPH

re’-zef (retseph;

1. Forms of the Name:

Codex Vaticanus Rhapheis; Rhaphes; Codex Alexandrinus ten Rhapheth (2Ki 19:12), B Q margin Rhapheth Codex Sinaiticus Q Rhafes; Codex Alexandrinus Rhapheis (Isa 37:12); Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Roseph (2Ki 19:12), Reseph (Isa 37:12)): One of the places referred to by Sennacherib’s Rabshakeh when delivering that king’s message to Hezekigh demanding the surrender of Jerusalem. The names which precede are Gozan and Haran; and "the children of Eden that were Telassar" follows.

2. Now Called Rucafa:

It is now represented by Rucafa, East of Tipsah and Northeast of Hamath, and is regarded as the (Rhesapha) of Ptolemy (v.15). It was for some time under Assyrian dominion, and appears in a geographical list (2 R 53, 37a) preceded by Arrapba (Arrapachitis) and Halabbu (Halah), and followed by Tamnunu, uder the form of Rasappa (elsewhere Racapi).

3. Its Assyrian Governors:

From the Eponym Canons, Ninip-kibsi-ucur was, it appears, prefect in 839 BC, Uras-eres from 804 to 775 BC, Sin-sallimanni in 747, and Bel-emuranni in 737 BC. Judging from their names, all these were Assyrians, but a seemingly native governor, Abda’u (or Abda’i), possibly later than the foregoina, is mentioned in a list of officials (K. 9921). Yabutu was sanu (deputy-governor?) of Rezeph in 673 BC. Its mention in the Assyrian geographical lists implies that Rezeph was an important trade-center in Old Testament times.

T. G. Pinches

REZIA

re-zi’-a.

See RIZIA.

REZIN

re’-zin (retsin; Rhaasson): The last of the kings of Syria who reigned in Damascus (2Ki 15:37; 16:5-10; Isa 7:1; 8:4-7). Alona with Pekah, the son of Remaliah, who reigned 20 years over Israel in Samaria, he joined in the Syro-Ephraimitic war aaainst Ahaz, the king of Judah. Together they laid siege to Jerusalem, but were unsuccessful in the effort to take it (2Ki 16:5; Isa 7:1). It was to calm the fears, and

to restore the fainting spirits of the men of Judah, that Isaiah was commissioned by the Lord to assure them that the schemes of "these two tails of smoking firebrands" (Isa 7:4) were destined to miscarry. It was then, too, that the sign was aiven of the vigin who should conceive, and bear a son, and should call his name Immanuel. Rezin had to content himself on this campaign to the South with the capture of Elath from the men of Judah and its restoration to the men of Edom, from whom it had been taken and made a seaport by Solomon (2Ki 16:6, where it is agareed that "Syria" and "Syrians" should be read "Edom" and "Edomites," which in the Hebrew script are easy to be mistaken for one another, and are in fact often mistaken). Rezin, however, had a more formidable enemy to encounter on his return to Damascus. Ahaz, like kings of Judah before and after him, placed his reliance more on the arm of flesh than on the true King of his people, and appealed to Tiglath-pileser III, of Assyria, for help. Ahaz deliberately sacrificed the independence of his country in the terms of his offer of submission to the Assyrian: "I am thy servant and thy son" (2Ki 16:7). Tiglath-pileser had already carried his arms to the West and ravaged the northern border of Israel; and now he crossed the Euphrates and hastened to Damascus, slaying Rezin and carrying his people captive to Kir (2Ki 16:9). In the copious Annals of Tialath-pileser, Rezin figures with the designation Racunu(ni), but the tablet recording his death, found and read by Sir Henry Rawlinson, has been irrecoverably lost, and only the fact of its existence and loss remains (Schrader, COT, I, 252, 257). With the death of Rezin the kingdom of Damascus and Syria came to an end.

Rezin, Sons of: Mentioned among the Nethinim (Ezr 2:48), who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel from captivity (compare Ne 7:50).

LITERATURE.

Schrader, COT, as above; Driver, Authority, 99 ff,

T. Nicol.

REZON

re’-zon (rezon; Rhazon): Son of Eliadah, and a subject of Hadadezer, king of Zobah (1Ki 11:23). The name appears to be given as chezyon; Hazein (1Ki 15:18; see HEZION), where he is the father of Tabrimmon, whose son Ben-hadad I is known through his leaaue with Asa, king of Judah. When David conquered Zobah, Rezon renounced his allegiance to Hadadezer and became powerful as an independent chief, capturing Damascus and setting up as king. Along with Hadad, the noted Edomite patriot, he became a thorn in the side of Solomon, the one making himself obnoxious in the South, the other in the North, of the kingdom of Israel, both being animated with a bitter hatred of the common foe. It is said of Rezon that he "reigned over Syria" (1Ki 11:25), and if the surmise adopted by many scholars is correct that he is the same as Hezion (1Ki 15:18), then he was really the founder of the dynasty of Syrian kings so well known in the history of this period of Israel; and the line would run: Rezon, Tabrimmon, Ben-hadad I, and Ben-hadad II.

LITERATURE.

Burney on 1Ki 11:23 and 15:18 in Notes on Hebrew Text of Books of Kings; Winckler, Alttest. Untersuchunaen, 60 ff.

T. Nicol.

RHEGIUM

re-ji-um: This city (@Rhegion] (Ac 28:13), the modern Reggio di Calabria) was a town situated on the east side of the Sicilian Straits, about 6 miles South of a point opposite Messana (Messina). Originally a colony of Chalcidian Greeks, the place enjoyed great prosperity in the 5th century BC, but was captured and destroyed by Dionysius, tyrant of Syracuse, in 387 BC, when all the surviving inhabitants were sold into slavery (Diodorus xiv. 106-8, 111, 112). The city never entirely recovered from this blow, althouah it was partially restored by the younaer Dionysius. On the occasion of the invasion of Italy by Pyrrhus, the people of Rhegium had recourse to an alliance with Rome (280 BC) and received 4,000 Campanian troops within their walls, who turned out to be very unruly guests. For, in imitation of a similar band of mercenaries across the strait in Messana, they massacred the male inhabitants and reduced the women to slavery (Polybius i.7; Orosius iv.3). They were not punished by the Romans until 270 BC, when the town was restored to those of its former inhabitants who still survived. The people of Rhegium were faithful to their alliance with Rome during the Second Punic War (Livy xxiii.30; xxiv. 1; xxvi.12; xxix.6). At the time of the Social War they were incorporated with the Roman state, Rhegium becoming a municipality (Cicero Verr. v.60; Pro Archia, 3).

The ship in which Paul sailed from Melita to Puteoli encountered unfavorable winds after leaving Syracuse, and reached Rhegium by means of tacking. It waited at Rhegium a day for a south wind which bore it to Puteoli (Ac 28:13), about 180 miles distant, where it probably arrived in about 26 hours.

George H. Allen

RHESA

re’-sa (Rhesa): A son of Zerubbabel in the genealogy of Jesus according to Luke (Lu 3:27).

RHINOCEROS

ri-nos’-er-os: This word is found in the King James Version margin to Isa 34:7 ("rhinocerots") for re’emim, the King James Version "unicorns," the Revised Version (British and American) "wild-oxen." The word is quite inappropriate to the passage, which refers to the land of Edom. The one-horned rhinoceros, Rhinoceros unicornis, is confined to India. Other rhinoceroses are found in India and in equatorial Africa, but it is hardly to be presumed that these animals were meant by the Hebrew writers.

See UNICORN.

RHODA

ro’-da (Rhode, "rose"): A maid in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark. She came to answer when Peter knocked at Mary’s door after his miraculous release from prison. On recognizing his voice, she so forgot herself with joy that she neglected to open the door, but ran in to tell the others the glad news. They would not believe her, thinking she was mad; and when she persisted in her statement they said it must be his angel. The Jewish belief was that each man had a guardian angel assigned to him. Peter continued knocking, and was ultimately admitted (Ac 12:12).

S. F. Hunter

RHODES

rodz (Rhodos): An island (and city) in the Aegean Sea, West of Caria, rough and rocky in parts, but well watered and productive, though at present not extensively cultivated. Almost one-third of the island is now covered with trees in spite of earlier deforestation. The highest mountains attain an altitude of nearly 4,000 ft. The older names were Ophiusa, Asteria, Trinacria, Corymbia. The capital in antiquity was Rhodes, at the northeastern extremity, a strongly fortitled city provided with a double harbor. Near the entrance of the harbor stood one of the seven wonders of the ancient world—a colossal bronze statue dedicated to Helios. Tiffs colossus, made by Chares about 290 BC, at a cost of 300 talents ($300,000 in 1915), towered to the height of 104 ft.

In the popular mind—both before and after Shakespeare represented Caesar as bestriding the world like a colossus—this gigantic figure is conceived as an image of a human being of monstrous size with leas spread wide apart, at the entrance of the inner harbor, so huge that the largest ship with sails spread could move in under it; but the account on which this conception is based seems to have no foundation.

The statue was destroyed in 223 BC by an earthquake. It was restored by the Romans. In 672 AD the Saracens sold the ruins to a Jew. The quantity of metal was so areat that it would fill the cars of a modern freight train (900 camel loads).

The most ancient cities of Rhodes were Ialysus, Ochyroma, and Lindus. The oldest inhabitants were immigrants from Crete. Later came the Carians. But no real advance in civilization was made before the immigration of the Dorians under Tlepolemus, one of the Heraclidae, and (after the Trojan war) Aethaemanes. Lindus, Ialysus and Camirus formed with Cos, Cnidus and Halicarnassus the so-called Dorian Hexapolis (Six Cities), the center of which was the temple of the Triopian Apollo on the coast of Caria. Rhodes now founded many colonies—in Spain (Rhode), in Italy (Parthenope, Salapia, Sirus, Sybaris), in Sicily (Gela), in Asia Minor (Soli), in Cilicia (Gaaae), and in Lycia (Corydalla). The island attained no political greatness until the three chief cities formed a confederation and rounded the new

capital (Rhodes) in 408 BC. In the beginning of the Peloponnesian war, Rhodes sided with the Athenians, but, after 19 years of loyalty to Athens, went over to the Spartans (412 BC). In 394, when Conon appeared with his fleet before the city, the island fell into the hands of the Athenians again. A garrison was stationed at Rhodes by Alexander the Great. After his death this garrison was driven out by the Rhodians. It is at this time that the really great period of the island's history begins. The inhabitants bravely defended their capital against Demetrius Poliorcetes in 304 BC—the same Demetrius who two years before had won a naval victory and had coins stamped with a "Victory" that is the counterpart of the "Winaed Victory" which commands the unbounded admiration of the modern world—and extended their dominion over a strip of the Carian coast, as well as over several of the neiahboring islands, and for the first time in the history of the world established an international maritime and commercial law. The arts and sciences now began to flourish in the fair island in the southeastern Aegean. Aeschines, the famous orator of Athens, fled to Rhodes after his defeat by Demosthenes, and rounded a school of oratory, which was attended by many Romans. Rhodes became the faithful ally of Rome after the defeat of Antiochus in 189 BC. As a reward for her loyalty she received Caria. In 168, however, only a small portion of this territory remained under Rhodian sway (Peraea, or the Chersonesus). In 42 BC the island was devastated by Cassius. Later it was made a part of the Roman province of Asia (44 AD). Strabo says that he knows no city so splendid in harbor, walls and streets. When the Roman power declined, Rhodes fell into the hands of Caliph Moawijah, but later was taken by the Greeks, from whom at a later date the Genoese wrested the island. In 1249 John Cantacuzenus attempted to recover Rhodes, but in vain. Finally, however, success crowned the efforts of the Greeks under Theodoros Protosebastos. In 1310 the Knights of John, who had been driven from Palestine, made Rhodes their home. After the subjuaation of the island by Sultan Soliman in 1522 the Knights of John removed to Malta, and Rhodes has remained uninterruptedly a possession of the Sublime Porte down to the recent war between Turkey and the Balkan allies, forming, with the other islands, the province of the "Islands of the White Sea" (Archipelago). It has a Christian governor whose seat, though mostly at Rhodes, is sometimes at Chios. The population of the island has greatly diminished by emigration. In 1890 the total number of inhabitants was 30,000 (20,000 Greeks, 7,000 Mohammedans, 1,500 Jews). The chief products of Rhodes are wheat, oil, wine, figs and tropical fruits. A very important industry is the exportation of sponges. The purity of the air and the mildness of the climate make Rhodes a most delightful place to live in during the fall, winter and early spring. The city, built in the shape of an amphitheater, has a magnificent view toward the sea. It contains several churches made out of old mosques. The once famous harbor is now almost filled with sand. The inhabitants number nearly 12,000 (all Turks and Jews). Rhodes is mentioned in the New Testament only as a point where Paul touched on his voyage southward from the Hellespont to Caesarea (Ac 21:1); but in 1 Macc 15:23 we are informed that it was one of the states to which the Romans sent letters in behalf of the Jews.

LITERATURE.

Berg, Die Insel Rhodes (Braunschweig, 1860-62): Schneiderwirth, Geschichte der Insel Rhodes (Heiligenstadt, 1868); Guerin, L'ile de Rhodes, 2nd edition, Paris, 1880; Biliotti and Cottrel, L'ile de Rhodes (Paris, 1881); Torr, Rhodes in Ancient Times (Cambridge, 1885) and Rhodes in Modern Times (1887).

J. E. Harry

RHODOCUS

rod’-o-kus (Rhodokos): A Jewish traitor who disclosed the plans of Judas to Antiochus (Eupator) (2 Macc 13:21) 162 BC. Of his fate nothing more is known.

RIB

(tsela‘, tsal‘ah; Aramaic ‘ala‘): The Hebrew words designate the "side," "flank," thence the "ribs." They are found thus translated only in connection with the creation of Eve: "He (Yahweh) took one of his (Adam’s) ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof: and the rib, which Yahweh God had taken from the man, made he (margin "builded he into") a woman" (Ge 2:21,22). The Aramaic word is only found in Da 7:5.

Twice the Revised Version (British and American) uses the word "rib" in a figurative sense of two beams or rafters built in to the ark of the covenant and the altar of incense, on which the golden rings were fastened, which served to carry ark and altar by means of staves (Ex 30:4; 37:27).

A curious mistranslation has crept into the King James Version, which here follows Jewish commentators or etymologists, in four passages in 2 Samuel (2:23; 3:27; 4:6; 20:10), where the "fifth rib" is mentioned as the place of the body under which spears or swords are thrust, so as to cause lethal wounds. The Hebrew word chomesh, which indeed means "fifth," is here a noun, derived from a root meaning "to be staunch," "stalwart," "stout" "fleshy," "obese" (compare chamush, "armed," "equipped soldier"; Arabic el khamis (el chamis), "the army," which, however, Arabic lexicographers explain as meaning "fivefold," namely, vanguard, right and left wing, center and rear guard). The word is to be translated "abdomen," "belly." the Revised Version (British and American) renders correctly "into the body."

H. L. E. Luering

RIBAI

ri’-ba-i, ri’-bi (ribhay; Septuagint Rheiba, with variants): A Benjamite, the father of ITTAI (which see), one of David’s "mighty men" (2Sa 23:29 parallel 1Ch 11:31).

RIBBAND

rib’-and, rib’-an (pathil (Nu 15:38 the King James Version)).

See COLOR, (2); CORD, (4).

RIBLAH

rib’-la (ribhlah; Rheblatha, with variants):

(1) Riblah in the land of Hamath first appears in history in 608 BC. Here Pharaoh-necoh, after defeating Josiah at Megiddo and destroying Kadytis or Kadesh on the Orontes, fixed his headquarters, and while in camp he deposed Jehoahaz and cast him into chains, fixed the tribute of Judah, and appointed Jehoiakim king (2Ki 23:31-35). In 588 BC Nebuchadnezzar, at war with Egypt and the Syrian states, also established his headquarters at Riblah, and from it he directed the subjugation of Jerusalem. When it fell, Zedekiah was carried prisoner to Riblah, and there, after his sons and his nobles had been slain in his presence, his eyes were put out, and he was taken as a prisoner to Babylon (2Ki 25:6,20; Jer 39:5-7; 52:8-11). Riblah then disappears from history, but the site exists today in the village of Ribleh, 35 miles Northeast of Baalbek, and the situation is the finest that could have been chosen by the Egyptian or Babylonian kings for their headquarters in Syria. An army camped there had abundance of water in the control of the copious springs that go to form the Orontes. The Egyptians coming from the South had behind them the command of the rich corn and forage lands of Coele-Syria, while the Babylonian army from the North was equally fortunate in the rich plains extending to Hamath and the Euphrates. Lebanon, close by, with its forests, its hunting grounds and its snows, ministered to the needs and luxuries of the leaders. Riblah commanded the great trade and war route between Egypt and Mesopotamia, and, besides, it was at the dividing-point of many minor routes. It was in a position to attack with facility Phoenicia, Damascus or Palestine, or to defend itself against attack from those places, while a few miles to the South the mountains on each side close in forming a pass where a mighty host might easily be resisted by a few. In every way Riblah was the strategical point between North and South Syria. Riblah should probably be read for Diblah in Eze 6:14, while in Nu 34:11 it does not really appear. See (2).

(2) A place named as on the ideal eastern boundary of Israel in Nu 34:11, but omitted in Eze 47:15-18. The Massoretic Text reads "Hariblah"; but the Septuagint probably preserves the true vocalization, according to which we should translate "to Harbel." It is said to be to the east of ‘Ain, and that, as the designation of a district, can only mean Merj ‘Ayun, so that we should seek it in the neighborhood of Hermon, one of whose spurs Furrer found to be named Jebel ‘Arbel.

W. M. Christie

RICHES

rich’-ez, rich’-iz: Used to render the following Hebrew and Greek words:

(1) ‘Osher, which should, perhaps, be considered the most general word, as it is the most often used (Ge 31:16; Ec 4:8; Jer 9:23). It looks at riches simply as riches, without regard to any particular feature. Alongside this would go the Greek ploutos (Mt 13:22; Eph 2:7).

(2) Chocen (Pr 27:24; Jer 20:5), nekhacim and rekhush (Ge 36:7; Da 11:13,14 the King James Version) look at riches as things accumulated, collected, amassed.

(3) Hon looks upon riches as earnings, the fruit of toil (Ps 119:14; Pr 8:18; Eze 27:27).

(4) Hamon regards riches in the aspect of being much, this coming from the original idea of noise, through the idea of a multitude as making the noise, the idea of many, or much, being in multitude (Ps 37:16 the King James Version).

(5) Chayil regards riches as power (Ps 62:1; Isa 8:4; 10:14).

(6) Yithrah means "running over," and so presents riches as abundance (Jer 48:36 the King James Version). Along with this may be placed shua‘, which has the idea of breadth, and so of abundance (Job 36:19 the King James Version).

(7) Qinyan regards riches as a creation, something made (Ps 104:24; compare margin);

(8) (chrema) looks at riches as useful (Mr 10:23 f parallel). Like the New Testament, the Apoe uses only ploutos and chrema.

Material riches are regarded by the Scriptures as neither good nor bad in themselves, but only according as they are properly or improperly used. They are transitory (Pr 27:24); they are not to be trusted in (Mr 10:23; Lu 18:24; 1Ti 6:17); they are not to be gloried in (Jer 9:23); the heart is not to be set on them (Ps 62:10); but they are made by God (Ps 104:24), and come from God (1Ch 29:12); and they are the crown of the wise (Pr 14:24). Material riches are used to body forth for us the most precious and glorious realities of the spiritual realm. See, e.g., Ro 9:23; 11:33; Eph 2:7; Php 4:19; Col 1:27.

Compare MAMMON; TREASURE; WEALTH.

E. J. Forrester

RID; RIDDANCE

rid, rid’-ans: "Rid" originally meant "rescue" (the King James Version Ge 37:22; Ex 6:6; Ps 82:4; 144:7,11), whence the meaning "remove" or "clean out" (Le 26:6 the King James Version, with "riddance" in Le 23:22; Ze 1:18). The word occurs in the American Standard Revised Version and in the English Revised Version in Ex 6:6.

RIDDLE

rid’-’-l (chidhah; ainigma).

See GAMES.

RIE

ri "Rye" (King James Version, Ex 9:32; Isa 28:25).

See SPELT.

RIGHT

rit (yashar, mishpaT; dikaios, euthus): Many Hebrew words are translated "right," with different shades of meaning. Of these the two noted are the most important: yashar, with the sense of being straight, direct, as "right in the sight" of Yahweh (Ex 15:26; De 12:25, etc.), in one’s own eyes (Jud 17:6), "right words" (Job 6:25 the King James Version, yosher), "right paths" (Pr 4:11 the King James Version); and mishpaT "judgment" "cause" etc., a forensic term, as "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" (Ge 18:25). In Job 34:17, the Revised Version (British and American) has "justice" (34:6, "right"), etc. The word tsedheq, tsedhaqah, ordinarily translated "righteousness," are in a few cases rendered "right" (2Sa 19:28; Ne 2:20; Ps 9:4; 17:1; 119:75; Eze 18:5, etc.). In the New Testament the chief word is dikaios, primarily "even," "equal" (Mt 20:4; Lu 12:57, etc.); more generally the word is rendered "just" and "righteous." Euthus, used by Septuagint for yashar (1Sa 12:23; Ho 14:9), occurs a few times (Ac 8:21; 13:10; 2Pe 2:15); so orthos, "straight," "upright" (Lu 10:28). "Right-hand" or "side" represents Hebrew yamin and kindred forms (Ge 48:13,14,17; Ex 15:6, etc.); the Greek, in this sense, is dexios (Mt 6:3; 20:21, etc.).

Revised Version, among other changes, has "right" for the King James Version "judgment" in Job 27:2; 34:5, and for "right" in the King James Version substitutes "straight" in Ezr 8:21, "skillful" in Ec 4:4, margin "successful," etc. In Joh 1:12 the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "the right to become children of God" for the King James Version "the power" (exousia); in Mt 20:7,15 "right" is omitted, with the larger part of the verse. In 2Ti 2:15 "rightly dividing" (orthotomeo) is changed to "handling aright" with margin "holding a straight course in the word of truth. Or, rightly dividing the word of truth."

W. L. Walker

RIGHTEOUSNESS

ri’-chus-nes (tsaddiq, adjective, "righteous," or occasionally "just" tsedheq, noun, occasionally =" riahteousness," occasionally =" justice"; dikaios, adjective, dikaiosune, noun, from dike, whose first meaning seems to have been "custom"; the general use suggested conformity to a standard:

righteousness, "the state of him who is such as he ought to be" (Thayer)):

1. Double Aspect of Righteousness: Changing and Permanent

2. Social Customs and Righteousness

3. Changing Conception of Character of God: Obligations of Power

4. Righteousness as Inner

5. Righteousness as Social

6. Righteousness as Expanding in Content with Growth in Ideals of Human Worth

LITERATURE

1. Double Aspect of Righteousness: Changing and Permanent:

In Christian thought the idea of righteousness contains both a permanent and a changing element. The fixed element is the will to do right; the changing factor is the conception of what may be right at different times and under different circumstances. Throughout the entire course of Christian revelation we discern the emphasis on the first factor. To be sure, in the days of later Pharisaism righteousness came to be so much a matter of externals that the inner intent was often lost sight of altogether (Mt 23:23); but, on the whole and in the main, Christian thought in all ages has recognized as the central element in righteousness the intention to be and do right. This common spirit binds together the first worshippers of God and the latest. Present-day conceptions of what is right differ by vast distances from the conceptions of the earlier Hebrews, but the intentions of the first worshippers are as discernible as are those of the doers of righteousness in the present day.

2. Social Customs and Righteousness:

There seems but little reason to doubt that the content of the idea of righteousness was determined in the first instance by the customs of social groups. There are some, of course, who would have us believe that what we experience as inner moral sanction is nothing but the fear of consequences which come through disobeying the will of the social group, or the feeling of pleasure which results as we know we have acted in accordance with the social demands. At least some thinkers would have us believe that this is all there was in moral feeling in the beginning. If a social group was to survive it must lay upon its individual members the heaviest exactions. Back of the performance of religious rites was the fear of the group that the god of the group would be displeased if certain honors were not rendered to him. Merely to escape the penalties of an angry deity the group demanded ceremonial religious observances. From the basis of fear thus wrought into the individuals of the group have come all our loftier movements toward righteousness.

It is not necessary to deny the measure of truth there may be in this account. To point out its inadequacy, however, a better statement would be that from the beginning the social group utilized the native moral feeling of the individual for the defense of the group. The moral feeling, by which we mean a sense of the difference between right and wrong, would seem to be a part of the native furnishing of the mind. It is very likely that in the beginning this moral feeling was directed toward the performance of the rites which the group looked upon as important.

See ALMS.

As we read the earlier parts of the Old Testament we are struck by the fact that much of the early Hebrew morality was of this group kind. The righteous man was the man who performed the rites which had been handed down from the beginning (De 6:25). The meaning of some of these rites is lost in obscurity, but from a very early period the characteristic of Hebrew righteousness is that it moves in the direction of what we should call today the enlargement of humanity. There seemed to be at work, not merely the forces which make for the preservation of the group, not merely the desire to please the God of the Hebrews for the sake of the material favors which He might render the Hebrews, but the factors which make for the betterment of humanity as such. As we examine the laws of the Hebrews, even at so late a time as the completion of the formal Codes, we are indeed struck by traces of primitive survivals (Nu 5:11-31). There are some injunctions whose purpose we cannot well understand. But, on the other hand, the vast mass of the legislation had to do with really human considerations. There are rules concerning Sanitation (Le 13), both as it touches the life of the group and of the individual; laws whose mastery begets emphasis, not merely upon external consequences, but upon the inner result in the life of the individual (Ps 51:3); and prohibitions which would indicate that morality, at least in its plainer decencies, had come to be valued on its own account. If we were to seek for some clue to the development of the moral life of the Hebrews we might well find it in this emphasis upon the growing demands of human life as such. A suggestive writer has pointed out that the apparently meaningless commandment, "Thou shalt not boil a kid in its mother’s milk" (Ex 23:19), has back of it a real human purpose, that there are some things which in themselves are revolting apart from any external consequences (see also Le 18).

3. Changing Conception of Character of God: Obligations of Power:

An index of the growth of the moral life of the people is to be found in the changing conception of the character of God. We need not enter into the question as to just where on the moral plane the idea of the God of the Hebrews started, but from the very beginning we see clearly that the Hebrews believed in their God as one passionately devoted to the right (Ge 18:25). It may well be that at the start the God of the Hebrews was largely a God of War, but it is to be noticed that His enmity was against the peoples who had little regard for the larger human considerations. It has often been pointed out that one proof of the inspiration of the Scriptures is to be found in their moral superiority to the Scriptures of the peoples around about the Hebrews. If the Hebrew writers used material which was common property of Chaldeans, Babylonians, and other peoples, they nevertheless used these materials with a moral

difference. They breathed into them a moral life which forever separates them from the Scriptures of other peoples. The marvel also of Hebrew history is that in the midst of revoltingly immoral surroundings the Hebrews grew to such ideals of human worth. The source of these ideals is to be found in their thougth of God. Of course, in moral progress there is a reciprocal effect; the thought of God affects the thought of human life and the thought of human life affects the thought of God; but the Hebrews no sooner came to a fresh moral insight than they made their moral discovery a part of the character of God. From the beginning, we repeat, the God of the Hebrews was a God directed in His moral wrath against all manner of abominations, aberrations and abnormalities. The purpose of God, according to the Hebrews, was to make a people "separated" in the sense that they were to be free from anything which would detract from a full moral life (Le 20:22).

We can trace the more important steps in the growth of the Hebrew ideal. First, there was an increasingly clear discernment that certain things are to be ruled out at once as immoral. The primitive decencies upon which individual and social life depended were discerned at an early period (compare passages in Leviticus cited above). Along with this it must be admitted there was a slower approach to some ideals which we today consider important, the ideals of the marriage relations for example (De 24:1,2). Then there was a growing sense of what constitutes moral obligation in the discharge of responsibilities upon the part of men toward their fellows (Isa 5:8,23). There was increasing realization also of what God, as a moral Being, is obligated to do. The hope of salvation of nations and individuals rests at once upon the righteousness of God.

By the time of Isaiah the righteousness of God has come to include the obligations of power (Isa 63:1). God will save His people, not merely because He has promised to save them, but because He must save them (Isa 42:6). The must is moral. If the people of Israel show themselves unworthy, God must punish them; but if a remnant, even a small remnant, show themselves faithful, God must show His favor toward them. Moral worth is not conceived of as something that is to be paid for by external rewards, but if God is moral He must not treat the righteous and the unrighteous alike. This conception of what God must do as an obligated Being influences profoundly the Hebrew interpretation of the entire course of history (Isa 10:20,21).

Upon this ideal of moral obligation there grows later the thought of the virtue of vicarious suffering (Isaiah 53). The sufferings of the good man and of God for those who do not in themselves deserve such sufferings (for them) are a mark of a still higher righteousness (see HOSEA). The movement of the Scriptures is all the way from the thought of a God who gives battle for the right to the thought of a God who receives in Himself the heaviest shocks of that battle that others may have opportunity for moral life.

These various lines of moral development come, of course, to their crown in the New Testament in the life and death of Christ as set before us in the Gospels and interpreted by the apostles. Jesus stated certain moral axioms so clearly that the world never will escape their power. He said some things once and for all, and He did some things once and for all; that is to say, in His life and death He set on high the righteousness of God as at once moral obligation and self-sacrificing love (Joh 3:16) and with such effectiveness that the world has not escaped and cannot escape this righteous influence (Joh 12:32).

Moreover, the course of apostolic and subsequent history has shown that Christ put a winning and compelling power into the idea of righteousness that it would otherwise have lacked (Ro 8:31,32).

4. Righteousness as Inner:

The ideas at work throughout the course of Hebrew and Christian history are, of course, at work today. Christianity deepens the sense of obligation to do right. It makes the moral spirit essential. Then it utilizes every force working for the increase of human happiness to set on high the meaning of righteousness. Jesus spoke of Himself as "life," and declared that He came that men might have life and have it more abundantly (Joh 10:10). The keeping of the commandments plays, of course, a large part in the unfolding of the life of the righteous Christian, but the keeping of the commandments is not to be conceived of in artificial or mechanical fashion (Lu 10:25-37). With the passage of the centuries some commandments once conceived of as essential drop into the secondary place, and other commandments take the controlling position. In Christian development increasing place is given for certain swift insights of the moral spirit. We believe that some things are righteous because they at once appeal to us as righteous. Again, some other things seem righteous because their consequences are beneficial, both for society and for the individual. Whatever makes for the largest life is in the direction of righteousness. In interpreting life, however, we must remember the essentially Christian conception that man does not live through outer consequences alone. In all thought of consequences the chief place has to be given to inner consequences. By the surrender of outward happiness and outward success a man may attain inner success. The spirit of the cross is still the path to the highest righteousness.

5. Righteousness as Social:

The distinctive note in emphasis upon righteousness in our own day is the stress laid upon social service. This does not mean that Christianity is to lose sight of the worth of the individual in himself. We have come pretty clearly to see that the individual is the only moral end in himself. Righteousness is to have as its aim the upbuilding of individual lives. The commandments of the righteous life are not for the sake of society as a thing in itself. Society is nothing apart from the individuals that compose it; but we are coming to see that individuals have larger relationships than we had once imagined and greater responsibilities than we had dreamed of. The influence of the individual touches others at more points than we had formerly realized. We have at times condemned the system of things as being responsible for much human misery which we now see can be traced to the agency of individuals. The employer, the day-laborer, the professional man, the public servant, all these have large responsibilities for the life of those around. The unrighteous individual has a power of contaminating other individuals, and his deadliness we have just begun to understand. All this is receiving new emphasis in our present-day preaching of righteousness. While our social relations are not ends in themselves, they are mighty means for reaching individuals in large numbers. The Christian conception of redeemed humanity is not that of society as an organism existing on its own account, but that of individuals knit very closely together in their social relationships and touching one another for good in these relationships (1Co 1:2; Re 7:9,10). If we were to try to point out the line in which the Christian doctrine of righteousness is to move more and more through the years, we should have to emphasize this element of obligation to society. This does not mean that a new gospel is to supersede the old or even place itself alongside the old. It does

mean that the righteousness of God and the teaching of Christ and the cross, which are as ever the center of Christianity, are to find fresh force in the thought of the righteousness of the Christian as binding itself, not merely by commandments to do the will of God in society, but by the inner spirit to live the life of God out into society.

6. Righteousness as Expanding in Content with Growth in Ideals of Human Worth:

In all our thought of righteousness it must be borne in mind that there is nothing in Christian revelation which will tell us what righteousness calls for in every particular circumstance. The differences between earlier and later practical standards of conduct and the differences between differing standards in different circumstances have led to much confusion in the realm of Christian thinking. We can keep our bearing, however, by remembering the double element in righteousness which we mentioned in the beginning; on the one hand, the will to do right, and, on the other, the difficulty of determining in a particular circumstance just what the right is. The larger Christian conceptions always have an element of fluidity, or, rather, an element of expansiveness. For example, it is clearly a Christian obligation to treat all men with a spirit of good will or with a spirit of Christian love. But what does love call for in a particular case? We can only answer the question by saying that love seeks for whatever is best, both for him who receives and for him who gives. This may lead to one course of conduct in one situation and to quite a different course in another. We must, however, keep before us always the aim of the largest life for all persons whom we can reach. Christian righteousness today is even more insistent upon material things, such as sanitary arrangements, than was the Code of Moses. The obligation to use the latest knowledge for the hygienic welfare is just as binding now as then, but "the latest knowledge" is a changing term. Material progress, education, spiritual instruction, are all influences which really make for full life.

Not only is present-day righteousness social and growing; it is also concerned, to a large degree, with the thought of the world which now is. Righteousness has too often been conceived of merely as the means of preparing for the life of some future Kingdom of Heaven. Present-day emphasis has not ceased to think of the life beyond this, but the life beyond this can best be met and faced by those who have been in the full sense righteous in the life that now is. There is here no break in true Christian continuity. The seers who have understood Christianity best always have insisted that to the fullest degree the present world must be redeemed by the life-giving forces of Christianity. We still insist that all idea of earthly righteousness takes its start from heavenly righteousness, or, rather, that the righteousness of man is to be based upon his conception of the righteousness of God. Present-day thinking concerns itself largely with the idea of the Immanence of God. God is in this present world. This does not mean that there may not be other worlds, or are not other worlds, and that God is not also in those worlds; but the immediate revelation of God to us is in our present world. Our present world then must be the sphere in which the righteousness of God and of man is to be set forth. God is conscience, and God is love. The present sphere is to be used for the manifestation of His holy love. The chief channel through which that holy love is to manifest itself is the conscience and love of the Christian believer. But even these terms are not to be used in the abstract. There is an abstract conscientiousness which leads to barren living: the life gets out of touch with things that are real. There is an experience of love which exhausts itself in well-wishing. Both conscience and love are to be kept close to the earth by emphasis upon the actual realities

of the world in which we live.

LITERATURE.

G. B. Stevens, The Christian Doctrine of Salvation; A. E. Garvie, Handbook of Christian Apologetics; Borden P. Bowne, Principles of Ethics; Newman Smyth, Christian Ethics; A. B. Bruce, The Kingdom of God; W. N. Clarke, The Ideal of Jesus; H. C. King, The Ethics of Jesus.

Francis J. McConnell

RIMMON (1)

rim’-on:

(1) The rock Rimmon (cela‘ rimmon; he petra Rhemmon): The place of refuge of the 600 surviving Benjamites of Gibeah (Jeba‘) who "turned and fled toward the wilderness unto the rock of Rimmon, and abode in the rock of Rimmon four months" (Jud 20:45,47; 21:13). Robinson’s identification (RB, I, 440) has been very generally accepted. He found a conical and very prominent hill some 6 miles North-Northeast of Jeba‘ upon which stands a village called Rummon. This site was known to Eusebius and Jerome (OS 146 6; 287 98), who describe it as 15 Roman miles from Jerusalem. Another view, which would locate the place of refuge of the Benjamites in the Mugharet el jai, a large cavern on the south of the Wady Suweinit, near Jeba‘, is strongly advocated by Rawnsley and Birch (see PEF, III, 137-48). The latter connects this again with 1Sa 14:2, where Saul, accompanied by his 600, "abode in the uttermost part of Gibeah" under the pomegranate tree (Rimmon).

(2) (rimmon; Eremmon, or Rhemmoth): A city in the Negeb, near the border of Edom, ascribed to Judah (Jos 15:32) and to Simeon (Jos 19:7; 1Ch 4:32, the King James Version "Remmon"). In Zec 14:10 it is mentioned as the extreme South of Judah—"from Geba to Rimmon, South of Jerusalem." In the earlier references Rimmon occurs in close association with ‘Ain (a spring), and in Ne 11:29, what is apparently the same place, ‘Ain Rimmon, is called En-rimmon (which see).

(3) (rimmon (Jos 19:13), rimmonah, in some Hebrew manuscripts dimah (see DIMNAH) (Jos 21:35), and rimmono (1Ch 6:77)): In the King James Version we have "Remmon-methoar" in Jos 19:13, but the Revised Version (British and American) translates the latter as "which stretcheth." This was a city on the border of Zebulun (Jos 19:13) allotted to the Levites (Jos 21:35, "Dimnah"; 1Ch 6:77). The site is now the little village of Rummaneh on a low ridge South of the western end of the marshy plain el Battauf in Galilee; there are many rock-cut tombs and cisterns. It is about 4 miles North of el Mesh-hed, usually considered to be the site of Gath-hepher. See PEF, I, 363, Sh VI.

E. W. G. Masterman

RIMMON (2)

(rimmon, "pomegranate"; see RIMMON-PEREZ):

(1) A Syrian god. Naaman the Syrian leper after being cured is troubled over the fact that he will still have to bow down in the house of the Syrian god, Rimmon, when his master goes into the house to worship leaning on his hand (2Ki 5:18). Elisha answers him ambiguously: "Go in peace." Judging from Naaman’s position and this incident, Rimmon must have been one of the leading gods of the Syrians worshipped in Damascus. He has been identified with Rammanu, the Assyrian god of wind, rain and storm. The name appears in the Syrian personal names HADADRIMMON and TABRIMMON (which see) and its meaning is dubious (ramamu, "to thunder" (?))

(2) A Benjamite of Beeroth, whose sons Baanah and Rechab assassinated Ish-bosheth (2Sa 4:2,5,9).

Nathan Isaacs

RIMMON, ROCK OF

See RIMMON, (1).

RIMMON-PEREZ

rim-mon-pe’-rez (rimmon perets; the King James Version Rimmon-parez): A desert camp of the Israelites (Nu 33:19 f), unidentified. Gesenius translates rimmon as "pomegranate," the place deriving its name from the abundance of pomegranates. But Conder derives it from ramam, "to be high," and translates it "cloven height."

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

RIMMONAH; RIMMONO

rim-mo’-na, rimmo’-no.

See RIMMON, (3).

RING

(Anglo-Saxon, Hring, "ring"): The word renders (the American Standard Revised Version) two Hebrew words (in the King James Version and the English Revised Version three) and two Greek words. Tabba‘ath, the principal Hebrew word, is from Tabha‘, "sink," either because the ring is something "cast" or molded, or, more probably, since the principal use of the ring was as a seal, because it "sank"

into the wax or clay that received the impression. In Exodus, Tabba‘ath, "ring," is a detail of furniture or equipment, as the rings of the ark through which the staves were thrust (Ex 25:12, etc.), rings for curtains, in the high priest’s ephod (Ex 28:28; 39:21), etc. Its other use was perhaps the original, to describe the article of personal adornment worn on the finger, apparently in the Old Testament always a signet-ring, and as such an indispensable article of masculine attire. Such a ring Pharaoh gave Joseph as a symbol of authority (Ge 41:42); and Ahasuerus gave Haman (Es 3:10); with it the royal missive was sealed (Es 3:12; 8:8 twice, 10). It was also a feminine ornament in Isaiah’s list of the fashionable feminine paraphernalia, "the rings and the nose-jewels" (quite likely rings also) (Isa 3:21). Either as ornaments or for their intrinsic value, or both, rings were used as gifts for sacred purposes from both men and women: "brooches, and ear-rings, and signet-rings" (margin "nose-rings") (Ex 35:22); "bracelets, rings (the American Standard Revised Version "signet-rings"), ear-rings" (Nu 31:50 the King James Version). chotham, "signet," mentioned in Ge 38:18,25; Ex 28:11,21,36; Ex 39:6,14,30; Jer 22:24; Hag 2:23, etc., was probably usually a seal ring, but in Ge 38 and elsewhere the seal may have been swung on wire, and suspended by a cord from the neck. It was not only an identification, but served as a stamp for signature. galil, "circle" (compare "Galilee," "Circle" of the Gentiles), rendered "ring" in Es 1:6; So 5:14, may rather mean "cylinder" or "rod" of metal. Earring (which see) in the King James Version is from totally different words: nezem, whose etymology is unknown, aghil, "round," or lachash, "amulet"; so the Revised Version (British and American). The "rings" of the wheels in Eze 1:18 (the King James Version) are gabh, "curved," and mean "rims" (American Standard Revised Version), "felloes." Egyptians especially wore a great profusion of rings, principally of silver or gold, engraved with scarabaei, or other devices. In the New Testament the ring, daktulios, "finger-ring," is a token of means, position, standing: "put a ring on his hand" (Lu 15:22). Perhaps also it included the right to give orders in his father’s name. To be chrusodaktulios, "golden-ringed," perhaps with more than one, indicated wealth and social rank: "a man with a gold ring" (Jas 2:2).

See also EARRING; SIGNET; SEAL.

Philip Wendell Crannell

RINGLEADER

ring’-led-er: In Ac 24:5 the translation of protostates, "one who stands first." Not an opprobrious word in the Greek.

RINGSTREAKED

ring’-strekt (the King James Version and the English Revised Version ringstraked): Ge 30:35,39,40; 31:8 (twice), 10,12 for ‘aqodh. In the context of Ge 30:35, etc., ‘aqodh certainly denotes defective coloring of some sort, but the exact meaning of the word is uncertain. The translation "ringstreaked" ("marked with circular bands") comes from connecting the word with the Hebrew root ‘-q-d, "to bind" (Ge 22:9), but this connection is dubious.

RINNAH

rin’-a (rinnah, "praise to God"; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Ana; Codex Alexandrinus Rhannon): A Judahite, according to Massoretic Text a son of Shimon (1Ch 4:20). But the Septuagint makes him a son of Hanan (Codex Vaticanus Phana; Codex Alexandrinus Anan) by reading "ben" in the next name (Ben-hanan) as "son of."

RIOT

ri’-ut: Properly, "unrestrained behavior" of any sort, but in modern English usually connoting mob action, although such phrases as a "riotous banquet" are still in common use. the King James Version uses the word in the first sense, and it is retained by the Revised Version (British and American) in Lu 15:13; Tit 1:6; 1Pe 4:4 for asotos, asotia, "having no hope of safety," "profligate]." In Pr 23:20; 28:7 the Revised Version (British and American) has preferred "gluttonous," "glutton," in Ro 13:13, "revelling," and in 2Pe 2:13, "revel."

Burton Scott Easton

RIPHATH

ri’-fath (riphath): A son of Gomer, the eldest son of Japhet (Ge 10:3; 1Ch 1:6, where Massoretic Text and the Revised Version (British and American) read DIPHATH (which see)). Josephus (Ant., I, vi, 1) identifies the Ripheans with the Paphlagonians, through whose country on the Black Sea ran the river "Rhebas" (Pliny, NH, vi.4).

RISING

riz’-ing (se’eth, "a tumor," "swelling" (Le 13:2,10, etc.)).

See LEPROSY.

RISSAH

ris’-a (riccah, "dew"): A camp of the Israelites in the wilderness wanderings between Libnah and Kehelathah (Nu 33:21 f).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

RITHMAH

rith’-ma (rithmah, "broom"): A desert camp of the Israelites (Nu 33:18,19). The name refers to the white desert broom.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

RIVER

riv’-er:

(1) The usual word is nahar (Aramaic nehar (Ezr 4:10, etc.)), used of the rivers of Eden (Ge 2:10-14), often of the Euphrates (Ge 15:18, etc.), of Abana and Pharpar (2Ki 5:12), the river of Gozan (2Ki 17:6), the river Chebar (Eze 1:1), the rivers (canals?) of Babylon (Ps 137:1), the rivers of Ethiopia (Isa 18:1; Ze 3:10). Compare nahr, the common Arabic word for "river."

(2) ye’or, according to BDB from Egyptian iotr, ‘io’r, "watercourse," often of the Nile (Ex 1:22, etc.). In Isa 19:6, for ye’ore matsor, the King James Version "brooks of defense," the Revised Version (British and American) has "streams of Egypt." In Isa 19:7,8, for ye’or, the King James Version "brooks," and Zec 10:11, the King James Version "river," the Revised Version (British and American) has "Nile." In Job 28:10, the King James Version "He cutteth out rivers among the rocks," the Revised Version (British and American) has "channels," the Revised Version margin "passages."

(3) There are nearly 100 references to nachal. In about half of these the King James Version has "brook" and in about half "river." the Revised Version (British and American) has more often "brook" or "valley." But the Revised Version (British and American) has river in "whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas, and in the rivers" (Le 11:9); "the river Jabbok" (De 2:37; Jos 12:2); the stream issuing from the temple (Eze 47:5-12). the Revised Version (British and American) has "brook of Egypt," i.e. el-‘Arish (Nu 34:5; Jos 15:47; 1Ki 8:65; 2Ki 24:7; 2Ch 7:8; Am 6:14, "of the Arabah"); "brook (the King James Version "river") of Kanah" (Jos 16:8); "valley (the King James Version "river") of the Arnon" (De 2:24). English Versions of the Bible has "valley": of Gerar (Ge 26:17), of Zered (Nu 21:12), but "brook Zered" (De 2:13), of Eschol (Nu 32:9), of Sorek (Jud 16:4), of Shittim (Joe 3:18). English Versions of the Bible has "brook": Besor (1Sa 30:10), Kidron (2Sa 15:23), Gaash, (2Sa 23:30), Cherith (1Ki 17:3); also the feminine nachalah, "brook (the King James Version "river") of Egypt" (Eze 47:19; 48:28). The torrent-valley (wady) is often meant.

(4) pelegh, with feminine pelaggah, the King James Version "river," is in the Revised Version (British and American) translated "stream," except English Versions of the Bible "river of God" (Ps 65:9); "streams of water" (Ps 1:3; Pr 5:16; Isa 32:2; La 3:48); "streams of honey" (Job 20:17); "streams of oil" (Job 29:6).

(5) ‘aphiq, the King James Version "river," except English Versions of the Bible "water brooks" (Ps 42:1), is in the Revised Version (British and American) "watercourses" (Eze 6:3; 31:12; 32:6; 34:13; 35:8; 36:4,6), "water-brooks" (So 5:12; Joe 1:20).

(6) yubhal, English Versions of the Bible "river" (Jer 17:8). ‘ubhal, and ‘ubhal, English Versions of the Bible "river" (Da 8:2,3,6).

(7) potamos: of the Jordan (Mr 1:5); Euphrates (Re 9:14); "rivers of living water" (Joh 7:38); "river of water of life" (Re 22:1). So always in Greek for "river" in the Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha (1 Esdras 4:23, etc.).

See BROOK; STREAM; VALLEY.

Alfred Ely Day

RIVER OF EGYPT

See BROOK OF EGYPT.

RIVER, THE (GREAT)

See EUPHRATES.

RIVERS OF EDEN

See EDEN (1).

RIZIA

riz’-i-a (ritsya’): An Asherite (1Ch 7:39).

RIZPAH

riz’-pa (ritspah, "hot stone"; Josephus, Rhaispha): In 2Sa 3:7 the subject of a coarse slander. 2Sa 21 contains the pathetic story of Rizpah’s faithful watch over the bodies of her dead sons Mephibosheth and Armoni (21:10,11). Did this story suggest Tennyson’s "Rizpah"? A three years’ famine had made David anxious, and in seeking a reason for the affliction he concluded that it lay in Saul’s unavenged conduct to the Gibeonites (21:2). To appease Yahweh he gave up to the Gibeonites the two sons of Saul, Mephibosheth and Armoni, as well as Saul’s 5 grandsons (whether by Michal or Merab; see MERAB). These seven were hanged at Gibeah. Rizpah watched 5 months over their exposed bodies, but meanwhile the famine did not abate. Word was brought to David of Rizpah’s act (21:10,11), and it is possible that her action suggested to David his next step in expiation. At any rate, he remembered the uncared-for bones of Jonathan and Saul lying in ignominy at Jabesh-gilead, whither they had been carried by stealth after the Philistines had kept them hung in the streets of Beth-shan for some time. The

bones were recovered and apparently mingled with the bones Rizpah had guarded, and they were together buried in the family grave at Zelah. We are told that then "God was entreated for the land" (21:14).

Henry Wallace

ROAD (INROAD)

rod the King James Version (1Sa 27:10; compare 1Sa 23:27).

See RAID.

ROAD (WAY)

See ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, II, 6; WAY.

ROAST

See FOOD.

ROBBER; ROBBERY

rob’-er, rob’-er-i: "Robber" represents no particular Hebrew word in the Old Testament, but in the Apocrypha and the New Testament is always a translation of lestes (see THIEF). In the King James Version Job 5:5; 18:9, "robber" stands for the doubtful word tsammim, the Revised Version (British and American) "hungry" in JOb 5:5 and "snare" in 18:9. The meaning is uncertain, and perhaps tseme’im, "thirsty," should be read in both places. Ps 62:10, "Become not vain in robbery," means "put not your trust in riches dishonestly gained." RV’s changes of the King James Version in Pr 21:7; Da 11:14; Na 3:1 are obvious. In Php 2:6 the King James Version reads "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." the English Revised Version has "a prize," while the English Revised Version margin and the American Standard Revised Version read "a thing to be grasped," the American Standard Revised Version rewording "counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped." The Greek here is harpagmos, a word derived from harpazo, "to ravish away," "carry off," "plunder" (compare "harpy"). Properly speaking, the termination -mos should give the derived noun an active sense, "the act of plundering," whence the King James Version’s "robbery." The verse would then mean "who thought that being on an equality with God did not consist in grasping," and this translation gives good sense in the context and has some excellent scholarly support. But a passive significance is frequently found despite a -mos termination, giving to harpagmos the sense of "thing grasped," as in the Revised Version (British and American). Usually English commentators take "grasped" as meaning "clung to"—"did not think equality with God should be clung to tenaciously"—but "to cling to" seems unknown as a translation of harpazo. Hence, render "a thing to be grasped at"—did not seek equality with God by selfish methods

but by humbling himself." It is to be noticed, naturally, that Paul is thinking of "equality with God" simply in the sense of "receiving explicit adoration from men" (Php 2:10,11), and that the metaphysical relation of the Son to the Father is not at all in point.

See also GRASP.

Burton Scott Easton

ROBBERS OF TEMPLES

(hierosuloi, "guilty of sacrilege"): A term used by the town clerk of Ephesus (Ac 19:37, the King James Version "robbers of churches"). As the temple of Diana (Artemas) had a great treasure-chamber, the offense might not be unknown among them; compare Ro 2:22.

In 2 Macc 4:42 the King James Version the epithet "church-robber" (the Revised Version (British and American) "author of the sacrilege") is applied to LYSIMACHUS (which see).

ROBE

rob.

See DRESS, sec. 1, (3).

ROBOAM

ro-bo'-am (Rhoboam). the King James Version; Greek form of "Rehoboam" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)) (Mt 1:7); successor of Solomon.

ROCK

rok ((1) cela'; (2) tsur (3) challamish, "flint"; compare Arabic khalanbus, "flint"; (4) kephim (Job 30:6;" Jer 4:29); compare Kephas, "Cephas" = Petros, "Peter" (Joh 1:42 the King James Version and the Revised Version margin); (5) petra):

1. Names:

Tsur and cela' are the words most often found, and there is no well-defined distinction between them. They are frequently coupled together in the parallelism which is characteristic of the Hebrew writers: e. g.

"Be thou to me a strong rock (tsur),

A house of defense to save me.

For thou art my rock (tsela) and my fortress"

(Ps 31:2,3).

"He clave rocks (tsur) in the wilderness,

And gave them drink abundantly as out of the depths.

He brought streams also out of the rock (sela),

And caused waters to run down like rivers"

(Ps 78:15,16).

It is plain here that the two words are used for the sake of variety, without any clear difference of meaning. Even challamish (translated "flint") is used in the same way with tsur in Ps 114:8:

"Who turned the rock (tsur) into a pool of water;

The flint (callamish) into a fountain of waters."

2. Figurative:

(1) Some of the most striking and beautiful imagery of the Bible is based upon the rocks. They are a symbol of God: "Yahweh is my rock, and my fortress" (2Sa 22:2; Ps 18:2; 71:3); "God, the rock of my salvation" (2Sa 22:47; compare Ps 62:2,7; 89:26); "my God the rock of my refuge" (Ps 94:22); "the rock of thy strength" (Isa 17:10); "Lead me to the rock that is higher than I" (Ps 61:2); repeatedly in the song of Moses (De 32:3,4,18,30,31; compare 2Sa 22:32). Paul applies the rock smitten in the wilderness (Ex 17:6; Nu 20:11) to Christ as the source of living water for spiritual refreshment (1Co 10:4).

(2) The rocks are a refuge, both figuratively and literally (Jer 48:28; So 2:14); "The rocks are a refuge for the conies" (Ps 104:18). Many a traveler in Palestine has felt the refreshment of "the shade of a great rock in a weary land" (Isa 32:2). A very different idea is expressed in Isa 8:14, "And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense" (compare Ro 9:33; 1Pe 2:8).

(3) The rock is a symbol of hardness (Jer 5:3; compare Isa 50:7). Therefore, the breaking of the rock exemplifies the power of God (Jer 23:29; compare 1Ki 19:11). The rock is also a symbol of that which endures, "Oh that they .... were graven in the rock for ever!" (Job 19:23,24). A rock was an appropriate

place for offering a sacrifice (Jud 6:20; 13:19). The central feature of the Mosque of ‘Umar in Jerusalem is Qubbat-uc-Cakhrat, the "dome of the rock." The rock or cakhrat under the dome is thought to be the site of Solomon’s altar of burnt offering, and further is thought to be the site of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite which David purchased to build an altar to Yahweh.

3. Kinds of Rock:

(1) The principal rock of Palestine and Syria is limestone of which there are many varieties, differing in color, texture, hardness and degrees of impurity, some of the limestone having considerable admixtures of clay or sand. Some of the harder kinds are very dense and break with a conchoidal fracture similar to the fracture of flint. In rocks which have for ages been exposed to atmospheric agencies, erosion has produced striking and highly picturesque forms. Nodules and layers of flint are of frequent occurrence in the limestone.

(2) Limestone is the only rock of Western Palestine, with the exception of some local outpourings of basaltic rock and with the further exception of a light-brown, porous, partly calcareous sandstone, which is found at intervals along the coast. This last is a superficial deposit of Quaternary or recent age, and is of aeolian origin. That is, it consists of dune sands which have solidified under the influence of atmospheric agencies. This is very exceptional, nearly all stratified rocks having originated as beds of sand or mud in the bottom of the sea.

(3) In Sinai, Edom, Moab, Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon is found the Nubian sandstone, a silicious sandstone which, at least in the North, is of middle or lower Cretaceous age. In the South, the lower strata of this formation seem to be paleozoic. Most of it is not sufficiently coherent to make good building stone, though some of its strata are very firm and are even used for millstones. In some places it is so incoherent or friable that it is easily dug with the pick, the grains falling apart and forming sand that can be used in mortar. In color the Nubian sandstone is on the whole dark reddish brown, but locally it shows great variation, from white through yellow and red to black. In places it also has tints of blue. The celebrated rock tombs and temples of Petra are carved in this stone.

(4) Extensive areas of the northern part of Eastern Palestine are covered with igneous rock. In the Jaulan Southeast of Mt. Hermon, this has been for ages exposed to the atmosphere and has formed superficially a rich dark soil. Further Southeast is the Leja’ (Arabic "refuge"), a wild tract covered with a deposit of lava which is geologically recent, and which, while probably earlier than man, is still but little affected by the atmosphere. It is with difficulty traversed and frequently furnishes an asylum to outlaws.

See CRAG; FLINT; GEOLOGY OF PALESTINE; LIME.

Alfred Ely Day

ROCK OF AGES

See AGES, ROCK OF; ISAIAH, VII.

ROCK-BADGER

r.-baj’-er: This term is found in the Revised Version margin for "coney," shaphan (Le 11:5; compare De 14:7; Ps 104:18; Pr 30:26). It is a translation of klip das, the name given. by the Boers to the Cape hyrax or coney.

See CONEY.

ROD

(maqqel, maTTeh, shebheT; rhabdos): Little distinction can be drawn between the Hebrew words used for "rod" and "staff." Maqqel is the word used in Ge 30:37 ff for the twigs of poplar put by Jacob before his sheep, and in Jer 1:11 of the "rod of an almond-tree." MaTTeh is used of a rod in the hand, as the "rods" of Moses and of Aaron (Ex 4:2 ff; 7:9 , etc.). ShebheT is used, but sometimes also maTTeh, of the rod used for correction (Ex 21:20; 2Sa 7:14; Pr 10:13; 13:24; Isa 10:5, etc.). In Ps 23:4 ("Thy rod and thy staff, they comfort me"), however, shebheT is the shepherd’s rod, figurative of divine guidance and care. In Eze 21:10,13, the word stands for the royal scepter. In the New Testament "rod" is used of a rod of correction (1Co 4:21), Aaron’s rod (Heb 9:4), a ruler’s rod "of iron" (severity, as in Re 2:27; 12:5; 19:15), a measuring rod (Re 11:1).

See also ARMOR, ARMS.

James Orr

RODANIM

rod’-a-nim: The reading of Massoretic Text in 1Ch 1:7 for the DODANIM (which see) of Ge 10:4, corresponding to the Rhodioi of the Septuagint in both passages. The Rodanim are generally identified as inhabitants of the island of RHODES (which see), well known to the ancient Phoenicians (Homer’s Iliad).

ROE; ROEBUCK

ro, ro’-buk: the King James Version has "roe" and "roebuck" for tsehi, tsebhiyah. the Revised Version (British and American) usually substitutes "gazelle" in the text (De 12:15, etc.) or margin (Pr 6:5, etc.), but retains "roe" in 2Sa 2:18; 1Ch 12:8; So 3:5; 7:3. So the Revised Version (British and American) has "gazelle" for the King James Version "roe" in Sirach 27:20 (dorkas). the Revised Version (British and American) has "roe-buck" for yachmur (De 14:5; 1Ki 4:23), where the King James Version has "fallow deer." In the opinion of the writer, ‘ayyal English Versions of the Bible "hart," should be translated "roe-

buck," yachmur "fallow deer," and tsebhi "gazelle."

See DEER; GAZELLE.

Alfred Ely Day

ROGELIM

ro'-ge-lim, ro-ge'-lim (roghelim; Rhogelleim): The place whence came Barzillai the Gileadite to succor David in his flight from Absalom (2Sa 17:27; 19:31). It probably lay near the path followed by David, but it is not identical.

ROHGAH

ro'-ga (Kethibh rohaghah, Qere rohgah): A name in the genealogy of Asher (1Ch 7:34).

ROIMUS

ro'-i-mus (Rhoeimos; Codex Alexandrinus Rhomelios): One of the leaders with Zerubbabel in the return (1 Esdras 5:8) =" Rehum" in Ezr 2:2, of which it is the Greek form =" Nehum" in Ne 7:7.

ROLL (SCROLL)

rol: The usual form of book in Biblical times. It had been in use in Egypt for perhaps 2,000 years at the time when, according to the Pentateuch, the earliest Biblical books were written in this form. The Babylonian tablet seems to have been the prevailing form in Palestine up to about 1350 BC, but by 1100 BC, at least, the roll had been in established use for some time as far North as Byblos. Two Hebrew words, gillayon, meghillah, one Aramaic, cephar, and one Greek word, biblion, are so translated in the King James Version. Cephar (Ezr 6:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "archives, margin "books"), with the corresponding Hebrew form cepher, is the generic word for any whole work large or small, but as a book form (Isa 34:4) it may mean "roll," and, according to Blau (pp. 37, 45, etc.), it never does mean anything else. Both the other words seem to be connected with galal, "roll," which is the technical term for opening or closing a book. The meghillath cepher (Jer 36:2) means the unwritten roll, or the roll considered in its material form as contrasted with the work. Meghillah, which is found in Ezr 6:2 (English Versions of the Bible, "roll"), Jeremiah (often), Ezekiel (often) and Zechariah, is a somewhat late word, and came to mean a small roll (but with a complete work) as distinguished from a book, corresponding thus to the modern distinction of pamphlet and book or document and book. The word gillayon is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) as "tablet," and is universally regarded as meaning (Isa 8:1) some smooth surface, corresponding to the same word in Isa 3:23 which is rendered "hand-mirror." But "cylinder-seal" would possibly fit the sense in both cases; this being hung round the neck as an ornament in one case and inscribed with a personal name in the other.

Biblion is regarded by the Bible translators as equivalent to meghillah in the sense of small roll. It is in fact 4 times in the Septuagint of Jer 36 used as the translation for meghillah, but very much oftener it is the translation for cepher, for which in fact it is the correct technical equivalent (Birt, Buchrolle, 21). Indeed the "small book" (Thayer, Lexicon, 101) is hardly consistent with the ideas of the heavens as a scroll, of the Lamb's Book of Life, or of the vast quantity of books of Joh 21:25, although in Lu 4:17 it may perhaps correspond closely with meghillah in the sense of a complete roll and work, which is at the same time a whole part of a larger work. Its use in Re 6:14 is reminiscent of Isa 34:4 ("scroll"), and is conclusive for the roll form. It is indeed always technically a roll and never codex or tablet.

It is not likely that Isaiah and John (here and in his Gospel, 21:25) refer directly to the Babylonian idea that the heavens are a series of written tablets or to the rabbinic saying that "if all the oceans were ink, all reeds pens, the heavens and earth sheets to write upon, and all men writers, still it would not suffice for writing out the teachings of my Masters" (Blau, op. cit., 34). Nevertheless, the "whole Cosmos" does suggest "the heavens and earth" as sheets to write on, and under all there does perhaps lurk a conception of the broad expanse of heaven as a roll for writing upon.

LITERATURE.

Birt, Die Buchrolle in der Kunst, Leipzig, 1907; Jew Encyclopedia, XI, 126-34, "Scroll of the Law"; Blau, Studien z. althebr. Buchwesen, Strassburg, 1902, 37-66, etc., and the literature under the article "Writing," especially Gardthausen, 134-54.

E. C. Richardson

ROLLER

rol'-er: the King James Version and the English Revised Version in Eze 30:21 for chittul, "bandage" (so the American Standard Revised Version). "Roller" was formerly a technical term in surgery for a wide bandage.

ROLLING THING

rol'-ing: Isa 17:13, the King James Version "like a rolling thing before the whirlwind," a noncommittal translation of galgal, "revolving thing," "wheel" (Ec 12:6). the Revised Version (British and American) "like the whirling dust before the storm" is probably right.

See CHAFF; DUST; STUBBLE.

ROMAMTI-EZER

ro-mam-ti-e'-zer, ro-mam-ti-e'-zer (romamti 'ezer, "highest help"): Son of Heman, appointed chief of

the 24th division of singers in David’s time (1Ch 25:4,31).

See JOSHBEKASHAH.

ROMAN ARMY

See ARMY, ROMAN.

ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, 1

em’-pir:

I. OUTLINE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

1. Roman Empire a Result of Social Conflict

2. Coming of Monarchy

(1) Exhaustion of Parties

(2) Inability of Either Aristocracy or Democracy to Hold Equilibrium

(3) Precedents

(4) Withdrawal from Public Life: Individualism

(5) Industrial

(6) Military

(7) Imperial Interests

(8) Influence of Orient

II. PREPARATION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE FOR CHRISTIANITY

1. Pax Romana and the Unification of the World

2. Cosmopolitanism

3. Eclecticism

4. Protection for Greek Culture

5. Linguistically

6. Materially

7. Tolerance

8. Pattern for a Universal Church

9. Roman Jurisprudence

10. Negative Preparation

III. ATTITUDE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE TO RELIGIONS

1. Roman or State Religion

2. Non-Roman Religions—religiones licitae and religiones illicitae

(1) Judaism a religio licita

(2) Why Christianity Was Alone Proscribed

(3) Two Empires: Causes of Conflict

(a) Confusion of Spiritual and Temporal

(b) Unique Claims of Christianity

(c) Novelty of Christianity

(d) Intolerance and Exclusiveness of the Christian Religion and Christian Society

(e) Obstinatio

(f) Aggressiveness against Pagan Faith

(g) Christianos ad leones: Public Calamities

(h) Odium generis humani

(4) The Roman Empire Not the Only Disturbing Factor

IV. RELATIONS BETWEEN THE ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY

1. Beginning of Christianity until Death of Nero, 68 AD

2. Flavian Period, 68-96 AD

3. The Antonine Period, 96-192 AD

4. Changing Dynasties, 192-284 AD

5. Diocletian until First General Edict of Toleration, 284-311 AD

6. First Edict of Toleration until Extinction of Western Empire, 311-476 AD

V. VICTORY OF CHRISTIANITY AND CONVERSION OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

1. Negative Causes

2. Positive Causes

LITERATURE

I. Outline of the Roman Empire.

1. Roman Empire a Result of Social Conflict:

The founding of the Roman empire was the grandest political achievement ever accomplished. The conquests of Alexander the Great, Charlemagne and Napoleon seem small compared with the durable structure reared by Julius and his successor, Augustus. In one sense Julius Caesar—the most wonderful man that Rome or any other country produced—was the founder of the empire, and Augustus the founder of the principate. But the Roman empire was the culmination of a long process of political, constitutional, and social growth which gives a lasting interest to Roman history. The Roman empire was the only possible solution of a 700 years' struggle, and Roman history is the story of the conflict of class with class, patrician against plebeian, populus against plebs, the antagonism of oligarchy and democracy, plutocracy against neglected masses. It is the account of the triumphant march of democracy and popular government against an exclusive governing caste. Against heavy odds the plebeians asserted

their rights till they secured at least a measure of social, political and legal equality with their superiors (see ROME, I, 2-4). But in the long conflict both parties degenerated until neither militant democracy nor despotic oligarchy could hold the balance with justice. Democracy had won in the uphill fight, but lost itself and was obliged to accept a common master with aristocracy. It was of no small importance for Christianity that the Roman empire—practically synonymous with the orbis terrarum—had been converging both from internal and external causes toward a one-man government, the political counterpart of a universal religion with one God and Saviour.

(1) Julius Caesar.

For a couple of generations political leaders had foreseen the coming of supreme power and had tried to grasp it. But it was Julius Caesar who best succeeded in exploiting democracy for his own aggrandizement. He proved the potent factor of the first triumvirate (60 BC); his consulship (59) was truly kingly. In 49 BC he crossed the Rubicon and declared war upon his country, but in the same year was appointed Dictator and thus made his enemies the enemies of his country. He vanquished the Pompeians—senatorial and republican—at Pharsalia in 48 BC, Thapsus in 46 BC, and Munda in 45 BC. Between 46 and the Ides of March 44 no emperor before Diocletian was more imperial. He was recognized officially as "demigod"; temples were dedicated to his "clemency." He encouraged the people to abdicate to him their privileges of self-government and right of election, became chief (princeps) of the senate and high priest (pontifex maximus), so that he could manipulate even the will of the gods to his own purposes. His plans were equally great and beneficent. He saw the necessity of blending the heterogeneous populations into one people and extending Roman citizenship. His outlook was larger and more favorable to the coming of Christianity than that of his successor, Augustus. The latter learned from the fate of Caesar that he had advanced too rapidly along the imperial path. It taught Augustus caution.

(2) Augustus.

Octavian (Augustus) proved the potent factor of the second triumvirate. The field of Actiuim on September 2, 31 BC, decided the fate of the old Roman republic. The commonwealth sank in exhaustion after the protracted civil and internecine strife. It was a case of the survival of the fittest. It was a great crisis in human history, and a great man was at hand for the occasion. Octavian realized that supreme power was the only possible solution. On his return to Rome he began to do over again what Caesar had done—gather into his own hands the reins of government. He succeeded with more caution and shrewdness, and became the founder of the Roman empire, which formally began on January 16, 27 BC, and was signalized by the bestowal of the title AUGUSTUS (which see). Under republican forms he ruled as emperor, controlling legislation, administration and the armies. His policy was on the whole adhered to by the Julio-Claudian line, the last of which was Nero (died 68 AD).

(3) Flavian Dynasty.

In 68 AD a new "secret of empire" was discovered, namely, that the principate was not hereditary in one

line and that emperors could be nominated by the armies. After the bloody civil wars of 68, "the year of the four emperors," Vespasian founded the IInd Dynasty, and dynastic succession was for the present again adopted. With the Flavians begins a new epoch in Roman history of pronounced importance for Christianity. The exclusive Roman ideas are on the wane. Vespasian was of plebeian and Sabine rank and thus non-Roman, the first of many non-Roman emperors. His ideas were provincial rather than Roman, and favorable to the amalgamation of classes, and the leveling process now steadily setting in. Though he accepted the Augustan "diarchy," he began to curtail the powers of the senate. His son Titus died young (79-81). Domitian's reign marks a new epoch in imperialism: his autocratic spirit stands half-way between the Augustan principate and the absolute monarchy of Diocletian. Domitian, the last of the "twelve Caesars" (Suetonius), was assassinated September 18, 96 AD. The soldiers amid civil war had elected the last dynasty. This time the senate asserted itself and nominated a brief series of emperors—on the whole the best that wore the purple.

(4) Adoptive or Antonine Emperors.

The Antonine is another distinct era marked by humane government, recognition of the rights of the provinces and an enlargement of the ideas of universalism. Under Trajan the empire was extended; a series of frontier blockades was established—a confession that Rome could advance no farther. Under Hadrian a policy of retreat began; henceforth Rome is never again on the aggressive but always on the defensive against restless barbarians. Unmistakable signs of weakness and decay set in under Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. This, the best and happiest period of Roman imperial government, was the beginning of the end. In this era we detect a growing centralization of authority; the senate practically becomes a tool of the emperor. A distinct civil service was established which culminated in bureaucracy under Hadrian.

(5) Changing Dynasties, 193-284 AD.

On the death of Commodus, whose reign 180-93 AD stands by itself, the empire was put up for sale by the soldiery and knocked down to the highest bidder. The military basis of the empire was emphasized—which was indeed essential in this period of barbaric aggressiveness to postpone the fall of the empire until its providential mission was accomplished. A rapid succession of rulers follows, almost each new ruler bringing a new dynasty. Those disintegrating forces set in which developed so rapidly from the reign of Diocletian. The pax Romana had passed; civil commotion accentuated the dangers from invading barbarians. Plague and famine depopulated rich provinces. Rome itself drops into the background and the provincial spirit asserts itself proportionally. The year 212 AD is memorable for the edict of Caracalla converting all the free population into Roman citizens.

(6) From Diocletian until Partition.

In the next period absolute monarchy of pure oriental type was established by Diocletian, one of the ablest of Roman rulers. He inaugurated the principle of division and subdivision of imperial power. The inevitable separation of East and West, with the growing prominence of the East, becomes apparent.

Rome and Italy are reduced to the rank of provinces, and new courts are opened by the two Augusti and two Caesars. Diocletian's division of power led to civil strife, until Constantine once more united the whole empire under his sway. The center of gravity now shifted from West to East by the foundation of Constantinople. The empire was again parceled out to the sons of Constantine, one of whom, Constantius, succeeded in again reuniting it (350 AD). In 364 it was again divided, Valentinian receiving the West and Valens the East.

(7) Final Partition.

On the death of Theodosius I (395), West and East fell to his sons Honorius and Arcadius, never again to be united. The western half rapidly degenerated before barbaric hordes and weakling rulers. The western provinces and Africa were overrun by conquering barbarians who set up independent kingdoms on Roman soil. Burgundians and Visigoths settled in Gaul; the latter established a kingdom in Spain. The Vandals under Genseric settled first in Southern Spain, then crossed to Africa and reduced it. Goths burst over Roman frontiers, settled in Illyria and invaded Italy. Alaric and his Goths spared Rome in 408 for a ransom; in 409 he appeared again and set up Attalus as king of the Romans, and finally in 410 he captured and sacked the city. It was again sacked by the Vandals under Genseric in 462, and, lastly, fell before Odoacer and his Germans in 476; he announced to the world that the empire of the West had ceased. The empire of the East continued at Constantinople the greatest political power through a chequred history down to the capture of the city in 1214 and its final capture by the Turks in 1453, when its spiritual and intellectual treasures were opened to western lands and proved of untold blessing in preparing the way for the Reformation of the 16th century. The East conquered the West intellectually and spiritually. In the East was born the religion of humanity.

2. Coming of the Monarchy:

(1) Exhaustion of Parties.

The Roman world had for two generations been steadily drifting toward monarchy, and at least one generation before the empire was set up clear minds saw the inevitable necessity of one-man government or supreme power, and each political leader made it his ambition to grasp it. The civil wars ceased for a century with the death of Antony. But the struggles of Tiberius Gracchus and Scipio Aemilianus, Caius Gracchus and Opimius, Drusus and Philippus, Marius and Sulla, Pompey and Caesar, and lastly Octavian and Antony had exhausted the state, and this exhaustion of political parties opened the way for monarchy. In fact it was a necessity for the welfare of the commonwealth that one should be elevated who could fairly hold the balance between oligarchy and the commons and duly recognize the claims of all parties. Even Cato Uticensis—the incarnation of republican ideas—admitted it would be better to choose a master than wait for a tyrant. The bloody wars could find no solution except the survival of the fittest. Moreover, the free political institutions of Rome had become useless and could no longer work under the armed oppression of factions. If any form of government, only supreme power would prove effectual amid an enfeebled, unpopular senate, corrupt and idle commons, and ambitious individuals.

(2) Inability of Either Aristocracy or Democracy to Hold Equilibrium.

Events had proved that a narrow exclusive aristocracy was incapable of good government because of its utterly selfish policy and disregard for the rights of all lower orders. It had learned to burke liberty by political murders. Neither was the heterogeneous population of later Rome disciplined to obey or to initiate just government when it had seized power. This anarchy within the body politic opened an easy way to usurpation by individuals. No republic and no form of free popular government could live under such conditions. Caesar said of the republic that it was "a name without any substance," and Curio declared it to be a "vain chimera." The law courts shared in the general corruption. The judicia became the bone of contention between the senate and the knights as the best instrument for party interests, and enabled the holders

(a) to receive large bribes,

(b) to protect their own order when guilty of the most flagrant injustice, and

(c) to oppress other orders.

Justice for all, and especially for conquered peoples, was impossible. Elective assemblies refused to perform their proper functions because of extravagant bribery or the presence of candidates in arms. In fact, the people were willing to forego the prerogative of election and accept candidates at the nomination of a despotic authority. The whole people had become incapable of self-government and were willing—almost glad—to be relieved of the necessity.

(3) Precedents.

Besides, precedents for one-man government, or the concentration of supreme power in one hand, were not wanting, and had been rapidly multiplying in Roman history as it drew nearer to the end of the republic. Numerous protracted commands and special commissions had accustomed the state to the novelty of obedience without participation in administration. The 7 consulships of Marius, the 4 of Cinna, the 3 extraordinary commissions of Pompey and his sole consulship, the dictatorship of Sulla without time limit, the two 5-year-period military commands of Caesar, his repeated dictatorships the last of which was to extend for 10 years—all these were pointing directly toward Caesarism.

(4) Withdrawal from Public Life: Individualism.

On another side the way was opened to supreme power by the increasing tendency for some of the noblest and best minds to withdraw from public life to the seclusion of the heart life and thus leave the field open for demagogic ambition. After the conquests of Alexander the Great, philosophy abandoned the civic, political or city-state point of view and became moral and individual. Stoicism adopted the lofty spiritual teachings of Plato and combined them with the idea of the brotherhood of humanity. It also preached that man must work out his salvation, not in public political life, but in the secret agonies

of his own soul. This religion took hold of the noblest Roman souls who were conscious of the weariness of life and felt the desire for spiritual fellowship and comfort. The pendulum in human systems of thought generally swings to the opposite extreme, and these serious souls abandoned public life for private speculation and meditation. Those who did remain at the helm of affairs—like the younger Cato—were often too much idealists, living in the past or in an ideal Platonic republic, and proved very unequal to the practical demagogues who lived much in the present with a keen eye to the future. Also a considerable number of the moderate party, who in better days would have furnished leaders to the state, disgusted with the universal corruption, saddened by the hopeless state of social strife and disquieted by uncertainty as to the issue of victory for either contending party, held aloof and must have wished for and welcomed a paramount authority to give stability to social life. Monarchy was in the air, as proved by the sentiments of the two pseudo-Sallustian letters, the author of which calls upon Caesar to restore government and reorganize the state, for if Rome perish the whole world must perish with her.

(5) Industrial.

To another considerable class monarchy must have been welcome—the industrial and middle class who were striving for competence and were engaged in trade and commerce. Civil wars and the strife of parties must have greatly hindered their activity. They cast their lot neither with the optimates nor with the idle commonalty. They desired only a stable condition of government under which they could uninterruptedly carry on their trades.

(6) Military.

Military conditions favored supreme power. Not only had the lengthened commands familiarized the general with his legions and given him time to seduce the soldiery to his own cause, but the soldiery too had been petted and spoiled like the spoon-fed populace. The old republican safeguards against ambition had been removed. The ranks of the armies had also been swollen with large numbers of provincials and non-Romans who had no special sentiment about republican forms. We have seen the military power growing more and more prominent. The only way of averting a military despotism supported and prompted by the soldiers was to set up a monarchy, holding all the military, legislative and administrative functions of the state in due proportion. This was superior to a merely nominal republic always cringing under fear of military leaders.

(7) Imperial Interests.

Lastly, the aggression and conquests of the republic had brought about a state of affairs demanding an empire. The East and the West had been subdued; many provinces and heterogeneous populations were living under the Roman eagle. These provinces could not permanently be plundered and oppressed as under the republican senate. The jus civile of Rome must learn also the jus naturale and jus gentium. An exclusive selfish senatorial clique was incapable of doing justice to the conquered peoples. One supreme ruler over all classes raised above personal ambition could best meet their grievances. The senate had

ruled with a rod of iron; the provinces could not possibly be worse under any form of government. Besides, monarchy was more congenial to the provincials than a republic which they could not comprehend.

(8) Influence of Orient.

The Orientals had long been used to living under imperial and absolute forms of government and would welcome such a form among their new conquerors. Besides, residence in the Orient had affected Roman military leaders with the thirst after absolute power. And no other form was possible when the old city-state system broke down, and as yet federal government had not been dreamed of. Another consideration: the vast and dissimilar masses of population living within the Roman dominions could more easily be held together under a king or emperor than by a series of ever-changing administrations, just as the Austro-Hungarian and the British empires are probably held together better under the present monarchies than would be possible under a republican system. This survey may make clear the permanent interest in Roman history for all students of human history. The Roman empire was established indeed in the fullness of the times for its citizens and for Christianity.

II. Preparation of the Roman Empire for Christianity.

About the middle of the reign of Augustus a Jewish child was born who was destined to rule an empire more extensive and lasting than that of the Caesars. It is a striking fact that almost synchronous with the planting of the Roman empire Christianity appeared in the world. Although on a superficial glance the Roman empire may seem the greatest enemy of early Christianity, and at times a bitter persecutor, yet it was in many ways the grandest preparation and in some ways the best ally of Christianity. It ushered in politically the fullness of the times. The Caesars—whatever they may have been or done—prepared the way of the Lord. A brief account must here be given of some of the services which the Roman empire rendered to humanity and especially to the kingdom of God.

1. Pax Romana and the Unification of the World:

The first universal blessing conferred by the empire was the famous pax Romana ("Roman peace"). The world had not been at peace since the days of Alexander the Great. The quarrels of the Diadochi, and the aggression of the Roman republic had kept the nations in a state of constant turmoil. A universal peace was first established with the beginning of the reign of Augustus and the closing of the temple of Janus. In all the countries round the Mediterranean and from distant Britain to the Euphrates the world was at rest. Rome had made an end of her own civil wars and had put a stop to wars among the nations. Though her wars were often iniquitous and unjustifiable, and she conquered like a barbarian, she ruled her conquests like a humane statesman. The quarrels of the Diadochi which caused so much turmoil in the East were ended, the territory of the Lagids; Attalids, Seleucids and Antigonids having passed under the sway of Rome. The empire united Greeks, Romans and Jews all under one government. Rome thus blended the nations and prepared them for Christianity. Now for the first time we may speak of the world as universal humanity, the orbis terrarum, he oikoumene (Lu 2:1), the genus humanum. These

terms represented humanity as living under a uniform system of government. All were members of one earthly state; the Roman empire was their communis omnium patria.

2. Cosmopolitanism:

This state of affairs contributed largely to the spread of cosmopolitanism which had set in with the Macedonia conqueror. Under the Roman empire all national barriers were removed; the great cities—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, etc.—became meeting-places of all races and languages. The Romans were everywhere carrying their laws and civilization; Greeks settled in thousands at all important centers as professors, merchants, physicians, or acrobats; Orientals were to be found in large numbers with their gods and mysteries in Rome, "the epitome of the world." In the Roman armies soldiers from all quarters of the empire became companions. And many thousands of slaves of fine education and high culture contributed much to cosmopolitanism. Being in many cases far superior in culture to their masters, they became their teachers. And in every city of importance, East or West, large bodies of the Jewish Diaspora were settled.

3. Eclecticism:

This cosmopolitanism gave great impetus to a corresponding eclecticism of thought. Nothing could have been more favorable to Christianity than this intermixture of all races and mutual exchange of thought. Each people discovered how much it had in common with its neighbors. From the days of the Diadochi, Stoicism had been preaching the gospel of a civic and ethical brotherhood of humanity. In the fusion of different philosophic systems the emphasis had shifted from the city-state or political or national to the moral and human point of view. All men were thus reduced to equality before the One; only virtue and vice were the differentiating factors. Men were akin with the divine—at least the wise and good—so that one poet could say, "We are His offspring."

Stoicism did a noble service in preparation for Christianity by preaching universalism along the path of individualism. It also furnished comfort and strength to countless thousands of weary human lives and ministered spiritual support and calm resignation at many a heathen deathbed. It may be declared to be the first system of religious thought—for it was a religion more than a philosophy—which made a serious study of the diseases of the human soul. We know of course its weakness and imperfections, that it was an aristocratic creed appealing only to the elect of mortals, that it had little message for the fallen and lower classes, that it was cold and stern, that it lacked—as Seneca felt—the inspiration of an ideal life. But with all its failures it proved a worthy pedagogue to a religion which brought a larger message than that of Greece. It afforded the spiritual and moral counterpart to the larger human society of which the Roman empire was the political and visible symbol. Hitherto a good citizen had been a good man. Now a good man is a good citizen, and that not of a narrow city-state, but of the world. Stoicism also proved tile interpreter and mouthpiece to the Roman empire of the higher moral and spiritual qualities of Greek civilization; it diffused the best convictions of Greece about God and man, selecting those elements that were universal and of lasting human value.

See STOICS.

The mind of the Roman empire was further prepared for Christianity by the Jewish Diaspora. Greeks learned from Jews and Jews from Greeks and the Romans from both. The unification effected by Roman Law and administration greatly aided the Diaspora. Jewish settlements became still more numerous and powerful both in the East and West. Those Jews bringing from the homeland the spiritual monotheism of their race combined it with Greek philosophy which had been setting steadily for monotheism. With the Jews the exclusively national element was subordinated to the more human and universal, the ceremonial to the religious. They even adopted the world-language of that day—Greek—and had their sacred Scriptures translated into this language in which they carried on an active proselytism. The Roman spirit was at first essentially narrow and exclusive. But even the Romans soon fell beneath the spell of this cosmopolitanism and eclecticism. As their conquests increased, their mind was correspondingly widened. They adopted the policy of Alexander—sparing the gods of the conquered and admitting them into the responsibility of guarding Rome; they assimilated them with their own Pantheon or identified them with Roman gods. In this way naturally the religious ideas of conquered races more highly civilized than the conquerors laid hold on Roman minds.

See DISPERSION.

4. Protection for Greek Culture:

Another inestimable service rendered to humanity and Christianity was the protection which the Roman power afforded the Greek civilization. We must remember that the Romans were at first only conquering barbarians who had little respect for culture, but idealized power. Already they had wiped out two ancient and superior civilizations—that of Carthage without leaving a trace, and that of Etruria, traces of which have been discovered in modern times. It is hard to conceive what a scourge Rome would have proved to the world had she not fallen under the influence of the superior culture and philosophy of Greece. Had the Roman Mars not been educated by Pallas Athene the Romans would have proved Vandals and Tartars in blotting out civilization and arresting human progress. The Greeks, on the other hand, could conquer more by their preeminence in everything that pertains to the intellectual life of man than they could hold by the sword. A practical and political power was needed to protect Greek speculation. But the Romans after causing much devastation were gradually educated and civilized and have contributed to the uplifting and enlightenment of subsequent civilizations by both preserving and opening to the world the spiritual qualities of Greece. The kinship of man with the divine, learned from Socrates and Plato, went forth on its wide evangel. This Greek civilization, philosophy and theology trained many of the great theologians and leaders of the Christian church, so that Clement of Alexandria said that Greek philosophy and Jewish law had proved schoolmasters to bring the world to Christ. Paul, who prevented Christianity from remaining a Jewish sect and proclaimed its universalism, learned much from Greek—especially from Stoic—thought. It is also significant that the early Christian missionaries apparently went only where the Greek language was known, which was the case in all centers of Roman administration.

5. Linguistically:

The state of the Roman empire linguistically was in the highest degree favorable to the spread of Christianity. The Greek republics by their enterprise, superior genius and commercial abilities extended their dialects over the Aegean Islands, the coasts of Asia Minor, Sicily and Magna Graecia. The preeminence of Attic culture and literature favored by the short-lived Athenian empire raised this dialect to a standard among the Greek peoples. But the other dialects long persisted. Out of this babel of Greek dialects there finally arose a normal koine or "common language." By the conquests of Alexander and the Hellenistic sympathies of the Diadochi this common Greek language became the lingua franca of antiquity. Greek was known in Northern India, at the Parthian court, and on the distant shores of the Euxine (Black Sea). The native land of the gospel was surrounded on all sides by Greek civilization. Greek culture and language penetrated into the midst of the obstinate home-keeping Palestinian Jews. Though Greek was not the mother-tongue of our Lord, He understood Greek and apparently could speak it when occasion required—Aramaic being the language of His heart and of His public teachings. The history of the Maccabean struggle affords ample evidence of the extent to Which Greek culture, and with it the Greek language, were familiar to the Jews. There were in later days Hellenistic bodies of devout Jews in Jerusalem itself. Greek was recognized by the Jews as the universal language: the inscription on the wall of the outer temple court forbidding Gentiles under pain of death to enter was in Greek. The koine became the language even of religion—where a foreign tongue is least likely to be used—of the large Jewish Diaspora. They perceived the advantages of Greek as the language of commerce—the Jews' occupation—of culture and of proselytizing. They threw open their sacred Scriptures in the Septuagint and other versions to the Greek-Roman world, adapting the translation in many respects to the requirements of Greek readers. "The Bible whose God was Yahweh was the Bible of one people: the Bible whose God was (kurios, "Lord") was the Bible of humanity." When the Romans came upon the scene, they found this language so widely known and so deeply rooted they could not hope to supplant it. Indeed they did not try—except in Sicily and Magna Graecia—to suppress Greek, but rather gladly accepted it as the one common means of intercourse among the peoples of their eastern dominions.

See LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Though Latin was of course the official language of the conquerors, the decrees of governors generally appeared with a Greek translation, so that they might be "understanded of the people," and Greek overcame Latin, as English drove out the French of the Norman invaders. Latin poets and historians more than once complained that Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit ("conquered Greece vanquished its stern conqueror"). With the spread of Latin there were two world-languages side by side for the whole Roman empire, but Greek was prevailingly the language of the eastern half of the Roman empire which was the first soil for Christian churches and the first half of the empire to be Christianized. Later when Christianity was able to extend her activity to the West, she found Latin ready as the common means of intercourse. That Rome respected Greek is greatly to her credit and much to the advantage of Christianity. For Christianity, when it began to aim at universalism, dropped its native Aramaic. The gospel in order to become a world-evangel was translated into Greek. The early Christian missionaries did not learn the languages or patois of the Roman empire, but confined themselves to centers of Greek culture. Paul wrote in Greek to the church in Rome itself, of which Greek was the language. And while

Christianity was spreading through the Greek East under the unification of Roman administration, the Romans were Romanizing and leveling the West for Latin Christianity (see LATIN). In the West it may be noted that the first foothold of the Christian religion was in Greek—witness the church in Gaul.

6. Materially:

In material ways too Rome opened the way for Christianity by building the great highways for the gospel. The great system of roads that knit then civilized world together served not only the legions and the imperial escorts, but were of equal service to the early missionaries, and when churches began to spring up over the empire, these roads greatly facilitated that church organization and brotherhood which strengthened the church to overcome the empire. With the dawn of the pax Romana all these roads became alive once more with a galaxy of caravans and traders. Commerce revived and was carried on under circumstances more favorable than any that obtained till the past century. Men exchanged not only material things, but also spiritual things. Many of these early traders and artisans were Christians, and while they bought and sold the things that perish, they did not lose an opportunity of spreading the gospel. For an empire which embraced the Mediterranean shores, the sea was an important means of intercommunication; and the Mediterranean routes were safer for commerce and travel at that period than during any previous one. Pompey the Great had driven the pirates off the sea, and with the fall of Sextus Pompey no hostile maritime forces remained. The ships which plied in countless numbers from point to point of this great inland sea offered splendid advantages and opportunity for early Christian missionary enthusiasm.

7. Tolerance:

The large measure of freedom permitted by Roman authorities to the religions of all nations greatly favored the growth of infant Christianity. The Roman empire was never in principle a persecutor with a permanent court of inquisition. Strange cults from the East and Egypt flourished in the capital, and except when they became a danger to public morality or to the peace of society they were allowed to spread unchecked under the eyes of the police. See below on non-Roman religions.

8. Pattern for a Universal Church:

Further, the Roman empire afforded Christianity a material and outward symbol for its spiritual ambition. It enlarged the vision of the church. Only a citizen (Paul) of such a world-empire could dream of a religion for all humanity. If the Roman sword could so conquer and unify the orbis terrarum, the militant church should be provoked to attempt nothing less in the religious sphere. It also furnished many a suggestion to the early organizers of the new community, until the Christian church became the spiritual counterpart of the Roman empire. The Christians appropriated many a weapon from the arsenal of the enemy and learned from them aggressiveness, the value of thorough organization and of military methods.

9. Roman Jurisprudence:

Roman law in its origins was characterized by the narrowest exclusiveness, and the first formal Roman code was on Greek patterns, yet the Romans here as in so many other respects improved upon what they had borrowed and became masters of jurisprudence in the antique world. As their empire and conceptions expanded, they remodeled their laws to embrace all their subjects. One of the greatest boons conferred by Rome upon the antique world was a uniform system of good laws—the source of much of our European jurisprudence. The Roman law played an equally important role with the Jewish in molding and disciplining for Christianity. It taught men to obey and to respect authority, and proved an effective leveling and civilizing power in the empire. The universal law of Rome was the pedagogue for the universal law of the gospel.

See ROMAN LAW.

10. Negative Preparation:

The Romans could offer their subjects good laws, uniform government and military protection, but not a satisfactory religion. A universal empire called for a universal religion, which Christianity alone could offer. Finally, not only by what Rome had accomplished but by what she proved incapable of accomplishing, the way of the Lord was made ready and a people prepared for His coming. It was a terrible crisis in the civilization and religion of antiquity. The old national religions and systems of belief had proved unable to soothe increasing imperious moral and spiritual demands of man’s nature. A moral bankruptcy was immanent. The old Roman religion of abstract virtues had gone down in formalism; it was too cold for human hearts. Man could no longer find the field of his moral activity in the religion of the state; he was no longer merely an atom in society performing religious rites, not for his own soul, but for the good of the commonwealth. Personality had been slowly emerging, and the new schools of philosophy called man away from the state to seek peace with God in the solitude of his own soul first of all. But even the best of these schools found the crying need of a positive, not a negative religion, the need for a perfect ideal life as a dynamic over ordinary human lives. Thus was felt an imperious demand for a new revelation, for a fresh vision or knowledge of God. In earlier days men had believed that God had revealed Himself to primitive wise men or heroes of their race, and that subsequent generations must accept with faith what these earlier seers, who stood nearer God, as Cicero said, had been pleased to teach of the divine. But soon this stock of knowledge became exhausted. Plato, after soaring to the highest point of poetic and philosophic thought about the divine, admitted the need of a demon or superman to tell us the secrets of eternity. With the early Roman empire began a period of tremendous religious unrest. Men tried philosophy, magic, astrology, foreign rites, to find a sure place of rest. This accounts for the rapid and extensive diffusion of oriental mysteries which promised to the initiated communion with God here, a "better hope" in death, and satisfied the craving for immortality beyond time. These were the more serious souls who would gladly accept the consolations of Jesus. Others, losing all faith in any form of religion, gave themselves up to blank despair and accepted Epicureanism with its gospel of annihilation and its carpe diem morals. This system had a terrible fascination for those who had lost themselves; it is presented in its most attractive form in the verses of Lucretius—the Omar Khayyam of Latin literature. Others again, unable to find God, surrendered themselves to cheerless skepticism. The sore need of the new gospel of life and immortality will be borne in upon the mind of

those who read the Greek and Roman sepulchral inscriptions. And even Seneca, who was almost a Christian in some respects, speaks of immortality as a "beautiful dream" (bellum somnium), though tribulation later gave a clearer vision of the "city of God." Servius Sulpicius, writing to Cicero a letter of consolation on the death of his much-missed Tullia, had only a sad "if" to offer about the future (Cic. Fam. iv.5). Nowhere does the unbelief and pessimism of pre-Christian days among the higher classes strike one more forcibly than in the famous discussion recorded by Sallust (Bel. Cat. li f) as to the punishment of the Catilinarian conspirators. Caesar, who held the Roman high-priesthood and the highest authority on the religion of the state, proposes life imprisonment, as death would only bring annihilation and rest to these villains—no hereafter, no reward or punishment (eam cuncta mortalium mala dissolvere; ultra neque curae neque gaudio locum esse). Cato next speaks—the most religious man of his generation—in terms which cast no rebuke upon Caesar's Epicureanism and materialism (ibid., 52). Cicero (In Cat. iv.4) is content to leave immortality an open question. The philosophers of Athens mocked Paul on Mars' Hill when he spoke of a resurrection. Such was the attitude of the educated classes of the Greek-Roman world at the dawn of Christianity, though it cannot be denied that there was also a strong desire for continued existence. The other classes were either perfunctorily performing the rites of a dead national religion or wereseeking, some, excitement or aesthetic worship or even scope for their baser passions, some, peace and promise for the future, in the eastern mysteries. The distinction between moral and physical evil was coming to the surface, and hence, a consciousness of sin. Religion and ethics had not yet been united. "The throne of the human mind" was declared vacant, and Christianity was at hand as the best claimant. In fact, the Greek-Roman mind had been expanding to receive the pure teachings of Jesus.

ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, 2

III. Attitude of the Roman Empire to Religions.

1. Roman or State Religion:

The history of Roman religion reveals a continuous penetration of Italian, Etruscan, Greek, Egyptian and oriental worship and rites, until the old Roman religion became almost unrecognizable, and even the antiquarian learning of a Varro could scarcely discover the original meaning or use of

many Roman deities. The Roman elements or modes of worship progressively retreated until they and the foreign rites with which they were overlaid gave way before the might of Christianity. As Rome expanded, her religious demands increased. During the regal period Roman religion was that of a simple agricultural community. In the period between the Regifugium and the Second Punic War Roman religion became more complicated and the Roman Pantheon was largely increased by importations from Etruria, Latium and Magna Graecia. The mysterious religion of Etruria first impressed the Roman mind, and from this quarter probably came the Trinity of the Capitol (Jupiter, Juno, Minerva) previously introduced into Etruria from Greek sources, thus showing that the Romans were not the first in Italy to be influenced by the religion of Greece. New modes of worship, non-Roman in spirit, also came in from the Etruscans and foreign elements of Greek mythology. Latium also made its contribution, the worship

of Diana coming from Aricia and also a Latin Jupiter. Two Latin cults penetrated even within the Roman pomoerium—that of Hercules and Castor, with deities of Greek origin. The Greek settlements in Southern Italy (Magna Graecia) were generous in their contributions and opened the way for the later invasion of Greek deities. The Sibylline Books were early imported from Cumae as sacred scriptures for the Romans. In 493 BC during a famine a temple was built to the Greek trinity Demeter, Dionysus, and Persephone, under the Latin names of Ceres, Liber, and Libera—the beginning of distrust in the primitive Roman numina and of that practice, so oft repeated in Roman history, of introducing new and foreign gods at periods of great distress. In 433 Apollo came from the same region. Mercury and Asclepius followed in 293 BC, and in 249 BC Dis and Proserpina were brought from Tarentum. Other non-Roman modes of approach to deity were introduced. Rome had been in this period very broad-minded in her policy of meeting the growing religious needs of her community, but she had not so far gone beyond Italy. A taste had also developed for dramatic and more aesthetic forms of worship. The period of the Second Punic War was a crisis in Roman religious life, and the faith of the Romans waned before growing unbelief. Both the educated classes and the populace abandoned the old Roman religion, the former sank into skepticism, the latter into superstition; the former put philosophy in the place of religion, the latter the more sensuous cults of the Orient. The Romans went abroad again to borrow deities—this time to Greece, Asia and Egypt. Greek deities were introduced wholesale, and readily assimilated to or identified with Roman deities (see ROME, III, 1). In 191 BC Hebe entered as Juventas, in 179 Artemis as Diana, in 138 Ares as Mars. But the home of religion—the Orient—proved more helpful. In 204 BC Cybele was introduced from Pessinus to Rome, known also as the Great Mother (magna mater)—a fatal and final blow to old Roman religion and an impetus to the wilder and more orgiastic cults and mysterious glamor which captivated the common mind. Bacchus with his gross immorality soon followed. Sulla introduced Ma from Phrygia as the counterpart of the Roman Bellona, and Egypt gave Isis. In the wars of Pompey against the pirates Mithra was brought to Rome—the greatest rival of Christianity. Religion now began to pass into the hands of politicians and at the close of the republic was almost entirely in their hands. Worship degenerated into formalism, and formalism culminated in disuse. Under the empire philosophic systems continued still more to replace religion, and oriental rites spread apace. The religious revival of Augustus was an effort to breathe life into the dry bones. His plan was only partly religious, and partly political—to establish an imperial and popular religion of which he was the head and centering round his person. He discovered the necessity of an imperial religion. In the East kings had long before been regarded as divine by their subjects. Alexander the Great, like a wise politician, intended to use this as one bond of union for his wide dominions. The same habit extended among the Diadochian kings, especially in Egypt and Syria. When Augustus had brought peace to the world, the Orient was ready to hail him as a god. Out of this was evolved the cult of the reigning emperor and of Roma personified. This worship gave religious unity to the empire, while at the same time magnifying the emperor. But the effort was in vain: the old Roman religion was dead, and the spiritual needs of the empire continued to be met more and more by philosophy and the mysteries which promised immortality. The cult of the Genius of the emperor soon lost all reality. Vespasian himself on his deathbed jested at the idea of his becoming a god. The emperor-worship declined steadily, and in the 3rd and 4th centuries oriental worships were supreme. The religion of the Roman empire soon became of that cosmopolitan and eclectic type so characteristic of the new era.

2. Non-Roman Religions: religiones licitae and religiones illicitae:

The non-Roman religions were divided into religiones licitae ("licensed worships") and religiones illicitae ("unlicensed"). The Romans at different times, on account of earthquakes, pestilences, famine or military disasters, introduced non-Roman cults as means of appeasing the numina. This generally meant that the cults in question could be performed with impunity by their foreign adherents. It legalized the collegia necessary for these worships from which Roman citizens were by law excluded. But, generally speaking, any people settling at Rome was permitted the liberty of its own native worship in so far as the exercise of it did not interfere with the peace of the state or corrupt the morals of society. On one occasion (186 BC), by a decree of the senate, a severe inquisition was instituted against the Bacchanalian rites which had caused flagrant immorality among the adherents. But Rome was never a systematic persecutor. These foreign rites and superstitions, though often forbidden and their professed adherents driven from the city, always returned stronger than ever. Roman citizens soon discovered the fascination of oriental and Greek mysteries, and devoted themselves to foreign gods while maintaining the necessary formalism toward the religion of the state. Very often too Roman citizens would be presidents of these religious brotherhoods. It should not be forgotten that the original moral elements had fallen out of Roman religion, and that it had become simply a political and military religion for the welfare of the state, not for the salvation of the individual. The individual must conform to certain prescribed rites in order to avert calamity from the state. This done, the state demanded no more, and left him a large measure of freedom in seeking excitement or aesthetic pleasure in the warm and more social foreign mysteries. Thus, while the Romans retained the distinction of religiones licitae and illicitae, they seldom used severity against the latter. Many unlicensed cults were never disturbed. In fact, the very idea of empire rendered toleration of non-Roman religions a necessity. Practically, though not theoretically, the empire abandoned the idea of religiones illicitae, while it retained it upon the statute-book to use in case of such an emergency as the Christian religion involved. Not only the government was tolerant, but the different varieties of religions were tolerant and on good terms with each other. The same man might be initiated into the mysteries of half a dozen divinities. The same man might even be priest of two or more gods. Some had not the slightest objection to worshipping Christ along with Mithra, Isis and Adonis. Men were growing conscious of the oneness of the divine, and credited their neighbors with worshipping the One Unknown under different names and forms. Hadrian is said to have meditated the erection of temples throughout the empire to the Unknown God.

(1) Judaism a "religio licita."

An interesting and, for the history of Christianity, important example of a religio licita is Judaism. No more exclusive and obstinate people could have been found upon whom to bestow the favor. Yet from the days of Julius Caesar the imperial policy toward the Jew and his religion was uniformly favorable, with the brief exception of the mad attempt of Gaius. The government often protected them against the hatred of the populace. Up to 70 AD they were allowed freely to send their yearly contribution to the temple; they were even allowed self-governing privileges and legislative powers among themselves, and thus formed an exclusive community in the midst of Roman society. Even the disastrous war of 68-70 AD and the fall of Jerusalem did not bring persecution upon the Jew, though most of these self-governing and self-legislating powers were withdrawn and the Jews were compelled to pay a poll-tax to the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter. Still their religion remained licensed, tolerated, protected. They

were excused from duties impossible for their religion, such as military service. This tolerance of the Jewish religion was of incalculable importance to infant Christianity which at first professed to be no more than a reformed and expanded Judaism.

(2) Why Christianity Was Alone Proscribed.

The question next arises: If such was the universally mild and tolerant policy of the empire to find room for all gods and cults, and to respect the beliefs of all the subject peoples, how comes the anomaly that Christianity alone was proscribed and persecuted? Christianity was indeed a religio illicita, not having been accepted by the government as a religio licita, like Judaism. But this is no answer. There were other unlicensed religions which grew apace in the empire. Neither was it simply because Christianity was aggressive and given to proselytism and dared to appear even in the imperial household: Mithraism and Isism were militant and aggressive, and yet were tolerated. Nor was it simply because of popular hatred, for the Christian was not hated above the Jew. Other reasons must explain the anomaly.

(3) Two Empires: Causes of Conflict.

The fact was that two empires were born about the same time so like and yet so unlike as to render a conflict and struggle to the death inevitable. The Christians were unequivocal in asserting that the society for which they were waiting and laboring was a "kingdom."

(a) Confusion of Spiritual and Temporal:

They thought not merely in national or racial but in ecumenical terms. The Romans could not understand a kingdom of God upon earth, but confused Christian ambition with political. It was soon discovered that Christianity came not to save but to destroy and disintegrate the empire. Early Christian enthusiasm made the term "kingdom" very provoking to pagan patriotism, for many, looking for the Parousia of their Lord, were themselves misled into thinking of the new society as a kingdom soon to be set up upon the earth with Christ as king. Gradually, of course, Christians became enlightened upon this point, but the harm had been done. Both the Rein empire and Christianity were aiming at a social organization to embrace the genus humanum. But though these two empires were so alike in several points and the one had done so much to prepare the way for the other, yet the contrast was too great to allow conciliation. Christianity would not lose the atom in the mass; it aimed at universalism along the path of individualism —giving new value to human personality.

(b) Unique Claims of Christianity:

It seemed also to provoke Roman pride by its absurd claims. It preached that the world was to be destroyed by fire to make way for new heavens and a new earth, that the Eternal City (Rome) was doomed to fall, that a king would come from heaven whom Christians were to obey, that amid the coming desolations the Christians should remain tranquil.

(c) Novelty of Christianity:

Again after Christianity came from underneath the aegis of Judaism, it must have taken the government somewhat by surprise as a new and unlicensed religion which had grown strong under a misnomer. It was the newest and latest religion of the empire; it came suddenly, as it were, upon the stage with no past. It was not apparent to the Roman mind that Christianity had been spreading for a generation under the tolerance granted to Judaism (sub umbraculo licitae Judeorum religionis: Tert.), the latter of which was "protected by its antiquity," as Tacitus said. The Romans were of a conservative nature and disliked innovations. The greatest statesman of the Augustan era, Maecenas, advised the emperor to extend no tolerance to new religions as subversive of monarchy (Dio Cassius lii.36). A new faith appearing suddenly with a large clientele might be dangerous to the public peace (multitude ingens: Tac. Ann. xv.44; polu plethos Clem. Rom.; Cor 1 6).

(d) Intolerance and Exclusiveness of the Christian Religion and Christian Society:

In one marked way Christians contravcned the tolerant eclective spirit of the empire—the intolerance and absoluteness of their religion and the exclusiveness of their society. All other religions of the empire admitted compromise and eclecticism, were willing to dwell rather on the points of contact with their neighbors than on the contrast. But Christianity admitted no compromise, was intolerant to all other systems. It must be admitted that in this way it was rather unfair to other cults which offered comfort and spiritual support to thousands of the human race before the dawn of Christianity. But we shall not blame, when we recognize that for its own life and mission it was necessary to show itself at first intolerant. Many heathen would gladly accept Christ along with Mithra and Isis and Serapis. But Christianity demanded complete separation. The Jesus cult could tolerate no rival: it claimed to be absolute, and worshippers of Jesus must be separate from the world. The Christian church was absolute in its demands; would not rank with, but above, all worships. This spirit was of course at enmity with that of the day which enabled rival cults to co-exist with the greatest indifference. Add to this the exclusive state of Christian society. No pious heathen who had purified his soul by asceticism and the sacraments of antiquity could be admitted into membership unless he renounced things dear to him and of some spiritual value. In every detail of public life this exclusive spirit made itself felt. Christians met at night and held secret assemblies in which they were reputed to perpetrate the most scandalous crimes. Thyestean banquets, Oedipean incest, child murder, were among the charges provoked by their exclusiveness.

(e) Obstinatio:

Add to this also the sullen obstinacy with which Christians met the demands of imperial power—a feature very offensive to Rein governors. Their religion would be left them undisturbed if they would only render formal obedience to the religion of the state. Roman clemency and respect for law were baffled before Christian obstinacy. The martyr’s courage appeared as sheer fanaticism. The pious Aurelius refers but once to Christianity, and in the words psile parataxis, "sheer obstinacy," and Aristides apparently refers to Christianity as authadeia, stubbornness.

See PERSECUTION, sec. 18.

(f) Aggressiveness against Pagan Faith:

But the Christians were not content with an uncompromising withdrawal from the practices of heathen worship: they also actively assailed the pagan cult. To the Christians they became doctrines of demons. The imperial cult and worship of the Genius of the emperor were very unholy in their sight. Hence, they fell under the charges of disloyalty to the emperor and might be proved guilty of majestas. They held in contempt the doctrine that the greatness of Rome was due to her reverence for the gods; the Christians were atheists from the pagan point of view. And as religion was a political concern for the welfare of the state, atheism was likely to call down the wrath of divinity to the subversion of the state.

(g) Christianos ad leones: Public Calamities:

Very soon when disasters began to fall thickly upon the Roman empire, the blame was laid upon the Christians. In early days Rome had often sought to appease the gods by introducing external cults; at other times oriental cults were expelled in the interests of public morality. Now in times of disaster Christians became the scapegoats. If famine, drought, pestilence, earthquake or any other public calamity threatened, the cry was raised "the Christians to the lions" (see NERO; PERSECUTION, sec. 12). This view of Christianity as subversive of the empire survived the fall of Rome before Alaric. The heathen forgot—as the apologists showed—that Rome had been visited by the greatest calamities before the Christian era and that the Christians were the most self-sacrificing in periods of public distress, lending succor to pagan and Christian alike.

(h) Odium generis humani:

All prejudices against Christianity were summed up in odium generis humani, "hatred for the human race" or society, which was reciprocated by "hatred of the human race toward them." The Christians were bitterly hated, not only by the populace, but by the upper educated classes. Most of the early adherents belonged to the slave, freedman and artisan classes, "not many wise, not many noble." Few were Roman citizens. We have mentioned the crimes which popular prejudice attributed to this hated sect. They were in mockery styled Christiani by the Antiochians (a name which they at first resented), and Nazarenes by the Jews. No nicknames were too vile to attach to them—Asinarii (the sect that worshipped the ass’s head), Sarmenticii or Semaxii. Roman writers cannot find epithets strong enough. Tacitus reckons the Christian faith among the "atrocious and abominable things" (atrocia aut pudenda) which flooded Rome, and further designates it superstitio exitiabilis ("baneful superstition," Ann. xv.44), Suetonius (Ner. 16) as novel and maletic (novae ac maleficae), and the gentle Pliny (Ep. 97) as vile and indecent (prava immodica). Well might Justus say the Christians were "hated and reviled by the whole human race." This opprobrium was accentuated by the attacks of philosophy upon Christianity. When the attention of philosophers was drawn to the new religion, it was only to scorn it. This attitude of heathen philosophy is best understood in reading Celsus and the Christian apologists.

(4) The Roman Empire Not the Only Disturbing Factor.

Philosophy long maintained its aloofness from the religion of a crucified Galilean: the "wise" were the last to enter the kingdom of God. When later Christianity had established itself as a permanent force in human thought, philosophy deigned to consider its claims. But it was too late; the new faith was already on the offensive. Philosophy discovered its own weakness and began to reform itself by aiming at being both a philosophy and a religion. This is particularly the case in neo-Platonism (in Plotinus) in which reason breaks down before revelation and mysticism. Another force disturbing the peace of the Christian church was the enemy within the fold. Large numbers of heathen had entered the ecclesia bringing with them their oriental or Greek ideas, just as Jewish Christians brought their Judaism with them. This led to grave heresies, each system of thought distorting in its own way the orthodox faith. Later another ally joined the forces against Christianity—reformed paganism led by an injured priesthood. At first the cause of Christianity was greatly aided by the fact that there was no exclusive and jealous priesthood at the head of the Greek-Roman religion, as in the Jewish and oriental religions. There was thus no dogma and no class interested in maintaining a dogma. Religious persecution is invariably instituted by the priesthood, but in the Roman world it was not till late in the day when the temples and sacrifices were falling into desuetude that we find a priesthood as a body in opposition. Thus the Roman imperial power stood not alone in antagonism to Christianity, but was abetted and often provoked to action by

(a) popular hate,

(b) philosophy,

(c) pagan priesthood,

(d) heresies within the church.

IV. Relations between the Roman Empire and Christianity.

We have here to explain how the attitude of the Roman empire, at first friendly or indifferent, developed into one of fierce conflict, the different stages in the policy—if we can speak of any uniform policy—of the Roman government toward Christianity, the charges or mode of procedure on which Christians were condemned, and when and how the profession of Christianity (nomen ipsum) became a crime. We shall see the Roman empire progressively weakening and Christianity gaining ground. For the sake of clearness we shall divide the Roman empire into six periods, the first from the commencement of the Christian era till the last of the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

1. Beginning of Christianity until Death of Nero, 68 AD:

At first the presence of the Christian faith was unknown to Roman authorities. It appeared first merely as a reformed and more spiritual Judaism; its earliest preachers and adherents alike never dreamed of severing from the synagogue. Christians were only another of the Jewish sects to which a Jew might

belong while adhering to Mosaism and Judaism. But soon this friendly relation became strained on account of the expanding views of some of the Christian preachers, and from the introduction of Gentile proselytes. The first persecutions for the infant church came entirely from exclusive Judaism, and it was the Jews who first accused Christians before the Roman courts. Even so, the Roman government not only refused to turn persecutor, but even protected the new faith both against Jewish accusations and against the violence of the populace (Ac 21:31 f). And the Christian missionaries—especially Paul—soon recognized in the Roman empire an ally and a power for good. Writing to the Romans Paul counsels them to submit in obedience to the powers that be, as "ordained of God." His favorable impression must have been greatly enhanced by his mild captivity at Rome and his acquittal by Nero on the first trial. The Roman soldiers had come to his rescue in Jerusalem to save his life from the fanaticism of his own coreligionists. Toward the accusations of the Jews against their rivals the Romans were either indifferent, as Gallio the proconsul of Achaia, who "cared for none of those things" (Ac 18:12), or recognized the innocence of the accused, as did both Felix (Ac 24:1) and Porcius Festus (Ac 25:14). Thus the Romans persisted in looking upon Christians as a sect of the Jews. But the Jews took another step in formulating a charge of disloyalty (begun before Pilate) against the new sect as acting "contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus" (Ac 17:7; compare Ac 25:8). Christianity was disowned thus early by Judaism and cast upon its own resources. The increasing numbers of Christians would confirm to the Roman government the independence of Christianity. And the trial of a Roman citizen, Paul, at Rome would further enlighten the authorities.

The first heathen persecution of Christianity resulted from no definite policy, no apprehension of danger to the body politic, and no definite charges, but from an accidental spark which kindled the conflagration of Rome (July, 64 AD). Up to this time no emperor had taken much notice of Christianity. It was only in the middle of the reign of Augustus that Jesus was born. In the reign of Tiberius belong Jesus’ public ministry, crucifixion and resurrection; but his reign closed too early (37 AD) to allow any prominence to the new faith, though this emperor was credited with proposing to the senate a decree to receive Christ into the Roman pantheon—legend of course. Under the brief principate of the mad Gaius (37-41 AD) the "new way" was not yet divorced from the parent faith. Gaius caused a diversion in favor of the Christians by his persecution of the Jews and the command to set up his own statue in the temple. In the next reign (Claudius, 41-54 AD) the Jews were again harshly treated, and thousands were banished from Rome (Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit: Suet. Claud. 25). Some would see in this an action against the Christians by interpreting the words as meaning riots between Jews and Christians, in consequence of which some Christians were banished as Jews, but Dio Cassius (lx.6) implies that it was a police regulation to restrain the spread of Jewish worship. It was in the reign of Nero, after the fire of 64 AD, that the first hostile step was taken by the government against the Christians, earliest account of which is given by Tacitus (Ann. xv.44). Nero’s reckless career had given rise to the rumor that he was the incendiary, that he wished to see the old city burned in order to rebuild it on more magnificent plans. See NERO. Though he did everything possible to arrest the flames, even exposing his own life, took every means of alleviating the destitution of the sufferers, and ordered such religious rites as might appease the wrath of the gods, the suspicion still clung to him.

"Accordingly in order to dissipate the rumor, he put forward as guilty (subdidit reos) and inflicted the most cruel punishments on those who were hated for their abominations (flagitia) and called Christians

by the populace. The originator of that name, Christus, had been executed by the procurator Pontius Pilatus in the reign of Tiberius, and the baneful superstition (exitiabilis superstitio) put down for the time being broke out again, not only throughout Judea, the home of this evil, but also in the City (Rome) where all atrocious and shameful (atrocia aut pudenda) things converge and are welcomed. Those therefore who confessed (i.e. to being Christians) were first arrested, and then by the information gained from them a large number (multitudo ingens) were implicated (coniuncti is the manuscript reading, not conuicti), not so much on the charge of incendiarism as for hatred of mankind (odio humani generis). The victims perished amid mockery (text here uncertain); some clothed in the skins of wild beasts were torn to pieces by dogs; others impaled on crosses in order to be set on fire to afford light by night after daylight had died. .... Whence (after these cruelties) commiseration began to be felt for them, though guilty and deserving the severest penalties (quamquam adversus sontes et novissima exempla meritos), for men felt their destruction was not from considerations of public welfare but to gratify the cruelty of one person (Nero)."

This passage—the earliest classical account of the crucifixion and the only mention of Pilate in a heathen author—offers some difficulties which require to be glanced at. It is held by some that Tacitus contradicts himself by writing subdidit reos at the beginning and sontes at the end, but sontes does not mean guilty of incendiarism, but guilty from the point of view of the populace and deserving severe punishment for other supposed flagitia, not for arson. It is thus quite clear that Tacitus regards the Christians as innocent, though he had not the slightest kindly feeling toward them. Qui fatebantur means most naturally, "those who confessed to being Christians," though Arnold argues that confiteri or profiteri would be the correct word for professing a religion. But this would contradict both the sense and the other evidences of the context; for if fatebantur could mean "confessed to arson," then the whole body of Christians should have been arrested, and, further, this would have diverted suspicion from Nero, which was not the case according to Tacitus. Some Christians boldly asserted their religion, others no doubt, as in Bithynia, recanted before tribulation. By indicio eorum Ramsay (Christianity in the Roman Empire, 233) understands "on the information elicited at their trial," i.e. from information gathered by the inquisitors in the course of the proceedings. This incidental information implicated a large number of others, hence Ramsay prefers the manuscript reading coniuncti to the correction conuicti. This is in order to explain the difficulty seemingly raised, namely, that the noblest Christians who boldly confessed their Christianity would seek to implicate brethren. But it is not impossible that some of these bold spirits did condescend to give the names of their coreligionists to the Roman courts. Hence, Hardy (Christianity and the Roman Government, 67) prefers the more usual rendering of indicio eorum as "on information received from them." This may have occurred either

(1) through torture, or

(2) for promised immunity, or

(3) on account of local jealousies.

The early Christian communities were not perfect; party strife often ran high as at Corinth. And in a

church like that of Rome composed of Jewish and pagan elements and undoubtedly more cosmopolitan than Corinth, a bitter sectarian spirit is easy to understand. This as a probable explanation is much strengthened and rendered almost certain by the words of Clement of Rome, who, writing to the church at Corinth (chapter vi) from Rome only a generation after the persecution, and thus familiar with the internal history of the Roman ecclesia, twice asserts that a (polu plethos = Tac. multitudo ingens) of the Roman Christians suffered (dia zelos), "through jealousy or strife." The most natural and obvious meaning is "mutual or sectarian jealousy." But those who do not like this fact explain it as "by the jealousy of the Jews." Nothing is more easily refuted, for had it been the jealousy of the Jews Clement would not have hesitated one moment to say so. Those who are familiar with the Christian literature of that age know that the Christians were none too sensitive toward Jewish feelings. But the very fact that it was not the Jews made Clement rather modestly omit details the memory of which was probably still bearing fruit, even in his day. Once more correpti, usually rendered "arrested," is taken by Hardy as "put upon their trial." He argues that this is more in accord with Tacitean usage. A "huge multitude" need not cause us to distrust Tacitus. It is a relative term; it was a considerable number to be so inhumanly butchered. There is some hesitation as to whether odio humani generis is objective or subjective genitive: "hatred of the Christians toward the human race" or "hatred of the human race toward the Christians." Grammatically of course it may be either, but that it is the former there can be no doubt: it was of the nature of a charge against Christians (Ramsay).

See PERSECUTION.

Some have impugned the veracity of Tacitus in this very important passage, asserting that he had read back the feelings and state of affairs of his own day (half a century later) into this early Neronian period. This early appearance of Christianity as a distinct religion and its "huge multitude" seem impossible to some. Schiller has accordingly suggested that it was the Jews who as a body at Rome were persecuted, that the Christians being not yet distinct from Jews shared in the persecutions and suffered, not as Christians, but as Jews. But Tacitus is too trustworthy a historian to be guilty of such a confusion; besides, as proconsul in Asia he must have been more or less familiar with the origin of the Christian party. Also Poppea was at this time mistress of Nero’s affections and sufficiently influential with him to stay such a cruel persecution against those to whom she had a leaning and who claimed her as proselyte. Again, the Jewish faith was certe licita and a recognized worship of the empire.

The next question is, Why were the Christians alone selected for persecution? That they were so singled out we know, but exactly for what reason is hard to say with certainty. A number of reasons no doubt contributed.

(1) Farrar (Early Days chapter iv) sees "in the proselytism of Poppea, guided by Jewish malice, the only adequate explanation of the first Christian persecution," and Lightfoot is of the same opinion, but this by itself is inadequate, though the Jews would be glad of an opportunity of taking revenge on their aggressive opponents.

(2) Christians had already become in the eyes of the Roman authorities a distinct sect, either from the

reports of the eastern provincial governors, where Christianity was making most headway, or from the attention attracted by Paul’s first trial. They were thus the newest religious sect, and as such would serve as victims to appease deity and the populace.

(3) Even if ingens multitudo be rhetorical, the Christians were no doubt considerably numerous in Rome. Their aggressiveness and active proselytism made their numbers even more formidable.

(4) They were uncompromising in their expression of their beliefs; they looked for a consummation of the earth by fire and were also eagerly expecting the Parousia of their king to reconstitute society. These tenets together with their calm faith amid the despair of others would easily cast suspicion upon them.

(5) For whatever reason, they had earned the opprobrium of the populace. "The hatred for the Jews passed over to hatred for the Christians" (Mommsen). A people whom the populace so detested must have fallen under the surveillance of the city police administration.

(6) A large proportion of the Christian community at Rome would be non-Roman and so deserve no recognition of Roman privileges.

These reasons together may or may not explain the singling-out of the Christians. At any rate they were chosen as scapegoats to serve Nero and his minion Tigellinus. The origin of the first persecution was thus purely accidental—in order to remove suspicion from Nero. It was not owing to any already formulated policy, neither through apprehension of any danger to the state, nor because the Christians were guilty of any crimes, though it gave an opportunity of investigation and accumulation of evidence. But accidental as this persecution was in origin, its consequences were of far reaching importance. There are three principal views as to the date of the policy of proscription of the new faith by the Roman government:

(1) the old view that persecution for the name, i.e. for the mere profession of Christianity, began under Trajan in 112 AD—a view now almost universally abandoned;

(2) that of Ramsay (Christianity in the Roman Empire, 242 ff, and three articles in The Expositor, 1893), who holds that this development from punishment for definite crimes (flagitia) to proscription "for the name" took place between 68 and 96 AD, and

(3) that of Hardy (Christianity and the Roman Government, 77), Mommsen (Expos, 1893, 1-7) and Sanday (ibid., 1894, 406 ff)—and adopted by the writer of this article—that the trial of the Christians under Nero resulted in the declaration of the mere profession of Christianity as a crime punishable by death.

Tacitus apparently represents the persecution of the Christians as accidental and isolated and of brief duration (in the place cited), while Suetonius (Ner. 16) mentions the punishment of Christians in a list of permanent police regulations for the maintenance of good order, into which it would be inconsistent to

introduce an isolated case of procedure against the "baneful superstition" (Ramsay, op. cit., p. 230). But these two accounts are not contradictory, Tacitus giving the initial stage and Suetonius "a brief statement of the permanent administrative principle into which Nero's action ultimately resolved itself" (ibid., 232). Nero's police administration, then, pursued as a permanent policy what was begun merely to avert suspicion from Nero. But as yet, according to Ramsay, Christians were not condemned as Christians, but on account of certain flagitia attaching to the profession and because the Roman police authorities had learned enough about the Christians to regard them as hostile to society. A trial still must be held and condemnation pronounced "in respect not of the name but of serious offenses naturally connected with the name," namely, first incendiarism, which broke down, and secondly hostility to civilized society and charges of magic. The others agree so far with Ramsay as describing the first stages, but assert that odium humani generis was not of the nature of a definite charge, but disaffection to the social and political arrangements of the empire. At the outset a trial was needed, but soon as a consequence the trial could be dispensed with, the Christians being "recognized as a society whose principle might be summarized as odium generis humani." A trial became unnecessary; the religion itself involved the crimes, and as a religion it was henceforth proscribed. The surveillance over them and their punishment was left to the police administration which could step in at any time with severe measures or remain remiss, according as exigencies demanded. Christianity was henceforth a religio illicita. The Roman government was never a systematic persecutor. The persecution or non-persecution of Christianity depended henceforth on the mood of the reigning emperor, the character of his administration, the activity of provincial governors, the state of popular feeling against the new faith, and other local circumstances. There is no early evidence that the Neronian persecution extended beyond Rome, though of course the "example set by the emperor necessarily guided the action of all Roman officials." The stormy close of Nero's reign and the tumultuous days till the accession of Vespasian created a diversion in favor of Christianity. Orosius (Hist. vii.7) is too late an authority for a general persecution (per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit; ipsum nomen exstirpare conatus ....). Besides, Paul after his acquittal seems to have prosecuted his missionary activity without any extraordinary hindrances, till he came to Rome the second time. This Neronian persecution is important for the history of Christianity: Nero commenced the principle of punishing Christians, and thus made a precedent for future rulers. Trouble first began in the world-capital; the next stage will be found in the East; and another in Africa and the West. But as yet persecution was only local. Nero was the first of the Roman persecutors who, like Herod Agrippa, came to a miserable end—a fact much dwelt upon by Lactantius and other Christian writers.

2. Flavian Period, 68-96 AD:

In the Flavian period no uniform imperial policy against Christianity can be discovered. According to Ramsay the Flavians developed the practice set by Nero from punishment of Christians for definite crimes to proscription of the name. But, as we have seen, the Neronian persecution settled the future attitude of the Roman state toward the new faith. The Flavians could not avoid following the precedent set by Nero. Christianity was spreading—especially in the East and at Rome. We have no account of any persecution under Vespasian (though Hilary erroneously speaks of him as a persecutor along with Nero and Decius) and Titus, but it does not follow that none such took place. As the whole matter was left to the police administration, severity would be spasmodic and called forth by local circumstances. The fall

of Jerusalem must have had profound influence both on Judaism and on Christianity. For the former it did what the fall of Rome under Goths, Vandals, and Germans did for the old Roman religion—it weakened the idea of a national God bound up with a political religion. The cleft between Judaism and its rival would now become greater. Christianity was relieved from the overpowering influence of a national center, and those Jews who now recognized the futility of political dreams would more readily join the Christian faith. Not only the distinction but the opposition and hostility would now be more apparent to outsiders, though Vespasian imposed the poll-tax on Jewish Christians and Jews alike. No memory of harshness against Christianity under Vespasian has survived. Ramsay (op. cit., 257) would interpret a mutilated passage of Suetonius (Vesp. 15) as implying Vespasian's reluctance to carry out justa supplicia against Christians.

Titus, "the darling of the human race," is not recorded as a persecutor, but his opinion of Judaism and Christianity as stated in the council of war before Jerusalem in 70 AD and recorded by Sulpicius Severus (Chron. ii.30, 6) is interesting as an approval of the policy adopted by Nero. Severus' authority is undoubtedly Tacitus (Bernays and Mommsen). The authenticity of the speech as contradicting the account of Josephus has been impugned; at any rate it represents the point of view of Tacitus. Titus then advocates the destruction of the temple in order that the religion of the Jews and the Christians may be more thoroughly extirpated (quo plenius Judeorum et Christianorum religio tolleretur), since these religions though opposed to each other were of the same origin, the Christians having sprung from the Jews. If the root was removed the stem would readily perish (radice sublata, stirpem facile perituram). We know, however, of no active measures of Titus against either party, his short reign perhaps allowing no time for such.

It is Domitian who stands out prominently as the persecutor of this period, as Nero of the first period. His procedure against Christians was not an isolated act, but part of a general policy under which others suffered. His reign was a return to ancient principles. He attempted to reform morals, suppress luxury and vice, banish immoral oriental rites, actors, astrologers and philosophers. It was in his attempt to revive the national religion that he came in conflict with the universal religion. His own cousin, Flavius Clemens, was condemned apparently for Christianity (atheism), and his wife, Domitilla, was banished. The profession of Christianity was not sufficient for the condemnation of Roman citizens of high standing; hence the charges of atheism or majestas were put forward. Refusal to comply with the religion of the national gods could be brought under the latter. But for ordinary Roman citizens and for provincials the profession of Christianity merited death. No definite edict or general proscription was enacted; only the principle instituted by Nero was allowed to be carried out. There was, as Mommsen remarks, a standing proscription of Christians as of brigands, but harsh procedure against both was spasmodic and depended on the caprice or character of provincial governors. Domitian took one definite step against Christianity in establishing an easy test by which to detect those who were Christians and so facilitate inquiries. This test was the demand to worship the Genius of the emperor. This too was only part of Domitian's general policy of asserting his own dominus et deus title and emphasizing the imperial cult as a bond of political union. The Apocalypse reflects the sufferings of the church in this reign.

3. The Antonine Period, 96-192 AD:

(1) Nerva and Trajan.

On the death of Domitian peace was restored to the Christian church which lasted throughout the brief reign of Nerva (96-98) and the first 13 years of Trajan. It is a curious fact that some of the best of the Roman emperors (Trajan, Marcus Aurelius, Decius and Diocletian) were harsh to the Christians, while some of the worst (as Commodus, Caracalla, Heliogabalus) left them in peace (see PERSECUTION, 17). Christianity had been rapidly spreading in the interval of tranquillity. Pliny became governor of Bithynia in 111 AD and found, especially in the eastern part of his province, the temples almost deserted. Some Christians were brought before him and on established precedents were ordered to be executed for their religion. But Pliny soon discovered that many of both sexes and all ages, provincials and Roman citizens, were involved. The Roman citizens he sent to Rome for trial; but being of a humane disposition he shrank from carrying out the wholesale execution required by a consistent policy.

He wrote to Trajan telling him what he had already done, rather covertly suggesting tolerant measures. Should no distinction be made between old and young? Should pardon not be extended to those who recanted and worshipped the emperor’s image and cursed Christ? Should mere profession (nomen ipsum) be a capital offense if no crimes could be proven, or should the crimes rather be punished that were associated with the faith (an flagitia cohaerentia nomini)? He then explains his procedure: he gave those who were accused an abundant opportunity of recanting; those who persisted in this faith were executed. He considered their "stubbornness and inflexible obstinacy" (pertinaciam certe et inflexibilem obstinationem) as in itself deserving punishment. But the administration having once interfered found plenty to do. An anonymous list of many names was handed in, most of whom, however, denied being Christians. Informers then put forward others who likewise denied belonging to the faith. Pliny was convinced their meetings were harmless, and on examination of two deaconesses under torture discovered nothing but a perverse extravagant superstition (sup. pravam immodicam). Trajan replied that no universal and definite rule could be laid down, apparently confirming the correctness of Pliny’s action and perhaps disappointing Pliny in not yielding to his humane suggestions. Nevertheless, the emperor made three important concessions: (1) the Christians were not to be sought out by the police authorities, but if they were accused and convicted they must be punished; (2) anonymous information against them was not to be accepted; (3) even those suspected of flagitia in the past were to be pardoned on proving they were not Christians or on renouncing Christianity. Some regard this rescript of Trajan as the first official and legal authorization to proscribe Christianity; but we have already seen that Christianity as such was proscribed as a result of the Neronian investigations. Besides, there is not the slightest trace of any new principle of severity, either in the letters of Pliny or in the rescript of Trajan. The persecution of Christianity had been "permanent" like that of highwaymen, but not systematic or general. Neither was Trajan’s rescript an edict of toleration, though on the whole it was favorable to the Christians in minimizing the dangers to which they were exposed. The question was as yet purely one of administration.

Trajan initiated no procedure against Christians—in fact rather discouraged any, asking his lieutenant to close his eyes to offenders—and Pliny consulted him in the hope of obtaining milder treatment for the Christians by putting in question form what he really wished to be approved. Trajan’s rescript "marks

the end of the old system of uncompromising hostility."

See PERSECUTION, 15.

(2) Hadrian.

The reign of Hadrian (117-38) was a period of toleration for the Christians. He was no bigot, but tolerant and eclective, inquiring into all religions and initiated into several mysteries and willing to leave religion an open question. In Asia, where Christianity was making most progress, a state of terrorism was imminent if delatores were encouraged against Christians making a profession of delatio (giving information). As we saw in the letter of Pliny, even non-Christians were accused, and any professing Christian could be threatened by these informers in order to secure a bribe for proceeding no farther. Licinius Silvanus Granianus, like Pliny, found himself involved in difficulties and wrote to Hadrian for advice. Hadrian's rescript in reply is addressed to Granianus' successor, Minucius Fundanus, the proconsul of Asia, about 124 AD. The genuineness of this important document, though impugned by Overbeck, Keim and Lipsius, is vouched for by Mommsen, Hardy, Lightfoot and Ramsay. Indeed, it is much easier accounted for as authentic than as a forgery, for who but the broad-minded Hadrian could have written such a rescript? Apparently the questions put by the proconsul must have been of a similar nature to those extant of Pliny. The answer of Hadrian is a decided step in favor of Christianity and goes beyond that of Trajan:

(1) information is not to be passed over (a) lest the innocent suffer (as was the case under Pliny), and (b) lest informers should make a trade of lodging accusations;

(2) provincials accusing Christians must give proof that the accused have committed something illegal;

(3) mere petitions and acclamations against the Christians are not to be admitted;

(4) a prosecutor on failing to make good his case is to be punished.

These terms would greatly increase the risk for informers and lessen the dangers for Christians. That the name is a crime is not admitted, neither is this established principle rescinded. It is quite possible that Hadrian's rescript "gave a certain stimulus toward the employment of the more definite and regular legal procedure."

(3) Antoninus Pius (138-161).

The liberal policy of Trajan and Hadrian was continued by Antoninus, though persecution occurred in his reign in which Ptolemeus and Lucius were executed at Rome and Polycarp at Smyrna. But he decidedly confirmed Hadrian's policy of protecting the Christians uncondemned against mob violence in his letters to Larissae, Athens, Thessalonica and to "all the Hellenes." As at Smyrna, his "rescript was in advance of public feeling," and so was disregarded. Anonymous delation was also repressed.

(4) Marcus Aurelius (161-80).

Under Aurelius a strong reaction set in affecting the Christians, caused partly by the frontier disasters and devastating pestilence and partly by Aurelius' policy of returning to ancient principles and reviving the Roman national religion. In this reign we find persecution extending to the West (Gaul) and to Africa —a step toward the general persecutions of the next century. Though no actual change was made by Aurelius, the leniency of the last three reigns is absent. No general edict or definite rescript of persecution was issued; the numerous martyrdoms recorded in this reign are partly due to the fuller accounts and the rise of a Christian literature. Christianity in itself still constituted a crime, and the obstinacy (parataxis) of Christians in itself deserved punishment. Aurelius seems to have actually rebuked the severity of the Roman governor at Lugdunum, and to have further discouraged the trade of informers against Christians. Tertullian actually styles him as debellator Christianorum ("protector of Christians"). We find as yet therefore no systematic or serious attempt to extirpate the new faith. The central government "was all this time without a permanent or steady policy toward the Christians. It had not yet made up its mind" (Hardy).

Under the rule of Commodus (180-192) Christians gain enjoyed a respite. The net result of the collisions between the new faith and the government in this period is somewhat differently estimated by Ramsay and by Hardy. The latter thinks (Christianity and Roman Government, 156 f) that Ramsay "has to some extent antedated the existence of anything like a policy of proscription," due to antedating the time when Christianity was regarded as a serious political danger. Hardy thinks that the Christian organization was never suspected as more than an abstract danger during the first two centuries. Had Rome taken the view that Christianity in its organization was a real danger and an imperium in imperio, she must have started a systematic exterminating policy during a period when Christianity could have least withstood it. When the empire did—as in the 3rd century—apprehend the practical danger and took the severest general measures, Christianity was already too strong to be harmed, and we shall find the empire henceforth each time worsted and finally offering terms.

4. Changing Dynasties, 192-284 AD:

In the next period the insecurity of the throne, when in less than 100 years about a score of candidates wore the purple and almost each new emperor began a new dynasty, enabled Christianity to spread practically untroubled. Further diversions in its favor were created by those fierce barbarian wars and by the necessity of renewed vigilance at the frontier posts. The Christians' aloofness from political strife and their acquiescence in each new dynasty brought them generally into no collision with new rulers. Further, the fact that many of these emperors were non-Roman provincials, or foreigners who had no special attachment to the old Roman faith, and were eclectic in their religious views, was of much importance to the new eastern faith. Moreover, some of the emperors proved not only not hostile to Christianity, but positively friendly. In this period we find no severe (except perhaps that of Decius) and certainly no protracted persecution. The Christian church herself was organized on the principle of the imperial government, and made herself thus strong and united, so that when the storm did come she remained unshaken. In 202 Severus started a cruel persecution in Africa and Egypt, but peace was

restored by the savage Caracalla (lacte Christiano educatus: Tert.). Heliogabalus assisted Christianity indirectly (1) by the degradation of Roman religion, and (2) by tolerance. According to one writer he proposed to fuse Christianity, Judaism and Samaritanism into one religion. Alexander Severus was equally tolerant and syncretic, setting up in his private chapel images of Orpheus, Apollonius, Abraham, and Christ, and engraving the golden rule on his palace walls and public buildings. He was even credited with the intention of erecting a temple to Christ. Local persecution broke out under Maximin the Thracian. The first general persecution was that of Decius, in which two features deserve notice: (1) that death was not the immediate result of Christian profession, but every means was employed to induce Christians to recant; (2) Roman authorities already cognizant of the dangers of Christian organization directed their efforts especially against the officers of the church. Gallus continued this policy, and Valerian, after first stopping persecution, tried to check the spread of the worship by banishing bishops and closing churches, and later enacted the death penalty. Gallienus promulgated what was virtually the first edict of toleration, forbade persecution and restored the Christian endowments. Christianity now entered upon a period of 40 years' tranquillity: as outward dangers decreased, less desirable converts came within her gates and her adherents were overtaken in a flood of worldliness, stayed only by the persecution of Diocletian.

5. Diocletian until First General Edict of Toleration, 284-311 AD:

Like some other persecutors, Diocletian was one of the ablest Roman rulers. He was not disposed to proceed against the Christians, but was finally driven to harsh measures by his son-in-law Galerius. The first edict, February 24, 303, was not intended to exterminate Christianity, but to check its growth and weaken its political influence, and was directed principally against Bibles, Christian assemblies and churches. The second was against church organization. A third granted freedom to those who recanted, but sought to compel the submission of recalcitrants by tortures—a partial confession of failure on the part of the imperial government. Bloodshed was avoided and the death penalty omitted. But a fourth edict issued by Maximin prescribed the death penalty and required the act of sacrifice to the gods. In the same year (304) Diocletian, convinced of the uselessness of these measures, stayed the death penalty. The change of policy on the part of the emperor and his abdication next year were virtually a confession that the Galilean had conquered. After the persecution had raged 8 years (or 10, if we include local persecutions after 311), Galerius, overtaken by a loathsome disease, issued from Nicomedia with Constantine and Licinius the first general edict of toleration, April 30, 311. Christianity had thus in this period proved a state within a state; it was finally acknowledged as a religio licita, though not yet on equality with paganism.

6. First Edict of Toleration until Fall of Western Empire, 311-476 AD:

In the next period the first religious wars began, and Christianity was first placed on an equal footing with its rival, then above it, and finally it became the state religion of both West and East. As soon as Christianity had gained tolerance it immediately became an intolerant, bitter persecutor, both of its old rival and of heresy. Constantine, having defeated Maxentius at the Milvian Bridge (October 27, 312), became sole ruler of the West, and, in conjunction with his eastern colleague Licinius, issued the famous edict of toleration from Milan, March 30, 313, by which all religions were granted equal tolerance, and

Christianity was thus placed on an equal footing with heathenism. Constantine's favors toward the Christian faith were largely political; he wished simply to be on the winning side. With each fresh success he inclined more toward Christianity, though his whole life was a compromise. His dream was to weld pagan and Christian into one society under the same laws; he in no way prohibited paganism. With the rounding of Constantinople Christianity became practically the state religion—an alliance with baneful consequences for Christianity. It now began to stifle the liberty of conscience for which it had suffered so much, and orthodoxy began its long reign of intolerance. The sons of Constantine inherited their father's cruel nature with his nominal Christianity. Constantine had left the old and the new religions on equal footing: his sons began the work of exterminating paganism by violence. Constantius when sole emperor, inheriting none of his father's compromise or caution, and prompted by women and bishops, published edicts demanding the closing of the temples and prohibiting sacrifices. Wise provincial administrators hesitated to carry out these premature measures. Christianity was now in the ascendancy and on the aggressive. It not only persecuted paganism, but the dominant Christian party proscribed its rival—this time heterodoxy banishing orthodoxy. The violence and intolerance of the sons of Constantine justified the mild reaction under Julian the Apostate—the most humane member of the Constantine family. He made a "romantic" effort to reestablish the old religion, and while proclaiming tolerance for Christianity, he endeavored to weaken it by heaping ridicule upon its doctrines, rescinding the privileges of the clergy, prohibiting the church from receiving many bequests, removing Christians from public positions and forbidding the teaching of classics in Christian schools lest Christian tongues should become better fitted to meet heathen arguments, and lastly by adding renewed splendor to pagan service as a counter-attraction. But the moral power of Christianity triumphed. Dying on a battle-field, where he fought the Persians, he is said (but not on good authority) to have exclaimed, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean" (nenikekas Galilaie). For a brief period after his death there was religious neutrality. Gratian—at the instigation of Ambrose—departed from this neutrality, removed the statue of Victory from the senate-house, refused the title and robes of pontifex maximus, prohibited bloody sacrifices, and dealt a severe blow to the old faith by withdrawing some of the treasury grants, thereby making it dependent on the voluntary system. Theodosius I, or the Great, adopted a strenuous religious policy against both heresy and paganism. His intolerance must be attributed to Ambrose—a bigot in whose eyes Jews, heretics and pagans alike had no rights. Systematic proscription of paganism began. In 381 Theodosius denied the right of making a will to apostates from Christianity, in 383 the right of inheritance, in 391 heathen public worship was interdicted, in 392 several acts of both private and public heathen worship were forbidden, and greater penalties were attached to the performance of sacrifice. Christian vandalism became rampant; all kinds of violence and confiscation were resorted to, monks or priests often leading the populace. For the present the West did not suffer so severely from fanatic iconoclasm. Under the sons of Theodosius the suppression of paganism was steadily pursued. Honorius in the West excluded (408 AD) pagans from civil and military offices; in a later edict (423) the very existence of paganism is doubted (paganos .... quamquam iam nullos esse credamus). That heathenism was still an attraction is proved by the repeated laws against apostasy. Under Valentinian III (423-55) and Theodosius II, laws were enacted for the destruction of temples or their conversion into Christian churches. In the western empire heathenism was persecuted till the end, and its final overthrow was hastened by the extinction of the western empire (476). In the East Justinian closed the heathen schools of philosophy at Athens (529 AD), and in a despotic spirit prohibited even heathen worship in private under pain of death.

ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, 3

V. Victory of Christianity and Conversion of the Roman Empire.

Christianity was now acknowledged as the religion of both East and West. It had also grown strong enough to convert the barbarians who overran the West. It restrained and educated them under the lead of the papacy, so that its conquests now extended beyond the Roman empire.

Merivale (preface to Conversion of Roman Empire) attributes the conversion of the Roman empire to four causes: (1) the external evidence of apparent fulfillment of prophecy and the evidence of miracles, (2) internal evidence as satisfying the spiritual wants of the empire and offering a Redeemer, (3) the example of the pure lives and heroic deaths of the early Christians, and (4) the success which attended the Christian cause under Constantine. Gibbon (chapter xv of Decline and Fall) seeks to account for the phenomenal success of Christianity in the empire by (1) the zeal and enthusiasm of the early Christians, (2) the belief of Christianity in immortality with both future rewards and future retributions, (3) miracles, (4) the high ethical code and pure morals of professing Christians, and (5) strong ecclesiastical organization on imperial patterns. But neither of these lists of causes seems to account satisfactorily for the progress and success of the religion of Jesus.

1. Negative Causes:

This was due in the first place to negative causes—the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of the antique world, the internal rottenness and decay of heathen systems. All ancient national religions had failed and were abandoned alike by philosophers and the masses, and no universal religion for humanity was offered except by Christianity. Worship had degenerated into pure formalism which brought no comfort to the heart. An imperious demand for revelation was felt which no philosophy or natural religion could satisfy.

2. Positive Causes:

But it was to positive causes chiefly that the success of the new religion was due, among which were the zeal, enthusiasm, and moral earnestness of the Christian faith. Its sterling qualities were best shown in persecution and the heroic deaths of its adherents. Paganism, even with the alliance of the civil power and the prestige of its romantic past, could not withstand persecution. And when heathenism was thrown back on the voluntary system, it could not prosper as Christianity did with its ideals of self-sacrifice. The earnestness of early Christianity was raised to its highest power by its belief in a near second coming of the Lord and the end of the aeon. The means of propagation greatly helped the spread of Christianity, the principal means being the exemplary lives of its professors. It opposed moral and spiritual power to political. Besides, Christianity when once studied by the thinkers of the ancient world was found to be in accord with the highest principles of reason and Nature. But "the chief cause of its success was the congruity of its teaching with the spiritual nature of mankind" (Lecky). There was a deepseated

earnestness in a large section of the ancient world to Whom Christianity offered the peace, comfort and strength desired. It was possessed also of an immense advantage over all competing religions of the Roman empire in being adapted to all classes and conditions and to all changes. There was nothing local or national about it; it gave the grandest expression to the contemporary ideal of brotherhood. Its respect for woman and its attraction for this sex gained it many converts who brought honor to it; in this respect it was far superior to its greatest rival, Mithraism. In an age of vast social change and much social distress it appealed to the suffering by its active self-denial for the happiness of others. As an ethical code it was equal and superior to the noblest contemporary systems. One incalculable advantage it could show above all religions and philosophies—the charm and power of an ideal perfect life, in which the highest manhood was held forth as an incentive to nobler living. The person of Jesus was an ideal and moral dynamic for both philosopher and the common man, far above any abstract virtue. "It was because it was true to the moral sentiments of the age, because it represented faithfully the supreme type of excellence to which men were then tending, because it corresponded with their religious wants, aims and emotions, because the whole spiritual being could then expand and expatiate under its influence that it planted its roots so deeply in the hearts of men" (Lecky, Hist of European Morals, chapter iii). Add to all this the favorable circumstances mentioned under "Preparation for Christianity," above (II), and we can understand how the Roman empire became the kingdom of Christ.

LITERATURE.

Ancient sources include Tacitus, Suetonius, Josephus, Pliny’s Letters, x.97-98 (in Hardy’s edition), Dio Cassius (in Xiphilin), the apologists, Church Fathers, Inscriptions, etc.

Modern sources are too numerous to mention in full, but those most helpful to the student are: Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire; Merivale, Hist of the Romans under the Empire; The Fall of the Roman Republic, 1856; Conversion of the Roman Empire, 1865; Milman, Hist of Christianity; Hist of Latin Christianity; Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire; The Expositor, IV, viii, pp. 8 ff, 110 ff, 282 ff; E. G. Hardy, Christianity and the Roman Government, 1894; D. Duff, The Early Church: a Hist of Christianity in the First Six Centuries, Edinburgh, 1891; J. J. Blunt, A Hist of the Christian Church during the First Three Centuries, 1861; Harnack, Mission and Expansion of Christianity, 1907; Mommsen, "Der Religionsfrevel nach rom. Recht," in Hist. Zeit, 1890, LXIV (important); Provinces of the Roman Empire; The Expositor, 1893, pp. 6 ff; G. Boissier, La religion romaine d’Auguste aux Antonins; La fin du paganisme; Wissowa, Religion u. Kultus der Romer; Gerb. Uhlhorn, Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism, English translation by Smyth and Ropes, 1879; B. Aube, Histoire des persecutions de l’eglise jusqu’a la fin des Antonins, 1875; Schaff, Hist of the Christian Church (with useful bibliographies of both ancient and modern authorities); Orr, Neglected Factors in Early Church Hist; Keim, Ro u. Christentum; Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, English translation, London, 1910; Wendland, Die hellenistischromische Kultur2, 1912; F. Overbeck, "Gesetze der rom. Kaiser gegen die Christen," in his Studien, 1875; C. F. Arnold, Die Neronische Christenverfolgung; Stud. zur Gesch. der Plinianischen Christenverfolgung; Westcott, "The Two Empires," in commentary to Epistles. of John, 250-82; Friedlander, Sittengeschichte Roms; Lightfoot, Apostolic Fathers; Lecky, Hist of European Morals, chapter iii. "The Conversion of Rome."

S. Angus

ROMAN LAW

I. ROMAN PRIVATE LAW

1. The Twelve Tables

2. Civil Procedure

3. Jus honorarium

4. The praetor peregrinus

5. Imperial Ordinances

6. Golden Age of Juristic Literature

7. Codification in the Later Empire

II. ROMAN CRIMINAL LAW

1. Jurisdiction in the Royal Period

2. The Right of Appeal

(1) Penalties

(2) The Porcian Law

3. Popular Jurisdiction Curtailed

4. Jurors

5. Disappearance of Criminal Courts

6. Right of Trial at Rome

LITERATURE

In the present article we shall treat (I) Roman Private Law and (II) Criminal Law only, reserving a consideration of the development of the principles of constitutional law for the article on ROME, since it is so closely interwoven with the political history of the state.

It will be necessary to confine the discussion of private law to its external history, without attempting to deal with the substance of the law itself. In the treatment of criminal law attention will be directed chiefly to the constitutional guaranties which were intended to protect Roman citizens against arbitrary and unjust punishments, these being one of the most important privileges of Roman citizenship.

See CITIZENSHIP.

Roman law found its original source in the family as a corporation. The proprietary rights of the pater familias as representative of this primitive unit of organization are a fundamental element in private law, and the scope of the criminal jurisdiction of the state was limited by the power of life and death which was exercised by the head of the family over those who were under his authority, by virtue of which their transgressions were tried before the domestic tribunal.

It is likewise of fundamental importance to recall the fact that before the earliest period in the history of Roman law of which we have positive information, there must have been a time when a large number of different classes of crime were punished by the priests as sacrilege, in accordance with divine law (fas), by putting the offender to death as a sacrifice to the offended deity, while restitution for private violence or injustice was left to private initiative to seek. For a law of the Twelve Tables that the person guilty of cutting another’s grain by night should be hanged, as an offering to Ceres, is a survival of the older religious character of condemnation to death, and the right to kill the nocturnal thief and the adulterer caught in the act may be cited as survivals of primitive private vengeance The secular conception of crime as an offense against the welfare of the state gradually superseded the older conception, while private law arose when the community did away with the disorder incident to the exercise of self-help in attempting to secure justice, by insisting that the parties to a disagreement should submit their claims to an arbitrator.

I. Roman Private Law.

1. The Twelve Tables:

Roman private law was at first a body of unwritten usages handed down by tradition in the patrician families. The demand of the plebeians for the publication of the law resulted in the adoption of the famous Twelve Tables (449 BC), which was looked upon by later authorities as the source of all public and private law (quae nunc quoque in hoc immenso aliarum super alias acervatarum legum cumulo fons omnis publici privdtique est iuris: Livy iii.34, 6), although it was not a scientific or comprehensive code of all the legal institutions of the time. This primitive system of law was made to expand to meet the growing requirements of the republican community chiefly by means of interpretation and the jus honorarium, which corresponds to equity.

2. Civil Procedure:

The function of interpretation may be defined by mentioning the principal elements in civil procedure. The praetor, or magistrate, listened to the claims of the litigants and prepared an outline of the disputed issues, called a formula, which was submitted to the judex, or arbitrator, a jury, as it were, consisting of one man, who decided the questions of fact involved in the case. Neither praetor nor judex had special legal training. The court had recourse, therefore, for legal enlightenment to those who had gained distinction as authorities on the law, and the opinions, or responsa, of these scholars (jurisprudentes) formed a valuable commentary on the legal institutions of the time. In this way a body of rules was amassed by interpretative adaptation which the authors of the Twelve Tables would never have recognized.

3. Jus honorarium:

Jus honorarium derived its name from the circumstance that it rested upon the authority of magistrates (honor = magistracy). In this respect and because it was composed of orders issued for the purpose of affording relief in cases for which the existing law did not make adequate provision, this second agency for legal expansion may be compared with English equity. These orders issued by the praetors had legal force during the tenure of their office only; but those the expediency of which had been established by this period of trial were generally reissued by succeeding magistrates from year to year, so that in time a large, but uniform body of rules, subject to annual renewal, formed the greater part of the edict which was issued by the praetors before entering upon their term of office. By these means Roman law maintained a proper balance between elasticity and rigidity.

4. The praetor peregrinus:

After the institution of the praetor peregrinus (241 BC) who heard cases in which one or both of the parties were foreigners, a series of similar edicts proceeded from those who were chosen to this tribunal. The annual edicts of the praetor peregrinus became an important means for broadening Roman law, for the strangers who appeared in the court of this magistrate were mostly Greeks from Southern Italy, so that the principles of law which were gradually formulated as a basis for proceedings were largely an embodiment of the spirit of Greek law.

5. Imperial Ordinances:

Direct legislation superseded the other sources of law under the empire, taking the form, occasionally, of bills ratified by the people (leges), but usually of enactments of the senate (senatus consulta), or imperial ordinances. The latter, which eventually prevailed to the exclusion of all other types, may be classified as edicta, which were issued by the emperor on the analogy of the similar orders of the republican magistrates, decreta, or decisions of the imperial tribunal, which had force as precedents, and rescripta, which were replies by the emperor to requests for the interpretation of the law. All these acts of imperial legislation were known as constitutiones.

6. Golden Age of Juristic Literature:

In the 2nd century Salvius Julianus was commissioned to invest the praetorian edict with definite form. The Institutes of Gaius appearing about the same time became a model for subsequent textbooks on jurisprudence (Gaii institutionum commentarii quattuor, discovered by Niebuhr in 1816 at Verona in a palimpsest). This was the Golden Age of juristic literature. A succession of able thinkers, among whom Papinian, Paulus, Ulpian, Modestinus, and Gaius hold foremost rank (compare Codex Theodosianus 1, 4, 3), applied to the incoherent mass of legal material the methods of scientific investigation, developing a system of Roman law and establishing a science of jurisprudence.

7. Codification in the Later Empire:

The period of the later empire was characterized by various attempts at codification which culminated in the final treatment of the body of Roman law under Justinian. The work of the board of eminent jurists to whom this vast undertaking was entrusted was published in three parts: (1) the Code, which contains a selection of the imperial enactments since Hadrian in twelve books, (2) the Digest or Pandects, which is composed of extracts from the juristic literature in fifty books, and (3) the Institutes, which is a textbook in four books. In this form mainly Roman private law has come down to modern times, and has become, in the words of an eminent authority Bryce, Studies in History and Jurisprudence, Oxford, 1901), next to the Christian religion, the most plentiful source of the rules governing actual conduct throughout Western Europe.

II. Roman Criminal Law.

1. Jurisdiction in the Royal Period:

In the royal period criminal jurisdiction, in so far as it was a function of secular administration, belonged by right to the king. The titles quaestores parricidii and duumviri perduellionis, belonging to officials to whom the royal authority in these matters was occasionally delegated, indicate the nature of the earliest crimes brought under secular jurisdiction. The royal prerogative passed to the republican magistrates, and embraced, besides the right to punish crimes, the power to compel obedience to their own decrees (coercitio) by means of various penalties.

2. The Right of Appeal:

But the right of the people to final jurisdiction in cases involving the life or civil status of citizens was established by an enactment (lex Valeria) which is said to have been proposed by one of the first consuls (509 BC), and which granted the right of appeal to the assembly (provocatio) against the execution of a capital or other serious penalty pronounced by a magistrate (Cicero De Re Publica ii.31, 54; Livy ii.8, 2; Dionysius v.19). This right of appeal was reinforced or extended by subsequent enactments (leges Valeriae) in 449 and 299 BC. It was valid against penalties imposed by virtue of the coercive power of

the magistrates as well as those based upon a regular criminal charge. Generally the magistrates made no provisional sentence of their own, but brought their charges directly before the people.

(1) Penalties.

The death penalty was practically abrogated in republican times by allowing the accused the alternative of voluntary exile. The Romans rarely employed imprisonment as a punishment. The imposition of fines above a certain amount was made subject to the right of appeal. At first the dictator possessed absolute power of life and death over the citizens, but this authority was limited, probably about 300 BC (Livy xxvii.6, 5), by being made subject to the right of appeal

(2) The Porcian Law.

The right of appeal to the people was valid within the city and as far as the first milestone; and although it was never extended beyond this limit, yet its protection was virtually secured for all Roman citizens, wherever they might be, by the provision of the Porcian law (of unknown date), which established their right to trial at Rome. In consequence of this a distinction of great importance was created in criminal procedure in the provinces, since Roman citizens were sent to Rome for trial in all serious cases, while other persons were subject to the criminal jurisdiction of the municipalities, except when the governor summoned them before his own tribunal.

3. Popular Jurisdiction Curtailed:

The exercise of popular jurisdiction in criminal matters was gradually curtailed by the establishment of permanent courts (quaestiones perpetuae) by virtue of laws by which the people delegated their authority to judge certain classes of cases. The first of these courts was authorized in 149 BC for the trial of charges of extortion brought against provincial governors. Compensation was the main purpose of accusers in bringing charges before this and later permanent courts, and for this reason, perhaps, the procedure was similar to that which was employed in civil cases. A praetor presided over the tribunal; a number of judices took the place of the single juror. The laws by which Sulla reorganized the systems of criminal jurisdiction provided for seven courts dealing individually with extortion, treason, peculation, corrupt electioneering practices, murder, fraud, and assault.

4. Jurors:

The judices, or jurors, were originally chosen from the senate. A law proposed by C. Gracchus transferred membership in all the juries to the equestrian class. Sulla replenished the senate by admitting about 300 members of the equestrian class, and then restored to it the exclusive control of the juries. But a judicial law of 70 BC provided for the equal representation of all three classes of the people in the courts. There were then about 1,080 names on the list of available jurors, of whom 75 seem to have been chosen for each trial (Cicero In Pisonem 40). Caesar abolished the plebeian jurors (Suetonius Caesar 41). Augustus restored the representatives of the third class (Suetonius Aug. 32), but confined their

action to civil cases of minor importance. He likewise excused the members of the senate from service as jurors.

5. Disappearance of Criminal Courts:

The system of criminal courts (quaestiones perpetuae) diminished in importance under the empire and finally disappeared toward the close of the 2nd century. Their place was taken by the senate under the presidency of a consul, the emperor, and eventually by imperial officials by delegated authority from the emperor. In the first case the senate stood in somewhat the same relation to the presiding consul as the jurors in the permanent courts to the praetor. But the emperor and imperial officials decided without the help of a jury, so that after the 3rd century, when the judicial competence of the senate was gradually lost, trial by jury ceased to exist. An important innovation in the judicial system of the empire was the principle of appeal from the decision of lower courts to higher tribunals. For the emperors and eventually their delegates, chiefly the praefectus urbi and praefectus praetorio, heard appeals from Roman and Italian magistrates and provincial governors.

6. Right of Trial at Rome:

Under the early empire, provincial governors were generally under obligation to grant the demand of Roman citizens for the privilege of trial at Rome (Digest xlviii. 6, 7), although there appear to have been some exceptions to this rule (Pliny, Epist. ii.1l; Digest xlviii.8, 16). Lysias, tribune of the cohort at Jerusalem, sent Paul as prisoner to Caesarea, the capital of the province, so that Felix the procurator might determine what was to be done in his case, inasmuch as he was a Roman citizen (Ac 23:27), and two years later Paul asserted his privilege of being tried at Rome by the emperor for the same reason (Ac 25:11,21).

Roman citizens who were sent to Rome might be brought either before the senate or emperor, but cognizance of these cases by the imperial tribunal was more usual, and finally supplanted entirely that of the senate, the formula of appeal becoming proverbial: cives Romanus sum, provoco ad Caesarem (Kaisara epikaloumai: Ac 25:11).

As Roman citizenship became more and more widely extended throughout the empire its relative value diminished, and it is obvious that many of the special privileges, such as the right of trial at Rome, which were attached to it in the earlier period must have been gradually lost. It became customary for the emperors to delegate their power of final jurisdiction over the lives of citizens (ius gladii) to the provincial governors, and finally, after Roman citizenship had been conferred upon the inhabitants of the empire generally by Caracalla, the right of appeal to Rome remained the privilege of certain classes only, such as senators, municipal decurions (Digest xlviii.19, 27), officers of equestrian rank in the army, and centurions (Dio Cassius lii.22, 33).

LITERATURE.

Greenidge, The Legal Procedure of Cicero’s Time, Oxford, 1901; Kruger, Geschichte der Quellen u. Litteratur des romischen Rechts, Leipzig, 1888; Mommsen, Romisches Strafrecht, Leipzig, 1899; Roby, Roman Private Law in the Times of Cicero and of the Antonines, Cambridge, 1902; Sohm, The Institutes of Roman Law, translated by J.C. Ledlie, Oxford, 1892.

George H. Allen

ROMAN RELIGION

See ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, III; ROME, IV.

ROMAN; ROMANS

ro’-man, ro’-manz.

See ROME, III, 2; CITIZENSHIP.

ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE

1. Its Genuineness

2. Its Integrity

3. The Approximate Date

4. The Place of Writing

5. The Destination

6. The Language

7. The Occasion

8. Some Characteristics

9. Main Teachings of the Epistle

(1) Doctrine of Man

(2) Doctrine of God

(3) Doctrine of Son of God—Redemption; Justification

(4) Doctrine of the Spirit of God

(5) Doctrine of Duty

(6) Doctrine of Israel

LITERATURE

This is the greatest, in every sense, of the apostolic letters of Paul; in scale, in scope, and in its wonderful combination of doctrinal, ethical and administrative wisdom and power. In some respects the later Epistles, Ephesians and Colossians, lead us to even higher and deeper arcana of revelation, and they, like Romans, combine with the exposition of truth a luminous doctrine of duty. But the range of Roman is larger in both directions, and presents us also with noble and far-reaching discussions of Christian polity, instructions in spiritual utterance and the like, to which those Epistles present no parallel, and which only the Corinthian Epistles rival.

1. Its Genuineness:

No suspicion on the head of the genuineness of the Epistle exists which needs serious consideration. Signs of the influence of the Epistle can be traced, at least very probably, in the New Testament itself; in 1 Peter, and, as some think, in James. But in our opinion Jas was the earlier writing, and Lightfoot has given strong grounds for the belief that the paragraph on faith and justification (Jas 2) has no reference to perversions of Pauline teaching, but deals with rabbinism. Clement of Rome repeatedly quotes Romans, and so do Ignatius, Polycarp, Justin. Marcion includes it in his list of Pauline Epistles, and it is safe to say in general Romans "has been recognized in the Christian church as long as any collection of Paul’s Epistles has been extant" (A. Robertson, in HDB, under the word). But above all other evidences it testifies to itself. The fabrication of such a writing, with its close and complex thought, its power and marked originality of treatment, its noble morale, and its spiritual elevation and ardor, is nothing short of a moral impossibility. A mighty mind and equally great heart live in every page, and a soul exquisitely sensitive and always intent upon truth and holiness. Literary personation is an art which has come to anything like maturity only in modern times, certainly not before the Renaissance. In a fully developed form it is hardly earlier than the 19th century. And even now who can point to a consciously personated authorship going along with high moral principle and purpose?

2. Its Integrity:

The question remains, however, whether, accepting the Epistle in block as Pauline, we have it, as to details, just as it left the author’s hands. Particularly, some phenomena of the text of the last two chapter invite the inquiry. We may—in our opinion we must—grant those chapters to be Pauline. They breathe

Paul in every sentence. But do they read precisely like part of a letter to Rome? For example, we have a series of names (Ro 16:1-15), representing a large circle of personally known and loved friends of the writer, a much longer list than any other in the Epistles, and all presumably—on theory that the passage is integral to the Epistle—residents at Rome. May not such a paragraph have somehow crept in, after date, from another writing? Might not a message to Philippian, Thessalonian or Ephesian friends, dwellers in places where Paul had already established many intimacies, have fallen out of its place and found lodgment by mistake at the close of this letter to Rome? It seems enough to reply by one brief statement of fact. We possess some 300 manuscripts of Romans, and not one of these, so far as it is uninjured, fails to give the Epistle complete, all the chapters as we have them, and in the present order (with one exception, that of the final doxology). It is observable meanwhile that the difficulty of supposing Paul to have had a large group of friends living at Rome, before his own arrival there, is not serious. To and from Rome, through the whole empire, there was a perpetual circulation of population. Suppose Aquila and Priscilla (e.g.) to have recently returned (Ac 18:2) to Rome from Ephesus, and suppose similar migrations from Greece or from Asia Minor to have taken place within recent years; we can then readily account for the greetings of Ro 16.

Lightfoot has brought it out in an interesting way (see his Philippians, on 4:22) that many of the names (e.g. Amplias, Urbanus, Tryphena) in Ro 16 are found at Rome, in inscriptions of the early imperial age, in cemeteries where members of the widely scattered "household of Caesar" were interred. This at least suggests the abundant possibility that the converts and friends belonging to the "household" who, a very few years later, perhaps not more than three, were around him at Rome when he wrote to Philippi (Php 4:22), and sent their special greeting ("chiefly they") to the Philipplans, were formerly residents at Philippi, or elsewhere in Macedonia, and had moved thence to the capital not long before the apostle wrote to the Romans. A. Robertson (ut supra) comes to the conclusion, after a careful review of recent theories, "that the case for transferring this section .... from its actual connection to a lost Epistle to Ephesus is not made out."

Two points of detail in the criticism of the text of Romans may be noted. One is that the words "at Rome" (1:7,15) are omitted in a very few manuscripts, in a way to remind us of the interesting phenomenon of the omission of "at Ephesus" (Eph 1:1 margin). But the evidence for this omission being original is entirely inadequate. The fact may perhaps be accounted for by a possible circulation of Romans among other mission churches as an Epistle of universal interest. This would be much more likely if the manuscripts and other authorities in which the last two chapters are missing were identical with those which omit "at Rome," but this is not the case.

The other and larger detail is that the great final doxology (Ro 16:25-27) is placed by many cursives at the end of Romans 14, and is omitted entirely by three manuscripts and by Marcion. The leading uncials and a large preponderance of ancient evidence place it where we have it. It is quite possible that Paul may have reissued Romans after a time, and may only then have added the doxology, which has a certain resemblance in manner to his later (captivity) style. But it is at least likely that dogmatic objections led Marcion to delete it, and that his action accounts for the other phenomena which seem to witness against its place at the finale.

It is worth noting that Hort, a singularly fearless, while sober student, defends without reserve the entirety of the Epistle as we have it, or practically so. See his essay printed in Lightfoot's Biblical Studies.

3. The Approximate Date:

We can fix the approximate date with fair certainty within reasonable limits. We gather from Ro 15:19 that Paul, when he wrote, was in the act of closing his work in the East and was looking definitely westward. But he was first about (15:25,26) to revisit Jerusalem with his collection, mainly made in Macedonia and Achaia, for the "poor saints." Placing these allusions side by side with the references in 1 and 2 Corinthians to the collection and its conveyance, and again with the narrative of Acts, we may date Romans very nearly at the same time as 2 Corinthians, just before the visit to Jerusalem narrated in Ac 20, etc. The year may be fixed with great probability as 58 AD. This estimate follows the lines of Lightfoot's chronology, which Robertson (ut supra) supports. More recent schemes would move the date back to 56 AD.

"The reader's attention is invited to this date. Broadly speaking, it was about 30 years at the most after the Crucifixion. Let anyone in middle life reflect on the freshness in memory of events, whether public or private, which 30 years ago made any marked impression on his mind. Let him consider how concrete and vivid still are the prominent personages of 30 years ago, many of whom of course are still with us. And let him transfer this thought to the 1st century, and to the time of our Epistle. Let him remember that we have at least this one great Christian writing composed, for certain, within such easy reach of the very lifetime of Jesus Christ when His contemporary friends were still, in numbers, alive and active. Then let him open the Epistle afresh, and read, as if for the first time, its estimate of Jesus Christ—a Figure then of no legendary past, with its halo, but of the all but present day. Let him note that this transcendent estimate comes to us conveyed in the vehicle not of poetry and rhetoric, but of a treatise pregnant with masterly argument and admirable practical wisdom, tolerant and comprehensive. And we think that the reader will feel that the result of his meditations on date and circumstances is reassuring as to the solidity of the historic basis of the Christian faith" (from the present writer's introduction to the Epistle in the Temple Bible; see also his Light from the First Days: Short Studies in 1 Thessalonians).

4. The Place of Writing:

With confidence we may name Corinth as the place of writing. Paul was at the time in some "city" (Ro 16:23). He was staying with one Gaius, or Caius (same place) , and we find in 1Co 1:14 a Gaius, closely connected with Paul, and a Corinthian. He commends to the Romans the deaconess Phoebe, attached to "the church at Cenchrea" (16:1), presumably a place near that from which he was writing; and Cenchrea was the southern part of Corinth.

5. The Destination:

The first advent of Christianity to Rome is unrecorded, and we know very little of its early progress.

Visiting Romans (epidemountes), both Jews and proselytes, appear at Pentecost (Ac 2:10), and no doubt some of these returned home believers. In Ac 18:2 we have Aquila and Priscilla, Jews, evidently Christians, "lately come from Italy," and probably from Rome. But we know practically nothing else of the story previous to this Epistle, which is addressed to a mission church obviously important and already spiritually advanced. On the other hand (a curious paradox in view of the historical development of Roman Christianity), there is no allusion in the Epistle to church organization. The Christian ministry (apart from Paul's own apostleship) is not even mentioned. It may fairly be said to be incredible that if the legend of Peter's long episcopate were historical, no allusion whatever to his work, influence and authority should be made. It is at least extremely difficult to prove that he was even present in Rome till shortly before his martyrdom, and the very ancient belief that Peter and Paul founded the Roman church is more likely to have had its origin in their martyrdoms there than in Peter's having in any sense shared in the early evangelization of the city.

As to Rome itself, we may picture it at the date of the Epistle as containing, with its suburbs, a closely massed population of perhaps 800,000 people; a motley host of many races, with a strong oriental element, among which the Jews were present as a marked influence, despised and sometimes dreaded, but always attracting curiosity.

6. The Language:

The Epistle was written in Greek, the "common dialect," the Greek of universal intercourse of that age. One naturally asks, why not in Latin, when the message was addressed to the supreme Latin city? The large majority of Christian converts beyond doubt came from the lower middle and lowest classes, not least from the slave class. These strata of society were supplied greatly from immigrants, much as in parts of East London now aliens make the main population. Not Latin but Greek, then lingua franca of the Mediterranean, would be the daily speech of these people. It is remarkable that all the early Roman bishops bear Greek names. And some 40 years after the date of this Epistle we find Clement of Rome writing in Greek to the Corinthians, and later again, early in the 2nd century, Ignatius writing in Greek to the Romans.

7. The Occasion:

We cannot specify the occasion of writing for certain. No hint appears of any acute crisis in the mission (as when 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, or Colossians were written). Nor would personal reminiscences influence the writer, for he had not yet seen Rome. We can only suggest some possibilities as follows:

(1) A good opportunity for safe communication was offered by the deaconess Phoebe's proposed visit to the metropolis. She doubtless asked Paul for a commendatory letter, and this may have suggested an extended message to the church.

(2) Paul's thoughts had long gone toward Rome. See Ac 19:21: "I must see Rome," words which seem

perhaps to imply some divine intimation (compare 23:11). And his own life-course would fall in with such a supernatural call. He had always aimed at large centers; and now his great work in the central places of the Levant was closing; he had worked at Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth; he was at last to think of the supreme center of all. Rome must always have had a dominant interest for the "Apostle of the Nations," and any suggestion that his Lord's will tended that way would intensify it to the highest degree.

(3) The form of the Epistle may throw further light on the occasion. The document falls, on the whole, into three parts. First we have Romans 1-8 inclusive, a prolonged exposition of the contrasted and related phenomena of sin and salvation, with special initial references to the cases of Jew and non-Jew respectively. Then come Romans 9-11, which deal with the Jewish rejection of the Jewish Messiah, developing into a prophetic revelation of the future of Israel in the grace of God. Lastly we have Romans 12-16. Some account of the writer's plans, and his salutations to friends, requests for prayer, etc., form the close of this section. But it is mainly a statement of Christian duty in common life, personal, civil, religious. Under the latter head we have a noble treatment of problems raised by varying opinions, particularly on religious observances, among the converts, Jew and Gentile.

Such phenomena cast a possible light on the occasion of writing. The Roman mission was on one side, by its locality and surroundings, eminently gentile. On the other, there was, as we have seen, a strong Judaic element in Roman life, particularly in its lower strata, and no doubt around the Jewish community proper there had grown up a large community of "worshippers" (sebomenoi) or, as we commonly call them, "proselytes" ("adherents," in the language of modern missionary enterprise), people who, without receiving circumcision, attended Jewish worship and shared largely in Jewish beliefs and ideals. Among these proselytes, we may believe, the earliest evangelists at Rome found a favorable field, and the mission church as Paul knew of it contained accordingly not only two definite classes, converts from paganism, converts from native Judaism, but very many in whose minds both traditions were working at once. To such converts the problems raised by Judaism, both without and within the church, would come home with a constant intimacy and force, and their case may well have been present in a special degree in the apostle's mind alike in the early passages (Romans 1-3) of the Epistle and in such later parts as Romans 2-11; 14; 15. On the one hand they would greatly need guidance on the significance of the past of Israel and on the destiny of the chosen race in the future. Moreover, discussions in such circles over the way of salvation would suggest to the great missionary his exposition of man's reconciliation with a holy God and of His secrets for purity and obedience in an unholy world. And meanwhile the ever-recurring problems raised by ceremonial rules in common daily life—problems of days and seasons, and of forbidden food—would, for such disciples, need wise and equitable treatment.

(4) Was it not with this position before him, known to him through the many means of communication between Rome and Corinth, that Paul cast his letter into this form? And did not the realization of the central greatness of Rome suggest its ample scale? The result was a writing which shows everywhere his sense of the presence of the Judaic problem. Here he meets it by a statement, massive and tender, of "heaven's easy, artless, unencumbered plan" of redemption, grace, and glory, a plan which on its other side is the very mystery of the love of God, which statement is now and forever a primary treasure of the Christian faith. And then again he lays down for the too eager champions of the new "liberty" a law of

loving tolerance toward slower and narrower views which is equally our permanent spiritual possession, bearing a significance far-reaching and benign.

(5) It has been held by some great students, notably Lightfoot and Hort, that the main purpose of Romans was to reconcile the opposing "schools" in the church, and that its exposition of the salvation of the individual is secondary only. The present writer cannot take this view. Read the Epistle from its spiritual center, so to speak, and is not the perspective very different? The apostle is always conscious of the collective aspect of the Christian life, an aspect vital to its full health. But is he not giving his deepest thought, animated by his own experience of conviction and conversion, to the sinful man's relation to eternal law, to redeeming grace, and to a coming glory? It is the question of personal salvation which with Paul seems to us to live and move always in the depth of his argument, even when Christian polity and policy is the immediate theme.

8. Some Characteristics:

Excepting only Ephesians (the problem of the authorship of which is insoluble, and we put that great document here aside), Romans is, of all Paul has written, least a letter and most a treatise. He is seen, as we read, to approach religious problems of the highest order in a free but reasoned succession; problems of the darkness and of the light, of sin and grace, fall and restoration, doom and remission, faith and obedience, suffering and glory, transcendent hope and humblest duty, now in their relation to the soul, now so as to develop the holy collectivity of the common life. The Roman converts are always first in view, but such is the writer, such his handling, that the results are for the universal church and for every believer of all time. Yet all the while (and it is in this a splendid example of that epistolary method of revelation which is one of the glories of the New Testament) it is never for a moment the mere treatise, however great. The writer is always vividly personal, and conscious of persons. The Epistle is indeed a masterpiece of doctrine, but also always "the unforced, unartificial utterance of a friend to friends."

9. Main Teachings of the Epistle:

Approaching the Epistle as a treatise rather than a letter (with the considerable reserves just stated), we indicate briefly some of its main doctrinal deliverances. Obviously, in limine, it is not set before us as a complete system either of theology or of morals; to obtain a full view of a Pauline dogma and ethics we must certainly place Ephesians and Colossians, not to speak of passages from Thessalonians, beside Romans. But it makes by far the nearest approach to doctrinal completeness among the Epistles.

(1) Doctrine of Man.

In great measure this resolves itself into the doctrine of man as a sinner, as being guilty in face of an absolutely holy and absolutely imperative law, whether announced by abnormal revelation, as to the Jew, or through nature and conscience only, as to the Gentile. At the back of this presentation lies the full recognition that man is cognizant, as a spiritual being, of the eternal difference of right and wrong, and of the witness of creation to personal "eternal power and Godhead" as its cause, and that he is

responsible in an awe-inspiring way for his unfaithfulness to such cognitions. He is a being great enough to be in personal moral relation with God, and able to realize his ideal only in true relation with Him; therefore a being whose sin and guilt have an unfathomable evil in them. So is he bound by his own failure that he cannot restore himself; God alone, in sovereign mercy, provides for his pardon by the propitiation of Christ, and for his restoration by union with Christ in the life given by the Holy Spirit. Such is man, once restored, once become "a saint" (a being hallowed), a "son of God" by adoption and grace, that his final glorification will be the signal (in some sense the cause?) of a transfiguration of the whole finite universe. Meanwhile, man is a being actually in the midst of a life of duty and trial, a member of civil society, with obligations to its order. He lives not in a God-forsaken world, belonging only to another and evil power. His new life, the "mind of the Spirit" in him, is to show itself in a conduct and character good for the state and for society at large, as well as for the "brotherhood."

(2) Doctrine of God.

True to the revelation of the Old Testament, Paul presents God as absolute in will and power, so that He is not only the sole author of nature but the eternal and ultimately sole cause of goodness in man. To Him in the last resort all is due, not only the provision of atonement but the power and will to embrace it. The great passages which set before us a "fore-defining" (proorisis, "predestination") and election of the saints are all evidently inspired by this motive, the jealous resolve to trace to the one true Cause all motions and actions of good. The apostle seems e.g. almost to risk affirming a sovereign causation of the opposite, of unbelief and its sequel. But patient study will find that it is not so. God is not said to "fit for ruin" the "vessels of wrath." Their woeful end is overruled to His glory, but nowhere is it taken to be caused by Him. All along the writer’s intense purpose is to constrain the actual believer to see the whole causation of his salvation in the will and power of Him whose inmost character is revealed in the supreme fact that, "for us all," "he spared not his Son."

(3) Doctrine of Son of God—Redemption; Justification.

The Epistle affords materials for a magnificently large Christology. The relation of the Son to creation is indeed not expounded in terms (as in Col), but it is implied in the language of Romans 8, where the interrelation of our redemption and the transfiguration of Nature is dealt with. We have the Lord’s manhood fully recognized, while His Godhead (as we read in 9:5; so too Robertson, ut supra) is stated in terms, and it is most certainly implied in the language and tone of e.g. the close of Romans 8. Who but a bearer of the Supreme Nature could satisfy the conception indicated in such words as those of 8:32,35-39, coming as they do from a Hebrew monotheist of intense convictions? Meantime this transcendent Person has so put Himself in relation with us, as the willing worker of the Father’s purpose of love, that He is the sacrifice of peace for us (Romans 3), our "propitiatory" One (hilasterion, is now known to be an adjective), such that (whatever the mystery, which leaves the fact no less certain) the man who believes on Him, i.e. (as Romans 4 fully demonstrates) relies on Him, gives himself over to His mercy, is not only forgiven but "justified," "justified by faith." And "justification" is more than forgiveness; it is not merely the remission of a penalty but a welcome to the offender, pronounced to be lawfully at peace with the eternal holiness and love.

See JUSTIFICATION; PROPITIATION.

In closest connection with this message of justification is the teaching regarding union with the Christ who has procured the justification. This is rather assumed than expounded in Romans (we have the exposition more explicitly in Eph, Col, and Gal), but the assumption is present wherever the pregnant phrase "in Christ" is used. Union is, for Paul, the central doctrine of all, giving life and relation to the whole range. As Lightfoot has well said (Sermons in Paul's, number 16), he is the apostle not primarily of justification, or of liberty, great as these truths are with him, but of union with Christ. It is through union that justification is ours; the merits of the Head are for the member. It is through union that spiritual liberty and power are ours; the Spirit of life is from the Head to the member. Held by grace in this profound and multiplex connection, where life, love and law are interlaced, the Christian is entitled to an assurance full of joy that nothing shall separate him, soul and (ultimately) body, from his once sacrificed and now risen and triumphant Lord.

(4) Doctrine of the Spirit of God.

No writing of the New Testament but John's Gospel is so full upon this great theme as Romans 8 may be said to be the locus classicus in the Epistles for the work of the Holy Ghost in the believer. By implication it reveals personality as well as power (see especially 8:26). Note particularly the place of this great passage, in which revelation and profoundest conditions run continually into each other. It follows Romans 7, in which the apostle depicts, in terms of his own profound and typical experience, the struggles of conscience and will over the awful problem of the "bondage" of indwelling sin. If we interpret the passage aright, the case supposed is that of a regenerate man, who, however, attempts the struggle against inward evil armed, as to consciousness, with his own faculties merely, and finds the struggle insupportable. Then comes in the divine solution, the promised Spirit of life and liberty, welcomed and put into use by the man who has found his own resources yam. "In Christ Jesus," in union with Him, he "by the Spirit does to death the practices of the body," and rises through conscious liberty into an exulting hope of "the liberty of the glory of the sons of God"—not so, however as to know nothing of "groaning within himself," while yet in the body; but it is a groan which leaves intact the sense of sonship and divine love, and the expectation of a final completeness of redemption.

(5) Doctrine of Duty.

While the Epistle is eminently a message of salvation, it is also, in vital connection with this, a treasury of principle and precept for the life of duty. It does indeed lay down the sovereign freedom of our acceptance for Christ's sake alone, and so absolutely that (Ro 6:1,2,15) the writer anticipates the inference (by foes, or by mistaken friends), "Let us continue in sin." But the answer comes instantly, and mainly through the doctrine of union. Our pardon is not an isolated fact. Secured only by Christ's sacrifice, received only by the faith which receives Him as our all, it is ipso facto never received alone but with all His other gifts, for it becomes ours as we receive, not merely one truth about Him, but Him. Therefore, we receive His Life as our true life; and it is morally unthinkable that we can receive this and express it in sin. This assumed, the Epistle (Romans 12 and onward) lays down with much detail and in

admirable application large ranges of the law of duty, civil, social, personal, embracing duties to the state, loyalty to its laws, payment of its taxes, recognition of the sacredness of political order, even ministered by pagans; and also duties to society and the church, including a large and loving tolerance even in religious matters, and a response to every call of the law of unselfish love. However we can or cannot adjust mentally the two sides, that of a supremely free salvation and that of an inexorable responsibility, there the two sides are, in the Pauline message. And reason and faith combine to assure us that both sides are eternally true, "antinomies" whose harmony will be explained hereafter in a higher life, but which are to be lived out here concurrently by the true disciple, assured of their ultimate oneness of source in the eternal love.

(6) Doctrine of Israel.

Very briefly we touch on this department of the message of Romans, mainly to point out that the problem of Israel's unbelief nowhere else in Paul appears as so heavy a load on his heart, and that on the other hand we nowhere else have anything like the light he claims to throw (Romans 11) on Israel's future. Here, if anywhere, he appears as the predictive prophet, charged with the statement of a "mystery," and with the announcement of its issues. The promises to Israel have never failed, nor are they canceled. At the worst, they have always been inherited by a chosen remnant, Israel within Israel. And a time is coming when, in a profound connection with Messianic blessing on the Gentiles, "all Israel shall be saved," with a salvation which shall in turn be new life to the world outside Israel. Throughout the passage Paul speaks, not as one who "will not give up a hope," but as having had revealed to him a vast and definite prospect, in the divine purpose.

It is not possible in our present space to work out other lines of the message of Romans. Perhaps enough has been done to stimulate the reader's own inquiries.

LITERATURE.

Of the Fathers, Chrysostom and Augustine are pre-eminent as interpreters of Romans: Chrysostom in his expository Homilies, models of eloquent and illuminating discourse, full of "sanctified common sense," while not perfectly appreciative of the inmost doctrinal characteristics; Augustine, not in any continuous comm., but in his anti-Pelagian writings, which show the sympathetic intensity of his study of the doctrine of the Epistle, not so much on justification as on grace and the will. Of the Reformers, Calvin is eminently the great commentator, almost modern in his constant aim to ascertain the sacred writer's meaning by open-eyed inference direct from the words. On Romans he is at his best; and it is remarkable that on certain leading passages where grace is theme he is much less rigidly "Calvinistic" than some of his followers. In modern times, the not learned but masterly exposition of Robert Haldane (circa 1830) claims mention, and the eloquent and highly suggestive expository lectures (about the same date) of Thomas Chalmers. H. A. W. Meyer (5th edition, 1872, English translation 1873-1874) among the Germans is excellent for carefulness and insight; Godet (1879, English translation 1881) equally so among French-writing divines; of late English interpreters I. A. Beet (1877, many revisions), Sanday and Headlam (1895, in the" International" series) and E. H. Gifford (admirable for scholarship and

exposition; his work was printed first in the Speaker's (Bible) Comm., 1881, now separately) claim particular mention. J. Denney writes on Romans in The Expositor's Greek Test. (1900).

Luther's lectures on Romans, delivered in 1516-1517 and long supposed lost, have been recovered and were published by J. Ficker in 1908. Among modern German commentators, the most important is B. Weiss in the later revisions of the Meyer series (9th edition, 1899), while a very elaborate commentary has been produced by Zahn in his own series (1910). Briefer are the works of Lipsius (Hand-Kommentar, 2nd edition, 1892, very scholarly and suggestive); Lietzmann (Handbuch zum N T, interest chiefly linguistic), and Julicher (in J. Weiss, Schriften des NTs, 2nd edition, 1908, an intensely able piece of popular exposition).

A. E. Garvie has written a brilliant little commentary in the "(New) Century" series (no date); that of R. John Parry in the Cambridge Greek Testament, 1913, is more popular, despite its use of the Greek text. F. B. Westcott's Paul and Justification, 1913, contains a close grammatical study with an excellent paraphrase.

The writer may be allowed to name his short commentary (1879) in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and a fuller one, in a more homiletic style, in the Expositor's Bible, 1894.

Handley Dunelm

ROME rom:

I. DEVELOPMENT OF THE REPUBLICAN CONSTITUTION

1. Original Roman State

2. The Struggle between Patricians and Plebeians

3. The Senate and Magistrates

4. Underlying Principles

II. EXTENSION OF ROMAN SOVEREIGNTY

III. THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT

1. Imperial Authority

2. Three Classes of Citizens

IV. ROMAN RELIGION

1. Deities

2. Religious Decay

V. ROME AND THE JEWS

1. Judea under Roman Procurators and Governors

2. Jewish Proselytism

VI. ROME AND THE CHRISTIANS

1. Introduction of Christianity

2. Tolerance and Proscription

3. Persecution

LITERATURE

Rome (Latin and Italian, Roma; Rhome): The capital of the Roman republic and empire, later the center of Lot Christendom, and since 1871 capital of the kingdom of Italy, is situated mainly on the left bank of the Tiber about 15 miles from the Mediterranean Sea in 41 degrees 53’ 54 inches North latitude and 12 degrees 0’ 12 inches longitude East of Greenwich.

It would be impossible in the limited space assigned to this article to give even a comprehensive outline of the ancient history of the Eternal City. It will suit the general purpose of the work to consider the relations of the Roman government and society with the Jews and Christians, and, in addition, to present a rapid survey of the earlier development of Roman institutions and power, so as to provide the necessary historical setting for the appreciation of the more essential subjects.

I. Development of the Republican Constitution.

1. Original Roman State:

The traditional chronology for the earliest period of Roman history is altogether unreliable, partly because the Gauls, in ravaging the city in 390 BC, destroyed the monuments which might have offered faithful testimony of the earlier period (Livy vi.1). It is known that there was a settlement on the site of Rome before the traditional date of the founding (753 BC). The original Roman state was the product of

the coalition of a number of adjacent clan-communities, whose names were perpetuated in the Roman genres, or groups of imaginary kindred, a historical survival which had lost all significance in the period of authentic history. The chieftains of the associated clans composed the primitive senate or council of elders, which exercised sovereign authority. But as is customary in the development of human society a military or monarchical regime succeeded the looser patriarchal or sacerdotal organs of authority. This second stage may be identified with the legendary rule of the Tarquins, which was probably a period of Etruscan domination. The confederacy of clans was welded into a homogeneous political entity, and society was organized for civic ends, upon a timocratic basis. The forum was drained and became a social, industrial and political center, and the Capitoline temple of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva (Etruscan pseudo-Hellenic deities) was erected as a common shrine for all the people. But above all the Romans are indebted to these foreign kings for a training in discipline and obedience which was exemplified in the later conception of magisterial authority signified by the term imperium.

The prerogatives of the kings passed over to the consuls. The reduction of the tenure of power to a single year and the institution of the principle of colleagueship were the earliest checks to the abuse of unlimited authority. But the true cornerstone of Roman liberty was thought to be the lexicon Valeria, which provided that no citizen should be put to death by a magistrate without being allowed the right of appeal to the decision of the assembly of the people.

2. The Struggle between Patricians and Plebeians:

A period of more than 150 years after the establishment of the republic was consumed chiefly by the struggle between the two classes or orders, the patricians and plebeians. The former were the descendants of the original clans and constituted the populus, or body-politic, in a more particular sense. The plebeians were descendants of former slaves and dependents, or of strangers who had been attracted to Rome by the obvious advantages for industry and trade. They enjoyed the franchise as members of the military assembly (comitia centuriata), but had no share in the magistracies or other civic honors and emoluments, and were excluded from the knowledge of the civil law which was handed down in the patrician families as an oral tradition.

The first step in the progress of the plebeians toward political equality was taken when they wrested from the patricians the privilege of choosing representatives from among themselves, the tribunes, whose function of bearing aid to oppressed plebeians was rendered effective by the right of veto (intercessio), by virtue of which any act of a magistrate could be arrested. The codification of the law in the Twelve Tables was a distinct advantage to the lower classes, because the evils which they had suffered were largely due to a harsh and abusive interpretation of legal institutions, the nature of which had been obscure (see ROMAN LAW). The abrogation, directly thereafter, of the prohibition of intermarriage between the classes resulted in their gradual intermingling.

3. The Senate and Magistrates: The kings had reduced the senate to the position of a mere advising body. But under the republican regime it recovered in fact the authority of which it was deprived in theory. The controlling power of the senate is the most significant feature of the republican government,

although it was recognized by no statute or other constitutional document. It was due in part to the diminution of the power of the magistrates, and in part to the manner in which the senators were chosen. The lessening of the authority of the magistrates was the result of the increase in their number, which led not only to the curtailment of the actual prerogative of each, but also to the contraction of their aggregate independent influence. The augmentation of the number of magistrates was made necessary by the territorial expansion of the state and the elaboration of administration. But it was partly the result of plebeian agitation. The events of 367 BC may serve as a suitable example to illustrate the action of these influences. For when the plebeians carried by storm the citadel of patrician exclusiveness in gaining admission to the consulship, the highest regular magistracy, the necessity for another magistrate with general competency afforded an opportunity for making a compensating concession to the patricians, and the praetorship was created, to which at first members of the old aristocracy were alone eligible. Under the fully developed constitution the regular magistracies were five in number, consulship, praetorship, aedileship, tribunate, and quaestorship, all of which were filled by annual elections.

Mention has been made of the manner of choosing the members of the senate as a factor in the development of the authority of the supreme council. At first the highest executive officers of the state exercised the right of selecting new members to maintain the senators at the normal number of three hundred. Later this function was transferred to the censors who were elected at intervals of five years. But custom and later statute ordained that the most distinguished citizens should be chosen, and in the Roman community the highest standard of distinction was service to the state, in other words, the holding of public magistracies. It followed, therefore, that the senate was in reality an assembly of all living ex-magistrates. The senate included, moreover, all the political wisdom and experience of the community, and so great was its prestige for these reasons, that, although the expression of its opinion (senatus consultum) was endowed by law with no compelling force, it inevitably guided the conduct of the consulting magistrate, who was practically its minister, rather than its president.

When the plebeians gained admission to the magistracies, the patriciate lost its political significance. But only the wealthier plebeian families were able to profit by this extension of privilege, inasmuch as a political career required freedom from gainful pursuits and also personal influence. These plebeian families readily coalesced with the patricians and formed a new aristocracy, which is called the nobilitas for the sake of distinction. It rested ultimately upon the foundation of wealth. The dignity conferred by the holding of public magistracies was its title to distinction. The senate was its organ. Rome was never a true democracy except in theory. During the whole period embraced between the final levelling of the old distinctions based upon blood (287 BC) and the beginning of the period of revolution (133 BC), the magistracies were occupied almost exclusively by the representatives of the comparatively limited number of families which constituted the aristocracy. These alone entered the senate through the doorway of the magistracies, and the data would almost justify us in asserting that the republican and senatorial government were substantially and chronologically identical.

The seeds of the political and social revolution were sown during the Second Punic War and the period which followed it. The prorogation of military authority established a dangerous precedent in violation of the spirit of the republic, so that Pub. Cornelius Scipio was really the forerunner of Marius, Julius Caesar, and Augustus. The stream of gold which found its way from the provinces to Rome was a bait to

attract the cupidity of the less scrupulous senators, and led to the growth of the worst kind of professionalism in politics. The middle class of small farmers decayed for various reasons; the allurement of service in the rich but effete countries of the Orient attracted many. The cheapness of slaves made independent farming unprofitable and led to the increase in large estates; the cultivation of grain was partly displaced by that of the vine and olive, which were less suited to the habits and ability of the older class of farmers.

The more immediate cause of the revolution was the inability of the senate as a whole to control the conduct of its more radical or violent members. For as political ambition became more ardent with the increase in the material prizes to be gained, aspiring leaders turned their attention to the people, and sought to attain the fulfillment o.f their purposes by popular legislation setting at nought the concurrence of the senate, which custom had consecrated as a requisite preliminary for popular action. The loss of initiative by the senate meant the subversion of senatorial government. The senate possessed in the veto power of the tribunes a weapon for coercing unruly magistrates, for one of the ten tribunes could always be induced to interpose his veto to prohibit the passage of popular legislation. But this weapon was broken when Tib. Gracchus declared in 133 BC that a tribune who opposed the wishes of the people was no longer their representative, and sustained this assertion.

4. Underlying Principles:

It would be foreign to the purpose of the present article to trace the vicissitudes of the civil strife of the last century of the republic. A few words will suffice to suggest the general principles which lay beneath the surface of political and social phenomena. Attention has been called to the ominous development of the influence of military commanders and the increasing emphasis of popular favor. These were the most important tendencies throughout this period, and the coalition of the two was fatal to the supremacy of the senatorial government. Marius after winning unparalleled military glory formed a political alliance with Glaucia and Saturninus, the leaders of the popular faction in the city in 100 BC. This was a turning-point in the course of the revolution. But the importance of the sword soon outweighed that of the populace in the combination which was thus constituted. In the civil wars of Marius and Sulla constitutional questions were decided for the first time by superiority of military strength exclusively. Repeated appeals to brute force dulled the perception for constitutional restraints and the rights of minorities. The senate had already displayed signs of partial paralysis at the time of the Gracchi. How rapidly its debility must have increased as the sword cut off its most stalwart members! Its power expired in the proscriptions, or organized murder of political opponents. The popular party was nominally triumphant, but in theory the Roman state was still an urban commonwealth with a single po1itical center. The franchise could be exercised only at Rome. It followed from this that the actual political assemblies were made up largely of the worthless element which was so numerous in the city, whose irrational instincts were guided and controlled by shrewd political leaders, particularly those who united in themselves military ability and the wiles of the demagogue. Sulla, Crassus, Julius Caesar, Antony, and lastly Octavian were in effect the ancient counterpart of the modern political "boss." When such men realized their ultimate power and inevitable rivalry, the ensuing struggle for supremacy and for the survival of the fittest formed the necessary process of elimination leading naturally to the establishment of the monarchy, which was in this case the rule of the last survivor. When Octavian

received the title Augustus and the proconsular power (27 BC), the transformation was accomplished.

LITERATURE.

The standard work on Roman political institutions is Mommsen and Marquardt, Handbuch der klassischen Altertumer. Abbott, Roman Political Institutions, Boston and London, 1901, offers a useful summary treatment of the subject.

II. Extension of Roman Sovereignty.

See ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, I.

LITERATURE.

Only the most important general works on Roman history can be mentioned: Ihne, Romische Geschichte (2nd edition), Leipzig, 1893-96, English translation, Longmans, London, 1871-82; Mommsen, History of Rome, English translation by Dickson, New York, 1874; Niebuhr, History of Rome, English translation by Hare and Thirlwall, Cambridge, 1831-32; Pais, Storia di Roma, Turin, 1898-99; Ferrero, Greatness and Decline of Rome, English translation by Zimmern, New York, 1909.

III. The Imperial Government.

1. Imperial Authority:

Augustus displayed considerable tact in blending his own mastery in the state with the old institutions of the republican constitution. His authority, legally, rested mainly upon the tribunician power, which he had probably received as early as 36 BC, but which was established on a better basis in 23 BC, and the proconsular prerogative (imperiurn proconsulare), conferred in 27 BC. By virtue of the first he was empowered to summon the senate or assemblies and could veto the action of almost any magistrate. The second title of authority conferred upon him the command of the military forces of the state and consequently the administration of the provinces where troops were stationed, besides a general supervision over the government of the other provinces. It follows that a distinction was made (27 BC) between the imperial provinces which were administered by the emperor’s representatives (legati Augusti pro praetore) and the senatorial provinces where the republican machinery of administration was retained. The governors of the latter were called generally proconsuls (see PROVINCE). Mention is made of two proconsuls in the New Testament, Gallio in Achaia (Ac 18:12) and Sergius Paulus in Cyprus (Ac 13:7). It is instructive to compare the lenient and common-sense attitude of these trained Roman aristocrats with that of the turbulent local mobs who dealt with Paul in Asia Minor, Judea, or Greece (Tucker, Life in the Roman World of Nero and Paul, New York, 1910, 95).

2. Three Classes of Citizens:

Roman citizens were still divided into three classes socially, senatorial, equestrian, and plebeian, and the whole system of government harmonized with this triple division. The senatorial class was composed of descendants of senators and those upon whom the emperors conferred the latus clavus, or privilege of wearing the tunic with broad purple border, the sign of membership in this order. The quaestorship was still the door of admission to the senate. The qualifications for membership in the senate were the possession of senatorial rank and property of the value of not less than 1,000,000 sesterces ($45,000; £9,000). Tiberius transferred the election of magistrates from the people to the senate, which was already practically a closed body. Under the empire senatus consulta received the force of law. Likewise the senate acquired judicial functions, sitting as a court of justice for trying important criminal cases and hearing appeals in civil cases from the senatorial provinces. The equestrian class was made up of those who possessed property of the value of 400,000 sesterces or more, and the privilege of wearing the narrow purple band on the tunic. With the knights the emperors filled many important financial and administrative positions in Italy and the provinces which were under their control.

IV. Roman Religion.

1. Deities:

(1) The Roman religion was originally more consistent than the Greek, because the deities as conceived by the unimaginative Latin genius were entirely without human character. They were the influences or forces which directed the visible phenomena of the physical world, whose favor was necessary to the material prosperity of mankind. It would be incongruous to assume the existence of a system of theological doctrines in the primitive period. Ethical considerations entered to only a limited extent into the attitude of the Romans toward their gods. Religion partook of the nature of a contract by which men pledged themselves to the scrupulous observance of certain sacrifices and other ceremonies, and in return deemed themselves entitled to expect the active support of the gods in bringing their projects to a fortunate conclusion. The Romans were naturally polytheists as a result of their conception of divinity. Since before the dawn of science there was no semblance of unity in the natural world, there could be no unity in heaven. There must be a controlling spirit over every important object or class of objects, every person, and every process of nature. The gods, therefore, were more numerous than mankind itself.

(2) At an early period the government became distinctly secular. The priests were the servants of the community for preserving the venerable aggregation of formulas and ceremonies, many of which lost at an early period such spirit as they once possessed. The magistrates were the true representatives of the community in its relationship with the deities both in seeking the divine will in the auspices and in performing the more important sacrifices.

(3) The Romans at first did not make statues of their gods. This was partly due to lack of skill, but mainly to the vagueness of their conceptions of the higher beings. Symbols sufficed to signify their existence, a spear, for instance, standing for Mars. The process of reducing the gods to human form was inaugurated when they came into contact with the Etruscans and Greeks. The Tarquins summoned Etruscan artisans and artists to Rome, who made from terra cotta cult statues and a pediment group for

the Capitoline temple.

The types of the Greek deities had already been definitely established when the Hellenic influence in molding Roman culture became predominant. When the form of the Greek gods became familiar to the Romans in works of sculpture, they gradually supplanted those Roman deities with which they were nominally identified as a result of a real or fancied resemblance.

See GREECE, RELIGION IN ANCIENT.

(4) The importation of new gods was a comparatively easy matter. Polytheism is by its nature tolerant because of its indefiniteness. The Romans could no more presume to have exhaustive knowledge of the gods than they could pretend to possess a comprehensive acquaintance with the universe. The number of their gods increased of necessity as human consciousness of natural phenomena expanded. Besides, it was customary to invite the gods of conquered cities to transfer their abode to Rome and favor the Romans in their undertakings. But the most productive source for religious expansion was the Sibylline Books. See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. V. This oracular work was brought to Rome from Cumae, a center of the cult of Apollo. It was consulted at times of crisis with a view to discover what special ceremonies would secure adequate divine aid. The forms of worship recommended by the Sibylline Books were exclusively Greek As early as the 5th century BC the cult of Apollo was introduced at Rome. Heracles and the Dioscuri found their way thither about the same time. Later Italian Diana was merged with Artemis, and the group of Ceres, Liber, and Libera were identified with foreign Demeter, Dionysus, and Persephone. Thus Roman religion became progressively Hellenized. By the close of the Second Punic War the greater gods of Greece had all found a home by the Tiber, and the myriad of petty local deities who found no counterpart in the celestial beings of Mt. Olympus fell into oblivion. Their memory was retained by the antiquarian lore of the priests alone.

See ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, III, 1.

2. Religious Decay:

Roman religion received with the engrafted branches of Greek religion the germs of rapid decay, for its Hellenization made Roman religion peculiarly susceptible to the attack of philosophy. The cultivated class in Greek society was already permeated with skepticism. The philosophers made the gods appear ridiculous. Greek philosophy gained a firm foothold in Rome in the 2nd century BC, and it became customary a little later to look upon Athens as a sort of university town where the sons of the aristocracy should be sent for the completion of their education in the schools of the philosophers. Thus at the termination of the republican era religious faith had departed from the upper classes largely, and during the turmoil of the civil wars even the external ceremonies were often abandoned and many temples fell into ruins. There had never been any intimate connection between formal religion and conduct, except when the faith of the gods was invoked to insure the fulfillment of sworn promises.

Augustus tried in every way to restore the old religion, rebuilding no fewer than 82 temples which lay in

ruins at Rome. A revival of religious faith did occur under the empire, although its spirit was largely alien to that which had been displayed in the performance of the official cult. The people remained superstitious, even when the cultivated classes adopted a skeptical philosophy. The formal religion of the state no longer appealed to them, since it offered nothing to the emotions or hopes. On the other hand the sacramental, mysterious character of oriental religions inevitably attracted them. This is the reason why the religions of Egypt and Syria spread over the empire and exercised an immeasurable influence in the moral life of the people. The partial success of Judaism and the ultimate triumph of Christianity may be ascribed in part to the same causes.

In concluding we should bear in mind that the state dictated no system of theology, that the empire in the beginning presented the spectacle of a sort of religious chaos where all national cults were guaranteed protection, that Roman polytheism was naturally tolerant, and that the only form of religion which the state could not endure was one which was equivalent to an attack upon the system of polytheism as a whole, since this would imperil the welfare of the community by depriving the deities of the offerings and other services in return for which their favor could be expected.

LITERATURE.

Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, III, 3, "Das Sacralwesen"; Wissowa, Religion u. Kultus der Romer, Munich, 1902; Boissier, La religion romaine, Paris, 1884.

V. Rome and the Jews.

1. Judea under Roman Procurators and Governors:

Judaea became a part of the province of Syria in 63 BC (Josephus, BJ, vii, 7), and Hyrcanus, brother of the last king, remained as high priest (archiereus kai ethnarches; Josephus, Ant, XIV, iv, 4) invested with judicial as well as sacerdotal functions. But Antony and Octavius gave Palestine (40 BC) as a kingdom to Herod, surnamed the Great, although his rule did not become effective until 3 years later. His sovereignty was upheld by a Roman legion stationed at Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant, XV, iii, 7), and he was obliged to pay tribute to the Roman government and provide auxiliaries for the Roman army (Appian, Bell. Civ., v.75). Herod built Caesarea in honor of Augustus (Josephus, Ant, XV, ix, 6), and the Roman procurators later made it the seat of government. At his death in 4 BC the kingdom was divided between his three surviving sons, the largest portion falling to Archelaus, who ruled Judea, Samaria and Idumaea with the title ethnarches (Josephus, Ant, XVII, xi, 4) until 6 AD, when he was deposed and his realm reduced to the position of a province. The administration by Roman procurators (see PROCURATOR), which was now established, was interrupted during the period 41-44 AD, when royal authority was exercised by Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, over the lands which had been embraced in the kingdom of his grandfather (Josephus, Ant, XIX, viii, 2), and, after 53 AD, Agrippa II ruled a considerable part of Palestine (Josephus, Ant, XX, vii, 1; viii, 4).

After the fall of Jerusalem and the termination of the great revolt in 70 AD, Palestine remained a

separate province. Henceforth a legion (legio X Fretensis) was added to the military forces stationed in the land, which was encamped at the ruins of Jerusalem. Consequently, imperial governors of praetorian rank (legati Augusti pro praetore) took the place of the former procurators (Josephus, BJ, VII, i, 2, 3; Dio Cassius lv.23).

Several treaties are recorded between the Romans and Jews as early as the time of the Maccabees (Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 6; XIII, ix, 2; viii, 5), and Jews are known to have been at Rome as early as 138 BC. They became very numerous in the capital after the return of Pompey who brought back many captives (see LIBERTINES). Cicero speaks of multitudes of Jews at Rome in 58 BC (Pro Flacco 28), and Caesar was very friendly toward them (Suetonius Caesar 84). Held in favor by Augustus, they recovered the privilege of collecting sums to send to the temple (Philo Legatio ad Caium 40). Agrippa offered 100 oxen in the temple when visiting Herod (Josephus, Ant, XVI, ii, 1), and Augustus established a daily offering of a bull and two lambs. Upon the whole the Roman government displayed noticeable consideration for the religious scruples of the Jews. They were exempted from military service and the duty of appearing in court on the Sabbath. Yet Tiberius repressed Jewish rites in Rome in 19 AD (Suetonius Tiberius 36) and Claudius expelled the Jews from the city in 49 AD (Suetonius Claudius 25); but in both instances repression was not of long duration.

2. Jewish Proselytism:

The Jews made themselves notorious in Rome in propagating their religion by means of proselytizing (Horace Satires i.4, 142; i.9, 69; Juvenal xiv.96; Tacitus Hist. v. 5), and the literature of the Augustan age contains several references to the observation of the Sabbath (Tibullus i.3; Ovid Ars amatoria i.67, 415; Remedium amoris 219). Proselytes from among the Gentiles were not always required to observe all the prescriptions of the Law. The proselytes of the Gate (sebomenoi), as they were called, renounced idolatry and serious moral abuses and abstained from the blood and meat of suffocated animals. Among such proselytes may be included the centurion of Capernaum (Lu 7:5), the centurion Cornelius (Ac 10:1), and the empress Poppea (Josephus, Ant, XX, viii, 11; Tacitus Ann. xvi.6).

On "proselytes of the Gate," GJV4, III, 177, very properly corrects the error in HJP. These "Gate" people were not proselytes at all; they refused to take the final step that carried them into Judaism—namely, circumcision (Ramsay, The Expositor, 1896, p. 200; Harnack, Expansion of Christianity, I, 11).

See DEVOUT; PROSELYTE.

Notwithstanding the diffusion of Judaism by means of proselytism, the Jews themselves lived for the most part in isolation in the poorest parts of the city or suburbs, across the Tiber, near the Circus Maximus, or outside the Porta Capena. Inscriptions show that there were seven communities, each with its synagogue and council of elders presided over by a gerusiarch. Five cemeteries have been discovered with many Greek, a few Latin, but no Hebrew inscriptions.

LITERATURE.

Ewald, The Hist of Israel, English translation by Smith, London, 1885; Renan, Hist of the People of Israel, English translation, Boston, 1896; Schurer, The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, English translation by MacPherson, New York.

VI. Rome and the Christians.

1. Introduction of Christianity:

The date of the introduction of Christianity into Rome cannot be determined. A Christian community existed at the time of the arrival of Paul (Ac 28:15), to which he had addressed his Epistle a few years before (58 AD). It is commonly thought that the statement regarding the expulsion of the Jews from Rome under Claudius on account of the commotion excited among them by the agitation of Chrestus (Suetonius Claudius 25: Iudaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantis Roma expulit), probably in 49 AD, is proof of the diffusion of Christian teaching in Rome, on the ground that Chrestus is a colloquial, or mistaken, form of Christus. It has been suggested that the Christian faith was brought to the capital of the empire by some of the Romans who were converted at the time of Pentecost (Ac 2:10,41). It would be out of place to discuss here the grounds for the traditional belief that Peter was twice in Rome, once before 50 AD and again subsequent to the arrival of Paul, and that together the two apostles established the church there. Our present concern is with the attitude of the government and society toward Christianity, when once established. It may suffice, therefore, to remind the reader that Paul was permitted to preach freely while nominally in custody (Php 1:13), and that as early as 64 AD the Christians were very numerous (Tacitus Ann. xv.44: multitudo ingens).

2. Tolerance and Proscription:

At first the Christians were not distinguished from the Jews, but shared in the toleration, or even protection, which was usually conceded to Judaism as the national religion of one of the peoples embraced within the empire. Christianity was not legally proscribed until after its distinction from Judaism was clearly perceived. Two questions demand our attention: (1) When was Christianity recognized as distinct from Judaism? (2) When was the profession of Christianity declared a crime? These problems are of fundamental importance in the history of the church under the Roman empire.

(1) If we may accept the passage in Suetonius cited above (Claudius 25) as testimony on the vicissitudes of Christianity, we infer that at that time the Christians were confused with the Jews. The account of Pomponia Graecina, who was committed to the jurisdiction of her husband (Tacitus Ann. xiii.32) for adherence to a foreign belief (superstitionis externae rea), is frequently cited as proof that as early as 57 AD Christianity had secured a convert in the aristocracy. The characterization of the evidence in this case by the contemporary authority from whom Tacitus has gleaned this incident would apply appropriately to the adherence to Judaism or several oriental religions from the point of view of Romans of that time; for Pomponia had lived in a very austere manner since 44 AD. Since there is some other evidence that Pomponia was a Christian, the indefinite account of the accusation against her as mentioned by Tacitus is partial proof that Christianity had not as yet been commonly recognized as a

distinct religion (Marucchi, Elements d'archeologie chretienne I, 13). At the time of the great conflagration in 64 AD the populace knew of the Christians, and Nero charged them collectively with a plot to destroy the city (Tacitus Ann. xv.44). The recognition of the distinctive character of Christianity had already taken place at this time. This was probably due in large measure to the circumstances of Paul's sojourn and trial in Rome and to the unprecedented number of converts made at that time. The empress Poppea, who was probably an adherent of Judaism (Josephus, Ant, XX, viii), may have enlightened the imperial court regarding the heresy of the Christians and their separation from the parent stock.

(2) In attempting to determine approximately the time at which Christianity was placed under the official ban of the imperial government, it will be convenient to adopt as starting-points certain incontestable dates between which the act of prosecution must have been issued. It is clear that at the time of the great conflagration (64 AD), the profession of Christianity was not a ground for criminal action. Paul had just been set at liberty by decree of the imperial court (compare 2Ti 4:17). Moreover, the charge against the Christians was a plot to burn the city, not adherence to a proscribed religion, and they were condemned, as it appears, for an attitude of hostility toward the human race (Tacitus Ann. xv. 44). While governor of Bithynia (circa 112 AD), Pliny the younger addressed Trajan in a celebrated letter (x.96) asking advice to guide his conduct in the trial of many persons who were accused as Christians, and inquiring particularly whether Christianity in itself was culpable, or only the faults which usually accompanied adherence to the new faith. The reply of the emperor makes quite plain the fundamental guilt at that time of adherence to Christianity, and it supposes a law already existing against it (x.97). It follows, therefore, that the law against Christianity which was the legal basis for persecution must have been issued between the conflagration in 64 AD and Pliny's administration of Bithynia.

We cannot define the time of this important act of legislation more closely with absolute certainty, although evidence is not wanting for the support of theories of more or less apparent probability. Tradition ascribes a general persecution to the reign of Domitian, which would imply that Christianity was already a forbidden religion at that time. Allusions in Revelation (as 6:9), the references to recent calamities in Rome by Clement in his letter to the Corinthians (1 Ad Cor.), the condemnation of Acilius Glabrio (Dio Cassius lxvii.13), a man of consular rank, together with the emperor's cousin Flavius Clemens (Dio Cassius, xiii) and Flavia Domitilla and many others on the charge of atheism and Jewish customs (95 AD), are cited as evidence for this persecution. The fact that a number of persons in Bithynia abandoned Christianity 20 years before the judicial investigation of Pliny (Pliny x. 96) is of some importance as corroborative evidence.

But there are grounds worthy of consideration for carrying the point of departure back of Domitian. The letter of Peter from Babylon (Rome ?) to the Christians in Asia Minor implies an impending persecution (1Pe 4:12-16). This was probably in the closing years of the reign of Nero. Allard cleverly observes (Histoire des persecutions, 61) that the mention of the Neronian persecution of the Christians apart from the description of the great fire in the work of Suetonius (Ner. 16), amid a number of acts of legislation, is evidence of a general enactment, which must have been adopted at the time of, or soon after, the proceedings which were instituted on the basis of the charge of arson. Upon the whole theory that the policy of the imperial government was definitely established under Nero carries with it considerable

probability (compare Sulpitius Severus, Chron., ii.41).

3. Persecution:

Although the original enactment has been lost the correspondence of Pliny and Trajan enables us to formulate the imperial policy in dealing with the Christians during the 2nd century. Adherence to Christianity was in itself culpable. But proceedings were not to be undertaken by magistrates on their own initiative; they were to proceed only from charges brought by voluntary accusers legally responsible for establishing the proof of their assertions. Informal and anonymous information must be rejected. Penitence shown in abjuring Christianity absolved the accused from the legal penalty of former guilt. The act of adoring the gods and the living emperor before their statues was sufficient proof of non-adherence to Christianity or of repentance.

The attitude of the imperial authorities in the 3rd century was less coherent. The problem became more complicated as Christianity grew. Persecution was directed more especially against the church as an organization, since it was believed to exert a dangerous power. About 202 AD, Septimius Severus issued a decree forbidding specifically conversion to Judaism or Christianity (Spartianus, Severus, 17), in which he departed from the method of procedure prescribed by Trajan (conquirendi non sunt), and commissioned the magistrates to proceed directly against suspected converts. At this time the Christians organized funerary associations for the possession of their cemeteries, substituting corporative for individual ownership, and it would appear that under Alexander Severus they openly held places of worship in Rome (Lampridius, Alexander Severus, 22, 49). The emperor Philip (244-49) is thought to have been a Christian at heart (Eusebius, HE, VI, 34). A period of comparative calm was interrupted by the persecution under Decius (250-51 AD), when the act of sacrifice was required as proof of non-adherence to Christianity. Several certificates testifying to the due performance of this rite have been preserved.

Under Valerian (257 AD) the Christian organizations were declared illegal and the cemeteries were sequestrated. But an edict in 260 AD restored this property (Eusebius, VII, 13). A short persecution under Aurelian (274 AD) broke the long period of calm which extended to the first edict of persecution of Diocletian (February 24, 303). The Christians seem to have gained a sort of prescriptive claim to exist, for Diocletian did not at first consider them guilty of a capital crime. He sought to crush their organization by ordering the cessation of assemblies, the destruction of churches and sacred books, and abjuration under pain of political and social degradation. (Lactantius, De Morte Persecutorum, x.11, 12, 13; Eusebius, VIII, 2; IX, 10). Later he ordered the arrest of all the clergy, who were to be put to death unless they renounced the faith (Eusebius, VIII, 6). Finally the requirement of an act of conformity in sacrificing to the gods was made general. This final persecution, continuing in an irregular way with varying degrees of severity, terminated with the defeat of Maxentius by Constantine (October 29, 312). The Edict of Milan issued by Constantine and Licinius the following year established toleration, the restoration of ecclesiastical property and the peace of the church.

See ROMAN EMPIRE AND CHRISTIANITY, III, IV, V.

LITERATURE.

Allard, Histoire des persecutions, Paris, 1903; Le christianisme et l’empire romain, Paris, 1903; Duchesne, Histoire ancienne de l‘eglise, Paris, 1907 (English translation); Marucchi, Elements d’archeologie chretienne, Paris, 1899-1902; Hardy, Christianity and the Roman Government, London, 1894; Renan, L’eglise chretienne, Paris, 1879; Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, London, 1893.

George H. Allen

ROOF

roof.

See HOUSE.

ROOF-CHAMBER

See HOUSE.

ROOM

room.

See HOUSE.

ROOT

root (shoresh; rhiza): Frequently mentioned in the Old Testament and New Testament, but almost always in a figurative sense, e.g. "root of the righteous" (Pr 12:3,12); "root that beareth gall" (De 29:18); "Their root shall be as rottenness" (Isa 5:24); "root of bitterness" (Heb 12:15). Also of peoples: "they whose root is in Amalek" (Jud 5:14); of Assyria (Eze 31:7); "Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up" (Ho 9:16); "Judah shall again take root downward" (2Ki 19:30; compare Isa 27:6; 37:31); the root of Jesse (Isa 11:10; Ro 15:12); root of David (Re 5:5; 22:16).

ROOT OF DAVID

See DAVID, ROOT OF.

ROOT OF JESSE

(shoresh yishay (Isa 11:10); rhiza tou Iessai (Ro 15:12)): The Hebrew and Greek words are practically the same in meaning. "Root" means descendant, branch of the family or stock. The Messianic king was to be of the family of Jesse the father of David. In Ro 15:12 Paul quotes the Septuagint of Isa 11:10. Jesus is a branch or descendant of the family of Jesse, as well as of David.

See also DAVID, ROOT OF.

ROPE

rop: Used in the Old Testament for chebhel, "that which binds" (2Sa 17:13, etc.), and for ‘abhoth, "that which is woven" (Jud 15:13, etc.). In neither word is any specified thickness or strength connoted, and chebhel is translated equally well by "line" (2Sa 8:2, etc.) or "cord" (Jos 2:15, etc.), and ‘abhoth by "cord" (Ps 118:27, etc.), as best suits the context. Similarly in the New Testament the word schoinion, literally, "made of rushes" can mean the rope by which a boat is fastened (Ac 27:32) or small cords suitable for a whip (Joh 2:15). The usual material for ropes was certainly flax (hemp), but the Egyptians, and so possibly the Hebrews, at times made ropes of leathern thongs.

See CORD; LINE; SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

Burton Scott Easton

ROSE

roz: (1) (chabhatstseleth; anthos, "a flower" (So 2:1) krinon, "a lily" (Isa 35:1)): By general consent English Versions of the Bible is wrong: in So 2:1 margin reads "Hebrew habazzeleth, the autumn crocus" and in Isa 35:1, margin reads "or autumn crocus." This is the Colchicum autumnale (Natural Order, Liliaceae). A Targum on So 2:1 explains the Hebrew word as "narcissus" , a very common plant in the plains and mountains of Palestine and a great favorite with the natives. Two species, N. tazetta and N. serolinus (Natural Order, Amaryllideae), occur, the latter being the finer; they are autumn plants. All authorities agree that the so-called "rose" was some kind of bulbed plant. (2) (rhodon, "the rose," mentioned in Ecclesiasticus 24:14; 39:13; 50:8; The Wisdom of Solomon 2:8; 2 Esdras 2:19): There is no reason why the rose, of which several varieties are common in Palestine, should not be meant. Tristram favors the rhododendron. The expression, "rose plants in Jericho," in Ecclesiasticus 24:14 has nothing whatever to do with what is now sold there as a "rose of Jericho," a dwarf annual plant, Anastatica hierochuntina (Natural Order, Cruciferae), which dries up and can be made to reexpand by placing the root in water.

E. W. G. Masterman

ROSH (1)

rosh, rosh (ro’sh): A son or grandson of Benjamin (Ge 46:21).

ROSH (2)

(ro’sh; Rhos, variant (Q margin) kephales; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) capiris):

1. Rosh and Its Renderings:

This name occurs in the prophecies against Gog in Eze 38:2,3 and 39:1, where the King James Version has "Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal." This translation is due to ro’sh being the common Hebrew word for "head" or "chief" (compare the Greek variant and the Vulgate), and is regarded as incorrect, that of the Revised Version (British and American), "Gog, of the land of Magog, the prince of Rosh, Meshech and Tubal," being preferred.

2. Identification with Russia:

The identification of Rosh is not without its difficulties. Gesenius regarded it as indicating the Russians, who are mentioned in Byzantine writers of the 10th century under the name of Rhos. He adds that they are also noticed by Ibn Fosslan (same period), under the name of Rus, as a people dwelling on the river Rha (Volga). Apart from the improbability that the dominion of Gog extended to this district, it would be needful to know at what date the Rus of the Volga arrived there.

3. Probably the Assyrian Rasu:

Notwithstanding objections on account of its eastern position, in all probability Fried. Delitzsch’s identification of Rosh with the mat Rasi, "land of Rash" of the Assyrian inscriptions, is the best. Sargon of Assyria (circa 710 BC) conquered the countries "from the land of Rasu on the border of Elam as far as the river of Egypt," and this country is further described in his Khorsabad Inscription, 18, as "the land of Rasu, of the boundary of Elam, which is beside the Tigris." Assyria having disappeared from among the nations when Ezekiel wrote his prophecies, Babylonia was probably the only power with which "Gog of the land of Magog" would have had to reckon, but it may well be doubted whether the Babylonian king would have allowed him to exercise power in the district of Rasu, except as a very faithful vassal. It may here be noted that the Hebrew spelling of Rosh presupposes an earlier pronunciation as Rash, a form agreeing closely with that used by the Assyrians. See Fried. Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 325.

T. G. Pinches

ROT; ROTTENNESS

rot, rot’-’-n-nes (verb raqebh, noun raqabh (riqqabhon, Job 41:27), with maq, "decay" (Isa 5:24), and

‘abhash, "shrivel" (so Joe 1:17 the Revised Version margin)): "Rottenness of the bones" (Pr 12:4; 14:30; Hab 3:16) is ulceration (caries) of the bones, used as an example of an intensely painful disease. the King James Version, in addition, has "rot" in Nu 5:21,22,27, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "fall away" (naphal), but a euphemistic paraphrase is in point (see the comms.). In Jer 38:11,12 the King James Version has "old rotten rags" for melach, "rag" (the Revised Version (British and American) "wornout garments," a translation that specializes too far).

ROTE

rot: the Revised Version margin gives "learned by rote" in Isa 29:13 for the King James Version "taught," which indicates that the service of Yahweh was merely formal.

ROWER; ROWING

ro’-er, ro’-ing.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 1.

ROYAL

roi’-al: Either belonging to a king (kingdom) or having kingly power, dignity, authority, etc. In Hebrew, the word is expressed by using different nouns in the gen. case (the "construct state"). They are:

(1) melekh, "king": "Asher .... shall yield royal dainties," literally, choice morsels of the king, meaning fit for a king (Ge 49:20); "besides that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty," literally, which he gave her according to the hand (the wealth) of King Solomon (1Ki 10:13; compare the Revised Version margin); "a royal statute," literally, statute of a malka’, which is the emphatic Aramaic term for melekh, "king" (Da 6:7);

(2) mamlakhah, "the power and dignity of a king," "Gibeon .... one of the royal cities," i.e. a capital city with a king of her own (Jos 10:2; compare 1Sa 27:5); "all the seed royal," literally, the seed of the kingdom (2Ki 11:1; compare 2Ch 22:10);

(3) malkhuth, "kinghood," "kingdom": "royal majesty," literally, majesty of kinghood (1Ch 29:25); quite frequently in the Book of Esther; royal wine (1:7); crown (1:11; compare 2:17; 6:8); commandment (1:19); "her royal estate," literally, her kinghood (1:19); house royal (2:16; compare 5:1); royal apparel (5:1; compare 6:8,15); throne (5:1);

(4) melukhah, "kingdom," "kingly power and dignity": "royal city," literally, the city of the kingdom, meaning here that part of the city (Rabbah) in which the royal palace was situated (2Sa 12:26); "royal diadem," literally, turban of kinghood (Isa 62:3);

(5) in Jer 43:10 we find the word shaphrir; its meaning is uncertain: "royal pavilion" (the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version), "glittering" (Revised Version, margin), "scepter," "a carpet covering a throne."

The New Testament uses the word for basilikos, "belonging to king": "royal apparel" (Ac 12:21); "the royal law," something like "the golden rule," being foremost because including all others (Jas 2:8), and for basileios (being vested with kingly power and honor), "royal priesthood," the Hebrew rendering would be mamlekheth kohanim, "a kingdom of priests," i.e. a kingdom whose citizens are priests, emphasizing the two facts that the true Christians have free access to the grace of God and that they enjoy the liberties and privileges of His kingdom (1Pe 2:9).

William Baur

ROYAL CITY

See ROYAL, (2), (4).

RUBY

roo’-bi.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

RUDDER; RUDDER-BANDS

rud’-er.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2, (3).

RUDDY

rud’-i (’adhmoni (1Sa 16:12; 17:42; Ge 25:25 the Revised Version margin), ‘adhom (So 5:10); verbs ‘adham (La 4:7), and eruthriao, "to blush" (Ad Es 15:5)): "Ruddy" is the form taken by the adjective "red" when used as a term of praise of the human skin, and this is its use in the Bible (the Hebrew and Greek words are all usual words for "red" or "to be red"). The dark-skinned Hebrews found great beauty in a clear complexion.

RUDE

rood: Not "impolite" in English Versions of the Bible (except perhaps 2 Macc 12:14), but "untrained,"

"ignorant"; compare the modern phrase, "a rude drawing." So Sirach 8:4 (apaideutos) and 2Co 11:6 (idiotes, ‘though I lack technical training in rhetoric’); compare the King James Version and the Revised Version margin Sirach 21:24.

RUDIMENTS

roo’-di-ments (stoicheia, plural of stoicheion (Ga 4:3,9; Col 2:8,20; Heb 5:12; 2Pe 3:10,12)): This word occurs 7 t in the New Testament, and the King James Version translates it in three different ways. In the two passages in Galatians, and in the two in 2 Peter, it is rendered "elements." In the two passages in Colossians, it is translated "rudiments." In He it is rendered "first principles."

1. Etymological Meaning:

The etymological meaning of the word is, that which belongs to a row or rank, hence any first thing, an element, first principle. It denotes, specially

(1) the letters of the alphabet, the spoken sounds, as the elements of speech;

(2) the material elements of the universe, the physical atoms of which the world is composed;

(3) the heavenly bodies;

(4) the elements, rudiments, fundamental principles of any art, science or discipline; compare the phrase, "the a, b, c."

2. Use of Term in the New Testament:

(1) The New Testament use of the word, where it always occurs in the plural, is as follows: In 2Pe 3:10,12, "The elements shall be dissolved with fervent heat," that is, the physical elements of the world and of the heavens are to be consumed, or subjected to change, by means of fire. In Heb 5:12, the King James Version "Ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God." This means that the Hebrew Christians had not made the advance expected, in grace and in the knowledge of God, but were in need of instruction in the elementary truths of the Christian faith.

(2) The Pauline use of the term is in Galatians and Colossians; see references as above. In Ga 4:3,9 the King James Version Paul writes, "When we were children, (we) were in bondage under the elements of the world"; "How turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?" The apostle here means the ceremonial precepts of the worship of the Jews. These requirements involved much and protracted difficulty in their observance; they were "a yoke .... which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (Ac 15:10). Yet the Galatian converts were tuning back again to these legal ordinances, and desired to be in bondage to them. These elements were "of the world," they had reference to material and not to spiritual things, they were formal and sensuous. They

were "weak," for they had no power to rescue man from condemnation, and they could not save him from sin. They were "beggarly," for they brought no endowment of the heavenly riches. By these epithets Paul signifies that rites, ordinances, sacrifices, observance of days and seasons belonged to the elementary stages of the Jewish religion, which had now attained its end and purpose in the coming of Christ and His work. These things were necessary at the time they were divinely instituted, but the time had come when they were no longer required. They contained and conveyed an elementary knowledge, and were intended, from the first, to lead to an advance in the moral and spiritual life, which is now revealed in Christ.

It has been thought by some that what is meant by "elements" or "rudiments" in Galatians and Colossians is the physical elements, presided over by angels, and that this is in some way connected with the worship of angels, to which Paul refers in Col 2:18. The Jews believed that there were, angels of fire and of the wind, and of the other physical elements. The apostle therefore wished to show the foolishness of the worship of angels and of the heavenly bodies which they were supposed to control.

This latter meaning of the term is a possible, but not a probable one. The interpretation, already first given, which understands "elements" to mean the ordinances of Jewish legalism, is most in harmony with the gospel and with the teaching of Paul. "This is probably the correct interpretation, both as simpler in itself and as suiting the context better. Paul seems to be dwelling still on the rudimentary character of the law, as fitted for an earlier stage in the world’s history" (Lightfoot, Commentary on Galatians, 167).

In Col 2:8 the King James Version Paul writes, "Beware lest any man spoil you .... after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ"; and in Col 2:20, the King James Version "Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why .... are ye subject to ordinances?" The meaning of the term here is the elements of religious training, the ceremonial precepts of the Jewish Law. In Colossians and Galatians the meaning is that the systems of the false teachers, both in Colosse and in Galatia, laid stress on Jewish ritual, ceremonial law and ascetic observances—things of this world, belonging to the visible sphere, things elementary, and intended, so far as the Jewish Law is concerned, simply as a preparation for the coming of Christ. Such were the rudiments of the world, so far as their source was Jewish. On their heathen side they were still more decidedly anti-Christian. Both of these tendencies, Jewish and heathen, were "not according to Christ." For Christ Himself who atoned for sin, and who now lives and reigns, delivers believers from all such methods, as well as from the need of them.

John Rutherfurd

RUE

roo (peganon): One of the plants mentioned in Lu 11:42 as subject to tithe: in the parallel passage, Mt 23:23, anise and cummin are mentioned. Ruta graveolens (Natural Order, Rutaceae) is the official rue, and a very similar species, R. chalepensis, is indigenous. Rue is a small shrub growing 2 to 4 ft. high with a heavy odor, disagreeable to Westerners, but a favorite with Orientals. A sprig of rue is often fixed

on a child’s cap or clothes as a kind of charm.

RUFUS

roo’-fus (Rhouphos): The name is mentioned twice:

(1) Simon of Cyrene, who was compelled to bear the cross of Jesus, is "the father of Alexander and Rufus" (Mr 15:21);

(2) Paul sends greetings to Roman Christians, "Rufus the chosen in the Lord, and his mother and mine" (Ro 16:13).

Rufus was well known among those for whom Mark primarily wrote his Gospel, and according to tradition this was the Christian community at Rome. There seems no reason to doubt, therefore, that the Rufus of Mark and the Rufus of Paul are the same person. The name, meaning "red," "reddish," was, however, one of the commonest of slave names; the identification of these two is therefore merely a conjecture. The Rufus whom Paul greets is "the chosen in the Lord," i.e. "that choice Christian" (Denhey). Since all Christians are "chosen," this title must express some distinction. The mother of Rufus had played the mother’s part to Paul on some occasion of which we are ignorant, hence the phrase "his mother and mine" (compare Mr 10:30).

S. F. Hunter

RUG

rug: Alternative rendering of a word (semikhah) in Jud 4:18 the Revised Version (British and American), "mantle" the King James Version. The translation is doubtful; Oxford Hebrew Lexicon; see Brown, Driver, and Briggs gives "rug or thick coverlet (?)."

RUHAMAH

roo-ha’-ma, roo-ha’-ma: See LO-RUHAMAH, the symbolical name of Hosea’s daughter (Ho 1:6,8).

RUIN

roo’-in (haricah, etc.; rhegma): "Ruin," the translation of haricah (Am 9:11; compare Ac 15:16, where the Revised Version (British and American) Greek text, ta katestrammena), and of a number of other Hebrew words: in Lu 6:49 rhegma, "breakage," is used both in a literal sense (Isa 23:13; 25:2, of fallen buildings; Eze 27:27; 31:13, of a state or people; Lu 6:49, of a house, etc.) and with a moral significance (Pr 26:28). the Revised Version margin correctly renders mikhshol in Eze 18:30 "stumblingblock" (the King James Version "ruin"), and the Revised Version (British and American) in Eze 21:15

"stumblings" (the King James Version "ruins"). The Revised Version (British and American) has "ruins" for the King James Version "desolations" in Ezr 9:9, margin "waste places"; Ps 74:3; "in their ruins" for "with their mattocks" (2Ch 34:6, margin "‘ with their axes.’ The Hebrew is obscure"); "midst of the ruin" for "desolation" (Job 30:14); "their ruin" for "their wickedness" (Pr 21:12). "Ruinous" is the translation of mappalah (Isa 17:1) and of natsah (2Ki 19:25; Isa 37:26).

W. L. Walker

RULER

rool’-er:

1. In the Old Testament:

(1) moshel, "ruler," "prince," "master" (tyrant), applied to Joseph in Egypt (Ge 45:8; compare Ps 105:21); to the Philistines (Jud 15:11); to David’s descendants, the future kings of Israel (2Ch 7:18; compare Jer 33:26); to Pharaoh (Ps 105:20); to a wicked prince, a tyrant (Pr 28:15; compare Isa 14:5; 49:7); to theocratic king, the Messiah (Mic 5:2); it is often used in general (Pr 6:7; 23:1; 29:12; Ec 10:4; Isa 16:1, etc.).

(2) naghidh, "leader," "noble" (nobles), "prince." In a number of instances the Revised Version (British and American) renders it "prince," where the King James Version has ruler (1Sa 25:30; 2Sa 6:21; 1Ki 1:35, etc.). It is used of Azrikam having charge of the palace of King Ahaz (2Ch 28:7, "governor" of the house, the King James Version); of Azariah (Seraiah, Ne 11:11), who is called the "ruler of the house of God" (1Ch 9:11; compare 2Ch 31:13); he was the leader of a division or group of priests. In 2Ch 35:8 the names of three others are given (Hilkiah, Zechariah and Jehiel).

(3) nasi, "prince" (so Nu 13:2, the King James Version "ruler"); generally speaking, the nasi’ is one of the public authorities (Ex 22:28); the rulers of the congregation (Ex 16:22; compare 34:31); "The rulers brought the onyx stones" (Ex 35:27), as it was to be expected from men of their social standing and financial ability: "when a ruler (the head of a tribe or tribal division) sinneth" (Le 4:22).

(4) caghan, the representative of a king or a prince; a vice-regent; a governor; then, in the times of Ezra and Nehemiah, a leader or principal of the people of Jerusalem under the general supervision of these two men. The English Versions of the Bible renders it "ruler" (Eze 23:12,23), "deputy" (Jer 51:23,28,57), and, in most cases, "ruler" with "deputy" in margin (Ezr 9:2; Ne 2:16; 4:14,19; 5:7,17; 7:5; 12:40; 13:11; Isa 41:25; Eze 23:6) always used in plural

(5) qatsin, "a judge" or "magistrate" (Isa 1:10; 3:6,7; 22:3; Mic 3:1,9); "a military chief" (Jos 10:24).

(6) rodheh, one having dominion: "There is little Benjamin their ruler" (Ps 68:27); the meaning is obscure; still we may point to the facts that Saul, the first one to conquer the heathen (1Sa 14:47 f), came

of this the smallest of all the tribes, and that within its boundaries the temple of Yahweh was erected.

(7) rozen, a "dignitary," a "prince." "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against Yahweh" (Ps 2:2); in the New Testament the word is rendered archontes (Ac 4:26).

(8) sar, "chief," "head"; prince, king; a nobleman having judicial or other power; a royal officer. The Revised Version (British and American) renders it frequently "prince": "rulers over my cattle" ("head-shepherds," Ge 47:6); "rulers of thousands, rulers of hundreds," etc. (Ex 18:21); they had to be men of good character because they were endowed with judicial power (Ex 18:22); in De 1:15 the rendering of English Versions of the Bible is captains," etc.; they were military leaders. "Zebul the ruler of the city" (of Shechem, Jud 9:30), meaning "governor" (compare 1Ki 22:26; 2Ki 23:8); "rulers (or captains; compare 1Ki 16:9) of his (Solomon's) chariots" (1Ki 9:22); the rulers of Jezreel (2Ki 10:1) were, presumably, the ruler of the palace of the king and the ruler of the city of Samaria (compare 2Ki 10:5). It is difficult to explain why they should be called the rulers of Jezreel; both Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) omit the word; "the rulers of the substance which was king David's" (1Ch 27:31) overseers of the royal domain; "The rulers were behind all the house of Judah" (Ne 4:16), the officers were ready to assume active command in case of an attack.

(9), (10) shilTon, "a commander," "an officer": "the rulers of the provinces" (Da 3:2 f); shalliT, "a person in power," "a potentate" (Da 2:10); there seems to be little doubt that the Aramaic term is used as an adjective (compare the Revised Version margin); in Da 5:7 occurs the verb shelaT, "to have dominion," "he shall rule as the third in rank" (compare 5:16,29).

(11) maghen, "shield": "Her rulers (shields) dearly love shame" (Ho 4:18). Perhaps we ought to read (with Septuagint) migge'onam, "their glory," and to translate it "they love shame more than their glory"; they would rather have a good (!) time than a good name.

2. In the Apocrypha:

(1) archon, used of the "rulers" of the Spartans (1 Macc 14:20) and, in a general sense, of the priest Mattathias (1 Macc 2:17). the King James Version has the word also in a general sense in Sirach 41:18 (the Revised Version (British and American) "mighty man").

(2) hegoumenos, "one leading the way." A quite general term, Sirach 10:2 (ruler of a city); 17:17 (of Gentile nations); 46:18 (of the Tyrians). Also 2:17 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "he that ruleth"), and Sirach 32:1 the Revised Version (British and American) ("ruler of a feast," the King James Version "master").

(3) hoi megistanes, a rare word found only in the plural, for "rulers of the congregation" (Sirach 33:18). The same word in Mr 6:21 is translated "lords."

(4) 2 Macc 4:27 the King James Version for eparchos (the Revised Version (British and American)

"governor").

(5) The King James Version inserts the word without Greek equivalent in 1 Macc 6:14; 11:57; 2 Macc 13:2.

3. In the New Testament:

(1) archon, "a person in authority," "a magistrate" "a judge," "a prince"; a councilor, a member of the supreme council of the Jews; a man of influence. "There came a ruler" (Mt 9:18), meaning a ruler of the synagogue (compare Mr 5:22; Lu 8:41); see (2) below; "one of the rulers of the Pharisees" (Lu 14:1), perhaps a member of the Jewish council belonging, at the same time, to the Pharisees, or, more probably, one of the leading Pharisees; "the chief priests and the rulers" (Lu 23:13,15; 24:20; compare Joh 3:1; 7:26,48; 12:42; Ac 3:17; 4:5,8; 13:27; 14:5); the rulers were, with the chief priests and the scribes, members of the Sanhedrin, either of two councils of the Jews (the Great and the Lesser); they were lay-members (elders); "before the rulers" (Ac 16:19), the police magistrates (praetores, "praetors") of the city of Philippi; "Thou shalt not speak evil of a ruler of thy people" (Ac 23:5; compare Ex 22:28, nasi'; see 1, (3) above), a magistrate, a person in authority (compare Ac 7:27,35; Ro 13:3, the public authorities); "the rulers of this world" (1Co 2:6,8), persons being mentally superior to their fellow-men, and so having great influence in shaping their opinions and directing their actions.

(2) archisundgogos, "ruler of the synagogue." He was the presiding officer of a board of elders, who had charge of the synagogue. Sometimes they, also, were given the same name (compare "one of the rulers of the synagogue," Mr 5:22,35; Lu 8:41,49; in Mt 9:18 Jairus is simply called archon); the ruler mentioned in Lu 13:14 was, of course, the president of the board (compare Ac 18:17, Sosthenes), while in Ac 13:15 the phrase "rulers of the synagogue" simply signifies the board. It was a deliberative body, but at the same time responsible for the maintenance of good order in the synagogue and the orthodoxy of its members; having, therefore, disciplinary power, they were authorized to reprimand, and even to excommunicate, the guilty ones (compare Joh 9:22; 12:42; 16:2).

(3) architriklinos, the ruler ("steward," the Revised Version margin) of the feast (Joh 2:8,9). See separate article.

(4) kosmokrator, a "world-ruler" (Eph 6:12). The angels of the devil (Mt 25:41; 12:45) or Satan, the prince of this world (Joh 12:31), participate in his power; they are his tools, their sphere of action being "this darkness," i.e. the morally corrupt state of our present existence.

(5) politarches; the prefect of a city (Ac 17:6,8). Luke being the only one of the Biblical authors to hand down to us this word, it is a noteworthy fact that, in relatively modern times, a Greek inscription Was discovered containing this very word and, moreover, having reference to the city of Thessalonica (AJT, 1898, II, 598-643). Here it was where Paul and Silas preached the gospel so successfully that the Jews, "being moved with jealousy," caused Jason and certain brethren to be dragged before the rulers of the city (epi tous politarchas). These magistrates suffered themselves to be made the tools of the

unscrupulous Jews by demanding and getting security from Jason and the rest.

William Baur

RULER OF THE FEAST

(architriklinos; the King James Version governor): The word occurs in the New Testament in the account of the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee (Joh 2:8,9). According to Ecclesiasticus (32:1) it was customary to appoint a "master of the ceremonies" from among the invited guests. It was his duty to determine the places of the guests, to see that the ordinary rules of etiquette were observed, etc., and generally to supervise the arrangements. The Revised Version margin "steward" is possible if the "governor of the feast" meant the "head waiter" (Merx renders "head servant of the feast"), and not one of the guests appointed for the purpose. But the context is in favor of the view that the person in question was one of the prominent guests—an intimate friend or relative of the host.

See RULER, 2, (2).

T. Lewis

RULER OF THE SYNAGOGUE

See RULER, 3, (1), (2).

RULERS OF THE CITY

See RULER, 1, (8), 2, (2), 3, (5).

RUMAH

roo’-ma (rumah; Codex Vaticanus Rhouma; Codex Alexandrinus Rhuma): To this place belonged Pedaiah whose daughter Zebudah (the Revised Version (British and American) "Zebidah") entered the harem of Josiah, king of Judah, and became the mother of Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:36). Josephus (Ant., X, v, 2) calls the place Abouma, but this is an obvious clerical error for Arouma. This suggests a possible identification with Arumah (Jud 9:41), which lay not far from Shechem. Another possible identification is with the Rumah mentioned by Josephus (BJ, III, vii, 21) in Galilee (compare Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 203), which may be identical with the modern Khirbet Rumeh, about 3 miles North of Seffuriyeh. Some, however, would identify Rumah with Dumah of Jos 15:52, where the substitution of "r" for "d" is supported by the Septuagint (Rheuma), possibly represented by the modern Domeh, about 13 miles Southeast of Beit Jibrin. This of course was in the territory of Judah, and no question of jus connubium is involved, such as might arise in the case of a Galilean site.

W. Ewing

RUMP

rump: the King James Version uses this word as translation of ‘alyah (Ex 29:22; Le 3:9; 7:3; 8:25; 9:19), where the Revised Version (British and American) correctly renders "fat tail." Reference is here had to the broad tail of the Syrian sheep, which occasionally weighs as much as 20 lbs., and is considered one of the daintiest portions of mutton. It was one of those portions of the peace and trespass offering which were not eaten by the priest or the sacrificer, but which with other choice portions were waved before the Lord and wholly burnt on the altar as a sweet savor unto Yahweh.

RUNAGATE

run’-a-gat: A runaway: "The runagates continue in scarceness" (Ps 68:6, Prayer Book Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "The rebellious dwell in a parched land").

RUNNER

run’-er.

See GAMES.

RUSH

(1) (gome’; papuros, "bulrushes," margin "papyrus" (Ex 2:3); "rush," margin "papyrus" (Job 8:11); "papyrus," the King James Version "rush" (Isa 18:2); "rushes" (Isa 35:7)): This is almost certainly the famous papyrus, Cyperus papyrus (Natural Order, Cyperaceae), known in Arabic as babir (whence comes our word "paper"). This plant, the finest of the sedges, flourishes plentifully in Upper Egypt; in Palestine there is a great mass of it growing in the marsh to the North of Lake Huleh, and it also occurs on the Lake of Galilee and the Jordan. Light boats of plaited papyrus have been used on the Nile from ancient times and are mentioned by many writers (compare Ex 2:3; Isa 18:2).

(2) (’aghmon, "rope," margin "Hebrew ‘a rope of rushes,’ " the King James Version "hook" (Job 41:2): "(burning) rushes," the King James Version "caldron" (Job 41:20); "rush," the King James Version "bulrush" (Isa 58:5); "rush" in Isa 9:14; 19:15, used of the humble and lowly folk as contrasted with the "palm branch," the highest class): The word ‘aghmon comes from ‘agham, meaning a marsh (see POOL), being transferred from the place of the things growing there. The word doubtless includes not only the rushes—of which there are several kinds in Palestine—but also members of the sedge family, the Cyperaceae.

See also REED.

E. W. G. Masterman

RUST

rust (chel’ah; brosis): Strictly speaking rust is the red oxide of iron formed by the corrosion of that metal, but by extension it has come to mean corrosion produced on any metal. Chel’ah is translated "rust" in Eze 24:11,12. This rendering is probably based on 24:11. Copper caldrons are still used in Bible lands. Such vessels must be constantly watched when on the fire to guard against the possibility of their becoming dry. If this should happen the contents, whatever they may be, and the vessel itself will be injured. The copper of the caldron oxidizes and scales off in black or brownish scales, or rust. ios, was used in Greek to denote the corroding of metals. In Jas 5:3 occurs, "Your gold and your silver are rusted; and their rust .... shall eat your flesh as fire." The writers must have had in mind the actions of chemicals upon these metals which formed some such compound as the caustic silver nitrate.

Brosis, literally, "eating," which occurs in Mt 6:19,20, may refer to the diseases which attack such vegetation as wheat, grapes, cucumbers, etc. In no country is the saying "where moth and rust consume" (Mt 6:19) more true than in Syria. Any metal subject to corrosion seems to rust faster in that country than anywhere else. There are also many rusting fungi which the people have not learned to destroy and which do much damage to the crops.

See also SCUM.

James A. Patch

RUTH

rooth (ruth; Rhouth): The name Ru is found in the Old Testament only in the book which is so entitled. It is a contraction for re’uth perhaps signifying "comrade," "companion" (feminine; compare Ex 11:2, "every woman of her neighbor"). OHL, 946, explains the word as an abstract noun =" friendship." The Book of Ru details the history of the one decisive episode owing to which Ru became an ancestress of David and of the royal house of Judah. From this point of view its peculiar interest lies in the close friendship or alliance between Israel and Moab, which rendered such a connection possible. Not improbably also there is an allusion to this in the name itself.

1. History:

The history lies in the period of the Judges (Ru 1:1), at the close of a great famine in the land of Israel. Elimelech, a native of Bethlehem, had, with his wife Naomi and two sons, taken refuge in Moab from the famine. There, after an interval of time which is not more precisely defined, he died (Ru 1:3), and his two sons, having married women of Moab, in the course of a further ten years also died, and left Orpah and Ru widows (Ru 1:5). Naomi then decided to return to Palestine, and her two daughters-in-law

accompanied her on her way (Ru 1:7). Orpah, however, turned back and only Ru remained with Naomi, journeying with her to Bethlehem, where they arrived "in the beginning of barley harvest" (Ru 1:22). The piety and fidelity of Ru are thus early exhibited in the course of the narrative, in that she refused to abandon her mother-in-law, although thrice exhorted to do so by Naomi herself, on account of her own great age and the better prospects for Ru in her own country. Orpah yielded to persuasion, and returned to Moab; but Ru remained with Naomi.

At Bethlehem Ru employed herself in gleaning in the field during the harvest and was noticed by Boaz, the owner of the field, a near kinsman of her father-in-law Elimelech. Boaz gave her permission to glean as long as the harvest continued; and told her that he had heard of her filial conduct toward her mother-in-law. Moreover, he directed the reapers to make intentional provision for her by dropping in her way grain from their bundles (Ru 2:15 f). She was thus able to return to Naomi in the evening with a whole ephah of barley (Ru 2:17). In answer to questioning she explained that her success in gleaning was due to the good-will of Boaz, and the orders that he had given. She remained accordingly and gleaned with his maidens throughout the barley and wheat harvest, making her home with her mother-in-law (Ru 2:23). Naomi was anxious for the remarriage of Ruth, both for her sake and to secure compliance with the usage and law of Israel; and sent her to Boaz to recall to him his duty as near kinsman of her late husband Elimelech (Ru 3:1 f). Boaz acknowledged the claim and promised to take Ru in marriage, failing fulfillment of the legal duty of another whose relationship was nearer than that of Boaz himself (Ru 3:8-13). Naomi was confident that Boaz would fulfill his promise, and advised Ru to wait in patience.

Boaz then adopted the customary and legal measures to obtain a decision. He summoned the near kinsman before ten elders at the gate of the city, related to him the circumstances of Naomi’s return, with her desire that Ru should be married and settled with her father-in-law’s land as her marriage-portion, and called upon him to declare his intentions. The near kinsman, whose name and degree of relationship are not stated, declared his inability to undertake the charge, which he renounced in legal form in favor of Boaz according to ancient custom in Israel (Ru 4:6). Boaz accepted the charge thus transferred to him, the elders and bystanders bearing witness and pronouncing a formal blessing upon the union of Boaz and Ru (4:9-12). Upon the birth of a son in due course the women of the city congratulated Naomi, in that the continuance of her family and house was now assured, and the latter became the child’s nurse. The name of Obed was given to the boy; and Obed through his son Jesse became the grandfather of David (compare Mt 1:5,6; Lu 3:31,32).

2. Interest and Importance of the Narrative:

Thus, the life and history of Ru are important in the eyes of the narrator because she forms a link in the ancestry of the greatest king of Israel. From a more modern point of view the narrative is a simple idyllic history, showing how the faithful loving service of Ru to her mother-in-law met with its due reward in the restored happiness of a peaceful and prosperous home-life for herself. Incidentally are illustrated also ancient marriage customs of Israel, which in the time of the writer had long since become obsolete. The narrative is brief and told without affectation of style, and on that account will never lose its interest. It has preserved moreover the memory of an incident, the national significance of which may have passed

away, but to which value will always be attached for its simplicity and natural grace.

For the literature, see RUTH, THE BOOK OF.

A. S. Geden

RUTH, THE BOOK OF

1. Order in the Canon:

The place which the Book of Ru occupies in the order of the books of the English Bible is not that of the Hebrew Canon. There it is one of the five meghilloth or Rolls, which were ordered to be read in the synagogue on 5 special occasions or festivals during the year.

In printed editions of the Old Testament the megilloth are usually arranged in the order: Cant, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiates, Esther. Ru occupied the second position because the book was appointed to be read at the Feast of Weeks which was the second of the 5 special days. In Hebrew manuscripts, however, the order varies considerably. In Spanish manuscripts generally, and in one at least of the German school cited by Dr. Ginsburg (Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, London, 1897, 4), Ru precedes Cant; and in the former Ecclesiastes is placed before Lamentations. The meghilloth constitute the second portion of the kethubhim or Haigographa, the third great division of the books of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Talmud, however, dissociates Ru altogether from the remaining meghilloth, and places it first among the Hagiographa, before the Book of Psalms. By the Greek translators the book was removed from the position which it held in the Hebrew Canon, and because it described events contemporaneous with the Judges, was attached as a kind of appendix to the latter work. This sequence was adopted in the Vulgate, and so has passed into all modern Bibles.

2. Authorship and Purpose:

The book is written without name of author, and there is no direct indication of its date. Its aim is to record an event of interest and importance in the family history of David, and incidentally to illustrate ancient custom and marriage law. There is no ground for supposing, as has been suggested, that the writer had a polemical purpose in view, and desired to show that the strict and stern action taken by Ezra and Nehemiah after the return in forbidding mixed marriages was not justifled by precedent. The narrative is simple and direct, and the preservation of the tradition which it records of the descent of Israel’s royal house from a Moabite ancestress was probably due in the first instance to oral communication for some considerable time before it was committed to writing. The Book of 1Sa also indicates a close relation between David and Moab, when during the period of his outlawry the future king confided his father and mother to the care of the king of Moab (1Sa 22:3 f), and so far supports the truth of the tradition which is embodied in the Book of Ruth.

3. Date of Composition:

With regard to the date at which the narrative was committed to writing, it is evident from the position of the Book of Ru in the Hebrew Canon that the date of its composition is subsequent to the close of the great period of the "earlier prophets." Otherwise it would have found a natural place, as was assigned to it in the Greek Bible, together with the Book of Judges and other historical writings, in the second division of the Hebrew Scriptures. In the opening words of the book also, "It came to pass in the days when the judges judged" (Ru 1:1), the writer appears to look back to the period of the Judges as to a comparatively distant epoch. The character of the diction is pure and chaste; but has been supposed in certain details, as in the presence of so-called Aramaisms, to betray a late origin. The reference to the observance of marriage customs and their sanctions "in former time in Israel" (Ru 4:7) does not necessarily imply that the composition of Ru was later than that of Deuteronomy, in which the laws arid rights of the succession are enjoined, or that the writer of the former work was acquainted with the latter in its existing form. Slight differences of detail in the procedure would seem to suggest the contrary. On the other hand, the motive of the book in the exhibition of the ancestry of David’s house would have lost its significance and raison d’etre with the death or disappearance of the last ruler of David’s line in the early period of the return from Babylon (compare Zec 4:9). The most probable date therefore for the composition of the book would be in the later days of the exile, or immediately after the return. There is no clue to the authorship. The last four verses, giving the genealogy from Perez to David (compare 1Ch 2:4-15; Mt 1:3-6; Lu 3:31-33), are generally recognized as a later addition.

4. Ethical Teaching:

The ethical value of the Book of Ru is considerable, as setting forth an example of stedfast filial piety. The action of Ru in refusing to desert her mother-in-law and persevering in accompanying her to her own land meets with its due reward in the prosperity and happiness which become hers, and in the honor which she receives as ancestress of the royal house of David. The writer desires to show in the person and example of Ru that a sincere and generous regard for the claims of duty and affection leads to prosperity and honor; and at the same time that the principles and recompense of righteous dealing are not dependent upon race, but are as valid for a Moabitess as for a Jew. There is no distinctive doctrine taught in the book. It is primarily historical, recording a decisive incident in the origin of David’s house; and in the second place ethical, indicating and enforcing in a well-known example the advantage and importance of right dealing and the observance of the dictates of filial duty. For detailed contents see preceding article.

LITERATURE. English commentaries upon the Book of Ru are naturally not numerous. Compare G. W. Thatcher, "Judges and Ruth," in (New) Century Bible; R.A. Watson, in Expositor’s Bible; the most recent critical commentary. is by L. B. Wolfenson in AJSL, XXVII (July, 1911), 285 ff, who defends the early date of the book. See also the relevant articles in Jew Encyclopedia, HDB, EB, and Driver, LOT, 6, 454 ff.

A. S. Geden

RYE

ri.

See SPELT.

SABACHTHANI

sat-bak’-tha-ne.

See ELI, ELI, LAMA, SABACHTHANI.

SABACO; SABAKON

sab’-a-ko, sab’-a-kon.

See SO.

SABAEANS

sa-be’-anz (shebha’im (Joe 3:8 the King James Version), cebha’-im; Sabaeim, Sebaeim (Isa 45:14); read cabha’im, but rendered as though from cabha’," to imbibe," hence, "drunkards"; oinomenoi, "wine-drunken" (Eze 23:42 the King James Version)):

1. Forms of the Word:

"Sabaeans" is also the translation of the name of the country itself (shebha’) in Job 1:15; 6:19. This last, which is the root of shebha’im, is regarded by Arabists as coming from that root with the meaning of "to take captive," though seba’a, "he raided" (compare Job 1:15), has also been suggested.

2. Two Different Races:

As Sheba is said in Ge 10:7; 10:28; and 25:3 respectively to have been

(1) a son of Raamah, the 4th son of Cush;

(2) the 10th son of Joktan, son of Eber;

(3) the 1st son of Jokshan, 2nd son of Abraham and Keturah, at least two nationalities of this name are implied. The former were identified by Josephus (Ant., II, x, 2) with the tall people of Saba in Upper Egypt, described by him as a city of Ethiopia, which Moses, when in the service of the Egyptians, besieged and captured.

3. Semitic Sabeans and Their Commerce:

It is the Semitic Sabeans, however, who are the best known, and the two genealogies attributed to them (Joktan-Eber and Jokshan-Abraham) seem to imply two settlements in the land regarded as that of their origin. As Ezekiel (27:23) mentions Haran (Hirran), Canneh (Kannah), and Eden (Aden) as being connected with Sheba, and these three places are known to have been in Southern Arabia, their Semitic parentage is undoubted. The Sabeans are described as being exporters of gold (Isa 60:6; Ps 72:15), precious stones (Eze 27:23), perfumes (Jer 6:20; Isaiah and Ezekiel), and if the rendering "Sabaeans" for Joe 3 (4):8 be correct, the Sebaim, "a nation far off," dealt in slaves.

See SEBA; SHEBA; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. Pinches

SABANNEUS

sab-a-ne’-us (Codex Vaticanus Sabannaious; Codex Alexandrinus Bannaious; the King James Version Bannaia, following the Aldine): One of the sons of Asom who had married strange wives (1 Esdras 9:33) =" Zabad" in Ezr 10:33.

SABANNUS

sa-ban’-nus (Sabannos; the King James Version Sabban): The father of Moeth, one of the Levites to whom the silver and gold were delivered (1 Esdras 8:63). "Moeth the son of Sabannus" stands in the position of "Noadiah the son of Binnui," in Ezr 8:33.

SABAOTH

sab’-a-oth, sa-ba’-oth.

See GOD, NAMES OF, III, 8; LORD OF HOSTS.

SABAT

sa’-bat: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SAPHAT, (2) (which see).

SABATEUS

sab-a-te’-us (Codex Alexandrinus Sabbataias; Codex Vaticanus Abtaios; the King James Version Sabateas): One of the Levites who "taught the law of the Lord" to the multitude (1 Esdras 9:48) =" Shabbethai" in Ne 8:7.

SABATHUS

sab’-a-thus (Sabathos; the King James Version Sabatus): An Israelite who put away his "strange wife" (1 Esdras 9:28) =" Zabad" in Ezr 10:27.

SABATUS

sab’-a-tus: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SABATHUS (which see).

SABBAN

sab’-an: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SABANNUS (which see).

SABBATEUS

sab-a-te’-us (Sabbataios; the King James Version Sabbatheus): One of the three (or rather two, for "Levis" = Levite) "assessors" in the investigation held concerning "foreign wives" (1 Esdras 9:14) =" Shabbethai the Levite" in Ezr 10:15. He is probably the "Sabateus," one of the Levites who expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:48), and so = the "Shabbethai" in Ne 8:7.

SABBATH

sab’-ath (shabbath, shabbathon; sabbaton, ta sabbata; the root shabhath in Hebrew means "to desist," "cease," "rest"):

I. ORIGIN OF THE SABBATH

1. The Biblical Account

2. Critical Theories

II. HISTORY OF THE SABBATH AFTER MOSES

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the Inter-Testamental Period

3. Jesus and the Sabbath

4. Paul and the Sabbath

LITERATURE

The Sabbath was the day on which man was to leave off his secular labors and keep a day holy to Yahweh.

I. Origin of the Sabbath.

1. The Biblical Account:

The sketch of creation in Ge 1:1-2:3 closes with an impressive account of the hallowing of the 7th day, because on it God rested from all the work which He had made creatively. The word "Sabbath" does not occur in the story; but it is recognized by critics of every school that the author (P) means to describe the Sabbath as primeval. In Ex 20:8-11 (ascribed to JE) the reason assigned for keeping the 7th day as a holy Sabbath is the fact that Yahweh rested after the six days of creative activity. Ex 31:17 employs a bold figure, and describes Yahweh as refreshing Himself ("catching His breath") after six days of work. The statement that God set apart the 7th day for holy purposes in honor of His own rest after six days of creative activity is boldly challenged by many modern scholars as merely the pious figment of a priestly imagination of the exile. There are so few hints of a weekly Sabbath before Moses, who is comparatively a modern character, that argumentation is almost excluded, and each student will approach the question with the bias of his whole intellectual and spiritual history. There is no distinct mention of the Sabbath in Gen, though a 7-day period is referred to several times (Ge 7:4,10; 8:10,12; 29:27 f). The first express mention of the Sabbath is found in Ex 16:21-30, in connection with the giving of the manna. Yahweh taught the people in the wilderness to observe the 7th day as a Sabbath of rest by sending no manna on that day, a double supply being given on the 6th day of the week. Here we have to do with a weekly Sabbath as a day of rest from ordinary secular labor. A little later the Ten Words (Commands) were spoken by Yahweh from Sinai in the hearing of all the people, and were afterward written on the two tables of stone (Ex 20:1-17; 34:1-5,27 f). The Fourth Commandment enjoins upon Israel the observance of the 7th day of the week as a holy day on which no work shall be done by man or beast. Children and servants are to desist from all work, and even the stranger within the gates is required to keep the day holy. The reason assigned is that Yahweh rested on the 7th day and blessed it and hallowed it. There is no hint that the restrictions were meant to guard against the wrath of a jealous and angry deity. The Sabbath was meant to be a blessing to man and not a burden. After the sin in connection with the golden call Yahweh rehearses the chief duties required of Israel, and again announces the law of the Sabbath (Ex 34:21, ascribed to J). In the Levitical legislation there is frequent mention of the Sabbath (Ex 31:13-16; 35:2 f; Le 19:3,10; 23:3,18). A willful Sabbath-breaker was put to death (Nu 15:32-36). In the Deuteronomic legislation there is equal recognition of the importance and value of the Sabbath (De 5:12-15). Here the reason assigned for the observance of the Sabbath philanthropic and humanitarian: "that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou." It is thus manifest that all the Pentateuchal codes, whether proceeding from Moses alone or from many hands in widely different centuries, equally recognize the Sabbath as one of the characteristic institutions

of Israel's religious and social life. If we cannot point to any observance of the weekly Sabbath prior to Moses, we can at least be sure that this was one of the institutions which he gave to Israel. From the days of Moses until now the holy Sabbath has been kept by devout Israelites.

2. Critical Theories:

"The older theories of the origin of the Jewish Sabbath (connecting it with Egypt, with the day of Saturn, or in general with the seven planets) have now been almost entirely abandoned (see ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5). The disposition at present is to regard the day as originally a lunar festival, similar to a Bablonian custom (Schrader, Stud. u. Krit., 1874), the rather as the cuneiform documents appear to contain a term sabattu or sabattum, identical in form and meaning with the Hebrew word sabbathon." Thus wrote Professor C. H. Toy in 1899 (JBL, XVIII, 190). In a syllabary (II R, 32, 16a, b) sabattum is said to be equivalent to um nuh libbi, the natural translation of which seemed to be "day of rest of the heart." Schrader, Sayce and others so understood the phrase, and naturally looked upon sabattum as equivalent to the Hebrew Sabbath. But Jensen and others have shown that the phrase should be rendered "day of the appeasement of the mind" (of an offended deity). The reference is to a day of atonement or pacification rather than a day of rest, a day in which one must be careful not to arouse the anger of the god who was supposed to preside over that particular day. Now the term sabattum has been found only 5 or 6 times in the Babylonian inscriptions and in none of them is it connected with the 7th day of a week. There was, however, a sort of institution among the superstitious Babylonians that has been compared with the Hebrew Sabbath. In certain months of the year (Elul, Marcheshvan) the 7th, 14th, 19th, 21st and 28th days were set down as favorable days, or unfavorable days, that is, as days in which the king, the priest and the physician must be careful not to stir up the anger of the deity. On these days the king was not to eat food prepared by fire, not to put on royal dress, not to ride in his chariot, etc. As to the 19th day, it is thought that it was included among the unlucky days because it was the 49th (7 times 7) from the 1st of the preceding month. As there were 30 days in the month, it is evident that we are not dealing with a recurring 7th day in the week, as is the case with the Hebrew Sabbath. Moreover, no proof has been adduced that the term sabattum was ever applied to these dies nefasti or unlucky days. Hence, the assertions of some Assyriologists with regard to the Babylonian origin of the Sabbath must be taken with several grams of salt. Notice must be taken of an ingenious and able paper by Professor M. Jastrow, which was read before the Eleventh International Congress of Orientalists in Paris in 1897, in which the learned author attempts to show that the Hebrew Sabbath was originally a day of propitiation like the Babylonian sabattum (AJT, II, 312-52). He argues that the restrictive measures in the Hebrew laws for the observance of the Sabbath arose from the original conception of the Sabbath as an unfavorable day, a day in which the anger of Yahweh might flash forth against men. Although Jastrow has supported his thesis with many arguments that are cogent, yet the reverent student of the Scriptures will find it difficult to resist the impression that the Old Testament writers without exception thought of the Sabbath not as an unfavorable or unlucky day but rather as a day set apart for the benefit of man. Whatever may have been the attitude of the early Hebrews toward the day which was to become a characteristic institution of Judaism in all ages and in all lands, the organs of revelation throughout the Old Testament enforce the observance of the Sabbath by arguments which lay emphasis upon its beneficent and humanitarian aspects.

We must call attention to Meinhold's ingenious hypothesis as to the origin of the Sabbath. In 1894 Theophilus G. Pinches discovered a tablet in which the term shapattu is applied to the 15th day of the month. Meinhold argues that shabattu in Babylonian denotes the day of the full moon. Dr. Skinner thus describes Meinhold's theory: "He points to the close association of new-moon and Sabbath in nearly all the pre-exilic references (Am 8:5; Ho 2:11; Isa 1:13; 2Ki 4:23 f); and concludes that in early Israel, as in Babylonia, the Sabbath was the full-moon festival and nothing else. The institution of the weekly Sabbath he traces to a desire to compensate for the loss of the old lunar festivals, when these were abrogated by the Deuteronomic reformation. This innovation he attributes to Ezekiel; but steps toward it are found in the introduction of a weekly day of rest during harvest only (on the ground of De 16:8 f; compare Ex 34:21), and in the establishment of the sabbatical year (Le 25), which he considers to be older than the weekly Sabbath" (ICC on Gen, p. 39). Dr. Skinner well says that Meinhold's theory involves great improbabilities. It is not certain that the Babylonians applied the term sabattu to the 15th day of the month because it was the day of the full moon; and it is by no means certain that the early prophets in Israel identified Sabbath with the festival of the full moon.

The wealth of learning and ingenuity expended in the search for the origin of the Sabbath has up to the present yielded small returns.

II. History of the Sabbath after Moses.

1. In the Old Testament:

The early prophets and historians occasionally make mention of the Sabbath. It is sometimes named in connection with the festival of the new moon (2Ki 4:23; Am 8:5; Ho 2:11; Isa 1:13; Eze 46:3). The prophets found fault with the worship on the Sabbath, because it was not spiritual nor prompted by love and gratitude. The Sabbath is exalted by the great prophets who faced the crisis of the Babylonian exile as one of the most valuable institutions in Israel's life. Great promises are attached to faithful observance of the holy day, and confession is made of Israel's unfaithfulness in profaning the Sabbath (Jer 17:21-27; Isa 56:2,4; 58:13; Eze 20:12-24). In the Persian period Nehemiah struggled earnestly to make the people of Jerusalem observe the law of the Sabbath (Ne 10:31; 13:15-22).

2. In the Inter-Testamental Period:

With the development of the synagogue the Sabbath became a day of worship and of study of the Law, as well as a day of cessation from all secular employment. That the pious in Israel carefully observed the Sabbath is clear from the conduct of the Maccabees and their followers, who at first declined to resist the onslaught made by their enemies on the Sabbath (1 Macc 2:29-38); but necessity drove the faithful to defend themselves against hostile attack on the Sabbath (1 Macc 2:39-41). It was during the period between Ezra and the Christian era that the spirit of Jewish legalism flourished. Innumerable restrictions and rules were formulated for the conduct of life under the Law. Great principles were lost to sight in the mass of petty details. Two entire treatises of the Mishna, Shabbath and 'Erubhin, are devoted to the details of Sabbath observance. The subject is touched upon in other parts of the Mishna; and in the

Gemara there are extended discussions, with citations of the often divergent opinions of the rabbis. In the Mishna (Shahbath, vii.2) there are 39 classes of prohibited actions with regard to the Sabbath, and there is much hair-splitting in working out the details. The beginnings of this elaborate definition of actions permitted and actions forbidden are to be found in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. The movement was at flood tide during our Lord's earthly ministry and continued for centuries afterward, in spite of His frequent and vigorous protests.

3. Jesus and the Sabbath:

Apart from His claim to be the Messiah, there is no subject on which our Lord came into such sharp conflict with the religious leaders of the Jews as in the matter of Sabbath observance. He set Himself squarely against the current rabbinic restrictions as contrary to the spirit of the original law of the Sabbath. The rabbis seemed to think that the Sabbath was an end in itself, an institution to which the pious Israelite must subject all his personal interests; in other words, that man was made for the Sabbath: man might suffer hardship, but the institution must be preserved inviolate. Jesus, on the contrary, taught that the Sabbath was made for man's benefit. If there should arise a conflict between man's needs and the letter of the Law, man's higher interests and needs must take precedence over the law of the Sabbath (Mt 12:1-14; Mr 2:23-3:6; Lu 6:1-11; also Joh 5:1-18; Lu 13:10-17; 14:1-6). There is no reason to think that Jesus meant to discredit the Sabbath as an institution. It was His custom to attend worship in the synagogue on the Sabbath (Lu 4:16). The humane element in the rest day at the end of every week must have appealed to His sympathetic nature. It was the one precept of the Decalogue that was predominantly ceremonial, though it had distinct sociological and moral value. As an institution for the benefit of toiling men and animals, Jesus held the Sabbath in high regard. As the Messiah, He was not subject to its restrictions; He could at any moment assert His lordship over the Sabbath (Mr 2:28). The institution was not on a par with the great moral precepts, which are unchangeable. It is worthy of note that, while Jesus pushed the moral precepts of the Decalogue into the inner realm of thought and desire, thus making the requirement more difficult and the law more exacting, He fought for a more liberal and lenient interpretation of the law of the Sabbath. Rigorous sabbatarians must look elsewhere for a champion of their views.

4. Paul and the Sabbath:

The early Christians kept the 7th day as a Sabbath, much after the fashion of other Jews. Gradually the 1st day of the week came to be recognized as the day on which the followers of Jesus would meet for worship. The resurrection of our Lord on that day made it for Christians the most joyous day of all the week. When Gentiles were admitted into the church, the question at once arose whether they should be required to keep the Law of Moses. It is the glory of Paul that he fought for and won freedom for his Gentile fellow-Christians. It is significant of the attitude of the apostles that the decrees of the Council at Jerusalem made no mention of Sabbath observance in the requirements laid upon Gentile Christians (Ac 15:28 f). Paul boldly contended that believers in Jesus, whether Jew or Gentile, were set free from the burdens of the Mosaic Law. Even circumcision counted for nothing, now that men were saved by believing in Jesus (Ga 5:6). Christian liberty as proclaimed by Paul included all days and seasons. A man could observe special days or not, just as his own judgment and conscience might dictate (Ro 14:5

f); but in all such matters one ought to be careful not to put a stumblingblock in a brother's way (Ro 14:13). That Paul contended for personal freedom in respect of the Sabbath is made quite clear in Col 2:16 f, where he groups together dietary laws, feast days, new moons and sabbaths. The early Christians brought over into their mode of observing the Lord's Day the best elements of the Jewish Sabbath, without its onerous restrictions.)

See further LORD'S DAY; ETHICS OF JESUS, I, 3, (1).

LITERATURE. J. A. Hessey, Sunday, Its Origin, History, and Present Obligation (Bampton Lectures for 1860); Zahn, Geschichte des Sonntags, 1878; Davis, Genesis and Semitic Tradition, 1894, 23-35; Jastrow, "The Original Character of the Heb Sabbath," AJT, II, 1898, 312-52; Toy, "The Earliest Form of the Sabbath," JBL, XVIII. 1899, 190-94; W. Lotz, Questionum de historia Sabbati libri duo, 1883; Nowack, Hebr. Arch., II, 1894, 140 ff; Driver, HDB, IV, 1902, 317-23; ICC, on "Gen," 1911, 35-39; Dillmann, Ex u. Lev3, 1897, 212-16; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 1883, 51-62, 777-87; Broadus, Commentary on Mt, 256-61; EB, IV, 1903, 4173-80; Gunkel, Gen3, 1910, 114-16; Meinhold, Sabbat u. Woche im Altes Testament, 1905; Beer, Schabbath, 1908.

John Richard Samphey

III. SEVENTH-DAY ADVENTIST POSITION

The views entertained by Seventh-Day Adventists concerning the nature and obligation of the Sabbath may conveniently be presented under three general divisions: (1) what the Bible says concerning the Sabbath; (2) what history says concerning the Sabbath; (3) the significance of the Sabbath.

1. What the Bible Says concerning the Sabbath:

(1) Old Testament Teaching.

In their views concerning the institution and primal obligation of the Sabbath, Seventh-Day Adventists are in harmony with the views held by the early representatives of nearly all the evangelical denominations. The Sabbath is coeval with the finishing of creation, and the main facts connected with establishing it are recorded in Ge 2:2,3. The blessing here placed upon the seventh day distinguishes it from the other days of the week, and the day thus blessed was "sanctified" (King James Version, Revised Version "hallowed") and set apart for man.

That the Sabbath thus instituted was well known throughout the Patriarchal age is clearly established both by direct evidence and by necessary inference.

"If we had no other passage than this of Ge 2:3, there would be no difficulty in deducing from it a precept for the universal observance of a Sabbath, or seventh day, to be devoted to God as holy time by all of that race for whom the earth and all things therein were specially prepared. The first men must

have known it. The words, ‘He hallowed it,’ can have no meaning otherwise. They would be a blank unless in reference to some who were required to keep it holy" (Lange’s Commentary on Ge 2:3, I, 197).

"And the day arrived when Moses went to Goshen to see his brethren, that he saw the children of Israel in their burdens and hard labor, and Moses was grieved on their account. And Moses returned to Egypt and came to the house of Pharaoh, and came before the king, and Moses bowed down before the king. And Moses said unto Pharaoh, I pray thee, my lord, I have come to seek a small request from thee, turn not away my face empty; and Pharaoh said unto him, Speak. And Moses said unto Pharaoh, Let there be given unto thy servants the children of Israel who are in Goshen, one day to rest therein from their labor. And the king answered Moses and said, Behold I have lifted up thy face in this thing to grant thy request. And Pharaoh ordered a proclamation to be issued throughout Egypt and Goshen, saying, To you, all the children of Israel, thus says the king, for six days you shall do your work and labor, but on the seventh day you shall rest, and shall not perform any work; thus shall you do in all the days, as the king and Moses the son of Bathia have commanded. And Moses rejoiced at this thing which the king had granted to him, and all the children of Israel did as Moses ordered them. For this thing was from the Lord to the children of Israel, for the Lord had begun to remember the children of Israel to save them for the sake of their fathers. And the Lord was with Moses, and his fame went throughout Egypt. And Moses became great in the eyes of all the Egyptians, and in the eyes of all the children of Israel, seeking good for his people Israel, and speaking words of peace regarding them to the king" (Book of Jashar 70 41-51, published by Noah and Gould, New York, 1840).

"Hence, you can see that the Sabbath was before the Law of Moses came, and has existed from the beginning of the world. Especially have the devout, who have preserved the true faith, met together and called upon God on this day" (Luther’s Works, XXXV, p. 330).

"Why should God begin two thousand years after (the creation of the world) to give men a Sabbath upon the reason of His rest from the creation of it, if He had never called man to that commemoration before? And it is certain that the Sabbath was observed at the falling of the manna before the giving of the Law; and let any considering Christian judge ....

(1) whether the not falling of manna, or the rest of God after the creation, was like to be the original reason of the Sabbath;

(2) and whether, if it had been the first, it would not have been said, Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day; for on six days the manna fell, and not on the seventh; rather than for in six days God created heaven and earth, etc., and rested the seventh day.’ And it is casually added, ‘Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.’ Nay, consider whether this annexed reason intimates not that the day on this ground being hallowed before, therefore it was that God sent not down the manna on that day, and that He prhibited the people from seeking it" (Richard Baxter, Practical Works, III, 774, edition 1707).

That the Sabbath was known to those who came out of Egypt, even before the giving of the Law at

Sinai, is shown from the experience with the manna, as recorded in Ex 16:22-30. The double portion on the sixth day, and its preservation, was the constantly recurring miracle which reminded the people of their obligation to observe the Sabbath, and that the Sabbath was a definite day, the seventh day. To the people, first wondering at this remarkable occurrence, Moses said, "This is that which the Lord hath said, To morrow is the rest of the holy sabbath unto the Lord" (Ex 16:23, King James Version). And to some who went out to gather manna on the seventh day, the Lord administered this rebuke: "How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws?" (Ex 16:28). All this shows that the Sabbath law was well understood, and that the failure to observe it rendered the people justly subject to Divine reproof.

At Sinai, the Sabbath which was instituted at creation, and had been observed during the intervening centuries, was embodied in that formal statement of man's duties usually designated as the "Ten Commandments." It is treated as an institution already well known and the command is, "Remember the sabbath day, to keep it holy" (Ex 20:8). In the 4th commandment the basis of the Sabbath is revealed. It is a memorial of the Creator's rest at the close of those six days in which He made "heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." For this reason "Yahweh blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it." This blessing was not placed upon the day at Sinai, but in the beginning, when "God blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it" (Ge 2:3).

From the very nature of the basis of the Sabbath, as set forth in this commandment, both the institution itself and the definite day of the Sabbath are of a permanent nature. So long as it is true that God created heaven and earth, and all things therein, so long will the Sabbath remain as a memorial of that work; and so long as it is true that this creative work was completed in six days, and that God Himself rested on the seventh day, and was refreshed in the enjoyment of His completed work, so long will it be true that the memorial of that work can properly be celebrated only upon the seventh day of the week.

During all the period from the deliverance out of Egypt to the captivity in Babylon, the people of God were distinguished from the nations about them by the worship of the only true God, and the observance of His holy day. The proper observance of the true Sabbath would preserve them from idolatry, being a constant reminder of the one God, the Creator of all things. Even when Jerusalem was suffering from the attacks of the Babylonians, God assured His people, through the prophet Jeremiah, that if they would hallow the Sabbath day, great should be their prosperity, and the city should remain forever (Jer 17:18). This shows that the spiritual observance of the Sabbath was the supreme test of their right relation to God. In those prophecies of Isaiah, which deal primarily with the restoration from Babylon, remarkable promises were made to those who would observe the Sabbath, as recorded in Isa 56:1-7.

(2) New Testament Teaching.

From the record found in the four Gospels, it is plain that the Jews during all the previous centuries had preserved a knowledge both of the Sabbath institution and of the definite day.

It is equally plain that they had made the Sabbath burdensome by their own rigorous exactions

concerning it. And Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath, both by example and by precept, brushed aside these traditions of men that He might reveal the Sabbath of the commandment as God gave it—a blessing and not a burden. A careful reading of the testimony of the evangelists will show that Christ taught the observance of the commandments of God, rather than the traditions of men, and that the charge of Sabbath-breaking was brought against Him for no other reason than that He refused to allow the requirements of man to change the Sabbath, blessed of God, into a merely human institution, grievous in its nature, and enforced upon the people with many and troublesome restrictions.

All are agreed that Christ and His disciples observed the seventh-day Sabbath previous to the crucifixion. That His followers had received no intimation of any proposed change at His death, is evident from the recorded fact that on the day when He was in the tomb they rested, "on the sabbath .... according to the commandment" (Lu 23:56); and that they treated the following day, the first day of the week, the same as of old, is further evident, as upon that day they came unto the sepulcher for the purpose of anointing the body of Jesus. In the Book of Acts, which gives a brief history of the work of the disciples in proclaiming the gospel of a risen Saviour, no other Sabbath is recognized than the seventh day, and this is mentioned in the most natural way as the proper designation of a well-known institution (Ac 13:14,27,42; 16:13; 18:4).

In our Lord’s great prophecy, in which He foretold the experience of the church between the first and the second advent, He recognized the seventh-day Sabbath as an existing institution at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD), when He instructed His disciples, "Pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, neither on a sabbath" (Mt 24:20). Such instruction given in these words, and at that time, would have been confusing in the extreme, had there been any such thing contemplated as the overthrow of the Sabbath law at the crucifixion, and the substitution of another day upon an entirely different basis.

That the original Sabbath is to be observed, not only during the present order of things, but also after the restoration when, according to the vision of the revelator, a new heaven and a new earth will take the place of the heaven and the earth that now are, is clearly intimated in the words of the Lord through the prophet Isaiah: "For as the new heavens and the new earth, which I will make, shall remain before me, saith Yahweh, so shall your seed and your name remain. And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith Yahweh" (Isa 66:22,23).

Seventh-Day Adventists regard the effort to establish the observance of another day than the seventh by using such texts as Joh 20:19,26; Ac 20:7; 1Co 16:1,2; Re 1:10 as being merely an afterthought, an effort to find warrant for an observance established upon other than Biblical authority. During the last two or three centuries there has been a movement for the restoration of the original seventh-day Sabbath, not as a Jewish, but as a Christian, institution. This work, commenced and carried forward by the Seventh-Day Baptists, has been taken up and pushed with renewed vigor by the Seventh-Day Adventists during the present generation, and the Bible teaching concerning the true Sabbath is now being presented in nearly every country, both civilized and uncivilized, on the face of the earth.

2. What History Says about the Sabbath:

(1) Josephus.

This summary of history must necessarily be brief, and it will be impossible, for lack of space, to quote authorities. From the testimony of Josephus it is clear that the Jews, as a nation, continued to observe the seventh-day Sabbath until their overthrow, when Jerusalem was captured by Titus, 70 AD. As colonies, and individuals, scattered over the face of the earth, the Jews have preserved a knowledge of the original Sabbath, and the definite day, until the present time. They constitute a living testimony for the benefit of all who desire to know the truth of this matter.

(2) Church History.

According to church history, the seventh-day Sabbath was observed by the early church, and no other day was observed as a Sabbath during the first two or three centuries (see HDB, IV, 322 b).

In the oft-repeated letter of Pliny, the Roman governor of Bithynia, to the emperor Trajan, written about 112 AD, there occurs the expression, "a certain stated day," which is usually assumed to mean Sunday. With reference to this matter W.B. Taylor, in Historical Commentaries, chapter i, section 47, makes the following statement: "As the Sabbath day appears to have been quite as commonly observed at this date as the sun's day (if not even more so), it is just as probable that this 'stated day' referred to by Pliny was the 7th day as that it was the 1st day; though the latter is generally taken for granted." "Sunday was distinguished as a day of joy by the circumstances that men did not fast upon it, and that they prayed standing up and not kneeling, as Christ had now been raised from the dead. The festival of Sunday, like all other festivals, was always only a human ordinance, and it was far from the intentions of the apostles to establish a divine command in this respect, far from them, and from the early apostolic church, to transfer the laws of the Sabbath to Sunday. Perhaps at the end of the 2nd century, a false application of this kind had begun to take place; for men appear by that time to have considered laboring on Sunday as a sin" (Tertullian De Orat., c. 23). This quotation is taken from Rose's Neander, London, 1831, I, 33 f, and is the correct translation from Neander's first German edition, Hamburg, 1826, I, pt. 2, p. 339. Neander has in his 2nd edition, 1842, omitted the second sentence, in which he expressly stated that Sunday was only a human ordinance, but he has added nothing to the contrary. "The Christians in the ancient church very soon distinguished the first day of the week, Sunday; however, not as a Sabbath, but as an assembly day of the church, to study the Word of God together and to celebrate the ordinances one with another: without a shadow of doubt this took place as early as the first part of the 2nd century" (Geschichte des Sonntags, 60).

Gradually, however, the first day of the week came into prominence as an added day, but finally by civil and ecclesiastical authority as a required observance. The first legislation on this subject was the famous law of Constantine, enacted 321 AD. The acts of various councils during the 4th and 5th centuries established the observance of the first day of the week by ecclesiastical authority, and in the great apostasy which followed, the rival day obtained the ascendancy. During the centuries which followed,

however, there were always witnesses for the true Sabbath, although under great persecution. And thus in various lands, the knowledge of the true Sabbath has been preserved.

3. The Significance of the Sabbath:

In the creation of the heavens and the earth the foundation of the gospel was laid. At the close of His created work, "God saw everything that he had made, and, behold, it was very good" (Ge 1:31). The Sabbath was both the sign and the memorial of that creative power which is able to make all things good. But man, made in the image of God, lost that image through sin. In the gospel, provision is made for the restoration of the image of God in the soul of man. The Creator is the Redeemer and redemption is the new creation. Since the Sabbath was the sign of that creative power which worked in Christ, the Word, in the making of the heaven and the earth and all things therein, so it is the sign of that same creative power working through the same eternal Word for the restoration of all things. "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, there is a new creation: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new" (2Co 5:17 margin). "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creation" (Ga 6:15 margin). "For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them" (Eph 2:10).

A concrete illustration of this gospel meaning of the Sabbath is found in the deliverance of Israel from Egypt. The same creative power which wrought in the beginning was exercised in the signs and miracles which preceded their deliverance, and in those miracles, such as the opening of the Red Sea, the giving of the manna, and the water from the rock, which attended the journeyings of the Israelites. In consequence of these manifestations of creative power in their behalf, the children of Israel were instructed to remember in their observance of the Sabbath that they were bondsmen in the land of Egypt. Israel’s deliverance from Egypt is the type of every man’s deliverance from sin; and the instruction to Israel concerning the Sabbath shows its true significance in the gospel of salvation from sin, and the new creation in the image of God.

Furthermore, the seventh-day Sabbath is the sign of both the divinity and the deity of Christ. God only can create. He through whom this work is wrought must be one with God. To this the Scriptures testify: "In the beginning was the Word, ... and the Word was God. .... All things were made through him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made." But this same Word which was with God, and was God, "became flesh, and dwelt among us" (Joh 1:1,3,14). This is the eternal Son, "in whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace" (Eph 1:7). To the Christian the Sabbath, which was the sign and memorial of that divine power which wrought through the eternal Word in the creation of the heaven and the earth, becomes the sign of the same power working through the same eternal Son to accomplish the new creation, and is thus the sign of both the divinity and the deity of Christ.

Inasmuch as the redemptive work finds its chiefest expression in the cross of Christ, the Sabbath, which is the sign of that redemptive work, becomes the sign of the cross.

Seventh-Day Adventists teach and practice the observance of the Sabbath, not because they believe in salvation through man’s effort to keep the law of God, but because they believe in that salvation which alone can be accomplished by the creative power of God working through the eternal Son to create believers anew in Christ Jesus.

Seventh-Day Adventists believe, and teach, that the observance of any other day than the seventh as the Sabbath is the sign of that predicted apostasy in which the man of sin would be revealed who would exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped.

Seventh-Day Adventists believe, and teach, that the observance of the true Sabbath in this generation is a part of that gospel work which is to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

W. W. Prescott

SABBATH DAY’S JOURNEY

jur’-ni (sabbatou hodos): Used only in Ac 1:12, where it designates the distance from Jerusalem to the Mount of Olives, to which Jesus led His disciples on the day of His ascension. The expression comes from rabbinical usage to indicate the distance a Jew might travel on the Sabbath without transgressing the Law, the command against working on that day being interpreted as including travel (see Ex 16:27-30). The limit set by the rabbis to the Sabbath day’s journey was 2,000 cubits from one’s house or domicile, which was derived from the statement found in Jos 3:4 that this was the distance between the ark and the people on their march, this being assumed to be the distance between the tents of the people and the tabernacle during the sojourn in the wilderness. Hence, it must have been allowable to travel thus far to attend the worship of the tabernacle. We do not know when this assumption in regard to the Sabbath day’s journey was made, but it seems to have been in force in the time of Christ. The distance of the Mount of Olives from Jerusalem is stated in Josephus (Ant., XX, viii, 6) to have been five stadia or furlongs and in BJ, V, ii, 3, six stadia, the discrepancy being explained by supposing a different point of departure. This would make the distance of the Sabbath day’s journey from 1,000 to 1,200 yards, the first agreeing very closely with the 2,000 cubits. The rabbis, however, invented a way of increasing this distance without technically infringing the Law, by depositing some food at the 2,000-cubit limit, before the Sabbath, and declaring that spot a temporary domicile. They might then proceed 2,000 cubits from this point without transgressing the Law.

And in some cases even this intricacy of preparation was unnecessary. If, for instance, the approach of the Sabbath found one on his journey, the traveler might select some tree or some stone wall at a distance of 2,000 paces and mentally declare this to be his residence for the Sabbath, in which case he was permitted to go the 2,000 paces to the selected tree or wall and also 2,000 paces beyond, but in such a case he must do the work thoroughly and must say: "Let my Sabbath residence be at the trunk of that tree," for if he merely said: "Let my Sabbath residence be under that tree," this would not be sufficient, because the, expression would be too general and indefinite (Tractate ‘Erubhin 4:7).

Other schemes for extending the distance have been devised, such as regarding the quarter of the town in which one dwells, or the whole town itself, as the domicile, thus allowing one to proceed from any part of the town to a point 2,000 cubits beyond its utmost limits. This was most probably the case with walled towns, at least, and boundary stones have been found in the vicinity of Gaza with inscriptions supposed to mark these limits. The 2,000-cubit limits around the Levitical cities (Nu 35:5) may have suggested the limit of the Sabbath day's journey also. The term came to be used as a designation of distance which must have been more or less definite.

H. Porter

SABBATH, COURT OF THE

See COVERED WAY.

SABBATH, DAY BEFORE THE

See DAY BEFORE THE SABBATH.

SABBATH, MORROW AFTER THE

See MORROW AFTER THE SABBATH.

SABBATH, SECOND AFTER THE FIRST

(sabbaton deuteroproton (Lu 6:1), literally, "the second-first sabbath," of the Revised Version margin): We will mention only a few of the explanations elicited by this expression.

(1) It was the first Sabbath in the second year of a 7-year cycle comprising the period from one Sabbatic year to the other;

(2) the first Sabbath after the second day of Passover, i.e. the first of the seven Sabbaths the Hebrews were to "count unto" themselves from "the morrow after the sabbath" (the day after Easter) until Pentecost (Le 23:15);

(3) the first Sabbath in the Jewish ecclesiastical year (about the middle of March), the first Sabbath in the civil year (about the middle of September) being counted as the "first-first" Sabbath;

(4) the term deuteroprotos, is a monstrous combination of the words deuteros, "second," and protos, "first," attributable to unskillful attempts at textual emendation on the part of copyists. This supposition would, of course, render unnecessary all other efforts to unravel the knotty problem, and, as a matter of fact, deuteroprotos is omitted by many manuscripts (including Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus).

To those not feeling inclined to accept this solution we would suggest the first of the above-named explanations as the most natural and probable one.

William Baur

SABBATH-BREAKING

sab’-bath-brak’-ing.

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

SABBATHEUS

sab-a-the’-us: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SABBATEUS (which see).

SABBATHS, OF YEARS

sab’-aths, (shabbethoth shanim; anapauseis eton (Le 25:8)): The seven sabbatic years preceding the Year of Jubilee.

See SABBATICAL YEAR; JUBILEE YEAR; ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

SABBATICAL YEAR

sa-bat’-ik-al, shenath shabbathon; eniautos anapauseos, "a year of solemn rest"; or shabbath shabbathon; sabbata anapausis, "a sabbath of solemn rest" (Le 25:4); or shehath ha-shemittah; etos tes apheseos, "the year of release" (De 15:9; 31:10)):

1. Primary Intention:

We find the first rudiments of this institution in the so-called Covenant Book (Ex 21-23). Its connection with the day of rest (Sabbath) is obvious, although it strikes us as somewhat remarkable that in Ex 23:10-12 the regulation regarding the 7th year should precede the statute respecting the 7th day. Still it seems natural that after the allusion in verse 9, "Ye were sojourners in the land of Egypt," the Covenant Book should put in a good word for the poor in Israel (verse 11: "Let it rest and lie fallow, that the poor of thy people may eat"). Even the beasts of the field are remembered (compare Jon 4:11).

We must, therefore, conclude that in this early period of the history of Israel the regulation regarding the 7th year was primarily intended for the relief of the poor and for the awakening of a sense of responsibility in the hearts of those better provided with the means of subsistence. It would be wrong,

however, to deny its Sabbatic character, for the text says expressly, "But in the 7th year thou shalt let it rest" (literally, "thou shalt release it"), implying that the land was entitled to a rest because it needed it; it must be released for a time in order to gain fresh strength and insure its future fertility. Two motives, then, present themselves most clearly, one of a social, the other of an economic character, and both are rooted in God’s dealings with Israel (compare Ex 21:1).

2. Mosaic Legislation Humane:

Another evidence of the humane spirit pervading the Mosaic Law may be found in Ex 21:2-6 where, in the case of a Hebrew slave, the length of his servitude is limited to six years. The connection with the idea of the Sabbath is evident, but we fail to detect here any reference to the Sabbatical year. It is clear that the 7th year in which a slave might be set free need not necessarily coincide with the Sabbatical year, though it might, of course, The same is true of De 15:12-18; it has nothing to do with the Sabbatical year. On the other hand it is reasonable to assume that the "release" mentioned in De 15:1-3 took place in the Sabbatical year; in other words, its scope had been enlarged in later years so as to include the release from pecuniary obligation, i.e. the remission of debts or, at least, their temporary suspension. This means that the children of Israel were now developing from a purely agricultural people to a commercial nation. Still the same spirit of compassion for the poor and those struggling for a living asserts itself as in the earlier period, and it goes without saying that the old regulation concerning the release of the land in the 7th year was still in force (compare 15:2: "because Yahweh’s release hath been proclaimed").

According to De 15:1, this proclamation occurred at the end of every 7 years, or, rather, during the 7th year; for we must be careful not to strain the expression "at the end" (compare 15:9, where the 7th year is called "the year of release"; it is quite natural to identify this 7th year with the Sabbatical year).

Moreover, we are now almost compelled to assert the Sabbatical year by this time had become an institution observed simultaneously all over the country. From the wording of the regulation regarding the 7th year in the Covenant Book we are not certain about this in those early times. But now it is different. "Yahweh’s release hath been proclaimed."

3. General Observance:

It was a solemn and general proclamation, the date of which was very likely the day of atonement in the 7th month (the Sabbatical month). The celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles (booths) began five days later and it lasted from the 15th day to the 21st of the 7th month (Tisri). In the Sabbatical year, at that time, the Law was read "before all Israel in their hearing," a fact which tends to prove that the Sabbatical year had become a matter of general and simultaneous observance (compare De 31:10-13). Another lesson may be deduced from this passage: it gives us a hint respecting the use to which the people may have put their leisure time during the 12 months of Sabbatical rest; it may have been a period of religious and probably other instruction.

In Le 25:1-7 the central idea of the Sabbatical year is unfolded. Although it has been said we should be careful not to look for too much of the ideal and dogmatic in the institutions of the children of Israel, yet we must never lose sight of the religious and educational character even of their ancient legislation.

4. Central Idea:

One central thought is brought home to them, namely, God is the owner of the soil, and through His grace only the chosen people have come into its possession. Their time, i.e. they themselves, belong to Him: this is the deepest meaning of the day of rest; their land, i.e. their means of subsistence, belong to Him: this reveals to us the innermost significance of the year of rest. It was Yahweh's pleasure to call the children of Israel into life, and if they live and work and prosper, they are indebted to His unmerited loving-kindness. They should, therefore, put their absolute trust in Him, never doubt His word or His power, always obey Him and so always receive His unbounded blessings.

If we thus put all the emphasis on the religious character of the Sabbatical year, we are in keeping with the idea permeating the Old Testament, namely that the children of Israel are the chosen people of Yahweh. All their agricultural, social, commercial and political relations were to be built upon their divine calling and shaped according to God's sovereign will.

But did they live up to it? Or, to limit the question to our subject: Did they really observe the Sabbatical year? There are those who hold that the law regarding the Sabbatical year was not observed before the captivity. In order to prove this assertion they point to Le 26:34 f, 43; also to 2Ch 36:21. But all we can gather from these passages is the palpable conclusion that the law regarding the Sabbatical year had not been strictly obeyed, a deficiency which may mar the effect of any law.

The possibility of observing the precept respecting the Sabbatical year is demonstrated by the post-exilic history of the Jewish people. Nehemiah registers the solemn fact that the reestablished nation entered into a covenant to keep the law and to maintain the temple worship (Ne 9:38; 10:32). In 10:31 of the last-named chapter he alludes to the 7th year, "that we would forego the 7th year, and the exaction of every debt." We are not sure of the exact meaning of this short allusion; it may refer to the Sabbatical rest of the land and the suspension of debts.

For a certainty we know that the Sabbatical year was observed by the Jews at the time of Alexander the Great. When he was petitioned by the Samaritans "that he would remit the tribute of the 7th year to them, because they did not sow therein, he asked who they were that made such a petition"; he was told they were Hebrews, etc. (Josephus, Ant, XI, viii, 6).

During Maccabean and Asmonean times the law regarding the Sabbatical year was strictly observed, although it frequently weakened the cause of the Jews (1 Macc 6:49,53; Josephus, Ant, XIII, viii, 1; compare Josephus, Jewish Wars, I, ii, 4; Ant, XIV, x, 6; XV, i, 2). Again we may find references to the Sabbatical year in Josephus, Ant, XIV, xvi, 2, etc.; Tac. Hist. v.4, etc., all of which testifies to the observance of the Sabbatical year in the Herodian era. The words of Tacitus show the proud Roman's

estimate of the Jewish character and customs: "For the 7th day they are said to have prescribed rest because this day ended their labors; then, in addition, being allured by their lack of energy, they also spend the 7th year in laziness."

See also ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5, (3), (4); JUBILEE YEAR.

William Baur

SABBEUS

sa-be'-us (Sabbaias): In 1 Esdras 9:32, the same as "Shemaiah" in Ezr 10:31.

SABI

sa'-bi:

(1) Codex Alexandrinus Sabei; Codex Vaticanus Tobeis, Fritzache; the King James Version, Sami): Eponym of a family of porters who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:28) =" Shobai" in Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45.

(2) The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SABIE (which see).

SABIAS

sa-bi'-as (Sabias, Fritzsche, Asabias; the King James Version Assabias): One of the six "captains over thousands" who supplied the Levites with much cattle for Josiah's Passover (1 Esdras 1:9) =" Hashabiah" in 2Ch 35:9.

SABIE

sa'-bi-e (Sabeie, or Sabie; the King James Version Sabi): In 1 Esdras 5:34 both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), following Codex Alexandrinus, read "the sons of Phacareth, the sons of Sabie" (the King James Version "Sabi") for the "Pochereth-hazzebaim" of Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59. Codex Vaticanus reads correctly as one proper name: "Phacareth Sabie."

SABTA or SABTAH

sab'-ta (cabhta', cabhtah): Third son of Cush (Ge 10:7 = 1Ch 1:9). A place Sabta is probably to be looked for in South Arabia. Arab geographers give no exact equivalent of the name. Al Bekri (i.65) quotes a line of early poetry in which Dhu 'l Sabta is mentioned, and the context might indicate a situation in Yemamah; but the word is possibly not a proper name. It is usually identified with Saubatha

(Ptol., vi.7, 38) or with the Sabota of Pliny (vi.32; xii.32), an old mercantile city in South Arabia celebrated for its trade in frankincense and, according to Ptolemy, possessing 60 temples. It is said also to have been the territory of a king Elisarus, whose name presents a striking resemblance to Dhu ‘l-Adhar, one of the "Tubbas" or Himyarite kings of Yemen. Another conjecture is the Saphtha of Ptolemy (vi.7, 30) near the Arabian shore of the Persian Gulf.

A. S. Fulton

SABTECA

sab’te-ka (cabhtekha’; Sabakatha, Sebethacha; the King James Version Sabtechah): The 5th named of the sons of Cush in the genealogy of Ge 10:5-7. In 1Ch 1:8,9 the King James Version reads "Sabtecha," the Revised Version (British and American) "Sabteca." Many conjectures have been made as to the place here indicated. Recently Glazer (Skizze, II, 252) has revived the suggestion of Bochart that it is to be identified with Samydake in Carmania on the East of the Persian Gulf. This seems to rest on nothing more than superficial resemblance of the names; but the phonetic changes involved are difficult. Others have thought of various places in Arabia, toward the Persian Gulf; but the data necessary for any satisfactory decision are not now available.

W. Ewing

SACAR

sa’-kar (sakhar):

(1) Father of Ahiam, a follower of David (1Ch 11:35, Codex Vaticanus Achar; Codex Alexandrinus Sachar =" Sharar" of 2Sa 23:33; Sharar is favored as the original reading).

(2) Eponym of a family of gatekeepers (1Ch 26:4).

SACKBUT

sak’-but.

See MUSIC, III, 1, (f).

SACKCLOTH

sak’-kloth.

See BURIAL.

SACRAMENTS

sak’-ra-ments:

1. The Term:

The word "sacrament" comes from the Latin sacramentum, which in the classical period of the language was used in two chief senses:

(1) as a legal term to denote the sum of money deposited by two parties to a suit which was forfeited by the loser and appropriated to sacred uses;

(2) as a military term to designate the oath of obedience taken by newly enlisted soldiers.

Whether referring to an oath of obedience or to something set apart for a sacred purpose, it is evident that sacramentum would readily lend itself to describe such ordinances as Baptism and the Lord’s Supper. In the Greek New Testament, however, there is no word nor even any general idea corresponding to "sacrament," nor does the earliest history of Christianity afford any trace of the application of the term to certain rites of the church. Pliny (circa 112 AD) describes the Christians of Bithynia as "binding themselves by a sacramentum to commit no kind of crime" (Epistles x.97), but scholars are now pretty generally agreed that Pliny here uses the word in its old Roman sense of an oath or solemn obligation, so that its occurrence in this passage is nothing more than an interesting coincidence.

It is in the writings of Tertullian (end of 2nd and beginning of 3rd century) that we find the first evidence of the adoption of the word as a technical term to designate Baptism, the Lord’s Supper, and other rites of the Christian church. This Christian adoption of sacramentum may have been partly occasioned by the evident analogies which the word suggests with Baptism and the Lord’s Supper; but what appears to have chiefly determined its history in this direction was the fact that in the Old Latin versions (as afterward in the Vulgate) it had been employed to translate the Greek musterion, "a mystery" (e.g. Eph 5:32; 1Ti 3:16; Re 1:20; 17:7)—an association of ideas which was greatly fostered in the early church by the rapidly growing tendency to an assimilation of Christian worship with the mystery-practices of the Greek-Roman world.

2. Nature and Number:

Though especially employed to denote Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, the name "sacraments" was for long used so loosely and vaguely that it was applied to facts and doctrines of Christianity as well as to its symbolic rites. Augustine’s definition of a sacrament as "the visible form of an invisible grace" so far limited its application. But we see how widely even a definition like this might be stretched when we find Hugo of Victor (12th century) enumerating as many as 30 sacraments that had been recognized in

the church. The Council of Trent was more exact when it declared that visible forms are sacraments only when they represent an invisible grace and become its channels, and when it sought further to delimit the sacramental area by reenacting (1547) a decision of the Council of Florence (1439), in which for the first time the authority of the church was given to a suggestion of Peter Lombard (12th century) and other schoolmen that the number of the sacraments should be fixed at seven, namely, Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony—a suggestion which was supported by certain fanciful analogies designed to show that seven was a sacred number.

The divergence of the Protestant churches from this definition and scheme was based on the fact that these proceeded on no settled principles. The notion that there are seven sacraments has no New Testament authority, and must be described as purely arbitrary; while the definition of a sacrament is still so vague that anything but an arbitrary selection of particulars is impossible. It is perfectly arbitrary, for example, to place Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, which were instituted by Christ as ordinances of the church, in the same category with marriage, which rests not on His appointment but on a natural relationship between the sexes that is as old as the human race. While, therefore, the Reformers retained the term "sacrament" as a convenient one to express the general idea that has to be drawn from the characteristics of the rites classed together under this name, they found the distinguishing marks of sacraments

(1) in their institution by Christ,

(2) in their being enjoined by Him upon His followers,

(3) in their being bound up with His word and revelation in such a way that they become "the expressions of divine thoughts, the visible symbols of divine acts."

And, since Baptism and the Lord’s Supper are the only two rites for which such marks can be claimed, it follows that there are only two New Testament sacraments. Their unique place in the original revelation justifies us in separating them from all other rites and ceremonies that may have arisen in the history of the church, since it raises them to the dignity of forming an integral part of the historical gospel. A justification for their being classed together under a common name may be found, again, in the way in which they are associated in the New Testament (Ac 2:41,42; 1Co 10:1-4) and also in the analogy which Paul traces between Baptism and the Lord’s Supper on the one hand, and Circumcision and the Passover—the two most distinctive rites of the Old Covenant—on the other (Col 2:11; 1Co 5:7; 11:26).

3. Institution by Christ:

The assumption made above, that both Baptism and the Lord’s Supper owe their origin as sacraments of the church to their definite appointment by Christ Himself, has been strongly challenged by some modern critics.

(1) In regard to Baptism it has been argued that as Mr 16:15 f occurs in a passage (16:9-20) which

textual criticism has shown to have formed no part of the original Gospel, Mt 28:19, standing by itself, is too slender a foundation to support the belief that the ordinance rests upon an injunction of Jesus, more especially as its statements are inconsistent with the results of historical criticism. These results, it is affirmed, prove that all the narratives of the Forty Days are legendary, that Mt 28:19 in particular only canonizes a later ecclesiastical situation, that its universalism is contrary to the facts of early Christian history, and its Trinitarian formula "foreign to the mouth of Jesus" (see Harnack, History of Dogma, I, 79, and the references there given). It is evident, however, that some of these objections rest upon anti-supernatural pre-suppositions that really beg the question at issue, and others on conclusions for which real premises are wanting. Over against them all we have to set the positive and weighty fact that from the earliest days of Christianity Baptism appears as the rite of initiation into the fellowship of the church (Ac 2:38,41, et passim), and that even Paul, with all his freedom of thought and spiritual interpretation of the gospel, never questioned its necessity (compare Ro 6:3 ff; 1Co 12:13; Eph 4:5). On any other supposition than that of its appointment by our Lord Himself it is difficult to conceive how within the brief space of years between the death of Jesus and the apostle's earliest references to the subject, the ordinance should not only have originated but have established itself in so absolute a manner for Jewish and Gentile Christians alike.

(2) In the case of the Lord's Supper the challenge of its institution by Christ rests mainly upon the fact that the saying, "This do in remembrance of me," is absent from the Mark-Matthew text, and is found only in the Supper-narratives of Paul (1Co 11:24,25) and his disciple Luke (Lu 22:19). Upon this circumstance large structures of critical hypothesis have been reared. It has been affirmed that in the upper room Jesus was only holding a farewell supper with His disciples, and that it never occurred to Him to institute a feast of commemoration. It has further been maintained that the views of Jesus regarding the speedy consummation of His kingdom make it impossible that He should have dreamed of instituting a sacrament to commemorate His death. The significance of the feast was eschatological merely; it was a pledge of a glorious future hour in the perfected kingdom of God (see Mt 26:29 and parallels). And theory has even been advanced that the institution of this sacrament as an ordinance of the church designed to commemorate Christ's death was due to the initiative of Paul, who is supposed to have been influenced in this direction by what he had seen in Corinth and elsewhere of the mystery-practices of the Greek world.

All these hypothetical fabrics fall, of course, to the ground if the underlying assumption that Jesus never said, "This do in remembrance of me," is shown to be unwarrantable. And it is unwarrantable to assume that a saying of Jesus which is vouched for by Paul and Luke cannot be authentic because it does not occur in the corresponding narratives of Matthew and Mark. In these narratives, which are highly compressed in any case, the first two evangelists would seem to have confined themselves to setting down those sayings which formed the essential moments of the Supper and gave its symbolic contents. The command of its repetition they may have regarded as sufficiently embodied and expressed in the universal practice of the church from the earliest days. For as to that practice there is no question (Ac 2:42,46; 20:7; 1Co 10:16; 11:26), and just as little that it rested upon the belief that Christ had enjoined it. "Every assumption of its having originated in the church from the recollection of intercourse with Jesus at table, and the necessity felt for recalling His death, is precluded" (Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, II, 279). That the simple historical supper of Jesus with His disciples in the upper room was converted

by Paul into an institution for the Gentile and Jewish churches alike is altogether inconceivable. The primitive church had its bitter controversies, but there is no trace of any controversy as to the origin and institutional character of the Lord's Supper.

4. Efficacy:

In the New Testament the sacraments are presented as means of grace. Forgiveness (Ac 2:38), cleansing (Eph 5:25 f), spiritual quickening (Col 2:12) are associated with Baptism; the Lord's Supper is declared to be a participation in the body and blood of Christ (1Co 10:16). So far all Christians are agreed; but wide divergence shows itself thereafter. According to the doctrine of the Roman church, sacraments are efficacious ex opere operato, i.e. in virtue of a power inherent in themselves as outward acts whereby they communicate saving benefits to those who receive them without opposing any obstacle. The Reformed doctrine, on the other hand, teaches that their efficacy lies not in themselves as outward acts, but in the blessing of Christ and the operation of His Spirit, and that it is conditioned by faith in the recipient. The traditional Lutheran doctrine agrees with the Reformed in affirming that faith is necessary as the condition of saving benefits in the use of the sacraments, but resembles the Roman teaching in ascribing the efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, not to the attendant working of the Holy Spirit, but to a real inherent and objective virtue resident in them—a virtue, however, which does not lie (as the Roman church says) in the mere elements and actions of the sacraments, but in the power of the divine word which they embody.

See BAPTISM; LORD'S SUPPER.

LITERATURE.

Candlish, The Christian Sacraments; Lambert, The Sacraments in the New Testament; Bartlet, Apostolic Age, 495 ff; Hodge, Systematic Theology, III, chapter xx.

J. C. Lambert

SACRIFICE, HUMAN

hu'-man: As an expression of religious devotion, human sacrifice has been widespread at certain stages of the race's development. The tribes of Western Asia were deeply affected by the practice, probably prior to the settlement of the Hebrews in Palestine, and it continued at least down to the 5th century BC. At times of great calamity, anxiety and danger, parents sacrificed their children as the greatest and most costly offering which they could make to propitiate the anger of the gods and thus secure their favor and help. There is no intimation in the Bible that enemies or captives were sacrificed; only the offering of children by their parents is mentioned. The belief that this offering possessed supreme value is seen in Mic 6:6 f, where the sacrifice of the firstborn is the climax of a series of offerings which, in a rising scale of values, are suggested as a means of propitiating the angry Yahweh. A striking example of the rite as actually practiced is seen in 2Ki 3:27, where Mesha the king of Moab (made famous by the

Moabite Stone), under the stress of a terrible siege, offered his eldest son, the heir-apparent to the throne, as a burnt offering upon the wall of Kir-hareseth. As a matter of fact this horrid act seems to have had the effect of driving off the allies.

Human sacrifice was ordinarily resorted to, no doubt, only in times of great distress, but it seems to have been practiced among the old Canaanitish tribes with some frequency (De 12:31). The Israelites are said to have borrowed it from their Canaanite neighbors (2Ki 16:3; 2Ch 28:3), and as a matter of fact human sacrifices were never offered to Yahweh, but only to various gods of the land. The god who was most frequently worshipped in this way was Moloch or Molech, the god of the Ammonites (2Ki 23:10; Le 18:21; 20:2), but from Jeremiah we learn that the Phoenician god Baal was, at least in the later period of the history, also associated with Molech in receiving this worship (Jer 19:5; 31:35).

As in the case of the Canaanites, the only specific cases of human sacrifice mentioned among the Israelites are those of the royal princes, sons of Ahaz and Manasseh, the two kings of Judah who were most deeply affected by the surrounding heathen practices and who, at the same time, fell into great national distress (2Ki 16:3; 2Ch 28:3; 2Ki 21:6; 2Ch 33:6). But it is clear from many general statements that the custom was widespread among the masses of the people as well. It is forbidden in the Mosaic legislation (Le 18:21; 20:2-5; De 18:10); it is said in 2Ki 17:17 that the sacrifice of sons and daughters was one of the causes of the captivity of the ten tribes. Jeremiah charges the people of the Southern Kingdom with doing the same thing (Jer 7:31; 19:5; 31:35); with these general statements agree Isa 57:5; Eze 16:2 f; 20:31; 23:37; Ps 106:37 f. A study of these passages makes it certain that in the period immediately before the captivity of Judah, human sacrifice was by no means confined to the royal family, but was rather common among the people. Daughters as well as sons were sacrificed. It is mentioned only once in connection with the Northern Kingdom, and then only in the summary of the causes of their captivity (2Ki 17:17), but the Southern Kingdom in its later years was evidently deeply affected. There were various places where the bloody rite was celebrated (Jer 19:5), but the special high place, apparently built for the purpose, was in the Valley of Tophet or Hinnom (ge-hinnom, Gehenna) near Jerusalem (2Ch 28:3; 33:6). This great high place, built for the special purpose of human sacrifice (Jer 7:31; 32:35), was defiled by the good king Josiah in the hope of eradicating the cruel practice (2Ki 23:10).

The Biblical writers without exception look upon the practice with horror as the supreme point of national and religious apostasy, and a chief cause of national disaster. They usually term the rite "passing through fire," probably being unwilling to use the sacred term "sacrifice" in reference to such a revolting custom. There is no evidence of a continuance of the practice in captivity nor after the return. It is said, however, that the heathen Sepharvites, settled by the Assyrian kings in the depopulated territory of the Northern Kingdom, "burnt their children in the fire to Adrammelech and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim" (2Ki 17:31). The practice is not heard of again, and probably rapidly died out. The restored Israelites were not affected by it.

Compare SACRIFICE (Old Testament), VI, 10.

William Joseph McGlothlin

SACRIFICE, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, 1

IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. TERMS OF SACRIFICE EPITOMIZED

II. ATTITUDE OF JESUS AND NEW TESTAMENT WRITERS TO THE OLD TESTAMENT SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM

1. Jesus' Attitude

2. Paul's Attitude

3. Attitude of the Author of Hebrews

III. THE SACRIFICIAL IDEA IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Teaching of John the Baptist

2. Teaching of Jesus

3. Teaching of Peter

4. Paul's Teaching

5. Teaching of Hebrews

6. Johannine Teaching

IV. RELATION OF CHRIST'S SACRIFICE TO MAN'S SALVATION

1. Redemption or Deliverance from Curse of Sin

2. Reconciliation

3. Remission of Sins

4. The Cancellation of Guilt

5. Justification or Right Standing with God

6. Cleansing or Sanctification

7. Sonship

V. HOW CHRIST'S SACRIFICE PROCURES SALVATION

1. Jesus' Teaching

2. Paul's Teaching

3. Teaching of Hebrews

4. Petrine and Johannine Teaching

VI. RATIONALE OF THE EFFICACY OF CHRIST'S SACRIFICE

1. Jesus' Teaching

2. Paul's Teaching

3. The Teaching in Hebrews

VII. THE HUMAN CONDITIONS OF APPLICATION

1. Universal in Objective Potentiality

2. Efficacious When Subjectively Applied

VIII. THE CHRISTIAN'S LIFE THE LIFE OF SACRIFICE

1. Consequence of Christ's Sacrifice

2. Christ's Death the Appeal for Christian's Sacrifice

3. Necessary to Fill Out Christ's Sacrifice

4. Content of the Christian's Sacrifice

5. The Supper as a Sacrifice

LITERATURE

I. Terms of Sacrifice Epitomized.

The word "offering" (prosphora) describes the death of Christ, once in Paul (Eph 5:2); 5 times in Hebrews (Heb 10:5,8,10,14,18). The verb prosphero, "to offer," is also used, 15 times in Hebrews (Heb 5:1,3; 8:3,4; 9:7,14,25,28; 10:1,8,11,12; 11:4). The noun prosphora occurs 15 times in the Septuagint, usually as the translation of minchah, "sacrifice." This noun in the New Testament refers to Old Testament sacrifices in Ac 7:42; 21:26; to the offering of money in Ac 24:17; Ro 15:16. The verb anaphero, also occurs 3 times in Hebrews (7:27; 9:28; 13:15); also in 1Pe 2:5.

The word "sacrifice" (thusia in the Septuagint translates 8 different Hebrew words for various kinds of sacrifice, occurring about 350 times) refers to Christ's death, once in Paul (Eph 5:2) 5 times in Heb (5:1; 9:23,26; 10:12,26). It refers several times to Old Testament sacrifice and 5 times to Christian living or giving (Php 2:17; 4:18; Heb 13:15,16; 1Pe 2:5). The verb "to sacrifice" (thuo) is used once by Paul to describe Christ's death (1Co 5:7).

The blood (haima) of Christ is said to secure redemption or salvation, 6 times in Paul (Ro 3:25; 5:9; 1Co 10:16; Eph 1:7; 2:13; Col 1:20); 3 times in Hebrews (9:12,14; 10:19; compare also 10:29); 2 times in 1 Peter (1:2,19) and 5 times in the Johannine writings (1Joh 1:7; 5:6,8; Re 1:5). Unmistakably this figure of the blood refers to Christ's sacrificial death. "In any case the phrase (en to autou haimati, 'in his blood,' Ro 3:25) carries with it the idea of sacrificial blood-shedding" (Sanday, Commentary on Epistle to Romans, 91).

(lutron, "ransom," the price paid for redeeming, occurring in Septuagint 19 times, meaning the price paid for redeeming the servant (Le 25:51,52); ransom for first-born (Nu 3:46); ransom for the life of the owner of the goring ox (Ex 21:30, etc.)) occurs in the New Testament only twice (Mt 20:28; Mr 10:45). This word is used by Jesus to signify the culmination of His sacrificial life in His sacrificial death.

(antilutron, "ransom," a word not found in Septuagint, stronger in meaning than the preceding word) occurs only once in the New Testament (1Ti 2:6).

(apolutrosis, "redemption," in Ex 21:8, meaning the ransom paid by a father to redeem his daughter from a cruel master) signifies

(1) deliverance from sin by Christ's death, 5 times in Paul (Ro 3:24; 1Co 1:30; Eph 1:7,14; Col 1:14); once in Hebrews (9:15);

(2) general deliverance, twice (Lu 21:28; Heb 11:35);

(3) the Christian’s final deliverance, physical and spiritual (Ro 8:23; Eph 4:30).

The simple word (lutrosis, "redemption," 10 times in Septuagint as the translation of 5 Hebrew words) occurs once for spiritual deliverance (Heb 9:12).

(exagorazo, "redeem," only once in Septuagint, Da 2:8) in the New Testament means

(1) to deliver from the curse of the law, twice by Paul (Ga 3:13; 4:5);

(2) to use time wisely, twice by Paul (Eph 5:16; Col 4:5).

The simple verb (agorazo, meaning in Le 27:19 to redeem land) occurs twice in Paul (1Co 6:20; 7:23) and means "to redeem" (in a spiritual sense). katallage, "reconciliation," only twice in the Septuagint) means the relation to God into which men are brought by Christ’s death, 4 times by Paul (Ro 5:11; 11:15; 2Co 5:18,19).

(katallassein, "to reconcile," 4 times in Septuagint (3 times in 2 Maccabees)) means to bring men into the state of reconciliation with God, 5 times in Paul (Ro 5:10 twice; 2Co 5:18,19,20).

The words with the propitiatory idea occur as follows: (hilaskomai, "to propitiate," 12 times in the Septuagint, translated "to forgive") occurs twice (Lu 18:13; Heb 2:17); (hilasmos, 9 times in Septuagint, Nu 5:8; Ps 129 (130):4, etc.; "atonement," "forgiveness") occurs twice in 1 Joh (2:2; 4:10); (hilasterion, 24 times in the Septuagint, translates "mercy-seat," where God was gracious and spake to man) translates in the New Testament "propitiation" (Ro 3:25), "mercy-seat" (Heb 9:5).

Christ is called "the Lamb," amnos, twice by the Baptist (Joh 1:29,36); once by Philip applied to Christ from Isa 53:7 (Ac 8:32); and once by Peter (1Pe 1:19); arnion, 28 times in Re (5:6,8,12,13; 6:1,16; 7:9,10,14; 19:7,9; 21:9,14,22,23,27; 22:1,3).

The cross (stauros) is used by Paul 10 times to describe the sacrificial death of Christ (1Co 1:17,18; Ga 5:11; 6:12,14; Eph 2:16; Php 2:8; 3:18; 1Co 1:20; 2:14) and once by the author of Hebrews (12:2). Jesus also 5 times used the figure of the cross to define the life of sacrifice demanded of His disciples and to make His own cross the symbol of sacrifice (Mt 10:38; 16:24; Mr 8:34; Lu 9:23; 14:27, with contexts; compare Joh 3:14; 12:32, etc.).

Though it is not our province in this article to discuss the origin and history of sacrifice in the ethnic religions, it must be noted that sacrifice has been a chief element in almost every religion (Jainism and Buddhism being the principal exceptions). The bloody sacrifice, where the idea of propitiation is prominent, is well-nigh universal in the ethnic religions, being found among even the most enlightened peoples like the Greeks and Romans (see article "Expiation and Atonement" in ERE). Whether or not the system of animal sacrifices would have ceased not only in Judaism but also in all the ethnic religions, had not Jesus lived and taught and died, is a question of pure speculation. It must be conceded

that the sect of the Jews (Essenes) attaining to the highest ethical standard and living the most unselfish lives of brotherhood and benevolence did not believe in animal sacrifices. But they exerted small influence over the Jewish nation as compared with the Pharisees. It is also to be noted that the prophets Amos, Hosea, Micah and Isaiah exalted the ethical far above the ceremonial; even denounced the sacrifice of animals if not accompanied by personal devotion to righteousness (Am 5:21 ff; Ho 6:6; Mic 6:6 ff; Isa 1:11). The Stoic and Platonic philosophers also attacked the system of animal sacrifices. But these exceptions only accentuate the historical fact that man's sense of the necessity of sacrifice to Deity is well-nigh universal. Only the sacrifice of Christ and the destruction of Jerusalem caused a cessation of the daily, weekly, monthly and annual sacrifices among the Jews, and only the knowledge of Christ's sacrifice of Himself will finally destroy the last vestige of animal sacrifice.

II. Attitude of Jesus and New Testament Writers to the Old Testament Sacrificial System.

1. Jesus' Attitude:

Jesus never attacks the sacrificial system. He even takes for granted that the Jews should offer sacrifices (Mt 5:24). More than that, He accepted the whole sacrificial system, a part of the Old Testament scheme, as of divine origin, and so He commanded the cleansed leper to offer the sacrifice prescribed in the Mosaic code (Mt 8:4). There is no record that Jesus Himself ever worshipped by offering the regular sacrifices. But He worshipped in the temple, never attacking the sacrificial system as He did the oral law (Mr 7:6). On the other hand, Jesus undermined the sacrificial system by teaching that the ethical transcends the ceremonial, not only as a general principle, but also in the act of worship (Mt 5:23,24). He endorses Hosea's fine ethical epigram, 'God will have mercy and not sacrifice' (Mt 9:13; 12:7). He also commends as near the kingdom the scribe who put love to God and man above sacrifice (Mr 12:33). But Jesus teaches not merely the inferiority of sacrifice to the moral law, but also the discontinuance of sacrifice as a system, when He said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many" (Mr 14:24; Mt 26:28; Lu 22:20). Not only is the ethical superior to the ceremonial, but His sacrifice of Himself is as superior to the sacrifices of the old system as the new covenant is superior to the old.

2. Paul's Attitude:

Paul's estimate of the Jewish sacrifices is easily seen, although he does not often refer to them. Once only (Ac 21:26) after his conversion does he offer the Jewish sacrifice, and then as a matter of expediency for winning the Judaistic wing of Christianity to his universal gospel of grace. He regarded the sacrifices of the Old Testament as types of the true sacrifice which Christ made (1Co 5:7).

3. Attitude of the Author of Hebrews:

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews discusses the Old Testament sacrifices more fully than other New Testament writers. He regards the bloody sacrifices as superior to the unbloody and the yearly sacririce on the Day of Atonement by the high priest as the climax of the Old Testament system. The

high priest under the old covenant was the type of Christ under the new. The sacrifices of the old covenant could not take away sin, or produce moral transformation, because of the frailties of men (10:1-11), shown by the necessity of repeating the offerings (5:2), and because God had appointed another high priest, His Son, to supplant those of the old covenant (5:5; 7:1-28). The heart of this author's teaching is that animal sacrifices cannot possibly atone for sin or produce moral transformation, since they are divinely-appointed only as a type or shadow of the one great sacrifice by Christ (8:7; 10:1).

To sum up, the New Testament writers, as well as Jesus, regarded the Old Testament sacrificial system as of divine origin and so obligatory in its day, but imperfect and only a type of Christ's sacrifice, and so to be supplanted by His perfect sacrifice.

III. The Sacrificial Idea in the New Testament.

The one central idea of New Testament writers is that the sacrifice made by Christ on the cross is the final perfect sacrifice for the atonement of sin and the salvation of men, a sacrifice typified in the various sacrifices of the Old Testament, which are in turn abrogated by the operation of the final sacrifice. Only James and Jude among New Testament writers are silent as to the sacrifice of Christ, and they write for practical purposes only.

1. Teaching of John the Baptist:

The Baptist, it is true, presents Jesus as the coming Judge in the Synoptic Gospels, but in Joh 1:29,36 he refers to Him as "the Lamb of God," in the former passage adding "that taketh away the sin of the world." Westcott (Commentary on John, 20) says: "The title as applied to Christ .... conveys the ideas of vicarious suffering, of patient submission, of sacrifice, of redemption, etc." There is scarcely any doubt that the Baptist looked upon the Christ as the one who came to make the great sacrifice for man's sins. Professor Burton (Biblical Ideas of Atonement, Burton, Smith and Smith, 107) says that John sees Christ "suffering under the load of human sin." 2. Teaching of Jesus:

There are recorded in the Synoptic Gospels two unmistakable references by Jesus to His death as a sacrifice (Mr 10:45 parallel Mt 20:28; Mr 14:24 parallel Mt 26:28 parallel Lu 22:20; compare 1Co 11:25). In the former He declares He came to give His "life a ransom." Thayer (Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament) says this word means "the price paid for redeeming." Hence, the idea in ransom must be of sacrificial significance. But if there could be any doubt as to the sacrificial import of this passage, there is a clear case of the sacrificial idea in Mr 14:24. Practically all writers of the New Testament theology, Wendt, Weiss, Stevens, Sheldon and others, hold that Jesus considered the death as the ratification sacrifice of the new covenant, just as the sacrifice offered at Sinai ratified the old covenant (Ex 24:3-8). Ritschl and Beyschlag deny that this passage is sacrificial. But according to most exegetes, Jesus in this reference regarded His death as a sacrifice. The nature of the sacrifice, as Jesus estimated it, is in doubt and is to be discussed later. What we are pressing here is the fact that Jesus regarded His death as a sacrifice. We have to concede the meagerness of material on the sacrificial idea of His death as taught by Jesus. Yet these two references are unquestioned by literary and historical

critics. They both occur in Mark, the primitive Gospel (the oldest Gospel record of Jesus' teachings). The first occurs in two of the Synoptists, the second in all three of them. Luke omits the first for reasons peculiar to his purpose. According to Lu 24:25, Jesus regarded His sufferings and death as the fulfillment of the Old Testament Scriptures.

3. Teaching of Peter:

Though the head apostle does not in the early chapters of Ac refer to Christ as the sacrifice for sin, he does imply as much in 2:36 (He is Lord and Christ in spite of His crucifixion); 3:18,19 (He fulfilled the prophecies by suffering, and by means of repentance sins are to be blotted out); 4:10-12 (only in His name is salvation) and in 5:30,31 (through whose death Israel received remission of sins). In his First Epistle (1Pe 1:18,19) he expressly declares that we are redeemed by the blood of the spotless Christ, thus giving the sacrificial significance to His death. The same is implied in 1Pe 1:2; 3:18.

4. Paul's Teaching:

Paul ascribes saving efficacy to the blood of Christ in Ro 3:25; 5:9; 1Co 10:16; Eph 1:7; 2:13; Col 1:20. He identifies Christ with a sin offering in Ro 8:3, and perhaps also in 2Co 5:21, and with the paschal lamb in 1Co 5:7. In other passages he implies that the death of Christ secured redemption, forgiveness of sins, justification and adoption (Ro 3:24-26; 5:10,11; 8:15,17, etc.).

5. Teaching of Hebrews:

The argument of the author of Hebrews to prove the finality of Christianity is that Christ is superior to the Aaronic high priest, being a royal, eternal high priest, after the order of Melchizedek, and offering Himself as the final sacrifice for sin, and for the moral transformation of men (4:14; 10:18).

6. Johannine Teaching:

In the First Epistle of John (1 Joh 1:7; 2:2; 5:6,8) propitiation for sin and cleansing from sin are ascribed to the blood of Christ. In Re 1:5 John ascribes deliverance (not washing or cleansing, according to best manuscripts) from sin, to the blood of Christ. Several times he calls Christ the Lamb, making the sacrificial idea prominent. Once he speaks of Him as the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (13:8).

To sum up, all the New Testament writers, except James and Jude, refer to Christ's death as the great sacrifice for sin. Jesus Himself regarded His death as such. In the various types of New Testament teaching Christ's death is presented

(1) as the covenant sacrifice (Mr 14:24 parallel Mt 26:28 parallel Lu 22:20; Heb 9:15-22);

(2) as the sin offering (Ro 8:3; 2Co 5:21; Heb 13:11; 1Pe 3:18);

(3) as the offering of the paschal lamb (1Co 5:7);

(4) as the sacrifice of the Day of Atonement (Heb 2:17; 9:12).

IV. Relation of Christ's Sacrifice to Man's Salvation.

The saving benefits specified in the New Testament as resulting from the sacrificial death of Christ are as follows:

1. Redemption or Deliverance from Curse of Sin:

Redemption or deliverance from the curse of sin: This must be the implication in Jesus' words, "The Son of man also came .... to give his life a ransom for many" (Mr 10:45 parallel Mt 20:28). Man is a captive in sin, the Father sends His Son to pay the ransom price for the deliverance of the captive, and the Son's death is the price paid. Paul also uses the words "redeemed" and "redemption" in the same sense. In the great letters he asserts that we are "justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation .... in his blood" (Ro 3:24,25). Here the apostle traces justification back to redemption as the means for securing it, and redemption back to the "blood" (Christ's death) as the cause of its procurement. That is, Christ's death secures redemption and redemption procures justification. In Galatians (3:13), he speaks of being redeemed "from the curse of the law." The law involved man in a curse because he could not keep it. This curse is the penalty of the broken law which the transgressor must bear, unless deliverance from said penalty is somehow secured. Paul represents Christ by His death as securing for sinners deliverance from this curse of the broken law (compare Ga 4:5 for the same thought, though the word "curse" is not used). Paul also emphasizes the same teaching in the Captivity Epistles: "In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses" (Eph 1:7; compare Col 1:14). In the pastoral letters (1Ti 2:6) he teaches that Christ gave "himself a ransom for all." This is the only New Testament passage in which occurs the strong word antilutron for "ransom." In his old age the apostle feels more positively than ever before that Christ's death is the ransom price of man's deliverance from sin.

The author of Hebrews asserts that Christ by the sacrifice of Himself "obtained eternal redemption" for man (9:12). John says that Christ "loosed (luo) us from our sins by his blood" (Re 1:5). This idea in John is akin to that of redemption or deliverance by ransom. Peter teaches the same truth in 1Pe 1:19. So, we see, Jesus and all the New Testament writers regard Christ's sacrifice as the procuring cause of human redemption.

2. Reconciliation:

The idea of reconciliation involves a personal difference between two parties. There is estrangement between God and man. Reconciliation is the restoration of favor between the two parties. Jesus does not utter any direct message on reconciliation, but implies God's repugnance at man's sin and strained

relations between God and the unrepentant sinner (see Lu 18:13). He puts into the mouth of the praying tax-gatherer the words, ‘God be propitious to me’ (see Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon, hilaskomai), but Jesus nowhere asserts that His death secures the reconciliation of God to the sinner. Paul, however, does. "For if, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son," etc. (Ro 5:10). There can be no doubt from this passage that Paul thought of the death of Christ as the procuring cause of reconciliation. In Eph 2:13,14,18 Paul makes the cross of Christ the means of reconciliation between the hostile races of men. Paul reaches the climax in his conception of the reconciliation wrought by the cross of Christ when he asserts the unifying results of Christ’s death to be cosmic in extent (Eph 1:10).

The author of Hebrews also implies that Christ’s death secures reconciliation when he regards this death as the ratification of the "better covenant" (8:6 ff), and when he plays on the double meaning of the word (diatheke, 9:15 ff), now "covenant" and now "will," "testament." The death of Christ is necessary to secure the ratification of the new covenant which brings God and man into new relations (8:12). In 2:17 the author uses a word implying propitiation as wrought by the death of Christ. So the doctrine of reconciliation is also in the Epistle to the Hebrews. John teaches reconciliation with God through Christ our Advocate, but does not expressly connect it with His death as the procuring cause (1 Joh 2:1,2). Peter is likewise silent on this point.

3. Remission of Sins:

Reconciliation implies that God can forgive; yea, has forgiven. Jesus and the New Testament writers declare the death of Christ to be the basis of God’s forgiveness. Jesus in instituting the memorial supper said, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins" (Mt 26:28). It is true Mark and Luke do not record this last phrase, "unto remission of sins." But there is no intimation that this phrase is the result of Matthew’s theologizing on the purpose of Christ’s death (see Wendt, Teaching of Jesus, II, 239 ff, who claims this phrase is not from Jesus; also Allen in "Mt," ICC, in the place cited.). But Paul leaves no doubt as to the connection between man’s forgiveness by God and Christ’s sacrifice for him. This idea is rooted in the great passage on justification (Ro 3:21-5:21; see especially 4:7); is positively declared in Eph 1:7; Col 1:14. The author of Heb teaches that the shedding of Christ’s blood under the new covenant is as necessary to secure forgiveness as the shedding of animal’s blood under the old. John also implies that forgiveness is based on the blood (1 Joh 1:7-9).

4. The Cancellation of Guilt:

True reconciliation and forgiveness include the canceling of the offender’s guilt. Jesus has no direct word on the cancellation of guilt. Paul closes his argument for the universality of human sin by asserting that "all the world may be brought under the judgment of God" (the King James Version "guilty before God," Ro 3:19). Thayer (Greek-English Lexicon, in the place cited.) says this word "guilty" means "owing satisfaction to God" (liable to punishment by God). But in Ro 8:1,3 Paul exclaims, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus .... God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin" (the English Revised Version and the American Revised Version margin "as an offering for sin"). The guilt, or exposure of the sinner to God’s wrath and so to

punishment, is removed by the sin offering which Christ made. This idea is implied by the author of Hebrews (2:15), but is not expressed in Peter and John.

5. Justification or Right Standing with God:

Right standing with God is also implied in the preceding idea. Forgiving sin and canceling guilt are the negative, bringing into right standing with God the positive, aspects of the same transaction. "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin (i.e. the sin offering; so Augustine and other Fathers, Ewald, Ritschl; see Meyer, Commentary, in loc., who denies this meaning) on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him" (2Co 5:21). In this passage Paul makes justification the divine purpose of the sacrificial death of Christ. This thought is elaborated by the apostle in Galatians and Romans, but is not expressed by Jesus, or in Hebrews, in Peter or in John.

6. Cleansing or Sanctification:

Jesus does not connect our cleansing or sanctification with His death, but with His word (Joh 17:17). The substantive "cleansing" (katharismos) is not used by Paul, and the verb "to cleanse" (katharizo) occurs only twice in his later letters (Eph 5:26; Tit 2:14). He does use the idea of sanctification, and in Ro 6-8 teaches that sanctification is a logical consequence of justification which is secured by Christ's sacrificial death. In Php 3:10,11, he views Christ's death and resurrection as the dynamic of transformation in the new life. The author of Hebrews (1:3; 9:14,22,23; 10:2), following his Old Testament figures, uses the idea of cleansing for the whole process of putting away sin, from atonement to sanctification (see Westcott, Commentary, in the place cited.). He makes Christ's death the procuring cause of the cleansing. John does the same (1 Joh 1:7; Re 7:14).

7. Sonship:

Divine sonship of the believer is also traced by Paul to the sacrificial death of Christ (Ro 8:17), though this thought is not found in other New Testament writers.

So, we sum up, the whole process of salvation, from reconciliation with God to the adoption of the saved sinner into heaven's household, is ascribed, to some extent by Jesus, largely by Paul theologian of the New Testament, and, in varying degrees, by other New Testament writers, to the sacrificial death of Christ. Even Holtzmann (Neutest. Theol., II, 111) admits "It is upon the moment of death that the grounding of salvation is exclusively concentrated."

V. How Christ's Sacrifice Procures Salvation.

It must be conceded that the New Testament writers, much less Jesus, did not discuss this subject from the philosophical point of view. Jesus never philosophizes except incidentally. Paul, the author of He, and John had a philosophy underlying their theology, the first and second dealing most with the sacrificial work of Christ, the last with His person. But Paul and the author of Heb did not write their

letters to produce a philosophical system explaining how Christ's sacrificial death can and does procure man's salvation.

1. Jesus' Teaching:

By some it is claimed that the word "ransom" (Mr 10:45) gives us the key to the philosophy of the atonement as presented by Jesus Himself. But the rules of exegesis are against this supposition. Jesus in the context is teaching His disciples that sacrificial service is greatness. To illustrate the truth He refers to His own example of coming to "minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." That is, Jesus is enforcing a practical principle and not elaborating a theoretical truth. Moreover, the word "ransom" is used metaphorically, and the laws of exegesis forbid us to press the literal meaning of a figure. The figure suggests captivity in sin and deliverance by payment of a price (the death of Christ). But Jesus does not tell us how His sacrificial death can and does pay the price for man's redemption from sin. The word "ransom" does give the clue to the development of the vicarious sacrifice elaborated later by Paul. Ritschl (Rechtfertigung und Versohnung, II, 85) does not do the word "ransom" justice when he claims that it merely reproduces the meaning of the Hebrew kopher, "covering as a protection," and that Christ's death, like a covering, delivers us by stimulating us to lead the life of sacrificial service as Christ did. Wendt (Lehre Jesu, II, 237; Teaching of Jesus, II, 226 f) admits the "ransom"-idea in the word, but says Christ delivers us from bondage to suffering and death, not by His death, but by His teaching which is illustrated by His sacrificial death. Beyschlag (Neutest. Theol., I, 153) thinks Christ's death delivers us from worldly ambitions and such sins by showing us the example of Jesus in sacrifice. Weiss (Biblical Theology of the New Testament, I, 101-3) thinks Christ's "surrender of His life .... avails as a ransom which He gives instead of the many" who were not able to pay the price themselves. He also adds, "The saying regarding the ransom lays emphasis upon the God-pleasing performance of Jesus which secures the salvation," etc.

Nor does Jesus' saying at the Last Supper, "This is my blood of the covenant" (Mr 14:24) give us unmistakable evidence of how His death saves men. It does teach that sinners on entering the kingdom come into a new covenant relation with God which implies forgiveness of sin and fellowship with God, and that, as the covenant sacrifices at Mt. Sinai (Ex 24:3-8) ratified the legal covenant between God and His people, so the death of Christ as a covenant sacrifice ratifies the covenant of grace between God and lost sinners, by virtue of which covenant God on His part forgives the penitent sinner, and the surrendering sinner on his part presents himself to God for the life of sacrifice. But this statement fails to tell us how God can forgive sin on the basis of a covenant thus ratified by Christ's death. Does it mean substitution, that as the animal whose blood ratified the covenant was slain instead of the people, so Christ was slain in the place of sinners? Or does it suggest the immutability of the covenant on the basis of the animal's (and so Christ's) representing both God and man, and killing signifying loss of life or will to change the covenant (so Westcott, Commentary on Hebrews, 301)? It could scarcely mean that Christ's sacrifice was the offering of a perfect, acceptable life to God (Wendt, op. cit., II, 237), or that Christ's death is viewed merely as the common meal sacrifice, that God and His people thus enter into a kind of union and communion (so some evolutionists in the study of comparative religion; see Menzies. Hist of Religion, 416 ff).

2. Paul’s Teaching:

Ritschl and many modern scholars are disposed to reject all philosophy in religion. They say, "Back to Christ." Paul was only a human interpreter of Jesus. But he was a divinely-guided interpreter, and we need his first-hand interpretations of Jesus. What has he to say as to how Christ’s death saves men?

(1) The Words Expressing the Idea of Redemption.

See above on the terms of sacrifice. The classical passage containing the idea of redemption is Ro 3:24-26: "Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." A fair interpretation of this passage gives us the following propositions: (a) The believer obtains right standing with God by means of, through the channel of (see Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon, dia, A, III, 2), redemption which is in Christ. (b) This redemption in Christ involves, or is based upon, the divinely-purposed propitiation which Christ made in His death. (c) The design of God in making such a propitiation was the exhibition of His righteousness; i.e., the vindication of that side of His character which demands the punishment of sin, which had not been shown in former generations when His forbearance passed over men’s sins. See Sanday, Commentary on Romans, in the place cited. The classical passage containing the other word to redeem (exagorazo) is Ga 3:13: "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us," etc. Professor E. D. Burton (AJT, October, 1907) thinks:

(a) Law here means "law legalistically understood."

(b) The "curse" was the verdict of the law of pure legalism, "a disclosure to man of his actual status before God on a basis of merit."

(c) The redemption meant is that Christ "brought to an end the regime of law .... rather than deliverance of individuals through release from penalty."

He bases this argument largely on the use of hemas, "us," meaning Jews in antithesis with ethne, the Gentiles (Ga 3:14). Everett (The Gospel of Paul) thinks that Christ was cursed in that He was "crucified" (the manner not the fact of His death being the curse); that is, as Everett sees it, Christ became ceremonially unclean, and so free from the law. So does His follower by being crucified with Christ become ceremonially unclean and so free from the law. The passage seems to give us the following propositions:

(a) Man under law (whether the revealed law of the Old Testament or the moral law) is under a "curse," that is, liable to the penalty which the broken law demands.

(b) Christ by His death on the cross became a "curse for us."

(c) By means of Christ thus becoming a "curse for us" He delivered us, "not the Jews as a nation, but all of us, Jews and Gentiles, who believed," from the curse incurred by the breaking of the law.

Professor Burton admits that the participle genomenos, "becoming," may be a "participle of means" (the article cited above, 643), and so we have "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us." The passage at least suggests, if it does not declare, that Christ saves us by vicariously enduring the penalty to which we were exposed.

(2) The Idea of Reconciliation.

Paul uses the phrase "wrath of God" (Ro 1:18, etc.) to express the attitude of God toward sin, an attitude of displeasure and of grief, of revulsion of holy character which demands the punishment of sin. On the other hand, God loves the sinner; love is the prompting cause of redemption through Christ (Ro 5:8; 8:32). That is, wrath is love grieving and righteousness revolting because of sin, and both phases may act simultaneously (Simon, Redemption of Man, 216, to the contrary). So Paul says, "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses" (2Co 5:19). Now this word "reconcile" (katallassein) means in the active, "to receive into favor," in the passive, "to be restored to favor" (Thayer). See also Revelation and The Expositor, October, 1909, 600 ff, where Professor Estes shows, from Sophocles, Xenophon, Josephus, Septuagint and passages in the New Testament like Mt 5:24, that the word must mean a change in the attitude of God toward men and not merely a change of men toward God. Practically the same is taught by Meyer (Commentary on 2 Corinthians); Lipsius (Handcomm. zum New Testament); Sanday (Commentary on Romans); Denney (Exegetical Greek Testament on Romans); Lietzmann (Handbuch zum New Testament); Holtzmann (Neutest. Theol.); Weiss (Religion of the New Testament); Pfleiderer (Paulinism); Stevens (Christian Doctrine of Salvation), and in nearly all the great commentaries on Romans and 2 Corinthians, and by all the writers on New Testament theology except Beyschlag.

See also RECONCILIATION; RETRIBUTION.

(3) The Idea of Propitiation.

Only once (Ro 3:25) does Paul use the word "propitiation." As saw in (1) above, the redemption in Christ is based upon the propitiation which Christ made in His death. Thayer (Greek-English Lexicon, in the place cited.) says the noun signifies "a means of appeasing, expiating, a propitiation, an expiatory sacrifice." He thinks it has this meaning in Ro 3:25, but refers it to the "mercy-seat" in Heb 9:5. Sanday (Comm. on Rom, 88) regards hilasterion as an adjective meaning "propitiatory." De Wette, Fritzsche, Meyer, Lipsius and many others take it in this sense; Gifford, Vaughan, Liddon, Ritschl think it means "mercy-seat" here as in Hebrews. But with either meaning the blood of Christ is viewed as securing the mercy of God. Propitiation of God is made by the blood of Christ, and because of that men have access to the mercy-seat where shines the glory of God in His forgiveness of man’s sins.

See ROMANS, EPISTLE TO THE, 9, (3).

(4) The Prepositions Huper, and Anti.

Paul never uses anti ("for," "instead of," "in place of," so Thayer) to express what Christ's sacrifice does for the sinner, but huper ("for one's safety or advantage," primarily, but also "in the place of," "instead of," so Thayer). See Ro 5:8; 8:32; 14:15; 1Co 11:24; 2Co 5:15; Ga 3:13; Eph 5:2,25; 1Th 5:10; 1Ti 2:6; Tit 2:14. It is to be noted that in 1Ti 2:6 Paul uses antilutron, "ransom," compounded with the preposition anti, but follows it with huper, which may suggest that huper is here used in the sense of anti, "in the place of."

Summing up Paul's teaching as to how Christ's sacrifice saves:

(a) The propitiatory sacrifice does not "soften God, or assuage the anger of God" (as Bushnell claims the advocates of the satisfaction theories assert, Vicarious Sacrifice, 486). God is already willing to save men, His love makes the propitiatory sacrifice (Ro 5:8). God's love makes the sacrifice, not the sacrifice His willingness to save.

(b) But man by breaking God's law had come under the curse, the penalty of the broken law (Ga 3:13), and so was under God's wrath (Ro 1:18), i.e. man's sin exposed him to punishment, while at the same time God's love for the sinner was grieved.

(c) Christ by His sacrificial death made it possible for God to show His righteousness and love at the same time; i.e. that He did punish sin, but did love the sinner and wish to save him (Ro 3:25,26; 5:8).

(d) Christ, who was sinless, suffered vicariously for sinful men. His death was not due to His sins but those of men (2Co 5:21).

(e) His death, followed by His resurrection which marked Him off as the sinless Son of God, and so appointed the Saviour of men (Ro 1:4), was designed by God to bring men into right relation with God (Ro 3:26; 2Co 5:21).

So, we may say, Paul explained the relation of Christ's death to the sinner's spiritual life by thinking of a transfer of the sinner's "curse" to Christ, which He bore on the cross, and of God's righteousness through Christ (Php 3:9) to the sinner by faith in Christ. But we must not press this vicarious idea too far into a system of philosophy of the atonement and claim that the system is the teaching of Paul. The quantitative, commercial idea of transfer is not in Paul's mind. The language of redemption, propitiation, ransom, is largely figurative. We must feel the spiritual truth of a qualitative transfer of sin from man to Christ and of righteousness from Christ to man, and rest the matter there, so far as Paul's teaching goes. Beyond this our conclusions as to substitution as the method of atonement are results of philosophizing on Paul's teaching.

3. Teaching of Hebrews:

The author of Hebrews adds nothing to Paul's teaching respecting the method whereby Christ's sacrifice operates in saving men. His purpose to produce an apology showing forth the superior efficacy of Christ's high-priestly sacrifice over that of the Aaronic priesthood fixes his first thought on the efficacy of the sacrifice rather than on its mode of operation. He does use the words "redemption" (9:12; compare 9:15), "propitiate" (2:17), and emphasizes the opening up of the heavenly holy of holies by the high-priestly sacrifice of Christ (the way of access to the very presence of God by Christ's death, 10:19,20), which gives us data for forming a system based on a real propitiation for sin and reconciliation of God similar to the Pauline teaching formulated above.

4. Petrine and Johannine Teaching:

Peter asserts that Christ suffered vicariously (1Pe 2:22-24), who, although He "did no sin," "his own self bare our sins in his body upon the tree"; who "suffered for sins once, the righteous for (huper, not anti) the unrighteous" (1Pe 3:18). But Peter goes no farther than Paul (perhaps not so far) in elaborating how Jesus' vicarious suffering saves the sinner. The Johannine writings contain the propitiatory idea (1 Joh 2:2; 4:10), although John writes to emphasize the incarnation and not the work of the Incarnate One (Joh 1:1-18; 1 Joh 4:2,3).

To sum up the New Testament teachings on the mode or operation: Jesus asserts His vicarious suffering (Mr 10:45; compare Joh 10:11) and hints at the mode of its operation by using the "ransom" figure. Paul, Peter and John teach that Christ's sacrifice was vicarious, and all but Peter suggest the idea of propitiation as to the mode of its operation. There is no direct discussion of what propitiation means.

SACRIFICE, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, 2

VI. Rationale of the Efficacy of Christ's Sacrifice.

1. Jesus' Teaching:

Jesus emphasizes His voluntary spirit in making the sacrifice. "The Son of man also came .... to give his life a ransom." The sacrifice was voluntary, not compulsory. God did not force Him to lay down His life; He chose to do so (compare Joh 10:11). But Jesus gives us no philosophy on this or any other element in His sacrifice as being the ground of its efficacy.

2. Paul's Teaching:

Paul also emphasizes the voluntary gift of Christ (Ga 2:20), but he urges rather the dignity of Him who makes the sacrifice as a ground of its efficacy. It is the sacrifice of God's Son, shown to be such in His resurrection (Ro 1:4; 4:25). It was no ordinary man but the sinless Son who gave "himself" (Ga 2:20). It

was not merely a dying Christ but the Son who rose again "in power" (Ro 1:4), who secures our "justification" (Ro 4:25; 1Co 15:3,4,17). Paul also emphasizes the sinless life and character of Jesus as a ground of efficacy in Christ's sacrifice, "who knew no sin" in His life experience (2Co 5:21).

3. The Teaching in Hebrews:

The author of Hebrews, most of all New Testament writers, elaborates the grounds of efficacy in Christ's sacrifice.

(1) It was a personal not an animal sacrifice (9:12-14; 9:26, "sacrifice of himself"; 10:4).

(2) It was the sacrifice of the Son of God (3:5).

(3) It was a royal person who made the sacrifice (6:20b; 7:1, "after the order of Melchizedek .... king of Salem").

(4) It was a sinless person (7:26,27; 9:14; 10:10,12). Westcott, Commentary on Hebrews, 298, well says, "It becomes necessary, therefore, in order to gain a complete view of the Sacrifice of Christ, to combine with the crowning act upon the Cross His fulfillment of the will of God from first to last, the Sacrifice of Life with the Sacrifice of Death."

(5) It was an eternal person (6:20, "for ever"; 7:16, "after the power of an endless (margin "indissoluble") life").

The author of Hebrews reaches the climax of his argument for the superior efficacy of Christ's sacrifice when he represents Him as entering the holy of holies in the very presence of God to complete the offering for man's sin (8:1,2; 9:11,12,24).

Peter and John do not discuss the ground of efficacy, and so add nothing to our conclusions above. The efficacy of the sacrifice is suggested by describing the glory of the person (1Pe 1:19; 2:22,23; 1 Joh 1:7; 2:2).

To sum up our conclusion as to the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice: Jesus and the leading New Testament writers intimate that the efficacy of His sacrifice centers in His personality. Jesus, Peter and John do not discuss the subject directly. Paul, though discussing it more extensively, does not do so fully, but the author of Heb centers and culminates his argument for the finality of Christianity, in the superior efficacy of Christ's sacrifice, which is grounded in His personality, divine, royal, sinless, eternal (see Menegoz, Theol. de l'Ep. aux Hebreux). It is easy to see, from the position taken by the author of He, how Anselm in Cur Deus Homo developed his theory of satisfaction, according to which the Divinity in Christ gave His atoning sacrifice its priceless worth in God's eyes.

VII. The Human Conditions of Application.

1. Universal in Objective Potentiality:

The sacrificial death of Christ is universal in its objective potentiality, according to Jesus (Lu 24:47, "unto all the nations"); according to Paul (Ro 1:5; 5:18; 11:32; 2Co 5:14,15; Ga 3:14); according to the author of Hebrews (2:9, "taste of death for every man"); according to John (1 Joh 2:2, "propitiation .... for the whole world").

2. Efficacious When Subjectively Applied:

But the objective redemption to be efficacious must be subjectively applied. The blood of Christ is the universally efficacious remedy for the sin-sick souls of men, but each man must make the subjective application. How is the application made? And the threefold answer is, by repentance, by faith, and by obedience.

(1) By Repentance.

The Baptist and Jesus emphasized repentance (change of mind first of all, then change of relation and of life) as the condition of entrance into the kingdom and of enjoyment of the Messianic salvation (Mt 3:2; Mr 1:15). Peter preached repentance at Pentecost and immediately after as a means of obtaining forgiveness (Ac 2:38; 3:19, etc.). Paul, although emphasizing faith, also stressed repentance as an element in the human condition of salvation (Ac 20:21; Ro 2:4, etc.). John (Re 2; 3, passim) emphasizes repentance, though not stressing it as a means of receiving the benefits of redemption.

(2) By Faith.

Jesus connected faith with repentance (Mr 1:15) as the condition of receiving the Messianic salvation. Paul makes faith the all-inclusive means of applying the work of Christ. The gospel is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth" (Ro 1:16); "whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith" (Ro 3:25); "faith (not works) is reckoned for righteousness" (Ro 4:5); "justified by faith" (Ro 5:1). In Galatians, the letters to the Corinthians, in the Captivity and the Pastoral Epistles he emphasizes faith as the sole condition of receiving salvation. But what kind of faith is it that appropriates the saving benefit of Christ’s death? Not historical or intellectual but "heart" faith (Ro 10:10). To Paul "heart" meant the seat or essence of the whole personality, and so faith which applies the redemption Christ is the personal commitment of one’s self to Christ as Saviour and Lord (2Co 5:15). See Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon, pisteuo, 1, b, gamma, for a particular discussion of the meaning of faith in this sense. The author of Heb discusses especially faith as a conquering power, but also implies that it is the condition of entrance upon the life of spiritual rest and fellowship (chapters 3 and 4, passim). Peter (1Pe 1:9) and John (1 Joh 3:23; 4:16; 5:1,5, etc.) also regard faith as a means of applying the saving benefits of Christ’s death.

(3) By Obedience in Sacrificial Service.

Jesus said, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me" (Mr 8:34). Here He lays down two elements in the conditions of discipleship, denying one's self and taking up his cross. The former means the renunciation of self as the center of thought, faith, hope and life. The latter means the life of sacrifice. Jesus was stressing this truth when He uttered that incomparable saying, "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mr 10:45 parallel Mt 20:28). Paul also emphasizes this phase of the human condition of salvation when he shows how sanctification grows spontaneously out of justification (Ro 6:8) and when he says that what "avails" is "faith working through love" (Ga 5:6). The author of Hebrews says, "He became unto all them that obey him the author (Greek aitios, "cause") of eternal salvation" (5:9). Peter and John, the latter especially, emphasize the keeping of His commandments, the life of service, as the means of appropriating to the fullest the saving benefits of Christ's death. The theologians in classrooms and preachers in the pulpits have failed to emphasize this aspect of "saving faith" as did Jesus, Paul, the author of He, and John. in the New Testament salvation is a process as well as an instantaneous act on the part of God, and the process is carried on by means of obedience, the life of service, which appropriates by faith the dynamic of Christ's sacrifice.

VIII. The Christian's Life the Life of Sacrifice.

This discussion of the faith that "obeys" leads to the consideration of that climactic thought of New Testament writers, namely, that the Christian's life is sacrificial living based on Christ's sacrifice for him. We note in outline the following:

The Christian's life of sacrifice is the logical consequence of Christ's sacrificial death. The Christ who sacrificed Himself for the believer is now continuing the sacrifice in the believer's life (Ga 1:20; Php 1:21).

1. Consequence of Christ's Sacrifice:

Paul was crucified when Christ was crucified (in a bold mystic figure), and the life of Christ which sacrificed itself on the cross and perpetuates itself in resurrection power now operates as a mighty dynamic for the apostle's moral and spiritual transformation (Php 3:10,11). It is to be noted, Jesus also emphasized this kind of living, though not so expressly connecting the believer's sacrificial life with His sacrificial death (see Mr 8:34 f).

2. Christ's Death the Appeal for a Christian's Sacrifice:

Christ's sacrificial death becomes the persuasive appeal for the Christian's sacrificial life, "Because we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died; and he died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto him who for their sakes died and rose again" (2Co 5:14,15). Because He died for us we should live for Him. But what is the appeal which Christ's sacrificial death makes to the saved sinner? "The love of Christ constraineth us" (2Co 5:14). Christ's death on the cross

exhibits His love, unspeakable, unthinkable love, for it was love for His "enemies" (Ro 5:10), and that matchless love kindles love in the forgiven sinner's heart. He is willing to do anything, even to die, for his Saviour who died for him (Ac 21:13; Php 1:29,30). It is a greater privilege for the saved sinner to suffer for Christ than it is to believe on Him. Peter (1Pe 3:17,18), the author of Hebrews (12; 13:13) and John (1 Joh 3:16; 4:16-19) emphasize this truth.

3. Necessary to Fill Out Christ's Sacrifice:

The Christian's sacrifice is necessary to fill out Christ's sacrifice. "Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church" (Col 1:24). Roman Catholic exegetes have made the apostle teach that the sufferings of the saints, along with Christ's sufferings, have atoning efficacy. But Paul nowhere intimates that his sufferings avail for putting away sins. We may hold with Weiss (Comm. on the New Testament) that Paul longed to experience in his life the perfect sacrificial spirit as Christ did; or with Alford (in loc.) that he wished to suffer his part of Christ's sufferings to be endured by him through His church; or, as it seems to us, he longed to make effective by his ministry of sacrificial service to as many others as possible the sacrificial death of Christ. Christ's sacrifice avails in saving men only when Christians sacrifice their lives in making known this sacrifice of Christ.

4. Content of the Christian's Sacrifice:

(1) The Christian is to present his personality (Ro 15:16). Paul commends the Macedonians for "first" giving "their own selves to the Lord" (2Co 8:5).

(2) Christians must present their "bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God" (Ro 12:1). In the old system of sacrifices the animals were offered as dead; Christians are to offer their bodies, all their members with their powers, to God a "living sacrifice," i.e. a sacrifice which operates in lives of holiness and service (see also Ro 6:13,19).

(3) Christians must offer their money or earthly possessions to God. Paul speaks of the gift from the church at Philippi as "a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God" (Php 4:18). This gift was to the apostle a beautiful expression of the sacrificial spirit imparted to them because they had the "mind" of Christ who "emptied himself, ... becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Php 2:5-8). The author of Hebrews (13:16) exhorts his readers, "But to do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

(4) The general exercise of all our gifts and graces is viewed by Peter as sacrificial living (1Pe 2:5): "Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices" etc. All Christians are priests and daily offer up their burnt offerings acceptable to God, if they 'suffer as Christians' (1Pe 2:20; 3:18) in the exercise of their graces and powers.

But how do these sacrifices of the Christian affect him and God? The New Testament writers never hint

that our sacrifices propitiate God, or so win His favor that He will or can on account of our sacrifices forgive our sins. They are "well-pleasing" to Him a "sweet odor"; that is, they win His approval of our lives thus lived according to the standard which Christ gives us. Their influence on us is the increase of our spiritual efficiency and power and finally a greater capacity for enjoying spiritual blessings in heaven (1Co 3:14).

5. The Supper as a Sacrifice:

Some scholars (Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, etc.) regard the memorial supper as a kind of sacrifice which the Christian offers in worship. Neither Jesus, Paul, the author of Hebrews, Peter, or John, ever hints that in eating the bread and drinking the wine the Christian offers a sacrifice to God in Christ. Paul teaches that in partaking of the Supper we "proclaim the Lord's death till he come" (1Co 11:26). That is, instead of offering a sacrifice ourselves to God, in partaking of the Supper we proclaim the offering of Christ's sacrifice for us. Milligan argues that as Christ in heaven perpetually offers Himself for us, so we on earth, in the Supper, offer ourselves to Him (Heavenly Priesthood, 266). Even Cave (Spiritual Doctrine of Sacrifice, 439) maintains, "In a certain loose sense the Lord's Supper may be called a sacrifice." See the above books for the argument supporting this position.

To sum up our conclusions on sacrifice in the New Testament:

(1) Jesus and New Testament writers regard the Old Testament sacrificial system as from God, but imperfect, the various sacrifices serving only as types of the one great sacrifice which Christ made.

(2) All the writers, except James and Jude, with Jesus, emphasize the sacrificial idea, Jesus less, giving only two hints of His sacrificial death (in the Synoptic Gospels), the author of Heb putting the climactic emphasis on Christ's sacrifice as the sacrifice of atonement.

(3) As to the relation of Christ's sacrifice to man's salvation, the latter is the achievement of the former, so expressed only twice by Jesus, but emphatically so declared by Paul, the author of Heb, Peter, and John (Paul and Heb laying most emphasis on this point).

(4) As to how Christ's sacrifice saves men, Jesus, the author of He, Peter and John suggest the idea of propitiation, while Paul emphatically teaches that man is under a curse, exposed to the displeasure of God, and that Christ's sacrifice secured the reconciliation of God by vindicating His righteousness in punishing sin and His love in saving sinners. Jesus and the leading New Testament writers agree that Christ saves men through His vicarious suffering.

(5) As to the rational basis of efficacy in Christ's sacrifice, there is no direct discussion in the New Testament except by the author of Hebrews who grounds its final, eternal efficacy in Christ's personality, divine, royal, sinless and eternal.

(6) As to the conditions of applying Christ's sacrifice, repentance and faith, which lives and fruits in

obedience and sacrificial living, are recognized by Jesus and all the leading New Testament writers as the means of appropriating the benefits of Christ's sacrifice.

(7) By Jesus, Paul, the author of He, Peter and John the Christian life is viewed as the life of sacrifice. Christ's death is at once the cause, motive, measure, and the dynamic of the Christian's sacrificial life.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the great comms.—ICC, Allen on "Mt," Gould on "Mk," Sanday-Headlam on "Rom"; Westcott on the Gospel and Epistles of John, and on the Hebrews; Davidson, Delitzsch and Meyer on Hebrews; Meyer on 2 Corinthians; Lightfoot and Abbott on Colossians; and the standard authors of the Biblical Theology of the New Testament, Weiss, Beyschlag, Bovon, Stevens, Sheldon—see the following special works: Cave, Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice, Edinburgh, 1890; Simon, Redemption of Man, 1886; G. Milligan, The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Edinburgh, 1899; Milligan, The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord, London, 1908; W.P. Du Bose, High-Priesthood and Sacrifice; Everett, The Gospel of Paul, Boston, 1893; Burton, Smith, and Smith, Biblical Ideas of Atonement, Chicago, 1909; Denney, The Death of Christ: Its Place and Interpretation in the New Testament, London, 1902; Denney, The Atonement and the Modern Mind, London, 1903; Ritschl, Rechtfertigung und Versohnung (Justification and Reconciliation), Bonn, 1895-1902, English translations of the Bible, 1900; Menegoz, Theol. del'Ep. aux Hebreux; article "Blood," Hastings, Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, by H. Wheeler Robinson; article "Communion with Deity," ibid., by Nathan Soderblom; article "Communion with Deity" (Christian), ibid., by Darwell Stone and D. C. Simpson; article "Expiation and Atonement," ibid., by W. A. Brown (Christian viewpoint), S. R. Driver (Hebrew), H. Loewe (Jewish); article "Redemption from the Curse of the Law," in AJT, October, 1907, by Professor E. D. Burton; article "Some Thoughts as to the Effects of the Death of Christ," in Revelation and The Expositor, October, 1909.

C. B. Williams

SACRIFICE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, 1

sak'-ri-fis, sak'-ri-fiz:

IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

I. TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

II. ORIGIN AND NATURE OF SACRIFICES

1. Theory of a Divine Revelation

2. Theories of a Human Origin

(1) The Gift-Theory

(2) The Magic Theory

(3) The Table-Bond Theory

(4) The Sacramental Communion Theory

(5) The Homage Theory

(6) The Piacular Theory

(7) Originating Religious Instincts

III. CLASSIFICATION OF SACRIFICES

1. Maimonides

2. W.R. Smith and Others

3. Oehler

4. Paterson and Others

5. H.M. Wiener

IV. SACRIFICES IN THE PRE-MOSAIC AGE

1. In Egypt

2. In Babylonia

3. Nomads and Tribes of Arabia and Syria

4. The Offerings of Cain and Abel

5. Of Noah

6. Of Abraham

7. Of Job

8. Of Isaac

9. Of Jacob

10. Of Israel in Egypt

11. Of Jethro

12. Summary and Conclusions

V. THE MOSAIC SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM

1. The Covenant Sacrifice

2. The Common Altars

3. The Consecration of Aaron and His Sons

4. Sacrifices before the Golden Calf

5. The Law of the Burnt Offering (‘Olah)

(1) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 1:3-17)

(2) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 1:3-17)

(3) General Laws for the Priest

(4) Laws in Deuteronomy 12:6,13,14,27; 27:6

6. The Law of the Meal Offering (Minchah)

(1) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 2:1-16)

(2) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 2:1-16)

(3) General Laws for the Priest (Leviticus 6:14-18 (Hebrew 7-11), etc.)

7. The Law of the Peace Offering

(1) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 3:1-17)

(2) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 3:1-17)

(3) General Laws for the Priest (Leviticus 6:12 (Hebrew 5); 7:1 ff)

8. The Law of the Sin Offering

(1) At the Consecration of Aaron and His Sons (Exodus 29:10 ff)

(2) The Law of the Sin Offering (Leviticus 4:1-35; 24-30, etc.)

(a) The Occasion and Meaning

(b) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 4:1-5,13, etc.)

(c) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 4:1-5,13, etc.)

(d) General Laws for the Priest (Leviticus 6:24-30)

(e) Special Uses of the Sin Offering

(i) Consecration of Aaron and His Sons

(ii) Purifications from Uncleanness

(iii) On the Day of Atonement

(iv) Other Special Instances

9. The Guilt Offering

(1) The Ritual (Leviticus 5:14-6:7)

(2) Special Laws: Leper, Nazirite, etc.

10. The Wave Offering

11. The Heave Offering

12. Drink Offerings

13. Primitive Nature of the Cult

VI. SACRIFICES IN THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL

1. The Situation at Moses’ Death

2. In the Time of Joshua

3. The Period of the Judges

4. Times of Samuel and Saul

5. Days of David and Solomon

6. In the Northern Kingdom

7. In the Southern Kingdom to the Exile

8. In the Exilic and Post-exilic Periods

9. A Temple and Sacrifices at Elephantine

10. Human Sacrifices in Israel’s History

11. Certain Heathen Sacrifices

VII. THE PROPHETS AND SACRIFICES

VIII. SACRIFICE IN THE "WRITINGS"

1. Proverbs

2. The Psalms

IX. THE IDEA AND EFFICACY OF SACRIFICES

1. A Gift of Food to the Deity

2. Expression of Adoration and Devotion, etc.

3. Means of Purification from Uncleanness

4. Means of Consecration to Divine Service

5. Means of Establishing a Community of Life between Worshipper and God

6. View of Ritschl

7. The Sacramental View

8. Symbol or Expression of Prayer

9. View of Kautzsch

10. Vicarious Expiation Theory; Objections

11. Typology of Sacrifice

LITERATURE

I. Terms and Definitions.

zebhach, "sacrifice"; ‘olah, "burnt offering"; chata’ah, chatta’th, "sin offering"; ‘asham, "guilt" or "trespass offering": shelem, shelamim, "peace offerings"; minchah, "offering," "present"; zebhach shelamim, "sacrifice of peace offerings"; zebhach ha-todhah, "thank offerings"; zebhach nedhabhah, "free-will offerings"; zebhach nedher, "votive offerings"; tenuphah, "wave offering"; terumah, "heave offering"; qorban, "oblation," "gift"; ‘ishsheh, "fire offering"; necekh, "drink offering"; kalil, "whole burnt offering"; chagh, "feast"; lebhonah, "frankincense"; qetorah, qetoreth, "odor," "incense"; melach, "salt"; shemen, "oil":

Zebhach: a "slaughtered animal," a "sacrifice," general term for animals used in sacrifice, including burnt offerings, peace offerings, thank offerings, and all sacrifices offered to the Deity and eaten at the festivals. More particularly it refers to the flesh eaten by the worshippers after the fat parts had been burned on the altar and the priest had received his portion.

‘Olah: a "burnt offering," sometimes whole burnt offering. Derived from the verb ‘alah, "to go up." It may mean "that which goes up to the altar" (Knobel, Wellhausen, Nowack, etc.), or "that which goes up in smoke to the sky" (Bahr, Delitzsch, Dillmann, etc.); sometimes used synonymously with kalil (which see). The term applies to beast or fowl when entirely consumed upon the altar, the hide of the beast

being taken by the priest. This was perhaps the most solemn of the sacrifices, and symbolized worship in the full sense, i.e. adoration, devotion, dedication, supplication, and at times expiation.

Chota'ah, chatta'th: a "sin offering," a special kind, first mentioned in the Mosaic legislation. It is essentially expiatory, intended to restore covenant relations with the Deity. The special features were:

(1) the blood must be sprinkled before the sanctuary, put upon the horns of the altar of incense and poured out at the base of the altar of burnt offering;

(2) the flesh was holy, not to be touched by worshipper, but eaten by the priest only. The special ritual of the Day of Atonement centers around the sin offering.

'Asham: "guilt offering," "trespass offering" (King James Version; in Isa 53:10, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "an offering for sin," the American Revised Version margin "trespass offering"). A special kind of sin offering introduced in the Mosaic Law and concerned with offenses against God and man that could be estimated by a money value and thus covered by compensation or restitution accompanying the offering. A ram of different degrees of value, and worth at least two shekels, was the usual victim, and it must be accompanied by full restitution with an additional fifth of the value of the damage. The leper and Nazirite could offer he-lambs. The guilt toward God was expiated by the blood poured out, and the guilt toward men by the restitution and fine. The calling of the Servant an 'asham (Isa 53:10) shows the value attached to this offering.

Shelem, shelamim: "peace offering," generally used the plural, shelamim, only once shelem (Am 5:22). These were sacrifices of friendship expressing or promoting peaceful relations with the Deity, and almost invariably accompanied by a meal or feast, an occasion of great joy. They are sometimes called zebhachim, sometimes zebhach shelamim, and were of different kinds, such as zebhach ha-todhah, "thank offerings," which expressed the gratitude of the giver because of some blessings, zebhach nedhabhah, "free-will offerings," bestowed on the Deity out of a full heart, and zebhach nedher, "votive offerings," which were offered in fulfillment of a vow.

Minchah: "meal offering" (the Revised Version), "meat offering" (the King James Version), a gift or presentation, at first applied to both bloody and unbloody offerings (Ge 4:5), but in Moses' time confined to cereals, whether raw or roast, ground to flour or baked and mixed with oil and frankincense. These cereals were the produce of man's labor with the soil, not fruits, etc., and thus represented the necessities and results of life, if not life itself. They were the invariable accompaniment of animal sacrifices, and in one instance could be substituted for them (see SIN OFFERING). The term minchah describes a gift or token of friendship (Isa 39:1), an act of homage (1Sa 10:27; 1Ki 10:25), tribute (Jud 3:15,17 f), propitiation to a friend wronged (Ge 32:13,18; Heb 14:19)), to procure favor or assistance (Ge 43:11 ff; Ho 10:6).

Tenuphah: "wave offering," usually the breast, the priest's share of the peace offerings, which was waved before the altar by both offerer and priest together (the exact motion is not certain), symbolic of

its presentation to Deity and given back by Him to the offerer to be used in the priests' service.

Terumah: "heave offering," something lifted up, or, properly, separated from the rest and given to the service of the Deity. Usually the right shoulder or thigh was thus separated for the priest. The term is applied to products of the soil, or portion of land separated unto the divine service, etc.

Qorban: "an oblation," or "offering"; another generic term for all kinds of offerings, animal, vegetable, or even gold and silver. Derived from the verb qarabh, "to draw near," it signifies what is drawn or brought near and given to God.

'Ishsheh: "fire offering," applied to offerings made by fire and usually bloody offerings, but at times to the minchah, the sacred bread and frankincense placed on the tables as a memorial, part of which was burned with the frankincense, the bulk, however, going to the priest. The gift was thus presented through fire to the Deity as a sort of etherealized food.

Necekh: "drink offering," or "libation," a liquid offering of wine, rarely water, sometimes of oil, and usually accompanying the 'olah, but often with the peace offerings.

Kalil: "whole burnt offering," the entire animal being burned upon the altar. Sometimes used synonymously with 'olah. A technical term among the Carthaginians.

Chagh: a "feast," used metaphorically for a sacrificial feast because the meat of the sacrifices constituted the material of the feast.

Lebhonah: "frankincense," "incense," used in combination with the meal offerings and burnt offerings and burned also upon the altar in the holy place.

See INCENSE.

Qetorah, qetoreth: "smoke," "odor of sacrifice," or incense ascending as a sweet savor and supposed to be pleasing and acceptable to God.

Melach: "salt," used in all sacrifices because of its purifying and preserving qualities.

Shemen: "oil," generally olive oil, used with the meal offerings of cakes and wafers, etc.

Sacrifice is thus a complex and comprehensive term. In its simplest form it may be defined as "a gift to God." It is a presentation to Deity of some material object, the possession of the offerer, as an act of worship. It may be to attain, restore, maintain or to celebrate friendly relations with the Deity. It is religion in action—in early times, almost the whole of religion—an inseparable accompaniment to all religious exercises. Few or many motives may actuate it. It may be wholly piacular and expiatory, or an Offering of food as a gift to God; it may be practically a bribe, or a prayer, an expression of dependence,

obligation and thanksgiving. It may express repentance, faith, adoration, or all of these combined. It was the one and only way of approach to God. Theophrastus defines it as expressing homage, gratitude and need. Hubert and Mauss define it as "a religious act which by the consecration of the victim modifies the moral state of the sacrificer, or of certain material objects which he has in view, i.e., either confers sanctity or removes it and its analogue, impiety."

II. Origin and Nature of Sacrifices.

The beginnings of sacrifice are hidden in the mysteries of prehistoric life. The earliest narrative in Genesis records the fact, but gives no account of the origin and primary idea. The custom is sanctioned by the sacred writings, and later on the long-established custom was adopted and systematized in the Mosaic Law. The practice was almost universal. The Vedas have their elaborate rituals. Some Semitic peoples, Greeks, Romans, Africans, and Indians of Mexico offered human sacrifices. It is unknown in Australia, but even there something akin to it exists, for some natives offer a portion of a kind of honey, others offer a pebble or a spear to their god. For this practically universal habit of the race, several solutions are offered.

1. Theory of a Divine Revelation:

One view maintains that God Himself initiated the rite by divine order at the beginnings of human history. Such a theory implies a monotheistic faith on the part of primitive man. This theory was strongly held by many of the Reformed theologians, and was based mainly on the narrative in Ge 4:4 f. Abel offered an acceptable sacrifice, and, according to Heb 11:4, this was because of his faith. Faber makes a strong plea as follows: Since faith was what made the sacrifice acceptable to God, this faith must have been based upon a positive enactment of God in the past. Without this divine positive enactment to guarantee its truthfulness, faith, in Abel, would have been superstition. In other words, faith, in order to be truly based and properly directed, must have a revelation from God, a positive expression of the divine will. Fairbairn, in his Typology, goes further and holds that the skins wherewith Adam and Eve were clothed were from animals which had been slain in sacrifices. This is entirely without support in the narrative. The theory of a divine order cannot be maintained on the basis of the Biblical narrative. Moreover, it involves certain assumptions regarding the nature of faith and revelation which are not generally held in this age. A revelation is not necessarily a positive divine command, an external thing, and faith may be just as real and true without such a revelation as with it. That there may have been such a revelation cannot be denied, but it is not a necessary or probable explanation.

2. Theories of a Human Origin:

(1) The Gift-Theory.

By this it is held that sacrifices were originally presents to the deity which the offerer took for granted would be received with pleasure and even gratitude. Good relations would thus be established with the god and favors would be secured. Such motives, while certainly true among many heathen people, were

obviously based upon low conceptions of the deity. They were either. Nature-spirits, ancestral ghosts or fetishes which needed what was given, and of course the god was placed under obligations and his favor obtained. Or, the god may have been conceived of as a ruler, a king or chief, as was the custom in the East.

Cicero vouches for such a view when he says: "Let not the impious dare to appease the gods with gifts. Let them hearken to Plato, who warns them that there can be no doubt what God's disposition to them will be, since even a good man will refuse to accept presents from the wicked" (HDB, IV, 331a). This view of sacrifice prevails in classical literature. Spencer therefore thinks it is self-evident that this was the idea of primitive man. Tylor and Herbert Spencer also find the origin of sacrifices in the idea of a gift, whether to the deity or to dead ancestors, food being placed for them, and this afterward comes to be regarded as a sacrifice. Such a view gives no account of the peculiar value attached to the blood, or to the burnt offerings. It may account for some heathen systems of sacrifice, but can help in no degree in understanding the Biblical sacrifices.

(2) The Magic Theory.

There are two slightly variant forms of this:

(a) that of R.C. Thompson (Semitic Magic, Its Origins and Developments, 175-218), who holds that a sacrificial animal serves as a substitute victim offered to a demon whose activity has brought the offerer into trouble; the aim of the priest is to entice or drive the malignant spirit out of the sick or sinful man into the sacrificial victim where it can be isolated or destroyed;

(b) that of L. Marillier, who holds that sacrifice in its origin is essentially a magical rite. The liberation of a magical force by the effusion of the victim's blood will bend the god to the will of the man. From this arose under the "cult of the dead" the gift-theory of sacrifice. Men sought to ally themselves with the god in particular by purifying a victim and effecting communion with the god by the application of the blood to the altar, or by the sacrifice of the animal and the contact of the sacrificer with its blood. Such theories give no account of the burnt offerings, meal offerings and sin offerings, disconnect them entirely from any sense of sin or estrangement from God, and divest them of all piacular value. They may account for certain depraved and heathen systems, but not for the Biblical.

(3) The Table-Bond Theory.

Ably advocated by Wellhausen and W.R. Smith, this view holds that sacrifices were meals which the worshippers and the god shared, partaking of the same food and thus establishing a firmer bond of fellowship between them. Sykes (Nature of Sacrifices, 75) first advocated this, holding that the efficacy of sacrifices "is the fact that eating and drinking were the known and ordinary symbols of friendship and were the usual rites in engaging in covenants and leagues." Thus sacrifices are more than gifts; they are deeds of hospitality which knit god and worshipper together. W.R. Smith has expounded the idea into the notion that the common meal unites physically those who partake of it. Though this view may

contain an element of truth in regard to certain Arabian customs, it does not help much to account for Bible sacrifices. As A.B. Davidson says, "It fails utterly to account for the burnt offering, which was one of the earliest, most solemn and at times the most important of all the sacrifices."

(4) The Sacramental Communion Theory.

This is a modification of the table-bond theory. The basis of it is the totemistic idea of reverencing an animal which is believed to share with man the divine nature. On certain solemn occasions this animal would be sacrificed to furnish a feast. At this meal, according to men's savage notions, they literally "ate the god," and thus incorporated into themselves the physical, the intellectual and the moral qualities which characterized the animal. If the divine life dwelt in certain animals, then a part of that precious life would be distributed among all the people (RS2, 313). In some cases the blood is drunk by the worshippers, thus imbibing the life. Sometimes, as in the case of the sacred camel, they devoured the quivering flesh before the animal was really dead, and the entire carcass was eaten up before morning.

The brilliant work of W. R. Smith has not been universally accepted. L. Marillier has criticized it along several lines. It is by no means certain that totemism prevailed so largely among Semites and there is no evidence of its existence in Israel. Also, if an original bond of friendship existed between the god and the kin, there is no need to maintain it by such sacrificial rites. There is no clear instance of this having been done. If on the other hand there was no common bond between the god and the people but that of a common meal, it does not appear that the god is a totem god. There is no reason why the animal should have been a totem. In any case, this idea of sacrifice could hardly have been anything but a slow growth, and consequently not the origin of sacrifice. Hubert and Mauss also point out that W. R. Smith is far from having established the historical or the logical connection between the common meal and the other kinds of sacrifices. Under piacula he confuses purification, propitiation and expiations. His attempts to show that purifications of magical character are late and not sacrificial do not succeed. Smith's theory is mainly the sacramental, though he does recognize the honorific and piacular element. The theory may be applicable to some of the heathen or savage feasts of the Arabs, but not to the practices of the Hebrews (see Encyclopedia Brit, XXIII, 981).

(5) The Homage Theory.

This has been advocated by Warburton and F. D. Maurice. The idea is that sacrifices were originally an expression of homage and dependence. Man naturally felt impelled to seek closer communion with God, not so much from a sense of guilt as from a sense of dependence and a desire to show homage and obedience. In giving expression to this, primitive man had recourse to acts rather than words and thoughts. Thus sacrifice was an acted prayer, rather than a prayer in words. It was an expression of his longings and aspirations, his reverence and submission. There is much truth in this view; the elements of prayer—dependence and submission—enter into some sacrifices, the burnt offerings in particular; but it does not account for all kinds of offerings.

(6) The Piacular Theory.

This holds that sacrifices are fundamentally expiatory or atoning, and the death of the beast is a vicarious expiation of the sins of the offerer. Hubert and Mauss admit that in all sacrifices there are some ideas of purchase or substitution, though these may not have issued from some primitive form. The unifying principle in all sacrifices is that the divine is put in communication with the profane by the intermediary—the victim—which may be piacular or honorific. It is thus a messenger, a means of divination, a means of alimenting the eternal life of the species, a source of magical energy which the rite diffuses over objects in its neighborhood. Westermarck (Origin of Moral Ideas) makes the original idea in sacrifice a piaculum, a substitute for the offerer.

This view is the most simple, the most natural, and the only one that can explain certain sacrifices. Man felt himself under liability to punishment or death. The animal was his, it had life, it was of value, and perchance the god would accept that life in place of his. He felt that it would be accepted, and thus the animal was sacrificed. The offerer in a sense gives up part of himself. The beast must be his own; no sacrifice can be made of another person's property (2Sa 24:24 a). The true spirit of sacrifice appears in a willingness to acknowledge God's right to what is best and dearest (Ge 12).

Objection is raised to this by A. B. Davidson (Old Testament Theology), Paterson (HDB, IV, 331) and others, on the ground that such an origin represents too advanced a stage of ethical thought and reflection for primitive man. We question seriously whether this be an advanced stage of moral reflection. On the contrary, it represents a very simple and primitive stage. The feeling that sin of some kind is never absent from human life, and that its true penalty is death, has been inseparable from the human heart's sense of sin. What could be more simple and natural than to take an innocent animal and offer it in place of himself, hoping that the Deity would accept it instead? Nor is there much force in Professor Paterson's objection that sacrifices were preponderantly joyous in character and therefore could not be offered as an expiation. This joyous character belongs to such sacrifices as peace offerings and thank offerings, but does not belong to the 'olah and others. In most cases the joyous feast followed the killing of the animal by which the expiation was accomplished, and the feast was joyous because atonement had been made. In fact, many sacrifices were of the most solemn character and represented the deepest and most serious emotions of the heart.

(7) Originating in Religious Instincts.

Neither theory of an objective divine revelation, nor of a human origin will account for the universality and variety of sacrifices. The truth lies in a proper combination of the two. The notion of offering a gift to the Deity arose out of the religious instincts of the human heart, which in an early period had a consciousness of something wrong between itself and God, and that this something would mean death sooner or later. Added to these true instincts was the Omnipresent Spirit to guide men in giving expression. What could be more simple and primitive than to offer something possessing life? Of course the notion originated in simple and childlike ideas of God, and its real motive was not to gratify God by sharing a meal with Him, or to gain His favor by a bribe, but to present Him with something that represented a part of the offerer which might be accepted in his stead. Thus sacrifices became the leading features of the religious life of primitive man. Naturally other ideas would be added, such as a

gift of food by fire to the Deity, the peace offerings, etc., to celebrate the friendly relations with God, the thank offerings, the sin offerings, etc., all of which naturally and logically developed from the primitive idea. It might be expected that there would be many corruptions and abuses, that the sense of sin would be obscured or lost among some peoples, and the idea of sacrifice correspondingly degraded. Such has been the case, and as well might we try to understand man at his best by studying the aboriginal tribes of Africa and Australia, or the inmates of asylums and penitentiaries, as to attempt to understand the Bible ideas in sacrifices by studying the cults of those heathen and savage tribes of Semites, etc.

III. Classification of Sacrifices.

1. Maimonides:

Maimonides was among the first to classify them, and he divided them into two kinds:

(1) Those on behalf of the whole congregation, fixed by statute, time, number and ritual being specified. This would include burnt, meal and peace offerings with their accompaniments. (2) Those on behalf of the individual, whether by virtue of his connection with the community or as a private person. These would be burnt offerings, sin offerings, and guilt offerings with their accompaniments.

2. W. R. Smith and Others:

Others, such as W. R. Smith, classify them as: (1) honorific, or designed to render homage, devotion, or adoration, such as burnt, meal and peace offerings; (2) piacular, designed to expiate or make atonement for the errors of the people, i.e. burnt offerings, sin offerings, and guilt offerings; (3) communistic, intended to establish the bond between the god and the worshipper, such as peace offerings.

3. Oehler:

Oehler divides them into two classes, namely: (1) those which assume that the covenant relation is undisturbed, such as peace offerings; (2) those intended to do away with any disturbance in the relation and to set it right, such as burnt, sin and guilt offerings.

4. Paterson and Others:

Professor Paterson and others divide them into three: (1) animal sacrifices, burnt offerings, peace offerings, sin offerings, and guilt offerings; (2) vegetable sacrifices, meal offerings, shewbread, etc.; (3) liquid and incense offerings; wine, oil, water, etc.

5. H. M. Wiener:

H. M. Wiener offers a more suggestive and scientific division (Essays on Pentateuchal Criticism, 200 f):

(1) customary lay offerings, such as had from time immemorial been offered on rude altars of earth or stone, without priest, used and regulated by Moses and in more or less general use until the exile, namely, burnt offerings, meal offerings, and peace offerings;

(2) statutory individual offerings, introduced by Moses, offered by laymen with priestly assistance and at the religious capital, i.e. burnt offerings, peace offerings, meal offerings, sin offerings, and guilt offerings;

(3) statutory national offerings introduced by Moses and offered by the priest at the religious capital, namely, burnt, meal, peace and sin offerings.

IV. Sacrifices in the Pre-Mosaic Age.

Out of the obscure period of origins emerged the dimly lighted period of ancient history. Everywhere sacrifices existed and sometimes abounded as an essential part of religion. The spade of the archaeologist, and the researches of scholars help us understand the pre-Mosaic period.

1. In Egypt:

In Egypt—probably from the beginning of the 4th millennium BC—there were sacrifices and sacrificial systems. Temples at Abydos, Thebes, On, etc., were great priestly centers with high priests, lower priests, rituals and sacrifices in abundance. Burnt, meal and peace offerings predominated. Oxen, wild goats, pigs, geese were the chief animals offered. Besides these, wine, oil, beer, milk, cakes, grain, ointment, flowers, fruit, vegetables were offered, but not human beings. In these offerings there were many resemblances to the Hebrew gifts, and many significant exceptions. Moses would be somewhat familiar with these practices though not with the details of the ritual. He would appreciate the unifying power of a national religious center. It is inconceivable that in such an age a national leader and organizer like Moses would not take special care to institute such a system.

2. In Babylonia:

In Babylonia, from the year 3000 BC or thereabouts, according to E. Meyer (Geschichte des Alterthums), there were many centers of worship such as Eridu, Nippur, Agade, Erech, Ur, Nisin, Larsa, Sippar, etc. These and others continued for centuries with elaborate systems of worship, sacrifices, temples, priesthoods, etc. Considerably over 100 temples and sanctuaries are mentioned on inscriptions, and several hundreds in the literature and tablets, so that Babylonia was studded with temples and edifices for the gods. At all these, sacrifices were constantly offered—animal and vegetable. A long list of the offerings of King Gudea includes oxen, sheep, goats, lambs, fish, birds (i.e. eagles and doves), dates, milk, greens (Jastrow, in HDB, V, 580 f, under the word). The sacrifices provided an income for the priests, as did the Mosaic system at a later time. It had long passed the stage when it was supposed to furnish a meal for the god. A sacrifice always accompanied a consultation with a priest, and was really an assessment for the services rendered. It was not a voluntary offering or ritualistic observance. The

priests on their own behalf offered a daily sacrifice, as in the Mosaic Law, and likewise on special occasions, to insure the good will of the gods they served. It seems certain that in some of the larger centers of worship animals were offered up twice a day, morning and evening. At these sacrifices certain portions were consumed on the altar, the rest belonging to the priest. The similarity of much of this to the Mosaic institutions is obvious. That the culture and civilization of Babylon was known to Egypt and Israel with other nations is shown clearly by the Tell el-Amarna Letters. Special sacrifices on special occasions were offered in Babylonia as in Israel. As Jastrow says, "In the Hebrew codes, both as regards the purely legal portions and those sections dealing with religious ritual, Babylonian methods of legal procedure and of ritual developed in Babylonian temples must be taken into consideration as determining factors." We do not doubt that Moses made use of many elements found in the Egyptian and Babylonian systems, and added to or subtracted from or purified as occasion required. As sacrificial systems and ritual had been in use more than a millennium before Moses, there is absolutely no need to suppose that Israel’s ritual was a thousand years in developing, and was completed after the exile. To do so is to turn history upside down.

3. Nomads and Tribes of Arabia and Syria:

Among the nomads and tribes of Arabia and Syria, sacrifices had been common for millenniums before Moses. The researches of Wellhausen and W. R. Smith are valuable here, whatever one may think of their theories. The offerings were usually from the flocks and herds, sometimes from the spoils taken in war which had been appropriated as their own. The occasions were many and various, and the ritual was very simple. A rude altar of earth or stone, or one stone, a sacred spot, the offerer killing the victim and burning all, or perhaps certain parts and eating the remainder with the clan or family, constituted the customary details. Sometimes wild animals were offered. Babylonians, Phoenicians and Arabs offered gazelles, but the Hebrews did not. Arabs would sometimes sacrifice a captive youth, while the Carthaginians chose some of the fairest of the captives for offerings by night. Assyrian kings sometimes sacrificed captive kings. The Canaanites and others constantly sacrificed children, especially the firstborn.

4. The Offerings of Cain and Abel:

The account of the offerings of Cain and Abel (Ge 4:4 f) shows that the ceremony dates from almost the beginnings of the human race. The custom of offering the firstlings and first-fruits had already begun. Arabian tribes later had a similar custom. Cain’s offering was cereal and is called minchah, "a gift" or "presentation." The same term is applied to Abel’s. There is no hint that the bloody sacrifice was in itself better than the unbloody one, but it is shown that sacrifice without a right attitude of heart is not acceptable to God. This same truth is emphasized by the prophets and others, and is needed in this day as much as then. In this case the altars would be of the common kind, and no priest was needed. The sacrifices were an act of worship, adoration, dependence, prayer, and possibly propitiation.

5. Of Noah:

The sacrifices of Noah followed and celebrated the epochal and awe-inspiring event of leaving the ark and beginning life anew. He offered burnt offerings of all the clean animals (Ge 8:20). On such a solemn occasion only an ‘olah would suffice. The custom of using domestic animals had arisen at this time. The sacrifices expressed adoration, recognition of God’s power and sovereignty, and a gift to please Him, for it is said He smelled a sweet savor and was pleased. It was an odor of satisfaction or restfulness. Whether or not the idea of expiation was included is difficult to prove.

6. Of Abraham:

Abraham lived at a time when sacrifices and religion were virtually identical. No mention is made of his offering at Ur or Charan, but on his arrival at Shechem he erected an altar (Ge 12:7). At Beth-el also (12:8), and on his return from Egypt he worshipped there (Ge 13:4). Such sacrifices expressed adoration and prayer and probably propitiation. They constituted worship, which is a complex exercise. At Hebron he built an altar (Ge 13:18), officiating always as his own priest. In Ge 15:4 ff he offers a "covenant" sacrifice, when the animals were slain, divided, the parts set opposite each other, and prepared for the appearance of the other party to the covenant. The exact idea in the killing of these animals may be difficult to find, but the effect is to give the occasion great solemnity and the highest religious sanction. What was done with the carcasses afterward is not told. That animals were slain for food with no thought of sacrifice is shown by the narrative in chapter 18, where Abraham had a calf slain for the meal. This is opposed to one of the chief tenets of the Wellhausen school, which maintains that all slaughtering of animals was sacrificial until the 7th century BC. In Genesis 22 Abraham attempts to offer up Isaac as a burnt offering, as was probably the custom of his neighbors. That he attempted it shows that the practice was not shocking to his ethical nature. It tested the strength of his devotion to God, shows the right spirit in sacrifices, and teaches for all time that God does not desire human sacrifice —a beast will do. What God does want is the obedient heart. Abraham continued his worship at Beer-sheba (Ge 21:33).

7. Of Job:

Whatever may be the date of the writing of the Book of Job, the saint himself is represented as living in the Patriarchal age. He constantly offered sacrifices on behalf of his children (1:5), "sanctifying" them. His purpose no doubt was to atone for possible sin. The sacrifices were mainly expiatory. This is true also of the sacrifices of his friends (42:7-9).

8. Of Isaac:

Isaac seems to have had a permanent altar at Beer-sheba and to have regularly offered sacrifices. Adoration, expiation and supplication would constitute his chief motives (Ge 26:25).

9. Of Jacob:

Jacob’s first recorded sacrifice was the pouring of the oil upon the stone at Beth-el (Ge 28:18). This was

consecration or dedication in recognition of the awe-inspiring presence of the Deity. After his covenant with Laban he offered sacrifices (zebhachim) and they ate bread (Ge 31:54). At Shechem, Jacob erected an altar (Ge 33:20). At Beth-el (Ge 35:7) and at Beer-sheba he offered sacrifices to Isaac's God (Ge 46:1).

10. Of Israel in Egypt:

While the Israelites were in Egypt they would be accustomed to spring sacrifices and spring feasts, for these had been common among the Arabs and Syrians, etc., for centuries. Nabatean inscriptions testify to this. Egyptian sacrifices have been mentioned (see above). At these spring festivals it was probably customary to offer the firstlings of the flocks (compare Ex 13:15). At the harvest festivals sacrificial feasts were celebrated. It was to some such feast Moses said Israel as a people wished to go in the wilderness (Ex 3:18; 5:3 ff; 7:16). Pharaoh understood and asked who was to go (Ex 10:8). Moses demanded flocks and herds for the feast (Ex 10:9). Pharaoh would keep the flocks, etc. (Ex 10:24), but Moses said they must offer sacrifices and burnt offerings (Ex 10:25 f).

The sacrifice of the Passover soon occurs (Ex 12:3-11). That the Hebrews had been accustomed to sacrifice their own firstborn at this season has no support and is altogether improbable (Frazer, Golden Bough(3), pt. III, 175 f). The whole ceremony is very primitive and has retained its primitiveness to the end. The choosing of the lamb or kid, the killing at a certain time, the family gathered in the home, the carcass roasted whole, eaten that night, and the remainder, if any, burned, while the feasters had staff in hand, etc., all this was continued. The blood in this case protected from the Deity, and the whole ceremony was "holy" and only for the circumcised. Frazer in his Golden Bough gives a very different interpretation.

11. Of Jethro:

As a priest of Midian, Jethro was an expert in sacrificing. On meeting Moses and the people he offered both ‘olah and zebhachim and made a feast (Ex 18:12).

12. Summary and Conclusions:

From the above it is evident that sacrifices were almost the substance of religion in that ancient world. From hilltops and temples innumerable, the smoke of sacrifices was constantly rising heavenward. Burnt offerings and peace offerings were well known. Moses, in establishing a religion, must have a sacrificial system. He had abundance of materials to choose from, and under divine guidance would adopt such rules and regulations as the pedagogic plans and purposes of God would require in preparing for better things.

SACRIFICE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, 2

V. The Mosaic Sacrificial System.

1. The Covenant Sacrifice:

The fundamental function of Moses' work was to establish the covenant between Israel and God. This important transaction took place at Sinai and was accompanied by solemn sacrifices. The foundation principle was obedience, not sacrifices (Ex 19:4-8). No mention is made of these at the time, as they were incidental—mere by-laws to the constitution. The center of gravity in Israel's religion is now shifted from sacrifices to obedience and loyalty to Yahweh. Sacrifices were helps to that end and without obedience were worthless. This is in exact accordance with Jer 7:21 ff. God did not speak unto the fathers at this time about sacrifices; He did speak about obedience.

The covenant having been made, the terms and conditions are laid down by Moses and accepted by the people (Ex 24:3). The Decalogue and Covenant Code are given, an altar is built, burnt offerings and peace offerings of oxen are slain by young men servants of Moses, not by priests, and blood is sprinkled on the altar (Ex 24:4). The blood would symbolize the community of life between Yahweh and Israel, and consecrated the altar. The Law was read, the pledge again given, and Moses sprinkled the representatives of the people, consecrating them also (Ex 24:7 f). Ascending the mount, they had a vision of God, held a feast before Him, showing the joys and privileges of the new relationship. The striking feature of these ceremonies is the use of the blood. It is expiatory and consecrating, it is life offered to God, it consecrates the altar and the people: they are now acceptable to God and dare approach Him and feast with Him. There is no idea of God's drinking the blood. The entire ritual is far removed from the crass features of common Semitic worship.

2. The Common Altars:

In the Covenant Code, which the people accepted, the customary altars are not abolished, but regulated (Ex 20:24). This law expressly applies to the time when they shall be settled in Canaan. 'In the whole place where I cause my name to be remembered,' etc. (Ex 20:24 margin). No need to change the reading to "in every place where I cause," etc., as the Wellhausen school does for obvious reasons. All the land was eligible. On such rude altars sacrifices were allowed. This same law is implied in De 16:21, a passage either ignored or explained away by the Wellhausen school (see Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism, 200 f). Moses commanded Joshua in accordance with it (De 27:5). Joshua, Gideon, Jephthah, Samuel, Saul, David, Elijah and many others used such altars. There were altars at Shechem (Jos 24:1,26), Mizpah in Gilead (Jud 11:11), Gilgal (1Sa 13:9). High places were chiefly used until the times of Hezekiah and Josiah, when they were abolished because of their corruptions, etc. All such altars were perfectly legitimate and in fact necessary, until there was a central capital and sanctuary in Jerusalem. The customary burnt offerings and peace offerings with the worshipper officiating were the chief factors. Heathen sacrifices and the use of heathen altars were strictly forbidden (Ex 22:20; (Heb 1:9); Ex 34:15)

3. The Consecration of Aaron and His Sons:

The altar used at the consecration of Aaron and his sons was a "horned" or official altar, the central one. The offerings were a bullock, two rams, unleavened bread, etc. (Ex 29:1-4), and were brought to the door of the sanctuary. The ritual consisted of Aaron laying his hand on the bullock's head, designating it as his substitute (Ex 29:10), killing it before the tent of meeting (Ex 29:11), smearing some blood on the horns of the altar, and pouring the rest at its base (Ex 29:12). The blood consecrated the altar, the life was given as atonement for sins, the fat parts were burned upon the altar as food for God, and the flesh and remainder were burned without the camp (Ex 29:13,14). This is a sin offering—chaTTa'th—the first time the term is used. Probably introduced by Moses, it was intended to be piacular and to "cover" possible sin. One ram was next slain, blood was sprinkled round about the altar, flesh was cut in pieces, washed and piled on the altar, then burned as an offering by fire ('ishsheh) unto God as a burnt offering, an odor of a sweet savor (Ex 29:15-18). The naive and primitive nature of this idea is apparent. The other ram, the ram of consecration, is slain, blood is smeared on Aaron's right ear, thumb and great toe; in the case of his sons likewise. The blood is sprinkled on the altar round about; some upon the garments of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:19-21). Certain parts are waved before Yahweh along with the bread, and are then burned upon the altar (Ex 29:22-25). The breast is offered as a wave offering (tenuphah), and the right thigh or shoulder as a heave offering (terumah). These portions here first mentioned were the priests' portion for all time to come, although this particular one went to Moses, since he officiated (Ex 29:26-30). The flesh must be boiled in a holy place, and must be eaten by Aaron and his sons only, and at the sanctuary. What was left till morning must be burned (Ex 29:31-34). Consecrated to a holy service it was dangerous for anyone else to touch it, or the divine wrath would flame forth. The same ceremony on each of the seven days atoned for, cleansed and consecrated the altar to the service of Yahweh, and it was most holy (Ex 29:35-37). The altar of incense is ordered (Ex 30:1), and Aaron is to put the blood of the sin offering once a year upon its horns to consecrate it.

4. Sacrifices before the Golden Calf:

When the golden calf was made an altar was erected, burnt offerings and peace offerings were presented. From the latter a feast was made, the people followed the usual habits at such festivals, went to excess and joined in revelry. Moses' ear quickly detected the nature of the sounds. The covenant was now broken and no sacrifice was available for this sin. Vengeance was executed on 3,000 Israelites. Moses mightily interceded with God. A moral reaction was begun; new tables of the Law were made with more stringent laws against idols and idol worship (Ex 32:1-35).

5. The Law of the Burnt Offering ('Olah):

At the setting-up of the tabernacle burnt and meal offerings were sacrificed (Ex 40:29). The law of the burnt offering is found in Le 1. Common altars and customary burnt offerings needed no minute regulations, but this ritual was intended primarily for the priest, and was taught to the people as needed. They were for the statutory individual and national offering upon the "horned" altar before the sanctuary. Already the daily burnt offerings of the priests had been provided for (Ex 29:38-42). The burnt offering is here called qorban, "oblation."

(1) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 1:3-17).

This may have been from the herd or flock or fowls, brought to the tent of meeting; hands were laid (heavily) upon its head designating it as the offerer's substitute, it was killed, flayed and cut in pieces. If of the flock, it was to be killed on the north side of the altar; if a fowl, the priest must kill it.

(2) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 1:3-17).

If a bullock or of the flock, the priest was to sprinkle the blood round about the altar, put on the fire, lay the wood and pieces of the carcass, wash the inwards, legs, etc., and burn it all as a sweet savor to God. If a fowl, he must wring the neck, drain out the blood on the side of the altar, cast the crop, filth, etc., among the ashes, rend the wings without dividing the bird and burn the carcass on the altar.

(3) General Laws for the Priest.

The burnt offering must be continued every morning and every evening (Ex 29:38 f; Nu 28:3-8). At the fulfillment of his vow the Nazirite must present it before God and offer it upon the altar through the priest (Nu 6:14,16): on the Sabbath, two lambs (Nu 28:9); on the first of the month, two bullocks, one ram and seven lambs (Nu 28:11); on the day of first-fruits, the same (Nu 28:27); on the 1st day of the 7th month, one bullock, one ram, seven lambs (Nu 29:8); on the 15th day, 13 bullocks, two rams, 14 lambs, the number of bullocks diminishing daily until the 7th day, when seven bullocks, two rams, 14 lambs were offered (Nu 29:12-34); on the 22nd day of this month one bullock, one ram and seven lambs were offered (Nu 29:35,36). Non-Israelites were permitted to offer the ‘olah, but no other sacrifices (Le 17:8; 22:18,25).

(4) Laws in Deuteronomy 12:6,13,14,27; 27:6.

Anticipating a central sanctuary in the future, the lawgiver counsels the people to bring their offerings there (De 12:6,11); they must be careful not to offer them in any place (De 12:13), but must patronize the central sanctuary (De 12:14). In the meantime common altars and customary sacrifices were allowable and generally necessary (De 16:21; 27:6).

6. The Law of the Meal Offering (Minchah):

The term "meal offering" is here confined to offerings of flour or meal, etc. (the King James Version "meat-offering"), and was first used at the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:41). These must not be offered on the altar of incense (Ex 30:9); were used at the completion of the tabernacle (Ex 40:29); and always with the morning and evening burnt offerings.

(1) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 2:1-16).

It must be of fine flour, with oil and frankincense added, and brought to the priest; if baked in the oven,

unleavened cakes mingled with oil, or wafers and oil; if of the baking pan, fine flour mingled with oil parted into pieces and oil thereon; if of the frying pan, the same ingredients. Leaven and honey must never be used as they quickly become corrupt. Every offering must be seasoned with salt. If of the first-fruits (bikkurim), it should consist of grain in the ear, parched with oil and frankincense upon it.

(2) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 2:1-16).

This required him to take out a handful with the oil and frankincense thereon and burn it as a memorial upon the altar. The remainder was holy and belonged to the priest. Of the cakes, after bringing them to the altar, he was to take a portion, burn it and appropriate the remainder; the same with the first-fruits.

(3) General Laws for the Priest (Leviticus 6:14-18 (Hebrew 7-11), etc.).

He might eat his portion without leaven in the holy place. At his anointing Aaron offered his own oblation of fine flour—1/10 of an ephah, one-half in the morning and one-half in the evening. If baked, it must be with oil. This meal offering must all be burnt; none could be eaten. With the sin offerings and guilt offerings every meal offering baked in any way belongs to the priest (Le 7:9,10; 10:12; Nu 18:9). The meal offerings accompanied the other offerings on all important occasions, such as the consecration of Aaron (Le 9:4,17); cleansing of a leper (Le 14:10,20,21,31); feast of first-fruits (Le 23:13); Pentecost (Le 23:16); set feasts (Le 23:37). Special charge was given to Eleazar to care for the continual meal offerings (Nu 4:16). The Nazirite must offer it (Nu 6:15,17). When the tribes presented their offerings, meal offerings were always included (Nu 7:13,19, etc.); when the Levites were set apart (Nu 8:8); with vows of freewill offerings (Nu 15:4,6); with the sin offerings (Nu 15:24); at all the several seasons (Nu 28:5-29:39). A special form was the "showbread" (bread of memorial). Twelve loaves were to be placed in two rows or heaps of six each on a pure table in the holy place, with frankincense on each pile or row. These were to remain for one week and then to be eaten by the priests. They were an offering of food by fire, though probably only the frankincense was actually burned (Le 24:5 f).

7. The Law of the Peace Offering:

The peace offerings indicated right relations with God, expressing good-fellowship, gratitude and obligation. The common altars were fitted for their use (Ex 20:24), as feasts had been thus celebrated from time immemorial. At the feast before God on the Mount, peace offerings provided the food (Ex 24:5); also before the golden bull (Ex 32:6). The wave offerings and heave offerings were portions of these.

(1) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 3:1-17).

The offering might be a bullock, a lamb, or a goat, either male or female, latitude being allowed in this case. The ritual was the same as in the case of the burnt offering (see above).

(2) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 3:1-17).

Blood must be sprinkled on the altar round about, the caul, the liver and the kidneys must be taken away and the fat parts burned on the altar; the fat tail of the lamb must also be burned. These portions were offerings of food by fire to the Deity. The ritual for a goat was the same as for a bullock.

(3) General Laws for the Priest (Leviticus 6:12 (Hebrew 5); 7:1 ff).

The fat was to be burned on the altar of burnt offering. If it was a thank offering (zebhach ha-todhah), it must have unleavened cakes with oil, cakes mingled with oil and fine flour soaked. Cakes of leavened bread might be offered, and one cake was to be a heave offering to the priest. The flesh was to be eaten that day, none was to be left till morning (Le 22:30). If it was a votive offering (zebhach nedher) or a freewill offering (zebhach nedhabhah), it might be eaten on the first and second days, but not on the third day; it should then be an abomination (Le 7:18 f). If eaten then by anyone, that person was to be cut off from the community. Of all peace offerings the wave-breast and heave-thigh belong to the priest (Le 7:29-34), the remainder was to be eaten by the worshippers. At Aaron's consecration an ox and a ram were the peace offerings (Le 9:4,18,22). The priest's portion was to be eaten in a clean place by the priest's family (Le 10:14). When Israel should have a central sanctuary, all were to be brought there (Le 17:4,5). When they had no central place, the common altars would suffice. All peace offerings must be made in an acceptable manner (Le 19:5). Votive offerings must be perfect (Le 22:18-22), but certain imperfections are allowable in freewill offerings (Le 22:23). At Pentecost two he-lambs of the first year could be offered as peace offerings (Le 23:19). The Nazirite at the end of his separation must offer one ram for a peace offering with unleavened bread (Nu 6:14,17), and the hair shaved from his head must be burned under the peace offerings (Nu 6:18). This hair was regarded as a thing having life and offered as a sacrifice by other nations. The various tribes brought peace offerings (Numbers 7, passim), and at the feast of trumpets the people were to rejoice and blow trumpets over the peace offerings (Nu 10:10). Some further regulations are given (Nu 15:9 f).

8. The Law of the Sin Offering:

The sin offering was a sacrifice of a special kind, doubtless peculiar to Israel and first mentioned at the consecration of Aaron and his sons. It is not then spoken of as an innovation. It was of special value as an expiatory sacrifice.

(1) At the Consecration of Aaron and His Sons (Exodus 29:10 ff).

A bullock was killed before the altar, some blood was put upon the horns of the altar by Moses, the rest was poured out at the base. The fat of the inwards was burned upon the altar, the flesh and skin were burned without the camp. Every day during the consecration this was done (Ex 29:36).

(2) The Law of the Sin Offering (Leviticus 4:1-35; 24-30, etc.).

(a) The Occasion and Meaning:

Specifically to atone for unwitting sins, sins of error (sheghaghah), mistakes or rash acts, unknown at the time, but afterward made known. There were gradations of these for several classes of offenders: the anointed priest (Le 4:3-12), the whole congregation (Le 4:13-21), a ruler (Le 4:22-26), one of the common people (Le 4:27-35), forswearing (5:1), touching an unclean thing (Le 5:2) or the uncleanness of man (Le 5:3), or rashly sweating in ignorance (Le 5:4). For conscious and willful violations of the Law, no atonement was possible, with some exceptions, for which provision was made in the guilt offerings (see below).

(b) Ritual for the Offerer (Leviticus 4:1-5,13, etc.):

The anointed priest must offer a bullock at the tent of meeting, lay his hands upon it and slay it before Yahweh. The congregation was also required to bring a young bullock before the tent of meeting, the elders were to lay hands upon it and slay it before Yahweh. The ruler must bring a he-goat and do the same. One of the common people might bring a she-goat or lamb and present it in the same manner. If too poor for these, two turtledoves or young pigeons, one for a sin offering and one for burnt offering, would suffice. If too poor for these, the tenth part of an ephah of fine flour without oil or flankincense would suffice.

(c) Ritual for the Priest (Leviticus 4:1-5,13, etc.):

He must bring the bullock’s blood to the tent of meeting, dip his finger into it and sprinkle blood 7 times before the veil of the sanctuary, and put some on the horns of the altar of incense, but most of the blood must be poured out at the base of the altar. The fat must be burned upon the altar, all the rest of the carcass must be carried to a clean place without the camp and burned. In the case of the whole congregation, the ritual is the same. In the case of a ruler, the blood is to be put upon the horns of the altar of burnt offering, not the altar of incense. In the case of one of the common people, the ritual is similar to that of the ruler. In both the latter cases the carcass belonged to the priest. If a bird, the priest must wring off its head, sprinkle some blood on the side of the altar and pour the rest at the base. Nothing is said of the disposal of the carcass. If of fine flour, the priest must take out a handful and burn it upon the altar, keeping the remainder for himself. The use of fine flour for an expiatory sacrifice is evidently exceptional and intended to be so. Though life was not given, yet necessity of life—that which represented life—was offered.

(d) General Laws for the Priest (Leviticus 6:24-30):

The sin offering was to be slain in the same place as the burnt offering. It was most holy, and the priest alone might eat what was left of the ram, pigeon or flour, in the holy place. Whatever touched it was to be holy, any garment sprinkled with the blood must be washed in a holy place, earthen vessels used must be broken, and brazen vessels thoroughly scoured and rinsed.

(e) Special Uses of the Sin Offering:

(i) Consecration of Aaron and His Sons:

The consecration of Aaron and his sons (Le 8:2,14,15) was similar to that of Le 4:11,12, only Moses was to kill the offering and put the blood on the horns of the altar. On the 8th day a bull-calf was offered (Le 9:2), and the congregation offered a he-goat (Le 9:3). In this case Aaron performed the ceremony, as in Le 4:11,12. Moses complained that they had not eaten the flesh of the calf and goat in the sanctuary, since that was requisite when the blood was not brought into the sanctuary (Le 10:16-20).

(ii) Purifications from Uncleannesses:

Purifications from uncleannesses required after childbirth a young pigeon or turtledove (Le 12:6-8). The leper must bring a guilt offering (a special kind of sin offering), a he-lamb (Le 14:12-14,19); if too poor for a lamb, a turtledove or young pigeon (Le 14:22,31). Special use of the blood is required (Le 14:25). In uncleanness from issues a sin offering of a turtledove or young pigeon must be offered by the priest (Le 15:15,30).

(iii) On the Day of Atonement:

On the Day of Atonement (Le 16:1-28) Aaron must take a bullock for himself and house, two he-goats for the people, present the goats at the sanctuary, cast losts, one for Yahweh, as a sin offering, the other for Azazel, to be sent into the wilderness. The bullock was killed, sweet incense was burned within the rail, blood was sprinkled on the mercy-seat and before it 7 times. The one he-goat was killed and a similar ceremony was performed. Blood must be put on the horns of the altar and sprinkled 7 times about it. The other goat was presented, hands were laid on it, the sins of all confessed and put upon the goat, and it was sent into the wilderness. The carcass of the bullock and he-goat were burned without the camp. At the feast of first-fruits a he-goat was offered (Le 23:19).

(iv) Other Special Instances:

Other special instances were: in the case of defilement, the Nazirite must offer a turtledove or young pigeon on the 8th day after contraction (Nu 6:10); when the days of the separation were fulfilled a ewe-lamb with the other offerings (Nu 6:14) was to be offered; the twelve tribes included in each case a he-goat for sin offering (Nu 7:16); at the consecration of the Levites a young bullock (Nu 8:8,12). For unwitting sins of the congregation a he-goat was to be offered (Nu 15:24,25). If one person erred, a she-goat was permitted (Nu 15:27). A sin offering was required at the feast of the new moon (28:15), at the Passover (Nu 28:22), at Pentecost (Nu 28:30), on the 1st day of the 7th month (Nu 29:5), and on the 10th, 15th-22nd days (Nu 29:10-38). The ceremony of the red heifer (Nu 19:1-10,17) was a special sin offering for purification purposes only. It was of ancient and primitive origin. The young cow was brought without the camp and was slain before the priest’s face, blood was sprinkled 7 times before the sanctuary, the entire carcass with cedar wood, hyssop and scarlet was burned, the ashes gathered and laid without the camp in a clean place to be kept for the water of impurity. It was to purify after contact with the dead. In the case of the unknown homicide (De 21:1-9) a young unbroken heifer was brought to

a running stream, its neck was broken, the elders washed their hands over the heifer in the presence of the priests, declaring their innocence. Thus the bloodshed was expiated. The action was a judicial one, but essentially vicarious and expiatory and had doubtless a primitive origin.

9. The Guilt Offering:

The guilt offering (the King James Version "trespass offering") (Le 5:14-6:7) was a special kind of sin offering, always of a private character and accompanied by a fine. It expressed expiation and restitution. The classes of sin requiring a guilt offering with reparation in money are:

(1) a trespass in the holy things done unwittingly;

(2) anything which the Law forbade depriving God or the priest of their due;

(3) dealing falsely, with a neighbor in a deposit, or pledge, or robbery, or oppression;

(4) swearing falsely regarding anything lost;

(5) seduction of a betrothed bondmaid (Le 19:20-22).

The first two of these are unwitting sins, the others cannot be. The clear statement is made in another place that sins done with a "high hand," i.e. in rebellion against the covenant and its provisions, can have no sacrifice (Nu 15:30). Is this a contradiction, or a later development when it was found that the more stringent law would not work? (See J. M. P. Smith, et al., Atonement, 47 f.) Neither conclusion is probable. These conscious sins are of a kind that will admit of full reparation because against rights of property or in money matters. The sin offering makes atonement toward God, the restitution with the additional one-fifth makes full reparation to man. No such reparation can be made with such sins described as committed with a "high hand." In the case of seduction, rights of property are violated (compare Nu 5:5-8; De 22:29).

(1) The Ritual (Leviticus 5:14-6:7).

A ram proportionate in value to the offense and worth at least two shekels is required. The ritual is probably the same as that of the sin offering, though no mention is made of the laying on of hands, and the blood is not brought into the sanctuary, but sprinkled about the base of the altar, the fat and inside parts being burned, and the flesh eaten by the priests in a holy place.

(2) Special Laws: Leper, Nazirite, etc.

The leper, when cleansed, on the 8th day must bring a guilt offering of two he-lambs and one ewe-lamb; the priest must wave one he-lamb before Yahweh, kill it, and smear blood on the right ear, thumb and toe of the leper. The guilt offering belongs to the priest (Le 14:12-20). If the leper were too poor for two

lambs, one sufficed, with a corresponding meal offering, or one turtle-dove and a young pigeon (Le 14:21,22). The Nazirite, if defiled during his period of separation, must bring a he-lamb for a guilt offering (Nu 6:12). All guilt offerings were the priests' and most holy (Nu 18:9).

10. The Wave Offering:

The wave offerings were parts of the peace offerings, and the custom was seemingly initiated at the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:24-27), when the breast and bread were waved before Yahweh. Le 7:30,34 fixes the law. It must be brought from the peace offerings of the offerer himself. At Aaron's consecration Moses put the breast, etc., on Aaron's hands and waved them before Yahweh (Le 8:27). On the 8th day Aaron did the waving (Le 9:21). The priests were to eat it in a clean place (Le 10:14 f) . The leper's he-lamb was to be waved by the priest, before being offered (Le 14:12); the lamb of the guilt offering also (Le 14:24). At the feast of first-fruits the sheaf must be waved before Yahweh (Le 23:10,11,15); two loaves also (Le 23:17,20). Of the Nazirite the priest took the boiled shoulder, a cake and a wafer, put them on the Nazirite's hand and waved them before Yahweh (Nu 6:19 f).

11. The Heave Offering:

Heave offerings also are parts of the peace offerings, and refer particularly to what is lifted up, or separated unto the service of Yahweh. They are first mentioned at the consecration of Aaron (Ex 29:27,28). The offering consisted of the right shoulder or thigh and was the fixed due of the priest (Le 7:32,34) One cake of the peace offering must be heaved (Le 7:14). The offering must be eaten in a clean place (Le 7:14) by the priest's family only (Le 10:14,15). Of the Nazirite's offering the heave thigh also went to the priest (Nu 6:20). When the Israelites should come into the promised land to eat bread, they must offer a heave offering of the dough, a cake (Nu 15:19,20,21). The law is repeated in Nu 18:8,11,19, and the Levites are to receive a tithe of the heave offerings of the people (Nu 18:24). They were in turn to offer up a tithe of this to the priests (Nu 18:26-32). A portion of the spoil of Midian was a heave offering (Nu 31:29,41). Deuteronomy commands that all heave offerings be brought to the central sanctuary and eaten there (12:6,11).

12. Drink Offerings:

Jacob poured oil on the stone he had set up (Ge 28:18) in honor of the Deity and consecrated the spot. Jacob later (Ge 35:14) set up a pillar where God had revealed Himself and poured drink offerings and oil upon it. Probably wine was used. Drink offerings accompanied many of the sacrifices (Ex 29:40,41). None could be poured upon the altar of incense (Ex 30:9). At all set feasts the Drink offerings must be presented (Le 23:13,18,37). The Nazirite was not exempt (Nu 6:15,17). Wine and oil must accompany all votive and freewill offerings (Nu 15:4,5,7,10,24); the continual burnt offering (Nu 28:7,8); sabbaths (Nu 28:9,10) and all the other set feasts (Nu 28:14-31; 29:6-39, passim). That drink offerings were common among the heathen is shown by De 32:38.

13. Primitive Nature of the Cultus:

The cult is thoroughly in keeping with and adapted to the age, and yet an ideal system in many respects. The ethical side is in the background, the external has the emphasis. No sacrifices will avail for a breach of the covenant between God and the people. The people thoroughly believed in the efficacy of the blood. It secured atonement and forgiveness. Their religious life found expression in the sacrifices. God was fed and pleased by the offerings by fire. Many of the customs are ancient and crude, so that it is difficult to imagine how such a primitive system could have been arranged and accepted afterward by the people who had the lofty ethical teachings of the prophets in their hands.

VI. Sacrifices in the History of Israel.

1. The Situation at Moses' Death:

The tribes were outwardly consolidated, and a religious system was provided. Some of it was for the rulers, much for the people and much for the priests alone. The various laws were given in portions and afterward compiled. No one expected them to be observed until the nation had a capital and central sanctuary. Even then not every detail was always possible. They were not observed to any extent in the wilderness (Am 5:25), as it was impracticable. Even circumcision was neglected until the wanderers crossed the Jordan (Jos 5:2). The body of the system was not in full practice for 300 or 400 years. The ritual, as far as it could be observed, served as an educational agency, producing in the minds of the worshippers proper conceptions of the holiness of God, the sinfulness of man, and the proper spirit in approaching God.

2. In the Time of Joshua:

Lay or common altars were in accordance With Ex 20:24; De 16:21; 27:7. In the days of Joshua, the Passover was celebrated (Jos 5:10 f). At Ebal an altar was erected, burnt and peace offerings were presented (Jos 8:30-32). The tabernacle was set up at Shiloh with a horned altar doubtless (Jos 18:1), and the cult was observed to some extent. Concerning the altar on the east side of the Jordan, see ALTAR.

3. The Period of the Judges:

Canaanitish altars were abundant with their corrupt and licentious cults of the Nature-gods. Israelites with their common altars would naturally use the high places, when possible. The stationary altars of the Canaanites were of course unlawful. The inevitable tendency would be to imitate the worship of the Canaanites. They were rebuked and threatened for this, and, weeping, offered sacrifices at Bochim (Jud 2:1-5). Gideon rebuilt an altar of Yahweh and offered a bullock as a burnt offering (Jud 6:25,26). The kid prepared for the angel was not first a sacrifice, but its acceptance as a gift was indicated by its being burned (Jud 6:19 f). Jephthah offered up his daughter as a burnt offering, believing such a sacrifice well-pleasing to Yahweh (Jud 11:31,39). Manoah and his wife prepared a kid for a burnt offering, a meal offering accompanying it (Jud 13:16 f). At the time of the civil war with Benjamin the ark and statutory altar seemed to be at Beth-el, where they offered burnt and peace offerings (Jud 20:26). The feasts at

Shiloh imply at least peace offerings (Jud 21:19).

4. Times of Samuel and Saul:

Common lay altars and customary sacrifices were still much in use. The official altar with the statutory individual and national offerings appears to be at Shiloh. El-kanah sacrifices and feasts there yearly (1Sa 1:3 f). Such feasts were joyous and tended to excesses, as drunkenness seemed common (1Sa 1:13 f). All Israel came thither (1Sa 2:14); the priests claimed their portion, seizing it in an unlawful manner before the fat had been burned, or the flesh had been boiled (1Sa 2:13-17). This shows that such ritual as was prescribed in Le was practiced and considered by the people the only lawful custom. Was it in writing? Why not? Guilt offerings were made by the Philistines when smitten by tumors (1Sa 6:3,1,8,17). There were five golden mice and five golden tumors. Crude as were their ideas of a guilt offering, their actions show familiarity with the concept. Burnt offerings were used on special occasions and in great crises, such as receiving the ark (1Sa 6:14 f), going to war (1Sa 7:9 f; 13:9-12), victory (1Sa 11:15), etc. Saul met Samuel at a sacrificial feast in a small city (1Sa 9:12,13) on a high place. At Gilgal there were burnt and peace offerings (1Sa 10:8; 15:15,21). Saul offered burnt offerings himself (1Sa 13:9-12), but his fault was not in offering them himself, but in his haste and disobedience toward Samuel. "To obey is better than sacrifice," etc., says Samuel (1Sa 15:22), recognizing the fundamental principle of the covenant and realizing that ceremonies are in themselves worthless without the right spirit. The same truth is reiterated by the prophets later. To prevent the eating of flesh with the blood Saul built a special altar (1Sa 14:32-35). Family and clan sacrifices and feasts were evidently common (1Sa 16:2-5).

5. Days of David and Solomon:

The common altars and those on the high places were still in use. The central sanctuary at Shiloh had been removed, first apparently to Gilgal, then to Nob, and later to Gibeon. David’s and Saul’s families kept the feast of the new moon, when peace offerings would be sacrificed (1Sa 20:5,24-29). The sanctuary at Nob had the shewbread upon the table (1Sa 21:4) according to Ex 25:30. When the ark was brought up to Jerusalem, burnt offerings and peace offerings were offered according to the Law (2Sa 6:17,18; 1Ch 16:2,40). Ahithophel offered private, sacrifices at Shiloh (2Sa 15:12). David offered up burnt offerings, meal offerings, and peace offerings when purchasing the threshing-floor of Araunah (1Ch 21:23-26). The statutory horned altar at this time was at Gibeon (2Ch 1:6; 1Ch 21:29), but was soon removed to Jerusalem (1Ch 22:1). In the organized sanctuary and ritual, Levites were appointed for attendance on the shewbread, meal offerings, burnt offerings, morning and evening sacrifices, sabbaths, new moons and set feasts (1Ch 23:28-31), attempting to carry out the Levitical laws as far as possible. At the dedication of the temple, Solomon offered burnt offerings, meal offerings, and peace offerings in enormous quantities (1Ki 8:63; 2Ch 7:4-7); also burnt offerings and peace offerings with incense triennially (1Ki 9:25). The ritual at the regular seasons, daily, sabbaths, new moons, set feasts, etc., was observed according to the Levitical Law (2Ch 2:4; 8:13). Was it written?

6. In the Northern Kingdom:

The golden calf worship was carried on at Da and Beth-el, with priests, altars and ritual (1Ki 12:27 f). The high places were in use, but very corrupt (1Ki 13:2). A common altar was in use on Mt. Carmel (1Ki 18:30,32). Many others were known as Yahweh's altars (1Ki 19:10). The system was in full swing in Amos' time (Am 4:4,5) at Beth-el and Gilgal and probably at Beer-sheba (Am 5:5). Amos bitterly satirizes the hollow, insincere worship, but does not condemn the common altars and sacrifices, as these were legitimate. With Hosea the situation is worse, the cult has been "canonized," priests have been fed on the sin or sin offerings of the people, and the kingdom soon perished because of its corruption.

The high places were still in use and not denounced yet by the prophets (1Ki 3:2; 2Ki 14:4; 15:4,35). Worship was not fully centralized, though tending in that direction. In the days of Abijah the temple cult was in full operation according to Moses' Law (2Ch 13:10 f). Asa removed many strange altars and high places because of their corruption (2Ch 14:3), but not all (2Ch 15:17; 20:33).

7. In the Southern Kingdom to the Exile:

In the days of Jehoiada priests and Levites were on duty according to Moses (2Ch 23:18; 24:14; 2Ki 12:4-16). Sin and guilt offerings were in sufficient numbers to be mentioned, but the money went to the priests. Kautzsch (HDB, V) and Paterson (HDB, IV), with others, think these offerings were only fines and altogether different from those of Le 4; 5. Such a statement is wholly gratuitous. The guilt offerings must be accompanied by fines, but not necessarily the sin offerings. The passage speaks of both as perfectly familiar and of long standing, but details are lacking and there can be no certainty in the matter, except that it proves nothing regarding a ritual of sin and guilt offerings existent or non-existent at that time. Kautzsch's and Paterson's motives are obvious. Having reversed the history and put the ritual law late, they must needs make adjustments in the records to have them agree. In the days of Ahaz, the regular offerings were observed for priests, kings and people (2Ki 16:13-15). Hezekiah destroyed many high places (2Ki 18:4). When repairing the temple, many sin offerings were presented to expiate the terrible sins of the previous reigns and the desecration of the temple (2Ch 29:21-24); and so, also, burnt offerings (2Ch 29:27 f), peace offerings and thank offerings, etc., in large number (2Ch 29:31-35; compare Isa 1:10-17). The Passover was celebrated with peace offerings (2Ch 30:1,2,15,22), oblations and tithes (2Ch 31:12); courses of Levites were established (2Ch 31:2), and the king's portion (2Ch 31:3). All the common altars were abolished as far as possible, and worship centralized in Jerusalem (2Ch 32:12). Reversed by Manasseh (2Ch 33:3 f), the high places were again used (2Ch 33:17). Josiah purged Jerusalem (2Ch 34:3), and on the discovery of the Book of the Law, with its rule regarding a central sanctuary, that law was rigidly enforced (2Ch 35:6-14). The reformation under Josiah did not change the hearts of the people, and the rule followed in spite of all the efforts of Jeremiah and other prophets.

8. In the Exilic and Post-exilic Periods:

That the cult was entirely suspended in Jerusalem from 586 to 536 BC seems certain. There is no support for G. F. Moore's statement (EB, IV) that an altar was soon rebuilt and sacrificing was carried on with scarcely a break. On the return of the exiles an altar was soon built and the continual burnt

offerings began (Ezr 3:2 f), and likewise at the Feast of Tabernacles, new moons and set feasts (Ezr 3:4-7). Darius decreed that the Israelites should be given what was needed for the sacrifices (Ezr 6:9 f). The band under Ezra offered many sin offerings on their return (8:35). At the dedication of the temple many burnt and sin offerings were made for all the tribes (6:17). Those who had married foreign wives offered guilt offerings (10:19). The firman of Artaxerxes provided money for bullocks, rams, lambs, with meal offerings and drink offerings (7:17). Under Nehemiah and after the formal acceptance of the Law, a more complete effort was made to observe it. The shewbread, continual burnt and meal offerings, sabbaths, new moons, set feasts, sin offerings, first-fruits, firstlings, first-fruits of dough, heave offerings of all trees, wine and oil, etc., were carefully attended to (Ne 10:33-37) and were in full force later (Ne 13:5,9). There is no hint of innovation, only a thoroughgoing attempt to observe laws that had been somewhat neglected.

9. A Temple and Sacrifices at Elephantine:

At the time of Nehemiah and probably two or three centuries previous, there existed a temple on the island of Elephantine in the Nile. It was built by a Jewish military colony, and a system of sacrifices was observed. Just how far they copied the laws of Moses, and what were their ideas of a central sanctuary are uncertain.

Several Semitic tribes or nations practiced human sacrifices. It was common among the Canaanites, as is shown by the excavations at Gezer, Taanach, etc. They seemed to offer children in sacrifice at the laying of cornerstones of houses and other such occasions.

10. Human Sacrifices in Israel’s History:

Among the Carthaginians, Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans human sacrifices were all too common. The custom was not unknown to the Israelites. Abraham felt called upon to offer up Isaac, but was stopped in the act, and a lesson was given for all time. The abominable practice is forbidden by Moses (Le 18:21), where it is spoken of as a passing through the fire to Moloch, referring to Moabite and Ammonitish practices. Anyone practicing it was to be stoned (Le 20:2-5; De 12:31; 18:10). The rash vow of Jephthah resulted in the immolation of his daughter, but the incident is recorded as something extraordinary (Jud 11:31 f). The execution of Zebah and Zalmunna is a case of blood revenge, not sacrifice (Jud 8:18). Nor is the slaughter of Agag in any sense a sacrifice (1Sa 15:32 f). The death of Saul’s sons because of his breach of covenant with the Gibeonites was an expiatory sacrifice, to atone for the father’s perfidy (2Sa 21:9). The Moabite king in desperation offered up his firstborn and heir to appease the anger of Chemosh, and the effect was startling to the Israelites (2Ki 3:27). Ahaz practiced the abomination in times of trouble (2Ki 16:3). Such sacrifices were intended to secure favor with the Deity or appease His wrath. Hiel’s firstborn and youngest sons were probably sacrificed at the rebuilding or fortifying of Jericho (1Ki 16:34; compare Jos 6:26). Manasseh practiced the custom (2Ki 21:6), but it was stopped by Josiah (2Ki 23:10). Micah’s words were probably applicable to those times of Ahaz or Manasseh, when they thought to obtain God’s favor by costly gifts apart from ethical conditions (Mic 6:6-8). Isaiah refers to a heathen custom practiced by Israel of slaying the children in

secret places (Isa 57:5), and Jeremiah represents it as practiced in his time (Jer 7:31; 19:5). Ezekiel denounces the same practice (Eze 16:20,21; 23:37).

11. Certain Heathen Sacrifices:

Heathen sacrifices are hinted at in the later books, such as swine, a mouse, a horse, a dog (Isa 65:4; 66:3,17; Eze 8:10; 2Ki 23:11). All such animals were unclean to the Hebrews, and the practice had its roots in some form of primitive totemism which survived in those heathen cults. They were little practiced among the Israelites.

See TOTEMISM.

VII. The Prophets and Sacrifices.

The prophets were reformers, not innovators. Their emphasis was on the ethical, rather than the ritual. They based their teachings on the fundamentals of the covenant, not the incidentals. They accepted sacrifices as part of the religious life, but would give them their right place. They accepted the law regarding common altars, and Samuel, David and Elijah used these altars. They also endorsed the movement toward a central sanctuary, but it is the abuse of the cult that they condemned, rather than its use. They combated the heathenish idea that all God needed was gifts, lavish gifts, and would condone any sin if only they bestowed abundance of gifts. They demanded an inward religion, morality, justice, righteousness, in short, an ethical religion. They preached an ethical God, rather than the profane, debasing and almost blasphemous idea of God which prevailed in their times. They reminded the people of the covenant at Sinai, the foundation principle of which was obedience and loyalty to Yahweh. If Joe is early, the cult is in full practice, as he deplores the cutting-off of the meal offering, or minchah, and the netsekh or drink offering, through the devastation of the locusts. He does not mention the burnt offerings, etc., as these would not be cut off by the locusts (Joe 1:7,13; 2:14). Joe emphasized the need for a genuine repentance, telling them to rend their hearts and not their garments (2:13).

Amos condemns the cult at Beth-el and Gilgal, and sarcastically bids them go on transgressing (4:4,5), mentions burnt offerings, peace offerings, thank offerings, and freewill offerings (4:4 f; 5:22), reminds them of the fact that they did not offer sacrifices in the wilderness (5:25), but demands rather righteousness and justice. There is nothing here against the Mosaic origin of the laws.

In Hosea’s time the hollow externalism of the cult had become worse, while vice, falsehood, murder, oppression, etc., were rampant. He utters an epoch-making sentence when he says, "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice," etc. (Ho 6:6). This is no sweeping renunciation of sacrifices, as such; it is only putting the emphasis in the right place. Such sacrifices as Hosea speaks of were worse than worthless. It is somewhat extravagant for Kautzsch to say, "It is perfectly futile to read out of Ho 6:6 anything else than a categorical rejection of sacrifices." Hosea recognizes their place in religion, and deplores the loss during exile (3:4). The corrupt cults he condemns (4:13 f), for they are as bad as the Canaanitish cults (4:9). Yahweh will spurn them (8:13; 9:4). The defection of the nation began early (11:2), and they have

multiplied altars (12:11; 13:2). He predicts the time when they shall render as bullocks the "calves" of their lips (14:2 the King James Version).

Micah is as emphatic. The sacrifices were more costly in his day, in order the more surely to purchase the favor of the Deity. Human sacrifices were in vogue, but Micah says God requires them "to do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God" (6:8). This does not in the least affect sacrifices of the right kind and with the right spirit.

Isaiah faces the same situation. There are multitudes of sacrifices, burnt offerings, blood of bullocks and goats, oblations, sweet incense, beasts, etc., but no justice, morality, love, truth or goodness. Thus their sacrifices, etc., are an abomination, though right in themselves (1:11-17; 61:8). The same is true of all pious performances today. It is probable that Isaiah worshipped in the temple (6:1,6). In his eschatological vision there is freedom to offer sacrifices in Egypt (19:19,21). The people are to worship in the holy mountain (27:13). Ariel must let the feasts come around (29:1).

Jeremiah maintains the same attitude. Your "frankincense from Sheba, and the sweet cane," burnt offerings and sacrifices are not pleasing to God (6:20; 14:12). They made the temple a den of robbers, in the streets they baked cakes to the Queen of heaven, etc. He speaks sarcastically, saying, "Add your burnt-offerings unto your sacrifices, and eat ye flesh. For I spake not unto your fathers .... concerning .... sacrifices: but .... commanded .... saying, Hearken unto my voice," etc. (7:21-23). This was literally true, as we have seen above; the covenant was not based on sacrifices but on obedience. Such a statement does not deny the institution of sacrifices for those within the covenant who are obedient. It is no "subterfuge," as Kautzsch calls it, "to say that the prophets never polemize against sacrifice per se, but only against offerings presented hypocritically, without repentance and a right disposition, with blood-stained hands; against the opera operata of the carnally-minded, half-heathen mass of the people." This is exactly what they do, and they are in perfect harmony with the covenant constitution and with their own ethical and spiritual functions. Kautzsch can make such an extravagant assertion only by ignoring the fact that Jeremiah himself in predicting the future age of righteousness and blessedness makes sacrifice an important factor (33:11,18). Picturing possible prosperity and glory, Jeremiah speaks of burnt offerings and meal offerings, frankincense, thank offerings, etc., being brought into the house of Yahweh (17:26). (We are aware of the harsh and arbitrary transference of this passage to a later time.)

Ezekiel is called by Kautzsch "the founder of the Levitical system." He is said to have preserved the fragment of the ritual that was broken up in the exile. But his references to the burnt offerings, sin offerings, and trespass offerings presuppose familiarity with them (40:38-42).

He assigns the north and south chambers for the meal, sin and trespass offerings (Eze 42:13). The cleansing of the altar requires a bullock and he-goat for a sin offering, with burnt and peace offerings with a ritual similar to Le 8:1 f (Eze 43:18-27). The Levites are to be ministers and slay burnt offerings and sacrifice for the people (Eze 44:11). The priest must offer his sin offering before he ministers in the sanctuary (Eze 44:27). They are to eat the meal, sin, and trespass offerings as in Eze 44:29. In Ezekiel 45, the people are to give the wheat, barley, oil and lambs for meal, burnt and peace offerings, while the

prince shall give the meal, burnt and drink offerings for the feasts, the new moons, sabbaths and appointed feasts. He is to prepare them to make atonement (45:13-17). In cleansing the sanctuary the Levitical ritual is followed with added details (45:18-20). The Passover requires the burnt offerings, sin offerings, and meal offerings with an extra amount of cereal. The priests prepare the prince's burnt offerings and peace offerings (46:2-4,6,9-12) for the sabbaths, new moons, etc. The daily burnt offerings (46:13-15) must have a sixth instead of a tenth part of an ephah, as in Leviticus 1. The sin and guilt offerings are to be boiled in a certain place, and the meal offering baked (1:20,26). Ezekiel varies from the Levitical Law in the quantity of the meal offering, picturing the ritual in a more ideal situation than Moses. The people are all righteous, with new hearts, the Spirit in them enabling them to keep the Law (36:26 f), and yet he institutes an elaborate ritual of purification for them. Does this seem to indicate that the prophets would abolish sacrifices entirely? It is strange reasoning which makes the prophets denounce the whole sacrificial system, when one of the greatest among them seeks to conserve an elaborate cult for the blessed age in the future.

In the second part of Isaiah, God declares that He has not been honored by the people with burnt offerings and meal offerings, etc., and that He has not burdened them with such offerings, but that He is wearied with their sins (43:23 f). Those foreigners who respect the covenant shall offer acceptable sacrifices (56:7) in the blessed age to come. The Servant of Yahweh is to be a guilt offering (53:10) to expiate the sins of Israel. Sacrifice is here for the first time lifted out of the animal to the human sphere, thus forging the link between the Old Testament and the New Testament. In the glorious age to come there are to be priests and Levites, new moons, sabbaths and worship in Jerusalem (66:21,23).

Daniel speaks of the meal offering being caused to cease in the midst of the week (9:27).

Zechariah pictures the golden age to come when all nations shall go up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles, which implies sacrifices. Pots are used, and all the worshippers shall use them in the ritual (14:16-21).

In Malachi's age the ritual was in practice, but grossly abused. They offered polluted bread (1:7), blind, lame and sick animals (1:13 f). Yahweh has the same attitude toward these as toward those in the times of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah (Mal 1:10 f). The Gentiles offer better ones (Mal 1:11). The Israelites covered the altar of Yahweh with tears by their hypocritical, non-ethical actions (Mal 2:13). They robbed God in withholding tithes and heave offerings (Mal 3:8). It is the abuse of the cult that is denounced here, as in all the other Prophets.

A special use of the term "sacrifice" is made by Zephaniah (1:7 f), applying it to the destruction of Israel by Yahweh. Bozrah and Edom are to be victims (Isa 34:6); also Gog and Magog (Eze 39:17,19).

In summing up the general attitude of the prophets toward sacrifices, even G. F. Moore in Encyclopedia Biblica admits: "It is not probable that the prophets distinctly entertained the idea of a religion without a cult, a purely spiritual worship. Sacrifice may well have seemed to them the natural expression of homage and gratitude." He might have added, "and of atonement for sin, and full fellowship with God."

SACRIFICE, IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, 3

VIII. Sacrifice in the "Writings."

1. Proverbs:

Dates are very uncertain here. The Psalms and Proverbs extend from David and Solomon into the Persian period. The sages take the same attitude as the prophets. They enjoin the sacrifice of first-fruits (Pr 3:9). A feast usually follows a sacrifice of peace offerings (7:14). The trespass offering (?) has no meaning to fools (14:9), and the sacrifices of the wicked are an abomination to God (15:8; 21:27). Righteousness and justice are more acceptable to Yahweh than sacrifices (21:3), yet to them sacrifices are a regular part of worship. Qoheleth speaks of sacrifices as quite the custom, and deprecates the offerings of fools (Ec 5:1; 9:2).

2. The Psalms:

The Psalmist admonishes the faithful to offer the sacrifices of righteousness, i.e. sacrifices offered in the right spirit (Ps 4:5). The drink offerings of idolaters are well known (Ps 16:4). Prayer is made for the acceptance of sacrifices (Ps 20:3). It is a coveted privilege to offer them (Ps 27:6; 84:1-4). The true relation between sacrifice and obedience is expressed in Ps 40:6-8. As in Jer 7:21 f, the emphasis is laid on obedience, without which sacrifices are worthless and repugnant to God. They are not the important thing in Israel’s religion, for that religion could exist without them as in the wilderness and exile. The teaching corresponds exactly with that of the prophets and is probably late. Ps 50 is even more emphatic. The Psalmist knows that sacrifices are in the covenant regulations (50:5), but repudiates the idea of giving anything to God or of feeding Him (50:12,13). Everything belongs to Him, He is not hungry, He would scorn the idea of drinking the blood of goats, etc. The idea of the cult being of any real value to God is scouted. Yet in the next verse the reader is admonished to offer sacrifices of thanksgiving and pay vows (50:14). The sacrifices that express worship, penitence, prayer, thanksgiving and faith are acceptable. The penitent Psalmist speaks in similar terms. Sacrifices as such are no delight to God, the real sacrifice is a broken heart (51:16 f). When the heart is right, then, as an expression of true-heartedness, devotion, repentance and faith, burnt offerings are highly acceptable (51:19). Another Psalmist promises a freewill offering to God (54:6; 66:13,15). Sacrifices of thanksgiving are advised (96:8; 107:22; 118:27) and promised (116:17). Prayer is likened to the evening sacrifice (141:2).

IX. The Idea and Efficacy of Sacrifices.

That the Hebrews thoroughly believed in the efficacy of sacrifices is without doubt. What ideas they entertained regarding them is not so clear. No single theory can account for all the facts. The unbloody sacrifices were regarded as food for the Deity, or a pleasant odor, in one instance, taking the place of a bloody offering (see above). The bloody offerings present some difficulties, and hence, many different views.

1. A Gift of Food to the Deity:

Included under the head of gifts of food to the Deity would be the meal and peace offerings, in so far as they were consumed by fire, the burnt offerings and the shewbread, etc. They were fire-food, the fire-distilled essence or etherealized food for God which gave Him pleasure and disposed Him favorably toward the offerer. They were intended either to appease wrath, to win favor, or to express thanks and gratitude for favors experienced. The earlier and more naive idea was probably to win the favor of the Deity by a gift. Later, other ideas were expressed in the offerings.

2. Expression of Adoration and Devotion, etc.:

The burnt offering best gave expression to the sentiments of adoration and devotion, though they may not be excluded from the meal and peace offerings. In other words, sacrifice meant worship, which is a complex exercise of the soul. Such was Abraham's attempted sacrifice of Isaac. The daily burnt offerings were intended to represent an unbroken course of adoration and devotion, to keep the right relations with the Deity. On particular occasions, special offerings were made to insure this relation which was specially needed at that time.

3. Means of Purification from Uncleanness:

The burnt and sin offerings were the principal kinds used for the purpose of purification; water being used in case of uncleanness from contact with the dead. There were three classes of uncleanness:

(1) those inseparable from the sex functions of men and women;

(2) those resulting from contact with a corpse;

(3) the case of recovery from leprosy.

Purification ceremonies were the condition of such persons enjoying the social and religious life of the community. Why they should require a sin offering when most of them occurred in the regular course of nature and could not be guarded against, can be understood only as we consider that these offenses were the effects of sin, or the weaknesses of the fleshly nature, due to sin. Such uncleannesses made the subject unfit for society, and that unfitness was an offense to God and required a piacular offering.

4. Means of Consecration to Divine Service:

Consecration was of men and things. The ceremonies at the sealing of the covenant and the consecration of the Levites and of Aaron and his sons have been mentioned. The altar and furniture of the tabernacle were consecrated by the blood of the sin offering. This blood being the means of expiation, it cleansed from all defilement caused by human hands, etc. The sprinkling and smearing of the blood consecrated

them to the service of God. The blood being holy, it sanctified all it touched (compare Eze 45:19 f).

5. Means of Establishing a Community of Life between Worshipper and God:

In other words, it is a kind of sacral communion. The blood is the sacred cement between man and God. This is possible only because it contains the life and is appropriated by God as a symbol of the communion into which He enters with the offerer. This blood "covers" all sin and defilement in man, permits him to enter God's presence and attests the communion with Him. This is the view of Schultz, and partly that of Kautzsch, in regard to earlier ideas of sacrifice. Such a view may have been held by certain peoples in primitive times, but it does not do justice to the Levitical system.

6. View of Ritschl:

The view of Ritschl is that sacrifices served as a form of self-protection from God whose presence meant destruction to a weak creature. Thus, sacrifices have no moral value and no relation to sin and defilement. They have relation only to man's creaturely weakness which is in danger of destruction as it approaches the presence of God. God's presence necessarily meant death to the creature without reference to his holiness, etc. Such a view banishes all real sense of sin, all ethical values, and furnishes no proper motives. It gives a false idea of the character of God, and is entirely out of accord with the sacred record.

7. The Sacramental View:

That sacrifices were really a sacrament has been advocated by many. According to some theologians, the sacrifices were signs of spiritual realities, not only representing but sealing and applying spiritual blessings, and their efficacy was proportionate to the faith of the offerer. By some Roman Catholic theologians it is held that the Passover was especially of a sacramental character, corresponding to the Lord's Supper. The purificatory rites corresponded to penance and the consecrating sacrifices to the sacrament of ordination. Bahr says that the acceptance of the sacrifice by Yahweh and His gift of sanctification to the worshippers give to the sacrifice the character of a sacramental act. Cave also speaks of them as having a sacramental significance, while refuting the position of Bahr. Though there may be a slight element of truth in some of these ideas, it is not the idea expressed in the cult, and seems to read into the ritual theology of theologians themselves. This view is closely allied to a phase of the following view (see Paterson, HDB, IV).

8. Symbol or Expression of Prayer:

That it is a symbol or expression of prayer is held by Maurice and to some extent by Schultz. Thus, the sacrifices are supposed to be symbols of the religious sentiment, which are the conditions of acceptance with God. The victim serves as an index of what is in the worshipper's heart, and its virtue is exhausted when it is presented to God. Thus, it may express spiritual aspiration or supplication, hatred of sin and surrender to God with confession and supplication. Bahr holds that a valuable and unblemished victim is

selected as symbolical of the excellence and purity to which the offerer aspires, the death is necessary to procure life which may be offered to God, and the sprinkling of the blood is the presentation to God of the life still resident in the blood. Schultz thinks that the sin offering was distinctively purifying. "Hence, the real ground of purification is that God accepts the sacrifice and thereby enters into communion with the sinner, granting him actual pardon, and that man in this offering enjoined by God as the embodied prayer of a penitent expresses his confession, his regrets and his petition for forgiveness." While there is an element of truth in this, and it is particularly applicable to the burnt offering, it does not embrace all the facts. It represents the views of the prophets and psalmists more than that of the Levitical code.

9. View of Kautzsch:

Kautzsch holds that the efficacy of sacrifices consists in this: "God has connected the accomplishment of atonement with the obedient discharge of the sacrificial prescriptions; whoever fulfils these and gets the priest to perform the atoning usages, is forgiven. The ritual, especially the presenting of the blood, is the indispensable condition of atonement, but it is not synonymous. Forgiveness of sin flows from the grace of God as taught by the prophets, only with them it is unnecessary, but with the Priestly Code it is necessary." Thus Kautzsch teaches a fundamental contradiction between the prophets and the Law, which is utterly wrong and is made necessary by first turning the history upside down and making the Priestly Code a hideous anachronism. He says, "That the process of atonement is connected with the presenting of blood, explains itself naturally as a powerful after-influence of primitive sacrificial usages, in which the presenting of blood had a different meaning. It is a symbolic (not real) satisfaction, as through the animal's life symbolic expression is given to the fact that the sinner's life is forfeited to God. But the main idea is that God has commanded it" (HDB, V, 721a). The half-truths in these statements will be obvious to most readers.

10. Vicarious Expiation Theory; Objections:

The theory that sacrifices were a vicarious expiation of sin and defilement, by a victim whose life is forfeited instead of the sinner's, is the only one that will complete the Levitical idea of sacrifices. This of course applies especially to the sin offering. While there is an element of truth in the gift-theory, the prayer and sacramental theories and others, including that of Kautzsch, the idea of a vicarious suffering is necessary to complete the conception. Oehler recognizes the force of the prayer-theory, but advances to the idea that in sacrifices man places the life of a pure, innocent, sacrificial animal between himself and God, because he is unable to approach God on account of his sinfulness and impurity. Thus it becomes a kopher for him, to cover his sin. This is not a punishment inflicted on the animal, although in the case of uncertain homicide it is (De 21:1-9). The law does not lay the emphasis upon the slaughter, but on the shedding of the blood and the sprinkling of it on certain articles. The slaughter is of course presupposed. The altar is not regarded as a place of execution, it is the means for "covering" the sins of the covenant people, a gracious ordinance of God and well-pleasing to Him. But the gift can please God only as the gift of one who has given himself up to Him; therefore the ritual must represent this self-surrender, the life of the clean and guiltless animal in place of the impure and sinful soul of the offerer, and this pure soul, coming in between the offerer and the Holy God, lets Him see at the altar a pure life by which the impure life is covered. In the same way the pure element serves to cover the pollutions of

the sanctuary and the altar, etc. Its meaning is specific, it is the self-sacrifice of the offerer vicariously accomplished. This self-sacrifice necessarily involves suffering and punishment, which is inflicted on the beast to which the guilt and sin are imputed, not imparted (see Oehler, Old Testament Theology, 278 f).

Objections have been raised by Dillmann, Kautzsch, and others on the ground that it could not have been vicarious because sacrifices were not allowed for sins which merited death, but only for venial transgressions (Nu 15:30). Certainly, but the entire sacrificial system was for those who were in the covenant, who did not commit sins that merited death, and was never intended as a penal substitute, because the sins of those in the covenant were not of a penal nature. The sacrifices were "to cover" the sin and defilement of the offerer, not the deserved death-penalty of one who broke the covenant. Again, they object, a cereal offering may atone, and this excludes a penal substitute. But sacrifices were not strictly penal, and the cereal was distinctly an exception in case of the very poor, and the exception proves the rule. In any case it represented the self-sacrifice of the offerer, and that was the important thing. Further, the victim was slain by the offerer and not by the priest, whereas it should have been put to death by God's representative. This carries no weight whatever, as the essential thing was a sacrifice, and priests were not necessary for that. A more serious objection is that in the case of penal substitution, by which the sin and guilt are transferred to the animal, the flesh of that animal is regarded as most holy and to be eaten by the priests only, whereas it would necessarily be regarded as laden with guilt and curse, and hence, polluted and unfit for use. This is a pure assumption. In the first place, the substitution was not strictly penal, and, secondly, there is no hint that actual pollution is conveyed to the flesh of the animal or to the blood. Even if it were so, the shedding of the blood would expiate the sin and guilt, wipe out the pollution, and the flesh would be in no way affected. On the contrary, the flesh, having been the vehicle for the blood which has accomplished such a sacred and meritorious service, would necessarily be regarded as most holy. All the animal would be holy, rather than polluted, since it had performed such a holy service. Kautzsch's objection thus appears puerile. The ritual of the Day of Atonement presents all these features. It is distinctly stated that the high priest confesses the iniquities of the children of Israel over the scapegoat, and that the goat carries this guilt away to the desert. Its blood is not shed, it is wholly unclean, and the man leading it away is unclean. This is undeniably a vicarious act. In the case of the other goat, a sin offering, the sin and guilt are imputed to it, but the life is taken and thus the expiation is made and the flesh of the victim used in such a holy service is most holy.

That this view of a vicarious expiation was generally accepted is evident on every hand. There was no need of a theoretical explanation in the cult; it was self-evident; as Holtzmann says, "the most external indeed, but also the simplest and most generally intelligible and the readiest answer to the nature of expiation" (New Testament Theology, I, 68). This view is amply corroborated by the researches of S. I. Curtiss in his Primitive Semitic Religion of Today. By searching questions he found that the fundamental idea of bloody sacrifices was that the victim took the place of the man, redeemed him, or atoned for him as a substitute. The "bursting forth of the blood" was the essential thing (see pp. 218 f).

11. Typology of Sacrifice:

The typology of sacrifice has been much discussed. There can be no question that, from the standpoint

of the New Testament, many of the sacrifices were typical. They pre-figured, and designedly so, the great sacrifice of Christ. Thus they could not really take away sin; they were in that sense unreal. But the question is, were they typical to the people of Israel? Did Moses and the priests and prophets and people understand that they were merely figures, adumbrations of the true Sacrifice to come, which alone could take away sin? Did they understand that their Messiah was to be sacrificed, His blood shed, to make an atonement for them, and render their divinely-given means of atonement all unreal? The answer must be an emphatic "No." There is no hint that their minds were directed to think of the Coming One as their sacrifice, foreshadowed by their offerings. That was the one thing the nation could not and would not understand, and to this day the cross is their chief stumblingblock. The statement that the Servant is to be a guilt offering (Isa 53:10) is the nearest approach to it, but this is far from saying that the whole sacrificial system was understood as foreshadowing that event. The great prophets all speak of a sacrificial system in full vogue in the Messianic age.

We prefer to regard the sacrificial system as great religious educational system, adapted to the capacity of the people at that age, intended to develop right conceptions of sin, proper appreciation of the holiness of God, correct ideas of how to approach God, a familiarity with the idea of sacrifice as the fundamental thing in redemption, life, and service to God and man.

LITERATURE.

Only a Selection Is Attempted:

Articles in Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition; Encyclopedia Biblica (G. F. Moore); HDB (Paterson); RE and Sch-Herz (Orelli); Jewish Encyclopedia; McClintock and Strong, etc.; Murray’s Bible Dict.; Standard BD, etc. Kautzsch, Jastrow and Wiedermann in HDB; article on "Comparative Religion" in Sch-Herz; Old Testament Theologies of Oehler, Dillmann, Smend, Schultz, Davidson, Koenig, etc.

On Sacrifices in General:

Wellhausen, Reste des arabischen Heidenthums; W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites; J. G. Frazer, Golden Bough, II, III; E. B. Tylor, Primitive Culture; E. Westermarck, Origin of Moral Ideas; H. Hubert et Mauss, Annee sociologique, II; L. Marillier, Revue de l’histoire des religions, XXXVI, 208; S. I. Curtiss, Primitive Semitic Religion of Today.

Biblical Sacrifices:

F. Bahr, Symbolik des Mosdischen Kultus; J. H. Kurtz, Der alttestamentliche Opfercultus; A. Stewart, The Mosaic Sacrifices; J. G. Murphy, Sacrifice as Set Forth in Scripture; A. Cave, Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice; F. Maurice, The Doctrine of Sacrifice; J. M. P. Smith, Biblical Doctrine of Atonement. See also: Schultz, AJT, 1900, 257 ff; Smoller, Studien und Kritiken, 1891; Wiener, Essays in Pentateuchal Criticism; Pentateuchal Studies; Driver, ERE, VI.

J. J. Reeve

SACRILEGE

sak’-ri-lej: For "commit sacrilege" in Ro 2:22 (the King James Version and the English Revised Version margin), the Revised Version (British and American) has "rob temples," which more exactly expresses the meaning of the verb (hierosuleo; compare Ac 19:37, "robbers of temples" (which see)). The noun occurs in 2 Macc 4:39 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) for the corresponding form hierosulema.

SADAMIAS

sad-a-mi’-as: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SALEMAS (which see).

SADAS

sa’-das: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) ASTAD (which see).

SADDEUS

sa-de’-us: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) LODDEUS (which see).

SADDLE

sad’-’-l: As noun (merkabh, "a riding seat") the word occurs in Le 15:9 (margin "carriage"); ordinarily it is used as a verb (chabhash, literally, to "bind up" or "gird about"), to saddle an ass (Ge 22:3; Nu 22:21; Jud 19:10, etc.).

SADDUCEES

sad’-u-sez (tsadduqim; Saddoukaioi):

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Name: Rival Etymologies. Probably from Zadok the High Priest

2. Authorities: New Testament, Josephus, Talmud (primary), Church Fathers (secondary)

II. ORIGIN AND HISTORY

1. Early Notices in Josephus: Alleged Relation to Differences between Prophets and Priests 2. Tendencies of Sadducees toward Hellenism as Causing Rise of Chacidhim

3. Favored by Alexander Janneus: Put in the Background by Alexandra Salome

4. From a Political Party, but also Became a Religious Party

5. Fear Roman Interference if Jesus' Messianic Claims Are Recognized

6. Sadducees Antagonistic to the Apostles: Pharisees More Favorable

7. Fall of Sadducean Party at Outbreak of Jewish War

III. DOCTRINES OF THE SADDUCEES

1. Laid Stress on Ceremonial Exactness

2. Disbelief in the Spiritual World, in a Resurrection, and in Providence: Their Materialism

3. Alleged Belief in Canonicity of the Pentateuch Alone

4. Relation to Epicureanism

IV. CHARACTER OF SADDUCEES

1. Characterized as Rough and Boorish

2. Talmudic Account of the Sadducees

3. Relation to Temple and Worship was a Heathenish One

4. Sadducean Literature

V. RELATION OF SADDUCEES TO JESUS

1. Less Denounced by Jesus than the Pharisees

2. Attitude of Sadducees to Jesus

This prominent Jewish sect, though not so numerous as their opponents, the Pharisees, by their wealth and the priestly descent of many of them had an influence which fully balanced that of their more popular rivals. They were a political party, of priestly and aristocratic tendency, as against the more religious and democratic Pharisees.

I. Introductory.

1. Name: Rival Etymologies. Probably from Zadok the High Priest:

The Talmud form suggests derivation from the name of their founder, but the form in New Testament and Josephus would imply connection with the verb "to be righteous." The probability is, that the name is derived from some person named "Zadok." The most prominent Zadok in history was the Davidic high priest (2Sa 8:17; 15:24; 1Ki 1:35), from whom all succeeding high priests claimed to descend. It is in harmony with this, that in the New Testament the Sadducees are the party to whom the high priests belonged. On the authority of ‘Abhoth de-Rabbi Nathan (circa 1000 AD) another Zadok is asserted to be he from whom the Sadducees received their name. He was a disciple of Antigonus of Socho (circa 250 BC) who taught that love to God should be absolutely disinterested (Pirqe ‘Abhoth, i.3). ‘Abhoth de-Rabbi Nathan’s account of the derivation of the Sadduceanism from this teaching is purely an imaginary deduction (Charles Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers(2), 112). The majority of authoritative writers prefer to derive the name from Zadok, the colleague of Abiathar, the contemporary of David.

2. Authorities: New Testament, Josephus, Talmud (primary), Church Fathers (secondary):

Our main authorities for the teaching of the Sadducees are the New Testament and Josephus. According to the former, the Sadducees denied the resurrection of the body, and did not believe in angels or spirits (Mt 22:23; Ac 23:8). More can be learned from Josephus, but his evidence is to be received with caution, as he was a Pharisee and, moreover, had the idea that the Sadducees were to be paralleled with the Epicureans. The Talmud is late. Before even the Mishna was committed to writing (circa 200 AD) the Sadducees had ceased to exist; before the Gemara was completed (circa 700 AD) every valid tradition of their opinions must have vanished. Further, the Talmud is Pharisaic. The Fathers, Origen, Hippolytus, Epiphanius and Jerome, have derived their information from late Pharisaic sources.

II. Origin and History.

1. Early Notices in Josephus: Alleged Relation to Differences between Prophets and Priests:

Josephus describes the Sadducees along with the contemporary sects, the Pharisees and the Essenes (Josephus, Ant, XIII, v, 9; X, vi 2; XVIII, i, 4, 5; BJ, II, viii, 14). His earliest notice of them is after his account of the treaties of Jonathan with the Romans and the Lacedemonians. He indicates his belief that the parties were ancient; but if so, they must have formerly had other names. It has been suggested that the earlier form of the conflict between the Sadducees and Pharisees was opposition between the priests and the prophets. This, however, is not tenable; in the Southern Kingdom there was no such opposition;

whatever the state of matters in the Northern Kingdom, it could have had no influence on opinion in Judea and Galilee in the time of our Lord. By others the rivalry is supposed to be inherited from that between the scribes and the priests, but Ezra, the earliest scribe, in the later sense of the term, was a priest with strong sacerdotal sympathies.

2. Tendencies of Sadducees toward Hellenism as Causing Rise of Chacidhim:

Probably the priestly party only gradually crystallized into the sect of the Sadducees. After the return from the exile, the high priest drew to himself all powers, civil and religious. To the Persian authorities he was as the king of the Jews. The high priest and those about him were the persons who had to do with the heathen supreme government and the heathen nationalities around; this association would tend to lessen their religious fervor, and, by reaction, this roused the zeal of a section of the people for the law. With the Greek domination the power of the high priests at home was increased, but they became still more subservient to their heathen masters, and were the leaders in the Hellenizing movement. They took no part in the Maccabean struggle, which was mainly supported by their opponents the chacidhim, as they were called (the Hasideans of 1 Macc 2:42, etc.). When the chacidhim, having lost sympathy with the Maccabeans, sought to reconcile themselves to the priestly party, Alcimus, the legitimate high priest, by his treachery and cruelty soon renewed the breach. The Hasmoneans then were confirmed in the high-priesthood, but were only lukewarmly supported by the chacidhim.

3. Favored by Janneus: Put in the Background by Alexandra Salome:

The division between the Hasmoneans and the chacidhim, or, as they were now called, Pharisees, culminated in the insult offered by Eleazar to John Hyrcanus, the Hasmonean high priest (Josephus, Ant, XIII, x, 5). Alexander Janneus, the son of Hyrcanus, became a violent partisan of the Sadducees, and crucified large numbers of the Pharisees. Toward the end of his life he fell out of sympathy with the Sadducees, and on his deathbed recommended his wife Alexandra Salome, who as guardian to his sons succeeded him, to favor the Pharisees, which she did. In the conflict between her two sons, John Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, the Sadducees took the side of Aristobulus, the younger and abler brother. So long as the contest was between Jews, the Sadducean candidate prevailed. When the Romans were called in, they gave the advantage to Hyrcanus.

4. From a Political, Become Also a Religious Party:

Thrown into the background by the overthrow of their candidate for the high-priesthood, they soon regained their influence. They allied themselves with the Herodiana who had supported Hyrcanus, but were subservient to Rome. Though they were not theological at first, they became so, to defend their policy against the attacks of the Pharisees. A historic parallel may be found in the Cavaliers of the reign of Charles I, as over against the Puritans.

5. Fear Roman Interference if Jesus’ Messianic Claims Are Recognized:

The Sadducees at first regarded the struggle between our Lord and the Pharisees as a matter with which they had no concern. It was not until our Lord claimed to be the Messiah, and the excitement of the people consequent on this proved likely to draw the attention of the Roman authorities, that they intervened. Should Tiberius learn that there was widespread among the Jews the belief in the coming of a Jewish king who was to rule the world, and that one had appeared who claimed to be this Messiah, very soon would the quasi-independence enjoyed by the Jews be taken from them, and with this the influence of the Sadducees would depart. An oligarchy is proverbially sensitive to anything that threatens its stability; a priesthood is unmeasured in its vindictiveness; and the Sadducees were a priestly oligarchy. Hence, it is not wonderful that only the death of Jesus would satisfy them.

6. Sadducees Antagonistic to the Apostles: Pharisees More Favorable:

After the resurrection, the Pharisees became less hostile to the followers of Christ; but the Sadducees maintained their attitude of suspicion and hatred (Ac 4:1). Although a Pharisee, it was as agent of the Sadducean high priest that Paul persecuted the believers. The Sadducees gained complete ascendancy in the Sanhedrin, and later, under the leadership of Annas, or as he is sometimes called by Josephus, Ananus, the high priest, they put James the brother of our Lord to death (Josephus, Ant, XX, ix, 1) with many others, presumably Christians. The Pharisees were against these proceedings; and even sent messengers to meet Albinus who was coming to succeed Festus as governor to entreat him to remove Annas from the highpriesthood.

7. The Fall of Sadducean Party at Outbreak of Jewish War:

With the outbreak of the Jewish war, the Sadducees with their allies the Herodians were driven into the background by the Zealots, John of Gischala and Simon ben Gioras. Annas and Joshua, also called high priest by Josephus, were both put to death by the Zealots and their Idumean allies (Josephus, BJ, IV, v, 2). With the destruction of the temple and the fall of the Jewish state the Sadducean party disappeared.

III. Doctrines of the Sadducees.

1. Laid Stress on Ceremonial Exactness:

As the sacerdotal party, the Sadducees laid great stress on the ceremonial of sacrifice, and rejected the changes introduced by their opponents unless these found support in the words of the Law.

2. Disbelief in the Spiritual World, in a Resurrection, and in Providence: Their Materialism:

The most prominent doctrine of the Sadducees was the denial of the immortality of the soul and of the resurrection of the body. The Pharisees believed that Moses had delivered these doctrines to the elders, and that they had in turn handed them on to their successors. The Sadducees rejected all these traditions. From Ac (23:8) we learn that they believed in neither "angel or spirit." As appearances of angels are mentioned in the Law, it is difficult to harmonize their reverence for the Law with this denial. They may

have regarded these angelophanies as theophanies. Josephus distinctly asserts (Ant., XVIII, i, 4) that the Sadducees believe that the soul dies with the body. They deny, he says, divine providence (BJ, II, viii, 14). Their theology might be called "religion within the limits of mere sensation."

3. Alleged Belief in Canonicity of the Pentateuch Alone:

The Fathers, Hippolytus, Origen and Jerome, credit the Sadducees with regarding the Pentateuch as alone canonical (Hipp., Haer., ix.24; Orig., Contra Celsum, i.49; on Mt 22:24-31; Jerome on Mt 22:31,32). This idea may be due to a false identification of the views of the Sadducees with those of the Samaritans. Had they rejected all the rest of Scripture, it is hardly possible that Josephus would have failed to notice this. The Talmud does not mention this among their errors. It is certain that they gave more importance to the Pentateuch than to any other of the books of Scripture. Hence, our Lord, in the passage commented on by Origen and Jerome, appeals to the Law rather than to the Prophets or the Psalms. It follows from the little value they put upon the Prophets that they had no sympathy with the Messianic hopes of the Pharisees.

4. Relation to Epicureanism:

It need hardly be said that there was no real connection between Sadduceanism and the doctrines of Epicurus. There was a superficial resemblance which was purely accidental. Their favor for Hellenism would give a color to this identification.

IV. Character of Sadducees.

1. Characterized as Rough and Boorish:

Josephus says that while the Pharisees have amiable manners and cultivate concord among all, the Sadducees are "very boorish" (BJ, II, viii, 14). This want of manners is not a characteristic usually associated with an aristocracy, or with supple diplomats, yet it suits what we find in the New Testament. The cruel horseplay indulged in when our Lord was tried before the irregular meeting of the Sanhedrin (Mt 26:67,68), the shout of Ananias at the trial of Paul before the same tribunal to "smite him on the mouth," show them to be rough and overbearing. What Josephus relates of the conduct of Annas (or Ananus) in regard to James, above referred to, agrees with this. Josephus, however, does not always speak in such condemnatory terms of Ananus—in Josephus, Jewish Wars (IV, v, 2) he calls him "a man venerable and most just." Only the violence which, as Josephus relates in the chapter immediately preceding that from which we have quoted, Ananus resorted to against the Zealots better suits the earlier verdict of Josephus than the later. As to their general character Josephus mentions that when the Sadducees became magistrates they conformed their judgments to Pharisaic opinion, otherwise they would not have been tolerated (Ant., XVIII, i, 4).

2. Talmudic Account of the Sadducees:

As noted above, the Talmud account is untrustworthy, late and Pharisaic. The Gemara from which most of the references are taken was not committed to writing till 7 centuries after Christ—when the traditions concerning the Sadducees, such as had survived, had filtered through 20 generations of Pharisaism. Despite this lengthened time and suspicious medium, there may be some truth in the representations of the Talmudic rabbin. In Pesachim 57a it is said, "Woe's me on account of the house of Boothus, woe's me on account of their spears; woe's me on account of the house of Hanun (Annas), woe's me on account of their serpent brood; woe's me on account of the house of Kathros, woe's me on account of their pen; woe's me on account of the house of Ishmael ben Phabi; woe's me on account of their fists. They are high priests and their sons are treasurers of the temple, and their sons-in-law, assistant treasurers; and their servants beat the people with sticks." As these are Sadducean names, this passage exhibits Pharisaic tradition as to the habits of the Sadducees.

3. Relation to Temple and Worship a Heathenish One:

The Sadducean high priests made Hophni and Phinehas too much their models. Annas and his sons had booths in the courts of the temple for the sale of sacrificial requisites, tables for money-changers, as ordinary coins had to be changed into the shekels of the sanctuary. From all these the priests of the high-priestly caste derived profit at the expense of desecrating the temple (Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus, I, 371 ff). They did not, as did the Pharisees, pay spiritual religion the homage of hypocrisy; they were frankly irreligious. While officials of religion, they were devoid of its spirit. This, however, represents their last stage.

4. Sadducean Literature:

The favor for the memory of John Hyrcanus shown by the writer of 1 Maccabees (16:23,14) renders probable Geiger's opinion that the author was a Sadducee. He shows the party in its best form: his outlook on life is eminently sane, and his history is trustworthy. He has sympathy with the patriotism of the Hasideans, but none with the religious scruples which led them to desert Judas Maccabeus. That the writer of Ecclesiasticus from his silence as to the national expectation of a Messiah and the hope of a future life was also a Sadducee, is almost certain.

V. Relation of Sadducees to Jesus.

1. Less Denounced by Jesus than the Pharisees:

As the doctrines and practices of the Sadducees were quite alien from the teaching of our Lord and the conduct He enjoined, it is a problem why He did not denounce them more frequently than He did. Indeed He never denounces the Sadducees except along with their opponents the Pharisees; whereas He frequently denounces the Pharisees alone. As His position, both doctrinal and practical, was much nearer that of the Pharisees, it was necessary that He should clearly mark Himself off from them. There was not the same danger of His position being confused with that of the Sadducees. Josephus informs us that the Sadducees had influence with the rich; Jesus drew His adherents chiefly from the poor, from whom also

the Pharisees drew. The latter opposed Him all the more that He was sapping their source of strength; hence, He had to defend Himself against them. Further, the Gospels mainly recount our Lord's ministry in Galilee, whereas the Sadducees were chiefly to be found in Jerusalem and its neighborhood; hence, there may have been severe denunciations of the Sadducees that have not come down to us.

2. Attitude of Sadducees to Jesus:

The Sadducees probably regarded Jesus as harmless fanatic who by His denunciations was weakening the influence of the Pharisees. Only when His claim to be the Messiah brought Him within the sphere of practical politics did they desire to intervene. When they did determine to come into conflict with Jesus, they promptly decreed His arrest and death; only the arrest was to be secret, "lest a tumult arise among the people" (Mt 26:5). In their direct encounter with our Lord in regard to the resurrection (Mt 22:25 ff; Mr 12:20 ff; Lu 20:29), there is an element of contempt implied in the illustration which they bring, as if till almost the end they failed to take Him seriously. For Literature see PHARISEES.

J. E. H. Thomson

SADDUK

sad'-uk (Codex Alexandrinus (Fritzsche), Saddoukos; Codex Vaticanus Saddouloukos; the King James Version Sadduc): The high priest, an ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:2) =" Zadok" in Ezr 7:2 =" Sadoc" in 2 Esdras 1:1.

SADOC

sa'-dok:

(1) (Latin Sadoch): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:1) =" Zadok" in Ezr 7:2 =" Sadduk" in 1 Esdras 8:2.

(2) (Sadok): A descendant of Zerubbabel and ancestor of Jesus (Mt 1:14).

SAFFRON

saf'-run (karkom; krokos): Identical with the Arabic kurqum, the same as za'faran, "saffron." The source of the true saffron is Crocus sativus (Natural Order, Indaceae), a plant cultivated in Palestine; there are 8 wild varieties in all of which, as in the cultivated species, the orange-colored styles and stigmas yield the yellow dye, saffron. So 4:14 probably refers to the C. sativus. There is a kind of bastard saffron plant, the Carthamus tinctorius (Natural Order, Compositae), of which the orange-colored flowers yield a dye like saffron.

E. W. G. Masterman

SAIL; SAILOR

sal, sal’-er.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3); III, 2.

SAINTS

sants: In the King James Version 3 words are thus rendered:

(1) qadhosh (in Da the same root occurs several times in its Aramaic form, qaddish);

(2) chacidh, and

(3) hagioi.

Of these words (2) has in general the meaning of righteousness or goodness, while (1) and (3) have the meaning of consecration and divine claim and ownership. They are not primarily words of character, like chacidh, but express a relation to God as being set apart for His own. Wherever qadhosh refers to angels, the rendering "holy one" or "holy ones" has been substituted in the Revised Version (British and American) for the King James Version "saint" or "saints," which is the case also in Ps 106:16 margin (compare 34:9), and in 1Sa 2:9, as the translation of chacidh.

While hagioi occurs more frequently in the New Testament than does qadhosh in the Old Testament, yet both are applied with practical uniformity to the company of God’s people rather than to any individual. Perhaps the rendering "saints" cannot be improved, but it is necessary for the ordinary reader constantly to guard against the idea that New Testament saintship was in any way a result of personal character, and consequently that it implied approval of moral attainment already made. Such a rendering as "consecrate ones," for example, would bring out more clearly the relation to God which is involved, but, besides the fact that it is not a happy translation, it might lead to other errors, for it is not easy to remember that consecration—the setting apart of the individual as one of the company whom God has in a peculiar way as His own—springs not from man, but from God Himself, and that consequently it is in no way something optional, and admits of no degrees of progress, but, on the contrary, is from the beginning absolute duty. It should also be noted that while, as has been said, to be a saint is not directly and primarily to be good but to be set apart by God as His own, yet the godly and holy character ought inevitably and immediately to result. When God consecrates and claims moral beings for Himself and His service, He demands that they should go on to be fit for and worthy of the relation in which He has placed them, and so we read of certain actions as performed "worthily of the saints" (Ro 16:2) and as such "as becometh saints" (Eph 5:3). The thought of the holy character of the "saints," which is now so common as almost completely to obscure the real thought of the New Testament writers, already lay in their thinking very close to their conception of saintship as consecration by God to be His own.

David Foster Estes

SALA, SALAH

sa’-la (shelach, "a missile," "petition"; Sala): A son of Arpachshad (the King James Version Ge 10:24; 11:13 ff; 1Ch 1:18,24). Lu 3:35,36 follows the Septuagint of Ge 10:24; 11:12 = SHELAH (which see).

SALAMIEL

sa-la’-mi-el (Codex Vaticanus Salamiel; Codex Alexandrinus Samamiel): An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1) = the King James Version "Samuel" =" Shelumiel."

SALAMIS

sal’-a-mis (Salamis):

1. Site:

A town on the east coast of Cyprus, situated some 3 miles to the North of the medieval and modern Famagusta. It lay near the river Pediaeus, at the eastern extremity of the great plain of the Mesorea, which runs far into the interior of the island toward Nicosia (Lefkosia), the present capital. It possessed a good harbor and was the most populous and flourishing town of Cyprus in the Hellenic and Roman periods, carrying on a vigorous trade with the ports of Cilicia and Syria. Its population was mixed, consisting of Greek and Phoenician elements. The former, however, gave its tone and color to the city, and the chief cult and temple were those of Salaminian Zeus.

2. Early History:

Tradition represented Salamis as rounded soon after the fall of Troy by Teucer, the prince of Greek archers according to the narrative of the Iliad, who named it after his home, the island of Salamis off the Attic coast. In the 6th century BC it figures as an important Hellenic city, ruled by a line of kings reputed to be descended from Teucer and strengthened by an alliance with Cyrene (Herodotus iv.162). Gorgus, who was on the throne in 498 BC, refused to join the Ionic revolt against Persia, but the townsmen, led by his brother Onesilus, took up arms in the struggle for freedom. A crushing defeat, however, inflicted udder the walls of Salamis, restored the island to its Persian overlords, who reinstated Gorgus as a vassal prince (Herodotus v.103 ff). In 449 a Greek fleet under Athenian leadership defeated the Phoenician navy, which was in the service of Persia, off Salamis; but the Athenian withdrawal which followed the battle led to a decided anti-Hellenic reaction, until the able and vigorous rule of the Salaminian prince Euagoras, who was a warm friend of the Athenians (Isocrates, Euag.) and a successful champion of Hellenism. In 306 a second great naval battle was fought off Salamis, in which Demetrius

Poliorcetes defeated the forces of Ptolemy I (Soter), king of Egypt. But 11 years later the town came into Ptolemy's hands and, with the rest of the island, remained an appanage of the Egyptian kingdom until the incorporation of Cyprus in the Roman Empire (58 BC).

3. Visit of the Apostles:

When Barnabas and Paul, accompanied by John Mark, set out on their 1st missionary journey, they sailed from Seleucia, the seaport of Antioch, and landed at Salamis, about 130 miles distant, as the harbor nearest to the Syrian coast. There they preached the gospel in the "synagogues of the Jews" (Ac 13:5); the phrase is worth noting as pointing to the existence of several synagogues and thus of a large Jewish community in Salamis. Of work among the Gentiles we hear nothing, nor is any indication given either of the duration of the apostles' visit or of the success of their mission; but it would seem that after a short stay they proceeded "through the whole island" (Ac 13:6 the Revised Version (British and American)) to Paphos. The words seem to imply that they visited all, or at least most, of the towns in which there were Jewish communities. Paul did not return to Salamis, but Barnabas doubtless went there on his 2nd missionary journey (Ac 15:39), and tradition states that he was martyred there in Nero's reign, on the site marked by the monastery named after him.

4. Later History:

In 116 AD the Jews in Cyprus rose in revolt and massacred 240,000 Greeks and Romans. The rising was crushed with the utmost severity by Hadrian. Salamis was almost depopulated, and its destruction was afterward consummated by earthquakes in 332 and 342 AD. It was rebuilt, though on a much smaller scale, by the emperor Constantius II (337-61 AD) under the name Constantia, and became the metropolitan see of the island. The most famous of its bishops was Epiphanius, the staunch opponent of heresy, who held the see from 367 to 403. In 647 the city was finally destroyed by the Saracens. Considerable remains of ancient buildings still remain on the site; an account of the excavations carried on there in 1890 by Messrs. J. A.R. Munro and H.A. Tubbs under the auspices of the Cyprus Exploration Fund will be found in the Journal of Hellenic Studies, XII, 59-198.

M. N. Tod

SALASADAI

sal-a-sad'-a-i (Codex Alexandrinus Salasadai; Codex Vaticanus Sarasadai, Sarisadai): An ancestor of Judith (Judith 8:1).

SALATHIEL

sa-la'-thi-el:

(1) (Salathiel): the King James Version; Greek form of "Shealtiel" (thus the Revised Version (British

and American)). The father of Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:5,48,56; 6:2; Mt 1:12; Lu 3:27).

(2) Revised Version: Another name of Esdras (2 Esdras 3:1, "Salathiel").

SALE

sal (mimkar): The word is used: (1) in the sense of the transaction (Le 25:50); (2) in the sense of the limit of time involved in the transaction (Le 25:27); (3) in the sense of the price paid in the transaction (De 18:8), though it may be the same as (1) above.

SALECAH; SALCAH, SALCHAH

sal'-e-ka, sal'-ka (calekhah; Codex Vaticanus Sekchai, Acha, Sela Codex Alexandrinus Elcha, Aselcha, Selcha): This place first appears in De 3:10 as marking the eastern boundary of Bashan. It is named as one of the cities in which Og, king of Bashan, ruled (Jos 12:5). It must certainly have been included in the portion given to the half-tribe of Manasseh, "all the kingdom of Og king of Bashan," although it is not named among the cities that fell to him (Jos 13:29). At a later time we are told that Gad dwelt over against the Reubenites in the land of Bashan unto Salecah (1Ch 5:11). The boundaries of the tribes probably changed from time to time.

The ancient city is represented by the modern Qalkhad, a city in a high and strong position at the southern end of Jebel ed-Druze (the Mountain of Bashan). On a volcanic hill rising some 300 ft. above the town, in what must have been the crater, stands the castle. The view from the battlements, as the present writer can testify, is one of the finest East of the Jordan, including the rich hollow of the Chauran, Mt. Hermon, and all the intervening country to the mountains of Samaria, with vast reaches of the desert to the South and to the East. The old Roman roads are still clearly seen running without curve or deviation across the country to Bozrah and Der'ah, away to the Southeast over the desert to Kal'at el-'Azraq, and eastward to the Persian Gulf. The castle was probably built by the Romans. Restored by the Arabs, it was a place of strength in Crusading times. It has now fallen on evil days. The modern town, containing many ancient houses, lies mainly on the slopes Southeast of the castle. The inhabitants are Druzes, somewhat noted for turbulence.

In the recent rising of the Druzes (1911) the place suffered heavily from bombardment by the Turks. For water-supply it is entirely dependent on cisterns filled during the rainy season. W. Ewing

SALEM (1)

sa'-lem (shalem; Salem): The name of the city of which Melchizedek was king (Ge 14:18; Heb 7:1,2; compare Ps 76:2).

1. Identification and Meaning:

To all appearance it lay near "the Vale of Shaveh," described as "the King's Vale." The general opinion among the Jews was that Salem was the same as Jerusalem, as stated by Josephus (Ant., I, x, 2), who adds (VII, iii, 2) that it was known as Solyma (Saluma, variants, according to Whiston, Salem and Hierosolyma) in the time of Abraham. It was also reported that the city and its temple were called Solyma by Homer, and he adds that the name in Hebrew means "security." This identification with Jerusalem was accepted by Onkelos and all the Targums, as well as by the early Christians. The Samaritans have always identified Salem with Salim, East of Nablus, but Jewish and Christian tradition is more likely to be correct, supported, as it is, by Ps 76:2.

2. Testimony of Tell el-Amarna Tablets:

The testimony of the Tell el-Amarna Letters is apparently negative. Knudtzon's number 287 mentions "the land" and "the lands of Urusalim," twice with the prefix for "city"; number 289 likewise has this prefix twice; and number 290 refers to "the city" or "a city of the land Urusalim called Bit-Ninip" Tablets (Beth-Anusat (?)). As there is no prefix of any kind before the element salim, it is not probable that this is the name of either a man (the city's founder) or a god (like the Assyrian Sulmanu). The form in Sennacherib's inscriptions (compare Taylor Cylinder, III, 50), Ursalimmu, gives the whole as a single word in the nominative, the double "m" implying that the "i" was long. As the Assyrians pronounced "s" as "sh", it is likely that the Urusalimites did the same, hence, the Hebrew yerushalaim, with "sh".

See JERUSALEM.

T. G. Pinches

SALEM (2)

(Salamos; the King James Version Salum): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:1) =" Shallum" in Ezr 7:2 =" Salemas" in 2 Esdras 1:1.

SALEMAS

sal'-e-mas, sa-le'-mas (Latin Salame; the King James Version Sadamias): An ancestor of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:1) =" Shallum" in Ezr 7:2; called also "Salem" in 1 Esdras 8:1.

SALIM

sa'-lim (Saleim): A place evidently well known, since the position of Aenon, the springs where John was baptizing, was defined by reference to it: they were "near to Salim" (Joh 3:23). It must be sought on the West of the Jordan, as will be seen from comparison of Joh 1:28; 3:26; 10:40. Many identifications have been proposed: e.g. that of Alford with Shilhim and Ain in the South of Judah; that of Busching with 'Ain Karim, and that of Barclay, who would place Salim in Wady Suleim near 'Anata, making

Aenon the springs in Wady Far‘ah. These are all ruled out by their distance from the district where John is known to have been at work. If there were no other objection to that suggested by Conder (Tent Work, 49 f) following Robinson (BR, III, 333) with Salim in the plain East of Nablus, Aenon being ‘Ainun in Wady Far‘ah, it would be sufficient to say that this is in the very heart of Samaria, and therefore impossible. In any case the position of Aenon, 6 miles distant, with a high ridge intervening, would hardly be defined by the village of Salim, with the important city of Shechem quite as near, and more easily accessible.

Onomasticon places Aenon 8 Roman miles South of Scythopolis (Beisan), near Salumias (Salim) and the Jordan. This points to Tell Ridhghah, on the northern side of which is a shrine known locally as Sheikh Selim. Not far off, by the ruins of Umm el-‘Amdan, there are seven copious fountains which might well be called Aenon, "place of springs."

There is reason to believe that this district did not belong to Samaria, but was included in the lands of Scythopolis, which was an important member of the league of ten cities.

W. Ewing

SALIMOTH

sal’-i-moth (Codex Vaticanus Saleimoth; Codex Alexandrinus ‘Assalimoth; the latter is due to a wrong division of syllables; the King James Version Assailmoth): The same as "Shelomith" (Ezr 8:10). Salimoth, the son of Josaphias, of the family of Banias, and with him 130 men went up to Jerusalem with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:36).

SALLAI

sal’-a-i, sal’-i (callay; Salom; Codex Alexandrinus Salo, with variants):

(1) Eponym of a Benjamite family which settled at Jerusalem after the return, descendants of "Sallu" (1Ch 9:7; Ne 11:7,8); the pedigrees of Sallu differ decidedly in the two passages. Curtis (ICC) suggests that "son of Hodaviah, the son of Hassenuah" (Chronicles) is a corruption or derivation of "Judah the son of Hassenuah" (Nehemiah).

(2) Name of a priestly family (Ne 12:20), called "Sallu" in Ne 12:7.

SALLU

sal’-u.

See SALLAI.

SALLUMUS

sa-lu’-mus, sal’-u-mus Salloumos): One of the porters who had taken "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:25) =" Shallum" in Ezr 10:24; called also "Salum" in 1 Esdras 5:28.

SALMA

sal’-ma.

See SALMON.

SALMAI

sal’-mi, sal’-ma-i (salmay; the King James Version, Shalmai (the King James Version in Ne 7:48 is "Shalmai" = Ezr 2:46); the Revised Version (British and American) "Salmai"): The eponym of a family of Nethinim, called "Shamlai" in Ezr 2:46 (Qere, shamlay, Kethibh, shalmay, followed by the King James Version text, "Shalmai"; Codex Vaticanus Samaan; Codex Alexandrinus Selami; Ne 7:48, Codex Vaticanus Salemei; Codex Alexandrinus Selmei; Codex Sinaiticus Samaei). The name suggests a foreign reign. In 1 Esdras 5:30 the corresponding name is "Subai."

SALMANASAR

sal-ma-na’-sar (2 Esdras 13:40) = SHALMANESER (which see).

SALMON; SALMA

sal’-mon, (salmon, "investiture" (Ru 4:21), salmah, "clothing" (Ru 4:20), salma’ (1Ch 2:11,51,54); Salmon):

(1) The father of Boaz, the husband of Ruth, and thus the grandfather of Jesse, David’s father (Ru 4:20,21). He is mentioned in both the genealogies of Jesus (Mt 1:4,5; Lu 3:32). From Mt 1:5 we learn that he married Rahab, by whom he begat Boaz.

(2) In 1Ch 2:51 ff, we read of a Salma, "the father of Beth-lehem," a son of Caleb, the son of Hur. He is also said to be the father of "the Netophathites, Atroth-beth-joab, and half of the Manahathites, the Zorites," and several "families of scribes."

See also ZALMON.

S. F. Hunter

SALMONE

sal-mo’-ne (Salmone): Ac 27:7.

See PHOENIX.

SALOAS

sal’-o-as (Saloas; the King James Version, Talsus after Lot Thalsas): In 1 Esdras 9:22, for "Elasah" of Ezr 10:22.

SALOM

sa’-lom (Salom):

(1) The father of Helkias (Baruch 1:7). Greek form of "Shallum."

(2) the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Salu" (1 Macc 2:26).

SALOME

sa-lo’-me (Salome):

(1) One of the holy women who companied with Jesus in Galilee, and ministered to Him (Mr 15:40,41). She was present at the crucifixion (Mr 15:40), and was among those who came to the tomb of Jesus on the resurrection morning (Mr 16:1,2). Comparison with Mt 27:56 clearly identifies her with the wife of Zebedee. It is she, therefore, whose ambitious request for her sons James and John is recorded in Mt 20:20-24; Mr 10:35-40. From Joh 19:25 many infer that she was a sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus (thus Meyer, Luthardt, Alford); others (as Godet) dispute the inference.

(2) Salome was the name of the daughter of Herodias who danced before Herod, and obtained as reward the head of John the Baptist (Mt 14:3-11; Mr 6:17-28; compare Josephus, Ant, XVIII, v, 4). She is not named in the Gospels.

James Orr

SALT

solt (melach; halas, hals): Common salt is considered by most authorities as an essential ingredient of

our food. Most people intentionally season their cooking with more or less salt for the sake of palatability. Others depend upon the small quantities which naturally exist in water and many foods to furnish the necessary amount of salt for the body. Either too much salt or the lack of it creates undesirable disturbance in the animal system. Men and animals alike instinctively seek for this substance to supplement or improve their regular diet. The ancients appreciated the value of salt for seasoning food (Job 6:6). So necessary was it that they dignified it by making it a requisite part of sacrifices (Le 2:13; Ezr 6:9; 7:22; Eze 43:24; Mr 9:49). In Nu 18:19; 2Ch 13:5, a "covenant of salt" is mentioned (compare Mr 9:49). This custom of pledging friendship or confirming a compact by eating food containing salt is still retained among Arabic-speaking people. The Arabic word for "salt" and for a "compact" or "treaty" is the same. Doughty in his travels in Arabia appealed more than once to the superstitious belief of the Arabs in the "salt covenant," to save his life. Once an Arab has received in his tent even his worst enemy and has eaten salt (food) with him, he is bound to protect his guest as long as he remains.

See COVENANT OF SALT.

The chief source of salt in Palestine is from the extensive deposits near the "sea of salt" (see DEAD SEA), where there are literally mountains and valleys of salt (2Sa 8:13; 2Ki 14:7; 1Ch 18:12; 2Ch 25:11). On the seacoast the inhabitants frequently gather the sea salt. They fill the rock crevices with sea water and leave it for the hot summer sun to evaporate. After evaporation the salt crystals can be collected. As salt-gathering is a government monopoly in Turkey, the government sends men to pollute the salt which is being surreptitiously crystallized, so as to make it unfit for eating. Another extensive supply comes from the salt lakes in the Syrian desert East of Damascus and toward Palmyra. All native salt is more or less bitter, due to the presence of other salts such as magnesium sulphate.

Salt was used not only as a food, but as an antiseptic in medicine. Newborn babes were bathed and salted (Eze 16:4), a custom still prevailing. The Arabs of the desert consider it so necessary, that in the absence of salt they batheir infants in camels’ urine. Elisha is said to have healed the waters of Jericho by casting a cruse of salt into the spring (2Ki 2:20 f). Abimelech sowed the ruins of Shechem with salt to prevent a new city from arising in its place (Jud 9:45). Lot’s wife turned to a pillar of salt (Ge 19:26).

Figurative:

Salt is emblematic of loyalty and friendship (see above). A person who has once joined in a "salt covenant" with God and then breaks it is fit only to be cast out (compare Mt 5:13; Mr 9:50). Saltness typified barrenness (De 29:23; Jer 17:6). James compares the absurdity of the same mouth giving forth blessings and cursings to the impossibility of a fountain yielding both sweet and salt water (Jas 3:11 f).

James A. Patch

SALT SEA

See DEAD SEA.

SALT, CITY OF

(‘ir ha-melach; Codex Alexandrinus hai pol(e)is halon): One of the six cities in the wilderness of Judah mentioned between Nibshan and Engedi (Jos 15:62). The site is very uncertain. The large and important Tell el-Milch (i.e. "the salt hill"), on the route from Hebron to Akaba, is possible.

SALT, COVENANT OF

See COVENANT OF SALT.

SALT, PILLAR OF

See LOT; SALT; SIDDIM; SLIME.

SALT, VALLEY OF

(ge’ ha-melach): The scene of battles, firstly, between David or his lieutenant Abishai and the Edomites (2Sa 8:13; 1Ch 18:12; Ps 60$, title), and later between Amaziah and these same foes (2Ki 14:7; 2Ch 25:11). It is tempting to connect this "Valley of Salt" with es Sebkhah, the marshy, salt-impregnated plain which extends from the southern end of the Dead Sea to the foot of the cliffs, but in its present condition it is an almost impossible place for a battle of any sort. The ground is so soft and spongy that a wide detour around the edges has to be made by those wishing to get from one side to the other. It is, too, highly probable that in earlier times the whole of this low-lying area was covered by the waters of the Dead Sea. It is far more natural to identify ge’ ha-melach with the Wady el-Milch ("Valley of Salt"), one of the three valleys which unite at Beersheba to form the Wady ec-Ceba‘. These valleys, el-Milch and ec-Ceba, together make a natural frontier to Canaan.

E. W. G. Masterman

SALT-WORT

solt’-wurt (malluach, a word connected with melach, "salt," translated halimos; the King James Version, mallows): The halimos of the Greeks is the sea orache, Atriplex halimus, a silvery whitish shrub which flourishes upon the shores of the Dead Sea alongside the rutm (see JUNIPER). Its leaves are oval and somewhat like those of an olive. They have a sour flavor and would never be eaten when better food was obtainable (Job 30:4). The translation "mallows" is due to the apparent similarity of the Hebrew malluach to the Greek malache, which is the Latin malva and English "mallow." Certain species of malva known in Arabic, as khubbazeh, are very commonly eaten by the poor of Palestine.

E. W. G. Masterman

SALU

sa’-lu (calu’; Septuagint: Codex Vaticanus Salmon; Codex Alexandrinus Salo; the King James Version has "Salom" in 1 Macc 2:26): A prince and the head of a house of the tribe of Simeon and the father of Zimri who was slain by Phinehas along with the Midianite woman whom he had brought to the camp of Israel (Nu 25:14; RAPC 1Ma 2:26).

SALUM

sa’-lum (Saloum):

(1) The head of one of the families of porters (1 Esdras 5:28; omitted in Codex Vaticanus) =" Shallum" in Ezr 2:42; 10:24; Ne 7:45 =" Sallumus" in 1 Esdras 9:25.

(2) 1 Esdras 8:1 King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Salem."

SALUTATION

sal-u-ta’-shun (aspasmos): A greeting which might be given in person, orally (Lu 1:29,41,44), or in writing, usually at the close of a letter (1Co 16:21; Col 4:18; 2Th 3:17; compare use of chairein, "greeting," "joy" in Jas 1:1). The Pharisaic Jews loved salutations in public places (Mt 23:7; Mr 12:38, the King James Version "greeting," the Revised Version (British and American) "salutation"; Lu 11:43; 20:46). Often these salutations were very elaborate, involving much time in prostrations, embracings, etc. When Jesus therefore sent out the Seventy, He forbade salutation by the way (Lu 10:4), though He ordinarily encouraged proper civilities of this sort (Mt 5:47; 10:12).

Edward Bagby Pollard

SALVATION

sal-va’-shun:

I. IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. General

2. Individualism

3. Faith

4. Moral Law

5. Sacrifices

6. Ritual Law

II. INTERMEDIATE LITERATURE

1. General

2. The Law

III. THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

1. The Baptist

2. Kingdom of God

3. Present and Future

4. Individualism

5. Moral Progress

6. Forgiveness

7. Person of Christ

8. Notes

IV. PAUL

1. General

2. Moral Progress

3. The Spirit

4. Mystical Union

5. Forgiveness

6. Atonement

7. Summary

8. Notes

V. THE REST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: SUMMARY

1. John

2. Hebrews

3. Peter

4. Summary

LITERATURE

In English Versions of the Bible the words "salvation" "save," are not technical theological terms, but denote simply "deliverance," in almost any sense the latter word can have. In systematic theology, however, "salvation" denotes the whole process by which man is delivered from all that would prevent his attaining to the highest good that God has prepared for him. Or, by a transferred sense, "salvation" denotes the actual enjoyment of that good. So, while these technical senses are often associated with the Greek or Hebrew words translated "save," etc., yet they are still more often used in connection with other words or represented only by the general sense of a passage. And so a collection of the original terms for "save," etc., is of value only for the student doing minute detailed work, while it is the purpose of the present article to present a general view of the Biblical doctrine of salvation.

I. In the Old Testament

1. General:

(1) As long as revelation had not raised the veil that separates this life from the next, the Israelite thought of his highest good as long life in a prosperous Palestine, as described most typically in De 28:1-14. But a definite religious idea was present also, for the "land of milk and honey," even under angelic protection, was worthless without access to God (Ex 33:1-4), to know whom gives happiness (Isa 11:9; Hab 2:14; Jer 31:34). Such a concept is normal for most of the Old Testament, but there are several significant enlargements of it. That Israel should receive God’s characteristic of righteousness is a part of the ideal (Isa 1:26; 4:3,4; 32:1-8; 33:24; Jer 31:33,34; Eze 36:25,26; Zec 8; Da 9:24; Ps 51:10-12). Good was found in the extension of Israel’s good to the surrounding nations (Mic 4:1-4; Isa 2:2-4;

45:5,6; Zec 2:11; 8:22,23; Isa 60; 66:19-21; Zec 14:16,17, etc.), even to the extension of the legitimate sacrificial worship to the soil of Egypt (Isa 19:19-22). Palestine was insufficient for the enjoyment of God's gifts, and a new heaven and a new earth were to be received (Isa 65:17; 66:22), and a share in the glories was not to be denied even to the dead (Isa 26:19; Da 12:2). And, among the people so glorified, God would dwell in person (Isa 60:19,20; Zec 2:10-12).

(2) Salvation, then, means deliverance from all that interferes with the enjoyment of these blessings. So it takes countless forms—deliverance from natural plagues, from internal dissensions, from external enemies, or from the subjugation of conquerors (the exile, particularly). As far as enemies constitute the threatening danger, the prayer for deliverance is often based on their evil character (Ps 101$, etc.). But for the individual all these evils are summed up in the word "death," which was thought to terminate all relation to God and all possibility of enjoying His blessings (Ps 115:17; Isa 38:18, etc.). And so "death" became established as the antinomy to "salvation," and in this sense the word has persisted, although the equation "loss of salvation = physical death" has long been transcended. But death and its attendant evils are worked by God's wrath, and so it is from this wrath that salvation is sought (Jos 7:26, etc.). And thus, naturally, salvation is from everything that raises that wrath, above all from sin (Eze 36:25,26, etc.).

2. Individualism:

(1) At first the "unit of salvation" was the nation (less prominently the family), i.e. a man though righteous could lose salvation through the faults of others. A father could bring a curse on his children (2Sa 21:1-14), a king on his subjects (2Sa 24), or an unknown sinner could bring guilt on an entire community (De 21:1-9). (On the other hand, ten righteous would have saved Sodom (Ge 18:32).) And the principle of personal responsibility was grasped but slowly. It is enunciated partly in De 24:16 (compare Jer 31:29,30), definitely in Eze 14:12-20; 18; 33:1-20, and fairly consistently in the Psalms. But even Ezekiel still held that five-and-twenty could defile the whole nation (8:16), and he had not the premises for resolving the problem—that temporal disasters need not mean the loss of salvation.

(2) But even when it was realized that a man lost salvation through his own fault, the converse did not follow. Salvation came, not by the man's mere merit, but because the man belonged to a nation peculiarly chosen by God. God had made a covenant with Israel and His fidelity insured salvation: the salvation comes from God because of His promise or (in other words) because of His name. Indeed, the great failing of the people was to trust too blindly to this promise, an attitude denounced continually by the prophets throughout (from, say, Am 3:2 to Mt 3:9). And yet even the prophets admit a real truth in the attitude, for, despite Israel's sins, eventual salvation is certain. Ezekiel 20 states this baldly: there has been nothing good in Israel and there is nothing good in her at the prophet's own day, but, notwithstanding, God will give her restoration (compare Isa 8:17,18; Jer 32:6-15, etc.).

3. Faith:

Hence, of the human conditions, whole-hearted trust in God is the most important. (Belief in God is, of

course, never argued in the Bible.) Inconsistent with such trust are, for instance, seeking aid from other nations (Isa 30:1-5), putting reliance in human skill (2Ch 16:12), or forsaking Palestine through fear (Jer 42). In Isa 26:20 entire passivity is demanded, and in 2Ki 13:19 lukewarmness in executing an apparently meaningless command is rebuked.

4. Moral Law:

(1) Next in importance is the attainment of a moral standard, expressed normally in the various codes of the Law. But fulfillment of the letter of the commandment was by no means all that was required. For instance, the Law permitted the selling of a debtor into slavery (De 15:12), but the reckless use of the creditor's right is sharply condemned (Ne 5:1-13). The prophets are never weary of giving short formulas that will exclude such supralegalism and reduce conduct to a pure motive: "Hate the evil, and love the good, and establish justice in the gate" (Am 5:15); "To do justly, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with thy God" (Mic 6:8). And the chief emphasis on the Law as written is found in the later books, especially Ps 119 (compare Ps 147:20).

(2) Certain breaches of the Law had no pardon, but were visited with death at once, even despite repentance and confession (Jos 7). But for the most part it is promised that repentance will remove the guilt of the sin if the sin be forsaken (Eze 18) or, in the case of a sin that would not be repeated, if contrition be felt (2Sa 12). Suffering played a part in salvation by bringing knowledge of sin to the conscience, the exile being the most important example (Eze 36:31). But almost always it is assumed that the possibility of keeping the Law is in man's own power, De 30:11-14 stating this explicitly, while the Wisdom Books equate virtue with learning. Consequently, an immense advance was made when man felt the need of God's help to keep the Law, the need of the inscription of the Laws on the heart (Jer 31:31-34). So an outlook was opened to a future in which God would make the nation righteous (see references in 1, above).

5. Sacrifices:

(1) The acceptance of repentance as expiating past sins was an act of God's mercy. And so His mercy instituted other and additional means of expiation, most notably that of the sacrifices. But a theology of sacrifice is conspicuously absent from the whole Old Testament, for Le 17:11 is too incidental and too obscure to be any exception. The Christian (or very late Jewish) interpretations of the ritual laws lack all solidity of exegetical foundation, despite their one-time prevalence. Nor is the study of origins of much help for the meaning attached to the rites by the Jews in historic times. General ideas of offering, of self-denial, of propitiation of wrath, and of entering into communion with God assuredly existed. But in the advanced stages of the religion there is no evidence that sacrifices were thought to produce their effect because of any of these things, but solely because God had commanded the sacrifices.

(2) Most sins required a sacrifice as part of the act of repentance, although in case of injury done the neighbor, only after reparation had been made. It is not quite true that for conscious sins no sacrifices were appointed, for in Le 5:1; 6:1-3, sins are included that could not be committed through mere

negligence. And so such rules as Nu 15:30,31 must not be construed too rigorously.

(3) Sacrifices as means of salvation are taught chiefly by Ezekiel, while at the rebuilding of the temple (Haggai, Zechariah) and the depression that followed (Malachi), they were much in the foreground, but the pre-exilic prophets have little to say about their positive value (Jer 7:22 is the nadir). Indeed, in preexilic times the danger was the exaltation of sacrifice at the expense of morality, especially with the peace offering, which could be turned into a drunken revel (Am 5:21-24; Isa 22:13; compare Pr 7:14). Attempts were made to "strengthen" the sacrifices to Yahweh by the use of ethnic rites (Ho 4:14; Isa 65:1-5), even with the extreme of human sacrifice (Jer 7:31; Eze 20:26). But insistence on the strict centralization of worship and increasing emphasis laid on the sin and trespass offerings did away with the worst of the abuses. And many of the Psalms, especially Ps 66 and Ps 118, give beautiful evidence of the devotion that could be nourished by the sacrificial rites.

6. Ritual Law:

Of the other means of salvation the ritual law (not always sharply distinguishable from the moral law) bulks rather large in the legislation, but is not prominent in the prophets. Requisite to salvation was the abstention from certain acts, articles of food, etc., such abstinence seeming to lie at the background of the term "holiness." But a ritual breach was often a matter of moral duty (burying the dead, etc.), and, for such breaches, ritual means of purification are provided and the matter dropped. Evidently such things lay rather on the circumference of the religion, even to Ezekiel, with his anxious zeal against the least defilement. The highest ritual point is touched by Zec 14:20,21, where all of Jerusalem is so holy that not a pot would be unfit to use in the temple (compare Jer 31:38-40). Yet, even with this perfect holiness, sacrifices would still have a place as a means by which the holiness could be increased. Indeed, this more "positive" view of sacrifices was doubtless present from the first.

II. Intermediate Literature.

1. General:

(1) The great change, compared with the earlier period, is that the idea of God had become more transcendent. But this did not necessarily mean an increase in religious value, for there was a corresponding tendency to take God out of relation to the world by an intellectualizing process. This, when combined with the persistence of the older concept of salvation in this life only, resulted in an emptying of the religious instinct and in indifferentism. This tendency is well represented in Ecclesiastes, more acutely in Sirach, and in New Testament times it dominated the thought of the Sadducees. On the other hand the expansion of the idea of salvation to correspond with the higher conception of God broke through the limitations of this life and created the new literary form of apocalyptics, represented in the Old Testament especially by Zechariah 9-14; Isaiah 24-27, and above all by Daniel. And in the intermediate literature all shades of thought between the two extremes are represented. But too much emphasis can hardly be laid on the fact that this intermediate teaching is in many regards simply faithful to the Old Testament. Almost anything that can be found in the Old

Testament—with the important exception of the note of joyousness of Deuteronomy, etc.—can be found again here.

(2) Of the conceptions of the highest good the lowest is the Epicureanism of Sirach. The highest is probably that of 2 Esdras 7:91-98 Revised Version: "To behold the face of him whom in their lifetime they served" the last touch of materialism being eliminated. Indeed, real materialism is notably absent in the period, even Enoch 10:17-19 being less exuberant than the fancies of such early Christian writers as Papias. Individualism is generally taken for granted, but that the opposite opinion was by no means dormant, even at a late period, is shown by Mt 3:9. The idea of a special privilege of Israel, however, of course pervades all the literature, Sibylline Oracles 5 and Jubilees being the most exclusive books and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs, the most broad-hearted. In place of national privilege, though, is sometimes found the still less edifying feature of party privilege (Ps Sol; Enoch 94-105), the most offensive case being the assertion of Enoch 90:6-9 that the (inactive) Israel will be saved by the exertions of the "little lamb" Pharisees, before whom every knee shall bow in the Messianic kingdom.

2. The Law:

(1) The conceptions of the moral demands for salvation at times reach a very high level, especially in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs (making every allowance for Christian interpolations). "The spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men" (Test. Gad 4:7) is hardly unworthy of Paul, and even Jubilees can say, "Let each love his brother in mercy and justice, and let none wish the other evil" (Jub 36:8). But the great tendency is to view God’s law merely as a series of written statutes, making no demands except those gained from a rigid construing of the letter. In Lu 10:29, "Who is my neighbor?" is a real question—if he is not my neighbor I need not love him! So duties not literally commanded were settled by utilitarian motives, as outside the domain of religion, and the unhealthy phenomenon of works of supererogation made its appearance (Lu 17:10). The writer of Wisdom can feel smugly assured of salvation, because idolatry had been abstained from (Wisd 15:4; contrast Paul’s polemic in Ro 2). And discussions about "greatest commandments" caused character in its relation to religion to be forgotten.

(2) As God’s commands were viewed as statutes the distinction between the moral and the ritual was lost, and the ritual law attained enormous and familiar proportions. The beautiful story of Judith is designed chiefly to teach abstinence from ritually unclean food. And the most extreme case is in Jubilees 6:34-38—all of Israers woes come from keeping the feasts by the actual moon instead of by a correct (theoretical) moon (!).

(3) Where self-complacency ceased and a strong moral sense was present, despair makes its appearance with extraordinary frequency. The period is the period of penitential prayers, with an undercurrent of doubt as to how far mercy can be expected (So of Three Children verses 3-22; Pr Man; RAPC Bar 3:1-8, etc.). "What profit is it unto us, if there be promised us an immortal time, whereas we have done the works that bring death?" (2 Esdras 7:119 the Revised Version (British and American)). The vast majority of men are lost (2 Esdras 9:16) and must be forgotten (2 Esdras 8:55), and Ezra can trust for his

own salvation only by a special revelation (7:77 the Revised Version (British and American)). So, evidently, Paul's pre-Christian experience was no unique occurrence.

(4) Important for the New Testament background is the extreme lack of prominence of the sacrifices. They are never given a theological interpretation (except in Philo, where they cease to be sacrifices). Indeed, in Sirach 35 they are explicitly said to be devotions for the righteous only, apparently prized only as an inheritance from the past and "because of the commandment" (Sirach 35:5; yet compare 38:11). When the temple was destroyed and the sacrifices ceased, Judaism went on its way almost unaffected, showing that the sacrifices meant nothing essential to the people. And, even in earlier times, the Essenes rejected sacrifices altogether, without losing thereby their recognition as Jews.

III. The Teaching of Christ.

1. The Baptist:

The Baptist proclaimed authoritatively the near advent of the kingdom of God, preceded by a Messianic judgment that would bring fire for the wicked and the Holy Spirit for the righteous. Simple but incisive moral teaching and warning against trusting in national privileges, with baptism as an outward token of repentance, were to prepare men to face this judgment securely. But we have no data to determine how much farther (if any) the Baptist conceived his teaching to lead.

2. Kingdom of God:

It was in the full heat of this eschatological revival that the Baptist had fanned, that Christ began to teach, and He also began with the eschatological phrase, "The kingdom of God is at hand." Consequently, His teaching must have been taken at once in an eschatological sense, and it is rather futile to attempt to limit such implications to passages where modern eschatological phrases are used unambiguously. "The kingdom of God is at hand" had the inseparable connotation "Judgment is at hand," and in this context, "Repent ye" (Mr 1:15) must mean "lest ye be judged." Hence, our Lord's teaching about salvation had primarily a future content: positively, admission into the kingdom of God, and negatively, deliverance from the preceding judgment. So the kingdom of God is the "highest good" of Christ's teaching but, with His usual reserve, He has little to say about its externals. Man's nature is to be perfectly adapted to his spiritual environment (see RESURRECTION), and man is to be with Christ (Lu 22:30) and the patriarchs (Mt 8:11). But otherwise—and again as usual—the current descriptions are used without comment, even when they rest on rather materialistic imagery (Lu 22:16,30). Whatever the kingdom is, however, its meaning is most certainly not exhausted by a mere reformation of the present order of material things.

3. Present and Future:

But the fate of man at judgment depends on what man is before judgment, so that the practical problem is salvation from the conditions that will bring judgment; i.e. present and future salvation are inseparably

connected, and any attempt to make rigid distinctions between the two results in logomachies. Occasionally even Christ speaks of the kingdom of God as present, in the sense that citizens of the future kingdom are living already on this earth (Mt 11:11; Lu 17:21(?); the meaning of the latter verse is very dubious). Such men are "saved" already (Lu 19:9; 7:50(?)), i.e. such men were delivered from the bad moral condition that was so extended that Satan could be said to hold sway over the world (Lu 10:18; 11:21).

4. Individualism:

That the individual was the unit in this deliverance needs no emphasis: Still, the divine privilege of the Jews was a reality and Christ's normal work was limited to them (Mt 10:5; 15:26, etc.). He admitted even that the position of the Jewish religious leaders rested on a real basis (Mt 23:3). But the "good tidings" were so framed that their extension to all men would have been inevitable, even had there not been an explicit command of Christ in this regard. On the other hand, while the message involved in every case strict individual choice, yet the individual who accepted it entered into social relations with the others who had so chosen. So salvation involved admission to a community of service (Mr 9:35, etc.). And in the latter part of Christ's ministry, He withdrew from the bulk of His disciples to devote Himself to the training of an inner circle of Twelve, an act explicable only on the assumption that these were to be the leaders of the others after He was taken away. Such passages as Mt 16:18; 18:17 merely corroborate this.

5. Moral Progress:

Of the conditions for the individual, the primary (belief in God being taken for granted) was a correct moral ideal. Exclusion from salvation came from the Pharisaic casuistry which had invented limits to righteousness. Ex 20:13 had never contemplated permitting angry thoughts if actual murder was avoided, and so on. In contrast is set the idea of character, of the single eye (Mt 6:22), of the pure heart (Mt 5:8). Only so can the spiritual house be built on a rock foundation. But the mere ideal is not enough; persistent effort toward it and a certain amount of progress are demanded imperatively. Only those who have learned to forgive can ask for forgiveness (Mt 6:12; 18:35). They who omit natural works of mercy have no share in the kingdom (Mt 25:31-46), for even idle words will be taken into account (Mt 12:36), and the most precious possession that interferes with moral progress is to be sacrificed ruthlessly (Mt 18:8,9, etc.). Men are known by their fruits (Mt 7:20); it is he that doeth the will of the Father that shall enter into the kingdom (Mt 7:21), and the final ideal—which is likewise the goal—is becoming a son of the Father in moral likeness (Mt 5:45). That this progress is due to God's aid is so intimately a part of Christ's teaching on the entire dependence of the soul on God that it receives little explicit mention, but Christ refers even His own miracles to the Father's power (Lu 11:20).

6. Forgiveness:

Moral effort, through God's aid, is an indispensable condition for salvation. But complete success in the moral struggle is not at all a condition, in the sense that moral perfection is required. For Christ's

disciples, to whom the kingdom is promised (Lu 12:32), the palsied man who receives remission of sins (Mr 2:5), Zaccheus who is said to have received salvation (Lu 19:9), were far from being models of sinlessness. The element in the character that Christ teaches as making up for the lack of moral perfection is becoming "as a little child" (compare Mr 10:15). Now the point here is not credulousness (for belief is not under discussion), nor is it meekness (for children are notoriously not meek). And it most certainly is not the pure passivity of the newly born infant, for it is gratuitous to assume that only such infants were meant even in Lu 18:15, while in Mt 18:2 (where the child comes in answer to a call) this interpretation is excluded. Now, in the wider teaching of Christ the meaning is made clear enough. Salvation is for the poor in spirit, for those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, for the prodigal knowing his wretchedness. It is for the penitent publican, while the self-satisfied Pharisee is rejected. A sense of need and a desire that God will give are the characteristics. A child does not argue that it has earned its father’s benefits but looks to him in a feeling of dependence, with a readiness to do his bidding. So it is the soul that desires all of righteousness, strives toward it, knows that it falls short, and trusts in its Father for the rest, that is the savable soul.

7. Person of Christ:

Christ speaks of the pardon of the publican (Lu 18:9) and of the prodigal welcomed by the Father (Lu 15:20), both without intermediary. And it is perhaps not necessary to assume that all of those finding the strait gate (Mt 7:14) were explicitly among Christ’s disciples. But would Christ have admitted that anyone who had come to know Him and refused to obey Him would have been saved? To ask this question is to answer it in the negative (Mr 9:40 is irrelevant). Real knowledge of the Father is possible only through the unique knowledge of the Son (Lu 10:21,22), and lack of faith in the Son forfeits all blessings (Mr 6:5,6; 9:23). Faith in Him brings instant forgiveness of sins (Mr 2:5), and love directed to Him is an indisputable sign that forgiveness has taken place (Lu 7:47). But Christ thought of Himself as Messiah and, if the term "Messiah" is not to be emptied of its meaning, this made Him judge of the world (such verses as Mr 8:38 are hardly needed for direct evidence). And, since for Christ’s consciousness an earthly judgeship is unthinkable, a transcendental judgeship is the sole alternative, corroborated by the use of the title Son of Man. But passage from simple humanity to the transcendental glory of the Son-of-Man Messiah involved a change hardly expressible except by death and resurrection. And the expectation of death was in Christ’s mind from the first, as is seen by Mr 2:18,19 (even without 2:20). That He could have viewed His death as void of significance for human salvation is simply inconceivable, and the ascription of Mr 10:45 to Pauline influence is in defiance of the facts. Nor is it credible that Christ conceived that in the interval between His death and His Parousia He would be out of relation to His own. To Him the unseen world was in the closest relation to the visible world, and His passage into glory would strengthen, not weaken, His power. So there is a complete justification of Mr 14:22-25: to Christ His death had a significance that could be paralleled only by the death of the Covenant victim in Ex 24:6-8, for by it an entirely new relation was established between God and man.

8. Notes:

(1) Salvation from physical evil was a very real part, however subordinate, of Christ’s teaching (Mr 1:34, etc.).

(2) Ascetic practices as a necessary element in salvation can hardly claim Christ's authority.

It is too often forgotten that the Twelve were not Christ's only disciples. Certainly not all of the hundred and twenty of Ac 1:15 (compare 1:21), nor of the five hundred of 1Co 15:6, were converted after the Passion. And they all certainly could not have left their homes to travel with Christ. So the demands made in the special case of the Twelve (still less in such an extremely special case as Mr 10:21) in no way represent Christ's normal practice, whatever readiness for self-sacrifice may have been asked of all. So the representations of Christ as ruthlessly exacting all from everyone are quite unwarranted by the facts. And it is well to remember that it is Mt 11:19 that contains the term of reproach that His adversaries gave Him.

IV. Paul.

Instead of laying primal stress on Paul's peculiar contributions to soteriology, it will be preferable to start from such Pauline passages as simply continue the explicit teaching of Christ. For it is largely due to the common reversal of this method that the present acute "Jesus-Paulus" controversy exists.

1. General:

That Paul expected the near advent of the kingdom of God with a judgment preceding, and that salvation meant to him primarily deliverance from this judgment, need not be argued. And, accordingly, emphasis is thrown sometimes on the future deliverance and sometimes on the present conditions for the deliverance (contrast Ro 5:9 and 8:24), but the practical problem is the latter. More explicitly than in Christ's recorded teaching the nature and the blessings of the kingdom are described (see KINGDOM OF GOD), but the additional matter is without particular religious import. A certain privilege of the Jews appears (Ro 3:1-8; 9-11), but the practical content of the privilege seems to be eschatological only (Ro 11:26). Individual conversion is of course taken for granted, but the life after that becomes highly corporate.

See CHURCH.

2. Moral Progress:

(1) The moral ideal is distinctly that of character. Paul, indeed, is frequently obliged to give directions as to details, but the detailed directions are referred constantly to the underlying principle, Ro 14 or 1Co 8 being excellent examples of this, while "love is the fulfillment of the law" (Ro 13:10) is the summary.

(2) Persistent moral effort is indispensable, and the new life absolutely must bring forth fruit to God (Ro 6:4; 13:12; Ga 5:24; Col 3:5; Eph 2:3; 4:17,22-32; Tit 2:11-14). Only by good conduct can one please God (1Th 4:1), and the works of even Christians are to be subjected to a searching test (1Co 3:13; 4:5; 2Co 5:10) in a judgment not to be faced without the most earnest striving (1Co 10:12; Php 2:12), not

even by Paul himself (1Co 9:27; Php 3:12-14). And the possibility of condemnation because of a lack of moral attainment must not be permitted to leave the mind (1Co 3:17; Ga 5:21; compare Ro 8:12,13; 11:20; 1Co 10:12; Ga 6:7-9). Consequently, growth in actual righteousness is as vital in Paul's soteriology as it is in that teaching of Christ: Christians have "put off the old man with his doings" (Col 3:9).

3. The Spirit:

That this growth is God's work is, however, a point where Paul has expanded Christ's quiet assumption rather elaborately. In particular, what Christ had made the source of His own supernatural power—the Holy Spirit—is specified as the source of the power of the Christian's ordinary life, as well as of the more special endowments (see SPIRITUAL GIFTS). In the Spirit the Christian has received the blessing promised to Abraham (Ga 3:14); by it the deeds of the body can be put to death and all virtues flow into the soul (Ga 5:16-26), if a man walks according to it (1Co 6:19,20; 1Th 4:8). The palmary passage is Romans 7-8. In Romans 7 Paul looks back with a shudder on his pre-Christian helplessness (it is naturally the extreme of exegetical perversity to argue that he dreaded not the sin itself but only God's penalty on sin). But the Spirit gives strength to put to death the deeds of the body (8:13), to disregard the things of the flesh (8:5), and to fulfill the ordinance of the Law (8:4). Such moral power is the test of Christianity: as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the sons of God (8:14).

4. Mystical Union:

This doctrine of the Spirit is simply that what Christ did on earth would be carried on with increased intensity after the Passion. That this work could be thought of out of relation to Christ, or that Christ Himself could have so thought of it (see above, III, 7) is incredible. So the exalted Christ appears as the source of moral and spiritual power (Paul speaks even more of Christ's resurrection than of the Passion), the two sources (Christ and the Spirit) being very closely combined in 2Co 3:17; Ro 8:9; Ga 4:6. Our old man has been crucified, so putting an end to the bondage of sin, and we can prevent sin from reigning in our mortal bodies, for our burial into Christ's death was to enable us to walk in newness of life (Ro 6:2-14). The resurrection is a source of power, and through Christ's strength all things can be done (Php 4:13,10). Christ is the real center of the believer's personality (Ga 2:20); the man has become a new creature (2Co 5:17; compare Col 2:20; 3:3); we were joined to another that we might bring forth fruit to God (Ro 7:4). And by contact with the glory of the Lord we are transformed into the same image (2Co 3:18), the end being conformation to the image of the Son (Ro 8:30).

5. Forgiveness:

(1) This growth in actual holiness, then, is fundamental with Paul: "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his" (Ro 8:9). And the acquisition of strength through union with Christ is vitally connected with the remission of sins. In Ro 7:1-6 (compare Col 2:11,12), the mystical union with Christ makes His death ours (compare Col 3:3) and so removes us from the Law (compare Ro 10:4; 1Co 15:56), which has no relation to the dead. And by the life-giving power of this union the strength of sin

is broken (Ro 6:6).

(2) The condition in man that makes forgiveness possible Paul calls "faith"—a very complicated term. Its chief use, however, is in opposition to "works" (most clearly in Ro 9:30-10:13). The Jews' "pursuit after righteousness"—the attempt to wring salvation from God as wages earned—was vain (Ro 10:13), and in contrast is the appeal to God, the conscious relinquishment of all claim (Ro 4:5). The soul looks trustingly for salvation to its Father, precisely the attitude of the "children" in the teaching of Christ. But no more than in the teaching of Christ is faith a purely passive virtue, for man must be "obedient" to it (Ro 1:5; 10:16; 1Th 2:13). And for the necessary presence of love in faith compare 1Co 13:2; Ga 5:6; Eph 3:17.

6. Atonement:

Because of faith—specifically, faith in Christ (except Ro 4; Ga 3:6)—God does not visit the penalties of sins on believers, but treats them as if they were righteous (Ro 5:1, etc.). But this is not because of a quality in the believer or in the faith, but because of an act that preceded any act of Christian faith, the death of Christ (not the cross, specifically, for Paul does not argue from the cross in all of Roman). Through this death God's mercy could be extended safely, while before this the exercise of that mercy had proved disastrous (Ro 3:25,26). And this death was a sacrifice (Ro 3:25, etc.). And it is certain that Paul conceived of this sacrifice as existing quite independently of its effect on any human being. But he has given us no data for a really complete sacrificial doctrine, a statement sufficiently proved by the hopeless variance of the interpretations that have been propounded. And that Paul ever constructed a theory of the operation of sacrifices must be doubted. There is none in the contemporary Jewish literature, there is none in the Old Testament, and there is none in the rest of the New Testament, not even in Hebrews. Apparently the rites were so familiar that sacrificial terminology was ready to hand and was used without particular reflection and without attempting to give it precise theological content. This is borne out by the ease with which in Ro 3:24,25 Paul passes from a ransom (redemption) illustration to a (quite discordant) propitation illustration. For further discussion see ATONEMENT; JUSTIFICATION. Here it is enough make a juridical theory constructed from Pauline implications and illustrations central in Christianity is to do exactly what Paul did not do.

7. Summary:

Summing up, there is a double line of thought in Paul: the remission of penalties through the atoning death of Christ and the destruction of the power of sin through strength flowing from Christ, the human element in both cases being faith. The question of the order of the steps is futile, for "to have faith," "to be in Christ," and "to have the Spirit" are convertible terms, i.e. in doctrinal phraseology, the beginnings of sanctification are simultaneous with justification. Attempts to unify the two lines of thought into a single theory cannot claim purely Biblical support. The "ethical" theory, which in its best form makes God's pardon depend on the fact that the sinner will be made holy (at least in the next world), introduces the fewest extraneous elements, but it says something that Paul does not say. On the other hand one may feel that considering Paul as a whole—to say nothing of the rest of the New Testament—the pure

justification doctrine has bulked a little too large in our dogmatics. God’s pardon for sin is an immensely important matter, but still more important is the new power of holiness.

8. Notes:

(1) Baptism presents another obstacle to a strict unifying of Pauline theology. A very much stronger sacramentarianism is admitted in Paul today than would have been accepted a generation ago, and such passages as Ro 6:1-7; Ga 3:27; Col 2:12 make it certain that he regarded baptism as conferring very real spiritual powers. But that he made a mechanical distinction between the blessings given then and those given at some other time must be doubted.

(2) Salvation from the flesh (Ro 7:24) involves no metaphysical dualism, as "flesh" is the whole of the lower nature from which the power to holiness saves a man (Ro 8:13). Indeed, the body itself is an object of salvation (Ro 8:11; and see RESURRECTION).

(3) Quite in the background lies the idea of salvation from physical evil (2Co 1:10, etc.). Such evils are real evils (1Co 11:30), but in God’s hands they may become pure blessings (Ro 5:3; 2Co 12:7).

(4) Salvation from sin after conversion is due to God’s judging the man in terms of the acquired supernatural nature (Ro 8:14, etc.). Yet certain sins may destroy the union with Christ altogether (1Co 3:17, etc.), while others bring God’s chastening judgment (1Co 11:30-32). Or proper chastisement may be inflicted by Paul himself (1Co 5:1-5; 1Ti 1:20) or by the congregation (Ga 6:1; 2Th 3:10-15; 2Co 2:6).

V. Rest of New Testament: Summary.

1. John:

(1) John had the task of presenting Christ to Gentiles, who were as unfamiliar with the technical meaning of such phrases as "kingdom of God" or "Son of Man" as is the world today, and to Gentiles who had instead a series of concepts unknown in Palestine. So a "translation of spiritual values" became necessary if the gospel were to make an immediate appeal, a translation accomplished so successfully that the Fourth Gospel has always been the most popular. The Synoptists, especially the extremely literal Mark, imperatively demand a historical commentary, while John has successfully avoided this necessity.

(2) The "kingdom of God," as a phrase (3:3,5; compare 18:36), is replaced by "eternal life." This life is given in this world to the one who accepts Christ’s teaching (5:24; 6:47), but its full realization will be in the "many mansions" of the Father’s house (14:2), where the believer will be with Christ (17:24). A judgment of all men will precede the establishment of this glorified state (5:28,29), but the believer may face the judgment with equanimity (5:24). So the believer is delivered from a state of things so bad as expressible as a world under Satan’s rule (12:31; 14:30; 16:11), a world in darkness (3:19), in ignorance of God (17:25), and in sin (8:21), all expressible in the one word "death" (5:24).

(3) The Jews had real privilege in the reception of Christ's message (1:11; 4:22, etc.), but the extension of the good tidings to all men was inevitable (12:23,12, etc.). Belief in Christ is wholly a personal matter, but the believers enter a community of service (13:14), with the unity of the Father and Son as their ideal (17:21).

(4) The nature of the moral ideal, reduced to the single word "love" (13:34; 15:12), is assumed as known and identified with "Christ's words" (5:24; 6:63, etc.), and the necessity of progress toward it as sharply pointed as in the Synoptists. The sinner is the servant of sin (8:34), a total change of character is needed (3:6), and the blessing is only on him who does Christ's commandments (13:17). This "doing" is the proof of love toward Christ (14:15,21); only by bearing fruit and more fruit can discipleship be maintained (15:1-6; compare 14:24), and, indeed, by bearing fruit men actually become Christ's disciples (15:8, Gr). The knowledge of Christ and of God that is eternal life (17:3) comes only through moral effort (7:17). In John the contrasts are colored so vividly that it would almost appear as if perfection were demanded. But he does not present even the apostles as models of sanctity (13:38; 16:32), and self-righteousness is condemned without compromise; the crowning sin is to say, "We see" (9:41). It is the Son who frees from sin (8:36), delivers from darkness (8:12; 12:46), and gives eternal life (11:25,26; compare 3:16; 5:24; 6:47). This emphasis on the divine side of the process is probably the reason for the omission of the terms "repent," "repentance," from the Gospel in favor of "faith" (6:29, especially), but this "faith" involves in turn human effort, for, without "abiding," faith is useless (8:30,31).

(5) An advance on the Synoptists is found in the number of times Christ speaks of His death (3:14,15; 10:11,15; 12:24,32; 17:19) and in the greater emphasis laid on it, but no more than in the Synoptists is there any explanation of how the Atonement became effectual. A real advance consists in the prospect of Christ's work after His death, when, through the Paraclete (7:38,39; 14:16 ff), a hitherto unknown spiritual power would become available for the world. And spiritual power is due not only to a union of will with Christ but to mystical union with Him (15:1-9). See above, III, 7, for the relation of these thoughts to the synoptic teaching.

2. Hebrews:

(1) The emphasis of He is of course on the sacrificial work of Christ, but the Epistle makes practically no contribution to theology of sacrifice. The argument is this: The Old Testament sacrifices certainly had an efficacy; Christ's sacrifice fulfilled their types perfectly, therefore it had a perfect efficacy (Heb 9:13,14). This must have been a tremendously potent argument for He's own purpose, but it is of very little help to the modern theologian. (2) More than in Paul is emphasized the human training of Christ for His high-priestly work. Since He laid hold of the seed of Abraham (Heb 2:16), He learned by experience all that man had to suffer (Heb 2:17; 4:15; 5:8, etc.). In He the essence of the sacrifice lies not in the death but in what we call the ascension—the presentation of the blood in the heavenly tabernacle (Heb 9:11-14; see the commentaries). That the death was specifically on the cross (Heb 12:2 only) belonged to the stage of training and had no special significance in the sacrificial scheme. Christ's intercession for us in heaven receives more emphasis than in the rest of the New Testament (Heb 7:25).

3. Peter:

The one other distinct contribution to New Testament soteriology is made in 1 Peter's evaluation of the vicarious suffering of the "Servant" of Isa 53. What Christ did through His sufferings we may do in some degree through our sufferings; as His pains helped not only living mankind, but even departed sinners, so we may face persecution more happily with the thought that our pains are benefiting other men (1Pe 3:16-20). It is hardly possible that Peter thought of this comparison as conveying an exhaustive description of the Atonement (compare 1Pe 1:19), but that the comparison should be made at all is significant.

4. Summary:

(1) Salvation is both a present and a future matter for us. The full realization of all that God has in store will not be ours until the end of human history (if, indeed, there will not be opened infinite possibilities of eternal growth), but the enjoyment of these blessings depends on conditions fulfilled in us and by us now. But a foretaste of the blessings of forgiveness of sins and growth in holiness is given on this earth. The pardon depends on the fact of God's mercy through the death of Christ—a fact for religious experience but probably incapable of expression as a complete philosophical dogma. But strength comes from God through the glorified Christ (or through the Spirit), this vital union with God being a Christian fundamental. These two lines are in large degree independent, and the selection of the proportions profitable to a given soul is the task of the pastor.

(2) That human effort is an essential in salvation is not to be denied in the face of all the New Testament evidence, especially Paul taken as a whole. And yet no one with the faintest conception of what religion means would think of coming before God to claim merit. Here the purely intellectual discussions of the subiect and its psychological course in the soul run in different channels, and "anti-synergistic" arguments are really based on attempts to petrify psychology experience into terms of pure dogma.

(3) Still more true is this of attempts to describe mathematically the steps in salvation—the ordo salutis of the older dogmatics—for this differs with different souls. In particular, New Testament data are lacking for the development of the individual born of Christian parents in a Christian country.

(4) Further, the social side of salvation is an essentially Christian doctrine and cannot be detached from the corporate life of the Christian church. Salvation from temporal evils is equally, if secondarily, Christian. Nationalism in salvation is at present much in the background. But it is as true today as it was in ancient Israel that the sins of a nation tend to harm the souls of even those who have not participated actively in those sins.

LITERATURE.

The literature of salvation is virtually the literature of theology (see under separate articles,

ATONEMENT; JUSTIFICATION; SANCTIFICATION; PERSON OF CHRIST; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY; PAULINE THEOLOGY, etc.), but a few recent works may be mentioned. Indispensable are the works of Stevens, The Christian Doctrine of Salvation and The Pauline Theology. Garvie's Romans in the "New Century" series should be used as a supplement to any other commentary on Romans. The juridical theory has as its best defense in English Denney's The Death of Christ. The ethical theory is best presented in the works of DuBose, The Gospel in the Gospels, The Gospel according to Paul, and High-Priesthood and Sacrifice (Sanday's The Expositor reviews of the two former, reprinted in The Life of Christ in Recent Research, should be read in any case).

Burton Scott Easton

SAMAEL

sam'-a-el: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SALAMIEL (which see).

SAMAIAS

sa-ma'-yas (Samaias):

(1) One of the "captains over thousands" prominent at the Passover of Josiah (1 Esdras 1:9) =" Shemaiah" in 2Ch 35:9.

(2) One of the heads of families of the sons of Adonikam who returned with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:39) =" Shemaiah" in Ezr 8:13.

(3) One of the "men of understanding" whom Ezra commissioned to obtain from Loddeus, the captain, men to execute the priest's office (1 Esdras 8:44) =" Shemaiah" in Ezr 8:16 (the King James Version Mamaias).

(4) the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Shemaiah the great," a kinsman of Tobit and father of Ananias and Jonathan (Tobit 5:13).

S. Angus

SAMARIA, CITY OF

sa-ma'-ri-a, (shomeron; Samareia, Semeron, and other forms):

(1) Shechem was the first capital of the Northern Kingdom (1Ki 12:25). Jeroboam seems later to have removed the royal residence to Tirzah (1Ki 14:17). After the brief reigns of Elah and Zimri came that of

Omri, who reigned 6 years in Tirzah, then he purchased the hill of Samaria and built a city there, which was thenceforward the metropolis of the kingdom of Israel (1Ki 16:24). Here the hill and the city are said to have been named after Shemer, the original owner of the land. There is nothing intrinsically improbable in this. It might naturally be derived from shamar, and the name in the sense of "outlook" would fitly apply to a city in such a commanding position. The residence, it was also the burying-place, of the kings of Israel (1Ki 16:28; 22:37; 2Ki 10:35; 13:9,13; 14:16).

Toward the western edge of the Ephraimite uplands there is a broad fertile hollow called Wady esh-Sha‘ir, "valley of barley." From the midst of it rises an oblong hill to a height of over 300 ft., with a level top. The sides are steep, especially to the Samaria. The greatest length is from East to West. The surrounding mountains on three sides are much higher, and are well clad with olives and vineyards. To the West the hills are lower, and from the crest a wide view is obtained over the Plain of Sharon, with the yellow ribbon of sand that marks the coast line, and the white foam on the tumbling billows; while away beyond stretch the blue waters of the Mediterranean. On the eastern end of the hill, surrounded by olive and cactus, is the modern village of Sebastiyeh, under which a low neck of land connects the hill with the eastern slopes. The position is one of great charm and beauty; and in days of ancient warfare it was one of remarkable strength. While it was overlooked from three sides, the battlements crowning the steep slopes were too far off to be reached by missiles from the only artillery known in those times—the sling and the catapult. For besiegers to attempt an assault at arms was only to court disaster. The methods adopted by her enemies show that they relied on famine to do their work for them (2Ki 6:24 f, etc.). Omri displayed excellent taste and good judgment in the choice he made.

The city wall can be traced in almost its entire length. Recent excavations conducted by American archaeologists have uncovered the foundations of Omri’s palace, with remains of the work of Ahab and of Herod (probably here was Ahab’s ivory palace), on the western end of the hill, while on the western slope the gigantic gateway, flanked by massive towers, has been exposed to view.

Under the influence of Jezebel, Samaria naturally became a center of idolatrous worship. Ahab "reared up an altar for Baal in the house of Baal, which he had built in Samaria. And Ahab made the Asherah" (1Ki 16:32 f). Jehoram his son put away the pillar of Baal (2Ki 3:2), and within the temple Jehu made an end at once of the instruments of idolatry and of the priests (2Ki 10:19 f). There are many prophetic references to the enormities practiced here, and to their inevitable consequences (Isa 8:4; 9:9; 10:9; 28:1 ff; 36:19; Jer 23:13; Eze 23:4; Ho 7:1; 13:16; Am 3:12; Mic 1:6, etc.).

Under pressure of Damascus Omri conceded to the Syrians the right to "make streets in Samaria" (1Ki 20:34).

Ben-hadad II besieged the city, but suffered ignominious defeat (1Ki 20:1-21; Josephus, Ant, VIII, xiv, 1 f). Persistent attempts by the Syrians to reach the city in the time of Jehoram were frustrated by Elisha (2Ki 6:8 ; Josephus, Ant, IX, iv, 3). At length, however, Ben-hadad again invested the city, and the besieged were reduced to dire straits, in which, urged by famine, scenes of awful horror were enacted (2Ki 6:24). A mysterious panic seized the Syrians. Their deserted camp was discovered by despairing

lepers who carried the good news to the famished citizens of the plenty to be found there. Probably in the throat of the great western gateway occurred the crush in which the incredulous captain was trampled to death (1 Kings 7; Josephus, Ant, IX, iv, 5).

Here the 70 sons of Ahab were slain by Jehu in the general destruction of the house of Ahab (2Ki 10:1). In Samaria, the Chronicler tells us, Ahaziah in vain hid from Jehu (2Ch 22:9; compare 2Ki 9:27). Pekah brought hither much spoil from Jerusalem and many captives, whom, at the instance of the prophet Oded, he released (2Ch 28). The siege of Samaria was begun by Shalmaneser in the 7th year of Hoshea, and the city was finally taken by Sargon II at the end of 3 years, 722 BC (2Ki 17:5 f; 18:9 f; Ant, IX, xiv, 1). This marked the downfall of the Northern Kingdom, the people being transported by the conqueror. That this was not done in a thoroughgoing way is evident from the fact recorded in the inscriptions that two years later the country had to be subdued again. Colonists were brought from other parts to take the places of the exiles (2Ki 17:24; Ezr 4:10). Alexander the Great took the city in 331 BC, killed many of the inhabitants, and settled others in Shechem, replacing them with a colony of Syro-Macedonians. He gave the adjoining country to the Jews (Apion, II, 4). The city suffered at the hands of Ptolemy Lagi and Demetrius Poliorcetes, but it was still a place of strength (Josephus, Ant, XIII, x, 2) when John Hyrcanus came against it in 120 BC. It was taken after a year’s siege, and the victor tried to destroy the city utterly. His turning of the water into trenches to undermine the foundations could only refer to the suburbs under the hill. From the only two sources, ‘Ain Harun and ‘Ain Kefr Rima, to the East of the town, the water could not rise to the hill. The "many fountains of water" which Benjamin of Tudela says he saw on the top, from which water enough could be got to fill the trenches, are certainly not to be seen today; and they have left no trace behind them. The city was rebuilt by Pompey and, having again fallen under misfortune, was restored by Gabinius (Josephus, Ant, XIV, iv, 4; v, 3; BJ, I, vii, 7; viii, 4). To Herod it owed the chief splendor of its later days. He extended, strengthened and adorned it on a scale of great magnificence, calling it Sebaste (= Augusta) in honor of the emperor, a name which survives in the modern Sebastiyeh. A temple also was dedicated to Caesar. Its site is probably marked by the impressive flight of steps, with the pedestal on which stood the gigantic statue of Augustus, which recent excavations have revealed. The statue, somewhat mutilated, is also to be seen. Another of Herod’s temples West of the present village was cleared out by the same explorers. The remains of the great double-columned street, which ran round the upper terrace of the hill, bear further testimony to the splendor of this great builder’s work (Josephus, Ant, XV, vii, 3; viii, 5; BJ, I, xxi, 2). It was here that Herod killed perhaps the only human being whom he ever really loved, his wife Mariamne. Here also his sons perished by his hand (Josephus, Ant, XV, vii, 5-7; XVI, iii, 1-3; xi, 7).

It is commonly thought that this city was the scene of Philip’s preaching and the events that followed recorded in Ac 8, but the absence of the definite article in 8:5 makes this doubtful. A Roman colony was settled here by Septimius Severus. From that time little is known of the history of the city; nor do we know to what the final castastrophe was due. It became the seat of a bishopric and was represented in the councils of Nicea, Constantinople and Chalcedon. Its bishop attended the Synod of Jerusalem in 536 AD.

The Church of John, a Crusading structure beside the modern village, is now a Moslem mosque. It is the traditional burying-place of John the Baptist’s body.

(2) he Samareia: A town mentioned in 1 Macc 5:66 as on the route followed by Judas from the district of Hebron to the land of the Philistines. The name is probably a clerical error. The margin reads Marisa, and probably the place intended is Mareshah, the site of which is at Tell Sandachannah, about a mile South of Belt Jibrin.

W. Ewing

SAMARIA, COUNTRY OF

(shomeron; he Samareitis chora): The name of the city was transferred to the country of which it was the capital, so that Samaria became synonymous with the Northern Kingdom (1Ki 13:32; Jer 31:5, etc.). The extent of territory covered by this appellation varied greatly at different periods. At first it included the land held by Israel East of the Jordan, Galilee and Mt. Ephraim, with the northern part of Benjamin. It was shorn of the eastern portion by the conquest of Tiglath-pileser (1Ch 5:26). Judah probably soon absorbed the territory of Da in the Samaria. In New Testament times Samaria had shrunk to still smaller dimensions. Then the country West of the Jordan was divided into three portions: Judea in the South, Galilee in the North, and Samaria in the middle. The boundaries are given in general terms by Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 1, 4, 5). The southern edge of the Plain of Esdraelon and the lands of Scythopolis, the city of the Decapolis West of the Jordan, formed the northern boundary. It reached South as far as the toparchy of Acrabatta (modern ‘Aqrabeh), while on the border between Samaria and Judea lay the villages of Annath and Borceos, the modern Khirbet ‘Aina and Berqit, about 15 miles South of Nablus. The Jordan of course formed the eastern boundary. On the West the coast plain as far as Acre belonged to Judea. The country thus indicated was much more open to approach than the high plateau of Judah with its steep rocky edges and difficult passes. The road from the North indeed was comparatively easy of defense, following pretty closely the line of the watershed. But the gradual descent of the land to the West with long, wide valleys, offered inviting avenues from the plain. The great trade routes, that to the fords of Jordan and the East, passing through the cleft in the mountains at Shechem, and those connecting Egypt with the North and the Northeast, traversed Samarian territory, and brought her into constant intercourse with surrounding peoples. The influence of the heathen religions to which she was thus exposed made a swift impression upon her, leading to the corruptions of faith and life that heralded her doom (Jer 23:13; Ho 7:1 , etc.). The Assyrians came as the scourge of God (2Ki 17:5-23). Their attack centered on the capital. Shalmaneser began the siege, and after three years the city fell to Sargon II, his successor. With the fall of Samaria the kingdom came to an end. Following the usual Assyrian policy, great numbers of the inhabitants were deported from the conquered country, and their places taken by men brought from "Babylon, and from Cuthah, and from Avva, and from Hamath and Sepharvaim," cities which had already bowed to the Assyrian power (2Ki 17:24).

It appears from the Assyrian inscriptions that the number carried away was 27,290. The number afterward deported from Judah was 200,000, and then the poorest of the land were left to be vinedressers and husbandmen (2Ki 25:12). It is evident that a similar policy must have been followed in Samaria, as 27,290 could certainly not include the whole population of the cities and the country. But it would

include the higher classes, and especially the priests from whom the victors would have most to fear. The population therefore after the conquest contained a large proportion of Israelites. It was no doubt among these that Josiah exercised his reforming energy (2Ki 23:19 f; 2Ch 34:6 f). Here also must have been that "remnant of Israel," Manasseh and Ephraim, who contributed for the repair of the house of God (2Ch 34:9). These people, left without their religious guides, mingling with the heathen who had brought their gods and, presumably, their priests with them, were apt to be turned from the purity of their faith. A further importation of pagan settlers took place under Esar-haddon and Osnappar (Ezr 4:9,10). The latter is to be identified with Assur-bani-pal. What the proportions of the different elements in the population were, there is now no means of knowing. That there was some intermarriage is probable; but having regard to racial exclusiveness, we may suppose that it was not common. When the Jews deny to them any relation to Israel, and call them Cuthaeans, as if they were the descendants purely of the heathen settlers, the facts just mentioned should be borne in mind.

After the Assyrian conquest we are told that the people suffered from lions (2Ki 17:25). Josephus (Ant., IX, xiv, 3) says "a plague seized upon them." In accordance with the ideas of the time, the strangers thought this due to the anger of the tutelary deity of the land, because they worshipped other gods in his territory, while neglecting him. Ignorant of his special ritual ("manner"), they petitioned the Assyrian king, who sent one (Josephus says "some") of the priests who had been carried away to teach them "how they should fear the Lord." How much is implied in this "fearing of the Lord" is not clear. They continued at the same time to serve their own gods. There is nothing to show that the Israelites among them fell into their idolatries. The interest of these in the temple at Jerusalem, the use of which they may now have shared with the Jews, is proved by 2Ch 34:9. In another place we are told that four score men "from Shechem, from Shiloh, and from Samaria," evidently Israelites, were going up with their offerings to the house of the Lord (Jer 41:5). Once the people of the country are called Samaritans (2Ki 17:29). Elsewhere this name has a purely religious significance.

See SAMARITANS.

Of the history of Samaria under Assyrian and Babylonian rulers we know nothing. It reappears at the return of the Jews under Persian auspices. The Jews refused the proffered assistance of the Samaritans in rebuilding the temple and the walls of Jerusalem (Ezr 4:1,3). Highly offended, the latter sought to frustrate the purpose of the Jews (Ezr 4:4 ff; Ne 4:7 ; RAPC 1Es 2:16). That the Samaritans were accustomed to worship in Jerusalem is perhaps implied by one phrase in the letter sent to the Persian king: "The Jews that came up from thee are come to us unto Jerus" (Ezr 4:12). Perhaps also they may be referred to in Ezr 6:21. Idolatry is not alleged against the "adversaries." We can hardly err if we ascribe the refusal in some degree to the old antagonism between the North and the South, between Ephraim and Judah. Whatever the cause, it led to a wider estrangement and a deeper bitterness. For the history of the people and their temple on Gerizim, see SAMARITANS.

Samaria, with Palestine, fell to Alexander after the battle of Issus. Antiochus the Great gave it to Ptolemy Epiphanes, as the dowry of his daughter Cleopatra (Josephus, Ant, XII, iv, 1). John Hyrcanus reduced and desolated the country (Josephus, BJ, I, ii, 6 f). After varying fortunes Samaria became part of the kingdom of Herod, at whose death it was given to Archelaus (Josephus, Ant, XVII, xi, 4; BJ, II,

vi, 3). When Archelaus was banished it was joined to the Roman province of Syria (Josephus, Ant, XVII, xiii, 5; BJ, II, viii, 1).

Samaria is a country beautifully diversified with mountain and hill, valley and plain. The olive grows plentifully, and other fruit trees abound. There is much excellent soil, and fine crops of barley and wheat are reaped annually. The vine also is largely cultivated on the hill slopes. Remains of ancient forests are found in parts. As Josephus said, it is not naturally watered by many rivers, but derives its chief moisture from rain water, of which there is no lack (BJ, III, iii, 4). He speaks also of the excellent grass, by reason of which the cows yield more milk than those in any other place.

There is a good road connecting Nablus with Jaffa; and by a road not quite so good, it is now possible to drive a carriage from Jerusalem to Nazareth, passing through Samaria.

W. Ewing

SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH

sa-mar’-i-tan.

See PENTATEUCH, THE SAMARITAN.

SAMARITANS

sa-mar’-i-tanz (shomeronim; Samareitai, New Testament; (singular), Samarites): The name "Samaritans" in 2Ki 17:29 clearly applies to the Israelite inhabitants of the Northern Kingdom. In subsequent history it denotes a people of mixed origin, composed of the peoples brought by the conqueror from Babylon and elsewhere to take the places of the expatriated Israelites and those who were left in the land (722 BC). Sargon claims to have carried away only 27,290 of the inhabitants (KIB, II, 55). Doubtless these were, as in the case of Judah, the chief men, men of wealth and influence, including all the priests, the humbler classes being left to till the land, tend the vineyards, etc. Hezekiah, who came to the throne of Judah probably in 715 BC, could still appeal to the tribes Ephraim, Manasseh, Issachar, Asher and Zebulun (2Ch 30:5,10,11,18); and the presence of these tribesmen is implied in the narrative of Josiah’s reformation (2Ch 34:6 f). Although the number of the colonists was increased by Esar-haddon and Osnappar (Assur-bani-pal, Ezr 4:2,9 f), the population, it is reasonable to suppose, continued prevailingly Israelite; otherwise their religion would not so easily have won the leading place. The colonists thought it necessary for their own safety to acknowledge Yahweh, in whose land they dwelt, as one among the gods to be feared (2Ki 17:24). In the intermixture that followed "their own gods" seem to have fallen on evil days; and when the Samaritans asked permission to share in building the temple under Zerubbabel, they claimed, apparently with a good conscience, to serve God and to sacrifice to Him as the Jews did (Ezr 4:1 f). Whatever justification there was for this claim, their proffered friendship was turned to deadly hostility by the blunt refusal of their request. The old enmity between north and south no doubt intensified the quarrel, and the antagonism of Jew and Samaritan, in

its bitterness, was destined to pass into a proverb. The Samaritans set themselves, with great temporary success, to frustrate the work in which they were not permitted to share (Ezr 4:4 ff; Ne 4:7 ; etc.).

From the strict administration of the Law in Jerusalem malcontents found their way to the freer atmosphere of Samaria. Among these renegades was Manasseh, brother of the high priest, who had married a daughter of Sanballat, the Persian governor of Samaria. According to Josephus, Sanballat, with the sanction of Alexander the Great, built a temple for the Samaritans on Mt. Gerizim, of which Manasseh became high priest (Ant., XI, vii, 2; viii, 2 ff). Josephus, however, places Manasseh a century too late. He was a contemporary of Ezra and Nehemiah (Ne 13:28).

When it suited their purpose the Samaritans claimed relationship with the Jews, asserting that their roll of the Pentateuch was the only authentic copy (see PENTATEUCH, THE SAMARITAN); they were equally ready to deny all connection in times of stress, and even to dedicate their temple to a heathen deity (Josephus, Ant, XII, v, 5). In 128 BC, John Hyrcanus destroyed the temple (XIII, ix, 1). In the time of Christ the Samaritans were ruled by procurators under the Roman governor of Syria. Lapse of years brought no lessening of the hatred between Jews and Samaritans (Ant., XX, vi, 1). To avoid insult and injury at the hands of the latter, Jews from Galilee were accustomed to reach the feasts at Jerusalem by way of Peraea. "Thou art a Samaritan, and hast a demon" was an expression of opprobrium (Joh 8:48). Although Jesus forbade the Twelve to go into any city of the Samaritans (Mt 10:5), the parable of the Good Samaritan shows that His love overleaped the boundaries of national hatred (Lu 10:30 ; compare Lu 17:16; Joh 4:9).

During the Jewish war Cerealis treated the Samaritans with great severity. On one occasion (67 AD) he slaughtered 11,600 on Mt. Gerizim. For some centuries they were found in considerable numbers throughout the empire, east and west, with their synagogues. They were noted as "bankers" money-changers, For their anti-Christian attitude and conduct Justinian inflicted terrible vengeance on them. From this the race seems never to have recovered. Gradually-dwindling, they now form a small community in Nablus of not more than 200 souls. Their great treasure is their ancient copy of the Law.

See SAMARIA.

LITERATURE.

The best account of the Samaritans is Mills, Nablus and the Modern Samaritans (Murray, London); compare Montgomery, The Samaritans (1907). A good recent description by J. E. H. Thomson, D. D., of the Passover celebrated annually on Mt. Gerizim will be found in PEFS, 1902, 82 ff.

W. Ewing

SAMATUS

sam’-a-tus (Samatos): One of the sons of Ezora who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:34). It is

difficult to say which, if any, name it represents in parallel Ezr 10:34 ff, where no "sons of Ezora" are inserted between "sons of Bani" and "sons of Nebo": probably Shallurn (10:42), but possibly Shemariah (10:41).

SAMECH

sam'-ek (camekh): The 15th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "c". It came to be used for the number 60. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

SAMEIUS

sa-me'-yus: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SAMEUS (which see).

SAMELLIUS

sa-mel'-i-us (Codex Vaticanus Samellios; Codex Alexandrinus Sebellios, al Semellios; the King James Version Semellius): "Samellius the scribe," one of those who wrote a letter of protest to Artaxerxes against the building of Jerusalem by the returned exiles (1 Esdras 2:16,17,25,30) =" Shimshai" in Ezr 4:8.

SAMEUS

sa-me'-us (Codex Alexandrinus and Fritzsche, Samaios; Codex Vaticanus Thamaios; the King James Version Sameius): One of the sons of Emmer who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:21) =" Shemaiah" (the Revised Version margin "Maaseiah") of the sons of Harim in Ezr 10:21.

SAMGAR-NEBO

sam-gar-ne'-bo (camgar nebho, a Babylonian name): An officer of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, who, according to the Massoretic Text of Jer 39:3, took his seat with other nobles in the middle gate of Jerusalem after the Chaldean army had taken the city. Schrader (COT, ii, 109) holds that the name is a Hebraized form of the Assyrian Sumgirnabu ("be gracious, Nebo"), but Giesebrecht (Comm., 211) conjectures for Samgar a corruption of Sar-mag (Sar-magh), equivalent to Rab-mag (rab-magh), which implies virtual dittography. The number of variant readings exhibited by the Septuagint seems to confirm the belief that the text is corrupt. Nebo (nabu) is there joined with the following Sarsechim to agree with Nebushazban of Jer 39:13. If the name Samgar-nebo is correct, the first Nergal-sharezer "should perhaps be dropped; we would then read: "Samgar-nebo the Sarsechim, Nebushazban the Rab-saris (compare 39:13) and Nergal-sharezer the Rab-mag" (Sayce).

See RAB-MAG; RAB-SARIS.

Horace J. Wolf

SAMI

sa’-mi: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SABI (which see).

SAMIS

sa’-mis: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SOMEIS (which see).

SAMLAH

sam’-la (samlah; Salama): One of the kings of Edom, of the city of Masrekah. He reigned before the Israelites had kings (Ge 36:36,37; 1Ch 1:47,48). The fact that the city is mentioned in connection with the name of the king suggests that Edom was a confederacy at this time and the chief city was the metropolis of the whole country.

SAMMUS

sam’-us (Codex Alexandrinus Sammous; Codex Vaticanus Sammou): One of those who stood on Ezra’s right hand as he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:43) =" Shema" in Ne 8:4.

SAMOS

sa’-mos (Samos, "height," "mountain" (see Strabo 346, 457)): One of the most famous of the Ionian islands, third in size among the group which includes Lesbos, CHIOS (which see) and Cos (which see). It is situated at the mouth of the bay of Ephesus, between the cities of EPHESUS and MILETUS (which see), and separated from the mainland of Ionia by the narrow strait where the Greeks met and conquered the Persian fleet in the battle of Mycale, 479 BC (Herodotus ix.100 ff). The surface of the island is very rugged and mountainous, Mt. Kerki (modern name) rising to a height of 4,700 ft., and it was due to this that the island received its name (see above).

See also SAMOTHRACE.

Samos was renowned in antiquity as one of the noted centers of Ionjan luxury, and reached its zenith of prosperity under the rule of the famous tyrant Polycrates (533-522 BC), who made himself master of the Aegean Sea. He carried on trade with Egypt, and his intercourse with that country, his friendship with Amasis, the famous "ring" story and the revolting manner of the death of Polycrates arere all told in one of the most interesting stories of Herodotus (Herod. iii.39 ff).

In 84 BC, the island was joined to the province of Asia, and in 17 BC it became a civitas libera, through the favor of Augustus (Dio Cass. liv.9; Pliny, NH, v.37). Both Marcus Agrippa and Herod visited the island; and according to Josephus (Ant., XVI, ii, 2; BJ, I, xxi, 11) "bestowed a great many benefits" on it. In the Apocrypha, Samos is mentioned among the places to which Lucius, consul of the Romans, wrote, asking their good will toward the Jews (1 Macc 15:23).

In the New Testament, Paul touched here, after passing CHIOS (which see), on his return from his third missionary journey (Ac 20:15). In Textus Receptus of the New Testament, we find in this passage kai meinantes en Trogullio ("and having remained in Trogyllium"). This reading is wanting in the oldest manuscripts, and may be a sort of gloss, or explanation; due to the technical use of paraballein, "to touch land" (compare Josephus, Ant, XVIII, vi, 4), and not necessarily "to make a landing." Trogyllium lay on the mainland opposite Samos, at the end of the ridge of Mycale. Still there is no particular reason why this reading should be supported, especially as it is not found in the earliest of authorities. Soden's 1913 text, however, retains the reading in brackets.

LITERATURE.

Tozer, Islands of the Aegean (1890). Herodotus and Pausanias have rather full accounts of Samos, and Encyclopedia Brit (11th edition) gives a good bibliography of works both ancient and modern.

Arthur J. Kinsella

SAMOTHRACE

sam'-o-thras (Samothrake, "the Thracian Samos"; the King James Version Samothracia, sam-o-thra'sha; the island was formerly Dardania; for change of name see Pausanias vii.4,3; Strabo x.457, and for a full discussion Conze, Hauser and Benndorf, Neue Untersuchungen auf South, 1880): An island in the Aegean Sea, South of Thrace opposite the mouth of the Hebrus River, and Northwest of Troas. The island is mountainous, as the name indicates (see SAMOS), and towers above Imbros when viewed from the Trojan coast. The summit is about a mile high. It is mentioned in the Iliad (xiii.12) as the seat of Poseidon and referred to by Virgil Aeneid vii.208.

The island was always famous for sanctity, and the seat of a cult of the Cabeiri, which Herodotus (ii.51) says was derived from the Pelasgian inhabitants (see also Aristophanes, Pax 277). The mysteries connected with the worship of these gods later rivaled the famous mysteries of Eleusis, and both Philip of Macedon and Olympias his wife were initiated here (Plut. Alex. 3).

Probably because of its sacred character the island did not figure to any extent in history, but in the expedition of Xerxes in 480 BC, one ship at least of the Samothracian contingent is mentioned as conspicuous in the battle of Salamis.

The famous "Victory of Samothrace" (now in the Louvre) was set up here by Demetrius Poliorcetes

circa 300 BC, and was discovered in 1863. Since that time (1873-75), the Austrian government carried on extensive excavations (see Conze, Hauser and Benndorf, op. cit.).

In the New Testament the island is mentioned in Ac 16:11. From Troas, Paul made a straight run to Samothrace, and the next day sailed to NEAPOLIS (which see) on the Thracian coast, the port of PHILIPPI (which see). At the northern end of Samothrace was a town where the ship could anchor for the night, and on the return journey (Ac 20:6) a landing may have been made, but no details are given. Pliny characterizes the island as being most difficult for anchorage, but because of the hazards of sailing by night, the ancient navigators always anchored somewhere if possible.

LITERATURE.

See under SAMOS.

Arthur J. Kinsella

SAMPSAMES

samp’-sa-mez (Sampsames): A place mentioned in 1 Macc 15:23, usually identified with Samsun, on the coast of the Black Sea. The Vulgate, with the Revised Version margin, has "Lampsacus."

SAMSON

sam’-sun (shimshon.

1. Name:

Derived probably from shemesh, "sun" with the diminutive ending -on, meaning "little sun" or "sunny," or perhaps "sun-man"; Sampson; Latin and English, Samson): His home was near Bethshemesh, which means "house of the sun." Compare the similar formation shimshay (Ezr 4:8,9,17,23).

2. Character:

Samson was a judge, perhaps the last before Samuel. He was a Nazirite of the tribe of Da (Jud 13:5); a man of prodigious strength, a giant and a gymnast—the Hebrew Hercules, a strange champion for Yahweh! He intensely hated the Philistines who had oppressed Israel some 40 years (Jud 13:1), and was willing to fight them alone. He seems to have been actuated by little less than personal vengeance, yet in the New Testament he is named among the heroes of faith (Heb 11:32), and was in no ordinary sense an Old Testament worthy. He was good-natured, sarcastic, full of humor, and fought with his wits as well as with his fists. Milton has graphically portrayed his character in his dramatic poem Samson Agonistes (1671), on which Handel built his oratorio, Samson (1743).

3. Story of His Life:

The story of Samson's life is unique among the biographies of the Old Testament. It is related in Judges 13-16. Like Isaac, Samuel and John the Baptist, he was a child of prayer (13:8,12). To Manoah's wife the angel of Yahweh appeared twice (13:3,9), directing that the child which should be born to them should be a Nazirite from the womb, and that he would "begin to save Israel out of the hand of the Philistines" (13:5,7,14). The spirit of Yahweh first began to move him in Mahaneh-dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol (13:25). On his arriving at manhood, five remarkable circumstances are recorded of him.

(1) His marriage with a Philistine woman of Timnah (Judges 14). His parents objected to the alliance (Jud 14:3), but Samson's motive in marrying her was that he "sought an occasion against the Philistines" At the wedding feast Samson propounded to his guests a riddle, wagering that if they guessed its answer he would give them 30 changes of raiment. Dr. Moore felicitously renders the text of the riddle thus:

'Out of the eater came something to eat,

And out of the strong came something sweet' (Jud 14:14).

The Philistines threatened the life of his bride, and she in turn wrung from Samson the answer; whereupon he retorted (in Dr. Moore's version):

'If with my heifer ye did not plow,

Ye had not found out my riddle, I trow' (Jud 14:18).

Accordingly, in revenge, Samson went down to Ashkelon, slew some 30 men, and paid his debt; he even went home without his wife, and her father to save her from shame gave her to Samson's "best man" (Jud 14:20). It has been suggested by W. R. Smith (Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia, 70-76) that Samson did not from the first intend to take his bride to his home, his marriage being what is known among the Arabs as a tsadiqat, or gift marriage, by which is meant that the husband becomes a part of the wife's tribe. This assumes that the social relations of the Hebrews at that time were matriarchate, the wife remaining with her family, of which custom there are other traces in the Old Testament, the husband merely visiting the wife from time to time. But this is not so obvious in Samson's case in view of his pique (Jud 14:19), and especially in view of his parents' objection to his marrying outside of Israel (Jud 14:3). Not knowing that his bride had been given by her father to his friend, Samson went down to Timnah to visit her, with a kid; when he discovered, however, that he had been taken advantage of, he went out and caught 300 jackals, and putting firebrands between every two tails, he burned up the grain fields and olive yards of the Philistines. The Philistines, however, showed they could play with fire, too, and burned his wife and her father. Thereupon, Samson smote the Philistines in revenge, "hip and thigh" (Jud 15:1-8).

(2) When he escaped to Etam, an almost vertical rock cliff in Judah (by some identified with ‘Araq Ismain) not far from Zorah, Samson’s home, the Philistines invaded Judah, encamped at Lehi above Etam, and demanded the surrender of their arch-enemy. The men of Judah were willing to hand Samson over to the Philistines, and accordingly went down to the cliff Etam, bound Samson and brought him up where the Philistines were encamped (Jud 15:9-13). When Samson came to Lehi the Philistines shouted as they met him, whereupon the spirit of Yahweh came mightily upon him, so that he broke loose from the two new ropes with which the 3,000 men of Judah had bound him, and seizing a fresh jawbone of an ass he smote with it 1,000 men of the Philistines, boasting as he did so in pun-like poetry, ‘With the jawbone of an ass, m-ass upon m-ass’; or, as Dr. Moore translates the passage, ‘With the bone of an ass, I ass-ailed my ass-ailants’ (Jud 15:16). At the same time, Samson reverently gave Yahweh the glory of his victory (Jud 15:18). Samson being thirsty, Yahweh provided water for him at a place called En-hakkore, or "Partridge Spring," or "the Spring of the Caller"—another name for partridge (Jud 15:17-19).

(3) Samson next went down to Gaza, to the very stronghold of the Philistines, their chief city. There he saw a harlot, and, his passions not being under control, he went in unto her. It was soon noised about that Samson, the Hebrew giant, was in the city. Accordingly, the Philistines laid wait for him. But Samson arose at midnight and laid hold of the doors of the gate and their two posts, and carried them a full quarter of a mile up to the top of the mountain that looketh toward Hebron (Jud 16:1-3).

(4) From Gaza Samson betook himself to the valley of Sorek where he fell in love with another Philistine woman, named Delilah, through whose machinations he lost his spiritual power. The Philistine lords bribed her with a very large sum to deliver him into their hands. Three times Samson deceived her as to the secret of his strength, but at last he explains that he is a Nazirite, and that his hair, which has never been shorn, is the secret of his wonderful power. J. G. Frazer (Golden Bough, III, 390 ff) has shown that the belief that some mysterious power resides in the hair is still widespread among savage peoples, e.g. the Fiji Islanders. Thus, Samson fell. By disclosing to Delilah this secret, he broke his covenant vow, and the Spirit of God departed from him (Jud 16:4-20). The Philistines laid hold on him, put out his eyes, brought him down to Gaza, bound him with fetters, and forced him to grind in the prison house. Grinding was women’s work! It is at this point that Milton catches the picture and writes,

"Eyeless in Gaza, at the mill with slaves."

Howbeit, the hair of his head began to grow again; but his eyes did not! (Jud 16:21,22).

(5) The final incident recorded of Samson is in connection with a great sacrificial feast which the Philistine lords gave in honor of Dagon, their god. In their joyous celebration they sang in rustic rhythm:

‘Our god has given us into our hand

The foe of our land,

Whom even our most powerful band

Was never able to withstand’ (Jud 16:24).

This song was accompanied probably, as Mr. Macalister suggests, by hand-clapping (Gezer, 129). When they became still more merry, they called for Samson to play the buffoon, and by his pranks to entertain the assembled multitude. The house of Dagon was full of people; about 3,000 were upon the roof beholding as Samson made sport. With the new growth of his hair his strength had returned to him. The dismantled giant longed to be avenged on his adversaries for at least one of his two eyes (Jud 16:28). He prayed, and Yahweh heard his prayer. Guided by his attendant, he took hold of the wooden posts of the two middle pillars upon which the portico of the house rested, and slipping them off their pedestals, the house fell upon the lords and upon all the people that were therein. "So the dead that he slew at his death were more than they that he slew in his life" (Jud 16:29,30). His kinsmen came and carried him up and buried him near his boyhood home, between Zorah and Eshtaol, in the family burying-ground of his father. "And he judged Israel twenty years" (Jud 16:31).

4. Historical Value:

The story of Samson is a faithful mirror of his times: "Every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jud 17:6; 21:25). There was no king in those days, i.e. no central government. Each tribe was separately occupied driving out their individual enemies. For 40 years the Philistines had oppressed Samson’s tribal compatriots. Their suzerainty was also recognized by Judah (Jud 14:4; 15:11). Samson was the hero of his tribe. The general historicity of his story cannot be impeached on the mere ground of improbability. His deeds were those which would most naturally be expected from a giant, filled with a sense of justice. He received the local popularity which a man of extraordinary prowess would naturally be given. All peoples glory in their heroes. The theory that the record in Judges 13-16 is based upon some "solar myth" is now generally abandoned. That there are incidents in his career which are difficult to explain, is freely granted. For example, that he killed a lion (14:6) is not without a parallel; David and Benaiah did the same (1Sa 17:34-36; 2Sa 23:20). God always inspires a man in the line of his natural endowments. That God miraculously supplied his thirst (Jud 15:19) is no more marvelous than what God did for Hagar in the wilderness (Ge 21:19). That Samson carried off the doors of the gate of Gaza and their two posts, bar and all, must not confound us till we know more definitely their size and the distance from Gaza of the hill to which he carried them. The fact that he pulled down the roof on which there were 3,000 men and women is not at all impossible, as Mr. Macalister has shown. If we suppose that there was an immense portico to the temple of Dagon, as is quite possible, which was supported by two main pillars of wood resting on bases of stone, like the cedar pillars of Solomon’s house (1Ki 7:2), all that Samson, therefore, necessarily did, was to push the wooden beams so that their feet would slide over the stone base on which they rested, and the whole portico would collapse. Moreover, it is not said that the whole of the 3,000 on the roof were destroyed (Jud 16:30). Many of those in the temple proper probably perished in the number (R. A. S. Macalister, Bible Side-Lights from the Mound of Gezer, 1906, 127-38).

5. Religious Value:

Not a few important and suggestive lessons are deducible from the hero's life:

(1) Samson was the object of parental solicitude from even before his birth. One of the most suggestive and beautiful prayers in the Old Testament is that of Manoah for guidance in the training of his yet unborn child (Jud 13:8). Whatever our estimate of his personality is, Samson was closely linked to the covenant.

(2) He was endowed with the Spirit of Yahweh—the spirit of personal patriotism, the spirit of vengeance upon a foe of 40 years' standing (Jud 13:1,25; 14:6:19; 15:14).

(3) He also prayed, and Yahweh answered him, though in judgment (Jud 16:30). But he was prodigal of his strength. Samson had spiritual power and performed feats which an ordinary man would hardly perform. But he was unconscious of his high vocation. In a moment of weakness he yielded to Delilah and divulged the secret of his strength. He was careless of his personal endowment. He did not realize that physical endowments no less than spiritual are gifts from God, and that to retain them we must be obedient.

(4) He was passionate and therefore weak. The animal of his nature was never curbed, but rather ran unchained and free. He was given to sudden fury. Samson was a wild, self-willed man. Passion ruled. He could not resist the blandishments of women. In short, he was an overgrown schoolboy, without self-mastery.

(5) He accordingly wrought no permanent deliverance for Israel; he lacked the spirit of cooperation. He undertook a task far too great for even a giant single-handed. Yet, it must be allowed that Samson paved the way for Saul and David. He began the deliverance of Israel from the Philistines. He must, therefore, be judged according to his times. In his days there was unrestrained individual independence on every side, each one doing as he pleased. Samson differed from his contemporaries in that he was a hero of faith (Heb 11:32). He was a Nazirite, and therefore dedicated to God. He was given to revenge, yet he was ready to sacrifice himself in order that his own and his people's enemies might be overthrown. He was willing to lay down his own life for the sake of his fellow-tribesmen—not to save his enemies, however, but to kill them. (Compare Mt 5:43 f; Ro 5:10.)

LITERATURE.

(1) Comma. on Jgs, notably those by G. F. Moore, ICC, 1895; Budde, Kurzer Handkommentar, 1897; Nowack, Handkommentar, 1900; E. L. Curtis, The Bible for Home and School, 1913; Bachmann, 1868; Keil, 1862; Farrar in Ellicott's Commentaries; Watson, Expositor's Bible. (2) Articles on "Samson" in the various Bible Dictionaries and Encyclopedias; in particular those by Budde, HDB; C. W. Emmet, in 1-vol HDB; S. A. Cook, New Encyclopedia Brit; Davis, Dict. of the Bible.

George L. Robinson

SAMUEL

sam’-u-el (shemu’el; Samouel): The word "Samuel" signifies "name of God," or "his name is El" (God). Other interpretations of the name that have been offered are almost certainly mistaken. The play upon the name in 1Sa 1:20 is not intended of course to be an explanation of its meaning, but is similar to the play upon the name Moses in Ex 2:10 and frequently elsewhere in similar instances. Thus, by the addition of a few letters shemu’el becomes sha’ul me’el, "asked of God," and recalls to the mother of Samuel the circumstances of the divine gift to her of a son. Outside of 1st Samuel the name of the great judge and prophet is found in Jer 15:1; Ps 99:6 and in 1 and 2 Chronicles. The reference in Jeremiah seems intended to convey the same impression that is given by the narrative of 1 Samuel, that in some sense Samuel had come to be regarded as a second Moses, upon whom the mantle of the latter had fallen, and who had been once again the deliverer and guide of the people at a great national crisis.

1. Sources and Character of the History:

The narrative of the events of the life of Samuel appears to be derived from more than one source (see SAMUEL, BOOKS OF). The narrator had before him and made use of biographies and traditions, which he combined into a single consecutive history. The completed picture of the prophet’s position and character which is thus presented is on the whole harmonious and consistent, and gives a very high impression of his piety and loyalty to Yahweh, and of the wide influence for good which he exerted. There are divergences apparent in detail and standpoint between the sources or traditions, some of which may probably be due merely to misunderstanding of the true nature of the events recorded, or to the failure of the modern reader rightly to appreciate the exact circumstances and time. The greater part of the narrative of the life of Samuel, however, appears to have a single origin.

2. Life:

In the portion of the general history of Israel contained in 1 Samuel are narrated the circumstances of the future prophet’s birth (chapter 1); of his childhood and of the custom of his parents to make annual visits to the sanctuary at Shiloh (2:11,18-21,26); of his vision, and the universal recognition of him as a prophet enjoying the special favor of Yahweh (3-4:1). The narrative is then interrupted to describe the conflicts with the Philistines, the fate of Eli and his sons, and the capture of the ark of God. It is only after the return of the ark, and apparently at the close of the 20 years during which it was retained at Kiriath-jearim, that Samuel again comes forward publicly, exhorting the people to repentance and promising them deliverance from the Philistines. A summary narrative is then given of the summoning of a national council at Mizpah, at which Samuel "judged the children of Israel," and offered sacrifice to the Lord, and of Yahweh’s response in a great thunderstorm, which led to the defeat and panic-stricken flight of the Philistines. Then follows the narrative of the erection of a commemorative stone or pillar, Eben-ezer, "the stone of help," and the recovery of the Israelite cities which the Philistines had captured (7:5-14). The narrator adds that the Philistines came no more within the border of Israel all the days of

Samuel (7:13); perhaps with an intentional reference to the troubles and disasters of which this people was the cause in the time of Saul. A brief general statement is appended of Samuel's practice as a judge of going on annual circuit through the land, and of his home at Ramah (7:15-17).

No indication is given of the length of time occupied by these events. At their close, however, Samuel was an old man, and his sons who had been appointed judges in his place or to help him in his office proved themselves unworthy (1Sa 8:1-3). The elders of the people therefore came to Samuel demanding the appointment of a king who should be his successor, and should judge in his stead. The request was regarded by the prophet as an act of disloyalty to Yahweh, but his protest was overruled by divine direction, and at Samuel's bidding the people dispersed (1Sa 8:4-22).

At this point the course of the narrative is again interrupted to describe the family and origin of Saul, his personal appearance, and the search for the lost asses of his father (1Sa 9:1-5); his meeting with Samuel in a city in the land of Zuph, in or on the border of the territory of Benjamin (Zuph is the name of an ancestor of Elkanah, the father of Samuel, in 1Sa 1:1), a meeting of which Samuel had received divine pre-intimation (1Sa 9:15 f) ; the honorable place given to Saul at the feast; his anointing by Samuel as ruler of Israel, together with the announcement of three "signs," which should be to Saul assurances of the reality of his appointment and destiny; the spirit of prophecy which took possession of the future king, whereby is explained a proverbial saying which classed Saul among the prophets; and his silence with regard to what had passed between himself and Samuel on the subject of the kingdom (1Sa 9:6-10:16).

It is usually, and probably rightly, believed that the narrative of these last incidents is derived from a different source from that of the preceding chapters. Slight differences of inconsistency or disagreement lie on the surface. Samuel's home is not at Ramah, but a nameless city in the land of Zuph, where he is priest of the high place, with a local but, as far as the narrative goes, not a national influence or reputation; and it is anticipated that he will require the customary present at the hands of his visitors (1Sa 9:6-8). He is described, moreover, not as a judge, nor does he discharge judicial functions, but expressly as a "seer," a name said to be an earlier title equivalent to the later "prophet" (1Sa 9:9,11,19). Apart, however, from the apparently different position which Samuel occupies, the tone and style of the narrative is altogether distinct from that of the preceding chapters. It suggests, both in its form and in the religious conceptions which are assumed or implied, an older and less elaborated tradition than that which has found expression in the greater part of the book; and it seems to regard events as it were from a more primitive standpoint than the highly religious and monotheistic view of the later accounts. Its value as a witness to history is not impaired, but perhaps rather enhanced by its separate and independent position. The writer or compiler of 1 Samuel has inserted it as a whole in his completed narrative at the point which he judged most suitable. To the same source should possibly be assigned the announcement of Saul's rejection in 13:8-15a.

The course of the narrative is resumed at 1Sa 10:17 ff, where, in a second national assembly at Mizpah, Saul is selected by lot and accepted by the people as king (10:17-24); after which the people dispersed, and Saul returned to his home at Gibeah (10:25-27). At a solemn assembly at Gilgal, at which the kingship is again formally conferred upon Saul, Samuel delivered a farewell address to his fellow-

countrymen. A thunderstorm terrified the people; they were reassured, however, by Samuel with promises of the protection and favor of Yahweh, if they continued to fear and serve Him (11:14-12:25). Later the rejection of Saul for disobedience and presumption is announced by Samuel (13:8-15a). The commission to destroy Amalek is delivered to Saul by Samuel; and the rejection of the king is again pronounced because of his failure to carry out the command. Agag is then slain by Samuel with his own hand; and, the latter having returned to his home at Ramah, the narrator adds that he remained there in seclusion until the day of his death, "mourning" for Saul, but refusing to meet him again (1 Samuel 15). Finally the death and burial of Samuel at Ramah, together with the lamentation of the people for him, are briefly recorded in 1Sa 25:1, and referred to again in 28:3.

Two incidents of Samuel's life remain, in which he is brought into relation with the future king David. No indication of date or circumstance is given except that the first incident apparently follows immediately upon the second and final rejection of Saul as recorded in 1 Samuel 15. In 16:1-13 is narrated the commission of Samuel to anoint a successor to Saul, and his fulfillment of the commission by the choice of David the son of Jesse, the Bethlehemite. And, in a later chapter (19:18-24), a second occasion is named on which the compelling spirit of prophecy came upon Saul, and again the proverbial saying, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" is quoted (19:24; compare 10:11,12), and is apparently regarded as taking its origin from this event.

The anointing of David by Samuel is a natural sequel to his anointing of Saul, when the latter has been rejected and his authority and rights as king have ceased. There is nothing to determine absolutely whether the narrative is derived from the same source as the greater part of the preceding history. Slight differences of style and the apparent presuppositions of the writer have led most scholars to the conclusion that it has a distinct and separate origin. If so, the compiler of the Books of Samuel drew upon a third source for his narrative of the life of the seer, a source which there is no reason to regard as other than equally authentic and reliable. With the second incident related in 1Sa 19:18-24, the case is different. It is hardly probable that so striking a proverb was suggested and passed into currency independently on two distinct occasions. It seems evident that here two independent sources or authorities were used, which gave hardly reconcilable accounts of the origin of a well-known saying, in one of which it has been mistakenly attributed to a similar but not identical occurrence in the life of Saul. In the final composition of the book both accounts were then inserted, without notice being taken of the inconsistency which was apparent between them.

Yet later in the history Samuel is represented as appearing to Saul in a vision at Endor on the eve of his death (1Sa 28:11-20). The witch also sees the prophet and is stricken with fear. He is described as in appearance an old man "covered with a robe" (1Sa 28:14). In characteristically grave and measured tones he repeats the sentence of death against the king for his disobedience to Yahweh, and announces its execution on the morrow; Saul's sons also will die with him (1Sa 28:19), and the whole nation will be involved in the penalty and suffering, as they all had a part in the sin.

The high place which Samuel occupies in the thought of the writers and in the tradition and esteem of the people is manifest throughout the history. The different sources from which the narrative is derived are at one in this, although perhaps not to an equal degree. He is the last and greatest of the judges, the

first of the prophets, and inaugurates under divine direction the Israelite kingdom and the Davidic line.

3. Character and Influence of Samuel:

It is not without reason, therefore, that he has been regarded as in dignity and importance occupying the position of a second Moses in relation to the people. In his exhortations and warnings the Deuteronomic discourses of Moses are reflected and repeated. He delivers the nation from the hand of the Philistines, as Moses from Pharaoh and the Egyptians, and opens up for them a new national era of progress and order under the rule of the kings whom they have desired. Thus, like Moses, he closes the old order, and establishes the people with brighter prospects upon more assured foundations of national prosperity and greatness. In nobility of character and utterance also, and in fidelity to Yahweh, Samuel is not unworthy to be placed by the side of the older lawgiver. The record of his life is not marred by any act or word which would appear unworthy of his office or prerogative. And the few references to him in the later literature (Ps 99:6; Jer 15:1; 1Ch 6:28; 9:22; 11:3; 26:28; 29:29; 2Ch 35:18) show how high was the estimation in which his name and memory were held by his fellow-countrymen in subsequent ages.

LITERATURE.

The literature is given in the article, SAMUEL, BOOKS OF (which see).

A. S. Geden

SAMUEL, BOOKS OF

I. PLACE OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL IN THE HEBREW CANON

II. CONTENTS OF THE BOOKS AND PERIOD OF TIME COVERED BY THE HISTORY

III. SUMMARY AND ANALYSIS

1. Life of Samuel (1 Samuel 1-15)

2. Reign and Death of Saul (1 Samuel 16-2 Samuel 1)

3. Reign of David (2 Samuel 2-20)

(1) David’s Seven and a Half Years’ Reign over Judah in Hebron (2 Samuel 2:1-5:3).

(2) Reign of David in Jerusalem over United Israel (2 Samuel 5:4-20:26).

4. Appendix (2 Samuel 21-24)

IV. SOURCES OF THE HISTORY Two Main and Independent Sources

V. CHARACTER AND DATE OF THE SOURCES

VI. GREEK VERSIONS OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL

VII. ETHICAL AND RELIGIOUS TEACHING

LITERATURE

I. Place of the Books of Samuel in the Hebrew Canon.

In the Hebrew Canon and enumeration of the sacred books of the Old Testament, the two Books of Samuel were reckoned as one, and formed the third division of the Earlier Prophets (nebhi’im ri’shonim). The one book bore the title "Samuel" (shemu’el), not because Samuel was believed to be the author, but because his life and acts formed the main theme of the book, or at least of its earlier part. Nor was the Book of Samuel separated by any real division in subject-matter or continuity of style from the Book of Kings, which in the original formed a single book, not two as in the English and other modern versions. The history was carried forward without interruption; and the record of the life of David, begun in Samuel, was completed in Kings. This continuity in the narrative of Israelite history was made more prominent in the Septuagint, where the four books were comprised under one title and were known as the four "Books of the Kingdoms" (bibloi basileion). This name was probably due to the translators or scholars of Alexandria. The division into four books, but not the Greek title, was then adopted in the Latin translation, where, however, the influence of Jerome secured the restoration of the Hebrew names, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings (Regum). Jerome’s example was universally followed, and the fourfold division with the Hebrew titles found a place in all subsequent versions of the Old Testament Scriptures. Ultimately, the distinction of Samuel and Kings each into two books was received also into printed editions of the Hebrew Bible. This was done for the first time in the editio princeps of the Rabbinic Bible, printed at Venice in 1516-17 AD.

II. Contents of the Books and Period of Time Covered by the History.

The narrative of the two Books of Samuel covers a period of about a hundred years, from the close of the unsettled era of the Judges to the establishment and consolidation of the kingdom under David. It is therefore a record of the changes, national and constitutional, which accompanied this growth and development of the national life, at the close of which the Israelites found themselves a united people under the rule of a king to whom all owed allegiance, controlled and guided by more or less definitely established institutions and laws. This may be described as the general purpose and main theme of the books, to trace the advance of the people under divine guidance to a state of settled prosperity and union in the promised land, and to give prominence to theocratic rule which was the essential condition of Israel’s life as the people of God under all the changing forms of early government. The narrative

therefore centers itself around the lives of the three men, Samuel, Saul and David, who were chiefly instrumental in the establishment of the monarchy, and to whom it was due more than to any others that Israel emerged from the depressed and disunited state in which the tribes had remained during the period of the rule of the Judges, and came into possession of a combined and effective national life. If the formal separation therefore into two books be disregarded, the history of Israel as it is narrated in "Samuel" is most naturally divided into three parts, which are followed by an appendix recording words and incidents which for some reason had not found a place in the general narrative:

A. The life and rule of Samuel (1Sa 1-15) (death 1Sa 25:1).

B. The life, reign and death of Saul (1Sa 16-2Sa 1).

C. The reign and acts of David to the suppression of the two rebellions of Absalom and Sheba (2Sa 2-20).

D. Appendix; other incidents in the reign of David, the names of his chief warriors and his So or Psalm of Praise (2Sa 21-24).

III. Summary and Analysis.

To present a brief and clear analysis of these Books of Samuel is not altogether easy. For as in the Pentateuch and the earlier historical Books of Joshua and Judges, repetitions and apparently duplicate accounts of the same event are found, which interfere with the chronological development of the narrative. Even the main divisions, as stated above, to a certain extent overlap.

1. Life of Samuel (1 Samuel 1-15):

(1) Visit of Hannah to Shiloh, and promise of the birth of a son (1Sa 1:1-19); birth and weaning of Samuel, and presentation to Eli at Shiloh (1Sa 1:19-28). (2) Hannah’s song or prayer (1Sa 2:1-10); ministry of Samuel to Eli the priest (1Sa 2:11,18-21,26); the evil practices of the sons of Eli and warning to Eli of the consequences to his house (1Sa 2:12-17,22-25,27-36).

(3) Samuel’s vision at the sanctuary and his induction to the prophetic office (1Sa 3:1-4:1).

(4) Defeat of the Israelites by the Philistines, capture of the ark of God, death of the two sons of Eli and of Eli himself (1Sa 4).

(5) Discomfiture of Dagon before the ark of God at Ashdod; return of the ark to Beth-shemesh, with expiatory offerings of golden tumors and golden mice; its twenty years’ sojourn at Kiriath-jearim (1Sa 5:1-7:4).

(6) Assembly of Israel under Samuel at Mizpah, and victory over the Philistines (1Sa 7:5-14); Samuel

established as judge over all Israel (1Sa 7:15-17).

(7) Samuel's sons appointed to be judges and the consequent demand of the people for a king; Samuel's warning concerning the character of the king for whom they asked (1Sa 8).

(8) Saul's search for, the lost asses of his father and meeting with Samuel (1Sa 9).

(9) Saul is anointed by Samuel to be ruler over the people of Israel, and receives the gift of prophecy (1Sa 10:1-16); second assembly of the people under Samuel at Mizpah, and election of Saul to be king (1Sa 10:17-27).

(10) Victory of Saul over the Ammonites and deliverance of Jabesh-gilead (1Sa 11:1-13); Saul made king in Gilgal (1Sa 11:14,15).

(11) Samuel's address to the people in Gilgal, defending his own life and action, and exhorting them to fear and serve the Lord (1Sa 12).

(12) Saul at Gilgal offers the burnt offering in Samuel's absence; gathering of the Philistines to battie at Michmash; the Israelites' lack of weapons of iron (1Sa 13).

(13) Jonathan's surprise of the Philistine army, and their sudden panic (1Sa 14:1-23); Saul's vow, unwittingly broken by Jonathan, whom the people deliver from the fatal consequences (1Sa 14:24-45); victories of Saul over his enemies on every side (1Sa 14:46-52).

(14) War against Amalek, and Saul's disobedience to the divine command to exterminate the Amaleldtes (1Sa 15).

2. Reign and Death of Saul (1 Samuel 16-2 Samuel 1):

(1) Anointing of David as Saul's successor (1Sa 16:1-13); his summons to the court of Saul to act as minstrel before the king (1Sa 16:14-23).

(2) David and Goliath (1Sa 17).

(3) The love of David and Jonathan (1Sa 18:1-4); the former's advancement and fame, the jealousy of Saul, and his attempt to kill David (1Sa 18:5-16,29,30); David's marriage to the daughter of Saul (1Sa 18:17-28).

(4) Saul's renewed jealousy of David and second attempt to kill him (1Sa 19:1-17); David's escape to Ramah, whither the king followed (1Sa 19:18-24).

(5) Jonathan’s warning to David of his father’s resolve and their parting (1Sa 20).

(6) David at Nob (1Sa 21:1-9); and with Achish of Gath (1Sa 21:10-15).

(7) David’s band of outlaws at Adullam (1Sa 22:1,2); his provision for the safety of his father and mother in Moab (1Sa 22:3-5); vengeance of Saul on those who had helped David (1Sa 22:6-23).

(8) Repeated attempts of Saul to take David (1Sa 23; 24).

(9) Death of Samuel (1Sa 25:1); Abigail becomes David’s wife, after the death of her husband Nabal (1Sa 25:2-44).

(10) Saul’s further pursuit of David (1Sa 26).

(11) David’s sojourn with Achish of Gath (1Sa 27:1-28:2; 29$); Saul and the witch of Endor (1Sa 28:3-25).

(12) David’s pursuit of the Amalekites who had raided Ziklag, and victory (1Sa 30).

(13) Battle between the Philistines and Israel in Mt. Gilboa and death of Saul (1Sa 31).

(14) News of Saul’s death brought to David at Ziklag (2Sa 1:1-16); David’s lamentation over Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:17-27).

3. Reign of David (2 Samuel 2-20):

(1) David’s Seven and a Half Years’ Reign over Judah in Hebron (2 Samuel 2:1-5:3).

(a) Consecration of David as king in Hebron (2Sa 2:1-4 a); message to the men of Jabesh-gilead (2Sa 2:4-7); Ish-bosheth made king over Northern Israel (2Sa 2:8-11); defeat of Abner and death of Asahel (2Sa 2:12-32).

(b) Increase of the fame and prosperity of David, and the names of his sons (2Sa 3:1-5); Abner’s submission to David, and treacherous murder of the former by Joab (2Sa 3:6-39).

(c) Murder of Ish-bosheth and David’s vengeance upon his murderers (2Sa 4:1-3,5-12); notice of the escape of Mephibosheth, when Saul and Jonathan were slain at Jezreel (2Sa 4:4).

(d) David accepted as king over all Israel (2Sa 5:1-3).

(2) Reign of David in Jerusalem over United Israel (2 Samuel 5:4-20:26).

(a) Taking of Jerusalem and victories over the Philistines (2Sa 5:4-25).

(b) Return of the ark to the city of David (2Sa 6).

(c) David's purpose to build a temple for the Lord (2Sa 7:1-3); the divine answer by the prophet Nathan, and the king's prayer (2Sa 7:4-29).

(d) Victories over the Philistines, Syrians, and other peoples (2Sa 8).

(e) David's reception of Mephibosheth (2Sa 9).

(f) Defeat of the Ammonites and Syrians by the men of Israel under the command of Joab (2Sa 10:1-11:1).

(g) David and Uriah, the latter's death in battle, and David's marriage with Bath-sheba (2Sa 11:2-27).

(h) Nathan's parable and David's conviction of sin (2Sa 12:1-15); the king's grief and intercession for his sick son (2Sa 12:15-25); siege and capture of Rabbah, the Ammonite capital (2Sa 12:26-31).

(i) Amnon and Tamar (2Sa 13:1-22); Absalom's revenge and murder of Amnon (2Sa 13:23-36); flight of Absalom (2Sa 13:37-39).

(j) Return of Absalom to Jerusalem (2Sa 14:1-24); his beauty, and reconciliation with the king (2Sa 14:25-33).

(k) Absalom's method of ingratiating himself with the people (2Sa 15:1-6); his revolt and the flight of the king from Jerusalem (2Sa 15:7-31); meeting with Hushai (2Sa 15:32-37); Absalom in Jerusalem (2Sa 15:37).

(l) David's' meeting with Ziba (2Sa 16:1-4), and Shimei (2Sa 16:5-14); counsel of Ahitophel and Hushai (2Sa 16:15-17:14); the news carried to David (2Sa 17:15-22); death of Ahitophel (2Sa 17:23).

(m) David at Mahanaim (2Sa 17:24-29).

(n) The revolt subdued, death of Absalom, and reception by David of the tidings (2Sa 18:1-19:8).

(o) Return of the king to Jerusalem, and meetings with Shimei, Mephibosheth, and Barzillai the Gileadite (2Sa 19:8-43).

(p) Revolt of Sheba the Benjamite, and its suppression by Joab with the death of Amasa (2Sa 20:1,2,4-

22); the king’s treatment of the concubines left at Jerusalem (2Sa 20:3); the names of his officers (2Sa 20:23-26).

4. Appendix (2 Samuel 21-24):

(1) Seven male descendants of Saul put to death at the instance of the Gibeonites (2Sa 21:1-14); incidents of wars with the Philistines (2Sa 21:15-22).

(2) David’s song of thanksgiving and praise (2Sa 22).

(3) The "last words" of David (2Sa 23:1-7); names and exploits of David’s "mighty men" (2Sa 23:8-39).

(4) The king’s numbering of the people, the resulting plague, and the dedication of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite (2Sa 24).

IV. Sources of the History.

The natural inference from the character and contents of the Books of Samuel, as thus reviewed, is that the writer has made use of authorities, "sources" or "documents," from which he has compiled a narrative of the events which it was his desire to place on record. The same characteristics are noticeable here which are found in parts of the Pentateuch and of the Books of Joshua and Judges, that in some instances duplicate or parallel accounts are given of one and the same event, which seems to be regarded from different points of view and is narrated in a style which is more or less divergent from that of the companion record. Examples of this so-called duplication are more frequent in the earlier parts of the books than in the later. There are presented, for instance, two accounts of Saul’s election as king, and an act of disobedience is twice followed, apparently quite independently, by the sentence of rejection. Independent also and hardly consistent narratives are given of David’s introduction to Saul (1Sa 16:14-23; 17:31 ff, 55); and the two accounts of the manner of the king’s death can be imperfectly reconciled only on the hypothesis that the young Amalekite told a false tale to David in order to magnify his own part in the matter. In these and other instances little or no attempt seems to be made to harmonize conflicting accounts, or to reconcile apparent discrepancies. In good faith the writer set down the records as he found them, making extracts or quotations from his authorities on the several events as they occurred, and thus building up his own history on the basis of the freest possible use of the materials and language of those who had preceded him. However alien such a method of composition may appear to modern thought and usage in the West, it is characteristic of all early oriental writing. It would be almost impossible to find in any eastern literature a work of any length or importance which was not thus silently indebted to its predecessors, had incorporated their utterances, and had itself in turn suffered interpolation at the hands of later editors and transcribers. Accordingly, early Hebrew historical literature also, while unique in its spirit, conformed in its methods to the practice of the age and country in which it was composed. It would have been strange if it had been otherwise.

Two Main and Independent Sources:

Apart from the appendix and minor additions, of which Hannah's song or psalm in 1 Samuel 2 is one, the main portion of the book is derived from two independent sources, which themselves in all probability formed part of a larger whole, a more or less consecutive history or histories of Israel. These sources may, however, have been, as others think, rather of a biographical nature, presenting and enforcing the teaching of the acts and experience of the great leaders and rulers of the nation. The parallelism and duplication of the narrative is perhaps most evident in the history of Saul. The broad lines of distinction between the two may be defined without much difficulty or uncertainty. The greater part of the first eight chapters of 1 Samuel is in all probability derived from the later of these two sources, to which is to be assigned more or less completely 1 Samuel 10-12:15; 17-19; 21-25; 28 and 2Sa 1-7. The earlier source has contributed 1Sa 9 with parts of 1 Samuel 10; 11; 13; 14; 16; 20 and considerable portions of 1 Samuel 22; 23; 26-27; 29-31; 2Sa 1 (in part); 2-6; 9-20. Some details have probably been derived from other sources, and additions made by the editor or editors. This general determination of sources rests upon a difference of standpoint and religious conception, and upon slighter varieties of style which are neither so pronounced nor so readily distinguished as in the books of the Pentateuch. It is reasonable also to bear in mind that a close and exact division or line of demarcation in every detail is not to be expected.

V. Character and Date of the Sources.

Attempts which have been made to determine the date of these two sources, or to identify them with one or other of the principal authorities from which the historical narratives of the Pentateuch are derived, have not been convincing. In the judgment of some, however, the later of the two sources should be regarded as a continuation of the narrative or document known as E, and the earlier be assigned to J. The style of the latter has much in common with the style of J, and is clear, vigorous and poetical; the religious conceptions also that are embodied and taught are of a simple and early type. The later writing has been supposed to give indications of the influence of the prophetic teaching of the 8th century. The indications, however, are not sufficiently decisive to enable a final judgment to be formed. If it is borne in mind that J and E represent rather schools of teaching and thought than individual writers, the characteristics of the two sources of the Books of Sam would not be out of harmony with the view that from these two schools respectively were derived the materials out of which the history was compiled. The "sources" would then, according to the usual view, belong to the 9th and 8th centuries before the Christian era; and to a period not more than a century or a century and a half later should be assigned the final compilation and completion of the book as it is contained in the Hebrew Canon of Scripture.

VI. Greek Versions of the Books of Samuel.

For an exact estimate and understanding of the history and text of the Books of Samuel count must further be taken of the Greek version or versions. In the Septuagint there is great divergence from the Hebrew Massoretic text, and it is probable that in the course of transmission the Greek has been exposed to corruption to a very considerable extent. At least two recensions of the Greek text are in existence, represented by the Vatican and Alexandrian manuscripts respectively, of which the latter is nearer to the Hebrew original, and has apparently been conformed to it at a later period with a view to removing

discrepancies; and this process has naturally impaired its value as a witness to the primary shape of the Greek text itself. There are therefore three existing types of the text of Samuel; the Massoretic Hebrew and Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus in the Greek. The original form of the Septuagint, if it could be recovered, would represent a text anterior to the Massoretic recension, differing from, but not necessarily superior to, the latter. For the restoration of the Greek text, the Old Latin, where it is available, affords valuable help. It is evident then that in any given instance the agreement of these three types or recensions of the text is the strongest possible witness to the originality and authenticity of a reading; but that the weight attaching to the testimony of A will not in general, on account of the history of its text, be equivalent to that of either of the other two.

VII. Ethical and Religious Teaching.

The religious teaching and thought of the two Books of Samuel it is not difficult to summarize. The books are in form a historical record of events; but they are at the same time and more particularly a history conceived with a definite purpose, and made to subserve a definite moral and religious aim. It is not a narrative of events solely, or the preservation of historical detail, that the writer has in view, but rather to elucidate and enforce from Israel’s experience the significance of the divine and moral government of the nation. The duty of king and people alike is to obey Yahweh, to render strict and willing deference to His commands, and on this path of obedience alone will national independence and prosperity be secured. With the strongest emphasis, and with uncompromising severity, sin even in the highest places is condemned; and an ideal of righteousness is set forth in language and with an earnestness which recalls the exhortations of Deuteronomy. Thus the same is true of the Books of Samuel as is manifest in the preceding books of the canonical Old Testament: they are composed with a didactic aim. The experience of the past is made to afford lessons of warning and encouragement for the present. To the writer or writers—the history of the development and upbuilding of the Israelite kingdom is pregnant with a deeper meaning than lies on the surface, and this meaning he endeavors to make plain to his readers through the record. The issues of the events and the events themselves are under the guidance and control of Yahweh, who always condemns and punishes wrong, but approves and rewards righteousness. Thus the narrative is history utilized to convey moral truth. And its value is to be estimated, not primarily as recording the great deeds of the past, but as conveying ethical teaching; that by means of the history with all its glamor and interest the people may be recalled to a sense of their high duty toward God, and be warned of the inevitable consequences of disobedience to Him.

LITERATURE.

Upon all points of introduction, criticism and interpretation, the commentaries afford abundant and satisfactory guidance. The principal English commentaries. are by H. P. Smith in ICC, Edinburgh, 1899, and S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1913; A. R. S. Kennedy, "Samuel," New Century Bible, New York, Frowde, 1905; in German by R. Budde, 1902, W. Nowack, 1902, A. Klostermann, 1887. See also the articles "Samuel" in HDB, Encyclopedia Biblica and Jewish Encyclopedia.

A. S. Geden

SANAAS

san’-a-as (Codex Alexandrinus and Fritzsche, Sanaas; Codex Vaticanus Sama; the King James Version, Annaas): The sons of Sanaas returned in large numbers with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:23) =" Senaah" in Ezr 2:35; Ne 7:38. The numbers vary in each case (Esdras, 3,330 or 3,301; Ezra, 3,630; Nehemiah, 3,930).

SANABASSAR; SANABASSARUS

san-a-bas’-ar, san-a-bas’-a-rus (in 1 Esdras 2:12,15), (in 1 Esdras 6:18,10; a name appearing in many variations, Codex Alexandrinus always reading Sanabassaros; Codex Vaticanus Sanamassaro, in 1 Esdras 2:12(11) (the Revised Version margin, Samanassar), Samanassarou, in 1 Esdras 2:15(14), but Sabanassaro, in 1 Esdras 6:18 (17) (Revised Version margin) and Sanabassaros, in 1 Esdras 6:20 (19)): He was "governor of Judea" under Cyrus, conveyed the holy vessels of the temple from Babylon to Jerusalem and "laid the foundations of the house of the Lord" for the first time since its destruction (1 Esdras 2:12,15; 6:18-20) =" SHESHBAZZAR (which see) the prince of Judah" (Ezr 1:8).

Some identify him with Zerubbabel as the King James Version margin in 1 Esdras 6:18: "Z., which is also Sanabassar the ruler." This view appears to be favored by the order of the words here, where, in case of two persons, one might expect "Sanabassar the ruler" to come first. Zerubbabel appears as "governor of Judea" also in 1 Esdras 6:27-29. Ezr 3:10 speaks of the foundation of the temple under Zerubbabel and 5:16 as under Sheshbazzar. There is further the analogy of 1 Esdras 5:40, where Nehemias and Attharias refer to the same person. Against this identification: Zerubbabel is not styled ruler or governor either in Nehemiah or Ezra, but in Hag 1:14; 2:2,21 he is pechah or governor of Judah; no explanation is given of the double name, as in the case of e.g. Daniel, Belteshazzar; the language of Ezr 5:14 f seems to refer to work commenced under a different person than Zerubbabel. Nor is there any reason against supposing a first return under Sheshbazzar (Sanabassar) and a foundation of the temple previous to the time of Zerubbabel—an undertaking into which the Jews did not enter heartily, perhaps because Sanabassar may have been a foreigner (though it is uncertain whether he was a Babylonian, a Persian, or a Jew). A later proposal is to identify Sanabassar with Shenazzar, the uncle of Zerubbabel in 1Ch 3:18. But either of these identifications must remain doubtful.

See SHENAZZAR; ZERUBBABEL.

S. Angus

SANASIB

san’-a-sib (Fritzsche, Sanasib, but Codex Vaticanus and Swete, Sanabeis; Codex Alexandrinus

Anaseib): Found only in 1 Esdras 5:24, where the sons of Jeddu, the son of Jesus, are a priestly family returning "among the sons of Sanasib." The name is not found in the parallel Ezr 2:36; Ne 7:39, and is perhaps preserved in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) "Eliasib."

SANBALLAT

san-bal'-at (canebhallaT; Greek and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Sanaballat; Peshitta, Samballat): Sanballat the Horonite was, if the appellation which follows his name indicates his origin, a Moabite of Horonaim, a city of Moab mentioned in Isa 15:5; Jer 48:2,5,34; Josephus, Ant, XIII, xxiii; XIV, ii. He is named along with Tobiah, the Ammonite slave (Ne 4:1), and Geshem the Arabian (Ne 6:1) as the leading opponent of the Jews at the time when Nehemiah undertook to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem (Ne 2:10; 4:1; 6:1). He was related by marriage to the son of Eliashib, the high priest at the time of the annulment of the mixed marriages forbidden by the Law (Ne 13:28).

Renewed interest has been awakened in Sanballat from the fact that he is mentioned in the papyri I and II of Sachau (Die aramaischen Papyrusurkunden aus Elephantine, Berlin, 1908, and in his later work, Aramaische Papyrus und Ostraka, Leipzig, 1911; compare Staerk's convenient edition in Lietzmanns Kleine Texte, Number 32, 1908) as having been the governor (pachath) of Samaria some time before the 17th year of Darius (Nothus), i.e. 408-407 BC, when Bagohi was governor of Judah. His two sons, Delaiah and Shelemiah, received a letter from Jedoniah and his companions the priests who were in Yeb (Elephantine) in Upper Egypt. This letter contained information concerning the state of affairs in the Jewish colony of Yeb, especially concerning the destruction of the temple or synagogue (agora) which had been erected at that place.

The address of this letter reads as follows: "To our lord Bagohi, the governor of Judea, his servants Jedoniah and his companions, the priests in the fortress of Yeb (Elephantine). May the God of Heaven inquire much at every time after the peace of our lord and put thee in favor before Darius the king," etc. The conclusion of the letter reads thus: "Now, thy servants, Jedoniah and his companions and the Jews, all citizens of Yeb, say thus: If it seems good to our lord, mayest thou think on the rebuilding of that temple (the agora which had been destroyed by the Egyptians). Since it has not been permitted us to rebuild it, do thou look on the receivers of thy benefactions and favors here in Egypt. Let a letter with regard to the rebuilding of the temple of the God Jaho in the fortress of Yeb, as it was formerly built, be sent from thee. In thy name will they offer the meal offerings, the incense, and the burnt offerings upon the altar of the God Jaho; and we shall always pray for thee, we and our wives and our children and all the Jews found here, until the temple has been rebuilt. And it will be to thee a meritorious work (tsedhaqah) in the sight of Jaho, the God of Heaven, greater than the meritorious work of a man who offers to him a burnt offering and a sacrifice of a value equal to the value of 1,000 talents of silver. And as to the gold (probably that which was sent by the Jews to Bagohi as a baksheesh) we have sent word and given knowledge. Also, we have in our name communicated in a letter all (these) matters unto Delaiah and Shelemiah, the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria. Also, from all that has been done to us, Arsham (the satrap of Egypt) has learned nothing.

The 20th of Marcheshvan in the 17th year of Darius the king." Sanballat is the Babylonian Sin-uballit, "may Sin give him life," a name occurring a number of times in the contract tablets from the time of Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, and Darius Hystaspis. (See Tallquist, Neubabylonisches Namenbuch, 183.)

R. Dick Wilson

SANCTIFICATION

sank-ti-fi-ka’-shun:

Etymology

I. THE FORMAL SENSE

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the New Testament

II. THE ETHICAL SENSE

1. Transformation of Formal to Ethical Idea

2. Our Relation to God as Personal: New Testament Idea

3. Sanctification as God’s Gift

4. Questions of Time and Method

5. An Element in All Christian Life

6. Follows from Fellowship with God

7. Is It Instantaneous and Entire?

8. Sanctification as Man’s Task

LITERATURE

Etymology:

The root is found in the Old Testament in the Hebrew verb qadhash, in the New Testament in the Greek verb hagoazo. The noun "sanctification" (hagiasmos) does not occur in the Old Testament and is found but 10 times in the New Testament, but the roots noted above appear in a group of important words which are of very frequent occurrence. These words are "holy," "hallow," "hallowed," "holiness," "consecrate," "saint," "sanctify," "sanctification." It must be borne in mind that these words are all translations of the same root, and that therefore no one of them can be treated adequately without reference to the others. All have undergone a certain development. Broadly stated, this has been from the formal, or ritual, to the ethical, and these different meanings must be carefully distinguished.

I. The Formal Sense.

By sanctification is ordinarily meant that hallowing of the Christian believer by which he is freed from sin and enabled to realize the will of God in his life. This is not, however, the first or common meaning in the Scriptures. To sanctify means commonly to make holy, that is, to separate from the world and consecrate to God.

1. In the Old Testament:

To understand this primary meaning we must go back to the word "holy" in the Old Testament. That is holy which belongs to Yahweh. There is nothing implied here as to moral character. It may refer to days and seasons, to places, to objects used for worship, or to persons. Exactly the same usage is shown with the word "sanctify." To sanctify anything is to declare it as belonging to God. "Sanctify unto me all the first-born .... it is mine" (Ex 13:2; compare Nu 3:13; 8:17). It applies thus to all that is connected with worship, to the Levites (Nu 3:12), the priests and the tent of meeting (Ex 29:44), the altar and all that touches it (Ex 29:36 f), and the offering (Ex 29:27; compare RAPC 2Ma 2:18; Ecclesiasticus 7:31). The feast and holy days are to be sanctified, that is, set apart from ordinary business as belonging to Yahweh (the Sabbath, Ne 13:19-22; a fast, Joe 1:14). So the nation as a whole is sanctified when Yahweh acknowledges it and receives it as His own, "a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Ex 19:5,6). A man may thus sanctify his house or his field (Le 27:14,16), but not the firstling of the flock, for this is already Yahweh’s (Le 27:26).

It is this formal usage without moral implication that explains such a passage as Ge 38:21. The word translated "prostitute" here is from the same root qadhash, meaning literally, , as elsewhere, the sanctified or consecrated one (qedheshah; see margin and compare De 23:18; 1Ki 14:24; Ho 4:14). It is the hierodule, the familiar figure of the old pagan temple, the sacred slave consecrated to the temple and the deity for immoral purposes. The practice is protested against in Israel (De 23:17 f), but the use of the term illustrates clearly the absence of anything essentially ethical in its primary meaning (compare also 2Ki 10:20, "And Jehu said, Sanctify a solemn assembly for Baal. And they proclaimed it"; compare Joe 1:14).

Very suggestive is the transitive use of the word in the phrase, "to sanctify Yahweh." To understand this we must note the use of the word "holy" as applied to Yahweh in the Old Testament. Its meaning is not

primarily ethical. Yahweh's holiness is His supremacy, His sovereignty, His glory, His essential being as God. To say the Holy One is simply to say God. Yahweh's holiness is seen in His might, His manifested glory; it is that before which peoples tremble, which makes the nations dread (Ex 15:11-18; compare 1Sa 6:20; Ps 68:35; 89:7; 99:2,3). Significant is the way in which "jealous" and "holy" are almost identified (Jos 24:19; Eze 38:23). It is God asserting His supremacy, His unique claim. To sanctify Yahweh, therefore, to make Him holy, is to assert or acknowledge or bring forth His being as God, His supreme power and glory, His sovereign claim. Ezekiel brings this out most clearly. Yahweh has been profaned in the eyes of the nations through Israel's defeat and captivity. True, it was because of Israel's sins, but the nations thought it was because of Yahweh's weakness. The ethical is not wanting in these passages. The people are to be separated from their sins and given a new heart (Eze 36:25,26,33). But the word "sanctify" is not used for this. It is applied to Yahweh, and it means the assertion of Yahweh's power in Israel's triumph and the conquest of her foes (Eze 20:41; 28:25; 36:23; 38:16; 39:27). The sanctification of Yahweh is thus the assertion of His being and power as God, just as the sanctification of a person or object is the assertion of Yahweh's right and claim in the same.

The story of the waters of Meribah illustrates the same meaning. Moses' failure to sanctify Yahweh is his failure to declare Yahweh's glory and power in the miracle of the waters (Nu 20:12,13; 27:14; De 32:51). The story of Nadab and Abihu points the same way. Here "I will be sanctified" is the same as "I will be glorified" (Le 10:1-3). Not essentially different is the usage in Isa 5:16: "Yahweh of hosts is exalted in justice, and God the Holy One is sanctified in righteousness." Holiness again is the exaltedhess of God, His supremacy, which is seen here in the judgment (justice, righteousness) meted out to the disobedient people (compare the recurrent refrain of Isa 5:25; 9:12,17,21; 10:4; see JUSTICE). Isa 8:13; 29:23 suggest the same idea by the way in which they relate "sanctify" to fear and awe. One New Testament passage brings us the same meaning (1Pe 3:15): "Sanctify in your hearts Christ as Lord," that is, exalt Him as supreme.

2. In the New Testament:

In a few New Testament passages the Old Testament ritual sense reappears, as when Jesus speaks of the temple sanctifying the gold, and the altar the gift (Mt 23:17,19; compare also Heb 9:13; 1Ti 4:5). The prevailing meaning is that which we found in the Old Testament. To sanctify is to consecrate or set apart. We may first take the few passages in the Fourth Gospel. As applied to Jesus in Joh 10:36; 17:19, sanctify cannot mean to make holy in the ethical sense. As the whole context shows, it means to consecrate for His mission in the world. The reference to the disciples, "that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth," has both meanings: that they may be set apart, (for Jesus sends them, as the Father sends Him), and that they may be made holy in truth.

This same meaning of consecration, or separation, appears when we study the word saint, which is the same as "sanctified one." Aside from its use in the Psalms, the word is found mainly in the New Testament. Outside the Gospels, where the term "disciples" is used, it is the common word to designate the followers of Jesus, occurring some 56 times. By "saint" is not meant the morally perfect, but the one who belongs to Christ, just as the sanctified priest or offering belonged to Yahweh. Thus Paul can salute the disciples at Corinth as saints and a little later rebuke them as carnal and babes, as those among whom

are jealousy and strife, who walk after the manner of men (1Co 1:2; 3:1-3). In the same way the phrase "the sanctified" or "those that are sanctified" is used to designate the believers. By "the inheritance among all them that are sanctified" is meant the heritage of the Christian believer (Ac 20:32; 26:18; compare 1Co 1:2; 6:11; Eph 1:18; Col 1:12). This is the meaning in Hebrews, which speaks of the believer as being sanctified by the blood of Christ. In 10:29 the writer speaks of one who has fallen away, who "hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing." Evidently it is not the inner and personal holiness of this apostate that is referred to, especially in view of the tense, but that he had been separated unto God by this sacrificial blood and had then counted the holy offering a common thing. The contrast is between sacred and common, not between moral perfection and sin (compare 10:10; 13:12). The formal meaning appears again in 1Co 7:12-14, where the unbelieving husband is said to be sanctified by the wife, and vice versa. It is not moral character that is meant here, but a certain separation from the profane and unclean and a certain relation to God. This is made plain by the reference to the children: "Else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." The formal sense is less certain in other instances where we have the thought of sanctification in or by the Holy Spirit or in Christ; as in Ro 15:16, "being sanctified by the Holy Spirit"; 1Co 1:2, to "them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus"; 1Pe 1:2, "in sanctification of the Spirit." Paul’s doctrine of the Spirit as the new life in us seems to enter in here, and yet the reference to 1 Corinthians suggests that the primary meaning is still that of setting apart, the relating to God.

II. The Ethical Sense.

We have been considering so far what has been called the formal meaning of the word; but the chief interest of Christian thought lies in the ethical idea, sanctification considered as the active deed or process by which the life is made holy.

1. Transformation of Formal to Ethical Idea:

Our first question is, How does the idea of belonging to God become the idea of transformation of life and character? The change is, indeed, nothing less than a part of the whole movement for which the entire Scriptures stand as a monument. The ethical is not wanting at the beginning, but the supremacy of the moral and spiritual over against the formal, the ritual, the ceremonial, the national, is the clear direction in which the movement as a whole tends. Now the pivot of this movement is the conception of God. As the thought of God grows more ethical, more spiritual, it molds and changes all other conceptions. Thus what it means to belong to God (holiness, sanctification) depends upon the nature of the God to whom man belongs. The hierodules of Corinth are women of shame because of the nature of the goddess to whose temple they belong. The prophets caught a vision of Yahweh, not jealous for His prerogative, not craving the honor of punctilious and proper ceremonial, but with a gracious love for His people and a passion for righteousness. Their great message is: This now is Yahweh; hear what it means to belong to such a God and to serve Him. "What unto me is the multitude of your sacrifices? .... Wash you, make you clean; .... seek justice, relieve the oppressed" (Isa 1:11,16,17). "When Israel was a child, then I loved him. .... I desire goodness, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than bunt-offerings" (Ho 11:1; 6:6).

In this way the formal idea that we have been considering becomes charged with moral meaning. To belong to God, to be His servant, His son, is no mere external matter. Jesus' teaching as to sonship is in point here. The word "sanctification" does not occur in the Synoptic Gospels at all, but "sonship" with the Jews expressed this same relation of belonging. For them it meant a certain obedience on the one hand, a privilege on the other. Jesus declares that belonging to God means likeness to Him, sonship is sharing His spirit of loving good will (Mt 5:43-48). Brother and sister for Jesus are those who do God's will (Mr 3:35). Paul takes up the same thought, but joins it definitely to the words "saint" and "sanctify." The religious means the ethical, those "that are sanctified" are "called to be saints" (1Co 1:2). The significant latter phrase is the same as in Ro 1:1, "Paul .... called to be an apostle." In this light we read Eph 4:1, "Walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called." Compare 1Th 2:12; Php 1:27. And the end of this calling is that we are "foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son" (Ro 8:29). We must not limit ourselves to the words "saint" or "sanctify" to get this teaching with Paul. It is his constant and compelling moral appeal: You belong to Christ; live with Him, live unto Him (Col 3:1-4; 1Th 5:10). It is no formal belonging, no external surrender. It is the yielding of the life in its passions and purposes, in its deepest affections and highest powers, to be ruled by a new spirit (Eph 4:13,10,23,24,32; compare Ro 12:1).

2. Our Relation to God as Personal: New Testament Idea:

But we do not get the full meaning of this thought of sanctification as consecration, or belonging, until we grasp the New Testament thought of our relation to God as personal. The danger has always been that this consecration should be thought of in a negative or passive way. Now the Christian's surrender is not to an outer authority but to an inner, living fellowship. The sanctified life is thus a life of personal fellowship lived out with the Father in the spirit of Christ in loving trust and obedient service. This positive and vital meaning of sanctification dominates Paul's thought. He speaks of living unto God, of living to the Lord, and most expressively of all, of being alive unto Golf (Ro 14:8; compare Ro 6:13; Ga 2:19). So completely is his life filled by this fellowship that he can say, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Ga 2:20). But there is no quietism here. It is a very rich and active life, this life of fellowship to which we are surrendered. It is a life of sonship in trust and love, with the spirit that enables us to say "Abba, Father" (Ro 8:15; Ga 4:6). It is a life of unconquerable kindness and good will (Mt 5:43-48). It is a life of "faith working through love" (Ga 5:6), it is having the mind of Christ (Php 2:5). The sanctified life, then, is the life so fully surrendered to fellowship with Christ day by day that inner spirit and outward expression are ruled by His spirit.

3. Sanctification as God's Gift:

We come now to that aspect which is central for Christian interest, sanctification as the making holy of life, not by our act, but by God's deed and by God's gift. If holiness represents the state of heart and life in conformity with God's will, then sanctification is the deed or process by which that state is wrought. And this deed we are to consider now as the work of God. Jesus prays that the Father may sanctify His disciples in truth (Joh 17:17). So Paul prays for the Thessalonians (1Th 5:23), and declares that Christ is to sanctify His church (compare Ro 6:22; 2Th 2:13; 2Ti 2:21; 1Pe 1:2). Here sanctification means to

make clean or holy in the ethical sense, though the idea of consecration is not necessarily lacking. But aside from special passages, we must take into account the whole New Testament teaching, according to which every part of the Christian life is the gift of God and wrought by His Spirit. "It is God that worketh in you both to will and to work" (Php 2:13; compare Ro 8:2-4,9,14,16-26; Ga 5:22 f). Significant is the use of the words "creature" ("creation," see margin) and "workmanship" with Paul (2Co 5:17; Ga 6:15; Eph 2:10; 4:24). The new life is God's second work of creation.

4. Questions of Time and Method:

When we ask, however, when and how this work is wrought, there is no such clear answer. What we have is on the one hand uncompromising ideal and demand, and on the other absolute confidence in God. By adding to these two the evident fact that the Christian believers seen in the New Testament are far from the attainment of such Christian perfection, some writers have assumed to have the foundation here for the doctrine that the state of complete holiness of life is a special experience in the Christian life wrought in a definite moment of time. It is well to realize that no New Testament passages give a specific answer to these questions of time and method, and that our conclusions must be drawn from the general teaching of the New Testament as to the Christian life.

5. An Element in All Christian Life:

First, it must be noted that in the New Testament view sanctification in the ethical sense is an essential element and inevitable result of all Christian life and experience. Looked at from the religious point of view, it follows from the doctrine of regeneration. Regeneration is the implanting of a new life in man. So far as that is a new life from God it is ipso facto holy. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit teaches the same (see HOLY SPIRIT). There is no Christian life from the very beginning that is not the work of the Spirit. "No man can (even) say, Jesus is Lord, but in the .... Spirit" (1Co 12:3). But this Spirit is the Holy Spirit, whether with Paul we say Spirit of Christ or Spirit of God (Ro 8:9). His presence, therefore, in so far forth means holiness of life. From the ethical standpoint the same thing is constantly declared. Jesus builds here upon the prophets: no religion without righteousness; clean hands, pure hearts, deeds of mercy are not mere conditions of worship, but joined to humble hearts are themselves the worship that God desires (Am 5:21-25; Mic 6:6-8). Jesus deepened the conception, but did not, change it, and Paul was true to this succession. "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, ... the spirit is life because of righteousness" (Ro 8:9,10). There is nothing in Paul's teaching to suggest that sanctification is the special event of a unique experience, or that there are two kinds or qualities of sanctification. All Christian living meant for him clean, pure, right living, and that was sanctification. The simple, practical way in which he attacks the bane of sexual impurity in his pagan congregations shows this. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye abstain from fornication; that each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honor. For God called us not for uncleanness, but in sanctification" (1Th 4:3,4,7). The strength of Paul's teaching, indeed, lies here in this combination of moral earnestness with absolute dependence upon God.

6. Follows from Fellowship with God:

The second general conclusion that we draw from the New Testament teaching as to the Christian life is this: the sanctification which is a part of all Christian living follows from the very nature of that life as fellowship with God. Fundamental here is the fact that the Christian life is personal, that nothing belongs in it which cannot be stated in personal terms. It is a life with God in which He graciously gives Himself to us, and which we live out with Him and with our brothers in the spirit of Christ, which is His Spirit. The two great facts as to this fellowship are, that it is God's gift, and that its fruit is holiness. First, it is God's gift. What God gives us is nothing less than Himself. The gift is not primarily forgiveness, nor victory over sin, nor peace of soul, nor hope of heaven. It is fellowship with Him, which includes all of these and without which none of these can be. Secondly, the fruit of this fellowship is holiness. The real hallowing of our life can come in no other way. For Christian holiness is personal, not something formal or ritual, and its source and power can be nothing lower than the personal. Such is the fellowship into which God graciously lifts the believer. Whatever its mystical aspects, that fellowship is not magical or sacramental. It is ethical through and through. Its condition on our side is ethical. For Christian faith is the moral surrender of our life to Him in whom truth and right come to us with authority to command. The meaning of that surrender is ethical; it is opening the life to definite moral realities and powers, to love, meekness, gentleness, humility, reverence, purity, the passion for righteousness, to that which words cannot analyze but which we know as the Spirit of Christ. Such a fellowship is the supreme moral force for the molding of life. An intimate human fellowship is an analogue of this, and we know with what power it works on life and character. It cannot, however, set forth either the intimacy or the power of this supreme and final relation where our Friend is not another but is our real self. So much we know: this fellowship means a new spirit in us, a renewed and daily renewing life.

It is noteworthy that Paul has no hard-and-fast forms for this life. The reality was too rich and great, and his example should teach us caution in the insistence upon theological forms which may serve to compress the truth instead of expressing it. Here are some of his expressions for this life in us: to "have the mind of Christ" (1Co 2:16; Php 2:5), "the Spirit of Christ" (Ro 8:9), "Christ is in you" (Ro 8:10), "the spirit which is from God" (1Co 2:12), "the Spirit of God" (1Co 3:16), "the Holy Spirit" (1Co 6:19), "the Spirit of the Lord" (2Co 3:17), "the Lord the Spirit" (2Co 3:18). But in all this one fact stands out, this life is personal, a new spirit in us, and that spirit is one that we have in personal fellowship with God; it is His Spirit. Especially significant is the way in which Paul relates this new life to Christ. We have already noted that Paul uses indifferently "Spirit of God" and "Spirit of Christ," and that in the same passage (Ro 8:9). Paul's great contribution to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit lies here. As he states it in 2Co 3:17: "Now the Lord is the Spirit." With that the whole conception of the Spirit gains moral content and personal character. The Spirit is personal, not some thing, nor some strange and magical power. The Spirit is ethical; there is a definite moral quality which is expressed when we say Christ. He has the Spirit who has the qualities of Christ. Thus the presence of the Spirit is not evidenced in the unusual, the miraculous, the ecstatic utterance of the enthusiast, or some strange deed of power, but in the workaday qualities of kindness, goodness, love, loyalty, patience, self-restraint (Ga 5:22 f). With this identification of the Spirit and the Christ in mind, we can better understand the passages in which Paul brings out the relation of Christ to the sanctification of the believer. He is the goal (Ro 8:29). We are to grow up in Him (Eph 4:15). He is to be formed in us (Ga 4:19). We are to behold Him and be changed into His image (2Co 3:17 f). This deepens into Paul's thought of the mystical relation with Christ. The Christian dies to sin with Him that he may live with Him a new life. Christ is now his real life. He dwells in

Christ, Christ dwells in him. He has Christ's thoughts, His mind. See Ro 6:3-11; 8:9,10; 1Co 2:16; 15:22; Ga 2:20.

This vital and positive conception of the sanctification of the believer must be asserted against some popular interpretations. The symbols of fire and water, as suggesting cleansing, have sometimes been made the basis for a whole superstructure of doctrine. (For the former, note Isa 6:6 f; Lu 3:16; Ac 2:3; for the latter, Ac 2:38; 22:16; 1Co 6:11; Eph 5:26; Tit 3:5; Heb 10:22; Re 1:5; 7:14.) There is a two-fold danger here, from which these writers have not escaped. The symbols suggest cleansing, and their over-emphasis has meant first a negative and narrow idea of sanctification as primarily separation from sin or defilement. This is a falling back to certain Old Testament levels. Secondly, these material symbols have been literalized, and the result has been a sort of mechanical or magical conception of the work of the Spirit. But the soul is not a substance for mechanical action, however sublimated. It is personal life that is to be hallowed, thought, affections, motives, desires, will, and only a personal agent through personal fellowship can work this end.

7. Is It Instantaneous and Entire?:

The clear recognition of the personal and vital character of sanctification will help us with another problem. If the holy life be God's requirement and at the same time His deed, why should not this sanctification be instantaneous and entire? And does not Paul imply this, not merely in his demands but in his prayer for the Thessalonians, that God may establish their hearts in holiness, that He may sanctify them wholly and preserve spirit and soul and body entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (1Th 3:13; 5:23)?

In answer to this we must first discriminate between the ideal and the empirical with Paul. Like John (1 Joh 1:6; 3:9), Paul insists that the life of Christ and the life of sin cannot go on together, and he knows no qualified obedience, no graduated standard. He brings the highest Christian demand to the poorest of his pagan converts. Nor have we any finer proof of his faith than this uncompromising idealism. On the other hand, how could he ask less than this? God cannot require less than the highest, but it is another question how the ideal is to be achieved. In the realm of the ideal it is always either .... or. In the realm of life there is another category. The question is not simply, Is this man sinner or saint? It is rather, What is he becoming? This matter of becoming is the really vital issue. Is this man turned the right way with all his power? Is his life wholly open to the divine fellowship? Not the degree of achievement, but the right attitude toward the ideal, is decisive. Paul does not stop to resolve paradoxes, but practically he reckons with this idea. Side by side with his prayer for the Thessalonians are his admonitions to growth and progress (1Th 3:12; 5:14). Neither the absolute demand or the promise of grace gives us the right to conclude how the consummation shall take place.

8. Sanctification as Man's Task:

That conclusion we can reach only as we go back again to the fundamental principle of the personal character of the Christian life and the relation thus given between the ethical and the religious. All

Christian life is gift and task alike. "Work out your own salvation .... for it is God who worketh in you" (Php 2:12 f). All is from God; we can only live what God gives. But there is a converse to this: only as we live it out can God give to us the life. This appears in Paul's teaching as to sanctification. It is not only God's gift, but our task. "This is the will of God, even your sanctification" (1Th 4:3). "Having therefore these promises .... let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness (hagiosune) in the fear of God" (2Co 7:1). Significant is Paul's use of the word "walk." We are to "walk in newness of life," "by (or in) the Spirit," "in love," and "in Christ Jesus the Lord" (Ro 6:4; Ga 5:16; Eph 5:2; Col 2:6). The gift in each case becomes the task, and indeed becomes real and effective only in this activity. It is only as we walk by the Spirit that this becomes powerful in overcoming the lusts of the flesh (Ga 5:16; compare Ga 5:25). But the ethical is the task that ends only with life. If God gives only as we live, then He cannot give all at once. Sanctification is then the matter of a life and not of a moment. The life may be consecrated in a moment, the right relation to God assumed and the man stand in saving fellowship with Him. The life is thus made holy in principle. But the real making holy is co-extensive with the whole life of man. It is nothing less than the constant in-forming of the life of the inner spirit and outer deed with the Spirit of Christ until we, "speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things into him, who is the head" (Eph 4:15). (Read also Ro 6; that the Christian is dead to sin is not some fixed static fact, but is true only as he refuses the lower and yields his members to a higher obedience. Note that in 1Co 5:7 Paul in the same verse declares "ye are unleavened," and then exhorts "Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump"; compare also 1Th 5:5-10.)

We may sum up as follows: The word "sanctify" is used with two broad meanings:

(1) The first is to devote, to consecrate to God, to recognize as holy, that is, as belonging to God. This is the regular Old Testament usage and is most common in the New Testament. The prophets showed that this belonging to Yahweh demanded righteousness. The New Testament deepens this into a whole-hearted surrender to the fellowship of God and to the rule of His Spirit.

(2) Though the word itself appears in but few passages with this sense, the New Testament is full of the thought of the making holy of the Christian's life by the Spirit of God in that fellowship into which God lifts us by His grace and in which He gives Himself to us. This sanctifying, or hallowing, is not mechanical or magical. It is wrought out by God's Spirit in a daily fellowship to which man gives himself in aspiration and trust and obedience, receiving with open heart, living out in obedient life. It is not negative, the mere separation from sin, but the progressive hallowing of a life that grows constantly in capacity, as in character, into the stature of full manhood as it is in Christ. And from this its very nature it is not momentary, but the deed and the privilege of a whole life.

See also HOLY SPIRIT and the following article.

LITERATURE.

The popular and special works are usually too undiscriminating and unhistorical to be of value for the Biblical study. An exception is Beet, Holiness Symbolic and Real. Full Biblical material in Cremer,

Biblical Theol. Lexicon, but treated from special points of view. See Systematic Theologies, Old Testament Theologies (compare especially Smend), and New Testament Theologies (compare especially Holtzmann).

Harris Franklin Rall

WESLEYAN DOCTRINE

1. Doctrine Stated

2. Objections Answered

3. Required for the Highest Success of the Preacher

4. Hymnology

5. Its Glorious Results

6. Wesley’s Personal Testimony

1. Doctrine Stated:

Christian perfection, through entire sanctification, by faith, here and now, was one of the doctrines by which John Wesley gave great offense to his clerical brethren in the Anglican church. From the beginning of his work in 1739, till 1760, he was formulating this doctrine. At the last date there suddenly arose a large number of witnesses among his followers. Many of these he questioned with Baconian skill, the result being a confirmation of his theories on various points.

In public address he used the terms "Christian Perfection," "Perfect Love," and "Holiness," as synonymous, though there are differences between them when examined critically. With Paul he taught that all regenerate persons are saints, i.e. holy ones, as the word "saint," from Latin sanctus, through the Norman-Fr, signifies (1Co 1:2; 2Co 1:1). His theory is that in the normal Christian the principle of holiness, beginning with the new birth, gradually expands and strengthens as the believer grows in grace and in the knowledge of the truth, till, by a final, all-surrendering act of faith in Christ, it reaches an instantaneous completion through the act of the Holy Spirit, the sanctifier: 2Co 7:1 "perfecting holiness," etc.; Eph 4:13, the King James Version "Till we all come .... unto a perfect man," etc. Thus sanctification is gradual, but entire sanctification is instantaneous (Ro 6:6, "our old man was crucified," etc., a sudden death; Ga 2:20, "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live"). In 1Th 5:23, the word "sanctify" is a Greek aorist tense, signifying an act and not a process, as also in Joh 17:19, "that they .... may be sanctified in truth," or truly. (See Meyer’s note.) Many Christians experience this change on their deathbeds. If death suddenly ends the life of a growing Christian before he is wholly sanctified, the Holy Spirit perfects the work. Wesley’s advice to the preachers of this evangelical perfection was to

draw and not to drive, and never to quote any threatenings of God’s word against God’s children. The declaration, "Without sanctification no man shall see the Lord" (Heb 12:14), does not apply to the saints, "the holy ones."

Wesley’s perfection of love is not perfection of degree, but of kind. Pure love is perfect love. The gradual growth toward perfect purity of love is beautifully expressed in Monod’s hymn,

"O the bitter shame and sorrow!"

The first response to the Saviour’s call is,

"All of self, and none of Thee."

But after a view of Christ on the cross. the answer is faintly,

"Some of self, and some of Thee."

Then, after a period of growing love, the cry is,

"Less of self, and more of Thee."

After another period, the final cry is,

"None of self, and all of Thee!"

an aspiration for pure love, without any selfishness.

The attainment of this grace is certified by the total cessation of all Servile fear (1 Joh 4:18). Wesley added to this the witness of the Spirit, for which his only proof-text is 1Co 2:12.

2. Objections Answered:

(1) Paul, in Php 3:12, declares that he is not "made perfect":

(a) in 3:15, he declares that he is perfect;

(b) "made perfect" is a term, borrowed from the ancient games, signifying a finished course. This is one of the meanings of teleioo, as seen also in Lu 13:32 margin, "The third day I end my course." Paul no more disclaims spiritual perfection in these words than does Christ before "the third day." Paul claims in Php 3:15, by the use of an adjective, that he is perfect. In 3:12 Paul claims that he is not perfect as a victor, because the race is not ended. In 3:15 he claims that he is perfect as a racer.

(2) Paul says (1Co 15:31), "I die daily." This does not refer to death to sin, as some say that it does, but to his daily danger of being killed for preaching Christ, as in Ro 8:36, "we are killed all the day long."

(3) 1 Joh 1:8: "If we say that we have no sin," etc.

(a) If this includes Christians, it contradicts John himself in the very next verse, and in 3:9, sin," "Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no and Joh 8:36, "If .... the Son shall make you free," etc., and in all those texts in the New Testament declaring sins forgiven.

(b) Bishop Westcott says that the expression, "to have sin," is distinguished from "to sin," as the sinful principle is distinguished from the sinful act in itself. It includes the idea of personal guilt. Westcott asserts that John refers to the Gnostics, who taught that moral evil exists only in matter, and never touches spirit, which is always holy; and, therefore, though guilty of all manner of vice, their spirits had no need of atonement, because they were untouched by sin, which existed only in their bodies, as it does in all matter. When told that this made the body of Christ sinful, they denied the reality of His body, saying that it was only a phantom. Hence, in the very first verse of this Epistle, John writes evidently against the Gnostic error, quoting three of the five senses to prove the reality of Chrtst's humanity. (By all means, see "The Epistles of John," Cambridge Bible for Schools, etc., 17-21.)

3. Required for the Highest Success of the Preacher:

The relation of this doctrine to the Methodist Episcopal church in the United States is seen in the following questions, which have been affirmatively answered in public by all its preachers on their admission to the Conferences: "Are you going on to perfection?"; "Do you expect to be made perfect in love in this life?"; "Are you earnestly striving after it?" The hymns of the Wesleys, still universally sung, are filled with this doctrine, in which occur such expressions as:

4. Hymnology:

"Take away our bent to sinning," ....

"Let us find that second rest," ....

"Make and keep me pure within," ....

"'Tis done! Thou dost this moment save,

With full salvation bless." ....

5. Its Glorious Results:

To the preaching of Christian perfection Wesley ascribed the success of his work in the conversion, religious training and intellectual education of the masses of Great Britain. It furnished him a multitude of consecrated workers, many of them lay preachers, who labored in nearly every hamlet, and who carried the gospel into all the British colonies, including America. It is declared by secular historians that this great evangelical movement, in which the doctrine of entire sanctification was so prominent, saved England from a disastrous revolution, like that which drenched France with the blood of its royal family and its nobility, in the last decade of the 18th century. It is certain that the great Christian and humanitarian work of William Booth, originally a Methodist, was inspired by this doctrine which he constantly preached. This enabled his followers in the early years of the Salvation Army to endure the persecutions which befell them at that time.

6. Wesley's Personal Testimony:

On March 6, 1760, Wesley enters in his Journal the following testimony of one Elizabeth Longmore: "'I felt my soul was all love. I was so stayed on God as I never felt before, and knew that I loved Him with all my heart. .... And the witness that God had saved me from all my sins grew clearer every hour. .... I have never since found my heart wander from God.' Now this is what I always did, and do now, mean by perfection. And this I believe many have attained, on the same evidence that I believe many are justified."

We have Wesley's only recorded testimony to his own justification in these words (May 24, 1738): "I felt my heart strangely warmed .... and an assurance was given me that He had taken away my sins," etc.

Daniel Steele

SANCTITY, LEGISLATION OF

sank'-ti-ti, lej-is-la'-shun.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5, (6).

SANCTUARY

sank'-tu-a-ri, sank'-tu-a-ri (miqdash, miqqedhash, qodhesh, "holy place"; hagion):

1. Nature of Article

2. The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis

The Three Stages

3. Difficulties of the Theory

(1) Slaughter Not Necessarily Sacrificial

(2) Sacrifice and Theophany

(3) Alleged Plurality of Sanctuaries

(4) The Altar of God’s House

(5) Local Altars in Deuteronomy

4. The Alternative View

(1) Lay Sacrifice

(2) Three Pilgrimage Festivals

5. The Elephantine Papyri

The Elephantine Temple

LITERATURE

1. Nature of Article:

The present article is designed to supplement the articles on ALTAR; HIGH PLACE; PENTATEUCH; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE, by giving an outline of certain rival views of the course of law and history as regards the place of worship. The subject has a special importance because it was made the turning-point of Wellhausen’s discussion of the development of Israel’s literature, history and religion. He himself writes: "I differ from Graf chiefly in this, that I always go back to the centralization of the cult, and deduce from it the particular divergences. My whole position is contained in my first chapter" (Prolegomena, 368). For the purposes of this discussion it is necessary to use the symbols J, E, D, H, and the Priestly Code (P), which are explained in the article PENTATEUCH.

It is said that there are three distinct stages of law and history.

2. The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis:

The Three Stages:

(1) In the first stage all slaughter of domestic animals for food purposes was sacrificial, and every layman could sacrifice locally at an altar of earth or unhewn stones. The law of JE is contained in Ex 20:24-26, providing for the making of an altar of earth or stones, and emphasis is laid on the words "in every place ("in all the place" is grammatically an equally possible rendering) where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee." This, it is claimed, permits a plurality of sanctuaries. Illustrations are provided by the history. The patriarchs move about the country freely and build altars at various places. Later sacrifices or altars are mentioned in connection with Jethro (Ex 18:12), Moses (Ex 17:15, etc.), Joshua (Jos 8:30), Gideon (Jud 6:26 etc.), Manoah (Jud 13:19), Samuel (1Sa 7:17, etc.), Elijah (1Ki 18:32), to take but a few instances. Perhaps the most instructive case is that of Saul after the battle of Michmash. Observing that the people were eating meat with blood, he caused a large stone to be rolled to him, and we are expressly told that this was the first altar that he built to the Lord (1Sa 14:35). While some of these examples might be accounted for by theophanies or other special circumstances, they are too numerous when taken together for such an explanation to suffice. In many instances they represent the conduct of the most authoritative and religious leaders of the age, e.g. Samuel, and it must be presumed that such men knew and acted upon the Law of their own day. Hence, the history and the Law of Ex 20 are in unison in permitting a multiplicity of sanctuaries. Wellhausen adds: "Altars as a rule are not built by the patriarchs according to their own private judgment wheresoever they please; on the contrary, a theophany calls attention to, or, at least afterward, confirms, the holiness of the place" (op. cit., 31).

(2) The second stage is presented by Deuteronomy in the Law and Josiah’s reformation in the history. Undoubtedly, De 12 permits local non-sacrificial slaughter for the purposes of food, and enjoins the destruction of heathen places of worship, insisting with great vehemence on the central sanctuary. The narrative of Josiah’s reformation in 2Ki 23 tallies with these principles.

(3) The third great body of law (the Priestly Code, P) does not deal with the question (save in one passage, Le 17). In Deuteronomy "the unity of the cult is commanded; in the Priestly Code it is presupposed. .... What follows from this forms the question before us. To my thinking, this: that the Priestly Code rests upon the result which is only the aim of Deuteronomy" (Prolegomena, 35). Accordingly, it is later than the latter book and dates from about the time of Ezra. As to Le 17:1-9, this belongs to H (the Law of Holiness, Le 17:1-26:46), an older collection of laws than the Priestly Code (P), and is taken up in the latter. Its intention was "to secure the exclusive legitimation of the one lawful place of sacrifice. .... Plainly the common man did not quite understand the newly drawn and previously quite unknown distinction between the religious and the profane act" (Prolegomena, 50). Accordingly, this legislator strove to meet the difficulty by the new enactment.

See CRITICISM (The Graf-Wellhausen Hypothesis).

3. Difficulties of the Theory:

(1) Slaughter Not Necessarily Sacrificial

The general substratum afforded by the documentary theory falls within the scope of the article PENTATEUCH. The present discussion is limited to the legal and historical outline traced above. The view that all slaughter of domestic animals was sacrificial till the time of Josiah is rebutted by the evidence of the early books. The following examples should be noted: in Ge 18:7 a calf is slain without any trace of a sacrifice, and in 27:9-14 (Jacob's substitute for venison) no altar or religious rite can fairly be postulated. In 1Sa 28:24 the slaughter is performed by a woman, so that here again sacrifice is out of the question. If Gideon performed a sacrifice when he "made ready a kid" (Jud 6:19) or when he killed an animal for the broth of which the narrative speaks, the animals in question must have been sacrificed twice over, once when they were killed and again when the food was consumed by flames. Special importance attaches to Ex 22:1 (Hebrew 21:37), for there the JE legislation itself speaks of slaughter by cattle thieves as a natural and probable occurrence, and it can surely not have regarded this as a sacrificial act. Other instances are to be found in Ge 43:16; 1Sa 25:11; 1Ki 19:21. In 1Sa 8:13 the word translated "cooks" means literally, "women slaughterers." All these instances are prior to the date assigned to Deuteronomy. With respect to Le 17:1-7 also, theory is unworkable. At any time in King Josiah's reign or after, it would have been utterly impossible to limit all slaughter of animals for the whole race wherever resident to one single spot. This part of theory therefore breaks down.

(2) Sacrifice and Theophany

The view that the altars were erected at places that were peculiarly holy, or at any rate were subsequently sanctified by a theophany, is also untenable. In the Patriarchal age we may refer to Ge 4:26, where the calling on God implies sacrifice but not theophanies, Abram at Beth-el (12:8) and Mamre (13:18), and Jacob's sacrifices (31:54; 33:20). Compare later Samuel's altar at Ramah, Adonijah's sacrifice at En-rogel (1Ki 1), Naaman's earth (2Ki 5), David's clan's sacrifice (1Sa 20:6,29). It is impossible to postulate theophanies for the sacrifices of every clan in the country, and it becomes necessary to translate Ex 20:24 "in all the place" (see supra 2, (1)) and to understand "the place" as the territory of Israel.

(3) Alleged Plurality of Sanctuaries

The hypothesis of a multiplicity of sanctuaries in JE and the history also leaves out of view many most important facts. The truth is that the word "sanctuary" is ambiguous and misleading. A plurality of altars of earth or stone is not a plurality of sanctuaries. The early legislation knows a "house of Yahweh" in addition to the primitive altars (Ex 23:19; 34:26; compare the parts of Jos 9:23,27 assigned to J). No eyewitness could mistake a house for an altar, or vice versa.

(4) The Altar of God's House

Moreover a curious little bit of evidence shows that the "house" had quite a different kind of altar. In 1Ki 1:50 f; 2:28 ff, we hear of the horns of the altar (compare Am 3:14). Neither earth nor unhewn stones (as required by the Law of Ex 20) could provide such horns, and the historical instances of the altars of the patriarchs, religious leaders, etc., to which reference has been made, show that they had no horns.

Accordingly, we are thrown back on the description of the great altar of burnt offering in Ex 27 and must assume that an altar of this type was to be found before the ark before Solomon built his Temple. Thus the altar of the House of God was quite different from the customary lay altar, and when we read of "mine altar" as a refuge in Ex 21:14, we must refer it to the former, as is shown by the passages just cited. In addition to the early legislation and the historical passages cited as recognizing a House of God with a horned altar, we see such a house in Shiloh where Eli and his sons of the house of Aaron (1Sa 2:27) ministered. Thus the data of both JE and the history show us a House of God with a horned altar side by side with the multiplicity of stone or earthen altars, but give us no hint of a plurality of legitimate houses or shrines or sanctuaries.

(5) Local Altars in Deuteronomy

Deuteronomy also recognizes a number of local altars in 16:21 (see ICC, at the place) and so does Later Deuteronomistic editors in Jos 8:30 ff. There is no place for any of these passages ia the Wellhausen theory; but again we find one house side by side with many lay altars.

4. The Alternative View:

(1) Lay Sacrifice

The alternative view seeks to account for the whole of the facts noted above. In bald outline it is as follows: In pre-Mosaic times customary sacrifices had been freely offered by laymen at altars of earth or stone which were not "sanctuaries," but places that could be used for the nonce and then abandoned. Slaughter, as shown by the instances cited, was not necessarily sacrificial. Moses did not forbid or discourage the custom he found. On the contrary, he regulated it in Ex 20:24-26; De 16:21 f to prevent possible abuses. But he also superimposed two other kinds of sacrifice—certain new offerings to be brought by individuals to the religious capital and the national offerings of Nu 28; 29 and other passages. If the Priestly Code (P) assumes the religious capital as axiomatic, the reason is that this portion of the Law consists of teaching entrusted to the priests, embracing the procedure to be followed in these two classes of offerings, and does not refer at all to the procedure at customary lay sacrifices, which was regulated by immemorial custom. Deuteronomy thunders not against the lay altars—which are never even mentioned in this connection—but against the Canaanite high places. Deuteronomy 12 contemplates only the new individual offerings. The permission of lay slaughter for food was due to the fact that the infidelity of the Israelites in the wilderness (Le 17:5-7) had led to the universal prohibition of lay slaughter for the period of the wanderings only, though it appears to be continued by De for those who lived near the House of God (see De 12:21, limited to the case "if the place .... be too far from thee").

(2) Three Pilgrimage Festivals.

The JE legislation itself recognizes the three pilgrimage festivals of the House of God (Ex 34:22 f). One of these festivals is called "the feast of weeks, even of the bikkurim (a kind of first-fruits) of wheat

harvest," and as Ex 23:19 and 34:26 require these bikkurim to be brought to the House of God and not to a lay altar, it follows that the pilgrimages are as firmly established here as in Deuteronomy. Thus we find a House (with a horned altar) served by priests and lay altars of earth or stone side by side in law and history till the exile swept them all away, and by breaking the continuity of tradition and practice paved the way for a new and artificial interpretation of the Law that was far removed from the intent of the lawgiver.

5. The Elephantine Papyri:

The Elephantine Temple.

Papyri have recently been found at Elephantine which show us a Jewish community in Egypt which in 405 BC possessed a local temple. On the Wellhausen hypothesis it is usual to assume that the Priestly Code (P) and Deuteronomy were still unknown and not recognized as authoritative in this community at that date, although the Deuteronomic law of the central sanctuary goes back at least to 621. It is difficult to understand how a law that had been recognized as divine by Jeremiah and others could still have been unknown or destitute of authority. On the alternative view this phenomenon will have been the result of an interpretation of the Law to suit the needs of an age some 800 years subsequent to the death of Moses in circumstances he never contemplated. The Pentateuch apparently permits sacrifice only in the land of Israel: in the altered circumstances the choice lay between interpreting the Law in this way or abandoning public worship altogether; for the synagogue with its non-sacrificial form of public worship had not yet been invented. All old legislations have to be construed in this way to meet changing circumstances, and this example contains nothing exceptional or surprising.

LITERATURE

J. Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, chapter i, for the critical hypothesis; H. M. Wiener, EPC, chapter vi, PS passim for the alternative view; POT, 173 ff.

Harold M. Wiener

SAND

(chol; ammos; a variant of the more usual psammos; compare amathos, psamathos): Sand is principally produced by the grinding action of waves. This is accompanied by chemical solution, with the result that the more soluble constituents of the rock diminish in amount or disappear and the sands tend to become more or less purely silicious, silica or quartz being a common constituent of rocks and very Insoluble. The rocks of Palestine are so largely composed of limestone that the shore and dune sands are unusually calcareous, containing from 10 to 20 per cent of calcium carbonate. This is subject to solution and redeposition as a cement between the sand grains, binding them together to form the porous sandstone of the seashore, which is easily worked and is much used in building.

See Rock, III, (2).

Figurative:

(1) Used most often as a symbol of countless multitude; especially of the children of Israel (Ge 22:17; 32:12; 2Sa 17:11; 1Ki 4:20; Isa 10:22; 48:19; Jer 33:22; Ho 1:10; Ro 9:27; Heb 11:12); also of the enemies of Israel (Jos 11:4; Jud 7:12; 1Sa 13:5; compare Re 20:8). Joseph laid up gram as the sand of the sea (Ge 41:49); God gave Solomon wisdom and understanding and largeness of heart as the sand that is on the seashore (1Ki 4:29); Job says "I shall multiply my days as the sand" (Job 29:18); the multitude of quails provided for the Israelites in the desert is compared to the sand (Ps 78:27); the Psalmist says of the thoughts of God, "They are more in number than the sand" (Ps 139:18); Jeremiah, speaking of the desolation of Jerusalem, says that the number of widows is as the sand (Jer 15:8).

(2) Sand is also a symbol of weight (Job 6:3; Pr 27:3), and

(3) of instability (Mt 7:26).

It is a question what is meant by "the hidden treasures of the sand" in De 33:19.

Alfred Ely Day

SAND FLIES

sand’-fliz (kinnim (Ex 8:16 margin; RAPC Wis 19:10 margin)): English Versions of the Bible "lice."

See FLEA; GNAT; INSECTS; LICE.

SAND, GLOWING

glo’-ing.

See MIRAGE.

SAND-LIZARD

sand’-liz-ard. (chomeT; Septuagint saura, "lizard"; the King James Version snail): ChomeT is 7th in the list of unclean "creeping things" in Le 11:29,30, and occurs nowhere else. It is probably a skink or some species of Lacerta.

See LIZARD

SANDAL

san’-dal.

See DRESS, sec. 6; SHOE; SHOE-LATCHET.

SANHEDRIN

san’-he-drin (canhedhrin, the Talmudic transcription of the Greek sunedrion):

1. Name:

The Sanhedrin was, at and before the time of Christ, the name for the highest Jewish tribunal, of 71 members, in Jerusalem, and also for the lower tribunals, of 23 members, of which Jerusalem had two (Tosephta’ Chaghighah] 11 9; Sanhedrin 1 6; 11 2). It is derived from sun, "together," and hedra, "seat." In Greek and Roman literature the senates of Sparta, Carthage, and even Rome, are so called (compare Pausan. iii.11, 2; Polyb. iii.22; Dion Cassius xl.49). In Josephus we meet with the word for the first time in connection with the governor Gabinius (57-55 BC), who divided the whole of Palestine into 5 sunedria (Ant., XIV, v, 4), or sunodoi (B J, I, viii, 5); and with the term sunedrion for the high council in Jerusalem first in Ant, XIV, ix, 3-5, in connection with Herod, who, when a youth, had to appear before the sunedrion at Jerusalem to answer for his doings in Galilee. But before that date the word appears in the Septuagint version of Proverbs (circa 130 BC), especially in 22:10; 31:23, as an equivalent for the Mishnaic beth-din =" judgment chamber."

In the New Testament the word sometimes, especially when used in the plural (Mt 10:17; Mr 13:9; compare Sanhedrin 1 5), means simply "court of justice," i.e. any judicatory (Mt 5:22). But in most cases it is used to designate the supreme Jewish Court of Justice in Jerusalem, in which the process against our Lord was carried on, and before which the apostles (especially Peter and John, Stephen, and Paul) had to justify themselves (Mt 26:59; Mr 14:55; 15:1; Lu 22:66; Joh 11:47; Ac 4:15; 5:21 ff; 6:12 ff; 22:30; 23:1 ff; 24:20). Sometimes presbuterion (Lu 22:66; Ac 22:5) and gerousia (Ac 5:21) are substituted for sunedrion.

See SENATE.

In the Jewish tradition-literature the term "Sanhedrin" alternates with kenishta’," meeting-place" (Meghillath Ta’-anith 10, compiled in the 1st century AD), and beth-din, "court of justice" (Sanhedrin 11 2,4). As, according to Jewish tradition, there were two kinds of sunedria, namely, the supreme sunedrion in Jerusalem of 71 members, and lesser sunedria of 23 members, which were appointed by the supreme one, we find often the term canhedhrin gedholah, "the great Sanhedrin," or beth-din ha-gadhol, "the great court of justice" (Middoth 5 4; Sanhedrin 1 6), or canhedhrin gedholah ha-yoshebheth be-lishekhath hagazith, "the great Sanhedrin which sits in the hall of hewn stone."

2. Origin and History:

There is lack of positive historical information as to the origin of the Sanhedrin. According to Jewish tradition (compare Sanhedrin 16) it was constituted by Moses (Nu 11:16-24) and was reorganized by Ezra immediately after the return from exile (compare the Targum to So 6:1). But there is no historical evidence to show that previous to the Greek period there existed an organized aristocratic governing tribunal among the Jews. Its beginning is to be placed at the period in which Asia was convulsed by Alexander the Great and his successors.

The Hellenistic kings conceded a great amount of internal freedom to municipal communities, and Palestine was then practically under home rule, and was governed by an aristocratic council of Elders (1 Macc 12:6; 2 Macc 1:10; 4:44; 11:27; 3 Macc 1:8; compare Josephus, Ant, XII, iii, 4; XIII, v, 8; Meghillath Ta‘anith 10), the head of which was the hereditary high priest. The court was called Gerousia, which in Greek always signifies an aristocratic body (see Westermann in Pauly’s RE, III, 49). Subsequently this developed into the Sanhedrin.

During the Roman period (except for about 10 years at the time of Gabinius, who applied to Judea the Roman system of government; compare Marquardt, Romische Staatsverwaltung, I, 501), the Sanhedrin’s influence was most powerful, the internal government of the country being practically in its hands (Ant., XX, x), and it was religiously recognized even among the Diaspora (compare Ac 9:2; 22:5; 26:12). According to Schurer (HJP, div II, volume 1, 171; GJV4, 236) the civil authority of the Sanhedrin, from the time of Archelaus, Herod the Great’s son, was probably restricted to Judea proper, and for that reason, he thinks, it had no judicial authority over our Lord so long as He remained in Galilee (but see G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, I, 416).

The Sanhedrin was abolished after the destruction of Jerusalem (70 AD). The beth-din (court of judgment) in Jabneh (68-80), in Usah (80-116), in Shafran (140-63), in Sepphoris (163-93), in Tiberias (193-220), though regarded in the Talmud (compare Ro’sh ha-shanah 31a) as having been the direct continuation of the Sanhedrin, had an essentially different character; it was merely an assembly of scribes, whose decisions had only a theoretical importance (compare Sotah 9 11).

3. Constitution:

The Great Sanhedrin in Jerusalem was formed (Mt 26:3,17,59; Mr 14:53; 15:1; Lu 22:66; Ac 4:5 f; 5:21; 22:30) of high priests (i.e. the acting high priest, those who had been high priests, and members of the privileged families from which the high priests were taken), elders (tribal and family heads of the people and priesthood), and scribes (i.e. legal assessors), Pharisees and Sadducees alike (compare Ac 4:1 ff; 5:17,34; 23:6). In Mr 15:43; Lu 23:50, Joseph of Arimathea is called bouleutes, "councillor," i.e. member of the Sanhedrin.

According to Josephus and the New Testament, the acting high priest was as such always head and president (Mt 26:3,17; Ac 5:17 ff; 7:1; 9:1 f; 22:5; 23:2; 24:1; Ant, IV, viii, 17; XX, x). Caiaphas is

president at the trial of our Lord, and at Paul's trial Ananias is president. On the other hand, according to the Talmud (especially Haghighah 2 2), the Sanhedrin is represented as a juridical tribunal of scribes, in which one scribe acted as nasi'," prince," i.e. president, and another as 'abh-beth-din, father of the judgment-chamber, i.e. vice-president. So far, it has not been found possible to reconcile these conflicting descriptions (see "Literature," below).

Sanhedrin 4 3 mentions the cophere-ha-dayanim, "notaries," one of whom registered the reasons for acquittal, and the other the reasons for condemnation. In the New Testament we read of huperetai, "constables" (Mt 5:25) and of the "servants of the high priest" (Mt 26:51; Mr 14:47; Joh 18:10), whom Josephus describes as "enlisted from the rudest and most restless characters" (Ant., XX, viii, 8; ix, 2). Josephus speaks of the "public whip," Matthew mentions "tormentors" (18:34), Luke speaks of "spies" (20:20).

The whole history of post-exilic Judaism circles round the high priests, and the priestly aristocracy always played the leading part in the Sanhedrin (compare Sanhedrin 4 2). But the more the Pharisees grew in importance, the more were they represented in the Sanhedrin. In the time of Salome they were so powerful that "the queen ruled only in name, but the Pharisees in reality" (Ant., XIII, xvi, 2). So in the time of Christ, the Sanhedrin was formally led by the Sadducean high priests, but practically ruled by the Pharisees (Ant., XVIII, i, 4).

4. Jurisdiction:

In the time of Christ the Great Sanhedrin at Jerusalem enjoyed a very high measure of independence. It exercised not only civil jurisdiction, according to Jewish law, but also, in some degree, criminal. It had administrative authority and could order arrests by its own officers of justice (Mt 26:47; Mr 14:43; Ac 4:3; 5:17 f; 9:2; compare Sanhedrin 1 5). It was empowered to judge cases which did not involve capital punishment, which latter required the confirmation of the Roman procurator (Joh 18:31; compare the Jerusalem Sanhedrin 1 1; 7 2 (p. 24); Josephus, Ant, XX, ix, 1). But, as a rule, the procurator arranged his judgment in accordance with the demands of the Sanhedrin.

For one offense the Sanhedrin could put to death, on their own authority, even a Roman citizen, namely, in the case of a Gentile passing the fence which divided the inner court of the Temple from that of the Gentiles (BJ, VI, ii, 4; Middoth 11 3; compare Ac 21:28). The only case of capital punishment in connection with the Sanhedrin in the New Testament is that of our Lord. The stoning of Stephen (Ac 7:54) was probably the illegal act of an enraged multitude.

5. Place and Time of Meeting:

The Talmudic tradition names "the hall of hewn stone," which, according to Middoth 5 4, was on the south side of the great court, as the seat of the Great Sanhedrin (Pe'-ah 2 6; 'Edhuyoth 7 4, et al.). But the last sittings of the Sanhedrin were held in the city outside the Temple area (Sanhedrin 41a; Shabbath 15a; Ro'sh ha-shanah 31a; Abhodhah zarah 8c). Josephus also mentions the place where the bouleutai,

"the councilors," met as the boule, outside the Temple (BJ, V, iv, 2), and most probably he refers to these last sittings.

According to the Tosephta' Sanhedrin 7 1, the Sanhedrin held its sittings from the time of the offering of the daily morning sacrifice till that of the evening sacrifice. There were no sittings on Sabbaths or feast days.

6. Procedure:

The members of the Sanhedrin were arranged in a semicircle, so that they could see each other (Sanhedrin 4 3; Tosephta' 8 1). The two notaries stood before them, whose duty it was to record the votes (see 3, above). The prisoner had to appear in humble attitude and dressed it, mourning (Ant., XIV, ix, 4). A sentence of capital punishment could not be passed on the day of the trial. The decision of the judges had to be examined on the following day (Sanhedrin 4 1), except in the case of a person who misled the people, who could be tried and condemned the same day or in the night (Tosephta' Sanhedrin 10). Because of this, cases which involved capital punishment were not tried on a Friday or on any day before a feast. A herald preceded the condemned one as he was led to the place of execution, and cried out: "N. the son of N. has been found guilty of death, etc. If anyone knows anything to clear him, let him come forward and declare it" (Sanhedrin 6 1). Near the place of execution the condemned man was asked to confess his guilt in order that he might partake in the world to come (ibid.; compare Lu 23:41-43).

LITERATURE.

Our knowledge about the Sanhedrin is based on three sources: the New Testament, Josephus, and the Jewish tradition-literature (especially Mishna, Sanhedrin and Makkoth, best edition, Strack, with German translation, Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin, N. 38, Leipzig, 1910).

See the article, TALMUD.

Consult the following histories of the Jewish people: Ewald, Herzfeld, Gratz, but especially Schurer's excellent HJP, much more fully in GJV4; also G. A. Smith, Jerusalem. Special treatises on Sanhedrin: D. Hoffmann, Der oberste Gerichtsh of in der Stadt des Heiligtums, Berlin, 1878, where the author tries to defend the Jewish traditional view as to the antiquity of the Sanhedrin; J. Reifmann, Sanhedrin (in Hebrews), Berditschew, 1888; A. Kuenen, On the Composition of the Sanhedrin, in Dutch, translated into German by Budde, Gesammelte Abhandlungen, etc., 49-81, Freiburg, 1894; Jelski, Die innere Einrichtung des grossen Synedrions zu Jerusalem, Breslau, 1894, who tries to reconcile the Talmudical statements about the composition of the Sanhedrin with those of Josephus and the New Testament (especially in connection with the question of president) by showing that in the Mishna (except Chaghighah 11 2) nasi' always stands for the political president, the high priest, and 'abh-beth-din for the scribal head of the Sanhedrin, and not for the vice-president; A. Buchler, Das Synedrium in Jerusalem und das grosse Beth-din in der Quaderkammer des jerusalemischen Tempels, Vienna, 1902, a

very interesting but not convincing work, where the author, in order to reconcile the two different sets of sources, tries to prove that the great Sanhedrin of the Talmud is not identical with the Sanhedrin of Josephus and the New Testament, but that there were two Sanhedrins in Jerusalem, the one of the New Testament and Josephus being a political one, the other a religious one. He also thinks that Christ was seized, not by the Sanhedrin, but by the temple authorities.

See also W. Bacher's article in HDB (excellent for sifting the Talmudic sources); Dr. Lauterbach's article in the Jewish Encyclopedia (accepts fully Biichler's view); H. Strack's article in Sch-Herz (concise and exact).

Paul Levertoff

SANSANNAH

san-san'-a (cancannah; [Sansanna], or Sethennak): One of the uttermost cities in the Negeb of Judah (Jos 15:31), identical with Hazar-susah (Jos 19:5), one of the cities of Simeon, and almost certainly the same as Hazar-susim (1Ch 4:31). It cannot be said to have been identified with any certainty, though Simsim, "a good-sized village with well and pool, surrounded by gardens and having a grove of olives to the north," has been suggested (PEF, III, 260, Sh XX).

SAPH

saf (caph; Codex Vaticanus Saph; Codex Alexandrinus Sephe): A Philistine, one of the four champions of the race of Rapha ("giant") who was slain by Sibbecai, one of David's heroes (2Sa 21:18; 1Ch 20:4). It is supposed by some that he was the son of the giant Goliath, but this is not proved. In 1Ch 20:4, the same person is called "Sippai."

SAPHAT

sa'-fat:

(1) A and Fritzsche, Saphat; omitted in Codex Vaticanus (and Swete); Babylonian margin Asaph: The eponym of a family which returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:9) =" Shephatiah" in Ezr 2:4; Ne 7:9.

(2) Codex Alexandrinus Saphat; Codex Vaticanus, Swete, and Fritzsche, Saphag; the King James Version Sabat: One of the families of "the sons of the servants of Solomon" who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:34); wanting in the parallel Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59.

SAPHATIAS

saf-a-ti'-as (Saphatias, Codex Vaticanus Sophotias; omitted in Codex Alexandrinus): Name of a family

of returning exiles (1 Esdras 8:34) =" Shephatiah" in Ezr 8:8. If Saphatias (1 Esdras 8:34) = Saphat (1 Esdras 5:9), as would appear, then part of the family went up with Zerubbabel and part with Ezra.

SAPHETH

sa’-feth: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SAPHUTHI (which see).

SAPHIR

sa’-fer (shaphir).

See SHAPHIR.

SAPHUTHI

saf’-u-thi, sa-fu’-thi (Codex Alexandrinus and Fritzsche, Saphuthi, Codex Vaticanus (and Swete), Saphuei; the King James Version Sapheth): Name of one of the families of "the sons of the servants of Solomon" (1 Esdras 5:33) =" Shephatiah" in Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59.

SAPPHIRA

sa-fi’-ra (shappira’; Aramaic for either "beautiful" or "sapphire"; Sappheira): Wife of Ananias (Ac 5:1-10).

See ANANIAS, (1).

SAPPHIRE

saf’-ir.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

SARABIAS

sar-a-bi’-as (Sarabias) :One of the Levites who taught and expounded the Law for Ezra (1 Esdras 9:48) =" Sherebiah" in Ne 8:7, probably identical with the "Asebebias" in 1 Esdras 8:47 (Ezr 8:18).

SARAH; SARAI

sa’-ra, sa’-ri:

(1) In Ge 17:15 the woman who up to that time has been known as Sarai (Saray; Sara) receives by divine command the name Sarah (Sarah; Sarra). (This last form in Greek preserves the ancient doubling of the r, lost in the Hebrew and the English forms.)

The former name appears to be derived from the same root as Israel, if, indeed, Ge 32:28 is intended as an etymology of Israel. "She that strives," a contentious person, is a name that might be given to a child at birth (compare Ho 12:3,4, of Jacob), or later when the child’s character developed; in Ge 16:6 and 21:10 a contentious character appears. Yet comparison with the history of her husband’s name (see ABRAHAM) warns us not to operate solely upon the basis of the Hebrew language. Sarai was the name this woman brought with her from Mesopotamia. On the other hand there can be little doubt that the name Sarah, which she received when her son was promised, means "princess," for it is the feminine form of the extremely common title sar, used by the Semites to designate a ruler of greater or lesser rank. In the verse following the one where this name is conferred, it is declared of Sarah that "kings of peoples shall be of her" (Ge 17:16).

We are introduced to Sarai in Ge 11:29. She is here mentioned as the wife that Abraham "took," while still in Ur of the Chaldees, that is, while among his kindred. It is immediately added that "Sarai was barren; she had no child." By this simple remark in the overture of his narrative, the writer sounds the motif that is to be developed in all the sequel. When the migration to Haran occurs, Sarai is named along with Abram and Lot as accompanying Terah. It has been held that the author (or authors) of Genesis 11 knew nothing of the relationship announced in 20:12. But there can be no proof of such ignorance, even on the assumption of diversity of authorship in the two passages.

Sarai’s career as described in Genesis 11 was not dependent on her being the daughter of Terah. Terah had other descendants who did not accompany him. Her movements were determined by her being Abram’s wife. It appears, however, that she was a daughter of Terah by a different mother from the mother of Abram. The language of 20:12 would indeed admit of her being Abram’s niece, but the fact that there was but 10 years’ difference between his age and hers (Ge 17:17) renders this hypothesis less probable. Marriage with half-sisters seems to have been not uncommon in antiquity (even in the Old Testament compare 2Sa 13:13).

This double relationship suggested to Abraham the expedient that he twice used when he lacked faith in God to protect his life and in cowardice sought his own safety at the price of his wife’s honor. The first of these occasions was in the earlier period of their wanderings (Genesis 12). From Canaan they went down into Egypt. Sarai, though above 60 years of age according to the chronology of the sacred historian, made the impression on the Egyptians by her beauty that Abraham had anticipated, and the result was her transfer to the royal palace. But this was in direct contravention of the purpose of God for His own kingdom. The earthly majesty of Pharaoh had to bow before the divine majesty, which plagued him and secured the stranger’s exodus, thus foreshadowing those later plagues and that later exodus when Abraham’s and Sarah’s seed "spoiled the Egyptians."

We meet Sarah next in the narrative of the birth of Ishmael and of Isaac. Though 14 years separated the two births, they are closely associated in the story because of their logical continuity. Sarah's barrenness persisted. She was now far past middle life, even on a patriarchal scale of longevity, and there appeared no hope of her ever bearing that child who should inherit the promise of God. She therefore adopts the expedient of being "builded by" her personal slave, Hagar the Egyptian (see Ge 16:2 margin). That is, according to contemporary law and custom as witnessed by the Code of Hammurabi (see ABRAHAM, iv, 2), a son born of this woman would be the freeborn son and heir of Abraham and Sarah.

Such was in fact the position of Ishmael later. But the insolence of the maid aroused the vindictive jealousy of the mistress and led to a painful scene of unjustified expulsion. Hagar, however, returned at God's behest, humbled herself before Sarah, and bore Ishmael in his own father's house. Here he remained the sole and rightful heir, until the miracle of Isaac's birth disappointed all human expectations and resulted in the ultimate expulsion of Hagar and her son.

The change of name from Sarai to Sarah when Isaac was promised has already been noted. Sarah's laughter of incredulity when she hears the promise is of course associated with the origin of the name of Isaac, but it serves also to emphasize the miraculous character of his birth, coming as it does after his parents are both so "well stricken in age" as to make parenthood seem an absurdity.

Before the birth of this child of promise, however, Sarah is again exposed, through the cowardice of her husband, to dishonor and ruin. Abimelech, king of Gerar, desiring to be allied by marriage with a man of Abraham's power, sends for Sarah, whom he knows only as Abraham's sister, and for the second time she takes her place in the harem of a prince. But the divine promise is not to be thwarted, even by persistent human weakness and sin. In a dream God reveals to Abimelech the true state of the case, and Sarah is restored to her husband with an indemnity. Thereupon the long-delayed son is born, the jealous mother secures the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael, and her career comes to a close at the age of 127, at Hebroni long time her home. The grief and devotion of Abraham are broadly displayed in Genesis 23, in which he seeks and obtains a burying-place for his wife. She is thus the first to be interred in that cave of the field of Machpelah, which was to be the common resting-place of the fathers and mothers of the future Israel.

The character of Sarah is of mingled light and shade. On the one hand we have seen that lapse from faith which resulted in the birth of Ishmael, and that lack of self-control and charity which resulted in a quarrel with Abraham, an act of injustice to Hagar, and the disinheriting of Ishmael. Yet on the other hand we see in Sarah, as the New Testament writers point out (Heb 11:11; 1Pe 3:6), one who through a long life of companionship with Abraham shared his hope in God, his faith in the promises, and his power to become God's agent for achieving what was humanly impossible. In fact, to Sarah is ascribed a sort of spiritual maternity, correlative with Abraham's position as "father of the faithful"; for all women are declared to be the (spiritual) daughters of Sarah, who like her are adorned in "the hidden man of the heart," and who are "doers of good" and "fearers of no terror" (1 Peter loc. cit., literally rendered). That in spite of her outbreak about Hagar and Ishmael she was in general "in subjection to her husband" and of "a meek and quiet spirit," appears from her husband's genuine grief at her decease, and still more

clearly from her son’s prolonged mourning for her (Ge 24:67; compare Ge 17:17, 23:1 with Ge 25:20). And He who maketh even the wrath of man to praise Him used even Sarah’s jealous anger to accomplish His purpose that "the son of the freewoman," Isaac, "born through promise," should alone inherit that promise (Ga 4:22-31).

Apart from the three New Testament passages already cited, Sarah is alluded to only in Isa 51:2 ("Sarah that bare you," as the mother of the nation), in Ro 4:19 ("the deadness of Sarah’s womb"), and in Ro 9:9, where God’s promise in Ge 18:10 is quoted. Yet her existence and her history are of course presupposed wherever allusion is made to the stories of Abraham and of Isaac.

To many modern critics Sarah supplies, by her name, a welcome argument in support of the mythical view of Abraham. She has been held to be the local numen to whom the cave near Hebron was sacred; or the deity whose consort was worshipped in Arabia under the title Dusares, i.e. Husband-of-Sarah; or, the female associate of Sin the moon-god, worshipped at Haran. On these views the student will do well to consult Baethgen, Beitrage, 94, 157, and, for the most recent point of view, Gressmann’s article, "Sage und Geschichte in den Patriarchenerzahlungen," ZATW, 1910, and Eerdmans, Alttestamentliche Studien, II, 13.

(2) The daughter of Raguel, and wife of Tobias (Tobit 3:7,17, etc.).

See TOBIT, BOOK OF.

J. Oscar Boyd

SARAIAS

sa-ra’-yas, sa-ri’-as (Saraias; Latin, Sareus):

(1) = Seraiah, the high priest in the reign of Zedekiah (1 Esdras 5:5, compare 1Ch 6:14).

(2) Sareus the father of Ezra (2 Esdras 1:1) =" Seraiah" in Ezr 7:1, sometimes identified with Saraias under (1). He is probably identical with the "Azaraias" of 1 Esdras 8:1.

(3) the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Azaraias" (1 Esdras 8:1).

SARAMEL

sar’-a-mel: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) ASARAMEL (which see).

SARAPH

sa’-raf, sa’-raf (saraph, "noble one"; compare saraph, "burn" "shine"): A descendant of Judah through Shelah (1Ch 4:22).

SARCHEDONUS

sar-ked’-o-nus (Codex Vaticanus Sacherdonos; Codex Alexandrinus Sacherdan, but Sacherdonosos in Tobit 1:22): An incorrect spelling, both in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), for Sacherdonus in Tobit 1:21 f, another form of Esar-haddon.

SARDEUS

sar-de’-us: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) ZARDEUS (which see).

SARDIN(E); SARDIUS

sar’-din, sar’-din.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

SARDIS

sar’-dis (Sardeis): Sardis is of special interest to the student of Herodotus and Xenophon, for there Artaphernes, the brother of Darius, lived, and from there Xerxes invaded Greece and Cyrus marched against his brother Artaxerxes; it is also of interest to the student of early Christian history as the home of one of the Seven Churches of Re (1:11; 3:1 ff). It was moreover one of the oldest and most important cities of Asia Minor, and until 549 BC, the capital of the kingdom of Lydia. It stood on the northern slope of Mt. Tmolus; its acropolis occupied one of the spurs of the mountain. At the base flowed the river Pactolus which served as a moat, rendering the city practically impregnable. Through the failure to watch, however, the acropolis had been successfully scaled in 549 BC by a Median soldier, and in 218 by a Cretan (compare Re 3:2,3). Because of its strength during the Persian period, the satraps here made their homes. However, the city was burned by the Ionians in 501 BC, but it was quickly rebuilt and regained its importance. In 334 BC it surrendered to Alexander the Great who gave it independence, but its period of independence was brief, for 12 years later in 322 BC it was taken by Antigonus. In 301 BC, it fell into the possession of the Seleucidan kings who made it the residence of their governor. It became free again in 190 BC, when it formed a part of the empire of Pergamos, and later of the Roman province of Asia. In 17 AD, when it was destroyed by an earthquake, the Roman emperor Tiberius remitted the taxes of the people and rebuilt the city, and in his honor the citizens of that and of neighboring towns erected a large monument, but Sardis never recovered its former importance (compare Re 3:12). Again in 295 AD, after the Roman province of Asia was broken up, Sardis became the capital of Lydia, and

during the early Christian age it was the home of a bishop. The city continued to flourish until 1402, when it was so completely destroyed by Tamerlane that it was never rebuilt. Among the ruins there now stands a small village called Sert, a corruption of its ancient name. The ruins may be reached by rail from Smyrna, on the way to Philadelphia.

The ancient city was noted for its fruits and wool, and for its temple of the goddess Cybele, whose worship resembled that of Diana of Ephesus. Its wealth was also partly due to the gold which was found in the sand of the river Pactolus, and it was here that gold and silver coins were first struck. During the Roman period its coins formed a beautiful series, and are found in abundance by the peasants who till the surrounding fields. The ruins of the buildings which stood at the base of the hill have now been nearly buried by the dirt washed down from above. The hill upon which the acropolis stood measures 950 ft. high: the triple walls still surround it. The more imposing of the ruins are on the lower slope of the hill, and among them the temple of Cybele is the most interesting, yet only two of its many stone columns are still standing. Equally imposing is the necropolis of the city, which is at a distance of two hours' ride from Sert, South of the Gygaean lake. The modern name of the necropolis is Bin Tepe or Thousand Mounds, because of the large group of great mounds in which the kings and nobles were buried. Many of the mounds were long ago excavated and plundered.

We quote the following from the Missionary Herald (Boston, Massachusetts, August, 1911, pp. 361-62):

Dr. C. C. Tracy, of Marsovan, has made a visit to ancient Sardis and observed the work of his countryman, Professor Butler, of Princeton University, who is uncovering the ruins of that famous city of the past. Already rich "finds" have been made; among them portions of a temple of Artemis, indicating a building of the same stupendous character as those at Ephesus and Baalbec, and a necropolis from whose tombs were unearthed three thousand relics, including utensils, ornaments of gold and precious stones, mirrors, etc. What chiefly impressed Dr. Tracy was the significance of those "Seven Churches of Asia," of which Sardis held one. "When I think of the myriads of various nationality and advanced civilization for whose evangelization these churches were responsible, the messages to the Christian communities occupying the splendid strategic centers fill me with awe. While established amid the splendors of civilization, they were set as candlesticks in the midst of gross spiritual darkness. Did they fulfill their mission?"

One of Dr. Butler's recoveries is the marble throne of the Bishop of Sardis; looking upon it the message to Sardis recurs to mind. A fact of current history quickened the visitor's appreciation of the word to "the angel" of that church. "Yonder among the mountains overhanging Sardis there is a robber gang led by the notorious Chakirjali. He rules in the mountains; no government force can take him. Again and again he swoops down like an eagle out of the sky, in one quarter of the region or another. From time immemorial these mountains have been the haunts of robbers; very likely it was so when Re was written, 'I will come upon thee as a thief.' In each case the message was addressed to 'the angel of the church.' Over every church in the world there is a spirit hovering, as it were—a spirit representing that church and by whose name it can be addressed. The messages are as vital as they were at the first. 'He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches.'"

E. J. Banks

SARDITE

sar’-dit.

See SERED.

SARDIUS

sar’-di-us.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

SARDONYX

sar’-do-niks.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

SAREPTA

sa-rep’-ta (Sarepta): The name in Lu 4:26 the King James Version, following the Greek, of the Phoenician town to which Elijah was sent in the time of the great famine, in order to save the lives of a widow and her son (1Ki 17:9,10). The Revised Version (British and American) adopts the form of the name based upon the Hebrew, and as found in the Old Testament: ZAREPHATH (which see).

SARGON

sar’-gon (722-705 BC): The name of this ruler is written cargon, in the Old Testament, Shar-ukin in the cuneiform inscriptions, Arna, in the Septuagint, and Arkeanos, in the Ptolemaic Canon. Sargon is mentioned but once by name in the Old Testament (Isa 20:1), when he sent his Tartan (turtannu) against Ashdod, but he is referred to in 2Ki 17:6 as "the king of Assyria" who carried Israel into captivity.

Shalmaneser V had laid siege to Samaria and besieged it three years. But shortly before or very soon after its capitulation, Sargon, perhaps being responsible for the king’s death, overthrew the dynasty, and in his annals credited himself with the capture of the city and the deportation of its inhabitants. Whether he assumed the name of the famous ancient founder of the Accad dynasty is not known.

Sargon at the beginning of his reign was confronted with a serious situation in Babylon. Merodach-

baladan of Kaldu, who paid tribute to previous rulers, on the change of dynasty had himself proclaimed king, New Year's Day, 721 BC. At Dur-ilu, Sargon fought with the forces of Merodachbalddan and his ally Khumbanigash of Elam, but although he claimed a victory the result was apparently indecisive. Rebellions followed in other parts of the kingdom.

In 720 BC Ilu-bi'di (or Yau-bi'di), king of Hamath, formed a coalition against Sargon with Hanno of Gaza, Sib'u of Egypt, and with the cities Arpad, Simirra, Damascus and Samaria. He claims that Sib'u fled, and that he captured and flayed Ilu-bi'di, burned Qarqar, and carried Hanno captive to Assyria. After destroying Rapihu, he carried away 9,033 inhabitants to Assyria.

In the following year Ararat was invaded and the Hittite Carchemish fell before his armies. The territory of Rusas, king of Ararat, as well as a part of Melitene became Assyrian provinces.

In 710 BC Sargon directed his attention to Merodachbaladan, who no longer enjoyed the support of Elam, and whose rule over Babylon had not been popular with his subjects. He was driven out from Babylon and also from his former capital Bit-Yakin, and Sargon had himself crowned as the shakkanak of Babylon.

In 706 BC the new city called Dur-Sharrukin was dedicated as his residence. A year later he was murdered. It was during his reign that the height of Assyrian ascendancy had been reached.

A. T. Clay

SARID

sa'-rid (saridh; Codex Vaticanus Esedekgola, Seddouk; Codex Alexandrinus Sarthid, Sarid): A place on the southern border of Zebulun to the West of Chisloth-tabor (Jos 19:10,12). It is mentioned but not identified in Eusebius, Onomasticon. Probably we should read "Sadid," and in that case may with Conder locate it at Tell Shaddu, an artificial mound with some modern ruins and good springs, which stands on the plain, about 5 miles West of Iksal.

SARON

sa'-ron, (Saron): the King James Version; Greek form of Sharon (Ac 9:35).

SAROTHIE

sa-ro'-thi-e (Codex Alexandrinus Sarothie; Codex Vaticanus and Swete, Sarothei): Name of a family of "the sons of the servants of Solomon" who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:34); it is wanting in the parallel lists in Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59.

SARSECHIM

sar’-se-kim, sar-se-kim (sarckhim): A prince of Nebuchadnezzar, present at the taking of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in the 11th year of Zedekiah (Jer 39:3). The versions with their various readings —"Nabousachar" "Nabousarach," "Sarsacheim"—point to a corrupt text. The best emendation is the reading "Nebhoshazibhon" (= Nabusezib-anni, "Nebo delivers me"); this is based on the reading in Jer 39:13.

SARUCH

sa’-ruk (Sarouch, Serouch): the King James Version; Greek form of Serug (thus, Lu 3:35 the Revised Version (British and American)).

SATAN

sa’-tan (saTan), "adversary," from the verb saTan, "to lie in wait" (as adversary); Satan, Satanas, "adversary," diabolos, "Devil," "adversary" or "accuser," kategor (altogether unclassical and unGreek) (used once in Re 12:10), "accuser"):

I. DEFINITION

II. SCRIPTURAL FACTS CONCERNING SATAN

1. Names of Satan

2. Character of Satan

3. Works of Satan

4. History of Satan

III. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Scripture Doctrine of Satan Not Systematized

2. Satan and God

3. Satan Essentially Limited

4. Conclusions

LITERATURE

I. Definition.

A created but superhuman, personal, evil, world-power, represented in Scripture as the adversary both of God and men.

II. Scriptural Facts concerning Satan.

1. Names of Satan:

The most important of these are the Hebrew and Greek equivalents noticed above. These words are used in the general sense justified by their etymological significance. It is applied even to Yahweh Himself (Nu 22:22,32; compare 1Sa 29:4; 2Sa 19:22; Ps 109:6, etc.). The word "Satan" is used 24 times in the Old Testament. In Job (1:6 f) and Zec (3:1 f) it has the prefixed definite article. In all cases but one when the article is omitted it is used in a general sense. This one exception is 1Ch 21:1 (compare 2Sa 24:1), where the word is generally conceded to be used as a proper name. This meaning is fixed in New Testament times. We are thus enabled to note in the term "Satan" (and Devil) the growth of a word from a general term to an appellation and later to a proper name. All the other names of Satan save only these two are descriptive titles. In addition to these two principal names a number of others deserve specific enumeration. Tempter (Mt 4:5; 1Th 3:5); Beelzebub (Mt 12:24); Enemy (Mt 13:39); Evil One (Mt 13:19,38; 1Joh 2:13,14; 3:12, and particularly 1Joh 5:18); Belial (2Co 6:15); Adversary (antidikos), (1Pe 5:8); Deceiver (literally "the one who deceives") (Re 12:9); Dragon (Great) (Re 12:3); Father of Lies (Joh 8:44); Murderer (Joh 8:44); Sinner (1 Joh 3:8)—these are isolated references occurring from 1 to 3 times each. In the vast majority of passages (70 out of 83) either Satan or Devil is used.

2. Character of Satan:

Satan is consistently represented in the New Testament as the enemy both of God and man. The popular notion is that Satan is the enemy of man and active in misleading and cursing humanity because of his intense hatred and opposition to God. Mt 13:39 would seem to point in this direction, but if one were to venture an opinion in a region where there are not enough facts to warrant a conviction, it would be that the general tenor of Scripture indicates quite the contrary, namely, that Satan’s jealousy and hatred of men has led him into antagonism to God and, consequently, to goodness. The fundamental moral description of Satan is given by our Lord when He describes Satan as the "evil one" (Mt 13:19,38; compare Isaiah’s description of Yahweh as the "Holy One," Isa 1:4 and often); that is, the one whose nature and will are given to evil. Moral evil is his controlling attribute. It is evident that this description could not be applied to Satan as originally created. Ethical evil cannot be concreated. It is the creation of each free will for itself. We are not told in definite terms how Satan became the evil one, but certainly it could be by no other process than a fall, whereby, in the mystery of free personality, an evil will takes the place of a good one.

3. Works of Satan:

The world-wide and age-long works of Satan are to be traced to one predominant motive. He hates both God and man and does all that in him lies to defeat God's plan of grace and to establish and maintain a kingdom of evil, in the seduction and ruin of mankind. The balance and sanity of the Bible is nowhere more strikingly exhibited than in its treatment of the work of Satan. Not only is the Bible entirely free from the extravagances of popular Satanology, which is full of absurd stories concerning the appearances, tricks, and transformations of Satan among men, but it exhibits a dependable accuracy and consistency, of statement which is most reassuring. Almost nothing is said concerning Satanic agency other than wicked men who mislead other men. In the controversy with His opponents concerning exorcism (Mr 3:22 f and parallel's) our Lord rebuts their slanderous assertion that He is in league with Satan by the simple proposition that Satan does not work against himself. But in so saying He does far more than refute this slander. He definitely aligns the Bible against the popular idea that a man may make a definite and conscious personal alliance with Satan for any purpose whatever. The agent of Satan is always a victim. Also the hint contained in this discussion that Satan has a kingdom, together with a few other not very definite allusions, are all that we have to go upon in this direction. Nor are we taught anywhere that Satan is able to any extent to introduce disorder into the physical universe or directly operate in the lives of men. It is true that in Lu 13:16 our Lord speaks of the woman who was bowed over as one "whom Satan has bound, lo, these eighteen years," and that in 2Co 12:7 Paul speaks of his infirmity as a "messenger of Satan sent to buffet him." Paul also speaks (1Th 2:18) of Satan's hindering him from visiting the church at Thessalonica. A careful study of these related passages (together with the prologue of Job) will reveal the fact that Satan's direct agency in the physical world is very limited. Satan may be said to be implicated in all the disasters and woes of human life, in so far as they are more or less directly contingent upon sin (see particularly Heb 2:14) On the contrary, it is perfectly evident that Satan's power consists principally in his ability to deceive. It is interesting and characteristic that according to the Bible Satan is fundamentally a liar and his kingdom is a kingdom founded upon lies and deceit. The doctrine of Satan therefore corresponds in every important particular to the general Biblical emphasis upon truth. "The truth shall make you free" (Joh 8:32)—this is the way of deliverance from the power of Satan.

Now it would seem that to make Satan pre-eminently the deceiver would make man an innocent victim and thus relax the moral issue. But according to the Bible man is particeps criminis in the process of his own deception. He is deceived only because he ceases to love the truth and comes first to love and then to believe a lie (2Co 1:10). This really goes to the very bottom of the problem of temptation. Men are not tempted by evil, per se, but by a good which can be obtained only at the cost of doing wrong. The whole power of sin, at least in its beginnings, consists in the sway of the fundamental falsehood that any good is really attainable by wrongdoing. Since temptation consists in this attack upon the moral sense, man is constitutionally guarded against deceit, and is morally culpable in allowing himself to be deceived. The temptation of our Lord Himself throws the clearest possible light upon the methods ascribed to Satan and The temptation was addressed to Christ's consciousness of divine sonship; it was a deceitful attack emphasizing the good, minimizing or covering up the evil; indeed, twisting evil into good. It was a deliberate, malignant attempt to obscure the truth and induce to evil through the acceptance of falsehood. The attack broke against a loyalty to truth which made self-deceit, and

consequently deceit from without, impossible. The lie was punctured by the truth and the temptation lost its power (see TEMPTATION OF CHRIST). This incident reveals one of the methods of Satan—by immediate suggestion as in the case of Judas (Lu 22:3; Joh 13:2,27). Sometimes, however, and, perhaps, most frequently, Satan's devices (2Co 2:11) include human agents. Those who are given over to evil and who persuade others to evil are children and servants of Satan (See Mt 16:23; Mr 8:33; Lu 4:8; Joh 6:70; 8:44; Ac 13:10; 1 Joh 3:8). Satan also works through persons and institutions supposed to be on the side of right but really evil. Here the same ever-present and active falseness and deceit are exhibited. When he is called "the god of this world" (2Co 4:4) it would seem to be intimated that he has the power to clothe himself in apparently divine attributes. He also makes himself an angel of light by presenting advocates of falsehood in the guise of apostles of truth (2Co 11:13,15; 1 Joh 4:1; 2Th 2:9; Re 12:9; 19:20). In the combination of passages here brought together, it is clearly indicated that Satan is the instigator and fomenter of that spirit of lawlessness which exhibits itself as hatred both of truth and right, and which has operated so widely and so disastrously in human life.

4. History of Satan:

The history of Satan, including that phase of it which remains to be realized, can be set forth only along the most general lines. He belongs to the angelic order of beings. He is by nature one of the sons of Elohim (Job 1:6). He has fallen, and by virtue of his personal forcefulness has become the leader of the anarchic forces of wickedness. As a free being he has merged his life in evil and has become altogether and hopelessly evil. As a being of high intelligence he has gained great power and has exercised a wide sway over other beings. As a created being the utmost range of his power lies within the compass of that which is permitted. It is, therefore, hedged in by the providential government of God and essentially limited. The Biblical emphasis upon the element of falsehood in the career of Satan might be taken to imply that his kingdom may be less in extent than appears. At any rate, it is confined to the cosmic sphere and to a limited portion of time. It is also doomed. In the closely related passages 2Pe 2:4 and Jude 1:6 it is affirmed that God cast the angels, when they sinned, down to Tartarus and committed them to pits of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment. This both refers to the constant divine control of these insurgent forces and also points to their final and utter destruction. The putting of Satan in bonds is evidently both constant and progressive. The essential limitation of the empire of evil and its ultimate overthrow are foreshadowed in the Book of Job (chapters 38-41), where Yahweh's power extends even to the symbolized spirit of evil.

According to synoptic tradition, our Lord in the crisis of temptation immediately following the baptism (Mt 4$ and parallel) met and for the time conquered Satan as His own personal adversary. This preliminary contest did not close the matter, but was the earnest of a complete victory. According to Luke (10:18), when the Seventy returned from their mission flushed with victory over the powers of evil, Jesus said: 'I saw Satan fall (not "fallen"; see Plummer, "Luke," ICC, in the place cited.) as lightning from heaven.' In every triumph over the powers of evil Christ beheld in vision the downfall of Satan. In connection with the coming of the Hellenists who wished to see Him, Jesus asserted (Joh 12:31), "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out." In view of His approaching passion He says again (Joh 14:30), "The prince of the world cometh: and he hath nothing in me." Once again in connection with the promised advent of the Spirit, Jesus asserted (Joh

16:11) that the Spirit would convict the world of judgment, "because the prince of this world hath been judged." In Hebrews (2:14,15) it is said that Christ took upon Himself human nature in order "that through death he might bring to nought him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil." In 1 Joh 3:8 it is said, "To this end was the Son of God manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil." In Re 12:9 it is asserted, in connection with Christ's ascension, that Satan was cast down to the earth and his angels with him. According to the passage immediately following (12:10-12), this casting down was not complete or final in the sense of extinguishing his activities altogether, but it involves the potential and certain triumph of God and His saints and the equally certain defeat of Satan. In 1 Joh 2:13 the young men are addressed as those who "have overcome the evil one." In Re 20 the field of the future is covered in the assertion that Satan is "bound a thousand years"; then loosed "for a little time," and then finally "cast into the lake of fire."

A comparison of these passages will convince the careful student that while we cannot construct a definite chronological program for the career of Satan, we are clear in the chief points. He is limited, judged, condemned, imprisoned, reserved for judgment from the beginning. The outcome is certain though the process may be tedious and slow. The victory of Christ is the defeat of Satan; first, for Himself as Leader and Saviour of men (Joh 14:30); then, for believers (Lu 22:31; Ac 26:18; Ro 16:20; Jas 4:7; 1 Joh 2:13; 5:4,18); and, finally, for the whole world (Re 20:10). The work of Christ has already destroyed the empire of Satan.

III. General Considerations.

There are, no doubt, serious difficulties in the way of accepting the doctrine of a personal, superhuman, evil power as Satan is described to be. It is doubtful, however, whether these diffificulties may not be due, at least in part, to a misunderstanding of the doctrine and certain of its implications. In addition, it must be acknowledged, that whatever difficulties there may be in the teaching, they are exaggerated and, at the same time, not fairly met by the vague and irrational skepticism which denies without investigation. There are difficulties involved in any view of the world. To say the least, some problems are met by the view of a superhuman, evil world-power. In this section certain general considerations are urged with a view to lessening difficulties keenly felt by some minds. Necessarily, certain items gathered in the foregoing section are here emphasized again.

1. Scripture Doctrine of Satan Not Systematized:

The Scriptural doctrine of Satan is nowhere systematically developed. For materials in this field we are shut up to scattered and incidental references. These passages, which even in the aggregate are not numerous, tell us what we need to know concerning the nature, history, kingdom and works of Satan, but offer scant satisfaction to the merely speculative temper. The comparative lack of development in this field is due partly to the fact that the Biblical writers are primarily interested in God, and only secondarily in the powers of darkness; and partly to the fact that in the Bible doctrine waits upon fact. Hence, the malign and sinister figure of the Adversary is gradually outlined against the light of God's holiness as progressively revealed in the providential world-process which centers in Christ. It is a

significant fact that the statements concerning Satan become numerous and definite only in the New Testament. The daylight of the Christian revelation was necessary in order to uncover the lurking foe, dimly disclosed but by no means fully known in the earlier revelation. The disclosure of Satan is, in form at least, historical, not dogmatic.

2. Satan and God:

In the second place, the relationship of Satan to God, already emphasized, must be kept constantly in mind. The doctrine of Satan merges in the general doctrine concerning angels (see ANGEL). It has often been pointed out that the personal characteristics of angels are very little insisted upon. They are known chiefly by their functions: merged, on the one hand, in their own offices, and, on the other, in the activities of God Himself.

In the Old Testament Satan is not represented as a fallen and malignant spirit, but as a servant of Yahweh, performing a divine function and having his place in the heavenly train. In the parallel accounts of David's numbering of Israel (1Sa 24:1; 1Ch 21:1) the tempting of David is attributed both to Yahweh and Satan. The reason for this is either that 'the temptation of men is also a part of his providence,' or that in the interval between the documents the personality of the tempter has more clearly emerged. In this case the account in Chronicles would nearly approximate the New Testament teaching. In the Book of Job (1:6), however, Satan is among the Sons of God and his assaults upon Job are divinely permitted. In Zec (3:1,2) Satan is also a servant of Yahweh. In both these passages there is the hint of opposition between Yahweh and Satan. In the former instance Satan assails unsuccessfully the character of one whom Yahweh honors; while in the latter Yahweh explicitly rebukes Satan for his attitude toward Israel (see G. A. Smith, BTP, II, 316 f). The unveiling of Satan as a rebellious world-power is reserved for the New Testament, and with this fuller teaching the symbolic treatment of temptation in Ge is to be connected. There is a sound pedagogical reason, from the viewpoint of revelation, for this earlier withholding of the whole truth concerning Satan. In the early stages of religious thinking it would seem to be difficult, if not impossible, to hold the sovereignty of God without attributing to His agency those evils in the world which are more or less directly connected with judgment and punishment (compare Isa 45:7; Am 3:6). The Old Testament sufficiently emphasizes man's responsibility for his own evil deeds, but super-human evil is brought upon him from above. "When willful souls have to be misled, the spirit who does so, as in Ahab's case, comes from above" (G. A. Smith, op. cit., 317). The progressive revelation of God's character and purpose, which more and more imperatively demands that the origin of moral evil, and consequently natural evil, must be traced to the created will in opposition to the divine will, leads to the ultimate declaration that Satan is a morally fallen being to whose conquest the Divine Power in history is pledged. There is, also, the distinct possibility that in the significant transition from the Satan of the Old Testament to that of the New Testament we have the outlines of a biography and an indication of the way by which the angels fell.

3. Satan Essentially Limited:

A third general consideration, based upon data given in the earlier section, should be urged in the same connection. In the New Testament delineation of Satan, his limitations are clearly set forth. He is superhuman, but not in any sense divine. His activities are cosmic, but not universal or transcendent. He is a created being. His power is definitely circumscribed. He is doomed to final destruction as a world-power. His entire career is that of a secondary and dependent being who is permitted a certain limited scope of power—a time-lease of activity (Lu 4:6).

4. Conclusions:

These three general considerations have been grouped in this way because they dispose of three objections which are current against the doctrine of Satan.

(1) The first is, that it is mythological in origin. That it is not dogmatic is a priori evidence against this hypothesis. Mythology is primitive dogma. There is no evidence of a theodicy or philosophy of evil in the Biblical treatment of Satan. Moreover, while the Scriptural doctrine is unsystematic in form, it is rigidly limited in scope and everywhere essentially consistent. Even in the Apocalypse, where naturally more scope is allowed to the imagination, the same essential ideas appear. The doctrine of Satan corresponds, item for item, to the intellectual saneness and ethical earnestness of the Biblical world-view as a whole. It is, therefore, not mythological. The restraint of chastened imagination, not the extravagance of mythological fancy, is in evidence throughout the entire Biblical treatment of the subject. Even the use of terms current in mythology (as perhaps Ge 3:1,13,14; Re 12:7-9; compare 1Pe 5:8) does not imply more than a literary clothing of Satan in attributes commonly ascribed to malignant and disorderly forces.

(2) The second objection is that the doctrine is due to the influence of Persian dualism (see PERSIAN RELIGION; ZOROASTRIANISM). The answer to this is plain, on the basis of facts already adduced. The Biblical doctrine of Satan is not dualistic. Satan’s empire had a beginning, it will have a definite and permanent end. Satan is God’s great enemy in the cosmic sphere, but he is God’s creation, exists by divine will, and his power is relatively no more commensurate with God’s than that of men. Satan awaits his doom. Weiss says (concerning the New Testament representation of conflict between God and the powers of evil): "There lies in this no Manichaean dualism, ... but only the deepest experience of the work of redemption as the definite destruction of the power from which all sin in the world of men proceeds" (Biblical Theology New Testament, English tanslations of the Bible, II, 272; compare G.A. Smith, op. cit., II, 318).

(3) The third objection is practically the same as the second, but addressed directly to the doctrine itself, apart from the question of its origin, namely, that it destroys the unity of God. The answer to this also is a simple negative. To some minds the reality of created wills is dualistic and therefore untenable. But a true doctrine of unity makes room for other wills than God’s—namely of those beings upon whom God has bestowed freedom. Herein stands the doctrine of sin and Satan. The doctrine of Satan no more militates against the unity of God than the idea, so necessary to morality and religion alike, of other created wills set in opposition to God’s. Just as the conception of Satan merges, in one direction, in the

general doctrine of angels, so, in the other, it blends with the broad and difficult subject of evil (compare "Satan," HDB, IV, 412a).

LITERATURE.

All standard works on Biblical Theology, as well as Dictionaries, etc., treat with more or less thoroughness the doctrine of Satan. The German theologians of the more evangelical type, such as Weiss, Lange, Martensen (Danish), Dorner, while exhibiting a tendency toward excessive speculation, discern the deeper aspects of the doctrine. Of monographs known to the writer none are to be recommended without qualification. It is a subject on which the Bible is its own best interpreter.

Louis Matthews Sweet

SATAN, DEPTHS OF

(ta bathea tou Satana): Found in Re 2:24, and has reference to false teaching at Thyatira. It is a question (that perhaps may not be decided) whether tou Satana, "of Satan," represents the claim of the false teachers, or is thrown in by the Lord. Did those false teachers claim to know "the depths" of Satan? Or was it that they claimed to know "the depths" of Deity, and the Lord said it was rather "the depths of Satan"? In either case the antithesis to "depths of Satan" is "depths of God," as referred to in Ro 11:33; 1Co 2:10.

E. J. Forrester

SATAN, SYNAGOGUE OF

The expression occurs neither in the Hebrew nor in the Greek of the Old Testament, nor in Apocrypha. Three passages in the Old Testament and one in Apocrypha suggest the idea conveyed in the expression. In Nu 14:27,35, Yahweh expresses His wrath against "the evil congregation" Septuagint sunagoge ponera) which He threatens to consume in the wilderness. In Ps 21 (22):16, we find, "A company of evil doers (the Septuagint sunagoge ponereuomenon) have enclosed me." In Sirach 16:6, we read, "In the congregation of sinners (the Septuagint sunagoge hamartolon) shall a fire be kindled."

Only in the New Testament occurs the phrase "synagogue of Satan," and here only twice (Re 2:9; 3:9). Three observations are evident as to who constituted "the synagogue of Satan" in Smyrna and Philadelphia.

(1) They claimed to be Jews, i.e. they were descendants of Abraham, and so laid claim to the blessings promised by Yahweh to him and his seed.

(2) But they are not regarded by John as real Jews, i.e. they are not the genuine Israel of God (the same

conclusion as Paul reached in Ro 2:28).

(3) They are persecutors of the Christians in Smyrna.

The Lord "knows their blasphemy," their sharp denunciations of Christ and Christians. They claim to be the true people of God, but really they are "the synagogue of Satan." The gen. Satana, is probably the possessive gen. These Jewish persecutors, instead of being God’s people, are the "assembly of Satan," i. e. Satan’s people.

In Polycarp, Mar. xvii.2 (circa 155 AD) the Jews of Smyrna were still persecutors of Christians and were conspicuous in demanding and planning the martyrdom of Polycarp the bishop of Smyrna, the same city in which the revelator calls persecuting Jews "the assembly of Satan."

In the 2nd century, in an inscription (CIJ, 3148) describing the classes of population in Smyrna, we find the expression hoi pote Ioudaioi, which Mommsen thinks means "Jews who had abandoned their religion," but which Ramsay says "probably means those who formerly were the nation of the Jews, but have lost the legal standing of a separate people."

LITERATURE.

Ramsay, The Seven Churches of Asia, chapter xii; Swete, The Apocalypse of John, 31, 32; Polycarp, Mar. xiii ff.17,2; Mommsen, Historische Zeitschrift, XXXVII, 417.

Charles B. Williams

SATCHEL

sach’-el.

See BAG.

SATHRABUZANES

sath-ra-bu’-za-nez, sath-ra-bu-za’-nez (Sathrabouzanes): In 1 Esdras 6:3,7,27 =" Shethar-bozenai" in Ezr 5:3,6; 6:6,13.

SATISFACTION

sat-is-fak’-shun: Occurs twice in the King James Version (Nu 35:31,32) as a rendering of the Hebrew kopher (the Revised Version (British and American) "ransom"). It means a price paid as compensation for a life, and the passage cited is a prohibition against accepting such, in case of murder, or for the

return of the manslayer. Such compensation was permitted in ancient justice among many peoples. Compare poine, which Liddell and Scott define as "properly quit-money for blood spilt, the fine paid by the slayer to the kinsman of the slain, as a ransom from all consequences." The same custom prevailed among Teutonic peoples, as seen in the German Wergeld and Old English wergild. The Hebrew lairs of the Old Testament permit it only in the case of a man or woman gored to death by an ox (Ex 21:30-32).

Benjamin Reno Downer

SATRAPS

sa'-traps, sat'-raps ('achashdarpenim, Ezr 8:36; Es 3:12; 8:9; 9:3, the King James Version "lieutenants"; Da 3:2,3,27; 6:1 ff, the King James Version "princes"): The viceroys or vassal rulers to whom was entrusted the government of the provinces in the Persian empire. The word answers to the Old Persian khshathrapavan, "protectors of the realm."

SATYR

sat'-er, sa'-ter (sa'ir, literally "he-goat"; sa'ir, "hairy" (Ge 27:11, of Esau), and Arabic sha'r, "hair"; plural se'irim): For se'irim in Le 17:7 and 2Ch 11:15, the King James Version has "devils," the Revised Version (British and American) "he-goats," the English Revised Version margin "satyrs," the Septuagint has tois mataiois, "vain things." For se'irim in Isa 13:21, the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "satyrs," the English Revised Version margin "he-goats," the American Standard Revised Version "wild goats," Septuagint daimonia, "demons." For sa'ir in Isa 34:14, the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "satyr," the English Revised Version margin "he-goat," the American Standard Revised Version "wild goat." Septuagint has heteros pros ton heteron, "one to another," referring to daimonia, which here stands for ciyim, "wild beasts of the desert."

The text of the American Standard Revised Version in these passages is as follows: Le 17:7, "And they shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices unto the he-goats, after which they play the harlot"; 2Ch 11:15, "And he (Jeroboam) appointed him priests for the high places, and for the he-goats, and for the calves which he had made"; Isa 13:21 f (of Babylon), "But wild beasts of the desert (tsiyim) shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures ('ochim); and ostriches (benoth ya'anah) shall dwell there, and wild goats (se'irim) shall dance there And wolves ('iyim) shall cry in their castles, and jackals (tannim) in the pleasant palaces"; Isa 34:11,13,14,15 (of Edom), "But the pelican (qa'ath) and the porcupine (kippodh) shall possess it; and the owl (yanshoph) and the raven ('orebh) shall dwell therein: .... and it shall be a habitation of jackals (tannim), a court for ostriches (benoth ya'anah). And the wild beasts of the desert (tsiyim) shall meet with the wolves ('iyim), and the wild goat (sa'ir) shall cry to his fellow; yea, the night monster (lilith) shall settle there ..... There shall the dart-snake (qippoz) make her nest .... there shall the kites (dayyoth) be gathered, every one with her mate."

The question is whether sa'ir and se'irim in these passages stand for real or for fabulous animals. In Le 17:7 and 2Ch 11:15, it is clear that they are objects of worship, but that still leaves open the question of

their nature, though it may to many minds make "devils" or "demons" or "satyrs" seem preferable to "he-goats." In Isa 13:20 we read, "neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall shepherds make their flocks to lie down there." This may very likely have influenced the American Committee of Revisers to use "wild goat" in Isa 13:21 and 34:14 instead of the "he-goat" of the other passages. In the American Standard Revised Version, no fabulous creatures (except perhaps "night-monster") are mentioned here, but the Septuagint employs daimonia, "demons" in Isa 13:21 for se‘irim and in 34:14 for tsiyim; onokentauroi, from "centaur," in Isa 13:22 and 34:14 for ‘iyim, and again in 34:14 for lilith; seirenes, "sirens," in Isa 13:21 for benoth ya‘anah, and in 34:13 for tannim. We must bear in mind the uncertainty regarding the identity of tsiyim, ‘iyim, ‘ochim and tannim, as well as of some of the other names, and we must recall the tales that are hung about the name lilith (the King James Version "screech owl," the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) "night-monster," the Revised Version margin "Lilith"). While sa‘ir is almost alone among these words in having ordinarily a well-understood meaning, i.e. "he-goat," there is good reason for considering that here it is used in an exceptional sense. The translation "satyr" has certainly much to be said for it.

See GOAT; JACKAL.

Alfred Ely Day

SAUL

sol (sha’ul; Saoul):

(1) The first king of Israel.

I. EARLY HISTORY

1. Name and Meaning

2. Genealogy

3. Home and Station

4. Sources for Life

5. Election as King

6. Reasons for It

II. REIGN AND FALL

1. His First Action

2. Army Reorganized

3. Battle of Michmash

4. Defeats the Amalekites

5. Deposition Pronounced

6. David Introduced to Saul

7. Two Accounts

8. Saul’s Envy of David

9. Attempts to Get Rid of David

10. David Spares Saul

11. Saul’s Divided Energies

12. Consults a Necromancer

13. Battle of Gilboa

14. Double Accounts

15. Saul’s Posterity

III. CHARACTER

1. Book of Chronicles

2. Saul’s Failings

3. His Virtue

4. David’s Elegy

I. Early History.

1. Name and Meaning:

The name Saul is usually regarded as simply the passive participle of the verb "to ask," and so meaning "asked" (compare 1Sa 8:4 ff), but the gentilic adjective sha’uli (Nu 26:13) would point to its having also an intensive connotation, "the one asked importunately," or perhaps, "the one asking insistently," "the beggar."

2. Genealogy:

Saul was the son of Kish, a Benjamite. His genealogical tree is given in 1Sa 9:1 (compare Septuagint 10:21). In 1Sa 9:1 his grandfather is Abiel, but in 1Ch 8:33; 9:39, Ner, who appears as his paternal uncle in 1Sa 14:50,51.

The last verse contains a very curious scribal error, a yodh having slipped out of one word in it into another. It states that both Abner and Ner were sons of Abiel. These apparent inconsistencies are to be explained by the fact that in Hebrew, as in Arabic, "son" is often used in the sense of grandson. Also, with the facility of divorce then prevalent, by "brother" and "sister" we must in most cases understand half-brother and half-sister. Moreover, Saul’s mother might have been the wife at different times of Kish and of his brother Ner (compare 1Sa 20:30). This was quite common, and in some cases compulsory (De 25:5-9).

3. Home and Station:

Saul’s home was at GIBEAH (which see), which is also called Gibeah of Saul, i.e. Saul’s Hill (1Sa 11:4; compare also 1Sa 10:5, God’s Hill, or simply The Hill, 1Sa 10:10; Ho 5:8, etc.), or the Hill of Benjamin or of the Benjamites (1Sa 13:15; 2Sa 23:29). It is usually identified with Tell el-Ful, but perhaps its site is marked rather by some ruins near but beneath that eminence. The tribe of Benjamin was the fighting tribe of Israel, and Kish seems to have been one of its most important members. Saul’s remarks in depreciation (1Sa 9:21) are not to be taken literally.

4. Sources for Life:

The circumstances of Saul’s career are too well known to require recapitulation. It will be sufficient to refer to some of the recognized difficulties of the narrative. These difficulties arise from the fact that we appear to have two distinct biographies of Saul in the present Books of Samuel. This may well be the case as it is the practice of the Semitic historian to set down more than one tradition of each event, without attempting to work these up into one consistent account. We shall call the duplicated narratives A and B, without postulating that either is a continuous whole.

See SAMUEL, BOOKS OF.

5. Election as King:

According to A, Saul was anointed king of Israel at Ramah by the prophet Samuel acting upon an inspiration from Yahweh, not only without consulting anyone, but in the strictest secrecy (1Sa 9:1-10:16). According to B, the sheiks of the tribes demanded a king. Samuel in vain tried to dissuade them. They would not listen, and a king was chosen by lot at Mizpah. The lot fell upon Saul, and Samuel immediately demitted office (1Sa 8$; 10:17-27, omitting the last clause; and chapter 12).

6. Reasons for It:

There are three distinct reasons given in the text for the abolition of theocracy and institution of an elective or hereditary monarchy: first, the incapacity of Samuel’s sons (1Sa 8:1); second, an invasion of the Ammonites (1Sa 12:12); and third, the Philistines (1Sa 9:16). These three motives are not mutually exclusive. The Philistines formed the standing menace to the national existence, which would have necessitated the creation of a monarchy sooner or later. The other two were temporary circumstances, one of which aggravated the situation, while the other showed the hopelessness of expecting any improvement in it in the near future.

II. Reign and Fall.

1. His First Action:

The election of Saul at Mizpah was conducted in the presence of the chieftains of the clans; it is not to be supposed that the whole nation was present. As soon as it was over, the electors went home, and Saul also returned to his father’s farm and, like Cincinnatus, once more followed the plow. "Within about a month," however (1Sa 10:27 the Septuagint, for Massoretic Text "But he held his peace"), the summons came. A message from the citizens of JABESH-GILEAD (which see) was sent round the tribes appealing for help against the Ammonites under Nahash. They, of course, knew nothing about what had taken place at Mizpah, and it was only by chance that their messengers arrived at Gibeah when they did. Saul rose to the occasion, and immediately after he was acclaimed king by the whole body of the people (1Sa 11). This double election, first by the chiefs and then by the people, is quite a regular proceeding.

2. Army Reorganized:

This first success encouraged Saul to enter upon what was to be the mission of his life, namely, the throwing off of the Philistine suzerainty. From the first he had had the boldest spirits upon his side (1Sa 10:26, the Septuagint, the Revised Version margin); he was now able to form a standing army of 3,000 men, under the command of himself and his son JONATHAN (which see). The Philistines, the last remnant of the Minoan race, had the advantage of the possession of iron weapons. It was, in fact, they who introduced iron into Palestine from Crete—the Israelites knowing only bronze, and having even been deprived of weapons of the softer metals. They seem to have armed themselves—with the exception of the king and his son—with mattocks and plowshares (1Sa 13:19).

3. Battle of Michmash:

The first encounter was the attack upon the Philistine post at Michmash (1Sa 13; 14). The text of the narrative is uncertain, but the following outline is clear. On hearing that the Hebrews had revolted (1Sa 13:3, the Septuagint), the Philistines gathered in great force, including 3,000 chariots (1Sa 13:5, the Septuagint; the Massoretic Text has 30,000) at Michmash. In dismay, Saul's troops deserted (1Sa 13:6 f), until he was left with only 600 (1Sa 14:2). In spite of this, Jonathan precipitated hostilities by a reckless attack upon one of the outposts. This was so successful that the whole Philistine army was seized with panic, and the onset of Saul and the desertion of their Hebrew slaves completed their discomfiture. Saul followed up his victory by making predatory excursions on every side (1Sa 14:47).

4. Defeats the Amalekites:

Saul's next expedition was against the Amalekites under Agag, who were likewise completely defeated. The fight was carried out with all the remorselessness common to tribal warfare. Warning was sent to the friendly Kenites to withdraw out of danger; then the hostile tribe was slaughtered to a man, their chief alone being spared for the time being. Even the women and children were not taken as slaves, but were all killed (1Sa 15).

5. Deposition Pronounced:

It is not clear what was the precise attitude of Samuel toward Saul. As the undoubted head of theocracy he naturally objected to his powers being curtailed by the loss of the civil power (1Sa 8:6). Even after the elections of Saul, Samuel claimed to be the ecclesiastical head of the state. He seems to have objected to Saul's offering the sacrifice before battle (1Sa 13:10), and to have considered him merely as his lieutenant (1Sa 15:3) who could be dismissed for disobedience (1Sa 15:14). Here again there seem to be two distinct accounts in the traditional text, which we may again call A and B. In A, Saul is rejected because he does not wait long enough for Samuel at Gilgal (1Sa 13:8; compare 1Sa 10:8). "Seven days," of course, means eight, or even more, in short, until Samuel should come, whenever that might be. The expression might almost be omitted in translating. In B Saul is rejected because he did not carry out Samuel's orders (1Sa 15:3) to the letter. The two narratives are not mutually exclusive. The second offense was an aggravation of the first, and after it Samuel did not see Saul again (1Sa 15:35).

6. David Introduced to Saul:

He had good reason for not doing so. He had anointed a rival head of the state in opposition to Saul, an act of treason which, if discovered, would have cost him his head (compare 2Ki 9:6,10). Saul did not at once accept his deposition, but he lost heart. One cannot but admire him, deserted by Samuel, and convinced that he was playing a losing game, and yet continuing in office. To drive away his melancholy, his servants introduced to him a musician who played until his spirits revived (1Sa 16:14 ; compare 2Ki 3:15).

7. Two Accounts:

By a strange coincidence (compare I, 5, above) the minstrel was the very person whom Samuel had secretly anointed to supplant Saul. According to what looks like another account, however, it was his encounter with Goliath which led to the introduction of David to Saul (1Sa 17:1 ; see DAVID). In spite of all that has been said to the contrary, the two narratives are not incompatible, since we are not told the order of the events nor over how many years these events were spread. The theory of duplicate narratives rests upon the assumption that all statements made by the dramatis personae in the Bible are to be taken at their face value. If 1 Samuel 16 and 17 had formed part of a play of Shakespeare, they would have been considered a fine example of his genius. Treatises would have been written to explain why Saul did not recognize David, and why Abner denied all knowledge of him. Septuagint, however, omits 1Sa 17:12-31,41,50,55-18:5.

8. Saul’s Envy of David:

Whether Saul actually discovered that David had been anointed by Samuel or not, he soon saw in him his rival and inevitable successor, and he would hardly have been human if he had not felt envious of him. His dislike of David had two motives. The first was jealousy, because the women preferred the military genius of David to his own (1Sa 18:7 f). His consequent attempt upon the life of David (1Sa 18:8-11) is omitted in the Septuagint. Not least was the love of his own daughter for David (1Sa 18:20; in 1Sa 18:28 read with Septuagint "all Israel"). The second cause was his natural objection to see his son Jonathan supplanted in his rights to the throne, an objection which was aggravated by the devotion of that son to his own rival (1Sa 20:30).

See also DAVID; JONATHAN.

9. Attempts to Get Rid of David:

Saul could not believe that David could remain loyal to him (1Sa 24:9); at the first favorable opportunity he would turn upon him, hurl him from the throne, and exterminate his whole house. In these circumstances, it was his first interest to get rid of him. His first attempt to do so (omitting with Septuagint 1Sa 18:8 b-11) was to encourage him to make raids on the Philistines in the hope that these might kill him (1Sa 18:21); his next, assassination by one of his servants (1Sa 19:1), and then by his own hand (1Sa 19:9 f). When David was compelled to fly, the quarrel turned to civil war. The superstitious fear of hurting the chosen of Yahweh had given place to blind rage. Those who sheltered the fugitive, even priests, were slaughtered (1Sa 22:17). From one spot to another David was hunted, as he says, like a partridge (1Sa 26:20).

10. David Spares Saul:

It is generally maintained that here also we have duplicate accounts; for example, that there are two accounts of David taking refuge with Achish, king of Gath, and two of his sparing Saul’s life. The latter

are contained in 1 Samuel 24 and 26, but the points of resemblance are slight. Three thousand (24:2; 26:2) was the number of Saul's picked men (compare 13:2). David uses the simile of "a flea" in 24:14, but in 26:20 for "a flea" Septuagint has "my soul," which is no doubt original. The few other expressions would occur naturally in any narrative with the same contents.

11. Saul's Divided Energies:

Obviously Saul's divided energies could not hold out long; he could not put down the imaginary rebellion within, and at the same time keep at bay the foreign foe. No sooner had he got the fugitive within his grasp than he was called away by an inroad of the Philistines (1Sa 23:27 f); but after his life had been twice spared, he seemed to realize at last that the latter were the real enemy, and he threw his whole strength into one desperate effort for existence.

12. Consults a Necromancer:

Saul himself saw that his case was desperate, and that in fact the game was up. As a forlorn hope he determined to seek occult advice. He could no longer use the official means of divination (1Sa 28:6), and was obliged to have recourse to a necromancer, one of a class whom he himself had taken means to suppress (1Sa 28:3). The result of the seance confirmed his worst fears and filled his soul with despair (1Sa 28:7).

13. Battle of Gilboa:

It says much for Saul that, hopeless as he was, he engaged in one last forlorn struggle with the enemy. The Philistines had gathered in great force at Shunem. Saul drew up his army on the opposing hill of Gilboa. Between the two forces lay a valley (compare 1Sa 14:4). The result was what had been foreseen. The Israelites, no doubt greatly reduced in numbers (contrast 1Sa 11:8), were completely defeated, and Saul and his sons slain. Their armor was placed in the temple of Ashtaroth, and their bodies hung on the wall of Bethshan, but Saul's head was set in the temple of Dagon (1Ch 10:10). The citizens of Jabesh-gilead, out of ancient gratitude, rescued the bodies and, in un-Semitic wise, burned them and buried the bones.

14. Double Accounts:

Once more we have, according to most present-day critics, duplicate accounts of the death of Saul. According to one, which we may name A, he fell, like Ajax whom he much resembles, upon his own sword, after being desperately wounded by the archers (1Sa 31:4). According to the second (2Sa 1:2), an Amalekite, who had been by accident a witness of the battle, dispatched Saul at his own request to save him from the enemy. But B is simply the continuation of A, and tells us how David received the news of the battle. The Amalekite's story is, of course, a fabrication with a view to a reward. Similar claims for the reward of assassination are common (2Sa 4:9).

15. Saul’s Posterity:

With Saul the first Israelite dynasty began and ended. The names of his sons are given in 1Sa 14:49 as Jonathan, Ishvi and Malchishua. Ishvi or Ishyo (Septuagint) is Eshbaal, called in 2Sa 2:8 ISH-BOSHETH (which see). 1Ch 8:33 adds Abinadab. Jonathan left a long line of descendants famous, like himself, as archers (1Ch 8:34). The rest of Saul’s posterity apparently died out. Malchishua and Abinadab were slain at Gilboa (1Sa 31:6; 1Ch 10:2), and Ish-bosheth was assassinated shortly after (2Sa 4:2). Saul had also two natural sons by Rizpah who were put to death by David in accordance with a superstitious custom, as also were the five sons of Saul’s daughter Merab (2Sa 21:8, not Michal; compare 1Sa 18:19). Saurs other daughter Michal apparently had no children. Saul had, it seems, other wives, who were taken into the harem of David in accordance with the practice of the times (2Sa 12:8), but of them and their descendants we know nothing.

III. Character. 1. Book of Chronicles:

Saul’s life and character are disposed of in a somewhat summary fashion by the Chronicler (1Ch 10$, especially 1Ch 10:13,14). Saul was rejected because he was disloyal to Yahweh, especially in consulting a necromancer. The major premise of this conclusion, however, is the ancient dictum, "Misfortune presupposes sin." From a wider point of view, Saul cannot be dismissed in so cavalier a manner.

2. Saul’s Failings:

Like everyone else, Saul had his virtues and his failings. His chief weakness seems to have been want of decision of character. He was easily swayed by events and by people. The praises of David (1Sa 18:7 f) at once set his jealousy on fire. His persecution of David was largely due to the instigation of mischievous courtiers (1Sa 24:9). Upon remonstrance his repentance was as deep as it was short-lived (1Sa 24:16; 26:21). His impulsiveness was such that he did not know where to stop. His interdict (1Sa 14:24) was quite as uncalled for as his religious zeal (1Sa 15:9) was out of place. He was always at one extreme. His hatred of David was only equal to his affection for him at first (1Sa 18:2). His pusillanimity led him to commit crimes which his own judgment would have forbidden (1Sa 22:17). Like most beaten persons, he became suspicious of everyone (1Sa 22:7 f), and, like those who are easily led, he soon found his evil genius (1Sa 22:9,18,22). Saul’s inability to act alone appears from the fact that he never engaged in single combat, so far as we know. Before he could act at all his fury or his pity had to be roused to boiling-point (1Sa 11:6). His mind was peculiarly subject to external influences, so that he was now respectable man of the world, now a prophet (1Sa 10:11; 19:24).

3. His Virtues:

On the other hand, Saul possessed many high qualities. His dread of office (1Sa 10:22) was only equaled by the coolness with which he accepted it (1Sa 11:5). To the first call to action he responded with promptitude (1Sa 11:6). His timely aid excited the lasting gratitude of the citizens of Jabesh-gilead (1Sa 31:11) If we remember that Saul was openly disowned by Samuel (1Sa 15:30), and believed himself

cast off by Yahweh, we cannot but admire the way in which he fought on to the last. Moreover, the fact that he retained not only his own sons, but a sufficient body of fighting men to engage a large army of Philistines, shows that there must have been something in him to excite confidence and loyalty.

4. David's Elegy:

There is, however, no question as to the honorable and noble qualities of Saul. The chief were his prowess in war and his generosity in peace. They have been set down by the man who knew him best in what are among the most authentic verses in the Bible (2Sa 1:19).

(2) Saul of Tarsus.

See PAUL.

Thomas Hunter Weir

SAVARAN

sav'-a-ran: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) AVARAN (which see).

SAVE

sav: In the sense "except," the word came into English through the French (sauf) and is fairly common (38 times, in addition to "saving," the King James Version Ec 5:11; Am 9:8; Mt 5:32; Lu 4:27; Re 2:17). It represents no particular Hebrew or Greek terms but is employed wherever it seems useful. It is still in good (slightly archaic) use, and the Revised Version (British and American) has few modifications (De 15:4 the King James Version; Ps 18:31, etc.), but the English Revised Version has dropped "saving" in Lu 4:27 and Re 2:17 and the American Standard Revised Version also in Ec 5:11; Am 9:8, retaining it only in Mt 5:32.

SAVIAS sa-vi'-as (Saouia): In 1 Esdras 8:2, for Uzzi, an ancestor of Ezra, in Ezr 7:4.

SAVIOUR

sav'-yer:

(1) While that "God is the deliverer of his people" is the concept on which, virtually, the whole Old Testament is based (see SALVATION), yet the Hebrews seem never to have felt the need of a title for God that would sum up this aspect of His relation to man. Nearest to our word "Saviour" is a participial form (moshia') from the verb yasha' (Qal not used; "save" in Hiphil), but even this participle is not

frequently applied to God (some 13 times of which 7 are in Isa 43:1-63:19).

(2) In the New Testament, however, the case is different, and Soter, is used in as technical a way as is our "Saviour." But the distribution of the 24 occurrences of the word is significant, for two-thirds of them are found in the later books of the New Testament—10 in the Pastorals, 5 in 2 Peter, and one each in John, 1 John, and Jude—while the other instances are Lu 1:47; 2:11; Ac 5:31; 13:23; Eph 5:23; Php 3:20. And there are no occurrences in Matthew, Mark, or the earlier Pauline Epistles. The data are clear enough. As might be expected, the fact that the Old Testament used no technical word for Saviour meant that neither did the earliest Christianity use any such word. Doubtless for our Lord "Messiah" was felt to convey the meaning. But in Greek-speaking Christianity, "Christ," the translation of Messiah, soon became treated as a proper name, and a new word was needed.

(3) Soter expressed the exact meaning and had already been set apart in the language of the day as a religious term, having become one of the most popular divine titles in use. Indeed, it was felt to be a most inappropriate word to apply to a human being. Cicero, for instance, arraigns Verres for using it: "Soter .... How much does this imply? So much that it cannot be expressed in one word in Latin" (Verr. ii.2, 63, 154). So the adoption of Soter by Christianity was most natural, the word seemed ready-made.

(4) That the New Testament writers derived the word from its contemporary use is shown, besides, by its occurrence in combination with such terms as "manifestation" (epiphaneia, 2Ti 1:10; Tit 2:13), "love toward man" (philanthropia, Tit 3:4), "captain" (archegos, Ac 5:31; compare Heb 2:10), etc. These terms are found in the Greek sources many times in exactly the same combinations with Sorer.

(5) In the New Testament Soter is uniformly reserved for Christ, except in Lu 1:47; Jude 1:25, and the Pastorals. In 1Ti 1:1; 2:3; 4:10 it is applied only to the Father, in 2Ti 1:10, (only) it is applied to Christ, while in Titus there seems to be a deliberate alternation: of the Father in 1:3; 2:10; 3:4; of Christ in 1:4; 2:13; 3:6.

LITERATURE.

P. Wendland, "Soter" Zeitschrift fur neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, V, 335-353, 1904; J. Weiss, "Heiland," in RGG, II, 1910; H. Lietzmann, Der Weltheiland, 1909. Much detailed information is available in various parts of Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, 1910.

Burton Scott Easton

SAVOR

sa’-ver (reach; osme;

(1) The primary meaning of the word is "taste," "flavor" (from Latin sapor, "taste"). So in Mt 5:13; Lu 14:34, "if the salt have lost its savor" (moranthe, "become tasteless," "insipid," so as to lose its

characteristic preserving virtue).

(2) But generally it has the meaning of "smell," "odor":

(a) once of evil odor: "Its stench shall come up, and its ill savor shall come up" (Joe 2:20);

(b) elsewhere in the sense of pleasant smell. In the Old Testament, with the exception of Ex 5:21 and the King James Version So 1:3 (the Revised Version (British and American) "fragrance"), it is always accompanied by the adjective "sweet." It stands for the smell of sacrifices and oblations, in agreement with the ancient anthropomorphic idea that God smells and is pleased with the fragrance of sacrifices (e. g. "Yahweh smelled the sweet savor," Ge 8:21; "to make a sweet savor unto Yahweh," Nu 15:3; and frequently).

In the New Testament, "savor" in the sense of smell is used metaphorically:

(a) once the metaphor is borrowed from the incense which attends the victor’s triumphal procession; God is said to make manifest through His apostles "the savor of his knowledge in every place" as He "leadeth" them "in triumph in Christ" (2Co 2:14; see TRIUMPH.

(b) Elsewhere the metaphor is borrowed from the fragrant smell of the sacrifices. The apostles "are a sweet savor of Christ unto God" (2Co 2:15), i.e. they are, as it were, a sweet odor for God to smell, an odor which is pleasing to God, even though its effect upon men varies (to some it is a "savor from death unto death," i.e. such as is emitted by death and itself causes death; to others it is "a savor from life unto life," 2Co 2:16). By the same sacrificial metaphor, Christ’s offering of Himself to God is said to be "for a sweet smelling savor" (Eph 5:2 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "for an odor of a sweet smell"; the same phrase is used in Php 4:18 of acts of kindness to Paul, which were "a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God").

(3) Once it is used in the figurative sense of reputation: "Ye have made our savor to be abhorred (literally, "our smell to stink") in the eyes of Pharaoh" (Ex 5:21). Compare the English phrase, "to be in bad odor."

The verb "to savor" means:

(1) intransitively, to taste or smell of, to partake of the quality of something, as in the Preface of the King James Version, "to savour more of curiosity than wisdome," or

(2) transitively, to perceive by the taste or smell, to discern: "thou savourest not the things that be of God" (the King James Version Mt 16:23; Mr 8:33, the Revised Version (British and American) "mindest"; phroneis; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) sapis). The adjective "savory" occurs only in Ge 27:4,7,9,14,17,31 ("savory food") and the Revised Version (British and American) Isa 30:24 (margin "salted").

D. Miall Edwards

SAW

so.

See TOOLS.

SAWING ASUNDER

so’-ing a-sun’-der.

See PUNISHMENTS.

SAYEST

sa’-est: "Thou sayest" (Mt 27:11; Mr 15:2; Lu 22:70, "Ye say"; Joh 18:37), i.e. rightly; "Thou hast said" (Mt 26:25,64), =" Yes"; a rabbinical idiom never found in the Old Testament. Mr 14:62 renders by "I am." All these passages WHm punctuate interrogatively (compare Kethubhoth, f. 103 b).

SAYINGS OF JESUS

See LOGIA.

SAYINGS, DARK

sa’-ingz.

See DARK SAYINGS.

SAYINGS, FAITHFUL

See FAITHFUL SAYINGS.

SAYINGS, UNWRITTEN

un-rit’-’-n.

See AGRAPHA.

SCAB, SCABBED

skab, skab’-ed, skabd (yallepheth, micpachath, cappachath, verb sippach; semasia, leichen): These are generic terms for any skin disease in which there are patches of hard crusts on the surface. The commonest of these are the forms now named eczema, herpes and, perhaps, psoriasis, all of which are common in Bible lands. Milder cases in which the disease was localized and in small patches (the semasia of the Septuagint) did not render the bearer unclean, and they were to be distinguished by the priest (Le 13:2,6) from the more virulent and spreading eruptions which (Le 13:7) were regarded as causes of ceremonial uncleanness. These severer forms are the leichen of Septuagint mentioned in Le 21:20, which disqualified any son of Aaron from serving as a priest, and when affecting an animal rendered it unfit to be offered as a burnt offering (Le 22:22). Hippocrates speaks of these cases as obstinate and persistent, and Galen believed that they might degenerate into leprosy; hence, the terms in which Aeschylus speaks of it (Choephori 281). Celsus, however, recognized that leichen was a papular eruption, not a true scab. The name yallepheth seems to have been given to it on account of the firmness of attachment of the scabs, while the term micpachath refers to its tendency to spread and cover the surface. A cognate word in Eze 13:18 is the name of a large Tallith or prayer veil used by the false prophetesses in Israel (translated "kerchief"). Scabs were especially disfiguring on the head, and this infliction was threatened as a punishment on the daughters of Zion for their wanton haughtiness (Isa 3:17). In Middle English, "scab" is used for itch or mange, and as a term of opprobrium, as in Greene, Bacon and Bungay, 35, 1591.

Alexander Macalister

SCABBARD, SHEATH

skab’-ard, sheth.

See ARMOR, III, 5; WAR, 9.

SCAFFOLD

skaf’-old (kiyyor): The English word is used once of Solomon’s "brazen scaffold" on which he knelt at the dedication of the temple (2Ch 6:13).

SCALE

skal.

See SIEGE 4, (e); WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

SCALES

skalz

(1) qasqeseth "fish-scales";

(2) meghinnah, maghen, "scales of the crocodile";

(3) lepis, with verb lepizo "scale away" (Tobit 3:17; 11:13)):

(1) The first Hebrew word qasqeseth means the imbricated scales of fish, which together with the dorsal fin were a distinguishing mark of all fish allowed as food to the Israelite (Le 11:9 ff; De 14:9 f). In the figurative sense the word is used of a coat of mail (1Sa 17:5,38).

(2) Meghinnah from maghen, literally, "a buckler" or "small shield" (2Ch 23:9; Jer 46:3), is used in the description of the crocodile (see LEVIATHAN) for the horny scales or scutes imbedded in the skin, not imbricated upon it (Job 41:15 (Hebrew verse 7)).

(3) The Greek lepis, which in classical language has a much wider range of meaning than the above Hebrew words ("rind," "husk," "shell," "fish-scale," "scale of snake," "flake of metal and of snow," etc.), is found in the New Testament description of Paul’s recovery from temporary blindness, "And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight" (Ac 9:18).

There is nothing in the words of the sacred text which compels us to think of literal scales. (In Tobit, however, a literal flaking-off of foreign substance is meant.) We have here rather a description of the sensation which terminated the three days’ period of blindness which the apostle suffered after his meeting with the risen Lord on the road to Damascus. The apostle himself does not use this expression in his own graphic description of the same experience: "In that very hour I looked upon him" (Ac 22:13). The phrase has, however, come into English, for we speak of "scales falling from one’s eyes" when we mean a sudden illumination or remembrance or a dissipation of harassing doubt.

In Isa 40:12; the Revised Version (British and American) Pr 16:11 for peles, in the sense of "instrument for weighing."

See BALANCE.

H. L. E. Luering

SCALL

skol (netheq; thrausma): This only occurs in Leviticus 13 and 14 where it is used 14 times to describe

bald or scaly patches of eruption on the skin. Such patches are generally the result of the action of parasitic organisms. The common form known now as scalled head is produced by a microscopic plant, Achorion schoenleinii. In Old and Middle English, scall was used for scabbiness of the head (Chaucer and Spenser). See also Skeat, Concise Etymol. Dict. of English Language.

SCAPE-GOAT

skap’-got.

See AZAZEL.

SCARLET

skar’-let.

See COLORS; DYEING.

SCARLET (WORM)

(tola‘ath shani (Ex 25:4, etc.)): Cermes vermilio, a scale insect from which a red dye is obtained.

See COLOR; DYEING; WORM.

SCATTERED ABROAD

skat’-erd a-brod’.

See DISPERSION.

SCENT

sent:

(1) In Ho 14:7, "The scent (margin "his memorial") thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon." "Scent" is used for zekher (so Massoretic Text, but the pointing is uncertain), properly "memorial," whence the Revised Version margin. The English translation comes through the Septuagint which took z-k-r as "offering of sweet savor," and so "sweet savor." For the "wine of Lebanon" see WINE. If this translation is not right, the alternative is "memorial" in the sense of "renown."

(2) Job 14:9; Jer 48:11 for reach, "odor." "Scent" of the water in Job 14:9 is poetic for "contact with."

(3) The Wisdom of Solomon 11:18 the King James Version has "filthy scents of scattered smoke," where "scent" is used in the obsolete sense of "disagreeable odor." The translation is, however, very loose, and "scents" is a gloss; the Revised Version (British and American) "noisome smoke."

Burton Scott Easton

SCEPTRE; SCEPTER

sep'-ter (shebheT, sharbhiT, expanded form in Es 4:11; 5:2; 8:4; rhabdos (Additions to Esther 15:11; Heb 1:8), skeptros): A rod or mace used by a sovereign as a symbol of royal authority. The Hebrew shebheT is the ordinary word for rod or club, and is used of an ordinary rod (compare 2Sa 7:14), of the shepherd's crook (Ps 23:4), scribe's baton or marshal's staff (Jud 5:14), as well as of the symbol of royalty. Its symbolism may be connected with the use of the shebheT for protection (2Sa 23:21; Ps 23:4) or for punishment (Isa 10:24; 30:31). It is used with reference to the royal line descended from Judah (Ge 49:10), and figuratively of sovereignty in general and possibly of conquest (Nu 24:17, in Israel; Isa 14:5, in Babylonia; Am 1:5,8, in Syria, among Philistines; Zec 10:11, in Egypt), the disappearance or cutting off of him that holdeth the scepter being tantamount to loss of national independence. The kingship of Yahweh is spoken of as a scepter (Ps 45:6 (Hebrew verse 7) quoted in Heb 1:8). The manner of using the scepter by an oriental monarch is suggested in the act of Ahasuerus, who holds it out to Esther as a mark of favor. The subject touches the top of it, perhaps simply as an act of homage or possibly to indicate a desire to be heard. The scepter of Ahasuerus is spoken of as "golden" (Es 5:2), but it is probable that scepters were ordinarily made of straight branches (maTeh) of certain kinds of vines (Eze 19:11,14).

It is sometimes difficult to determine whether the word shebheT is used in figurative passages in the sense of scepter or merely in the ordinary sense of staff (e.g. Ps 125:3, the King James Version "rod," the Revised Version (British and American) and the American Standard Revised Version "sceptre" (of the wicked); Ps 2:9, "rod of iron"; Pr 22:8, "rod of his wrath"). Another word, mechoqeq, literally, "prescribing" (person or thing), formerly translated uniformly "lawgiver," is now generally taken, on the basis of parallelism, to mean "sceptre" in four poetic passages (Ge 49:10, "ruler's staff" to avoid repetition; Nu 21:18; Ps 60:7; 108:8).

Nathan Isaacs

SCEVA

se'-va (Skeua): A Jew, a chief priest, resident in Ephesus, whose seven sons were exorcists (Ac 19:14). Ewald regards the name as being Hebrew shekhabhyah. He was not an officiating priest, as there were only synagogues in Asia Minor. He may have belonged to a high-priestly family, or perhaps at one time he had been at the head of one of the 24 courses in the temple.

In the narrative the construction is loose. There were seven sons (Ac 19:14), and it would appear (Ac 19:16) that in this particular case all were present. But (Ac 19:16) the demon-possessed man over-powered "both of them." Textus Receptus of the New Testament gets over the difficulty by omitting "both," but Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Bezae, so Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, von Soden, and the best critics, retain the difficult reading. The explanation is that Ac 19:14 states the custom: "who did this" being hoi touto poiountes, "who used to do this." Ac 19:15 and 16 state a particular case in which two took part, but the incident is introduced in a careless manner.

Ewald would translate amphoteron as "in both sides," but this is impossible. Baur understood "disciples" for "sons." Codex Bezae and Syriac have an interesting expansion which Blass considers original (Ac 19:14): "Among whom also the sons (Syriac ‘seven’) of a certain Sceva, a priest, wished to do the same, (who) were in the custom of exorcising such. And entering into the demon-possessed man they began to call upon the Name, saying, ‘We charge you by Jesus whom Paul preaches to come out.’ "

S. F. Hunter

SCHISM

siz’-m (schisma): Only in 1Co 12:25. The same Greek word, literally, "a split," is translated "rent" in Mt 9:16; Mr 2:21; and "division" in Joh 7:43; 9:16; 10:19. It designates "a separation," not from, but within, the church, interfering with the harmonious coordination and cooperation of the members described in the preceding verses (1Co 12:18). The ecclesiastical meaning is that of a break from a church organization, that may or may not be connected with a doctrinal dissent.

SCHOOL

skool (schole).

See TYRANNUS.

SCHOOLMASTER

skool’-mas-ter: Ga 3:24 f the King James Version reads: "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." "Schoolmaster" is a translation of paidagogos, literally, "child-leader." This paidagagos was not a teacher but a slave, to whom in wealthy families the general oversight of a boy was committed. It was his duty to accompany his charge to and from school, never to lose sight of him in public, to prevent association with objectionable companions, to inculcate moral lessons at every opportunity, etc. He was a familiar figure in the streets, and the (sour) "face of paidagogos" and "to follow one like a paidagogos" were proverbial expressions. Naturally, to the average boy the paidagogos must have represented the incorporation of everything objectionable. Hence, Paul’s figure may be

paraphrased: "The law was a paidagogos, necessary but irksome, to direct us until the time of Christ. Then was the time of our spiritual coming-of-age, so that the control of the paidagogos ceased." The word paidagogos was taken over into Aramaic at an early date, and Paul's language; which is hardly that of a mere adult observer, suggests that he had had personal experience with the institution. Wealthy and intensely orthodox Jewish parents living in a Gentile city may well have adopted such a precaution for the protection of their children.

No English word renders paidagogos adequately. "Schoolmaster" is quite wrong, but Revised Version's "tutor" (compare 1Co 4:15) is little better in modern English.

Burton Scott Easton

SCHOOLS OF THE PROPHETS

See EDUCATION; PROPHETS.

SCIENCE

si'-ens: This word as found in the King James Version means simply "knowledge." "Science" occurs in the King James Version only in two places, Da 1:4, "children .... understanding science" (yodhe'edha'ath, "those who understand science"). The meaning of the term here is "knowledge," "wisdom." The only other occurrence of "science" is in the New Testament (1Ti 6:20, "avoiding .... oppositions of science falsely so called," tes pseudonumou gnoseos, "the falsely called gnosis"). "Science" is the translation of the Greek gnosis, which in the New Testament is usually rendered "knowledge." The science here referred to was a higher knowledge of Christian and divine things, which false teachers alleged that they possessed, and of which they boasted. It was an incipient form of Gnosticism, and it prevailed to a considerable extent in the churches of proconsular Asia, e.g. in Colosse and Ephesus. Timothy is put on his guard against the teaching of this gnosis falsely so called, for it set itself in opposition to the gospel.

See GNOSTICISM.

"Science" in the modern sense of the word, as the discovery and orderly classification and exposition of the phenomena and of the laws of Nature, is not found either in the Old Testament or the New Testament unless the passage in Daniel be interpreted as meaning the scientific knowledge which the learned men of Babylon possessed of mathematics and astronomy, etc. See also Ac 7:22. To the Hebrew mind all natural phenomena meant the working of the hand of God in the world, directly and immediately, without the intervention of any secondary laws.

John Rutherfurd

SCIMITAR

sim’-i-tar, -ter (akindke): Formerly given as "fauchion" in the King James Version Judith 13:6; 16:9, the weapon which Judith took down from the rail of the bed at Holofernes’ head, and with which she severed his head from his body.

SCOFF; SCOFFER

skof, skof’-er: The verb indicates the manifestation of contempt by insulting words or actions; it combines bitterness with ridicule. It is much more frequent in the Revised Version (British and American) than in the King James Version, replacing "scorn" of the latter in Ps 1:1; Pr 1:22, etc. "Scorn" refers rather to an inner emotion based on a sense of superiority; "scoff," to the outward expression of this emotion.

SCORN

skorn: Fox Talbot connects this English word with the Danish skarn, "dirt," "ordure" "mud," "mire." As distinguished from such words as "mock," "deride," "scoff," all of which refer specifically to the various ways in which scorn finds outward expression, scorn itself denotes a subjective state or reaction.

Further, this state or reaction is not simple but complex. It includes a sense of superiority, resentment, and aversion. This reaction occurs when one is confronted with a person or a proposition that by challenging certain things for itself evokes a vivid sense of one’s own superiority and awakens mingled resentment, repulsion and contempt by the hollowness of its claims and its intrinsic inferiority or worse. Scorn is a hotter, fiercer emotion than disdain or contempt. It is obvious that scorn may—indeed, it not uncommonly does—arise in connection with an not grounded, arrogant sense of self-esteem.

The word, outside of the phrase "laugh to scorn," is found only in the Old Testament, and then only 4 times (Es 3:6; King James Version, Ps 44:13; 79:4; Hab 1:10), and it represents three different Hebrew words for none of which it is a suitable rendering. The two words "thought scorn" in Es 3:6 represent but one in Hebrew, namely, bazah, for which "disdain" would be a nearer equivalent. In Hab 1:10 (the King James Version) the word translated "scorn" is micchaq, "an object of laughter," "laughing-stock." In Ps 44:13; 79:4 the Hebrew word is la‘agh from a root, probably meaning "to stutter," "stammer," for which "mocking" is a better English equivalent. In the King James Version Job 34:7; Ps 123:4, la‘agh is rendered "scorning". (the rendering given in Pr 1:22 to latson, a word from a totally different root and one much more nearly approximating the fundamental idea of the English word "Scorn." In Pr 29:8 and Isa 28:14 latson is rendered "scornful").

As a verb the word is the translation given to la‘agh, "to mock" (2Ki 19:21 parallel Isa 37:22 Job 22:19; Ne 2:19; Ps 22:7, "all laugh to scorn"); qalas =" to scoff" (Eze 16:31, margin "Greek: scoffeth," but text still "scorneth"); for the noun tsechoq, "laughter" (Eze 23:32); sachaq = to laugh," "laugh at" (Job 39:7,18; 2Ch 30:10), with the noun sechoq, "laugh to scorn" (the Revised Version (British and

American) "laughing-stock," Job 12:4); luts =" to scoff" (as used in ethical and religious connections) (Job 16:20; Pr 3:34; 9:12, all "scoff" in the Revised Version (British and American)); in Pr 19:28 the Revised Version (British and American), not happily, "mock at." the Revised Version (British and American) is warranted in substituting "scoff" for "scorn" because the context indicates some form of outward expression of the scorn.

The Revised Version (British and American) always (except Job 12:4; Sirach 6:4; 1 Macc 10:70) retains "laugh to scorn" (2Ki 19:21; 2Ch 30:10; Ne 2:19; Job 22:19; Ps 22:7; Isa 37:22; Eze 16:31; 23:32; RAPC 2Es 2:21; Jdt 12:12; Wis 4:18; Sir 7:11; 13:7; 20:17; Mt 9:24; Mr 5:40; Lu 8:53). The verb in Apocrypha and the New Testament is usually katagelao, but in The Wisdom of Solomon 4:1 ekgelao; in Sirach 13:7 [@katamokomai; and in 2 Esdras 2:21 inrideo. In addition "scorn" is retained in Es 3:6; Job 39:7,18; RAPC 2Es 8:56 (contemno). In Pr 19:28 "scorn" is changed to "mock at" but elsewhere invariably to "scoff."

Scorner is the translation of the participle of luts and once of the participle of latsats. For "scorner" the Revised Version (British and American) everywhere substitutes—properly—"scoffer." Outside of Proverbs (and Ho 7:5) the word is to be found only in Ps 1:2. The force of the word has been well indicated by Cheyne, who says that the "scorner (scoffer) is one who despises that which is holy and avoids the company of the noble ‘wise men,’ but yet in his own vain way seeks for truth; his character is marked by arrogance as that of the wise is characterized by devout caution."

W. M. McPheeters

SCORPION

skor’-pi-un (aqrabh; compare Arabic aqrab, "scorpion"; ma‘aleh ‘aqrabbim, "the ascent of Akrabbim"; skorpios. Note that the Greek and Hebrew may be akin; compare, omitting the vowels, ‘krb and skrp): In De 8:15, we have, "who led thee through the great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents (nachash saraph) and scorpions (‘aqrabh)." Rehoboam (1Ki 12:11,14; 2Ch 10:11,14) says, "My father chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions." Ezekiel is told to prophesy to the children of Israel (2:6), and "Be not afraid of them, neither be afraid of their words, though briers and thorns are with thee, and thou dost dwell among scorpions." "The ascent of Akrabbim," the north end of Wadi-ul-‘Arabah, South of the Dead Sea, is mentioned as a boundary 3 times (Nu 34:4; Jos 15:3; Jud 1:36). Jesus says to the Seventy (Lu 10:19), "Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions," and again in Lu 11:12 He says, "Or if he shall ask an egg, will he give him a scorpion?"

Note that we have here three doublets, the loaf and the stone, the fish and the serpent, and the egg and the scorpion, whereas in the passage in Matthew (7:9 f) we have only the loaf and stone and the fish and serpent. Encyclopedia Biblica (s.v. "Scorpion") ingeniously seeks to bring Lu into nearer agreement with Matthew by omitting from Luke the second doublet, i.e. the fish and the serpent, instancing several texts as authority for the omission, and reading opson, "fish," for oon, "egg."

In Re 9:2-10 there come out of the smoke of the abyss winged creatures ("locusts," akrides) like war-horses with crowns of gold, with the faces of men, hair of women, teeth of lions, breastplates of iron, and with stinging tails like scorpions. In Ecclesiasticus 26:7 it is said of an evil wife, "He that taketh hold of her is as one that graspeth a scorpion." In 1 Macc 6:51 we find mention of "pieces [@skorpidia, diminutive of skorpios to cast darts." In Plutarch skorpios is used in the same sense (Liddell and Scott, under the word skorpios.

In the passage cited from Deuteronomy, and probably also in the name "ascent of Akrabbim," we find references to the abundance of scorpions, especially in the warmer parts of the country. Though there is a Greek proverb, "Look for a scorpion under every stone," few would agree with the categorical statement of Tristram (NHB) that "every third stone is sure to conceal one." Nevertheless, campers and people sleeping on the ground need to exercise care in order to avoid their stings, which, though often exceedingly painful for several hours, are seldom fatal.

Scorpions are not properly insects, but belong with spiders, mites and ticks to the Arachnidae. The scorpions of Palestine are usually 2 or 3 inches long. The short cephalothorax bears a powerful pair of jaws, two long limbs terminating with pincers, which make the creature look like a small crayfish or lobster, and four pairs of legs. The rest of the body consists of the abdomen, a broad part continuous with the cephalothorax, and a slender part forming the long tail which terminates with the sting. The tail is usually carried curved over the back and is used for stinging; the prey into insensibility. Scorpions feed mostly on insects for which they lie in wait. The scorpion family is remarkable for having existed with very little change from the Silurian age to the present time.

It does not seem necessary to consider that the words of Rehoboam (1Ki 12:11, etc.) refer to a whip that was called a scorpion, but rather that as the sting of a scorpion is worse than the lash of a whip, so his treatment would be harsher than his father’s.

Alfred Ely Day

SCORPIONS, CHASTISING WITH

skor’-pi-unz.

See PUNISHMENTS 3, (17); SCORPION.

SCOURGE; SCOURGING

skurj, skur’-jing (@mastix], mastigoo; in Ac 22:25 mastizo, in Mr 15:15 parallel Mt 27:26 phragelloo): A Roman implement for severe bodily punishment. Horace calls it horribile flagellum. It consisted of a handle, to which several cords or leather thongs were affixed, which were weighted with jagged pieces of bone or metal, to make the blow more painful and effective. It is comparable, in its horrid effects, only with the Russian knout. The victim was tied to a post (Ac 22:25) and the blows were applied to the

back and loins, sometimes even, in the wanton cruelty of the executioner, to the face and the bowels. In the tense position of the body, the effect can easily be imagined. So hideous was the punishment that the victim usually fainted and not rarely died under it. Eusebius draws a horribly realistic picture of the torture of scourging (Historia Ecclesiastica, IV, 15). By its application secrets and confessions were wrung from the victim (Ac 22:24). It usually preceded capital punishment (Livy xxxiii.36). It was illegal to apply the flagallum to a Roman citizen (Ac 22:25), since the Porcian and Sempronian laws, 248 and 123 BC, although these laws were not rarely broken in the provinces (Tac. Hist. iv.27; Cic. Verr. v.6, 62; Josephus, BJ, II, xiv, 9). As among the Russians today, the number of blows was not usually fixed, the severity of the punishment depending entirely on the commanding officer. In the punishment of Jesus, we are reminded of the words of Ps 129:3. Among the Jews the punishment of flagellation was well known since the Egyptian days, as the monuments abundantly testify. The word "scourge" is used in Le 19:20, but the American Standard Revised Version translates "punished," the original word biqqoreth expressing the idea of investigation. De 25:3 fixed the mode of a Jewish flogging and limits the number of blows to 40. Apparently the flogging was administered by a rod. The Syrians reintroduced true scourging into Jewish life, when Antiochus Epiphanes forced them by means of it to eat swine's flesh (2 Macc 6:30; 7:1). Later it was legalized by Jewish law and became customary (Mt 10:17; 23:34; Ac 22:19; 26:11), but the traditional limitation of the number of blows was still preserved. Says Paul in his "foolish boasting": "in stripes above measure," "of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one," distinguishing it from the "beatings with rods," thrice repeated (2Co 11:23-25).

The other Old Testament references (Job 5:21; 9:23; Isa 10:26; 28:15,18 shot; Jos 23:13 shotet) are figurative for "affliction." Notice the curious mixture of metaphors in the phrase "over-flowing scourge" (Isa 28:15-18).

Henry E. Dosker

SCRABBLE

skrab'-l: Occurs only in 1Sa 21:13, as the translation of tawah: "David .... feigned himself mad and scrabbled on the doors of the gate." "To scrabble" (modern English "scrawl") is here to make unmeaning marks; tawah means "to make a mark" from taw, "a mark," especially as a cross (Eze 9:4), a signature (Job 31:35, see the Revised Version (British and American)), the name of the Hebrew letter taw ("t") originally made in the form of a cross; the Revised Version margin has "made marks"; but Septuagint has tumpanizo, "to beat as a drum," which the Vulgate, Ewald, Driver and others follow ("beat upon" or "drummed on the doors of the city," which seems more probable).

SCREECH OWL

skrech.

See NIGHT-MONSTER.

SCRIBES

skribz: The existence of law leads necessarily to a profession whose business is the study and knowledge of the law; at any rate, if the law is extensive and complicated. At the time of Ezra and probably for some time after, this was chiefly the business of the priests. Ezra was both priest and scholar (copher). It was chiefly in the interest of the priestly cult that the most important part of the Pentateuch was written. The priests were therefore also in the first instance the scholars and the guardians of the Law; but in the course of time this was changed. The more highly esteemed the Law became in the eyes of the people, the more its study and interpretation became a lifework by itself, and thus there developed a class of scholars who, though not priests, devoted themselves assiduously to the Law. These became known as the scribes, that is, the professional students of the Law. During the Hellenistic period, the priests, especially those of the upper class, became tainted with the Hellenism of the age and frequently turned their attention to paganistic culture, thus neglecting the Law of their fathers more or less and arousing the scribes to opposition. Thus, the scribes and not the priests were now the zealous defenders of the Law, and hence, were the true teachers of the people. At the time of Christ, this distinction was complete. The scribes formed a solid profession which held undisputed sway over the thought of the people. In the New Testament they are usually called (grammateis), i.e. "students of the Scriptures," "scholars," corresponding to the Hebrew (copherim) = homines literati, those who make a profession of literary studies, which, in this case, of course, meant chiefly the Law. Besides this general designation, we also find the specific word (nomikoi), i.e. "students of the Law," "lawyers" (Mt 22:35; Lu 7:30; 10:25; 11:45,52; 14:3); and in so far as they not only know the Law but also teach it they are called (nomodidaskaloi), "doctors of the Law" (Lu 5:17; Ac 5:34).

The extraordinary honors bestowed on these scholars on the part of the people are expressed in their honorary titles. Most common was the appellative "rabbi" =" my lord" (Mt 23:7 and otherwise). This word of polite address gradually became a title. The word "rabboni" (Mr 10:51; Joh 20:16) is an extensive form, and was employed by the disciples to give expression to their veneration of Christ. In the Greek New Testament "rabbi" is translated as (kurie) (Mt 8:2,6,8,21,25 and otherwise), or (didaskale) (Mt 8:19 and otherwise), in Luke by (epistata) (Lu 5:5; 8:24,45; 9:33,19; 17:13). Besides these, we find (pater), "father," and (kathegetes), "teacher" (Mt 23:9 f).

From their students the rabbis demanded honors even surpassing those bestowed on parents. "Let the honor of thy friend border on the honor of thy teacher, and the honor of thy teacher on the fear of God" (’Abhoth 4 12). "The honor of thy teacher must surpass the honor bestowed on thy father; for son and father are both in duty bound to honor the teacher" (Kerithoth 6 9). Everywhere the rabbis demanded the position of first rank (Mt 23:6 f; Mr 12:38 f; Lu 11:43; 20:46). Their dress equaled that of the nobility. They wore (stolai), "tunics," and these were the mark of the upper class.

Since the scribes were lawyers (see LAWYER), much of their time was occupied in teaching and in judicial functions, and both these activities must be pursued gratuitously. Rabbi Zadok said: "Make the knowledge of the Law neither a crown in which to glory nor a spade with which to dig." Hillel used to say: "He who employs the crown (of the Law) for external purposes shall dwindle." That the judge

should not receive presents or bribes was written in the Law (Ex 23:8; De 16:19); hence, the Mishna said: "If anyone accept pay for rendering judgment, his judgment is null and void." The rabbis were therefore obliged to make their living by other means. Some undoubtedly had inherited wealth; others pursued a handicraft besides their study of the Law. Rabbi Gamaliel II emphatically advised the pursuit of a business in addition to the pursuit of the Law. It is well known that the apostle Paul kept up his handicraft even after he had become a preacher of the gospel (Ac 18:3; 20:34; 1Co 4:12; 9:6; 2Co 11:7; 1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8), and the same is reported of many rabbis. But in every instance the pursuit of the Law is represented as the worthier, and warning is given not to overestimate the value of the ordinary avocation. It was a saying of Hillel: "He that devotes himself to trade will not become wise." The principle of gratuity was probably carried out in practice only in connection with the judicial activity of the scribes; hardly in connection with their work as teachers. Even the Gospels, in spite of the admonition that the disciples should give without pay because they had received without pay (Mt 10:8), nevertheless also state that the workman is worthy of his hire (Mt 10:10; Lu 10:7); and Paul (1Co 9:14) states it as his just due that he receive his livelihood from those to whom he preaches the gospel, even though he makes use of this right only in exceptional cases (1Co 9:3-18; 2Co 11:8,9; Ga 6:6; Php 4:10,18). Since this appears to have been the thought of the times, we are undoubtedly justified in assuming that the Jewish teachers of the Law also demanded pay for their services. Indeed, the admonitions above referred to, not to make instruction in the Law the object of self-interest, lead to the conclusion that gratuity was not the rule; and in Christ’s philippics against the scribes and Pharisees He makes special mention of their greed (Mr 12:40; Lu 16:14; 20:47). Hence, even though they ostensibly gave instruction in the Law gratuitously, they must have practiced methods by which they indirectly secured their fees.

Naturally the place of chief influence for the scribes up to the year 70 AD was Judea. But not only there were they to be found. Wherever the zeal for the law of the fathers was a perceptible force, they were indispensable; hence, we find them also in Galilee (Lu 5:17) and in the Diaspora. In the Jewish epitaphs in Rome, dating from the latter days of the empire, grammateis are frequently mentioned; and the Babylonian scribes of the 5th and 6th centuries were the authors of the most monumental work of rabbinical Judaism—the Talmud.

Since the separation of the Pharisaic and the Sadducean tendencies in Judaism, the scribes generally belonged to the Pharisaic class; for this latter is none other than the party which recognized the interpretations or "traditions" which the scribes in the course of time had developed out of the body of the written Law and enforced upon the people as the binding rule of life. Since, however, "scribes" are merely "students of the Law," there must also have been scribes of the Sadducee type; for it is not to be imagined that this party, which recognized only the written Law as binding, should not have had some opposing students in the other class. Indeed, various passages of the New Testament which speak of the "scribes of the Pharisees" (Mr 2:16; Lu 5:30; Ac 23:9) indicate that there were also "scribes of the Sadducees."

Under the reign and leadership of the scribes, it became the ambition of every Israelite to know more or less of the Law. The aim of education in family, school and synagogue was to make the entire people a people of the Law. Even the common laborer should know what was written in the Law; and not only

know it, but also do it. His entire life should be governed according to the norm of the Law, and, on the whole, this purpose was realized in a high degree. Josephus avers: "Even though we be robbed of our riches and our cities and our other goods, the Law remains our possession forever. And no Jew can be so far removed from the and of his fathers nor will he fear a hostile commander to such a degree that he would not fear his Law more than his commander." So loyal were the majority of the Jews toward their Law that they would gladly endure the tortures of the rack and even death for it. This frame of mind was due almost wholly to the systematic and persistent instruction of the scribes.

The motive underlying this enthusiasm for the Law was the belief in divine retribution in the strictest judicial sense. The prophetic idea of a covenant which God had made with His select people was interpreted purely in the judicial sense. The covenant was a contract through which both parties were mutually bound. The people are bound to observe the divine Law literally and conscientiously; and, in return for this, God is in duty bound to render the promised reward in proportion to the services rendered. This applies to the people as a whole as well as to the individual. Services and reward must always stand in mutual relation to each other. He who renders great services may expect from the justice of God that he will receive great returns as his portion, while, on the other hand, every transgression also must be followed by its corresponding punishment.

The results corresponded to the motives. Just as the motives in the main were superficial, so the results were an exceedingly shallow view of religious and moral life. Religion was reduced to legal formalism. All religious and moral life was dragged down to the level of law, and this must necessarily lead to the following results:

(1) The individual is governed by a norm, the application of which could have only evil results when applied in this realm. Law has the purpose of regulating the relations of men to each other according to certain standards. Its object is not the individual, but only the body of society. In the law, the individual must find the proper rule for his conduct toward society as an organism. This is a matter of obligation and of government on the part of society. But religion is not a matter of government; where it is found, it is a matter of freedom, of choice, and of conduct.

(2) By reducing the practice of religion to the form of law, all acts are placed on a paragraph with each other. The motives are no longer taken into consideration, but only the deed itself.

(3) From this it follows that the highest ethical attainment was the formal satisfaction of the Law, which naturally led to finical literalism.

(4) Finally, moral life must, under such circumstances, lose its unity and be split up into manifold precepts and duties. Law always affords opportunity for casuistry, and it was the development of this in the guidance of the Jewish religious life through the "precepts of the elders" which called forth Christ’s repeated denunciation of the work of the scribes.

Frank E. Hirsch

SCRIP

skrip: A word connected with "scrap," and meaning a "bag," either as made from a "scrap" (of skin) or as holding "scraps" (of food, etc.). the King James Version has "scrip" in 1Sa 17:40 and 6 times in New Testament; the English Revised Version has "wallet" in the New Testament, but retains "script" in 1Sa 17:40; the American Standard Revised Version has "wallet" throughout.

See BAG.

SCRIPTURE

skrip’-tur (he graphe, plural hai graphai): The word means "writing." In the Old Testament it occurs in the King James Version only once, "the scripture of truth," in Da 10:21, where it is more correctly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), "the writing of truth." The reference is not to Holy Scripture, but to the book in which are inscribed God’s purposes. In the New Testament, "scripture" and "scriptures" stand regularly for the Old Testament sacred books regarded as "inspired" (2Ti 3:16), "the oracles of God" (Ro 3:2). Compare on this usage Mt 21:42; 22:29; Mr 12:10; Lu 4:21; 24:27,32,45; Joh 5:39; 10:35; Ac 8:32; 17:2,11; Ro 15:4; 16:26, etc.; in Ro 1:2, "holy scriptures." See BIBLE. The expression "holy scriptures" in 2Ti 3:15 the King James Version represents different words (hiera grammata) and is properly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "sacred writings." In 2Pe 3:16, the term "scriptures" is extended to the Eppistle of Paul. In Jas 4:5, the words occur: "Think ye that the scripture speaketh in vain? Doth the spirit which he made to dwell in us long unto envying?" The passage is probably rather a summary of Scripture teaching than intended as a direct quotation. Others (e.g. Westcott) think the word is used in a wide sense of a Christian hymn.

James Orr

SCRIPTURES, SEARCH THE

skrip’-turz.

See SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES.

SCROLL

skrol.

See ROLL.

SCUM

skum (chel’ah; Septuagint ios, "poison" or "verdigris"; compare Plato Rep. 609a): The word is only found in Eze 24:6,11,12, where the Revised Version (British and American) translates it "rust." The fact, however, that the caldron is of brass and therefore not liable to rust, and the astonishment expressed that the fire did not remove it (24:12), would seem to point to the preferability of the translation "scum," the residue of dirt adhering to the caldron from previous use.

SCURVY skur’-vi (garabh); psora agria (Le 21:20; 22:22)): This word is used to denote an itchy, scaly disease of the scalp, probably any of the parasitic diseases which are known as tinea, porrigo or impetigo. These cases have no relation whatever to the disease now known as scorbutus or scurvy. The name was probably derived from its scaliness, and the old Greek physicians believed these diseases to be peculiarly intractable.

The name "Gareb" is used in Jer 31:39 as the placename of a hill at or near the southeastern corner of Jerusalem, probably from the bare roughness of the surface of its slope at the southern end of the Wady er-Rababi. Another hill of this name is mentioned near Shiloh in the Talmud, and the name is given to one of David’s warriors (2Sa 23:38).

Scurvy etymologically means any condition of scaliness of skin which can be scraped off, such as dandruff.

Alexander Macalister

SCYTHIANS

sith’-i-anz (hoi Skuthai): The word does not occur in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, but Septuagint of Jud 1:27 inserts (Skuthon polis (Scythopolis), in explanation, as being the same as Beth-shean. The same occurs in Apocrypha (Judith 3:10; 1 Macc 12:29), and the Scythians as a people in 2 Macc 4:47, and the adjective in 3 Macc 7:5. The people are also mentioned in the New Testament (Col 3:11), where, as in Maccabees, the fact that they were barbarians is implied. This is clearly set forth in classical writers, and the description of them given by Herodotus in book iv of his history represents a race of savages, inhabiting a region of rather indefinite boundaries, north of the Black and Caspian seas and the Caucasus Mountains. They were nomads who neither plowed nor sowed (iv.19), moving about in wagons and carrying their dwellings with them (ibid. 46); they had the most filthy habits and never washed in water (ibid. 75); they drank the blood of the first enemy killed in battle, and made napkins of the scalps and drinking bowls of the skulls of the slain (ibid. 64-65). Their deities were many of them identified with those of the Greeks, but the most characteristic rite was the worship of the naked sword (ibid. 62), and they sacrificed every hundredth man taken in war to this deity. War was their chief business, and they were a terrible scourge to the nations of Western Asia. They broke through the barrier of the Caucasus in 632 BC and swept down like a swarm of locusts upon Media and Assyria, turning the fruitful fields into a desert; pushing across Mesopotamia, they ravaged Syria and were about to invade

Egypt when Psammitichus I, who was besieging Ashdod, bought them off by rich gifts, but they remained in Western Asia for 28 years, according to Herodotus. It is supposed that a company of them settled in Beth-shean, and from this circumstance it received the name Scythopolis. Various branches of the race appeared at different times, among the most noted of which were the PARTHIANS (which see).

H. Porter

SCYTHOPOLIS

si-thop’-o-lis, si-thop’-o-lis.

See BETH-SHEAN.

SEA

se (yam; thalassa; in Ac 27:5 pelagos): The Mediterranean is called ha-yam ha-gadhol, "the great sea" (Nu 34:6; Jos 1:4; Eze 47:10, etc.); ha-yam ha-’acharon, "the hinder," or "western sea" (De 11:24; 34:2; Joe 2:20; Zec 14:8); yam pelishtim, "the sea of the Philis" (Ex 23:31); the King James Version translates yam yapho’ in Ezr 3:7 by "sea of Joppa," perhaps rightly.

The Dead Sea is called yam ha-melach, "the Salt Sea" (Nu 34:3; De 3:17; Jos 3:16, etc.); ha-yam ha-qadhmoni, "the east sea" (Eze 47:18; Joe 2:20; Zec 14:8); yam ha-‘arabhah,"the sea of the Arabah" (De 3:17; Jos 3:16; 12:3; 2Ki 14:25).

The Red Sea is called yam cuph, literally, "sea of weeds" (Ex 10:19; Nu 14:25; De 1:1; Jos 2:10; Jud 11:16; 1Ki 9:26; Ne 9:9; Ps 106:7; Jer 49:21, etc.); (eruthra thalassa), literally, "red sea" (The Wisdom of Solomon 19:7; Ac 7:36; Heb 11:29); yam mitsrayim, "the Egyptian sea" (Isa 11:15).

Yam is used of the Nile in Na 3:8 and probably also in Isa 19:5, as in modern Arabic bachr, "sea," is used of the Nile and its affluents. Yam is often used for "west" or "westward," as "look from the place where thou art, ... westward" (Ge 13:14); "western border" (Nu 34:6). Yam is used for "sea" in general (Ex 20:11); also for "molten sea" of the temple (1Ki 7:23).

The Sea of Galilee is called kinnereth, "Chinnereth" (Nu 34:11); kinaroth, "Chinneroth" (Jos 11:2); kinneroth, "Chinneroth" (1Ki 15:20); yam kinnereth, "the sea of Chinnereth" (Nu 34:11; Jos 13:27); yam kinneroth, "the sea of Chinneroth (Jos 12:3); (he limne Gennesaret), "the lake of Gennesaret" (Lu 5:1); and (to hudor Gennesar), "the water of Gennesar" (1 Macc 11:67), from late Hebrew ginecar, or (genecar; he thalassa tes Galilaias), "the sea of Galilee" (Mt 4:18; 15:29; Mr 1:16; 7:31; Joh 6:1); (he thalassa tes Tiberiados), "the sea of Tiberias" (Joh 21:1; compare Joh 6:1).

In Jer 48:32 we have yam ya‘zer, "the sea of Jazer." Jazer is a site East of the Jordan, not satisfactorily

identified (Nu 21:32; 32:1,3,15; Jos 13:25; 21:39; 2Sa 24:5; 1Ch 6:81; 26:31; Isa 16:8,9).

See SEA OF JAZER.

In midhbar yam, "the wilderness of the sea" (Isa 21:1), there may perhaps be a reference to the Persian Gulf.

Alfred Ely Day

SEA OF CHINNERETH

kin’-e-reth.

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

SEA OF GALILEE

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

SEA OF GLASS

See GLASS, SEA OF.

SEA OF JAZER

(yam ya‘zer): This is a scribal error (Jer 48:32), yam ("sea") being accidentally imported from the preceding clause.

See JAZER; SEA.

SEA OF JOPPA

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

SEA OF LOT

See DEAD SEA; LAKE.

SEA OF SODOM (SODOMITISH

sod-om-it’-ish).

See DEAD SEA.

SEA OF THE ARABAH

See DEAD SEA.

SEA OF THE PHILISTINES

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

SEA OF THE PLAIN (ARABAH)

ar’-a-ba).

See DEAD SEA.

SEA OF TIBERIAS

ti-be’-ri-as.

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

SEA, ADRIATIC

a-dri-at’-ic, ad-ri-at’-ik.

See ADRIA.

SEA, BRAZEN

bra’-z’n.

See SEA, THE MOLTEN.

SEA, DEAD; EASTERN

es’-tern.

See DEAD SEA.

SEA, FORMER

for’-mer.

See DEAD SEA; FORMER.

SEA, HINDER; UTMOST; UTTERMOST; WESTERN

hin’-der; ut’-most; ut’-er-most; wes’-tern.

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

SEA, MEDITERRANEAN

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

SEA, RED

See RED SEA.

SEA, SALT

See DEAD SEA.

SEA, THE

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA; SEA, THE GREAT.

SEA, THE GREAT

(ha-yam ha-gadhol):

1. Names of the Sea:

This is the name given to the Mediterranean, which formed the western boundary of Palestine (Nu 34:6 f; Jos 15:12,47; Eze 47:19 f; 48:28). It is also called "the hinder sea" (Hebrew ha-yam ha-’aharon), i.e. the western sea (De 11:24; 34:2; , Joe 2:20; Zec 14:8), and "the sea of the Philis" (Ex 23:31), which, of

course, applies especially to the part washing the shore of Philistia, from Jaffa southward. Generally, when the word "sea" is used, and no other is definitely indicated, the Mediterranean is intended (Ge 49:13; Nu 13:29, etc.). It was the largest sheet of water with which the Hebrews had any acquaintance. Its gleaming mirror, stretching away to the sunset, could be seen from many an inland height.

2. Israel and the Sea:

It bulked large in the minds of the landsmen—for Israel produced few mariners—impressing itself upon their speech, so that "seaward" was the common term for "westward" (Ex 26:22; Jos 5:1, etc.). Its mystery and wonder, the raging of the storm, and the sound of "sorrow on the sea," borne to their upland ears, infected them with a strange dread of its wide waters, to which the seer of Patmos gave the last Scriptural expression in his vision of the new earth, where "the sea is no more" (Re 21:1).

3. The Coast Line:

Along the coast lay the tribal territories assigned to Asher, Zebulun, Manasseh, Da and Judah. Many of the cities along the shore they failed to possess, however, and much of the land. The coast line offered little facility for the making of harbors. The one seaport of which in ancient times the Hebrews seem to have made much use was Joppa—the modern Jaffa (2Ch 2:16, etc.). From this place, probably, argosies of Solomon turned their prows westward. Here, at least, "ships of Tarshish" were wont to set out upon their adventurous voyages (Jon 1:3). The ships on this sea figure in the beautiful vision of Isaiah (60:8 f).

See ACCO; JOPPA.

4. The Sea in the New Testament:

The boy Jesus, from the heights above Nazareth, must often have looked on the waters of the great sea, as they broke in foam on the curving shore, from the roots of Carmel to the point at Acre. Once only in His journeyings, so far as we know, did He approach the sea, namely on His ever-memorable visit to the "borders of Tyre and Sidon" (Mt 15:21; Mr 7:24). The sea, in all its moods, was well known to the great apostle of the Gentiles. The three shipwrecks, which he suffered (2Co 11:25), were doubtless due to the power of its angry billows over the frail craft of those old days.

See PAUL.

5. Debt of Palestine to the Sea:

The land owes much to the great sea. During the hot months of summer, a soft breeze from the water springs up at dawn, fanning all the seaward face of the Central Range. At sunset the chilled air slips down the slopes and the higher strata drift toward the uplands, charged with priceless moisture, giving rise to the refreshing dews which make the Palestinian morning so sweet.

See, further, MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

W. Ewing

SEA, THE MOLTEN; SEA, THE BRAZEN

mol’-t’n, or (yam mutsaq, yam hanechosheth): This was a large brazen (bronze) reservoir for water which stood in the court of Solomon’s Temple between the altar and the temple porch, toward the South (1Ki 7:23-26; 2Ch 4:2-5,10). The bronze from which it was made is stated in 1Ch 18:8 to have been taken by David from the cities Tibhath and Cun. It replaced the laver of the tabernacle, and, like that, was used for storing the water in which the priests washed their hands and their feet (compare Ex 30:18; 38:8). It rested on 12 brazen (bronze) oxen, facing in four groups the four quarters of heaven. For particulars of shape, size and ornamentation, see TEMPLE. The "sea" served its purpose till the time of Ahaz, who took away the brazen oxen, and placed, the sea upon a pavement (2Ki 16:17). It is recorded that the oxen were afterward taken to Babylon (Jer 52:20). The sea itself shared the same fate, being first broken to pieces (2Ki 25:13,16).

W. Shaw Caldecott

SEA, WESTERN

wes’-tern.

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

SEA-MEW

se’-mu (shachaph; laros; Latin, Larus canus): The sea-gull. Used by modern translators in the list of abominations in the place of the cuckoo (Le 11:16; De 14:15). It is very probable that the sea-gull comes closer to the bird intended than the CUCKOO (which see). The sea-gull is a "slender" bird, but not "lean" as the root shachaph implies. However, with its stretch of wing and restless flight it gives this impression. Gulls are common all along the Mediterranean coast and around the Sea of Galilee. They are thought to have more intelligence than the average bird, and to share with some eagles, hawks, vultures and the raven the knowledge that if they find mollusk they cannot break they can carry it aloft and drop it on the rocks. Only a wise bird learns this. Most feathered creatures pick at an unyielding surface a few times and then seek food elsewhere. There are two reasons why these birds went on the abomination lists. To a steady diet of fish they add carrion. Then they are birds of such nervous energy, so exhaustless in flight, so daring in flying directly into the face of fierce winds, that the Moslems believed them to be tenanted with the souls of the damned. Moses was reared and educated among the Egyptians, and the laws he formulated often are tinged by traces of his early life. History fails to record any

instance of a man reared in Egypt who permitted the killing of a gull, ibis, or hoopoe.

Gene Stratton-Porter

SEA-MONSTER

se’-mon-ster: Ge 1:21 (tanninim), "sea monsters," the King James Version "whales," Septuagint (ta kete), "sea-monsters," "huge fish," or "whales." Job 7:12 (tannin), "sea-monster" the King James Version "whale," the Septuagint drakon, "dragon." Ps 74:13 (tanninim), the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version margin. "sea-monsters," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "dragons," the King James Version margin "whales" Septuagint drakontes, "dragons" Ps 148:7 (tanninim), "sea-monsters" the King James Version and the English Revised Version "dragons," the English Revised Version margin "sea-monsters" or "water-spouts," Septuagint drakontes, "dragons." La 4:3 (tannin) "jackals," the King James Version "sea monsters" the King James Version margin "sea calves," Septuagint drakontes. Mt 12:40 (referring to Jonah) (ketos), English Versions of the Bible "whale," the Revised Version margin "sea-monster." In the Apocrypha, the Revised Version (British and American) changes the King James Version "whale (ketos) into "sea-monster" in Sirach 43:25 but not in So of Three Children verse 57.

See DRAGON; JACKAL; WHALE.

Alfred Ely Day

SEAH

se’-a (ce’ah): A dry measure equal to about one and one-half pecks.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

SEAL

sel (substantive chotham, "seal," "signet," Tabba‘ath, "signet-ring"; Aramaic ‘izqa’; sphragis; verb chatham, (Aramaic chatham); (sphragizo), (katasphragizomai, "to seal"):

I. Literal Sense.

A seal is an instrument of stone, metal or other hard substance (sometimes set in a ring), on which is engraved some device or figure, and is used for making an impression on some soft substance, as clay or wax, affixed to a document or other object, in token of authenticity.

1. Prevalence in Antiquity:

The use of seals goes back to a very remote antiquity, especially in Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria. Herodotus (i.195) records the Babylonian custom of wearing signets. In Babylonia the seal generally took the form of a cylinder cut in crystal or some hard stone, which was bored through from end to end and a cord passed through it. The design, often accompanied by the owner's name, was engraved on the curved part. The signet was then suspended by the cord round the neck or waist (compare the Revised Version (British and American) "cord" in Ge 38:18; "upon thy heart .... upon thine arm," i.e. one seal hanging down from the neck and another round the waist; So 8:6). In Egypt, too, as in Babylonia, the cylinder was the earliest form used for the purpose of a seal; but this form was in Egypt gradually superseded by the scarab (= beetle-shaped) as the prevailing type. Other forms, such as the cone-shaped, were also in use. From the earliest period of civilization the finger-ring on which some distinguishing badge was engraved was in use as a convenient way of carrying the signet, the earliest extant rings being those found in Egyptian tombs. Other ancient peoples, such as the Phoenicians, also used seals. From the East the custom passed into Greece and other western countries. Devices of a variety of sorts were in use at Rome, both by the emperors and by private individuals. In ancient times, almost every variety of precious stones was used for seals, as well as cheaper material, such as limestone or terra-cotta. In the West wax came early into use as the material for receiving the impression of the seal, but in the ancient East clay was the medium used (compare Job 38:14). Pigment and ink also came into use.

2. Seals among the Hebrews:

That the Israelites were acquainted with the use in Egypt of signets set in rings is seen in the statement that Pharaoh delivered to Joseph his royal signet as a token of deputed authority (Ge 41:41 f). They were also acquainted with the use of seals among the Persians and Medes (Es 3:12; 8:8-10; Da 6:17). The Hebrews themselves used them at an early period, the first recorded instance being Ge 38:18,25, where the patriarch Judah is said to have pledged his word to Tamar by leaving her his signet, cord and staff. We have evidence of engraved signets being in important use among them in early times in the description of the two stones on the high priest's ephod (Ex 28:11; 39:6), of his golden plate (Ex 28:36; 39:30), and breastplate (Ex 39:14). Ben-Sirach mentions as a distinct occupation the work of engraving on signets (Sirach 38:27). From the case of Judah and the common usage in other countries, we may infer that every Hebrew of any standing wore a seal. In the case of the signet ring, it was usual to wear it on one of the fingers of the right hand (Jer 22:24). The Hebrews do not seem to have developed an original type of signets. The seals so far discovered in Palestine go to prove that the predominating type was the Egyptian, and to a less degree the Babylonian.

3. Uses of Sealing:

(1) One of the most important uses of sealing in antiquity was to give a proof of authenticity and authority to letters, royal commands, etc. It served the purposes of a modern signature at a time when the art of writing was known to only a few. Thus Jezebel "wrote letters in Ahab's name, and sealed them with his seal" (1Ki 21:8); the written commands of Ahasuerus were "sealed with the king's ring," "for the writing which is written in the king's name, and sealed with the king's ring, may no man reverse" (Es 8:8,10; 3:12).

(2) Allied to this is the formal ratification of a transaction or covenant. Jeremiah sealed the deeds of the field which he bought from Hanamel (Jer 32:10-14; compare Jer 32:44); Nehemiah and many others affixed their seal to the written covenant between God and His people (Ne 9:38; 10:1).

(3) An additional use was the preservation of books in security. A roll or other document intended for preservation was sealed up before it was deposited in a place of safety (Jer 32:14; compare the "book .... close sealed with seven seals," Re 5:1). In sealing the roll, it was wrapped round with flaxen thread or string, then a lump of clay was attached to it impressed with a seal. The seal would have to be broken by an authorized person before the book could be read (Re 5:2,5,9; 6:1,3, etc.).

(4) Sealing was a badge of deputed authority and power, as when a king handed over his signet ring to one of his officers (Ge 41:42; Es 3:10; 8:2; RAPC 1Ma 6:15).

(5) Closed doors were often sealed to prevent the entrance of any unauthorized person. So the door of the lion’s den (Da 6:17; compare Bel and the Dragon verse 6:14). Herodotus mentions the custom of sealing tombs (ii.121). So we read of the chief priests and Pharisees sealing the stone at the mouth of our Lord’s tomb in order to "make the sepulchre sure" against the intrusion of the disciples (Mt 27:66). Compare the sealing of the abyss to prevent Satan’s escape Re 20:3). A door was sealed by stretching a cord over the stone which blocked the entrance, spreading clay or wax on the cord, and then impressing it with a seal.

(6) To any other object might a seal be affixed, as an official mark of ownership; e.g. a large number of clay stoppers of wine jars are still preserved, on which seal impressions of the cylinder type were stamped, by rolling the cylinder along the surface of the clay when it was still soft (compare Job 38:14).

II. Metaphorical Use of the Term.

The word "seal," both substantive and verb, is often used figuratively for the act or token of authentication, confirmation, proof, security or possession. Sin is said not to be forgotten by God, but treasured and stored up with Him against the sinner, under a seal (De 32:34; Job 14:17). A lover’s signet is the emblem of love as an inalienable possession (So 8:6); an unresponsive maiden is "a spring shut up, a fountain sealed" (So 4:12). The seal is sometimes a metaphor for secrecy. That which is beyond the comprehension of the uninitiated is said to be as "a book that is sealed" (Isa 29:11 f; compare the book with seven seals, Re 5:1). Daniel is bidden to "shut up the words" of his prophecy "and seal the book, even to the time of the end," i.e. to keep his prophecy a secret till it shall be revealed (Da 12:4,9; compare Re 10:4). Elsewhere it stands for the ratification of prophecy (Da 9:24). The exact meaning of the figure is sometimes ambiguous (as in Job 33:16; Eze 28:12). In the New Testament the main ideas in the figure are those of authentication, ratification, and security. The believer in Christ is said to "set his seal to this, that God is true" (Joh 3:33), i.e. to attest the veracity of God, to stamp it with the believer’s own endorsement and confirmation. The Father has sealed the Son, i.e. authenticated Him as the bestower of life-giving bread (Joh 6:27). The circumcision of Abraham was a "sign" and "seal," an

outward ratification, of the righteousness of faith which he had already received while uncircumcised (Ro 4:11; compare the prayer offered at the circumcision of a child, "Blessed be He who sanctified His beloved from the womb, and put His ordinance upon his flesh, and sealed His offering with the sign of a holy covenant"; also Targum So 38: "The seal of circumcision is in your flesh as it was sealed in the flesh of Abraham"). Paul describes his act in making over to the saints at Jerusalem the contribution of the Gentiles as having "sealed to them this fruit" (Ro 15:28); the meaning of the phrase is doubtful, but the figure seems to be based on sealing as ratifying a commercial transaction, expressing Paul's intention formally to hand over to them the fruit (of his own labors, or of spiritual blessings which through him the Gentiles had enjoyed), and to mark it as their own property. Paul's converts are the "seal," the authentic confirmation, of his apostleship (1Co 9:2). God by His Spirit indicates who are His, as the owner sets his seal on his property; and just as documents are sealed up until the proper time for opening them, so Christians are sealed up by the Holy Spirit "unto the day of redemption" (Eph 1:13; 4:30; 2Co 1:22). Ownership, security and authentication are implied in the words, "The firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his" (2Ti 2:19). The seal of God on the foreheads of His servants (Re 7:2-4) marks them off as His own, and guarantees their eternal security, whereas those that "have not the seal of God on their foreheads" (Re 9:4) have no such guaranty.

On the analogy of the rite of circumcision (see above), the term "seal" (sphragis) was at a very early period applied to Christian baptism. But there is no sufficient ground for referring such passages as Eph 1:13; 4:30; 2Co 1:22 to the rite of baptism (as some do). The use of the metaphor in connection with baptism came after New Testament times (early instances are given in Gebhardt and Lightfoot on 2 Clem 7:6). Harnack and Hatch maintain that the name "seal" for baptism was taken from the Greek mysteries, but Anrich and Sanday-Headlam hold that it was borrowed from the Jewish view of circumcision as a seal.

See MYSTERY.

D. Miall Edwards

SEALED, FOUNTAIN

seld, These words, applied to the bride (So 4:12), find their explanation under SEAL (which see). Anything that was to be authoritatively protected was sealed. Where water was one of the most precious things, as in the East, fountains and wells were often sealed (Ge 29:3; Pr 5:15-18).

SEALSKIN

sel'-skin: The rendering of the Revised Version (British and American) (Ex 25:5; Eze 16:10) for 'or tachash, the Revised Version margin "porpoise-skin," the King James Version "badgers' skin." A seal, Monachus albiventer, is found in the Mediterranean, though not in the Red Sea, but it is likely that tachash means the dugong, which is found in the Red Sea.

See BADGER; PORPOISE.

SEAM; SEAMLESS

sem, sem’-les: The coat or inner garment (chiton) of Jesus is described in Joh 19:23 as "without seam" (arrhaphos), i.e. woven in one piece.

SEAR

ser: In 1Ti 4:2 for (kausteriazo), "burn with a hot iron" (compare "cauterize"), the King James Version "having their conscience seared with a hot iron," and the Revised Version margin. "Seared" in this connection means "made insensible," like the surface of a deep burn after healing. The verb, however, probably means "brand" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). "Criminals are branded on their forehead, so that all men may know their infamy. The consciences of certain men are branded just as truly, so that there is an inward consciousness of hypocrisy." See the commentaries

SEARCH

surch: Some peculiar senses are:

(1) In the books of Moses, especially in Nu, "searching out the land" means to spy out (raggel), to investigate carefully, to examine with a view to giving a full and accurate report on.

(2) When applied to the Scriptures, as in Ezr 4:15,19 (baqqer); Joh 5:39; 1Pe 1:11 (eraunao), it means to examine, to study out the meaning. In Ac 17:11, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "examining" for the "searched" of the King James Version. See SEARCHINGS.

(3) "Search out" often means to study critically, to investigate carefully, e.g. Job 8:8; 29:16; Ec 1:13; La 3:40; Mt 2:8; 1Co 2:10; 1Pe 1:10.

(4) When the word is applied to God’s searching the heart or spirit, it means His opening up, laying bare, disclosing what was hidden, e.g. 1Ch 28:9; Ps 44:21; 139:1; Pr 20:27; Jer 17:10; Ro 8:27.

G. H. Gerberding

SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES

The sentence beginning with (eraunate), in Joh 5:39 the King James Version has been almost universally regarded as meaning "Search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life." But one cannot read as far as dokeite, "ye think," without feeling that there is something wrong with the ordinary

version. This verb is at least a disturbing element in the current of thought (if not superfluous), and only when the first verb is taken as an indicative does the meaning of the writer become clear. The utterance is not a command, but a declaration: "Ye search the scriptures, because ye think that in them," etc. Robert Barclay as early as 1675, in his Apology for the True Christian Divinity (91 ff), refers to two scholars before him who had handed down the correct tradition: "Moreover, that place may be taken in the indicative mood, Ye search the Scriptures; which interpretation the Greek word will bear, and so Pasor translated it: which by the reproof following seemeth also to be the more genuine interpretation, as Cyrillus long ago hath observed." So Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, in his Johannine Grammar (London, 1906, section 2439 (i)). See also Transactions American Philological Association, 1901, 64 f.

J. E. Harry

SEARCHINGS

sur'-chingz (chiqre (lebh), from chaqar, to "search," "explore," "examine thoroughly"): In the song of Deborah the Reubenites are taunted because their great resolves of heart, chiqeqe lebh, led to nothing but great "searchings" of heart, chiqre lebh, and no activity other than to remain among their flocks (Jud 5:15 f). The first of the two Hebrew expressions so emphatically contrasted (though questioned by commentators on the authority of 5 manuscripts as a corruption of the second) can with reasonable certainty be interpreted "acts prescribed by one's understanding" (compare the expressions chakham lebh, nebhon lebh, in which the heart is looked upon as the seat of the understanding). The second expression may mean either irresolution or hesitation based on selfish motives, as the heart was also considered the seat of the feelings, or answerability to God (compare Jer 17:10; Pr 25:3); this rendering would explain the form liphelaghoth in Jud 5:16, literally, 'for the water courses of Reuben, great the searchings of heart!'

Nathan Isaacs

SEASONS

se'-z'nz (summer: qayits, Chaldaic qayiT (Da 2:35); (theros; winter: cethaw) (So 2:11), (choreph; cheimon): The four seasons in Palestine are not so marked as in more northern countries, summer gradually fading into winter and winter into summer. The range of temperature is not great. In the Bible we have no reference to spring or autumn; the only seasons mentioned are "summer and winter" (Ge 8:22; Ps 74:17; Zec 14:8).

Winter is the season of rain lasting from November to May. "The winter is past; the rain is over" (So 2:11). See RAIN. The temperature at sealevel in Palestine reaches freezing-point occasionally, but seldom is less than 40ø F. On the hills and mountains it is colder, depending on the height. The people have no means of heating their houses, and suffer much with the cold. They wrap up their necks and heads and keep inside the houses out of the wind as much as possible. "The sluggard will not plow by reason of the winter" (Pr 20:4). Jesus in speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem says, "Pray ye that your

flight be not in the winter" (Mt 24:20). Paul asks Timothy to "come before winter" (2Ti 4:21) as navigation closed then and travel was virtually impossible.

Summer is very hot and rainless. "(When) the fig tree .... putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh" (Mr 13:28); "The harvest is past, the summer is ended" (Jer 8:20). It is the season of harvesting and threshing (Da 2:35). "He that gathereth in summer is a wise son" (Pr 10:5).

See COLD; HEAT; ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

Alfred H. Joy

SEAT

set: This word is used to translate the Hebrew words (moshabh, shebheth, kicce', and tekhunah), once (Job 23:3). It translates the Greek word (kathedra) (Mt 21:12; 23:2; Mr 11:15), and "chief seat" translates the compound word (protokathedria) (Mt 23:6; Mr 12:39; Lu 20:46). In the King James Version it translates (thronos) (Lu 1:52; Re 2:13; 4:4; 11:16; 13:2; 16:10), which the Revised Version (British and American) renders "throne." It denotes a place or thing upon which one sits, as a chair, or stool (1Sa 20:18; Jud 3:20). It is used also of the exalted position occupied by men of marked rank or influence, either in good or evil (Mt 23:2; Ps 1:1).

Jesse L. Cotton

SEATS, CHIEF

sets.

See CHIEF SEATS.

SEBA

se'-ba (cebha'; Saba (Ge 10:7; 1Ch 1:9); Greek ibid., but Codex Vaticanus has (Saban):

1. Forms of Name, and Parentage of Seba:

The first son of Cush, his brothers being Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabtecha. In Ps 72:10 and Isa 43:3 (where the Greek has Soene), Seba is mentioned with Egypt and Ethiopia, and must therefore have been a southern people. In Isa 45:14 we meet with the gentilic form, (csebha'im) (Sabaeim), rendered "Sabaeans," who are described as "men of stature" (i.e. tall), and were to come over to Cyrus in chains, and acknowledge that God was in him—their merchandise, and that of the Ethiopians, and the labor of Egypt, were to be his.

2. Position of the Nation:

Their country is regarded as being, most likely, the district of Saba, North of Adulis, on the west coast of the Red Sea. There is just a possibility that the Sabi River, stretching from the coast to the Zambesi and the Limpopo, which was utilized as a waterway by the states in that region, though, through silting, not suitable now, may contain a trace of the name, and perhaps testifies to still more southern extensions of the power and influence of the Sebaim. (See Th. Bent, The Ruined Cities of Mashonaland, 1892.) The ruins of this tract are regarded as being the work of others than the black natives of the country. Dillmann, however, suggests (on Ge 10:7) that the people of Seba were another branch of the Cushites East of Napatha by the Arabian Sea, of which Strabo (xvi. 4, 8, 10) and Ptolemy (iv.7, 7 f) give information.

See SHEBA and HDB, under the word

T. G. Pinches

SEBAM se'-bam (sebham; Sebama; the King James Version Shebam): A town in the upland pasture land given to the tribes of Reuben and Gad. It is named along with Heshbon, Elealeh and Nebo (Nu 32:3). It is probably the same place as Sibmah (the King James Version "Shibmah") in Nu 32:38 (so also Jos 13:19). In the time of Isaiah and Jeremiah it was a Moabite town, but there is no record of how or when it was taken from Israel. It appears to have been famous for the luxuriance of its vines and for its summer fruits (Isa 16:8 f; Jer 48:32). Eusebius (in Onomasticon) calls it a city of Moab in the land of Gilead which fell to the tribe of Reuben. Jerome (Comm. in Isa 5) says it was about 500 paces from Heshbon, and he describes it as one of the strong places of that region. It may be represented by the modern Simia, which stands on the south side of Wady Chesban, about 2 miles from Chesban. The ancient ruins are considerable, with large sarcophagi; and in the neighboring rock wine presses are cut (PEFM, "Eastern Palestine," 221 f).

W. Ewing

SEBAT

se-bat', se'-bat (Zec 1:7).

See SHEBAT.

SECACAH

se-ka'-ka, sek'-a-ka (cekhakhah; Codex Vaticanus Aichioza; Codex Alexandrinus Sochocha): One of the six cities "in the wilderness of Judah" (Jos 15:61), that is in the uncultivated lands to the West of the Dead Sea, where a scanty pasturage is still obtained by wandering Bedouin tribes. There are many signs

in this district of more settled habitation in ancient times, but the name Secacah is lost. Conder proposed Khirbet edition Diqqeh] (also called Khirbet es Siqqeh), "the ruin of the path," some 2 miles South of Bethany. Though an ancient site, it is too near the inhabited area; the name, too, is uncertain (PEF, III, 111, Sh XVII).

E. W. G. Masterman

SECHENIAS

sek-e-ni’-as:

(1) (Codex Alexandrinus Sechenias; omitted in Codex Vaticanus and Swete): 1 Esdras 8:29 =" Shecaniah" in Ezr 8:3; the arrangement in Ezra is different.

(2) (Codex Alexandrinus Sechenias, but Codex Vaticanus and Swete, Eiechonias): Name of a person who went up at the head of a family in the return with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:32) =" Shecaniah" in Ezr 8:5.

SECHU

se’-ku (sekhu).

See SECU.

SECOND COMING

sek’-und kum’-ing.

See PAROUSIA; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, V.

SECOND DEATH

See DEATH; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, sec. X, (6).

SECOND SABBATH

See SABBATH, SECOND AFTER THE FIRST.

SECONDARILY

sek’-un-da-ri-li: the King James Version for (deuteron) (1Co 12:28). Probably without distinction from

"secondly" (so the Revised Version (British and American), and so the King James Version also for deuteron in Sirach 23:23). Still the King James Version may have wished to emphasize that the prophets have a lower rank than the apostles.

SECRET

se’-kret: In Eze 7:22, English Versions of the Bible has "secret place" for (tsaphan), "hide," "treasure." A correct translation is, "They shall profane my cherished place" (Jerusalem), and there is no reference to the Holy of Holies. The other uses of "secret" in the Revised Version (British and American) are obvious, but Revised Version’s corrections of the King James Version in Jud 13:18; 1Sa 5:9; Job 15:11 should be noted.

SECT

sekt (hairesis): "Sect" (Latin, secta, from sequi, "to follow") is in the New Testament the translation of hairesis, from haireo, "to take," "to choose"; also translated "heresy," not heresy in the later ecclesiastical sense, but a school or party, a sect, without any bad meaning attached to it. The word is applied to schools of philosophy; to the Pharisees and Sadducees among the Jews who adhered to a common religious faith and worship; and to the Christians. It is translated "sect" (Ac 5:17, of the Sadducees; Ac 15:5, of the Pharisees; Ac 24:5, of the Nazarenes; Ac 26:5, of the Pharisees; Ac 28:22, of the Christians); also the Revised Version (British and American) Ac 24:14 (the King James Version and the English Revised Version margin "heresy"), "After the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers" (just as the Pharisees were "a sect"); it is translated "heresies" (1Co 11:19, margin "sects," the American Standard Revised Version "factions," margin "Greek: ‘heresies’ "; the English Revised Version reverses the American Standard Revised Version text and margin; Ga 5:20, the American Standard Revised Version "parties," margin "heresies"; the English Revised Version reverses text and margin; 2Pe 2:1, "damnable heresies," the Revised Version (British and American) "destructive heresies," margin "sects of perdition"); the "sect" in itself might be harmless; it was the teaching or principles which should be followed by those sects that would make them "destructive." Hairesis occurs in 1 Macc 8:30 ("They shall do it at their pleasure," i.e. "choice"); compare Septuagint Le 22:18,21.

See HERESY.

W. L. Walker

SECU

se’-ku (sekhu; Codex Vaticanus en Sephei; Codex Alexandrinus en Sokcho; the King James Version Sechu): This name occurs only in the account of David’s visit to Samuel (1Sa 19:22). Saul, we are told, went to "Ramah, and came to the great well that is in Secu," where he inquired after Samuel and David. It evidently lay between the residence of Saul at Gibeah and Ramah. It is impossible to come to any sure conclusion regarding it. Conder suggested its identification with Khirbet Suweikeh, which lies to the

South of Bireh. This is possible, but perhaps we should read with the Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus, "He came to the cistern of the threshing-floor that is on the bare hill" (en to Sephei). The threshing-floors in the East are naturally on high exposed ground where this is possible, and often form part of the area whence water in the rainy season is conducted to cisterns. This might have been a place actually within the city of Ramah.

W. Ewing

SECUNDUS

se-kun'-dus (Westcott-Hort Greek text Se'koundos, Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Sekou'ndos): A Thessalonian who was among those who accompanied Paul from Greece to Asia (Ac 20:4). They had preceded Paul and waited for him at Troas. If he were one of the representatives of the churches in Macedonia and Greece, entrusted with their contributions to Jerusalem (Ac 24:17; 2Co 8:23), he probably accompanied Paul as far as Jerusalem. The name is found in a list of politarchs on a Thessalonian inscription.

SECURE; SECURITY

se-kur', se-ku'-ri-ti: The word baTach and its derivatives in Hebrew point to security, either real or imaginary. Thus we read of a host that "was secure" (Jud 8:11) and of those "that provoke God (and) are secure" (Job 12:6); but also of a security that rests in hope and is safe (Job 11:18). The New Testament words (poieo amerimnous), used in Mt 28:14 (the King James Version "secure you"), guarantee the safety of the soldiers, who witnessed against themselves, in the telling of the story of the disappearance of the body of Christ.

Securely is used in the sense of "trustful," "not anticipating danger" (Pr 3:29; Mic 2:8; Ecclesiasticus 4:15).

The word (hikanon, translated security (Ac 17:9), may stand either for a guaranty of good behavior exacted from, or for some form of punishment inflicted on, Jason and his followers by the rulers of Thessalonica.

Henry E. Dosker

SEDECIAS

sed-e-si'-as:

The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SEDEKIAS (which see).

SEDEKIAS

sed-e-ki’-as:

(1) (Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus Sedekias; the King James Version Zedechias): 1 Esdras 1:46 (44) = Zedekiah king of Judah; also in Baruch 1:8 where the King James Version reads "Sedecias."

(2) In Baruch 1:1 (the King James Version "Sedecias"), an ancestor of Baruch, "the son of Asadias," sometimes (but incorrectly) identified with the false prophet "Zedekiah the son of Maaseiah" (Jer 29:21).

SEDITION

se-dish’-un: The translation in Ezr 4:15,19 for ‘eshtaddur, "struggling," "revolt"; in 2 Esdras 15:16 for inconstabilitio, "instability" with "be seditious" for stasiazo, "rise in rebellion" in 2 Macc 14:6. In addition, the King James Version has "sedition" for stasis, "standing up," "revolt" (the Revised Version (British and American) "insurrection") in Lu 23:19,25; Ac 24:5, with (dichostasia), "a standing asunder" (the Revised Version (British and American) "division") in Ga 5:20. As "sedition" does not include open violence against a government, the word should not have been used in any of the above cases.

SEDUCE; SEDUCER

se-dus’, se-dus’-er (Hiphil of (Ta‘ah, or ta‘ah, "to err"; of pathah, "to be simple"; planao, apoplanao, "to lead astray"):

(1) The word "seduce" is only used in the Bible in its general meaning of "to lead astray," "to cause to err," as from the paths of truth, duty or religion. It occurs in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Eze 13:10; 2Ki 21:9; 1Ti 4:1; Re 2:20; in the King James Version only, Pr 12:26 (the Revised Version (British and American) "causeth to err"); Isa 19:13 (the Revised Version (British and American) "caused to go astray"); Mr 13:22; 1Joh 2:26 (the Revised Version (British and American) "lead astray"). The noun "seducer" (2Ti 3:13 the King James Version, goes) is correctly changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into "impostor."

(2) It is not found in its specific sense of "to entice a female to surrender her chastity." Yet the crime itself is referred to and condemned.

Three cases are to be distinguished:

(a) The seduction of an unbetrothed virgin: In this case the seducer cording to J-E (Ex 22:16 f) is to be compelled to take the virgin as his wife, if the father consents, and to pay the latter the usual purchase price, the amount of which is not defined. In the Deuteronomic Code (De 22:28) the amount is fixed at

50 shekels, and the seducer forfeits the right of divorce.

(b) The seduction of a betrothed virgin: This case (De 22:23-27; not referred to in the other codes) is treated as virtually one of adultery, the virgin being regarded as pledged to her future husband as fully as if she were formally married to him; the penalty therefore is the same as for adultery, namely, death for both parties (except in the case where the girl can reasonably be acquitted of blame, in which case the man only is put to death).

(c) The seduction of a betrothed bondmaid (mentioned only in Le 19:20-22): Here there is no infliction of death, because the girl was not free; but the seducer shall make a trespass offering, besides paying the fine.

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

D. Miall Edwards

SEE

se: In addition to the ordinary sense of perceiving by the eye, we have

(1) chazah, "to see" (in vision): "Words of Amos .... which he saw concerning Israel" (Am 1:1). The revelation was made to his inward eye. "The word of Yahweh .... which he (Micah) saw concerning Samaria" (Mic 1:1), describing what he saw in prophetic vision (compare Hab 1:1); see REVELATION, III, 4;

(2) horao, "to take heed": "See thou say nothing" (Mr 1:44);

(3) eidon, "to know," "to note with the mind": "Jesus saw that he answered discreetly" (Mr 12:34);

(4) theoreo, "to view," "to have knowledge or experience of": "He shall never see death" (Joh 8:51).

M. O. Evans

SEED

sed (Old Testament always for zera‘, Aramaic (Da 2:43) zera‘, except in Joe 1:17 for perudhoth (plural, the Revised Version (British and American) "seeds," the King James Version "seed"), and Le 19:19 (the King James Version "mingled seed") and De 22:9 (the King James Version "divers seeds") for kil’ayim, literally, "two kinds," the Revised Version (British and American) "two kinds of seed." Invariably in Greek Apocrypha and usually in the New Testament for sperma, but Mr 4:26,27; Lu 8:5,11; 2Co 9:10 for sporos, and 1Pe 1:23 for spora):

(1) For "seed" in its literal sense see AGRICULTURE. Of interest is the method of measuring land by means of the amount of seed that could be sown on it (Le 27:16). The prohibition against using two kinds of seed in the same field (Le 19:19; De 22:9) undoubtedly rests on the fact that the practice had some connection with Canaanitish worship, making the whole crop "consecrated" (taboo). Jer 31:27 uses "seed of man" and "seed of beast" as a figure for the means by which God will increase the prosperity of Israel (i.e. "seed yielding men").

(2) For the transferred physiological application of the word to human beings (Le 15:16, etc.) see CLEAN; UNCLEANNESS. The conception of Christians as "born" or "begotten" of God (see REGENERATION) gave rise to the figure in 1Pe 1:23; 1 Joh 3:9. If the imagery is to be stressed, the Holy Spirit is meant. In I Joh 3:9 a doctrine of certain Gnostics is opposed. They taught that by learning certain formulas and by submitting to certain rites, union with God and salvation could be attained without holiness of life. John’s reply is that union with a righteous God is meaningless without righteousness as an ideal, even though shortcomings exist in practice (1 Joh 1:8).

(3) From the physiological use of "seed" the transition to the sense of "offspring" was easy, and the word may mean "children" (Le 18:21, etc.) or even a single child (Ge 4:25; 1Sa 1:11 the Revised Version margin). Usually, however, it means the whole posterity (Ge 3:15, etc.); compare "seed royal" (2Ki 11:1, etc.), and "Abraham’s seed" (2Ch 20:7, etc.) or "the holy seed" (Ezr 9:2; Isa 6:13; RAPC 1Es 8:70; compare Jer 2:21) as designations of Israel. So "to show one’s seed" (Ezr 2:59; , Ne 7:61) is to display one’s genealogy, and "one’s seed" may be simply one’s nation, conceived of as a single family (Es 10:3). From this general sense there developed a still looser use of "seed" as meaning simply "men" (Mal 2:15; Isa 1:4; 57:4; RAPC Wis 10:15; 12:11, etc.).

In Ga 3:16 Paul draws a distinction between "seeds" and "seed" that has for its purpose a proof that the promises to Abraham were realized in Christ and not in Israel. The distinction, however, overstresses the language of the Old Testament, which never pluralizes zera‘ when meaning "descendants" (plural only in 1Sa 8:15; compare Ro 4:18; 9:7). But in an argument against rabbinical adversaries Paul was obliged to use rabbinical methods (compare Ga 4:25). For modern purposes it is probably best to treat such an exegetical method as belonging simply to the (now superseded) science of the times.

Burton Scott Easton

SEER

se’-er, ser: The word in English Versions of the Bible represents two Hebrew words, ro’eh (1Sa 9:9,11,18,19; 2Sa 15:27; 1Ch 9:22, etc.), And chozeh (2Sa 24:11; 2Ki 17:13; 1Ch 21:9; 25:5; 29:29, etc.). The former designation is from the ordinary verb "to see"; the latter is connected with the verb used of prophetic vision. It appears from 1Sa 9:9 that "seer" (ro’-eh) was the older name for those who, after the rise of the more regular orders, were called "prophets." It is not just, however, to speak of the "seers" or "prophets" of Samuel’s time as on the level of mere fortune-tellers. What insight or vision

they possessed is traced to God’s Spirit. Samuel was the ro’-eh by pr-eeminence, and the name is little used after his time. Individuals who bear the title "seer" (chozeh) are mentioned in connection with the kings and as historiographers (2Sa 24:11; 1Ch 21:9; 25:5; 29:29; 2Ch 9:29; 12:15; 19:2, etc.), and distinction is sometimes made between "prophets" and "seers" (2Ki 17:13; 1Ch 29:29, etc.). Havernick thinks that "seer" denotes one who does not belong to the regular prophetic order (Introductions to Old Testament, 50 ff, English translation), but it is not easy to fix a precise distinction.

See PROPHET; PROPHECY.

James Orr

SEETHE

seth: Old English for "boil"; past tense, "sod" (Ge 25:29), past participle, "sodden" (La 4:10). See Ex 23:19 the King James Version.

SEGUB

se’-gub (seghubh (Qere), seghibh (Kethibh); Codex Vaticanus Zegoub; Codex Alexandrinus Segoub): 15:27; 1Ch 9:22, etc.), And chozeh (2Sa 24:11; 2Ki 17:13; 1Ch 21:9; 25:5; 29:29, etc.). The former designation is from the ordinary verb "to see"; the latter is connected with the verb used of prophetic vision. It appears from 1Sa 9:9 that "seer" (ro’-eh) was the older name for those who, after the rise of the more regular orders, were called "prophets." It is not just, however, to speak of the "seers" or "prophets" of Samuel’s time as on the level of mere fortune-tellers. What insight or vision they possessed is traced to God’s Spirit. Samuel was the ro’-eh by pr-eeminence, and the name is little used after his time. Individuals who bear the title "seer" (chozeh) are mentioned in connection with the kings and as historiographers (2Sa 24:11; 1Ch 21:9; 25:5; 29:29; 2Ch 9:29; 12:15; 19:2, etc.), and distinction is sometimes made between "prophets" and "seers" (2Ki 17:13; 1Ch 29:29, etc.). Havernick thinks that "seer" denotes one who does not belong to the regular prophetic order (Introductions to Old Testament, 50 ff, English translation), but it is not easy to fix a precise distinction.

(1) The youngest son of Hiel, the rebuilder of Jericho (1Ki 16:34). The death of Segub is probably connected with the primitive custom of laying foundations with blood, as, indeed, skulls were found built in with the brickwork when the tower of Bel at Nippur was excavated. See GEZER. If the death of the two sons was based on the custom just mentioned, the circumstance was deliberately obscured in the present account. The death of Segub may have been due to an accident in the setting up of the gates. In any event, tradition finally yoked the death of Hiel’s oldest and youngest sons with a curse said to have been pronounced by Joshua on the man that should venture to rebuild Jericho (Jos 6:26).

(2) Son of Hezron and father of Jair (1Ch 2:21).

Horace J. Wolf

SEIR

se’-ir:

(1) (har se’-ir, "Mt. Seir" (Ge 14:6, etc.), ‘erets se‘-ir (Ge 32:3, etc.); to oros Seeir, ge Seeir): In Ge 32:3 "the land of Seir" is equated with "the field of Edom." The Mount and the Land of Seir are alternative appellations of the mountainous tract which runs along the eastern side of the Arabah, occupied by the descendants of Esau, who succeeded the ancient Horites (Ge 14:6; 36:20), "cave-dwellers," in possession. For a description of the land see EDOM.

(2) (har se‘ir; Codex Vaticanus Assar; Codex Alexandrinus Seeir): A landmark on the boundary of Judah (Jos 15:10), not far from Kiriath-jearim and Chesalon. The name means "shaggy," and probably here denoted a wooded height. It may be that part of the range which runs Northeast from Saris by Karyat el-‘Anab and Biddu to the plateau of el-Jib. Traces of an ancient forest are still to be seen here.

W. Ewing

SEIRAH

se-i’-ra, se’-i-ra (ha-se‘irah; Codex Vaticanus Seteirotha; Codex Alexandrinus Seeirotha; the King James Version, Seirath): The place to which Ehud escaped after his assassination of Eglon, king of Moab (Jud 3:26). The name is from the same root as the foregoing, and probably applied to some shaggy forest. The quarries by which he passed are said to have been by Gilgal (Jud 3:19), but there is nothing to guide us to an identification. Eusebius, in Onomasticon, gives the name, but no indication of the site.

SEIRATH

se-i’-rath, se’-i-rath.

See SEIRAH.

SELA

se’-la (sela‘, ha-cela‘ (with the article); petra, he petra; the King James Version Selah (2Ki 14:7)): English Versions of the Bible renders this as the name of a city in 2Ki 14:7; Isa 16:1. In Jud 1:36; 2Ch 25:12; and Ob 1:3, it translates literally, "rock"; but the Revised Version margin in each case "Sela." It is impossible to assume with Hull (HD B, under the word) that this name, when it appears in Scripture, always refers to the capital of Edom, the great city in Wady Musa. In Jud 1:36 its association with the Ascent of Akrabbim shuts us up to a position toward the southwestern end of the Dead Sea. Probably in that case it does not denote a city, but some prominent crag. Moore ("Judges," ICC, 56), following Buhl,

would identify it with es-Safieh, "a bare and dazzlingly white sandstone promontory 1,000 ft. high, East of the mud fiats of es-Sebkah, and 2 miles South of the Dead Sea." A more probable identification is a high cliff which commands the road leading from Wady el-Milh, "valley of Salt," to Edom, over the pass of Akrabbim. This was a position of strategic importance, and if fortified would be of great strength. (In this passage "Edomites" must be read for "Amorites.") The victory of Amaziah was won in the Valley of Salt. He would naturally turn his arms at once against this stronghold (2Ki 14:7); and it may well be the rock from the top of which he hurled his prisoners (2Ch 25:12). He called it Jokteel, a name the meaning of which is obscure. Possibly it is the same as Jekuthiel (1Ch 4:18), and may mean "preservation of God" (OHL, under the word). No trace of this name has been found. The narratives in which the place is mentioned put identification with Petra out of the question.

"The rock" (the Revised Version margin "Sela") in Ob 1:3, in the phrase "thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock." is only a vivid and picturesque description of Mt. Edom. "The purple mountains into which the wild sons of Esau clambered run out from Syria upon the desert, some hundred miles by twenty, of porphyry and red sandstone. They are said to be the finest rock scenery in the world. ‘Salvator Rosa never conceived so savage and so suitable a haunt for banditti.’ .... The interior is reached by defiles so narrow that two horsemen may scarcely ride abreast, and the sun is shut out by the overhanging rocks. .... Little else than wild fowls’ nests are, the villages: human eyries perched on high shelves or hidden away in caves at the ends of the deep gorges" (G. A. Smith. The Book of the Twelve Prophets. II. 178 f).

In Isa 16:1; 42:11 the Revised Version (British and American), perhaps we have a reference to the great city of Petra. Josephus (Ant., IV, vii, 1) tells us that among the kings of the Midianites who fell before Moses was one Rekem, king of Rekem (akre, or rekeme), the city deriving its name from its founder. This he says was the Arabic name; the Greeks called it Petra. Eusebius, Onomasticon says Petra is a city of Arabia in the land of Edom. It is called Jechthoel; but the Syrians call it Rekem. Jokteel, as we have seen, must be sought elsewhere. There can be no doubt that Josephus intended the city in Wady Musa. Its Old Testament name was Bozrah (Am 1:12, etc.). Wetzstein (Excursus in Delitzsch’s Isa, 696 ff) hazards the conjecture that the complete ancient nine was Bozrat has-Sela, "Bozrah of the Rock."

This "rose-red city half as old as Time"

Sela was for long difficult of access, and the attempt to visit it was fraught with danger. In recent years, however, it has been seen by many tourists and exploring parties. Of the descriptions written the best is undoubtedly that of Professor Dalman of Jerusalem (Petra und seine Felsheiligtumer, Leipzig, 1908). An excellent account of this wonderful city, brightly and interestingly written, will be found in Libbey and Hoskins’ book (The Jordan Valley and Petra, New York and London, 1905; see also National Geographic Magazine, May, 1907, Washington, D.C.). The ruins lie along the sides of a spacious hollow surrounded by the many-hued cliffs of Edom, just before they sink into the Arabah on the West. It is near the base of Jebel Harun, about 50 miles from the Dead Sea, and just North of the watershed between that sea and the Gulf of Akaba. The valley owes its modern name, Wady Musa, "Valley of Moses," to its connection with Moses in Mohammedan legends. While not wholly inaccessible from other directions, the two usual approaches are that from the Southwest by a rough path, partly artificial,

and that from the East. The latter is by far the more important. The valley closes to the East, the only opening being through a deep and narrow defile, called the Sik, "shaft," about a mile in length. In the bottom of the Sik flows westward the stream that rises at ‘Ain Musa, East of the cleft is the village of Elji, an ancient site, corresponding to Gaia of Eusebius (Onomasticon). Passing this village, the road threads its way along the shadowy winding gorge, overhung by lofty cliffs. When the valley is reached, a sight of extraordinary beauty and impressiveness opens to the beholder. The temples, the tombs, theater, etc., hewn with great skill and infinite pains from the living rock, have defied to an astonishing degree the tooth of time, many of the carvings being as fresh as if they had been cut yesterday. An idea of the scale on which the work was done may be gathered from the size of theater, which furnished accommodation for no fewer than 3,000 spectators.

Such a position could not have been overlooked in ancient times; and we are safe to assume that a city of importance must always have existed here. It is under the Nabateans, however, that Petra begins to play a prominent part in history. This people took possession about the end of the 4th century BC, and continued their sway until overcome by Hadrian, who gave his own name to the city—Hadriana. This name, however, soon disappeared. Under the Romans Petra saw the days of her greatest splendor.

According to old tradition Paul visited Petra when he went into Arabia (Ga 1:17). Of this there is no certainty; but Christianity was early introduced, and the city became the seat of a bishopric. Under the Nabateans she was the center of the great caravan trade of that time. The merchandise of the East was brought hither; and hence, set out the caravans for the South, the West, and the North. The great highway across the desert to the Persian Gulf was practically in her hands. The fall of the Nabatean power gave Palmyra her chance; and her supremacy in the commerce of Northern Arabia dates from that time. Petra shared in the declining fortunes of Rome; and her death blow was dealt by the conquering Moslems, who desolated Arabia Petrea in 629-32 AD. The place now furnishes a retreat for a few poor Bedawy families.

W. Ewing

SELA-HAMMAHLEKOTH

se-la-ha-ma’-le-koth, -koth (cela‘ha-machleqoth; petra he meristheisa): "The rock of divisions (or, escape)" (1Sa 23:28 margin). "Saul .... pursued after David in the wilderness of Maon. And Saul went on this side of the mountain, and David and his men on that side of the mountain: and David made haste to get away for fear of Saul" (1Sa 23:25,26). The name seems to survive in Wady Malaki, "the great gorge which breaks down between Carmel and Maon eastward, with vertical cliffs" (PEF, III, 314, Sh. XXI).

SELAH

se’-la.

See MUSIC, II, 1.

SELED

se’-led (tseledh): A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:30 twice).

SELEMIA

sel-e-mi’-a: One of the swift scribes whose services Ezra was commanded to secure (2 Esdras 14:24). The name is probably identical with SELEMIAS of 1 Esdras 9:34 (which see).

SELEMIAS

sel-e-mi’-as (Selemias): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:34) =" Shelemiah". in Ezr 10:39, and probably identical with "Selemia" in 2 Esdras 14:24.

SELEUCIA

se-lu’-shi-a (Seleukia): The seaport of Antioch from which it is 16 miles distant. It is situated 5 miles North of the mouth of the Orontes, in the northwestern corner of a fruitful plain at the base of Mt. Rhosus or Pieria, the modern Jebel Musa, a spur of the Amanus Range. Built by Seleucus Nicator (died 280 BC) it was one of the Syrian Tetrapolis, the others being Apameia, Laodicea and Antioch. The city was protected by nature on the mountain side, and, being strongly fortified on the South and West, was considered invulnerable and the key to Syria (Strabo 751; Polyb. v.58). It was taken, however, by Ptolemy Euergetes (1 Macc 11:8) and remained in his family till 219 BC, when it was recovered for the Seleucids by Antiochus the Great, who then richly adorned it. Captured again by Ptolemy Philometor in 146 BC, it remained for a short time in the hands of the Egyptians. Pompey made it a free city in 64 BC in return for its energy in resisting Tigranes (Pliny, NH, v.18), and it was then greatly improved by the Romans, so that in the 1st century AD it was in a most flourishing condition.

On their first missionary journey Paul and Barnabas passed through it (Ac 13:4; 14:26), and though it is not named in Ac 15:30,39, this route is again implied; while it is excluded in Ac 15:3.

The ruins are very extensive and cover the whole space within the line of the old walls, which shows a circuit of four miles. The position of the Old Town, the Upper City and the suburbs may still be identified, as also that of the Antioch Gate, the Market Gate and the King’s Gate, which last leads to the Upper City. There are rock-cut tombs, broken statuary and sarcophagi at the base of the Upper City, a position which probably represents the burial place of the Seleucids. The outline of a circus or amphitheater can also be traced, while the inner harbor is in perfect condition and full of water. It is 2,000 ft. long by 1,200 ft. broad, and covers 47 acres, being oval or pear-shaped. The passage seaward, now silted up, was protected by two strong piers or moles, which are locally named after Barnabas and Paul. The most remarkable of the remains, however, is the great water canal behind the city, which the

emperor Constantius cut through the solid rock in 338 AD. It is 3,074 ft. long, has an average breadth of 20 ft., and is in some places 120 ft. deep. Two portions of 102 and 293 ft. in length are tunneled. The object of the work was clearly to carry the mountain torrent direct to the sea, and so protect the city from the risk of flood during the wet season.

Church synods occasionally met in Seleucia in the early centuries, but it gradually sank into decay, and long before the advent of Islam it had lost all its significance.

W. M. Christie

SELEUCIDAE

se-lu’-si-de.

See SELEUCUS.

SELEUCUS

se-lu’-kus (Seleukos):

(1) Seleucus I (Nicator, "The Conqueror"), the founder of the Seleucids or House of Seleucus, was an officer in the grand and thoroughly equipped army, which was perhaps the most important part of the inheritance that came to Alexander the Great from his father, Philip of Macedon. He took part in Alexander’s Asiatic conquests, and on the division of these on Alexander’s death he obtained the satrapy of Babylonia. By later conquests and under the name of king, which he assumed in the year 306, he became ruler of Syria and the greater part of Asia Minor. His rule extended from 312 to 280 BC, the year of his death; at least the Seleucid era which seems to be referred to in 1 Macc 1:16 is reckoned from Seleucus I, 312 BC to 65 BC, when Pompey reduced the kingdom of Syria to a Roman province. He followed generally the policy of Alexander in spreading Greek civilization. He founded Antioch and its port Seleucia, and is said by Josephus (Ant., XII, iii, 1) to have conferred civic privileges upon the Jews. The reference in Da 11:5 is usually understood to be to this ruler.

(2) Seleucus II (Callinicus, "The Gloriously Triumphant"), who reigned from 246 to 226 BC, was the son of Antiochus Soter and is "the king of the north" in Da 11:7-9, who was expelled from his kingdom by Ptolemy Euergetes.

(3) Seleucus III (Ceraunus, "Thunderbolt"), son of Seleucus II, was assassinated in a campaign which he undertook into Asia Minor. He had a short reign of rather more than 2 years (226-223 BC) and is referred to in Da 11:10.

(4) Seleucus IV (Philopator, "Fond of his Father") was the son and successor of Antiochus the Great and

reigned from 187 to 175 BC. He is called "King of Asia" (2 Macc 3:3), a title claimed by the Seleucids even after their serious losses in Asia Minor (see 1 Macc 8:6; 11:13; 12:39; 13:32). He was present at the decisive battle of Magnesia (190 BC). He was murdered by HELIODORUS (which see), one of his own courtiers whom he had sent to plunder the Temple (2 Macc 3:1-40; Da 11:20).

For the connection of the above-named Seleucids with the "ten horns" of Da 7:24, the commentators must be consulted.

Seleucus V (125-124 BC) and Seleucus VI (95-93 BC) have no connection with the sacred narrative.

J. Hutchison

SELF-CONTROL

self-kon-trol’ (egkrateia): Rendered in the King James Version "temperance" (compare Latin temperario and continentia), but more accurately "self-control," as in the Revised Version (British and American) (Ac 24:25; Ga 5:23; 2Pe 1:6); adjective of same, egkrates, "self-controlled" (Tit 1:8 the Revised Version (British and American)); compare verb forms in 1Co 7:9, "have .... continency"; 9:25, the athlete "exerciseth self-control." Self-control is therefore repeatedly set forth in the New Testament as among the important Christian virtues.

SELF-RIGHTEOUSNESS

self-ri’-chus-nes: A term that has come to designate moral living as a way of salvation; or as a ground for neglecting the redemptive work of Jesus Christ. The thought is present in the teaching of Jesus, who spoke one parable particularly to such as reckoned themselves to be righteous (Lu 18:9). The Pharisees quite generally resented the idea of Jesus that all men needed repentance and they most of all. They regarded themselves as righteous and looked with contempt on "sinners." Paul in all his writings, especially Ro 3; Ga 3; Eph 2; Php 3, contrasts the righteousness that is God’s gift to men of faith in Jesus Christ, with righteousness that is "of the law" and "in the flesh." By this latter he means formal conformity to legal requirements in the strength of unregenerate human nature. He is careful to maintain (compare Ro 7) that the Law is never really kept by one’s own power. On the other hand, in full agreement with Jesus, Paul looks to genuine righteousness in living as the demand and achievement of salvation based on faith. God’s gift here consists in the capacity progressively to realize righteousness in life (compare Ro 8:1 ff).

See also SANCTIFICATION.

William Owen Carver

SELF-SURRENDER

self-su-ren’-der: The struggle between the natural human impulses of selfseeking, self-defence and the like, on the one hand, and the more altruistic impulse toward self-denial, self-surrender, on the other, is as old as the race. All religions imply some conception of surrender of self to deity, ranging in ethical quality from a heathen fanaticism which impels to complete physical exhaustion or rapture, superinduced by more or less mechanical means, to the high spiritual quality of self-sacrifice to the divinest aims and achievements. The Scriptures represent self-surrender as among the noblest of human virtues.

I. In the Old Testament.

1. Illustrious Examples:

In the Old Testament self-surrender is taught in the early account of the first pair. Each was to be given to the other (Ge 2:24; 3:16) and both were to be surrendered to God in perfect obedience (Ge 3:1-15). The faithful ones, throughout the Bible narratives, were characterized by self-surrender. Abraham abandons friends and native country to go to a land unknown to him, because God called him to do so (Ge 12:1). He would give up all his cherished hopes in his only son Isaac, at the voice of God (Ge 22:1-18). Moses, at the call of Yahweh, surrenders self, and undertakes the deliverance of his fellow-Hebrews (Ex 3:1-4:13; compare Heb 11:25). He would be blotted out of God’s book, if only the people might be spared destruction (Ex 32:32).

2. The Levitical System:

The whole Levitical system of sacrifice may be said to imply the doctrine of self-surrender. The nation itself was a people set apart to Yahweh, a holy people, a surrendered nation (Ex 19:5,6; 22:31; Le 20:7; De 7:6; 14:2). The whole burnt offering implied the complete surrender of the worshipper to God (Le 1). The ceremony for the consecration of priests emphasized the same fundamental doctrine (Le 8); so also the law as to the surrender of the firstborn child (Ex 13:13 ff; 22:29).

3. The Prophets:

In the divine call to the prophets and in their life-work self-surrender is prominent. The seer, as such, must be receptive to the divine impress, and as mouthpiece of God, he must speak not his own words, but God’s: "Thus saith the Lord." He was to be a "man of God," a "man of the spirit." ‘The hand of the Lord was upon me’ (Eze 1:3; 3:14) implies complete divine mastery. Isaiah must submit to the divine purification of his lips, and hearken to the inquiry, "who will go for us?" with the surrendered response, "Here am I; send me" (Isa 6:8). Jeremiah must yield his protestations of weakness and inability to the divine wisdom and the promise of endowment from above (Jer 1:1-10). Ezekiel surrenders to the dangerous and difficult task of becoming messenger to a rebellious house (Eze 2:1-3:3). Jonah, after flight from duty, at last surrenders to the divine will and goes to the Ninevites (Jon 3:3).

4. Post-exilic Examples:

On the return of the faithful remnant from captivity, self-giving for the sake of Israel's faith was dominant, the people enduring great hardships for the future of the nation and the accomplishment of Yahweh's purposes. This is the spirit of the great Messianic passage, Isa 53:7: "He was oppressed, yet when he was afflicted he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth." Nehemiah surrendered position in Shushan to help reestablish the returned exiles in Jerusalem (Ne 2:5). Esther was ready to surrender her life in pleading for the safety of her people (Es 4:16).

II. In the New Testament.

1. Christ's Teaching and Example:

In the New Testament self-surrender is still more clearly set forth. Christ's teachings and example as presented in the Gospels, give to it special emphasis. It is a prime requisite for becoming His disciple (Mt 10:38 f; 16:24; Lu 9:23,24,59 f; 14:27,33; compare Mt 19:27; Mr 8:34). When certain of the disciples were called they left all and followed (Mt 4:20; 9:9; Mr 2:14; Lu 5:27 f). His followers must so completely surrender self, as that father, mother, kindred, and one's own life must be, as it were, hated for His sake (Lu 14:26). The rich young ruler must renounce self as an end and give his own life to the service of men (Mt 19:21; Mr 10:21; compare Lu 12:33). But this surrender of self was never a loss of personality; it was the finding of the true selfhood (Mr 8:35; Mt 10:39). our Lord not only taught self-surrender, but practiced it. As a child, He subjected Himself to His parents (Lu 2:51). Self-surrender marked His baptism and temptation (Mt 3:15; 4:1). It is shown in His life of physical privation (Mt 8:20). He had come not to do His own will, but the Fathers (Joh 4:34; 5:30; 6:38). He refuses to use force for His own deliverance (Mt 26:53; Joh 18:11). In His person God's will, not His own, must be done (Mt 26:29; Lu 22:42); and to the Father He at last surrendered His spirit (Lu 23:46). So that while He was no ascetic, and did not demand asceticism of His followers, He "emptied himself .... becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross" (Php 2:7 f).

See KENOSIS.

2. Ac of Apostles:

The early disciples practiced the virtue of self-surrender. Counting none of their possessions their own, they gave to the good of all (Ac 2:44,45; 4:34,35,37). Stephen and others threw themselves into their witnessing with the perfect abandon of the martyr; and Stephen's successor, Paul, counted not his life dear unto himself that he might finish the divinely-appointed course (Ac 20:22-24).

3. Epistles of Paul:

The Epistles are permeated with the doctrine of self-surrender. The Pauline Epistles are particularly full of it. The Christian life is conceived of as a dying to self and to the world—a dying with Christ, a

crucifixion of the old man, that a new man may live (Ga 2:20; 6:14; Col 2:20; 3:3; Ro 6:6), so that no longer the man lives but Christ lives in him (Ga 2:20; Php 1:21). The Christian is no longer his own but Christ's (1Co 6:19,20). He is to be a living sacrifice (Ro 12:1); to die daily (1Co 15:31). As a corollary to surrender to God, the Christian must surrender himself to the welfare of his neighbor, just as Christ pleased not Himself (Ro 15:3); also to leaders (1Co 16:16), and to earthly rulers (Ro 13:1).

4. Epistles of Peter:

In the Epistles of Peter self-surrender is taught more than once. Those who were once like sheep astray now submit to the guidance of the Shepherd of souls (1Pe 2:25). The Christian is to humble himself under the mighty hand of God (1Pe 5:6); the younger to be subject to the elder (1Pe 5:5); and all to civil ordinances for the Lord's sake (1Pe 2:13).

So also in other Epistles, the Christian is to subject himself to God (Jas 4:7; Heb 12:9).

Edward Bagby Pollard

SELF-WILL

self-wil' (ratson; authades): Found once in the Old Testament (Ge 49:6, "In their self-will they hocked an ox") in the death song of Jacob (see HOCK). The idea is found twice in the New Testament in the sense of "pleasing oneself": "not self-willed, not soon angry" (Tit 1:7); and "daring, self-willed, they tremble not to rail at dignities" (2Pe 2:10). In all these texts it stands for a false pride, for obstinacy, for "a pertinacious adherence to one's will or wish, especially in opposition to the dictates of wisdom or propriety or the wishes of others."elfare of his neighbor, just as Christ pleased not Himself (Ro 15:3); also to leaders (1Co 16:16), and to earthly rulers (Ro 13:1).

Henry E. Dosker

SELL, SELLER

sel'-er.

See TRADE; LYDIA.

SELVEDGE

sel'-vej (qatsah): The word occurs only in the description of the tabernacle (Ex 26:4; 36:11). It has reference to the ten curtains which overhung the boards of the sanctuary. Five of these formed one set and five another. These were "coupled" at the center by 50 loops of blue connected by "clasps" (which see) with 50 others on the opposite side. The "selvedge" (self-edge) is the extremity of the curtain in

which the loops were.

SEM

sem (Sem): the King James Version from the Greek form of Shem; thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Lu 3:36).

SEMACHIAH

sem-a-ki’-a (cemakhyahu, "Yah has sustained"): A Korahite family of gatekeepers (1Ch 26:7). Perhaps the same name should be substituted for "Ismachiah" in 2Ch 31:13 (see HPN, 291, 295).

SEMEI

sem’-e-i:

(1) (Codex Alexandrinus Semei; Codex Vaticanus Semeei): One of those who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:33) =" Shimei" "of the sons of Hashum" in Ezr 10:33.

(2) the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Semeias" (Additions to Esther 11:2).

(3) the King James Version form of the Revised Version (British and American) "Semein" (Lu 3:26).

SEMEIAS

se-me-i’-as (Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus Semeias; Codex Vaticanus Semeeias; the King James Version Semei): An ancestor of Mordecai (Additions to Esther 11:2) =" Shimei" (Es 2:5).

SEMEIN

se-me’-in (Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Vaticanus Semeein; Codex Alexandrinus Semeei, Textus Receptus of the New Testament, Semei; the King James Version, Semei): An ancestor of Jesus in Luke’s genealogy (Lu 3:26).

SEMEIS

sem’-e-is (Codex Alexandrinus and Fritzsche, Semeis; Codex Vaticanus Senseis; the King James Version, Semis): One of the Levites who put away their "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:23) =" Shimei" in Ezr 10:23.

SEMELLIUS

se-mel’-i-us: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SAMELLIUS (which see).

SEMIS

se’-mis: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SEMEIS (which see).

SEMITES, SEMITIC RELIGION

sem’-its, sem-it’-ik,

1. Biblical References

2. The Five Sons of Shem

3. Original Home of the Semites

4. Confusion with Other Races

5. Reliability of Genesis 10

6. Semitic Languages

7. Semitic Religion

(1) Its Peculiar Theism

(2) Personality of God

(3) Its View of Nature

(4) The Moral Being of God

LITERATURE

1. Biblical References:

The words "Semites," "Semitic," do not occur in the Bible, but are derived from the name of Noah’s

oldest son, Shem (Ge 5:32; 6:10; 9:18,23 ff; 10:1,21 f; 11:10 f; 1Ch 1). Formerly the designation was limited to those who are mentioned in Ge 10; 11 as Shem's descendants, most of whom can be traced historically and geographically; but more recently the title has been expanded to apply to others who are not specified in the Bible as Semites, and indeed are plainly called Hamitic, e.g. the Babylonians (Ge 10:10) and the Phoenicians and Canaanites (Ge 10:15-19). The grounds for the inclusion of these Biblical Hamites among the Semites are chiefly linguistic, although political, commercial and religious affinities are also considered. History and the study of comparative philology, however, suggest the inadequacy of a linguistic argument.

2. The Five Sons of Shem:

The sons of Shem are given as Elam, Assbur, Arpachshad, Lud and Aram (Ge 10:22). All except the third have been readily identified, Elam as the historic nation in the highlands East of the Tigris, between Media and Persia; Asshur as the Assyrians; Lud as the Lydians of Asia Minor; and Aram as the Syrians both East and West of the Euphrates. The greatest uncertainty is in the identification of Arpachshad, the most prolific ancestor of the Semites, especially of those of Biblical and more recent importance. From him descended the Hebrews and the Arab tribes, probably also some East African colonies (Ge 10:24-30; 11:12-26). The form of his name 'arpakhshadh) has given endless trouble to ethnographers. McCurdy divides into two words, Arpach or Arpath, unidentified, and kesedh, the singular of kasdim, i.e. the Chaldeans; Schrader also holds to the Chaldean interpretation, and the Chaldeans themselves traced their descent from Arpachshad (Josephus, Ant, I, vi, 4); it has been suggested also to interpret as the "border of the Chaldeans" (BDB; Dillmann, in the place cited.). But the historic, ordinary and most satisfactory identification is with Arrapachitis, Northeast of Assyria at the headwaters of the Upper Zab in the Armenian highlands (so Ptolemy, classical geographers, Gesenius, Delitzsch). Delitzsch calls attention to the Armenian termination shadh (Commentary on Genesis, in the place cited.).

3. Original Home of the Semites:

If we accept, then, this identification of Arpachshad as the most northeasterly of the five Semitic families (Ge 10:22), we are still faced by the problem of the primitive home and racial origin of the Semites. Various theories of course have been proposed; fancy and surmise have ranged from Africa to Central Asia.

(1) The most common, almost generally accepted, theory places their beginnings in Arabia because of the conservative and primitive Semitic of the Arabic language, the desert characteristics of the various branches of the race, and the historic movements of Semitic tribes northward and westward from Arabia. But this theory does not account for some of the most significant facts: e.g. that the Semitic developments of Arabia are the last, not the first, in time, as must have been the case if Arabia was the cradle of the race. This theory does not explain the Semitic origin of the Elamites, except by denial; much less does it account for the location of Arpachshad still farther north. It is not difficult to understand a racial movement from the mountains of the Northeast into the lowlands of the South and

West. But how primitive Arabs could have migrated uphill, as it were, to settle in the Median and Armenian hills is a much more difficult proposition.

(2) We must return to the historic and the more natural location of the ancient Semitic home on the hillsides and in the fertile valleys of Armenia. Thence the eldest branch migrated in prehistoric times southward to become historic Elam; Lud moved westward into Asia Minor; Asshur found his way down the Tigris to become the sturdy pastoral people of the middle Mesopotamian plateau until the invasion of the Babylonian colonists and civilization; Aram found a home in Upper Mesopotamia; while Arpachshad, remaining longer in the original home, gave his name to at least a part of it. There in the fertile valleys among the high hills the ancient Semites developed their distinctively tribal life, emphasizing the beauty and close relationship of Nature, the sacredness of the family, the moral obligation, and faith in a personal God of whom they thought as a member of the tribe or friend of the family. The confinement of the mountain valleys is just as adequate an explanation of the Semitic traits as the isolation of the oasis. So from the purer life of their highland home, where had been developed the distinctive and virile elements which were to impress the Semitic faith on the history of mankind, increasing multitudes of Semites poured over the mountain barriers into the broader levels of the plains. As their own-mountain springs and torrents sought a way to the sea down the Tigris and Euphrates beds, so the Semitic tribes followed the same natural ways into their future homes: Elam, Babylonia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Arabia, Palestine. Those who settled Arabia sent further migrations into Africa, as well as rebounding into the desert west of the Euphrates, Syria and Palestine. Thus Western Asia became the arena of Semitic life, whose influences also reached Egypt and, through Phoenicia, the far-away West-Mediterranean.

4. Confusion with Other Races:

While we may properly call Western and Southwestern Asia the home of the Semitic peoples, there still remains the difficulty of separating them definitely from the other races among whom they lived. The historic Babylonians, e.g., were Semites; yet they dispossessed an earlier non-Semitic people, and were themselves frequently invaded by other races, such as the Hittites, and even the Egyptians. It is not certain therefore which gods, customs, laws, etc., of the Babylonians were Semites, and not adopted from those whom they superseded.

Assyria was racially purely Semitic, but her laws, customs, literature, and many of her gods were acquired from Babylonia; to such an extent was this true that we are indebted to the library of the Assyrian Ashurbanipal for much that we know of Babylonian religion, literature and history. In Syria also the same mixed conditions prevailed, for through Syria by the fords of the Euphrates lay the highway of the nations, and Hittite and Mitannian at times shared the land with her, and left their influence. Possibly in Arabia Semitic blood ran purest, but even in Arabia there were tribes from other races; and the table of the nations in Ge divides that land among the descendants of both Ham and Shem (see TABLE OF NATIONS). Last of all, in Palestine, from the very beginning of its historic period, we find an intermingling and confusion of races and religions such as no other Semitic center presents. A Hamitic people gave one of its common names to the country—Canaan, while the pagan and late-coming Philistine gave the most used name—Palestine. The archaic remains of Horite, Avite and Hivite

are being uncovered by exploration; these races survived in places, no doubt, long after the Semitic invasion, contributing their quota to the customs and religious practices of the land. The Hittite also was in the land, holdling outposts from his northern empire, even in the extreme south of Palestine. If the blue eyes and fair complexions of the Amorites pictured on Egyptian monuments are true representations, we may believe that the gigantic Aryans of the North had their portion also in Palestine

5. Reliability of Genesis 10:

It is customary now in Biblical ethnology to disregard the classification of Genesis 10, and to group all the nations of Palestine as Semitic, especially the Canaanite and the Phoenician along with the Hebrew. McCurdy in the Standard BD treats the various gods and religious customs of Palestine as though they were all Semitic, although uniformly these are represented in the Old Testament as perversions and enormities of alien races which the Hebrews were commanded to extirpate. The adoption of them would be, and was, inimical to their own ancestral faith. Because the Hebrews took over eventually the language of the Phoenician, appropriated his art and conveniences, did traffic in his ships, and in Ahab's reign adopted his Baal and Astarte, we are not warranted at all in rushing to the conclusion that the Phoenicians represented a primitive Semitic type. Racial identification by linguistic argument is always precarious, as history clearly shows. One might as well say that Latin and the gospel were Saxon. There are indications that the customs and even the early language of the Hebrews were different from those of the people whom they subdued and dispossessed. Such is the consistent tradition of their race, the Bible always emphasizing the irreconcilable difference between their ancestral faith and the practices of the people of Canaan. We may conclude that the reasons for disregarding the classification of Ge with reference to the Semites and neighboring races are not final. Out from that fruitful womb of nations, the Caucasus, the Semites, one branch of the C Caucasian peoples, went southwestward—as their cousins the Hamites went earlier toward the South and as their younger relatives, the Aryans, were to go northward and westward—with marked racial traits and a pronounced religious development, to play a leading part in the life of man.

6. Semitic Languages:

The phrase Semitic Languages is used of a group of languages which have marked features in common, which also set them off from other languages. But we must avoid the unnecessary inference that nations using the same or kindred languages are of the same ancestry. There are other explanations of linguistic affinity than racial, as the Indians of Mexico may speak Spanish, and the Germans of Milwaukee may speak English. So also neighboring or intermingled nations may just as naturally have used branches of the Semitic language stock. However, it is true that the nations which were truly Semitic used languages which are strikingly akin. These have been grouped as

(1) Eastern Sere, including Babylonian and Assyrian;

(2) Northern, including Syriac and Aramaic;

(3) Western, including Canaanite, or Phoenician, and Hebrew, and

(4) Southern, including Arabic, Sabean and Ethiopic (compare Geden, Introduction to the Hebrew Bible, 14-28).

The distinctive features of this family of languages are

(1) the tri-literal root,

(2) the consonantal writing, vowel indications being unnecessary so long as the language was spoken,

(3) the meager use of moods and tenses in verbal inflection, every action being graphically viewed as belonging to one of two stages in time: completed or incomplete,

(4) the paucity of parts of speech, verb and noun covering nearly all the relations of words,

(5) the frequent use of internal change in the inflection of words, e.g. the doubling of a consonant or the change of a vowel, and

(6) the use of certain letters, called "serviles," as prefixes or suffixes in inflection; these are parts of pronouns or the worn-down residua of nouns and particles. The manner of writing was not uniform in these languages, Babylonian and Assyrian being ideographic and syllabic, and written from left to right, while Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic were alphabetic and written from right to left.

The primitive forms and inflections of the group are best preserved in the Arabic by reason of the conservatism of the desert peoples, and in the Assyrian by the sudden destruction of that empire and the burial of the records of that language in a comparatively pure state, to be brought back to light by 19th-century exploration. All the characteristics given above are clearly manifest in the Hebrew of the Old Testament.

7. Semitic Religion:

In the study of Semitic Religion there are two tendencies toward error:

(1) the Western pragmatical and unsympathetic overtaxing of oriental Nature-symbols and vividly imaginative speech. Because the Semite used the figure of the rock (De 32:4,18,30) in describing God, or poetically conceived of the storm-cloud as Yahweh’s chariot (Ps 104:3), we must not be led into believing that his religion was a savage animism, or that Yahweh of Israel was only the Zeus of the Greeks. How should an imaginative child of Nature speak of the unseen Spiritual Power, except in the richest analogies of Nature?

(2) The second error is the tendency to treat the accretions acquired by contact with other nations as of the essence of Semitic religion, e.g. the golden calf following the Egyptian bondage, and the sexual abominations of the Canaanite Baal and Astarte.

The primitive and distinctive beliefs of the Semitic peoples lie still in great uncertainty because of the long association with other peoples, whose practices they readily took over, and because of the lack of records of the primitive periods of Semitic development, their origin and dispersion among the nations being prehistoric. Our sources of information are the Babylonian and Assyrian tablets and monuments, the Egyptian inscriptions, Phoenician history, Arabian traditions and inscriptions, and principally the Old Testament Scriptures. We can never know perhaps how much the pure Semitism ofBabylonians and Assyrians was diverted and corrupted by the developed civilization which they invaded and appropriated; Egypt was only indirectly affected by Semitic life; Semitic development in Arabia was the latest in all the group, besides which the monuments and reste of Arabian antiquity which have come down to us are comparatively few; and the Phoenician development was corrupted by the sensuality of the ancient Canaanitish cults, while the Bible of the Hebrews emphatically differentiated from the unwholesome religions of Palestine their own faith, which was ancestral, revealed and pure. Was that Bible faith the primitive Semitic cult? At least we must take the Hebrew tradition at its face value, finding in it the prominent features of an ancestral faith, preserved through one branch of the Semitic group. We are met frequently in these Hebrew records by the claim that the religion they present is not a new development, nor a thing apart from the origin of their race, but rather the preservation of an ancient worship, Abraham, Moses and the prophets appearing not as originators, but reformers, or revivers, who sought to keep their people true to an inherited religion. Its elemental features are the following:

(1) Its Peculiar Theism:

It was pronouncedly theistic; not that other religions do not affirm a god; but theism of the Semites was such as to give their religion a unique place among all others. To say the least, it had the germ of monotheism or the tendency toward monotheism, if we have not sufficient evidence to affirm its monotheism, and to rate the later polytheistic representations of Babylonia and Assyria as local perversions. If the old view that Semitic religion was essentially monotheistic be incapable of proof, it is true that the necessary development of their concept of God must ultimately arrive at monotheism. This came to verification in Abram the Hebrew, Jesus the Messiah (Joh 4:21-24) and Mohammed the false prophet. A city-state exclusively, a nation predominantly, worshipped one god, often through some Nature-symbol, as sun or star or element. With the coming of world-conquest, intercourse and vision, the one god of the city or the chief god of the nation became universalized. The ignorant and materialistic Hebrew might localize the God of Israel in a city or on a hilltop; but to the spiritual mind of Amos or in the universal vision of Isaiah He was Yahweh, Lord of all the earth.

(2) Personality of God:

Closely related to this high conception of Deity was the apparently contradictory but really potent idea of the Deity as a personality. The Semite did not grossly materialize his God as did the savage, nor

vainly abstract and etherealize Him and so eliminate Him from the experience of man as did the Greek; but to him God universal was also God personal and intimate. The Hebrew ran the risk of conditioning the spirituality of God in order to maintain His real personality. Possibly this has been the most potent element in Semitic religion; God was not far from every one of them. He came into the closest relations as father or friend. He was the companion of king and priest. The affairs of the nation were under His immediate care; He went to war with armies, was a partner in harvest rejoicings; the home was His abode. This conception of Deity carried with it the necessary implication of revelation (Am 3:8). The office, message and power of the Hebrew prophet were also the logical consequence of knowing God as a Person.

(3) Its View of Nature:

Its peculiar view of Nature was another feature of Semitic religion. God was everywhere and always present in Nature; consequently its symbolism was the natural and ready expression of His nature and presence. Simile, parable and Nature-marvels cover the pages and tablets of their records. Unfortunately this poetic conception of Nature quickly enough afforded a ready path in which wayward feet and carnal minds might travel toward Nature-worship with all of its formalism and its degrading excesses. This feature of Semitic religion offers an interesting commentary on their philosophy. With them the doctrine of Second Causes received no emphasis; God worked directly in Nature, which became to them therefore the continuous arena of signs and marvels. The thunder was His voice, the sunshine reflected the light of His countenance, the winds were His messengers. And so through this imaginative view of the world the Semite dwelt in an enchanted realm of the miraculous.

(4) The Moral Being of God:

The Semite believed in a God who is a moral being. Such a faith in the nature of it was certain to influence profoundly their own moral development, making for them a racial character which has been distinctive and persistent through the changes of millenniums. By it also they have impressed other nations and religions, with which they have had contact. The Code of Hammurabi is an expression of the moral issues of theism. The Law and the Prophets of Israel arose out of the conviction of God’s righteousness and of the moral order of His universe (Ex 19:5,6; Isa 1:16-20). The Decalogue is a confession of faith in the unseen God; the Law of Holiness (Le 17-26) is equally a moral code.

While these elements are not absent altogether from other ancient religions, they are pronouncedly characteristic of the Semitic to the extent that they have given to it its permanent form, its large development, and its primacy among the religions of the human race. To know God, to hear His eternal tread in Nature, to clothe Him with light as with a garment, to establish His throne in righteousness, to perceive that holiness is the all-pervading atmosphere of His presence—such convictions were bound to affect the life and progress of a rate, and to consecrate them as a nation of priests for all mankind.

LITERATURE.

For discussion of the details of Semitic peoples and religions reference must be made to the particular articles, such as ARPACHSHAD; EBER; ABRAHAM; HAMMURABI; ASSYRIA; BABYLONIA; BAAL; ASHTORETH; ASHERITES; MOLOCH; CHEMOSH; CHIUN; ISRAEL, RELIGION OF etc. The literature on the subject is vast, interesting and far from conclusive. Few of the Bible Dictionaries have articles on this particular subject; reference should be made to those in the Standard and in the HDB, volume both by McCurdy; "Semites" in Catholic Encyclopedia skims the surface; articles in International Eric are good. In Old Testament Theologies, Davidson, pp. 249-52; Schultz, chapter iii of volume I; Riehm, Alttestamentliche Theologie; Delitzsch, Psychology of the Old Testament. For language see Wright's Comparative Grammar of Semitic Languages. For history and religion: Maspero's three volumes; McCurdy, HPM; Hommel. Ancient Hebrew Tradition, and Semitic Volker u. Sprache; Jastrow, Comparative Semitic Religion; Friedr. Delitzsch, Babel u. Bibel; W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites.

Edward Mack

SENAAH

se-na'-a, sen'-a-a (cena'ah; Codex Vaticanus Sanana; Sananat; Codex Alexandrinus Sanana, Sennaa, Hasan): The children of Senaah are mentioned as having formed part of the company returning from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:35; Ne 7:38). The numbers vary as given by Ezr (3,630) and Ne (3,930), while 1 Esdras 5:23 puts them at 3,330. In the last place the name is Sanaas, the King James Version "Annaas" (Codex Vaticanus Sama; Codex Alexandrinus Sanaas). In Ne 3:3 the name occurs with the definite article, ha-senaah. The people may be identical with the Benjamite clan Hassenuah (1Ch 9:7). Eusebius, in Onomasticon, speaks of Magdalsenna a village about 7 miles North of Jericho, which may be the place intended; but the site is not known.

W. Ewing

SENATE; SENATOR

sen'-at, sen'-a-ter: In Ps 105:22, "teach his senators (the Revised Version (British and American) "elders") wisdom." The Hebrew is zaqen, "elder" Septuagint presbuteroi). In Ac 5:21, "called the council together and all the senate of the children of Israel." The Greek gerousia, is here evidently used as a more precise equivalent of the foregoing "council" (sunedrion), to which it is added by kai, explicative. Reference is had to the Sanhedrin. See SANHEDRIN. This term gerousia occurs in Septuagint Ex 3:16, etc., and in 1 Macc 12:6; 2 Macc 1:10; 4:44 of the supreme council of the Jews (see GOVERNMENT). In 1 Macc 8:15; 12:3, bouleuterion, is used of the Roman senate, which is said to consist of 320 members meeting daily, consulting always for the people, to the end that they may be well governed. These statements are not quite accurate, since the senate consisted normally of 300 members, and met not daily, but on call of the magistrates. Originally, like the gerousia of the Jews, the representatives of families and clans (gentes), the senators were subsequently the ex-magistrates, supplemented, to complete the tale of members, by representatives of patrician (in time also of plebeian) families selected

by the censor. The tenure was ordinarily for life, though it might be terminated for cause by the censor. Although constitutionally the senate was only an advisory body, its advice (senatus consultum, auctoritas) in fact became in time a mandate which few dared to disregard. During the republican period the senate practically ruled Rome; under the empire it tended more and more to become the creature and subservient tool of the emperors.

William Arthur Heidel

SENEH

se’-ne (ceneh; Senna): This was the name attaching to the southern of the two great cliffs between which ran the gorge of Michmash (1Sa 14:4). The name means "acacia," and may have been given to it from the thorn bushes growing upon it. Josephus (BJ, V, ii, 1) mentions the "plain of thorns" near Gabathsaul. We may hear an echo of the old name in that of Wady Suweinit, "valley of the little thorn tree," the name by which the gorge is known today. The cliff must have stood on the right side of the wady; see BOZEZ. Conder gives an excellent description of the place in Tent Work in Palestine, II, 112-14.

W. Ewing

SENIR

se’-nir (senir; Saneir): This was the Amorite name of Mt. Hermon, according to De 3:9 (the King James Version "Shenir").’ But in 1Ch 5:23; So 4:8, we have Senir and Hermon named as distinct mountains. It seems probable, however, that Senir applied to a definite part of the Anti-Lebanon or Hermon range. An inscription of Shalmaneser tells us that Hazael, king of Damascus, fortified Mt. Senir over against Mt. Lebanon. So in Eze 27:5, Senir, whence the Tyrians got planks of fir trees, is set over against Lebanon, where cedars were obtained. The Arab geographers give the name Jebel Sanir to the part of the Anti-Lebanon range which lies between Damascus and Homs (Yakut, circa 1225 AD, quoted by Guy le Strange in Palestine under the Moslems, 79. He also quotes Mas‘udi, 943 AD, to the effect that Baalbek is in the district of Senir, 295).

W. Ewing

SENNACHERIB

se-nak’-er-ib (cancheribh; Sennachereim, Assyrian Sin-akhierba, "the moon-god Sin has increased the brothers"): Sennacherib (704-682 BC) ascended the throne of Assyria after the death of his father Sargon. Appreciating the fact that Babylon would be difficult to control, instead of endeavoring to conciliate the people he ignored them. The Babylonians, being indignant, crowned a man of humble origin, Marduk-zakir-shum by name. He ruled only a month, having been driven out by the irrepressible Merodach-baladan, who again appeared on the scene.

In order to fortify himself against Assyria the latter sent an embassy to Hezekiah, apparently for the purpose of inspiring the West to rebel against Assyria (2Ki 20:12-19).

Sennacherib in his first campaign marched into Babylonia. He found Merodach-baladan entrenched at Kish, about 9 miles from Babylon, and defeated him; after which he entered the gates of Babylon, which had been thrown open to him. He placed a Babylonian, named Bel-ibni, on the throne.

This campaign was followed by an invasion of the country of the Cassites and Iasubigalleans. In his third campaign he directed his attention to the West, where the people had become restless under the Assyrian yoke. Hezekiah had been victorious over the Philistines (2Ki 18:8). In preparation to withstand a siege, Hezekiah had built a conduit to bring water within the city walls (2Ki 20:20). Although strongly opposed by the prophet Isaiah, gifts were sent to Egypt, whence assistance was promised (Isa 30:1-4). Apparently also the Phoenicians and Philistines, who had been sore pressed by Assyria, had made provision to resist Assyria. The first move was at Ekron, where the Assyrian governor Padi was put into chains and sent to Hezekiah at Jerusalem.

Sennacherib, in 701 BC, moved against the cities in the West. He ravaged the environs of Tyre, but made no attempt to take the city, as he was without a naval force. After Elulaeus the king of Sidon fled, the city surrendered without a battle, and Ethbaal was appointed king. Numerous cities at once sent presents to the king of Assyria. Ashkelon and other cities were taken. The forces of Egypt were routed at Eltekeh, and Ekron was destroyed. He claims to have conquered 46 strongholds of Hezekiah’s territory, but he did not capture Jerusalem, for concerning the king he said, in his annals, "himself like a bird in a cage in Jerusalem, his royal city, I penned him." He states, also, how he reduced his territory, and how Hezekiah sent to him 30 talents of gold and 800 talents of silver, besides hostages.

The Biblical account of this invasion is found in 2Ki 18:13-19:37; Isa 36; 37. The Assyrian account differs considerably from it; but at the same time it corroborates it in many details. One of the striking parallels is the exact amount of gold which Hezekiah sent to the Assyrian king (see The Expository Times, XII, 225,405; XIII, 326).

In the following year Sennacherib returned to Babylonia to put down a rebellion by Bal-ibni and Merodach-baladan. The former was sent to Assyria, and the latter soon afterward died. Ashurnadin-shum, the son of Sennacherib, was then crowned king of Babylon. A campaign into Cilicia and Cappadocia followed.

In 694 BC Sennacherib attacked the Elamites, who were in league with the Babylonians. In revenge, the Elamites invaded Babylonia and carried off Ashur-nadin-shum to Elam, and made Nergalushezib king of Babylon. He was later captured and in turn carried off to Assyria. In 691 BC Sennacherib again directed his attention to the South, and at Khalute fought with the combined forces. Two years later he took Babylon, and razed it to the ground.

In 681 BC Sennacherib was murdered by his two sons (2Ki 19:37; see SHAREZER). Esar-haddon their

younger brother, who was at the time conducting a campaign against Ararat, was declared king in his stead.

A. T. Clay

SENSES

sen’-siz: The translation of aistheterion (Heb 5:14, "those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern good and evil"). The word means, primarily, the seat of the senses, the region of feeling; in the Septuagint of Jer 4:19, it represents the Hebrew qir, "the walls of the heart" (see the Revised Version (British and American)), and is used to denote the internal sense or faculty of perceiving and judging, which in Heb 5:14 is regarded as becoming perfected by use or exercise (compare Eph 4:12 f; 1Ti 4:7; 2Pe 3:18).

In 2 Esdras 10:36 we have "Or is my sense deceived, or my soul in a dream?" Latin sensus, here "mind" rather than "sense."

W. L. Walker

SENSUAL

sen’-shoo-al (psuchikos, "animal," "natural"): Biblical psychology has no English equivalent for this Greek original. Man subject to the lower appetites is sarkikos, "fleshly"; in the communion of his spirit with God he is pneumatikos, "spiritual." Between the two is the psuche, "soul," the center of his personal being. This ego or "I"in each man is bound to the spirit, the higher nature; and to the body or lower nature.

The soul (psuche) as the seat of the senses, desires, affections, appetites, passions, i.e. the lower animal nature common to man with the beasts, was distinguished in the Pythagorean and Platonic philosophy from the higher rational nature (nous, pneuma).

The subjection of the soul to the animal nature is man’s debasement, to the spirit indwelt of God is his exaltation. The English equivalent for psuchikos, "psychic" does not express this debasement. In the New Testament "sensual" indicates man’s subjection to self and self-interest, whether animal or intellectual—the selfish man in whom the spirit is degraded into subordination to the debased psuche, "soul." This debasement may be

(1) intellectual, "not wisdom .... from above, but .... earthly, sensual" (Jas 3:15);

(2) carnal (and of course moral), "sensual, having not the Spirit" (Jude 1:19).

It ranges all the way from sensuous self-indulgence to gross immorality. In the utter subjection of the spirit to sense it is the utter exclusion of God from the life. Hence, "the natural (psuchikos) man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God" (1Co 2:14). The term is equivalent to "the mind of the flesh" (Ro 8:7) which "is not subject to the law of God."

See PSYCHOLOGY.

Dwight M. Pratt

SENT

(shalach; apostello): "Sent" in the Old Testament is the translation of shalach, "to send" (of presents, messengers, etc., Ge 32:18; 44:3; Jud 6:14; 1Ki 14:6; Es 3:13; Pr 17:11; Jer 49:14; Eze 3:5; 23:40; Da 10:11; Ob 1:1); of shelach, Aramaic (Ezr 7:14; Da 5:24); of shilluchim, "sending" (Ex 18:2); in the New Testament of apostello, "to send off" or "away," "to send forth" (Joh 9:7, "the pool of Siloam (which is by interpretation, Sent)"); compare Lu 13:4; Ne 3:15, the pool of Siloah, the Revised Version (British and American) "Shelah"; Isa 8:6, "the waters of Shiloah that go softly," where Septuagint has Siloam for Hebrew shiloach, "a sending," which, rather than "Sent," is the original meaning—a sending forth of waters. See SILOAM. "Sent" is also the translation of apostolos, "one sent forth" (the original of the familiar word "apostle"); in Joh 13:16, "one that is sent" (margin, "Greek ‘an apostle’"); compare Heb 1:14.

W. L. Walker

SENTENCE

sen’-tens: Eight Hebrew and three Greek words are thus translated in the King James Version. Sometimes it points to a mystery (Da 5:12; 8:23); then again to the contents of the Law (De 17:11); then again to the idea of judgment (Ps 17:2) or of a judicial sentence (2Co 1:9; Lu 23:24), or of judicial advice (Ac 15:19, the American Standard Revised Version "judgment").

SENUAH

se-nu’-a, sen’-u-a (cenu’ah): In the King James Version "A Benjamite" (Ne 11:9); the Revised Version (British and American) has "Hassenuah," transliterating the definite article the King James Version is to be preferred (compare 1Ch 9:7).

SEORIM

se-o’-rim, se-or’-im (se‘orim): The name borne by one of the (post-exilic) priestly courses (1Ch 24:8).

SEPARATE

sep’-a-rat: The translation of a number of Hebrew and Greek words, badhal (Le 20:24, etc.), and aphorizo (Mt 25:32, etc.), being the most common. "To separate" and "to consecrate" were originally not distinguished (e.g. Nu 6:2 margin), and probably the majority of the uses of "separate" in English Versions of the Bible connote "to set apart for God." But precisely the same term that is used in this sense may also denote the exact opposite (e.g. the use of nazar in Eze 14:7 and Zec 7:3).

See HOLINESS; NAZIRITE; SAINTS.

SEPARATION

sep-a-ra’-shun: In the Pentateuch the word niddah specially points to a state of ceremonial uncleanness (Le 12:2,5; 15:20 ff; Nu 6:4 ff; 12:13; 19:21). For a description of the "water of purification," used for cleansing what was ceremonially unclean (Nu 19), see HEIFER, RED; UNCLEANNESS. For "separation" in the sense of nezer, see NAZIRITE.

SEPHAR

se’-far: Only in Ge 10:30 cepharah, "toward Sephar"), as the eastern limit of the territory of the sons of Yoktan (Joktan). From the similarity between the names of most of Yoktan’s sons and the names of South Arabian towns or districts, it can hardly be doubted that Sephar is represented by the Arabic Qafar. The appropriateness of the site seems to outweigh the discrepancy between Arabic "z" and Hebrew "s". But two important towns in South Arabia bear this name. The one lies a little to the South of San‘a’. According to tradition it was founded by Shammir, one of the Sabean kings, and for a long time served as the royal seat of the Tubbas. The other Zafar stands on the coast in the district of Shichr, East of Chadramaut. The latter is probably to be accepted as the Biblical site.

A. S. Fulton

SEPHARAD

se-fa’-rad, sef’-a-rad (cepharadh): Mentioned in Ob 1:20 as the place of captivity of certain "captives of Jerusalem," but no clear indication is given of locality. Many conjectures have been made. The Targum of Jonathan identifies with Spain; hence, the Spanish Jews are called Sephardim. Others (Pusey, etc.) have connected it with the "(Tsparda" of the Behistun Inscription, and some have even identified it with "Sardis." The now generally accepted view is that which connects it with the "Saparda" of the Assyrian inscriptions, though whether this is to be located to the East of Assyria or in Northern Asia Minor is not clear. See Schrader, Cuneiform Inscriptions, II, 145-46; Sayce, HCM, 482-84; articles in DB, HDB, EB, etc.

James Orr

SEPHARVAIM

sef-ar-va'-im, se-far-va'-im (cepharwayim: Sephpharouaim, Seppharoudim, Seppharoun, Seppharoumain, Eppharouaim, Sepphareim, the first two being the forms in manuscripts Alexandrinus and Vaticanus respectively, of the passages in Kings, and the last two in Isaiah):

1. Formerly Identified with the Two Babylonian Sippars:

This city, mentioned in 2Ki 17:24; 18:34; 19:13; Isa 36:19; 37:13, is generally identified with the Sip(p)ar of the Assyrians-Babylonian inscriptions (Zimbir in Sumerian), on the Euphrates, about 16 miles Southwest of Bagdad. It was one of the two great seats of the worship of the Babylonian sun-god Samas, and also of the goddesses Ishtar and Anunit, and seems to have had two principal districts, Sippar of Samas, and Sippar of Anunit, which, if the identification were correct, would account for the dual termination -ayim, in Hebrew. This site is the modern 'Abu-Habbah, which was first excavated by the late Hormuzd Rassam in 1881, and has furnished an enormous number of inscriptions, some of them of the highest importance.

2. Difficulties of That Identification:

Besides the fact that the deities of the two cities, Sippar and Sepharvaim, are not the same, it is to be noted that in 2Ki 19:13 the king of Sepharvaim is referred to, and, as far as is known, the Babylonian Sippar never had a king of its own, nor had Akkad, with which it is in part identified, for at least 1,200 years before Sennacherib. The fact that Babylon and Cuthah head the list of cities mentioned is no indication that Sepharvaim was a Babylonian town—the composition of the list, indeed, points the other way, for the name comes after Ava and Hamath, implying that it lay in Syria.

3. Another Suggestion:

Joseph Halevy therefore suggests (ZA, II, 401 ff) that it should be identified with the Sibraim of Eze 47:16, between Damascus and Hamath (the dual implying a frontier town), and the same as the Sabara'in of the Babylonian Chronicle, there referred to as having been captured by Shalmaneser. As, however, Sabara'in may be read Samara'in, it is more likely to have been the Hebrew Shomeron (Samaria), as pointed out by Fried. Delitzsch.

LITERATURE.

See Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, I, 71 f; Kittel on K; Dillmann-Kittel on Isa, at the place; HDB, under the word

T. G. Pinches

SEPHARVITES se’-far-vits, se-far’-vits> (cepharwim): In 2Ki 17:31, the inhabitants of SEPHARVAIM (which see), planted by the king of Assyria in Samaria. They continued there to burn their children to their native gods.

SEPPHORIS

sef’-o-ris: A city of Galilee, taken by Josephus (Vita, IX, lxvii, 71) and later destroyed by the son of Varus (Ant., XVII, x, 9).

SEPTUAGINT, 1

sep’-tu-a-jint:

I. IMPORTANCE

II. NAME

III. TRADITIONAL ORIGIN

1. Letter of Aristeas

2. Evidence of Aristobulus and Philo

3. Later Accretions

4. Criticism of the Aristeas Story

5. Date

6. Credibility

IV. EVIDENCE OF PROLOGUE TO SIRACH

V. TRANSMISSION OF THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT

1. Early Corruption of the Text

2. Official Revision of Hebrew Text circa 100 AD

3. Adoption of Septuagint by Christians

4. Alternative 2nd-Century Greek Versions

5. Aquila

6. Theodotion

7. Symmachus and Others

8. Origen and the Hexapla

9. Hexaplaric Manuscripts

10. Recensions Known to Jerome

11. Hesychian Recension

12. Lucianic Recension

VI. RECONSTRUCTION OF SEPTUAGINT TEXT; VERSIONS, MANUSCRIPTS AND PRINTED EDITIONS

1. Ancient Versions Made from Septuagint

2. Manuscripts

3. Printed Texts

4. Reconstruction of Original Text

VII. NUMBER, TITLES AND ORDER OF BOOKS

1. Contents

2. Titles

3. Bipartition of Books

4. Grouping and Order of Books

VIII. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VERSION AND ITS COMPONENT PARTS

1. Grouping of Books on Internal Evidence

(1) The Hexateuch

(2) The "Latter" Prophets

(3) Partial Version of the "Former" Prophets (4) The "Writings"

(5) The Latest Septuagint Translations

2. General Characteristics

IX. SALIENT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE GREEK AND HEBREW TEXTS

1. Sequence

2. Subject-Matter

LITERATURE

I. Importance.

The Greek version of the Old Testament commonly known as the Septuagint holds a unique place among translations. Its importance is manysided. Its chief value lies in the fact that it is a version of a Hebrew text earlier by about a millennium than the earliest dated Hebrew manuscript extant (916 AD), a version, in particular, prior to the formal rabbinical revision of the Hebrew which took place early in the 2nd century AD. It supplies the materials for the reconstruction of an older form of the Hebrew than the Massoretic Text reproduced in our modern Bibles. It is, moreover, a pioneering work; there was probably no precedent in the world’s history for a series of translations from one language into another on so extensive a scale. It was the first attempt to reproduce the Hebrew Scriptures in another tongue. It is one of the outstanding results of the breaking-down of international barriers by the conquests of Alexander the Great and the dissemination of the Greek language, which were fraught with such vital consequences for the history of religion. The cosmopolitan city which he founded in the Delta witnessed the first attempt to bridge the gulf between Jewish and Greek thought. The Jewish commercial settlers at Alexandria, forced by circumstances to abandon their language, clung tenaciously to their faith; and the translation of the Scriptures into their adopted language, produced to meet their own needs, had the further result of introducing the outside world to a knowledge of their history and religion. Then came the most momentous event in its history, the starting-point of a new life; the translation was taken over from the Jews by the Christian church. It was the Bible of most writers of the New Testament. Not only

are the majority of their express citations from Scripture borrowed from it, but their writings contain numerous reminiscences of its language. Its words are household words to them. It laid for them the foundations of a new religious terminology. It was a potent weapon for missionary work, and, when versions of the Scriptures into other languages became necessary, it was in most cases the Septuagint and not the Hebrew from which they were made. Preeminent among these daughter versions was the Old Latin which preceded the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.), for the most part a direct translation from the Hebrew, was in portions a mere revision of the Old Latin; our Prayer-book version of the Psalter preserves peculiarities of the Septuagint, transmitted through the medium of the Old Latin. The Septuagint was also the Bible of the early Greek Fathers, and helped to mold dogma; it furnished proof-texts to both parties in the Arian controversy. Its language gives it another strong claim to recognition. Uncouth and unclassical as much of it appears, we now know that this is not wholly due to the hampering effects of translation. "Biblical Greek," once considered a distinct species, is now a rather discredited term. The hundreds of contemporary papyrus records (letters, business and legal documents, etc.) recently discovered in Egypt illustrate much of the vocabulary and grammar and go to show that many so-called "Hebraisms" were in truth integral parts of the koine, or "common language," i.e. the international form of Greek which, since the time of Alexander, replaced the old dialects, and of which the spoken Greek of today is the lineal descendant. The version was made for the populace and written in large measure in the language of their everyday life.

II. Name.

The name "Septuagint" is an abbreviation of Interpretatio secundum (or juxta) Septuaginta seniores (or viros), i.e. the Greek translation of the Old Testament of which the first installment was, according to the Alexandrian legend (see III, below), contributed by 70 (or 72) elders sent from Jerusalem to Alexandria for the purpose at the request of Ptolemy II. The legend in its oldest form restricts their labors to the Pentateuch but they were afterward credited with the translation of the whole Bible, and before the 4th century it had become customary to apply the title to the whole collection: Aug., De Civ. Dei, xviii.42, "quorum interpretatio ut Septuaginta vocetur iam obtinuit consuetudo" ("whose translation is now by custom called the Septuagint"). The manuscripts refer to them under the abbreviation hoi o' ("the seventy"), or hoi ob',(" the seventy-two"). The "Septuagint" and the abbreviated form "LXX" have been the usual designations hitherto, but, as these are based on a now discredited legend, they are coming to be replaced by "the Old Testament in Greek," or "the Alexandrian version" with the abbreviation "G".

III. Traditional Origin.

The traditional account of the translation of the Pentateuch is contained in the so-called letter of Aristeas (editions of Greek text, P. Wendland, Teubner series, 1900, and Thackeray in the App. to Swete's Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 1900, etc.; Wendland's sections cited below appear in Swete's Introduction, edition 2; English translation by Thackeray, Macmillan, 1904, reprinted from JQR, XV, 337, and by H. T. Andrews in Charles' Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, II, 83-122, Oxford, 1913).

1. Letter of Aristeas:

The writer professes to be a high official at the court of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285-247 BC), a Greek interested in Jewish antiquities. Addressing his brother Philocrates he describes an embassy to Jerusalem on which he has recently been sent with another courtier Andreas. According to his narrative, Demetrius of Phalerum, a prominent figure in later Athenian history, who here appears as the royal librarian at Alexandria, convinced the king of the importance of securing for his library a translation of the Jewish Law. The king at the same time, to propitiate the nation from whom he was asking a favor, consented, on the suggestion of Aristeas, to liberate all Jewish slaves in Egypt. Copies follow of the letters which passed between Ptolemy and Eleazar, the high priest at Jerusalem. Ptolemy requests Eleazar to select and dispatch to Alexandria 72 elders, proficient in the Law, 6 from each tribe, to undertake the translation the importance of the task requiring the services of a large number to secure an accurate version Eleazar complies with the request and the names of the selected translators are appended to his letter.

There follow: (1) a detailed description of votive offerings sent by Ptolemy for the temple; (2) a sketch of Jerusalem, the temple and its services, and the geography of Palestine, doubtless reflecting in part the impressions of an eyewitness and giving a unique picture of the Jewish capital in the Ptolemaic era; (3) an exposition by Eleazar of portions of the Law.

The translators arrive at Alexandria, bringing a copy of the Law written in letters of gold on rolls of skins, and are honorably received by Ptolemy. A seven days' banquet follows, at which the king tests the proficiency of each in turn with hard questions. Three days later Demetrius conducts them across the mole known as the Heptastadion to the island of Pharos, where, with all necessaries provided for their convenience, they complete their task, as by a miracle, in 72 days; we are expressly told that their work was the result of collaboration and comparison. The completed version was read by Demetrius to the Jewish community, who received it with enthusiasm and begged that a copy might be entrusted to their leaders; a solemn curse was pronounced on any who should venture to add to or subtract from or make any alteration in the translation. The whole version was then read aloud to the king who expressed his admiration and his surprise that Greek writers had remained in ignorance of its contents; he directed that the books should be preserved with scrupulous care.

2. Evidence of Aristobulus and Philo:

To set beside this account we have two pre-Christian allusions in Jewish writings. Aristobulus, addressing a Ptolemy who has been identified as Philometor (182-146 BC), repeats the statement that the Pentateuch was translated under Philadelphus at the instance of Demetrius Phalereus (Eusebius, Praep. Ev., XIII, 12,664b); but the genuineness of the passage is doubtful. If it is accepted, it appears that some of the main features of the story were believed at Alexandria within a century of the date assigned by "Aristeas" to the translation Philo (Vit. Moys, ii.5 ff) repeats the story of the sending of the translators by Eleazar at the request of Philadelphus, adding that in his day the completion of the undertaking was celebrated by an annual festival on the isle of Pharos. It is improbable that an artificial

production like the Aristeas letter should have occasioned such an anniversary; Philo's evidence seems therefore to rest in part on an independent tradition. His account in one particular paves the way for later accretions; he hints at the inspiration of the translators and the miraculous agreement of their separate VSS: "They prophesied like men possessed, not one in one way and one in another, but all producing the same words and phrases as though some unseen prompter were at the ears of each." At the end of the 1st century AD Josephus includes in his Antiquities (XII, ii, 1 ff) large portions of the letter, which he paraphrases, but does not embellish.

3. Later Accretions:

Christian writers accepted the story without suspicion and amplified it. A catena of their evidence is given in an Appendix to Wendland's edition. The following are their principal additions to the narrative, all clearly baseless fabrications.

(1) The translators worked independently, in separate cells, and produced identical versions, Ptolemy proposing this test of their trustworthiness. So Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Augustine, the Chronicon Paschale and the Cohortatio ad Graecos (wrongly attributed to Justin); the author of the last work asserts that he had seen the cells and heard the tradition on the spot.

(2) A modification of this legend says that the translators worked in pairs in 36 cells. So Epiphanius (died 403 AD), and later G. Syncellus, Julius Pollux and Zonaras. Epiphanius' account is the most detailed. The translators were locked up in sky-lighted cells in pairs with attendants and shorthand writers; each pair was entrusted with one book, the books were then circulated, and 36 identical versions of the whole Bible, canonical and apocryphal books, were produced; Ptolemy wrote two letters, one asking for the original Scriptures, the second for translators.

(3) This story of the two embassies appears already in the 2nd century AD, in Justin's Apology, and

(4) the extension of the translators' work to the Prophets or the whole Bible recurs in the two Cyrils and in Chrysostom.

(5) The miraculous agreement of the translators proved them to be no less inspired than the authors (Irenaeus, etc.; compare Philo).

(6) As regards date, Clement of Alexandria quotes an alternative tradition referring the version back to the time of the first Ptolemy (322-285 BC); while Chrysostom brings it down to "a hundred or more years (elsewhere "not many years") before the coming of Christ." Justin absurdly states that Ptolemy's embassy was sent to King Herod; the Chronicon Paschale calls the high priest of the time Onias Simon, brother of Eleazar.

Jerome was the first to hold these later inventions up to ridicule, contrasting them with the older and more sober narrative. They indicate a growing oral tradition in Jewish circles at Alexandria. The origin

of the legend of the miraculous consensus of the 70 translators has been reasonably sought in a passage in Ex 24 Septuagint to which Epiphanius expressly refers. We there read of 70 elders of Israel, not heard of again, who with Aaron, Nadab and Abihu form a link between Moses and the people. After reciting the Book of the Covenant Moses ascends to the top of the mount; the 70, however, ascend but a little way and are bidden to worship from afar: according to the Septuagint text "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood .... and of the elect of Israel not one perished" (Ex 24:11), i.e. they were privileged to escape the usual effect of a vision of the Deity (Ex 33:20). But the verb used for "perish" (diaphonein) was uncommon in this sense; "not one disagreed" would be the obvious meaning; hence, apparently the legend of the agreement of the translators, the later intermediaries between Moses and Israel of the Dispersion. When the translations were recited, "no difference was discoverable," says Epiphanius, using the same verb, cave-dwellings in the island of Pharos probably account for the legend of the cells. A curious phenomenon has recently suggested that there is an element of truth in one item of Epiphanius' obviously incredible narrative, namely, the working of the translators in pairs. The Greek books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel fall into two nearly equal parts, apparently the work of separate translators (see VIII, 1, (2), below); while in Exodus, Leviticus and Psalms orthographical details indicate a similar division of the books for clerical purposes. There was, it seems, a primitive custom of transcribing each book on 2 separate rolls, and in the case of Jeremiah and Ezekiel the practice goes back to the time of translation (JTS, IV, 245 ff, 398 ff; IX, 88 ff).

4. Criticism of the Aristeas Story:

Beside the later extravagances, the story of Aristeas appears comparatively rational. Yet it has long been recognized that much of it is unhistorical, in particular the professed date and nationality of the writer. Its claims to authenticity were demolished by Dr. Hody two centuries ago (De bibliorum textibus originalibus, Oxon., 1705). Clearly the writer is not a Greek, but a Jew, whose aim is to glorify his race and to disseminate information about their sacred books. Yet the story is not wholly to be rejected, though it is difficult to disentangle truth from fiction. On one side his veracity has since Hody's time been established; his court titles, technical terms, epistolary formulas, etc., reappear in Egyptian papyri and inscriptions, and all his references to Alexandrian life and customs are probably equally trustworthy (sections 28, 109 ff, measures to counteract the ill effects upon agriculture of migration from country to town; section 167, treatment of informers (compare section 25); section 175 reception of foreign embassies (compare section 182)). The import of this discovery has, however, since its announcement by Lombroso (Recherches sur l'economie politique de l'Egypte, Turin, 1870), been somewhat modified by the new-found papyri which show that Aristeas' titles and formulas are those of the later, not the earlier, Ptolemaic age.

5. Date:

The letter was used by Josephus and probably known to Philo. How much earlier is it? Schurer (HJP, II, iii, 309 f (GJV4, III, 608-16)), relying on (1) the questionable Aristobulus passage, (2) the picture drawn of Palestine as if still under Ptolemaic rule, from which it passed to the Seleucids circa 200 BC, argued that the work could not be later than that date. But it is hard to believe that a fictitious story (as he regards it to be) could have gained credence within little more than half a century of the period to which

it relates, and Wendland rightly rejects so ancient an origin. The following indications suggest a date about 100-80 BC.

(1) Many of Aristeas' formulas, etc. (see above), only came into use in the 2nd century BC (Strack, Rhein. Mus., LV, 168 ff; Thackeray, Aristeas, English translation, pp. 3, 12).

(2) The later Maccabean age or the end of the 2nd century BC is suggested by some of the translators' names (Wendland, xxvi), and

(3) by the independent position of the high priest.

(4) Some of Ptolemy's questions indicate a tottering dynasty (section 187, etc.).

(5) The writer occasionally forgets his role and distinguishes between his own time and that of Philadelphus (sections 28, 182).

(6) He appears to borrow his name from a Jewish historian of the 2nd century BC and to wish to pass off the latter's history as his own (section 6).

(7) He is guilty of historical inaccuracies concerning Demetrius, etc.

(8) The prologue to the Greek Ecclesiasticus (after 132 BC) ignores and contradicts the Aristeas story, whereas Aristeas possibly used this prologue (Wendland, xxvii; compare Hart, Ecclesiasticus in Greek, 1909).

(9) The imprecation upon any who should alter the translation (section 311) points to divergences of text which the writer desired to check; compare section 57, where he seems to insist on the correctness of the Septuagint text of Ex 25:22, "gold of pure gold," as against the Hebrew.

(10) Allusions to current criticisms of the Pentateuch (sections 128, 144) presuppose a familiarity with it on the part of non-Jewish readers only explicable if the Septuagint had long been current.

(11) Yet details in the Greek orthography preclude a date much later than 100 BC.

6. Credibility:

The probable amount of truth in the story is ably discussed by Swete (Intro, 16-22). The following statements in the letter may be accepted:

(1) The translation was produced at Alexandria, as is conclusively proved by Egyptian influence on its language.

(2) The Pentateuch was translated first and, in view of the homogeneity of style, as a whole.

(3) The Greek Pentateuch goes back to the first half of the 3rd century BC; the style is akin to that of the 3rd-century papyri, and the Greek Genesis was used by the Hellenist Demetrius toward the end of the century.

(4) The Hebrew rolls were brought from Jerusalem.

(5) Possibly Philadelphus, the patron of literature, with his religious impartiality, may have countenanced the work.

But the assertion that it owed its inception wholly to him and his librarian is incredible; it is known from other sources that Demetrius Phalereus did not fill the office of librarian under that monarch. The language is that of the people, not a literary style suitable to a work produced under royal patronage. The importation of Palestinian translators is likewise fictitious. Dr. Swete acutely observes that Aristeas, in stating that the translation was read to and welcomed by the Jewish community before being presented to the king, unconsciously reveals its true origin. It was no doubt produced to meet their own needs by the large Jewish colony at Alexandria. A demand that the Law should be read in the synagogues in a tongue "understanded of the people" was the originating impulse.

IV. Evidence of Prologue to Sirach.

The interesting, though in places tantalizingly obscure, prologue to Ecclesiasticus throws light on the progress made with the translation of the remaining Scriptures before the end of the 2nd century BC.

The translator dates his settlement in Egypt, during which he produced his version of his grandfather’s work, as "the 38th year under Euergetes the king." The words have been the subject of controversy, but, with the majority of critics, we may interpret this to mean the 38th year of Euergetes II, reckoning from the beginning (170 BC) of his joint reign with Philometor, i.e. 132 BC. Euergetes I reigned for 25 years only. Others, in view of the superfluous preposition, suppose that the age of the translator is intended, but the cumbrous form of expression is not unparalleled. A recent explanation of the date (Hart, Ecclesiasticus in Greek) as the 38th year of Philadelphus which was also the 1st year of Euergetes I (i.e. 247 BC) is more ingenious than convincing.

The prologue implies the existence of a Greek version of the Law; the Prophets and "the rest of the books." The translator, craving his readers’ indulgence for the imperfections of his own work, due to the difficulty of reproducing Hebrew in Greek, adds that others have experienced the same difficulties: "The Law itself and the prophecies and the rest of the books have no small difference when spoken in their original language." From these words we may understand that at the time of writing (132-100 BC) Alexandrian Jews possessed Greek versions of a large part (probably not the whole) of "the Prophets," and of some of "the Writings" or Hagiographa. For some internal evidence as to the order in which the

several books were translated see VIII, below.

V. Transmission of the Septuagint Text.

The main value of the Septuagint is its witness to an older Hebrew text than our own. But before we can reconstruct this Hebrew text we need to have a pure Greek text before us, and this we are at present far from possessing. The Greek text has had a long and complex history of its own. Used for centuries by both Jews and Christians it underwent corruption and interpolation, and, notwithstanding the multitude of materials for its restoration, the original text has yet to be recovered. We are much more certain of the ipsissima verba of the New Testament writers than of the original Alexandrian version of the Old Testament. This does not apply to all portions alike. The Greek Pentateuch, e.g., has survived in a relatively pure form. But everywhere we have to be on our guard against interpolations, sometimes extending to whole paragraphs. Not a verse is without its array of variant readings. An indication of the amount of "mixture" which has taken place is afforded by the numerous "doublets" or alternative renderings of a single Hebrew word or phrase which appear side by side in the transmitted text.

1. Early Corruption of the Text:

Textual corruption began early, before the Christian era. We have seen indications of this in the letter of Aristeas (III, 5, (9) above). Traces of corruption appear in Philo (e.g. his comment, in Quis Rer. Div. Her. 56, on Ge 15:15, shows that already in his day tapheis, "buried," had become trapheis, "nurtured," as in all our manuscripts); doublets already exist. Similarly in the New Testament the author of Hebrews quotes (12:15) a corrupt form of the Greek of De 29:18.

2. Official Revision of Hebrew Text circa 100 AD:

But it was not until the beginning of the 2nd century AD that the divergence between the Greek and the Palestinian Hebrew text reached an acute stage. One cause of this was the revision of the Hebrew text which took place about this time. No actual record of this revision exists, but it is beyond doubt that it originated in the rabbinical school, of which Rabbi Akiba was the chief representative, and which had its center at Jamnia in the years following the destruction of Jerusalem. The Jewish doctors, their temple in ruins, concentrated their attention on the settlement of the text of the Scriptures which remained to them. This school of eminent critics, precursors of the Massoretes, besides settling outstanding questions concerning the Canon, laid down strict rules for Biblical interpretation, and in all probability established an official text.

3. Adoption of Septuagint by Christians:

But another cause widened still farther the distance between the texts of Jerusalem and Alexandria. This was the adoption of the Septuagint by the Christian church. When Christians began to cite the Alexandrian version in proof of their doctrines, the Jews began to question its accuracy. Hence, mutual recriminations which are reflected in the pages of Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho. "They dare to assert,"

says Justin (Dial., 68), "that the interpretation produced by your seventy elders under Ptolemy of Egypt is in some points inaccurate." A crucial instance cited by the Jews was the rendering "virgin" in Isa 7:14, where they claimed with justice that "young woman" would be more accurate. Justin retaliates by charging the Jews with deliberate excision of passages favorable to Christianity.

4. Alternative 2nd Century Greek Versions:

That such accusations should be made in those critical years was inevitable, yet there is no evidence of any material interpolations having been introduced by either party. But the Alexandrian version, in view of the revised text and the new and stricter canons of interpretation, was felt by the Jews to be inadequate, and a group of new translations of Scripture in the 2nd century AD supplied the demand. We possess considerable fragments of the work of three of these translators, namely, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, besides scanty remnants of further anonymous versions

5. Aquila:

The earliest of "the three" was Aquila, a proselyte to Judaism, and, like his New Testament namesake, a native of Pontus. He flourished, according to Epiphanius (whose account of these later translators in his De mens. et pond. is not wholly trustworthy), under Hadrian (117-38 AD) and was related to that emperor; there is no ~probability in Epiphanius' further statement that Hadrian entrusted to Aquila the superintendence of the building of Aelia Capitolina on the site of Jerusalem, that there he was converted to Christianity by Christian exiles returning from Pella, but that refusing to abandon astrology he was excommunicated, and in revenge turned Jew and was actuated by a bias against Christianity in his version of the Old Testament. What is certain is that he was a pupil of the new rabbinical school, in particular of Rabbi Akiba (95-135 AD), and that his version was an attempt to reproduce exactly the revised official text. The result was an extraordinary production, unparalleled in Greek literature, if it can be classed under that category at all. No jot or tittle of the Hebrew might be neglected; uniformity in the translation of each Hebrew word must be preserved and the etymological kinship of different Hebrew words represented. Such were some of his leading principles. The opening words of his translation (Ge 1:1) may be rendered: "In heading rounded God with the heavens and with the earth." "Heading" or "summary" was selected because the Hebrew word for "beginning" was a derivative of "head." "With" represents an untranslatable word ('eth) prefixed to the accusative case, but indistinguishable from the preposition "with." The Divine Name (the tetragrammaton, YHWH) was not translated, but written in archaic Hebrew characters. "A slave to the letter," as Origen calls him, his work has aptly been described by a modern writer as "a colossal crib" (Burkitt, JQR, October, 1896, 207 ff). Yet it was a success. In Origen's time it was used by all Jews ignorant of Hebrew, and continued in use for several centuries; Justinian expressly sanctioned its use in the synagogues (Nov., 146). Its lack of style and violation of the laws of grammar were not due to ignorance of Greek, of which the writer shows, in vocabulary at least, a considerable command. Its importance lay and lies (so far as it is preserved) in its exact reproduction of the rabbinical text of the 2nd century AD; it may be regarded as the beginning of the scientific study of the Hebrew Scriptures. Though "a bold attempt to displace the Septuagint," it cannot be charged with being intentionally antagonistic to Christianity. Of the original work, previously known only from extracts in manuscripts, some palimpsest fragments were recovered

from the Cairo Genizah in 1897 and edited by F. C. Burkitt (Fragments of the Books of Kings, 1897) and by C. Taylor (Sayings of the Jewish Fathers2, 1897; Hebrew-Greek Cairo Genizah Palimpsests, 1900). The student of Swete's Old Testament will trace Aquila's unmistakable style in the footnotes to the Books of Samuel and Kings; the older and shorter B text in those books has constantly been supplemented in the A text from Aquila. A longer specimen of his work occurs in the Greek Ecclesiastes, which has no claim to be regarded as "Septuagint"; Jerome refers to a second edition of Aquila's version, and the Greek Ecclesiastes is perhaps his first edition of that book, made on the basis of an unrevised Hebrew text (McNeile, Introduction to Ecclesiastes, Cambridge, 1904, App. I). The suggested identification of Aquila with Onkelos, author of the Targum of that name, has not been generally accepted.

6. Theodotion:

Epiphanius' account of the dates and history of Theodotion and Symmachus is untrustworthy. He seems to have reversed their order, probably misled by the order of the translations, in the columns of the Hexapla (see below). He also apparently confused Aquila and Theodotion in calling the latter a native of Pontus. As regards date, Theodotion, critics are agreed, preceded Symmachus and probably flourished under M. Aurelius (161-80), whereas Symmachus lived under Commodus (180-92); Irenaeus mentions only the versions of Aquila and Theodotion, and that of Symmachus had in his day either not been produced or at least not widely circulated. According to the more credible account of Irenaeus, Theodotion was an Ephesian and a convert to Judaism. His version constantly agrees with the Septuagint and was rather a revision of it, to bring it into accord with the current Hebrew text, than an independent work. The supplementing of lacunae in the Septuagint (due partly to the fact that the older version of some books did not aim at completeness) gave scope for greater originality. These lacunae were greatest in Job and his version of that book was much longer than the Septuagint. The text of Job printed in Swete's edition is a patchwork of old and new; the careful reader may detect the Theodotion portions by transliterations and other peculiarities. Long extracts from Theodotion are preserved in codex Q in Jeremiah. As regards the additional matter contained in Septuagint, Theodotion was inconsistent; he admitted, e.g., the additions to Daniel (Sus, Bel and the Dragon, and the So of Three Children), but did not apparently admit the non-canonical books as a whole. The church adopted his Daniel in place of the inadequate Septuagint version, which has survived in only one Greek manuscript; but the date when the change took place is unknown and the early history of the two Greek texts is obscure. Theodotion's renderings have been found in writings before his time (including the New Testament), and it is reasonably conjectured that even before the 2nd century AD the Septuagint text had been discarded and that Theodotion's version is but a working over of an older alternative version Theodotion is free from the barbarisms of Aquila, but is addicted to transliteration, i.e. the reproduction of Hebrew words in Greek letters: His reasons for this habit are not always clear; ignorance of Hebrew will not account for all (compare VIII, 1, (5), below).

7. Symmachus and Others:

Beside the two versions produced by, and primarily intended for, Jews was a third, presumably to meet the needs of a Jewish Christian sect who were dissatisfied with the Septuagint. Symmachus, its author,

was, according to the more trustworthy account, an Ebionite, who also wrote a commentary on Matthew, a copy of which was given to Origen by Juliana, a lady who received it from its author (Euseb., HE, VI, 17). Epiphanius' description of him as a Samaritan convert to Judaism may be rejected. The date of his work, as above stated, was probably the reign of Commodus (180-192 AD). In one respect the version resembled Aquila's, in its faithful adherence to the sense of the current Hebrew text; its style, however, which was flowing and literary, was a revolt against Aquila's monstrosities. It seems to have been a recasting of Aquila's version, with free use of both Septuagint and Theodotion. It carried farther a tendency apparent in the Septuagint to refine away the anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament.

Of three other manuscripts discovered by Origen (one at Nicopolis in Greece, one at Jericho) and known from their position in the Hexapla as Quinta, Sexta, and Septima, little is known. There is no reason to suppose that they embraced the whole Old Testament. Quinta is characterized by Field as the most elegant of the Greek versions F.C. Burkitt has discussed "the so-called Quinta of 4 Kings" in PSBA, June, 1902. The Christian origin of Sexta betrays itself in Hab 3:13 ("Thou wentest forth to save thy people for the sake of (or "by") Jesus thy anointed One").

8. Origen and the Hexapla:

These later versions play a large part in the history of the text of the Septuagint. This is due to the labors of the greatest Septuagint scholar of antiquity, the celebrated Origen of Alexandria, whose active life covers the first half of the 3rd century. Origen frankly recognized, and wished Christians to recognize, the merits of the later VSS, and the divergences between the Septuagint and the current Hebrew. He determined to provide the church with the materials for ascertaining the true text and meaning of the Old Testament. With this object he set himself to learn Hebrew—a feat probably unprecedented among non-Jewish Christians of that time—and to collect the later versions The idea of using these versions to amend the Septuagint seemed to him an inspiration: "By the gift of God we found a remedy for the divergence in the copies of the Old Testament, namely to use the other editions as a criterion" (Commentary on Mt 15:14). The magnum opus in which he embodied the results of his labors was known as the Hexapla or "six-column" edition. This stupendous work has not survived; a fragment was discovered toward the end of the 19th century in the Ambrosian Library at Milan (Swete, Introduction, 61 ff) and another among the Cairo Genizah palimpsests (ed C. Taylor, Cambridge, 1900). The material was arranged in six parallel columns containing

(1) the current Hebrew text,

(2) the same in Greek letters,

(3) the version of Aquila,

(4) that of Symmachus,

(5) that of the Septuagint,

(6) that of Theodotion.

The text was broken up into short clauses; not more than two words, usually one only, stood in the first column. The order of the columns doubtless represents the degree of conformity to the Hebrew; Aquila's, as the most faithful, heads the VSS, and Symmachus' is on the whole a revision of Aquila as Theodotion's is of the Septuagint. But Origen was not content with merely collating the VSS; his aim was to revise the Septuagint and the 5th column exhibited his revised text. The basis of it was the current Alexandrian text of the 3rd century AD; this was supplemented or corrected where necessary by the other versions Origen, however, deprecated alteration of a text which had received ecclesiastical sanction, without some indication of its extent, and the construction of the 5th column presented difficulties. There were

(1) numerous cases of words or paragraphs contained in the Septuagint but not in the Hebrew, which could not be wholly rejected,

(2) cases of omission from the Septuagint of words in the Hebrew,

(3) cases of paraphrase and minor divergences,

(4) variations in the order of words or chapters.

Origen here had recourse to a system of critical signs, invented and employed by the grammarian Aristarchus (3rd century BC) in his edition of Homer. Passages of the first class were left in the text, but had prefixed to them an obelus, a sign of which the original form was a "spit" or "spear," but figuring in Septuagint manuscripts as a horizontal line usually with a dot above and a dot below; there are other varieties also. The sign in Aristarchus indicated censure, in the Hexapla the doubtful authority of the words which followed. The close of the obelized passage was marked by the metobelus, a colon (:), or, in the Syriac VSS, shaped like a mallet. Passages missing in the Septuagint were supplied from one of the other versions (Aquila or Theodotion), the beginning of the extract being marked by an asterisk—a sign used by Aristarchus to express special approval—the close, by the metobelus. Where Septuagint and Hebrew widely diverged, Origen occasionally gave two VSS, that of a later translator under an asterisk, that of Septuagint obelized. Divergence in order was met by transposition, the Hebrew order being followed; in Proverbs, however, the two texts kept their respective order, the discrepancy being indicated by a combination of signs. Minor supposed or real corruptions in the Greek were tacitly corrected. Origen produced a minor edition, the Tetrapla, without the first two columns of the larger work. The Heptapla and Octapla, occasionally mentioned, appear to be alternative names given to the Hexapla at points where the number of columns was increased to receive other fragmentary versions. This gigantic work, which according to a reasonable estimate must have filled 5,000 leaves, was probably never copied in extenso. The original was preserved for some centuries in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea; there it was studied by Jerome, and thither came owners of Biblical manuscripts to collate their copies with it, as we learn from some interesting notes in our uncial manuscripts (e.g. a

7th-century note appended to Esther in codex S). The Library probably perished circa 638 AD, when Caesarea fell into the hands of the Saracens.

9. Hexaplaric Manuscripts:

But, though the whole work was too vast to be copied, it was a simple task to copy the 5th column. This task was performed, partly in prison, by Pamphilus, a martyr in the Diocletian persecution, and his friend Eusebius, the great bishop of Caesarea. Copies of the "Hexaplaric" Septuagint, i.e. Origen's doctored text with the critical signs and perhaps occasional notes, were, through the initiative of these two, widely circulated in Palestine in the 4th century. Naturally, however, the signs became unintelligible in a text detached from the parallel columns which explained them; scribes neglected them, and copies of the doctored text, lacking the precautionary symbols, were multiplied. This carelessness has wrought great confusion; Origen is, through others' fault, indirectly responsible for the production of manuscripts in which the current Septuagint text and the later versions are hopelessly mixed. No manuscripts give the Hexaplaric text as a whole, and it is preserved in a relatively pure form in very few: the uncials G and M (Pentatruch and some historical books), the cursives 86 and 88 (Prophets). Other so-called Hexaplaric manuscripts, notably codex Q (Marchalianus: Proph.) preserve fragments of the 5th and of the other columns of the Hexapla. (For the Syro-Hexaplar see below, VI, 1.) Yet, even did we possess the 5th column entire, with the complete apparatus of signs, we should not have "the original Septuagint," but merely, after removing the asterisked passages, a text current in the 3rd century. The fact has to be emphasized that Origen's gigantic work was framed on erroneous principles. He assumed (1) the purity of the current Hebrew text, (2) the corruption of the current Septuagint text where it deviated from the Hebrew. The modern critic recognizes that the Septuagint on the whole presents the older text, the divergences of which from the Hebrew are largely attributable to an official revision of the latter early in the Christian era. He recognizes also that in some books (e.g. Job) the old Greek version was only a partial one. To reconstruct the original text he must therefore have recourse to other auxiliaries beside Origen.

10. Recensions Known to Jerome:

Such assistance is partly furnished by two other recensions made in the century after Origen. Jerome (Praef. in Paralipp.; compare Adv. Ruf., ii.27) states that in the 4th century three recensions circulated in different parts of the Christian world: "Alexandria and Egypt in their Septuagint acclaim Hesychius as their authority, the region from Constantinople to Antioch approves the copies of Lucian the martyr, the intermediate Palestinian provinces read the manuscripts which were promulgated by Eusebius and Pamphilus on the basis of Origen's labors, and the whole world is divided between these three varieties of text."

11. Hesychian Recension:

Hesychius is probably to be identified with the martyr bishop mentioned by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, VIII, 13) along with another scholar martyr, Phileas bishop of Thmuis, and it is thought

that these two were engaged in prison in revising the Egyptian text at the time when Pamphilus and Eusebius were employed on a similar task under similar conditions. How far existing manuscripts preserve the Hesychian recension is uncertain; agreement of their text with that of Egyptian versions and Fathers (Cyril in particular) is the criterion. For the Prophets Ceriani has identified codex Q and its kin as Hesychian. For the Octateuch N. McLean (JTS, II, 306) finds the Hesychian text in a group of cursives, 44, 74, 76, 84, 106, 134, etc. But the first installments of the larger Cambridge Septuagint raise the question whether Codex B (Vaticanus) may not itself be Hesychian; its text is more closely allied to that of Cyril Alex. than to any other patristic text, and the consensus of these two witnesses against the rest is sometimes (Ex 32:14) curiously striking. In the Psalter also Rahlfs (Septuaginta-Studien, 2. Heft, 1907, 235) traces the Hesychian text in B and partially in Codex Sinaiticus. Compare von Soden's theory for the New Testament.

See TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

12. Lucianic Recension:

The Lucianic recension was the work of another martyr, Lucian of Antioch (died 311-12), probably with the collaboration of the Hebraist Dorotheus. There are, as Hort has shown, reasons for associating Lucian with a "Syrian" revision of the New Testament in the 4th century, which became the dominant type of text. That he produced a Syrian recension of the Greek Old Testament is expressly stated by Jerome, and we are moreover able with considerable certainty to identify the extant manuscripts which exhibit it. The identification, due to Field and Lagarde, rests on these grounds:

(1) certain verses in 2 Kings are in the Arabic Syro-Hexaplar marked with the letter L, and a note explains that the letter indicates Lucianic readings;

(2) the readings so marked occur in the cursives 19, 82, 93, 108, 118;

(3) these manuscripts in the historical books agree with the Septuagint citations of the Antiochene Fathers Chrysostom and Theodoret.

This clue enabled Lagarde to construct a Lucianic text of the historical books (Librorum Vet. Test. canonic. pars prior, Gottingen, 1883); his death prevented the completion of the work. Lagarde's edition is vitiated by the fact that he does not quote the readings of the individual manuscripts composing the group, and it can be regarded only as an approximate reconstruction of "Lucian." It is evident, however, that the Lucianic Septuagint possessed much the same qualities as the Syrian revision of the New Testament; lucidity and completeness were the main objects. It is a "full" text, the outcome of a desire to include, so far as possible, all recorded matter; "doublets" are consequently numerous. While this "conflation" of texts detracts from its value, the Lucianic revision gains importance from the fact that the sources from which it gleaned include an element of great antiquity which needs to be disengaged; where it unites with the Old Latin version against all other authorities its evidence is invaluable.

SEPTUAGINT, 2

VI. Reconstruction of Septuagint Text; Versions, Manuscripts and Printed Editions.

The task of restoring the original text is beset with difficulties. The materials (MSS, VSS, patristic citations) are abundant, but none has escaped "mixture," and the principles for reconstruction are not yet securely established (Swete, Introduction, I, iv-vi; III, vi).

1. Ancient Versions Made from Septuagint:

Among the chief aids to restoration are the daughter versions made from the Septuagint, and above all the Old Latin (pre-Hieronymian) version, for the earliest (African) Old Latin version dates from the 2nd century AD, i.e. before Origen, and contains a text from which the asterisked passages in Hexaplaric manuscripts are absent; it thus "brings us the best independent proof we have that the Hexaplar signs introduced by Origen can be relied on for the reconstruction of the LXX" (Burkitt). The Old Latin also enables us to recognize the ancient element in the Lucianic recension. But the Latin evidence itself is by no means unanimous. Augustine (De Doctr. Christ., ii.16) speaks of the infinite variety of Latin VSS; though they may ultimately prove all to fall into two main families, African and European. Peter Sabatier’s collection of patristic quotations from the Old Latin is still useful, though needing verification by recent editions of the Fathers. Of Old Latin manuscripts one of the most important is the codex Lugdunensis, edited by U. Robert (Pentateuchi e codex Lugd. versio Latin antiquissima, Paris, 1881; Heptateuchi partis post. versio Latin antiq. e codex Lugd., Lyons, 1900). The student should consult also Burkitt’s edition of The Rules of Tyconius ("Texts and Studies," III, 1, Cambridge, 1894) and The Old Latin and the Itala (ibid., IV, 3, 1896).

Jerome’s Vulgate is mainly a direct translation from the Hebrew, but the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Psalter, the so-called Gallican, is one of Jerome’s two revisions of the Old Latin, not his later version from the Hebrew, and some details in our Prayer-book Psalter are ultimately derived through the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Psalter from the Septuagint. Parts of the Apocrypha (Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, 1 and 2 Maccabees) are also pure Old Latin, untouched by Jerome.

The early date (2nd century AD) once claimed for the Egyptian or Coptic versions (Bohairic, i.e. in the dialect of Lower Egypt, Sahidic or Upper Egyptian and Middle Egyptian) has not been confirmed by later researches, at least as regards the first-named, which is probably not earlier than the 3rd or 4th century AD. Rahlfs (Sept-Studien, II, 1907) identifies the Bohairic Psalter as the Hesychian recension. The Sahidic version of Job has fortunately preserved the shorter text lacking the later insertions from Theodotion (Lagarde, Mittheilungen, 1884, 204); this does not conclusively prove that it is pre-Origenic; it may be merely a Hexaplaric text with the asterisked passages omitted (Burkitt, EB, IV, 5027). The influence bf the Hexapla is traceable elsewhere in this version

The Ethiopic version was made in the main from the Greek and in part at least from an early text; Rahlfs

(Sept. Stud., I, 1904) considers its text of S-K, with that of codex B, to be pre-Origenic.

The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) or Peshitta Syriac version was made from the Hebrew, though partly influenced by the Septuagint. But another Syriac version is of primary importance for the Septuagint text, namely, that of Paul, bishop of Tella (Constantine in Mesopotamia), executed at Alexandria in 616-17 and known as the Syro-Hexaplar. This is a bald Syriac version of the Septuagint column of the Hexapla, containing the Hexaplar signs. A manuscript of the poetical and prophetical books is in the Ambrosian Library at Milan and has been edited by Ceriani (Monumenta sacra et profana, 1874); fragments of the historical books are also extant (Lagarde and Rahlfs, Bibliothecae Syriacae, Gottingen, 1892). This version supplements the Greek Hexaplaric manuscripts and is the principal authority for Origen's text. For the original version of Daniel, which has survived in only one late MS, the Syro-Hexaplar supplies a second and older authority of great value.

The Armenian version (ascribed to the 5th century) also owes its value to its extreme literalness; its text of the Octateuch is largely Hexaplaric.

A bare mention must suffice of the Arabic version (of which the prophetical and poetical books, Job excluded, were rendered from the Septuagint); the fragments of the Gothic version (made from the Lucianic recension), and the Slavonic (partly from Septuagint, also Lucianic) and the Georgian versions.

2. Manuscripts:

For a full description of the Greek manuscripts see Swete, Introduction, I, chapter V. They are divided according to their script (capitals or minuscules) into uncials and cursives, the former ranging from the 4th century (four papyrus scraps go back to the 3rd century; Nestle in Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche, XXIII, 208) to the 10th century AD, the latter from the 9th to the 16th century AD. Complete Bibles are few; the majority contain groups of books only, such as the Pentateuch, Octateuch (Gen-Ruth), the later historical books, the Psalter, the 3 or 5 "Solomonic" books, the Prophets (major, minor or both). Uncials are commonly denoted by capital letters (in the edition of Holmes and Parsons by Roman figures); cursives, of which over 300 are known, by Arabic figures; in the larger Cambridge Septuagint the selected cursives are denoted by small Roman letters.

The following are the chief uncials containing, or which once contained, the whole Bible: B (Vaticanus, at Rome, 4th century AD), adopted as the standard text in all recent editions; Codex Sinaiticus, at Petersburg and Leipzig, 4th century AD), discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 and subsequent years in Catherine's Convent, Mt. Sinai; A (Alexandrinus, British Museum, probably 5th century AD); C (Ephraemi rescriptus, Paris, probably 5th century), a palimpsest, the older Biblical matter underlying a medieval Greek text of works of Ephrem the Syrian. For the Octateuch and historical books: D (Cottonianus, British Museum, probably 5th or 6th century), fragments of an illuminated Gen, the bulk of which perished in a fire at Ashburnham House in 1731, but earlier collations of Grabe and others are extant, which for the lost portions are cited in the Cambridge texts as D (Dsil, i.e. silet Grabius, denotes an inference from Grabe's silence that the manuscript did not contain a variant); F (Ambro-sianus,

Milan, 4th to 5th century), fragments of the Octateuch; G (Sarravianus, fragments at Leyden, Paris and Petersburg, 4th to 5th century), important as containing an Origenic text with the Hexaplar signs; L (Purpureus Vindobonensis, Vienna, 5th to 6th century), fragments of an illuminated manuscript Genesis on purple vellum; M (Coislinianus, Paris, 7th century), important on account of its marginal Hexaplaric matter. For the Prophets, Q (Marchalianus, Rome, 6th century) is valuable, both for its text, which is "Hesychian" (see above), and for its abundant marginal Hexaplaric matter. A curious mixture of uncial and cursive writing occurs in E (Bodleianus, probably 10th century), fragments of the historical books (to 3 R 16 28) preserved at Oxford, Cambridge (1 leaf), Petersburg and London; Tischendorf, who brought the manuscript from the East, retained the tell-tale Cambridge leaf, on which the transition from uncial to cursive script occurs, until his death. The long-concealed fact that the scattered fragments were part of a single manuscript came to light through Swete's identification of the Cambridge leaf as a continuation of the Bodleian fragment. Many of the cursives still await investigation, as do also the lectionaries. The latter, though the manuscripts are mainly late, should repay study. The use of the Septuagint for lectionary purposes was inherited by the church from the synagogue, and the course of lessons may partly represent an old system; light may also be expected from them on the local distribution of various types of text.

3. Printed Texts:

Of the printed text the first four editions were

(1) the Complutensian Polyglot of Cardinal Ximenes, 1514-17, comprising the Greek, Hebrew and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) texts, the last in the middle place of honor being compared to Jesus in the midst between the two thieves (!). The Greek was based on manuscripts from the Vatican and one from Venice; it exhibits on the whole the Lucianic recension, as the Hesychian is by a curious coincidence represented in

(2) the Aldine edition of 1518, based on Venetian manuscripts.

(3) The monumental Sixtine edition, published at Rome in 1586 under the auspices of Pope Sixtus V and frequently reprinted, was mainly based on the codex Vaticanus, the superiority of which text is justly recognized in the interesting preface (printed in Swete's Intro)

(4) The English edition (Oxford, 1707-20) begun by Grabe (died 1712) was based on the codex Alexandrinus, with aid from other manuscripts, and had the peculiarity that he employed Origen's critical signs and different sizes of type to show the divergence between the Greek and the Hebrew. Of more recent editions three are preeminent.

(5) The great Oxford edition of Holmes and Parsons (Oxford, 1798-1827, 5 volumes, folio) was the first attempt to bring together in a gigantic apparatus criticus all the evidence of uncial and cursire manuscripts (upward of 300), versions and early Citations from Philo and Josephus onward. As a monumental storehouse of materials "H. and P." will not be wholly superseded by the latest edition now

(1913) in preparation.

(6) The serviceable Cambridge "manual," edition of Swete (lst edition 1887-94, edition 3, 1901-7, 3 volumes, 8vo), is in the hands of all serious Septuagint students. The text is that of B, or (where B fails) of A, and the apparatus contains the readings of the principal uncial manuscripts. New materials discovered since the edition of H. and P., especially codex S, are employed, and greater accuracy in the presentation of the other evidence has been made possible by photography. The fact that the text here printed is but a provisional one is sometimes overlooked. Swete's edition was designed as a precursor to

(7) the larger Cambridge Septuagint, of which three installments embracing the Pentateuch have (1913) appeared (The Old Testament in Greek, edition A.E. Brooke and N. McLean, Cambridge, 1911 pt. III. Numbers and Deuteronomy). The text is a reprint of Swete's except that from Ex onward a few alterations of errors in the primary manuscript have been corrected, a delicate task in which the editors have rejected a few old readings without sufficient regard to the peculiarities of Hellenistic Greek. The importance of the work lies in its apparatus, which presents the readings of all the uncials, versions and early citations, and those of a careful representative selection of the cursives. The materials of H (Law of Holiness, Lev. 17-26) and P (the Priestly Code) are brought up to date and presented in a more reliable and convenient form. Besides these there is

(8) Lagarde's reconstruction of the Lucianic recension of the historical books, which, as stated, must be used with caution (see above)

4. Reconstruction of Original Text:

The task of reconstructing the Oldest text is still unaccomplished. Materials have accumulated, and much preliminary "spade-work" has been done, by Lagarde in particular (see his "axioms" in Swete, Introduction, 484, ff) and more recently by Nestle and Rahlfs; but the principles which the editor must follow are not yet finally determined. The extent to which "mixture" has affected the documents is the stumbling-block. Clearly no single Moabite Stone presents the oldest text. That of codex B, as in the New Testament, is on the whole the purest. In the 4 books of "Reigns" (1 Samuel through 2 Kings), e.g., it has escaped the grosser interpolations found in most manuscripts, and Rahlfs (Sept.-Studien, I, 1904) regards its text as pre-Origenic. It is, however, of unequal value and by no means an infallible guide; in Judges, e.g., its text is undoubtedly late, no earlier than the 4th century AD, according to one authority (Moore," Jgs," ICC). In relation to two of the 4th-century recensions its text is neutral, neither predominantly Lucianic nor Hexaplaric; but it has been regarded by some authorities as Hesychian. Possibly the recension made in the country which produced the Septuagint adhered more closely than others to the primitive text; some "Hesychian" features in the B text may prove to be original. Still even its purest portions contain marks of editorial revision and patent corruptions. Codex Alexandrinus presents a quite different type of text, approximating to that of the Massoretic Text. In the books of "Reigns" it is practically a Hexaplaric text without the critical signs, the additional matter being mainly derived from Aquila. Yet that it contains an ancient element is shown by the large support given to its readings by the New Testament and early Christian writers. Individual manuscripts must give place to

groups. In order to reconstruct the texts current before Origen’s time, it is necessary to isolate the groups containing the three 4th-century recensions, and to eliminate from the recensions thus recovered all Hexaplaric matter and such changes as appear to have been introduced by the authors of those recensions. Other groups brought to light by the larger Cambridge text have also to be taken into account. The attempt to Renetrate into the earlier stages of the history is the hardest task. The Old Latin version is here the surest guide; it has preserved readings which have disappeared from all Greek manuscripts, and affords a criterion as to the relative antiquity of the Greek variants. The evidence of early Christian and Jewish citations is also valuable. Ultimately, after elimination of all readings proved to be "recensional" or late, the decision between outstanding variants must depend on internal evidence. These variants will fall into two classes: (1) those merely affecting the Greek text, by far the larger number and presenting less difficulty; (2) those which imply a different Hebrew text. In adjudicating on the latter Lagarde’s main axioms have to be borne in mind, that a free translation is to be preferred to a slavishly literal one, and a translation presupposing another Hebrew original to one based on the Massoretic Text.

VII. Number, Titles and Order of Books.

1. Contents:

In addition to the Hebrew canonical books, the Septuagint includes all the books in the English Apocrypha except 2 Esdras (The Prayer of Manasseh only finds a place among the canticles appended in some manuscripts to the Psalms) besides a 3rd and 4th book of Maccabees. Swete further includes in his text as an appendix of Greek books on the borderland of canonicity the Ps of Sol (found in some cursives and mentioned in the list in codex A), the Greek fragments of the Book of Enoch and the ecclesiastical canticles above mentioned. Early Christian writers in quoting freely from these additional books as Scripture doubtless perpetuate a tradition inherited from the Jews of Alexandria. Most of the books being original Greek compositions were ipso facto excluded from a place in the Hebrew Canon. Greater latitude as regards canonicity prevailed at Alexandria; the Pentateuch occupied a place apart, but as regards later books no very sharp line of demarcation between "canonical" and "uncanonical" appears to have been drawn.

2. Titles:

Palestinian Jews employed the first word or words of each book of the Pentateuch to serve as its title; Genesis e.g. was denoted "in the beginning," Exodus "(and these are the) names"; a few of the later books have similar titles. It is to the Septuagint, through the medium of the Latin VSS, that we owe the familiar descriptive titles, mostly suggested by phrases in the Greek version. In some books there are traces of rival titles in the Ptolemaic age. Exodus ("outgoing") is also called Exagoge ("leading out") by Philo and by the Hellenist Ezekiel who gave that name to his drama on the deliverance from Egypt. Philo has also alternative names for Deuteronomy—Epinomis ("after-law") borrowed from the title of a pseudo-Platonic treatise, and for Judgess "the Book of Judgments." The last title resembles the Alexandrian name for the books of Samuel and Kings, namely, the four Books of Kingdoms or rather

Reigns; the name may have been given in the first place to a partial version including only the reigns of the first few monarchs. Jerome's influence in this case restored the old Hebrew names as also in Chronicles (= Hebrew "Words of Days," "Diaries"), which in the Septuagint is entitled Paraleipomena, "omissions," as being a supplement to the Books of Reigns.

3. Bipartition of Books:

Another innovation, due apparently to the Greek translators or later editors, was the breaking up of some of the long historical narratives into volumes of more manageable compass. In the Hebrew manuscripts, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah form respectively one book apiece. In the Septuagint the first three of these collections are subdivided into two volumes as in modern Bibles; an acquaintance with the other arrangement is, however, indicated in Codex B by the insertion at the end of 1 R, 3 R, 1 Chronicles of the first sentence of the succeeding book, a reminder to the reader that a continuation is to follow. Ezra-Nehemiah, the Greek version (2 Esdras) being made under the influence of Palestinian tradition, remains undivided. Originally Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah formed a unit, as was apparently still the case when the oldest Greek version (1 Esdras) was made.

4. Grouping and Order of Books:

In the arrangement of books there is a radical departure from Palestinian practice. There were three main unalterable divisions in the Hebrew Bible, representing three stages in the formation of the Canon: Law, Prohets "Former" i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and "Latter") and "Writings." This arrangement was known at Alexandria at the end of the 2nd century BC (Sir, prol.) but was not followed. The "Writings" were a miscellaneous collection of history and poetry with one prophetical book (Daniel). Alexandrian scholars introduced a more literary and symmetrical system, bringing together the books of each class and arranging them with some regard to the supposed chronological order of their authors. The Law, long before the Greek translation, had secured a position of supreme sanctity; this group was left undisturbed, it kept its precedence and the individual books their order (Leviticus and Numbers, however, exchange places in a few lists). The other two groups are broken up. Ru is removed from the "Writings" and attached to Judges. Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah are similarly transferred to the end of the historical group. This group, from chronological considerations, is followed by the poetical and other "Writings," the Prophets coming last (so in Codex Vaticanus, etc.; in Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus, prophets precede poets). The internal order of the Greek Hagiographa, which includes quasi-historical (Esther, Tobit, Judith) and Wisdom books, is variable. Daniel now first finds a place among the Prophets. The 12 minor prophets usually precede the major (Codex Sinaiticus and Western authorities give the four precedence), and the order of the first half of their company is shuffled, apparently on chronological grounds, Hosea being followed by Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Jeremiah has his train of satellites, Baruch, Lamentation (transferred from the "Writings") and Epistle of Jeremiah; Susanna and Bel and the Dragon consort with and form integral parts of Daniel. Variation in the order of books is partly attributable to the practice of writing each book on a separate papyrus roll, kept in a cylindrical case; rolls containing kindred matter would tend to be placed in the same case, but there would be no fixed order for these separate items until the copying of large groups in book-form came into vogue (Swete, Introduction, 225 f, 229 f).

VIII. Characteristics of the Version and Its Component Parts.

Notwithstanding the uncertain state of the text, some general characteristics of the version are patent. It is clear that, like the Hebrew itself, it is not a single book, but a library. It is a series of versions and Greek compositions covering well-nigh 400 years, since it includes a few productions of the 2nd century AD; the bulk of the translations, however, fall within the first half of the period (Sirach, prolegomena).

1. Grouping of Septuagint Books on Internal Evidence:

The translations may be grouped and their chronological order approximately determined from certain characteristics of their style.

(1) We may inquire how a Hebrew word or phrase is rendered in different parts of the work. Diversity of renderings is not an infallible proof that different hands have been employed, since invariable uniformity in translation is difficult of attainment and indeed was not the aim of the Pentateuch translators, who seem rather to have studied variety of expression. If, however, a Hebrew word is consistently rendered by one Greek word in one portion and by another elsewhere, and if each of the two portions has other features peculiar to itself, it becomes highly probable that the two portions are the work of different schools. Among "test-words" which yield results of this kind are "servant" in "Moses the servant of the Lord," "Hosts" in "Lord of Hosts," "Philistines" (Swete, Introduction, 317 f; Thackeray, Grammar of the Old Testament, 7 ff).

(2) We may compare the Greek with that of dated documents of the Ptolemaic age. The translations were written in the koine or "common" Greek, most of them in the vernacular variety of it, during a period when this new cosmopolitan language was in the making; the abundant dated papyri enable us to trace some stages in its evolution. The Petrie and Hibeh papyri of the 3rd century BC afford the closest parallels to the Greek Pentateuch. The following century witnessed a considerable development or "degeneracy" in the language, of which traces may be found in the Greek of the prophetical books. Beside the vernacular Greek was the literary language of the "Atticistic" school which persistently struggled, with indifferent success, to recover the literary flavor of the old Greek masterpieces. This style is represented in the Septuagint by most of the original Greek writings and by the paraphrases of some of the "Writings."

(3) We may compare the Greek books as translations, noting in which books Iicense is allowed and which adhere strictly to the Hebrew. The general movement is in the direction of greater literalism; the later books show an increasing reverence for the letter of Scripture, resulting in the production of pedantically literal VSS; the tendency culminated in the 2nd century AD in the barbarisms of Aquila. Some of the "Writings" were freely handled, because they had not yet obtained canonical rank at the time of translation. Investigation on these lines goes to show that the order of the translation was approximately that of the Hebrew Canon. The Greek Hexateuch may be placed in the 3rd century BC, the Prophets mainly in the 2nd century BC, the "Writings" mainly in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC.

(1) The Hexateuch.

The Greek Pentateuch should undoubtedly be regarded as a unit: the Aristeas story may so far be credited. It is distinguished by a uniformly high level of the "common" vernacular style, combined with faithfulness to the Hebrew, rarely lapsing into literalism. It set the standard which later translators tried to imitate. The text was more securely established in this portion and substantial variant readings are comparatively few. The latter part of Exodus is an exception; the Hebrew had here not reached its final form in the 3rd century BC, and there is some reason for thinking that the version is not the work of the translator of the first half. In Deuteronomy a few new features in vocabulary appear (e.g. ekklesia; see Hort, Christian Ecclesia, 4 ff). The Greek version of Josephus forms a link between the Pentateuch and the later historical books. The text was not yet fixed, and variants are more abundant than in the Pentateuch. The earliest VS, probably of selections only, appears from certain common features to have been nearly coeval with that of the Law.

(2) The "Latter" Prophets.

There is little doubt that the next books to be translated were the Prophets in the narrower sense, and that Isaiah came first. The style of the Greek Isaiah has a close similarity, not wholly attributable to imitation, to that of the Pentateuch: a certain freedom of treatment connects it with the earlier translation period: it was known to the author of Wisdom (Isa 3:10 with Ottley’s note). The translation shows "obvious signs of incompetence" (Swete), but the task was an exacting one. The local Egyptian coloring in the translation is interesting (R. R. Ottley, Book of Isaiah according to the Septuagint, 2 volumes, Greek text of A, translation and notes, Cambridge, 1904-6, with review in JTS, X, 299). Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets were probably translated en bloc or nearly so. The Palestinian Canon had now been enlarged by a second group of Scriptures and this stimulated a desire among Alexandrian Jews to possess the entire collection of the Prophets in Greek. The undertaking seems to have been a formal and quasi-official one, not a haphazard growth. For it has been ascertained that Jeremiah and Ezekiel were divided for translation purposes into two nearly equal parts; a change in the Greek style occurs at the junctures. In Jeremiah the break occurs in chapter 29 Septuagint order); the clearest criterion of the two styles is the twofold rendering of "Thus saith the Lord." The last chapter (Jer 52) is probably a later addition in the Greek. The translator of the second half of Jer also translated the first half of Baruch (1:1-3:8); he was incompetent and his work, if our text may be relied on, affords flagrant examples of Greek words being selected to render words which he did not understand merely because of their similar sound. Ezekiel is similarly divided, but here the translator of the first half (chapters 1-27) undertook the difficult last quarter as well (chapters 40-48), the remainder being left to a second worker. An outstanding test is afforded by the renderings of the refrain, "They shall know that I am the Lord." The Greek version of "the twelve" shows no trace of a similar division; in its style it is closely akin to the first half of Ezekiel and is perhaps by the same hand (JTS, IV, 245, 398, 578). But this official version of the Prophets had probably been preceded by versions of short passages selected to be read on the festivals in the synagogues. Lectionary requirements occasioned the earliest versions of the Prophets, possibly of the Pentateuch as well. Two indications of this have been traced. There exists in four manuscripts a Greek version of the Psalm of Habakkuk (Hab 3), a chapter which has been a Jewish

lesson for Pentecost from the earliest times, independent of and apparently older than the Septuagint and made for synagogue use. Similarly in Ezekiel of the Septuagint there is a section of sixteen verses (36:24-38) with a style quite distinct from that of its context. This passage was also an early Christian lesson for Pentecost, and its lectionary use was inherited from Judaism. Here the Septuagint translators seem to have incorporated the older version, whereas in Hab 3 they rejected it (JTS, XII, 191; IV, 407).

(3) Partial Version of the "Former" Prophets.

The Greek style indicates that the history of the monarchy was not all translated at once. Ulfilas is said to have omitted these books from the Gothic version as likely to inflame the military temper of his race; for another reason the Greek translators were at first content with a partial version. They omitted as unedifying the more disastrous portions, David's sin with the subsequent calamities of his reign and the later history of the divided monarchy culminating in the captivity. Probably the earliest versions embraced only (1) 1 R, (2) 2 R 1 1-11 1 (David's early reign), (3) 3 R 2 12-21 13 (Solomon and the beginning of the divided monarchy); the third book of "Reigns" opened with the accession of Solomon (as in Lucian's text), not at the point where 1 Kings opens. These earlier portions are written in a freer style than the rest of the Greek "Reigns," and the Hebrew original differed widely in places from that translated in the English Bible (JTS, VIII, 262).

(4) The "Writings."

The Hagiographa at the end of the 2nd century BC were regarded as national literature. (Sirach, prolegomena "the other books of our fathers"), but not as canonical. The translators did not scruple to treat these with great freedom, undeterred by the prohibition against alteration of Scripture (De 4:2; 12:32). Free paraphrases of extracts were produced, sometimes with legendary additions. A partial version of Job (one-sixth being omitted) was among the first; Aristeas, the historian of the 2nd century BC, seems to have been acquainted with it (Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien, 1875, 136 ff). The translator was a student of the Greek poets; his version was probably produced for the general reader, not for the synagogues. Hatch's theory (Essays in Biblical Greek, 1889, 214) that his Hebrew text was shorter than ours and was expanded later is untenable; avoidance of anthropomorphisms explains some omissions, the reason for others is obscure. The first Greek narrative of the return from exile (1 Esdras) was probably a similar version of extracts only from Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah, grouped round a fable of non-Jewish origin, the story of the 3 youths at the court of Darius. The work is a fragment, the end being lost, and it has been contended by some critics that the version once embraced the whole of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah (C. C. Torrey, Ezra Studies, Chicago, 1910). The Greek is obviously earlier than Esdras B and is of great value for the reconstruction of the Hebrew. The same translator appears from peculiarities of diction to have produced the earliest version of Dnl, treating it with similar freedom and incorporating extraneous matter (the So of Three Children, Susanna, Bel). The maximum of interpolation is reached in Esther, where the Greek additions make up two-thirds of the story. The Greek Proverbs (probably 1st century BC) includes many maxims not in the Hebrew; some of these appear to be derived from a lost Hebrew collection, others are of purely Greek origin. This translator also knew and imitated the Greek classics; the numerous fragments of iambic and hexameter verse in the translation cannot be accidental (JTS, XIII, 46). The Psalter is the one translation in this category in

which liberties have not been taken; in Ps 13 (14):3 the extracts from other parts of Psalms and from Isaiah included in the B text must be an interpolation possibly made before Paul's time (Ro 3:13), or else taken from Romans. The little Ps 151 in Septuagint, described in the title as an "autograph" work of David and as "outside the number," is clearly a late Greek production, perhaps an appendix added after the version was complete.

(5) The Latest Septuagint Translations.

The latest versions included in the Septuagint are the productions of the Jewish translators of the 2nd century AD; some books may be rather earlier, the work of pioneers in the new school which advocated strict adherence to the Hebrew. The books of "Reigns" were now completed, by Theodotion, perhaps, or by one of his school; the later portions (2 R 11 2-3 R 2 11, David's downfall, and 3 R 22-4 R end, the downfall of the monarchy) are by one hand, as shown by peculiarities in style, e.g. "I am have with child" (2 R 11 5) =" I am with child," a use which is due to desire to distinguish the longer form of the pronoun 'anokhi ("I," also used for "I am") from the shorter 'ani. A complete version of Jud was now probably first made. In two cases the old paraphrastic versions were replaced. Theodotion's Daniel, as above stated, superseded in the Christian church the older version A new and complete version of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah was made (Esdras B), though the older version retained its place in the Greek Bible on account of the interesting legend imbedded in it; the new version is here again possibly the work of Theodotion; the numerous transliterations are characteristic of him (Torrey, Ezra Studies; theory had previously been advanced by Sir H. Howorth). In the Greek Ecclesiastes we have a specimen of Aquila's style (see McNeile's edition, Cambridge, 1904). Canticles is another late version

2. General Characteristics:

A marked feature of the whole translation is the scrupulous avoidance of anthropomorphisms and phrases derogatory to the divine transcendence. Thus Ex 4:16, "Thou shalt be to him in things pertaining to God" (Hebrew "for" or "as God"); 15:3, "The Lord is a breaker of battles" (Hebrew "a Man of war"); 24:10, "They saw the place where the God of Israel stood" (Hebrew "they saw the God of Israel"); 24:11, "Of the elect of Israel not one perished and they were seen in the place of God" (Hebrew "Upon the nobles .... He laid not His hand, and they beheld God"). The comparison of God to a rock was consistently paraphrased as idolatrous, as was sometimes the comparison to the sun from fear of sun-worship (Ps 83 (84):12, "The Lord loves mercy and truth" for Hebrew "The Lord is a sun and shield"). "The sons of God" (Ge 6:2) becomes "the angels of God." For minor liberties, e.g. slight amplifications, interpretation of difficult words, substitution of Greek for Hebrew coinage, translation of place-names, see Swete, Introduction, 323 ff. Blunders in translation are not uncommon, but the difficulties which these pioneers had to face must be remembered, especially the paleographical character of the Hebrew originals. These were written on flimsy papyrus rolls, in a script probably in a transitional stage between the archaic and the later square characters; the words were not separated, and there were no vowel-points; two of the radicals (waw and yodh) were also frequently omitted. Add to this the absence at Alexandria, for parts at least of the Scriptures, of any sound tradition as to the meaning. On the other hand the vocalization adopted by the translators, e.g. in the proper names, is of great value in the history of early Semitic pronunciation. It must further be remembered that the Semitic language most familiar to

them was not Hebrew but Aramaic, and some mistakes are due to Aramaic or even Arabic colloquialisms (Swete, Introduction, 319).

IX. Salient Differences between Greek and Hebrew Texts.

Differences indicating a Hebrew original other than the Massoretic Text affect either the sequence or the subject-matter (compare Swete, Introduction, 231 ff).

1. Sequence:

The most extensive discrepancies in arrangement of materials occur in

(1) Ex 35-39, the construction of the Tabernacle and the ornaments of its ministers,

(2) 3 R 4-11, Solomon's reign,

(3) Jeremiah (last half),

(4) Proverbs (end).

(1) In Exodus the Septuagint gives precedence to the priests' ornaments, which in the Hebrew follow the account of the Tabernacle, and omits altogether the altar of incense. The whole section describing the execution of the instructions given in the previous chapters in almost identical words is one of the latest portions of the Pentateuch and the text had clearly not been finally fixed in the 3rd century BC; the section was perhaps absent from the oldest Greek version In Ex 20:13-15 Codex B arranges three of the commandments in the Alexandrian order (7, 8, 6), attested in Philo and in the New Testament.

(2) Deliberate rearrangement has taken place in the history of Solomon, and the Septuagint unquestionably preserves the older text. The narrative of the building of the Temple, like that of the Tabernacle, contains some of the clearest examples of editorial revision in the Massoretic Text (Wellhausen, Hist of Israel, 67, 280, etc.). At the end of 3 R Septuagint places chapters 20 and 21 in their proper order; Massoretic Text reverses this, interposing the Naboth story in the connected account of the Syriac wars and justifying the change by a short preface.

(3) In Jeremiah the chapter numbers differ from the middle of chapter 25 to the end of chapter 51, the historical appendix (chapter 52) concluding both texts. This is due to the different position assigned to a group of prophecies against the nations: Septuagint places them in the center, Massoretic Text at the end. The items in this group are also rearranged. The diversity in order is earlier than the Greek translation; see JTS, IV; 245.

(4) The order of some groups of maxims at the end of Proverbs was not finally fixed at the time of the

Greek translation; like Jeremiah’s prophecies against the nations, these little groups seem to have circulated as late as the 2nd or 1st century BC as separate pamphlets. The Psalms numbers from 10 to 147 differ by one in Septuagint and Massoretic Text, owing to discrepancies in the lines of demarcation between individual psalms.

2. Subject Matter:

Excluding the end of Exodus, striking examples of divergence in the Pentateuch are few. Septuagint alone preserves Cain’s words to his brother, "Let us go into the field" (Ge 4:8). The close of Moses’ song appears in an expanded form in Septuagint (De 32:43). Similarly Hannah’s song in 1 R 2 (? originally a warrior’s triumph-song) has been rendered more appropriate to the occasion by the substitution in verse 8c of words about the answer to prayer, and enlarged by the insertion of a passage from Jeremiah; the changes in both songs may be connected with their early use as canticles. In Joshua the larger amount of divergence suggests that this book did not share the peculiar sanctity of the Law. But the books of "Reigns" present the widest differences and the fullest scope for the textual critic. The Septuagint here proves the existence of two independent accounts of certain events. Sometimes it incorporates both, while the Massoretic Text rejects one of them; thus Septuagint gives (3 R 2 35a ff, 46a ff) a connected summary of events in Solomon’s personal history; most of which appear elsewhere in a detached form, 3 R 12 24a-z is a second account of the dismemberment of the kingdom; 16:28a-h a second summary of Jehoshaphat’s reign (compare 22 41 ff); 4 R 1 18a another summary of Joram’s reign (compare 3 1 ff). Conversely in 1 R 17-18, Massoretic Text has apparently preserved two contradictory accounts of events in David’s early history, while Septuagint presents a shorter and consistent narrative (Swete, Intro, 245 f). An "addition" in Septuagint of the highest interest appears in 3 R 8 53b, where a stanza is put into the mouth of Solomon at the Temple dedication, taken from "the Song-book" (probably the Book of Jashar); the Massoretic Text gives the stanza in an edited form earlier in the chapter (8 12 f); for the reconstruction of the original Hebrew see JTS, X, 439; XI, 518. The last line proves to be a title, "For the Sabbath—On Alamoth" (i.e. for sopranos), showing that the song was set to music for liturgical purposes. In Jeremiah, besides transpositions, the two texts differ widely in the way of excess and defect; the verdict of critics is mainly in favor of the priority of the Septuagint (Streane, Double Text of Jeremiah, 1896). For divergences in the "Writings" see VIII, above; for additional titles to the Psalms see Swete, Introduction, 250 f.

LITERATURE.

The most important works have been mentioned in the body of the article. See, further, the very full lists in Swete’s Introduction and the bibliographies by Nestle in PRE3, III, 1-24, and XXIII, 207-10 (1913); HDB, IV, 453-54.

H. St. J. Thackeray

SEPULCHRE

sep’-ul-ker (2Ch 21:20; 32:33; Joh 19:41 f; Ac 2:29, etc.).

See BURIAL; JERUSALEM, VIII.

SERAH

se’-ra (serach, "abundance"): Daughter of Asher (Ge 46:17; Nu 26:46, the King James Version "Sarah"; 1Ch 7:30).

SERAIAH

se-ra’-ya, se-ri’-a (serayahu, "Yah hath prevailed"; Septuagint Saraias, or Saraia):

(1) Secretary of David (2Sa 8:17); in 2Sa 20:25 he is called Sheva; in 1Ki 4:3 the name appears as Shisha. This last or Shasha would be restored elsewhere by some critics; others prefer the form Shavsha, which is found in 1Ch 18:16.

(2) A high priest in the reign of Zedekiah; executed with other prominent captives at Riblah by order of Nebuchadnezzar (2Ki 25:18,21; Jer 52:24,27). Mentioned in the list of high priests (1Ch 6:14). Ezra claims descent from him (Ezr 7:1 (3)).

See AZARAIAS; SARAIAS.

(3) The son of Tanhumeth the Netophathite, and one of the heroic band of men who saved themselves from the fury of Nebuchadnezzar when he stormed Jerusalem. They repaired to Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, but killed him on account of his allegiance to the Chaldeans (2Ki 25:23,25).

(4) Son of Kenaz, and younger brother of Othniel, and father of Joab, the chief of Ge-harashim (1Ch 4:13,14).

(5) Grandfather of Jehu, of the tribe of Simeon (1Ch 4:35).

(6) A priest, the third in the list of those who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2; Ne 7:7, here called Azariah; 12:1), and third also (if the same person is meant) in the record of those who sealed the covenant binding all Jews not to take foreign wives (Ne 10:2). As the son of Hilkiah, and consequently a direct descendant of the priestly family, he became governor of the temple when it was rebuilt (Ne 11:11). He is mentioned (under the name Azariah) also in 1Ch 9:11. Ne 12:2 adds that "in the days of Joiakim" the head of Seraiah’s house was Meraiah.

(7) Son of Azriel, one of those whom Jehoiakim commanded to imprison Jeremiah and Baruch, the son of Neriah (Jer 36:26).

(8) The son of Neriah, who went into exile with Zedekiah. He was also called Sar Menuchah ("prince of repose"). The Targum renders Sar Menuchah by Rabh Tiqrabhta, "prince of battle, and Septuagint by archon doron, "prince of gifts," reading Minchah for Menuchah. At the request of Jeremiah he carried with him in his exile the passages containing the prophet's warning of the fall of Babylon, written in a book which he was bidden to bind to a stone and cast into the Euphrates, to symbolize the fall of Babylon (Jer 51:59-64).

Horace J. Wolf

SERAPHIM

ser'-a-fim (seraphim): A plural word occurring only in Isa 6:2 ff—Isaiah's vision of Yahweh. The origin of the term in Hebrew is uncertain. Saraph in Nu 21:6; Isa 14:29, etc., signifies a fiery serpent. A Babylonian name for the fire-god, Nergal, was Sharrapu. In Egypt there have been found eagle-lion-shaped figures guarding a grave, to which is applied the name seref. The equivalent English term is "griffin."

It is probable enough that popular mythology connected fire with the attendants of the deity in various ways among different peoples, and that burning lies at the base of the idea in all these suggested etymologies. It remains, however, that in Isaiah's use there is nothing of the popular legend or superstition. These seraphim are august beings whose forms are not at all fully described. They had faces, feet, hands and wings. The six wings, in three pairs, covered their faces and feet in humility and reverence, and were used for sustaining them in their positions about the throne of Yahweh. One of them is the agent for burning (with a coal off the altar, not with his own power or person) the sin from the lips of the prophet.

Seraphim are in Jewish theology connected with cherubim and ophanim as the three highest orders of attendants on Yahweh, and are superior to the angels who are messengers sent on various errands. As the cherubim in popular fancy were represented by the storm-clouds, so the seraphim were by the serpentine flashes of the lightning; but none of this appears in Isaiah's vision.

In the New Testament the only possible equivalent is in "the living ones" ("beasts" of the King James Version) in Re 4; 5, etc. Here, as in Isaiah, they appear nearest Yahweh's throne, supreme in praise of His holiness.

William Owen Carver

SERAR

se'-rar (Serar; the King James Version Aserer): Name of one of the families which returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:32) =" Sisera" of Ezr 2:53; Ne 7:55.

SERED

se’-red (ceredh): Son of Zebulun (Ge 46:14; Nu 26:26).

SERGIUS PAULUS

sur’-ji-us po’-lus.

See PAULUS, SERGIUS.

SERJEANTS

sar’-jents, -jants (rhabdouchoi): In Ac 16:35,38 the word (literally, "holders of rods," corresponding to Roman "lictors," thus the Revised Version margin) is used of the officers in attendance on the Philippian magistrates, whose duty it was to execute orders in scourging, etc., in this case in setting prisoners free. Paul and Silas, however, as Romans, refused thus to be "privily" dismissed.

SERMON ON THE MOUNT

sur’-num,

I. PARALLEL ACCOUNTS

II. HISTORICITY OF THE DISCOURSE

III. TIME AND OCCASION

IV. SCENE

V. THE HEARERS

VI. THE MESSAGE: SUMMARY

1. Analysis

2. Argument: The Kingdom of God (Heaven)

(1) Characteristics of the Subjects (Matthew 5:3-12)

(2) Vocation of the Subjects (Matthew 5:13-16)

(3) Relation of New Righteousness to Mosaic Law (Matthew 5:17-48)

(a) The Relation Defined (Matthew 5:17-20)

(b) The Relation Illustrated (Matthew 5:21-48)

(4) Motives and Principles of Conduct (Matthew 6:1-7:12)

(a) In Worship (Matthew 6:1-18)

(b) In Life's Purpose (Matthew 6:19-34)

(c) In Social Relations (Matthew 7:1-12)

(5) Hortatory Conclusion (Matthew 7:13-27)

(a) The Narrow Way (Matthew 7:13-14) (b) The Tests of Character (Matthew 7:15-27)

VII. PRINCIPLES

LITERATURE

The Sermon on the Mount is the title commonly given to the collection of sayings recorded in Mt 5-7 and in Lu 6:20-49. The latter is sometimes called the Sermon on the Plain from the fact that it is said to have been delivered on a level space somewhere on the descent of the mountain. The Sermon appears to be an epitome of the teachings of Jesus concerning the kingdom of heaven, its subjects and their life. For this reason it has always held the first place of attention and esteem among the sayings of Jesus.

See SERMON ON THE PLAIN.

I. Parallel Accounts.

As indicated above, the Sermon is reported by both Matthew and Luke. A comparison of the two accounts reveals certain striking differences. A total of 47 verses of the account in Matthew have no parallel in Luke, while but 4 1/2 verses of the latter are wanting in the former. On the other hand, many of the sayings in Matthew that are lacking in the Sermon of Luke, amounting in all to 34 verses, appear elsewhere distributed throughout the Lukan narrative and in some instances connected with different incidents and circumstances.

These facts give rise to some interesting literary and historical questions: Do the two accounts represent two distinct discourses dealing with the same general theme but spoken on different occasions, or are they simply different reports of the same discourse? If it be held that the Sermon was delivered but once, which of the accounts represents more closely the original address? Is the discourse in Matthew homogeneous or does it include sayings originally spoken on other occasions and early incorporated in the Sermon in the gospel tradition?

II. Historicity of the Discourse.

There have been and are today scholars who regard the sermons recorded in Matthew and Luke as collections of sayings spoken on different occasions, and maintain that they do not represent any connected discourse ever delivered by Jesus. In their view the Sermon is either a free compilation by the evangelists or a product of apostolic teaching and oral tradition.

The prevailing opinion among New Testament scholars is, however, that the gospel accounts represent a genuine historical discourse. The Sermon as recorded in Matthew bears such marks of inner unity of theme and exposition as to give the appearance of genuineness. That Jesus should deliver a discourse of this kind accords with all the circumstances and with the purpose of His ministry. Besides, we know that in His teaching He was accustomed to speak to the multitudes at length, and we should expect Him to give early in His ministry some formal exposition of the kingdom, the burden of His first preaching. That such a summary of one of His most important discourses should have been preserved is altogether probable.

On the other hand, it may be conceded that the accounts need not necessarily be regarded as full or exact reports of the discourse but possibly and probably rather summaries of its theme and substance. our Lord was accustomed to teach at length, but this discourse could easily be delivered in a few minutes. Again, while His popular teaching was marked by a unique wealth of illustration the Sermon is largely gnomic in form. This gnomic style and the paucity of the usual concrete and illustrative elements suggest the probability of condensation in transmission. Moreover, it is hardly probable that such an address of Jesus would be recorded at the time of its delivery or would be remembered in detail.

There is evidence that the account in Mt 5-7 contains some sayings not included in the original discourse. This view is confirmed by the fact that a number of the sayings are given in Luke’s Gospel in settings that appear more original. It is easy to believe that related sayings spoken on other occasions may have become associated with the Sermon in apostolic teaching and thus handed down with it, but if the discourse were well known in a specific form, such as that recorded in Matthew, it is hardly conceivable that Luke or anyone else would break it up and distribute the fragments or associate them with other incidents, as some of the sayings recorded in both Gospels are found associated in Luke.

III. Time and Occasion.

Both Matthew and Luke agree in assigning the delivery of the Sermon to the first half of the Galilean

ministry. The former apparently places it a little earlier than the latter, in whose account it follows immediately after the appointment of the twelve apostles. While the time cannot be accurately determined, the position assigned by the Gospels is approximately correct and is supported by the internal evidence. Portions of the Sermon imply that the opposition of the religious teachers was already in evidence, but it clearly belongs to the first year of our Lord's ministry before that opposition had become serious. On the other hand, the occasion was sufficiently late for the popularity of the new Teacher to have reached its climax. In the early Galilean ministry Jesus confined His teaching to the synagogues, but later, when the great crowds pressed about Him, He resorted to open-air preaching after the manner of the Sermon. Along with the growth in His popularity there is observed a change in the character of His teaching. His earlier message may be summed up in the formula, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Mt 4:17). Later, both in His public discourses and in His more intimate conferences with His disciples, He was occupied with the principles of the kingdom. The Sermon on the Mount belongs to this later type of teaching and fits naturally into the circumstances to which it has been assigned. Luke probably gives the true historical occasion, i.e. the appointment of the Twelve.

IV. Scene.

According to the evangelists, the scene of the delivery of the Sermon was one of the mountains or foothills surrounding the Galilean plain. Probably one of the hills lying Northwest of Capernaum is meant, for shortly after the Sermon we find Jesus and His disciples entering that city. There are no data justifying a closer identification of the place. There is a tradition dating from the time of the Crusades that identifies the mount of the Sermon with Karn Chattin], a two-peaked hill on the road from Tiberias to Nazareth, but there are no means of confirming this late tradition and the identification is rather improbable.

V. The Hearers.

The Sermon was evidently addressed, primarily, to the disciples of Jesus. This is the apparent meaning of the account of both evangelists. According to Matthew, Jesus, "seeing the multitudes, ... went up into the mountain: and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him: and he opened his mouth and taught them." The separation from the multitudes and the direction of His words to the disciples seem clear, and the distinction appears intentional on the part of the writer. However, it must be observed that in the closing comments on the Sermon the presence of the multitudes is implied. In Luke's account the distinction is less marked. Here the order of events is: the night of prayer in the mountain, the choice of the twelve apostles, the descent with them into the presence of the multitude of His disciples and a great number of people from Judea, Jerusalem and the coast country, the healing of great numbers, and, finally, the address. While the continued presence of the multitudes is implied, the plain meaning of the words, "And he lifted up his eyes on his disciples, and said," is that his address was intended especially for the latter. This view is borne out by the address itself as recorded in both accounts. Observe the use of the second person in the reference to suffering, poverty and persecution for the sake of the Son of Man. Further the sayings concerning the "salt of the earth" and "the light of the world" could hardly have been addressed to any but His disciples. The term disciple, however, was doubtless employed in the broader sense by both evangelists. This is clearly the case in Matthew's account, according to which

the Twelve had not yet been appointed.

VI. The Message: Summary.

It is hardly proper to speak of the Sermon on the Mount as a digest of the teaching of Jesus, for it does not include any reference to some very important subjects discussed by our Lord on other occasions in the course of His ministry. It is, however, the most comprehensive and important collection or summary of His sayings that is preserved to us in the gospel record. For this reason the Sermon properly holds in Christian thought the first place of esteem among all the New Testament messages. As an exposition of the ideal life and the program of the new society which Jesus proposed to create, its interpretation is of the deepest interest and the profoundest concern.

1. Analysis:

It may assist the student of the Sermon in arriving at a clear appreciation of the argument and the salient features of the discourse if the whole is first viewed in outline. There is some difference of opinion among scholars as to certain features of the analysis, and consequently various outlines have been presented by different writers. Those of C. W. Votaw in HDB, Canon Gore in The Sermon on the Mount, and H. C. King in The Ethics of Jesus are worthy of special mention. The following analysis of the Sermon as recorded by Matthew is given as the basis of the present discussion.

It is not implied that there was any such formal plan before the mind of Jesus as He spoke, but it is believed that the outline presents a faithful syllabus of the argument of the Sermon as preserved to us.

THEME: THE KINGDOM OF GOD (HEAVEN), ITS SUBJECTS AND ITS RIGHTEOUSNESS (MATTHEW 5:3-7:27)

I. The subjects of the kingdom (Mt 5:3-16).

1. The qualities of character essential to happiness and influence (Mt 5:3-12).

2. The vocation of the subjects (Mt 5:13-16).

II. The relation of the new righteousness to the Mosaic Law (Mt 5:17-48).

1. The relation defined as that of continuance in a higher fulfillment (Mt 5:17-20).

2. The higher fulfillment of the new righteousness illustrated by a comparison of its principles with the Mosaic Law as currently taught and practiced (Mat 5:21-48)

(1) The higher law of brotherhood judges ill-will as murder (Mt 5:21-26).

(2) The higher law of purity condemns lust as adultery (Mt 5:27-32).

(3) The higher law of truth forbids oaths as unnecessary and evil (Mt 5:33-37).

(4) The higher law of rights substitutes self-restraint and generosity for retaliation and resistance (Mt 5:38-42).

(5) The higher law of love demands universal good will of a supernatural quality like that of the Father (Mt 5:43-48).

III. The new righteousness. Its motives as applied to religious, practical and social duties, or the principles of conduct (Mt 6:1-7:12).

1. Reverence toward the Father essential in all acts of worship (Mt 6:1-18).

(1) In all duties (Mt 6:1).

(2) In almsgiving (Mt 6:2-4).

(3) In prayer (Mt 6:5-15).

(4) In fasting (Mt 6:16-18).

2. Loyalty toward the Father fundamental in all activities (Mt 6:19-34).

(1) In treasure-seeking (Mt 6:19-24).

(2) In trustful devotion to the kingdom and the Father’s righteousness (Mt 6:25-34).

3. Love toward the Father dynamic in all social relations (Mt 7:1-12).

(1) Critical estimate of self instead of censorious judgment of others (Mt 7:1-5).

(2) Discrimination in the communication of spiritual values (Mt 7:6).

(3) Kindness toward others in all things like the Father’s kindness toward all His children (Mt 7:7-12).

IV. Hortatory conclusion (Mt 7:13-27).

1. The two gates and the two ways (Mt 7:13-14).

2. The tests of character (Mt 7:15-27).

2. Argument: The Kingdom of God (Heaven):

(1) Characteristics of the Subjects (Matthew 5:3-12).

The Sermon opens with the familiar Beatitudes. Unlike many reformers, Jesus begins the exposition of His program with a promise of happiness, with a blessing rather than a curse. He thus connects His program directly with the hopes of His hearers, for the central features in the current Messianic conception were deliverance and happiness. But the conditions of happiness proposed were in strong contrast with those in the popular thought. Happiness does not consist, says Jesus, in what one possesses, in lands and houses, in social position, in intellectual attainments, but in the wealth of the inner life, in moral strength, in self-control, in spiritual insight, in the character one is able to form within himself and in the service he is able to render to his fellowmen. Happiness, then, like character, is a by-product of right living. It is presented as the fruit, not as the object of endeavor.

It is interesting to note that character is the secret of happiness both for the individual and for society. There are two groups of Beatitudes. The first four deal with personal qualities: humility, penitence, self-control, desire for righteousness. These are the sources of inner peace. The second group deals with social qualities; mercifulness toward others, purity of heart or reverence for personality, peacemaking or solicitude for others, self-sacrificing loyalty to righteousness. These are the sources of social rest. The blessings of the kingdom are social as well as individual.

(2) Vocation of the Subjects (Matthew 5:13-16).

Men of the qualities described in the Beatitudes are called "the salt of the earth," "the light of the world." Their happiness is not, then, in themselves or for themselves alone. Their mission is the hope of the kingdom. Salt is a preservative element; light is a life-giving one; but the world is not eager to be preserved or willing to receive life. Therefore such men must expect opposition and persecution, but they are not on that account to withdraw from the world. On the contrary, by the leaven of character and the light of example they are to help others in the appreciation and the attainment of the ideal life. By their character and deeds they are to make their influence a force for good in the lives of men. In this sense the men of the kingdom are the salt of the earth, the light of the world.

See BEATITUDES.

(3) Relation of the New Righteousness to Mosaic Law (Matthew 5:17-48).

(a) The Relation Defined (Matthew 5:17-20):

The qualities of character thus set before the citizens of the kingdom were so surprising and

revolutionary as to suggest the inquiry: What is the relation of the new teaching to the Mosaic Law? This Jesus defines as continuance and fulfillment. His hearers are not to think that He has come to destroy the law. On the contrary, He has come to conserve and fulfil. The old law is imperfect, but God does not despair of what is imperfect. Men and institutions are judged, not by the level of present attainment, but by character and direction. The law moves in the right direction and is so valuable that those who violate even its least precepts have a very low place in the kingdom.

The new righteousness then does not set aside the law or offer an easier religion, but one that is more exacting. The kingdom is concerned, not so much with ceremonies and external rules, as with motives and with social virtues, with self-control, purity, honesty and generosity. So much higher are the new standards of righteousness that Jesus is constrained to warn His hearers that to secure even a place in the kingdom, their righteousness must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees.

(b) The Relation Illustrated (Matthew 5:21-48):

In illustration of the deeper meaning of the new righteousness and its relation to the Mosaic Law, Jesus proceeds to deal in detail with the precepts of the old moral law, deepening it as He proceeds into the higher law of the kingdom. In each instance the standard of judgment is raised and the individual precepts are deepened into spiritual principles that call for perfect fulfillment. In considering specific precepts no account is taken of overt acts, for in the new righteousness they are impossible. All acts are treated as expressions of the inner life. The law is carried back to the impulse and the will to sin, and these are judged as in the old law the completed acts were judged. Therefore, all anger and lust in the heart are strictly enjoined. Likewise every word is raised to a sacredness equal with that of the most solemn religious vow or oath. Finally, the instinct to avenge is entirely forbidden, and universal love like that of the Father is made the fundamental law of the new social life. Thus Jesus does not abrogate any law but interprets its precepts in terms that call for a deeper and more perfect fulfillment.

(4) Motives and Principles of Conduct (Matthew 6:1-7:12).

The relation of His teaching to the law defined, Jesus proceeds to explain the motives and principles of conduct as applied to religious and social duties.

(a) In Worship (Matthew 6:1-18):

In the section Mt 6:1-7:12 there is one central thought. All righteousness looks toward God. He is at once the source and the aim of life. Therefore worship aims alone at divine praise. If acts of worship are performed before men to be seen of them there is no reward for them before the Father. In this Jesus is passing no slight on public worship. He Himself instituted the Lord’s Supper and authorized the continuance of the rite of baptism. Such acts have their proper value. His censure is aimed at the love of ostentation so often associated with them. The root of ostentation is selfishness, and selfishness has no part in the new righteousness. Any selfish desire for the approval of men thwarts the purpose of all worship. The object of almsgiving, of prayer or of fasting is the expression of brotherly love,

communion with God or spiritual enrichment. The possibility of any of these is excluded by the presence of the desire for the approval of men. It is not merely a divine fiat but one of the deeper laws of life which decrees that the only possible reward for acts of worship performed from such false motives is the cheap approval of men as well as the impoverishment of the inner life.

(b) In Life's Purpose (Matthew 6:19-34):

The same principle holds, says Jesus, in the matter of life's purpose. There is only one treasure worthy of man's search only one object worthy of his highest endeavor, and that is the kingdom of God and His righteousness. Besides, there can be no division of aim. God will be first and only. Material blessings must not be set before duty to Him or to men. With any lower aim the new righteousness would be no better than that of the Gentiles. And such a demand is reasonable, for God's gracious providence is ample guaranty that He will supply all things needful for the accomplishment of the purposes He has planned for our lives. So in our vocations as in our worship, God is the supreme and effectual motive.

(c) In Social Relations (Matthew 7:1-12):

Then again because God is our Father and the supreme object of desire for all men, great reverence is due toward others. Considerate helpfulness must replace the censorious spirit. For the same reason men will have too great reverence for spiritual values to cast them carelessly before the unworthy. Moreover, because God is so gracious and ready to bestow the best gifts freely upon His children, the men of the kingdom are under profound obligation to observe the higher law of brotherhood expressed in the Golden Rule: "All things .... whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them." Thus in the perfect law of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men the new righteousness makes perfect the Law and the Prophets.

(5) Hortatory Conclusion (Matthew 7:13-27).

(a) The Narrow Way (Matthew 7:13-14):

In the hortatory conclusion (Mt 7:13-27), Jesus first of all warns His hearers that the way into the kingdom is a narrow one. It might seem that it ought to be different; that the way to destruction should be narrow and difficult, and the way to life broad and easy, but it is not so. The way to all worthy achievement is the narrow way of self-control, self-sacrifice and infinite pains. Such is the way to the righteousness of the kingdom, the supreme object of human endeavor. "Narrow is the gate, and straitened the way, that leadeth unto life."

(b) The Tests of Character (Matthew 7:15-27):

The test of the higher fulfillment is fruit. By their fruits alone the subjects of the kingdom will be known. In the presence of the Father there is no room for those who bring nothing but the leaves of empty professions. The kingdom is for those alone who do His will. The test of righteousness is illustrated in

conclusion by the beautiful parable of the Two Builders. The difference between the two is essentially one of character. It is largely a question of fundamental honesty. The one is superficial and thinks only of that which is visible to the eye and builds only for himself and for the present. The other is honest enough to build well where only God can see, to build for others and for all time. Thus he builds also for himself. The character of the builder is revealed by the building.

VII. Principles.

The Sermon on the Mount is neither an impractical ideal nor a set of fixed legal regulations. It is, instead, a statement of the principles of life essential in a normal society. Such a society is possible in so far as men attain the character and live the life expressed in these principles. Their correct interpretation is therefore important.

Many of the sayings of the Sermon are metaphorical or proverbial statements, and are not to be understood in a literal or legal sense. In them Jesus was illustrating principles in concrete terms. Their interpretation literally as legal enactments is contrary to the intention and spirit of Jesus. So interpreted, the Sermon becomes in part a visionary and impractical ideal. But rather the principles behind the concrete instances are to be sought and applied anew to the life of the present as Jesus applied them to the life of His own time.

The following are some of the leading ideas and principles underlying and expressed in the Sermon:

(1) Character Is the Secret of Happiness and Strength.

Men of the qualities described in the Beatitudes are called "blessed." Happiness consists, not in external blessings, but in the inner poise of a normal life. The virtues of the Beatitudes are also the elements of strength. Humility, self-control, purity and loyalty are the genuine qualities of real strength. Men of such qualities are to inherit the earth because they are the only ones strong enough to possess and use it.

(2) Righteousness Is Grounded in the Inner Life.

Character is not something imposed from without but a life that unfolds from within. The hope of a perfect morality and a genuine fulfillment of the law lies in the creation of a sound inner life. Therefore, the worth of all religious acts and all personal and social conduct is judged by the quality of the inner motives.

(3) The Inner Life Is a Unity.

The spiritual nature is all of a piece, so that a moral slump at one point imperils the whole life. Consequently, a rigid and exacting spiritual asceticism, even to the extent of extreme major surgery, is sometimes expedient and necessary. "If thy right eye causeth thee to stumble, pluck it out, and cast it from thee: for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body be

cast into Gehenna" (Mt 5:29 margin).

(4) Universal Love Is the Fundamental Social Law.

It is the dynamic principle of true character and right conduct. In this respect, at least, the perfection of the Father is set as the standard for men. Kindliness in disposition, in word and in act is an obligation binding on all. We may not feel alike toward all, but our wills must be set to do good even to our enemies. In this the supernatural quality of the Christian life may be known.

(5) The Sermon Sets the Fact of God the Father at the Center of Life.

Character and life exist in and for fellowship with the Father. All worship and conduct look toward God. His service is the supreme duty, His perfection the standard of character, His goodness the ground of universal love. Given this fact, all the essentials of religion and life follow as a matter of course. God is Father, all men are brothers. God is Father, all duties are sacred. God is Father, infinite love is at the heart of the world and life is of infinite worth.

(6) Fulfillment Is the Final Test of Life.

The blossoms of promises must ripen into the fruit of abiding character. The leaves of empty professions have no value in the eyes of the Father. Deeds and character are the only things that abide, and endurance is the final test. The life of perfect fulfillment is the life anchored on the rock of ages.

See further ETHICS; ETHICS OF JESUS; KINGDOM OF GOD.

LITERATURE.

The standard commentaries and Lives of Christ. Among the most important encyclopaedic articles are those of C. W. Votaw in HDB, James Moffatt in Encyclopedia Biblica and W. F. Adeney in DCG. The following are a few of the most helpful separate volumes on the subject: A. Tholuck, Exposition of Christ’s Sermon on the Mount; Canon Gore, The Sermon on the Mount; B. W. Bacon, The Sermon on the Mount; W. B. Carpenter, The Great Charter of Christ; Hubert Foston, The Beatitudes and the Contrasts; compare H. C. King, The Ethics of Jesus, and Stalker, The Ethic of Jesus. The following periodical articles are worthy of notice: Franklin Johnson, "The Plan of the Sermon on the Mount," Homiletic Review, XXIV, 360; A. H. Hall, "The Gospel in the Sermon on the Mount," Biblical Sac., XLVIII, 322; The Bishop of Peterborough (W. C. Magee), "The State and the Sermon on the Mount," Fortnightly Review, LIII, 32; J. G. Pyle, "The Sermon on the Mount," Putnam’s Magazine, VII, 285.

Russell Benjamin Miller

SERMON ON THE PLAIN, THE

This title is sometimes given to the discourse recorded in Lu 6:20-49, because according to the Gospel (6:17) it was delivered on a plain at the foot of the mountain. In many respects this address resembles the one recorded in Mt 5-7, but in general the two are so different as to make it uncertain whether they are different reports of the same discourse or reports of different addresses given on different occasions.

See SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

1. The Occasion:

In contrast with the Sermon on the Mount which is assigned a place early in the Galilean ministry, and prior to the appointment of the Twelve, that event is represented as the occasion of this discourse. If the two accounts are reports of the same address the setting of Luke is probably the historical one.

2. Contents:

The Sermon of Luke includes a little less than one-third of the matter recorded in the Sermon on the Mount. The Lukan discourse includes only a portion of the Beatitudes, with a set of four "woes," a rather brief section on the social duties, and the concluding parable of the Two Houses.

3. Message:

The Gospel of Luke has been called the social Gospel because of its sympathy with the poor and its emphasis on the duty of kindliness of spirit. This social interest is especially prominent in the Sermon. Here the Beatitudes deal with social differences. In Matthew they refer to spiritual conditions. Here Jesus speaks of those who hunger now, probably meaning bodily hunger. In Matthew the reference is to hunger and thirst after righteousness. In Matthew the invectives are addressed against the self-satisfied religious teachers and their religious formalism. Here the rich and their unsocial spirit are the subject of the woes. This social interest is further emphasized by the fact that in addition to this social bearing of the Beatitudes, Luke’s discourse omits the remainder of the Sermon on the Mount, except those portions that deal with social relations, such as those on the Golden Rule, the duty of universal love, the equality of servant and master, and the obligation of a charitable spirit.

Russell Benjamin Miller

SERON

se’-ron (Seron): "The commander of the host of Syria" of Antiochus Epiphanes, who was defeated at Beth-horon by Judas in 166 BC (1 Macc 3:13 ff). Not a Greek name; "perhaps it represents the Phoenician Hiram" (Rawlinson, at the place).

SERPENT

sur’-pent:

1. General:

Serpents are not particularly abundant in Palestine, but they are often mentioned in the Bible. In the Hebrew there are 11 names. The New Testament has four Greek names and the Septuagint employs two of these and three others as well as several compound expressions, such as ophis petamenos, "flying serpent," ophis thanaton, "deadly serpent," and ophis daknon, "biting" or "stinging serpent." Notwithstanding this large vocabulary, it is impossible to identify satisfactorily a single species. Nearly every reference states or implies poisonous qualities, and in no case is there so much as a hint that a snake may be harmless, except in several expressions referring to the millennium, where their harmlessness is not natural but miraculous. In Arabic there is a score or more of names of serpents, but very few of them are employed at all definitely. It may be too much to say that the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine consider all snakes to be poisonous, but they do not clearly distinguish the non-poisonous ones, and there are several common and well-known species which are universally believed to be poisonous, though actually harmless. Of nearly 25 species which are certainly known to be found in Syria and Palestine, four are deadly poisonous, five are somewhat poisonous, and the rest are absolutely harmless. With the exception of qippoz, "dart-snake" (Isa 34:15) which is probably the name of a bird and not of a snake, every one of the Hebrew and Greek names occurs in passages where poisonous character is expressed or implied. The deadly poisonous snakes have large perforated poison fangs situated in the front of the upper jaw, an efficient apparatus like a hypodermic syringe for conveying the poison into the depths of the wound. In the somewhat poisonous snakes, the poison fangs are less favorably situated, being farther back, nearly under the eye. Moreover, they are smaller and are merely grooved on the anterior aspect instead of being perforated. All snakes, except a few which are nearly or quite toothless, have numerous small recurved teeth for holding and helping to swallow the prey, which is usually taken into the stomach while living, the peculiar structure of the jaws and the absence of a breast-bone enabling snakes to swallow animals which exceed the ordinary size of their own bodies.

2. Serpents of Palestine and Syria:

The following list includes all the serpents which are certainly known to exist in Palestine and Syria, omitting the names of several which have been reported but whose occurrence does not seem to be sufficiently confirmed. The range of each species is given.

(1) Harmless Serpents.

Typhlops vermicularis Merr., Greece and Southwestern Asia; T. simoni Bttgr., Palestine; Eryx jaculus L., Greece, North Africa, Central and Southwestern Asia; Tropidonotus tessellatus Laur., CentraI and Southeastern Europe, Central and Southwestern Asia; Zamenis gemonensis Laur., Central and Southeastern Europe, Greek islands, Southwestern Asia; Z. dahlii Fitz., Southeastern Europe, Southwestern Asia, Lower Egypt; Z. rhodorhachis Jan., Egypt, Southwestern Asia, India; Z. ravergieri Menatr., Southwestern Asia: Z. nummifer Renss., Egypt, Syria, Palestine, Cyprus, Asia Minor; Oligodon

melanocephalus Jan., Syria, Palestine, Sinai, Lower Egypt; Contia decemlineata D. and B., Syria, Palestine; C. collaris Menerr., Greek islands, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine; C. rothi Jan., Syria, Palestine; C. coronella Schleg., Syria, Palestine

(2) Somewhat Poisonous Serpents.

Tarbophis savignyi Blgr., Syria, Palestine, Egypt; T. fallax Fleischm., Balkan Peninsula, Greek islands, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine; Coelopeltis monspessulana Herre., Mediterranean countries, Caucasus, Persia; Psammophis schokari Forsk., North Africa, Southwestern Asia; Micrelaps muelleri Bttgr., Syria, Palestine

(3) Deadly Poisonous Serpents.

Vipera ammodytes L., Southeastern Europe, Asia Minor, Syria; Vipera lebetina L., North Africa, Greek islands, Southwestern Asia; Cerastes cornutus Forsk., Egypt, Sinai, Arabia; Echis coloratus Gthr., Southern Palestine, Arabia, Socotra.

To this list should be added the scheltopusik, a large snake-like, limbless lizard, Ophiosaurus apus, inhabiting Southeastern Europe, Asia Minor, Persia, Syria and Palestine, which while perfectly harmless is commonly classed with vipers.

Of all these the commonest is Zamenis nummifer, Arabic ‘aqd-ul-jauz, "string of walnuts," a fierce but non-poisonous snake which attains the length of a meter. Its ground color is pale yellow and it has a dorsal series of distinct diamond-shaped dark spots. Alternating with spots of the dorsal row are on each side two lateral rows of less distinct dark spots. It is everywhere considered to be fatal. Another common snake is Zamenis gemonensis, Arabic chanash, which attains the length of two meters. It is usually black and much resembles the American black snake, Zamenis constrictor. Like all species of Zamenis, these ire harmless. Other common harmless snakes are Zamenis dahlii, Tropidonotus tessellatus which is often found in pools and streams, Contia collaris, Oligodon melanocephalus, a small, nearly toothless snake with the crown of the head coal black.

Among the somewhat poisonous snakes, a very common one is Coelopeltis monspessulana, Arabic al-chaiyat ul-barshat, which is about two meters long, as larke as the black snake. It is uniformly reddish brown above, paler below. Another is Psammophis schokari. Arabic an-nashshab, "the arrow." It is about a meter long, slender, and white with dark stripes. Many marvelous and utterly improbable tales are told of its jumping powers, as for instance that it can shoot through the air for more than a hundred feet and penetrate a tree like a rifle bullet.

The commonest of the deadly poisonous snakes is Vipera lebetina, which attains the length of a meter, has a thick body, a short tail, a broad head and a narrow neck. It is spotted somewhat as Zamenis nummifer, but the spots are less regular and distinct and the ground color is gray rather than yellow. It does not seem to have a distinct name. Cerastes cornutus, having two small horns, which are modified

scales, over the eyes, is a small but dangerous viper, and is found in the south. Not only are the species of poisonous serpents fewer than the non-poisonous species, but the individuals also appear to be less numerous. The vast majority of the snakes which are encountered are harmless.

3. Names:

As stated above, all of the Hebrew and Greek names except qippoz, which occurs only in Isa 34:15, are used of snakes actually or supposedly poisonous. This absence of discrimination between poisonous and non-poisonous kinds makes determination of the species difficult. Further, but few of the Hebrew names are from roots whose meanings are clear, and there is little evident relation to Arabic names.

(1) The commonest Hebrew word is nachash, which occurs 31 times and seems to be a generic word for serpent. While not always clearly indicating a venomous serpent, it frequently does: e.g. Ps 58:4; 140:3; Pr 23:32; Ec 10:8,11; Isa 14:29; Jer 8:17; Am 5:19. According to BDB it is perhaps from an onomatopoetic nachash, "to hiss." It may be akin to the Arabic chanash, which means "snake" in general, or especially the black snake. Compare Ir-nahash (1Ch 4:12); Nahash

(a) (1Sa 11:1; 2Sa 10:2),

(b) (2Sa 17:27),

(c) (2Sa 17:25); also nechosheth, "copper" or "brass"; and nechushtan, "Nehushtan," the brazen serpent (2Ki 18:4). But BDB derives the last two words from a different root.

(2) saraph, apparently from saraph, "to burn," is used of the fiery serpents of the wilderness. In Nu 21:8, it occurs in the singular: "Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a standard." In 21:6 we have ha-nechashim ha-seraphim, "fiery serpents"; in De 8:15 the same in the singular: nachash saraph, also translated "fiery serpents"; in Isa 14:29; 30:6 we have saraph me‘opheph, "fiery flying serpent." The same word in the plural seraphim, is translated "seraphim" in Isa 6:2,6.

(3) tannin, elsewhere "dragon" or "seamonster" (which see), is used of the serpents into which the rods of Aaron and the magicians were transformed (Ex 7:9,10,12), these serpents being designated by nachash in Ex 4:3; 7:15. Tannin is rendered "serpent" (the King James Version "dragon") in De 32:33, "Their wine is the poison of serpents," and Ps 91:13, "The young lion and the serpent shalt thou trample under foot." On the other hand, nachash seems in three passages to refer to a mythical creature or dragon: "His hand hath pierced the swift serpent" (Job 26:13); "In that day Yahweh .... will punish leviathan the swift serpent and leviathan the crooked serpent" (Isa 27:1); ".... though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the serpent, and it shall bite them" (Am 9:3).

(4) zochale is translated "crawling things" in De 32:24 (the King James Version "serpents") and in Mic 7:17 (the King James Version "worms").

(5) ‘akhshubh, occurs only in Ps 140:3, where it is translated "adder" Septuagint aspis, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) aspis), "adders’ poison is under their lips." It has been suggested (BDB) that the reading should be ‘akkabhish, "spider" (which see). The parallel word in the previous line is nachash.

(6) pethen, like most of the other names a word of uncertain etymology, occurs 6 times and it is translated "asp," except in Ps 91:13, "Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder." According to Liddell and Scott, aspis is the name of the Egyptian cobra, Naia haje L., which is not included in (2) above, because it does not certainly appear to have been found in Palestine The name "adder" is applied to various snakes all of which may perhaps be supposed to be poisonous but some of which are actually harmless. Aspis occurs in Ro 3:13 in a paraphrase of Ps 140:3 (see (5) above); it occurs frequently, though not uniformly, in Septuagint for (2), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (10).

(7) tsepha‘, occurs only in Isa 14:29 where it is translated "adder" (the King James Version "cockatrice," the English Revised Version "basilisk," Septuagint ekgona aspidon, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) regulus). The root tsapha‘, of (7) and (8) may be an onomatopoetic word meaning "to hiss" (BDB).

(8) ..., or tsiph‘oni, occurs in Pr 23:32, "At the last it biteth like a serpent (nachash), and stingeth like an adder" (tsiph‘oni). In Isa 11:8; 59:5, and Jer 8:17, the American Standard Revised Version has "adder," while the King James Version has cockatrice" and the English Revised Version has "basilisk."

(9) shephiphon, occurs only in Ge 49:17:

"Da shall be a serpent (nachash) in the way,

An adder (shephiphon) in the path,

That biteth the horse’s heels,

So that his rider falleth backward."

This has been thought to be Cerastes cornulus, on the authority of Tristram (NHB), who says that lying in the path it will attack the passer-by, while most snakes will glide away at the approach of a person or large animal. He adds that his horse was much frightened at seeing one of these serpents coiled up in a camel’s footprint. The word is perhaps akin to the Arabic siff, or suff, which denotes a spotted and deadly snake.

(10) ‘eph’eh, is found in Job 20:16; Isa 30:6; 59:5, and in English Versions of the Bible is uniformly translated "viper." It is the same as the Arabic ‘af‘a, which is usually translated "viper," though the writer has never found anyone who could tell to what snake the name belongs. In Arabic as in Hebrew a poisonous snake is always understood.

(11) qippoz, the American Standard Revised Version "dart-snake," the English Revised Version "arrowsnake," the King James Version "great owl," only in Isa 34:15, "There shall the dart-snake make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shade; yea, there shall the kites be gathered, every one with her mate." "This is the concluding verse in a vivid picture of the desolation of Edom. The renderings "dart-snake" and "arrowsnake" rest on the authority of Bochert, but Septuagint has echinos, "hedgehog," and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) ericeus, "hedgehog." The rendering of the King James Version "great owl" seems preferable to the others, because the words "make her nest, and lay, and hatch, and gather under her shade" are as a whole quite inapplicable to a mammal or to a reptile. The derivation from qaphaz (compare Arabic qafaz), "to spring," "to dart," suits, it is true, a snake, and not a hedgehog, but may also suit an owl. Finally, the next word in Isa 34:15 is "kites," dayyoth; compare Arabic chida'at.

See BITTERN; OWL; PORCUPINE.

(12) ophis, a general term for "serpent," occurs in numerous passages of the New Testament and Septuagint, and is fairly equivalent to nachash.

(13) aspis, occurs in the New Testament only in Ro 3:13 parallel to Ps 140:3. See under (5) 'akhshubh and (6) pethen. It is found in Septuagint for these words, and also for 'eph'eh (Isa 30:6).

(14) echidna, occurs in Ac 28:3, "A viper came out .... and fastened on his (Paul's) hand," and 4 times in the expression "offspring (the King James Version "generation") of vipers," gennemata echidnon (Mt 3:7; 12:34; 23:33; Lu 3:7). The allied (masculine?) form echis, occurs in Sirach 39:30, the Revised Version (British and American) "adder."

(15) herpeton, "creeping thing," the King James Version "serpent," is found in Jas 3:7.

That the different Hebrew and Greek names are used without clear distinction is seen from several examples of the employment of two different names in parallel expressions:

"Their poison is like the poison of a serpent (nachash);

They are like the deaf adder (pethen) that stoppeth her ear" (Ps 58:4).

"They have sharpened their tongue like a serpent (nachash); Adders' ('akhshubh) poison is under their lips" (Ps 140:3).

"For, behold, I will send serpents (nechashim), adders (tsiph'onim), among you, which will not be charmed; and they shall bite you, saith Yahweh" (Jer 8:17).

"They shall lick the dust like a serpent (nachash): like crawling things of the earth (zohale 'erets) they

shall come trembling out of their close places" (Mic 7:17).

"He shall suck the poison of asps (pethen): The viper's (’eph‘eh) tongue shall slay him" (Job 20:16).

"Their wine is the poison of serpents (tanninim), and the cruel venom of asps (pethanim)" (De 32:33).

"And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp (pethen), and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's (tsiph‘oni) den" (Isa 11:8).

See also (8) and (9) above.

4. Figurative:

Most of the Biblical references to serpents are of a figurative nature, and they usually imply poisonous qualities. The wicked (Ps 58:4), the persecutor (Ps 140:3), and the enemy (Jer 8:17) are likened to venomous serpents. The effects of wine are compared to the bites of serpents (Pr 23:32). Satan is a serpent (Ge 3; Re 12:9; 20:2). The term "offspring of vipers" is applied by John the Baptist to the Pharisees and Sadducees (Mt 3:7) or to the multitudes (Lu 3:7) who came to hear him; and by Jesus to the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 12:34; 23:33). Da is a "serpent in the way .... that biteth the horse's heels" (Ge 49:17). Serpents are among the terrors of the wilderness (De 8:15; Isa 30:6). Among the signs accompanying believers is that "they shall take up serpents" (Mr 16:18; compare Ac 28:5). It is said of him that trusts in Yahweh:

"Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder:

The young lion and the serpent shalt thou trample under foot" (Ps 91:13).

In the millennium, "the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder's den" (Isa 11:8). The serpent is subtle (Ge 3:1; 2Co 11:3); wise (Mt 10:16); accursed (Ge 3:14); eats dust (Ge 3:14; Isa 65:25; Mic 7:17). The adder is deaf (Ps 58:4). The serpent lurks in unexpected places (Ge 49:17; Ec 10:8; Am 5:19). Serpents may be charmed (Ps 58:5; Ec 10:11; Jer 8:17). Among four wonderful things is "the way of a serpent upon a rock" (Pr 30:19).

Alfred Ely Day

SERPENT WORSHIP

wur'-ship: Traces of this superstition are thought by certain critics to be discoverable in the religion of Israel. Stade mentions that W. R. Smith supposed the serpent to be the totem of the house of David (Geschichte, I, 465). H. P. Smith says: "We know of a Serpent's Stone near Jerusalem, which was the site of a sanctuary (1Ki 1:9), and this sanctuary was dedicated to Yahweh" (Hist of Old Testament, 239,

240). Special reliance is placed on the narrative of the brazen serpent, which Hezekiah is recorded to have destroyed as leading to idolatry, (2Ki 18:4). "In that case," says H. P. Smith, "we must treat the Nehushtan as a veritable idol of the house of Israel, which had been worshipped in the temple from the time of its erection. Serpent worship is so widespread that we should be surprised not to find traces of it in Israel" (ut supra). In the same line, see G. B. Gray, Nu, 275-76. The fancifulness of these deductions is obvious.

See NEHUSHTAN.

James Orr

SERPENT, BRAZEN

bra'-z'-n.

See NEHUSHTAN.

SERPENT, CROOKED

krook'-ed: With reference to the constellation round the North Pole, in Job 26:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "the swift serpent," margin "fleeing"; and Isa 27:1, the Revised Version margin "winding." In the first part of the latter passage, the King James Version "piercing serpent" is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) to "swift serpent," margin "gliding" or "fleeing."

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 1.

SERPENT, FIERY

See SERPENT, 3, (2).

SERPENT-CHARMING

-charm'-ing: Allusion to this art, widely practiced by the ancients (see references in DB, under the word; especially Bothart, Hieron., III, 161, 164, etc.), as by modern Orientals, is found in Ps 58:5; Ec 10:11; Jer 8:17; Sirach 12:13, perhaps in Jas 3:7. The skill displayed in taming snakes, often without removing the poison fangs, is very surprising. Bruce, Davy, and other travelers give striking illustrations. See especially the interesting account of serpent-charming in Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses, English Translation, 100-104.

SERUG

se’-rug (serugh; Serouch): Son of Reu and great-grandfather of Abraham (Ge 11:20 ff; 1Ch 1:26; Lu 3:35).

SERVANT

sur’-vant (’ebhedh; doulos): A very common word with a variety of meanings, all implying a greater or less degree of inferiority and want of freedom:

(1) The most frequent usage is as the equivalent of "slave" (which see), with its various shades in position (Ge 9:25; 24:9; Ex 21:5; Mt 10:24; Lu 17:7, and often); but also a hired workman where "hired servant" translates Hebrew and Greek expressions which differ from the above.

(2) An attendant in the service of someone, as Joshua was the "servant" the Revised Version (British and American) "minister" of Moses (Nu 11:28).

(3) As a ‘term of respectful self-depreciation referring to one’s self, "thy servant." or "your servant" is used in place of the personal pronoun of the first person:

(a) in the presence of superiors (Ge 19:2; 32:18, and often);

(b) in addressing the Supreme Being (1Sa 3:9; Ps 19:11; 27:9; Lu 2:29, and often).

(4) Officials of every grade are called the "servants" of kings, princes, etc. (1Sa 29:3; 2Sa 16:1; 1Ki 11:26; Pr 14:35, and often).

(5) The position of a king in relation to his people (1Ki 12:7).

(6) One who is distinguished as obedient and faithful to God or Christ (Jos 1:2; 2Ki 8:19; Da 6:20; Col 4:12; 2Ti 2:24). (7) One who is enslaved by sin (Joh 8:34).

William Joseph Mcglothlin

SERVANT OF JEHOVAH; SERVANT OF THE LORD; SERVANT OF YAHWEH

1. Historical Situation

2. The Authorship of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66

3. The Prophet of the Exile

4. The Unity of Isaiah 40-66

5. Principal Ideas of Isaiah 40-66

6. The Servant-Passages

(1) Date of the Servant-Passages

(2) Discussion of the Passages

(3) Whom Did the Prophet Mean by the Servant?

(4) The Psychology of the Prophecy

7. Place of the Servant-Passages in Old Testament Prophecy

8. Large Messianic Significance of the Servant-Passages

1. Historical Situation:

A century and a half had passed since the great days of Isaiah in Jerusalem. The world had vastly changed during those long decades when politicians had planned, armies surged back and forth, and tribes and nations had lost or won in the struggle for existence, place and power. The center of the world had changed—for Assyria had gone to its long home, and the city claiming preeminence was not Nineveh but Babylon.

Nowhere perhaps had time laid a heavier hand than on the city of Jerusalem and the country of Judah. For city and land had come to desolation, and the inhabitants of the country had become familiar with the strange sights and sounds of Babylonia, whither they had been carried by their conquerors. Many had found graves in the land of the exile, and new generations had arisen who had no memory of the hill country of their fathers. It is the situation of these captive Jews in Babylonia which is reflected and they who are addressed at the waning of the long night of captivity by the stirring message recorded in Isaiah 40-66 (leaving out of account here disputed passages in Isaiah 40-66).

2. The Authorship of Isaiah, Chapters 40-66:

The more one studies the problem of the authorship of these chapters, the more unlikely does it seem that their author penned them 150 years before the time with which they are vitally connected. It is obviously impossible to treat that problem in a detailed way here, but one may sum up the arguments by saying that in theological ideas, in style, and use of words they show such differences from the assured productions of Isaiah’s pen as to point to a different authorship. And the great argument, the argument which carries the most weight to the author of this article, is that these late chapters are written from the

standpoint of the exile. The exile is assumed in what is said. These chapters do not prophesy the exile, do not say it is to come; they all the time speak as though it had come. The message is not that an exile is to be, but beginning with the fact that the exile already is, it foretells deliverance. Now of course it is conceivable that God might inspire a man to put himself forward 150 years, and with a message to people who were to live then, assuming their circumstances as a background of what he said, but it is improbable to the last degree. To put it in plain, almost gruff, English, it is not the way God did things. The prophet's message was always primarily a message to his own age. Then there is no claim in the chapters themselves that Isaiah was their author. And having once been placed so that it was supposed they were by Isaiah—placed so through causes we do not know—the fact that in speaking of passages from these chapters New Testament authors referred to them by a name the people would recognize, is not a valid argument that they meant to teach anything as to their authorship. The problem had not arisen in New Testament times. Isaiah 40-66, as Professor Davidson has suggested, has a parallel in the Book of Job, each the production of a great mind, each from an author we do not know.

Compare ISAIAH.

3. The Prophet of the Exile:

Out of the deep gloom of the exile—when the Jew was a man without a country, when it seemed as if the nation's sins had murdered hope—out of this time comes the voice most full of gladness and abounding hope of all the voices from the Old Testament life. In the midst of the proud, confident civilization of Babylonia, with its teeming wealth and exhaustless splendor, came a man who dared to speak for Yahweh—a man of such power to see reality that to him Babylonia was already doomed, and he could summon the people to prepare for God's deliverance.

4. The Unity of Isaiah 40-66:

In recent criticism, especially in Germany, there has been a strong tendency to assign the last chapters of this section to a different author from the first. The background it is claimed is not Babylonian; the sins rebuked are the sins of the people when at home in Judea, and in at least one passage the temple at Jerusalem seems to be standing. That these chapters present difficulties need not be disputed, but it seems to me that again and again in them one can find the hand of Second Isaiah. Then undoubtedly the author quotes from previous prophecies which we can recognize, and the suggestion that some of the difficult passages may be quotations from other older prophecies which are not preserved to us, I think an exceedingly good one. The quotation of such passages in view of the prospect of return, and the prophet's feeling of the need of the people, would seem to me not at all unnatural. If a later hand is responsible for some utterances in the latter part of the section, it seems to me fairly clear that most of it is from the hand of the great unknown prophet of the exile.

The questions regarding the Servant-passages as affecting the unity of the book will be treated later.

5. Principal Ideas of Isaiah 40-66:

The first part of this section vividly contrasts Yahweh and the idols worshipped with such splendor and ceremony. All the resources of irony and satire are used to give point and effect to the contrast. Cyrus the Median conqueror is already on the horizon, and he is declared to be God's instrument in the deliverance. The idols are described in process of manufacture; they are addressed in scornful apostrophe, they are seen carried away helpless. On the other side Yahweh, with illimitable foresight and indomitable strength, knows and reveals the future. They know and reveal nothing. He brings to pass what He has planned. They do nothing. Not only the idols but Babylonia itself is made the victim of satire—and the prophet hurls a taunt song at the proud but impotent city.

Israel—the people of Yahweh—the elect of God—is given the prophet's message. The past is called up as a witness to Yahweh's dealings. His righteousness—His faithfulness to His people—shall not fail. They are unworthy, but out of His own bounty salvation is provided. And with joy of this salvation from exile and from sin the book rings and rings. The Zion of the restored Israel is pictured with all the play of color and richness of imagery at the prophet's command. And this restored Israel is to have a world-mission. Its light is to fall upon all lands. It is to minister salvation to all races of men.

But back of and under these pictures of great hope is the prophet's sense of his people's sin and their struggle with it. In the latter part of the book, especially Isaiah 59 and 64 this comes out clearly. And the mood of these chapters expresses the feeling out of which some of the deep things of the Servant-passages came. There is no need to insist that the chapters as they stand are in the order in which they were written. We know from other prophecies that this was not always true. But even if a man were convinced that the chapters now occurring after the Servant-passages were all written after them, he could still hold, and I think would be justified in holding, that in places in those chapters the reader finds the record of a state of the prophet's mind before the writing of those passages. The former view would be, I think, the preferable one. At any rate the point of view is logically that out of which some of the deep things in the Servant-passages came.

In profoundness of meaning the climax of the book is reached in these passages where the deliverance from exile and the deliverance from sin are connected with one great figure—the Servant of Yahweh.

6. The Servant-Passages:

The word "servant," as applied to servants of God, is not an unfamiliar one to readers of the Old Testament. It is applied to different individuals and by Jeremiah to the nation (compare Jer 30:10; 46:27); but its message is on the whole so distinct and complete in Second Isa that we can study it without any further reference to previous usage.

The "servant" first appears in Isa 41:8. Here the reference is undoubtedly to Israel, chosen and called of God and to be upheld by Him. Here Israel is promised victory over its enemies. In vivid picture their destruction and Isracl's future trust and glory in God are portrayed.

There are several incidental references to Israel as Yahweh's servant: created by Yahweh and not to be

forgotten (Isa 41:8); Cyrus is said to be called for the sake of His servant Jacob (Isa 45:4); Yahweh is said to have redeemed His servant Jacob (Isa 48:20).

In Isa 44:26 "servant" seems to be used with the meaning of prophet. It is said of Yahweh that He "confirmeth the word of his servant, and performeth the counsel of his messengers."

In Isa 42:19 we find the failure and inadequacy of Israel presented in the words, "Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I send?" This passage is an explanation of the exile. Israel proved unworthy and sinned, hence, its punishment, but even in the exile the lesson had not been taken to heart.

In Isa 43:8 ff Yahweh summons Israel the servant, who in spite of blindness and deafness yet is His witness. It has at least seen enough to be able to witness for Him in the presence of the heathen.

In Isa 44:1-5, leaving the unworthiness of the actual Israel, there comes what seems to me a summons in the name of the possible, the ideal. The underlying thought is a call to the high future which God has ready to give.

This covers the reference to the servant outside the great Servant-passages to which we now come. There are four of these: Isa 42:1-9; 49:1-9 a; 50:4-11; 52:13-53:12; 61:1-4 perhaps represents words of the Servant, but may refer to words of the prophet, and, as at any rate it adds no new features to the picture of the Servant already given in the passages undoubtedly referring to him, we will not discuss it.

(1) Date of the Servant-Passages.

Ewald long ago suggested that the last of the Servant-passages must have been borrowed from an earlier composition, which he assigned to the age of Manasseh. "If we find in the study of the passage reason for its vividness, we shall not need to seek its origin in the description of some past martyrdom."

Duhm quoted by Cheyne thinks the Servant-passages post-exilic. The gentleness and quiet activity of the Servant for one thing, according to Duhm, suggest the age of the scribes, rather than that of the exile. But might not an age of suffering be a time to learn the lesson of gentleness? According to Skinner, Duhm thinks the passages were inserted almost haphazard, but Skinner also refers to Kosters, showing that the passages cannot be lifted without carrying some of the succeeding verses with them. This is particularly significant in view of the recent popularity of other theories which deny the Servant-passages to the hand and time of Second Isa. The theory that these passages form by themselves a poem or a set of poems which have been inserted here can boast of distinguished names.

There does not seem much to commend it, however. As to the argument from difference as to rhythm, there is disagreement, and the data are probably not of a sort to warrant much significance being applied to it either way. The fact that the passages are not always a part of connected movement of thought would play great havoc if made a universal principle of discrimination as to authorship in the prophecies of the Old Testament. If we succeed in giving the fundamental ideas of the passages a place in relation

to the thought of Deutero-Isaiah, an argument for which cogency might be claimed will be dissipated. But even at its best this argument would not be conclusive. To deny certain ideas to an author simply because he has not expressed them in a certain bit of writing acknowledged to him is perilous business. A message of hope surely does not preclude an appreciation of the dark things.

The truth of the matter is that even by great scholars the temptation to a criticism of knight-errantry is not always resisted. And I think we shall not make any mistake in believing that this is the case with the attempt to throw doubt upon the Deutero-Isaianic authorship of the Servant-passages.

(2) Discussion of the Passages.

Isa 42:1-9: In these verses Yahweh Himself is the speaker, describing the Servant as His chosen, in whom His soul delights, upon whom He has put His spirit. He is to bring justice to the Gentiles. His methods are to be quiet and gentle, and the very forlorn hope of goodness He will not quench. He is to set justice in the earth, and remote countries are described as waiting for His law. Then comes a declaration by the prophet that Yahweh, the Creator of all, is the speaker of words declaring the Servant's call in righteousness to be a covenant for the people, a light to the Gentiles, a helper to those in need—the blind and imprisoned. Yahweh's glory is not to be given to other, nor His praise to graven images. Former prophecies have come to pass. New things He now declares. One's attention needs to be called to the distinction of the Servant from Israel in this passage. He is to be a covenant of the people: according to Delitzsch, "he in whom and through whom Yahweh makes a new covenant with His people in place of the old one that has been broken."

Isa 49:1-9 a; Here the Servant himself spoaks, telling of his calling from the beginning of his life, of the might of his word, of his shelter in God, of a time of discouragement in which he thought his labor in vain, followed by insistence on his trust in God. Then Yahweh promises him a larger mission than the restoration of Israel, namely, to be a light to the Gentiles. Yahweh speaks of the Servant as one despised, yet to be triumphant so that he will be honored by kings and princes. He is to lead his people forth at their restoration, "to make them inherit the desolate heritages; saying to them that are bound, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves."

Clearly the Servant is distinct from the people Israel in this passage. Yet in Isa 49:3 he is addressed as Israel. The word Israel here may be a gloss, which would solve the difficulty, or the Servant may be addressed as Israel because he gathers up in himself the meaning of the ideal Israel. If it is true that the prophet gradually passed from the conception of Israel as a nation to a person through whom its true destiny would be realized, this last suggestion would gain in probability.

One notices here the emphasis on the might of the Servant, and in this passage we come to understand that he is to pass through a time of ignominy. The phrase "a servant of rulers" is a difficult one, which would be clear if the prophet conceived of him as one of the exiles, and typically representing them. The Servant's mission in this passage seems quite bound up with the restoration.

Isa 50:4-11: In the first part of this passage the Servant is not mentioned directly, but it seems clear that he is speaking. He is taught of God continually, that he may bring a message to the weary. He has opened his ear so that he may fully understand Yahweh's message. The Servant now describes his sufferings as coming to him because of his obedience. He was not rebellious and did not turn back from his mission. Flint-like he set his face and with confidence in God met the shame which came upon him. After language vivid with a sense of ignominy his assured consciousness of victory and faith in God are expressed, .

In Isa 50:10-11, according to Delitzsch, Yahweh speaks, first encouraging those who listen to the Servant, then addressing those who despise his word. Cheyne thinks the Servant mentioned in 50:10 may be the prophet, but I prefer Delitzsch's view.

Isa 52:13-53:12: The present division of 52:13-53:12 is unfortunate, for obviously it is all of a piece and ought to stand together in one chapter.

In Isa 52:13-15 Yahweh speaks of the humiliation and later of the exaltation of the Servant. He shall deal wisely—the idea here including the success resulting from wisdom—and shall be exalted. Words are piled upon each other here to express his exaltation. But the appearance of the Servant is such as to suggest the very opposite of his dignity, which will astonish nations and kings when they come, to understand it.

Entering upon Isaiah 53 we find the people of Israel speaking confessing their former unbelief, and giving as a reason the repulsive aspect of the Servant—despised, sad, sick with a visage to make men turn from him. He is described as though he had been a leper. They thought all this had come upon him as a stroke from God, but they now see how he went even to death, not for his own transgression but for theirs. Their peace and healing came through his suffering and death. They have been sinful and erring; the result of it all God has caused to light upon him.

They look back in wonder at the way he bore his sufferings—like a lamb led to the slaughter; with a false judicial procedure he was led away, no one considering his death, or its relation to them. His grave even was an evidence of ignominy.

Beginning at Isa 53:10 the people cease speaking, according to Delitzsch, and the prophecy becomes the organ of God who acknowledges His Servant. The reference to a trespass offering in 53:10 is remarkable. Nowhere else is prophecy so connected with the sacrificial system (A. B. Davidson). It pleased God to bruise the Servant—his soul having been made a trespass offering; the time of humiliation over, the time of exaltation will come.

By his knowledge we are told—here a momentary reversion to the time of humiliation taking place—by his knowledge he shall justify many and bear their iniquities. Then comes the exaltation—dividing of spoils and greatness—the phrases suggesting kingly glory: all this is to be his because of his suffering. The great fact of Isaiah 53 is vicarious suffering.

(3) Whom Did the Prophet Mean by the Servant?

(a) Obviously not all of Israel always, for the Servant is distinguished from Israel. (b) Not the godly remnant, for he is distinguished from them. Then the godly remnant does not attain to any such proportions as to fit the description of Isaiah 53. (c) And one cannot accept theory that the prophetic order is intended. The whole order is not great enough to exhaust the meaning of one of a half-dozen of the greatest lines in chapter 53.

Professor A. B. Davidson's Old Testament Prophecy contains a brilliant and exceedingly able discussion of the question which he approaches from the stand-point of Biblical rather than simply exegetical theology. His fundamental position is that in the prophet's outlook the restoration is the consummation. In his mind the Servant and his work cannot come after the restoration. The Servant, if a real person, must be one whose work lies in the past or the present, as there is not room in the future for him, for the restoration which is at the door brings felicity, and after that no sufferings of the Servant are conceivable. But there is no actual person in the past and none in the present who could be the Servant. Hence, the Servant cannot be to the prophet's mind a real person.

See CONIAH.

Of course Davidson relates the result to his larger conception of prophecy in such a way as to secure the Messianic significance of the passages in relation to their fulfillment in our Lord. The ideas they contain are realized in Him.

But coming back to the prophet's mind—if the Servant was not a person to him, what significance did he have? The answer according to Davidson is, He is a great personification of the ideal Israel. "He is Israel according to its idea." To quote more fully, "The prophet has created out of the divine determinations imposed on Israel, election, creation and forming, endowment with the word or spirit of Yahweh, and the divine purpose in these operations, an ideal Being, an inner Israel in the heart of the phenomenal or actual Israel, an indestructible Being having these divine attributes or endowments, present in the outward Israel in all ages, powerful and effectual because really composed, if I can say so, of divine forces, who cannot fail in God's purpose, and who as an inner power within Israel by his operation causes all Israel to become a true servant" (compare Davidson, Old Testament Prophecy, 435-36).

Now it seems to me that Davidson is more effective in his destructive than in his constructive work. One must confess that he presents real difficulties in the way of holding to a personal Servant as the prophet's conception. But on the other hand when he tries to replace that by a more adequate conception, I do not think he conspicuously succeeds.

The greatest of the Servant-passages (it seems to me) presents more than can be successfully dealt with under the conception of the Servant as the ideal Israel. The very great emphasis on vicarious suffering in Isaiah 53 simply is not answered by theory. Words would not leap with such a flame of reality in

describing the suffering of a personification. The sense of sin back of the passage is not a thing whose problem could be solved by a glittering figure of speech. There it surges—the movement of an aroused conscience—and the answer to it could never be anything less than a real deed by a real person. My own feeling is that if language can express anything it expresses the fact that the prophet had a real personal Servant in view.

But what of the difficulties Davidson suggests? Even if the answer were not easy to find, one could rest on the total impression the passages make. One cannot vaporize a passage for the sake of placing it in an environment in which one believes it belongs. As Cheyne in other days said, "In the sublimest descriptions of the Servant I am unable to resist the impression that we have the presentment of an individual, and venture to think that our general view of the Servant ought to be ruled by those passages in which the enthusiasm of the author is at its height."

The first thing we need to remember in dealing with the difficulties Davidson has brought forth is the timelessness of prophecy, and the resulting fact that every prophet saw the future as if lying just on the horizon of his own time. As prophets saw the day of Yahweh as if at hand, so it seems to me Deutero-Isaiah saw the Servant: each really afar off, yet each really seen in the colors of the present. Then we must remember that the prophets did not relate all their conceptions. They stated truths whose meaning and articulation they did not understand. They were not philosophers with a Hegelian hunger for a total view of life, and when we try to read them from this standpoint we misjudge them. Then we must remember that the prophet may here have been lifted to a height of prophetic receptivehess where he received and uttered what went beyond the limits of his own understanding. To be sure there was a point of contact, but I see no objection to the thought that in a place of unique significance and importance like this, God might use a man to utter words which reached far beyond the limits of his own understanding. In this connection some words of Professor Hermann Schultz are worth quoting: "If it is true anywhere in the history of poetry and prophecy, it is true here that the writer being full of the spirit has said more than he himself meant to say and more than he himself understood."

(4) The Psychology of the Prophecy.

This does not mean that something may. not be said about the connection of the Servant-passages with the prophet’s own thought. Using Delitzsch’s illustration, we can see how from regarding all Israel as the servant the prophet could narrow down to the godly part of Israel as experience taught him the faithlessness of many, and it ought not to be impossible for us to see how all that Israel really meant at its best could have focused itself in his thought upon one person. Despite Davidson’s objection, I can see nothing artificial about this movement in the prophet’s mind. There was probably more progression in his thought than Professor Davidson is willing to allow. If it is asked, Where was the person to whom the prophet could ascribe such greatness, conceiving as he did that he was to come at once? surely a similar question would be fair in relation to Isaiah’s Messiah. The truth is that even on the threshold of the restoration there was time for a great one suddenly to arise. As John the Baptist on the Jordan watched for the coming One whom he knew not, yet who was alive, so the great prophet of the exile may have watched even day by day for the coming Servant whose work had been revealed to him.

But deep in the psychology of the prophecy is the sense of sin out of which these passages came and indications of which I think are found in the latter part of the book. The great guilt-laden past lay terribly behind the prophet, and as he mused over the sufferings of the righteous, perhaps especially drawn to tim heart-rent Jeremiah, the thought of redemptive suffering may have dawned upon him. And if in its light, and with a personal sense of sin drawn from what experiences we know not, he grapples with the problem, can we not understand, can we not see that God might flash upon him the great conception of a sin-bearer?

7. Place of the Servant-Passages in Old Testament Prophecy:

At last the idea of vicarious suffering had been connected with the deep things of the nation's life, and henceforward was a part of its heritage. To the profoundest souls it would be a part of the nation's forward look. The priestly idea had been deepened and filled with new moral meaning. The Servant was a prophet too—so priest and prophet met in one. And I think Cheyne was right when he suggested that in the Servant's exaltation in Isaiah 53, the idea of the Servant is brought nearer to that of king than we sometimes think. So in suggestion, at least, prophet, priest and king meet in the great figure of the suffering Servant.

A new rich stream had entered into prophecy, full of power to fertilize whatever shores of thought it touched. In the thoughts of these passages prophecy seemed pressing with impatient eagerness to its goal, and though centuries were to pass before that goal was reached, its promise is seen here, full of assurance and of knowledge of the kind of goal it is to be.

8. Larger Messianic Significance of the Servant-Passages:

But whatever our view of the meaning of the prophet, we must agree (compare Mt 8:17; 12:18-21; 26:67; Joh 12:41, et al.) that the conception he so boldly and powerfully put upon his canvas had its realization, its fulfillment in the One who spoke to the world from the cross on Calvary. And in its darkly glorious shadow the Christian, with all the sadness and joy and wonder of it, with a sense of its solving all his problems and meeting the deepest needs and outreaches of his life, can feel a strange companionship with the exilic prophet whose yearning for a sin-bearer and belief in His coming call across the long and slowly moving years. In the light and penetration of that hour he may be trusted to know what the prophet meant. Professor Delitzsch well said of that passage, "Every word is as it were written under the cross at Golgotha."

Lynn Harold Hough

SERVANTS, SOLOMON'S

See SOLOMON'S SERVANTS.

SERVICE

sur’-vis: Six Hebrew, two Aramaic and four Greek words are so rendered.

1. In the Old Testament:

In the Old Testament the word most used for "service" is

(1) ‘abhodhah, from ‘abhadh, which is the general word, meaning "to work" and so "to serve," "to till," also "to enslave." The noun means "bondage," "labor," "ministering," "service," "tillage," "work," "use." The word is used in describing work in the fields (Ex 1:14, et al.), work in the tabernacle (Ex 27:19, et al.), sanctuary service (Nu 7:9), service of Yahweh (Nu 8:11), Levitical or priestly service (Nu 8:22), kingly service (1Ch 26:30), etc. Reference is made to instruments, wood vessels, cattle, herbs, shekels for the service in the house of Yahweh.

(2) ‘Abhadh itself is translated "service" in Nu 8:15; 18:23; Jer 22:13.

(3) Seradh means "stitching," i.e. piercing with a needle; it occurs only 4 times, and in each case in the Revised Version (British and American) instead of "service" is translated "finely wrought garments" (Ex 31:10; 35:19; 39:1,41).

(4) Sharath means primarily "to attend" as a servant or worshipper, and to contribute to or render service, wait on, and thence service; occurs only 3 times (Ex 35:19; 39:1,41 the King James Version) and in the American Standard Revised Version is rendered "for ministering."

(5) Tsabha’ is found 7 times, used in the same connection each time, and refers to those numbered for service in the tent of meeting. Its primary root meaning refers to service for war, campaign, hardship (Nu 4:30,35,39,43; 8:24).

(6) Yadh means literally, an "open hand, indicating direction, power, and so ministry as in 1Ch 6:31, where David appoints certain ones to have direction of the music, translated in 1Ch 29:5, the Revised Version (British and American) not service, but "himself."

(7) ‘Abhidhah means "business," "labor," "affairs"; Ezr 6:18 is the only place where it is found.

(8) Polchan, from root meaning "to worship," "minister to," and so in Ezr 7:19 vessels given for service.

2. In the New Testament:

The following are the uses in the New Testament:

(1) Diakonia, from root meaning "to run on errands," and so attendance, aid as a servant, ministry, relief, and hence, service; compare English word "deacon"; Paul: "that I might minister unto you" (2Co 11:8); also found in Ro 15:31 ("ministration") and Re 2:19 ("ministry").

(2) Douleuo, literally, "to be a slave," in bondage, service (Ga 4:8, "bondage"; Eph 6:7, "service"; 1Ti 6:2, "serve").

(3) Latreia, from root meaning "to render religious homage," menial service to God, and so worship (Joh 16:2, "service"; Ro 9:4, "service"; Ro 12:1, "spiritual service"; Heb 9:1, "service"; 9:6, "services").

(4) Leitourgia, from root "to perform religious or charitable functions," worship, relieve, obey, minister, and hence, a public function, priestly or charitable (liturgy) (2Co 9:12, "service"; also in Php 2:17,30).

See SERVANT.

William Edward Raffety

SERVITUDE

sur’-vi-tud.

See SERVANT; SLAVE.

SESIS se’-sis (Codex Vaticanus Seseis; Codex Alexandrinus Sesseis): One who put away his foreign wife (1 Esdras 9:34) =" Shashai" in Ezr 10:40.

SESTHEL

ses’-thel (Sesthel): One of the sons of Addi who put away their foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:31)=" Bezalel" in Ezr 10:30.

SET

Few words in the English language have such a rich variety of meaning and are used in so rich a variety of idiomatic expression as the word "set." A glance at any of the great dictionaries will convince anyone of the truth of this statement. The Standard Dictionary devotes three and a half columns to the word. In its primary meaning it there denotes 22 distinct things, in its secondary meaning 17 more, while 18 distinct phrases are given in which it is used, in some cases again in a variety of meanings. It is indeed a word calculated to drive a foreigner to despair. Some 70 Hebrew and about 30 Greek words in the original tongues of the Holy Scriptures have been rendered by the word "set," in the King James Version and also in the Revised Version (British and American). A careful comparative study of the original and

of translations in other tongues will at once indicate that a lack of discrimination is evident on the part of the English translators in the frequent use of the word "set."

Thus in So 5:14, "hands are as rings of gold set with beryl," the Hebrew word is male’," to be filled," "full." Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates plenae, the Dutch gevuld, the German voll; Pr 8:27, "when he set a circle," Hebrew chaqaq, "to describe," "decree," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) vallabat, Dutch beschreef; Ezr 4:10, "set in the city of Samaria," Aramaic yethibh, "to cause to sit down," "to cause to dwell," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) habitare eas fecit, Dutch doen wonen; Ps 2:6, "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill," Hebrew nacakh, "to pour out," "to anoint," Dutch gezalfd; Isa 19:2, the King James Version "I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians," Hebrew cakhakh, "to disturb," "to confuse," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) concurrere faciam, , Dutch verwarren, German an einander setzen; Re 3:8, "I have, set before thee a door," Greek didomi, "to give," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) dedi coram te, Dutch gegeven, German gegeben; Ac 19:27, the King James Version "Our craft is in danger to be set at nought," Greek erchomai, "to come," Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) periclitabitur, Dutch in verachting komen; Lu 4:18, "to set at liberty them," Greek apostello, "to send away," Dutch heen te zenden in vrijheid; Ac 13:9, the King James Version "Saul .... set his eyes on him," Greek atenizo, "to stare fixedly," Vulgate: intuens in eum, Dutch de oogen op hem houdende. These are but a few examples chosen at random where our English translators have rendered Hebrew and Greek words by "set," where a more literal translation, in equally good idiomatic language, was possible. The word "set" is the causative of "sit," and indicates primarily a power of self-support, in opposition to the idea of the word "lay."

(1) In its primary meaning the word "set" is used in our English Bible in many senses:

(a) Foundation: So 5:15, "His legs are as pillars of marble set upon."

(b) Direction: Eze 21:16, "whithersoever thy face is set."

(c) Appointed time: Ac 12:21, "upon a set day."

(d) Fixed place: 2Ch 20:17, "Set yourselves, stand ye still, and see"; 2Sa 6:17; Mt 4:5.

(e) Cause to sit: 1Sa 2:8, the King James Version "to set them among princes"; 2Ch 23:20; Ps 68:6.

(f) Appointment: Ezr 7:25, the King James Version "set magistrates and judges"; Ge 41:41; 1Sa 12:13; Ps 2:6; Da 1:11. (g) To lift up: Ge 31:17, "set his sons and his wives upon."

(h) Appointed place: Ge 1:17, "God set them in the firmament."

(i) Cause to stand: Ge 47:7, "Joseph brought in Jacob .... and set him before Pharaoh"; Nu 8:13; 2Ch 29:25.

(j) Sitting: Mt 5:1, the King James Version "when he was set"; Heb 8:1 the King James Version.

(k) Location: Mt 5:14, "a city set on a hill." These by no means exhaust the meaning which the word, in its primary sense, has in our English Bible.

(2) In a secondary or tropical sense it is used with equal frequency, usually with various prepositions. Thus,

(a) To attack: Jud 9:33, the King James Version "and set upon the city."

(b) To imprint: Ge 4:15, the King James Version "The Lord set a mark upon Cain."

(c) To direct to: 1Ki 2:15, "And that all Israel set their faces on me."

(d) To place: 1Ki 20:12, Ben-hadad shouted one word to his allies: "Set," i.e. set the armies in array, the battering-rams and engines of attack in their place.

(e) To incline toward: Eze 40:4, "Set thy heart upon all that I shall show."

(f) To trust in: Ps 62:10, "If riches increase, set not your heart thereon."

(g) To place before: Ps 90:8, "Thou hast set our iniquities before"; Ps 141:3, "Set a watch, O Yahweh, before my mouth."

(h) To go down: of the setting of the sun (Mr 1:32; Lu 4:40).

(i) To be proud: Mal 3:15, the King James Version "They that work wickedness are set up."

(j) To fill in: Ex 35:9, "stones to be set, for the ephod."

(k) To plant: Mr 12:1, "set a hedge about it."

(l) To mock: Lu 23:11, "Herod .... set him at nought."

(m) To honor: 1Sa 18:30, "so that his name was much set by."

(n) To start: Ac 21:2, "We went aboard, and set sail." As may be seen the word is used in an endless variety of meanings.

Henry E. Dosker

SETH; SHETH

seth, sheth (sheth; Seth):

(1) The son born to Adam and Eve after the death of Abel (Ge 4:25 f; 5:3 ff; 1Ch 1:1; Sirach 49:16; Lu 3:38). In Ge 4:25 the derivation of the name is given. Eve "called his name Seth: For, said she, God hath appointed (shath) me another seed instead of Abel." In 1Ch 1:1 the King James Version, the form is "Sheth"; elsewhere in the King James Version and in the Revised Version (British and American) throughout the form is "Seth."

(2) the King James Version "the children of Sheth," the Revised Version (British and American) "the sons of tumult." According to the King James Version rendering, the name of an unknown race mentioned in Balaam's parable (Nu 24:17).

S. F. Hunter

SETHUR

se'-thur (cethur; Sathour): An Asherite spy (Nu 13:13 (14)).

SETTING

set'-ing (millu'ah, literally, "a filling"): The word is used in the description of the manufacture of the breastplate of judgment (Ex 28:17). The instruction runs: "Thou shalt set in it settings of stones," namely, four rows of precious stones. The same word is rendered "inclosings" in Ex 28:20, and in 39:13 the King James Version.

SETTLE (1)

set'-'-l ('azarah): For this word in Eze 43:14,17,20; 45:19, the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version margin substitute more correctly "ledge."

See TEMPLE.

SETTLE (2)

The Hebrew language has 8 words which are thus translated: yashabh, nachath, 'amadh, shaqat, tabha', natsabh, maqom, qapha'. Now the meaning is to settle down, to cause to occur (Eze 36:11 the King James Version; 1Ch 17:14); then it denotes fixedness (2Ki 8:11; Ps 119:89; Pr 8:25); again it points to a condition of absolute quiescence, as the settlings on the lees (Jer 48:11); and in still another place it

means packing solidly together (Ps 65:10). In the New Testament the words hedraios, themelioo, and tithemi, have been translated "settle." the Revised Version (British and American) in 1Pe 5:10 has translated "establish," and the context unquestionably points to the idea of a fixed establishment in the faith. In Lu 21:14 the word translated "settle" evidently points to a fixed determination.

Henry E. Dosker

SEVEN

sev’-’-n (shebha‘; hepta).

See NUMBER.

SEVEN CHURCHES

See CHURCHES, SEVEN.

SEVEN STARS

See ASTRONOMY.

SEVENEH

se-ven’-e, se-ve’-ne (ceweneh): For the King James Version "the tower of Syene," in Eze 29:10; 30:6, the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "the tower of Seveneh," with a marginal note, "or, from Migdol to Syene." Seveneh is the town at the First Cataract in Egypt, now known as Assuan. Fresh interest has recently been given to it by the Elephantine discoveries bearing on the ancient Jewish colony and temple of Yahweh in that place in the 5th century BC.

See ARAMAIC; EGYPT; PAPYRUS; SANCTUARY, 4, etc.

SEVENTH, DAY

sev’-’-nth.

See SABBATH.

SEVENTY

sev’-n-ti (shibh‘im; hebdomekonta).

See NUMBER.

SEVENTY DISCIPLES

The account of the designation and mission of these is found only in Luke 10. Some have therefore sought to maintain that we have here only a confused variant of the appointment of the Twelve; but this is impossible in the light of Luke’s account of the Twelve in chapter 9.

The documents vary as between the numbers seventy and seventy-two, so that it is impossible to determine which is the correct reading; and internal evidence does not help at all in this case. There is nothing in the function or circumstances to indicate any reason for the specific number.

Commentators have sought parallels in the seventy elders chosen to assist Moses (Nu 11) and suppose that Jesus was incidentally indicating Himself as the "prophet like unto Moses" whom God would raise up.

Again, the Jews popularly reckoned the "number of the nations of the earth" at seventy (compare Ge 10), and some have supposed Jesus to be thus indicating that His gospel is universal. Attention is called to the fact that the Seventy are not forbidden to go to Gentiles and that their commission probably included Peraea, where many Gentiles were to be found. Some, again, have supposed that Jesus had in mind the Jewish Sanhedrin, composed of seventy (or seventy-two), and that the appointment of a like number to extend the work of His kingdom was a parabolic recognition that as the Jews were officially rejecting Him, so He was rejecting them as agents for the work of the kingdom. It is impossible to speak with any certainty as to any of these suggestions. It is to be noted that there is the same confusion between the numbers seventy and seventy-two in all four instances, as also in the tradition as to the number of translators of the Septuagint.

Inasmuch as no further mention is made of these workers, it is to be understood that they were appointed for a temporary ministry. Tradition names several of them and identifies them with disciples active after Pentecost. While it is probable that some of these were witnesses later, the tradition is worthless in details. The mission of these and the reason assigned for their appointment are essentially the same as in the case of the Twelve. Jesus is now completing His last popular campaign in preaching and introducing the kingdom of heaven. The employing of these in this service is in line with the permanent ideal of Christianity, which makes no distinction between the "laymen" and the "clergy" in responsibility and service. Jesus was perhaps employing all whose experience and sympathy made them fit for work in the harvest that was so plenteous while the laborers were few. He found seventy such now as He would find a hundred and twenty such after His ascension (Ac 1:15).

William Owen Carver

SEVENTY WEEKS

The "seventy weeks" of the prophecy in Da 9:24-27 have long been a subject of controversy in the critical schools. The conflicting views may be seen very fully in Dr. Driver's Daniel, 94 ff, 143 ff, and Dr. Pusey's Daniel the Prophet, lectionaries II, III, IV. On both sides it is agreed that the "weeks" in this prophecy are to be interpreted as "weeks of years," i.e. the 70 weeks represent 490 years. This period, commencing with "the going forth of the commandments to restore and build Jerus" (Da 9:25), is divided into three parts, 7 weeks (49 years), 62 weeks (434 years), and one week (7 years). The 69 weeks extend to the appearance of "an anointed one (Hebrew "Messiah"), the prince" (Da 9:25), who, after the 62 weeks, shall be "cut off" (Da 9:26), apparently in the "midst" of the 70th week (Da 9:27). On the traditional view (see Pusey), the 69 weeks (483 years) mark the interval from the decree to rebuild Jerusalem till the appearance of Christ; and if, with Pusey, the decree in question be taken to be that of the 7th year of Artaxerxes (457-56 BC; the mission of Ezra; compare Ezr 7:8 ff), confirmed and extended in the 20th year of the same king (mission of Nehemiah; compare Ne 2:1 ff), the 483 years run out about 27-28 AD, when our Lord's public ministry began. On the other hand, the view which supposes that the Book of Daniel belongs wholly to the Maccabean age, and does not here contain genuine prediction, is under the necessity of making the 490 years terminate with the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (171-164 BC), and this, it is admitted, cannot be done. To give time the violent expedient is adopted of dating the commencement of the 70 weeks from the prophecy of Jeremiah of the 70 years' captivity, or of the rebuilding of Jerusalem (606 or 587 BC), i.e. before the captivity had begun. Even this, as Dr. Driver admits (p. 146), leaves us in 171 BC, some 67 years short of the duration of the 62 weeks, and a huge blunder of the writer of Daniel has to be assumed. The divergent reckonings are legion, and are mutually contradictory (see table in Pusey, p. 217). To invalidate the older view Dr. Driver avails himself of the altered renderings of Da 9:25 and 27 in the English Revised Version. It is to be noted, however, that the American Standard Revised Version does not follow the English Revised Version in these changes. Thus, whereas the English Revised Version reads in 9:25, "Unto the anointed one; the prince, shall be seven weeks: and threescore and two weeks, it shall be built again," and accordingly takes "the anointed one" of 9:26 to be a distinct person, the American Standard Revised Version (as also the English Revised Version margin) reads, as in the King James Version, "shall be seven weeks, and threescore and two weeks." Again, where the English Revised Version reads in Da 9:27 "For the half of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease," the American Standard Revised Version (and the English Revised Version margin) has as formerly, "In the midst of the week he shall cause" etc. (conversely, in 9:25 the American Revised Version margin gives the English Revised Version rendering). The question cannot be discussed here, but it is believed that the traditional interpretation may yet claim acceptance from those who do not accept the postulates of the newer critical writers.

See DANIEL; JUBILEES, BOOK OF.

James Orr

SEVENTY YEARS

The period assigned by Jeremiah for the duration of the Jewish exile in Babylon (Jer 25:11,12; 29:10;

compare 2Ch 36:21; Ezr 1:1; Da 9:2). If the period be reckoned from the date of the first deportation in the 4th year of Jehoiakim (2Ki 24:1; 2Ch 36:6; Da 1:1 by another reckoning calls it the 3rd year), i.e. 606 BC, till the decree of Cyrus, 536 BC, the prediction was fulfilled to a year.

See CAPTIVITY.

SEVER

sev'-er: The three Hebrew words badhal, palah and paradh are thus translated. The idea conveyed is that of setting apart (Le 20:26 the King James Version) or of setting someone or something apart in a miraculous way (Ex 8:22; 9:4 the King James Version, the English Revised Version), or, again, of simple separation on one's own volition (Jud 4:11 the King James Version, the English Revised Version). The Greek word aphorizo (Mt 13:49) stands for final judicial segregation.

SEVERAL; SEVERALLY

sev'-er-al, sev'-er-al-i: The Hebrew words chophshuth and chophshith, translated "several" in the King James Version, the English Revised Version, 2Ki 15:5; 2Ch 26:21, are in both cases translated "separate" in the American Standard Revised Version, and indicate ceremonial uncleanness and consequent severance on account of leprosy. In the parable of the Talents (Mt 25:15) and also in 1Co 12:11 the word idios, is translated "several," "severally." In both cases it points to the individuality of the recipients of the gift bestowed.

SHAALABBIN

sha-a-lab'-in (sha'alabbin; Codex Vaticanus Salabein; Codex Alexandrinus Salamein): A town in the territory of Da named between Irshemesh and Aijalon (Jos 19:42). It seems to be identical with SHAALBIM.

SHAALBIM

sha-al'-bim (sha'albim; Codex Vaticanus Bethalamei; Codex Alexandrinus Salabeim, in Joshua, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Thalabeim): When the Amorites had forced the children of Da into the mountain they came and dwelt in Mt. Heres, Aijalon and Shaalbim, where, it appears, they were made tributary to the house of Joseph (Jud 1:35). In the time of Solomon it was included in the administrative district presided over by Ben-deker, along with Makaz, Beth-shemesh and Elon-beth-hanan (1Ki 4:9). Beth-shemesh is the same as Ir-shemesh (Jos 19:42). Shaalbim is probably only another name of Shaalabbin. One of David's mighty men is called Eliahba the Shaalbonite. This presumes the existence of a town called Shaalbon (2Sa 23:32; 1Ch 11:33), which again is probably identical with Shaalbim. Eusebius (in Onomasticon) identifies it with Salaba, a large village in the district of Sebaste (Samaria), which apparently Eusebius and Jerome thought to be in the territory of Dan. It seems,

however, too far to the North. Jerome in his commentary on Eze 48 speaks of the towers of Aijalon and Selebi and Emmaus. Conder would identify Selebi with Selbit, 3 miles Northwest of Aijalon (Yalo), and 8 miles North of Bethshemesh. This would suit for Shaalbim, as far as position is concerned; but it is difficult to account for the heavy "T" (Hebrew letter Tet) in the name, if derived from Shaalbim.

W. Ewing

SHAALBONITE

sha-al-bo'-nit, sha-al'-bo-nit (ha-sha'alboni; ho Salaboneites (2Sa 23:32) Codex Vaticanus ho Homei; Codex Alexandrinus ho Salaboni): Eliahba, one of David's heroes, a native of Shaalbon.

See SHAALBIM.

SHAALIM, LAND OF

sha'-a-lim ('erets sha'alim; Codex Vaticanus tes ges Easakem; Codex Alexandrinus tes ges Saaleim; the King James Version Shalim): Saul in search of his father's asses passed through Mt. Ephraim and the land of Shalishah, then through the land of Shaalim and the land of yemini. This last name English Versions of the Bible renders "Benjamin" (1Sa 9:4). The whole passage is so obscure that no certain conclusions can be reached. The search party may have proceeded northward from Gibeah, through the uplands of Ephraim, turning then westward, then southward, and finally eastward. We should thus look for the land of Shalishah and the land of Shaalim on the west side of the mountain range: and the latter may have been on the slopes to the East of Lydda. Possibly we ought here to read "Shaalbim," instead of "Shaalim."

W. Ewing

SHAAPH

shy'-af (sha'aph):

(1) A son of Jahdai (1Ch 2:47).

(2) The son of Maachah, a concubine of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel. Shaaph is called the "father," or founder, of the city Madmannah (1Ch 2:48 f).

SHAARAIM

sha-a-ra'-im (sha'arayim, "two gates"; Sakareim; the King James Version Sharaim):

(1) A city in the Shephelah or "lowland" of Judah mentioned (Jos 15:36) in close association with Socoh and Azekah; the vanquished army of the Philistines passed a Shaaraim in their flight from Socoh toward Gath and Ekron (1Sa 17:52). It is possible that in this latter reference the "two gates" may refer—as Septuagint implies—to the two Philistine strongholds themselves. Shaaraim has been identified with Tell Zakariya (see however AZEKAH) and with Kh. Sa‘ireh (PEF, III, 124, Sh XVII), an old site West of Beit ‘Atab. Both proposals are hazardous.

(2) One of the towns of Simeon (1Ch 4:31), called (Jos 19:6) "Sharuhen" and, as one of the uttermost cities of Judah, called (Jos 15:32) "Shilhim." This town was in Southwestern Palestine and is very probably identical with the fortress Sharhana, a place of some importance on the road from Gaza to Egypt. Aahmes (XVIIIth Dynasty) besieged and captured this city in the 5th year of his reign in his pursuit of the flying Hyksos (Petrie, Hist, II, 22, 35), and a century later Tahutmes III, in the 23rd year of his reign, took the city of Sharuhen on his way to the siege and capture of Megiddo (Petrie, Hist, II, 104). On philological grounds Tell esh-Sheri‘ah, 12 miles Northwest of Beersheba, large ruin, has been proposed, but it does not suit at all the Egyptian data (PEF, III, 399, Sh XXIV).

E. W. G. Masterman

SHAASHGAZ

sha-ash’-gaz (sha‘ashgaz; Septuagint reads Gai, the same name it gives to the official referred to in Es 2:8,15; the name may go back to the Old Bactrian word Sasakshant, "one anxious to learn" (Scheft); most commentators suggest no explanation): A chamberlain of Ahasuerus, king of Persia; as keeper of "the second house of women," he had Esther under his charge (2:14).

SHABBETHAI

shab’-e-thi (shabbethay, "one born on the Sabbath"; Codex Vaticanus Sabathai; Codex Alexandrinus Kabbathai =" Sabbateus" of 1 Esdras 9:14): A Levite who opposed (?) Ezra’s suggestion that the men who had married foreign wives put them aside (Ezr 10:15). Kuenen, however, renders the phrase ‘amedhu ‘al zo’th, of which Asahiel and Jahaziah are the subjects, to mean "stand over," "have charge of," rather than "stand against," "oppose" (Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 247 f); this would make Shabbethai, who was in accord with the two men mentioned above, an ally rather than an opponent of Ezra. We incline toward Kuenen’s interpretation in view of the position attained by Shabbethai under Nehemiah—one he would have been unlikely to attain had he been hostile to Ezra. He is mentioned among those appointed to explain the Law (Ne 8:7), and as one of the chiefs of the Levites who had the oversight of "the outward business of the house of God" (Ne 11:16).

Horace J. Wolf

SHACHIA

sha-ki’-a, shak’-i-a (sakheyah (so Baer, Ginsberg); some editions read sakheya’, or sakheya’; also shakheyah, and shabheyah. This last reading is favored by the Syrian and the Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus Sabia; Codex Alexandrinus Sebia, but Lucian, Sechia); the forms in "kh" instead of "bh" have the support of the Vulgate, Sechia, "Yahweh has forgotten" (?)): A name in genealogy of Benjamin (1Ch 8:10).

SHADDAI

shad’-a-i, shad’-i.

See GOD, NAMES OF, II, 8.

SHADE; SHADOW; SHADOWING

shad, shad’-o, shad’-o-ing (tsel; skia): A shadow is any obscuration of the light and heat with the form of the intervening object, obscurely projected, constantly changing and passing away. "Shadow" is used literally of a roof (Ge 19:8), of mountains (Jud 9:36), of trees (Jud 9:15, etc.), of wings (Ps 17:8, etc.), of a cloud (Isa 25:5), of a great rock (Isa 32:2), of a man (Peter, Ac 5:15), of the shadow on the dial (2Ki 20:9, etc.), of Jonah’s gourd (Jon 4:5 f). It is used also figuratively

(1) of shelter and protection (of man, Ge 19:8; So 2:3; Isa 16:3, etc.; of God, Ps 36:7; 91:1; Isa 4:6, etc.);

(2) of anything fleeting or transient, as of the days of man’s life on earth (1Ch 29:15; Job 8:9; Ps 109:23);

(3) with the idea of obscurity or imperfection (in Heb 8:5; 10:1, of the Law; compare Col 2:17);

(4) of darkness, gloom; see SHADOW OF DEATH.

In Jas 1:17, we have in the King James Version, "the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning" (aposkiasma); the Revised Version (British and American) "shadow that is cast by turning"; the reference is to the unchangeableness of God as contrasted with the changes of the heavenly bodies. the Revised Version (British and American) has "of the rustling of wings" for "shadowing with wings" in Isa 18:1; the American Standard Revised Version has "shade" for "shadow" in various places (Jud 9:15; Job 40:22; Isa 4:6, etc.). In Job 40:21,22, for "shady trees" the Revised Version (British and American) has "lotus-trees."

W. L. Walker

SHADOW OF DEATH

(tsalmaweth): The Hebrew word translated "shadow of death" is used poetically for thick darkness (Job 3:5), as descriptive of Sheol (Job 10:21 f; 12:22; 38:17); figuratively of deep distress (Job 12:22; 16:16; 24:17; 28:3; 34:22 (in the last three passages the American Standard Revised Version has "thick darkness" and "thick gloom"); Ps 23:4, the Revised Version margin "deep darkness (and so elsewhere)"; 44:19; 107:10,14; Isa 9:2; Jer 2:6; 13:16; Am 5:8; Mt 4:16; Lu 1:79, skia thanatou). The Hebrew word is perhaps composed of tsel, "shadow," and maweth, "death," and the idea of "the valley of the shadow of death" was most probably derived from the deep ravines, darkened by over-hanging briars, etc., through which the shepherd had sometimes to lead or drive his sheep to new and better pastures.

W. L. Walker

SHADRACH

sha’-drak: The Babylonian name of one of the so-called Hebrew children. Shadrach is probably the Sumerian form of the Bah Kudurru-Aki, "servant of Sin." It has been suggested by Meinhold that we should read Merodach instead of Shadrach. Since there were no vowels in the original Hebrew or Aramaic, and since "sh" and "m" as well as "r" and "d" are much alike in the old alphabet in which Daniel was written, this change is quite possible.

Shadrach and his two companions were trained along with Daniel at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, who had carried all four captive in the expedition against Jerusalem in the 3rd year of Jehoiakim (Da 1:1). They all refused to eat of the food provided by Ashpenaz, the master who had been set over them by the king, but preferred to eat pulse (Da 1:12). The effect was much to their advantage, as they appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than those who ate of the king’s meat. At the end of the appointed time they passed satisfactory examinations, both as to their physical appearance and their intellectual acquirements, so that none were found like them among all with whom the king communed, and they stood before the king (see Da 1).

When Daniel heard that the wise men of Babylon were to be slain because they could not tell the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, after he had gained a respite from the king, he made the thing known to his three companions that they might unite with him in prayer to the God of heaven that they all might not perish with the rest of the wise men of Babylon. After God had heard their prayer and the dream was made known to the king by Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar, at Daniel’s request, set Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego over the affairs of the province of Babylon (Da 2). With Meshach and Abed-nego, Shadrach was cast into a fiery furnace, but escaped unhurt (Da 3).

See ABED-NEGO; HANANIAH; SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN.

R. Dick Wilson

SHADY, TREES

shad’-i (Job 40:21 f).

See LOTUS TREES.

SHAFT

shaft: Isa 49:2 for chets, "an arrow"; also Ex 25:31; 37:17; Nu 8:4 the King James Version for a part of the candlestick of the tabernacle somewhat vaguely designated by the word yarekh, "thigh." The context in the first 2 verses shows that the upright stem or "shaft" is intended, but in Nu 8:4 a different context has caused the Revised Version (British and American) to substitute "base."

See also ARCHERY; ARMOR, ARMS.

SHAGEE

sha’-ge (shaghe’; Codex Vaticanus Sola; Codex Alexandrinus Sage; the King James Version Shage): The father of Jonathan, one of David’s heroes (1Ch 11:34).

SHAHAPAIM

sha-ha-ra’-im (shacharayim; Codex Vaticanus Saarel; Codex Alexandrinus Saarem): A Benjamite name (1Ch 8:8). The passage is corrupt beyond only the most tentative emendation. "Sharaim" has no connection with the foregoing text. One of the suggested restorations of 1Ch 8:8,9 reads: "And Shaharaim begat in the field of Moab, after he had driven them (i.e. the Moabites) out, from Hodesh his wife, Jobab," etc. (Curtis, International Critical Commentary).

SHAHAZUMAH

sha-ha-zoo’-ma, sha-haz’-oo-ma (shachatsumah; Codex Vaticanus Saleim kata thalassan; Codex Alexandrinus Saseimath; the King James Version Shahazimah, sha-haz’i-mah): A town in the territory of Issachar on the boundary which ran from Tabor to the Jordan (Jos 19:22). The site, which has not yet been recovered, must be sought, probably, to the Southeast of the mountain.

SHALEM

sha’-lem (shalem; eis Salem): The word as a place-name occurs only in Ge 33:18. With Luther, following Septuagint, Peshitta and Vulgate, the King James Version reads "And Jacob came to Shalem, a city of Shechem." the Revised Version (British and American) with the Targums Onqelos and pseudo-Jonathan, the Samaritan codex and the Arabic, reads "came in peace to the city of Shechem." There is a heavy balance of opinion among scholars in favor of the latter reading. It is certainly a remarkable fact, supporting the King James Version, that about 4 miles East of Shechem (Nablus), there is a village

bearing the name Salem. If the King James Version is right, this must represent the city referred to; and East of Salem would transpire the events recorded in Ge 44. Against this is the old tradition locating Jacob's well and Joseph's tomb near to Shechem. Eusebius (in Onomasticon) gets over the difficulty by identifying Shalem with Shechem.

W. Ewing

SHALIM

sha'-lim.

See SHAALIM.

SHALISHAH, LAND OF

sha-li'-sha, shal'-i-sha ('erets shalishah; Codex Vaticanus he ge Selcha; Codex Alexandrinus he ge Salissa): If the general indication of the route followed by Saul, given under SHAALIM, is correct, the land of Shalishah (1Sa 9:4) will lie to the Northeast of Lydda on the western slope of the range. Baal-shalishah would most likely be in the district, and may indeed have given its name to it. If Conder is right in identifying this city with Khirbet Kefr Thilth, about 19 miles Northeast of Jaffa, it meets well enough the general indication given above. Eusebius, Onomasticon knows the name, but gives no guidance as to where the district is. Baal-shalishah it places in the Thamnite region, 15 miles North of Diospolis (Lydda). No boundaries can be laid down, but probability points to this neighborhood.

W. Ewing

SHALLECHETH, THE GATE

shal'-e-keth, sha-le'-keth (sha'ar shallekheth, i.e. as in margin, "Casting forth"): A gate of the temple "at the causeway that goeth up" (1Ch 26:16)—probably an ascent from the Tyropoeon Valley to the West of the temple. It has been supposed on account of the meaning of the name that the ashes and offal of the temple were cast forth there, but this is very unlikely—they were thrown into the Kidron valley to the East or Southeast. The Septuagint has pastophorion, which seems to point to a building with chambers; in consonance with this Cheyne reads in the Hebrew lishkoth, "(of) the chambers."

E. W. G. Masterman

SHALLUM (1)

shal'-um (shallum, shallum; various forms in the Septuagint): This is the name of not less than 12 Hebrew persons:

(1) The youngest son of Naphtali (1Ch 7:13). He is also called "Shillem" in Ge 46:24; Nu 26:49.

(2) A descendant of Simeon, the son of Shaul and the father of Mibsam (1Ch 4:25). He lived in 1618 BC.

(3) The son of Sismai "son" of Shesham of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:40,41). He lived in 1300 BC.

(4) A son of Kore, a porter of the sanctuary during the reign of David (1Ch 9:17,19,31; Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45). The name is also written "Meshullam" in Ne 12:25, "Salum" in 1 Esdras 5:28, "Meshelemiah" in 1Ch 26:1,2,9, and "Shelemiah" in 1Ch 26:14. He lived about 1050 BC.

(5) A son of Zadok and father of Hilkiah, a high priest and ancestor of Ezra the scribe (1Ch 6:12,13; Ezr 7:2). In the works of Josephus he is called "Sallumus"; in 1 Esdras 8:1, "Salem," and in 2 Esdras 1:1, "Salemas."

(6) The 15th king of Israel. See following article.

(7) A son of Bani, a priest who had taken a heathen wife and was compelled by Ezra the scribe to put her away (Ezr 10:42; omitted in 1 Esdras 9:34).

(8) The father of Jehizkiah, an Ephraimite in the time of Ahaz king of Israel (2Ch 28:12).

(9) The husband of the prophetess Huldah (2Ki 22:14; 2Ch 34:22). He was the keeper of the sacred wardrobe and was probably the uncle of Jeremiah the prophet (Jer 32:7; compare Jer 35:4).

(10) King of Judah and son of Josiah (Jer 22:11; 1Ch 3:15), better known by the name Jehoahaz II. This name he received when he ascended the throne of the kingdom of Judah (2Ch 36:1).

(11) A Levite who was a porter at the time of Ezra (Ezr 10:24; "Sallumus" in 1 Esdras 9:25).

(12) A ruler over a part of Jerusalem and a son of Hallohesh. He with his daughters aided in building the walls of Jerusalem in the time of Nehemiah (Ne 3:12).

S. L. Umbach

SHALLUM (2)

(shallum, shallum, "the requited one" (2Ki 15:10-15)): The 15th king of Israel, and successor of Zechariah, whom he publicly assassinated in the 7th month of his reign. Nothing more is known of Shallum than that he was a son of Jabesh, which may indicate that he was a Gileadite from beyond

Jordan. He is said to have made "a conspiracy" against Zechariah, so was not alone in his crime. The conspirators, however, had but a short-lived success, as, when Shallum had "reigned for the space of a month in Samaria," Menahem, then at Tirzah, one of the minor capitals of the kingdom, went up to Samaria, slew him and took his place.

It was probably at this time that Syria threw off the yoke of tribute to Israel (see JEROBOAM, II), as when next we meet with that kingdom, it is under its own king and in alliance with Samaria (2Ki 16:5).

The 10 years of rule given to Menahem (2Ki 15:17) may be taken to include the few months of military violence under Zechariah and Shallum, and cover the full years 758-750, with portions of years before and after counted as whole ones. The unsuccessful usurpation of Shallum may therefore be put in 758 BC (some date lower).

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHALLUN shal'-un (shallun, not in the Septuagint): Another form of Shallum, the son of Col-hozeh. He was the ruler of the district of Mizpah. He assisted Nehemiah in building the wall of Jerusalem and in repairing the gate by the Pool of Siloah at the King's Gardens (Ne 3:15).

SHALMAI

shal'-mi, shal'-ma-i: the King James Version form in Ezr 2:46 for "Shamlai"; Ne 7:48 "Salmai" (which see).

SHALMAN

shal'-man (shalman): A name of uncertain meaning, found only once in the Old Testament (Ho 10:14), in connection with a place-name, equally obscure, "as Shalman destroyed Betharbel." Shalman is most commonly interpreted as a contracted form of Shalmaneser, the name of several Assyrian kings. If this explanation is correct, the king referred to cannot be identified. Some have thought of Shalmaneser IV, who is said to have undertaken expeditions against the West in 775 and in 773-772. Others have proposed Shalmaneser V, who attacked Samaria in 725. This, however, is improbable, because the activity of Hosea ceased before Shalmaneser V became king. Shalman has also been identified with Salamanu, a king of Moab in the days of Hosea, who paid tribute to Tiglath-pileser V of Assyria; and with Shalmah, a North Arabian tribe that invaded the Negeb. The identification of BETH-ARBEL (which see) is equally uncertain. From the reference it would seem that the event in question was well known and, therefore, probably one of recent date and considerable importance, but our present historical knowledge does not enable us to connect any of the persons named with the destruction of any of the localities suggested for Beth-arbel. The ancient translations offer no solution; they too seem to have been in the dark.

F. C. Eiselen

SHALMANESER

shal-ma-ne’-zer (shalman’ecer; Septuagint Samennasar, Salmandsar): The name of several Assyrian kings. See ASSYRIA; CAPTIVITY. It is Shalmaneser IV who is mentioned in the Biblical history (2Ki 17:3; 18:9). He succeeded Tiglathpileser on the throne in 727 BC, but whether he was a son of his predecessor, or a usurper, is not apparent. His reign was short, and, as no annals of it have come to light, we have only the accounts contained in 2 Kings for his history. In the passages referred to above, we learn that Hoshea, king of Israel, who had become his vassal, refused to continue the payment of tribute, relying upon help from So, king of Egypt. No help, however, came from Egypt, and Hoshea had to face the chastising forces of his suzerain with his own unaided resources, the result being that he was taken prisoner outside Samaria and most likely carried away to Nineveh. The Biblical narrative goes on to say that the king of Assyria came up throughout all the land, and went up to Samaria and besieged it 3 years. There is reason to believe that, as the siege of Samaria was proceeding, Shalmaneser retired to Nineveh and died, for, when the city was taken in 722 BC, it is Sargon who claims, in his copious annals, to have captured it and carried its inhabitants into captivity. It is just possible that Shalman (Ho 10:14) is a contraction for Shalmaneser, but the identity of Shalman and of Beth-arbel named in the same passage is not sufficiently made out.

LITERATURE.

Schrader, COT, I, 258 ff; McCurdy, HPM, I, 387 ff.

T. Nicol

SHAMA

sha’-ma (shama‘): One of David’s heroes (1Ch 11:44).

SHAMAI

sham’-a-i.

See SALMAI.

SHAMARIAH

sham-a-ri’-a, sha-mar’-ya.

See SHEMARIAH.

SHAMBLES

sham’-b’-lz (makellon): A slaughter-house; then a butcher’s stall, meat-market. The word is once used in the New Testament in 1Co 10:25.

SHAME

sham (bosh, "to be ashamed," bosheth, "shame," qalon; aischune, "ignominy," atimia, "dishonor," and other words): An oft-recurring word in Scripture almost uniformly bound up with a sense of sin and guilt. It is figuratively set forth as a wild beast (Jer 3:24), a Nessus-garment (Jer 3:25), a blight (Jer 20:18), a sin against one’s own soul (Hab 2:10), and twice as the condensed symbol of Hebrew abomination—Baal (Jer 11:13 margin; Ho 9:10 margin; see ISH-BOSHETH). It is bracketed with defeat (Isa 30:3), reproach (Ps 69:7; Isa 54:4; Mic 2:6), confusion (Isa 6:7), nakedness (Isa 47:3; Mic 1:11), everlasting contempt (Da 12:2), folly (Pr 18:13), cruelty (Isa 50:6; Heb 12:2), poverty (Pr 13:18), nothingness (Pr 9:7 the King James Version), unseemliness (1Co 11:6; 14:35 the King James Version; Eph 5:12), and "them that go down to the pit" (Eze 32:25). In the first Biblical reference to this emotion, "shame" appears as "the correlative of sin and guilt" (Delitzsch, New Commentary on Genesis and Biblical Psychology). Shamelessness is characteristic of abandoned wickedness (Php 3:19; Jude 1:13, margin "Greek: ‘shames’"). Manifestly, then, shame is a concomitant of the divine judgment upon sin; the very worst that a Hebrew could wish for an enemy was that he might be clothed with shame (Ps 109:29), that the judgment of God might rest upon him visibly.

Naturally, to the Hebrew, shame was the portion of those who were idolaters, who were faithless to Yahweh or who were unfriendly to themselves—the elect people of Yahweh. Shame is to come upon Moab because Moab held Israel in derision (Jer 48:39,27), and upon Edom "for violence against his brother Jacob" (Ob 1:10). But also, and impartially, shame is the portion of faithless Israelites who deny Yahweh and follow after strange gods (Eze 7:18; Mic 7:10; Ho 10:6, and often). But shame, too, comes upon those who exalt themselves against God, who trust in earthly power and the show of material strength (2Ch 32:21; Isa 30:3); and upon those who make a mock of righteousness (Job 8:22; Ps 35:26; 132:18). With a fine sense of ethical distinctions the Biblical writers recognize that in confessing to a sense of shame there is hope for better things. Only in the most desperate cases is there no sense of shame (Ho 4:18; Ze 3:5; Php 3:19; Jude 1:13); in pardon God is said to remove shame (Isa 54:4 twice; Isa 61:7).

On conditions beyond the grave the Biblical revelation is exceedingly reticent, but here and there are hints that shame waits upon the wicked here and hereafter. Such an expression as that in Daniel (12:2) cannot be ignored, and though the writing itself may belong to a late period and a somewhat sophisticated theological development, the idea is but a reflection of the earlier and more elementary period, when the voice of crime and cruelty went up from earth to be heard in the audience chamber of God (Ge 4:11; 6:13). In the New Testament there is similar reticence but also similar implications. It cannot be much amiss to say that in the mind of the Biblical writers sin was a shameful thing; that part

of the punishment for sin was a consciousness of guilt in the sense of shame; and that from this consciousness of guilt there was no deliverance while the sin was unconfessed and unforgiven. "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." From one's own past there is no deliverance, save through contrition of spirit and the grace and forgiveness of God. While the sense of shame persists, or, in other words, while the moral constitution of man's nature remains as it is, there will never be wanting an avenger of sin.

Charles M. Stuart

SHAMED

sha'-med.

See SHEMED.

SHAMEFACEDNESS

sham'-fast-nes, sham-fas'-ed-nes.

See SHAMEFASTNESS.

SHAMEFASTNESS

sham'-fast-nes: The original the King James Version translation of aidos, in Sirach 41:16 and 1Ti 2:9. Perhaps half a century later the spelling "shamefacedness" supplanted the better form, and continues in the ordinary editions of the King James Version. The Revised Version (British and American), however, rightly restores "shamefastness."

SHAMER

sha'-mer.

See SHEMER.

SHAMGAR

sham'-gar (shamgar):

1. Biblical Account:

One of the judges, son of Anath (‘anath), in whose days, which preceded the time of Deborah (Jud 5:6,7) and followed those of Ehud, Israel’s subjugation was so complete that "the highways were unoccupied, and the travelers walked through byways." The government had become thoroughly disorganized, and apparently, as in the days of Deborah, the people were entirely unprepared for war. Shamgar’s improvised weapon with which he helped to "save Israel" is spoken of as an oxgoad. With this he smote of the Philistines 600 men. This is the first mention of the Philistines as troublesome neighbors of the Israelites (Jud 3:31). According to a tradition represented in Josephus (Ant., V, iv, 3), Shamgar died in the year he became judge.

2. Critical Hypotheses:

Several writers have challenged the Biblical account on the following grounds: that in Jud 5 no mention is made of any deliverance; that the name "Shamgar" resembles the name of a Hittite king and the name "Anath" that of a Syrian goddess; that the deed recorded in Jud 3:31 is analogous to that of Samson (Jud 15:15), and that of Shammah, son of Agee (2Sa 23:11 f); and lastly, that in a group of Greek manuscripts and other versions this verse is inserted after the account of Samson’s exploits. None of these is necessarily inconsistent with the traditional account. Neverthelesss, they have been used as a basis not only for overthrowing the tradition, but also for constructive theories such as that which makes Shamgar a foreign oppressor and not a judge, and even the father of Sisera. There is, of course, no limit to which this kind of interesting speculation cannot lead.

(For a complete account of these views see Moore, "Judges," in ICC, 1895, 104 f, and same author in Journal of the American Oriental Society, XIX, 2, 159-60.)

Ella Davis Isaacs

SHAMHUTH

sham’-huth.

See SHAMMUAH, IV.

SHAMIR (1)

sha’-mer (shamir; Sameir):

(1) Mentioned along with Jattir and Socoh (Jos 15:48) as one of the cities of Judah in the hill country. Possibly it is Khirbet (or Umm) Somerah, 2,000 ft. above sea-level, a site with ancient walls, caves, cisterns and tombs not far West of Debir (edh Dhatheriyeh) and 2 miles North of Anab (‘Anab) (Palestine Exploration Fund, III, 262, 286, Sh XX).

(2) A place in the hill country of Ephraim (Jud 10:1) from which came "Tola, the son of Pual, a man of Issachar," who judged Israel 23 years; he died and was buried there. It is an attractive theory (Schwartz) which would identify the place with the semi-fortified and strongly-placed town of Sanur on the road from Nablus to Jenin. A local chieftain in the early part of the last century fortified Sanur and from there dominated the whole district. That Sanur could hardly have been within the bounds of Issachar is an objection, but not necessarily a fatal one. It is noticeable that the Septuagint's Codex Alexandrinus has Samareia, for Shamir (Palestine Exploration Fund, II, Sh XI).

E. W. G. Masterman

SHAMIR (2)

(shamir; Samer): A Kohathite, son of Micah (1Ch 24:24).

SHAMLAI

sham'-la-i, sham'-li.

See SALMAI.

SHAMMA

sham'-a (shamma'; Codex Vaticanus Sema; Codex Alexandrinus Samma): An Asherite (1Ch 7:37).

SHAMMAH

sham'-a (shammah):

(1) The son of Reuel, the son of Esau, a tribal chief of Edom (Ge 36:13,17; 1Ch 1:37, Some).

(2) The third son of Jesse and brother of David. Together with his two other brothers he fought under Saul in the campaign against the Philistines and was with the army in the valley of Elah when David slew Goliath (1Sa 17:13). One redactor states that he was a witness of the anointing of David by Samuel (1Sa 16:1-13). He was the father of Jonadab, the friend of Amnon (2Sa 13:3), and that Jonathan whose victory over a Philistine giant is narrated in 2Sa 21:20 ff was also his son. His name is rendered as "Shammah" (1Sa 16:9; 17:13), "Shimeah" (2Sa 13:3,12), "Shimei" (2Sa 21:21), and "Shimea" (1Ch 2:13; 20:7).

(3) The son of Agee, a Hararite, one of the "three mighty men" of David (2Sa 23:11, Septuagint Samaia), who held the field against the Philistines. The parallel passage (1Ch 11:10) ascribes this deed to Eleazar, the son of Dodo. The succeeding incident (2Sa 23:13), namely, the famous act of three of

David’s heroes who risked their lives to bring their leader water from the well of Bethlehem, has frequently been credited to Shammah and two other members of "the three"; but the three warriors are plainly said (2Sa 23:13) to belong to "the thirty"; 2Sa 23:33 should read "Jonathan, son of Shammah, the Hararite." Jonathan, one of David’s "thirty," was a son of Shammah; the word "son" has been accidentally omitted (Driver, Budde, Kittel, etc.). The parallel passage (1Ch 11:34) has "son of Shagee," which is probably, a misreading for "son of Agee." Lucian’s version, "son of Shammah," is most plausible. "Shimei the son of Ela" (1Ki 4:18) should also appear in this passage if Lucian’s reading of "Ela" for "Agee" (2Sa 23:11) be correct.

(4) A Harodite (2Sa 23:25,33), i.e. probably a native of ‘Ain-charod (‘Ain Jalud, Jud 7:1; see HAROD). One of "the thirty" and captain of Solomon’s 5th monthly course. In the parallel lists (1Ch 11:27) he is called "the Harorite" (this last being a scribal error for Harodite) and "Shamhuth the Izrahate" (1Ch 27:8).

Horace J. Wolf

SHAMMAI sham’a-i, sham’-i (shammay):

(1) A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:28,32).

(2) The son of Rekem and father of Maon (1Ch 2:44).

(3) A Judahite (1Ch 4:17).

SHAMMOTH

sham’-oth, sham’-oth.

See SHAMMAH, (4).

SHAMMUA; SHAMMUAH

sha-mu’-a, sham’-u-a (shammua‘):

(1) The Reubenite spy (Nu 13:4, Samouel, and other forms).

(2) One of David’s sons (2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 14:4, Sammous). In 1Ch 3:5 he is called "Shimea."

(3) A Levite (Ne 11:17); he is called "Shemaiah" in 1Ch 9:16. (4) The head of a priestly family (Ne 12:18); a contemporary of Joiakim.

SHAMSHERAI

sham’-she-ri, sham-she-ra’-i (shamsheray): A Benjamite (1Ch 8:26).

SHAPE

shap: In the King James Version the translation of eidos, "form," "appearance" (Lu 3:22; Joh 5:37), and of homoioma, "likeness," "resemblance" (Re 9:7). The meaning of these words is not so much "tangible shape," in which sense we use the word in modern English, but rather "aspect," "appearance," the looks of a thing or a person. This is even the case where the word is joined with the adjective somatikos, "bodily" as in the passage Lu 3:22, "The Holy Spirit descended in a bodily form (i.e. "in a corporeal appearance," the King James Version "in a bodily shape"), as a dove, upon him." The second passage also refers to the "appearance" of God, and cannot therefore be regarded as material shape: "Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his form" (the King James Version "shape") (Joh 5:37). As has been seen from the above quotations, the Revised Version (British and American) which retains the translation "shape" for homoioma, has translated eidos with "form," which also serves to render several other Greek synonyms, such as morphe (Mr 16:12; Php 2:6 f), morphosis (Ro 2:20; 2Ti 3:5), tupos (the Revised Version margin "pattern" Ro 6:17), and hupotuposis (the Revised Version (British and American) "pattern," 2Ti 1:13). In the King James Version The Wisdom of Solomon 18:1 "shape" translates morphe, the Revised Version (British and American) "form."

H. L. E. Luering

SHAPHAM

sha’-fam (shapham; Sapham, Sabat): Name of a Gadite chief, who had the second place in command of his tribe (1Ch 5:12). So far as the fragmentary genealogies are intelligible, they seem to indicate that Shapham and his chief, Joel, lived in the time of Saul and shared in the war against the Hagrites (1Ch 5:7-10,18-22), but it is to be noted that these lists were first recorded between the years 750 and 740 BC, just before the eastern tribes were carried into captivity.

SHAPHAN

sha’-fan (shaphan, "rockbadger," English Versions of the Bible "coney"; Saphphan): An old totem clan name (so W.R. Smith; compare, however, the article TOTEMISM; Gray, Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 103 ff, and Jacob’s Studies in Biblical Archaeology, 84 ff).

(1) Son of Azaliah and scribe of King Josiah. He received from Hilkiah the Book of the Law which had been found in the Temple (2Ki 22:3 ff; 2Ch 34:8-28). It was from Shaphan’s lips that Josiah heard the Law read. Shaphan was also one of those sent by the king to the prophetess Huldah (2Ki 22; 2Ch 34). He was undoubtedly one of the staunchest supporters of Josiah in his work of reform. He was the father

of Ahikam (2Ki 22:12; 2Ch 34:20; Jer 26:24), who befriended and protected the prophet Jeremiah. Another son, Elasah, was one of the two men entrusted by Jeremiah with his letter to the captives in Babylon (Jer 29:3). A third son, Gemariah, vainly tried to prevent King Jehoiakim from burning "the roll" (Jer 36:10,11,12,25). The Micaiah of Jer 36:11,12, and Gedaliah, the governor of Judea after the captivity of 586 BC, were his grandsons (Jer 39:14).

(2) Perhaps the father of Jaazaniah, one of the 70 men whom Ezekiel saw, in his vision of the Temple, sacrificing to idols (Eze 8:11).

Horace J. Wolf

SHAPHAT

sha’-fat (shaphat):iah, one of the 70 men whom Ezekiel saw, in his vision of the Temple, sacrificing to idols (Eze 8:11).

(1) The Simeonite spy (Nu 13:5, Saphat).

(2) The father of the prophet Elisha (1Ki 19:16; 2Ki 3:11, Septuagint Saphath).

(3) A name in the royal genealogy of Judah (1Ch 3:22).

(4) A Gadite (1Ch 5:12).

(5) One of David’s herdsmen (1Ch 27:29).

SHAPHER

sha’-fer.

See SHEPHER.

SHAPHIR

sha’-fer (shaphir, "glittering"; kalos; the King James Version Saphir): One of a group of towns mentioned in Mic 1:10-15. From the association with Gath, Achzib (of Judah) and Mareshah, it would seem that the places mentioned were in Southwestern Palestine. According to Eusebius, in Onomasticon, there was a Sapheir, "in the hill country" (from a confusion with Shamir (Jos 15:48), where Septuagint A has Sapheir) between Eleutheropolis and Ascalon. The name probably survives in that of three villages called es-Suafir, in the plain, some 3 1/2 miles Southeast of Ashdod (PEF, II, 413, Sh XV). Cheyne (EB, col. 4282) suggests the white "glittering" hill Tell ec-Cafi, at the entrance to the Wady ec-Sunt, which

was known to the Crusaders as Blanchegarde, but this site seems a more probable one for GATH (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

SHARAI

sha-ra’-i, sha’-ri (sharay): One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:40).

SHARAIM

sha-ra’-im.

See SHAARAIM.

SHARAR

sha’-rar.

See SACAR.

SHARE

shar.

See PLOW.

SHAREZER

sha-re’zer (sar’etser, shar’etser): Corresponds to the Assyrian Shar-ucur, "protect the king"; found otherwise, not as a complete name, but as elements in personal names, e.g. Bel-shar-ucur, "may Bel protect the king," which is the equivalent of Belshazzar (Da 5:1). The name is borne by two persons in the Old Testament:

(1) The son of Sennacherib, king of Assyria, who with ADRAMMELECH (which see) murdered his father (2Ki 19:37; Isa 37:38). The Babylonian Chronicle says concerning Sennacherib’s death: "On the 20th day of Tebet Sennacherib, king of Assyria, was slain by his son in a revolt." This differs from the Old Testament account in that it speaks of only one murderer, and does not give his name. How the two accounts can be harmonized is still uncertain. Hitzig, (Kritik, 194 ff), following Abydenus, as quoted by Eusebius, completed the name of Sennacherib’s son, so as to read Nergal-sharezer = Nergal-shar-ucur

(Jer 39:3,13), and this is accepted by many modern scholars. Johns thinks that Sharezer (shar'etser or sar'etser) may be a corruption from Shar-etir-Ashur, the name of a son of Sennacherib (1-vol HDB, under the word). The question cannot be definitely settled.

(2) A contemporary of the prophet Zechariah, mentioned in connection with the sending of a delegation to the spiritual heads of the community to inquire concerning the propriety of continuing the fasts: "They of Beth-el had sent Sharezer and Regem-melech" (Zec 7:2). This translation creates a difficulty in connection with the succeeding words, literally, "and his men." The Revisers place in the margin as an alternative rendering, "They of Beth-el, even Sharezer .... had sent." Sharezer sounds peculiar in apposition to "they of Beth-el"; hence, some have thought, especially since Sharezer seems incomplete, that in the two words Beth-el and Sharezer we have a corruption of what was originally a single proper name, perhaps Bel-sharezer = Bel-shar-ucur = Bel-shazzar. The present text, no matter how translated, presents difficulties.

See REGEM-MELECH.

F. C. Eiselen

SHARON

shar'-un (ha-sharon, with the definite article possibly meaning "the plain"; to pedion, ho drumos, ho Saron):

(1) This name is attached to the strip of fairly level land which runs between the mountains and the shore of the Mediterranean, stretching from Nahr Ruben in the South to Mt. Carmel in the North. There are considerable rolling hills; but, compared with the mountains to the East, it is quite properly described as a plain. The soil is a deep rich loam, which is favorable to the growth of cereals. The orange, the vine and the olive grow to great perfection. When the many-colored flowers are in bloom it is a scene of rare beauty.

Of the streams in the plain four carry the bulk of the water from the western slopes of the mountains to the sea. They are also perennial, being fed by fountains. Nahr el-'Aujeh enters the sea to the North of Jaffa; Nahr Iskanderuneh 7 miles, and Nahr el-Mefjir fully 2 miles South of Caesarea; and Nahr ez-Zerqa, the "Crocodile River," 2 1/2 miles North of Caesarea. Nahr el-Falik runs its short course about 12 miles North of Nahr el-'Aujeh. Water is plentiful, and at almost any point it may be obtained by digging. Deep, finely built wells near some of the villages are among the most precious legacies left by the Crusaders. The breadth of the plain varies from 8 to 12 miles, being broadest in the Sharon. There are traces of a great forest in the northern part, which accounts for the use of the term drumos. Josephus (Ant., XIV, xiii, 3) speaks of "the woods" (hoi drumoi) and Strabo (xvi) of "a great wood." There is still a considerable oak wood in this district. The "excellency" of Carmel and Sharon (Isa 35:2) is probably an allusion to the luxuriant oak forests. As in ancient times, great breadths are given up to the pasturing of cattle. Over David's herds that fed in Sharon was Shitrai the Sharonite (1Ch 27:29). In the day of

Israel’s restoration "Sharon shall be a fold of flocks" (Isa 65:10). Jerome speaks of the fine cattle fed in the pastures of Sharon, and also sings the praises of its wine (Comm. on Isa 33 and 65). Toward the Sharon no doubt there was more cultivation then than there is at the present day. The German colony to the North of Jaffa, preserving in its name, Sarona, the old Greek name of the plain, and several Jewish colonies are proving the wonderful productiveness of the soil. The orange groves of Jaffa are far-famed.

"The rose of Sharon" (So 2:1) is a mistranslation: chabhatstseleth is not a "rose," but the white narcissus, which in season abounds in the plain.

Sharon is mentioned in the New Testament only in Ac 9:35.

(2) A district East of the Jordan, occupied by the tribe of Gad (1Ch 5:16; here the name is without the article). Kittel ("Ch," SBOT) suggests that this is a corruption from "Sirion," which again is synonymous with Hermon. He would therefore identify Sharon with the pasture lands of Hermon. Others think that the mishor or table-land of Gilead is intended.

(3) In Jos 12:18 we should perhaps read "the king of Aphek in Sharon." See LASSHARON. The order seems to point to some place Northeast of Tabor. Perhaps this is to be identified with the Sarona of Eusebius, Onomasticon, in the district between Tabor and Tiberias. If so, the name may be preserved in that of Sarona on the plateau to the Southwest of Tiberias.

W. Ewing

SHARONITE

shar’-un-it (ha-sharoni; ho Saroneites): Applied in Scripture only to Shitrai (1Ch 27:29).

See SHARON.

SHARUHEN

sha-roo’-hen (sharuchen; hoi agroi auton): One of the cities in the territory of Judah assigned to Simeon (Jos 19:6). In Jos 15:32 it is called "Shilhim," and in 1Ch 4:31, "Shaaraim" (which see).

SHASHAI

sha’-shi (shashay; Sesei): One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:40) =" Sesis" in 1 Esdras 9:34.

SHASHAK

sha’-shak (shashak): Eponym of a Benjamite family (1Ch 8:14,25).

SHAUL; SHAULITES

sha’-ul, sha’-ul-its (sha’ul; Saoul):

(1) A king of Edom (Ge 36:37 = 1Ch 1:48).

(2) A son of Simeon (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15; Nu 26:13; 1Ch 4:24). The clan was of notoriously impure stock, and, therefore, Shaul is called "the son of a Canaanitish woman" (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15); the clan was of mixed Israelite and Canaanitish descent. The patronymic Shaulites is found in Nu 26:13.

(3) An ancestor of Samuel (1Ch 6:24 (Hebrew 9)); in 1Ch 6:36 he is called "Joel."

SHAVEH, VALE OF

sha’-ve (‘emeq shaweh).

See KING’S VALE.

SHAVEH-KIRIATHAIM

sha’-ve-kir-ya-tha’-im (shaweh qiryathayim; en Saue te polei): Here Chedorlaomer is said to have defeated the Emim (Ge 14:5). the Revised Version margin reads "the plain of Kiriathaim." If this rendering is right, we must look for the place in the neighborhood of Kiriathaim of Moab (Jer 48:1, etc.), which is probably represented today by el-Qareiyat, about 7 miles to the North of Dibon.

SHAVING

shav’-ing (in Job 1:20, gazaz, usually galach; in Ac 21:24, xurao): Customs as to shaving differ in different countries, and in ancient and modern times. Among the Egyptians it was customary to shave the whole body (compare Ge 41:14). With the Israelites, shaving the head was a sign of mourning (De 21:12; Job 1:20); ordinarily the hair was allowed to grow long, and was only cut at intervals (compare Absalom, 2Sa 14:26). Nazirites were forbidden to use a razor, but when their vow was expired, or if they were defiled, they were to shave the whole head (Nu 6:5,9,18 ; compare Ac 21:24). The shaving of the beard was not permitted to the Israelites; they were prohibited from shaving off even "the corner of their beard" (Le 21:5). It was an unpardonable insult when Hanun, king of the Ammonites, cut off the half of the beards of the Israelites whom David had sent to him (2Sa 10:4; 1Ch 19:4).

Shaving "with a razor that is hired" is Isaiah’s graphic figure to denote the complete devastation of Judah by the Assyrian army (Isa 7:20).

James Orr

SHAVSHA

shav’-sha (shawsha’; in 2Sa 20:25, Kethibh, sheya’, Kere, shewa’, English Versions of the Bible "Sheva," are refuted by the Septuagint; in 2Sa 8:15-18, in other respects identical with Chronicles, "Seraiah" is found; the Septuagint varies greatly in all passages; it is the general consensus that Shavsha is correct): State secretary or scribe during the reign of David (1Ch 18:16; 2Sa 20:25). He was the first occupant of this office, which was created by David. It is significant that his father’s name is omitted in the very exact list of David’s officers of state (1Ch 18:14-17 parallel 2Sa 8:15-18); this fact, coupled with the foreign sound of his name, points to his being an "alien"; the assumption that the state secretary handled correspondence with other countries may explain David’s choice of a foreigner for this post. Shavsha’s two sons, Elihoreph and Ahijah, were secretaries of state under Solomon; they are called "sons of Shisha" (1Ki 4:3), "Shisha" probably being a variant of "Shavsha."

Horace J. Wolf

SHAWL

shol: the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "shawls" for the King James Version "wimples" in Isa 3:22.

See DRESS.

SHEAF; SHEAVES

shef, shevz (’alummah, ‘omer, ‘amir): When the grain is reaped, it is laid in handfuls back of the reaper to be gathered by children or those who cannot stand the harder work of reaping (Ps 129:7). The handfuls are bound into large sheaves, two of which are laden at a time on a donkey (compare Ne 13:15). In some districts carts are used (compare Am 2:13). The sheaves are piled about the threshing-floors until threshing time, which may be several weeks after harvest. It is an impressive sight to see the huge stacks of sheaves piled about the threshing-floors, the piles often covering an area greater than the nearby villages (see AGRICULTURE). The ancient Egyptians bound their grain into small sheaves, forming the bundles with care so that the heads were equally distributed between the two ends (see Wilkinson, Ancient Egyptians, 1878, II, 424; compare Joseph’s dream, Ge 37:5-8). The sheaves mentioned in Ge 37:10-12,15 must have been handfuls. It is a custom in parts of Syria for the gatherers of the sheaves to run toward a passing horseman and wave a handful of grain, shouting kemshi, kemshi (literally, "handful"). They want the horseman to feed the grain to his horse. In Old Testament times forgotten sheaves had to be left for the sojourner (De 24:19); compare the kindness shown to Ru by the reapers of Boaz (Ru 2:7,15).

Figurative: "Being hungry they carry the sheaves" is a picture of torment similar to that of the hungry horse urged to go by the bundle of hay tied before him (Job 24:10). The joyful sight of the sheaves of an abundant harvest was used by the Psalmist to typify the joy of the returning captives (Ps 126:6).

James A. Patch

SHEAL

she’-al (she’al, "request"): One of the Israelites of the sons of Bani who had taken foreign wives (Ezr 10:29, Septuagint: Salouia; Septuagint, Lucian, Assael; RAPC 1Es 9:30, "Jasaelus").

SHEALTIEL

she-ol’-ti-el (she’alti’el, but in Hag 1:12,14; 2:2, shalti’el; Septuagint and the New Testament always Salathiel, hence, "Salathiel" of 1 Esdras 5:5,48,56; 6:2; the King James Version of Mt 1:12; Lu 3:27): Father of Zerubbabel (Ezr 3:2,8; 5:2; Ne 12:1; Hag 1:1,12,14; 2:2,23). But, according to 1Ch 3:17, Shealtiel was the oldest son of King Jeconiah; in 3:19 the Massoretic Text makes Pedaiah, a brother of Shealtiel, the father of Zerubbabel (compare Curtis, ICC).

SHEAR

sher.

See SHEEP; SHEEP TENDING.

SHEAR-JASHUB

she-ar-ja’-shub or jash’-ub (she’ar yashubh, "a remnant shall return"; Septuagint ho kataleiphtheis Iasoub): The son of Isaiah, who accompanied him when he set out to meet Ahaz (Isa 7:3). The name like that of other children of prophets (compare "Immanuel," "Mahershalal-hash-baz," "Lo-ruhamah," etc.) is symbolic of a message which the prophet wishes to emphasize. Thus Isaiah uses the very words she’ar yashubh to express his oft-repeated statement that a remnant of Israel will return to Yahweh (Isa 10:21).

SHEARIAH

she-a-ri-a, she-ar’-ya (she‘aryah; Saraia): A descendant of Saul (1Ch 8:38; 9:44).

SHEARING HOUSE

sher’-ing (beth ‘eqedh ha-ro‘im, "house of binding of the shepherds"; Codex Vaticanus Baithakath

(Codex Alexandrinus Baithakad) ton poimenon): Here in the course of his extinction of the house of Ahab, Jehu met and destroyed 42 men, "the brethren of Ahaziah king of Judah" (2Ki 10:12-14). Eusebius (in Onomasticon) takes the phrase as a proper name, Bethacath, and locates the village 15 miles from Legio in the plain. This seems to point to identification with Beit Kad, about 3 miles East of Jenin.

SHEATH

sheth.

See SWORD.

SHEBA (1)

she’-ba (shebha’; Saba):

(1) Sheba and Dedan are the two sons of Raamah son of Cush (Ge 10:7).

(2) Sheba and Dedan are the two sons of Jokshan the son of Abraham and Keturah (Ge 25:3).

(3) Sheba is a son of Joktan son of Eber who was a descendant of Shem (Ge 10:28).

From the above statements it would appear that Sheba was the name of an Arab tribe, and consequently of Semitic descent. The fact that Sheba and Dedan are represented as Cushite (Ge 10:7) would point to a migration of part of these tribes to Ethiopia, and similarly their derivation from Abraham (Ge 25:3) would indicate that some families were located in Syria. In point of fact Sheba was a South-Arabian or Joktanite tribe (Ge 10:28), and his own name and that of some of his brothers (e.g. Hazarmaveth = Hadhramaut) are place-names in Southern Arabia.

The Sabeans or people of Saba or Sheba, are referred to as traders in gold and spices, and as inhabiting a country remote from Palestine (1Ki 10:1 f; Isa 60:6; Jer 6:20; Eze 27:22; Ps 72:15; Mt 12:42), also as slave-traders (Joe 3:8), or even desert-rangers (Job 1:15; 6:19; compare CIS 84 3).

By the Arab genealogists Saba is represented as great-grandson of Qachtan (= Joktan) and ancestor of all the South-Arabian tribes. He is the father of Chimyar and Kahlan. He is said to have been named Saba because he was the first to take prisoners (shabhah) in war. He founded the capital of Saba and built its citadel Marib (Mariaba), famous for its mighty barrage.

1. History: The authentic history of the Sabeans, so far as known, and the topography of their country are derived from South-Arabian inscriptions, which began to be discovered about the middle of the last century, and from coins dating from about 150 BC to 150 AD, the first collection of which was

published in 1880, and from the South-Arabian geographer Hamdani, who was later made known to European scholars. One of the Sabean kings is mentioned on Assyrian inscriptions of the year 715 BC; and he is apparently not the earliest. The native monuments are scattered over the period extending from before that time until the 6th century AD, when the

Sabean state came to an end, being most numerous about the commencement of our era. Saba was the name of the nation of which Marib was the usual capital. The Sabeans at first shared the sovereignty of South Arabia with Himyar and one or two other nations, but gradually absorbed the territories of these some time after the Christian era. The form of government seems to have been that of a republic or oligarchy, the chief magistracy going by a kind of rotation, and more than one "king" holding office simultaneously (similarly De 4:47 and often in the Old Testament). The people seem to have been divided into patricians and plebeians, the former of whom had the right to build castles and to share in the government.

2. Religion:

A number of deities are mentioned on the inscriptions, two chief being Il-Maqqih and Ta‘lab. Others are Athtar (masculine form of the Biblical ‘ashtaroth), Rammon (the Biblical Rimmon), the Sun, and others. The Sun and Athtar were further defined by the addition of the name of a place or tribe, just as Baal in the Old Testament. Worship took the form of gifts to the temples, of sacrifices, especially incense, of pilgrimages and prayers. Ceremonial ablution, and abstinence from certain things, as well as formal dedication of the worshipper and his household and goods to the deity, were also religious acts. In return the deity took charge of his worshipper’s castle, wells, and belongings, and supplied him with cereals, vegetables and fruits, as well as granted him male issue.

3. Civilization:

(1) The chief occupations of the Sabeans were raiding and trade. The chief products of their country are enumerated in Isa 60:6, which agrees with the Assyrian inscriptions. The most important of all commodities was incense, and it is significant that the same word which in the other Semitic languages means "gold," in Sabean means "perfume" (and also "gold"). To judge, however, from the number of times they are mentioned upon the inscriptions, agriculture bulked much more largely in the thoughts of the Sabean than commerce, and was of equal importance with religion.

(2) The high position occupied by women among the Sabeans is reflected in the story of the Queen of Sheba and Solomon. In almost all respects women appear to have been considered the equal of men, and to have discharged the same civil, religious and even military functions. Polygamy does not seem to have been practiced. The Sabean inscriptions do not go back far enough to throw any light upon the queen who was contemporary with Solomon, and the Arabic identification of her with Bilqis is merely due to the latter being the only Sabean queen known to them. Bilqis must have lived several centuries later than the Hebrew monarch.

(3) The alphabet used in the Sabean inscriptions is considered by Professor Margoliouth to be the original Semitic alphabet, from which the others are derived. In other respects Sabean art seems to be dependent on that of Assyria, Persia and Greece. The coins are Greek and Roman in style, while the system of weights employed is Persian.

See further SABAEANS.

LITERATURE.

Rodiger and Osidander in ZDMG, volumes XX and XXI; Halevy in Journal Asiatique, Serie 6, volume IX; Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, pt. IV, edition by J. and H. Derenbourg; Hamdani, edition by D. H. Muller, 1891; Mordtmann, Himyarische Inschriften, 1893; Hommel, Sudarabische Chresthomathie, 1893; Glaser, Abyssinien in Arabien, 1895; D. H. Muller, Sudarabische Alterthumer, 1899; Derenbourg, Les monuments sabeens, 1899. On the coins, Schlumberger, Le tresor de San'a, 1880; Mordtmann in Wiener numismatische Zeitschrift, 1880.

Thomas Hunter Weir

SHEBA (2)

she'-ba (shebha'; Sabee, or Samaa): The name of one of the towns allotted to Simeon (Jos 19:2). the King James Version mentions it as an independent town, but as it is not mentioned at all in the parallel list (1Ch 4:28), and is omitted in Jos 19:2 in some manuscripts, it is probable that the Revised Version (British and American) is correct in its translation "Beer-sheba or Sheba." Only in this way can the total of towns in this group be made 13 (Jos 19:6). If it is a separate name, it is probably the same as SHEMA (which see).

E. W. G. Masterman

SHEBA, QUEEN OF

See QUEEN OF SHEBA.

SHEBAH

she'-ba.

See SHIBAH.

SHEBAM

she’-bam.

See SEBAM.

SHEBANIAH

sheb-a-ni’-a, she-ban’-ya (shebhanyah, in 1Ch 15:24, shebhanyahu):

(1) Name of a Levite or a Levitical family that participated in the religious rites that followed the reading of the Law (Ne 9:4). The name is given in Ne 10:10 among those that sealed the covenant.

(2) A priest or Levite who took part in the sealing of the covenant (Ne 10:4; 12:14).

See SHECANIAH.

(3) Another Levite who sealed the covenant (Ne 10:12).

(4) A priest in the time of David (1Ch 15:24).

SHEBARIM

sheb’-a-rim, she-ba’-rim (ha-shebharim; sunetripsan): After the repulse of the first attack on their city the men of Ai chased the Israelites "even unto Shebarim" (Jos 7:5). the Revised Version margin reads "the quarries"; so Keil, Steuernagel, etc. Septuagint reads "until they were broken," i.e. until the rout was complete. The direction of the flight was of course from Ai toward Gilgal in the Jordan valley. No trace of such name has yet been found.

SHEBAT

she-bat’ (shebhat): The 11th month of the Jewish year (Zec 1:7), corresponding to February.

See CALENDAR.

SHEBER

she’-ber (shebher; Codex Vaticanus Saber, Codex Alexandrinus Seber): A son of Caleb by his concubine Maacah (1Ch 2:48).

SHEBNA

sheb’-na (shebhna’; Somnas; but shebhnah, in 2Ki 18:18,26; meaning uncertain (2Ki 18:18,26,37; 19:2 = Isa 36:3,11,22; 37:2; 22:15)):

1. Position in Isaiah 22:

In Isa 22:15 Shebna is referred to as he "who is over the house," or household, apparently that of the king. The phrase is translated "steward of the house" in the Revised Version (British and American) of Ge 43:16,19; 44:1, and occurs also in 39:4, "overseer"; 44:4. It is used of an officer of the Northern Kingdom in 1Ki 16:9; 18:3; 2Ki 10:5. This officer is distinguished from him "that was over the city" in 2Ki 10:5, and it is said in 2Ki 15:5 that after his father Azariah was stricken with leprosy, "Jotham, the king’s son, was over the household, judging all the people of the land." Again Isa 22:15 speaks of "this cokhen," a phrase that must apply to Shebna if the prophecy refers to him. This word is the participle of a verb meaning "to be of use or service," so "to benefit" in Job 15:3; 22:2; 34:9. The feminine participle is employed of Abishag in 1Ki 1:2,4, where King James Version, margin translates "cherisher"; BDB renders it "servitor" or "steward" in Isa 22:15. It occurs also as a Canaanite gloss in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Winckler, number 237,9). The cokhen was evidently a high officer: Shebna had splendid chariots (22:18), but what the office exactly was is not certain. The other reference to Shebna in the title of the prophecy would lead one to conclude that it denoted him "who was over the household," i.e. governor of the palace, probably, or major-domo. The word cokhen is thus a general title; others deny this, maintaining that it would then occur more frequently.

2. Shebna in 2 Kings 18 f:

In 2Ki 18 f = Isa 36 f we find too a Shebna mentioned among the officers of Hezekiah. There he is called the copher, "scribe" or "secretary," i.e. a minister of state of some kind, whereas Eliakim is he "who is over the household." Is then the Shebna of Isa 22 the same as this officer? It is of course possible that two men of the same name should hold high office about the same time. We find a Joshua (ben Asaph) "recorder" under Hezekiah (2Ki 18:18) and a Joshua (ben Joahaz) having the very same position under Josiah a century later (2Ch 34:8). But such a coincidence is rare. Had there been two high officers of state bearing this name, it is most probable that they would somehow have been distinguished one from the other. Shebna’s name is thought to be Aramaic, thus pointing to a foreign descent, but G. B. Gray, "Isa," ICC, 373 ff, denies this. We can perhaps safely infer that he was a parvenu from the fact that he was hewing himself a sepulcher in Jerusalem, apparently among those of the nobility, whereas a native would have an ancestral burial-place in the land.

However, in 2 Kings, Shebna is the scribe and not the governor of the palace. How is this to be explained? The answer is in Isaiah’s prophecy.

3. Isaiah 22:15 ff:

The prophecy of Isa 22 divides itself into 3 sections. The words "against (not as the Revised Version (British and American) "unto") Shebna who is over the house," or palace, are properly the title of the

prophecy, and should come therefore at the very beginning of verse 15.

(1) Isa 22:15-18 form one whole. In 22:16 the words "hewing him out a sepulchre," etc., should be placed immediately before the rest of the verse as 22:16a with the rest of the section is in the second person. We thus read (22:15-17): ‘Against Shebna who was over the house. Thus saith the Lord, Yahweh of hosts, Go unto this steward (Revised Version margin) that is hewing him out a sepulchre on high, graying a habitation for himself in the rock, (and say) What doest thou here and whom hast thou here that thou hast hewed thee out here a sepulchre? Behold, Yahweh of hosts, ...’ etc. G.H. Box (Isaiah) would further transpose some parts of 22:17 f. Shebna is to be tossed like a ball into "a land wide of sides," i.e. a broad extensive land. He is addressed as a disgrace to the house of his royal master. The prophet’s language is that of personal invective, and one asks what had made him so indignant. Some (e.g. Dillmann, Delitzsch) suggest that Shebna was the leader of a pro-Egyptian party, while others (e.g. Cheyne) believe that the party was pro-Assyrian (compare Isa 8:5-8 a). The actual date of the prophecy can only be inferred.

(2) Isa 22:19-23 contains a prophecy which states that Eliakim is to be given someone’s post, apparently that of Shebna, if this section be by Isaiah; 22:23, however, is held by many to be a gloss. These verses are not so vehement in tone as the previous ones. Some maintain that the section is not by Isaiah (Duhm, Marti). It can, however, be Isaianic, only later in date than 22:15 ff, being possibly meant to modify the former utterance. The palace governor is to lose his office and to be succeeded by Eliakim, who is seen to hold that post in 2Ki 18 f.

See ELIAKIM.

(3) Isa 22:24 f are additions to the two utterances by a later hand; they predict the ruin of some such official as Eliakim owing to his own family.

4. Date of the Prophecy:

There is nothing a priori against believing that these three sections are entirely independent one of another, but there seems to be some connection between (1) and (2), and again between (2) and (3). Now the question that has to be solved is that of the relation of Isa 22:15 ff with 2Ki 18 f = Isa 36 f, where are given the events of 701 BC. We have the following facts:

(a) Shebna is scribe in 701, and Eliakim is governor of the palace;

(b) Shebna is governor of the palace in Isa 22:15, and is to be deposed;

(c) if Isa 22:18-22 be by Isaiah, Eliakim was to succeed Shebna in that post.

Omitting for the moment everything but (a) and (b), the only solution that is to any extent satisfactory is that Isa 22:15-18 is to be dated previous to 701 BC. This is the view preferred by G.B. Gray, in the work

quoted And this is the most satisfactory theory if we take (2) above into consideration. The prophecy then contained in (1) had not been as yet fulfilled in 701, but (2) had come to pass; Shebna was no longer governor of the palace, but held the position of scribe. Exile might still be in store for him.

Another explanation is put forward by K. Fullerton in AJT, IX, 621-42 (1905) and criticized by E. Konig in X, 675-86 (1906). Fullerton rejects verses 24 f as not due to Isaiah, and maintains that Isa 22:15-18 was spoken by the prophet early in the reign of Manasseh, i.e. later than 2Ki 18 f, "not so much as a prophecy, a simple prediction, as an attempt to drive Shebna from office. .... It must be admitted that Isaiah probably did not succeed. The reactionary party seems to have remained in control during the reign of Manasseh. .... Fortunately, the moral significance of Isaiah does not depend on the fulfillment of this or that specific prediction. We are dealing not with a walking oracle, but with a great character and a noble life" (p. 639). He then infers from the massacres of Manasseh (2Ki 21:16) "that a conspiracy had been formed against him by the prophetic party which proposed to place Eliakim on the throne" (p. 640). Isaiah he thinks would not "resort to such violent measures," and so the character of Isaiah makes it questionable whether he was the author of 22:20-23. This part would then be due to the prophetic party "who went a step farther than their great leader would approve." This view assumes too much,

(a) that the terms in 22:20-23 refer to kingly power;

(b) that Eliakim was of Davidic descent, unless we have a man of non-Davidic origin aiming at the throne, which is again a thing unheard of in Judah; and

(c) that there was such a plot in the reign of Manasseh, of which we have no proof.

David Francis Roberts

SHEBUEL

she-bu’-el, sheb’-u-el (shebhu’el; Soubael):

(1) A son of Gershom and grandson of Moses (1Ch 23:16). He was "ruler over the treasures" (1Ch 26:24). In 1Ch 24:20 he is called "Shubael," which is probably the original form of the name (see Gray, HPN, 310).

(2) A son of Heman (1Ch 25:4), called in 1Ch 25:20 "Shubael" (Septuagint as in 25:4).

SHECANIAH; SHECHANIAH

shek-a-ni’-a, shekan’-ya (shekhanyah (in 1Ch 24:11; 2Ch 31:15, shekhanyahu); Codex Vaticanus Ischania, Sekenia):

(1) A descendant of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:21,22). This is the same Shecaniah mentioned in Ezr 8:3.

(2) "The sons of Shecaniah," so the Massoretic Text of Ezr 8:5 reads, were among those who returned with Ezra, but a name appears to have been lost from the text, and we should probably read "of the sons of Zattu, Shecaniah the son of Jahaziel" (compare 1 Esdras 8:32, "of the sons of Zathoes, Sechenias the son of Jezelus").

(3) Chief of the tenth course of priests (1Ch 24:11).

(4) A priest in the reign of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:15).

(5) A contemporary of Ezra who supported him in his opposition to foreign marriages (Ezr 10:2).

(6) The father of Shemaiah, "the keeper of the east gate" (Ne 3:29).

(7) The father-in-law of Tobiah the Ammonite (Ne 6:18).

(8) The eponym of a family which returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:3). It is the same name which, by an interchange of "bh" and "kh", appears as Shebaniah (see SHEBANIAH, (2)) in Ne 10:4,12,14.

Horace J. Wolf

SHECHEM

she’-kem (shekhem, "shoulder"; Suchem, he Sikima, ta Sikima, etc.; the King James Version gives "Sichem" in Ge 12:6; and "Sychem" in Ac 7:16):

1. Historical:

This place is first mentioned in connection with Abraham’s journey from Haran. At the oak of Moreh in the vicinity he reared his first altar to the Lord in Palestine (Ge 12:6 f). It was doubtless by this oak that Jacob, on his return from Paddan-aram, buried "the strange (the American Standard Revised Version "foreign") gods" (Ge 35:4). Hither he had come after his meeting with Esau (Ge 33:18). Eusebius, in Onomasticon, here identifies Shechem with Shalem; but see SHALEM. To the East of the city Jacob pitched his tent in a "parcel of ground" which he had bought from Hamor, Shechem’s father (Ge 33:19). Here also he raised an altar and called it El-Elohe-Israel, "God, the God of Israel" (Ge 33:20). Then follows the story of Dinah’s defilement by Shechem, son of the city’s chief; and of the treacherous and terrible vengeance exacted by Simeon and Levi (Genesis 34). To the rich pasture land near Shechem Joseph came to seek his brethren (Ge 37:12). It is mentioned as lying to the West of Michmethath (el-Makhneh) on the boundary of Manasseh (Jos 17:7). It was in the territory of Ephraim; it was made a city of refuge, and assigned to the Kohathite Levites (Jos 20:7; 21:21). Near the city the Law was

promulgated (De 27:11; Jos 8:33). When his end was approaching Joshua gathered the tribes of Israel here and addressed to them his final words of counsel and exhortation (chapter 24). Under the oak in the neighboring sanctuary he set up the stone of witness (24:26). The war of conquest being done, Joseph's bones were buried in the parcel of ground which Jacob had bought, and which fell to the lot of Joseph's descendants (24:33). Abimelech, whose mother was a native of the city, persuaded the men of Shechem to make him king (Jud 9:1-6), evidently seeking a certain consecration from association with "the oak of the pillar that was in Shechem." Jotham's parable was spoken from the cliff of Gerizim overhanging the town (Jud 9:7). After a reign of three years Abimelech was rejected by the people. He captured the city, razed it to the foundations, and sowed it with salt. It was then the seat of Canaanite idolatry, the temple of Baal-berith being here (Jud 9:4,46). In the time of the kings we find that the city was once more a gathering-place of the nation. It was evidently the center, especially for the northern tribes; and hither Rehoboam came in the hope of getting his succession to the throne confirmed (1Ki 12:1; 2Ch 10:1). At the disruption Jeroboam fortified the city and made it his residence (2Ch 10:25; Ant, VIII, viii, 4). The capital of the Northern Kingdom was moved, however, first to Tirzah and then to Samaria, and Shechem declined in political importance. Indeed it is not named again in the history of the monarchy. Apparently there were Israelites in it after the captivity, some of whom on their way to the house of the Lord at Jerusalem met a tragic fate at the hands of Ishmael ben Nethaniah (Jer 41:5). It became the central city of the Samaritans, whose shrine was built on Mt. Gerizim (Sirach 50:26; Ant, XI, viii, 6; XII, i, 1; XIII, iii, 4). Shechem was captured by John Hyrcanus in 132 BC (Ant., XIII, ix, 1; BJ, I, ii, 6). It appears in the New Testament only in the speech of Stephen (Ac 7:16, King James Version "Sychem"). Some (e.g. Smith, DB, under the word) would identify it with Sychar of Joh 4:5; but see SYCHAR. Under the Romans it became Flavia Neapolis. In later times it was the seat of a bishopric; the names of five occupants of the see are known.

2. Location and Physical Features:

There is no doubt as to the situation of ancient Shechem. It lay in the pass which cuts through Mts. Ephraim, Ebal and Gerizim, guarding it on the North and South respectively. Along this line runs the great road which from time immemorial has formed the easiest and the quickest means of communication between the East of the Jordan and the sea. It must have been a place of strength from antiquity. The name seems to occur in Travels of a Mohar (Max Muller, Asien u. Europa, 394), "Mountain of Sahama" probably referring to Ebal or Gerizim. The ancient city may have lain somewhat farther East than the modern Nablus, in which the Roman name Neapolis survives. The situation is one of great beauty. The city lies close to the foot of Gerizim. The terraced slopes of the mountain rise steeply on the South. Across the valley, musical with the sound of running water, the great bulk of Ebal rises on the North, its sides, shaggy with prickly pear, sliding down into grain fields and orchards. The copious springs which supply abundance of water rise at the base of Gerizim. The fruitful and well-wooded valley winds westward among the hills. It is traversed by the carriage road leading to Jaffa and the sea. Eastward the valley opens upon the plain of Makhneh. To the East of the city, in a recess at the base of Gerizim, is the sanctuary known as Rijal el-'Amud, literally, "men of the column" or "pillar," where some would locate the ancient "oak of Moreh" or "of the pillar." Others would find it in a little village farther East with a fine spring, called BalaTa, a name which may be connected with balluT, "oak." Still farther to the East and near the base of Ebal is the traditional tomb of Joseph, a little white-

domed building beside a luxuriant orchard. On the slope of the mountain beyond is the village of ‘Askar; see SYCHAR. To the South of the vale is the traditional Well of Jacob; see JACOB’S WELL. To the Southwest of the city is a small mosque on the spot where Jacob is said to have mourned over the blood-stained coat of Joseph. In the neighboring minaret is a stone whereon the Ten Commandments are engraved in Samaritan characters. The main center of interest in the town is the synagogue of the Samaritans, with their ancient manuscript of the Pentateuch.

3. Modern Shechem:

The modern town contains about 20,000 inhabitants, the great body of them being Moslems. There are some 700 or 800 Christians, chiefly belonging to the Greek Orthodox church. The Samaritans do not total more than 200. The place is still the market for a wide district, both East and West of Jordan. A considerable trade is done in cotton and wool. Soap is manufactured in large quantities, oil for this purpose being plentifully supplied by the olive groves. Tanning and the manufacture of leather goods are also carried on. In old times the slopes of Ebal were covered with vineyards; but these formed a source of temptation to the "faithful." They were therefore removed by authority, and their place taken by the prickly pears mentioned above.

W. Ewing

SHECHEMITES

she’-kem-its (hashikhmi; Suchemei): The descendants of Shechem the son of Gilead, a clan of Eastern Manasseh (Nu 26:31; Jos 17:2).

SHED, SHEDDING

The three Hebrew words, naghar, sim or sum and shaphakh, translated "shed" in many Old Testament passages, always mean a "pouring out," and in nearly every case point to the effusion of blood (Ge 9:6; Nu 35:33; De 21:7; 2Sa 20:10; 1Ch 22:8; Pr 1:16, etc.). The Greek words ekcheo, and ekchuno, have precisely the same specific meaning (Mt 23:35; 26:28; Mr 14:24; Lu 11:50; Heb 9:22; Re 16:6). Sometimes they are tropically used in reference to the outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Ac 2:33 the King James Version; Tit 3:6), and to the outpouring of the love of God in the believer’s heart (Ro 5:5).

Henry E. Dosker

SHEDEUR

shed’-e-ur, she-de’-ur (shedhe’ur, "daybreak"; Codex Vaticanus Sediour, Ediour): The father of Elizur, the chief of Reuben (Nu 1:5; 2:10; 7:30). French Delitzsch correctly conceives the name as an Assyrian compound, sad uri, "daybreak." Cf, however, Gray, HPN, 169, 197, who emends the text to read

Shaddai ‘Ur, "Shaddai is flame."

SHEEP

shep:

1. Names:

The usual Hebrew word is tso’n, which is often translated "flock," e.g. "Abel .... brought of the firstlings of his flock" (Ge 4:4); "butter of the herd, and milk of the flock" (De 32:14). The King James Version and the English Revised Version have "milk of sheep." Compare Arabic da’n. The Greek word is probaton. For other names, see notes under CATTLE; EWE; LAMB; RAM.

2. Zoology:

The origin of domestic sheep is unknown. There are 11 wild species, the majority of which are found in Asia, and it is conceivable that they may have spread from the highlands of Central Asia to the other portions of their habitat. In North America is found the "bighorn," which is very closely related to a Kamschatkan species. One species, the urial or sha, is found in India. The Barbary sheep, Ovis tragelaphus, also known as the aoudad or arui, inhabits the Atlas Mountains of Northwest Africa. It is thought by Tristram to be zemer, English Versions of the Bible "chamois" of De 14:5, but there is no good evidence that this animal ranges eastward into Bible lands. Geographically nearest is the Armenian wild sheep, Ovis gmelini, of Asia Minor and Persia. The Cyprian wild sheep may be only a variety of the last, and the mouflon of Corsica and Sardinia is an allied species. It is not easy to draw the line between wild sheep and wild goats. Among the more obvious distinctions are the chin beard and strong odor of male goats. The pelage of all wild sheep consists of hair, not wool, and this indeed is true of some domestic sheep as the fat-rumped short-tailed sheep of Abyssinia and Central Asia. The young lambs of this breed have short curly wool which is the astrachan of commerce. Sheep are geologically recent, their bones and teeth not being found in earlier deposits than the pleiocene or pleistocene. They were, however, among the first of domesticated animals.

3. Sheep of Palestine:

The sheep of Syria and Palestine are characterized by the possession of an enormous fat tail which weighs many pounds and is known in Arabic as ‘alyat, or commonly, liyat. This is the ‘alyah, "fat tail" (the King James Version "rump") (Ex 29:22; Le 3:9; 7:3; 8:25; 9:19), which was burned in sacrifice. This is at the present day esteemed a great delicacy. Sheep are kept in large numbers by the Bedouin, but a large portion of the supply of mutton for the cities is from the sheep of Armenia and Kurdistan, of which great droves are brought down to the coast in easy stages. Among the Moslems every well-to-do family sacrifices a sheep at the feast of al-’adcha’, the 10th day of the month dhu-l-chijjat, 40 days after the end of ramadan, the month of fasting. In Lebanon every peasant family during the summer fattens a young ram, which is literally crammed by one of the women of the household, who

keeps the creature’s jaw moving with one hand while with the other she stuffs its mouth with vine or mulberry leaves. Every afternoon she washes it at the village fountain. When slaughtered in the fall it is called ma‘luf, "fed," and is very fat and the flesh very tender. Some of the meat and fat are eaten at once, but the greater part, fat and lean, is cut up fine, cooked together in a large vessel with pepper and salt, and stored in an earthen jar. This, the so-called qauramat, is used as needed through the winter.

In the mountains the sheep are gathered at night into folds, which may be caves or enclosures of rough stones. Fierce dogs assist the shepherd in warding off the attacks of wolves, and remain at the fold through the day to guard the slight bedding and simple utensils. In going to pasture the sheep are not driven but are led, following the shepherd as he walks before them and calls to them. "When he hath put forth all his own, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice" (Joh 10:4).

4. Old Testament References:

The sheepfolds of Reuben on the plain of Gilead are referred to in Nu 32:16 and Jud 5:16. A cave is mentioned in 1Sa 24:3 in connection with the pursuit of David by Saul. The shepherd origin of David is referred to in Ps 78:70:

"He chose David also his servant,

And took him from the sheepfolds."

Compare also 2Sa 7:8 and 1Ch 17:7.

The shearing of the sheep was a large operation and evidently became a sort of festival. Absalom invited the king’s sons to his sheep-shearing in Baal-hazor in order that he might find an opportunity to put Amnon to death while his heart was "merry with wine" (2Sa 13:23-29). The character of the occasion is evident also from the indignation of David at Nabal when the latter refused to provide entertainment at his sheep-shearing for David’s young men who had previously protected the flocks of Nabal (1Sa 25:2-13). There is also mention of the sheep-shearing of Judah (Ge 38:12) and of Laban (Ge 31:19), on which occasion Jacob stole away with his wives and children and his flocks.

Sheep were the most important sacrificial animals, a ram or a young male being often specified. Ewes are mentioned in Le 3:6; 4:32; 5:6; 14:10; 22:28; Nu 6:14.

In the Books of Chronicles we find statements of enormous numbers of animals consumed in sacrifice: "And king Solomon offered a sacrifice of twenty and two thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep" (2Ch 7:5); "And they sacrificed unto Yahweh in that day (in the reign of Asa) .... seven hundred oxen and seven thousand sheep" (2Ch 15:11); at the cleansing of the temple by Hezekiah "the consecrated things were six hundred oxen and three thousand sheep. But the priests were too few, so that they could not flay all the burnt-offerings: wherefore their brethren the Levites did help them" (2Ch 29:33 f); and "Hezekiah king of Judah did give to the assembly for offerings a thousand bullocks and

seven thousand sheep; and the princes gave to the assembly a thousand bullocks and ten thousand sheep" (2Ch 30:24). In the account of the war of the sons of Reuben and their allies with the Hagrites, we read: "And they took away their cattle; of their camels fifty thousand, and of sheep two hundred and fifty thousand, and of asses two thousand, and of men a hundred thousand" (1Ch 5:21). Mesha king of Moab is called a "sheep-master," and we read that "he rendered unto the king of Israel the wool of a hundred thousand lambs, and of a hundred thousand rams" (2Ki 3:4).

5. Figurative:

Christ is represented as the Lamb of God (Isa 53:7; Joh 1:29; Re 5:6). Some of the most beautiful passages in the Bible represent God as a shepherd: "From thence is the shepherd, the stone of Israel" (Ge 49:24); "Yahweh is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Ps 23:1; compare Isa 40:11; Eze 34:12-16). Jesus said "I am the good shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me .... and I lay down my life for the sheep" (Joh 10:14 f). The people without leaders are likened to sheep without a shepherd (Nu 27:17; 1Ki 22:17; 2Ch 18:16; Eze 34:5). Jesus at the Last Supper applies to Himself the words of Zec 13:7; "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad" (Mt 26:31; Mr 14:27). The enemies of Yahweh are compared to the fat of the sacrifice that is consumed away in smoke (Ps 37:20). God's people are "the sheep of his pasture" (Ps 79:13; 95:7; 100:3). In sinning they become like lost sheep (Isa 53:6; Jer 50:6; Eze 34:6; Lu 15:3). In the mouth of Nathan the poor man's one little ewe lamb is a vivid image of the treasure of which the king David has robbed Uriah the Hittite (2Sa 12:3). In So 6:6, the teeth of the bride are likened to a flock of ewes. It is prophesied that "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb" (Isa 11:6) and that "the wolf and the lamb shall feed together" (Isa 65:25). Jesus says to His disciples, "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves" (Mt 10:16; compare Lu 10:3). In the parable of the Good Shepherd we read: "He that is a hireling, and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, beholdeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth" (Joh 10:12).

Alfred Ely Day

SHEEP GATE

(sha'ar ha-tso'-n (Ne 3:1,32; 12:39)): One of the gates of Jerusalem, probably near the northeast corner. See JERUSALEM. For the "sheep gate" of Joh 5:2, see BETHESDA; SHEEP MARKET.

SHEEP MARKET

(Joh 5:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "sheep gate"): The Greek (he probatike) means simply something that pertains to sheep.

See BETHESDA; SHEEP GATE.

SHEEP TENDING

ten’-ding: The Scriptural allusions to pastoral life and the similes drawn from that life are the most familiar and revered in the Bible. Among the first verses that a child learns is "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not wants" (Ps 23:1 the King James Version, the English Revised Version). What follower of the Master does not love to dwell on the words of the "Good Shepherd" chapter in the Gospel of John (Joh 10)? Jesus must have drawn a sympathetic response when He referred to the relationship of sheep to shepherd, a relationship familiar to all His hearers and doubtless shared by some of them with their flocks. As a rule the modern traveler in the Holy Land meets with disappointment if he comes expecting to see things as they were depicted in the Bible. An exception to this is the pastoral life, which has not changed one what since Abraham and his descendants fed their flocks on the rich plateaus East of the Jordan or on the mountains of Palestine and Syria. One may count among his most prized experiences the days and nights spent under the spell of Syrian shepherd life.

James A. Patch

SHEEP-MASTER

(noqedh, "herdsman," 2Ki 3:4).

See SHEEP-SHEARING.

SHEEP-SHEARING

shep’-sher-ing: The sheep-shearing is done in the springtime, either by the owners (Ge 31:19; 38:13; De 15:19; 1Sa 25:2,4) or by regular "shearers" (gazaz) (1Sa 25:7,11; Isa 53:7). There were special houses for this work in Old Testament times (2Ki 10:12,14). The shearing was carefully done so as to keep the fleece whole (Jud 6:37). The sheep of a flock are not branded but spotted. Lime or some dyestuff is painted in one or more spots on the wool of the back as a distinguishing mark. In 2Ki 3:4, Mesha, the chief or sheikh of Moab, was a sheep-master, literally, "a sheep spotter."

James A. Patch

SHEEPCOTE; SHEEPFOLD

shep’-kot, shep’-kot, shep’-fold (gedherah, mikhlah, mishpethayim, naweh; aule): At night the sheep are driven into a sheepfold if they are in a district where there is danger from robbers or wild beasts. These folds are simple walled enclosures (Nu 32:16; Jud 5:16; 2Ch 32:28; Ps 78:70; Ze 2:6; Joh 10:1). On the top of the wall is heaped thorny brushwood as a further safeguard. Sometimes there is a covered hut in the corner for the shepherd. Where there is no danger the sheep huddle together in the open until daylight, while the shepherd watches over them (Ge 31:39; Lu 2:8). In the winter time caves are sought after (1Sa 24:3; Ze 2:6). The antiquity of the use of some of the caves for this purpose is indicated by the thick deposit of potassium nitrate formed from the decomposition of the sheep dung.

James A. Patch

SHEEPSKIN

shep’-skin.

See BOTTLE; DRESS; RAMS’ SKINS, etc.

SHEERAH

she’-e-ra (she’erah; Codex Alexandrinus Saara, Codex Vaticanus omits): A daughter of Ephraim, who, according to the Massoretic Text of 1Ch 7:24 (the King James Version "Sherah"), built the two Beth-horons and Uzzen-sheerah. The verse has been suspected because elsewhere in the Old Testament the founders of cities are men. Uzzen-sheerah as a place is unidentified; Conder suggests as the site Bet Sira, a village 2 miles Southwest of the Lower Beth-horon (Mem 3 16).

SHEET

shet. See DRESS; compare Ac 10:11, "as it were a great sheet" (othone).

SHEHARIAH

she-ha-ri’-a (sheharyah): A Benjamite (1Ch 8:26).

SHEKEL

shek’-’-l, shek’-el, she’-kel, she’-kul (sheqel): A weight and a coin. The Hebrew shekel was the 50th part of a mina, and as a weight about 224 grains, and as money (silver) was worth about 2 shillings 9d., or 66 cents (in 1915). No gold shekel has been found, and hence, it is inferred that such a coin was not used; but as a certain amount of gold, by weight, it is mentioned in 2Ch 3:9 and is probably intended to be supplied in 2Ki 5:5. The gold shekel was 1/60 of the heavy Babylonian mina and weighed about 252 grains. In value it was about equal to 2 British pounds and 1 shilling, or about $10.00 (in 1915). See MONEY; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. In the Revised Version (British and American) of Mt 17:27 "shekel" replaces "piece of money" of the King James Version, the translation of stater.

See STATER.

H. Porter

SHEKEL OF THE KING’S WEIGHT, ROYAL SHEKEL

(’ebhen ha-melekh, "stone (i.e. weight) of the king"): The shekel by which Absalom’s hair was weighed (2Sa 14:26), probably the light shekel of 130 grains.

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

SHEKEL OF THE SANCTUARY; SACRED SHEKEL

(sheqel ha-qodhesh (Nu 7$ passim)): The same as the silver shekel mentioned under SHEKEL (which see), except in Ex 38:24, where it is used in measuring gold. The term is used for offerings made for sacred purposes.

SHEKINAH

she-ki’-na (shekhinah, "that which dwells," from the verb shakhen, or shakhan, "to dwell," "reside"): This word is not found in the Bible, but there are allusions to it in Isa 60:2; Mt 17:5; Lu 2:9; Ro 9:4. It is first found in the Targums.

See GLORY.

SHELAH

she’-la (shelah; Sala):

(1) The youngest son of Judah and the daughter of Shua the Canaanite (Ge 38:5,11,14,26; 46:12; Nu 26:20 (16); 1Ch 2:3; 4:21). He gave his name to the family of the Shelanites (Nu 26:20 (16)). Probably "the Shelanite" should be substituted for "the Shilonite" of Ne 11:5; 1Ch 9:5.

(2) (shelach): The son or (Septuagint) grandson of Arpachshad and father of Eber (Ge 10:24; 11:13 (12), 14,15; 1Ch 1:18,24; Lu 3:35).

(3) Ne 3:15 =" Shiloah" of Isa 8:6.

See SILOAM.

SHELANITES

she’-lan-its, she-la’-nits.

See SHELAH.

SHELEMIAH

shel-e-mi’-a, she-lem’-ya (shelemyah; Codex Vaticanus Selemia, Codex Alexandrinus (Selemias):

(1) One of the sons of Bani who married foreign wives in the time of Ezra (Ezr 10:39), called "Selemias" in 1 Esdras 9:34.

(2) Father of Hananiah who restored part of the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:30) (Codex Vaticanus Telemia, ..., Telemias). (3) A priest who was appointed one of the treasurers to distribute the Levitical tithes by Nehemiah (Ne 13:13).

(4) The father of Jehucal (or Jucal) in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer 37:3; 38:1; in the second passage the name is Shelemyahu).

(5) The father of Irijah, the captain of the ward, who arrested Jeremiah as a deserter to the Chaldeans (Jer 37:13).

(6) 1Ch 26:14.

See MESHELEMIAH.

(7) Another of the sons of Bani who married foreign wives in the time of Ezra (Ezr 10:41). It is of interest to note that the order of names in this passage—Sharai, Azarel, and Shelemiah—is almost identical with the names in Jer 36:26, namely, Seraiah, Azriel, Shelemiah.

(8) Ancestor of Jehudi (Jer 36:14).

(9) Septuagint omits.) Son of Abdeel, one of the men sent by Jehoiakim to seize Baruch and Jeremiah after Baruch had read the "roll" in the king’s presence (Jer 36:26).

Horace J. Wolf

SHELEPH

she’-lef (shaleph, in pause; Septuagint Saleph): Son of Joktan (Ge 10:26; 1Ch 1:20). Sheleph is the name of a Yemenite tribe or district, named on Sabean inscriptions and also by Arabian geographers, located in Southern Arabia.

SHELESH

she’-lesh (shelesh; Codex Vaticanus Seme; Codex Alexandrinus Selles, Lucian, Selem): An Asherite, son of Helem (1Ch 7:35).

SHELOMI

she-lo’-mi, shel’-o-mi (shelomi): An Asherite (Nu 34:27).

SHELOMITH

she-lo’-mith, shel’-o-mith (shelomith; in Ezr 8:10, shelomith):

(1) The mother of the man who was stoned for blasphemy (Le 24:11) (BAF, Salomeith, Lucian, Salmith).

(2) Daughter of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19) (Codex Vaticanus Salomethei; Codex Alexandrinus Salomethi, Lucian, Salomith).

(3) One of the "sons of Izhar" (1Ch 23:18) (Codex Vaticanus Salomoth; Codex Alexandrinus Saloumoth, Lucian, Salomith), called "Shelomoth" in 24:22.

(4) The name of a family whose representatives returned with Ezra (Ezr 8:10) (Codex Vaticanus Saleimouth; Lucian, Salimoth). The Massoretic Text here should read, "and the sons of Bani; Shelomith, son of Josiphiah"; and in 1 Esdras 8:36, "of the sons of Banias, Salimoth, son of Josaphias."

Horace J. Wolf

SHELOMOTH

she-lo’-moth, shel’-o-moth, -moth (shelomoth):

(1) An Izharite (1Ch 24:22, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Salomoth; Lucian, Salomith =" Shelomith" of 1Ch 23:18).

(2) A Levite descended from Eliezer ben Moses (1Ch 26:25, Qere shelomith; 1Ch 26:28).

(3) A Gershonite (1Ch 23:9, Qere Shelomith; Codex Vaticanus Alotheim, Codex Alexandrinus Salomeith).

SHELUMIEL

she-lu’-mi-el (shelumi’el; both the punctuation and interpretation are in doubt. Massoretic Text punctuates the first element as a passive participle; the use of the participle in compounds is common in Assyrian but rare in Heb (compare Gray, HPN, 200). The meaning of the present form, if it be correct, is "at peace with God" (Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 200, "my friend is God"). Septuagint reads Salamiel: Prince of the tribe of Simeon (Nu 1:6; 2:12; 7:36,41; 10:19). The genealogy of Judith (8:1) is carried back to this Shelumiel or Shelamiel, called there "Salamiel."

Horace J. Wolf

SHEM

shem (shem; Sem):

1. Position in Noah’s Family: His Name:

The eldest son of Noah, from whom the Jews, as well as the Semitic ("Shemitic") nations in general have descended. When giving the names of Noah’s three sons, Shem is always mentioned first (Ge 9:18; 10:1, etc.); and though "the elder" in "Shem the brother of Japheth the elder" (Ge 10:21 margin) is explained as referring to Shem, this is not the rendering of Onkelos. His five sons peopled the greater part of West Asia’s finest tracts, from Elam on the East to the Mediterranean on the West. Though generally regarded as meaning "dusky" (compare the Assyr-Babylonian samu—also Ham—possibly =" black," Japheth, "fair"), it is considered possible that Shem may be the usual Hebrew word for "name" (shem), given him because he was the firstborn—a parallel to the Assyr-Babylonian usage, in which "son," "name" (sumu) are synonyms (W. A. Inscriptions, V, plural 23, 11,29-32abc).

2. History, and the Nations Descended from Him:

Shem, who is called "the father of all the children of Eber," was born when Noah had attained the age of 500 years (Ge 5:32). Though married at the time of the Flood, Shem was then childless. Aided by Japheth, he covered the nakedness of their father, which Ham, the youngest brother, had revealed to them; but unlike the last, Shem and Japheth, in their filial piety, approached their father walking backward, in order not to look upon him. Two years after the Flood, Shem being then 100 years old, his son Arpachshad was born (Ge 11:10), and was followed by further sons and daughters during the remaining 500 years which preceded Shem’s death. Noah’s prophetic blessing, on awakening from his wine, may be regarded as having been fulfilled in his descendants, who occupied Syria (Aramaic), Palestine (Canaan), Chaldea (Arpachshad), Assyria (Asshur), part of Persia (Elam), and Arabia (Joktan). In the first three of these, as well as in Elam, Canaanites had settled (if not in the other districts mentioned), but Shemites ruled, at some time or other, over the Canaanites, and Canaan thus became "his servant" (Ge 9:25,26). The tablets found in Cappadocia seem to show that Shemites (Assyrians) had settled in that district also, but this was apparently an unimportant colony. Though designated sons of Shem, some of his descendants (e.g. the Elamites) did not speak a Semitic language, while other nationalities, not his descendants (e.g. the Canaanites), did.

See HAM; JAPHETH; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. Pinches

SHEMA (1)

she’-ma (shema‘; Samaa): A city of Judah in the Negeb (Jos 15:26). If, as some think, identical with SHEBA (which see) of Jos 19:2, then the latter must have been inserted here from Jos 15:26. It is noticeable that the root letters (sh-m-‘) were those from which Simeon is derived. Shema is probably identical with Jeshua (Ne 11:26). The place was clearly far South, and it may be Kh. Sa‘wah, a ruin upon a prominent hilltop between Kh. ‘Attir and Khirbet el-Milch. There is a wall around the ruins, of large blocks of conglomerate flint (PEF, III, 409, Sh XXV).

E. W. G. Masterman

SHEMA (2)

(shema‘):

(1) A Reubenite (1Ch 5:8, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Sama, Lucian, Semeei).

See SHIMEI.

(2) One of the heads of "fathers’ houses" in Aijalon, who put to flight the inhabitants of Gath (1Ch 8:13, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Sama, Lucian, Samoa); in 1Ch 8:21 he is called "Shimei." The statement is very obscure and the whole incident is probably due to some marginal note.

(3) One of those who stood at Ezra’s right during the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4, Samaias). He is called "Sammus" in 1 Esdras 9:43.

Horace J. Wolf

SHEMAAH

she-ma’-a, shem’-a-a (ha-shema‘-ah; Codex Vaticanus Ama, Codex Alexandrinus Samaa, Lucian, Asma): A Benjamite, who was the father, according to the Massoretic Text, of Ahiezer and Joash; but according to the Septuagint huios =(ben) instead of (bene) of Joash alone (1Ch 12:3). The original text may have read ben yeho-shama‘ (compare hoshama‘, of 1Ch 3:18); then a dittography of the following (h) caused the error (Curtis, ICC).

SHEMAIAH

she-ma’-ya, she-mi’-a (shema‘yah (in 2Ch 11:2; 17:8; 31:15; 35:9; Jer 26:20; 29:24; 36:12, shema‘yahu), "Jahveh hears"): The name is most frequently borne by priests, Levites and prophets.

(1) Codex Vaticanus Sammaias; Codex Alexandrinus Samaias (2Ch 12:5,7). A prophet who, together with Ahijah, protested against Rehoboam’s contemplated war against the ten revolted tribes (1Ki 12:22-24 = 2Ch 11:2-4). He declared that the rebellion had divine sanction. The second Greek account knows nothing of Ahijah in this connection and introduces Shemaiah at the gathering at Shechem where both Jeroboam and Rehoboam were present; it narrates that on this occasion Shemaiah (not Ahijah) rent his garment and gave ten parts to Jeroboam to signify the ten tribes over which he was to become king. (This version, however, is not taken very seriously, because of its numerous inconsistencies.) Shemaiah also prophesied at the invasion of Judah by Shishak (2Ch 12:5-7). His message was to the effect that as the princes of Israel had humbled themselves, God’s wrath against their idolatrous practices would not be poured out upon Jerusalem by the hand of Shishak (2Ch 13:7). He is mentioned as the author of a history of Rehoboam (2Ch 12:15).

(2) Son of Shecaniah (1Ch 3:22, Samaia), a descendant of Zerubbabel. This is also the name of one of the men who helped to repair the wall (Ne 3:29, Semeia (...)(compare Curtis, ICC, in 1Ch 3:17-24)).

(3) A Simeonite (1Ch 4:37, Codex Vaticanus Sumeon; Codex Alexandrinus Samaias), identical, perhaps, with the Shimei of 1Ch 4:26,27.

(4) A Reubenite (1Ch 5:4, Codex Vaticanus Semeei; Codex Alexandrinus Semein), called Shema in 1Ch 5:8.

(5) A Merarite Levite (1Ch 9:14; Ne 11:15, Samaia), one of those who dwelt in Jerusalem.

(6) A Levite of the family of Jeduthun, father of Obadiah or Abda (1Ch 9:16, Sameia, Codex Alexandrinus Samias, called "Shammua" in Ne 11:17).

(7) Head of the Levitical Kohathite clan of Elizaphan in the time of David (1Ch 15:8, Codex Vaticanus Samaias; Codex Alexandrinus Samaia; Codex Sinaiticus Sameas; 1Ch 15:11, Codex Vaticanus Samias; Codex Alexandrinus Semeias; Codex Sinaiticus Samai). He may be the same person as (8).

(8) The scribe (1Ch 24:6), the son of Nethanel, who registered the names of the priestly courses.

(9) A Korahite Levite, eldest son of Obed-edom (1Ch 26:4,6, Codex Vaticanus Samaias; Codex Alexandrinus Sameias; 1Ch 26:7, Codex Vaticanus Samai; Codex Alexandrinus Semeia).

(10) A Levite (2Ch 17:8, Codex Vaticanus Samouas; Codex Alexandrinus Samouias). One of the commission appointed by Jehoshaphat to teach the book of the Law in Judah. The names of the

commissioners as a whole belong to a period later than the 9th century. (Gray, HPN, 231).

(11) One of the men "over the free-will offerings of God" (2Ch 31:15, Semeei).

(12) A Levite of the family of Jeduthun in the reign of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:14), one of those who assisted in the purification of the Temple.

(13) A chief of the Levites (2Ch 35:9), called "Samaias" in Septuagint and 1 Esdras 1:9.

(14) A "chief man" under Ezra (Ezr 8:16), called "Maasmas" and "Samaias" in 1 Esdras 8:43,44.

(15) A member of the family of Adonikam (Ezr 8:13, Codex Vaticanus Samaia; Codex Alexandrinus Samaeia; "Samaias" in RAPC 1Es 8:39).

(16) A priest of the family of Harim who married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:21), called "Sameus" in 1 Esdras 9:21.

(17) A layman of the family of Harim who married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:31), called "Sabbeus" in 1 Esdras 9:32.

(18) A prophet (Ne 6:10-14, Codex Vaticanus Semeei; Codex Alexandrinus Semei), employed by Sanballat and Tobiah to frighten Nehemiah and hinder the rebuilding of the wall.

(19) One of the 24 courses of priests, 16th under Zerubbabel (Ne 12:6, Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus Semeias), 15th under Joiakim (Ne 12:18; Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus Semeia), and 21st under Nehemiah (Ne 10:8, Samaia), mentioned in connection with the dedication of the wall.

(20) A priest, descendant of Asaph (Ne 12:35).

(21) A singer (or clan) participating in the dedication of the wall (Ne 12:36).

(22) Father of the prophet Urijah (Jer 26:20, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Samaias; Codex Sinaiticus Maseas).

(23) A false prophet who was upbraided by Jeremiah (29:24-32) for attempting to hinder his work. He is styled "the Nehelamite" and was among those carried into captivity with Jehoiachin. In opposition to Jeremiah, he predicted a speedy ending to the captivity. Jeremiah foretold the complete destruction of Shemaiah’s family.

(24) Father of Delaiah, who was a prince in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer 36:12).

(25) "The great," kinsman of Tobias (Tobit 5:13).

Horace J. Wolf

SHEMARIAH

shem-a-ri’-a, she-mar’-ya (shemaryah and shemaryahu, "whom Jahveh guards"):

(1) A Benjamite warrior who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5, Codex Vaticanus Sammaraia; Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus Samaria; Lucian, Samarias).

(2) A son of Rehoboam (2Ch 11:19).

(3) One of the sons of Harim who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:32, Codex Vaticanus Samareia, Lucian, Samarias; Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Alexandrinus Semaria).

(4) One of the sons of Bani who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:41, Codex Alexandrinus Samareias; Codex Vaticanus Samareia; Lucian, Samarias).

Horace J. Wolf

SHEMEBER

shem-e’-ber, shem’-e-ber (shem’-ebher): The king of Zeboiim (Ge 14:2).

See SHINAB.

SHEMED

she’-med.

See SHEMER, (4).

SHEMER

she’-mer (shemer; Semer, Lucian, Semmer):

(1) The owner of the hill which Omri bought and which became the site of Samaria (1Ki 16:24, shomeron). Shemer may be an ancient clan name. The fact, however, that the mountain was called Shomeron when Omri bought it makes one doubt that the city of Samaria was named after Shemer; the

passage is questionable. The real etymology of Samaria roots it in "watch mountain" (see Stade, Zeitschrift, 165 f).

(2) A Merarite (1Ch 6:46 (31), Semmer).

(3) An Asherite (1Ch 7:34, A and Lucian, Somer), called "Shomer" in 1Ch 7:32.

(4) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:12, Codex Vaticanus Semer; Codex Alexandrinus Semmer; Lucian, Samaiel); the Revised Version (British and American) "Shemed," the King James Version "Shamed."

The Hebrew manuscripts differ; some read "Shemer," others "Shemedh."

Horace J. Wolf

SHEMIDA; SHEMIDAH; SHEMIDAITES

she-mi’-da, she-mi’-da-its (shemidha): A Gileadite clan belonging to Manasseh (Nu 26:32; Jos 17:2, Codex Vaticanus Sumareim; Codex Alexandrinus Semirae; Lucian, Samidae; 1Ch 7:19, the King James Version "Shemidah," after whom the Shemidaites (Nu 26:32) were called).

SHEMINITH

shem’-i-nith.

See MUSIC; PSALMS.

SHEMIRAMOTH

she-mir’-a-moth, she-mi’-ra-moth, shem-i-ra’-moth (shemiramoth; in 2Ch 17:8, Kethibh shemiramoth; Semeiramoth): The name of a Levitical family. In 1Ch 15:18,20; 16:5 Shemiramoth is listed among the names of David’s choirs; in 2Ch 17:8 the same name is given among the Levites delegated by Jehoshaphat to teach the Law in the cities of Judah. According to Schrader (KAT (2), 366) the name is to be identified with the Assyrian Sammuramat; the latter occurs as a woman’s name on the monuments, more especially on the statues of Nebo from Nimrod. Another suggestion is that Shemiramoth was originally a place-name meaning "image of Shemiram" (= name of Ram or "the Exalted One").

Horace J. Wolf

SHEMITES

shem’-its.

See SEMITES.

SHEMUEL

she-mu’-el, shem’-u-el (shemu’el, "name of God" (?)(1Ch 6:33 (18)); the Revised Version (British and American) Samuel, the prophet (see SAMUEL); compare Gray, HPN, 200, note 3):

(1) The Simeonite appointed to assist in the division of the land (Nu 34:20). The Massoretic Text should be emended to shelumi’el, to correspond with the form found in Nu 1:6; 2:12; 7:36,41; 10:19. Septuagint has uniformly Salamiel.

(2) Grandson of Issachar (1Ch 7:2) (Codex Vaticanus Isamouel; Codex Alexandrinus and Lucian, Samouel).

SHEN

shen (ha-shen, "the tooth" or "peak"; tes palaias): A place named only in 1Sa 7:12 to indicate the position of the stone set up by Samuel in connection with the victory over the Philistines, "between Mizpah and Shen." The Septuagint evidently reads yashan, "old." Probably we should here read yeshanah, as in 2Ch 13:19 (OHL, under the word). Then it may be represented by ‘Ain Sinia, to the North of Beitin.

SHENAZAR

she-na’-zar: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SHENAZZAR (which see).

SHENAZZAR

she-naz’-ar (shen’atstsar): A son of Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) and uncle of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:18, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Sanesar; Lucian, Sanasar; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) Sennaser, Senneser). It is highly probable that Sheshbazzar (Ezr 1:8,11), "the prince of Judah," and Shenazzar are identical (so Meyer, Rothstein, etc.). The name is difficult; some suggest a corruption of shushbalatstsar, and as equivalent to Sin-usur, "Sin (the moon-god) protect."

SHENIR

she’-ner (senir, shenir): Only found in So 4:8 (Massoretic Text).

See SENIR.

SHEOL

she’-ol (she’ol):

1. The Name

2. The Abode of the Dead

(1) Not a State of Unconsciousness

(2) Not Removed from God’s Jurisdiction

(3) Relation to Immortality

3. Post-canonical Period

1. The Name:

This word is often translated in the King James Version "grave" (e.g. Ge 37:35; 1Sa 2:6; Job 7:9; 14:13; Ps 6:5; 49:14; Isa 14:11, etc.) or "hell" (e.g. De 32:22; Ps 9:17; 18:5; Isa 14:9; Am 9:2, etc.); in 3 places by "pit" (Nu 16:30,33; Job 17:16). It means really the unseen world, the state or abode of the dead, and is the equivalent of the Greek Haides, by which word it is translated in Septuagint. The English Revisers have acted somewhat inconsistently in leaving "grave" or "pit" in the historical books and putting "Sheol" in the margin, while substituting "Sheol" in the poetical writings, and putting "grave" in the margin ("hell" is retained in Isa 14). Compare their "Preface." The American Revisers more properly use "Sheol" throughout. The etymology of the word is uncertain. A favorite derivation is from sha’al, "to ask" (compare Pr 1:12; 27:20; 30:15,16; Isa 5:14; Hab 2:5); others prefer the sha’al, "to be hollow." The Babylonians are said to have a similar word Sualu, though this is questioned by some.

2. The Abode of the Dead:

Into Sheol, when life is ended, the dead are gathered in their tribes and families. Hence, the expression frequently occurring in the Pentateuch, "to be gathered to one’s people," "to go to one’s fathers," etc. (Ge 15:15; 25:8,17; 49:33; Nu 20:24,28; 31:2; De 32:50; 34:5). It is figured as an under-world (Isa 44:23; Eze 26:20, etc.), and is described by other terms, as "the pit" (Job 33:24; Ps 28:1; 30:3; Pr 1:12; Isa 38:18, etc.), ABADDON (which see) or Destruction (Job 26:6; 28:22; Pr 15:11), the place of "silence" (Ps 94:17; 115:17), "the land of darkness and the shadow of death" (Job 10:21 f). It is, as the antithesis of the living condition, the synonym for everything that is gloomy, inert, insubstantial (the abode of Rephaim, "shades," Job 26:5; , Pr 2:18; 21:16; Isa 14:9; 26:14). It is a "land of forgetfulness,"

where God’s "wonders" are unknown (Ps 88:10-12). There is no remembrance or praise of God (Ps 6:5; 88:12; 115:17, etc.). In its darkness, stillness, powerlessness, lack of knowledge and inactivity, it is a true abode of death (see DEATH); hence, is regarded by the living with shrinking, horror and dismay (Ps 39:13; Isa 38:17-19), though to the weary and troubled it may present the aspect of a welcome rest or sleep (Job 3:17-22; 14:12 f). The Greek idea of Hades was not dissimilar.

(1) Not a State of Unconsciousness.

Yet it would be a mistake to infer, because of these strong and sometimes poetically heightened contrasts to the world of the living, that Sheol was conceived of as absolutely a place without consciousness, or some dim remembrance of the world above. This is not the case. Necromancy rested on the idea that there was some communication between the world above and the world below (De 18:11); a Samuel could be summoned from the dead (1Sa 28:11-15); Sheol from beneath was stirred at the descent of the king of Babylon (Isa 14:9). The state is rather that of slumbrous semi-consciousness and enfeebled existence from which in a partial way the spirit might temporarily be aroused. Such conceptions, it need hardly be said, did not rest on revelation, but were rather the natural ideas formed of the future state, in contrast with life in the body, in the absence of revelation.

(2) Not Removed from God’s Jurisdiction.

It would be yet more erroneous to speak with Dr. Charles (Eschatology, 35 ff) of Sheol as a region "quite independent of Yahwe, and outside the sphere of His rule." "Sheol is naked before God," says Job, "and Abaddon hath no covering" (Job 26:6). "If I make my bed in Sheol," says the Psalmist, "behold thou art there" (Ps 139:8). The wrath of Yahweh burns unto the lowest Sheol (De 32:22). As a rule there is little sense of moral distinctions in the Old Testament representations of Sheol, yet possibly these are not altogether wanting (on the above and others points in theology of Sheol).

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

(3) Relation to Immortality.

To apprehend fully the Old Testament conception of Sheol one must view it in its relation to the idea of death as something unnatural and abnormal for man; a result of sin. The believer’s hope for the future, so far as this had place, was not prolonged existence in Sheol, but deliverance from it and restoration to new life in God’s presence (Job 14:13-15; 19:25-27; Ps 16:10,11; 17:15; 49:15; 73:24-26; see IMMORTALITY; ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; RESURRECTION). Dr. Charles probably goes too far in thinking of Sheol in Psalms 49 and 73 as "the future abode of the wicked only; heaven as that of the righteous" (op. cit., 74); but different destinies are clearly indicated.

3. Post-canonical Period:

There is no doubt, at all events, that in the postcanonical Jewish literature (the Apocrypha and

apocalyptic writings) a very considerable development is manifest in the idea of Sheol. Distinction between good and bad in Israel is emphasized; Sheol becomes for certain classes an intermediate state between death and resurrection; for the wicked and for Gentiles it is nearly a synonym for Gehenna (hell). For the various views, with relevant literature on the whole subject, see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; also DEATH; HADES; HELL, etc.

James Orr

SHEPHAM

she’-fam (shepham; Sepphamar): A place, probably a hill town, on the ideal eastern boundary of Israel, named in Nu 34:10, but omitted in Eze 47:15-18. It lay between Hazar-enan and Harbel (Massoretic Text: "Hariblah"), which must have been in the neighborhood of Hermon. The word means a "naked" place, and doubtless indicates one of the barer midway ridges of Anti-Lebanon. It was probably the native place of Zabdi the Shiphmite, who was David’s chief vine-gardener (1Ch 27:27).

SHEPHATIAH

shef-a-ti’-a, she-fat’-ya (shephaTyah, "Yah has judged"):

(1) A son of David, by Abital (2Sa 3:4; 1Ch 3:3).

(2) A Benjamite, father of Meshullam, of Jerusalem (1Ch 9:8).

(3) A Benjamite, who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5).

(4) A prince of the Simeonites in the time of David (1Ch 27:16).

(5) A son of King Jehoshaphat (2Ch 21:2).

(6) A family, 372 of whom returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:4; Ne 7:9); 80 more males of this family, with their head, returned with Ezra (Ezr 8:8).

(7) A servant of Solomon, 392 of whose descendants returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:57 f; Ne 7:59 f); "Saphat" in 1 Esdras 5:9 and "Saphatias" in 1 Esdras 8:34.

(8) A Perezzite (Judahite), some of whose descendants dwelt at Jerusalem in the time of Nehemiah (Ne 11:4).

(9) A son of Mattan, a contemporary of Jeremiah (Jer 38:1).

James Orr

SHEPHELAH

shef-e’-la (ha-shephelah; sephela, saphela):

1. Name and References:

The word denotes "lowland," and is variously rendered in the King James Version. It is "vale" in De 1:7; Jos 10:40; 1Ki 10:27; 2Ch 1:15; Jer 33:13; "valley" in Jos 9:1; 11:2,16; 12:8; 15:33; Jud 1:9; Jer 32:44; "low plain" in 1Ch 27:28; 2Ch 9:27; "plain" in Jer 17:26; Ob 1:19; Zec 7:7; and "low country" in 2Ch 28:18. the Revised Version (British and American) renders uniformly "lowland." As the word always occurs with the definite article, indicating a distinct district, it might have been well to retain it without translation. The boundaries of the district are clearly marked and include much broken country; the hills being low compared with the mountains to the East, but much higher than the plain that runs to the shore. If a translation was to be made, perhaps "lowlands" would have been the best, as applied to the "Lowlands" of Scotland, "which likewise are not entirely plain, but have their groups and ranges of hills" (HGHL, 203). In the wide sense the Shephelah included the territory originally given to the tribe of Dan, and also a considerable part of Western and Southwestern Judea. At an early day the tribes of Da and Simeon were practically absorbed by Judah, and hence, we find in Jos 15 many cities in the Shephelah which belonged to that tribe (LB, I, 211).

2. Districts and Features:

(1) The sites of many ancient cities named in the Shephelah have been identified. They all lie within the strip of hill country that runs along the western base of the mountains of Judah, terminating in the North at the Valley of Aijalon. Once indeed the name appears to apply to the low hills North of this (Jos 11:16, ‘the mount of Israel and its Shephelah’). Every other reference applies only to the South.

Principal G. A. Smith has pointed out the difference between the district to the N. and that to the S. of Aijalon (HGHL, 203 ff). "North of Ajalon the low hills which run out on Sharon are connected with the high mountains behind them. You ascend to the latter from Sharon either by long sloping ridges, such as that which today carries the telegraph wire and the high road from Jaffa to Nablus; or else you climb up terraces, such as the succession of ranges closely built upon one another by which the country rises from Lydda to Bethel. That is, the low hills west of Samaria are (to use the Hebrew phrase) ‘ashedhoth, or slopes of the central range, and not a separate group. But South of Ajalon the low hills do not so hang upon the Central Range, but are separated from the mountains of Judah by a series of valleys, both wide and narrow, which run all the way from Ajalon to near Beersheba; and it is only when the low hills are thus flung off the Central Range into an independent group, separating Judea from Philistia, that the name Shephelah seems to be applied to them."

(2) On the East of the Shephelah, then, taking the name in this more limited sense, rises the steep wall of

the mountain, into which access is gained only by narrow and difficult defiles. The hills of the Shephelah are from 500 to 800 ft. high, with nothing over 1,500. The formation is soft limestone. In the valleys and upland plains there is much excellent land which supports a fairly good population still. Wheat, barley and olives are the chief products. But ancient wine presses cut in the rocks testify to the culture of the vine in old times. The district is almost entirely dependent on the rain for its water-supply. This is collected in great cisterns, partly natural. The rocks are in many places honeycombed with caves.

The western boundary is not so definite as that on the East. Some have held that it included the Philistine plain. This contention draws support from the mention of the Philistine cities immediately after those of Judah, which are said to be in the Shephelah (Jos 15:45 ; these verses can hardly be ruled out as of a later date). On the other hand the Philistines are said to have invaded the cities of the Shephelah (2Ch 28:18), which implies that it was outside their country. In later times the Talmud (Jerusalem, Shebhi‘ith 9 2) distinguishes the Mountain, the Shephelah, and the Plain. See, however, discussion in Buhl (GAP, 104, n.; and G. A. Smith, The Expositor, 1896, 404 ff).

3. The Five Valleys:

The Shephelah is crossed by five wide valleys which furnish easy access from the plain. These are of importance chiefly because from each of them a way, crossing the "foss," enters one of the defiles by which alone armies could approach the uplands of Judea. The hills of Judea are much steeper on the east than on the west, where they fall toward Philistia in long-rolling hills, forming the Shephelah.

(1) Vale of Aijalon:

The most noteworthy of these is the Vale of Aijalon. It winds its way first in a northeasterly direction, past the Beth-horons, then, turning to the Southeast, it reaches the plateau at el-Jib, the ancient Gibeon, fully 5 miles Northwest of Jerusalem. This is the easiest of all the avenues leading from the plain to the heights, and it is the one along which the tides of battle most frequently rolled from the days of Joshua (Jos 10:12) to those of the Maccabees (1 Macc 3:16 ff, etc.). It occupies also a prominent place in the records of the Crusades.

(2) Wady ec-Surar:

Wady ec-Surar, the Valley of Sorek, crosses the Shephelah South of Gezer, and pursues a tortuous course past Beth-shemesh and Kiriath-jearim to the plateau Southwest of Jerusalem. This is the line followed by the Jaffa-Jerus Railway.

(3) Wady ec-Sunt:

Wady ec-Sunt runs eastward from the North of Tell ec-Safieh (Gath) up the Vale of Elah to its confluence with Wady ec-Sur which comes in from the South near Khirbet Shuweikeh (Socoh); and from that point, as Wady el-Jindy, pursues its way South of Timnah to the uplands West of Bethlehem.

(4) Wady el-‘Afranj:

Wady el-‘Afranj crosses the plain from Ashdod (Esdud), passes Beit Jibrin (Eleutheropolis), and winds up through the mountains toward Hebron.

(5) Wady el-Chesy:

Wady el-Chesy, from the sea about 7 miles North of Gaza, runs eastward with many windings, passes to the North of Lachish, and finds its way to the plateau some 6 miles Southwest of Hebron.

From the Shephelah thus opened the gateways by which Judea and Jerusalem might be assailed: and the course of these avenues determined the course of much of the history. It is evident that the shephelah lay open to attack from both sides, and for centuries it was the debatable land between Israel and the Philistines. The ark for a time sojourned in this region (1Sa 5:6 f). In this district is laid the scene of Samson’s exploits (Jud 14-16). The scene of David’s memorable victory over the giant was in the Wady ec-Sunt, between Socoh and Azekah (1Sa 17:1). David found refuge here in the cave of Adullam (1Sa 22:1). For picturesque and vivid accounts of the Shephelah and of the part it played in history see Smith, HGHL, 201 ff; A. Henderson, Palestine, Its Historical Geography, 1894.

W. Ewing

SHEPHER

she’-fer (shepher, "beauty"): A mount near which the Israelites encamped (Nu 33:23 f).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

SHEPHERD

shep’-erd (ro‘eh, ro‘i; poimen, "a feeder"): The sheep owner frequently tends the flocks himself (Ge 4:4; 30:40; compare Eze 34:12), but more often he delegates the work to his children (Ge 29:9; 1Sa 16:19; 17:15) or relatives (Ge 31:6). In such cases the sheep have good care because the keepers have a personal interest in the well-being of the animals, but when they are attended by a hireling (1Sa 17:20) the flocks may be neglected or abused (Isa 56:10,11; Eze 34:8,10; Zec 11:15,17; Joh 10:12). The chief care of the shepherd is to see that the sheep find plenty to eat and drink. The flocks are not fed in pens or folds, but, summer and winter, must depend upon foraging for their sustenance (Ps 23:2). In the winter of 1910-11 an unprecedented storm ravaged Northern Syria. It was accompanied by a snowfall of more than 3 ft., which covered the ground for weeks. During that time, hundreds of thousands of sheep and goats perished, not so much from the cold as from the fact that they could get no food. Goats hunt out the best feeding-grounds, but sheep are more helpless and have to be led to their food (compare Nu 27:16,17); nor do they possess the instinct of many other animals for finding their way home (compare

Eze 34:6-8). Flocks should be watered at least once a day. Where there are springs or streams this is an easy matter. Frequently the nearest water is hours away. One needs to travel in the dry places in Syria or Palestine, and then enter the watered valleys like those in Edom where the flocks are constantly being led for water, to appreciate the Psalmist's words, "He leadcth me beside still waters." Sometimes water can be obtained by digging shallow wells (Ge 26:18-22,25,32). The shepherd frequently carries with him a pail from which the sheep can drink when the water is not accessible to them. On the mountain tops the melting snows supply the needed water. In other districts it is drawn from deep wells (Ge 29:2; Joh 4:6). The usual time for watering is at noon, at which time the flocks are led to the watering-places (Ge 29:2,3). After drinking, the animals lie down or huddle together in the shade of a rock while the shepherd sleeps. At the first sound of his call, which is usually a peculiar guttural sound, hard to imitate, the flock follow off to new feeding-grounds. Even should two shepherds call their flocks at the same time and the sheep be intermingled, they never mistake their own master's voice (Joh 10:3-5).

The shepherd's equipment is a simple one. His chief garment is a cloak woven from wool or made from sheepskins. This is sleeveless, and so made that it hangs like a cloak on his shoulders. When he sleeps he curls up under it, head and all. During the summer a lighter, short-sleeved 'aba or coat is worn. He carries a staff or club (see STAFF), and a characteristic attitude is to make a rest for his arms by placing his staff on his shoulders against the back of his neck. When an especially productive spot is found, the shepherd may pass the time, while the animals are grazing, by playing on his pipe (Jud 5:16). He sometimes carries a sling (qela') of goat's hair (1Sa 17:40). His chief belongings are kept in a skin pouch or bag (keli) (1Sa 17:40). This bag is usually a whole tawed skin turned wrong side out, with the legs tied up and the neck forming the opening. He is usually aided in the keeping and the defending of the sheep by a dog (Job 30:1). In Syria the Kurdish dogs make the best protectors of the sheep, as, unlike the cowardly city dogs, they are fearless and will drive away the wild beasts. The shepherd is often called upon to aid the dogs in defending the sheep (Ge 31:39; 1Sa 17:34,35; Isa 31:4; Jer 5:6; Am 3:12).

Figurative:

The frequent use of the word "shepherd" to indicate a spiritual overseer is familiar to Bible readers (Ps 23:1; 80:1; Ec 12:11; Isa 40:4; 63:14; Jer 31:10; Eze 34:23; 37:24; Joh 21:15-17; Eph 4:11; 1Pe 5:1-4). We still use the term "pastor," literally, "a shepherd." Leaders in temporal affairs were also called shepherds (Ge 47:17 margin; Isa 44:28; 63:11). "Sheep without a shepherd" typified individuals or nations who had forgotten Yahweh (Nu 27:17; 1Ki 22:17; 2Ch 18:16; Eze 34:5,8; Zec 10:2; Mt 9:36; Mr 6:34).

Jesus is spoken of as the good shepherd (Joh 10:14); chief shepherd (1Pe 5:4); great shepherd (Heb 13:20); the one shepherd (Joh 10:16). "He will feed his flock like a shepherd, he will gather the lambs in his arm, and carry them in his bosom, and will gently lead those that have their young" (Isa 40:11) is a picture drawn from pastoral life of Yahweh's care over His children. A strong sympathy for helpless animals, though sometimes misdirected, is a marked characteristic of the people of Bible lands. The birth of offspring in a flock often occurs far off on the mountain side. The shepherd solicitously guards the mother during her helpless moments and picks up the lamb and carries it to the fold. For the few days, until it is able to walk, he may carry it in his arms or in the loose folds of his coat above his girdle.

See also SHEEP.

James A. Patch

SHEPHI, SHEPHO

she’-fi, she’-fo (shephi; Codex Vaticanus Sob, Codex Alexandrinus Sophar; Lucian, Sapphei (1Ch 1:40); or Shepho, shepho; Codex Alexandrinus Soph; Lucian, Sophan (Ge 36:23)): A Horite chief.

SHEPHUPHAM, SHEPHUPHAN

she-fu’-fam or she-fu’-fan (shephupham; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Sophan; Lucian, Sophan (Nu 26:39 (43)); or Shephuphan, shephuphan; Codex Vaticanus Sopharphak, Codex Alexandrinus Sophan, Lucian, Seppham (1Ch 8:5), "a kind of serpent," Gray, HPN, 95): Eponym of a Benjamite family. The name occurs in Ge 46:21 as "Muppim" and in 1Ch 7:12,15; 26:16 as "Shuppim." It is almost impossible to arrive at the original form; the gentilic "Shuphamites" appears in Nu 26:39 (43).

SHERAH

she’-ra.

See SHEERAH.

SHERD

shurd.

See POTSHERD.

SHEREBIAH

sher-e-bi’-a, she-reb’-ya (sherebhyah, "God has sent burning heat"(?); the form is doubtful): A post-exilic priest and family. Sherebiah, who joined Ezra at the river Ahava (Ezr 8:18; the Septuagint omits), and had charge, along with eleven others, of the silver and gold and vessels for the Temple (Ezr 8:24, Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Saraia, Lucian, Sarabias). He aided in the exposition of the Law (Ne 8:7), was among those who made public confession (Ne 9:4) and sealed the covenant (Ne 10:12 (13)). His name also appears in Ne 12:8,24. In every passage listed above except 10:12 (13), Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus read Sarabia, Lucian, Sarabias. In 1 Esdras 8:47 the name

appears as "Asebebia," the Revised Version (British and American) "Asebebias"; in 1 Esdras 8:54, "Esebrias," the Revised Version (British and American) "Eserebias," and 1 Esdras 9:48, "Sarabias." Many of the companion-names on the lists are plainly ethnic (Cheyne).

Horace J. Wolf

SHERESH

she’-resh, sharesh; Codex Vaticanus Souros; Codex Alexandrinus Soros, Lucian, Phares, Phoros): A Machirite name in a genealogy of Manasseh (1Ch 7:16).

SHEREZER

she-re’-zer (Zec 7:2 the King James Version).

See SHAREZER.

SHERGHAT, ASSHUR, ASSUR

shur’-gat, sher’-gat: The name of the first capital city of Assyria is known by the Arabs as Qala’ at Sherghat, or the Fortress of Sherghat. Its ancient name was Asshur or Assur (Ge 10:11 margin). From it was derived the name of the country, Assyria, and of the people, Assyrians. The date of the founding of the city is not known. Apparently about 2000 BC a colony of Babylonians migrated northward along the Tigris River and settled upon the right shore about halfway between the Upper and Lower Zab, or halfway between the modern cities of Mosul and Bagdad. Assur, the local deity of the place, became the national god of Assyria. It is uncertain whether the deity gave the name to the city, or the city to the deity, but probably an early shrine of Assur stood there, and the people, building their city about it, became known as the Assyrians. At first the city was a Bah dependency, governed by priests from Babylonia. In time, as the city acquired a political significance, the power of the priesthood declined; allegiance to Babylonia ceased, and the Assyrian empire came into existence. About 1200 BC the political power had so increased that a new capital, Nimrud (Calah) was built to the North near the junction of the Upper Zab with the Tigris. In 722 BC the capital was transferred by Sargon to his new city, Dur-Sharrukin, and in 705 BC Sennacherib enlarged Nineveh, and it remained the capital city till the fall of the empire in 606 BC. Assur, however, as the seat of the national deity, never ceased to be the chief religious center.

The mounds of Assur are among the largest in Mesopotamia. They rise abruptly from the Tigris, which they follow for about half a mile, and extend a quarter of a mile inland. In the surrounding plain are other mounds, marking the sites of temples, and indicating that a part of the city was without the walls. At the northern end the mounds are surmounted by a high conical peak, which represents the tower or ziggurat of the temple of Assur.

Of the early excavators Layard and Rassam examined the ruins, but the fanaticism of the surrounding Arabs prevented extensive excavations. In 1904 Dr. W. Andrae, for the Deutsche Orientgesellschaft, began the systematic excavations which have been continued by Dr. P. Maresch for ten years. Discoveries of the greatest importance have been made. The city was found to have been surrounded on the land side by a double wall. The space between the walls, several rods in width, was occupied by houses, possibly the homes of the soldiers. The base of the outer wall was of stone; above it were mud bricks strengthened at intervals with courses of burned bricks. Along the outer upper edge was a parapet, protected by battlements. From the floor of the parapet small holes were bored vertically downward, so that the soldiers, without exposing themselves, might discharge their arrows at the enemy close to the base of the wall. Many of the holes are still visible. The wall was pierced with several gateways; the names "Gate of Assur," "Gate of the Tigris," "Gate of the Sun God" have survived. At the sides of the gateways were small chambers for the guards, and from them passageways led to the parapet above. The gates were reached by bridges which spanned the moat. Along the river side the city was protected by a high steep embankment, which was built partly of limestone, but chiefly of square bricks laid in bitumen.

The temple of Assur at the northern end of the city has been thoroughly excavated. With its outer and inner court and tower it conformed in its general plan to the older Babylonian temples. Several of the palaces of the early kings were discovered, but the best-preserved of the palaces was one which the excavators have called the residence of the mayor. It stood near the western edge of the city on the main street which ran from the western gate to the Tigris. It consisted of two courts surrounded by chambers. Grooves in the paved floor conducted fresh water to the kitchen, the baths and the chambers, and round tiles beneath the floor carried away the waste water to the arched city sewer and to the Tigris. To the rear of the mayor’s house was a crowded residential quarter. The streets were very narrow and winding. The houses were exceedingly small; in some of them one could not lie at full length upon the floor. Among their ruins appeared little but stone mortars and broken pottery and other essential household implements.

Near the southern end of the city a most remarkable discovery was made. About a hundred monoliths, from 4 to 8 ft. high, were found still standing erect. On the side of each one, near the top, was an inscription of several lines, dedicating the stone to some individual who had been of great service to the state. They were not tombstones; apparently they had been erected during the lifetime of the people whom they honored. Of the greatest interest was one which bore the name of Sammuramat or Semiramis, the once supposed mythical queen of Nineveh. Its translation reads: "The column of Sa-am-mu-ra-mat, the palace wife of Samsi-Adad, king of the world, king of Assyria, the mother of Adad-Nirari, king of the world, king of Assyria, the .... of Shalmaneser, king of the four regions." The inscription not only makes Semiramis a historical character, but places her among the foremost rulers of Assyria.

The tombs of the kings and nobles were found deep in the ruins in the very center of the city. They were rectangular structures of cut stone, covered above with a rounded arch of burned bricks. In some cases the massive stone doors still turned in their sockets. The roofs of many of them had fallen in; others,

which were intact, were filled with dust. From the tombs a vast amount of silver, gold and copper jewelry and stone beads and ornaments were recovered.

One of the chief temples of the city stood at short distance without the eastern wall. Nothing but its foundations remain. However, the temple was surrounded by a park, traces of which still exist. The soil of the surrounding plain is a hard clay, incapable of supporting vegetable life. Into the clay large holes, several feet in diameter, were dug and filled with loam. Long lines of the holes may still be traced, each marking the spot where a tree, probably the date palm, stood in the temple park.

A modern cemetery on the summit of the main mound is still used by the neighboring Arabs, and therefore it will likely prevent the complete excavation of this oldest of the capital cities of Assyria.

See further ASSYRIA.

E. J. Banks

SHERIFF

sher’-if (Aramaic tiphtaye’ "judicial," "a lawyer," "a sheriff" (Da 3:2 f]): Probably a "lawyer" or "jurist" whose business it was to decide points of law. At best, however, the translation "sheriff" is but a conjecture.

SHESHACH

she’-shak (sheshakh, as if "humiliation"; compare shakhakh, "to crouch"): The general explanation is that this is "a cypherform of ‘Babel’ (Babylon)" which is the word given as equivalent to "Sheshach" by the Targum (Jer 25:26; 51:41; the Septuagint omits in both passages). By the device known as Atbas ‘atbas, i.e. disguising a name by substituting the last letter of the alphabet for the first, the letter next to the last for the second, etc., sh-sh-k is substituted for babhel. This theory has not failed of opposition. Delitzsch holds that "Sheshach" represents Sis-ku-KI of an old Babylonian regal register, which may have stood for a part of the city of Babylon. (For a refutation of this interpretation see Schrader, KAT2, 415; COT, II, 108 f.) Lauth, too, takes "Sheshach" to be a Hebraization of Siska, a Babylonian district. Winckler and Sayce read Uru-azagga. Finally, Cheyne and a number of critics hold that the word has crept into the text, being "a conceit of later editors."

See further JEREMIAH, 6.

Horace J. Wolf

SHESHAI

she’-shi (sheshay): One of the sons of Anak, perhaps an old Hebronite clan name. (Sayce combines the name with Sasu, the root sh-c-h, the Egyptian name for the Syrian Bedouins.) The clan lived in Hebron at the time of the conquest and was expelled by Caleb (Nu 13:22, Codex Vaticanus Sessei; Codex Alexandrinus Semei; Jos 15:14, Codex Vaticanus Sousei; Codex Alexandrinus Sousai; Jud 1:10, Codex Vaticanus Sessei; Codex Alexandrinus Geththi).

SHESHAN

she’-shan (sheshan; Sosan): A Jerahmeelite whose daughter married his servant Jarha (1Ch 2:31,34,35). The genealogical list which follows embraces some very early names (compare Curtis, ICC, at the place).

SHESHBAZZAR

shesh-baz’-ar (shesh-batstsar or sheshbatstsar): Sheshbazzar is the Hebrew or Aramaic form of the Babylonian Shamash-aba-ucur, or Shamash-bana-ucur: "Oh Shamash, protect the father." It is possible that the full name was Shamash-ban-zeri-Babili-ucur, "Oh Shamash, protect the father (builder) of the seed of Babylon." (See Zerubbabel, and Compare the Babylonian names Ashur-banaucur, Ban-ziri, Nabu-ban-ziri, Shamash-ban-apli, Shamash-apil-ucur, Shamash-ban-achi, and others in Tallquist’s Neubabylonisches Namenbuch, and the Aramaic names on numbers 35, 44, 36, and 45 of Clay’s Aramaic Dockets.) If this latter was the full name, there would be little doubt that Sheshbazzar may have been the same person as Zerubbabel, since the former is called in Ezr 5:14 the governor of Judah, and the latter is called by the same title in Hag 1:1,14; 2:2,21. It is more probable, however, that Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel were different persons, and that Sheshbazzar was governor of Judah in the time of Cyrus and Zerubbabel in that of Darius. It is possible that Sheshbazzar came to Jerusalem in the time of Cyrus and laid the foundations, and that Zerubbabel came later in the time of Darius Hystaspis and completed the building of the temple (compare Ezr 2:68; 4:2; Hag 1:14).

According to Ezr 1:8 Sheshbazzar was the prince (Hannasi) of Judah into whose hands Cyrus put the vessels of the house of the Lord which Nebuchadnezzar had brought forth out of Jerusalem and had put in the house of his gods. It is further said in 1:11 that Sheshbazzar brought these vessels with them of the captivity which he brought up from Babylon to Jerusalem. In Ezr 5:14 f it is said that these vessels had been delivered by Cyrus unto one whose name was Sheshbazzar, whom he had made governor (pechah), and that Sheshbazzar came and laid the foundations of the house of God which was in Jerusalem.

See SANABASSAR.

R. Dick Wilson

SHETH

See SETH.

SHETHAR

she’-thar (~shethar]; Codex Vaticanus and Lucian, Sarsathaios; Codex Alexandrinus Sarestheos): One of the "seven princes" at the court of Ahasuerus (Es 1:14); these princes "sat first in the kingdom" and had the right of entrance to the king’s presence at any time, except when he was in the company of one of his wives. (According to Marquart, Fund., 69, Shethar comes from sh-r-sh-th-y with which the Persian siyatis, "joy," is to be compared.) The word has never really been satisfactorily explained; it is presumably Persian.

SHETHAR-BOZENAI, SHETHAR-BOZNAI

she’-thar-boz’-e-ni, she’-thar-boz’-ni, -boz’-na-i, (shethar boznay, meaning uncertain): The name of a Persian (?) official mentioned with Tattenai in connection with the correspondence with Darius relative to the rebuilding of the Temple (Ezr 5:3,6; 6:6,12; Codex Vaticanus Satharbouzan; Codex Alexandrinus Satharbouzanai, in Ezr 5:3; 6:13; Satharbouzanes, in Ezr 5:6; Satharbouzane, in Ezr 6:6; Lucian, throughout, Tharbouzanaios), called in 1 Esdras 6:3,7,27; 7:1 "Shathrabuzanes."

Among the conjectures as to the meaning and derivation of the name, the following may be mentioned:

(1) Shethar-boznai may be a corruption of metharboznay = Mithrobouzanes, Old Persian Mithrobauzana —i.e. "Mithra is deliverer."

(2) shathar is identical with the Old Persian Tsithra ("seed," "brilliance"); names have been found that are confounded with this word.

(3) shethar bowzenay may be a title, but sethar, must then be read for shethar.

(4) shethar boznay is equivalent to the Old Persian Sethrabuzana, "empire-delivering"; compare Encyclopedia Biblica, article "Shethar-boznai," and Brown, Driver, and Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament.

Horace J. Wolf

SHEVA

she’-va (shewa’; Codex Vaticanus Saou; Codex Alexandrinus Saoul, Lucian, Soue):

(1) A son of Caleb by his concubine Maacah (1Ch 2:49).

(2) See SHAVSHA.

SHEW, SHOW

sho: "Show" (so always the American Standard Revised Version) is simply a modernized spelling of "shew" (so always in the King James Version and generally in the English Revised Version), and it should be carefully noted that "shew" is never pronounced "shoo," not even in the combination "shewbread"; Compare "sew."

In the King James Version "shew" as a verb is the translation of a very large number of terms in the original. This number is reduced considerably by the Revised Version (British and American) (especially in the New Testament), but most of these changes are to secure uniformity of rendition, rather than to correct obscurities. The proper sense of the verb, of course, is "to cause a person to see" (Ge 12:1, etc.) or "to cause a thing (or "person") to be seen" (De 4:35; Jud 4:22, etc.). "Seeing," naturally, can be taken as intellectual or moral (Jer 38:21; Ps 16:11, etc.), and can even be used for "hearing" (Isa 43:9, etc.; contrast the Revised Version (British and American) 1Sa 9:27). Hence, "shew" can be used as a general translation for the most various phrases, as "be shewed" for ginomai, "come to pass" (Ac 4:22, the Revised Version (British and American) "be wrought"); "shew forth themselves" for energeo, "be active" (Mt 14:2, the Revised Version (British and American) "work"); "shew" for poieo "do" (Ac 7:36, the Revised Version (British and American) "having wrought"); for diegeomai, "relate" (Lu 8:39 the Revised Version (British and American) "declare"); for deloo, "make clear" (2Pe 1:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "signify"), etc. In So 2:9 the King James Version (English Revised Version) "shewing himself" and the American Standard Revised Version (English Revised Version margin) "glanceth" both miss the poetry of the original: "His eyes shine in through the lattice" (tsuts, "blossom" "sparkle").

The King James Version’s uses of the noun "shew" usually connote appearance in contrast to reality. So Lu 20:47, "for a shew" (prophasis, "apparent cause," the Revised Version (British and American) "pretence"); Col 2:23, "shew of wisdom" (so the Revised Version (British and American), logos, "word," "repute"); Ga 6:12, "make a fair shew" (so the Revised Version (British and American), euprosopeo, "have a fair face"); Ps 39:6, "vain shew" (so the American Standard Revised Version tselem, "image" the Revised Version margin "shadow"). However, in Sirach 43:1 (horama, "spectacle" (so the Revised Version (British and American))) and in Col 2:15 deigmatizo, "to display") "shew" =" spectacle." In Isa 3:9 "the shew of their countenance" is a bad translation for "their respect of persons" (so the Revised Version margin for hakkarath penehem). The "shewing" of the Baptist "unto Israel" (Lu 1:80 the King James Version, the English Revised Version) is of course his appearing to begin his ministry.

Burton Scott Easton

SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF

(shulchan (Ex 25:25-30, etc.); he trapeza kai he prothesis ton arton (Heb 9:2)): For construction, see TABERNACLE; TEMPLE. A rude representation of the table is given on the Arch of Titus in Rome. The bas-relief was measured by Professor Boni in 1905, and the height and width of the represented tables were found to be 48 centimeters, or nearly 19 inches. The table represented is, of course, that of Herod's temple, taken at the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD. See the author's article on "The Temple Spoils" in PEFS, 1906, 306 ff.

The table of shewbread is to be distinguished from the altar of incense. It has become the fashion of the newer criticism to deny the existence of the altar of incense in preexilic times, and to explain the allusion to it in 1Ki 6:20 as the table of shewbread (so in Eze 41:22). The other references (1Ki 6:22; 7:48; 9:25) are dismissed as interpolations. The procedure is radically vicious. The table of shewbread is not an "altar," though the altar is once spoken of as a "table" (Eze 41:22). There was only one altar of incense (1Ki 6:20), but (in 2Ch 4:8) ten tables of shewbread.

See SHEWBREAD.

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHEWBREAD, THE

sho'-bred lechem ha-panim, "bread of the presence"; he prothesis ton arton (Heb 9:2); the American Standard Revised Version "showbread").

See SHEW:

1. The Term:

The marginal reading of Ex 25:30; 35:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "Presence-bread," exactly gives the meaning of the Hebrew. In 2Ch 2:4 it is spoken of as the "continual showbread," because it was to be before Yahweh "alway" (Ex 25:30).

2. Mosaic Regulations:

Later Judaism has much to say as to the number and size of the loaves, more properly thin cakes, which bore this name, together with many minute regulations as to the placing of the loaves, the covering of them with frankincense, and other ritualistic vapidities. All that the Mosaic legislation required was that, once in every week, there should be twelve cakes of unleavened bread, each containing about four-fifths of a peck of fine flour, placed in two piles upon a pure table with frankincense beside each pile and changed every Sabbath day (Le 24:5-9). From the description of the table upon which the fiat cakes were to lie (Ex 25:23-30; 37:10-16), it held a series of golden vessels comprising dishes, spoons, flagons and bowls. As it is unlikely that empty cups were set before Yahweh—they being described as "the vessels which were upon the table"—we may conclude that the table held presentation offerings of

"grain and wine and oil," the three chief products of the land (De 7:13). The "dishes" were probably the salvers on which the thin cakes were piled, six on each. The "flagons" would contain wine, and the bowls (made with spouts, "to pour withal"), the oil; while the "spoons" held the frankincense, which was burned as a memorial, "even an offering made by fire unto Yahweh." The cakes themselves were eaten by the priests on every Sabbath day, as being among the "most holy" sacrifices. Each of the synoptists refers to the incident of David and his companions having eaten of the shewbread (hoi artoi tes protheseos), as told in 1Sa 21:4-6 (Mt 12:4; Mr 2:26; Lu 6:4).

3. On Journeyings:

At such times as the removal of the tabernacle took place, the separate appointments of the table of incense were not parted from it, but were carried with it—dishes, spoons, bowls, and cups (Nu 4:7). These, like the other furniture, were borne by the Kohathite Levites, but a few articles of lighter weight were in the personal care of the high priest. These comprised the oil for the candlestick, the sweet incense, the holy oil of consecration, and the meal for the continual bread offering (Nu 4:7,8,16). Small quantities of these alone would be borne from place to place, such as would be needed with the least delay to refurbish the vessels of the sanctuary on every reerection of the tent of meeting.

4. Significance:

With this view of the nature, we have a natural and adequate sense of the meanings and importance of the shewbread, in the economy of the temple ritual and service. It was a continual reminder to the worshippers of the truth that man does not live by bread alone, emphasized by the fact that these most holy offerings were afterward eaten. It was the Old Testament version of the prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread"; and in the fact that the holy table was never for a moment left without some loaves lying on it, we have the symbol of man’s continued and unbroken dependence upon God. Even during the travels of the table of shewbread with the tabernacle, the "continual bread" was required to be in its place thereon (Nu 4:7).

It has been usual to say that "frankincense in golden urns stood beside the twelve loaves" (EB, IV, col. 4212). But this is a mere repetition of a Jewish legend, as spoons were the recognized holders of the frankincense to be burned (compare Nu 7:14 ff). Such spoons formed a part of the equipment of the shewbread table, and on the removal of the week-old cakes the spoons were carried forth and the frankincense in them burned on the great altar on the Sabbath day. If this were done while the grain and wine and oil were being consumed, it would derive additional significance, as betokening the gratitude and adoration of the representative recipients of the bounties of Nature, just as the daily burning of incense in the holy place betokened the worship and adoration of the praying multitudes without the temple (Lu 1:10).

See SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF.

W. Shaw Caldecott

SHIBAH

shi’-ba (shibh‘ah, "seven"; horkos; Swete reads Phrear horkou, literally, "well of oath"; the King James Version Shebah): The name of the original well of Beer-sheba according to Ge 26:33.

See BEERSHEBA.

SHIBBOLETH

shib’-o-leth (shibboleth): A test of speech applied by the men of Gilead to the Ephraimites, who wished to cross the Jordan, after defeat. If they pronounced the word cibboleth, their dialectic variety of speech betrayed them. (Jud 12:6). The word probably has the sense of stream or "flood" (compare Ps 69:2).

SHIBMAH

shib’-ma (sibhmah).

See SIBMAH.

SHICRON

shik’-ron (shikkeron).

See SHIKKERON.

SHIELD

sheld.

See ARMOR, IV, 1.

SHIGGAION

shi-ga’-yon, shi-gi’-on (shiggayon): Occurs in the title of Ps 7, and, in the plural, in the verse introducing Habakkuk’s prayer (Hab 3:1). Derived from a verb meaning "to wander," it is generally taken to mean a dithyramb, or rhapsody. This is not supported by the Greek VSS, but they are evidently quite at a loss.

See PSALMS, BOOK OF.

SHIHON

shi’-hon (shi’on).

See SHION.

SHIHOR

shi’-hor (shichor, also written without a yodh (y) and waw (w) in Hebrew and incorrectly "Sihor" in English): A stream of water mentioned in connection with Egypt. Joshua (13:3) speaks of the "Shihor, which is before Egypt," a stream which commentators have thought to be "the brook of Egypt," the stream which separated Egypt from Palestine, now called Wady el-‘Arish. Jeremiah (2:18 the King James Version) says, "What hast thou to do in the way to Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor?" Commentators have thought Shihor in this case to be a name for the Nile. Both interpretations cannot be correct. Whatever the name South means, at least it did not denote a movable river. It must be the same stream in both these passages, and no identification of the stream can be correct that does not satisfy both of them. Professor Naville has recently shown conclusively (Proc. Soc. Biblical Arch., January, 1913) that neither of these interpretations is strictly correct, and has made clear the Biblical references to South. In the northeasternmost province of ancient Egypt, Khentabt ("Fronting on the East"), was a canal, a fresh-water stream drawn off from the Nile, called in the Egyptian language Shi-t-Hor, i.e. "the Horus Canal" (the -t- is an Egyptian feminine ending). There have been many changes in the branches and canals from the Nile in the Delta, and this one with many others has been lost altogether; but there is a tradition among the Bedouin of Wady el-‘Arish to this day that once a branch of the Nile came over to that point. This Shi-t-Hor, "Stream of Horus," makes perfectly clear and harmonious the different references of Scripture to South. It was "before Egypt," as Jos describes it, and it was the first sweet water of Egypt which the traveler from Palestine in those days was able to obtain, as the words of Jeremiah indicate. "To drink the waters of South" meant to reach the supply of the fresh water of the Nile at the border of the desert. The two other references to South (1Ch 13:5; Isa 23:3) are perfectly satisfied by this identification. The "seed of South" (Isa 23:3 the King James Version) would be grain from Egypt by way of the Shihor.

M. G. Kyle

SHIHOR-LIBNATH

shi’-hor-lib’-nath shichor libhnath; Codex Vaticanus to Seion kai Labanath; Codex Alexandrinus Seior, etc.): A place named on the boundary of Asher (Jos 19:26). It seems to mark with Carmel the western limit, and may have been on the South of that mountain. Peshitta, Syriac, and Eusebius (Onomasticon) take this as two distinct names attaching to cities in this region. So far, however, no trace of either name has been found in the course of very careful exploration. More probably Shihor was the name of a river, "Libnath" distinguishing it from the Nile, which was called Shihor of Egypt. It may have been called Shihor because, like the Nile, it contained crocodiles. The boundary of Asher included Dor (TanTurah),

so the river may be sought South of that town. Crocodiles are said still to be found in the Kishon; but this river runs North of Carmel. The Crocodeilon of Ptolemy (V. xv.5; xvi.2) and Pliny (v.19), which the latter makes the southern boundary of Phoenicia, may possibly be Nahr ez-Zerqa, which enters the sea about 5 miles South of TanTurah. Here also it is said the crocodile is sometimes seen. Perhaps therefore we may identify this stream with Shihor-libnath.

W. Ewing

SHIKKERON

shik'-er-on (shikkeron; the King James Version Shicron): A place mentioned in Jos 15:11 as being on the northern border of Judah, between Ekron and Baalah, Jabneel being beyond, toward the sea. The site is unknown, but Rev. C. Hauser (PEFS, 1907, 289) suggests Tell es-Sellakeh, Northwest of 'Akir, remarking that if this were the site the boundary would follow a natural course over the mountain to Jabneel.

SHILHI

shil'-hi (shilchi): Father of Jehoshaphat's mother (1Ki 22:42 = 2Ch 20:31; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus in 2 Chronicles, Salei, Codex Vaticanus in 1 Kings, Semeei; Codex Alexandrinus in 1 Kings, Salala; Lucian in both, Seleei). Cheyne (Encyclopaedia Biblica, article "Shilhi") ventures the supposition that "Shilhi" is a misreading for "Shilhim" (Jos 15:32), and is therefore the name of place rather than that of a person; he holds it to be the name of the birthplace of Azubah, the king's mother.

SHILHIM

shil'-him shilchim (Jos 15:32)): See SHAARAIM, (2). Possibly Azubah the mother of Jehoshaphat, who is called "the daughter of Shilhi" (1Ki 22:42; 2Ch 20:31), was a native of Shilhim.

SHILLEM, SHILLEMITES

shil'-em, shil'-em-its (shillem, ha-shillemi): Shillem is found in Ge 46:24, a son of Naphtali; Shillemites, his descendants, are mentioned in Nu 26:49; SHALLUM (which see) is found in 1Ch 7:13.

SHILOAH

shi-lo'-a, shi-lo'-a (Isa 8:6).

See SILOAM.

SHILOH (1)

shi’-lo (shiloh): The prophecy in Ge 49:10, "The scepter shall not depart from Judah, ... until Shiloh come," etc., has been the subject of very diverse interpretations. the Revised Version margin gives as alternative renderings, "‘ Till he come to Shiloh having the obedience of the peoples’ Or, according to the Syriac, ‘Till he come whose it is,’ etc."

(1) From the earliest times the passage has been regarded as Messianic, but the rendering in the text, which takes "Shiloh" as a proper name, bearing a meaning such as "peaceful" (compare Isa 9:6, "Prince of Peace"), labors under the difficulty that Shiloh is not found elsewhere as a personal name in the Old Testament, nor is it easy to extract from it the meaning desired. Further, the word was not personally applied to the Messiah in any of the ancient VSS, which rather assume a different reading (see below). Apart from a purely fanciful passage in the Talmud (compare Driver, Gen, 413), this application does not appear earlier than the version of Seb. Munster in the 16th century (1534).

(2) The rendering, "till he come to Shiloh," where Shiloh is taken as the name of a place, not a person, is plausible, but is felt to yield no suitable sense in the context. It is, therefore, now also set aside by most recent scholars.

(3) The 3rd rendering, which regards Shiloh as representing the Hebrew shelloh = shiloh for ‘asher low, "whose (it is)," has in its favor the fact that this is evidently the reading presupposed in the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and the this is evidently the reading presupposed in the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and the Jewish Targums, and seems to be alluded to in Eze 21:27, "until he come whose right it is." In this view the passage has still a Messianic reference, though critics argue that it must then be regarded as late in origin. Other interpretations need not detain us. See for details the full discussions in Hengstenberg’s Christology, I, 54 ff, English translation, the commentaries of Delitzsch, Driver, and Skinner, on Genesis (especially Excursus II in Driver), and the articles in the various Bible dictionaries.

See also PROPHECY.

James Orr

SHILOH (2)

(The most usual form is shiloh, but it appears 8 times as shilo, and 3 times as Shilow; Selo, Selom): A town in the lot of Ephraim where Israel assembled under Joshua at the close of the war of conquest (Jos 18:1). Here territory was allotted to the seven tribes who had not yet received their portions. A commission was sent out to "describe the land into seven portions"; this having been done, the inheritances were assigned by lot. Here also were assigned to the Levites their cities in the territories of the various tribes (Joshua 18-21). From Shiloh Reuben and Gad departed for their homes East of the Jordan; and here the tribes gathered for war against these two, having misunderstood their building of the great altar in the Jordan valley (Joshua 22). From Jud 18:31 we learn that in the period of the Judges the house of God was in Shiloh; but when the sanctuary was moved thither from Gilgal there is no

indication. The maids of Shiloh were captured by the Benjamites on the occasion of a feast, while dancing in the vineyards; this having been planned by the other tribes to provide the Benjamites with wives without involving themselves in responsibility (21:21 ff). While the house of the Lord remained here it was a place of pilgrimage (1Sa 1:3). To Shiloh Samuel was brought and consecrated to God's service (1Sa 1:24). The sanctuary was presided over by Eli and his wicked sons; and through Samuel the doom of their house was announced. The capture of the ark by the Philistines, the fall of Hophni and Phinehas, and the death of the aged priest and his daughter-in-law followed with startling rapidity (1Sa 3; 4). The sanctuary in Shiloh is called a "temple" (1Sa 1:9; 3:3) with doorpost and doors (1Sa 1:9; 3:15). It was therefore a more durable structure than the old tent. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE. It would appear to have been destroyed, probably by the Philistines; and we find the priests of Eli's house at Nob, where they were massacred at Saul's order (1Sa 22:11). The disaster that befell Shiloh, while we have no record of its actual occurrence, made a deep impression on the popular mind, so that the prophets could use it as an effective illustration (Ps 78:60; Jer 7:12:14; 26:6). Here the blind old prophet Ahijah was appealed to in vain by Jeroboam's wife on behalf of her son (1Ki 14:2,4), and it was still occupied in Jeremiah's time (Jer 41:5).

The position of Shiloh is indicated in Jud 21:19, as "on the north of Beth-el, on the east side of the highway that goeth up from Beth-el to Shechem, and on the south of Lebonah." This is very explicit, and points definitely to Seilun, a ruined site on a hill at the Northeast of a little plain, about 9 miles North of Beitin (Bethel), and 3 miles Southeast of Khan el-Lubban (Lebonah), to the East of the highway to Shechem (Nablus). The path to Seilun leaves the main road at Sinjil, going eastward to Turmus 'Aya, then northward across the plain. A deep valley runs to the North of the site, cutting it off from the adjoining hills, in the sides of which are rock-hewn tombs. A good spring rises higher up the valley. There are now no vineyards in the district; but indications of their ancient culture are found in the terraced slopes around.

The ruins on the hill are of comparatively modern buildings. At the foot of the hill is a mosque which is going quickly to ruin. A little distance to the Southeast is a building which seems to have been a synagogue. It is called by the natives Jami' el-'Arba'in, "mosque of the Forty." There are many cisterns.

Just over the crest of the hill to the North, on a terrace, there is cut in the rock a rough quadrangle 400 ft. by 80 ft. in dimensions. This may have been the site of "the house of the Lord" which was in Shiloh.

W. Ewing

SHILONITE

shi'-lo-nit (shiloni (2Ch 9:29), shiloni (2Ch 10:15; Ne 11:5), Shilowniy; Selonei, Seloneites): This denotes an inhabitant of Shiloh, and applies (1) to Ahijah the prophet (1Ki 11:29, etc.); and (2) to a family of the children of Judah, who, after the exile, made their home in Jerusalem (1Ch 9:5; Ne 11:5, the King James Version "Shiloni").

SHILSHAH

shil’-sha shilshah; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Saleisa; Lucian, Selemsan): An Asherite (1Ch 7:37).

SHIMEA

shim’-e-a (shim‘a’):

See SHAMMUA and SHAMMAH.

(1) Brother of David.

See SHAMMAH.

(2) Son of David (1Ch 3:5, Codex Vaticanus Saman; but in 2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 14:4, "Shammua").

(3) A Merarite Levite (1Ch 6:30, Codex Vaticanus Somea; Codex Alexandrinus Sama, Lucian, Samaa).

(4) A Gershonite Levite (1Ch 6:39 (24), Semaa).

SHIMEAH

shim’-e-a (shim’ah; Codex Vaticanus Semaa, Codex Alexandrinus Samea, Lucian, Samaa): A descendant of Jehiel, the "father" of Gibeon (1Ch 8:32); in 1Ch 9:38 he is called "Shimeam" (Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Lucian; Samaa Codex Alexandrinus Sama; see Jewish Quarterly Review, XI, 110-13, section symbol section symbol 10-12).

SHIMEAM

shim’-e-am.

See SHIMEAH.

SHIMEATH

shim’-e-ath (shim‘ath, or shim‘ath; the Septuagint in 2 Kings, Iemouath, Codex Vaticanus in 2 Chronicles, Sama, Codex Alexandrinus Samath, Lucian, Samaath): Father of Jozacar (2Ki 12:21 (22)), one of the murderers of Joash, king of Judah. According to 2Ch 24:26 Shimeath is an Ammonitess and the mother, not the father, of Jozacar. Many textual emendations have been suggested (compare HDB,

article "Shimeath"), but they are unnecessary, as the Chronicler's revised version of the incident in Kings was a deliberate one. The Chronicler was a sturdy opponent of intermarriage, and in the story of the assassination of King Joash he saw an opportunity to strike a blow against the hated practice. In the older account in Kings the names of the conspirators are given as "Jozakar the son of shim'ath, and Jehozabad the son of shemer." The two names are both masculine; but the final taw (t) of the former looked to the Chronicler like the feminine ending and offered him his opportunity. In his account, the one of the two murderers (dastardly villains, even though the king had merited death) was "the son of (shim'ath), the Ammonitess" and the other was "the son of (shimrith), the Moabitess" (compare Torrey, Ezra Studies, 212 ff).

Horace J. Wolf.

SHIMEATHITES

shim'-e-ath-its shim'athim; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Samathieim; Lucian, Samathein): A subdivision of the tribe of Caleb (1Ch 2:55). In the three families mentioned in this passage Jerome saw three distinct classes of religious functionaries: Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) canentes atque resonantes et in tabernaculis commorantes. The Targum has a similar explanation, except that the "Sucathites" are those "covered" with a spirit of prophecy. Bertheau (Handbuch zum Altes Testament) accepts Jerome's explanation, except that he regards the first class as gate-keepers (Aramaic tera' = Hebrew sha'ar). Wellhausen (DGJ, 30 f) finds underlying the three names tir'ah, a technical term for sacred music-making, shim'ah, the Halacha or sacred tradition. Buhl (HWB13) derives Shimeathites and Sucathites from unknown places. Keil interprets as descendants from the unknown Shemei (compare Curtis, ICC). The passage is hopelessly obscure.

Horace J. Wolf

SHIMEI

shim'-e-i (shim'i, possibly "hear me (El)" or "(Jah)"; Semeei, Semei): A name of frequent occurrence throughout the Old Testament records, sometimes varying slightly in form in English Versions of the Bible. The King James Version has "Shimi" in Ex 6:17; "Shimhi" in 1Ch 8:21; "Shimeah" in 2Sa 21:21. the Revised Version (British and American) has "Shimeites" in Zec 12:13, where the King James Version has "Shimei," and Nu 3:21 for the King James Version "Shimites." English Versions of the Bible has "Shema" in 1Ch 8:13,21 margin for the "Shimei" of 8:21. In all others of the many occurrences in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) the form is "Shimei."

(1) A family name among the Levites before and after the exile, at least five of whom bore it:

(a) Son of Gershon and grandson of Levi (Ex 6:17; Nu 3:18; 1Ch 6:17; 23:7,10). The text of 1 Chronicles 6 and 23 is corrupt, making difficult the tracing of the various genealogies and the

identification of the several Shimeis. Evidently that of 23:9 is a scribe's error for one of the four sons of Ladan or Libni, whose names are given in the preceding verse.

(b) An ancestor of Asaph the musician (1Ch 6:42), possibly the same as (a) above, Jahath the son of South (compare 1Ch 23:10) being by a copyist's error transposed so as to read as if he were the father of South

(c) A descendant of the Merarite branch of the Levites (1Ch 6:29).

(d) One of the 288 trained singers in the service of the sanctuary under Asaph (1Ch 25:17).

(e) One of the Levites who helped to cleanse the Temple in Hezekiah's reformation (2Ch 29:14). He was a descendant of Heman the musician. Hezekiah afterward appointed him with Conaniah to have chief oversight of "the oblations and the tithes and the dedicated things" which were brought into the chambers of Yahweh's house prepared for them (2Ch 31:11,12).

(f) A Levite who under Ezra put away his foreign wife (Ezr 10:23), "Semeis" in 1 Esdras 9:23.

(2) The best-known Bible character of this name is the Benjamite, of the family of Saul (2Sa 16:5-12; 19:16-20; 1Ki 2:8,9,36-46), who met David at Bahurim as he was fleeing from Absalom, and in bitter and cowardly fashion cursed and attacked the hard-pressed king. Apparently David's flight to the Jordan led through a narrow ravine, on one side of which, or on the ridge above, stood Shimei in safety as he cast stones at David and his men, cursing as he threw (2Sa 16:5,6). His hatred of David who had displaced his royal kinsman Saul had smouldered long in his mean heart; and now the flame bursts out, as the aged and apparently helpless king flees before his own son. Shimei seizes the long-coveted opportunity to pour out the acid hate of his heart. But when David's faithful companions would cross the ravine to make quick work of Shimei, the noble king forbade them with these remarkable words: "Behold, my son, who came forth from my bowels, seeketh my life: how much more may this Benjamite now do it? let him alone, and let him curse; for Yahweh hath bidden him. It may be that Yahweh .... will requite me good for his cursing" (2Sa 16:11,12). After Absalom's overthrow, as the king was returning victorious and vindicated, Shimei met him at the Jordan with most abject confession and with vows of allegiance (2Sa 19:16-23).

The king spared his life; but shortly before his death charged his son Solomon to see that due punishment should come to Shimei for his sins: "Thou shalt bring his hoar head down to Sheol with blood" (1Ki 2:9). When he came to the throne Solomon summoned Shimei and bade him build a house in Jerusalem, to which he should come and from which he must not go out on pain of death (1Ki 2:36-38). Feeling secure after some years, Shimei left his home in Jerusalem to recapture some escaped slaves (1Ki 2:39-41), and in consequence he was promptly dispatched by that gruesome avenger of blood, the royal executioner, "Benaiah the son of Jehoiada," who "fell upon him," as he had upon Adonijah and Joab, "so that he died" (1Ki 2:46).

(3) Another Benjamite, mentioned with Rei as an officer in the king's bodyguard, who was faithful to David in the rebellion of Adonijah (1Ki 1:8). Josephus reads Rei as a common noun, describing Shimei as "the friend of David." He is to be identified with the son of Elah (1Ki 4:18), whom Solomon, probably because of his fidelity, named as one of the 12 chief commissary officers appointed over all Israel, "who provided victuals for the king and his household."

(4) A man of some prominence in the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:21), whose home was in Aijalon, where he was a "head of fathers' houses" (1Ch 8:13); but his descendants lived in Jerusalem (1Ch 8:28). In the King James Version he is called "Shimhi"; in 1Ch 8:13 he is called "Shema."

(5) Another Benjamite, an ancestor of Mordecai (Es 2:5), "Semeias" in Additions to Esther 11:2.

(6) A brother of David (2Sa 21:21, the King James Version "Shimeah"); in 1Sa 16:9 he is called "Shammah"; compare "Shimeah," "Shimea."

(7) A man of Judah, called "the Ramathite," who was "over the vineyards" in David's reign (1Ch 27:27).

(8) A Simeonite living in the time of David (1Ch 4:26,27), whose chief claim to distinction was that he was father of 16 sons and 6 daughters. The descendants of such a numerous progeny, not being able to maintain themselves in their ancestral home in Beer-sheba, in the days of Hezekiah fell upon Gerar, and dispossessed "the sons of Ham" (1Ch 4:39, the Septuagint), and upon Mt. Seir, driving out the Amalekites (1Ch 4:43).

(9) A man of Reuben, son of Gog (1Ch 5:4).

(10), (11) Two men of "Israel," i.e. not priests or Levites, one "of the sons of Hashum" (Ezr 10:33), the other "of the sons of Bani" (Ezr 10:38), who put away their foreign wives at Ezra's command, in 1 Esdras called respectively "Semei" (9:33) and "Someis" (9:34).

(12) A brother of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:19).

The Shimeites were descendants of Shimei, grandson of Levi; compare (1) (a) above (Nu 3:21; Zec 12:13).

Edward Mack

SHIMEON

shim'-e-on (shim'on; elsewhere "Simeon"): One of the sons of Harim who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:31; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Semeon; Lucian, Sumeon = 1 Esdras 9:32, "Simon Chosameus").

SHIMHI

shim’-hi.

See SHIMEI

SHIMI, SHIMITES

shim’-i, shi’-mi, shim’-its.

See SHIMEI.

SHIMMA

shim’-a.

See SHAMMAH.

SHIMON

shi’-mon (shimon; Codex Vaticanus Semion, Codex Alexandrinus Semeion; Lucian, Sami): A name in the Judahite genealogy (1Ch 4:20).

SHIMRATH

shim’-rath (shimrath; Samarath): The last of nine sons of Shimei of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:21).

SHIMRI

shim’-ri (shimri; various forms in the Septuagint): There are four Hebrews mentioned in the Bible who bear this name:

(1) A Simeonite, a son of Shemaiah and father of Jedaiah, a chief of his tribe (1Ch 4:37).

(2) The father of Jediael, a bodyguard of King David (1Ch 11:45).

(3) A son of Hosah, a Levite. He was appointed by David to be doorkeeper in the house of the Lord. He was made chief of the tribe, although not the firstborn of his family (1Ch 26:10).

(4) One of the sons of Elizaphan, a Levite. He assisted in purifying the temple in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:13).

S. L. Umbach

SHIMRITH

shim’-rith (shimrith, "guard," feminine): A Moabitess, the mother of Jehozabad, one of those that conspired against King Joash (2Ch 24:26). Elsewhere (2Ki 12:21) Jehozabad is described as the son of SHOMER (which see), the same name without the feminine ending.

SHIMRON (1)

shim’-ron (shimron, "watch"): The 4th son of Issachar (Ge 46:13; Nu 26:24; 1Ch 7:1), and ancestor of the Shimronites (Nu 26:24).

SHIMRON (2)

(shimron; Codex Vaticanus Sumoon; Codex Alexandrinus Someron and other forms): A town whose king was tributary to Jabin king of Hazor, and who joined in the attempt to resist the invasion under Joshua (Jos 11:1). It was in the territory allotted to Zebulun (Jos 19:15). No sure identification is yet possible. The Septuagint and the Talmud both omit the "r" from the name; and Neubauer would identify it with Simonias (Vita, 24), the Simonia of the Talmud, which is now represented by Semuniyeh, a village about 5 miles West of Nazareth, on the edge of the plain (Geog. du Talm). Beit Lachm, named by Josephus along with it, is a short distance to the Northwest Es-Semeiriyeh, about 3 miles North of Acre, has also been suggested; but it is perhaps too far to the West.

W. Ewing

SHIMRON-MERON

shim’-ron-me’-ron (shimron mer’on; Sumoon .... Mamroth, Codex Alexandrinus Samron .... Phasga .... Maron): A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (12:20). Here the name is followed by that of Achshaph, which also follows the name of Shimron in 11:1. This suggests that the two are in reality one, and that Shimron-meron may only be the full name. A royal Canaanite city, Sam-simuruna, is mentioned in the inscriptions of Sen-nacherib, Esar-haddon and Assur-bani-pal, which Schrader (KAT2, 163) would identify with this, and thinks it may now be represented by es-Semeiri-yeh.

See SHIMRON.

W. Ewing

SHIMSHAI

shim’-shi, shim’-sha-i (shimshay; Codex Vaticanus Samasa, Samae, Sameais Samesa; Codex Alexandrinus Samsai; Lucian, Samaias, throughout; in 1 Esdras 2:17 he is called "Semellius," the Revised Version (British and American) "Samellius"; a number of explanations of this name have been offered, but no one has been generally favored. One conjecture traces it to an Old Iranian caritative sh-sh-m-y conformed to shamash; another prefers the Old Bactrian simezhi = simaezhi; compare BDB, under the word The name looks as though it were derived from shemesh, "the sun"): A state secretary who, with REHUM (which see) and others, wrote to Artaxerxes to persuade him to prohibit the rebuilding of the temple (Ezr 4:8,9,17,23).

Horace J. Wolf

SHIN, SIN

shen, sen "sh", "s": The 21st letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "sh" and "s". It came also to be used for the number 300. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

SHINAB

shi’-nab shin’abh; Samaritan: shin’ar; Sennaar): King of ADMAH (which see). He is mentioned with Shemeber, king of Zeboiim; he was attacked by Chedorlaomer and his allies (Ge 14:2). The reading is very uncertain. If the incident narrated is founded on fact, Shinab may be identical with Sanibu, an Ammonite king in the time of Tiglath-pileser III (so French Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 294); or the name may be equated by the Assyrian Sin-sar-ucur (compare "Shenazzar"), and Shem-eber with the Assyrian Sumu-abi (Sayce, The Expository Times, VIII, 463). Jewish exegesis gives a sinister explanation of all four names (Ge 14:2). The Midrash (Ber. Rab. 42) explains Shinab as sho’-ebh mammon, "one who draws money (wherever he can)." It is of interest to note that the names fall into two alliterative pairs and that each king’s name contains exactly as many letters as that of his city. On the whole, however, the list leaves an impression of artificiality; as the names are not repeated in Ge 14:8, it is highly probable that they are later additions to the text.

Horace J. Wolf

SHINAR

shi’-nar (shin‘ar; Senaar Sen(n)aar):

1. Identification

2. Possible Babylonian Form of the Name

3. Sumerian and Other Equivalents

4. The Syriac Sen’ar

5. The Primitive Tongue of Shinar

6. Comparison with the Semitic Idiom

7. The Testimony of the Sculptures, etc., to the Race

8. The Sumerians Probably in Shinar before the Semites

9. The States of Shinar:

(1) Sippar;

(2) Kes;

(3) Babylon;

(4) Nippur;

(5) Adab;

(6) Surippak;

(7) Umma;

(8) Erech;

(9) Lagas;

(10) Larsa;

(11) Ur;

(12) Eridu;

(13) The Land of the Sea;

(14) Nisin, Isin, or Karrak;

(15) Upa or Upia (Opis);

(16) Other Well-known Cities

10. Shinar and Its Climate

11. Sculpture in Shinar

12. The First Nation to Use Writing in Western Asia

13. The System Employed, with an Example

1. Identification:

The name given, in the earliest Hebrew records, to Babylonia, later called Babel, or the land of Babel (babhel, ‘erets babhel). In Ge 10:10 it is the district wherein lay Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh, cities which were the "beginning" of Nimrod’s kingdom. In 11:2 Shinar is described as the land of the plain where migrants from the East settled, and founded Babel, the city, and its great tower.

2. Possible Babylonian Form of the Name:

Though sometimes identified with the Babylonian Sumer, the connection of Shinar with that name is doubtful. The principal difficulty lies in the fact that what might be regarded as the non-dialectical form singar (which would alone furnish a satisfactory basis of comparison) is not found, and would, if existent, only apply to the southern portion of Babylonia. The northern tract was called Akkad, after the name of its capital city (see ACCAD). The Greek form Sen(n)aar shows that, at the time the Septuagint translation was made, there was no tradition that the ‘ayin was guttural, as the supposed Babylonian forms would lead us to expect. As the Biblical form Shinar indicates the whole of Babylonia, it corresponds with the native (Sumerian) Kingi-Ura, rendered "Sumer and Akkad," from which, by changing "K" into "Sh" (found in Sumerian), Shinar may have been derived, but this explanation is not free from difficulties.

3. Sumerian and Other Equivalents:

This two-fold designation, Kingi-Ura, is that which is commonly used in the inscriptions of the earlier kings, though it cannot then have indicated always the whole country, but only such parts of it as acknowledged their overlordship. Later on the corresponding term seems to have been Kar-Dunias ("the

territory of the god Dunias," to all appearance a term introduced by the Kassite rulers). Nabonassar and his successors seem to have contented themselves with the title "king of Babylon," rule in the city implying also the dominion over the whole country. Often, however, the equivalent term for Babylonia is Ehi, probably an abbreviation of Eridu, and here standing for the land belonging to that sacred city —"the good city," a type of Paradise, Babylonia being, in fact, situated upon the edinu, or "plain."

See EDEN.

4. The Syriac Sen’ar:

All these comparisons tend to show that the Babylonian equivalent of Shinar is not any of the above, and as yet has not, in fact, been found. This is also implied by the fact, that Sen’ar was used in Syriac for the country around Bagdad, and in ancient times included (it may be supposed) the plain upon which the ruins of Babylon stand. Sen’ar was therefore in all probability an ancient Babylonian designation of the tract, now lost, but regarded by the Hebrews as synonymous with Babylonia.

5. The Primitive Tongue of Shinar:

From the inscriptions it would seem that the primitive language of Shinar was not Semitic, but the agglutinative idiom now named Sumerian—a tongue long regarded as Turanian, and having, it is thought, Turko-Chinese affinities—gal, "to be," Turkish ol-mak; ama (ana), "mother," Turkish ana; abba, "old man," Turkish baba, "father"; (h)e, "house," Turkish ev, etc. The Chinese affinities seem less close, but the following may be quoted: a(y)a "father," Chinese ye (Amoy ia); ge, "night," Chinese ye; gu, "to speak," Chinese yu; shu, "hand," Chinese sheu; kin, "business," Chinese kung, "work"; etc. Chinese and Turkish, however, have had time to pass through many changes since Sumerian was current in Shinar. Many words of the Sumerian language were borrowed by the Semitic Babylonians, and a few (like hekal, "temple," Semitic (h)egal, "great house") entered the other Semitic languages.

6. Comparison with the Semitic Idiom:

Halevy’s contention, that Sumerian is simply "an allography" for the expression of Sera Babylonian, seems to be untenable, as they differ not only in words, but also in grammar; moreover, Sumerian had a dialect, called by the natives "woman’s tongue." For the rest, the principal differences between Sumerian and Semitic Babylonian are:

(1) post-positional suffixes instead of prepositions;

(2) verbs with long strings of prefixes and infixes to express the persons and regimens, instead of a prefix and a suffix;

(3) compound words, both nouns and verbs, are common instead of being exceedingly rare. Sumerian seems to have borrowed several words from Semitic Babylonian.

7. The Testimony of the Sculptures, etc. to the Race:

Not only the language, but also the sculptures which they have left, point to the probability that the earlier inhabitants of Shinar belonged to a different race from the later. The Semites of Babylonia were to all appearance thick-set and muscular, but the Sumerians, notwithstanding the stumpy figures which their statues and bas-reliefs show, seem to have been slim—in any case, their warriors, in the better basreliefs, as well as the figures of the god Nin-Girsu (formerly known as "the god with the firestick"), and the engraved cylinders, have this type. Moreover, the sculptures and cylinder-seals show that certain classes—priests or the like—were clean shaven, in marked contrast to Semitic usage elsewhere. Their deities, however, always had hair and beard, implying that they came from a different, though possibly related, stock. These deities were very numerous, and it is noteworthy that, though those with Sumerian names may be counted by hundreds, those with Semitic names are only to be reckoned by tens.

8. The Sumerians Probably in Shinar before the Semites:

Though there is no certain indication which race entered Shinar first, it is to be noted that Nimrod, presumably Shinar’s first king and the founder of its great cities, was a son of Cush (Ge 10:8), and the name of Shinar seems to have existed before the foundation of Babel (Babylon) and its tower (Ge 11:2). In the native sculptures, moreover, the non-Semitic type precedes the Semitic; and in the inscriptions the non-Semitic idiom precedes that of the Semitic tranlation. Everything points, therefore, to the Sumerians having been in Babylonia before the Semitic inhabitants.

9. The States of Shinar:

At the earliest period to which our records refer the Sumerians of Shinar were divided into a number of small states, of which the following may be regarded as the principal:

(1) Sippar:

Sippar or Sippar-Aruru (-Ya’ruru), possibly including Accad (Ge 10:10), some distance Southwest of Bagdad. It is the modern ‘Abu-habbah, "father of grain." Though it seems to have fallen early under the dominion of the Semites, it was at first Sumerian, as its native name, Zimbir, and the ideographic writing thereof show. According to Berosus, who calls it Pantabiblion, one of its earliest kings was Amelon or Amillarus, who reigned 13 sari, or 46,800 years. Later on came Evedoreschus, the native Enwe-duran-ki, renowned as a priest favored by the gods. His descendants, if of pure race, inherited the divine grace which he enjoyed. It is said to have been in Sippara (Sippar) that Ut-napistim, the Babylonian Noah, buried the records before entering the ark.

(2) Kes:

About 18 miles North of Babylon lay Kes, now Oheimer—a foundation which seems to have preceded

Babylon as the capital of Shinar. Its early queen, Azag-Bau, is said to have been the wife of a wine-merchant and to have reigned 100 years.

(3) Babylon:

Babylon, for which see BABEL; BABYLON. As one of its early kings, Berosus mentions Alorus, "the shepherd of the people," as having reigned for 10 sari, or 36,000 years. The state of Babylon probably included Cuthah. (Tel Ibrahim), which once had kings of its own, and possessed a special legend of the Creation. Belonging to Babylon, also, was the renowned city Borsippa, now Birs, or the Birs Nimroud, the traditional site of the Tower of Babel.

See BABEL, TOWER OF.

(4) Nippur:

Some distance Southeast of Babylon lay Nippur or Niffur, now Niffer (Noufar), identified by the rabbis with the "Calneh" of Ge 10:10. It was a place of considerable importance, and the seat of the worship of Enlil and Ninlil, later, also, of their son Ninip and his spouse (see CALNEH). The American excavations on this site have thrown a flood of light upon almost every branch of Assyriological research.

(5) Adab:

Adab, now called Bismaya, the city of Mah, the goddess of reproduction. One of the earliest rulers of Adab was seemingly called Lugal-dalu, of whom a fine statue, discovered by the American explorers, exists. It was apparently renowned as a necropolis.

(6) Surippak:

South and a little West of Adab was Surippak, now Fara. This was the birthplace of the Babylonian Noah, Ut-napistim, son of Opartes (Umbara-Tutu), a Chaldean of Larancha. The coming of the Flood was revealed to Ut-napistim here.

(7) Umma:

Practically East of Fara lay Umma or Gisuh (or Giuh), now Jokha. This city was apparently of considerable importance, and the traditional rival of Lagas.

(8) Erech:

South of Fara lay Unuga, Semitic Uruk, the Biblical ERECH (which see), now Warka. Its most celebrated king, after Gilgames, was Lugal-zaggi-si, one of the opponents of the rulers of Lagas.

(9) Lagas:

Some distance East of Warka was the territory of Lagas, now Tel-loh—a little state, rather in accessible, but of considerable importance to the antiquarian, which is a testimonial to the advance in civilization which it had made. Its kings and viceroys were among the most renowned, though apparently unknown outside their own domains. The most celebrated were the reformer Uru-ka-gina and viceroy Gudea, to whom many erections in the city were due. (See Gudea's remarkable statue in the Louvre.)

(10) Larsa:

Somewhat to the Southeast of Warka lay Larsa, the "Ellasar" of Ge 14:1 (which see). This center of learning maintained its independence even after the other states had been absorbed by Hammurabi and his dynasty into the Babylonian empire.

(11) Ur:

To the Southeast of Warka and Senqara lies the site of the ancient UR OF THE CHALDEES (which see) now Mugheir. It was renowned for its temple to the moon, and for the kings known as the dynasty of Ur: Sur-Engur, Dungi, Bur-Sin, Gimil-Sin, and Ibi-Sin.

(12) Eridu:

South of the Ur lay Eridu, or, in full, Guruduga, "the good city," wherein, apparently, lay the earthly Paradise. This is identified with the present 'Abu-shahrein, and was the seat of Ea or Enki, god of the sea and of fertilizing streams. According to the tradition, it was there that the "dark vine" grew—a type, seemingly, of the tree of life. The later kings of Babylon sometimes bear the title "king of Eridu," as though rulers of the domain of Paradise.

(13) The Land of the Sea:

The Land of the Sea (that bordering on the Persian Gulf), in which, seemingly, the Chaldeans afterward settled, seems to have played an important part in the early history of Shinar. Berosus speaks of its king Ammenon, who reigned 12 sari, or 43,200 years, and in whose time the Musarus Oannes, or Annedotus, arose out of the Persian Gulf. Like others referred to in the legends which Berosus refers to, he was half-man and half-fish. It is thought that these incidents, though evidently mythical, point to the introduction of civilization into Babylonia, from this point.

See also JONAH; JONAH, THE BOOK OF.

(14) Nisin, Isin, or Karrak:

Nisin, Isin, or Karrak, seat of the worship of Nin-Karraga, was also an important state governed by its own kings.

(15) Upe or Upia (Opis):

Upe or Upia, the Greek Opis, apparently obtained renown at a very early date, its kings being given in the great chronological list before those of Kis.

(16) Other Well-known Cities:

Other well-known cities, possibly state-capitals, were Larak, Greek Laranche; Amarda, one of the centers of the worship of Nergal; Asnunna, a province East of the present Bagdad; Dilmu, now Dailem; Nuru, Ennigi, and Kakra, seemingly centers of the worship of Hadad; Tilmun, at the head of the Persian Gulf, and including the island of Bahrein; the province of Sabu; Seseb or Bagdadu, possibly the modern Bagdad; and several others.

10. Shinar and Its Climate:

Whether the country was in the same seemingly uncared-for state in ancient times as at present is unknown; but one cannot help admiring the courage of the original immigrants into such a district, for example, as that of Lagas. This, which belongs to the southern region, is very inaccessible on account of the watercourses and marshes. Like the whole of Shinar in general, it is more or less dried up in summer, and unhealthy for Europeans. The alterations in the waterways, owing to changes in the irrigation-channels, must then, as now, have hindered communication. Sharp cold, with frost, succeeds the heat of summer, and from time to time sand-storms sweep across the plain. Notwithstanding the destruction sometimes wrought, the floods were always welcomed in consequence of the fruitfulness which followed, and which was such as to make Babylonia one of the most fertile tracts known.

11. Sculpture in Shinar:

The reference to the Sumerian sculptures in (7) above will have shown that the inhabitants of the Plain of Shinar possessed an art of no mean order and of some antiquity, even at the time when it first presents itself to our notice. It is true that many specimens are crude and uncouth, but this is probably due to the sculptors having been, often enough, the slaves of their material. Their stones were frequently more or less pebble-shaped, and they had neither the skill nor the tools to reduce them to better proportions—moreover, reduction of bulk would have meant a diminution of their importance. The broad, squat figures which they produced, however, gave them bad models for their bas-reliefs, and it was long ere this defect was removed, notwithstanding the superior work produced by their seal-engravers during and after the 4th millennium BC.

12. The First Nation to Use Writing in Western Asia:

But in all probability special renown will always be attached to the non-Semitic inhabitants of Shinar as the inventors, or at least the earliest users known to us, of the cuneiform script. It may be objected that the system which they introduced was cumbersome and imperfect, but they knew of nothing simpler, and modern Chinese, with which their script has been compared, is far less practical. Briefly, the system may be described as syllabic for the prefixes and suffixes, and ideographic for the roots. To show this the following transcribed example will probably suffice:

13. The System Employed, with an Example:

E nu-DU URU nu-DIM, A house was not built, a city was not constructed;

URU nu-DIM ADAM nu-mun-GAR, A city was not constructed, a community he had not founded;

ABZU nu-DU GURUDUGA nu-DIM, The abyss was not built, Eridu was not constructed;

E AZAGA DINGIRene KI-DURA-bi nu-DIM, The holy house of the gods, its seat was not constructed;

Su-NIGIN KURKURAgi AABBAama, The whole of the lands was sea.

The nominal and verbal roots of the above extract from the bilingual account of the Creation are in capitals, and the pronominal prefixes and suffixes, with a couple of lengthenings which determine the pronunciations of the nouns, in small letters. This will not only give an idea of the poetical form of the Sumerian legend of the Creation by Merodach and Aruru, but also show how short and concise, as a language, was the speech of Shinar, before Semitic supremacy.

T. G. Pinches

SHINE

shin: The Hebrew words ‘ahal, ‘or, halal, zahar, zarach, yapha‘, naghah, ‘ashath and qaran are all translated "shine." All indicate either the direct or indirect diffusion of beams of light. In a direct and literal sense the word "shine" is used of the heavenly bodies, or of candles, and fire (Job 18:5; 25:5 the King James Version; Job 29:3; 31:26; 2Ki 3:22). In a figurative sense it is used of reflected light or brightness, in any sense (Ex 34:29 f, 35; Isa 60:1; Eze 43:2; Da 12:3). God as the sun of righteousness is thus depicted in Ps 50:2. The New Testament words astrapto, augazo, lampo and phaino are translated "shine." Thus literally it is said of the lightning that it shines (Mt 24:27 the King James Version; Lu 17:24); the word is tropically applied to the life of faith or to men prominent in the kingdom of God (Mt 5:16; Joh 5:35; 2Co 4:6; Php 2:15; 2Pe 1:19); to the glory of God (Lu 2:9); to angelic appearances (Lu 24:4; Ac 12:7), or to Christ as He appeared to John on Patmos (Re 1:16).

Henry E. Dosker

SHION

shi’-on (shi’on; Codex Vaticanus Siona, Codex Alexandrinus Seian): A town in the territory of Issachar, named with Shunem, Hapharaim and Anaharath (Jos 19:19). It is possibly identical with Khirbet Sha’in, near ‘Ain esh-Sha’in, circa 4 miles Northwest of Mt. Tabor.

SHIPHI

shi’fi (shiph‘i; Codex Vaticanus Saphal, Codex Alexandrinus Sephein, Lucian, Sophei): A Simeonite prince (1Ch 4:37 (36)).

SHIPHMITE

shif’-mit.

See SHEPHAM; SIPHMOTH.

SHIPHRAH

shif’-ra (shiphrah, "fairness," "beauty"; . Septuagint Sepphora, the rendering also of tsipporah, in Ex 2:21): The name of one of the Hebrew midwives (Ex 1:15).

See also ZIPPORAH.

SHIPHTAN

shif’-tan (shiphTan; Codex Vaticanus Sabatha; Codex Alexandrinus Sabathan, F, Saphatan, Lucian, ((S) ephatha): An Ephraimite prince (Nu 34:24).

SHIPMASTER

ship’-mas-ter.

See SHIPS AND BOATS; PHOENIX.

SHIPMEN

ship’-men.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (3); III, 2.

SHIPS AND BOATS

I. THE HEBREWS AND THE SEA

II. SHIPS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THE APOCRYPHA

1. Among the Hebrews

(1) In Early Times

(2) During the Monarchy

(3) In Later Times

2. Among Neighboring Nations

(1) Egypt

(2) Assyria and Babylonia

(3) Phoenicia

3. General References

III. SHIPS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. In the Gospels

2. In the Ac of the Apostles

3. In Other Books

LITERATURE

In the Old Testament the following words are found:

(1) The word most commonly used in Hebrew for "a ship" is ‘oniyah (Pr 30:19; Jon 1:3,4), of which the plural ‘oniyoth is found most frequently (Jud 5:17; 1Ki 22:48 f, and many other places).

The collective term for "a navy of ships" is ‘oni (1Ki 9:26 f; 10:22, ‘oni Tharshish, "a navy (of ships) of Tarshish"; but Isa 33:21, ‘oni shayit, a "galley with oars").

(2) tsi (Nu 24:24; Eze 30:9; Isa 33:21), tsi ‘addir, "gallant ship"; Da 11:30, tsiyim Kittim, "ships of Kittim.’

(3) cephinah, "innermost parts of the ship" the Revised Version (British and American), "sides of the ship" the King James Version (Jon 1:5, the only place where the word is found).

In Apocrypha ploion, is the usual word (The Wisdom of Solomon 14:1; Ecclesiasticus 33:2, etc.), translated "vessel" in The Wisdom of Solomon 14:1, but "ship" elsewhere. For "ship" The Wisdom of Solomon 5:10 has naus. "Boat" in 2 Macc 12:3,6 is for skaphos, and "navy" in 1 Macc 1:17; 2 Macc 12:9; 14:1 for stolos. In The Wisdom of Solomon 14:6 Noah’s ark is called a schedia, a "clumsy ship" (the literal translation "raft" in the Revised Version (British and American) is impossible).

In the New Testament there are four words in use:

(1) naus (Ac 27:41, the only place where it occurs, designating the large sea-going vessel in which Paul suffered shipwreck).

(2) ploiarion, "a little boat" (Mr 3:9 and two other places, Joh 6:22 ff; 21:8).

(3) ploion, "boat" (Mt 4:21,22 and many other places in the Gospels—the ordinary fishingboat of the Sea of Galilee rendered "boat" uniformly in the Revised Version (British and American) instead of "ship" the King James Version), "ship" (Ac 20:13, and all other places where the ship carrying Paul is mentioned, except Ac 27:41, as above). In Jas 3:4; Re 8:9; 18:17 ff, it is rendered "ship."

(4) skaphe, "boat" (Ac 27:16,30,32, where it means the small boat of the ship in which Paul was being conveyed as a prisoner to Rome).

Cognate expressions are: "shipmen," ‘anshe ‘oniyoth (1Ki 9:27); nautai (Ac 27:27,30 the King James Version, "sailors" the Revised Version (British and American)); "mariners," mallachim (Jon 1:15; Eze 27:9,27,29), shaTim (Eze 27:8 the King James Version, "rowers" the Revised Version (British and American); Eze 27:26, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)); "pilot," chobhel (Jon 1:6; Eze 27:8,27,28,29); "sailing," "voyage," plous (Ac 21:7; 27:9,10, the Revised Version (British and American) "voyage" in all verses).

I. The Hebrews and the Sea.

The Hebrews were a pastoral and agricultural people, and had no inducements to follow a seafaring life. They were possessed of a considerable seaboard along the Mediterranean, but the character of their coast gave little encouragement to navigation. The coast line of the land of Israel from Carmel southward had

no bays and no estuaries or river-mouths to offer shelter from storm or to be havens of ships. Solomon landed his timber and other materials for the Temple at Joppa, and tradition has handed down what is called "Solomon's Harbor" there. The builders of the second temple also got timber from Lebanon and conveyed it to Joppa. It was Simon Maccabeus, however, who built its harbor, and the harbor at Joppa was "the first and only harbor of the Jews" (G. A. Smith, HGHL, 136). Caesarea in New Testament times was a place of shipping and possessed a harbor which Josephus declared to be greater than the Piraeus, but it was Herodian and more Greek and Roman than Jewish. It was mostly inhabited by Greeks (Josephus, BJ, III, ix, 1). Now Caesarea has disappeared; and Joppa has only an open roadstead where vessels lie without shelter, and receive and discharge cargo and passengers by means of boats plying between them and the shore. It was in other directions that Israel made acquaintance with the activities of the sea. Of internal navigation, beyond the fishing-boats on the Sea of Galilee which belong exclusively to the New Testament, the ferry boat on the Jordan (2Sa 19:18, 'abharah) alone receives notice, and even that is not perfectly clear (the Revised Version margin "convoy," but a "ford" is doubtless meant). It is from Tyre and Egypt and even Assyria and Babylonia, rather than from their own waters, that the Hebrew prophets and psalmists drew their pictures of seafaring life.

II. Ships in the Old Testament and Apocrypha.

1. Among the Hebrews:

(1) In Early Times.

In the early books of the Old Testament there are references connecting certain of the tribes, and these northern tribes, with the activities of the sea. In the "Blessing of Jacob" and in the "Blessing of Moses" Zebulun and Issachar are so connected (Ge 49:13; De 33:19); and in Deborah's Song, which is acknowledged to be a very early fragment of Hebrew literature, Da and Asher are also spoken of as connected with the life and work of the sea (Jud 5:17). The Oracle of Balaam (Nu 24:24) looks forward to a day when a fleet from Kittim should take the sea for the destruction of Assyria. "Ships of Kittim" are mentioned in Daniel (11:30). Kittim is referred to in the three greater Prophets (Isa 23:1,12; Jer 2:10; Eze 27:6). The land of Kittim is Cyprus, and in the references in Isaiah it is associated with Tyre and the ships of Tarshish.

(2) During the Monarchy.

It is not till the time of the monarchy that the Hebrews begin to figure as a commercial people. Already in the time of David commercial relations had been established between Israel and Tyre (2Sa 5:11 f). The friendly cooperation was continued by Solomon, who availed himself not only of the cedar and the fir at Hiram's command on Lebanon, but also of the skilled service of Hiram's men to bring the timber from the mountains to the sea. Hiram also undertook to make the cedar and the fir into rafts (1Ki 5:9, dobheroth, the King James Version "floats"; 2Ch 2:16, raphcodhoth, "flotes" the King James Version, "floats" the Revised Version (British and American)) to go by sea and to deliver them to Solomon's men at the place appointed, which the Chronicler tells us was Joppa. From this cooperation in the building of

the Temple there grew up a larger connection in the pursuit of sea-borne commerce. It was at Ezion-geber near to Eloth on the Red Sea, in the land of Edom which David had conquered, that Solomon built his fleet, "a navy of ships" (1Ki 9:26-28). Hiram joined Solomon in these enterprises which had their center on the Red Sea, and thus the Phoenicians had water communication with the coasts of Arabia and Africa, and even of India. The same partnership existed for the commerce of the West. "For the king (Solomon) had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram: once every three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold, and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks" (1Ki 10:22).

Tarshish is the name of the Phoenician colony on the river Tartessus, called also Baetis, the modern Guadalquivir. It was the farthest limit of the western world as known to the Hebrews. Attempts have been made to identify it with Tarsus of Cilicia, but they are not convincing. It is conceived of in Hebrew literature as remote (Isa 66:19; Jon 1:3; 4:2), as rich (Ps 72:10; Jer 10:9), as powerful in commerce (Eze 38:13). Ships of Tarshish were no doubt ships actually built for the Tarshish trade (2Ch 20:36 f; Jon 1:3), but the expression became a general designation for large sea-going vessels to any quarter. Ships of Tarshish made a deep impression upon the imagination of the Hebrew people. The Psalmist takes it as a proof of the power of Yahweh that He breaks the ships of Tarshish with an east wind (Ps 48:7). Isaiah includes them among the great and lofty objects of power and glory which the terror of the Lord would certainly overtake (Isa 2:16). Ezekiel regards them as the caravans that bore the merchandise of the mistress of the sea (Eze 27:25). It is in ships of Tarshish that the prophet of the Return sees the exiles borne in crowds to Jerusalem as their natural home (Isa 60:9).

From Solomon’s time onward the kings of Judah retained their hold upon Eloth (1Ki 22:48 f; 2Ch 20:35-37) till it was seized by the Syrians in the days of Ahaz (2Ki 16:6).

(3) In Later Times.

As Solomon had the cooperation of Hiram in securing material and craftsmen for the building of the first Temple, so Joshua and Zerubbabel by the favor of Cyrus obtained timber from Lebanon, and masons and carpenters from Sidon and Tyre for the building of the second. Again, cedar trees were brought from Lebanon by sea to Joppa, and thence conveyed to Jerusalem (Ezr 3:7).

From Joppa Jonah fled to avoid compliance with God’s command to go to Nineveh and preach repentance there (Jon 1:1). He found a ship bound for Tarshish as far toward the West as Nineveh to the East. The fare (cakhar) paid by him as a passenger, the hold of the ship in which he stowed himself away (cephinah), the crew (mallachim) the captain or shipmaster (rabh ha-chobhel), the storm, the angry sea, the terrified mariners and their cry to their gods, and the casting of Jonah overboard to appease the raging waters—all make a lifelike picture.

It was in the time of Simon, the last survivor of the Maccabean brothers, that Joppa became a seaport with a harbor for shipping—"Amid all his glory he took Joppa for a haven, and made it an entrance for the isles of the sea" (1 Macc 14:5). When Simon reared his monument over the sepulcher of his father and brothers at Modin, he set up seven pyramids with pillars, upon which were carved figures of ships to

be "seen of all that sail on the sea" (1 Macc 13:29). About this period we hear of ships in naval warfare. When Antiochus IV Epiphanes planned his expedition against Egypt, he had with other armaments "a great navy," presumably ships of war (1 Macc 1:17); and at a later time Antiochus VII speaks expressly of "ships of war" (1 Macc 15:3).

2. Among Neighboring Nations:

(1) Egypt.

The Egyptians, like other nations of antiquity, had a great horror of the open sea, although they were expert enough in managing their craft upon the Nile. Pharaoh-necoh built up a powerful navy to serve him both in commerce and in war.

See PHARAOH-NECOH.

Of explicit references to Egyptian ships in the Old Testament there are but few. Isaiah speaks of "vessels of papyrus upon the waters" of the Upper Nile, on board of which are the messengers of Cush or Ethiopia returning to tell the tidings of the overthrow of Assyria to the inhabitants of those remote lands (18:2 the King James Version has "bulrushes" instead of "papyrus"). Ezekiel also, foretelling the overthrow of Egypt, speaks of messengers traveling with the news on swift Nile boats to strike terror into the hearts of the "careless Ethiopians" (30:9). When Job compares his days to "the swift ships" ("the ships of reed" the Revised Version margin), the allusion is most likely to Egypt’s, these being skiffs with a wooden keel and the rest of bulrushes, sufficient to carry one person, or at most two, and light, to travel swiftly (9:26).

(2) Assyria and Babylonia.

The Assyrians and Babylonians were mainly an inland people, but their rivers gave them considerable scope for navigation. The Assyrian monuments contain representations of naval engagements and of operations on the seacoast. When Isaiah pictures Yahweh as a better defense of Judah than the rivers and streams of Assyria and Egypt are to their people he says, "There Yahweh will be with us in majesty, a place of broad rivers and streams, wherein shall go no galley with oars (’oni shayiT), neither shall gallant ship (tsi ‘addir) pass thereby. .... Thy tacklings (ropes, cables) are loosed; they could not strengthen the foot of their mast, they could not spread the sail" (Isa 33:21,23). Speaking of Yahweh’s wonders to be performed toward His people after Babylon had been overthrown, the prophet declares: "Thus saith Yahweh, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: For your sake I have sent to Babylon, and I will bring down all of them as fugitives, even the Chaldeans, in the ships of their rejoicing" (Isa 43:14). In this case, however, the ships are not war ships, but more probably merchant ships, or ships for pleasure, sailing in the Euphrates.

(3) Phoenicia.

It was from the Phoenicians that the Mediterranean peoples learned seamanship and skill in navigation. It is fitting, therefore, that in his dirge over the downfall of the mistress of the sea, Ezekiel should represent Tyre as a gallant ship, well built, well furnished, and well manned, broken by the seas in the depths of the waters, fallen into the heart of the seas in the day of her ruin. Ezekiel's description (chapter 27, with Davidson's notes) brings together more of the features of the ship of antiquity than any other that has come down to us. Her builders have made her perfect in beauty with planks of fir or cypress, mast of cedar, oars of the oak of Bashan, benches or deck of ivory inlaid with boxwood, sail of fine linen with broidered work from Egypt, and an awning of blue and purple from the coastlands of Elisha (possibly Sicily). She is manned with oarsmen of Sidon and Arvad, pilots of the wise men of Tyre, calkers from Gebal to stop up the cracks and seams in her timbers, mariners and men of war from other lands who enhanced her beauty by hanging up the shield and helmet within her. She is freighted with the most varied cargo, the produce of the lands around, her customers, or as they are called, her traffickers, being Tarshish in the far West, Sheba and Arabia in the South, Haran and Asshur in the East, Javan, which is Greece, and Togarmah, which is Armenia, in the North. One or two of the particulars of this description may be commented upon.

(a) As regards rigging, the Phoenician ships of the time of Ezekiel, as seen in Assyrian representations, had one mast with one yard and carried a square sail. Egyptian ships on the Red Sea about the time of the Exodus, from reliefs of the XIXth Dynasty, had one mast and two yards, and carried also one large square sail. The masts and yards were made of fir, or of pine, and the sails of linen, but the fiber of papyrus was employed as well as flax in the manufacture of sail-cloth. The sail had also to serve "for an ensign" (lenes, Eze 27:7). "The flag proper," says Davidson (ad loc.), "seems not to have been used in ancient navigation; its purpose was served by the sail, as for example at the battle of Actium the ship of Antony was distinguished by its purple sail."

(b) As regards the crew, in the two-banked Phoenician ship the rowers of the first bank work their oars over the gunwale, and those of the second through portholes lower down, so that each may have free play for his oar. The calkers were those who filled up seams or cracks in the timbers with tow and covered them over with tar or wax, after the manner of the instruction given to Noah regarding the Ark: "Thou .... shalt pitch it within and without with pitch" (Ge 6:14).

(c) As regards cargo, it is to be noted that "the persons of men," that is, slaves, formed an article of merchandise in which Javan, Tubal, and Meshech, countries to the North, traded with Tyre.

3. General References:

Of general references to shipping and seafaring life there are comparatively few in the Old Testament. In his great series of Nature-pictures in Ps 104, the Psalmist finds a place for the sea and ships (104:25 ff), and in Ps 107 there is a picture of the storm overtaking them that go down to the sea in ships, and of the deliverance that comes to them when God "bringeth" them into their desired haven" (107:23 ff). In the Book of Proverbs the ideal woman who brings her food from far is like "the merchant ships" (31:14). In the same book the drunkard, because of his unnatural insensibility to danger, is likened to a man "that

lieth down in the midst of the sea, or as he that lieth upon the top of a mast" (23:34); and among the inscrutable things of the world the writer includes "the way of a ship in the midst of the sea" (30:19). In Wisdom, human life is described "as a ship passing through the billowy water, whereof, when it is gone by, there is no trace to be found, neither pathway of its keel in the billows" (Wisd 5:10). The same book notes it as a striking example of the case of a divine and beneficent Providence that "men entrust their lives to a little piece of wood, and passing through the surge on a raft are brought safe to land" (Wisd 14:1-5). The Jews like the Egyptians and the Assyrians had a natural shrinking from the sea, and Ecclesiasticus interprets their feeling when he says: "They that sail on the sea tell of the danger thereof; and when we hear it with our ears, we marvel" (43:24).

III. Ships in the New Testament.

1. In the Gospels:

It is the fishing-boats of the Sea of Galilee which exclusively occupy attention in the Gospels. In the time of our Lord’s ministry in Galilee the shores of the Sea were densely peopled, and there must have been many boats engaged in the fishing industry. Bethsaida at the northern end of the Lake and Tarichea at the southern end were great centers of the trade. The boats were probably of a size and build similar to the few employed on the Lake today, which are between 20 and 30 ft. in length and 7 ft. in breadth. The word "launch," of putting a boat or a ship into the sea, has disappeared from the Revised Version (British and American), except in Lu 8:22, where it is more appropriate to an inland lake. They were propelled by oars, but no doubt also made use of the sail when the wind was favorable (Lu 8:23), though the pictures which we have in the Gospels are mostly of the boatmen toiling in rowing in the teeth of a gale (Mr 6:48), and struggling with the threatening waves (Mt 14:24). In the boat on which Jesus and the disciples were crossing the Lake after the feeding of the 5,000, Jesus was in the stern "asleep on the cushion" (Mr 4:38, the King James Version "a pillow"; Greek proskephalaion, "headrest"). More than once Jesus made special use of a boat. As He was by the seashore a great concourse of people from all parts made it desirable that "a small boat" (ploiarion) should be in attendance off the shore to receive Him in case of need, though He does not seem to have required it (Mr 3:9). On another occasion, when the crowds were still greater, He went into a boat and sat "in the sea" with the multitude on the sloping beach before Him (Mr 4:1; Lu 5:3). This boat is said in Luke’s narrative to have been Simon’s, and it seems from references to it as "the boat" on other occasions to have been generally at the disposal of Jesus.

2. In the Ac of the Apostles:

It is Paul’s voyages which yield us the knowledge that we possess from Biblical sources of ships in New Testament times. They are recorded for us in the Ac by Luke, who, as Sir William Ramsay puts it, had the true Greek feeling for the sea (St. Paul the Traveler, 21). In Luke’s writings there are many nautical terms, peculiar to him, used with great exactitude and precision.

When Paul had appealed to Caesar and was proceeding to Rome in charge of Julius, the centurion, along

with other prisoners, a ship of Adramyttium, a coasting vessel, carried the party from Caesarea along the Syrian coast, northward of Cyprus, past Cilicia and Pamphylia, to Myra of Lycia. There the centurion found a ship of Alexandria sailing for Italy, one of the great corn fleet carrying grain from Egypt for the multitudes of Rome. (After the capture of Jerusalem the emperor Titus returned to Italy in such a vessel, touching at Rhegium and landing at Puteoil.) The size of the vessel is indicated by the fact that there were 276 persons on board, crew and passengers all told (Ac 27:37). Luke has made no note of the name of this or of the previous vessels in which Paul had voyaged. Of the presumably larger vessel, also an Alexandrian corn ship bound for Rome, which had wintered in Melita, and which afterward took on board the shipwrecked party (Ac 28:11), "the sign" (parasemon) is given, and she is called "The Twin Brothers." The expression shows that it was in painting or relief; a figurehead, with the Twin Brothers represented, would be given by episemon. The cargo (phortion, Ac 27:10, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "lading") in this case was wheat (Ac 27:38), but another word is used, gomos, by Luke of a ship’s load of varied wares (Ac 21:3; compare Re 18:11).

Of those engaged in handling the ship we find (Ac 27:11) the master (kubernetes), the owner (naukleros, although this expression seems not quite consistent with the ownership of a grain ship of the imperial service, and Ramsay’s distinction between the words, making the former "sailing-master" and the latter "captain," may be better), the sailors (Ac 27:30, who treacherously sought to lower the ship’s boat on the pretense of laying out anchors from the "foreship" or prow, and to get away from the doomed vessel).

Of operations belonging to the navigation of the vessel in the storm there were

(1) the taking on board of the ship’s boat and securing it with ropes (Ac 27:16, in which operation Luke seems to have taken part; compare Ac 27:32),

(2) the undergirding of the ship (Ac 27:17, using helps, that is taking measures of relief and adopting the expedient, only resorted to in extremities, of passing cables under the keel of the ship to keep the hull together and to preserve the timbers from starting),

(3) the lowering of the gear (Ac 27:17, reducing sail, taking down the mainsail and the main yard),

(4) throwing freight overboard and later casting out the tackling of the ship (Ac 27:19),

(5) taking soundings (Ac 27:28),

(6) letting go four anchors from the stern (Ac 27:29, stern-anchoring being very unusual, but a necessity in the circumstances),

(7) further lightening the ship by throwing the wheat into the sea (Ac 27:38),

(8) cutting the anchor cables, unlashing the rudders, hoisting up the foresail to the wind, and holding straight for the beach (Ac 27:40).

Of the parts of the ship’s equipment there are mentioned "the sounding lead" (bolis, though it is the verb which is here used), "the anchors" (agkurai, of which every ship carried several, and which at successive periods have been made of stone, iron, lead and perhaps other metals, each having two flukes and being held by a cable or a chain), "the rudders" (pedalia, of which every ship had two for steering, which in this case had been lifted out of the water and secured by "bands" to the side of the ship and unlashed when the critical moment came), "the foresail" artemon, not the mainsail, but the small sail at the bow of the vessel which at the right moment was hoisted to the wind to run her ashore), and "the boat" (skaphe, which had been in tow in the wake of the vessel, according to custom still prevalent in those seas—coasting-vessels being sometimes becalmed, when the crew get into the small boat and take the ship in tow, using the oars to get her round a promontory or into a position more favorable for the wind). The season for navigation in those seas in ancient times was from April to October. During the winter the vessels were laid up, or remained in the shelter of some suitable haven. The reason for this was not simply the tempestuous character of the weather, but the obscuration of the heavens which prevented observations being taken for the steering of the ship (Ac 27:20).

3. In Other Books:

In 2Co 11:25 Paul mentions among sufferings he had endured for Christ’s sake that thrice he had suffered shipwreck, and that he had been "a night and a day in the deep," implying that he had been in danger of his life clinging to a spar, or borne upon a hurriedly constructed raft. It may be a reminiscence of the sea when Paul in the very earliest of his Epistles (1Th 4:16), speaking of the coming of the Lord, says "The Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout" en keleusmati), where the picture is that of the keleustes, giving the time to the rowers on board a ship. Although huperetes, was "an underrower" and huperesia, "the crew of a ship" as contrasted with kubernetes, "the sailing-master," the derived meaning of "servant" or "officer" has lost in the New Testament all trace of its origin (Mt 5:25; Lu 1:2 and many passages; compare stellein, and sustellein, where the idea of "furling" or "shifting a sail" is entirely lost: 1Co 7:29; 2Co 8:20).

Figurative:

In Hebrews the hope of the gospel is figured as "an anchor .... sure and stedfast, and entering into that which is within the veil" (6:19, especially with Ebrard’s note in Alford, at the place). James, showing the power of little things, adduces the ships, large though they be, and driven by fierce winds, turned about by a very small "rudder" (pedalion), as "the impulse of the steersman willeth" (Jas 3:4). In Revelation there is a representation of the fall of Babylon in language reminiscent of the fall of Tyre (Eze 27), in which lamentations arise from the merchants of the earth who can no more buy her varied merchandise (ton gomon, "cargo" the Revised Version margin), and shipmasters and passengers and seafaring people look in terror and grief upon the smoke of her burning (Re 18:12-18).

LITERATURE.

The usual books on Greek and Roman antiquities furnish descriptions and illustrations. Works on the monuments like Layard, Nineveh, II, 379 ff; Maspero, Ancient Egypt and Assyria; Ball, Light from the East, and Reissner, Cairo Museum Catalogue, "Models of Ships and Boats," 1913, contain descriptions and figured representations which are instructive. On shipping and navigation in classical antiquity Smith of Jordanhill, Voyage and Shipwreck of Paul, is still the standard authority.

T. Nicol

SHISHA

shi’-sha (shisha’): One of Solomon’s officers of state (1Ki 4:3).

SHISHAK

shi’-shak (shishaq (1Ki 14:25); Sousakeim):

1. Shishak, 952-930 BC:

Sheshonk or Sheshenq I, as he is called on the monuments, the founder of the XXIInd Dynasty, was in all probability of Libyan origin. It is possible that his claim to the throne was that of the sword, but it is more likely that he acquired it by marriage with a princess of the dynasty preceding. On the death of Pasebkhanu II, the last of the kings of the XXIst Dynasty, 952 BC, Shishak ascended the throne, with an efficient army and a well-filled treasury at his command. He was a warlike prince and cherished dreams of Asiatic dominion.

2. Patron of Jeroboam:

He had not long been seated on the throne when Jeroboam the son of Nebat, of the tribe of Ephraim, whom Solomon had promoted but afterward had cause to suspect, fled from the displeasure of his sovereign to the court of Shishak (1Ki 11:26). There Jeroboam remained till the death of Solomon, when he returned to Canaan, and, on Rehoboam’s returning an unsatisfactory answer to the people’s demands for relief from their burdens, headed the revolt of the Ten Tribes, over whom he was chosen king with his capital at Shechem (1Ki 12:25). Whether there was not in the XXIst Dynasty some kind of suzerainty of Egypt over Palestine, when Solomon married Pharaoh’s daughter and received with her Gezer as a dowry, seems not to be clearly established. It is, however, natural that Jeroboam’s patron in the day of adversity should take sides with him against Rehoboam, now that the kingdom was divided. Active support of Jeroboam would be in the line of his dreams of an eastern empire.

3. Syrian Campaign:

So it came to pass that in the 5th year of Rehoboam, Shishak came up against Jerusalem with 1,200

chariots, and 60,000 horsemen, and people without number out of Egypt, the Libyans, Sukkiim, and Ethiopians, and took the fenced cities of Judah, and came to Jerusalem. At the preaching of the prophet Shemaiah, Rehoboam and his people repented, and Jerusalem was saved from destruction, though not from plunder nor from servitude, for he became Shishak's servant (2Ch 12:8). Shishak took away the treasures of the house of the Lord and the treasures of the king's house, carrying off among the most precious of the spoils all the shields of gold which Solomon had made (1Ki 14:25 ff; 2Ch 12:1-9). From the Scripture narrative it does not appear that there was any occupation of Palestine by the Egyptian forces on this occasion.

4. Shishak's Record at Karnak:

There is, however, a remarkable contemporary record of the campaign engraved on the south wall of the Temple of Amon at Karnak by Shishak himself. Not only is the expedition recorded, but there is a list of districts and towns of Palestine granted to his victories by Amon-Ra and the goddess of Thebes engraved there. A number of towns mentioned in the Book of Jos have been identified; and among the names of the list are Rabbath, Taanach, Gibeon, Mahanaim, Beth-horon and other towns both of Israel and Judah. That names of places in the Northem Kingdom are mentioned in the list does not imply that Shishak had directed his armies against Jeroboam and plundered his territories. It was the custom in antiquity for a victorious monarch to include among conquered cities any place that paid tribute or was under subjection, whether captured in war or not; and it was sufficient reason for Shishak to include these Israelite places that Jeroboam, as seems probable, had invited him to come to his aid. Among the names in the list was "Jud-hamalek"—Yudhmalk on the monuments—which was at first believed to represent the king of Judah, with a figure which passed for Rehoboam. Being, however, a place-name, it is now recognized to be the town Yehudah, belonging to the king. On the death of Shishak his successor assumed a nominal suzerainty over the land of Canaan.

LITERATURE.

Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 227 ff; Maspero, Struggle of the Nations, 772 ff; Nicol, Recent Archaeology and the Bible, 222-25.

T. Nicol

SHITRAI

shit'-ri, shit-ra'-i, shit'-ra-i (shiTray): A Sharonite, David's chief shepherd (1Ch 27:29).

SHITTAH; TREE; SHITTIM WOOD

shit'a, (shiTTah; Septuagint xulon asepton; the Revised Version (British and American) ACACIA TREE (Isa 41:19)); ('ace shiTTim; the Revised Version (British and American) ACACIA WOOD (Ex 25:5,10,13; 26:15,26; 27:1,6; De 10:3)): The word was originally shinTah, derived from the Arabic

sanT, now a name confined to one species of acacia, Acacia nilotica (Natural Order, Leguminosae), but possibly was once a more inclusive term. The Acacia nilotica is at present confined to the Sinaitic peninsula and to Egypt. Closely allied species, the Acacia tortilis and Acacia seyal, both classed together under the Arabic name sayyal, are plentiful in the valleys about the Dead Sea from Engedi southward. Those who have ridden from ‘Ain Jidy to Jebel Usdum will never forget these most striking features of the landscape. They are most picturesque trees with their gnarled trunks, sometimes 2 ft. thick, their twisted, thorny branches, which often give the whole tree an umbrella-like form, and their fine bipinnate leaves with minute leaflets. The curiously twisted pods and the masses of gum arabic which exude in many parts are also peculiar features. The trees yield a valuable, hard, close-grained timber, not readily attacked by insects.

E. W. G. Masterman

SHITTIM

shit’-im (ha-shiTTim, "the acacias"; Sattein):

(1) This marked the last camping-ground of Israel before they crossed the Jordan to begin the conquest of Western Palestine. Here it was that the people fell into the snare set for them by the satanic counsel of Balaam, who thus brought upon them greater evil than all his prohibited curses could have done (Nu 25:1 ff; 31:16). In Nu 33:49 it is called Abel-shittim. It was from Shittim that Joshua sent the spies to view out the land and Jericho (Jos 2:1); and from this point the host moved forward to the river (Jos 3:1). The place is mentioned by Micah in a passage of some difficulty (Jos 6:5): after "what Balaam the son of Beor answered," perhaps some such phrase as "remember what I did" has fallen out. This would then be a reference to the display of divine power in arresting the flow of Jordan until the host had safely crossed. Josephus places the camp "near Jordan where the city Abila now stands, a place full of palm trees" (Ant., IV, viii, 1). Eusebius, Onomasticon says Shittim was near to Mt. Peor (Fogor). It may possibly be identical with Khirbet el-Kefrain, about 6 miles South of the Jordan, on the lip of Wady Seiseban, where there are many acacias.

(2) In Joe 3:18 we read of the valley of Shittim which is to be watered by a fountain coming forth of the house of the Lord. It must therefore be sought on the West of the Jordan. The waters from the Jerusalem district are carried to the Dead Sea down the Wady which continues the Brook Kidron: Wady en-Nar. The acacia is found plentifully in the lower reaches of this valley, which may possibly be intended by the prophet.

W. Ewing

SHIZA

shi’-za (shiza; Saiza): A Reubenite, one of David’s leading warriors (1Ch 11:42).

SHOA

sho’-a (shoa‘; Soue): A people named in Eze 23:23 in association with Babylonians, Chaldeans and Assyrians. Schrader identifies with the Sutu of the inscriptions (East of the Tigris).

SHOBAB

sho’-bab (~shobhabh]; Sobab):

(1) One of the sons of David (2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 3:5; 14:4).

(2) A son of Caleb (1Ch 2:18).

SHOBACH

sho’-bak (shobhakh; Sobak): Captain of the Syrian host (2Sa 10:16,18); but "Shophach" (shophakh) in 1Ch 19:16,18.

SHOBAI

sho’-bi, sho-ba’-i, sho’-ba-i (shobhay; Codex Vaticanus Abaou; Codex Alexandrinus Lucian, Sobai): The head of one of the families which returned from the Babylonian captivity (Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45).

SHOBAL

sho’-bal (shobhal, "overflowing"; Sobal, with variants):

(1) An Edomite name mentioned in connection with Lotan, Zibeon and Anah, as that of a "son" of Seir (Ge 36:20), the father of a clan (Ge 36:23), and a Horite "duke" (’alluph) (Ge 36:29; 1Ch 1:38,40).

(2) A Calebite, the father (possibly of the inhabitants) of Kiriath-jearim (1Ch 2:50,52).

(3) A Judahite, perhaps to be identified with (2) above (1Ch 4:1 f).

SHOBEK

sho’-bek (shobheq; Sobek): One of those who sealed the covenant under Nehemiah after the Babylonian captivity (Ne 10:24).

SHOBI

sho’-bi (shobhi; Ouesbei): One of those who remained faithful to David during the rebellion of Absalom (2Sa 17:27).

SHOCHOH

sho’-ko (sokhoh, Codex Vaticanus Sokchoth; Codex Alexandrinus Okcho): This in 1Sa 17:1 the King James Version is a variant of SOCOH (which see).

SHOE; SHOE-LATCHET

shoo, shoo’-lach-et (na‘al, literally, "that which is fastened," with denominative verb na‘al, "to provide with shoes" (2Ch 28:15; Eze 16:10); hupodema (Sirach 46:19; Mt 3:11, etc.), from the verb hupodeo (Mr 6:9; Eph 6:15), "to bind under," sandalion, "sandal" (Judith 10:4; 16:9; Mr 6:9; Ac 12:8); the King James Version, the Revised Version margin also have "shoe" for min‘al, "bar" (so the Revised Version (British and American) text) in De 33:25; the "latchet" is either serokh, "twisted thing" (Ge 14:23; Isa 5:27), or himas, "leather thong" (Mr 1:7; Lu 3:16; Joh 1:27)): The na‘al was a simple piece of leather tied on the foot with the serokh, so easy of construction that its low cost was proverbial (Am 2:6; 8:6; RAPC Sir 46:19; compare Ge 14:23), and to be without it was a sign of extreme poverty (2Ch 28:15; Isa 20:2). Women, however, might have ornamental sandals (So 7:1; RAPC Jdt 16:9), and Ezekiel names "sealskin" (16:10) as a particularly luxurious material, but the omission of sandals from the list of Isa 3:18-23 shows that they were not commonly made articles of great expense. The hupodema was likewise properly a sandal, but the word was also used to denote a shoe that covered the foot. The contrast between hupodema in Mt 10:10 and sandalion in Mr 6:9 seems to show that this meaning is not unknown in the New Testament, the "shoe" being regarded as an article of luxury (compare Lu 15:22). But in Mt 3:11 and parallel’s, only the sandal can be meant.

Sandals were not worn indoors, so that putting them on was a sign of readiness for activity (Ex 12:11; Ac 12:8; Eph 6:15), the more wealthy having them brought (Mt 3:11) and fastened (Mr 1:7 and parallel’s) by slaves. When one entered a house they were removed; all the more, naturally, on entering a sanctuary (Ex 3:5; Jos 5:15; Ac 7:33). Mourners, however, did not wear them even out of doors, as a sign of grief (Eze 24:17,23), perhaps for the same reason that other duties of the toilet were neglected (2Sa 12:20, etc.). A single long journey wore out a pair of sandals (Jos 9:5,13), and the preservation of "the latchet of their shoes" from being broken (Isa 5:27) would require almost miraculous help.

Ru 4:7 f states as a "custom in former times in Israel," that when any bargain was closed "a man drew off his shoe, and gave it to his neighbor." This was of course simply a special form of earnest-money, used in all transactions. In De 25:9 f the custom appears in a different light. If a man refused to perform his duty to his deceased brother’s wife, the elders of the city were to remove his shoe and disgrace him publicly, "And his name shall be called in Israel, The house of him that hath his shoe loosed." The removal of the shoe is apparently connected with the rite in Ru 4:7 as a renunciation of the man’s privilege. But the general custom seems to have become obsolete, for the removal of the shoe is now a

reproach. The meaning of Ps 60:8 parallel 108:9, "Upon (margin "unto") Edom will I cast my shoe," is uncertain. ‘al, may mean either "upon" or "unto." If the former, some (otherwise unsubstantiated) custom of asserting ownership of land may be meant. If the latter, the meaning is "Edom I will treat as a slave," to whom the shoes are cast on entering a house.

Burton Scott Easton

SHOHAM

sho’-ham (shoham, "onyx"; Codex Vaticanus Isoam; Codex Alexandrinus Issoam): One of the sons of Merari (1Ch 24:27).

SHOMER

sho’-mer (shomer):

(1) The father of one of the conspirators who killed Joash (2Ki 12:21).

See SHIMEATH.

(2) One of the sons of Heber of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:32).

See SHEMER.

SHOPHACH

sho’-fak.

See SHOBACH.

SHOPHAN

sho’-fan (shophan).

See ATROTH-SHOPHAN.

SHORE

shor:

(1) choph, always of the Mediterranean, variously translated "haven," "beach," "shore," "sea-shore," "coast," "sea coast" (Ge 49:13; De 1:7; Jos 9:1; Jud 5:17; Jer 47:7; Eze 25:16).

(2) saphah, literally, "lip"; compare Arabic shafat, "lip"; of the sand upon the seashore, a figure of multitude (Ge 22:17; Ex 14:30; Jos 11:4; Jud 7:12; 1Sa 13:5; 1Ki 4:29); the shore of the Red Sea or Gulf of ‘Aqabah by Ezion-geber (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:17); the brink of the River Nile (Ge 41:3,17); the edge (the King James Version "brink") of the valley of Arnon (De 2:36).

(3) qatseh, literally, "end," "extremity," the uttermost part (the King James Version "shore") of the Salt Sea (Jos 15:2); qetsh ha-’arets, "the end of the earth" (Ps 46:9); compare Arabic ‘aqaci-l-’ard, "the uttermost parts of the earth."

(4) cheilos, literally, "lip," "as the sand which is by the seashore" (Heb 11:12).

(5) aigialos, the beach (the King James Version "shore") of the Sea of Galilee (Mt 13:2,48; Joh 21:4); of the Mediterranean (Ac 21:5; 27:39,40).

(6) asson parelegonto ten Kreten, doubtful reading, "sailed along Crete, close in shore" (the King James Version "sailed along by Crete") (Ac 27:13).

See COAST; HAVEN; SAND.

Alfred Ely Day

SHORTEN

shor’-t’-n: The Hebrew word qatsar and the Greek koloboo literally indicate abbreviation of time or space (Ps 89:45; Pr 10:27; Eze 42:5); figuratively they point to limitation of power or of suffering (Nu 11:23; Isa 50:2; 59:1; Mt 24:22; Mr 13:20).

SHOSHANNIM EDUTH

sho-shan’-im e’-duth.

See SONG; PSALMS.

SHOULDER

shol’-der (shekhem, katheph, zeroa‘ or zerowa‘, or zero‘ah, shoq; omos, brachion (Sirach 7:31 only)): The meanings of the Hebrew words are rather varied. The first (shekhem) has perhaps the widest application. It is used for the part of the body on which heavy loads are carried (Ge 21:14; 24:15,45; Ex

12:34; Jos 4:5; Jud 9:48). King Saul's impressive personality is thus described: "There was not among the children of Israel a goodlier person than he: from his shoulders and upward he was higher than any of the people" (1Sa 9:2; 10:23). To carry loads on the shoulder or to have "a staff on the shoulder" is expressive of subjection and servitude, yea, of oppression and cruel punishment, and the removal of such burdens or of the rod of the oppressor connotes delivery and freedom (Isa 9:4; 14:25).

Figuratively:

The shoulders also bear responsibility and power. Thus it is said of King Messiah, that "the government shall be upon his shoulder" (Isa 9:6) and "the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open" (Isa 22:22). Job declares that he will refute all accusations of unlawful conduct made against him, in the words: "Oh .... that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written! Surely I would carry it upon my shoulder" (Job 31:35 f).

The Hebrew word katheph comes very close in meaning to the above, though it is occasionally used in the sense of arm-piece and shoulder-piece of a garment. Like Hebrew shekhem, it is used to describe the part of the body accustomed to carry loads. On it the Levites carried the implements of the sanctuary (Nu 7:9; 1Ch 15:15; 2Ch 35:3). Oriental mothers and fathers carried their children on the shoulder astride (Isa 49:22; compare Isa 60:4); thus also the little bundle of the poor is borne (Eze 12:6,7,12). The loaded shoulder is likely to be "worn" or chafed under the burden (Eze 29:18). In the two passages of the New Testament in which we find the Greek equivalent of shoulder (omos, fairly common in Apocrypha), it corresponds most closely with this use (Mt 23:4; Lu 15:5). Of the shoulders of animals the word katheph is used in Eze 34:21 (of sheep, where, however, men are intended) and in Isa 30:6 (of asses).

Stubborn opposition and unwillingness is expressed by "withdrew the shoulder" (Ne 9:29), or "pulled away the shoulder" (Zec 7:11), where the marginal rendering is "they gave (or "turned") a stubborn shoulder." Contrast "bow the shoulder," i.e. "submit" (Baruch 2:21). Compare "stiffnecked"; see NECK. Somewhat difficult for the understanding of Occidentals is the poetical passage in the blessing of Moses: "Of Benjamin he said, The beloved of Yahweh shall dwell in safety by him; he covereth him all the day long, and he dwelleth between his shoulders" (De 33:12). The "shoulders" refer here to the mountain saddles and proclivities of the territory of Benjamin between which Jerusalem, the beloved of Yahweh, which belonged to Judah, lay nestling close upon the confines of the neighboring tribe, or even built in part on ground belonging to Benjamin.

Much less frequently than the above-mentioned words. we find zeroa‘, zero‘ah, which is used of the "boiled shoulder of the ram" which was a wave offering at the consecration of a Nazirite (Nu 6:19) and of one of the priestly portions of the sacrifice (De 18:3). In Sirach 7:31 this portion is called brachion, properly "arm," but both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) translate "shoulder." Regarding the wave and heave offerings see SACRIFICE. the King James Version frequently translates Hebrew shoq, literally, "leg," "thigh" (which see) by "shoulder," which the Revised Version (British and American) occasionally retains in the margin (e.g. Nu 6:20).

H. L. E. Luering

SHOULDER-BLADE

shol’der-blad (shikhmah): "Then let my shoulder (kathephi) fall from the shoulder-blade (shikhmah), and mine arm (zeroa‘ be broken from the bone (qaneh)" (Job 31:22). The Hebrew word is the feminine form of shekhem (see SHOULDER). It is found only in this passage.

SHOULDER-PIECE

shol’-der-pes (katheph): The word designates the two straps or pieces of cloth which passed from the back of the ephod (see EPHOD) of the high priest over the shoulder and were fastened at the front. These shoulder-pieces seem to have been made of a precious texture of linen (or byssos) with threads of gold, blue, purple and scarlet, to which two onyx (or beryl) stones were attached bearing the names of six tribes of Israel each. These are called the "stones of memorial" (Ex 39:18). On these straps there were also fastened the plaited or woven bands ("wreathed chains") from which, by means of two golden rings, the breastplate was suspended. It is by no means clear from the descriptions (Ex 28:7,12,25; 39:4,7,18,20) how we have to imagine the form and attachment of these shoulder-pieces. It has been thought that the ephod might be of Egyptian origin, which is not very probable, though V. Ancessi, Annales de philosophie chretienne, 1872, 45 ff, reproduces some representations from the great work of Lepsius, Denkmaler, where costly royal garments have two shoulder straps, like the ephod. Usually Egyptian garments have no shoulder strap, or at most one.

H. L. E. Luering

SHOVEL

shuv’-l:

(1) rachath, is a wooden shovel used on the threshing-floor for winnowing the grain (Isa 30:24).

(2) ya‘, is used in various passages to indicate some instrument employed to carry away ashes from the altar (Ex 27:3; 38:3; Nu 4:14; 1Ki 7:40,45; 2Ki 25:14; 2Ch 4:11,16; Jer 52:18). It was very likely a small shovel like those used in connection with modern fireplaces for cleaning away the ashes (compare Hebrew ya‘ah, "to sweep away") or for carrying live coals to start a new fire.

(3) yathedh (De 23:13 the Revised Version margin)

James A. Patch

SHOW

sho.

See SHEW.

SHOWBREAD

sho’-bred.

See SHEWBREAD.

SHOWBREAD, TABLE OF

See SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF.

SHOWER

shou’-er:

(1) rebhibhim, a plural form apparently denoting gentle rain, usually used figuratively, as in De 32:2; Ps 72:6; Mic 5:7.

(2) geshem, used of gentle rain in Job 37:6: "shower of rain," the King James Version "small rain"; used of the flood in Ge 7:12. Figuratively, of blessing, "showers of blessing" (Eze 34:26); of destruction: "There shall be an overflowing shower in mine anger, and great hailstones in wrath to consume it" (Eze 13:13).

(3) zerem, usually storm or tempest (compare Isa 4:6; 28:2): "They are wet with the showers of the mountain" (Job 24:8).

(4) ombros (Lu 12:54), Rain is unknown in Palestine in the long summer of 5 or 6 months. A few showers usually fall in September, succeeded by fine weather for some weeks before the beginning of the heavy and long-continued winter rains.

Alfred Ely Day

SHRINE

shrin (@naos]): In Ac 19:24 small models of temples for Diana.

SHROUD

shroud (choresh, "bough"): Winding-sheet for the dead. See BURIAL. Used in the King James Version, the English Revised Version Eze 31:3 in the rare old sense of "shelter," "covering." the American Standard Revised Version has "a forest-like shade" choresh, "wood," "wooded height") (Isa 17:9, etc.). Compare Milton, Comus, 147.

SHRUB

shrub (siach (Ge 21:15)).

See BUSH, (2).

SHUA; SHUAH

shoo’-a:

(1) (shua‘ "prosperity"): A Canaanite whose daughter Judah took to wife (Ge 38:2,12; 1Ch 2:3).

See BATHSHUA.

(2) (shu‘-a"," prosperity"): Daughter of Heber, an Asherite (1Ch 7:32).

(3) (shuach, "depression"): A son of Keturah by Abraham (Ge 25:2; 1Ch 1:32), and his posterity.

See BILDAD.

(4) A brother of Caleb (1Ch 4:11).

See SHUHAH.

SHUAL

shoo’-al (shu‘al): An Asherite (1Ch 7:36).

SHUAL, LAND OF

(’erets shu‘al; he Sogal): From their encampment at Michmash the Philistines sent out marauding bands, one going westward toward Beth-horon, another eastward, "the way of the border that looketh down upon the valley of Zeboim." The pass to the South was held against them by Israel. The third party

therefore went northward, turning "unto the way that leadeth to Ophrah, unto the land of Shual" (1Sa 13:17 f). Ophrah is probably identical with et-taiyibeh, a village which lies some 5 miles East of Beitin (Bethel). It is in this district therefore that the land of Shual must be sought, but no definite identification is possible.

W. Ewing

SHUBAEL

shoo'ba-el, shoo-ba'-el (shubha'el):

(1) A Levite, son of Amram (1Ch 24:20); one of the leaders of song in the temple (1Ch 25:20).

See SHEBUEL; Gray, HPN, 310.

(2) A son of Heman (1Ch 25:4).

See SHEBUEL.

SHUHAH

shoo'-ha (shuchah, "depression"): A brother of Caleb (1Ch 4:11).

SHUHAM

shoo'-ham (shucham): Son of Dan, ancestor of the Shuhamites (Nu 26:42 f). In Ge 46:23 called "Hushim."

SHUHITE

shoo'-hit (shuchi): Cognomen of Bildad, one of Job's friends (Job 2:11; 8:1; 18:1; 25:1; 42:9). The place referred to cannot be definitely located.

See BILDAD; SHUAH.

SHULAMMITE

shoo'-la-mit (So 6:13, the King James Version "Shulamite").

See SHUNAMMITE.

SHUMATHITES

shoo’-math-its (~shumathi]): One of the families of Kiriath-jearim (1Ch 2:53).

SHUNAMMITE

shoo’-na-mit (shunammith, shunammith; Codex Vaticanus Somaneitis; Codex Alexandrinus Soumanites): Applied to natives of Shunem.

(1) Abishag, who was brought to minister to the aged king David, love for whom led Adonijah to his doom (1Ki 1:3,15; 2:17, etc.).

(2) The woman, name unknown, whose son Elisha raised from the dead (2Ki 4:12, etc.). Later when apparently she had become a widow, after seven years’ absence on account of famine, in the land of the Philistines, she returned to find her property in the hands of others. Elisha’s intervention secured its restoration (2Ki 8:1-6).

(3) The Shulammite (So 6:13). In this name there is the exchange of "l" for "n" which is common.

W. Ewing

SHUNEM

shoo’-nem (shunem; Codex Vaticanus Sounan; Codex Alexandrinus Sounam): A town in the territory of Issachar named with Jezreel and Chesulloth (Jos 19:18). Before the battle of Gilboa the Philistines pitched their camp here. They and the army of Saul, stationed on Gilboa, were in full view of each other (1Sa 28:4). It was the scene of the touching story recorded in 2Ki 4:8-37, in which the prophet Elisha raises to life the son of his Shunammite benefactress. Eusebius (Onomasticon) describes it as a village called Sulem, 5 Roman miles South of Mt. Tabor. This points to the modern Solam, a village surrounded by cactus hedges and orchards on the lower southwestern slope of Jebel ed-Duchy ("Hill of Moreh"). It commands an uninterrupted view across the plain of Esdraelon to Mt. Carmel, which is about 15 miles distant. It also looks far across the valley of Jezreel to the slopes of Gilboa on the South. It therefore meets satisfactorily the conditions of Joshua and 1 Samuel. A question has, however, been raised as to its identity with the Shunem of 2Ki 4. Elisha’s home was in Samaria. Apparently Carmel was one of his favorite haunts. If he passed Shunem "continually" (2Ki 4:9), going to and coming from the mountain, it involved a very long detour if this were the village visited. It would seem more natural to identify the Shunem of Elisha with the Sanim of Eusebius, Onomasticon, which is said to be in the territory of Sebaste (Samaria), in the region of Akrabatta: or perhaps with Salim, fully a mile North of Taanach, as nearer the line of travel between Samaria and Carmel.

There is, however, nothing to show that Elisha’s visits to Shunem were paid on his journeys between

Samaria and Carmel. It may have been his custom to visit certain cities on circuit, on business calling for his personal attention, e.g. in connection with the "schools of the prophets." Materials do not exist on which any certain conclusion can rest. Both Solam Salim are on the edge of the splendid grain fields of Esdraelon (2Ki 4:18).

W. Ewing

SHUNI; SHUNITES

shoo’-ni, shoo’-nits. (shuni): One of the sons of Gad and his descendants (Ge 46:16; Nu 26:15).

SHUPHAM; SHUPHAMITES

shoo’-fam, shoo’-fam-its.

See SHEPHUPHAM.

SHUPPIM

shup’-im (shuppim):

(1) One of the descendants of Benjamin (1Ch 7:12,15).

(2) One of the porters in the temple (1Ch 26:16).

See MUPPIM; SHEPHUPHAM.

SHUR

shur, shoor (shur; Sour): The name of a desert East of the Gulf of Suez. The word means a "wall," and may probably refer to the mountain wall of the Tih plateau as visible from the shore plains. In Ge 16:7 Hagar at Kadesh (‘Ain Qadis) (see 16:14) is said to have been "in the way to Shur." Abraham also lived "between Kadesh and Shur" (Ge 20:1). The position of Shur is defined (Ge 25:18) as being "opposite Egypt on the way to Assyria." After crossing the Red Sea (Ex 15:4) the Hebrews entered the desert of Shur (Ex 15:22), which extended southward a distance of three days’ journey. It is again noticed (1Sa 15:7) as being opposite Egypt, and (1Sa 27:8) as near Egypt. There is thus no doubt of its situation, on the East of the Red Sea, and of the Bitter Lakes.

Brugsch, however, proposed to regard Shur ("the wall") as equivalent to the Egyptian anbu ("wall"), the name of a fortification of some kind apparently near Kantarah] (see MIGDOL (2)), probably barring the entrance to Egypt on the road from Pelusium to Zoan. The extent of this "wall" is unknown, but Brugsch

connects it with the wall mentioned by Diodorus Siculus (i.4) who wrote about 8 BC, and who attributed it to Sesostris (probably Rameses II) who defended "the east side of Egypt against the irruptions of the Syrians and Arabians, by a wall drawn from Pelusium through the deserts as far as to Heliopolis, for a space of 1,500 furlongs." Heliopolis lies 90 miles (not 188) Southwest of Pelusium: this wall, if it existed at all, would have run on the edge of the desert which extends North of Wady Tumeilat from Kantarah] to Tell el-Kebir; but this line, on the borders of Goshen, is evidently much too far West to have any connection with the desert of Shur East of the Gulf of Suez. See Budge, Hist. Egypt, 90; Brugsch, Egypt under the Pharaohs, abridged edition, 320.

C. R. Conder

SHUSHAN

shoo’-shan (shushan; Sousan, Sousa):

1. Position, Eytmology and Forms of Its Name:

This city, the Susu or Susan of the Babylonians, and the native (Elamite) Susun, is the modern Shush (Sus) in Southwestern Persia, a series of ruin-mounds on the banks of the river Kerkha. The ancient etymologies ("city of lilies" or "of horses") are probably worthless, as an etymology in the language of the place would rather be expected. Sayce therefore connects the name with sassa, meaning "former," and pointing to some such meaning as "the old" city. It is frequently mentioned in the Babylonian inscriptions of the 3rd millennium BC, and is expressed by the characters for the goddess Ishtar and for "cedar," implying that it was regarded as the place of the "divine grove" (see 5, below). In later days, the Assyrians substituted for the second character, that having the value of ses, possibly indicating its pronunciation. Radau (Early Babylonian History, 236) identifies Shushan (Susa) with the Sasa of the Babylonian king Kuri-galzu (14th century BC, if the first of the name), who dedicates to the Babylonian goddess Ninlil an inscription of a certain Siatu, who had, at an earlier date, dedicated it to Ishtar for the life of the Babylonian king Dungi (circa 2500 BC).

2. The Ruins:

The surface still covered with ruins is about 2,000 hectares (4,940 acres), though this is but a fraction compared with the ancient extent of the city, which is estimated to have been between 12,000 and 15,000 hectares (29,640-37,000 acres). Though considerable, the extent of Susa was small compared with Nineveh and Babylon. The ruins are divided by the French explorers into four tracts:

(1) The Citadel-mound (West), of the Achemenian period (5th century BC), circa 1,476 by 820 ft., dominating the plain (height circa 124 ft.).

(2) The Royal City on the East of the Citadel, composed of two parts: the Apadana (Northeast), and a nearly triangular tract extending to the East and the South. This contains the remains of the palace of

Darius and his successors, and occupies rather more than 123 acres. The palace proper and the throne-room were separated from the rest of the official buildings.

(3) The City, occupied by artisans, merchants, etc.

(4) The district on the right bank, similarly inhabited. This in ancient times extended into all the lower plain, between the Shaour and the Kerkha. Besides these, there were many isolated ruins, and the suburbs contained a number of villages and separate constructions.

3. The "Royal City," "The Citadel," and the Ruins Therein:

Most of the constructions at Susa are of the Persian period. In the northern part of the Royal City lie the remains of the Apadana, the only great monument of which remains were found on the level. The principal portion consisted of a great hall of columns, known as the throne-room of Artaxeres Mnemon. It replaced an earlier structure by Darius, which was destroyed by fire in the time of Artaxerxes I. The columns apparently had capitals of the style common in Persia—the foreparts of two bulls kneeling back to back. In the Citadel a palace built by Xerxes seems to have existed, the base of one of his columns having been found there. Bricks bearing the inscriptions of early Elamite kings, and the foundations of older walls, testify to the antiquity of the occupation of this part. According to the explorers, this was the portion of the city reserved for the temples.

4. The Monuments Discovered:

The number of important antiquities found on the site is considerable. Among the finds may be mentioned the triumphal stele of Naram-Sin, king of Agade (3rd-4th millennium BC); the statuettes of the Babylonian king Dungi (circa 2360 BC); the reliefs and inscriptions of the Elamite king Ba(?)-sa-Susinak (circa 2340 BC); the obelisk inscribed with the laws of Hammurabi of Babylon; the bronze bas-relief of the Elamite king Sutruk-Nahhunte (circa 1120 BC), who carried off from Babylonia the stelae of Naram-Sin and Hammurabi above mentioned, together with numerous other Babylonian monuments; the stele of Adda-hamiti-In-Susnak, of a much later date, together with numerous other objects of art and inscriptions—a most precious archaeological find.

5. Assur-bani-apli’s Description of the City:

Shushan passed through many serious crises, one of the severest being its capture and destruction by the armies of the Assyrian king Assur-bani-apli about 640 BC. According to his account, the ziqqurat or temple-tower of Susa was built of enameled brick imitating lapis-lazuli, and was adorned with pinnacles of bright bronze. The god of the city was Susinak, who dwelt in a secret place, and none ever saw the form of his divinity. Lagamaru (Laomer) and five other of the city’s deities were adored only by kings, and their images, with those of 12 more (worshipped by the people), were carried off as spoil to Assyria. Winged bulls and genii adorned Susa’s temples, and figures of wild bulls protected the entrances to their shrines. Other noteworthy things were the sacred groves into which no stranger was allowed to enter,

and the burial-places of the Elamite kings. After recovering from the blow inflicted by the Assyrians, Shushan ultimately regained its old importance, and, as the summer residence of the Persian kings, became

the home of Ahasuerus and Queen Esther (Ne 1:1; Es 1:2,5; 2:3; 3:15; 9:11 ff; Da 8:2; Additions to Esther 11:3).

LITERATURE.

See Perrot et Chipiez, Histoire de l’art dans l’antiquite, volume V, Perse, 1890; de Morgan, Delegation en Perse (Memoires), 1900, etc.; Histoire et travaux de la delegation en Perse, 1905; article "Elamites" in Hastings ERE; article ELAM in this work.

T. G. Pinches

SHUSHAN EDUTH

shoo’-shan e’-duth.

See SONG; PSALMS.

SHUSHANCHITES

shoo-shan’-kits (shushanekhaye’ (Aramaic); Codex Vaticanus Sousunachaioi; the King James Version Susanchites): Colonists in Samaria whose original home was in Shushan (Ezr 4:9).

SHUTHALHITES

shoo-thal’-hits, sho’-thal-hits.

See SHUTHELAH.

SHUTHELAH; SHUTHELAHITES

shoo-the’-la, shoo’-the-la, shoo-the’-la-hits, shoo’-the-la-hits (shuthalchi): A son of Ephraim (Nu 26:35,36; compare 1Ch 7:20,21), and his descendants.

See GENEALOGY.

SHUTTLE

shut’-’l.

See WEAVING.

SIA; SIAHA

si’-a, si’-a-ha (ci’a’): One of the remnant which returned from captivity (Ne 7:47; Ezr 2:44).T +>shuthalchi): A son of Ephraim (Nu 26:35,36; compare 1Ch 7:20,21), and his descendants.

SIBBECAI, SIBBECHAI

sib’-e-ki, sib-e-ka’-i (cibbekhay): One of the valiant men in David’s army (2Sa 21:18; 1Ch 11:29; 20:4; 27:11).

SIBBOLETH

sib’o-leth (cibboleth).

See SHIBBOLETH.

SIBMAH

sib’-ma.

See SEBAM.

SIBRAIM

sib-ra’-im, sib’-ra-im (cibhrayim; Codex Vaticanus Sebram; Codex Alexandrinus Sephram): A place named as on the boundary of Palestine in Ezekiel’s ideal delineation, "between the border of Damascus and the border of Hamath" (Eze 47:16). It may possibly be represented by the modern Khirbet Sanbariyeh on the west bank of Nahr el-Chasbany, about 3 miles Southeast of ‘Abil.

SIBYLLINE ORACLES

sib’-i-lin, -lin or’-a-k’-lz.

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. B, V.

SICARII

si-ka’-ri-i.

See ASSASSINS.

SICHEM si’-kem (shekhem). the King James Version in Ge 12:6.

See SHECHEM.

SICK; SICKNESS

sik, sik’-nes (chalah (Ge 48:1, etc.), choli (De 28:61, etc.), tachalu’ (De 29:21, etc.), machalah (Ex 23:25, etc.), daweh (Le 15:33, etc.), ‘anash (2Sa 12:15, etc.); astheneo (Mt 10:8, etc.; compare RAPC 2Ma 9:22), [@kakos echon (Lu 7:2), kakos echontas (Mt 4:24, etc.), arrhostos (Sirach 7:35; Mt 14:14, etc.), arrhostema (Sirach 10:10, etc.), with various cognates, kamno (Jas 5:15); Latin morbus (2 Esdras 8:31)): Compared with the number of deaths recorded in the historical books of the Bible the instances in which diseases are mentioned are few. "Sick" and "sickness" (including "disease," etc.) are the translations of 6 Hebrew and 9 Greek words and occur 56 times in the Old Testament and 57 times in the New Testament. The number of references in the latter is significant as showing how much the healing of the sick was characteristic of the Lord’s ministry. The diseases specified are varied. Of infantile sickness there is an instance in Bath-sheba’s child (2Sa 12:15), whose disease is termed ‘anash, not improbably trismus nascentium, a common disease in Palestine. Among adolescents there are recorded the unspecified sickness of Abijah (1Ki 14:1), of the widow’s son at Zarephath (1Ki 17:17), the sunstroke of the Shunammite’s son (2Ki 4:19), the epileptic boy (Mt 17:15), Jairus’ daughter (Mt 9:18), and the nobleman’s son (Joh 4:46). At the other extreme of life Jacob’s death was preceded by sickness (Ge 48:1). Sickness resulted from accident (Ahaziah, 2Ki 1:2), wounds (Joram, 2Ki 8:29), from the violence of passion (Amnon, 2Sa 13:2), or mental emotion (Da 8:27); see also in this connection So 2:5; 5:8. Sickness the result of drunkenness is mentioned (Ho 7:5), and as a consequence of famine (Jer 14:18) or violence (Mic 6:13). Daweh or periodic sickness is referred to (Le 15:33; 20:18), and an extreme case is that of Lu 8:43.

In some examples the nature of the disease is specified, as Asa’s disease in his feet (1Ki 15:23), for which he sought the aid of physicians in vain (2Ch 16:12). Hezekiah and Job suffered from sore boils, Jehoram from some severe dysenteric attack (2Ch 21:19), as did Antiochus Epiphanes (2 Macc 9:5). Probably the sudden and fatal disease of Herod was similar, as in both cases there is reference to the presence of worms (compare Ac 12:23 and 2 Macc 9:9). The disease of Publius’ father was also dysentery (Ac 28:8). Other diseases specified are paralysis (Mt 8:6; 9:2), and fever (Mt 8:14). Not improbably the sudden illness of the young Egyptian at Ziklag (1Sa 30:11), and the illness of Ben-hadad which weakened him so that he could not resist the violence of Hazael, were also the common Palestine fever (2Ki 8:15) of whose symptoms and effects there is a graphic description in Ps 38. Unspecified fatal illnesses were those of Elisha (2Ki 13:14), Lazarus (Joh 11:1), Tabitha (Ac 9:37). In the language of the

Bible, leprosy is spoken of as a defilement to be cleansed, rather than as a disease to be cured.

The proverb concerning the sick quoted by the Lord at Capernaum (Mr 2:17) has come down to us in several forms in apocryphal and rabbinical writings (Babha' Qamma' 26:13; Sanhedhrin 176), but is nowhere so terse as in the form in which He expresses it. The Lord performed His healing of the sick by His word or touch, and one of the most emphatic charges which He gave to His disciples when sending them out was to heal the sick. One of the methods used by them, the anointing with oil, is mentioned in Mr 6:13 and enjoined by James (5:15). In later times the anointing which was at first used as a remedial agent became a ceremonial in preparation for death, one of the seven sacraments of the Roman church (Aquinas, Summa Theologia suppl. ad Piii. 29).

The duty of visiting the sick is referred to in Eze 34:4,16, and by the Lord in the description of the Judgment scene (Mt 25:36,43). It is inculcated in several of the rabbinical tracts. "He that visits the sick lengthens his life, he who refrains shortens it," says Rabbi Ischanan in Nedharim 29. In Shulchan 'Arukh, Yoreh De'ah there is a chapter devoted to this duty, which is regarded as incumbent on the Jew, even though the sick person be a Gentile (Gittin 61a). The church's duty to the sick, so long neglected, has, within the last century, been recognized in the mission field, and has proved, in heathen lands, to be the most important of all pioneer agressive methods.

While we find that the apostles freely exercised their gifts of healing, it is noteworthy that we read of the sickness of two of Paul's companions, Epaphroditus (Php 2:26) and Trophimus (2Ti 4:20), for whose recovery he seems to have used no other means than prayer.

See also DISEASE.

Alexander Macalister

SICKLE

sik'-'l (chermesh (De 16:9; 23:25), maggal; compare Arabic minjal (Jer 50:16; Joe 3:13); drepanon (Mr 4:29; Re 14:14-19)): Although the ancients pulled much of their grain by hand, we know that they also used sickles. The form of this instrument varied, as is evidenced by the Egyptian sculptures. The earliest sickle was probably of wood, shaped like the modern scythe, although much smaller, with the cutting edge made of sharp flints set into the wood. Sickle flints were found at Tel el-Chesy. Crescent-shaped iron sickles were found in the same mound. In Palestine and Syria the sickle varies in size. It is usually made wholly of iron or steel and shaped much like the instrument used in western lands. The smaller-sized sickles are used both for pruning and for reaping.

James A. Patch

SICYON

sish’-i-on (Sikuon, Sukuon, Sukion): Mentioned in 1 Macc 15:23 in the list of countries and cities to which Lucius the Roman consul (probably Lucius Calpurnius Piso, 139 BC) wrote, asking them to be friendly to the Jews. The Jewish dispersion had already taken place, and Jews were living in most of the seaports and cities of Asia Minor, Greece and Egypt (compare Sib Or 3:271, circa 140 BC, and Philo).

Sicyon was situated 18 miles West of Corinth on the south side of the Gulf of Corinth. Its antiquity and ancient importance are seen by its coins still extant, dating from the 5th century. Though not as important as Corinth in its sea trade, the burning of that city in 143 BC, and the favor shown to Sicyon by the Roman authorities in adding to its territory and assigning to it the direction of the Isthmian games, increased its wealth and influence for a time.

S. F. Hunter

SIDDIM, VALE OF

sid’-im, (‘emeq ha-siddim; Septuagint he pharangx (or koilas) he haluke): The place mentioned in Ge 14:3-8 as being the scene of encounter between Chedorlaomer and his allies with the kings of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboiim and Zoar. In 14:3 it is identified with the Salt Sea, and in 14:10 it is said to have been full of slime pits ("bitumen").

According to the traditional view, the Vale of Siddim was at the southern end of the Dead Sea. But in recent years a number of eminent authorities have maintained that it was at the northern end of the Dead Sea, in the vicinity of Jericho. Their argument has mainly been drawn from incidental references in the scene (Ge 13:1-13) describing the parting of Lot and Abram, and again in the account of Moses’ vision from Pisgah (De 34:3).

In the account of Abram and Lot, it is said that from Bethel they saw "all the Plain of the Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before Yahweh destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah." The word here translated "plain" means "circle," and well describes the view which one has of the plain about Jericho from Bethel as he looks down the valley past Ai. But it seems to go beyond the text to assume that the Vale of Siddim was within that circle of vision, for it is said in Ge 13:12 simply that Lot dwelt "in the cities of the Plain, and moved his tent as far as Sodom." In the vision of Moses, likewise, we have a very general and condensed description, in which it is said that he was shown "the Plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar," which, as we learn from Ge 19:22, was not far from the Vale of Siddim. It is true that from the traditional site of Pisgah the south end of the Dead Sea could not be seen. But we are by no means sure that the traditional site of Pisgah is the true one, or that the import of this language should be restricted to the points which are actually within range of vision.

The tendency at the present time is to return to the traditional view that the Vale of Siddim was at the south end of the Dead Sea. This is supported by the fact that Jebel Usdum, the salt mountain at the southwest corner of the Dead Sea, still bears the name of Sodom, Usdum being simply another form of the word. A still stronger argument, however, is drawn from the general topographical and geological

conditions. In the first place, Zoar, to which Lot is said to have fled, was not far away. The most natural site for it is near the mouth of the Wady Kerak, which comes down from Moab into the southern end of the Dead Sea (see ZOAR); and this city was ever afterward spoken of as a Moabite city, which would not have been the case if it had been at the north end of the sea. It is notable in Jos 13:15-21, where the cities given to Reuben are enumerated, that, though the slopes of Pisgah are mentioned, Zoar is not mentioned.

In Ge 14, where the battle between Amraphel and his allies with Sodom and the other cities of the plain is described, the south end of the Dead Sea comes in logical order in the progress of their campaign, and special mention is made of the slime or bitumen pits which occurred in the valley, and evidently played an important part in the outcome of the battle.

At the south end of the Dead Sea there is an extensive circle or plain which is better supplied with water for irrigation than is the region about Jericho, and which, on the supposition of slight geological changes, may have been extremely fertile in ancient times; while there are many indications of such fertility in the ruins that have been described by travelers about the mouth of the Kerak and other localities nearby. The description, therefore, of the fertility of the region in the Vale of Siddim may well have applied to this region at the time of Lot’s entrance into it.

There are very persistent traditions that great topographical changes took place around the south end of the Dead Sea in connection with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, while the opinion has been universally prevalent among the earlier historical writers that the site of Sodom and Gomorrah is beneath the waters of the Dead Sea.

Geological investigations, so far from disproving these traditions, render them altogether possible and credible. There is a remarkable contrast between the depths of the north end of the Dead Sea and of the south end. Near the north end the depth descends to 1,300 ft., whereas for many miles out from the south end it is very shallow, so that at low water a ford exists, and is occasionally used, from the north end of the salt mountain across to el-Lisan.

The precipitous salt cliffs of Jebel Usdum which border the southwest corner of the Dead Sea would indicate that, in comparatively recent times, there had been abrupt subsidence of a good many feet in the bottom of the Dead Sea at that end.

Such subsidences of limited areas and in connection with earthquakes are by no means uncommon. In 1819 an area of 2,000 square miles about the delta of the Indus sank beneath the level of the sea, so that the tops of the houses were barely seen above the water. A smaller area in the delta of the Selenga River sank during the last century beneath the waters of Lake Baikal. Professor R.S. Tarr of Cornell University has recently described the effect of an earthquake on the shores of Alaska, in which there was a change of level of 47 ft.

More probably (see ARABAH; DEAD SEA) there has been a rise in the waters of the Dead Sea since

Abraham’s time, caused by the encroachment upon the original area of evaporation by the deltas which have been pushed into the main part of the depression by the Jordan, and various smaller streams descending from the highlands on either side. In consequence of these encroachments, the equilibrium between precipitation and evaporation could be maintained only by a rise in the water causing it to spread over the shallow shelf at the south end, thus covering a large part of the Vale of Siddim with the shoal water now found between el-Lisan and Jebel Usdum.

George Frederick Wright

SIDE

si’-de (Side): An ancient town of Pamphylia, occupying a triangular promontory on the coast. It was one of the towns to which a letter favorable to the Jews was sent by the Roman consul Lucius (1 Macc 15:23). The town seems to have been of considerable antiquity, for it had existed long before it fell into the possession of Alexander the Great, and for a time it was the metropolis of Pamphylia. Off the coast the fleet of Antiochus was defeated by the Rhodians. During the 1st century, Side was noted as one of the chief ports of pirates who disposed of much of their booty there. The ruins of the city, which are now very extensive, bear the name Eski Adalia, but among them there are no occupied houses. The two harbors protected by a sea wall may still be traced, but they are now filled with sand. The wall on the land side of the city was provided with a gate which was protected with round towers; the walls themselves are of Greek-Roman type. Within the walls the more important of the remains are three theaters near the harbors, and streets with covered porticoes leading from the city gate to the harbors. Without the walls, the street leading to the city gate is lined with sarcophagi, and among the shrubbery of the neighboring fields are traces of many buildings and of an aqueduct.

E. J. Banks

SIDES

sidz (yarekhah, "thigh," "flank"): the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "innermost parts" for the King James Version "sides" in Jon 1:5; compare 1Sa 24:3.

SIDON (1)

si’-don (tsidhon): The oldest son of Canaan (Ge 10:15).

SIDON (2)

si’-don (tsidhon; Sidon; the King James Version, Sidon and Zidon; the Revised Version (British and American) SIDON only):

1. Location and Distinction:

One of the oldest Phoenician cities, situated on a narrow plain between the range of Lebanon and the sea, in latitude 33 degrees 34 minutes nearly. The plain is well watered and fertile, about 10 miles long, extending from a little North of Sarepta to the Bostrenus (Nahr el-'Auly). The ancient city was situated near the northern end of the plain, surrounded with a strong wall. It possessed two harbors, the northern one about 500 yds. long by 200 wide, well protected by little islets and a breakwater, and a southern about 600 by 400 yards, surrounded on three sides by land, but open to the West, and thus exposed in bad weather. The date of the founding of the city is unknown, but we find it mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters in the 14th century BC, and in Ge 10:19 it is the chief city of the Canaanites, and Joshua (Jos 11:8) calls it Great Sidon. It led all the Phoenician cities in its early development of maritime affairs, its sailors being the first to launch out into the open sea out of sight of land and to sail by night, guiding themselves by the stars. They were the first to come into contact with the Greeks and we find the mention of them several times in Homer, while other Phoenician towns are not noticed. Sidon became early distinguished for its manufactures and the skill of its artisans, such as beautiful metal-work in silver and bronze and textile fabrics embroidered and dyed with the famous purple dye which became known as Tyrian, but which was earlier produced at Sidon. Notices of these choice articles are found in Homer, both in the Iliad and the Odyssey. Sidon had a monarchical form of government, as did all the Phoenician towns, but it also held a sort of hegemony over those to the South as far as the limit of Phoenicia. It likewise made one attempt to establish an inland colony at Laish or Dan, near the headwaters of the Jordan, but this ended in disaster (Jud 18:7,27,28). The attempt was not renewed, but many colonies were established over-sea. Citium, in Cyprus, was one of the earliest.

2. Historical:

(1) The independence of Sidon was lost when the kings of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties of Egypt added Palestine and Syria to their dominions (1580-1205 BC). The kings of Sidon were allowed to remain on the throne as long as they paid tribute, and perhaps still exercised authority over the towns that had before been subject to them. When the power of Egypt declined under Amenhotep IV (1375-1358), the king of Sidon seems to have thrown off the yoke, as appears from the Tell el-Amarna Letters. Rib-addi of Gebal writes to the king of Egypt that Zimrida, king of Sidon, had joined the enemy, but Zimrida himself claims, in the letters he wrote, to be loyal, declaring that the town belonging to him had been taken by the Khabiri (Tab. 147). Sidon, with the other towns, eventually became independent of Egypt, and she retained the hegemony of the southern towns and perhaps added Dor, claimed by the Philistines, to her dominion. This may have been the reason for the war that took place about the middle of the 12th century BC, in which the Philistines took and plundered Sidon, whose inhabitants fled to Tyre and gave the latter a great impetus. Sidon, however, recovered from the disaster and became powerful again. The Book of Judges claims that Israel was oppressed by Sidon (10:12), but it is probable Sidon stands here for Phoenicia in general, as being the chief town.

(2) Sidon submitted to the Assyrian kings as did the Phoenician cities generally, but revolted against Sennacherib and again under Esar-haddon. The latter destroyed a large part of the city and carried off most of the inhabitants, replacing them by captives from Babylon and Elam, and renamed it Ir-Esar-had-

don ("City of Esar-haddon"). The settlers readily mingled with the Phoenicians, and Sidon rose to power again when Assyria fell, was besieged by Nebuchadnezzar at the time of his siege of Jerusalem and Tyre, and was taken, having lost about half of its inhabitants by plague. The fall of Babylon gave another short period of independence, but the Persians gained control without difficulty, and Sidon was prominent in the Persian period as the leading naval power among the Phoenicians who aided their suzerain in his attacks upon Greece. In 351 BC, Sidon rebelled under Tabnit II (Tennes), and called in the aid of Greek mercenaries to the number of 10,000; but Ochus, the Persian king, marched against him with a force of 300,000 infantry and 30,000 horse, which so frightened Tabnit that he betrayed the city to save his own life. But the citizens, learning of the treachery, first burned their fleet and then their houses, perishing with their wives and children rather than fall into the hands of Ochus, who butchered all whom he seized, Tabnit among them. It is said that 40,000 perished in the flames. A list of the kings of Sidon in the Persian period has been recovered from the inscriptions and the coins, but the dates of their reigns are not accurately known. The dynasty of the known kings begins with Esmunazar I, followed by Tabnit I, Amastoreth; Esmunazar II, Strato I (Bodastart), Tabnit II (Tennes) and Strato II. Inscriptions from the temple of Esmun recently discovered give the name of a Bodastart and a son Yatonmelik, but whether the first is one of the Stratos above mentioned or a third is uncertain; also whether the son ever reigned or not. As Bodastart calls himself the grandson of Esmunazar, he is probably Strato I who reigned about 374-363 BC, and hence, his grandfather, Esmunazar I, must have reigned in 400 BC or earlier. Strato II was on the throne when Alexander took possession of Phoenicia and made no resistance to him, and even aided him in the siege of Tyre, which shows that Sidon had recovered after the terrible disaster it suffered in the time of Ochus. It perhaps looked upon the advance of Alexander with content as its avenger. The destruction of Tyre increased the importance of Sidon, and after the death of Alexander it became attached to the kingdom of the Ptolemies and remained so until the victory of Antiochus III over Scopas (198 BC), when it passed to the Seleucids and from them to the Romans, who granted it a degree of autonomy with native magistrates and a council, and it was allowed to coin money in bronze.

3. New Testament Mention:

Sidon comes into view several times in the New Testament; first when Christ passed into the borders of Tyre and Sidon and healed the daughter of the Syro-phoenician woman (Mr 7:24-30); also when Herod Agrippa I received a delegation from Tyre and Sidon at Caesarea (Ac 12:20), where it appears to have been outside his jurisdiction. Paul, on his way to Rome, was permitted to visit some friends at Sidon (Ac 27:3). See also Mt 11:21 f and Mr 3:8.

It was noted for its school of philosophy under Augustus and Tiberius, its inhabitants being largely Greek; and when Berytus was destroyed by an earthquake in 551, its great law school was removed to Sidon. It was not of great importance during the Crusades, being far surpassed by Acre, and in modern times it is a small town of some 15,000.

LITERATURE.

See PHOENICIA.

H. Porter

SIDONIANS

si-do’-ni-anz: Natives or inhabitants of Sidon (De 3:9; Jos 13:4,6; Jud 3:3; 1Ki 5:6).

SIEGE

sej (matsor (De 28:52,53; 1Ki 15:27; 2Ki 25:2; Isa 29:3; Eze 4:2); "to be besieged," "to suffer siege," ba-matsor bo’ (De 20:19; 2Ki 24:10; 25:2)):

1. In Early Hebrew History

2. In the Monarchy

3. Preliminaries to Siege

4. Siege Operations: Attack

(1) Investment of City

(2) Line of Circumvallation

(3) Mound, or Earthworks

(4) Battering-Rams

(5) Storming of Walls and Rushing of Breach

5. Siege Operations: Defense

6. Raising of Siege

7. Horrors of Siege and Capture

8. Siege in the New Testament

LITERATURE

1. In Early Hebrew History:

In early Hebrew history, siege operations are not described and can have been little known. Although the Israelites had acquired a certain degree of military discipline in the wilderness, when they entered Canaan they had no experience of the operations of a siege and were without the engines of war necessary for the purpose. Jericho, with its strongly fortified wall, was indeed formally invested—it "was straitly shut up because of the children of Israel: none went out, and none came in" (Jos 6:1)—but it fell into their hands without a siege. Other cities seem to have yielded after pitched battles, or to have been taken by assault. Many of the Canaanite fortresses, like Gezer (2Sa 5:25; Jos 16:10), Taanach and Megiddo (Jud 1:27), remained unreduced. Jerusalem was captured by the men of Judah (Jud 1:8), but the fort of Jebus remained unconquered till the time of David (2Sa 5:6).

2. In the Monarchy:

In the days of the monarchy more is heard of siege operations. At the siege of Rabbath-Ammon Joab seems to have deprived the city of its water-supply and rendered it untenable (2Sa 11:1; 12:27). At Abel of Beth-maacah siege operations are described in which Joab distinguished himself (2Sa 20:15). David and Solomon, and, after the disruption of the kingdom, Rehoboam and Jeroboam built fortresses which ere long became the scene of siege operations. The war between Judah and Israel in the days of Nadab, Baasha, and Elah was, for the most part, a war of sieges. It was while besieging Gibbethon that Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, was slain by Baasha (1Ki 15:27), and, 27 years after, while the army of Israel was still investing the same place, the soldiery chose their commander Omri to be king over Israel (1Ki 16:16). From the Egyptians, the Syrians, the Assyrians, and the Chaldeans, with whom they came into relations in later times as allies or as enemies, the people of the Southern and of the Northern Kingdoms learned much regarding the art, both of attack and of defense of fortified places.

3. Preliminaries to Siege:

It was an instruction of the Deuteronomic Law that before a city was invested for a long siege, it should be summoned to capitulate (De 20:10; compare 2Sa 20:18; 2Ki 18:17). If the offer of peace be declined, then the siege is to be proceeded with, and if the city be captured, all the male population is to be put to death, and the women and children reserved as a prey for the captors. To this humane reservation the cities of the Canaanites were to be an exception: their inhabitants were to be wholly exterminated (De 20:16-18).

The same law prescribed that there should be no unnecessary destruction of fruit trees in the prosecution of a long siege. Trees not yielding fruit for human sustenance might be cut down: "And thou shalt build bulwarks (matsor, "siegeworks") against the city that maketh war with thee, until it fall" (De 20:19,20). This instruction to have regard to the fruit trees around a hostile city seems to have been more honored in the breach than in the observance, even in Israel. When the allied kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom were invading Moab and had instruction to "smite every fortified city," the prophet Elisha bade them also "fell every good tree, and stop all fountains of water, and mar every good piece of land with

stones" (2Ki 3:19,25). When the assault of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans was imminent, Yahweh commanded the cutting down of the trees (Jer 6:6). In Arabian warfare, we are told, the destruction of the enemy's palm groves was a favorite exploit (Robertson Smith, OTJC2, 369), and the Assyrians when they captured a city had no compunction in destroying its plantations (Inscription of Shalmaneser II on Black Obelisk).

4. Siege Operations: Attack:

From passages in the Prophets, upon which much light has been thrown by the ancient monuments of Assyria and Chaldea, we gain a very clear idea of the siege works directed against a city by Assyrian or Chaldean invaders. The siege of Lachish (2Ki 18:13,14; Isa 36:1,2) by Sennacherib is the subject of a series of magnificent reliefs from the mound of Koyunjik (Layard, Monuments of Nineveh, lI, plates 20, 21, 22). The downfall of Nineveh as predicted in Nahum s prophecy lets us see the siege operations proceeding with striking realism (see Der Untergang Ninivehs by A. Jeremias and Colonel Billerbeck). Nowhere, however, are the incidents of a siege—the gathering of hostile forces, the slaughter of peaceful inhabitants in the country around, the raising of siegeworks, the setting of engines of war against the walls, the demolition of the towers, the breach in the principal wall, the rush of men and the clatter of horses' hoofs through the streets, the slaughter, the pillage, the destruction of walls and houses —more fully and faithfully recorded than by Ezekiel when predicting the capture of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar (Eze 26:7-12). The siege of Tyre lasted 13 years, and Ezekiel tells how every head was made bald and every shoulder worn by the hard service of the besiegers (Eze 29:18). There were various ways in which an invading army might deal with a fortified city so as to secure its possession. Terms might be offered to secure a capitulation (1Ki 20:1 ff; 2Ki 18:14). An attempt might be made to reduce the city by starvation (2Ki 6:24 ff; 2Ki 17:5). The city might be invested and captured by assault and storm, as Lachish was by Sennacherib (2Ki 18:13; 19:8; see Layard, op cit., II, plates 20-24). The chief operations of the besiegers were as follows:

(1) Investment of City:

There was the investment of the city by the besieging army. It was sometimes necessary to establish a fortified camp, like that of Sennacherib at Lachish to guard against sorties by the defenders. Of the siege of Jerusalem we read that Nebuchadrezzar came, "he and all his army, against Jerusalem, and encamped against it" (Jer 52:4; compare 2Ki 25:1). From the commencement of the siege, slingers and archers were posted where they could keep the defenders engaged; and it is to this that reference is made when Jeremiah says: "Call together the archers against Babylon, all them that bend the bow; encamp against her round about; let none thereof escape" (Jer 50:29).

(2) Line of Circumvallation:

There was next the drawing of a line of circumvallation (day'eq) with detached forts round about the walls. These forts were towers manned by archers, or they were used as stations from which to discharge missiles (Jer 52:4; Eze 17:17). In this connection the word "munition" in the King James Version and the

English Revised Version (matsor) in Na 1:1 disappears in the American Standard Revised Version and is replaced by "fortress."

(3) Mound or Earthworks:

Following upon this was the mound (colelah), or earthworks, built up to the height of the walls, so as to command the streets of the city, and strike terror into the besieged. From the mound thus erected the besiegers were able to batter the upper and weaker part of the city wall (2Sa 20:15; Isa 37:33; Jer 6:6; Eze 4:2; Da 11:15; La 4:18). If, however, the town, or fortress, was built upon an eminence, an inclined plane reaching to the height of the eminence might be formed of earth or stones, or trees, and the besiegers would be able to bring their engines to the foot of the walls. This road was even covered with bricks, forming a kind of paved way, up which the ponderous machines could be drawn without difficulty. To such roads there are references in Scripture (Job 19:12; Isa 29:3, "siege works"; compare Layard, Nineveh and Its Remains, II, 366 f). In the case of Tyre this mound, or way of approach, was a dam thrown across the narrow strait to obtain access to the walls (Eze 26:8). Very often, too, there was a trench, sometimes filled with water, at the foot of the wall, which had to be dealt with previous to an assault.

(4) Battering-Rams:

The earthworks having been thrown up, and approaches to the walls secured, it was possible to set and to work the battering-rams (karim) which were to be employed in breaching the walls (Eze 4:2), or in bursting open the gates (Eze 21:22). The battering-rams were of different kinds. On Assyrian monuments they are found joined to movable towers holding warriors and armed men, or, in other cases, joined to a stationary tower constructed on the spot. When the men who are detailed to work the ram get it into play, with its heavy beams of planks fastened together and the great mass of metal forming its head, they can hardly fail to make an impression, and gradually, by the constantly repeated shocks, a breach is opened and the besiegers are able to rush in and bear down the defenders. It is to the shelter furnished by these towers that the prophet Nahum refers (2:5) when he Says,"the mantelet is prepared," and that Isaiah points when he declares that the king of Assyria "shall not come unto this city, nor shoot an arrow there, neither shall he come before it with shield (maghen), nor cast up a mound against it" (Isa 37:33). Ezekiel has the same figure when, describing the siege of Tyre by Nebuchadrezzar, he declares that he shall "cast up a mound" against her, and "raise up the buckler," the buckler (qinnah) being like the Roman testudo, or roof of shields, under cover of which the besiegers carried on operations (Eze 26:8; Colonel Billerbeck (op. cit., 178) is doubtful whether this device was known to the Assyrians). Under the shelter of their movable towers the besiegers could push forward mines, an operation known as part of siegecraft from a high antiquity (see 2Sa 20:15, where the American Revised Version margin and the English Revised Version margin give "undermined" as an alternative to "battered"; tunneling was well known in antiquity, as the Siloam tunnel shows).

(5) Storming of Walls and Rushing of Breach:

The culminating operation would be the storming of the walls, the rushing of the breach. Scaling-ladders were employed to cross the encircling trench or ditch (Pr 21:22); and Joe in his powerful description of the army of locusts which had devastated the land says that they "climb the wall like men of war" (Joe 2:7). Attempts were made to set fire to the gates and to break them open with axes (Jud 9:52; compare Ne 1:3; 2:3; Eze 26:9). Jeremiah tells of the breach that was made in the city when Jerusalem was captured (Jer 39:2). The breaches in the wall of Samaria are referred to by Amos (4:3), who pictures the women rushing forth headlong like a herd of kine with hooks and fishhooks in their nostrils.

5. Siege Operations: Defense: While the besiegers employed this variety of means of attack, the besieged were equally ingenious and active in maintaining the defense. All sorts of obstructions were placed in the way of the besieging army. Springs and cisterns likely to afford supplies of water to the invaders were carefully covered up, or drained off into the city. Where possible, trenches were filled with water to make them impassable. As the siege-works of the enemy approached the main wall, it was usual to build inner fortifications, and for this purpose houses were pulled down to provide the needful space and also to supply building materials (Isa 22:10). Slingers placed upon the walls hurled stones upon the advancing enemy, and archers from loopholes and protected battlements discharged arrows against the warriors in their movable towers. Sorties were made to damage the siege-works of the enemy and to prevent the battering-rams from being placed in position. To counteract the assaults of the battering-rams, sacks of chaff were let down like a ship’s fender in front of the place where the engine operated—a contrivance countered again by poles with scythes upon them which cut off the sacks (Josephus, BJ, III, vii, 20). So, too, the defenders, by dropping a doubled chain or rope from the battlements, caught the ram and broke the force of its blows. Attempts were made to destroy the ram also by fire. In the great bas-relief of the siege of Lachish an inhabitant is seen hurling a lighted torch from the wall; and it was a common device to pour boiling water or oil from the wall upon the assailants. Missiles, too, were thrown with deadly effect from the battlements by the defenders, and it was by a piece of a millstone thrown by a woman that Abimelech met his death at Thebez (Jud 9:53). While Uzziah of Judah furnished his soldiers with shields and spears and helmets and coats of mail and bows and slingstones, he also "made in Jerusalem engines, invented by skillful men, to be on the towers and upon the battlements, wherewith to shoot arrows and great stones" (2Ch 26:15). The Jews had, for the defense of Jerusalem against the army of Titus, engines which they had taken from the Twelfth Legion at Beth-horon which seem to have had a range of 1,200 ft. Many ingenious devices are described by Josephus as employed by himself when conducting the defense of Jotapata in Galilee against Vespasian and the forces of Rome (BJ, III, vii).

6. Raising of Siege:

When Nahash king of the Ammonites laid siege to Jabesh-gilead in the opening days of the reign of Saul, the terms of peace offered to the inhabitants were so humiliating and cruel that they sought a respite of seven days and appealed to Saul in their distress. When the newly chosen king heard of their desperate condition he assembled a great army, scattered the Ammonites, and raised the siege of Jabesh-gilead, thus earning the lasting gratitude of the inhabitants (1Sa 11$; compare 1Sa 31:12,13). When Zedekiah of Judah found himself besieged in Jerusalem by the Chaldean army under Nebuzaradan, he sent intelligence to Pharaoh Hophra who crossed the frontier with his army to attack the Chaldeans and

obliged them to desist from the siege. The Chaldeans withdrew for the moment from the walls of Jerusalem and offered battle to Pharaoh Hophra and his host, but the courage of the Egyptian king failed him and he retired in haste without encountering the Chaldeans in a pitched battle. The siege was prosecuted to the bitter end, and Jerusalem was captured and completely overthrown (2Ki 25:1; Jer 37:3-10; Eze 17:17).

7. Horrors of Siege and Capture:

In the ancient law of Israel "siege" is classed with drought and pestilence and exile as punishments with which Yahweh would visit His people for their disobedience (De 28:49-57). Of the horrors there described they had again and again bitter experience. At the siege of Samaria by Ben-hadad II, so terrible were the straits to which the besieged were reduced that they cooked and ate their own children (2Ki 6:28). In the siege of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, which ended in the overthrow of the city and the destruction of the Temple, the sufferings of the inhabitants from hunger and disease were incredible (2Ki 25:3; Jer 32:24; La 2:20; 4:8-10). The horrors of siege have, perhaps, reached their climax in the account given by Josephus of the tragedy of Masada. To escape capture by the Romans, ten men were chosen by lot from among the occupants of the fortress, 960 in number, including combatants and non-combatants, men, women and children, to slay the rest. From these ten one was similarly chosen to slay the survivors, and he, having accomplished his awful task, ran his sword into his own body (Josephus, BJ, VII, ix, 1). While all the inhabitants of a city under siege suffered the famine of bread and the thirst for water, the combatants ran the risk of impalement and other forms of torture to which prisoners in Assyrian and Chaldean and Roman warfare were subjected.

The horrors attending the siege of a city were only surpassed by the barbarities perpetrated at its capture. The emptying of a city by its capture is likened to the hurling of a stone from a sling (Jer 10:17,18). Deportation of the whole of the inhabitants often followed (2Ki 17:6; 24:14). Not only were the inhabitants of the captured city deported, but their gods were carried off with them and the idols broken in pieces. This is predicted or recorded of Babylon (Isa 21:9; 46:1; Jer 50:2), of Egypt (Jer 43:12), of Samaria (Ho 10:6). Indiscriminate slaughter followed the entrance of the assailants, and the city was usually given over to the flames (Jer 39:8,9; La 4:18). "Cities without number," says Shalmaneser II in one of his inscriptions, "I wrecked, razed, burned with fire." Houses were destroyed and women dishonored (Zec 14:2). When Darius took Babylon, he impaled three thousand prisoners (Herodotus iii.159). The Scythians scalped and flayed their enemies and used their skins for horse trappings (ibid., iv.64). The Assyrian sculptures show prisoners subjected to horrible tortures, or carried away into slavery. The captured Zedekiah had his eyes put out after he had seen his own sons cruelly put to death (2Ki 25:7). It is only employing the imagery familiar to Assyrian warfare when Isaiah represents Yahweh as saying to Sennacherib: "Therefore will I put my hook in thy nose, and my bridle in thy lips, and I will turn thee back by the way by which thou camest" (Isa 37:29). Anticipating the savage barbarities that would follow the capture of Samaria by the Assyrians, Hosea foresees the infants being dashed to pieces and the women with child being ripped up (Ho 10:14; 13:16; compare Am 1:13). The prophet Nahum predicting the overthrow of Nineveh recalls how at the capture of No-amon (Egyptian Thebes) by the Assyrian conqueror, Ashurbanipal, "her young children also were dashed in pieces at the head of all the streets; and they cast lots for her honorable men, and all her great men were bound in

chains" (Na 3:10).

8. Siege in the New Testament:

The only. explicit reference to siege operations in the New Testament is our Lord's prediction of the complete destruction of Jerusalem when He wept over its coming doom: "For the days shall come upon thee, when thine enemies shall cast up a bank (charax, the King James Version, quite incorrectly, "trench") about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall dash thee to the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another" (Lu 19:43,44). The order and particulars of the siege are in accordance with the accounts of siege operations in the Old Testament. How completely the prediction was fulfilled we see from Josephus (BJ, V, vi, 10).

Figurative:

In Paul's Epistles there are figures taken from siege operations. In 2Co 10:4 we have "the casting down of strongholds," where the Greek word kathairesis, from kathairein, is the regular word used in Septuagint for the reduction of a fortress (Pr 21:22; La 2:2; RAPC 1Ma 5:65). In Eph 6:16 there is allusion to siege-works, for the subtle temptations of Satan are set forth as the flaming darts hurled by the besiegers of a fortress which the Christian soldier is to quench with the shield of faith.

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebraische Archaeologie, 71; Benzinger, "Kriegswesen" in Herzog3; Billerbeck and A. Jeremias, Der Untergang Ninivehs; Billerbeck, Der Festungsbau im alten Orient.

T. Nicol

SIEVE; SIFT

siv.

See AGRICULTURE; THRESHING.

SIGLOS

sig'-los (siglos): A Persian silver coin, twenty of which went to the gold DARIC (which see).

SIGN

sin ('oth "a sign" "mark" mopheth, "wonder"' semeion, "a sign," "signal," "mark"): A mark by which persons or things are distinguished and made known. In Scripture used generally of an address to the

senses to attest the existence of supersensible and therefore divine power. Thus the plagues of Egypt were "signs" of divine displeasure against the Egyptians (Ex 4:8 ff; Jos 24:17, and often); and the miracles of Jesus were "signs" to attest His unique relationship with God (Mt 12:38; Joh 2:18; Ac 2:22). Naturally, therefore, both in the Old Testament and the New Testament, "signs" are assimilated to the miraculous, and prevailingly associated with immediate divine interference. The popular belief in this manner of communication between the visible and the invisible worlds has always been, and is now, widespread. So-called "natural" explanations, however ingenious or cogent, fail with the great majority of people to explain anything. Wesley and Spurgeon were as firm believers in the validity of such methods of intercourse between man and God as were Moses and Gideon, Peter and John.

The faith that walks by signs is not by any means to be lightly esteemed. It has been allied with the highest nobility of character and with the most signal achievement. Moses accepted the leadership of his people in response to a succession of signs: e.g. the burning bush, the rod which became a serpent, the leprous hand, etc. (Ex 3$; 4$); so, too, did Gideon, who was not above making proof of God in the sign of the fleece of wool (Jud 6:36-40). In the training of the Twelve, Jesus did not disdain the use of signs (Lu 5:1-11, and often); and the visions by which Peter and Paul were led to the evangelization of the Gentiles were interpreted by them as signs of the divine purpose (Ac 10$; 16$).

The sacramental use of the sign dates from the earliest period, and the character of the sign is as diverse as the occasion. The rainbow furnishes radiant suggestion of God’s overarching love and assurance that the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy the earth (Ge 9:13; compare Ge 4:15); the Feast of Unleavened Bread is a reminder of God’s care in bringing His people out of bondage (Ex 13:3); the Sabbath is an oft-recurring proclamation of God’s gracious thought for the well-being of man (Ex 31:13; Eze 20:12); the brazen serpent, an early foreshadowing of the cross, perpetuates the imperishable promise of forgiveness and redemption (Nu 21:9); circumcision is made the seal of the special covenant under which Israel became a people set apart (Ge 17:11); baptism, the Christian equivalent of circumcision, becomes the sign and seal of the dedicated life and the mark of those avowedly seeking to share in the blessedness of the Kingdom of God (Lu 3:12-14; Ac 2:41, and often); bread and wine, a symbol of the spiritual manna by which soul and body are preserved unto everlasting life, is the hallowed memorial of the Lord’s death until His coming again (Lu 22:14-20; 1Co 11:23-28). Most common of all were the local altars and mounds consecrated in simple and sincere fashion to a belief in God’s ruling and overruling providence (Jos 4:1-10).

Signs were offered in proof of the divine commission of prophet (Isa 20:3) and apostle (2Co 12:12), and of the Messiah Himself (Joh 20:30; Ac 2:22); and they were submitted in demonstration of the divine character of their message (2Ki 20:9; Isa 38:1; Ac 3:1-16). By anticipation the child to be born of a young woman (Isa 7:10-16; compare Lu 2:12) is to certify the prophet’s pledge of a deliverer for a captive people.

See IMMANUEL.

With increase of faith the necessity for signs will gradually decrease. Jesus hints at this (Joh 4:48), as

does also Paul (1Co 1:22). Nevertheless "signs," in the sense of displays of miraculous powers, are to accompany the faith of believers (Mr 16:17 f), usher in and forthwith characterize the dispensation of the Holy Spirit, and mark the consummation of the ages (Re 15:1).

See also MIRACLE.

For "sign" of a ship (parasemos, "ensign," Ac 28:11).

See DIOSCURI; SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

Charles M. Stuart

SIGNET

sig’-net.

See SEAL.

SIGNS OF THE HEAVENS

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 4.

SIGNS, NUMERICAL

nu-mer’-i-kal.

See NUMBER.

SIHON

si’-hon (cichon): King of the Amorites, who vainly opposed Israel on their journey from Egypt to Palestine, and who is frequently mentioned in the historical books and in the Psalms because of his prominence and as a warning for those who rise against Yahweh and His people (Nu 21:21, and often; De 1:4; 31:4; Jos 2:10; Jud 11:19,20,21; 1Ki 4:19; Ne 9:22; Ps 135:11; 136:19; Jer 48:45).

SIHOR

si’-hor.

See SHIHOR.

SIHOR-LIBNATH

si’-hor-lib’-nath.

See SHIHOR-LIBNATH.

SILAS

si’-las (Silas, probably contraction for Silouanos; the Hebrew equivalents suggested are shalish, "Tertius," or shelach (Ge 10:24) (Knowling), or sha’ul =" asked" (Zahn)): The Silas of Ac is generally identified with the Silvaus of the Epistles. His identification with Titus has also been suggested, based on 2Co 1:19; 8:23, but this is very improbable (compare Knowling, Expositor’s Greek Test., II, 326). Silas, who was probably a Roman citizen (compare Ac 16:37), accompanied Paul during the greater part of his 2nd missionary journey (Ac 15-18). At the meeting of the Christian community under James at Jerusalem, which decided that circumcision should not be obligatory in the case of Gentile believers, Silas and Judas Barsabas were appointed along with Paul and Barnabas to convey to the churches in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia the epistle informing them of this decision. As "leading men among the brethren" at Jerusalem, and therefore more officially representative of the Jerusalem church than Paul and Barnabas, Silas and Judas were further commissioned to confirm the contents of the letter by "word of mouth." On arrival at Antioch, the epistle was delivered, and Judas and Silas, "being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words, and confirmed them." Their mission being thus completed, the four were "dismissed in peace from the brethren unto those that had sent them forth" (Revised Version), or "unto the apostles" (the King James Version) (Ac 15:22-33).

Different readings now render the immediate movements of Silas somewhat obscure; Ac 15:33 would imply that he returned to Jerusalem. But some texts proceed in 15:34, "Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still," and others add "and Judas alone proceeded." Of this, the first half is accepted by the King James Version. The principal texts however reject the whole verse and are followed in this by the Revised Version (British and American). It is held by some that he remained in Antioch till chosen by Paul (Ac 15:40). Others maintain that he returned to Jerusalem where John Mark then was (compare Ac 13:13); and that either during the interval of "some days" (Ac 15:36), when the events described in Ga 2:11 ff took place (Wendt), he returned to Antioch along with Peter, or that he and John Mark were summoned thither by Paul and Barnabas, subsequent to their dispute regarding Mark. (For fuller discussion, see Knowling, Expositor’s Greek Test., II, 330, 332-35.)

Upon Barnabas’ separation from Paul, Silas was chosen by Paul in his place, and the two missionaries, "after being commended by the brethren (at Antioch) to the grace of the Lord," proceeded on their journey (Ac 15:33-40 margin). Passing through Syria, Cilicia, Galatia, Phrygia and Mysia, where they delivered the decree of the Jerusalem council and strengthened the churches, and were joined by Timothy, they eventually reached Troas (Ac 15:41-16:8). Indications are given that at this city Luke also became one of their party (compare also the apocryphal "Ac of Paul," where this is definitely stated;

Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 544).

Upon the call of the Macedonian, the missionary band set sail for Greece, and after touching at Samothrace, they landed at Neapolis (Ac 16:9-11). At Philippi, Lydia, a seller of purple, was converted, and with her they made their abode; but the exorcism of an evil spirit from a sorceress brought upon Silas and Paul the enmity of her masters, whose source of gain was thus destroyed. On being charged before the magistrates with causing a breach of the peace and preaching false doctrine, their garments were rent off them and they were scourged and imprisoned. In no way dismayed, they prayed and sang hymns to God, and an earthquake in the middle of the night secured them a miraculous release. The magistrates, on learning that the two prisoners whom they had so maltreated were Roman citizens, came in person and besought them to depart out of the city (Ac 16:12-39). After a short visit to the house of Lydia, where they held an interview with the brethren, they departed for Thessalonica, leaving Luke behind (compare Knowling, op. cit., 354-55). There they made many converts, especially among the Greeks, but upon the house of Jason, their host, being attacked by hostile Jews, they were compelled to escape by night to Berea (Ac 16:40-17:10). There they received a better hearing from the Jews, but the enmity of the Thessalonian Jews still pursued them, and Paul was conducted for safety to Athens, Silas and Timothy being left behind. On his arrival, he dispatched an urgent message back to Bercea for Silas and Timothy to rejoin him at that city (Ac 17:11-15). The narrative of Ac implies, however, that Paul had left Athens and had reached Corinth before he was overtaken by his two followers (18:5). Knowling (op. cit., 363-64) suggests that they may have actually met at Athens, and that Timothy was then sent to Thessalonica (compare 1Th 3:1,2), and Silas to Philippi (compare Php 4:15), and that the three came together again at Corinth. The arrival of Silas and Timothy at that city is probably referred to in 2Co 11:9. It is implied in Ac 18:18 that Silas did not leave Corinth at the same time as Paul, but no further definite reference is made to him in the narrative of the 2nd missionary journey.

Assuming his identity with Silvanus, he is mentioned along with Paul and Timothy in 2Co 1:19 as having preached Christ among the Corinthians (compare Ac 18:5). In 1Th 1:1, and 2Th 1:1, the same three send greetings to the church at Thessalonica (compare Ac 17:1-9). In 1Pe 5:12 he is mentioned as a "faithful brother" and the bearer of that letter to the churches of the Dispersion (compare on this last Knowling, op. cit., 331-32). The theory which assigns He to the authorship of Silas is untenable.

C. M. Kerr

SILENCE

si’-lens: Five Hebrew roots, with various derivatives, and two Greek words are thus translated. The word is used literally for dumbness, interrupted speech, as in La 2:10; Ps 32:3; Ec 3:7; Am 5:13; Ac 15:12; 1Co 14:28; 1Ti 2:11,12 the King James Version (the American Standard Revised Version "quietness"); Re 8:1, or figuratively of the unanswered prayers of the believer (Ps 83:1; 35:22; Jer 8:14); of awe in the presence of the Divine Majesty (Isa 41:1; Zec 2:13), or of death (1Sa 2:9; Ps 94:17; 115:17).

SILK; SILKWORM

silk'-wurm ((1) meshi (Eze 16:10,13), perhaps from mashah, "to draw" "to extract" compare Arabic masa' of same meaning; Septuagint trichapton, "woven of hair"; (2) serikon (Re 18:12); (31 shesh; compare Arabic shash, a thin cotton material; (4) buts; compare Arabic 'abyad, "white," from bad; (5) bussos, "fine linen," later used of cotton and silk): The only undoubted reference to silk in the Bible is the passage cited from Revelation, where it is mentioned among the merchandise of Babylon. Serikon, "silk," is from Ser, the Greek name of China, whence silk was first obtained. The equivalent Latin sericum occurs frequently in classical authors, and is found in the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) (Es 8:15) for buts, "fine linen." For buts, bussos, and shesh English Versions of the Bible has nearly always "fine linen," but for shesh in Pr 31:22, the King James Version has "silk," and in Ge 41:42 and Ex 25:4, the King James Version margin has "silk" and the Revised Version margin has "cotton."

See LINEN; FINE.

There can be little doubt of the correctness of English Versions of the Bible "silk" for meshi in Eze 16:10, "I girded thee about with fine linen (shesh), and' covered thee with silk (meshi)," and in the similar passage, Eze 16:13.

Silk is produced by all Lepidoptera, butterflies and moths, but it is of great economic importance only in the Chinese silkworm, Bombyx mori, whose larva, a yellowish-white caterpillar from 2 to 3 in. long, feeds on the leaves of the mulberry (Morus). A pair of large glands on the two sides of the stomach secrete a viscous fluid, which is conveyed by ducts to an orifice under the mouth. On issuing into the air, the fine stream is hardened into the silk fiber, which the caterpillar spins into a cocoon. Within the cocoon the caterpillar is presently transformed into the chrysalis or pupa. The cocoons from which silk is to be spun are subjected to heat which kills the pupae and prevents them from being transformed into the perfect insects or moths, which would otherwise damage the cocoons as they made their exit.

The raising of silkworms, and the spinning and weaving of silk are now important industries in Syria, though the insect was unknown in Bible times. It was introduced to the Mediterranean region from China a few centuries after Christ. Coarse silk is produced from the Chinese oak silk-moth, Saturnia pernyi, and from the Japanese oak silk-moth, Saturnia yama-mai. The largest moth of Syria and Palestine is Saturnia pyri, from which silk has also been spun, but not commercially.

See, further, WEAVING.

Alfred Ely Day

SILLA

sil'-a (cilla'; Codex Vaticanus Galla; Codex Alexandrinus Gaallad): Joash was assassinated by his servants "at the house of Millo, on the way that goeth down to Silla" (2Ki 12:20). Wherever Beth-millo stood, Silla was evidently in the valley below it; but nothing is known of what it was or where it stood.

SILOAM, TOWERIN

See JERUSALEM; SILOAM.

SILOAM; SILOAH; SHELAH; SHILOAH

si-lo’-am, si-lo’-am, si-lo’-a, she’-la, shi-lo’-a:

(1) me ha-shiloach (shiloach or shilloach is a passive form and means "sent" or "conducted") "the waters of (the) Shiloah" (Isa 8:6).

(2) berekhath ha-shelach, "the pool of (the) Shelah" (the King James Version "Siloah") (Ne 3:15).

(3) ten kolumbethran tou (or ton) Siloam, "the pool of Siloam" (Joh 9:7).

(4) ho purgos en to Siloam, "the tower in Siloam" (Lu 13:4).

1. The Modern Silwan:

Although the name is chiefly used in the Old Testament and Josephus as the name of certain "waters," the surviving name today, Silwan, is that of a fairly prosperous village which extends along the steep east side of the Kidron valley from a little North of the "Virgin’s Fountain" as far as Bir Eyyub. The greater part of the village, the older and better built section, belongs to Moslem fellahin who cultivate the well-watered gardens in the valley and on the hill slopes opposite, but a southern part has recently been built in an extremely primitive manner by Yemen Jews, immigrants from South Arabia, and still farther South, in the commencement of the Wady en Nar, is the wretched settlement of the lepers. How long the site of Silwan has been occupied it is impossible to say. The village is mentioned in the 10th century by the Arab writer Muqaddasi. The numerous rock cuttings, steps, houses, caves, etc., some of which have at times served as chapels, show that the site has been much inhabited in the past, and at one period at least by hermits. The mention of "those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and killed them" (Lu 13:4) certainly suggests that there was a settlement there in New Testament times, although some writers consider that this may have reference to some tower on the city walls near the Pool of Siloam.

2. The Siloam Aqueduct:

Opposite to the main part of Silwan is the "Virgin’s Fount," ancient GIHON (which see), whose waters are practically monopolized by the villagers. It is the waters of this spring which are referred to in Isa 8:5,6: "Forasmuch as this people have refused the waters of Shiloah that go softly, ... now therefore, behold, the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the River."

The contrast between the little stream flowing from the Gihon and the great Euphrates is used as a figure of the vast difference between the apparent strength of the little kingdom of Judah and the House of David on the one hand, and the might of "Rezin and Remaliah's son" and "all his glory." Although it is quite probable that in those days there was an open streamlet in the valley, yet the meaning of Shiloah, "sent" or "conducted," rather implies some kind of artificial channel, and there is also archaeological evidence that some at least of the waters of Gihon were even at that time conducted by a rock-cut aqueduct along the side of the Kidron valley (see JERUSALEM, VII, 5). It was not, however, till the days of Hezekiah that the great tunnel aqueduct, Siloam's most famous work, was made (2Ki 20:20): "Hezekiah also stopped the upper spring of the waters of Gihon, and brought them, straight down on the west side of the City of David" (2Ch 32:30); "They stopped all the fountains, and the brook (nachal) that flowed through the midst of the land, saying, Why should the kings of Assyria come, and find much water?" (2Ch 32:4; Ecclesiasticus 48:17). Probably the exit of the water at Gihon was entirely covered up and the water flowed through the 1,700 ft. of tunnel and merged in the pool made for it (now known as the Birket Silwan) near the mouth of the Tyropceon valley. This extraordinary winding aqueduct along which the waters of the "Virgin's Fount" still flow is described in JERUSALEM, VII, 4 (which see). The lower end of this tunnel which now emerges under a modern arch has long been known as 'Ain Silwan, the "Fountain of Siloam," and indeed, until the rediscovery of the tunnel connecting this with the Virgin's Fount (a fact known to some in the 13th century, but by no means generally known until the last century), it was thought this was simply a spring. So many springs all over Palestine issue from artificial tunnels—it is indeed the rule in Judea—that the mistake is natural. Josephus gives no hint that he knew of so great a work as this of Hezekiah's, and in the 5th century a church was erected, probably by the empress Eudoxia, at this spot, with the high altar over the sacred "spring." The only pilgrim who mentions this church is Antonius Martyr (circa 570), and after its destruction, probably by the Persians in 614, it was entirely lost sight of until excavated by Messrs. Bliss and Dickie. It is a church of extraordinary architectural features; the floor of the center aisle is still visible.

3. The "Pool of Siloam":

The water from the Siloam aqueduct, emerging at 'Ain Silwan, flows today into a narrow shallow pool, approached by a steep flight of modern steps; from the southern extremity of this pool the water crosses under the modern road by means of an aqueduct, and after traversing a deeply cut rock channel below the scarped cliffs on the north side of el-Wad, it crosses under the main road up the Kidron and enters a number of channels of irrigation distributed among the gardens of the people of Silwan. The water here, as at its origin, is brackish and impregnated with sewage.

The modern Birket es-Silwan is but a poor survivor of the fine pool which once was here. Bliss showed by his excavations at the site that once there was a great rock-cut pool, 71 ft. North and South, by 75 ft. East and West, which may, in part at least, have been the work of Hezekiah (2Ki 20:20), approached by a splendid flight of steps along its west side. The pool was surrounded by an arcade 12 ft. wide and 22 1/2 ft. high, and was divided by a central arcade, to make in all probability a pool for men and another for women. These buildings were probably Herodian, if not earlier, and therefore this, we may reasonably picture, was the condition of the pool at the time of the incident in Joh 9:7, when Jesus sent the blind man to "wash in the pool of Siloam."

This pool is also probably the Pool of Shelah described in Ne 3:15 as lying between the Fountain Gate and the King’s Garden. It may also be the "king’s pool" of Ne 2:14. If we were in any doubt regarding the position of the pool of Siloam, the explicit statement of Josephus (BJ, V, iv, 1) that the fountain of Siloam, which he says was a plentiful spring of sweet water, was at the mouth of the Tyropoeon would make us sure.

4. The Birket el Chamra:

A little below this pool, at the very mouth of el-Wad, is a dry pool, now a vegetable garden, known as Birket el Chamra ("the red pool"). For many years the sewage of Jerusalem found its way to this spot, but when in 1904 an ancient city sewer was rediscovered (see PEFS, 1904, 392-94), the sewage was diverted and the site was sold to the Greek convent which surrounded it with a wall. Although this is no longer a pool, there is no doubt but that hereabouts there existed a pool because the great and massive dam which Bliss excavated here (see JERUSALEM, VI, 5) had clearly been made originally to support a large body of water. It is commonly supposed that the original pool here was older than the Birket Silwan, having been fed by an aqueduct which was constructed from Gihon along the side of the Kidron valley before Hezekiah’s great tunnel. If this is correct (and excavations are needed here to confirm this theory), then this may be the "lower pool" referred to in Isa 22:9, the waters of which Hezekiah "stopped," and perhaps, too, that described in the same passage as the "old pool."

5. The Siloam Aqueduct:

The earliest known Hebrew inscription of any length was accidentally discovered near the lower end of the Siloam aqueduct in 1880, and reported by Dr. Schick. It was inscribed upon a rock-smoothed surface about 27 in. square, some 15 ft. from the mouth of the aqueduct; it was about 3 ft. above the bottom of the channel on the east side. The inscription consisted of six lines in archaic Hebrew, and has been translated by Professor Sayce as follows:

(1) Behold the excavation. Now this (is) the history of the tunnel: while the excavators were still lifting up

(2) The pick toward each other, and while there were yet three cubits (to be broken through) .... the voice of the one called

(3) To his neighbor, for there was an (?) excess in the rock on the right. They rose up .... they struck on the west of the

(4) Excavation; the excavators struck, each to meet the other, pick to pick. And there flowed

(5) The waters from their outlet to the pool for a thousand, two hundred cubits; and (?)

(6) Of a cubit, was the height of the rock over the head of the excavators ....

It is only a roughly scratched inscription of the nature of a graffito; the flowing nature of the writing is fully explained by Dr. Reissner's recent discovery of ostraca at Samaria written with pen and ink. It is not an official inscription, and consequently there is no kingly name and no date, but the prevalent view that it was made by the work people who carried out Hezekiah's great work (2Ki 20:20) is now further confirmed by the character of the Hebrew in the ostraca which Reissner dates as of the time of Ahab.

Unfortunately this priceless monument of antiquity was violently removed from its place by some miscreants. The fragments have been collected and are now pieced together in the Constantinople museum. Fortunately several excellent "squeezes" as well as transcriptions were made before the inscription was broken up, so that the damage done is to be regretted rather on sentimental than on literary grounds.

E. W. G. Masterman

SILVANUS

sil-va'-nus (Silouanos (2Co 1:19)).

See SILAS.

SILVER

sil'-ver (keceph; argurion, arguros): Silver was known in the earliest historic times. Specimens of early Egyptian and Babylonian silver work testify to the skill of the ancient silversmiths. In Palestine, silver objects have been found antedating the occupation of the land by the Hebrews. This metal was used for making all kinds of ornamental objects. In the mound of Gezer were found bowls, vases, ladles, hairpins, rings and bracelets of silver. The rings and settings for scarabs or seals were commonly of this metal. The first mention of silver in the Bible is in Ge 13:2, where it says that Abraham was rich in cattle, in silver and gold. At that time it was commonly used in exchange in the form of bars or other shapes. Coins of that metal were of a much later date (Ge 20:16; 23:15; 24:53; 37:28, etc.). Booty was collected in silver (Jos 6:19); tribute was paid in the same (1Ki 15:19). It was also used for jewelry (Ge 44:2). The Children of Israel systematically despoiled the Egyptians of their silver before the exodus (Ex 3:22; 11:2; 12:35, etc.). Ex 20:23 implies that idols were made of it. It was largely used in the fittings of the tabernacle (Ex 26) and later of the temple (2Ch 2).

It is likely that the ancient supply of silver came from the mountains of Asia Minor where it is still found in abundance associated with lead as argentiferous galena, and with copper sulfide. The Turkish government mines this silver on shares with the natives. The Sinaitic peninsula probably also furnished some silver. Later Phoenician ships brought quantities of it from Greece and Spain. The Arabian sources are doubtful (2Ch 9:14). Although silver does not tarnish readily in the air, it does corrode badly in the

limestone soil of Palestine and Syria. This probably partly accounts for the small number of objects of this metal found. On the site of the ancient jewelers' shops of Tyre the writer found objects of gold, bronze, lead, iron, but none of silver.

Figurative:

Silver to be as stones in Jerusalem (1Ki 10:27) typified great abundance (compare Job 3:15; 22:25; 27:16; also Isa 60:17; Zec 9:3). The trying of men's hearts was compared to the refining of silver (Ps 66:10; Isa 48:10). Yahweh's words were as pure as silver refined seven times (Ps 12:6). The gaining of understanding is better than the gaining of silver (Pr 3:14; compare Pr 8:19; 10:20; 16:16; 22:1; 25:11). Silver become dross denoted deterioration (Isa 1:22; Jer 6:30). Breast and arms of silver was interpreted by Daniel to mean the inferior kingdom to follow Nebuchadnezzar's (Da 2:32,39).

In the New Testament, reference should be made especially to Ac 19:24; Jas 5:3; Re 18:12.

James A. Patch

SILVERLING

sil'-ver-ling ('eleph kecheph (Isa 7:23)): 'A thousand of silver' means a thousand shekels.

See PIECE OF SILVER.

SILVERSMITH

sil'-ver-smith (argurokopos): Mentioned only once (Ac 19:24), where reference is made to Demetrius, a leading member of the silversmiths' guild of Ephesus.

SIMALCUE

si-mal-ku'-e: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) IMALCUE (which see).

SIMEON (1)

sim'-e-on (shim'on; Sumeon; the Hebrew root is from shama', "to hear" (Ge 29:33); some modern scholars (Hitzig, W. R. Smith, Stade, etc.) derive it from Arabic sima', "the offspring of the hyena and female wolf"): In Ge 29:33; 30:18-21; 35:23, Simeon is given as full brother to Reuben, Levi, Judah, Issachar and Zebulun, the son of Leah; and in Ge 34:25; 49:5 as the brother of Levi and Dinah. He was left as a hostage in Egypt by orders of Joseph (Ge 42:24; 43:23).

1. The Patriarch: Biblical Data:

In the "blessing" of the dying Jacob, Simeon and Levi are linked together:

"Simeon and Levi are brethren;

Weapons of violence are their swords.

O my soul, come not thou into their council;

Unto their assembly, my glory, be not thou united;

For in their anger they slew a man,

And in their self-will they hocked an ox.

Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce;

And their wrath, for it was cruel:

I will divide them in Jacob,

And scatter them in Israel" (Ge 49:5-7).

Whatever view may be taken of the events of Ge 34:25 (and some would see in it "a tradition of the settlement of Jacob which belongs to a cycle quite independent of the descent into Egypt and the Exodus" (see S. A. Cook, Encyclopedia Brit, article "Simeon")), it is clear that we have here a reference to it and the suggestion that the subsequent history of the tribe, and its eventual absorption in Judah, was the result of violence. In the same way the priestly Levites became distributed throughout the other tribes without any tribal inheritance of their own (De 18:1; Jos 13:14). From the mention (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15) of Shaul as being the son of a Canaanite woman, it may be supposed that the tribe was a mixed one.

In the "blessing of Moses" (De 33) Simeon is not mentioned at all in the Hebrew text, although in some manuscripts of the Septuagint the latter half of De 33:6 is made to apply to him: "Let Simeon be a small company." The history of the tribe is scanty and raises many problems. Of the many theories advanced to meet them it cannot be said that any one answers all difficulties.

2. The Tribe in Scripture:

In the wilderness of Sinai the Simeonites camped beside the Reubenites (Nu 2:12; 10:19); it was Zimri,

a member of one of the leading families of this tribe, who was slain by Phinehas in the affair of Baal-peor (Nu 25:14). The statistics in Nu 1:22 f, where the Simeonites are given as 59,300, compared with the 2nd census (Nu 26:14), where the numbers are 22,200, indicate a diminishing tribe. Some have connected this with the sin of Zimri.

At the recital of the law at Mt. Gerizim, Simeon is mentioned first among those that were to respond to the blessings (De 27:12). In the conquest of Canaan "Judah said unto Simeon his brother, Come up with me into my lot, that we may fight against the Canaanites; and I likewise will go with thee into thy lot. So Simeon went with him" (Jud 1:3; compare Jud 1:17). (Many scholars find in Ge 34 a tribal attempt on the part of the Simeonites to gain possession of Shechem; if this is so, Judah did not assist, and the utter failure may have been a cause of Simeon's subsequent dependence upon, and final absorption in, Judah.) In Jud 4 and 5 Simeon is never mentioned. In the settlement of the land there is no account of how Simeon established himself in his territory (except the scanty reference in Jud 1:3), but "their inheritance was in the midst of the inheritance of the children of Judah" (Jos 19:1); this is accounted for (Jos 19:9), "for the portion of the children of Judah was too much for them." Nevertheless we find there the very cities which are apportioned to Simeon, allotted to Judah (Jos 15:21-32; compare Ne 11:26-29). It is suggested (in 1Ch 4:31) that the independent possession of these cities ceased in the time of David. David sent spoil to several Simeonite towns (1Sa 30:26 f), and in 1Ch 12:25 it is recorded that 7,100 Simeonite warriors came to David in Hebron. In 1Ch 27:16 we have mention of a ruler of the Simeonites, Shephatiah, son of Maacah.

In 1Ch 4:39 f mention is made of certain isolated exploits of Simeonites at GEDOR (which see), against the MEUNIM (which see), and at Mt. SEIR (which see). Later references associate certain Simeonites with the Northern Kingdom (2Ch 15:9; 34:6), and tradition has come to view them as one of the ten tribes (compare Eze 48:24,25,33; Re 7:7), although all the history of them we have is bound up with Judah and the Southern Kingdom. There is no mention of the return of any Simeonites after the captivity; their cities fall to Judah (Ne 11:26 f).

3. References in Egyptian and Assyrian Inscriptions:

It has been supposed by many authorities that the name Shim'an occurs in the list of places plundered by Thothmes III (see Petrie, Hist, II, 104; also Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 268; Sayce, Early Hebrew Traditions, 392). In the 7th century we have a doubtful reference in an inscription of Esar-haddon relating his Egyptian campaign when a city Ap-ku is mentioned as in the country of Sa-me-n(a), which may possibly be a reference to Simeon. The survival of the name so late, if true, is strange, in the light of what we gather from the Bible about the tribe. (For discussion of both of these inscriptions, with references to the lit., see EB, coll. 4528-30.)

4. The Territory of Simeon:

The cities of Simeon as given in Jos 19:2-6 and 1Ch 4:28,31 are (the names in parentheses are variations in the latter reference): Beer-sheba, Moladah, Hazar-shual, Balah (Bilhah), Azem (the King James

Version) (Ezem), Eltolad (Tolad), Bethuel, Hormah, Ziklag, Beth-marcaboth, Hazar-susah (Hazar Susim), Beth-lebaoth (Beth-biri), Sharuhen (Shaaraim) (Etam), Ain Rimmon, Ether (Tochen), Ashan—in all, 16 cities in Joshua and 17 cities in 1 Chronicles. Ashan (1Ch 6:59) is the only one assigned to the priests. It is written wrongly as "Ain" in Jos 21:16. All the above cities, with certain variations in form, and with the exception of Etam in 1Ch 4:32, which is probably a mistake, occur in the list of the cities of Judah (Jos 15:26-32,42). Ziklag is mentioned (1Sa 27:6) as being the private property of the kings of Judah from the days of David, who received it from Achish, king of Gath.

For the situation of these cities, so far as is known, see separate articles under their names. It is clear that they were all situated in the southwestern part of Palestine, and that Simeon had no definite territorial boundaries, but isolated cities, with their villages, among those of the people of Judah.

E. W. G. Masterman

SIMEON (2)

(shim‘on; Sumeon):

(1) The 2nd son of Jacob by Leah (see separate article).

(2) Great-grandfather of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 2:1).

(3) A man in Jerusalem described as "righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel." When the infant Jesus was brought into the Temple, he took Him into his arms and blessed God in words which are famous as the Nunc dimittis. Simeon bestowed his blessing on the wondering father and mother (Lu 2:25,34). Legend has made him the son of Hillel and father of Gamaliel I, but this has no historical basis.

(4) An ancestor of Jesus (Lu 3:30); the Revised Version (British and American) "Symeon."

(5) The Revised Version (British and American) "Symeon": one of the prophets and teachers in the Christian community at Antioch. He is also called Niger, which was the Gentile name he had assumed, Symeon being Hebrew. He was among those who set apart Paul and Barnabas for their missionary work (Ac 13:1,2). Nothing more is known of him.

(6) The Revised Version (British and American) "Symeon": the Hebrew name of Simon Peter (Ac 15:14).

S. F. Hunter

SIMEON (NIGER)

ni’-jer): The King James Version in Ac 13:1, the Revised Version (British and American) "Symeon" (which see).

SIMEONITES

sim’-e-on-its.

See SIMEON.

SIMILITUDE

si-mil’-i-tud: In the King James Version means either "an exact facsimile" (Ps 106:20 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "likeness"; Ro 5:14, etc.), or else "the form itself" (Nu 12:8; De 4:12,15,16 for temunah, "form" (so the Revised Version (British and American))); compare LIKENESS. the English Revised Version has retained the word in 2Ch 4:3; Da 10:16 (the American Standard Revised Version "likeness"), while the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version have used "similitudes" in Ho 12:10 (damah, "be like"). The meaning is "I have inspired the prophets to speak parables."

SIMON (1)

(Simon, Greek form of SIMEON (which see)): The persons of the name of Simon mentioned in the Apocrypha are:

(1) Simon the Maccabean (Hasmonean), surnamed THASSI (which see), the 2nd son of Mattathias and elder brother of Judas Maccabeus. On his deathbed, Mattathias commended Simon as a "man of counsel" to be a "father" to his brethren (1 Macc 2:65), and a "man of counsel" he proved himself. But it was not till after the death of Judas and the capture of Jonathan that he played the chief role. Dispatched by Judas with a force to the relief of the Jews in Galilee he fought with great success (1 Macc 5:17 ff; Josephus, Ant, XII, viii, 1 f). We find him next taking revenge along with Jonathan on the "children of Jambri" (1 Macc 9:33 ff), and cooperating in the successful campaign around Bethbasi against Bacchides (circa 156 BC) (1 Macc 9:62 ff), and in the campaign against Apollonius (1 Macc 10:74 ff). In the conflict between Tryphon and Demetrius II, Simon was appointed by Antiochus VI "captain from the Ladder of Tyre unto the borders of Egypt" (1 Macc 11:59). After the capture of Jonathan at Ptolemais by Tryphon, Simon became acknowledged leader of his party. He thwarted Tryphon in his attempts upon Jerusalem, in revenge for which the latter murdered Jonathan (1 Macc 13:23). Simon then took the side of Demetrius on condition of immunity for Judea, and so ‘in the 170th year’ (143-142 BC) ‘the yoke of the heathen was taken away from Israel’ (1 Macc 13:41). Simon applied himself to rebuild the strongholds of Judea, reduced Gazara, captured the Acra (citadel) and made Joppa a seaport. He showed his wisdom most of all in his internal administration: "He sought the good of his country"; commerce and agriculture revived; lawlessness was suppressed and "the land had rest all the days of

Simon (1 Macc 14:4 ff). His power was acknowledged by Sparta and Rome (1 Macc 14:16 ff). In 141 BC he was appointed by the nation leader, high priest and captain "for ever, until there should arise a faithful prophet" (1 Macc 14:41 ff), and thus the Hasmonean dynasty was founded. A new chronological era began with the first year of his administration, and he minted his own coins. A few years later Simon again meddled in Syrian politics (139 BC), this time at the entreaty of Antiochus VII (Sidetes) in his contest against Tryphon; when, however, Antiochus was assured of success, he refused the help of Simon and sent Cendebaeus against Judea. Judas and John, sons of Simon, defeated the invaders near Modin (137-136 BC). In 135 BC Simon met his death by treachery. Ptolemy the son of Abubus, Simon's own son-in-law, determined to secure supreme power for himself and, in order to accomplish this, to assassinate the whole family of Simon. He accordingly invited Simon and his sons to a banquet in the stronghold of Dok near Jericho, where he treacherously murdered Simon with his two sons Mattathias and Judas. The other son, John Hyrcanus, governor of Gazara, received intimation of the plot and saved himself to become the head of the Hasmonean dynasty. "The significance of Simon's administration consists in this, that he completed the work of Jonathan and left the Jewish people absolutely independent of Syria" (Schurer).

See MACCABAEUS, II, 4.

(2) Simon I, the high priest, son of Onias I, whom he succeeded circa 300 BC. He was one of the last of the Great Synagogue, and to him is attributed the saying, "On three things the world depends—the Law, Worship and the showing of kindness." According to Josephus (Ant., XII, ii, 5) this Simon was called "the Just" (ho dikaios), "on account of his piety and his benevolent disposition toward his countrymen."

Many authorities (Herzfeld, Derenbourg, Stanley, Cheyne) assert that Josephus is wrong in attaching this epithet to Simon I instead of Simon II, and Schurer is not certain on this question. But the Talmud passage which Derenbourg cites means the opposite of what he takes it, namely, it is intended to show how splendid and holy were the days of Simeon (ha-tsaddiq) compared with the later days. Besides, Josephus is more likely to have known the truth on this matter than these later authorities. The same uncertainty obtains as to whether the eulogium in Sirach 50:1 ff of "the great priest" refers to Simon I or Simon II. Schurer and others refer it to Simon II. It is more likely to refer to the Simon who was famous as "the Just," and consequently to Simon I. Besides we know of no achievements of Simon II to entitle him to such praise. The building operations mentioned would suit the time of Simon I better, as Ptolemy captured Jerusalem and probably caused considerable destruction. The Talmud states that this Simon (and not Jaddua) met Alexander the Great.

(3) Simon II, high priest, son of Onias II and grandson of Simon I and father of Onias III, flourished about the end of the 3rd century BC, and was succeeded by his son Onias III circa 198 BC. Josephus says that this Simon in the conflict of the sons of Joseph sided with the elder sons against Hyrcanus the younger. Schurer (probably incorrectly) thinks he is the Simon praised in Sirach 50:1 ff. See (2) above (3 Macc 2:1; Josephus, Ant, XII, iv, 10).

(4) Simon, a Benjamite, guardian of the temple, who, having quarreled with the high priest Onias III,

informed Apollonius of the untold sums of money in the temple treasury. Apollonius laid the matter before the king Seleucus IV, who sent Heliodorus to remove the money. An apparition prevented Heliodorus from accomplishing his task (2 Macc 3:4 ff). It is further recorded, that Simon continued his opposition to Onias. He is spoken of as brother of the renegade Menelaus (2 Macc 4:23). Of his end we know nothing.

(5) Simon Chosameus (Codex Vaticanus (and Swete) Chosamaos; Codex Alexandrinus Chosomaios), one of the sons of Annas who had married "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:32). Simon apparently =" Shimeon" (shim‘on) of the sons of Harim (Ezr 10:31); Chosameus is probably a corruption standing in the place of, but not resembling, any of the three names: Benjamin, Malluch, Shemaraiah, which Esdras omits from the Ezra list.

S. Angus

SIMON (2)

si’-mon (Simon):

(1) Simon Peter.

See PETER (SIMON).

(2) Another of the Twelve, Simon "the Cananean" (Mt 10:4; Mr 3:18), "the Zealot" (Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13).

See CANANAEAN.

(3) One of the brethren of Jesus (Mt 13:55; Mr 6:3).

See BRETHREN OF THE LORD.

(4) "The leper" in Bethany, in whose house a woman poured a cruse of precious ointment over the head of Jesus (Mt 26:6; Mr 14:3). He had perhaps been healed by Jesus; in that case his ungracious behavior was not consistent with due gratitude. However he was healed, the title referred to his condition in the past, as lepers were ostracized by law.

(5) A Pharisee in whose house a woman, "a sinner," wet the feet of Jesus with her tears, and anointed them with ointment (Lu 7:36). By some he is identified with (4), this being regarded as Luke’s version of the incident recorded in Mt 26 and Mr 14. Others as strongly deny this view.

For discussion see MARY, IV.

(6) A man of Cyrene, who was compelled to carry the cross of Jesus (Mt 27:32; Mr 15:21; Lu 23:26). Mark calls him "the father of Alexander and Rufus," well-known members of the church at (probably) Rome (compare Ac 19:33; Ro 16:13).

See CYRENIAN.

The father of Judas Iscariot (Joh 6:71; 12:4 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) omits; Joh 13:2,26).

(8) Simon Magus (Ac 8:9). See separate article.

(9) Simon, the tanner, with whom Peter lodged at Joppa. His house was by the seaside outside the city wall, because of its ceremonial uncleanness to a Jew, and also for reasons of sanitation (Ac 9:43).

S. F. Hunter

SIMON MAGUS

ma’-gus (Simon, Greek form of Hebrew shim‘on; Gesenius gives the meaning of the Hebrew word as "hearing with acceptance"; it is formed from [?] shama‘, "to hear"):

1. Simon, a Magician

2. Simon and the Apostles

(1) Simon and Philip

(2) Simon and Peter John

3. The Magicians and the Gospel

4. Testimony of Early Christian Writers

5. Sources of Legendary History

6. Traditions of His Death

7. The Simoniani

8. Was Simon the Originator of Gnosticism?

1. Simon, a Magician:

The name or term "Magus" is not given to him in the New Testament, but is justly used to designate or particularize him on account of the incident recorded in Ac 8:9-24, for though the word "Magus" does not occur, yet in 8:9 the present participle mageuon is used, and is translated, both in the King James Version and in the Revised Version (British and American), "used sorcery." Simon accordingly was a sorcerer, he "bewitched the people of Samaria" (the King James Version). In Ac 8:11 it is also said that "of long time he had amazed" them "with his sorceries" (magiais). The claim, given out by himself, was that he "was some great one"; and this claim was acknowledged by the Samaritans, for previous to the introduction of the gospel into Samaria, "they all gave heed (to him), from the least to the greatest, saying, This man is that power of God which is called Great" (8:10).

2. Simon and the Apostles:

(1) Simon and Philip:

It so happened, however, that Philip the deacon and evangelist went down from Jerusalem to Samaria, and "proclaimed unto them the Christ" (Ac 8:5); and as the result of the proclamation of the gospel, many were gathered into the Christian church. Many miracles also were performed by Philip, sick persons cured, and demons cast out; and Simon fell under the influence of all these things, both of the preaching and of "the signs." So great was the impression now made upon Simon that he "believed" (Ac 8:13). This means, at least, that he saw that Philip was able in the name of Jesus Christ to display powers greater than anything he himself was acquainted with: Philip’s power was greater by far than Simon’s. He therefore came forward as one of the new converts, and was baptized. After his baptism he continued with Philip. The signs which accompanied the introduction of the gospel into this city did not cease, and Simon seeing them "was amazed." The word denoting Simon’s amazement at the "signs" wrought by Philip is the same as that used to express how the people of Samaria had been amazed at Simon’s sorceries. It is an indication of the nature of the faith which he possessed in the gospel—wondering amazement at a new phenomenon not yet understood, not repentance or trust in Christ.

(2) Simon and Peter and John:

News having reached Jerusalem of the events which had occurred in Samaria, the apostles sent Peter and John to establish the work there. These two apostles prayed for the converts that they might receive the Holy Ghost, which they had not yet received. And when they had laid their hands upon the converts, the Spirit was given to them. At this early period in the history of the church the Holy Ghost was bestowed in a visible manner which showed itself in such miraculous gifts as are described in Ac 2. Simon saw what had taken place, and then, instead of joining the company of those who had truly repented and trusted Christ, he came forward with the same amazement as he had previously shown, and offered money to Peter and John, if they would impart to him the power of giving the Holy Spirit to others. Peter instantly rebuked this bold and ungodly request, and did so with such sterness as to cause Simon to ask that the judgment threatened by the apostle might not fall upon him.

Such is the unenviable history of Simon Magus, as it is recorded in the New Testament. Later centuries have shown their estimation of the heinousness of Simon's sin by employing his name to indicate the crime of buying or selling price a spiritual office for a price in money—"simony."

3. The Magicians and the Gospel:

It is not strange to find the gospel brought into direct conflict with magicians, for in the 1st and 2nd centuries there were a multitude of such persons who pretended to possess supernatural powers by which they endeavored to deceive men. They flattered the sinful inclinations of the human heart, and fell in with men's current ways of thinking, and required no self-renunciation at all. For these reasons the magicians found a ready belief on the part of many. The emperor Tiberius, in his later years, had a host of magicians in constant attendance upon him. Elymas, with whom Paul came in contact in Cyprus "was with the deputy of the country, Sergius Paulus, a prudent man" (Ac 13:7 the King James Version). Elymas was one of those magicians, and he endeavored to turn away the deputy from the faith. Luke expressly calls this man "magus", Elymas the magus (Ac 13:6,8 margin).

The influence of such persons presented an obstacle to the progress of the Christian faith, which had to force its way through the delusions with which these sorcerers had surrounded the hearts of those whom they deceived. When the gospel came in contact with these magicians and with their works, it was necessary that there should be striking facts, works of supernatural power strongly appealing to men's outward senses, in order to bring them out of the bewilderment and deception in which they were involved, and to make them able to receive the impression of spiritual truth. Such miracles were wrought both in Cyprus and in Samaria, the spheres of influence of the magicians Elymas and Simon. These divine works first arrested men's attention, and then dispelled the delusive influence of the sorcerers.

4. Testimony of Early Christian Writers:

(1) The history of Simon Magus does not close with what is narrated in the Acts, for the early Christian writers have much to say in regard to him.

Justin Martyr, himself a Samaritan, states that Simon Magus was a "Samaritan from the village called Gitton." Justin also relates that, in the time of Claudius Caesar, Simon was worshipped as a god at Rome on account of his magical powers, and that a statue had been erected to him, on the island in the river Tiber, with the inscription Simoni Deo Sancto, that is, "To Simon the sacred god." Curiously enough, in the year 1574, a stone which appears to have served as a pedestal of a statue, was dug up in the Tiber at the spot described by Justin; and on it were inscribed the words Semoni Sanco Deo Fidio Sacrum, that is, the stone then discovered was dedicated to the god Semo Sancus, the Sabine Hercules. This antiquarian find makes it probable that Jstin was mistaken in what he said about a statue having been erected in honor of Simon Magus. "It is incredible that the folly should ever be carried to such an extent as that a statue should be erected, and the senate should pass a decree enrolling Simon Magus among the deos Romanos" (Neander, Church History, II, 123). The inscription found in 1574 shows the source of the error into which Justin had fallen.

There are many stories told by some of the early Christian writers regarding Simon Magus, but they are full of legend and fable: some of them are improbable in the extreme and border on the impossible.

(2) Jerome, who professes to quote from writings of Simon, represents him as employing these words in reference to himself, "I am the Word of God, I am the Comforter, I am Almighty, I am all there is of God" (Mansel, The Gnostic Heresies, 82). Irenaeus (Mansel, ibid., 82) writes regarding him: "Simon, having purchased a certain woman named Helena, who had been a prostitute in the city of Tyre, carried her about with him, and said that she was the first conception of his mind, the mother of all things, by whom, in the beginning, he conceived the thought of making the angels and archangels; for that this conception proceeded forth from him, and knowing her father's wishes, she descended to the lower world, and produced the angels and powers; by whom also he said that this world was made. But after she had produced them, she was detained by them through envy, since they were unwilling to be considered the offspring of any other being; for he himself was entirely unknown by them; but his conception was detained by those powers and angels which were put forth from her, and suffered every insult from them that she might not return upward to her father; and this went so far that she was even confined within a human body, and for ages passed into other female bodies, as if from one vessel into another. He said also that she was that Helen, on whose account the Trojan war was fought .... and that after passing from one body to another, and constantly meeting with insult, at last she became a public prostitute, and that this was the lost sheep. On this account he himself came, that he might first of all reclaim her and free her from her chains, and then give salvation to men through the knowledge of himself. For since the angels ruled the world badly, because one of them desired the chief place, he had come down for the restoration of all things, and had descended, being changed in figure, and made like to principalities and powers and angels, so that he appeared among men as a man, and was thought to have suffered in Judea, though he did not suffer. .... Furthermore he said that the prophets uttered their prophecies under the inspiration of those angels who framed the world; for which reason they who rest their hope on him and his Helena no longer cared for them, but as free men could act as they pleased, for that men are saved by his (i.e. Simon's) grace, and not according to their own just works, for that no acts were just by nature, but by accident, according to the rules established by the angels, who made the world, and who attempt by these precepts to bring men into bondage. For this reason he promised that the world should be released, and those who are his set at liberty from the government of those who made the world."

5. Sources of Legendary History:

The chief sources of the legendary history of Simon Magus are the collection of writings known as The Clementines (see LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC; PETER, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF; PETER, THE SECOND EPISTLE OF). What is there said of him is, that he studied at Alexandria, and that he had been, along with the heresiarch Dositheus, a disciple of John the Baptist. He became also a disciple of Dositheus, and afterward his successor. The Clementines comprise (1) The Homilies, (2) The Recognitions, and (3) The Epitome. These three are cognate works, and in part are identical. The date of The Homilies may be placed about 160 AD. The contents comprise a supposed letter from the apostle Peter to the apostle James, along with other matter. Then follow the homilies, of which there are twenty.

These record the supposed travels of Clement, a Roman citizen. Clement meets with Barnabas and with Peter. Then there is narrated a discussion between Peter and Simon Magus. This disputation lasts for three days, Simon maintaining that there are two gods, and that the God of the Old Testament is an imperfect being. Simon Magus withdraws to Tyre and then to Sidon. Peter follows Simon from place to place, counteracting his sorceries, and instructing the people. At Laodicea a second disputation takes place between the apostle and Simon on the same subjects.

The Homilies are not a Christian protest against Gnosticism, but merely that of one Gnostic school or sect against another, the Ebionite against the Marcionite. The Deity of Christ is denied, and He is regarded as one of the Jewish prophets.

In the legends Simon is represented as constantly opposing Peter, who ultimately discredits and vanquishes him. These legends occur in more forms than one, the earlier form selecting Antioch as the place where Simon was discomfited by the apostle and where he also died, while the later tradition chooses Rome for these events.

6. Traditions of His Death:

One tradition tells how the magician ordered his followers to bury him in a grave, promising that if this were done, he would rise again on the third day. They did as he wished and buried him; but this was the end of him, for he did not rise again.

Simon is said to have met his death at Rome, after an encounter with the apostle Peter. During this his final controversy with the apostle, Simon had raised himself in the air by the help of evil spirits, and in answer to the prayer of Peter and Paul he was dashed to the ground and killed.

According to another form of this tradition, Simon proposed to give the Roman emperor a proof of his power by flying off to God. He succeeded, it is said, in flying for a certain distance over Rome, but in answer to the prayer of Peter he fell and broke one of his legs. This tradition accounts for his end by saying that the people stoned him to death.

7. The Simoniani:

The Simoniani, the Simonians or followers of Simon, were an eclectic sect, who seem, at one time, to have adopted tenets and opinions derived from paganism, at another, from Judaism and the beliefs of the Samaritans, and at another still, from Christianity. Sometimes they seem to have been ascetics; at others they are wild scoffers at moral law. They regarded Simon Magus as their Christ, or at least as a form of manifestation of the redeeming Christ, who had manifested Himself also in Jesus. The Simonians were one of the minor Gnostic sects and were carried far away both from the doctrine and from the ethical spirit of the Christian faith.

Origen denies that the followers of Simon were Christians in any sense. The words of Origen are, "It

escapes the notice of Celsus that the Simonians do not in any way acknowledge Jesus as the Son of God, but they call Simon the Power of God." In the time of Origen the followers of Simon had dwindled in number to such a degree that he writes, "I do not think it possible to find that all the followers of Simon in the whole world are more than thirty: and perhaps I have said more than there really are" (Contra Celsus, i.57, quoted by Alford, Greek New Testament, Ac 8:9).

8. Was Simon the Originator of Gnosticism?:

Irenaeus also has much to say regarding Simon and his followers. He makes the legendary Simon identical with the magician of Ac 8, makes him also the first in the list which he gives of heretics, and also says that it was from him that Gnosticism sprang. The account which he gives of the Simonians shows that by the time when Irenaeus lived, their system had developed into Gnosticism; but this fact does not justify Irenaeus in the assertion that Simon of Ac 8 is the originator of the Gnostic system. The early Christian writers took this view, and regarded Simon Magus as the founder of Gnosticism. Perhaps they were right, "but from the very little authentic information we possess, it is impossible to ascertain how far he was identified with their tenets" (Alford, New Testament, II, 86). In the midst of the various legends regarding Simon, it may be that there is a substratum of fact, of such a nature that future investigation and discovery will justify these early Christian writers in their judgment, and will show that Simon Magus is not to be overlooked as one of the sources from which Gnosticism sprang. The exact origin of Gnosticism is certainly difficult to trace, but there is little or no indication that it arose from the incidents narrated in Ac 8. It cannot be denied that a connection is possible, and may have existed between the two, that is between Simon Magus and some of the Gnostic heresies; but the facts of history show widespread tendencies at work, during and even before the Apostolic age, which amply account for the rise of Gnosticism. These are found e.g. in the Alexandrian philosophy, and in the tenets of the false teachers at Colosse and in other places. These philosophical and theosophical ideas commingled with the influences of Zoroastrianism from Persia, and of Buddhism from India, and these tendencies and influences, taken in conjunction, were the sources of the various heresies known by the name of Gnosticism.

See GNOSTICISM.

John Rutherfurd

SIMON PETER

See PETER, SIMON.

SIMON THE CANAANITE; SIMON THE CANANAEAN; SIMON THE ZEALOT

(Simon Kananaios; kanna’i, "the Jealous (or Zealous) One"): One of the Twelve Apostles. This Simon was also named "the Canaanite" (Mt 10:4; Mr 3:18 the King James Version) or "the Cananean" (Mt 10:4; Mr 3:18 the Revised Version (British and American)) or "Zelotes" (Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13 the King

James Version) or "the Zealot" (Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13 the Revised Version (British and American)).

According to the "Gospel of the Ebionites" or" Gospel of the Twelve Apostles" (of the 2nd century and mentioned by Origen) Simon received his call to the apostleship along with Andrew and Peter, the sons of Zebedee, Thaddaeus and Judas Iscariot at the Sea of Tiberias (compare Mt 4:18-22; see also Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 24-27).

Although Simon, like the majority of the apostles, was probably a Galilean, the designation "Cananaean" is regarded as of political rather than of geographical significance (compare Luke's rendering). The Zealots were a faction, headed by Judas of Galilee, who "in the days of the enrollment" (compare Ac 5:37; Lu 2:1,2) bitterly opposed the threatened increase of taxation at the census of Quirinius, and would have hastened by the sword the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy.

Simon has been identified with Simon the brother of Jesus (Mr 6:3; Mt 13:55), but there also are reasons in favor of identifying him with Nathanael.

Thus (1) all the arguments adduced in favor of the Bartholomew-Nathanael identification (see NATHANAEL) can equally be applied to that of Simon-Nathanael, except the second. But the second is of no account, since the Philip-Bartholomew connection in the Synoptists occurs merely in the apostolic lists, while in John it is narrative. Further, in the Synoptists, Philip is connected in the narrative, not with Bartholomew but with Andrew.

(2) The identity is definitely stated in the Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles (see NATHANAEL). Further, the "Preaching of Simon, son of Cleopas" (compare Budge, II, 70 ff) has the heading "The preaching of the blessed Simon, the son of Cleopas, who was surnamed Judas, which is interpreted Nathanael, who became bishop of Jerusalem after James the brother of our Lord." Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, III, xi, 32; IV, xxii) also refers to a Simon who succeeded James as bishop of Jerusalem and suffered martyrdom under Trajan; and Hegesippus, whom Eusebius professes to quote, calls this Simon a son of Cleopas.

(3) The invitation of Philip to Nathanael (compare Joh 1:45) was one which would naturally be addressed to a follower of the Zealots, who based their cause on the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy.

(4) As Alpheus, the father of James, is generally regarded as the same as Clopas or Cleopas (see JAMES), this identification of the above Simon Nathanael, son of Cleopas, with Simon Zelotes would shed light on the reason of the juxtaposition of James son of Alpheus and Simon Zelotes in the apostolic lists of Luke and Acts, i.e. they were brothers.

C. M. Kerr

SIMPLE

sim’-p’l: In the Old Testament the uniform tranlation of the Hebrew word pethi (root pathah, "be open"). Like the English word "simple" (etymologically "of one fold"), the Hebrew pethi is used sometimes in a good sense, i.e. "open-minded" (Ps 19:7; 116:6; 119:130, possibly in all three cases the sense is neutral rather than positively good), and sometimes in a bad sense (Pr 7:7, parallel to "destitute of understanding"; Pr 8:5, parallel to "fools" (blockheads); Pr 14:15, opposed to prudent). The fundamental idea of pethi seems to be open to influence, i.e. easily influenced. That one open to influence should as a rule be classed with the irreligious is one of many instances in which language is an unwilling witness to the miasmatic moral atmosphere in which we live. The line between moral weakness and moral turpitude, between negative goodness (if indeed such a thing be conceivable) and positive badness, is soon passed.

In the New Testament the word "simple" is found only in Ro 16:18,19 the King James Version. In the first of these passages it is used to translate akakos (the Revised Version (British and American) "innocent"). In Heb 7:26 the King James Version the same word is rendered "harmless," the rendering of the Revised Version (British and American) in this instance being "guileless." This would suit Ro 16:18 better than "innocent." Guilelessness is not a synonym for gullibility; but the guileless are frequently the prey of designing men. In Ro 16:19 the word translated "simple" is akeraios, literally, "unmixed," "sincere" (Trench and Godet; Young, erroneously "hornless" and so "harmless"). "Uncontaminated" seems to be the idea of the apostle. He would have those to whom he wrote "wise as regards good" and not ignorant as regards evil—for that would be impossible, even if desirable—but without that kind of knowledge of evil that comes from engaging in it, as we say, mixing themselves up with it, unalloyed with evil.

W. M. McPheeters

SIMPLICITY

sim-plis’-i-ti (pethayyuth; haplotes): The words in the Old Testament commonly translated "simplicity" are pethi, "simple" (Pr 1:22), pethayyuth, "simplicity" (9:13 margin), tom, "completeness," "integrity" (2Sa 15:11), "They went in their simplicity." In the New Testament, haplotes, "singleness of mind," "simplicity," occurs in Ro 12:8, "He that giveth let him do it with simplicity," the Revised Version (British and American) "liberality," margin "Greek: ‘singleness’"; 2Co 1:12, "in simplicit and godly sincerity," the Revised Version (British and American) (with corrected text) "in holiness and sincerity of God"; 2Co 11:3, "the simplicity that is in Christ," the Revised Version (British and American) (with corrected text) "the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ"; compare Eph 6:5; Col 3:22, where the translation is "singleness" In The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1 we have, "Think ye of the Lord with a good mind (the King James Version "heart"), and in singleness (the King James Version "simplicity") of heart seek ye him" (haplotes). our Lord also speaks (Mt 6:22; Lu 11:34) of the "single eye" (haplous), and James (1:5) applies haplos, "simply," "directly," without after-thought (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) "liberally") to God, who had been described by Plato (Rep. ii.382 E) as being perfectly simple (haplous) and true, both in word and deed. In such "simplicity"—openness, sincerity, freedom from double-mindedness—man most resembles God

and is most open to His visitation and blessing.

W. L. Walker

SIMRI

sim’-ri.

See SHIMRI.

SIN (1)

(chaTTa’th, "a missing," ‘awon, "perversity]" pesha‘, "transgression," ra‘, "evil," etc.; hamartano, "miss the mark," parabasis, "transgression" with a suggestion of violence, adikia, "injustice," "unrighteousness"):

1. Sin as Disobedience

2. Affects the Inner Life

3. Involves All Men

4. The Story of the Fall

5. The Freedom of Man

6. A Transgression against Light

7. Inwardness of the Moral Law

(1) Prophets

(2) Paul

(3) Jesus

8. Sin a Positive Force

9. Heredity

10. Environment

11. Redemption

12. Life in Christ

13. Repentance

14. Forgiveness

LITERATURE

1. Sin as Disobedience:

A fairly exact definition of sin based on Biblical data would be that sin is the transgression of the law of God (1 Joh 3:4). Ordinarily, sin is defined simply as "the transgression of the law," but the idea of God is so completely the essential conception of the entire Biblical revelation that we can best define sin as disobedience to the law of God. It will be seen that primarily sin is an act, but from the very beginning it has been known that acts have effects, not only in the outward world of things and persons, but also upon him who commits the act.

2. Affects the Inner Life:

Hence, we find throughout the Scriptures a growing emphasis on the idea of the sinful act as not only a fact in itself, but also as a revelation of an evil disposition on the part of him who commits the act (Ge 6:5).

3. Involves All Men:

Then also there is the further idea that deeds which so profoundly affect the inner life of an individual in some way have an effect in transmitting evil tendencies to the descendants of a sinful individual (Ps 51:5,6; Eph 2:3). See HEREDITY; TRADITION. Hence, we reach shortly the conception, not only that sin is profoundly inner in its consequences, but that its effects reach outward also to an extent which practically involves the race. Around these various items of doctrine differing systems of theology have sprung up.

4. The Story of the Fall:

Students of all schools are agreed that we have in the Old Testament story of the fall of Adam an eternally true account of the way sin comes into the world (Ge 3:1-6). The question is not so much as to the literal historic matter-of-factness of the narrative, as to its essentially psychological truthfulness. The

essential thought of the narrative is that both Adam and Eve disobeyed an express command of God. The seductiveness of temptation is nowhere more forcefully stated than in this narrative. The fruit of the tree is pleasant to look upon; it is good to eat; it is to be desired to make one wise; moreover, the tempter moves upon the woman by the method of the half truth (see ADAM IN THE OLD TESTAMENT). God had said that disobedience to the command would bring death; the tempter urged that disobedience would not bring death, implying that the command of God had meant that death would immediately follow the eating of the forbidden fruit. In the story the various avenues of approach of sin to the human heart are graphically suggested, but after the seductiveness of evil has thus been set forth, the fact remains that both transgressors knew they were transgressing (Ge 3:2 f). Of course, the story is told in simple, naive fashion, but its perennial spiritual truth is at once apparent. There has been much progress in religious thinking concerning sin during the Christian ages, but the progress has not been away from this central conception of willful disobedience to the law of God.

5. The Freedom of Man:

In this early Biblical account there is implicit the thought of the freedom of man. The idea of transgression has sometimes been interpreted in such wise as to do away with this freedom. An unbiased reading of the Scriptures would, with the possible exception of some passages which designedly lay stress on the power of God (Ro 8:29,30), produce on the mind the impression that freedom is essential to sin. Certainly there is nothing in the account of the Old Testament or New Testament narratives to warrant the conception that men are born into sin by forces over which they have no control. The argument of the tempter with the woman is an argument aimed at her will. By easy steps, indeed, she moves toward the transgression, but the transgression is a transgression and nothing else. Of course, the evil deed is at once followed by attempts on the part of the transgressors to explain themselves, but the futility of the explanations is part of the point of the narrative. In all discussion of the problem of freedom as relating to sin, we must remember that the Biblical revelation is from first to last busy with the thought of the righteousness and justice and love of God (Ge 6:9 tells us that because of justice or righteousness, Noah walked with God). Unless we accept the doctrine that God is Himself not free, a doctrine which is nowhere implied in the Scripture, we must insist that the condemnation of men as sinful, when they have not had freedom to be otherwise than sinful, is out of harmony with the Biblical revelation of the character of God. Of course this does not mean that a man is free in all things. Freedom is limited in various ways, but we must retain enough of freedom in our thought of the constitution of men to make possible our holding fast to the Biblical idea of sin as transgression. Some who take the Biblical narrative as literal historical fact maintain that all men sinned in Adam (see IMPUTATION, III, 1). Adam may have been free to sin or not to sin, but, "in his fall we sinned all." We shall mention the hereditary influences of sin in a later paragraph; here it is sufficient to say that even if the first man had not sinned, there is nothing in our thought of the nature of man to make it impossible to believe that the sinful course of human history could have been initiated by some descendant of the first man far down the line.

6. A Transgression against Light:

The progress of the Biblical teaching concerning sin also would seem to imply that the transgression of

the law must be a transgression committed against the light (Ac 17:30; 1Ti 1:13). To be sinful in any full sense of the word, a man must know that the course which he is adopting is an evil course. This does not necessarily mean a full realization of the evil of the course. It is a fact, both of Biblical revelation and of revelation of all times, that men who commit sin do not realize the full evil of their deeds until after the sin has been committed (2Sa 12:1-13). This is partly because the consequences of sin do not declare themselves until after the deed has been committed; partly also because of the remorse of the conscience; and partly from the humiliation at being discovered; but in some sense there must be a realization of the evil of a course to make the adoption of the course sinful. E.g. in estimating the moral worth of Biblical characters, especially those of earlier times, we must keep in mind the standards of the times in which they lived. These standards were partly set by the customs of the social group, but the customs were, in many cases, made sacred by the claim of divine sanction. Hence, we find Biblical characters giving themselves readily to polygamy and warfare. The Scriptures themselves, however, throw light upon this problem. They refer to early times as times of ignorance, an ignorance which God Himself was willing to overlook (Ac 17:30). Even so ripe a moral consciousness as that of Paul felt that there was ground for forgiveness toward a course which he himself later considered evil, because in that earlier course he had acted ignorantly (Ac 26:9; 1Ti 1:13).

7. Inwardness of the Moral Law:

The Biblical narratives, too, show us the passage over from sin conceived of as the violation of external commands to sin conceived of as an unwillingness to keep the commandments in the depths of the inner life. The course of Biblical history is one long protest against conceiving of sin in an external fashion.

(1) Prophets.

In the sources of light which are to help men discern good from evil, increasing stress is laid upon inner moral insight (compare Isa 58:5 f; Ho 6:1-7). The power of the prophets was in their direct moral insight and the fervor with which they made these insights real to the mass of the people. Of course it was necessary that the spirit of the prophets be given body and form in carefully articulated law. The progress of the Hebrews from the insight of the seer to the statute of the lawmaker was not different from such progress in any other nations. It is easy to see, however, how the hardening of moral precepts into formal codes, absolutely necessary as that task was, led to an externalizing of the thought of sin. The man who did not keep the formal law was a sinner. On such basis there grew up the artificial systems which came to their culmination in the New Testament times in Pharisaism. On the other hand, a fresh insight by a new prophet might be in violation of the Law, considered in its literal aspects. It might be necessary for a prophet to attack outright some additions to the Law. We regard as a high-water mark of Old Testament moral utterances the word of Micah that the Lord requires men to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with Him (6:8). At the time this word was uttered, the people were giving themselves up to multitudes of sacrifices. Many of these sacrifices called for the heaviest sufferings on the part of the worshippers. It would seem that an obligation to sacrifice the firstborn was beginning to be taught in order that the Hebrews might not be behind the neighboring heathen nations in observances of religious codes. The simple direct word of Micah must have seemed heresy to many of its first hearers. The outcome, however, of this conflict between the inner and the outer in the thought of

transgression was finally to deepen the springs of the inner life. The extremes of externalism led to a break with moral realities which tended to become apparent to the most ordinary observer. The invective of Jesus against New Testament Pharisaism took its force largely from the fact that Jesus gave clear utterance to what everyone knew. Those who thought of religion as external gave themselves to formal keeping of the commandments and allowed the inner life to run riot as it would (Mt 23:23, et al.).

(2) Paul.

With the more serious-minded the keeping of the Law became more and more a matter of the inner spirit. There were some who, like Paul, found it impossible to keep the Law and find peace of conscience (Ro 7). It was this very impossibility which forced some, like Paul, to understand that after all, sin or righteousness must be judged by the inner disposition. It was this which led to the search for a conception of a God who looks chiefly at the heart and judges men by the inner motive.

(3) Jesus.

In the teaching of Jesus the emphasis upon the inner spirit as the essential factor in the moral life came to its climax. Jesus honored the Law, but He pushed the keeping of the Law back from the mere performance of externals to the inner stirrings of motives. It is not merely the actual commission of adultery, for example, that is sin: it is the lustful desire which leads to the evil glance; it is not merely the actual killing of the man that is murder; it is the spirit of hatred which makes the thought of murder welcome (Mt 5:21,27). Paul caught the spirit of Jesus and carried the thought of Jesus out into more elaborate and formal statements. There is a law of the inner life with which man should bind himself, and this law is the law of Christ's life itself (Ro 8:1-4). While both Jesus and Paul recognized the place of the formal codes in the moral life of individuals and societies, they wrought a great service for righteousness in setting on high the obligations upon the inner spirit. The follower of Christ is to guard the inmost thoughts of his heart. The commandments are not always precepts which can be given articulated statement; they are rather instincts and intuitions and glimpses which must be followed, even when we cannot give them full statement.

8. Sin a Positive Force:

From this standpoint we are able to discern something of the force of the Biblical teaching as to whether sin is to be looked upon as negative or positive. Very often sin is defined as the mere absence of goodness. The man who sins is one who does not keep the Law. This, however, is hardly the full Biblical conception. Of course, the man who does not keep the Law is regarded as a sinner, but the idea transgression is very often that of a positive refusal to keep the commandment and a breaking of the commandment. Two courses are set before men, one good, the other evil. The evil course is, in a sense, something positive in itself. The evil man does not stand still; he moves as truly as the good man moves; he becomes a positive force for evil. In all our discussions we must keep clearly in mind the truth that evil is not something existing in and by itself. The Scriptures deal with evil men, and the evil men are as positive as their natures permit them to be. In this sense of the word sin does run a course of positive

destruction. In the thought, e.g., of the writer who describes the conditions which, in his belief, made necessary the Flood, we have a positive state of evil contaminating almost the whole world (Ge 6:11). It would be absurd to characterize the world in the midst of which Noah lived as merely a negative world. The world was positively set toward evil. And so, in later writings, Paul's thought of Roman society is of a world of sinful men moving with increasing velocity toward the destruction of themselves and of all around them through doing evil. It is impossible to believe that Romans 1 conceives of sin merely in negative terms. We repeat, we do not do full justice to the Biblical conception when we speak of sin merely in negative terms. If we may be permitted to use a present-day illustration, we may say that in the Biblical thought sinful men are like the destructive forces in the world of Nature which must be removed before there can be peace and health for human life. For example, science today has much to say concerning germs of diseases which prove destructive to human life. A large part of modern scientific effort has been to rid the world of these germs, or at least to cleanse human surroundings from their contaminating touch. The man who sterilizes the human environment so that these forces cannot touch men does in one sense a merely negative work; in another sense, however, his work makes possible the positive development of the forces which make for health.

9. Heredity:

It is from this thought of the positiveness of sin that we are to approach the problem of the hereditary transmission of evil. The Biblical teaching has often been misinterpreted at this point. Apart from certain passages, especially those of Paul, which set forth the practically universal contamination of sin (e.g. Ro 5:18, etc.), there is nothing in the Scriptures to suggest the idea that men are born into the world under a weight of guilt. We hold fast to the idea of God as a God of justice and love. There is no way of reconciling these attributes with the condemnation of human souls before these souls have themselves transgressed. Of course much theological teaching moves on the assumption that the tendencies to evil are so great that the souls will necessarily trangress, but we must keep clearly in mind the difference between a tendency to evil and the actual commission of evil. Modern scientific research reinforces the conception that the children of sinful parents, whose sins have been such as to impress their lives throughout, will very soon manifest symptoms of evil tendency. Even in this case, however, we must distinguish between the psychological and moral. The child may be given a wrong tendency from birth, not only by hereditary transmission, but by the imitation of sinful parents; yet the question of the child's own personal responsibility is altogether another matter. Modern society has come to recognize something of the force of this distinction. In dealing with extreme cases of this kind, the question of the personal guilt of the child is not raised. The attempt is to throw round about the child an environment that will correct the abnormal tendency. But there can be little gainsaying the fact that the presence of sin in the life of the parent may go as far as to mark the life of the child with the sinful tendency.

10. Environment:

The positive force of sinful life also appears in the effect of sin upon the environment of men. It is not necessary for us to believe that all the physical universe was cursed by the Almighty because of man's sin, in order to hold that there is a curse upon the world because of the presence of sinful men. Men have sinfully despoiled the world for their own selfish purposes. They have wasted its resources. They have

turned forces which ought to have made for good into the channels of evil. In their contacts with one another also, evil men furnish an evil environment. If the employer of 100 men be himself evil, he is to a great extent the evil environment of those 100 men. The curse of his evil is upon them. So with the relations of men in larger social groups: the forces of state-life which are intended to work for good can be made to work for evil. So far has this gone that some earnest minds have thought of the material and social realms as necessarily and inherently evil. In other days this led to retreats from the world in monasteries and in solitary cells. In our present time the same thought is back of much of the pessimist idea that the world itself is like a sinking ship, absolutely doomed. The most we can hope for is to save individuals here and there from imminent destruction. Yet a more Biblical conception keeps clear of all this. The material forces of the world—apart from certain massive physical necessities (e.g. earthquakes, storms, floods, whirlwinds, fires, etc.), whose presence does more to furnish the conditions of moral growth than to discourage that growth—are what men cause them to be. Social forces are nothing apart from the men who are themselves the forces. No one can deny that evil men can use physical forces for evil purposes, and that evil men can make bad social forces, but both these forces can be used for good as well as for evil. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain" waiting for the redemption at the hands of the sons of God (Ro 8:19-23).

11. Redemption:

In the thought of Jesus, righteousness is life. Jesus came that men might have life (Joh 10:10). It must follow therefore that in His thought sin is death, or rather it is the positive course of transgression which makes toward death (Joh 5:24). But man is to cease to do evil and to learn to do well. He is to face about and walk in a different direction; he is to be born from above (Joh 3:3), and surrender himself to the forces which beat upon him from above rather than to those which surge upon him from below (Ro 12:2). From the realization of the positiveness both of sin and of righteousness, we see the need of a positive force which is to bring men from sin to righteousness (Joh 3:3-8).

Of course, in what we have said of the positive nature of sin we would not deny that there are multitudes of men whose evil consists in their passive acquiescence in a low moral state. Multitudes of men may not be lost, in the sense that they are breaking the more obvious of the commandments. They are lost, in the sense that they are drifting about, or that they are existing in a condition of inertness with no great interest in high spiritual ideals. But the problem even here is to find a force strong enough and positive enough to bring such persons to themselves and to God. In any case the Scriptures lay stress upon the seriousness of the problem constituted by sin. The Bible is centered on redemption. Redemption from sin is thought of as carrying with it redemption from all other calamities. If the kingdom of God and of His righteousness can be seized, all other things will follow with the seizure (Mt 6:33). The work of Christ is set before us as chiefly a work of redemption from sin. A keen student once observed that almost all failures to take an adequate view of the person of Christ can be traced to a failure to realize adequately the seriousness of sin. The problem of changing the course of something so positive as a life set toward sin is a problem which may well tax the resources of the Almighty. Lives cannot be transformed merely by precept. The only effective force is the force of a divine life which will reach and save human lives.

See REDEMPTION.

12. Life in Christ:

We are thus in a position to see something of the positiveness of the life that must be in Christ if He is to be a Saviour from sin. That positiveness must be powerful enough to make men feel that in some real sense God Himself has come to their rescue (Ro 8:32-39). For the problem of salvation from sin is manifold. Sin long persisted in begets evil habits, and the habits must be broken. Sin lays the conscience under a load of distress, for which the only relief is a sense of forgiveness. Sin blights and paralyzes the faculties to such a degree that only the mightiest of tonic forces can bring back health and strength. And the problem is often more serious than this. The presence of evil in the world is so serious in the sight of a Holy God that He Himself, because of His very holiness, must be under stupendous obligation to aid us to the utmost for the redemption of men. Out of the thought of the disturbance which sin makes even in the heart of God, we see something of the reason for the doctrine that in the cross of Christ God was discharging a debt to Himself and to the whole world; for the insistence also that in the cross there is opened up a fountain of life, which, if accepted by sinful men, will heal and restore them.

13. Repentance:

It is with this seriousness of sin before us that we must think of forgiveness from sin. We can understand very readily that sin can be forgiven only on condition that men seek forgiveness in the name of the highest manifestation of holiness which they have known. For those who have heard the preaching of the cross and have seen something of the real meaning of that preaching, the way to forgiveness is in the name of the cross. In the name of a holiness which men would make their own, if they could; in the name of an ideal of holy love which men of themselves cannot reach, but which they forever strive after, they seek forgiveness. But the forgiveness is to be taken seriously. In both the Old Testament and New Testament repentance is not merely a changed attitude of mind. It is an attitude which shows its sincerity by willingness to do everything possible to undo the evil which the sinner has wrought (Lu 19:8). If there is any consequence of the sinner's own sin which the sinner can himself make right, the sinner must in himself genuinely repent and make that consequence right. In one sense repentance is not altogether something done once for all. The seductiveness of sin is so great that there is need of humble and continuous watching. While anything like a morbid introspection is unscriptural, constant alertness to keep to the straight and narrow path is everywhere enjoined as an obligation (Ga 6:1).

14. Forgiveness:

There is nothing in the Scriptures which will warrant the idea that forgiveness is to be conceived of in such fashion as would teach that the consequences of sin can be easily and quickly eliminated. Change in the attitude of a sinner necessarily means change in the attitude of God. The sinner and God, however, are persons, and the Scriptures always speak of the problem of sin after a completely personal fashion. The changed attitude affects the personal standing of the sinner in the sight of God. But God is the person who creates and carries on a moral universe. In carrying on that universe He must keep moral

considerations in their proper place as the constitutional principles of the universe. While the father welcomes back the prodigal to the restored personal relations with himself, he cannot, in the full sense, blot out the fact that the prodigal has been a prodigal. The personal forgiveness may be complete, but the elimination of the consequences of the evil life is possible only through the long lines of healing set at work. The man who has sinned against his body can find restoration from the consequences of the sin only in the forces which make for bodily healing. So also with the mind and will. The mind which has thought evil must be cured of its tendency to think evil. To be sure the curative processes may come almost instantly through the upheaval of a great experience, but on the other hand, the curative processes may have to work through long years (see SANCTIFICATION). The will which has been given to sin may feel the stirrings of sin after the life of forgiveness has begun. All this is a manifestation, not only of the power of sin, but of the constitutional morality of the universe. Forgiveness must not be interpreted in such terms as to make the transgression of the Law of God in any sense a light or trivial offense. But, on the other hand, we must not set limits to the curative powers of the cross of God. With the removal of the power which makes for evil the possibility of development in real human experience is before the life (see FORGIVENESS). The word of the Master is that He "came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly" (Joh 10:10). Sin is serious, because it thwarts life. Sin is given so large a place in the thought of the Biblical writers simply because it blocks the channel of that movement toward the fullest life which the Scriptures teach is the aim of God in placing men in the world. God is conceived of as the Father in Heaven. Sin has a deeply disturbing effect in restraining the relations between the Father and the sons and of preventing the proper development of the life of the sons.

See further ETHICS, I, 3, (2); ETHICS OF JESUS, I, 2; GUILT; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY, V, 1; PAUL, THE APOSTLE; PAULINE THEOLOGY; REDEMPTION, etc. LITERATURE.

Tennant, Origin and Propagation of Sin; Hyde, Sin and Its Forgiveness; chapter on "Incarnation and Atonement" in Bowne’s Studies in Christianity; Stevens, Christian Doctrine of Salvation; Clarke, Christian Doctrine of God; various treatises on Systematic Theology.

Francis J. McConnell

SIN (2)

sin (cin, "clay or mud"; Suene, Codex Alexandrinus Tanis): A city of Egypt mentioned only in Eze 30:15,16. This seems to be a pure Semitic name. The ancient Egyptian name, if the place ever had one such, is unknown. Pelusium (Greek Pelousion) also meant "the clayey or muddy town." The Pelusiac mouth of the Nile was "the muddy mouth," and the modern Arabic name of this mouth has the same significance. These facts make it practically certain that the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) is correct in identifying Sin with Pelusium. But although Pelusium appears very frequently in ancient history, its exact location is still not entirely certain. The list of cities mentioned in Eze in connection with Sin furnishes no clue to its location. From other historical notices it seems to have been a frontier city. Rameses II built a wall from Sin to Heliopolis, probably by the aid of Hebrew slaves (Diodorus Siculus; compare Budge, History of Egypt, V, 90), to protect the eastern frontier. Sin was a meeting-

place of Egypt with her enemies who came to attack her, many great battles being fought at or near this place. Sennacherib and Cambyses both fought Egypt near Pelusium (Herodotus ii.141; iii.10-13). Antiochus IV defeated the Egyptians here (Budge, VIII, 25), and the Romans under Gabinius defeated the Egyptians in the same neighborhood. Pelusium was also accessible from the sea, or was very near a seaport, for Pompey after the disaster at Pharsalia fled into Egypt, sailing for Pelusium. These historical notices of Pelusium make its usual identification with the ruins near el-Kantara, a station on the Suez Canal 29 miles South of Port Said, most probable. "Sin, the stronghold of Egypt," in the words of Ezekiel (30:15), would thus refer to its inaccessibility because of swamps which served as impassable moats. The wall on the South and the sea on the North also protected it on either flank.

M. G. Kyle

SIN AGAINST THE HOLY GHOST (SPIRIT)

See BLASPHEMY.

SIN MONEY

See SACRIFICE.

SIN OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

SIN, MAN OF

See MAN OF SIN.

SIN, WILDERNESS OF

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

SINA

si’-na: In Ac 7:38 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "Sinai" (which see).

SINAI

si’-ni, si’-na-i (cinay; Codex Alexandrinus Sina, Codex Vaticanus Seina):

1. The Name:

The name comes probably from a root meaning "to shine," which occurs in Syriac, and which in Babylonian is found in the name sinu for "the moon." The old explanation, "clayey," is inappropriate to any place in the Sinaitic desert, though it might apply to Sin (Eze 30:15,16) or Pelusium; even there, however, the applicability is doubtful. The desert of Sin (Ex 16:1; 17:1; Nu 33:11 f) lay between Sinai and the Gulf of Suez, and may have been named from the "glare" of its white chalk. But at Sinai "the glory of Yahweh was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel" (Ex 24:17); and, indeed, the glory of the Lord still dyes the crags of Jebel Musa (the "mountain of Moses") with fiery red, reflected from its red granite and pink gneiss rocks, long after the shadows have fallen on the plain beneath. Sinai is mentioned, as a desert and a mountain, in 35 passages of the Old Testament. In 17 passages the same desert and mountain are called "Horeb," or "the waste." This term is chiefly used in Deuteronomy, though Sinai also occurs (De 33:2). In the other books of the Pentateuch, Sinai is the usual name, though Horeb also occurs (Ex 3:1; 17:6; 33:6), applying both to the "Mount of God" and to the desert of Rephidim, some 20 miles to the Northwest.

2. Traditional Site:

The indications of position, in various passages of the Pentateuch, favor the identification with the traditional site, which has become generally accepted by all those explorers who have carefully considered the subject, though two other theories may need notice. Moses fled to the land of Midian (or "empty land"), which lay East of the Sinaitic peninsula (Nu 22:4,7; 25; 31), and when he wandered with his flocks to Horeb (Ex 3:1) he is said to have reached the west side of the desert. In another note (De 1:2) we read that the distance was "eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea" or Petra (see WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL), the distance being about 145 miles, or 14 miles of daily march, though Israel—with its flocks, women and children—made 16 marches between these points. Sinai again is described as being distant from Egypt "three days' journey into the wilderness" (Ex 5:3), the actual route being 117 miles, which Israel accomplished in 10 journeys. But, for Arabs not encumbered with families and herds, this distance could still be covered by an average march of 39 miles daily, on riding camels, or even, if necessary, on foot.

3. Identification with Jebel Musa:

These distances will not, however, allow of our placing Sinai farther East than Jebel Musa. Lofty mountains, in all parts of the world, have always been sacred and regarded as the mysterious abode of God; and Josephus says that Sinai is "the highest of all the mountains thereabout," and again is "the highest of all the mountains that are in that country, and is not only very difficult to be ascended by men, on account of its vast. altitude but because of the sharpness of its precipices: nay, indeed, it cannot be looked at without pain of the eyes, and besides this it was terrible and inaccessible, on account of the rumor that passed about, that God dwelt there" (Ant., II, xii, 1; III, v, 1). Evidently in his time Sinai was supposed to be one of the peaks of the great granitic block called et Tur—a term applying to any lofty mountain. This block has its highest peak in Jebel Katarin (so named from a legend of Catherine of

Egypt), rising 8,550 ft. above the sea. Northeast of this is Jebel Musa (7,370 ft.), which, though less high, is more conspicuous because of the open plain called er Rachah ("the wide") to its Northwest. This plain is about 4 miles long and has a width of over a mile, so that it forms, as Dr. E. Robinson (Biblical Researches, 1838, I, 89) seems to have been the first to note, a natural camp at the foot of the mountain, large enough for the probable numbers (see EXODUS, 3) of Israel.

4. Description of Jebel Musu:

Jebel Musa has two main tops, that to the Southeast being crowned by a chapel. The other, divided by gorges into three precipitous crags, has the Convent to its North, and is called Ras-es-Cafcafeh, or "the willow top." North of the Convent is the lower top of Jebel edition Deir ("mountain of the monastery"). These heights were accurately determined by Royal Engineer surveyors in 1868 (Sir C. Wilson, Ordnance Survey of Sinai); and, though it is impossible to say which of the peaks Moses ascended, yet they are all much higher than any mountains in the Sinaitic desert, or in Midian. The highest tops in the Tih desert to the North are not much over 4,000 ft. Those in Midian, East of Elath, rise only to 4,200 ft. Even Jebel Serbal, 20 miles West of Sinai—a ridge with many crags, running 3 miles in length—is at its highest only 6,730 ft. above the sea. Horeb is not recorded to have been visited by any of the Hebrews after Moses, except by Elijah (1Ki 19:8) in a time of storm. In favor of the traditional site it may also be observed that clouds suddenly formed, or lasting for days (Ex 24:15 f), are apt to cap very lofty mountains. The Hebrews reached Sinai about the end of May (Ex 19:1) and, on the 3rd day, "there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount" (Ex 19:16). Such storms occur as a rule in the Sinaitic desert only in December and January, but thunderstorms are not unknown in Palestine even in May.

5. Patristic Evidence:

A constant tradition fixing the site is traceable back to the 4th century AD. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomasticon, under the word "Choreb") place Horeb near Paran, which in their time was placed (Onomasticon, under the word "Raphidim") in Wady Feiran. Anchorites lived at Paran, and at Sinai at least as early as 365 AD, and are noticed in 373 AD, and often later (Robinson, Biblical Res., 1838, I, 122-28); the monastery was first built for them by Justinian in 527 AD and his chapel still exists. Cosmas (Topogr. Christ.), in the same reign, says that Rephidim was then called Pharan, and (distinguishing Horeb from Sinai, as Eusebius also does) he places it "about 6 miles from Pharan," and "near Sinai." These various considerations may suffice to show that the tradition as to Horeb is at least as old as the time of Josephus, and that it agrees with all the indications given in the Old Testament.

6. Lepsius' Theory:

Lepsius, it is true (Letters from Egypt, 1842-44), denying the existence of any unbroken tradition, and relying on his understanding of Cosmas, supposed Sinai to be the Jebel Serbal above mentioned, which lies immediately South of Wady Feiran. His main argument was that, visiting Sinai in March, he considered that the vicinity did not present sufficient water for Israel (Appendix B, 303-18). But, on this

point, it is sufficient to give the opinion of the late F. W. Holland, based on the experience of four visits, in 1861, 1865, 1867-68.

He says (Recovery of Jerusalem, 524):

"With regard to water-supply there is no other spot in the whole Peninsula which is nearly so well supplied as the neighborhood of Jebel Musa. Four streams of running water are found there: one in Wady Leja; a second in Wady et Tl'ah which waters a succession of gardens extending more than 3 miles in length, and forms pools in which I have often had a swim; a third stream rises to the North of the watershed of the plain of er Rachah and runs West into Wady et Tl'ah; and a fourth, is formed by the drainage from the mountains of Umm Alawy, to the East of Wady Sebaiyeh and finds its way into that valley by a narrow ravine opposite Jebel edition Deir. In addition to these streams there are numerous wells and springs, affording excellent water throughout the whole of the granitie district. I have seldom found it necessary to carry water when making a mountain excursion, and the intermediate neighborhood of Jebel Masa would, I think, bear comparison with many mountain districts in Scotland with regard to its supply of water. There is also no other district in the Peninsula which affords such excellent pasturage."

This is important, as Israel encamped near Sinai from the end of May till April of the next year. There is also a well on the lower slope of Jebel Musa itself, where the ascent begins.

7. Greene's Theory:

Another theory, put forward by Mr. Baker Greene (The Hebrew Migration from Egypt), though accepted by Dr. Sayce (Higher Cricitism, 1894, 268), appears likewise to be entirely untenable. Mr. Greene supposed Elim (Ex 15:27) to be Elath (De 2:8), now 'Ailah at the head of the Gulf of 'Akabah; and that Sinai therefore was some unknown mountain in Midian. But in this case Israel would in 4 days (see Ex 15:22,23,27) have traveled a distance of 200 miles to reach Elim, which cannot but be regarded as quite impossible for the Hebrews when accompanied by women, children, flocks and herds.

C. R. Conder

SINCERE; SINCERITY

sin-ser', sin-ser'-i-ti (tamim; aphtharsia, eilikrineia): "Sincerity" occurs once in the Old Testament as the translation of tamim, "complete," "entire," "sincere," etc. (Jos 24:14); the same word is translated "sincerity" (Jud 9:16,19, the Revised Version (British and American) "uprightly"). Four different words are rendered "sincere," "sincerely" "sincerity," in the New Testament: adolos, "without guile," "unadulterated," "desire the sincere milk of the word" (1Pe 2:2 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "the spiritual," the American Revised Version margin "Greek, 'belonging to the reason'; compare Ro 12:1," the English Revised Version margin reasonable"), "milk which is without guile," with no other purpose but to nourish and benefit the soul (Alford); hagnos,

"without blame," "pure," "preach Christ .... not sincerely" (Php 1:17); aphtharsia, "without corruption" (Eph 6:24, the King James Version "that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity," the American Standard Revised Version "with a love incorruptible," margin "‘ in incorruption.’ See Ro 2:7," the English Revised Version "uncorruptness"; Tit 2:7, the King James Version "shewing uncorruptness .... sincerity," the Revised Version (British and American) "uncorruptness"); gnesios, "not spurious" (2Co 8:8); eilikrines, literally, , judged of in the sunlight, hence, "clear," "manifest" (Php 1:10); eilikrineia, with same meaning, is translated "sincerity" (1Co 5:8; 2Co 1:12; 2:17).

The Revised Version (British and American) has "sincere" for "pure" (2Pe 3:1), "sincerely" for "clearly" (Job 33:3).

In The Wisdom of Solomon 7:25 we have eilikrines in the description of Wisdom as a "pure influence," the Revised Version (British and American) "clear effluence."

W. L. Walker

SINEW

sin’-u (gidh (Job 10:11, etc.)): The tendons and sinews of the body are uniformly (7 times) thus called. "Therefore the children of Israel eat not the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day: because he touched the hollow of Jacob’s thigh in the sinew of the hip" (Ge 32:32). In the poetical description of Behemoth (hippopotamus) it is said: "He moveth his tail like a cedar: the sinews of his thighs are knit together" (Job 40:17). The prophet Ezekiel saw in his vision (37:6,8) that the dry bones were gathered together, that they were covered with sinews, flesh and skin, and that they were revived by the spirit of the Lord. In figurative language the neck of the obstinate is compared to an "iron sinew" (Isa 48:4). the King James Version "my sinews take no rest" (we‘oreqay lo’ yishkabhun, Job 30:17) has been corrected by the Revised Version (British and American) into "the pains that gnaw me take no rest," but the earlier version has been retained in the margin.

H. L. E. Luering

SINGERS; SINGING

sing’-erz, sing’-ing: Singing seems to have become a regular profession at quite early date among the Hebrews. David had his troupe of "singing men and singing women" at Jerusalem (2Sa 19:35), and no doubt Solomon added to their numbers. Isa 23:16 suggests that it was not uncommon for foreign female minstrels of questionable character to be heard making "sweet melody," singing songs along the streets and highways of Judea. Nor was the worship of the temple left to the usually incompetent and inconstant leadership of amateur choristers. The elaborate regulations drawn up for the constitution of the temple orchestra and chorus are referred to under MUSIC (which see). It has been inferred from Ezr 2:65 that women were included among the temple singers, but this is erroneous, as the musicians there mentioned were of the class employed at banquets, festivals, etc. The temple choir consisted exclusively of Levites,

one essential qualification of an active member of that order being a good voice.

Of the vocal method of the Hebrews we know nothing. Wellhausen imagines that he can detect one of the singers, in the portrayal of an Assyrian band, compressing his throat in order to produce a vibrato; and it is quite possible that in other respects as well as this, ancient and modern oriental vocalization resembled each other. But that is about all that can be said.

On the other hand, we cannot repeat too often that we are quite unable to identify any intervals, scales, or tunes as having been used in ancient Israel. Even those who hold that the early church took the Gregorian "tones" from the synagogue, confess that it was "certainly not without considerable modifications." And, of course, there was not the slightest affinity between the Hebrew and the Anglican chant.

See MUSIC; PRAISE; SONG; TEMPLE.

James Millar

SINGLE, EYE

sin’-g’-l:Mt 6:22 f parallel Lu 11:34: "If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness." "Single" and "evil" here represent haplouis, and poneros. Poneros elsewhere in the New Testament means "wicked"; haplous occurs only here in the New Testament, but is very common in ordinary Greek and always has the meaning "simple." But in view of the context, most commentators take haplous here as meaning "normal," "healthy," and poneros as "diseased," so rendering "Just as physical enlightenment depends on the condition of the eye, so does spiritual enlightenment depend on the condition of the heart." This is natural enough, but it is not satisfactory, as it gives to haplous a unique sense and to poneros a sense unique in the 73 New Testament examples of the word. Moreover, the same expression, "evil eye," is found also in Mt 20:15; Mr 7:22, where it means "jealousy" or "covetousness." With poneros =" covetous" haplous would =" generous"; and this rendition gives excellent sense in Matthew, where the further context deals with love of money. Yet in Luke it is meaningless, where the context is of a different sort, a fact perhaps indicating that Luke has placed the saying in a bad context. Or the Greek translation of Christ’s words used by Matthew and Luke may have taken the moral terms haplous and poneros to translate physical terms ("healthy" and "diseased"?) employed in the original Aramaic. The Sinaitic Syriac version of Lu 11:36 may perhaps contain a trace of an older rendering. See Julicher, Die Gleichnisreden Jesu, II, 98-108.

Burton Scott Easton

SINGULAR

sin’-gu-lar: "Pertaining to the single person," "individual," and so sometimes "unusual," "remarkable."

So The Wisdom of Solomon 14:18, the King James Version "the singular diligence of the artificer" (philotimia, "love of honor," the Revised Version (British and American) "ambition"). In Le 27:2 by "when a man shall make a singular vow" the King James Version seems to have understood a "personal" or "private" vow. the Revised Version (British and American) has "accomplish a vow," with margin "make a special vow." Compare the same phrase (yaphli' (yephalle') nedher) used of the Nazirite vow in Nu 6:2.

SINIM, LAND OF

si'-nim, sin'-im ('erets cinim; ge Person): The name occurs in Isaiah's prophecy of the return of the people from distant lands: "Lo, these shall come from far; and, lo, these from the north and from the west; and these from the land of Sinim" (Isa 49:12). The land is clearly far off, and it must be sought either in the South or in the East. Septuagint points to an eastern country. Many scholars have favored identification with China, the classical Sinae. It seems improbable that Jews had already found their way to China; but from very early times trade relations were established with the Far East by way of Arabia and the Persian Gulf; and the name may have been used by the prophet simply as suggesting extreme remoteness. Against, this view are Dillmann (Commentary on Isaiah), Duhm, Cheyne and others. Some have suggested places in the South: e.g. Sin (Pelusium, Eze 30:15) and Syene (Cheyne, Introduction to Isa, 275). But these seem to be too near. In harmony with his reconstruction of Biblical history, Cheyne finally concludes that the reference here is to the return from a captivity in North Arabia (EB, under the word). While no certain decision is possible, probability points to the East, and China cannot be quite ruled out. See article "China," Encyclopedia Brittanica (11th edition), 188b.

W. Ewing

SINITES

si'-nits (cini): A Canaanite people mentioned in Ge 10:17; 1Ch 1:15. The identification is uncertain. Jerome mentions a ruined city, Sin, near Arka, at the foot of Lebanon.

SINLESSNESS

sin'-les-nes: The 15th Anglican article ("Of Christ Alone without Sin") may be quoted as a true summary of Scripture teaching on sinlessness: "Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only excepted, from which He was clearly (prorsus) void, both in His flesh and in His spirit ..... Sin, as Saint John saith, was not in Him. But all we the rest, though baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things; and, if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves."

1. Christ Sinless:

Here the sinlessness of the Incarnate Son is affirmed. It needs no elaborate argument to show that this is

the affirmation of Scripture. It is not only, as we are reminded above, definitely taught there. Yet more is it implied in the mysterious (and morally miraculous) phenomenon of the Lord's evidently total immunity from the sense of sin, His freedom from inward discord or imperfection, from the slightest discontent with self. It is not too much to say that this representation is self-evidential of its truth to fact. Had it been the invention of worshipping disciples, we may say with confidence that they (supposed thus capable of "flee handling") would have been certain to betray some moral aberrations in their portraiture of their Master. They must have failed to put before us the profound ethical paradox of a person who, on the one hand, enjoins penitence and (with a tenderness infinitely deep) loves the penitent, and, on the other hand, is never for a moment penitent Himself, and who all the while has proved, from the first, a supreme moral and spiritual magnet, "drawing all men to him." Meanwhile the Scripture represents the sinlessness of the Incarnate Lord as no mere automatic or effortless condition. He is sensitive to temptation, to a degree which makes it agony. His sinlessness, as to actual experience (we are not here considering the matter sub specie aeternitatis), lies in the perfect fidelity to the Father of a will, exercised under human conditions, filled absolutely with the Holy Spirit, willingly received.

2. Saints Not Sinless:

On the other hand, "we the rest," contemplated as true believers, are warned by the general teaching of Scripture never to affirm sinlessness as our condition. There are passages (e.g. 1 Joh 3:9; 5:1 f) which affirm of the regenerate man that he "sinneth not." But it seems obvious to remark that such words, taken without context and balance, would prove too much; they would make the smallest sense of sin a tremendous evidence against the person's regeneration at all. It would seem that such words practically mean that sin and the regenerate character are diametrical opposites, so that sinning is out of character, not in the man as such, but in the Christian as such. And the practical result is an unconquerable aversion and opposition in the regenerate will toward all known sin, and a readiness as sensitive as possible for confession of failure. Meanwhile such passages as 1 John are, to the unbiased reader, an urgent warning of the peril of affirming our perfect purity of will and character. But then, on the other hand, Scripture abounds in both precepts and promises bearing on the fact that in Christ and by the power of His Spirit, received by faith into a watchful soul, our weakness can be so lifted and transformed that a moral purification and emancipation is possible for the weakest Christian which, compared with the best efforts of unregenerate nature, is a "more than conquest" over evil (see e.g. 2Co 12:9,10; Ga 2:20; Eph 6:16; Jude 1:24).

See further FLESH; SPIRIT.

Handley Dunelm

SINNER

sin'-er (chaTTa; hamartolos, "devoted to sin," "erring one"): In the New Testament, in addition to its ordinary significance of one that sins (Lu 5:8; 13:2; Ro 5:8,19; 1Ti 1:15; Heb 7:26), the term is applied to those who lived in disregard of ceremonial prescription (Mt 9:10,11; Mr 2:15 ff; Lu 5:30; Ga 2:15); to

those stained with certain definite vices or crimes, as the publicans (Lu 15:2; 18:13; 19:7); to the heathen (Mt 26:45; Ga 2:15; compare Tobit 13:6; 1 Macc 1:34; 2 Macc 2:48,62); to the preeminently sinful (Mr 8:38; Joh 9:24,31; Ga 2:17; 1Ti 1:9; Jude 1:15). It was the Jewish term for a woman of ill-fame (Lu 7:37; compare Mt 21:32, where it is stated that such had come even to John's baptism also). For the general Biblical conception of the term, see SIN.

M. O. Evans

SION

si'-un (si'on; Seon):

(1) A name given to Mt. Hermon in De 4:48. The name may mean "protuberance" or "peak," and may have denoted the lofty snow-covered horn of the mountain as seen from the South. It may, however, be a scribal error for Sirion, the name by which the mountain was known to the Zidonians. Syriac takes it in this sense, which, however, may be a correction of the Hebrew. It is possible that this name, like Senir, may have applied to some distinct part of the Hermon Range.

(2) Mt. Sion.

See ZION.

SIPHMOTH

sif'-moth, sif'-moth (siphmoth (Ginsburg), shiphamoth (Baer); Saphei): One of the cities to which David sent presents from Ziklag (1Sa 30:28). It occurs between Aroer and Eshtemoa, so it must have been somewhere in Southern Judah. The site has not been recovered. Zabdi the Shiphmite (1Ch 27:27) may quite probably have been a native of this place.

SIPPAI

sip'-i, si-pa'-i.

See SAPH.

SIR

sur: In the Old Testament this word in Ge 43:20 the King James Version ('adhon) is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into "my lord." In the New Testament the word sometimes represents aner, as in Ac 7:26; 14:15; 19:25, etc.; more frequently kurios, "lord," as in Mt 13:27; 21:30; 27:36; Joh 4:11,15,19,49 (the Revised Version margin "lord"); Joh 20:15. In Re 7:14, the Revised

Version (British and American) renders "my lord."

SIRACH, BOOK OF

si’-rak, or The Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach:

I. NAME

II. CANONICITY

III. CONTENTS

IV. TEACHING

1. Religion

2. Morals

3. Manners

4. Counsels of Prudence

V. LITERARY FORM

VI. AUTHOR

1. Jesus, Son of Sirach

2. Other Views

VII. UNITY AND INTEGRITY

VIII. DATE

1. Most Probable Views

2. Brief Statement of Other Views

IX. ORIGINAL LANGUAGES

1. Composed in Hebrew

2. Margoliouth’s View

X. VERSIONS

1. Greek

2. Syriac

3. Latin

4. English

LITERATURE

Sirach is the largest and most comprehensive example of Wisdom Literature (see WISDOM LITERATURE), and it has also the distinction of being the oldest book in the Apocrypha, being indeed older than at least two books (Daniel, Esther) which have found a place in the Canon alike of the Eastern and Western churches.

I. Name.

The Hebrew copy of the book which Jerome knew bore, according to his explicit testimony (see his preface to his version of Libri Sol.), the same title as the canonical Proverbs, i.e. meshalim, "Proverbs" (Parabolae is Jerome’s word). It is quoted in rabbinical literally, by the sing. of this name, mashal = Aramaic mathla’, but in the Talmud it is cited by the author’s name, "Ben Sira" (ben cira’). The Hebrew fragments found in recent years have no title attached to them. In the Greek manuscripts the heading is Sophia Iesou huiou Sirach (or Seirach), "The Wisdom of Jesus, son of Sirach" (so "A"); or simply Sophia Seirach (B), "The Wisdom of Sirach." The Fathers called it either (as Euseb., etc.) he panaretos sophia, "the all virtuous wisdom," or simply he panaretos, "the all virtuous (one)," or (Clement of Alexandria) paidagogos, "teacher." The first Hebrew and the several Greek titles describe the subject-matter, one Hebrew title (ben cira’) the author. But the Latin name Ecclesiasticus was given the book because it was one of the books allowed to be read in the Ecclesia, or church, for edification (libri ecclesiastici), though not one of the books of the Canon (libra canonici) which could be quoted in proof or disproof of doctrine. The present book is called Ecclesiasticus by way of preeminence since the time of Cyprian (Testimon. 2, etc.). The Syriac (Peshitta) title as given in the London Polyglot is "The Book of Jesus the son of Simon ‘Acira’, called also the Book of the Wisdom of Baruch (= Hebrew ben, "son of") ‘Acira’." There can be no doubt that Asira (sometimes translated "bound") is but a corrupted form of Sira. For other explanations see Ryssel in Kautzsch, AT Apocrypha, 234.

Lagarde in his corrected text prefixes the title, "The Wisdom of Baruch = Hebrew ben, "son of") Sira."

How is that the Hebrew cira', has in the Greek become Sirach (or Seirach)? How are we to explain the final chapter in the Greek? The present writer thinks it is due to an attempt to represent in writing the guttural sound of the final letter 'aleph (') in the Hebrew name as in the Greek Akeldamach, for the Aramaic chaqal dema' (Ac 1:19). Dalman, however (Aramaic Grammar, 161, note 6), followed by Ryssel, holds that the final chapter is simply a sign that the word is indeclinable; compare Iosech (Lu 3:26), for Hebrew yoce.

II. Canonicity.

Though older than both Da and Esther, this book was never admitted into the Jewish Canon. There are numerous quotations from it, however, in Talmudic and rabbinic literature, (see a list in Zunz, Die Gottesdiensilichen Vortrage(2), 101 f; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jud. Poesie, 204 f; Schechter, JQR, III, 682-706; Cowley and Neubauer, The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus, xix-xxx). It is not referred to explicitly in Scripture, yet it is always cited by Jewish and Christian writers with respect and perhaps sometimes as Scripture. It forms a part of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) of the Tridentine Council and therefore of the Romanist Canon, but the Protestant churches have never recognized it as canonical, though the bulk of modern Protestant scholars set a much higher value upon it than they do upon many books in the Protestant Canon (Chronicles, Esther, etc.). It was accepted as of canonical rank by Augustine and by the Councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397, 419), yet it is omitted from the lists of accepted books given by Melito (circa 180 AD), Origen, in the Apostolic Canons and in the list of the Councils of Laodicea (341 and 381). Jerome writes in Libri Sol.: "Let the church read these two books (Wisdom and Sirach) for the instruction of the people, not for establishing the authority of the dogmas of the church." It suffered in the respect of many because it was not usually connected with a great name; compare the so-called "Proverbs of Solomon." Sirach is cited or referred to frequently in the Epistle of James (Jas 1:2-4—compare Sirach 2:1-5; Jas 1:5—compare Sirach 1:26; 41:22; 51:13 f; Jas 1:8 ("double minded")—compare Sirach 1:28, etc.). The book is often cited in the works of the Fathers (Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Augustine, etc.) and also in the Apostolical Constitutions with the formula that introduces Scripture passages: "The Scripture says," etc. The Reformers valued Sirach highly, and parts of it have been incorporated into the Anglican Prayer-book.

III. Contents.

It is quite impossible in the book as it stands to trace any one scheme of thought, for the author's mind moves lightly from topic to topic, recurring frequently to the same theme and repeating not seldom the same idea. It is, however, too much to say with Sonntag (De Jesu Siracidae, etc.) that the book is a farrago of sayings with no connection, or with Berthold that the "work is but a rhapsody," for the whole is informed and controlled by one master thought, the supreme value to everyone of Wisdom. By this last the writer means the Jewish religion as conceived by enlightened Jews toward the beginning of the 2nd century BC, and as reflected in the Law of Moses (see Sirach 24:23-34), and in a less degree in the books of the Prophets and in the other writings (see Prologue). The book follows the lines of the canonical Book of Proverbs, and is made up of short pithy sayings with occasional longer discussions, largely collected but in part composed, and all informed and governed by the dominant note of the book: true Wisdom, the chief end of man. Most of the book is poetical in form, and even in the prose parts the

parallelism of Hebrew poetry is found. Many unsuccessful attempts have been made to trace a definite continuous line of reasoning in the book, but the vital differences in the schemes propounded suggest what an examination of the book itself confirms, that the compiler and author put his materials together with little or no regard to logical connection, though he never loses sight of his main theme—Wisdom, the chief thing.

Eichhorn (Einleitung, 50 ff) divides the book into three parts (Sirach 1-23; 24-42:14; 42:15-50:24), and maintains that at first each of these was a separate work, united subsequently by the author. Julian divides the work into three, Scholz into twelve, Fritzsche (Einleitung, xxxii) and Ryssel (op. cit., 240) into seven, Edershelm (op. cit., 19 f) and R.G. Moulton (Modern Reader's Bible: Ecclus, xvi ff) into five portions, and many other arrangements have been proposed and defended as by Ewald, Holzmann, Bissell, Zockler, etc. That there are small independent sections, essayettes, poems, etc., was seen by the early scribes to whom the Septuagint in its present form was largely due, for they have prefixed headings to the sections beginning with the following verses: Sirach 18:30 ("Temperance of Soul"); 20:27 ("Proverbs"); 23:7 ("Discipline of the Mouth"); 24:1 ("The Praise of Wisdom"); 30:1 ("Concerning Children"); 30:14 ("Concerning Health"); 30:16 ("Concerning Foods "; this is absent from many manuscripts, though retained by Swete who, however, omits the preceding heading); 30:24 (English Versions of the Bible 33:24, "Concerning Servants"); Sirach 35 (English Versions of the Bible 32:1, "Concerning Rulers"); 44:1 ("Praise of the Fathers"); 51:1 ("The Prayer of Jesus, Son of Sirach"). Probably the whole book possessed such headings at one time, and it is quite possible that they originated in the need to guide readers after the book had become one of the chief church reading-books (so W. J. Deane ii The Expositor, II, vi, 327). These headings are given in English in the King James Version proper (in the margin), though in modern reprints, as also in the Revised Version (British and American), they are unfortunately omitted. The whole book has been arranged in headed sections by H. J. Holzmann (Bunsen's Bibelwerk, IX, 392 ff) and by R. G. Moulton (op. cit.).

IV. Teaching.

In general it may be said that the principles enunciated in this book agree with those of the Wisdom school of Palestinian Judaism about 200 BC, though there is not a word in the book about a Messianic hope or the setting up of a Messianic kingdom. None of the views characteristic of Alexandrian Judaism and absent from the teaching of Palestinian Judaism are to be found in this book, though some of them at least are represented in Wisdom (see WISDOM OF SOLOMON, VI; TEACHING). Girorer (Milo und die jud.-alex. Philo., II, 18 ff) and Dahne (Gesch. der jud.-alex. rel. Phil., II, 141 ff) hold that the book contains many Alexandrian expressions and numerous statements peculiar to the Alexandrian philosophy. But apart from some late interpolations, mostly Christian, what these German scholars say is untrue, as Drummond (Philo Judaeus, I, 144 ff), Deane (Expos, II, v, 334 ff) and others have shown. The outstanding features of Alexandrianism are the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures, its conception of the ecstatic vision of God, its doctrine of mediating powers between man and God and its adoption of purely Greek ideas. None of these can be traced in Sir. The Hebrews never developed a theoretical or speculative theology or philosophy: all their thinking gathered about life and conduct; the duties that men owed to God and to one another; the hopes that they cherished and the fears by which they were animated. This is the only philosophy which the Bible and the so-called Apocrypha teach, and it is seen

at its highest point in the so-called WISDOM LITERATURE (which see). The main lines of the teaching of Sirach may be set out as follows, under the three heads of religion, morals, and manners.

1. Religion:

(1) God.

The view of God given in this book agrees generally with that put forth by the later writers of the Old Testament from the exile (Second Isaiah, Job, etc.) onward, though the God of this book lacks the love and tenderness of the Yahweh of the Old Testament prophets. God is present everywhere (Sirach 16:17-23); He created the world as an ordered whole (Sirach 16:26-30) and made man intelligent and supreme over all flesh. The expressions used are no doubt modeled on Ge 1, and it may fairly be inferred that creation out of nothing is meant. Wisdom, on the other hand, teaches the Alexandrian doctrine that matter (hule) is eternal and that the Creator's work consisted of fashioning, adapting and beautifying. The world is a creature of God, not (as in Philo, etc.) an emanation from Him. Yet is He compassionate and forgiving (Sirach 17:24 ff). His works are past finding out (Sirach 18:2 ff); but His compassion is upon all flesh (Sirach 18:13), i.e. upon all that accept His chastening and seek to do His will (Sirach 18:14). In Sirach 43:27 God is said to be "the all" (to pan), which simply means that He pervades and is the ground of everything. It is not Alexandrian pantheism that is taught. Gfrorer and others take a contrary view.

(2) Revelation.

In harmony with other products of the "Wise Men," Sirach sets chief value upon natural religion, that revealed in the instincts, reason and conscience of man as well as by the sun, moon, stars, etc. Yet Sirach gives far more prominence than Proverbs to the idea that the Divine Will is specially made known in the Law of Moses (Sirach 24:23; 45:1-4). We do not meet once with the word "law" in Ecclesiastes, nor law in the technical sense (Law of Moses) in either Job, Wisdom or Proverbs. In the last-named it is simply one of many synonyms denoting "Wisdom." In Sirach the word occurs over 20 times, not, however, always, even when the expression "Law of Moses" is used, in the sense of the "five books" (Pentateuch). It generally includes in its connotation also "the prophecies and the rest of the books" (Prologue); see Sirach 32 (Septuagint 35):24; 33 (Septuagint 36):1-3.

(3) Sin.

Sin is due to the wrong exercise of man's free will. Men can, if they like, keep the commandments, and when they break from them they are themselves alone to be blamed (Sirach 15:14-17). Yet it was through a woman (Eve) that sin entered the world and death by sin (Sirach 25:24; compare 1Ti 2:14). See Ro 5:12 where "one man," strictly "human being" (5:14, "Adam"), is made the first cause of sin. But nowhere in Sirach is the doctrine of original sin taught.

(4) Predestination.

Notwithstanding the prominence given to "free will" (see (3), above), Sirach teaches the doctrine of predestination, for God has determined that some men should be high and some low, some blessed and others cursed (33:10 ft).

(5) Satan.

The word "Satan" (Satanas) in Sirach 21:27 (it occurs nowhere else in the Apocrypha) denotes one's own wicked heart, as the parallelism shows.

(6) Salvation.

There is no salvation except by way of good works on man's part (Sirach 14:16 f) and forgiveness on God's (Sirach 17:24-32). The only atonement is through one's own good works (Sirach 5:5 f), honoring parents (Sirach 32:14 f), almsgiving, etc. (Sirach 3:30; 17:19 ff). There is no objective atonement ("expiation," literally, "propitiation"; the Greek verb exilaskomai, is the great Septuagint word for the Hebrew kipper, "to atone").

(7) Sacrifice.

The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to God (Sirach 34:18 ff), though He Himself appointed sacrifices and first-fruits (Sirach 45:20 f), and when the righteous offer sacrifices to God they are accepted and remembered in the time to come (Sirach 35:1-12).

(8) Feasts.

Festivals as well as seasons are ordained by God to be observed by man (Sirach 33 (Septuagint 36):8 f; compare Ge 1:14).

(9) Prayer.

The duty of prayer is often pointed out (Sirach 37:15, etc.), the necessary preparation defined (Sirach 17:25; 18:20,23), and its successful issue promised (Sirach 35:17). There must be no vain repetitions (Sirach 7:14; compare Mt 6:7), nor should there be any faint-heartedness in the matter (Sirach 5:10; compare Jas 1:6). Men are to pray in sickness (Sirach 38:9), but all the same the physician should be consulted and his advice followed (Sirach 38:1 f, 12 ff).

(10) Angelology.

Sirach nowhere clearly expresses his belief in angels or uses language which implies such a belief. For "an angel (ho aggelos) destroyed them" the Hebrew of the original passage (2Ki 19:35) has maggephah, "plague," and so the Syriac, though the Septuagint (followed by the Vulgate) has "angel."

(11) Eschatology.

Nowhere in this book is the doctrine of a future life taught, and the whole teaching of the book leaves no place for such a doctrine. Men will be indeed rewarded or punished according to their conduct, but in this world (see Sirach 2:10 f; 9:12; 11:26 f). The retribution is, however, not confined to the individuals in their lifetime; it extends to their children and involves their own glorious or inglorious name after death (see Sirach 11:28; 40:15; 41:6; 44:11-13). The passage concerning Gehenna (Sirach 7:17) is undoubtedly spurious and is lacking in the Syriac, Ethiopic, etc. Since the book is silent as to a future life, it is of necessity silent on the question of a resurrection. Nothing is hinted as to a life beyond the grave, even in Sirach 41:1-4, where the author deprecates the fear of death. In these matters Sirach agrees with the Pentateuch and the prophetic and poetical books of the Old Testament (Psalms, Job, etc.), none of which give any intimation of a life beyond the grave. Little or nothing is said of the Messianic hope which must have been entertained largely by Palestinian Jews living in the author's time, though in Sirach 36 (Septuagint 33):1-17 the writer prays for the restoration of Israel and Jerusalem, i.e. R.H. Charles thinks (Eschatology, etc., 65), for the bringing in of the Messianic kingdom.

(12) Sirach's Doctrine of Wisdom.

For a general discussion of the rise and development of the conception of Wisdom in the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha see WISDOM LITERATURE. A brief statement as to what the word implies in Sirach is all that can here be attempted. It is in chapters 1 and 24 that Ben Sira's doctrine is chiefly contained.

Wisdom is from God: He created it and it must therefore have a separate existence. Yet it is dependent on Him. It is omnipresent, though it dwells in a peculiar sense with all flesh. The root and beginning of Wisdom, its fullness and crown, are the fear of God (Sirach 1:14,16,18,21); so that only the obedient and pious possess it (Sirach 1:10,26); indeed Wisdom is identified with the fear of the Lord and the observance of the Law (Sirach 19:20); it is even made one with the Law of Moses (Sirach 24:23), i.e. it consists of practical principles, of precepts regulating the life. In this doctrine we have a combination of universalism, principles of reason and Jewish particularism as the teaching of the revealed Law. We have the first in Sirach 24:3-21; the second in 24:23-34. Have we in this chapter, as in Proverbs, nothing outside the teaching of Palestinian Judaism? Gfrorer (op. cit., II, 18 ff) denies this, maintaining that the whole of Sirach 24 was written by an Alexandrian Jew and adopted unchanged by Ben Sira. But what is there in this chapter which an orthodox, well-informed Palestinian Jew of Ben Sira's time might not well have written? It is quite another question whether this whole conception of Wisdom in the so-called Wisdom books is not due, in some measure, to Greek, though not Alexandrian, influence, unless indeed the Greek influence came by way of Alexandria. In the philosophy of Socrates, and in a less exclusive sense in that of Plato and Aristotle, the good man is the wise one. Cheyne (Job and Solomon, 190) goes probably too far when he says, "By Greek philosophy Sirach, as far as we can see, was wholly uninfluenced."

2. Morals:

The ethical principle of Sirach is Hedonism or individual utilitarianism, as is that of Proverbs and the Old Testament generally, though in the Psalms and in the prophetical writings gratitude to God for the love He has shown and the kind acts He has performed is the basis of endless appeals and vows. Moreover, the individual point of view is reached only in the late parts of the Old Testament. In the older Old Testament books, as in Plato, etc., it is the state that constitutes the unit, not the individual human being. The rewards and penalties of conduct, good and bad, belong to this present world. See what is said in (11) "Eschatology," above; see also Sirach 2:7 f; 11:17; 16:6 f; 40:13 f, etc.

The hedonistic principle is carried so far that we are urged to help the good because they are most likely to prove serviceable to us (Sirach 12:2); to aid our fellow-man in distress, so that in his days of prosperity he may be our friend (Sirach 22:23); contrast the teaching of Jesus Christ (Lu 6:30-36). Friends are to be bemoaned for appearance' sake (Sirach 38:17). Yet many of the precepts are lofty. We are exhorted to show kindness and forbearance to the poor and to give help to our fellow-man (Sirach 29:8,20); to give alms (Sirach 12:3); speak kindly (Sirach 18:15-18); masters should treat servants as brethren, nay as they would themselves be treated (Sirach 7:20-22; 33:30 f); parents should give heed to the proper training of their children (Sirach 3:2; 7:23; 30:1-13); and children ought to respect and obey their parents (Sirach 3:1-16). It is men's duty to defend the truth and to fight for it. So shall the Lord fight for them (Sirach 4:25,28). Pride is denounced (Sirach 10:2 ff), and humility (Sirach 3:18), as well as forgiveness (Sirach 28:2), commended.

3. Manners:

Sirach is as much a code of etiquette as one of ethics, the motive being almost invariably the individual's own good. Far more attention is given to "manners" in Sirach than in Proverbs, owing to the fact that a more complex and artificial state of society had arisen in Palestine. When one is invited to a banquet he is not to show greed or to be too forward in helping himself to the good things provided. He is to be the first to leave and not to be insatiable (Sirach 31:12-18). Moderation in eating is necessary for health as well as for appearance' sake (Sirach 31:19-22). Mourning for the dead is a social propriety, and it should on that account be carefully carried out, since failure to do this brings bad repute (Sirach 38:16 f). It is quite wrong to stand in front of people's doors, peeping and listening: only fools do this (Sirach 21:23 f). Music and wine are praised: nay even a "concert of music" and a "banquet of wine" are good in their season and in moderation (Sirach 32 (Septuagint 35):5 f). The author has not a high opinion of woman (Sirach 25:13). A man is to be on his strict guard against singing and dancing girls and harlots, and adultery is an evil to be feared and avoided (Sirach 36:18-26). From a woman sin began, and it is through her that we all die (Sirach 25:4). Yet no one has used more eulogistic terms in praising the good wife than Ben Sira (Sirach 26:1 ff), or in extolling the happiness of the home when the husband and wife "walk together in agreement" (Sirach 25:1).

4. Counsels of Prudence:

Never lend money to a man more powerful than thyself or thou wilt probably lose it (Sirach 8:12). It is unwise to become surety for another (Sirach 29:18; 8:13), yet for a good man one would become surety (Sirach 29:14) and he would even lend to him (Sirach 29:1 ff). It should be remembered that in those times lending and becoming financially liable were acts of kindness, pure and simple: the Jewish Law forbade the taking of interest in any form (see Century Bible, "Ezra," etc., 198). "A slip on, a pavement is better than a slip with the tongue," so guard thy mouth (Sirach 20:18); "He that is wise in words shall advance himself; and one that is prudent will please great men" (Sirach 20:27). The writer has the pride of his class, for he thinks the common untrained mind, that of the plowman, carpenter and the like, has little capacity for dealing with problems of the intellect (Sirach 38:24-34).

V. Literary Form.

The bulk of the book is poetical in form, abounding in that parallelism which characterizes Hebrew poetry, though it is less antithetic and regular than in Prov. No definite meter has been discovered, though Bickell, Margoliouth and others maintain the contrary (see POETRY, HEBREW). Even in the prose parts parallelism is found. The only strophic arrangement is that suggested by similarity of subject-matter.

Bickell (Zeitschr. far katholische Theol., 1882) translated Sirach 51:1-20 back into Hebrew and tried to prove that it is an alphabetic acrostic psalm, and Taylor supports this view by an examination of the lately discovered fragments of the Hebrew text (see The Wisdom of Ben Sira, etc., by S. Schechter and C. Taylor, lxxix ff). After Sirach 51:12 of the Greek and other versions the Hebrew has a psalm of 15 verses closely resembling Ps 136; but the Hebrew version of Sirach 51:1-20 does not favor Bickell’s view, nor does the ps, found only in the Hebrew, lend much support to what either Bickell or Taylor says. Space precludes detailed proofs.

VI. Author.

1. Jesus, Son of Sirach:

The proper name of the author was Jesus (Jeshua, Greek Iesous(?)), the family name being "Ben Sira." The full name would be therefore "Jesus Ben Sirs." In the Talmud and other Jewish writings he is known as "Ben Sira," literally, "son (or descendant?) of Sira." Who Sira was is unknown. No other book in the Apocrypha gives the name of its author as the Prologue to Sirach does. In the best Greek manuscripts (Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus) of Sirach 50:27, the author’s name appears as ‘Iesous huios Seirach Eleazar ho Hierosolumeites, "Jesus the son of Sirach (son of) Eleazar the Jerusalemite." For the last two words Codex Sinaiticus has by a copyist’s error, ho hiereus ho Solumeites, "the Solomon-like priest." The Hebrew text of Sirach 50:27 and 51:30 gives the following genealogy: Simeon son of Jesus, son of Eleazar, son of Sira, making the author the grandson and not the son of Sira, and so he is called by Saadia; see HDB (Nestle) and EB, II, 1165 (Toy). We know nothing of Ben Sira beyond what can be gathered from the book itself. He was a resident in Palestine (24:10 f), an orthodox Jew, well read in at least Jewish literature, a shrewd observer of life, with a philosophical bent, though true to the national

faith. He had traveled far and seen much (34:11 f). His interests were too general and his outlook too wide to allow of his being either a priest or a scribe.

2. Other Views:

Many suppositions have been put forward as to the author's identity.

(1) That the Author Was a Priest:

So in Codex Sinaiticus (Sirach 50:27). In Sirach 7:29-31 he speaks much of the priesthood, and there are numerous references to sacrifices in the book. In 45:6-26 he has a long poem in praise of Aaron and his high-priesthood. Yet on the whole Ben Sira does not write as a priest.

(2) That He Was a High Priest:

So Syncellus (Chronicles, edition Dindf., 1 525) through a misunderstanding of a passage in Eusebius. But the teaching and temper of the book make this supposition more improbable than the last.

(3) That He Was a Physician:

An inference drawn from Sirach 38:1 f, 12 ff and other references to the professional healer of the body (10:10). But this is a very small foundation on which to build so great an edifice.

(4) That He Was One of the 72 Translators (Septuagint):

So Lapide (Comm.), Calmer, Goldhager, a wholly unsupported hypothesis.

(5) No One of Course Believes that Solomon Wrote the Book:

Though many of the early Fathers held that he was the author of the five Wisdom Books—Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, Sirach and Wisdom.

VII. Unity and Intergrity.

There is, on the whole, such a uniformity in the style and teaching of the book that most scholars agree in ascribing the whole book (except, the Prologue, which is the work of the translator) to Ben Sira. This does not mean that he composed every line; he must have adopted current sayings, written and oral, and this will account for the apparent contradictions, as about becoming surety (Sirach 29:14), and refusing to become surety (Sirach 8:13; 29:18); words in praise (Sirach 25:1; 26:1 ff) and condemnation of women (Sirach 25:4,13; 36:18-26); the varying estimates of life (Sirach 36:16-35; 40:1-11), etc. But in these seeming opposites we have probably no more than complementary principles, the whole making

up the complete truth. Nothing is more manifest in the book than the all-pervading thought of one dominant mind. Some have denied the genuineness of Sirach 51, but the evidence is at least indecisive. There is nothing in this chapter inconsistent with the rest of the book.

In the recently discovered fragments of Hebrew text there is a psalm between Sirach 51:12 and 13 of the Greek and English Versions of the Bible which seems a copy of Ps 136. It is absent from the versions and its genuineness is doubtful. But in both the Hebrew and Greek texts there are undoubted additions and omissions. There are, in the Greek, frequent glosses by Christian editors or copyists and other changes (by the translators?) in the direction of Alexandrian Judaism; see Speaker's Apocrypha and other commentaries for details.

VIII. Date.

In the book itself there is one mark of definite date (Sirach 50:1), and in the Prologue there is another. Unfortunately both are ambiguous. In the Prologue the translator, whose grandfather or ancestor (Greek pappos) wrote the book (the younger Siracides, as he is called), says that he reached Egypt, where he found and translated this book in the reign of Euergetes, king of Egypt. But there were two Egyptian kings called Euergetes, namely, Ptolemy Euergetes, or Euergetes I (247-222 BC), and Ptolemy VII Physcon, or Euergetes II (218-198 BC). Sirach 50:1 mentions, among the great men whom he praises, Simon the high priest, son of Onias, who is named last in the list and lived probably near the time of the elder Siracidess. But there were two high priests called Simon and each of them was a son of Onias, namely, Simon I, son of Onias I (circa 310-290 BC), and Simon II, son of Onias II (circa 218-198 BC). Scholars differ as to which Euergetes is meant in the Prologue and which Simon in 50:1.

1. Most Probable Views:

The conclusions to which the evidence has brought the present writer are these: (1) that Simon I (died 290 BC) is the high priest meant; (2) that Ptolemy VII Physcon (218-198 BC) is the Euergetes meant.

(1) In Favor of the First Proposition Are the Following:

(a) The book must have been written some time after the death of Simon, for in the meantime an artificial fame had gathered around the name, and the very allusion to him as a hero of the past makes it clear that he had been long dead. Assuming that Simon had died in 290 BC, as seems likely, it is a reasonable conclusion that the original Hebrew work was composed somewhat later than 250 BC. If Simon II is the man intended, the book could hardly have been composed before 150 BC, an impossible date; see below.

(b) In the list of great men in Sirach 44-50 the praises of Simon (50:1 ff) are sung after those of Nehemiah (Sirach 49:13), suggesting that the space of time between them was not very great.

(c) The "Simon the Just" of Josephus was certainly Simon I, he being so called, this Jewish historian

says (Ant., XII, ii, 5), on account of his piety and kindness.

(d) It is probable that the "Simon the Just" of the Mishna (’Abhoth i.2) is also Simon I, though this is not certain. It is said of him that he was one of the last members of the great synagogue and in the Talmud he is the hero of many glorifying legends. The so-called great synagogue never really existed, but the date assigned to it in Jewish tradition shows that it is Simon I that is thought of.

(e) In the Syriac version (Pesh) Sirach 50:23 reads thus: "Let it (peace) be established with Simon the Just," etc. Some manuscripts have "Simon the Kind." This text may of course be wrong, but Graetz and Edersheim support it. This is the exact title given to Simon I by Josephus (op. cit.), the Mishna and by Jewish tradition generally.

(f) The only references to Simon II in Jewish history and tradition depict him in an unfavorable light. In 2 Macc 3 he is the betrayer of the temple to the Syrians. Even if the incident of the above chapter were unhistorical, there must have been some basis for the legend. Josephus (Ant., XII, iv, 10 f) makes him side with the sons of Tobias against Hyrcanus, son of Joseph, the wrong side from the orthodox Jewish point of view.

(g) The high priest Simon is said (Sirach 50:1-13) to have repaired the temple and fortified the city. Edersheim says that the temple and city stood in need of what is here described in the time of Simon I, but not in the time of Simon II, for Ptolemy I (247-222 BC) in his wars with Demetrius destroyed many fortifications in Palestine to prevent their falling into the hands of the enemy, among which Acco, Joppa, Gaza are named, and it is natural to think that the capital and its sanctuary were included. This is, however, but a priori reasoning, and Derenbourg argues that Simon II must be meant, since according to Josephus (Ant., XII, iii, 3) Antiochus the Great (223-187 BC) wrote a letter in which he undertakes that the city and temple of Jerusalem shall be fully restored. This is not, however, to say that Simon II or anyone else did, at that time, restore either.

(h) Of the numerous errors in the Greek text some at least seem due to the fact that the version in that language was made so long after the composition of the original Hebrew that the sense of several Hebrew words had become lost among the Alexandrian Jews. If we assume that the Simon of chapter 50 was Simon I (died 290 BC), so that the Hebrew work was composed about 250 BC; if we further assume that the Euergetes of the Prologue was Ptolemy VII (died 198 BC), there is a reasonable space of time to allow the sense of the Hebrew to be lost in many instances (see Halevy, Revue semitique, July, 1899). It must be admitted that there is no decisive evidence on one side or the other, but the balance weighs in favor of Simon I in the opinion of the present writer.

(2) Euergetes of the Prologue:

That the Euergetes of the Prologue in whose reign the translation was made must have been Ptolemy VII Physcon, Euergetes II, seems proved by the translator’s statement that he came to Egypt in the 38th year, epi tou Euergetou basileos, i.e. almost certainly of the reign of Euergetes, for what reason could the

younger Siracides have for giving his own age? Now Euergetes I reigned but 25 years, but Euergetes II (Physcon) reigned in all 54 years, from 170 to 145 BC as regent with his father, and from 145 to 116 BC as sole monarch. If we accept this interpretation of the above words, the question is settled. Westcott, however (DB, 1863, I, 479, note c), says "the words can only mean that the translator in his 38th year came to Egypt during the reign of Euergetes." The other rendering adopted by Eichhorn is, he adds, "absolutely set at variance with the grammatical structure of the sentence." In the second edition of DB (1893) this note has become expunged, and the article as edited by D.S. Margoliouth (I, 841) teaches the contrary view, which is now accepted by nearly all scholars (Schurer, etc.). We may therefore assume that the original Hebrew book was composed about 240-200 BC, or some 50 or more years after the death of Simon I, and that the translation was made about 130 BC, for the younger Siracides came to Egypt in 132 BC, and he gives us to understand in the Prologue that he translated the Hebrew work of his grandfather almost immediately after reaching that country. If Simon II (died 198 BC) is meant in Sirach 50, we are compelled to assume a date for the original work of about 150 BC in order to allow time for the growth of the halo of legend which had gathered about Simon. The translation must, in that case, have been completed some 20 years after the composition of the Hebrew, a conclusion which the evidence opposes. The teaching of the book belongs to 200 BC, or slightly earlier. The doctrine of the resurrection taught in Daniel (165 BC) is ignored in Sirach, as it has not yet become Jewish doctrine.

2. Brief Statement of Other Views:

(1) That the Euergetes of the Prologue and the Simon of chapter 50 are in both cases the first so called. So Hug, Scholz, Welt, Keil, Edersheim (Speaker’s Apocrypha) and many others. The book was accordingly written after 290 BC, perhaps in 250 BC, or later, and the translation was made some time after 220 BC, say 200 BC.

(2) That Euergetes II (died 116 BC) and Simon II (died 198 BC) are the two persons referred to. So Eichhorn, De Wette, Ewald, Franz Delitzsch, Hitzig, Schurer.

(3) Hitzig (Psalms, 1836, II, 118) made the original work a product of the Maccabean period—an impossible supposition, for the book says nothing at all about the Maccabees. Moreover, the priestly house of Zadok is praised in this book (Sirach 50, etc.); it was held in little respect during the time of the Maccabean wars, owing to the sympathy it showed toward the Hellenizing party.

IX. Original Languages.

1. Composed in Hebrew:

Even before the discovery of the substantial fragments of what is probably the original Hebrew text of this book, nearly all scholars had reached the conclusion that Sirach was composed in Hebrew.

(1) The fact of a Hebrew original is definitely stated in the Prologue.

(2) Jerome (Praef. in vers. libri Sol.) says that he had seen the Hebrew original—the same text probably that underlies the fragments recently published, though we cannot be sure of this.

(3) Citations apparently from the same Hebrew text are made not seldom in Talmudic and rabbinical literature.

(4) There are some word-plays in the book which in the Greek are lost, but which reappear in the discovered Hebrew text, e.g. (Sirach 43:8) ho men kata to onoma autes estin auxanomene (read ananeomene), "the month is called after her name," chodhesh kishemo hu’ mitchadhes, "the moon according to its name renews itself"; the Hebrew words for "moon" and "renews itself" come from one root, as if we said in English—what of course is not English—"the moon moons itself."

There are other cases where mistakes and omissions in the Greek are explained by a reference to the newly found Hebrew text.C, or some 50 or more years after the death of Simon I, and that the translation was made about 130 BC, for the younger Siracides came to Egypt in 132 BC, and he gives us to understand in the Prologue that he translated the Hebrew work of his grandfather almost immediately after reaching that country. If Simon II (died 198 BC) is meant in Sirach 50, we are compelled to assume a date for the original work of about 150 BC in order to allow time for the growth of the halo of legend which had gathered about Simon. The translation must, in that case, have been completed some 20 years after the composition of the Hebrew, a conclusion which the evidence opposes. The teaching of the book belongs to 200 BC, or slightly earlier. The doctrine of the resurrection taught in Daniel (165 BC) is ignored in Sirach, as it has not yet become Jewish doctrine.

The strongly supported conjecture of former years that the book was composed in Hebrew was turned into a practical certainty through the discovery, by Dr. S. Schechter and others in 1896 and after, of the fragments of a (probably the) Hebrew text called now A B C and D. These contain much over half the whole book, and that the text in them, nearly always identical when the same passages are given in more than one, is the original one, is exceedingly likely, to say the least.

2. Margoliouth’s View:

D. S. Margoliouth (Origin of the Original Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, 1899) has tried to prove that the Hebrew text of the fragments is a translation of a Persian version which is itself derived from Greek and Syriac. The proofs he offers have not convinced scholars.

(1) He refers to words in Hebrew which in that language are senseless, and he endeavors to show that they are disguised Persian words. As a matter of fact, in such cases the copyist has gone wholly wrong or the word is undecipherable.

(2) There do appear to be Persian glosses, but they are no part of the original text, and there can be no reasonable doubt that they are due to a Persian reader or copyist.

(3) There are many cases in which the Hebrew can be proved to be a better and older text than the Greek or Syriac (see Konig, The Expository Times, XI, 170 ff).

(4) As regards the character of the language, it may be said that in syntax it agrees in the main with the classical Hebrew of the Old Testament, but its vocabulary links it with the latest Old Testament books. Thus we have the use of the "waw-consecutive" with the imperfect (Sirach 43:23; 44:9,23; 45:2 f, etc.) and with the perfect (Sirach 42:1,8,11), though the use of the simple waw with both tenses occurs also. This mixed usage is exactly what meets us in the latest part of the Old Testament (Ecclesiastes, Esther, etc.). As regards vocabulary, the word chephets, has the sense of "thing," "matter," in Sirach 20:9, as in Ec 3:1; 5:7; 8:6. In general it may be said that the Hebrew is that of early post-Biblical times. Margoliouth holds that the extant Hebrew version is no older than the 11th century, which is impossible. His mistake is due to confounding the age of the manuscripts with that of the version they contain.

(5) It is nevertheless admitted that in some cases the Syriac or the Greek or both together preserve an older and correcter text than the Hebrew, but this because the latter has sometimes been miscopied and intentionally changed.

(6) The numerous Hebraisms in the Greek version which in the Hebrew have their original expression point to the same conclusion—that this Hebrew text is the original form of the book.

Margoliouth has been answered by Smend (TLZ, 1889, col. 506), Konig (Expository Times, X, XI, 1899-1900), Noldeke (ZATW, XX, 81-94), and by many others. Bickell (Zeitschrift fur katholische Theol., III, 387 ff) holds also that the Hebrew Sirach extant is a translation from the Greek or Syriac or both.

X. Versions.

1. Greek:

The Septuagint translation was made from the Hebrew direct; it is fairly correct, though in all the extant manuscripts the text is very corrupt in several places. (1) The book occurs in the uncials Vaticanus, Sinaiticus, Ephraemi, and part of Alexandrinus fairly free from glosses, though abounding in obvious errors.

(2) The text is found in a much purer form in Codex Venetus and also in Codex Sinaiticus (ca) and part of Codex Alexandrinus.

All extant Greek manuscripts except the late cursive 248 seem to go back to one original MS, since in all of them the two sections Sirach 30:25-33:15 and 33:16-36:11 have changed places, so that 33:16-36:11 follows 30:24 and 30:25-33:15 comes after 36:11. Most scholars accept the explanation of Fritzsche (Exeg. Handbuch zu den Apok, V, 21 f) that the two leaves on which these two parts (of similar size) were written got mixed, the wrong one being put first. On the other hand, the cursive 248 (14th century)

has these sections in their proper order, and the same is true of the Syriac (Peshitta), Latin and Armenian versions and of the Greek version of the Complutensian Polyglot (which follows throughout 248 and not the uncials) and English Versions of the Bible which is made from this Polyglot. The superiority of 248 to the older manuscript (B S A C V) is seen in other parts of the Greek text. In the other Greek manuscripts, Sirach 3:25 is omitted, as it is by Edersheim and most commentators before the discovery of the Hebrew text. But this last supports 248 in retaining the verse, and it is now generally kept. In 43:23 "islands" is properly read by 248, Vulgate, Syriac, 23 and the Hebrew, but older Greek manuscripts read "Jesus," making nonsense ("And Jesus planted her" [auten] for "he planted islands therein"). The other manuscripts have a text which yields no sense in 43:26: English Versions of the Bible "By reason of him his end hath success." The Greek of 248 and the Hebrew give this sense: "The angel is equipped for his task," etc.

2. Syriac:

The Syriac (Peshitta) version is now almost universally acknowledged to have been made from the Hebrew, of which, on the whole, it is a faithful rendering. In some places, however, it agrees with the Septuagint against the Hebrew, probably under the influence of the inaccurate idea that the Greek text is the original one. In this version the two sections Sirach 30:25-33:5 and 33:16-36:11 are in proper order, as in the Hebrew, a fresh proof that the Syriac is not translated from the Greek

3. Latin:

The Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) agrees with the Old Latin which follows the Septuagint closely. Lapide, Sabatier and Bengel tried to prove that the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) was based on the lost original Hebrew, but the evidence they supply falls far short of proof, and recently discovered Hebrew fragments show that they were wrong. The two sections transposed in the Septuagint (except 248) are also transposed in the Latin, showing that the latter is based on the Greek text. The Latin text of both Sirach and Wisdom according to the codex Amiant is given by Lagarde in his Mittheilungen, I, 243-84. This closely follows the Greek text.

4. English:

The King James Version follows the cursives and often repeats their errors. the Revised Version (British and American) is based, for the most part, on the uncials and thus often departs from the Hebrew. Sirach 3:19 is retained by the King James Version but omitted by the Revised Version (British and American). For the latter clause of the verse ("mysteries are revealed unto the meek"), the King James Version is supported by codex 248, the Syriac and the Hebrew. Both English Versions of the Bible should be corrected by the Hebrew in Sirach 7:26 and 38:1,15.

For fuller details concerning versions see Speaker’s Apocrypha, II, 23-32 (Edersheim); Kautzsch, Die Apok. des Altes Testament, I, 242 ff (Ryssel), and the article by Nestle in HDB, IV, 544 ff.

LITERATURE.

In addition to books mentioned under Apocrypha and in the course of the present article, note the following:

(1) The Text of the Hebrew Fragments:

For accounts of the discovery and decipherments of these see HDB, IV, 546 f (Nestle); Bible Polyglotte (F. Vigoureux), V, 4 ff; Schurer GJ V4, III, 221 ff. The text of the Hebrew as yet known is conveniently printed in the following: H. L. Strack, Die Spruche Jesus, etc. (with notes and glossary), Leipzig, 1903; Isaac Levi, The Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus (with notes and glossary), Leiden, 1906; Rudolf Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, Hebrew und Deutsch (with notes and glossary), Berlin, 1906. The Hebrew appears also in the Bible Polyglotte, edition F. Vigoureux, with the Septuagint, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and a French translation in parallel columns. (No other Polyglot has appeared since the discovery of the Hebrew.) There are parallel texts in Hebrew, Syriac, Greek and English, and also useful notes and tables in The Original Hebrew of Sirach 39:15-49:11, by Cowles and Neubauer, Oxford, 1897. Still later and fuller is The Wisdom of Ben Sira in Hebrew and English, with notes on the Hebrew by Schechter and Taylor, Cambridge, 1899.

(2) Commentaries:

The works of Fritzsche (1859), who neglects the evidence of the Syriac and ignores the Hebrew idioms in the book, and of Bissell (1880) and Edersheim (1888) appeared before the discovery of the Hebrew fragments. The last-named shows both learning and ingenuity in tracking the Hebrew idioms and in explaining difficulties by means of Hebrew. The following commentaries take full note of the Hebrew text as far as discovered: Israel Levi, L'Ecclesiastique ou la sagesse de Jesus fils de Sira: traduit et commente, Paris, 1898, 1901; Ryssel in Kautzsch's Apok. des Altes Testament, I, 280-475, exceedingly valuable, especially for the text and introduction, but he takes account of the Hebrew fragments published by Cowley and Neubauer only in this book. To complete his treatment of the Hebrew parts published after he wrote, see further articles by him in Stud. u. Krit., 1900-1-2; Knabenbaur, Commentarius in Ecclesiasticum, Paris, 1902; Peters, Der jungst wieder aufgefundene hebraische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus, 1902 (compare the notice by Smend, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1903, 72-77); Smend, Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklart, 1906 (full discussion of the book in the newest light; compare notice by Julicher in TLZ, 1908, 323-29). The New Oxford Apocrypha (Introduction and Notes), edition by R. H. Charles (1913), contains a full Introduction and Commentary. J. H. A. Hart has published separately a critical edition of codex 248, in which he collates the principal authorities, manuscript and printed.

(3) Dictionaries:

Of the Dict. articles those in HDB (Nestle, strong in the critical, but weak and defective on the historical and exegetical side); Encyclopedia Biblica (C. H. Toy, sound and well balanced); see also Jewish

Encyclopedia (Israel Levi) and Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) (W. Baxendale). For detailed register of the literature see HDB (Nestle); Jew Encyclopedia, "Sirach" (Israel Levi); and especially Schurer, GJ V4, III, 219 ff.

T. Witton Davies

SIRACH, THE ALPHABET OF

Usually called The Alphabet of Ben Sira. The compilation so designated consists of two lists of proverbs, 22 in Aramaic and 22 in Hebrew, arranged in each case as alphabet acrostics. Each of these proverbs is followed by a haggadic comm., with legends and tales, many of them indecent. Some of the proverbs in the Alphabets are probably genuine compositions by Ben Sira and are quoted as such in the Talmud, but in their present form the Alphabets are at least as late as the 11th century AD.

LITERATURE.

The only complete copy of the text known is in the British Museum, the copy in the Bodleian being defective. Steinschneider has published a reprint of this last with critical notes (Alphabeticum Syracidis, Berlin, 1854). Cowley and Neubauer (The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus), besides giving a general account of this work, add a translation into English of the Aramaic proverbs. In his brief but excellent articles in the Jewish Encyclopedia (Ben Sira, The Alphabet of), Dr. Louis Ginzberg (New York) also gives a translation of the 22 Aramaic proverbs with useful remarks after each. The work has been translated into Latin, Yiddish (often), Judeo-Spanish, French and German, but never, so far, completely into English.

T. Witton Davies

SIRAH, WELL OF

si’-ra (bor hacirah, "the pit," "well" or "cistern of Sarah"): The spot from which Abner was enticed back to Hebron to his death (2Sa 3:26). Josephus (Ant., VII, i, 5) calls it Be(r)sira, implying that it was a "well." It is possible that this spot is now ‘Ain Sarah, a spring which flows into a little tank near the west side of the road about a mile out of ancient Hebron, on the way to Jerusalem. There is, however, a curious cistern with steps known as Chamam Sarah ("Sarah’s bath") near Ramet el-Khalil, which is also possibly the site (PEF, 314, Sh XXI).

SIRION

sir’-i-on (siryon; Sanior): The name of Mt. Hermon among the Phoenicians (De 3:9). It is given as "Shirion" in Ps 29:6 (Hebrew "breastplate" or "body armor"). Here it is named with Lebanon. Sirion therefore probably did not denote a particular part of the Hermon Range, as did Senir, but may have

been suggested by the conformation of the range itself, as seen from the heights above the Phoenician coast.

SISAMAI

sis'-a-mi.

See SISMAI.

SISERA

sis'-er-a (cicera', of doubtful meaning; S(e)isara):

(1) Given in Judges 4 as the captain of the army of Jabin, king of Hazor. The accounts given of the battle of Sisera with Barak, as found in Judges 4 and 5, have important points of difference. The first is a prose, the second a poetic narrative. In the first only Naphtali and Zebulun are mentioned as being under the command of Barak; in the second 6 tribes are given as being under his command. In Judges 4 Sisera is known as the captain of Jabin's forces, while in Judges 5 he seems to have been an independent leader. There is also a difference as to the scene of the battle and as to the manner in which Sisera met his death at the hand of Jael. Because of these points of difference, added to the fact that this is the only account, in these early times, where a king did not lead his own forces, it is thought by many that there is here the combination of two traditions dealing with different and distinct events.

Sisera resided in Harosheth of the Gentiles, a place identified with el-Charithiyeh, on the right bank of the Kishon and commanding the way from the Central Plain to the sea. Taking the versions in the two chapters of Judges as being the account of a single campaign, we find Deborah urging Barak to combine the forces of Israel to wage war with Sisera as the representative of Jabin, the king of Hazor. The scene of the battle was on the plain at the foot of the slopes of Mt. Tabor (Jud 4:12-14), or at the foot of the Carmel heights (Jud 5:19). The attack of Barak and Deborah was so furious, animated as it was by the hatred of Sisera and the Canaanites, that the hosts of Sisera were put to rout, and Sisera, deserting his troops, fled on foot to the Northeast. He took refuge in the tent of Heber, near Kedesh, and here met death at the hands of Jael, the wife of Heber (see JAEL). Sisera's name had long produced fear in Israel because of his oppression of the people, his vast army and his 900 chariots of iron. His overthrow was the cause of much rejoicing and was celebrated by the song in which Deborah led the people.

See DEBORAH.

It is interesting to note that the great rabbi Aqiba, who fought so valiantly in the Jewish war for independence as standard bearer to Bar-cocheba, was descended from the ancient warlike Sisera of Harosheth.

(2) In Ezr 2:53 and Ne 7:55 the name Sisera, after a long interval, reappears in a family of the Nethinim.

There is no evidence that the latter Sisera is connected by family descent with the former.

C. E. Schenk

SISINNES

si-sin’-ez (Sisinnes): "The eparch (governor) of Syria and Phoenicia" under Darius Hystaspis (1 Esdras 6:3,7,27; 7:1) circa 520 BC =" Tattenai the governor beyond the river" in Ezr 5:3,6; 6:6,13. He took a prominent part in the efforts to prevent the rebuilding of the temple.

SISMAI

sis’-mi (tsitsmay; the King James Version Sisamai): A Judahite, of the descendants of the daughter of Sheshan and Jarha, his Egyptian servant (1Ch 2:40). Commentators have compared the name to tstsm, a Phoenician god (compare Rudolph Kittel, Commentary at the place; BDB, under the word).

SISTER

sis’-ter (’achoth): Used repeatedly in the Old Testament of a female

(1) having the same parents as another; or

(2) having one parent in common, with another, half-sister (Ge 20:12; Le 18:9), and also

(3) of a female belonging to the same family or clan as another, so a kinswoman (Ge 24:60; Job 42:11);

(4) also of a woman of the same country (Nu 25:18).

(5) Figuratively, the two kingdoms, Israel and Judah, are sisters (Eze 23:7).

(6) Confederate cities are conceived of as sisters (Eze 16:45).

(7) ‘Achoth is used of objects which go in pairs, as curtains, each ‘coupled to its sister’ (Ex 26:3,6), and of wings in pairs (Eze 1:9; 3:13);

(8) of virtues or conditions, with which one is closely related: "Say unto wisdom, thou art my sister" (Pr 7:4; compare Job 17:14);

(9) of a lover concerning his spouse, as a term of endearment (So 4:9 f; 5:1 f; 8:8).

In the New Testament, adelphe, used

(1) in sense of physical or blood kinship (Mt 12:50; 13:56; 19:29; Lu 10:39 f; 14:26; Joh 11:1 ff; 19:25; Ac 23:16);

(2) of fellow-members in Christ: "Phoebe, our sister" (Ro 16:1; see also 1Co 7:15; 1Ti 5:1; Jas 2:15);

(3) possibly, of a church, "thy elect sister" (2 Joh 1:13).

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

Edward Bagby Pollard

SISTER'S SON

The King James Version translates rightly

(1) ben-'achotho (Ge 29:13); and

(2) huios tes adelphes (Ac 23:16), and wrongly,

(3) anepsios (Col 4:10), where, without doubt, the real meaning is "cousin," as in the Revised Version (British and American).

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

SITH

sith: An Anglo-Saxon word meaning "afterward," "since" (Eze 35:6 the King James Version and the English Revised Version, the American Standard Revised Version "since").

SITHRI

sith'-ri (cithri): A grandson of Kohath (Ex 6:22).

SITNAH

sit'-na (siTnah, "hatred," "hostility"; echthria): The name of the second of the two wells dug by the herdsmen of Isaac, the cause of further "enmity" with the herdsmen of Gerer (Ge 26:21, margin "That is, Enmity"). The site is unknown, but Palmer (PEFS, 1871) finds an echo of the name in Shutnet er

Rucheibeh, the name of a small valley near Rucheibeh.

See REHOBOTH.

SITTING

sit’-ing (yashabh, "to sit down or still," daghar, "to brood," "hatch"; kathezomai, "to sit down," anakeimai, "to lie back," "recline"): The favorite position of the Orientals (Mal 3:3; Mt 9:9; 26:55 (compare Mt 5:1; Lu 4:20; 5:3); Mr 14:18; Lu 18:35; Joh 2:14, etc.).

"In Palestine people sit at all kinds of work; the carpenter saws, planes, and hews with his hand-adze, sitting upon the ground or upon the plank he is planing. The washerwoman sits by the tub, and, in a word, no one stands where it is possible to sit. .... On the low shopcounters the turbaned salesmen squat in the midst of the gay wares" (LB, II, 144, 275; III, 72, 75).

Figurative:

(1) To sit with denotes intimate fellowship (Ps 1:1; 26:5; Lu 13:29; Re 3:21);

(2) to sit in the dust indicates poverty and contempt (Isa 47:1), in darkness, ignorance (Mt 4:16) and trouble (Mic 7:8);

(3) to sit on thrones denotes authority, judgment, and glory (Mt 19:28).

M. O. Evans

SIVAN

se-van’, si’-van (ciwan): The third month of the Jewish year, corresponding to June (Es 8:9).

See CALENDAR.

SIXTY

siks’-ti (shishshim; hexekonta).

See NUMBER.

SKILL; SKILFUL

skil, skil'-fool (forms of yadha' (2Ch 2:14, etc.), bin (1Ch 15:22), sakhal (Da 1:4, etc.), lamadh (1Ch 5:18), chakham (1Ch 28:21), charash (Eze 21:31), yaTabh (Ps 33:3); in Apocrypha empeiria (The Wisdom of Solomon 13:13), episteme (Sirach 1:19; 38:3,6); adverb eumathos (The Wisdom of Solomon 13:11)): As a verb "to skill," meaning to have understanding or to be dexterous, common in Elizabethan English and in the King James Version and the English Revised Version (1Ki 5:6; 2Ch 2:7 f; 34:12), is obsolete. The American Standard Revised Version substitutes such expressions as "knoweth how" (1Ki 5:6) and "were skillful with" (2Ch 34:12). As a noun the word is used in the sense of "knowledge" (Ec 9:11), "insight" (Da 1:17), and "wisdom" (1Ch 28:21). The adjective skillful is used in corresponding senses, especially in the American Standard Revised Version, where it takes the place of "cunning" (Ex 26:31; 31:4; 35:33,35; 38:23; 2Ch 2:7,13,14; So 7:1; Isa 40:20; Jer 10:9) and of "curious" (Ex 35:32), where the Hebrew chashabh suggests planning or devising, and thus what we should call "original" work. Both the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version use the word in place of "eloquent" (Isa 3:3), "right" (Ec 4:4) and "cunning" (1Ch 25:7). In the first of these instances the Hebrew word means "understanding"; in the second, it refers to the manner of doing a thing, and in the third, to the training that makes one "skilled." the Revised Version (British and American) uses the word "skilled" of those that "took the war upon them" (Nu 31:27 the King James Version). Skillfulness (Ps 78:72) is used with reference to the hands, not only in their work, but also in guiding (as, e.g., a pilot). To play well (Hebrew heTibhu naggen), is rendered "play skillfully" (Ps 33:3). "Unskillful" is used with reference to the uninitiated in the sense of "inexperienced" (Heb 5:13, apeiros).

Nathan Isaacs

SKIN

('or, geledh, "human skin" (Job 16:15), basar, "flesh," in the sense of "nakedness" (Ps 102:5 the King James Version); derma):

Literal:

The word 'or designates the skin of both men and animals, the latter both raw and in tanned condition: "Yahweh God made for Adam and for his wife coats of skins ('or), and clothed them" (Ge 3:21); "She put the skins ('or) of the kids of the goats upon his hands, and upon the smooth of his neck" (Ge 27:16); "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?" (Jer 13:23). The Hebrew geledh is found in the sense of human skin: "I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin, and have laid my horn in the dust" (Job 16:15).

Figurative:

'To escape by the skin of the teeth' is equivalent to a narrow escape (Job 19:20). Satan says in his calumny of Job: "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life" (Job 2:4). The idea here is, that a man will endure or do the worst, even as it were the flaying of his body, to save his life. The Revised Version (British and American) has replaced "skin" as the translation of Hebrew basar by

"flesh": "My bones cleave to my flesh" (Ps 102:5). "The bars of his skin" is a poetical expression for "the members of his body" in Job 18:13 margin, where the text interprets rather than translates the original.

Skins served for purposes of clothing from an early date (Ge 3:21). In later days they were the raiment of prophets and hermits (Zec 13:4; Heb 11:37). Septuagint translates ‘addereth, "the mantle" of Elijah (1Ki 19:13,19; 2Ki 2:8,13 f), with melote, i.e. "sheepskin," the word in He being derived from these passages. It is not unlikely that the raiment of John the Baptist made "of camel’s hair" and the "leathern girdle about his loins" are identical with the rough garb of Old Testament prophets. The skins of cattle were largely employed for technical uses; "rams’ skins and badgers’ skins" are especially mentioned in the construction of the tabernacle as material for the waterproof covering of the roof (Ex 25:5; Nu 4:8,10).

The Revised Version, rejecting the translation "badgers’ skins," substitutes "sealskins" and adds "porpoise skins" in the margin. There is little doubt that the rendering of the King James Version is indeed incorrect. The Hebrew name of the animal (tachash) is the same as the Arabic tuchas, which means the dolphin and the "sea-cow" or halicore of the Red Sea, of which genus there are two species even now extant (H. tabernaculi Russ, and H. Helprichii Ehr.). It is probable that the Jews included various marine animals, seals, porpoises, dolphins and halicores, under the same expression.

See SEALSKIN.

In Eze 16:10 we find these skins mentioned as material for elegant shoes, and the Arabs of the Red Sea littoral use the same material in the manufacture of sandals. A quaint use was made of skins in the making of skin bottles, the qurbeh or qirbeh of modern Arabia. We find a great variety of Hebrew expressions, which possibly designated special varieties, all of which were rendered askos, in Septuagint and the New Testament (chemeth, no’dh, no’dhah, nebhel, nebhel, baqbuq, ‘obh). the Revised Version (British and American) has rendered the Greek askos in the New Testament by "wineskin" (Mt 9:17; Mr 2:22; Lu 5:37) with the marginal addition "that is, skins used as bottles." These skin bottles were made of the skins of goats, sheep, oxen or buffaloes; the former had more or less the shape of the animals, the holes of the extremities being closed by tying or sewing, and the neck of the skin being closed by a tap or a plug, while the larger ones were sewn together in various shapes. As a rule only the inside of the skin was tanned, the skin turned inside out, and the fluid or semi-fluid filled in, e.g. water, milk, butter, cheese. The hairy inside was not considered as in any way injurious to the contents. Only in the case of wine-and oil-skins was it thought advantageous to tan the skins inside and out.

H. L. E. Luering

SKIRT

skurt:

(1) kanaph, "wing" "extremity" (Ru 3:9, etc.), is the usual word. But in 1Sa 24:4 ff perhaps "corner" is the best translation.

(2) shul, "loose hanging" (Ex 28:33, etc.; in the King James Version often rendered "hem").

(3) peh, "mouth," "opening" (Ps 133:2, "the precious oil .... that came down upon the skirt"). But the "opening" is that for is that for the head, so that the Revised Version margin "collar" is the correct translation.

"Skirt" is frequently used in a euphemistic sense, for which the commentaries must be consulted.

See DRESS; TRAIN.

SKULL

skul (gulgoleth; kranion): The Hebrew word, which is well known to Bible readers in its Aramaic-Greek form "Golgotha," expresses the more or less globular shape of the human skull, being derived from a root meaning "to roll." It is often translated in English Versions of the Bible by "head," "poll," etc. In the meaning "skull" it is found twice (Jud 9:53; 2Ki 9:35). In the New Testament the word is found only in connection with GOLGOTHA (which see), "the place of a skull" (Mt 27:33; Mr 15:22; Joh 19:17), or "the skull" (Lu 23:33).

SKY

ski (shachaq, "fine dust" or "cloud," apparently from [?] shachaq, "to rub," "to pulverize"; Samaritan: shechaqayyah instead of Hebrew shamayim; sachq =" cloud," "small dust"):

1. In the Old Testament:

The Revised Version (British and American) has "skies" for the King James Version "clouds" in Job 35:5; 36:28; 37:21; Ps 36:5; 57:10; 68:34; 78:23; 108:4; Pr 3:20; 8:28, in which passages BDB supports the rendering of King James Version. In Ps 89:6,37 Revised Version (British and American) has "sky" for King James Version "heaven." English Versions has "sky" in De 33:26; 2Sa 22:12; Job 37:18; Ps 18:11; 77:1; Isa 45:8; Jer 51:9. The word occurs mainly in poetical passages.

2. In the New Ttestament:

In the New Testament ouranos, is translated "heaven" (the King James Version "sky") in connection with the weather in Mt 16:2,3; Lu 12:56. In Heb 11:12 we find "the stars of heaven" ("the sky") as a figure of multitude. The conception, however, that the visible "sky" is but the dome-like floor of a higher world often makes it hard to tell whether "heaven" in certain passages may or may not be identified with

the sky.

See HEAVEN; COSMOGONY.

Alfred Ely Day

SLANDER

slan’-der (substantive, dibbah, "slander"; diabolos, "slanderer"; verb raghal, "to slink about" as a talebearer, lashan, "to use the tongue," "to slander"; diaballo, "to calumniate," "to slander"; and other words): Slander (etymologically a doublet of "scandal," from OFr. esclandre, Latin scandalum, "stumblingblock") is an accusation maliciously uttered, with the purpose or effect of damaging the reputation of another. As a rule it is a false charge (compare Mt 5:11); but it may be a truth circulated insidiously and with a hostile purpose (e.g. Da 3:8, "brought accusation against," where Septuagint has diaballo, "slander"; Lu 16:1, the same Greek word). Warnings, condemnations and complaints in reference to this sin are very frequent, both in the Old Testament and New Testament. Mischievous "tale-bearing" or "whispering" is condemned (Le 19:16; Eze 22:9). There are repeated warnings against evil-speaking (as in Ps 34:13; Pr 15:28; Eph 4:31; Col 3:8; Jas 4:11; 1Pe 3:10), which is the cause of so much strife between man and man (Pr 16:27-30), and which recoils on the speaker himself to his destruction (Ps 101:5; 140:11). Especially is false witness, which is "slander carried into a court of justice," to be condemned and punished (Ex 20:16; De 19:16-21; compare Pr 12:17; 14:5,25; 19:5; 21:28; 24:28). Special cases of slander more than usually mean are when a wife’s chastity is falsely impeached by her husband (De 22:13-19), and when one slanders a servant to his master (Pr 30:10). Even a land may be slandered as well as persons (Nu 14:36). Slanderers and backbiters are mentioned in some of Paul’s darkest catalogues of evildoers (Ro 1:29,30; 2Co 12:20; 2Ti 3:3). To refrain from slander is an important qualification for citizenship in theocracy (Ps 15:1,3; 24:3,4) and for a place in the Christian church (1Ti 3:11; Tit 2:3). Jesus Himself was the victim of slanders (Mt 11:19) and of false testimony (Mt 27:63). The apostles, too, came in for a full share of it (e.g. Ac 24:5 f; 28:22; 2Co 6:8). In the case of Paul, even his central doctrine of justification was "slanderously reported" as if it encouraged immorality (Ro 3:8). The devil (=" the calumniator") is represented as the great accuser of God’s people (Re 12:10), the slanderer paragraph excellence (compare Job 1:9-11; Zec 3:1).

See also CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

D. Miall Edwards

SLAUGHTER, OF THE INNOCENTS

slo’-ter.

See INNOCENTS, MASSACRE OF THE.

SLAUGHTER, VALLEY OF

In Jer 7:32; 19:6, a name given to the valley of Hinnom.

See HINNOM, VALLEY OF; JERUSALEM, III, 2.

SLAVE; SLAVERY

slav, slav’-er-i:

1. Acquiring of Slaves

2. Hebrews as War Captives

3. Freedom of Slaves

4. Rights of Slaves

5. Rights of Slave Masters

6. The New Testament Conception

LITERATURE

The origin of the term "slave" is traced to the German sklave, meaning a captive of the Slavonic race who had been forced into servitude (compare Slav); French esclave, Dutch slaaf, Swedish slaf, Spanish esclavo. The word "slave" occurs only in Jer 2:14 and in Re 18:13, where it is suggested by the context and not expressed in the original languages (Hebrew yelidh bayith, "one born in the house"; Greek soma, "body"). However, the Hebrew word ‘ebhedh, in the Old Testament and the Greek word doulos, in the New Testament more properly might have been translated "slave" instead of "servant" or "bondservant," understanding though that the slavery of Judaism was not the cruel system of Greece, Rome, and later nations. The prime thought is service; the servant may render free service, the slave, obligatory, restricted service.

Scripture statement rather than philological study must form the basis of this article. We shall notice how slaves could be secured, sold and redeemed; also their rights and their masters’ rights, confining the study to Old Testament Scripture, noting in conclusion the New Testament conception. The word "slave" in this article refers to the Hebrew slave unless otherwise designated.

1. Acquiring of Slaves:

Slaves might be acquired in the following ways, namely:

(1) Bought.

There are many instances of buying slaves (Le 25:39). Hebrew slavery broke into the ranks of every human relationship: a father could sell his daughter (Ex 21:7; Ne 5:5); a widow's children might be sold to pay their father's debt (2Ki 4:1); a man could sell himself (Le 25:39,47); a woman could sell herself (De 15:12,13,17), etc. Prices paid were somewhat indefinite. According to Ex 21:32 thirty shekels was a standard price, but Le 27:3-7 gives a scale of from 3 to 50 shekels according to age and sex, with a provision for an appeal to the priest in case of uncertainty (27:8). Twenty shekels is the price set for a young man (27:5), and this corresponds with the sum paid for Joseph (Ge 37:28).

But in 2 Macc 8:11 the price on the average is 90 for a talent, i.e. 40 shekels each. The ransom of an entire talent for a single man (1Ki 20:39) means that unusual value (far more than that of a slave) was set on this particular captive.

There were certain limitations on the right of sale (Ex 21:7).

(2) Exchange.

Slaves, i.e. non-Hebrew slaves, might be traded for other slaves, cattle, or provisions.

(3) Satisfaction of Debt.

It is probable that a debtor, reduced to extremity, could offer himself in payment of his debt (Le 25:39), though this was forbidden in the Torath Kohanim; compare 'Otsar Yisra'el, vii.292b. That a creditor could sell into slavery a debtor or any of his family, or make them his own slaves, has some foundation in the statement of the poor widow whose pathetic cry reached the ears of the prophet Elisha: "Thy servant my husband is dead; .... and the creditor is come to take unto him my two children to be bondsmen" (2Ki 4:1).

(4) Gift.

The non-Hebrew slave, and possibly the Hebrew slave, could be acquired as a gift (Ge 29:24).

(5) Inheritance.

Children could inherit non-Hebrew slaves as their own possessions (Le 25:46).

(6) Voluntary Surrender.

In the case of a slave’s release in the seventh year there was allowed a willing choice of indefinite slavery. The ceremony at such a time is interesting: "Then his master shall bring him unto the judges (margin), and shall bring him to the door, or unto the door-post; and his master shall bore his ear through with an awl; and he shall serve him for ever" (Ex 21:6). A pierced ear probably meant obedience to the master’s voice. History, however, does not record a single instance in which such a case occurred.

(7) Arrest.

"If the thief be found breaking in, ... he shall make restitution: if he have nothing, then he shall be sold for his theft" (Ex 22:2,3).

(8) Birth.

The children of slaves, born within the master’s house of a wife given to the slave there, became slaves, and could be held, even if the father went free (Ex 21:4; compare Le 25:54).

(9) Capture in War.

Thousands of men, women and children were taken in war as captives and reduced, sometimes, to most menial slavery. Such slavery, however, was more humane than wholesale butchery according to the customs of earlier times (Nu 31:7-35). Males were usually slain and females kept for slavery and concubinage (De 21:10,11,14). Captive slaves and bought slaves, "from nations round about," forced moral ruin into Israel’s early civilization.

See SIEGE, 3.

The two principal sources of slave supply were poverty in peace and plunder in war.

2. Hebrews as War Captives:

The Hebrews themselves were held as captive slaves at various times by

(1) Phoenicians (the greatest slave traders of ancient times),

(2) Philistines,

(3) Syrians (2Ki 5:2),

(4) Egyptians, and

(5) Romans.

There must have been thousands subjected to severest slavery.

See also EGYPT; ISRAEL; PHARAOH; SERVANT, etc.

3. Freedom of Slaves:

The freedom of slaves was possible in the following ways:

(1) By Redemption.

Manumission by redemption was common among the Hebrews. The slave's freedom might be bought, the price depending on

(a) the nearness to the seventh year or the Jubilee year,

(b) the first purchase price, and

(c) personal considerations as to age and ability of the one in bondage.

A slave could be redeemed as follows:

(a) by himself,

(b) by his uncle,

(c) by his nephew or cousin,

(d) or by any near relative (Le 25:48-55).

The price depended on certain conditions as indicated above.

(2) By the Lapse of Time.

The seventh year of service brought release from bondage. "If thou buy a Hebrew servant (margin "bondman"), six years he shall serve: and in the seventh he shall go out free for nothing" (Ex 21:2-4).

(3) By the Law of the Jubilee Year.

The year of Jubilee was the great year when slaves were no longer slaves but free. "He shall serve with thee unto the year of jubilee: then shall he go out from thee, he and his children .... return unto his own

family, and unto the possession of his fathers" (Le 25:40 f).

(4) By Injury.

A servant whose master maimed him (or her), in particular by causing the loss of an eye or even a tooth, was thereby freed (Ex 21:26 f).

(5) By Escape.

(De 23:15 f; 1Ki 2:39). See "Code of Hammurabi" in HDB (extra vol, p. 600) and compare Phm 1:12 ff.

(6) By Indifference.

In case of a certain kind of female slave, the neglect or displeasure of her master in itself gave her the right to freedom (Ex 21:7-11; De 21:14).

(7) By Restitution.

A caught thief, having become a bondsman, after making full restitution by his service as a slave, was set at liberty (Ex 22:1-4).

(8) By the Master’s Death.

"And Abram said, ... I go childless, and he that shall be possessor of my house is Eliezer of Damascus .... and, lo, one born in my house is mine heir" (Ge 15:2 f). This passage has been mistakenly supposed to indicate that a master without children might give freedom to a slave by constituting the slave an heir to his possessions. But on the contrary, Abram seems to contemplate with horror the possibility that Eliezer will take possession of his goods in the absence of an heir. In view of the fact that adoption, the adrogatio of the Roman law, was unknown both to Biblical and Talmudic law (see Jewish Encyclopedia, under the word), the statement in Ge 15:2 does not seem to indicate any such custom as the adoption of slaves. If any method of emancipation is here suggested, it is by the death of the master without heir, a method thoroughly discussed in the Talmud (mithath ha-’adhon).

(9) By Direct Command of Yahweh.

"The word that came unto Jeremiah from Yahweh, ... that every man should let his man-servant, and .... his maid-servant, that is a Hebrew or a Hebrewess, go free; that none should make bondsmen of them .... they obeyed, and let them go" (Jer 34:8-10).

The nine methods here enumerated may be classified thus:

A. By operation of law:

1. By lapse of time.

(a) After serving six years or other contractual period. See (2) above.

(b) Upon the approach of the Jubilee year. See (3) above.

2. By death of the master without heirs. See (8) above.

B. By act of the parties:

1. By an act of the master.

(a) Voluntary manumission, including (9) above.

(b) Indifference in certain cases. See (6) above.

(c) Maiming servant. See (4) above.

2. By act of the servant.

(a) Redemption. See (1) above.

(b) Restitution. See (7) above.

(c) Escape. See (5) above.

3. By act of a third party.

Redemption—(1) above.

4. Rights of Slaves:

As noted in the beginning of this article, the Hebrew slaves fared far better than the Grecian, Roman and other slaves of later years. In general, the treatment they received and the rights they could claim made their lot reasonably good. Of course a slave was a slave, and there were masters who disobeyed God and even abused their "brothers in bonds." As usual the unfortunate female slave got the full measure of inhuman cruelty. Certain rights were discretionary, it is true, but many Hebrew slaves enjoyed valuable individual and social privileges. As far as Scripture statements throw light on this subject, the slaves of Old Testament times might claim the following rights, namely:

(1) Freedom.

Freedom might be gained in any one of the above-mentioned ways or at the master's will. The non-Hebrew could be held as a slave in perpetuity (Le 25:44-46).

(2) Good Treatment.

"Thou shalt not rule over him (Hebrew slave) with rigor, but shalt fear thy God. .... Ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigor" (Le 25:43,46). The non-Hebrew seemed to be left unprotected.

(3) Justice.

An ancient writer raises the query of fairness to slaves. "If I have despised the cause of my man-servant or of my maid-servant, when they contended with me; what then shall I do when God riseth up?" (Job 31:13 f). No doubt the true Hebrew master was considerate of the rights of his slaves. The very fact, however, that the Hebrew master could punish a Hebrew slave, "to within an inch of his life," gave ready opportunity for sham justice. "And if a man smite his servant, or his maid ("bondman or bondwoman"), with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall surely be punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished; for he is his money" (Ex 21:20 f).

(4) Family.

The slave before his release might have his wife and children (Ex 21:5).

(5) Voluntary Slavery.

Even when the seventh year came, the slave had a right to pledge himself, with awl-pierced ear, to perpetual service for his master (Ex 21:5 f; De 15:16). The traditional interpretation of "forever" in these passages is "until the next Jubilee year" (compare Kiddushin 21).

(6) Money or Property.

Some cases at least indicate that slaves could have money of their own. Thus, if a poor slave "waxed rich" he could redeem himself (Le 25:49). Compare 1Sa 9:5-10, where, however, the Hebrew throughout calls the "servant" na‘ar, "a youth," never ‘ebhedh.

(7) Children.

If married when free, the slave could take wife and children with him when freedom came, but if he was married after becoming a slave, his wife and children must remain in possession of his master. This law led him often into perpetual slavery (Ex 21:3 f).

(8) Elevation.

A chance to rise was allowable in some instances, e.g. Eliezer, a foreign slave in a Hebrew household, and Joseph, a Hebrew slave in a foreign household. Each rose to a place of honor and usefulness (Ge 15:2; 39:4).

(9) Religious Worship.

After being circumcised, slaves were allowed to participate in the paschal sacrifice (Ex 12:44) and other religious occasions (De 12:12).

(10) Gifts.

Upon obtaining freedom, slaves, at the discretion of masters, were given supplies of cattle, grain and wine (De 15:13 f).

5. Rights of Slave Masters:

The rights of a slave master may briefly be stated as follows:

(1) to hold as chattel possession his non-Hebrew slaves (Le 25:45);

(2) to leave such slaves as an inheritance for his children (Le 25:46);

(3) to hold as his own property the wife and children of all slaves who were unmarried at the time they became slaves (Ex 21:4);

(4) to pursue and recover runaway slaves (1Ki 2:39-41);

(5) to grant freedom at any time to any slave. This is implied rather than stated. Emancipation other than at the Sabbatical and Jubilee years was evidently the right of masters;

(6) to circumcise slaves, both Jew and Gentile, within his own household (Ge 17:13,23,27);

(7) to sell, give away, or trade slaves (Ge 29:24. According to Torath Kohanim a Hebrew servant could be sold only under certain restrictions. See 1, (1));

(8) to chastise male and female slaves, though not unto death (Ex 21:20);

(9) to marry a slave himself, or give his female slaves in marriage to others (1Ch 2:35);

(10) to marry a daughter to a slave (1Ch 2:34 f);

(11) to purchase slaves in foreign markets (Le 25:44);

(12) to keep, though not as a slave, the runaway slave from a foreign master (De 23:15,16. See 3, (5));

(13) to enslave or sell a caught thief (Ge 44:8-33; Ex 22:3);

(14) to hold, in perpetuity, non-Hebrew slaves (Le 25:46);

(15) to seek advice of slaves (1Sa 25:14 ff; but the reference here is open to doubt. See 4, (6));

(16) to demand service (Ge 14:14; 24).

Throughout Old Testament times the rights of both slaves and masters varied, but in general the above may be called the accepted code. In later times Zedekiah covenanted with the Hebrews never again to enslave their own brothers, but they broke the covenant (Jer 34:8).

6. The New Testament Conception:

There were slaves during New Testament times. The church issued no edict sweeping away this custom of the old Judaism, but the gospel of Christ with its warm, penetrating love-message mitigated the harshness of ancient times and melted cruelty into kindness. The equality, justice and love of Christ's teachings changed the whole attitude of man to man and master to servant. This spirit of brotherhood quickened the conscience of the age, leaped the walls of Judaism, and penetrated the remotest regions. The great apostle proclaimed this truth: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, ... ye all are one man in Christ Jesus" (Ga 3:28). The Christian slaves and masters are both exhorted in Paul's letters to live godly lives and make Christ-like their relations one to the other—obedience to masters and forbearance with slaves. "Bondservants (m), be obedient unto .... your masters, ... as bondservants (m) of Christ .... And, ye masters .... forbear threatening: .... their Master and yours is in heaven, and there is no respect of persons with him" (Eph 6:5-9).

Christ was a reformer, but not an anarchist. His gospel was dynamic but not dynamitic. It was leaven, electric with power, but permeated with love. Christ's life and teaching were against Judaistic slavery, Roman slavery and any form of human slavery. The love of His gospel and the light of His life were destined, in time, to make human emancipation earth-wide and human brotherhood as universal as His own benign presence.

LITERATURE.

Nowack, Hebrew Arch.; Ewald, Alterthumer, III, 280-88; Grunfeld, Die Stellung des Sklaven bei den Juden, nach bibl. und talmud. Quellen, 1886; Mielziner, Die Verhaltnisse der Sklaven bei den alter Hebrdern, 1859; Mandl, Das Sklavenrecht des Altes Testament, 1886; Kahn, L'esclavagedans la Bible et le Talmud, 1867; Sayce, Social Life among the Assyrians and Babylonians; Lane, Manners and Customs of Modern Egyptians, 205; Arabian Nights, I, 64 ff; Thomson, LB; McCurdy, HPM, 1894; Trumbull, Studies in Oriental Social Life, 1894. There is a wealth of material in the Talmudic tractate Kiddushin (pp. 17-22).

William Edward Raffety

SLAYING

sla'-ing (by spear, dart, or sword).

See PUNISHMENTS.

SLEEP

slep: Represents many words in Hebrew and Greek. For the noun the most common are shenah, and hupnos; for the verb, yashen, shakhabh, and katheudo. The figurative uses for death (De 31:16, etc.) and sluggishness (Eph 5:14, etc.) are very obvious.

See DREAM.

SLEEP, DEEP

(tardemah, verb radham, from a root meaning "to be deaf"): The verb radham has no further meaning than "to be fast asleep" (Jud 4:21; Jon 1:5), but the King James Version used "deep sleep" as a translation only in Da 8:18; 10:9, where a sleep supernaturally caused (a "trance") is meant compare "dead sleep" in Ps 76:6). The Revised Version's insertion of deep sleep in place of The King James Version's "fast asleep" in Jud 4:21 is consequently unfortunate. The noun tardemah has the same meaning of "trance" in Ge 2:21; 15:12; 1Sa 26:12; Job 4:13; 33:15, but in Pr 19:15; Isa 29:10, it is used figuratively of torpor. In Ac 20:9 (huipnos bathtus), heavy natural sleep is meant.

Burton Scott Easton

SLEEVES

slevz (Ge 37:3 margin).

See DRESS;

SLEIGHT

slit: No connection with "slight," but from the same root as "sly" and so =" cunning." So in Eph 4:14, "sleight of men," for kubeia, "dice-plalying" (compare "cube") "gamblers' tricks" "trickery."

SLIME; SLIME PITS

slim, slim'-pits (chemar; Septuagint asphaltos; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) bitumen; the Revised Version margin "bitumen"; compare Arabic chummar, "bitumen"; and compare chomer, "clay," "mortar"): In the account of the ark in Ge 6:14, kopher Septuagint asphaltos; Vulgate: bitumen; compare Arabic kufr, "pitch") does not necessarily denote vegetable pitch, but may well mean bitumen. The same may be said of zepheth, "pitch" (compare Arabic zift, "pitch"), in Ex 2:3 and Isa 34:9. The word "slime" occurs in the following passages: "And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar" (Ge 11:3); "Now the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits" (Ge 14:10, margin "bitumen pits"); "She took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with slime and with pitch" (Ex 2:3).

Bitumen is a hydrocarbon allied to petroleum and natural gas. It is a lustrous black solid, breaking with a conchoidal fracture, burning with a yellow flame, and melting when ignited. It is probably derived from natural gas and petroleum by a process of oxidation and evaporation, and its occurrence may be taken as a sign that other hydrocarbons are or have been present in the strata. It is found in small lumps and larger masses in the cretaceous limestone on the west side of the Dead Sea, and there is reason to believe that considerable quantities of it rise to the surface of the Dead Sea during earthquakes. In ancient times it was exported to Egypt to be used in embalming mummies. Important mines of it exist at Chasbeiya near Mt. Hermon and in North Syria. Springs of liquid bituminous matter exist in Mesopotamia, where according to Herodotus and other classical writers it was used as mortar with sun-dried bricks. Various conjectures have been made as to the part played by bitumen in the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. Diodorus Siculus calls the Dead Sea limne asphalstitis, "lake of asphalt."

See SIDDIM; CITIES OF THE PLAIN.

Alfred Ely Day

SLING

See ARMOR, III, 2.

SLIP

As meaning "a cutting from a plant," it is still good English. In this sense in Isa 17:10 for zemorah, "branch," "twig." For the phrase "slip of the tongue" compare Sirach 14:1; 19:16; 20:18; 21:7; 25:8.

SLOPES

slops.

See ASHDOTH PISGAH.

SLOW

slo: Chiefly for ‘erekh, literally, "long," in the phrase "slow to anger" (Ne 9:17, etc.). In Ex 4:10; Lu 24:25; Jas 1:19, for kabhedh; bradus, both meaning "heavy," "sluggish," while Sirach 7:35 uses "be slow" for okneo, "hesitate." In addition, the King James Version uses. "slow" for argos, "inactive," in The Wisdom of Solomon 15:15, "slow to go" (the Revised Version (British and American) "helpless for walking"), and in Tit 1:12, "slow bellies" (the Revised Version (British and American) "idle gluttons"). In Sirach 51:24, the King James Version has "be slow" for hustereo, "be lacking" (so the Revised Version (British and American)).

SLUGGARD

slug’-ard: Found only in the Old Testament, and there only in Proverbs. It is the rendering given the word ‘atsel everywhere in the Revised Version (British and American), but in the King James Version only in Pr 6:6,9; 10:26; 13:4; 20:4; 26:16 (elsewhere the King James Version translates by "slothful"). The root meaning of [’atsel] is "to be sluggish," "stupid." The English word "slug" is said to be "allied to slack" (Webster).

SLUICE

sloos (sekher, literally, "hire"): In Isa 19:10, the King James Version reads, "all that make sluices and ponds for fish." the Revised Version (British and American) entirely alters the translation of the whole verse. It reads, "And the pillars of Egypt shall be broken in pieces; all they that work for hire (margin "that make dams") shall be grieved in soul."

SMELL

smel (Hebrew and Aramaic reach, as noun, "savor," "scent"; ruach, as verb, literally, "to breathe," "to inhale," thence "to smell"; osme, the "smell," "savor," euodia, "sweet smell" "fragrance" osphresis "the sense of smell"; verb osphrainomai): And he came near, and kissed him: and he smelled (way-yarach) the smell (reach) of his raiment, and blessed him, and said, See, the smell (reach) of my son is as the smell (reach) of a field which Yahweh hath blessed" (Ge 27:27). Idols are described as "gods, the work of men’s hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell" (De 4:28). Acceptable sacrifices and pious conduct are called a "sweet smell" or "savor" (Ex 29:18; Eph 5:2; Php 4:18) well-

pleasing to God. The godless life, which dishonors God, is hateful to Him: "I will not smell the savor of your sweet odors" (Le 26:31). The phrase, "being in bad odor with a person," can be traced to Biblical language: "Ye have made our savor to be abhorred in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of his servants" (Ex 5:21). Thus "smell" is occasionally equivalent with "quality," "character": "His (Moab's) taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed" (Jer 48:11). Character or quality is the most infallible test, the most manifest advertisement of a thing or a person; thus we find the following very instructive passage: "(God) maketh manifest through us the savor (osme) of his knowledge in every place. For we are a sweet savor (euodia) of Christ unto God, in (better: "among") them that are saved, and in (better: "among") them that perish; to the one a savor (osme) from death unto death; to the other a savor (osme) from life unto life" (2Co 2:14-16). See TRIUMPH. In the passage Isa 3:24, the King James Version "sweet smell" (besem, "balsam plant") has been changed to "sweet spices" in the Revised Version (British and American).

H. L. E. Luering

SMITH

smith.

See CRAFTS, 10; TUBAL-CAIN.

SMITING BY THE SUN

See SUN, SMITING BY.

SMOKE

smok: Used figuratively of the divine jealousy (De 29:20) and anger (Ps 74:1); symbolic of the glory of the divine holiness (Isa 4:5; 6:4; Re 15:8).

SMYRNA

smur'-na (Smurna):

1. Ancient:

Smyrna, a large ancient city on the western coast of Asia Minor, at the head of a gulf which reaches 30 miles inland, was originally peopled by the Asiatics known as the Lelages. The city seems to have been taken from the Lelages by the Aeolian Greeks about 1100 BC; there still remain traces of the cyclopean masonry of that early time. In 688 BC it passed into the possession of the Ionian Greeks and was made one of the cities of the Ionian confederacy, but in 627 BC it was taken by the Lydians. During the years

301 to 281 BC, Lysimachus entirely rebuilt it on a new site to the Southwest of the earlier cities, and surrounded it by a wall. Standing, as it did, upon a good harbor, at the head of one of the chief highways to the interior, it early became a great trading-center and the chief port for the export trade. In Roman times, Smyrna was considered the most brilliant city of Asia Minor, successfully rivaling Pergamos and Ephesus. Its streets were wide and paved. Its system of coinage was old, and now about the city coins of every period are found. It was celebrated for its schools of science and medicine, and for its handsome buildings. Among them was the Homerium, for Smyrna was one of several places which claimed to be the birthplace of the poet. On the slope of Mt. Pagus was a theater which seated 20,000 spectators. In the 23 AD year a temple was built in honor of Tiberius and his mother Julia, and the Golden Street, connecting the temples of Zeus and Cybele, is said to have been the best in any ancient city. Smyrna early became a Christian city, for there was one of the Seven Churches of the Book of Revelation (2:8-11). There Polycarp, the bishop of Smyrna, was martyred, though without the sanction of the Roman government. It seems that the Jews of Smyrna were more antagonistic than were the Romans to the spread of Christianity, for it is said that even on Saturday, their sacred day, they brought wood for the fire in which Polycarp was burned. His grave is still shown in a cemetery there. Like many other cities of Asia Minor, Smyrna suffered frequently, especially during the years 178-80 AD, from earthquakes, but it always escaped entire destruction. During the Middle Ages the city was the scene of many struggles, the most fierce of which was directed by Timur against the Christians. Tradition relates that there he built a tower, using as stones the heads of a thousand captives which he put to death, yet Smyrna was the last of the Christian cities to hold out against the Mohammedans; in 1424 it fell into the hands of the Turks. It was the discovery of America and the resulting discovery of a sea route to India which ruined the Smyrna trade.

2. Modern:

Modern Smyrna is still the largest city in Asia Minor, with a population of about 250,000, of whom half are Greek and less than one-fourth are Mohammedans. Its modern name, Ismir, is but a Turkish corruption of the ancient name. Even under the Turkish government the city is progressive, and is the capital of the Aidin vilayet, and therefore the home of a governor. Several railroads follow the courses of the ancient routes into the distant interior. In its harbor ships from all parts of the world may be seen. The ancient harbor of Paul’s time has been filled in, and there the modern bazaars stand. The old stadium has been destroyed to make room for modern buildings, and a large part of the ancient city lies buried beneath the modern houses and the 40 mosques of which the city boasts. The better of the modern buildings, belonging to the government and occupied by the foreign consuls, stand along the modern quay. Traces of the ancient walls are still to be found. West of Mt. Pagus is the Ephesian gate, and the Black-gate, as the Turks call it, is near the railroad station. The castle upon Mt. Pagus, 460 ft. above the sea, dates from Byzantine times. The prosperity of Smyrna is due, not only to the harbor and the port of entry to the interior, but partly to the perfect climate of spring and autumn—the winters are cold and the summers are hot; and also to the fertility of the surrounding country. Figs, grapes, valonia, opium, sponges, cotton and liquorice root are among the chief articles of trade.

See also CHURCHES, SEVEN.

E. J. Banks

SNAIL

snal

((1) chomeT, the Revised Version (British and American) "sand-lizard," Septuagint saura, "lizard" (Le 11:30);

(2) shabbelul, Septuagint keros, "wax" (Ps 58:8)):

(1) ChomeT is 7th in the list of unclean "creeping things" in Le 11:30, and occurs nowhere else. "Snail" is not warranted by Septuagint or Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) the Revised Version (British and American) has "sand-lizard." It may be the skink or a species of Lacerta. See LIZARD.

(2) Shabbelul is translated "snail" in Ps 58:8: "Let them be as a snail which melteth and passeth away." Mandelkern gives limax, "slug."

Gesenius derives shabbelul from balal, "to pour"; compare Arabic balla, "to wet," instancing leimax, "snail," or "slug," from leibo, "to pour." While Septuagint has keros, "wax," Talmud (Mo'edh QaTan 6b) supports "snail." The ordinary explanation of the passage, which is not very satisfying, is that the snail leaves a trail of mucus (i.e. it melts) as it moves along. This does not in any way cause the snail to waste away, because its glands are continually manufacturing fresh mucous. Two large species of snail, Helix aspersa and Helix pomatia, are collected and eaten, boiled, by the Christians of Syria and Palestine, especially in Lent. The Jews and Moslems declare them to be unclean and do not eat them.

Alfred Ely Day

SNARE

snar (pach; pagis, but brochos, in 1Co 7:35): Over half a dozen Hebrew words are used to indicate different methods of taking birds and animals, of which the snare (pach) is mentioned oftener than any other. It was a noose of hair for small birds, of wire for larger birds or smaller animals. The snares were set in a favorable location and grain scattered to attract the attention of feathered creatures. They accepted the bribe of good feeding and walked into the snare, not suspecting danger. For this reason the snare became particularly applicable in describing a tempting bribe offered by men to lead their fellows into trouble, and the list of references is a long one, all of the same nature. See Ex 10:7; 1Sa 18:21; 28:9; Ps 11:6; 18:5, "snares of death"; used symbolically of anything that may kill: 91:3; 124:7; 140:5; 141:9; Pr 7:23; 13:14; 18:7; 20:25; 22:25; 29:25; Ec 9:12. But this is a people robbed and plundered; they are all of them snared in holes, and they are hid in prison-houses: they are for a prey, and none delivereth; for a spoil, and none saith, Restore" (Isa 41:22). Here it is specified that the snare was in a hole so

covered as to conceal it. Jer 18:22 clearly indicates that the digging of a pit to take prey was customary, and also the hiding of the snare for the feet. North American Indians in setting a snare usually figure on catching the bird around the neck. Jer 50:24, "I have laid a snare for thee"; Ho 9:8, "A fowler's snare is in all his ways"; Am 3:5 seems to indicate that the snare was set for the feet; Lu 21:34, "But take heed to yourselves, lest haply .... that day come on you suddenly as a snare"; Ro 11:9, "Let their table be made a snare, and a trap"; 1Co 7:35, "not that I may cast a snare upon you"; 1Ti 3:7, "the snare of the devil"; also 6:9 "But they that are minded to be rich fall into a temptation and a snare and many foolish and hurtful lusts, such as drown men in destruction and perdition."

See GIN; NET; TRAP.

Gene Stratton-Porter

SNEEZE

snez (zorer, Pho'el-form zarar): "The child sneezed seven times, and the child opened his eyes" (2Ki 4:35). "Sneezing," better "snorting," is found in the description of Leviathan (the crocodile): "His sneezings ('atsishah) flash forth light, and his eyes are like the eyelids of the morning" (Job 41:18 (Hebrew 10)).

See NEESING.

SNOW

sno (shelegh, telagh (Da 7:9); chion):

(1) Snow is not uncommon in the winter in Jerusalem, but it never reaches any depth and in many winters it is not seen at all. It usually disappears, for the most part, as soon as the sun appears, though it may "hide itself" for a time in the gorge cut by a stream (Job 6:16). On lower levels than Jerusalem there is never sufficient to cover the ground, though often there are some flakes seen in the air. Even at sea-level there is occasionally a sufficient fall of hail to cover the ground. A very exceptional snowfall is related in 1 Macc 13:22 at Adora (near Hebron). It was heavy enough to prevent the movement of troops.

(2) The tops of the mountains of Lebanon are white with snow for most of the year, and snow may be found in large banks in the valleys and the northern slopes at any time in the summer. Mt. Hermon, 9,200 ft. high, has long streaks of snow in the valleys all the summer.

(3) The snow of the mountains is the source of the water of the springs which last throughout the drought of summer. In case the snow fails there is sure to be a lack of water in the fountains: "Shall the snow of Lebanon fail .... or shall the cold waters that flow down from afar be dried up?" (Jer 18:14).

(4) Large quantities of snow are stored in caves in the mountains in winter and are brought down to the cities in summer to be used in place of ice for cooling drinks and refrigerating purposes.

(5) God’s power over the elements of Nature is often brought out in the Old Testament: "For he saith to the snow, Fall thou on the earth" (Job 37:6); but man cannot fathom the works of God: "Hast thou entered the treasuries of the snow?" (Job 38:22). "The snowy day" (1Ch 11:22; 2Sa 23:20) and the "fear of snow" (Pr 31:21) are figurative uses describing winter and cold. "Snow in summer" (Pr 26:1) would be most out of place, yet it might be most refreshing to the tired workmen in the time of harvest.

(6) Snow is the symbol of purity and cleanness, giving us some of our most beautiful passages of Scripture: "Wash me and I shall be whiter than snow" (Ps 51:7); "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow" (Isa 1:18). Carrying the figure farther, snow-water might be expected to have a special value for cleansing: "If I wash myself with snow-water" (Job 9:30). The most common use in Scripture is to denote whiteness in color and implying purity as well: "His raiment was white as snow" (Da 7:9; Mt 28:3; Mr 9:3; Re 1:14).

(7) The whiteness of leprosy is compared to snow (Ex 4:6; Nu 12:10; 2Ki 5:27).

Alfred H. Joy

SNUFFERS; SNUFFDISHES

snuf’-erz, snuf’-dish-ez (melqachayim, machtoth): These two utensils are thrice mentioned in connection with the wilderness tabernacle (Ex 25:38; 37:23; Nu 4:9). the American Standard Revised Version prefers to read "snuffers and snuffdishes" in place of "tongs and snuffdishes" (compare 2Ch 4:22), the connection between the two utensils being indicated by the fact that both are said to belong to the seven lamps, and were to be made out of the talent of gold which was specified as the weight of the whole (Ex 25:37-39).

The seven-branched candlestick which stood in the holy place of both tabernacle and temple was surmounted, in each of its arms, by a removable lamp in which olive oil was burnt. From the requirement of keeping these lights brilliantly burning throughout each night of the year, arose the need for snuffers and snuffdishes. By the former, the burnt portions of the wick were removed; in the latter they were deposited previous to removal. The lamps may have required to be trimmed as often as every half-hour. For this purpose a priest would enter the outer chamber "accomplishing the services" (Heb 9:6).

In the time of Solomon’s Temple another word than melqachayim was used to describe this utensil. It is mezammeroth, from a verb meaning "to prune" or "trim," and is found in 1Ki 7:50; 2Ki 12:13; 25:14; 2Ch 4:22; Jer 52:18. In 4 of these passages, the English text reads, "the snuffers and the basins"; the 5th is merely a summary of things taken to Babylon (2Ki 25:14). In this constant later association of "basins" and "snuffers" it is seen that the basins referred to were used for the reception of the cast-off

portions of the wicks of the seven lamps, and took the place of the snuffdishes of an earlier age.

See TONGS.

W. Shaw Caldecott

SO

so (co’, although the Hebrew might be pointed cewe’; Assyrian Sib’u; Septuagint Segor, Soa; Manetho, Seuechos; Latin Sevechus; Herodotus (ii. 137 ff), Sabakon): In all probability the "Sabaeo" of Herodotus, the Shabaka, who founded the Ethiopian dynasty, the XXVth of Egyptian kings. His date is given as 715-707 BC (Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 281 ff), but we may suppose that before his accession to the throne he was entitled to be designated king, as being actually regent. To this So, Hoshea, king of Israel, made an appeal for assistance to enable him to throw off the yoke of the Assyrian Shalmaneser IV (2Ki 17:3). But Hoshea’s submission to So brought him no advantage, for Shalmaneser came up throughout all the land and laid siege to Samaria. Not long after the fall of Samaria, So ventured upon an eastern campaign, and was defeated by Sargon, the successor of Shalmaneser, in the battle of Raphia in 720 BC.

LITERATURE.

Flinders Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 281 ff; McCurdy, HPM, I, 422; Schrader, COT, I, 261.

T. Nicol.

SOAP

sop (borith; the King James Version sope): Borith is a derivative of bor, "purity," hence, something which cleanses or makes pure. Soap in the modern sense, as referring to a salt of a fatty acid, for example, that produced by treating olive oil with caustic soda, was probably unknown in Old Testament times. Even today there are districts in the interior of Syria where soap is never used. Cooking utensils, clothes, even the body are cleansed with ashes. The ashes of the household fires are carefully saved for this purpose. The cleansing material referred to in Jer 2:22 (compare Septuagint at the place, where borith is rendered by poia =" grass") and Mal 3:2 was probably the vegetable lye called in Arabic el qali (the origin of English alkali). This material, which is a mixture of crude sodium and potassium carbonates, is sold in the market in the form of grayish lumps. It is produced by burning the desert plants and adding enough water to the ashes to agglomerate them. Before the discovery of Leblanc’s process large quantities of qali were exported from Syria to Europe.

For washing clothes the women sprinkle the powdered qali over the wet garments and then place them on a flat stone and pound them with a wooden paddle. For washing the body, oil is first smeared over the

skin and then qali rubbed on and the whole slimy mixture rinsed off with water. Qali was also used in ancient times as a flux in refining precious metals (compare Mal 3:2). At the present time many Syrian soap-makers prefer the qali to the imported caustic soda for soap-making.

In Susanna (verse 17) is a curious reference to "washing balls" (smegmata).

James A. Patch

SOBER; SOBRIETY; SOBERNESS so’-ber, sa-bri’-e-ti, so’-ber-nes (Greek adjective sophron, and its related nouns, sophrosune, sophronismos; verbs sophroneo and sophronizo; adverb sophronos, "of sound mind," and sophronizo; "self-possessed," "without excesses of any kind," "moderate and discreet"): In Mr 5:15; Lu 8:35, "sane," said of one out of whom demons had just been cast. In the Pastoral Epistles, this virtue is especially commended to certain classes, because of extravagances characterizing particular periods of life, that had to be guarded against, namely, to aged men, with reference to the querulousness of old age (Tit 2:2); to young men, with reference to their sanguine views of life, and their tendency to disregard consequences (Tit 2:6); enjoined upon young women, with reference to extravagance in dress and speech (Tit 2:5; 1Ti 2:9); and, in a similar manner, commended to ministers, because of the importance of their judgment and conduct, as teachers and exemplars (1Ti 3:2). "Words of soberness" (Ac 26:25) are contrasted with the "mania," "madness," that Festus had just declared to be the explanation of Paul’s eloquence (Ac 26:24).

In a few passages, the Greek verb nepho and its derivative adjective nephalios are used in the same sense. The word originally had a physical meaning, as opposed to drunkenness, and is thus used in 1Th 5:6,8, as the foundation of the deeper meaning. Used metaphorically also in the Pastoral Epistles and 1 Peter, as sometimes in the classics, for "cool," "unimpassioned." Ellicott, on 1Ti 3:2,11, distinguishes between the two words by regarding sophron "as pointing to the outward exhibition of the inward virtue" implied in nephalios.

H. E. Jacobs

SOCHO

so’-ko: Occurs in 1Ch 4:18, the Revised Version (British and American) "Soco."

See SOCOH.

SOCKET

sok’-et (’edhen): The tabernacle in the wilderness being constructed as a portable building without permanent foundation, its stability was attained by the use of "sockets" into which the pillars and boards forming its walls were sunk. The word therefore is used solely in relation to the tabernacle, except in one

poetic passage (So 5:15), where the legs of the beloved are compared to "pillars of marble set upon sockets of fine gold." In all, the tabernacle with its court rested upon 165 bases or sockets, apportioned thus:

(1) silver sockets, each a talent (circa 95 lbs.) in weight (Ex 38:27), namely, 96 to support the 48 boards of the tabernacle (Ex 26:19); 4 for the pillars supporting the veil (Ex 26:32) = 100;

(2) bronze sockets, weight not given, namely, 50 to support the 50 standards on which were hung the curtains of the tabernacle on North, South and West (Ex 27:10), 10 to support 10 pillars on the E. (Ex 27:13), and 5 to support the 5 pillars upholding the screen at the tabernacle entrance (Ex 26:27) = 65. The site for the tabernacle being chosen and leveled, these sockets would be "laid" upon it (Ex 40:18), and the tenons of the boards, or projecting base of the pillar, inserted into holes made for the purpose.

W. Shaw Caldecott

SOCOH; SOCO

so’-ko (sokkhoh, "branches"), (sokho (in Chronicles only); Socho, most usual, but many forms in Septuagint and in the King James Version: Socoh, Shochoh, Shoco, Shocho):

(1) A city in the Shephelah of Judah mentioned along with Jarmuth, Adullam, Azekah, etc. (Jos 15:35); the Philistines "gathered together at Socoh, which belongeth to Judah, and encamped between Socoh and Azekah" (1Sa 17:1); it is mentioned as one of the districts from which Solomon drew his supplies (1Ki 4:10, the King James Version "Sochoh"); the association of Socoh in this verse with Hepher is worth noticing in connection with 1Ch 4:18 ("Heber"). Soco (the King James Version "Shoco") was one of the cities fortified by Rehoboam for the defense of Judah (2Ch 11:7); it was captured by the Philistines in the time of Ahaz (2Ch 28:18). The site is, without doubt, Khirbet esh Shuweikeh (Shuweikeh is a diminutive of Shaukeh, "a thorn"), a rounded, elongated hilltop, showing clear traces of ancient city walls. The situation is one of considerable natural strength on the south side of the Vale of Elah just where the Wady ec Cur makes a sweep to the West and becomes the Wady es Sunt. Like so many such ancient sites, the hill has very steep slopes on 3 sides (South, West, and North), and is isolated from the ridge of higher ground to the East by a narrow neck of lower ground. In the valley to the Southwest is a plentiful spring. The site was known to Jerome in the 4th century. He described it as 8 or 9 Roman miles from Eleutheropolis (Beit Jibrin) (PEF, III, 53, 125, Sh XVII, BR, II, 21). The Sucathites (1Ch 2:55) were probably inhabitants of Soco.

(2) A city of Judah in the South, associated (Jos 15:48) with Shamir and Jattir. This is doubtless Khirbet Shuweikeh, a large ruin occupying a low hill, 10 miles Southwest of Hebron; there are many caves and rock-cut cisterns as well as drafted stones. Cheyne doubtfully locates the Socoh of 1Ki 4:10 here. See PEF, 404, 410, Sh XXV; B R, I, 494.

E. W. G. Masterman

SOD, SODDEN

sod’-’-n.

See SEETHE.

SODA

so’-da.

See NITRE.

SODERING

sod’-er-ing (debheq): the King James Version in Isa 41:7, the Revised Version (British and American) "soldering," of smith work.

SODI

so’-di (codhi): One of the spies, representing the tribe of Zebulun (Nu 13:10).

SODOM

sod’-um (cedhom; Sodoma) One of the 5 CITIES OF THE PLAIN (which see), destroyed by fire from heaven in the time of Abraham and Lot (Ge 19:24). The wickedness of the city became proverbial. The sin of sodomy was an offense against nature frequently connected with idolatrous practices (see Rawlinson, History of Phoenicia). See SODOMITE. The fate of Sodom and Gomorrah is used as a warning to those who reject the gospel (Mt 10:15; 11:24; 2Pe 2:6; Jude 1:7). The word is used in a typical sense in Re 11:8. Sodom was probably located in plain South of the Dead Sea, now covered with water. The name is still preserved in Jebel Usdum (Mt. Sodom).

See ARABAH; CITIES OF THE PLAIN; DEAD SEA.

LITERATURE.

Dillmann. Genesis, 111 f; Robinson, BR, II, 187 ff; G. A. Smith, HGHL, 505 ff; Blanckenhorn, ZDPV, XIX, 1896, 53 ff; Baedeker-Socin, Palestine, 143; Buhl, GAP, 117, 271, 274.

George Frederick Wright

SODOM, VINE OF

(gephen cedhom):

"For their vine is of the vine of Sodom,

And of the fields of Gomorrah:

Their grapes are grapes of gall,

Their clusters are bitter" (De 32:32).

This must be distinguished from the "Apples of Sodom" (which see), described by Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4), which appear to have been an actual species of fruit, probably either the colocynth or the fruit of the Usher tree, Calotropis procera. It would appear, however, from the above, the only passage referring to the Vine of Sodom, that this expression is metaphorical and does not refer to any particular plant.

E. W. G. Masterman

SODOMITE

sod’-om-it (qadhesh, feminine qedheshah): Qadhesh denotes properly a male temple prostitute, one of the class attached to certain sanctuaries of heathen deities, and "consecrated" to the impure rites of their worship. Such gross and degrading practices in Yahweh’s land could only be construed as a flagrant outrage; and any association of these with His pure worship was abhorrent (De 23:17 f): The presence of Sodomites is noted as a mark of degeneracy in Rehoboam’s time (1Ki 14:24). Asa endeavored to get rid of them (1Ki 15:12), and Jehoshaphat routed them out (1Ki 22:46). Subsequent corruptions opened the way for their return, and Josiah had to break down their houses which were actually "in the house of the Lord" (2Ki 23:7). The feminine qedheshah is translated "prostitute" in Ge 38:21,22; Ho 4:14; in De 23:17 "prostitute" (the King James Version margin "sodomitess," the Revised Version margin transliterates). The English word is, of course, derived from Sodom, the inhabitants of which were in evil repute for unnatural vice.

W. Ewing

SODOMITISH; SEA

sod’-om-it-ish.

See DEAD SEA.

SODOMY

sod’-o-mi.

See SODOM; SODOMITE; CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

SOJOURNER

soj’-er-ner, so’-jur-ner, suj’-er-ner.

See STRANGER AND SOJOURNER.

SOLDERING

sod’-er-ing.

See SODERING.

SOLDIER

sol’-jer.

See ARMY.

SOLEMN ASSEMBLY (MEETING)

See CONGREGATION; FASTS AND FEASTS; SOLEMN, SOLEMNITY.

SOLEMN, SOLEMNITY

sol’-em, so-lem’-ni-ti: The word "solemn" had

(1) at first the meaning "once in the year," through its derivation from Latin sollus, "whole," annus, "year." As, however, a regular annual occurrence is usually one of particular importance, the word took on

(2) the meaning "ceremonious." From this is derived

(3) the usual modern force of "grave" in opposition to "joyous."

This last meaning is not in Biblical English, and the meanings of "solemn" in English Versions of the Bible are either (1) or (2). Nor is there any certain case of (1), for the word is always a gloss in English Versions of the Bible and, although frequently introduced in references to annual events (Le 23:36, etc.), it is even more often used where "annual" is foreign to the passage (2Ki 10:20; Ps 92:3, etc.). The use of the word in the King James Version is unsystematic. It is always (except in Jer 9:2) found in conjunction with "assembly" when (10 times) the latter word represents atsarah (’atsereth) (Le 23:36, etc.) (retained by the Revised Version (British and American) with margin "closing festival," Le 23:36; 2Ch 7:9; Ne 8:18). the King James Version uses "solemnity" or "solemn day," "feast," etc., 17 times for the very common word mo‘edh ("appointed" time, etc.).

See FEASTS.

RV’s treatment of these passages defies analysis. "Solemnity" is kept in Isa 33:20; Eze 46:11, and "solemn" in Lamentations (4 times); Hosea (3 times); Ze 3:18. In Eze 36:38; 45:17; 46:9 it is replaced by "appointed," elsewhere (and for mo’adhoth, 2Ch 8:13) by "set." The margins further complicate the renderings. the King James Version also uses "solemn" with chagh, "feast," 4 times, and with chaghagh, "keep a feast," in De 16:15. The word is dropped by the Revised Version (British and American), except the English Revised Version in Ps 81:3. Finally, the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "solemn sound" for higgayon, in Ps 92:3. The context, however, demands "resounding melody." And 11 times the Revised Version (British and American) has introduced "solemn" to represent the intensive in the form shabbath shabbathon (Ex 16:23, etc.), where the King James Version has simply "sabbath" or "sabbath of rest." the Revised Version (British and American) here has imitated the adverbial "solemnly" in the similar intensified expressions in Ge 43:3; 1Sa 8:9.

The Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha translates en hemerais kairou, "in the days of the season" (Baruch 1:14), by "on the days of the solemn assembly" (the King James Version "solemn days"), and both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) have "solemn feast days" for dies festos (2 Esdras 1:31). Otherwise the King James Version’s use of "solemn" is dropped by the Revised Version (British and American).

Burton Scott Easton

SOLOMON

sol’-o-mun (shelomoh; New Testament Solomon):

I. EARLY LIFE

1. Name and Meaning

2. Sources

3. Birth and Upbringing

4. His Accession

5. Closing Days of David

II. REIGN OF SOLOMON

1. His Vision

2. His Policy

3. Its Results

4. Alliance with Tyre

5. Alliance with Egypt

6. Domestic Troubles

III. HIS BUILDINGS

1. The Temple

2. The Palace

3. Other Buildings

4. The Corvee

IV. HIS CHARACTER

1. Personal Qualities

2. His Wisdom

3. His Learning

4. Trade and Commerce

5. Officers of State

6. Wives

7. Revenues

8. Literary Works

LITERATURE

I. Early Life.

Solomon was the son of David and Bath-sheba, and became the 3rd king of Israel.

1. Name and Meaning:

He was so named by his mother (2Sa 12:24, Qere; see TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT), but by the prophet Nathan, or by his father (Vulgate), he was called Jedidiah—"loved of Yahweh." The name "Solomon" is derived from the root meaning "to be quiet" or "peaceful," and Solomon was certainly the least warlike of all the kings of Israel or Judah, and in that respect a remarkable contrast to his father (so 1Ch 22:9). His name in Hebrew compares with Irenaeus in Greek, Friedrich in German, and Selim in Arabic; but it has been suggested that the name should be pronounced shillumah, from the word denoting "compensation," Bath-sheba's second son being given in compensation for the loss of the first (but see 3, below).

2. Sources:

The oldest sources for the biography of Solomon are doubtless the "Annals of Solomon" referred to in 1Ki 11:41, the "history of Nathan the prophet," the "prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite" and the "visions of Iddo the seer," mentioned in 2Ch 9:29, all which may be merely the relative sections of the great book of the "Annals of the Kings" from which our Books of Kings and Chronicles are both derived. These ancient works are, of course, lost to us save in so far as they have been embodied in the Old Testament narrative. There the life of South is contained in 2Sa 12:24 f; 1Ki 1-11; 1Ch 22-2Ch 9. Of these sources 2Sa 12:24 f and 1Ki 1; 2 are much the oldest and in fact form part of one document, 2Sa 9-20; 1Ki 1; 2 dealing with the domestic affairs of David, which may well be contemporary with the events it describes. The date of the composition of the Books of Chronicles is about 300 BC—700 years after the time of Solomon—and the date of the Books of Kings, as a completed work, must, of course, be later than the exile. Nothing of importance is gained from citations from early historians in Josephus and later writers. Far and away the best source for, at least, the inner life of Solomon would be the writings ascribed to him in the Old Testament, could we be sure that these were genuine (see below).

3. Birth and Upbringing:

The children of David by Bath-sheba are given in 1Ch 3:5 as Shimea, Shobab, Nathan and Solomon. Compare also 2Sa 5:14; 1Ch 14:4, where the same persons evidently are named. It would thus appear that Solomon was the 4th son of Bath-sheba, supposing Shimea to be the child that died. Otherwise Solomon would be the 5th son. There are therefore some events omitted in 2Sa 12:24 f, or else the names Shobab and Nathan are remains of some clause which has been lost, and not proper names. Like the heir apparent of a Turkish sultan, Solomon seems to have spent his best years in the seclusion of the harem. There he was doubtless more influenced by his mother than by his father, and in close intimacy with his mother was the prophet Nathan, who had given him his by-name of fortunate import (2Sa 12:25).

4. His Accession:

It was not until David lay on his deathbed that Solomon left the women's quarters and made his appearance in public. That he had been selected by David, as the son of the favorite wife, to succeed him, is pre-supposed in the instructions which he received from his father regarding the building of the Temple. But as soon as it appeared that the life of David was nearing its end, it became evident that Solomon was not to have a "walk over." He found a rival in Adonijah the son of Haggith, who was apparently the eldest surviving son of his father, and who had the support of Joab, by far the strongest man of all, of Abiathar, the leading, if not the favorite, priest (compare 2Sa 15:24 ff), and of the princes of the royal house. Solomon, on the other hand, had the support of his mother Bath-sheba, David s favorite wife, of Nathan the court prophet, of Zadok who had eclipsed Abiathar, of Benaiah, the son of a priest, but one of the three bravest of David's soldiers, and captain of the bodyguard of Cherethites and Pelethites, and of the principal soldiers. It is especially noted that Shimei and Hushai (so Josephus) took no active part at any rate with Adonijah (1Ki 1:8). The conspiracy came to nothing, for, before it developed, Solomon was anointed at Gibeon (not Gihon, 1Ki 1:33,38,45), and entered Jerusalem as king.

5. Closing Days of David:

The age of Solomon at his accession is unknown. The expression in 1Ki 3:7 is not, of course, to be taken literally (otherwise Ant, VIII, vii, 8). His reign opened, like that of many an oriental monarch, with a settlement in blood of the accounts of the previous reign. Joab, David's nephew, who had brought the house within the bounds of blood revenge, was executed. Adonijah, as soon as his father had breathed his last, was on a nominal charge put to death. Abiathar was relegated to his home at Anathoth (1Ki 2:26). Conditions were imposed on Shimei which he failed to keep and so forfeited his life (1Ki 2:36). These steps having been taken, Solomon began his reign, as it were, with a clean slate.

II. Reign of Solomon.

1. His Vision:

It was apparently at the very beginning of his reign that Solomon made his famous choice of a "hearing heart," i.e. an obedient heart, in preference to riches or long life. The vision took place at Gibeon (2Ch 1:7, but in 1Ki 3:4 f the ancient versions read "upon the altar that was in Gibeon. And the Lord appeared," etc.). The life of Solomon was a curious commentary on his early resolution. One of the first acts of his reign was apparently, in the style of the true oriental monarch, to build himself a new palace, that of his father being inadequate for his requirements. In regard to politics, however, the events of Solomon's reign may be regarded as an endorsement of his choice. Under him alone was the kingdom of Israel a great world-power, fit almost to rank beside Assyria and Egypt. Never again were the bounds of Israel so wide; never again were north and south united in one great nation. There is no doubt that the credit of this result is due to the wisdom of Solomon.

2. His Policy:

Solomon was by nature an unwarlike person, and his whole policy was in the direction of peace. He disbanded the above-mentioned foreign legion, the Cherethites and Pelethites, who had done such good service as bodyguard to his father. All his officers seem to have been mediocre persons who would not be likely to force his hand, as Joab had done that of David (2Sa 3:39). Even the fortification of Jerusalem and of the frontier towns was undertaken with a view to repel attack, not for the purposes of offense. Solomon did, no doubt, strengthen the army, especially the cavalry arm (1Ki 4:26; 10:26), but he never made any use of this, and perhaps it existed largely on paper. At any rate Solomon seems to have been rather a breeder of and dealer in horse-flesh than a soldier. He appears also to have had a fine collection of armor (1Ki 10:25), but much of it was made of gold (1Ki 10:16 f) and was intended for show, not for use. Both in his reputation for wisdom and in his aversion to war Solomon bears a striking resemblance to King James VI of Scotland and I of England, as depicted by the hand of Sir Walter Scott. It was fortunate for him that both the neighboring great powers were for the time in a decadent state, otherwise the history of the kingdom of Israel would have ended almost before it had begun. On the other hand, it has been remarked that if Solomon had had anything like the military genius of David and his enthusiasm for the religion of Yahweh, he might have extended the arms of Israel from the Nile to the Tigris and anticipated the advent of Islam. But his whole idea was to secure himself in peace, to amass wealth and indulge his love of grandeur with more than oriental splendor.

3. Its Results:

Solomon, in fact, was living on the achievements and reputation of his father, who laid the basis of security and peace on which the commercial genius of Solomon could raise the magnificent structure which he did. But he took the clay from the foundations in order to build the walls. The Hebrews were a military people and in that consisted their life. Solomon withdrew their energies from their natural bent and turned them to cornmerce, for which they were not yet ripe. Their soul rebelled under the irksome drudgery of an industry of which they did not reap the fruits. Solomon had in fact reduced a free people to slavery, and concentrated the wealth of the whole country in the capital. As soon as he was out of the way, his country subjects threw off the yoke and laid claim to their ancient freedom. His son found himself left with the city and a territory as small as an English county.

4. Alliance with Tyre:

Solomon's chief ally was Hiram, the king of Tyre, probably the friend and ally of David, who is to be distinguished from Hiram the artificer of 1Ki 7:13 ff. Hiram the king entered into a treaty with Solomon which was to the advantage of both parties. Hiram supplied Solomon with cedar and pine wood from Lebanon, as well as with skilled artisans for his building. Tyrian sailors were also drafted into the ships of Solomon, the Hebrews not being used to the sea (1Ki 9:26 f), besides which Phoenician ships sailed along with those of Solomon. The advantages which Hiram received in return were that the Red Sea was open to his merchantmen, and he also received large supplies of corn and oil from the land of Israel (1Ki 5:11 corrected by Septuagint and 2Ch 2:10). At the conclusion of the building of the palace and Temple, which occupied 20 years, Solomon presented Hiram with 20 villages (1Ki 9:11; the converse, 2Ch 8:2), and Hiram made Solomon a return present of gold (1Ki 9:14; omitted in 2 Chronicles).

5. Alliance with Egypt:

Second to Hiram was the Pharaoh of Egypt, whose daughter Solomon married, receiving as her dower the town of Gezer (1Ki 9:16). This Pharaoh is not named in the Old Testament. This alliance with Egypt led to the introduction of horses into Israel (1Ki 10:28 f), though David had already made a beginning on a small scale (2Sa 8:4). Both these alliances lasted throughout the reign. There is no mention of an alliance with the eastern power, which was then in a decadent state.

6. Domestic Troubles:

It was probably nearer the beginning than the end of Solomon's reign that political trouble broke out within the realm. When David had annexed the territory of the Edomites at the cost of the butchery of the male population (compare 2Sa 8:14; Ps 60, title) one of the young princes of the reigning house effected his escape, and sought and found an asylum in Egypt, where he rose to occupy a high station. No sooner had he heard of the death of David and Joab than he returned to his native country and there stirred up disaffections against Solomon (1Ki 11:14 ff; see HADAD), without, however, restoring independence to Edom (1Ki 9:26). A second occasion of disaffection arose through a prophet having foretold that the successor of Solomon would have one of the Israelite tribes only and that the other ten clans would be under Solomon's master of works whom he had set over them. This officer also took refuge in Egypt and was protected by Shishak. He remained there until the death of Solomon (1Ki 11:26). A third adversary was Rezon who had fled from his master the king of Zobah (1Ki 11:23), and who established himself at Damascus and rounded a dynasty which was long a thorn in the side of Israel. These domestic troubles are regarded as a consequence of the falling away of Solomon from the path of rectitude, but this seems to be but a kind of anticipative consequence, that is, if it was not till the end of his reign that Solomon fell into idolatry and polytheism (1Ki 11:4).

III. His Buildings.

1. The Temple:

The great undertaking of the reign of Solomon was, of course, The TEMPLE (which see), which was at first probably considered as the Chapel Royal and an adjunct of the palace. The Temple was begun in the 4th year of the reign and finished in the 11th, the work of the building occupying 7" years (1Ki 6; 7:13). The delay in beginning is remarkable, if the material were all ready to hand (1Ch 22). Worship there was inaugurated with fitting ceremony and prayers (1Ki 8).

2. The Palace:

To Solomon, however, his own palace was perhaps a more interesting undertaking. It at any rate occupied more time, in fact 13 years (1Ki 7:1-12; 9:10; 2Ch 8:1), the time of building both palace and Temple being 20 years. Possibly the building of the palace occupied the first four years of the reign and was then intermitted and resumed after the completion of the Temple; but of this there is no indication in the text. It was called the House of the Forest of Lebanon from the fact that it was lined with cedar wood (1Ki 7:2). A description of it is given in 1Ki 7:1-12.

3. Other Buildings:

Solomon also rebuilt the wall of the city and the citadel (see JERUSALEM; MILLO). He likewise erected castles at the vulnerable points of the frontiers—Hazor, Megiddo and Gezer (1Ki 9:15), lower Beth-horon and BAALATH (which see). According to the Qere of 1Ki 9:18 and the ancient versions as well as 2Ch 8:4, he was the founder of Tadmor (Palmyra); but the Kethibh of 1Ki 9:18 reads Tamar (compare Eze 47:19). Some of the remains of buildings recently discovered at Megiddo and Gezer may go back to the time of Solomon.

4. The Corvee:

Solomon could not have built on the scale he did with the resources ordinarily at the command of a free ruler. Accordingly we find that one of the institutions fostered by him was the corvee, or forced labor. No doubt something of the kind always had existed (Jos 9:21) and still exists in all despotic governments. Thus the people of a village will be called on to repair the neighboring roads, especially when the Pasha is making a progress in the neighborhood. But Solomon made the thing permanent and national (1Ki 5:13-15; 9:15). The immediate purpose of the levy was to supply laborers for work in the Lebanon in connection with his building operations. Thus 30,000 men were raised and drafted, 10,000 at a time, to the Lebanon, where they remained for a month, thus having two months out of every three at home. But even when the immediate cause had ceased, the practice once introduced was kept up and it became one of the chief grievances which levi to the dismemberment of the kingdom (1Ki 12:18, Adoram = Adoniram; compare 2Sa 20:24), for hitherto the corvee had been confined to foreign slaves taken in war (1Ki 9:21). It is said the higher posts were reserved for Israelites, the laborers being foreigners (1Ki 9:22), that is, the Israelites acted as foremen. Some of the foreign slaves seem to have formed a guild in connection with the Temple which lasted down to the time of the exile (Ezr 2:55-57; Ne 7:57-59).

See NETHINIM.

IV. His Character.

1. Personal Qualities:

In Solomon we have the type of a Turkish sultan, rather than a king of Israel. The Hebrew kings, whether of Israel or Judah, were, in theory at least, elective monarchs like the kings of Poland. If one happened to be a strong ruler, he managed to establish his family it might be, for three or even four generations. In the case of the Judean dynasty the personality of the first king made such a deep impression upon the heart of the people that the question of a change of dynasty there never became pressing. But Solomon would probably have usurped the crown if he had not inherited it, and once on the throne he became a thoroughgoing despot. All political power was taken out of the hands of the sheiks, although outward respect was still paid to them (1Ki 8:1), and placed in the hands of officers who were simply creatures of Solomon. The resources of the nation were expended, not on works of public utility, but on the personal aggrandizement of the monarch (1Ki 10:18). In the means he took to gratify his passions he showed himself to be little better than a savage and if he did not commit such great crimes as David, it was perhaps because he had no occasion, or because he employed greater cunning in working out his ends.

2. His Wisdom:

The wisdom for which Solomon is so celebrated was not of a very high order; it was nothing more than practical shrewdness, or knowledge of the world and of human nature. The common example of it is that given in 1Ki 3:16 ff, to which there are innumerable parallels in Indian, Greek and other literatures. The same worldly wisdom lies at the back of the Book of Proverbs, and there is no reason why a collection of these should not have been made by Solomon just as it is more likely that he was a composer of verses than that he was not (1Ki 4:32). The statement that he had breadth of heart (1Ki 4:29) indicates that there was nothing known which did not come within his ken.

3. His Learning:

The word "wisdom," however, is used also in another connection, namely, in the sense of theoretical knowledge or book leaning, especially in the department of natural history. It is not to be supposed that Solomon had any scientific knowledge of botany or zoology, but he may have collected the facts of observation, a task in which the Oriental, who cannot generalize, excels. The wisdom and understanding (1Ki 4:29) for which Solomon was famous would consist largely in stories about beasts and trees like the well-known Fables of Pilpai. They included also the "wisdom" for which Egypt was famous (1Ki 4:30), that is, occult science. It results from this last statement that Solomon appears in post-Biblical and Arabian literature as a magician.

4. Trade and Commerce:

Solomon was very literally a merchant prince. He not only encouraged and protected commerce, but engaged in it himself. He was in fact the predominant, if not sole, partner in a great trading concern, which was nothing less than the Israelite nation. One of his enterprises was the horse trade with Egypt. His agents bought up horses which were again sold to the kings of the Hittites and the Arameans. The prices paid are mentioned (1Ki 10:29). The best of these Solomon no doubt retained for his own cavalry (1Ki 10:26). Another commodity imported from that country was linen yarn (1Ki 10:28 the King James Version). The navy which Solomon built at the head of the Gulf of Akaba was not at all for military, but purely commercial ends. They were ships of Tarshish, that is, merchant ships, not ships to Tarshish, as 2Ch 9:21. They traded to OPHIR (which see), from which they brought gold; silver, ivory, apes and peacocks, the round voyage lasting 3 years (1Ki 9:26 ff; 10:22). Special mention is made of "almug" (1Ki 10:11) or "algum" (2Ch 9:10 f) trees (which see). The visit of the Queen of Sheba would point to the overland caravan routes from the Yemen being then open (1Ki 10:15). What with direct imports and the result of sales, silver and cedar wood became very plentiful in the capital (1Ki 10:27).

5. Officers of State:

The list of Solomon’s officers of state is given in 1Ki 4:2 ff. These included a priest, two secretaries, a recorder, a commander-in-chief, a chief commissariat officer, a chief shepherd (if we may read ro‘eh for re’eh), a master of the household, and the head of the corvee. The list should be compared with those of David’s officers (2Sa 8:16 ff; 20:23). There is much resemblance, but we can see that the machine of state was becoming more complicated. The bodyguard of foreign mercenaries was abolished and the captain Benaiah promoted to be commander-in-chief. Two scribes were required instead of one. Twelve commissariat officers were appointed whose duty it was to forward from their districts the supplies for the royal household and stables. The list of these officials, a very curious one, is given in 1Ki 4:7 ff. It is to be noted that the 12 districts into which the country was divided did not coincide with the territories of the 12 tribes. It may be remarked that Solomon seems as far as possible to have retained the old servants of his father. It will be noticed also that in all the lists there is mention of more than one priest. These "priests" retained some of their original functions, since they acted as prognosticators and diviners.

6. Wives:

Solomon’s principal wife was naturally the daughter of Pharaoh; it was for her that his palace was built (1Ki 3:1; 7:8; 9:16,24). But in addition to her he established marriage relations with the neighboring peoples. In some cases the object was no doubt to cement an alliance, as with the Zidonians and Hittites and the other nationalities (1Ki 11:1), some of which were forbidden to Israelites (De 7:3). It may be that the daughter of Pharaoh was childless or died a considerable time before Solomon, but his favorite wife was latterly a grand-daughter of Nahash, the Ammonite king (1Ki 14:21 Septuagint), and it was her son who succeeded to the throne. Many of Solomon’s wives were no doubt daughters of wealthy or powerful citizens who wished by an alliance with the king to strengthen their own positions. Yet we do not read of his marrying an Israelite wife. According to the Arabian story Bilqis, the Queen of Sheba who visited Solomon (1Ki 10:1), . was also married to him. He appears to have had only one son; we

are not told of any other than Rehoboam. His daughters were married to his own officers (1Ki 4:11,15).

7. Revenues:

Solomon is said to have started his reign with a capital sum of 100,000 talents of gold and a million talents of silver, a sum greater than the national debt of Great Britain. Even so, this huge sum was ear-marked for the building of the Temple (1Ch 22:14). His income was, for one year, at any rate, 666 talents of gold (1Ki 10:14), or about twenty million dollars. This seems an immense sum, but it probably was not so much as it looks. The great mass of the people were too poor to have any commodities which they could exchange for gold. Its principal use was for the decoration of buildings. Its purchasing power was probably small, because so few could afford to buy it. It was in the same category as the precious stones which are of great rarity, but which are of no value unless there is a demand for them. In the time of Solomon there was no useful purpose to which gold could be put in preference to any other metal.

8. Literary Works:

It is not easy to believe that the age of Solomon, so glorious in other respects, had not a literature to correspond. Yet the reign of the sultan Ismail in Morocco, whom Solomon much resembles, might be cited in favor of such a supposition. Solomon himself is stated to have composed 3,000 animal stories and 1,005 songs (1Ki 4:32). In the Old Testament the following are ascribed to him: three collections of Proverbs, 1:1 ff; 10:1 ff; 25:1 ff; The So of Songs; Psalms 72 and 127; Ecclesiastes (although Solomon is not named). In Pr 25:1 the men of Hezekiah are said to have copied out the following proverbs.

LITERATURE.

The relative portions of the histories by Ewald, Stanley (who follows Ewald), Renan, Wellhausen and Kittel; also H. Winckler, Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen; and the commentaries on the Books of Kings and Chronicles.

Thomas Hunter Weir

SOLOMON’S PORCH

See PORCH, PORTICO, SOLOMON’S.

SOLOMON’S SERVANTS

(’adbhedhe shelomoh; douloi Salomon): "The children of Solomon’s servants" constituted a company or guild of the Jewish exiles who returned with Zerubbabel from Babylonia to Jerusalem in 537 BC, pursuant to the decree of Cyrus; they are mentioned 5 times (Ezr 2:55,58 parallel Ne 7:57,60; Ne 11:3). As the prime purpose of the returning exiles was the rebuilding of the Temple and the restoration of

Yahweh’s worship (Ezr 1:2,3), it was important that those who held the privileges of sanctuary service as a family heritage should go back to their duties. This included, besides priests and Levites, the NETHINIM (which see) and Solomon’s Servants. In every reference to them, Solomon’s Servants are connected with the Nethinim, who had been "given" or dedicated (nethinim or nethunim is pass. participle of nathan, "to give," "to appoint") by David "for the service of the Levites (Ezr 8:20); so Solomon’s Servants traced their official beginning back to Solomon’s appointment, as their name indicates. In the joint references they always fall into the natural chronological order, i.e. following the Nethinim. It is possible, therefore, that they are referred to in Ezr 7:24 also, under the title "servants of this house of God," which immediately follows "Nethinim" in the list of those exempt from taxation and tolls.

What their duties in the house of God may have been is not stated in the records. These must have been more or less menial, the more formal and honorable duties being reserved for "the priests and Levites, the singers, (and) porters" (Ezr 7:24). When the ark was brought to Jerusalem by David and the ceremonial of the sacrificial system was more strictly observed, the services of priests and Levites were greatly increased, and to meet the needs of the new order David appointed the Nethinim (Ezr 8:20; compare 1Ch 9:2). Likewise the much greater increase in such duties on the completion of Solomon’s Temple was the occasion for the dedication of an additional number of these assistants to the Levites.

The number of those who returned with Zerubbabel was not great, together with the Nethinim being only 392. This does not appear to have been sufficient for the needs of the sanctuary, since Ezra, in preparation for his expedition in 458 BC, made special appeal for Nethinim to go with him, of whom 220 responded (Ezr 8:15-20). No doubt at the first their service was considered to be lowly; but by the time of the exile, certainly after it, their position had developed into one of considerable honor and constituted them a privileged class in the nation. While many of the people were required by Nehemiah to live in Jerusalem, they were allowed to dwell in their possessions "in the cities of Judah" (Ne 11:3).

A question of some interest and of difference of opinion is whether Solomon’s Servants were Levites or non-Israelites. The latter view is the more generally held, for the following reasons; (1) After the completion of the Temple and his other great buildings a large body of workmen, whom Solomon had drafted from the non-Israelite population, were without occupation, and might well have been assigned to the menial duties of the Temple (1Ki 9), their name in Septuagint (douloi) properly indicating such a class; (2) Ezekiel excludes non-Israelites from the service of his ideal temple, as though they had been allowed in the preexilic Temple (44:9); (3) they are always clearly distinguished from the Levites in the lists of religious bodies.

But, on the other hand, equally strong arguments favor their Levitical descent:

(1) Levites also are called douloi in 1 Esdras; (2) it is more probable that Ezekiel refers to the abuses of Athaliah, Ahaz and Manasseh than to the institutions of David and Solomon;

(3) Ezra specifically classifies the Nethinim as Levites (8:15-20);

(4) there is not the slightest intimation in the text of 1Ki 9:15-22 that the Gentilebondservants were assigned to temple-service after completion of the great building operations; such an interpretation is wholly inferential, while, on the contrary, it is more probable that such an innovation would have been mentioned in the narrative; and

(5) it is not probable that Ezra and Nehemiah, or Zerubbabel, with their strict views of Israelite privilege (compare Ezr 2:62), would have admitted non-Israelites to sacred functions, the less so in view of Ezekiel's prohibition. There is more ground, then, for holding that Solomon's Servants, like the porters and singers, were an order of Levites.

Edward Mack

SOLOMON, ODES OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. B, III, 2.

SOLOMON, POOLS OF

See POOLS OF SOLOMON.

SOLOMON, PSALMS (PSALTER) OF

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. B, III, 1.

SOLOMON, SONG OF

See SONG OF SONGS.

SOLOMON, WISDOM OF

See WISDOM OF SOLOMON.

SOMEIS

so'-me-is (Someeis; the King James Version Samis): One of the Israelites, who put away their foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:34) =" Shimei" in Ezr 10:38.

SOMETIME

sum’-tim: In modern English means "occasionally," and is so used in Sirach 37:14 for eniote. Otherwise the word means "at some past time," and is the translation of pote. the Revised Version (British and American) changes to "aforetime" in The Wisdom of Solomon 5:3; 1Pe 3:20; to "once" in Eph 2:13; 5:8; to "in time past" in Col 1:21; while in Col 3:7 the English Revised Version has "aforetime," the American Standard Revised Version "once." the King James Version does not distinguish between "sometime" and "sometimes."

SON OF GOD, THE

(ho huios theou):

1. Use of Title in the Synoptists

2. Meanings in the Old Testament

3. Sense as Applied to Jesus

4. Physical Reason

5. Alleged Equivalence to "Messiah"—Personal Sense Implied

6. Higher Use by Jesus Himself

7. The "Son" in Matthew 11:27

8. The "Son" in Mark 13:32

9. The "Son" in Matthew 28:18-20

10. Apostolic Doctrine: Deity Affirmed

11. The Fourth Gospel: Deity, Preexistence, etc.

LITERATURE

1. Use of Title in the Synoptists:

While the title "the Son of man" is always, except once, applied by Jesus to Himself, "the Son of God" is never applied by Jesus to Himself in the Synoptists. When, however, it is applied to Him by others, He accepts it in such a way as to assert His claim to it. Now and then He Himself employs the abbreviated form, "the Son," with the same intention; and He often speaks of God as "the Father" or "my Father" or

"my Father who is in heaven" in such a manner as to betray the consciousness that He is the Son of God.

2. Meanings in the Old Testament:

While to the common mind "the Son of man" is a title designating the human side of our Lord's person, "the Son of God" seems as obviously to indicate the divine side. But scholarship cannot take this for granted; and, indeed, it requires only a hasty glance at the facts to bring this home even to the general reader, because in Scripture the title is bestowed on a variety of persons for a variety of reasons. First, it is applied to angels, as when in Job 2:1 it is said that "the sons of God came to present themselves before Yahweh"; they may be so called because they are the creatures of God's hands or because, as spiritual beings, they resemble God, who is a spirit. Secondly, in Lu 3:38 it is applied to the first man; and from the parable of the Prodigal Son it may be argued that it is applicable to all men. Thirdly, it is applied to the Hebrew nation, as when, in Ex 4:22, Yahweh says to Pharaoh, "Israel is my son, my first-born," the reason being that Israel was the object of Yahweh's special love and gracious choice. Fourthly, it is applied to the kings of Israel, as representatives of the chosen nation. Thus, in 2Sa 7:14, Yahweh says of Solomon, "I will be his father, and he shall be my son"; and, in Ps 2:7, the coronation of a king is announced in an oracle from heaven, which says, "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee." Finally, in the New Testament, the title is applied to all saints, as in Joh 1:12, "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." When the title has such a range of application, it is obvious that the Divinity of Christ cannot be inferred from the mere fact that it is applied to Him.

3. Sense as Applied to Jesus:

It is natural to assume that its use in application to Jesus is derived from one or other of its Old Testament uses; and the one almost universally fixed upon by modern scholarship as that from which it was derived is the fourth mentioned above—that to the Jewish kings. Indeed, it is frequently asserted that in the Jewish literature between the Old Testament and the New Testament, it is found already coined as a title for the Messianic king; but the instances quoted by Dalman and others in proof of this are far from satisfactory.

4. Physical Reason:

When we come to examine its use in the New Testament as applied by others to Jesus, the facts are far from simple, and it is not applied in a uniform sense. In Lu 1:35, the following reason for its use is given, "The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is begotten shall be called the Son of God." This is a physical reason, akin to that on account of which the angels or the first man received the title; but it is rather curious that this point of view does not seem to be adopted elsewhere, unless it be in the exclamation of the centurion at the foot of the cross, "Truly this was the Son of God" (Mt 27:54). As a pagan this soldier might be thinking of Jesus as one of those heroes, born of human mothers but divine fathers, of whom the mythology of his country had so much to tell (compare the margin).

5. Alleged Equivalence to Messiah—Personal Sense Implied:

(1) Baptism, Temptation.

It has been contended, not without plausibility, that for Jesus Himself the source of the title may have been the employment of it in the voice from heaven at His Baptism, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Mt 3:17). By these words, it is usually assumed, He was designated as the Messiah; but in the adjective "beloved," and the words "in whom I am well pleased," there is something personal, beyond the merely official recognition. The same may be said of the voice from heaven in the scene of the Transfiguration. Milton, in Paradise Regained, makes Satan become aware of the voice from heaven at the Baptism; but this is also implied in the terms with which he approached Him in the Temptation in the wilderness, "If thou art the Son of God" (Mt 4:3, etc.); and, if this was the sense in which the prince of devils made use of the phrase, we may conclude that in the mouths of the demoniacs who hailed Jesus by the same title it must have had the same meaning.

(2) At Caesarea Philippi.

When, at Caesarea Philippi, Jesus evoked from the Twelve their great confession, this is given by two of the synoptists in the simple form, "Thou art the Christ" (Mr 8:29; Lu 9:20); but Mt adds, "the Son of the living God" (Mt 16:16). It is frequently said that Hebrew parallelism compels us to regard these words as a mere equivalent for "Messiah." But this is not the nature of parallelism, which generally includes in the second of the parallel terms something in excess of what is expressed in the first; it would be quite in accordance with the nature of parallelism if the second term supplied the reason for the first. That is to say, Jesus was the Messiah because He was the Son of God.

(3) Trial before Sanhedrin.

There is another passage where it is frequently contended that "the Christ" and "the Son of God" must be exactly parallel, but a close examination suggests the reverse. In the account of the ecclesiastical trial in the Gospel of Lk, He is charged, "If thou art the Christ, tell us"; and, when He replies, "If I tell you, ye will not believe: and if I ask you, ye will not answer. But from henceforth shall the Son of man be seated at the right hand of the power of God," they all say, "Art thou then the Son of God?" and, when He replies in the affirmative, they require no further witness (Lu 22:67-71), Matthew informing us that the high priest hereupon rent his garments, and they all agreed that He had spoken blasphemy and was worthy of death (Mt 26:65 f). The usual assumption is that the second question, "Art thou .... the Son of God?" implies no more than the first, ‘Art thou the Christ?’; but is not the scene much more intelligible if the boldness of His answer to the first question suggested that He was making a still higher claim than to be the Christ, and that their second question applied to this? It was when Jesus affirmed this also that their angry astonishment knew no bounds, and their sentence was immediate and capital. It may be questioned whether it was blasphemy merely to claim to be the Messiah; but it was rank and undeniable blasphemy to claim to be the Son of God. This recalls the statement in Joh 5:18, "The Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only brake the sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making

himself equal with God"; to which may be added (Joh 10:33), "The Jews answered him, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God."

6. Higher Use by Jesus Himself:

Naturally it is with the words of Jesus Himself on this subject that we are most concerned. He speaks of God as His Father, and to the disciples He speaks of God as their Father; but He never speaks to them of God as their common Father: what He says is, "My Father and your Father" (Joh 20:17). H. J. Holtzmann and others have attempted to make light of this, and even to speak of the opening words of the Lord's Prayer, "Our Father who art in heaven," as if Jesus might have uttered them in company with the disciples; but the distinction is a vital one, and we do not agree with those who can believe that Jesus could have uttered, for Himself along with others, the whole of the Lord's Prayer, including the petition, "Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors."

7. The "Son" in Matthew 11:27:

Of the passages in the Synoptists where Jesus speaks about God as "the Father" and Himself as "the Son," a peculiar solemnity attaches to Mt 11:27 parallel Lu 10:22, "All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him." There is a Johannine flavor in these words, and they reveal an intimacy of the Son with the Father, as well as a power over all things, which could not have been conferred by mere official appointment, unless there had been in the background a natural position warranting the official standing. Not infrequently has the word "Messianic" been allowed by scholars to blind them to the most obvious facts. The conferring of an office on a mere man could not enable him to do things beyond the reach of human powers; yet it is frequently assumed that, if only Jesus was Messiah, He was able for anything, even when the thing in question is something for which a mere man is wholly incompetent.

8. The "Son" in Mark 13:32:

There is a saying of Jesus (Mr 13:32) about His own Sonship which may seem to refute the church doctrine on the subject, as in it He confesses ignorance of the date of His Second Coming: "Of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Yet, while there is much in this passage fitted to produce sane and sober views as to the real manhood of Jesus, there are few sayings of His that betray a stronger consciousness of His being more than man. Four planes of being and of knowledge are specified—that of men, that of angels, that of Himself, and that of God. Evidently the Son is above not only men but angels, and, if it is confessed that He is ignorant of anything, this is mentioned as a matter of surprise.

9. The "Son" in Matthew 28:18-20:

The conclusion would seem to be that He is a being intermediate between the angels and God; but this

impression is corrected by the greatest of all the sayings in which He calls Himself the Son (Mt 28:18-20), "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Here the Son is named along with the Father and the Holy Spirit in a way suggesting the equality of all three, an act of worship being directed to them jointly. By those who disbelieve in the Deity of Christ, the most strenuous attempts have been made to get rid of this passage, and in certain quarters it is taken for granted that it must have been an addition to the text of this Gospel. But for this there is no ground whatever; the passage is the climax of the Gospel in which it occurs, in the same way as the confession of Thomas is the climax of the Gospel of Jn; and to remove it would be an intolerable mutilation. Of course to those who disbelieve in the bodily resurrection of our Lord, this has no more substance than the other details of the Forty Days; but to those who believe in His risen glory the words appear to suit the circumstances, their greatness being congruous with the entire representation of the New Testament.

10. Apostolic Doctrine: Deity Affirmed:

Indeed, it is the Son of God, as He appears in this final scene in the First Gospel, who dominates the rest of the New Testament. Thus, in Ac 9:20, the beginning of Paul’s testimony as a Christian is given in these words, "And straightway in the synagogues he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God"; and what this meant to Paul may be gathered from his own statement in the opening of Romans, "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures, concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord" (Ro 1:1-4). In He the equality of the Son with the Father is theme throughout the entire book; and in Re 2:18, "the Son of God, who hath his eyes like a flame of fire," speaks from the right hand of power to the church.

On this subject there was no division of opinion in the apostolic church. On many other questions the followers of Jesus were divided; but on this one they were unanimous. For this the authority of Paul is often assumed to be responsible; but there was a prior and higher authority. This was the self-testimony of Jesus in the Gospel of John. Though this may not have been put in literary form till all the other books of the New Testament had been completed, it was active and influential in the church all the time, affecting Paul and the other New Testament writers.

11. The Fourth Gospel: Deity, Preexistence, etc.:

There is no real disharmony between the expression of our Lord’s self-consciousness in the Synoptists and that in John; only in the latter it is far ampler and more distinct. Here Jesus is not only called "the Son of God" by others, but applies the title to Himself in its full shape, as well as in the abbreviated form of "the Son." He further calls Himself the "only begotten Son of God" (3:16,18), that is to say, He is Son in a sense in which no others can claim the title. This seems expressly to contradict the statement, so

often made, that He makes others sons of God in the same sense as Himself, or that His Sonship is ethical, not metaphysical. No doubt it is ethical—that is to say, He is like the Father in feeling, mind and will—but it does not follow that it is not at the same time metaphysical. In fact, the perfection of ethical unity depends upon that which is metaphysical. Between a dog and a man there may be deep sympathy, yet it is limited by the difference of their natures; whereas between a woman and a man there is perfect sympathy, because they are identical in nature.

Another feature of Sonship in the Fourth Gospel is preexistence, though, strange to say, this is more than once connected with the title "Son of man." But the strongest and most frequent suggestions as to what is implied in Sonship are to be found in the deeds attributed to the Son; for these are far beyond the competence of any mere man. Thus, He executes judgment (Joh 5:22); He has life in Himself and quickeneth whom He will (Joh 5:26,21); He gives eternal life (Joh 10:10), and it is the will of the Father that all men should honor the Son, even as they do the Father (Joh 5:23). Nevertheless, the Son does nothing of Himself, but only what He hath seen the Father do (Joh 5:19); and only that which He hath heard of the Father does He speak (Joh 14:10). In short, God is not only His Father, but His God (Joh 20:17). To statements such as these a merely official Sonship is not adequate; the relation must be ethical and metaphysical as well; and to a perfect Sonship all three elements are essential.

LITERATURE.

See the books on the Theology of the New Testament by Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Feine, Schlatter, Weinel, Bovon, Stevens, Sheldon; and on the Teaching of Jesus by Bruce, Wendt, Dalman; Gore, The Incarnation of the Son of God, Bampton Lectures, 1891, and Dissertations on Subjects Connected with the Incarnation; Robertson, Teaching of Jesus concerning God the Father; full bibliography in Stalker, Christ’s Teaching concerning Himself.

James Stalker

SON OF MAN, THE

(ho huios tou anthropou) :

1. Use in the New Testament: Self-Designation of Jesus

2. Questions as to Meaning

I. SOURCE OF THE TITLE

1. The Phrase in the Old Testament—Psalms, Ezekiel, Daniel

2. "Son of Man" in Daniel 7—New Testament Allusions

3. Expressive of Messianic Idea

4. Post-canonical Literature: Book of Enoch

II. WHY JESUS MADE USE OF THE TITLE

1. Consciousness of Being the Messiah

2. Half Concealed, Yet Half Revealed His Secret

3. Expressive of Identification with Men in Sympathy, Fortunes and Destiny

4. Speculations (Lietzmann, Wellhausen, etc.) on Aramaic Meaning: These Rejected (Dalman, etc.)

LITERATURE

1. Use in New Testament: Self-Designation of Jesus:

This is the favorite self-designation of Jesus in the Gospels. In Matthew it occurs over 30 times, in Mark 15 times, in Luke 25 times, and in John a dozen times. It is always in the mouth of Jesus Himself that it occurs, except once, when the bystanders ask what He means by the title (Joh 12:34). Outside the Gospels, it occurs only once in Acts, in Stephen’s speech (Ac 7:56), and twice in the Book of Revelation (1:13; 14:14).

2. Questions as to Meaning:

At first sight it appears so apt a term for the human element in our Lord’s person, the divine element being similarly denoted by "the Son of God," that this was supposed to be its meaning, as it still is by the common man at the present day. As long as it was assumed that the meaning could be elicited by merely looking at the words as they stand and guessing what they must signify, this was substantially the view of all, although this common conception went in two directions—some noting especially the loftier and more ideal elements in the conception, while others emphasized what was lowly and painful in the human lot; and both could appeal to texts in support of their view. Thus, the view "that Christ by this phrase represented Himself as the head, the type, the ideal of the race" (Stanton, The Jewish and the Christian Messiah), could appeal to such a saying as, "The Son of man is Lord even of the sabbath" (Mr 2:28); while the humbler view could quote such a saying as, "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heaven have nests; but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head" (Mt 8:20).

The more scientific investigation of the phrase began, however, when it was inquired, first, what the source was from which Jesus derived this title, and, secondly, why He made use of it.

I. Source of the Title.

1. The Phrase in the Old Testament—Psalms, Ezekiel, Daniel:

That the phrase was not one of Jesus' own invention is manifest, because it occurs often in the Old Testament.

Thus, in Ps 8:4 it is used as an equivalent for "man" in the parallel lines,

"What is man, that thou art mindful of him?

And the son of man, that thou visitest him ?"

This passage has sometimes been regarded as the source whence Jesus borrowed the title; and for this a good deal might be said, the psalm being an incomparable exposition both of the lowliness and the loftiness of human nature. But there is another passage in the Psalms from which it is far from incredible that it may have been derived: in Ps 80:17 occur the words,

"Let thy hand be upon the man of thy right hand,

Upon the son of man whom thou maddest strong for thyself."

This is an appeal, in an age of national decline, for the raising up of a hero to redeem Israel; and it might well have kindled the spark of Messianic consciousness in the heart of the youthful Jesus.

There is a book of the Old Testament in which the phrase "the son of man" occurs no fewer than 90 times. This is the Book of Ezekiel, where it is always applied to the prophet himself and designates his prophetic mission. In the words of Nosgen (Christus der Menschenund Gotlessohn): "It expresses the contrast between what Ezekiel is in himself and what God will make out of him, and to make his mission appear to him not as his own, but as the work of God, and thus to lift him up, whenever the flesh threatens to faint and fail." Thus there was one before Jesus of Nazareth who bore the title, at least in certain moments of his life; and, after Ezekiel, there arose another Hebrew prophet who has put on record that he was addressed from the same high quarter in the same terms; for, in Da 8:17, it is written, "So he came near where I stood; and when he came, I was affrighted, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man"—words then following intended to raise the spirit of the trembling servant of God. By Weizsacker and others the suggestion has been made that Jesus may have borrowed the term from Ezekiel and Daniel to express His consciousness of belonging to the same prophetic line.

2. "Son of Man" in Daniel 7—New Testament Allusions:

There is, however, in the same Book of Daniel another occurrence of the phrase, in a totally different sense, to which the attention of science is more and more being drawn. In 7:3 ff, in one of the

apocalyptic visions common to this prophet, four beasts are seen coming out of the sea—the first a lion with eagle's wings, the second a bear, the third a fourheaded leopard, and the fourth a terrible monster with ten heads. These beasts bear rule over the earth; but at last the kingdom is taken away from them and given to a fifth ruler, who is thus described, "I saw in the night-visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Da 7:13,14). Compare with these words from Da the words of Jesus to the high priest during His trial, "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven" (Mt 26:64), and the echo of the Old Testament words cannot be mistaken. Equally distinct is it in the great discourse in Mt 24:30, "Then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory."

3. Expressive of Messianic Idea:

The use of this self-designation by Jesus is especially frequent and striking in passages referring to His future coming to judgment, in which there is necessarily a certain resemblance to the apocalyptic scene in Daniel. In such utterances the Messianic consciousness of Jesus is most emphatically expressed; and the passage in Daniel is also obviously Messianic. In another considerable series of passages in which this phrase is used by Jesus, the references are to His sufferings and death; but the assumption which explains these also most easily is that they are Messianic too; Jesus is speaking of the fortunes to which He must submit on account of His vocation. Even the more dignified passages, expressive of ideality, are best explained in the same way. In short, every passage where the phrase occurs is best understood from this point of view, whereas, from any other point of view, not a few appear awkward and out of place. How little, for example, does the idea that the phrase is expressive of lowliness or of brotherhood with suffering humanity accord with the opening of the judgment-scene in Mt 25:31, "But when the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory"!

4. Post-canonical Literature: Book of Enoch:

The son of man, or rather "one like unto a son of man" mentioned in Daniel, is primarily the Hebrew people, as is expressly noted in the prophecy itself; but Jesus must have looked upon Himself as the representative of the people of God, in the same way as, in the Old Testament generally, the reigning sovereign was regarded as the representative of the nation. But the question has been raised whether this transference of the title from a collective body to an individual may have been mediated for Him through postcanonical religious literature or the prevalence among the people of ideas generated through this literature. In the Book of Enoch there occur numerous references to the son of man, which bear a remarkable resemblance to some of the sayings of Jesus. The date usually assigned to this production is some 200 years BC; and, if these passages in it actually existed as early as this, the book would almost require to be included in the canonical Scriptures, though for other reasons it is far from worthy of any such honor. The whole structure of the Book of Enoch is so loose and confused that it must always have

invited interpolation; and interpolations in it are recognized as numerous. The probability, therefore, is that the passages referring to the son of man are of later date and of Christian origin.

II. Why Jesus Made Use of the Title.

The conclusion that this title expresses, not the personal qualities of Jesus as a man, but His functions as Messiah, may be disappointing; but there is a way of recovering what seems to have been lost; because we must now inquire for what reasons He made use of this term.

1. Consciousness of Being the Messiah:

The first reason, of course, is, that in Daniel it expressed Messiahship, and that Jesus was conscions of being the Messiah. In the Old Testament He was wont all His days to read His own history. He ranged over all the sacred books and found in them references to His own person and work. With divinatory glance He pierced into the secrets of Scripture and brought forth from the least as well as the best-known portions of the ancient oracles meanings which are now palpable to all readers of the Bible, but which He was the first to discover. From the passage in Daniel, or from some other passage of the Old Testament in which the phrase "the son of man" occurs, a hint flashed out upon Him, as He read or heard; and the suggestion grew in His brooding mind, until it rounded itself into the fit and satisfying expression for one side of His self-consciousness.

2. Half Concealed, Yet Half Revealed His Secret:

Another reason why He fixed upon this as His favorite self-designation may have been that it half concealed as well as half revealed His secret. Of the direct names for the Messiah He was usually shy, no doubt chiefly because His contemporaries were not prepared for an open declaration of Himself in this character; but at all stages of His ministry He called Himself the Son of man without hesitation. The inference seems to be, that, while the phrase expressed much to Himself, and must have meant more and more for those immediately associated with Him, it did not convey a Messianic claim to the public ear. With this accords well the perplexity once manifested by those listening to Him, when they asked, "Who is this Son of man?" (Joh 12:34); as it also explains the question of Jesus to the Twelve at Caesarea Philippi, "Who do men say that the Son of man is?" or, as it is in the margin, "that I the Son of man am?" (Mt 16:13). That He was the Son of man did not evidently mean for all that He claimed to be the Messiah.

3. Expressive of Identification with Men in Sympathy, Fortunes and Destiny:

But when we try to realize for what reasons Jesus may have picked this name out from all which presented themselves to Him in His intimate and loving survey of the Old Testament, it is difficult to resist the belief that a third and the principal reason was because it gave expression to His sense of connection with all men in sympathy, fortunes and destiny. He felt Himself to be identified with all as their brother, their fellow-sufferer, their representative and champion; and, in some respects, the deepest

word He ever spake was, "For the Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mr 10:45 parallel).

4. Speculations (Lietzmann, Wellhausen, etc.) on Aramaic Meaning: These Rejected (Dalman, etc.):

In 1896, Hans Lietzmann, a young German scholar, startled the learned World with a speculation on the "Son of man." Making the assumption that Aramaic was the language spoken by Jesus, he contended that Jesus could not have applied to Himself the Messianic title, because there is nothing corresponding with it in Aramaic. The only term approximating to it is barnash, which means something very vague, like "anyone" or "everyman" (in the sense of the old morality play thus entitled). Many supposed Lietzmann to be arguing that Jesus had called Himself Anyone or Everyman; but this was not his intention. He tried to prove that the Messianic title had been applied to Jesus in Asia Minor in the first half of the 2nd century and that the Gospels had been revised with the effect of substituting it for the first personal pronoun. But he failed to show how the manuscripts could have been so universally altered as to leave no traces of this operation, or how, if the text of the New Testament was then in so fluid a state as to admit of such a substitution, the phrase should not have overflowed into other books besides the Gospels. Although the hypothesis has secured wide attention through being partially adopted by Wellhausen, whose view is to be found in Skizzen und Vorarbeiten, VI, and at p. 66 of his Commentary on Mark, it may be reckoned among the ghosts which appear for an hour on the stage of learning, attracting attention and admiration, but have no permanent connection with the world of reality. Dalman, the leading authority on Aramaic, denies the foundation on which the views of both Lietzmann and Wellhausen rest, and holds that, had the Messianic title existed, the Aramaic language would have been quite capable of expressing it. And in 1911 Wellhausen himself explicitly admitted this (Einleitung in die drei eraten Evangelien(2), 130).

LITERATURE.

See the books on New Testament Theology by Weiss, Beyschlag, Holtzmann, Feine, Schlatter, Weinel, Stevens, Sheldon; and on the Teaching of Jesus by Wentit, Bruce, Dalman; Abbott, The Son of Man, 1910; very full bibliography in Stalker, The Teaching of Jesus concerning Himself.

James Stalker

SON-IN-LAW

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

SON; SONS

sun, sunz:

(1) In Biblical language the word "son" is used first of all in its strictly literal sense of male issue or

offspring of a man or woman. In a few cases in the Old Testament, as in Ge 3:16; Jos 17:2; Jer 20:15, the Hebrew word ben, is translated correctly in the English by the word "child" or "children" as it includes both sexes, as in Ge 3:16, or is limited to males by the use of the modifying term "male." Closely connected with this meaning of direct male issue or of children is its use to denote descendants, posterity in the more general sense. This usage which, as in the case of the sons (children) of Israel, may be regarded perhaps as originating in the conception of direct descent from the common ancestor Israel, came in the course of time to be a mere ethnographic designation, so that the term "the children of Israel" and "the children of Ammon" meant no more than Israelites or Ammonites, that is, inhabitants of the lands of Israel or Ammon respectively. An extension of this usage is to be found in the designation of a people as the sons or children of a land or city; so in Am 9:7 "children of the Ethiopians," or Eze 16:28, where the literal rendering would be "sons of Asshur," instead of the Assyrians, and "the children of Jerus" in Joe 3:6.

See BAR (prefix); BEN-.

(2) More characteristic of Biblical usage is the employment of the word "son" to indicate membership in a class or guild, as in the common phrase "sons of the prophets," which implies nothing whatever as to the ancestry, but states that the individuals concerned are members of the prophetic guilds or schools. In the New Testament the word "sons" (huioi) in Lu 11:19, rendered "children" in Mt 12:27 the King James Version, means, not physical descendants, but members of the class or sect; according to Mt the Pharisees, who were attacking Christ.

(3) The word "son" is used with a following genitive of quality to indicate some characteristic of the person or persons described. In the English the word "son" is usually omitted and the phrase is paraphrased as in 2Sa 3:34, where the words translated "wicked men" in the King James Version mean literally, sons or children of wickedness. Two examples of this usage may be cited: the familiar phrase "sons of Belial" in the Old Testament (De 15:13 the King James Version, and often), where the meaning is simply base or worthless fellows (compare Nu 24:17, margin "children of Sheth" (Expository Times, XIII, 64b)); and in the New Testament the phrase "sons of thunder," which is given in Mr 3:17 as the explanation of the epithet "Boanerges." This use is common in the New Testament, as the phrases "children of the kingdom," "children of light," etc., indicate, the general meaning being that the noun in the genitive following the word children indicates some quality of the persons under consideration. The special phrases "Son of man" and "Son of God" are considered in separate articles.

See also RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

Walter R. Betteridge

SONG

(shir, shirah): Besides the great collection of sacred songs contained in the Psalter, as well as the lyric outbursts, marked by strong religious feeling, on great national occasions, it is natural to believe, and we

have evidence to show, that the Hebrews possessed a large number of popular songs of a secular kind. So of Songs (which see) of itself proves this. Probably the very oldest song or fragment of song in the Old Testament is that "To the well" (Nu 21:17). W. R. Smith (Religions of the Semites, 167) regards this invocation of the waters to rise as in its origin hardly a mere poetic figure. He compares what Cazwini 1, 189, records of the well of Ilabistan: "When the water failed, a feast was held at its source with music and dancing, to induce it to flow again." If, however, the song had its origin in an early form of religious belief, it must have been secularized later.

But it is in the headings of the Psalms that we find the most numerous traces of the popular songs of the Hebrews. Here there are a number of words and phrases which are now believed to be the names or initial words of such lyrics. In the King James Version they are prefaced with the prep. "on," in the Revised Version (British and American) with "set to," i.e. "to the tune of." We give a list:

(1) Aijeleth Shahar the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) Aijeleth hash-shahar, ‘ayyeleth ha-shachar. The title means (Revised Version, margin) "The hind of the morning," but whether the original song so named was a hunting song or a morning serenade it is useless to conjecture. See HIND OF THE MORNING.

(2) Al-taschith (the King James Version), Al-tashheth (Revised Version), ‘al-tashcheth, i.e. "Destroy not," Psalms 57-59; 75, is apparently quoted in Isa 65:8, and in that case must refer to a vintage song.

(3) Jonah elem rehokim or Yonath’elem rechoqim (Ps 56), the Revised Version margin "The silent dove of them that are afar off," or—with a slightly different reading—"The dove of the distant terebinths."

(4) Machalath (Ps 53) and Machalath le‘annoth (Ps 88). Machalath may mean "sickness," and be the first word of a song. It might mean, on the other hand, a minor mode or rhythm. It has also been held to designate a musical instrument.

(5) Muthlabben (Ps 9) has given rise to many conjectures. Literally, it may mean "Die for the son," or "Death of the son." An ancient tradition referred the words to Goliath (death at the hand of the son [?]), and they have been applied to the fate of Absalom. Such guesses need only be quoted to show their worthlessness.

(6) Lastly, we have Shoshannim =" Lilies" (Psalms 45; 69), Shushan ‘Edhuth =" The lily of testimony" (Ps 60); and Shoshannim ‘Edhuth =" Lilies, a testimony" (Ps 80), probably to be explained like the others.

The music to which these songs were sung is irretrievably lost, but it was, no doubt, very similar in character to that of the Arabs at the present day. While the music of the temple was probably much more elaborate, and of wider range, both in notes and expression of feeling, the popular song was almost certainly limited in compass to a very few notes repeated over and over in long recitations or ballads. This is characteristic of the performances of Arab minstrels of today. The melodies are plaintive, in spite

of the majority of them being in major keys, owing to the 7th being flattened, as in genuine Scottish music. Arabic music, further, is marked by great variety and emphasis of rhythm, the various kinds of which have special names.

See SPIRITUAL SONGS.

James Millar

SONG OF SONGS

(shir hashirim; Septuagint Asma; Codices Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Ephraemi, Asma asmaton; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Canticum Canticorum):

I. CANONICITY

II. TEXT

III. AUTHORSHIP AND DATE

IV. HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION

1. The Allegorical Interpretation

2. The Typical Interpretation

3. The Literal Interpretation

V. CLOSING HINTS AND SUGGESTIONS

LITERATURE

The full title in Hebrew is "The So of Songs, which is Solomon’s." The book is called by some Canticles, and by others Solomon’s Song. The Hebrew title implies that it is the choicest of all songs, in keeping with the dictum of Rabbi ‘Aqiba (90-135 AD) that "the entire world, from the beginning until now, does not outweigh the day in which Canticles was given to Israel."

I. Canonicity.

Early Jewish and Christian writers are silent as to the So of Songs. No use is made of it by Philo. There is no quotation from it in the New Testament, nor is there any clear allusion to it on the part of our Lord or the apostles. The earliest distinct references to the So of Songs are found in Jewish writings of the 1st

and 2nd centuries AD (4 Esdras 5:24,26; 7:26; Ta‘anith 4:8). The question of the canonicity of the So was debated as late as the Synod of Jamnia (circa 90 AD), when it was decided that Canticles was rightly reckoned to "defile the hands," i.e. was an inspired book. It should be borne in mind that the So of Songs was already esteemed by the Jews as a sacred book, though prior to the Synod of Jamnia there was probably a goodly number of Jewish teachers who did not accept it as canonical. Selections from Canticles were sung at certain festivals in the temple at Jerusalem, prior to its destruction by Titus in 70 AD (Ta‘anith 4:8). The Mishna pronounces an anathema on all who treat Canticles as a secular song (Sanhedhrin, 101a). The latest date for the composition of the So of Songs, according to critics of the advanced school, is toward the close of the 3rd century BC. We may be sure that it was included in the Kethubhim before the ministry of our Lord, and so was for Him a part of the Scriptures.

II. Text.

Most scholars regard the text of Canticles as comparatively free from corruption. Gratz, Bickell, Budde and Cheyne have suggested a good many emendations of the traditional text, a few of which commend themselves as probable corrections of a faulty text, but most of which are mere guesses without sufficient confirmation from either external or internal evidence. For details see Budde’s able commentary, and articles by Cheyne in JQR and Expository Times for 1898-99 and in the The Expositor, February, 1899.

III. Authorship and Date.

The title in the Hebrew text ascribes the poem to Solomon. That this superscription was prefixed by an editor of Canticles and not by the original writer is evident from the fact that the relative pronoun employed in the title is different from that employed throughout the poem. The beauty and power of the book seemed to later students and editors to make the writing worthy of the gifted king, whose fame as a composer of both proverbs and songs was handed on to later times (1Ki 4:32). Moreover, the name of Solomon is prominent in the So of Songs itself (1:5; 3:7,9,11; 8:11 f). If the traditional view that Solomon wooed and won the Shulammite be true, the Solomonic authorship may even yet be defended, though the linguistic argument for a later date is quite strong.

The question in debate among recent critics is whether the So was composed in North Israel in preexilic days, or whether it is post-exilic. The author is at home in Hebrew. His vocabulary is extensive, and the movement of the poem is graceful. There is no suggestion of the use of lexicon and grammar by a writer living in the period of the decadence of the Hebrew language. The author is familiar with cities and mountains all over Palestine, especially in the northern section. He speaks of the beauty of Tirzah, the capital of North Israel in the 10th century BC, along with the glory of Jerusalem, the capital of Judah (So 6:4). The recollection of Solomon’s glory and pomp seems to be fresh in the mind of the writer and his contemporaries. W.R. Smith regarded Canticles as a protest against the luxury and the extensive harem of Solomon. True love could not exist in such an environment. The fidelity of the Shulammite to her shepherd lover, notwithstanding the blandishments of the wealthy and gifted king, stands as a rebuke to the notion that every woman has her price. Driver seems inclined to accept a preexilic date, though the

arguments from vocabulary and philology cause him to waver in his opinion (LOT, 8th edition, 450). An increasing number of critics place the composition of Canticles in the post-exilic period, many bringing it down into the Greek period. Among scholars who date Canticles in the 3rd century BC we may name Gratz, Kuenen, Cornill, Budde, Kautzsch, Martineau and Cheyne. The chief argument for bringing the So into the time of the early Ptolemies is drawn from the language of the poem. There are many Hebrew words that are employed elsewhere only in later books of the Old Testament; the word pardec (So 4:13) is a Persian loan-word for "park"; the word for "palanquin" may be Indian, or possibly Greek. Moreover, the form of the relative pronoun is uniformly that which is found in some of the latest books of the Old Testament. The influence of Aramaic is apparent, both in the vocabulary and in a few constructions. This may be accounted for on theory of the northern origin of the Song, or on the hypothesis of a post-exilic date. The question of date is still open.

IV. History of Interpretation.

1. The Allegorical Interpretation:

All interpreters of all ages agree in saying that Canticles is a poem of love; but who the lovers are is a subject of keen debate, especially in modern times.

First in point of time and in the number of adherents it has had is theory that the So is a pure allegory of the love of Yahweh and His people. The Jewish rabbis, from the latter part of the 1st century AD down to our own day, taught that the poem celebrates a spiritual love, Yahweh being the bridegroom and Israel the bride. Canticles was supposed to be a vivid record of the loving intercourse between Israel and her Lord from the exodus on to the glad Messianic time. The So is read by the Jews at Passover, which celebrates Yahweh’s choice of Israel to be His spouse. The Targum interprets Canticles as an allegory of the marital love of Yahweh and Israel. Origen made the allegorical theory popular in the early church. As a Christian he represented the bride as the church or the soul of the believer. In more recent centuries the Christian allegorical interpreters have favored the idea that the soul of the believer was the bride, though the other type of the allegorical view has all along had its advocates.

Bernard of Clairvaux wrote 86 sermons on the first two chapters of Canticles; and a host of writers in the Roman church and among Protestants have composed similar mystical treatises on the Song. Devout souls have expressed their fervent love to God in the sensuous imagery of Canticles. The imagery could not become too fervid or ecstatic for some of these devout men and women in their highest moments of beatific vision. Whatever may be the final verdict of sane criticism as to the original purpose of the author of the Song, it is a fact that must not be overlooked by the student of Canticles that some of the noblest religious souls, both Hebrew and Christian, have fed the flame of devotion by interpreting the So as an allegory.

What justification is there for theory that Canticles is an allegory of the love between Yahweh and His people, or of the love of Christ and the church, or of the love of the soul of the believer and Christ? It must be frankly confessed that there is not a hint in the So itself that it is an allegory. If the modern

reader of Canticles had never heard of the allegorical interpretation, nothing in the beginning, middle or end of the poem would be likely to suggest to his mind such a conception of the poet's meaning. How, then, did the early Jewish interpreters come to make this the orthodox interpretation of the Song? The question is not easy to answer. In the forefront of our answer we must recall the fact that the great prophets frequently represent the mutual love of Yahweh and Israel under the symbolism of marriage (Hosea 1-3; Jeremiah 3; Ezekiel 16; 23; Isa 50:1; 54:5,6). The Hebrew interpreter might naturally expect to find some echo of this bold imagery in the poetry of the Kethubhim. In the Torah the frequent command to love Yahweh might suggest the marital relation as well as that of the father and son (De 6:5; 7:7-9,13; 10:12,15; 30:16,20), though it must be said that the language of De suggests the high ethical and religious teaching of Jesus in the matter of love to God, in which the sexual does not appear.

Cheyne suggests (EB, I, 683 f) that the So was too joyous to be used, in its natural sense, by the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and hence, they consecrated it by allegorical interpretation. The suggestion may contain an element of truth.

It is an interesting fact that the Psalter has so few expressions in which love to Yahweh is expressed (Ps 31:23; 97:10; 145:20; compare 18:1; 42:1; 63:1). In this manual of devotion one would not be suprised to find the expansion of the image of wedlock as expressive of the soul's relation to God; but we look in vain for such a poem, unless Ps 45 be capable of allegorical interpretation. Even that beautiful song of love and marriage contains no such highly sensuous imagery as is found in Canticles.

Christian scholars found it easy to follow the Jewish allegorical interpreters; for the figure of wedlock is employed in the New Testament by both Paul and John to represent the intimate and vital union of Christ and His church (2Co 11:2; Eph 5:22-33; Re 19:7-9; 21:2,9).

The entire body of true believers is conceived of as the bride of Christ. Naturally the purity of the church is sullied through the impure conduct of the individuals of whom it is composed. Hence, the appeal to individuals and to local churches to live pure lives (2Co 11:1). To the unmarried believer the Lord Jesus takes the place of the husband or wife as the person whom one is most eager to please (1Co 7:32 f). It is not difficult to understand how the fervid, sensuous imagery of Canticles would appeal to the mind of a man like Origen as a proper vehicle for the expression of his passionate love for Christ.

Sober inquiry discovers no sufficient justification of the allegorical interpretation of the So of Songs. The pages of the mystical commentators are filled with artificial interpretations and conceits. Many of them practice a familiarity with Christ that is without example in the Biblical devotional literature.

2. The Typical Interpretation:

The allegorical interpreters, for the most part, saw in the So of Songs no historic basis. Solomon and the Shulammite are introduced merely as figures through whom God and His people, or Christ and the soul, can express their mutual love. In modern times interpreters have arisen who regard the So as primarily the expression of strong and passionate human love between Solomon and a beautiful maiden, but by

virtue of the typical relation of the old dispensation, secondarily, the fitting expression of the love of Christ and the church.

The way for this modern typical interpretation was prepared by Lowth (Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, Lectionaries XXX, XXXI) in his modified allegorical view, which is thus described by Canon Driver: "Bishop Lowth, though not abandoning the allegorical view, sought to free it from its extravagances; and while refusing to press details, held that the poem, while describing the actual nuptials of Solomon with the daughter of Pharaoh, contained also an allegoric reference to Christ espousing a church chosen from among the Gentiles" (LOT, 451). Few interpreters have been found to follow Theodore of Mopsuestia and Lowth in their view that the So celebrates the marriage of Solomon and an Egyptian princess; and Lowth's notion of a reference to the espousal of a church chosen from among the Gentiles is one of the curiosities of criticism. Of the typical interpreters Delitzsch is perhaps the ablest (Commentary on Ecclesiastes and the So of Songs).

The typical commentators are superior to the allegorical in their recognition of Canticles as the expression of the mutual love of two human beings. The further application of the language to Yahweh and His people (Keil), or to Christ and the church (Delitzsch), or to God and the soul (M. Stuart) becomes largely a matter of individual taste, interpreters differing widely in details.

3. The Literal Interpretation:

Jewish interpreters were deterred from the literal interpretation of Canticles by the anathema in the Mishna upon all who should treat the poem as a secular song (Sanhedhrin, 101a). Cheyne says of Ibn Ezra, a great medieval Jewish scholar, he "is so thorough in his literal exegesis that it is doubtful whether he is serious when he proceeds to allegorize." Among Christian scholars Theodore of Mopsuestia interpreted Canticles as a song in celebration of the marriage of Solomon and Pharaoh's daughter. This strictly literal interpretation of the So was condemned at the second council of Constantinople (553 AD). For the next thousand years the allegorical theory reigned supreme among Christian interpreters. In 1544 Sebastian Castellio revived the literal theory of the Song, though the allegorical view remained dominant until the 19th century.

Herder in 1778 published a remarkable little treatise entitled Lieder der Liebe, die altesten und schonsten aus dem Morgenlande, in which he advanced theory that Canticles is a collection of independent erotic songs, about 21 in number, which have been so arranged by a collector as to trace "the gradual growth of true love in its various nuances and stages, till it finds its consummation in wedlock" (Cheyne). But the greatest and most influential advocate of the literal interpretation of Canticles was Heinrich Ewald, who published the 1st edition of his commentary in 1826. It was Ewald who first developed and made popular theory that two suitors compete for the hand of the Shulammite, the one a shepherd and poor, the other a wise and wealthy king. In the So he ascribes to Solomon 1:9-11,15; 2:2; 4:1-7; 6:4-13 (quoting the dialogue between the Shulammite and the ladies of the court in 6:10-13); 7:1-9. To the shepherd lover he assigns few verses, and these are repeated by the Shulammite in her accounts of imaginary or real interviews with her lover. In the following passages the lover described is supposed to

be the shepherd to whom the Shulammite had plighted her troth: 1:2-7,9-14; 1:16-2:1; 2:3-7,8-17; 3:1-5; 4:8-5:1; 5:2-8; 5:10-16; 6:2 f; 7:10-8:4; 8:5-14. The shepherd lover is thus supposed to be present in the Shulammite's dreams, and in her waking moments she is ever thinking of him and describing to herself and others his many charms. Not until the closing scene (So 8:5-14) does Ewald introduce the shepherd as an actor in the drama. Ewald had an imperial imagination and a certain strength of mind and innate dignity of character which prevented him from dragging into the mud any section of the Biblical literature. While rejecting entirely the allegorical theory of Canticles, he yet attributed to it an ethical quality which made the So worthy of a place in the Old Testament. A drama in praise of fidelity between human lovers may well hold a place beside Ecclesiastes and Proverbs in the Canon. Many of the ablest Old Testament critics have followed Ewald in his general theory that Canticles is a drama celebrating the loyalty of a lowly maiden to her shepherd lover. Not even Solomon in all his glory could persuade her to become his queen.

Within the past quarter of a century the unity of Canticles has been again sharply challenged. An account of the customs of the Syrian peasants in connection with weddings was given by the Prussian consul at Damascus, J. G. Wetzstein, in 1873, in an article in Bastian's Zeitschrift fur Ethnologie, 270 ff, on "Die syrische Dreschtafel," in which he illustrated the Old Testament from modern Syrian customs. Driver thus describes the customs that are supposed to throw light upon Canticles: "In modern Syria, the first seven days after a wedding are called the 'king's week'; the young pair play during this time king and queen; the 'threshing-board' is turned into a mock-throne, on which they are seated, while songs are sung before them by the villagers and others, celebrating them on their happiness, among which the watsf, or poetical 'description' of the physical beauty of the bride and bridegroom, holds a prominent place. The first of these watsfs is sung on the evening of the wedding-day itself: brandishing a naked sword in her right hand, and with a handkerchief in her left, the bride dances in her wedding array, lighted by fires, and surrounded by a circle of guests, half men and half women, accompanying her dance with a watsf in praise of her charms" (LOT, 452). Wetzstein suggested the view that Canticles was composed of the wedding-songs sung during "the king's week." This theory has been most fully elaborated by Budde in an article in the New World, March, 1894, and in his commentary (1898). According to Budde, the bridegroom is called King Solomon, and the bride Shulammith. The companions of the bridegroom are the 60 valiant men who form his escort (So 3:7). As a bride, the maiden is called the most beautiful of women (So 1:8; 5:9; 6:1). The pictures of wedded bliss are sung by the men and women present, the words being attributed to the bride and the bridegroom. Thus the festivities continue throughout the week. Budde's theory has some decided advantages over Ewald's view that the poem is a drama; but the loss in moral quality is considerable; the book becomes a collection of wedding-songs in praise of the joys of wedlock.

V. Closing Hints and Suggestions.

Having given a good deal of attention to Canticles during the past 15 years, the author of this article wishes to record a few of his views and impressions.

(1) Canticles is lyric poetry touched with the dramatic spirit. It is not properly classed as drama, for the Hebrews had no stage, though much of the Old Testament is dramatic in spirit. The descriptions of the

charms of the lovers were to be sung or chanted.

(2) The amount that has to be read between the lines by the advocates of the various dramatic theories is so great that, in the absence of any hints in the body of the book itself, reasonable certitude can never be attained. (3) The correct translation of the refrain in So 2:7 and 3:5 (compare 8:4) is important for an understanding of the purpose of Canticles. It should be rendered as follows:

‘I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,

By the gazelles, or by the hinds of the field,

That ye stir not up, nor awaken love,

Until it please.’

Love between man and woman should not be excited by unnatural stimulants, but should be free and spontaneous. In So 8:4 it seems to be implied that the women of the capital are guilty of employing artifices to awaken love:

‘I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem,

Why do ye stir up, or awaken love,

Until it please?’

That this refrain is in keeping with the purpose of the writer is clear from the striking words toward the close of the book:

"Set me as a seal upon thy heart,

As a seal upon thine arm:

For love is strong as death;

Jealousy is cruel as Sheol;

The flashes thereof are flashes of fire,

A very flame of Yahweh.

Many waters cannot quench love,

Neither can floods drown it:

If a man would give all the substance of his house for love,

He would utterly be contemned" (So 8:6 f).

(4) Canticles discloses all the secret intimacies of wedded life without becoming obscene. The imagery is too sensuous for our taste in western lands, so that words of caution are often timely, lest the sensuous degenerate into the sensual; but I have been told by several Syrian and Palestinian students whom I have had the privilege of teaching, that Canticles is considered quite chaste among their people, the wedding-songs now in use among them being more minute in their description of the physical charms of the lovers.

(5) Canticles is by no means excluded from the Canon by the acceptance of the literal interpretation. Ewald's theory makes it an ethical treatise of great and permanent value. Even if Canticles is merely a collection of songs describing the bliss of true lovers in wedlock, it is not thereby rendered unworthy of a place in the Bible, unless marriage is to be regarded as a fall from a state of innocency. If Canticles should be rejected because of its sensuous imagery in describing the joys of passionate lovers, portions of Proverbs would also have to be excised (Pr 5:15-20). Perhaps most persons need to enlarge their conception of the Bible as a repository for all things that minister to the welfare of men. The entire range of man's legitimate joys finds sympathetic and appreciative description in the Bible. Two young lovers in Paradise need not fear to rise and meet their Creator, should He visit them in the cool of the day.

LITERATURE.

C. D. Ginsburg, The So of Songs, with a Commentary, Historical and Critical, 1857; H. Ewald, Dichter des Alten Bundes, III, 333-426, 1867; F. C. Cook, in Biblical Commentary, 1874; Franz Delitzsch, Hoheslied u. Koheleth, 1875 (also translation); O. Zockler, in Lange's Comm., 1875; S. Oettli, Kurzgefasster Kommentar, 1889; W. E. Griffis, The Lily among Thorns, 1890; J. W. Rothstein, Das Hohe Lied, 1893; K. Budde, article in New World, March, 1894. and Kommentar, 1898; C. Siegfried, Prediger u. Hoheslied, 1898; A. Harper, in Cambridge Bible, 1902; G. C. Martin, in Century Bible, 1908; article on "Canticles" by Cheyne in EB, 1899.

John Richard Sampey

SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN

1. Name

2. Canonicity

3. Contents

4. Author and Date

5. Original Language

6. Text and Versions

LITERATURE

For general remarks concerning the Additions to Daniel see BEL AND THE DRAGON.

1. Name:

This Addition has no separate title in any manuscript or version because in the Septuagint, Theod, Syriac and Latin (Old Latin and Vulgate) it follows Da 3:23 immediately, forming an integral portion of that chapter, namely, The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:24-90 in the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) It is the only one of the three Additions which has an organic connection with Daniel; as regards the others see preliminary remarks to BEL AND THE DRAGON. The title in English Versions of the Bible is "The So of the Three Holy Children," a title describing its matter as formerly understood, though a more rigid analysis shows that in the 68 verses so designated, we have really two separate sections. See 3, below.

2. Canonicity:

See introductory remarks to BEL AND THE DRAGON. The order in which the three "Additions to Daniel" are found in the (Separate Protestant) Apocrypha is decided by their sequence in the Vulgate, the So of the Three Children forming part of chapter 3, Susanna of chapter 13, and Bel and the Dragon of chapter 14 of Daniel.

3. Contents:

Though the English and other Protestant versions treat the 68 verses as one piece under the name given above, there are really two quite distinct compositions. These appear separately in the collection of Odes appended to the Psalter in Cod. A under the headings, "The Prayer of Azarias" (Proseuche Azariou, Azariah, Da 1:6 f) and "The Hymn of Our Fathers" (Humnos ton pateron hemon); see Swete, The Old Testament in Greek, 3804 ff, and Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, 253 f. Luther with his usual independence makes each of these into a separate book under the titles, "The Prayer of Azaria" (Das Gebet Asarjas) and "The So of the Three Men in the Fire" (Der Gesang der drei Manner im Feuerofen).

(1) The Prayer of Azarias (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:1-22) (Daniel 3:24-48).

Azariah is the Hebrew name of Abed-nego (= Abednebo, "servant of Nebo"), the latter being the Babylonian name (see Da 1:7; 2:49, etc.). This prayer joins on to Da 3:23, where it is said that "Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-nego (Azariah) fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace." [?](the version of Theodotion; see "Text and Versions" below) adds, "And they walked (Syr adds "in their chains") in the midst of the fire, praising God, and blessing the Lord." This addition forms a suitable connecting link, and it has been adopted by the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and in modern versions which are made from [?] and not from the Septuagint, which last was lost for many centuries (see BEL AND THE DRAGON, III). In the Septuagint the words with which the Prayer was introduced are these: "Thus therefore prayed Hananias, and Azarias and Misael and sang praises (hymns) to the Lord when the king commanded that they should be cast into the furnace." The prayer (offered by Azarias) opens with words of adoration followed by an acknowledgment that the sufferings of the nation in Babylon were wholly deserved, and an earnest entreaty that God would intervene on behalf of His exiled and afflicted people. That this prayer was not composed for the occasion with which it is connected goes without saying. No one in a burning furnace could pray as Azarias does. There are no groans or sighs, nor prayer for help or deliverance of a personal nature. The deliverance sought is national.

(2) The So of the Three Holy Children (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:28-68) (Da 3:51-90).

This is introduced by a brief connecting narrative (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:23-27). The king's servants continued to heat the furnace, but an angel came down and isolated an inner zone of the furnace within which no flames could enter; in this the three found safety. Rothstein (Kautzsch, Die Apok., 175) is inclined to think that this narrative section (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:23-27) stood between Da 3:23 and 3:24 in the original Hebrew text. The "Song" is really a psalm, probably a translation of a Hebrew original. It has nothing to do with the incident—the three young men in the furnace—except in The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:66 (EV) where the three martyrs call upon themselves by name to praise and bless the Lord for delivering them from the midst of the furnace. This verse is an interpolation, for the rest of the So is a long litany recalling Ps 103 and especially Psalms 136; 148, and Sirach 43. The Song, in fact, has nothing to do with the sufferings of the three young men, but is an ordinary hymn of praise. It is well known from the fact that it forms a part of the Anglican Prayer-book, as it had formed part of many early Christian liturgies.

4. Author and Date:

(1) Author.

We know nothing whatever of the author besides what may be gathered from this Addition. It is quite evident that none of the three Additions belong to the original text of Daniel, and that they were added because they contained legends in keeping with the spirit of that book, and a song in a slight degree (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:66 English Version of the Bible) adapted to the situation of the

three Hebrew youths in the furnace, though itself of an independent liturgical origin.

For a long time the three Additions must have circulated independently. Polychronius says that "The So of the Three Holy Children" was, even in the 5th century AD, absent from the text of Daniel, both in the Peshitta and in the Septuagint proper. Rothstein (Kautzsch, Die Apok., 176) contends that the Additions formed a part of the Septuagint from the beginning, from which he infers that they were all composed before the Septuagint was made. What was the date of this version of Daniel? Since its use seems implied in 1 Macc 1:54 (compare Da 11:31; 12:11), it would be safe to conclude that it existed about 100 BC.

(2) Date of the Prayer of Azarias.

In The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:15 (English Versions of the Bible) it is said that at the time the prayer was offered, there was no prince, prophet or leader, nor sacrifice of any kind. This may point to the time between 168 and 165 BC, when Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) profaned the temple. If written in that interval, it must have been added to Da at a much later time. But on more occasions than one, in later times, the temple-services were suspended, as e.g. during the invasion of Jerusalem by the Egyptian king, Ptolemy IV (Philopater).

(3) Date of the Song.

We find references in the So (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:62 f English Versions of the Bible) to priests and temple-servants, and in The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:31 to the temple itself, suggesting that when the So was written the temple-services were carried on. This, in itself, would suit a time soon after the purification of the temple, about 164 BC. But the terms of the So are, except in verse 66 (English Versions of the Bible), so general that it is impossible to fix the date definitely. On the date of the historical connecting narrative (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:23-27) see 3, (2), above.

5. Original Language:

(1) Romanist scholars in general and several Protestants (Eichhorn, Einleit., in das Altes Testament, IV, 24 f; Einleit. in die apok. Schriften, 419; Vatke; Delitzsch, De Habacuci, 50; Zockler, Bissell, Ball, Rothstein, etc.) hold that the original language was Hebrew. The evidence, which is weak, is as follows: (a) The style is Hebraistic throughout (not more so than in writings known to have been composed in Alexandrian Gr; the idiom kataischunesthai + apo = bosh min (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:44 English Versions of the Bible; the Septuagint 1:44), "to be ashamed of," occurs in parts of the Septuagint which are certainly not translations). (b) The three Hebrew martyrs bear Hebrew names (The So of the Three Children (Azariah) 1:66 English Versions). This only shows that the tale is of Hebrew origin. (2) Most modern non-Romanist scholars hold that the original language of the So (and Prayer) was Greek. So Keil, Fritzsche, De Wette, Schurer, Konig, Cornill, Strack, etc.

Some grounds:

(1) The Hebraisms are comparatively few, and those which do exist can be paralleled in other writings composed in Hellenistic Greek

(2) It can be proved that in Daniel and also in Bel and the Dragon (see Introduction to Bel in the Oxford Apocrypha, edition R.H. Charles), Theodotion corrects the Septuagint from the Hebrew (lost in the case of Bel); but in Three, Theodotion corrects according to Greek idiom or grammar. It must be admitted, however, that the evidence is not very decisive either way.

6. Text and Versions:

As to the text and the various versions of the Song, see what is said in the article BEL AND THE DRAGON. It is important to note that the translations in English Versions of the Bible are made from Theodotion's Greek version, which occurs in ancient versions of the Septuagint (A B V Q dc) instead of the true Septuagint (Cod. 87).

LITERATURE.

See the article BEL AND THE DRAGON; Marshall (Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 754); W. H. Bennett (Oxford Apocrypha, edition R.H. Charles, 625 ff).

T. Witton Davies

SONGS OF DEGREES

See DEGREES, SONGS OF; DIAL OF AHAZ, 7.

SONS OF

See SON, SONS.

SONS OF GOD

(Old Testament) (bene ha-'elohim, "sons of God" (Ge 6:2,4; Job 1:6; 2:1); bene 'elohim, "sons of God" (Job 38:7); bene 'elim, "ye mighty," the King James Version; "ye sons of the mighty," King James Version margin, the Revised Version (British and American); "sons of God" or "sons of the gods," the Revised Version margin (Ps 29:1); "sons of the mighty," the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American); "sons of God" or "sons of the gods," the Revised Version margin (Ps 89:6 (Hebrew 7)); Septuagint huioi tou theou, hoi aggeloi tou theou (Ge 6:2); huioi tou theou (Ge 6:4); hoi aggeloi tou theou (Job 1:6; 2:1); aggeloi mou (Job 38:7); huioi theou (Ps 29:1; 89:6; compare Da

3:25)):

1. Job and Psalms:

This article will deal with this phrase as it is used in the above passages. In the passages from Job and Psalms it is applied to supernatural beings or angels. In Job the "sons of God" are represented as appearing before the throne of Yahweh in heaven, ready to do Him service, and as shouting for joy at the creation of the earth, In the Psalms they are summoned to celebrate the glory of Yahweh, for there is none among them to be compared to Him. The phrase in these passages has no physical or moral reference. These heavenly beings are called "sons of God" or "sons of the ‘elohim" simply as belonging to the same class or guild as the ‘elohim, just as "sons of the prophets" denotes those who belong to the prophetic order (see A.B. Davidson, Commentary on Job 1:6).

2. Genesis 6:2,4:

Different views, however, are taken of the passage in Ge 6:2,4: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose ..... The Nephilim were in the earth in those days, and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men."

See GIANTS; NEPHILIM.

(1) "Sons of God" is interpreted as referring to men,

(a) to sons of the nobles, who married daughters of the common people. This is the view of many Jewish authorities, who hold that it is justified by the use of ‘elohim in the sense of "judges" (Ex 21:6; 22:8 f, etc.). But this cannot be the meaning of ‘elohim here, for when ‘adham, "men," is used to denote the lower classes, it is contrasted with ‘ish, as in Ps 49:2 (Hebrew 3), not with ‘elohim. When contrasted with ‘elohim it signifies the human race.

(b) Some commentators hold that by "sons of God" is to be understood the pious race descended from Seth, and by "daughters of men" the daughters of worldly men. These commentators connect the passage with Ge 4:25 f, where the race of Seth is characterized as the worshippers of Yahweh and is designated as a whole, a seed (compare De 14:1; 32:5; Ho 1:10 (Hebrew 2:1)). They consider the restricted meaning they put upon "men" as warranted by the contrast (compare Jer 32:20; Isa 43:4), and that as the term "daughters" expresses actual descent, it is natural to understand "sons" in a similar sense. The phrase "took wives," they contend also, supports the ethical view, being always used to signify real and lasting marriages, and cannot, therefore, be applied to the higher spirits in their unholy desire after flesh. On this view Ge 6:1-4 are an introduction to the reason for the Flood, the great wickedness of man upon the earth (6:5). It is held that nothing is said in 6:4 of a race of giants springing from the union of angels with human wives (see paragraph 2, below), and that the violence which is mentioned along with the corruption of the world (6:11) refers to the sin of the giants.

(2) Most scholars now reject this view and interpret "sons of God" as referring to supernatural beings in accordance with the meaning of the expression in the other passages. They hold that De 14:1, etc., cannot be regarded as supporting the ethical interpretation of the phrase in a historical narrative. The reference to Jer 32:20, etc., too, is considered irrelevant, the contrast in these passages being between Israel and other nations, not, as here, between men and God. Nor can a narrower signification (daughters of worldly men) be attached to "men" in Ge 6:2 than to "men" in 6:1, where the reference is to the human race in general. This passage (Ge 6:1-4), therefore, which is the only one of its kind, is considered to be out of its place and to have been inserted here by the compiler as an introduction to the story of the Flood (6:5-8). The intention of the original writer, however, was to account for the rise of the giant race of antiquity by the union of demigods with human wives. This interpretation accords with Enoch chapters 6-7, etc., and with Jude 1:6 f, where the unnatural sin of the men of Sodom who went after "strange flesh" is compared with that of the angels (compare 2Pe 2:4 ff). (See Havernick, Introduction to the Pentateuch; Hengstenberg on the Pentateuch, I, 325; Oehler, Old Testament Theology, I, 196 f; Schultz, Old Testament Theology, I, 114 ff; Commentary on Genesis by Delitzsch, Dillmann, and Driver.)

See ANTEDILUVIANS, 3; CHILDREN OF GOD; GIANTS; NEPHILIM; REPHAIM.

James Crichton

SONS OF GOD (NEW TESTAMENT)

1. New Testament Terms:

Two Greek words are translated "son," teknon, huios, both words indicating sonship by parentage, the former indicating that the sonship has taken place by physical descent, while the latter presents sonship more from the legal side than from the standpoint of relationship. John, who lays special emphasis on sonship by birth, uses teknon, while Paul, in emphasizing sonship from the legal side, as referring to adoption, which was current among the Romans but scarcely if at all known to, or if known, practiced by, the Jews, uses the word huios (Joh 1:12; Ro 8:14,16,19; Ga 4:6,7; 1 Joh 3:1,2).

2. New Testament Doctrine:

Men are not by nature the sons of God, at least not in the sense in which believers in Christ are so called. By nature those outside of Jesus Christ are "children of wrath" (Eph 2:3), "of disobedience" (Eph 2:2), controlled not by the Spirit of God (Ro 8:14), but by the spirit of disobedience (Eph 2:2-4). Men become sons of God in the regenerative and adoptive sense by the acceptance of Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour (Joh 1:12 f; Ga 3:26). The universal brotherhood which the New Testament teaches is that brotherhood which is based on faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the divine and only Saviour of the world. And the same is true of the universal Fatherhood of God. It is true that all men are "his offspring" (Ac 17:28 f) in the sense that they are God’s created children; but that the New Testament makes a very clear and striking distinction between sonship by virtue of creation and sonship by faith in the Lord Jesus

Christ, there can be no reasonable doubt.

Sonship is the present possession of the believer in Christ (1 Joh 3:2). It will be completed at the second coming of our Lord (Ro 8:23), at which time the believer will throw off his incognito, by reason of which the world may not have recognized his sonship (1 Joh 3:1,2), and be fully and gloriously revealed as the son of God (2Co 5:10). It doth not yet appear, it hath not yet appeared, what we shall be; the revelation of the sons of God is reserved for a coming day of manifestation.

The blessings of sonship are too numerous to mention, save in the briefest way. His sons are objects of God's peculiar love (Joh 17:23), and His Fatherly care (Lu 12:27-33). They have the family name (Eph 3:14 f; 1 Joh 3:1); the family likeness (Ro 8:29); family love (Joh 13:35; 1 Joh 3:14); a filial spirit (Ro 8:15; Ga 4:6); a family service (Joh 14:23 f; 15:8). They receive fatherly chastisement (Heb 12:5-11); fatherly comfort (2Co 1:4), and an inheritance (Ro 8:17; 1Pe 1:3-5).

Among the evidences of sonship are: being led by the Spirit (Ro 8:14; Ga 5:18); having a childlike confidence in God (Ga 4:5); having liberty of access (Eph 3:12); having love for the brethren (1 Joh 2:9-11; 5:1), and obedience (1 Joh 5:1-3).

William Evans

SOOTHSAYERS

sooth'-sa-erz.

See ASTROLOGY, 1; DIVINATION.

SOP

sop (psomion): A thin, wafer-like piece of bread dipped into the common dish as a sort of improvised spoon, is thus designated in Joh 13:26 ff.

See MORSEL.

SOPATER

so'-pa-ter, sop'-a-ter (Sopatros): the Revised Version (British and American) the son of Pyrrhus; the King James Version omits. A man of Berea who is mentioned with some Thessalonians and others as accompanying Paul as far as Asia on his return to Jerusalem after his 3rd missionary journey (Ac 20:4). He is probably the same as the "Sosipater" of Ro 16:21.

SOPE

sop.

See SOAP.

SOPHERETH

so-fe’-reth, sof’-e-reth, so’-fe-reth (cophereth): One of the remnant returning from captivity (Ezr 2:55 the King James Version; Ne 7:57). In the Revised Version (British and American) of Ezr 2:55 it is "Hassophereth," the definite article being transliterated.

SOPHONIAS

sof-o-ni’-as Septuagint Sophonias): The form in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) of 2 Esdras 1:40 for Zephaniah the prophet.

SORCERER; SORCERY sor’-ser-er, sor’-ser-i.

See ASTROLOGY, 1; DIVINATION; MAGIC; WITCHCRAFT.

SORE

sor (substantive) (negha‘; helkos, verb helkoomai): In the account of the appearance of leprosy (Le 13:42 f) the spot on the skin is called by this name, which in the King James Version is translated "sore," but in the Revised Version (British and American) "plague"; similarly in the Dedication Prayer (2Ch 6:28 f) the Revised Version (British and American) has altered the rendering of negha‘ for "sore" to "plague" as it has done also in Ps 38:11. The word literally means a "stroke" or "blow," and so is applied to a disease or infliction from God. makkah Teriyah, in the King James Version is rendered "putrifying sores," the English Revised Version "festering sores," the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version margin "fresh stripes." See STRIPES. In the only other text in the Old Testament in which "sore" is used as a substantive in the King James Version (Ps 77:2), the word used is yadh, which literally means the "outstretched hand," hence, the Revised Version (British and American) renders the text: "My hand was stretched out in the night and slacked not." In the New Testament the ulcers on the limbs of Lazarus which were the result of poverty and hardship (Lu 16:20), and were licked by the pariah dogs (Lu 16:21), are called "sores." Sores also which are called noisome and grievous, were the result of the outpouring of the first of the seven bowls of the wrath of God (Re 16:2-11).

Alex. Macalister

SOREK, VALLEY OF

so’-rek (nachal soreq, "the valley of the choice (soreq) vine" (see VINE); sorech): "(Samson) loved a woman in the valley of Sorek, whose name was Delilah" (Jud 16:4). Jerome (OS, 153 f, 6) mentions a Capharsorec which was near Saraa (ancient ZORAH (which see)); this latter is undoubtedly the village of Sura‘h, high up upon the northern slopes of the great Wady es Surar. About 3/4 of a mile West of this is Khurbet Surik, which is certainly the site referred to by Jerome, and possibly marks that of a more ancient town which gave its name to the whole valley. This valley is of importance in the historical geography of Palestine out of all proportion to its scanty mention in the Old Testament (HGHL, 218 ff). The Wady es Surar is an expansion of the ravine Wady Isma‘in (which itself is formed by the junction of the great Wady Beit Chanineh, which rises near Bereh, and the Wady es Sikkeh, which drains the "Plain of Rephaim" near Jerusalem). The Jerus-Jaffa Railway traverses successively the Wady es Surar, the Wady Ismai‘n and the Wady es Sikkeh to reach the Jerusalem plateau. The Valley of Sorek is a name which probably belonged only to the open, fertile valley, well suited for vineyards, which traverses the Shephelah. It is now given over almost entirely to the cultivation of wheat, barley and maize (durra). The valley passes between the lofty hill of Sara‘h (Zorah) to the North and ‘Ain Shems (Beth-shemesh) and Tibneh (Timnah) on the South. Standing on the ruins of Beth-shemesh, one can watch the modern railway train winding for miles up the valley along almost the very road from Ekron (now ‘Akiv), upon which came the strange sight of the milch kine dragging the ark (1Sa 6:12). Very probably it was in this valley that the Philistines were defeated (1Sa 7:5-14) (PEF, III, 53, Sh XVII).

E. W. G. Masterman

SORREL

sor’-el: the Revised Version (British and American) in Zec 1:8 for "speckled."

See COLORS.

SORROW

sor’-o (chebhel, yaghon, makh’obh, etc.; lupe): The Old Testament has very many words translated "sorrow," those named being the most frequent; in the New Testament "sorrow" is usually the translation of lupe (Lu 22:45; Joh 16:6; 2Co 2:3,7, etc.). Penthos, translated "sorrow" in Re 18:7; 21:4, is in the Revised Version (British and American) "mourning." Odune, of pain-and distress, is thus rendered in Ro 9:2; 1Ti 6:10 (compare the verb in Lu 2:48; Ac 20:38). the Revised Version (British and American) frequently gives a more literal rendering of the words used, as "toil" (Ge 3:17), "pangs" (Ex 15:14), "pining" (De 28:65), "distress" (Isa 5:30), "lamentation" (Isa 29:2), etc.; sometimes also it uses "sorrow" for other words, as for "grief" (2Ch 6:29; Ps 31:10; 69:26; etc.; 2Co 2:5), "heaviness" (Ro 9:2; 2Co 2:1).

Sorrow or grief is necessary for discipline, for the development of the finer feelings and higher nature of the soul and spirit (Ec 7:3, "Sorrow is better than laughter; for by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made glad," margin "better"). Sorrow inevitably follows sin, and is its punishment, yet the

righteous are not exempt from it. The "Servant of Yahweh" was "a man of sorrows" (Isa 53:3). Christians learn how to be "sorrowful, yet always rejoicing" (2Co 6:10; 7:4; Col 1:24; 1Th 1:6; etc.). In the New Jerusalem it is predicted that there shall be no sorrow, for sorrow shall have done its work, and the first things have passed away (Re 21:4).

W. L. Walker

SOSIPATER

so-sip'-a-ter (Sosipatros): Sosipater unites with Lucius and Jason in sending greetings to the Roman Christians (Ro 16:21). He is a "kinsman" of Paul, by which Paul means a Jew (Ro 9:3; 16:11,21). It is the same name as SOPATER (which see). "Sopater of Berea" was one of the companions of Paul on his journey from Philippi after his 3rd missionary journey (Ac 20:4). These two are probably the same person, Paul having with him in Corinth, at the time of writing to the Roman Christians, the two Macedonians, Sopater of Berea and Jason of Thessalonica. The name Sosipater is found on a list of politarchs of Thessalonica.

S. F. Hunter

SOSTHENES

sos'-the-nez (Sosthenes): Chief of the synagogue at Corinth (Ac 18:17). Possibly identical with the co-worker (afterward) of Paul mentioned in 1Co 1:1.

SOSTRATUS

sos'-tra-tus (Sostratos, in Codex Venetus Sos-):" The governor of the citadel" of Jerusalem under Antiochus IV (Epiphanes). His duty was to gather the revenues of the city and province for the imperial treasury. He made a new departure in demanding from Menelaus direct the sum promised to the king in 2 Macc 4:27 ff (for Jason had the privilege of sending the money by his own messenger to the king (2 Macc 4:23)). This claim the usurper Menelaus disputed; consequently he and the governor were both summoned to appear before the king. No more is told, and Sostratus is otherwise unknown.

S. Angus

SOTAI

so'-ti, so'-ta-i, so-ta'-i (coTay): One of those who returned from captivity, being descendants of Solomon's servants (Ezr 2:55; Ne 7:57).

SOTTISH

sot’-ish (cakhal "thick-headed"): "They are sottish (stupid, very foolish) children" (Jer 4:22).

SOUL

sol (nephesh; psuche; Latin anima):

1. Shades of Meaning in the Old Testament:

(1) Soul, like spirit, has various shades of meaning in the Old Testament, which may be summarized as follows: "Soul," "living being," "life," "self," "person," "desire," "appetite," "emotion" and "passion" (BDB under the word). In the first instance it meant that which breathes, and as such is distinguished from basar, "flesh" (Isa 10:18; De 12:23); from she’er, "the inner flesh," next the bones (Pr 11:17, "his own flesh"); from beTen, "belly" (Ps 31:10, "My soul and my belly are consumed with grief"), etc.

(2) As the life-breath, it departs at death (Ge 35:18; Jer 15:2). Hence, the desire among Old Testament saints to be delivered from Sheol (Ps 16:10, "Thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol") and from shachath, "the pit" (Job 33:18, "He keepeth back his soul from the pit"; Isa 38:17, "Thou hast .... delivered it (my soul) from the pit of corruption").

(3) By an easy transition the word comes to stand for the individual, personal life, the person, with two distinct shades of meaning which might best be indicated by the Latin anima and animus. As anima, "soul," the life inherent in the body, the animating principle in the blood is denoted (compare De 12:23,24, ‘Only be sure that thou eat not the blood: for the blood is the soul; and thou shalt not eat the soul with the flesh’). As animus, "mind," the center of our mental activities and passivities is indicated. Thus we read of ‘a hungry soul’ (Ps 107:9), ‘a weary soul’ (Jer 31:25), ‘a loathing soul’ (Le 26:11), ‘a thirsty soul’ (Ps 42:2), ‘a grieved soul’ (Job 30:25), ‘a loving soul’ (So 1:7), and many kindred expressions. Cremer has characterized this use of the word in a sentence: "Nephesh (soul) in man is the subject of personal life, whereof pneuma or ruach (spirit) is the principle" (Lexicon, under the word, 795).

(4) This individuality of man, however, may be denoted by pneuma as well, but with a distinction. Nephesh or "soul" can only denote the individual life with a material organization or body. Pneuma or "spirit" is not so restricted. Scripture speaks of "spirits of just men made perfect" (Heb 12:23), where there can be no thought of a material or physical or corporeal organization. They are "spiritual beings freed from the assaults and defilements of the flesh" (Delitzsch, in the place cited.). For an exceptional use of psuche in the same sense see Re 6:9; 20:4, and (irrespective of the meaning of Ps 16:10) Ac 2:27.

2. New Testament Distinctions:

(1) In the New Testament psuche appears under more or less similar conditions as in the Old Testament.

The contrast here is as carefully maintained as there. It is used where pneuma would be out of place; and yet it seems at times to be employed where pneuma might have been substituted. Thus in Joh 19:30 we read: "Jesus gave up his pneuma" to the Father, and, in the same Gospel (Joh 10:15), Jesus gave up His "psuche for the sheep," and in Mt 20:28 He gave His psuche (not His pneuma) as a ransom—a difference which is characteristic. For the pneuma stands in quite a different relation to God from the psuche. The "spirit" (pneuma) is the outbreathing of God into the creature, the life-principle derived from God. The "sour" (psuche) is man's individual possession, that which distinguishes one man from another and from inanimate nature. The pneuma of Christ was surrendered to the Father in death; His psuche was surrendered, His individual life was given "a ransom for many." His life "was given for the sheep"

(2) This explains those expressions in the New Testament which bear on the salvation of the soul and its preservation in the regions of the dead. "Thou wilt not leave my soul unto Hades" (the world of shades) (Ac 2:27); "Tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil" (Ro 2:9); "We are .... of them that have faith unto the saving of the soul" (Heb 10:39); "Receive ..... the implanted word, which is able to save your souls" (Jas 1:21).

The same or similar expressions may be met with in the Old Testament in reference to the soul. Thus in Ps 49:8, the King James Version "The redemption of their soul is precious" and again: "God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol" (Ps 49:15). Perhaps this may explain—at least this is Wendt's explanation—why even a corpse is called nephesh or soul in the Old Testament, because, in the region of the dead, the individuality is retained and, in a measure, separated from God (compare Hag 2:13; Le 21:11).

3. Oehler on Soul and Spirit:

The distinction between psuche and pneuma, or nephesh and ruach, to which reference has been made, may best be described in the words of Oehler (Old Testament Theology, I, 217): "Man is not spirit, but has it: he is soul. .... In the soul, which sprang from the spirit, and exists continually through it, lies the individuality—in the case of man, his personality, his self, his ego." He draws attention to the words of Elihu in Job (33:4): 'God's spirit made me,' the soul called into being; 'and the breath of the Almighty animates me,' the soul kept in energy and strength, in continued existence, by the Almighty, into whose hands the inbreathed spirit is surrendered, when the soul departs or is taken from us (1Ki 19:4). Hence, according to Oehler the phrases naphshi ("my soul"), naphshekha ("thy soul") may be rendered in Latin egomet, tu ipse; but not ruchi ("my spirit"), ruchakha ("thy spirit")—soul standing for the whole person, as in Ge 12:5; 17:14; Eze 18:4, etc.

See PSYCHOLOGY.

J. I. Marais

SOUND

sound: In Isa 63:15 the King James Version has "the sounding of thy bowels," a painfully literal translation of hamon me'eykha, with the similar phrase, "my bowels shall sound like an harp," in Isa 16:11 (compare Jer 48:36). The intestines were considered a seat of emotion, and at times of great excitement were thought (in poetry, at least) to become tense and to give forth a musical sound. The Revised Version (British and American) (following the King James Version in Jer 48:36) substitutes "heart" for "bowels" in Isa 16:11, thus obscuring the figure but preserving the sense. In Isa 63:15 the Revised Version (British and American) paraphrases "the yearning of thy heart" (the English Revised Version "bowels"), a needless change from 16:11.

See also BATH KOL; SOLEMN, SOLEMNITY.

Burton Scott Easton

SOUNDINGS

sound'-ingz.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

SOUR

sour:

(1) bocer, "immature," "unripe": "The fathers have eaten sour grapes" (Jer 31:29 f; Eze 18:2; compare Isa 18:5 the King James Version).

(2) cur, "to turn aside," "degenerate": "Their drink is turned sour" (the King James Version margin "gone," the Revised Version margin "Their carouse is over").

SOUTH

south:

(1) neghebh, according BDB from [?] naghabh, meaning "to be dry," the word most often used, in the Revised Version (British and American) capitalized (South) in those places where it seems to denote a particular region, i.e. to the South of Judah.

(2) yamin, "right hand," "right." The derived meaning, "south," seems to imply an eastern posture in prayer in which the right hand is toward the South; compare Arabic yamin, "right," and yemen, "Yemen," a region in Southwestern Arabia.

(3) teman, from the same root as (2) is often used for the south; also for the south wind (Ps 78:26; So 4:16).

(4) yam, literally, "sea" (Ps 107:3).

(5) darom, etymology doubtful (De 33:23; Eze 40:24).

(6) midhbar, literally, "desert" (Ps 75:6, reading doubtful).

(7) lips, "south west wind" (Ac 27:12).

(8) mesembria, literally, "mid-day"; "south" (Ac 8:26); "noon" (Ac 22:6).

(9) notos, "south wind" (Lu 12:55; Ac 27:13; 28:13); "south" (1 Macc 3:57; Mt 12:42; Lu 11:31; 13:29; Re 21:13).

The south wind is often referred to: see So 4:16; Job 37:9 (compare 9:9); Zec 9:14 (of Isa 21:1); Lu 12:55.

Of the passages where South (neghebh) clearly refers to a particular region between Palestine and Sinai see: "And Abraham journeyed, going on still toward the South" (neghbah) (Ge 12:9; 13:1; De 1:7). We read of "the South of the Jerahmeelites," "the South of the Kenites" (1Sa 27:10); "the South of the Cherethites," "the South of Caleb" (1Sa 30:14); "the South of Judah" (2Ch 28:18); "Ramoth of the South" (1Sa 30:27).

In Ps 126:4, "Turn again our captivity, O Yahweh, as the streams in the South," we have a figurative reference to the fact that, after a long period of drought, the dry watercourses are finally filled with rushing streams. The reference in Eze 20:46 f to "the forest of the South" is to a condition of things very different from that which exists today, though the region is not incapable of supporting trees if they are only planted and protected.

Alfred Ely Day

SOUTH RAMOTH

See RAMOTH.

SOUTH, CHAMBERS OF THE

The twelve constellations of the Zodiac.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 12.

SOUTH, QUEEN OF THE

(Mt 12:42).

See QUEEN OF SHEBA.

SOUTHEAST

See NORTHEAST.

SOW

sou.

See SWINE.

SOWER; SOWING

so’-er, so’-ing.

See AGRICULTURE.

SPAIN

span (Spania): The country in the Southwest of Europe which still bears this name. It was Paul’s purpose, as stated in Ro 15:24,28, to visit Spain. If, as is probable, he ultimately carried out this intention, it must have been after a release from his first imprisonment. Clement of Rome speaks of the apostle as having reached "the extreme limit of the West" (Epistle of Clement, v).

See PAUL, THE APOSTLE; TARSHISH.

SPAN

(zereth; spithame): A measure of length equal to half a cubit or about 9 in. (Ex 28:16; 39:9; 1Sa 17:4, etc.). La 2:20 the King James Version is a mistranslation; see the Revised Version (British and American).

See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

SPARK

spark.

See LEVIATHAN.

SPARROW

spar’-o (tsippor; strouthion; Latin passer): A small bird of the Fringillidae family. The Hebrew tsippor seems to have been a generic name under which were placed all small birds that frequented houses and gardens. The word occurs about 40 times in the Bible, and is indiscriminately translated "bird" "fowl" or "sparrow." Our translators have used the word "sparrow" where they felt that this bird best filled the requirements of the texts. Sparrows are small brown and gray birds of friendly habit that swarm over the northern part of Palestine, and West of the Sea of Galilee, where the hills, plains and fertile fields are scattered over with villages. They build in the vineyards, orchards and bushes of the walled gardens surrounding houses, on the ground or in nooks and crannies of vine-covered walls. They live on seeds, small green buds and tiny insects and worms. Some members of the family sing musically; all are great chatterers when about the business of life. Repeatedly they are mentioned by Bible writers, but most of the references lose force as applying to the bird family, because they are translated "bird" or "fowl." In a few instances the word "sparrow" is used, and in some of these, painstaking commentators feel that what is said does not apply to the sparrow. For example see Ps 102:7:

"I watch, and am become like a sparrow

That is alone upon the housetop."

The feeling that this is not characteristic of the sparrow arises from the fact that it is such a friendly bird that if it were on the housetop it would be surrounded by half a dozen of its kind; so it has been suggested that a solitary thrush was intended. There is little force in the change. Thrushes of today are shy, timid birds of thickets and deep undergrowth. Occasionally a stray one comes around a house at migration, but once settled to the business of living they are the last and most infrequent bird to appear near the haunts of man. And bird habits do not change in one or two thousand years. In an overwhelmed hour the Psalmist poured out his heart before the Almighty. The reason he said he was like a "sparrow that is alone upon the housetop" was because it is the most unusual thing in the world for a sparrow to sit mourning alone, and therefore it attracted attention and made a forceful comparison. It only happens when the bird’s mate has been killed or its nest and young destroyed, and this most cheerful of birds sitting solitary and dejected made a deep impression on the Psalmist who, when his hour of trouble came, said he was like the mourning sparrow—alone on the housetop. Another exquisite song describes the bird in its secure and happy hour:

"Yea, the sparrow hath found her a house,

And the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young,

Even thine altars, O Yahweh of hosts,

My King, and my God" (Ps 84:3).

When the mind of man was young and he looked on the commonest acts of creatures around him as filled with mystery, miracle and sign—he held in superstitious reverence any bird that built on a temple, because he thought it meant that the bird thus building claimed the protection of God in so doing. For these reasons all temple builders were so reverenced that authentic instances are given of people being put to death, if they disturbed temple nests or builders. Because he noticed the sparrow in joyful conditions is good reason why the Psalmist should have been attracted by its mourning. There is a reference to the widespread distribution of these birds in Pr 26:2:

"As the sparrow in her wandering, as the swallow in her flying,

So the curse that is causeless alighteth not."

Once settled in a location, no bird clings more faithfully to its nest and young, so this "wandering" could only mean that they scatter widely in choosing locations. Mt 10:29: "Are not two sparrows sold for a penny? and not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father." This is a reference to the common custom in the East of catching small birds, and selling them to be skinned, roasted and sold as tid-bits—a bird to a mouthful. These lines no doubt are the origin of the oft-quoted phrase, "He marks the fall of the sparrow." Then in verse 31 comes this comforting assurance: "Fear not therefore: ye are of more value than many sparrows." Lu 12:6: "Are not five sparrows sold for two pence? and not one of them is forgotten in the sight of God." This affirms the implication of Mark that these tiny birds were an article of commerce in the days of Jesus, just as they are now in the Far East.

Gene Stratton-Porter

SPARTA; SPARTANS

spar’-ta, spar’-tanz (Sparte (1 Macc 14:16), Spartiatai; Lacedaemonians (the King James Version 1 Macc 12:2,5,6,10,21; 14:20-23; 15:23; in 2 Macc 5:9, Greek Lakedaimonioi)): The passages in 1 Macc relate to a correspondence initiated by Jonathan, the priest, during the Maccabean revolt, and continued after his death with his brother Simon, between the Jews and the Lacedaemonians or Spartans, with a view to a friendly alliance. The proposals, curiously based on a claim to kindredship, were favorably received by the Lacedaemonians. See the letters (1 Macc 12:5 ff, 19 ff; 14:16 ff). The claim to blood-relationship (compare 1 Macc 12:21; 2 Macc 5:9) is of course absurd, but there is no good reason to doubt the genuineness of the transaction described.

See ARIUS; ASMONEANS; LACEDAEMONIANS; MACCABAEUS, etc.

James Orr

SPEAKING, EVIL

spe’-king.

See EVIL-SPEAKING; SLANDER.

SPEAR; SPEARMEN

sper, sper’-men.

See ARMOR, III, 4; ARMY, 7.

SPECIALLY

spesh’-al-i (me’odh (Ps 31:11 the King James Version); malista): Used in an emphatic sense; derived from a superlative. While usually employed for emphasis, it carries with it slightly the idea of something additional. Not used in the Old Testament in the Revised Version (British and American), the sense of the Hebrew being, , expressed more clearly by "exceedingly," "very." Its ordinary New Testament usage is, "mostly," "particularly," "chiefly" or, "most of all." Paul in his practical exhortations says: "But if any provideth not for his own, and specially his own household, he hath denied the faith (1Ti 5:8; compare Ga 6:10; 1Ti 4:10).

Walter G. Clippinger

SPECKLED

spek’-l’-d: Zec 1:8; the Revised Version (British and American) "sorrel."

See COLORS; HYENA.

SPECTACLE

spek’-ta-k’-l (theatron): Occurs twice in the New Testament:

(1) of the place where assemblies or exhibitions Were held (Ac 19:29, "theatre");

(2) figuratively of the suffering apostles (1Co 4:9).

SPEECH

spech (’imrah, dabhar, etc.; logos): "Speech," the articulate utterance of thought, is the tranlation of various Hebrew terms which convey this idea of "saying" or "word"; so, in the New Testament, the term generally so rendered is logos, "word." See LOGOS; WORD. Eulogia in Ro 16:18 is "fair speech"; lalia in Mt 26:73; Mr 14:70 the King James Version; Joh 8:43 is simply "talk." the Revised Version (British and American) has "speech" for various other words in the King James Version, as "matters" (1Sa 16:18, margin "bussiness"), "communication" (Mt 5:37; Eph 4:29), "words" (Lu 20:20; 1Co 14:9); "persuasiveness of speech" for "enticing words" (Col 2:4), etc.

W. L. Walker

SPELT

spelt (kuccemeth; olura, zea (Ex 9:32, the King James Version "rye"; Isa 18:25, the King James Version "rye," margin "spelt"; Eze 4:9, the King James Version "fitches" margin "spelt"; the Revised Version (British and American) adopts "spelt," influenced by the Septuagint, in all passages)): Spelt is the seed of Triticum spelta, a kind of wild wheat. Several writers would identify this kuccemeth with the Arabic kirsenneh (Vicia ervilia), a kind of vetch much used as camels’ fodder.

SPICE; SPICES

spis, spi’-sis, -sez:

(1) (besem (Ex 30:23), bosem, plural besamim, all from root "to attract by desire," especially by smell): The list of spices in Ex 30:23 includes myrrh, cinnamon, "sweet calamus cassia." These, mixed with olive oil, made the "holy anointing oil." Officials of the temple had charge of the spices (1Ch 9:29). Among the treasures of the temple shown by Hezekiah to the messengers of Babylon were the spices (2Ki 20:13). They were used in the obsequies of kings (2Ch 16:14) and in preparation of a bride for a royal marriage (Es 2:12, "sweet-odors" = balsam). Spices are frequently mentioned in So (4:10,14,16; 5:1, margin and the King James Version "balsam"; So 5:13; 6:2, "bed of spices," margin "balsam"; 8:14). These passages in So may refer in particular to balsam, the product of the balsam plant, Balsamodendron opobalsamum, a plant growing in Arabia. According to Josephus it was cultivated at Jericho, the plant having been brought to Palestine by the Queen of Sheba (Ant., VIII, vi, 6; see also XIV, iv, 1; XV, iv, 2; BJ, I, vi, 6).

See MYRRH.

(2) cammim (Ex 30:34, "sweet spices")): "Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte, and onycha, and

galbanum; sweet spices with pure frankincense." It is a general term for fragrant substances finely powdered. Compare Arabic shamm, "a smell" or "sense of smell"; generally translated "sweet incense" (Ex 25:6; 30:7; 31:11; 35:8,15,28; 39:38; 40:27 (the King James Version only); Le 4:7; 16:12; Nu 4:16; 2Ch 2:4 (the King James Version only); 2Ch 13:11). In Ex 37:29; 40:27; 2Ch 2:4, we have qsToreth cammim, "incense of sweet spices."

(3) (nekho'th; thumiamata (Ge 37:25, "spicery," margin "gum tragacanth or storax"); thumiama "incense" (Ge 43:11, "spicery"; some Greek versions and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) have "storax")): Storax is the dried gum of the beautiful Styrax officinalis (see POPLAR), which was used as incense—different article from that now passing under that name. Tragacanth is the resinous gum of several species of milk vetch (Natural Order, Leguminosae), especially of the Astragalus gummifer. Septuagint "incense" is probably the best translation.

(4) (reqach, "spiced" wine (So 8:2)).

See WINE.

(5) (aroma, "spices" (Mr 16:1, the King James Version "sweet spices"; Lu 23:56; 24:1; Joh 19:40; in Joh 19:39 defined as a mixture of aloes and myrrh)).

See PERFUME; BURIAL.

(6) (amomon (Re 18:13), margin "amomum"; the King James Version "odours"): The Greek means "blameless," and it was apparently applied in classical times to any sweet and fine odor. In modern botany the name Amomum is given to a genus in the Natural Order. Zingiberaceae. The well-known cardamon seeds (Amomum cardamomum) and the A. grana Paradisi which yields the well-known "grains of Paradise," used as a stimulant, both belong to this genus. What was the substance indicated in Re 18:13 is quite uncertain.

E. W. G. Masterman

SPIDER

spi'-der

(1) 'akkabhish; compare Arabic 'ankabut, English Versions of the Bible "spider"; Septuagint arachne (Job 8:14; Isa 59:5);

(2) semamith, "lizard," the King James Version "spider"; Septuagint kalabotes (Pr 30:28)): Semamith of Pr 30:28 is probably the gecko, a kind of lizard, as Septuagint and the Revised Version (British and American) have it. See LIZARD.

In Job 8:14 the spider’s web is an emblem of frailty: "Whose confidence shall break in sunder, and whose trust is a spider’s web." Frailty or futility seems to be indicated also in Isa 59:5,6: "They hatch adders’ eggs, and weave the spider’s web: .... Their webs shall not become garments, neither shall they cover themselves with their works" "Spider’s web" is in Job 8:14 both ‘akkabhish, "spider’s house," while in Isa 59:5 it is qure ‘akkabhish, qur, according to BDB, being "thread" or "film."

Alfred Ely Day

SPIKENARD

spik’-nard (nerd; nardos (So 1:12; 4:14); neradhim; nardoi (So 4:13), "spikenard plants"; nardos pistike (Mr 14:3; Joh 12:3), "pure nard," margin "liquid nard"; the English word is for "spiked nard," which comes from the Nardus spicatus of the Vulgate): Spikenard is the plant Nardostachys jatamansi (Natural Order, Valerianaceae); in Arabic the name Sunbul hind, "Indian spike," refers, like the English and Latin name, to the "snike"-like shape of the plant from which the perfume comes. The dried plant as sold consists of the "withered stalks and ribs of leaves cohering in a bundle of yellowish-brown capillary fibres and consisting of a spike about the size of a small finger" (Sir W. Jones, As. Res., II, 409); in appearance the whole plant is said to look like the tail of an ermine. It grows in the Himalayas. The extracted perfume is an oil, which was used by the Romans for anointing the head. Its great costliness is mentioned by Pliny.

With regard to the exact meaning of the pistike, in the New Testament, there is much difference of opinion: "pure" and "liquid" are both given in margin, but it has also been suggested among other things that this was a local name, that it comes from the Latin spicita or from pisita, the Sanskrit name of the spikenard plant. The question is an open one: either "genuine" or "pure" is favored by most commentators.

E. W. G. Masterman

SPINDLE

spin’-d’-l.

See SPINNING.

SPINNING

spin’-ing: Although spinning must have been one of the commonest of the crafts in Bible times, it is mentioned definitely in three passages only, namely, Ex 35:25 f, where Tawah, is so translated, and in Mt 6:28; Lu 12:27 nethein), where Jesus refers to the lilies of the field as neither toiling nor spinning.

The materials commonly spun were flax, cotton, wool, goats' hair. Goats' hair required little preparation other than washing, before spinning. Wool was first cleansed and then carded. The present method of carding, which no doubt is of ancient origin, is to pile the wool on a mat and then detach the fibers from each other by snapping a bow-string against the pile. The bow is specially constructed and carefully balanced so that it can be easily held with one hand while with the other the string is struck with a pestle-shaped mallet like a carver's mallet. The same instrument is used for carding cotton.

Flax was treated in ancient times as today, if the Egyptian sculptures have been rightly interpreted. The stalks after being stripped of their seeds were first retted. This operation consisted in soaking the stems in water until fermentation or rotting had so loosened the fibers that they could be separated from each other by combing. A series of washings and long exposure to the weather finally produced what was termed snowy-white linen.

The various fibers, mentioned above, to be made into thread, were gathered into a loose rope which was wound around a distaff or about the left hand. From this reel it was unwound as needed, the fibers more carefully adjusted with the thumbs and two first fingers of both hands, and then the rope twisted by means of a spindle. The spindle varied in form but was always a shaft, 8 to 12 in. in length, provided at one end with a hook or other means of fastening the thread and at the other end with a circular wharve or whorl of stone or other heavy material to give momentum to the rotating spindle. When 2 or 3 ft. of the rope was prepared as mentioned above, the spindle was twirled with the right hand or laid on the thigh and rotated by passing the hand over the shaft. After the thread was twisted it was wound on the spindle, fastened, and a new portion of rope prepared and twisted. The rope was sometimes fastened to a post and the spindle twisted with both hands, in which case the whorl was not necessary (see Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, I, 317; II, 170, 172). Spinning was the work of both men and women in ancient Egypt. The Bible characterizes it as the work of women (Ex 35; Pr 31:19). The same method of spinning is still used by the women of Syria, although imported yarn is largely taking the place of homespun thread.

See DISTAFF.

James A. Patch

SPIRIT

spir'-it (ruach; pneuma; Latin, spiritus):

1. Primary and Figurative Senses

(1) As Wind, Breath

(2) As Anger or Fury

(3) As Mental and Moral Qualities in Man

2. Shades of Meaning

(1) As Life-Principle

(2) As Surviving Death

(3) Spiritual Manifestations

3. Human and Divine Spirit

(1) The Human as Related with the Divine

(2) Operations of the Divine Spirit as Third Person of the Trinity

4. Old Testament Applications

5. Various Interpretations

1. Primary and Figurative Senses:

(1) As Wind, Breath:

Used primarily in the Old Testament and New Testament of the wind, as in Ge 8:1; Nu 11:31; Am 4:13 ("createth the wind"); Heb 1:7 (angels, "spirits" or "winds" in margin); often used of the breath, as in Job 12:10; 15:30, and in 2Th 2:8 (wicked consumed by "the breath of his mouth").

(2) As Anger or Fury:

In a figurative sense it was used as indicating anger or fury, and as such applied even to God, who destroys by the "breath of his nostrils" (Job 4:9; Ex 15:8; 2Sa 22:16; see 2Th 2:8).

(3) As Mental and Moral Qualities in Man:

Hence, applied to man—as being the seat of emotion in desire or trouble, and thus gradually of mental and moral qualities in general (Ex 28:3, "the spirit of wisdom"; Eze 11:19, "a new spirit" etc.). Where man is deeply stirred by the Divine Spirit, as among the prophets, we have a somewhat similar use of the word, in such expressions as: "The Spirit of the Lord came .... upon him" (1Sa 10:10).

2. Shades of Meaning:

(1) As Life-Principle:

The spirit as life-principle in man has various applications: sometimes to denote an apparition (Mt 14:26, the King James Version "saying, It is a spirit"; Lu 24:37, the King James Version "had seen a spirit"); sometimes to denote angels, both fallen and unfallen (Heb 1:14, "ministering spirits"; Mt 10:1, "unclean spirits"; compare also Mt 12:43; Mr 1:23,26,27; and in Re 1:4, "the seven Spirits .... before his throne").

(2) As Surviving Death:

The spirit is thus in man the principle of life—but of man as distinguished from the brute—so that in death this spirit is yielded to the Lord (Lu 23:46; Ac 7:59; 1Co 5:5, "that the spirit may be saved"). Hence, God is called the "Father of spirits" (Heb 12:9).

(3) Spiritual Manifestations:

Thus generally for all the manifestations of the spiritual part in man, as that which thinks, feels, wills; and also to denote certain qualities which characterize the man, e.g. "poor in spirit" (Mt 5:3); "spirit of gentleness" (Ga 6:1); "of bondage" (Ro 8:15); "of jealousy" (Nu 5:14); "of fear" (2Ti 1:7 the King James Version); "of slumber" (Ro 11:8 the King James Version). Hence, we are called upon to "rule over our own spirit" (Pr 16:32; 25:28), and are warned against being overmastered by a wrong spirit (Lu 9:55 the King James Version, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of"). So man may submit to the "spirit of error," and turn away from the "spirit of truth" (1 Joh 4:6). Thus we read of the "spirit of counsel" (Isa 11:2); "of wisdom" (Eph 1:17).

3. Human and Divine Spirit:

(1) The Human as Related with the Divine:

We go a step higher when we find the human spirit brought into relationship with the Divine Spirit. For man is but a creature to whom life has been imparted by God’s spirit—life being but a resultant of God’s breath. Thus life and death are realistically described as an imparting or a withdrawing of God’s breath, as in Job 27:3; 33:4; 34:14, "spirit and breath" going together. The spirit may thus be "revived" (Ge 45:27), or "overwhelmed" (Ps 143:4), or "broken" (Pr 15:13). And where sin has been keenly felt, it is "a broken spirit" which is "a sacrifice to God" (Ps 51:17); and when man submits to the power of sin, a new direction is given to his mind: he comes under a "spirit of whoredom" (Ho 4:12); he becomes "proud in spirit" (Ec 7:8), instead of being "patient in spirit"; he is a fool because he is "hasty in spirit" and gives way to "anger" (Ec 7:9). The "faithful in spirit" are the men who resist talebearing and backbiting in the world (Pr 11:13). In such instances as these the difference between "soul" and "spirit" appears.

See SOUL; PSYCHOLOGY.

(2) Operations of the Divine Spirit as Third Person of the Trinity:

On this higher plane, too, we find the Divine Spirit at work. The terminology is very varied here: In the New Testament we read of the "Holy Spirit" (1Co 6:19; Mt 1:18,20; 1Th 1:5,6); the "Spirit of God" (1Co 2:10 ff; 3:16; Ro 8:9,11; Eph 3:16, etc.); the "Spirit of Christ" (Ro 8:9; 1Co 3:17; Ga 4:6); or simply of "Spirit," with distinct reference to God (1Co 2:10; Ro 8:16,23, etc.). God Himself is Spirit (Joh 4:24). Hence, God's power is manifested in human life and character (Lu 4:14; Ro 1:1; 1Co 2:4; especially Lu 24:49). The Book of Ac may be termed the Book of the Holy Spirit, working with power in man. This Spirit is placed on a level with Father and Son in the Apostolic Benediction (2Co 13:14) and in the parting message of the Saviour to His disciples (Mt 28:19). As the agent in redemption and sanctification His work is glorified by lives "renewed" in the very "spirit of the mind"—a collocation of terms which has puzzled many interpreters (Eph 4:23,24), where pneuma and nous appear together, to indicate a renewal which is all-embracing, 'renewed in the spirit of your mind, so that the new man is put on, created in righteousness and true holiness' (see also Joh 14:17,26; 15:26; 16:13; 1Co 12:11, etc.).

4. Old Testament Applications:

In the Old Testament this spirit of God appears in varied functions, as brooding over chaos (Ge 1:2; Job 26:13); as descending upon men, on heroes like Othniel, Gideon, etc. (Jud 3:10; 6:34), on prophets (Eze 37:1), on "cunning workmen," like Bezalel and Aholiab (Ex 31:2,3,4, "filled with the Spirit of God"), and specially in such passages as Ps 51:11, where the very presence of God is indicated by an abiding influence of the Holy Spirit: "The Spirit of Yahweh is Yahweh himself."

5. Various Interpretations:

May we not reach a still higher stage? Wendt in his interesting monograph (Die Begriffe Fleisch und Geist), of which extracts are given in Dickson's Paul's Use of the Terms Flesh and Spirit, draws attention to the transcendental influence of the Divine ruach in the Old Testament as expressed in such phrases as 'to put on' (Jud 6:34), 'to fall upon' (14:6,19), 'to settle' (Nu 11:25 f). May we not then rightly assume that more is meant than a mere influence emanating from a personal God? Are we not right in maintaining with Davidson that "there are indeed a considerable number of passages in the Old Testament which might very well express the idea that the Spirit is a distinct hypostasis or person."? (see SUBSTANCE). Rejecting the well-known passage in Genesis: "Let us make man after our own image," which some have interpreted in a trinitarian sense, we may point to such texts as Zec 4:6, "by my Spirit"; Isa 63:10,11, "They rebelled, and grieved his holy Spirit"; "Where is he that put his holy Spirit in the midst of them?" This is borne out by the New Testament, with its warnings against "grieving the Holy Spirit," "lying against the Holy Spirit," and kindred expressions (Eph 4:30; Ac 5:3). It is this Spirit which "beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God" (Ro 8:16)—the spirit which, as Auberlen has put it (PRE1, article "Geist des Menschen"), "appears in a double relationship to us, as the principle of natural life, which is ours by birth, and that of spiritual life, which we receive through the new birth (Wiedergeburt)." Hence, Paul speaks of God whom he serves "with his spirit" (Ro 1:9); and in 2Ti 1:3 he speaks of serving God "in a pure conscience."

See CONSCIENCE; FLESH; HOLY SPIRIT; PSYCHOLOGY; SOUL.

J. I. Marais

SPIRIT OF DIVINATION

See DIVINATION.

SPIRIT, EVIL

See SATAN; DEMON, DEMONIAC.

SPIRIT, FAMILIAR

See FAMILIAR; DIVINATION; PYTHON.

SPIRIT, HOLY

See HOLY SPIRIT.

SPIRIT, UNCLEAN (OR EVIL)

See DEMON, DEMONIAC.

SPIRITS IN PRISON

See PRISON, SPIRITS IN.

SPIRITS, DISCERNINGS OF

See DISCERNINGS OF SPIRITS; SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

SPIRITUAL

spir’-it-u-al (pneumatikos, "spiritual," from pneuma, "spirit"): Endowed with the attributes of spirit. Any being made in the image of God who is a Spirit (Joh 4:24.), and thus having the nature of spirit, is a spiritual being.

(1) Spiritual hosts of wickedness (Eph 6:12), in distinction from beings clothed in "flesh and blood"—

the devil and his angels. This use of the word has reference to nature, essence, and not to character or moral quality. God, angels, man, devil, demons are in essence spiritual. The groundwork and faculties of their rational and moral being are the same. This limited use of the word in the New Testament has its adverb equivalent in Re 11:8, "which (the great and wicked city) spiritually is called Sodom." As the comprehensive term moral includes immoral, so spiritual includes unspiritual and all that pertains to spirit.

(2) With the above exception, "spiritual" in the New Testament signifies moral, not physical antithesis: an essence springing from the Spirit of God and imparted to the spirit of man. Hence, spiritual in this sense always presupposes the infusion of the Holy Spirit to quicken, and inform. It is opposed

(a) to sarkikos, "fleshly" (1Co 3:1), men of the flesh and not of the spirit;

(b) to psuchikos, "natural," man in whom the pneuma, "spirit," is over-ridden, because of the Fall, by psuche, the principle of the animal life, "soul"; hence, the unrenewed man, unspiritual, alienated from the life of God (1Co 2:14; 2Pe 2:12; Jude 1:10). See MAN, NATURAL;

(c) to natural, meaning physical, ".... sown a natural body; .... raised a spiritual body" (1Co 15:44).

(3) In the New Testament and general use "spiritual" thus indicates man regenerated, indwelt, enlightened, endued, empowered, guided by the Holy Spirit; conformed to the will of God, having the mind of Christ, living in and led by the Spirit. The spiritual man is a new creation born from above (Ro 8:6; 1Co 2:15; 3:1; 14:37; Col 1:9; 1Pe 2:5).

(4) Ecclesiastically used of things sacred or religious, as spiritual authority, spiritual assembly, spiritual office.

See SPIRIT.

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUAL BLESSING

(eulogia pneumatike): Any blessing administered in the realm of the spiritual life; specifically the blessing of the Spirit in introducing the believer into "the heavenly places in Christ" (Eph 1:3); a term expressing the fullness of blessing in God’s gift of eternal life in Jesus Christ.

SPIRITUAL BODY

(soma pneumatikon, "body spiritual"): The resurrection-body, a body fitted to the capacities and wants of the spirit in the celestial world; an organism conformed to the spiritual life at the resurrection (see

1Co 15:44).

See BODY, SPIRITUAL.

SPIRITUAL DRINK

(pneumatikon poma): Having a spiritual significance, as referring to the water that flowed miraculously from the smitten rock (1Co 10:4; Nu 20:11). Symbolic also of nourishment for the thirsty soul in the sacramental cup and the outpoured blood (life) of Christ.

See ROCK, 2, (1); SPIRITUAL ROCK.

SPIRITUAL GIFTS

(charismata):

1. Gifts Connected with the Ministry of the Word

(1) Apostleship

(2) Prophecy

(3) Discernings of spirits

(4) Teaching

(5) The Word of Knowledge

(6) The Word of Wisdom

(7) Kinds of Tongues

(8) Interpretation of Tongues

2. Gifts Connected with the Ministry of Practical Service

(1) Workings of Miracles

(2) Gifts of Healings

(3) Ruling, Governments

(4) Helps

LITERATURE

The word charisma, with a single exception (1Pe 4:10), occurs in the New Testament only in the Pauline Epistles, and in the plural form is employed in a technical sense to denote extraordinary gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon Christians to equip them for the service of the church. Various lists of the charismata are given (Ro 12:6-8; 1Co 12:4-11,28-30; compare Eph 4:7-12), none of which, it is evident, are exhaustive. Some of the gifts enumerated cannot be said to belong in any peculiar sense to the distinctive category. "Faith" (1Co 12:9), for example, is the essential condition of all Christian life; though there were, no doubt, those who were endowed with faith beyond their fellows. "Giving" and "mercy" (Ro 12:8) are among the ordinary graces of the Christian character; though some would possess them more than others. "Ministry" (Ro 12:7), again, i.e. service, was the function to which every Christian was called and the purpose to which every one of the special gifts was to be devoted (Eph 4:12). The term is applied to any spiritual benefit, as the confirmation of Christians in the faith by Paul (Ro 1:11). And as the general function of ministry appears from the first in two great forms as a ministry of word and deed (Ac 6:1-4; 1Co 1:17), so the peculiar charismatic gifts which Paul mentions fall into two great classes—those which qualify their possessors for a ministry of the word, and those which prepare them to render services of a practical nature.

1. Gifts Connected with the Ministry of the Word:

(1) Apostleship

(1Co 12:28 f; compare Eph 4:11).—The name "apostle" is used in the New Testament in a narrower and a wider sense. It was the peculiar title and privilege of the Twelve (Mt 10:2; Lu 6:13; Ac 1:25 f), but was claimed by Paul on special grounds (Ro 1:1; 1Co 9:1, etc.); it was probably conceded to James the Lord’s brother (1Co 15:7; Ga 1:19), and in a freer use of the term is applied to Barnabas (Ac 14:4,14; compare 1Co 9:5,6), Andronicus and Junias (Ro 16:7). From the Didache (xi.4 ff) we learn that the ministry of apostles was continued in the church into the sub-apostolic age (see LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC). The special gift and function of apostleship, taken in the widest sense, was to proclaim the word of the gospel (Ac 6:2; 1Co 1:17, etc.), and in particular to proclaim it to the world outside of the church, whether Jewish or Gentile (Ga 2:7,8).

See APOSTLE.

(2) Prophecy

(Ro 12:6; 1Co 12:10,28,29), under which may be included exhortation (Ro 12:8; compare 1Co 14:3). The gift of prophecy was bestowed at Pentecost upon the church as a whole (Ac 2:16), but in particular

measure upon certain individuals who were distinctively known as prophets. Only a few of the Christian prophets are directly referred to—Judas and Silas (Ac 15:32), the prophets at Antioch (Ac 13:1), Agabus and the prophets from Jerusalem (Ac 11:27 f), the four daughters of Philip the evangelist (Ac 11:9). But 1 Corinthians shows that there were several of them in the Corinthian church; and probably they were to be found in every Christian community. Some of them moved about from church to church (Ac 11:27 f; 21:10); and in the Didache we find that even at the celebration of the Eucharist the itinerant prophet still takes precedence of the local ministry of bishops and deacons (Didache x.7).

It is evident that the functions of the prophet must sometimes have crossed those of the apostle, and so we find Paul himself described as a prophet long after he had been called to the apostleship (Ac 13:1). And yet there was a fundamental distinction. While the apostle, as we have seen, was one "sent forth" to the unbelieving world, the prophet was a minister to the believing church (1Co 14:4,22). Ordinarily his message was one of "edification, and exhortation, and consolation" (1Co 14:3). Occasionally he was empowered to make an authoritative announcement of the divine will in a particular case (Ac 13:1). In rare instances we find him uttering a prediction of a future event (Ac 11:28; 21:10 f).

(3) Discernings of Spirits

With prophecy must be associated the discernings of spirits (1Co 12:10; 14:29; 1Th 5:20 f; compare 1Joh 4:1). The one was a gift for the speaker, the other for those who listened to his words. The prophet claimed to be the medium of divine revelations (1Co 14:30); and by the spiritual discernment of his hearers the truth of his claim was to be judged (1Co 14:29). There were false prophets as well as genuine prophets, spirits of error as well as spirits of truth (1 Joh 4:1-6; compare 2Th 2:2; Didache xi). And while prophesyings were never to be despised, the utterances of the prophets were to be "proved" (1Th 5:20 f), and that in them which came from the Spirit of God spiritually judged (1Co 2:14), and so discriminated from anything that might be inspired by evil spirits.

See DISCERNINGS OF SPIRITS.

(4) Teaching

(Ro 12:7; 1Co 12:28 f).—As distinguished from the prophet, who had the gift of uttering fresh truths that came to him by way of vision and revelation, the teacher was one who explained and applied established Christian doctrine—the rudiments and first principles of the oracles of God (Heb 5:12).

(5) The Word of Knowledge

Possibly the word of knowledge (gnosis).

(6) The Word of Wisdom

The word of wisdom (sophia) (1Co 12:8) are to be distinguished, the first as the utterance of a prophetic

and ecstatic intuition, the second as the product of study and reflective thought; and so are to be related respectively to the functions of the prophet and the teacher.

See TEACHER, TEACHING.

(7) Kinds of Tongues

(1Co 12:10,28,30).—What Paul means by this he explains fully in 1 Corinthians 14. The gift was not a faculty of speaking in unknown foreign languages, for the tongues (glossai) are differentiated from the "voices" or languages (phonai) by which men of one nation are distinguished from those of another (14:10,11). And when the apostle says that the speaker in an unknown tongue addressed himself to God and not to men (14:2,14) and was not understood by those who heard him (14:2), that he edified himself (14:4) and yet lost the power of conscious thought while praying with the spirit (14:14 f), it would appear that the "tongues" must have been of the nature of devout ejaculations and broken and disjointed words, uttered almost unconsciously under the stress of high ecstatic feeling.

(8) Interpretation of Tongues

Parallel to this gift was that of the interpretation of tongues (1Co 12:10,30). If the gift of tongues had been a power of speaking unknown foreign languages, the interpretation of tongues would necessarily have meant the faculty of interpreting a language unknown to the interpreter; for translation from a familiar language could hardly be described as a charisma. But the principle of economy makes it improbable that the edification of the church was accomplished in this round-about way by means of a double miracle—a miracle of foreign speech followed by a miracle of interpretation. If, on the other hand, the gift of tongues was such as has been described, the gift of interpretation would consist in turning what seemed a meaningless utterance into words easy to be understood (1Co 12:9). The interpretation might be given by the speaker in tongues himself (1Co 12:5,13) after his mood of ecstasy was over, as he translated his exalted experiences and broken cries into plain intelligible language. Or, if he lacked the power of self-interpretation, the task might be undertaken by another possessed of this special gift (1Co 12:27,28). The ability of a critic gifted with sympathy and insight to interpret the meaning of a picture or a piece of music, as the genius who produced it might be quite unable to do (e.g. Ruskin and Turner), will help us to understand how the ecstatic half-conscious utterances of one who had the gift of tongues might be put into clear and edifying form by another who had the gift of interpretation.

See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

2. Gifts Connected with the Ministry of Practical Service:

(1) Workings of Miracles

(1Co 12:10,28,29).—The word used for miracles in this chapter (dunameis, literally, "powers") is

employed in Ac (8:7,13; 19:11,12) so as to cover those cases of exorcism and the cure of disease which in Paul's list are placed under the separate category of "gifts of healing." As distinguished from the ordinary healing gift, which might be possessed by persons not otherwise remarkable, the "powers" point to a higher faculty more properly to be described as miraculous, and bestowed only upon certain leading men in the church. In 2Co 12:12 Paul speaks of the "powers" he wrought in Corinth as among "the signs of an apostle." In Heb 2:4 the writer mentions the "manifold powers" of the apostolic circle as part of the divine confirmation of their testimony. In Ro 15:18 ff Paul refers to his miraculous gifts as an instrument which Christ used for the furtherance of the gospel and the bringing of the Gentiles to obedience. The working of "powers," accordingly, was a gift which linked itself to the ministry of the word in respect of its bearing upon the truth of the gospel and the mission of the apostle to declare it. And yet, like the wider and lower gift of healing, it must be regarded primarily as a gift of practical beneficence, and only secondarily as a means of confirming the truth and authenticating its messenger by way of a sign. The Book of Ac gives several examples of "powers" that are different from ordinary healings. The raising of Dorcas (9:36 ff) and of Eutychus (20:9 ff) clearly belong to this higher class, and also, perhaps, such remarkable cures as those of the life-long cripple at the Temple gate (3:1 ff) and Aeneas of Lydda (9:32 ff).

(2) Gifts of Healings

(1Co 12:9,28,30).

See HEALING, GIFTS OF.

(3) Ruling, Governments

(Ro 12:8, 1Co 12:28).—These were gifts of wise counsel and direction in the practical affairs of the church, such as by and by came to be formally entrusted to presbyters or bishops. When Paul wrote to the Corinthians, the ministry of office had not yet supplanted the ministry of inspiration, and Christian communities were guided and governed by those of their members whose wisdom in counsel proved that God through His Spirit had bestowed upon them the gift of ruling.

(4) Helps

(1Co 12:28).—This has sometimes been understood to denote the lowliest Christian function of all in Paul's list, the function of those who have no pronounced gifts of their own and can only employ themselves in services of a subordinate kind. But the usage of the Greek word (antilempsis) in the papyri as well as the Septuagint points to succor rendered to the weak by the strong; and this is confirmed for the New Testament when the same Greek word in its verbal form (antilambano) is used in Ac 20:35, when Paul exhorts the elders of the Ephesian church to follow his example in helping the weak. Thus, as the gift of government foreshadowed the official powers of the presbyter or bishop, the gift of helps appears to furnish the germ of the gracious office of the deacon—the "minister" paragraph excellence, as the name diakonos denotes—which we find in existence at a later date in Philippi and Ephesus (Php 1:1;

1Ti 3:1-13), and which was probably created, on the analogy of the diakonia of the Seven in Jerusalem (Ac 6:1), as a ministry, in the first place, to the poor.

See, further, HELPS.

LITERATURE. Hort, Christian Ecclesia, Lect X; Neander, Hist of the Planting of the Christian Church, I, 131 ff; Weizsacker, Apostolic Age, II, 255-75; Lindsay, Church and Ministry, passim; EB, IV, article "Spiritual Gifts"; ERE, III, article "Charismata"; PRE, VI, article "Geistesgaben."

J. C. Lambert

SPIRITUAL HOUSE

(oikos pneumatikos, "house spiritual"): A body of Christians (a church), as pervaded by the Spirit and power of God (1Pe 2:5); a term applicable to God's house: "house of prayer," the temple (Mt 21:13); to heaven: "my Father's house" (Joh 14:2); to the tabernacle: "Moses .... faithful in all his house" (Heb 3:2); to saints: as "the household of God" (Eph 2:19), and "the temple of the Holy Spirit" (1Co 6:19); hence, any "habitation of God in the spirit" (Eph 2:22) in which His glory dwells and His power and grace are manifest.

SPIRITUAL MAN

(ho pneumatikos): In distinction from the natural, the unrenewed man (1Co 2:15); man in whom the Holy Spirit dwells and rules. This divine indwelling insures mental illumination: "He that is spiritual discerneth (AVm) (or interpreteth) all things"; moral renewal: "a new creature" (2Co 5:17); "a new man" (Eph 4:24); spiritual enduement: "Ye shall receive power" (Ac 1:8).

See SPIRITUAL, 2; SPIRITUALITY; MAN.

SPIRITUAL MEAT

(broma pneumatikon, "food spiritual"): Nourishment for the soul, referring specifically (1Co 10:3) to the manna by which the children of Israel were miraculously fed and which was made by Paul prophetically equivalent to the broken bread of the Christian sacrament symbolizing the body of Christ. Hence,

(1) Christ Himself as the food of the soul: "I am the bread of life" (Joh 6:48-58);

(2) anything that nourishes the spiritual life:

(a) obedience to the will of God: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me" (Joh 4:32-34);

(b) the truths of God in the Scriptures: "Word of righteousness" =" strong meat" (Heb 5:12-14); "word of God" (Mt 4:4);

(c) the things of the Spirit (1Co 3:1-2; compare 1Co 2$).

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUAL ROCK

(pneumatike petra): Having a spiritual significance: supernatural, manifesting the power of the Divine Spirit; allegorically applied to Christ as fulfilling the type in the smitten rock in the desert, from which water miraculously burst forth to nourish the Israelites. A tradition current among the Jews affirms that this rock followed the people in their journeyings and gave forth a living stream for their supply. Paul made this ever-flowing rock a beautiful and accurate symbol of Christ: "The rock was Christ" (1Co 10:4).

Without the characterizing word "spiritual," this figurative term, with the same significance, is common to the Scriptures; applied

(1) to Yahweh, God: "Rock of his salvation," "their rock is not as our Rock" (De 32:15,31); "Yahweh is my rock" (Ps 18:2; compare Isa 26:4; 32:2; 1Sa 2:2; 2Sa 22:2);

(2) to the foundation-stone of Christian confession and testimony (Mt 16:18; compare Eph 2:20; 1Co 3:11; 1Pe 2:6-8), and thus to Christ Himself;

(3) in Christian hymnology to Jesus crucified and spear-pierced: "Rock of ages, cleft for me."

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUAL SACRIFICE

pneumatikai thusiai): A figure taken from the victim slain and offered on the altar, as e.g. the paschal lamb; thus signifying the complete and acceptable offering of the self-dedicated spirit. As the temple, priesthood and God Himself are spiritual, so is the sacrifice of the consecrated believer (1Pe 2:5); compare "living sacrifice" (Ro 12:1); "sacrifice of praise" (Heb 13:15,16). Any self-dedicating act of the inner man; the devout, renewed, consecrated spirit, e.g. Christian benevolence (Php 4:18); "to do good and to communicate" (Heb 13:16); "mercy" and "knowledge of God," instead of material and outward sacrifice (Ho 6:6). This is defined and beautifully illustrated in the classic verse on this theme, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," etc. (Ps 51:17).

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUAL SONGS

(odai pneumatikai): ode, English "ode," is the general, and generic word for "song," of which "psalms and hymns" are specific varieties (Eph 5:19; Col 3:16). It includes all lyric poetry, but is limited by the word "spiritual" to songs inspired by the Holy Spirit and employed in the joyful and devotional expression of the spiritual life. While songs, like psalms and hymns, were used in public worship and praise, they were more intended for, and suited to, personal and private and social use; as, e.g. in family worship, at meals, in the agapai ("love-feasts"), in meetings for prayer and religious intercourse from house to house. The passages above cited give apostolic authority for the use of other than the Old Testament psalms in public praise, and rebuke the narrowness and unbelief that would forever limit the operations of the Holy Spirit and the hymnology of the church to the narrow compass of the Davidic era and the Davidic school of poetry and song.

The "new song" of Re 5:9; 14:3, and "the song of Moses and of the Lamb" (15:3), indicate that spiritual songs are to be perpetuated in the eternal melodies of the redeemed.

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUAL THINGS

(ta pneumatika): Things proceeding from the Holy Spirit and pertaining to man’s spiritual life, worship, service. Contrasted in 1Co 9:11 and in Ro 15:27 with ta sarkika, things fleshly, physical, which have to do with man’s sensuous, corporeal nature, such as food, raiment, money. By "spiritual things" Paul signifies the benefits accompanying salvation, the gifts of the Spirit—faith, hope, love, justification, sanctification, peace—all the fruits and blessings and aids of the regenerate life.

Ecclesiastically:

Things pertaining to spiritual office, the ministry of the Word, or the service of the sanctuary.

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUALITY

spir-it-u-al’-i-ti: The state of being spiritual in the higher use of the word. It is purely a religious term and signifies the state of a soul vitalized by the Divine Spirit and made alive unto God. It covers the entire range of man’s faculties: intellect, feeling, will—all the attributes of personality.

1. Intellect:

The intellectual can be divorced from the spiritual, but the spiritual can never be divorced from the

intellectual. If a man is spiritual, his intellect is touched with the divine life and comes under the power of the divine baptism. One word describes this mental quickening and illumination—"vision." "The pure in heart shall see God." Paul affirms (1Co 2:12,13) that the Spirit of God operates directly on the mental faculties, adjusting reason and intellect to the divine reason, and enabling man to think God's thoughts and discern His purposes, nature and will. The common use of the word "spirituality" limits it mistakenly to religious experience, narrowly interpreted, but as spirituality brings the intellect into harmony with the divine reason in every realm of mental action, it may be as manifest in science, art, philosophy, commerce and law as in religion.

2. Affections:

The feelings and emotions are fertile soil for the spiritual life. Love is the beginning and end of true religion. Spirituality in the realm of the affections is that state of soul in which the heart with its holiest love is centered on God as revealed in Christ. The specific and supreme work of the Holy Spirit is to shed abroad God's love in the heart (Ro 5:5). Spirituality sets the affections on things above and brings the entire emotional nature under the regulating and redeeming sway of the Holy Spirit.

3. Will:

A spiritually-minded man is one whose will is set on God as well as his intellect and affections. In every fiber of his moral being, and in all the activities of his soul, he is under the guidance and dominion of the Holy Spirit. The affections present motives, the intellect estimates their worthiness, the will decides upon the course of action. When this trinity of mental operation—necessary to normal manhood—is under the sway of the Divine Spirit, man possesses spirituality, a state in which all the faculties of the soul are voluntarily and joyfully under the dominion and guidance of Christ's indwelling Spirit. When intellect, heart and will focus their energies reverently and affectionately upon Him, love—a passionate, ever-present, everdominant love—is the result. This is the triune sphere of the Holy Spirit's indwelling and activity, and the character of such a God-centered and Spirit-filled life is described by the exalted word "spirituality."

Dwight M. Pratt

SPIRITUALLY

spir'-it-u-al-i (pneumatikos): As in 1Co 2:14, "spiritually judged," i.e. by means of the spirit renewed and enlightened by the spirit of God; having the mind of the Spirit is to be spiritually-minded (compare the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) Ro 8:6).

Allegorically used also (Re 11:8) to characterize, in a bad sense, the qualities of the spiritual (i.e. the spirit's) life: "which spiritually is called Sodom."

See SPIRITUAL.

SPIT; SPITTLE

spit, spit’-l (yaraq, roq; (em)ptuo): Spitting in a person’s face indicated gross contempt (Nu 12:14; De 25:9; Job 30:10; Isa 50:6; Mt 26:67; 27:30, etc.); when performed by an unclean person it produced defilement (Le 15:8) which necessitated washing the clothes and a bath. When David allowed his spittle (rir) to run down over his beard, it was his purpose to behave like a lunatic (1Sa 21:13). "Till I swallow down my spittle" (Job 7:19) has the same import as the English "in the twinkling of an eye" (1Co 15:52). Spittle was used by our Lord in restoring sight and speech (Mr 7:33; Joh 9:6) as signifying His will to cure. It was a widespread belief that spittle, accompanied with magical formulas, possessed medicinal qualities. "Oil" possessed a similar virtue. (Mr 6:13; Jas 5:14).

T. Lewis

SPOIL

spoil.

See BOOTY; WAR, 8.

SPOILER

spoil’-er (ha-shodhedh, "the spoiler"): A favorite expression of the prophet Jeremiah by which he describes generally the enemies that invade and devastate a country—with special reference to enemies that invade Judah (Jer 12:12; 15:8); to enemies who devastate Moab (48:8,18); to enemies from the North who are to assail Babylon (51:48), and in one case (6:26) to Nebuchadrezzar making an irresistible advance upon Jerusalem. the American Standard Revised Version uniformly renders "destroyer."

SPOKE

spok (1Ki 7:33).

See SEA, THE MOLTEN.

SPONGE

spunj (spoggos): The word "sponge," the King James Version "spunge," occurs only in the accounts of our Lord’s crucifixion in Mt 27:48; Mr 15:36; Joh 19:29. Sponges have been known from the earliest periods. They are mentioned by Homer, Aeschylus, Aristophanes and other ancient writers. The sponge fisheries of the Eastern Mediterranean are still among the most important in the world. Sponges are

animals of a very simple organization, fixed to rocks or other objects in the sea or in fresh water. The marketable sponge consists of a mass of soft interlacing fibers which constituted the skeleton of the living animal. The sponge fishers of the Levant dive from boats, with or without diving apparatus, and tear the sponges from the rocks with their hands. The sponges are allowed to die and rot in the air and are then thoroughly washed until nothing but the skeleton remains. Sponges which have calcareous or silicious skeletons are unfit for use.

Alfred Ely Day

SPOON

spoon (kaph; Septuagint thuiske, except in Jer 52:18, where it is kreagra, literally, "fork"): A hollow vessel, a censer; a small vessel in which incense was to be burnt, as is seen from the account given in Nu 7 of the oblations of the princes of the tribes after the setting-up of the tabernacle. Beginning with 7:14, we meet at every succeeding 6th verse the statement, "one golden spoon of ten shekels, full of incense," till at 7:86 the summary statement is made, "the twelve golden spoons, full of incense."

SPORTS

sports.

See GAMES.

SPOT; SPOTTED

spot, spot’-ed (mum; spilos): The Hebrew word is used to denote a blemish which mars the perfection of the face, as in So 4:7; Job 11:15. It is translated "blemish" in Le 24:19 f, where it means an injury the result of violence, and is rendered "blot" in Pr 9:7, where it signifies "shame" or "disgrace." The "spotted" cattle of Ge 30:32-39 are animals of variegated color (Tala’; compare Eze 16:16, "decked with divers colors"; Jos 9:5, "patched"). For chabharburah in Jer 13:23, see LEOPARD. Spilos is used in the figurative sense of a stain of sin in 2Pe 3:14, and similarly along with rhutis ("a wrinkle") in Eph 5:27. The "garment spotted (verb, spiloomai) by the flesh" of Jude 1:23 is, as Calvin has para-phrased it, anything that in any way savors of sin or temptation. The "spots" of Jude 1:12 the King James Version are spilades, "hidden (sunken) rocks" which are betrayed by the surf beating over them (as in Homer Od. iii.298), and are so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). "Spot" in Le 13 is referred to under FRECKLED SPOT; LEPROSY; TETTER.

"Without spot" in Nu 19:2, etc., is tamim, a usual word for "perfect" (so the Revised Version margin); aspilos (the negative form of spilos) occurs in 1Ti 6:14; 1Pe 1:19; 2Pe 3:14, with Jas 1:27 ("unspotted"). For the King James Version Heb 9:14 see BLEMISH.

Alex. Macalister

SPOUSE

spouz (kallah, "bride," "daughter-in-law"): the Revised Version (British and American) gives "bride" for the King James Version "spouse" in So 4:8 ff, and "brides" for "spouses" in Ho 4:13 f (margin "daughters-in-law").

See ESPOUSAL; MARRIAGE; RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

SPREAD; SPREADING

spred, spred’-ing: Alone, or in phrases like "spread abroad," "spread forth," etc., "spread" represents very many Hebrew terms, principally paras; in the New Testament the act of spreading is stronnumi, where in Mt 21:8 b the King James Version has "strawed" (which see); compound in Lu 19:36. For "spread abroad" in Mr 1:28; 1Th 1:8 (exerchomai), the Revised Version (British and American) has "went out" and "gone forth"; conversely, the Revised Version (British and American) has "spread abroad" for the King James Version "break forth" (Isa 54:3,), and "published" (diaphero, Ac 13:49), and for "commonly reported" (diaphemizo, Mt 28:15).

SPRING

See FOUNTAIN; WELL.

SPRINKLE; SPRINKLING

sprin’-k’-l, sprin’-kling (zaraq, nazah; rhantizein): The first word means "to toss" or "scatter abundantly," e.g. in handfuls, as dust on the head (Job 2:12) or blood from a bowl (Ex 9:8). The other Hebrew word is used of sprinkling with the finger (Le 14:7; 16:14, etc.). In the account of Jezebel’s death the word is used in its literal meaning of "spurt" (2Ki 9:33).

Sprinkling (blood, water, oil) formed an important—if not the essential—part of the act of sacrifice. A consideration of the chief passages in the Old Testament will reveal the prominence and the significance of sprinkling as a feature of the sacrificial act. The significance of the sprinkling of blood is seen in the account of the establishment of the covenant between Yahweh and Israel (Ex 24:6-8). Half the blood was sprinkled on the altar as representing the Deity, while the remainder was put into a basin and then sprinkled on the people. This ceremony is a survival in a modified form of the communal meal in which the tribal god and his worshippers sat together and participated in the same food, and in this way came to possess the same life. The two-fold sprinkling of blood resulted in the establishment of an inviolable bond (Nu 18:17; 2Ki 16:15). In the account of the consecration of Aaron and his sons (Ex 29:16,20,21) the blood of the ram of the burnt offering was sprinkled on the altar, while the blood of the ram of

consecration was put on the altar and sprinkled on Aaron and his sons and on their garments. Water of purifying was sprinkled on the Levites at their ordination (Nu 8:7). Le gives detailed information in regard to sacrificial sprinkling. In the case of burnt offering the blood was sprinkled round about upon the altar (Le 1:5,11). The same practice obtained in the case of peace offerings, whether ox, lamb or goat (Le 3:2,8,13). When a sin offering for sins inadvertently committed was made, the priest dipped his fingers in the blood and sprinkled it seven times before Yahweh, before the veil of the Holy Place (Le 4:6). Elsewhere (Le 16:11,15) we read that Aaron took the blood of the sin offering and sprinkled it with his finger upon the mercy-seat, eastward, 7 times (see also Nu 19:4). Sprinkling constituted part of the process of purification. But it is obvious that the sprinkling, even in this case, was a religious act, and not part of the actual physical cleaning. A simple kind of sprinkler was made by fastening a bunch of hyssop to a cedar rod by a piece of scarlet thread or wool and then the patient was besprinkled 7 times (Le 14:7), while oil was sprinkled with the finger, also 7 times, before Yahweh (Le 14:16; see also Ex 12:22; Nu 19:18; Ps 51:7). The house in which the leper lived was disinfected in the same thorough manner (Le 14:51).

In the case of persons who had contracted uncleanness through contact with a corpse, sprinkling with the "water of separation" was part of the process of cleansing. The water of separation consisted of the ashes of a red heifer (slain for the purpose) mixed with running water (Nu 19). A sprinkler was used as in the case of the leper (Nu 19:18). The final sprinkling—on the 7th day—was followed by a bath (Nu 19:19). The "tent" in which the corpse lay, together with all the contents, were thoroughly disinfected.

See HEIFER, RED.

According to Ex (9:8,10) the plague of "boils and blains" was caused through the sprinkling of ashes ("soot" the Revised Version margin) in the air toward heaven, which settled on man and beast and produced the eruption. The narrative gives no clue in reference to the connection between the ashes and the eruption, but the religious character of the act is obvious. By means of it, the assistance of the Deity was invoked. According to primitive thought, there was no necessary connection between the religious act and the consummation devoutly wished for. The purpose of the religious observance was to influence, or bring pressure to bear upon, the Deity so that He might exert Himself on behalf of the worshipper. It is evident that sprinkling as part of the act of worship was believed to be religiously effectual. It was not symbolical nor morally significant. It was a religious act. It is not denied that in some passages sprinkling is symbolical. According to Eze (36:25) the restored community will experience moral and spiritual renewal. There will be a "new heart" and a "new spirit." The sprinkling with clean water is the outward symbol of the inward lustration. In Isa 63:3 the sacrificial allusion is obvious. The conqueror who strides triumphantly from Bozrah is "besprinkled" with the life-blood (or juice) of his victims. In Isa 52:15 "sprinkle" is a doubtful rendering. There is no apparent connection between bodily disfigurement and national purification. the Revised Version margin renders "startle" (literally, "cause to spring"). The exalted dignity of the "martyr" will excite the wonder of kings and peoples.

In 1Pe 1:2, "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" is used figuratively of its cleansing efficacy (compare Heb 9:13,14; 10:22).

T. Lewis

SPURIOUS, ACTS, EPISTLES, GOSPELS

spa’-ri-us.

See APOCRYPHAL ACTS; APOCRYPHAL EPISTLES; APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

SPY

spi.

See ESPY.

STACHYS

sta’-kis (Stachus): The name of a Roman Christian to whom Paul sent greetings. The name is Greek and uncommon; it has been found in inscriptions connected with the imperial household. Paul designates him "my beloved" (Ro 16:9).

STACK

stak: Ex 22:6 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "shocks" (of grain).

STACTE

stak’-te (nataph, "drops" (Job 36:27); stakte, meaning "oozing out in drops"): One of the ingredients of the holy ointment (Ex 30:34; Ecclesiasticus 24:15, margin "opobalsamum," the King James Version "storax"). The marginal reading is a concession to Jewish tradition, but see SPICE, (1). Dioscorides describes two kinds of stacte, one of pure myrrh and one of storax and a fat mixed. See MYRRH. This nataph must have been either myrrh "in drops," as it is collected, or some other fragrant gum, similarly collected, such, for example, as gum tragacanth.

STAFF

staf: Many Hebrew terms are represented by this word. The "staves" of the ark translate the word badh, literally, "a part," hence, branch, bar, etc. (Ex 25:13,14,15,27,28, etc.). Other words, as matteh, maqqel, shebhet, used of the staff in the hand, the shepherd’s staff, figuratively, "staff of bread" (matteh, Eze 4:16; 5:16; 14:13), as indispensable for support of life, are dealt with under ROD (which see). The New

Testament word is rhabdos (Mt 10:10 parallel Lu 9:3; Heb 11:21).

See also SCEPTRE.

STAIR

star.

See HOUSE.

STAKE

stak: Isa 33:20; 54:2 for yathedh, "tent-pin," or, perhaps, "tent-pole" (Ex 27:19; Jud 4:21, etc.). The King James Version Sirach 43:19, "The hoar frost, ... being congealed, lieth on the top of sharp stakes," is of course meaningless. the Revised Version (British and American) "When it is congealed, it is as points of thorns" renders the Greek very exactly, but the Hebrew would indicate for the original meaning "forms frost-flowers of sapphire."

STALK

stok: In Ge 41:5,22 is for qaneh, "cane"; in Jos 2:6 for ets, "wood." In Ho 8:7, the Revised Version margin has "stalk" for qamah, "that which stands." The Revised Version's "standing grain" is due to this meaning of qamah in Ex 22:6, etc., but this translation spoils the figure. The meaning is, "They sow the wind, a worthless sowing, for such seed produces no stalk, it yields no grain."

STALL

stol

((1) marbeq, literally, ," a place for tying up" (Am 6:4; Mal 4:2),

(2) 'abhac, "to give fodder" (Pr 15:17),

(3) 'urvah, "to pluck and feed" (1Ki 4:26; 2Ch 9:25; 32:28),

(4) repheth, "a resting place" (Hab 3:17);

(5) phatne, "a manger" or "crib" (Lu 13:15; compare 'ebhuc, translated "crib" in Isa 1:3; Pr 14:4)): During the season when cattle are not being used they are allowed to roam in the fields. Otherwise they are tied in rooms in the winter time, or under shelters made of green boughs in the summer, and all their food brought to them. Horses and cattle alike are haltered and the chains fastened through holes made in

stones projecting from the walls. No stanchions and no separating partitions between animals are used. The horses are usually hobbled as well.

James A. Patch

STAMMERER

stam’-er-er: Isa 32:4, ‘illegh, "inarticulate speaking." In Isa 28:11; 33:19, l‘g (pointing uncertain) is rendered "strange" by the Revised Version (British and American), with "stammering" in the King James Version, the Revised Version margin. Probably the word means both, as primitive people always think that their own language alone is clearly pronounced. Or the word may mean "mocking."

STANDARD-BEARER

stand’-ard-bar’-er.

See WAR, 5; BANNER.

STANDARDS

stand’-ardz.

See WAR, 5; BANNER; ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 7.

STANDING stand’-ing. See ATTITUDES.

STAR IN THE EAST

See STAR OF THE MAGI; MAGI.

STAR OF BETHLEHEM

See STAR OF THE MAGI.

STAR OF THE MAGI

1. The Magi

2. Herod’s Enquiry

3. Two Facts concerning the Star

4. The Wisdom of the Magi Not Astrological

5. The Prophecy of Balaam

6. The Star Not a Conjunction of Planets

7. The Star Not Nova Cassiopeiae

8. The Legend of the Well

9. Lesson of the Narrative

1. The Magi:

The birth of our Lord was announced in a supernatural manner not only to Jews by the angelic message to the shepherds, but also to Gentiles, for "Wise-men from the east came to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we saw his star in the east, and are come to worship him" (Mt 2:1,2). The word which has been rendered "wise men" in the King James Version and the English Revised Version (the American Standard Revised Version "Wise-men") is "Magi." These, according to Herodotus, were originally a tribe of the Medes (Herodotus i.101) and from their supposed skill in divination the term was applied to the learned and priestly caste among the followers of Zoroaster; they were thus in principle worshippers of one only God, and rejecters of polytheism and idolatry. The simple creed and high morality, which Zoroastrianism in its purest form professed, were well adapted to prepare its faithful disciples to receive a further revelation, and we may reasonably believe that the wise men who had been thus guided to worship the new-born king of the Jews had been faithful to the light afforded to them, for "in every nation he that feareth him (God), and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him" (Ac 10:35).

See MAGI.

2. Herod’s Enquiry:

The gospel tells us that the arrival of the Magi at Jerusalem threw Herod the king and all the city into great excitement, and Herod at once called a council of all the chief priests and scribes of the people that he might learn from them where the Messiah should be born. In reply they quoted to him the prophecy of Micah which had indicated Bethlehem as the destined site. "Then Herod privily called the Wise-men, and learned of them exactly what time the star appeared. And he sent them to Bethlehem, and said, Go and search out exactly concerning the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word, that I also may come and worship him. And they, having heard the king, went their way; and lo, the star, which they saw in the east, went before them, till it came and stood over where the young child was.

And when they saw the star, they rejoiced with exceeding great joy" (Mt 2:7-10). So much, and no more, are we told of the star of the Magi, and the story is as significant in its omissions as in that which it tells us.

3. Two Facts concerning the Star:

What sort of a star it Was that led the wise men; how they learned from it that the King of the Jews was born; how it went before them; how it stood over where the young Child was, we do not know. We are indeed told but two facts concerning it: first, that its appearance in some way or other did inform the wise men, not of the birth of a king of the Jews, but of the King of the Jews for whose coming, not Israel only, but more or less consciously the whole civilized world was waiting; next, that, when they had come to Judea in consequence of this information, the star pointed out to them the actual spot where the new-born King was to be found. It went before them till it came and stood over where the young Child was. It may also be inferred from Mt 2:10 that in some way or other the wise men had for a time lost sight of the star, so that the two facts mentioned refer to two separate appearances. The first appearance induced the Magi to leave the East and set out for Judea; the second pointed out to them the place at Bethlehem where the object of their search was to be found. Nothing is told us respecting the star except its work as a guide.

There can be no doubt that the Magi took their journey in obedience to direct revelation from God, and since we are told that God warned them in a dream not to return to Herod, so that they departed to their own country another way, it is but reasonable to suppose that their outward journey had been directed in a similar manner.

4. The Wisdom of the Magi Not Astrological:

It has been conjectured that as the Magians were credited with a great skill in astrology they may have been able to forecast the birth of our Lord by the rules of their article But this conjecture must be peremptorily rejected. It ascribes to the pseudo-science of astrology a reality to which it has no claim, for it is inconceivable that the planetary configurations can really foretell the birth of princes. Even if it were admitted that such could be the case, no such event could be taken as indicating the One Birth for which the world was waiting, unless some direct and explicit revelation from God had been received to that effect. For that Birth was necessarily unique, and science can deal only with repeated events. No astronomical research is now, or was at any time, competent in itself to supply the indication needed; it was not in virtue of any natural learning that the wise men understood the meaning of the star. And if a mere astronomical research was helpless to supply any such power of prediction, still more emphatically must the claim of "occult knowledge" be disallowed. So far as occult knowledge has had any basis in fact at all, it has been simply a euphemistic way of describing the frauds, impostures and crimes by which debased heathen priesthoods and "medicine men" have imposed upon the gross superstition of their followers. The very suggestion that, by means like these, God’s purpose would be made known shows that those who suggest it have not entirely shaken off the influence of heathenism.

5. The Prophecy of Balaam:

The suggestion has often been made that the prophecy of Balaam, "There shall come forth a star out of Jacob, and a scepter shall rise out of Israel" (Nu 24:17), may have been preserved in the East and have furnished the clue upon which the Magi acted. It is a pleasing thought that these devout Gentiles had thus preserved and meditated upon the prophecy given through one who may well have been of an allied order to themselves; but that prophecy can surely not have been sufficient in itself, and some much more direct intimation must have been vouch-safed to them; though the prophecy may have aided their faith and have dictated the form in which they announced their mission to King Herod and the Jews.

6. The Star Not a Conjunction of Planets:

We are not told how the Magi learned the meaning of the star, neither are we told what kind of a star it was. Some three centuries ago the ingenious and devout Kepler supposed that he could identify the star with a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces, the two planets being so close as to seem a single star. This conjunction took place in the month of May, 7 BC, not very long before the birth of our Lord is supposed to have taken place. But the late Professor Pritchard has shown (Nature and Revelation, 243-55), first, that a similar and closer conjunction occurred 59 years earlier, and should therefore have brought a Magian deputation to Judea then. Next, that the two planets never approached each other nearer than twice the diameter of the moon, so that they would have appeared, not as one star, but as two, and thirdly, if the planets had seemed to stand over Bethlehem as the wise men left Jerusalem, they would assuredly not have appeared to do so when they arrived at the little city. Ingenious as the suggestion was, it may be dismissed as unworthy of serious consideration.

7. The Star Not Nova Cassiopeiae:

Another suggestion has received at times a very wide popularity. In the year 1572 a wonderful new star appeared in the constellation Cassiopeia. At its brightest it outshone Venus and was visible in the daylight, and though it gradually declined in splendor it was not lost to sight until after 16 months. There have been other instances of outbursts of short-lived bright stars, and in the annals of the years 1265 and 952 some brief notices have been found which may have referred to objects of this class, but more probably described comets. The guess was then hazarded that these three events might all refer to the same object; that the star in Cassiopeia might be a "variable" star, bursting into brilliancy about every 350 years or so; that it was the star that announced the birth of our Lord, and that it would reappear about the end of the 19th century to announce His second coming. This rumor was widely spread, and from time to time ignorant people have noticed the planet Venus which shines with extraordinary brilliancy when in particular parts of her orbit, and have imagined, especially when she has been thus seen as a morning star in the east, that she was none other than the star of Bethlehem at its predicted return. There is no reason to suppose that the star of 1572 had ever appeared before that date or will ever appear again; but in any case we are perfectly sure that it could not have been the star of Bethlehem, for Cassiopeia is a northern constellation, and the wise men in their journey from Jerusalem to Bethlehem had Cassiopeia and all her stars behind their back.

The statement that the star "went before" the Magi gives the impression that it was some supernatural light like the shekhinah, "glory," resting upon the tabernacle, or the pillar of fire which led the children of Israel through the wilderness. But this view raises the questions as to the form in which it first appeared to the wise men, when they were still in the East, and how they came to call it a star, when they must have recognized how un-starlike it was. On the other hand, if what they saw when in the East was really a star, it seems most difficult to understand how it can have appeared to go before them and to stand over the place where the young Child lay.

8. The Legend of the Well:

Yet there is a legend still current in Palestine which may possibly explain how an actual star may have fulfilled this part, and there is a well at Bethlehem that is still shown to pilgrims as the means whereby the wise men "saw the star" the second time. It is said that when they had reached Bethlehem, apparently nearly at mid-day, one of them went to the well of the inn in order to draw water. Looking down into the well he saw the star reflected from the surface of the water and knew that it must be directly overhead. Its re-observation under such unusual circumstances would be a sufficient assurance to the Magi that they had reached the right place, and inquiry in the inn would soon inform them of the visit of the shepherds, and of the angelic message which had told them where to find the babe ‘born in the city of David, the Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.’

If we may accept this legend we may take the star as having been what astronomers know as a "new" or "temporary" star, like that of 1572. When the Magi first saw it, and in consequence set out upon their journey, it may have been an evening star and thus, being seen only in the west shortly after sunset, it would appear, evening after evening, to point them their way to Judea. As they journeyed thither it probably faded as temporary stars in general quickly do. At the same time it would have drawn nearer and nearer to the sun, until it was lost in its rays by the time they reached Jerusalem, when they would seem to have lost sight of it altogether. Having thus lost it, they would naturally not expect to see it again until it had drawn away from the sun on the other side, and been detected as a morning star in the east before sunrise; they would not expect to discover it in the daytime.

In the ordinary way, the planet Venus is, after the two "great lights," the brightest object in the heavens, but temporary stars are on record that have even exceeded Venus in brightness. The difficulty of seeing the planet Venus in full sunshine does not lie in her want of brightness, but in picking up and holding steadily so minute a point of light in the broad expanse of the gleaming sky. This difficulty, which would be even greater in the case of a star, would be lessened by looking down the well, as the shaft would narrow the field of view down to a small area, and would direct the observer’s gaze straight to the star. There may also have been, at the very time of observation, a temporary revival of the brightness of the star as has been recorded in the case of one or two objects of the same class. The legend, whether well founded or not, seems to have some astronomical verisimilitude, and at any rate suggests a mode in which an actual star could have seemed to stand over the place where the young Child lay. It would also explain what seems to have been implied in the narrative, how it happened that the Magi alone, and not the Jews in general, perceived the star at its second appearance.

9. Lesson of the Narrative:

Yet it seems safer to conclude that the narrative has been purposely left—astronomically—too incomplete for any astronomical conclusion to be drawn from it. One verse more, and that a short one, could have answered all our inquiries, could have told us whether the star was a conjunction of the planets, a comet, or a temporary star; or whether it was a supernatural light like the pillar of fire in the wilderness. But that verse has not been given. The score of additional words which could have cleared up the matter have been withheld, and there can be no doubt as to the reason. The star, whatever its physical nature, was of no importance except as a guide to the birthplace of the infant Jesus. The reticence of the gospel narrative on all points, except those directly relating to our Lord Himself, enforces the truth that the Scriptures were not written to instruct us in astronomy, or in any of the physical sciences, but that we might have life eternal (Joh 17:3).

E. W. Maunder

STAR OF WORMWOOD

See WORMWOOD.

STAR; STARS

star, starz.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 6.

STARGAZERS

star’-gaz-erz.

See ASTROLOGY, 5.

STARS, COURSES OF

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 1.

STARS, FALLING; MORNING; WANDERING

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 8; I, 7; I, 9.

STARS, SEVEN

See ASTRONOMY.

STATELY

stat’-li (kebhuddah, "weight," "honor," "wealth"): "And sit upon a stately (magnificent) bed" (Eze 23:41).

STATER

sta’-ter (stater): Used only once, Mt 17:27, where it is rendered by "piece of money" in the King James Version and "shekel" in the Revised Version (British and American). It was originally a standard Greek weight equal to two drachmas, but later it was used to designate the tetradrachma, and this is probably the coin referred to in the above passage.

See MONEY.

STATURE

stat’-ur (madh, middah, "measure" (Nu 13:32, etc.), qomah, "standing up" (1Sa 16:7, etc.); helikia, "greatness"): This last word means "height of the body," "stature," in Lu 2:52; 19:3; Eph 4:13, but it can mean "length of life" equally well and has this force in Joh 9:21,23; Heb 11:11. And this meaning, not "stature" (as in the King James Version), is fixed for Mt 6:27 parallel Lu 12:25, for to add some 18 inches (see CUBIT) to one’s "stature" would be a grotesque feat, while it is the smallness of the act that is emphasized. Hence, the translation "able to extend his long path of life by a single cubit" (the Revised Version (British and American) "measure of life"). Compare also "great of stature" Baruch 3:26 (eumegethes).

Burton Scott Easton

STAVES

stavz (baddim): Ten or eleven Hebrew words are used in the Old Testament to describe various staffs, bars, and wooden rods used by the Hebrews (compare STAFF; ROD; SCEPTER). One word only is used to describe the staves or wooden poles used for carrying the holy furniture of the tabernacle from place to place. That word is badh (plural baddim), which occurs 28 times in Exodus and Numbers and 5 times in Kings and Chronicles (compare also Job 17:16; Ho 11:6). The only passage in which these staves are mentioned by another name is 1Ch 15:15, where the staves used for carrying the ark from its captivity into Jerusalem are called motah. The reason for this probably is that the original baddim had been lost during the long absence of the sacred chest from its home in the tabernacle.

In the wilderness wanderings, arrangements were made that four items of the holy furniture of the portable tabernacle should be carried on the shoulders of Levites, suspended on these staves. These were the golden altar of incense, the golden table for shewbread, the brazen altar of sacrifice, and the ark of the covenant (Ex 35:12-16).

In the case of the large altar of sacrifice, which was in reality a hollow wooden chest covered with brass (bronze) plates (see ALTAR), four rings were attached to the brass grating which rose midway in the chest, and through these rings the staves passed. The staves were of acacia wood and were covered with brass plating. In the case of the three golden utensils of the sanctuary, the staves were of acacia wood, covered with gold plates.

The last mention of any of these staves is in 1Ki 8:7-9, where it is stated of the ark, in the holy of holies in Solomon’s Temple, that the ends of its staves were seen by anyone standing in the adjoining holy place, before (i.e. east of) the oracle. Priests only might view them there, the curtain being withdrawn. The writer of 1Ki 8 adds that the staves were thus visible when he wrote, an item of evidence worthy of note as to the date of the document.

W. Shaw Caldecott

STAY

sta: Is derived from two distinct forms. From one derivation it has the meaning "to stand" and so "to continue in one place" (Ge 8:10; Le 13:23,28, etc.), "to forbear to act" (Ru 1:13), "to rest," "to be trustful" (King James Version, the English Revised Version Isa 10:20; see below). Transitively it means "to cause to stay," "to hinder" (Da 4:35, etc.), and "stay" as a noun means "cessation of progress"‘ (Le 13:5,37), "sojourn." From the second derivation the verb means "to support" (Ex 17:12; 1Ki 22:35; So 2:5), while the noun means "a support" (1Ki 10:19; Isa 3:1, etc.). the American Standard Revised Version has judged obsolete "stay on" in the sense "trust in," and for "stay" has substituted "lean" in Isa 10:20 and "rely" in 30:12; 31:1; 50:10, although "stay themselves upon" (=" support themselves by") has been kept in 48:2. Otherwise the Revised Version (British and American) has made few alterations. But such as have been made ("tarry ye" for "stay yourselves" in Isa 29:9 and the American Standard Revised Version "restrain" for "stay" in Job 37:4) could have been carried farther with advantage.

Burton Scott Easton

STEAD; STEADS

sted, stedz (tachath, "(same) place"; AS stede, "place"): Occurs only in 1Ch 5:22, "They dwelt in their stead (place) until the captivity."

STEALING

ste’-ling.

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

STEDFASTNESS

sted’-fast-nes:

(1) stereoma, "firmness": "The steadfastness of your faith in Christ" (Col 2:5). Some take this figuratively, in a military sense, of a "solid front" (see Thayer, Greek-English Lexicon of New Testament, under the word).

(2) sterigmos, "stability" (2Pe 3:17; compare 1Co 15:58).

STEEL

stel: the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "brass" for "steel" in 2Sa 22:35; Job 20:24; Ps 18:34; Jer 15:12, and "steel" for "torches" in Na 2:3.

See BRASS.

STEPHANAS

stef’-a-nas (Stephanas): The name occurs only in 1Co 1:16; 16:15-18. Stephanas was a Christian of Corinth; his household is mentioned in 1Co 16:15 as the first family won to Christ in Achaia, and in 1Co 1:16 as among the few personally baptized by Paul at Corinth. The "house of Stephanas," apparently of independent means, had "set themselves to minister unto the saints" (1Co 16:15), i.e. to do Christian service. Possibly this service consisted in putting their house at the disposal of the Christians at Corinth for worshipping, or in rendering special assistance in establishing intercommunication between the Corinthian church and the apostle, or the other churches. An instance of such service was the commission of Stephanas at Ephesus referred to in 1Co 16:17,18. At the occasion of some disorders in the Corinthian church Stephanas, with Fortunatus and Achaicus in the deputation, brought a letter of the Corinthians to Paul. Our present 1 Corinthians is the reply to this letter, and thus, in all probability, the three men mentioned above were the bearers of this epistle. With fine courtesy Paul expresses his appreciation for this service in 1Co 16:18, referring to it as a cherished opportunity of fellowship with his beloved Corinthians through these representatives. It is in consideration of such Christian service that Paul enjoins upon the Corinthians to show the house of Stephanas that respect and deference due to Christian leaders by willingly submitting to their direction.

S. D. Press

STEPHEN

ste’-vn (Stephanos, "crown" (Ac 6:5-8:12)):

1. His Personal Antecedents

2. His Character and Activity

3. His Teaching

4. His Arraignment before the Sanhedrin

5. His Defence before the Sanhedrin

(1) Personal Defence

(2) Defense of His Teaching

6. Martyrdom of Stephen

LITERATURE

Known best as the proto-martyr of the Christian church, introducing the heroic period of persecutions. He deserves as well to be called the first great apologist for Christianity, since it was this that brought on his death as a martyr (circa 36 or 37 AD).

1. His Personal Antecedents:

As his name and his relations in the church at Jerusalem seem to imply (Ac 6:3), he was a Hellenist, i.e. a Greek-speaking Jew. Thus he belonged to that class of Jews usually residing outside of Palestine who, though distinguished from the orthodox Palestinian Jew by a broader outlook on life due to a more liberal education, were Jews none the less, the original Jewish element predominating in their character, and who might be true Israelites indeed, as Stephen was. Of his conversion to Christianity we know nothing, though there is a tradition that he was among the Seventy. As Stephen by his life and work marks a period of transition in the development of the early Christian church, so his name is connected with an important new departure within the organization of the church itself, namely, the institution of the office of the Seven (Ac 6:1), who were entrusted with the administration of the work of relief in the church at Jerusalem—the foundation of the diaconate (Iren., Haer., i.26; Cyprian, Epist., iii.3). Of the seven men, all Hellenists, elected to this office at the occasion of a grievance of the Hellenistic Christians in the Jerusalem church against the Hebrew Christians, to the effect that in the distribution of alms their widows were being discriminated against, Stephen, who heads the list, is by far the most

distinguished.

2. His Character and Activity:

Stephen more than met the requirements of the office to which he was elected (Ac 6:3); the record characterizes him as "a man full of faith and of the Holy Spirit" (Ac 6:5), i.e. of an enthusiastic faith and of a deep spirituality, and his activity was not restricted to the functions of his office; in fact while nothing is said of the manner in which he fulfilled the duties of his office, though without doubt he fulfilled them faithfully, the record makes it very clear that the importance of Stephen lay in his activity as a preacher, a witness for Christ; it is this activity which has given him the place he holds in history (Ac 22:20). In itself that is not surprising, for in the early Christian church every Christian was at once a witness for Christ, and lay-preaching was common. The Seven from the first were occupied with essentially spiritual work, as also the later diaconate was engaged in something far different from mere charity organization. But Stephen was especially qualified for this high work, having been endued by the Holy Spirit with apostolical gifts, not only that of preaching, but also that of working miracles (Ac 6:8). In his freer views of Jewish law and customs, due to his deeper conception and better understanding of the essence of Christianity, he even excelled the apostles.

3. His Teaching:

He burst the bonds of Judaism, by which the other apostles were still bound, by teaching that the temple and the Law of Moses were evanescent and that Christianity was destined to supersede Judaism (Ac 6:14). These freer views of Stephen, though possibly attributable to his Hellenic culture, were certainly not of Hellenistic origin, for just their promulgation is what brought him into controversy with the Hellenistic synagogues of Jerusalem. Though the Hellenist dispensed himself from keeping all of the Pharisaic additions to the Law, he always regarded the Law of Moses and the temple at Jerusalem as highly as the Palestinian Jew. Even Philo characterizes the Law of Moses in distinction from the laws of other nations, as stedfast, immovable and unchangeable, placing it on a level with the laws of Nature. The true source of Stephen’s freer views of the Mosaic Law and the temple was Christ’s own teachings, Stephen showing a wonderfully ripened understanding of them, paralleled only by that of Paul some time later. Christ’s words regarding the temple (Joh 4:20-24; Mr 13:2) not only led Stephen to see that the true worship of God was not confined to the temple, but opened his eyes as to the purely formal character of this worship in that day, which, far from being true worship, had become a mere ceremonialism (Mr 7:6), and in the words of Christ (Joh 2:19) he saw an intimation of the new temple which was to take the place of the old. Thus also his conception of the transitory nature of the Mosaic Law may be traced to Christ’s teaching as to the Sabbath, the laws of purifying, the fulfillment of the Law and Jewish customs of the day (Mt 5:20) and of a better righteousness than that of the Pharisees and scribes (Mt 9:16). As Christ had been drawn into controversy with Pharisees and scribes on account of these freer views, and as His word about the temple was used to frame the accusation against Him in His trial, so also in the case of Stephen. He did not hesitate to preach his views, choosing the Hellenistic synagogues for this purpose, and soon became engaged in controversies there. But, as the record says, his opponents "were not able to withstand the wisdom," i.e. better understanding, convincing knowledge, "and the Spirit," i.e. the deep earnestness and spirituality, "by which he spake" so convincingly (Ac 6:10;

Mt 10:19,20). Seeing themselves beaten, they took recourse to the ignoble method of declaring him a blasphemer and a heretic, by using the same foul means that the enemies of Jesus had resorted to, by suborning false witnesses to the plot, by stirring up the people against him, by appealing to their Jewish prejudices and to the scribes and elders, members of the Sanhedrin, and thus eventually brought about his arraignment.

4. His Arraignment before the Sanhedrin:

The accusation which they brought against him, through the introduction of false witnesses, included a twofold charge, one against his person, a charge of blasphemous words against Moses which would make him also a blasphemer of God, and one against his teaching, charging him with revolutionary and radical statements concerning the temple and the Law. (compare Mr 14:58; 13:2; 15:29). "Customs of Moses" (Ac 6:14) were the institutions that distinguished the Jews and that were derived from Moses. By his reference to "this place" and "these customs" Stephen was understood to imply the destruction of the temple and the change of the Law, Christianity thus aiming not only at the overthrow of the Jews' religion but the very termination of their national existence.

The charge against Stephen's person was a baseless accusation. There was no blasphemy on the part of Stephen, save by perversion of his words. The charge against his teaching was both false and true. It was false as an implied insinuation that he impugned the divine origin and character of the temple and the Mosaic Law, but it was true as far as he conceived both to be only of a temporary nature and serving a merely provisional purpose, which, as we have seen, constituted the peculiarity of his teaching. As in the trial of Christ, the judge, Pontius Pilate, read his true verdict, "I find no guilt in him," written on His countenance and whole bearing, thus here the record tells us that the judges of Stephen, "All that sat in the council .... saw his face as it had been the face of an angel" (Ac 6:15; 2Co 3:18); as if in refutation of the charge made against him, Stephen receives the same mark of divine favor which had been granted to Moses. It is a significant fact that Stephen was not arraigned before the Sanhedrin as being a Nazarene though at bottom it was the real cause of his arraignment. Thus also his defense before the Sanhedrin, though the name of Jesus was not mentioned until the very last, was in reality a grand apology for Christ.

5. His Defense before the Sanhedrin:

While the assembly was overawed by the evidence of singular innocence and holiness written upon the countenance of Stephen (Ac 6:15), the question of the high priest "Are these things so?" broke in upon the silence. It drew forth from Stephen that masterful pleading which, so sublime in form and content and bare of all artificiality, belongs to the highest type of oratory, characterized by its deep, earnest, and genuine spirituality, the kind of oratory of which the great speeches of our own martyred Lincoln were models. It is not so much a plea in selfdefence as a grand apology for the cause which Stephen represents.

Beginning by mentioning "the God of glory" and ending with a vision of that glory itself, the speech is a

wonderful apotheosis of the humble cause of the Nazarene, the enthusiastic tribute of its first great martyr delivered in the face of death. The contents of his speech are a recital of the most marked phases of Jewish history in the past, but as read from the point of view of its outworkings in the present—old facts interpreted by a spiritfilled disciple of Christ. It is in reality a philosophy of Israel's history and religion, and in so far it was a novum. Thus the new feature that it furnishes is its philosophy of this history which might be termed the Christian philosophy of Jewish history. In appealing to their reason he calls up picture after picture from Abraham to Moses; the speech exhibits vividly the continuity and the progress of the divine revelation which culminated in Jesus of Nazareth, the same thought as that expressed by Christ in Mt 5:17 of the principal agreement between the Old Testament and the New Testament revelation.

The emotional appeal lies in the reverential and feeling manner in which he handles the history sacred to them all. The strong appeal to the will is made by holding up the figure of Moses type of the Law, in its vital significance, in such a way as passionately to apply it to the fundamental relation of divine plan and human conduct. Thus the aim of Stephen was to point out to his hearers the true meaning of Jewish history and Jewish Law in reference to the present, i.e. in such a way that they might better understand and judge the present and adjust their conduct to it accordingly. Their knowledge of Jewish history and Jewish religion as he would convey it to them would compel them to clear him of the accusation against him as blasphemer and false teacher.

In accordance with the accusation against him, his defense was a twofold one: personal defense and defense of his teaching.

(1) Personal Defense

The charge of blasphemy against God and contempt of the Law is implicitly repudiated by the tenor of the whole speech. The courteous and at once endearing terms in Stephen's address (Ac 7:2) to the council, and the terms "our fathers" and "our race" in Ac 7:2,19 by which he closely associates himself with his hearers, his declaration of the divine majesty of Yahweh with which the speech opens (7:2), of the providential leading of the patriarchs (7:8,10), his recognition of the Old Testament institutions as divinely decreed (7:8), his reference to the divine sanction of the Law and its condemnation of those who had not kept it (7:53), at the close of his speech, show clearly his reverence, not only for the past history of the Jewish race, but as well for its Sacred Writings and all of its religious institutions. It makes evident beyond doubt how not grounded the accusation of blasphemy against him was. Not to impiety or frivolity in Stephen, but to some other cause, must be due therefore the difference between him and his opponents. What it is Stephen himself shows unmistakenly in the second part of his defense.

(2) Defence of His Teaching

The fundamental differences between Stephen and his opponents, as is evident from the whole tone and drift and purpose of his speech, lay in that he judged Old Testament history from the prophetical point of view, to which Jesus had also allied Himself, while his opponents represented the legalistic point of

view, so characteristic of the Jewish thought of that day. The significance of this difference is borne out by the fact upon which Stephen's refutation hinges, namely, the fact, proved by the history of the past, that the development of the divine revelation and the development of the Jewish nation, so far from combining, move in divergent lines, due to a disposition of obstinate disobedience on the part of their fathers, and that therefore not he but they were disobedient to the divine revelation. Thus in a masterful way Stephen converts the charge of Antinomianism and anti-Mosaism brought against him into a countercharge of disobedience to the divine revelation, of which his hearers stood guilty in the present as their fathers had in the past. In this sense the speech of Stephen is a grand apology for the Christian cause which he represented, inasmuch as it shows clearly that the new religion was only the divinely-ordered development of the old, and not in opposition to it.

The main arguments of the speech may be summed up as follows:

(a) God's self-manifestation to Israel in revealing His covenant and His will, so far from being bound to one sanctuary and conveyed to one single person (Moses), began long before Moses and long before there was a temple. Thus it was gradual, and as it had begun before Moses it was not completed by him, as is evident from his own words, "A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me" (Ac 7:2-37).

(b) The Jews to whom these revelations were granted, so far from being thankful at all stages of their history, had been slow to believe and understand them because they "would not be obedient" (Ac 7:39,57). They resisted the purpose of God by obstinately and stiff-neckedly opposing those through whom God worked. Thus their fathers had turned away from Moses at the very moment when he was receiving God's greatest revelation, and, instead of obeying the "living oracles" (7:38) he gave them, turned to idol-worship for which God punished them by the Babylonian captivity (7:39-43). They had killed the prophets who had protested against the dead ritualism of the temple-worship and raised their voice in behalf of a true spiritual worship as that of the tabernacle had been (7:44-50,52). This disposition of disobedience so characteristic of the race in its whole history, because, in spite of the divine revelation received, they remained unregenerate (7:51), reached its culmination in that awful crime of betrayal and murder committed by the present generation upon the "Righteous One" whose coming the prophets had predicted the rejection of Jesus of Nazareth, by which the Jews doomed not only their national existence, but also their temple-worship and the reign of the Law to destruction (7:52-6:14).

Though the name of Jesus was not uttered by Stephen in his speech and does not occur until in his dying prayer, his hearers could not fail to notice the hidden reference to Him throughout the entire speech and to draw parallels intended by Stephen: As Joseph and Moses, types of the Messiah, had been rejected, scorned and illtreated (Ac 7:9,27,39), before being raised to be ruler and deliverer, so Jesus had also been repulsed by them.

The climax of his speech is reached in Ac 7:51-53, when Stephen, breaking off the line of argument, suddenly in direct address turns upon his hearers, and, the accused becoming the accuser, charges them

openly with the sin of resisting the Holy Spirit, with the murder of the prophets and the Righteous One, and with continual disobedience to the Law. These words which mark the climax, though probably not the close of the speech, pointed the moral in terms of the most cutting rebuke, and were at once prophetical as to the effect the speech would have upon his hearers and for him.

6. Martyrdom of Stephen:

Such arguing and directness as Stephen's could have but one result. Prejudiced and enraged as they were, the unanswerable arguments of Stephen, based on their own Scriptures, made them mad with fury, and doubtless through their demonstrations they stopped the speech. But Stephen, ansported with enthusiasm and inspiration, was vouchsafed a vision of the "glory of God," which he had mentioned in the beginning of his speech (Ac 7:2), and of Jesus, whose cause he had so gallantly defended (Ac 7:55). Stephen standing there, his gaze piercing into heaven, while time and human limitations seemed effaced for him, marks one of the most historic moments in the history of Israel, as his words constitute the most memorable testimony ever uttered in behalf of Christ: "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man"—the only place where this title is uttered by any other person than Jesus—"standing on the right hand of God" (Ac 7:56). Now the audience could restrain its rage no longer, and the catastrophe followed immediately. Contrary to Roman law and order they took Stephen, and without awaiting sentence against him, amid a tumultuous scene, stoned him to death, the punishment prescribed in Mosaic Law for a blasphemer (De 17:7; Le 24:14-16). This recourse to lynch law may have been connived at by the Roman authorities, since the act was without political significance. It is noteworthy, however, that the Jewish legal forms were observed, as if to give to the violence the appearance of legality. Accordingly, Stephen was taken outside the city (Le 24:14; compare Lu 4:29); the witnesses threw the first stone at him (compare De 17:7) after taking off their upper garments and laying them at the feet of a "young man named Saul" (Ac 7:58)—afterward Paul, now about 30 years old—who evidently had charge of the whole proceedings.

Stephen died as he had lived, a faithful witness to his Master whom he acknowledged as such amid the rain of stones hurled at him, loudly calling upon His name, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit" (Ac 7:59; compare Lu 23:46), and whose spirit he exemplified so nobly when, with a final effort, bending his knees, he "cried with a loud voice, Lord, lay not this sin to their charge" (Ac 7:60; compare Lu 23:34). "And when he had said this, he fell asleep" (Ac 7:60; compare 1Co 15).

The impression made by Stephen's death was even greater than that made by his life. Though it marks the beginning of the first great persecution of Christians, the death of the first Christian martyr resulted in the greatest acquisition Christianity has probably ever made, the conversion of Saul of Tarsus. The vision of the risen and exalted Jesus vouchsafed to the dying Stephen presented Christianity to Saul of Tarsus in a new light, tending to remove what had been its greatest stumbling-block to him in the Crucified One. This revelation coupled with the splendid personality of Stephen, the testimony of his righteous life and the noble bravery of his sublime death, and above all his dying prayer, fell upon the honest soul of Saul with an irresistible force and inevitably brought on the Damascus event, as Augustine clearly recognized: "Si Stephanus non orasset, ecclesia Paulum non habuisset." Judged by his teaching, Stephen may be called the forerunner of Paul. He was one of the first to conceive of the fact

that Christianity represented a new order of things and as such would inevitably supersede the old order. Thus his teachings forecast that greatest controversy of the first Christian century, the controversy between Judaism and Christianity, which reached its culmination-point in the Council of Jerusalem, resulting in the independence of the Christian church from the fetters of Judaistic legalism.

LITERATURE.

R. J. Knowling, "Acts" in Expositor's Greek Testament., II (1900); Feine, PRE3, XIX (1907); Pahncke in Studien u. Krit. (1912), I. S. D. Press

STEWARD

stu'-erd ('ish 'al bayith (Ge 43:16,19; 44:1; 1Ki 16:9), ha-meltsar (Da 1:11), ha-cokhen (Isa 22:15)):

1. Old Testament Usage:

In the King James Version the word "steward" is found in Ge 15:2; 1Ch 28:1, in addition to the above. The American Standard Revised Version renders Ge 15:2 as "possessor," and 1Ch 28:1 "rulers."

The phrase ben-mesheq in Ge 15:2 is best rendered "son of acquisition," hence, "heir." But this is disputed. Skinner in the ICC on Ge regards the text as hopelessly corrupt, and offers no solution of the difficulty. In the other passages, the phrase 'ish 'al bayith is conveniently translated "steward," though literally it is "man over the house." The word ha-meltsar in Da 1:11 is translated in the King James Version as a proper noun. This is certainly a mistake. The margin gives "the steward," and this is followed in the Revised Version (British and American). A better rendering perhaps would be "overseer," as this man seemed to have the superintendence of the training and feeding of the young men until they were fitted to enter the king's service. He was thus rather a steward of persons than of property (see MELZAR). In Isa 22:15 Shebna is described in the text as "treasurer," but in the margin as "steward," and seems to combine the ideas in both the words "treasurer" and "steward." Shebna was thus one of the highest officials, having charge of the city's funds, and of administering them for the city's benefit.

Though the word for "steward" occurs but once in that sense, the idea is one familiar to the Old Testament. Eliezer of Damascus was Abraham's slave and trusted steward. Heseems to have had the oversight of all his affairs and was entrusted with the important duty of getting a wife for Isaac. He apparently had charge over the family of his master as well as his property. Whether Isaac had such a steward or not is nowhere stated, but it is practically certain that he had. Jacob seems to have been Laban's steward for a time, as he apparently had full charge of the flocks and herds of his master. Joseph was practically Potiphar's steward, and when he became Pharaoh's chief minister, he himself had a steward over his own house (Ge 39:4,5; 44:1,4). The king Elah in his brief reign of two years had a steward in charge of his household (1Ki 16:9). The same was doubtless true of all the kings, and it may be safely inferred that every household of distinction or of sufficient wealth had a steward in charge. The

functions of this officer seem at times to have included the care of the children or minors, as well as of the property. Sometimes he was a slave, sometimes a freedman.

2. In the New Testament:

epitropos, oikonomos. These two terms denote similar positions. The exact difference cannot be clearly defined, as they are sometimes almost synonymous. The two are found together in Ga 4:2. Some scholars say they are used synonymously, others that the first word is a more general term including the latter. Lightfoot and Ellicott think that the former refers rather to the guardianship of persons, the child's legal representative, while the latter word refers to the head servant appointed to manage the household or property (compare 2 Macc 11:1; 13:2). There would, however, not be any such hard-and-fast line between their respective duties; these might vary with every master, or might be combined in one individual.

(1) In the Gospels.

The idea seems to have been perfectly familiar to the people in Christ's day. Every household of distinction seems to have had a steward in charge, Herod's steward was named Chuzas, and his wife, Joanna, followed and ministered to Jesus (Lu 8:3). The word epitropos used here is held by some scholars to imply that he had charge of the education of Herod's children. This is very probable but not certain. In the parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard, it is the steward who pays the laborers at the close of the day (Mt 20:8). The parable of the Unjust Steward best illustrates the practice. This steward was a freeman, had full charge of his master's affairs and could use them to his own advantage if he chose, was fully accountable to his master and had to render an account when called upon. If unfaithful he was usually discharged at once (Lu 16:1-13). The parables of the Minae or Pounds (Lu 19:12-27), the Talents (Mt 25:14-30), and the Wicked Husbandmen (Mt 21:33-46) teach similar truths. In His warning to His disciples Jesus seems to imply that they were to act as stewards in His absence (Lu 12:42). According to this passage a steward's task was to manage all the affairs of his master, attend to receipts and expenditures, and portion out to each one of the household what should come to him. The disciples were left thus in charge of His gospel and were to use this gift to the best advantage in behalf of others until His return. In Joh 2:8 the term "ruler" is given in the margin as "steward." The one referred to here was really director of the feast rather than steward, though in a sense charged with the responsibility of conducting it. Many stewards were no doubt slaves, as is implied in Mt 24:45, while others were freedmen (Lu 16:1-21).

(2) In the Epistles.

The application of this term is largely confined to the ministry of the gospel. Paul and his fellow-laborers regarded themselves as stewards of the mysteries of God (1Co 4:1,2). The idea is that he take scrupulous care of that which was entrusted to him, and give it out to others faithfully and as directed by his master Jesus Christ. A bishop or overseer is to be as God's steward (Tit 1:7). Peter considered himself and all other Christians as "stewards of the manifold grace of God" (1Pe 4:10). The prevalence

of the custom of having guardians and stewards over children in their minority is shown in Ga 4:2. The difference in meaning of the two words used here is stated above. In Romans 16:23 Erastus is called the oikonomos of the city. This is best translated "treasurer." Erastus was thus an influential member of the community of Corinth and evidently a faithful Christian.

James Josiah Reeve

STEWPAN

stu’-pan (Le 11:35 margin).

See PAN.

STIFF-NECKED

stif’-nekt (qesheh ‘oreph, literally, "hard of neck"): As it is figuratively used, both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament, the word means "stubborn," "untractable," "not to be led." The derivation of the idea was entirely familiar to the Jews, with whom the ox was the most useful and common of domestic animals. It was especially used for such agricultural purposes as harrowing and plowing (Jud 14:18; 1Co 9:9).

The plow was usually drawn by two oxen. As the plowman required but one hand to guide the plow, he carried in the other an "ox-goad." This was a light pole, shod with an iron spike. With this he would prick the oxen upon the hind legs to increase their speed, and upon the neck to turn, or to keep a straight course when deviating. If an ox was hard to control or stubborn, it was "hard of neck," or stiff-necked. Hence, the figure was used in the Scriptures to express the stubborn, untractable spirit of a people not responsive to the guiding of their God (Ex 32:9; 33:3; De 9:6; 2Ch 36:13; Jer 17:23, etc.). See also the New Testament where sklerotrachelos, is so translated (Ac 7:51), "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit.". Compare Baruch 2:30,33.

Arthur Walwyn Evans

STILL

stil: "To be still" is "to keep silence" (Ps 4:4, etc.) and so "to be quiet" (Ps 107:29, etc.) or "inactive" in any way (Jud 18:9; 1Ki 22:3; Zec 1:11, etc.). So "be still" in Ps 46:10 means "desist from your war" (compare the Revised Version margin "let be"). The "still small voice" of 1Ki 19:12 (the Revised Version margin "sound of gentle stillness") is due to taking the Hebrew demamah in its literal force of "silent," but the word here means "whisper"—"a whispering, little voice." This familiar passage, however, has made "still voice" good English, and the combination is used in Job 4:16 by the Revised Version margin. In Ps 23:2 the translation "still waters" takes "waters of rest" (so literally for menuchah;

compare the Revised Version margin) to mean "waters with little motion." But the meaning is either "wells by which the flocks rest" or "wells that give refreshing water." As an adverb "still" is perhaps more emphatic than in modern English; compare "power to keep still the kingdom," 2Ch 22:9 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "to hold the kingdom").

Burton Scott Easton

STING

sting (parash, "to cut into"; kentron, "a goad," "spur"): A sharp, pointed organ or instrument for inflicting wounds by puncture; sting of an adder, Pr 23:32; of scorpions, Re 9:10. In the free quotation of 1Co 15:55 from Ho 13:14, death is personified as a deadly animal, like a scorpion or serpent, which inflicts destruction by means of sin as its kentron. It should also be remembered that in Ac 26:14 the same Greek word is used with reference to an instrument for exciting fear, rather than death. Both figures are pertinent; for death is powerless, except through sin, and, also, when sin is vanquished, the fear of death (Heb 2:15) is gone.

H. E. Jacobs

STIR, STIR UP

stur: Used transitively and intransitively to indicate inner, concentrated movement; translates a number of Hebrew and Greek verbs, each of which has its different shade of meaning. Thus, e.g. in Ps 39:2, we have ‘akhar, "to be troubled," "excited"; in So 2:7, ‘ur, "to awake," "disturb" (by the festal dances and songs). In 2Ti 1:6, it stands for Greek anazopureo, used of the resuscitation of a flame; in 2Pe 1:13; 3:1, Greek diegeiro, "to awaken from sleep or stupor"; in Ac 21:27, Greek sugcheo, "to commingle," vividly portraying the confusion and tumult that resulted; in Ac 13:50, Greek parotruno, "to urge on"; Ac 17:13, Greek saleuo, "to shake to and fro."

STOCK

stok: In English Versions of the Bible is used for:

(1) The stem of a tree, whether alive (Job 14:8; Isa 40:24) or cut down (Isa 44:19; RAPC Wis 14:21). In Jer 2:27; 3:9; Ho 4:12, where the Hebrew has simply ‘ets, "wood," either meaning is possible (tree-worship? idolatry?). In Jer 10:8 the text is doubtful.

(2) A family (Le 25:47; RAPC 1Es 5:37; Tob 5:13; 1Ma 12:21; 2Ma 1:10; Ac 13:26; Php 3:5).

(3) Elsewhere (Job 13:27, etc.) the word refers to an instrument of punishment.

See PUNISHMENTS.

STOICS

sto’-iks (Stoikoi):

1. Origin and Propagation

2. Metaphysics and Religion

3. Sensationalist Epistemology

4. Ethical Teaching

5. Relation to Christianity

LITERATURE

1. Origin and Propagation:

The name was derived from the Stoa Poikile, the painted porch at Athens, where the founders of the school first lectured. This school of Greek philosophy was founded at Athens circa 294 BC by Zeno (circa 336-264 BC), a native of Citium, a Greek colony in Cyprus. But the Semitic race predominated in Cyprus, and it has been conjectured that Zeno was of Semitic rather than Hellenic origin. His Greek critics taunted him with being a Phoenician. It has therefore been suggested that the distinctive moral tone of the system was Semitic and not Hellenic. Further color is given to this view by the fact that Zeno’s immediate successors at the head of the school also hailed from Asia Minor, Cleanthes (331-232 BC) being a native of Assos, and Chrysippus (280-206 BC) of Soli in Cilicia. Several other adherents of the system hailed from Asia Minor, and it flourished in several Asiatic cities, such as Tarsus and Sidon. In the 2nd century BC the doctrine was brought to Rome by Panaetius of Rhodes (circa 189-109 BC), and in the course of the two succeeding centuries it spread widely among the upper classes of Roman society. It reckoned among its adherents a Scipio and a Cato, Seneca and Marcus Aurelius, as well as the freedman Epictetus. The most adequate account of the teaching of the Greek Stoics has been preserved in the writings of Cicero, who, however, was a sympathetic critic, rather than an adherent of the school. The system acquired its most lasting influence by its adoption as the formative factor in the jurisprudence of imperial Rome, and Roman law in its turn contributed to the formation of Christian doctrine and ethics.

2. Metaphysics and Religion:

The main principles of Stoicism were promulgated by Zeno and Cleanthes, and Chrysippus formulated

them into a systematic doctrine which became a standard of orthodoxy for the school, and which permitted but little freedom of speculation for its subsequent teachers. Whatever may have been the Semitic affinities of mind of Zeno and his followers, they derived the formal principles of their system from Greek antecedents. The ethical precept, "Follow Nature," they learnt from the Socratic school of Antisthenes, the Cynics. But they followed the earlier philosopher Heraclitus in defining the law of Nature as reason (logos), which was at once the principle of intelligence in man, and the divine reason immanent in the world. This doctrine they again combined with the prevalent Greek hylozoism, and therefore their metaphysics inclined to be a materialistic pantheism. On the one side, Nature is the organization of material atoms by the operation of its own uniform and necessary laws. On the other side, it is a living, rational being, subduing all its parts to work out a rational purpose inherent in the whole. As such it may be called Providence or God.

While the Stoics rejected the forms and rites of popular religion, they defended belief in God and inculcated piety and reverence toward Him. Their pantheism provided a basis for Greek polytheism also alongside of their monism, for where all the world is God, each part of it is divine, and may be worshipped. Another consequence of their pantheism was their attitude to evil, which they held to be only apparently or relatively evil, but really good in the harmony of the whole. Therefore they bore evil with courage and cheerfulness, because they believed that "all things worked together for good" absolutely.

3. Sensationalist Epistemology: The materialistic trend of their metaphysics also comes out in their epistemology, which was sensationalist. The human mind at its birth was a tabula rasa. Its first ideas were derived from sensations, the impressions made by the external world upon the soul, which they also conceived as a material body, though made of finer atoms than the external body. Out of these sense-impressions the mind built up its intuitions or preconceptions, and its notions, which constituted its store of ideas. It is not clear how far they attributed originative power to the mind as contributing some factor to the organization of knowledge, which was not derived from experience. The Stoic system is never consistently materialistic, nor consistently idealistic. Most of its terms are used in a dual sense, material and spiritual.

4. Ethical Teaching:

But its ethical teaching shows that the main trend of the system was spiritualistic. For its crown and climax was the ethics. The Stoics did not pursue knowledge for its own sake. They speculated about ultimate problems only for the practical purpose of discovering a rule of life and conduct. And in their ethics, the great commandment, "Follow Nature," is interpreted in a distinctly idealistic sense. It means, "Follow reason," as reason inheres both in man and in the universe as a whole. It is submission to Providence or the rational order of the universe, and the fulfillment of man’s own rational nature. The life according to Nature is man’s supreme good. How actual Nature could be the ideal good that man ought to seek, or how man was free to pursue an ideal, while he was bound in a system of necessity, were fundamental paradoxes of the system which the Stoics never solved. They summed up their moral teaching in the ideal of the sage or the wise man. His chief characteristic is ataraxy, a calm passionless mastery of all emotions, and independence of all circumstances. He therefore lives a consistent,

harmonious life, in conformity with the perfect order of the universe. He discovers this order by knowledge or wisdom. But the Stoics also defined this ideal as a system of particular duties, such as purity in one's self, love toward all men, and reverence toward God. In Stoic ethics, Greek philosophy reached the climax of its moral teaching. Nowhere else outside Christianity do we find so exalted a rule of conduct for the individual, so humane, hopeful and comprehensive an deal for society.

5. Relation to Christianity:

When "certain .... of the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers encountered" Paul at Athens, and when, after the apostle had spoken on Mars' Hill, "some mocked; but others said, We will hear thee concerning this yet again" (Ac 17:18,32), it is no improbable inference that the Epicureans mocked, while the Stoics desired to hear more. For they would find much in the apostle's teaching that harmonized with their own views. Paul's quotation from the classics in his Athenian speech was from the Stoic poet, Aratus of Soli in Cilicia: "For we are also his offspring." His doctrine of creation, of divine immanence, of the spirituality and fatherhood of God, would be familiar and acceptable to them. His preaching of Christ would not have been unwelcome to them, who were seeking for the ideal wise man. Paul's moral teaching as it appears in his Epistles reveals some resemblance to Stoic ethics. it is possible that Paul had learnt much from the Stoic school at Tarsus. It is certain that subsequent Christian thought owed much to Stoicism. Its doctrine of the immanent Logos was combined with Philo's conception of the transcendent Logos, to form the Logos doctrine through which the Greek Fathers construed the person of Christ. And Stoic ethics was taken over almost bodily by the Christian church.

See EPICUREANS; PHILOSOPHY.

LITERATURE. The chief extant sources are the writings of Cicero, De Finibus, De Natura Deorum, etc.; Seneca, Plutarch, M. Antoninus Aurelius, Epictetus, Diogenes Laertius, Sextus Empiricus and Stobaeus. Modern works: H. von Arnim, Stoicorum veterum fragmenta; Zeller, Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics; R. D. Hicks, Stoic and Epicurean; W. L. Davidson, The Stoic Creed; E. V. Arnold, Roman Stoicism, which contains a full bibliography and deals with the relation of Stoicism to Christianity; on the latter point see also Lightfoot, Philippians, Excursus II, "St. Paul and Seneca"; histories of philosophy by Rogers, Windelband, Ueberweg, and E. Caird.

T. Rees

STOMACH

stum'-uk (stomachos): In man and most vertebrates, a membranous sac-like portion of the alimentary canal, in which the earlier stages of digestion take place and in which food is prepared to yield its nourishment (1Ti 5:23).

Used figuratively of pride, "A proud look and high stomach" (Ps 101:7, Prayer-book Version), and courage, "Stirring up her womanish thoughts with a manly stomach" (2 Macc 7:21 the King James

Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "with manly passion").

STOMACHER

stum’-uk-er: Used to translate pethighil (Isa 3:24 the King James Version), where the meaning is uncertain. The English word denotes that part of a woman’s dress which covered the breast and the pit of the stomach. It was usually much ornamented.

STONE, STONES

ston, stonz:

1. Hebrew and Greek Words:

(1) Chiefly ‘ebhen, and lithos; but also, occurring rarely, ‘eshekh (Le 21:20); tsur (Job 22:24), usually "rock"; tseror (2Sa 17:13); petros (Joh 1:42); psephos (Re 2:17). For cela‘, usually "cliff," "crag," "rock," the King James Version, in Ps 137:9; 141:6, has "stone," but the Revised Version (British and American) "rock." For the King James Version "stones," cheres (Job 41:30), the Revised Version (British and American) has "potsherds."

See SELA.

2. Literal Usage:

The word is used of great stones (Ge 29:2); of small stones (1Sa 17:40); of stones set up as memorials (1Sa 7:12, "Eben-ezer," "stone of help"); of precious stones (Ex 35:9, etc.); of hailstones (Jos 10:11).

3. Figurative Usage: Of hardness: "I will take the stony heart out of their flesh" (Eze 11:19); of one smitten: "(Nabal’s) heart died within him, and became as a stone" (1Sa 25:37); of weight: "A stone is heavy, and the sand weighty" (Pr 27:3); of dumbness: "Woe unto him that saith to the wood, Awake; to the dumb stone, Arise!" (Hab 2:19); of Jerusalem: "I will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all the peoples" (Zec 12:3); of the corner-stone as a figure of high position:

"The stone which the builders rejected

Is become the head of the corner" (Ps 118:22).

See FLINT; ROCK.

(2) Used also anatomically of the testicles (Le 21:20; De 23:1; Job 40:17, pachadh, the Revised Version (British and American) "thighs").

Alfred Ely Day

STONE-SQUARERS

ston’-skwar-erz: the King James Version in 1Ki 5:18; the Revised Version (British and American) "the Gebalites" (which see).

STONES, PRECIOUS

1. Ancient and Modern Names

2. Change of Signification of Names

3. Three Important Lists of Stones

4. Interpretation of Greek Names Used by John

5. Interpretation of Hebrew Names

6. Greek and Latin Equivalents of Hebrew Names

7. Inconsistencies of Text or Translation

8. Vulgate and Septuagint

9. Hebrew Texts of Septuagint and English Versions of the Bible

10. Equivalence of Hebrew and Greek Names

11. Interpretation of Greek Names Used by Septuagint

12. List of Names with Biblical References

1. Ancient and Modern Names:

Great difficulty is met with in any attempt to translate the Greek and Hebrew names mentioned in the Bible into names that would be used for the same minerals in a particular country at the present day. It is only within the last century, through the development of the sciences of chemistry and crystallography, that it has become possible to define mineral species with any considerable approach to precision. In ancient times various minerals were regarded as belonging to a single kind, and indicated by a single

name, that are now distributed into different kinds and mentioned under different names.

For example, 2,000 years ago the Greek term anthrax was used to signify various hard, transparent, red stones that are now known to differ much from one another in chemical composition, and are therefore assigned to different species and given different names; among them are oriental ruby (red corundum), balas ruby (red spinel), almandine and pyrope (red garnets); a stone designated anthrax by the ancient Greeks might thus belong to any one of a number of various kinds to the assemblage of which no name is now given, and the word anthrax has no simple equivalent in a modern language.

2. Change of Signification of Names:

Confusion is introduced in another way. The English names of most of the precious stones mentioned in the Bible are adaptations of Greek names through the Latin; for instance, the English word "topaz" is a modification of the Latin word topazius, itself merely a Latin form of the Greek word topazion. It would at first sight appear that the Greek word topazion must be translated into English by the word "topaz"; but, strangely, although the words are virtually identical, the stones indicated by the words are quite different. The topazion of the ancient Greeks was a green stone yielding to the action of a file and said to be brought from an island in the Red Sea, whereas the topaz of the present day is not a green stone, does not yield to the action of a file, and has not been brought from an island in the Red Sea. The topazion of the ancient Greeks is really the peridot, not the topaz, of modern mineralogy; topazion and topaz are different kinds of stone. For the interpretation of the Bible it is thus necessary to ascertain, if possible, the kind of stone to which a Greek or Hebrew name was applied at the time when the word was written.

3. Three Important Lists of Stones:

Most of the names of the precious stones mentioned in the Bible are contained in the Hebrew description of the breastplate of the high priest and the Greek description of the foundations of the New Jerusalem. The ornaments assigned to the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13) included only stones that had been used in the breastplate; indeed, in the Septuagint, they are the same twelve, mentioned in precisely the same order.

The stones of the breastplate according to our Hebrew text (Ex 28:17-21) were:

The foundations of the New Jerusalem are (Re 21:19,20):

1 iaspis

2 sappheiros

3 chalkedon

4 smaragdos

5 sardonux

6 sardion

7 chrusolithos

8 berullos

9 topazion

10 chrusoprasos

11 huakinthos

12 amethustos

Only 4 of the latter stones are mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament, also in the Book of Revelation, namely: iaspis (4:3; 21:18), smaragdos (4:3), sardion (4:3) and huakinthos (9:17).

4. Interpretation of Greek Names Used by John:

For the interpretation of the Greek names used by John, much help is given by Pliny's great work on Natural History, published 77 AD, for it records what was known about precious stones at the very time when John himself was living. The Greek names of stones and their Latin verbal equivalents had presumably the same signification for both these writers; it is thus possible, in some cases at least, to ascertain what name is now assigned to a stone mentioned in the New Testament if the name and description are recorded in the treatise of Pliny; the results are given in the alphabetical list below. All twelve stones, except chalkedon, are mentioned by Pliny; the few important stones described by him, but not mentioned by John as foundations, are crystallum and adamas, both of them colorless; onyx, remarkable rather for structure than color; electrum (amber), a soft material; carbunculus, fiery red; callaina, pale green, probably turquoise; cyanus, dark blue; and opalus (opal); ranked in Pliny's time immediately after smaragdus in value. Achates (agate) is omitted, but was no longer precious.

5. Interpretation of Hebrew Names:

In the interpretation of the Hebrew names of the stones of the breastplate there is much greater difficulty, for no Hebrew literature other than the Old Testament has been preserved, and little help is afforded by the contexts of other verses in which some of the Hebrew names of precious stones occur. If we could assume that the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions of the description of the breastplate were made from Hebrew texts absolutely identical in respect of the names of the stones with those used for the preparation of the English Versions of the Bible, and that the

versions were correctly made, the Greek equivalents of the Hebrew terms for the time of the Septuagint translators (about 280 BC) and their Latin equivalents for the time of Jerome (about 400 AD) would be directly determinable by collation of the Hebrew original with the Greek and Latin translations.

It must be remembered, however, that a Hebrew writer, in describing the arrangement of a row of stones, began with that on his right and mentioned them in the order right to left, while a western writer begins with the stone on his left and mentions them in the reverse order. Hence, in translating a Hebrew statement of arrangement into a western language, one may either translate literally word by word, thus adopting the Hebrew direction of reading, or, more completely, may adopt the western direction for the order in the row. As either method may have been adopted by the Septuagint translators, it follows that ‘odhem and bareqeth, the first and last stones of the 1st row according to our Hebrew text, may respectively be equivalent either to sardion and smaragdos, or, conversely, to smaragdos and sardion; and similarly for the other rows. The number of the middle stone of any row is the same whichever direction of reading is adopted. ‘Odhem being red, and sardion and smaragdos respectively red and green (see below), ‘odhem must be equivalent to the former, not the latter, and the Septuagint translators must have adopted the Hebrew direction of reading the rows.

6. Greek and Latin Equivalents of Hebrew Names:

Other sets of possible equivalents are derivable by collation of the Biblical description with each of the two descriptions given by Josephus (Ant., III, vii, 5; BJ, V, v, 7). The possible Greek and Latin equivalents of Hebrew names are thus as follows:

It may be remarked, as regards the 1st stone of the 1st row, that in the time of Josephus the stone sardonux could be signified also by the more general term sardion; and, as regards the 1st stone of the 2nd row, that anthrax and carbo being respectively Greek and Latin for "glowing coal," anthrax and carbunculus, diminutive of carbo, were used as synonyms for certain red stones.

7. Inconsistencies of Text or Translations

From the inconsistencies of the above table of possible equivalents it may be inferred that either

(1) essentially different translations were given in several cases for the same Hebrew word, or

(2) the Hebrew texts used in the preparation of the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions were, in respect of the precious stones, different from each other and from that used in the preparation of English Versions of the Bible, or

(3) the breastplate differed at different epochs, or

(4) one or other, or both, of the descriptions by Josephus are incorrect. Conceivably differences may have arisen in all the above-mentioned ways.

(1) Inconsistency of Septuagint Translators

That the Septuagint translators were uncertain as to the correct translation of the Hebrew names used for the precious stones into the Greek names used in their time, and that they translated the Hebrew name of a stone in more than one way may be shown as follows. In the Hebrew text corresponding to English Versions of the Bible the word shoham, designating the 2nd stone of the 4th row of the breastplate, occurs also in several verses where there is no mention of other stones, and where there is thus no risk of accidental interchange, such as may easily occur when technical terms, more especially if unintelligible to the transcriber, are near to one another in the text. Now, for our versions shoham has been systematically translated "onyx," and for the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) the Hebrew word having the same position in the text has been systematically translated by a Latin synonym of onyx, namely, lapis onychinus (except in Job 28:16, where lapis sardonychus is the rendering). Hence, it is probable that the word in these particular verses was shoham in the Hebrew original of the Vulgate, and therefore also of the Hebrew original of the Septuagint. Yet in the Septuagint the Hebrew word is translated soom (1Ch 29:2, indicating that the translator, not knowing the Greek word for shoham, gave merely its Greek transliteration) as well as smaragdos (Ex 28:9; 35:27; 39:6 or Septuagint LXX Ex 36:13), prasinos (Ge 2:12), sardion (Ex 25:7; 35:9 or Septuagint LXX Ex 35:8), onux (Job 28:16).

These differences suggest that there were different Septuagint translators, even for different chapters of the same book, and that little care was taken by them to be consistent with one another in the translation of technical terms.

(2) Differences of Hebrew Texts

That the Hebrew texts used for the Septuagint, Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and English Versions of the Bible were not identical in all the verses in which there is mention of precious stones is especially clear from an analysis of the respective descriptions of the ornaments of the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13). In the Septuagint 12 stones are mentioned; as already stated, they have precisely the same names and are mentioned in precisely the same order as the stones of the breastplate described in that version, the only difference being that gold and silver are inserted in the middle of the list. On the other hand, in Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and English Versions of the Bible descriptions of the ornaments, only 9 of the 12 stones of the breastplate are mentioned; they are not in the same order as the corresponding stones in the breastplate as described in those VSS, silver is not mentioned at all, while gold is placed, not in the middle, but at the end of the list. Further, the order of mention of the stones in English Versions of the Bible differs from that of mention in Vulgate.

(3) Changes in the Breastplate

That the breastplate in use in the time of the Septuagint translators (about 280 BC) may have been different from the one described in the Book of Exodus is manifest if we have regard to the history of the Jewish nation; for Jerusalem was captured by Shishak, king of Egypt, about 973 BC, by

Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, about 586 BC, and by Ptolemy Soter, king of Egypt, about 320 BC. The original breastplate may have been part of the spoil on one or other of these occasions, and have then disappeared forever.

Again, between the times of the Septuagint translators and Josephus, Jerusalem was more than once in the hands of its enemies; in 198 BC the city was captured by Antiochus the Great; in 170 BC it was stormed, and its temple plundered, by Antiochus Epiphanes; in 54 BC the temple was desecrated by Crassus. The breastplate familiar to Josephus (for he was long a priest in the temple of Jerusalem) may thus not have been identical with that in use when the Septuagint version was made.

And if the signification of the Hebrew names of the stones had not been carefully passed down from one generation to another while the breastplate was no longer in existence (for instance, during the Babylonian captivity), or if stones like those of the original breastplate were not available when a new breastplate was being made, there would inevitably be differences in the breastplate at different times.

The probability of this hypothesis of one or more replacements of the breastplate is still further increased if we have regard to the large stones that were set in gold buttons and fastened to the shoulderpieces of the ephod, the vestment to which the breastplate itself was attached (Ex 28:9; 39:6 or Septuagint LXX Ex 36:13). According to the Septuagint, the material was smaragdos (and therefore green); according to Josephus it was sardonux (and therefore red with a layer of white). Though the Septuagint translators may never have had opportunities of looking closely at the stones, they might be expected to know the color of the material; Josephus must have seen them often. But the complete difference of colors of smaragdos and sardonux suggests that the difference of the names is due, not to a Septuagint mistranslation of the Hebrew name shoham, but to an actual difference of the material; it may have been smaragdos (and green) at the time when the Septuagint translation was made, and yet sardonux (and red with a layer of white) in the time of Josephus.

(4) Descriptions Given by Josephus

That in respect of the breastplate it is unsafe to collate the Hebrew texts of the various versions with that of Josephus may be demonstrated as follows. The 2nd stone of the 2nd row, termed cappir in our Hebrew text, is termed sappheiros in the Septuagint and sapphirus in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Wherever else cappir occurs in our Hebrew text, sappheiros occurs in the corresponding place in the Septuagint and sapphirus in the Vulgate; it may thus be inferred that in respect of the word cappir our Hebrew text and the Hebrew texts used for the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions were in complete accord with one another. Also, it is certain that the Latin word sapphirus was derived from the Greek word sappheiros, and that either the latter had its origin in the Hebrew word cappir or that both words had the same source. There is no reason to think that from the time of the Septuagint translators to that of Jerome the word sappheiros was ever used to signify any other than one kind of stone or that the kind was ever called iaspis. But in both the descriptions given by Josephus the middle stone of the 2nd row is given as iaspis, not as sappheiros, which he makes the last stone of the row. Hence, for the middle stone of the 2nd row, the Hebrew texts were concordant in

giving the name cappir, but they fundamentally differed from that of Josephus whose two descriptions agree in giving the name iaspis; it is not a difference of mere nomenclature or translation, but of the kind of stone set in a definite part of the breastplate. This being the case, collation of the Hebrew, Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) descriptions of the breastplate with those given by Josephus cannot be relied on to give a true Greek or a true Latin equivalent for the Hebrew name of any of the stones.

It may be added that the two descriptions given by Josephus differ from each other only as regards the order of the stones in the last two rows; in the 3rd row, the order is precisely reversed; in the 4th row the order is chrusolithos, onuchion, berullion for Ant, and onuchion, berullion, chrusolithos for BJ. Josephus, Antiquities was written at greater leisure than BJ, and was not completed till 18 years later; Josephus had thus more time for the consultation of old manuscripts. Speaking generally, it is more accurate than his earlier treatise as regards the history of those times of which he had no direct knowledge; its description of the breastplate is more precise as regards the arrangement of the stones, and is therefore the one to which the greater weight must be given. It differs from the Septuagint only through the interchange of the 2nd and 3rd stones in the 2nd, 3rd and 4th rows; and possibly Josephus gave the order from his memory either of the Septuagint or of the actual breastplate.

The only difference between the descriptions given in the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is that the last two stones, namely berullion (beryllus) and onuchion (onychinus), are interchanged.

8. Vulgate and Septuagint:

As already pointed out, the Hebrew texts of the Septuagint and English Versions of the Bible must have differed completely as regards the descriptions of the ornaments of the king of Tyre; it is thus not at all certain that they were in complete accord as regards the descriptions of the breastplate. In fact, it is generally accepted that the Hebrew word yashepheh and the Greek word iaspis are virtually identical, and that they were used to signify the same kind of stone.

9. Hebrew Texts of Septuagint and English Versions of the Bible:

Hence, it follows that the Hebrew text of English Versions of the Bible is not identical with the Hebrew texts of the Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions in respect of the stones in the 2nd and 4th rows; if our Hebrew text is correct as regards yashepheh, that stone was the last stone in the last row; if the Hebrew texts of the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) versions were correct, yashepheh, which had for its Greek equivalent iaspis, must have been the last stone in the 2nd row; further, onuchion (Septuagint) and beryllus (Vulgate) must be equivalent, not to yashepheh, but to some other stones of the breastplate.

10. Equivalence of Hebrew and Greek Names:

Taking these matters into consideration, the following have considerable claims to be regarded as equivalents:

The remaining three stones, tarshish, shoham and yahalom, are thus equivalent to chrusolithos, onuchion and berullion, but it is uncertain which Greek name corresponds to any of those Hebrew names.

11. Interpretation of Greek Names Used by Sepuagint:

For the interpretation of the Greek names of stones mentioned in the Septuagint (and thus of the Hebrew names in the original text), the work of Theophrastus, a contemporary of the Septuagint translators, is very useful. That author mentions, besides krustallos and margarites which occur elsewhere than in the description of the breastplate, nine of the Septuagint names of the breastplate stones, namely: achates, amethustos (as amethuson), anthrax, iaspis, ligurion (as lugkurion), onuchion, sappheiros, sardion, smaragdos. The three stones mentioned in the Septuagint but not by Theophrastus are berullion, chrusolithos, and topazion. Since he mentions only four stones that are not referred to in the Septuagint, namely chrusokolla, hualoeides, kuanos and omphax, it follows that the Septuagint translators at Alexandria introduced every important name that was then in use at Athens for a precious stone.

In the following alphabetical list references are given to all the verses in which each name of a precious stone occurs, and for each use of a translated name the corresponding word in the original text.

12. List of Names with Biblical References:

Achates (achates): probably Septuagint translation of shebho (Ex 28:19; 39:12). It is not mentioned in Apocrypha or the New Testament.

Adamant (see also special article): in Eze 3:9; Zec 7:12, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew shamir.

Agate: in Ex 28:19; 39:12, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew shebho; in Isa 54:12; Eze 27:16, the King James Version translation of Hebrew kadhkodh.

‘Achlamah: in Ex 28:19; 39:12: 3rd stone, 3rd row, of the breastplate. Septuagint translates amethustos; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates amethystus; English Versions of the Bible "amethyst."

The Septuagint rendering amethustos is generally accepted as correct, but the late Professor N. S. Maskelyne, F.R.S., formerly (1857-80) Keeper of Minerals in the British Museum, gave reasons for regarding the ‘achlamah of breastplate times as possibly an onyx in which white bands alternated with waxy-yellow to reddish-yellow bands.

Amber: in Eze 1:4,27; 8:2, the King James Version, the English Revised Version and the American

Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew chashmal; in Ex 28:19, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew leshem.

Amethustos (amethustos): in Re 21:20: the 12th foundation of the New Jerusalem; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates amethystus; English Versions of the Bible "amethyst." Four varieties of amethystus were recognized by Pliny as precious; all of them were transparent, and of purple tint or of tints derived from purple. According to the Septuagint, amethustos was the 3rd stone, 3rd row, of the breastplate, and the stone occupying this position is given in our Hebrew text as 'achlamah. Amethustos is mentioned under the name amethuson by Theophrastus; he describes it as a transparent stone resembling wine in color and as used by the gem engravers of his day. Amethystus and amethuson were doubtless identical with the amethyst of the present day, a purple variety of quartz (silica). Beads and other ornaments of amethyst found in old Egyptian tombs show that the stone was regarded as precious in very ancient times.

Amethyst: in Ex 28:19; 39:12, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew 'achlamah; in Re 21:20, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek amethustos.

Anthrax (anthrax): in Tobit 13:17; Ecclesiasticus 32:5, English Versions of the Bible translates "carbuncle." According to the Septuagint, anthrax was also a stone of the breastplate, 1st stone, 2nd row, but there is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text of the Septuagint in respect of this word. The anthrax of Theophrastus included different kinds of hard, red stone used by the gem engravers. It is the carbunculus of Pliny's time, and probably included the oriental ruby (corundum, alumina), the balas ruby (spinel, aluminate of magnesium), the almandine (a kind of garnet, alumino-silicate of iron) and pyrope (another kind of garnet, alumino-silicate of magnesium) of the present day.

Bareqeth: in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Eze 28:13: 3rd stone, 1st row, of breastplate. Septuagint probably translates smaragdos, but there is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text of the Septuagint in respect of this word: English Versions of the Bible translates "carbuncle"; the Revised Version margin translates "emerald." The rendering smaragdos may be correct, but no emeralds of very early age have been found in Egypt. From the similarity of the words bareqeth and baraq ("lightning"), it has been suggested that possibly the breastplate stone was not green but of bluish-red color, in which case it may have been an almandine (garnet). English Versions of the Bible has interchanged the names given by Septuagint, to the 3rd stone of the 1st row (smaragdos, "emerald") and the 1st stone of the 2nd row (anthrax, "carbuncle").

Bdellium (see also special article): in Ge 2:12; Nu 11:7, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew bedholach.

Bedholach: The Septuagint translates anthrax in Ge 2:12, and krustallos in Nu 11:7; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and English Versions of the Bible translate bdellium. Some commentators, rejecting both the Septuagint translations, interpret the material to be pearl, others to be the gum of an Arabian tree.

Berullos (berullos): in Tobit 13:17; Re 21:20: the 8th foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates beryllus; English Versions of the Bible translates "beryl." According to Septuagint, berullion was a stone of the breastplate, the 2nd stone, 4th row; owing to uncertainty as to their Hebrew text, there is doubt as to the Hebrew word translated berullion. Berullos is not mentioned by Theophrastus, who may have regarded it as included in the smaragdos of his day.

In the time of Pliny 8 varieties were recognized; he says that beryllus was already thought by some to be "of the same nature as the smaragdus, or at least closely analogous. India produces them, and they are rarely to be found elsewhere. The lapidaries cut all beryls of a hexagonal form because the color which is deadened by a dull uniformity of surface is heightened by the reflections resulting from the angles. If they are cut in any other way, these stones have no brilliancy whatever. The most esteemed beryls are those which in color resemble the pure green of the sea. Some are of opinion that beryls are naturally angular."

This description suggests the identity of the seagreen beryllus of Pliny's time with the sea-green beryl (alumino-silicate of beryllium) of the present day.

Beryl: in Ex 28:20; 39:13; So 5:14; Eze 1:16; 10:9; 28:13; Da 10:6, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew tarshish; in Ge 2:12; Ex 25:7 margin; 28:9,20; 35:27 margin; 1Ch 29:2 margin; Job 28:16 margin, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew shoham; in Tobit 13:17; Re 21:20, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek berullos.

Carbuncle: in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Eze 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew bareqeth; in Ex 28:18 margin; 39:11; Eze 27:16; 28:13, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew nophekh; in Isa 54:12, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew 'eqdach; Tobit 13:17; Ecclesiasticus 32:5, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek anthrax.

Chalcedony: in Ex 28:20, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew tarshish; in Re 21:19, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek chalkedon.

Chalkedon (chalkedon): in Re 21:19: the 3rd foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates calcedonius; English Versions of the Bible translates "chalcedony." Though the name Chalcedon (Latin form) occurs in Pliny, it is not as the name of a stone but as that of a free town then standing on the southern side of the Bosphorus, probably close to the site on which Scutari now stands. Chalcedon had once been noted for its copper mines; but the latter, when Pliny wrote, had been so far exhausted that they were no longer worked.

Pliny refers to a kind of smaragdus (a green stone) as having been found near Chalcedon, but adds that the stones were of very small size and value. They were "brittle, and of a color far from distinctly pronounced; they resembled in their tints the feathers that are seen in the tail of the peacock or on the neck of the pigeon. More or less brilliant, too, according to the angle at which they were viewed, they presented an appearance like that of veins and scales." In another place he refers to a stone from

Chalcedon or Calchedon (another reading) as being an iaspis of turbid hue. It is possible that at Patmos or Ephesus, at one of which John was living when he wrote the Book of Revelation, the word chalkedon was used to specify the particular kind of smaragdus or iaspis that had been found near the town of that name. It is uncertain what name would be given to such a stone in the present day, but the signification now attached to the name "chalcedony" (cryptocrystalline silica) cannot be traced farther back than the 15th century.

Chrusolithos (chrusolithos): in Re 21:20: the 7th foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates chrysolithus; the King James Version translates "chrysolyte"; the Revised Version (British and American) translates "chrysolite." According to Septuagint chrusolithos was one of the stones of the breastplate (lst stone, 4th row), but there is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text of the Septuagint in respect of this word; the name is not mentioned by Theophrastus. The chrysolithus of Pliny was a "transparent stone with a refulgence like that of gold." Those were most valued which "when placed by the side of gold, impart to it a sort of whitish hue, and so give it the appearance of silver."

It may perhaps have included the yellow sapphire (alumina), the yellow quartz (citrine, silica) and the yellow jargoon (zircon; silicate of zirconium) of the present day. The term "chrysolite" is now applied to a different mineral, namely, to a yellow variety of olivine (silicate of magnesium and iron), a species that includes the green precious stone peridot as another of its varieties.

Chrusoprasos (chrusoprasos): in Re 21:20: the 10th foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the King James Version translate chrysoprasus; the Revised Version (British and American) translates "chrysoprase." The chrysoprasus was regarded by some naturalists of the time of Pliny as a variety of beryllus. The 1st variety of beryllus and the most esteemed was, as stated above, of a pure sea-green color; the 2nd was paler, and approached a golden tint; the 3rd, allied to the 2nd in brilliancy but more pallid, was the chrysoprasus. The latter was thought by other naturalists to belong to an independent genus of stone. In another place Pliny describes the color as like that of the leek, but as varying in tint between the topazion of his day (our peridot) and gold. The stone may have been a yellowish-green plasma (chalcedony, crypto-crystalline silica) or, as suggested by King, pale chrysoberyl (aluminate of beryllium); it is not the chrysoprase of the present day, which is an apple-green chalcedony (colored by nickel).

Chrysolite, chrysolyte: "chrysolite" in Eze 28:13, the King James Version margin translation of Hebrew tarshish; Re 21:20, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Greek chrusolithos; "chrysolyte" in Re 21:20, the King James Version translation of Greek chrusolithos.

Chrysoprase, chrysoprasus: "chrysoprase" in Eze 27:16, the King James Version margin translation of Hebrew kadhkodh; Re 21:20, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Greek chrusoprasos; "chrysoprasus" in Re 21:20, the King James Version translation of Greek chrusoprasos.

Coral, red coral (see special article): "coral" in Job 28:18; Eze 27:16, English Versions of the Bible

translation of Hebrew ra'moth; La 4:7, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew peninim; "red coral" in Job 28:18, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew peninim.

Crystal (see special article): in Job 28:17, the King James Version translation of Hebrew zekhukhith; Eze 1:22, the King James Version translation of Hebrew qerach; in Job 28:18, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Hebrew gabhish; in Re 4:6; 22:1, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek krustallos; in Re 21:11, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek krustallizo ("to shine like crystal").

Diamond: in Jer 17:1, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew shamir; in Ex 28:18; 39:11; Eze 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew yahalom.

'Eqdach: in Isa 54:12: Septuagint translates krustallos; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) periphrases as lapides sculpti ("engraved stones"); English Versions of the Bible translates "carbuncles." From the similarity to qadhach, "to burn," it is interpreted as meaning fiery or sparkling, whence comes the rendering "carbuncles."

Electrum (see special article): Eze 1:4, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew chashmal, "amber."

Emerald: in Ex 28:18; 39:11; Eze 27:16; 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew nophekh; in Ex 28:17; 39:10, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew bareqeth; in Tobit 13:16; Judith 10:21; Ecclesiasticus 32:6; Re 21:19, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek smaragdos; in Re 21:19, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek adjective smaragdinos.

Gabhish: in Job 28:18: The Septuagint transliterates gabis; the King James Version translates "pearls"; the Revised Version (British and American) translates "crystal." From the similarity to gabhash, "ice," the rendering "crystal" is suggested.

Chashmal: in Eze 1:4,27; 8:2: The Septuagint translates elektron; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the Revised Version margin translate electrum; the King James Version, the English Revised Version and the American Revised Version margin translate "amber"; the American Standard Revised Version translates "glowing metal." The elektron of the time of the Septuagint and Theophrastus was the amber, of the present day; in the time of Pliny amber was an object of luxury ranked next to crystal, and the term electrum was then applied, not only to amber, but also to a metallic alloy of gold and silver.

Huakinthos, (huakinthos): in Re 9:17; 21:20: the 11th foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates hyacinthus; the King James Version translates "jacinth"; the Revised Version (British and American) translates "jacinth" (Re 21:20) and "hyacinth" (Re 9:17); the Revised Version margin translates "sapphire" (Re 21:20). Pliny describes the hyacinthus as being very different from amethystus, "though partaking of a color that closely' borders upon it" and as being of a

more diluted violet, It may have been the pale blue sapphire (alumina) of the present day; the modern hyacinth, or jacinth, is a quite different stone, a brownish to reddish zircon (silicate of zirconium).

Hyacinth, jacinth (see also special article on HYACINTH): "hyacinth" in Re 9:17, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Greek huakinthos; "jacinth" in Ex 28:19; 39:12, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Hebrew leshem; in Re 9:17; 21:20, the King James Version translation of Greek huakinthos.

Iaspis (iaspis): in Re 4:3; 21:11,18 f: the 1st foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates jaspis; English Versions of the Bible translates "jasper." According to Septuagint iaspis was the 3rd stone, 2nd row, of the breastplate, but there is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text of the Septuagint in respect of this word; Septuagint translates also kadhkodh as iaspis (Isa 54:12). Pliny describes iaspis as being generally green and often transparent; he recognizes as many as 14 varieties.

He adds that "many countries produce this stone: that of India is like smaragdus in color; that of Cyprus is hard and of a full sea-green; and that of Persia is skyblue. Similar to the last is the Caspian iaspis. On the banks of the river Thermodon the iaspis is of an azure color; in Phrygia it is purple; and in Cappadocia of an azure-purple, somber and not refulgent. The best kind is that which has a shade of purple, the next best being the rose-colored, and the next the stone with the green color of the smaragdus," etc.

The term "jasper" is now restricted to opaque stones; the green transparent kind of iaspis may have been identical with the green chalcedony (crypto-crystalline silica) called plasma at the present day.

Jasper: in Ex 28:20; 39:13; Eze 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew yashepheh; in Re 4:3; 21:11,18,19, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek iaspis.

Kadhkodh: in Isa 54:12; Eze 27:16: The Septuagint translates iaspis (Isa 54:12) and transliterates chorchor (Eze 27:16); Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates jaspis (Isa 54:12) and transliterates chodchod (Eze 27:16); the King James Version translates "agate"; the King James Version margin translates "chrysoprase" (Eze 27:16); the Revised Version (British and American) translates "ruby." There is little to indicate the probable meaning of the word.

Qerach: in Eze 1:22: Septuagint translates krustallos; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates crystallum; English Versions of the Bible translates "crystal"; the Revised Version margin translates "ice." The translations are suggested by the similarity to the Hebrew qerach, "ice."

Krustallos (krustallos): in Re 4:6; 22:1: Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates crystallum; English Versions of the Bible translates "crystal." The crystallum of Pliny was the rock-crystal (clear quartz) of the present day. Among the localities cited for crystallum by Pliny are "the crags of the Alps, so difficult of access that it is usually found necessary to be suspended by ropes in order to

extract it."

Lapis lazuli: in Re 21:19, the Revised Version margin translation of Greek sappheiros.

Leshem: in Ex 28:19; 39:12: 1st stone, 3rd row, of the breastplate. Septuagint probably translates ligurion, but there is uncertainty as to their Hebrew text; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) probably translates ligurius; the King James Version translates "ligure"; the Revised Version (British and American) translates "jacinth"; the Revised Version margin translates "amber."

The ligurion of the Septuagint is probably identical with the lugkurion of Theophrastus; this was a yellow to yellowishred stone used by seal engravers, and was transparent and difficult to polish. The yellow ligurion may be the yellow jargoon of the present day (zircon, silicate of zirconium), a stone much used by the ancient Greek and Roman engravers; but as the jargoon has not been found among ancient Egyptian work, it has been suggested that the ligurion of the breastplate may have been a yellow quartz (citrine) or agate. The yellowish-red ligurion may have been one of the stones to which the name "jacinth" (also a zircon) is now applied. Professor Maskelyne, rejecting the Septuagint translated, suggests that the leshem was identical with the neshem of the Egyptians, namely the green feldspar now called amazon stone; as an alternative rendering to this he suggests yellow jasper. The translation "amber" (Revised Version, margin) is not likely to be correct, for that material would have been too soft for use as a stone of the breastplate; its properties do not accord with those assigned by Theophrastus to the lugkurion.

Ligure: in Ex 38:19; 39:12, the King James Version translation of Hebrew leshem.

Ligurion (ligurion): in Septuagint Ex 28:19; 39:12, Septuagint translation of Hebrew leshem: 1st stone, 3rd row, of breastplate.

Margarites (margarites): in Mt 7:6; 13:45,46; 1Ti 2:9; Re 18:12,16; 21:21: Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates margarita; English Versions of the Bible translates "pearl." The margarites is mentioned by Theophrastus as being one of the precious stones, but not pellucid, as produced in a kind of oyster and in the pinna, and as brought from the Indies and the shores of certain islands in the Red Sea. Hence, it was identical with the pearl of the present day.

Nophekh, in Ex 28:18; 39:11; Eze 27:16; 28:13: 1st stone, 2nd row, of the breastplate. There is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text used by the Septuagint, but probably nophekh is translated anthrax (except in Eze 27:16, where the text differs); Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) probably translates carbunculus; English Versions of the Bible translates "emerald"‘ the Revised Version margin translates "carbuncle." English Versions of the Bible interchanges the names given by the Septuagint to the 3rd stone, 1st row (smaragdos, "emerald") and the 1st stone, 2nd row (anthrax, "carbuncle"). Professor Maskelyne suggests that the nophekh of the breastplate may have been the mophak or mafka of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, the turquoise of the present day.

‘Odhem, in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Eze 28:13: 1st stone, 1st row, of the breastplate. Septuagint probably translates sardion, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) probably translates sardius; English Versions of the Bible translates "sardius"; EVm translates "ruby." The Hebrew word is related to [’adham], "to be red," and signifies a reddish stone; it may have been sard (a name given not only to red, but also to pale reddish-yellow or brown, translucent chalcedony), but was more probably carnelian, a red stone closely allied to sard, and much used by the ancient Egyptians and Assyrians.

Onuchion, (onuchion, onux): "onux," Septuagint translation of Hebrew shoham (Job 28:16); onuchion, perhaps Septuagint translation of shoham in the descriptions of the ornaments of the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13) and the stones of the breastplate (being there made 3rd stone, 4th row, in Ex 28:20; 39:13), but there is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text of the Septuagint; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A. D.) translates onyx, lapis onychinus, lapis sardonychus. The onuchion of Theophrastus was a hard, translucent stone used by the seal engravers; it consisted of white and dusky layers in alternation. The onyx of Roman times was an opaque stone of white and black layers, like the onyx of the present day.

Onyx: in Ge 2:12; Ex 25:7; 28:9,20; 35:9,27; 39:6,13; 1Ch 29:2; Job 18:16; Eze 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew shoham.

Pearl: in Job 28:18, the King James Version translation of Hebrew gabhish; in Job 28:18, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew peninim; in Mt 7:6; 13:45 f; 1Ti 2:9; Re 18:12,16; 21:20,21, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek margarites.

Peninim, in Job 28:18; Pr 3:15; 8:11; 20:15; 31:10; La 4:7: Septuagint (from which Pr 20:15 is missing) periphrases the word or had a different Hebrew text; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates ebur antiquum ("old ivory") in La 4:7, but elsewhere periphrases the word or had a different Hebrew text; English Versions of the Bible translates "rubies"; the Revised Version margin translates "red coral," or "pearls," except for La 4:7, where the translation is "corals." The word is similar to an Arabic word meaning "branches" and may signify red coral, which has been highly esteemed since very ancient times; a description of korallion is given by Theophrastus. Pliny says that in his day the reddest and most branched was most valued.

PiTedhah, in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Job 28:19; Eze 28:13: 2nd stone, 1st row, of the breastplate. Septuagint translates topazion in Job 28:19 and probably also in the other verses; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates topazius; English Versions of the Bible translates "topaz." The topazion of ancient times appears to have been scarcely known before the Ptolemaic period, and Professor Maskelyne suggested that the Hebrew word may possibly be allied to bijada, which in Persian and Arabic signifies "garnet."

Ramoth: in Job 28:18, the King James Version margin translation of Hebrew ra’moth.

Ra’moth, in Job 28:18; Eze 27:16: Septuagint translates meteora (Job 28:18) and ramoth (Eze 27:16); Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) periphrases the passages; English Versions of the Bible

translates "coral"; the King James Version margin translates "ramoth" (only in Job 28:18). There is little to indicate the meaning of the Hebrew word.

Ruby: in Job 28:18; Pr 3:15; 8:11; 20:15; 31:10; La 4:7, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew peninim; in Isa 54:12; Eze 27:16, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Hebrew kadhkodh; in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Eze 28:13, the King James Version margin translation of Hebrew ‘odhem.

Sappheiros (sappheiros): in Tobit 13:16; Re 21:19: the 2nd foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates sapphirus; English Versions of the Bible translates "sapphire"; the Revised Version margin translates "lapis lazuli" (but only in Re 21:19). According to the Septuagint, sappheiros was the 2nd stone, 3rd row, of the breastplate, but there is uncertainty as to the Hebrew text. Pliny describes sapphirus as "refulgent with spots like gold. It is also of an azure color, though sometimes, but rarely, it is purple; the best kind being that which comes from Media. In no case, however, is this stone transparent." These characteristics correspond to the lapis lazuli (sulphato-silicate of sodium and aluminum), not to the sapphire (alumina) of the present day.

Cappir, in Ex 24:10; 28:18; 39:11; Job 28:6,16; So 5:14; Isa 54:11; La 4:7; Eze 1:26; 10:1; 28:13: 2nd stone, 2nd row, of the breastplate. Septuagint translates sappheiros; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates sapphirus and (Ex 24:10) lapis sapphirinus; English Versions of the Bible translates "sapphire." The Hebrew word is universally accepted as equivalent to the Greek sappheiros; that name was used, not for the stone now known as sapphire, but for that now known as lapis lazuli, a substance which was regarded by the ancient Egyptians as a precious stone.

Sardine (stone), sardius: "sardine" (stone) in Re 4:3, the King James Version translation of Greek sardinon, an error of text for sardion; "sardius" in Re 4:3, the Revised Version (British and American) translation of Greek sardion; in Re 21:20, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek sardion; in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Eze 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew ‘odhem.

Sardion (sardion): in Re 4:3; 21:20: the 6th foundation of the New Jerusalem. According to the Septuagint, sardion was the 1st stone, 1st row, of the breastplate. Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates sardius; the King James Version translates "sardine" (stone) (Re 4:3) and "sardius" (Re 21:20); the Revised Version (British and American) translates "sardius." The sarda of Pliny’s time was much used by the seal engravers. There were three Indian varieties, all of them transparent, one of them red in color; there was then no precious stone in more common use; those of honey-color were less valued. It probably included both the sard and the carnelian of the present day (crypto-crystalline silica).

Sapphire: in Ex 24:10; 28:18; 39:11; Job 28:6,16; So 5:14; Isa 54:11; La 4:7; Eze 1:26; 10:1; 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew sappir; in Tobit 13:16; Re 21:19, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek sappheiros; in Re 21:20, the Revised Version margin translation of Greek huakinthos.

Sardonux (sardonux): in Re 21:20: the 5th foundation of the New Jerusalem. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and English Versions of the Bible translate sardonyx. According to Pliny, the name sardonyx was at first given to an Indian (red) sarda with a layer of white in it, both being transparent.

Pliny says that later three colors were considered essential, but that they might be repeated indefinitely. The Arabian sardonyx was "characterized by several different colors, black or azure for the base and vermilion surrounded with a line of rich white for the upper part, not without a certain glimpse of purple as the white passes into the red."

The sardonux of John's time is included in the sardonyx of the present day.

Sardonyx: in Re 21:20, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek sardonux; Ex 28:18; 39:11, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew yahalom.

Shamir, in Jer 17:1; Eze 3:9; Zec 7:12; Septuagint omits Jer 17:1, and in the other two verses either periphrases the word or had a different text; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates (unguis) adamantinus in Jer 17:1, and adamas in the other two verses; English Versions of the Bible translates "diamond" (Jer 17:1) and "adamant" (Eze 3:9; Zec 7:12). Shamir was a hard material used for engraving precious stones; in the days of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah, splinters of both diamond and corundum (white sapphire or adamant stone) were probably available for the purpose. Both diamond and adamant are English modifications of the Latin adamas; the form "diamond" has been restricted for some centuries to the more precious of the above stones.

Shebho, in Ex 28:19; 39:12: the 2nd stone, 3rd row, of the breastplate. Both Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) probably translate achates, but their Hebrew texts are uncertain; English Versions of the Bible translates "agate." The name achates was given in ancient times to certain stones having banded structures, the agates of the present day. In the time of Theophrastus achates was sold at a great price, but by the time of Pliny had ceased to be a precious stone. Professor Maskelyne suggests that the shebho of the breastplate may have signified the "stone of Sheba" or "Seba," a district in Southern Arabia, and have been the Arabian onyx.

Shoham, in Ge 2:12; Ex 25:7; 28:9,20; 35:9,27; 39:6,13; 1Ch 29:2; Job 28:16; Eze 28:13: the 2nd stone, 4th row, of the breastplate. Septuagint translates prasinos, i.e. "leek-green stone" (Ge 2:12), sardion (Ex 25:7; 35:9), smaragdos (Ex 28:9; 35:27), berullion, probably, through interchange of words in the Hebrew text (Ex 28:20; 39:13), soom (1Ch 29:2), onux (Job 28:16) and perhaps onuchion (Eze 28:13); Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates onyx (Eze 28:13), lapis sardonychus (Job 28:16) and lapis onychinus elsewhere; English Versions of the Bible translates "onyx"; the Revised Version margin translates "beryl" (except in Eze 28:13). Professor Maskelyne and Professor Sayce, accepting green as the color of shoham, have expressed the opinion that the stone known by that name in very early times was the stone called 'siamu by the Assyrians, and therefore the green turquoise; Professor Maskelyne gives "amazon stone" as an alternative rendering of the word. Berullion is given by

the Septuagint as the 2nd stone, onuchion as the 3rd stone, of the 4th row; sardion as the 1st stone, smaragdos as the 3rd stone, of the 1st row; but their Hebrew text is uncertain.

Smaragdinos, smaragdos (smaragdinos): in Re 4:3: the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates smaragdinus; English Versions of the Bible translates "emerald." Smaragdos (smaragdos) in Tobit 13:16; Judith 10:21; Ecclesiasticus 32:5; Re 21:19: the Vulgate translates it as smaragdus; English Versions of the Bible translates "emerald." According to the Septuagint, smaragdos was the 3rd stone, 1st row, of the breastplate, but their Hebrew text is uncertain. The smaragdos of Theophrastus was a small, scarce, presumably green, stone used by the gem engravers. In Pliny's time the genus smaragdus comprised no fewer than 12 kinds; one of them was the emerald of the present day, and probably the smaragdos of Theophrastus.

Tarshish, in Ex 28:20; 39:13; So 5:14; Eze 1:16; 10:9; 28:13; Da 10:6: the 1st stone, 4th row, of the breastplate. The Septuagint translates tharsis (So 5:14; Eze 1:16; Da 10:6), anthrax (Eze 10:9); in the remaining verses there is uncertainty as to the order of the Hebrew words in the several texts. The most likely Septuagint equivalent of tarshish is either chrusolithos or berullion; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates hyacinthus (So 5:14), mare ("sea") (Eze 1:16), chrysolithus (Eze 10:9; Da 10:6). The Septuagint gives anthrax as the 1st stone, 2nd row, chrusolithos as the 1st stone, 4th row, berullion as the 2nd stone, 4th row, of the breastplate; English Versions of the Bible translates "beryl"; the King James Version margin translates "chrysolite" (in Eze 28:13 only); the Revised Version margin translates "chalcedony" (Ex 28:20; 39:13), "topaz" (So 5:14) and "stone of Tarshish" (Eze 10:9). Professor Maskelyne suggests that the stone may have been citrine (quartz), if yellow as suggested by chrusolithos, and green jasper, if green as suggested by berullion.

Topaz: in Ex 28:17; 39:10; Job 28:19; Eze 28:13, English Versions of the Bible translation of Hebrew piTedhah; in Re 21:20, English Versions of the Bible translation of Greek topazion; in So 5:14, the Revised Version margin translation of Hebrew tarshish.

Topazion (topazion): in Re 21:20: the 9th foundation of the New Jerusalem. According to the Septuagint topazion was the 2nd stone, 1st row, of the breastplate. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates topazius; English Versions of the Bible translate it as "topaz."

The topazion of Pliny's time was "held in very high estimation for its green tints; when it was first discovered it was preferred to every other kind of precious stone." It was said to be brought from an island in the Red Sea, off the coast of Arabia. It was the only stone of high value that yielded to the action of the file. Topazion is not mentioned by Theophrastus. Pliny's account corresponds to the peridot of the present day (silicate of magnesium and iron), not to our topaz (fluosilicate of aluminium).

Yahalom, in Ex 28:18; 39:11; Eze 28:13: the 3rd stone, 2nd row, of the breastplate. Owing to the uncertainty as to the order of the words in the Hebrew text of the Septuagint, there is uncertainty as to the Greek equivalent of yahalom; probably it is one of the words chrusolithos, berullion, onuchion, given by the Septuagint as the names of the stones of the 4th row. English Versions of the Bible

translates "diamond"; this is certainly wrong, for the stone had a name engraved on it and the method of engraving a diamond was not invented till 2,000 or 3,000 years after the breastplate was made; nor were diamonds, if known at all, then known so large as to be comparable in respect of size, with the other stones of the breastplate. The Revised Version margin translates "sardonyx" (in Exodus only). Professor Maskelyne suggests that the Hebrew yahalom and the Greek hualos may be kindred words and that yahalom may have been a bluish glass (considered valuable in very early times), or blue chalcedony, or perhaps even beryl.

Yashepheh, in Ex 28:20; 39:13; Eze 28:13: the 3rd stone, 4th row, of the breastplate. Septuagint probably translates iaspis, though iaspis is placed by the Septuagint as the 3rd stone, 2nd row; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) probably translates jaspis; English Versions of the Bible translate it as "jasper." The equivalence of the Hebrew yashepheh and the Greek iaspis is generally accepted.

Zekhukhith, in Job 28:17: Septuagint translates hualos, a name given at first to any transparent stone, but in later times only to glass; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) translates vitrum; the King James Version translates "crystal"; the Revised Version (British and American) translates "glass." Zekhukhith is related to a Hebrew word meaning "to be pure," whence the renderings crystal and glass.

Lazarus Fletcher

STONING

ston'-ing. See PUNISHMENTS.

STOOL

stool ('obhnayim): It is not clear what the character and purpose of this stool were Septuagint has no reference to it). It seems to have been a chair of a peculiar sort upon which a woman reclined in parturition (Ex 1:16). The Hebrew word is in the dual number and primarily means "two stones." The only other place where it occurs is Jer 18:3, where it is rendered "wheels" Septuagint epi ton lithon, "on the stones"). In 2Ki 4:10, the word translated in the King James Version as "stool" (kicce') is in the Revised Version (British and American) more correctly translated "seat."

See also BIRTH-STOOL; SEAT.

Jesse L. Cotton

STORAX

sto'-raks.

See POPLAR; STACTE.

STORE-CITIES

stor’-cit-iz (mickenoth): the Revised Version (British and American) Ex 1:11 (of PITHOM and RAAMSES (which see)) for the King James Version "treasure cities" (compare 1Ki 9:19; 2Ch 8:4,6; 16:4, etc.). Depots of provisions and magazines of arms.

STOREHOUSES

stor’-houz-iz, -ez: The following chief changes in the use of this word (representing various Hebrew words) in the Revised Version (British and American) to be noted are: In De 28:8, the Revised Version (British and American) has "barns" (’acamim); in 1Ch 27:25, "treasures" (’otsroth); in Ne 12:25, for "thresholds" has "storehouses" (’asuppim), so, for "Asuppim" in 1Ch 26:15,17 ("house of Asuppim," "toward Asuppim") has "store-house"; in Lu 12:24, for "storehouse" has "store-chamber" (tameion). In other passages the King James Version "storehouse" is retained (Ge 41:56; 2Ch 32:28, mickenoth; Ps 33:7, ‘otsroth; Jer 50:26, ma’abhucim).

STORIES

sto’-riz: For the King James Version "stories" (ma’aloth) in Am 9:6, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "chambers" (in heavens); in Ge 6:16 (ark); Eze 42:3,6 (temple), the word is supplied. the Revised Version (British and American) in the latter verse reads in the text "the third story" (margin as in the King James Version). In 1Ki 6:5,10, the Revised Version (British and American) has "stories" (yatsia‘ yatsua‘; see TEMPLE), and in Eze 41:6 supphes "stories."

STORK

stork (chacidhah; variously rendered in the Septuagint: Le 11:19, erodios; De 14:18, pelekan; Job 39:13, hasida (transliteration of Hebrew); Zec 5:9, (epops; Latin Ciconia alba): A large wading bird of the family Ardeidae, related to crane, ibis, heron and bittern. The stork on wing is a bird of exquisite beauty. The primary, secondary and a few of the tertiary wing feathers are black, the remainder, also the head, neck, and back and under parts white, the bill and legs red. When a perching white bird suddenly unfolds these wonderful wings, having at times a sweep of 7 ft., and sails away, it makes a very imposing picture. Zechariah in a vision saw a woman having the wings of a stork; Zec 5:9, "Then lifted I up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there came forth two women, and the wind was in their wings; now they had wings like the wings of a stork; and they lifted up the ephah between eaxth and heaven." These birds winter in Africa. In their spring migration many pairs pause in Palestine, others cross the Mediterranean and spread over the housetops, ruins and suitable building-places of Europe as far north as Rolland and England. Always and everywhere the bird has been more or less protected on account of its fidelity to a chosen location, its fearlessness of man and the tender love between mated pairs and for its young.

The stork first appears among the birds of abomination, and it is peculiar that the crane does not, for they are closely related. But the crane eats moles, mice, lizards and smaller animals it can capture, also frogs and fish. To this same diet the stork adds carrion and other offensive matter, and the laws of Moses, as a rule, are formulated with good reason. Yet at one time, storks must have been eaten, for Pliny quoted Cornelius Nepos, who died in the days of Augustus Caesar, as saying that "in his time storks were holden for a better dish at board than cranes." Pliny adds: "Yet see, how in our age now, no man will touch a stork if it be set before him on the board, but everyone is ready to reach into the crane and no dish is more in request." He also wrote that it was a capital crime in Thessaly to kill storks, because of their work in slaying serpents. This may have been the beginning of the present laws protecting the bird, reinforced by the steady growth of respect and love for its tender, gentle disposition. The Hebrew word chaidhah, from which the stork took its name, means "kindness."

There is a smaller stork having a black neck and back, that homes in Palestine, but only in small numbers as compared with the white. These birds flock and live in forests around the borders of waste and desert places, and build in trees. The young of both species remain a long time in the nest and are tenderly cared for, so much so indeed that from their performances and love of building on housetops arose the popular tradition that the stork delivers newly born children to homes. The birds first appear in Le 11:19 and De 14:18. Jeremiah noticed that the stork was migratory; see 8:7: "Yea, the stork in the heavens knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle-dove and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the law of Yahweh." The Psalmist referred to their nesting in the cedars of Lebanon, for in Palestine these birds could not build on housetops, which were flat, devoid of chimneys and much used by the people as we use a veranda today; see Ps 104:17:

"Where the birds make their nests:

As for the stork, the fir-trees are her house."

Gene Stratton-Porter

STORY

sto-ri.

See COMMENTARY.

STORY TELLING

See GAMES, I, 4.

STORY WRITER

sto’-ri-rit-er: In the sense of chronicler or historian occurs in 1 Esdras 2:17 (margin "recorder") and 2:25.

STOUT; STOUTNESS

stout, stout’-nes: In modern English the word signifies strength firmness, corpulence, etc., but in English Versions of the Bible (Ps 76:5; Isa 10:12; 46:12; Da 7:20; Mal 3:13 with stoutness" in Isa 9:9) it always means "bold" or "proud" and invariably in a bad sense; compare the German stolz, with which "stout" is allied.

STRAIGHT STREET

strat stret.

See DAMASCUS.

STRAIGHT; STRAIGHTWAY

strat, strat’-wa: "Straiglit" and "strait" are two entirely different words that have no connection with each other in English, the former being derived from the Anglo-Saxon, while the latter has come back from the Latin through the Romance. At some point still farther back, however, the two words may have had some common original with the general meaning "to stretch." But in straight the stretched object is a cord from which all curvature is removed, while in strait a solid is thought of, which is drawn out and made narrow, used figuratively in Job 20:22; 36:16; Mt 7:13 f; Php 1:23. Before English spelling had reached a relatively settled stage the spelling of the two words was interchanged occasionally, but in even Elizabethan times this could happen only through ignorance. In English Versions of the Bible the forms are kept distinct with great care. "Straight," then, appears only in the sense "not crooked," in the Old Testament most commonly for some form of yashar, "be smooth" (2Ch 32:30, etc.). In the Apocrypha and New Testament the word is not very common, being used for orthos (Baruch 6:27; Heb 12:13); euthus (Judith 13:20; Mr 1:3 and parallel’s), with the verbs anorthoo (Lu 13:13), and euthuno (Joh 1:23; Heb 12:12 the Revised Version margin), "to make straight," and euthudromeo, "to make a straight course" (Ac 16:11; 21:1). For straightway in English Versions of the Bible overwhelmingly the most common word is euthus, or eutheos. the King James Version varies the translation of this adverb by using either "straightway" or "immediately" without distinction, but the Revised Version (British and American) (with a very few exceptions, e.g., Mt 24:29) has adhered to "straightway." The other occurrences in the Bible (1Sa 9:13; 28:20, etc.) represent no special word.

Burton Scott Easton

STRAIN

stran (diulizo, "to strain off," "to filter"): Mt 23:24, "Ye blind guides, that strain out the gnat, and

swallow the camel" The imagery is that of a drinking-vessel full of liquid, from which tiny impurities are carefully removed while immense masses of other impure matter (Le 11:4) are overlooked (compare Mt 7:3 f). The first edition of the King James Version read the same as the Revised Version (British and American), but in the later editions a misprint converted "strain out" into "strain at," an error that has never been corrected.

STRAIT; STRAITEN; STRAITLY

strat, strat'-'-n, strat'-il: The word "strait" and its compounds are used in English Versions of the Bible in the literal sense of "narrow" (tsar, 2Ki 6:1; Isa 49:20; mutsaq, Job 37:10; 'atsal, Eze 42:6) and in the figurative sense of "strict" (shabha', Ex 13:19; caghar, Jos 6:1; tsarar, "to be distressed," 2Sa 24:14 parallel; yatsar, Job 20:22; metsar, La 1:3). In Apocrypha the verb "straitened" occurs in Susanna verse 22. In the New Testament we have stenos (Mt 7:13 f parallel, the Revised Version (British and American) "narrow"; polus, "much"; so the Revised Version (British and American) Mr 3:12; 5:43; sunecho, "to urge," "hold together," Lu 12:50; Php 1:23). It occurs in its superlative form in Ac 26:5, "After the straitest (akribestatos, "most exact," "scrupulous") sect of our religion," i.e. "the most precise and rigorous in interpreting the Mosaic Law, and in observing the more minute precepts of the Law and of tradition" (Thayer, Lexicon, under the word; compare Ac 22:3).

See also STRAIGHT, STRAIGHTWAY.

M. O. Evans

STRAKES

straks: An older form for "streaks" (so the American Standard Revised Version) in the King James Version, the English Revised Version Ge 30:37 (pitslah, "peeled spot"); Le 14:37 (sheqa'aruroth, "hollow places"). For "strake," Tobit 11:11; the King James Version Ac 27:17.

See STRIKE.

STRANGE GODS

See GOD, STRANGE.

STRANGE WIFE

"Strange" as contrasted with "an Israelite." Such wives are spoken of in the King James Version Ezr 10:2,11 (the English Revised Version "strange women," the American Standard Revised Version "foreign women"; see STRANGER AND SOJOURNER; in the parallel 1 Esdras 8:68-9:37, the King James Version uses "strange wives" and "strange women" indifferently, and the Revised Version

(British and American) here follows the King James Version) as "wives of the people of the land," in taking whom the men of Israel are said to have "trespassed against their God." Accordingly such wives were "put away."

STRANGE WOMAN

The Hebrew zar, translated "stranger," meant primarily one "who turns aside," i.e. to visit another country; then a "sojourner," "stranger." The "strange woman" of Pr 2:16 is a technical term for "harlot"; compare Jud 11:1,2, where "son of a strange (the Revised Version (British and American) "another") woman" (11:2, ‘acher) is parallel to "the son of a harlot" (11:1).

See STRANGE WIFE.

STRANGE, FIRE

stranj (’esh zarah, "alien fire"): These words are mentioned in connection with the fatal sin committed by the two oldest sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, in "offering strange fire before Yahweh," on the occasion of the formal consecration of the Aaronitic priesthood (Le 10:1,2). The fact is mentioned again in Nu 3:4; 26:61. The greatest calamity of all befell them in that they were cut off childless, which for every true Israelite was the darkest fate imaginable. This fact is mentioned twice (Nu 3:4; 1Ch 24:2). The power which cut off the lives of Nadab and Abihu (Le 10:1,2) is the same as that which shortly before had consumed the consecratory burnt offering (Le 9:24). What was its true character, whether, as Rosenmuller and Dachsel surmise, it was a lightning stroke or some other supernatural agency, is not worth while debating. It is enough for us to know that "there came forth fire from before Yahweh and devoured them." Yet this latter word is not to be taken literally, since they were carried out for burial in their own linen garments (Le 10:5). They were therefore merely killed, not incinerated. What was their sin? The words "strange fire" have been explained either as common fire, which they placed in their censers, or as unholy incense, which they put thereon (Ex 39:38). But the text plainly points to the former. The sacred fire, once kindled on the altar, was never to be permitted to go out (Le 6:12 f). When later the temple was dedicated Yahweh again lighted the fire on the altar from heaven, as in the case of the dedication of the tabernacle. As, however, the injunction to take fire for the censers of the incense offering only from the coals of the altar is not found before (Le 16:12), Rosenmuller’s observation would seem to be very much to the point: "Quamquam enim in iis quae praecedunt, non extat hoc interdictum, tamen est verisimile Mosem vetasse Aaroni et filiis eius ne ignem alienum altari imponerent." ("For although his injunction does not hold in regard to the preceding cases, yet it is very probable that Moses had forbidden Aaron and his sons to place strange fire upon the altar.") A verbal injunction of Moses must have preceded the fatal mistake. But the text leads us to believe there was more than a mistake here. Some find here the sin of drunkenness, from the enjoined abstinence from any intoxicating drink before the priests thereafter minister before Yahweh (Le 10:9). The likeliest explanation is that, inflated with pride on account of the exaltation of the Aaronitic family above all Israel, they broke unbidden into the ritual of the consecration of the tabernacle and priesthood, eager to take part in the ceremony, and in their haste bringing strange fire into the tabernacle, and thus met their

death (see Oehler, Old Testament Theol., 126, 282). The fire burning on the altar came from God, it might never go out, since it represented "the unbroken course of adoration of Yahweh, carried on in sacrifice." And this course was interrupted by Nadab and Abihu. The fire on the altar was a symbol of holiness, and they sought to overlay it with unholiness. And thus it became to them a consuming fire, because they approached the Holy One in a profane spirit (compare Isa 33:14).

Henry E. Dosker

STRANGER AND SOJOURNER (IN THE APOCRYPHA AND THE NEW TESTAMENT)

The technical meaning attaching to the Hebrew terms is not present in the Greek words translated "stranger" and "sojourner," and the distinctions made by English Versions of the Bible are partly only to give uniformity in the translation. For "stranger" the usual Greek word is xenos, meaning primarily "guest" and so appearing in the combination "hatred toward guests" in The Wisdom of Solomon 19:13 (misoxenia). Xenos is the most common word for "stranger" in the New Testament (Mt 25:35, etc.), but it seems not to be used by itself with this force in the Apocrypha. Almost equally common in the New Testament is allotrios, "belonging to another" (Mt 17:25,26; Joh 10:5 (bis)), and this is the usual word in the Apocrypha (Sirach 8:18; 1 Macc 1:38, etc.), but for some inexplicable reason the Revised Version (British and American) occasionally translates by "alien" (contrast, e.g. 1 Macc 1:38; 2:7). Compare the corresponding verb apallotrioo (Eph 2:12; 4:18; Col 1:21). With the definite meaning of "foreigner" are allogenes, "of another nation," the Revised Version (British and American) "stranger" (1 Esdras 8:83; 1 Macc 3:45 (the King James Version "alien"); Lu 17:18 (the Revised Version margin "alien")), and allophulos, "of another tribe," the Revised Version (British and American) "stranger" (Baruch 6:5; 1 Macc 4:12, etc.) or "of another nation" (Ac 10:28). For "to sojourn" the commonest form is paroikeo, "to dwell beside," the Revised Version (British and American) always "to sojourn" (Judith 5:7; Sirach 41:19; Lu 24:18 (the King James Version "to be a stranger"); Heb 11:9). The corresponding noun for "sojourner" is paroikos (Sirach 29:26 f (the King James Version "stranger"); Ac 7:6,26; Eph 2:19; 1Pe 2:11), with paroikia, "sojourning" (The Wisdom of Solomon 19:10; Sirach 16:8; Ac 13:17 (the King James Version "dwelling as strangers"); 1Pe 1:17). In addition, epidemeo, "to be among people," is translated "to sojourn" in Ac 2:10; 17:21, and its compound parepidemos, as "sojourner" in 1Pe 1:1 (in Heb 11:13; 1Pe 2:11, "pilgrim").

Burton Scott Easton

STRANGER AND SOJOURNER (IN THE OLD TESTAMENT)

stranj’-er:

I. THE GER

1. Legal provisions

(1) Principles

(2) Rules

2. Relation to Sacrifice and Ritual

3. Historical Circumstances

II. THE TOSHABH

III. THE NOKHRI OR BEN NEKHAR

1. Marriage

2. Exclusion of Some Races from the Assembly

IV. THE ZAR

Four different Hebrew words must be considered separately:

(1) ger, the American Standard Revised Version "sojourner" or "stranger";

(2) toshabh, the American Standard Revised Version "sojourner";

(3) nokhri, ben nekhar, the American Standard Revised Version "foreigner";

(4) zar, the American Standard Revised Version "stranger."

I. The Ger.

This word with its kindred verb is applied with slightly varying meanings to anyone who resides in a country or a town of which he is not a full native land-owning citizen; e.g., the word is used of the patriarchs in Palestine, the Israelites in Egypt, the Levites dwelling among the Israelites (De 18:6; Jud 17:7, etc.), the Ephraimite in Gibeah (Jud 19:16). It is also particularly used of free aliens residing among the Israelites, and it is with the position of such that this article deals. This position is absolutely unparalleled in early legal systems (A. H. Post, Grundriss der ethnologischen Jurisprudenz, I, 448, note 3), which are usually far from favorable to strangers.

1. Legal Provisions:

(1) Principles.

The dominant principles of the legislation are most succinctly given in two passages: He "loveth the ger in giving him food and raiment" (De 10:18); "And if a ger sojourn with thee (variant "you") in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The ger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the home-born among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were gerim in the land of Egypt" (Le 19:33 f). This treatment of the stranger is based partly on historic recollection, partly on the duty of the Israelite to his God. Because the ger would be at a natural disadvantage through his alienage, he becomes one of the favorites of a legislation that gives special protection to the weak and helpless.

(2) Rules.

In nationality the freeman followed his father, so that the son of a ger and an Israelitess was himself a ger (Le 24:10-22). Special care was to be taken to do him no judicial wrong (De 1:16; 27:19). In what may roughly be called criminal law it was enacted that the same rules should apply to gerim as to natives (Le 18:26, which is due to the conception that certain abominations defile a land; Le 20:2, where the motive is also religious; Le 24:10-22; see SBL, 84 ff; Nu 35:15). A free Israelite who became his slave was subject to redemption by a relative at any time on payment of the fair price (Le 25:47). This passage and De 28:43 contemplate the possibility of a stranger’s becoming wealthy, but by far the greater number of the legal provisions regard him as probably poor. Thus provision is made for him to participate in tithes (De 14:29; 26:12), gleanings of various sorts and forgotten sheaves (Le 19:10; 23:22; De 24:19,20,21), and poor hired servants were not to be oppressed (De 24:14).

2. Relation to Sacrifice and Ritual:

Nearly all the main holy days apply to the ger. He was to rest on the Sabbath (Ex 20:10; 23:12, etc.), to rejoice on Weeks and Tabernacles (De 16), to observe the Day of Atonement (Le 16:29), to have no leaven on the Festival of Unleavened Bread (Ex 12:19). But he could not keep the Passover unless he underwent circumcision (Ex 12:48). He could not eat blood at any rate during the wilderness period (Le 17:10-12), and for that period, but not thereafter, he was probihited from eating that which died of itself (Le 17:15; De 14:21) under pain of being unclean until the even. He could offer sacrifices (Le 17:8 f; 22:18; Nu 15:14 f), and was subject to the same rules as a native for unwitting sins (Nu 15:22-31), and for purification for uncleanness by reason of contact with a dead body (Nu 19:10-13).

3. Historical Circumstances:

The historical circumstances were such as to render the position of the resident alien important from the first. A "mixed multitude" went up with the Israelites from Egypt, and after the conquest we find Israelites and the races of Palestine living side by side throughout the country. We repeatedly read of resident aliens in the historical books, e.g. Uriah the Hittite. According to 2Ch 2:17 f (Hebrew 16 f) there was a very large number of such in the days of Solomon, but the figure may be excessive. These seem to have been the remnant of the conquered tribes (1Ki 9:20 f). Ezekiel in his vision assigned to

gerim landed inheritance among the Israelites (47:22 f). Hospitality to the ger was of course a religious duty and the host would go to any lengths to protect his guest (Ge 19; Jud 19:24).

II. The Toshabh.

Of the toshabh we know very little. It is possible that the word is practically synonymous with ger, but perhaps it is used of less permanent sojourning. Thus in Le 22:10 it appears to cover anybody residing with a priest. A toshabh could not eat the Passover or the "holy" things of a priest (Ex 12:45; Le 22:10). His children could be purchased as perpetual slaves, and the law of the Jubilee did not apply to them as to Israelites (Le 25:45). He is expressly mentioned in the law of homicide (Nu 35:15), but otherwise we have no information as to his legal position. Probably it was similar to that of the ger.

III. The Nokhri Ben Nekhar.

The nokhri or ben nekhar was a foreigner. The word is far wider than those considered above. It covers everything of alien or foreign character regardless of the place of residence. By circumcision a foreign slave could enter into the covenant with Abraham. Foreigners were of course excluded from the Passover (Ex 12:43), but could offer sacrifices to Israel’s God at the religious capital (Le 22:25). The Israelite could exact interest of them (De 23:20) and the payment of debts in cases where an Israelite debtor was protected by the release of De 15:3. Moses forbade the appointment of a foreigner as a ruler (De 17:15, in a law which according to Massoretic Text relates to a "king," but in the preferable text of Septuagint to a ruler generally). Later the worship of God by foreigners from a distance was contemplated and encouraged (1Ki 8:41-43; Isa 2:2 f; 56:3,6 f; etc.), while the case of Naaman shows that a foreigner might worship Him abroad (2Ki 5:17). A resident foreigner was of course a ger. The distinction between these three words is perhaps best seen in Ex 12:43,45,48 f. in the first of these verses we have ben nekhar, used to cover "alien" generally; in the last the ger is contemplated as likely to undergo a complete naturalization; while in 12:45 the toshabh is regarded as certain to be outside the religious society.

1. Marriage:

In the earlier period marriages with foreigners are common, though disliked (e.g. Ge 24:3; 27:46 ff; Nu 12:1; Jud 14:3, etc.). The Law provides for some unions of this kind (De 21:10 ; compare Nu 31:18), but later Judaism became more stringent. Moses required the high priest to marry a virgin of his own people (Le 21:14); Ezekiel limited all descendants of Zadok to wives of the house of Israel (44:22); Ezra and Nehemiah carried on a vigorous polemic against the intermarriage of any Jew with foreign women (Ezr 10; Ne 13:23-31).

2. Exclusion of Some Races from Assembly:

Deuteronomy further takes up a hostile attitude to Ammonites and Moabites, excluding them from the assembly of the Lord even to the tenth generation, while the children of the third generation of Edomites

and Egyptians could enter it (23:3-8 (Hebrew 4-9)). From 1Ki 9:20,21,24; 1Ch 22:2 we learn of the existence of foreign quarters in Israel.

IV. The Zar.

The remaining word zar means "stranger" and takes its coloring from the context. It may mean "stranger in blood," e.g. non-Aaronite (Nu 16:40 (Heb 17:5)), or non-Levite (e.g. Nu 1:51), or a non-member of some other defined family (De 25:5). In opposition to priest it means "lay" (Le 22:10-13), and when the contrast is with holy, it denotes "profane" (Ex 30:9).

See FOREIGNER; GENTILES; PROSELYTE; CHERETHITES; PELETHITES; MARRIAGE; COMMERCE.

Harold M. Wiener

STRANGLED

stran’-g’-ld (chanaq; pniktos, from verb pnigo, "to choke," "to smother," "to strangle" (compare choking of swine in the lake, Mr 5:13; the seed are choked by the thorns, Mt 13:7; the servant takes his fellow-servant by the throat, the King James Version Mt 18:28)): As adjective "strangled," used of animals deprived of life by choking, and so without the shedding of the blood. Flesh thus killed was forbidden as food among the Hebrews, because it contained the blood (Le 17:12). Even Jewish Christians in the Jerusalem council thought it best to forbid things strangled to be eaten by Gentile converts, so as not to give offense to Jewish sentiment, and doubtless also to prevent participation in heathen sacrificial feasts (Ac 15:20; 21:25).

Edward Bagby Pollard

STRANGLING

stran’-g’-ling.

See PUNISHMENTS.

STRAW; STUBBLE

stro, stub’-’-l: The cognates of Hebrew tebhen, "straw" and qash, "stubble," have been retained in the modern Arabic terms tibn and qashsh. Tibn applies to the straw which has been cut up into short pieces and more or less split by the threshing operations. It is commonly used throughout the East as a coarse fodder or roughage for domestic herbivorous animals (compare Ge 24:25,32; Jud 19:19; 1Ki 4:28; Isa 11:7; 65:25). Hay and similar cured crops are practically unknown. Barley, peas and other grain, when

fed to animals, are mixed with the tibn. The animals will frequently reject the tibn unless there is grain in it. They often nose about the tibn until the grain settles to the bottom so that they can eat the latter without the straw. Straw left in the manger is thrown out in the stall to form part of the bedding (compare Isa 25:10).

Tibn is mixed with clay for plastering walls or for making sun-dried bricks. It is also mixed with lime and sand for plastering. The children of Israel had their task of brickmaking made more arduous by being required to gather stubble and prepare it by chopping it up instead of being given the already prepared straw of the threshing-floors (Ex 5:7).

Qashsh (literally, "dried up") refers to the stalks left standing in the wheat fields or to any dried-up stalks or stems such as are gathered for burning. Camels and other flocks sometimes supplement their regular meals by grazing on the stubble, otherwise it has no use. In the Bible stubble is used to typify worthless inflammable material (Ex 15:7; Job 13:25; 41:28,29; Ps 83:13; Isa 5:24, etc.; 1Co 3:12, kalame).

mathben, is translated "straw" in Isa 25:10.

James A. Patch

STRAWED

strod: Past participle of "to strew," "scatter," or "spread about," as powder (of the golden calf, Ex 32:20, the Revised Version (British and American) "strewed"); branches (Mt 21:8, the Revised Version (British and American) "spread"); seed (Mt 25:24,26, the Revised Version (British and American) "scatter").

STREAM

strem:

(1) nachal, English Versions of the Bible "stream," as: "Behold, he smote the rock, so that waters gushed out, and streams overflowed" (Ps 78:20). Often "valley," as "the valley (the King James Version "river") of the Arnon" (De 2:24); or "brook," as "the brook (the King James Version "river") of Egypt" (Jos 15:4; see BROOK or EGYPT); or "river," as "the river Kishon" (Jud 4:7).

(2) nahar (Aramaic nehar (Da 7:10); compare Arabic nahr, "river"): "He bindeth the streams," the King James Version "floods" (Job 28:11); "the River" (Euphrates) (Ex 23:31, etc.); "Abanah and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus" (2Ki 5:12).

(3) pelegh, the root palagh, "to split," "to divide," hence, "cleft," "channel": "a tree planted by the streams (the King James Version "rivers") of water" (Ps 1:3); "There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God" (Ps 46:4); but: "The king’s heart is .... as the watercourses" (the King James

Version "rivers of water") (Pr 21:1).

(4) ‘aphiq, the root ‘aphaq, "to be strong," hence, "channel," "valley," as holding, confining (BDB): "the streams in the South" (Ps 126:4); elsewhere "brook," as "the brooks (the King James Version "rivers") of Judah" (Joe 3:18); or "channel," as "the channel of brooks" (Job 6:15); or "watercourses" (the Revised Version margin "ravines," the King James Version "rivers") (Eze 6:3, etc.).

(5) ye’or, from Egyptian ‘iotr, ‘io’r, especially of the Nile, as: "Seven other kine came up after them out of the river" (Ge 41:3); the Revised Version (British and American) "stream," the King James Version "river" (Ex 7:19; 8:5); , the Revised Version (British and American) "stream," the King James Version "brook"; "The streams (margin "canals") of Egypt shall be diminished and dried up" (Isa 19:6).

(6) yabhal, the root yabhal, "to bear along": "brooks and streams of waters" (Isa 30:25); compare yabhal, "river," "that spreadeth out its roots by the river" (Jer 17:8); ‘ubhal, "the river Ulai" (Da 8:2).

(7) nazal, "to flow," "to trickle": "He brought streams also out of the rock" (Ps 78:16).

(8) ‘eshedh, "the slope of the valleys," the King James Version "the stream of the brooks" (Nu 21:15); compare ‘ashedhoth, "the slopes" (Jos 10:40); "the slopes (margin "springs") of Pisgah" (De 3:17).

(9) potamos, "The stream brake against that house" (Lu 6:48,49); elsewhere "river," as "the river Jordan" (Mr 1:5).

(10) kludon, "stream," the King James Version The Wisdom of Solomon 19:7 (the Revised Version (British and American) "surge").

See BROOK; CANALS; CHANNEL; RIVER; VALE; WATERCOURSE.

Alfred Ely Day

STREET

stret.

See CITY.

STRENGTH, OF ISRAEL

strength: For "the strength of the children of Israel," applied to Yahweh in the King James Version Joe 3:16, the Revised Version (British and American) reads "a stronghold to the children of Israel."

STRIKE

strik: The verbs "to strike" and "to stroke" (latter not in English Versions) have the same derivation, and originally "strike" was the intrans, "stroke" the transitive form. "Strike" however, became used in both senses (always transitive in English Versions of the Bible), while "to stroke" took on the meaning "to, rub gently." But in the King James Version this last force still belonged sometimes to "strike" and is so found in 2Ki 5:11, "strike his hand over the place" (the Revised Version (British and American) "wave"), and perhaps Ex 12:7,22; Tobit 11:11 Otherwise AV's uses of the simple "strike" are modern, including "strike sail" (Ac 27:17; here and in RAPC Tob 11:11 with an archaic preterite "strake," elsewhere "struck"). The Revised Version's "They lowered the gear" is a more precise translation, not a modernizing of the King James Version's English. The combination "to strike through," however, is not modern English, and was used by the King James Version as meaning either "to pierce" (Jud 5:26; Job 20:24; Pr 7:23; La 4:9), or, as an intensive, "to strike violently," "to crush" (Ps 110:5). The Revised Version (British and American) has attempted to distinguish only in Hab 3:14, "pierce," margin "smite." "Striking hands" is a common custom at the conclusion of a bargain (Additions to Esther 14:8), but in Job 17:3; Pr 6:1; 17:18; 22:26; the Revised Version margin 11:15, the ceremony is used technically for an agreement to be surety for another. Striking (the Revised Version margin "firing") stones to produce a fire is mentioned (2 Macc 10:3).

The past participle of "strike" is stricken (modern English "struck") (compare Pr 23:35; Jer 5:3; La 4:9). So Isa 1:5, "Why will ye be still stricken?" is equivalent to "Why should ye receive any more blows?" (compare 16:7; 53:4,8 margin). But in the phrase "stricken in age" (Ge 18:11, etc.) "strike" has an older meaning, "advance."

Striker is found in 1Ti 3:3; Tit 1:7 as a literal translation of plektes. A hot-tempered man, prone to physical outbursts, is meant. A stroke is simply a"blow," but in De 17:8; 21:5, "stroke" is used technically for "assault."

Burton Scott Easton

STRINGED, INSTRUMENTS

stringd.

See MUSIC.

STRIPES

strips.

See PUNISHMENTS.

STRIVE

striv.

See GAMES, II, 2.

STRONGHOLD

strong’-hold.

See FORTIFIED CITIES, IV, 1.

STUBBLE

stub’-’-l (qash (Ex 5:12, etc.); kalame (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:7; 1Co 3:12)): These Hebrew and Greek forms are used of the stalks of wheat, etc., left knee-high in the field by the reapers. tebhen (Job 21:18), is a mixture of chopped straw and chaff produced in threshing, which is winnowed out by the fan (compare Jer 23:28; Isa 5:24; Mt 3:12). When tebhen was withheld from them the Israelites had to utilize qash for the manufacture of their bricks (Ex 5:12).

STUDS

studz (nequddoth, "engraving," "stud"): Ornaments consisting of small silver points which it was proposed (So 1:11) to affix to the new golden "plaits" (the Revised Version) or "borders" (the King James Version), and which were to replace the strung beads of the bride’s necklace.

STUFF

stuf (keli; skeuos): "Material" for any purpose (Eze 12:3,4,7); or "supplies" in a more general sense (Ex 36:7, Hebrew mela’-khah; compare the King James Version, the English Revised Version 1Sa 10:22; 25:13; 30:24 (the American Standard Revised Version substitutes "baggage")); frequently, "household possessions" (Ge 31:37; 45:20; Ex 22:7; Jos 7:11; Ne 13:8; RAPC Jdt 16:19; the King James Version Judith 15:11 (skeuasmata, the Revised Version (British and American) "furniture"); the King James Version Lu 17:31, where the Revised Version (British and American) reads "goods"). "Mingled stuff" is the translation of sha’aTnez in the Revised Version (British and American) instead of "garment of divers sorts" the King James Version (De 22:11).

STUMBLING-BLOCK; STUMBLING-STONE

stum’-bling-blok, (mikhshol, makhshelah; proskomma, skandalon): These are the most important of the

varied renderings of either of two cognate Hebrew words, or of two different Greek words. Sometimes the Greek word for "stone" (lithos) accompanies the principal word. There is no important difference in the meaning of the words or of their renderings. the Revised Version (British and American) generally substitutes "stumbling" for "offence" of the King James Version.

The literal meaning of the Hebrew words—an object which causes one to stumble or fall—appears in such passages as Le 19:14: "Thou shalt not .... put a stumblingblock (mikhshol) before the blind" (compare Jer 6:21). But the expression is ordinarily figurative, referring to that which causes material ruin or spiritual downfall, which were closely connected in Old Testament thought (Ps 119:165; Eze 21:15). The things that lead astray are silver and gold (Eze 7:19); idols (Eze 14:3; Ze 1:3, etc.).

One of the New Testament words, skandalon, literally means the stick of a trap to which the bait is attached, and which when touched springs the trap. Figuratively either word refers to a thing or a person that leads one to fall into error, into sin or into destruction: the cross of Christ (Ga 5:11; Ro 11:9); another's liberty (1Co 8:9); Peter in Mt 16:23; Christ, whose life and character were so different from Jewish expectation (Ro 9:33).

See also OFFENCE.

George Rice Hovey

SUA

su'-a (Soua; the King James Version, Sud): Name of a family of temple-servants who went up from exile with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:29) =" Sia" of Ne 7:47; "Siaha" of Ezr 2:44.

SUAH

su'-a (cuach): Son of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:36).

SUB-APOSTOLIC LITERATURE

See LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC.

SUBAI

su'-ba-i, su'-bi (Subaei): Name of a family of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:30) =" Shamlai" of Ezr 2:46; "Salmai" of Ne 7:48.

SUBAS

su’-bas (Soubas; the King James Version, Suba): Name of a family of "the sons of the servants of Solomon" returning with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:34), wanting in the parallel lists of Ezr 2:57; Ne 7:59.

SUBORN

sub-orn’ (hupoballo (Ac 6:11; only here in the New Testament)): The word means to introduce by collusion, to put one person in the place of another, to employ anyone in a secret manner and instruct such a one to act for and as though he were another person.

SUBSTANCE

sub’-stans (rekhush; hupostasis): Lit. that which stands under, is in the Bible used chiefly of material goods and possessions. In the Old Testament it is the translation of numerous Hebrew words, of which rekhush, "that which is gathered together," is one of the earliest and most significant (Ge 12:5; 13:6; 15:14; 1Ch 27:31; Ezr 8:21, etc.). In the New Testament "substance" appears in a few passages as the translation of ousia, "being," "subsistence" (Lu 15:13), huparxis, "goods," "property" (Heb 10:34), huparchonta, "things at hand" (Lu 8:3). Special interest attaches to Heb 11:1, the King James Version "Now faith is the substance of things hoped for," etc., where the word is used in its proper etymological sense as the translation of hupostasis, "that which stands under." the Revised Version (British and American) changes to "assurance," margin "the giving substance to," which last seems best to bring out the idea of faith as that which makes the things hoped for real to the soul. The same Greek word hupostasis is rendered "substance" in Heb 1:3 the Revised Version (British and American), instead of the King James Version "person," with reference to Christ, "the very image (margin "impress") of his substance," i.e. of God’s invisible essence or being, the manifestation of God Himself.

W. L. Walker

SUBTIL; SUBTLE; SUBTLETY; SUBTILTY

sub’-til, sut’-’-l, sut’-’-l-ti (chakham, nakhal, mirmah; dolos): These words are used

(1) in a good sense: 2Sa 13:3, chakham, "wise," "Jonadab was a very subtle (the American Standard Revised Version "subtle") man" (discreet); Pr 1:4, ‘ormah, "prudence," "to give subtlety to the simple," the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version margin "prudence"; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:22, leptos, "thin," said of the spirit in Wisdom (very fine or refined); 8:8, strophe, "winding," "subtilties of speeches"; Ecclesiasticus 39:2, "subtil parables," the Revised Version (British and American) "the subtleties of parables";

(2) in a bad sense: Ge 3:1, ‘arum, "crafty," "Now the serpent was more subtle than any beast of the field," the American Standard Revised Version "subtle."

Ge 27:35, mirmah, "deceit," "fraud," "Thy brother came with subtlety," the Revised Version (British and American) "with guile"; Ps 105:25, nakhal, "to deceive," the King James Version "deal subtlely," the American Standard Revised Version "subtly"; Pr 7:10, natsar, "to watch," "guard," "to be hidden or subtle of heart," the Revised Version (British and American) "wily," margin "‘ close,’ Hebrew ‘guarded’"; 2Ki 10:19, ‘oqebhah, "deceit" or "treachery" (here only); Judith 5:11, katasophizo, "to use subtlety"; Ecclesiasticus 19:25, panourgia, "cunning," "unscrupulousness," "There is an exquisite subtlety, and the same is unjust"; 2Co 11:3, "The serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety," the Revised Version (British and American) "in his craftiness"; Mt 26:4, dolos, "deceit," "that they might take Jesus by subtlety, and kill him"; Ac 13:10, "O full of all subtlety and all mischief," the Revised Version (British and American) "all guile and all villany."

English Revised Version has "subtilty" for "wisdom" (Pr 8:5,12), margin and the American Standard Revised Version, "prudence"; for "with subtlety" (the English Revised Version Mr 14:1, the King James Version "by craft") the American Standard Revised Version has "with subtlety."

W. L. Walker

SUBURBS

sub’-urbz.

See CITY.

SUBVERT

sub-vurt’ (‘awath; anatrepo): Occurs 5 t:

(1) in the sense of overturning, etc., as the translation of ‘awath, "to make bent or crooked" (La 3:36), "to subvert a man in his cause"; of anaskeudzo, primarily, "to pack up baggage"; then, "to ravage," etc. (Ac 15:24, "subverting your souls"); of anatrepo, "to turn upside down," "to overturn" (Tit 1:11, "who subvert whole houses," the Revised Version (British and American) "overthrow"); of katastrophe, "overthrow," "destruction" (2Ti 2:14, "to the subverting of them that hear");

(2) in the sense of perverting: ekstrepho, "to turn or twist out" "to turn about" (Tit 3:11, "such is subverted," the Revised Version (British and American) "perverted"). For "overthrown me" (Job 19:6) the Revised Version (British and American) has "subverted me (in my cause)," margin "overthrown me"; for "perverteth" (Pr 19:3), "subverteth."

W. L. Walker

SUCATHITES

su’kath-its (sukhathim; Codex Vaticanus Sochathieim; Codex Alexandrinus Sokathieim; the King James Version Suchathites): These are named only once (1Ch 2:55), a family of scribes living at Jabez.

SUCCEED; SUCCESS

suk-sed’, suk-ses’ (yarash, sakhal; euemeria): "To succeed" means,

(1) and originally, "to follow after";

(2) mostly in modern English, "to prosper"; in the King James Version, with one exception, the word has a qualifying adjective.

(1) In the first sense it is the translation of yarash, "to seize" or "to take possession" (De 2:12; 12:29, the American Standard Revised Version "dispossessest," the English Revised Version "possessest"); of qum, "to rise up" (De 25:6, "shall succeed in the name of his brother"); of diadechomai (Ecclesiasticus 48:8, "prophets to succeed after him").

(2) In the sense of prospering, "success" is the translation of sakhal, "to be wise," "to prosper" (Jos 1:8, "Thou shalt have good success," the King James Version margin "do wisely," the Revised Version margin "deal wisely"; compare the King James Version margin Job 22:2; Ps 111:10; Pr 3:4); "good success" occurs in Tobit 7:12, euodosei ta kallista; The Wisdom of Solomon 13:19, epituchia; Ecclesiasticus 20:9, euodia, the Revised Version (British and American) "prosperity," "There is a prosperity that a man findeth in misfortunes; and there is a gain that turneth to loss"; Ecclesiasticus 38:13, euodia (so Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Ephraemi—this word =" sweet savior," "fragrance"; compare Php 4:18; Eph 5:2; 2Co 2:15). See further EUODIA. the Revised Version (British and American) "the issue for good" 1 Macc 4:55, euodoo; 8:23, kalos, etc. "Success," simply (as "prosperity," euemeria), 2 Macc 10:28, "a pledge of success and victory"; "successor" occurs (Ecclesiasticus 46:1, "Joshua .... was the successor diadochos of Moses"; 2 Macc 9:23; 14:26).

W. L. Walker

SUCCOR; SUCCORER

suk’-er, suk’-er-er (’azar; boetheo, prostatis): Is the translation of ‘azar, "to gird" (2Sa 8:5, etc.); of boetheo, "to come in aid of" (2Co 6:2, "In a day of salvation did I succor thee"; Heb 2:18, "He is able to succor them that are tempted"); of prostatis, "one standing before" (Ro 16:2, the American Standard Revised Version "helper of many"); of antilepsis (Ecclesiasticus 51:7, the King James Version "I looked for the succour of men, but there was none"); of phugadeuterion (1 Macc 1:53, "flee for succor," the Revised Version (British and American) "place of refuge"); of sozo (1 Macc 2:44, "for succor," the Revised Version (British and American) "for safety"); of skepe (2 Macc 5:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "shelter"); "succors" occurs (The Wisdom of Solomon 17:12, the King James

Version boethema, "for fear is nothing else but a betraying (the Revised Version (British and American) "surrender") of the succours which reason offereth"); "succoreth" (1 Macc 12:15, boetheo, "help from heaven that succoureth us," the Revised Version (British and American) "to help us"). the Revised Version (British and American) has "succor" for "help" (1Ch 18:5); "O thou my succor," for "O my strength" (Ps 22:19).

W. L. Walker

SUCCOTH (1)

suk'-oth, suk'-oth (cukkoth, "booths"; Skenai, Sokchoth, etc.): After parting with Esau, Jacob journeyed to Succoth, a name which he gave to the place from the "booths" which he erected to shelter his cattle (Ge 33:17). It was in the territory of Gad, and is mentioned with Beth-nimrah (Jos 13:27). In his pursuit of Zeba and Zalmunnah, Gideon seems to have retraced the path followed by Jacob, passing Succoth before Penuel (Jud 8:5). Their churlishness on that occasion brought dire punishment upon the men of Succoth. Gideon on his return "taught them" with thorns and briers (Jud 8:16). In the soil of the valley between Succoth and Zarethan, which was suitable for the purpose, the brass castings of the furniture for Solomon's Temple were made (1Ki 7:46; 2Ch 4:17). Jerome (on Ge 33:17) says that in his day it was a city beyond Jordan in the district of Scythopolis. From the above data it is clear that Succoth lay on the East of the Jordan and North of the Jabbok. From Ps 60:6; 108:7, we may infer that it was close to the Jordan valley, part of which was apparently known by its name. Neubauer (Geog. du Talmud, 248) gives the Talmudic name as Tar'ala. Merrill (East of the Jordan, 386) and others compare this with Tell Deir 'Alla, the name of an artificial mound about a mile North of the Jabbok, on the edge of the valley, fully 4 miles East of the Jordan. There is a place called Sakut West of the Jordan, about 10 miles South of Beisan. This has been proposed by some; but it is evident that Succoth lay East of the river. No trace of the name has been found here.

W. Ewing

SUCCOTH (2)

(cukkoth; Sokchoth (Ex 12:37; 13:20; Nu 33:5)): The first station of the Hebrews on leaving Rameses (see EXODUS). The word means "booths." The distance from ETHAM (which see) suggests that the site may have lain in the lower part of Wady Tumeilat, but the exact position is unknown. This region seems possibly to have been called T-K-u by the Egyptians (see PITHOM). Brugsch and other scholars suppose this term to have been changed to Succoth by the Old Testament writer, but this is very doubtful, Succoth being a common Hebrew word, while T-K-u is Egyptian The Hebrew "c" does not appear ever to be rendered by "t" in Egyptian. The capital of the Sethroitic nome was called T-K-t (Pierret, Vocab. hieroglyph., 697), and this word means "bread." If the region of T-K-u was near this town, it would seem to have lain on the shore road from Edom to Zoan, in which case it could not be the Succoth of the Exodus.

C. R. Conder

SUCCOTH-BENOTH

suk’-oth, suk’-oth-be’-noth, be’-noth (cukkoth benoth; Rhochchothbaineithei, Codex Alexandrinus (better) Sokchothbenithei):

1. The Meaning according to the Hebrew:

The name of an idol made by the Babylonians sent into exile at Samaria by an Assyrian king (Shalmaneser), and mentioned among the deities of the various nationalities there assembled (2Ki 17:30). In Hebrew, Succoth-benoth means "booths of daughters," and has been explained as the chambers wherein the Babylonians placed women for prostitution; or booths or tabernacles in which images of certain goddesses were worshipped.

2. Sir H. Rawlinson’s Identification of the Name:

The parallelism, however, requires a deity, like the Nergal of the Cutheans, the Ashima of the Hamathites, etc., and not a chamber or shrine. This consideration caused Sir H. to suggest an identification of Succoth-benoth with the Babylonian Zer-panitum (= Zer-banitum), whose name was probably pronounced Zer-panith, the spouse of Merodach (the god of Babylon), as the "seed-creatress." The difference in the first component, zer, was regarded as due to its possible Hamitic (= Sumerian) equivalent, or to a Semitic mistranslation, both of which explanations are now known to be untenable.

3. Is Succoth the Babylonian Sakut?:

As the people who made Succoth-benoth were Babylonians, we should expect here either a name of Merodach, the god of Babylon, or one of the deities identified with him. At present the only suggestion which can be made is that Benoth is for ban wath, i.e. ban’(i) mati, "creator of the land." Both the Semitic and the bilingual creation-stories speak of Merodach as the creator of the world, with its products, and the great cities of Babylonia; and "father Enlil," who bore the title "lord of the world," bestowed the same upon Merodach at the creation, thus identifying Merodach with himself. Now there is a group which may be read either Dikut, "the Judge," or Sakut, "the Counselor," and if we can read Succoth-benoth as Sakut(h)ban’ wat(h), "the Counselor, creator of the land," a satisfactory explanation of this puzzling name will be furnished. The terminal -i of the Babylonian has been preserved in the ei, of the Greek. The adoption of such a descriptive name of Enlil-Merodach would form a compromise between abandoning their old objects of worship and accepting "the god of the land" (2Ki 17:26).

T. G. Pinches

SUCHATHITES

su’-kath-its.

See SUCATHITES.

SUD

sud: The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) SUA (which see).

SUDIAS

su’-di-as (Soudias): In 1 Esdras 5:23, a Levitical family that returned with Zerubbabel, called in Ezr 2:40 "Hodaviah" and in Ne 7:43 "Hodevah" (which see).

SUFFERING

suf’-er-ing: A great variety of Hebrew and Greek expressions, too large to be here enumerated, have been translated by "suffering" and other forms derived from the same verb. The most obvious meanings of the word are the following:

(1) The commonest meaning perhaps in the English Versions of the Bible is "to permit," "to allow," "to give leave to": "Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away" (Mr 10:4).

(2) "To experience," "to go through,"‘ "to endure": "I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him" (Mt 27:19). A woman "had suffered many things of many physicians" (Mr 5:26). Other common phrases are "to suffer affliction" (1Th 3:4; Heb 11:25, the Revised Version (British and American) "share ill-treatment"), "to suffer hardship" (2Ti 2:9), "to suffer adversity" (Heb 13:3 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "to be ill-treated"), "to suffer dishonor" (the King James Version "shame," Ac 5:41), "to suffer violence," (Mt 11:12), "to suffer wrong" (Ac 7:24), "to suffer terror" (Ps 88:15), "to suffer shipwreck" (2Co 11:25), "to suffer hunger" (Ps 34:10; Pr 19:15), "to suffer thirst" (Job 24:11).

(3) "To put up with," "to tolerate": the King James Version, "For ye suffer fools gladly (the Revised Version (British and American) "ye bear with the foolish gladly"), seeing ye yourselves are wise" (2Co 11:1,9).

(4) "To undergo punishment": "Think ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they have suffered these things?" (Lu 13:2).

(5) "To sustain loss": "If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss" (1Co 3:15; also Php 3:8).
(6) "To suffer death." Here the clearest references are to the suffering or passion of Christ, which indeed includes the enduring of untold hardships and affliction, all of which culminate in His vicarious death

for man (Mt 16:21; Mr 8:31; 9:12; Lu 9:22; 17:25; 22:15; 24:26,46; Ac 3:18; 17:3; 26:23; 1Pe 3:18).

Suffering belongs to the discipline of all Christ's followers (Ro 8:17; 2Co 1:7; Ga 3:4; Php 3:10; 1Th 2:2; 2Th 1:5; 2Ti 2:12; 3:12; Jas 5:10; 1Pe 2:20 f; 3:14,17; 4:1,13,16; 5:10). Such suffering is called a suffering for God's or Christ's sake (Jer 15:15; Ac 9:16; Php 1:29; 2Ti 1:12). This fellowship in suffering unites us with the saints of God in all times (Jas 5:10), and is indeed a fellowship with the Lord Himself (Php 3:10), who uses this discipline to mold us more and more according to His character.

H. L. E. Luering

SUFFOCATION

suf-o-ka'-shun.

See PUNISHMENTS.

SUICIDE

su'-i-sid.

See CRIMES.

SUKKIIM

suk'-i-im (cukkiyim): Named in 2Ch 12:3 as a tribe that took part with Libyans and Cretans in the invasion of Judea by Shishak. The identification is uncertain.

SULPHUR

sul'-fur.

See BRIMSTONE.

SUMMER

sum'-er (qayits; Aramaic qayiT (Da 2:35), from quts quT, "to cut off," "to pluck or gather fruit," hence, the time of fruit, summer (2Sa 16:1,2; Jer 40:10,12); theros (Mt 24:32; Lu 21:30)): The Hebrew verb, mentioned above, occurs in Isa 18:6, "to summer," used of the ravenous birds feeding upon carcasses of the slain. The term "summer parlor" in Jud 3:20 (compare 3:24) is literally, "upper room," and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). The summer was the dry season extending

from April to October when usually no rain falls. Hence, the "drought of summer" (Ps 32:4).

See SEASONS.

H. Porter

SUMMER-HOUSE

(beth ha-qayits): Am 3:15 notes it as part of the judgment on Israel that Yahweh would smite "the winter-house with the summer-house." It belonged to the luxury of the period that kings and wealthy persons had separate residences for the cold and hot seasons. This is the only mention of "the summer-house," but Eglon's "cool upper room" (Jud 3:20, the King James Version and the English Revised Version "summer parlour," not in this case a separate building) may be compared.

See WINTER-HOUSE.

SUN (1)

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 2.

SUN (2)

(Figurative): Poetical conceptions for the sun are frequently found in the Scriptures, though the strictly figurative expressions are not common. Undoubtedly the Jewish festivals, religious as well as agricultural, were determined by the sun's movements, and this fact, together with the poetical nature of the Hebrews and their lack of scientific knowledge, had a tendency. to multiply spiritual and metaphorical expressions concerning the "greater light" of the heavens. Some of these poetical conceptions are very beautiful, such as the sun having a habitation (Hab 3:11), a tabernacle (Ps 19:4 f) set for him by Yahweh, out of which he comes as a bridegroom from his chamber, rejoicing as a strong man to run a race. The sun is also given as the emblem of constancy (Ps 72:5,17), of beauty (So 6:10), of the law of God (Ps 19:7), of the purity of heavenly beings (Re 1:16; 12:1), and of the presence and person of God (Ps 84:11). The ancient world given to personifying the sun did not refrain from sun-worship, and even the Hebrew in the time of the kings came perilously near this idolatry (2Ki 23:11).

See SUN-WORSHIP.

C. E. Schenk

SUN GATE

See EAST GATE.

SUN, CHARIOTS OF THE

See HORSES OF THE SUN.

SUN, HORSES OF THE

See HORSES OF THE SUN.

SUN, SMITING BY

smit’-ing: Exposure of the uncovered head to the heat of the sun is likely to produce either of two conditions; the commoner is heat exhaustion with faintness, the rarer is heatstroke with fever and paralysis of the heat-regulating apparatus of the nervous system. This condition is described as siriasis. The two fatal instances recorded were probably of the latter kind. One, the case of the Shunammite’s son (2Ki 4:19), was apparently very acute, like some of the cases described by Manson and Sambon. Of the other case, that of Manasseh, Judith’s husband, we have no particulars (Judith 8:3), except that it was likewise brought on by exposure in the harvest field, and occurred at the time of barley harvest, that is, early in May. Jonah’s attack was one of heat syncope, as he fainted from the heat (Jon 4:8). According both to psalmist (Ps 121:6) and to prophet (Isa 49:10), the people of God are protected from the stroke of the sun as well as from that of the moon. The latter was supposed to cause lunacy (hence, the name), and epilepsy, so in Mt 4:24 the word rendered "lunatic" (the King James Version) for "epileptic" (Revised Version) is seleniazomenous, literally, "moon struck."

See MOON.

Alexander Macalister

SUN-IMAGES

See IMAGES.

SUN-WORSHIP

sun’-wur-ship: The splendor of the sun makes it a natural object of adoration, once the purer idea of the one true God (Ro 1:20,21) is parted with, and in most ancient nations the worship of the sun was an outstanding feature. It is found in Babylonian and Assyrian (Samas; special seats of sun-worship were Sippara and Larsa); in Egypt it is a leading feature of the religion (Ra, and, under special phases, Horus, Tum, Aten; a special seat of sun-worship was Heliopollis, the Old Testament On, called in Jer 43:13 Beth-shemesh, "house of the sun"). Other cities bore the same name: Beth-shemesh (Jos 15:10 = Ir-shemesh; Jos 19:41, in Judah; Jos 19:22, in Issachar; Jos 19:38, in Naphtali; see BETH-SHEMESH).

Allusions to, and warnings against, sun-worship are frequent in the Old Testament, as in Le 26:30; 2Ch 14:5; 34:4,7; Isa 17:8; 27:9; Eze 6:4,6, in which passages for the King James Version "images," "idols," the Revised Version (British and American) has "sun-images" (which see); Job 31:26,27 and numerous passages show that this form of idolatry latterly penetrated deeply into Judah—even into its temple-worship (2Ki 23:5,11, "horses .... given to the sun" (see under HORSES OF THE SUN,

"Chariots of the Sun"); and Eze 8:16). Josiah's reformation took account of these abuses (2Ki 23:5,11 ff; 2Ch 34:4,7), and Ezekiel strenuously denounced them (8:16 ff).

James Orr

SUNDAY

sun'-da.

See LORD'S DAY.

SUNRISING

sun'-riz-ing: A frequent designationin the Old Testament for the East (Nu 21:11; De 4:41,47; Jos 1:15, etc.). In Re 7:2, the Revised Version (British and American) has "sunrising" for the King James Version "east."

SUNSTROKE

sun'-strok.

See SUN, SMITING BY.

SUP; SUPPER

sup'-er.

See MEALS.

SUPERFLUOUS; SUPERFLUITY

su-pur'-floo-us, su-per-floo'-i-ti (sara'; perissos (2Co 9:1), perisseia): According to the Levitical Law, "a blind man, or a lame, or he that hath a fiat nose, or anything superfluous" could not fulfill priestly functions (Le 21:18; 22:23). According to Dillmann (Baentsch, BDB) the word should be rendered "a

limb too long," but Ewald (following the Septuagint) suggests "having cropped ears." The only instance of superfluity occurs in Jas 1:21, the King James Version "superfluity of naughtiness"; according to Mayor "overflowing ebullition of malice" (the Revised Version (British and American) "overflowing of wickedness," margin "malice"); but the Greek word is used in other connections, e.g. of "grace" (Ro 5:17); "joy" (2Co 8:2).

T. Lewis

SUPERSCRIPTION

su-per-skrip’-shun (epigraphe):

(1) The legend on a coin designating the person in whose honor or by whose authority it is issued (Mt 22:20; Mr 12:16; Lu 20:24).

(2) The accusation on the cross of Jesus (Mr 15:26; Lu 23:38). According to Roman custom an inscription bearing the charge or ground of a criminal’s condemnation was fixed to the cross on which he was crucified. The use of such an inscription at the crucifixion of Jesus is mentioned by all four evangelists. The fullest description is that of Mark, "the superscription of his accusation" (he epigraphe tes aitias autou) (15:26). Matthew calls it more briefly "his accusation" (ten aitian autou) (27:38), while Luke styles it merely "a superscription" (epigraphe) (23:38). In the Fourth Gospel it is called a "title" (titlon) (Joh 19:19). The text of the superscription is given by the four evangelists in varying terms and with various degrees of fullness.

Russell Benjamin Miller

SUPERSTITION; SUPERSTITIOUS

su-per-stish’-un; su-per-stish’-us (deisidaimonia, "fearing demons"): The Biblical use of these words is limited to that of the former in Ac 25:19 the King James Version, and of the latter in Ac 17:22. In the former reference, Festus speaks of the Jews’ "superstition" (the Revised Version (British and American) "religion"), thus artfully dodging an avowal of his own convictions "respecting the Hebrew faith." In Ac 17:22 the King James Version Paul tactfully refers to the Athenians as being "too superstitious" (the Revised Version (British and American) "too religious"), thus using the term correctly from both their and his point of view. They were truly too "religious" with their superstitions.

Leonard W. Doolan

SUPH

soof (cuph; plesion tes eruthras (thalasses); the King James Version Red Sea): As the verse stands, the

place where Moses addressed the children of Israel is indicated as "beyond the Jordan in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Suph" (De 1:1). the King James Version, following Septuagint, takes the name as a contraction of yam cuph (see RED SEA). The abbreviation is not found elsewhere. The name of the sea was not derived from that of a city; so we need not look in that direction. Knobel suggested Naqb es-Safa, a pass about 25 miles West-Southwest of the Dead Sea. But it is "unsuitably situated; nor does the name agree phonetically (for @@ ... agrees with ..., not with ...)"(Driver, "Deuteronomy," ICC, 4). No identification is possible.

W. Ewing

SUPHAH

soo’-fa (suphah, for wahebh becuphah; Septuagint reads ten Zoob ephlogise; the King James Version Rea Sea): Suphah is the region in which Vaheb is situated (Nu 21:14). It is probably identical with Suph of De 1:1. Tristram (Land of Moab, 50 f) suggested identification with Ghor es-Safiyeh], a small oasis East of the mud fiats of Es-Sebkhah], South of the Dead Sea; but "the sibilants do not correspond, and Safiyeh is a specifically Arabic term (Wetzstein in Delitzsch, Gen4, 586, note 2) which does not seem to be a likely explanation of Suphah" (Gray, "Nu," ICC, 285 f). This, and other questions of identification, must wait for solution until a more thorough exploration of the whole district has been accomplished.

W. Ewing

SUPPER

sup’-er.

See MEALS.

SUPPER, LORD’S

See LORD’S SUPPER.

SUPPLY

su-pli’:Php 4:19 for pleroo; 1Co 16:17; Php 2:30 for anapleroo; 2Co 9:12 (the King James Version); 2Co 11:9 for prosanapleroo. All three verbs mean "to fill," the 3rd containing the additional connotation "fill up to a certain point." Eph 4:16; Php 1:19 for the noun epichoregia, literally, "an additional supply." But no special force of "additional" seems to be contained in the passages. In 2Co 9:10 a; Ga 3:5; Col 2:9; 2Pe 1:5,11, we have epichoregeo, "to furnish besides," i.e. fully supply; in 2Co 9:10 b; 1Pe 4:11 the simple choregeo, "to furnish,"

Burton Scott Easton

SUR

sur (Codex Vaticanus Assour, Codex Alexandrinus Sour): Those that dwelt in Sur are mentioned along with the inhabitants of Sidon, Tyre, Ocina, etc., as dreading the approach of Holofernes and the Assyrian any (Judith 2:28). The names run from North to South, and Sur immediately follows Tyre (modern Sur]), with which, therefore, it can hardly be identified. No probable identification has been suggested.

See also JERUSALEM.

SURE; SURELY

shoor, shoor’-li: In modern English is used chiefly in the phrases "to be sure" or "to make sure," and as a simple adjective it is usually either archaic or exceedingly colloquial. The adjectival use, however, is common (chiefly for ‘aman, "to confirm," and its derivatives) in English Versions of the Bible, where modern English would prefer "secure" or "certain" (1Sa 2:35; RAPC Sir 40:25; Ac 13:34, etc.). "To be sure that" is also fairly common in the King James Version, and occasionally (as in De 12:23, "Be sure that thou eat not the blood," for chazaq, "to be firm") it has rather more emphasis than in modern English. But usually the phrase is a mere periphrasis for some word meaning "to know" (compare the Revised Version (British and American) Ex 3:19; Lu 10:11; Ro 2:2, etc.). In Pr 6:3, the King James Version has "Make sure thy friend" for rahabh, "be boisterous" "beset" the Revised Version (British and American) "importune." The sense is "Force him to pay his debt."

Surely in English Versions of the Bible is used almost always to qualify an entire phrase, as in Ge 28:16, "Surely Yahweh is in this place." In modern English "surely" used in this way suggests that the statement is being argued and is therefore slightly doubtful, but in Elizabethan English the purpose is to exclude all doubt ("beyond question"). With this force the King James Version uses "surely" to translate almost any emphatic form, and the Revised Version (British and American) has conformed to AV’s use, and such changes as have been made by the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 26:73; Lu 4:23; Re 22:20, etc.) are merely to preserve uniformity of rendition. The most common use of "surely" in this sense is to translate a verb when emphasized by its own part. (absolute inf. in Hebrew), as "Thou shalt, surely die" (Ge 2:17) for "dying thou shalt die" (compare Ge 22:17 for the Hebrew construction). In this sense "surely" is sometimes varied by "of a surety" (Ge 15:13, etc.) without the slightest difference in meaning (compare Ge 9:5 and 26:9). In addition "surely" is used occasionally as a simple adverb where modern English would prefer "securely" or "certainly" (compare Pr 10:9 and the King James Version Lu 1:1, "surely believed," the Revised Version (British and American) "fulfilled," the Revised Version margin "fully established").

Surety, besides its use in "of a surety" appears, in the Old Testament to translate ‘arabh, "to be surety," and in Heb 7:22 for egguos, "guarantor," "giver of security." Modern English prefers "security," as does even the King James Version in Ac 17:9. "Suretiship" (the American Standard Revised Version

"suretyship") in Proverbs 11:15 for taqa‘, "to strike (hands)."

See STRIKE; SURETY.

Burton Scott Easton

SURETY

shoor’-ti: This word is used in three different connections or groups:

(1) As a derivative of the word "sure" it means "of a certainty" or "surely."—In Ge 15:13 the infinitive absolute of the verb is used to give emphasis to the idea of the verb and is rendered "of a surety." In Ge 18:13 the Hebrew ‘omnam is translated "of a surety." In Ge 26:9 ‘akh is similarly rendered, and has the force of our "indeed." In Ac 12:11 alethos, is translated in the King James Version "of a surety," but better in the Revised Version (British and American) "of a truth."

(2) In the sense of security or pledge for a person.—This means that one person may become security for another, that such a one will do a certain thing at a time in the future. Judah was "surety" to his father Jacob that Benjamin would safely return from Egypt (Ge 43:9). He pledged his life that the younger brother would return safely. He tells Joseph (Ge 44:32) how he had become surety for Benjamin, and offers to become Joseph’s slave for the sake of his brother. Job says (Job 17:3), "Give now a pledge, be surety for me with thyself; who is there that will strike hands with me?" The striking of hands refers to the action or gesture by which the surety or pledge was publicly manifested and thus ratified. Job here beseeches God to become surety for him, to pledge him that some time in the future He will cause Job’s innocence to be made known and be acknowledged by God Himself. In Isa 38:14 Hezekiah says, "O Lord, I am oppressed, be thou my surety." He wishes God to give him a pledge of some kind, to go security for him in such a way that he will surely be saved out of his sickness and distress. Jesus is called "the surety (egguos) of a better covenant" (Heb 7:22). Jesus is the pledge or surety that through Him we may obtain the assurance and certainty that a more excellent covenant has been established by God, and are assured also of the truth of the promises connected with it.

(3) It is used to describe the practice of going security for another by striking hands with that person and becoming responsible for money or any object loaned.—The Book of Proverbs unhesitatingly condemns the practice. No mention is made of it in the Mosaic Law, as if the custom were then practically unknown. The Book of Proverbs makes no distinction between a stranger and a neighbor; the person who does such a thing is likened unto an animal caught in a trap. He is exhorted to sleep no more until he has got out of the trap, or freed himself from this obligation (Pr 6:1-5). The wisdom of such advice has been abundantly verified by experience. It does not necessarily preclude certain special cases, where the practice may be justified. The international relationships of the Jews in the period of the monarchy, together with the unsettled condition of the country (Ne 5:3) and people, needed such commercial strictness. Their trade was mostly in the hands of the Phoenicians and other foreigners, and the pressure of taxation for the payment of foreign tribute, etc., was heavy (Ne 5:4 f). Pr 11:15; 17:18 declare one

"void of understanding" who thus goes security for another. Pr 20:16 seems to contain an exclamation of contemptuous rebuke for the man who goes security. Pr 22:26; 27:13 contain like admonitions.

See DEBT; PLEDGE; SECURITY; STRIKE.

James Josiah Reeve

SURNAME

sur’-nam (kanah; epikalein): A word derived from the French., meaning "an additional name"; in modern English always the family name of a person. Indeed, the spelling "surname" in the King James Version 1 Macc 1:10; 2:2; 6:43 may be due to a confusion with "sire’s name." But the custom of family names was entirely unknown among the Hebrews. The word is used twice in the King James Version of the Old Testament, namely, Isa 44:5; 45:4. The Hebrew word means "to give flattering or honorary titles." In the former passage foreigners are so envious of the prosperity of the Jews that they are anxious to be surnamed by the name of Israel, i.e. to be enrolled as members of the Jewish nation. In the latter case Yahweh gives Cyrus an honorary title, namely, "servant of Yahweh," and thus appoints him to be His instrument in the restoration of His people. The same word is rendered in Job 32:21, the King James Version "give flattering titles." Elihu declares his intention to examine the situation without fear or favor. He will not allow such high-sounding titles as "Your Worship" or "My Lord" to stand in his way. He will not be overawed by Job’s social position. In the New Testament the word is used in the case of Peter—Simon whose surname is Peter (Ac 10:5,32; 11:13); of Mark—John whose surname was Mark (Ac 12:12,25; 15:37); of Judas—surnamed Iscariot (Lu 22:3); of Barsabbas—who was surnamed Justus (Ac 1:23); and of Judas—surnamed Barsabbas (Ac 15:22). It was a widespread custom in the ancient world to give honorary and symbolical titles. our Lord surnamed Simon Peter (Mr 3:16), and James and John Boanerges (Mr 3:17). Ac 15:37 the King James Version has "surname" for the simple "call" (so the Revised Version (British and American)).

T. Lewis

SUSA

su’-sa, soo’-sa (Additions to Esther 11:3).

See SHUSHAN.

SUSANCHITES

su-san’-kits (shushanekhaye’).

See SHUSHANCHITES.

SUSANNA, THE HISTORY OF

su-zan’-a:

1. Name

2. Canonicity and Position

3. Contents

4. Fact or Fiction?

5. Date

6. Original Language

1. Name:

This novelette has, in the Septuagint, the bare title "Susanna" (Sousanna, from Hebrew shoshannah, "lily"). So also in the Syro-Hexapla. In Codex Alexandrinus (Theodotion) it is designated Horasis a (Vision I); see BEL AND THE DRAGON, sec. I. In the Harklensian Syriac (Ball’s W2) its title is "The Book of Little (or the child?) Daniel."

2. Canonicity and Position:

Susanna was with the other Additions included in the Bible Canon of the Greek, Syrian and Latin churches. Julius Africanus (circa 230 AD) was the first to dispute the right of Susanna to a place in the Canon, owing to its improbable character. Origen replied to him, strongly maintaining its historicity (see Schurer, GJV4, III, 455; HJP, II, 3, p. 186, where the references are given). In the Septuagint, Syro-Hexapla and Vulgate, Susanna is Daniel 14, but in Theodotion (ABQ) it opens Daniel, preceding chapter 1, a position implied in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) which are based on Theodotion, formerly believed to be the true Septuagint. Yet it is probable that even in Theodotion the original place agreed with that in the true Septuagint (Swete’s 87); so Roth (Kautzsch, Die Apok., 172) and Driver (Commentary on Daniel, Cambridge Bible, xviii).

See BEL AND THE DRAGON.

3. Contents:

The story of Susanna is thus told in Theodotion’s version, and therefore in English Versions of the Bible which follows it. Susanna was the beautiful and devout wife of Joakim who resided in Babylon in the

early years of the exile, and owned a fine park which was open to his fellow-exiles (verses 1-4). Two of these last were elders and judges who, though held in high esteem, suffered impure thoughts toward Susanna to enter their minds. One day, meeting in the park, they divulged to each other their lustful passion toward this beautiful woman, and resolved together to seize the first opportunity to waylay her in the park and to overpower her (verses 5-15). A joint attempt was made upon Susanna, who resisted, notwithstanding threats of false accusation (verses 22-26). The elders make a false charge, both in private and in public, and she is accordingly condemned to death (verses 27-41). On the way to execution she is met by Daniel (= judge "of God") who has the case reopened, and by a system of cross-examination of the two elders succeeds in convincing the people that Susanna is innocent of the charge brought against her. She is acquitted, but her accusers are put to death.

The story told in the Septuagint (87) is essentially the same, though varying somewhat in details. Versions 1-4 seem to have been prefixed for clearness by Theodotion, for in Susanna verse 7 of the Septuagint Susanna is introduced for the first time: "These seeing a woman of beautiful appearance called Susanna, the wife of one of the Israelites," etc. The original text began therefore with verse 5, though in a slightly different form. Septuagint omits verses 15-18 which tell of the two elders concealing themselves and watching as Susanna entered the park and took her bath. There is not a word in Septuagint concerning the threats of the elders to defame Susanna in the event of her refusing what they desired (verses 20 ff); this omission makes the Septuagint form of the story obscure, suggesting that this section has fallen out by error. Nor does the Septuagint mention the crying out of Susanna and the elders (verse 24). The trial took place in the house, according to Theodotion (and English Versions of the Bible) (verse 28), but, according to Septuagint, in the synagogue (verse 28). In Septuagint (verse 30) it is said that the number of Susanna’s relatives, servants and servant-maids present at the trial was 500; Theodotion is silent on this. Septuagint (verse 35) makes Susanna pray to God before her condemnation, but Theodotion (English Versions of the Bible, verses 42-44) after. According to Septuagint the young man whom the elders falsely said they found with Susanna escaped unobserved because masked; Theodotion says he got away because the elders had not strength to hold him (verse 39). Septuagint is silent about the two maids who, according to Theodotion (verse 36), accompanied Susanna to the bath. Theodotion does not speak of the angel who according to Septuagint imparted to Daniel the wisdom he displayed (but compare Theodotion, verse 50); but on the other hand he adds the words ascribed to Daniel (verse 51, English Versions), though he leaves out the words imputed to him by Septuagint (= even elders may lie). Septuagint omits the words of the people addressed to Daniel: "What mean these words which thou hast spoken?" (verse 47, Theodotion, English Versions of the Bible). According to Theodotion (verse 50) the people entreated Daniel to act as judge among them; Septuagint omits this statement. Two questions were put to the elders, according to the Septuagint: "Under what kind of tree?" "In what part of the park?" but only one, according to Theodotion (and English Versions of the Bible): "Under what kind of tree?" Septuagint has it that as a punishment the two elders were hurled down the precipice; according to Theodotion they were slain (verse 62). In the last two verses (verses 63 f) Septuagint points the moral of the story, but Theodotion closes by describing the joy of Susanna’s relatives at the happy issue of the trial and the increased respect in which Daniel came to be held. For the dependence of the version see TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; VERSIONS.

4. Fact or Fiction?:

It is quite evident that the story is a fabrication and that it came to be attached to Daniel on account of the part played in it by Daniel the judge.

(1) The form of the story differs in Septuagint, Theodotion and the various Syriac recensions, showing that it was a floating legend, told in manifold ways.

(2) No confirmation of what is here narrated has been discovered in written or epigraphic sources.

(3) The grounds on which Susanna was condemned are trivial and wholly inadequate.

(4) The conduct of the judge, Daniel, is unnatural and arbitrary.

Though, however, the story is fictitious, it rests in part or wholly on older sources.

(1) Ewald (Geschichte(3), IV, 386) believed that it was suggested by the Babylonian legend in which two old men are seduced by the goddess of love (compare Koran 2 96).

(2) Brull (Das apokryphische Sus-Buch, 1877), followed by Ball (Speaker’s Apocrypha, II, 323-31), Marshall and R. H. Charles, came to the following conclusions:

(a) That the first half of the story rests on a tradition regarding two elders (Ahab and Zedekiah) who seduced certain women by persuading them that they would thus become the mother of the Messiah. This tradition has its origin probably in Jer 29:21-23, where it is said that Yahweh would sorely punish Ahab and Zedekiah because they had "committed villany in Israel," having "committed adultery with their neighbours’ wives" (the King James Version). We can trace the above story amid many variations in the writings of Origen and Jerome and in sundry rabbinical works.

(b) The trial scene is believed to have a wholly different origin. It is said to have arisen about 100-96 BC, when Simon ben Shetach was president of the Sanhedrin. His son was falsely accused of a capital offense and was condemned to death. On the way to execution the accusers admitted that he was innocent of the crime; yet at his own request the son is executed in order that the father’s hands might be strengthened in the inauguration of new reforms in the administration of justice. The Pharisees and Sadducees differed as to the punishment to be meted out to false witnesses where the death sentence was involved. The first party advocated a stricter examination of witnesses, and a severer penalty if their testimony could be proved false. The Sadducee party took up a more moderate position on both points. Susanna has been held to be a kind of tract setting forth by example the views of the Pharisee party. If this opinion of the origin of Susanna be accepted, this tract was written by a Palestinian Jew, a position rendered probable by other considerations.

5. Date:

If, as the Greek, Latin and Syriac churches held and hold, Susanna forms an integral part of Daniel, the date of this last book (see DANIEL) is the date of Sus. But there is conclusive evidence that the three "Additions" circulated independently, though we have no means of fixing the date with any certainty. Perhaps this piece arose during the struggles between the Pharisees and Sadducees about 94-89 BC; see preceding section. In that case 90 BC would be a suitable date. On the date of Theodotion's translation see DANIEL; BEL AND THE DRAGON; VERSIONS; TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

6. Original Language:

Our materials for judging of the language in which the author wrote are slender, and no great probability can at present be reached. The following scholars argue for a Greek original: Fritzsche, De Wette, Keil, Herzfeld, Graf, Holtzmann. The following are some of the grounds:

(1) There are several paronomasias or word-plays, as in Susanna verses 54 f, schinon ("under a mastick tree") .... schisei ("will cut"); verses 58 f, prinon ("under a holm tree") .... prisai ("to cut"). But this last word (prisai) is absent from the true Septuagint, though it occurs in Theodotion (Swete's text, verse 59, has kataprise from the same root). If the word-play in verses 58 f is due to a translation based on Septuagint, the first example (verses 54 f), found in Septuagint and Theodotion, is as likely to be the work of the translator of those verses from the Hebrew.

(2) It is said that no trace of a Hebrew original has been discovered; but up to a few years ago the same statement could have been made of Sir.

There is a growing opinion that the author wrote in Hebrew (or Aramaic?); so Ball, J. T. Marshall, R. H. Charles.

(1) The writer was almost certainly a Palestinian Jew, and he would be far more likely to write in his own language, especially as he seems to have belonged to the Pharisaic party, who were ardent nationalists (see preceding section, at end).

(2) There is a goodly number of Hebraisms, rather more than one would expect had the writer composed in Hellenistic Greek

For versions and literature see BEL AND THE DRAGON; DANIEL; the Oxford Apocrypha, edition by R. H. Charles, 638 ff.

T. Witton Davies

SUSI

su’-si, soo’-si (cuci): Father of Gaddi, one of the spies, who represented the tribe of Manasseh (Nu 13:11). See Gray, HPN, 92.

SWADDLE; SWADDLING-BAND

swod’-’-l, swod’-ling-band (verb chathal, "enwrap," "swaddle" (Eze 16:4), noun chathullah, "swaddling-band" (Job 38:9); verb sparganoo, "to wrap in swaddling clothes" (Lu 2:7,12), noun spargana (pl.), "swaddling clothes" (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:4). the King James Version also has "swaddle" (La 2:22) for Taphach, literally, "to extend." But the word means "to carry on the outstretched palms of the hands" (compare Tippuchim, "dandled in the hands," La 2:20), whence RV’s "to dandle"): "To swaddle" and "to swathe" are really the same word, both forms going back to an AS form swethel, "a bandage," but "swaddle" has become the technical term for the wrapping of an infant in the Orient or elsewhere. The oriental swaddling-clothes consist of a square of cloth and two or more bandages. The child is laid on the cloth diagonally and the corners are folded over the feet and body and under the head, the bandages then being tied so as to hold the cloth in position. This device forms the clothing of the child until it is about a year old, and its omission (Eze 16:4) would be a token that the child had been abandoned. The mention of darkness as a "swaddling-band" at the birth of the sea (Job 38:9) is only a poetic way of saying that the sea, at its creation, was covered with clouds and darkness, and to find any idea of restraint involved is fanciful.

Burton Scott Easton

SWALLOW

swal’-o (deror; strouthos, in Proverbs and Psalms, chelidon, in Isa; Latin Hirundo rustica): A small long-winged bird of exhaustless flight, belonging to the family Hirundinidae. Deror means the bird of freedom, and as the swallow is of tireless wing, it has been settled upon as fitting the requirements of the text. In the passages where ‘aghur is translated "swallow," there is a mistake, that word referring to the crane. There is also a word, cuc or cic, that means a rushing sound, that is incorrectly translated "swallow," when it should be "swift" (Cypselus apus).

These birds are near relatives and so alike on the wing as to be indistinguishable to any save a close observer. Yet the Hebrews knew and made a difference. The swallow is a trifle larger and different in color. It remains all the year, while in numerous instances the swift migrates and is a regular sign of returning spring. The swallow is of long and tireless flight. The swift is so much faster that the sound of its wings can be heard when passing. The swallow plasters a mud nest under eaves, on towers, belfries, and close to human habitations. The swifts are less intimate, building in deserted places, under bridges and on rocky crevices. The swallows utter constantly a rather sweet low note; the swifts chatter harshly and incessantly at their nests. These differences are observable to the most careless people. Scientists separate the birds on account of anatomical structure also. Despite this, the birds are confused in most of our translations.

"Like a swallow or a crane, so did I chatter;

I did moan as a dove; mine eyes fail with looking upward:

O Lord, I am oppressed, be thou my surety"

(Isa 38:14).

Here ‘aghur is translated "swallow" and cuc "crane," which is clearly interchanging words, as the Arabic for "swift" is cuc, the same as the Hebrew. The line should read, "swift and crane." And another reason for changing swallow to swift, in this passage, lies in the fact that of the two birds the swift is the incessant and raucous chatterer, and this was the idea in the mind of Hezekiah when he sang his Trouble Song. Another incorrect reference is found in Jer 8:7: "Yea, the stork in the heavens knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle-dove and the swallow and the crane observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the law of Yahweh." Few swallows migrate. Returning swifts are one of the first signs of spring.

"As the sparrow in her wandering, as the swallow in her flying,

So the curse that is causeless alighteth not" (Pr 26:2).

This reference might apply to either, remembering always that the swift took its name from its exceptional flight, it being able to cover over 80 miles an hour. However, the swallow is credited with 800 miles in a night.

"Yea, the sparrow hath found her a house,

And the swallow a nest for herself, where she may lay her young,

Even thine altars, O Yahweh of hosts,

My King, and my God" (Ps 84:3).

Here is one instance, at least, where the swallow is at home and the translation correct. The swift might possibly have built in the temple: the swallow was sure to be there.

Gene Stratton-Porter

SWAN

swon (tinshemeth, "chameleon," "tree-toad," "water-hen," "owl"; kuknos; Latin cygnus; Anglo-Saxon:

swan and swon): Mentioned only in old versions and the Revised Version margin in Le 11:18: "the swan, and the pelican, and the gier eagle," and in De 14:16 Septuagint porphurion =" water-hen"; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) ibis). In the Revised Version (British and American) this is rightly changed to "the horned owl, and the pelican, and the vulture." A bird of the duck family wrongly placed among the abominations in old versions of the Bible, now changed to horned owl.

White and gray swans spend their winter migratory season on the waters of the Holy Land. They are among the most ancient birds of history; always have been used for food; when young and tender, of fine flesh and delicious flavor; so there is no possibility that they were ever rightfully placed among the birds unsuitable for food. Their feeding habits are aquatic, their food in no way objectionable.

Gene Stratton-Porter

SWEARING

swar’-ing.

See OATH; PERJURY; CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

SWEAT

swet (ze‘ah (Ge 3:19), yeza‘ (Eze 44:18); hidros (2 Macc 2:26; Lu 22:44)): "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" (Ge 3:19). Somewhat difficult is the passage, which the Revised Version (British and American) renders: "But the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok .... shall have linen tires upon their heads, and shall have linen breeches upon their loins; they shall not gird themselves with anything that causeth sweat," literally, "they shall not gird themselves with sweat" (Eze 44:15,18). The idea is evidently that profuse perspiration would make their ministrations unpleasant. The rule was of special importance in the sultry climate of Palestine.

Luke, the physician, describing the agony of the Lord in Gethsemane, says: "His sweat became as it were great drops (thromboi) of blood falling down upon the ground" (Lu 22:44, the Revised Version (British and American), following Codex Sinaiticus (a), Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Vaticanus etc., notes in margin: "Many ancient authorities omit Lu 22:43,44"). There are two difficulties of interpretation in this passage, apart from the difficulty which the physiological explanation of the phenomenon presents:

(1) the word (thrombos) translated "drop" means literally, "a clot of blood," "a lump," "a curd," and is nowhere else used in the sense of drop.

(2) It has been generally accepted that the sweat of the brow of Jesus had become bloody in appearance and in character, a symptom called in ancient medicine haimatodes hidros, "bloody sweat."

It must, however, be observed that this translation would make the Greek particle hosei, superfluous, by which, not the identity of the sweat with drops of blood, but a certain similarity or comparison must be intended. Ch. Th. Kuinoel, in his Latin commentary on the historical books of the New Testament (Leipzig, 1809, II, 654), has given all known parallel instances in history and legend, which seem to prove that under certain psychological or physiological conditions, though rarely, haimatodes hidros has occurred.

Olshausen in his Commentary, II, 469, thinks that the following points of comparison might have been in the mind of Luke:

(1) the sweat may have appeared on the forehead of Jesus in heavy drops;

(2) these may have dropped visibly to the ground, just as drops of blood fall from a wound;

(3) in addition, possibly a reddish color may have been noticeable, owing to an exudation of the arteries, though the latter is not directly expressed in the words of the evangelist. See also Dr. Stroud, On the Physical Cause of the Death of Christ, 183; Bynaeus, De morte Christi, II, 33.

The people of Palestine in Greek-Roman times were generally provided with handkerchiefs, used especially to wipe off the perspiration. The fashion was derived from Rome, whence the name of these napkins became soudarion, Latin sudarium. The late legend of Berenice or Veronica, who presented her handkerchief to the Saviour on His way to be crucified, and who found, when it had been returned to her by the Lord, that His features had been imprinted upon the cloth, is a reminiscence of this use. These handkerchiefs were frequently used to tie up small bundles of certain possessions, money, etc. (Lu 19:20). As a rule the dead had their faces covered with one, or had it tied around the head (Joh 11:44; 20:7). In Ephesus the handkerchiefs of Paul were carried to the sick, and achieved miraculous cures (Ac 19:12).

The verb hidroo, "to sweat," is found in a rather difficult passage of the Didache (i.6), which is introduced as a quotation, the source of which, however, we do not know: "Let thy alms sweat into (in ?) thy hands, until thou knowest to whom thou givest." The context seems to show that we have here a free repetition of the arguments of Sirach 12:1 ff. so that the meaning would be: "In giving charity, do not give indiscriminately or thoughtlessly, but consider carefully so that no one who is unworthy receive your benefaction." Still it is not impossible that the text is corrupt in the passage.

H. L. E. Luering

SWEET CANE

swet kan.

See REED.

SWEET INCENSE

See SPICES.

SWELL

swel (tsabhah): In the ordeal of the Water of Jealousy described in Nu 5:11-31 (P), the effect on the unfaithful wife ot the drinking of the holy water was to cause the thigh to fall away (Revised Version) or rot (the King James Version) and the abdomen to "swell." This ceremonial was a direct appeal to the judgment of God, for there was nothing in the holy water (taken from the laver) or the dust of the temple which was mixed with it to produce this effect. In the Talmudic tract Cotah there are given many rabbinical opinions and particulars as to the procedure in later times. Apparently from the passage in Numbers, the judgment speedily followed the appeal, but according to Sotah, iii.4, it might be postponed even for four years, and in v.1, it is said to have produced the same effect on the adulterer as on the unfaithful wife. We have no details as to the nature or permanency of the swelling.

"Swell" as the translation of another word, batseq, is used in the sense of blistering of the feet from long tramping. Both in De 8:4 and Ne 9:21 it is said that in spite of their long wilderness marches the feet of the Israelites did not swell. This was a token of divine protection.

See SWOLLEN.

Alexander Macalister

SWELLING

swel’-ing: The verb ga’-ah, means "rise up" (Eze 47:5, etc.), so that the noun ga’awah (Ps 46:3) means "arising." The "swelling" of the sea that shakes the mountains is a perfectly good translation, and "pride" (so the American Revised Version margin) is beside the mark. In Jer 12:5; 49:19 parallel 50:44; Zec 11:3 is found the phrase ge’on ha-yarden, "exaltation of the Jordan," which the King James Version translates "pride of Jordan" in Zechariah and "swelling of Jordan" in Jeremiah (the Revised Version (British and American) has "pride" throughout, with "swelling" in the margin of Jeremiah). What is described is a place, with a mass of vegetation, easily burned (Zec 11:1-3), a lair of lions (Jer 49:19; Zec 11:3), and a particularly dangerous place for human beings (Jer 12:5). The luxuriant thicket of the Jordan bank is evidently meant, which could well be spoken of as "Jordan’s pride" (OHL, "majesty of the Jordan"), and "swelling" is quite impossible.

In the New Testament "swelling" is used in 2Co 12:20 for phusiosis, "puffing up," "blatant self-conceit," and 2Pe 2:18 parallel Jude verse 16 for huperogkos, "overgrown," "solemnly inane."

Burton Scott Easton

SWIFT

See SWALLOW.

SWIFT BEASTS

(kirkaroth (Isa 66:20)): the King James Version and the English Revised Version "swift beasts," the English Revised Version margin and the American Standard Revised Version "dromedaries." In Mic 1:13 (rekhesh) a horse is meant, the Revised Version (British and American) "swift steed."

See CAMEL; HORSE.

SWINE

swin (chazir; compare Arabic khinzir; hus, Septuagint and New Testament; compare Greek sus, and Latin sus; adjective hueios, as a substantive, the Septuagint; choiros, Septuagint and New Testament): In both ancient and modern times domestic swine have been little kept in Palestine, but wild swine are well known as inhabitants of the thickets of the Chuleh, the Jordan valley, the Dead Sea, and some of the mountains. The species is Susanna scrofa, the wild pig of Europe, North Africa and Western Asia.

In the Old Testament the swine is mentioned in Le 11:7 and De 14:8 as an unclean animal: "And the swine, because he parteth the hoof, and is clovenfooted, but cheweth not the cud, he is unclean unto you." In Isa 65:4 and 66:3,17 the eating of swine's flesh and the offering of oblations of swine's blood are referred to as abominations. Septuagint also refers to swine in three passages where these animals are not mentioned in the Hebrew and EV. In 2Sa 17:8 where English Versions of the Bible has "as a bear robbed of her whelps in the field," Septuagint adds (translation) "and as a savage boar in the plain." In 1Ki 21:19 Septuagint 20:19), where English Versions of the Bible has "in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth," Septuagint has "where the swine and the dogs licked"; similarly in 1Ki 22:38. In 1 Macc 1:47 there is reference to a decree of Antiochus ordering the sacrifice of swine. In 2 Macc 6 and 7 there are accounts of the torture and death of Eleazar, an aged scribe, and of a mother and her seven sons for refusing to taste swine's flesh. Swine, the property of Gentiles, are mentioned in the account of the Gadarene demoniac (Mt 8:30,31,32; Mr 5:11,12,13,14,16; Lu 8:32,33), and in the parable of the Prodigal Son (Lu 15:15,16).

Figurative: We find the following figurative references to swine:

"The boar out of the wood doth ravage it,

And the wild beasts of the field feed on it" (i.e. on the "vine out of Egypt") (Ps 80:13);

"As a ring of gold in a swine’s snout,

So is a fair woman that is without discretion"

(Pr 11:22);

"The Carmonians (the King James Version Carmanians, perhaps of Kirman or Carmania, in Southwestern Persia) raging in wrath shall go forth as the wild boars of the wood"

(2 Esdras 15:30);

"The dog turning to his own vomit again, and the sow that had washed to wallowing in the mire"

(2Pe 2:22; compare Pr 26:11).

Alfred Ely Day

SWOLLEN

swol’-’-n (pimprasthai, only in Ac 28:6): The Melitans expected to see Paul poisoned by the viper’s bite. the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version translate it "swollen," but the word is used by certain medical writers in the sense of inflammation; see Nicander, Theriaca, 306; Hesiod, Theogonia, 856, expressing thereby the burning up by a thunderbolt. Swelling accompanies the local lesion of snake-bite and often large purpuric exudation of blood, as well as paralysis, especially of the lower limbs.

SWORD

sord.

See ARMOR, III, 5.

SYCAMINE, TREE

sik’-a-min, (sukaminos (Lu 17:6)): This is generally accepted as the black mulberry tree (Morus nigra; Natural Order, Urlicaceae), known in Arabic as tut shrami, "the Damascus mulberry," a fine tree which grows to the height of 30 ft. It produces the dark blood-red mulberry juice referred to in 1 Macc 6:34 (moron), "the blood of .... mulberries," which was shown to the elephants of the Syrians. The white mulberry, M. alba, has white and less juicy fruit, and it is cultivated largely for the sake of its leaves with which the silkworms of the Lebanon are fed.

E. W. G. Masterman

SYCAMORE

sik’-a-mor.

See SYCOMORE.

SYCHAR

si’-kar (Suchar): Mentioned only once, in connection with the visit of Jesus to Jacob’s Well (Joh 4:5). He was passing through Samaria on His way to Galilee, "so he cometh to a city of Samaria, called Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph: and Jacob’s well was there." Jerome thought the name was a clerical error for Sychem (Epistle 86). In Eusebius (in Onomasticon) he is content to translate Eusebius, placing Sychar East of Neapolis. It is now generally admitted that the text is correct. Some have held, however, that Sychar is only another name for Shechem ("Sychem"). It is suggested, e.g., that it is a nickname applied in contempt by the Jews, being either shikkor, "drunken," or sheqer, "falsehood." Others think the form has arisen through change of "m" to "r" in pronunciation; as "l" to "r" in Beliar. These theories may safely be set aside. The evidence that Sychar was a distinct place East of Shechem may be described as overwhelming. It is carefully and perspicuously marshaled by G. A. Smith (Historical Geography of the Holy Land, 367 ff). The manner in which it is mentioned shows that it was not a specially well-known place: "a city of Samaria called Sychar." No one familiar with Palestine would have written "a city of Samaria called Sychem." It is mentioned only because of its nearness to the well.

As to the position of the well, there is general agreement (see JACOB’S WELL). It is on the right of the road where it bends from the plain of Makhneh into the pass of Shechem. Fully half a mile off, on the edge of the plain, is the village of ‘Askar, on the lower slope of Ebal. A little to the West is the traditional tomb of Joseph. This is the district East of Shechem usually identified with Jacob’s "parcel of ground." Many have sought to find Sychar in the modern ‘Askar. There are two difficulties. The first is the initial letter ‘ain in the modern name. But G. A. Smith has shown that such a change as this, although unusual, is not impossible. The second is the presence of the copious spring, ‘Ain ‘Askar, which would make it unnecessary for the villagers to carry water from Jacob’s Well. This cannot easily be explained away. One could understand a special journey at times, if any peculiar value attached to the water in the well; but from it, evidently, the woman drew her ordinary supplies (Joh 4:15). This difficulty would probably in any case be fatal to the claim of the village at ‘Ain ‘Askar to represent the ancient Sychar. But Professor R. S. A. Macalister has shown reason to believe that the village is not older than Arab times (PEFS, 1907, 92 ff). He examined the mound Telul Balata, nearly 1/2 mile Southwest of ‘Askar, and just West of Joseph’s tomb. There he found evidence of occupation from the days of the Hebrew monarchy down to the time of Christ. Here there is no spring; and it is only 1/4 mile distant from Jacob’s Well—nearer therefore to the well than to ‘Askar. In other respects the site is suitable, so that perhaps

here we may locate the Sychar of the Gospel. The name may easily have migrated to ‘Askar when the village fell into decay.

W. Ewing

SYCHEM si’-kem (Suchem): In this form the name of Shechem appears in Ac 7:16 the King James Version, in the report of Stephen’s speech. the King James Version is a transcription from the Greek; the Revised Version (British and American) in accordance with its practice, to give uniformity in the English, follows the Hebrew form of the name given in the Old Testament.

SYCOMORE, TREE

sik’-o-mor, (shiqmah, Aramaic shiqema’ plural shiqmim; in Septuagint wrongly translated by sukaminos, "the mulberry"; see SYCAMINE (1Ki 10:27; 1Ch 27:28; 2Ch 1:15; 9:27; Isa 9:10; Am 7:14): shiqkmoth (Ps 78:47); sukomoraia (Lu 19:4)): The sycomore-fig, Ficus sycomorus (Natural Order, Urticaceae), known in Arabic as Jummeiz, is one of the finest of the lowland trees of Palestine, and attains still greater proportions in Lower Egypt. It is evident from 1Ki 10:27; 2Ch 1:15 that it was once abundant, and at a later period it was so plentiful in the neighborhood of what is now Haifa as to give the name Sykaminon to the town which once stood near there. It is a tree which cannot flourish in the cooler mountain heights; it cannot stand frost (Ps 78:47). It was one of the distinguishing marks of Lower, as contrasted with Upper, Galilee that the sycomore could flourish there. It is highly improbable that sycomores could ever have flourished near Tekoa (compare Am 7:14), but it is quite possible that the town or individual inhabitants may have held lands in the Jordan valley or in the Shephelah on which these trees grew. Villages in Palestine today not infrequently possess estates at considerable distances; the village of Silwan (Siloam), for example, possesses and cultivates extensive fertile lands halfway to the Dead Sea. The sycomore produces small, rounded figs, about an inch long, which grow upon tortuous, leafless twigs springing from the trunk or the older branches; they are more or less tasteless. It would appear that in ancient times some treatment was adopted, such as piercing the apex of the fruit to hasten the ripening. Amos was a "nipper" (bolec) of sycomore figs (Am 7:14). The tree not uncommonly attains a height of 50 ft., with an enormous trunk; in many parts, especially where, as near the coast, the tree grows out of sandy soil, the branching roots stand out of the ground for some distance. The timber is of fair quality and was much valued in ancient times (1Ki 10:27; 2Ch 1:15; 9:27; Isa 9:10). Mummy cases and many of the best preserved wooden utensils of ancient Egyptian life are made of it. This tree must be distinguished from the English sycamore, Acer pseudo-platanus (Natural Order, Spindaceae), the "false plane tree," a kind of maple.

E. W. G. Masterman

SYENE

si-e’-ne.

See SEVENEH.

SYMEON

sim’-e-on (Sumeon): the Revised Version (British and American) in Lu 3:30; Ac 13:1; 15:14 for the King James Version "Simeon" (which see). The persons are:

(1) An ancestor of Jesus (Lu 3:30).

(2) Symeon, called Niger, one of the prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch (Ac 13:1).

(3) For Simon Peter, see PETER; compare Ac 15:14.

See SIMEON, (4), (5), (6).

SYNAGOGUE

sin’-a-gog:

1. Name

2. Origin

3. Spread of Synagogues

4. The Building

(1) The Site

(2) The Structure

(3) The Furniture

5. The Officials

(1) The Elders

(2) The Ruler

(3) The Servant (or Servants)

(4) Delegate of the Congregation

(5) The Interpreter

(6) The Almoners

6. The Service

(1) Recitation of the "Shema‘"

(2) Prayers

(3) Reading of the Law and the Prophets

(4) The Sermon

(5) The Benediction

LITERATURE

1. Name:

Synagogue, Greek sunagoge, "gathering" (Ac 13:43), "gathering-place" (Lu 7:5), was the name applied to the Jewish place of worship in later Judaism in and outside of Palestine Proseuche, "a place of prayer" (Ac 16:13), was probably more of the nature of an enclosure, marking off the sacred spot from the profane foot, than of a roofed building like a synagogue. Sabbateion in Ant, XV, i, 6, 2, most probably also meant synagogue. In the Mishna we find for synagogue beth ha-keneceth, in the Targums and Talmud be-khenishta’, or simply kenishta’. The oldest Christian meetings and meeting-places were modeled on the pattern of the synagogues, and, in Christian-Palestinian Aramaic the word kenishta’ is used for the Christian church (compare Zahn, Tatian’s Diatessaron, 335).

2. Origin:

That the synagogue was, in the time of our Lord, one of the most important religious institutions of the Jews is clear from the fact that it was thought to have been instituted by Moses (Apion, ii, 17; Philo, De Vita Moses, iii.27; compare Targum Jer to Ex 18:20). It must have come into being during the Babylonian exile. At that time the more devout Jews, far from their native land, having no sanctuary or altar, no doubt felt drawn from time to time, especially on Sabbath and feast days, to gather round those who were specially pious and God-fearing, in order to listen to the word of God and engage in some kind of worship. That such meetings were not uncommon is made probable by Eze 14:1; 20:1. This would furnish a basis for the institution of the synagogue. After the exile the synagogue remained and

even developed as a counterpoise to the absolute sacerdotalism of the temple, and must have been felt absolutely necessary for the Jews of the Dispersion. Though at first it was meant only for the exposition of the Law, it was natural that in the course of time prayers and preaching should be added to the service. Thus these meetings, which at first were only held on Sabbaths and feast days, came also to be held on other days, and at the same hours with the services in the temple. The essential aim, however, of the synagogue was not prayer, but instruction in the Law for all classes of the people. Philo calls the synagogues "houses of instruction, where the philosophy of the fathers and all manner of virtues were taught" (compare Mt 4:23; Mr 1:21; 6:2; Lu 4:15,33; 6:6; 13:10; Joh 6:59; 18:20; CAp, ii, 17).

3. Spread of Synagogues:

In Palestine the synagogues were scattered all over the country, all the larger towns having one or more (e.g. Nazareth, Mt 13:54; Capernaum, Mt 12:9). In Jerusalem, in spite of the fact that the Temple was there, there were many synagogues, and all parts of the Diaspora were represented by particular synagogues (Ac 6:9). Also in heathen lands, wherever there was a certain number of Jews, they had their own synagogue: e.g. Damascus (Ac 9:2), Salamis (Ac 13:5), Antioch of Pisidia (Ac 13:14), Thessalonica (Ac 17:1), Corinth (Ac 18:4), Alexandria (Philo, Leg Ad Cai, xx), Rome (ibid., xxiii). The papyrus finds of recent years contain many references to Jewish synagogues in Egypt, from the time of Euergetes (247-221 BC) onward. According to Philo (Quod omnis probus liber sit, xii, et al.) the Essenes had their own synagogues, and, from ‘Abhoth 3 10, it seems that "the people of the land," i.e. the masses, especially in the country, who were far removed from the influence of the scribes, and were even opposed to their narrow interpretation of the Law had their own synagogues.

4. The Building:

(1) The Site.

There is no evidence that in Palestine the synagogues were always required to be built upon high ground, or at least that they should overlook all other houses (compare PEFS, July, 1878, 126), though we read in the Talmud that this was one of the requirements (Tos Meghillah, edition Zunz, 4:227; Shabbath 11a). From Ac 16:13 it does not follow that synagogues were intentionally built outside the city, and near water for the sake of ceremonial washing (compare Monatsschr. fur Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums, 1889, 167-70; HJP II, 370).

(2) The Structure.

Of the style of the architecture we have no positive records. From the description in the Talmud of the synagogue at Alexandria (Toc Cukkah, edition Zunz, 198 20; Cukkah 51b one imagrees the synagogues to have been modeled on the pattern of the temple or of the temple court. From the excavations in Palestine we find that in the building the stone of the country was used. On the lintels of the doors were different forms of ornamentation, e.g. seven-branched candlesticks, an open flower between two paschal lambs, or vine leaves with bunches of grapes, or, as in Capernaum, a pot of manna between two

representations of Aaron’s rod. The inside plan "is generally that of two double colonnades, which seem to have formed the body of the synagogue, the aisles East and West being probably used as passages. The intercolumnar distance is very small, never greater than 9 1/2 ft." (Edersheim). Because of a certain adaptation of the corner columns at the northern end, Edersheim supposes that a woman’s gallery was once erected there. It does not appear, however, from the Old Testament or New Testament or the oldest Jewish tradition that there was any special gallery for women. It should be noted, as against this conclusion, that in De Vita Contemplativa, attributed by some to Philo, a certain passage (sec. iii) seems to imply the existence of such a gallery.

(3) The Furniture.

We only know that there was a movable ark in which the rolls of the Law and the Prophets were kept. It was called ‘aron ha-qodhesh, but chiefly tebhah (Meghillah 3 1; Nedharim 5 5; Ta‘anith 2 1,2), and it stood facing the entrance. According to Ta‘anith 15a it was taken out and carried in a procession on fast days. In front of the ark, and facing the congregation, were the "chief seats" (see CHIEF SEATS) for the rulers of the synagogue and the learned men (Mt 23:6). From Ne 8:4 and 9:4 it appears that the bemah (Jerusalem Meghillah 3 1), a platform from which the Law was read, although it is not mentioned in the New Testament, was of ancient date, and in use in the time of Christ.

5. The Officials:

(1) The Elders.

These officials (Lu 7:3) formed the local tribunal, and in purely Jewish localities acted as a Committee of Management of the affairs of the synagogue (compare Berakhoth 4 7; Nedharim 5 5; Meghillah 3 1). To them belonged, most probably, among other things, the power to excommunicate (compare Ezr 10:8; Lu 6:22; Joh 9:22; 12:42; 16:2; ‘Edhuyoth 5 6; Ta‘anith 3 8; Middoth 2 2).

(2) The Ruler.

Greek archisunagogos (Mr 5:35; Lu 8:41,49; 13:14; Ac 18:8,17), Hebrew ro’sh ha-keneseth (Sotah 7 7,8). In some synagogues there were several rulers (Mr 5:22; Ac 13:15). They were most probably chosen from among the elders. It was the ruler’s business to control the synagogue services, as for instance to decide who was to be called upon to read from the Law and the Prophets (Yoma’ 7 1) and to preach (Ac 13:15; compare Lu 13:14); he had to look after the discussions, and generally to keep order.

(3) The Servant (or Servants).

Greek huperetes; Talmud chazzan (Lu 4:20; Yoma’ 7 1; Sotah 7 7,8). He had to see to the lighting of the synagogue and to keep the building clean. He it was who wielded the scourge when punishment had to be meted out to anyone in the synagogue (Mt 10:17; 23:34; Mr 13:9; Ac 22:19; compare Makkoth 16). From Shabbath 1 3 it seems that the chazzan was also an elementary teacher.

See EDUCATION.

(4) Delegate of the Congregation.

Hebrew sheliach tsibbur (Ro'sh ha-shanah 4 9; Berakhoth 5 5). This office was not permanent, but one was chosen at each meeting by the ruler to fill it, and he conducted the prayers. According to Meghillah 4 5, he who was asked to read the Scriptures was also expected to read the prayers. He had to be a man of good character.

(5) The Interpreter.

Hebrew methargeman. It was his duty to translate into Aramaic the passages of the Law and the Prophets which were read in Hebrew (Meghillah 3 3; compare 1Co 14:28). This also was probably not a permanent office, but was filled at each meeting by one chosen by the ruler.

(6) The Almoners.

(Dema'i 3 1; Kiddushin 4 5). Alms for the poor were collected in the synagogue (compare Mt 6:2). According to Pe'ah 8 7, the collecting was to be done by at least two persons, and the distributing by at least three.

6. The Service:

(1) Recitation of the "Shema'".

At least ten persons bad to be present for regular worship (Meghillah 4 3; Sanhedhrin 1 6). There were special services on Saturdays and feast days. In order to keep the synagogue services uniform with those of the temple, both were held at the same hours. The order of service was as follows: the recitation of the shema', i.e. a confession of God's unity, consisting of the passages De 6:4-9; 11:13-21; . Nu 15:37-41 (Berakhoth 2 2; Tamidh 5 1). Before and after the recitation of these passages "blessings" were said in connection with the passages (Berakhoth 1 4). This formed a very important part of the liturgy. It was believed to have been ordered by Moses (compare Ant, IV, viii, 13).

(2) Prayers.

The most important prayers were the Shemoneh 'esreh, "Eighteen Eulogies," a cycle of eighteen prayers, also called "The Prayer" (Berakhoth 4 3; Ta'anith 2 2). Like the shema' they are very old.

The following is the first of the eighteen: "Blessed art Thou, the Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: the great, the mighty and the terrible God, the most high God Who showest mercy and kindness, Who createst all things, Who

rememberest the pious deeds of the patriarchs, and wilt in love bring a redeemer to their children's children for Thy Name's sake; O King, Helper, Saviour and Shield! Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Shield of Abraham."

The prayers of the delegate were met with a response of Amen from the congregation.

(3) Reading of the Law and the Prophets.

After prayers the parashah, i.e. the pericope from the Law for that Sabbath, was read, and the interpreter translated verse by verse into Aramaic (Meghillah 3 3). The whole Pentateuch was divided into 154 pericopes, so that in the course of 3 years it was read through in order. After the reading of the Law came the HaphTarah, the pericope from the Prophets for that Sabbath, which the interpreter did not necessarily translate verse by verse, but in paragraphs of 3 verses (Meghillah, loc. cit.).

(4) The Sermon.

After the reading from the Law and the Prophets followed the sermon, which was originally a caustical exposition of the Law, but which in process of time assumed a more devotional character. Anyone in the congregation might be asked by the ruler to preach, or might ask the ruler for permission to preach.

The following example of an old (lst century AD) rabbinic sermon, based on the words, "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation" (Isa 61:10, a verse in the chapter from which Jesus took His text when addressing the synagogue of Nazareth), will serve as an illustration of contemporary Jewish preaching:

"Seven garments the Holy One—blessed be He!—has put on, and will put on from the time the world was created until the hour when He will punish the wicked Edom (i.e. Roman empire). When He created the world, He clothed Himself in honor and majesty, as it is said (Ps 104:1): 'Thou art clothed in honor and majesty.' Whenever He forgave the sins of Israel, He clothed Himself in white, for we read (Da 7:9): 'His raiment was white as snow.' When He punishes the peoples of the world, He puts on the garments of vengeance, as it is said (Isa 59:17): 'He put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and was clad with zeal as a cloke.' The sixth garment He will put on when the Messiah comes; then He will clothe Himself in a garment of righteousness, for it is said (same place) :'He put on righteousness as a breast-plate, and an helmet of salvation upon His head.' The seventh garment He will put on when He punishes Edom; then He will clothe Himself in 'adhom, i.e. 'red,' for it is said (Isa 63:2): 'Wherefore art Thou red in Thine apparel?' But the garment which He will put upon the Messiah, this will shine afar, from one end of the earth to the other, for it is said (Isa 61:10): 'As a bridegroom decketh himself with a garland.' And the Israelites will partake of His light, and will say:

'Blessed is the hour when the Messiah shall come!

Blessed the womb out of which He shall come!

Blessed His contemporaries who are eye-witnesses!

Blessed the eye that is honored with a sight of Him!

For the opening of His lips is blessing and peace;

His speech is a moving of the spirits;

The thoughts of His heart are confidence and cheerful-ness;

The speech of His tongue is pardon and forgiveness;

His prayer is the sweet incense of offerings;

His petitions are holiness and purity.

O how blessed is Israel, for whom such has been prepared!

For it is said (Ps 31:19): "How great is Thy goodness, which thou hast laid up for them that fear thee" ‘ "

(Pesiqta’, edition Buber).

(5) The Benediction.

After the sermon the benediction was pronounced (by a priest), and the congregation answered Amen (Berakhoth 5 4; Sotah 7 2,3).

LITERATURE.

L. Zunz, Die gottesdienstlichen Vortrage der Juden, 2nd edition; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, III, 129-37, 183-226; Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch., 2d edition, 73-80; HJP, II, 357-86; GJV4, II; 497-544; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 5th edition, I, 431-50; Oesterly and Box, "The Religion and Worship of the Synagogue," Church and Synagogue, IX, number 2, April, 1907, p. 46; W. Bacher, article "Synagogue" in HDB; Strack, article "Synagogen," in RE, 3rd edition, XIX.

Paul Levertoff

SYNAGOGUE OF LIBERTINES

See LIBERTINES.

SYNAGOGUE OF SATAN

See SATAN, SYNAGOGUE OF.

SYNAGOGUE, THE GREAT

A college or assembly of learned men, originating with Ezra, to whom Jewish tradition assigns an important share in the formation of the Old Testament Canon, and many legal enactments (see CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). One of its latest members is said to have been Simon the Just (circa 200 BC). The oldest notice of the Great Synagogue is in the tract of the Mishna, Pirqe ‘Abhoth (circa 200 AD); this is supplemented by an often-quoted, passage in another tract of the Mishna, Babha’ Bathra’ (14b), on the Canon, and by later traditions. It tells against the reliabe of these traditions that they are late, and are mixed up with much that is self-evidently unhistorical, while no corroboration is found in Ezra or Nehemiah, in the Apocrypha, or in Josephus. On this account, since the exhaustive discussion by Kuenen on the subject (Over de Mannen der Groote Synagoge), most scholars have been disposed to throw over the tradition altogether, regarding it as a distorted remembrance of the great convocation described in Ne 8-10 (so W. R. Smith, Driver, etc.; compare article by Selbie in HDB in support of total rejection). This probably is an excess of skepticism. The convocation in Nehemiah has no points of resemblance to the kind of assembly recalled in this tradition; and while fantastic details may be unreal, it is difficult to believe that declarations so circumstantial and definite have no foundation at all in actual history. The direct connection with Ezra may be discounted, though possibly—indeed it is likely—somebody associated with Ezra in his undeniable labors on the Canon may have furnished the germ from which the institution in question was developed (see the careful discussion in C. H. H. Wright, Ec 1-10, and Excursus III, "The Men of the Great Synagogue").

For the rabbinical quotations and further important details, see C. Taylor’s Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, 11 f and 110 f.

James Orr

SYNOPTIC; GOSPELS

si-nop’-tik,

See GOSPELS, THE SYNOPTIC.

SYNTYCHE

sin’-ti-ke (Suntuche, literally, "fortunate" (Php 4:2)): A Christian woman in the church at Philippi; She and Euodia, who had some quarrel or cause of difference between them, are mentioned by name by

Paul, and are besought separately: "I beseech Euodia, and I beseech Syntyche" (the King James Version) to be reconciled to one another, to be "of the same mind in the Lord." The apostle also entreats an unnamed Christian at Philippi, whom he terms "true yokefellow," to "help these women, for they labored with me in the gospel." What he means is that he asks the true yokefellow to help Euodia and Syntyche, each of whom had labored with Paul.

This refers to the visit which he, in company with Silas and Luke and Timothy, paid to Philippi (Ac 16:12), and which resulted in the gospel being introduced to that city and the church being formed there. Euodia and Syntyche had been among the first converts and had proved helpful in carrying on the work. The word used for "labored" signifies "they joined with me in my struggle," and probably refers to something more than ordinary labor, for those were critical times of danger and suffering, which the apostle and his companions and fellow-workers then encountered at Philippi.

That workers so enthusiastic and so honored should have quarreled, was very sad. Paul, therefore, entreats them to be reconciled. Doubtless his request was given heed to, especially in view of his promised visit to Philippi.

See EUODIA; YOKE-FELLOW.

John Rutherfurd

SYNZYGUS

sin’-zi-gus (sunzuge): In Php 4:3 it is rendered "yokefellow." WHm (Sunzuge), Thayer, Lex. New Testament, 594 (Suzuge), and others, take it as a proper name in this passage.view of his promised visit to Philippi.

See YOKE-FELLOW.

SYRACUSE

sir’-a-kus, sir-a-kus’ (Surakousai; Latin Syracusae, Ital. Siracusa): Situated on the east coast of Sicily, about midway between Catania and the southeastern extremity of the island.

The design of the present work scarcely permits more than a passing allusion to Syracuse, the most brilliant Greek colony on the shores of the Western Mediterranean, where Paul halted three days, on his way from Melita to Rome (Ac 28:12). The original Corinthian colony rounded in 734 BC (Thucydides vi.3) was confined to the islet Ortygia, which separates the Great Harbor from the sea. Later the city spread over the promontory lying northward of Ortygia and the harbor.

Syracuse assumed a pre-eminent position in the affairs of Sicily under the rule of the tyrants Gelon (485-

478 BC; compare Herodotus vii.154-55) and Hieron (478-467 BC). It nourisher greatly after the establishment of popular government in 466 BC (Diodorus xi.68-72). The Syracusans successfully withstood the famous siege by the Athenians in 414 BC, the narrative of which is the most thrilling part of the work of Thucydides (vi, vii).

Dionysius took advantage of the fear inspired by the Carthaginians to elevate himself to despotic power in 405 BC, and he was followed, after a reign of 38 years, by his son of the same name. Although democratic government was restored by Timoleon after a period of civil dissensions in 344 BC (Plutarch, Timoleon), popular rule was not of long duration.

The most famous of the later rulers was the wise Hieron (275-216 BC), who was the steady ally of the Romans. His grandson and successor Hieronymus deserted the alliance of Rome for that of Carthage, which led to the celebrated siege of the city by the Romans under Marcellus and its fall in 212 (Livy xxiv.21-33). Henceforth Syracuse was the capital of the Roman province of Sicily. Cicero calls it "the greatest of Greek cities and the most beautiful of all cities" (Cicero Verr. iv.52). George H. Allen

SYRIA (1)

sir’-i-a (Suria (Mt 4:24; Lu 2:2)):

1. Name and Its Origin

2. Other Designations

3. Physical

(1) The Maritime Plain

(2) First MoUntain Belt

(3) Second Mountain Belt

(4) Great Central Valley

(5) The Eastern Belt

(6) Rivers

(7) Nature of Soil

(8) Flora

(9) Fauna

(10) Minerals

(11) Central Position

4. History

(1) Canaanitic Semites

(2) Sargon of Agade

(3) Babylonian Supremacy

(4) Hittite and Aramean

(5) Hittites and Egyptians

(6) Amarna Period

(7) Rameses II

(8) Philistines

(9) Tiglath-pileser I

(10) Aramean States

(11) Peaceful Development

(12) Shalmaneser II

(13) Tiglath-pileser III

(14) Shalmaneser IV and Sargon

(15) Pharaoh-necoh and Nebuchadnezzar

1. Name and Its Origin:

The name does not occur in the Massoretic Text nor the Peshitta of the Old Testament, but is found in the Septuagint, in the Peshitta of the New Testament and in the Mishna In the Septuagint it represents "Aram" in all its combinations, as Aram-zobah, etc. The name itself first appears in Herodotus vii.63, where he says that "Syrians" and "Assyrians" were the Greek and barbarian designations of the same people. Otherwise he is quite vague in his use of the term. Xenophon is clearer when he (Anab; vii.8, 25) distinguishes between Syria and Phoenicia. Syria is undoubtedly an extension of the name "Suri" the ancient Babylonian designation of a district in North Mesopotamia, but later embracing regions beyond the Euphrates to the North and West, as far as the Taurus. Under the Seleucids, Syria was regarded as coextensive with their kingdom, and the name shrank with its dimensions. Strabo, Pliny and Ptolemy give its boundaries as the Taurus Mountains, the Euphrates, the Syro-Arabian desert and the Mediterranean, and the territory within these limits is still politically designated Syria, though popularly Palestine is generally named separately.

2. Other Designations:

Homer (Iliad ii.785) and Hesiod (Theog. 304) call the inhabitants of the district "Arimoi," with which compare the cuneiform "Arimu" or "Aramu" for Arameans. The earliest Assyrian name was "Martu," which Hommel regards as a contraction of "Amartu," the land of the "Amurru" or Amorites. In Egyptian records the country is named "Ruten" or "Luten," and divided into "Lower" and "Upper," the former denoting Palestine and the latter Syria proper.

3. Physical:

(1) The Maritime Plain.

Syria, within the boundaries given, consists of a series of belts of low and high land running North and South, parallel to the Mediterranean. The first of these is the maritime plain. It consists of a broad strip of sand dunes covered by short grass and low bushes, followed by a series of low undulating hills and wide valleys which gradually rise to a height of about 500 ft. This belt begins in North Syria with the narrow Plain of Issus, which extends to a few miles South of Alxandretta, but farther South almost disappears, being represented only by the broader valleys and the smaller plains occupied by such towns as Latakia, Tripolis and Beirut. South of the last named the maritime belt is continuous, being interrupted only where the Ladder of Tyre and Mt. Carmel descend abruptly into the sea. In the Plain of Akka it has a breadth of 8 miles, and from Carmel southward it again broadens out, till beyond Caesarea it has an average of 10 miles. Within the sand dunes the soil is a rich alluvium and readily yields to cultivation. In ancient times it was covered with palm trees, which, being thence introduced into Greece, were from their place of origin named phoinikes.

(2) First Mountain Belt.

From the maritime plain we rise to the first mountain belt. It begins with the Amanus, a branch of the Taurus in the North. Under that name it ceases with the Orontes valley, but is continued in the

Nuseiriyeh range (Mt. Cassius, 5,750 ft.), till the Eleutherus valley is reached, and thence rising again in Lebanon (average 5,000 ft.), Jebel Sunnin (8,780 ft.), it continues to the Leontes or Quasmiyeh. The range then breaks down into the rounded hills of Upper Galilee (3,500 ft.), extends through the table-land of Western Palestine (2,500 ft.), and in the South of Judea broadens out into the arid Badiet et-Tih or Wilderness of Wandering.

(3) Second Mountain Belt.

Along with this may be considered the parallel mountain range. Beginning in the neighborhood of Riblah, the chain of anti-Lebanon extends southward to Hermon (9,200 ft.), and thence stretches out into the plateau of the Jaulan and Hauran, where we meet with the truncated cones of extinct volcanoes and great sheets of basaltic lava, especially in el-Leja and Jebel ed-Druz. The same table-land continues southward, with deep ravines piercing its sides, over Gilead, Moab and Edom.

(4) Great Central Valley.

Between Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon lies the great valley of Coele-Syria. It is continued northward along the Orontes and thence stretches away eastward to the Euphrates, while southward it merges into the valleys of the Jordan and the Arabah. From the sources of the Orontes and Leontes at Baalbek (4,000 ft.) it falls away gently to the North; but to the South the descent is rapid. In Merj ‘Ayun it has sunk to 1,800 ft., at Lake Huleh it is over 7 ft., at the Lake of Tiberias—682 ft., and at the Dead Sea—1,292 ft., and thence it rises again to the Gulf of Akabah. This great valley was caused by a line of fault or fracture of the earth’s crust, with parallel and branching faults. In ancient times the whole valley formed an arm of the sea, and till the Glacial period at the end of the Tertiary (Pleistocene) Age, a lake extended along the whole Jordan valley as far as the Huleh. We can thus understand that the great plain and adjoining valleys consist mainly of alluvial deposits with terraces of gravel and sand on the enclosing slopes.

See LEBANON; NATURAL FEATURES; PALESTINE; PHOENICIA.

(5) The Eastern Belt.

To the East of the Anti-Lebanon belt there is a narrow stretch of cultivated land which in some places attains a breadth of several miles, but this is always determined by the distance to which the eastern streams from Anti-Lebanon flow. Around Damascus the Abana (Barada) and neighboring streams have made the district an earthly paradise, but they soon lose themselves in the salt marshes about 10 miles East of the city. Elsewhere the fruitful strip gradually falls away into the sands and rocks of the Syrian desert, barren alike of vegetable and animal life.

(6) Rivers.

The mountain ranges determine the course of the rivers and their length. The streams flowing westward are naturally short and little more than summer torrents. Those flowing to the desert are of the same

character, the only one of importance being the Abana, to which Damascus owes its existence. Only the great central valley permits the formation of larger rivers, and there we find the Orontes and Leontes rising within a few feet of each other beside Baalbek, and draining Coele-Syria to the North and South, till breaking through the mountains they reach the sea. The Jordan is the only other stream of any size. In ancient, as also in modern times, the direction of these streams determined the direction of the great trade route from Mesopotamia to Egypt through Coele-Syria and across pal, as also the position of the larger towns, but, not being themselves navigable, they did not form a means of internal communication.

(7) Nature of Soil.

The variation in altitude both above and below the sea-level is naturally conducive to a great variety of climate, while the nature of the disintegrating rocks and the alluvial soil render great productivity possible. Both of the mountain belts in their whole length consist chiefly of cretaceous limestone, mixed with friable limestone with basaltic intrusions and volcanic products. The limestone is highly porous, and during the rainy season absorbs the moisture which forms reservoirs and feeds the numerous springs on both the eastern and western slopes. The rocks too are soft and penetrable and can easily be turned into orchard land, a fact that explains how much that now appears as barren wastes was productive in ancient times as gardens and fruitful fields (Bab Talmud, Megh. 6a).

(8) Flora.

The western valleys and the maritime plain have the flora of the Mediterranean, but the eastern slopes and the valleys facing the desert are poorer. On the southern coasts and in the deeper valleys the vegetation is tropical, and there we meet with the date-palm, the sugar-cane and the sycomore. Up to 1,600 ft., the products include the carob and the pine, after which the vine, the fig and the olive are met with amid great plantations of dwarf oak, till after 3,000 ft. is reached, then cypresses and cedars till the height of 6,200 ft., after which only Alpine plants are found. The once renowned "cedars of Lebanon" now exist only in the Qadisha and Baruk valleys. The walnut and mulberry are plentiful everywhere, and wheat, corn, barley, maize and lentils are widely cultivated. Pasture lands are to be found in the valleys and plains, and even during the dry season sheep, goats and cattle can glean sufficient pasturage among the low brushwood.

(9) Fauna.

The animal world is almost as varied. The fox, jackal, hyena, bear, wolf and hog are met nearly everywhere, and small tigers are sometimes seen (compare 2Ki 14:9). The eagle, vulture, partridge and blue pigeon are plentiful, and gay birds chirp everywhere. The fish in the Jordan and its lakes are peculiar and interesting. There are in all 22 varieties, the largest being a kind of perch, the coracinus, which is known elsewhere also in the Nile (Josephus, Ant, III, x, 8), and a peculiar old-world variety locally named ‘Abu-musht.

(10) Minerals.

In both the eastern and the western mountain belts there are abundant supplies of mineral wealth. They consist chiefly of coal, iron, bitumen, asphalt and mineral oil, but they are mostly unworked. In the Jordan valley all the springs below the level of the Mediterranean are brackish, and many of them are also hot and sulfurous, the best known being those Tiberias.

(11) Central Position.

The country, being in virtue of its geographical configuration separated into small isolated districts, naturally tended to break up into a series of petty independent states. Still the central position between the Mesopotamian empires on the one hand and Egypt and Arabia on the other made it the highway through which the trade of the ancient world passed, gave it an importance far in excess of its size or productivity, and made it a subject of contention whenever East and West were ruled by different powers.

4. History:

(1) Canaanitic Semites.

When history begins for us in the 3rd millennium BC, Syria was already occupied by a Semitic population belonging to the Canaanitic wave of immigration, i.e. such as spoke dialects akin to Hebrew or Phoenician. The Semites had been already settled for a considerable time, for a millennium earlier in Egypt we find Semitic names for Syrian articles of commerce as well as Semites depicted on the Egyptian monuments.

(2) Sargon of Agade.

Omitting as doubtful references to earlier relations between Babylonia and Syria, we may consider ourselves on solid ground in accepting the statements of the Omen Tablets which tell us that Sargon of Agade (2750 BC) four times visited the land of Martu and made the peoples of one accord. His son Naram-sin, while extending the empire in other directions maintained his authority here also. Commercial relations were continued, and Babylonia claimed at least a supremacy over Martu, and at times made it effective.

(3) Babylonian Supremacy.

Hammurabi and also his great-grandson Ammisatana designate themselves in inscriptions as kings of Martu, and it is very likely that other kings maintained the traditional limits of the empire. The long-continued supremacy of Babylon not only made itself felt in imposing place-names, but it made Assyrian the language of diplomacy, even between Syria and Egypt, as we see in the Tell el-Amarna Letters.

(4) Hittite and Aramean.

By the middle of the 2nd millennium BC we find considerable change in the population. The Mitanni, a Hittite people, the remains of whose language are to be found in the still undeciphered inscriptions at Carchemish, Marash, Aleppo and Hamath, are now masters of North Syria.

See HITTITES.

The great discoveries of Dr. H. Winckler at Boghazkeui have furnished a most important contribution to our knowledge. The preliminary account may be found in OLZ, December 15, 1906, and the Mitteilungen der deutschen orient. Gesellschaft, number 35, December, 1907.

Elsewhere the Aramean wave has become the predominant Semitic element of population, the Canaanitic now occupying the coast towns (Phoenicians) and the Canaan of the Old Testament.

(5) Hittites and Egyptians.

At this time Babylonia was subject to the Kassites, an alien race of kings, and when they fell, about 1100 BC, they gave place to a number of dynasties of short duration. This gave the Egyptians, freed from the Hyksos rule, the opportunity to lay claim to Syria, and accordingly we find the struggle to be between the Hittites and the Egyptians. Thothmes I, about 1600 BCa overran Syria as far as the Euphrates and brought the country into subjection. Thothmes III did the same, and he has left us on the walls of Karnak an account of his campaigns and a list of the towns he conquered.

(6) Amarna Period.

In the reign of Thothmes IV the Hittites began to leave their mountains more and more and to press forward into Central Syria. The Tell el-Amarna Letters show them to be the most serious opponents to the Egyptian authority in Syria and Palestine during the reign of Amenhotep IV (circa 1380 BC), and before Seti I came to the throne the power of the Pharaohs had greatly diminished in Syria. Then the Egyptian sphere only reached to Carmel, while a neutral zone extended thence to Kadesh, northward of which all belonged to the Hitites.

(7) Rameses II.

Rameses II entered energetically into the war against Hatesar, king of the Hittites, and fought a battle near Kadesh. He claims a great victory, but the only result seems to have been that his authority was further extended into the neutral territory, and the sphere of Egyptian influence extended across Syria from the Lycus (Dog River) to the South of Damascus. The arrangement was confirmed by a treaty in which North Syria was formally recognized as the Hittite sphere of influence, and, on the part of the Assyrians who were soon to become the heirs of the Hittite pretensions, this treaty formed the basis of a claim against Egypt. About the year 1200 BC the Hittites, weakened by this war, were further

encroached upon by the movements of northern races, and the empire broke up into a number of small separate independent states.

(8) Philistines.

Among the moving races that helped to weaken and break up the Hittite influence in Syria were the Pulusati (or Purusati), a people whose origin is not yet definitely settled. They entered Syria from the North and overcame all who met them, after which they encamped within the Egyptian sphere of influence. Rameses III marched against them, and he claims a great victory. Later, however, we find them settled in Southeastern Palestine under the name of Philistines. Their settlement at that time is in harmony with the Tell el-Amarna Letters in which we find no trace of them, while in the 11th century BC they are there as the inveterate foes of Israel.

(9) Tiglath-pileser I.

Assyria was now slowly rising into power, but it had to settle with Babylon before it could do much in the West. Tiglath-pieser I, however, crossed the Euphrates, defeated the Hittite king of Carchemish, advanced to the coast of Arvad, hunted wild bulls in Lebanon and received gifts from the Pharaoh, who thus recognized him as the successor of the Hittites in North Syria.

(10) Aramean States.

When the Hittite empire broke up, the Arameans in Central Syria, now liberated, set up a number of separate Aramean states, which engaged in war with one another, except when they had to combine against a common enemy. Such states were established in Hamath, Hadrach, Zobah and Rehob. The exact position of Hadrach is still unknown, but Hamath was evidently met on its southern border by Rehob and Zobah, the former extending along the Biqa’a to the foot of Hermon, while the latter stretched ~along the eastern slopes of Anti-Lebanon and included Damascus, till Rezon broke away and there set up an independent kingdom, which soon rose to be the leading state; Southeast of Hermon were the two smaller Aramean states of Geshur and Maacah.

(11) Peaceful Development.

For nearly three centuries now, Syria and Palestine were, except on rare occasions, left in peace by both Mesopotamia and Egypt. In the 12th century BC Babylonia was wasted by the Elamite invasion, and thereafter a prolonged war was carried on between Assyria and Babylonia, and although a lengthened period of peace succeeded, it was wisely used by the peaceful rulers of Assyria for the strengthening of their kingdom internally. In Egypt the successors of Rameses III were engaged against the aggressive Theban hierarchy. During the XXIst Dynasty the throne was usurped by the high priests of Amen, while the XXIId were Lybian usurpers, and the three following dynasties Ethiopian conquerors.

(12) Shalmaneser II.

In the 9th century Asshur-nazirpal crossed the Euphrates and overran the recently established state of Patin in the Plain of Antioch. He besieged its capital and planted a colony in its territory, but the arrangement was not final, for his successor, Shalmaneser II, had again to invade the territory and break up the kingdom into a number of small principalities. Then in 854 BC he advanced into Central Syria, but was met at Karkar by a strong confederacy consisting of Ben-hadad of Damascus and his Syrian allies including Ahab of Israel. He claims a victory, but made no advance for 5 years. He then made three unsuccessful expeditions against Damascus, but in 842 received tribute from Tyre, Sidon and Jehu of Israel, as recorded and depicted on the Black Obelisk. It was not till the year 797 that Ramman-nirari, after subduing the coast of Phoenicia, was able to reduce Mari'a of Damascus to obedience at which time also he seems to have carried his conquests through Eastern Palestine as far as Edom. The Assyrian power now suffered a period of decline, during which risings took place at Hadrach and Damascus, and Jeroboam II of Israel was able (2Ki 14:25) to extend his boundaries northward to the old limits.

(13) Tiglath-pileser III.

It thus happened that Tiglath-pileser III (745-728) had to reconquer the whole of Syria. He captured Arpad after two years' warfare (742-740). Then he divided the territory of Hamath among his generals. At this juncture Ahaz of Judah implored his aid against Rezin of Damascus and Remaliah of Israel. Ahaz was relieved, but was made subject to Assyria. Damascus fell in 732 BC and a Great Court was held there, which the tributary princes of Syria, including Ahaz (2Ki 16:10), attended. The Assyrian empire now possessed the whole of Syria as far as the River of Egypt. Sibahe, however, encouraged revolt in what had been the Egyptian sphere of infiuence and insurrections took place in Phoenicia and Samaria.

(14) Shalmaneser IV and Sargon.

After some difficulty Shalmaneser IV compelled Tyre and Sidon to submit and to pay tribute. Samaria, too, was besieged, but was not taken till Sargon came to the throne in 722. Hamath and Carchemish again rose, but were finally reduced in 720 and 717 respectively. Again in 711 Sargon overran Palestine and broke up a fresh confederacy consisting of Egypt, Moab, Edom, Judah and the Philistines. In 705 the Egyptians under Sibahe and their allies the Philistines under Hanun of Gaza were defeated at Raphia.

The last three rulers of Assyria were in constant difficulties with Babylonia and a great part of the empire was also overrun by the Scythians (circa 626 BC), and so nothing further was done in the West save the annexation of the mainland possessions of Phoenicia.

(15) Pharaoh-necoh and Nebuchadnezzar.

In 609 when Assyria was in the death grapple with Babylonia, Pharaoh-necoh took advantage of the situation, invaded Syria, and, defeating Josiah en route, marched to Carchemish. In 605, however, he was there completely defeated by Nebuchadnezzar, and the whole of Syria became tributary to

Babylonia. the former Syrian states now appear as Babylonian provinces, and revolts in Judah reduced it also to that position in 586 BC.

Under Persian rule these provinces remained as they were for a time, but ultimately "Ebir nari" or Syria was formed into a satrapy. The Greek conquest with the Ptolemies in Egypt and the Seleucids in Babylon brought back some of the old rivalry between East and West, and the same unsettled conditions. On the advent of Rome, Syria was separated from Babylonia and made into a province with Antioch as its capital, and then the Semitic civilization which had continued practically untouched till the beginning of the Christian era was brought more and more into contact with the West. With the advent of Islam, Syria fell into Arab hands and Damascus became for a short time (661-750 AD) the capital of the new empire, but the central authority was soon removed to Babylonia. Thenceforward Syria sank to the level of a province of the caliphate, first Abbasside (750-1258), then Fatimite (1258-1517), and finally Ottoman.

W. M. Christie

SYRIA (2)

sir’-i-ak: In Da 2:4, for the King James Version "Syriack" the Revised Version (British and American) has "Syrian," and in the margin "Or, ‘in Aramaic.’"

See ARAMAIC LANGUAGE; LANGUAGES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

SYRIA-MAACHAH

sir’-i-a-ma’a-ka.

See MAACAH; SYRIA.

SYRIAC VERSIONS

1. Analogy of Latin Vulgate

2. The Designation "Peshito" ("Peshitta")

3. Syriac Old Testament

4. Syriac New Testament

5. Old Syriac Texts

(1) Curetonian

(2) Tatian’s Diatessaron

(3) Sinaitic Syriac

(4) Relation to Peshito

6. Probable Origin of Peshito

7. History of Peshito

8. Other Translations

(1) The Philoxenian

(2) The Harclean

(3) The Jerusalem Syriac

LITERATURE

As in the account of the Latin versions it was convenient to start from Jerome’s Vulgate, so the Syriac versions may be usefully approached from the Peshitta, which is the Syriac Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

1. Analogy of Latin Vulgate:

Not that we have any such full and clear knowledge of the circumstances under which the Peshitta was produced and came into circulation. Whereas the authorship of the Latin Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has never been in dispute, almost every assertion regarding the authorship of the Peshitta, and the time and place of its origin, is subject to question. The chief ground of analogy between the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the Peshitta is that both came into existence as the result of a revision. This, indeed, has been strenuously denied, but since Dr. Hort in his Introduction to Westcott and Hort’s New Testament in the Original Greek, following Griesbach and Hug at the beginning of the last century, maintained this view, it has gained many adherents. So far as the Gospels and other New Testament books are concerned, there is evidence in favor of this view which has been added to by recent discoveries; and fresh investigation in the field of Syriac scholarship has raised it to a high degree of probability. The very designation. "Peshito," has given rise to dispute. It has been applied to the Syriac as the version in common use, and regarded as equivalent to the Greek (koine) and the Latin Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.)

2. The Designation "Peshito" ("Peshitta"):

The word itself is a feminine form (peshiTetha’), meaning "simple," "easy to be understood." It seems to have been used to distinguish the version from others which are encumbered, with marks and signs in the nature of an apparatus criticus. However this may. be, the term as a designation of the version has not been found in any Syriac author earlier than the 9th or 10th century.

As regards the Old Testament, the antiquity of the Version is admitted on all hands. The tradition, however, that part of it was translated from Hebrew into Syriac for the benefit of Hiram in the days of Solomon is a myth. That a translation was made by a priest named Assa, or Ezra, whom the king of Assyria sent to Samaria, to instruct the Assyrian colonists mentioned in 2Ki 17, is equally legendary. That the tr of the Old Testament and New Testament was made in connection with the visit of Thaddaeus to Abgar at Edessa belongs also to unreliable tradition. Mark has even been credited in ancient Syriac tradition with translating his own Gospel (written in Latin, according to this account) and the other books of the New Testament into Syriac

3. Syriac Old Testament:

But what Theodore of Mopsuestia says of the Old Testament is true of both: "These Scriptures were translated into the tongue of the Syrians by someone indeed at some time, but who on earth this was has not been made known down to our day" (Nestle in HDB, IV, 645b). Professor Burkitt has made it probable that the translation of the Old Testament was the work of Jews, of whom there was a colony in Edessa about the commencement of the Christian era (Early Eastern Christianity, 71 ff). The older view was that the translators were Christians, and that the work was done late in the 1st century or early in the 2nd. The Old Testament known to the early Syrian church was substantially that of the Palestinian Jews. It contained the same number of books but it arranged them in a different order. First there was the Pentateuch, then Job, Joshua, Judgess, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Ruth, Canticles, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah followed by the Twelve Minor Prophets, Jeremiah and Lamentations, Ezekiel, and lastly Daniel. Most of the apocryphal books of the Old Testament are found in the Syriac, and the Book of Sirach is held to have been translated from the Hebrew and not from the Septuagint.

4. Syriac New Testament:

Of the New Testament, attempts at translation must have been made very early, and among the ancient versions of New Testament Scripture the Syriac in all likelihood is the earliest. It was at Antioch, the capital of Syria, that the disciples of Christ were first called Christians, and it seemed natural that the first translation of the Christian Scriptures should have been made there. The tendency of recent research, however, goes to show that Edessa, the literary capital, was more likely the place.

If we could accept the somewhat obscure statement of Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, IV, xxii) that Hegesippus "made some quotations from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and from the Syriac

Gospel," we should have a reference to a Syriac New Testament as early as 160-80 AD, the time of that Hebrew Christian writer. One thing is certain, that the earliest New Testament of the Syriac church lacked not only the Antilegomena—2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude, and Revelation—but the whole of the Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse. These were at a later date translated and received into the Syriac Canon of the New Testament, but the quotations of the early Syrian Fathers take no notice of these New Testament books.

From the 5th century, however, the Peshitta containing both Old Testament and New Testament has been used in its present form only as the national version of the Syriac Scriptures. The translation of the New Testament is careful, faithful and literal, and the simplicity, directness and transparency of the style are admired by all Syriac scholars and have earned for it the title of "Queen of the versions."

5. Old Syriac Texts:

It is in the Gospels, however, that the analogy between the Latin Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the Syriac Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) can be established by evidence. If the Peshitta is the result of a revision as the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) was, then we may expect to find Old Syriac texts answering to the Old Latin. Such texts have actually been found. Three such texts have been recovered, all showing divergences from the Peshitta, and believed by competent scholars to be anterior to it. These are, to take them in the order of their recovery in modern times, (1) the Curetonian Syriac, (2) the Syriac of Tatian’s Diatessaron, and (3) the Sinaitic Syriac.

(1) Curetonian.

The Curetonian consists of fragments of the Gospels brought in 1842 from the Nitrian Desert in Egypt, and now in the British Museum. The fragments were examined by Canon Cureton of Westminster and edited by him in 1858. The manuscript from which the fragments have come appears to belong to the 5th century, but scholars believe the text itself to be as old as the 2nd century. In this recension the Gospel according to Matthew has the title Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, which will be explained in the next section.

(2) Tatian’s "Diatessaron."

The Diatessaron of Tatian is the work which Eusebius ascribes to that heretic, calling it that "combination and collection of the Gospels, I know not how, to which he gave the title Diatessaron." It is the earliest harmony of the Four Gospels known to us. Its existence is amply attested in the church of Syria, but it had disappeared for centuries, and not a single copy of the Syriac work survives.

A commentary upon it by Ephraem the Syrian, surviving in an Armenian translation, was issued by the Mechitarist Fathers at Venice in 1836, and afterward translated into Latin. Since 1876 an Arabic translation of the Diatessaron itself has been discovered; and it has been ascertained that the Cod. Fuldensis of the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) represents the order and contents of the

Diatessaron. A translation from the Arab can now be read in English in Dr. J. Hamlyn Hill’s The Earliest Life of Christ Ever Compiled from the Four Gospels.

Although no copy of the Diatessaron has survived, the general features of Tatian’s Syriac work can be gathered from these materials. It is still a matter of dispute whether Tatian composed his Harmony out of a Syriac version already made, or composed it first in Greek and then translated it into Syriac. But the existence and widespread use of a Harmony, combining in one all four Gospels, from such an early period (172 AD), enables us to understand the title Evangelion da-Mepharreshe It means "the Gospel of the Separated," and points to the existence of single Gospels, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, in a Syriac translation, in contradistinction to Tatian’s Harmony. Theodoret, bishop of Cyrrhus in the 5th century, tells how he found more than 200 copies of the Diatessaron held in honor in his diocese and how he collected them, and put them out of the way, associated as they were with the name of a heretic, and substituted for them the Gospels of the four evangelists in their separate forms.

(3) Sinaitic Syriac.

In 1892 the discovery of the 3rd text, known, from the place where it was found, as the Sin Syriac, comprising the four Gospels nearly entire, heightened the interest in the subject and increased the available material. It is a palimpsest, and was found in the monastery of Catherine on Mt. Sinai by Mrs. Agnes S. Lewis and her sister Mrs. Margaret D. Gibson. The text has been carefully examined and many scholars regard it as representing the earliest translation into Syriac, and reaching back into the 2nd century. Like the Curetonian, it is an example of the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe as distinguished from the Harmony of Tatian.

(4) Relation to Peshito.

The discovery of these texts has raised many questions which it may require further discovery and further investigation to answer satisfactorily. It is natural to ask what is the relation of these three texts to the Peshitta. There are still scholars, foremost of whom is G. H. Gwil-liam, the learned editor of the Oxford Peshito (Tetraevangelium sanctum, Clarendon Press, 1901), who maintain the priority of the Peshitta and insist upon its claim to be the earliest monument of Syrian Christianity. But the progress of investigation into Syriac Christian literature points distinctly the other way. From an exhaustive study of the quotations in the earliest Syriac Fathers, and, in particular, of the works of Ephraem Syrus, Professor Burkitt concludes that the Peshitta did not exist in the 4th century. He finds that Ephraem used the Diatessaron in the main as the source of his quotation, although "his voluminous writings contain some clear indications that he was aware of the existence of the separate Gospels, and he seems occasionally to have quoted from them (Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, 186). Such quotations as are found in other extant remains of Syriac literature before the 5th century bear a greater resemblance to the readings of the Curetonian and the Sinaitic than to the readings of the Peshitta. Internal and external evidence alike point to the later and revised character of the Peshitta

6. Probable Origin of Peshito:

How and where and by whom was the revision carried out? Dr. Hort, as we have seen, believed that the "revised" character of the Syriac Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) was a matter of certainty, and Dr. Westcott and he connected the authoritative revision which resulted in the Peshitta with their own theory, now widely adopted by textual critics, of a revision of the Greek text made at Antioch in the latter part of the 3rd century, or early in the 4th. The recent investigations of Professor Burkitt and other scholars have made it probable that the Peshitta was the work of Rabbula, bishop of Edessa, at the beginning of the 5th century. Of this revision, as of the revision which plays such an important part in the textual theory of Westcott and Hort, direct evidence is very scanty, in the former case altogether wanting. Dr. Burkitt, however, is able to quote words of Rabbula's biographer to the effect that "by the wisdom of God that was in him he translated the New Testament from Greek into Syriac because of its variations, exactly as it was." This may well be an account of the first publication of the Syriac Vulg, the Old Syriac texts then available having been brought by this revision into greater conformity with the Greek text current at Antioch in the beginning of the 5th century. And Rabbula was not content with the publication of his revision; he gave orders to the priests and the deacons to see that "in all the churches a copy of the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe shall be kept and read" (ib 161 ff, 177 f). It is very remarkable that before the time of Rabbula, who ruled over the Syr-speaking churches from 411 to 435, there is no trace of the Peshitta, and that after his time there is scarcely a vestige of any other text. He very likely acted in the manner of Theodoret somewhat later, pushing the newly made revision, which we have reason to suppose the Peshitta to have been, into prominence, and making short work of other texts, of which only the Curetonian and the Sinaitic are known to have survived to modern times.

7. History of Peshito:

The Peshitta had from the 5th century onward a wide circulation in the East, and was accepted and honored by all the numerous sects of the greatly divided Syriac Christianity. It had a great missionary influence, and the Armenian and Georgian VSS, as well as the Arabic and the Persian, owe not a little to the Syriac. The famous Nestorian tablet of Sing-an-fu witnesses to the presence of the Syriac Scriptures in the heart of China in the 7th century. It was first brought to the West by Moses of Mindin, a noted Syrian ecclesiastic, who sought a patron for the work of printing it in vain in Rome and Venice, but found one in the Imperial Chancellor at Vienna in 1555—Albert Widmanstadt. He undertook the printing of the New Testament, and the emperor bore the cost of the special types which had to be cast for its issue in Syriac. Immanuel Tremellius, the converted Jew whose scholarship was so valuable to the English reformers and divines, made use of it, and in 1569 issued a Syriac New Testament in Hebrew letters. In 1645 the editio princeps of the Old Testament was prepared by Gabriel Sionita for the Paris Polyglot, and in 1657 the whole Peshitta found a place in Walton s London Polyglot. For long the best edition of the Peshitta was that of John Leusden and Karl Schaaf, and it is still quoted under the symbol Syriac schaaf, or Syriac Sch. The critical edition of the Gospels recently issued by Mr. G. H. Gwilliam at the Clarendon Press is based upon some 50 manuscripts. Considering the revival of Syriac scholarship, and the large company of workers engaged in this field, we may expect further contributions of a similar character to a new and complete critical edition of the Peshitta

8. Other Translations:

(1) The Philoxenian.

Besides the Peshitta there are other translations which may briefly be mentioned. One of these is the Philoxenian, made by Philoxenus, bishop of Mabug (485-519) on the Euphrates, from the Greek, with the help of his Chorepiscopus Polycarp. The Psalms and portions of Isa are also found in this version; and it is interesting as having contained the Antilegomena—2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude.

(2) The Harclean.

Another is the Harclean, which is a revision of the Philoxenian, undertaken by Thomas of Harkel in Mesopotamia, and carried out by him at Alexandria about 616, with the help of Greek manuscripts exhibiting western reading. The Old Testament was undertaken at the same time by Paul of Tella. The New Testament contains the whole of the books, except Rev. It is very literal in its renderings, and is supplied with an elaborate system of asterisks and daggers to indicate the variants found in the manuscripts.

(3) The Jerusalem Syriac.

Mention may also be made of a Syriac version of the New Testament known as the Jerusalem or Palestinian Syriac, believed to be independent, and not derived genealogically from those already mentioned. It exists in a Lectionary of the Gospels in the Vatican, but two fresh manuscripts of the Lectionary have been found on Mt. Sinai by Dr. Rendel Harris and Mrs. Lewis, with fragments of Ac and the Pauline Epistles. The dialect employed deviates considerably from the ordinary Syriac, and the Greek text underlying it has many peculiarities. It alone of Syriac manuscripts has the pericope adulterae. In Mt 27:17 the robber is called Jesus Barabbas. Gregory describes 10 manuscripts (Textkritik, 523 f).

LITERATURE.

Nestle, Syrische Uebersetzungen, PRE3, Syriac VSS, HDB, and Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament, 95-106; G. H. Gwilliam, Studia Biblica, II, 1890, III, 1891, V, 1903, and Tetraevangelium sanctum Syriacum; Scrivener, Intro4, 6-40; Burkitt, "Early Eastern Christianity," Texts and Studies, VII, 2:1-91, Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, I, II, and "Syr VSS," EB; Gregory, Textkritik, 479-528.

T. Nicol

SYRIAN; LANGUAGE

sir’-i-an (the King James Version SYRIAC).

See SYRIAC VERSIONS.

SYRIANS

sir’-i-anz (’aram; Suroi; Assyrian Aramu, Arumu, Arimu):

1. Division of Aram

2. A Semitic Race

3. Syria and Israel

4. Under Nabateans and Palmyrenes

5. A Mixed Race, Semitic Type

6. Religion

The terms "Syria" and "Syrians" are used in two senses in the Bible. In the Old Testament they are uniformly "Aram," "Aramaean," while in the New Testament they are used in a wider and more indefinite sense (Mt 4:24; Ac 15:23; 18:18; Ga 1:21), and include all the dwellers of the land whether Arameans or not.

1. Division of Aram:

Aram was divided into several districts, comprising, in general, the region to the East of the Jordan, but extending in the North over most of Northern Syria, or from the Orontes eastward, and Northern Mesopotamia. This latter division was called Aram-naharaim—Aram of the two rivers, i.e. Tigris and Euphrates—and is the Nahrina of the Egyptian inscriptions. It is also called Paddan-aram in the Old Testament (Ge 25:20) or field of Aram (Ho 12:12). The most important of the divisions of Aram in Old Testament times was Aram-dammesek, the Syria of Damascus, which sometimes dominated all of the other divisions lying to the South, such as Rehob, Tob, Zobah, and Mancab (2Sa 10:8). Geshur was in this region and should be reckoned as an Aramean dis-trict (2Sa 15:8).

2. A Semitic Race:

The Arameans were of Semitic stock and closely akin to the Hebrews. Aram is called a son of Shem (Ge 10:22), which means a descendant, for we find him afterward called a grandson of Nahor, the brother of Abraham (Ge 22:21). The Israelites were taught to say "A Syrian (Ara-maean) ready to perish was my father" (De 26:5), and the kinship of the Hebrews and Arameans was further cemented by the marriage of Isaac with Rebekah, the sister of Laban the Syrian, and of Jacob with his daughters (Ge 24; 29). The

period when the Arameans first appeared in Syria is uncertain, but was probably later than 2000 BC. When Abraham came from Haran, Damascus was already occupied (Ge 15:2), and this may have been the oldest settlement of the Arameans in Syria proper, although it is not mentioned on the monuments until long after, in the time of Thothmes III of Egypt, about 1479 BC. The Syrians were generally hostile to the Hebrews and had wars with them from the time of David onward. David subdued them, although they were aided by the tribes from beyond the Euphrates (2Sa 10), but after the division of the kingdom they often proved too strong for the northern Israelites.

3. Syria and Israel:

In the days of Omri the Syrians of Damascus brought them into subjection, but Ahab recovered all the lost territory and Damascus seems to have been subordinate for a time (1Ki 20:34). The king of Damascus afterward regained the supremacy, as appears from the Assyrian records, for in the war of Shalmaneser II with the peoples of Syria we find them led by Ben-hadad of Damascus and, among his subject allies, Ahab, who furnished 2,000 chariots and 10,000 men. Ben-hadad succeeded in uniting most of the petty kingdoms of Syria together in opposition to Assyria, but could not hold them, and they fell, one after another, as well as Damascus itself, into the hands of the great world-power. Jeroboam II recovered the districts that had been taken from Israel by the Syrians (2Ki 14:25), but this was only a temporary success, for Rezin extended his authority over all the East-Jordanic region as far as Elath on the Red Sea (2Ki 16:6), and he and Pekah joined in an attack upon Judah, but failed on account of the Assyrian advance (2Ki 16:5-9). Damascus fell into the hands of Tiglath-pileser in 732 BC, and the power of the Syrians was completely broken.

4. Under Nabatheans and Palmyrenes:

The Aramaic peoples became prominent again under the Nabateans and Palmyrenes, both of whom were of this stock, as their language is clearly Aramaic. The former established a kingdom extending from the Euphrates to the Red Sea, their capital being Petra, and Damascus was under their control in the reign of their king Aretas (el-Harith) (2Co 11:32). This kingdom was absorbed by Rome in the reign of Trajan. The Palmyrenes did not come into prominence until the 3rd century AD, but became, for a short time, the leading power in Western Asia. In the weakness of Rome, under Gallienus, Odenathus and his still more distinguished wife, Zenobia, dominated all Syria, and the latter dared to dispute with Aurelian the empire of the East. With her fall in 272 AD the power of the Arameans was extinguished and never revived.

5. A Mixed Race, Semitic Type:

The Syrians in the broader sense have always been a mixed people, though of a prevailing Semitic type. The earliest layer of Semitic population was the Amorite which was found in Syria when the first Babylonian empire extended its authority over the land. Later appear the Canaanites, Phoenicians, Jebusites, Hivites and other tribes, all of which are classed together as descendants of Canaan in Ge 10, but their Semitic character in historic times is undoubted. The Hyksos who were driven from Egypt to

Palestine and Syria were of the same race, as would appear from the Egyptian records. The Arameans formed the next wave of Semitic stock, but there were others, like the Hittites, who were not Semitic, and the Philistines, whose race affinity is doubtful. The Egyptians occupied the country for a long period, but did not contribute much to the population. Some of the tribes brought in by the Assyrians may have been non-Semitic, but most of them were evidently of cognate race (2Ki 17:24), and the racial characteristics of the Syrians were not changed. When Alexander and his successors brought in the Greek and Macedoninn elements there was a decided change in the city population, but little in the country districts, and although the Greeks had a powerful influence upon the civilization of the country the Semitic type overcame the admixture of Greek blood and prevailed in the country as a whole. The Romans ruled the country for centuries and established a number of military colonies, but they did not affect the population even as much as the Greeks. When, in the 7th century AD, the Mohammedan conquest swept over Syria, it brought in another great wave of pure Semitic stock with the numerous Arab settlers, who tended to obliterate any non-Semitic elements that might have existed. The effects of the influx of Europeans in the time of the Crusades were not sufficient to produce any marked change, and the same may be said of all later invasions of Turks and Kurds.

The Syrians, while thus a mixed people to a large extent, have maintained the Semitic type, but they have never, in all their history, been able to unite politically, and have always been divided, when independent. They have been, during the greater part of their history, under foreign domination, as they still are, under Turkish rule.

6. Religion:

The religion of the Syrians in ancient times was undoubtedly similar to that of the Babylonians, as is shown by the names of their gods. The Arameans worshipped Hadad and Rimmon (2Ki 5:18), sometimes joined as Hadadrimmon (Zec 12:11). Baal, or Bel, Ashtoreth, or Ishtar, were almost universally worshipped, and Nebu, Agli-bol, Melakh-bol, Ati and other deities are found in the Palmyrene inscriptions, showing the Babylonian influence in their cult. This was to be expected from the known prevalence of Babylonian culture throughout Western Asia for centuries.

H. Porter

SYROPHOENICIAN

si’-ro-fe-nish’-an, sir-o- (Surophoinissa, Surophoinikissa; Westcott and Hort, The New Testament in Greek has variant Sura Phoinikissa; the King James Version Syrophenician): The woman from the borders of Tyre and Sidon whose daughter Jesus healed is described as "a Greek, a Syrophoenician by race" (Mr 7:26), and again as "a Canaanitish woman" (Mt 15:22). This seems to mean that she was of Canaanite descent, a native of the Phoenician seaboard, Greek in religion, and probably also in speech. The names Syria and Phoenicia are both applied to the same region in Ac 21:2,3. Syrophoenician may therefore denote simply an inhabitant of these parts. According to Strabo (xvii.3), this district was called Syrophoenicia to distinguish it from the North African Lybophoenicia.

W. Ewing

SYRTIS

sir’-tis (surtis): the Revised Version (British and American) form for "quicksands" in Ac 27:17. These sandbanks, off the northern coast of Africa, have from early times been regarded as a source of danger to mariners. Virgil refers to them (Aen. iv.40 f). In Paul’s voyage, the ship, driven by a tempestuous wind, Euraquilo, was in peril of being cast-upon them.

SYZYGUS

siz’-i-gus.

See SYNZYGUS.

TAANACH

ta’-nak (ta‘anakh, or ta‘nakh; the Septuagint Tanach, with many variants): A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (12:21). It was within the boundaries of the portion of Issachar, but was one of the cities reckoned to Manasseh (Jos 17:11; 1Ch 7:29), and assigned to the Kohathite Levites (Jos 21:25). The Canaanites were not driven out; only at a later time they were set to taskwork (Jos 17:12 f; Jud 1:27 f). Here the great battle was fought when the defeat of Sisera broke the power of the oppressor Jabin (Jud 5:19). It was in the administrative district of Baana ben Ahilud (1Ki 4:12). The name appears in the list of Thothmes III at Karnak; and Shishak records his plundering of Taanach when he invaded Palestine under Jeroboam I (compare 1Ki 14:25 f). Eusebius says in Onomasticon that it is a very large village, 3 miles from Legio. it is represented by the modern Ta‘annek, which stands on a hill at the southwestern edge of the plain of Esdraelon. Megiddo (Tell el-Mutesellim) lies 5 miles to the Northwest. These two places are almost invariably named together. The great highway for traffic, commercial and military, from Babylon and Egypt, ran between them. They were therefore of high strategic importance. Excavations were recently conducted on the site by Professor Sellin, and a series of valuable and deeply interesting discoveries were made, shedding light upon the social and religious life and practices of the inhabitants down to the 1st century BC, through a period of nearly 2,000 years. The Canaanites were the earliest occupants. In accordance with Biblical history, "there is no evidence of a break or abrupt change in the civilization between the Canaanite and the Israelite occupation of Taanach; the excavations Show rather gradual development. The Canaanites will have gradually assimilated the Israelites drawn to them from the villages in the plain" (Driver, Schweich Lectures, 1908, 84). In the work just cited Driver gives an admirable summary of the results obtained by Professor Sellin. In his book on the Religion of Ancient Palestine, Professor Stanley A. Cook has shown, in short compass, what excellent use may be made of the results thus furnished.

W. Ewing

TAANATH-SHILOH

ta’-a-nath-shi’-lo (ta’-anath shiloh; Codex Vaticanus Thenasa kai Sellesa, Tenathselo): A town on the border of the territory of Ephraim named between Michmethath and Janoah (Jos 16:6). According to Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Thena") it lay about 10 Roman miles East of Neapolis, on the road to the Jordan. Ptolemy speaks of Thena, probably the same place, as a town in Samaria (Jos 16:5). It may be identified with Ta‘na, a village about 7 miles Southeast of Nablus. Yanun, the ancient Janoah, lies 2 miles to the South. A Roman road from Neapolis to the Jordan valley passed this way. At Ta‘na there are "foundations, caves, cisterns and rockcut tombs" (PEFM, II, 245). This identification being quite satisfactory, the Talmudic notion that Taanath-shiloh was the same place as Shiloh may be dismissed (Jerusalem Talmud, Meghillah, i).

W. Ewing

TABAOTH, TABBAOTH

ta-ba’-oth, tab’-a-oth (tabba‘oth; Tabaoth, Taboth): The name of a family of temple-servants (1 Esdras 5:29) =" Tabbaoth" (Hebrew: Tabba‘oth) of Ezr 2:43; Ne 7:46; perhaps called after the name of a place.

Compare TABBATH.

TABBATH

tab’-ath (Tabbath; Codex Vaticanus Tabath; Gabath): A place named after Abel-meholah in the account of the Midianite flight before Gideon (Jud 7:23). It must therefore have been a place in the Jordan valley to the East of Beth-shan. No trace of the name has yet been recovered.

TABEEL

ta’-be-el: A name meaning "good is God," borne by two persons in the Old Testament (Isa 7:6, the King James Version, "Tabeal").

(1) The father of the man whom the kings of Israel and Damascus planned to place upon the throne of Judah (Isa 7:6). The form of the name Tabhe’el, suggests that he was a Syrian; his son evidently was a tool of Rezin, king of Damascus. The name is vocalized so as to read Tebeal (Tabhe’al), which might be translated "good for nothing," though some explain it as a pausal form, with the ordinary meaning. The change, probably due to a desire to express contempt, is very slight in Hebrew.

(2) A Persian official in Samaria (Tabhe’el) (Ezr 4:7). All that is known of him is that he joined with other officials in sending a letter to Artaxerxes for the purpose of hindering the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem.

F. C. Eiselen

TABELLIUS

ta-bel’-i-us (Tabellios): One of the Persian officials in Samaria who wrote a letter to Artaxerxes which caused the rebuilding of Jerusalem to be stopped for a time (1 Esdras 2:16) =" Tabeel" of Ezr 4:7.

TABER

ta’-ber (taphaph, "to strike a timbrel" ((Ps 68:25)): The word is used only once in the King James Version, namely, in the exceedingly graphic account of the capture of Nineveh given in Na 2:7. The queen (perhaps the city personified) is dishonored and led into ignominious captivity, followed by a mourning retinue of "maids of honor" who taber upon, that is, beat violently, their breasts. Such

drumming on the breasts was a gesture indicative of great grief (Lu 18:3).

TABERAH

tab’-e-ra, ta-be’-ra (tabh‘erah, "burning"): A wilderness camp of the Israelites, the site of which is unidentified. Here, it is recorded, the people complained against Yahweh, who destroyed many of them by fire. This is the origin of the name (Nu 11:3; De 9:22).

TABERNACLE OF TESTIMONY (WITNESS)

(Nu 9:15; 2Ch 24:6, the Revised Version (British and American) "the tent of the testimony").

See TABERNACLE.

TABERNACLE, A

tab’-er-na-k’l (’ohel mo‘edh "tent of meeting," mishkan, "dwelling"; skene):

A. STRUCTURE AND HISTORY

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Earlier "Tent of Meeting"

2. A Stage in Revelation

3. The Tabernacle Proper

II. STRUCTURE

1. The Enclosure or Court

2. Structure, Divisions and Furniture of the Tabernacle

(1) Coverings of the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:1-14; 36:8-19)

(a) Tabernacle Covering Proper

(b) Tent Covering

(c) Protective Covering

(2) Framework and Divisions of the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:15-37; 36:20-38)

Arrangement of Coverings

(3) Furniture of the Sanctuary

(a) The Table of Shewbread

(b) The Candlestick (Lampstand)

(c) The Altar of Incense

III. HISTORY

1. Removal from Sinai

2. Sojourn at Kadesh

3. Settlement in Canaan

4. Destruction of Shiloh

5. Delocalization of Worship

6. Nob and Gibeon

7. Restoration of the Ark

8. The Two Tabernacles

IV. SYMBOLISM

1. New Testament References

2. God’s Dwelling with Man

3. Symbolism of Furniture

LITERATURE

I. Introductory.

Altars sacred to Yahweh were earlier than sacred buildings. Abraham built such detached altars at the Terebinth of Moreh (Ge 12:6,7), and again between Beth-el and Ai (Ge 12:8). Though he built altars in more places than one, his conception of God was already monotheistic. The "Judge of all the earth" (Ge 18:25) was no tribal deity. This monotheistic ideal was embodied and proclaimed in the tabernacle and in the subsequent temples of which the tabernacle was the prototype.

1. Earlier "Tent of Meeting":

The first step toward a habitation for the Deity worshipped at the altar was taken at Sinai, when Moses builded not only "an altar under the mount," but "12 pillars, according to the 12 tribes of Israel" (Ex 24:4). There is no recorded command to this effect, and there was as yet no separated priesthood, and sacrifices were offered by "young men of the children of Israel" (Ex 24:5); but already the need of a separated structure was becoming evident. Later, but still at Sinai, after the sin of the golden calf, Moses is stated to have pitched "the tent" (as if well known: the tense is frequentative, "used to take the tent and to pitch it") "without the camp, afar off," and to have called it, "the tent of meeting," a term often met with afterward (Ex 33:7). This "tent" was not yet the tabernacle proper, but served an interim purpose. The ark was not yet made; a priesthood was not yet appointed; it was "without the camp"; Joshua was the sole minister (Ex 33:11). It was a simple place of revelation and of the meeting of the people with Yahweh (Ex 33:7,9-11). Critics, on the other hand, identifying this "tent" with that in Nu 11:16 ff; 12:4 ff; De 31:14,15 (ascribed to the Elohist source), regard it as the primitive tent of the wanderings, and on the ground of these differences from the tabernacle, described later (in the Priestly Code), deny the historicity of the latter. On this see below under B, 4, (5).

2. A Stage in Revelation:

No doubt this localization of the shrine of Yahweh afforded occasion for a possible misconception of Yahweh as a tribal Deity. We must remember that here and throughout we have to do with the education of a people whose instincts and surroundings were by no means monotheistic. It was necessary that their education should begin with some sort of concession to existing ideas. They were not yet, nor for long afterward, capable of the conception of a God who dwelleth not in temples made with hands. So an altar and a tent were given them; but in the fact that this habitation of God was not fixed to one spot, but was removed from place to place in the nomad life of the Israelites, they had a persistent education leading them away from the idea of local and tribal deities.

3. The Tabernacle Proper:

The tabernacle proper is that of which the account is given in Ex 25-27; 30-31; 35-40, with additional details in Nu 3:25 ff; 4:4 ff; 7:1 ff. The central idea of the structure is given in the words, "Make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them" (Ex 25:8). It was the dwelling-place of the holy Yahweh in the

midst of His people; also the place of His "meeting" with them (Ex 25:22). The first of these ideas is expressed in the name mishkan; the second in the name ‘ohel mo‘edh (it is a puzzling fact for the critics that in Ex 25-27:19 only mishkan is used; in Exodus 28-31 only ‘ohel mo‘edh; in other sections the names intermingle). The tabernacle was built as became such a structure, according to the "pattern" shown to Moses in the mount (25:9,40; 26:30; compare Ac 7:44; Heb 8:2,5). The modern critical school regards this whole description of the tabernacle as an "ideal" construction—a projection backward by post-exilian imagination of the ideas and dimensions of the Temple of Solomon, the measurements of the latter being throughout halved. Against this violent assumption, however, many things speak. See below under B.

II. Structure.

The ground plan of the Mosaic tabernacle (with its divisions, courts, furniture, etc.) can be made out with reasonable certainty. As respects the actual construction, knotty problems remain, in regard to which the most diverse opinions prevail. Doubt rests also on the precise measurement by cubits (see CUBIT; for a special theory, see W. S. Caldecott, The Tabernacle; Its History and Structure). For simplification the cubit is taken in this article as roughly equivalent to 18 inches.

A first weighty question relates to the shape of the tabernacle. The conventional and still customary conception (Keil, Bahr, A. R. S. Kennedy in HDB, etc.) represents it as an oblong, flat-roofed structure, the rich coverings, over the top, hanging down on either side and at the back—not unlike, to use a figure sometimes employed, a huge coffin with a pall thrown over it. Nothing could be less like a "tent," and the difficulty at once presents itself of how, in such a structure, "sagging" of the roof was to be prevented. Mr. J. Fergusson, in his article "Temple" in Smith’s DB, accordingly, advanced the other conception that the structure was essentially that of a tent, with ridge-pole, sloping roof, and other appurtenances of such an erection. He plausibly, though not with entire success, sought to show how this construction answered accurately to the measurements and other requirements of the text (e.g. the mention of "pins of the tabernacle," Ex 35:18). With slight modification this view here commends itself as having most in its favor.

To avoid the difficulty of the ordinary view, that the coverings, hanging down outside the framework, are unseen from within, except on the roof, it has sometimes been argued that the tapestry covering hung down, not outside, but inside the tabernacle (Keil, Bahr, etc.). It is generally felt that this arrangement is inadmissible. A newer and more ingenious theory is that propounded by A. R. S. Kennedy in his article "Tabernacle" in HDB. It is that the "boards" constituting the framework of the tabernacle were, not solid planks, but really open "frames," through which the finely wrought covering could be seen from within. There is much that is fascinating in this theory, if the initial assumption of the flat roof is granted, but it cannot be regarded as being yet satisfactorily made out. Professor Kennedy argues from the excessive weight of the solid "boards." It might be replied: In a purely "ideal" structure such as he supposes this to be, what does the weight matter? The "boards," however, need not have been so thick or heavy as he represents.

In the more minute details of construction yet greater diversity of opinion obtains, and imagination is often allowed a freedom of exercise incompatible with the sober descriptions of the text.

1. The Enclosure or Court:

The attempt at reconstruction of the tabernacle begins naturally with the "court" (chatser) or outer enclosure in which the tabernacle stood (see COURT OF THE SANCTUARY). The description is given in Ex 27:9-18; 38:9-20. The court is to be conceived of as an enclosed space of 100 cubits (150 ft.) in length, and 50 cubits (75 ft.) in breadth, its sides formed (with special arrangement for the entrance) by "hangings" or curtains (qela‘im) of "fine twined linen," 5 cubits (7 1/2 ft.) in height, supported by pillars of brass (bronze) 5 cubits apart, to which the hangings were attached by "hooks" and "fillets" of silver. It thus censisted of two squares of 50 cubits each, in the anterior of which (the easterly) stood the "altar of burnt-offering" (see ALTAR), and the "layer" (see LAVER), and in the posterior (the westerly) the tabernacle itself. From Ex 30:17-21 we learn that the laver—a large (bronze) vessel for the ablutions of the priests—stood between the altar and the tabernacle (Ex 30:18) The pillars were 60 in number, 20 being reckoned to the longer sides (North and South), and 10 each to the shorter (East and West). The pillars were set in "sockets" or bases (’edhen) of brass (bronze), and had "capitals" (the King James Version and the English Revised Version "chapiters") overlaid with silver (Ex 38:17). The "fillets" are here, as usually, regarded as silver rods connecting the pillars; some, however, as Ewald, Dillmann, Kennedy, take the "fillet" to be an ornamental band round the base of the capital. On the eastern side was the "gate" or entrance. This was formed by a "screen" (macakh) 20 cubits (30 ft.) in breadth, likewise of fine twined linen, but distinguished from the other (white) hangings by being embroidered in blue, and purple, and scarlet (see EAST GATE). The hangings on either side of the "gate" were 15 cubits in breadth. The 10 pillars of the east side are distributed—4 to the entrance screen, 3 on either side to the hangings. The enumeration creates some difficulty till it is remembered that in the reckoning round the court no pillar is counted twice, and that the corner pillars and those on either side of the entrance had each to do a double duty. The reckoning is really by the 5-cubit spaces between the pillars. Mention is made (Ex 27:19; 38:20) of the "pins" of the court, as well as of the tabernacle, by means of which, in the former case, the pillars were held in place. These also were of brass (bronze).

2. Structure, Divisions and Furniture of the Tabernacle:

In the inner of the two squares of the court was reared the tabernacle—a rectangular oblong structure, 30 cubits (45 ft.) long and 10 cubits (15 ft.) broad, divided into two parts, a holy and a most holy (Ex 26:33). Attention has to be given here

(1) to the coverings of the tabernacle,

(2) to its framework and divisions, and

(3) to its furniture.

(1) Coverings of the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:1-14; 36:8-19).

The wooden framework of the tabernacle to be afterward described had 3 coverings—one, the immediate covering of the tabernacle or "dwelling," called by the same name, mishkan (Ex 26:1,6); a second, the tent" covering of goats' hair; and a third, a protective covering of rams' and seal- (or porpoise-) skins, cast over the whole.

(a) Tabernacle Covering Proper:

The covering of the tabernacle proper (Ex 26:1-6) consisted of 10 curtains (yeri'oth, literally, "breadth") of fine twined linen, beautifully-woven with blue, and purple, and scarlet, and with figures of cherubim. The 10 curtains, each 28 cubits long and 4 cubits broad, were joined together in sets of 5 to form 2 large curtains, which again were fastened by 50 loops and clasps (the King James Version "taches") of gold, so as to make a single great curtain 40 cubits (60 ft.) long, and 28 cubits (42 ft.) broad.

(b) Tent Covering:

The "tent" covering (Ex 26:7-13) was formed by 11 curtains of goats hair, the length in this case being 30 cubits, and the breadth 4 cubits. These were joined in sets of 5 and 6 curtains, and as before the two divisions were coupled by 50 loops and clasps (this time of bronze), into one great curtain of 44 cubits (66 ft.) in length and 30 cubits (45 ft.) in breadth—an excess of 4 cubits in length and 2 in breadth over the fine tabernacle curtain.

(c) Protective Covering:

Finally, for purposes of protection, coverings were ordered to be made (Ex 26:14) for the "tent" of rams' skins dyed red, and of seal-skins or porpoise-skins (English Versions of the Bible, "badgers' skins"). The arrangement of the coverings is considered below.

(2) Framework and Division of the Tabernacle (Exodus 26:15-37; 36:20-38)

The framework of the tabernacle was, as ordinarily understood, composed of upright "boards" of acacia wood, forming 3 sides of the oblong structure, the front being closed by an embroidered screen," depending from 5 pillars (Ex 26:36,37; see below). These boards, 48 in number (20 each for the north and south sides, and 8 for the west side), were 10 cubits (15 ft.) in height, and 1 1/2 cubits (2 ft. 3 in.) in breadth (the thickness is not given), and were overlaid with gold. They were set by means of "tenons" (literally, "hands"), or projections at the foot, 2 for each board, in 96 silver "sockets," or bases ("a talent for a socket," Ex 38:27). In the boards were "rings" of gold, through which were passed 3 horizontal "bars," to hold the parts together—the middle bar, apparently, on the long sides, extending from end to end (Ex 26:28), the upper and lower bars being divided in the center (5 bars in all on each side). The bars, like the boards, were overlaid with gold. Some obscurity rests on the arrangement at the back: 6 of the boards were of the usual breadth (= 9 cubits), but the 2 corner boards appear to have made

up only a cubit between them (Ex 26:22-24). Notice has already been taken of theory (Kennedy, article "Tabernacle," HDB) that the so-called "boards" were not really such, but were open "frames," the 2 uprights of which, joined by crosspieces, are the "tenons" of the text. It seems unlikely, if this was meant, that it should not be more distinctly explained. The enclosure thus constructed was next divided into 2 apartments, separated by a "veil," which hung from 4 pillars overlaid with gold and resting in silver sockets. Like the tabernacle-covering, the veil was beautifully woven with blue, purple, and scarlet, and with figures of cherubim (Ex 26:31,32; see VEIL). The outer of these chambers, or holy place" was as usually computed, 20 cubits long by 10 broad; the inner, or most holy place, was 10 cubits square. The "door of the tent" (Ex 26:36) was formed, as already stated, by a "screen," embroidered with the above colors, and depending from 5 pillars in bronze sockets. Here also the hooks were of gold, and the pillars and their capitals overlaid with gold (Ex 36:38).

Arrangement of Coverings:

Preference has already been expressed for Mr. Fergusson's idea that the tabernacle was not flat-roofed, the curtains being cast over it like drapery, but was tentlike in shape, with ridge-pole, and a sloping roof, raising the total height to 15 cubits. Passing over the ridge pole, and descending at an angle, 14 cubits on either side, the inner curtain would extend 5 cubits beyond the walls of the tabernacle, making an awning of that width North and South, while the goats'-hair covering above it, 2 cubits wider, would hang below it a cubit on either side. The whole would be held in position by ropes secured by bronze tent-pins to the ground (Ex 27:19; 38:31). The scheme has obvious advantages in that it preserves the idea of a "tent," conforms to the principal measurements, removes the difficulty of "sagging" on the (flat) roof, and permits of the golden boards, bars and rings, on the outside, and of the finely wrought tapestry, on the inside, being seen (Professor Kennedy provides for the latter by his "frames," through which the curtain would be visible). On the other hand, it is not to be concealed that the construction proposed presents several serious difficulties. The silence of the text about a ridge-pole, supporting pillars, and other requisites of Mr. Fergusson's scheme (his suggestion that "the middle bar" of Ex 26:28 may be the ridge-pole is quite untenable), may be got over by assuming that these parts are taken for granted as understood in tent-construction. But this does not apply to other adjustments, especially those connected with the back and front of the tabernacle. It was seen above that the inner covering was 40 cubits in length, while the tabernacle-structure was 30 cubits. How is this excess of 10 cubits in the tapestry-covering dealt with? Mr. Fergusson, dividing equally, supposes a porch of 5 cubits at the front, and a space of 5 cubits also behind, with hypothetical pillars. The text, however, is explicit that the veil dividing the holy from the most holy place was hung "under the clasps" (Ex 26:33), i.e. on this hypothesis, midway in the structure, or 15 cubits from either end. Either, then,

(1) the idea must be abandoned that the holy place was twice the length of the Holy of Holies (20 X 10; it is to be observed that the text does not state the proportions, which are inferred from those of Solomon's Temple), or

(2) Mr. Fergusson's arrangement must be given up, and the division of the curtain be moved back 5 cubits, depriving him of his curtain for the porch, and leaving 10 cubits to be disposed of in the rear. Another difficulty is connected with the porch itself. No clear indication of such a porch is given in the

text, while the 5 pillars "for the screen" (Ex 26:37) are most naturally taken to be, like the latter, at the immediate entrance of the tabernacle. Mr. Fergusson, on the other hand, finds it necessary to separate pillars and screen, and to place the pillars 5 cubits farther in front. He is right, however, in saying that the 5th pillar naturally suggests a ridge-pole; in his favor also is the fact that the extra breadth of the overlying tentcovering was to hang down, 2 cubits at the front, and 2 cubits at the back of the tabernacle (Ex 26:9,12). It is possible that there was a special disposition of the inner curtain—that belonging peculiarly to the "dwelling"—"according to which its "clasps" lay above the "veil" of the Holy of Holies (20 cubits from the entrance), and its hinder folds closed the aperture at the rear which otherwise would have admitted light into the secrecy of the shrine. But constructions of this kind must ever remain more or less conjectural.

The measurements in the above reckoning are internal. Dr. Kennedy disputes this, but the analogy of the temple is against his view.

(3) Furniture of the Sanctuary

The furniture of the sanctuary is described in Ex 25:10-40 (ark, table of shewbread, candlestick); 30:1-10 (altar of incense); compare Exodus 37 for making. In the innermost shrine, the Holy of Holies, the sole object was the ark of the covenant, overlaid within and without with pure gold, with its molding and rings of gold, its staves overlaid with gold passed through the rings, and its lid or covering of solid gold —the propitiatory or mercy-seat—at either end of which, of one piece with it. (25:19; 37:8), stood cherubim, with wings outstretched over the mercy-seat and with faces turned toward it (for details see ARK OF THE COVENANT; MERCY-SEAT; CHERUBIM). This was the meeting-place of Yahweh and His people through Moses (25:22). The ark contained only the two tables of stone, hence its name "the ark of the testimony" (25:16,22). It is not always realized how small an object the ark was—only 2 1/2 cubits (3 ft. 9 in.) long, 1 1/2 cubits (2 ft. 3 in.) broad, and the same (1 1/2 cubits) high.

The furniture of the outer chamber of the tabernacle consisted of

(a) the table of shewbread;

(b) the golden candlestick:

(c) the altar of incense, or golden altar.

These were placed, the table of shewbread on the north side (Ex 40:22), the candlestick on the south side (Ex 40:24), and the altar of incense in front of the veil, in the holy place.

(a) The Table of Shewbread:

The table of shewbread was a small table of acacia wood, overlaid with gold, with a golden rim round the top, gold rings at the corners of its 4 feet, staves for the rings, and a "border" (at middle?) joining the

legs, holding them together. Its dimensions were 2 cubits (3 ft.) long, 1 cubit (18 inches) broad, and 1 1/2 cubits (2 ft. 3 inches) high. On it were placed 12 cakes, renewed each week, in 2 piles (compare Le 24:5-9), together with dishes (for the bread), spoons (incense cups), flagons and bowls (for drink offerings), all of pure gold.

See SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF.

(b) The Candlestick:

The candlestick or lampstand was the article on which most adornment was lavished. It was of pure gold, and consisted of a central stem (in Ex 25:32-35 this specially receives the name "candlestick"), with 3 curved branches on either side, all elegantly wrought with cups of almond blossom, knops, and flowers (lilies?)—3 of this series to each branch and 4 to the central stem. Upon the 6 branches and the central stem were 7 lamps from which the light issued. Connected with the candlestick were snuffers and snuff-dishes for the wicks—all of gold. The candlestick was formed from a talent of pure gold (Ex 25:38).

See CANDLESTICK.

(c) The Altar of Incense:

The description of the altar of incense occurs (Ex 30:1-10) for some unexplained reason or displacement out of the place where it might be expected, but this is no reason for throwing doubt (with some) upon its existence. It was a small altar, overlaid with gold, a cubit (18 in.) square, and 2 cubits (3 ft.) high, with 4 horns. On it was burned sweet-smelling incense. It had the usual golden rim, golden rings, and gold-covered staves.

See ALTAR OF INCENSE.

III. History.

1. Removal from Sinai:

We may fix 1220 BC as the approximate date of the introduction of the tabernacle. It was set up at Sinai on the 1st day of the 1st month of the 2nd year (Ex 40:2,17), i.e. 14 days before the celebration of the Passover on the first anniversary of the exodus (see CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, sec. VII, VIII). When the people resumed their journey, the ark was wrapped in the veil which had served to isolate the most holy place (Nu 4:5). This and the two altars were carried upon the shoulders of the children of Kohath, a descendant of Levi, and were removed under the personal supervision of the high priest (Nu 3:31,32; 4:15). The rest of the dismembered structure was carried in six covered wagons, offered by the prince, each drawn by two oxen (Nu 7). Doubtless others were provided for the heavier materials (compare Keil). Before leaving Sinai the brazen altar had been dedicated, and utensils of gold

and silver had been presented for use at the services. The tabernacle had been standing at Sinai during 50 days (Nu 10:11).

2. Sojourn at Kadesh:

The journey lay along the "great and terrible wilderness" between Horeb in the heart of Arabia and Kadesh-barnea in the Negeb of Judah; of the 40 years occupied in the journey to Canaan, nearly 38 were spent at Kadesh, a fact not always clearly recognized. The tabernacle stood here during 37 years (one year being occupied in a punitive journey southward to the shore of the Red Sea). During this whole time the ordinary sacrifices were not offered (Am 5:25), though it is possible that the appropriate seasons were nevertheless marked in more than merely chronological fashion. Few incidents are recorded as to these years, and little mention is made of the tabernacle throughout the whole journey except that the ark of the covenant preceded the host when on the march (Nu 10:33-36). It is the unusual that is recorded; the daily aspect of the tabernacle and the part it played in the life of the people were among the things recurrent and familiar.

3. Settlement in Canaan:

When, at last, the Jordan was crossed, the first consideration, presumably, was to find a place on which to pitch the sacred tent, a place hitherto uninhabited and free from possible defilement by human graves. Such a place was found in the neighborhood of Jericho, and came to be known as Gilgal (Jos 4:19; 5:10; 9:6; 10:6,43). Gilgal, however, was always regarded as a temporary site. The tabernacle is not directly mentioned in connection with it. The question of a permanent location was the occasion of mutual jealousy among the tribes, and was at last settled by the removal of the tabernacle to Shiloh, in the territory of Ephraim, a place conveniently central for attendance of all adult males at the three yearly festivals, without the zone of war, and also of some strategic importance. During the lifetime of Joshua, therefore, the tabernacle was removed over the 20 miles, or less, which separated Shiloh among the hills from Gilgal in the lowlands (Jos 18:1; 19:51). While at Shiloh it seems to have acquired some accessories of a more permanent kind (1Sa 1:9, etc.), which obtained for it the name "temple" (1Sa 1:9; 3:3).

4. Destruction of Shiloh:

During the period of the Judges the nation lost the fervor of its earlier years and was in imminent danger of apostasy. The daily services of the tabernacle were doubtless observed after a perfunctory manner, but they seem to have had little effect upon the people, either to soften their manners or raise their morals. In the early days of Samuel war broke out afresh with the Philistines. At a council of war the unprecedented proposal was made to fetch the ark of the covenant from Shiloh (1Sa 4:1). Accompanied by the two sons of Eli—Hophni and Phinehas—it arrived in the camp and was welcomed by a shout which was heard in the hostile camp. It was no longer Yahweh but the material ark that was the hope of Israel, so low had the people fallen. Eli himself, at that time high priest, must at least have acquiesced in this superstition. It ended in disaster. The ark was taken by the Philistines, its two guardians were slain,

and Israel was helpless before its enemies. Though the Hebrew historians are silent about what followed, it is certain that Shiloh itself fell into the hands of the Philistines. The very destruction of it accounts for the silence of the historians, for it would have been at the central sanctuary there, the center and home of what literary culture there was in Israel during this stormy period, that chronicles of events would be kept. Ps 78:60 ff no doubt has reference to this overthrow, and it is referred to in Jer 7:12. The tabernacle itself does not seem to have been taken by the Philistines, as it is met with later at Nob.

5. Delocalization of Worship:

For lack of a high priest of character, Samuel himself seems now to have become the head of religious worship. It is possible that the tabernacle may have been again removed to Gilgal, as it was there that Samuel appointed Saul to meet him in order to offer burnt offerings and peace offerings. The ark, however, restored by the Philistines, remained at Kiriath-jearim (1Sa 7:1,2), while courts for ceremonial, civil, and criminal administration were held, not only at Gilgal, but at other places, as Beth-el, Mizpah and Ramah (1Sa 7:15-17), places which acquired a quasi-ecclesiastical sanctity. This delocalization of the sanctuary was no doubt revolutionary, but it is partly explained by the fact that even in the tabernacle there was now no ark before which to burn incense. Of the half-dozen places bearing the name of Ramah, this, which was Samuel’s home, was the one near to Hebron, where to this day the foundations of what may have been Samuel’s sacred enclosure may be seen at the modern Ramet-el-Khalil.

6. Nob and Gibeon:

We next hear of the tabernacle at Nob, with Ahimelech, a tool of Saul (probably the Ahijah of 1Sa 14:3), as high priest (1Sa 21:1). This Nob was 4 miles to the North of Jerusalem and was more-over a high place, 30 ft. higher than Zion. It does not follow that the tabernacle was placed at the top of the hill. Here it remained a few years, till after the massacre by Saul of all the priests at Nob save one, Abiathar (1Sa 22:11). Subsequently, possibly by Saul himself, it was removed to Gibeon (1Ch 16:39; 21:29). Gibeon was 6 miles from Jerusalem, and 7 from Beth-el, and may have been chosen for its strategic advantage as well as for the fact that it was already inhabited by priests, and was Saul’s ancestral city.

7. Restoration of the Ark:

This removal by Saul, if he was the author of it, was recognized afterward by David as a thing done, with which he did not think it wise to interfere (of 1Ch 16:40). On his capturing the fortress of Jebus (later Jerusalem), and building himself a "house" there, David prepared a place for the ark of God, and pitched a tent on Zion in imitation of the tabernacle at Gibeon (2Sa 6:17 ff; 1Ch 16:1). He must also have provided an altar, for we read of burnt offerings and peace offerings being made there. Meanwhile the ark had been brought from Kiriath-jearim, where it had lain so long; it was restored in the presence of a concourse of people representing the whole nation, the soldiery and civilians delivering it to the priests (2Sa 6:1). On this journey Uzzah was smitten for touching the ark. Arrived near Jerusalem, the ark was carried into the house of Obed-edom, a Levite, and remained there for 3 months. At the end of this time it was carried into David’s tabernacle with all fitting solemnity and honor.

8. The Two Tabernacles:

Hence, it was that there were now two tabernacles, the original one with its altar at Gibeon, and the new one with the original ark in Jerusalem, both under the protection of the king. Both, however, were soon to be superseded by the building of a temple. The altar at Gibeon continued in use till the time of Solomon. Of all the actual material of the tabernacle, the ark alone remained unchanged in the temple. The tabernacle itself, with its sacred vessels, was brought up to Jerusalem, and was preserved, apparently, as a sacred relic in the temple (1Ki 8:4). Thus, after a history of more than 200 years, the tabernacle ceases to appear in history.

IV. Symbolism.

Though the tabernacle was historically the predecessor of the later temples, as a matter of fact, the veil was the only item actually retained throughout the series of temples. Nevertheless it is the tabernacle rather than the temple which has provided a substructure for much New Testament teaching. All the well-known allusions of the writer to the Hebrews, e.g. in chapters 9 and 10, are to the tabernacle, rather than to any later temple.

1. New Testament References:

In general the tabernacle is the symbol of God’s dwelling with His people (Ex 25:8; compare 1Ki 8:27), an idea in process of realization in more and more perfect forms till it reaches its completion in the carnation of the Word ("The Word became flesh, and dwelt (Greek "tabernacled") among us," Joh 1:14; compare 2Co 5:1), in the church collectively (2Co 6:16) and in the individual believer (1Co 6:19) and finally in the eternal glory (Re 2:13). In the Epistle to the Hebrews, the locus classicus of the tabernacle in Christian thought, the idea is more cosmical—the tabernacle in its holy and most holy divisions representing the earthly and the heavenly spheres of Christ’s activity. The Old Testament was but a shadow of the eternal substance, an indication of the true ideal (Heb 8:5; 10:1). The tabernacle in which Christ ministered was a tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man (Heb 8:2). He is the high priest of "the greater and more perfect tabernacle" (Heb 9:11). "Christ entered not into a holy place made with hands, like in pattern to the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear before the face of God for us" (Heb 9:24). The symbolical significance of the tabernacle and its worship is not, however, confined to the Epistle to the Hebrews. It must be admitted that Paul. does not give prominence to the tabernacle symbolism, and further, that his references are to things common to the tabernacle and the temple. But Paul speaks of "the layer of regeneration" (Tit 3:5 the Revised Version margin), and of Christ, who "gave himself up for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God, for an odor of a sweet smell" (Eph 5:2). The significance which the synoptic writers give to the rending of the veil of the temple (Mt 27:51; Mr 15:38; Lu 23:45) shows how this symbolism entered deeply into their thought and was felt by them to have divine attestation in this supernatural fact. The way into the holiest of all, as the writer to the Hebrews says, was now made manifest (9:8; 10:19,20).

2. God’s Dwelling with Man:

The suggestion which underlies all such New Testament references is not only that Christ, in His human manifestation, was both tabernacle and priest, altar and sacrifice, but also, and still more, that God ever has His dwelling among men, veiled no doubt from the unbelieving and insincere, but always manifest and accessible to the faithful and devout. As we have a great high priest who is now passed into the heavens, there to appear in our behalf in the true tabernacle, so we ourselves have permission and encouragement to enter into the holiest place of all on earth by the blood of the everlasting covenant. Of the hopes embodied in these two planes of thought, the earthly tabernacle was the symbol, and contained the prospect and foretaste of the higher communion. It is this which has given the tabernacle such an abiding hold on the imagination and veneration of the Christian church in all lands and languages.

3. Symbolism of Furniture:

The symbolism of the various parts of the tabernacle furniture is tolerably obvious, and is considered under the different headings. The ark of the covenant with its propitiatory was the symbol of God’s gracious meeting with His people on the ground of atonement (compare Ro 3:25; see ARK OF THE COVENANT). The twelve cakes of shewbread denote the twelve tribes of Israel, and their presentation is at once an act of gratitude for that which is the support of life, and, symbolically, a dedication of the life thus supported; the candlestick speaks to the calling of Israel to be a people of light (compare Jesus in Mt 5:14-16); the rising incense symbolizes the act of prayer (compare Re 5:8; 8:3).

LITERATURE.

See the articles on "Tabernacle" and "Temple" in Smith’s DB, HDB, EB, The Temple BD, etc.; also the commentaries. on Exodus (the Speaker’s Pulpit Commentary, Keil’s, Lange’s, etc.); Bahr, Symbolik d. Mosaischen Cult; Keil, Archaeology, I, 98 ff (English translation); Westcott, essay on "The General Significance of the Tabernacle," in his Hebrews; Brown, The Tabernacle (1899); W. S. Caldecott, The Tabernacle: Its History and Structure. See the articles in this Encyclopedia on the special parts of the tabernacle.

See also TEMPLE.

W. Shaw Caldecott

James Orr

TABERNACLE, B

B. IN CRITICISM

I. CONSERVATIVE AND CRITICAL VIEWS

II. ARGUMENTS IN SUPPORT OF THE CRITICAL THEORY EXAMINED

1. Not Stated, That the Temple Was Constructed after the Pattern of the Tabernacle

2. No Trace of the Tabernacle in Pre-Solomonic Times

3. The Tabernacle Could Not Have Been Built as Exodus Describes

4. Biblical Account Contains Marks of Its Unhistorical Character

5. Pre-exilic Prophets Knew Nothing of Levitical System of Which the Tabernacle Was Said to Be the Center.

LITERATURE

I. Conservative and Critical Views.

The conservative view of Scripture finds:

(1) that the tabernacle was constructed by Moses in the wilderness of Sinai;

(2) that it was fashioned according to a pattern shown to him in the Mount;

(3) that it was designed to be and was the center of sacrificial worship for the tribes in the wilderness; and

(4) that centuries later the Solomonic Temple was constructed after it as a model.

However, the critical (higher) view of Scripture says:

(1) that the tabernacle never existed except on paper;

(2) that it was a pure creation of priestly imagination sketched after or during the exile;

(3) that it was meant to be a miniature sanctuary on the model of Solomon’s Temple;

(4) that it was represented as having been built in the wilderness for the purpose of legitimizing the newly-published Priestly Code (P) or Levitical ritual still preserved in the middle books of the Pentateuch; and

(5) that the description of the tabernacle furnished in the Priestly Code (P) (Ex 25-31; 36-40; Nu 2:2,17;

5:1-4; 14:44) conflicts with that given in the Elohist (E) (Ex 33:7-11), both as to its character and its location.

The principal grounds on which it is proposed to set aside the conservative viewpoint and put in its place the critical theory are these:

II. Arguments in Support of the Critical Theory Examined.

(1) It is nowhere stated that Solomon's Temple was constructed after the pattern of the Mosaic tabernacle; hence, it is reasonable to infer that the Mosaic tabernacle had no existence when or before the Solomonic Temple was built.

(2) No trace of the Mosaic tabernacle can be found in the pre-Solomonic period, from which it is clear that no such tabernacle existed.

(3) The Mosaic tabernacle could not have been produced as Exodus describes, and, accordingly, the story must be relegated to the limbo of romance.

(4) The Biblical account of the Mosaic tabernacle bears internal marks of its completely unhistorical character.

(5) The pre-exilic prophets knew nothing of the Levitical system of which the Mosaic tabernacle was the center, and hence, the whole story must be set down as a sacred legend.

These assertions demand examination:

1. Not Stated, That the Temple Was Constructed after the Pattern of the Tabernacle:

It is urged that nowhere is it stated that Solomon's Temple was fashioned after the pattern of the Mosaic tabernacle. Wellhausen thinks (GI, chapter i, 3, p. 44) that, had it been so, the narrators in Kings and Chronicles would have said so. "At least," he writes, "one would have expected that in the report concerning the building of the new sanctuary, casual mention would have been made of the old." And so there was—in 1Ki 8:4 and 2Ch 5:5. Of course, it is contended that "the tent of meeting" referred to in these passages was not the Mosaic tabernacle of Ex 25, but simply a provisional shelter for the ark—though in P the Mosaic tabernacle bears the same designation (Ex 27:21). Conceding, however, for the sake of argument, that the tent of the historical books was not the Mosaic tabernacle of Exodus, and that this is nowhere spoken of as the model on which Solomon's Temple was constructed, does it necessarily follow that because the narrators in Kings and Chronicles did not expressly state that Solomon's Temple was built after the pattern of the Mosaic tabernacle, therefore the Mosaic tabernacle had no existence when the narrators wrote? If it does, then the same logic will demonstrate the non-existence of Solomon's Temple before the exile, because when the writer of P was describing the Mosaic tabernacle he made no mention whatever about its being a miniature copy of Solomon's Temple. A reductio ad

absurdum like this disposes of the first of the five pillars upon which the new theory rests.

2. No Trace of the Tabernacle in Pre-Solomonic Times

It is alleged that no trace of the Mosaic tabernacle can be found in pre-Solomonic times. On the principle that silence about a person, thing or event does not prove the non-existence of the person or thing or the non-occurrence of the event, this 2nd argument might fairly be laid aside as irrelevant. Yet it will be more satisfactory to ask, if the assertion be true, why no trace of the tabernacle can be detected in the historical books in pre-Solomonic times. The answer is, that of course it is true, if the historical books be first "doctored," i.e. gone over and dressed to suit theory, by removing from them every passage, sentence, clause and word that seems to indicate, presuppose or imply the existence of the tabernacle, and such passage, sentence, clause and word assigned to a late R who inserted it into the original text to give color to his theory, and support to his fiction that the Mosaic tabernacle and its services originated in the wilderness. Could this theory be established on independent grounds, i.e. by evidence derived from other historical documents, without tampering with the sacred narrative, something might be said for its plausibility. But every scholar knows that not a particle of evidence has ever been, or is likely ever to be, adduced in its support beyond what critics themselves manufacture in the way described. That they do find traces of the Mosaic tabernacle in the historical books, they unconsciously and unintentionally allow by their efforts to explain such traces away, which moreover they can only do by denouncing these traces as spurious and subjecting them to a sort of surgical operation in order to excise them from the body of the text. But these so-called spurious traces are either true or they are not true. If they are true, whoever inserted them, then they attest the existence of the tabernacle, first at Shiloh, and afterward at Nob, later at Gibeon, and finally at Jerusalem; if they are not true, then some other things in the narrative must be written down as imagination, as, e.g. the conquest of the land, and its division among the tribes, the story of the altar on the East of Jordan, the ministry of the youthful Samuel at Shiloh, and of Ahimelech at Nob.

(1) The Mosaic Tabernacle at Shiloh.

That the structure at Shiloh (1Sa 1:3,9,19,24; 2:11,12; 3:3) was the Mosaic tabernacle everything recorded about it shows. It contained the ark of God, called also the ark of the covenant of God and the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, or more fully the ark of the covenant of Yahweh of Hosts, names, especially the last, which for the ark associated with the tabernacle were not unknown in the period of the wandering. It had likewise a priesthood and a sacrificial worship of three parts—offering sacrifice (in the forecourt), burning incense (in the holy place), and wearing an ephod (in the Holy of Holies)—which at least bore a close resemblance to the cult of the tabernacle, and in point of fact claimed to have been handed down from Aaron. Then Elkanah’s pious custom of going up yearly from Ramathaim-zophim to Shiloh to worship and to sacrifice unto Yahweh of Hosts suggests that in his day Shiloh was regarded as the central high place and that the law of the three yearly feasts (Ex 23:14; Le 23:1-18; De 16:16) was not unknown, though perhaps only partially observed; while the statement about "the women who did service at the door of the tent of meeting" as clearly points back to the similar female institution in connection with the tabernacle (Ex 38:8). To these considerations it is objected (a) that the Shiloh sanctuary was not the Mosaic tabernacle, which was a portable tent, but a solid structure with posts and

doors, and

(b) that even if it was not a solid structure but a tent, it could be left at any moment without the ark, in which case it could not have been the Mosaic tabernacle of which the ark was an "inseparable companion"; while

(c) if it was the ancient "dwelling" of Yahweh, it could not have been made the dormitory of Samuel.

But

(a) while it need not be denied that the Shiloh sanctuary possessed posts and doors—Jer 7:12 seems to admit that it was a structure which might be laid in ruins—yet this does not warrant the conclusion that the Mosaic tabernacle had no existence in Shiloh. It is surely not impossible or even improbable that, when the tabernacle had obtained a permanent location at Shiloh, and that for nearly 400 years (compare above under A, III, 1, 8 and see CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, VII, VIII), during the course of these centuries a porch with posts and doors may have been erected before the curtain that formed the entrance to the holy place, or that strong buildings may have been put up around it as houses for the priests and Levites, as treasure-chambers, and such like—thus causing it to present the appearance of a palace or house with the tabernacle proper in its interior. Then

(b) as to the impossibility of the ark being taken from the tabernacle, as was done when it was captured by the Philistines, there is no doubt that there were occasions when it was not only legitimate, but expressly commanded to separate the ark from the tabernacle, though the war with the Philistines was not one. In Nu 10:33, it is distinctly stated that the ark, by itself, went before the people when they marched through the wilderness; and there is ground for thinking that during the Benjamite war the ark was with divine sanction temporarily removed from Shiloh to Beth-el (Jud 20:26,27) and, when the campaign closed, brought back again to Shiloh (Jud 21:12).

(c) As for the notion that the Shiloh sanctuary could not have been the Mosaic tabernacle because Samuel is said to have slept in it beside the ark of God, it should be enough to reply that the narrative does not say or imply that Samuel had converted either the holy place or the most holy into a private bedchamber, but merely that he lay down to sleep "in the temple of the Lord where the ark of God was," doubtless "in the court where cells were built for the priests and Levites to live in when serving at the sanctuary" (Keil). But even if it did mean that the youthful Samuel actually slept in the Holy of Holies, one fails to see how an abuse like that may not have occurred in a time so degenerate as that of Eli, or how, if it did, it would necessarily prove that the Shiloh shrine was not the Mosaic tabernacle.

(2) The Mosaic Tabernacle at Nob.

That the sanctuary at Nob (1Sa 21:1-6) was the Mosaic tabernacle may be inferred from the following circumstances:

(a) that it had a high priest with 85 ordinary priests, a priest's ephod, and a table of shewbread;

(b) that the eating of the shewbread was conditioned by the same law of ceremonial purity as prevailed in connection with the Mosaic tabernacle (Le 15:18); and

(c) that the Urim was employed there by the priest to ascertain the divine will—all of which circumstances pertained to the Mosaic tabernacle and to no other institution known among the Hebrews.

If the statement (1Ch 13:3) that the ark was not inquired at in the days of Saul calls for explanation, that explanation is obviously this, that during Saul's reign the ark was dissociated from the tabernacle, being lodged in the house of Abinadab at Kiriath-jearim, and was accordingly in large measure forgotten. The statement (1Sa 14:18) that Saul in his war with the Philistines commanded Ahijah, Eli's great-grandson, who was "the priest of the Lord in Shiloh, wearing an ephod" (1Sa 14:3) to fetch up the ark—if 1Sa 14:18 should not rather be read according to the Septuagint, "Bring hither the ephod"—can only signify that on this particular occasion it was fetched from Kiriath-jearim at the end of 20 years and afterward returned thither. This, however, is not a likely supposition; and for the Septuagint reading it can be said that the phrase "Bring hither" was never used in connection with the ark; that the ark was never employed for ascertaining the Divine Will, but the ephod was; and that the Hebrew text in 1Sa 14:18 seems corrupt, the last clause reading "for the ark of God was at that day and the sons of Israel," which is not extremely intelligible.

(3) The Mosaic Tabernacle at Gibeon.

The last mention of the Mosaic tabernacle occurs in connection with the building of Solomon's Temple (1Ki 8:4; 2Ch 1:3; 5:3), when it is stated that the ark of the covenant and the tent of meeting, and all the holy vessels that were in the tent were solemnly fetched up into the house which Solomon had built. That what is here called the tabernacle of the congregation, or the tent of meeting, was not the Mosaic tabernacle has been maintained on the following grounds:

(a) that had it been so, David, when he fetched up the ark from Obed-edom's house, would not have pitched for it a tent in the city of David, but would have lodged it in Gibeon;

(b) that had the Gibeon shrine been the Mosaic tabernacle it would not have been called as it is in Kings, "a great high place";

(c) that had the Gibeon shrine been the Mosaic tabernacle, Solomon would not have required to cast new vessels for his Temple, as he is reported to have done; and

(d) that had the Gibeon shrine been the Mosaic tabernacle the brazen altar would not have been left behind at Gibeon but would also have been conveyed to Mt. Moriah.

But

(a) if it was foolish and wrong for David not to lodge the ark in Gibeon, that would not make it certain that the Mosaic tabernacle was not at Gibeon. That it was either foolish or wrong, however, is not clear. David may have reckoned that if the house of Obed-edom had derived special blessing from the presence of the ark in it for three months, possibly it would be for the benefit of his (David's) house and kingdom to have the ark permanently in his capital. And in addition, David may have remembered that God had determined to choose out a place for His ark, and in answer to prayer David may have been directed to fetch the ark to Jerusalem. As good a supposition this, at any rate, as that of the critics.

(b) That the Gibeon shrine should have been styled "the great high place" (1Ki 3:4) is hardly astonishing, when one calls to mind that it was the central sanctuary, as being the seat of the Mosaic tabernacle with its brazen altar. And may not the designation "high place," or bamah, have been affixed to it just because, through want of its altar, it had dwindled down into a mere shadow of the true sanctuary and become similar to the other "high places" or bamoth?

(c) The casting of new vessels for Solomon's Temple needs no other explanation than this, that the new house was at least twice as spacious as the old, and that in any case it was fitting that the new house should have new furniture.

(d) That the brazen altar would not have been left behind at Gibeon when the Mosaic tabernacle was removed, may be met by the demand for proof that it was actually left behind. That it was left behind is a pure conjecture. That it was transplanted to Jerusalem and along with the other tabernacle utensils laid up in a side chamber of the temple is as likely an assumption as any other (see 1Ki 8:4).

3. The Tabernacle Could Not Have Been Built as Exodus Describes

It is maintained that the Mosaic tabernacle could not have been produced as Exodus describes:

(1) that the time was too short,

(2) that the Israelites were too little qualified, and

(3) that the materials at their disposal were too scanty for the construction of so splendid a building as the Mosaic tabernacle.

But

(1) does any intelligent person believe that 9 months was too short a time for 600,000 able-bodied men, to say nothing of their women and children, to build a wooden house 30 cubits long, 10 high and 10 broad, with not as many articles in it as a well-to-do artisan's kitchen oftentimes contains?

(2) Is it at all likely that they were so ill-qualified for the work as the objection asserts? The notion that

the Israelites were a horde of savages or simply a tribe of wandering nomads does not accord with fact. They had been bond-men, it is true, in the land of Ham; but they and their fathers had lived there for 400 years; and it is simply incredible, as even Knobel puts it, that they should not have learnt something of the mechanical articles One would rather be disposed to hold that they must have had among them at the date of the Exodus a considerable number of skilled artisans. At least, archaeology has shown that if the escaped bondsmen knew nothing of the arts and sciences, it was not because their quondam masters had not been able to instruct them. The monuments offer silent witness that every art required by the manufacturers existed at the moment in Egypt, as e.g. the arts of metal-working, wood-carving, leather-making, weaving and spinning. And surely no one will contend that the magnificent works of art, the temples and tombs, palaces and pyramids, that are the world's wonder today, were the production always and exclusively of native Egyptian and never of Hebrew thought and labor! Nor

(3) is the reasoning good, that whatever the Israelites might have been able to do in Egypt where abundant materials lay to hand, they were little likely to excel in handicrafts of any sort in a wilderness where such materials were wanting.

Even Knobel could reply to this, that as the Israelites when they escaped from Egypt were not a horde of savages, so neither were they a tribe of beggars; that they had not entered on their expedition in the wilderness without preparation, or without taking with them their most valuable articles; that the quantities of gold, silver and precious stones employed in the building of the tabernacle were but trifles in comparison with other quantities of the same that have been found in possession of ancient oriental peoples; that a large portion of what was contributed had probably been obtained by despoiling the Egyptians before escaping from their toils and plundering the Amalekites whom they soon after defeated at Rephidim, and who, in all likelihood, at least if one may judge from the subsequent example of the Midianites, had come to the field of war bedecked with jewels and gold; and that the acacia wood, the linen, the blue, the purple and the scarlet, with the goats' skins, rams' skins, and seal skins might all have been found and prepared in the wilderness (compare Kurtz, Geschichte des alten Bundes, II, section 53). In short, so decisively has this argument, derived from the supposed deficiency of culture and resources on the part of the Israelites, been disposed of by writers of by no means too conservative pro-clivities, that one feels surprised to find it called up again by Benzinger in Encyclopedia Biblica to do duty in support of the unhistorical character of the tabernacle narrative in Exodus.

4. Biblical Account Contains Marks of Its Unhistorical Character

The Biblical account of the Mosaic tabernacle, it is further contended, bears internal marks of its completely unhistorical character, as e.g.

(1) that it represents the tabernacle as having been constructed on a model which had been supernaturally shown to Moses;

(2) that it habitually speaks of the south, north, and west sides of the tabernacle although no preceding order had been issued that the tent should be so placed;

(3) that the brazen altar is described as made of timber overlaid with brass, upon which a huge fire constantly burned;

(4) that, the tabernacle is depicted, not as a mere provisional shelter for the ark upon the march, but "as the only legitimate sanctuary for the church of the twelve tribes before Solomon"; and

(5) that the description of the tabernacle furnished in P (Ex 25-31; 36-40; Nu 2:2,17; 5:1-4; 14:44) conflicts with that given in E (Ex 33:7-11), both as to its character and its location.

But

(1) why should the story of the tabernacle be a fiction, because Moses is reported to have made it according to a pattern showed to him in the Mount (Ex 25:40 (Hebrew 8:5))? No person says that the Temple of Solomon was a fiction, because David claimed that the pattern of it given to Solomon had been communicated to him (David) by divine inspiration (1Ch 28:19). Every critic also knows that Ezekiel wrote the book that goes by his name. Yet Ezekiel asserts that the temple described by him was beheld by him in a vision. Unless therefore the supernatural is ruled out of history altogether, it is open to reply that God could just as easily have revealed to Moses the pattern of the tabernacle as He afterward exhibited to Ezekiel the model of his temple. And even if God showed nothing to either one prophet or the other, the fact that Moses says he saw the pattern of the tabernacle no more proves that he did not write the account of it, than Ezekiel's stating that he beheld the model of his temple attests that Ezekiel never penned the description of it. The same argument that proves Moses did not write about the tabernacle also proves that Ezekiel could not have written about the vision-temple. Should it be urged that as Ezekiel's temple was purely visionary so also was Moses' tabernacle, the argument comes with small consistency and less force from those who say that Ezekiel's vision-temple was the model of a real temple that should afterward be built; since if Ezekiel's vision-temple was (or should have been, according to the critics) converted into a material sanctuary, no valid reason can be adduced why Moses' vision-tabernacle should not also have been translated into an actual building.

(2) How the fact that the tabernacle had three sides, south, north and west, shows it could not have been fashioned by Moses, is one of those mysteries which takes a critical mind to understand. One naturally presumes that the tabernacle must have been located somewhere and oriented somehow; and, if it had four sides, would assuredly suit as well to set them toward the four quarters of heaven as in any other way. But in so depicting the tabernacle, say the critics, the fiction writers who invented the story were actuated by a deep-laid design to make the Mosaic tabernacle look like the Temple of Solomon. Quite a harmless design, if it was really entertained! But the Books of Kings and Chronicles will be searched in vain for any indication that the Temple foundations were set to the four quarters of heaven. It is true that the 12 oxen who supported the molten sea in Solomon's Temple were so placed—4 looking to the North, 4 to the South, 4 to the East, and 4 to the West (1Ki 7:25); but this does not necessarily warrant the inference that the sides of the Temple were so placed. Hence, on the well-known principle of modern criticism, that when a thing is not mentioned by a writer the thing does not exist, seeing that nothing is recorded about how the temple was placed, ought it not to be concluded that the whole story about the

(3) As to the absurdity of representing a large fire as constantly burning upon a wooden altar overlaid with a thin plate of brass, this would certainly have been all that the critics say—a fatal objection to receiving the story of the tabernacle as true. But if the story was invented, surely the inventor might have given Moses and his two skilled artisans, Bezalel and Oholiab, some credit for common sense, and not have made them do, or propose to do, anything so stupid as to try to keep a large fire burning upon an altar of wood. This certainly they did not do. An examination of Ex 27:1-8; 38:1-7 makes it clear that the altar proper upon which "the strong fire" burned was the earth or stone-filled (Ex 20:24 f) hollow which the wooden and brass frame enclosed.

(4) The fourth note of fancy—what Wellhausen calls "the chief matter"—that the tabernacle was designed for a central sanctuary to the church of the Twelve Tribes before the days of Solomon, but never really served in this capacity—is partly true and partly untrue. That it was meant to be a central sanctuary, until Yahweh should select for Himself a place of permanent habitation, which He did in the days of Solomon, is exactly the impression a candid reader derives from Exodus, and it is gratifying to learn from so competent a critic as Wellhausen that this impression is correct. But that it really never served as a central sanctuary, it is impossible to admit, after having traced its existence from the days of Joshua onward to those of Solomon. That occasionally altars were erected and sacrifices offered at other places than the tabernacle—as by Gideon at Ophrah (Jud 6:24-27) and by Samuel at Ramah (1Sa 7:17)—is no proof that the tabernacle was not the central sanctuary. If it is, then by parity of reasoning the altar in Mt. Ebal (De 27:5) should prove that Jerusalem was not intended as a central sanctuary. But, if alongside of the Temple in Jerusalem, an altar in Ebal could be commanded, then also alongside of the tabernacle it might be legitimate to erect an altar and offer sacrifice for special needs. And exactly this is what was done. While the tabernacle was appointed for a central sanctuary the earlier legislation was not revoked: "An altar of earth thou shalt make unto me, and shalt sacrifice thereon thy burnt-offerings, and thy peace-offerings, thy sheep, and thine oxen: in every place where I record my name I will come unto thee and I will bless thee" (Ex 20:24). It was still legitimate to offer sacrifice in any spot where Yahweh was pleased to manifest Himself to His people. And even though it had not been, the existence of local shrines alongside of the tabernacle would no more warrant the conclusion that the tabernacle was never built than the failure of the Christian church to keep the Golden Rule would certify that the Sermon on the Mount was never preached.

(5) With regard to the supposed want of harmony between the two descriptions of the tabernacle in P and E, much depends on whether the structures referred to in these documents were the same or different.

(a) If different, i.e. if the tent in E (Ex 33:7-11) was Moses' tent (Kurtz, Keil, Kalisch, Ewald and others), or a preliminary tent erected by Moses (Havernick, Lange; Kennedy, and section A (I, 1), above), or possessed by the people from their forefathers (von Gerlach, Benzinger in EB), no reason can be found why the two descriptions should not have varied as to both the character of the tent and its location. The tent in E, which according to the supposition was purely provisional, a temporary sanctuary, may well have been a simple structure and pitched outside the camp; while the tent in P could

just as easily have been an elaborate fabric with an ark, a priesthood and a complex sacrificial ritual and located in the midst of the camp. In this case no ground can arise for suggesting that they were contradictory of one another, or that P's tent was a fiction, a paper-tabernacle, while E's tent was a reality and the only tabernacle that ever existed in Israel. But

(b) if on the other hand the tent in E was the same as the tent in P (Calvin, Mead in Lange, Konig, Eerdmans, Valeton and others), then the question may arise whether or not any contradiction existed between them, and, if such contradiction did exist, whether this justifies the inference that P's tent was unhistorical, i.e. never took shape except in the writer's imagination.

That the tent in E was not P's Mosaic tabernacle has been argued on the following grounds:

(a) that the Mosaic tabernacle (assuming it to have been a reality and not a fiction) was not yet made; so that E's tent must have been either the tent of Moses or a provisional tent;

(b) that nothing is said about a body of priests and Levites with an ark and a sacrificial ritual in connection with E's tent, but only of a non-Levitical attendant Joshua, and

(c) that it was situated outside the camp, whereas P's tabernacle is always represented as in the midst of the camp.

The first of these grounds largely disappears when Ex 33:7 is read as in the Revised Version: "Now Moses used to take the tent and to pitch it without the camp." The verbs, being in the imperfect, point to Moses' practice (Driver, Introduction and Hebrew Tenses; compare Ewald, Syntax, 348), which again may refer either to the past or to the future, either to what Moses was in the habit of doing with his own or the preliminary tent, or what he was to do with the tent about to be constructed. Which interpretation is the right one must be determined by the prior question which tent is intended. Against the idea of E's tent being Moses' private domicile stands the difficulty of seeing why it was not called his tent instead of the tent, and why Moses should be represented as never going into it except to hold communion with Yahweh. If it was a provisional tent, struck up by Moses, why was no mention of its construction made? And if it was a sort of national heirloom come down from the forefathers of Israel, why does the narrative contain not the slightest intimation of any such thing?

On the other hand if E's tent was the same as P's, the narrative does not require to be broken up; and Ex 33:7-11 quite naturally falls into its place as an explanation of how the promises of 33:3 and 5 were carried out (see infra).

The second supposed proof that E's tent was not P's but an earlier one, namely, that P's had a body of priests and Levites, an ark and a complex ritual, while E's had only Joshua as attendant and made no mention of ark, priests or sacrifices, loses force, unless it can be shown that there was absolute necessity that in this paragraph a full description of the tabernacle should be given. But obviously no such necessity existed, the object of the writer having been as above explained. Driver, after Wellhausen (GJ,

387), conjectures that in E’s original document Ex 33:7-11 may have been preceded "by an account of the construction of the Tent of Meeting and of the ark," and that "when the narrative was combined with that of P this part of it (being superfluous by the side of Exodus 25-35) was probably omitted." As this however is only a conjecture, it is of no more (probably of less) value than the opinion that Exodus 25-35 including 33:7-11 proceeded from the same pen. The important contribution to the interpretation of the passage is that the absence from the paragraph relating to E’s tent of the ark, priests and sacrifices is no valid proof that E’s tent was not the Mosaic tabernacle.

The third argument against their identity is their different location—E’s outside and P’s inside the camp. But it may be argued (a) that the translation in the Revised Version (British and American) distinctly relieves this difficulty. For if Moses used to take and pitch the tabernacle outside the camp, the natural implication is that the tabernacle was often, perhaps usually, inside the camp, as in the Priestly Code (P), and only from time to time pitched outside the camp, when Yahweh was displeased with the people (Eerdmans, Valeton). Or (2) that "outside the camp" may signify away, at an equal distance from all the four camps ("over against the tent of meeting"—in the King James Version "far off," after Jos 3:4—were the various tribes with their standards, i.e. the four camps, to be pitched; Nu 2:2); so that the tabernacle might easily be in the midst of all the camps and yet "outside" and "far off" from each camp separately, thus requiring every individual who sought the Lord to go out from his camp unto the tabernacle. Nu 11:26-30 may perhaps shed light upon the question. There it is stated that "there remained two men in the camp (who) had not gone out with Moses unto the Tent," and that Moses and the elders after leaving the tent, "gat (them) into the camp." Either the tent at this time was in the center of the square, around which the four camps were stationed, or it was outside. If it was outside, then the first of the foregoing explanations will hold good; if it was inside the camp, then the second suggestion must be adopted, namely, that while the camps were round about the tabernacle, the tabernacle was outside each camp. "Although the tabernacle stood in the midst of the camp, yet it was practically separated from the tents of the tribes by an open space and by the encampment of the Levites" (Pulpit Commentary, in the place cited.; compare Keil, in the place cited.). When one calls to mind that the tabernacle was separated from each side of the square probably, as in Jos 3:4, by 2,000 cubits (at 19-25 inches each = about 3/4 of a mile), one has small difficulty in understanding how the tabernacle could be both outside the several camps and inside them all; how the two promises in Ex 33 (the King James Version)—"I will not go up in the midst of thee" (33:3) and "I will come up into the midst of thee" (33:5)—might be fulfilled; how Moses and the elders could go out from the camp (i.e. their several camps) to the tabernacle and after leaving the tabernacle return to the camp (i.e. their several camps); and how no insuperable difficulty in the shape of an insoluble contradiction exists between E’s account and P’s account.

5. Pre-exilic Prophets Knew Nothing of Levitical System of Which the Tabernacle Was Said to Be the Center.

That the pre-exilic prophets knew nothing about the Levitical system of which the tabernacle was the center is regarded as perhaps the strongest proof that the tabernacle had no existence in the wilderness and indeed never existed at all except on paper. The assertion about the ignorance of the pre-exilic prophets as to the sacrificial system of the Priestly Code has been so often made that it has come to be a

"commonplace" and "stock-phrase" of modern criticism. In particular, Amos in the 8th century BC (5:25,26) and Jeremiah in the 7th century BC (7:21-23) are quoted as having publicly taught that no such sacrificial ritual as the tabernacle implied had been promulgated in the wilderness. But, if these prophets were aware that the Levitical Law had not been given by Moses, one would like to know,

(1) how this interpretation of their language had been so long in being discovered;

(2) how the critics themselves are not unanimous in accepting this interpretation—which they are not;

(3) how Amos could represent Yahweh as saying "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings, I will not accept them; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts" (5:21,22), if Yahweh had never accepted and never enjoined them;

(4) how Jeremiah could have been a party to putting forward Deuteronomy as a work of Moses if he knew that Yahweh had never commanded sacrifices to be offered, which Deuteronomy does; and

(5) how Jeremiah could have blamed Judah for committing spiritual adultery if Yahweh had never ordered the people to offer sacrifice.

In reply to

(1) it will scarcely do to answer that all previous interpreters of Amos and Jeremiah had failed to read the prophets' words as they stand (Am 5:25,26; Jer 7:22), because the question would then arise why the middle books of the Pentateuch should not also be read as they stand, as e.g. when they say, "The Lord spake unto Moses," and again "These (the legislative contents of the middle books) are the commandments, which Yahweh commanded Moses for the children of Israel in mount Sinai" (Le 27:34). As for

(2) it is conveniently forgotten that Bohlen (Introduction to Genesis, I, 277) admitted that some of the Pentateuch "might possibly have originated in the time of Moses," and when quoting Jer 7:22 never dreamed of putting forward an explanation different from the orthodox rendering of the same, and certainly did not cite it as a proof that the Law had no existence prior to the exile; that De Wette in his Einleitung (261, 262, 8th edition) stated that "the holy laws and institutions of theocratic people had for their author Moses, who in giving them stood under divine guidance"; that Knobel (Die Bucher Ex und Lev, xxii) explicitly declared that Moses must be regarded not only as the liberator and founder of his people, but also the originator of the peculiar Israelite constitution and lawgiving, at least in its fundamental elements; that Ewald (Die Propheten, II, 123) regarded Jer 7:22 as making no announcement about the origin of the sacrificial cult; and that Bleek (Introduction to the Old Testament) forgot to read the modern critical interpretation into the words of Amos and Jeremiah for the simple reason that to have done so would have stultified his well-known view that many of the laws of the middle books of the Pentateuch are of Mosaic origin. Nor is the difficulty

(3) removed by holding that, if prior to the days of Amos Yahweh did accept the burnt offerings and meal offerings of Israel, these were not sacrifices that had been appointed in the wilderness, because Yahweh Himself appears to intimate (Am 5:25,26) that no such sacrifices or offerings had been made during the whole 40 years' wandering. Had this been the case, it is not easy to see why the post-exilic authors of the Priestly Code should have asserted the contrary, should have represented sacrifices as having been offered in the wilderness, as they have done (see Nu 16; 18). The obvious import of Yahweh's language is either that the sacrificial worship which He had commanded had been largely neglected by the people, or that it had been so heartless and formal that it was no true worship at all—their real worship being given to their idols—and that as certainly as the idolaters in the wilderness were excluded from Canaan, so the idolaters in Amos' day, unless they repented, would be carried away into exile. As to

(4) Jeremiah's action in putting forward or helping to put forward Deuteronomy as a work of Moses when he knew that it represented Yahweh as having commanded sacrifices to be offered both in the wilderness and in Canaan (De 12:6,11,13), and must have been aware as well that J-E had represented Yahweh as commanding sacrifice at Sinai (Ex 20:24,25), no explanation can be offered that will clear the prophet from the charge of duplicity and insincerity, or prevent his classification with the very men who were a grief of mind to him and against whom a large part of his life was spent in contending, namely, the prophets that prophesied lies in the name of God. Nor does it mend matters to suggest (Cheyne) that when Jeremiah perceived that Deuteronomy, though floated into publicity under high patronage, did not take hold, he changed his mind, because in the first place if Jeremiah did so, he should, like an honest man, have washed his hands clear of Deuteronomy, which he did not; and in the second place, because had he done so he could not have been "the iron pillar and brazen wall" which Yahweh had intended him to be and indeed had promised to make him against the princes, priests and people of the land (1:18). And, still further,

(5) it passes comprehension how, if Yahweh never commanded His people to offer sacrifice to Him, Jeremiah could have represented Yahweh as enjoining him to pronounce a curse upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem because they transgressed the words of Yahweh's covenant, which He had made with their fathers in the day when He brought them out of the land of Egypt, by running after other gods to serve them, setting up altars and burning incense unto Baal and even working lewdness in Yahweh's house (Jer 11:1-15). It is urged in answer to this, that the offense complained of was not that the men of Judah did not offer sacrifices to Yahweh, but that they offered them to Baal and polluted His temple with heathen rites—that what Yahweh demanded from His worshippers was not the offering of sacrifice, but obedience to the moral law conjoined with abstinence from idolatry. But in that case, what was the use of a temple at all? And why should Yahweh speak of it as "mine house," if sacrifices were not required to be offered in it (compare on this Kittel, The Scientific Study of the Old Testament, 218)? Why idolatrous sacrifices were denounced was not merely because they were wrong in themselves, but also because they had supplanted the true sacrificial worship of Yahweh. As already stated, it is not easy to perceive how Jeremiah could have said that Yahweh had never commanded sacrifices to be offered to Him, when he (Jeremiah) must have known that the Book of the Covenant in J-E (Ex 20:24,25) represented Yahweh as expressly enjoining them. Had Jeremiah not read the Book of the Covenant with

sufficient care? This is hardly likely in so earnest a prophet. Or will it be lawful to suggest that Jeremiah knew the Book of the Covenant to be a fiction and the assumption of divine authority for its enactments to be merely a rhetorical device? In this case his words might be true; only one cannot help regretting that he did not distinctly state that in his judgment the Book of the Covenant was a fraud.

It may now be added in confirmation of the preceding, that the various references to a tabernacle in the New Testament appear at least to imply that in the 1st Christian century the historicity of the Mosaic tabernacle was generally accepted. These references are Peter's exclamation on the Mount of Transfiguration (Mt 17:4; Mr 9:5; Lu 9:33); Stephen's statement in the council (Ac 7:44); the affirmations in Hebrews (chapters 8; 9); and the voice which John heard out of heaven (Re 21:3). It may be admitted that taken separately or unitedly these utterances do not amount to a conclusive demonstration that the tabernacle actually existed in the wilderness; but read in the light of Old Testament aeclarations that such a tabernacle did exist, they have the force of a confirmation. If the language of Peter and that of John may fairly enough be regarded as figurative, even then their symbolism suggests, as its basis, what Stephen and the writer to the He affirm to have been a fact, namely, that their "fathers had the tabernacle .... in the wilderness," and that, under the first covenant, "there was a tabernacle prepared."

LITERATURE.

I, critical: De Wette, Beitrage; von Bohlen, Genesis; Georg, Judische Feste; Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des AT; Graf, de Templo Silonensi; Kuenen, The Religion of Israel; Wellhausen, Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels; HDB and EB, articles "Tabernacle," II, conservative: Bredenkamp, Gesetz und Propheten; Kurtz, Geschichte des alten Bundes; Havernick, Einleitung; Hengstenberg, Egypt and the Books of Moses; Riehm, Handworterbuch, and Herzog, RE (ed 1; edition 3 is "critical"), articles "Stiftshutte"; Baxter, Sanctuary and Sacrifice; Bissell, The Pentateuch: Its Origin and Structure; Orr, The Problem of the Old Testament; Whitelaw, Old Testament Critics.

T. Whitelaw

TABERNACLES, FEAST OF

See FEASTS AND FASTS, I, A, 3.

TABITHA

tab'-i-tha (Tabeitha). See DORCAS.

TABLE

"Table" is derived from the Latin tabula, meaning primarily "a board," but with a great variety of other

significances, of which "writing-tablet" is the most important for the Biblical use of "table." So in English "table" meant at first "any surface" and, in particular, "a surface for writing," and further specialization was needed before "table" became the name of the familiar article of furniture ("object with a horizontal surface"), a meaning not possessed by tabula in Latin. After this specialization "table" in the sense of "a surface for writing" was replaced in later English by the diminutive form "tablet." But "surface for writing" was still a common meaning of "table," and in this sense it represents luach (Ex 24:12, etc.), a word of uncertain origin, plax, "something flat" (2Co 3:3; Heb 9:4), deltos, "a writing tablet" (1 Macc 8:22; 14:18,27,48), or pinakidion "writing tablet" (Lu 1:63—a rather unusual word). the American Standard Revised Version has kept the word in the familiar combination "tables of stone" (Ex 24:12, etc.), but elsewhere (Pr 3:3; 7:3; Isa 30:8; Jer 17:1; Hab 2:2; Lu 1:63) has replaced "table" by "tablet," a change made by the English Revised Version only in Isa 30:8; Lu 1:63.

See TABLET.

The table as an article of furniture is shulchan, in the Hebrew and trapezal, in the Greek. The only exceptions are So 1:12, mecabh, "something round," perhaps a "round table," perhaps a "cushion," perhaps a "festal procession," and Mr 7:4, the King James Version kline, "couch" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), while Joh 13:28 and Joh 12:2, the King James Version "at the table," and Tobit 7:8, the King James Version "on the table," represent only the general sense of the original. Of the two regular words, shulchan is properly "a piece of hide," and so "a leather mat," placed on the ground at meal time, but the word came to mean any "table," however elaborate (e.g. Ex 25:23-30). Trapeza means "having four feet."

2Ki 4:10 seems to indicate that a table was a necessary article in even the simpler rooms. Curiously enough, however, apart from the table of shewbread there is no reference in the Bible to the form or construction of tables, but the simpler tables in Palestine of the present day are very much lower than ours. The modern "tables of the money changers" (Mr 11:15 and parallel’s) are small square trays on stands, and they doubtless had the same form in New Testament times.

See SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF; MONEY-CHANGERS.

To eat at a king’s table (2Sa 9:7, etc.) is naturally to enjoy a position of great honor, and the privilege is made by Christ typical of the highest reward (Lu 22:30). Usually "to eat at one’s table" is meant quite literally, but in 1Ki 18:19; Ne 5:17 (compare 1Ki 10:5) it probably means "be fed at one’s expense." On the other hand, the misery of eating the leavings of a table (Jud 1:7; Mr 7:28; Lu 16:21) needs no comment. The phrase "table of the Lord (Yahweh)" in Mal 1:7,12 the King James Version (compare Eze 41:22; 44:16; Eze 39:20 is quite different) means "the table (altar) set before the Lord," but the same phrase in 1Co 10:21 is used in a different sense and the origin of its use by Paul is obscure. Doubtless the language, if not the meaning, of Malachi had its influence and may very well have been suggested to Paul as he wrote 1Co 10:18. On the other hand, light may be thrown on the passage by such a papyrus fragment as "Chareimon invites you to dine at the table (kline) of the lord Serapis," a formal invitation to an idol-banquet (1Co 8:10; Pap. Oxyr. i.110; compare iii.523). This would explain Paul’s "table of

demons"—a phrase familiar to the Corinthians—and he wrote "table of the Lord" to correspond (compare, however, Pirqe ‘Abhoth, iii.4). "Table at which the Lord is Host," at any rate, is the meaning of the phrase. On the whole passage see the comms., especially that of Lietzmann (fullest references). Probably Lu 22:30 has no bearing on 1Co 10:21. The meaning of Ps 69:22 (quoted in Ro 11:9), "Let their table before them become a snare," is very obscure ("let them be attacked while deadened in revelings"?), and perhaps was left intentionally vague.

Burton Scott Easton

TABLE OF NATIONS

1. The Table and Its Object

2. What It Includes and Excludes

3. Order of the Three Races

4. Extent of Each

5. Sons of Japheth

6. Sons and Descendants of Ham

7. Further Descendants of Ham

8. Sons of Shem

9. Further Descendants of Shem

10. Value of Table and Its Historical Notes

11. Further Arguments for Early Date of Table

1. The Table and Its Object:

This is the expression frequently used to indicate "the generations of the sons of Noah" contained in Ge 10. These occupy the whole chapter, and are supplemented by Ge 11:1-9, which explain how it came about that there were so many languages in the world as known to the Hebrews. The remainder of Genesis 11 traces the descent of Abram, and repeats a portion of the information contained in Genesis 10 on that account only. The whole is seemingly intended to lead up to the patriarch’s birth.

2. What It Includes and Excludes:

Noah and his family being the only persons left alive after the Flood, the Table naturally begins with them, and it is from his three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth, that the inhabitants of the earth, as known to the Hebrews, were descended. All others—the Mongolians of the Far East and Japan, the American Indians, both North and South, the natives of Australia and New Zealand—were naturally omitted from the list. It may, of course, be argued that all the nations not regarded as descended from Shem and Japheth might be included among the descendants of Ham; but apart from the fact that this would give to Ham far more than his due share of the human race, it would class the Egyptians and Canaanites with the Mongolians, Indians, etc., which seems improbable. "The Table of Nations," in fact, excludes the races of which the Semitic East was in ignorance, and which could not, therefore, be given according to their lands, languages, families, and nations (Ge 10:5,20,31).

3. Order of the Three Races:

Notwithstanding that the sons of Noah are here (Ge 10:1) and elsewhere mentioned in the order Shem, Ham and Japheth (Ge 5:32; 6:10), and Ham was apparently the youngest (see HAM), the Table begins (Ge 10:2) with Japheth, enumerates then the descendants of Ham (Ge 10:6), and finishes with those of Shem (Ge 10:21). This order in all probability indicates the importance of each race in the eyes of the Hebrews, who as Semites were naturally interested most in the descendants of Shem with whom the list ends. This enabled the compiler to continue the enumeration of Shem’s descendants in Ge 11:12 immediately after the verses dealing with the building of the Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Tongues.

4. Extent of Each:

The numbers of the descendants of each son of Noah, however, probably bear witness to the compiler’s knowledge, rather than their individual importance in his eyes. Thus, the more remote and less known race of Japheth is credited with 14 descendants only (7 sons and 7 grandsons), while Ham has no less than 29 descendants (4 sons, 23 grandsons, and 2 great-grandsons), and Shem the same (5 sons, 5 grandsons, 1 great-grandson, and 20 remoter descendants to the 6th generation). Many of the descendants of Shem and Ham, however, are just as obscure as the descendants of Japheth. How far the relationship to the individual sons of Noah is to be taken literally is uncertain. The earlier names are undoubtedly those of nations, while afterward we have, possibly, merely tribes, and in chapter 11 the list develops into a genealogical list of individuals.

5. Sons of Japheth:

It is difficult to trace a clear system in the enumeration of the names in the Table. In the immediate descendants of Japheth (Ge 10:2), Gomer, Magog, Tubal and Mesech, we have the principal nations of Asia Minor, but Madai stands for the Medes on the extreme East, and Javan (the Ionians) for the Greeks (? and Romans) on the extreme West (unless the Greeks of Asia Minor were meant). Gomer’s

descendants apparently located themselves northward of this tract, while the sons of Javan extended themselves along the Mediterranean coastlands westward, Tarshish standing, apparently, for Spain, Kittim being the Cyprians, and Rodanim the Rhodians.

6. Sons and Descendants of Ham:

Coming to the immediate descendants of Ham (Ge 10:6), the writer begins with those on the South and then goes northward in the following order: Cush or Ethiopia, Mizraim or Egypt, Phut (better Put, the Revised Version (British and American)) by the Red Sea, and lastly Canaan—the Holy Land—afterward occupied by the Israelites. The sons of Cush, which follow (Ge 10:7), are apparently nationalities of the Arabian coast, where Egyptian influence was predominant. These, with the sons of Raamah, embrace the interior of Africa as known to the Hebrews, and the Arabian tract as far as Canaan, its extreme northern boundary. The reference to Babylonia (Nimrod) may be regarded as following not unnaturally here, and prominence is given to the district on account of its importance and romantic history from exceedingly early times. Nevertheless, this portion (Ge 10:8-12) reads like an interpolation, as it not only records the foundation of the cities of Babylonia, but those of Assyria as well—the country mentioned lower down (Ge 10:22) among the children of Shem.

7. Further Descendants of Ham:

The text then goes back to the West again, and enumerates the sons of Mizraim or Egypt (Ge 10:13), mostly located on the southeastern and eastern shores of the Mediterranean. These include the "Libyans in the narrowest sense" (Lehabim), two districts regarded as Egyptian (Naphtuhim and Pathrusim), the Casluhim from whom came the Philistines, and the Caphtorim, probably not the Cappadocians of the Targums, but the island of Crete, "because such a large island ought not to be wanting" (Dillmann). The more important settlements in the Canaanitish sphere of influence are referred to as the sons of Canaan (Ge 10:15)—Sidon, Heth (the Hittites), the Jebusites (who were in occupation of Jerusalem when the Israelites took it), the Amorites (whom Abraham found in Canaan), and others. Among the sons of Canaan are, likewise, the Girgashites, the Arkites and Sinites near Lebanon, the Arvadites of the coast, and the Hamathites, in whose capital, Hamath, many hieroglyphic inscriptions regarded as records of the Hittites or people of Heth have been found. It is possibly to this occupation of more or less outlying positions that the "spreading abroad" of the families of the Canaanites (Ge 10:18) refers. In Ge 10:19 the writer has been careful to indicate "the border of the Canaanites," that being of importance in view of the historical narrative which was to follow; and here he was evidently on familiar ground. 8. Sons of Shem:

In his final section—the nations descended from Shem (Ge 10:21)—the compiler again begins with the farthest situated—the Elamites—after which we have Asshur (Assyria), to the Northwest; Arpachshad (? the Chaldeans), to the West; Lud (Lydia), Northwest of Assyria; and Aram (the Aramean states), South of Lud and West of Assyria. The tribes or states mentioned as the sons of Aram (Uz, Hul, Gether and Mash), however, do not give the names with which we are familiar in the Old Testament (Aram Naharaim, Aram Zobah, etc.), and have evidently to be sought in different positions, indicating that they represent an earlier stage of their migrations. With regard to their positions, it has been suggested that

Uz lay in the neighborhood of the Hauran and Damascus; Hul near the Sea of Galilee; and that Mash stands for Mons Masius. This last, however, may have been the land of Mas, West of Babylonia.

9. Further Descendants of Shem:

Only one son is attributed to Arpachshad, namely, Shelah (shalach, shelach, Ge 10:24), unidentified as a nationality. This name should, however, indicate some part of Babylonia, especially if his son, Eber, was the ancestor of the Hebrews, who were apparently migrants from Ur (Mugheir) (see ABRAHAM; UR OF THE CHALDEES). Though Peleg, "in whose days the land was divided," may not have been an important link in the chain, the explanatory phrase needs notice. It may refer to the period when the fertilizing watercourses of Babylonia—the "rivers of Babylon" (Ps 137:1)—were first constructed (one of their names was pelegh), or to the time when Babylonia was divided into a number of small states, though this latter seems to be less likely. Alternative renderings for Selah, Eber and Peleg are "sending forth" (Bohlen), "crossing" (the Euphrates), and "separation" (of the Joktanites) (Bohlen), respectively.

The Babylonian geographical fragment 80-6-17, 504 has a group explained as Pulukku, perhaps a modified form of Peleg, followed by (Pulukku) sa ebirti, "Pulukku of the crossing", the last word being from the same root as Eber. This probably indicates a city on one side of the river (? Euphrates), at a fordable point, and a later foundation bearing the same name on the other side.

Reu, Serug, and Nahor, however, are regarded generally as place-names, and Terah as a personal name (the father of Abram, Nahor and Haran). From this point onward the text (Ge 11:27) becomes the history of the Israelite nation, beginning with these patriarchs.

10. Value of Table and Its Historical Notes:

Arguments for its early date.—There is hardly any doubt that we have in this ethnographical section of Ge one of the most valuable records of its kind. Concerning the criticisms upon it which have been made, such things are unavoidable, and must be regarded as quite legitimate, in view of the importance of the subject. The interpolated sections concerning Nimrod and the Tower of Babel are such as would be expected in a record in which the compiler aimed at giving all the information which he could, and which he thought desirable for the complete understanding of his record. It may be regarded as possible that this information was given in view of the connection of Abraham with Babylonia. In his time there were probably larger cities than Babylon, and this would suggest that the building of the Babylonian capital may have been arrested. At the time of the captivity on the other hand, Babylon was the largest capital in then known world, and the reference to its early abandonment would then have conveyed no lesson—seeing the extent of the city, the reader realized that it was only a short setback from which it had suffered, and its effects had long since ceased to be felt.

11. Further Arguments for Early Date of Table:

Limits of its information.—For the early date of the Table also speaks the limited geographical

knowledge displayed. Sargon of Agade warred both on the East and the West of Babylonia, but he seems to have made no expeditions to the North, and certainly did not touch either Egypt or Ethiopia. This suggests not only that the information available was later than his time, but also that it was obtained from merchants, travelers, envoys and ambassadors. The scantiness of the information about the North of Europe and Asia, and the absence of any reference to the Middle or the Far East, imply that communications were easiest on the West, the limit of trade in that direction being apparently Spain. If it could be proved that the Phoenicians came as far westward as Britain for their tin, that might fix the latest date of the compilation of the Table, as it must have been written before it became known that their ships went so far; but in that case, the date of their earliest journeys thither would need to be fixed. Noteworthy is the absence of any reference to the Iranians (Aryan Persians) on the East. These, however, may have been included with the Medes (Madai), or one of the unidentified names of the descendants of Japheth in Ge 10:2,3.

See SHEM; HAM; JAPHETH, and the other special articles in this Encyclopedia; also, for a great mass of information and theories by many scholars and specialists, Dillmann, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Altes Testament, "Die Genesis," Leipzig, 1882; W. Max Muller, Asien und Europa, Leipzig, 1893; and F. Hommel, Grundriss der Geographic und Geschichte des alten Orients, Munich, 1904.

T. G. Pinches

TABLET

tab’-let: A rigid flat sheet (plate, pad or slab) used to receive writing. Stone, clay, wood and perhaps bronze, gold and lead tablets, at least, are mentioned in the Bible. In the Old English sense of "locket" the word is incorrectly used in the King James Version also of what the Revised Version (British and American) translates as "armlets," margin "necklaces" (Ex 35:22; Nu 31:50) and "perfume boxes" (Isa 3:20).

The technical Hebrew word for tablet, luach, is generally translated in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) as "table." This is used for stone, wood or metal plates or tablets with or without writing. In Isaiah (30:8) where the Revised Version (British and American) translates "tablet," it is contrasted with the "roll" and probably means the wood or waxed tablet. In Habakkuk (2:2, the American Standard Revised Version "tablet," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "table") it perhaps refers to a metal tablet to be erected on a wall, but more likely it refers to the wooden tablet. It is also used in Proverbs (3:3; 7:3, the American Standard Revised Version "tablet," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "table") and in Jeremiah (17:1) figuratively of the writing upon the tablets of the heart, the word being rendered in the Septuagint by the same word (plax) used by Paul (2Co 3:3, "tables" in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) in the same figure. In other cases (Ex 24:12, etc.) it is used of the tablets of stone containing the Decalogue.

The word gillayon (Isa 8:1), which is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "tablet" and in the King James Version "roll," is elsewhere (Isa 3:23) translated "mirror," and is thought to mean a blank polished surface for writing, particularly because in later use it means the blank margin of a roll.

See ROLL.

The clay tablet is referred to in Ezekiel (4:1, English Versions of the Bible "tile"), and its use there for a map of the city has been strikingly illustrated in modern excavation by a tablet map discovered at Nippur (Hilprecht, Explorations, 518). Jeremiah (32:14, the Revised Version (British and American) "deeds," the King James Version "evidences") may also refer to clay tablets, but not surely, since roll deeds were also kept in earthen jars. Job (19:24) is thought by some to refer to the writing on leaden tablets, such as were in very common use in antiquity and in the Middle Ages for the writing of charms and especially curses, but more hold that inscriptions filled with lead are meant here. The plate of pure gold (Ex 28:36; Le 8:9), engraved like the gravings of a signet, which was on Aaron’s miter, may also be properly described as a tablet, recalling the silver treaty between the Hittites and Egyptians and the gold plate on which Queen Helena of Adiabene (Yoma’ 37a; Jewish Encyclopedia, VI, 334) had engraved a passage from the Pentateuch (Nu 5:19-22). Bronze tablets (deltos) are several times referred to in 1 Maccabees (8:22; 14:18,27,48).

"Daleth" (daleth or deleth), the Semitic (Phoenician) original from which the generic Greek word for tablet (deltos) is derived (Gardthausen, p. 124, note 1), is perhaps not found strictly in this meaning in the Old Testament. The word is used, however, of two kinds of written documents and in such a way as to suggest that one is the original of, and the other derived from, the "daleth"-tablet. In De 6:9 and 11:20 it is enjoined that the laws of Yahweh shall be written upon the gates of the houses, and in each case the "daleths" (doors) are meant, since the door-posts are also mentioned, and in 1Sa 21:13, where David "scrabbles," it is expressly said to be upon the "doors" ("daleths") of the gate. This practice of writing upon house doors and city gates corresponds to the modern posting of notices on church doors and scoring of tallies on a door by the rural innkeeper; and the name seems to have passed from this great door tablet to the portable tablet. On the other hand Jeremiah (36:23) uses "daleths" (English Versions of the Bible "leaves") for the columns of a roll, obviously transferring the term from the panel form of the folding tablets.

pinakis, or pinakidion, is found in Eze 9:2,11 in the version of Symmachus in place of the "writer’s inkhorn," and pinakidion, in Lu 1:63, of the (wooden) tablet on which Zacharias wrote the name of John. Puxion is used several times by Septuagint as the translation for luach, and once (So 5:14) for ivory tablets. Sanis is used as the translation of "daleth" or luach 2 or 3 times in the Septuagint and still oftener in the other versions. The most common Greek term both in the New Testament (2Co 3:3; Heb 9:4) and in the Greek Old Testament is plax, most often used of the tables of stone. This, like platos, which is also used for luach in Septuagint, is not recognized in the modern textbooks (Thompson, Gardthausen, Birt).

LITERATURE.

Gardthausen, Griechische Palaeog., Leipzig, I (1911), 123-32; compare pp. 24-45.

See also literature under WRITING.

E. C. Richardson

TABOR

ta'-ber, tar'-bor (tabhor; Codex Vaticanus Thachcheia; Codex Alexandrinus Thabor): One of the towns in the territory of Zebulun, given to the Merarite Levites (1Ch 6:77). The parallel list in Jos 21:24 f contains no name like this. There is no indication of its position. Some have thought that it may correspond to Daberath in the territory of Issachar (21:28), now represented by Deburiyeh on the western slope of Mt. Tabor; others that it may be the mountain itself; and yet others that it may be a city on the mountain, which probably was occupied from very early times. There is a Tabor mentioned as on the border of Issachar (Jos 19:22); but that is almost certainly the mountain. It has been suggested that Tabor in 1Ch 6:17 may be a contraction of Chisloth-tabor (Jos 19:12), the modern Iksal, 3 miles West of the mountain. No certainty is possible.

W. Ewing

TABOR, MOUNT

(tabhor, har tabhor; oros Thabor, to Itaburion): This mountain seems to be named as on the border of Issachar (Jos 19:22). It is possibly identical with the mountain to which Zebulun and Issachar were to call the peoples (De 33:19). Standing on the boundary between the tribes, they would claim equal rights in the sanctuary on the top. The passage seems to indicate that it was a place of pilgrimage. The worshippers, bringing with them the "abundance of the sea" and the "treasures of the sand," would be a source of profit to the local authorities. The mountain can be no other than Jebel et-Tur, an isolated and shapely height, rising at the northeast corner of the Plain of Esdraelon, about 5 miles West of Nazareth. The mountain has retained its sacred character, and is still a place of pilgrimage, only the rites being changed. The present writer has mingled with great interest among the crowds that assemble there from all parts at the Feast of the Transfiguration.

It was on the summit and slopes of this mountain that Deborah and Barak gathered their forces; and hence, they swept down to battle with Sisera in the great plain (Jud 4:6,12,14). Here probably the brothers of Gideon were murdered by Zeba and Zalmunna (Jud 8:18). Moore ("Jgs," ICC, at the place) thinks the scene of the slaughter must have been much farther South. He does not see what the brothers of Gideon were doing so far North of their home in Abiezer. There is, however, no reason for placing Ophrah so far to the South as he does; and in any case the men were probably captured and taken to Tabor as prisoners. Josephus (Ant., VII, ii, 3) says it was in one of Solomon's administrative districts (compare 1Ki 4:17). Such a prominent and commanding position must always have invited fortification.

In the time of Antiochus the Great, 218 BC, we find a fortress here, which that king took by stratagem, Atabyrion by name (Polyb. v. 70, 6). It was recovered by the Jews, and was held by them under Janneus, 105-70 BC (Ant., XIII, xv, 4). The place fell to the Romans at the conquest under Pompey; and not far from the mountain Alexander, son of Aristobulus II, suffered defeat at the hands of Gabinius, proconsul of Syria, 53 BC (Ant., XIV, iv, 3; BJ, I, viii, 7). Josephus, who commanded in Galilee at the outbreak of the Jewish war, recognized the importance of the position, and built a wall round the summit. After the disaster to Jewish arms at Jotapata, where Josephus himself was taken prisoner, many fugitives took refuge here. Placidus the Roman general did not attempt an assault upon the fortress. Its defenders were by a feint drawn into the plain, where they were defeated, and the city surrendered.

A tradition which can be traced to the 4th century AD places the scene of the Transfiguration on this mountain. Allusion has been made above to the sacred character of the place. To this, and to the striking appearance of the mountain, the rise of the tradition may have been due. Passing centuries have seen a succession of churches and monasteries erected on the mountain. The scene of the Transfiguration was laid at the southeastern end of the summit, and here a church was built, probably by Tancred. Hard by was also shown the place where Melchizedek met Abraham returning from the pursuit of Chedorlaomer. The mountain shared to the full the vicissitudes of the country's stormy history. In 1113 AD the Arabs from Damascus plundered the monasteries and murdered the monks. An unsuccessful attack was made by Saladin in 1183, but 4 years later, after the rout of the Crusaders at Hattin, he devastated the place. Twenty-five years after that it was fortified by el-Melek el-'Adel, brother of Saladin, and the Crusaders failed in an attempt to take it in 1217. In 1218, however, the Saracens threw down the defenses. Sultan Bibars in 1263 ordered the destruction of the Church of the Transfiguration, and for a time the mountain was deserted. The Feast of the Transfiguration, however, continued to be celebrated by the monks from Nazareth. During the last quarter of the 19th century much building was done by the Latin and Greek churches, who have now large and substantial monasteries and churches. They have also excavated the ruins of many of the old ecclesiastical buildings. The remains now to be seen present features of every period, from Jewish times to our own.

Mt. Tabor rises to a height of 1,843 ft. above the sea, and forms the most striking feature of the landscape. Seen from the South it presents the shape of a hemisphere; from the West, that of a sugar loaf. Its rounded top and steep sides are covered with thick brushwood. It is about half a century since the oak forest disappeared; but solitary survivors here and there show what the trees must have been. A low neck connects the mountain with the uplands to the North. It is cut off from Jebel ed-Duchy on the South by a fertile vale, which breaks down into Wady el-Bireh, and thence to the Jordan. A zigzag path on the Northwest leads to the top, whence most interesting and comprehensive views are obtained. Southward, over Little Hermon, with Endor and Nain on its side, and Shunem at its western base, we catch a glimpse of Mt. Gilboa. Away across the plain the eye runs along the hills on the northern boundary of Samaria, past Taanach and Megiddo to Carmel by the sea, and the oak forest that runs northward from the gorge of the Kishon. A little to the North of West, 5 miles of broken upland, we can see the higher houses of Nazareth gleaming white in the sun. Eastward lies the hollow of the Jordan, and beyond it the wall of Gilead and the steep cliffs East of the Sea of Galilee, broken by glens and watercourses, and especially by the great chasm of the Yarmuk. The mountains of Zebulun and Naphtali seem to culminate in the shining mass of Great Hermon, rising far in the northern sky. Standing here one

realizes how aptly the two mountains may be associated in the Psalmist’s thought, although Hermon be mighty and Tabor humble (Ps 89:12). Tabor is referred to by Jeremiah (46:18), and Hosea alludes to some ensnaring worship practiced on the mountain (5:1).

The present writer spent some weeks on Mt. Tabor, and as the result of careful observation and consideration concluded that the scene of the Transfiguration cannot be laid here. The place would appear to have been occupied at that time; and the remoteness and quiet which Jesus evidently sought could hardly have been found here.

See TRANSFIGURATION, MOUNT OF.

W. Ewing

TABOR, OAK OF

(PLAIN OF TABOR in the King James Version) (elon tabhor; he drus Thabor): A place mentioned only in Samuel’s directions to Saul after his anointing (1Sa 10:3). It lay between the city where the two met and Gibeah whither Saul was returning. Ewald and Thenius thought it might be identical with the palm tree of Deborah, but there is nothing to support this conjecture. Others have thought we might read "oak of Deborah," as signifying the place where Rachel’s nurse was buried (Ge 35:8). The truth is that nothing whatever is now known of the site.

W. Ewing

TABRET; TIMBREL

tab’-ret, tim’-brel.

See MUSIC, III, 3, (1).

TABRIMMON

tab-rim’-on, tab’-ri-mon (Tabhrimmon, "Rimmon is good"; Codex Vaticanus Taberema; Codex Alexandrinus Tabenraema): The son of Hezion and father of BENHADAD (which see) (1Ki 15:18, the King James Version, "Tabrimon").

TACHES

tach’-iz.

See CLASPS.

TACHMONITE

tak’-mo-nit.

See TAHCHEMONITE.

TACKLING

tak’-ling.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (2).

TADMOR

tad’-mor, tad’-mor (tadhmor): A city built by Solomon in the wilderness (2Ch 8:4), the Roman Palmyra. Tadmor is the native name and is found on inscriptions. It occurs also in the Kere of 1Ki 9:18, where the Kethibh or consonants read "Tamar" (compare Eze 47:19; 48:28). It is famous in Arabian as well as in Hebrew literature, and enters Roman history in connection with Zenobia and Longinus. The inscriptions, which belong for the most part to the latter period (266-73 AD), have been published by Dawkins and Wood and also by M. Waddington and the Duc de Luynes. Popular works on the subject are An Account of Palmyra and Zenobia by W. Wright, and The Last Days and Fall of Palmyra by W. Ware.

See TAMAR.

Thomas Hunter Weir

TAHAN; TAHANITES

ta’-han, ta’-han-its (tachan, tachani): The name of two Ephraimites who lived toward the end of the exodus of the Israelites (circa 1415 BC).

(1) The head of one of the families of the tribe of Ephraim (Nu 26:35).

(2) The son of Telah and father of Ladan, also of the tribe of Ephraim (1Ch 7:25 f).

TAHAPANES

ta-hap’-a-nez (tachpanchec).

See TAHPANHES.

TAHASH

ta’-hash (tachash; Tochos; the King James Version Thahash): A son of Nahor by his concubine Reumah (Ge 22:24). The word tachash means a kind of leather or skin, and perhaps the animal yielding it, probably the "dugong" (compare Brown, Briggs, and Driver). Tachash has been identified by Winckler with Tichis (Egypt), located on the Orontes, North of Kadesh.

TAHATH (1)

ta’-hath (tachath, "below"): A wilderness station of the Israelites (Nu 33:26,27), between Makheloth and Terah.

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

TAHATH (2)

(1) A Kohathite Levite (1Ch 6:24).

(2) The name is mentioned twice among the sons of Ephraim (1Ch 7:20); two families may be meant, or perhaps the name has been accidentally repeated.

TAHCHEMONITE

ta-ke’-mo-nit, ta’-ke-mon-it (tachkemoni): Name of a family to which Jashobeam, the chief captain in David’s army, belonged (2Sa 23:8; 1Ch 11:11). In 1 Chronicles it is "Hachmonite."

TAHPANHES

ta’-pan-hez, ta-pan’-hez (usually in the Old Testament tachpanchec; Septuagint Taphnas; Coptic, Taphnes): The various spellings of the Hebrew text are fairly well indicated in the King James Version by Tahapanes (Jer 2:16); Tahpanhes (Jer 43:7-9; 44:1; 46:14); Tehaphnehes (Eze 30:18), while an Egyptian queen (XXIst Dynasty) is named Tahpenes (1Ki 11:19,20). Tahpanhes was a city on the eastern frontier of Lower Egypt, represented today by Tell Defenneh, a desert mound lying some 20 miles Southwest from Pelusium (Biblical "Sin") and a little North of the modern Al-Kantarah ("the bridge"), marking the old caravan route from Egypt to Palestine, Mesopotamia and Assyria. Its Egyptian name is unknown, but it was called Daphnai, by the Greeks, and by the modern Arabs Def’neh. The site is now desolate, but it was a fertile district when watered by the Pelusiac branch of the Nile (compare Isa 19:6,7). Tahpanhes was so powerful that Jeremiah can say that it, with Memphis, has "broken the crown" of Israel’s head (2:16), and Ezekiel can speak of its "daughters" (colonies or suburban towns),

and names it with Heliopolis and Bubastis when the "yokes Septuagint "sceptres") of Egypt" shall be broken by Yahweh (30:18). In a later passage Jeremiah describes the flight of the Jews from their ruined capital to Tahpanhes after the death of Gedaliah (43:1-7) and prophesies that Nebuchadnezzar shall invade Egypt and punish it, establishing his throne upon the brick pavement (the King James Version "kiln") which is at the entry of Pharaoh's royal palace at Tahpanhes (Jer 43:8-11). He calls Tahpanhes as a witness to the desolation of the cities of Judah (Jer 44:1), but prophesies an equal destruction of Tahpanhes and other Egyptian cities (probably occupied by fugitive Jews) when Nebuchadnezzar shall smite them (Jer 46:14).

This invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar was for a long time strenuously denied (e.g. as late as 1889 by Kuenen, Historisch-critisch Onderzoek, 265-318); but since the discovery and publication (1878) of fragments of Nebuchadnezzar's annals in which he affirms his invasion of Egypt in his 37th year (568-567 BC), most scholars have agreed that the predictions of Jeremiah (43:9-13; 44:30) uttered shortly after 586 BC and of Ezekiel (29:19) uttered in 570 BC were fulfilled, "at least in their general sense" (Driver, Authority and Archaeology, 116). Three cuneiform inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar were found by Arabs probably on or near this site. The excavation of Tahpanhes in 1886 by W. M. Flinders Petrie made it "highly probable that the large oblong platform of brickwork close to the palace fort built at this spot by Psammetichus I, circa 664 BC, and now called Kasr Bint el-Yehudi, 'the castle of the Jew's daughter,' is identical with the quadrangle 'which is at the entry of Pharaoh's house in Tahpanhes' in which Jeremiah was commanded to bury the stones as a token that Nebuchadnezzar would spread his pavilion over them when he led his army into Egypt" (ibid., 117). Josephus explicitly mentions that Nebuchadnezzar, when he captured Tahpanhes, carried off a Jewish contingent from that city (Ant., IX, vii). Dr. Petrie found that while a small fort had existed here since the Rameside era (compare Herodotus ii.17), yet the town was practically founded by Psammetichus I, continued prosperous for a century or more, but dwindled to a small village in Ptolemaic times. Many sealings of wine jars stamped with the cartouches of Psammetichus I and Amosis were found in situ. Tahpanhes being the nearest Egyptian town to Palestine, Jeremiah and the other Jewish refugees would naturally flee there (43:7). It is not at all unlikely that Nebuchadnezzar's invasion of Egypt was partly due to Egypt's favorable reception of these refugees.

The pottery found at Tahpanhes "shows on the whole more evidence of Greeks than Egyptians in the place. .... Especially between 607-587 BC a constant intercourse with the Greek settlers must have been going on and a wider intercourse than even a Greek colony in Palestine would have produced. .... The whole circumstances were such as to give the best possible opportunity for the permeation of Greek words and Greek ideas among the upper classes of the Jewish exiles" (Petrie, Nebesheh and Defenneh, 1888, 50). This was, however, only one of many places where the Greeks and Hebrews met freely in this century (see e.g. Duruy, History of Greece, II, 126-80; Cobern, Daniel, 301-307). A large foreign traffic is shown at Tahpanhes in which no doubt the Jews took part. Discoveries from the 6th century BC included some very finely painted pottery, "full of archaic spirit and beauty," many amulets and much rich jewelry and bronze and iron weapons, a piece of scale armor, thousands of arrow heads, and three seals of a Syrian type. One of the few inscriptions prays the blessing of Neit upon "all beautiful souls." There was also dug up a vast number of minute weights evidently used for weighing precious metals, showing that the manufacture of jewelry was carried on here on a large scale. One of the most pathetic

and suggestive "finds" from this century, which witnessed the Babylonian captivity, consisted of certain curious figures of captives, carved in limestone, with their legs bent backward from their knees and their ankles and elbows bound together (Petrie, op. cit., chapters ix-xii).

Camden M. Cobern

TAHPENES

ta'-pe-nez, ta-pe'-nez (tachpenec; Septuagint Thekem(e)ina): Queen of Egypt, the sister of Hadad's wife and the foster-mother of his son Genubath (1Ki 11:19 f).

See PHARAOH.

TAHREA

ta'-re-a, ta-re'-a (tachrea'): Son of Micah, a descendant of Gibeon (1Ch 9:41; in 8:35 "Tarea").

TAHTIM-HODSHI

ta-tim-hod'-shi.

See KADESH ON THE ORONTES.

TAIL

tal ('alyah; zanabh; oura): The broad tail of the Syrian sheep, wrongly rendered "rump" (which see) in the King James Version, is mentioned as one of the portions of sacrifice which was burned on the altar as a sweet savor to God (Ex 29:22). The 2nd Hebrew word is used of the tails of serpents (Ex 4:4), of foxes, which Samson tied together in his cruel sport, in order to destroy the grainfields of the Philistines by means of attached firebrands (Jud 15:4, etc.). The following seems to be an allusion to this incident: "Fear not, neither let thy heart be faint, because of these two tails of smoking firebrands, for the fierce anger of Rezin and Syria, and of the son of Remaliah" (Isa 7:4).

Figurative: "Tail" = inferiority, as opposed to "head" = superiority, leadership. "Yahweh will make thee the head, and not the tail; and thou shalt be above only, and thou shalt not be beneath; if thou shalt hearken unto the commandments of Yahweh" (De 28:13; compare also 28:44).

In the New Testament we find oura used of the apocalyptic animals, scorpions, horses, and the dragon (Re 9:10,19; 12:4).

H. L. E. Luering

TAKE

tak: Most of the very numerous examples of this word are still in good use and only a few call for special attention. "To take" in the sense of "capture" is still common, but when a person or living animal is in point, modern English usually adds "prisoner" or "captive." English Versions of the Bible not infrequently has this addition (Ge 14:14, etc.), but more commonly "take" is used without it (Jos 10:39; Job 5:13; Sirach 23:21; Joh 7:30, etc.). An occasional obscurity is thus caused, as in Ge 27:3, "take me venison" for "hunt venison for me." "To take advice" (2Ch 25:17; the King James Version Jud 19:30, the Revised Version (British and American) "counsel") is "to reflect," not "to consult others" (compare 1Ki 12:28; but contrast 2Ki 6:8, etc.). "To take knowledge of" is "to learn thoroughly," "investigate" (1Sa 23:23, etc.), as is "to take notice of" (2Sa 3:36). "To take an oath of" (Ge 50:25, etc.) is "to exact an oath of." "To be taken with a disease" in the King James Version Mt 4:24; Lu 4:38 is "to suffer with" (the Revised Version (British and American) "be holden with"), but in 1 Macc 9:55; 2 Macc 9:21 (the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)), the context gives the force "be attacked by," as in modern English Compare the King James Version Lu 8:37 (the Revised Version (British and American) "holden"); Mic 4:9 (the Revised Version (British and American) "take hold of"). "Take" occurs in the sense "overtake" in the King James Version Ge 19:19 (the Revised Version (British and American) "overtake"); Sirach 36:26. "Take away" has sometimes a more forcible significance than in modern English, as in the King James Version Le 6:2, "a thing taken away by violence" (the Revised Version (British and American) "robbery"); Da 11:12, the King James Version "He hath taken away the multitude," where the meaning is "swept away" (compare the Revised Version margin "carried away"; the Revised Version (British and American) "shall be lifted up" is inappropriate here). So in "lest he take thee away with his stroke" (the King James Version Job 36:18), "take away" means simply "slay." (The text here is intensely obscure, and the Revised Version (British and American) has followed a different interpretation.) So "to be taken away" may mean simply "to die," as in Eze 33:6; The Wisdom of Solomon 14:15; Sirach 16:9; 19:3; Mr 2:20, although in 1Co 5:2 it means "to be expelled." "To take away judgment" or "right" (Job 27:2; 34:5; Ac 8:33) is "to refuse it," but in Ze 3:15 English Versions of the Bible means "the sentence against thee is canceled" (the Hebrew text is dubious). Ne 5:2 the King James Version has "take up" for "get" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), perhaps with the connotation "on credit." "Take up" is also used frequently for "utter solemnly" (Nu 23:7; Isa 14:4, etc.), a use due to the Hebrew "lift up," "exalt" (nasa'). For "take up" in the sense of "lift" (physically), compare Isa 40:15; Ac 7:43; the King James Version 21:15. "Take care" in Tobit 5:20; 1Co 9:9 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "to care") means "be anxious about," "have in mind" And the very obscure "scurrility in the matter of giving and taking" (Sirach 41:19) is explained by the Hebrew to mean "refusing the gift for which thou art besought." The following phrases are archaic, but hardly need explanation: "Take indignation" (Ne 4:1); "take wrong" (1Co 6:7); "take up in the lips" (Eze 36:3; the King James Version Ps 16:4, "take .... into my lips," the Revised Version (British and American) "take .... upon my lips"); and in the King James Version "take to record" (Ac 20:26, the Revised Version (British and American) "testify unto"); "take shame" (Mic 2:6 the King James Version).

Burton Scott Easton

TALE

tal (tokhen, mithkoneth, micpar; leros): In the King James Version of the Old Testament (with one exception, Ps 90:9) "tale" (in the sing.) means number. "Tell" often has the same meaning, e.g. "I may tell (i.e. reckon) all my bones" (Ps 22:17). When Moses requested permission to go three days' journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to Yahweh, Pharaoh replied by demanding the full "tale" of bricks from the Israelites although they were compelled to provide themselves with straw (Ex 5:8,18; see also 1Sa 18:27; 1Ch 9:28). In Ps 90:9, "as a tale that is told" is a doubtful rendering (see GAMES). The Septuagint and the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) render "as a spider's web." The literal and perhaps accurate translation is "as a sigh" (Driver, in the Parallel Psalter, gives "as a murmur"). The word used in this psalm means "to whisper," or "speak sotto voce," as a devout believer repeats to himself the words of a favorite hymn or passage (Ps 1:2).

The disciples considered the account given by the women in regard to the resurrection as "idle tales" (the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "idle talk"), literally, "nonsensical talk" (Lu 24:11).

In talebearer the word has another meaning, namely, "slanderous talk or gossip." The word occurs 5 times in Pr 11:13; 18:8; 20:19; 26:20,22 (the King James Version) and once in Leviticus (19:16). The word used in Leviticus and also in Pr 20:19 means a person who gads about from house to house hawking malicious gossip (compare 1Ti 5:13). From the same root comes the Hebrew word for "merchant." In Eze 22:9 for the King James Version "men that carry tales" the Revised Version (British and American) gives "slanderous men," as Doeg (1Sa 22:9,22); Ziba (2Sa 16:3; 19:27); and a certain maid-servant (2Sa 17:17).

See SLANDER.

T. Lewis

TALENT

tal'-ent (kikkar; talanton): A weight composed of 60 manehs (English Versions of the Bible "pounds") equal to about 120 pounds troy and 96 pounds avoirdupois, or 672,500 grains, of the Phoenician standard. See WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. When used in the monetary sense the talent might be either of silver or gold, and the value varied according to the standard, but is probably to be taken on the Phoenician, which would give about 410 British pounds, or $2,050 (in 1915), for the silver talent and 6,150 British pounds or $30,750 (in 1915), for the gold.

See MONEY.

Figurative: "Talent," like "pound," is used metaphorically in the New Testament for mental and spiritual attainments or gifts (Mt 25:15-28).

H. Porter

TALITHA CUMI

ta-le’-tha koo’-me (talitha koumi): Derived from the Aramaic Talyetha’ qumi, "damsel, arise"), which in the New Testament manuscripts is transliterated variously (Westcott-Hort, Taleitha koum, otherwise Talitha koumi). We have no data for determining how far Jesus employed the Aramaic language, but Mark (5:41) notes its use in this tender incident, and there is strong probability that Aramaic was used normally, if not exclusively, by Christ. There is, however, no ground for attributing any magical significance to the use of the Aramaic words in connection with this miracle.

TALMAI tal’-mi, tal’-ma-i (talmay):

(1) A clan, possibly of Aramean origin, generally reputed to be of gigantic height; resident in Hebron at the time of the Hebrew conquest and driven thence by Caleb (Nu 13:22; Jos 15:14; Jud 1:10).

(2) A son of Ammihur (or Ammihud), king of Geshur, a small Aramean kingdom, and a contemporary of David, to whom he gave his daughter Maacah in marriage. When Absalom fled from David after the assassination of Amnon he took refuge with Talmai at Geshur (2Sa 3:3; 13:37; 1Ch 3:2).

TALMON

tal’-mon (talmon): One of the porters in connection with the temple-service (1Ch 9:17; Ezr 2:42; Ne 7:45; 11:19; 12:25).

TALMUD

tal’-mud (talmudh):

I. PRELIMINARY REMARKS AND VERBAL EXPLANATIONS

II. IMPORTANCE OF THE TALMUD

III. THE TRADITIONAL LAW UNTIL THE COMPOSITION OF THE MISHNA

IV. DIVISION AND CONTENTS OF THE MISHNA (AND THE TALMUD)

1. Zera‘im, "Seeds"

2. Mo‘edh, "Feasts"

3. Nashim, "Women"

4. Neziqin, "Damages"

5. Kodhashim, "Sacred Things"

6. Teharoth, "Clean Things"

V. THE PALESTINIAN TALMUD

VI. THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD

VII. THE NON-CANONICAL LITTLE TREATISES AND THE TOSEPHTA’

1. Treatises after the 4th Cedher

2. Seven Little Treatises

LITERATURE

The present writer is, for brevity’s sake, under necessity to refer to his Einleitung in den Talmud, 4th edition, Leipzig, 1908. It is quoted here as Introduction.

There are very few books which are mentioned so often and yet are so little known as the Talmud. It is perhaps true that nobody can now be found, who, as did the Capuchin monk Henricus Seynensis, thinks that "Talmud" is the name of a rabbi. Yet a great deal of ignorance on this subject still prevails in many circles. Many are afraid to inform themselves, as this may be too difficult or too tedious; others (the anti-Semites) do not want correct information to be spread on this subject, because this would interfere seriously with their use of the Talmud as a means for their agitation against the Jews.

I. Preliminary Remarks and Verbal Explanations.

(1) Mishnah, "the oral doctrine and the study of it" (from shanah, "to repeat," "to learn," "to teach"), especially

(a) the whole of the oral law which had come into existence up to the end of the 2nd century AD;

(b) the whole of the teaching of one of the rabbis living during the first two centuries AD (tanna’, plural

tanna’im);

(c) a single tenet;

(d) a collection of such tenets;

(e) above all, the collection made by Rabbi Jehudah (or Judah) ha-Nasi’.

(2) Gemara’," the matter that is leaned" (from gemar, "to accomplish," "to learn"), denotes since the 9th century the collection of the discussions of the Amoraim, i.e. of the rabbis teaching from about 200 to 500 AD.

(3) Talmudh, "the studying" or "the teaching," was in older times used for the discussions of the Amoraim; now it means the Mishna with the discussions thereupon.

(4) Halakhah (from halakh, "to go"): (a) the life as far as it is ruled by the Law; (b) a statutory precept.

(5) Haggadhah (from higgidh, "to tell"), the non-halakhic exegesis.

II. Importance of the Talmud.

Commonly the Talmud is declared to be the Jewish code of Law. But this is not the case, even for the traditional or "orthodox" Jews. Really the Talmud is the source whence the Jewish Law is to be derived. Whosoever wants to show what the Jewish Law says about a certain case (point, question) has to compare at first the Shulchan ‘arukh with its commentary, then the other codices (Maimonides, Alphasi, etc.) and the Responsa, and finally the Talmudic discussions; but he is not allowed to give a decisive sentence on the authority of the Talmud alone (see Intro, 116, 117; David Hoffmann, Der Schulchan-Aruch, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1894, 38, 39). On the other hand, no decision is valid if it is against the yield of the Talmudic discussion. The liberal (Reformed) Jews say that the Talmud, though it is interesting and, as a Jewish work of antiquity, ever venerable, has in itself no authority for faith and life.

For both Christians and Jews the Talmud is of value for the following reasons:

(1) on account of the language, Hebrew being used in many parts of the Talmud (especially in Haggadic pieces), Palestinian Aramaic in the Palestinian Talmud, Eastern Aramaic in the Babylonian Talmud (compare "Literature," (7), below). The Talmud also contains words of Babylonian and Persian origin;

(2) for folklore, history, geography, natural and medical science, jurisprudence, archaeology and the understanding of the Old Testament (see "Literature," (6), below, and Introduction, 159-75). For Christians especially the Talmud contains very much which may help the understanding of the New Testament (see "Literature," (12), below).

III. The Traditional Law until the Composition of the Mishna.

The Law found in the Torah of Moses was the only written law which the Jews possessed after their return from the Babylonian exile. This law was neither complete nor sufficient for all times. On account of the ever-changing conditions of life new ordinances became necessary. Who made these we do not know. An authority to do this must have existed; but the claim made by many that after the days of Ezra there existed a college of 120 men called the "Great Synagogue" cannot be proved. Entirely untenable also is the claim of the traditionally orthodox Jews, that ever since the days of Moses there had been in existence, side by side with the written Law, also an oral Law, with all necessary explanations and supplements to the written Law.

What was added to the Pentateuchal Torah was for a long time handed down orally, as can be plainly seen from Josephus and Philo. The increase of such material made it necessary to arrange it. An arrangement according to subject-matter can be traced back to the 1st century AD; very old, perhaps even older, is also the formal adjustment of this material to the Pentateuchal Law, the form of Exegesis (Midrash). Compare Introduction, 19-21.

A comprehensive collection of traditional laws was made by Rabbi Aqiba circa 110-35 AD, if not by an earlier scholar. His work formed the basis of that of Rabbi Me’ir, and this again was the basis of the edition of the Mishna by Rabbi Jehudah ha-Nasi’. In this Mishna, the Mishna paragraph excellence, the anonymous portions generally, although not always, reproduce the views of Rabbi Me’ir.

See TIBERIAS.

The predecessors Rabbi (as R. Jehudah ha-Nasi’, the "prince" or the "saint," is usually called), as far as we know, did not put into written form their collections; indeed it has been denied by many, especially by German and French rabbis of the Middle Ages, that Rabbi put into written form the Mishna which he edited. Probably the fact of the matter is that the traditional Law was not allowed to be used in written form for the purposes of instruction and in decisions on matters of the Law, but that written collections of a private character, collections of notes, to use a modern term, existed already at an early period (see Intro, 10 ff).

IV. Division and Contents of the Mishna (and the Talmud).

The Mishna (as also the Talmud) is divided into six "orders" (cedharim) or chief parts, the names of which indicate their chief contents, namely, Zera‘im, Agriculture; Moe‘dh, Feasts; Nashim, Women; Neziqin, Civil and Criminal Law; Qodhashim, Sacrifices; Teharoth, Unclean Things and Their Purification.

The "orders" are divided into tracts (maccekheth, plural maccikhtoth), now 63, and these again into chapters (pereq, plural peraqim), and these again into paragraphs (mishnayoth). It is Customary to cite the Mishna according to tract chapter and paragraph, e.g. Sanh. (Sanhedhrin) x.1. The Babylonian

Talmud is cited according to tract and page, e.g. (Babylonian Talmud) Shabbath 30b; in citing the Palestinian Talmud the number of the chapter is also usually given, e.g. (Palestinian Talmud) Shabbath vi.8d (in most of the editions of the Palestinian Talmud each page has two columns, the sheet accordingly has four).

1. Zera‘im, "Seeds":

(1) Berakhoth, "Benedictions": "Hear, O Israel" (De 6:4, shema‘); the 18 benedictions, grace at meals, and other prayers.

(2) Pe’ah, "Corner" of the field (Le 19:9 f; De 24:19).

(3) Dema’i, "Doubtful" fruits (grain, etc.) of which it is uncertain whether the duty for the priests and, in the fixed years, the 2nd tithe have been paid.

(4) Kil’ayim, "Heterogeneous," two kinds, forbidden mixtures (Le 19:19; De 22:9).

(5) Shebhi‘ith, "Seventh Year," Sabbatical year (Ex 23:11; Le 25:1); Shemiqqah (De 15:1).

(6) Terumoth, "Heave Offerings" for the priests (Nu 18:8 ff; De 18:4).

(7) Ma‘aseroth or Ma‘aser ri’shon, "First Tithe" (Nu 18:21).

(8) Ma‘aser sheni, "Second Tithe" (De 14:22).

(9) Challah, (offering of a part of the) "Dough" (Nu 15:18).

(10) ‘Orlah, "Foreskin" of fruit trees during the first three years (Le 19:23).

(11) Bikkurim, "First-Fruits" (De 26:1 ff; Ex 23:19).

2. Mo‘edh, "Feasts":

(1) Shabbath (Ex 20:10; 23:12; De 5:14).

(2) ‘Erubhin, "Mixtures," i.e. ideal combination of localities with the purpose of facilitating the observance of the Sabbatical laws.

(3) Pesachim, "Passover" (Ex 12; Le 23:5 ff; Nu 28:16 ff; De 16:1); Numbers 9, the Second Passover (Nu 9:10). (4) Sheqalim, "Shekels" for the Temple (compare Ne 10:33; Ex 30:12 ff).

(5) Yoma’," The Day" of Atonement (Le 16).

(6) Cukkah, "Booth," Feast of Tabernacles (Le 23:34 ff; Nu 29:12 ff; De 16:13).

(7) Betsah, "Egg" (first word of the treatise) or Yom Tobh, "Feast," on the difference between the Sabbath and festivals (compare Ex 12:10).

(8) Ro’sh ha-shanah, "New Year," first day of the month Tishri (Le 23:24 f; Nu 29:1).

(9) Ta‘anith, "Fasting."

(10) Meghillah, "The Roll" of Esther, Purim (Es 9:28).

(11) Mo‘edh qatan, "Minor Feast," or Mashqin, "They irrigate" (first word of the treatise), the days between the first day and the last day of the feast of Passover, and likewise of Tabernacles.

(12) Chaghighah, "Feast Offering," statutes relating to the three feasts of pilgrimage (Passover, Weeks, Tabernacles); compare De 16:16 f.

3. Nashim, "Women":

(1) Yebhamoth, "Sisters-in-Law" (perhaps better, Yebhamuth, Levirate marriage; De 25:5 ff; compare Ru 4:5; Mt 22:24).

(2) Kethubhoth, "Marriage Deeds."

(3) Nedharim, "Vows," and their annulment (Nu 30).

(4) Nazir, "Nazirite" (Nu 6).

(5) Gittin, "Letters of Divorce" (De 24:1; compare Mt 5:31).

(6) Cotah, "The Suspected Woman" (Nu 5:11).

(7) Qiddushin, "Betrothals."

4. Nezikin, "Damages":

(1) (2) and (3) Babha’ qamma’, Babha’ metsi‘a’, Babha’ bathra’," The First Gate," "The Second Gate," "The Last Gate," were in ancient times only one treatise called Neziqin: (a) Damages and injuries and the responsibility; (b) and (c) right of possession.

(4) and (5) Sanhedhrin, "Court of Justice," and Makkoth "Stripes" (De 25:1 ff; compare 1Co 11:24). In ancient times only one treatise; criminal law and criminal proceedings.

(6) Shebhu‘oth, "Oaths" (Le 5:1 ff).

(7) ‘Edhuyoth, "Attestations" of later teachers as to the opinions of former authorities.

(8) ‘Abhodhah zarah, "Idolatry," commerce and intercourse with idolaters.

(9) ‘Abhoth, (sayings of the) "Fathers"; sayings of the Tanna’im.

(10) Horayoth, (erroneous) "Decisions," and the sin offering to be brought in such a case (Le 4:13 ff).

5. Qodhashim, "Sacred Things":

(1) Zebhahim, "Sacrifices" (Le 1 ff).

(2) Menachoth, "Meal Offerings" (Le 2:5,11; 6:7; Nu 5:15, etc.).

(3) Chullin, "Common Things," things non-sacred; slaughtering of animals and birds for ordinary use.

(4) Bekhoroth, "The Firstborn" (Ex 13:2,12; Le 27:26,32; Nu 8:6, etc.).

(5) ‘Arakhin, "Estimates," "Valuations" of persons and things dedicated to God (Le 27:2).

(6) Temurah, "Substitution" of a common (non-sacred) thing for a sacred one (compare Le 27:10,33).

(7) Kerithoth, "Excisions," the punishment of being cut off from Israel (Ge 17:14; Ex 12:15, etc.).

(8) Me‘ilah, "Unfaithfulness," as to sacred things, embezzlement (Nu 5:6; Le 5:15).

(9) Tamidh, "The Daily Morning and Evening Sacrifice" (Ex 29:38; Nu 38:3).

(10) Middoth, "Measurements" of the Temple.

(11) Qinnim, "Nests," the offering of two turtle-doves or two young pigeons (Le 1:14 ff; 5:1 ff; 12:8).

6. Teharoth, "Clean Things":

This title is used euphemistically for "unclean things":

(1) Kelim, "Vessels" (Le 6:20 f; 11:32 ff; Nu 19:14 ff; 31:20).

(2) ‘Oholoth, "Tents," the impurity originating with a corpse or a part of it (compare Nu 19:14).

(3) Negha‘im, "Leprosy" (Le 13; 14).

(4) Parah, "Red Heifer"; its ashes used for the purpose of purification (Nu 19:2).

See HEIFER, RED.

(5) Teharoth, "Clean Things," euphemistically for defilements.

(6) Mikwa’oth, "Diving-Baths" (Le 15:12; Nu 31:33; Le 14:8; 15:5 ff; compare Mr 7:4).

(7) Niddah, "The Menstruous" (Le 15:19 ff; 12).

(8) Makhshirin, "Preparers," or Mashqin, "Fluids" (first word of the treatise). Seven liquids (wine, honey, oil, milk, dew, blood, water) which tend to cause grain, etc., to become defiled (compare Le 11:34,37 f) .

(9) Zabhim, "Persons Having an Issue," flux (Le 15).

(10) Tebhul yom, "A Person Who Has Taken the Ritual Bath during the Day," and is unclean until sunset (Le 15:5; 22:6 f).

(11) Yadhayim, "Hands," the ritual impurity of hands and their purification (compare Mt 15:2,20; Mr 7:22 ff).

(12) ‘Uqtsin, "Stalks," the conveyance of ritual impurity by means of the stalks and hulls of plants.

V. The Palestinian Talmud.

Another name, Talmudh Yerushalmi ("Jerusalem Talmud"), is also old, but not accurate. The Palestinian Talmud gives the discussions of the Palestinian Amoraim, teaching from the 3rd century AD until the beginning of the 5th, especially in the schools or academies of Tiberias, Caesarea and Sepphoris. The editions and the Leyden manuscript (in the other manuscripts there are but few treatises) contain only the four cedharim i-iv and a part of Niddah. We do not know whether the other treatises had at any time a Palestinian Gemara. "The Mishna on which the Palestinian Talmud rests" is said to be found in the manuscript Add. 470,1 of the University Library, Cambridge, England (ed W.H. Lowe, 1883). The treatises ‘Edhuyoth and ‘Abhoth have no Gemara in the Palestinian Talmud or in the Babylonian.

Some of the most famous Palestinian Amoraim may be mentioned here (compare Introduction, 99 ff): 1st generation: Chanina bar Chama, Jannai, Jonathan, Osha'ya, the Haggadist Joshua ben Levi; 2nd generation: Jochnnan bar Nappacha, Simeon ben Lackish; 3rd generation: Samuel bar Nachman, Levi, Eliezer ben Pedath, Abbahu, Ze'ira (i); 4th generation: Jeremiah, Acha', Abin (i), Judah, Huna; 5th generation: Jonah, Phinehas, Berechiah, Jose bar Abin, Mani (ii), Tanhuma'.

VI. The Babylonian Talmud.

The Babylonian Talmud is later and more voluminous than the Palestinian Talmud, and is a higher authority for the Jews. In the first cedher only Berakhoth has a Gemara; Sheqalim in the 2nd cedher has in the manuscripts and in the editions the Palestinian Gemara; Middoth and Qinnim in the 5th cedher have no Babylonian Gemara. The greatest Jewish academies in Babylonia were in Nehardea, Cura, Pumbeditha and Mahuza.

Among the greatest Babylonian Amoraim are the following (compare Introduction, 99 ff): 1st generation: Abba Arikha or, shortly, Rab in Cura (died 247 AD). Mar Samuel in Nehardea (died 254 AD). 2nd generation: Rab Huna, Rab Judah (bar Ezekiel). 3rd generation: Rab Chisda, Rab Shesheth, Rab Nachman (bar Jacob), Rabbah bar Chana, the story-teller, Rabbah bar Nahmai, Rab Joseph (died 323 AD). 4th generation: Abaye, Raba' (bar Joseph). 5th generation: Rab Papa. 6th generation: Amemar, Rab Ashi.

VII. The Non-canonical Little Treatises and the Tocephta'.

In the editions of the Babylonian Talmud after the 4th cedher we find some treatises which, as they are not without some interest, we shall not pass over in silence, though they do not belong to the Talmud itself (compare Introduction, 69 ff).

1. Treatises after the 4th Cedher:

(1) 'Abhoth deRabbi Nathan, an expansion of the treatise 'Abhoth, edition. S. Schechter, Vienna, 1887.

(2) Copherim, edition Joe Muller, Leipzig, 1878.

(3) 'Ebhel Rabbathi, "Mourning," or, euphemistically, Semachoth, "Joys."

(4) Kallah, "Bride."

(5) Derekh 'erets, "Way of the World," i.e. Deportment; Rabba' and Zuta'," Large" and "Small."

2. Seven Little Treatises:

Septem Libri Talmudici parvi Hierolymitani, edition. R. Kirchheim, Frankfurt a. Main, 1851: Cepher Torah, Mezuzah, Tephillin, Tsitsith, ‘Abhadhim, Kuthim (Samaritans), Gerim (Proselytes).

The Tocephta’, a work parallel to Rabbi’s Mishna, is said to represent the views of R. Nehemiah, disciple of R. Aqiba, edition. M. S. Zuckermandel, Posewalk, 1880. Zuckermandel tries to show that the Tocephta’ contains the remains of the old Palestinian Mishna, and that the work commonly called Mishna is the product of a new revision in Babylonia (compare his Tosephta, Mischna und Boraitha in ihrem Verhaltnis zu einander, 2 volumes, Frankfurt a. Main, 1908, 1909).

LITERATURE.

(1) Introductions:

Hermann L. Strack, Einleitung in d. Talmud, 4th edition, Leipzig, 1908, in which other books on this subject are mentioned, pp. 139-44.

(2) Manuscripts (Introduction, 72-76):

There are manuscripts of the whole Mishna in Parma, in Budapest, and in Cambridge, England (the latter is published by W.H. Lowe, 1883). The only codex of the Palestinian Talmud is in Leyden; Louis Ginsberg, Yerushalmi Fragments from the Genizah, volume I, text with various readings from the editio princeps, New York, 1909 (372 pp., 4to). The only codex of the Babylonian Talmud was published whole in 1912 by the present writer: Talmud Babylonian codicis Hebrew Monacensis 95 phototypice depictum, Leyden (1140 plates, royal folio). On the manuscripts in the Vatican see S. Ochser, ZDMG, 1909, 365-93,126, 822 f.

(3) Editions (Introduction, 76-81):

(a) Mishna, editio princeps, Naples, 1492, folio, with the commentary of Moses Maimonides; Riva di Trento, 1559, folio, contains also the commentary of Obadiah di Bertinoro. The new edition printed in Wilna contains a great number of commentaries

(b) Palestinian Talmud, editio princeps, Venice, 1523 f, folio; Cracow, 1609, folio. Of a new edition begun by Asia Minor Luncz, Jerusalem, 1908 ff, two books, Berakhoth and Pe’ah, are already published. Another new critical edition, with German translation and notes, was begun in 1912 by G. Beer and O. Holtzman (Die Mischna, Giessen). Compare also B. Ratner, Ahabath Tsijjon Wirushalayim, Varianten und Erganzungen des Jerusalem Talmuds, Wilna, 1901 ff.

(c) Babylonian Talmud, editio princeps, Venice, 1520-23. The edition, Bale, 1578-81, is badly disfigured by the censorship of Marcus Marinus, Amsterdam, 1644-48, Berlin 1862-66. Compare R. Rabbinowicz, Variae Lectiones in Mishna et in Talmud Babylonicum, Munich, 1868-86, Przemysl, 1897 (the cedharim 3, 6 and 5 in part are missing).

(4) Translations:

E. Bischoff, Krit. Geschichte d. Tal-mudubersetzungen, Frankfurt a. Main, 1899.

(a) Mishna, Latin: Gull. Surenhusius, Amsterdam, 1698-1703 (contains also a translation of Maimonides and Obadiah di Bertinoro); German.: J.J. Rabe, Onolzbach, 1760 ff; A. Saminter, D. Hoffmann and others, Berlin, 1887 ff (not yet complete); English: De Sola and Raphall, 18 Treatises from the Mishna, London, 1843; Josephus Barclay, The Talmud, a Translation of 18 Treatises, London, 1878 (but 7 treatises also in De Sola and Raphall; Fiebig, Ausgewahlte Mischnatractate, Tubingen, 1905 ff (annotated German translation).

(b) Palestinian Talmud, Latin: 20 treatises in B. Ugolini, Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum, volumes XVII-XXX, Venice, 1755 ff. French: M. Schwab, Paris, 1878-89 (in 1890 appeared a 2nd edition of volume I).

(c) Babylonian Talmud, German.: L. Goldschmidt, Berlin (Leipzig), 1897 ff; gives also the text of the 1st Venetian edition and some variant readings (cedharim 1, 2, and 4 are complete); A. Wunsche, Der Babylonian Talmud in seinen haggadischen Bestandteilen ubersetzt, Leipzig, 1886-89. English: M.L. Rodkinson, New Edition of the Babylonian Talmud .... Translated into English, New York, 1896 ff (is rather an abridgment (unreliable)).

(5) Commentaries (Introduction, 146-51):

(a) Mishna:

Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), Obadiah di Bertinoro (died 1510), Yom-Tobh Lipmann Heller (1579-1654), Israel Lipschutz.

(b) Babylonian Talmud:

Rashi or Solomon Yitschaqi (died 1105); The Tosaphoth (see L. Zunz, Zur Geschichte und Literatur, Berlin, 1845, 29-60); Menahem ben Solomon or Me'-iri (1249-1306); Solomon Luria (died 1573), commonly called Maharshal; Bezaleel Ashkenazi (16th century), author of the Shittah Mequbbetseth; Samuel Edels (1559-1631) or Maharsha'; Meir Lublin (died 1616); Elijah Wilna (died 1797); Aqiba Eger (died 1837).

(6) Single Treatises (Compare Introduction, 151-55):

(a) Mishna:

The present writer is publishing: Ausgewahlte Misnatraktate, nach Handschriften und alten Drucken

(Text vokalisiert, Vokabular), ubersetzt und mit Berucksichtigung des Neuen Testaments erlautert, Leipzig (J. C. Hinrichs); Yoma', 3rd edition, 1912, 'Abhodhah Zarah, 2nd edition, 1909, Pirqe 'Abhoth, 4th edition, 1914, Shabbath, 2nd edition, 1914, Sanhedhrin, Makkoth, 1910, Pecachim 1911, Berakhoth, 1914. This series is to be continued (H. Laible, e.g., is writing Nedharim); Ch. Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, in Hebrew and English, 2nd edition, Cambridge, 1897; W. A. L. Elmslie, The Mishna on Idolatry, with Translation, Cambridge, 1911.

(b) Gemara, Berakhoth, German:

E. M. Pinner, Berlin, 1842, fol; Pe'ah (Palestintan Talmud), German.: J. J. Rabe, Ansbach, 1781; Cukkah, Latin: F. B. Dachs, Utrecht, 1726, 4to; Ro'sh ha-shanah, German: M. Rawicz, Frankfurt a. Main, 1886; Ta'anith German.: Straschun Halle, 1883; Chaghighah, English: A. W. Streane Cambridge, 1891; Kethubhoth, German: M. Rawicz, 1891; Cotah, Latin: J. Chr. Wagenseil, Altdorf, 1674-78; Babha' Metsi'a', German: A. Sammter, Berlin, 1876, fol; Sanhedhrin, Latin: Ugolini, Thesaurus, volume XXV, German.: M. Rawicz, 1892; 'Abhodhah Zarah, German: F. Chr. Ewald, Nurnberg, 1856; Zebhachin and Menachoth, Latin: Ugolini, Thesaurus, volume XIX; Hullin, German: M. Rawicz, Offenburg, 1908; Tamidh, Latin: Ugolini, Thesaurus, Vol XIX.

(7) Helps for the Grammatical Understanding (Introduction, 155-58):

(a) Mishna:

M. H. Segal, "Misnaic Hebrew," JQR, 1908, 647-737; K. Albrecht, Grammatik des Neuhebraischen (Sprache der Mishna), Munich, 1913;

(b) Talmud:

J. Levy, Neuhebr. und chald. Worterbuch, Leipzig, 1876-89; M. Jastrow, Dictionary of the .... Talmud Babylonian and Yerushalmi, New York, 1886-1903; W. Bacher, Die Terminologie der jud. Traditionsliteratur, Leipzig, 1905; G. Dalman, Grammatik des judischpalastin. Aramaisch, 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1905; C. Levias, Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom Contained in the Babylonian Talmud, Cincinnati, 1900; Max L. Margolis, Grammar of the Aramaic Language of the Babylonian Talmud with a Chrestomathy, Munich, 1909.

(8) The Haggadah (Introduction, 159-62):

The Haggadic elements of the Palestinian Talmud are collected by Samuel Jaffe in Yepheh Mar'eh, Constantinople, 1587, etc., those of the Babylonian by Jacob ibn Chabib in 'En Ya'aqobh, Saloniki, about 1516, etc.; W. Bacher, Die Agada der Tannaiten, 2 volumes, Strassburg, 1884, 1890 (1st volume, 2nd edition, 1903); Die A. der babylon. Amoraer, 1878; Die A. der palastinensischen Amoraer, 1892-99, 3 volumes; P. T. Hershon, A Talmudic Miscellany or 1001 Extracts, London, 1880; Treasures of the Talmud, London, 1882.

(9) Theology (Introduction, 162-65):

F. Weber, Judische Theologie, 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1897; J. Klausner, Die messianischen Vorstellungen des jud. Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten, Berlin, 1904; R.T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, London, 1903; H.L. Strack, Jesus, die Haretiker und die Christen nach den altesten jud. Angaben (texts, translation, commentary), Leipzig, 1910; L. Blau, Das altjudische Zauberwesen, Budapest, 1898; M. Lazarus, Die Ethik des Judentums, 2 volumes, Frankfurt a. Main, 1898, 1911.

(10) The Talmud and the Old Testament (Introduction, 167 f):

G. Aicher, Das Altes Testament in der Mischna, Freiburg i. Baden, 1906; V. Aptowitzer, Das Schriftwort in der rabbin. Literatur, 4 parts, Wien, 1906-11 (to be continued; various readings in the quotations); P.T. Hershon, Genesis, with a Talmudical Commentary, London, 1883.

(11) The Talmud and the New Testament (Introduction, 165-67):

Joh. Lightfoot, Horae hebraicae et talmudicae, edition Leusden, 2 volumes, fol T, Franeker, 1699; Chr. Schottgen, Horae hebraicae et talmudicae in universum Novum Test., 2 volumes, 4to, Dresden, 1733; Franz Delitzsch, "Horae hebraicae et talmudicae," in Zeitschrift fur die gesammte luther. Theologie u. Kirche, 1876-78; Aug. Wunsche, Neue Beitrage zur Erlauterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash, Goettingen, 1878; Th. Robinson, The Evangelists and the Mishna, London, 1859; W.H. Bennett, The Mishna as Illustrating the Gospels, Cambridge, 1884; Erich Bischoff, Jesus und die Rabbinen, Jesu Bergpredigt und "Himmelreich" in ihrer Unabhangigkeit vom Rabbinismus, Leipzig, 1905.

(12) Jurisprudence (Introduction, 169-71):

J. L. Saalschtitz, Das Mosaische Recht, 2nd edition, Berlin, 1853; Josephus Kohler, "Darstellung des talludischen Rechts," in Zeitschrift fur vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, 1908, 161-264; Z. Frankel, Der gerichtliche Beweis nach mosaisch-talmud. Rechte, Berlin, 1846; P.B. Benny, The Criminal Code of the Jews, London, 1880; S. Mendelsohn, The Criminal Jurisprudence of the Ancient Hebrews, Baltimore, 1891; H.B. Fassel, Das mosaisch-rabbinische Civilrecht, Gross-Kanischa, 2 volumes, 1852-54; Das mos.-rabb. Gerichtsverfahren in civilrechtl. Sachen, 1859; M. Mielziner, The Jewish Law of Marriage and Divorce, Cincinnati, 1884; D.W. Amram, The Jewish Law of Divorce, Philadelphia, 1896; M. Rapaport, Der Talmud und sein Recht, Berlin, 1912.

(13) History (Introduction, 171 f):

J. Derenbourg, Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu’a Adrien, Paris, 1867; L. Herzfeld, Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Altertums, 2nd edition, Braunschweig, 1894; A. Buchler, The Political and the Social Leaders of the Jewish Community of Sepphoris, London, 1909; S. Funk, Die Juden in

Babylonien 200-500, 2 volumes, Berlin, 1902, 1908.

(14) Medical Science (Intro, 173):

Jul. Preuss, Biblisch-talmudische Medizin, Berlin, 1911 (735 pp.); L. Kotelmann, Die Ophthalmologie bei den alten Hebraern, Hamburg, 1910 (436 pp.).

(15) Archaeology:

Sam. Krauss, Talmudische Archaologic, 3 volumes, Leipzig, 1910-1912.

Hermann L. Strack

TALSAS

tal’-sas (Codex Alexandrinus Saloas, Codex Vaticanus Zalthas; the Revised Version (British and American) "Saloas"): In 1 Esdras 9:22 the King James Version =" Elasha" of Ezr 10:22.

TAMAH

ta’-ma.

See TEMAH.

TAMAR (1)

ta’-mar (tamar, "palm"; Codex Vaticanus Themar; Codex Alexandrinus Thamar (so Codex Vaticanus in Genesis)):

(1) The wife of Er, the oldest son of Judah (Ge 38:6). Upon her husband’s death under the displeasure of Yahweh, his brother Onan ought to have performed the husband’s part, but he evaded his duty in this respect, and likewise perished. Shelah, the next brother, was promised to her, but not given. This led Tamar to the extraordinary course narrated in Ge 38:13 ff, on which see JUDAH. By her father-in-law she became the mother of Perez and Zerah (the King James Version "Pharez and Zarah"). Judah, who at first condemned her to be burned (Ge 38:24), was compelled to vindicate her (Ge 38:25,26). Through Perez she became an ancestress of Jesus (Thamar, Mt 1:3).

(2) A daughter of David and sister of Absalom (2Sa 13:1). Her beauty inflamed her half-brother Amnon with passion, and by stratagem he forcibly violated her. This brought upon Amnon the terrible revenge of Absalom.

See ABSALOM; AMNON.

(3) A daughter of Absalom (2Sa 14:27).

See MAACAH.

James Orr

TAMAR (2)

(tamar, "palm tree"; Thaiman):

(1) This name occurs in Ezekiel's ideal delimitation of the territory to be occupied by Israel (Eze 47:19; 48:28). The Dead Sea is the eastern border; and the southern boundary runs from Tamar as far as the waters of Meriboth-kadesh to the Brook of Egypt and the Great Sea. The place therefore lay somewhere to the Southwest of the Dead Sea. "Hazazon-tamar (the same is En-gedi)" (2Ch 20:2) is of course out of the question, being much too far to the North. Eusebius (in Onomasticon) mentions Asasonthamar, with which Thamara was identified. This place was a village with fortress and Roman garrison, a day's journey from Mampsis on the way from Hebron to Elath. It is the Thamaro mentioned by Ptolemy (v.16, 8), as a military station on the road from Hebron to Petra. It is named also in the Peutinger Tables. Neither Mampsis nor Thamaro has been identified.

(2) Among the towns "built" or fortified by Solomon, named in 1Ki 9:18, is Tamar (the Revised Version (British and American) following Kethibh), or Tadmor (the King James Version following Qere; compare 2Ch 8:4). Gezer, Beth-horon and Baalath, named along with it, are all in Southern Palestine, while Tamar is described as in the wilderness in the land, pointing to the Negeb or to the Wilderness of Judah. It was probably intended to protect the road for trade from Ezion-geber to Jerusalem. We may with some confidence identify it with (1) above. It is interesting to note that the Chronicler (2Ch 8:4) takes it out of connection with the other cities (2Ch 8:5), and brings its building into relation with Solomon's conquest of Hamath-zobah. Clearly in his mind it denoted the great and beautiful city of Palmyra, which has so long been known as "Tadmor in the Wilderness."

W. Ewing

TAMARISK

tam'-a-risk:

(1) 'eshel (Ge 21:33, the King James Version "grove," margin "tree"; 1Sa 22:6, the King James Version "tree," margin "grove"; 1Sa 31:13, the King James Version "tree"). The Revised Version (British and American) translation is due to the similarity of 'eshel to the Arabic 'athl, "the tamarisk."

(2) ar‘ar (Jer 17:6 margin (compare Jer 48:6), English Versions of the Bible "heath" (which see)).

The tamarisk (Tamarix, with various species in Palestine, chiefly T. Syriaca) is a very characteristic tree of Palestine, especially in the Maritime Plain, near the sea itself, and in the Jordan Valley. Eight species are described. They are characterized by their brittle, feathery branches and by their tiny scale-like leaves. Some varieties flourish not infrequently in salty soil unsuited to any ordinary vegetation.

E. W. G. Masteran

TAMMUZ

tam’-uz, tam’-mooz (tammuz; Thammouz):

(1) The name of a Phoenician deity, the Adonis of the Greeks. He was originally a Sumerian or Babylonian sun-god, called Dumuzu, the husband of Ishtar, who corresponds to Aphrodite of the Greeks. The worship of these deities was introduced into Syria in very early times under the designation of Tammuz and Astarte, and appears among the Greeks in the myth of Adonis and Aphrodite, who are identified with Osiris and Isis of the Egyptian pantheon, showing how widespread the cult became. The Babylonian myth represents Dumuzu, or Tammuz, as a beautiful shepherd slain by a wild boar, the symbol of winter. Ishtar long mourned for him and descended into the underworld to deliver him from the embrace of death (Frazer, Adonis, Attis and Osiris). This mourning for Tammuz was celebrated in Babylonia by women on the 2nd day of the 4th month, which thus acquired the name of Tammuz (see CALENDAR). This custom of weeping for Tammuz is referred to in the Bible in the only passage where the name occurs (Eze 8:14). The chief seat of the cult in Syria was Gebal (modern Gebail, Greek Bublos) in Phoenicia, to the South of which the river Adonis (Nahr Ibrahim) has its mouth, and its source is the magnificent fountain of Apheca (modern ‘Afqa), where was the celebrated temple of Venus or Aphrodite, the ruins of which still exist. The women of Gebal used to repair to this temple in midsummer to celebrate the death of Adonis or Tammuz, and there arose in connection with this celebration those licentious rites which rendered the cult so infamous that it was suppressed by Constantine the Great.

The name Adonis, by which this deity was known to the Greeks, is none other than the Phoenician ‘Adhon, which is the same in Hebrew. His death is supposed to typify the long, dry summer of Syria and Palestine, when vegetation perishes, and his return to life the rainy season when the parched earth is revivified and is covered with luxuriant vegetation, or his death symbolizes the cold, rough winter, the boar of the myth, and his return the verdant spring.

Considering the disgraceful and licentious rites with which the cult was celebrated, it is no wonder that Ezekiel should have taken the vision of the women weeping for Tammuz in the temple as one of the greatest abominations that could defile the Holy House.

See ADONIS.

(2) The fourth month of the Jewish year, corresponding to July. The name is derived from that of a Syrian god, identified with Adonis (Eze 8:14).

See above, and CALENDAR.

H. Porter

TANACH

ta’-nak (ta‘nakh, ta‘andkh).

See TAANACH.

TANHUMETH

tan-hu’-meth (tanchumeth): One of those who were left in Judah by Nebuchadnezzar under the governorship of Gedallah (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:8).

TANIS

ta’-nis (Tanis (Judith 1:10)).

See ZOAN.

TANNER

tan’-er (burseus, from bursa "a hide"): The only references to a tanner are in Ac 9:43; 10:6,32. The Jews looked upon tanning as an undesirable occupation and well they might, for at best it was accompanied with unpleasant odors and unattractive sights, if not even ceremonially unclean. We can imagine that Simon the tanner found among the disciples of Jesus a fellowship which had been denied him before. Peter made the way still easier for Simon by choosing his house as his abode while staying in Joppa. Simon’s house was by the seashore, as is true of the tanneries along the Syrian coast today, so that the foul-smelling liquors from the vats can be drawn off with the least nuisance, and so that the salt water may be easily accessible for washing the skins during the tanning process. These tanneries are very unpretentious affairs, usually consisting of one or two small rooms and a courtyard. Within are the vats made either of stone masonry, plastered within and without, or cut out of the solid rock. The sheep or goat skins are smeared on the flesh side with a paste of slaked lime and then folded up and allowed to stand until the hair loosens. The hair and fleshy matter are removed, the skins are plumped in lime, bated in a concoction first of dog dung and afterward in one of fermenting bran, in much the same way as in a modern tannery. The bated skins are tanned in sumach (Arabic summak), which is the common tanning material in Syria and Palestine. After drying, the leather is blackened on one side by rubbing on a

solution made by boiling vinegar with old nails or pieces of copper, and the skin is finally given a dressing of olive oil. In the more modern tanneries degras is being imported for the currying processes. For dyeing the rams' skins red (Ex 25) they rub on a solution of qermes (similar to cochineal; see DYEING), dry, oil, and polish with a smooth stone.

Pine bark is sometimes used for tanning in Lebanon. According to Wilkinson (Ancient Egypt, II, 186), the Arabs use the juice of a desert plant for dehairing and tanning skins. The skins for pouches are either tawed, i.e. tanned with a mineral salt like alum, or treated like parchment (see PARCHMENT). About Hebron oak branches, chopped into small chips, are used for tanning the leather bottles or water skins. In this case the hair is not removed. The tanning is accomplished, after removing the fleshy matter, by filling the skin with oak chips and water, tying up all openings in the skins, and allowing them to lie in the open on their "backs," with "legs" upright, for weeks. The field near Hebron where they arrange the bulging skins in orderly rows during the tanning process presents a weird sight. These are the bottles referred to in the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "skins") (Jos 9:4,13; Ho 7:5; Mt 9:17; Mr 2:22; Lu 5:37).

Leather was probably used more extensively than any records show. We know that the Egyptians used leather for ornamental work. They understood the art of making stamped leather. The sculptures give us an idea of the methods used for making the leather into sandals, trimmings for chariots, coverings of chairs, decorations for harps, sarcophagi, etc. There are two Biblical references to leather, where leather girdles are mentioned (2Ki 1:8; Mt 3:4).

See also CRAFTS, II, 17.

James A. Patch

TAPESTRY

tap'-es-tri (marebhaddim, from rabhadh, "to spread"): "Carpets of tapestry" are mentioned in Pr 7:16; 31:22. We have no means of knowing just what form of weaving is here referred to.

See WEAVING.

TAPHATH

ta'-fath (taphath): Daughter of Solomon and wife of Ben-abinadab (1Ki 4:11).

TAPHON

ta'-fon

See TEPHON.

TAPPUAH (1)

tap’-u-a, ta-pu’-a (tappuach, "apple"):

(1) A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (12:17). It is named between Beth-el and Hepher, and may possibly be identical with the city named in Jos 16:8; see (3) below. There is nothing to guide us to a decision.

(2) (Omitted by Septuagint.) A city in the Shephelah of Judah (Jos 15:34). It is named between Engannim and Enam in a group of cities that lay in the Northwest of the territory of Judah. Tristram suggested identification with ‘Artuf, about 1 1/2 miles Southeast of Zorah. G.A. Smith places it in Wady el ‘Afranj, possibly identifying it with Tuffuch, fully 4 miles West of Hebron. This position, however, is not in the Shephelah. The place probably represents "Beth-tappuah" of Jos 15:53. No quite satisfactory identification has yet been suggested.

(3) A place on the border between Ephraim and Manasseh (Jos 16:8). "The land of Tappuah," i.e. the land adjoining the town, belonged to Manasseh, but the town itself belonged to Ephraim (Jos 17:8). En-tappuah was probably a neighboring spring. Tappuah was to the South of Michmethath, and the border ran from here westward to the brook Kanah. Some would place it at Khirbet ‘Atuf, about 11 miles Northeast of Nablus. More probably it should be sought to the Southwest of the plain of Makhneh (Michmethath). It may be identical with Tephon, which, along with Timnath, Pharathon, and other cities, Bacchides fortified "with high walls and gates and bars" (1 Macc 9:50). No identification is possible.

W. Ewing

TAPPUAH (2)

(Tappuach; Codex Vaticanus Thapous; Codex Alexandrinus Thaphphou; Lucian, Phethrouth): A "son" of Hebron (1Ch 2:43).

TARAH

ta’-ra, tar’-a (Nu 33:27 f the King James Version).

See TERAH.

TARALAH

tar’-a-la (tar’alah; Codex Vaticanus Thareela; Codex Alexandrinus Tharala): A town in the territory of Benjamin named between Irpeel and Zelah (Jos 18:27). Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Therama") simply says it was in the tribe of Benjamin. In the times of Eusebius and Jerome, therefore, the site was already lost, and has not since been covered.

TAREA

ta’-re-a, ta-re’-a (ta’area‘, a copyist’s mistake (1Ch 8:35) for tacharea, "the shrewd one," in 1Ch 9:41; Codex Vaticanus Theree; Codex Alexandrinus Tharee; Lucian, Tharaa; in 1Ch 9:41, Codex Vaticanus Tharach; Codex Alexandrinus Thara; Lucian, Tharaa; see TAHREA): A descendant of Saul mentioned in a genealogy of Benjamin (1Ch 9:41).

TARES

tarz (zizania (Mt 13:25), margin "darnel"): Zizania is equivalent to Arabic zuwan, the name given to several varieties of darnel of which Lolium temulentum, the "bearded darnel," is the one most resembling wheat, and has been supposed to be degenerated wheat. On the near approach of harvest it is carefully weeded out from among the wheat by the women and children. Zuwan is commonly used as chickens’ food; it is not poisonous to human beings unless infected with the mold ergot.

TARGET

tar’-get.

See MARK.

TARGUM

tar’-gum (targum):

1. Meaning and Etymology of the Term

2. Origin of the Targums

3. Language of the Targums

4. Mode in Which the Targums Were Given

5. Date of the Targums

6. Characteristics of the Different Targums

(1) Onqelos—the Man Characteristics of His Targum

(2) The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Prophets

Characteristics of His Targum—Earlier Prophets; Later Prophets

(3) Hagiographa: Psalms, Job and Proverbs

(a) The Meghilloth

(b) Chronicles

(4) The Non-official Targums—Jonathan ben Uzziel and the Pentateuch

7. Use of the Targums

LITERATURE

The Targums were explanations of the Hebrew Scriptures in Chaldaic (Western Aramaic) for the benefit of those Jews who had partially or completely ceased to understand the sacred tongue.

1. Meaning and Etymology of the Term:

By Gesenius the word methurgam, which occurs in Ezr 4:7, is interpreted as derived from ragham, "to pile up stones," "to throw," hence, "to stone," and then "to translate," though no example is given. Jastrow derives it from the Assyrian r-g-m, "to speak aloud," an etymology which suits the origin of the Targums. It is unfortunate that he gives no reference to any Assyrian document.

The word turgamanu is found, e.g., in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Berlin edition, 21, 1. 25, Knudtzon, 154), with the meaning "interpreter." It may, none the less, be of Aramaic origin. See Muss-Arnolt, Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language, 1191 f, and the references there given.

The word is used as the Aramaic interpretation of shiggayon (Ps 7:1), a term the precise force of which is yet unfixed. From this ragham comes meturgheman, "an interpreter," and our modern "dragoman." Whatever the original meaning of the root, the word came to mean "to translate," "to explain."

2. Origin of the Targums:

At the time when Nebuchadnezzar carried the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judah captive to the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates, the language of everyday life in Assyria and Babylonia had ceased to be

that which has come down to us in the cuneiform inscriptions, and had become Aramaic, the lingua franca of Southwestern Asia. It was the language of diplomacy, of business and of social intercourse, and had long been so. Dwelling in the midst of those who used Aramaic alone, the Jews soon adopted it for every occasion save worship. In the family they might retain their mother tongue for a time, but this would yield at length to continuous pressure from without. In Palestine a similar process had been going on in the absence of the captives. Intruders from various neighboring peoples had pressed in to occupy the blanks left by the removal of the Jewish captives to Babylon. Although it is not recorded, it is not impossible that following the example of the Assyrians, Nebuchadnezzar may have sent into Judea compulsory colonists from other parts of his empire. The language common to all these, in addition to their native dialect, was Aramaic. The Jewish inhabitants that had been left in the land would, like their relatives in Babylonia, have become accustomed to the use of Aramaic, to the exclusion, more or less complete, of Hebrew. Another process had begun among the captives. Away from the site of their destroyed temple, the exiles did not, like those in Upper Egypt, erect another temple in which to offer sacrifices. Their worship began to consist in the study of the Law in common, in chanting of the Psalms and united prayers. This study of the Law implied that it should be understood. Though some form of synagogue worship was known in the times preceding the captivity under the direction probably of the prophets (2Ki 4:23), it must have become weak and ineffective. With the arrival of Ezra there was a revival of the study of the Law, and with that the necessity for the interpretation of it in language which the people could understand.

3. Language of the Targums:

From the facts above narrated, this language was of necessity Aramaic. There were, however, forces at work to modify the language. A translation is liable to be assimilated so far, to the language from which it is made. Thus there is a difference, subtle but observable, between the English of our the King James Version of the Bible and that of Shakespeare, Bacon, or even Hooker. Or, to take an example more cognate, if less accessible to the general reader, the difference may be seen if one compares the Syriac of the New Testament Peshitta with that of the Peshitta of the Old Testament. The Aramaic of the Targums is Western Aramaic, but it is Western Aramaic tinctured with Hebrew. The fact that the returned captives originally had spoken Hebrew would doubtless have its effect on their Aramaic. German in Jewish lips becomes Yiddish. One very marked feature is the presence of yath, the sign of the accusative translating the Hebrew ‘eth, whereas in ordinary Aramaic, Eastern and Western, this is unused, except as supporting the oblique case of pronouns. Further, the intensive construction of infinitive with finite sense, so frequent in Hebrew, though little used in ordinary Aramaic, appears in the Targums wherever it occurs in the Hebrew text. As a negative characteristic there is to be noted the comparative rarity with which the emphatic repetition of the personal pronoun, so frequent in ordinary Aramaic, occurs in the Targumic.

4. Mode in Which the Targums Were Given:

The account given in Nehemiah (8:8) of the reading of the Law to the people not only mentions that Ezra’s helpers read "distinctly" (mephorash), but "gave the sense" (som sekhel) "and caused them to understand the reading," the King James Version (wayyabhinu ba-miqra’). This threefold process

implies more than merely distinct enunciation. If this passage is compared with Ezr 4:18 it would seem that mephorash ought to mean "interpreted." The most natural explanation is that alongside of the readers of the Law there were interpreters, meturghemanim, who repeated in Aramaic what had been read in Hebrew. What interval separated this public reading of the Law from the reading of the Law as a portion of synagogue worship we have no means of knowing. The probability is that in no long time the practice of reading the Law with an Aramaic interpretation was common in all Jewish synagogues. Elaborate rules are laid down in the Talmud for this interpretation; how far these were those actually used we cannot be absolutely certain. They at least represent the ideal to which after-generations imagined the originators of the practice aspired. The Law was read by the reader verse by verse, and each verse was followed by a recitation by the meturgheman of the Aramaic version. Three verses of the prophetic books were read before the Aramaic was recited. The Talmudists were particular that the reader should keep his eye on the roll from which he read, and that the meturgheman should always recite his version without looking at any writing, so that a distinction should be kept between the sacred word and the version. At first the Targum was not committed to writing, but was handed down by tradition from meturgheman to meturgheman. That of the Law became, however, as stereotyped as if it had been written. So to some extent was it with the Prophets and also the Psalms. The Targums of the rest of the Kethubhim seem to have been written from the beginning and read in private.

5. Date of the Targums:

We have assumed that the action of Ezra narrated in Ne 8:8 implied not only the reading of the Law, but also the interpretation of its language—its translation in fact from Hebrew to Aramaic, and that, further, this practice was ere long followed in all the synagogues in Judea. This view is maintained by Friedmann (Onkelos u. Akylas, 1896) and was that assumed to be correct by the Talmud. Dr. Dalman assures his readers that this is a mistake, but without assigning any reasons for his assertion. Dr. Dalman is a very great authority, but authority is not science, so we venture to maintain the older opinion. The fact is undeniable that, during the Persian domination all over Southwestern Asia, Aramaic was the lingua franca, so much so that we see by the Assouan and Elephantine papyri the Jewish garrison at Assouan in Egypt wrote to their co- religionists in Judea, and to the Persian governors, in Aramaic. Moreover, there is no trace that they used any other tongue for marriage contracts or deeds of sale.

We may assume that in Judea the language commonly used in the 5th century BC was Aramaic. We may neglect then the position of Mr. Stenning (Enc Brit (11th edition), XXVI, 418b) that "probably as early as the 2nd century BC the people had adopted Aramaic." By that time Aramaic was giving place to Greek. His reason for rejecting the position above maintained is that the dates assigned by criticism to certain prophetic writings conflict with it—a mode of reasoning that seems to derive facts from theories, not theories from facts.

The fact that the necessity for translation into Aramaic existed in the Persian period implies the existence of the meturgheman and the targum. It is more difficult to know when these Targums were committed to writing. It is probable that the same movement, which led Jehudah ha-Nasi’ to commit to writing the decisions of the rabbis which form the Mishna, would lead to writing down the Targums—that is to say late in the 2nd century of our era. Aramaic was disappearing in Palestine and the traditional

renderings would be liable to be forgotten. Talmudic stories as to dates at which the various Targums were written down are absolutely valueless.

6. Characteristics of the Different Targums:

The Targums that require most to be considered are the official Targums, those that are given in the rabbinic Bibles in columns parallel with the columns of Hebrew. In addition, there is for the Law the Targum Yerushalmi, another recension of which is called Targum Yonathan ben Uzziel. The Book of Esther has two Targums. Besides these, Targums of doubtful value have been written by private individuals. Certain books have no official Targums: Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles. The reason for this is supposed to be that in both Daniel and Ezra there are portions written in Aramaic. Nehemiah and Chronicles were regarded as forming one book with Ezra. A late Targum on Chronicles has been found and published separately. Some of the apocryphal additions to Esther appear in a late Targum to that book. The official Targums of the Law and the Prophets approach more nearly the character of translations, though even in them verses are at times explained rather than translated. The others are paraphrastic to a greater or less degree.

(1) Onqelos—the Man.

This is the name given to the official Targum of the Pentatuech. The legend is that it was written by one Onqelos, a proselyte son of Kalonymus or Kalonikus, sister's son of Titus. He was associated with the second Gamaliel and is represented as being even more minutely punctilious in his piety than his friend. The legend goes on to say that, when he became a proselyte, his uncle sent company after company of soldiers to arrest him, but he converted them, one after another. It is at the same time extremely doubtful whether there ever was such a person, a view that is confirmed by the fact that legends almost identical are related of Aquila, the translator of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek. The names are similar, and it may be are identical. While there may have been a person so named, the admission of this does not imply that he had any connection with the Targum of the Pentateuch named after him. Another explanation is that as the Greek version of Aquila was much praised by the Jews for its fastidious accuracy, and this Targum of the Law was credited with equally careful accuracy, so all that is meant is that it was regarded as a version which as accurately represented in Aramaic the Hebrew of the Law as did Aquila's Greek. The probability is that whoever it was who committed the Targum to writing did little or no actual translating. It might not be the work of one unassisted author; the reference to the guidance Onqelos is alleged to have received from the rabbis Eliezer and Joshua suggests this. Owing to the fact that the Law was read through in the course of a year in Babylonian (once in three years in Pal) and every portion interpreted verse by verse in Aramaic, as it was read, the very words of the traditional rendering would be remembered. This gives the language of the Targum an antique flavor which may be seen when it is compared with that of the Palestinian lectionary discovered by Mrs. Gibson and Mrs. Lewis. Especially is this observed when the renderings of the same passage are put in comparison. Both in vocabulary and grammar there is a difference; thus mar occurs for shalleT, and yath as the sign of the accusative has disappeared in the lectionary. An analogy may be seen in the antique flavor of the language of our English Bible, even in the Revised Version (British and American). If any credence

were to be given to the traditional account of the alleged authors, the date of this Targum would be the end of the 1st century AD. But we have seen that it has been named Aquila and that the title means "as accurate as Aquila." He, however, lived in the beginning of the 2nd century. His Greek version must have already gained a reputation before the Aramaic Targum appeared. We cannot therefore date the actual committing of this Targum to writing earlier than late in the 2nd century, not improbably, as suggested above, contemporary with the writing down of the Mishna by Jehadah ha-Nasi'.

Characteristics of His Targum:

The characteristics of this Targum are in general close adherence to the original, sometimes even to the extent of doing violence to the genius of the language into which it has been translated. One prominent example of this is the presence of yath as the sign of the accusative; and there is also the intensive construction of infinitive with finite tense. There is a tendency to insert something between God and His worshipper, as "mimera' Yahweh" instead of simply "Yahweh." Where anthropomorphisms occur, an exact translation is not attempted, but the sense is represented in an abstract way, as in Ge 11:5, where instead of "The Lord (YHWH) came down" there is "The Lord (yiya') was revealed." At the same time there is not a total avoidance of paraphrase. In Ge 4:7 the Targum renders, "If thou doest thy work well, is it not remitted unto thee? if thou doest not thy work well, thy sin is reserved unto the day of judgment when it will be required of thee if thou do not repent, but if thou repent it shall be remitted to thee." It will be observed that the last clause of the Hebrew is omitted. So in Ge 3:22, instead of "Man has become as one of us," Onqelos writes "Man has become alone in the world by himself to know good and evil.' A more singular instance occurs in Ge 27:13, where Rebekah answers Jacob, "Upon me be thy curse, my son"; in the Targum it is, "Unto me it hath been said in prophecy, there shall be no curse upon thee my son." Sometimes there is a mere explanatory expansion, as in Ex 3:1, where instead of "the mount of God," Onqelos has "the mountain on which the glory of the Lord was revealed." In the mysterious passage, Ex 4:24-26, later Jewish usage is brought in to make an easy sense: "And it was on the way in the inn (house of rest) that the angel of the Lord met him and sought to slay him. And Zipporah took a flint knife and cut off the foreskin of her son and came near before him and said 'In the blood of this circumcision is the bridegroom given back to us,' and when therefore he had desisted she said, 'Had it not been for the blood of this circumcision the bridegroom would have been condemned to die.'" Here chathan (" bridegroom") is used according to later custom of the child to be circumcised. Sometimes reasons of propriety come in, as when the sin of Onan is described "corrupting his way on the earth. It is, however, in the poetical passages that the writer gives loose rein to paraphrase. As an example the blessing of Judah in Jacob's blessing of his sons may be given: "Judah, thou art praise and not shame; thee thy brethren shall praise. Thy hands shall be strong upon thine enemies, those that hate thee shall be scattered; they shall be turned back before thee; the sons of thy father shall come before thee with salutations. (Thy) rule shall be in the beginning, and in the end the kingdom shall be increased from the house of Judah, because from the judgment of death, my son, thy soul hast thou removed. He shall rest, he shall abide in strength, as a lion and as a lioness there is nothing may trouble him. The ruler shall not depart from the house of Judah nor the scribe from his son's sons for ever till the Messiah come whose is the kingdom and whom the heathen shall obey. Israel shall trade in his cities, the people shall build his temple, the saints shall be going about to him and shall be doers of the Law through his instruction. His raiment shall be goodly crimson; his clothing covering him, of wool dyed bright with

colors. His mountains shall be red with his vineyards, his hills shall flow down with wine, and his valleys shall be white with corn and with flocks of sheep."

Committed to writing in Palestine, the Targum of Onqelos was sent to Babylon to get the imprimatur of the famous rabbis residing there. There are said to be traces in the language of a revision by the Babylonian teachers, but as this lies in the prevalence of certain words that are regarded as more naturally belonging to Eastern than Western Aramaic, it is too restrictedly technical to be discussed here. The result of the Babylonian sanction was the reception of this Targum as the official interpretation of the books of the Law. It seems probable that the mistake which led to its being attributed to Onqelos was made in Babylon where Aquila's Greek version was not known save by vague reputation.

(2) The Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel on the Prophets.

This Jonathan, to whom the Targum on the Prophets is attributed, is declared to be one of the most distinguished pupils of Hillel. The prophetic section of the Bible according to the Jews contains, besides what we ordinarily reckon prophetic books, also all the earlier historical books except Ruth, which is placed among the Hagiographa. During the persecution of the Jews by Epiphanes, when the Law was forbidden to be read in the synagogue, portions of the Prophets were read instead. There was no attempt to read the whole of the Prophets thus, but very considerable portions were used in worship. This necessitated the presence of the meturgheman. If one might believe the Talmudic traditions, Jonathan's Targum was committed to writing before that of Onqelos. Jonathan is regarded as the contemporary of the first Gamaliel, whereas Onqelos is the friend of Aqiba, the contemporary of Hadrian. The tradition is that when he published his Targum of the Prophets, all Palestine was shaken, and a voice from heaven was heard demanding, "Who is this who revealeth my secrets to the sons of men?" As an example of the vagueness of Talmudic chronology, it may be mentioned that Jonathan was said to have made his Targum under the guidance of Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi. He is said to have desired to write a Targum of the Kethubhim, but was forbidden by a voice from heaven. The Targum of Job was skid to have been already written, but was buried by Gamaliel. It is said to have been exhumed and that the present Targum on that book is from Jonathan's hand. The tomb of Jonathan ben Uzziel is shown on the face of a hill to the North of Safed, Palestine.

Characteristics of His Targum—Earlier Prophets; Later Prophets

In the former Prophets—the historical books—the style does not differ much from that of Onqelos. Occasionally there are readings followed which are not in the Massoretic Text, as Jos 8:12, where the Targum has "the west side of Ai" instead of as in the Massoretic Text, "the west side of the city." Sometimes two readings are combined, as in 8:16, where the Massoretic Text has "all the people which were in the city," the Targum adds "in Ai." Again, the Targum translates proper names, as, in Jos 7:5, "Shebarim" (shebharim) is rendered "till they were scattered." Such are the variations to be seen in the narrative portion of the Targum of the earlier Prophets. When, however, a poetical piece occurs, the writer at times gives rein to his imagination. Sometimes one verse is exceedingly paraphrastic and the next an accurate rendering without any addition. In the song of Deborah (Jud 5) the 1st verse has only a

little of paraphrase: "Then sang praises Deborah and Barak the son of Abinoam on account of the lifting up and deliverance which had been wrought in that day, saying ...." The verse which follows is very paraphrastic; instead of the 7 words of the verse in the Massoretic Text the Targum has 55. it is too long to quote in full, but it begins, "Because the house of Israel rebelled against His Law, the Gentiles came up upon them and disturbed their assemblies, and because they refused to obey the Law, their enemies prevailed against them and drove them from the borders of the land of Israel," and so on, Sisera and all his host being introduced. Jud 5:3 reads thus, "Hear O kings who are with him, with Sisera for war, who obey the officers of Jabin the king of Canaan; with your might and your valor ye shall not prevail nor go up against Israel, said I Deborah in prophecy before the Lord. I will sing praise and bless before Yahweh the God of Israel."

The later prophets are more paraphrastic as a whole than the earlier, as having more passages with poetic metaphors in them—a fact that is made plain to anyone by the greater space occupied in the rabbinic Bibles by the Targums of the Prophets. A marked example of this tendency to amplify is to be found in Jer 10:11: "Thus shall ye say unto them, The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, these shall perish from the earth, and from under the heavens." As this verse is in Aramaic it might have been thought that it would have been transferred to the Targum unchanged, but the Targumist has made of the 10 words of the original text 57. Sometimes these expansions may be much shorter than the above example, but are illuminative, showing the views held by the Jewish teachers. In Isa 29:1, "Ho Ariel, Ariel, the city where David encamped!" the Targum has "Woe to the altar, the altar which David built in the city in which he dwelt." In this rendering we see the Jewish opinion that "Ariel," which means "lion of God," in this connection stood for the "altar" which David erected in Jerusalem. It seems unlikely that this whole Targum was the work of one writer, but the style gives little indication of difference. The paraphrase of the synagogal haphTaroth being traditional, the style of the person who committed it to writing had little scope. The language represents naturally an older stage of development than we find in the contemporary Christian lectionaries. As only portions of the Prophets were used in synagogue worship, only those portions would have a traditional rendering; but these fixed the style. In the Revised Version (British and American) of the Apocrypha the 70 verses which had been missing from 2 Esdras 7 are translated in the style adopted by the translators under King James. It is impossible to fix the date at which the Targum of any of the prophetic books was written down. It is probable that it was little if at all after that of Onqelos. The completion of the paraphrases of the prophetic writings, of which only portions were used in the synagogue, seems to imply that there were readers of the Aramaic for whose benefit those Targums were made.

(3) Hagiographa: Psalms, Job and Proverbs

(a) The Meghilloth

The Targums of the third division of the Hebrew sacred writings, the Kethubhim (the Hagiographa), are ascribed to Joseph Caecus, but this is merely a name. There is no official Targum of any of the Hagiographa, and several of them, Daniel, Nehemiah and Ezra, as above noted, have no Targum at all. Those of the longer books of this class, Psalms, Proverbs and Job, are very much closer to the text than are the Targums of the Meghilloth. In the Psalms, the paraphrase is explanatory rather than simply

expansive. Thus in Ps 29:1, "ye sons of the mighty" is rendered "ye companies of angels, ye sons of the mighty." Ps 23 is further from the text, but it also is exegetic; instead of "Yahweh is my shepherd, I shall not want," the Targum reads, "The Lord nourished His people in the wilderness so that they lacked nothing." So the last clause of the last verse of this psalm is, "'I shall indeed dwell in the house of the holiness of the Lord for the length of days." Another example of exegesis is Ps 46:4, in which the "river whose streams make glad the city of our God" is explained as "the nations as rivers making glad the city of Yahweh." Much the same may be said of Job, so examples need not be given.

The Targum of Proverbs has been very much influenced by the Peshitta; it may be regarded as a Jewish recension of it. Those of the five Meghilloth, as they are called, So of Songs, Ruth, Lamentation, Ecclesiates, and Esther, are excessively paraphrastic. If one compare the space occupied by the text of Canticles and Proverbs, it will be found that the former occupies about one-sixth of the latter; if the Targums of the two books are compared in Lagarde's text, the Canticles are two-thirds of Proverbs. So Lamentations occupies in the Massoretic Text less than a quarter the space which Proverbs occupies; but the Targum of Lain is two-fifths the size of the Targum of Proverbs. Ru has not suffered such a dilatation; in the text it is a fifth, in the Targum a fourth, the size of Proverbs. The expansion mainly occurs in the first verse in which ten different famines are described. Ecclesiates in the Massoretic Text uses about three-eighths of the space occupied by Proverbs. This is increased to five-sixths in the Targum. There are two Targums of Esther, the first about five-sixths the size of Proverbs, the second, nearly double. The text is under one-half. We subjoin the Targum of La 11 from Mr. Greenup's translation: Jeremiah the prophet and high priest said: "How is it decreed against Jerusalem and against her people that they should be condemned to exile and that lamentation should be made for them? How? Just as Adam and Eve were condemned who were ejected from the garden of Eden and over whom the Lord of the universe lamented. How? God the judge answers and speaks thus: 'Because of the multitude of the sins which were in the midst of her, therefore she will dwell alone as the man in whose flesh is the plague of leprosy dwells alone! And the city that was full of crowds and many people hath been deserted by them and become like a widow. And she that was exalted among the peoples and powerful among the provinces, to whom they paid tribute, hath been scattered abroad so as to be oppressed and to give tribute to them after this." This gives a sufficient example of the extent to which expansion can go. Verse 1 of Esther in the first Targum informs us that the cessation of the work of building the Temple was due to the advice of Vashti, and that she was the daughter of Evil-merodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and a number of equally accurate pieces of information. Yet more extravagant is the 2nd Targum; it begins by asserting that there are ten great monarchs of whom Achhashverosh was the 6th, the Greek and Roman were the 7th and the 8th, Messiah the king the 9th, and the Almighty Himself the 10th. It evidently has no connection with the first Targum.

(b) Chronicles

The Targum of Chronicles, although late, is modeled on the Targums of Jonathan ben Uzziel. In cases where the narrative of Chronicles runs parallel with that of Samuel the resemblance is very great, even to verbal identity at times. The differences sometimes are worthy of note, as where in 1Ch 21:2, instead of "Dan" the Targum has "Pameas" (Paneas), which affords an evidence of the lateness of this Targum. In the rabbinic Bible, Chronicles appear, as do Ezra, Nehemiah and Daniel, without a parallel Targum.

(4) The Non-official Targums—Jonathan ben Uzziel and the Pentateuch

There is a Targum on the Pentateuch attributed to Jonathan ben Uzziel which is very paraphrastic. Fragments of another closely related Targum have been preserved, known as the Jerusalem Targum. In face the two may really be regarded as different recensions of the same Targum. It is supposed that some manuscript was denominated simply "the targum of J," which, really being the initial representing, "Jerusalem," was taken as representing Jonathan. At the end of each of the books of the Pentateuch is is stated that this Targum is the "targum Yerushalmi" Of the two the Yerushalmi is the longer. Both assert that five signs accompanied Jacob in his stay in Haran: the time was shortcried; the distance was shortened; the four stones for his pillow became one; his strength was increased so that with his own arm he moved the stone covering the well which it took all the shepherds to move; the water gushed from the well all the days he dwelt in Haran. But the narrative of ben Uzziel is expanded to nearly twice the length in the Yerushalmi. This Targum may be regarded as to some extent semi-official.

7. Use of the Targums:

As the Targums appear to have been committed to writing after the Massoretic Text was fixed, textual differences are few and unimportant. Kohn mentions that in a few cases Onqelos agrees with the Samaritan against the Massoretic Text; they are, however, few, and possibly may be explained by differences of idiom, though from the slavish way in which Onqelos follows the Hebrew text this is improbable. The Palestine Targum agrees with the Samaritan and the versions in adding "Let us go into the field" in Ge 4:8. The main benefit received from the Targums is the knowledge of the views of the Jewish rabbis as to the meaning of certain passages Thus in Ge 49:10 there is no doubt in the mind of the Targumist that "Shiloh" refers to the Messiah. Some other cases have been noted above. The frequency with which the word of the Lord (mimera’ yeya’) is used in Onqelos as equivalent to YHWH, as Ge 3:8, "They heard the voice of the word of the Lord God," mimera’ dheyeya’ ‘Elohim, requires to be noted from its bearing on Christian theology. There is a peculiar usage in Ge 15:1: YHWH says to Abraham, "Fear not, Abram, my word (mimera’) shall help thee." Pharaoh is represented as using this periphrasis: "The word of the Lord (mimera’ yeya’) be for your help when I send away you and your little ones" (Ex 10:10). A striking use of this phrase is to be found in De 33:27, where instead of "Underneath are the everlasting arms," we have "By His word the world was made." This is at once seen to resemble the usage of Philo and the apostle John. As the Targums had not been committed to writing during the lifetime of either of these writers, it might be maintained that the Targumists had been influenced by Philo. This, however, does not follow necessarily, as both apostle and philosopher would have heard the Targum of the Law recited Sabbath after Sabbath from their boyhood, and the phrase mimera’ yeya’ would remain in their memory. The Targums of the pseudo-Jonathan and that of Jerusalem have a yet more frequent use of the term. Edersheim has counted 176 occurrences of the phrase in Onqelos and 321 in that of the pseudo-Jonathan and in the fragments of the Yerushalmi 99. This is made the more striking by the fact that it rarely occurs in the rest of Scripture. In Am 1:2, instead of "Yahweh .... will utter his voice from Jerusalem," we have "From Jerusalem will He lift up His word" (memerih). The usual equivalent for the prophet’s formula "the word of the Lord" is pithgam YHWH. An example of the usage before us may be found in Ps 56:4,10: "In the righteousness of the judgment of God will I praise

his word" (memerih). There was thus a preparation for the Christian doctrine of the Trinity imbedded in the most venerated Targum, that of the Law.

LITERATURE.

The text of the official Targums is to be found in every rabbinic Bible. Berliner has published a careful, vocalized edition of Onqelos. The Prophets and the Hagiographa have been edited by Lagarde, but unvocalized. For the language Peterrnann's grammar in the Porta Linguarum Orientalium is useful. Levy's Chaldaisches Woterbuch is very good. Jastrow's Diet. of the Targumim is invaluable. Brextorf's Lexicon Talmudicum supplies information not easily available elsewhere. The Targums on the Pentateuch have been translated by Etheridge. There is an extensive literature on this subject in German. In English the different Bible Dictionaries. may be consulted, especially McClintock, DB, HDB, EB, etc. The article in Encyclopedia Brit is worthy of study, as also naturally that in the Jewish Encyclopedia.

J. E. H. Thomson

TARPELITES

tar'-pel-its (Tarpelaye' (Ezr 4:9)): Various theories have been advanced as to the identity of the Tarpelites. Rawlinson suggested the Tuplai, which name appears in the inscriptions as equivalent to the Greek Tibarenoi, a tribe on the coast of Pontus. Hitzig located them in Tripolis in Northern Phoenicia. The latest theory emends the text to Tiphceraya'," tablet-writers" (from the Assyrian dup sarru); compare Schrader, Schrader, The Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament, on Jer 51:27.

TARSHISH

tar'-shish (tarshish):

(1) Eponym of a Benjamite family (1Ch 7:10); Rhamessai, A and Lucian, Tharseis

(2) One of the "seven princes" at the court of Ahasuerus (Es 1:14 Massoretic Text).

(3) The Hebrew name of a precious stone (Eze 10:9 margin, English Versions of the Bible "beryl"; Ex 28:20; 39:13; Eze 1:16; 28:13; So 5:14; Da 10:6).

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

TARSHISH, NAVY (SHIPS) OF

See SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 1, (2).

TARSUS

tar’-sus (Tarsos, ethnic Tarseus) :

1. Situation

2. Foundation Legends

3. Tarsus under Oriental Power

4. Tarsus under Greek Sway

5. Tarsus in the Roman Empire

6. The University

7. The Tarsian Constitution 8. Paul of Tarsus

9. Later History

LITERATURE

1. Situation:

The chief city of Cilicia, the southeastern portion of Asia Minor. It lay on both banks of the river Cydnus, in the midst of a fertile alluvial plain, some 10 miles from the seacoast. About 6 miles below the city the river broadened out into a considerable lake called Rhegma (Strabo xiv.672), which afforded a safe anchorage and was in great part fringed with quays and dockyards. The river itself, which flowed southward from the Taurus Mountains with a clear and swift stream, was navigable to light craft, and Cleopatra, when she visited Antony at Tarsus in 38 BC, was able to sail in her richly decorated barge into the very heart of the city (Plut. Ant. 26). The silting-up of the river’s mouth seems to have resulted in frequent floods, against which the emperor Justinian (527-65 AD) attempted to provide by cutting a new channel, starting a short distance North of the city, to divert the surplus water into a watercourse which lay to the East of Tarsus. Gradually, however, the original bed was allowed to become choked, and now the Cydnus flows wholly through Justinian’s channel and passes to the East of the modern town. Two miles North of Tarsus the plain gives way to low, undulating hills, which extend to the foothills of Taurus, the great mountain chain lying some 30 miles North of the city, which divides Cilicia from Lycaonia and Cappadocia. The actual frontier-line seems to have varied at different periods, but the natural boundary lies at the Cilician Gates, a narrow gorge which Tarsian enterprise and engineering skill had widened so as to make it a wagon road, the chief highway of communication and

trade between Cilicia and the interior of Asia Minor and one of the most decisive factors in Anatolian history. Eastward from Tarsus ran an important road crossing the Sarus at Adana and the Pyramus at Mopsuestia; there it divided, one branch running southeastward by way of Issus to Antioch on the Orontes, while another turned slightly northward to Castabala, and thence ran due East to the passage of the Euphrates at Zeugma. Thus the fertility of its soil, the safety and convenience of its harbor and the command of the main line of communication between Anatolia and Syria or Mesopotamia combined to promote the greatness of Tarsus, though its position was neither a healthful or a strong one and the town had no acropolis.

2. Foundation Legends:

Of the foundation of the city various traditions were current in antiquity, and it is impossible to arrive any certain conclusion, for such foundation legends often reflected the sympathies and wishes of a city's later population rather than the historic facts of its origin. At Anchiale, about 12 miles Southeast of Tarsus, was a monument commonly known as the tomb of Sardanapalus, king of Assyria, bearing an inscription "in Assyrian letters" stating that that monarch "built Anchiale and Tarsus in a single day" (Strabo xiv. 672; Arrian Anab. ii.5). The statement of Alexander Polyhistor, preserved by Eusebius (Chron. i, p. 27, ed Schoene), that Sennacherib, king of Nineveh (705-681 BC), rounded the city, also ascribes to it an Assyrian origin.

On the other hand, the Greeks had their own traditions, claiming Tarsus as a Greek or semi-Gr foundation. Strabo says that it owed its rise to the Argives who with Triptolemus wandered in search of Io (xiv.673), while others spoke of Heracles or Perseus as the founder. It must be admitted that these tales, taken by themselves, give us little aid.

3. Tarsus under Oriental Power:

Ramsay believes that Tarsus existed from time immemorial as a native Cilician settlement, to which was added, at some early date unknown to us, a body of Ionians, which migrated from the western coast of Asia Minor under the auspices and direction of the oracle of Clarian Apollo near Colophon. The earliest historical record of the town is found on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser, about 850 BC, where it figures among the places captured by that king. It is thus proved that Tarsus already existed at that remote date. For many centuries it remained an oriental rather than a Hellenic city, and its history is almost a blank. After the fall of the Assyrian empire, Cilicia may have regained its independence, at least partially, but it subsequently became a province of the Persian empire, paying to the Great King an annual tribute of 260 white horses and 500 talents of silver (Herodotus iii.90) and contributing considerable fleets, when required, to the Persian navy. From time to time we hear of rulers named Syennesis, who appear to have been vassal princes in a greater or less degree of dependence upon the oriental empires. Two clear glimpses of the city are afforded us, thanks to the passage through it of Hellenic troops engaged upon eastern expeditions. Xenophon (Anab. i.2, 21 ff) tells how, in 40l BC, Cyrus the Younger entered Cilicia on his famous march against his brother Artaxerxes, and how some of his Greek mercenaries plundered Tarsus, which is described as a great and prosperous city, in which was

the palace of King Syennesis. The king made an agreement with Cyrus, who, after a delay of 20 days, caused by the refusal of his troops to march farther, set out from Tarsus for the Euphrates. Again, in 333 BC, Alexander the Great passed through the Cilician Gates on his way to Issus, where he met and routed the Persian army under Darius III. Arsames, the satrap of Cilicia, failed to post a sufficient force at the pass, the garrison fled without resistance and Alexander thus entered the province without striking a blow. The Persians thereupon set fire to Tarsus, but the timely arrival of the Macedonian advance guard under Parmenio saved the city from destruction. A bath in the cold waters of the Cydnus which Alexander took while heated with his rapid advance brought on a fever which all but cost him his life (Arrian Anab. ii.4; Q. Curtius Hist. Alex. iii.4 f) For two centuries Tarsus had been the capital of a Persian satrapy, subject to oriental rather than to Hellenic influence, though there was probably a Hellenic element in its population, and its trade brought it into touch with the Greeks. The Cilician coins struck at Tarsus confirm this view. Down to Alexander's conquest, they ordinarily bear Aramaic legends, and many of them show the effigy of Baal Tarz, the Lord of Tarsus; yet, these coins are clearly influenced by Greek types and workmanship.

4. Tarsus under Greek Sway:

Alexander's overthrow of the Persian power brought about a strong Hellenic reaction in Southeastern Asia Minor and must have strengthened the Greek element in Tarsus, but more than a century and a half were to elapse before the city attained that civic autonomy which was the ideal and the boast of the Greek polis. After Alexander's death in 323 BC his vast empire was soon dismembered by the rivalries and wars of his powerful generals. Cilicia ultimately fell under the rule of the Seleucid kings of Syria, whose capital was Antioch on the Orontes. Though Greeks, they inherited certain features of the old Persian policy and methods of rule; Cilicia was probably governed by a satrap, and there was no development within it of free city life. Early in the 2nd century, however, came a change. Antiochus III, defeated by the Romans in the battle of Magnesia (190 BC), was forced to evacuate most of his possessions in Asia Minor. Cilicia thus became a frontier province and gained greatly in importance. The outcome was the reorganization of Tarsus as an autonomous city with a coinage of its own, which took place under Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164), probably in 171 BC. It is at this time that Tarsus is first mentioned in the Bible, unless we are to accept the disputed identification with TARSHISH (which see). In 2 Macc 4:30 f we read that, about 171 "it came to pass that they of Tarsus and Mallus made insurrection, because they were to be given as a present to Antiochis, the king's concubine. The king therefore came to Cilicia in all haste to settle matters." That this settlement took the form of a compromise and the grant to Tarsus of at least a municipal independence we may infer from the fact that Tarsus struck its own coins from this reign onward. At first they bear the name of Antioch on the Cydnus, but from the death of Antiochus this new appellation falls into disuse and the old name reasserts itself. But it is almost certain that, in accordance with Seleucid policy, this reorganization was accompanied by the enlargement of the citizen body, the new citizens in this case consisting probably of Jews and Argive Greeks. From this time Tarsus is a city of Hellenic constitution, and its coins no longer bear Aramaic but Greek legends. Yet it must be remembered that there was still a large, perhaps a preponderating, native and oriental element in the population, while the coin types in many cases point to the continued popularity of non-Hellenic cults.

5. Tarsus in the Roman Empire:

About 104 BC part of Cilicia became a Hem province, and after the Mithridatic Wars, during which Tarsus fell temporarily into the hands of Tigranes of Armenia, Pompey the Great reorganized the eastern portion of the Hem Empire (64-63 BC), and Tarsus became the capital of a new and enlarged province, administered by Hem governors who usually held office for a single year. Thus we find Cicero in command of Cilicia from the summer of 51 BC to the summer of the following year, and though he expressly mentions Tarsus only rarely in his extant letters of this period (e.g. Ad Art. v.20,3; Ad Faro. ii.17,1), yet there is reason to believe that he resided there during part of his year of office. Julius Caesar passed through the city in 47 BC on his march from Egypt to Pontus, and was enthusiastically received. In his honor the name Tarsus was changed to Juliopolis, but this proved no more lasting than Antioch on the Cydnus had been. Cassius temporarily overawed it and imposed on it a crushing fine, but, after the overthrow of the republican cause at Philippi and the assignment of the East to Antony's administration, Tarsus received the position of an independent and duty-free state (civitas libera et immunis) and became for some time Antony's place of residence. This privileged status was confirmed by Augustus after the victory of Actium had made him sole master of the Roman Empire (31 BC). It did not by itself bestow Roman citizenship on the Tarsinas, but doubtless there were many natives of the city to whom Pompey, Caesar, Antony and Augustus granted that honor for themselves and, as a consequence, for their descendants.

6. The University:

It is under the rule of Augustus that our knowledge of Tarsus first becomes fairly full and precise, Strabo, writing about 19 AD, tells us (xiv.673 ff) of the enthusiasm of its inhabitants for learning, and especially for philosophy. In this respect, he says, Tarsus surpasses Athens and Alexandria and every other university town. It was characterized by the fact that the student body was composed almost entirely of natives, who, after finishing their course, usually went abroad to complete their education and in most cases did not return home, whereas in most universities the students were to a large extent foreigners, and the natives showed no great love of learning. Alexandria, however, formed an exception, attracting a large number of foreign students and also sending out many of its younger citizens to other centers. In fact, adds Strabo, Rome is full of Tarsians and Alexandrians. Among the famous men who learned or taught at Tarsus, we hear of the Stoics Antipater, Archedemus, Nestor, Athenodorus surnamed Cordylion, the friend and companion of the younger Marcus Cato, and his more famous namesake (called Canaanites after the village of his birth), who was the tutor and confidant of Augustus, and who subsequently reformed the Tarsian constitution. Other philosophers of Tarsus were Nestor, a representative of the Academy, and tutor of Marcellus, Augustus' nephew and destined successor, and of Tiberius, Plutiades and Diogenes; the latter was also famous as an improvisatore, and indeed the Tarsians in general were famed for their ease and fluency in impromptu speaking. Artemidorus and Diodorus the grammarians and Dionysides the tragic poet, a member of the group of seven writers known as "the Pleiad," complete Strabo's list of eminent Tarsians. A less attractive view of the life in Tarsus is given by Philostratus in his biography of Apollonius of Tyana, who went there to study in the early part of Tiberius' reign (14-37 AD). So disgusted was he by the insolence of the citizens, their love of pleasure and their extravagance in dress, that he shook the dust of Tarsus off his feet and went to

Aegae to pursue his studies in a more congenial atmosphere (Vit. Apollon. i.7). But Strabo's testimony is that of a contemporary and an accurate historian and must outweigh that of Philostratus, whose work is largely tinged with romance and belongs to the early years of the 3rd century AD.

7. The Tarsian Constitution:

Strabo also tells us something of an important constitutional reform carried out in Tarsus under the Emperor Augustus, probably about 15-10 BC. Athenodorus Canaanites, the Stoic, returned to his city as an old man, after some 30 years spent at Rome, armed with authority from the emperor to reform abuses in its civic life. He found the constitution a democracy, swayed and preyed upon by a corrupt clique headed by a certain Boethus, "bad poet and bad citizen," who owed his position partly to his ready and persuasive tongue, partly to the favor of Antony, whom he had pleased by a poem composed to celebrate the victory of Philippi. Athenodorus sought at first to mend matters by argument and persuasion, but, finding Boethus and his party obdurate, he at length exercised his extraordinary powers, banished the offenders and remodeled the constitution, probably in a timocratic mold, restricting the full citizenship to those possessed of a considerable property qualification. On his death, his place as head of the state was taken for a while by the academic philosopher Nestor (Strabo xiv.674 f). Next to Strabo's account our most valuable source of information regarding Tarsus is to be found in the two orations of Dio Chrysostom addressed to the Tarsians about 110 AD (Orat. xxxiii, xxxiv; see Jour. Hell. Studies, XXIV, 58 ff). Though admitting that the city was an Argive colony, he emphasized its non-Hellenic character, and, while criticizing much in its institutions and manners, found but a single feature to commend, the strictness with which the Tarsian women were veiled whenever they appeared in public.

8. Paul of Tarsus:

Such was Tarsus, in which Paul was born (Ac 22:3) and of which he was a citizen (Ac 9:11; 21:39). Its ancient traditions and its present greatness explain and justify the pride with which he claimed to be "a citizen of no mean city" (Ac 21:39). It is probable that his forefathers had been among the Jews settled at Tarsus by Antiochus Epiphanes, who, without sacrificing nationality or religion, became citizens of a community organized after the Greek model. On what occasion and for what service Roman civitas had been conferred on one of Paul's ancestors we cannot say; this only we know, that before his birth his father had possessed the coveted privilege (Ac 22:28). It is a fascinating, but an elusive, quest to trace in Paul's life and writings the influence of his Tarsian ancestry, birth and early life. Jerome, it is true, claims that many Pauline words and phrases were characteristic of Cilicia, and some modern scholars profess to find traces, in the apostle's rhetoric and in his attitude toward pagan religion and secular learning, of Tarsian influence. But such speculations are likely to be misleading, and it is perhaps best to admit that, save in the trade learned by Paul, which was characteristic of his birthplace, we cannot with any precision gauge the effects of his early surroundings. At the same time it is certain that the character of his native city, its strong oriental element, its Greek constitution and speech, its position in the Roman Empire, its devotion to learning, must have made an impression upon one who, uniting Jewish nationality with membership of a Greek state and Roman citizenship, was to be the great interpreter to the Greco-Roman world of a religion which sprang from the soil of Judaism. How long Paul remained at Tarsus before beginning his studies in Jerusalem we cannot say. His own declaration that he was "born

in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city" (Ac 22:3) seems to show that his training at Jerusalem began at an early age, and is inconsistent with the supposition that he was one of those Tarsian students who, after studying at their native university, completed their education abroad. During his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, plots were formed against his life, and he was induced to return to Tarsus (Ac 9:30), where, according to Ramsay's chronology, he remained for some 8 years. Thither Barnabas went to seek him when he felt the need of a helper in dealing with the new problems involved in the growth of the Antiochene church and the admission into it of Gentiles in considerable numbers (Ac 11:25). Tarsus is not again mentioned in the New Testament, but Paul doubtless revisited it on his second missionary journey, when he "went through Syria and Cilicia" (Ac 15:41), and traveled thence by way of the Cilician Gates into Lycaonia, and again at the beginning of his third journey when, after some time spent at Antioch, "he departed, and went through the region of Galatia, and Phrygia, in order" (Ac 18:23).

9. Later History:

This is not the place to discuss in detail the later history of Tarsus, many passages of which are obscure and difficult. It remained a focus of imperial loyalty, as is indicated by the names Hadriane, Commodiane, Severiane and others, which appear, isolated or conjoined, upon its coins, together with the title of metropolis and such epithets as "first," "greatest," "fairest." Indeed it was chiefly in the matter of such distinctions that it carried on a keen, and sometimes bitter, rivalry, first with Mallus and Adana, its neighbors in the western plain, and later with Anazarbus, the chief town of Eastern Cilicia. But Tarsus remained the capital of the district, which during the 1st century of the empire was united with Syria in a single imperial province, and when Cilicia was made a separate province Tarsus, as a matter of course, became its metropolis and the center of the provincial Caesar-worship, and, at a later date, the capital of "the three Eparchiae,"cilicia, Isauria and Lycaonia. Toward the close of the 4th century Cilicia was divided into two, and Tarsus became the capital of Cilicia Prima only. Soon after the middle of the 7th century it was captured by the Arabs, and for the next three centuries was occupied by them as their northwestern capital and base of operations against the Anatolian plateau and the Byzantine empire. In 965 it was recaptured, together with the rest of Cilicia, by the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, but toward the close of the following century it fell into the hands of the Turks and afterward of the Crusaders. It was subsequently ruled by Armenian princes as part of the kingdom of Lesser Armenia, and then by the Memluk sultans of Egypt, from whom it was finally wrested by the Ottoman Turks early in the 16th century. The modern town, which still bears the ancient name in the slightly modified form Tersous, has a very mixed population, numbering about 25,000, and considerable trade, but suffers from its unhealthful situation and the proximity of large marshy tracts. Few traces of its ancient greatness survive, the most considerable of them being the vast substructure of a Greco-Roman temple, known locally as the tomb of Sardanapalus (R. Koldewey in C. Robert, Aus der Anomia, 178 ff).

LITERATURE.

The best account of Tarsus will be found in W. M. Ramsay, The Cities of Paul (London, 1907), 85-244; the same writer's articles on "Cilicia, Tarsus and the Great Taurus Pass" in the Geographical Journal, 1903, 357 ff, and on "Tarsus" in HDB should also be consulted, as well as H. Bohlig, Die Geisteskultur

yon Tarsos im augusteischen Zeitalter (Gottingen, 1913). For inscriptions see LeBas-Waddington, Voyage archeologique, III, numbers 1476 ff; Inscr. Graec. ad res Roman. pertinetes, III, 876 ff. For coins, B. V. Head, Historia Numorum2, 729 ff; G. F. Hill, British Museum Catalogue of Coins: Lycaonia, Isauria and Cilicia, lxxvi ff, 162 ff.

M. N. Top

TARTAK

tar’-tak (tartaq): In 2Ki 17:31 mentioned as the name of an idol of the Avvites, one of the peoples sent by Shalmaneser to the cities of Samaria. It is otherwise unknown.

TARTAN

tar’-tan (tartan): For a long time the word was interpreted as a proper name, but the Assyrian inscriptions have shown it to be the title of a high official. From the eponym lists it would seem that it was the title of the highest official next to the king, which in a military empire like Assyria would be the "commander-in-chief." The Assyrian form of the name is tartanu or turtanu. In both Old Testament passages the reference is to a military officer. In Isa 20:1 it is used of the officer sent by Sargon, king of Assyria, against Ashdod; according to 2Ki 18:17, Sennacherib sent Tartan and RAB-SARIS (which see) and RABSHAKEH (which see) with a great host against Jerusalem. The names of the-two officials are not known.

F. C. Eiselen

TASKMASTER

task’-mas-ter. (sar mac, "chief of the burden" or "levy" (Ex 1:11); noghes, "distress," "driver," "oppressor," "raiser of taxes," "taskmaster" (Ex 3:7; 5:6,10,13,14)): Officials of this class seem to have been officially appointed by Pharaoh for the purpose of oppressing the Israelites and subduing their spirits, lest they seek complete independence or organize a rebellion against the government (Ex 1:11). The condition of the Israelites at this time became one of complete vassalage or slavery, probably owing to the fact that the Hyksos were driven out and a new dynasty was established, which knew nothing of Joseph and his people.SARIS">RAB-SARIS /Jl(which see) and Jl:jump,"rabshakeh"rabshakeh /Jl(which see) with a great host against Jerusalem. The names of the-two officials are not known.

Frank E. Hirsch

TASSEL

tas’-’l (tsitsith): This word occurs only in Nu 15:38 (Revised Version margin), which reads "tassels in

the corners" for "fringes in the borders of their garments" (the King James Version).

It is probable that the dress of the Palestinian peasant has undergone little change in the centuries since the occupation of the land by the Hebrews. His outer garment, worn for protection against cold and rain, is the simlah of Ex 22:26, now known as ‘abayah by the Arabs. It is a square cloak, with unsewn spaces for armholes, and is composed of either three or four widths of woven stuff. The outer strips of the stuff, folded back and sewn at the upper edges, form shoulder-straps. It was to such a garment as this that the injunctions of Nu 15:37-41 and of De 22:12 applied.

See FRINGES.

W. Shaw Caldecott

TASTE

tast (Hebrew Ta‘am, "the sense of taste," "perception," from Ta‘am, "to taste," "to perceive"; Aramaic Te‘em, "flavor," "taste" (of a thing); Hebrew chekh, "palate," "roof of the mouth" =" taste"; geuomai; noun geusis; in 2 Macc 7:1 the verb is ephaptomai):

(1) Literal:

(a) Gustation, to try by the tongue: "The taste (ta‘am) of it manna was like wafers made with honey" (Ex 16:31); "Doth not the ear try words, even as the palate (chekh) tasteth (Ta‘am) its food?" (Job 12:11); "Belshazzar, while he tasted (literally, "at the taste of," Te‘em) the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which Nebuchadnezzar his father had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king and his lords, his wives and his concubines, might drink therefrom" (Da 5:2).

(b) "To sample," "to eat but a small morsel": "I did certainly taste (Ta‘am) a little honey with the end of the rod that was in my hand; and, lo, I must die" (1Sa 14:43).

(2) Figurative:

"To experience," "to perceive": "Oh taste and see that Yahweh is good" (Ps 34:8; compare 1Pe 2:3); "How sweet are thy words unto my taste!" (margin "palate," chekh) (Ps 119:103); "That by the grace of God he should taste of death for every man" (Heb 2:9); "For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the age to come .... "(Heb 6:4,5).

H. L. E. Luering

TATTENAI

tat’-e-ni (tattenay, various forms in the Septuagint; the King James Version Tatnai, tat’ni, tat’na-i’): A Persian governor, who was the successor of Rehum in Samaria and some other provinces belonging to Judah, bordering on Samaria. He governed the provinces during the reign of Darius Hystaspis and Zerubbabel (Ezr 5:3,6; 6:6,13). He was friendly to the Jews, and when he heard adverse reports from Jerusalem he suspended judgment till he had investigated the matter on the ground, and then reported to the Persian government in a very moderate manner. In 1 Esdras 6:3,7,27; 7:1 he is called "Sisinnes."

S. L. Umbach

TATTLER

tat’-ler: Only in 1Ti 5:13 for phluaros. A "silly talker," rather than a "revealer of secrets," is meant.

TAV tav.

See TAW.

TAVERNS, THREE

tav’-ernz: Three Taverns (Latin Tres Tabernae, Greek transliterates treis tabernai; Cicero Ad Att. i.13; ii.12, 13) was a station on the Appian Road at the 33rd milestone (301/3 English miles from Rome), according to the Itineraries of the Roman Empire (Itin. Ant. vii; Tab. Peut.; Geogr. Rav. iv.34), a converging point of traffic at the crossing of a road from Antium to Norba. Tripontium, 6 miles down the Appian Road in the direction of Appii Forum, was reckoned as the point where the highway entered the region of the Pontiac marshes, the most notable natural feature of this part of Italy.

Parties of the Christian brethren in Rome went out to greet the apostle Paul when news was brought that he had arrived at Puteoli, one group proceeding as far as Appii Forum, while another awaited his coming at Three Taverns (Ac 28:15).

George H. Allen

TAW

tau ("t", "th"): The 22nd letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia with the daghesh as "t", and as "th" without. It came also to be used for the number 400. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

See also FOREHEAD; MARK.

TAX; TAXING

taks, taks'-ing:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. General Considerations

2. Limits of the Discussion

II. TAXES IN ISRAEL UNDER SELF-GOVERNMENT

1. In the Earliest Period

2. Under the Theocracy; in the Period of the Judges

3. Under the Kings

III. TAXES IN ISRAEL UNDER CONQUERORS

1. Under the Assyrians and Babylonians

2. Under the Persians

3. Under the Ptolemies and Seleucid Kings

4. Under the Romans

I. Introduction.

1. General Considerations:

Taxation, in the sense of regular, graduated imposts levied by authority upon wealth, whether in the form of flocks and herds, tilled lands or accumulated treasure, is a comparatively late product of social evolution. The beginnings of this trouble-breeding institution are, of course, very ancient. If in the beginning all wealth was common wealth, all property vested in the family or tribe, making any kind of levies unnecessary, with the rise of individualism, the prorata setting aside, for common uses, of certain possessions held as private property by individuals, which is the essence of taxation, is inevitable. With the advent of more advanced civilization, by which is meant fixed residence, systematic use and cultivation of defined and limited territory, established political organization centering in rulers of one kind or another, regular taxation must necessarily have begun. Throughout history the burden of taxation

has kept pace with the elaboration of the machinery of government; kings, courts, ceremonials, legislative and judicial administration, wars, diplomacy—all these institutions spell expense and, consequently, taxation. In a very real sense, the history of taxation is the history of civilization.

2. Limits of the Discussion:

In following the history of taxation in the Bible, two lines of development are to be noted: Israel's internal history when left to herself, and her experiences as tributary to successive conquerors. These two lines of experience form the main divisions of this article. We shall confine ourselves so far as possible to the civil aspects of the subject, leaving for others those interesting problems of taxation connected with the origin and development of the priestly legislation.

See TITHE etc.

II. Taxes in Israel under Self-Government.

In the first glimpses of the ancestors of the Hebrew people given us in the Bible, no such institution as taxation appears.

1. In the Earliest Period:

Like all primitive communities, the nomadic Hebrews had no regular system of taxation nor use for any. Voluntary presents were given by the less to the more powerful in return for protection or other advantages. These are really ominous words, for even as late as the United Kingdom, when, of a certainty, the voluntary element had long since gone out the royal income was spoken of, with perhaps unconscious irony as "presents" (1Sa 10:27; 1Ki 4:21; 10:25). One great tap-root of the whole after-development of systematic taxation is to be found in this primitive custom of giving presents (Ge 32:13-21; 33:10; 43:11). The transition is so fatally easy from presents voluntarily given to those which are expected and finally to those which are demanded (2Ki 16:8; compare 17:4, where the King James Version has "presents").

The first evidence of what corresponds to compulsory taxation discoverable in the Bible is in connection with the conquered Canaanites who were compelled to serve under tribute, that is, to render forced labor (Jos 16:10; 17:13; Jud 1:28-35). In the early custom of making presents to the powerful and in the exactions laid upon conquered peoples, with the necessary public expense of community life as the natural basis, we have the main sources of what grew to be institutional taxation.

2. Under the Theocracy; in the Period of the Judges:

The only fixed impost under theocracy which has a semi-civil character was the so-called "atonement money" (Ex 30:11-16), really a poll-tax amounting to a half-shekel for each enrolled male member of the community above 20 years of age. The proceeds of this tax were to be used for the service of the

Tent of Meeting (see TABERNACLE). It seems to have been levied by the authorities and accepted by the people whenever faithfulness to the ordinances of Yahweh was the order of the day (2Ch 24:4-14; Ne 10:32; note here the emphasis laid upon the offering as voluntary, and the variation in amount from one-half to one-third shekel). In later times this tax was devoted to the service of the temple, and was paid by Jews at a distance during the Dispersion. Josephus speaks of the large amounts accruing to the temple-treasury from this source (Ant., XIV, vii, 2). It was still collected as the distinctive temple-tax levied upon the citizen as such (Mt 17:24). It is interesting to note that Jesus paid it under protest and with one of the most distinctive of His miracles, on the ground of His being the founder and head of a new temple, and hence, not subject to the impost which was the badge of citizenship in the old order.

The period of the Judges was too disorganized and chaotic to exhibit many of the characteristics of a settled mode of procedure. As far as we know the only source of public moneys was the giving of presents. If the action of Gideon (Jud 8:24) is to be taken as indicating the ordinary policy of the period, the judges received nothing. more than a share of the spoil taken in battle. The account emphasizes, evidently with purpose, the fact that Gideon proffers a request (Jud 8:24), and that the people respond freely and gladly.

3. Under the Kings:

As was to be expected, taxation assumes far greater prominence the moment we cross the threshold of the kingdom. 1Sa 8:10-18 is equally significant for our purpose whether it was, as appears on the face of the narrative, the actual words of warning uttered by Samuel in view of the well-known attitude of kings in general, or a later recension from the viewpoint of experience. In either case, the passage gives us a fairly exhaustive list of royal prerogatives. Aside from various forms of public and private service, the king would take (note the word) the best of the vineyards, etc., together with a tenth of the seed and of the flocks. The underlying principle, suggested by Samuel’s summary and fully exemplified in the actions of Israel’s kings, is that the king would take what he needed for his public and private needs from the strength and substance of his people. Constitutional laws regulating the expenditure of public funds and the amount of exactions from the people in taxation seem never to have been contemplated in these early monarchies. The king took what he could get; the, people gave what they could not hold back. The long battle for constitutional rights has centered from the beginning about the matter of taxation.

In 1Sa 10:27 (compare 2Ch 17:5) the case cited of worthless fellows who brought Saul no present clearly shows that fealty to the new king was expressed in the giving of presents. The refusal to make these so-called presents was an act of constructive treason, so interpreted by the writer, who mentions Saul’s silence in the premises as something notable. It is evident that the word "present" has become euphemistic. In 1Sa 17:25 exemption from taxation is specifically mentioned, together with wealth and marriage into the royal family, as one element in the reward to be obtained for ridding Israel of the menace of Goliath.

In David’s time an unbroken series of victories in war so enriched the public treasury (see 2Sa 8:2,7,8)

that we hear little of complaints of excessive taxation. If David's census was for fiscal purposes (2Sa 24:2), we can understand why he was so severely dealt with for it, but the matter is still obscure. David's habit of dedicating spoil to Yahweh (2Sa 8:10-12) kept the sacred treasury well supplied. Solomon undoubtedly inherited David's scale of public expense (1Ch 27:25-31) and added to it through his well-developed love of luxury and power. At the same time the cessation of war made the development of internal resources for carrying on his ambitious schemes imperative. The boundaries of his kingdom are specified (1Ki 4:21 (Hebrew 5:1)) together with the amount of his income (1Ki 10:14,28; compare 2Ki 3:4). It is also stated that other kingdoms paid tribute to him. His system of fiscal administration was very thoroughly organized. He put the whole country under twelve officers (to specify one feature) whose business was to provide, by months, provisions for the court (1Ki 4:7-19). Under Solomon also, for the first time, so far as we know, Israelites were compelled to render forced labor (1Ki 5:13-17). By the end of his reign the burden of taxation had become so severe that in the public address made to Rehoboam the people demanded a lightening of the "grievous service" of Solomon as the condition of their fealty to his successor. Rehoboam's foolish answer of defiance precipitated the separation of the tribes which proved in the end so disastrous. During the period of prophetic activity which follows, one recurring specification in the denunciations uttered by the prophets against the kings was the excessive burden of taxation imposed upon the people. Amos speaks of "exactions of wheat taken from the poor" (5:11; compare 2:6-8). In 7:1 he incidentally refers to a custom which has grown up of rendering to the king the first mowings of grass. Isaiah speaks of eating up the vineyards and taking the spoil of the poor (3:14). Micah, with even greater severity, denounces rulers "who eat the flesh of my people" (3:1-4). These citations are sufficient to show that all through the later monarchy the Israelites suffered more or less from official rapacity and injustice.

III. Taxes in Israel under Conquerors.

1. Under the Assyrians and Babylonians: During the reign of Menahem, who-succeeded Jeroboam II as king of Israel, the Assyrian invasion under Tiglath-pileser III (Biblical "Pul," 2Ki 15:19) began. The one act of Menahem (aside from his general sinfulness) which is specified in 2Ki 15:17-22, the remainder of his unedifying career being left to the Chronicles of the kings of Israel, is that he bought off the Assyrian conqueror by a tribute of a thousand talents which he obtained by mulcting men of wealth in his kingdom to the extent of fifty talents each. A little later, Ahaz of Judah sent a present to the same ruler. He took the novel method of robbing the temple-treasury and adding the sum thus gained to the accumulations at hand in the royal treasury. Both these kings were somewhat original in their methods. Hoshea of Israel, a contemporary of Ahaz, was reduced to tribute; later, upon his neglect to pay, he was put in prison (2Ki 17:4). A little later still, Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, was deposed by Pharaoh-necoh, who placed a tribute upon the land of a hundred talents of silver and one of gold (2Ki 23:31-33). Jehoiakim, the puppet king, raised this tribute by a special tax upon the people (2Ki 23:34,35). This latter passage is especially interesting because it seems to indicate (2Ki 23:35 f) a graduated system of taxation supposedly honored more often in the breach than in the observance. This same unfortunate Jehoiakim came under the heavy hand of Nebuchadnezzar (2Ki 24:1-7). This latter ruler seems not to have levied a special tribute, at least it is not mentioned; but reimbursed himself for the expenses of conquest by carrying away to Babylon the vessels of the temple (2Ch 36:7).

2. Under the Persians:

In Ezr 4:13, a part of a letter addressed to Artaxerxes by officials "west of the river" (see whole passage Ezr 4:7-24) who were hostile to the Jews, it is charged that in the event of rebuilding the city the inhabitants would not pay "tribute, custom, or toll." These three words, which are evidently combined in a formula and indicate three distinct classes of taxes, are interesting as being characteristic of the Persian period.

The three words are:

(1) middah =" tribute" (Ezr 4:13,10; compare Ne 5:4, where the expression is "king's tribute");

(2) belo = according to Gesenius under the word: "tax on articles consumed" or "excise". (HDB "impost") (Ezr 4:13,10; 7:24);

(3) halakh =" road-toll" or "custom tax" (Ezr 4:13,10; 7:24).

These Assyrian words are to be contrasted with the words used elsewhere:

(1) mac =" forced labor" (1Ki 5:13 (Hebrew 5:27); compare ut sup. Jos 16:10; 17:13; Jud 1:28,30,33,35; De 20:11; Es 10:1);

(2) massa' =" burden" (2Ch 17:11);

(3) mekhec =" measure," used of tribute exacted for Yahweh, taken from people, cattle, and spoil, etc. (Nu 31:25-31).

From this enumeration and comparison it will be seen that the Hebrew had no general word corresponding to the English word "tax."

To return to the situation in the Persian period, it is evident that the Persian rulers exacted practically the same classified tributes, direct and indirect, that are found elsewhere. It is recorded that Artaxerxes, in response to the letter of his officers in Palestine (Ezr 4:21), stopped the work of the rebuilding of Jerusalem in anticipation of the refusal of the Jewish leaders to pay taxes. The work was resumed in the 2nd year of Darius under the protection of a royal decree which gave to the Jewish authorities a sufficient amount from the "tribute beyond the river" to finish without delay.

Artaxerxes, in addition to his generous gifts, exempted the priests and temple-servants from all taxation (Ezr 7:24). In the days of Nehemiah a serious condition arose. The king's tribute was so heavy that the Jewish common people were compelled to borrow money upon mortgages, and in so doing fell into the hands of usurers of their own people, by whom they were so impoverished as to be compelled to sell their sons and daughters into slavery (Ne 5:1-13). In addition to the royal tribute, they were forced to

support the governors who were entitled to bread, wine and forty shekels of silver annually (Ne 5:14,15). In the prayer offered on the fast day (Ne 9) it was asserted that their burdens of taxation were so heavy that they were servants in their own land (Ne 9:36,37).

3. Under the Ptolemies and Seleucid Kings:

The Ptolemies, who practically controlled Palestine from 301 to 218 BC, do not appear to have been excessive in their demands for tribute (twenty talents for Jews (Ant., XII, iv, 1) seems no great amount), but the custom which they introduced, or at least established, of farming the taxes to the highest bidder, introduced a principle which prevailed through all the subsequent history and was the cause of much popular suffering and discontent. The story of Joseph, the Jewis tax-collector (Ant., XII, iv, 1-5), who was for 23 years farmer-general of taxes for Palestine under Ptolemy Euergetes, and the cause of "a long train of disasters" is peculiarly significant for the student of the New Testament.

The conquest of Palestine by Antiochus the Great (202 BC) brought a certain amount of relief to the "storm-tossed" (Josephus) Jews of Palestine, as of old the buffer state between contending powers. According to Josephus (Ant., XII, iii, 3), Antiochus gave the Jews generous gifts in money, remitted their taxes for three years, and permanently reduced them one-third (see Kent’s discussion of the credibility of these statements, Historical Series for Bible Students, Babylonian, Persian, Greek Periods, 296).

That the Selucid kings were particularly severe in their exactions is clearly shown in the letter of Demetrius to the Jews, whose favor he was seeking in rivalry with Alexander Balas of Smyrna, the pretender to the Selucid throne (see 1 Macc 10:26-30; 11:34,35; 13:39; compare 11:28).

In this quoted letter Demetrius promises the following exemptions:

from (1) "tributes" (phori =" polltaxes");

(2) tax on salt;

(3) crown taxes (stephanoi =" crowns of gold" or their equivalents);

(4) the tribute of one-third of the seed;

(5) another of one-half of the fruit of the trees (1 Macc 10:29,30).

This seems almost incredibly severe, but evidence is not lacking of its probability (Lange’s Commentary Apocrypha, edition 1901, 525). With Selcucus IV (187-176 BC) the Jews felt for the first time, indirectly but powerfully, the pressure of Rome. This disreputable ruler had to pay tribute to Rome as well as to find means whereby to gratify his own passion for luxury, and was correspondingly rapacious in the treatment of his subjects (2 Macc 3).

4. Under the Romans:

During the early part of the Heroadian epoch, taxes were paid to the king and collected by officers appointed by him. This method which worked fairly well, at least under Herod the Great, had passed away before any books of the New Testament were written. After the deposition of Archelaus (6 AD), at the request of the Jews themselves, Judea was incorporated into the Roman empire and put under procurators who were in charge of all financial administration, although the tetrarchs still collected the internal taxes. This fact conditions all that is to be said about "tribute" and "publicans" in connection with the New Testament. It is to be noted first of all (a fact that is often overlooked by the student) that in the imperial era the direct taxes were not farmed out, but collected by regular imperial officers in the regular routine of official duty. The customs or tolls levied upon exports and imposts, and upon goods in the hands of merchants passing through the country, were sold to the highest bidders, who were called publicans.

With this distinction clearly in mind we may dismiss the subject of general taxation with the following remarks: First that the taxes in Judea went to the imperial treasury (Mt 22:17; Mr 12:14; Lu 20:22); second that these taxes were very heavy. These two facts explain why the question of paying tribute to Caesar, which our Lord was obliged to meet, was so burning an issue. It touched at once religious and financial interest—a powerful combination. In 7 AD, immediately after the appointment of Coponius as procurator, Quirinius (see Quirinius, New Testament Chronology, etc.) was sent to Judea to take a census (apographe) for the purpose of poll-tax (kensos, phoros, or epikephalaion (Mt 22:17; Mr 12:13,14; Lu 20:20)). This census was the occasion for the bloody uprising of Judas of Gamala (or Galilee) (Ac 5:37; compare Ant, XVIII, i 1, 6).As a matter of historical faxct this same census was the occasion of the final destruction of the Jewish commonwealth, for the fierce antagonism to Rome which was aroused at that time never died out until it was extingushed in blood, 70 AD.

We are now free to discuss thos matters which center in a general way about the term "publican." According to Stapfer (PTC, 215) this term (telones) is commonly used to cover several grades of minor officials engaged in the customs service. The word was extended in meaning from the publicanus, properly so called, the farmer-general of a province, to his subordinate local officils. The publicans of the New Testament "examined the goods and collected tolls on roads and bridges" (Stapfer, op. cit., 216; compare Mt 9:9). These tolls (Latin, portoria; Greek tele) were collected in Palestine at Caesarea, Capernaum and Jericho (Josephus, BJ, II, xiv, 4). Those collected at Capernaum went into the treasury of Herod Antipas. At Jericho there was a chief publican (architelones), but most of the publicans mentioned in the New Testament were probably subordinate to men higher in authority.

Sufficient cause for the unpopularity of publicans in New Testament times is not far seek. Hatred of paying duties seems to be ingrained in human nature. Customs officials are always unpopular. The method is necessarily inquisitorial. The man who opens one’s boxes and bundles to appraise the value of what one has, is at best a tolerated evil. In Judea, under the Roman system, all circumstances combined to make the publican the object of bitter hatred. He represented and exercised in immediate contact, at a

sore spot with individuals, the hatred power of Rome. The tax itself was looked upon as an inherent religious wrong, as well as civil imposition, and by many the payment of it was considered a sinful act of disloyalty to God. The tax-gatherer, if a Jew, was a renegade in the eyes of his patriotic fellows. He paid a fixed sum for the taxes, and received for himself what he could over and above that amount. The ancient and widespread curse of arbitrariness was in the system. The tariff rates were vague and indefinite (see Schurer, HJP, I, ii, 67 f). The collector was thus always under the suspicion of being an extortioner and probably was in most instances. The name was apt to realize itself. The unusual combination in a publican of petty tyrant, renegade and extortioner, made by circumstances almost inevitable, was not conductive to popularity. In the score of instances in the New Testament where publicans are mentioned, their common status, their place in the thought and action of Jesus, their new hope in the gospel are clearly set forth. The instances in which our Lord speaks of them are especially illuminating:

(1) He uses them on the basis of the popular estimate which the disciples undoubtedly shared, to point in genial irony a reproach addressed to His hearers for their low standard of love and forgiveness (Mt 5:46,47).

(2) He uses the term in the current combination in giving directions about excommunicating a persistently unrepentant member of the church (Mt 18:17).

(3) He uses the term in the popular sense in describing the current condemnation of His attitude of social fellowship with them, and constructively accepts the title of "friend of publicans and sinners" (Mt 11:19; Lu 7:34).

(4) Most significant of all, Jesus uses the publican, as He did the Samaritan, in a parable in which the despised outcast shows to advantage in an attitude acceptable to God (Lu 18:9).

This parable is reinforced by the statement, made more than once by our Lord, that the readiness to repent shown by the publicans and other outcasts usually found with them was more promising of salvation than the spiritual pride shown by some who were satisfied with themselves (Lu 3:12; compare 7:29; Mt 21:31,32; Lu 15:1). The choice of Levi as a disciple (Mt 10:3, etc.) and the conversion of Zaccheus (Lu 19:8 f), of whom Jesus speaks so beautifully as a son of Abraham (Lu 19:9), justified the characteristic attitude which our Lord adopted toward the despised class, about equally guilty and unfortunate. He did not condone their faults or crimes; neither did He accept the popular verdict that pronounced them unfit for companionship with the good and without hope in the world. According to the teaching and accordant action of jesus, no man or woman is without hope until the messenger of hope has been definitely rejected.

It is fitting, if somewhat dramatic, that a study of taxation—that historic root of bitterness periodically springing up through the ages—should end in comtemplation of Him who spoke to an outcast and guilty tax-collector (Lu 19:10) the wonderful words: "The Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost."

Louis Matthews Sweet

TEACH; TEACHER; TEACHING

tech, tech’-er, tech’-ing:

I. OLD TESTAMENT TERMS

1. Discipline

2. Law

3. Discernment

4. Wisdom

5. Knowledge

6. Illumination

7. Vision

8. Inspiration

9. Nourishment

II. NEW TESTAMENT TERMS

1. Instruction

2. Acquisition

3. Presentation

4. Elucidation

5. Exposition

6. Authority

7. Care

8. Supervision

III. OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

1. In the Home

2. In Public

IV. EXTRA-BIBLICAL TEACHING

V. NEW TESTAMENT HISTORY

1. Christ’s Life

2. Apostolic Labors

3. General Considerations

A rich variety of words is employed in the Bible to describe the teaching process. The terms do not so much indicate an office and an official as a function and a service, although both ideas are often expressed or implied.

I. Old Testament Terms.

1. Discipline:

lamadh, "to beat": A very common word for "to teach"; it may have meant "to beat with a rod," "to chastise," and may have originally referred to the striking and goading of beasts by which they were curbed and trained. By a noble evolution the term came to describe the process of disciplining and training men in war, religion and life (Isa 2:3; Ho 10:11; Mic 4:2). As teaching is both a condition and an accompaniment of disciplining, the word often means simply "to teach," "to inform" (2Ch 17:7; Ps 71:17; Pr 5:13). The glory of teaching was its harmony with the will of God, its source in God’s authority, and its purpose to secure spiritual obedience (De 4:5,14; 31:12,13).

2. Law:

yarah, "to cast": The teaching idea from which the law was derived is expressed by a verb which means "to throw," "to cast as an arrow or lot." It is also used of thrusting the hand forth to point out or show clearly (Ge 46:28; Ex 15:25). The original idea is easily changed into an educational conception, since

the teacher puts forth new ideas and facts as a sower casts seed into the ground. But the process of teaching was not considered external and mechanical but internal and vital (Ex 35:34,35; 2Ch 6:27). The nominal form is the usual word for law, human and divine, general and specific (De 4:8; Ps 19:8; Pr 1:8). The following are suggestive phrases: "the book of the law" (De 28:61; 2Ki 22:8); "the book of the law of Moses" (Jos 8:31; 2Ki 14:6); "the book of the law of God" (Jos 24:26); "the book of the law of Yahweh" (2Ch 17:9). Thus even in the days of Joshua there was in the possession of the religious teachers a book of the Law of the Lord as given by Moses. This recorded revelation and legislation continued to be the divine norm and ultimate authority for priest, king and people (2Ch 23:11; Ne 8:1-3).

3. Discernment:

bin, "to separate": The word meaning "to separate," "to distinguish," is often used in a causative sense to signify "to teach." The idea of teaching was not an aggregation of facts bodily transferred like merchandise. Real learning followed genuine teaching. This word suggests a sound psychological basis for a good pedagogy. The function of teaching might be exercised with reference to the solution of difficult problems, the interpretation of God’s will, or the manner of a godly life (Da 8:16,26; Ne 8:7-9; Ps 119:34).

4. Wisdom:

sakhal, "to be wise": The verb from which the various nominal forms for "wisdom" are derived means "to look at," "to behold," "to view," and in the causative stem describes the process by which one is enabled to see for himself what had never before entered his physical or intellectual field of consciousness. The noun indicates a wise person or sage whose mission is to instruct others in the ways of the Lord (Pr 16:23; 21:11; and often in the Wisdom literature). In Da 12:3 we read: "They that are wise (margin, "the teachers") shall shine as the brightness of the firmament."

5. Knowledge:

yadha’," to see" (compare oida): This verb literally means "to see" and consequently "to perceive," "to know," "to come to know," and "cause to know or teach." It describes the act of knowing as both progressive and completed. The causative conception signifies achievement in the sphere of instruction. It is used of the interpretation and application by Moses of the principles of the law of God (Ex 18:16,20), of the elucidation of life’s problems by the sages (Pr 9:9; 22:19), and of constant Providential guidance in the way of life (Ps 16:11).

6. Illumination:

zahar, "to shine": This verbal root signifies "to shine," and when applied to the intellectual sphere indicates the function of teaching to be one of illumination. Ignorance is darkness, knowledge is light. Moses was to teach the people statutes and laws, or to enlighten them on the principles and precepts of God’s revelation (Ex 18:20). The service rendered by the teachers—priests, Levites and fathers—sent

forth by Jehoshaphat, was one of illumination in the twofold sense of instruction and admonition (2Ch 19:8-10).

7. Vision:

ra’-ah, "to see": The literal meaning of this verb is "to see," and the nominal form is the ancient name for prophet or authoritative teacher who was expected to have a clear vision of spiritual realities, the will of God, the need of man and the way of life (1Sa 9:9; 1Ch 9:22; 2Ch 16:7 f; Isa 30:10).

8. Inspiration;

nabha’," to boil up": The most significant word for "prophet" is derived from the verb which means "to boil up or forth like a fountain," and consequently to pour forth words under the impelling power of the Spirit of God. The Hebrews used the passive forms of the verb because they considered the thoughts and words of the prophets due not to personal ability but to divine influence. The utterances of the prophets were characterized by instruction, admonition, persuasion and prediction (De 18:15-22; Eze 33:1-20).

9. Nourishment:

ra‘ah, "to feed a flock": The name "shepherd," so precious in both the Old Testament and the New Testament, comes from a verb meaning "to feed," hence, to protect and care for out of a sense of devotion, ownership and responsibility. It is employed with reference to civil rulers in their positions of trust (2Sa 5:2; Jer 23:2); with reference to teachers of virtue and wisdom (Pr 10:21; Ec 12:11); and preeminently with reference to God as the great Shepherd of His chosen people (Ps 23:1; Ho 4:16). Eze 34 presents an arraignment of the unfaithful shepherds or civil rulers; Ps 23 reveals Yahweh as the Shepherd of true believers, and Joh 10 shows how religious teachers are shepherds under Jesus the Good Shepherd.

II. New Testament Terms.

Further light is thrown upon religious teaching in Bible times by a brief view of the leading educational terms found in the New Testament.

1. Instruction:

didasko, "to teach": The usual word for "teach" in the New Testament signifies either to hold a discourse with others in order to instruct them, or to deliver a didactic discourse where there may not be direct personal and verbal participation. In the former sense it describes the interlocutory method, the interplay of the ideas and words between pupils and teachers, and in the latter use it refers to the more formal monologues designed especially to give information (Mt 4:23; Mt 5-7; 13:36 f; Joh 6:59; 1Co 4:17; 1Ti 2:12). A teacher is one who performs the function or fills the office of instruction. Ability and fitness for the work are required (Ro 2:20; Heb 5:12). The title refers to Jewish teachers (Joh 1:38), to John the

Baptist (Lu 3:12), to Jesus (Joh 3:2; 8:4, and often), to Paul (1Ti 2:7; 2Ti 1:11), and to instructors in the early church (Ac 13:1; Ro 12:7; 1Co 12:28). Teaching, like preaching, was an integral part of the work of an apostle (Mt 28:19; Mr 16:15; Eph 4:1).

2. Acquisition:

manthano, "to learn": The central thought of teaching is causing one to learn. Teaching and learning are not scholastic but dynamic, and imply personal relationship and activity in the acquisition of knowledge (Mt 11:29; 28:19; Ac 14:21). There were three concentric circles of disciples in the time of our Lord: learners, pupils, superficial followers, the multitude (Joh 6:66); the body of believers who accepted Jesus as their Master (Mt 10:42); and the Twelve Disciples whom Jesus also called apostles (Mt 10:2).

3. Presentation:

paratithemi, "to place beside": The presentative idea involved in the teaching process is intimately associated with the principle of adaptation. When it is stated that Christ put forth parables unto the people, the sacred writer employs the figure of placing alongside of, or near one, hence, before him in an accessible position. The food or teaching should be sound, or hygienic, and adapted to the capacity and development of the recipient (Mt 13:24; Mr 8:6; Ac 16:34; 1Co 10:27; 2Ti 4:3; Heb 5:12-14).

4. Elucidation:

diermeneuo, "to interpret": In the walk to Emmaus, Christ explained to the perplexed disciples the Old Testament Scriptures in reference to Himself. The work of interpreter is to make truth clear and to effect the edification of the hearer (Lu 24:27; 1Co 12:30; 14:5,13,17).

5. Exposition:

ektithemi, "to place out": The verb literally means "to set or place out," and signifies to bring out the latent and secret ideas of a literary passage or a system of thought and life. Thus Peter interpreted his vision, Aquila and Priscilla unfolded truth to Apollos, and Paul expounded the gospel in Rome (Ac 11:4; 18:26; 28:23). True teaching is an educational exposition.

6. Authority:

prophetes, "one who speaks for": A prophet was a man who spoke forth a message from God to the people. He might deal with past failures and achievements, present privileges and responsibilities, or future doom and glory. He received his message and authority from God (De 18:15-22; Isa 6). The word refers to Old Testament teachers (Mt 5:12), to John the Baptist (Mt 21:26), to Jesus the Messiah (Ac 3:25), and to special speakers in the Apostolic age (Mt 10:41; Ac 13:1; 1Co 14:29,37).

7. Care:

poimen, "a shepherd": The word for shepherd signifies one who tends a flock, and by analogy a person who gives mental and spiritual nourishment, and guards and supports those under his care (Mt 9:36; Joh 10:2,16; 1Pe 2:25; Eph 4:11). Love is a fundamental prerequisite to the exercise of the shepherding function (Joh 21:15-18). The duties are to be discharged with great diligence and in humble recognition of the gifts and appointment of the Holy Spirit (Ac 20:28).

8. Supervision:

episkopos, "an overseer": The bishop or overseer was to feed and protect the blood-bought church of God (Ac 20:28). Among the various qualifications of the religious overseers was an aptitude for teaching (1Ti 3:2; Tit 1:9). The Lord is pre-eminently shepherd and bishop (1Pe 2:25).

III. Old Testament History.

1. In the Home:

In the Jewish home the teaching of the law of the Lord was primarily incumbent upon the parents. The teaching was to be diligent, the conversation religious, and the atmosphere wholesome (De 6:7-9).

2. In Public:

Provision was also made for public instruction the law of God (De 31:12,13). This is a compact summary of early Hebrew teaching in regard to the extent of patronage, the substance of instruction, and the purpose of the process. Samuel the judge and prophet recognized that his duty was fundamentally to pray, to God for his people and to teach the nation "the good and the right way" (1Sa 12:23). The glory and prosperity of Judah under Jehoshaphat were due in large measure to the emphasis he laid upon religious instruction as the basis of national character and stability. His peripatetic Bible school faculty consisted of five princes, nine Levites and two priests who effected a moral and religious transformation, for "they taught in Judah, having the book of the law of Yahweh with them" (2Ch 17:7-9). The most striking illustration we have of public religious instruction in the Old Testament is found in Ne 8. Ezra the priest and scribe was superintendent, and had an ample corps of teachers to instruct the multitude of men, women and children eager to hear. Prayer created a devotional atmosphere. The reading was distinct, the interpretation correct and intelligible. There was real teaching because the people were made to understand and obey the law. In Ne 9 and 10 we have recorded the spiritual, ceremonial, social and civic effects of ancient religious instruction.

IV. Extra-Biblical Teaching.

The captivity gave mighty impulse to teaching. In far-away Babylon the Jews, deprived of the privilege and inspiration of the temple, established the synagogue as an institutional center of worship and instruction. During the latter part of the inter-Biblical period, religious teaching was carried on in the

synagogue and attendance was compulsory, education in the Law being considered the fundmental element of national security (Deutsch, Literary Remains, 23; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, I, 230). The Bible text alone was taught those from 5 to 10 years of age, the first lessons being taken from Le (Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, 111). From 10 to 15 years of age the pupil was taught the substance of the Mishna or unwritten tradition, and accorded the privilege of entering into the discussions of the Mishna which constitute the Gemara (Edersheim, op. cit., I, 232). Selections of Scriptures like the shema (De 6:4-9) were made for study, and lesson helps were adapted to the capacity of the pupils (Ginsburg, article "Education" in Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature). The significance of the teaching idea among the Jews is indicated by numerous expressions for school (article "Education," Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature) and the prevalence of the synagogues, there being perhaps 480 in Jerusalem in the time of Christ (Hor. Heb. I, 78). The pupil was not expected to be a passive hearer but an active participant (Ab., vi.6; Taylor, Sayings of the Jewish Fathers, 115 f). Great emphasis was laid upon audible repetition and exact memory, yet the teacher was culpable if the pupil failed to understand the prescribed lesson (Hamburger, RE, II, 672, 674). The pupil was regarded as the child of his teacher (Sanhedhrin 19), which is a familiar idea in the New Testament. The faithful teacher was considered destined to occupy a high seat among the ancients (Da 12:3). The scribes were secretaries or copyists of the sacred Law, and would thus acquire at least an accurate verbal knowledge of its contents. Quite naturally they would become religious teachers (Ne 8:4). Hence, also their prominence in the New Testament.

LITERATURE.

Article "Torah," Jewish Encyclopedia (compare the articles "Talmud"and "Education"); Trumbull, Yale Lectures on the Sunday-School, 3-40; Hamburger. See Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche.

V. New Testament History.

1. Christ’s Life:

In the New Testament we find that Jesus is pre-eminently the teacher, though He was also preacher and healer (Mt 4:23). His Sermon on the Mount was matchless teaching. He opened His mouth and "taught" (Mt 5:2). The titles "teacher," "master," "rabbi" all indicate the most prominent function of His active ministry. Even at the age of 12 years He revealed His wisdom and affinity in the midst of the rabbis or Jewish teachers of the Law in the temple (Lu 2:41 f). In the power of the Spirit He taught so that all recognized His authority (Lu 4:14,15; Mt 7:29). He explained to the disciples in private what He taught the people in public (Mt 13:36). His principles and methods of teaching constitute the standard by which all true pedagogy is measured, and the ideal toward which all subsequent teachers have toiled with only partial success (Mt 7:28,29; Joh 1:49; 3:2; 6:46). In the Commission as recorded in Mt 28:18,19,20 we have the work of Christianity presented in educational terms. We find the supreme authority (28:18), the comprehensive content—the evangelistic, the ceremonial, the educational, the practical (28:19 and 20a), and the inspiring promise (28:20b).

2. Apostolic Labors:

The emphasis laid upon teaching in the Apostolic age is a natural consequence of the need of the people and the commands of Jesus. The practice of the apostles is quite uniform. They preached or proclaimed, but they also expounded. In Jerusalem the converts continued in the apostles' teaching (Ac 2:42); and daily in the temple and in the homes of the people the teaching was correlated with preaching (Ac 5:42). In Antioch, the center of foreign missionary operations, Paul, Silas, Barnabas and many others taught the word of the Lord (Ac 15:35). In Thessalonica, Paul and Silas for three weeks reasoned with the people out of the Scriptures, opening up the sacred secrets and proving to all candid minds that Jesus was the Messiah (Ac 17:1-3). In Berea, instruction in the synagogue was followed by private study, and as a result many believed in the Lord (Ac 17:10-15). In Athens, Paul discussed and explained the things of the kingdom of God, both in the synagogue 3 times a week and in the market daily (Ac 17:16 f). In Corinth, Paul having been denied the use of the synagogue taught the word of the Lord for a year and a half in the house of Justus, and thus laid the foundation for a great church (Ac 18:1-11). In Ephesus, Paul taught for 2 years in the school of Tyrannus, disputing and persuading the people concerning the kingdom of God (Ac 19:8-10). In Rome, Paul expounded the word, testified to its truth, and persuaded men to accept the gospel (Ac 28:23). His method of work in Rome under trying limitations is described as cordially receiving the people and preaching the kingdom of God, and "teaching the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ" (Ac 28:30,31).

3. General Considerations:

The office of teacher is fundamentally related to the creation of a missionary atmosphere (Ac 13:1). Religious teaching is necessary to the development of Christian character and the highest efficiency in service (1Co 12:4-11,28,29; Eph 4:11,12). The qualification of the pastor is vitally connected with the teaching function of the church. He is to hold the truth, or to be orthodox (Tit 1:9), to apply the truth, or to be practical (Tit 1:9), to study the truth, or to be informed (1Ti 4:13,15), to teach the truth, or to be equipped or able and tactful (2Ti 2:2; 1Ti 3:2), to live the truth, or to be faithful in all things (2Ti 2:2; 1Ti 4:16). The teaching function of Christianity in the 2nd century became strictly official, thereby losing much of its elasticity. A popular manual for the guidance of religious teachers was styled the "Teaching of the Twelve" ‘(see DIDACHE). The writings of the Apostolic Fathers give valuable information in regard to the exercise of the gifts of teaching in the early centuries (Didache xiii.2; xv. 1, 2; Barnabas 18; Ignatius to the Ephesians 31).

See CATECHIST; EDUCATION; SPIRITUAL GIFTS.

Byron H. Dement

TEAR BOTTLE

See next article.

TEARS

terz (dim‘ah; dakrua): In the instances recorded in Scripture weeping is more frequently associated with mental distress than with physical pain. Eastern peoples show none of the restraint of emotion in lamentation which is characteristic of modern Occidentals, and there are many records of this manifestation of woe, even among men accustomed to hardships and warfare, such as David and his soldiers. The flow of tears is the evidence of sorrow in prospect of approaching death in Ps 39:12; 2Ki 20:5; Isa 38:5, and of the suffering consequent on oppression (Ec 4:1), or defeat in battle (Isa 16:9), or hopeless remorse, as with Esau (Heb 12:17, probably referring to Ge 27:34). The Psalmist describes his condition of distress metaphorically as feeding on the bread of tears and having tears to drink (Ps 80:5; 42:3). Tears in the figurative sense of anxiety for the future are referred to in Ps 126:5; Mr 9:24 the King James Version, and the tears accompanying penitence in Lu 7:38 (44 the Revised Version margin). Jeremiah is sometimes called the "weeping prophet" on account of his expressive hyperbole in Jer 9:1,18 (see also 14:7; 31:16; La 1:2; 2:11,18 and ten other passages). Conversely the deliverance from grief or anxiety is described as the wiping away of tears (Ps 116:8; Isa 25:8; Re 7:17; 21:4).

The expression in Ps 56:8 in which the Psalmist desires that God should remember his wanderings and his tears has given rise to a curious mistake. There is a paronomasia in the passage as he pleads that God should record his wanderings (Hebrew, nodh) and that his tears should be put into God’s no’-dh (receptacle or bottle). No’dh literally means a leathern or skin bottle, as is evident from Ps 119:83 and Jos 9:4-13. The request is obviously figurative, as there is no evidence that there was even a symbolical collection of tears into a bottle in any Semitic funeral ritual, and there is no foundation whatever for the modern identification of the long, narrow perfume jars so frequently found in late Jewish and Greek-Jewish graves, as "lachrymatories" or tear bottles.

See BOTTLE.

Alexander Macalister

TEAT

tet (shadh (Isa 32:12), dadh (Eze 23:3,11)): In all these passages the Revised Version (British and American) has replaced the word by "breast" or "bosom," both of which occasionally stand in poetical parallelism. The above passages in Ezekiel are to be understood figuratively of the inclination of Israel to connive at, and take part in, the idolatry of their neighbors. To "smite upon the breasts" (Isa 32:12, where the King James Version translates wrongly "lament for the teats") means "to mourn and grieve in the ostentatious way of oriental women."

See PAP.

TEBAH

te’-ba (tebhach): A son of Nahor, the brother of Abraham (Ge 22:24).

TEBALIAH

teb-a-li’-a, te-bal’-ya (Tebhalyahu, "Yahweh hath dipped," i.e. "purified"; Codex Vaticanus Tablai; Codex Alexandrinus Tabelias; Lucian, Tabeel): A Merarite gatekeeper. (1Ch 26:11). The name should perhaps read Tobhiyahu, "Yahweh is good" (possibly from t-w-b-y-h-w misread Tebhalyahu).

See TOBIJAH.

TEBETH

te-beth’, te’-beth (tebheth): The tenth month of the Jewish year, corresponding to January (Es 2:16).

See CALENDAR.

TEHAPHNEHES

te-haf’-ne-hez

See TAHPANHES.

TEHINNAH

te-hin’-a (techinnah, "supplication"; Codex Vaticanus Thaiman; Codex Alexandrinus Thana; Lucian, Theenna): "The father of the city Nahash" (1Ch 4:12). The verse seems to refer to some post-exilic Jewish settlement, but is utterly obscure.

TEIL; TREE

tel the King James Version Isa 6:13 = the Revised Version (British and American) TEREBINTH (which see).

TEKEL

te’-kel (teqel).

See MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN.

TEKOA

te-ko’-a (teqoa’, or teqo‘ah; Thekoe; the King James Version Tekoah; one of David’s mighty men, "Ira the son of Ikkesh," is called a Tekoite, te-ko’-it (teqo‘i; 2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:28; 27:9; the "woman of Tekoa" [2Sa 14:2] is in Hebrew teqo‘ith; in Ne 3:5 mention is made of certain Tekoites, te-ko’its teqo’im, who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem):

1. Scripture References:

From here came the "wise woman" brought by Joab to try and make a reconciliation between David and Absalom (2Sa 14:2 f); it was one of the cities fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:6; Josephus, Ant, VIII, ix, 1). The wilderness of Tekoa is mentioned (2Ch 20:20) as the extreme edge of the inhabited area; here Jehoshaphat took counsel before advancing into the wilderness of Judea to confront the Ammonites and Moabites. In Jer 6:1, we read, "Blow the trumpet in Tekoa and raise a signal in Beth-haccherim"—because of the enemy advancing from the North. Amos 1:1, one of the "herdsmen of Tekoa," was born here.

In Jos 15:59 (addition to verse in Septuagint only) Tekoa occurs at the beginning of the list of 11 additional cities of Judah—a list which includes Bethlehem, Ain Kairem and Bettir—which are omitted in the Hebrew. A Tekoa is mentioned as a son of Ashhur (1Ch 2:24; 4:5).

Jonathan Maccabeus and his brother Simon fled from the vengeance of Bacchides "into the wilderness of Thecoe (the Revised Version (British and American) "Tekoah") and pitched their tents (the Revised Version (British and American) "encamped") by the water of the pool Asphar" (1 Macc 9:33).

2. Later History:

Josephus calls Tekoa a village in his day (Vita, 75), as does Jerome who describes it as 12 miles from Jerusalem and visible from Bethlehem; he says the tomb of the prophet Amos was there (Commentary on Jeremiah, VI, 1). "There was," he says, "no village beyond Tekoa in the direction of the wilderness." The good quality of its oil and honey is praised by other writers. In the 6th century a monastery, Laura Nova, was founded there by Saba. In the crusading times Tekoa was visited by pious pilgrims wishing to see the tomb of Amos, and some of the Christian inhabitants assisted the Crusaders in the first siege of Jerusalem. In 1138 the place was pillaged by a party of Turks from the East of the Jordan, and since that time the site appears to have lain desolate and ruined, although even in the 14th century the tomb of Amos was still shown.

3. The Site of Tequ‘a:

The site is without doubt the Khirbet Tequ’a, a very extensive ruin, covering 4 or 5 acres, about 6 miles South of Bethlehem and 10 miles from Jerusalem, near the Frank Mountain and on the road to ‘Ain Jidy. The remains on the surface are chiefly of large cut stone and are all, apparently, medieval. Fragments of pillars and bases of good hard limestone occur on the top of the hill, and there is an octagonal font of

rose-red limestone; it is clear that the church once stood there. There are many tombs and cisterns in the neighborhood of a much earlier period. A spring is said to exist somewhere on the site, but if so it is buried out of sight. There is a reference in the "Life of Saladin" (Bahaoddenus), to the "river of Tekoa," from which Richard Coeur de Lion and his army drank, 3 miles from Jerusalem: this may refer to the Arab extension of the "low-level aqueduct" which passes through a long tunnel under the Sahl Tequ‘a and may have been thought by some to rise there.

The open fields around Teqa’a are attractive and well suited for olive trees (which have now disappeared), and there are extensive grazing-lands. The neighborhood, even the "wilderness" to the East, is full of the flocks of wandering Bedouin. From the site, Bethlehem, the Mount of Olives and Nebi Samuel (Mizpah) are all visible; to the Northeast is a peep of the Jordan valley near Jericho and of the mountains of Gilead, but most of the eastern outlook is cut off by rising ground (PEF, III, 314, 368, Sh XXI).

E. W. G. Masterman

TEL-ABIB

tel-a’-bib (tel ‘abhibh; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) ad acervum novarum frugum):

1. The Name and Its Meaining:

As written in Hebrew, Tel-abib means "hill of barley-ears" and is mentioned in Eze 3:15 as the place to which the prophet went, and where he found Jewish captives "that dwelt by the river Chebar." That Tel-abib is written, as Fried. Delitzsch suggests, for Til Ababi, "Mound of the Flood" (which may have been a not uncommon village-name in Babylonia) is uncertain. Moreover, if the captives themselves were the authors of the name, it is more likely to have been in the Hebrew language. Septuagint, which has meteoros, "passing on high," referring to the manner in which the prophet reached Tel-abib, must have had a different Hebrew reading.

2. The Position of the Settlement:

If the Chebar be the nar Kabari, as suggested by Hilprecht, Tel-abib must have been situated somewhere in the neighborhood of Niffer, the city identified with the Calneh of Ge 10:10. The tablet mentioning the river Kabaru refers to grain (barley?) seemingly sent by boat from Niffer in Nisan of the 21st year of Artaxerxes I. Being a navigable waterway, this was probably a good trading-center.

LITERATURE.

See Hilprecht and Clay, Business Documents of Murasha Sons ("Pennsylvania Exp.," Vol IX, 28); Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, 405.

T. G. Pinches

TEL-HARSHA

tel-har’-sha (tel-charsha’): In Ezr 2:59; Ne 7:61 (the King James Version in latter, "‘Telharesha," tel-ha-re’sha, -har’e-sha), a Babylonian town or village from which Jews who could not show their lineage returned with Zerubbabel. The site is unknown. In 1 Esdras 5:36 it is called "Thelersas."

TEL-MELAH

tel-me’-la (tel-melah, "hill of salt"): A Babylonian town mentioned in Ezr 2:59; Ne 7:61 with Tel-harsha and Cherub (see TEL-HARSHA). It possibly lay on the low salt tract near the Persian Gulf. In 1 Esdras 5:36 it is called "Thermeleth."

TELAH

te’-la (telah; Codex Vaticanus Thalees, Codex Alexandrinus Thale; Lucian, Thala): An Ephraimite (1Ch 7:25).

TELAIM

te-la’-im (ha-tela’-im "the young lambs"; en Galgalois): The place where Saul "summoned the people, and numbered them" (1Sa 15:4) before his attack on Agag, king of the Amalekites. Some authorities read "Telam" for "Havilah" in verse 7 and also find this name in 1Sa 27:8 instead of me‘olam. In Septuagint and Josephus (Ant., VI, vii, 2) Gilgal occurs instead of Telaim, on what ground is not known. Probably Telaim is identical with TELEM (which see), though the former may have been the name of a Bedouin tribe inhabiting the latter district. Compare Dhallam Arabs now found South of Tell el-Milch.

E. W. G. Masterman

TELASSAR

te-las’-ar (tela’-ssar (2Ki 19:12), telassar (Isa 37:12); Codex Alexandrinus Thalassar; Codex Vaticanus Thaesthen; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Thelassar, Thalassar):

1. The Name and Its Meaning:

This city, which is referred to by Sennacherib’s messengers to Hezekiah, is stated by them to have been inhabited by the "children of Eden." It had been captured by the Assyrian king’s forefathers, from whose hands its gods had been unable to save it. Notwithstanding the vocalization, the name is generally rendered "Hill of Asshur," the chief god of the Assyrians, but "Hill of Assar," or Asari (a name of the

Babylonian Merodach), would probably be better.

2. Suggestions as to the Geographical Position:

As Telassar was inhabited by the "children of Eden," and is mentioned with Gozan, Haran, and Rezeph, in Western Mesopotamia, it has been suggested that it lay in Bit Adini, "the House of Adinu," or Betheden, in the same direction, between the Euphrates and the Belikh. A place named Til-Assuri, however, is twice mentioned by Tiglath-pileser IV (Ann., 176; Slab-Inscr., II, 23), and from these passages it would seem to have lain near enough to the Assyrian border to be annexed. The king states that he made there holy sacrifices to Merodach, whose seat it was. It was inhabited by Babylonians (whose home was the Edinu or "plain"; see EDEN). Esarhaddon, Sennacherib's son, who likewise conquered the place, writes the name Til-Asurri, and states that the people of Mihranu called it Pitanu. Its inhabitants, he says, were people of Barnaku. If this be Bit Burnaki in Elam, extending from the boundary of Rasu (see ROSH), which was ravaged by Sennacherib (Babylonians Chronicles, III, 10 ff), Til-Assuri probably lay near the western border of Elam. Should this identification be the true one, the Hebrew form telassar would seem to be more correct than the Assyrian Til-Assuri (-Asurri), which latter may have been due to the popular idea that the second element was the name of the national god Assur. See French Delitzsch, Wo lag das Paradies? 264.

T. G. Pinches

TELEM (1)

te'-lem (Telem; Telem): A city in the Negeb "toward the border of Edom," belonging to Judah (Jos 15:24). In Septuagint of 2Sa 3:12 Abner is said to send messengers to David at Thelam (Thailam); this would seem to be the same place and also to be identical with the Telaim and Telam of Saul (see TELAIM). It is probably the same as the Talmia of the Talmud (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 121). The site has not been recovered.

TELEM (2)

(Telem; Septuagint Codex Vaticanus Telem; Codex Alexandrinus Tellem): One of three "porters" who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:24), his name appearing as "Tolbanes" in 1 Esdras 9:25; perhaps the same as TALMON (which see).

TELL

See TALE.

TELL EL-AMARNA; TABLETS

tel-el-a-mar’-na,

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Name

2. Discovery

3. Physical Character

II. EPIGRAPHICAL VALUE

1. Peculiar Cuneiform Script

2. Method of Writing Proper Names

III. PHILOLOGICAL VALUE

1. Knowledge of Amorite, Hittite and Mitannian Tongues

2. Persistence of Canaanite Names to the Present Time

3. Verification of Biblical Statements concerning "the Language of Canaan"

IV. GEOGRAPHICAL VALUE

1. Political and Ethnological Lines and Locations

2. Verification of Biblical and Egyptian Geographical Notices

3. Confirmation of General Evidential Value of Ancient Geographical Notes of Bible Lands

V. HISTORICAL VALUE

1. Revolutionary Change of Opinion concerning Canaanite Civilization in Patriarchal Times

2. Anomalous Historical Situation Revealed by Use of Cuneiform Script

3. Extensive Diplomatic Correspondence of the Age

4. Unsolved Problem of the Habiri

LITERATURE

A collection of about 350 inscribed clay tablets from Egypt, but written in the cuneiform writing, being part of the royal archives of Amenophis III and Amenophis IV; kings of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty about 1480 to 1460 BC. Some of the tablets are broken and there is a little uncertainty concerning the exact number of separate letters. 81 are in the British Museum = BM; 160 in the New Babylonian and Assyrian Museum, Berlin= B; 60 in the Cairo Museum = C; 20 at Oxford = O; the remainder, 20 or more, are in other museums or in private collections.

I. Introduction.

1. Name:

The name, Tell el-Armarna, "the hill Amarna," is the modern name of ancient ruins about midway between Memphis and Luxor in Egypt. The ruins mark the site of the ancient city Khut Aten, which Amenophis IV built in order to escape the predominant influence of the old religion of Egypt represented by the priesthood at Thebes, and to establish a new cult, the worship of Aten, the sun’s disk.

2. Discovery:

In 1887 a peasant woman, digging in the ruins of Tell el-Amarna for the dust of ancient buildings with which to fertilize her garden, found tablets, a portion of the royal archives. She filled her basket with tablets and went home. How many she had already pulverized and grown into leeks and cucumbers and melons will never be known. This time someone’s curiosity was aroused, and a native dealer secured the tablets. Knowledge of the "find" reached Chauncey Murch, D.D., an American missionary stationed at Luxor, who, suspecting the importance of the tablets, called the attention of cuneiform scholars to them. Then began a short but intense and bitter contest between representatives of various museums on the one hand, eager for scientific material, and native dealers, on the other hand, rapacious at the prospect of the fabulous price the curious tablets might bring. The contest resulted in the destruction of some of the tablets by ignorant natives and the final distribution of the remainder and of the broken fragments, as noted at the beginning of this article. (see also Budge, History of Egypt, IV, 186). After the discovery of the tablets the site of the ancient city was excavated by Professor Petrie in 1891-92 (Tell el-Amarna; compare also Baedeker, Egypt).

3. Physical Character:

The physical character of the tablets is worthy of some notice. They are clay tablets. Nearly all are brick tablets, i.e. rectangular, flat tablets varying in size from 2 X 2 1/2 in. to 3 1/2 X 9 inches, inscribed on both sides and sometimes upon the edges. One tablet is of a convex form (B 1601). The clay used in the tablets also varies much. The tablets of the royal correspondence from Babylonia and one tablet from Mitanni (B 153) are of fine Babylonian clay. The Syrian and Palestinian correspondence is in one or two

instances of clay which was probably imported from Babylonia for correspondence, but for the most part these tablets are upon the clay of the country and they show decided differences among themselves in color and texture: in some instances the clay is sandy and decidedly inferior. A number of tablets have red points, a kind of punctuation for marking the separation into words, probably inserted by the Egyptian translator of the letters at the court of the Pharaoh. These points were for the purpose of assisting in the reading. They do now assist the reading very much. Some tablets also show the hieroglyphic marks which the Egyptian scribe put on them when filing them among the archives. The writing also is varied. Some of the tablets from Palestine (B 328, 330, 331) are crudely written. Others of the letters, as in the royal correspondence from Babylonia, are beautifully written. These latter (B 149-52) seem to have been written in a totally different way from the others; those from Western Asia appear to have been written with the stylus held as we commonly hold a pen, but the royal letters from Babylonia were written by turning the point of the stylus to the left and the other end to the right over the second joint of the first finger.

The results of the discovery of the Tell el-Amarna Letters have been far-reaching, and there are indications of still other benefits which may yet accrue from them. The discovery of them shares with the discovery of the Code of Hammurabi the distinction of the first place among Biblical discoveries of the past half-century.

II. Epigraphical Value

1.Peculiar Cuneiform Script:

The peculiar use of the cuneiform method of writing in these tablets in order to adapt it to the requirements of a strange land having a native tongue, and the demands made upon it for the representation of proper names of a foreign tongue, have already furnished the basis for the opinion that the same cuneiform method of writing was employed originally in other documents, especially some portions of the Bible and much material for Egyptian governmental reports. It is not improbable that by means of such data furnished by the tablets definite clues may be obtained to the method of writing, and by that also approximately the time of the composition, of the literary sources that were drawn upon in the composition of the Pentateuch, and even of the Pentateuch itself (compare especially Naville, Archaeology of the Bible).

2. Method of Writing Proper Names:

Most of the letters were probably written by Egyptian officers or, more frequently, by scribes in the employ of native appointees of the Egyptian government. The writing of so many proper names by these scribes in the cuneiform script has thrown a flood of light upon the spelling of Canaanite names by Egyptian scribes in the hieroglyphic inscriptions of Egypt. It is evident now that certainly some, perhaps most, of these scribes worked from cuneiform lists (Muller, Egyptological Researches, 1906, 40). As the system of representation of Palestinian names by Egyptian scribes becomes thus better understood, the identification of more and more of the places in Palestine named in the Egyptian inscriptions becomes

possible. Every such identification makes more nearly perfect the identification of Biblical places, the first and most important item in historical evidence.

III. Philologlcal Value.

1. Knowledge of Amorite, Hittite and Mitannian Tongues:

No other literary discovery, indeed, not all the others together, have afforded so much light upon philological problems in patriarchal Palestine as the Tell el-Amarna Letters. Something is now really definitely known of "the language of Canaan," the speech of the people of patriarchal days in Palestine. The remarkable persistence of old Canaanite words and names and forms of speech of these tablets down to the present time makes it plain that the peasant speech of today is the lineal descendant of that of Abraham's day. The letters are in the Babylonian tongue modified by contact with the speech of the country, a kind of early Aramaic (Conder, The Tell Amarna Tablets, X; Dhorme, "La langue de Canaan," Revue Biblique, Juillet, 1913, 369). There are also frequent Canaanite words inserted as glosses to explain the Babylonian words (Dhorme, op. cit.).

2. Persistence of Canaanite Names to the Present Time: The facts evinced by the persistence of the early Canaanite speech (compare 1, above) down through all the centuries to the peasant speech of Palestine of today furnishes a verification of the Biblical reference to the "language of Canaan" (lsa 19:18). That peasant speech is, as it manifestly has always been since patriarchal times, a Semitic tongue. Now, even so adventurous a work as a grammar of the ancient Canaanite language has been attempted, based almost entirely upon the material furnished by the Tell el-Amarna Letters (Dhorme, op. cit.), in which the speech of Palestine in patriarchal days is described as "ancient Canaanite or Hebrew."

3. Verification of Biblical Statements concerning "the Language of Canaan":

Some more specific knowledge is also supplied by the Tell el-Amarna Letters concerning the Amorite language through the many Amorite names and the occasional explanations given in Amorite words (compare especially the 50 letters of Ribadda), and some knowledge of Hittite (Letter of Tarkhundara; Conder, The Tell Amarna Tablets, 225 f), concerning the Mitannian tongue (B 153, 190, 191, 233). One other tablet (B 342) is in an unknown tongue.

IV. Geographical Value.

1. Political and Ethnological Lines and Locations

There was a very wide international horizon in the days of the correspondence contained in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, a horizon that enclosed Egypt, Babylonia, Canaan, Mitanni and the land of the Hittites; but the more definite geographical information supplied by the tablets is limited almost entirely to the great Syrian and Canaanite coast land. There is difference of opinion concerning the identification of a few of the places mentioned, but about 90 have been identified with reasonable certainty.

2. Verification of Biblical and Egyptian Geographical Notices

It is possible now to trace the course of the military operations mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters with almost as much satisfaction as the course of a modern military campaign, and there is much verification also of Biblical and Egyptian geographical notices.

3. Confirmation of General Evidential Value of Ancient Geographical Notes of Bible Lands

The identification of such a large number of places and the ability thus given to trace the course of historical movements in that remote age are a remarkable testimony to the historical value of ancient records of that part of the world, for accuracy concerning place is of first importance in historical records.

V. Historical Value.

The Tell el-Amarna Letters furnish an amount of historical material about equal in bulk to one-half of the Pentateuch. While much of this bears more particularly upon general history of the ancient Orient, there is scarcely any part of it which does not directly or indirectly supply information which parallels some phase of Biblical history. It is not certain that any individual mentioned in the Bible is mentioned in these tablets, yet it is possible, many think it well established, that many of the persons and events of the conquest period are mentioned (compare 4 (1), below). There is also much that reflects the civilization of times still imperfectly understood, reveals historical events hitherto unknown, or but little known, and gives many sidelights upon the movements of nations and peoples of whom there is something said in the Bible.

1. Revolutionary Change of Opinion concerning Canaanite Civilization in Patriarchal Times

A revolutionary change of opinion concerning the civilization of patriarchal Palestine has taken place. It was formerly the view of all classes of scholars, from the most conservative, on the one hand, to the most radical, on the other, that there was a very crude state of civilization in Palestine in the patriarchal age, and this entirely independent of, and indeed prior to, any demand made by the evolutionary theory of Israel’s history. Abraham was pictured as a pioneer from a land of culture to a distant dark place in the world, and his descendants down to the descent into Egypt were thought to have battled with semi-barbarous conditions, and to have returned to conquer such a land and bring civilization into it. All this opinion is now changed, primarily by the information contained in the Tell el-Amarna Letters and secondarily by incidental hints from Egyptian and Babylonian inscriptions now seen to support the high stage of civilization revealed in the Tell el-Amarna Letters (see ARCHAEOLOGY AND CRITICISM). The tablets make mention of "‘ capital cities,’ ‘provincial cities,’ ‘fortresses,’ ‘towns,’ and ‘villages’ with ‘camps’ and Hazors (or enclosures); while irrigation of gardens is also noticed, and the papyrus grown at Gebal, as well as copper, tin, gold, silver, agate, money (not, of course, coins) and precious objects of many kinds, mulberries, olives, corn, ships and chariots" (Conder, op. cit., 4).

The account of a bride’s marriage portion from Mitanni reveals conditions farther north: "Two horses, and a chariot plated with gold and silver, and adorned with precious stones. The harness of the horses was adorned in like manner. Two camel litters appear to be next noticed, and apparently variegated garments worked with gold, and embroidered zones and shawls. These are followed by lists of precious stones, and a horse’s saddle adorned with gold eagles. A necklace of solid gold and gems, a bracelet of iron gilt, an anklet of solid gold, and other gold objects follow; and apparently cloths, and silver objects, and vases of copper or bronze. An object of jade or jasper and leaves of gold. .... Five gems of ‘stone of the great light’ (probably diamonds) follow, with ornaments for the head and feet, and a number of bronze objects and harness for chariots" (ibid., 188-89). The record of Thothmes III concerning booty brought from Palestine fully confirms this representation of the tablets (Birch, Records of the Past, 1st ser., II, 35-52; compare Sayce, Archaeology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions, 156-57).

The Babylonian inscriptions show that Abraham was a part of an emigration movement from the homeland to a frontier province, having the same laws and much of the same culture (Lyon, American Oriental Society Journal, XXV, 254; Barton, American Philosophical Proceedings, LII, number 209, April, 1913, 197; Kyle, Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism, chapter xv). The Egyptian sculptured pictures make clear that the civilization of Palestine in patriarchal times was fully equal to that of Egypt (compare Petrie, Deshasheh, plural IV).

That these things of elegance and skill are not merely the trappings of "barbaric splendor" is manifest from the revelation which the Tell el-Amarna Letters make of ethnic movements and of influences at work from the great nations on either side of Canaan, making it impossible that the land could have been, at that period, other than a place of advanced civilization. Nearly all the tablets furnish most unequivocal evidence that Egypt had imperial rule over the land through a provincial government which was at the time falling into decay, while the cuneiform method of writing used in the tablets by such a variety of persons, in such high and low estate, implying thus long-established literary culture and a general diffusion of the knowledge of a most difficult system of writing, makes it clear that the civilization of Babylonia had been well established before the political power of Egypt came to displace that of Babylonia.

2. Anomalous Historical Situation Revealed by Use of Cuneiform Script

The displacement of Babylonian political power in Palestine just mentioned (1, above) points at once to a most remarkable historical situation revealed by the Tell el-Amarna Letters, i.e. official Egyptian correspondence between the out-lying province of Canaan and the imperial government at home, carried on, not in the language and script of Egypt, but in the script of Babylonia and in a language that is a modified Babylonian. This marks one step in the great, age-long conflict between the East and the West, between Babylonia and Egypt, with Canaan as the football of empires. It reveals—what the Babylonian inscriptions confirm—the long-preceding occupation of Canaan by Babylonia, continuing down to the beginning of patriarchal times, which had so given Canaan a Babylonian stamp that the subsequent political occupation of the land by Egypt under Thothmes III had not yet been able to efface the old stamp or give a new impression.

3. Extensive Diplomatic Correspondence of the Age

The extensive diplomatic correspondence between nations so widely separated as Egypt on the West, and Babylonia on the East, Mitanni on the North, and the Hittite country on the Northwest, is also shown by the Tell el-Amarna Letters. In addition to the large number of letters between Canaan and Egypt, there are quite a number of these royal tablets: letters from Kadashman Bell, or Kallima-Sin (BM 29784), and Burna-burias of Babylonia (B 149-52), Assur-uballidh of Assyria and Dusratta of Mitanni (B 150, 191-92, 233), etc. There seems at first sight a little pettiness about this international correspondence that is almost childish, since so much of it is occupied with the marriage of princesses and the payment of dowers, and the exchange of international gifts and privileges (Budge, History of Egypt, IV, 189-90). But one might be surprised at the amount of such things in the private correspondence of kings of the present day, if access to it could be gained. The grasping selfishness also revealed in these tablets by the constant cry for gold is, after all, but a less diplomatic and more frank expression of the commercial haggling between nations of today for advantages and concessions.

4. Unsolved Problem of the Habiri

The subject of greatest historical interest in Biblical matters presented by the Tell el-Amarna Letters is the great, unsolved problem of the Habiri. Unsolved it is, for while every writer on the subject has a very decided opinion of his own, all must admit that a problem is not solved upon which there is such wide and radical difference of opinion among capable scholars, and that not running along easy lines of cleavage, but dividing indiscriminately all classes of scholars.

(1) One view very early advanced and still strongly held by some (Conder, op. cit., 138-44) is that Habiri is to be read ‘Abiri, and means the Hebrews. It is pointed out that the letters referring to these people are from Central and Southern Palestine, that the Habiri had some relation with Mt. Seir, that they are represented as contemporaneous with Japhia king of Gezer, Jabin king of Hazor, and probably Adonizedek king of Jerusalem, contemporaries of Joshua, and that certain incidental movements of Israel and of the people of Palestine mentioned in the Bible are also mentioned or assumed in the tablets (Conder, op. cit., 139-51). In reply to these arguments for the identification of the Habiri with the Hebrews under Joshua, it may be noted that, although the letters which speak of the Habiri are all from Central or Southern Palestine, they belong to very nearly the same time as the very numerous letters concerning the extensive wars in the North. The distinct separation of the one set of letters from the other is rather arbitrary and so creates an appearance which has little or no existence in fact. Probably these southern letters refer to the same disturbances spreading from the North toward the South, which is fatal to theory that the Habiri are the Hebrews under Joshua, for these latter came in from the Southeast. The reference to Seir is obscure and seems rather to locate that place in the direction of Carmel (Conder, op. cit., 145). The mention of Japhia king of Gezer, and Jabin king of Hazor, does not signify much, for these names may be titles, or there may have been many kings, in sequence, of the same name. Concerning Adonizedek, it is diffcult to believe that this reading of the name of the king of Jerusalem would ever have been thought of, except for the desire to identify the Habiri with the Hebrews under Joshua. This name Adonizedek is only made out, with much uncertainty, by the unusual method of

translating the king’s name instead of transliterating it. If the name was Adonizedek, why did not the scribe write it so, instead of translating it for the Pharaoh into an entirely different name because of its meaning? The seeming correspondences between the letters and the account of the conquest in the Bible lose much of their significance when the greater probabilities raised in the names and the course of the wars are taken away.

(2) Against the view that the Habiri were the Hebrews of the Bible may be cited not only these discrepancies in the evidence presented for that view (compare (1), above), but also the very strong evidence from Egypt that the Exodus took place in the Ramesside dynasties, thus not earlier than the XIXth Dynasty and probably under Merenptah, the successor of Rameses II. The name Rameses for one of the store cities could hardly have occurred before the Ramesside kings. The positive declaration of Rameses II: "I built Pithom," against which there is no evidence whatever, and the coincidence between the Israel tablet of Merenptah (Petrie, Six Temples at Thebes, 28, pls. XIII-XIV) and the Biblical record of the Exodus, which makes the 5th year under Merenptah to be the 5th year of Moses’ leadership (see MOSES), make it very difficult, indeed seemingly impossible, to accept the Habiri as the Hebrews of the conquest.

(3) Another view concerning the Habiri, strongly urged by some (Sayce, The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments, 175 ff), is that they are Habiri, not ‘Abiri, and that the name means "confederates," and was not a personal or tribal name at all. The certainty that there was, just a little before this time, an alliance in conspiracy among the Amorites and others, as revealed in the tablets for the region farther north, gives much color to this view. This opinion also relieves the chronological difficulties which beset the view that the Habiri were the Biblical Hebrews (compare (2), above), but it is contended that this reading does violence to the text.

(4) Another most ingenious view is advanced by Jeremias (The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East, 341), that the name is Habiri, that "the name answers to the sounds of ‘Hebrews,’ and that the names are identical," but that this name in the Tell el-Amarna Letters is not a proper name at all, but a descriptive word, as when we read of "Abraham the Hebrew," i.e. the "stranger" or "immigrant." Thus Habiri would be "Hebrews," i.e. "strangers" or "immigrants" (see HEBERITES; HEBREW), but the later question of the identification of these with the Hebrews of the Bible is still an open question.

(5) It may be that the final solution of the problem presented by the Habiri will be found in the direction indicated by combining the view that sees in them only "strangers" with the view that sees them to be "confederates." There were undoubtedly "confederates" in conspiracy against Egypt in the time of the Tell el-Amarna Letters. The government of Egypt did not come successfully to the relief of the beleaguered province, but weakly yielded. During the time between the writing of the tablets and the days of Merenptah and the building of Pithom no great strong government from either Egypt or Babylonia or the North was established in Palestine. At the time of the conquest there is constant reference made to "the Hittites and the Amorites and the Perizzites," etc. Why are they so constantly mentioned as a group, unless they were in some sense "confederates"? It is not impossible, indeed it is probable, that these Hittites and Amorites and Perizzites, etc., Palestinian tribes having some kind of loose confederacy in the days of the conquest, represent the last state of the confederates," the

conspirators, who began operations in the Amorite war against the imperial Egyptian government recorded in the Tell el-Amarna Letters, and, in the correspondence from the South, were called in those days Habiri, i.e. "strangers" or "immigrants." For the final decision on the problem of the Habiri and the full elucidation of many things in the Tell el-Amarna Letters we must await further study of the tablets by expert cuneiform scholars, and especially further discovery in contemporary history.

The Jerusalem letters of the southern correspondence present something of much importance which does not bear at all upon the problem of the Habiri. The frequently recurring title of the king of Jerusalem, "It was not my father, it was not my mother, who established me in this position" (Budge, History of Egypt, IV, 231-35), seems to throw light upon the strange description given of MELCHIZEDEK (which see), the king of Jerusalem in the days of Abraham. The meaning here clearly is that the crown was not hereditary, but went by appointment, the Pharaoh of Egypt having the appointing power. Thus the king as such had no ancestor and no descendant, thus furnishing the peculiar characteristics made use of to describe the character of the Messiah's priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews (7:3).

LITERATURE.

Conder, The Tell Amarna Tablets; Knudtzon, Die El-Amarna-Tafeln, in Heinrich's Vorderasiatische Bibliothek, II; Petrie, Tell el Amarna Tablets; idem, Syria and Egypt from the Tell el Amarna Letters; idem, Hist of Egypt; Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East.

M. G. Kyle

TEMA

te'-ma (tema'," south country"; Thaiman): The name of a son of Ishmael (Ge 25:15; 1Ch 1:30), of the tribe descended from him (Jer 25:23), and of the place where they dwelt (Job 6:19; Isa 21:14). This last was a locality in Arabia which probably corresponds to the modern Teima' (or Tayma' (see Doughty, Arabia Deserta, I, 285)), an oasis which lies about 200 miles North of el-Medina, and some 40 miles South of Dumat el-Jandal (Dumah), now known as el-Jauf. It is on the ancient caravan road connecting the Persian Gulf with the Gulf of Aqaba; and doubtless the people took a share in the carrying trade (Job 6:19). The wells of the oasis still attract the wanderers from the parched wastes (Isa 21:14). Doughty (loc. cit.) describes the ruins of the old city wall, some 3 miles in circuit. An Aramaic stele recently discovered, belonging to the 6th century BC, shows the influence of Assyrian article The place is mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions (Schrader, KAT2, 149).

W. Ewing

TEMAH

te'-ma (temach, Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus Thema; Lucian, Themaa; Ne 7:55; Codex Vaticanus Hemath; Codex Alexandrinus Thema; Lucian, Themaa; the King James Version, Thamah):

The family name of a company of Nethinim (Ezr 2:53).

TEMAN

te’-man (teman, "on the right," i.e. "south"; Thaiman): The name of a district and town in the land of Edom, named after Teman the grandson of Esau, the son of his firstborn, Eliphaz (Ge 36:11; 1Ch 1:36). A duke Teman is named among the chiefs or clans of Edom (Ge 36:42; 1Ch 1:53). He does not however appear first, in the place of the firstborn. Husham of the land of the Temanites was one of the ancient kings of Edom (Ge 36:34; 1Ch 1:45). From Obad 1:9 we gather that Teman was in the land of Esau (Edom). In Am 1:12 it is named along with Bozrah, the capital of Edom. In Eze 25:13 desolation is denounced upon Edom: "From Teman even unto Dedan shall they fall by the sword." Dedan being in the South, Teman must be sought in the North Eusebius, Onomasticon knows a district in the Gebalene region called Theman, and also a town with the same name, occupied by a Roman garrison, 15 miles from Petra. Unfortunately no indication of direction is given. No trace of the name has yet been found. It may have been on the road from Elath to Bozrah.

The inhabitants of Teman seem to have been famous for their wisdom (Jer 49:7; Obad 1:8 f). Eliphaz the Temanite was chief of the comforters of Job (2:11, etc.). The manner in which the city is mentioned by the prophets, now by itself, and again as standing for Edom, shows how important it must have been in their time.

W. Ewing

TEMENI

tem’-e-ni, te’-me-ni (temeni, Baer, timeni; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus Thaiman; Lucian, Thaimanei): The word temeni means a southerner, i.e. of Southern Judah; compare TEMAN (patronymic temani), the name of Edom (Ge 36:11, etc.), the "son" of Ashhur (1Ch 4:6).

TEMPER

tem’-per: The word is used in the King James Version to render different Hebrew words. In Eze 46:14 for "temper" (racac) the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "moisten." In So (5:2) a noun from the same stem means "dew-drops." In Ex 29:2 the King James Version we read "cakes unleavened, tempered (balal, literally, "mixed") with oil," the Revised Version (British and American) "mingled." The word denotes "rough-and-ready mixing." In the recipe for the making of incense given in Ex (30:35) occur the words "tempered together," malach (literally, "salted"; hence, the Revised Version (British and American) "seasoned with salt"). The word occurs in two interesting connections in The Wisdom of Solomon 15:7 (the Revised Version (British and American) "knead") and 16:21. In 1Co 12:24 it occurs in English Versions of the Bible as a rendering of the Greek word sugqerannumi, which meant to "mix together." Paul is arguing in favor of the unity of the church and of cooperation on the part of individual members, and uses as an illustration the human body which consists of various organs

with various functions. It is God, argues the apostle, who has "tempered," "compounded" or "blended," the body. Each member has its place and function and must contribute to the welfare of the whole frame. The same Greek word occurs in Heb 4:2. The author urges the necessity of faith in regard to the gospel. The unbelieving Israelites had derived no benefit from their hearing of the gospel because their hearing of it was not "mixed" with faith.

T. Lewis

TEMPERANCE; TEMPERATE

tem’-per-ans; tem’-per-at (egkrateia), (egkrates, nephalios, sophron): the American Standard Revised Version departs from the King James Version and the English Revised Version by translating egkrateia "self-control" (Ac 24:25; Ga 5:23; 2Pe 1:6; 1Co 9:25), following the English Revised Version margin in several of these passages. This meaning is in accordance with classical usage, Plato applying it to "mastery" not only of self, but of any object denoted by a genitive following. Septuagint applies it to the possession "of strongholds" (2 Macc 8:30; 10:15), "of a position" (2 Macc 10:17), "of the city" (2 Macc 13:13), "of wisdom" (Sirach 6:27). The reflexive meaning of "self-mastery," "self-restraint," is equally well established in the classics and Septuagint. Thus, in the verbal form, it is found in Ge 43:31, for the self-restraint exercised by Joseph in the presence of his brethren, when they appeared before him as suppliants, and in 1Sa 13:12, where Saul professes that he "forced" himself to do what was contrary to his desire. For patristic use of the term, see illustrations in Suicer’s Thesaurus Ecclesiasticus, I, 1000 ff. Clement of Alexandria: "Not abstaining from all things, but using continently such things as one has judged should be used"; "such things as do not seem beyond right reason." Basil: "To avoid excess on both sides, so as neither by luxury to be confused, nor, by becoming sickly, to be disabled from doing what has been commanded." Chrysostom (on 1Ti 1:8) applies it to "one mastering passion of tongue, hand and unbridled eyes." Ellicott and Eadie (on Ga 5:23) quote Diogenes Laertius to the effect that the word refers to "control over the stronger passions." In 1Co 9:25, Paul illustrates it by the training of an athlete, whose regimen is not only described in the Ars Poetica of Horace (412 ff), and in Epictetus (quoted in Alford on this passage), but can be learned of the many devotees and admirers of similar pursuits today.

The principle involved is that of the concentration of all man’s powers and capabilities upon the one end of doing God’s will, in and through whatever calling God appoints, and the renunciation of everything either wholly or to whatever degree necessary, however innocent or useful it may be in its proper place, that interferes with one’s highest efficiency in this calling (1Co 10:31). Not limited to abstinence, it is rather the power and decision to abstain with reference to some fixed end, and the use of the impulses of physical, as servants for the moral, life. It does not refer to any one class of objects that meets us, but to all; to what concerns speech and judgment, as well as to what appeals to sense. It is properly an inner spiritual virtue, working into the outward life, incapable of being counterfeited or replaced by any abstinence limited to that which is external (Augsburg Confession, Articles XXVI, XXVII). When its absence, however, is referred to as sin, the negative is generally more prominent than the positive side of temperance. The reference in Ac 24:25 is to chastity, and in 1Co 7:9, as the context shows, to the inner

side of chastity. In 1Ti 3:2,11; Tit 2:2, the word nephalios has its original meaning as the opposite to "drunken" (see SOBRIETY; DRINK, STRONG). See also the treatises on ethics by Luthardt (both the Compendium and the History), Martensen, Koestlin and Haring on temperance, asceticism, continence.

H. E. Jacobs

TEMPEST

tem'-pest (ce'-arah, or se'-arah, "a whirlwind," zerem, "overflowing rain"; cheimon, thuella): Heavy storms of wind and rain are common in Palestine and the Mediterranean. The storms particularly mentioned in the Bible are:

(1) the 40 days' rain of ~the great flood of Noah (Ge 7:4);

(2) hail and rain as a plague in Egypt (Ex 9:18);

(3) the great rain after the drought and the contest of Elijah on Carmel (1Ki 18:45);

(4) the tempest on the sea in the story of Jonah (1:4);

(5) the storm on the Lake of Galilee when Jesus was awakened to calm the waves (Mt 8:24; Mr 4:37; Lu 8:23);

(6) the storm causing the shipwreck of Paul at Melita (Ac 27:18).

Frequent references are found to God's power over storm and use of the tempest in His anger: "He maketh the storm a calm" (Ps 107:29); He sends the "tempest of hail, a destroying storm" (Isa 28:2). See also Job 9:17; 21:18; Isa 30:30. Yahweh overwhelms His enemies as with a storm: "She shall be visited of Yahweh of hosts with thunder, and with earthquake, and great noise, with whirlwind and tempest" (Isa 29:6). Yahweh is a "refuge from the storm" (Isa 25:4; 4:6).

Alfred H. Joy

TEMPLE KEEPERS (SERVANTS)

After the conquest of Midian, "Moses took one drawn out of every fifty, both of man and of beast, and gave them unto the Levites, that kept the charge of the tabernacle of Yahweh" (Nu 31:47; compare 31:30). Similarly, after the deception of Joshua by the Gibeonites, "Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the congregation, and for the altar of Yahweh, unto this day" (Jos 9:27). The object of these notices, evidently, is to explain how a non-Israelitish class of sanctuary servants had taken their origin. Their existence at the time of Ezekiel, however, is the object of one of

the latter’s severest denunciations: "Ye have brought in foreigners, uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh, to be in my sanctuary, to profane it. .... And ye have not kept the charge of my holy things; but ye have set keepers of my charge in my sanctuary for yourselves" (Eze 44:7 f). In place of these servants or "keepers" Ezekiel directs that such Levites are to be employed as have been degraded from priestly privileges for participating in idolatrous worship. On them shall devolve all the various duties of the temple except the actual offering of sacrifices, which is reserved for "the priests the Levites, the sons of Zadok" (44:10-15). For the use of this deposed class, "the priests, the keepers of the charge of the house," is reserved a special room in the inner court of the temple (40:44 f).

See, further, NETHINIM.

Burton Scott Easton

TEMPLE, A1

tem’-p’l (hekhal, "palace"; sometimes, as in 1Ki 6:3,5, etc.; Eze 41:1,15 ff, used for "the holy place" only; bayith, "house," thus always in the Revised Version (British and American); hieron, naos):

A. STRUCTURE AND HISTORY

I. SOLOMON’S TEMPLE

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. David’s Project

2. Plans and Preparations

3. Character of the Building

4. Site of the Temple

5. Phoenician Assistance

II. THE TEMPLE BUILDING

1. In General

2. Dimensions, Divisions and Adornments

3. The Side-Chambers

4. The Porch and Pillars

III. COURTS, GATES ANY ROYAL BUILDINGS

1. The Inner Court

(1) Walls

(2) Gates

2. The Great Court

3. The Royal Buildings

IV. FURNITURE OF THE TEMPLE

1. The Sanctuary

(1) The "Debhir"

(2) The "Hekhal"

2. The Court (Inner)

(1) The Altar

(2) The Molten (Bronze) Sea

(3) The Layers and Their Bases

V. HISTORY OF THE TEMPLE

1. Building and Dedication

2. Repeated Plunderings, etc.

3. Attempts at Reform

4. Final Overthrow

II. EZEKIEL’S PROPHETIC SKETCH

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Relation to History of Temple

2. The Conception Unique and Ideal

3. Its Symmetrical Measurements

II. PLAN OF THE TEMPLE

1. The Outer Court

2. The Inner Court

3. The Temple Building and Adjuncts

III. THE TEMPLE OF ZERUBBABEL

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. The Decree of Cyrus

2. Founding of the Temple

3. Opposition and Completion of the Work

II. THE TEMPLE STRUCTURE

1. The House

2. Its Divisions and Furniture

3. Its Courts, Altar, etc.

4. Later Fortunes

IV. THE TEMPLE OF HEROD

I. INTRODUCTORY

1. Initiation of the Work

2. Its Grandeur

3. Authorities

4. Measurements

II. THE TEMPLE AND ITS COURTS

1. Temple Area—Court of Gentiles

2. Inner Sanctuary Inclosure

(1) Wall, "Chel," "Coregh," Gates

(2) Court of the Women

(3) Inner Courts: Court of Israel; Court of the Priests

(4) The Altar, etc.

3. The Temple Building

(1) House and Porch

(2) "Hekhal" and "Debhir"

(3) The Side-Chambers

III. NEW TESTAMENT ASSOCIATIONS OF HEROD'S TEMPLE

1. Earlier Incidents

2. Jesus in the Temple

3. The Passion-Week

4. Apostolic Church

5. The Temple in Christian Thought

LITERATURE

A. STRUCTURE AND HISTORY

I. SOLOMON'S TEMPLE

I. Introductory.

1. David's Project:

The tabernacle having lasted from the exodus till the commencement of the monarchy, it appeared to David to be no longer fitting that the ark of God should dwell within curtains (it was then in a tent David had made for it on Zion: 2Sa 6:17), while he himself dwelt in a cedar-lined house. The unsettled and unorganized state of the nation, which had hitherto necessitated a portable structure, had now given place to an established kingdom. The dwelling of Yahweh should therefore be henceforth a permanent building, situated at the center of the nation's life, and "exceeding magnificent" (1Ch 22:5), as befitted the glory of Yahweh, and the prospects of the state.

2. Plans and Preparations:

David, however, while honored for his purpose, was not permitted, because he had been a man of war (2Sa 7; 1Ch 22:8; compare 1Ki 5:3), to execute the work, and the building of the house was reserved for his son, Solomon. According to the Chronicler, David busied himself in making extensive and costly preparations of wood, stone, gold, silver, etc., for the future sanctuary and its vessels, even leaving behind him full and minute plans of the whole scheme of the building and its contents, divinely communicated (1Ch 22:2 ff; 28:11 ff; 29). The general fact of lengthened preparation, and even of designs, for a structure which so deeply occupied his thoughts, is extremely probable (compare 1Ki 7:51).

3. Character of the Building:

The general outline of the structure was based on that of the tabernacle (on the modern critical reversal of this relation, see under B, below). The dimensions are in the main twice those of the tabernacle, though it will be seen below that there are important exceptions to this rule, on which the critics found so much. The old question (see TABERNACLE) as to the shape of the building—flat or gable-roofed—here again arises. Not a few modern writers (Fergusson, Schick, Caldecott, etc.), with some older, favor the tentlike shape, with sloping roof. It does not follow, however, even if this form is, with these writers, admitted for the tabernacle—a "tent"—that it is applicable, or likely, for a stone "house," and the measurements of the Temple, and mention of a "ceiling" (1Ki 6:15), point in the opposite direction. It

must still be granted that, with the scanty data at command, all reconstructions of the Solomonte Temple leave much to be filled in from conjecture. Joseph Hammond has justly said: "It is certain that, were a true restoration of the Temple ever to be placed in our hands, we should find that it differed widely from all attempted ‘restorations’ of the edifice, based on the scanty and imperfect notices of our historian and Ezekiel" (Commentary on 1Ki 6, "Pulpit Commentary").

4. Site of the Temple:

The site of the Temple was on the eastern of the two hills on which Jerusalem was built—that known in Scripture as Mt. Moriah (2Ch 3:1) or Mt. Zion (the traditional view which locates Zion on the western hill, on the other side of the Tyropoeon, though defended by some, seems untenable; see "Zion," in HDB; "Jerusalem," in DB, etc.). The place is more precisely defined as that where Araunah (Ornan) had his threshing-floor, and David built his altar after the plague (1Ch 21:22; 2Ch 3:1). This spot, in turn, is now all but universally held to be marked by the sacred rock, es-Sakhra (within what is called the Haram area on the eastern summit; see JERUSALEM), above which the "Dome of the Rock," or so-called "Mosque of Omar," now stands. Here, according to traditional belief, was reared the altar of burnt offering, and to the West of it was built the Temple. This location is indeed challenged by Fergusson, W. R. Smith, and others, who transfer the Temple-site to the southwestern angle of the Haram area, but the great majority of scholars take the above view. To prepare a suitable surface for the Temple and connected buildings (the area may have been some 600 ft. East to West, and 300 to 400 ft. North to South), the summit of the hill had to be leveled, and its lower parts heightened by immense substructures (Josephus, Ant, VIII iii, 9; XV, xi, 3; BJ, V, v, 1), the remains of which modern excavations have brought to light (compare Warren’s Underground Jerusalem; G. A. Smith’s Jerusalem, etc.).

5. Phoenician Assistance:

For aid in his undertaking, Solomon invited the cooperation of Hiram, king of Tyre, who willingly lent his assistance, as he had before helped David, granting Solomon permission to send his servants to cut down timber in Lebanon, aiding in transport, and in the quarrying and hewing of stones, and sending a skillful Tyrian artist, another Hiram, to superintend the designing and graving of objects made of the precious metals, etc. For this assistance Solomon made a suitable recompense (1Ki 5; 2Ch 2). Excavations seem to show that a large part of the limestone of which the temple was built came from quarries in the immediate neighborhood of Jerusalem (Warren, Underground Jerusalem, 60). The stones were cut, hewn and polished at the places whence they were taken, so that "there was neither hammer nor axe nor any tool of iron heard in the house, while it was in building" (1Ki 5:17,18; 6:7). Opinions differ as to the style of architecture of the building. It was probably unique, but Phoenician art also must have left its impress upon it.

See ARCHITECTURE.

II. The Temple Building.

1. In General:

In contrast with the tabernacle, which was a portable "tent," consisting of a framework of acacia wood, with rich coverings hung over it, and standing in a "court" enclosed by curtains (see TABERNACLE), the Temple was a substantial "house" built of stone (probably the hard white limestone of the district), with chambers in three stories, half the height of the building (1Ki 6:5,6), round the sides and back, and, in front, a stately porch (1Ki 6:3), before which stood two lofty bronze pillars—Jachin and Boaz (1Ki 7:21; 2Ch 3:4,15-17). Within, the house was lined with cedar, overlaid with gold, graven with figures of cherubim, palms, and open flowers (1Ki 6:15,18,21,22,29), and a partition of cedar or stone divided the interior into two apartments—one the holy place (the hekhal), the other the most holy place, or "oracle" (debhir) (1Ki 6:16-18). The floor was of stone, covered with fir (or cypress), likewise overlaid with gold (1Ki 6:15,30). The platform on which the whole building stood was probably raised above the level of the court in front, and the building may have been approached by steps. Details are not given. The more particular description follows.

2. Dimensions, Divisions and Adornments:

The Temple, like the tabernacle, stood facing East, environed by "courts" ("inner" and "greater"), which are dealt with below, Internally, the dimensions of the structure were, in length and width, double those of the tabernacle, namely, length 60 cubits, width 20 cubits. The height, however, was 30 cubits, thrice that of the tabernacle (1Ki 6:2; compare 6:18,20). The precise length of the cubit is uncertain (see CUBIT); here, as in the article TABERNACLE, it is taken as approximately 18 inches. In internal measurement, therefore, the Temple was approximately 90 ft. long, 30 ft. broad, and 45 ft. high. This allows nothing for the thickness of the partition between the two chambers. For the external measurement, the thickness of the walls and the width of the surrounding chambers and their walls require to be added. It cannot positively be affirmed that the dimensions of the Temple, including the porch, coincided precisely with those of Ezekiel’s temple (compare Keil on 1Ki 6:9,10); still, the proportions must have closely approximated, and may have been in agreement.

The walls of the building, as stated, were lined within with cedar; the holy place was ceiled with fir or cypress (2Ch 3:5; the "oracle" perhaps with cedar); the flooring likewise was of fir (1Ki 6:15). All was overlaid with gold, and walls and doors (see below) were adorned with gravings of cherubim, palm trees, and open flowers (1Ki 6:19-35; 2Ch 3:6 adds "precious stones"). Of the two chambers into which the house was divided, the outermost (or hekhal) was 40 cubits (60 ft.) long, and 20 cubits (30 ft.) wide (1Ki 6:17); the innermost (or debhir) was 20 cubits in length, breadth and height—a cube (1Ki 6:20). As the height of the Temple internally was 30 cubits, it is obvious that above the most holy place there was a vacant space 20 cubits long and 10 high. This apparently was utilized as a chamber or chambers for storage or other purposes. It has been held by some (Kurtz, Fergusson, etc.) that the ceiling along the entire Temple was at the height of 20 cubits, with chambers above (compare the allusion to "upper chambers" in 1Ch 28:11; 2Ch 3:9); this, however, seems unwarranted (compare Bahr on 1Ki 6:14-19; the upper chambers" were "overlaid with gold," 2Ch 3:9, which points to something nobler in character). The inner chamber was a place of "thick darkness" (1Ki 8:12).

3. The Side-Chambers:

The thickness of the Temple walls is not given, but the analogy of Ezekiel's temple (Eze 41) and what is told of the side-chambers render it probable that the thickness was not less than 6 cubits (9 ft.). Around the Temple, on its two sides and at the back, were built chambers (tsela'oth, literally, "ribs"), the construction of which is summarily described. They were built in three stories, each story 5 cubits in height (allowance must also be made for flooring and roofing), the lowest being 5 cubits in breadth, the next 6 cubits, and the highest 7 cubits. This is explained by the fact that the chambers were not to be built into the wall of the Temple, but were to rest on ledges or rebatements in the wall, each rebate a cubit in breadth, so that the wall became thinner, and the chambers broader, by a cubit, each stage in the ascent. (1Ki 6:5-10). The door admitting into these chambers was apparently in the middle of the right side of the house, and winding stairs led up to the second and third stories (1Ki 6:8). It is not stated how many chambers there were; Josephus (Ant., VIII, iii, 2) gives the number as 30, which is the number in Ezekiel's temple (Eze 41:6). The outer wall of the chambers, which in Ezekiel is 5 cubits thick (41:9), may have been the same here, though some make it less. It is a question whether the rebatements were in the Temple wall only, or were divided between it and the outer wall; the former seems the more probable opinion, as nothing is said of rebatements in the outer wall. Above the chambers on either side were "windows of fixed lattice-work" (41:4), i.e. openings which could not be closed ("windows broad within and narrow without"). The purposes for which the chambers were constructed are not mentioned. They may have been used partly for storage, partly for the accommodation of those engaged in the service of the Temple (compare 1Ch 9:27).

4. The Porch and Pillars:

A conspicuous feature of the Temple was the porch in front of the building, with its twin pillars, Jachin and Boaz. Of the porch itself a very brief description is given. It is stated to have been 20 cubits broad—the width of the house—and 10 cubits deep (1Ki 6:3). Its height is not given in 1 Kings, but it is said in 2Ch 3:4 to have been 120 cubits, or approximately 180 ft. Some accept this enormous height (Ewald, Stanley, etc.), but the majority more reasonably infer that there has been a corruption of the number. It may have been the same height as the Temple—30 cubits. It was apparently open in front, and, from what is said of its being "overlaid within with pure gold" (2Ch 3:4), it may be concluded that it shared in the splendor of the main building, and had architectural features of its own which are not recorded. Some find here, in the wings, treasury chambers, and above, "upper chambers," but such restorations are wholly conjectural. It is otherwise with the monumental brass (bronze) pillars—Jachin and Boaz—of which a tolerably full description is preserved (1Ki 7:15-22; 2Ch 3:15-17; 4:11-13; compare Jer 52:20-23), still, however, leaving many points doubtful. The pillars which stood in front of the porch, detached from it, were hollow bronze castings, each 18 cubits (27 ft.) in height (35 cubits in 2Ch 3:15 is an error), and 12 cubits (18 ft.) in circumference, and were surmounted by capitals 5 cubits (7 1/2 ft.) high, richly ornamented on their lower, bowl-shaped (1Ki 7:20,41,42) parts, with two rows of pomegranates, enclosing festoons of chain-work, and, in their upper parts, rising to the height of 4 cubits (6 ft.) in graceful lily-work.

See JACHIN AND BOAZ.

It was seen that the holy place (hekhal) was divided from the most holy (debhir) by a partition, probably of cedar wood, though some think of a stone wall, one or even two cubits thick. In this partition were folding doors, made of olive wood, with their lintels 4 cubits wide (1Ki 6:31; some interpret differently, and understand the upper part of the doorway to be a pentagon). The doors, like the walls, had carvings of cherubim, palm trees, and flowers, and the whole was gold-plated (1Ki 6:32). Behind the partition hung the sanctuary veil (2Ch 3:14). At the entrance of the Temple, similarly, were folding doors, with their lintels 5 cubits in width, only this time the posts only were of olive, while the doors, divided into two leaves, were of fir (or cypress) wood (1Ki 6:33-35). The carving and gold-plating were as on the inner doors, and all the doors had hinges of gold (1Ki 7:50).

III. Courts, Gates and Royal Buildings.

The Temple was enclosed in "courts"—an "inner" (1Ki 6:36; 7:12; 2Ch 4:9, "court of the priests"; Jer 36:10, "the upper court"; Eze 8:3,16; 10:3), and an outer or "greater court" (1Ki 7:9,12; 2Ch 4:9)—regarding the situation, dimensions and relations of which, alike to one another and to the royal buildings described in 1Ki 7 the scanty notices in the history leave room for great diversity of opinion.

See COURT OF THE SANCTUARY.

1. The Inner Court:

The "inner court" (chatser ha-penimith) is repeatedly referred to (see above). Its dimensions are not given, but they may be presumed to be twice those of the tabernacle court, namely, 200 cubits (300 ft.) in length and 100 cubits (150 ft.) in breadth. The name in Jer 36:10, "the upper court," indicates that it was on a higher level than the "great court," and as the Temple was probably on a platform higher still, the whole would present a striking terraced aspect.

(1) Walls:

The walls of the court were built of three rows of hewn stone, with a coping of cedar beams (1Ki 6:36). Their height is not stated; it is doubtful if it would admit of the colonnades which some have supposed; but "chambers" are mentioned (Jer 35:4; 36:10—if, indeed, all belong to the "inner" court), which imply a substantial structure. It was distinctively "the priests' court" (2Ch 4:9); probably, in part, was reserved for them; to a certain degree, however, the laity had evidently free access into it (Jer 36:10; 38:14; Eze 8:16, etc.). The mention of "the new court" (2Ch 20:5, time of Jehoshaphat), and of "the two courts of the house of Yahweh" (2Ki 21:5; 2Ch 33:5, time of Manasseh), suggests subsequent enlargement and division.

(2) Gates:

Though gates are not mentioned in the narratives of the construction, later allusions show that there were several, though not all were of the time of Solomon. The principal entrance would, of course, be that toward the East (see EAST GATE). In Jer 26:10 there is allusion to "the entry of the new gate of Yahweh's house." This doubtless was "the upper gate" built by Jotham (2Ki 15:35) and may reasonably be identified with the "gate that looketh toward the North" and the "gate of the altar" (i.e. through which the sacrifices were brought) in Eze 8:3,1, and with "the upper gate of Benjamin" in Jer 20:3. Mention is also made of a "gate of the guard" which descended to the king's house (2Ki 11:19; see below). Jeremiah speaks of a "third entry that is in the house of Yahweh" (38:14), and of "three keepers of the threshold" (52:24), but it is not clear which court is intended.

2. The Great Court:

The outer or "great court" of the Temple (chatser ha-gedholah) opens up more difficult problems. Some regard this court as extending to the East in front of the "inner court"; others, as Keil, think of it as a great enclosure surrounding the "inner court" and stretching perhaps 150 cubits East of the latter (compare his Biblical Archaeology, I, 170-71). These writers remove the court from all connection with the royal buildings of 1Ki 7, and distinguish it from "the great court of 7:9,12." A quite different construction is that advocated by Stade and Benzinger, and adopted by most recent authorities (compare articles on "Temple" in HDB, IV, in EB, IV, in one-vol HDB, in DB (Dalman); G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 59 ff, etc.). The great court, on this view, not only surrounds the Temple, with its (inner) court, but, extending to the South, encloses the whole complex of the royal buildings of 1Ki 7. This has the advantage of bringing together the references to the "great court" in 1Ki 7:9,12 and the other references to the outer court. The court, thus conceived, must have been very large. The extensive part occupied by the royal buildings being on a lower level than the "inner court," entrance to it is thought to have been by "the gate of the guard unto the king's house" mentioned in 2Ki 11:19. Its wall, like that of the inner court, was built in three courses of hewn stone, and one course of cedar (1Ki 7:12). Its gates overlaid with brass (2Ch 4:9, i.e., "bronze") show that the masonry must have been both high and substantial. On the "other court" of 1Ki 7:8, see next paragraph.

3. The Royal Buildings:

The group of buildings which, on theory now stated, were enclosed by the southern part of the great court, are those described in 1Ki 7:1-12. They were of hewn stone and cedar wood (1Ki 7:9-11), and embraced:

(1) The king's house, or royal palace (1Ki 7:8), in close contiguity with the Temple-court (2Ki 11:19).

(2) Behind this to the West, the house of Pharaoh's daughter (2Ki 11:9)—the apartments of the women. Both of these were enclosed in a "court" of their own, styled in 2Ki 11:8 "the other court," and in 2Ki 20:4 margin "the middle court."

(3) South of this stood the throne-room, and porch or hall of judgment, paneled in cedar" from floor to

floor," i.e. from floor to ceiling (2Ki 11:7). The throne, we read later (1Ki 10:18-20), was of ivory, overlaid with gold, and on either side of the throne, as well as of the six steps that led up to it, were lions. The hall served as an audience chamber, and for the administration of justice.

(4) Yet farther South stood the porch or hall of pillars, 50 cubits (75 ft.) long and 30 cubits (45 ft.) broad, with a sub-porch of its own (1Ki 10:6). It is best regarded as a place of promenade and vestibule to the hall of judgment.

(5) Lastly, there was the imposing and elaborate building known as "the house of the forest of Lebanon" (1Ki 10:2-5), which appears to have received this name from its multitude of cedar pillars.

The scanty hints as to its internal arrangements have baffled the ingenuity of the commentators. The house was 100 cubits (150 ft.) in length, 50 cubits (75 ft.) in breadth, and 30 cubits (45 ft.) in height. Going round the sides and back there were apparently four rows of pillars. The Septuagint has three rows), on which, supported by cedar beams, rested three tiers or stories of side-chambers (literally, "ribs," as in 1Ki 6:5; compare the Revised Version margin). In 1Ki 6:3 it is disputed whether the number "forty and five; fifteen in a row" (as the Hebrew may be read) refers to the pillars or to the chambers; if to the former, the Septuagint reading of "three rows" is preferable. The windows of the tiers faced each other on the opposite sides (1Ki 6:4,5). But the whole construction is obscure and doubtful. The spacious house was used partly as an armory; here Solomon put his 300 shields of beaten gold (1Ki 10:17).

IV. Furniture of the Temple.

1. The Sanctuary:

We treat here, first, of the sanctuary in its two divisions, then of the (inner) court.

(1) The "Debhir".

In the most holy place, or debhir, of the sanctuary stood, as before, the old Mosaic ark of the covenant, with its two golden cherubim above the mercy-seat (see ARK OF THE COVENANT; TABERNACLE). Now, however, the symbolic element was increased by the ark being placed between two other figures of cherubim, made of olive wood, overlaid with gold, 10 cubits (15 ft.) high, their wings, each 5 cubits (7 1/2 ft.) long, outstretched so that they reached from wall to wall of the oracle (20 cubits), the inner wings meeting in the center (1Ki 6:23-28; 2Ch 3:10-13).

See CHERUBIM.

(2) The "Hekhal".

In the holy place, or hekhal, the changes were greater. (a) Before the oracle, mentioned as belonging to it (1Ki 6:22), stood the altar of incense, covered with cedar, and overlaid with gold (1Ki 6:20-22; 7:48;

2Ch 4:19; see ALTAR OF INCENSE). It is an arbitrary procedure of criticism to attempt to identify this altar with the table of shewbread. (b) Instead of one golden candlestick, as in the tabernacle, there were now 10, 5 placed on one side and 5 on the other, in front of the oracle. All, with their utensils, were of pure gold (1Ki 7:49; 2Ch 4:7). (c) Likewise, for one table of shewbread, there were now 10, 5 on one side, 5 on the other, also with their utensils made of gold (1Ki 7:48, where, however, only one table is mentioned; 2Ch 4:8, "100 basins of gold"). As these objects, only enlarged in number and dimensions, are fashioned after the model of those of the tabernacle, further particulars regarding them are not given here.

2. The Court (Inner):

(1) The Altar.

The most prominent object in the Temple-court was the altar of burnt offering, or brazen altar (see BRAZEN ALTAR). The site of the altar, as already seen, was the rock es Sakhra], where Araunah had his threshing-floor. The notion of some moderns that the rock itself was the altar, and that the brazen (bronze) altar was introduced later, is devoid of plausibility. An altar is always something reared or built (compare 2Sa 24:18,25). The dimensions of the altar, which are not mentioned in 1 K, are given in 2Ch 4:1 as 20 cubits (30 ft.) long, 20 cubits (30 ft.) broad, and 10 cubits (15 ft.) high. As utensils connected with it—an incidental confirmation of its historicity—are pots, shovels, basins and fleshhooks (1Ki 7:40,45; 2Ch 4:11,16). It will be observed that the assumed halving proportions of the tabernacle are here quite departed from (compare Ex 27:1).

(2) The Molten (Bronze) Sea.

A new feature in the sanctuary court—taking the place of the "laver" in the tabernacle—was the "molten sea," the name being given to it for its great size. It was an immense basin of bronze, 5 cubits (7 1/2 ft.) high, 10 cubits (15 ft.) in diameter at the brim, and 30 cubits (45 ft.) in circumference, resting on 12 bronze oxen, and placed between the altar and the Temple-porch, toward the South (1Ki 7:23-26,39; 2Ch 4:2-5,10). The bronze was a handbreadth in thickness. The brim was shaped like the flower of a lily, and encompassing the basin were ornamental knops. Its capacity is given as 2,000 baths (1Ki 7:26; by error in 2Ch 4:5, 3,000 baths). The oxen on which it rested faced the four cardinal points—three looking each way. The "sea," like the laver, doubtless supplied the water for the washing of the priests' hands and feet (compare Ex 30:18; 38:8). The view of certain scholars (Kosters, Gunkel, etc.) that the "sea" is connected with Babylonian mythical ideas of the great deep is quite fanciful; no hint appears of such significance in any part of the narrative. The same applies to the lavers in the next paragraph.

(3) The Lavers and Their Bases.

The tabernacle laver had its place taken by the "sea" just described, but the Temple was also provided with 10 lavers or basins, set on "bases" of elaborate design and moving upon wheels—the whole made of bronze (1Ki 7:27-37). Their use seems to have been for the washing of sacrifices (2Ch 4:6), for which

purpose they were placed, 5 on the north side, and 5 on the south side, of the Temple-court. The bases were 4 cubits (6 ft.) long, 4 cubits broad, and 3 cubits (4 1/2 ft.) high. These bases were of the nature of square paneled boxes, their sides being ornamented with figures of lions, oxen and cherubim, with wreathed work beneath. They had four feet, to which wheels were attached. The basin rested on a rounded pedestal, a cubit high, with an opening 1 1/2 cubits in diameter to receive the laver (1Ki 7:31). Mythological ideas, as just said, are here out of place.

V. History of the Temple.

1. Building and Dedication:

The Temple was founded in the 4th year of Solomon's reign (1Ki 6:1), and occupied 7 1/2 years in building (1Ki 6:38); the royal buildings occupied 13 years (1Ki 7:1)—20 years in all (the two periods, however, may in part synchronize). On the completion of the Temple, the ark was brought up, in the presence of a vast assemblage, from Zion, and, with innumerable sacrifices and thanksgiving, was solemnly deposited in the Holy of Holies (1Ki 8:1-21; 2Ch 5; 6:1-11). The Temple itself was then dedicated by Solomon in the noble prayer recorded in 1Ki 8:22-61; 2Ch 6:12-42, followed by lavish sacrifices, and a 14 days' feast. At its inauguration the house was filled with the "glory" of Yahweh (1Ki 8:10,11; 2Ch 5:13,14).

2. Repeated Plunderings, etc.:

The religious declension of the later days of Solomon (1Ki 11:1-8) brought in its train disasters for the nation and the Temple. On Solomon's death the kingdom was disrupted, and the Temple ceased to be the one national sanctuary. It had its rivals in the calf-shrines set up by Jeroboam at Beth-el and Da (1Ki 12:25-33). In the 5th year of Rehoboam an expedition was made against Judah by Shishak, king of Egypt, who, coming to Jerusalem, carried away the treasures of the Temple, together with those of the king's house, including the 300 shields of gold which Solomon had made (1Ki 14:25-28; 2Ch 12:2-9). Rehoboam's wife, Maacah, was an idolatress, and during the reign of Abijam, her son, introduced many abominations into the worship of the Temple (1Ki 15:2,12,13). Asa cleared these away, but himself further depleted the Temple and royal treasuries by sending all that was left of their silver and gold to Ben-hadad, king of Syria, to buy his help against Baasha, king of Israel (1Ki 15:18,19). Again the Temple was foully desecrated by Athaliah (2Ch 24:7), necessitating the repairs of Jehoash (2Ki 12:4; 1Ch 24:4); and a new plundering took place in the reign of Ahaziah, when Jehoash of Israel carried off all the gold and silver in the Temple and palace (2Ki 14:14). Uzziah was smitten with leprosy for presuming to enter the holy place to offer incense (2Ch 26:16-20). Jehoshaphat, earlier, is thought to have enlarged the court (2Ch 20:5), and Jotham built a new gate (2Ki 15:35; 2Ch 27:3). The ungodly Ahaz went farther than any of his predecessors in sacrilege, for, besides robbing the Temple and palace of their treasures to secure the aid of the king of Assyria (2Ki 16:8), he removed the brazen altar from its time-honored site, and set up a heathen altar in its place, removing likewise the bases and ornaments of the lavers, and the oxen from under the brazen (bronze) sea (2Ki 16:10-17).

3. Attempts at Reform:

An earnest attempt at reform of religion was made by Hezekiah (2Ki 18:1-6; 2Ch 29:31), but even he was driven to take all the gold and silver in the Temple and king's house to meet the tribute imposed on him by Sennacherib, stripping from the doors and pillars the gold with which he himself had overlaid them (2Ki 18:14-16; 2Ch 32:31). Things became worse than ever under Manasseh, who reared idolatrous altars in the Temple-courts, made an Asherah, introduced the worship of the host of heaven, had horses dedicated to the sun in the Temple-court, and connived at the worst pollutions of heathenism in the sanctuary (2Ki 21:3-7; 23:7,11). Then came the more energetic reforms of the reign of Josiah, when, during the repairs of the Temple, the discovery was made of the Book of the Law, which led to a new covenant with Yahweh, a suppression of the high places, and the thorough cleansing-out of abuses from the Temple (2Ki 22; 23:1-25; 2Ch 34; 35). Still, the heart of the people was not changed, and, as seen in the history, and in the pages of the Prophets, after Josiah's death, the old evils were soon back in full force (compare e.g. Eze 8:7-18).

4. Final Overthrow:

The end, however, was now at hand. Nebuchadnezzar made Jehoiakim his tributary; then, on his rebelling, came, in the reign of Jehoiachin, took Jerusalem, carried off the treasures of the Temple and palace, with the gold of the Temple vessels (part had already been taken on his first approach, 2Ch 36:7), and led into captivity the king, his household and the chief part of the population (2Ki 24:1-17). Eleven years later (586 BC), after a siege of 18 months, consequent on Zedekiah's rebellion (2Ki 25:1), the Babylonian army completed the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. Only a few lesser utensils of value, and the brazen (bronze) pillars, bases and sea remained; these were now taken away, the larger objects being broken up (2Ki 25:13-16). The Temple itself, with its connected buildings, and the houses in Jerusalem generally, were set on fire (2Ki 25:9). The ark doubtless perished in the conflagration, and is no more heard of. The residue of the population—all but the poorest—were carried away captive (2Ki 25:11,12; see CAPTIVITY). Thus ended the first Temple, after about 400 years of chequered existence.

TEMPLE, A2

II. EZEKIEL'S PROPHETIC SKETCH

I. Introductory.

1. Relation to History of Temple:

Wellhausen has said that Ezekiel 40-48 "are the most important in his book, and have been, not incorrectly, called the key to the Old Testament" (Prolegomena, English translation, 167). He means that Ezekiel's legislation represents the first draft, or sketch, of a priestly code, and that subsequently, on its basis, men of the priestly school formulated the Priestly Code as we have it. Without accepting this view, dealt with elsewhere, it is to be admitted that Ezekiel's sketch of a restored temple in chapters 40-

43 has important bearings on the history of the Temple, alike in the fact that it presupposes and sheds back light upon the structure and arrangements of the first Temple (Solomon's), and that in important respects it forecasts the plans of the second (Zerubbabel's) and of Herod's temples.

2. The Conception Unique and Ideal:

While, however, there is this historical relation, it is to be observed that Ezekiel's temple-sketch is unique, presenting features not found in any of the actually built temples. The temple is, in truth, an ideal construction never intended to be literally realized by returned exiles, or any other body of people. Visionary in origin, the ideas embodied, and not the actual construction, are the main things to the prophet's mind. It gives Ezekiel's conception of what a perfectly restored temple and the service of Yahweh would be under conditions which could scarcely be thought of as ever likely literally to arise. A literal construction, one may say, was impossible. The site of the temple is not the old Zion, but "a very high mountain" (Eze 40:2), occupying indeed the place of Zion, but entirely altered in elevation, configuration and general character. The temple is part of a scheme of transformed land, partitioned in parallel tracts among the restored 12 tribes (Eze 47:13-48:7,23-29), with a large area in the center, likewise stretching across the whole country, hallowed to Yahweh and His service (Eze 48:8-22). Supernatural features, as that of the flowing stream from the temple in Ezekiel 47, abound. It is unreasonable to suppose that the prophet looked for such changes—some of them quite obviously symbolical—as actually impending.

3. Its Symmetrical Measurements:

The visionary character of the temple has the effect of securing that its measurements are perfectly symmetrical. The cubit used is defined as "a cubit and a handbreadth" (Eze 40:5), the contrast being with one or more smaller cubits (see CUBIT). In the diversity of opinion as to the precise length of the cubit, it may be assumed here that it was the same sacred cubit employed in the tabernacle and first Temple, and may be treated, as before, as approximately equivalent to 18 inches.

II. Plan of the Temple.

Despite obscurities and corruption in the text of Ezekiel, the main outlines of the ideal temple can be made out without much difficulty (for details the commentaries must be consulted; A. B. Davidson's "Ezekiel" in the Cambridge Bible series may be recommended; compare also Keil; a very lucid description is given in Skinner's "Book of Ezk," in the Expositor's Bible, 406-13; for a different view, see Caldecott, The Second Temple in Jerusalem).

1. The Outer Court:

The temple was enclosed in two courts—an outer and an inner—quite different, however, in character and arrangement from those of the first Temple. The outer court, as shown by the separate measurements (compare Keil on Eze 40:27), was a large square of 500 cubits (750 ft.), bounded by a

wall 6 cubits (9 ft.) thick and 6 cubits high (Eze 40:5). The wall was pierced in the middle of its north, east and south sides by massive gateways, extending into the court to a distance of 50 cubits (75 ft.), with a width of 25 cubits (37 1/2 ft.). On either side of the passage in these gateways were three guardrooms, each 6 cubits square (Eze 40:7 margin), and each gateway terminated in "porch," 8 cubits (12 ft.) long (Eze 40:9), and apparently (thus, the Septuagint, Eze 40:14; the Hebrew text seems corrupt), 20 cubits across. The ascent to the gateways was by seven steps (Eze 40:6; compare 40:22,26), showing that the level of the court was to this extent higher than the ground outside. Round the court, on the three sides named—its edge in line with the ends of the gateways—was a "pavement," on which were built, against the wall, chambers, 30 in number (Eze 40:17,18). At the four corners were enclosures (40 cubits by 30) where the sacrifices were cooked (compare Eze 46:21-24)—a fact which suggests that the cells were mainly for purposes of feasting. (The "arches" (’elammim) of Eze 40:16,21, etc. (the Revised Version margin "colonnade"), if distinguished from the "porch" (’ulam)—A. B. Davidson and others identify them—are still parts of the gateway—Eze 40:21, etc.).

2. The Inner Court:

The inner court was a square of 100 cubits (150 ft.), situated exactly in the center of the larger court (Eze 40:47). It, too, was surrounded by a wall, and had gateways, with guardrooms, etc., similar to those of the outer court, saving that the gateways projected outward (50 cubits), not inward. The gates of outer and inner courts were opposite to each other on the North, East, and South, a hundred cubits apart (Eze 40:19,23,27; the whole space, therefore, from wall to wall was 50 and 100 and 50 = 200 cubits). The ascent to the gates in this case was by eight steps (Eze 40:37), indicating another rise in level for the inner court. There were two chambers at the sides of the north and south gates respectively, one for Levites, the other for priests (Eze 40:44-46; compare the margin); at the gates also (perhaps only at the north gate) were stone tables for slaughtering (Eze 40:39-43). In the center of this inner court was the great altar of burnt offering (Eze 43:14-17)—a structure 18 cubits (27 ft.) square at the base, and rising in four stages (1, 2, 4, and 4 cubits high respectively, Eze 43:14,15), till it formed a square of 12 cubits (18 ft.) at the top or hearth, with four horns at the corners (Eze 43:15,16). Steps led up to it on the East (Eze 43:17).

See ALTAR OF BURNT OFFERING.

3. The Temple Building and Adjuncts:

The inner court was extended westward by a second square of 100 cubits, within which, on a platform elevated another 6 cubits (9 ft.), stood the temple proper and its connected buildings (Eze 41:8). This platform or basement is shown by the measurements to be 60 cubits broad (North and and South) and 105 cubits long (East and West)—5 cubits projecting into the eastern square. The ascent to the temple-porch was by 10 steps (Eze 40:49; Septuagint, the Revised Version margin). The temple itself was a building consisting, like Solomon’s, of three parts—a porch at the entrance, 20 cubits (30 ft.) broad by 12 cubits (18 ft.) deep (so most, following the Septuagint, as required by the other measurements); the holy place or hekhal, 40 cubits (60 ft.) long by 20 cubits (30 ft.) broad; and the most holy place, 20

cubits by 20 (Eze 40:48,49; 41:1-4); the measurements are internal. At the sides of the porch stood two pillars (Eze 40:49), corresponding to the Jachin and Boaz of the older Temple. The holy and the most holy places were separated by a partition 2 cubits in thickness (Eze 41:3; so most interpret). The most holy place was empty; of the furniture of the holy place mention is made only of an altar of wood (Eze 41:22; see ALTAR, sec. A, III, 7; B, III, 3). Walls and doors were ornamented with cherubim and palm trees (Eze 41:18,25). The wall of the temple building was 6 cubits (9 ft.) in thickness (Eze 41:5), and on the north, south, and west sides, as in Solomon's Temple, there were side-chambers in three stories, 30 in number (Eze 41:6; in each story?), with an outer wall 5 cubits (7 1/2 ft.) in thickness (Eze 41:9). These chambers were, on the basement, 4 cubits broad; in the 2nd and 3rd stories, owing, as in the older Temple, to rebatements in the wall, perhaps 5 and 6 cubits broad respectively (Eze 41:6,7; in Solomon's Temple the side-chambers were 5, 6, and 7 cubits, 1Ki 6:6). These dimensions give a total external breadth to the house of 50 cubits (with a length of 100 cubits), leaving 5 cubits on either side and in the front as a passage round the edge of the platform on which the building stood (described as "that which was left") (Eze 41:9,11). The western end, as far as the outer wall, was occupied, the whole breadth of the inner court, by a large building (Eze 41:12); all but a passage of 20 cubits (30 ft.) between it and the temple, belonging to what is termed "the separate place" (gizrah, Eze 41:12,13, etc.). The temple-platform being only 60 cubits broad, there remained a space of 20 cubits (30 ft.) on the north and south sides, running the entire length of the platform; this, continued round the back, formed the gizrah, or "separate place" just named. Beyond the gizrah for 50 cubits (75 ft.) were other chambers, apparently in two rows, the inner 100 cubits, the outer 50 cubits, long, with a walk of 10 cubits between (Eze 42:1-14; the passage, however, is obscure; some, as Keil, place the "walk" outside the chambers). These chambers were assigned to the priests for the eating of "the most holy things" (Eze 42:13).

See GALLERY.

Such, in general, was the sanctuary of the prophet's vision, the outer and inner courts of which, and, crowning all, the temple itself, rising in successive terraces, presented to his inner eye an imposing spectacle which, in labored description, he seeks to enable his readers likewise to visualize.

III. THE TEMPLE OF ZERUBBABEL

I. Introductory.

1. The Decree of Cyrus:

Forty-eight years after Nebuchadnezzar's destruction of the first Temple, the Babylonian empire came to an end (538 BC), and Persia became dominant under Cyrus. In the year following, Cyrus made a decree sanctioning the return of the Jews, and ordering the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem (2Ch 36:23; Ezr 1:1-4). He not only caused the sacred vessels of the old Temple to be restored, but levied a tax upon his western provinces to provide materials for the building, besides what was offered willingly (Ezr 1:6-11; 6:3). The relatively small number of exiles who chose to return for this work (40,000) were led by Sheshbazzar, "the prince of Judah" (Ezr 1:11), whom some identify with Zerubbabel, likewise named

"governor of Judah" (Hag 1:1). With these, if they were distinct was associated Joshua the high priest (in Ezra and Nehemiah called "Jeshua").

2. Founding of the Temple:

The first work of Joshua and Zerubbabel was the building of the altar on its old site in the 7th month of the return (Ezr 3:3). Masons and carpenters were engaged for the building of the house, and the Phoenicians were requisitioned for cedar wood from Lebanon (Ezr 3:7). In the 2nd year the foundations of the temple were laid with dignified ceremonial, amid rejoicing, and the weeping of the older men, who remembered the former house (Ezr 3:8-13).

3. Opposition and Completion of the Work:

The work soon met with opposition from the mixed population of Samaria, whose offer to join it had been refused; hostile representations, which proved successful, were made to the Persian king; from which causes the building was suspended about 15 years, till the 2nd year of Darius Hystaspis (520 BC; Ezr 4). On the other hand, the prophets Haggai and Zechariah stimulated the flagging zeal of the builders, and, new permission being obtained, the work was resumed, and proceeded so rapidly that in 516 BC the temple was completed, and was dedicated with joy (Ezr 5; 6).

II. The Temple Structure.

1. The House:

Few details are available regarding this temple of Zerubbabel. It stood on the ancient site, and may have been influenced in parts of its plan by the descriptions of the temple in Ezekiel. The inferiority to the first Temple, alluded to in Ezr 3:12 and Hag 2:3, plainly cannot refer to its size, for its dimensions as specified in the decree of Cyrus, namely, 60 cubits in height, and 60 cubits in breadth (Ezr 6:3; there is no warrant for confining the 60 cubits of height to the porch only; compare Josephus, Ant, XI, i), exceed considerably those of the Temple of Solomon (side-chambers are no doubt included in the breadth). The greater glory of the former Temple can only refer to adornment, and to the presence in it of objects wanting in the second. The Mishna declares that the second temple lacked five things present in the first —the ark, the sacred fire, the shekhinah, the Holy Spirit, and the Urim and Thummim (Yoma', xxi.2).

2. Its Divisions and Furniture:

The temple was divided, like its predecessor, into a holy and a most holy place, doubtless in similar proportions. In 1 Macc 1:22 mention is made of the "veil" between the two places. The most holy place, as just said, was empty, save for a stone on which the high priest, on the great Day of Atonement, placed his censer (Yoma' v.2). The holy place had its old furniture, but on the simpler scale of the tabernacle— a golden altar of incense, a single table of shewbread, one 7-branched candlestick. These were taken away by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 1:21,22). At the cleansing of the sanctuary after its profanation

by this prince, they were renewed by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 4:41 ff). Judas pulled down also the old desecrated altar, and built a new one (1 Macc 4:44 ff).

3. Its Courts, Altar, etc.:

The second temple had two courts—an outer and an inner (1 Macc 4:38,48; 9:54; Josephus, Ant, XIV, xvi, 2)—planned apparently on the model of those in Ezekiel. A.R.S. Kennedy infers from the measurements in the Haram that "the area of the great court of the second temple, before it was enlarged by Herod on the South and East, followed that of Ezekiel's outer court—that is, it measured 500 cubits each way with the sacred rock precisely in the center" (Expository Times, XX, 182). The altar on this old Sakhra site—the first thing of all to be "set on its base" (Ezr 3:3)—is shown by 1 Macc 4:47 and a passage quoted by Josephus from Hecataeus (Apion, I, xxii) to have been built of unhewn stones. Hecataeus gives its dimensions as a square of 20 cubits and 10 cubits in height. There seems to have been free access to this inner court till the time of Alexander Janneus (104-78 BC), who, pelted by the crowd as he sacrificed, fenced off the part of the court in front of the altar, so that no layman could come farther (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xiii, 5). The courts were colonnaded (Ant., XI, iv, 7; XIV, xvi, 2), and, with the house, had numerous chambers (compare Ne 12:44; 13:4 ff, etc.).

A brief contemporary description of this Temple and its worship is given in Aristeas, 83-104. This writer's interest, however, was absorbed chiefly by the devices for carrying away the sacrificial blood and by the technique of the officiating priests.

4. Later Fortunes:

The vicissitudes of this temple in its later history are vividly recorded in 1 Maccabees and in Josephus. In Ecclesiasticus 50 is given a glimpse of a certain Simon, son of Onias, who repaired the temple, and a striking picture is furnished of the magnificence of the worship in his time. The desecration and pillaging of the sanctuary by Antiochus, and its cleansing and restoration under Judas are alluded to above (see HASMONEANS; MACCABAEUS). At length Judea became an integral part of the Roman empire. In 66 BC Pompey, having taken the temple-hill, entered the most holy place, but kept his hands off the temple-treasures (Ant., XIV, iv, 4). Some years later Crassus carried away everything of value he could find (Ant., XIV, vii, 1). The people revolted, but Rome remained victorious. This brings us to the time of Herod, who was nominated king of Judea by Rome in 39 BC, but did not attain actual power until two years later.

IV. THE TEMPLE OF HEROD

I. Introductory.

1. Initiation of the Work:

Herod became king de facto by the capture of Jerusalem in 37 BC. Some years later he built the fortress

Antonia to the North of the temple (before 31 BC). Midway in his reign, assigning a religious motive for his purpose, he formed the project of rebuilding the temple itself on a grander scale (Josephus gives conflicting dates; in Ant, XV, xi, 1, he says "in his 18th year"; in BJ, I, xxi, 1, he names his 15th year; the latter date, as Schurer suggests (GJV4, I 369), may refer to the extensive preparations). To allay the distrust of his subjects, he undertook that the materials for the new building should be collected before the old was taken down; he likewise trained 1,000 priests to be masons and carpenters for work upon the sanctuary; 10,000 skilled workmen altogether were employed upon the task. The building was commenced in 20-19 BC. The naos, or temple proper, was finished in a year and a half, but it took 8 years to complete the courts and cloisters. The total erection occupied a much longer time (compare Joh 2:20, "Forty and six years," etc.); indeed the work was not entirely completed till 64 AD-6 years before its destruction by the Romans.

2. Its Grandeur:

Built of white marble, covered with heavy plates of gold in front and rising high above its marble-cloistered courts—themselves a succession of terraces—the temple, compared by Josephus to a snow-covered mountain (BJ, V, v, 6), was a conspicuous and dazzling object from every side. The general structure is succinctly described by G. A. Smith: "Herod’s temple consisted of a house divided like its predecessor into the Holy of Holies, and the Holy Place; a porch; an immediate fore-court with an altar of burnt offering; a Court of Israel; in front of this a Court of Women; and round the whole of the preceding, a Court of the Gentiles" (Jerusalem, II, 502). On the "four courts," compare Josephus, Apion, II, viii.

3. Authorities:

The original authorities on Herod’s temple are chiefly the descriptions in Josephus (Ant., XV, xi, 3, 5; BJ, V, v, etc.), and the tractate Middoth in the Mishna. The data in these authorities, however, do not always agree. The most helpful modern descriptions, with plans, will be found, with differences in details, in Keil, Biblical Archaeology, I, 187 ff; in Fergusson, Temples of the Jews; in the articles "Temple" in HDB (T. Witton Davies) and Encyclopedia Biblica (G. H. Box); in the important series of papers by A. R. S. Kennedy in The Expository Times (vol XX), "Some Problems of Herod’s Temple" (compare his article "Temple" in one-vol DB); in Sanday’s Sacred Sites of the Gospels (Waterhouse); latterly in G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 499 ff.

4. Measurements:

Differences of opinion continue as to the sacred cubit. A. R. S. Kennedy thinks the cubit can be definitely fixed at 17,6 inches. (Expostory Times, XX, 24 ff); G. A. Smith reckons it at 20,67 inches. (Jerusalem, II, 504); T. Witton Davies estimates it at about 18 in. (HDB, IV, 713), etc. W. S. Caldecott takes the cubit of Josephus and the Middoth to be 1 1/5 ft. It will suffice in this sketch to treat the cubit, as before, as approximately equivalent to 18 inches.

II. The Temple and Its Courts.

1. Temple Area—Court of Gentiles:

Josephus states that the area of Herod's temple was double that of its predecessor (BJ, I, xxi, 1). The Mishna (Mid., ii.2) gives the area as 500 cubits (roughly 750 ft.); Josephus (Ant., XV, xi, 3) gives it as a stadium (about 600 Greek ft.); but neither measure is quite exact. It is generally agreed that on its east, west and south sides Herod's area corresponded pretty nearly with the limits of the present Haram area (see JERUSALEM), but that it did not extend as far North as the latter (Kennedy states the difference at about 26 as compared with 35 acres, and makes the whole perimeter to be about 1,420 yards, ut supra, 66). The shape was an irregular oblong, broader at the North than at the South. The whole was surrounded by a strong wall, with several gates, the number and position of some of which are still matters of dispute. Josephus mentions four gates on the West (Ant., XV, xi, 5), the principal of which, named in Mid., i.3, "the gate of Kiponos," was connected by a bridge across the Tyropoeon with the city (where now is Wilson's Arch). The same authority speaks of two gates on the South. These are identified with the "Huldah" (mole) gates of the Mishna—the present Double and Triple Gates—which, opening low down in the wall, slope up in tunnel fashion into the interior of the court. The Mishna puts a gate also on the north and one on the east side. The latter may be represented by the modern Golden Gate—a Byzantine structure, now built up. This great court—known later as the "Court of the Gentiles," because open to everyone—was adorned with splendid porticos or cloisters. The colonnade on the south side—known as the Royal Porch—was specially magnificent. It consisted of four rows of monolithic marble columns—162 in all—with Corinthian capitals, forming three aisles, of which the middle was broader and double the height of the other two. The roofing was of carved cedar. The north, west, and east sides had only double colonnades. That on the east side was the "Solomon's Porch" of the New Testament (Joh 10:23; Ac 3:11; 5:19). There were also chambers for officials, and perhaps a place of meeting for the Sanhedrin (beth din) (Josephus places this elsewhere). In the wide spaces of this court took place the buying and selling described in the Gospels (Mt 21:12 and parallel's; Joh 2:13 ff).

2. Inner Sanctuary Inclosure:

(1) Wall, "Chel," "Coregh," Gates.

In the upper or northerly part of this large area, on a much higher level, bounded likewise by a wall, was a second or inner enclosure—the "sanctuary" in the stricter sense (Josephus, BJ, V, v, 2)—comprising the court of the women, the court of Israeland the priests' court, with the temple itself (Josephus, Ant, XV, xi, 5). The surrounding wall, according to Josephus (BJ, V, v, 2), was 40 cubits high on the outside, and 25 on the inside—a difference of 15 cubits; its thickness was 5 cubits. Since, however, the inner courts were considerably higher than the court of the women, the difference in height may have been some cubits less in the latter than in the former (compare the different measurements in Kennedy, ut supra, 182), a fact which may explain the difficulty felt as to the number of the steps in the ascent (see below). Round the wall without, at least on three sides (some except the West), at a height of 12 (Mid.) or 14 (Jos) steps, was an embankment or terrace, known as the chel (fortification), 10 cubits broad (Mid.

says 6 cubits high), and enclosing the whole was a low balustrade or stone parapet (Josephus says 3 cubits high) called the coregh, to which were attached at intervals tablets with notices in Greek and Latin, prohibiting entry to foreigners on pain of death (see PARTITION, THE MIDDLE WALL OF). From within the coregh ascent was made to the level of the chel by the steps aforesaid, and five steps more led up to the gates (the reckoning is probably to the lower level of the women's court). Nine gates, with two-storied gatehouses "like towers" (Josephus, BJ, V, v, 3), are mentioned, four on the North, four on the South, and one on the East—the last probably to be identified, though this is still disputed (Waterhouse, etc.), with the "Gate of Nicanor" (Mid.), or "Corinthian Gate" (Jos), which is undoubtedly "the Beautiful Gate" of Ac 3:2,10 (see for identification, Kennedy, ut supra, 270). This principal gate received its names from being the gift of a wealthy Alexandrian Jew, Nicanor, and from its being made of Corinthian brass. It was of great size—50 cubits high and 40 cubits wide—and was richly adorned, its brass glittering like gold (Mid., ii.3). See BEAUTIFUL GATE. The other gates were covered with gold and silver (Josephus, BJ, V, v, 3).

(2) Court of the Women.

The eastern gate, approached from the outside by 12 steps (Mid., ii.3; Maimonides), admitted into the court of the women, so called because it was accessible to women as well as to men. Above its single colonnades were galleries reserved for the use of women. Its dimensions are given in the Mishna as 135 cubits square (Mid., ii.5), but this need not be precise. At its four corners were large roofless rooms for storage and other purposes. Near the pillars of the colonnades were 13 trumpet-shaped boxes for receiving the money-offerings of the people (compare the incident of the widow's mite, Mr 12:41 ff; Lu 21:1 ff); for which reason, and because this court seems to have been the place of deposit of the temple-treasures generally, it bore the name "treasury" (gazophulakion, Joh 8:20).

See TREASURY.

(3) Inner Courts: Court of Israel; Court of the Priests:

From the women's court, the ascent was made by 15 semicircular steps (Mid., ii.5; on these steps the Levites chanted, and beneath them their instruments were kept) to the inner court, comprising, at different levels, the court of Israel and the court of the priests. Here, again, at the entrance, was a lofty, richly ornamented gate, which some, as said, prefer to regard as the Gate of Nicanor or Beautiful Gate. Probably, however, the view above taken, which places this gate at the outer entrance, is correct. The Mishna gives the total dimensions of the inner court as 187 cubits long (East to West) and 135 cubits wide (Mid., ii.6; v.1). Originally the court was one, but disturbances in the time of Alexander Janneus (104-78 BC) led, as formerly told, to the greater part being railed off for the exclusive use of the priests (Josephus, Ant, XIII, xiii, 5). In the Mishna the name "court of the priests" is used in a restricted sense to denote the space—11 cubits—between the altar and "the court of Israel" (see the detailed measurements in Mid., v.1). The latter—"the court of Israel"—2 1/2 cubits lower than "the court of the priests," and separated from it by a pointed fence, was likewise a narrow strip of only 11 cubits (Mid., ii.6; v.1). Josephus, with more probability, carries the 11 cubits of the "court of Israel" round the whole of the

temple-court (BJ, V, vi). Waterhouse (Sacred Sites, 112) thinks 11 cubits too small for a court of male Israelites, and supposes a much larger enclosure, but without warrant in the authorities (compare Kennedy, ut supra, 183; G. A. Smith, Jerusalem, II, 508 ff).

(4) The Altar, etc.

In the priests' court the principal object was the great altar of burnt offering, situated on the old site—the Sakhra—immediately in front of the porch of the temple (at 22 cubits distance—the space "between the temple and the altar" of Mt 23:35). The altar, according to the Mishna (Mid., iii.1), was 32 cubits square, and, like Ezekiel's, rose in stages, each diminishing by a cubit: one of 1 cubit in height, three of 5 cubits, which, with deduction of another cubit for the priests to walk on, left a square of 24 cubits at the top. It had four horns. Josephus, on the other hand, gives 50 cubits for the length and breadth, and 15 cubits for the height of the altar (BJ, V, v, 6)—his reckoning perhaps including a platform (a cubit high?) from which the height is taken (see ALTAR). The altar was built of unhewn stones, and had on the South a sloping ascent of like material, 32 cubits in length and 16 in width. Between temple and altar, toward the South, stood the "laver" for the priests. In the court, on the north side, were rings, hooks, and tables, for the slaughtering, flaying and suspending of the sacrificial victims.

3. The Temple Building:

(1) House and Porch.

Yet another flight of 12 steps, occupying most of the space between the temple-porch and the altar, led up to the platform (6 cubits high) on which stood the temple itself. This magnificent structure, built, as said before, of blocks of white marble, richly ornamented with gold on front and sides, exceeded in dimensions and splendor all previous temples. The numbers in the Mishna and in Josephus are in parts discrepant, but the general proportions can readily be made out. The building with its platform rose to the height of 100 cubits (150 ft.; the 120 cubits in Josephus, Ant, XV, xi, 3, is a mistake), and was 60 cubits (90 ft.) wide. It was fronted by a porch of like height, but with wings extending 20 cubits (30 ft.) on each side of the temple, making the total breadth of the vestibule 100 cubits (150 ft.) also. The depth of the porch was 10 or 11 cubits; probably at the wings 20 cubits (Jos). The entrance, without doors, was 70 cubits high and 25 cubits wide (Mid. makes 40 cubits high and 20 wide). Above it Herod placed a golden eagle, which the Jews afterward pulled down (Ant., XVII, vi, 3). The porch was adorned with gold.

(2) "Hekhal" and "Debhir".

Internally, the temple was divided, as before, into a holy place (hekhal) and a most holy (debhir)—the former measuring, as in Solomon's Temple, 40 cubits (60 ft.) in length, and 20 cubits (30 ft.) in breadth; the height, however, was double that of the older Temple—60 cubits (90 ft.; thus Keil, etc., following Josephus, BJ, V, v, 5). Mid., iv.6, makes the height only 40 cubits; A. R. S. Kennedy and G. A. Smith make the debhir a cube—20 cubits in height only. In the space that remained above the holy places,

upper rooms (40 cubits) were erected. The holy place was separated from the holiest by a partition one cubit in thickness, before which hung an embroidered curtain or "veil"—that which was rent at the death of Jesus (Mt 27:51 and parallel's; Mid., iv.7, makes two veils, with a space of a cubit between them). The Holy of Holies was empty; only a stone stood, as in the temple of Zerubbabel, on which the high priest placed his censer on the Day of Atonement (Mishna, Yoma', v.2). In the holy place were the altar of incense, the table of shewbread (North), and the seven-branched golden candlestick (South). Representations of the two latter are seen in the carvings on the Arch of Titus (see SHEWBREAD, TABLE OF; CANDLESTICK, THE GOLDEN). The spacious entrance to the holy place had folding doors, before which hung a richly variegated Babylonian curtain. Above the entrance was a golden vine with clusters as large as a man (Josephus, Ant, XV, xi, 3; BJ, V, v, 4).

(3) The Side-Chambers.

The walls of the temple appear to have been 5 cubits thick, and against these, on the North, West, and South, were built, as in Solomon's Temple, side-chambers in three stories, 60 cubits in height, and 10 cubits in width (the figures, however, are uncertain), which, with the outer walls, made the entire breadth of the house 60 or 70 cubits. Mid., iv.3, gives the number of the chambers as 38 in all. The roof, which Keil speaks of as "sloping" (Bib. Archaeology, I, 199), had gilded spikes to keep off the birds. A balustrade surrounded it 3 cubits high. Windows are not mentioned, but there would doubtless be openings for light into the holy place from above the sidechambers.

III. New Testament Associations of Herod's Temple.

1. Earlier Incidents:

Herod's temple figures so prominently in New Testament history that it is not necessary to do more than refer to some of the events of which it was the scene. It was here, before the incense altar, that the aged Zacharias had the vision which assured him that he should not die childless (Lu 1:11). Here, in the women's court, or treasury, on the presentation by Mary, the infant Jesus was greeted by Simeon and Anna (Lu 2:27 ff). In His 12th year the boy Jesus amazed the temple rabbis by His understanding and answers (Lu 2:46).

2. Jesus in the Temple: The chronological sequence of the Fourth Gospel depends very much upon the visits of Jesus to the temple at the great festivals (see JESUS CHRIST). At the first of these occurred the cleansing of the temple-court—the court of the Gentiles—from the dealers that profaned it (Joh 2:13), an incident repeated at the close of the ministry (Mt 21:12 ff and parallel's). When the Jews, on the first occasion, demanded a sign, Jesus spoke of the temple of His body as being destroyed and raised up in three days (Joh 2:19), eliciting their retort, "Forty and six years was this temple in building," etc. (Joh 2:20). This may date the occurrence about 27 AD. At the second cleansing He not only drove out the buyers and sellers, but would not allow anyone to carry anything through this part of the temple (Mr 11:15-17). In Joh His zeal flamed out because it was His Father's house; in Mk, because it was a house of prayer for all nations (compare Isa 56:7). With this non-exclusiveness agrees the word of Jesus to the

woman of Samaria: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain (in Samaria), nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father" (Joh 4:21). During the two years following His first visit, Jesus repeatedly, at festival times, walked in the temple-courts, and taught and disputed with the Jews. We find Him in Joh 5 at "a feast" (Passover or Purim?); in John 7; 8, at "the feast of tabernacles," where the temple-police were sent to apprehend Him (7:32,45 ff), and where He taught "in the treasury" (8:20); in Joh 10:22 ff, at "the feast of the dedication" in winter, walking in "Solomon's Porch." His teaching on these occasions often started from some familiar temple scene—the libations of water carried by the priests to be poured upon the altar (Joh 7:37), the proselytes (Greeks even) in the great portico (Joh 12:20), etc. Of course Jesus, not being of the priestly order, never entered the sanctuary; His teaching took place in the several courts open to laymen, generally in the "treasury" (see Joh 8:20).

3. The Passion-Week:

The first days of the closing week of the life of Jesus—the week commencing with the Triumphal Entry—were spent largely in the temple. Here He spoke many parables (Mt 21; 22 and parallel's); here He delivered His tremendous arraignment of the Pharisees (Mt 23 and parallel's); here, as He "sat down over against the treasury," He beheld the people casting in their gifts, and praised the poor widow who cast in her two mites above all who cast in of their abundance (Mr 12:41 ff and parallel's). It was on the evening of His last day in the temple that His disciples drew His attention to "the goodly stones and offerings" (gifts for adornment) of the building (Lu 21:5 and parallel's) and heard from His lips the astonishing announcement that the days were coming—even in that generation—in which there should not be left one stone upon another (Lu 21:6 and parallel's). The prediction was fulfilled to the letter in the destruction of the temple by the Romans in 70 AD.

4. Apostolic Church:

Seven weeks after the crucifixion the Pentecost of Ac 2 was observed. The only place that fulfils the topographical conditions of the great gatherings is Solomon's Porch. The healing of the lame man (Ac 3:1) took place at the "door .... called Beautiful" of the temple, and the multitude after the healing ran together into "Solomon's Porch" or portico (Ac 3:11). Where also were the words of Lu 24:53, they "were continually in the temple, blessing God," and after Pentecost (Ac 2:46), "day by day, continuing stedfastly .... in the temple," etc., so likely to be fulfilled? For long the apostles continued the methods of their Master in daily teaching in the temple (Ac 4:1). Many years later, when Paul visited Jerusalem for the last time, he was put in danger of his life from the myriads of Jewish converts "all zealous for the law" (Ac 21:20), who accused him of profaning the temple by bringing Greeks into its precincts, i.e. within the coregh (Ac 21:28-30). But Christianity had now begun to look farther afield than the temple. Stephen, and after him Saul, who became Paul, preached that "the Most High dwelleth not in houses made with hands" (Ac 7:48; 17:24), though Paul himself attended the temple for ceremonial and other purposes (Ac 21:26).

5. The Temple in Christian Thought:

From the time that the temple ceased to exist, the Talmud took its place in Jewish estimation; but it is in Christianity rather than in Judaism that the temple has a perpetual existence. The New Testament writers make no distinction between one temple and another. It is the idea rather than the building which is perpetuated in Christian teaching. The interweaving of temple associations with Christian thought and life runs through the whole New Testament. Jesus Himself supplied the germ for this development in the word He spoke concerning the temple of His body (Joh 2:19,21). Paul, notwithstanding all he had suffered from Jews and Jewish Christians, remained saturated with Jewish ideas and modes of thought. In one of his earliest Epistles he recognizes the "Jerus that is above" as "the mother of us all" (Ga 4:26 the King James Version). In another, the "man of sin" is sitting "in the temple of God" (2Th 2:4). The collective church (1Co 3:16,17), but also the individual believer (1Co 6:19), is a temple. One notable passage shows how deep was the impression made upon Paul's mind by the incident connected with Trophimus the Ephesian (Ac 21:29). That "middle wall of partition" which so nearly proved fatal to him then was no longer to be looked for in the Christian church (Eph 2:14), which was "a holy temple" in the Lord (Eph 2:21). It is naturally in the Epistle to the Hebrews that we have the fullest exposition of ideas connected with the temple, although here the form of allusion is to the tabernacle rather than the temple (see TABERNACLE; compare Westcott on Hebrews, 233 ff). The sanctuary and all it included were but representations of heavenly things. Finally, in Revelation, the vision is that of the heavenly temple itself (11:19). But the church—professing Christendom?—is a temple measured by God's command (11:1,2 ff). The climax is reached in 21:22-23: "I saw no temple therein (i.e. in the holy city): for the Lord God the Almighty, and the Lamb, are the temple thereof .... and the lamp thereof is the Lamb." Special ordinances are altogether superseded.

LITERATURE.

In general on the temples see Keil, Biblical Archaeology, I, in which the older literature is mentioned; Fergusson, Temples of the Jews; Comms. on K, Chronicles, Ezr, Neh, and Ezk; articles in the dicts. and encs (DB, HDB, EB); G. A. Smith, Jerusalem and similar works. On Solomon's Temple, compare Benzinger, Heb. Archaologie. On Ezekiel's temple, see Skinner's "Book of Ezekiel" in Expositor's Bible. On Zerubbabel's temple, compare W. Shaw Caldecott, The Second Temple in Jerusalem. The original authorities on Herod's temple are chiefly Josephus, Ant, XV, xi, and BJ, V, v; and the Mishna, Middoth, ii (this section of the Middoth, from Barclay's Talmud, may be seen in App. I of Fergusson's work above named). The German literature is very fully given in Schurer, HJP, I, 1, 438 ff (GJV4, I, 392 f). See also the articles of A. R. S. Kennedy in Expository Times, XX, referred to above, and P. Waterhouse, in Sanday, Sacred Sites of the Gospels, 106 ff. On symbolism, compare Westcott, Hebrews, 233 ff. See also articles in this Encyclopedia on parts, furniture, and utensils of the temple, under their several headings.

W. Shaw Caldecott

James Orr

TEMPLE, B

B. IN CRITICISM

I. ALLEGED LACK OF HARMONY BETWEEN EARLIER (KINGS) AND LATER (CODE OF HAMMURABI) VERSIONS OF TEMPLE BUILDING

1. Second Version Not a Facsimile of First

2. The Two Versions Differ as to the Builder

3. The Earlier Version Silent about Things Recorded in Later Version

II. DETAILED OBJECTIONS AGAINST CHRONICLER'S ACCOUNT

1. Reason for Interdicting David's Purpose to Build a Temple

2. Impossibility of David in His Old Age Collecting Materials Enumerated by the Chronicler

3. Supernaturally Received Pattern of the Temple Said to Have Been Given by David to Solomon

4. Alleged Organization of the Temple-Service by David

5. Assertion by Solomon That the Temple Would Be Used as a Central Sanctuary

LITERATURE

B. IN CRITICISM

Modern criticism does not challenge the existence of a Solomonic Temple on Mt. Moriah, as it does that of a Mosaic tabernacle in the wilderness. Only it maintains that historic value belongs exclusively to the narrative in Kings, while the statements in Chronicles are pure ornamentation or ecclesiastical trimming dating from post-exilic times. All that is true about the Temple, says criticism, is

(1) that David originally, i.e. on coming to the throne of all Israel, contemplated erecting such a structure upon Araunah's threshing-floor, but was prohibited from doing so by Nathan, who at first approved of his design but was afterward directed by Yahweh to stay the king's hand, and to inform the king that the work of building a house for Yahweh to dwell in was not to be his (the king's) task and privilege but his son's, and that as a solatium for his disappointment Yahweh would build him a house, by establishing the throne of his kingdom forever (2Sa 7:4-17);

(2) that after David's death Solomon called to mind the pious purpose of his father of which he had been informed and the express promise of Yahweh that David's successor on the throne should execute that

purpose, and accordingly resolved to "build a house for the name of Yahweh his God" (1Ki 5:3-5); and

(3) that 7 1/2 years were employed in the work of construction, after which the finished Temple was dedicated in the presence of the congregation of Israel, with their princes, priests and Levites, in a speech which rehearsed the fact that David had intended to build the house but was prevented, and with a prayer which once more connected the Temple with the pious intention of David (1Ki 8:18-20).

All the rest is simply embellishment (Wellhausen, GI, 181-92; article "Temple" in EB):

(1) that David's purpose to build the Temple was interdicted because he had been a man of war and had shed blood (1Ch 28:3), which in Wellhausen's judgment should rather have been a qualification for the business;

(2) that David in his old and feeble age made elaborate preparations for the construction of the house he was not to see—which, again writes Wellhausen, was like "making the bread so far ready that his son only required to shove it into the oven";

(3) that David gave to his son Solomon the pattern of the house in all its details as the Lord had caused him to understand in writing ("black upon white," as Wellhansen expresses it) by His (the Lord's) hand upon him—which was different from the way in which Moses received instruction about the tabernacle, namely, by a pattern shown to him in the Mount, and carried in his recollection;

(4) that David before his death arranged all the musical service for the Temple, invented musical instruments, appointed all the officers to be associated with the Temple priests, Levites, porters and singers, distributing them in classes and assigning them their duties by lot (1Ch 23:2-26; 2Ch 8:12-16)—exactly as these things were afterward arranged in the second or post-exilic temple and were now carried back to David as the legislation of the Priestly Code was assigned to Moses; and

(5) that David's son Solomon assures Hiram (the Revised Version (British and American) "Huram") that the Temple will be used as a central sanctuary "to burn before him (Yahweh) incense of sweet spices, and for the continual showbread, and for the burnt-offerings morning and evening, on the sabbaths, and on the new moons, and on the set feasts of Yahweh our God" (2Ch 2:3), i.e. for divine service, which, according to criticism, was of post-exilic origin.

The questions that now fall to be considered are: (1) whether the statements of the Chronicler are inconsistent with those in the Books of Samuel and Kings; and (2) if not, whether they are in themselves such as to be incredible.

I. Alleged Want of Harmony between Earlier (K) and Later (Ch) Versions of Temple Building.

1. Second Version Not a Facsimile of First

It does not seem reasonable to hold that this has been established. The circumstance that the second account is not a facsimile of the first does not warrant the conclusion that the first alone is fact and the second fiction. It is quite conceivable that both might be true. David might have had it in his mind, as the first account states and the second acknowledges, to build a house for Yahweh, and yet not have been able to carry his purpose into effect, and have been obliged to hand over its execution to his son. David, moreover, might have been hindered by Yahweh (through His prophet Nathan) from building the Temple for more reasons than one—because the proposal was premature, God having it in His mind to build a house for David, i.e. to establish his dynasty, before requiring a permanent habitation for Himself; and also because the time was unpropitious, David having still much to do in the subjugation of his country's enemies; and because it was more fitting that a temple for the God of Peace should not be erected by one who had been a man of war from his youth. The first of these reasons is stated in Samuel, the second and third are recorded in Chronicles.

2. The Two Versions Differ as to the Builder

The earlier version does not say that David built the house; but that his son was to do it, and this the later version does not contradict; the later version does not claim that the idea originated with Solomon, but ascribes it to David, precisely as the earlier version does. In this there is no disharmony, but rather underlying harmony. Both versions assert that David purposed and that Solomon performed, in which surely there is perfect agreement.

3. The Earlier Version Silent about Things Recorded in Later Version

The silence of the earlier version about the things recorded in the later version, such as the preparation of material and the organization of the Temple-service, does not prove that these things were not known to the author of the earlier version, or had not taken place when he wrote. No writer is obliged to cram into his pages all he knows, but only to insert as much of his information as will subserve his aim in writing. Nor does his omission to set down in his narrative this or that particular fact or incident amount to a demonstration that the unrecorded fact or incident had not then occurred or was not within his cognizance. Least of all is it expected that a writer of civil history shall fill his pages with details that are purely or chiefly ecclesiastical. In short, if the omission from Kings of David's preparations and arrangement for the Temple testifies that no such preparations or arrangements were made, the omission from Chronicles of David's sin with Bath-sheba and of Nathan's parable of the Ewe Lamb should certify that either these things never happened or they were not known after the exile. It is usual to say they were purposely left out because it was the Chronicler's intention to encircle David with a nimbus of glory (Wellhausen), but this is simply critical hypothesis, the truth of which is disputed. On critical principles either these incidents in David's life were not true or the Chronicler was not aware of them. But the Chronicler had as one main source for his composition "the earlier historical books from Genesis to Kings" (Driver), and "the tradition of the older source only has historical value" (Wellhausen).

II. Detailed Objections against Chronicler's Account.

1. Reason for Interdicting David’s Purpose to Build a Temple

Examining now in detail the abovestated objections, we readily see that they are by no means so formidable as at first sight they look, and certainly do not prove the Chronicler’s account to be incredible. That David’s purpose to build a temple should have been interdicted because he had been a man of war and had shed blood appears to Wellhausen to be a watermark of non-historicity. Benzinger in Encyclopedia Biblica (art. "Temple") goes beyond this and says "There is no historical probablity David had thoughts of building a temple." But if David never thought of building a temple, then not only was the Chronicler mistaken in making Solomon say (2Ch 6:7) that it was in the heart of his father so to do, but he was chargeable with something worse in making the Lord say to David, "Whereas it was in thy heart to build a house for my name, thou didst well in that it was in thy heart" (2Ch 6:8), unless he was absolutely certain that the statement was true—which it was not if Benzinger may be relied on.

Nor is it merely the Chronicler whose character for intelligence and piety suffers, if David never thought of building a temple; the reputation of the author or authors of Samuel and Kings must also go, since they both declare that David did entertain the purpose which Benzinger denies (2Sa 7:2; 1Ki 5:3); and an impartial reasoner will hesitate before he sacrifices the good name even of two unknown ancient writers at the ipse dixit of any modern scholar.

We may therefore limit our remarks to Wellhausen’s objection and reply that the reason assigned by Chronicles for prohibiting David from carrying out his purpose, namely, that he had been a man of war, might have been an argument for permitting him to do so, or at least for his seeking to do so, had his object been to erect a monument to his own glory or a thank offering to God for the victories he had won; but not if the Temple was designed to be a habitation wherein God might dwell among His people to receive their worship and bless them with His grace. Strange as it may seem (Winer) that David should have been debarred from carrying out his purpose for the reason assigned, yet there was reason in the interdict, for not only was it fitting that peaceful works should be carried out by peaceful hands (Merz in PRE2), but David’s vocation was not temple-building but empire-building (to use a modern phrase); and many campaigns lay before him ere the leisure could be found or the land could be ready for the execution of his sacred design.

2. Impossibility of David in His Old Age Collecting Materials Enumerated by the Chronicler

That David in his old and feeble age could not possibly have collected all the materials enumerated by 1Ch 29 might possibly have been true, had David been an impecunious chieftain and had he only in the last years of his life commenced to amass treasure. But David was a powerful and wealthy eastern potentate and a valiant warrior besides, who had conquered numerous tribes, Philistines, Moabites, Syrians, Edomites and Ammonites, and had acquired from his victories large spoil, which from an early stage in his career he had been accustomed to dedicate to the Lord (2Sa 8:11). Hence, it is little better than trifling to put forward as an inherent mark of incredibility the statement that David in his old age could not have made extensive and costly preparations for the building of the Temple—all the more that according to the narrative he was assisted by "the princes of the fathers’ houses, and the princes of the

tribes of Israel, and the captains of thousands and of hundreds, with the rulers over the king's work," and "the people" generally, who all "offered willingly for the service of the house of God."

No doubt the value in sterling money of these preparations is enormous—the gold and silver alone being variously reckoned at 8 (Keil), 16 (Bertheau), 81 (Michaelis), 450 (Kautzsch), 1,400 (Rawlinson) millions of pounds—and might reasonably suggest either that the text has become corrupt, or the numbers were originally used loosely to express the idea of an extraordinary amount, or were of set purpose exaggerated. The first of these explanations is adopted by Rawlinson; the second by Berthcan; the third by Wellhausen, who sees in the whole section (1Ch 22-29) "'a frightful example of the statistical fantasy of the Jews, which delights itself in immense sums of gold upon paper." But even conceding that in each of these explanations a measure of truth may lie, it does not seem justifiable to wipe out as unhistorical and imaginary the main statement of the Chronicler, that David's preparations were both extensive and costly, all the less that 1Ki 10:14,15 bears witness to the extraordinary wealth of Solomon. whose income is stated to have been 666 talents of gold, or about 3 millions sterling, a year, besides that he had of the merchantmen, and of the traffic of the spice merchants, and of all the kings of Arabia and of the governors of the country. If David's annual income was anything like this, and if he had command of all the treasures accumulated in previous years, it does not look so impossible as criticism would make out that David could have prepared for the future Temple as the Chronicler reports.

3. Supernaturally Received Pattern of the Temple Said to Have Been Given by David to Solomon

That David gave to Solomon the pattern of the Temple in a writing which had been prepared by him under direct supernatural guidance can be objected to only by those who deny the possibility of such divine communications being made by God to man. If criticism admits, as it sometimes does, the possibility of both revelation and inspiration, the objection under consideration must fall to the ground. That the method of making David acquainted with the pattern of the Temple was not in all respects the same as that adopted for showing Moses the model of the tabernacle, only proves that the resources of infinite wisdom are not usually exhausted by one effort, and that God is not necessarily tied down to one particular way of uttering His thoughts.

But criticism mostly rejects the idea of the supernatural and accordingly dismisses this statement about the God-given pattern as altogether fanciful—pointing (1) to the fact that similar temples already existed among the Canaanites, as e.g. at Shechem (Jud 9:46) and at Gaza (Jud 16:29), which showed there was no special need for a divinely-prepared plan; and (2) to the circumstance that Solomon fetched Hiram, a Tyrian worker in brass, to assist in the erection of the Temple, which again, it is urged, renders probable the conclusion that at least Phoenician ideas entered into its structure (Duncker, Benzinger). Suppose, however, it were true that the Temple was fashioned on a Phoenician, Canaanite or Egyptian model, that would not disprove the statement that David was guided by divine inspiration in drawing up the outline of the building.

4. Alleged Organization of the Temple-Service by David

That David’s organization of the Temple-service, both as to officers and instruments as to ritual and music, corresponded exactly (or nearly so) with what afterward existed in the second temple can hardly be adduced as a proof of non-historicity, except on the supposition that Chronicles deliberately "transformed the old history into church history" by ascribing to David the holy music and the arrangement of the Temple personals" which belonged to the post-exilic age, precisely as the author or authors of the Priestly Code, which dated from the same age (according to criticism), attributed this to Moses (Wellhausen, GI, 187)—in other words, by stating what was not true in either case, by representing that as having happened which had not happened. Whether this was originally intended to deceive and was a willful fraud, as some hold, and whether it was legitimate then "to do evil that good might come," to persuade men that David organized the musical service which was performed in the second temple in order to secure for it popular acceptance, it may be left to each reader to determine; it must always be wrong to ascribe doubtful practices to good men like the authors of the Priestly Code (P) and of Chronicles unless one is absolutely sure that they were guilty of such practices. Undoubtedly the fair and reasonable thing is to hold that the Chronicler wrote the truth until it is proved that he did not; and for his statement it may be claimed that at least it has this in its favor, that in the earlier sources David is distinctly stated to have been a musician (1Sa 16:23), to have composed a song, Ps 18 (2Sa 22:1), and to have been designated "the sweet psalmist of Israel." No doubt on the critical hypothesis this might explain why the thought occurred to the Chronicler to credit David with the organization of the Temple-service; but without the critical hypothesis it equally accounts for the interest David took in preparing "the music and the personals" for the Temple which his son was to, build. "The tradition that David intended to build a temple and that he reorganized public worship, not forgetting the musical side thereof (compare 2Sa 6:5 with Am 6:5)," says Kittel (The Scientific Study of the Old Testament, 136, English translation), "is not altogether without foundation."

5. Assertion by Solomon That the Temple Would Be Used as a Central Sanctuary

That the Temple-service was carried out in accordance with the regulations of the Priestly Code does not prove that the Chronicles account is unreliable, unless it is certain that the postexilic Priestly Code was an entirely new ritual which had never existed before, which some modern critics do not admit. But, if it was merely, as some maintain, a codification of a cult that existed before, then no sufficient reason exists for holding that Solomon’s Temple was designed to be a private chapel for the king (Benzinger), erected partly out of piety but partly also out of love of splendor and statecraft (Reuss), rather than a central sanctuary for the people. A study of Solomon’s letter to Hiram (2Ch 2:4) shows that the Temple was intended for the concentration of the nation’s sacrificial worship which had up till then been frequently offered at local shrines, though originally meant for celebration at the Mosaic tabernacle—for the burning of sweet incense (Ex 30:1), the offering day by day continually of the burnt offering (Ex 29:39). And though, it is admitted, the letter to Hiram as reported in 1 Kings makes no mention of this intention, yet it is clear from 1Ki 8:62-65, that Solomon, after dedicating the Temple by prayer, used it for this purpose. Wherefore, if Chronicles simply transferred to the consecration of the Temple a ritual that had no existence until after the exile, the author of Kings did the same, which again would destroy Wellhausen’s admission that historical validity attaches to the earlier source. A much more likely supposition is that the ritual reported by both historians was not that of a Priestly Code manufactured for the second temple, but that which had been published by Moses for the tabernacle, in place of which it

had come. That local shrines for many years existed alongside of the Temple only proves that Solomon’s original idea was not perfectly carried out either by himself or his people.

LITERATURE.

The Commentaries of Bertheau and Keil on Chronicles; Reuss. Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Alten Testaments; articles on "Temple" in Sch-Herz; Riehm. Handworterbuch; HDB; EB; Wellhausen. Prolegomena schichte Israels.

T. Whitelaw

TEMPLE, HEROD’S

see TEMPLE

TEMPLES

tem’-p’lz (raqqah, "thinness," "upper cheeks"): The original signifies the thinnest part of the skull (Jud 4:21,22; 5:26). In So 4:3; 6:7, the bride’s cheeks are likened to pomegranates because of the rich coloring of a slice of this fruit.

TEMPLES, ROBBERS OF

(hierosuloi; the King James Version "robbers of churches," Ac 19:37): To explain this as "sacrilegious persons" is irreconcilable with the contrast in Ro 2:22. In De 7:25, the Jews were commanded entirely to destroy the gold and silver idols, ornaments of the heathen temples. The sin reproved is that of making that a matter of gain which, without regard to its value, they should have destroyed. "Dost thou, who regardest the mere touch of an idol as a horrible defilement, presume to rob their temples?" There is abundant evidence to show that this crime was not unusual. When the town-clerk of Ephesus declares the companions of Paul innocent of such charge, his words imply that the fact that they were Jews rendered them liable to such suspicion. So Josephus goes out of his way (Ant., IV, viii, 10) to deny that Jews ever committed the crime.

H. E. Jacobs

TEMPT; TEMPTATION

temt, tem-ta’-shun (nacah, "to prove" "try," "tempt" maccah, "a trial," "temptation"; peirazo, "to try" "prove" peirasmos "a trial," "proof"): The words have a sinister connotation in present-day usage which has not always attached to them. Originally the words were of neutral content, with the sense of "putting to the proof," the testing of character or quality. Thus, God is "tempted" by Israel’s distrust of Him, as if

the people were actually challenging Him to show His perfections (Ex 17:2; Ps 78:18; Ac 15:10; Heb 3:9, and often); Abraham is "tempted," being called upon to offer up Isaac (Ge 22:1); and Jesus is "tempted" to a spectacular Messiahship (Mt 4 and parallel passages (see TEMPTATION OF CHRIST)). No evil is implied in the subject of these temptations. Temptation therefore in the Scripture sense has possibilities of holiness as well as of sin. For as all experience witnesses, it is one thing to be tempted, another thing to fall. To be tempted—one may rejoice in that (Jas 1:2), since in temptation, by conquering it, one may achieve a higher and nobler manhood.

"Why comes temptation but for man to meet

And master and make crouch beneath his foot,

And so be pedestaled in triumph?"

Holiness in its best estate is possible only under conditions which make it necessary to meet, resist and triumph over temptation. Thus, Jesus Himself became our Great High Priest in that, being tempted in all points like as we are, He never once yielded, but fought and triumphed (Heb 4:15).

One must not deceive one’s self, however, in thinking that, because by the grace of God one may have profit of virtue through temptation as an instrument, all temptation is equally innocent and virtuous. It is noticeable in the case of Jesus that His temptation was under the direction of the Spirit (Mr 1:12); He Himself did not seek it, nor did He fear it. Temptations encountered in this way, the way of duty, the way of the Spirit, alone constitute the true challenge of saintship (Jas 1:12); but it is the mark of an ignoble nature to be perpetually the center of vicious fancies and tempers which are not of God but of the devil (Jas 1:13-15). One may not escape entirely such buffetings of faith, but by any sound nature they are easily disposed of. Not so easily disposed of are the trials (temptations) to faith through adversity, affliction, trouble (Lu 22:28; Ac 20:19; Jas 1:2; 1Pe 1:6); and yet there is no lack of evidence to the consoling fact that God does not suffer His own to be tempted above what they are able to bear (1Co 10:13) and that for every crisis His grace will be sufficient (2Co 12:8,9).

Charles M. Stuart

TEMPTATION OF CHRIST

1. The Sources:

The sources for this event are Mr 1:12,13; Mt 4:1-11; Lu 4:1-13; compare Heb 2:18; 4:15,16, and see GETHSEMANE. Mark is probably a condensation; Mt and Luke have the same source, probably the discourses of Jesus. Matthew is usually regarded as nearest the original, and its order is here followed.

2. Time and Place:

The Temptation is put immediately after the Baptism by all the synoptists, and this is psychologically necessary, as, we shall see. The place was the wilderness; it was "up" from the Jordan valley (Matthew), and was on the way back to Galilee (Luke). The traditional site, Mt. Quarantana, is probably a good guess.

3. Significance:

At His baptism, Jesus received from heaven the final confirmation of His thought that He was the Messiah. It was the greatest conception which ever entered a human mind and left it sane. Under the irresistible influence of the Spirit, He turned aside to seek out in silence and alone the principles which should govern Him in His Messianic work. This was absolutely necessary to any wise prosecution of it. Without the slightest precedent Jesus must determine what a Messiah would do, how He would act. Radical critics agree that, if such a period of meditation and conflict were not recorded, it would have to be assumed. By this conflict, Jesus came to that clearness and decision which characterized His ministry throughout. It is easy to see how this determination of guiding principles involved the severest temptation, and it is noteworthy that all the temptation is represented as coming from without, and none from within. Here too He must take His stand with reference to all the current ideas about the Messiah and His work.

4. The Reporter:

Jesus alone can be the original reporter. To this Holtzmann and J. Weiss agree. The report was given for the sake of the disciples, for the principles wrought out in this conflict are the guiding principles in the whole work of the kingdom of God on earth.

5. Exposition:

(1) Fasting.

Jesus was so intensely absorbed that He forgot to eat. There was nothing ascetic or ritualistic about it, and so this is no example for ascetic fasting for us. It is doubtful whether the text demands absolute abstinence from food; rather, long periods of fasting, and insufficient food when He had it. At the end of the forty days, He woke to the realization that He was a starving man.

(2) The First Temptation.

The first temptation is not a temptation to doubt His Messiahship, nor is the second either. "If thou art the Son of God," i.e. "the Messiah," means, simply, "since thou art the Son of God" (see Burton, Moods and Tenses, sections 244, 245; Robertson, Short Grammar, 161). There was not the slightest doubt on this point in Jesus' mind after the baptism, and Satan knew it. There is no temptation to prove Himself the Messiah, nor any hint of such a thing in Jesus' replies. The very point of it all is, How are you going to act, since you are Messiah? (Mt 4:3 parallel Lu 4:3).

The temptation has these elements:

(a) The perfectly innocent craving for food is imperious in the starving man.

(b) Why should He not satisfy His hunger, since He is the Son of God and has the power?

Jesus replies from De 8:3, that God can and will provide Him bread in His own way and in His own time. He is not referring to spiritual food, which is not in question either here or in Deuteronomy (see Broadus' just and severe remark here). He does not understand how God will provide, but He will wait and trust. Divinely-assured of Messiahship, He knows that God will not let Him perish. Here emerges the principle of His ministry; He will never use His supernatural power to help Himself. Objections based on Lu 4:30 and Joh 10:39 are worthless, as nothing miraculous is there implied. The walking on the water was to help the apostles' faith. But why would it have been wrong to have used His supernatural power for Himself? Because by so doing He would have refused to share the human lot, and virtually have denied His incarnation. If He is to save others, Himself He cannot save (Mt 27:42). In passing, it is well to notice that "the temptations all turn on the conflict which arises, when one, who is conscious of supernatural power, feels that there are occasions, when it would not be right to exercise it." So the miraculous is here most deeply imbedded in the first principles of Messianic action.

(3) The Second Temptation.

The pinnacle of the temple was probably the southeast corner of the roof of the Royal Cloister, 326 ft. above the bottom of the Kidron valley. The proposition was not to leap from this height into the crowd below in the temple courts, as is usually said, for

(a) there is no hint of the people in the narrative;

(b) Jesus reply does not fit such an idea; it meets another temptation entirely;

(c) this explanation confuses the narrative, making the second temptation a short road to glory like the third;

(d) it seems a fantastic temptation, when it is seriously visualized.

Rather Satan bids Jesus leap into the abyss outside the temple. Why then the temple at all, and not some mountain precipice? asks Meyer. Because it was the sheerest depth well known to the Jews, who had all shuddered as they had looked down into it (Mt 4:5-7 parallel Lu 4:5-8).

The first temptation proved Jesus a man of faith, and the second is addressed to Him as such, asking Him to prove His faith by putting God's promise to the test. It is the temptation to fanaticism, which has been the destruction of many a useful servant of God Jesus refuses to yield, for yielding would have

been sin. It would have been

(a) wicked presumption, as though God must yield to every unreasonable whim of the man, of faith, and so would have been a real "tempting" of God;

(b) it would have denied His incarnation in principle, like the first temptation;

(c) such fanaticism. would have destroyed His ministry.

So the principle was evolved: Jesus will not, of self-will, run into dangers, but will avoid them except in the clear path of duty. He will be no fanatic, running before the Spirit, but will be led by Him in paths of holy sanity and heavenly wisdom. Jesus waited on God.

(4) The Third Temptation.

The former tests have proved Jesus a man of faith and of common sense. Surely such a man will take the short and easy road to that universal dominion which right-fully belongs to the Messiah. Satan offers it, as the prince of this world. The lure here is the desire for power, in itself a right instinct, and the natural and proper wish to avoid difficulty and pain. That the final object is to set up a universal kingdom of God in righteousness adds to the subtlety of the temptation. But as a condition Satan demands that Jesus shall worship him. This must be symbolically interpreted. Such worship as is offered God cannot be meant, for every pious soul would shrink from that in horror, and for Jesus it could constitute no temptation at all. Rather a compromise with Satan must be meant—such a compromise as would essentially be a submission to him. Recalling the views of the times and the course of Jesus ministry, we can think this compromise nothing else than the adoption by Jesus of the program of political Messiahship, with its worldly means of war, intrigue, etc. Jesus repudiates the offer. He sees in it only evil, for

(a) war, especially aggressive war, is to His mind a vast crime against love,

(b) it changes the basis of His kingdom from the spiritual to the external,

(c) the means would defeat the end, and involve Him in disaster.

He will serve God only, and God is served in righteousness. Only means which God approves can be used (Mt 4:8-11 parallel Lu 4:9-13). Here then is the third great principle of the kingdom: Only moral and spiritual means to moral and spiritual ends. He turns away from worldly methods to the slow and difficult way of truth-preaching, which can end only with the cross. Jesus must have come from His temptation with the conviction that His ministry meant a life-and-death struggle with all the forces of darkness.

6. The Character of the Narrative:

As we should expect of Jesus, He throws the story of the inner conflict of His soul into story form. So only could it be understood by all classes of men in all ages. It was a real struggle, but pictorially, symbolically described. This seems to be proved by various elements in the story, namely, the devil can hardly be conceived as literally taking Jesus from place to place. There is no mountain from which all the kingdoms of the world can be seen. This view of the matter relieves all the difficulties.

7. How Could a Sinless Christ be Tempted?:

The difficulty is that there can be no drawing toward an object unless the object seems desirable. But the very fact that a sinful object seems desirable is itself sin. How then can a sinless person really be tempted at all? Possibly an analysis of each temptation will furnish the answer. In each ease the appeal was a real appeal to a perfectly innocent natural instinct or appetite. In the first temptation, it was to hunger; in the second, to faith; in the third, to power as a means of establishing righteousness. In each ease, Jesus felt the tug and pull of the natural instinct; how insistent is the demand of hunger, for instance! Yet, when He perceived that the satisfaction of these desires was sinful under the conditions, He immediately refused their clamorous appeal. It was a glorious moral victory. It was not that He was metaphysically not able to sin, but that He was so pure that He was able not to sin. He did not prove in the wilderness that He could not be tempted, but that He could overcome the tempter. If it is then said that Jesus, never having sinned, can have no real sympathy with sinners, the answer is twofold: (1) Not he who falls at the first assault feels the full force of temptation, but he who, like Jesus, resists it through long years to the end. (2) Only the victor can help the vanquished; only he, who has felt the most dreadful assaults and yet has stood firm, can give the help needed by the fallen.

LITERATURE.

Broadus on Matthew in the place cited.; Rhees, Life of Jesus of Nazareth, secs. 91-96; Sanday, Outlines of the Life of Christ, section 13; Holtzmann, Hand-Commentar, I, 67 f; J. Weiss, Die Schriften des New Testament, I, 227 f; Weiss, Life of Christ, I, 337-54; Dods, article "Temptation," in DCG; Carvie, Expository Times, X (1898-99).

F. L. Anderson

TEN

(‘eser; deka).

See NUMBER.

TEN COMMANDMENTS, THE

I. THE TEN COMMANDMENTS, AN ISRAELITISH CODE

II. THE PROMULGATON OF THE DECALOGUE

III. ANALYSIS OF THE DECALOGUE WITH BRIEF EXEGETICAL NOTES

1. How Numbered

2. How Grouped

3. Original Form

4. Brief Exegetical Notes

IV. JESUS AND THE TEN COMMANDMENTS

LITERATURE

In the Old Testament the Decalogue is uniformly referred to as "the ten words" (Ex 34:28 margin; De 4:13 margin; 10:4 margin), or simply as "the words" spoken by Yahweh (Ex 20:1; 34:27; De 5:22; 10:2), or as "the words of the covenant" (Ex 34:28). In the New Testament they are called "commandments" (Mt 19:17; Eph 6:2), as with us in most Christian lands.

I. The Ten Commandments an Israelite Code.

The "ten words" were spoken by Yahweh to the people whom He had but recently delivered from Egyptian bondage, and then led out into the wilderness, that He might teach them His laws. It was to Israel that the Decalogue was primarily addressed, and not to all mankind. Thus, the reason assigned for keeping the 5th commandment applies to the people who were on their way to the land which had been given to Abraham and his descendants (Ex 20:12); and the 4th commandment is enforced by reference to the servitude in Egypt (De 5:15). It is possible, then, that even in the Ten Commandments there are elements peculiar to the Mosaic system and which our Lord and His apostles may not make a part of faith and duty for Christians.

See SABBATH.

Of the "ten words," seven were perhaps binding on the consciences of enlightened men prior to the days of Moses: murder, adultery, theft and false witness were already treated as crimes among the Babylonians and the Egyptians; and intelligent men knew that it was wrong to dishonor God by improper use of His name, or to show lack of respect to parents, or to covet the property of another. No doubt the sharp, ringing words in which these evils are forbidden in the Ten Commandments gave to

Israel a clearer apprehension of the sins referred to than they had ever had before; and the manner in which they were grouped by the divine speaker brought into bold relief the chief elements of the moral law. But the first two prohibitions were novelties in the religious life of the world; for men worshipped many gods, and bowed down to images of every conceivable kind. The 2nd commandment was too high even for Israel to grasp at that early day; a few weeks later the people were dancing about the golden calf at the foot of Sinai. The observance of the Sabbath was probably unknown to other nations, though it may have been already known in the family of Abraham.

II. The Promulgation of the Decalogue.

The "ten words" were spoken by Yahweh Himself from the top of the mount under circumstances the most awe-inspiring. In the early morning there were thunders and lightnings and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of a trumpet exceeding loud. It is no wonder that the people trembled as they faced the smoking and quaking mount, and listened to the high demands of a holy God. Their request that all future revelations should be made through Moses as the prophet mediator was quite natural. The promulgation of the Ten Commandments stands out as the most notable event in all the wilderness sojourn of Israel. There was no greater day in history before the coming of the Son of God into the world.

After a sojourn of 40 days in the mount, Moses came down with "the two tables of the testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." At the foot of the mount, when Moses saw the golden calf and the dancing throng about it, he cast the tables out of his hands and broke them in pieces (Ex 31:18; 39:15-20). Through the intercession of Moses, the wrath of Yahweh was averted from Israel; and Yahweh invited Moses to ascend the mount with two new tablets, on which He would write the words that were on the first tables, which were broken. Moses was commanded to write the special precepts given by God during this interview; but the. Ten Commandments were written on the stone tablets by Yahweh Himself (Ex 34:1-4,27-29; De 10:1-5). These precious tablets were later deposited in the ark of the covenant (Ex 40:20). Thus in every way possible the Ten Commandments are exalted as the most precious and directly divine of all the precepts of the Mosaic revelation.

III. Analysis of the Decalogue with Brief Exegetical Notes.

That there were "ten words" is expressly stated (Ex 34:28; De 4:13; 10:4); but just how to delimit them one from another is a task which has not been found easy. For a full discussion of the various theories, see Dillmann, Exodus, 201-5, to whom we are indebted for much that is here set forth.

1. How Numbered:

(1) Josephus is the first witness for the division now common among Protestants (except Lutherans), namely,

(a) foreign gods,

(b) images,

(c) name of God,

(d) Sabbath,

(e) parents,

(f) murder,

(g) adultery,

(h) theft,

(i) false witness,

(j) coveting.

Before him, Philo made the same arrangement, except that he followed the Septuagint in putting adultery before murder. This mode of counting was current with many of the church Fathers, and is now in use in the Greek Catholic church and with most Protestants.

(2) Augustine combined foreign gods and images (Ex 20:2-6) into one commandment and following the order of De 5:21 (Hebrew 18) made the 9th commandment a prohibition of the coveting of a neighbor's wife, while the 10th prohibits the coveting of his house and other property. Roman Catholics and Lutherans accept Augustine's mode of reckoning, except that they follow the order in Ex 20:17, so that the 9th commandment forbids the coveting of a neighbor's house, while the 10th includes his wife and all other property.

(3) A third mode of counting is that adopted by the Jews in the early Christian centuries, which became universal among them in the Middle Ages and so down to the present time. According to this scheme, the opening statement in Ex 20:2 is the "first word," Ex 20:3-6 the second (combining foreign gods with images), while the following eight commandments are as in the common Protestant arrangement.

The division of the prohibition of coveting into two commandments is fatal to the Augustinian scheme; and the reckoning of the initial statement in Ex 20:2 as one of the "ten words" seems equally fatal to the modern Jewish method of counting. The prohibition of images, which is introduced by the solemn formula, "Thou shalt not," is surely a different "word" from the command to worship no god other than Yahweh. Moreover, if nine of the "ten words" are commandments, it would seem reasonable to make the remaining "word" a commandment, if this can be done without violence to the subjectmatter. See Eerdmaus, The Expositor, July, 1909, 21 ff.

2. How Grouped:

(1) The Jews, from Philo to the present, divide the "ten words" into two groups of five each. As there were two tables, it would be natural to suppose that five commandments were recorded on each tablet, though the fact that the tablets had writing on both their sides (Ex 32:15) would seem to weaken the force of the argument for an equal division. Moreover, the first pentad, in the present text of Exodus and Deuteronomy, is more than four times as long as the second.

(2) Augustine supposed that there were three commandments on the first table and seven on the second. According to his method of numbering the commandments, this would put the command to honor parents at the head of the second table, as in the third method of grouping the ten words.

(3) Calvin and many moderns assign four commandments to the first table and six to the second. This has the advantage of assigning all duties to God to the first table and all duties to men to the second. It also accords with our Lord's reduction of the commandments to two (Mt 22:34-40).

3. Original Form:

A comparison of the text of the Decalogue in De 5 with that in Ex 20 reveals a goodly number of differences, especially in the reasons assigned for the observance of the 4th and 5th commandments, and in the text of the 10th commandment. A natural explanation of these differences is the fact that De employs the free-and-easy style of public discourse. The Ten Commandments are substantially the same in the two passages.

From the days of Ewald to the present, some of the leading Old Testament scholars have held that originally all the commandments were brief and without the addition of any special reasons for their observance. According to this hypothesis, the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, and the 10th commandments were probably as follows: "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image"; "Thou shalt not take the name of Yahweh thy God in vain"; "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy"; "Honor thy father and thy mother"; "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house." This early critical theory would account for the differences in the two recensions by supposing that the motives for keeping the 2nd, 3rd, 4th, and 5th commandments, as well as the expansion of the 10th, were additions made through the influence of the prophetic teaching. If accompanied by a full recognition of the divine origin of the ten words in the Mosaic era, this hypothesis might be acceptable to a thorough believer in revelation. Before acquiescing in the more radical theories of some recent scholars, such a believer will demand more cogent arguments than the critics have been able to bring forward. Thus when we are told that the Decalogue contains prohibitions that could not have been incorporated into a code before the days of Manasseh, we demand better proofs than the failure of Israel to live up to the high demands of the 2nd and the 10th commandments, or a certain theory of the evolution of the history that may commend itself to the mind of naturalistic critics. Yahweh was at work in the early history of Israel; and the great prophets of the 8th century, far from creating ethical monotheism, were reformers sent to demand that Israel should embody

in daily life the teachings of the Torah.

Goethe advanced the view that Ex 34:10-28 originally contained a second decalogue.

Wellhausen (Code of Hammurabi, 331 f) reconstructs this so-called decalogue as follows:

(1) Thou shalt worship no other god (Ex 34:14).

(2) Thou shalt make thee no molten gods (Ex 34:17).

(3) The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep (Ex 34:18 a).

(4) Every firstling is mine (Ex 34:19 a).

(5) Thou shalt observe the feast of weeks (Ex 34:22 a).

(6) And the feast of ingathering at the year's end (Ex 34:22c).

(7) Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread (Ex 34:25 a).

(8) The fat of my feast shall not remain all night until the morning (23:18b; compare 34:25b).

(9) The best of the first-fruits of thy ground shalt thou bring to the house of Yahweh thy God (Ex 34:26 a).

(10) Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk (Ex 34:26).

Addis agrees with Wellhausen that even this simpler decalogue must be put long after the time of Moses (EB, 1051).

Now, it is evident that the narrative in Ex 34:27 f, in its present form, means to affirm that Moses was commanded to write the precepts contained in the section immediately preceding. The Ten Commandments, as the foundation of the covenant, were written by Yahweh Himself on the two tablets of stone (Ex 31:18; 32:15 f; 34:28). It is only by free critical handling of the narrative that it can be made to appear that Moses wrote on the two tables the supposed decalogue of Ex 34:14-26. Moreover, the law of the Sabbath (34:21), which is certainly appropriate amid the ritual ordinances of Ex 34, must be omitted altogether, in order to reduce the precepts to ten; also the command in 34:23 has to be deleted. It is interesting to observe that the prohibition of molten gods (34:17), even according to radical critics, is found in the earliest body of Israelite laws. There is no sufficient reason for denying that the 2nd commandment was promulgated in the days of Moses. Yahweh's requirements have always been in advance of the practice of His people.

4. Brief Exegetical Notes:

(1) The 1st commandment prohibits the worship of any god other than Yahweh. If it be said that this precept inculcates monolatry and not monotheism, the reply is ready to hand that a consistent worship of only one God is, for a people surrounded by idolaters, the best possible approach to the conclusion that there is only one true God. The organs of revelation, whatever may have been the notions and practices of the mass of the Israelite people, always speak in words that harmonize with a strict monotheism.

(2) The 2nd commandment forbids the use of images in worship; even an image of Yahweh is not to be tolerated (compare Ex 32:5). Yahweh's mercy is greater than His wrath; while the iniquity of the fathers descends to the third and the fourth generation for those who hate Yahweh, His mercy overflows to thousands who love Him. It is doubtful whether the rendering 'showing mercy to the thousandth generation' (Ex 20:6) can be successfully defended.

(3) Yahweh's name is sacred, as standing for His person; therefore it must be employed in no vain or false way. The commandment, no doubt, includes more than false swearing. Cursing, blasphemy and every profane use of Yahweh's name are forbidden.

(4) As the 1st commandment inculcates the unity of God and the 2nd His spirituality, so also the 3rd commandment guards His name against irreverent use and the 4th sets apart the seventh day as peculiarly His day, reserved for a Sabbath. Ex 20:11 emphasizes the religious aspect of the Sabbath, while De 5:14 lays stress on its humane aspect, and De 5:15 links it with the deliverance from bondage in Egypt.

(5) The transition from duties to God to duties to men is made naturally in the 5th commandment, which inculcates reverence for parents, to whom their children should look up with gratitude, as all men should toward the Divine Father.

(6) Human life is so precious and sacred that no man should dare to take it away by violence.

(7) The family life is safeguarded by the 7th commandment.

(8) The 8th commandment forbids theft in all its forms. It recognizes the right of personal ownership of property.

(9) The 9th commandment safeguards honor and good name among men. Slander, defamation, false testimony in court and kindred sins are included.

(10) The 10th commandment is the most searching of them all, for it forbids the inward longing, the covetous desire for what belongs to another. The presence of such a deeply spiritual command among the "ten words" shows that we have before us no mere code of laws defining crimes, but a body of

ethical and spiritual precepts for the moral education of the people of Yahweh.

IV. Jesus and the Ten Commandments.

Our Lord, in the interview with the rich young ruler, gave a recapitulation of the commandments treating of duties to men (Mr 10:19; Mt 19:18 f; Lu 18:20). He quotes the 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th commandments. The minor variations in the reports in the three Synoptic Gospels remind the student of the similar variations in Ex 20 and De 5. Already in the Sermon on the Mount Jesus had quoted the 6th and 7th commandments, and then had gone on to show that anger is incipient murder, and that lust is adultery in the heart (Mt 5:27-32). He takes the words of the Decalogue and extends them into the realm of thought and feeling. He may have had in mind the 3rd commandment in His sharp prohibition of the Jewish habit of swearing by various things (Mt 5:33-37). As to the Sabbath, His teaching and example tended to lighten the onerous restrictions of the rabbis (Mr 2:23-28). Duty to parents He elevated above all supposed claims of vows and offerings (Mt 15:4-6). In further extension of the 8th commandment, Jesus said, "Do not defraud" (Mr 10:19); and in treating of the ethics of speech, Jesus not only condemns false witness, but also includes railing, blasphemy, and even an idle word (Mt 15:19; 12:31,36 f). In His affirmation that God is spirit (Joh 4:24), Jesus made the manufacture of images nothing but folly. All his ethical teaching might be said to be founded on the 10th commandment, which tracks sin to its lair in the mind and soul of man.

Our Lord embraced the whole range of human obligation in two, or at most three, commands: (1) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind"; (2) "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Mt 22:37-40; compare De 6:5; Le 19:18). With love such as is here described in the heart, man cannot trespass against God or his fellow-men. At the close of His ministry, on the night of the betrayal, Jesus gave to His followers a third commandment, not different from the two on which the whole Law hangs, but an extension of the second great commandment upward into a higher realm of self-sacrifice (Joh 13:34 f; 15:12 f, 17; compare Eph 5:2; Ga 6:10; 1Joh 3:14-18). "Thou shalt love" is the first word and the last in the teaching of our Lord. His teaching is positive rather than negative, and so simple that a child can understand it. For the Christian, the Decalogue is no longer the highest summary of human duty. He must ever read it with sincere respect as one of the great monuments of the love of God in the moral and religious education of mankind; but it has given place to the higher teaching of the Son of God, all that was permanently valuable in the Ten Commandments having been taken up into the teaching of our Lord and His apostles.

LITERATURE.

Oehler, Old Testament Theology, I, 267 ff; Dillmann, Exodus-Leviticus, 200-219; Kuenen, Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch, 244; Wellhausen, Code of Hammurabi, 331 f; Rothstein, Das Bundesbuch; Baenstch, Das Bundesbuch; Meissaner, Der Dekalog; Driver, "Deuteronomy," ICC; Addis, Documents of the Hexateuch, I, 136 ff; R. W. Dale, The Ten Commandments; G. D. Boardman, University Lectures on the Ten Commandments (Philadelphia, 1889).

John Richard Sampey

TEN STRINGS

(‘asor).

See MUSIC, I, 1, (2), (c).

TENDER

ten’-der: The usua1 (11 out of 16 times) translation of rakh, "soft," "delicate," with the noun rokh, in De 28:56 and the verb rakhakh, in 2Ki 22:19 parallel 2Ch 34:27. Attention need be called only to the following cases: In Ge 29:17, "Leah’s eyes were tender," a physical defect is described ("weak-eyed"; see BLINDNESS). "Tender-hearted" in 2Ch 13:7 means "faint-hearted," while in 2Ki 22:19 parallel 2Ch 34:27 ("because thy heart was tender"), it means "penitent." Contrast the modern use in Eph 4:32.

Throughout Psalms (10 times) and Proverbs (12:10), but not elsewhere (the King James Version has "tender love" in Da 1:9, the Revised Version (British and American) "compassion"), English Versions of the Bible translate rachamim, "bowels," by "tender mercies," and this translation has been carried into the New Testament as "tender mercy" (the Revised Version margin "heart of mercy") for the corresponding Greek phrase splagchna eleous ("bowels of mercy") in Lu 1:78; compare "tenderhearted" for eusplagchnos ("right boweled") in Eph 4:32, based upon the idea of psychology widely spread among Semitic people, which considers the "bowels" (qerebh) as the seat of all tender emotions of kindness and mercy: See BOWELS. the King James Version also has "of tender mercy" in Jas 5:11 without justification in the Greek (oiktirmon, the Revised Version (British and American) "merciful").

Other special phrases: "tender grape" in the King James Version, So 2:13,15; 7:12, for cemadhar. The meaning of the word is not quite certain, but Revised Margin’s "blossom" (except 7:12 margin) is probably right. "Tender grass" in 2Sa 23:4; Pr 27:25; the Revised Version (British and American) De 32:2 (the King James Version "tender herb"); Isa 15:6; 66:14 for deshe’ "grass" (Aramaic dethe’, Da 4:15,23). The context in these passages and the meaning of the cognates of deshe’ in other Semitic languages make this translation probable, but Revised Version’s usage is not consistent (compare Ge 1:11,12; Job 6:5; Ps 23:2, etc.). Isa, 53:2 has "tender plant" for yoneq, "a sapling," while Job 14:7 has "tender branch" for the allied word yoneqeth, usually rendered "shoot" (Job 8:16, etc.). Finally, "tender" in Mr 13:28 parallel Mt 24:32 is for hapalos, "soft." The running sap of springtime softens the branches that were stiff during the winter.

The verb "tender" occurs in 2 Macc 4:2, the King James Version "(he had) tendered his own nation," in the modern sense of "tend." The translation is a paraphrase of the noun kedemon, "a protector," the Revised Version (British and American) "the guardian of his fellow-countrymen."

Burton Scott Easton

TENON

ten’-un (yadh): This word, occurring in Ex 26 and 36, is used in the account of the tabernacle to describe the "hand" or yadh by which its 48 boards were kept in place. Each board had two tenons which were mortised into it (Ex 36:22 margin). These tenons would be made of harder wood than the acacia, so as better to stand the strain of wind and weather. When in use the tenons were sunk into the "sockets" (which see), and allowed of a speedy reerection of the tabernacle at its every remove.

Sockets are also mentioned as in use for the standards of the tabernacle court (Ex 27:10), but there is no mention of tenons. It may be that the base of each standard was let into its socket, without the use of any tenon. This would give it sufficient stability, as the height of each standard was but 5 cubits (7 1/2 ft.) (Ex 27:18).

For Professor A. R. S. Kennedy’s different theory of "tenons," see TABERNACLE, and his own article on the "Tabernacle" in HDB, IV.

W. Shaw Caldecott

TENT

tent (’ohel; skene; ‘ohel is a derivative of ‘ahal, "to be clear," "to shine"; hence, ‘ohel, "to be conspicuous from a distance"): In the great stretches of uncultivated lands in the interior of Syria or Arabia, which probably have much the same aspect today as in Abraham’s time, it is an easy matter to espy an encampment of roving Bedouin, "a nation .... that dwelleth without care .... that have neither gates nor bars" (Jer 49:31). The peaks of their black (compare So 1:5) goats’ hair tents stand out in contrast against the lighter colors of the soil.

There seems to be little doubt about the antiquity of the Arab tent, and one can rightly believe that-the dwelling-places of Abraham, Sarah, Jacob, and their descendants were made on the same pattern and of the same materials (Ge 4:20; 9:27; 12:8; 13:3; 18:6; 31:25,30; Ps 78:55; Heb 11:9, etc.). Long after the children of Israel had given up their tents for houses they continued to worship in tents (2Sa 7:1-6; 2Ch 1:3,4) (for the use of tents in connection with religious observances see TABERNACLE).

The Arab tents (called bait sha‘r, "house of hair") are made of strips of black goats’ hair cloth, sewed together into one large piece (see GOATS’ HAIR; WEAVING). Poles are placed under this covering at intervals to hold it from the ground, and it is stretched over these poles by ropes of goats hair or hemp (compare Job 4:21; Isa 54:2; Jer 10:20) "fastened to hard-wood pins driven into the ground (Isa 54:2; Jud 4:21; 5:26). A large wooden mallet for driving the pegs is part of the regular camp equipment (Jud 4:21; 5:26). The sides (curtains) of the tent (Isa 54:2) are made of strips of goats hair cloth or from mats woven from split cane or rushes (see Illustration, p. 2948). Where more than one family occupies the same tent or the animals are provided with shelter under the same roof (compare 2Ch 14:15), curtains of

the same materials mentioned above form the dividing walls. A corner of the matting where two ends meet is turned back to form the door of the tent (Ge 18:1). In the summer time the walls are mostly removed. New tents are not water-proof, and the condition of the interior after a heavy rain is not far from squalid. The tent material becomes matted by use, especially if wool has been woven into the fabric, and is then a better protection against the rain. It is the women's duty to pitch the tents.

The poorer Arabs have no mats to cover the ground under their tents. Straw mats, goats' hair or woolen rugs (compare Jud 4:18), more or less elaborate as the taste and means of the family allow, are the usual coverings for the tent floor. The food supplies are usually kept in goats' hair bags, the liquids, as oil or milk products, in skins. One or two tinned copper cooking-vessels, a shallow tray of the same material, a coffee set consisting of roasting pan, mortar and pestle, boiling-pot and cups, make up the usual camp furniture. The more thrifty include bedding in their equipment, but this increases the difficulties of moving, since it might require more than the one animal, sometimes only a donkey, which carries all the earthly belongings of the family. A sheikh or chief has several tents, one for himself and guests, separate ones for his wives and female servants, and still others for his animals (compare Ge 31:33).

Other Hebrew words translated "tent" are forms of chanah (Nu 13:19; 1Sa 17:53; 2Ki 7:16; 2Ch 31:2; Zec 14:15); cukkah (2Sa 11:11; 22:12); mishkenoth (So 1:8).

Figurative: "Neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there" typified utter desolation (Isa 13:20). "Enlarge the place of thy tent .... stretch forth the curtains .... lengthen thy cords .... strengthen thy stakes" prophesied an increase in numbers and prosperity of God's people (Isa 54:2; compare 33:20; Lu 16:9; 2Co 5:4). Tent cords plucked up denoted death. (Job 4:21). Jer 10:20 is a picture of a destroyed household as applied to Judah. Hezekiah in his sickness bewails that his dwelling (life) had been carried away as easily as a shepherd's tent is plucked up (Isa 38:12). Isaiah compared the heavens to a tent spread out (Isa 40:22). "They shall pitch their tents against her" i.e. they shall make war (Jer 6:3).

James A. Patch

TENT-MAKER

tent'-mak-er (~skenopoios): Mentioned only once (Ac 18:3). Paul's native province of Cilicia was noted for its goats' hair cloth which was exported under the name of cilicium and was used largely for tentmaking. We are told in the passage mentioned that Paul dwelt with Aquila and Priscilla, and worked with them at tent-making (compare Ac 20:34).

See also CRAFTS, II, 18.

TENTH

See TITHE.

TENTH DEAL

del (‘issaron): The tenth part of an ephah, and so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) (Nu 28; 29). It was used in connection with the sacrifices for measuring flour.

TEPHON te’-fon (he Tepho): In 1 Macc 9:50, a city of Judea fortified by Bacchides, probably the "Beth-tappuah" of Jos 15:53, near Hebron. Josephus (Ant., XII, i, 3) calls it "Tochoa."

TERAH (1)

te’-ra (terach; Septuagint Tharra, or (with New Testament) Thara; on the name see especially HDB, under the word): The son of Nahor and father of Abraham, Nahor and Haran (Ge 11:24 f). At Abraham’s birth Terah was 70 years old (Ge 11:26), and after Abraham’s marriage, Terah, Abraham, Sarah and Lot emigrated from Ur of the Chaldees on the road into the land of Canaan, but stopped in Haran (Ge 11:31). When Abraham was 75 years old he and his nephew resumed their journey, leaving Terah in Haran, where 60 years later he died (Ge 11:32). Stephen, however, states (Ac 7:4) that Terah was dead when Abraham left Haran, an impression that is easily gained from Ge 11-12 if the dates are not computed. As there is no reason to suppose that Stephen was granted inspiration that would preserve him from such a purely formal error, the contradiction is of no significance and attempts at "reconciliation" are needless. In particular, the attempt of Blass (Stud. u. Krit., 1896, 460 ff) to alter the text of Ac is quite without foundation. For further discussion see especially Knowling, The Expositor’s Greek Testament, at the place It is worth noting that Philo makes the same error (Migr. Abr. 177 (section 32)), perhaps indicating some special Jewish tradition of New Testament times. In Jos 24:2 Terah is said to have been an idolater. In Jubilees 12 this is softened into explaining that through fear of his life Terah was forced to yield outward conformity to the idolatrous worship of his neighbors. On the other hand certain Jewish legends (e.g. Ber. Rab. 17) represent Terah as actually a maker of idols. Otherwise in the Bible Terah is mentioned only by name in 1Ch 1:26; Lu 3:34.

Burton Scott Easton

TERAH (2)

(Codex Vaticanus Tarath; Codex Alexandrinus Tharath): A wilderness camp of the Israelites between Tahath and Mithkah (Nu 33:27,28).

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

TERAPHIM

ter’-a-fim.

See ASTROLOGY; DIVINATION; IMAGES.

TEREBINTH

ter’-e-binth:

(1) ‘elah (Isa 6:13, the King James Version "teil tree"; Ho 4:13, the King James Version "elms"); in Ge 35:4 (the King James Version "oak"); Jud 6:11,19; 9:6 (the King James Version "plain"); 2Sa 18:9,10,14; 1Ki 13:14; 1Ch 10:12; Isa 1:30; Eze 6:13, translated "oak," and in margin "terebinth"; "vale of Elah," margin "the terebinth" in 1Sa 17:2,19; 21:9.

(2) ‘elim (Isa 1:29, "oaks," margin "terebinths").

(3) ‘allah (Jos 24:26, English Versions of the Bible have "oak," but the Septuagint terebinthos).

(4) ‘elon, "oak (margin, "terebinth") of Zaanannim" (Jos 19:33; Jud 4:11); "oak (the Revised Version margin "terebinth," the King James Version "plain") of Tabor" (1Sa 10:3); also Ge 12:6; 13:18; 14:13; 1Sa 10:3; De 11:30; Jud 6:19 all translated "oak" or "oaks," with margin "terebinth" or "terebinths."

(5) In Ge 14:6 Septuagint has terebinthos, as the translation of the el of El-paran.

(6) In Ecclesiasticus 24:16 terem (b)inthos, the King James Version turpentine tree," the Revised Version (British and American) "terebinth."

It is clear that the translators are uncertain which translation is correct, and it would seem not improbable that then there was no clear distinction between oak and terebinth in the minds of the Old Testament. writers; yet the two are very different trees to any but the most superficial observation.

The terebinth—Pistacia terebinthus (Natural Order, Anacardiaceae), Arabic Butm]—is a tree allied to the P. vera, which produces the pistachio nut, and to the familiar "pepper tree" (Schinus molle) so extensively cultivated in modern Palestine. Like the latter the terebinth has red berries, like small immature grapes. The leaves are pinnate, four to six pairs, and they change color and fall in autumn, leaving the trunk bare (compare Isa 1:30). The terebinth is liable to be infected by many showy galls, some varieties looking like pieces of red coral. In Palestine, this tree assumes noble proportions, especially in situations when, from its association with some sacred tomb, it is allowed to flourish undisturbed. It is in such situations not infrequently as much as 40 ft. high and spreads its branches, with their thick, dark-green foliage, over a wide area (compare 2Sa 18:9 f, 14; Ecclesiasticus 24:16). Dwarfed trees occur among the brushwood all over the land.

From this tree a kind of turpentine is obtained, hence, the alternative name "turpentine tree" (Ecclesiasticus 24:16 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "terebinth").

E. W. G. Masterman

TERESH

te’-resh (teresh (Es 2:21; 6:2); Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, and Codex Sinaiticus omit it; but Codex Sinaiticus’ margin has Tharas and Tharras): A chamberlain of King Ahasuerus. Oppert compares the name with Tiri-dates, the name of the governor of Persepolis in the time of Alexander. Another explanation identifies it with the Persian word turs "firm"; Scheft links it with the Persian tarsha, "desire."

TERRACE

ter’-as (mecillah): Solomon is said, in 2Ch 9:11, to have made of the algum trees brought him from Ophir "terraces," or raised walks, for the house of Yahweh. In the parallel 1Ki 10:12, the word used is rendered "pillars," margin "‘a railing’; Hebrew ‘a prop.’"

TERRIBLE, TERROR

ter’-i-b’l, ter’-er (yare’," to be feared," "reverenced," arits, "powerful," "tyrannical," ‘ayom, "aweinspiring," chittith "terror," ballahah, "a worn-out or wasted thing," ‘emah, "fright"; phoberos, "dreadful," phobos, "fear"): The above terms, and many others which employed, denote whatever, by horrible aspect, or by greatness, power, or cruelty, affrights men (De 1:19; 26:8; Da 2:31). God is terrible by reason of His awful greatness, His infinite power, His inscrutable dealings, His perfect holiness, His covenant faithfulness, His strict justice and fearful judgments (Ex 34:10; De 7:21; Ne 9:32; Job 6:4; 37:22; Ps 65:5; 88:15 f; Joe 2:11; Ze 2:11; Heb 12:21). The term is also applied to the enemies of God and of His people (Isa 13:11; 25:3 ff; 49:25; Da 7:7; 1Pe 3:14). "The terror (the Revised Version (British and American) "fear") of the Lord" (2Co 5:11) denotes the reverence or fear inspired by the thought that Christ is judge (2Co 5:10).

M. O. Evans

TERTIUS

tur’-shi-us (Tertios): The amanuensis of Paul who wrote at his dictation the Epistle to the Romans. In the midst of Paul’s greetings to the Christians in Rome he interpolated his own, "I Tertius, who write the epistle, salute you in the Lord" (Ro 16:22). "It is as a Christian, not in virtue of any other relation he has to the Romans, that Tertius salutes them" (Denney). Some identify him with Silas, owing to the fact that shalish is the Hebrew for "third (officer)," as tertius is the Latin Others think he was a Roman Christian residing in Corinth. This is, however, merely conjecture. Paul seems to have dictated his letters to an amanuensis, adding by his own hand merely the concluding sentences as "the token in every

epistle" (2Th 3:17; Col 4:18; 1Co 16:21). How far this may have influenced the style of his letters is discussed in Sanday-Headlam, Romans, Introduction, LX.

S. F. Hunter

TERTULLUS

ter-tul’-us, ter- (Tertullos, diminutive of Latin tertius, "third"):, An orator who descended with Ananias the high priest and elders from Jerusalem to Caesarea to accuse Paul before Felix the Roman governor (Ac 24:1). Tertullus was a hired pleader whose services were necessary that the case for the Jews might be stated in proper form. Although he bore a Roman name, he was not necessarily a Roman; Roman names were common both among Greeks and Jews, and most orators were at this time of eastern extraction. Nor is it definitely to be concluded from the manner of his speech (Ac 24:2-8) that he was a Jew; it has always been customary for lawyers to identify themselves in their pleading with their clients. His speech before Felix is marked by considerable ingenuity. It begins with an adulation of the governorship of Felix that was little in accord with history (see FELIX); and the subsequent argument is an example of how a strong case may apparently be made out by the skillful manipulation of half-truths. Thus the riot at Jerusalem was ascribed to the sedition-mongering of Paul, who thereby proved himself an enemy of Roman rule and Jewish religion, both of which Felix was pledged to uphold. Again, the arrest of Paul was not an act of mob violence, but was legally carried out by the high priests and elders in the interests of peace; and but for the unwarranted interference of Lysias (see LYSIAS), they would have dealt with the prisoner in their own courts and thus have avoided trespassing on the time of Felix. They were, however, perfectly willing to submit the whole case to his jurisdiction. It is interesting to compare this speech of Tertullus with the true account, as given in Ac 21:27-35, and also with the letter of Lysias (Ac 23:26-30).

C. M. Kerr

TESTAMENT

tes’-ta-ment: The word diatheke, almost invariably rendered "covenant," was rendered in the King James Version "testament" in Heb 9:16,17, in the sense of a will to dispose of property after the maker’s death. It is not easy to find justification for the retention of this translation in the Revised Version (British and American), "especially in a book which is so impregnated with the language of the Septuagint as the Epistle to the Hebrews" (Hatch).

See COVENANT, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TESTAMENT OF ISAAC

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. IV, 3.

TESTAMENT, NEW, CANON OF THE

See CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TESTAMENT, NEW, TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE

See TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

TESTAMENT, OLD, CANON OF THE

See CANON OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

TESTAMENT, OLD, TEXT OF THE

See TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. IV, 1.

TESTAMENTS, BETWEEN THE

See BETWEEN THE TESTAMENTS.

TESTIMONY, ARK OF THE

tes’-ti-mo-ni (Ex 25:21 f).

See ARK OF THE COVENANT.

TETA

te’-ta. See ATETA.

TETH

teth (T): The 9th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "T" (a more intense "t"). It came also to be used for the number 9; and with waw ("w") for 15, with zayin ("z") for 16 (i.e. 9 plus 6 and 9 plus 7) to avoid forming regular series with the abbreviation for Yahweh. For name, etc.,

see ALPHABET.

TETRARCH

te’-trark, tet’-rark tetrarches): As the name indicates it signifies a prince, who governs one-fourth of a domain or kingdom. The Greeks first used the word. Thus Philip of Macedon divided Thessaly into four "tetrarchies." Later on the Romans adopted the term and applied it to any ruler of a small principality. It is not synonymous with "ethnarch" at least the Romans made a distinction between Herod "tetrarch" of Galilee, Philip "tetrarch" of Trachonitis, Lysanias "tetrarch" of Abilene, and Archelaius "ethnarch" of Judea (BJ, II, vi, 3; Ant, XVII, xi, 4). The title was often conferred on Herodian princes by the Romans, and sometimes it was used courteously as a synonym for king (Mt 14:9; Mr 6:14). In the same way a "tetrarchy" was sometimes called a kingdom.

Henry E. Dosker

TETTER

tet’-er (bohaq; alphos): The term "freckled spot" in the King James Version is thus rendered in the Revised Version (British and American). The eruption referred to in Le 13:39 is a pale white spot on the skin. This is described by Gorraeus as an eruption arising from a diseased state of the system without roughness of skin, scales or ulceration. It did not render the sufferer unclean, although it is difficult of cure. The disease is commonly known by its Latin name vitiligo. Pliny recommended the use of capers and lupins to remove it.

See FRECKLED SPOT; LEPROSY.

TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

I. SOURCES OF EVIDENCE FOR THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. Autographs of the New Testament Writers

2. Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament

3. Greek Copies or Manuscripts of the New Testament Text

4. List of Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament

(1) Uncials

(2) Minuscules

5. Vernacular Versions

6. Patristic Quotations

7. Lectionaries and Service-Books

II. NECESSITY OF SIFTING AND CRITICIZING THE EVIDENCE

III. METHODS OF CRITICAL PROCEDURE

IV. HISTORY OF THE PROCESS

LITERATURE

The literary evidence to the text of the New Testament is vastly more abundant than that to any other series of writings of like compass in the entire range of ancient letters. Of the sacred books of the Hebrew Bible there is no known copy antedating the 10th century AD. Of Homer there is no complete copy earlier than the 13th century. Of Herodotus there is no manuscript earlier than the 10th century. Of Vergil but one copy is earlier than the 4th century, and but a fragment of all Cicero’s writings is even as old as this. Of the New Testament, however, we have two splendid manuscripts of the 4th century, at least ten of the 5th, twentyfive of the 6th and in all a total of more than four thousand copies in whole or in part of the Greek New Testament. To these copies of the text itself may be added the very important and even more ancient evidence of the versions of the New Testament in the Latin, Syriac, and Egyptian tongues, and the quotations and clear references to the New Testament readings found in the works of the early Church Fathers, as well as the inscriptions and monumental data in Syria, Asia Minor, Africa, Italy, and Greece, dating from the very age of the apostles and their immediate successors. It thus appears that the documents of the Christian faith are both so many and so widely scattered that these very facts more than any others have embarrassed the final determination of the text. Now however, the science of textual criticism has so far advanced and the textual problems of the Greek Testament have been so well traversed that one may read the Christian writings with an assurance approximating certainty.

Professor Eberhard Nestle speaks of the Greek text of the New Testament issued by Westcott and Hort as the "nearest in its approach to the goal." Professor Alexander Souter’s student’s edition of the Revisers’ Greek New Testament, Oxford, 1910, no doubt attains even a higher watermark. It is the purpose of the present article to trace, as far as it can be done in a clear and untechnical manner, the process of connection between the original writings and this, one of the latest of the editions of the Greek New Testament.

I. Sources of Evidence for the Text of the New Testament.

1. Autographs of the New Testament Writers:

Until very recent times it has not been customary to take up with any degree of confidence, if at all, the subject of New Testament autographs, but since the researches in particular of Dalman, Deissmann, Moulton (W. F.) and Milligan (George), the task is not only appropriate but incumbent upon the careful student. The whole tendency of recent investigation is to give less place to the oral tradition of Christ's life and teaching and to press back the date of the writing of the Synoptic Gospels into the period falling between Pentecost and the destruction of Jerusalem. Sir William M. Ramsay goes so far as to claim that "antecedent probability founded on the general character of personal and contemporary Greek of Gr-Asiatic society" would indicate that the first Christian account of the circumstances connected with the death of Jesus must be presumed to have been written in the year when Jesus died" (Letters to the Seven Churches, 7). W. M. Flinders Petrie argues to the same end and says: "Some generally accepted Gospels must have been in circulation before 60 AD. The mass of briefer records and Logia which the habits and culture of that age would produce must have been welded together within 10 or 20 years by the external necessities" (The Growth of the Gospels, 7).

The autographs of the New Testament writers have long been lost, but the discovery during the last few years of contemporary documents enables us to form fairly clear notions as to their general literary character and condition. In the first place papyrus was probably the material employed by all the New Testament writers, even the original Gospel of Matthew and the general Epistle of James, the only books written within Palestine, not being excepted, for the reason that they were not originally written with a view to their liturgical use, in which case vellum might possibly have been employed. Again the evidence of the writings themselves witnesses to the various literary processes followed during the 1st century. Dictation was largely followed by Paul, the names of at least four of his secretaries, Tertius, Sosthenes, Timothy, and Sylvanus, being given, while the master himself, as in many of the Egyptian papyri, appended his own signature, sometimes with a sentence or two at the end. The method of personal research was pursued, as well as compilation of diverse data including folklore and genealogies, together with the grouping of cognate matters in artistic forms and abundant quotation in writings held in high esteem by the readers, as in the First and Third Gospels and the Book of Acts. The presentation copy of one's works must have been written with unusual pains in case of their dedication to a patrician patron, as Luke to "most excellent Theophilus." For speculation as to the probable dimensions of the original papyrus rolls of New Testament books, one will find Professor J. Rendel Harris and Sir F. G. Kenyon extremely suggestive, and from opposite viewpoints; compare Kenyon, Handbook of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament; Harris, New Testament Autographs.

Comparatively few papyrus fragments of the New Testament are now known to be extant, and no complete book of the New Testament has as yet been found, though the successes in the field of contemporary Greek writings inspire confidence that ere long the rubbish heaps of Egypt will reward the diligent explorer. Of the Septuagint (Greek Old Testament) somewhat more has come to light than the New Testament, while the papyrus copies and fragments of Homer are almost daily increasing.

The list below is condensed from that of Sir Frederick G. Kenyon's Handbook of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 2nd edition, 1912, 41 ff, using Dr. Gregory's method of notation.

2. Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New Testament:

P1 Mt 1:1-9,12,14-20. 3rd century. Found at Oxyrhynchus in 1896, now in the University of Pennsylvania.

See illustration under PAPYRUS.

P2 Joh 12:12-15 in Greek on the verso, with Lu 7:18 ff in Sahidic on the recto. 5th or 6th century. In book form, at the Museo Archeologico, Florence.

P3 Lu 7:36-43; 10:38-42. 6th century. In book form. In the Rainer Collection, Vienna.

P4 Lu 1:74-80; 5:3-8,30-6:4. 4th century. In book form. Found in Egypt joined to a manuscript of Philo; now in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris.

P5 Joh 1:23-31,33-41; 20:11-17,19-25. 3rd century. An outer sheet of a single-quire book. Found at Oxyrhynchus and now in the British Museum.

P6 Joh 11:45. University of Strassburg.

P7 Lu 4:1,2. Archaeological Museum at Kieff.

P8 Ac 4:31-37; 5:2-9; 6:1-6,8-15. 4th century. In the Berlin Museum.

P9 1 Joh 4:11-13,15-17. 4th or 5th century. In book form. Found at Oxyrhynchus; now in Harvard University Library.

P10 Ro 1:1-7. 4th century. Found at Oxyrhynchus; now in Harvard University Library.

P11 1Co 1:17-20; 6:13-18; 7:3,4,10-14. 5th century. In the Imperial Library at Petersburg.

P12 Heb 1:1. 3d or 4th century. In the Amherst Library.

P13 Heb 2:14-5:5; 10:8-11:13; 11:28-12:17. 3rd or 4th century. Found at Oxyrhynchus; now in the British Museum.

P14:1Co 1:25-27; 2:3-8; 3:8-10,20. 5th century. In book form; at Catherine’s Monastery, Mt. Sinai.

P15:1Co 7:18-8:4; Php 3:9-17; 4:2-8. 4th century. Found at Oxyrhynchus.

P16 Ro 12:3-8. 6th or 7th century. Ryland's Library, Manchester.

P17 Tit 1:11-15; 2:3-8. 3rd century. Ryland's Library, Manchester.

P18 Heb 9:12-19. 4th century. Found at Oxyrhynchus.

P19 Re 1:4-7. 3rd or 4th century. Found at Oxyrhynchus.

3. Greek Copies or Manuscripts of the New Testament Text:

Greek copies or manuscripts of the New Testament text have hitherto been and probably will continue to be the chief source of data in this great field. For determining the existence of the text in its most ancient form the autographs are of supreme value. For determining the content or extent of the text the versions are of highest worth. For estimating the meaning and at the same time for gaining additional data, both as to existence and extent of usage of the New Testament, the quotations of its text by the Church Fathers, whether as apologists, preachers, or historians, in Assyria, Greece, Africa, Italy or Gaul, are of exceeding importance. But for determining the readings of the text itself the Greek manuscripts or copies of the original autographs are still the principal evidence of criticism. About 4,000 manuscripts, in whole or in part, of the Greek New Testament are now known. These manuscripts furnish abundant evidence for determining the reading of practically the entire New Testament, while for the Gospels and most important Epistles the evidence is unprecedented for quantity and for clearness. They are usually divided into two classes: Uncial, or large hand, and Minuscule, or small hand, often called Cursive. The term "cursive" is not satisfactory, since it does not coordinate with the term "uncial," nor are so-called cursive features such as ligatures and oval forms confined to minuscule manuscripts. The uncials comprise about 140 copies extending from the 4th to the 10th centuries. The minuscules include the remaining manuscripts and fall between the 9th century and the invention of printing. Herewith is given a brief description of a few of the chief manuscripts, both uncial and minuscule, of the New Testament.

4. List of Manuscripts of the Greek New Testament:

(1) Uncials.

Codex Sinaiticus found by Tischendorf at Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai and now in the Imperial Library at Petersburg; 4th century. This is the only uncial which contains the New Testament entire. It also has the Epistle of Barnabas and part of the Shepherd of Hermas and possibly originally the Didache. The marks of many correctors are found in the text. It is written on 147 1/2 leaves of very thin vellum in four narrow columns of 48 lines each. The pages measure 15 X 13 1/2 in., and the leaves are arranged in quaternions of four sheets. The open sheet exposing eight columns resembles greatly an open papyrus roll. There is but rudimentary punctuation and no use of accent or initial letters, but the Eusebian section numbers are found on the margin of the Gospels.

Codex Alexandrinus (A), so named since it was supposed to have come from Alexandria, being the gift

of Cyril Lucar, at one time Patriarch of that Province, though later of Constantinople, to Charles I, through the English ambassador at the Turkish court in 1627, and in 1757 presented to the Royal Library and now in the British Museum. It doubtless belongs to the 5th century, and contained the entire New Testament, lacking now only portions of Matthew, John, and 1 Corinthians, as well as the two Epistles of Clement of Rome and the Psalm of Solomon. It is written on thin vellum in two columns of 41 lines to the page, which is 12 5/8 X 10 3/8 in.; employs frequent initial capitals, and is divided into paragraphs, but has no marginal signs except in the Gospels. Several different hands are discovered in the present state of the MS.

Codex Vaticanus (B), since 1481, at least, the chief treasure of the Vatican Library, and universally esteemed to be the oldest and best manuscript of the Greek New Testament; 4th century. Written on very fine vellum, the leaves nearly square in shape, 10 X 10 1/2 in., with three narrow columns of 40-44 lines per column and five sheets making the quire. A part of the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Pastorals, Philemon and Revelation are lacking. It is without accents, breathings or punctuation, though corrected and retraced by later hands. In the Gospels the divisions are of an earlier date than in Codex Sinaiticus. The theory of Tischendorf that Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus were in part prepared by the same hand and that they were both among the 50 manuscripts made under the direction of Eusebius at Caesarea in 331 for use in the emperor Constantine’s new capital, is not now generally accepted.

Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C). This is the great palimpsest (twice written) manuscript of the uncial group, and originally contained the whole New Testament. Now, however, a part—approximately half—of every book is lacking, and 2 Thessalonians and 2 John are entirely gone. It belongs to the 5th century, is written on good vellum 9 X 12 1/2 in. to the page of 41 lines, and of one column in the original text, though the superimposed writings of Ephraem are in two. Enlarged initials and the Eusebian marginal sections are used and several hands have corrected the MS. See Fig. 2. Brought to Italy from the East in the 16th century, it came to France with Catherine de’ Medici and is now in the Bibliotheque Nationale, Paris.

Codex Bezae (D). This is the early known manuscript which Theodore Beza obtained in 1562 from the monastery of Irenaeus at Lyons and which he gave in 1581 to the University of Cambridge, where it now is. It is a Greek-Latin text, the Greek holding the chief place on the left-hand page, measuring 8 X 10 in., and dates probably from the end of the 5th century. Both Greek and Latin are written in large uncials and divided into short clauses, corresponding line for line. The hands of no less than nine correctors have been traced, and the critical questions arising from the character of the readings are among the most interesting in the whole range of Biblical criticism and are still unsettled. It contains only the Gospels and Ac with a fragment of 3 John.

Codex Washingtoniensis (W). The United States has now in the National Library (Smithsonian) at the capital one of the foremost uncial manuscripts of the Greek New Testament. It is a complete codex of the Gospels, in a slightly sloping but very ancient hand, written upon good vellum, in one column of 30 lines to the page, and 6 X 9 in. in size. By all the tests ordinarily given, it belongs to the period of the earliest codices, possibly of the 4th century. Like Codex Bezae (D), it has the order of the Gospels: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, and contains an apocryphal interpolation within the longer ending of Mark

for which no other Greek authority is known, though it is probably referred to by Jerome. It has been published in facsimile by Mr. C. L. Freer of Detroit, who obtained the manuscript in Egypt in 1906, and is edited by Professor H. A. Sanders for the University of Michigan Press, 1911.

(2) Minuscules.

Out of the thousands of minuscule manuscripts now known only the four used by Erasmus, together with one now found in the United States, will be enumerated.

1. This is an 11th-century codex at Basel. It must have been copied from a good uncial, since its text often agrees with Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus.

1R. Of the 12th century, and now at Mayhingen, Bayaria: This is the only manuscript Erasmus had for Revelation in his editio princeps, and being defective at the end, 22:16-21, he supplied the Greek text by retranslating from the Latin; compare Textus Receptus of the New Testament and the King James Version. Generally speaking, this manuscript is of high quality.

2. This is a 15th-century manuscript at Basel, and was that on which Erasmus most depended for his 1st edition, 1516. It reflects a good quality of text.

2AP. Some have assigned this manuscript to the 12th century, though it was probably later. It is at Basel, and was the principal text used by Erasmus in the Ac and Epistles.

667. An illustration of a good type of minuscule of the Gospels is taken from Evangelistaria 667, which came from an island of the Sea of Marmorn; purchased in Constantinople by Dr. Albert L. Long in 1892 and now in the Drew Seminary Library at Madison, N.J.

5. Vernacular Versions:

Vernacular VSS, or translations of the Scriptures into the tongues of western Christendom, were, some of them, made as early as the 2nd century, and thus antedate by several generations our best-known Greek text. It is considered by many as providential that the Bible was early translated into different tongues, so that its corruption to any large extent became almost if not altogether an impossibility, since the versions of necessity belonged to parts of the church widely removed from one another and with very diverse doctrinal and institutional tendencies. The testimony of translations to the exact form of words used either in an autograph or a Greek copy of an author is at best not beyond dispute, but as evidence for the presence or absence of whole sections or clauses of the original, their standing is of prime importance. Such extreme literalness frequently prevails that the vernacular idiom is entirely set aside and the order and construction of words in the original sources are slavishly followed and even transliterated, so that their bearing on many questions at issue is direct and convincing. Although the Greek New Testament has now been translated into all the principal tongues of the earth, comparative criticism is confined to those versions made during the first eight centuries.

6. Patristic Quotations:

Patristic quotations afford a unique basis of evidence for determining readings of the New Testament. So able and energetic were the Church Fathers of the early centuries that it is entirely probable that the whole text of the Greek New Testament could be recovered from this source alone, if the writings of apologists, homilists and commentators were carefully collated. It is also true that the earliest heretics as well as the defenders of the faith recognized the importance of accurately determining the original text, so that their remains also comprise no mean source for critical research. It is evident that the value of patristic quotations will vary according to such factors as the reliability of the reading, as quoted, the personal equation or habit of accuracy or looseness of the particular writer, and the purity or corruption of the text he employs. One of the marked advantages of this sort of evidence arises from the fact that it affords additional ground for localizing and dating the various classes of texts found both in original copies and in versions. For general study the more prominent Church Fathers of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th centuries are sufficient, though profitable investigation may be made of a much wider period. By the beginning of the 5th century, however, the type of text quoted almost universally was closely akin to that now known as the Textus Receptus.

7. Lectionaries and Service-Books:

Lectionaries and service-books of the early Christian period afford a source of considerable value in determining the general type of texts, together with the order and contents and distribution of the several books of the Canon. As the lectionary systems both of the eastern and western churches reach back to post-apostolic times and all are marked by great verbal conservatism, they present data of real worth for determining certain problems of textual criticism. From the very nature of the case, being compiled for a liturgical use, the readings are often introduced and ended by set formulas, but these are easily separated from the text itself, which generally follows copy faithfully. Even the systems of chapter headings and divisions furnish clues for classifying and comparing texts, for there is high probability that texts with the same chapter divisions come from the same country. Probably the earliest system of chapter divisions is preserved in Codex Vaticanus, coming down to us from Alexandria probably by way of Caesarea. That it antedates the codex in which it appears is seen from the fact that the Pauline Epistles are numbered as comprising a continuous book with a break between Galatians and Ephesians and the dislocated section numbers attached to Hebrews which follows 2 Thessalonians here, though the numbers indicate its earlier position after Galatians. Another system of chapter divisions, at least as old as the 5th century, found in Codex Alexandrinus, cuts the text into much larger sections, known as Cephalia Majora. In all cases the enumeration begins with the 2nd section, the 1st being considered introductory. Bishop Eusebius developed a system of text division of the Gospels based upon an earlier method attributed to Ammonius, adding a series of tables or Canons. The first table contained sections giving events common to all four evangelists, and its number was written beneath the section number on the margin in each Gospel, so that their parallels could readily be found. The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Canons contain lists of sections in which three of the Gospels have passages in common (the combination Mark, Luke, John, does not occur). The 5th, 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th contain lists in which two combine (the combination Mark, John, does not occur). Canon 10 contains those peculiar to some one of the Gospels.

II. Necessity of Sifting and Criticizing the Evidence.

Criticism from its very nature concerns itself entirely with the problems suggested by the errors of various kinds which it brings to light. In the writings of the New Testament the resources of textual evidence are so vast, exceeding, as we have seen, those of any other ancient literature, sacred or secular, that the area of actual error is relatively quite appreciable, though it must be remembered that this very abundance of textual variety ultimately makes for the integrity and doctrinal unity of the teaching of the New Testament books. Conjectural emendation which has played so large a part in the restoration of other writings has but slight place in the textual criticism of the New Testament, whose materials are so abundant that the difficulty is rather to select right renderings than to invent them. We have catalogued the principal sources of right readings, but on the most casual investigation of them discover large numbers of wrong readings mingled with the true, and must proceed to consider the sources of error or various readings, as they are called, of which approximately some 200,000 are known to exist in the various manuscripts, VSS, patristic citations and other data for the text.

"Not," as Dr. Warfield says, "that there are 200,000 places in the New Testament where various readings occur, but that there are nearly 200,000 readings all told, and in many cases the documents so differ among themselves that many various readings are counted on a single word, for each document is compared in turn with one standard and the number of its divergences ascertained, then these sums are themselves added together and the result given as the number of actually observed variations." Dr. Ezra Abbott was accustomed to remark that "about nineteen-twentieths of the variations have so little support that, although there are various readings, no one would think of them as rival readings, and nineteen-twentieths of the remainder are of so little importance that their adoption or rejection would cause no appreciable difference in the sense of the passages in which they occur." Dr. Hort’s view was that "upon about one word in eight, various readings exist supported by sufficient evidence to bid us pause and look at it; about one word in sixty has various readings upon it supported by such evidence as to render our decision nice and difficult, but that so many variations are trivial that only about one word in every thousand has upon it substantial variation supported by such evidence as to call out the efforts of the critic in deciding between the readings." The oft-repeated dictum of Bentley is still valid that "the real text of the sacred writings is competently exact, nor is one article of faith or moral precept either perverted or lost, choose as awkwardly as you will, choose the worst by design, out of the whole lump of readings." Despite all this, the true scholar must be furnished rightly to discriminate in the matter of diverse readings.

From the very nature of the case it is probable that errors should be frequent in the New Testament; indeed, even printed works are not free from them, as is seen in the most carefully edited editions of the English Bible, but in manuscripts the difficulty is increased in direct proportion to the number of various copies still extant. There are two classes of errors giving rise to various readings, unconscious or unintentional and conscious or intentional.

1. First Class:

Of the first class, that of unconscious errors, there are five sorts:

(1) Errors of the Eye.

Errors of the eye, where the sight of the copyist confuses letters or endings that are similar, writing e.g. capital eta for capital sigma; capital omicron for capital theta; capital alpha for capital lambda or capital delta; capital pi (P) for capital tau and capital iota (written together, TI); PAN for TIAN; capital mu (M) for a double capital lambda (LL). Here should be named homoeoteleuton, which arises when two successive lines in a copy end in the same word or syllable and the eye catches the second line instead of the first and the copyist omits the intervening words as in Codex Ephraemi of Joh 6:39.

(2) Errors of the Pen.

Here is classed all that body of variation due to the miswriting by the penman of what is correctly enough in his mind but through carelessness he fails rightly to transfer to the new copy. Transposition of similar letters has evidently occurred in Codices E, M, and H of Mr 14:65, also in H2 L2 of Ac 13:23.

(3) Errors of Speech.

Here are included those variations which have sprung from the habitual forms of speech to which the scribe in the particular case was accustomed and which he therefore was inclined to write. Under this head comes "itacism," arising from the confusion of vowels and diphthongs, especially in dictation. Thus, iota (i) is constantly written as epsilon-iota (ei) and vice versa; alpha-iota (ai) for epsilon (e); eta (ee) and iota (i) for epsilon-iota (ei); eta (ee) and omicron-iota (oi) for upsilon (u); omicron (o) for omega (oo) and epsilon (e) for eta (ee). It is observed that in Codex Sinaiticus we have scribal preference for iota (i) alone, while in Codex Vaticanus epsilon-iota (ei) is preferred.

(4) Errors of Memory.

These are explained as having arisen from the "copyist holding a clause or sequence of letters in his somewhat treacherous memory between the glance at the manuscript to be copied and his writing down what he saw there." Here are classed the numerous petty changes in the order of words and the substitution of synonyms, as eipen for ephee, ek for apo, and vice versa.

(5) Errors of Judgment.

Under this class Dr. Warfield cites "many misreadings of abbreviations, as also the adoption of marginal glosses into the text by which much of the most striking corruption which has entered the text has been produced." Notable instances of this type of error are found in Joh 5:1-4, explaining how it happened that the waters of Bethesda were healing; and in Joh 7:53-8:12, the passage concerning the adulteress, and the last twelve verses of Mark.

2. Second Class:

Turning to the second class, that of conscious or intentional errors, we may tabulate:

(1) Linguistic or Rhetorical Corrections.

Linguistic or rhetorical corrections, no doubt often made in entire good faith under the impression that an error had previously crept into the text and needed correcting. Thus, second aorist terminations in -a are changed to -o and the like.

(2) Historical Corrections.

Under this head is placed all that group of changes similar to the case in Mr 1:2, where the phrase "Isaiah the prophet" is changed into "the prophets."

(3) Harmonistic Corrections.

These are quite frequent in the Gospels, e.g. the attempted assimilation of the Lord's Prayer in Luke to the fuller form in Matthew, and quite possibly the addition of the words "of sin" to the phrase in Joh 8:34, "Every one that doeth sin is a slave." A certain group of harmonistic corruptions where scribes allow the memory, perhaps unconsciously, to affect the writing may rightly be classed under (4) above.

(4) Doctrinal Corrections.

Of these it is difficult to assert any unquestioned cases unless it be the celebrated Trinitarian passage (King James Version, 1 Joh 5:7,8 a) or the several passages in which fasting is coupled with prayer, as in Mt 17:21; Mr 9:29; Ac 10:30; 1Co 7:5.

(5) Liturgical Corrections.

These are very common, especially in the lectionaries, as in the beginning of lessons, and are even found in early uncials, e.g. Lu 8:31; 10:23, etc.

III. Methods of Critical Procedure.

Here as in other human disciplines necessity is the mother of invention, and the principles of critical procedure rest almost entirely on the data connected with the errors and discrepancies which have consciously or unconsciously crept into the text. The dictum of Dr. George Salmon that "God has at no time given His church a text absolutely free from ambiguity" is true warrant for a free and continued inquiry into this attractive field of study. The process of textual criticism has gradually evolved certain rules based upon judgments formed after patiently classifying and taking into account all the

documentary evidence available, both internal and external.

(1) An older reading is preferable to one later, since it is presumed to be nearer the original. However, mere age is no sure proof of purity, as it is now clear that very many of the corruptions of the text became current at an early date, so that in some cases it is found that later copies really represent a more ancient reading.

(2) A more difficult reading, if well supported, is preferable to one that is easier, since it is the tendency of copyists to substitute an easy, well-known and smooth reading for one that is harsh, unusual and ungrammatical. This was commonly done with the best of intentions, the scribe supposing he was rendering a real service to truth.

(3) A shorter is preferable to a longer reading, since here again the common tendency of scribes is toward additions and insertions rather than omissions. Hence arose, in the first place, the marginal glosses and insertions between the lines which later transcribers incorporated into the text. Although this rule has been widely accepted, it must be applied with discrimination, a longer reading being in some cases clearly more in harmony with the style of the original, or the shorter having arisen from a case of homoeoteleuton.

(4) A reading is preferable, other things being equal, from which the origin of all alternative readings can most clearly be derived. This principle is at once of the utmost importance and at the same time demands the most careful application. It is a sharp two-edged-sword, dangerous alike to the user and to his opponents.

(5) A reading is preferable, says Scrivener, "which best suits the peculiar style, manner and habits of thought of an author, it being the tendency of copyists to overlook the idiosyncrasies of the writer. Yet habit or the love of critical correction may sometimes lead the scribe to change the text to his author’s more usual style as well as to depart from it through inadvertence, so that we may securely. apply the rule only where the external evidence is not unequally balanced.".

(6) A reading is preferable which reflects no doctrinal bias, whether orthodox on the one side or heretical on the other. This principle is so obvious that it is accepted on all sides, but in practice wide divergence arises, owing to the doctrinal bias of the critic himself.

These are the main Canons of internal evidence. On the side of external evidence may be summarized what has already been implied:

(1) A more ancient reading is usually one that is supported by the most ancient manuscripts.

(2) A reading which has the undoubted support of the earliest manuscripts, versions and patristic writers is unquestionably original.

(3) A disagreement of early authorities usually indicates the existence of corruption prior to them all.

(4) Mere numerical preponderance of witnesses (to a reading) of any one class, locality or time, is of comparative insignificance.

(5) Great significance must be granted to the testimony of witnesses from localities or times widely apart, and it can only be satisfactorily met by a balancing agreement of witnesses also from different times and localities.

These rules, though they are all excellent and each has been employed by different critics with good results, are now somewhat displaced, or rather supplemented, by the application of a principle very widely used, though not discovered, by Westcott and Hort, known as the principle of the genealogy of manuscripts. The inspection of a very broad range of witnesses to the New Testament text has led to their classification into groups and families according to their prevailing errors, it being obvious that the greater the community of errors the closer the relationship of witnesses. Although some of the terms used by Westcott and Hort, as well as their content, have given rise to well-placed criticism, yet their grouping of manuscripts is so self-convincing that it bids fair, with but slight modification, to hold, as it has thus far done, first place in the field. Sir Frederick G. Kenyon has so admirably stated the method that the gist of his account will be given, largely using his identical words (Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 2nd edition, London, 1912). As in all scientific criticism, four steps are followed by Westcott and Hort:

(a) The individual readings and the authorities for them are studied;

(b) an estimate is formed of the character of the several authorities;

(c) an effort is made to group these authorities as descendants of a common ancestor, and

(d) the individual readings are again taken up and the first provisional estimate of their comparative probability revised in the light of the knowledge gained as to the value and interrelation of the several authorities.

Applying these methods, four groups of texts emerge from the mass of early witnesses:

(a) The Antiochian or Syrian, the most popular of all and at the base of the Greek Textus Receptus and the English King James Version; in the Gospels the great uncials Alexandrinus and Ephraemi (C) support it as well as Codex N, Codex Sigma and Codex Phi, most of the later uncials and almost all minuscules, the Peshitta-Syriac version and the bulk of the Church Fathers from Chrysostom;

(b) the Neutral, a term giving rise to criticism on all sides and by some displaced by the term Egyptian; this group is small but of high antiquity, including S B L T Z, A and C, save in the Gospels, the Coptic versions (especially the Bohairic) and some of the minuscules, notably 33 and 81;

(c) the Alexandrian, closely akin to the Neutral group, not found wholly in any one manuscript but traceable in such manuscripts as S C L X, 33, and the Bohairic version, when they differ from the other members headed by B;

(d) the Western, another term considered ambiguous, since it includes some important manuscripts and Fathers very ancient and very Eastern; here belong D D2 E2 F2 G2 among the uncials, 28, 235, 383, 565, 614, 700, and 876 among the minuscules, the Old Syriac and Old Latin and sometimes the Sahidic versions.

Of these groups by far the most superior is the Neutral, though Westcott and Hort have made it so exclusively to coincide with Codex Vaticanus that they appear at times to have broken one of the great commandments of a philologist, as quoted by Dr. Nestle from a German professor, "Thou shalt worship no codices. Now, the only serious dispute centers on the apparent slight which this system may have put upon the so-called Western type of text in group four. The variants of this family are extensive and important and appear due to an extremely free handling of the text at some early date when scribes felt themselves at liberty to vary the language of the sacred books and even to insert additional passages of considerable length.

Although this type of text is of very early origin and though prevalent in the East was very early carried to the West, and being widely known there has been called Western, yet, because of the liberties above referred to, its critical value is not high, save in the one field of omissions. In Egypt, however, and especially Alexandria, just as in the case of the Old Testament, the text of the New Testament was critically considered and conserved, and doubtless the family called Neutral, as well as the so-called Alexandrian, springs up here and through close association with Caesarea becomes prevalent in Palestine and is destined to prevail everywhere. The Westcott-Hort contention. that the Antiochian text arose as a formal attempt at repeated revision of the original text in Antioch is not so convincing, but for want of a better theory still holds its place. Their objections, however, to its characteristic readings are well taken and everywhere accepted, even von Soden practically agreeing here, though naming it the Koine text. It is also interesting to find that von Soden’s Hesychian text so closely parallels the Neutral-Alexandrian above, and his Jerusalem family the Western. And thus we arrive at the present consensus of opinion as to the genealogical source of the text of the New Testament.

IV. History of the Process.

Abundant evidence exists and is constantly growing to show that critical opinion and methods were known at least from the very days of the formation of the New Testament Canon, but in such a sketch as the present the history can only be traced in modern times. The era of printing necessarily marks a new epoch here. Among available manuscripts choice must be made and a standard set, and in view of the material at hand it is remarkable how ably the work was done. It began in Spain under Cardinal Ximenes of Toledo, who printed at Alcala (Complutum) in 1514 the New Testament volume of his great Polyglot, though it was not actually issued until 1522. Meanwhile the great Erasmus, under patronage of Froben

the printer of Basel, had been preparing a Greek New Testament, and it was published early in 1516 in a single volume and at low cost, and had reached its 3rd edition by 1522. His 4th edition in 1537 contains Erasmus' definitive text, and, besides using Cardinal Ximenes' text, had the advantage of minuscule manuscripts already named. The next important step was taken by Robert Estienne (Stephanus), whose 3rd edition, "Regia," a folio published in Paris in 1550, was a distinct advance, and, though based directly upon the work of Ximenes and Erasmus, had marginal readings from 15 new manuscripts, one of which was Codex Bezae (D). The learned Theodore Beza himself worked with Stephanus' son Henri, and brought out no less than nine editions of the New Testament, but no great critical advance was made in them. The same may be said of the Seven Elzevir editions brought out at Leyden and Amsterdam between 1624 and 1678, the second, that of 1633, in the preface of which occurs the phrase, "Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum," becoming the continental standard, as the 1550 edition of Stephanus has for England. Thus, we arrive at the Textus Receptus, and the period of preparation is closed.

The second period, or that of discovery and research, was ushered in by the great London Polyglot of 1657, edited by Brian Walton (later Bishop of Chester) with collations by Archbishop Ussher of 15 fresh manuscripts, including Codex Alexandrinus and Codex 59. But Dr. John Mill of Oxford was the Erasmus of this period, and in 1707 after 30 years of labor brought out the Greek Textus Receptus with fresh collations of 78 manuscripts, many versions and quotations from the early Fathers. His manuscripts included A B D E K, 28, 33, 59, 69, 71, the Peshito, Old Latin and Vulgate, and his Prolegomena set a new standard for textual criticism. This apparatus was rightly appreciated by Richard Bentley of Cambridge and a revised text of the Greek and of the Vulgate New Testament was projected along lines which have prevailed to this day. The work and wide correspondence of Bentley had stirred up continental scholars, and J. A. Bengel published in 1734 at Tubingen a Greek New Testament with the first suggestion as to genealogical classification of manuscripts. J. J. Wetstein of Basel and Amsterdam, though a very great collector of data and the author of the system of manuscript notation which has continued ever since, made little critical advance. J. S. Semler, taking Wetstein's material, began rightly to interpret it, and his pupil J. J. Griesbach carried the work still farther, clearly distinguishing for the first time a Western, an Alexandrian and a Constantinopolitan recension.

With Carl Lachmann began the last epoch in New Testament criticism which has succeeded in going behind the Textus Receptus and establishing an authentic text based on the most ancient sources. He applied the critical methods with which he was familiar in editing the classics, and with the help of P. Buttmann produced an edition in 1842-50 which led the way directly toward the goal; but they were limited in materials and Tischendorf soon furnished these. Constantine Tischendorf, both as collector and editor, is the foremost man thus far in the field. His 8th edition, 1872, of the Greek New Testament, together with his Prolegomena, completed and published, 1884-1894, by C. R. Gregory, set a new standard. Dr. Gregory's German edition of the Prolegomena, 1900-1909, supplemented by his Die griechischen Handschriften des New Testament, 1908, marks the further advance of the master through his master pupil. Meanwhile, S. P. Tregelles was doing almost as prodigious and valuable a work in England, and was thus preparing for the final advances at Cambridge. F. H. A. Scrivener also ranks high and did extremely valuable, though somewhat conservative, work in the same direction. In 1881 "the greatest edition ever published," according to Professor Souter, was brought out in England coincident

with the Revised Version of the English New Testament. This, together with the introduction, which the same writer characterizes as "an achievement never surpassed in the scholarship of any country," was the joint product of B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, friends and co-workers for many years in the University of Cambridge. Thus with the end of the 19th century the history of the process may be said to close, though both process and progress still advance with everincreasing triumph.

Von Soden's edition of the New Testament appeared during the summer of 1913 and is of first importance. It differs from all others in the extreme weight laid on Tatian's Diatessaron as the source of the bulk of the errors in the Gospels. This theory is not likely to command the assent of scholars and the text (which does not differ greatly from Tischendorf's) is consequently of doubtful value. Nevertheless, for fullness of material, clearness of arrangement, and beauty of printing, von Soden's edition must inevitably supersede all others, even where the text is dissented from. Dr. Gregory promises a new edition at some day not too far in the future which, in turn, will probably supersede von Soden's.

LITERATURE.

C. R. Gregory, Prolegomena to Tischendorf's New Testament, Leipzig, 1884-94, Textkritik des New Testament, Leipzig, 1900-1909, Die griechischen Handschriften des New Testament, Leipzig, 1908, Einleitung in das New Testament, Leipzig, 1909, Vorschlage fur eine kritische Ausgabe des griechischen New Testament, Leipzig, 1911; F. G. Kenyon, Paleography of Greek Papyri, Oxford, 1899, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, London2, 1912; K. Lake, The Text of the New Testament, 4th edition, London, 1910; G. Milligan, Selections from the Greek Papyri, Cambridge, 1910, The New Testament Documents, 1913; Eb. Nestle, Einfuhrung in das New Testament, Gottingen3, 1909; F. H. A. Scrivener, Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, 4th edition, London, 1894; Souter, Text and Canon of the New Testament, 1913; E. M. Thompson, Handbook of Greek and Latin Paleography, 2nd edition, London, 1894; H. von Soden, Die Schriften des New Testament, I. Tell, Untersuchungen, Berlin, 1902-10; II, Tell, 1913; B. F. Westcott, and F. J. A. Hort, The New Testament in Greek with Introduction, Cambridge and London, 1896; Th. Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, English translation, Edinburgh, 1910.

Charles Fremont Sitterly

TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

I. EARLIEST FORM OF WRITING IN ISRAEL

1. Invention of Alphabet

2. The Cuneiform

3. References to Writing in the Old Testament

4. Inscriptions after Settlement in Canaan

5. Orthography of the Period

II. THE TWO HEBREW SCRIPTS

1. The Old Hebrew Alphabet

2. Aramean Alphabets

3. The New Hebrew Script

4. New Hebrew Inscriptions

5. Summary

III. THE CHANGE OF SCRIPT

1. Various Theories

2. The Change in the Law

3. In the Other Books

4. Evidence of the Septuagint

5. Evidence of the Text Itself

6. Conclusion

IV. PRESERVATION OF THE TEXT

1. Internal Conditions

2. External Circumstances

3. The Septuagint Version

V. THE TEXT IN THE 1ST CENTURY AD

1. Word Separation

2. Other Breaks in the Text

3. Final Forms of Letters

4. Their Origin

5. Conclusion

6. The Vowel-Letters

7. Anomalous Forms

8. The Dotted Words

9. Their Antiquity

10. The Inverted Nuns ("n")

11. Large and Small Letters

12. Suspended Letters and Divided Waw ("w")

13. Abbreviations

14. Conclusion

VI. ALTERATION OF PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTS

1. Yahweh and Baal

2. Euphemistic Expressions

3. "Tiqqun copherim"

VII. SCRIBAL ERRORS IN THE TEXT

1. Misunderstanding

2. Errors of the Eye

3. Errors of the Ear

4. Errors of Memory

5. Errors of Carelessness and Ignorance

VIII. HISTORY OF THE TEXT

1. Changes Made in Reading

2. Preservation of Text

3. Division into Verses

4. Sections of the Law

5. Sections of the Prophets

6. Poetical Passages

7. Division into Books

IX. VOCALIZATION OF THE TEXT

1. Antiquity of the Points

2. Probable Date of Invention

3. Various Systems and Recensions

X. THE PALESTINIAN SYSTEM

1. The Consonants

2. The Vowels

3. The Accents

4. Anomalous Pointings

XI. THE MASORAH

1. Meaning of the Term

2. The "Qere" and "Kethibh"

3. Other: Features

XII. MANUSCRIPTS AND PRINTED TEXTS

1. Manuscripts

2. Early Printed Texts

3. Later Editions

4. Chapters and Verses

LITERATURE

I. Earliest Form of Writing in Israel.

The art of writing is not referred to in the Book of Genesis, even where we might expect a reference to it, e.g. in Ge 23, nor anywhere in the Old Testament before the time of Moses (compare however, Ge 38:18,25; 41:44, which speak of "sealing" devices).

See SEAL; WRITING.

1. Invention of Alphabet:

About the year 1500 BC alphabetic writing was practiced by the Phoenicians, but in Palestine the syllabic Babylonian cuneiform was in use (see ALPHABET). The Israelites probably did not employ any form of writing in their nomadic state, and when they entered Canaan the only script they seem ever to have used was the Phoenicia. This is not disproved by the discovery there of two cuneiform contracts of the 7th century, as these probably belonged to strangers. There is only one alphabet in the world, which has taken many forms to suit the languages for which it was employed. This original alphabet was the invention of the Semites, for it has letters peculiar to the Semitic languages, and probably of the Phoenicians (so Lucan, Pharsalia iii.220; compare Herodotus v.58), who evolved it from the Egyptian hieroglyphics.

2. The Cuneiform:

Of the literature of Canaan before the Israelites entered it the remains consist of a number of cuneiform tablets found since 1892 at Lachish, Gezer, Taanach and Megiddo, but especially of the famous the Tell el-Amarna Letters, discovered in Egypt in 1887. Although this non-alphabetic script was in use in Canaan when the Israelites entered it, they do not seem to have adopted it.

3. References to Writing in the Old Testament:

The earliest reference to writing in the Old Testament is Ex 17:14. The next is Ex 24:7, mentioning the Book of the Covenant (Ex 20-23). The Book of the Wars of Yahweh is named in Nu 21:14. Other early references are Jud 5:14 margin; 8:14 margin. By the time of the monarchy the king and nobles could write (2Sa 11:14; 8:17), but not the common people, until the time of Amos and Hosea, when writing seems to have been common.

4. Inscriptions after Settlement in Canaan:

The Phoenician script prevailed in Palestine after the conquest as well as in the countries bordering on it. This is shown by the inscriptions which have been discovered. The chief of these are: the Baal Lebanon inscription found in Cyprus (beginning of the 9th century); the manuscript of about the year 896 of the ordinary chronology; a Hebrew agricultural calendar of the 8th century; fifteen lion-weights from Nineveh of about the year 700; the Siloam Inscription of the time of Hezekiah; about a score of seals; and, in 1911, a large number of ostraca of the time of Ahab.

5. Orthography of the Period:

In this oldest writing the vowels are rarely expressed, not even final vowels being indicated. The only mark besides the letters is a point separating the words. There are no special forms for final letters. Words are often divided at the ends of lines. The writing is from right to left. The characters of the Siloam Inscription and the ostraca show some attempt at elegant writing.

II. The Two Hebrew Scripts.

1. The Old Hebrew Alphabet:

Two distinct scripts were used by the Hebrews, an earlier and a later. The Old Hebrew alphabet contained 22 letters, all consonants. The order of these letters is known from that of the Greek, taken in order of their numerical values, and later by the alphabetic psalms, etc., and by the figure called ‘at-bash (see SHESHACH). In the acrostic passages, however, the order is not always the same; this may be due to corruption of the text. In the alphabet, letters standing together bear similar names. These are ancient, being the same in Greek as in Semitic. They were probably given from some fancied resemblance which the Phoenicians saw in the original Egyptian sign to some object.

2. Aramean Alphabets:

The development of the Phoenician alphabet called Aramaic begins about the 7th century BC. It is found inscribed as dockets on the cuneiform clay tablets of Nineveh, as the Phoenician letters were upon the lion-weights; on coins of the Persian satraps to the time of Alexander; on Egyptian inscriptions and papyri; and on the Palmyrene inscriptions. The features of this script are the following: The loops of the Hebrew letters beth (b), daleth (d), Teth (T), qoph (q) and resh (r), which are closed in the Phoenician and Old Hebrew, are open, the bars of the Hebrew letters he (h), waw (w), zayin (z), cheth (ch) and taw (t) are lost, and the tails of kaph (k), lamedh (l), mem (m), pe (p) and tsadhe (ts), which are vertical in the old Aramaic, begin in the Egyptian Aramaic to curve toward the left; words are divided, except in Palmyrene, by a space instead of a point; vowel-letters are freely used; and the use of ligatures involves a distinction of initial, medial and final forms. There are of course no vowel-marks.

3. The New Hebrew Scripture:

After the Jews returned from the exile, the Aramaic language was the lingua franca of the Seleucid empire, displacing Assyrian, Old Hebrew and Phoenician. The Phoenician script also had given place to the Aramaic in Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt. In Syria it divided into two branches, a northern which grew into Syriac, and a southern, or Jewish, from which the New Hebrew character was produced.

4. New Hebrew Inscriptions:

What is believed to be the oldest inscription in the modern Hebrew character is that in a cave at ‘Araq al-‘Amir near Heshbon, which was used as a place of retreat in the year 176 BC (Ant., XII, iv, 11; CIH, number 1). Others are: four boundary stones found at Gezer; the inscriptions over the "Tomb of James" really of the Beni Hezir (1Ch 24:15; Ne 10:20); that of Kefr Birim, assigned to the year 300 AD (CIH, number 17), in which the transition to the New Hebrew script may be said to be accomplished; and others have been found all over the Roman empire and beyond.

See ARCHAEOLOGY.

5. Summary:

The inscriptions show that the familiar Hebrew character is a branch of the Aramaic. In the 3rd century BC the latter script was in general use in those countries where Assyrio-Babylonian, Old Hebrew and Phoenician had been used before. The Jews, however, continued to employ the Old Hebrew for religious purposes especially, and the Samaritans still retain a form of it in their Bible (the Pentateuch).

III. The Change of Script.

It is now almost universally agreed that the script in which the Old Testament was written was at some time changed from the Phoenician to the Aramaic. But in the past many opinions have been held on the

a subject.

1. Various Theories:

Rabbi Eleazar of Modin (died 135 AD), from the mention of the hooks (waws) in Ex 27:10 and from Es 8:9, denied any change at all. Rabbi Jehuda (died circa 210) maintained that the Law was given in the New Hebrew, which was later changed to the Old as a punishment, and then back to the New, on the people repenting in the time of Ezra. Texts bearing on the matter are 2Ki 5:7; 18:26; Isa 8:1, from which various deductions have been drawn. There may have been two scripts in use at the same time, as in Egypt (Herod. ii.36).

2. The Change in the Law:

In regard to the change in the Law, the oldest authority, Eleazar ben Jacob (latter part of the 1st century AD), declared that a Prophet at the time of the Return commanded to write the Torah in the new or square character. Next Rabbi Jose (a century later) states (after Ezr 4:7) that Ezra introduced a new script and language. But the locus classicus is a passage in the Talmud (Sanhedhrin 21b): "Originally the Law was given to Israel in the Hebrew character and in the Holy Tongue; it was given again to them in the days of Ezra in the Assyrian characters and in the Aramaic tongue. Israel chose for herself the Assyrian character and the Holy Tongue, and left the Hebrew character and the Aramaic tongue to the hedhyoToth." Here Hebrew = Old Hebrew; Assyrian = the new square character, and hedhyoToth is the Greek idiotai = the Hebrew ‘am ha-’arets, the illiterate multitude. From the 2nd century on (but not before), the Talmudic tradition is unanimous in ascribing the change of script in the Law to Ezra. The testimony of Josephus points to the Law at least being in the square character in his day (Ant., XII, ii, 1, 4). The Samaritan Pentateuch was almost certainly drawn up in the time of Nehemiah (compare 13:28; also Ant, XI, vii, 2), and points to the Old Hebrew being then in use. So Rabbi Chasda (died 309) refers the word hedhyoToth above to the Samaritans. On the other hand, the Samaritan Pentateuch may have been the original Law, common to both Israel and Judah. In any case it is written in a form of the Old Hebrew character.

3. In the Other Books:

In regard to the other books, the old script was used after Ezra’s time. Es 8:9 and Da 5:8 ff must refer to the unfamiliar Old Hebrew. So the Massoretic Text of 5:18 implies the New Hebrew, but only in the Law.

4. Evidence of the Septuagint:

The Greek translation known as the Septuagint was made in Alexandria, and is hardly evidence for Palestine. The Law was probably translated under Ptolemy II (284-247 BC), and the other books by the end of the 2nd century BC (compare Ecclesiasticus, Prologue). The variations of the Septuagint from the Massoretic Text point to an early form of the square character as being in use; but the Jews of Egypt had

used Aramaic for some centuries before that.

5. Evidence of the Text Itself:

The variations between parallel passages in the Massoretic Text itself, such as Jos 21 and 1Ch 6; 2Sa 23 and 1Ch 11, etc., show that the letters most frequently confused are "d" and "r", which are similar in both the Old and New Hebrew; "b" and "d", which are more alike in the Old Hebrew; "w" and "y" and several others, which are more alike in the New Hebrew. Such errors evidently arose from the use of the square character, and they arose subsequent to the Septuagint, for they are not, except rarely, found in it. The square character is, then, later than the Septuagint.

6. Conclusion:

The square character was ascribed to Ezra as the last person who could have made so great a change, the text after his time being considered sacred. This is disproved by the fact of the coins of the Maccabees and of Bar Cochba being in the old character. The Talmud permits Jews resident outside Palestine to possess copies of the Law in Coptic, Median, Hebrew, etc. Here Hebrew can only mean the Old Hebrew script.

IV. Preservation of the Text.

1. Internal Conditions:

Judaism has always been a book religion: it stands or falls with the Old Testament, especially with the Pentateuch. Although no manuscript of the Hebrew Old Testament is older than the 10th century AD, save for one minute papyrus, we know, from citations, translations, etc., that the consonantal text of the Old Testament was in the 1st century AD practically what it is today. The Jews transliterated as well as translated their Bible. All the most important translations—the Septuagint, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus—were made by Jews and aimed at a more literal rendering of the Hebrew—that of Aquila being hardly Greek. The Syriac (Peshitta) seems to be also by Jews or Jewish Christians. Great care was taken of the text itself, and the slightest variant readings of manuscripts were noted. One manuscript belonging to Rabbi Meir (2nd century) is said to have omitted the references to "Admah and Zeboiim" in De 29:23 and to Bethlehem in Ge 48:7, and to have had other lesser variations, some of which were found also in the manuscript which, among other treasures, decked the triumph of Vespasian (BJ, VII, v, 7).

2. External Circumstances:

Religious persecution makes for the purity of the Scriptures by reducing the number of copies and increasing the care bestowed on those saved. The chief moments in which the existence of the Jewish Scriptures was threatened were the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple under Nebuchadnezzar in 587 BC, in which the Book of Jashar and that of the Wars of the Lord may have been lost; the

persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, during which the possession of the sacred books was a capital offense (1 Macc 1:56,57; Ant, XII, v), in which the sources used by the Chronicler may have perished; and the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 AD. By this time, however, the Law at least was known by heart. Josephus says Titus made him a gift of the sacred books (Vita, 75). It is also said that at one time only three copies of the Law were left, and that a text was obtained by taking the readings of two against one. However that may be, it is a fact that there are no variant readings in the Massoretic Text, such as there are in the New Testament.

3. The Septuagint Version: The only ancient version which can come into competition with the Massoretic Text is the Septuagint, and that on two grounds. First, the manuscripts of the Septuagint are of the 4th century AD, those of the Massoretic Text of the 10th. Secondly, the Septuagint translation was made before a uniform Hebrew text, such as our Massoretic Text, existed. The quotations in the New Testament are mainly from the Septuagint. Only in the Book of Jeremiah, however, are the variations striking, and there they do not greatly affect the sense of individual passages. The Greek has also the Apocrypha. The Septuagint is an invaluable aid to restoring the Hebrew where the latter is corrupt.

V. The Text in the 1st Century AD.

The Massoretic Text of the 1st Christian century consisted solely of consonants of an early form of the square character. There was no division into chapters or, probably, verses, but words were separated by an interstice, as well as indicated by the final letters. The four vowel-letters were used most freely in the later books. A few words were marked by the scribes with dots placed over them.

1. Word Separation:

The Samaritan Pentateuch still employs the point found on the Moabite Stone to separate words. This point was probably dropped when the books came to be written in the square character. Wrong division of words was not uncommon.

Tradition mentions 15 passages noted on the margin of the Hebrew Bible (Ge 30:11, etc.) in which two words are written as one. One word is written as two in Jud 16:25; 1Sa 9:1, etc. Other passages in which tradition and text differ as to the word-division are 2Sa 5:2; Eze 42:9; Job 38:12; Ezr 4:12. The Septuagint frequently groups the letters differently from the Massoretic Text, e.g. (see the commentaries) Ho 11:2; 1Ch 17:10; Ps 73:4; 106:7.

2. Other Breaks in the Text:

The verse-division was not shown in the prose books. The present division is frequently wrong and the Septuagint different from the Hebrew: e.g. Ge 49:19,20; Ps 42:6,7; Jer 9:5,6; Ps 90:2,3. Neither was there any division into chapters, or even books. Hence, the number of the psalms is doubtful. The Greek counts Psalms 9 and 10 as one, and also Psalms 114 and 115, at the same time splitting Psalms 116 and 147 each into two. The Syriac follows the Greek with regard to Psalms 114 and 147. Some manuscripts

make one psalm of 42 and 43. In Ac 13:33, Codex Bezae, Ps 2 appears as Ps 1.

3. Final Forms of Letters:

Final forms of letters are a result of the employment of ligatures. In the Old Hebrew they do not occur, nor apparently in the text used by the Septuagint. Ligatures begin to make their appearance in Egyptian, Aramaic, and Palmyrene. Final forms for the letters k, margin, n, p, ts, were accepted by the 1st century, and all other final forms were apparently rejected.

4. Their Origin:

The first rabbi to mention the final forms is Mathiah ben Harash (a pupil of Rabbi Eleazar who died in 117 AD), who refers them to Moses. They are often referred to in the Talmud and by Jerome. The Samaritan Chronicle (11th century) refers them to Ezra. In point of fact, they are not so old as the Septuagint translation, as is proved by its variations in such passages as 1Sa 1:1; 20:40; Ps 16:3; 44:5; Jer 16:19; 23:14,23,33; Ho 6:5; Na 1:12; Zec 11:11; Ecclesiasticus 3:7. From the fact that the final forms make up the Hebrew expression for "from thy watchers," their invention was referred in the 3rd century to the prophets (compare Isa 52:8; Hab 2:1).

5. Conclusion:

After the adoption of the square character, therefore, the only breaks in the text of prose books were the spaces left between the words. Before the 1st century there was much uncertainty as to the grouping of the letters into words. After that the word-division was retained in the copies, even when it was not read (as in 2Sa 5:2, etc.). At first the final form would occur at the end of the ligature, not necessarily at the end of the word. Remains of this will be found in 1Ch 27:12; Isa 9:6; Ne 2:13; Job 38:1; 40:6. When the ligatures were discarded, these forms were used to mark the ends of words. The wonder is that there are not more, or even an initial, medial and final form for every letter, as in Arabic and Syriac.

6. The Vowel-Letters:

The four letters, ‘,h, w, y, seem to have been used to represent vowel sounds from the first. They are found in the manuscripts, but naturally less freely on stone inscriptions than in books. The later the text the more freely they occur, though they are commoner in the Samaritan Pentateuch than in the Massoretic Text. The copies used by the Septuagint had fewer of them than the Textus Receptus, as is proved by their translations, of Am 9:12; Eze 32:29; Ho 12:12, and other passages, The four letters occur on Jewish coins of the 2nd century BC and AD.

7. Anomalous Forms:

In the 1st and 2nd centuries the vowel-letters were retained in the text, even when not read (Ho 4:6; Mic 3:2, etc.). In the Pentateuch, De 32:13 seems to be the sole instance. The Pentateuch is peculiar also in

that in it the 3rd person singular, masculine, of the personal pronoun is used for the feminine, which occurs only 11 times; Ge 2:12; 14:2; compare Isa 30:33; 1Ki 17:15; Job 31:11. This phenomenon probably arises from the stage in the growth of the script when waw (w) and yodh (y) were identical in form; compare Ps 73:16; Ec 5:8. Frequently the 1st person singular perfect of the verb is written defectively (Ps 140:13; 2Ki 18:20; compare Isa 36:5); similarly the "h" of na‘arah (De 22). All this shows there was no attempt to correct the text. It was left as it was found.

8. The Dotted Words:

When a scribe had miscopied a word he sometimes placed dots over it, without striking it out. There are 15 passages so marked in the Old Testament, and the word naqudh, "pointed," is generally placed in the margin. The word may also be read naqodh, "speckled" (Ge 30:32), or niqqudh, "punctuation." It is also possible that these points may denote that the word is doubtful. They occur in the following places: Ge 16:5; 18:9; 19:33; 33:4; 37:12; Nu 3:39; 9:10; 21:30; 29:15; De 29:28 (29); Ps 27:13; 2Sa 19:20; Isa 44:9; Eze 41:20; 46:22. For conjectures as to the meanings of the points in each passage, the reader must be referred to the commentaries.

9. Their Antiquity:

These points are found even on synagogue rolls which have, with one exception, no other marks upon them, beyond the bare consonants and vowel-letters. Only those in the Pentateuch and Psalms are mentioned in the Talmud or Midrashim, and only one, Nu 9:10, in the Mishna before the end of the 2nd century, by which time its meaning had been lost. The lower limit, therefore, for their origin is the end of the 1st century AD. They have been, like most things not previously annexed by Moses, assigned to Ezra; but the Septuagint shows no sign of them. They, therefore, probably were inserted at the end of the 1st century BC, or in the 1st century AD. As four only occur in the Prophets and one in the Hagiographa, most care was evidently expended on the collation of the, Law. Blau thinks the reference originally extended to the whole verse or even farther, and became restricted to one or more letters.

10. The Inverted Nuns ("n"):

In Nu 10:35 and 36 are enclosed within two inverted nuns as if with brackets. In Ps 107 inverted nuns should stand before verses 23-28 and 40, with a note in the foot margin. These nuns were originally dots (Siphre’ on Numbers) and stand for naqkudh, indicating that the verses so marked are in their wrong place (Septuagint Nu 10:34-36).

11. Large and Small Letters:

Large letters were used as our capitals at the beginnings of books, etc. Thus there should be a capital nun at the beginning of the second part of Isaiah. But they serve other purposes also. The large waw (w) in Le 11:42 is the middle letter of the Torah; so in the Israelites’ Credo (De 6:4). Other places are De 32:4,6; Ex 34:7,14; Le 11:30; 13:33; Isa 56:10, and often. Buxtorf’s Tiberias gives 31 large and 32 small

letters. Examples of the latter will be found in Ge 2:4; 23:2; Le 1:1; Job 7:5, etc. The explanations given are fanciful.

12. Suspended Letters and Divided Waw ("w"):

There are four letters suspended above the line in the Massoretic Text. They will be found in Jud 18:30; Job 38:13,15; Ps 80:14 (13). The last probably indicates the middle letter of the Psalter. The first points to Manasseh being put for Moses. The two in Job are doubtful. In Nu 25:12 will be found a waw cut in two, perhaps to indicate that the covenant was in abeyance for a time.

13. Abbreviations:

Abbreviations are found on early Jewish inscriptions and on coins. Thus the letter shin stands for shanah =" year"; yodh sin =" Israel"; ‘aleph = 1; beth = 2, etc. In the text used by the Septuagint the name Yahweh seem to have been indicated merely by a yodh, e.g. Ps 31:7 (6), "I hate" = Septuagint 30:7, "Thou hatest" (compare 5:5), and the yodh of the Hebrew =" O Yahweh." In Jud 19:18 the Hebrew "house of Yahweh" = Septuagint "my house"; so Jer 6:11; 25:37. A curious example will be found Jer 3:19. The great corruption found in the numbers in the Old Testament is probably due to letters or ciphers being employed. For wrong numbers compare 2Sa 10:18; 24:13; 1Ki 4:26 with parallel passages; also compare Ezr 2 with Ne 7, etc. Possible examples of letters representing numbers are: Ps 90:12, "so" = ken, and kaph plus nun = 20 plus 50 = 70; 1Sa 13:1, ben shanah is perhaps for ben n shanah, "fifty years old"; in 1Sa 14:14, an apparently redundant k is inserted after "twenty men"; k = 20.

14. Conclusion:

Such was the Hebrew text in the 1st Christian century. It was a Received Text obtained by collating manuscripts and rejecting variant readings. Henceforward there are no variant readings. But before that date there were, for the Greek and Samaritan often differ from the Hebrew. The Book of Jubilees (middle of 1st century) also varies. The fidelity of the scribes who drew up this text is proved by the many palpable errors which it contains.

VI. Alteration of Principal Documents.

1. Yahweh and Baal:

For various reasons the original documents were altered by the scribes, chiefly from motives of taste and religion. In the earliest literary period there was no objection to the use of the divine name Yahweh; later this was felt to be irreverent, and ‘Elohim was put in its place; later still Yahweh was written, but not pronounced. Hence, is Psalms 1-41, Yahweh occurs 272 times; ‘Elohim is hardly used as a proper name; in Psalms 42-83 ‘Elohim occurs 200 times, Yahweh, only 44 times; compare especially Ps 14 with 53; 40:14-18 with 70; 50:7 with Ex 20:2. Lastly in Psalms 90-150 Yahweh is again used, and ‘Elohim as a proper name does not occur except in citations in 108 and 144:9. Compare also 2Ki 22:19 with 2Ch

34:27. A precisely parallel change is that of Baal into bosheth ("shame"). At first there was no objection to compounding names with Baal meaning Yahweh (Jud 6:32; 8:35). Then objection was taken to it (Ho 2:16 or 18), and it was changed into Bosheth (Jer 3:24; Ho 9:10); hence, Ishbosheth (2Sa 2-4), Mephibosheth (2Sa 4:4), Eliada (2Sa 5:16), Jerrubesheth (2Sa 11:21). Later still the objection lost force and the old form was restored, Eshbaal (1Ch 8:33, 9:39), Merribaal (1Ch 8:34), Beeliada (1Ch 14:7; compare 3:8). The Septuagint follows the Hebrew; it treats Baal as feminine, i.e. = Bosheth. So too Molech takes its vowels from Bosheth; it should be Melech.

2. Euphemistic Expressions:

Words have been changed from motives of taste, e.g. "bless" is put for "curse" or "blaspheme" (1Ki 21:10, Septuagint 20:10; Job 1:5; 2:5,9, where the word "Lord" follows immediately; otherwise Ex 22:27, etc.). Sometimes "the enemies of" was inserted (e.g. 2Sa 12:14). Another use for the latter expression is 1Sa 25:22, where it is not in the Greek Compare further, 2Sa 7:12,14; 24:1, with the parallel passages in Ch.

3. "Tiqqun Copherim":

In some 18 places the text was slightly altered by the correction (tiqqun) of the scribes, without any indication being inserted to show that it had been altered. The following are the passages: Ge 18:22, which orginally ran "Yahweh stood before Abraham"; Nu 11:15; 12:12; 1Sa 3:13; 2Sa 16:12; 20:1: Eze 8:17; Hab 1:12; Mal 1:13; Zec 2:8 (12); Jer 2:11; Job 7:20; Ho 4:7; Job 32:3; La 3:20; Ps 106:20. The remaining two, to make 18, may be accounted for either by the third containing more than one correction, or by counting the parallels to the sixth. The Septuagint ignores the supposed original forms of the text, except in the case of 1Sa 3:13 and Job 7:20. The Syriac has the supposed original form of Nu 12:12 and Ciphre of Nu 11:15, that is, it survived till the 2nd century AD. But the rest must have been corrected very early. Like the tiqqun is the ‘iTTur copherim, that is, the substraction or deletion of the conjunction "and" in five places, namely, Ge 18:5; 24:55; Nu 31:2 and Ps 68:25 (26) before the word "after"; and in Ps 36:6 (7) before "thy judgments."

VII. Scribal Errors in the Text.

The Hebrew text of the Old Testament in no way resembles a text of one of the classics which is obtained by collating many manuscripts and eliminating all errors as far as possible. It is to all intents and purposes a manuscript, and displays all the forms of error found in all manuscripts. These are the following, classifying them according to their source.

1. Misunderstanding:

Failure to understand the sense gives rise to wrong division into words, e.g. Am 6:12, "with oxen" (plural) should probably be "with oxen (collective) the sea"; Jer 15:10; 22:14; Ps 73:4 have found their way into the text, e.g. Ps 40:8,9, "In a volume of a book it is written ‘alay," referring to li in 40:7;

2Sa 1:18 (see Wellhausen).

2. Errors of the Eye:

Due to the eye are repetitions, transpositions, omissions, mistaking one letter for another, and so forth. Repetitions will be found: 2Sa 6:3,4 (Septuagint); 1Ki 15:6 (= 14:30); Ex 30:6 (Septuagint); Le 20:10; 1Ch 9:35-44 = 8:29-38; Isa 41:1 (compare 40:31); 53:7; Ps 35:15; 37:40, and very often. Omissions may be supplied from parallel passages or VSS, as 1Ch 8:29-31 from 1Ch 9:35-37; compare 9:41; Jos 22:34 (from Syriac); Jud 16:2; Ge 4:8 (Samaritan, Peshitta); Pr 10:10 Septuagint, Syriac); 11:16 Septuagint, Syriac); 2Sa 17:3 (Septuagint). Transpositions of letters will be found (Jos 6:13; Isa 8:12; compare 8:13,14). Sometimes a letter slips from word into another, as in 1Sa 14:50,51; Jer 18:23; Ps 139:20. Other examples are Jud 10:12, and many times. Words are transposed in Ps 35:7; 95:7; 1Ki 6:17, etc. Examples of transposition of verses will be found: Ge 24:29 follows 24:30a; Isa 38:21,22 follows 38:8; compare 2Ki 20:6-8; Isa 40:19,20 should go with 41:6 ff. Most omissions and repetitions are due to homoeoteleuton or homoearchy. Similar letters are frequently mistaken for one another. Examples are: d and r (Ps 110:3; 2Sa 22:11; compare Ps 18:11). Traditions mention 6 other places, as well as 154 in which waw and yodh are interchanged; other examples are: Jos 9:4; De 14:13; compare Le 11:14; 2Ch 22:10; compare 2Ki 11:1.

3. Errors of the Ear:

Errors du to the ear would arise when one scribe was dictating to another. Such are: lo’ =" not," for lo =" to him," in 15 places (Ps 100:3, etc.). Also Yahweh and Adonai would be sounded alike. Again we have Adoram in 1Ki 12:18 and Hadoram in 2Ch 10:18.

4. Errors of Memory:

Failure of memory in copying would explain the occurrence of synonymous words in parallel passages without any apparent motive, as for "I call" in 2Sa 22:7 and Ps 18:7, and the interchange of Yahweh and Adonai. In Jer 27:1 Jehoiakim should be Zedekiah.

5. Errors of Carelessness and Ignorance:

Many of the scribal errors in the Massoretic Text are due to carelessness and ignorance: in Ge 36:2, the last "daughter" should be "son"; Nu 26:8, "son" for son, a common error; compare 1Ch 3:22; 1Ch 6:13 (28), Vashni means "and the second" (wehasheni); compare 1Sa 8:2; also in 1Sa 13:1 (compare above V, 13), where a number has dropped out, as also perhaps Isa 21:16, and 2Sa 3:7, where Ishbosheth has fallen like Mephibosheth. In 2Sa 23:18,19 the first "three" should be "thirty." Compare also Ge 3:10 (Syr); 2Ch 22:6; Eze 43:13, and often. The Books of Sirach seem to be the most carelessly copied of all the Old Testament books, though the text of Ezekiel is in some respects more unintelligible. In Jeremiah, the Septuagint is shorter by one-eighth than the Hebrew, but it is doubtful which is original.

VIII. History of the Text.

The consonantal text of the Old Testament was what it now is by the 1st or at latest the 2nd Christian century. During the next four centuries it was minutely studied, the number of its words and even of its letters being counted. The results of this study are found chiefly in the Talmud. All such study was oral. During this period the text remained a purely consonantal text plus the puncta extraordinaria.

1. Changes Made in Reading:

The text was not always read, however, exactly as it was written. Soon after the return from Babylon changes were made. Perhaps the earliest was that the proper name Yahweh was read Adonai, whence the Septuagint, and through it the New Testament "Lord." The reason will be found in Le 24:11, where render "pronounced the name." Sometimes the change was due to motives of taste (De 28:30; 1Sa 6:11; 2Ki 18:27); but the commonest ground was grammar or logic. Thus a word was frequently read which was not in the text at all (Jud 20:13; 2Sa 18:20); or a word was omitted in reading (2Sa 15:21; 2Ki 5:18); or the letters of a word were transposed, as in Jos 6:13; or one letter was put for another, especially waw for yodh or yodh for waw; or words were divided in reading otherwise than in the text (see above V, 1). The written text is called the Kethibh ("written"); what was read is called the Qere ("read").

2. Preservation of Text:

The scribes during these centuries, besides fixing the reading, took means to preserve the text by counting the words and letters, and finding the middle verse (Jud 10:8; Isa 33:21), and so forth. The middle verse of the Law is Le 8:7, and the middle of the words falls in 10:16. The middle verse of the Hebrew Bible is Jer 6:7. Note was made of words written abnormally (Ho 10:14; Mic 1:15; Isa 3:8) and lists were made up. All such lists were retained in the mind; nothing was written.

3. Division into Verses:

When the public reading of the Law was accompanied by an Aramaic translation (Ne 8:8), the division of the text into verses would arise spontaneously. The Mishna gives rules for the number of verses to be read at a time before translating. These verses were separated by a space only, as the words were. Hence, versions frequently divide differently for the Hebrew, as Ho 4:11; Isa 1:12. In the Hebrew itself there are 28 old verse divisions no longer observed (see Baer on Ho 1:2). The space is called picqa’ and the verse pacuq.

4. Sections of the Law:

About the same time the Law was divided into sections (parashah) for the annual reading. In Palestine the Law was read through once in 3 1/2 years; in Babylon once a year. Hence, the Law is divided into 54 sections (Ge 6:9; 12:1, etc.) for the annual reading. It is also divided into 379 "shut" sections, indicated by a space in the middle of a line, and 290 "open" sections, indicated by a space at the end of a line. In

printed texts these sections are noted by the letters c and p, but, if they coincide with one of the 54, by ccc or ppp. The Palestinian division was into 154 cedharim.

5. Sections of the Prophets:

From Maccabean times 54 passages (haphTaroth) were selected from the Prophets for the purposes of the synagogue (Lu 4:17). The Prophets were also divided into smaller sections. As in the case of the Law (Ex 6:28), there are cases of false division (Isa 56:9; Hag 1:15).

6. Poetical Passages:

In the Hebrew Bible certain passages were early written in a peculiar way to resemble the bricks in the wall of a house, either in three columns, a half-brick upon a brick and a brick upon a half-brick (Ex 15; Jud 5; 2Sa 22), or in two columns, a half-brick upon a half-brick and a brick upon a brick (De 32; Jos 12; Es 9). In the Septuagint, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiates, Canticles, Job are written in stichs; but that this was not done in Hebrew seems proved by the variations as to the number of lines (Ps 65:8; 90:2,11).

7. Division into Books:

The number of books is 24, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles each counting as one, Ezr including Neh, the twelve Minor Prophets counting one book (Mic 3:12 is the middle). The Law counts 5 books, Psalms one, though the division of it into 5 books is ancient (compare Ps 106:48 with 1Ch 16:35,36). By joining Ru to Judges and Lamentations to Jeremiah, the number 22 was obtained—the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet. When, probably about the 3rd century AD, leather rolls gave place to parchment books, it would be possible to have the whole Bible in one volume and the question of the order of the books would arise. The order in the Talmud is as follows: The Law (5), the Prophets (8), Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the XII, the Hagiographa or Kethubhim (11), Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiates, Canticles, Lamentation, Daniel, Esther, Ezra, Chronicles. The Prophets are usually subdivided into Former: Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings; and Latter: Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah and the XII. The traditional or "Masoretic" order places Isaiah before Jeremiah, and in the Hagiographa the order is: Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiates, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Ezra, the middle verse being Ps 130:3. The order found in printed texts is that of German manuscripts. The books receive their names from a word near the beginning, from their contents, or from their supposed author.

IX. Vocalization of the Text.

About the time of the Reformation it was the universal belief that the vowel-marks and other points were of equal antiquity with the consonants. The Jews believed Moses received them orally and Ezra reduced them to writing.

1. Antiquity of the Points:

The first to assign a late date to the points was Elias Levita (1468-1549). The battle was fought out in the 17th century. Ludovicus Cappellus (died 1658) argued for a date about 600 AD. The Buxtorfs defended the old view. The following are the facts.

2. Probable Date of Invention:

When the Septuagint was made, the Hebrew text had not even as many vowel-letters as it has now, and still less points; nor when the Syriac version was made in the 2nd century, or Jerome's Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) between 393-405, or the earlier Targums. Lastly, the points were unknown to the Talmud. They, therefore, did not exist before 600 AD. The earliest authority on the points is Aaron ben Asher of the school of Tiberias (died about 989). He wrote a copy of the Hebrew Bible with all the points, which became the standard codex. The probable date is, therefore, taken to be about the year 700; and this agrees with what was taking place in regard to Greek, Syriac and Arabic manuscripts. The Jews probably borrowed from the Syrians.

3. Various Systems and Recensions:

No doubt, at first, many systems of pointing existed. Of these, two survived, the Palestinian and Babylonian, or superlinear. The chief features of the latter are that the signs are placed above the line; it has no sign for "e" (ceghol), and has but one system of accents. The Palestinian, the one familiar to us, exists in two recensions, those of Ben Asher and of his contemporary, Ben Naphtali of Babylon; hence, a Western and an Eastern.

X. The Palestinian System.

Since the vocalization of the text took place about 700 AD, it will be understood that it differs considerably from the living language. What that was may be found from the transliteration of proper names in the Septuagint, in Origen and Jerome, and from a comparison with modern Arabic.

1. The Consonants:

A comparison with Arabic indicates that the Hebrew letter cheth (ch), and it is certain from the Septuagint that the Hebrew letter 'ayin ('), had each two distinct sounds. This difference is not shown in the pointing, though a point was used to distinguish the two sounds of "b", "g", "d", "k", "p", "t", and of "s", and "sh" and the two values of "h". The absence of this point is indicated by rapheh. The same point marks the doubling of a consonant. The gutturals and "r" are not doubled, though they certainly were when the language was spoken (compare Ge 43:26; Eze 16:4, etc.).

2. The Vowels:

The system of vowel-marks attempts to reproduce the sounds exactly. Thus the short a-sound which

must precede a guttural letter is indicated, and before a guttural "i" and "u" are replaced by "e" and "o". On the other hand, "y" before "i" does not seem to have been sounded in some cases. Thus the Septuagint has Israel, but Ieremias. Shewa’ is said by Ben Asher to sound "i" before "y"; before a guttural it took the sound of the guttural’s vowel, as mo’odh (me’odh), and had other values as well.

3. The Accents:

There is a special accentual system for the poetical books, Proverbs, Psalms, and Job (except the prose parts). The titles and such marks as celah are in the Psalms accented as forming part of the verse. The accents had three values, musical, interpunctional, and strictly accentual. But these values have to do with the language, not as it was spoken, but as it was chanted in the public reading of the synagogue.

4. Anomalous Pointings:

The words were not always pointed in the usual way, but sometimes according to subjective considerations. Thus the phrase "to see the face of God" is pointed "to appear before God," on account of Ex 33:20 (Ps 42:3; Isa 1:12). Similarly in Ec 3:21, "which goeth upward" is put for "whether it goeth upward." See also Jer 34:18; Isa 7:11. Frequently the punctuation is inconsistent with itself. Thus, ‘gathered to his peoples’ (Ge 35:29), but "gathered to my people" (singular, Ge 49:29). So pelishtim, "Philistines," receives the article with prepositions, otherwise not. In many places two pointings are mixed, as if to give a choice of readings (Ps 62:4; 68:3, and often).

XI. The Masorah.

1. Meaning of the Term:

The Hebrew text as printed with all the points and accents is called the Masoretic text. Masorah, or better, Maccoreth, is derived from a root meaning "to hand down" (Nu 31:5). This tradition began early. Rabbi Akiba (died 135) called it a "hedge about the Law." It tells the number of times a particular expression occurs, and mentions synonymous expressions, and so forth. The remarks placed in the side margin of the codex, often merely a letter denoting the number of times the word occurs, are called the Masorah parva. The notes were afterward expanded and placed in the top and bottom margins and called the Masorah magna. Notes too long for insertion in the margin were placed sometimes at the beginning, generally at the end of the codex, and called the Masorah finalis. The Masorah differs with different manuscripts; and there is an Eastern and a Western Masorah.

2. The "Qere" and "Kethibh":

The oldest and most important part of the Masorah lies in the readings which differ from the written text, called Qere. These may represent, variant readings of manuscripts, especially of them called cebhir. The most are mere errata and corrigenda of the text. Such are the four Q. perpetua, ‘adhonay (for YHWH), Jerusalem, Issachar and hu’, in the case of which the read form is not appended at the foot of the page.

Sometimes the emendation is right, as in Am 8:8; compare 9:5; sometimes the Kethibh represents an archaic form (Jud 9:8,12; Isa 32:11).

A Qere was inserted at 1Sa 17:34 to correct a misprint in the Venice Bible of 1521.

3. Other Features:

Other notes at the foot of the page draw attention to redundant or defective writing. Directions for the arrangement of the text are in Ge 49:8; De 31:28, and elsewhere. Each book concludes with a note giving the number of verses, sections, middle verse and other particulars about the book. The second last verses of Isaiah, Malalachi, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes are repeated after the last, which is ill-omened.

XII. Manuscripts and Printed Texts.

1. Manuscripts:

The manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible are not nearly so old as those of the Greek, old Hebrew manuscripts being generally destroyed. By far the oldest manuscript of any part of the Bible is the Papyrus Nash of about 150 AD, containing the Decalogue and Shema‘ (De 6:4). Next comes the Petersburg codex of the latter Prophets of 916 AD, though Ginsburg considers a manuscript of the Pentateuch (British Museum Orient. 4445) older. The pointing of the latter is Palestinian; of the former, supper-linear. The oldest manuscript of the whole Old Testament is dated 1010 AD.

2. Early Printed Texts:

The following are the chief printed texts: The Psalter of 1477, place unknown, with commentary of Kimchi. The first few psalms are voweled; the Pentateuch, 1482, Bologna, with Rashi and Targum Onkelos; perhaps the Five Rolls appeared at the same time; the Prophets, unpointed, 1485-86, at Soncino, with Rashi and Kimchi; the Hagiographa, 1486-87, at Naples, with points, but not accents, and commentaries (In the last two YHWH and ‘Elohim are spelled YHDH and ‘Elodhim); the 2nd edition of the Pentateuch at Faro in Portugal, 1487, first without commentary; the editio princeps of the whole Old Testament with points and accents, but no commentary, finished at Soncino, February 14, 1488, reprinted in 1491-93, and in the Brescia Bible of 1494. The last was the one used by Luther. Owing to persecution, the next edition was not till 1511-1517.

3. Later Editions:

The first Christian edition of the Hebrew text is that contained in the Complutensian Polyglot, finished July 10, 1517. It has many peculiarities, and first discarded the Masoretic sections for the Christian chapters, the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) being followed. The first rabbinic Bible—that is, pointed and accented text, with Masorah, Targums, and commentaries—was printed by Daniel Bomberg at Venice in 1516-17. The division of Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, and Ezra into two books

each is first marked here in a purely Hebrew text, and the consonants of the Qere first given in the margin. Previously the vowels were inserted in the text only. Thus in Isa 44:14, Luther did not observe the small nun, taking it for a zayin. What is called, however, the editio princeps of the rabbihic Bible is Bomberg's second edition, edition by Jacob ben Chayyim (1524-25). This forms the standard edition of the Massoretic Text. Samuel and Kings are each treated as two books. Cebhirim are noticed for the first time, and the Qeres marked with q. The Polyglot of Arias Montanus (1567-71) used the dilatable letters'," h", "l", "t", "m", broadened to fill up lines, and first numbered the chapters (in Hebrew letters). Buxtorf's rabbinic Bible appeared in 1618-19; the Paris Polyglot in 1629-44; the London Polyglot of Walton in 1654-57, which first gives the Ethiopic and Persian VSS; that of Athias in 1661, which first inserted the numbers of Christian chapters in the clauses at the end of the books of the Law, the Mantua edition of 1744 inserting them for all the books. In the last is embodied the Masoretic commentary of Solomon de Norzi (1626). Recent editors are Baer and Ginsburg. Special mention must be made of the edition of Kittel which inserts the variant readings of the versions at the foot of the page.

4. Chapters and Verses:

In modern editions of the Hebrew text the numbers of the Christian chapters are inserted. The chapters had their origin in the Vulgate, and are variously ascribed to Lanfranc (died 1089), Stephen Langton (died 1228), but with most probability to Hugo de Sancto Care (13th century). They mostly coincide with the Masoretic sections, and came in with the Polyglots from 1517 on, being used first in a purely Hebrew text in 1573-1574. Some modern editions mark the verses in the margin, the 5's in Hebrew letters, except 15, which is denoted by "Tw" = 9 plus 6, instead of "yh" = 10 plus 5, because the latter would = Yah. After the Clausula Masoretica at the end of Chronicles and elsewhere, there is an extended note taken from 1Ch 19:13 (2Sa 10:12).

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, Hebraische Archaologie, Leipzig, 1894; Berger, Histoire de l'ecriture dans l'antiquite, Paris, 1892; Blau, Masoretische Untersuchungen, Strassburg, 1891; Einleitung in die heilige Schrift, Budapest, 1894; Studien zum althebraischen Buchwesen, Pt. I, Strassburg, 1902; Buhl, Canon and Text (English translation by J. Macpherson), Edinburgh, 1892; Butin, The Ten Nequdoth of the Torah, Baltimore, 1906; Buxtorf (father), Tiberias side Commentarius Masorethicus, Basel, 1620; Buxtorf (son), Tractatus de Punctorum Origins, etc., Basel, 1648; Cappellus, Arcanum Punctationis Revelatum, Leyden, 1624; Chwolson, Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum, Petersburg, 1882; Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel, Oxford, 1913; Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, London, 1896; Etheridge, Jerusalem and Tiberias ("Post-Biblical Hebrew Literature"), London, 1856; Frankel, Ueber palastinische und alexandrinische Schriftforschung, Breslau, 1854; Geden, The Massoretic Notes Contained in the Edition of the Hebrew Scriptures, Published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1905; Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel, Breslau, 1857; Ginsburg, Introduction to the .... Hebrew Bible, London, 1897; The Massorah, London, 1880-85; Kennedy, The Note-Line in the Hebrew Scriptures, Edinburgh, 1903; Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient manuscripts, London, 1898; King, The Psalms in Three Collections (on the triennial cycle), Cambridge, 1898; Konig, Einleitung in das Altes Testament, Bonn, 1893; Loisy, Histoire critique du texts et des versions de la Bible, Paris, 1892-95; Nowack,

Lehrbuch der hebraischen Archaologie, Freiburg and Leipzig, 1894; De Rouge, Memoire sur l'origine egyptienne de l'alphabet phenicien, Paris, 1874; Schurer, Geschichte des judischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi (English translation by John Macpherson and others), Edinburgh, 1890; Schwab, Jerusalem Talmud (French translation), Paris, 1871-90; Strack, Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, Leipzig, 1873; Einleitung in den Talmud, Lelpzig, 1894; Taylor, The Alphabet, London, 1883; T.H. Weir, A Short History of the Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, London, 1907; Winckler, Die Thontafeln yon Tell-el-Amarna, Berlin, 1896; The Tell-el-Amarna Letters, Berlin, London and New York, 1896; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebraea, Hamburg and Leipzig, 1715-33; Wunsche, Bibliotheca Rabbinica, Leipzig, 1880.

Encyclopaedias:

Cheyne and Black, EB, London, 1899-1903; Fairbairn, Imperial Bible Dict., London, 1866 ("OT," "Scriptures," "Writing," by D. H. Weir); HDB, Edinburgh, 1898-1904 ("Text of the Old Testament," by H. L. Strack); Herzog, RE, Leipzig, 1896 ff; Jew Encyclopedia, New York and London, 1901-6; Vigoureux, Dictionnaire de la Bible, Paris, 1891 ff.

Hebrew texts:

Dikduke ha Te'amim des Ahron .... ben Asher, edition by Baer and Strack, Leipzig, 1879; Massoreth ha-Massoreth of Elias Levita, with English translation and notes by C.D. Ginsburg, London, 1867; Midrash hag-Gadol: Genesis, edition by S. Schechter, Cambridge, 1902; Das Buch, Ochla Weochla, edition by Frensdorff, Hanover, 1864; Mishna, With Latin translation, by Guil. Surenhusius, Amsterdam, 1698-1703; Sifra, edition by Jacob Schlossberg, Vienna, 1862; Sifre, edition by M. Friedmann (first part), Vienna, 1864; Soferim, edition by Joe Muller, Vienna, 1878; Babylonian Talmud, edition (With German translation) by Lazarus Goldschmidt, Berlin, 1896—.

Periodicals:

Academy, XXXI, 454 "The Moabite Stone"; Good Words, 1870, 673, "The Moabite Stone," by D. H. Weir; Jewish Quarterly Review: Dr. A. Buchler on "The Triennial Cycle," V, 420, VI, 1; "E. G. King on the Influence of the Triennial Cycle upon the Psalter," by I. Abrahams, April, 1904; "Neue Masoretische Studien," by Blau, January, 1904; "On the Decalogue Papyrus," by F. C. Burkitt, April, 1903; Journal of Theological Studies, V, 203, "The Influence of the Triennial Cycle upon the Psalter," by E. G., King; PEF: "Heb Mosaic Inscription at Kerr Kenna," by Clermont-Ganneau, October, 1901; "On the Siloam Inscription," 1881, 198; "On the Excavations at Taanach and Megiddo," 1904, 180, 1905, 78; Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology: E. J. Pilcher, "On the Date of the Siloam Inscription," XIX, 165, XX, 213; "On the Decalogue Papyrus," by S. A. Cook, January, 1903 "Hebrew Illuminated manuscripts of the Bible of the 11th and 12th Centuries," by M. Caster, XXII, 226; Scottish Review, IX, 215, "The Apocryphal Character of the Moabite Stone," by Albert Lowy; Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, III, 1, "The Introduction of the Square Characters in Biblical Manuscripts, and an Account of the Earliest Manuscripts of the Old Testament, with a Table of Alphabets and Facsimiles," by Ad.

Neubauer; Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palaestina-Vereins: "On the Excavations at Taanach," by Sellin, 1902, 13, 17, 33, 1903, 1, and 1905, number 3; "On the Excavations at Tell el Mutesellim," by Schumacher, 1904, 14, 33, and 1906, number 3; and by Benzinger, 1904, 65; Zeitschrift des deutschen Palaestina-Vereins: "On the Siloam Inscription," by Socin, XXII, 61; Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft: "Zur Geschichte der hebraischen Accents," by P. Kahle, 1901, 167.

Thomas Hunter Weir

THADDAEUS

tha-de'-us (Thaddaios): One of the Twelve Apostles (Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18). In Mt 10:3 the King James Version, the reading is "Lebbaeus, whose surname was Thaddaeus." The name corresponds to Judas, the son (Revised Version), or brother (the King James Version), of James, given in the lists of Lu 6:16; Ac 1:13.

See JUDAS, NOT ISCARIOT; LEBBAEUS.

The "Gospel of the Ebionites," or "Gospel of the Twelve Apostles," of the 2nd century and mentioned by Origen, narrates that Thaddaeus was also among those who received their call to follow Jesus at the Sea of Tiberias (compare Mt 4:18-22).

See also SIMON THE CANANAEAN.

According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (compare Budge, Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50), Thaddaeus was of the house of Joseph; according to the "Book of the Bee" he was of the tribe of Judah. There is abundant testimony in apocryphal literature of the missionary activity of a certain Thaddaeus in Syria, but doubt exists as to whether this was the apostle. Thus

(1) according to the "Ac of Peter" (compare Budge, II, 466 ff) Peter appointed Thaddaeus over the island of Syria and Edessa.

(2) The "Preaching of the blessed Judas, the brother of our Lord, who was surnamed Thaddaeus" (Budge, 357 ff), describes his mission in Syria and in Dacia, and indicates him as one of the Twelve.

(3) The "Acta Thaddaei" (compare Tischendorf, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, 1851, 261 ff) refers to this Thaddaeus in the text as one of the Twelve, but in the heading as one of the Seventy.

(4) The Abgar legend, dealing with a supposed correspondence between Abgar, king of Syria, and Christ, states in its Syriac form, as translated by Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, I, xiii, 6-22) (compare THOMAS), that "after the ascension of Christ, Judas, who was also called Thomas, sent to Abgar the

apostle Thaddaeus, one of the Seventy" (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 76 ff).

Jerome, however, identifies this same Thaddaeus with Lebbaeus and "Judas .... of James" of Luke (Lu 6:16). Hennecks (op. cit., 473, 474) surmises that in the original form of the Abgar legend Thomas was the central figure, but that through the influence of the later "Ac of Thomas", which required room to be made for Thomas' activity in India, a later Syriac recension was made, in which Thomas became merely the sender of Thaddaeus to Edessa, and that this was the form which Eusebius made use of in his translation According to Phillips (compare Phillips, The Doctrine of Addai the Apostle), who quotes Zahn in support, the confusion may be due to the substitution of the Greek name Thaddaeus for the name Addai of the Syriac manuscripts.

See APOCRYPHAL ACTS.

The general consensus seems to indicate, however, that both Thomas and Thaddaeus the apostle had some connection with Edessa. Of the various identifications of Thaddaeus with other Biblical personages which might be inferred from the foregoing, that with "Judas .... of James" is the only one that has received wide acceptance.

The burial place of Thaddaeus is variously placed at Beirut and in Egypt. A "Gospel of Thaddaeus" is mentioned in the Decree of Gelasius.

C. M. Kerr

THAHASH

tha'-hash.

See TAHASH.

THAMAH

tha'-ma.

See TEMAH.

THAMAR

tha'-mar (Thamar): the King James Version; Greek form of "Tamar" (thus Mt 1:3 the Revised Version (British and American)). Mother of Perez and Zerah.

THAMMUZ

tham’-uz (tammuz).

See TAMMUZ.

THAMNATHA

tham’-na-tha.

See TIMNATH.

THANK OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

THANK; THANKS; THANKSGIVING

thank, thanks, thanks-giv’-ing, thanks’-giv-ing: Both the verb and the nouns appear almost uniformly for yadhah, and eucharisteo, and their cognates. Eucharisteo is the usual Greek verb for "to thank," but yadhah takes on this force only through its context and is rather a synonym for "raise" or "bless" (which see) Septuagint renders yadhah usually by exomologeo, "speak forth together" "praise" (compare Tobit 12:20; Sirach 39:6, etc., and the use of "thank" in English Versions of the Bible to correspond), and this verb reappears in Mt 11:25 parellel Lu 10:21, with English "thank" (the Revised Version margin "praise"). Compare the use of anthomologeomai (Lu 2:38) and homologeo (Heb 13:15, the King James Version "giving thanks," the Revised Version (British and American) "make confession"; the King James Version is preferable). For charis in the sense of "thanks" (note the singular "thank" in the King James Version Sirach 20:16; Lu 6:32-34), see GRACE. 1Pe 2:19 the King James Version has "thankworthy" for charis, the Revised Version (British and American) "acceptable," the Revised Version margin "grace."

Burton Scott Easton

THARA

tha’-ra, thar’-a (Thara): the King James Version; Greek form of "Terah" (thus, Lu 3:34 the Revised Version (British and American)).

THARRA

thar’-a (Tharra): One of the two eunuchs, "keepers of the court," who with his companion Gabatha

(Bigthan) formed a conspiracy against King Artaxerxes which was detected by Mordecai (Additions to Esther 12:1 =" Teresh" of Es 2:21; 6:2). Tharra and his companion were hanged. Josephus (BJ, II, vi, 4) calls him "Theodestes."

THARSHISH

thar’-shish (tarshish).

See TARSHISH.

THASSI

thas’-i (Codex Venetus Thassei; Codex Vaticanus Thassis): The surname of Simon, the brother of Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 2:3; Syriac "Tharsi"). It is uncertain what the name means, perhaps "director" or "guide," since Simon was "a man of counsel," or "the zealous."

THAT DAY

See DAY OF THE LORD.

THEATRE

the’-a-ter (Ac 19:29,31).

See GAMES.

THEBES

thebz.

See NO-AMON.

THEBEZ

the’-bez (tebhets, "‘brightness"; Codex Vaticanus Thebes; Codex Alexandrinus Thaibais): A city in Mt. Ephraim which refused submission to Abimelech when he set up as king of Israel. After the reduction of Shechem he turned his arms against Thebez. There was a strong tower within the city—the citadel—into which all the inhabitants gathered for safety, climbing onto the roof of the tower. Abimelech incautiously venturing near the tower, a woman cast an upper millstone upon his head and broke his skull. Fearing the shame of perishing by the hand of a woman, he persuaded his armor-bearer to thrust

him through (Jud 9:50). The incident is alluded to in 2Sa 11:21. Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 13 Roman miles from Neapolis (Nablus) on the road to Scythopolis (Beisan). There is no doubt that it is represented by Tubas. This is a village situated in a district of considerable fertility, about 10 miles from Nablus. There are many olive trees. The rain is captured and led to rockcut cisterns, whence the village draws its water-supply. According to the Samaritans the tomb of Neby Toba marks the grave of the patriarch Asher.

W. Ewing

THECOE

the-ko’-e (1 Macc 9:33).

See TEKOA.

THEE-WARD

the’-werd. "To thee-ward" (1Sa 19:4) = toward thee.

See WARD.

THEFT

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

THELASAR

the-la’-sar (tela’ssar, telassar).

See TELASSAR.

THELERSAS

the-lur’-sas (Thelersas (1 Esdras 5:36)).

See TEL-HARSHA.

THEOCANUS

the-ok’-a-nus: 1 Esdras 9:14 the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American)

"Thocanus."

THEOCRACY

the-ok’-ra-si (theokratia, from theos, "a god," and kratos, "power"; after the analogy of the words "democracy," "aristocracy," and the like): "Theocracy" is not a Biblical word. The idea, however, is Biblical, and in strictness of speech exclusively Biblical. The realization of the idea is not only confined to Israel, but in the pre-exilic history of Israel the realization of the idea was confined to the Southern Kingdom, and in post-exilic history to the period between the return under Ezra and the days of Malachi.

For the word "theocracy" we are, by common consent, indebted to Josephus. In his writings it seems to occur but once (Apion, II, xvi). The passage reads as follows: "Our lawgiver had an eye to none of these," that is, these different forms of government, such as monarchy, aristocracy, oligarchy, and others of which Josephus had been speaking, "but, as one might say, using a strained expression, he set forth the national polity as a theocracy, referring the rule and might to God" (Stanton’s translation). It is generally agreed that the language here used indicates that Josephus knew himself to be coining a new word.

If, now, we turn from the word to the Old Testament idea to which it gives fitting and apt expression, that idea cannot be better stated than it has been by Kautzsch—namely, "The notion of theocracy is that the constitution (of Israel) was so arranged that all the organs of government were without any independent power, and had simply to announce and execute the will of God as declared by priest and prophets, or reduced to writing as a code of laws" (HDB, extra vol, 630, 1, init.). The same writer is entirely correct when he says that in what is known in certain circles as "the PC"—though he might have said in the Old Testament generally—"everything, even civil and criminal law, is looked at from the religious standpoint" (ibid., ut supra).

If the foregoing be a correct account of the idea expressed by the word "theocracy," and particularly if the foregoing be a correct account of the Old Testament representation of God’s relation to, and rule in and over Israel, it follows as a matter of course that the realization of such an idea was only possible within the sphere of what is known as special revelation. Indeed, special revelation of the divine will, through divinely-chosen organs, to Divinely appointed executive agents, is, itself, the very essence of the idea of a theocracy.

That the foregoing is the Old Testament idea of God’s relation to His people is admitted to be a natural and necessary implication from such passages as Jud 8:23; 1Sa 8; compare 12:12; 2Ch 13:8; 2Sa 7:1-17; Ps 89:27; De 17:14-20.

Upon any other view of the origin of the Old Testament books than that which has heretofore prevailed, it is certainly a remarkable fact that whenever the books of the Old Testament were written, and by whomsoever they may have been written, and whatever the kind or the number of the redactions to which they may have been subjected, the conception—the confessedly unique conception—of a

government of God such as that described above by Kautzsch is evidenced by these writings in all their parts. This fact is all the more impressive in view of the further fact that we do not encounter this sharply defined idea of a rule of God among men in any other literature, ancient or modern. For while the term "theocracy" occurs in modern literature, it is evidently used in a much lower sense. It is futher worth remarking that this Old Testament idea of the true nature of God's rule in Israel has only to be fully apprehended for it to become obvious that many of the alleged analogies between the Old Testament prophet and the modern preacher, reformer and statesman are wholly lacking in any really solid foundation.

W. M. McPheeters

THEODOTION

the-o-do'-shi-un.

See LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; SEPTUAGINT.

THEODOTUS

the-od'o-tus (Theodotos):

(1) One of the three ambassadors sent by the Syrian general Nicanor to Judas to make peace (2 Macc 14:19).

(2) One who plotted to assassinate Ptolemy Philopator, but was prevented by a Jew, Dositheos (3 Macc 1:2 f).

THEOLOGY

the-ol'-o-ji.

See BIBLICAL THEOLOGY; JOHANNINE THEOLOGY; PAULINE THEOLOGY.

THEOPHILUS

the-of'-i-lus (Theophilos, "loved of God"): The one to whom Luke addressed his Gospel and the Ac of the Apostles (compare Lu 1:3; Ac 1:1). It has been suggested that Theophilus is merely a generic term for all Christians, but the epithet "most excellent" implies it was applied by Luke to a definite person, probably a Roman official, whom he held in high respect. Theophilus may have been the presbyter who took part in sending the letter from the Corinthians to Paul, given in the "Acta Pauli" (compare Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 378). There is also a magistrate Theophilus mentioned in the

"Ac of James" as being converted by James on his way to India (compare Budge, The Contendings of the Apostles, II, 299), but these and other identifications, together with other attempts to trace out the further history of the original Theophilus, are without sufficient evidence for their establishment (compare also Knowling in The Expositor Greek Testament, II, 49-51).

C. M. Kerr

THERAS

the’-ras (Thera): The river by which the company assembled in preparation for the march to Jerusalem under Ezra (1 Esdras 8:41,61). In Ezr 8:21,31 the name of the river is Ahava. Possibly the place is represented by the modern Hit on the Euphrates; but no certain identification is possible.

THERMELETH

thur’-me-leth (Thermeleth (1 Esdras 5:36)).

See TEL-MELAH.

THESSALONIANS, THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE

thes-a-lo’-ni-anz

I. IMPORTANCE OF THE EPISTLE

II. CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH

1. Luke’s Narrative in Acts

2. Confirmation of Luke’s Narrative in the Epistle

III. CONDITIONS IN THE THESSALONIAN CHURCH AS INDICATED IN THE LETTER

IV. ANALYSIS WIENER, ORIGIN OF THE PENTATEUCH THE EPISTLE

1. Paul’s Past and Present Relations with the Thessalonians and His Love for Them

2. Exhortations against Vice, and Comfort and Warning in View of the Coming of Christ

V. DOCTRINAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE EPISTLE

VI. THE EPISTLE'S REVELATIONS OF PAUL'S CHARACTERISTICS

LITERATURE

I. The Importance of the Epistle.

The letter is especially important as a witness to the content of the earliest Gospel, on account of its date and its well-nigh unchallenged authenticity. According to Harnack it was written in the year 48 AD; according to Zahn, in the year 53. It is likely that these two dates represent the extreme limits. We are thus justified in saying with confidence that we have before us a document that could not have been written more than 24 years, and may very easily have been written but 19 years, after the ascension of our Lord. This is a fact of great interest in view of the contention that the Jesus of the four Gospels is a product of the legend-making propensity of devout souls in the latter part of the 1st century. When we remember that Paul was converted more than 14 years before the writing of the Epistles, and that he tells us that his conversion was of such an overwhelming nature as to impel him in a straight course from which he never varied, and when we note that at the end of 14 years Peter and John, having fully heard the gospel which he preached, had no corrections to offer (Ga 1:11-2:10, especially 2:6-10), we see that the view of Christ and His message given in this Epistle traces itself back into the very presence of the most intimate friends of Jesus. It is not meant by this that the words of Paul or the forms of his teaching are reproductions of things Jesus said in the days of His flesh, but rather that the conception which is embodied in the Epistle of the person of Christ and of His relation to the Father, and of His relation also to the church and to human destiny, is rooted in Christ's own self-revelation.

II. Circumstances of the Founding of the Church.

1. Luke's Narrative in Acts:

For the founding of the church we have two sources of information, the Book of Ac and the Epistle itself. Luke's narrative is found in Ac 17. Here we are told that Paul, after leaving Philippi, began his next siege against entrenched paganism in the great market center of Thessalonica. He went first into the synagogues of the Jews, and for three Sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures. Some of them, Luke tells us, "were persuaded, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few." This very naturally excited the jealousy of the Jews who found themselves losing the social prestige that came from having a large number of Greeks, including some of the nobility, resorting to them for instruction. Accordingly, they raised a mob of the worst men in town and brought the leading members of the church before the magistrate. These brethren, Jason and certain others, who seem to have been men of some property, were compelled to give bond to preserve the peace, and the intense feeling against Paul made it necessary for him, for the sake of these brethren as well as for his personal safety, to flee from the city.

2. Confirmation of Luke's Narrative in the Epistle:

The historicity of Luke's story of the founding of the church is strongly supported by the text of the Epistle. Paul, for instance, notes that the work in Thessalonica began after they had been shamefully entreated at Philippi (1Th 2:2). He bears witness also in the same verse to the conflict in the midst of which the Thessalonian church was founded (see also 1Th 2:14). Paul's exhortation to salute all the brethren with a holy kiss, his solemn adjuration that this letter be read unto all the brethren (1Th 5:26,27), and his exhortation to despise not prophesying (1Th 5:20) are harmonious with Luke's account of the very diverse social elements out of which the church was formed: diversities that would very easily give rise to a disposition on the part of the more aristocratic to neglect the cordial greetings to the poorer members, and to despise their uncouth testimonies to the grace of God that had come to them (Ac 17:4).

Paul tells us that he was forced to labor for his daily bread at Thessalonica (1Th 2:9). Luke does not make mention of this, but he tells us of his work at tent-making in the next town where he made a considerable stop (Ac 18:1-3), and thus each statement makes the other probable.

Perhaps, however, the most marked corroboration of the Ac which we have in the letter is the general harmony of its revelation of the character of Paul with that of the Acts. The reminiscences of Paul's work among them (1Th 2:1-12) correspond, for instance, in a marked way, in essence though not in style and vocabulary, with Luke's report of Paul's account of the method and spirit of his work at Ephesus (Ac 20:17-35). This, however, is only one of many correspondences which could be pointed out and which will at once be evident to anyone who will read the letter, and then go over Ac 13-28.

It may seem irrelevant thus to emphasize the historicity of Ac in an article on Thessalonians, but the witness of the Epistle to the historicity of the Gospels and of Ac is for the present moment one of its most important functions.

III. Conditions in the Thessalonian Church as Indicated in the Letter.

A New Testament epistle bears a close resemblance to a doctor's prescription. It relates itself to the immediate situation of the person to whom it is directed. If we study it we can infer with a great deal of accuracy the tendencies, good or bad, in the church. What revelation of the conditions at Thessalonica is made in the First Epistle? Plainly, affairs on the whole are in a very good state, especially when one takes into account the fact that most of the members had been out of heathenism but a few months. They were so notably devoted to God that they were known all over Macedonia as examples to the church (1Th 1:7). In particular the Christian grace of cordial good will toward all believers flourished among them: a grace which they doubtless had good opportunity to exercise in this great market town to which Christians from all parts would resort on business errands and where there would be constant demands on their hospitality (1Th 4:9-10).

There were, however, shadows in the picture. Some persons were whispering dark suspicions against Paul. Perhaps, as Zahn suggests, they were the unbelieving husbands of the rich ladies who had become members of the church. It was in answer to these criticisms that he felt called upon to say that he was not

a fanatic nor a moral leper, nor a deceiver (1Th 2:3). When he is so careful to remind them that he was not found at any time wearing a cloak of covetousness, but rather went to the extreme of laboring night and day that he might not be chargeable to any of them (1Th 2:9), we may be sure that the Christians were hearing constant jibes about their money-making teacher who had already worked his scheme with the Philippians so successfully that they had twice sent him a contribution (Php 4:16). Paul's peculiar sensitiveness on this point at Corinth (1Co 9:14,15) was possibly in part the result of his immediately preceding experiences at Thessalonica.

One wonders whether Greece was not peculiarly infested at this time with wandering philosophers and religious teachers who beat their way as best they could, living on the credulity of the unwary.

Paul's anxiety to assure them of his intense desire to see them and his telling of his repeated attempts to come to them (1Th 2:17-20) show rather plainly also that his absence had given rise to the suspicion that he was afraid to come back, or indeed quite indifferent about revisiting them. "We would fain have come unto you," he says, "I Paul once and again; and Satan hindered us."

Some also were saying that Paul was a flatterer (1Th 2:5), who was seeking by this means to carry out unworthy ends. This sneer indeed, after the reading of the letter, would come quite naturally to the superficial mind. Paul's amazing power to idealize his converts and see them in the light of their good intentions and of the general goal and trend of their minds is quite beyond the appreciation of a shallow and sardonic soul.

More than this, we can see plain evidence that the church was in danger of the chronic heathen vice of unchastity (1Th 4:3-8). The humble members also, in particular, were in danger of being intoxicated by the new intellectual and spiritual life into which they had been inducted by the gospel, and were spending their time in religious meetings to the neglect of their daily labor (1Th 4:10-12). Moreover, some who had lost friends since their baptism were mourning lest at the second coming of Christ these who had fallen asleep would not share in the common glory (1Th 4:13-18). This is a quaint proof of the immaturity of their view of Christ, as though a physical accident could separate from His love and care. There was likewise, as suggested above, the ever-present danger of social cliques among the members (1Th 5:13,15,20,26,27). It is to this condition of things that Paul pours forth this amazingly vital and human Epistle.

IV. Analysis of the Epistle.

The letter may be divided in several ways. Perhaps as simple a way as any is that which separates it into two main divisions.

First, Paul's past and present relations with the Thessalonians, and his love for them (1Th 1:1-3:13):

1. Paul's Past and Present Relations with the Thessalonians and His Love for Them:

(1) Greeting and Thanksgiving (1Th 1:1-10).

(2) Paul reminds them of the character of his life and ministry among them (1Th 2:1-12).

(3) The sufferings of the Thessalonians the same as those endured by their Jewish brethren (1Th 2:13-16).

(4) Paul's efforts to see them (1Th 2:17-20).

(5) Paul's surrender of his beloved helper in order to learn the state of the Thessalonian church, and his joy over the good news which Timothy brought (1Th 3:1-13).

Second, exhortations against vice, and comfort and warning in view of the coming of Christ (1Th 4:1-5,28):

2. Exhortations against Vice, and Comfort and Warning in View of the Coming of Christ:

(1) Against gross vice (1Th 4:1-8).

(2) Against idleness (1Th 4:9-12).

(3) Concerning those who have fallen asleep (1Th 4:13-18).

(4) Concerning the true way to watch for the Coming (1Th 5:1-11).

(5) Sundry exhortations (1Th 5:12-28).

V. Doctrinal Implications of the Epistle.

The Epistle to the Thessalonians is not a doctrinal letter. Paul's great teaching concerning salvation by faith alone, apart from the works of the Law, is not sharply defined or baldly stated, and the doctrine of the cross of Christ as central in Christianity is here implied rather than enforced. Almost the only doctrinal statement is that which assures them that those of their number who had fallen asleep would not in any wise be shut out from the rewards and glories at Christ's second coming (1Th 4:13-18). But while the main doctrinal positions of Paul are not elaborated or even stated in the letter, it may safely be said that the Epistle could scarcely have been written by one who denied those teachings. And the fact that we know that shortly before or shortly after Paul wrote the Epistle to the Galatians, and the fact that he so definitely describes his attitude at this very time toward the preaching of the cross of Christ, in his reminiscences in 1 Corinthians (see especially 1Co 2:1-5), show how foolish it is to assume that an author has not yet come to a position because he does not constantly obtrude it in all that he writes.

The Epistle, however, bears abundant evidence to the fact that this contemporary of Jesus had seen in the life and character and resurrection of Jesus that which caused him to exalt Him to divine honors, to mention Him in the same breath with God the Father, and to expect His second coming in glory as the event which would determine the destiny of all men and be the final goal of history. As such the letter, whose authenticity is now practically unquestioned, is a powerful proof that Jesus was a personality as extraordinary as the Jesus of the first three Gospels. And even the Christ of the Fourth Gospel is scarcely more exalted than He who now with God the Father constitutes the spiritual atmosphere in which Christians exist (1Th 1:1), and who at the last day will descend from heaven with a shout and with the voice of an archangel and the trump of God, and cause the dead in Christ to rise from their tombs to dwell forever with Himself (1Th 4:16,17).

VI. The Epistle’s Revelations of Paul’s Characteristics.

We notice in the letter the extreme tactfulness of Paul. He has some plain and humiliating warnings to give, but he precedes them in each case with affectionate recognition of the good qualities of the brethren. Before he warns against gross vice he explains that he is simply urging them to continue in the good way they are in. Before he urges them to go to work he cordially recognizes the love that has made them linger so long and so frequently at the common meeting-places. And when in connection with his exhortations about the second coming he alludes to the vice of drunkenness, he first idealizes them as sons of the light and of the day to whom, of course, the drunken orgies of those who are "of the night" would be unthinkable. Thus by a kind of spiritual suggestion he starts them in the right way.

LITERATURE.

Bishop Alexander, the Speaker’s Commentary (published in America under the title, The Bible Comm., and bound with most excellent commentaries on all of the Pauline Epistles), New York, Scribners; Milligan, The Epistles to the Thessalonians (the Greek text with Introduction and notes), London, Macmillan; Moffatt, The Expositor’s Greek Test. (bound with commentaries by various authors on the Pastoral Epistles, Philemon, Hebrews and James), New York, Dodd, Mead and Co.; Frame, ICC, New York, Scribners; Stevens, An American Commentary on the New Testament, Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society; Adeney, The New Century Bible, "1 and 2 Thessalonians" and "Galatians," New York, Henry Frowde; Findlay, "The Epistles to the Thessalonians," Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, New York, Putnams; James Denney, "The Epistles to the Thessalonians," Expositor’s Bible, New York, Doran; the two latter are especially recommended as inexpensive, popular and yet scholarly commentaries. The Cambridge Bible is a verse-by-verse commentary, and Professor Denney on "Thess" in Expositor’s Bible is one of the most vital and vigorous pieces of homiletical exposition known to the present writer.

Rollin Hough Walker

THESSALONIANS, THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE

I. IMPORTANCE OF STUDYING 1 THESSALONIANS AND 2 THESSALONIANS TOGETHER

II. AUTHENTICITY

1. Arguments against the Pauline Authorship

2. Arguments for the Pauline Authorship

III. THE MAN OF SIN

1. Primary Reference

2. Permanent Value of the Teaching concerning the Man of Sin

V. PAUL'S EXHORTATION TO QUIET INDUSTRY

LITERATURE

I. Importance of Studying 1 Thessalonians and 2 Thessalonians Together.

Those who hold to the Pauline authorship of the Epistle unite in ascribing it to a time but little subsequent to the writing of the First Letter. It is simply a second prescription for the same case, made after discovering that some certain stubborn symptoms had not yielded to the first treatment. 2Th should be studied in connection with 1 Thessalonians because it is only from an understanding of the First Epistle and the situation that it revealed that one can fully grasp the significance of the Second. And more than that, the solution of the problem as to whether Paul wrote the Second Letter is likewise largely dependent on our knowledge of the First. It would, for instance, be much harder to believe that Paul had written 2 Thessalonians if we did not know that before writing it he had used the tender and tactful methods of treatment which we find in the First Letter. It is as though one should enter a sick rook where the physician is resorting to some rather strong measures with a patient. One is better prepared to judge the wisdom of the treatment if he knows the history of the case, and discovers that gentler methods have already been tried by the physician without success.

II. Authenticity.

1. Arguments against the Pauline Authorship:

The different treatment of the subject of the second coming of Christ, the different emotional tone, and the different relationships between Paul and the church presupposed in the First and Second Epistles have been among the causes which have led to repeated questionings of the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians. Scholars argue, in the first place, that the doctrine concerning the coming of Christ which

we find in the Second Letter is not only differently phrased but is contradictory to that in the First. We get the impression from the First Letter that the Day of the Lord is at hand. It will come as a thief in the night (1Th 5:2), and one of the main parts of Christian duty is to expect (1Th 1:9,10). In the Second Letter, however, he writer urges strongly against any influence that will deceive them into believing that the Day of the Lord is at hand, because it will not be "except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshiped" (2Th 2:1-4).

Again very plainly also, say the critics, a different relation exists between the writer and the church at Thessalonica. In the First Letter he coaxes; in the Second Letter he commands (1Th 4:1,2,9-12; 5:1-11; 2Th 2:1-4; 3:6,12-14). Moreover, the whole emotional tone of the Second Letter is different from that of the First. The First Epistle is a veritable geyser of joyous, grateful affection and tenderness. The Second Letter, while it also contains expressions of the warmest affection and appreciation, is quite plainly not written under the same pressure of tender emotion. Here, say the critics, is a lower plane of inspiration. Here are Paul's words and phrases and plain imitations of Paul's manner, but here most emphatically is not the flood tide of Paul's inspiration. Moreover, the lurid vision of the battle between the man of sin and the returning Messiah in the Second Letter is different in form and coloring from anything which we find elsewhere in Paul. These, and other considerations have led many to assume that the letter was written by a hand other than that of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

2. Arguments for the Pauline Authorship:

The Hypothesis, however, that Paul was not the author of the Epistle, while it obviates certain difficulties, raises many more. Into a statement of these difficulties we will not go here, but refer the reader to a brief and scholarly putting of them in Peake's Critical Introduction to the New Testament, 12-16 (New York, Scribners, 1910).

There is accordingly today a manifest tendency among all scholars, including those in the more radical camps, to return to the traditional position concerning the authorship. The following are some of the positive arguments for the authenticity:

As for the opposing views of the coming of Christ in the two Epistles, it is to be noted that precisely the same superficial contradiction occurs in our Lord's own teaching on this same subject (Mt 24:6,23,24,25,26; Lu 12:35,40). Jesus exhorts His disciples to watch, for in such an hour as they think not the Son of man cometh, and yet at the same time and in the same connection warns them that when they see certain signs they should not be troubled, for the end is not yet. Paul, brooding over the subject after writing the First Letter, might easily have come strongly to see the obverse side of the shield. The apostle built his theology upon the tradition which had come from Jesus as interpreted by its practical effects upon his converts, and his mind was quick to counteract any danger due to overemphasis or wrong inferences. He was not nearly as eager for a consistently stated doctrine as he was for a doctrine that made for spiritual life and efficiency. During the fierce persecutions at the beginning of the movement in Thessalonica, the comfort of the thought of the swift coming of Christ was in need of

emphasis but as soon as the doctrine was used as an excuse for unhealthful religious excitement the minds of the disciples must be focused on more prosaic and less exciting aspects of reality.

That Paul assumes a commanding and peremptory attitude in the Second Letter which we do not find so plainly asserted in the First is readily admitted. Why should not the First Letter have had its intended effect upon the Thessalonian church as a whole? And if Paul received word that his gracious and tactful message had carried with it the conviction of the dominant elements of the church, but that certain groups had continued to be fanatical and disorderly, we can easily see how, with the main current of the church behind him, he would have dared to use more drastic methods with the offending members.

It is also readily admitted that the Second Letter is not so delightful and heart-warming as the First. It was plainly not written in a mood of such high emotional elevation. But the question may be raised as to whether the coaxing, caressing tone of the First Epistle would have been appropriate in handling the lazy and fanatical elements of the church after it had persisted in disregarding his tender and kindly admonitions. Jesus' stern words to the Pharisees in Mt 23 are not so inspiring as Joh 14, but they were the words and the only words that were needed at the time. "Let not your heart be troubled" would not be inspired if delivered to hypocrites. Furthermore, we are not called upon to assume that Paul at all times lived in the same mood of emotional exaltation. Indeed his Epistles abound with assertions that this was not the case (2Co 1:8; 1Th 3:9), and it is unreasonable to expect him always to write in the same key. It must be added, however, that the suggestion that the Second Epistle is stern may easily be overdone. If 1 Thessalonians were not before us, it would be the tenderness of Paul's treatment of the church which would most impress us.

Harnack has recently added the weight of his authority to the argument for the Pauline authorship of the letter. He thinks that there were two distinct societies in Thessalonica, the one perhaps meeting in the Jewish quarter and composed chiefly of Jewish Christians, and the other composed of Greeks meeting in some other part of the city. In addition to the probability that this would be true, which arises from the very diverse social classes out of which the church was formed (Ac 17:4), and the size of the city, he points to the adjuration in the First Letter (1Th 5:27) that this Epistle be read unto all the brethren, as a proof that there was a coterie in the church that met separately and that might easily have been neglected by the rest, just as the Greeks in Jerusalem were neglected in the daily ministration (Ac 6:1). He thinks that the Second Letter was probably directed to the Jewish element of the Church.

It is to be noted also that Professor Moffatt (Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, 76 ff), who calls in question the authenticity of nearly all of the books of the New Testament that any reputable scholars now attack, finds no sufficient reason to question the Pauline authorship of 2 Thessalonians.

III. The Man of Sin.

1. Primary Reference:

The question as to whom or what Paul refers to in 2Th 2:1-12, when he speaks of the man of sin, whose

revelation is to precede the final manifestation of Christ, has divided scholars during all the Christian centuries. (For a good discussion of the history of the interpretation of this difficult section, see Findlay, "I and II Thessalonians," Cambridge Bible, 170-80.) The reason why each age has had its fresh interpretation identifying the man of sin with the blasphemous powers of evil then most active is the fact that the prophecy has never yet found its complete accomplishment. The man of sin has never been fully revealed, and Christ has never finally destroyed him.

But Paul says that the mystery of iniquity already works (2Th 2:7), and he tells the church that the restraining influence which for the time being held it in check is something that "ye know" (2Th 2:6). Plainly, then, the evil power and that which held it in check were things quite familiar both to Paul and to his readers. We must therefore give the prophecy a lst-century reference. The alternative probably lies between making the mystery of iniquity the disposition of the Roman emperor to give himself out as an incarnation of deity and force all men to worship him, a tendency which was then being held in check by Claudius, but which soon broke out under Caligula (see Peake's Introduction above cited); or, on the other hand, making the mystery of iniquity to be some peculiar manifestation of diabolism which was to break out from the persecuting Jewish world, and which was then held in check by the restraining power of the Roman government.

In favor of making a blasphemous Roman emperor the man of sin, may be urged the fact that it was this demand of the emperor for worship which brought matters to a crisis in the Roman world and turned the terrific enginery of the Roman empire against Christianity. And it may be argued that it is hardly likely that the temporary protection which Paul received from the Roman government prevented him from seeing that its spirit was such that it must ultimately be ranged against Christianity. One may note also, in arguing for the Roman reference of the man of sin, the figurative and enigmatic way in which Paul refers to the opposing power, a restraint that would be rendered necessary for reasons of prudence (compare Mr 13:14, and also the cryptograms used by the author of the Book of Revelation in referring to Rome). Paul has none of this reserve in referring to the persecuting Jewish world who "please not God, and are contrary to all men" (1Th 2:15). And in view of the fact that the Jews were in disfavor in the Roman empire, as is proved by then recently issued decree of Claudius commanding all Jews to depart from Rome (Ac 18:2), and by the fact that to proclaim a man a Jew helped at that time to lash a mob into fury against him (Ac 16:20; 19:34), it would seem hardly likely that Paul would expect the subtle and attractive deception that was to delude the World to come from Jerusalem; and particularly would this seem unlikely in view of the fact that Paul seems to be familiar with our Lord's prophecy of the swift destruction of Jerusalem, as is shown by his assertion in 1Th 2:16, that wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.

On the other hand, however, to make the man of sin a person or an influence coming from Judaism is supported by the fact that he is to sit in the temple of God, setting himself forth to be God (1Th 2:4), and by the fact that the natural punishment for the rejection of their Messiah was that the Jews should be led to accept a false Messiah. Having opposed Him who came in the Father's name, they were doomed to accept one who came in his own name. Again, and far more important than this, is the fact that during nearly the whole of Paul's life it was the Roman empire that protected him, and the unbelieving Jews that formed the malicious, cunning and powerful opposition to his work and to the well-being and peace

of his churches, and he could very well have felt that the final incarnation of evil was to come from the source which had crucified the Christ and which had thus far been chiefly instrumental in opposing the gospel. Moreover, this expectation that a mysterious power of evil should arise out of the Jewish world seems to be in harmony with the rest of the New Testament (Mt 24:5,23,24; Re 11:3,1,8). It is the second alternative, therefore, that is, with misgivings, chosen by the present writer.

It may be objected that this cannot be the true Interpretation, as it was not fulfilled, but, on the contrary, it was Rome that became the gospel's most formidable foe. But this type of objection, if accepted as valid, practically puts a stop to all attempts at a historical interpretation of prophecy. It would force us to deny that the prophecies of the Old Testament, which are usually taken as referring to Christ, referred to Him at all, because plainly they were not literally fulfilled in the time and manner that the prophets expected them to be fulfilled. It would almost force us to deny that John the Baptist referred to Christ when he heralded the coming of the one who would burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire, because as the Gospels tell us Jesus did not fulfill this prophecy in the way John expected (Lu 7:19).

See MAN OF SIN.

2. Permanent Value of the Teaching concerning the Man of Sin:

Although Paul's prediction concerning the man of sin was not literally fulfilled, nevertheless his teaching has a permanent significance. It is always true in every battle for good that the Son of man does not come until the falling away comes and the man of sin is revealed. First, there is the fresh tide of enthusiasm and the promise of swift victory for the kingdom of heaven, but soon there is the reaction and the renascence of opposition in new and overwhelming power. The battle is to the death. And then above the smoke of the battle men see the sign of the coming of the Son of man with power and great glory; the conviction floods them that after all what Christ stands for is at the center of the universe and must prevail, and men begin to recognize Christ's principles as though they were natural law. This action and reaction followed by final victory takes place in practically all religious and reforming movements which involve the social reconstruction of society according to the principles of the Kingdom. It is exceedingly important that men should be delivered from shallow optimism. And this Epistle makes its contribution to that good end.

IV. Paul's Exhortation to Quiet Industry.

The exhortation that the brethren should work with quietness and earn their own bread (2Th 3:12) is full of interest to those who are studying the psychological development of the early Christians under the influence of the great mental stimulus that came to them from the gospel. Some were so excited by the new dignity that had come to them as members of the Christian society, and by the new hopes that had been inspired in their minds, that they considered themselves above the base necessity of manual labor. This is not an infrequent phenomenon among new converts to Christianity in heathen lands. Paul would have none of it. Fortunately he could point to his own example. He not only labored among them to earn his own livelihood, but he worked until muscles ached and body rebelled (2 These 3:8).

Paul saw that the gospel was to be propagated chiefly by its splendid effects on the lives of all classes of society, and he realized that almost the first duty of the church was to be respected, and so he not only exhorts the individual members to independence, but he lays down the principle that no economic parasite is to be tolerated in the church. "If any man will not work, neither let him eat" (2Th 3:10). This forms an important complement to the teaching of Jesus (Mt 5:42): "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." LITERATURE.

See under 1 Thessalonians.

Rollin Hough Walker

THESSALONICA

thes-a-lo-ni'-ka (Thessalonike, ethnic Thessalonikeus):

1. Position and Name:

One of the chief towns of Macedonia from Hellenistic times down to the present day. It lies in 40 degrees 40 minutes North latitude, and 22 degrees 50 minutes East longitude, at the northernmost point of the Thermaic Gulf (Gulf of Salonica), a short distance to the East of the mouth of the Axius (Vardar). It is usually maintained that the earlier name of Thessalonica was Therma or Therme, a town mentioned both by Herodotus (vii.121 ff, 179 ff) and by Thucydides (i.61; ii.29), but that its chief importance dates from about 315 BC, when the Macedonian king Cassander, son of Antipater, enlarged and strengthened it by concentrating there the population of a number of neighboring towns and villages, and renamed it after his wife Thessalonica, daughter of Philip II and step-sister of Alexander the Great. This name, usually shortened since medieval times into Salonica or Saloniki, it has retained down to the present. Pliny, however, speaks of Therma as still existing side by side with Thessalonica (NH, iv.36), and it is possible that the latter was an altogether new foundation, which took from Therma a portion of its inhabitants and replaced it as the most important city on the Gulf.

2. History:

Thessalonica rapidly became populous and wealthy. In the war between Perseus and the Romans it appears as the headquarters of the Macedonian navy (Livy xliv. 10) and when, after the battle of Pydna (168 BC), the Romans divided the conquered territory into four districts, it became the capital of the second of these (Livy xlv.29), while later, after the organization of the single Roman province of Macedonia in 146 BC, it was the seat of the governor and thus practically the capital of the whole province. In 58 BC Cicero spent the greater part of his exile there, at the house of the quaestor Plancius (Pro Plancio 41, 99; Epistle Ad Att, iii.8-21). In the civil war between Caesar and Pompey, Thessalonica took the senatorial side and formed one of Pompey's chief bases (49-48 BC), but in the final struggle of the republic, six years later, it proved loyal to Antony and Octavian, and was rewarded by receiving the

status and privileges of a "free city" (Pliny, NH, iv.36). Strabo, writing in the reign of Augustus, speaks of it as the most populous town in Macedonia and the metropolis of the province (vii.323, 330), and about the same time the poet Antipater, himself a native of Thessalonica, refers to the city as "mother of all Macedon" (Jacobs, Anthol. Graec., II, p. 98, number 14); in the 2nd century of our era Lucian mentions it as the greatest city of Macedonia (Asinus, 46). It was important, not only as a harbor with a large import and export trade, but also as the principal station on the great Via Egnatia, the highway from the Adriatic to the Hellespont.

3. Paul's Visit:

Paul visited the town, together with Silas and Timothy, on his 2nd missionary journey. He had been at Philippi, and traveled thence by the Egnatian Road, passing through Amphipolis and Apollonia on the way (Ac 17:1). He found at Thessalonica a synagogue of the Jews, in which for three successive Sabbaths he preached the gospel, basing his message upon the types and prophecies of the Old Testament Scriptures (Ac 17:2,3). Some of the Jews became converts and a considerable number of proselytes and Greeks, together with many women of high social standing (Ac 17:4). Among these converts were in all probability Aristarchus and Secundus, natives of Thessalonica, whom we afterward find accompanying Paul to Asia at the close of his 3rd missionary journey (Ac 20:4). The former of them was, indeed, one of the apostle's most constant companions; we find him with Paul at Ephesus (Ac 19:29) and on his journey to Rome (Ac 27:2), while in two of his Epistles, written during his captivity, Paul refers to Aristarchus as still with him, his fellow-prisoner (Col 4:10; Phm 1:24). Gaius, too, who is mentioned in conjunction with Aristarchus, may have been a Thessalonian (Ac 19:29). How long Paul remained at Thessalonica on his 1st visit we cannot precisely determine; certainIy we are not to regard his stay there as confined to three weeks, and Ramsay suggests that it probably extended from December, 50 AD, to May, 51 AD (St. Paul the Traveler, 228). In any case, we learn that the Philippines sent him assistance on two occasions during the time which he spent there (Php 4:16), although he was "working night and day" to maintain himself (1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8). Paul, the great missionary strategist, must have seen that from no other center could Macedonia be permeated with the gospel so effectively as from Thessalonica (1Th 1:8).

But his success roused the jealousy of the Jews, who raised a commotion among the dregs of the city populace (Ac 17:5). An attack was made on the house of Jason, with whom the evangelists were lodging, and when these were not found Jason himself and some of the other converts were dragged before the magistrates and accused of harboring men who had caused tumult throughout the Roman world, who maintained the existence of another king, Jesus, and acted in defiance of the imperial decrees. The magistrates were duly alive to the seriousness of the accusation, but, since no evidence was forthcoming of illegal practices on the part of Jason or the other Christians, they released them on security (Ac 17:5-9). Foreseeing further trouble if Paul should continue his work in the town, the converts sent Paul and Silas (and possibly Timothy also) by night to Berea, which lay off the main road and is referred to by Cicero as an out-of-the-way town (oppidum devium: in Pisonem 36). The Berean Jews showed a greater readiness to examine the new teaching than those of Thessalonica, and the work of the apostle was more fruitful there, both among Jews and among Greeks (Ac 17:10-13). But the news of this success reached the Thessalonian Jews and inflamed their hostility afresh. Going to Berea, they

raised a tumult there also, and made it necessary for Paul to leave the town and go to Athens (Ac 17:14,15).

Several points in this account are noteworthy as illustrating the strict accuracy of the narrative of the Acts. Philippi was a Roman town, military rather than commercial; hence, we find but few Jews there and no synagogue; the magistrates bear the title of praetors (Ac 16:20,22,35,36,38 the Revised Version margin) and are attended by lictors (Ac 16:35,38 the Revised Version margin); Paul and Silas are charged with the introduction of customs which Romans may not observe (Ac 16:21); they are beaten with rods (Ac 16:22) and appeal to their privileges as Roman citizens (16:37,38). At Thessalonica all is changed. We are here in a Greek commercial city and a seaport, a "free city," moreover, enjoying a certain amount of autonomy and its own constitution. Here we find a large number of resident Jews and a synagogue. The charge against Paul is that of trying to replace Caesar by another king; the rioters wish to bring him before "the people," i.e. the popular assembly characteristic of Greek states, and the magistrates of the city bear the Greek name of politarchs (Ac 17:5-9). This title occurs nowhere in Greek literature, but its correctness is proved beyond possibility of question by its occurrence in a number of inscriptions of this period, which have come to light in Thessalonica and the neighborhood, and will be found collected in AJT (1898, 598) and in M. G. Dimitsas, (Makedonia), 422 ff. Among them the most famous is the inscription engraved on the arch which stood at the western end of the main street of Salonica and was called the Vardar Gate. The arch itself, which was perhaps erected to commemorate the victory of Philippi, though some authorities assign it to a later date, has been removed, and the inscription is now in the British Museum (CIG, 1967; Leake, Northern Greece, III, 236; Le Bas, Voyage archeologique, number 1357; Vaux, Trans. Royal Sec. Lit., VIII, 528). This proves that the politarchs were six in number, and it is a curious coincidence that in it occur the names Sosipater, Gaius and Secundus, which are berate by three Macedonian converts, of whom the first two were probably Thessalonians, the last certainly.

4. The Thessalonian Church:

The Thessalonian church was a strong and flourishing one, composed of Gentiles rather than of Jews, if we may judge from the tone of the two Epistles addressed to its members, the absence of quotations from and allusions to the Old Testament, and the phrase "Ye turned unto God from idols" (1Th 1:9; compare also 2:14). These, by common consent the earliest of Paul’s Epistles, show us that the apostle was eager to revisit Thessalonica very soon after his enforced departure: "once and again" the desire to return was strong in him, but "Satan hindered" him (1Th 2:18)—a reference probably to the danger and loss in which such a step would involve Jason and the other leading converts. But though himself prevented from continuing his work at Thessalonica, he sent Timothy from Athens to visit the church and confirm the faith of the Christians amid their hardships and persecutions (1Th 3:2-10). The favorable report brought back by Timothy was a great comfort to Paul, and at the same time intensified his longing to see his converts again (1Th 3:10,11). This desire was to be fulfilled more than once. Almost certainly Paul returned there on his 3rd missionary journey, both on his way to Greece (Ac 20:1) and again while he was going thence to Jerusalem (Ac 20:3); it is on this latter occasion that we hear of Aristarchus and Secundus accompanying him (Ac 20:4). Probably Paul was again in Thessalonica after his first imprisonment. From the Epistle to the Philippians (Ac 1:26; 2:24), written during his captivity,

we learn that his intention was to revisit Philippi if possible, and 1Ti 1:3 records a subsequent journey to Macedonia, in the course of which the apostle may well have made a longer or shorter stay at Thessalonica. The only other mention of the town in the New Testament occurs in 2Ti 4:10, where Paul writes that Demas has forsaken him and has gone there. Whether Demas was a Thessalonian, as some have supposed, cannot be determined.

5. Later History:

For centuries the city remained one of the chief strongholds of Christianity, and it won for itself the title of "the Orthodox City," not only by the tenacity and vigor of its resistance to the successive attacks of various barbarous races, but also by being largely responsible for their conversion to Christianity.

From the middle of the 3rd century AD it was entitled "metropolis and colony," and when Diocletian (284-305) divided Macedonia into two provinces, Thessalonica was chosen as the capital of the first of these. It was also the scene in 390 AD of the famous massacre ordered by Theodosius the Great, for which Ambrose excluded that emperor for some months from the cathedral at Milan. In 253 the Goths had made a vain attempt to capture the city, and again in 479 Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, found it so strong and well prepared that he did not venture to attack it. From the 6th to the 9th century it was engaged in repeated struggles against Avars, Slavonians and Bulgarians, whose attacks it repelled with the utmost difficulty. Finally, in 904 AD it was captured by the Saracens, who, after slaughtering a great number of the inhabitants and burning a considerable portion of the city, sailed away carrying with them 22,000 captives, young men, women and children. In 1185, when the famous scholar Eustathius was bishop, the Normans under Tancred stormed the city, and once more a general massacre took place. In 1204 Thessalonica became the center of a Latin kingdom under Boniface, marquis of Monferrat, and for over two centuries it passed from hand to hand, now ruled by Latins now by Greeks, until in 1430 it fell before the sultan Amurath II. After that time it remained in the possession of the Turks, and it was, indeed, the chief European city of their dominions, with the exception of Constantinople, until it was recaptured by the Greeks in the Balkan war of 1912. Its population includes some 32,000 Turks, 47,000 Jews (mostly the descendants of refugees from Spain) and 16,000 Greeks and other Europeans. The city is rich in examples of Byzantine ecclesiastical architecture and art, and possesses, in addition to a large number of mosques, 12 churches and 25 synagogues.

LITERATURE.

The fullest account of the topography of Thessalonica and its history, especially from the 5th to the 15th century, is that of Tafel, De Thessalonica eiusque agro. Dissertatio geographica, Berlin, 1839; compare also the Histories of Gibbon and Finlay. A description of the town and its ancient remains is given by Leake, Travels in Northern Greece, III, 235 ff; Cousinery, Voyage dans la Macedoine, I, 23 ff; Heuzey, Mission archeol. de Macedoine,' 272 ff; and other travelers. The inscriptions, mostly in Greek, are collected in Dimitsas, (Makedonia), 421 ff.

M. N. Tod

THEUDAS

thu’-das (Theudas, a contraction of Theodorus, "the gift of God"): Theudas is referred to by Gamaliel in his speech before the Sanhedrin, when he advised them as to the position they should adopt in regard to the apostles (Ac 5:36). The failure of the rebellion of Theudas was quoted by Gamaliel on this occasion as typical of the natural end of such movements as were inspired "not of God, but of men." A rising under one Theudas is also described by Josephus (Ant., XX, v, 1), but this occurred at a later date (according to Josephus about 44 or 45 AD) than the speech of Gamaliel (before 37 AD). Of theories put forward in explanation of the apparent anachronism in Gameliels speech, the two most in favor are

(1) that as there were many insurrections during the period in question, the two writers refer to different Theudases;

(2) that the reference to Theudas in the narrative of Ac was inserted by a later reviser, whose historical knowledge was inaccurate (Weiss; compare also Knowling, The Expositor’s Greek Testament, II, 157-59).

C. M. Kerr

THICK TREES

(‘ets ‘abhoth (Le 23:40; Ne 8:15)): One of the varieties of trees which the Israelites were directed to use at the Feast of Tabernacles; in the latter passage they are expressly directed to make booths with them. According to the Talmudic writings, the "thick trees" are myrtles (Suk. 12a; Jer Suk. iii, 53d), and further tradition has prescribed certain special features as to the varieties of myrtle employed, without which they cannot be used in the ritual of the feast. In Sirach 14:18 "thick tree" represents dendron dasu, "leafy tree."

See MYRTLE.

THICKET

thik’-et (cebhakh (Ge 22:13; Isa 9:18; 10:34), or cobhekh (Jer 4:7); in 1Sa 13:6, choach): A thick or dense growth of trees or shrubs (thorns, brambles), in which wild beasts may lurk (Jer 4:7), or animals be caught by their horns (Ge 22:13; Abraham’s ram).

See FOREST.

THIEF

thef: In the Old Testament the uniform translation (17 times) of gannabh, from ganabh, "steal," but gannabh is rather broader than the English "thief," and may even include a kidnapper (De 24:7). In Apocrypha and the New Testament, the King James Version uses "thief" indifferently for kleptes, and lestes, but the Revised Version (British and American) always renders the latter word by "robber" (a great improvement), See CRIMES. The figurative use of thief" as one coming without warning" (Mt 24:43, etc.) needs no explanation.

The penitent thief ("robber," the Revised Version (British and American) Mr 15:27; Mt 27:38,44; "malefactor," Lu 23:32,39) was one of the two criminals crucified with Christ. According to Mark and Matthew, both of these joined in the crowd's mockery, but Luke tells that one of them reproached his fellow for the insults, acknowledged his own guilt, and begged Christ to remember him at the coming of the Kingdom. And Christ replied by promising more than was asked—immediate admission into Paradise. It should be noted that unusual moral courage was needed for the thief to make his request at such a time and under such circumstances, and that his case has little in common with certain sentimental "death-bed repentances."

To explain the repentance and the acknowledgment of Christ as Messiah, some previous acquaintance of the thief with Christ must be supposed, but all guesses as to time and place are of course useless. Later tradition abundantly filled the blanks and gave the penitent thief the name Titus or Dysmas.

See ASSASSINS; BARABBAS.

Burton Scott Easton

THIGH

thi (yarekh; Aramaic yarekhah (Da 2:32); meros (Judith 9:2; Sirach 19:12; Re 19:16); as part of a sacrificial animal (Ex 29:22, etc.) shoq, the King James Version, the Revised Version margin "shoulder"; in addition the King James Version has "thigh" for shoq in Isa 47:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) "leg")): The portion of the leg from the knee to the hip, against which a weapon hangs when suspended from the waist (Ex 32:27; Jud 3:16,21; Ps 45:3, etc.). So the thigh of a rider on horseback would be covered by a loose girdle, on which his name might be embroidered (Re 19:16). The "hollow of the thigh" (Ge 32:25) is the hip-socket or the groin.

See also HIP.

The thighs were thought to play a part in procreation (Ge 46:26; Ex 1:5, English Versions of the Bible "loins"; Jud 8:30, English Versions of the Bible "body"; compare Nu 5:21 ff), so that an oath taken with the hand under the thigh (Ge 24:2,9; 47:29) was taken by the life-power (the rabbis interpreted "by the seal of circumcision"). It is perhaps significant that this oath in both Ge 24 and 47 is said to have been exacted by persons in danger of death. Doubtless this association of the thigh with life (aided perhaps by its excellence as food (1Sa 9:24; Eze 24:4)) determined its choice as a sacrificial potion (Ex 29:22, etc.;

on the "heave thigh" see SACRIFICE). Consequently, it is natural to find the thigh classed as forbidden ("sacred") food among certain peoples, and, probably, this sacred character of the part is the real basis of Ge 32:32: "The children of Israel eat not the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh, unto this day." The origin of the prohibition, however, was unknown to the writer of the verse, and he sought an explanation from a story in which special attention was called to the thigh. Nothing else is heard about this precept in the Old Testament, but it receives elaborate attention in the Mishna (Chullin vii), where, for instance, all food cooked with meat containing the sinew (nervus ischiadicus) is rendered unclean if the sinew imparts a flavor to it, but not otherwise. (For further details see the comms., especially Skinner. (ICC) and RS2, 380.) One of the proofs of guilt in the jealousy trial (Nu 5:27) was the falling-away of the "thigh" (a euphemism; see JEALOUSY). To smite upon the thigh was a token of contrition (Jer 31:19) or of terror (Ezr 21:12).

Burton Scott Easton

THIMNATHAH

thim’-na-tha, thim-na’-tha (timnathah): the King James Version in Jos 19:43. It is correctly "Timnah" with Heb locale meaning "towed Timnah."

See TIMNAH.

THINK

think: The Old Testament often translates ‘amar, "to say," meaning what one says to himself, and hence, a definite and clearly formulated decision or purpose (Ge 20:11; Nu 24:4; Ru 4:4, etc.), illustrated by the, change made by the Revised Version (British and American) in the King James Version of Es 6:6, where "thought in his heart" becomes "said in his heart." In other passages, for chashabh, damah, or zamam, indicating the result of mental activity, as in an intention or estimate formed after careful deliberation (compare Ecclesiasticus 18:25); In the New Testament, most, frequently for dokeo, "to be of the opinion, "suppose," literally, "seem" (Mt 3:9; 6:7; Lu 10:36, etc.). Sometimes, for logizomai, "to compute," "reckon" (Ro 2:3, etc.); sometimes, for nomizo, literally referring to what attains the force of law (nomos), and then, "to be of the opinion"; or, for phroneo, implying a thought that is cherished—a mental habit, rather than an act (Ro 12:3; 1Co 13:11). The Greek hegeomai, "to consider," implies logical deduction from premises (Ac 26:2; Php 2:6), while in Mt 1:20; 9:4, and Ac 10:19, enthumoumai, refers to the mental process itself, the thinking-out of a project, the concentration of the faculties upon the formation of a plan.

H. E. Jacobs

THIRD

thurd (shelishi; tritos): Isa 19:24, "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria," etc., brings out very distinctly the universal and missionary character of Isaiah's prophecies and of Israel's destiny (compare Eze 16:63; and see G. A. Smith, Isaiah, II, 275, 278; Watkinson, Th. Blind Spot 21 ff).

For "third hour," "third month," "third year," see CALENDAR; DAY; TIME.

THIRD DAY

See LORD'S DAY.

THIRST

thurst (tsama', verb tsame'; dipsao, dipsos, dipsa): One of the most powerful natural appetities, the craving for water or other drink. Besides its natural significance, thirst is figuratively used of strong spiritual desire. The soul thirsts for God (Ps 42:2; 63:1). Jesus meets the soul's thirst with water of life (Joh 4:13 ff; 6:35; 7:37). It is said of the heavenly bliss, "They shall hunger no more; neither thirst any more" (Re 7:16,17; compare Isa 49:10).

THIRTEEN; THIRTY

thur'-ten, thur-ten', thur'-ti.

See NUMBER.

THISBE

thiz'-be (Codex Vaticanus Thisbe, Codex Alexandrinus Thibe): The home of Tobit whence he was carried into captivity to Babylon. It is said te be "on the right hand (i.e. South) of Kedesh-naphtali in Galilee" (Tobit 1:2). Some have thought that this was the native place of Elijah the Tishbite, but this is mere conjecture. The site has not been recovered. We need not expect strict geographical accuracy in the romance of Tobit, any more than in that of Judith.

THISTLES

this'-'-lz.

See THORNS.

THOCANUS tho-ka'-nus (Thokanos, Thokanos; the King James Version Theocanus): The father of Ezekias, who with Jonathan "took the matter upon them" in the proceedings under Ezra against foreign

wives (1 Esdras 9:14) =" Tikvah" in Ezr 10:15.

THOMAS

tom’-as (Thomas; ta’om, "a twin" (in plural only):

1. In the New Testament:

One of the Twelve Apostles. Thomas, who was also called "Didymus" or "the Twin" (compare Joh 11:16; 20:24; 21:2), is referred to in detail by the Gospel of John alone. His election to the Twelve is recorded in Mt 10:3; Mr 3:18; Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13. In Joh 11:1-54, when Jesus, despite imminent danger at the hands of hostile Jews, declared His intention of going to Bethany to heal Lazarus, Thomas alone opposed the other disciples who sought to dissuade Him, and protested, "Let us also go; that we may died with him" (Joh 11:16). On the eve of the Passion, Thomas put the question, "Lord, we know now whither thou goest; how know we the way?" (Joh 14:5). After the crucifixion, Thomas apparently severed his connection with the rest of the apostiles for a time, as he was not present when the risen Christ first appeared to them (compare Joh 20:24). But his subsequent conversation with them, while not convincing him of the truth of the resurrection—"except I shall see .... I will not believe" (Joh 20:25)—at least induced him to be among their number eight days afterward (Joh 20:26) in the upper room. There, having received the proofs for which he sought, he made the confession, "My Lord and my God" (Joh 20:28), and was reproved by Jesus for his previous unbelief: "Because thou hast seen me thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed" (Joh 20:29). He was one of the disciples to whom Jesus manifested Himself during the fishing expedition at the Sea of Tiberias (Joh 21:1-11).

2. In Apocryphal Literature:

According to the "Genealogies of the Twelve Apostles" (compare Budge, The Contendings of the Apostles, II, 50), Thomas was of the house of Asher. The oldest accounts are to the effect that he died a natural death of (compare Clement of Alexandria iv.9, 71). Two fields are mentioned by apocryphal literature as the scene of Thomas’ missionary labors.

(1) According to origen, he preached in Parthia, the according to a Syrian legend he died at Edessa. The Agbar legend also indicates the connection of Thomas with Edessa. But Eusebius indicates it was Thaddaeus and not Thomas who preached there (see THADDAEUS).

(2) Along with these are other sources identifying Thomas with India. Thus, "The Ac of Thomas" (see APOCRYPHAL ACTS, sec. B, V), a Gnostic work dating from the 2nd century, tells how when the world was partitioned out as a mission field among the disciples, India fell to "Judas Thomas, also called Didymus," and narrates his adventures on the way, his trials, missionary success, and death at the hands of Misdai, king of India (compare Budge, II, 404 ff; Hennecke, Neutestamentliche Apokryphen, 473-544; Pick, The Apocryphal Acts, 224 ff). The "Preaching of Thomas" (compare Budge, II, 319) relates

still more fantastic adventures of Thomas in India, and the "Martyrdom of Thomas in India" states that on his departure toward Macedonia he was put to death as a sorcerer.

Of the two, the former is the more probable. An attempt at reconciliation has been made by supposing that the relics of Thomas were transported from India to Edessa, but this is based on inaccurate historical information (compare Hennecke, op. cit., 474). The additional names "Judas" and "Didymus" have causd further confusion in apocryphal literature in regard to Thomas, and have led to his identification with Judas of James, and hence, with Thaddaeus (see THADDAEUS), and also with Judas the brother of Jesus (compare Mt 13:55). Thus in the "Ac of Thomas" he is twice called the "twin brother of the Messiah." Another legend makes Lysia the twin sister of Thomas. A Gnostic "Gospel of Thomas" (see APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, 2, (a)) was known to Irenaeus (compare Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., 1,20).

3. Character:

Although little is recorded of Thomas in the Gospels, he is yet one of the most fascinating of the apostles. He is typical of that nature—a nature by no means rare—which contains within it certain conflicting elements exceedingly difficult of reconciliation. Possessed of little natural buoyancy of spirit, and inclined to look upon life with the eyes of gloom or despondency, Thomas was yet a man of indomitable courage and entire unselfishness. Thus with a perplexed faith in the teaching of Jesus was mingled a sincere love for Jesus the teacher. In the incident of Christ’s departure for Bethany, his devotion to his Master proved stronger than his fear of death. Thus far, in a situation demanding immediate action, the faith of Thomas triumphed; but when it came into conflict with his standards of belief it was put to a harder test. For Thomas desired to test all truth by the evidence of his senses, and in this, coupled with a mind tenacious both of its beliefs and disbeliefs, lay the real source of his religious difficulties. It was his sincerity which made him to stand aloof from the rest of the disciples till he had attained to personal conviction regarding the resurrection; but his sincerity also drew from him the testimony to that conviction, "My Lord and my God," the greatest and fullest in all Christianity.

C. M. Kerr

THOMAS, GOSPEL OF

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS, III, 2, (a).

THOMEI thom’-e-i (Codex Alexandrinus Thomei; Fritzsche Thomoi; Codex Vaticanus and Swete Thomthei; the King James Version, Thomoi): A family name of temple-servants who returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:32) =" Temah" in Ezr 2:53; Ne 7:55.

THORN IN THE FLESH

thorn (skolops te sarki): Paul thus characterizes some bodily ailment which afflicted him and impaired

his usefulness (2Co 12:7). The data are insufficient to enable us to ascertain its real nature, and all the speculations on the point are therefore inconclusive. All that we are told is that it was a messenger of Satan; that thereby he was beaten as with a fist, which might be figurative or actual; that it rendered his bodily presence unattractive. It appears that the infirmity recurred, for thrice he sought deliverance; but, by the help of God, he was able to glory in it. Sir W. Ramsay sees in it some form of recurring malarial fever. It was something that disabled him (Ga 4:12-15); hence, Farrar supposes that it was ophthalmia, from the reference to his eyes, from his inability to recognize the high priest (Ac 23:5), from his employing amanuenses to write his epistles, and his writing the Galatian letter in large characters with his own hand (Ga 6:11). Krenkel has at great length argued that it was epilepsy, and thereby endeavors to account for his trances and his falling to the earth on his way to Damascus, but his work is essentially a special pleading for a foregone conclusion, and Paul would not have called his visions "a messenger of Satan." It is also beside the question to heap up instances of other distinguished epileptics. On the whole Farrar’s theory is the most probable.

It is probably only a coincidence that "pricks in your eyes" Septuagint skolopes) are mentioned in Nu 33:55. Any pedestrian in Palestine must be familiar with the ubiquitous and troublesome thorny shrubs and thistles which abound there.

Alexander Macalister

THORNS, THISTLES, etc.

thornz: There are very many references to various thorny plants in the Bible, and of the Hebrew words employed great uncertainty exists regarding their exact meaning. The alternative translations given in the text of English Versions of the Bible and in the margin show how divided are the views of the translators. In the following list the suggestions given of possinle species indicated, usually by comparison with the Arabic, are those of the late Professor Post, who spent the best years of his life in study of the botany of Palestine. In the great majority of instances, however, it is quite impossible to make any reasonable suggestion as to any particular species being indicated.

(1) ‘aTadh (Jud 9:14, English Versions of the Bible "bramble," the King James Version margin "thistle," the Revised Version margin "thorn"; Ps 58:9, English Versions of the Bible "thorns"): Probably the buckthorn (Rhamnus Palestina Post). Atad occurs as a proper name in Ge 50:10,11.

(2) barqanim (Jud 8:7,16, English Versions of the Bible "briers"): Some thorny plant. The Egyptian-Arabic bargan is, according to Moore (Commentary on Judges), the same as Centaurea scoparius (Natural Order, Compositae), a common Palestinian thistle.

(3) dardar (Ge 3:18; Ho 10:8, English Versions of the Bible "thistle"; Septuagint tribolos): In Arabic, shauket ed-dardar is a general name for the thistles known as Centaureae or star-thistles (Natural Order, Compositae), of which Palestine produces nearly 50 species. The purple-flowered C. calcitrapa and the yellow C. verutum are among the commonest and most striking.

(4) chedheq (Pr 15:19, English Versions of the Bible "thorns"; Septuagint akantha; Mic 7:4, English Versions of the Bible "brier"): From former passages this should be some thorny plant suitable for making a hedge (compare Arabic chadaq, "to enclose," "wall in"). Lane states that Arabic chadaq is Solanum sanctum. Post suggests the oleaster, Eleagnus hortensis.

(5) choach; Septuagint knide, and akantha (2Ki 14:9; Job 31:40, English Versions of the Bible, "thistle," margin "thorn"; 2Ch 25:18, English Versions of the Bible "thistle," the King James Version margin "furze bush," the Revised Version margin "thorn"; Ho 9:6; So 2:2, English Versions of the Bible "thorns"; Isa 34:13 the King James Version "brambles" the Revised Version (British and American) "thistles"; Pr 26:9, English Versions of the Bible "a thorn"; 1Sa 13:6, "thickets"; chawachim, is, however, according to Driver and others a corruption for horim, "holes"; Job 41:2, the King James Version "thorn" the Revised Version (British and American) "hook"; 2Ch 33:11, the King James Version "thorns," the Revised Version (British and American) "in chains," margin "with hooks"): Clearly choach stands for some plant with very strong thorns, but it is quite impossible to say what species is intended; indeed, probably the word was used in a general way.

See HOOK.

(6) mecukhah, occurs only in Mic 7:4, where it means a "thorn hedge."

(7) na‘atsuts (Isa 7:19, the King James Version "thorns," the Revised Version (British and American) "thorn hedges"; Isa 55:13, English Versions of the Bible "thorn"): The word is derived from the root na‘ats, "to prick," or "pierce," and probably applies to any prickly plant. The Septuagint translation has stoibe (Isa 55:13), suggesting the thorny burnet, Poterium spinosum, so common in Palestine (see BOTANY). Post says, "It may be one of the thorny acacias" (HDB, IV, 752).

(8) cirim (Ec 7:6, "the crackling of thorns (cirim) under a pot" (cir); Isa 34:13, "Thorns shall come up in its palaces"; Ho 2:6, "I will hedge up thy way with thorns"; Na 1:10, "Entangled like thorns (King James Version "folden together as thorns") .... they are consumed utterly as dry stubble"): The thorny burner, Poterium spinosum, is today so extensively used for burning in ovens and lime-kilns in Palestine that it is tempting to suppose this is the plant especially indicated here. In Am 4:2 ciroth, is translated "fish-hooks."

See HOOK.

(9) cillon (Eze 28:24, English Versions of the Bible, "brier"); callonim (Eze 2:6, English Versions of the Bible, "thorns"): Arabic, sallu =" thorn."

(10) carabhim (Eze 2:6, English Versions of the Bible, "briers;" the King James Version margin "rebels"): The translation as a plant name is very doubtful.

(11) cirpadh (Isa 55:13, "Instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle-tree"): The Septuagint has konuza, which is (Post) the elecampane, Inula viscosa (Natural Order Compositae), a plant 2 or 3 ft. high, growing on the bare hillsides of Palestine, not infrequently in close association with the myrtle.

(12) tsinnim (Job 5:5; Pr 22:5, English Versions of the Bible, "thorns"); tseninim (Nu 33:55; Jos 23:13, English Versions of the Bible, "thorns"): The words apparently have a very general meaning.

(13) qots; the Septuagint akantha: A general name for thorny and prickly plants, the commonest in the Old Testament (Ge 3:18; Ex 22:6; Jud 8:7,16; 2Sa 23:6; Ps 118:12; Isa 32:13; 33:12; Jer 4:3; 12:13; Eze 28:24; Ho 10:8).

(14) qimmosh (Pr 24:31, "thorns"; Isa 34:13; Ho 9:6, "nettles").

See NETTLES.

(15) sikkim, plural of sekh, same as Arabic shauk, "a thorn" (Nu 33:55, "pricks").

(16) shayith: A word peculiar to Isa (5:6; 7:23 ff; 9:18; 10:17; 27:4) and always associated with shamir (See (17)), always translated "thorns."

(17) shamir: References as above (16), and in Isa 32:13, where it is with qots (see (13)) always translated briers." The Arabic samur is the thorny acacia A. seyyal and A. tortilis (Post).

(18) akanthos: The equivalent of qots (see (13)) (Mt 7:16; 13:7,22; 27:29, etc.). Always translated "thorns."

(19) rhamnos (Baruch 6:71, "white thorn"): The Rhamnus Palaestina.

(20) skolops (2Co 12:7, English Versions of the Bible "thorn," margin "stake").

See THORN IN THE FLESH.

(21) tribolos (Mt 7:16, "thistle"; Heb 6:8, the King James Version "briers" the Revised Version (British and American) "thistles").

The extraordinary plentifulness of various prickly plants in Palestine—in its present condition—is evident to any traveler during the summer months. Many of the trees and shrubs are thorny and the ground is everywhere covered thick with thistles, many of which are very handsome and some of which attain a height of 6 or 8 ft. Before the peasant can plow, he must dear these away by burning (compare Isa 10:17). The early autumn winds often drive before them in revolving mass some of the star-thistles—a sight so characteristic that it may be the "thistle down" (the King James Version margin, the Revised

Version (British and American) "whirling dust") of Isa 17:13. Thorns and thistles are described (Ge 3:18) as God's curse on the ground for sin. The Talmud suggests that these must be edible and are therefore artichokes. The removal of them and the replacement by more useful plants is a sign of God's blessing (Isa 55:13; Eze 28:24).

Ge 3:18 uses the words qots and dardar for "thorns" and "thistles." Midrash Rabba' to Genesis (Midr. Gen. Rabba' 20 10) says that qots ("thorn") is the same as ('akkabhith), which means an edible thistle (compare Levy, Dictionary, 645), and that (dardar, "thistle") is the same as (qinrac; Greek kunara, "artichoke") (compare Levy, Dictionary, 298). "But," adds the Midrash, "some reverse it, and say that (dardar) is ('akkabhith) and that (qots) is (qinrats)."

The neglected vineyard of the sluggard "was all grown over with thorns the face thereof was covered with nettles" (Pr 24:31), and in God's symbolic vineyard "there shall come up briers and thorns" (Isa 5:6); "They have sown wheat and have reaped thorns; they have put themselves to pain, and profit nothing" (Jer 12:13).

Jotham compares the usurper Abimelech to a bramble (Rhamnus Palaestina) (Jud 9:14 f), and Jehoash king of Israel, taunted Amaziah, king of Judah, by comparing him slightingly to a thistle (margin "thorn"), readily trodden down by a wild beast (2Ki 14:9).

Nevertheless, thorns and thistles have their uses. On them the goats and camels browse; scarcely any thorns seem to be too sharp for their hardened palates. The thorny burner (Poterium spinosum), Arabic ballan, which covers countless acres of bare hillside, is used all over Palestine for ovens (Ec 7:6) and lime-kilns. Before kindling one of these latter the fellahin gather enormous piles of this plant—carried on their heads in masses much larger than the bearers—around the kiln mouth.

Thorny hedges around dwellings and fields are very common. The most characteristic plant for the purpose today is the "prickly pear" (Opunctia ficus Indica), but this is a comparatively late introduction. Hedges of brambles oleasters, etc., are common, especially where there is some water In the Jordan valley masses of broken branches of the Zizyphus and other thorny trees are piled in a circle round tents or cultivated fields or flocks as a protection against man and beast (Pr 15:19; Mic 7:4, etc.).

The Saviour's "crown of thorns" (Mt 27:29) was according to Palestinian tradition constructed from the twisted branches of a species of Rhamnaceae either the Zizyphus lotus or the Z. spina.

E. W. G. Masterman

THOUGHT

thot: The most frequent word in the Old Testament (machashebheth, from the verb chashabh, "to think") refers to a "device," or a purpose firmly fixed, as in the passage in Isa (55:7-9) where the "thought" of God and of man are contrasted (compare Ps 40:5; 92:5; Jer 29:11). In the New Testament dialogismos

(Mt 15:19; 1Co 3:20), refers to the inner reasoning or deliberation of one with himself.

See THINK.

THOUSAND

thou’-zand (’eleph; chilioi).

See NUMBER.

THRACIA; THRACIAN

thra’-shi-a, thra’-shan (Thrakia): The name given to the country lying between the rivers Strymon and Danube. Mention is made of a Thracian horseman in 2 Macc 12:35. The cavalry of this fierce people were in demand as mercenaries in all countries. In 46 AD Thrace became the name of a Roman province. Some have sought a connection between Thracia and the TIRAS (which see) of Ge 10:2, but the identification is conjectural.

THRASAEUS

thra-se’-us (Codex Alexandrinus Swete and Fritzsche Thrasaios; Codex Venetus Tharsiou; Codex Venetus(a) Tharseou; Conjecture of Dr. Hort Tharsea; the King James Version, Thraseas): The father of APOLLONIUS (which see) (2 Macc 3:5). the Revised Version margin gives "Or ‘Thrasca.’" The Greek text is probably corrupt. Perhaps the true reading is "Apollonius of Tarsus".

THREE

(shalosh; treis).

See NUMBER.

THREE CHILDREN, SONG OF THE

See SONG OF THE THREE CHILDREN.

THREESCORE

thre’-skor.

See NUMBER.

THRESHING

thresh’-ing (dush; aloao): Dush means literally, "to trample out." In Jer 51:33, darakh, is used of threshing. Fitches and cummin were beaten off with a rod. The distinction between beating and threshing is made in Isa 28:27. Gideon, in order to avoid being seen by the Midianites, beat out his wheat in a wine press instead of threshing it on the threshing-floor (Jud 6:11). For a general description of the threshing operations see AGRICULTURE.

Figurative: "Thou shalt thresh the mountains," i.e. thou wilt overcome great difficulties (Isa 41:15). Babylon’s destruction was foretold poetically in the language of the threshing-floor (Isa 21:10; Jer 51:33; Da 2:35); Zion’s foes would be gathered as sheaves on the threshing-floor (Mic 4:12,13; compare 2Ki 13:7; Am 1:3; Hab 3:12); threshing unto the vintage, i.e. throughout the summer, indicated an extra abundant yield (Le 26:5).

James A. Patch

THRESHING-FLOOR

thresh’-ing-flor (goren; halon; ‘iddar, occurs in Da 2:35): The location and method of making threshing-floors have already been described under AGRICULTURE. These floors have come into prominence because of the Biblical events which occurred on or near them. Joseph with his kinsmen and Egyptian followers halted for seven days at the threshing-floor of Atad to lament the death of Jacob (Ge 50:10). Probably there was a group of floors furnishing a convenient spot for a caravan to stop. Travelers today welcome the sight of a threshing-floor at their halting-place. The hard, level spot is a much preferable to the surrounding stony fields for their tents.

David built an altar on Ornan’s (Araunah’s) threshing-floor (2Sa 24:18-24; 1Ch 21:18-27), which later became the site of the Temple (2Ch 3:1). David probably chose this place for his altar because it was on an elevation, and the ground was already level and prepared by rolling. Uzzah died near the threshing-floor of Nacon for touching the ark (2Sa 6:6). Ru reveals herself to Boaz on his threshing-floor (Ru 3:6-9).

Threshing-floors are in danger of being robbed (1Sa 23:1). For this reason, someone always sleeps on the floor until the grain is removed (Ru 3:7). In Syria, at the threshing season, it is customary for the family to move out to the vicinity of the threshing-floor. A booth is constructed for shade; the mother prepares the meals and takes her turn with the father and children at riding on the sledge.

The instruments of the threshing-floor referred to in 2Sa 24:22 were probably:

(1) the wooden drag or sledge, charuts or moragh, Arabic lauch eddiras;

(2) the fan (fork), mizreh, Arabic midra, for separating straw from wheat;

(3) shovel, meghraphah, Arabic mirfashat, for tossing the wheat into the air in winnowing;

(4) broom, maT'aTe', for sweeping the floor between threshing and for collecting the wheat after winnowing;

(5) goad, malmedh, Arabic messas;

(6) the yoke, 'ol, Arabic tauk;

(7) sieve, kebharah, Arabic gharbal;

(8) dung catcher, Arabic milkat.

THRESHOLD

thresh'-old.

See HOUSE, II, 1, (7).

THRONE

thron. (kicce', a "seat" in 2Ki 4:10; a "royal seat" in Jon 3:6; thronos): Usually the symbol of kingly power and dignity. Solomon's throne was noted for its splendor and magnificence (1Ki 10:18-20; compare 2Ch 9:17-19). It symbolizes:

(1) The exalted position of earthly kings, rulers, judges, etc., their majesty and power (of kings: Ge 41:40; 1Ki 2:19; Job 36:7, etc.; denoting governing or judicial power: 2Sa 14:9; Ne 3:7; Ps 122:5, etc.; often equivalent to kingdom or reign: 1Sa 2:8; 1Ki 1:37,47, etc.; in this connection we note the expressions: "a man on the throne of Israel," 1Ki 2:4, etc.; "to sit upon a throne" 1Ki 1:13,17, etc.; Jer 13:13, etc.; "to set a person on a throne," 2Ki 10:3; "the throne of Israel," 1Ki 8:20, etc.; "the throne of David" 2Sa 3:10, etc.; of Solomon, 2Sa 7:13, etc.; of Joash, 2Ch 23:20, etc.). In Jer 17:12 it is equivalent to "temple" ("A glorious throne .... is the place of our sanctuary"); it symbolizes the power of the Gentiles being hostile to the people of Yahweh (Ps 94:20), and is used metaphorically in Isa 22:23 ("He (i.e. Eliakim) shall be for a throne of glory to his father's house").

(2) The majesty and power of Yahweh as the true king of Israel; He "is enthroned above the cherubim" (1Sa 4:4 the Revised Version margin; compare 2Sa 6:2; 2Ki 19:15; Solomon's throne is really Yahweh's throne (1Ch 29:23), and there shall come a time when Jerusalem shall be called "the throne of Yahweh" (Jer 3:17) and the enemies of Yahweh shall be judged by him ("I will set my throne

in Elam," Jer 49:38). According to Eze 43:7, the Lord said of the future temple: "This is the place of my throne."

(3) The rule of the promised theocratic king (the Messiah), its everlasting glory and righteousness. He, too, is Yahweh's representative, inasmuch as He "shall rule upon his throne" (Zec 6:13). Thus, the permanence of the throne of David is warranted (Isa 9:7); eternal peace (1Ki 2:33), loving-kindness and justice (Isa 16:5) characterize his reign. The New Testament points to Jesus as this promised king (Lu 1:32; compare Ac 2:30; Heb 12:2); Christ Himself refers to His future state of glory (Mt 25:31) and guarantees His faithful disciples a similar distinction (Mt 19:28; compare Lu 22:30; Re 20:4).

(4) The matchless glory, the transcendent power and absolute sovereignty of God (and Christ); Micaiah "saw Yahweh sitting on his throne," etc. (1Ki 22:19; compare 2Ch 18:18); Isaiah and Ezekiel had similar visions (Isa 6:1; Eze 1:26); compare also Da 7:9 and Re 4:2 (and often); in trying to depict the incomparable greatness of the King of kings, the Bible tells us that His throne is in heaven (Ps 11:4, etc.) and, moreover, that heaven itself is His throne (Isa 66:1; Mt 5:34, etc.); His reign is founded on righteousness and justice (Ps 89:14; compare 97:2) and of eternal duration (Ps 45:6; compare Heb 1:8; La 5:19); He acts justly and kindly (Ps 9:4 and Ps 89:14); He defends His glory (Jer 14:21); He manifests His holiness (Ps 47:8) and His grace (Heb 4:16), and yet His dealings with us are not always fully understood by us (Job 26:9).

(5) Heavenly kingdoms or rulers (angels: Col 1:16).

See KING, KINGDOM.

William Baur

THRUM

thrum: In Isa 38:12 the Revised Version (British and American) reads "He will cut me off from the loom," margin "thrum." "Thrum" is a technical term of weavers, denoting the threads of the warp hanging down in a loom, suiting dallah, "that which hangs down" (So 7:5, "hair"). A misinterpretation of "hanging down" is responsible for the King James' "pining sickness."

THUMMIM

thum'-im. See URIM AND THUMMIM.

THUNDER

thun'-der (ra'am (1Sa 2:10; Job 26:14; 39:19; 40:9; Ps 77:18; 81:7; 104:7; Isa 29:6), qol, "a voice" (Ex 9:23; 1Sa 7:10; 12:17; Job 28:26; 38:25)): Thunder is the noise resulting from the lightning discharge. It

is very common in the winter storms of Syria and Palestine and occurs in the extra-season storms. Thunder accompanied the storm of hail in Egypt at the time of the plagues: "The Lord sent thunder and hail" (Ex 9:23).

Lightning and thunder are indications of the power of Yahweh and His might. "The thunder of his power who can understand?" (Job 26:14); "The God of glory thundereth" (Ps 29:3). Yahweh also confused the Philistines with thunder (1Sa 7:10), and His foes were "visited of Yahweh of hosts with thunder" (Isa 29:6). Thunder was regarded as the voice of Yahweh: "God thundereth with the voice of his excellency" (Job 37:4), and God spoke to Jesus in the thunder (bronte, Joh 12:29).

See also LIGHTNING.

Alfred H. Joy

THYATIRA

thi-a-ti’-ra (Thuateira): Thyatira was a wealthy town in the northern part of Lydia of the Roman province of Asia, on the river Lycus. It stood so near to the borders of Mysia, that some of the early writers have regarded it as belonging to that country. Its early history is not well known, for until it was refounded by Seleucus Nicator (301-281 BC) it was a small, insignificant town. It stood on none of the Greek trade routes, but upon the lesser road between Pergamos and Sardis, and derived its wealth from the Lycus valley in which it rapidly became a commercial center, but never a metropolis. The name "Thyatira" means "the castle of Thya." Other names which it has borne are Pelopia and Semiramis. Before the time of Nicator the place was regarded as a holy city, for there stood the temple of the ancient Lydian sun-god, Tyrimnos; about it games were held in his honor. Upon the early coins of Thyatira this Asiatic god is represented as a horseman, bearing a double-headed battle-ax, similar to those represented on the sculptures of the Hittites. A goddess associated with him was Boreatene, a deity of less importance. Another temple at Thyatira was dedicated to Sambethe, and at this shrine was a prophetess, by some supposed to represent the Jezebel of Re 2:20, who uttered the sayings which this deity would impart to the worshippers.

Thyatira was specially noted for the trade guilds which were probably more completely organized there than in any other ancient city. Every artisan belonged to a guild, and every guild, which was an incorporated organization, possessed property in its own name, made contracts for great constructions, and wielded a wide influence. Powerful among them was the guild of coppersmiths; another was the guild of the dyers, who, it is believed, made use of the madder-root instead of shell-fish for making the purple dyestuffs. A member of this guild seems to have been Lydia of Thyatira, who, according to Ac 16:14, sold her dyes in Philippi. The color obtained by the use of this dye is now called Turkish red. The guilds were closely connected with the Asiatic religion of the place. Pagan feasts, with which immoral practices were associated, were held, and therefore the nature of the guilds was such that they were opposed to Christianity. According to Ac 19:10, Paul may have preached there while he was living at Ephesus, but this is uncertain; yet Christianity reached there at an early time. It was taught by many of

the early church that no Christian might belong to one of the guilds, and thus the greatest opposition to Christianity was presented.

Thyatira is now represented by the modern town of Ak-Hissar on a branch line of the Manisa-Soma Railroad, and on the old Ro road 9 hours from Sardis. Ak-Hissar is Turkish for "white castle," and near the modern town may be seen the ruins of the castle from which the name was derived. The village is of considerable size; most of the houses are of mud, but several of the buildings erected by Caracalla are still standing, yet none of them are perfect. In the higher part of the town are the ruins of one of the pagan temples, and in the walls of the houses are broken columns and sarcophagi and inscribed stones. The population of 20,000 is largely Greek and Armenian, yet a few Jews live among them. Before the town is a large marsh, fever-laden, and especially unhealthful in the summer time, formed by the Lycus, which the Turks now call Geurdeuk Chai. The chief modern industry is rug-making.

E. J. Banks

THYINE, WOOD

thi’-in (xulon thuinon): An aromatic wood described as sold in "Babylon" (Re 18:12, the King James Version margin "sweet wood"). It is the wood of the thya (thuia) tree, probably identical with Thuia articulata an evergreen tree growing in North Africa, resembling the cypress, which in Roman times was employed for making valuable furniture.

TIBERIAS

ti-be’-ri-as ([Tiberias], Joh 6:23): About the middle of the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, the mountains fall back from the coast, and leave a roughly crescent-shaped plain, about 2 miles in length. The modern city of Tiberias (Tabariyeh) stands at the northern extremity, where the ground begins to rise; and the Hot Baths (Hammath) at the south end. On the southern part of this plain Herod Antipas built a city (circa 26 AD), calling it "Tiberias" in honor of the emperor who had befriended him. In clearing the ground and digging foundations certain tombs were disturbed (Ant., XVIII ii, 3). It may have been the graveyard of old Hammath. The palace, the famous "Golden House," was built on the top of a rocky hill which rises on the West to a height of some 500 ft. The ruin is known today as Qasr bint el-Melek, "Palace of the King’s Daughter" The strong walls of the city can be traced in almost their entire length on the landward side. Parts are also to be seen along the shore, with towers at intervals which guarded against attack by sea. The ruins cover a considerable area. There is nothing above ground older than Herod’s city. Only excavation can show whether or not the Talmud is fight in saying that Tiberias was built on the site of Rakkath and Chinnereth (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 208). The Jews were shy of settling in a city built over an old cemetery; and Herod had trouble in finding occupants for it. A strange company it was that he ultimately gathered of the "poorer people," foreigners, and others "not quite freemen"; and these were drawn by the prospect of good houses and land which he freely promised them. With its stadium, its palace "with figures of living things" and its senate, it may be properly described as a Greek city, although it also contained a proseuche, or place of prayer, for the

Jews (BJ II, xxi, 6; Vita, XII, 54, etc.). This accounts for it figuring so little in the Gospels. In his anxiety to win the favor of the Jews, Herod built for them "the finest synagogue in Galilee"; but many years were to elapse before it should become a really Jewish city.

Superseding Sepphoris, Tiberias was the capital of Galilee under Agrippa I and the Roman procurators. It surrendered to Vespasian, and was given by Nero to Agrippa II, Sepphoris again becoming the capital. During the Jewish war its inhabitants were mainly Jewish, somewhat turbulent and difficult to manage. In 100 AD, at Agrippa's death, the Romans assumed direct control. After the fall of Jerusalem, the Sanhedrin retreated to Galilee, first to Sepphoris, and then to Tiberias. Here, some time before 220 AD, under supervision of the famous Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi'," Judah the Prince," or, as he is also called ha-qadhosh, "the Holy," the civil and ritual laws, decrees, customs, etc., held to be of binding obligation, handed down by tradition, but not having Scriptural authority, were codified and written down, under the title of "Mishna." Here also later was compiled the Jerusalem Talmud (Yerushalmi), as distinguished from that compiled in Babylon (Babhli). The city thus became a great center of Jewish learning. Maimonides' tomb is shown near the town, and that of Aqiba on the slope of the mountain, where it is said 24,000 of his disciples are buried with him.

In Christian times Tiberias was the seat of a bishop. It fell to the Moslems in 637. It changed hands several times as between the Crusaders and the Saracens. It was finally taken by the Moslems in 1247.

The enclosing walls of the modern city, and the castle, now swiftly going to ruin, were built by Tancred and repaired by Daher el-'Omar in 1730. There are over 5,000 inhabitants, mostly Jews, in whose hands mainly is the trade of the place. The fishing in the lake, in which some 20 boats are occupied, is carried on by Moslems and Christians. Tiberias is the chief inhabited place on the lake, to which as in ancient days it gives its name, Bachr Tabariyeh, "Sea of Tiberias" (Joh 6:1; 21:1). It is the market town for a wide district. The opening of the Haifa-Damascus Railway has quickened the pulse of life considerably. A steamer and motor boat ply between the town and the station at Semach, bringing the place into easy touch with the outside world. The water of the lake is largely used for all purposes, although there are cisterns for rain water under some of the houses.

After a residence of over five years in the city, the present writer can say that it does not deserve the evil reputation which casual travelers have given it. In matters of cleanliness and health it stands comparison very well with other oriental towns. Sometimes, in east wind; it is very hot, thermometer registering over 114 Degrees Fahrenheit in the shade. The worst time is just at the beginning of the rainy season, when the impurities that have gathered in the drought of summer are washed into the sea, contaminating the water.

The United Free Church of Scotland has here a well-equipped mission to the Jews.

W. Ewing

TIBERIAS, SEA OF

See GALILEE, SEA OF.

TIBERIUS

ti-be’-ri-us (Tiberios):

1. Name and Parentage:

The 2nd Roman emperor; full name Tiberius Claudius Nero, and official name as emperor Tiberius Caesar Augustus; born November 16, 42 BC. His father—of the same name—had been an officer under Julius Caesar and had later joined Antony against Octavian (Augustus). His mother was Livia, who became the 3rd wife of Augustus; thus Tiberius was a stepson of Augustus.

2. Early Life and Relation to Augustus:

Much of his early life was spent in successful campaigning. Although the ablest of the possible heirs of Augustus, Tiberius was subjected to many an indignity, Augustus accepting him as his successor only when every other hope failed. When Julia, daughter of Augustus, became a widow for the second time (12 BC), Tiberius was obliged to marry her (11 BC) in order to become protector of the future emperors. For this purpose he was compelled to divorce his wife, Vipsania Agrippina, who had borne him a son, Drusus. Julia brought Tiberius nothing but shame, and for her immorality was banished by her father (2 BC). Tiberius was consul in 12 BC, and received the proconsular authority, 9 BC. He carried on successful wars in Pannonia, Dalmatia, Armenia and Germany. He retired in disgust to voluntary exile at Rhodes where he spent several years in study. In 2 AD, he returned to Rome, and lived there in retirement, 2-4 AD. On June 27, 4 AD, Tiberius and Agrippa Postumus were adopted by Augustus. From this date on Tiberius came more and more into prominence, receiving the tribunician power for 10 years.

3. Reign:

In 13 AD (or according to Mommsen 11 AD) Tiberius was by a special law raised to the co-regency. Augustus died August 19, 14 AD, and Tiberius succeeded. A mutiny in the Rhine legions was suppressed by Germanicus. The principal events of his reign (see also below) were the campaigns of Germanicus and Drusus, the withdrawal of the Romans to the Rhine, the settlement of the Armenian question, the rise and fall of Sejanus, the submission of Parthia. In 26 AD, Tiberius retired to Capreae, where rumor attributed to him every excess of debauchery. On March 16, 37 AD, Tiberius died at Misenum and was succeeded by Caius.

4. Administration:

On the whole, Tiberius followed the conservative policy of Augustus and maintained the "diarchy." But

he approached nearer to monarchy by receiving supreme power for an indefinite period. He went beyond Augustus in practically excluding the people from government by transferring the right of election from the comitia of the people to the senate, leaving to the people the right merely to acclaim the nominees of the senate, and further by imposing laws upon the people without their counsel or discussion. He established a permanent praetorian camp at Rome—a fact of great importance in later Roman history. The administration of Tiberius was that of a wise, intelligent statesman with a strong sense of duty. The civil service was improved, and officers were kept longer at their posts to secure efficiency. Taxes were light on account of his economy. Public security increased. He paid attention to the administration of justice and humane laws were placed on the statute-book.

5. Character:

Though Tiberius was unpopular, he left the empire in a state of prosperity and peace. Of his character the most opposite views are held. His fame has suffered especially from his suspecting nature, which extended the law of majestas to offenses against his person and encouraged delation, which made the latter part of his reign one of terror. The tyranny of Sejanus, too, has been laid upon his shoulders, and he has been accused of the wildest excesses in his retreat at Capreae—a charge which seems to be refuted by the fact that no interruption to his wise administration took place. His character has been blackened most by Tacitus and Suetonius. But on nearer criticism Tiberius's character will appear in better light. No doubt, toward the close of his reign he degenerated, but his cruelties affected only the upper classes. He was called a tyrant and was refused deification after death, and Augustus was said to have prophesied "Alas for the Roman people who shall be ground under such slow jaws." Tiberius was stern and taciturn, critical with himself and, soured by his own disappointments, was suspicious of others. Pliny the Elder calls him "the gloomiest of men." Much of his unpopularity was due to his inscrutability, to the fact that people could not understand him or penetrate into the mystery of his motives. He rarely took counsel with anyone. His life was frugal and modest—a rebuke to the contemporary dissipation. He felt contempt for the inanities of court life and was supremely indifferent to public opinion, but actuated by a strong sense of duty.

6. Tiberius and the New Testament:

The reign of Tiberius is memorable as that in which fell our Lord's public ministry, death and resurrection. It also witnessed the preaching of John the Baptist (Lu 3:1), the conversion of Paul and perhaps his first preaching, the martyrdom of Stephen and the first Christian persecution (by the Jews). Tiberius is mentioned by name only once in the New Testament (Lu 3:1): "the 15th year of the reign (hegemonia) of Tiberius." The question is, From what date is this to be reckoned—the date of Tiberius's co-regency, 13 (or 11) AD, or from his accession, 14 AD? He is the "Caesar" mentioned in the Gospels in connection with Jesus' public ministry (Mr 12:14 and parallel's; Joh 19:12,15). Herod Antipas built Tiberias in honor of Tiberius (Josephus, Ant, XVIII, ii-iii). It is unlikely that Tiberius ever heard anything about Christianity; it had not risen as yet into prominence. Early Christian writers wished to represent Tiberius, if not friendly to the new faith, at least as condemning the action of Pilate. According to one apocryphal tradition, Tiberius actually summoned Pilate to Rome to answer for crucifying Jesus. It is true that Pilate was sent to Rome by the governor of Syria to answer to a charge of unjustifiable

cruelty, but Tiberius died before Elate reached Rome.

7. Tiberius and the Jews:

Under Tiberius Palestine was governed by Roman procurators. Toward the Jews in Italy, Tiberius showed some intolerance. In 19 AD all the Jews were expelled from Rome according to Josephus (Ant., XVIII, iii, 5), from Italy according to Tacitus (Ann. ii.85), and 4,000 Jewish freedmen were deported to Sardinia to reduce bands of brigands. Philo attributes this severity to Sejanus, and says that after Sejanus' fall Tiberius, recognizing that the Jews had been persecuted without cause, gave orders that officials should not annoy them or disturb their rites. They were therefore probably allowed to return to Rome (see Schurer, III, 60 f, 4th edition).

LITERATURE.

(a) Ancient literature, as modern, is divided on its estimate of Tiberius; Tacitus Annals i-vi; Dio Cassius Rom. Hist. xivi-xivii, and Suetonius Tib. painting him in the darkest colors, while Velleius Paterculus II gives the other side.

(b) Of modern literature it is enough to cite on opposite sides: J. C. Tarver, Tiberius the Tyrant, 1902; Ihne, Zur Ehrenrettung des K. Tib., 1892, and the moderate estimate of Merivale, Romans under the Empire.

S. Angus

TIBHATH

tib'-hath (tibhchath; Metabechas, Codex Alexandrinus Matebeth; Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Thebath; Peshitta Tebhach): A city of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, from which David took much of the brass used later by Solomon in the construction of the temple-furnishings (1Ch 18:8). In 2Sa 8:8 we must for the beTach of the Massoretic Text read with the Syriac Tebhach. It may be the same as the Tubihi of the Tell el-Amarna Letters; the Dibhu of the Karnak lists; and the Tubihi mentioned with Kadesh on the Orontes in the "Travels of an Egyptian" in the reign of Rameses II. The site is unknown, but it must have been on the eastern slopes of Anti-Lebanon, between which and the Euphrates we must locate Hadadezer's kingdom of Zobah. "Tebah" occurs also as an Aramaic personal or tribal name in Ge 22:24.

W. M. Christie

TIBNI

tib'-ni (tibhni; Codex Vaticanus Thamnei, Codex Alexandrinus Thamni, Lucian Thabennei): A rival of

Omri for the throne of Israel after the death of Zimri (1Ki 16:21 f). This is the only reference to Tibni that has come down to us; a comparison of this passage with the account of Zimri's death (especially 1Ki 16:15) shows that the length of the struggle was four years.

TIDAL

ti'-dal (tidh'al; Thalga, Thalgal, Codex E, Thargal):

1. The Name and Its Forms:

Tidal is mentioned in Ge 14:1,9 in the account of the expedition of Chedorlaomer of Elam, with his allies, Amraphel of Shinar (Babylonia), Arioch of Ellasar, and Tidal, who is called "king of nations" (the King James Version) (goyim, Targum 'ammin). Whether the last-named took part in this expedition as one of Chedorlaomer's vassals or not is unknown. The Greek form possibly prints to an earlier pronunciation Tadgal.

2. Its Babylonian Equivalent:

The only name in the cuneiform inscriptions resembling Tidal is Tudhula, or, as it was probably later pronounced, Tudhul. This, from its form, might be Sumerian, meaning "evil progeny," or the like. In addition to the improbability of a name with such a signification, however, his title "king of goyim," or "nations," in Ge 14:1, presupposes a ruler of another race.

3. The Babylonian Tudhula and His Time:

The inscription in which the name Tudhula occurs is one of three of late date (4th to 3rd century BC), all referring, apparently, to the same historical period. The text in question (Sp. iii.2) is of unbaked clay, and is broken and defaced. After referring to a ruler who did not maintain the temples, Durmah-ilani son of Eri-Aku (Arioch) is referred to, appatently as one who ravaged the country, and "waters (came) over Babylon and E-sagila," its great temple. The words which follow suggest that Durmah-ilani was slain by his son, after which a new invader appeared, who would seem to have been Tudhula, son of Gazza(ni?). He likewise ravaged the land, and floods again invaded Babylon and E-sagila. To all appearance he met with the fate which overtook Durmah-ilani—death at the hands of his son, who "smote his head." Then came the Elamite, apparently Chedorlaomer, who was likewise slain. This inscription, therefore, gave historical quotations of the fate which overtook those who were regarded as enemas of the gods.

4. Doubts as to His Identity:

Though we have here the long-sought name of Tidal, it may legitimately be doubted whether this personage was the ruler of that name mentioned in Ge 14. The "nations" (goyim) which he ruled are regarded by Sayce as having been wandering hordes (umman manda), probably Medes. On the other hand, the occurrence of the name Dudhalia, son of Hattusil (Khetasir), contemporary of Rameses II, in

the inscriptions found at Hattu, the capital of the Hittites, suggests that that extensive confederation may have been the "nations" referred to. In other words, Tidal or Tudhula (for Dudhalia) was an earlier ruler bearing the same name as Hattusil’s son.

5. Probably a Hittite:

If he be, as is possible, the same personage as is mentioned in Ge 14, he must have fought against Arioch’s son, conquered his domains and been killed, in his turn, by either the Biblical Chedorlaomer or another Elamite ruler beaming the same or a similar name. See AMRAPHEL; ARIOCH; CHEDORLAOMER; ERI-AKU; NATIONS.

TIDINGS, GLAD

see GLAD TIDINGS.

TIGLATH-PILESER

tig-lath-pi-le-zer

tighlath pil’eser, as the name is read in 2 Kings, tilleghath pilnecer, in 2 Chronicles; Septuagint Algathphellasar; Assyrian, Tukulti-abal-i-sarra): King of Assyria in the days of Menahem, Pekahiah, and Pekah, kings of Israel, and of Uzziah, Jotham and Ahaz, kings of Judah. The king of Assyria, whom the historian of 2 Kings knows as exacting tribute from Menahem, is Pul (2Ki 15:19 f). In the days of Pekah who had usurped the throne of Menahem’s son and successor, Pekahiah, the king of Assyria is known as Tiglath-pileser, who invaded Naphtali and carried the inhabitants captive to Assyria (2Ki 15:29). This invasion is described by the Chronicler (1Ch 5:25 f) rather differently, to the effect that "the God of Israel stirred up the spirit of Pul king of Assyria, and the spirit of Tilgath-pilneser king of Assyria, and he carried them away, even the Reubenites and the Gadites, and the half-tribe of Manasseh, and brought them unto Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and to the river of Gozan, unto this day." Still later we find Pekah forming a coalition with Rezin, king of Damascus, into which they tried to force Ahaz, even going the length of besieging him in Jerusalem (2Ki 16:5). The siege was unsuccessful. Ahaz called in the aid of Tiglath-pileser, sacrificing his independence to get rid of the invaders (2Ki 16:7,8). He offered the Assyrian the silver and gold that were found in the house of the Lord and in the royal treasury; and Tiglath-pileser, in return, invaded the territories of Damascus and Israel in the rear, compelling the allied forces to withdraw from Judah, while he captured Damascus, and carried the people away to Kir and slew Rezin (2Ki 16:9). It was on the occasion of his visit to Damascus to do homage to his suzerain Tiglath-pileser, that Ahaz fancied the idolatrous altar, a pattern of which he sent to Urijah, the priest, that he might erect an altar to take the place of the brazen altar which was before the Lord in the temple at Jerusalem. It is a significant comment which is made by the Chronicler (2Ch 28:21) upon the abject submission of Ahaz to the Assyrian king: "It helped him not."

From the inscriptions we learn particulars which afford striking corroboration of the Biblical narrative

and clear up some of the difficulties involved. It is now practically certain that Pul, who is mentioned as taking tribute from Menahem, is identical with Tiglath-pileser (Schrader, COT, I, 230, 231). In all probability Pul, or Pulu, was a usurper, who as king of Assyria assumed the name of one of his predecessors, Tiglath-pileser I, and reigned as Tiglath-pileser III. This king of Assyria, who reigned, as we learn from his annals, from 745 BC to 727 BC, was one of the greatest of Assyrian monarchs. See ASSYRIA. From the fact that no fewer than five Hebrew kings are mentioned in his annals, the greatest interest attaches to his history as it has come down to us. These kings are Uzziah or Azariah, and Jehoahaz, that is Ahaz, of Judah; and Menahem, Pekah and Hushes of Israel. Along with them are mentioned their contemporaries Rezin of Damascus, Hiram of Tyre, and two queens of Arabia otherwise unknown, Zabibi and Samsi. When he died in 727 BC, he was succeeded by Shalmaneser IV, who had occasion to suspect the loyalty of his vassal Hoshea, king of Israel, and besieged him in Samaria.

LITERATURE.

Schrader, COT, I, 229-57; McCurdy, HPM, sections 279-341.

T. Nicol

TIGRIS

ti’-gris (Tigris, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew chiddeqel): One of the rivers of Eden going "eastward to Assyria" (Ge 2:14 margin), called the Great River (Da 10:4), elsewhere mentioned in the apocryphal books, as in Tob 6:1; Judith 1:6; Ecclesiasticus 24:25, called Diglath in Josephus, and Diglit in Pliny, now called in Mesopotamia Dijleh, generally supposed to be a Semitic corruption of Tigra, meaning originally an arrow, which from its rapidity of motion is symbolized. The Tigris rises in the mountains of Armenia, latitude 38 degrees 10 minutes, longitude 39 degrees 20 minutes, only a few miles from the main branch of the Euphrates. After pursuing a tortuous southeasterly course for 150 miles, it is joined by the east branch at Osman Kieui, some distance below Diarbekr. Here the stream is 450 ft. wide and 3 or 4 ft. deep. Passing through numerous mountain gorges for another 150 miles, it emerges into the region of low hills about Nineveh, and a little below into the great alluvial plain of Mesopotamia. Thence in its course to Bagdad it is joined by the Great Zab, the Lesser Zab, the Adhem, and the Diyaleh rivers, bringing a large amount of water from the Zagros Mountains. At Bagdad the overflows from the Euphrates in high water often increase the inundations. The flood season begins early in the month of March, reaching its climax about May 1, declining to its natural level by midsummer. In October and November, the volume of water increases considerably, but not so much as to overflow its banks. Below Bagdad, throughout the region of Babylonia proper, the Tigris joins with the Euphrates in furnishing the water for irrigation so successfully used in ancient times. English engineers are at present with great promise of success aiming to restore the irrigating systems of the region and the prosperity of ancient times. The total length of the river is 1,146 miles. It now joins the Euphrates about 40 miles Northwest of the Persian Gulf, the two streams there forming the Shat el Arab, but in early historical times they entered the Persian Gulf by separate mouths, the Gulf then extending a considerable distance above the present junction of the rivers, the sediment of the streams having silted

up the head of the Gulf to that distance.

See also EDEN.

George Frederick Wright

TIKVAH; TIKVATH

tik’-va, tik’-vath (tiqwah, "hope"):->/ CS, the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew Cs:hebrewIt +chiddeqelIT-/ CS): One of the rivers of Eden going "eastward to Assyria" (Ge 2:14 margin), called the Great River (Da 10:4), elsewhere mentioned in the apocryphal books, as in Tob 6:1; Judith 1:6; Ecclesiasticus 24:25, called Diglath in Josephus, and Diglit in Pliny, now called in Mesopotamia Dijleh, generally supposed to be a Semitic corruption of Tigra, meaning originally an arrow, which from its rapidity of motion is symbolized. The Tigris rises in the mountains of Armenia, latitude 38 degrees 10 minutes, longitude 39 degrees 20 minutes, only a few miles from the main branch of the Euphrates. After pursuing a tortuous southeasterly course for 150 miles, it is joined by the east branch at Osman Kieui, some distance below Diarbekr. Here the stream is 450 ft. wide and 3 or 4 ft. deep. Passing through numerous mountain gorges for another 150 miles, it emerges into the region of low hills about Nineveh, and a little below into the great alluvial plain of Mesopotamia. Thence in its course to Bagdad it is joined by the Great Zab, the Lesser Zab, the Adhem, and the Diyaleh rivers, bringing a large amount of water from the Zagros Mountains. At Bagdad the overflows from the Euphrates in high water often increase the inundations. The flood season begins early in the month of March, reaching its climax about May 1, declining to its natural level by midsummer. In October and November, the volume of water increases considerably, but not so much as to overflow its banks. Below Bagdad, throughout the region of Babylonia proper, the Tigris joins with the Euphrates in furnishing the water for irrigation so successfully used in ancient times. English engineers are at present with great promise of success aiming to restore the irrigating systems of the region and the prosperity of ancient times. The total length of the river is 1,146 miles. It now joins the Euphrates about 40 miles Northwest of the Persian Gulf, the two streams there forming the Shat el Arab, but in early historical times they entered the Persian Gulf by separate mouths, the Gulf then extending a considerable distance above the present junction of the rivers, the sediment of the streams having silted up the head of the Gulf to that distance.

(1) The father-in-law of Huldah the prophetess (2Ki 22:14) (Codex Vaticanus Thekkouau; Codex Alexandrinus Thekkoue; Lucian Thekoue), called in 2Ch 34:22 "Tokhath" (Qere Kethibh Codex Vaticanus Kathoual; Codex Alexandrinus Thakouath, Lucian Thekoe). The reading of 2 Kings is to be preferred.

(2) The father of Jahzeiah (Ezr 10:15) (Codex Vaticanus Helkeia; Codex Alexandrinus Thekoue, called "Theocanus," Revised Version "Thocanus" in 1 Esdras 9:14).

TILE; TILING

til, til’-ing (lebhenah, "brick" Eze 4:1; keramos, "potter’s clay," "a tile," Lu 5:19).

See EZEKIEL, II, 1, (2); HOUSE, II, 1, (10).

TILGATH-PILNESER

til’-gath-pil-ne’-zer, til’-gath-pil-ne’-ser.

See TIGLATH-PILESER.

TILLAGE

til’-aj.

See AGRICULTURE.

TILON

ti’-lon (tilon; Kethibh, Qere; Codex Vaticanus Inon; Codex Alexandrinus Thilan; Lucian Tholeim: A son of Shimon (1Ch 4:20).

TIMAEUS

ti-me’-us (Timaios (Mr 10:46); English Versions of the Bible, "Timaeus").

See BARTIMAEUS.

TIMBREL

tim’-brel.

See MUSIC, III, 3, (1).

TIME

tim: The basis of the Hebrew measurement of time was the day and the lunar month, as with the Semites generally. The division of the day into hours was late, probably not common until after the exile, although the sun-dial of Ahaz (2Ki 20:9; Isa 38:8) would scent to indicate some division of the day into periods of some sort, as we know the night was divided, The word used for "hour" is Aramaic she‘a’ (sha‘ta’), and does not occur in the Old Testament until the Book of Daniel (4:33; 5:5), and even

there it stands for an indefinite period for which "time" would answer as well.

1. The Day:

The term "day" (yom) was in use from the earliest times, as is indicated in the story of the Creation (Ge 1). It there doubtless denotes an indefinite period, but is marked off by "evening and morning" in accordance with what we know was the method of reckoning the day of 24 hours, i.e. from sunset to sunset.

2. Night:

The night was divided, during pre-exilic times, into three divisions called watches (’ashmurah, ‘ashmoreth), making periods of varying length, as the night was longer or shorter (Jud 7:19). This division is referred to in various passages of the Old Testament, but nowhere with indication of definite limits (see Ps 90:4; 119:148; Jer 51:12; Hab 2:1).

In the New Testament we find the Roman division of, etc.). But the use of the word in the indefinite sense, as in the expressions: "day of the Lord," "in that day," "the day of judgment," etc., is far more frequent (see DAY). Other more or less indefinite periods of the day and night are: dawn, dawning of the day, morning, evening, noonday, midnight, cock-crowing or crowing of the cock, break of day, etc.

3. Week:

The weekly division of time, or the seven-day period, was in use very early and must have been known to the Hebrews before the Mosaic Law, since it was in use in Babylonia before the days of Abraham and is indicated In the story of the Creation. The Hebrew shabhua‘, used in the Old Testament for "week," is derived from shebha‘, the word for "seven." As the seventh day was a day of rest, or Sabbath (Hebrew shabbath), this word came to be used for "week," as appears in the New Testament sabbaton, sabbata), indicating the period from Sabbath to Sabbath (Mt 28:1). The same usage is implied in the Old Testament (Le 23:15; 25:8). The days of the week were indicated by the numerals, first, second, etc., save the seventh, which was the Sabbath. In New Testament times Friday was called the day of preparation (paraskeue) for the Sabbath (Lu 23:54).

4. Month:

The monthly division of time was determined, of course, by the phases of the moon, the appearance of the new moon being the beginning of the month, chodhesh. Another term for month was yerach yerach, meaning "moon," which was older and derived from the Phoenician usage, but which persisted to late times, since it is found in the Aramaic inscriptions of the 3rd century AD in Syria. The names of the months were Babylonian and of late origin among the Hebrews, probably coming into use during and after the Captivity. But they had other names, of earlier use, derived from the Phoenicians, four of which have survived in "Abib," "Ziv," "Ethanim" and "Bul."

See CALENDAR.

5. Year:

The Hebrew year (shanah) was composed of 12 or 13 months, the latter being the year when an intercalary month was added to make the lunar correspond with the solar year. As the difference between the two was from ten to eleven days, this required the addition of a month once in about three years, or seven in nineteen years. This month was added at the vernal equinox and was called after the month next preceding, we-’adhar, or the "second Adar." We do not know when this arrangement was first adopted, but it was current after the Captivity. There were two years in use, the civil and the ritual, or sacred year. The former began in the autumn, as would appear from Ex 23:16; 34:22, where it is stated that the "feast of ingathering" should be at the end of the year, and the Sabbatic year began in the 7th month of the calendar or sacred year, which would correspond to September-October (Le 25:9). Josephus says (Ant., I, iii, 3) that Moses designated Nican (March-April) as the 1st month of the festivals, i.e. of the sacred year, but preserved the original order of the months for ordinary affairs, evidently referring to the civil year. This usage corresponds to that of the Turkish empire, where the sacred year is lunar and begins at different seasons, but the financial and political year begins in March O.S. The beginning of the year was called ro’sh ha-shanah, and was determined by the priests, as was the beginning of the month. Originally this was done by observation of the moon, but, later, calculation was employed in connection with it, until finally a system based on accurate calculation was adopted, which was not until the 4th century AD. New-Year was regarded as a festival.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5; YEAR.

6. Seasons:

The return of the seasons was designated by summer and winter, or seed-time and harvest; for they were practically the same. There is, in Palestine, a wet season, extending from October to March or April, and a dry season comprising the remainder of the year. The first is the winter (choreph), and this is the seed-time (zera‘), especially the first part of it called yoreh, or the time of the early rain; the second is the summer (qayits, "fruit-harvest," or qatsir, "harvest").

Seed-time begins as soon as the early rains have fallen in sufficient quantity to moisten the earth for plowing, and the harvest begins in some parts, as in the lower Jordan region, near the Dead Sea, about April, but on the high lands a month or two later. The fruit harvest comes in summer proper and continues until the rainy season. "The time when kings go out to war" (2Sa 11:1; 1Ki 20:22) probably refers to the end of the rainy season in Nican.

7. No Era:

We have no mention in the Old Testament of any era for time reckoning, and we do not find any such

usage until the time of the Maccabees. There are occasional references to certain events which might have served for eras had they been generally adopted. Such was the Exodus in the account of the building of the temple (1Ki 6:1) and the Captivity (Eze 33:21; 40:1) and the Earthquake (Am 1:1). Dates were usually fixed by the regnal years of the kings, and of the Persian kings after the Captivity. When Simon the Maccabee became independent of the Seleucid kings in 143-142 or 139-138 BC, he seems to have established an era of his own, if we may attribute to him a series of coins dated by the years "of the independence of Israel" (see COINS: MONEY; also 1 Macc 13:41 and 15:6,10). The Jews doubtless were familiar with the Seleucid era, which began in 312 BC, and with some of the local eras of the Phoenician cities, but we have no evidence that they made use of them. The era of the Creation was not adopted by them until after the time of Christ. This was fixed at 3,830 years before the destruction of the later temple, or 3760 BC.

See ERA.

H. Porter

TIME, LAST

See LAST TIME.

TIME, TIMES AND A HALF

(Da 12:7; compare 7:25; Re 12:14): A luni-solar cycle.

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 5.

TIMES, OBSERVER OF

See DIVINATION; MAGIC.

TIMNA

tim’-na (timna‘; Thamna): A conbubine of Eliphaz, Esau’s son, and the mother of Amalek (Ge 36:12). But in Ge 36:22 and 1Ch 1:39 Timna is the sister of Lotan, and in Ge 36:40 and 1Ch 1:51 a chief or elan of Edom (see TIMNAH (3)). These variations are to be expected when the origin of genealogies is recalled. (In Genesis, English Versions of the Bible read, contrary to rule, "Timnah.") Gunkel’s theory is that Ge 36:12 is a later insertion in P.

TIMNAH

tim’-na (timnah, timnathah (Jos 19:43; Jud 14:1,2,5), "allotted portion; Codex Vaticanus Thamnatha;

also several Greek variations; King James Version has Timnath in Ge 38:12,13,14; Jud 14:1,2,5; and Thimnathah in Jos 19:43):

(1) A town in the southern part of the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:57). Tibna proposed by Conder, a ruin 8 miles West of Bethlehem, seems too far N. (PEF, III, 53, Sh XVII). It is possible this may be the "Timnah" of Ge 38:12,13,14.

(2) A town on the northern border of Judah (Jos 15:10), lying between Beth-shemesh and Ekron. It is probably the same Timnah as Judah visited (Ge 38:12-14), and certainly the scene of Samson's adventures (Jud 14:1 f); his "father-in-law" is called a "Timnite" (Jud 15:6). At this time the place is clearly Philistine (Jud 14:1), though in Jos 19:43 it is reckoned to Dan. Being on the frontier, it probably changed hands several times. In 2Ch 28:18 it was captured from the Philistines by Ahaz, and we learn from Assyrian evidence (Prison Inscription) that Sennacherib captured a Tamna after the battle of Alteka before he besieged Ekron (Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das Altes Testament, 170). The site is undoubted. It is now a deserted ruin called Tibneh on the southern slopes of the Wady es Surar (Valley of Sorek), about 2 miles West of Beth-shemesh. There is a spring, and there are evident signs of antiquity (PEF, II, 417, 441, Sh XVI).

(3) There was probably a Timna in Edom (Ge 36:12,22,40; 1Ch 1:39,51). Eusebius and Jerome (in Onomasticon) recognized a Thamna in Edom at their time.

(4) The "Thamnatha" of 1 Macc 9:50 (the King James Version) is probably another Timnah, and identical with the Thamna of Josephus (BJ, III, iii, 5; IV, viii, 1). This is probably the Tibneh, 10 miles Northwest of Bethel, an extensive ruin.

E. W. G. Masterman

TIMNATH

tim'-hath.

See TIMNAH.

TIMNATH-HERES

tim-nath-he'rez (timnath cherec, "portion of the sun"; Codex Vaticanus Thamnathares; Codex Alexandrinus Thamnathar; heos): This is the form of the name given to Joshua's property and place of burial in Jud 2:9. The name in Jos 19:50; 24:30 is Timnath-serah. "Serah" simply reverses the order of the letters in "Heres." Scholars are divided in opinion as to which form is correct. It is possible that the change from Heres to Serah may have been deliberate, in order to avoid a form which might savor of idolatry—sun-worship. The Jews and Samaritans hold that Heres is the original form.

W. Ewing

TIMNATH-SERAH

tim-nath-se’-ra (timnath cerach; Codex Vaticanus Thamarchdres; Codex Alexandrinus Thamathsara): This place, assigned as an inheritance to Joshua, is described as being in Mt. Ephraim, on the north side of the mountain of Gaash (Jos 19:50; 24:30). Here, when his work was done, the great leader was laid to rest. The mountain of Gaash unfortunately cannot be identified. Josephus says that Joshua was buried at Thamna, a city of Ephraim (Ant., V, i, 29), which probably corresponds to Thamna, the head of a Jewish toparchy (BJ, III, iii, 5). Vespasian marched from Thamnatha to Lydda, which apparently was near (IV, viii, 1). The place was taken and reduced to slavery by Cassius (Ant., XIV, xi, 2). It was put in charge of John the Essene at the beginning of the Jewish war (BJ, II, xx, 4). Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Thamna" and "Thamnathsara") identifies it with "Timnath" of Ge 38:12 the King James Version, placing it in the mountain in the tribe of Da (or Judah), on the way from Diospolis (Lydda) to Jerusalem. The tomb of Joshua was still shown there. This points to Tibneh, in the uplands 12 miles Northeast of Lydda. South of the village, in the face of a rock, are a series of rock-hewn tombs, the largest of which, containing 14 loculi, and a small chamber behind with one loculus, may be that associated with Joshua by Eusebius, Onomasticon. A giant oak grows hard by perhaps the greatest tree in Palestine. Kefr Ishu‘a, "village of Joshua," lies about 3 miles to the East. This identification is now generally accepted.

The Samaritan tradition points to the tomb of Joshua at Kefr Charis, 9 miles South of Nablus. Outside the village to the East are two shrines. One is called Neby Kifl, the other, Neby Kala‘a. The former, "prophet of division," or "of the portion," might apply to Joshua; the latter is identified with Caleb. This identification assumes that the first element of the name has fallen out, the second only surviving.

W. Ewing

TIMNITE

tim’-nit (timni Thamnathaios): The father of Samson’s wife, a native of Timnah (Jud 15:6).

TIMON

ti’-mon (Timon): One of "the seven" chosen to relieve the apostles by attending to "the daily ministration" to the poor of the Christian community in Jerusalem (Ac 6:5). The name is Greek, but as Nicolaus is distinguished from the remaining six as a proselyte, Timon and the others were probably Jews by birth.

TIMOTHEUS

ti-mo’-the-us (Timotheos):

(1) A leader of the children of Ammon who was on several occasions severely defeated by Judas Maccabeus (1 Macc 5:6 ff, 34 ff; 2 Macc 8:30; 9:3; 10:24; 19:2,18 ff) in 165-163 BC. According to 2 Macc 10:37, he was slain at Gazara after having hidden in a cistern. But in 2 Macc 12:2 he is again at liberty as an opponent of the Jews, and in 12:24 f he falls into the hands of Dositheus and Sosipater, but by representing that many Jewish captives were at his mercy and likely to suffer if he were put to death, he is again released. These discrepancies are so great—though not unusual in 2 Maccabees—that some suppose another Timotheus is referred to in 12:2 ff. He is most probably the same person, the careless author of 2 Maccabees making a slip in saying Timotheus was killed at Gazara. He probably escaped by hiding in the cistern. The Greek name for an Ammonite leader is striking:

(a) he may have been a genuine Ammonite with a Greek name, or

(b) a Syro-Macedonian officer placed by Syrian authority over the Ammonites, or

(c) a Greek soldier of fortune invited by the Ammonites to be their commander.

(2) See next article.

S. Angus

TIMOTHY

tim'-o-thi (Timotheos (Ac 17:14; 18:5; 19:22; 20:4; Ro 16:21; 1Co 4:17; 16:10; 2Co 1:1,19; Php 1:1; 2:19; Col 1:1; 1Th 1:1; 3:2,6; 2Th 1:1; 1Ti 1:2,18; 6:20; 2Ti 1:2; Phm 1:1; Heb 13:23; the King James Version, Timotheus):

1. One of Paul's Converts:

Timothy was one of the best known of Paul's companions and fellow-laborers. He was evidently one of Paul's own converts, as the apostle describes him as his beloved and faithful son in the Lord (1Co 4:17); and in 1Ti 1:2 he writes to "Timothy my true child in faith"; and in 2Ti 1:2 he addresses him as "Timothy my beloved child."

2. A Native of Lystra:

He was a resident, and apparently a native, either of Lystra or Derbe, cities which were visited and evangelized by Paul on his 1st missionary journey (Ac 14:6). It is probable that of these two cities, it was Lystra treat was Timothy's native place. For instance, in Ac 20:4 in a list of Paul's friends there are the names of "Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy"; this evidently infers that Timothy was not "of Derbe." And in Ac 16:3, the brethren who gave Paul the good report of Timothy were "at Lystra and Iconium"; the brethren from Derbe are not mentioned. Lystra was evidently Timothy's native city.

3. Converted at Lystra:

In 2Ti 3:10,11 Paul mentions that Timothy had fully known the persecutions and afflictions which came to him at Antioch, at Iconium and at Lystra. These persecutions occurred during the apostle's first visit to these towns; and Timothy seems to have been one of those who were converted at that time, as we find that on Paul's next visit to Lystra and Derbe, Timothy was already one of the Christians there: "He came also to Derbe and to Lystra: and behold a certain disciple was there, named Timothy" (Ac 16:1).

Timothy was now chosen by Paul to be one of his companions. This was at an early period in Paul's apostolic career, and it is pleasing to find that to the end of the apostle's life Timothy was faithful to him.

4. His Father and Mother:

Timothy's father was a heathen Greek (Hellen, not Hellenistes, a Greek-speaking Jew); this fact is twice mentioned (Ac 16:1,3). His mother was a Jewess, but he had not been circumcised in infancy, probably owing to objections made by his father. Timothy's mother was called Eunice, and his grandmother Lois. Paul mentions them by name in 2Ti 1:5; he there speaks of the unfeigned faith which was in Timothy, and which dwelt at the first in Eunice and Lois. It is evident that Eunice was converted to Christ on Paul's 1st missionary journey to Derbe and Lystra, because, when he next visited these cities, she is spoken of as "a Jewess who believed" (Ac 16:1).

5. Becomes a Co-worker with Paul:

On this 2nd visit to Derbe and Lystra, Paul was strongly attracted to Timothy, and seeing his unfeigned faith, and that from a child he had known the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament (2Ti 3:15), and seeing also his Christian character and deportment, and his entire suitability for the work of the ministry, he would have him "to go forth with him" (Ac 16:3). Timothy acquiesced in Paul's desire, and as preliminaries to his work as a Christian missionary, both to Jew and Gentile, two things were done. In order to conciliate the Jewish Christians, who would otherwise have caused trouble, which would have weakened Timothy's position and his work as a preacher of the gospel, Paul took Timothy and circumcised him.

6. Circumcised:

Paul was willing to agree to this being done, on account of the fact that Timothy's mother was a Jewess. It was therefore quite a different case from that of Titus, where Paul refused to allow circumcision to be performed (Ac 15:2)—Titus being, unlike Timothy, a Gentile by birth.

See TITUS.

The other act which was performed for Timothy's benefit, before he set out with Paul, was that he was ordained by the presbytery or local council of presbyters in Derbe and Lystra.

7. His Ordination:

Showing the importance which Paul assigned to this act of ordination, he refers to it in a letter to Timothy written many years afterward: "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery" (1Ti 4:14). In this ordination Paul himself took part, for he writes, "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee through the laying on of my hands" (2Ti 1:6).

"2Ti 1:6 should be viewed in the light of 1Ti 4:14. Probably it was prophetic voices (through prophecy; compare 1Ti 1:18, 'according to the prophecies which went before in regard to thee') which suggested the choice of Timothy as assistant of Paul and Silvanus, and his consecration to this work with prayer and the laying on of hands (compare Ac 13:2 f). The laying on of hands by the presbyters (1Ti 4:14), and that by Paul (2Ti 1:6), are not mutually exclusive, especially since the former is mentioned merely as an accompanying circumstance of his endowment with special grace, the latter as the efficient cause of this endowment. The churches in the neighborhood of Timothy's home, according to Ac 14:23, had been furnished with a body of presbyters soon after their founding" (Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, II, 23).

8. Accompanies Paul:

Thus, prepared for the work, Timothy went forth with Paul on the apostle's 2nd missionary journey. We find Timothy with him at Berea (Ac 17:14), having evidently accompanied him to all places visited by him up to that point, namely, Phrygia, the region of Galatia, Mysia, Troas, Neapoils, Philippi, Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica and Berea. Paul next went—and went alone, on account of the persecution at Berea—to Athens (Ac 17:15); and from that city he sent a message to Silas and Timothy at Berea, that they should come to him at Athens with all speed. They quickly came to him there, and were immediately sent on an errand to the church in Thessalonica; "When we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left behind at Athens alone; and sent Timothy, our brother, and minister of God, and our fellow-labourer in the gospel of Christ, to establish you, and to comfort you concerning your faith: that no man should be moved by these afflictions" (1Th 3:1,2,3 the King James Version). Timothy and Silas discharged this duty and returned to the apostle, bringing him tidings of the faith of the Christians in Thessalonica, of their love and of their kind remembrance of Paul, and of their ardent desire to see him; and Paul was comforted (1Th 3:5,6,7).

9. At Corinth:

Paul had left Athens before Silas and Timothy were able to rejoin him. He had proceeded to Corinth, and it was while the apostle was in that city, that "when Silas and Timothy came down from Macedonia, Paul was constrained by the word, testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Christ" (Ac 18:5). Timothy

evidently remained with Paul during the year and six months of his residence in Corinth, and also throughout this missionary journey to its end. From Corinth Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans, and he sent them a salutation from Timothy, "Timothy my fellow-worker saluteth you" (Ro 16:21).

10. Salutations:

In connection with this salutation from Timothy, it should be noticed that it was Paul's custom to associate with his own name that of one or more of his companions, in the opening salutations in the Epistles. Timothy's name occurs in 2Co 1:1; Php 1:1; Col 1:1; Phm 1:1. It is also found, along with that of Silvanus, in 1Th 1:1 and 2Th 1:1.

11. At Ephesus:

On Paul's 3rd missionary journey, Timothy again accompanied him, though he is not mentioned until Ephesus was reached. This journey involved much traveling, much work and much time. At Ephesus alone more than two years were spent. And when Paul's residence there was drawing to a close, he laid his plans to go to Jerusalem, after passing en route through Macedonia and Achaia. Accordingly he sent on before him "into Macedonia two of them that ministered unto him, Timothy and Erastus" (Ac 19:22).

12. To Corinth Again:

From Ephesus Paul wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians (1Co 16:8), and in it he mentioned (1Co 16:10) that Timothy was then traveling to Corinth, apparently a prolongation of the journey into Macedonia. After commending him to a kind reception from the Corinthians, Paul proceeded to say that Timothy was to return to him from Corinth; that is, Timothy was to bring with him a report on the state of matters in the Corinthian church.

13. In Greece:

Soon thereafter the riot in Ephesus occurred; and when it was over, Paul left Ephesus and went to Macedonia and Greece. In Macedonia he was rejoined by Timothy, whose name is associated with his own, in the opening salutation of the Second Epistle, which he now wrote to Corinth. Timothy accompanied him into Greece, where they abode three months.

14. In Jerusalem:

From Greece the apostle once more set his face toward Jerusalem, Timothy and others accompanying him (Ac 20:4). "We that were of Paul's company" (Ac 21:8 the King James Version), as Luke terms the friends who now traveled with Paul—and Timothy was one of them—touched at Troas and a number of other places, and eventually reached Jerusalem, where Paul was apprehended. This of course terminated, for the time, his apostolic journeys, but not the cooperation of his friends, or of Timothy among them.

15. In Rome:

The details of the manner in which Timothy was now employed are not recorded, until he is found once more with Paul—during his 1st imprisonment in Rome. But, from that point onward, there are many notices of how he was occupied in the apostle's service. He is mentioned in three of the Epistles written by Paul at this time, namely, in Col 1:1, and Phm 1:1, in both of which his designation is "Timothy our brother," and in Php 1:1, "Paul and Timothy, servants of Christ Jesus." In Php 2:19, there is the interesting notice that, at a time when Paul's hope was that he would soon be liberated from his imprisonment, he trusted that he would be able to send Timothy to visit the church at Philippi:

16. To Visit Philippi:

"I hope in the Lord Jesus to send Timothy shortly unto you, that I also may be of good comfort, when I know your state. For I have no man likeminded, who will care truly for your state. .... But ye know the proof of him, that, as a child serveth a father, so he served with me in furtherance of the gospel. Him therefore I hope to send forthwith."

17. Appointed to Ephesus:

Paul's hope was realized: he was set free; and once again Timothy was his companion in travel. Perhaps it was in Philippi that they rejoined each other, for not only had Paul expressed his intention of sending Timothy there, but he had also said that he hoped himself to visit the Philippian church (Php 1:26; 2:24). From this point onward it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to trace the course of Paul's journeys, but he tells us that he had left Timothy as his delegate or representative in Ephesus (1Ti 1:3); and soon thereafter he wrote the First Epistle to Timothy, in which he gave full instructions in regard to the manner in which he should conduct the affairs of the Ephesian church, until Paul himself should again revisit Ephesus: "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly" (1Ti 3:14).

18. His Position in Ephesus:

"The position which Timothy occupied in Ephesus, as it is described in 1 Timothy, cannot without doing the greatest violence to history be called that of a bishop, for the office of bishop existed only where the one bishop, superior to the presbytery, represented the highest expression of the common church life. The office was for life, and confined to the local church. This was particularly the case in Asia Minor, where, although as early as the time of Revelation and the time of Ignatius, bishoprics were numerous and closely adjacent, the office always retained its local character. On the other hand, Timothy's position at the head of the churches of Asia was due to the position which he occupied as Paul's helper in missionary work. It was his part in the apostolic calling, as this calling involved the oversight of existing churches. Timothy was acting as a temporary representative of Paul in his apostolic capacity at Ephesus, as he had done earlier in Corinth, and in Thessalonica and Philippi (1Co 4:17; 1Th 3:2 f; Php 2:19-23). His relation was not closer to one church than to the other churches of the province; its rise and disappearance did not affect at all the organization of the local congregations" (Zahn, Introduction to

the New Testament, II, 34).

19. Paul Summons Him to Rome:

From the Second Epistle still further detail can be gathered. Paul was a second time imprisoned, and feeling that on this occasion his trial would be followed by an adverse judgment and by death, he wrote from Rome to Timothy at Ephesus, affectionately requesting him to come to him: "Give diligence to come shortly unto me" (2Ti 4:9). The fact that at that time, when no Christian friend was with Paul except Luke (2Ti 4:11), it was to Timothy he turned for sympathy and aid, closing with the request that his own son in the faith should come to him, to be with him in his last hours, shows how true and tender was the affection which bound them together. Whether Timothy was able to reach Rome, so as to be with Paul before his execution, is unknown.

20. Mention in Hebrews 13:

One other notice of him occurs in Heb 13:23: "Know ye that our brother Timothy hath been set at liberty; with whom, if he come shortly, I will see you." As the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews is not Paul, it is problematical what the meaning of these words really is, except that Timothy had been imprisoned and—unlike what took place in Paul's case—he had escaped death trod had been set free.

21. His Character:

Nothing further is known of him. Of all Paul's friends, with the exception, perhaps, of Luke, Paul's beloved friend, Timothy was regarded by him with the tenderest affection; he was his dearly loved son, faithful and true. Various defects have been alleged to exist in Timothy's character. These defects are inferred from the directions and instructions addressed to him by Paul in the Pastoral Epistles, buy these inferences may be wrong, and it is a mistake to exaggerate them in view of his unbroken and unswerving loyalty and of the long and faithful service rendered by him to Paul, "as a child serveth a father" (Php 2:22).

John Rutherfurd

TIMOTHY, EPISTLES TO

See PASTORAL EPISTLES.

TIN

tin (bedhil): Tin is mentioned with brass, iron and lead in Nu 31:22; Eze 22:18,20. Ezekiel mentions tin along with silver, iron and lead as being imported into Tyre from Tarshish (see METALS). The tin must have been brought in the form of ore and smelted in Syria. The writer has some slag dug from a deposit

near Beirut which yielded nearly pure tin. It was probably the site of an ancient smelter's shop.

Alfred Ely Day

TIPHSAH

tif'-sa (tiphcach, "ford"; Thapsa):

(1) This marks the northern extremity of the dominions ruled by Solomon, Gaza being the limit on the South (1Ki 4:24). It can hardly be other than Thapsacus, on the right bank of the Euphrates, before its waters join those of the Balik. The great caravan route between East and West crossed the river by the ford at this point. Here Cyrus the younger effected a somewhat perilous crossing (Xenophon, Anabasis i.4, 2). The ford was also used by Darius; but Alexander the Great, in his pursuit constructed two bridges for the transport of his army (Arrian iii.7). Under the Seleucids it was called Amphipolis. The site is probably occupied by the modern Qal'at Dibse, where there is a ford still used by the caravans. It is about 8 miles below Meskene, where the river makes a bend to the East.

(2) (Codex Vaticanus Thersa, Codex Alexandrinus Thaira): The inhabitants of this town, which was apparently not far from Tirzah, did not favor the regicide Menahem, refusing to open to him. In his wrath he massacred the Tiphsites with circumstances of horrible cruelty (2Ki 15:16). Khirbet Tafsah, about 6 miles Southwest of Nablus, corresponds in name, but is probably too far from Tirzah.

W. Ewing

TIRAS

ti'-ras (tirac; Theiras, Lucian Thiras): A son of Japheth (Ge 10:2 (P); 1Ch 1:5). Not mentioned elsewhere; this name was almost unanimously taken by the ancient commentators (so Josephus, Ant, I, vi, 1) to be the same as that of the Thracians (Thrakes); but the removal of the nominative ending -s does away with this surface resemblance. Tuch was the first to suggest the Tursenioi, a race of Pelasgian pirates, who left many traces of their ancient power in the islands and coasts of the Aegean, and who were doubtless identical with the Etruscans of Italy. This brilliant suggestion has since been confirmed by the discovery of the name Turusa among the seafaring peoples who invaded Egypt in the reign of Merenptah (W.M. Muller, AE, 356 ff). Tiras has also been regarded as the same as Tarshish.

Horace J. Wolf

TIRATHITES

ti'-rath-its (tir'athim; Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, Argathieim; Lucian, Tharathei: A family of scribes that dwelt at Jabez (1Ch 2:55). The three families mentioned in this verse (Tirathites,

Shimathites and Sucathites) are taken by Jerome to be three different classes of religious functionaries—singers, scribes, recorders ("canentes atque resonances et in tabernaculis commorantes"). The Targum takes the same view, save that the "Sucathites" are those "covered" with a spirit of prophecy. Bertheau sees the Tirathites as "gate-keepers" (Aramaic tera‘ = Heb] sha‘ar). Keil holds the three names to be those of the descendants of unknown men named Tira, Shemei and Sucah. The passage seems too obscure to admit of interpretation.

Horace J. Wolf

TIRE, HEADTIRE

tir (2Ki 9:30; Isa 3:20; Eze 24:17,23; Judith 10:3; 16:8).

See DRESS, V.

TIRES, ROUND

tirz: Small ornaments in the shape of crescents (Isa 3:18 King James Version, Revised Version "crescents").

See ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 3; CRESCENTS.

TIRHAKAH

ter-ha’-ka, tir-ha’-ka (tirhaqah; Codex Vaticanus in 2 Kings Thara; elsewhere and in Codex Alexandrinus Tharaka; Josephus Tharsikes):

1. Name and Prenomen:

The king of Cush or Ethiopia (basileus Aithiopon), who opposed Sennacherib in Palestine (2Ki 19:9; Isa 37:9). The name of this ruler of Egypt and his native realm appears in hieroglyphics as Taharqa, his prenomen being Nefer-atmu-Ra-chu, "Nefer-atmu-Ra protects." The Assyrian form of Tirhakah is Tarqu or Tarqu’u (inscriptions of Assur-bani-pal).

2. Origin and Length of Reign:

Tirhakah was one of the sons, and apparently the favorite, of Piankhy II. He left his mother, and the city Napata, at the age of 20; and when she followed him northward, she found him crowned as king of Egypt. As he died, after a reign of at least 26 years, in 667 BC, he must have mounted the throne about 693 BC.

3. A Chronological Difficulty

The engagement between Tirhakah's army and the Assyrians is regarded as having taken place in 701 BC. Petrie explains this date by supposing he acted at first for the reigning Pharaoh, his cousin Shabatoka, Tirhakah not having officially become Pharaoh until the former's death in 693 BC. There is a general opinion, however, that the Assyrian historians, like those of 2 King and Isaiah, have mingled two campaigns made by Sennacherib, one of them being after the accession of Tirhakah.

4. First Conflict with the Assyrians:

According to the Old Testament account, Sennacherib was besieging Libnah when Tirhakah's army appeared in Palestine. In Sennacherib's inscriptions, however, the battle with "the king(s) of Mucuru (Egypt) and the bowmen, chariots, and cavalry of Meruhha" (Meroe or Ethiopia), who had come to Hezekiah's help, took place in the neighborhood of Eltekeh. He claims to have captured the sons of the king (variant, "kings") of Egypt and the charioteers of the king of Meruhha, and then, having taken Eltekeh, Timna, and Ekron, he brought out Padi from Jerusalem, and resented him on the throne of Ekron. The name of Tirhakah does not occur in his account.

5. Struggles with Esar-haddon and Assur-bani-pal. His Death:

It would seem to have been Egypt's interference in Palestinian affairs which caused the Assyrian kings to desire the conquest of that distant country. According to the Babylonian Chronicle, the Assyrian army fought in Egypt in the 7th year of Esar-haddon (675 BC), and the country was then apparently quiet until 672 BC, when Esar-haddon marched thither, and after fighting three battles, entered Memphis. "The king" (Tirhakah) fled, but his sons and nephews were made prisoners. In the latter campaign (670 BC) Esar-haddon fell ill and died on the way out, so that the operations were, apparently, completed by his son, Assur-bani-pal (Osnap-par); On hearing of the Assyrian success at Kar-Baniti, Tirhakah, who was at Memphis, fled to Thebes. The 20 petty kings installed in Egypt by Esar-haddon were restored by Assur-bani-pal, but they feared the vengeance of Tirhakah after the Assyrian army had retired, and therefore made an agreement with him. On this news reaching the Assyrian king, he sent his army back to Egypt, and the petty rulers having been abolished, Necho king of Memphis and Sais was set on the throne, with his son, Nabu-sizbanni, as ruler in Athribes. On hearing of the success of the Assyrian armies, Tirhakah fled, and died in Cush (Ethiopia). He was suceeded by TanTamane (Identified with Tanut-Amon), son of Sabaco, whom the Assyrians defeated in the last expedition which they ever made to Egypt (see W. F. Petrie, History of Egypt, III, 294 ff).

T. G. Pinches

TIRHANA

tur'-ha-na, ter-ha'-na (tirchanah; Codex Vaticanus Tharam; Codex Alexandrinus Tharchna, Lucian Tharaana): A son of Caleb by his concubine, Maacah (1Ch 2:48).

TIRIA

tir’-i-a, ti’-ri-a (tireya’, Baer tirya’; Codex Vaticanus omits it; Codex Alexandrinus Theria; Lucian Ethria): A son of Jehallelel (1Ch 4:16).

TIRSHATHA

ter-sha’-tha, tur’-sha-tha (tirshatha’; Hathersatha): A title which occurs 5 times in Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:65, the American Standard Revised Version and the English Revised Version margin "governor"). In Ne 8:9; 10:1, Nehemiah is called the tirshatha’. In Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:65,70, it is the title of Sheshbazzar, or Zerubbabel. As in Ne 12:26, Nehemiah is called a pechah, or governor, a title which in Ezr 5:14 is given to Sheshbazzar also, it has been supposed that pechah and tirshatha’ were equivalent terms, the former being of Assyrio-Babylonian and the latter of Persian origin. According to Lagarde, it comes from the Bactrian antarekshatra, that is, "he who takes the place of the king." According to Meyer and Scheftelowitz it is a modified form of a hypothetical Old Persian word tarsata. According to Gesenius and Ewald, it is to be compared with the Persian torsh, "severe," "austere," i.e. "stern lord." It seems more probable that it is derived from the Babylonian root rashu, "to take possession of," from which we get the noun rashu, "creditor." In this case it may well have had the sense of a tax-collector. One of the principal duties of the Persian satrap, or governor, was to assess and collect the taxes (see Rawlinson’s Persia, chapter viii). This would readily account for the fact that in Ne 7:70 the tirshatha’ gave to the treasure to be used in the building of the temple a thousand drachms of gold, etc., and that in Ezr 1:8 Cyrus numbered the vessels of the house of the Lord unto Sheshbazzar. This derivation would connect it with the Aramaic rashya, "creditor," and the New Hebrew rashuth, "highest power," "magistrate."

R. Dick Wilson

TIRZAH

tur’-za (tirtsah; Thersa):

(1) A royal city of the Canaanites, the king of which was slain by Joshua (12:24). It superseded Shechem as capital of the Northern Kingdom (1Ki 14:17, etc.), and itself gave place in turn to Samaria. Here reigned Jeroboam, Nadab his son, Baasha, Elah and Zimri (1Ki 15:21,33; 16:6,8,9,15). Baasha was buried in Tirzah. Here Elah was assassinated while "drinking himself drunk" in the house of his steward; here therefore probably he was buried. Zimri perished in the flames of his palace, rather than fall into Omri’s hands. In Tirzah Menahem matured his rebellion against Shallum (2Ki 15:14). The place is mentioned in So 6:4 the King James Version, where the Shulammite is said to be "beautiful .... as Tirzah, comely as Jerusalem." The comparison may be due to the charm of its situation. The name may possibly be derived from ratsah, "to delight." Several identifications have been suggested. Buhl (Geographic des alten Palestina, 203) favors et-tireh, on the West of the plain of Makhneh, 4 miles

South of Nablus, which he identifies with the Tira-thana of Josephus. He quotes Neubauer to the effect that the later Jews said Tir‘an or Tar‘ita instead of Tirzah, as weakening the claim of Telluzah, which others (e.g. Robinson, BR, III, 302) incline to. It is a partly ruined village with no spring, but with ancient cisterns, on a hill about 4 miles East of North from Nablus. This was evidently the place intended by Brocardius—Thersa, about 3 miles East of Samaria (Descriptio, VII). A third claimant is Teiasir, a fortress at the point where the road from Abel-meholah joins that from Shechem to Bethshan, fully 11 miles Northeast of Nablus. It is impossible to decide with certainty. The heavy "T" in Telluzah is a difficulty. Teiasir is perhaps too far from Shechem. Buhl’s case for identification with eT-Tireh is subject to the same difficulty as Telluzah.

(2) One of the five daughters of Zelophehad (Nu 26:33; 27:1; 36:11; Jos 17:3).

W. Ewing

TISHBITE

tish’-bit.

See ELIJAH; Expostory Times, XII, 383.

TISHRI; TISRI

tish’-re, tiz’-re: The 7th month of the Jewish ecclesiastical, and 1st of the civil, year (September-October). The same as Ethanim.

See CALENDAR.

TITANS

ti’-tanz: In Judith 16:7, "Neither did the sons of the Titans (huioi Titanon) smite him." The name of an aboriginal Canaanitish race of reputed giants who inhabited Palestine before the Hebrews, and so used in the sense of "giants" in general. See REPHAIM. In 2Sa 5:18,22, the "valley of Rephaim" is translated by the Septuagint as "the valley of the Titans."

TITHE

tith (ma‘aser; dekate): The custom of giving a 10th part of the products of the land and of the spoils of war to priests and kings (1 Macc 10:31; 11:35; 1Sa 8:15,17) was a very ancient one among most nations. That the Jews had this custom long before the institution of the Mosaic Law is shown by Ge 14:17-20 (compare Heb 7:4) and Ge 28:22. Many critics hold that these two passages are late and only reflect the later practice of the nation; but the payment of tithes is so ancient and deeply rooted in the history of the

human race that it seems much simpler and more natural to believe that among the Jews the practice was in existence long before the time of Moses.

In the Pentateuch we find legislation as to tithes in three places.

(1) According to Le 27:30-33, a tithe had to be given of the seed of the land, i.e. of the crops, of the fruit of the tree, e.g. oil and wine, and of the herd or the flock (compare De 14:22,23; 2Ch 31:5,6). As the herds and flocks passed out to pasture they were counted (compare Jer 33:13; Eze 20:37), and every 10th animal that came out was reckoned holy to the Lord. The owner was not allowed to search among them to find whether they were bad or good, nor could he change any of them; if he did, both the one chosen and the one for which it was changed were holy. Tithes of the herds and flocks could not be redeemed for money, but tithes of the seed of the land and of fruit could be, but a 5th part of the value of the tithe had to be added.

(2) In Nu 18:21-32 it is laid down that the tithe must be paid to the Levites. (It should be noted that according to Heb 7:5, ‘they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood .... take tithes of the people.’ Westcott’s explanation is that the priests, who received from the Levites a tithe of the tithe, thus symbolically received the whole tithe. In the time of the second temple the priests did actually receive the tithes. In the Talmud (Yebhamoth 86a et passim) it is said that this alteration from the Mosaic Law was caused by the sin of the Levites, who were not eager to return to Jerusalem, but had to be persuaded to do so by Ezra (Ezr 8:15).) The Levites were to receive the tithes offered by Israel to Yahweh, because they had no other inheritance, and in return for their service of the tabernacle (Nu 18:21,24). The tithe was to consist of corn of the threshing-floor and the fullness of the wine press (Nu 18:27), which coincides with seed of the land and fruit of the trees in Le 27. The Levites, who stood in the same relation to the priests as the people did to themselves, were to offer from this their inheritance a heave offering, a tithe of a tithe, to the priests (compare Ne 10:39), and for this tithey were to choose of the best part of what they received.

(3) In De 12:5,6,11,18 (compare Am 4:4) it is said that the tithe is to be brought "unto the place which Yahweh your God shall choose out of all your tribes, to put his name there," i.e. to Jerusalem; and in De 12:7,12,18, that the tithe should be used there as a sacred meal by the offerer and his household, including the Levite within his gates. Nothing is said here about tithing cattle, only grain, wine and oil being mentioned (compare Ne 10:36-38; 13:5,12). In De 14:22-29 it is laid down that if the way was too long to carry the tithe to Jerusalem it could be exchanged for money, and the money taken there instead, where it was to be spent in anything the owner chose; and whatever was bought was to be eaten by him and his household and the Levites at Jerusalem. In the third year the tithe was to be reserved and eaten at home by the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow. In De 26:12-15 it is laid down that in the 3rd year, after this feast had been given, the landowner should go up himself before the Lord his God, i. e. to Jerusalem, and ask God’s blessing on his deed. (According to the Mishna, CoTah 9 10; Ma‘aser Sheni 5 65, the high priest Johanan abolished this custom.) In this passage this 3rd year is called "the year of tithing."

There is thus an obvious apparent discrepancy between the legislation in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. It is harmonized in Jewish tradition, not only theoretically but in practice, by considering the tithes as three different tithes, which are named the First Tithe, the Second Tithe, and the Poor Tithe, which is called also the Third Tithe (Pe'ah, Ma'aseroth, Ma'ser Sheni, Dema'i, Ro'sh ha-shanah; compare Tobit 1:7,8; Ant, IV, iv, 3; viii, 8; viii, 22). According to this explanation, after the tithe (the First Tithe) was given to the Levites (of which they had to give the tithe to the priests), a Second Tithe of the remaining nine-tenths had to be set apart and consumed in Jerusalem. Those who lived far from Jerusalem could change this Second Tithe into money with the addition of a 5th part of its value. Only food, drink or ointment could be bought for the money (Ma'aser Sheni 2 1; compare De 14:26). The tithe of cattle belonged to the Second Tithe, and was to be used for the feast in Jerusalem (Zebhachim 5 8). In the 3rd year the Second Tithe was to be given entirely to the Levites and the poor. But according to Josephus (Ant., IV, viii, 22) the "Poor Tithe" was actually a third one. The priests and the Levites, if landowners, were also obliged to give the Poor Tithe (Pe'ah 1 6).

The explanation given by many critics, that the discrepancy between Deuteronomy and Leviticus is due to the fact that these are different layers of legislation, and that the Levitical tithe is a post-exilian creation of the Priestly Code, is not wholly satisfactory, for the following reasons:

(1) The allusion in De 18:1,2 seems to refer to the Levitical tithe.

(2) There is no relation between the law of Nu 18 and post-exilian conditions, when the priests were numerous and the Levites a handful.

(3) A community so poor and disaffected as that of Ezra's time would have refused to submit to a new and oppressive tithe burden.

(4) The division into priests and Levites cannot have been of the recent origin that is alleged.

See LEVITES.

W. R. Smith and others suggest that the tithe is simply a later form of the first-fruits, but this is difficult to accept, since the first-fruits were given to the priest, while the tithes were not. The whole subject is involved in considerable obscurity, which with our present information cannot easily be cleared away.

The Talmudic law of tithing extends the Mosaic Law, with most burdensome minuteness, even to the smallest products of the soil. Of these, according to some, not only the seeds, but, in certain cases, even the leaves and stalks had to be tithed (Ma'aseroth 4 5), "mint, anise, and cummin" (Dema'i 11 1; compare Mt 23:23; Lu 11:42). The general principle was that "everything that is eaten, that is watched over, and that grows out of the earth" must be tithed (Ma'aseroth 1 1).

Considering the many taxes, religious and secular, that the Jews had to pay, especially in post-exilian times, we cannot but admire the liberality and resourcefulness of the Jewish people. Only in the years

just after the return from exile do we hear that the taxes were only partially paid (Ne 13:10; compare Mal 1:7 ff; and for pre-exilian times compare 2Ch 31:4 ff). In later times such cases seldom occur (Sotah 48a), which is the more surprising since the priests, who benefited so much by these laws of the scribes, were the adversaries of the latter.

Paul Levertoff

TITLE

ti'-t'-l: Joh 19:19,20 for titlos.

The following arrangement of the title on the cross has been suggested: See Geikie, Life and Words of Christ, chapter lxiii, note e; Seymour, The Cross in Tradition, History and Art (New York, 1898), pp. 115, 116,136, 138.

In 2Ki 23:17, the King James Version has "title" for tsiyyun. The word is connected with tsawah, "to command," and King James Version seems to have understood tsiyyun as "that giving directions," "sign-posts" (compare Eze 39:15). The word, however, means "grave-stone," "monument."

See SUPERSCRIPTION.

TITTLE

tit'-'-l (keraia (Westcott-Hort, kerea), from keras, "a horn"): A small stroke or mark, specif. on a letter to denote accent, or as a diacritical mark; used only in Mt 5:18 and Lu 16:17. In the first passage it is used in connection with iota, or jot, i.e. the very smallest thing, and in both it refers to the minutiae of the Law. It is well known that the scribes paid the greatest attention to such marks attached to the letters in the Hebrew Scriptures, the Massoretic Text of which abounds in them.

See JOT; YODH.

TITUS

ti'-tus (Titos (2Co 2:13; 7:6,13; 8:6,16,23; 12:18; Ga 1:2:1,3; 2Ti 4:10; Tit 1:4)):

1. One of Paul's Converts:

A Greek Christian, one of Paul's intimate friends, his companion in some of his apostolic journeys, and one of his assistants in Christian work. His name does not occur in the Acts; and, elsewhere in the New Testament, it is found only in 2 Corinthians, Galatians, 2 Timothy and Titus. As Paul calls him "my true child after a common faith" (Tit 1:4), it is probable that he was one of the apostle's converts.

2. Paul Refuses to Have Him Circumcised:

The first notice of Titus is in Ac 15:2, where we read that after the conclusion of Paul's 1st missionary journey, when he had returned to Antioch, a discussion arose in the church there, in regard to the question whether it was necessary that Gentile Christians should be circumcised and should keep the Jewish Law. It was decided that Paul and Barnabas, "and certain other of them," should go up to Jerusalem to the apostles and elders about this question. The "certain other of them" includes Titus, for in Ga 2:3 it is recorded that Titus was then with Paul. The Judaistic party in the church at Jerusalem desired to have Titus circumcised, but Paul gave no subjection to these persons and to their wishes, "no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you" (Ga 2:5). The matter in dispute was decided as recorded in Ac 15:13-29. The decision was in favor of the free promulgation of the gospel, as preached by Paul, and unrestricted by Jewish ordinances. Paul's action therefore in regard to Titus was justified. In fact Titus was a representative or test case.

It is difficult and perhaps impossible to give the true reason why Titus is not mentioned by name in the Acts, but he is certainly referred to in 15:2.

3. Sent to Corinth:

There is no further notice of Titus for some years afterward, when he is again mentioned in 2 Corinthians. In this Epistle his name occurs 8 times. From the notices in this Epistle it appears that Titus had been sent by Paul, along with an unnamed "brother," to Corinth as the apostle's delegate to the church there (2Co 12:18). His chief business was evidently to deal with the cases of immorality which had occurred there. His mission was largely successful, so that he was able to return to Paul with joy, because his spirit was refreshed by the Corinthians (2Co 7:13). His inward affection was largely drawn out to them, and "he remembereth the obedience of you all, how with fear and trembling ye received him" (2Co 7:15). At Corinth Titus seems also to have assisted in organizing the weekly collections for the poor saints in Jerusalem. See 1Co 16:1,2 compared with 2Co 8:6: "We exhorted Titus, that as he had made a beginning before, so he would also complete in you this grace also."

After the departure of Titus from Corinth, difficulty had again arisen in the church there, and Titus seems to have been sent by Paul a second time to that city, as the apostle's messenger, carrying a letter from him—referred to in 2Co 2:3 ff; 7:8 ff.

4. Paul Goes to Meet Him:

The state of the Corinthian church had been causing much anxiety to Paul, so much so that when he had come to Troas to preach Christ's gospel, and a door was opened to him of the Lord, he found no rest in his spirit, because he found not Titus, his brother; so he left Troas, and went thence into Macedonia, in order to meet Titus the sooner, so as to ascertain from him how matters stood in Corinth. In Macedonia accordingly the apostle met Titus, who brought good news regarding the Corinthians. In the unrest and

fightings and fears which the troubles at Corinth had caused Paul to experience, his spirit was refreshed when Titus reached him. "He that comforteth the lowly, even God, comforted us by the coming of Titus .... while he told us your longing, your mourning, your zeal for me; so that I rejoiced yet more" (2Co 7:6,7).

Paul now wrote to the Corinthians again—our Second Epistle to the Corinthians—and dispatched it to its destination by the hand of Titus, into whose heart ‘God had put the same earnest care for them’ (2Co 8:16-18). Titus was also again entrusted with the work of overseeing the weekly collection in the Corinthian church (2Co 8:10,24).

5. Travels with Paul to Crete:

There is now a long interval in the history of Titus, for nothing further is recorded of him till we come to the Pastoral Epistles. From Paul’s Epistle to him these details are gathered: On Paul’s liberation at the conclusion of his first Roman imprisonment he made a number of missionary journeys, and Titus went with him, as his companion and assistant, on one of these—to the island of Crete. From Crete, Paul proceeded onward but he left Titus to "set in order the things that were wanting, and appoint elders in every city" (Tit 1:5) . Paul reminds him of the character of the people of Crete, and gives him various instructions for his guidance; charges him to maintain sound doctrine, and advises him how to deal with the various classes of persons met with in his pastoral capacity.

6. Paul Sends for Him:

Titus is informed that Artemas or Tychicus will be sent to Crete so that he will be free to leave the island and to rejoin the apostle at Nicopolis, where he has determined to winter. Such were Paul’s plans; whether they were carried out is unknown. But this at least is certain, that Titus did rejoin Paul, if not at Nicopolis, then at some other spot; and he was with him in Rome on the occasion of his 2nd imprisonment there, for he is mentioned once again (2Ti 4:10) as having gone to Dalmatia, evidently on an evangelistic errand, as the apostle was in the habit of sending his trusted friends to do such work, when he himself was no longer able to do this, owing to his imprisonment. "Paul regarded as his own the work done from centers where he labored, by helpers associated with him, considering the churches thus organized as under his jurisdiction. This throws light upon the statement in 2Ti 4:10, that Titus at that time had gone to Dalmatia, and a certain Crescens to Gaul. There is no indication that they, like Demas, had deserted the apostle and sought safety for themselves, or that, like Tychicus, they had been sent by the apostle upon some special errand. In either case it would be a question why they went to these particular countries, with which, so far as we know, Paul, up to this time, had never had anything to do. The probability is that Titus, who had long been associated with Paul (Ga 2:3), who, as his commissioner, had executed difficult offices in Corinth (2Co 7-9), and who, not very long before 2 Timothy was written, had completed some missionary work in Crete that had been begun by others, had gone as a missionary and as Paul’s representative and helper to Dalmatia. .... If by this means, beginnings of church organizations had been made .... in Spain by Paul himself, in Gaul by Crescens, in Dalmatia by Titus, then, in reality, the missionary map had been very much changed since Paul’s first

defense" (Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament. II, 11).

7. His Character:

Titus was one of Paul's very dear and trusted friends; and the fact that he was chosen by the apostle to act as his delegate to Corinth, to transact difficult and delicate work in the church there, and that he did this oftener than once, and did it thoroughly and successfully, shows that Titus was not merely a good but a most capable man, tactful and resourceful and skillful in the handling of men and of affairs. "Whether any inquire about Titus, he is my partner and fellow-worker to you-ward" (2Co 8:23).

John Rutherfurd

TITUS JUSTUS

tish'-us jus'-tus.

See JUSTUS, (2); TITUS JUSTUS.

TITUS MANIUS

See MANIUS.

TITUS, EPISTLE TO

See PASTORAL EPISTLES.

TITUS or TITIUS JUSTUS

(Titos or Titios Ioustos (Ac 18:7)): Titus or Titius—for the manuscripts vary in regard to the spelling—was the prenomen of a certain Corinthian, a Jewish proselyte (sebomenos ton Theon). See PROSELYTE). His name seems also to indicate that he was a Roman by birth. He is altogether a different person from Titus, Paul's assistant and companion in some of his journeys, to whom also the Epistle to Titus is addressed.

Titus or Titius Justus was not the "host of Paul at Corinth" (HDB, article "Justus," p. 511), for Luke has already narrated that, when Paul came to Corinth, "he abode with" Aquila and Priscilla (Ac 18:3). What is said of Titius Justus is that when the Jews in Corinth opposed themselves to Paul and blasphemed when he testified that Jesus was the Christ, then Paul ceased to preach the gospel in the Jewish synagogue as he had formerly done, and "he departed thence, and went into the house of a certain man named Titus Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue" (Ac 18:7).

"Titius Justus was evidently a Roman or a Latin, one of the coloni of the colony Corinth. Like the centurion Cornelius, he had been attracted to the synagogue. His citizenship would afford Paul an opening to the more educated class of the Corinthian population" (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler and the Ro Citizen, 256).

Paul's residence in Corinth continued for a year and a half, followed without a break by another period indicated in the words, he "tarried after this yet many days" (Ac 18:11,18), and during the whole of this time he evidently used the house of Titius Justus, for the purposes both of preaching the gospel and of gathering the church together for Christian worship and instruction, "teaching the word of God among them" (Ac 18:11).

Titius Justus, therefore, must have been a wealthy man, since he possessed a house in which there was an apartment sufficiently large to be used for both of these purposes; and he himself must have been a most enthusiastic member of the church, when in a period of protracted difficulty and persecution, he welcomed Paul to his house, that he might use it as the meeting-place of the church in Corinth.

See JUSTUS, (2).

John Rutherfurd

TIZITE

ti'-zit (ha-titsi; Codex Vaticanus ho Ieasei; Codex Alexandrinus ho Thosaei; Lucian Athosi): A gentilic attached to the name "Joha" (1Ch 11:45), one of the soldiers of David; the origin is totally unknown.

TOAH

to'-a.

See NAHATH.

TOB, THE LAND OF

tob, tob ('erets Tobh, "a good land"; ge Tob): Hither Jephthah escaped from his brethren after his father's death (Jud 11:3), and perfected himself in the art of war, making forays with "the vain fellows" who joined him. Here the elders of Gilead found him, when, reduced to dire straits by the children of Ammon, they desired him to take command of their army (Jsg 11:5 ff). This country contributed 12,000 men to the forces of the allies, who with the Ammonites were defeated by Israel (2Sa 10:8). In 1 Macc 5:13 we read of the land of Tubins where the Jews, about 1,000 men, were slain by the Gentiles, their wives and children being carried into captivity. The Tubieni, "men of Tobit" of 2 Macc 12:17, were probably from this place. Ptolemy (v.19) speaks of Thauba, a place to the Southwest of Zobah, which

may possibly be Tobit. The Talmud (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 239) identifies the land of Tobit with the district of Hippene. Tobit would then be represented by Hippos, modern Susiyeh, to the Southwest of Fiq on the plateau East of the Sea of Galilee. Perhaps the most likely identification is that supported by G. A. Smith (HGHL, 587), with eT-Taiyibeh, 10 miles South of Umm Qeis (Gadara). The name is the same in meaning as Tobit.

W. Ewing

TOB-ADONIJAH

tob-ad-o-ni'-ja, tob-(Tobh 'adhoniyah, "good is the Lord"; Codex Vaticanus Tobadobeia; Codex Alexandrinus and Lucian Tobadonia): One of the Levites sent by King Jehoshaphat to teach in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:8). The name looks like a dittography arising from the two previous names, Adonijah and Tobijah.

TOBIAH

to-bi'-a (Tobhiyah; Codex Alexandrinus Tobias; omitted in Codex Vaticanus):

(1) An Ammonite slave (King James Version, "servant"), probably of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria (Ne 2:10). He was grieved exceedingly when Nehemiah came to seek the welfare of the children of Israel. In two ways he was connected by marriage with the Jews, having himself married the daughter of Shecaniah, the son of Arab, and his son Jehohanan having married the daughter of Meshullam, the son of Berechiah (Ne 6:18). Because of this close connection with the Jews, the nobles of the latter corresponded by letter with him and also reported his good deeds to Nehemiah and reported Nehemiah's words to Tobiah. In consequence of the report, Tobiah sent letters to Nehemiah to put him in fear (6:17-19). Nehemiah seems to have considered him to be his chief enemy; for he put him before Sanballat in his prayers to God to remember his opponents according to their works (6:14). In 13:4 we are told that he was an ally of Eliashib, the high priest who had the oversight of the chambers of the house of God and had prepared for him as a guest chamber the room which had before been used as a storehouse for offerings of various kinds. Nehemiah, having heard during his second visit to Jerusalem of this desecration of the temple, cast out the household stuff of Tobiah and cleansed the chambers, restoring the vessels of God and the offerings as of old.

(2) The eponym of a family which returned with Zerubbabel, but could not trace its descent (Ezr 2:60; Ne 7:62).

R. Dick Wilson

TOBIAS

to-bi’-as:

(1) The son of Tobit.

See TOBIT, BOOK OF.

(2) Tobias, Codex Alexandrinus Tobio the father (according to Josephus, grandfather) of HYRCANUS (which see) (2 Macc 3:11).

TOBIE

to’-bi.

See TUBIAS.

TOBIEL

to-bi’-el, to’-bi-el (Tobiel, Codex Alexandrinus Tobiel): The father of Tobit (Tobit 1:1); another form of "Tabeel]" "God is good."

TOBIJAH

to-bi’-ja (Tobhiyah, "Yahweh is good"):

(1) A Levite in the reign of Jehoshaphat whom the king sent to teach in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:8; Tobhiyahu; the Septuagint omits).

(2) One of a party of Jews that came from Babylon to Jerusalem with gold and silver for a crown for Zerubbabel and Joshua, or for Zerubbabel alone (Zec 6:10,14). The crown was to be stored in the temple in remembrance of the donors (the Septuagint in both passages translates Tobiyah by chresimoi, i.e. Tobheyha).

TOBIT, BOOK OF

to’-bit:

1. Name

2. Canonicity

3. Contents

4. Fact or Fiction?

5. Some Sources

6. Date

7. Place of Composition

8. Versions

9. Original Language

LITERATURE

1. Name:

The book is called by the name of its principal hero which in Greek is Tobit, Tobeit and Codex N Tobeith. The original Hebrew word thus transliterated (Tobhiyah) means "Yahweh is good." The Greek name of the son is Tobias, a variant of the same Hebrew word. In the English, Welsh, etc., translations, the father and son are called Tobit and Tobias respectively, but in the Vulgate both are known by the same name—Tobias—the cause of much confusion. In Syriac the father is called Tobit, the son Tobiya, following apparently the Greek; the former is not a transliteration of the Hebrew form given above and assumes a different etymology, but what?

2. Canonicity:

Though this book is excluded from Protestant Bibles (with but few exceptions), Tobit 4:7-9 is read in the Anglican offertory, and at one time Tobias and Sarah occupied in the marriage service of the Anglican rubrics the position at present held by Abraham and Sarah. For the position of the book in the Septuagint, Vulgate and English Versions of the Bible, see JUDITH, 2.

3. Contents:

The Book of Tobit differs in essential matters in its various versions and even in different manuscripts of the same versions (compare the Septuagint). The analysis of the book which follows is based on the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, which English Versions of the Bible follow. The Vulgate differs in many respects. The book tells of two Jewish families, living, one at Nineveh, the other at Ecbatana, both of which had fallen into great trouble, but at length recovered their fortunes and became united by the marriage of the son of one to the daughter of the other. Tobit had, with his

brethren of the tribe of Naphtali, been taken captive by Enemessar (= Shalmaneser). remaining in exile under his two successors, Sennacherib and Sarchedonus (Esar-haddon). During his residence in the Northern Kingdom (Israel) and after his removal to Nineveh (Assyria), he continued faithful to the Jewish religion and supported the observances of that religion at Jerusalem. Moreover, he fasted regularly, gave alms freely. and buried such of his fellow-countrymen as had been put to death with the approval or by the command of the Assyrian king. Notwithstanding this loyalty to the religion of his fathers and the fact that he buried Jewish corpses intended to be

disgraced by exposure, he like other Jews (Daniel, etc.) won favor at court by his upright demeanor and was made steward of the king's estate. Under the next king (Sennacherib) all this was changed, for he not only lost his high office but was deprived of his wealth, and came perilously near to losing his life. Through an accident (bird dung falling into his eyes) he lost his sight, and, to make bad worse, his wife, in the manner of Job's, taunted him with the futility of his religious faith. Job-like he prayed that God might take him out of his distress.

Now it happened that at this time another Jewish family, equally loyal to the ancestral faith, had fallen into similar distress—Raguel, his wife Edna and his daughter Sarah, who resided at Ecbatana (Vulgate "Rages"; compare Tobit 1:14) in Media. Now Sarah was an only daughter, comely of person and virtuous of character. She had been married to seven successive husbands, but each one of them had been slain on the bridal night by the demon Asmodeus, who seems to have been eaten up with jealousy and wished no other to have the charming maid whom he loved. The parents of Tobias at Nineveh, like those of Sarah at Ecbatana, wished to see their only child married that they might have descendants, but the marriage must be in each case to one belonging to the chosen race (Tobit 3:7-15; but see 7, below). The crux of the story is the bringing together of Tobias and Sarah and the frustration of the jealous murders of Asmodeus. In the deep poverty to which he had been reduced Tobit bethought himself of the money (ten talents, i.e. about 3,500 British pounds) which he had deposited with one Gabael of Rages. The Septuagint's Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus have Rhagoi) in Media (see Tobit 1:14). This he desired his son to fetch; but the journey is long and dangerous, and he must have a trustworthy guide which he finds in Raphael, an angel sent by God, but who appears in the guise of an orthodox Jew. The old man is delighted with the guide, whom, however, he first of all carefully examines, and dismisses his son with strict injunctions to observe the Law, to give alms and not to take to wife a non-Jewish (EV "strange") maiden (Tobit 4:3 ff). Proceeding on the journey they make a halt on reaching the Tigris, and during a bath in the river Tobias sees a fish that made as if it would devour him. The angel tells him to seize the fish and to extract from it and carefully keep its heart, liver and gall. Reaching Ecbatana they are hospitably lodged in the home of Raguel, and at once Tobias falls madly in love with the beautiful daughter Sarah, and desires to have her for wife. This is approved by the girl's parents and by Raphael, and the marriage takes place. Before going together for the night the angel instructs the bridegroom to burn the heart and liver of the fish he had caught in the Tigris. The smoke that resulted acted as a countercharm, for it drove away the evil spirit who nevermore returned (Tobit 8:1 ff). At the request of Tobias, Raphael leaves for Rages and brings from Gabael the ten talents left in his charge by Tobit. Tobias and his bride led by the angel now set out for Nineveh amid the prayers and blessings of Raguel and with half his wealth. They are warmly welcomed by the aged and anxious parents Tobit and Anna, and Tobias' dog which he took with him (Tobit 5:16) was so pleased upon getting back to the old

home that, according to the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) rendering, he "ran on before as if bringing the news .... , showing his joy by fawning and by wagging his tail" (Vulgate Tobit 11:9; compare English Versions of the Bible 11:4). Upon reaching his father, acting upon Raphael's directions, Tobias heals Tobit's demon-caused blindness by applying to the old man's eyes the gall of the fish, whereupon sight returns and the family's cup of happiness is full. The angel is offered a handsome fee for the services he has rendered, but, refusing all, he declares who he is and why he was sent by God, who deserves all the praise, he none. Tobit, having a presentiment of the coming doom of Nineveh, urges his son to leave the country and make his home in Media after the death of his parents. Tobias is commanded to write the events which had happened to him in a book (12:20). We then have Tobit's hymn of praise and thanksgiving and a record of his death at the age of 158 years (Tobit 13; 14). Tobias and Sarah, in accordance with Tobit's advice, leave for Ecabatana. His parents-in-law follow his parents into the other world, and at the age of 127 he himself dies, though not before hearing of the destruction of Nineveh by Nebuchadnezzar (14:13-15).

4. Fact or Fiction?:

Luther seems to have been the first to call in question the literal historicity of this book, regarding it rather in the light of a didactic romance. The large number of details pervading the book, personal, local and chronological, give it the appearance of being throughout a historical record; but this is but part of the author's article. His aim is to interest, instruct and encourage his readers, who were apparently in exile and had fallen upon evil times. What the writer seeks to make clear is that if they are faithful to their religious duties, giving themselves to prayer and almsgiving, burying their dead instead of exposing them on the "Tower of Silence," as did the Persians, then God would be faithful to them as He had been to Tobit.

That the book was designed to be a book of religious instruction and not a history appears from the following considerations:

(1) There are historical and geographical inaccuracies in the book. It was not Shalmaneser (Enemessar) who made the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulun exiles in Assyria, but Tiglath-pileser (734); see 2Ki 15:29. Sennacherib was not the son of Shalmaneser (Tobit 1:15), but of Sargon the Usurper. Moreover, the Tigris does not lie on the way from Nineveh to Ecbatana, as Tobit 6 f imply.

(2) The prominence given to certain Jewish principles and practices makes it clear that the book was written on their account. See Tobit 1:3 ff, Tobit's integrity, his support of the Jerusalem sanctuary, his almsgiving, etc.: (a) he buries the dead bodies of Jews; (b) he and his wife pray; (c) he teaches Tobias to keep the Law, give alms, etc. Note in particular the teaching of Raphael the angel (Tobit 12:6 ff) and that contained in Tobit's song of praise (Tobit 13).

(3) The writer has borrowed largely from other sources, Biblical and non-Biblical, and he shows no regard for correctness of facts so long as he succeeds in making the teaching clear and the tale interesting. The legend about the angel who pretended to be an orthodox Jew with a proper Jewish name

and pedigree was taken from popular tradition and could hardly have been accepted by the writer as literally true.

For oral and written sources used by the author of Tobit see the next section. A writer whose aim was to give an exact account of things which happened would hardly have gone to so many sources belonging to such different times, nor would he bring into one life events which in the sources belong to many lives (Job, etc.).

5. Some Sources:

The Book of Tobit is dependent upon older sources, oral or written, more than is the case with most books in the Apocrypha. The following is a brief statement of some of these:

(1) The Book of Job.

Besides belonging to the same general class of literature as Job, such as deals with the problem of suffering, Tobit presents us with a man in whose career there are alternations of prosperity and adversity similar to those that meet us in Job. When Anna reproaches her husband for continuing to believe in a religion which fails him at the critical moment (Tobit 2:14), we have probably to see a reflection of the similar incident in Job ("renounce God and die" (Job 2:9)).

(2) The Book of Sirach.

There are so many parallels between Sirach and Tobit that some kind of dependence seems quite clear. Take the following as typical: Both lay stress on the efficacy of alms-giving (Tobit 4:11; 12:9; compare Sirach 3:30; 29:12; 40:24). Both teach the same doctrine of Sheol as the abode of feelingless shades to which the good as well as the bad go (Tobit 3:6,10; 13:2, compare Sirach 46:19; 14:16; 17:28). The importance of interring the dead is insisted upon in both books (Tobit 1:17; 2:3,7; 4:3 f; compare Sirach 7:33; 30:18; 38:16). The same moral duties are emphasized: continued attention to God and the life He enjoins (Tobit 4:5 f, 19; compare Sirach 6:37; 8:8-14; 35:10; 37:2); chastity and the duty of marrying within one’s own people (Tobit 4:12 f; 8:6; compare Sirach 7:26; 36:24); proper treatment of servants (Tobit 4:14; compare Sirach 7:20 f); the sin of covetousness (Tobit 5:18 f; compare Sirach 5); see more fully Speaker’s Apocrypha, I, 161 f.

(3) The Achiqar Legend.

We now know that the story of Ahikar referred to in Tobit 14:10 existed in many forms and among many ancient nations. The substance of the legend is briefly that Achiqar was prime minister in Assyria under Sennacherib. Being childless he adopted a boy Nadan (called "Aman" in 14:10) and spared no expense or pains to establish him well in life. Upon growing up the young man turns out badly and squanders, not only his own money, but that of Achiqar. When rebuked and punished by the latter, he intrigues against his adoptive father and by false letters persuades the king that his minister is a traitor.

Achiqar is condemned to death, but the executioner saves the fallen minister's life and conceals him in a cellar below his (Achiqar's) house. In a great crisis which unexpectedly arises the king expresses the wish that he had still with him his old and (as he thought) now executed minister. He is delighted to find after all that he is alive, and he loses no time in restoring him to his lost position, handing over to him Nadan for such punishment as he thinks fit.

There can be no doubt that the "Achiacharus" of Tobit (Achiacharos, 1:21 f; 2:10; 11:18; 14:10), a nephew of Tobit, is the Achiqar of the above story. George Hoffmann of Kiel (Auszuge aus syrischen Akten persiacher Martyrer) was the first to connect the Achiqar legend with the Achiacharus of Tobit, though he believed that the story arose in the Middle Ages under the influence of Tobit. Modern scholars, however, agree that the story is of heathen origin and of older date than Tobit. Rendel Harris published a Syriac version of this legend together with an Introduction and translation (Cambridge Press, 1898), but more important are the references to this tale in the papyri found at Elephantine and recently published by Eduard Sachau, Aramaic Papyrus und Ostraka, (1911, 147 ff). This last proves that the tale is as old as 400 BC at least. For lull bibliography on the subject (up to 1909) see Schurer, GJV4, III, 256 ff. See also The Story of Achiqar from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, Greek, Slavonic versions by Conybeare, J. Rendel Harris and A. S. Lewis, 1898, and in particular Histoire et Sagesse d'Achiqar, paragraph Francois Nace, 1909.

(4) The Book of Esther:

The occurrence in Tobit 14:10 of "Aman" for "Nadan" may show dependence upon Esther, in which book Haman, prime minister and favorite of Ahasuerus (Xerxes, 485-464 BC) exhibits treachery comparable with that of Nadan. But Esther seems to the present writer to have been written after and not before Tobit (see Century Bible, "Esther," 299 ff). It is much more likely that a copyist substituted, perhaps unconsciously through mental association, the name Haman for that which stood originally in the text. Marshall (HDB, IV, 789) thinks that the author of Tobit was acquainted with the Book of Jubilees, but he really proves no more than that both have many resemblances. In its angelology and demonology the Book of Jubilees is much more developed and belongs to a later date (about 100 BC; see R.H. Charles, Book of Jubilees, lvi ff, lviii ff). But the two writings have naturally much in common because both were written to express the sentiments of strict Jews living in the 2nd century BC.

6. Date:

This book seems to reflect the Maccabean age, an age in which faithful Jews suffered for their religion. It is probable that Judith and Tobit owe their origin to the same set of circumstances, the persecutions of the Jews by the Syrian party. The book belongs therefore to about 160 BC. The evidence is external and internal.

(1) External.

(a) Tobit 14:4-9 implies the existence of the Book of Jonah and also the completion and recognition of

the prophetic Canon (about 200 BC).

(b) Since Sirach is used as a source, that book must have been written, i.e. Tobit belongs to a later date than say 180 BC.

(c) The Christian Father Polycarp in 112 AD quotes from Tobit, but there is no earlier allusion to the book. The external evidence proves no more than that Tobit must have been written after 180 BC and before 112 AD.

(2) Internal.

(a) Tobit 14:5 f seems to show that Jonah was written while the temple of Zerubbabel was in existence, but before this structure had been replaced by the gorgeous temple erected under Herod the Great: i.e. Tobit was written before 25 BC.

(b) The stress laid upon the burial of the dead suits well the period of the Syrian persecution, when we know Antiochus Epiphanes allowed Jewish corpses to lie about unburied.

(c) We have in Tobit and Judith the same zeal for the Jewish Law and its observance which in a special degree marked the Maccabean age. Noldeke and Lohr (Kautzsch, Apok. des Altes Testament, 136) argue for a date about 175 BC, on the ground that in Tobit there is an absence of that fervent zeal for Judaism and that hatred of men and things non-Jewish which one finds in books written during the Maccabean wars. But we know for certain that when the Maccabean enthusiasm was at its height there existed all degrees of fervor among the Jews, and it would be a strange thing if all the literature of the time represented but one phase of the national life.

7. Place of Composition:

We have no means of ascertaining who wrote this book, for the ascription of the authorship to Tobit (1:1 ff) is but a literary device. There are, however, data which help in fixing the nationality of the writer and the country in which he lived. That the author was a Jew is admitted by all, for no other than a Jew could have shown such a deep interest in Jewish things and in the fortunes of the Jewish nation. Moreover, the fact that Tobit, though member of the Northern Kingdom, is represented as worshipping at the Jerusalem temple and observing the feasts there (1:4-7) makes it probable that the author was a member of the Southern Kingdom wishing to glorify the religion of his country.

That he did not live in Palestine is suggested by several considerations:

(1) The book describes the varying fortunes of Jews in exile so completely and with such keen sympathy as to suggest that the writer was himself one of them.

(2) The affectionate language in which he refers to Jerusalem and its religious associations (Tobit 1:4 ff)

is such as a member of the Diaspora would use.

(3) The author nowhere reveals a close personal knowledge of Palestine. That Tobit, the ostensible author (1:1), should be set forth as a native of Galilee (1:1 f) is due to the art of the writer.

Assuming that the book was written in a foreign land, opinions differ as to which. The evidence seems to favor either Persia or Egypt. In favor of Persia is the Persian background of the book. Asmodeus (Tobit 3:8,17) is the Pets Aesma daeva. The duty of burying the dead is suggested to the Jewish writer by the Persian (Zoroastrian) habit of exposing dead bodies on the "Tower of Silence" to be eaten by birds. Consanguineous marriages are forbidden in the Pentateuch (see Le 18:6 ff); but they are favored by Tobit 1:9; 3:15; 4:12; 7:4. The latter seems to show that Tobias and Sarah whom he married were first cousins. Marriages between relatives were common among the Iranians and were defended by the magicians as a religious duty. One may say it was allowed in the particular case in question on account of the special circumstances, the fewness of Jews in the parts where the families of Tobit and Raguel lived; compare Nu 36:4 ff for another special case. The fact that a dog is made to accompany Tobias on his journey to Ecbatana (Tobit 5:17; 11:4) favors a Persian origin, but is so repugnant to Semitic ideas that it is omitted from the Hebrew versions of this story (see DOG). For an elaborate defense of a Persian origin of Tobit see J. H. Moulton, The Expository Times, XI, 157 ff; compare H. Maldwyn Hughes, The Ethics of Jewish Apocryphal Literature, 42 ff. The evidence is not decisive; for a knowledge of Iranian modes of thought and expression may be possessed by persons living far away from Iranian territory. And at some points Tobit teaches things contrary to Zoroastrianism. Noldeke and Lohr hold that the book was composed in Egypt, referring to the facts that the demon Asmodeus on being overcome flees to Egypt (8:3) and that there were Jews in Egypt who remained loyal to their ancestral faith and were nevertheless promoted to high places in the state. The knowledge of Mesopotamia shown by the author is so defective (see 4, above) that a Mesopotamian origin for the book cannot be conceived of.

8. Versions:

Tobit exists in an unusually large number of manuscripts and versions showing that the book was widely read and regarded as important. But what is peculiar in the case of this book is that its contents differ largely—and not seldom in quite essential matters—in the various manuscripts, texts and translations (see 3. above).

Tobit has come down to us in the following languages:

(1) Greek.

Manuscripts of the Greek text belong to three classes:

(a) that found in the uncials Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, BA, (which are almost identical) and most Greek manuscripts; our English and other modern translations are made from this;

(b) that of Codex Sinaiticus which deviates from (a) often in important matters. The old Latin tallies with this very closely;

(c) that of Codices 44, 106 and 107 (adopting the numbers of Holmes and Parsons), which largely coincides with (b).

From 7:10 onward this text forms the basis of the Syriac (Peshitta) version Opinions differ as to which of these three Greek texts is the oldest. Fritzsche, Noldeke and Grimm defend the priority of BA. In favor of this are the following: This text exists in the largest number of manuscripts and translations; it is most frequently quoted by the Fathers and other early writers; it is less diffuse and more spontaneous, showing less editorial manipulation. Ewald, Reusch, Schurer, Nestle and J. Rendel Harris hold that [?] represents the oldest Greek text. Schurer (GJV4, III, 243) gives the principal arguments for this view (compare Fuller, Speaker's Commentary, I, 168 f) is much fuller than BA. Condensation (compare BA) is much more likely, Fuller and Schurer say, than expansion (Codex Sinaiticus); but this is questioned. In some cases, Codex Sinaiticus preserves an admittedly better text, which is of course true often of the Septuagint and even the minor versions as against the Massoretic Text.

(2) Latin.

(i) The Old Latin based on Codex Sinaiticus found in (i) the editions published in 1751 by Sabbathier (Bib. Sac. Latin versions Antiq.); (ii) in the Book of Tobit (A. Neubauer, 1878). This text exists in at least three recensions. (b) The Vulgate, which simply reproduces Jerome's careless translation made in a single night; see (3). In Judith and Tobit, the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is in every respect identical with its translation made by Jerome.

(3) Aramaic (a Term Which Strictly Embraces Syriac).

(a) That from which Jerome's Jewish help made the Hebrew that formed the basis of Jerome's Latin version. We have no copy of this (see next section).

(b) That published by Neubauer (Book of Tobit, a Chaldee Text) which was found by him imbedded in a Jewish Midrash of the 15th century.

Neubauer was convinced and tried to prove that this is the version which Jerome's teacher put into Hebrew and which therefore formed the basis of Jerome's own version In favor of this is the fact that in Tobit 1-36, and therefore throughout the book, Tobit is spoken of in the third person alike in this Aramaic (Chaldee) version and in Jerome's Latin translation; whereas in all the other versions (compare chapters 1-36) Tobit speaks in the first person ("I," etc.). But the divergences between this Aramaic and Jerome's Latin versions are numerous and important, and Neubauer's explanations are inadequate (op. cit., vi ff). Besides, Dalman (Grammatik des jud.-palest. Aramaic, 1894, 27-29) proves from the language that this version belongs to the 7th century AD or to a later time.

(4) Syriac.

The text of this version was first printed in the London Polyglot (Volume IV) and in a critically revised form in the Lib. Apocrypha. Vet. Test. Syriac of Lagarde. This text consists of parts of two different versions. The Hexaplar text based on the usual manuscripts (Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus etc.) is used from Tobit 1:1-7:9. From 7:10 onward the text corresponds closely with the Greek, [?], and [?] especially in parts, with the manuscripts 44, 106, 107. See fully Schurer, GJV4, 244 ff.

(5) Hebrew.

None of the Hebrew recensions are old. Two Hebrew texts of Tobit have been known since the 16th century, having been printed then and often afterward. Both are to be found in the London Polyglot.

(a) That known as Hebraeus Munsteri (HM), from the fact that it was published at Basel in 1542 by Sebastian Munster, though it had also been printed in 1516 at Constantinople.

(b) That known as Hebraeus Fagii (HF), on account of the fact that Paul Fagius published it in 1542.

It had, however, been previously published, i.e. in Constantinople in 1517. HF introduces Biblical phraseology wherever possible. Since these are comparatively late translations they have but little critical value, and the same statement applies to the two following Hebrew translations discovered, edited and translated by Dr. M. Caster (see PSBA, XVIII, 204 ff, 259 ff; XIX, 27 ff):

(a) A Hebrew manuscript found in the British Museum and designated by him HL. This manuscript agrees with the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and Aramaic at some points where the other authorities differ, and Dr. Gaster thinks it not unlikely that in HL we have a copy of the original text. He has not been followed by any scholar in this opinion.

(b) Dr. Gaster copied some years ago from a Hebrew Midrash, apparently no longer existing, a condensed Hebrew version (HG) of Tobit. Like HL it agrees often with the Vulgate and Aramaic against other versions and manuscripts.

(6) Ethiopic.

Dillmann has issued the ancient Ethiopic versions in his Biblia Veteris Testamenti Aethiopica, V, 1894.

9. Original Language:

The majority of modern scholars, who have a better knowledge of Sere than the older scholars, hold that the original text of Tobit was Semitic (Aramaic or Hebrew); so Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Graetz, Neubauer, Bickell, Fuller (Speaker's Apocrypha), Marshall (HDB). In favor of this are the following

considerations:

(1) The existence of an Aramaic text in Jerome's day (see (3), above).

(2) The proper names in the book, male and female, have a Semitic character.

(3) The style of the writer is Semitic rather than Aryan, many of the expressions making bad Greek, but when turned into Semitic yielding good Aramaic or Hebrew.

See the arguments as set out by Fuller (Speaker's Apocrypha, I, 164 ff). Marshall (HDB, III, 788) gives his reasons for concluding that the original language was Aramaic, not Hebrew, in this opinion following Neubauer (op. cit.). Graetz (Monatsschrift far Geschichte und Wissenschaft der Juden, 1879, 386 ff) gives his grounds for deciding for a Hebrew original. That the book was written in Greek is the view upheld by Fritzsche, Noldeke, W.R. Smith, Schurer and Lbhr. The text of Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus says Lohr, contains Greek of the most idiomatic kind, and gives no suggestion of being a translation.

LITERATURE.

Much of the best literature has been cited in the course of the preceding article. See also "Literature" in article APOCRYPHA, for text, comms., etc., and the Bible Dicts., Encyclopedia Biblica (W. Erbt) and HDB (J. T. Marshall). Note in addition the following: K. D. Ilgen, Die Geschichte Tobias, nach den drei verschiedenen Originalen, Griechisch, Lateinisch u. Syriac., etc., 1800; Ewald, Gesch.3, IV, 269-74; Graetz, Gesch.2, IV, 466 ff; Noldeke, "Die Texte des Buchs Tobit," Monatsschrift der Berlin Acad., 1879, 45 ff; Bickell, "A Source of the Book of Tobit," Athenaeum, 1890, 700 ff; 1891, 123 ff; I. Abrahams, "Tobit's Dog," Jewish Quarterly Review, I, 3, 288 E. Cosquin, "Le livre de Tobie et l'histoire du sage Achiqar," Rev. Biblical Int., VIII, 1899, 50-82, 519-31, rejects R. Harris' views; Margarete Plath, "Zum Buch Tobit," Stud. und Krit., 1901, 377-414; I. Levi, "La langue originale de Tobit," Rev. Juive, XLIV, 1902, 288-91, Oxford Apocrypha, "Tobit" (full bibliography).

T. Witton Davies

TOCHEN

to'-ken (tokhen, "task," "measure"; Codex Vaticanus Thokka; Codex Alexandrinus Thochchan): One of the cities of Simeon, mentioned with Rimmen and Ashan (1Ch 4:32). The name does not appear in Joshua's list (Jos 19:7), but in that place the Septuagint gives Thokka, from which we may infer that the name has fallen out in the Hebrew. It is not identified.

TOGARMAH

to-gar’-ma (~togharmah]; Thorgama, Thergama, Thurgama, Thurgaba; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Thorgoma):

1. Its Forms: A Suggested Identification:

The 3rd son of Gomer, and grandson of Japheth, his brothers being Ashkenaz and Riphath (Ge 10:3). The meaning of the name is doubtful. Grimm (Gesch. deutsch. Sprache, II, 325) suggests Sanskr. toka, "tribe," and arma = Armenia. Etymological and other difficulties stand in the way of French Delitzsch’s identification of Togarmah with the Assyrian Til-garimmu, "hill of Garimmu," or, possibly, "of the bone-heap," a fortress of Melitene, on the borders of Tabal (Tubal).

2. Probably Armenia or a Tract Connected Therewith:

In Eze 27:14 Togarmah is mentioned after Tubal, Javan and Mesech as supplying horses and mules to the Tyrians, and in 38:6 it is said to have supplied soldiers to the army of Gog (Gyges of Lydia). In the Assyrian inscriptions horses came from Kusu (neighborhoed of Cappadocia), Andia and Mannu, to the North of Assyria. Both Kiepert and Dillmann regard Togarmah as having been Southeastern Armenia, and this is at present the general opinion. The ancient identification of their country with Togarmah by the Armenians, though correct, is probably due to the Septuagint transposition of "g" and "r" (Thorgama for Togarmah), which has caused them to see therein the name of Thorgom, father of Haik, the founder of their race (Moses of Khor, I, 4, secs. 9-11). Eze 27:14 (Swete) alone has "g" before "r": Thaigrama. The name "Armenia" dates from the 5th century BC.

See ARMENIA; TABLE OF NATIONS.

T. G. Pinches

TOHU

to’-hu.

See NAHATH.

TOI

to’-i.

See TOU.

TOKEN

to’-k’-n (’oth, usually rendered "sign" (on De 22:14 ff see the comms.)): "Sign" and "token" are virtually synonymous words and in the King James Version are used with little or no distinction (in Ex 13, compare 13:9 and 16). If there is any difference, "token" is perhaps more concrete and palpable than "sign," but this difference cannot be stressed. The modern use of "token," however, as a "memorial of something past" found in Nu 17:10; Jos 2:12. the Revised Version (British and American) has substituted sign in Ex 13:16; Ps 135:9; Isa 44:25, and the American Standard Revised Version has "evidence" in Job 21:29 (a needlessly prosaic change). The four New Testament examples, Mr 14:44; Php 1:28; 2Th 1:5; 3:17 (each for a different Greek word) are self-explanatory.

See SIGN.

Burton Scott Easton

TOKHATH

tok’-hath.

See TIKVAH.

TOLA

to’-la (tola‘, "worm" or "scarlet stuff"):

(1) One of the four sons of Issachar (Ge 46:13; 1Ch 7:1), mentioned among those who journeyed to Egypt with Jacob (Ge 46:8 f), and in the census taken by Moses and Eleazar, as father of the Tolaites (Nu 26:23) whose descendants in the reign of David included 22,600 "mighty men of valor" (1Ch 7:2).

(2) One of the Judges, the son of Puah, a man of Isaachar. He dwelt in the hill country of Ephraim in the village of Shamir, where after judging Israel 23 years he was buried (Jud 10:1,2). In the order of succession he is placed between Abimelech and Jair. It is interesting to note that both Tola and Puah are names of colors, and that they occur together both in the case of the judge and in that of the sons of Isaachar. They may therefore be looked upon as popular typical or ancestral names of the Issachar tribe, although current critical theories seek an explanation in a confusion of texts.

Ella Davis Isaacs

TOLAD

to-’lad.

See ELTOLAD.

TOLAITES

to-’la-its.

See TOLA.

TOLBANES

tol’-ba-nez, tol-ba’-nez (Tolbanes): One of the porters who had taken foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:25) =" Telem" of Ezr 10:24; perhaps identical with the porter Talmon (Ne 12:25).

TOLL

tol: (1) Aramaic middah, "toll" or "tribute" paid by a vassal nation to its conqueror (Ezr 4:20; 6:8; Ne 5:4); written also mindah (Ezr 4:13; 7:24). More accurately for halakh, "toll," or "way tax" (Ezr 4:13,10; 7:24). In New Testament times the Romans had placed throughout Palestine many toll stations (telonion). Levi the publican was stationed at such a tax office (Mt 9:9; Mr 2:14; Lu 5:27); compare telones, a "tax collector" or "publican." The tax which the Jews paid toward the support of the temple, a didrachma, is called telos, "toll" (Mt 17:25), the same as the word rendered "tribute" (Ro 13:7).

Edward Bagby Pollard

TOMB

toom.

See BURIAL.

TOMORROW

too-mor’-o.

See MORROW.

TONGS

tongz (melqachayim): This word is, where it occurs in the King James Version and the English Revised Version, with two exceptions, changed in the American Standard Revised Version into "snuffers" (Ex 25:38; Nu 4:9; 2Ch 4:21; see SNUFFERS), The exceptions are 1Ki 7:49, "tongs of gold," and Isa 6:6,

"taken with the tongs from off the altar."

In Isa 44:12, where another word (ma‘atsadh) is used, "the smith with the tongs" of the King James Version is changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into "the smith maketh an axe" (compare Jer 10:3).

See also ALTAR; TOOLS.

TONGUE

tung: Almost invariably for either lashon, or glossa the latter word with the cognates heteroglossos, "of strange tongues" (1Co 14:21), glossodes, "talkative," English Versions of the Bible "full of tongue" (Sirach 8:3; 9:18), glossotomeo, "to cut out the tongue" (2 Macc 7:4), diglossos, "double-tongued" (Sirach 5:9; 28:13). In 1Ti 3:8, however, "double-tongued" is for dilogos, literally, "two-worded." Where "tongue" in the King James Version translates dialektos (Ac 1:19; 2:8; 21:40; 22:2; 26:14), the Revised Version (British and American) has "language," while for the King James Version "in the Hebrew tongue" in Joh 5:2; Re 9:11; 16:16 (Hebraisti) the Revised Version (British and American) has simply "in Hebrew." In addition, in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, the King James Version uses "to hold one’s tongue" as a translation for various verbs meaning "to be silent"; the Revised Version (British and American) in the Old Testament writes "to hold one’s peace" and in the Apocrypha "to be silent," except in Sirach 32:8, where the King James Version is retained (siopao).

The various uses of "tongue" in English are all possible also for lashon and glossa, whether as the physical organ (Ex 11:7; Mr 7:33, etc.) or as meaning "language" (Ge 10:5; Ac 2:4, etc.) or as describing anything shaped like a tongue (Isa 11:15; Ac 2:3, etc.). In addition, both words, especially lashon appear in a wider range of meanings than can be taken by "tongue" in modern English. So the tongue appears as the specific organ of speech, where we should prefer "mouth" or "lips" (Ex 4:10; Ps 71:24; 78:36; Pr 16:1; Php 2:11, etc.), and hence, "tongue" is used figuratively for the words uttered (Job 6:30; Ps 139:4; 1Joh 3:18, etc.). So the tongue can be said to have moral qualities (Ps 109:2; Pr 15:4, etc.) or to be "glad" (Ac 2:26); to "love with the tongue" (1 Joh 3:18) is to love in word only, and to be "double-tongued" (Sirach 5:9; 28:13; 1Ti 3:8 is to be a liar. A further expansion of this figurative use has produced expressions that sound slightly bizarre in English, although their meaning is clear enough: e.g., "Who have whet their tongue like a sword" (Ps 64:3); "His tongue is as a devouring fire" (Isa 30:27); "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer" (Ps 45:1), and, especially, "Their tongue walketh through the earth" (Ps 73:9).

In Job 20:12, "Though wickedness be sweet in his mouth, though he hide it under his tongue," the figure is that of an uncultured man rolling a choice morsel around in his mouth so as to extract the utmost flavor. In Ps 10:7; 66:17 (Revised Version margin), however "under the tongue" means "in readiness to utter," while in So 4:11, "Honey and milk are under thy tongue," the pleasure of a caress is described. To "divide their tongue" (Ps 55:9) is to visit on offenders the punishment of Babel.

See TONGUES, CONFUSION OF.

Burton Scott Easton

TONGUES OF FIRE

(glossai hosei puros): The reference in this topic is to the marvelous gift of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost (Ac 2:1-13). After His resurrection the Lord bade His disciples to tarry in Jerusalem until He should fulfill to them the promise of the Father, and until they should be clothed with power from on high (Lu 24:49). Ac 1:8 repeats the same gracious promise with additional particulars: "But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." These were probably the last words our Lord spoke on earth before He ascended to the right hand of God.

1. Supernatural Manifestations:

When the Day of Pentecost was fully come and the disciples, no doubt by previous arrangement and with one accord, were gathered together in one place, the promise was gloriously fulfilled. On that day, the 50th after the Passover, and so the first day of the week, the Lord’s day, the Spirit of God descended upon them in marvelous copiousness and power. The gift of the Spirit was accompanied by extraordinary manifestations or phenomena. These were three and were supernatural. His coming first appealed to the ear. The disciples heard a "sound from heaven," which rushed with mighty force into the house and filled it even as the storm rushes, but there was no wind. It was the sound that filled the house, not a wind. It was an invisible cause producing audible effects. Next, the eye was arrested by the appearance of tongues of fire which rested on each of the gathered company. Our the King James Version "cloven tongues" is somewhat misleading, for it is likely to suggest that each fire-like tongue was cloven or forked, as one sometimes sees in the pictures representing the scene. But this is not at all the meaning of Luke’s expression; rather, tongues parting asunder, tongues distributed among them, each disciple sharing in the gift equally with the others. "Like as of fire," or, more exactly, "as if of fire," indicates the appearance of the tongues, not that they were actually aflame, but that they prefigured the marvelous gift with which the disciples were now endowed.

Finally, there was the impartation to them of a new strange power to speak in languages they had never learned. It was because they were filled with the Holy Spirit that this extraordinary gift was exhibited by them. Not only did the Spirit enable them thus to speak, but even the utterance of words depended on His divine influence—they spake "as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Many attempts have been made by writers on the Ac to explain the phenomenon of Pentecost so as to exclude in whole or in part the supernatural element which Luke unquestionably recognizes. Some try to account for the gift of tongues by saying that it was a new style of speaking, or new forms of expression, or new and elevated thoughts, but this is both unnatural and wholly inconsistent with the narrative where a real difference of language is implied. Others imagine that the miracle was wrought upon the ears of

the hearers, each of whom supposed what he heard to be uttered in his mother-tongue. But this view contradicts the distinct statement in Ac 2:4: they "began to speak with other tongues," i.e. the disciples did. It contradicts what the multitude affirmed, namely, "How hear we, every man in our own language, wherein we were born?" (2:8). Furthermore, the view contains an element of falsehood, for in this case the miracle was wrought to make men believe what was not actually the fact. The only reasonable explanation of the phenomena is that which the record bears on its face, and which Luke obviously meant his readers to believe, namely, that the Holy Spirit enabled the disciples to speak in the various languages represented by the multitude gathered together at the time.

2. Sinai and Pentecost:

The scenes witnessed at Pentecost were somewhat analogous to the events which occurred at the giving of the Law at Sinai, but the contrast between them is much more pronounced. We are told in Heb 12:18,19 that "tempest," "fire," and "the voice of words" attended the inauguration of the Mosaic dispensation. Something similar was witnessed at Pentecost. But the differences between the two are very marked. At Sinai there were also the blackness and darkness, the quaking earth, the thunderings and lightnings, the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud, the terror of the people, and the fear of Moses (Ex 19:16-18; Heb 12:18,19). Nothing of this was seen at Pentecost.

The phenomena characterize the two dispensations. That of Sinai was legal. Its substance was: Do and live; disobey and die. Law knows no mercy, extends no grace. Exact justice is its rule, perfect righteousness its requirement, and death its penalty. No wonder terrible things accompanied its proclamation, and Moses trembled with fear. No wonder it was called "a fiery law" (De 33:2).

3. Qualities Imparted by the Spirit:

With the advent of the Spirit came perfect grace, divine power and complete pardon for the worst of men. At Sinai God spoke in one language. At Pentecost the Spirit through the disciples spoke in many tongues (15 in all are mentioned in Ac 2). The Law was for one people alone; the gospel is for the whole race. The sound that accompanied the outpouring of the Spirit filled all the house and all the disciples likewise—token and pledge of the copiousness, the fullness of the gift. The tongues of flame signified the power of speech, boldness of utterance, and persuasiveness which from henceforth were to mark the testimony of the disciples.

The marvelous capabilities which the witnesses display after Pentecost are most noteworthy. It is common to admire their courage and zeal, to contrast their fearlessness in the presence of enemies and danger with their former timidity and cowardice. It is perhaps not so common to recognize in them the qualities that lie at the foundation of all effective work, that which gives to witness-bearing for Christ its real energy and potency. These qualities are such as: knowledge and wisdom, zeal and prudence, confidence and devotion, boldness and love. skill and tact. These and the like gifts appear in their discourses, in their behavior when difficulties arise and dangers impend, and in their conduct before the angry rulers. It is altogether remarkable with what skill and tact they defend themselves before the

Sanhedrin, and with what effectiveness they preach the gospel of the grace of God to the multitude, often a scoffing and hostile multitude. In Peter's address on the Day of Pentecost there are the marks of the highest art, the most skillful logic, and the most, persuasive argument. Professor Stifler well says of it: "It is without a peer among the products of uninspired men. And yet it is the work of a Galilean fisherman, without culture or training, and his maiden effort." The like distinguished traits are found in Peter's address recorded in Ac 3, in that to Cornelius and his friends, and in his defense when arraigned by the strict believers at Jerusalem for having gone into the company of men uncircumcised and having eaten with them. No less must be said of the equally wonderful reply of Stephen to the charge brought against him as recorded in Ac 7. It is quite true that Stephen did not share in the effusion of the Spirit on the Day of Pentecost, so far as we know, but he did share in the gift and power of the Spirit soon after, for we are told that he was full of faith and of the Holy Spirit, that he was also full of grace and power. Accordingly, it should be no surprise to read, as the effect of his discourse, that the high priest and all the rest who heard him "were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth" (7:54). Stephen spoke with a tongue of fire.

In the management of the serious complaint made by the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews as to the neglect of their widows in the daily ministration (Ac 6:1), and in their conduct and defense when brought before the council, as they were once and again (Ac 4; 5; 12), they exhibited a wisdom and prudence far enough removed from shrewdness and cunning. The qualities they possessed and displayed are uncommon, are more than human, they are the gift of the Holy Spirit with whom they were baptized on Pentecost. So the Lord Jesus had promised (Mr 13:11; Joh 16:13; Ac 1:8).

4. Distinguished from 1 Corinthians 12; 14:

The tongues of fire which we have been considering appear to have differed in one important aspect from the like gift bestowed on the Corinthians (1Co 12; 14). At Pentecost the disciples spoke in the languages of the various persons who heard them; there needed to be no interpreter, as was provided for at Corinth. Paul distinctly orders that if there be no one to explain or interpret the ecstatic utterance of a speaker, he shall keep silent (1Co 14:28). At Pentecost many spoke at the same time, for the Spirit had perfect control of the entire company and used each as it pleased Him. At Corinth Paul directed that not more than two or at most three should speak in a tongue, and that by course (one at a time). At Pentecost each one of the 15 nationalities there represented by the crowd heard in his own tongue wherein he was born the wonderful works of God. At Corinth no one understood the tongue, not even the speaker himself, for it seems to have been a rhapsody, an uncontrolled ecstatic outburst, and in case there was no one to interpret or explain it, the speaker was to hold his peace and speak to himself and to God, i.e. he must not disturb the worship by giving voice to his ecstasy unless the whole assembly should be edified thereby. Paul sets prophecy, or preaching the word of God, far above this gift of tongues.

It may not be out of place here to say that the so-called "gift of tongues," so loudly proclaimed by certain excitable persons in our day, has nothing in common with the mighty action of the Spirit of God on the day of Pentecost, and hardly anything with that which the Corinthian Christians enjoyed, and which Paul regulated with a master-hand.

See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

LITERATURE.

Stifler, Introduction to the Book of Acts; Alexander, Commentary on the Acts; Kuyper, Work of the Holy Spirit; Moorehead, Outline Studies in Acts—Ephesians.

William G. Moorehead

TONGUES, CONFUSION OF

tungz:

1. The Narrative:

According to Ge 11:1-9, at some time not very long after the Flood, "the whole earth was of one language and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed east" (the "they" is left vague) that they settled in the land of Shinar (Babylonia). There they undertook to build "a city, and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven," using the Bah burned brick and "slime" as building materials. The motive was to "make us a name; lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth." This seems to mean that the buildings would give them a reputation for impregnability that would secure them against devastating invasions. "And Yahweh came down to see." And He said, "Nothing will be withholden from them, which they purpose to do. Come, let us go down, and there confound their language." The persons spoken to are not named (compare Ge 1:26; 3:22), nor is it explained how Yahweh, who in Ge 11:5 was on earth, is now in heaven. "So Yahweh scattered them abroad from thence," and the name of the city was "called Babel (babhel); because Yahweh did there confound (balal) the language of all the earth: and from thence did Yahweh scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth."

The purpose of this narrative is the explanation of the diversity of human languages. They originated through an act of Yahweh, in order to destroy the presumptuous designs of the first builders of Babylon.

2. Context:

The section admittedly belongs to J and it has no connection with the matter (mostly P) in Ge 10. For Genesis 10 explains the origin of the nations "every one after his tongue, after their families" (10:5,20,31) as due to the orderly migration and gradual spreading of the sons and descendants of Noah, and names Nimrod (10:10) as the sole founder of Babylon. Nor does 11:1-9 logically continue the J matter in Genesis 9, as too many persons are involved for the time immediately following the Flood. Still, it is quite possible that some J matter was dropped when the J and P sources were united at this point. Another possibility is to see in Ge 11:1-9 the continuation of Ge 4:16-24, which it carries on smoothly, with the same distrust of human culture. The murderer Cain went to the East of Eden (4:16),

and his descendants brought in the knowledge of the various arts (4:20-22). These descendants journeyed still farther to the East (11:2), attempted to use their skill in building the tower and were punished by the balal catastrophe. No account of the Deluge could have followed, for all the diversities of languages would have been wiped away by that event.

This assumption of a special, early source within J probably best explains the facts. It is indicated by the very primitive, naive theology, which is much less developed than that of J as a whole. And the obscure relation of Ge 11:1-9 to the Flood narrative is accounted for, for two narratives were combined here, one of which contained an account of the Deluge, while the other did not.

3. Homogeneity:

By using the repeated "going down" of verses 5,7 as a clue, the section can be resolved fairly easily into two narratives, e.g.

(1) The men build a tower, "whose top may reach unto heaven," in order to make a name for themselves as marvelous builders. Yahweh, seeing the work beginning and "lest nothing be withholden from them," etc., goes down and confounds their language.

(2) The men build a city, as a defensive measure, "lest we be scattered abroad on the face of the whole earth." Yahweh goes down to see and scatters them abroad. For other analyses see the commentaries.

But they are hardly imperative. For (2) gives no motive for Yahweh's action, while "city" and "tower," "confusion of tongues" and "scattering," are complementary rather than parallel terms. The supposition that a few words describing Yahweh's return to heaven have disappeared somewhere from verse 6 relieves the awkwardness.

4. Historicity:

The "historicity" of the narrative will be upheld by very few persons of the present day. Human languages began to diverge (if, indeed there ever was such a thing as a primitive language) tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of years before the building of Babylon and long before human beings had attained enough skill to erect the most rudimentary structures, let alone such an elaborate affair as the brick-built city and tower of Babel. And what is true of languages as a whole is equally true of the languages spoken in the vicinity of Palestine. If Egyptian Hittite, and the Semitic group have any common point of origin, it lies vastly back of the time and cultural conditions presupposed in Ge 11:1-9. It is needless to enlarge on this, but for the harm done by a persistent clinging to the letter of the narrative, White's History of the Warfare of Science with Theology may be consulted. It belonged to the genius of the Hebrews to seek religious explanations of the things around them. And such an explanation of the origin of languages is the content of Ge 11:1-9.

5. Sources:

This explanation seems, as yet, to be without parallel, for the translation of the fragmentary British Museum Inscription K 3657 is entirely uncertain. Indeed, legends as to how the differences of human speech began seem to be extremely scanty everywhere, as if the question were not one that occupied the minds of primitive people. Comparative folklore still has much work to do as regards this special topic (for a few references see Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, article "Babel" and Gunkel Genesis3 in the place cited.). The other features of the narrative, however, are without great significance. Buildings that were unfinished because the builders offended the gods are fairly abundant, and it is quite possible that the writer of Ge 11:1-9 had some particular Bah structure in mind (see BABEL, TOWER OF). Nor are attempts of men to climb into heaven difficult to conceive, when the sky is thought of (as it nearly always was until comparatively modern times) as a material dome. So Greek Baruch (3:6 f) specifies that they "built the tower to the height of 463 cubits. And they took a gimlet, and sought to pierce the heaven, saying, Let us see whether the heaven is made of clay, or of brass, or of iron." Closely parallel to the Babel story is the Greek legend of the giants, who piled Pelion on Ossa in their attempt to storm the dwelling of the gods, and, as a matter of fact, the two accounts seem to be combined in Sib Or 3:97-104.

Whether aided by a tradition about some particular Babylonian tower or not, the localization of the story in Babylonia was inevitable. The Babylonians, above all nations in the world, relied on their wisdom and their skill, and so nowhere but in Babylon would this supreme presumption have been possible. Babylon, the embodiment of pride, at the very beginning of her existence was guilty of an act of pride so overwhelming as to call out God’s vengeance. The "folk-etymology" babhel-balal (in Aramaic babhel-balbel) may have been suggested by this story or (perhaps more probably) it may have originated separately, perhaps at first as a piece of deliberate irony. Certainly the many languages that could be heard in Babylon were not without significance for the story.

6. Religious Value:

The religious value of the story is dimmed for the modern reader because of the very primitive concepts that it contains. The men are able to build up into heaven. In order to see what they are doing Yahweh is obliged to "come down." He is obliged to take action lest His dwelling-place be invaded (compare Ge 3:22). And the "let us go down" of Ge 11:7, while certainly not polytheistic, is equally certainly a polytheistic "remnant." On the other hand, it is to be noted that God’s power is never in question and that there is no desperate and uncertain battle as in the Greek legend. Important, also (and often overlooked), is the realization that God’s power is just as active in Babylon as it is in Palestine. The primal meaning to the Israelite, however, was this: In Babylon was seen the greatest enemy of the people of God, possessing immeasurable resources. Humanly speaking, there were no limits to this power, and if it had been uncontrolled at the beginning, all the world would have been overwhelmed with the rule of evil. This God had prevented.

LITERATURE.

Driver in HDB; Cheyne (art. "Babel, Tower of") in EB; the commentaries. on Gen, especially those of

Skinner, Driver, Procksch, and Gunkel.

Burton Scott Easton

TONGUES, GIFT OF

1. Basic Character of 1 Corinthians 14:

A spiritual gift mentioned in Ac 10:44-46; 11:15; 19:6; Mr 16:17, and described in Ac 2:1-13 and at length in 1Co 12-14, especially chapter 14. In fact, 1Co 14 contains such a full and clear account that this passage is basic. The speaker in a tongue addressed God (14:2,28) in prayer (14:14), principally in the prayer of thanksgiving (14:15-17). The words so uttered were incomprehensible to the congregation (14:2,5,9, etc.), and even to the speaker himself (14:14). Edification, indeed, was gained by the speaker (14:4), but this was the edification of emotional experience only (14:14). The words were spoken "in the spirit" (14:2); i.e. the ordinary faculties were suspended and the divine, specifically Christian, element in the man took control, so that a condition of ecstasy was produced. This immediate (mystical) contact with the divine enabled the utterance of "mysteries" (14:2)—things hidden from the ordinary human understanding (see MYSTERY). In order to make the utterances comprehensible to the congregation, the services of an "interpreter" were needed. Such a man was one who had received from God a special gift as extraordinary as the gifts of miracles, healings, or the tongues themselves (12:10,30); i.e. the ability to interpret did not rest at all on natural knowledge, and acquisition of it might be given in answer to prayer (14:13). Those who had this gift were known, and Paul allowed the public exercise of "tongues" only when one of the interpreters was present (14:28). As the presence of an interpreter was determined before anyone spoke, and as there was to be only one interpreter for the "two or three" speakers (14:28), any interpreter must have been competent to explain any tongue. But different interpreters did not always agree (14:26), whence the limitation to one.

2. Foreign Languages Barred Out:

These characteristics of an interpreter make it clear that "speaking in a tongue" at Corinth was not normally felt to be speaking in a foreign language. In 1Co 14:10 English Versions of the Bible are misleading with "there are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world," which suggests that Paul is referring directly to the tongues. But tosauta there should be rendered "very many," "ever so many," and the verse is as purely illustrative as is 14:7. Hence, foreign languages are to be barred out. (Still, this need not mean that foreign phrases may not occasionally have been employed by the speakers, or that at times individuals may not have made elaborate use of foreign languages. But such cases were not normative at Corinth.) Consequently, if "tongues" means "languages," entirely new languages must be thought of. Such might have been of many kinds (12:28), have been regarded as a fit creation for the conveyance of new truths, and may even at times have been thought to be celestial languages—the "tongues of angels" (13:1). On the other hand, the word for "tongue" (glossa) is of fairly common use in Greek to designate obsolete or incomprehensible words, and, specifically, for the obscure phrases uttered by an oracle. This use is closely parallel to the use in Corinth and may be its source, although

then it would be more natural if the "ten thousand words in a tongue" of 14:19 had read "ten thousand glossai." In no case, however, can "tongue" mean simply the physical organ, for 14:18,19 speaks of articulated words and uses the plural "tongues" for a single speaker (compare 14:5,6).

3. A State of Ecstasy:

A complete explanation of the tongues is given by the phenomena of ecstatic utterances, especially when taken in connection with the history of New Testament times. In ecstasy the soul feels itself so suffused with the divine that the man is drawn above all natural modes of perception (the understanding becomes "unfruitful"), and the religious nature alone is felt to be active. Utterances at such times naturally become altogether abnormal. If the words remain coherent, the speaker may profess to be uttering revelations, or to be the mere organ of the divine voice. Very frequently, however, what is said is quite incomprehensible, although the speaker seems to be endeavoring to convey something. In a still more extreme case the voice will be inarticulate, uttering only groans or outcries. At the termination of the experience the subject is generally unconscious of all that has transpired.

For the state, compare Philo, Quis rerum. divin., li-liii.249-66: "The best (ecstasy) of all is a divinely-infused rapture and ‘mania,’ to which the race of the prophets is subject. .... The wise man is a sounding instrument of God’s voice, being struck and played upon invisibly by Him. .... As long as our mind still shines (is active) .... we are not possessed (by God) .... but .... when the divine light shines, the human light sets. .... The prophet .... is passive, and another (God) makes use of his vocal organs." Compare, further, the descriptions of Celsus (Origen, Contra Celsus, vii.9), who describes the Christian "prophets" of his day as preaching as if God or Christ were speaking through them, closing their words with "strange, fanatical, and quite unintelligible words of which no rational person can find the meaning." The Greek papyri furnish us with an abundance of magical formulas couched in unintelligible terms (e.g. Pap. Lond., 121, "Iao, eloai, marmarachada, menepho, mermai, ieor, aeio, erephie, pherephio," etc.), which are not infrequently connected with an ecstatic state (e.g. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, 53-58).

Interpretation of the utterances in such a state would always be difficult and diversities of interpretation would be unavoidable. Still, with a fixed content, such as the Christian religion gave, and with the aid of gestures, etc., men who felt that they had an understanding of such conditions could undertake to explain them to the congregation. It is to be noted, however, that Paul apparently does not feel that the gift of interpretation is much to be relied on, for otherwise he would have appraised the utility of tongues more highly than he does. But the popularity of tongues in Corinth is easily understood. The speaker was felt to be taken into the closest of unions with God and hence, to be an especial object of God’s favor. Indeed, the occurrence of the phenomenon in a neo-convert was irrefragable proof that the conversion was approved by God (Ac 10:44-48; 11:15; 19:6). So in Mr 16:17 the gift is treated as an exceptional and miraculous divine blessing (in this verse "new" is textually uncertain, and the meaning of the word, if read, is uncertain also). Moreover, for the more selfish, the gift was very showy (1Co 13:1 suggests that it was vociferous), and its possession gratified any desire for personal prominence.

4. The Account in Ac 2:

The account in Ac 2 differs from that of 1Co 14 in making the tongues foreign languages, although the ability to use such languages is not said to have become a permanent apostolic endowment. (Nor is it said that the speech of Ac 2:14-36 was delivered in more than one language.) When the descent of the Spirit occurred, those who were assembled together were seized with ecstasy and uttered praises to God. A crowd gathered and various persons recognized words and phrases in their own tongues; nothing more than this is said. That the occasion was one where a miracle would have had unusual evidential value is evident, and those who see a pure miracle in the account have ample justification for their position. But no more than a providential control of natural forces need be postulated, for similar phenomena are abundantly evidenced in the history of religious experience. At times of intense emotional stress the memory acquires abnormal power, and persons may repeat words and even long passages in a foreign language, although they may have heard them only once. Now the situation at Jerusalem at the time of the Feast gave exactly the conditions needed, for then there were gathered pilgrims from all countries, who recited in public liturgical passages (especially the Shemoneh ‘Esreh) in their own languages. These, in part, the apostles and the "brethren" simply reproduced. Incomprehensible words and phrases may well have been included also (Ac 2:13), but for the dignity of the apostles and for the importance of Pentecost Luke naturally cared to emphasize only the more unusual side and that with the greatest evidential value. It is urged, to be sure, that this interpretation contradicts the account in 1Co 14. But it does so only on the assumption that the tongues were always uniform in their manifestation and appraisement everywhere—and the statement of this assumption is its own refutation. If the modern history of ecstatic utterances has any bearing on the Apostolic age, the speaking in foreign languages could not have been limited only to Pentecost. (That, however, it was as common as the speaking in new "languages" would be altogether unlikely.) But both varieties Luke may well have known in his own experience.

5. Religious Emotionalism:

Paul’s treatment of the tongues in 1Co 12-14 is a classical passage for the evaluation of religious emotionalism. Tongues are a divine gift, the exercise is not to be forbidden (14:39), and Paul himself is grateful that he has the gift in an uncommon degree (14:18). Indeed, to those who treat them simply with scorn they become a "sign" that hardening is taking place (14:21-23). Yet a love of them because they are showy is simply childish (14:20; 13:11), and the possessor of the gift is not to think that he has the only thing worth obtaining (1Co 12). The only gift that is utterly indispensable is love (1Co 13), and without it tongues are mere noise (13:1). The public evidential value of tongues, on which perhaps the Corinthians were inclined to lay stress, Paul rates very low (14:21-23). Indeed, when exercised in public they tend to promote only the self-glorification of the speaker (14:4), and so are forbidden when there is not an interpreter, and they are limited for public use at all times (14:27,28). But the ideal place for their exercise is in private: "Let him speak to himself, and to God" (14:28). The applicability of all this to modern conditions needs no commentary. Ultra-emotionalistic outbreaks still cause the formation of eccentric sects among us, and every evangelist knows well-meaning but slightly weak individuals who make themselves a nuisance. On the other hand, a purely intellectual and ethical religion is rather a dreary thing. A man who has never allowed his religious emotions to carry him away may well be in a high state of grace—but he has missed something, and something of very great value.

See also SPIRITUAL GIFTS; TONGUES OF FIRE.

LITERATURE.

Plumptre in DB is still useful. Wright, Some New Testament Problems (1898), and Walker, The Gift of Tongues and Other Essays (1906), have collections of material. Of the commentaries on 1 Corinthians those of Heinrici (latest edition, 1896), Lietzmann (1907) and J. Weiss (1910) are much the best, far surpassing Robertson and Plummer in ICC (1911). For the Greek material, see ... in the index of Rhode's Psyche. Gunkel, Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes (1888, 2nd reprint in 1909), was epoch-making. For the later period, see Weinel, Die Wirkungen des Gelstes und der Geister (1899); Lake, The Earlier Epistles of Paul (London, 1911); and see Inge in The Quarterly Review (London, 1914).

Burton Scott Easton

TONGUES, INTERPRETATION, OF

in-tur-pre-ta'-shun.

See SPIRITUAL GIFTS; TONGUES, GIFT OF.

TOOLS

toolz: In the Bible, references to the handicrafts are almost entirely incidental, and not many tools are named. The following article aims to give a list of those mentioned, together with those that must have existed also. For detailed description and the Hebrew and Greek terms employed, see the separate articles.

(1) The percussion tool was the hammer, used for splitting or trimming stone, beating metals, and in wood-carving, as well as for driving nails, tent pins, etc. Several words are translated "hammer," but the distinction between them is very vague and in some cases the propriety of the translation is dubious. Certainly no such distinction is made as that between "hammer" and "mallet," nor were separate names given to the different hammers used in the various crafts (compare, e.g., Jud 4:21; 1Ki 6:7; Isa 44:12; Jer 10:4—all for maqqabhah).

See HAMMER.

(2) Of cutting tools, the simplest was of course the knife. In Ex 20:25, however, the knife ("sword," English Versions of the Bible "tool") appears as a stone-cutter's implement and is without doubt a chisel. But the hatchet of Ps 74:6 may be a knife.

See HATCHET; KNIFE.

For ax, again, various words are employed in a way that is quite obscure to us and apparently with meanings that are not fixed. So garzen in De 20:19 is certainly an ax, but in the Siloam Inscription (ll 2,4) it is a pickax (see MATTOCK). The various words translated "ax" (the Revised Version (British and American) "axe") must also somewhere include the word for adz, but the specific term, if there were any such (ma’atsadh(?)), is unknown. But the adz is a very ancient tool and must certainly have existed in Palestine.

See AX (AXE), AX-HEAD.

The saw was used both for wood and for stone (1Ki 7:9), in the latter case being employed in connection with water and sand. But sawing stone was a very laborious process, and this was one reason why the ancients preferred stone in large blocks. These were quarried by the use of heavy hammers and wedges.

See SAW.

The plane (maqtso‘ah) of Isa 44:13 should be translated chisel. Chisels, of course, are almost as old as humanity, and were used on both wood and stone and doubtless also on metals. In particular, with a broad chisel and an adz the surface of wood may be finished very smoothly, and these two implements took the place of the plane. For wood-carving the concave chisel (gouge) may have been invented.

The pencil of Isa 44:13 is probably a stylus, for engraving as well as for marking out lines. For engraving on gems (Ex 28:9, etc.) particularly delicate instruments of this kind must have been used.

See LINE; PENCIL.

(3) Among the boring tools, only the awl appears (Ex 21:6; De 15:17), an instrument primarily for the use of workers in leather. Holes in wood or stone were made by a drill, often worked with the aid of a drawn bow, through the string of which the drill was passed.

See AWL.

(4) Blunted tools were of course sharpened on stones, as everywhere. In 1Sa 13:21 English Versions of the Bible speaks of sharpening with a file, but the text of the verse is hopelessly corrupt and the translation mere guesswork. But files of some sort (stone?) must of course have been used by metal-workers.

See FILE.

(5) Measuring tools were the line and the rod (see REED), and the latter must also have been used as a straight-edge. The compasses of Isa 44:13 were for drawing circles, but doubtless served for measuring also. See COMPASSES. Plumb-line (’anakh in Am 7:7 f, a symbol of the searching moral investigation

which would be followed by a precise and exact judgment; compare mishkoleth, "plummet," 2Ki 21:13; Isa 28:17) and plummet (’ebhen bedhil, "a stone of tin," Zec 4:10, used by Zerubbabel in testing the completed walls) were likewise necessities and had existed from a very early period. Tools of some sort must have been used in addition by builders in drawing plans, but their nature is unknown.

See LINE.

(6) The tools for holding and handling work (vises, tongs, pincers, etc.) are never alluded to (the King James Version in Isa 44:12 is wrong; see TONGS). For moving larger objects no use was made of cranes, and lifting was done by the aid of inclined planes and rollers; but blocks of stone weighing hundreds of tons could be handled in this way.

The material of the Hebrew tools was either iron or bronze. The former was introduced at least by the time of David (2Sa 12:31), but the mention of iron as a material is often made in such a way (Am 1:3, etc.) as to show that it was not to be taken for granted. In fact, iron was hard to work and expensive, and bronze probably persisted for a while as a cheaper material. Stone tools would be used only by the very poor or as occasional makeshifts or for sacred purposes (Jos 5:2).

For the agricultural tools see AGRICULTURE.

See also CARPENTER; CRAFTS; POTTER; SMITH, etc.

Burton Scott Easton

TOPARCHY

to’-par-ki, top’-ar-ki (toparchia): the King James Version renders this Greek word by "government" in 1 Macc 11:28 (the King James Version margin and the Revised Version (British and American) "province"). It denotes a small administrative district corresponding to the modern Turkish Nahieh, administered by a Mudir. Three such districts were detached from the country of Samaria and added to Judea. Elsewhere (1 Macc 10:30; 11:34) the word used to describe them is nomos. Some idea of the size of these districts may be gathered from the fact that Judea was divided into ten (Pliny v.14) or eleven (BJ, III, iii, 5) toparchies.

TOPAZ

to’-paz.

See STONES, PRECIOUS.

TOPHEL

to’-fel (tophel; Tophol): This name is found in a passage with many difficulties (De 1:1). The verse ostensibly makes clearer the position occupied by the camp of Israel where Moses addressed the people, by reference to certain other places which might be presumed to be better known. Not one of them, however, has been satisfactorily identified. Some think Tophel may be represented by the modern et-tafeleh, 15 miles Southeast of the Dead Sea, on the caravan road from Petra to Kerak. Apart from the question of position, the change of "t" to "T" is not easily explained. Meantime we must suspend judgment.

W. Ewing

TOPHETH

to’-feth (ha-topheth, etymology uncertain; the most probable is its connection with a root meaning "burning"—the "place of burning"; the King James Version, Tophet, except in 2Ki 23:10): The references are to such a place: "They have built the high places of Topheth, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire" (Jer 7:31). On account of this abomination Topheth and the Valley of Hinnom should be called "The valley of Slaughter: for they shall bury in Topheth, till there be no place to bury," the Revised Version margin "because there shall be no place else" (Jer 7:32); see also Jer 19:6,12,13,14. Josiah is said to have "defiled Topheth" as part of his great religious reforms (2Ki 23:10). The site of this shameful place would seem to have been either at the lower end of the Valley of Hinnom (see HINNOM, VALLEY OF), near where Akeldama is now pointed out, or in the open ground where this valley joins the Kidron.

E. W. G. Masterman

TORAH

to’-ra.

See LAW IN THE OLD TESTAMENT; REVELATION.

TORCH

torch (lappidh; lampas; in the King James Version this word occurs only 4 times (Na 2:3,4 (Hebrew 4,5); Zec 12:6; Joh 18:3). In the Revised Version (British and American) it is found 10 times (Ge 15:17; Jud 7:16,20; Job 41:19 (Hebrew 11); Eze 1:13; Da 10:6; Na 2:4 (Hebrew 5); Zec 12:6; Joh 18:3; Re 8:10)): A flambeau; a large portable light.

See LAMP; LANTERN.

TORMAH

tor’-ma (tormah, "fraud"; Codex Vaticanus en kruphe, "in secret," Codex Alexandrinus meta doron, "with gifts"): This name is given in EVm as an alternative to "privily" , or "craftily" the Revised Version (British and American) (Jud 9:31). There is no knowledge of such a place. The text is corrupt.

TORMENT, PLACE OF

tor’-ment: A literal translation in Lu 16:28 of topos tes basanou.

See HELL.

TORMENTOR

tor-men’-ter: the King James Version 2 Macc 7:29 for demios "belonging to the people," and so "public executioner," the Revised Version (British and American) "butcher." A term of utter contempt, whose force is lost in the King James Version. Also Mt 18:34 for basanistes, "torturer." Normally the bankrupt debtor was sold into slavery. But, apparently, in extreme cases (where concealment of assets was suspected?) the defaulter was sent to prison until restitution should be made. Probably the imprisonment itself was regarded as "torment" (as it doubtless was), and the "tormentors" need mean nothing more than jailers.

Burton Scott Easton

TORTOISE

tor’-tus, tor’-tis, tor’-tois. (the King James Version) (tsabh, the Revised Version (British and American) "great lizard"; compare the Arabic word, dabb, the thorny-tailed lizard): The word tsabh occurs as the name of an animal only in Le 11:29, being the third in the list of unclean "creeping things."

The same word is found in Isa 66:20, translated "litters," and in Nu 7:3, where ‘eghloth tsabh is translated "covered wagons." Gesenius derives the word, in all senses, from the root cabhabh, "to move gently," "to flow"; compare Arabic dabba, "to flow." The Arabic noun dabb is Uromastix spinipes, the Arabian thorny-tailed lizard. This lizard is about 18 inches long, its relatively smooth body being terminated with a great tail armed with rings of spiny scales. The Arabs have a familiar proverb, ‘a‘kad min dhanab ud-dabb, "knottier than the tail of the dabb." The Septuagint has for tsabh in Le 11:29 ho krokodeilos ho chersaios, the English equivalent of which, "land-crocodile," is used by the Revised Version (British and American) for the fifth in the list of unclean "creeping things," koach, the King James Version "chameleon."

The writer does not know what can have led the translators of the King James Version to use here the

word "tortoise." Assuming that the thorny-tailed lizard is meant, the "great lizard" of the Revised Version (British and American) may be considered to be a fair translation.

See LIZARD.

Alfred Ely Day

TOTEMISM

to'-tem-iz'-m: How far the belief in totems and totemistic relationships existed in early Israel cannot be discussed at length here. Evidence of the belief in deified animal ancestors is supposed by some writers to be found in the tribal names Leah ("wild cow"?), Rachel ("ewe"), Simeon (synonymous with the Arabic sim'u, which denotes a cross between a wolf and a hyena), Hamor ("ass"), Caleb ("dog"), Zibiah ("gazelle"), etc. But these names in themselves "do not prove a totem stage in the development of Israel" (HPN, 114); philologically, the view has a shaky foundation (see, e.g. article "Leah" in 1-vol HDB).

Again, it is true that, as a rule, in totemic communities the individual may not kill or eat the name-giving object of his kin, these animals being regarded as sacred in totem worship and therefore "unclean" (taboo) as food. But the attempt to connect such personal names as Shaphan ("rock-badger"), Achbor ("mouse"), Huldah ("weasel")—all from the time of Josiah (2Ki 22:3,12,14; compare Deborah ("bee"), Gaal ("beetle"?), Told ("crimson worm," "cochineal"), Nabash ("serpent"))—with the list of unclean animals in Le 11 (see 11:5 (margin), 29) and De 14 is beset with difficulties (compare, however, Isa 66:17; Eze 8:10 f), since all the names cannot possibly be explained on this ground.

See also SACRIFICE, II, 2, (4); VI, 1.

Robertson Smith (followed by Stade and Benzinger) strongly advocated the view "that clear traces of totemism can be found in early Israel" (see HDB, III, 100). G. B. Gray also seems inclined to favor the view that some of these names may be "indirectly derivative from a totem stage of society" (HDB, III, 483 f), while at the same time he recognizes that "the only question is whether other explanations are not equally satisfactory" (HPN, 105).

Other writers, such as Wellhausen, Noldeke (ZDMG, 157 f, 1886), Marti (Gesch. der israelit. Religion, 4th edition, 24), Addis (Hebrew Rel., 33 f), have opposed or abandoned theory as applied to Israel.

"Upon the whole we must conclude once more that, while it is certainly possible that Totemism once prevailed in Israel, its prevalence cannot be proved; and, above all, we must hold that the religion of Israel as it presents itself in the Old Testament has not retained the very slightest recollection of such a state of things" (Kautzsch, HDB, extra vol, 614 f; compare p. 623).

The theory is also opposed by Job. Jacobs (article "Are there Totem-Clans in the Old Testament?" in

Archaeol. Review, III (1889), number 3, 145 ff); F.V. Zapletal, Der Totemismus u. die Religion Israels; and S. A. Cook, in JQR, XIV, number 55.

The evidence on either side is inconclusive, but the weight of authority is opposed to the view that totemism ever existed in Israel. What is certain is that totemism was never a potent factor, either in the early religion of Israel as an organized people, or in any of the dominant cults of the historical period as a whole (see articles "Family" in HDB, I, 850 (Bennett); "Sacrifice," HDB, IV, 331 (Paterson], and DEFILEMENT (Crannell), IMAGES, 3, 6 (Cobern), and ISRAEL, RELIGION OF, II, 1, (4) (Orelli), in this Encyclopedia).

LITERATURE.

In addition to the works cited in the text, see, for theory of the prevalence of totemism in early Israel, W. R. Smith, Religion of the Semites (2nd edition, 1894), Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia (1903); A. F. Scot, Offering and Sacrifice (1900); and I. Benzinger, Hebraische Archaol. (1907); against, Eric Brit, 11th edition, XIII, 177, article "Hebrew Religion" (Whitehouse); Standard BD, 782; Temple DB, article "Shaphan." For a general account and discussion of totemism, see Frazer, Totemism and Exogamy (1910) and The Golden Bough (3rd edition, 1907-13); Westermarck, History of Human Marriage (1891); Deans, Tales from the Totems of Hidery (1898); Lang, Myth, Ritual, Religion (new edition, 1899), The Secret of the Totem (1905), and article "Totemism" in Encyclopedia Brit, 11th edition, XXVII, with extensive bibliography; HDB, extra vol, 115; and Cymru, 1892-93, p. 137; 1893-94, p. 7.

M. O. Evans

TOU

to’-oo (to‘u; Codex Vaticanus Thoa; Codex Alexandrinus Thoou): King of Hamath. As an enemy of Hadarezer, after David’s victory over the latter, he sent David a message of congratulation (1Ch 18:9 f). In 2Sa 8:9 f spelled "Toi."

TOW

to (ne‘oreth (Jud 16:9; Isa 1:31)): The coarser part of flax, with short threads, used as an example of easily inflammable material. Also Isa 43:17 the King James Version for pishtah, the usual word for "flax" (so the English Revised Version), here as used for a wick (so the American Standard Revised Version, the English Revised Version margin).

TOWER

tou’-er.

See FORTIFICATION, I, 5; CITY, II, 1.

TOWER OF BABEL

See ASTRONOMY; BABEL, TOWER OF; TONGUES, CONFUSION OF.

TOWER OF DAVID

(So 4:4).

See JERUSALEM.

TOWER OF EDAR (THE FLOCK)

See EDER.

TOWER OF HANANEEL

See HANANEL.

TOWER OF IVORY

(mighdal hashen): Occurs only in So 7:4. Cheyne would, not unreasonably, emend the text and read the "tower of Shenir" as a parallel to the "tower of Lebanon" in the same verse. If the reading "tower of ivory" is correct, the reference must be to some piece of furniture in the adornment of which ivory was much used, and when we compare the word mighdal here with its use for a "pulpit" in Ne 8:4, we can think only of a reminiscence of something of the nature of the throne of ivory made by Solomon (1Ki 10:18).

W. M. Christie

TOWER OF LEBANON

(mighdal ha-lebhanon): (So 7:4)): The designation "which looketh toward Damascus" compels us to identify it with some portion of, or something in, the eastern range of "Lebanon, toward the sun-rising" (Jos 13:5). It would then of necessity correspond to the chief summit of Hermon, on which there has been from ancient times also a tower-like temple, and from which the view is almost of boundless extent, Damascus with its gardens and groves being surprisingly near and appearing like a beautiful island in a wide extended sea.

See LEBANON.

W. M. Christie

TOWER OF MEAH

me’-a.

See HAMMEAH.

TOWER OF PENUEL

See PENIEL.

TOWER OF SHECHEM

(mighdal shekhem): Mentioned only in Jud 9:46-49. It seems along with the Beth-millo and the Beth-el-berith to have comprised the three strongest parts of the fortification when Abimelech besieged the town. It was, however, abandoned by its defenders, who took refuge in the Beth-millo, in which they were slain.

TOWER OF SILOAM

See SILOAM.

TOWER OF SYENE

si-e’-ne.

See SEVENEH.

TOWER OF THE FURNACES

See FURNACES, TOWER OF THE.

TOWN

toun: This word is used to represent a number of different Hob terms in the Old Testament.

(1) When any explanatory word or attendant circumstances show that a "city" was unwalled, and

sometimes in the contrary case (1Sa 23:7), the Hebrew ‘ir is translated "town" by the King James Version, and the Revised Version (British and American) generally agrees with it (De 3:5; 1Sa 27:5; Es 9:19).

(2) Both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) translate chawwoth by "towns" (Nu 32:41; Jos 13:30; 1Ki 4:13; 1Ch 2:23), while chatserim and perazoth both appear in the King James Version as "towns," but in the Revised Version (British and American) as "villages" (Ge 25:16; Zec 2:4). See HAVVOTH-JAIR.

(3) Bath, literally, "daughter," is sometimes found in the plural between the name of a city and chatserim, "villages," as in Jos 15:45 margin, "Ekron, with its daughters and its villages." "Towns" is evidently the appropriate translation, and, even without chatserim, bath is rendered "town" (the Revised Version (British and American) Nu 21:25, etc.). The same use of "daughter" occurs also in the Greek of 1 Macc 5:65 (thugater), the King James Version "town," the Revised Version (British and American) "village," margin "daughter."

(4) the King James Version and the English Revised Version gloss qir, "wall" in Jos 2:15 by rendering it "town wall"; the American Standard Revised Version omits.

(5) The Greek term komopoleis (Mr 1:38), being a combination of the words for "village" and "city," is a clear attempt to describe something between the two, and is well translated "town." (6) the King James Version uses "town" (Mt 10:11 etc.) and "village" (Mt 9:35, etc.) quite indifferently for kome; the Revised Version (British and American) has "village" throughout. For similar changes of the King James Version "town" compare 2 Macc 8:6 (chora); 11:5; 12:21 (chorion, the Revised Version (British and American) "place").

See CITY; VILLAGE.

W. M. Christie

TOWN CLERK

klurk, klark (grammateus): The word "clerk," "writer," "town clerk," "scribe," is found in this meaning only in Ac 19:35, "when the townclerk had quieted the multitude." Cremer defines the word as signifying a "public servant among the Greeks and the reader of the legal and state-papers" (Lexicon of the New Testament). There was considerable difference between the authority of these "clerks" in the cities of Asia Minor and of Greece. Among the Greeks the grammateis were usually slaves, or at least persons belonging to the lower classes of society, and their office was a nominal, almost a mechanical, one. In Asia, on the contrary, they were officers of considerable consequence, as the passage quoted indicates (Thucidydes vii.19, "the scribe of the city") and the grammateus is not infrequently mentioned in the inscriptions and on the coins of Ephesus (e.g. British Museum Inscriptions, III, 2, 482, 528). They had the supervision of the city archives, all official decrees were drawn up by them, and it was their

prerogative to read such decrees to the assembled citizens. Their social position was thus one of eminence, and a Greek scribe would have been much amazed at the deference shown to his colleagues in Asia and at the power they wielded in the administration of affairs. See, further, Hermann, Staats Altertum, 127, 20; and EPHESUS.

Henry E. Dosker

TRACHONITIS

trak-o-ni’-tis: Appears in Scripture only in the phrase tes Itouraias kai Trachbnitidos choras, literally, "of the Iturean and Trachonian region" (Lu 3:1). Trachonitis signifies the land associated with the trachon, "a rugged stony tract." There are two volcanic districts South and East of Damascus, to which the Greeks applied this name: that to the Northwest of the mountain of Bashan (Jebel ed-Druze) is now called el-Leja’," the refuge" or "asylum." It lies in the midst of an arable and pastoral country; and although it could never have supported a large population, it has probably always been inhabited. The other is away to the Northeast of the mountain, and is called in Arabic es-Safa. This covers much the larger area. It is a wild and inhospitable desert tract, remote from the dwellings of men. It was well known to the ancients; but there was nothing to attract even a sparse population to its dark and forbidding rocks, burning under the suns of the wilderness. It therefore plays no part in the history. These are the two Trachons of Strabo (xvi.2, 20). They are entirely volcanic in origin, consisting of lava belched forth by volcanoes that have been extinct for ages. In cooling, the lava has split up and crumbled into the most weird and fantastic forms. The average elevation of these districts above the surrounding country is about 30 ft. Es-Safa is quite waterless. There are springs around the border of el-Leja’, but in the interior, water-supply depends entirely upon cisterns. Certain great hollows in the rocks also form natural reservoirs, in which the rain water is preserved through the summer months.

El-Leja’ is roughly triangular in shape, with its apex to the North. The sides are about 25 miles in length, and the base about 20. The present writer has described this region as he saw it during two somewhat lengthened visits: From Zor‘a our course lay Northeast by East .... What a wild solitude it is! Far on every hand stretched a veritable land of stone. The first hour or two of our march no living thing was seen. .... Wherever we looked, before or behind, lay wide fields of volcanic rock, black and repulsive, ... with here and there a deep circular depression, through which in the dim past red destruction belched forth, now carefully walled round the lip to prevent wandering sheep or goat from falling in by night. The general impression conveyed was as if the dark waters of a great sea, lashed to fury by a storm, had been suddenly petrified. .... At times we passed over vast sheets of lava which in cooling had cracked in nearly regular lines, and which, broken through in parts, appeared to rest on a stratum of different character, like pieces of cyclopaean pavement. Curious rounded rocks were occasionally seen by the wayside, like gigantic black soap bubbles blown up by the subterranean steam and gases of the active volcanic age; often, with the side broken out as if burst by escaping vapor, the mass, having cooled too far to collapse, remained an enduring monument of the force that formed it. Scanty vegetation peeped from the fissures in the rocks, or preserved a precarious existence in the scanty soil sometimes seen in a hollow between opposing slopes. In a dreary waterless land where the cloudless sun, beating down on

fiery stones, creates a heat like that of an oven, it were indeed a wonder if anything less hardy than the ubiquitous thistle could long hold up its head. .... When the traveler has fairly penetrated the rough barriers that surround eI-Leja' he finds not a little pleasant land within—fertile soil which, if only freed a little from overlying stones, might support a moderate population. In ancient times it was partly cleared, and the work of the old-world agriculturists remains in gigantic banks of stones built along the edges of the patches they cultivated" (Arab and Druze at Home, 30 ff).

In some parts, especially those occupied by the Druzes, fair crops are grown. Where the Arabs are masters, poverty reigns. They also have an evil reputation. As one said to the present writer, "They will even slay the guest." 'Arab el-Leja' anjas ma yakun is a common saying, which may be freely rendered: "Than the Arabs of el-Leja' greater rascals do not exist." Until comparatively recent years there were great breadths of oak and terebinth. These have disappeared, largely owing to the enterprise of the charcoal burners. The region to the Northeast was described by a native as bass wa'r, "nothing but barren rocky tracts" (compare Hebrew ya'ar), over which in summer, he said, not even a bird would fly. There are many ruined sites. A list of 71 names collected by the present writer will be found in PEFS, 1895, 366 ff. In many cases the houses, strongly built of stone, are still practically complete, after centuries of desertion.

There may possibly be a reference to the Trachons in the Old Testament where Jeremiah speaks of the charerim, "parched places" (17:6). The cognate el-Charrah is the word used by the Arabs for such a burned, rocky area. For theory that el-Leja' corresponds to the Old Testament "Argob," see ARGOB.

The robbers who infested the place, making use of the numerous caves, were routed out by Herod the Great (Ant., XV, x, 1 ff; XVI, ix, 1; XVII, ii, 1 f). Trachonitis was included in the tetrarchy of Philip (viii, 1; ix, 4). At his death without heirs it was joined to the province of Syria (XVIII, iv, 6). Caligula gave it to Agrippa I. After his death in 44 AD, and during the minority of his son, it was administered by Roman officers. From 53 till 100 AD it was ruled by Agrippa II. In 106 AD it was incorporated in the new province of Arabia. Under the Romans the district enjoyed a period of great prosperity, to which the Greek inscriptions amply testify. To this time belong practically all the remains to be seen today. The theaters, temples, public buildings and great roads speak of a high civilization. That Christianity also made its way into these fastnesses is vouched for by the ruins of churches. Evil days came with the advent of the Moslems. Small Christian communities are still found at Khabab on the western Luchf, and at Sur in the interior. The southeastern district, with the chief town of Damet el-'Alia, is in the hands of the Druzes; the rest is dominated by the Arabs.

W. Ewing

TRADE

trad:

I. GENERAL

1. Terms

2. Position of Palestine

3. Trade Products of Palestine

4. Palestinian Traders

II. HISTORY

1. To David

2. Solomon

3. Maritime Trade

4. To the Exile

5. The Exile and After

LITERATURE

I. General. 1. Terms:

For a full list of the commercial terms used in the Old Testament, reference must be made to EB, IV, cols. 5193-99. Only the more important can be given here.

For "merchant" the Hebrew uses almost always one of the two participial forms cocher, or rokhel, both of which mean simply "one who travels." There is no difference in their meaning, but when the two are used together (Eze 27:13) the Revised Version (British and American) distinguishes by using "trafficker" for rokhel. The verb cachar, from which cocher is derived, is translated "to trade" in Ge 34:10,21 and "to traffic" in Ge 49:34, with numerous noun formations from the same stem. The verb rakhal from which rokhel is derived does not occur, but the noun formation rekhullah in Eze 26:12 (the Revised Version (British and American) "merchandise"); 28:5,16,18 (the Revised Version (British and American) "traffic") may be noted. In Eze 27:24 the Revised Version (British and American) has "merchandise" for markoleth, but the word means "place of merchandise," "market." The participle tarim, from tur, "seek out," in combination with ‘aneshe, "men," in 1Ki 10:15, is translated "merchant men" by the King James Version, "chapmen" by the English Revised Version and "traders" by the American Standard Revised Version; in 2Ch 9:14, the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "chapmen" and the American Standard Revised Version "traders." The text of these verses is suspected. In Eze 27 (only) "merchandise" represents ma‘arabh, from ‘arabh, "to exchange,"

translated "to deal," margin "exchange," in 27:9 the American Standard Revised Version, with "dealers," margin "exchangers," in 27:27 (the King James Version and the English Revised Version have "occupy," "occupiers"). kena‘an, and kena‘ani "Canaanite," are sometimes used in the sense of "merchant," but it is often difficult to determine whether the literal or the transferred force is intended. Hence, all the confusion in English Versions of the Bible; in the Revised Version (British and American) note "merchant," Job 41:6; "merchant," margin "Canaanite," Pr 31:24; "trafficker," Isa 23:8; "trafficker," margin "Canaanite," Ho 12:7; "Canaan," margin "merchant people," Isa 23:11; Ze 1:11, and compare "land of traffic," margin "land of Canaan," Eze 17:4.

See CHAPMAN; OCCUPY.

In Apocrypha and New Testament "merchant" is for emporos (Sirach 26:29, etc.; Mt 13:45; Re 18:3,11,15,23). So "merchandise" is emporion, in Joh 2:16 and emporia, in Mt 22:5, while emporeuomai, is translated "make merchandise of" in 2Pe 2:3 and "trade" in Jas 4:13 (the King James Version "buy and sell"). But "to trade" in Mt 25:16 is for ergazomai (compare Re 18:17), and Lu 19:13 for pragmateuomai, the King James Version "occupy"; while "merchandise" in Re 18:11,12 is for gomos, "cargo" (so the Revised Version margin; compare Ac 21:3). Worthy of note, moreover, is metabolia, "exchange" (Sirach 37:11).

2. Position of Palestine:

Any road map of the ancient world shows that Palestine, despite its lack of harbors, occupied an extremely important position as regards the trade-routes. There was no exit to the West from the great caravan center Damascus, there was virtually no exit landward from the great maritime centers Tyre and Sidon, and there was no exit to the North and Northeast from Egypt without crossing Palestine. In particular, the only good road connecting Tyre (and Sidon) with Damascus lay directly across Northern Palestine, skirting the Sea of Galilee. In consequence, foreign merchants must at all tames have been familiar figures in Palestine (Ge 37:25,28; 1Ki 10:15; Ne 13:16; Isa 2:6; Ze 1:11, etc.). As a corollary, tolls laid on these merchants would always have been a fruitful source of income (1Ki 10:15; Eze 26:2; Ezr 4:20), and naturally Palestine enjoyed particular advantages for the distribution of her own products through the presence of these traders.

3. Trade Products of Palestine:

Of these products the three great staples were grain, oil and wine (Ho 2:8; De 7:13, etc.). The wine of Palestine, however, gained little reputation in the ancient world, and its export is mentioned only in 2Ch 2:10,15; Ezr 3:7, while Eze 27:18 says expressly that for good wine Tyre sent to Damascus. Grain would not be needed by Egypt, but it found a ready market in Phoenicia, both for consumption in the great cities of Tyre and Sidon and for export (1Ki 5:11; Ezr 3:7; Eze 27:17, etc.). A reverse dependence of Palestine on Tyre for food (Isa 23:18; compare Ge 41:57) could have occurred only under exceptional circumstances. Oil was needed by Egypt as well as by Phoenicia (Ho 12:1; Isa 57:9), but from Northern Israel was probably shipped into Egypt by way of Phoenicia. Ho 2:5,9 mentions wool and flax as

products of Israel, but neither could have been important. Flax was a specialty of Egypt (Isa 19:9) and is hardly mentioned in the Old Testament, while for wool Israel had to depend largely on Moab (2Ki 3:4; Isa 16:1). Minor products that were exported were "balm .... honey, spicery and myrrh, pistachio-nuts and almonds" (Ge 43:11 margin; see the separate articles, and compare "pannag and .... balm" in Eze 27:17). These were products of Gilead (Ge 37:25). "Oaks of Bashan" had commercial value, but only for use for oars (Eze 27:5), and so in small logs. Palestine had to import all heavy timbers (1Ki 5:6, etc.). Despite De 8:9, Palestine is deficient in mineral wealth. The value of Pal's manufactured products would depend on the skill of the inhabitants, but for the arts the Hebrews seem to have had no particular aptitude (1Ki 5:6; compare 1Sa 13:19 ff).

4. Palestinian Traders:

In comparison with the great volume of international trade that was constantly passing across Palestine, the above products could have had no very great value and the great merchants would normally have been foreigners. A wide activity as "middlemen" and agents was, however, open to the inhabitants of Palestine, if they cared to use it. Such a profession would demand close contact with the surrounding nations and freedom from religious scruples. The Canaanites evidently excelled in commercial pursuits of this time, so much so that "Canaanite" and "merchant" were convertible terms.

II. History.

1. To David:

The Israelites entered Canaan as a nomadic people who had even agriculture yet to learn, and with a religious self-consciousness that restrained them from too close relations with their neighbors. Hence, they were debarred from much participation in trade. The legislation of the Pentateuch (in sharp distinction from that of Code of Hammurabi) shows this non-commercial spirit very clearly, as there are no provisions that relate to merchants beyond such elementary matters as the prohibition of false weights, etc. (De 25:13; Le 19:36; Covenant Code has not even these rules). In particular, the prohibition of interest (Ex 22:25; De 23:19, etc.) shows that no native commercial life was contemplated, for, without a credit-system, trade on any extensive scale was impossible. All this was to be left to foreigners (De 23:20; compare 15:6; 28:12,44). The Jewish ideal, indeed, was that each household should form a self-sufficient producing unit (Pr 31:10-27), with local or national exchange of those commodities (such as tools and salt) that could not be produced at home. And this ideal seems to have been maintained tolerably well. The most northerly tribes, through their proximity to the Phoenicians, were those first affected by the commercial spirit, and in particular the isolated half-tribe of Dan. In Jud 5:17 we find them "remaining in ships" at the time of Barak's victory. As their territory had no seacoast, this must mean that they were gaining funds by serving in the ships of Tyre and Sidon. Zebulun and Issachar, likewise, appear in De 33:19 as the merchants of Israel, apparently selling their wares chiefly at the time of the great religious assemblages. But the disorders at the time of the Judges were an effectual bar against much commerce. Saul at length succeeded in producing some kind of order, and we hear that he had brought in a prosperity that showed itself in richer garments and golden

ornaments for the women (2Sa 1:24; see MONEY). David's own establishment of an official shekel (2Sa 14:26) is proof that trade was becoming a matter of importance.

2. Solomon:

Under Solomon, however, Israel's real trade began. The writer of Ki lays special stress on his imports. From Tyre came timber (1Ki 5:6, etc.) and gold (1Ki 9:11). From Sheba came gold and spices (1Ki 10:10, "gave" here, like "presents" elsewhere, is a euphemism). From Ophir and elsewhere came gold, silver, precious stones, almug trees, ivory, apes and peacocks (1Ki 10:11,22,25). According to Massoretic Text 1Ki 10:28 f, horses and chariots were brought from Egypt and re-sold to the North.

But the text here is suspected. Egypt had no reputation as a horse-mart in comparison with Northern Syria and Western Armenia (see TOGARMAH). So many scholars prefer to read "Musri" (in Northwestern Arabia) for "Egypt" (mtsr for mtsrym—see the comms., especially EB, III, cols. 3162-63). Yet the change does not clear up all the difficulties, and Egypt was certainly famous for her chariots. And compare De 17:16.

In exchange Solomon exported to Tyre wheat and oil (1Ki 5:11; 2Ch 2:10,15 adds "barley .... and wine"). What he sent to the other countries is not specified, and, in particular, there is no mention of what he exchanged for gold. 1Ki 5:11; 9:11, however, indicate that Hiram was the intermediary for most of this gold traffic, so that at the final settlement of accounts Solomon must have been heavily in Hiram's debt. 1Ki 9:11 proves this. Solomon had undertaken a larger task than the resources of Palestine could meet, and in payment was obliged to cede Northern Galilee to Hiram. (The writer of 1 Kings explains that 'the cities were worthless,' while Chronicles passes over the unedifying incident altogether, if 2Ch 8:2 is not a reversal of the case.)

3. Maritime Trade:

Among Solomon's other activities sea-commerce was not forgotten. David's victory over Edom gave access to the Red Sea at Eziongeber, and this port was utilized by Hiram and Solomon in partnership (1Ki 9:26), Hiram, apparently, supplying the ships and the sailors (1Ki 10:11). After Solomon's death, Edom revolted and the way to the sea was closed (1Ki 11:14). It was not recovered until the time of Jehoshaphat, and he could do nothing with it, "for the ships were broken at Eziongeber" (1Ki 22:48), i.e. in the home harbor. Either they were badly built or incompetently manned. The Hebrews had no skill as sailors.

See SHIPS AND BOATS.

4. To the Exile:

After the time of Solomon the commerce established by him of course continued, with fluctuations. Samaria became so important a city from the trade standpoint that Ben-hadad I forced Baasha to assign a

street there to the merchants of Damascus, while Ahab succeeded in extracting the reverse privilege from Ben-hadad II (1Ki 20:34). The long and prosperous contemporary reigns of Jeroboam II and Uzziah evidently had great importance for the growth of commerce, and it was the growing luxury of the land under these reigns that called forth the denunciations of Amos, Hosea and Isaiah. Amos complains of the importation of expensive foreign luxuries by the rich (compare Isa 3:18-23), who wasted the natural products of Palestine (Isa 6:3-6; 3:12,15). Grain, the chief article of value, was extorted from the poor (Isa 5:11), and the grain-dealers were notoriously dishonest (Isa 8:4-6); Isa 8:6c in English Versions of the Bible suggests the sale of adulterated grain. The meaning of the Hebrew, however, is obscure, but of course adulteration must have existed, and it is doubtless not without significance that the labels on the recently discovered Samaritan jar-fragments emphasize the purity of the contents (Harvard Theological Review, 1911, 138-39). The extent of commercialism so overwhelms Hosea that he exclaims ‘Ephraim is become a Canaanite!’ (12:7 margin). The most unscrupulous dealing is justified by the plea, "Surely I am become rich" (12:8). Isaiah is shocked at the intimate contracts made with foreigners, which prove so profitable to the makers, but which bring in idolatry (2:6-8). It was in the time of Isaiah that Assyrian influence began to make itself felt in Judah, and the setting up in the Temple of a pattern of an Assyrian altar (2Ki 16:10 f) must have been accompanied with an influx of Assyrian commodities of all descriptions. (Similarly, the religious reaction under Hezekiah would have been accompanied by a boycott on Assyrian goods.) Data for the following pre-exilic period are scanty, but Eze 26:2 shows that Jerusalem retained a position of some commercial importance up to the time of her fall. Of especial interest are Isa 23 and Eze 26; 27 with their descriptions of the commerce of Tyre. Ezekiel indeed confines himself to description, but Isaiah characterizes the income of all this trade as "the hire of a harlot" (23:17,18), a phrase that reappears in Re 18:3,9—a chapter couched in the genuine old prophetic tone and based almost exclusively on Isaiah and Ezekiel. But it is important to note that Isaiah realizes (23:18) that all this enterprise is capable of consecration to Yahweh and is therefore not wrong in itself.

5. The Exile and After:

The deportation into Babylon brought the Jews directly into the midst of a highly developed commercial civilization, and, although we are ignorant of the details, they must have entered into this life to a very considerable extent. Indeed, it is more than probable that it was here that the famed commercial genius of the Jews made its appearance. Certain it is that exiles acquired great wealth and rose to high position (Zec 6:10; Ne 1:11; 5:17, etc.), and that when an opportunity to return to Palestine was opened, most of the exiles preferred to stay where they were (see EXILE). As a matter of fact, the Palestinian community was beggarly poor for years (Zec 8:10; Hag 1:6; Ne 1:3; Mal 3:10-12, etc.) and could not even prevent the sale of its children into slavery (Joe 3:6). Such trade as existed was chiefly in the hands of foreigners (Joe 3:17; Zec 14:21), but the repeated crop-failures must have forced many Jews into commerce to keep from starving. The history of the 4th century is very obscure, but for the later commercial history of the Jews the foundation of Alexandria (332 BC) was a fact of fundamental importance. For Alexandria rapidly became the commercial center of the world and into it the Jews, attracted by the invitations of the Ptolemies, poured in streams. Alexandria’s policy was closely copied by Antioch (on the period see Ant, XII, i, iii; compare ALEXANDRIA; ANTIOCH), and Ant, XII, iv, shows that the ability of the Jews was duly recognized by the Gentiles. But this development was outside Palestine. Sirach does not

count commerce among the list of trades in 38:24-30 (note, however, the increased importance of artisans) and his references to commerce throughout are not especially characteristic (5:8; 8:13, etc.; but see 42:7). But even the trade of Palestine must have been increasing steadily. Under the Maccabees Joppa was captured, and the opening of its port for Greek commerce is numbered among Simon's "glories" (1 Macc 14:5). The unification of the trade-world under Rome, of course, gave Palestine a share in the benefits. Herod was able to work commercial miracles (Ant., XV, vi, 7; viii, 1; ix, 2; xi, 1; XVI, v, 3, etc.), and the Palestine of the New Testament is a commercial rather than an agricultural nation. Christ's parables touch almost every side of commercial life and present even the pearl merchant as a not unfamiliar figure (Mt 13:45). Into the ethics of commerce, however, He entered little. Sharp dealings were everywhere (Mr 12:40; Lu 16:1-12, etc.), and the service of Mammon, which had pushed its way even into the temple (Mr 11:15-17 and parallel's), was utterly incompatible with the service of God (Mt 6:19-34, etc.). In themselves, however the things of Caesar and the things of God (Mr 12:17 and parallel's) belong to different spheres, and with financial questions pure and simple He refused to interfere (Lu 12:13 f). For further details and for the (not very elaborate) teaching of the apostles see ETHICS.

LITERATURE.

The appropriate sections in the HA's and Biblical diets., especially G. A. Smith's indispensable article "Trade" in EB, IV, cols. 5145-99 (1903); for the later period, GJV4, II, 67-82 (1907), III, 97-102 (1909). Compare also Herzfeld, Handelsgeschichte der Juderi des Alterthums2 (1894).

Burton Scott Easton

TRADES

tradz.

See CRAFTS.

TRADITION

tra-dish'-un: The Greek word is paradosis, "a giving over," either by word of mouth or in writing; then that which is given over, i.e. tradition, the teaching that is handed down from one to another. The word does not occur in the Hebrew Old Testament (except in Jer 39 (32):4; 41 (34):2, used in another sense), or in the Septuagint or the Apocrypha (except in 2 Esdras 7:26, used in a different sense), but is found 13 times in the New Testament (Mt 15:2,3,6; Mr 7:3,5,8,9,13; 1Co 11:2; Ga 1:14; Col 2:8; 2Th 2:15; 3:6).

1. Meaning in Jewish Theology:

The term in the New Testament has apparently three meanings. It means, in Jewish theology, the oral

teachings of the elders (distinguished ancestors from Moses on) which were reverenced by the late Jews equally with the written teachings of the Old Testament, and were regarded by them as equally authoritative on matters of belief and conduct. There seem to be three classes of these oral teachings:

(a) some oral laws of Moses (as they supposed) given by the great lawgiver in addition to the written laws;

(b) decisions of various judges which became precedents in judicial matters;

(c) interpretations of great teachers (rabbis) which came to be prized with the same reverence as were the Old Testament Scriptures.

It was against the tradition of the elders in this first sense that Jesus spoke so pointedly to the scribes and Pharisees (Mt 15:2 f; Mr 7:3 f). The Pharisees charged Jesus with transgressing "the tradition of the elders." Jesus turned on them with the question, "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?" He then shows how their hollow traditionalism has fruited into mere ceremonialism and externalism (washing of hands, vessels, saying "Corban" to a suffering parent, i.e. "My property is devoted to God, and therefore I cannot use it to help you," etc.), but He taught that this view of uncleanness was essentially false, since the heart, the seat of the soul, is the source of thought, character and conduct (Mr 7:14 f).

2. As Used in 1 Corinthians and 2 Thessalonians:

The word is used by Paul when referring to his personal Christian teachings to the churches at Corinth and Thessalonica (1Co 11:2; 2Th 2:15; 3:6). In this sense the word in the singular is better translated "instruction," signifying the body of teaching delivered by the apostle to the church at Thessalonica (2Th 3:6). But Paul in the other two passages uses it in the plural, meaning the separate instructions which he delivered to the churches at Corinth and Thessalonica.

3. As Used in Colossians:

The word is used by Paul in Col 2:8 in a sense apparently different from the two senses above. He warns his readers against the teachings of the false teachers in Colosse, which are "after the tradition of men." Olshausen, Lightfoot, Dargan, in their commentaries in the place cited., maintain that the reference is to the Judaistic character of the false teachers. This may be true, and yet we must see that the word "tradition" has a much broader meaning here than in 1 above. Besides, it is not certain that the false teachings at Colosse are essentially Jewish in character. The phrase "tradition of men" seems to emphasize merely the human, not necessarily Jewish, origin of these false teachings.

The verb paradidomi, "to give over," is also used 5 times to express the impartation of Christian instruction: Lu 1:2, where eyewitnesses are said to have handed down the things concerning Jesus; 1Co 11:2,23 and 15:3 referring to the apostle’s personal teaching; 2Pe 2:21, to instruction by some Christian

teacher (compare 1Pe 1:18).

LITERATURE.

Broadus, Allen, Meyer, commentaries on Mt 15:2 f; Swete, Gould, commentaries on Mr (7:3 f); Lightfoot, Meyer, commentaries on Ga 1:14; Lightfoot, Olshausen, Dargan (American Commentary), commentaries on Col 2:8; Milligan, commentary on 1 and 2Th (2Th 2:15 and 3:6); Weber, Jewish Theology (Ger., Altsyn. Theol.); Pocock, Porta Mosis, 350-402; Schurer, HJP, II, i, section 25; Edersheim, Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, chapter xxxi; Josephus, Ant, XIII, x, 6. Charles B. Williams

TRAFFIC, TRAFFICKER

traf'-ik, traf'-ik-er (kena'-an, micchar, cachar, rekhullah):

(1) Kena'an =" Canaan," and, as the Canaanites were celebrated merchants, came to mean "merchant," and so "traffic" (see CANAAN). Eze 17:4 refers to the great eagle who "cropped off the topmost of the young twigs (of cedar) thereof, and carried it unto a land of traffic; he set it in a city of merchants."

(2) Micchar means "trade," and so "traffic"; comes from a root meaning "to travel round," e.g. as a peddler. 1Ki 10:15 reads: "Besides that which the traders brought, and the traffic of the merchants." This refers to the income of Solomon.

(3) Cachar means "to go about," "occupy with," "trade," "traffic," "merchant," and so the business of the moving merchant or peddler. Joseph said to his brothers: "So will I deliver you your brother, and ye shall traffic in the land" (Ge 42:34). He evidently meant that they should have license to become, throughout Egypt, traveling traders.

(4) Rekhullah, from a root meaning "to travel for trading," and so a peddled traffic, as in spices, etc. Ezekiel speaks against the prince of Tyre: "By thy great wisdom and by thy traffic hast thou increased thy riches" (28:5); and against the king of Tyre: "in the unrighteousness of thy traffic," etc. (Eze 28:18).

See MARKET; MERCHANDISE; SHIPS AND BOATS, II, 2, (2); TRADE.

William Edward Raffety

TRAGACANTH

trag'-a-kanth: For "spicery" in Ge 37:25, the Revised Version margin gives "gum tragacanth or storax."

See SPICE; STORAX.

TRAIN

tran (verb chanakh, "educate" (Pr 22:6), with adjective chanikh (Ge 14:14)): In 1Ki 10:2 the Queen of Sheba’s "train," the noun is chayil, the usual word for "force," "army." But in Isa 6:1 the "train" (shul, "loose hanging garment") is that of God’s robe (the Revised Version margin "skirts").

TRAIN; TRAINED

tran, trand: The word is used in two places in both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American), namely, Ge 14:14, where it means "drilled," "prepared for war," and Pr 22:6. "Train up a child" means more than to teach, and includes everything that pertains to the proper development of the child, especially in its moral and spiritual nature. In this broader sense also the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "train" for the "teach" of the King James Version in Tit 2:4 (sophronizo).

TRANCE

trans (ekstasis): The condition expressed by this word is a mental state in which the person affected is partially or wholly unconscious of objective sensations, but intensely alive to subjective impressions which, however they may be originated, are felt as if they were revelations from without. They may take the form of visual or auditory sensations or else of impressions of taste, smell, heat or cold, and sometimes these conditions precede epileptic seizures constituting what is named the aura epileptica. The word occurs 5 times in the King James Version, twice in the story of Balaam (Nu 24:4,16), twice in the history of Peter (Ac 10:10; 11:5), and once in that of Paul (Ac 22:17). In the Balaam story the word is of the nature of a gloss rather than a translation, as the Hebrew naphal means simply "to fall down" and is translated accordingly in the Revised Version (British and American). Here Septuagint has en hupno, "in sleep" (see SLEEP, DEEP). In Peter’s vision on the housetop at Joppa he saw the sail (othone) descending from heaven, and heard a voice. Paul’s trance was also one of both sight and sound. The vision on the Damascus road (Ac 9:3-9) and that recorded in 2Co 12:2-4 were also cases of trance, as were the prophetic ecstasies of Saul, Daniel and Elisha, and the condition of John in which he says that he was "in the Spirit" (Re 1:10).

The border line between trance and dream is indefinite: the former occurs while one is, in a sense, awake; the latter takes place in the passage from sleep to wakefulness. The dream as well as the vision were supposed of old to be channels of revelation (Job 33:15). In Shakespearean English, "trance" means a dream (Taming of the Shrew, I, i, 182), or simply a bewilderment (Lucrece, 1595).

In the phenomena of hypnotic suggestion, sometimes affecting a number of persons simultaneously we have conditions closely allied to trance, and doubtless some of the well-authenticated phantom appearances are similar subjective projections from the mind affecting the visual and auditory centers of the brain.

Alex. Macalister

TRANSFIGURATION trans-fig-o-ra'-shun (metamorphoomai, "to be transformed"): Used only with reference to the transfiguration of Christ (Mt 17:2; Mr 9:2) and the change wrought in the Christian personality through fellowship with Christ (Ro 12:2; 2Co 3:18).

(1) About midway of His active ministry Jesus, accompanied by Peter, James and John, withdrew to a high mountain apart (probably Mt. Hermon; see next article) for prayer. While praying Jesus was "transfigured," "his face did shine as the sun," "and his garments became glistering, exceeding white, so as no fuller on earth can whiten them." It was night and it was cold. The disciples were drowsy and at first but dimly conscious of the wonder in progress before their eyes. From the brightness came the sound of voices. Jesus was talking with Moses and Elijah, the subject of the discourse, as the disciples probably learned later, being of the decease (exodus) which Jesus was about to accomplish at Jerusalem. As the disciples came to themselves, the figures of Moses and Elijah seemed to withdraw, whereupon Peter impetuously demanded tents to be set up for Jesus and His heavenly visitants that the stay might be prolonged and, if possible, made permanent. Just then a cloud swept over them, and out of the cloud a voice came, saying, "This is my beloved Son: hear ye him." In awe the disciples prostrated themselves and in silence waited. Suddenly, lifting up their eyes they saw no one, save Jesus only (Mt 17:1-13; Mr 9:2-13; Lu 9:28-36).

Such is the simple record. What is its significance? The Scripture narrative offers no explanation, and indeed the event is afterward referred to only in the most general way by Peter (2Pe 1:16-18) and, perhaps, by John (Joh 1:14). That it marked a crisis in the career of Jesus there can be no doubt. From this time He walked consciously under the shadow of the cross. A strict silence on the subject was enjoined upon the three witnesses of His transfiguration until after "the Son of man should have risen again from the dead." This means that, as not before, Jesus was made to realize the sacrificial character of His mission; was made to know for a certainty that death, soon and cruel, was to be His portion; was made to know also that His mission as the fulfillment of Law (Moses) and prophecy (Elijah) was not to be frustrated by death. In His heart now would sound forever the Father's approval, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The scene, therefore, wrought out in Jesus a new fervor, a new boldness, a new confidence of ultimate victory which, as a source of holy joy, enabled Him to endure the cross and to despise the shame (Heb 12:2). In the disciples the scene must have wrought a new faith in the heavensent leadership of Jesus. In the dark days which were soon to come upon them the memory of the brightness of that unforgettable night would be a stay and strength. There might be opposition, but there could be no permanent defeat of one whose work was ratified by Moses, by Elijah, by God Himself. Indeed, was not the presence of Moses and Elijah a pledge of immortality for all? How in the face of such evidence, real to them, however it might be to others, could they ever again doubt the triumph of life and of Him who was the Lord of life? The abiding lesson of the Transfiguration is that of the reality of the unseen world, of its nearness to us, and of the comforting and inspiring fact that "spirit with spirit may meet."

The transfigured appearance of Jesus may have owed something to the moonlight on the snow and to the

drowsiness of the disciples; but no one who has ever seen the face of a saint fresh from communion with God, as in the case of Moses (Ex 34:29-35) and of Stephen (Ac 6:15), will have any difficulty in believing that the figure of Jesus was irradiated with a "light that never was on sea or land." See Comms. and Lives of Christ; also a suggestive treatment in Westcott's Introduction to the Study of the Gospels. (2) The transfiguration of Christians is accomplished by the renewing of the mind whereby, in utter abandonment to the will of God, the disciple displays the mind of Christ (Ro 12:2); and by that intimate fellowship with God, through which, as with unveiled face he beholds the glory of the Lord, he is "transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit" (2Co 3:18).

Charles M. Stuart

TRANSFIGURATION, MOUNT OF

trans-fig-u-ra'-shun (referred to as the "holy mount" in 2Pe 1:18): Records of the Transfiguration are found in Mt 17:1 ff; Mr 9:2 ff; Lu 9:28 ff. From these narratives we gather that Jesus went with His disciples from Bethsaida to the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi, where Peter's memorable confession was made. Some six or eight days later Jesus went up into a high mountain to pray, taking with Him Peter, James and John. There He was transfigured before them. Descending the next day, He healed a demoniac boy, and then passed through Galilee to Capernaum.

1. Not Olivet or Tabor:

It is quite evident that the tradition placing the scene on the Mount of Olives must be dismissed. Another tradition, dating from the 4th century, identifies the mountain with Tabor. In the article on TABOR, MOUNT, reasons are stated for rejecting this tradition. It was indeed possible in the time indicated to travel from Caesarea Philippi to Tabor; but there is nothing to show why this journey should have been undertaken; and, the mountain top being occupied by a town or village, a suitable spot could not easily have been found.

2. Mt. Hermon:

In recent years the opinion has become general that the scene must be placed somewhere on Mt. Hermon. It is near to Caesarea Philippi. It is the mountain paragraph excellence in that district (Lu 9:28). It was easily possible in the time to make the journey to Chasbeiyah and up the lofty steeps. The sacred associations of the mountain might lend it special attractions (Stanley, S and the Priestly Code (P), 399). This is supported by the transient comparison of the celestial splendor with the snow, where alone it could be seen in Palestine (ibid., 400).

It seems to have been forgotten that Mt. Hermon lay beyond the boundaries of Palestine, and that the district round its base was occupied by Gentiles (HJP, II, i, 133 f). The sacred associations of the mountain were entirely heathen, and could have lent it no fitness for the purpose of Jesus; hos chion, "as snow," in Mr 9:3, does not belong to the original text, and therefore lends no support to the

identification. It was evidently in pursuance of His ordinary custom that Jesus "went up into the mountain to pray" (Lu 9:28). This is the only indication of His purpose. It is not suggested that His object was to be transfigured. "As he was praying," the glory came. There is no hint that He had crossed the border of Palestine; and it is not easy to see why in the circumstances He should have made this journey and toilsome ascent in heathen territory. Next morning as usual He went down again, and was met by a crowd that was plainly Jewish. The presence of "the scribes" is sufficient proof of this (Mr 9:14). Where was such a crowd to come from in this Gentile district? Matthew in effect says that the healing of the demoniac took place in Galilee (Mt 17:22). The case against Mt. Hermon seems not less conclusive than that against Tabor.

3. Jebel Jermuk:

The present writer has ventured to suggest an identification which at least avoids the difficulties that beset the above (Expository Times, XVIII, 333 f). Among the mountains of Upper Galilee Jebel Jermuk is especially conspicuous, its shapely form rising full 4,000 ft. above the sea. It is the highest mountain in Palestine proper, and is quite fitly described as hupselon ("high"). It stands to the West over against the Safed uplands, separated from them by a spacious valley, in the bottom of which runs the tremendous gorge, Wady Leimun. It is by far the most striking feature in all the Galilean landscape. The summit commands a magnificent view, barred only to the Southwest by other mountains of the range. It rises from the midst of a district which then supported a large population of Jews, with such important Jewish centers as Kefr Bir‘im, Gishcala, Meiron, etc., around its base. Remote and lonely as it is, the summit was just such a place as Jesus might have chosen for prayer. It was comparatively easy to reach, and might be comfortably climbed in the evening. Then on His descent next day the crowd might easily assemble from the country and the villages near by. How long our Lord stayed near Caesarea Philippi after the conversation recorded in Mt 16:21 ff we do not know. From Banias to Gishcala, e.g. one could walk on foot without fatigue in a couple of days. If a little time were spent in the Jewish villages passed on the way, the six days, or Luke’s "about eight days," are easily accounted for. From this place to Capernaum He would "pass through Galilee" (Mr 9:30).

W. Ewing

TRANSFORM

trans-form’ (Ro 12:2; the Revised Version (British and American) 2Co 3:18 for metamorphoomai, and the King James Version 2Co 11:13,14,15 for metaschematizo, the Revised Version (British and American) "fashion"): The commentaries often explain the former word as connoting a change of nature, while the latter refers only to the appearance, but this distinction is probably fanciful.

TRANSGRESSION

trans-gresh’-un: From "transgress," to pass over or beyond; to overpass, as any rule prescribed as the limit of duty; to break or violate, as a law, civil or moral; the act of transgressing; the violation of a law

or known principle of rectitude; breach of command; offense; crime; sin. In the Old Testament pesha‘, occurs 80 times, rendered in all versions by "transgression." Its meaning is "rebellion"; see REBELLION. The word "rebellion" differs from this word in that it may be in the heart, though no opportunity should be granted for its manifestation: "An evil man seeketh only rebellion" (Pr 17:11). Here the wise man contemplates an evil heart, looking for an excuse or opportunity to rebel.

The New Testament uses parabasis, "trespass": "The law .... was added because of transgressions" (Ga 3:19); "Where there is no law, neither is there transgression" (Ro 4:15); "for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant" (Heb 9:15).

David Roberts Dungan

TRANSLATION

trans-la’-shun: The verb "translate" is found once in the Old Testament (2Sa 3:10 the King James Version, in the sense of "to transfer") and 3 times in the New Testament (Col 1:13, methistemi, where it means "to transfer"; twice in Heb 11:5, where it has the quasi-technical sense of removing one from the earthly to the heavenly state without the intervening experience of death).

The noun "translation" occurs only in Heb 11:5, metathesis, where it refers to the transition, the general nature of which has just been described in connection with the verb. With their customary reserve in regard to such matters, the Scriptures simply record the fact of Enoch’s translation without commenting either upon the attendant circumstances, or upon the nature of the change involved in his experience. Doubtless what Paul says in 1Co 15:51,52 applied in the case of Enoch and also in that of Elijah (2Ki 2:11).

W. M. McPheeters

TRAP

(moqesh; thera, literally, "hunting," used metaphorically in Psalms and Romans as "trap"): Any of the methods for taking birds; see SNARE; NET; GIN, etc. It is probable that a trap was more particularly a hole in the ground covered with twigs, concealed by leaves and baited with food. Such devices were common in taking the largest animals and may have been used with birds also. Trap is mentioned frequently in connection with snare and in such manner as to indicate that they were different devices: "Know for a certainty that Yahweh your God will no more drive these nations from out of your sight; but they shall be a snare and a trap unto you" (Jos 23:13). Another such reference will be found in Ps 69:22:

"Let their table before them become a snare;

And when they are in peace, let it become a trap."

This is quoted in Ro 11:9: "Let their table be made a snare, and a trap,

And a stumbling block, and a recompense unto them."

An instance where a trap alone is referred to can be found in Jer 5:26: "They set a trap, they catch men." Isa 42:22 uses this expression, "snared in holes." This might mean that a snare was placed in a hole, or that the hole was the snare to lure bird or animal to its death. The former proposition is sustained by Job, who says, "A noose is hid for him in the ground, and a trap for him in the way" (18:10). This translation appears as if it were reversed and should read, "A trap is hid for him in the ground and a noose in the way."

Gene Stratton-Porter

TRAVAIL

trav'-al (yaladh (Ge 35:16, etc.), chul, chil (properly "writhe," Job 15:20, etc.); odin (classical odis) (Mt 24:8, etc.), odino (Sirach 19:11, etc.; Ga 4:19, etc.)): "Travail" and its derivatives are used in the primary sense of the labor of childbirth, descriptive of the actual cases of Rachel (Ge 35:16), Tamar (Ge 38:27), Ichabod's mother (1Sa 4:19), and the apocalyptic woman clothed with the sun (Re 12:2). In the majority of passages, however, "travail" is used figuratively, to express extreme and painful sorrow (9 times in Jeremiah), "as of a woman in travail." It is also employed in the sense of irksome and vexatious business (6 times in Ecclesiastes, where it is the rendering of the word 'inyan). In the same book "travail" is used to express the toil of one's daily occupation (Ecclesiastes 4:4,6), where it is the translation of 'amal. In three places (Ex 18:8; Nu 20:14; La 3:5) where the King James Version has "travel" the Revised Version (British and American) has changed it to "travail," as in these passages the word tela'ah refers to the sense of weariness and toil, rather than to the idea of journeying (in the King James Version the spellings "travel" and "travail" were used indiscriminately; compare Sirach 19:11; 31:5). The sorrows which are the fruits of wickedness are compared to the pain of travail in Job 15:20 (chul) and Ps 7:14 (chabhal), the word used here meaning the torture or twisting pains of labor; see also the fanciful employment of "travail" in Sirach 19:11.

In the New Testament the travail of childbirth is used as the figure of the painful and anxious struggle against the evils of the world in the soul's efforts to attain the higher ideals of the Christian life (Joh 16:21 (tikto); Ro 8:22; Ga 4:27); twice, however, it is the rendering of mochthos, the ordinary word for "toil," "hardship" or "distress" (1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8).

See BIRTH; LABOR.

Alex. Macalister

TRAVELLER

trav’-el-er: Jud 5:6 for halakh nethibhah, "goers on paths"; 2Sa 12:4 for helekh, literally, "a going"; Job 31:32 for ‘arach, participle of a verb meaning "to wander"; Sirach 26:12; 42:3 for hodoiporos, "one making a way."

See WAYFARING MAN.

TREAD

tred.

See WINE PRESS.

TREASON

tre’-z’-n: The translation of qesher, in English Versions of the Bible 1Ki 16:20; 2Ki 11:14 parallel 2Ch 23:13. Qesher (from qashar, "to bind") means "a conspiracy" (2Sa 15:12; 2Ki 12:20, etc.), and the translation "treason" is due to the King James Versions’ love of variety.

TREASURE; TREASURER; TREASURY

trezh’-ur, trezh’-ur-er, trezh’-ur-i (otsar, genaz, genez, ganzakh, chocen matmon, mickenah, mikhman, ‘athudh, saphan; gaza, thesauros):

I. In the Old Testament.

1. Treasure

The English word "treasure" has in the Old Testament at least five somewhat distinct meanings as expressed in the words: "treasure," genaz (Aramaic) or genez (Hebrew), usually meaning "the thing stored"; translated "treasures" in Ezr 6:1, but in 5:17 and 7:20 translated "treasure-house": "search made in the king’s treasure-house." In Es 3:9; 4:7 the Hebrew form is translated "treasury," as is ganzakh in 1Ch 28:11.

2. Storehouse:

"Storehouse," not the thing stored but the place of storage; ‘otsar means depository, cellar, garner, armory, store or treasure-house. In several places it ought to be translated by some of these words. It is the most frequent word for treasure. the English Revised Version and the American Standard Revised Version both translate in some instances by other words, e.g. 1Ki 7:51, "treasuries of the house of

Yahweh," so also 2Ch 5:1; "treasury" in Ne 7:70,71, "gave to the treasury a thousand darics of gold"; in Job 38:22, "treasuries of the snow" (compare Pr 8:21; Jer 10:13; 51:16; Ezr 2:69).

3. Hidden Riches:

"Treasure" or something concealed. There are 3 Hebrew words with this meaning and all in the King James Version translated "treasure." (1) Matmon, which literally means "a secret storehouse" and so a secreted valuable, usually money buried, and so hidden riches of any kind, hid treasures: "treasure in your sacks" (Ge 43:23); "dig for it more than for hid treasures" (Job 3:21); "search for her as for hid treasures" (Pr 2:4); "We have stores hidden in the field, of wheat," etc. (Jer 41:8). (2) Mikhman, treasure as hidden, used only in Da 11:43: "have power over the treasures of gold and silver." (3) Saphan, meaning hidden treasure or valuables concealed: "hidden treasures of the sand" (De 33:19).

4. Strength:

Perhaps the strength of riches and so treasure, the Hebrew word being chocen, from a root meaning to hoard or lay up: "In the house of the righteous is much treasure" (Pr 15:6); "They take treasure and precious things" (Eze 22:25).

5. Something Prepared:

"Something prepared," made ready, the Hebrew word being ‘athudh, meaning "prepared," "ready," therefore something of value and so treasure: "have robbed their treasures," fortifications or other things "made ready" (Isa 10:13).

In the Old Testament the Hebrew word most often translated "treasure" is ‘otsar. It occurs in the sing. as follows: De 28:12; 1Ch 29:8; Ne 10:38; Ps 17:14; 135:4; Pr 15:16; 21:20; Ec 2:8; Isa 33:6; Da 1:2; Ho 13:15; in the pl.: De 32:34; 1Ki 14:26; 15:18; 2Ki 12:18; 14:14; 16:8; 18:15; 20:13,15; 24:13, etc.

The same word is in the King James Version translated "treasuries" in 1Ch 9:26; 28:12; 2Ch 32:27; Ne 13:12,13; Ps 135:7; and "treasury" in Jos 6:19,24; Jer 38:11.

II. In the New Testament.

1. Gaza:

There are two words translated "treasure": Gaza is of Persian origin, meaning "treasure." Found only once in Ac 8:27 concerning the Ethiopian "who was over all her (Queen Candace’s) treasure." In the compound gazophulakion, "guarding of gaza," the same word appears and the compound is translated "treasury" in Mr 12:41,43 parallel Lu 21:1; Joh 8:20.

See TEMPLE; TREASURY (OF TEMPLE).

2. Thesauros:

The word thesauros means literally, a "deposit," so wealth and treasure. Evidently throughout the New Testament it has a twofold usage as describing

(1) material treasure, either money or other valuable material possession, and

(2) spiritual treasure, e.g. "like unto treasure hid in a field" (Mt 13:44); "good treasure of the heart" (Mt 12:35).

Other references to material treasure are Mt 6:21; 13:52; Lu 12:21,34, etc. References to spiritual treasure are Mt 19:21; Mr 10:21; Lu 6:45; 12:33; 18:22; plural Mt 6:20; Col 2:3.

In Mt 27:6 the word for "treasury" is korbanas; compare the Revised Version margin.

See CORBAN.

TREASURER

(’atsar, gedhabhar, gizbar, cakhan; oikonomos):

(1) ‘Atsar, meaning primarily "to store up," and hence, one who lays up in store, i.e. a "treasurer": "I made treasurers over the treasuries" (Ne 13:13).

(2) Gedhabhar (Aramaic), used only in Da 3:2,3: "treasurers," named with judges and counselors as recognized officials.

(3) Gizbar, used in Ezr 7:21 (Aramaic) and equivalent in Ezr 1:8 (Hebrew): "treasurers beyond the river" and "Mithredath the treasurer."

(4) Cakhan, primarily meaning "one who ministers to," and hence, a keeper of treasure, treasurer: "Get thee unto this treasurer" (Isa 22:15). Perhaps the idea of steward is here intended.

(5) Oikonomos, by the King James Version translated "chamberlain," more properly in the American Standard Revised Version translated "treasurer": "Erastus the treasurer of the city saluteth you" (Ro 16:23).

William Edward Raffety

TREASURY, (OF TEMPLE)

trezh’-ur-i (’otsar, usually; ganzakh, 1Ch 28:11; gazophulakion, korbanas):

1. Origin of the Treasury:

The need of a "treasury" in connection with the house of Yahweh would early be felt for the reception of the offerings of the people, of tithes, and of the spoils of war dedicated to Yahweh. Already in Jos 6:19,24, therefore, we read of a "treasury of the house of Yahweh," into which "the silver and gold, and vessels of brass and iron," taken at Jericho, were brought. In the reign of David, and in his plans for the future temple, great prominence is given to the "treasuries." In 1Ch 26:20 ff are given the names of those who were over "the treasures of the house of God," and over "the treasures of the dedicated things" ("the spoil won in battles," 26:27), the latter being applied "to repair the house of Yahweh."

2. The Solomonic Temple:

In David’s plans for Solomon the "treasuries" (ganzakkim) are mentioned with the "porch," "the houses," the "upper rooms," the "inner chambers" of the Temple (1Ch 28:11); and the same distinction is made of "the treasuries (’otsroth) of the house of God," and "the treasuries of the dedicated things" (1Ch 28:12). In the accounts of the actual building of the Temple, "treasuries" are not mentioned, but subsequent notices give ample evidence of their existence. In the narratives of the repeated plunderings of the Temple (see TEMPLE), constant allusion is made to the carrying away of "the treasures of the house of Yahweh" and "the treasures of the king’s house" or palace (1Ki 14:26; 15:15,18; 2Ki 12:18; 14:14; 16:8; 18:15; 24:13). In the episode of Jehoash’s repair of the Temple (2Ki 12; 2Ch 24), we have a refreshing glimpse of the presence and uses of the treasury; but this brighter gleam is soon swallowed up again in darkness. Of the larger store-chambers we get a glance in Jeremiah, where we are told that "the house of the king" was "under the treasury" (38:11), i.e. on a lower level under the south wall.

3. The Second Temple:

The Book of Ne introduces us to treasury-chambers in the second temple—now used for the voluntary offerings (tithes) of the people—grain, and wine, and oil (Ne 13:4 ff; compare Mal 3:10). A certain Meshullam had repaired the city wall "over against his chamber" (Ne 3:30), and he, with other Levites, kept "the watch at the storehouses of the gates" (Ne 12:25). These gates were probably gates of exit on the southern side, as in the Herodian temple.

4. Herod’s Temple in the New Testament:

In Herod’s temple the name "treasury" was specially given to the "court of the women" (see TEMPLE, HEROD’S), where were 13 trumpet-shaped boxes for the reception of the offerings of the worshippers. It was here that Jesus saw the poor widow cast in her two mites (Mr 12:41; Lu 21:1-4), and the court is expressly named the "treasury" in Joh 8:20: "These words spake he in the treasury, as he taught in the temple." It is a legitimate deduction that this court was the ordinary scene of the Lord’s ministry when

teaching in the temple.

See also TREASURE, TREASURER, TREASURY.

W. Shaw Caldecott

TREATY

tre’-ti (berith, karath berith, "make a covenant," "league," "treaty"): Although the Israelites were forbidden to make treaties, or enter into covenant, with the Canaanites because of the risk thereby involved of religious apostasy and moral contamination (Ex 23:32; 34:12; De 7:2; Jud 2:2), they were so situated in the midst of the nations that treaty relations of some sort with their neighbors were from time to time inevitable. After the rise of the monarchy, treaties were common. David and Solomon had friendly relations with Hiram, king of Tyre (1Ki 5:15); Asa, to rid himself of the hostile approaches of Baasha, king of Israel, entered into a league with Ben-hadad of Syria, which the prophet Hanani denounced (2Ch 16:1); Ahab entered into a similar compact with Ben-hadad’s son and successor, and set him at liberty when he was his prisoner of war (1Ki 20:34); and at a later time Jehoshaphat joined Ahab in an expedition against Ben-hadad II to Ramoth-gilead in which Ahab lost his life (1Ki 22). Sometimes with Syria and neighboring states against the terrible Assyrian power, and sometimes with Egypt against Assyria or Babylon, the kings of Israel and Judah entered into treaty to resist their advances and to preserve their own independence (2Ki 17:4; Ho 7:11; Isa 30:1). Against such alliances the prophets raised their testimony (Isa 31:1; Jer 27:3).

See also WAR, 9; ROME, V, 1.

T. Nicol

TREE

tre.

See BOTANY.

TREE OF LIFE

(‘ets chayyim; xulon tes zoes): The expression "tree of life" occurs in four groups or connections: (1) in the story of the Garden of Eden, (2) in the Proverbs of the Wise Men, (3) in the apocryphal writings, and (4) in the Apocalypse of John.

1. The Tree of Life in the Garden of Eden:

The tree was in the midst of the Garden, and its fruit of such a nature as to produce physical immortality (Ge 2:9; 3:22). After guiltily partaking of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the sinful tendency having thus been implanted in their natures, the man and woman are driven forth from the Garden lest they should eat of the tree of life and live forever (Ge 3:22). The idea seems to be that, if they should eat of it and become immortalized in their sinful condition, it would be an unspeakable calamity to them and their posterity. For sinful beings to live forever upon earth would be inconceivably disastrous, for the redemption and development of the race would be an impossibility in that condition. Earth would soon have been a hell with sin propagating itself forever. To prevent such a possibility they were driven forth, cherubim were placed at the entrance of the Garden, the flame of a sword revolving every way kept the way of the tree of life, and this prevented the possibility of man possessing a physical immortality. It is implied that they had not yet partaken of this tree and the opportunity is now forever gone. Immortality must be reached in some other way.

The interpretation of the story is a standing problem. Is it mythical, allegorical, or historical? Opinions vary from one of these extremes to the other with all degrees of difference between. In general, interpreters may be divided into three classes:

(1) Many regard the story as a myth, an ancient representation of what men then conceived early man to have been, but with no historical basis behind it. All rationalistic and modern critical scholars are practically agreed on this. Budde in his Urgeschichte says there was but one tree, that is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and the intimation of a tree of life is an interpolation. Barton has endeavored to show that the tree of life was really the date-palm, and the myth gathered around this tree because of its bisexual nature. He holds that man came to his self-realization through the sexual relation, and therefore the date-palm came to be regarded as the tree of life, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. But this difference came in later when the knowledge of its origin became obscured. He calls attention to the fact that the sacred palm is found in the sanctuary of Ea at Eridu. All such interpretations are too obviously based upon a materialistic evolution hypothesis.

(2) There are those who regard the entire story as literal: one tree would actually impart physical immortality, the other the knowledge of evil. But this involves endless difficulties also, requires tremendous differences between the laws of Nature then and now, vast differences in fruits, men and animals, and an equally vast difference in God’s dealings with man.

(3) We prefer to regard it as a pictorial-spiritual story, the representing of great spiritual facts and religious history in the form of a picture. This is the usual Bible method. It was constantly employed by the prophets, and Jesus continually "pictured" great spiritual facts by means of material objects. Such were most of His parables. John’s Apocalypse is also a series of pictures representing spiritual and moral history. So the tree of life is a picture of the glorious possibilities which lay before primitive man, and which might have been realized by him had not his sin and sinful condition prevented it. God’s intervention was a great mercy to the human race. Immortality in sin is rendered impossible, and this has made possible an immortality through redemption; man at first is pictured as neither mortal nor immortal, but both are possible, as represented by the two trees. He sinned and became mortal, and then immortality was denied him. It has since been made possible in a much higher and more glorious way.

2. A Common Poetic Simile:

This picture was not lost to Israel. The "tree of life," became a common poetic simile to represent that which may be a source of great blessing. In the Book of Pr the conception deepens from a physical source of a mere physical immortality to a moral and spiritual source of a full life, mental moral and spiritual, which will potentially last forever. Life, long life, is here attributed to a certain possession or quality of mind and heart. Wisdom is a source and supply of life to man. This wisdom is essentially of a moral quality, and this moral force brings the whole man into right relations with the source of life. Hence, a man truly lives by reason of this relationship (Pr 3:18). The allusion in this verse is doubtless to Ge 2:9; 3:22. An expression very similar is Pr 10:11, where the mouth of the righteous is declared to be a fountain of life. Good words are a power for good, and hence, produce good living. Pr 11:30 has a like thought: "The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life," i.e. the good life is a source of good in its influence on others. Pr 13:12 says: "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick; but when the desire cometh, it is a tree of life." The meaning seems to be that the gratification of good and lawful desires produces those pleasures and activities which make up life and its blessings. Pr 15:4 says: "A gentle tongue is a tree of life," i.e. its beneficent influences help others to a better life.

3. The Apocryphal Writings:

The apocryphal writings contain a few references to the tree of life, but use the phrase in a different sense from that in which it is used in the canonical books: "They shall have the tree of life for an ointment of sweet savour" (2 Esdras 2:12). Ecclesiasticus 1:20 has only an indirect reference to it. Ethiopic Enoch, in his picture of the Messianic age, uses his imagination very freely in describing it: "It has a fragrance beyond all fragrances; its leaves and bloom and wood wither not forever; its fruit is beautiful and resembles the date-palm" (24:4). Slavonic Enoch speaks thus: "In the midst there is the tree of life .... and this tree cannot be described for its excellence and sweet odor" (8:3). 2 Esdras describing the future says: "Unto you is paradise opened, the tree of life is planted" (8:52).

4. The Book of Revelation:

The Apocalypse of John refers to the tree of life in three places (Re 2:7; 22:2,14). These are pictures of the glorious possibilities of life which await the redeemed soul. In Ezekiel’s picture of the ideal state and the Messianic age, there flows from the sanctuary of God a life-giving river having trees upon its banks on either side, yielding fruit every month. The leaf of this tree would not wither, nor its fruit fail, because that which gave moisture to its roots flowed from the sanctuary. This fruit was for food and the leaves for medicine (Eze 47:12). Very similar to this and probably an expansion of it is John’s picture in Revelation: "To him that overcometh, to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God" (2:7). This means that all the possibilities of a complete and glorious life are open to the one that overcomes, and by overcoming is prepared to become immortal in a vastly higher sense than was possible to primitive man. In his picture of the few Jerusalem, the river of water of life has the tree of life on either side (22:2). Its leaf never fades and its monthly fruitage never fails. Food and medicine

these are to be to the world, supplied freely to all that all may enjoy the highest possibilities of activity and blessedness which can come to those who are in right relationships with God and Jesus Christ. In 22:14 John pronounces a blessing on those who wash their robes, who lead the clean and pure Christ life, for they thereby have the right and privilege of entering into the gates of the City and partaking of the tree of life. This means not only immortal existence, but such relations with Jesus Christ and the church that each has unrestricted access to all that is good in the universe of God. The limit is his own limited capacity.

James Josiah Reeve

TREES, GOODLY

See GOODLY TREES.

TREES, SHADY

sha’-di.

See LOTUS TREES.

TREES, THICK

See THICK TREES.

TRENCH

trench, trensh.

See SIEGE, (5), (8).

TRESPASS

tres’-pas: To pass over, to go beyond one’s right in place or act; to injure another; to do that which annoys or inconveniences another; any violation of law, civil or moral; it may relate to a person, a community, or the state, or to offenses against God. The Hebrew ‘asham ("sin"), is used very frequently in the Old Testament when the trespass is a violation of law of which God is the author. The Greek word is paraptoma.

In the Old Testament an offering was demanded when the offense was against God: a female lamb; in other cases, according to the magnitude of the wrong, a ram or a goat; the offering was to be preceded by a confession by the one committing the trespass. If the trespass was against a human being, the

wrong-doer must make it right with the person, and when reconciliation should have been effected, then the offering for sin was to be made. See under SACRIFICE, "Trespass Offering." If a person's property has been injured, then the trespasser shall add a fifth to the value of the property injured and give that to the injured party (Le 6:5). Zaccheus, wanting to make full restitution, went beyond the demands of the Law (Lu 19:1-9).

The New Testament teaching on the subject is, first to be reconciled to the brother and then offer, or worship (Mt 5:23,24). In all cases, also, the offended party must forgive if the offender shall say, "I repent" (Mt 6:14; Eph 4:32; Col 3:13). We have been alienated by our trespasses from God (Eph 2:1). It was the Father's good will to reconcile all to Himself through Christ (Col 1:20-22). We must be reconciled to God (2Co 5:20,21). This being done, our trespasses shall be forgiven and we shall be justified.

David Roberts Dungan

TRESPASS OFFERING

See SACRIFICE.

TRIAL

tri'-al.

See COURTS, JUDICIAL; SANHEDRIN.

TRIAL OF JESUS

See JESUS CHRIST, THE ARREST AND TRIAL OF.

TRIBE

trib (in the Old Testament always for matteh, 183 times, or shebhet, 145 times, also spelled shebhet; Aramaic shebhat (Ezr 6:17)): Both words mean "staff," and perhaps "company led by chief with staff" (OHL, 641) is the origin of the meaning "tribe." In the Apocrypha and New Testament always for phule, from phuo, "beget," with dodekaphulon, "twelve tribes," in Ac 26:7. Of the two Hebrew words, shebhet appears to be considerably the older, and is used in Ps 74:2; Jer 10:16; 51:19 of the whole people of Israel, and in Nu 4:18; Jud 20:12 (Revised Version margin); 1Sa 9:21 (Revised Version margin) of subdivisions of a tribe (but the text of most of these six verses is suspicious). Further, in Isa 19:13, shebhet is used of the "tribes" (nomes?) of Egypt and phule in Mt 24:30 of "all the tribes of the earth," but otherwise shebhet, matteh and phule refer exclusively to the tribes of Israel. In 2Sa 7:7 for shibhete, "tribes," read shophete, "judges" (of the Revised Version margin).

Burton Scott Easton

TRIBULATION

trib-u-la’-shun (tsar, tsar, "staid," "narrow," "pent up"; compare Nu 22:26):

1. In the Old Testament:

Closely pressed, as of seals (Job 41:15 (7)); of streams pent up (Isa 59:9 margin); of strength limited (Pr 24:10, "small"). Hence, figuratively, of straitened circumstances; variously rendered "affliction," "tribulation," "distress" (De 4:30; Job 15:24; 30:12; Ps 4:2; 18:7; 32:7; 44:11, etc.; Ps 78:42; 102:3; 106:44; 119:143; Isa 26:16; 30:20; Ho 5:15; Eze 30:16). Frequently, the feminine form (tsarah) is similarly rendered "tribulation" (Jud 10:14 the King James Version; 1Sa 10:19 the King James Version; 1Sa 26:24); in other places "distress," "affliction" (Ge 42:21; Ps 120:1; Pr 11:8; 2Ch 20:9; Isa 63:9; Jer 15:11; Jon 2:2; Na 1:9; Zec 10:11).

2. In the New Testament:

The Greek is thlipsis, a "pressing together" (as of grapes), squeezing or pinching (from verb thlibo); used figuratively for "distress," "tribulation"; Septuagint for tsar and tsarah; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) tribulatio pressura (from tribulum, "a threshing sledge"). The verb form is rendered "suffer tribulation" (1Th 3:4 the King James Version, "suffer affliction" the Revised Version (British and American)); "trouble" (2Th 1:6 the King James Version, "afflict" the Revised Version (British and American); compare 2Co 1:6; 4:8; 7:5; 1Ti 5:10; Heb 11:37). The noun form is rendered in the King James Version variously as "tribulation," "affliction," "persecution," though more uniformly "tribulation" in the Revised Version (British and American). The word is used generally of the hardships which Christ’s followers would suffer (Mt 13:21; 24:9,21,29; Mr 4:17; 13:19,24; Joh 16:33; 1Co 7:28); or which they are now passing through (Ro 5:3; 12:12; 2Co 4:17; Php 4:14); or through which they have already come (Ac 11:19; 2Co 2:4; Re 7:14).

Edward Bagby Pollard

TRIBUTE

trib’-ut (mac, "tribute," really meaning "forced laborers," "labor gang" (1Ki 4:6; 9:15,21); also "forced service," "serfdom"; possibly "forced payment" is meant in Es 10:1; the idea contained in the modern word is better given by middah (Ezr 6:8; Ne 5:4)): Words used only of the duty levied for Yahweh on acquired spoils are mekhec, "assessment" (Nu 31:28,37,38,39,40,41), belo, "excise" (Ezr 4:13,10; Ne 7:24), massa’," burden" (2Ch 17:11), and ‘onesh, "fine" or "indemnity" (2Ki 23:33; compare Pr 19:19). The translation "tribute" for miccath, in De 16:10 is wrong (compare the Revised Version margin). kensos (Mt 22:17; Mr 12:14) =" census," while phoros (Lu 20:22; 23:2; Ro 13:6,7), signifies an annual

tax on persons, houses, lands, both being direct taxes. The phoroi were paid by agriculturists, payment being made partly in kind, partly in money, and are contrasted with the tele of the publicans, while kensos is strictly a poll tax. The amount of tribute required as a poll tax by the Romans was the didrachmon (Mt 17:24), the King James Version "tribute," the Revised Version (British and American) "half-shekel." The stater (Mt 17:27), was a tetradrachm, "one shekel," or pay for two. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews were required to pay this poll tax toward the support of the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. Different kinds of personal taxes were raised by the Romans:

(1) an income tax,

(2) the poll tax.

The latter must be paid by women and slaves as well as by free men, only children and aged people being exempted. The payment exacted began with the 14th year in the case of men and the 12th in the case of women, the obligation remaining in force up to the 65th year in the case of both. For purposes of assessment, each person was permitted to put his own statement on record. After public notice had been given by the government, every citizen was expected to respond without personal visitation by an official (see Lu 2:1 ff). On the basis of the records thus voluntarily made, the tax collectors would enforce the payment of the tribute.

See also TAX, TAXING.

Frank E. Hirsch

TRIBUTE MONEY

(to nomisma tou kensou (Mt 22:19), "the coin used in payment of the imperial taxes"): Lit. "the lawful money of the tax," which, in the case of the poll tax, had to be paid in current coin of the realm (see Mt 17:27).

TRICLINIUM

tri-klin’-ti-um (Latin from Greek triklinion, from tri and kline, "a couch"): A couch for reclining at meals among the ancient Romans, arranged along three sides of a square, the fourth side being left open for bringing in food or tables, when these were used. In the larger Roman houses the dining-rooms consisted of small alcoves in the atrium arranged to receive triclinia. In early Old Testament times people sat at their meals (Ge 27:19; Jud 19:6; 1Sa 20:5; 1Ki 13:20). Reclining was a luxurious habit imported from foreign countries by the degenerate aristocracy in the days of the later prophets (Am 2:8; 6:4). Still, we find it common in New Testament times (Mt 9:10; 26:7; Mr 6:22,39; 14:3,18; Lu 5:29; 7:36,37; 14:10; 17:7; Joh 12:2; in these passages, though English Versions of the Bible read "sat," the Greek words are anakeimai, sunanakeimai, anapipto, katakeimai and anaklino, all indicating "reclining"; compare Joh 13:23; 21:20; here the King James Version translates these words "lean," probably with

reference to the Jewish custom of leaning at the Passover feast). In Joh 2:8,9 the ruler or governor of the feast is called architriklinos, that is, the master of the triclinium.

See MEALS, III.

Nathan Isaacs

TRIM

The only non-modern use is in Jer 2:33, "How trimmest thou thy way to seek love!" used for yatabh, "to make good," here "to study out," and the whole phrase means "to walk in an artificial manner," "like a courtesan."

TRINE IMMERSION; TRIUNE IMMERSION

trin tri’-un i-mur’-shun:

I. LINGUISTIC BASIS

1. Immersion

2. Triple Action

II. DOCTRINAL ARGUMENT

III. HISTORICAL PRACTICE

1. The Jews

2. John the Baptist

3. The Didache

4. Justin Martyr

5. Tertullian

6. Eunomius

7. Greek Church

LITERATURE

I. Linguistic Basis.

1. Immersion:

The meaning of the word baptizo, is "to dip repeatedly," "to sub-merge" (Thayer, Greek Lexicon of the New Testament). It is probably the frequentative of bapto, "to dip," meaning "to dip repeatedly." The word baptizo (and baptisma) in the New Testament is "used absolutely, ‘to administer the rite of ablution,’ ‘to baptize’ "(same place) . It is "an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin," etc. (same place) ;" Baptizo, to dip in or under water" (Liddell and Scott, Greek Lexicon).

2. Triple Action:

The threefold immersion is based upon the Trinity into which the believer is to be baptized "into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (eis to onoma tou patros kal tou huiou kai tou hagiou pneumatos, Mt 28:19). (On the genuineness of this passage see Plummer, Commentary on Matthew.)

II. Doctrinal Argument.

Whether Jesus spoke the words of Mt 28:19 as a baptismal formula or not does not affect the question. The passages in Acts, "in the name of Jesus Christ" (2:38; 10:48), and "in the name of the Lord Jesus" (8:16; 19:5), are not baptismal formulas, but mean the confession of Christ with all that Christ stands for, namely, the fullness of God and His salvation. The idea of the Trinity pervades the New Testament and many of the earliest writings (compare 1Co 12:4-6; 2Co 13:14; Eph 2:18; 3:14-17; 4:4-6; 2Th 2:13-15; Heb 6:4-6; 1Joh 3:23,24; 4:2; Jude 1:20,21; Re 1:4,5). "Baptized into Christ" has the same religious content as Mt 28:19. Triune immersion is the symbol of baptism into the Triune God. All believers in the Trinity should see the consistency of this symbol. Baptism is the symbol

(1) of a complete cleansing,

(2) of death,

(3) of burial,

(4) of resurrection, and

(5) of entering into full union and fellowship with the Triune God as revealed by Christ.

Triune immersion is the only symbol that symbolizes all that baptism stands for. Note the words of

Sanday on Ro 6:1-14 (comm. on Rom, ICC, 153): "Baptism has a double function:

(1) It brings the Christian into personal contact with Christ, so close that it may fitly be described as personal union with Him.

(2) It expresses symbolically a series of acts corresponding to the redeeming acts of Christ. Immersion = Death. Submersion = Burial (the ratification of Death). Emergence = Resurrection. All these the Christian has to undergo in a moral and spiritual sense, and by means of his union with Christ." Hence, the psychological need of a true symbol, triune immersion, to teach and impress the significance of the new life.

III. Historical Practice.

1. The Jews: The Jews received proselytes by circumcision, baptism (complete immersion) and sacrifice (Schurer, HJP, II, 2, pp. 319 f; Edersheim, LTJM, II, 745, and I, 273). John the Baptist, baptized "in the river Jordan" (Mt 3:6) and "in AEnon near to Salim, because there was much water there" (Joh 3:23).

2. John the Baptist:

Philip and the eunuch "both went down into the water" and they "came up out of the water." All New Testament baptisms were by immersion (see also Ro 6:1-11).

3. The Didache:

The Didache (100-150 AD) chapter vii: "Baptize into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit in living (running) water. But if they have not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, in warm" (baptisate eis to onoma tou patos kai tou huiou kai tou hagiou pneumatos en hudati zonti). "But if thou have not either, pour out water thrice (tris) upon the head into the name of the Father and Son and Holy Spirit." Here the triple action is maintained throughout, even in clinical baptism, while immersion is the rule.

Justin Martyr (Apology i.61) describes baptism which can only be understood as triune immersion.

4. Justin Martyr:

Tertullian (De Corona, iii) says, "Hereupon we are thrice immersed" (dehinc ter mergitamur). Again (Ad Praxeam, xxvi), "And lastly he commands them to baptize into the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, not into a unipersonal God.

5. Tertullian:

And indeed it is not only once but three times that we are immersed into the Three Persons, at each several mention of their names" (nam nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina, in personas singulos, tinguimur).

6. Eunomius:

Eunomius (circa 360) introduced single immersion "into the death of Christ." This innovation was condemned. Apostolical Constitutions, 50, says, "If any presbyter or bishop does not perform the one initiation with three immersions, but with giving one immersion only into the death of the Lord, let him be deposed." Single immersion was allowed by Gregory the Great (circa 691) to the church in Spain in opposition to the Arians who used a trine (not triune) immersion (Epis., i.43). This was exceptional.

7. Greek Church:

The Greek church has always baptized by triune immersion. The historical practice of the Christian church may well be summed up in the words of Dean Stanley: "There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost monstrous case. .... A few drops of water are now the western substitute for the threefold plunge into the rushing river or the wide baptisteries of the East" (History of Eastern Church, 28). "For the first three centuries the most universal practice of baptism was .... that those who were baptized, were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water" (Christian Institutions, p. 21).

See further, BAPTISM; LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC, II, 5.

LITERATURE.

James Quinter, Triune Immersion as the Apostolic Form of Christian Baptism; C. F. Yoder, God’s Means of Grace, Brethren Pub. House, Elgin, Ill., U.S.A.; Smith, Dict. of Christian Antiquities; Hastings, ERE; Bible Dicts.; Church Fathers; Church Histories, and Histories of Baptism.

Daniel Webster Kurtz

TRINITY, 1

trin’-i-ti

1. The Term "Trinity"

2. Purely a Revealed Doctrine

3. No Rational Proof of It

4. Finds Support in Reason

5. Not Clearly Revealed in the Old Testament

6. Prepared for in the Old Testament

7. Presupposed Rather Than Inculcated in the New Testament

8. Revealed in Manifestation of Son and Spirit

9. Implied in the Whole New Testament

10. Conditions the Whole Teaching of Jesus

11. Father and Son in Johannine Discourses

12. Spirit in Johannine Discourses

13. The Baptismal Formula

14. Genuineness of Baptismal Formula

15. Paul’s Trinitarianism

16. Conjunction of the Three in Paul

17. Trinitarianism of Other New Testament Writers

18. Variations in Nomenclature

19. Implications of "Son" and "Spirit"

20. The Question of Subordination

21. Witness of the Christian Consciousness

22. Formulation of the Doctrine

LITERATURE

1. The Term "Trinity":

The term "Trinity" is not a Biblical term, and we are not using Biblical language when we define what is expressed by it as the doctrine that there is one only and true God, but in the unity of the Godhead there are three coeternal and coequal Persons, the same in substance but distinct in subsistence. A doctrine so defined can be spoken of as a Biblical doctrine only on the principle that the sense of Scripture is Scripture. And the definition of a Biblical doctrine in such un-Biblical language can be justified only on the principle that it is better to preserve the truth of Scripture than the words of Scripture. The doctrine of the Trinity lies in Scripture in solution; when it is crystallized from its solvent it does not cease to be Scriptural, but only comes into clearer view. Or, to speak without figure, the doctrine of the Trinity is given to us in Scripture, not in formulated definition, but in fragmentary allusions; when we assemble the disjecta membra into their organic unity, we are not passing from Scripture, but entering more thoroughly into the meaning of Scripture. We may state the doctrine in technical terms, supplied by philosophical reflection; but the doctrine stated is a genuinely Scriptural doctrine.

2. Purely a Revealed Doctrine:

In point of fact, the doctrine of the Trinity is purely a revealed doctrine. That is to say, it embodies a truth which has never been discovered, and is indiscoverable, by natural reason. With all his searching, man has not been able to find out for himself the deepest things of God. Accordingly, ethnic thought has never attained a Trinitarian conception of God, nor does any ethnic religion present in its representations of the divine being any analogy to the doctrine of the Trinity.

Triads of divinities, no doubt, occur in nearly all polytheistic religions, formed under very various influences. Sometimes, as in the Egyptian triad of Osiris. Isis and Horus, it is the analogy of the human family with its father, mother and son which lies at their basis. Sometimes they are the effect of mere syncretism, three deities worshipped in different localities being brought together in the common worship of all. Sometimes, as in the Hindu triad of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, they represent the cyclic movement of a pantheistic evolution, and symbolize the three stages of Being, Becoming and Dissolution. Sometimes they are the result apparently of nothing more than an odd human tendency to think in threes, which has given the number three widespread standing as a sacred number (so H. Usener). It is no more than was to be anticipated, that one or another of these triads should now and again be pointed to as the replica (or even the original) of the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. Gladstone found the Trinity in the Homeric mythology, the trident of Poseidon being its symbol. Hegel very naturally found it in the Hindu Trimurti, which indeed is very like his pantheizing notion of what the Trinity is. Others have perceived it in the Buddhist Triratna (Soderblom); or (despite their crass dualism) in some speculations of Parseeism; or, more frequently, in the notional triad of Platonism (e.g. Knapp); while Jules Martin is quite sure that it is present in Philo’s neo-Stoical doctrine of the "powers," especially when applied to the explanation of Abraham’s three visitors. Of late years, eyes have been turned rather to Babylonia; and H. Zimmern finds a possible forerunner of the Trinity in a Father, Son,

and Intercessor, which he discovers in its mythology. It should be needless to say that none of these triads has the slightest resemblance to the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. The Christian doctrine of the Trinity embodies much more than the notion of "threeness," and beyond their "threeness" these triads have nothing in common with it.

3. No Rational Proof of It:

As the doctrine of the Trinity is indiscoverable by reason, so it is incapable of proof from reason. There are no analogies to it in Nature, not even in the spiritual nature of man, who is made in the image of God. In His trinitarian mode of being, God is unique; and, as there is nothing in the universe like Him in this respect, so there is nothing which can help us to comprehend Him. Many attempts have, nevertheless, been made to construct a rational proof of the Trinity of the God head. Among these there are two which are particularly attractive, and have therefore been put forward again and again by speculative thinkers through all the Christian ages. These are derived from the implications, in the one case, of self-consciousness; in the other, of love. Both self-consciousness and love, it is said, demand for their very existence an object over against which the self stands as subject. If we conceive of God as self-conscious and loving, therefore, we cannot help conceiving of Him as embracing in His unity some form of plurality. From this general position both arguments have been elaborated, however, by various thinkers in very varied forms.

The former of them, for example, is developed by a great 17th-century theologian—Bartholomew Keckermann (1614)—as follows: God is self-conscious thought; and God’s thought must have a perfect object, existing eternally before it; this object to be perfect must be itself God; and as God is one, this object which is God must be the God that is one. It is essentially the same argument which is popularized in a famous paragraph (section 73) of Lessing’s The Education of the Human Race. Must not God have an absolutely perfect representation of Himself—that is, a representation in which everything that is in Him is found? And would everything that is in God be found in this representation if His necessary reality were not found in it? If everything, everything without exception, that is in God is to be found in this representation, it cannot, therefore, remain a mere empty image, but must be an actual duplication of God. It is obvious that arguments like this prove too much. If God’s representation of Himself, to be perfect, must possess the same kind of reality that He Himself possesses, it does not seem easy to deny that His representations of everything else must possess objective reality. And this would be as much as to say that the eternal objective coexistence of all that God can conceive is given in the very idea of God; and that is open pantheism. The logical flaw lies in including in the perfection of a representation qualities which are not proper to representations, however perfect. A perfect representation must, of course, have all the reality proper to a representation; but objective reality is so little proper to a representation that a representation acquiring it would cease to be a representation. This fatal flaw is not transcended, but only covered up, when the argument is compressed, as it is in most of its modern presentations, in effect to the mere assertion that the condition of self-consciousness is a real distinction between the thinking subject and the thought object, which, in God’s case, would be between the subject ego and the object ego. Why, however, we should deny to God the power of self-contemplation enjoyed by every finite spirit, save at the cost of the distinct hypostatizing of the contemplant and the contemplated self, it is hard to understand. Nor is it always clear that what we get is

a distinct hypostatization rather than a distinct substantializing of the contemplant and contemplated ego: not two persons in the Godhead so much as two Gods. The discovery of the third hypostasis—the Holy Spirit—remains meanwhile, to all these attempts rationally to construct a Trinity in the Divine Being, a standing puzzle which finds only a very artificial solution.

The case is much the same with the argument derived from the nature of love. Our sympathies go out to that old Valentinian writer—possibly it was Valentinus himself—who reasoned—perhaps he was the first so to reason—that "God is all love," "but love is not love unless there be an object of love." And they go out more richly still to Augustine, when, seeking a basis, not for a theory of emanations, but for the doctrine of the Trinity, he analyzes this love which God is into the triple implication of "the lover," "the loved" and "the love itself," and sees in this trinary of love an analogue of the Triune God. It requires, however, only that the argument thus broadly suggested should be developed into its details for its artificiality to become apparent. Richard of Victor works it out as follows: It belongs to the nature of amor that it should turn to another as caritas. This other, in God’s case, cannot be the world; since such love of the world would be inordinate. It can only be a person; and a person who is God’s equal in eternity, power and wisdom. Since, however, there cannot be two divine substances, these two divine persons must form one and the same substance. The best love cannot, however, confine itself to these two persons; it must become condilectio by the desire that a third should be equally loved as they love one another. Thus love, when perfectly conceived, leads necessarily to the Trinity, and since God is all He can be, this Trinity must be real. Modern writers (Sartorius, Schoberlein, J. Muller, Liebner, most lately R. H. Grutzmacher) do not seem to have essentially improved upon such a statement as this. And after all is said, it does not appear clear that God’s own all-perfect Being could not supply a satisfying object of His all-perfect love. To say that in its very nature love is self-communicative, and therefore implies an object other than self, seems an abuse of figurative language.

Perhaps the ontological proof of the Trinity is nowhere more attractively put than by Jonathan Edwards. The peculiarity of his presentation of it lies in an attempt to add plausibility to it by a doctrine of the nature of spiritual ideas or ideas of spiritual things, such as thought, love, fear, in general. Ideas of such things, he urges, are just repetitions of them, so that he who has an idea of any act of love, fear, anger or any other act or motion of the mind, simply so far repeats the motion in question; and if the idea be perfect and complete, the original motion of the mind is absolutely reduplicated. Edwards presses this so far that he is ready to contend that if a man could have an absolutely perfect idea of all that was in his mind at any past moment, he would really, to all intents and purposes, be over again what he was at that moment. And if he could perfectly contemplate all that is in his mind at any given moment, as it is and at the same time that it is there in its first and direct existence, he would really be two at that time, he would be twice at once: "The idea he has of himself would be himself again." This now is the case with the Divine Being. "God’s idea of Himself is absolutely perfect, and therefore is an express and perfect image of Him, exactly like Him in every respect. .... But that which is the express, perfect image of God and in every respect like HIm is God, to all intents and purposes, because there is nothing wanting: there is nothing in the Deity that renders it the Deity but what has something exactly answering to it in this image, which will therefore also render that the Deity." The Second Person of the Trinity being thus attained, the argument advances. "The Godhead being thus begotten of God’s loving (having?) an idea of Himself and showing forth in a distinct Subsistence or Person in that idea, there proceeds a most pure

act, and an infinitely holy and sacred energy arises between the Father and the Son in mutually loving and delighting in each other. .... The Deity becomes all act, the divine essence itself flows out and is as it were breathed forth in love and joy. So that the Godhead therein stands forth in yet another manner of Subsistence, and there proceeds the Third Person in the Trinity, the Holy Spirit, namely, the Deity in act, for there is no other act but the act of the will." The inconclusiveness of the reasoning lies on the surface. The mind does not consist in its states, and the repetition of its states would not, therefore, duplicate or triplicate it. If it did, we should have a plurality of Beings, not of Persons in one Being. Neither God's perfect idea of Himself nor His perfect love of Himself reproduces Himself. He differs from His idea and His love of Himself precisely by that which distinguishes His Being from His acts. When it is said, then, that there is nothing in the Deity which renders it the Deity but what has something answering to it in its image of itself, it is enough to respond—except the Deity itself. What is wanting to the image to make it a second Deity is just objective reality.

4. Finds Support in Reason:

Inconclusive as all such reasoning is, however, considered as rational demonstration of the reality of the Trinity, it is very far from possessing no value. It carries home to us in a very suggestive way the superiority of the Trinitarian conception of God to the conception of Him as an abstract monad, and thus brings important rational support to the doctrine of the Trinity, when once that doctrine has been given us by revelation. If it is not quite possible to say that we cannot conceive of God as eternal self-consciousness and eternal love, without conceiving Him as a Trinity, it does seem quite necessary to say that when we conceive Him as a Trinity, new fullness, richness, force are given to our conception of Him as a self-conscious, loving Being, and therefore we conceive Him more adequately than as a monad, and no one who has ever once conceived Him as a Trinity can ever again satisfy himself with a monadistic conception of God. Reason thus not only performs the important negative service to faith in the Trinity, of showing the self-consistency of the doctrine and its consistency with other known truth, but brings this positive rational support to it of discovering in it the only adequate conception of God as self-conscious spirit and living love. Difficult, therefore, as the idea of the Trinity in itself is, it does not come to us as an added burden upon our intelligence; it brings us rather the solution of the deepest and most persistent difficulties in our conception of God as infinite moral Being, and illuminates, enriches and elevates all our thought of God. It has accordingly become a commonplace to say that Christian theism is the only stable theism. That is as much as to say that theism requires the enriching conception of the Trinity to give it a permanent hold upon the human mind—the mind finds it difficult to rest in the idea of an abstract unity for its God; and that the human heart cries out for the living God in whose Being there is that fullness of life for which the conception of the Trinity alone provides. 5. Not Clearly Revealed in the Old Testament:

So strongly is it felt in wide circles that a Trinitarian conception is essential to a worthy idea of God, that there is abroad a deep-seated unwillingness to allow that God could ever have made Himself known otherwise than as a Trinity. From this point of view it is inconceivable that the Old Testament revelation should know nothing of the Trinity. Accordingly, I. A. Dorner, for example, reasons thus: "If, however—and this is the faith of universal Christendom—a living idea of God must be thought in some way after a Trinitarian fashion, it must be antecedently probable that traces of the Trinity cannot be lacking in the

Old Testament, since its idea of God is a living or historical one." Whether there really exist traces of the idea of the Trinity in the Old Testament, however, is a nice question. Certainly we cannot speak broadly of the revelation of the doctrine of the Trinity in the Old Testament. It is a plain matter of fact that none who have depended on the revelation embodied in the Old Testament alone have ever attained to the doctrine of the Trinity. It is another question, however, whether there may not exist in the pages of the Old Testament turns of expression or records of occurrences in which one already acquainted with the doctrine of the Trinity may fairly see indications of an underlying implication of it. The older writers discovered intimations of the Trinity in such phenomena as the plural form of the divine name ‘Elohim, the occasional employment with reference to God of plural pronouns ("Let us make man in our image," Ge 1:26; 3:22; 11:7; Isa 6:8), or of plural verbs (Ge 20:13; 35:7), certain repetitions of the name of God which seem to distinguish between God and God (Ge 19:27; Ps 45:6,7; 110:1; Ho 1:7), threefold liturgical formulas (De 16:4; Nu 6:24,26; Isa 6:3), a certain tendency to hypostatize the conception of Wisdom (Pr 8), and especially the remarkable phenomena connected with the appearances of the Angel of Yahweh (Ge 16:2-13; 22:11,16; 31:11,13; 48:15,16; Ex 3:2,4,5; Jud 13:20-22). The tendency of more recent authors is to appeal, not so much to specific texts of the Old Testament, as to the very "organism of revelation" in the Old Testament, in which there is perceived an underlying suggestion "that all things owe their existence and persistence to a threefold cause," both with reference to the first creation, and, more plainly, with reference to the second creation. Passages like Ps 33:6; Isa 61:1; 63:9-12; Hag 2:5,6, in which God and His Word and His Spirit are brought together, co-causes of effects, are adduced. A tendency is pointed out to hypostatize the Word of God on the one hand (e.g. Ge 1:3; Ps 33:6; 107:20; 119:87; 147:15-18; Isa 55:11); and, especially in Ezekiel and the later Prophets, the Spirit of God, on the other (e.g. Ge 1:2; Isa 48:16; 63:10; Eze 2:2; 8:3; Zec 7:12). Suggestions—in Isaiah for instance (7:14; 9:6)—of the Deity of the Messiah are appealed to. And if the occasional occurrence of plural verbs and pronouns referring to God, and the plural form of the name ‘Elohim, are not insisted upon as in themselves evidence of a multiplicity in the Godhead, yet a certain weight is lent them as witnesses that "the God of revelation is no abstract unity, but the living, true God, who in the fullness of His life embraces the highest variety" (Bavinck). The upshot of it all is that it is very generally felt that, somehow, in the Old Testament development of the idea of God there is a suggestion that the Deity is not a simple monad, and that thus a preparation is made for the revelation of the Trinity yet to come. It would seem clear that we must recognize in the Old Testament doctrine of the relation of God to His revelation by the creative Word and the Spirit, at least the germ of the distinctions in the Godhead afterward fully made known in the Christian revelation. And we can scarcely stop there. After all is said, in the light of the later revelation, the Trinitarian interpretation remains the most natural one of the phenomena which the older writers frankly interpreted as intimations of the Trinity; especially of those connected with the descriptions of tile Angel of Yahweh, no doubt, but also even of such a form of expression as meets us in the "Let us make man in our image" of Ge 1:26—for surely 1:27: "And God created man in his own image," does not encourage us to take the preceding verse as announcing that man was to be created in the image of the angels. This is not an illegitimate reading of New Testament ideas back into the text of the Old Testament; it is only reading the text of the Old Testament under the illumination of the New Testament revelation. The Old Testament may be likened to a chamber richly furnished but dimly lighted; the introduction of light brings into it nothing which was not in it before; but it brings out into clearer view much of what is in it but was only dimly or even not at all perceived before. The mystery of the Trinity is not revealed in the Old Testament; but the mystery of the Trinity

underlies the Old Testament revelation, and here and there almost comes into view. Thus, the Old Testament revelation of God is not corrected by the fuller revelation which follows it, but only perfected, extended and enlarged.

6. Prepared for in the Old Testament:

It is an old saying that what becomes patent in the New Testament was latent in the Old Testament. And it is important that the continuity of the revelation of God contained in the two Testaments should not be overlooked or obscured. If we find some difficulty in perceiving for ourselves, in the Old Testament, definite points of attachment for the revelation of the Trinity, we cannot help perceiving with great clearness in the New Testament abundant evidence that its writers felt no incongruity whatever between their doctrine of the Trinity and the Old Testament conception of God. The New Testament writers certainly were not conscious of being "setters forth of strange gods." To their own apprehension they worshipped and proclaimed just the God of Israel; and they laid no less stress than the Old Testament itself upon His unity (Joh 17:3; 1Co 8:4; 1Ti 2:5). They do not, then, place two new gods by the side of Yahweh, as alike with Him to be served and worshipped; they conceive Yahweh as Himself at once Father, Son and Spirit. In presenting this one Yahweh as Father, Son and Spirit, they do not even betray any lurking feeling that they are making innovations. Without apparent misgiving they take over Old Testament passages and apply them to Father, Son and Spirit indifferently. Obviously they understand themselves, and wish to be understood, as setting forth in the Father, Son and Spirit just the one God that the God of the Old Testament revelation is; and they are as far as possible from recognizing any breach between themselves and the Fathers in presenting their enlarged conception of the Divine Being. This may not amount to saying that they saw the doctrine of the Trinity everywhere taught in the Old Testament. It certainly amounts to saying that they saw the Triune God whom they worshipped in the God of the Old Testament revelation, and felt no incongruity in speaking of their Triune God in the terms of the Old Testament revelation. The God of the Old Testament was their God, and their God was a Trinity, and their sense of the identity of the two was so complete that no question as to it was raised in their minds.

7. Presupposed Rather Than Inculcated in the New Testament:

The simplicity and assurance with which the New Testament writers speak of God as a Trinity have, however, a further implication. If they betray no sense of novelty in so speaking of Him, this is undoubtedly in part because it was no longer a novelty so to speak of Him. It is clear, in other words, that, as we read the New Testament, we are not witnessing the birth of a new conception of God. What we meet with in its pages is a firmly established conception of God underlying and giving its tone to the whole fabric. It is not in a text here and there that the New Testament bears its testimony to the doctrine of the Trinity. The whole book is Trinitarian to the core; all its teaching is built on the assumption of the Trinity; and its allusions to the Trinity are frequent, cursory, easy and confident. It is with a view to the cursoriness of the allusions to it in the New Testament that it has been remarked that "the doctrine of the Trinity is not so much heard as overheard in the statements of Scripture." It would be more exact to say that it is not so much inculcated as presupposed. The doctrine of the Trinity does not appear in the New Testament in the making, but as already made. It takes its place in its pages, as Gunkel phrases it, with

an air almost of complaint, already "in full completeness" (vollig fertig), leaving no trace of its growth. "There is nothing more wonderful in the history of human thought," says Sanday, with his eye on the appearance of the doctrine of the Trinity in the New Testament, "than the silent and imperceptible way in which this doctrine, to us so difficult, took its place without struggle—and without controversy—among accepted Christian truths." The explanation of this remarkable phenomenon is, however, simple. Our New Testament is not a record of the development of the doctrine or of its assimilation. It everywhere presupposes the doctrine as the fixed possession of the Christian community; and the process by which it became the possession of the Christian community lies behind the New Testament.

8. Revealed in Manifestation of Son and Spirit:

We cannot speak of the doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, if we study exactness of speech, as revealed in the New Testament, any more than we can speak of it as revealed in the Old Testament. The Old Testament was written before its revelation; the New Testament after it. The revelation itself was made not in word but in deed. It was made in the incaration of God the Son, and the outpouring of God the Holy Spirit. The relation of the two Testaments to this revelation is in the one case that of preparation for it, and in the other that of product of it. The revelation itself is embodied just in Christ and the Holy Spirit. This is as much as to say that the revelation of the Trinity was incidental to, and the inevitable effect of, the accomplishment of redemption. It was in the coming of the Son of God in the likeness of sinful flesh to offer Himself a sacrifice for sin; and in the coming of the Holy Spirit to convict the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment, that the Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead was once for all revealed to men. Those who knew God the Father, who loved them and gave His own Son to die for them; and the Lord Jesus Christ, who loved them and delivered Himself up an offering and sacrifice for them; and the Spirit of Grace, who loved them and dwelt within them a power not themselves, making for righteousness, knew the Triune God and could not think or speak of God otherwise than as triune. The doctrine of the Trinity, in other words, is simply the modification wrought in the conception of the one only God by His complete revelation of Himself in the redemptive process. It necessarily waited, therefore, upon the completion of the redemptive process for its revelation, and its revelation, as necessarily, lay complete in the redemptive process.

From this central fact we may understand more fully several circumstances connected with the revelation of the Trinity to which allusion has been made. We may from it understand, for example, why the Trinity was not revealed in the Old Testament. It may carry us a little way to remark, as it has been customary to remark since the time of Gregory of Nazianzus, that it was the task of the Old Testament revelation to fix firmly in the minds and hearts of the people of God the great fundamental truth of the unity of the Godhead; and it would have been dangerous to speak to them of the plurality within this unity until this task had been fully accomplished. The real reason for the delay in the revelation of the Trinity, however, is grounded in the secular development of the redemptive purpose of God: the times were ripe for the revelation of the Trinity in the unity of the Godhead until the fullness of the time had come for God to send forth His Son unto redemption, and His Spirit unto sanctification. The revelation in word must needs wait upon the revelation in fact, to which it brings its necessary explanation, no doubt, but from which also it derives its own entire significance and value. The revelation of a Trinity in the divine unity as a mere abstract truth without relation to manifested fact, and without significance to

the development of the kingdom of God, would have been foreign to the whole method of the divine procedure as it lies exposed to us in the pages of Scripture. Here the working-out of the divine purpose supplies the fundamental principle to which all else, even the progressive stages of revelation itself, is subsidiary; and advances in revelation are ever closely connected with the advancing accomplishment of the redemptive purpose. We may understand also, however, from the same central fact, why it is that the doctrine of the Trinity lies in the New Testament rather in the form of allusions than in express teaching, why it is rather everywhere presupposed, coming only here and there into incidental expression, than formally inculcated. It is because the revelation, having been made in the actual occurrences of redemption, was already the common property of all Christian hearts. In speaking and writing to one another, Christians, therefore, rather spoke out of their common Trinitarian consciousness, and reminded one another of their common fund of belief, than instructed one another in what was already the common property of all. We are to look for, and we shall find, in the New Testament allusions to the Trinity, rather evidence of how the Trinity, believed in by all, was conceived by the authoritative teachers of the church, than formal attempts, on their part, by authoritative declarations, to bring the church into the understanding that God is a Trinity.

9. Implied in the Whole New Testament:

The fundamental proof that God is a Trinity is supplied thus by the fundamental revelation of the Trinity in fact: that is to say, in the incarnation of God the Son and the outpouring of God the Holy Spirit. In a word, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are the fundamental proof of the doctrine of the Trinity. This is as much as to say that all the evidence of whatever kind, and from whatever source derived, that Jesus Christ is God manifested in the flesh, and that the Holy Spirit is a Divine Person, is just so much evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity; and that when we go to the New Testament for evidence of the Trinity we are to seek it, not merely in the scattered allusions to the Trinity as such, numerous and instructive as they are, but primarily in the whole mass of evidence which the New Testament provides of the Deity of Christ and the divine personality of the Holy Spirit. When we have said this, we have said in effect that the whole mass of the New Testament is evidence for the Trinity. For the New Testament is saturated with evidence of the Deity of Christ and the divine personality of the Holy Spirit, Precisely what the New Testament is, is the documentation of the religion of the incarnate Son and of the outpoured Spirit, that is to say, of the religion of the Trinity, and what we mean by the doctrine of the Trinity is nothing but the formulation in exact language of the conception of God presupposed in the religion of the incarnate Son and outpoured Spirit. We may analyze this conception and adduce proof for every constituent element of it from the New Testament declarations. We may show that the New Testament everywhere insists on the unity of the Godhead; that it constantly recognizes the Father as God, the Son as God and the Spirit as God; and that it cursorily presents these three to us as distinct Persons. It is not necessary, however, to enlarge here on facts so obvious. We may content ourselves with simply observing that to the New Testament there is but one only living and true God; but that to it Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit are each God in the fullest sense of the term; and yet Father, Son and Spirit stand over against each other as I, and Thou, and He. In this composite fact the New Testament gives us the doctrine of the Trinity. For the doctrine of the Trinity is but the statement in wellguarded language of this composite fact. Through out the whole course of the many efforts to formulate the doctrine exactly, which have followed one another during the entire history of the church, indeed, the

principle which has ever determined the result has always been determination to do justice in conceiving the relations of God the Father, God the Son and God the Spirit, on the one hand to the unity of God, and, on the other, to the true Deity of the Son and Spirit and their distinct personalities. When we have said these three things, then—that there is but one God, that the Father and the Son and the Spirit is each God, that the Father and the Son and the Spirit is each a distinct person—we have enunciated the doctrine of the Trinity in its completeness.

That this doctrine underlies the whole New Testament as its constant presupposition and determines everywhere its forms of expression is the primary fact to be noted. We must not omit explicitly to note, however, that it now and again also, as occasion arises for its incidental enunciation, comes itself to expression in more or less completeness of statement. The passages in which the three Persons of the Trinity are brought together are much more numerous than, perhaps, is generally supposed; but it should be recognized that the formal collocation of the elements of the doctrine naturally is relatively rare in writings which are occasional in their origin and practical rather than doctrinal in their immediate purpose. The three Persons already come into view as Divine Persons in the annunciation of the birth of our Lord: ‘The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee,’ said the angel to Mary, ‘and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee: wherefore also the holy thing which is to be born shall be called the Son of God’ (Lu 1:35 margin; compare Mt 1:18 ff). Here the Holy Ghost is the active agent in the production of an effect which is also ascribed to the power of the Most High, and the child thus brought into the world is given the great designation of "Son of God." The three Persons are just as clearly brought before us in the account of Matthew (1:18 ff), though the allusions to them are dispersed through a longer stretch of narrative, in the course of which the Deity of the child is twice intimated (1:21: ‘It is He that shall save His people from their sins’; 1:23: ‘They shall call His name Immanuel; which is, being interpreted, God-with-us’) In the baptismal scene which finds record by all the evangelists at the opening of Jesus’ ministry (Mt 3:16,17; Mr 1:10,11; Lu 3:21,22; Joh 1:32-34), the three Persons are thrown up to sight in a dramatic picture in which the Deity of each is strongly emphasized. From the open heavens the Spirit descends in visible form, and ‘a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my Son, the Beloved, in whom I am well pleased.’ Thus care seems to have been taken to make the advent of the Son of God into the world the revelation also of the Triune God, that the minds of men might as smoothly as possible adjust themselves to the preconditions of the divine redemption which was in process of being wrought out.

10. Conditions the Whole Teaching of Jesus:

With this as a starting-point, the teaching of Jesus is conditioned throughout in a Trinitarian way. He has much to say of God His Father, from whom as His Son He is in some true sense distinct, and with whom He is in some equally true sense one. And He has much to say of the Spirit, who represents Him as He represents the Father, and by whom He works as the Father works by Him. It is not merely in the Gospel of John that such representations occur in the teaching of Jesus. In the Synoptics, too, Jesus claims a Sonship to God which is unique (Mt 11:27; 24:36; Mr 13:32; Lu 10:22; in the following passages the title of "Son of God" is attributed to Him and accepted by Him: Mt 4:6; 8:29; 14:33; 27:40,43,44; Mr 3:11; 12:6-8; 15:39; Lu 4:41; 22:70; compare Joh 1:34,49; 9:35; 11:27), and which involves an absolute community between the two in knowledge, say, and power: both Matthew (11:27) and Luke (10:22) record His great declaration that He knows the Father and the Father knows Him with perfect mutual

knowledge: "No one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son." In the Synoptics, too, Jesus speaks of employing the Spirit of God Himself for the performance of His works, as if the activities of God were at His disposal: "I by the Spirit of God"—or as Luke has it, "by the finger of God—cast out demons" (Mt 12:28; Lu 11:20; compare the promise of the Spirit in Mr 13:11; Lu 12:12).

11. Father and Son in Johannine Discourses:

It is in the discourses recorded in John, however, that Jesus most copiously refers to the unity of Himself, as the Son, with the Father, and to the mission of the Spirit from Himself as the dispenser of the divine activities. Here He not only with great directness declares that He and the Father are one (10:30; compare 17:11,21,22,25) with a unity of interpenetration ("The Father is in me, and I in the Father," 10:38; compare 16:10,11), so that to have seen Him was to have seen the Father (14:9; compare 15:21); but He removes all doubt as to the essential nature of His oneness with the Father by explicitly asserting His eternity ("Before Abraham was born, I am," Joh 8:58), His co-eternity with God ("had with thee before the world was," 17:5; compare 17:18; 6:62), His eternal participation in the divine glory itself ("the glory which I had with thee," in fellowship, community with Thee "before the world was," 17:5). So clear is it that in speaking currently of Himself as God's Son (5:25; 9:35; 11:4; compare 10:36), He meant, in accordance with the underlying significance of the idea of sonship in Semitic speech (founded on the natural implication that whatever the father is that the son is also; compare 16:15; 17:10), to make Himself, as the Jews with exact appreciation of His meaning perceived, "equal with God" (5:18), or, to put it brusquely, just "God" (10:33). How He, being thus equal or rather identical with God, was in the world, He explains as involving a coming forth (exelthon) on His part, not merely from the presence of God (apo, 16:30; compare 13:3) or from fellowship with God (para, 16:27; 17:8), but from out of God Himself (ek, 8:42; 16:28). And in the very act of thus asserting that His eternal home is in the depths of the Divine Being, He throws up, into as strong an emphasis as stressed pronouns can, convey, His personal distinctness from the Father. 'If God were your Father,' says Hebrews (8:42), 'ye would love me: for I came forth and am come out of God; for neither have I come of myself, but it was He that sent me.' Again, He says (Joh 16:26,27): 'In that day ye shall ask in my name: and I say not unto you that I will make request of the Father for you; for the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that it was from fellowship with the Father that I came forth; I came from out of the Father, and have come into the world.' Less pointedly, but still distinctly, He says again (Joh 17:8): They know of a truth that it was from fellowship with Thee that I came forth, and they believed that it was Thou that didst send me.' It is not necessary to illustrate more at large a form of expression so characteristic of the discourses of our Lord recorded by Joh that it meets us on every page: a form of expression which combines a clear implication of a unity of Father and Son which is identity of Being, and an equally clear implication of a distinction of Person between them such as allows not merely for the play of emotions between them, as, for instance, of love (Joh 17:24; compare 15:9 (3:35); 14:31), but also of an action and reaction upon one another which argues a high measure, if not of exteriority, yet certainly of exteriorization. Thus, to instance only one of the most outstanding facts of our Lord's discourses (not indeed confined to those in John's Gospel, but found also in His sayings recorded in the Synoptists, as e.g. Lu 4:43 (compare parallel Mr 1:38); Lu 9:48; 10:16; 4:34; 5:32; 7:19; 19:10), He continually represents Himself as on the one hand sent by God, and as, on the other, having come forth

from the Father (e.g. Joh 8:42; 10:36; 17:3; 5:23, et saepe).

12. Spirit in Johannine Discourses:

It is more important to point out that these phenomena of interrelationship are not confined to the Father and Son, but are extended also to the Spirit. Thus, for example, in a context in which our Lord had emphasized in the strongest manner His own essential unity and continued interpenetration with the Father (" If ye had known me, ye would have known my Father also"; "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father"; "I am in the Father, and the Father in me"; "The Father abiding in me doeth his works," Joh 14:7,9,10), we read as follows (Joh 14:16-26): ‘And I will make request of the Father, and He shall ive you another (thus sharply distinguished from Our lord as a distinct Person) Advocate, that He may be with you forever, the Spirit of Truth .... He abideth with you and shall be in you. I will not leave you orphans; I come unto you. .... In that day ye shall know that I am in the Father. .... If a man love me, he will keep my word; and my Father will love him and we (that is, both Father and Son) will come unto him and make our abode with him. .... These things have I spoken unto you while abiding with you. But the Advocate, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.’ It would be impossible to speak more distinctly of three who were yet one. The Father, Son and Spirit are constantly distinguished from one another—the Son makes request of the Father, and the Father in response to this request gives an Advocate, "another" than the Son, who is sent in the Son’s name. And yet the oneness of these three is so kept in sight that the coming of this "another Advocate" is spoken of without embarrassment as the coming of the Son Himself (Joh 14:18,19,20,21), and indeed as the coming of the Father and the Son (Joh 14:23). There is a sense, then, in which, when Christ goes away, the Spirit comes in His stead; there is also a sense in which, when the Spirit comes, Christ comes in Him; and with Christ’s coming the Father comes too. There is a distinction between the Persons brought into view; and with it an identity among them; for both of which allowance must be made. The same phenomena meet us in other passages. Thus, we read again (Joh 15:26): But when there is come the Advocate whom I will send unto you from (fellowship with) the Father, the Spirit of Truth, which goeth forth from (fellowship with) the Father, He shall bear witness of me.’ In the compass of this single verse, it is intimated that the Spirit is personally distinct from the Son, and yet, like Him, has His eternal home (in fellowship) with the Father, from whom He, like the Son, comes forth for His saving work, being sent thereunto, however, not in this instance by the Father, but by the Son.

This last feature is even more strongly emphasized in yet another passage in which the work of the Spirit in relation to the Son is presented as closely parallel with the work of the Son in relation to the Father (Joh 16:5).‘ But now I go unto Him that sent me .... Nevertheless I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for, if I go not away the Advocate will not come unto you; but if I go I will send Him unto you. And He, after He is come, will convict the world .... of righteousness because I go to the Father and ye behold me no more. .... I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. Howbeit when He, the Spirit of truth is come, He shall guide you into all the truth; for He shall not speak from Himself; but what things soever He shall hear, He shall speak, and He shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for He shall take of mine and shall show it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine: therefore said I that He taketh of mine, and shall declare it

unto you.' Here the Spirit is sent by the Son, and comes in order to complete and apply the Son's work, receiving His whole commission from the Son—not, however, in derogation of the Father, because when we speak of the things of the Son, that is to speak of the things of the Father.

It is not to be said, of course, that the doctrine of the Trinity is formulated in passages like these, with which the whole mass of our Lord's discourses in John are strewn; but it certainly is presupposed in them, and that is, considered from the point of view of their probative force, even better. As we read we are kept in continual contact with three Persons who act, each as a distinct person, and yet who are in a deep, underlying sense, one. There is but one God—there is never any question of that—and yet this Son who has been sent into the world by God not only represents God but is God, and this Spirit whom the Son has in turn sent unto the world is also Himself God. Nothing could be clearer than that the Son and Spirit are distinct Persons, unless indeed it be that the Son of God is just God the Son and the Spirit of God just God the Spirit.

13. The Baptismal Formula:

Meanwhile, the nearest approach to a formal announcement of the doctrine of the Trinity which is recorded from our Lord's lips, or, perhaps we may say, which is to be found in the whole compass of the New Testament, has been preserved for us, not by John, but by one of the synoptists. It too, however, is only incidentally introduced, and has for its main object something very different from formulating the doctrine of the Trinity. It is embodied in the great commission which the resurrected Lord gave His disciples to be their "marching orders" "even unto the end of the world": "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Mt 28:19). In seeking to estimate the significance of this great declaration, we must bear in mind the high solemnity of the utterance, by which we are required to give its full value to every word of it. Its phrasing is in any event, however, remarkable. It does not say, "In the names (plural) of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost"; nor yet (what might be taken to be equivalent to that), "In the name of the Father, and in the name of the Son, and in the name of the Holy Ghost," as if we had to deal with three separate Beings. Nor, on the other hand does it say, "In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," as if "the Father, Son and Holy Ghost" might be taken as merely three designations of a single person. With stately impressiveness it asserts the unity of the three by combining them all within the bounds of the single Name; and then throws up into emphasis the distinctness of each by introducing them in turn with the repeated article: "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (the King James Version). These three, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, each stand in some clear sense over against the others in distinct personality: these three, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, all unite in some profound sense in the common participation of the one Name. Fully to comprehend the implication of this mode of statement, we must bear in mind, further, the significance of the term, "the name," and the associations laden with which it came to the recipients of this commission. For the Hebrew did not think of the name, as we are accustomed to do, as a mere external symbol; but rather as the adequate expression of the innermost being of its bearer. In His Name the Being of God finds expression; and the Name of God—"this glorious and fearful name, Yahweh thy God" (De 28:58)—was accordingly a most sacred thing, being indeed virtually equivalent to God Himself. It is no solecism, therefore, when we read (Isa 30:27), "Behold, the name of Yahweh cometh"; and the

parallelisms are most instructive when we read (Isa 59:19): ‘So shall they fear the Name of Yahweh from the west, and His glory from the rising of the sun; for He shall come as a stream pent in which the Spirit of Yahweh driveth.’ So pregnant was the implication of the Name, that it was possible for the term to stand absolutely, without adjunction of the name itself, as the sufficient representative of the majesty of Yahweh: it was a terrible thing to ‘blaspheme the Name’ (Le 24:11). All those over whom Yahweh’s Name was called were His, His possession to whom He owed protection. It is for His Name’s sake, therefore, that afflicted Judah cries to the Hope of Israel, the Saviour thereof in time of trouble: ‘O Yahweh, Thou art in the midst of us, and Thy Name is called upon us; leave us not’ (Jer 14:9); and His people find the appropriate expression of their deepest shame in the lament, ‘We have become as they over whom Thou never barest rule; as they upon whom Thy Name was not called’ (Isa 63:19); while the height of joy is attained in the cry, ‘Thy Name, Yahweh, God of Hosts, is called upon me’ (Jer 15:16; compare 2Ch 7:14; Da 9:18,19). When, therefore, our Lord commanded His disciples to baptize those whom they brought to His obedience "into the name of ...," He was using language charged to them with high meaning. He could not have been understood otherwise than as substituting for the Name of Yahweh this other Name "of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"; and this could not ‘possibly have meant to His disciples anything else than that Yahweh was now to be known to them by the new Name, of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The only alternative would have been that, for the community which He was rounding, Jesus was supplanting Yahweh by a new God; and this alternative is no less than monstrous. There is no alternative, therefore, to understanding Jesus here to be giving for His community a new Name to Yahweh, and that new Name to be the threefold Name of "the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Nor is there room for doubt that by "the Son" in this threefold Name, He meant just Himself with all the implications of distinct personality which this carries with it; and, of course, that further carries with it the equally distinct personality of "the Father" and "the Holy Ghost," with whom "the Son" is here associated, and from whom alike "the Son" is here distinguished. This is a direct ascription to Yahweh, the God of Israel, of a threefold personality, and is therewith the direct enunciation of the doctrine of the Trinity. We are not witnessing here the birth of the doctrine of the Trinity; that is presupposed. What we are witnessing is the authoritative announcement of the Trinity as the God of Christianity by its Founder, in one of the most solemn of His recorded declarations. Israel had worshipped the one only true God under the Name of Yahweh; Christians are to worship the same one only and true God under the Name of "the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost." This is the distinguishing characteristic of Christians; and that is as much as to say that the doctrine of the Trinity is, according to our Lord’s own apprehension of it, the distinctive mark of the religion which He founded.

14. Genuineness of Baptismal Formula:

A passage of such range of implication has, of course, not escaped criticism and challenge. An attempt which cannot be characterized as other than frivolous has even been made to dismiss it from the text of Matthew’s Gospel. Against this, the whole body of external evidence cries out; and the internal evidence is of itself not less decisive to the same effect. When the "universalism," "ecclesiasticism," and "high theology" of the passage are pleaded against its genuineness, it is forgotten that to the Jesus of Matthew there are attributed not only such parables as those of the Leaven and the Mustard Seed, but such declarations as those contained in 8:11,12; 21:43; 24:14; that in this Gospel alone is Jesus recorded as speaking familiarly about His church (16:18; 18:17); and that, after the great declaration of 11:27 if,

nothing remained in lofty attribution to be assigned to Him. When these same objections are urged against recognizing the passage as an authentic saying of Jesus own, it is quite obvious that the Jesus of the evangelists cannot be in mind. The declaration here recorded is quite in character with the Jesus of Matthew's Gospel, as has just been intimated; and no less with the Jesus of the whole New Testament transmission. It will scarcely do, first to construct a priori a Jesus to our own liking, and then to discard as "unhistorical" all in the New Testament transmission which would be unnatural to such a Jesus. It is not these discarded passages but our a priori Jesus which is unhistorical. In the present instance, moreover, the historicity of the assailed saying is protected by an important historical relation in which it stands. It is not merely Jesus who speaks out of a Trinitarian consciousness, but all the New Testament writers as well. The universal possession by. His followers of so firm a hold on such a doctrine requires the assumption that some such teaching as is here attributed to Him was actually contained in Jesus' instructions to His followers. Even had it not been attributed to Him in so many words by the record, we should have had to assume that some such declaration had been made by Him. In these circumstances, there can be no good reason to doubt that it was made by Him, when it is expressly attributed to Him by the record.

15. Paul's Trinitarianism:

When we turn from the discourses of Jesus to the writings of His followers with a view to observing how the assumption of the doctrine of the Trinity underlies their whole fabric also, we naturally go first of all to the letters of Paul. Their very mass is impressive; and the definiteness with which their composition within a generation of the death of Jesus may be fixed adds importance to them as historical witnesses. Certainly they leave nothing to be desired in the richness of their testimony to the Trinitarian conception of God which underlies them. Throughout the whole series, from 1 Thessalonians, which comes from about 52 AD, to 2 Timothy, which was written about 68 AD, the redemption, which it is their one business to proclaim and commend, and all the blessings which enter into it or accompany it are referred consistently to a threefold divine causation. Everywhere, throughout their pages, God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit appear as the joint objects of all religious adoration, and the conjunct source of all divine operations. In the freedom of the allusions which are made to them, now and again one alone of the three is thrown up into prominent view; but more often two of them are conjoined in thanksgiving or prayer; and not infrequently all three are brought together as the apostle strives to give some adequate expression to his sense of indebtedness to the divine source of all good for blessings received, or to his longing on behalf of himself or of his readers for further communion with the God of grace. It is regular for him to begin his Epistles with a prayer for "grace and peace" for his readers, "from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ," as the joint source of these divine blessings by way of eminence (Ro 1:7; 1Co 1:3; 2Co 1:2; Ga 1:3; Eph 1:2; Php 1:2; 2Th 1:2; 1Ti 1:2; 2Ti 1:2; Phm 1:3; compare 1Th 1:1). It is obviously no departure from this habit in the essence of the matter, but only in relative fullness of expression, when in the opening words of the Epistle to the Colossians, the clause "and the Lord Jesus Christ" is omitted, and we read merely: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father." So also it would have been no departure from it in the essence of the matter, but only in relative fullness of expression, if in any instance the name of the Holy Spirit had chanced to be adjoined to the other two, as in the single instance of 2Co 13:14 it is adjoined to them in the closing prayer for grace with which Paul ends his letters, and which ordinarily takes the simple form of, "the grace of our

Lord Jesus Christ be with you" (Ro 16:20; 1Co 16:23; Ga 6:18; Php 4:23; 1Th 5:28; 2Th 3:18; Phm 1:25; more expanded form, Eph 6:23,24; more Compressed, Col 4:18; 1Ti 6:21; 2Ti 4:22; Tit 3:15). Between these opening and closing passages the allusions to God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit are constant and most intricately interlaced. Paul's monotheism is intense: the first premise of all his thought on divine things is the unity of God (Ro 3:30; 1Co 8:4; Ga 3:20; Eph 4:6; 1Ti 2:5; compare Ro 16:22; 1Ti 1:17). Yet to him God the Father is no more God than the Lord Jesus Christ is God, or the Holy Spirit is God. The Spirit of God is to him related to God as the spirit of man is to man (1Co 2:11), and therefore if the Spirit of God dwells in us, that is God dwelling in us (Ro 8:10), and we are by that fact constituted temples of God (1Co 3:16). And no expression is too strong for him to use in order to assert the Godhead of Christ: He is "our great God" (Tit 2:13); He is "God over all" (Ro 9:5); and indeed it is expressly declared of Him that the "fulness of the Godhead, that is, everything that enters into Godhead and constitutes it Godhead, dwells in Him. In the very act of asserting his monotheism Paul takes our Lord up into this unique Godhead. "There is no God but one" he roundly asserts, and then illustrates and proves this assertion by remarking that the heathen may have "gods many, and lords many," but "to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him" (1Co 8:6). Obviously, this "one God, the Father," and "one Lord, Jesus Christ," are embraced together in the one God who alone is. Paul's conception of the one God, whom alone he worships, includes, in other words, a recognition that within the unity of His Being, there exists such a distinction of Persons as is given us in the "one God, the Father" and the "one Lord, Jesus Christ."

TRINITY, 2

16. Conjunction of the Three in Paul:

In numerous passages scattered through Paul's Epistles, from the earliest of them (1Th 1:2-5; 2Th 2:13,14) to the latest (Tit 3:4-6; 2Ti 1:3,13,14), all three Persons, God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, are brought together, in the most incidental manner, as co-sources of all the saving blessings which come to believers in Christ. A typical series of such passages may be found in Eph 2:18; 3:2-5,14,17; 4:4-6; 5:18-20. But the most interesting instances are offered to us perhaps by the Epistles to the Corinthians. In 1Co 12:4-6 Paul presents the abounding spiritual gifts with which the church was blessed in a threefold aspect, and connects these aspects with the three Divine Persons. "Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord. And there are diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all." It may be thought that there is a measure of what might almost be called artificiality in assigning the endowments of the church, as they are graces to the Spirit, as they are services to Christ, and as they are energizings to God. But thus there is only the more strikingly revealed the underlying Trinitarian conception as dominating the structure of the clauses: Paul clearly so writes, not because "gifts," "workings," "operations" stand out in his thought as greatly diverse things, but because God, the Lord, and the Spirit lie in the back of his mind constantly suggesting a threefold causality behind every manifestation of grace. The Trinity is alluded to rather than asserted; but it is so alluded to as to show that it constitutes the determining basis of all Paul's thought of the God of redemption. Even more instructive is 2Co 13:14, which has passed into general liturgical use in the churches as a benediction: "The grace of the

Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." Here the three highest redemptive blessings are brought together, and attached distributively to the three Persons of the Triune God. There is again no formal teaching of the doctrine of the Trinity; there is only another instance of natural speaking out of a Trinitarian consciousness. Paul is simply thinking of the divine source of these great blessings; but he habitually thinks of this divine source of redemptive blessings after a trinal fashion. He therefore does not say, as he might just as well have said, "The grace and love and communion of God be with you all," but "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all." Thus he bears, almost unconsciously but most richly, witness to the trinal composition of the Godhead as conceived by Him.

17. Trinitarianism of Other New Testament Writers:

The phenomena of Paul's Epistles are repeated in the other writings of the New Testament. In these other writings also it is everywhere assumed that the redemptive activities of God rest on a threefold source in God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit; and these three Persons repeatedly come forward together in the expressions of Christian hope or the aspirations of Christian devotion (e.g. Heb 2:3,4; 6:4-6; 10:29-31; 1Pe 1:2; 2:3-12; 4:13-19; 1Joh 5:4-8; Jude 1:20,21; Re 14-6). Perhaps as typical instances as any are supplied by the two following: "According to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 1:2); "Praying in the Holy Spirit, keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life" (Jude 1:20,21). To these may be added the highly symbolical instance from the Apocalypse: 'Grace to you and peace from Him which is and was and which is to come; and from the Seven Spirits which are before His throne; and from Jesus Christ, who is the faithful witness, the firstborn of the dead, and the ruler of the kings of the earth' (Re 1:4,5). Clearly these writers, too, write out of a fixed Trinitarian consciousness and bear their testimony to the universal understanding current in apostolical circles. Everywhere and by all it was fully understood that the one God whom Christians worshipped and from whom alone they expected redemption and all that redemption brought with it, included within His undiminished unity the three: God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit, whose activities relatively to one another are conceived as distinctly personal. This is the uniform and pervasive testimony of the New Testament, and it is the more impressive that it is given with such unstudied naturalness and simplicity, with no effort to distinguish between what have come to be called the ontological and the economical aspects of the Trinitarian distinctions, and indeed without apparent consciousness of the existence of such a distinction of aspects. Whether God is thought of in Himself or in His operations, the underlying conception runs unaffectedly into trinal forms.

18. Variations in Nomenclature:

It will not have escaped observation that the Trinitarian terminology of Paul and the other writers of the New Testament is not precisely identical with that of our Lord as recorded for us in His discourses. Paul, for example—and the same is true of the other New Testament writers (except John)—does not speak, as our Lord is recorded as speaking, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, so much as of God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit. This difference of terminology finds its account in large measure in the different relations in which the speakers stand to the Trinity. our Lord could not naturally speak of

Himself, as one of the Trinitarian Persons, by the designation of "the Lord," while the designation of "the Son," expressing as it does His consciousness of close relation, and indeed of exact similarity, to God, came naturally to His lips. But He was Paul's Lord; and Paul naturally thought and spoke of Him as such. In point of fact, "Lord" is one of Paul's favorite designations of Christ, and indeed has become with him practically a proper name for Christ, and in point of fact, his Divine Name for Christ. It is naturally, therefore, his Trinitarian name for Christ. Because when he thinks of Christ as divine he calls Him "Lord," he naturally, when he thinks of the three Persons together as the Triune God, sets Him as "Lord" by the side of God—Paul's constant name for "the Father"—and the Holy Spirit. Question may no doubt be raised whether it would have been possible for Paul to have done this, especially with the constancy with which he has done it, if, in his conception of it, the very essence of the Trinity were enshrined in the terms "Father" and "Son." Paul is thinking of the Trinity, to be sure, from the point of view of a worshipper, rather than from that of a systematizer. He designates the Persons of the Trinity therefore rather from his relations to them than from their relations to one another. He sees in the Trinity his God, his Lord, and the Holy Spirit who dwells in him; and naturally he so speaks currently of the three Persons. It remains remarkable, nevertheless, if the very essence of the Trinity were thought of by him as resident in the terms "Father," "Son," that in his numerous allusions to the Trinity in the Godhead, he never betrays any sense of this. It is noticeable also that in their allusions to the Trinity, there is preserved, neither in Paul nor in the other writers of the New Testament, the order of the names as they stand in our Lord's great declaration (Mt 28:19). The reverse order occurs, indeed, occasionally, as, for example, in 1Co 12:4-6 (compare Eph 4:4-6); and this may be understood as a climactic arrangement and so far a testimony to the order of Mt 28:19. But the order is very variable; and in the most formal enumeration of the three Persons, that of 2Co 13:14, it stands thus: Lord, God, Spirit. The question naturally suggests itself whether the order Father, Son, Spirit was especially significant to Paul and his fellow-writers of the New Testament. If in their conviction the very essence of the doctrine of the Trinity was embodied in this order, should we not anticipate that there should appear in their numerous allusions to the Trinity some suggestion of this conviction?

19. Implications of "Son" and "Spirit":

Such facts as these have a bearing upon the testimony of the New Testament to the interrelations of the Persons of the Trinity. To the fact of the Trinity—to the fact, that is, that in the unity of the Godhead there subsist three Persons, each of whom has his particular part in the working out of salvation—the New Testament testimony is clear, consistent, pervasive and conclusive. There is included in this testimony constant and decisive witness to the complete and undiminished Deity of each of these Persons; no language is too exalted to apply to each of them in turn in the effort to give expression to the writer's sense of His Deity: the name that is given to each is fully understood to be "the name that is above every name." When we attempt to press the inquiry behind the broad fact, however, with a view to ascertaining exactly how the New Testament writers conceive the three Persons to be related, the one to the other, we meet with great difficulties. Nothing could seem more natural, for example, than to assume that the mutual relations of the Persons of the Trinity are revealed in the designations, "the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit," which are given them by our Lord in the solemn formula of Mt 28:19. Our confidence in this assumption is somewhat shaken, however, when we observe, as we have just observed, that these designations are not carefully preserved in their allusions to the Trinity by the

writers of the New Testament at large, but are characteristic only of our Lord's allusions and those of John, whose modes of speech in general very closely resemble those of our Lord. Our confidence is still further shaken when we observe that the implications with respect to the mutual relations of the Trinitarian Persons, which are ordinarily derived from these designations, do not so certainly lie in them as is commonly supposed.

It may be very natural to see in the designation "Son" an intimation of subordination and derivation of Being, and it may not be difficult to ascribe a similar connotation to the term "Spirit." But it is quite certain that this was not the denotation of either term in the Semitic consciousness, which underlies the phraseology of Scripture; and it may even be thought doubtful whether it was included even in their remoter suggestions. What underlies the conception of sonship in Scriptural speech is just "likeness"; whatever the father is that the son is also. The emphatic application of the term "Son" to one of the Trinitarian Persons, accordingly, asserts rather His equality with the Father than His subordination to the Father; and if there is any implication of derivation in it, it would appear to be very distant. The adjunction of the adjective "only begotten" (Joh 1:14; 3:16-18; 1 Joh 4:9) need add only the idea of uniqueness, not of derivation (Ps 22:21; 25:16; 35:17; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:22 margin); and even such a phrase as "God only begotten" (Joh 1:18 margin) may contain no implication of derivation, but only of absolutely unique consubstantiality; as also such a phrase as 'the first-begotten of all creation' (Col 1:15) may convey no intimation of coming into being, but merely assert priority of existence. In like manner, the designation "Spirit of God" or "Spirit of Yahweh," which meets us frequently in the Old Testament, certainly does not convey the idea there either of derivation or of subordination, but is just the executive name of God—the designation of God from the point of view of His activity—and imports accordingly identity with God; and there is no reason to suppose that, in passing from the Old Testament to the New Testament, the term has taken on an essentially different meaning. It happens, oddly enough, moreover, that we have in the New Testament itself what amounts almost to formal definitions of the two terms "Son" and "Spirit," and in both cases the stress is laid on the notion of equality or sameness. In Joh 5:18 we read: 'On this account, therefore, the Jews sought the more to kill him, because, not only did he break the Sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal to God.' The point lies, of course, in the adjective "own." Jesus was, rightly, understood to call God "his own Father," that is, to use the terms "Father" and "Son" not in a merely figurative sense, as when Israel was called God's son, but in the real sense. And this was understood to be claiming to be all that God is. To be the Son of God in any sense was to be like God in that sense; to be God's own Son was to be exactly like God, to be "equal with God." Similarly, we read in 1Co 2:10,11: 'For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For who of men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth, save the Spirit of God.' Here the Spirit appears as the substrate of the divine self-consciousness, the principle of God's knowledge of Himself: He is, in a word, just God Himself in the innermost essence of His Being. As the spirit of man is the seat of human life, the very life of man itself, so the Spirit of God is His very life-element. How can He be supposed, then, to be subordinate to God, or to derive His Being from God? If, however, the subordination of the Son and Spirit to the Father in modes of subsistence and their derivation from the Father are not implicates of their designation as Son and Spirit, it will be hard to find in the New Testament compelling evidence of their subordination and derivation.

20. The Question of Surbordination:

There is, of course, no question that in "modes of operation," as it is technically called—that is to say, in the functions ascribed to the several persons of the Trinity in the redemptive process, and, more broadly, in the entire dealing of God with the world—the principle of subordination is clearly expressed. The Father is first, the Son is second, and the Spirit is third, in the operations of God as revealed to us in general, and very especially in those operations by which redemption is accomplished. Whatever the Father does, He does through the Son (Ro 2:16; 3:22; 5:1,11,17,21; Eph 1:5; 1Th 5:9; Tit 3:5) by the Spirit. The Son is sent by the Father and does His Father's will (Joh 6:38); the Spirit is sent by the Son and does not speak from Himself, but only takes of Christ's and shows it unto His people (Joh 17:7); and we have our Lord's own word for it that 'one that is sent is not greater than he that sent him' (Joh 13:16). In crisp decisiveness, our Lord even declares, indeed: 'My Father is greater than I' (Joh 14:28); and Paul tells us that Christ is God's, even as we are Christ's (1Co 3:23), and that as Christ is "the head of every man," so God is "the head of Christ" (1Co 11:3). But it is not so clear that the principle of subordination rules also in "modes of subsistence," as it is technically phrased; that is to say, in the necessary relation of the Persons of the Trinity to one another. The very richness and variety of the expression of their subordination, the one to the other, in modes of operation, create a difficulty in attaining certainty whether they are represented as also subordinate the one to the other in modes of subsistence. Question is raised in each case of apparent intimation of subordination in modes of subsistence, whether it may not, after all, be explicable as only another expression of subordination in modes of operation. It may be natural to assume that a subordination in modes of operation rests on a subordination in modes of subsistence; that the reason why it is the Father that sends the Son and the Son that sends the Spirit is that the Son is subordinate to the Father, and the Spirit to the Son. But we are bound to bear in mind that these relations of subordination in modes of operation may just as well be due to a convention, an agreement, between the Persons of the Trinity—a "Covenant" as it is technically called—by virtue of which a distinct function in the work of redemption is voluntarily assumed by each. It is eminently desirable, therefore, at the least, that some definite evidence of subordination in modes of subsistence should be discoverable before it is assumed. In the case of the relation of the Son to the Father, there is the added difficulty of the incarnation, in which the Son, by the assumption of a creaturely nature into union with Himself, enters into new relations with the Father of a definitely subordinate character. Question has even been raised whether the very designations of Father and Son may not be expressive of these new relations, and therefore without significance with respect to the eternal relations of the Persons so designated. This question must certainly be answered in the negative. Although, no doubt, in many of the instances in which the terms "Father" and "Son" occur, it would be possible to take them of merely economical relations, there ever remain some which are intractable to this treatment, and we may be sure that "Father" and "Son" are applied to their eternal and necessary relations. But these terms, as we have seen, do not appear to imply relations of first and second, superiority and subordination, in modes of subsistence; and the fact of the humiliation of the Son of God for His earthly work does introduce a factor into the interpretation of the passages which import His subordination to the Father, which throws doubt upon the inference from them of an eternal relation of subordination in the Trinity itself. It must at least be said that in the presence of the great New Testament doctrines of the Covenant of Redemption on the one hand, and of the Humiliation of the Son of God for His work's sake and of the Two Natures in the constitution of His Person as incarnated, on

the other, the difficulty of interpreting subordinationist passages of eternal relations between the Father and Son becomes extreme. The question continually obtrudes itself, whether they do not rather find their full explanation in the facts embodied in the doctrines of the Covenant, the Humiliation of Christ, and the Two Natures of His incarnated Person. Certainly in such circumstances it were thoroughly illegitimate to press such passages to suggest any subordination for the Son or the Spirit which would in any manner impair that complete identity with the Father in Being and that complete equality with the Father in powers which are constantly presupposed, and frequently emphatically, though only incidentally, asserted for them throughout the whole fabric of the New Testament.

21. Witness of the Christian Consciousness:

The Trinity of the Persons of the Godhead, shown in the incarnation and the redemptive work of God the Son, and the descent and saving work of God the Spirit, is thus everywhere assumed in the New Testament, and comes to repeated fragmentary but none the less emphatic and illuminating expression in its pages. As the roots of its revelation are set in the threefold divine causality of the saving process, it naturally finds an echo also in the consciousness of everyone who has experienced this salvation. Every redeemed soul, knowing himself reconciled with God through His Son, and quickened into newness of life by His Spirit, turns alike to Father, Son and Spirit with the exclamation of reverent gratitude upon his lips, "My Lord and my God!" If he could not construct the doctrine of the Trinity out of his consciousness of salvation, yet the elements of his consciousness of salvation are interpreted to him and reduced to order only by the doctrine of the Trinity which he finds underlying and giving their significance and consistency to the teaching of the Scriptures as to the processes of salvation. By means of this doctrine he is able to think clearly and consequently of his threefold relation to the saving God, experienced by him as Fatherly love sending a Redeemer, as redeeming love executing redemption, as saving love applying redemption: all manifestations in distinct methods and by distinct agencies of the one seeking and saving love of God. Without the doctrine of the Trinity, his conscious Christian life would be thrown into confusion and left in disorganization if not, indeed, given an air of unreality; with the doctrine of the Trinity, order, significance and reality are brought to every element of it. Accordingly, the doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of redemption, historically, stand or fall together. A Unitarian theology is commonly associated with a Pelagian anthropology and a Socinian soteriology. It is a striking testimony which is borne by E. Koenig (Offenbarungsbegriff des Altes Testament, 1882, I, 125): "I have learned that many cast off the whole history of redemption for no other reason than because they have not attained to a conception of the Triune God." It is in this intimacy of relation between the doctrines of the Trinity and redemption that the ultimate reason lies why the Christian church could not rest until it had attained a definite and well-compacted doctrine of the Trinity. Nothing else could be accepted as an adequate foundation for the experience of the Christian salvation. Neither the Sabellian nor the Arian construction could meet and satisfy the data of the consciousness of salvation, any more than either could meet and satisfy the data of the Scriptural revelation. The data of the Scriptural revelation might, to be sure, have been left unsatisfied: men might have found a modus vivendi with neglected, or even with perverted Scriptural teaching. But perverted or neglected elements of Christian experience are more clamant in their demands for attention and correction. The dissatisfied Christian consciousness necessarily searched the Scriptures, on the emergence of every new attempt to state the doctrine of the nature and relations of God, to see whether these things were true, and never

reached contentment until the Scriptural data were given their consistent formulation in a valid doctrine of the Trinity. Here too the heart of man was restless until it found its rest in the Triune God, the author, procurer and applier of salvation.

22. Formulation of the Doctrine:

The determining impulse to the formulation of the doctrine of the Trinity in the church was the church's profound conviction of the absolute Deity of Christ, on which as on a pivot the whole Christian conception of God from the first origins of Christianity turned. The guiding principle in the formulation of the doctrine was supplied by the Baptismal Formula announced by Jesus (Mt 28:19), from which was derived the ground-plan of the baptismal confessions and "rules of faith" which very soon began to be framed all over the church. It was by these two fundamental principia—the true Deity of Christ and the Baptismal Formula—that all attempts to formulate the Christian doctrine of God were tested, and by their molding power that the church at length found itself in possession of a form of statement which did full justice to the data of the redemptive revelation as reflected in the New Testament and the demands of the Christian heart under the experience of salvation.

In the nature of the case the formulated doctrine was of slow attainment. The influence of inherited conceptions and of current philosophies inevitably showed itself in the efforts to construe to the intellect the immanent faith of Christians. In the 2nd century the dominant neo-Stoic and neo-Platonic ideas deflected Christian thought into subordinationist channels, and produced what is known as the Logos-Christology, which looks upon the Son as a prolation of Deity reduced to such dimensions as comported with relations with a world of time and space; meanwhile, to a great extent, the Spirit was neglected altogether. A reaction which, under the name of Monarchianism, identified the Father, Son, and Spirit so completely that they were thought of only as different aspects or different moments in the life of the one Divine Person, called now Father, now Son, now Spirit, as His several activities came successively into view, almost succeeded in establishing itself in the 3rd century as the doctrine of the church at large. In the conflict between these two opposite tendencies the church gradually found its way, under the guidance of the Baptismal Formula elaborated into a "Rule of Faith," to a better and more well-balanced conception, until a real doctrine of the Trinity at length came to expression, particularly in the West, through the brilliant dialectic of Tertullian. It was thus ready at hand, when, in the early years of the 4th century, the Logos-Christology, in opposition to dominant Sabellian tendencies, ran to seed in what is known as Arianism, to which the Son was a creature, though exalted above all other creatures as their Creator and Lord; and the church was thus prepared to assert its settled faith in a Triune God, one in being, but in whose unity there subsisted three consubstantial Persons. Under the leadership of Athanasius this doctrine was proclaimed as the faith of the church at the Council of Nice in 325 AD, and by his strenuous labors and those of "the three great Cappadocians," the two Gregories and Basil, it gradually won its way to the actual acceptance of the entire church. It was at the hands of Augustine, however, a century later, that the doctrine thus become the church doctrine in fact as well as in theory, received its most complete elaboration and most carefully grounded statement. In the form which he gave it, and which is embodied in that "battle-hymn of the early church," the so-called Athanasian Creed, it has retained its place as the fit expression of the faith of the church as to the nature of its God until today. The language in which it is couched, even in this final declaration, still retains elements of

speech which owe their origin to the modes of thought characteristic of the Logos-Christology of the 2nd century, fixed in the nomenclature of the church by the Nicene Creed of 325 AD, though carefully guarded there against the subordinationism inherent in the Logos-Christology, and made the vehicle rather of the Nicene doctrines of the eternal generation of the Son and procession of the Spirit, with the consequent subordination of the Son and Spirit to the Father in modes of subsistence as well as of operation. In the Athanasian Creed, however, the principle of the equalization of the three Persons, which was already the dominant motive of the Nicene Creed—the homoousia—is so strongly emphasized as practically to push out of sight, if not quite out of existence, these remanent suggestions of derivation and subordination. It has been found necessary, nevertheless, from time to time, vigorously to reassert the principle of equalization, over against a tendency unduly to emphasize the elements of subordinationism which still hold a place thus in the traditional language in which the church states its doctrine of the Trinity. In particular, it fell to Calvin, in the interests of the true Deity of Christ—the constant motive of the whole body of Trinitarian thought—to reassert and make good the attribute of self-existence (autotheotos) for the Son. Thus Calvin takes his place, alongside of Tertullian, Athanasius and Augustine, as one of the chief contributors to the exact and vital statement of the Christian doctrine of the Triune God.

LITERATURE.

F. C. Baur, Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit Gottea, 3 volumes, Tubingen, 1841-43; Dionysius Petavius, De Trinitate (vol II, of De Theologicis Dogmaticis, Paris, 1647); G. Bull, A Defence of the Nicene Creed (1685), 2 volumes, Oxford, 1851; G. S. Faber, The Apostolicity of Trinitarianism, 2 volumes, 1832; Augustine, On the Holy Trinity (Volume III of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, 1-228), New York, 1887; Calvin, Institutes of the Christian Religion, I, chapter xiii; C. Hodge, Systematic Theology and Index, I, New York, 1873, 442-82; H. Bavinck, Gereformeerde Dogmatick(2), II, Kampen, 1908, 260-347 (gives excellent references to literature); S. Harris, God, Creator, and Lord of All, New York, 1896; R. Rocholl, Der christliche Gottesbegriff, Gottingen, 1900; W. F. Adeney, The Christian Conception of God, London, 1909, 215-46; J. Lebreton, Lea origines du dogme de la Trinite, Paris, 1910; J. C. K. Hofmann, Der Schriftbeweis(2), Nordlingen, 1857-60, I, 85-111; J. L. S. Lutz, Biblische Dogmatik, Pforzheim, 1817, 319-94; R. W. Landis, A Plea for the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, Philadelphia, 1832; E. H. Bickersteth, The Rock of Ages, etc., London, 1860, New York, 1861; E. Riggenbach, "Der trinitarische Taufbefehl, Mt 28:19" (in Schlatter and Cremer, Beitrage zur Forderung christlicher Theologie, 1903, VII; also 1906, X); F. J. Hall, The Trinity, London and New York, 1910, 100-141; J. Pearson, An Exposition of the Creed, edition Chevallier and Sinker, Cambridge, 1899; J. Howe," Calm Discourse on the Trinity," in Works, edition Hunt, London, 1810-22; J. Owen, ‘Vindication of the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity," and" Saint’s Fellowship with the Trinity," in Works, Gould’s edition, London, 1850-55; J. Edwards, Observations concerning the Scripture Economy of the Trinity, etc., New York, 1880, also An Unpublished Essay on the Trinity, New York, 1903; J. R. Illingworth, The Doctrine of the Trinity Apologetically Considered, London and New York, 1907; A. F. W. Ingrain, The Love of the Trinity, New York, 1908.

(NOTE.—In this article the author has usually given his own renderings of original passages, and not those of any particular version—EDITORS.)

Benjamin B. Warfield

TRIPOLIS

trip’-o-lis (Tripoils, "triple city"): Demetrius the son of Seleucus, having fled from Rome, collected "a mighty host and fleet," sailed into the haven of Tripoils, took the city, obtained possession of the country, and put to death his cousin, Antiochus V, along with his guardian Lysias (2 Macc 14:1 ff; Josephus, Ant, XII, x, 1). After a period of unsuccessful guerrilla warfare against Hyrcanus in Samaria, Antiochus Cyzicenus retired to Tripells (Ant., XII, x, 2). The city was founded by the Phoenicians and was a member of the Phoenician league. It was divided into 3 quarters by walls—hence, the name "triple city"—and these were occupied by settlers from Tyre, Sidon, and Aradus, respectively. The federal council of these states sat here. Its position on the Phoenician seacoast, with easy access to the interior, gave it many advantages from the commercial point of view. The Seleucid monarchs, the Romans, and Herod the Great did much to beautify the city; the last-named building a gymnasium (Josephus, BJ, I, xxi, 11). When attacked by the Arabs the inhabitants took ship and escaped. Later their places were taken by Jews and Persians. Captured by the Crusaders in 1109, it was taken by the Egyptians in 1289. The ancient city was surrounded on three sides by the sea. The site is now occupied by el-Mina, the harbor of the modern city, Tarabulus, which stands on the bank of Nahr Kadisha, about 2 miles away. The inhabitants number about 23,000. The town gives its name to a district under the vilayet of Beirut, which has always been famous for its fruitfulness.

W. Ewing

TRIUMPH

tri’-umf (thriambeuo, "to lead in triumph"): The word is used by Paul to express an idea very familiar to antiquity, and to the churches at Corinth and Colosse: "But thanks be unto God, who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ" (2Co 2:14); "Having despoiled the principalities and the powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it" (Col 2:15).

A triumph in Rome was a magnificent procession in honor of a victorious general, and the highest military distinction which he could obtain. It was granted by the senate only to one who had held the office of dictator, consul, or praetor, and after a decisive victory in the complete subjugation of a province. In a Roman triumph the victorious general entered the city in a chariot drawn by four horses. He was crowned with laurel, having a scepter in one hand and a branch of laurel in the other. He was preceded by the senate and magistrates, musicians, the spoils of his victory, and the captives in fetters; and followed by his army on foot, in marching order. The procession thus advanced along the Via Sacra to the Capitol, where a bull was sacrificed to Jupiter, and the laurel wreath deposited in the lap of the god. During the triumphal entry the priests burned incense, and hence, the reference of the apostle: "For we are a sweet savor of Christ unto God, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one a savor from death unto death; to the other a savor from life unto life" (2Co 2:15,16). The incense that was

to the victor the "savor" of his triumph would be to the wretched captives the "savor," or intimation, of a rapidly approaching death in the Roman arena or in the damp vaults of the Tullianum. Thus the "incense," or influence, of the apostolic gospel would be to the believer the assurance of redemption through Christ, and to the unbeliever the assurance of spiritual death.

After the suicide of Antony in Alexandria (30 BC) Augustus Caesar succeeded in getting Cleopatra into his power. She had hoped to subdue him by her charms, but without avail. Aware that she was doomed, she revolted against the thought of being led in triumph to Rome, and, as tradition states, took her own life by allowing an asp to bite her, saying, "I will not be led in triumph"; see Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra, V, ii:

"He'll lead me, then, in triumph? ....

Thou, an Egyptian puppet, shalt be shown

In Rome as well as I: mechanic slaves,

With greasy aprons, rules, and hammers shall

Uplift us to the view. ....

Arthur Walwyn Evans

TROAS

tro'-as (Troas): The chief city in the Northwest of Asia Minor, on the coast of Mysia in the Roman province of Asia. From here, according to Ac 16:8, Paul sailed. Here, also, according to Ac 20:5-12, Paul raised Eutychus from the dead. The name Troas was not confined to the town itself, but it was also applied to the surrounding district, or to that part of the coast which is now generally known as the Troad. In its early history it bore the name of Antigona Troas, which was given it by its founder Antigonus, but after 300 BC it was generally known to the classical writers as Alexander Troas, a name given to it by Lysimachus. For a time the Seleucid kings made their homes at Troas. Later, when the city became free, it struck its own coins, of which vast numbers are found; a common type is one upon which is stamped a grazing horse. In 133 BC Troas came into the possession of the Romans, and later, during the reign of Augustus, it was made a Roman colonia, independent of the Roman governor of the province of Asia. Its citizens were then exempt from poll and land tax. During Byzantine times Troas was the seat of a bishopric.

The ruins of Troas, now bearing the name of Eski Stambul, are extensive, giving evidence of the great size and importance of the ancient city. They have, however, long been used as a quarry, and the columns of the public buildings were taken to Constantinople for use in the construction of the mosque known as the Yeni Valideh Jami. The site is now mostly overgrown with oaks, but from the higher

portions of the ruins there is an extensive view over the sea and the neighboring islands. It is only with difficulty that one may now trace the city walls and locate the square towers which flanked them at intervals. Within the walls are the remains of theater, the temple and the gymnasium, which was provided with baths. The port from which Paul sailed was constructed by means of a mole, with an outer and an inner basin. The most imposing of the ruins, however, is a large aqueduct which was built in the time of Trajan.

E. J. Banks

TROGYLLIUM

tro-jil'-i-um, tro-gil'-i-um (Trogullion): According to Ac 20:15 the King James Version, the American Revised Version margin, the ship in which Paul sailed to Caesatea on his return from his 3rd missionary journey tarried at Trogyllium. Several of the early manuscripts omit the words, "tarried at Trogyllium" (Westcott and Hort omit as "Western" interpolation); yet, whether the words belonged to the text or not, Paul evidently passed the promontory, and probably stopped there. From the coast near Miletus the promontory projects into the sea toward the island of Samos; the strait separating the mainland from the island is scarcely a mile wide. It was in this strait which is now called Kutchuk Boghaz by the Turks that the battle of Mycale was fought in 479 BC. The promontory now bears the name of Santa Maria, and the place of anchorage is called Saint Paul's port.

E. J. Banks

TROOP

troop.

See ARMY.

TROPHIMUS

trof'-i-mus (Trophimos, literally, "a foster child" (Ac 20:4; 21:29; 2Ti 4:20)): An Asiatic Christian, a friend and companion-in-travel of the apostle Paul.

1. An Ephesian:

In the first of the three passages in which Trophimus is mentioned, he and Tychicus are called Asianoi, that is, natives of the Roman province of Asia; and making it still more definite, in Ac 21:29, he is termed an "Ephesian." Trophimus was one of eight friends, who accompanied Paul at the close of his 3rd missionary journey, and traveled with him from Greece through Macedonia into Asia, and onward by sea until Jerusalem was reached (see TYCHICUS). Trophimus went with Paul all the way, for, in the

second of the passages referred to, he is mentioned as being with Paul in Jerusalem immediately on the close of this journey.

2. Cause of Paul's Arrest:

He was the innocent cause of Paul being assaulted, in the courts of the temple by the Jewish mob, and then of his being arrested and imprisoned by the Romans. The occasion of this outrage was that the Jews supposed that Paul had "brought Greeks also into the temple, and .... defiled this holy place" (Ac 21:28). The modicum of fact lying at the root of this false accusation was that they had seen Paul and Trophimus in each other's company in the city. On this slender basis "they supposed" that Paul had brought Trophimus past the barrier or middle wall of partition (Eph 2:14; see PARTITION), beyond which no Gentile was allowed to penetrate on pain of death. They supposed that Trophimus who was neither a Jew nor a proselyte, but Gentile Christian, had been introduced into the temple itself by Paul—which would have been profanation. Hence, their fury against the apostle.

How strongly they insisted on the crime which Trophimus was falsely alleged to have committed on that occasion, is seen again in the way in which the orator Tertullus repeated the charge against Paul before the Roman governor Felix, who moreover assayed to profane the temple" (Ac 24:6).

3. At Miletus:

The third reference to Trophimus is in 2Ti 4:20, "Trophimus I left at Miletus sick." This final notice shows that he was again—several years after the date indicated in the previous passages—traveling with Paul on one of the missionary journeys which the apostle undertook after being liberated from his first imprisonment in Rome. It is exceedingly difficult, perhaps impossible, to trace the course of the different journeys which Paul now made, as there is no such narrative as is given in Ac for the former journeys, but merely incidental notices of his later travels, in the Pastoral Epistles. In this, the last of all his letters—2 Timothy—Paul indicates various places which he had visited, and also the names of friends who traveled with him on this the last of his apostolic journeys.

Among other places, he had visited Miletus, a city on the coast of the province of Asia; and there his old friend Trophimus had been laid down with illness, so severe that he could travel no farther, but Paul left him "at Miletus sick." It is to be noted that Miletus was not far from Ephesus, which was Trophimus' native city. There would be much intercourse between the two cities (see Ac 17, where Paul sends for the elders of the church at Ephesus to come to him at Miletus, which they did). Trophimus therefore, in his sickness, could easily reach Ephesus, or his friends from that city could quickly come to him at Miletus, and give him whatever attention and nursing he might require.

4. The Description of 2 Corinthians 8:18:

It has been conjectured that Trophimus is to be identified with the person mentioned in 2Co 8:16-24. Paul there speaks in the highest terms of one of his companions—but without giving his name—whom

he sent with Titus. Titus and this disciple were evidently those to whose care Paul entrusted the carrying of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians to its destination. The apostle says of this unnamed brother, not only that his praise is in the gospel throughout all the churches, but also that he was chosen by the churches to travel with him, i.e. with Paul, with this grace, i.e. with the contribution of money collected in the Gentile churches for the poor saints in Jerusalem.

Now it is certain that at the close of his 3rd missionary journey Paul carried these gifts to Jerusalem ("I came to bring alms to my nation, and offerings," Ac 24:17); and some of the eight friends who accompanied him on the journey (Ac 20:4) were those who had been entrusted by the churches with the safe conveyance of the money. Speaking of these collections, Paul writes (1Co 16:3-4). "Whomsoever ye shall approve, them will I send with letters to carry your bounty unto Jerusalem: and if it be meet for me to go also, they shall go with me." These conditions were fulfilled, when Paul and his eight friends traveled from Greece to Jerusalem, carrying the money with them. There is therefore certainty that one of the eight is the brother referred to in 2Co 8:18, whose praise in the gospel was in all the churches, and whom the churches had appointed to travel with Paul for the purpose of carrying the money contribution, and whom Paul had "many times proved earnest in many things" (2Co 8:18,19,22). The eight were Sopater of Berea, Aristarchus and Secundus, both from Thessalonica, Gaius of Derbe, Timothy, Tychicus and Trophimus, both "Asians," and lastly Luke.

There is certainly the possibility that the unnamed brother was Trophimus: if not Trophimus, then he was one of the other seven. Of these seven, by the process of elimination, the unnamed brother could only be one of those who traveled with Paul the whole distance as far as Jerusalem, for this was the work which "the brother" had been appointed by the churches to do. Now it is certain that Luke and Trophimus were with him on his arrival in Jerusalem (Ac 21:17,29). Therefore the brother whose praise in the gospel was in all the churches may very well have been Trophimus: if not Trophimus, then possibly Luke or Aristarchus. Gaius and Aristarchus are termed "Paul’s companions in travel" (Ac 19:29); and Aristarchus was afterward with Paul in Palestine, and sailed with him to Rome. It is quite remarkable that the same word, sunekdemos, "companion in travel," is applied to the unnamed brother (2Co 8:19), and to Gaius and Aristarchus in Ac 19:29.

As the conditions do not seem to be satisfied in Sopater, Secundus or Timothy, the brother so highly commended must have been either Luke or Gaius or Aristarchus or Tychicus or Trophimus.

John Rutherfurd

TROUGH

trof.

See SHEEP TENDING; BREAD.

TROW

tro: An obsolete verb meaning "to believe"; compare "trust" and the German trauen. It occurs only in Lu 17:9, the King James Version "Doth he thank that servant. ...? I trow not," as a translation of ou doko, "I believe not." The words ou doko, however, are not part of the original text, but are a later gloss to supply an answer to the question, and hence, "I trow not" is omitted by the Revised Version (British and American).

TRUCEBKEAKER

troos'-brak-er: The King James Version rendering in 2Ti 3:3 of aspondos, literally, "without a libation." As a libation always accompanied the making of a treaty in Greek lands, the lack implied that no treaty had been made, or, by a natural extension of meaning, could be made. Hence, the word came to mean "implacable" (Revised Version).

TRUMP; TRUMPET

trump, trum'-pet, trum'pit.

See MUSIC.

TRUMPETS, FEAST OF

1. Description:

In Le 23:23-25 the first day (new moon) of the seventh month is set apart as a solemn rest, "a memorial of blowing of trumpets" (the Hebrew leaves "of trumpets" to be understood), signalized further by "a holy convocation," abstinence from work, and the presentation of "an offering made by fire." In Nu 29:1-6 these directions are repeated, with a detailed specification of the nature of the offering. In addition to the usual daily burnt sacrifices and the special offerings for new moons, there are to be offered one bullock, one ram, and seven he-lambs, with proper meal offerings, together with a he-goat for a sin offering.

2. Significance:

The significance of the feast lay in the fact that it marked the beginning of the new year according to the older calendar. Originally the "revolution" of the year was reckoned in the fall (Ex 23:16; 34:22), and the change to the spring never thoroughly displaced the older system. In fact the spring New Year never succeeded in becoming a specially recognized feast, and to Jewish ears "New Year's Day" (ro'sh ha-shanah) invariably signifies an autumnal festival. So the Mishna (Ro'sh ha-shanah, i.1): "There are four periods of commencement of years: On the 1st of Nisan is a new year for kings and for festivals; the 1st of Elul is a new year for the tithe of cattle. .... The 1st of Tishri is new year's (day) for the ordinary or

civil year, for the computation of 7th years, and of the jubilees; also for the planting of trees, and for herbs. On the 1st of Shebat is the new year for trees."

3. Ritual:

The ritual for the day consequently needs little explanation. All new moons were heralded by trumpeting (Nu 10:10), and so the custom was of course observed on this feast also. There is nothing in the language of either Le 23 or Nu 29 to require a prolongation of the music on this special new moon, but its special distinction was no doubt marked by special trumpeting at all times, and at a later period (see below) elaborate rules were laid down for this feature. The additional sacrifices simply involved an increase of those prescribed for new moons (Nu 28:11-15), without changing their type. Perhaps Ps 81 was especially written for this feast (compare 81:3).

4. Origin:

Mentions of a special observance of the 1st of Tishri are found also in Eze 45:20 (reading, as is necessary, "first day of seventh month" here for "seventh day") and Ne 8:1-12. In the former passage, the day is kept by offering a bullock as a sin offering and sprinkling its blood in a way that recalls the ritual of the Day of Atonement. In Nehemiah an assembly of the people was held to hear Ezra read the Law. The day was kept as a festival on which mourning was forbidden (Ne 8:9). Apart from these references there is no mention of the feast elsewhere in the Old Testament, and, indeed, there is some reason to think that at one time the 10th, and not the 1st, of Tishri was regarded as the beginning of the year. For Eze 40:1 specifically calls this day ro’sh hashanah, and Le 25:9 specifies it as the opening of the Jubilee year (contrast the Mishna passage, above). Consequently scholars generally are inclined to assign Le 23:23-25 and Nu 29:1-6 to the latest part of the Pentateuch (Ps). This need not mean that the observance of the 1st (or 10th) of Tishri was late, but only that the final adoption of the day into Israel’s official calendar, with a fixed ritual for all Israelites, was delayed. If the original New Year’s Day fell on the 10th of Tishri, its displacement ten days earlier was certainly due to the adoption of the 10th for the Day of Atonement. An explanation of the date of the latter feast would be gained by this supposition.

5. Later History:

The instrument to be used in the trumpeting is not specified in the Bible, but Jewish tradition decided in favor of the horn and not the metal trumpet, permitting for synagogue use any kind of horn except a cow’s, but for temple use only a straight (antelope’s) horn and never a crooked (ram’s) horn (Ro’-sh ha-shanah, iii. 2-4). According to iv. 1, when the new year began on a Sabbath the horns were blown only in the temple, but after its destruction they were blown in every synagogue. Every Israelite was obliged to come within hearing distance of the sound (iii.7). In the synagogue liturgy of iv.5-9 (which forms the basis of the modern Jewish practice), four sets of "benedictions" were read, and after each of the last three sets the horn blown nine times. Modern Judaism sees in the signals a call to self-examination and repentance, in view of the approaching Day of Atonement.

See TRUMPET, III, 2, (8).

Burton Scott Easton

TRUST, BREACH OF

The clearest reference to the crime designated by this modern expression is found in Le 6:2-7, where the transgression is defined and the penalty set forth. Breach of covenant or contract and the removal of landmarks (De 19:14; 27:17; Pr 22:28; 23:10) may be included.

TRUTH

trooth (‘emeth, emunah, primary idea of "firmness," "stability" (compare Ex 17:12), hence "constancy," "faithfulness," etc.; the Septuagint’s Apocrypha and the New Testament, aletheia (Ro 3:7), pistis (Ro 3:3); in adjectival and adverbial sense, "in truth," "of a truth," "faithful," etc.; alethos (Lu 21:3; Joh 6:14; 7:40; 1Th 2:13); alethinos (Joh 17:3); ontos (1Co 14:25); pistos (1Ti 3:1); in the King James Version; the Revised Version (British and American), the American Standard Revised Version, as generally, "faithful"; Anglo-Saxon: treow, tryw with Teutonic stem, trau-," to believe," "to keep faith"):

I. TERMS

II. GENERAL VIEW

1. Aspects of Truth

(1) Ontological

(2) Logical

(3) Moral

(4) Religious

2. Standards of Truth

3. Special Features in Biblical Writings

III. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY

1. Truth in God

2. Truth in Man

3. Truth in Religion

I. Terms.

The English word has developed and maintained the broadest, most general and varied usage, going beyond both Hebrew and Greek, which were already extended in connotation. It is possible to analyze and classify the special applications of the term almost indefinitely, using other terms to indicate specific meanings in special connections, e.g. loyalty (Jud 9:15); honesty (Ex 18:21); fidelity (De 32:4); justice (Ro 2:2); uprightness (Isa 38:3); faith (Isa 26:2); righteousness (Ps 85:10); reality (Joh 17:19); veracity (Ge 42:16). It is unfortunate that translators have generally adhered to single terms to represent the original words. On the other hand, they have sometimes introduced words not represented in the original, and thus unduly limited the meaning. An example is Eph 4:15, where the original meaning "being true," i.e. in all respects, is narrowed to "speaking the truth."

II. General View.

No term is more familiar and none more difficult of definition.

With applications in every phase of life and thought the word has varying general senses which may be classified as:

1. Aspects of Truth:

(1) Ontological

Ontological truth, i.e. accurate and adequate idea of existence as ultimate reality. In this sense it is a term of metaphysics, and will be differently defined according to the type of philosophical theory accepted. This aspect of truth is never primary in Scripture unless in the question of Pilate (Joh 18:38). He had so far missed the profound ethical sense in which Jesus used the word that Jesus did not at all answer him, nor, indeed, does Pilate seem to have expected any reply to what was probably only the contemptuous thrust of a skeptical attitude. In Proverbs where, if at all, we might look for the abstract idea, we find rather the practical apprehension of the true meaning and method of life (23:23). Ontological reality and possible ideas of reality apprehending it are obviously presupposed in all Scripture. There is objective reality on which subjective ideas depend for their validity; and all knowing is knowledge of reality. There is also in the whole of Scripture a subjective idea, the product of revelation or inspiration in some form of working, that constitutes an ideal to be realized objectively. The Kingdom of God, for example, is the formative idea of Scripture teaching. In a definite sense the kingdom exists and still it is to be created. It must be kept in mind, however, that only vaguely and indirectly does truth have abstract, meta-physical meaning to the Biblical writers. For John it approaches this, but the primary interest is always concrete.

(2) Logical

Logical truth is expressive of the relation between the knower and that which is known, and depends upon the arrangement of ideas with reference to a central or composite idea. Truth in this sense involves the correspondence of concepts with facts. While this meaning of truth is involved in Scripture, it is not the primary meaning anywhere, save in a practical religious application, as in Eph 4:21; 1 Joh 2:4,21.

(3) Moral

Moral truth is correspondence of expression with inner conception. Taken in its full meaning of correspondence of idea with fact, of expression with thought and with intention, of concrete reality with ideal type, this is the characteristic sense of the word in the Scriptures. Here the aim of religion is to relate man to God in accordance with truth. In apprehension man is to know God and His order as they are in fact and in idea. In achievement, man is to make true in his own experience the idea of God that is given to him. Truth is thus partly to be apprehended and partly to be produced. The emphatically characteristic teaching of Christianity is that the will to produce truth, to do the will of God, is the requisite attitude for apprehending the truth. This teaching of Jesus in Joh 7:17 is in accord with the entire teaching of the Bible. Eph 1:18 suggests the importance of right attitude for learning, while 4:18 shows the effect of a wrong attitude in ignorance of vital truth.

(4) Religious

Religious truth is a term frequently met in modern literature, but it has no sound basis in reason and it has none at all in the Bible. All truth is ultimately religious and only in a superficial way can religious truth be spoken of as an independent conception. Least of all can religious truth and scientific truth be at variance.

2. Standards of Truth:

Philosophy has continuously tried to find tests for truth, and so has wrought out theories of knowledge—epistemologies, Not to go back into the Greek philosophy, we have in modern times such theories as (1) the Kantian, (2) the scholastic, (3) the Hegelian, (4) the pragmatic, (5) that of the "new realism"; and these include only such as may be defined with some clearness, for the tendencies of current thought have been toward confusion concerning all standards of truth and reality, and so toward widespread agnosticism and skepticism. This temper has, naturally, reacted on thinking in practical ethics and upon the sanctions of religion. There is thus in religion and morals a tendency to obscure the distinction between what is and what ought to be.

See AUTHORITY; ETHICS; PHILOSOPHY; RIGHT; SIN.

In the Bible, the known will of God is final for man as a standard of truth, not as arbitrary, but as

expressive of God’s nature. God’s nature is all-comprehensive of fact and goodness, and so is, all and in all, the source, support and objective of all concrete being. The will of God thus reveals, persuades to and achieves the ideals and ends of complete existence. The term "truth" is sometimes, therefore, nearly equivalent to the revealed will of God.

3. Special Features in Biblical Writings:

(1) The Old Testament uses the term "truth" primarily of God and applies the principle to man. The practical objective is ever prominent.

(2) The Synoptic Gospels and Ac use the term chiefly in popular idiomatic phrases "of a truth," "in truth," "surely" (compare Lu 22:59; Ac 4:27). In Mt 22:16 there is a more serious and comprehensive application, but it is in the flattering words of Pharisaic hypocrisy (compare Mr 12:14; Lu 20:21). To be sure, we are to understand that even in the phrases of common speech Jesus employed the term in all seriousness (Lu 4:25; 9:27).

(3) In Paul the sense of divine faithfulness, as in the Old Testament, is occasionally met (Ro 3:3,7; 15:8). Again the term emphasizes sincerity (1Co 5:8; 2Co 7:14). Generally it has direct or clearly implied reference to God’s revelation in Jesus Christ with a view to redeeming men. In a general way the term is thus equivalent to the gospel, but there is never identification of the two terms (see Ro 2:8; Eph 1:13; 1Ti 3:15). In Ga 2:5; 5:7, "the truth of the gospel" is its content in the purpose of God, in contrast with misconceptions of it: the true gospel as against false representations of the gospel.

(4) In the Johannine writings we find occasionally the emphatic phrase of genuineness (1 Joh 3:18; 2 Joh 1:1; 3 Joh 1:1) and emphatic reality (Joh 8:46; 16:7). In Revelation we have "true" in the sense of trustworthy, because ultimately real or in accord with ultimate reality (3:7,14; 6:10; 15:3; 19:9,11, etc.). Generally, as in the Gospel, we approach more nearly than elsewhere in Scripture a metaphysical use, yet always with the practical religious end dominant. Truth is reality in relation to the vital interests of the soul. It is primarily something to be realized and done, rather than something to be learned or known. In the largest aspect it is God’s nature finding expression in His creation, in revelation, in Jesus Christ in whom "grace and truth came" (Joh 1:17), and finally in man apprehending, accepting and practically realizing the essential values of life, which are the will of God (Joh 1:14; 8:32; 17:19; 18:37 f; 1 Joh 2:21; 3:19). Truth is personalized in Jesus Christ. He truly expresses God, presents the true ideal of man, in Himself summarizes the harmony of existence and becomes the agent for unifying the disordered world. Hence, He is the Truth (Joh 14:6), the true expression (Logos, Joh 1:1) of God. See the same idea without the terminology in Paul (Col 1:14 ff; 2:9). Similarly, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth because His function is to guide into all truth (Joh 16:13; 1Joh 2:27; 5:7).

(5) It is understood by many that in James, Peter, Hebrews, and possibly the Pastoral Epistles, the term connotes "the body of Christian teaching" (compare Jas 1:18; 3:14; 1Pe 1:22; 2Pe 2:2; Heb 10:26; 1Ti 3:15). The use of the article here cannot be conclusive, and instead of "the body of Christian teaching," it seems more correct to understand the reality of life values as represented in the gospel plan of salvation

and of living. In a general way this would include "the body of Christian teaching," but the reference would be less concrete. James is too early a writing to employ the term in this so specific a sense.

III. Analytical Summary.

1. Truth in God:

(1) Truth is presented in Scripture as a chief element in the nature of God (Ps 31:5; Isa 65:16).

(2) But this quality is never given as an abstract teaching, but only as qualifying God in His relations and activities. So it is a guaranty of constancy (De 32:4; Ps 100:5; 146:6; Jas 1:17); especially a ground of confidence in His promises (Ex 34:6; Ps 91:4; 146:6); of right dealing with men without reference to any explicit pledges (Ps 85:11; 89:14); a basis of security in the correctness of His teachings (Ne 9:13; Ps 119:142; Isa 25:1); of assurance within His covenant relations (Ps 89:5; Isa 55:3).

(3) God’s truth is especially noteworthy as a guaranty of merciful consideration of men. This is an important element in theology of the Old Testament, as it is a point guarded also in the New Testament (Ps 25:10; 31:5; 61:7; 85:10; 98:3; Joh 3:16; Ro 3:23-26).

(4) Equally is the truth of God an assurance to men of righteous judgment in condemnation of sin and sinners (1Sa 15:29; Ps 96:13; Ro 2:2,8). In general the truth of God stands for the consistency of His nature and guarantees His full response in all the relations of a universe of which He is the Maker, Preserver, and End.

2. Truth in Man:

As related to God in origin and obligation, man is bound morally to see and respond to all the demands of his relations to God and to the order in which he lives under God.

(1) Truthfulness in speech, and also in the complete response of his nature to the demand upon it, is urged as a quality to be found in man and is commended where found, as its lack is condemned. It is essential to true manhood. Here, as in the case of truth in God, truth is regarded as revealed in social relations and responsibilities. Truth is not merely in utterance, nor is it only response to a specific command or word, but lies in the response of the will and life to the essential obligations of one’s being (Ps 15:2; 119:30; Pr 12:19; 23:23; Isa 59:4,14,15; Jer 7:28; 9:3; Ho 4:1; Ro 1:18,25; Eph 4:15; 2Th 2:10,12).

(2) Truth in man is in response to truth in God, and is to be acquired on the basis of a gift from God. This gift comes by way of teaching and also by way of the working of the Divine Spirit in the life of man. Highest truth in correspondence to ideal is possible only by the working of "the God of truth" in the spirit of the man. Man’s freedom to realize his being is dependent upon his receptive attitude toward the Son of God. Hence salvation in its fullest idea is stated in terms of truth (Joh 11:3; Php 3:10 ff). See

in general, Ps 51:6; Isa 25:1; Joh 3:21; 8:32; 16:13; 17:19; 18:37; Eph 4:21,24; 5:9; Heb 10:26; 1Joh 2:27.

3. Truth in Religion:

The modern study of religion on an evolutionary hypothesis and the comparative study of religions have contributed to an extensive questioning whether there is any absolute truth in religion, or at least any standards by which truth in religion may be known. Isa 43 and 44 and Paul in Ac 17 and Ga 3 accord with modern findings that there is an element of truth in religions generally, and that God's faithfulness pledges Him to bring the light of fuller truth to all men. This He does through the religion and the testimony of them to whom He has already come with this fuller light. This light is contained in the revealed word of the Old Testament prophets and of the New Testament witnesses to Jesus. In a definite way the Scriptures preserve these standards of religious truth. But always the attitude of the individual, as also of the group, determines the measure of apprehension of the truth and the certainty with which it is held. It is always important to keep in mind that truth in religion is not primarily an intellectualistic affair, to be cognized, but is essentially a voluntaristic experience and a duty to be done for the glory of God in the realization of the complete truth of God. Jesus Christ as the truth of God becomes the standard and test for truth in the religion of men. And this not in any objective and formal way of a series of propositions, to be accepted and contended for, but in the subjective way of experience, in a series of ideals to be realized and propagated. If anyone wishes to do God's will, he shall be able to decide the truth of religious teaching, and the Son who is true will give the freedom of truth (Joh 7:17; 8:32).

William Owen Carver

TRYPHAENA

tri-fe'-na (Truphaina; the King James Version, Tryphena): Tryphaena is coupled with "Tryphosa"—among those members of the Christian community at Rome to whom Paul sends greetings (Ro 16:12). He describes them as those "who labor in the Lord." "The names, which might be rendered 'Dainty' and 'Disdain' (see Jas 5:5; Isa 66:11), are characteristically pagan, and unlike the description" (Denney). They were probably sisters or near relatives, for "it was usual to designate members of the same family by derivatives of the same root" (Lightfoot, Phil, 175). Both names are found in inscriptions connected with the imperial household, "Tryphosa" occurring more frequently than "Tryphaena."

S. F. Hunter

TRYPHON

tri'-fon (Truphon): The surname of Diodotus, a usurper of the Syrian throne. He was a native of Apamea, and had been in the service of Alexander Balas. On the death of Balas (145 BC), Tryphon, taking advantage of the complaints of discontent among the troops of Demetrius II (Nicator), set up the

younger son of Balas, Antiochus VI, as claimant to the throne against Demetrius (1 Macc 11:39). The Jews under Jonathan came to the assistance of Demetrius in his difficulties against his revolting subjects. But Demetrius, when confirmed on his throne, soon made it apparent that he did not intend to fulfill his promises to his Jewish allies (1 Macc 11:53). Consequently, Jonathan and Simon joined Tryphon and Antiochus VI, securing many advantages for their country (1 Macc 11:54 ff). Jonathan inflicted a severe defeat on the forces of Demetrius. The successes of the Jewish leaders awakened the jealousy and suspicion of Tryphon, who determined to thwart the further plans of Jonathan and to remove him as an obstacle in the way of his securing the crown for himself. By an act of shrewd treachery, Tryphon captured Jonathan at Ptolemais and butchered all his followers (1 Macc 12:48). Simon, brother of Jonathan, now undertook the conduct of affairs and thwarted Tryphon in his attempts upon Jerusalem, whereupon the latter murdered Jonathan at Bascama (1 Macc 13:1 ff) in 143 BC. Tryphon next murdered the young Antiochus VI (1 Macc 13:31) and claimed the throne of Syria for himself (143 BC) (but see the chronology as given in Schurer, HJP, 4th edition, I, 172). Simon now went over to the side of Demetrius on condition that Judea should be free from tribute to Syria—a privilege that was rather in the power of Tryphon than of Demetrius to give, and so "in the 170th year (143 BC) was the yoke of the heathen taken away from Israel" (1 Macc 13:41). In 138 BC Demetrius was captured by Mithridates I (Arsaces), king of Parthia (1 Macc 14:2). His brother, Antiochus VII (Sidetes), continued the struggle against Tryphon, first with the aid of Simon, but later repudiating it. Tryphon was obliged to flee before Sidetes to Dor (1 Macc 15:11), where Antiochus refused the assistance of Simon (1 Macc 15:26). He next escaped to Ptolemais, then to Orthosia, and finally to his native Apamea, where he was driven to suicide (Josephus, Ant, XIII, vii, 2; Strabo, 668; Appian, Syriac, 68). (The best account is given in Schurer, 4th edition, I, 172 ff; compare also Speaker’s Commentary in the place cited.)

See ANTIOCHUS; DEMETRIUS.

S. Angus

TRYPHOSA

tri-fo’-sa (Truphosa): Greetings are sent by Paul to "Tryphaena and Tryphosa, who labor in the Lord" (Ro 16:12).

See TRYPHAENA.

TSADHE

tsa-tha’ ("ts"): The eighteenth letter of the Hebrew alphabet, and as such employed in Ps 119 to designate the 18th part, every verse of which begins with this letter. It is transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "ts". It came also to be used for the number 90. For name, etc., see ALPHABET; TSADHE.

TUBAL

tu’-bal (tubhal, tubhal; Septuagint Thobel, Codex Alexandrinus in Eze 39:1, Thober): As the text stands, Tubal and Meshech are always coupled, except in Isa 66:19 (Massoretic Text) and Ps 120:5. In the former passage Tubal is yoked with Javan; in the latter Meshech occurs in 120:5 and Kedar in 120:6. In Ge 10:2 parallel, they are sons of Japheth. In Ezekiel (27:13) the two are mentioned as exporters of slaves and copper, as a warlike people of antiquity (32:26), in the army of Gog (38:2 ff; 39:1). Josephus identifies them with the Iberians and Cappadocians respectively; but they are most probably the Tibarenoi, and Moschoi, first mentioned in Herodotus iii.94 as belonging to the 19th satrapy of Darius, and again (vii.78) as furnishing a contingent to the host of Xerxes. Equally obvious is their identity with the Tabali and Muski of the Assyrian monuments, where the latter is mentioned as early as Tiglath-pileser I, and the former under Shalmaneser II; both are described as powerful military states. They appear together in Sargon’s inscriptions; and during this entire period their territory must have extended much farther South and West than in Greek-Roman times. They are held (Winckler and Jeremias) to have been remnants of the old Hittite population which were gradually driven (probably by the Cimmerian invasion) to the mountainous district Southeast of the Black Sea.

Horace J. Wolf

TUBAL-CAIN

tu’-bal-kan (tubhal qayin): One of the sons of Lamech (Ge 4:22). He is a brother of Jabal and Jubal, who appear to have been the founders of several industries and articles The text (loTesh kol choresh nechosheth u-bharzel) has been the cause of endless dispute. Holzinger and Gunkel hold that laTash was a marginal gloss to charash, and that, as in Ge 4:20 and 21, there stood before kal originally hu hayah ‘abhi. This would make Tubal-cain the founder of the metal industry, and place him in a class similar to that of his brothers. The Septuagint, however, has no equivalent of qayin. This omission leads Dillmann, Wellhausen, and others to the position that "Tubal" originally stood alone, and qayin, being a later addition, was translated "smith." Many commentators identify Tubal with the Assyrian Tubal, a people living Southwest of the Black Sea; in later times they were called "Tibareni" (Eze 27:13). Tubal may be the eponymous ancestor of these people, whose principal industry seems to have been the manufacture of vessels of bronze and iron.

Horace J. Wolf

TUBIAS

tu’-bi-as (en tois Tobiou; the King James Version "in the places of Tobie," the Revised Version (British and American) "in the land of Tubias"): A place in Gilead where 1,000 men of the Jews were slaughtered by the Gentiles, their wives and children being carried away captive (1 Macc 5:13). It is identified with the land of TOB (which see).

TUBIENI

tu-bi-e’-ni (pros tous legomenous Toubienous Ioudaious, "unto the Jews that are called Tubieni"): Men of TOB (which see) who had occupied the town of Charax (2 Macc 12:17).

TUMOR

tu’-mer, tu’-mor (‘ophel): the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes this word for "emerods" in 1Sa 5:12; 6:4; De 28:27 margin.

See EMERODS.

TURBAN

tur’-ban (Le 16:4 margin).

See DRESS, V.

TURPENTINE TREE

tur’-pen-tin.

See TEREBINTH.

TURTLE-DOVE

tur’-t’-l-duv.

See DOVE.

TUTOR

tu’-ter: In modern English an "instructor," more particularly a private instructor, but the word properly means a "guardian." Hence its use in Ga 4:2 the King James Version for epitropos, here "guardian" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), and 1Co 4:15; Ga 3:24,25 the Revised Version (British and American) for paidagogos.

See SCHOOLMASTER.

TWELVE

twelv (shenem ‘asar; dodeka).

See APOSTLE; NUMBER.

TWELVE APOSTLES, GOSPELS OF THE

See APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.

TWELVE PATRIARCHS; TESTAMENTS OF THE

See APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, sec. IV, 1.

TWELVE STARS

See ASTRONOMY, sec. II, 12.

TWENTY

twen’-ti.

See NUMBER.

TWILIGHT

twi’-lit (nesheph): The twilight of Palestine is of short duration, owing to the low latitude, there being scarcely more than an hour between sunset and complete darkness. It is a distinct boundary between daytime and the darkness. The people of Palestine still give the time of an event as so many hours before or after sunrise or sunset: "David smote them from the twilight even unto the evening of the next day" (1Sa 30:17), and "They rose up in the twilight to go" (2Ki 7:5). The word is evidenly used in the sense of darkness in "the stars of twilight" (Job 3:9) and "The adulterer waiteth for the twilight" (Job 24:15). the King James Version has "twilight" in Eze 12:6 ff, but the Revised Version (British and American) has "dark."

Alfred H. Joy

TWIN BROTHERS

(Ac 28:11).

See DIOSCURI.

TWINE

twin (shazar, "to be twined"): The word is used in Ex 26:1 ff; 36:8 ff, etc., of the "fine twined linen" used for the curtains and hangings of the tabernacle, and for parts of the priests' dress. It denotes linen the finely spun threads of which consisted of two or more smaller threads twined together.

See LINEN; TABERNACLE.

TWO

too.

See NUMBER.

TYCHICUS

tik'-i-kus (Tuchikos, lit. "chance"): Mentioned 5 times in the New Testament (Ac 20:4; Eph 6:21; Col 4:7; 2Ti 4:12; Tit 3:12); an Asiatic Christian, a friend and companion of the apostle Paul.

(1) In the first of these passages his name occurs as one of a company of the friends of Paul. The apostle, at the close of his 3rd missionary journey, was returning from Greece through Macedonia into Asia, with a view to go to Jerusalem. This journey proved to be the last which he made, before his apprehension and imprisonment. It was felt, both by himself and by his friends, that this journey was a specially important one. He was on his way to Jerusalem, "bound in the spirit" (Ac 20:22). But another cause which gave it particular importance was that he and his friends were carrying the money which had been collected for several years previous in the churches of the Gentiles, for the help of the poor members of the church in Jerusalem (Ac 24:17). No fewer than eight of his intimate friends companied him into Asia, and one of these was Tychicus Luke uses the word "Asian" (English Versions of the Bible "of Asia," Ac 20:4) to describe Tychicus. He was with Paul at Troas, and evidently journeyed with him, as one of "Paul's company" (Ac 21:8 the King James Version), all the way to Jerusalem.

(2) The 2nd and 3rd passages in which the name of Tychicus occurs (see above) give the information that he was with Paul in Rome during his first imprisonment. In Colossians Paul writes, "All my affairs shall Tychicus make known unto you, the beloved brother and faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord: whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose, that ye may know our state, and that he may comfort your hearts" (4:7,8). In almost identical words he writes in Ephesians, "But that ye also may know my affairs, how I do, Tychicus, the beloved brother and faithful minister in the Lord, shall make known to you all things: whom I have sent unto you for this very purpose, that ye may know our state, and that he may comfort your hearts" (6:21,22).

Paul had entrusted Tychicus with a very important mission. He was to deliver the Epistle to the

Ephesians, that is, "the circular letter" (see LAODICEANS, EPISTLE TO THE) to the churches in proconsular Asia, to which it was sent, giving a copy of it to the church in Laodicea. He was then to proceed to Colosse, with the Epistle to the church there. In Colosse Tychicus would plead the cause of Onesimus, who accompanied him from Rome. "Under his shelter Onesimus would be safer than if he encountered Philemon alone" (Lightfoot, Commentary on Colossians, 314). In Laodicea and Colosse Tychicus would not only deliver the Epistles from Paul, but he would also, as the apostle had written to the churches in those places, Communicate to them all information about his "state," that is, how things were going with him in regard to his appeal to the emperor, and his hope of being soon set at liberty. Tychicus would make known to them all things.

(3) The passages in the Epistles to Titus and to Timothy show that Tychicus was again with Paul, after the appeal to the emperor had resulted in the apostle regaining his freedom. The passage in Titus evidently refers to the interval between Paul's first and second Roman imprisonments, and while he was again engaged in missionary journeys. The apostle writes to Titus, who was in Crete in charge of the churches there, that he intended to send either Artemas or Tychicus to him, so as to take the oversight of the work of the gospel in that island, that Titus might be free to come to be with the apostle at Nicopolis.

(4) The last passage where Tychicus is mentioned occurs in 2 Timothy, which was written in Rome not long before Paul's execution. To the very end Paul was busy as ever in the work of the gospel; and though it would have been a comfort to him to have his friends beside him, yet the interests of the kingdom of Christ are uppermost in his thoughts, and he sends these friends to help the progress of the work. To the last, Tychicus was serviceable as ever: "Tychicus I sent to Ephesus" (4:12). As Timothy was in charge of the church in Ephesus (1Ti 1:3), the coming of Tychicus would set him free, so as to enable him to set off at once to rejoin Paul at Rome, as the apostle desired him (2Ti 4:9,21).

It should also be noted that at Ephesus Tychicus would be able to visit his old friend Trophimus, who was, at that very time, only a few miles away, at Miletus, sick (2Ti 4:20).

It is possible that Tychicus is the brother referred to in 2Co 8:22,23 as one "whom we have many times proved earnest in many things ....(one of) the messengers of the churches .... the glory of Christ."

(5) The character and career of Tychicus are such as show him altogether affectionate, faithful and worthy of the confidence reposed in him by Paul, who, as already seen, sent him again and again on important work, which could be performed only by a man of ability and of high Christian worth and experience. Thus, all that is known regarding Tychicus fully bears out the description of his character given by the apostle himself, that he was a beloved brother, a faithful minister and fellow-servant in the Lord.

John Rutherfurd

TYPE

tip:

1. Definition of Type

2. Distinctive Features

3. Classification of Types

4. How Much of the Old Testament Is Typical?

LITERATURE

The Bible furnishes abundant evidence of the presence of types and of typical instruction in the Sacred Word. The New Testament attests this fact. It takes up a large number of persons and things and events of former dispensations, and it treats them as adumbrations and prophecies of the future. A generation ago a widespread interest in the study of typology prevailed; latterly the interest has largely subsided, chiefly because of the vagaries and extravagances which attended its treatment on the part of not a few writers. Pressing the typical teaching of Scripture so far as to imperil the historical validity of God’s word is both dangerous and certain to be followed by reaction and neglect of the subject.

1. Definition of Type:

The word "type" is derived from a Greek term tupos, which occurs 16 times in the New Testament. It is variously translated in the King James Version, e.g. twice "print" (Joh 20:25); twice "figure" (Ac 7:43; Ro 5:14); twice "pattern" (Tit 2:7; Heb 8:5); once "fashion" (Ac 7:44); once "manner" (Ac 23:25); once "form" (Ro 6:17); and 7 t example" (1Co 10:6,11; Php 3:17; 1Th 1:7; 2Th 3:9; 1Ti 4:12; 1Pe 5:3). It is clear from these texts that the New Testament writers use the word "type" with some degree of latitude; yet one general idea is common to all, namely, "likeness." A person, event or thing is so fashioned or appointed as to resemble another; the one is made to answer to the other in some essential feature; in some particulars the one matches the other. The two are called type and antitype; and the link which binds them together is the correspondence, the similarity, of the one with the other.

Three other words in the New Testament express the same general idea. One is "shadow" (skia, Heb 10:1), "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come"—as if the substance or reality that was still future cast its shadow backward into the old economy. "Shadow" implies dimness and transitoriness; but it also implies a measure of resemblance between the one and the other.

The 2nd term is "parable" (parabole, Heb 9:9); the tabernacle with its services was an acted parable for the time then present, adumbrating thus the blessed reality which was to come.

The 3rd term is "copy." or "pattern" (hupodeigma), a word that denotes a sketch or draft of something future. invisible (Heb 9:23); the tabernacle and its furniture and services were copies, outlines of

heavenly things.

Types are pictures, object-lessons, by which God taught His people concerning His grace and saving power. The Mosaic system was a sort of kindergarten in which God's people were trained in divine things, by which also they were led to look for better things to come. An old writer thus expresses it: "God in the types of the last dispensation was teaching His children their letters. In this dispensation He is teaching them to put the letters together, and they find that the letters, arrange them as they will, spell Christ, and nothing but Christ."

In creation the Lord uses one thing for many purposes. One simple instrument meets many ends. For how many ends does water serve! And the atmosphere: it supplies the lungs, conveys sound, diffuses odors, drives ships, supports fire, gives rain, fulfills besides one knows not how many other purposes. And God's Word is like His work, is His work, and, like creation, is inexhaustible. Whatever God touches, be it a mighty sun or an insect's wing, a vast prophecy or a little type, He perfects for the place and the purpose He has in mind.

2. Distinctive Features:

What are the distinctive features of a type? A type, to be such in reality, must possess three well-defined qualities.

(1) It must be a true picture of the person or the thing it represents or prefigures. A type is a draft or sketch of some well-defined feature of redemption, and therefore it must in some distinct way resemble its antitype, e.g. Aaron as high priest is a rough figure of Christ the Great High Priest, and the Day of Atonement in Israel (Le 16) must be a true picture of the atoning work of Christ.

(2) The type must be of divine appointment. In its institution it is designed to bear a likeness to the antitype. Both type and antitype are preordained as constituent parts of the scheme of redemption. As centuries sometimes lie between the type and its accomplishment in the antitype, of course infinite wisdom alone can ordain the one to be the picture of the other. Only God can make types.

(3) A type always prefigures something future. A Scriptural type and predictive prophecy are in substance the same, differing only in form. This fact distinguishes between a symbol and a type. A symbol may represent a thing of the present or of the past as well as of the future, e.g. the symbols in the Lord's Supper. A type always looks to the future; an element of prediction must necessarily be in it.

3. Classification of Types:

Another thing in the study of types should be borne in mind, namely, that a thing in itself evil cannot be the type of what is good and pure. It is somewhat difficult to give a satisfactory classification of Biblical types, but broadly they may be distributed under three heads:

(1) Personal types, by which are meant those personages of Scripture whose lives and experiences illustrate some principle or truth of redemption. Such are Adam, who is expressly described as the "figure of him that was to come" (Ro 5:14), Melchizedek, Abraham, Aaron, Joseph, Jonah, etc.

(2) Historical types, in which are included the great historical events that under Providence became striking foreshadowings of good things to come, e.g. the Deliverance from the Bondage of Egypt; the Wilderness Journey; the Conquest of Canaan; the Call of Abraham; Deliverances by the Judges, etc.

(3) Ritual types, such as the Altar, the Offerings, the Priesthood, the Tabernacle and its furniture. There are typical persons, places, times, things, actions, in the Old Testament, and a reverent study of them leads into a thorough acquaintance with the fullness and the blessedness of the word of God.

4. How Much of the Old Testament Is Typical?:

How much of the Old Testament is to be regarded as typical is a question not easily answered. Two extremes, however, should be avoided. First, The extravagance of some of the early Fathers, as Origen, Ambrose, Jerome (revived in our time by Andrew Jukes and his imitators). They sought for types, and of course found them, in every incident and event, however trivial, recorded in Scripture. Even the most simple and commonplace circumstance was thought to conceal within itself the most recondite truth. Mystery and mysticism were seen everywhere, in the cords and pins of the tabernacle, in the yield of herds, in the death of one, in the marriage of another, even in the number of fish caught by the disciples on the night the risen Saviour appeared to them—how much some have tried to make of that number, 153! The very serious objection to this method is, that it wrests Scripture out of the sphere of the natural and the historical and locates it in that of the arbitrary and the fanciful; it tends to destroy the validity and trustworthiness of the record.

Second, the undue contraction of the typical element. "Professor Moses Stuart expresses this view as follows: "Just so much of the Old Testament is to be accounted typical as the New Testament affirms to be so, and no more." This opinion assumes that the New Testament writers have exhausted the types of the Old Testament, while the fact is that those found in the later Scripture are but samples taken from the storehouse where many more are found. If they are not, then nothing is more arbitrary than the New Testament use of types, for there is nothing to distinguish them from a multitude of others of the same class. Further, the view assumes that divine authority alone can determine the reality and import of types —a view that applies with equal force against prophecy. This rule may be safely followed: wherever the three characteristics of types are found which have been already mentioned, there is the type.

Weighty are the words of one equally eminent for his piety as for his learning: "That the Old Testament is rich in types, or rather forms in its totality one type, of the New Testament, follows necessarily from the entirely unique position which belongs to Christ as the center of the history of the world and of revelation. As we constantly see the principle embodied in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, that the higher species are already typified in a lower stage of development, so do we find, in the domain of saving revelation, the highest not only prepared for, but also shadowed forth, by that which precedes in

the lower spheres" (Van Oosterzee).

LITERATURE

P. Fairbairn, Typology of Scripture, 2 volumes; Angus, The Bible HandBook; Andrew Jukes, Law of Offerings in Leviticus; Mather, Gospel of Old Testament, Explanation of Types; McEwen, Grace and Truth: Types and Figures of the Old Testament; Soltau, Tabernacle, Priesthood and Offerings.

William G. Moorehead

TYRANNUS

ti-ran’-us (Turannos): When the Jews of Ephesus opposed Paul’s teaching in the synagogue, he withdrew, and, separating his followers, reasoned daily in the school of Tyrannus. "This continued for the space of two years" (Ac 19:9,10). D Syriac (Western text) adds after Tyrannus (Ac 19:9), "from the 5th hour unto the 10th." Schole is the lecture-hall or teaching-room of a philosopher or orator, and such were to be found m every Greek city. Tyrannus may have been

(1) a Greek rhetorician or

(2) a Jewish rabbi.

(1) This is the common opinion, and many identify him with a certain Tyrannus, a sophist, mentioned by Suidas. Paul would thus appear to be one of the traveling rhetors of the time, who had hired such a hall to proclaim his own peculiar philosophy (Ramsay, Paul the Traveler, 246, 271).

(2) Meyer thinks that as the apostle had not passed wholly to the Gentiles, and Jews still flocked to hear him, and also that as Tyrannus is not spoken of as a proselyte (sebomenos ton Theon), this schole is the beth Midrash of a Jewish rabbi. "Paul with his Christians withdrew from the public synagogue to the private synagogue of Tyrannus, where he and his doctrine were more secure from public annoyance" (Meyer in the place cited.).

(3) Another view (Overbeck) is that the expression was the standing name of the place after the original owner.

S. F. Hunter

TYRE

tir (tsowr. tsor, "rock"‘ Turos, "Tyrus"; modern Sur):

1. Physical Features:

The most noted of the Phoenician cities situated on the coast, lat. 33ø 17 minutes, about 20 miles South of Sidon and about 35 North of Carmel. The date of its foundation is uncertain, but it was later than that of Sidon. It is mentioned in the travels of the Egyptian Mohar, dating probably from the 14th century BC, and in the Tell el-Amarna Letters of about the same period. Herodotus describes the temple of Hercules at Tyre and says it was built 2,300 years before his time, which would carry back the beginning of the city to more than 2700 BC. It was a double city, one part on an island, a short distance from the shore, and the other on the mainland opposite. The island city had two harbors, connected by a canal, one looking North and the other South. The island was rocky and the city was fortitled on the land side by a wall 150 ft. high, the wall being of less elevation on the other sides. It was an exceedingly strong position, and is referred to in the Bible as the "strong" or "fortitled" city (Jos 19:29). The space within the walls was crowded with buildings, and is said to have contained 40,000 inhabitants. The town on the mainland was situated in a plain extending from the Ras el-‘Abyad, on the South to Sarepta on the North, a distance of about 20 miles. It was fertile and well watered, the river Leontes (Litany) passing through it to the sea, about 5 miles N. of Tyre, and the copious fountain of Ras el-‘Ain, 3 miles to the South, furnishing an abundant supply both for the city and the gardens.

2. History:

(1) Tyre was for centuries subordinate to Sidon, but when the Philistines subdued the latter city, probably in the 12th century. (see SIDON), Tyre received an accession of inhabitants from the fugitives which gave it the pre-eminence. From this time dates its great commercial and colonial activity. Its mariners pushed boldly out to the West and founded colonies in Spain and North Africa, some of which, like Gades, Abdera and Carthage, became famous. They extended their commerce more widely than Sidon had ever done and ventured into the Atlantic and reached the coasts of Britain and West Africa. They reached out to the East also, and had their ships in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean, and their land routes threaded all Western Asia (see PHOENICIA). Tyre, like all the Phoenician cities, became subject to Egypt under Thothmes III in the first half of the 15th century BC, and remained so for some 300 years, but it enjoyed practical autonomy under native kings, being only subject to tribute and to furnishing contingents of ships when the Egyptian kings made their expeditions to the North. In the Tell el-Amarna Letters, dating from the first half of the 14th century, we find a certain Abi-melek (or Abi-milki) writing from Tyre to the king of Egypt asking for aid against the Amorite leader, Aziru, and the king of Sidon, who had joined the rebels. The name is Phoenician, and we know that it was the policy of the Egyptian kings to leave the native dynasts on the throne.

(2) After the decline of Egypt, Tyre regained her independence and exercised the hegemony over most of the Phoenician towns, at least as far North as Gebal (Byblus), as appears in the control that Hiram had over the Lebanon forests in the time of David and Solomon. Hiram was evidently desirous of an alliance with Israel, since he sent messengers to David and furnished cedar and workmen to build him a house, apparently without solicitation. The friendly connection between the two kingdoms was advantageous to both, since David and Solomon needed the timber and the skilled artisans that Hiram could furnish, and Hiram needed the food products of the land of Israel (1Ki 5). Tyre was at this time noted for the skill of

its artificers, and its manufactured products were famous throughout the world (see PHOENICIA, 4). The purple dye and works in bronze were especially famous, and Hiram, the Tyrian artisan, was engaged by Solomon to cast the bronzes required for the temple (1Ki 7:13). Hiram, the king, enlarged and beautified his capital. He united the two small islands on which the city was built by filling up the space between, where he made an open square and built a splendid temple to Melkarth and Astarte. He engaged in commercial enterprises with Solomon (1Ki 9:26-28; 10:22), both in pursuance of the friendly alliance and also for the advantage of having the use of the port of Ezion-geber on the Red Sea. His brilliant reign lasted 43 years.

(3) The list of kings who succeeded him contains the names of Baal-azar, Abd-ashtoreth, murdered by his brothers, the eldest of whom succeeded him, followed by Astartus and Aserymus murdered by his brother, Pheles, who was overthrown by the high priest Eth-baal, showing how disturbed the period was. Eth-baal, or Ithobal, was the king who made an alliance with Ahab and gave him Jezebel, his daughter, in marriage, which proved most disastrous both to her and the country because of the introduction of the Baal-worship into Israel. Eth-baal was an energetic monarch, and is said to have rounded Botrys (Batrun). He reigned 32 years, and was followed by Badezor and Mattan, who gave his daughter, Elissa (Dido), in marriage to her uncle Sicharbas and transferred the throne to them; but they were set aside by an uprising of the people, and Pygmalion, son of Mattan, was placed on the throne, and Sicharbas put to death. Elissa fled with a party of nobles, by sea, to Africa and founded the city of Carthage. This happened about the middle of the 9th century BC, Josephus putting it at 860 BC.

(4) In the first half of this century Tyre became subject to Assyria, and her hegemony in Phoenicia came to an end, but her prosperity was not seriously checked as we may infer from Isa 23:8, which was written a century or so later. Assyria was satisfied with the payment of tribute until the time of Tiglath-pileser III (745-727), who laid a heavier hand upon her, and this led Elulaeus, king of Tyre, to form a confederacy of the Phoenician cities against Assyria. Shalmaneser IV subdued all except Tyre, which he distressed by cutting off her water-supply. But the people dug wells and obtained enough to subsist upon for five years, when Shalmaneser was killed and Elulaeus recovered control of his territory. He was not molested by Sargon, but Sennacherib advanced against him with 200,000 men, and Elulaeus fled to Cyprus. The citizens made a successful resistance and Sennacherib did not take Tyre, but it submitted to Esar-haddon, and its king, Baal, obtained the special favor of the Assyrian king, who made him ruler of all the coast cities from Dor to Gebal, and the Lebanon was placed under his control (680-673 BC). It is rather surprising that Baal refused to assist him in his attack upon Egypt and that Esar-haddon did not punish him, probably because he was too much occupied with Egypt. Ashur-banipal, however, did compel him to submit and to give him his daughter, and those of his brothers, as secondary wives, but left him as king of Tyre.

(5) On the decline of Assyria, Tyre regained its independence, and its greatness is indicated by the fact that it resisted Nebuchadnezzar 13 years (598-585); it is uncertain whether the island city was taken, but it evidently came to terms with the king of Babylon (compare Eze 27:26; Josephus, Ant, X, xi, 1 and see The Expository Times, 1899, pp. 378, 430, 475, 520). After this siege Sidon took the lead and Tyre was in a disturbed state: the monarchy was overthrown and suffetes, or judges, took its place for six years, when the old order was restored. The decline of Babylon enabled Tyre to regain her independence for a

short period until its submission to the Persians about 525 BC, and thenceforth it was a vassal state during the continuance of the Persian empire.

(6) It was by no means hindered in its commercial prosperity, and its great strength is seen in the brave and energetic resistance it made to Alexander the Great. All Phoenicia submitted to him without resistance, and Tyre was willing to admit his suzerainty, but declined to receive him into the city. This so angered Alexander that he at once commenced a siege that proved the most difficult undertaking in all his wars. He had no fleet and was obliged to build a mole (causeway) from the mainland to the island, but before he could finish it the Tyrians destroyed it and beat back their assailants handily. Alexander had to do the work all over again, and since he was convinced that without a fleet he would not be able to take the city, he procured ships from the Phoenician towns that had submitted, and with the aid of these was able to blockade the port and prevent the besieged from issuing forth to destroy the new causeway. This was at length pushed up to the very wall of the city, which was finally breached, and the troops of Alexander forced their way in. But even then the defenders would not yield, and the king himself had to lead the assault upon them with his bodyguard and put them all to the sword. Those who died with arms in their hands were 8,000, and the survivors, women, children and slaves, to the number of 30,000, were sold in the open market. He placed over the ruined city, into which he introduced some colonists, a certain Abd-elonim, and left it after having spent about seven months in subduing it.

(7) After the death of Alexander, Tyre passed into the hands of Ptolemy Lagi, and when Antigonus, in 314 BC, took Phoenicia from him, Tyre resisted, and he had to blockade it 15 months before it would yield, showing how quickly it had recovered from its previous disaster. It became a part of the Seleucid kingdom when Antiochus III drove the Ptolemies from Syria (198 BC), and the Seleucid kings regarded it of importance and gave it the right of asylum, and it was allowed the status of a free city by the Romans, Antony recognizing the magistrates and council of Tyre as allies. When the Parthians attacked and took Syria, in 40 BC, Tyre would not submit and was left untouched, being too strong for them. Augustus deprived it of its freedom, but it was given the status of a "metropolis" by Hadrian, and this title appears on its coins.

(8) Tyre is mentioned in the New Testament several times: Christ visited its territory (Mt 15:21; Mr 7:24), and people from there came to hear Him (Lu 6:17). Herod Agrippa I had trouble with Tyre, and a deputation came to visit him at Caesarea (Ac 12:20). Paul visited Tyre on his journey from Asia to Jerusalem (Ac 21:6-7).

Christianity was accepted by the people of Tyre, so that the 2nd century AD saw a bishopric established there, and in the 4th a council was held there to consider charges against Athanasius, by the party of Arius; he was condemned, a decision which brought the Tyrian church into disrepute. Tyre was already obnoxious to Christians because the anti-Christian philosopher Porphyry was from there. Tyre continued a commercial center, and Jerome says that it was the noblest and most beautiful of the Phoenician cities and an emporium of commerce for almost the whole world (Commentary on Ezekiel). It was of considerable importance in the Crusades and continued so until toward the end of the 13th century, when its trade declined, and it has now dwindled to a town of some 5,000 inhabitants. For "literature" see

PHOENICIA.

H. Porter

TYRE, LADDER OF

(klimakos Turou): Given. in 1 Macc 11:59 as the northern limit of the territory placed under the authority of Simon Thassi the Maccabee by Antiochus VI (Theos), in the year 143 BC. The statement of Josephus (B J, II, x, 2) that it was 100 furlongs North of Ptolemais, and a similar indication of position in the Jerusalem Talmud (Ab Zar 19) lead us to identify it with Ras-en-Naqurah and not with Ras-el-‘Abyad (Promontorium Album of Pliny), as has been done. Here the rugged hills of Upper Galilee descend in bold precipices to the sea and leave no beach between. A natural barrier is thus formed which prevented the histories of Israel and Tyre from ever touching one another except in peaceful relations.

W. M. Christie

TYROPOEON, THE

ti-ro-pe’-on.

See JERUSALEM.

TYRUS

ti’-rus.

See TYRE.

TZADDI

tza-de’.

See TSADHE.

UCAL

u’-kal (’ukhal (see below)): This name occurs along with that of Ithiel (Pr 30:1), both being taken by older interpreters as those of ancient sages. Some have suggested (see Toy, Proverbs, 519 f) that Ucal might be the "Caleol" of 1Ki 4:31 (Hebrew 5:11). Ucal was also explained as "I can," i.e. "I can maintain my obedience to God," just as Ithiel was taken to be "signs of God." Septuagint, Aquila, Theodotion do not take the words as proper names, and so BDB with others point this word as a vb., "(and) I am consumed" (wa’ekhel, for [~we’ukhal). The last three words of the verse are then translated "I have wearied myself, O God, I have wearied myself, O God, and am consumed."

See ITHIEL.

David Francis Roberts

UEL

u’-el, ‘u’el, ," will of God"): One of the sons of Bani who had taken foreign wives (Ezr 10:34). The name in 1 Esdras 9:35 is "Juel" (Codex Vaticanus Ouel; Codex Alexandrinus Iouel).

UKNAZ

uk’-naz (uqenaz, "and Kenaz," probably): Found in the King James Version margin of 1Ch 4:15 for the King James Version "even Kenaz," the Revised Version (British and American) "and Kenaz," whereas the Septuagint omits "and." It is probable that some name has dropped out after Elah. Curtis suggests reading "and these are the sons of Kenaz," i.e. those mentioned in 1Ch 4:13 f.

See KENAZ.

ULAI

u’-li, u’-lai (’ubhal ‘ulay, "river Ulai"; Theodotion Da 8:2, Oubal, the Septuagint and Theodotion in 8:16, Oulai Latin, Eulaeus):

1. The Name and Its Forms:

A river which, running through the province of Elam, flowed through Shushan or Susa. It was from "between" this river that Daniel (8:16) heard a voice, coming apparently from the waters which flowed between its two banks.

2. Present Names and Course:

Notwithstanding that the rivers of Elam have often changed their courses, there is but little doubt that the Ulai is the Kerkhah, which, rising in the Persian plain near Nehavend (there called the Gamas-ab), is even there a great river. Turned by the mountains, it runs Northwest as far as Bisutun, receiving all the waters of Southern Kurdistan, where, as the Sein Merre, it passes through the inaccessible defiles of Luristan, its course before reaching the Kebir-Kuh being a succession of rapids. Turned aside by this mountain, it follows for about 95 miles the depression which here exists as far as the foothills of Luristan, reaching the Susian plain as a torrent; but it becomes less rapid before losing itself in the marshes of Hawizeh. The course of the stream is said to be still doubtful in places.

3. Changed Bed at Susa:

In ancient times it flowed at the foot of the citadel of Susa, but its bed is now about 1 1/4 miles to the West. The date of this change of course (during which a portion of the ruins of Susa was carried away) is uncertain, but it must have been later than the time of Alexander the Great. The stream's greatest volume follows the melting of the snows in the mountains, and floods ensue if this coincides with the advent of heavy rain. Most to be dreaded are the rare occasions when it unites with the Ab-e-Diz.

4. Assyrian References:

The Ulai (Assyrian Ulaa or Ulaia) near Susa is regarded as being shown on the sculptures of the Assyrian king Ashur-bani-pal (British Museum, Nineveh Gal.) illustrating his campaign against Te-umman. Its rapid stream bears away the bodies of men and horses, with chariots, bows and quivers. The bodies which were thrown into the stream hindered its course, and dyed its waters with their blood.

LITERATURE

See Delegation en Perse: Memoires, I, Recherches Archeologiques, 25 ff.

T. G. Pinches

ULAM

u'-lam ('ulam, "preceding"):

(1) A "son"of Peresh; a Manassite clan (1Ch 7:16,17). Lucian reads Elam.

(2) A descendant of Benjamin who had sons, "mighty men of valor" (1Ch 8:39,40). The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus has Ailam in 1Ch 8:39 and Aileim in 8:40; Codex Alexandrinus has Oulam in both verses, and so Lucian.

ULLA

ul’-a (‘ulla’ meaning unknown): An Asherite (1Ch 7:39).

UMMAH

um’-a (‘ummah; Archob, Amma): One of the cities allotted to the tribe of Asher (Jos 19:30). By a slight emendation of the text it would read Acco, the name of the place subsequently known as Ptolemais, the modern ‘Akka. This emendation is generally adopted by scholars, although it is at best a conjecture. No other identification is yet possible.

UMPIRE

um’-pir.

See DAYSMAN.

UNBELIEF

un-be-lef’:The word (the King James Version) represents two Greek words, apeitheia, "disobedience" (only in Ro 11:30,32; Heb 4:6,11), and apistia, "distrust," the antithesis to "faith". (which see). The two words are not only akin etymologically but run into one another by mental connection, certainly where spiritual relations are concerned, as between man and God. For when God has spoken, in precept and yet more in promise, distrust involves, at least potentially, an element of disobedience. His supreme claim is to be trusted to command only what is right, and to promise only what is true. He is infinitely sympathetic in His insight, and infallibly knows where distrust comes only of the dim perceptions and weak mis-givings of our mortal nature, and where, on the other hand, a moral resistance lies at the back of the non-confidence. But the presence of that darker element is always to be suspected, at least, and searched for in serious self-examination.

We may remark that it is a loss in our language that "unbelief" is the only word we can use as the antithesis to "faith"; for "faith" and "belief" (which see) are not exactly synonyms. "Unfaith" would be a welcome word for such use, if it were generally so understood.

Handley Dunelm

UNBELIEVER

un-be-lev’-er: This word follows closely the lines of "unbelief" (which see) in its relation to originals. Once only (Ac 14:2) it represents the participle apeithountes, "disobeying (ones)." Elsewhere (nine cases) it represents apistos, "faithless," "without faith." In six of these passages (all in 1 and 2

Corinthians) it denotes the unconverted pagan as distinguished from the convert. In the other passages (Lu 12:46; Tit 1:15; Re 21:8) the reference is to the unbelief which comes of moral resistance to God.

UNCERTAIN; UNCERTAINTY

un-sur'-tin, un-sur'-tin-ti: Adjective adelos, 2 Macc 7:34; 1Co 14:8; adverb adelos, 1Co 9:26; noun adelotes, 1Ti 6:17; adelos means "not clear," and so "uncertain." Also the King James Version The Wisdom of Solomon 9:14 for episphales, "unsteady," the Revised Version (British and American) "prone to fall."

UNCHANGEABLE; UNCHANGEABLENESS

un-chanj'-a-bl, un-chanj'-a-bl-nes:

I. UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD A TRUTH OF NATURAL THEOLOGY

II. SCRIPTURAL DOCTRINE OF THE UNCHANGEABLENESS OF GOD

1. Not Lifeless Immobility

2. As Contrasted with the Finite

3. God's Knowledge, Will and Purpose

4. In His Relation to the World

5. His Relations to Men

LITERATURE

The unchangeablehess or immutability of God is that divine attribute which expresses the truth that in His nature and perfections, in His knowledge, will and purpose, He always remains the same in the fullness of His infinite and perfect Being; infinitely exalted above change, becoming and development, which are the specific characteristics of all finite existence. This is one of what theologians have called the incommunicable attributes of God, that is, one of those specific characteristics of the divine nature which make God to be God in distinction from all that is finite. These attributes have also been called negative attributes. By calling them negative, however, it is not meant that they express the nature of God in so far as He is unknowable and incomprehensible by the finite mind, while the positive attributes, such as love and righteousness, express God's nature as revealed and known. Both kinds of attributes can be known only in so far as God reveals Himself, and furthermore the so-called negative attributes involve a positive idea, while the positive ones in turn imply the negation of all finite

limitations. Moreover, since the finite mind cannot comprehend the infinite God, back of all that God has revealed of Himself, back even of His absoluteness, eternity and unchangeability, lies the fullness of His infinite Being, unsearchable, unknowable, and incomprehensible alike in His nature and attributes (Ps 145:3; 147:5; Job 11:7-9; Isa 40:28).

It is these incommunicable attributes, including unchangeableness, which make God to be God, and mark the specific difference between Him and all finite existence. Unchangeableness is, therefore, the characteristic of God's entire nature and of all His attributes. It cannot be limited to His ethical nature or to His love, and, while it is true that these incommunicable attributes are revealed with especial richness in God's saving activity, they cannot be limited to marks of God's saving action or purpose. It is true that God is unchangeable in His love and grace and power to save, but that is only because it is the love and grace and power of the absolute, infinite and immutable God.

I. Unchangeableness of God a Truth of Natural Theology.

As the One infinitely perfect and absolute or self-existent Being, God is exalted far above the possibility of change, because He is independent, self-existent and unlimited by all the causes of change. As uncaused and self-existent, God cannot be changed from without; as infinitely perfect, He cannot suffer change from within; and as eternal and independent of time, which is the "form" of change and mutability, He cannot be subject to any change at all. God's unchangeablehess, therefore, follows from His self-existence and eternity.

II. Scriptural Doctrine of the Unchangeableness of God.

The Scripture doctrine of God reaffirms this truth. It conceives of God as a living Person in relation to the world and man, and at the same time as absolutely unlimited by the world and man, and as absolutely unchangeable. The God who has revealed Himself in the Old Testament and the New Testament is never identified with, or merged in, the processes of Nature. He is complete and perfect in Himself, and is not the result of any process of self-realization. He is so great that His relations to the created universe cannot begin to exhaust His Being, and yet He stands in the closest relations to man and the world as Creator, Preserver, Governor, and Saviour.

1. Not Lifeless Immobility:

On the one hand, then, the Bible never represents the unchangeableness of God as a dead immobility out of all relation to man and the world. This tendency of thought, fearing anthropomorphism, proceeds on the principle that to make any definite predications about God is to limit Him. The logical result of this is to conceive of God as abstract Being or Substance, so that the word "God" becomes only a name for the Unknowable. Over against this error, the Scripture represents God concretely as a Person in relation to the world and man. In the beginning He created the heavens and the earth, and from that time on He is the life of the world, especially of Israel, His chosen people. To bring out this truth anthropomorphisms are employed. God comes and goes, reveals Himself and hides Himself. He repents (Ge 6:6; 1Sa 15:11;

Am 7:3; Joe 2:13); He becomes angry (Nu 11:1; Ps 106:40); and lays aside His anger (De 13:17; Ho 14:4). He sustains a different relation to the godly and the wicked (Pr 11:20; 12:22). In the fullness of time He became incarnate through the Son, and He dwells in His people by His Spirit, their experience of His grace being greater at some times than at others.

But on the other hand, the Scripture always asserts in unmistakable terms the unchangeableness of God. He is unchangeable in His nature. Although the name ‘El Shadday, by which He made Himself known in the patriarchal period of revelation, denotes especially God’s power, this name by no means exhausts the revelation of God in that period. His unchangeableness is involved in His eternity as made known to Abraham (Ge 21:33). This attribute finds its clearest expression in the name Yahweh as revealed to Moses, the significance of which is unfolded in the passage Ex 3:13-15. God here reveals Himself to His people as "I AM THAT I AM," using the future tense of the verb "to be," which, as the context shows, is given as the meaning of the name Yahweh. Some recent writers would derive these words from the Hiphil stem of the verb, and affirm that it signifies that God is the giver of life. The verb, however, is in the Qal stem, the tense denoting the changeless continuity of the life and nature of God. The idea expressed is not merely that of self-existence, but also of unchangeableness, and this unchangeableness, as the context clearly indicates (especially Ex 3:15), is here set forth not simply as belonging to the nature of God in Himself, but is brought into closest connection with His covenant relation to His people, so that the religious value of God’s unchangeableness is most clearly implied in this fundamental assertion of the attribute. The same idea of God’s immutability is reaffirmed in the prophecy of Isaiah. It is connected with the name Yahweh (Isa 41:4; compare also 48:12), where Yahweh affirms that He is the first and, with the last, the same God, thereby asserting not merely His eternity, but also that He is the same in His divine existence throughout all ages. This attribute, moreover, is claimed by Yahweh, and set forth as an especial mark of His Godhead in Isa 44:6. The unchangeableness of the divine nature is also asserted by the prophet Malachi in a difficult passage (3:6). This is a clear affirmation of the unchangeableness of God, the only question being whether it is set forth as the ground of Israel’s confidence, or in contrast with their fickleness, a question which depends partly on that of the text.

In the New Testament the thought of the passage in Exodus 3 is reiterated in the Apocalypse where God is described as He who is and was and is to come (Re 1:4). This is an expansion of the covenant name Yahweh in Ex 3:13-15, denoting not merely eternity but also immutability. The phrases "the Alpha and the Omega" (Re 1:8; 21:6; 22:13); and "the first and the last" (Re 1:17; 22:13); and "the beginning and the end" (Re 21:6; 22:13) bring out the same idea, and are applied to Christ as well as to God, which is a clear indication of our Lord’s Deity. The apostle Paul likewise asserts the incorruptibility, eternity and immortality of the divine nature, all of which ideas imply the unchangeableness of God (Ro 1:23; 1Ti 1:17; 6:16).

2. As Contrasted with the Finite:

Not only is the unchangeableness of God’s nature asserted in Scripture, and placed in relation to His dealings with men, but also it is declared to be the distinctive characteristic of God’s nature as contrasted with the entire universe of finite being. While the heavens and the earth change and are passing away,

God endures forever and forever the same God (Ps 102:26-28 (Hebrew versification, 27-29)). The application of the language of this psalm to Christ by the author of the Epistle to the Heb 1:10-12 involves the unchangeableness of Christ, which is again explicitly asserted in this Epistle (Heb 13:8), being another clear indication of the way in which the Deity of Jesus Christ pervades the New Testament. This idea of God's immutability, as contrasted with the mutability of finite existence which is His creation, is given expression in the New Testament by the apostle James. As Creator of the heavenly bodies, God is called the Father of lights. While their lights, however, are intermittent, God's light is subject to neither change nor obscuration (Jas 1:17).

In accordance with this idea of the unchangeableness of God's nature, the Scripture, in ascribing life and personality to Him, never regards God as subject to any process of becoming or self-realization, and the views which so conceive of God are unscriptural whether they proceed upon a unitarian or a trinitarian basis.

3. God's Knowledge, Will and Purpose:

God is also represented in Scripture as unchangeable in His knowledge, will and purpose. He is not a man that He should repent (1Sa 15:29). His purposes, therefore, are unchangeable (Nu 23:19; Isa 46:11; Pr 19:21); and His decrees are accordingly likened to "mountains of brass" (Zec 6:1). His righteousness is as immutable as mountains (Ps 36:6 (Hebrew 7)); and His power also is unchangeable (Isa 26:4). Hence, while the Scripture represents God as sustaining living relations to His creatures, it does not conceive of Him as conditioned or determined in any way by men's acts, in either His knowledge, will, purpose or power. God knows eternally the changing course of events, and He acts differently upon different occasions, but all events, including human actions, are determined by God's unchangeable purpose, so that God's knowledge and actions are not contingent upon anything outside Himself.

Although, therefore, the idea of God as pure abstract Being, out of all relation to the world, is unscriptural, it is no less true that conception of God which represents a reaction from this, and which conceives of God anthropomorphically and as conditioned and determined by the world and man, is also quite contradictory to the Scripture conception of God. This latter tendency goes too far in the opposite direction, and falls into the error of conceiving God's knowledge, will, purpose and power too anthropomorphically, and as limited by the free acts of man. While the opposite tendency kept God out of all relation to the world, this one erects God's relation to the world into something which limits Him. This way of conceiving of God, which is the error of Rationalism, Socinianism and Arminianism, is as unscriptural as that which conceives of God as abstract Being, unknowable, and entirely out of relation to the world.

4. In His Relation to the World:

Unchangeable in His nature and attributes, God is likewise unchangeable in His relation to the world, which relation the Scripture represents as creation and providence, and not as emanation. Hence while everything finite changes, God remains ever the same (Ps 102:26-28). Consequently, the pantheistic idea

is also unscriptural, which idea, going farther than the anthropomorphic and dualistic conception which places the world over against God, completely merges God's Being in the world and its processes of change, affirming that God comes to self-realization in the evolution of the world and man. In its reaction from the denial of God's living relation to the world, this view does not stop with limiting God by reason of this relation, but merges Him completely in the world-development. The Scripture, on the contrary, always conceives of God as immutably free and sovereign in His relation to all the creation.

In accordance with this idea of the unchangeableness of God's nature and attributes, the Bible always maintains God's absoluteness and transcendence of Nature and her processes in all of the relations which He sustains to the finite universe. It came into being by His creative fiat, not by any process of emanation from His Being. He sustains it in existence, and governs it, not by any process of Self-realization in the series of second causes, but from without, by His sovereign will and power. And He intrudes into the series of finite causes miraculously, producing events in Nature which are due solely to His power. When for man's salvation the Son of God became incarnate, it was not by any change of His nature in laying aside some or all of the attributes of Deity, but by assuming a human nature into personal union with the divine nature. The Scripture passages which speak of the incarnation of our Lord clearly indicate that the Son retained His full Deity in "becoming flesh" (compare especially the prologue to John's Gospel and Php 2:6-8). Moreover, the Old Testament doctrine of the Spirit of God as the source of life to the world is always at pains to avoid any mingling of the Spirit with the processes of Nature, and the same thing is true of the New Testament doctrine of the indwelling of the Spirit in the believer, always keeping the Spirit distinct from the spirit of man (Ro 8:16).

5. His Relations to Men:

Finally, God is unchangeable not only in relation to the universe, but in His relations to men and especially to His people. This follows from His unchangeable ethical nature. The Scripture often connects the unchangeableness of God with His goodness (Ps 100:5; Jas 1:17); with His truthfulness and mercy (Ps 100:5; 117:2); and with His covenant promises (Ex 3:13). In connection with His covenant promises, God's unchangeableness gives the idea of His faithfulness which is emphasized in the Old Testament to awaken trust in God (De 7:9; Ps 36:5 (Hebrew 6); Ps 92:2 (Hebrew 3); Isa 11:5; La 3:23). This idea of God's unchangeableness in His covenant promises or His faithfulness is repeated and emphasized in the New Testament. His gifts or graces and election are without repentance (1Th 5:24; Ro 11:29); He is faithful toward men because unchangeably true to His own nature (2Ti 2:13); His faithfulness abides in spite of men's lack of faith (Ro 3:5), and is in many places represented as the basis of our confidence in God who is true to His election and gracious promises (1Co 1:9; 10:13; 2Th 3:3; Heb 10:23; 11:11; 1Pe 4:19; 1 Joh 1:9). See FAITHFULNESS. It is thus the religious significance and value of God's unchangeableness which is especially emphasized throughout the Scripture. Because He is unchangeably true to His promises, He is the secure object of religious faith and trust, upon whom alone we can rely in the midst of human change and decay. It is this idea to which expression is given by calling God a rock, the rock of our strength and of our salvation (De 32:15; Ps 18:2 (Hebrew 3); 42:9 (Hebrew 10); 71:3; Isa 17:10). God is even eternally a rock, the never-failing object of confidence and trust (Isa 26:4).

It appears, therefore, that the Scripture idea of the unchangeableness of God lays emphasis upon four points. First, it is not lifeless immobility, but the unchangeableness of a living Person. Second, it is, however, a real unchangeableness of God's nature, attributes and purpose. Third, this unchangeableness is set forth as one of the specific characteristics of Deity in distinction from all that is finite. Fourth, God's unchangeableness is not dealt with in an abstract or merely theoretic manner, but its religious value is invariably emphasized as constituting God the one true object of religious faith.

LITERATURE.

Besides the commentaries on appropriate passages, and the discussion of the divine attributes in the general works on systematic theology, see Dillmann, Handbuch der alttest. Theol., 1895, 215-20, 243-44; Oehler, Theology of the Old Testament, English translation, 1883, 95, 100; Schultz, Alttest. Theol., 1896, 419; Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, 1904, 45-58, 165. For a fuller discussion see Charhock, "The Immutability of God," Works, volume I, 374-419; Dorner, Ueber die richtige Fassung des dogmatischen Begrifts der Unverdnderlichkeit Gottea, u.s.w.; Article I, "Die neueren Laugnungen der Unveranderlichkeit des personlichen Gottes, u.s.w.," JDT, I, 201-77; II, "Die Geschichte der Lehre von der Unveranderlichkeit Gottea bis auf Schleiermacher," JDT, II, 440-500; III, "Dogmatische Erorterung der Lehre von der Unveranderlichkeit Gottes," JDT, III, 579-660; H. Cremer, Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottea, 1897, pub. in the Beitrage zur Forderung christlicher Theol., I, 7-111; see pp. 10 ff, and especially pp. 102-9.

Caspar Wistar Hodge

UNCHASTITY

un-chas'-ti-ti.

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

UNCIRCUMCISED; UNCIRCUMCISION

un-sur'-kum-sizd, un-sur-kum-sizh'-un: The adjective in the Old Testament is 'arel (Ge 17:14, etc.), from a root of uncertain meaning, with the noun 'orlah, "uncircumcised (person)" (Le 19:23; Jer 9:25), and the verb 'aral, "count as uncircumcised" (Le 19:23; the Revised Version (British and American) Hab 2:16). In the Apocrypha and the New Testament the noun is akrobustia (a physiological term, 1 Macc 1:15; Ac 11:3, etc.), and the adjective aperitmetos (Additions to Esther 14:15; 1 Macc 1:48; 2:46; Ac 7:51), with the verb epispaomai, "become uncircumcised" (1Co 7:18). The language of 1 Macc 1:15 suggests the performance of some surgical operation, but no such operation appears to be possible, and "behaved like uncircumcised persons" (as in 1Co 7:18) is the probable meaning.

See CIRCUMCISION.

Burton Scott Easton

UNCLE

un’-k’l (dodh, "beloved," "uncle," "relation").

See RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

UNCLEAN SPIRIT

un-klen’.

See SPIRIT, UNCLEAN; DEMON, DEMONIAC.

UNCLEANNESS

un-klen’-nes:

I. TERMS

1. In the Old Testament (Hebrew)

2. In the New Testament

3. In the Septuagint

II. POSSIBLE RELATION OF ISRAEL’S LAWS ON UNCLEANNESS WITH THE LAWS OF TABOO AMONG THE NATIONS

III. TEACHING AS TO UNCLEANNESS

1. In the Old Testament

2. In the Apocrypha

3. In the New Testament

LITERATURE

I. Terms.

1. In the Old Testament (Hebrew):

Tum’ah, "uncleanness," "defilement," occurs 26 times (Le 7:20,21; 14:19; 15:3,15,26,30,31, etc.). niddah, "separation," "impurity," occurs in Le 20:21; Ezr 9:11; Zec 13:1. ‘erwah, occurs in De 23:14. ‘erwath dabhar, "unclean thing" (De 24:1) is translated "uncleanness" in the King James Version. The adjective Tame’," defiled," "unclean," occurs 72 times (over half in Leviticus), but is never translated "uncleanness," but always "unclean." The verb Tame’," to make" or "declare unclean," occurs often. Other Hebrew verbs "to defile" are ga’al, chalal, chaneph, Tanaph, ‘alal, ‘anah.

2. In the New Testament:

The Greek word for "uncleanness" is akatharsia, which occurs 10 times (Mt 23:27; Ro 1:24; 6:19; 2Co 12:21, etc.). miasmos, "pollution," occurs only in 2Pe 2:10. The adjective akathartos, "unclean," occurs 31 times, 23 times in reference to unclean spirits (Luke once using the expression "unclean demon," 4:33), 4 times to ceremonial uncleanness (thee by Peter and one by John the revelator), and 4 times to moral uncleanness (three by Paul and one by John the revelator). Koinos, "common," "unclean," occurs 8 times in the sense of "unclean" (Mr 7:2,5; Ac 10:14,28; 11:8; Ro 14:14; Re 21:27). The verb koinoo, "to defile," occurs 11 times (Mt 15:11,18,20; Mr 7:15, etc.). miaino, "to defile," occurs 5 times (Joh 18:28; Tit 1:15; Heb 12:15; Jude 1:8). moluno, "to make filthy," occurs 3 times (1Co 8:7; Re 3:4; 14:4). spiloo, occurs twice (Jas 3:6; Jude 1:23) and phtheiro, "to corrupt," occurs 7 times in Greek, once in English Versions of the Bible (1Co 3:17).

3. In the Septuagint:

Akatharsia, "uncleanness," occurs 59 times in Septuagint (including many instances in apocryphal books) (1 and 2 Esdras, Tobit, 1 and 2 Maccabees, etc.). Akathartos, "unclean," occurs 134 times in the Septuagint (including one example in 1 Maccabees). Koinos, "unclean," and koinoo, "to make unclean," occur in Esther, Proverbs, Wisdom, 1, 2, 3 and 4 Maccabees). Miaino, "to defile," occurs over 100 times. Moluno, "to make filthy," occurs 18 times (both in the Old Testament and in the Apocrypha).

II. Possible Relation of Israel’s Laws on Uncleanness with the Laws of Taboo among the Nations:

W. R. Smith (Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, 152-55) thinks there is a kinship between Israel’s laws of uncleanness and the heathen taboo. Frazer, in The Golden Bough, shows numerous examples of the taboo among various tribes and nations which present striking similarity to some of Israel’s laws on uncleanness. But does this diminish our respect for the Old Testament laws on uncleanness? Might not Yahweh use this natural religious perception of men as to an intrinsic distinction between clean and unclean in training Israel to a realization of a higher conception—the real difference between sin and holiness, i.e. between moral defilement and moral purification? The hand of Yahweh is visible even in the development of Israel’s rudimentary laws on ceremonial uncleanness. They are not explicable on purely naturalistic grounds, but Yahweh is training a people to be holy, and so He starts on the lower

plane of ceremonial uncleanness and cleanness (see Le 11:44 as to the purpose of Yahweh in establishing these laws respecting clean and unclean animals).

III. Teaching as to Uncleanness.

1. In the Old Testament:

Each term above for uncleanness is used in two senses:

(a) to signify ceremonial uncleanness, which is the most usual significance of the term in the Old Testament;

(b) but, in the Prophets, to emphasize moral, rather than ceremonial, uncleanness. There are four principal spheres of uncleanness in the Old Testament:

(1) Uncleanness in the Matter of Food.

The law as to clean and unclean beasts is laid down in Le 11:1-23. Notice that the law does not extend to vegetable foods, as does a similar law in the Egyptian religion. Four kinds of beasts are named as fit for food:

(a) among quadrupeds, those that both chew the cud and part the hoof;

(b) among fishes, only those having both fins and scales;

(c) most birds or fowls, except, in the main, birds of prey and those noted for uncleanness of habits, are permitted;

(d) of insects those that have legs above the feet to leap withal (e.g. the cricket, the grasshopper, etc.), but those that go on all four, or have many feet, or go upon the belly (e.g. worms, snakes, lizards, etc.), are forbidden.

See, further, FOOD.

(2) Uncleanness Connected with the Functions of Reproduction (Leviticus 12 and 15).

In Le 15:2-18, we find the laws applied to issues of men; in 15:19 ff, to the issues of women. Not only is the man or woman unclean because of the issue, whether normal or abnormal, but the bed on which they lie, or whatever or whoever is touched by them while they are in this state, is unclean. The uncleanness lasts seven days from the cessation of the issue. To become clean men must wash their clothes and batheir bodies (though this requirement is not made of women), and both men and women must offer

through the priest a pair of turtle-doves, or two young pigeons (Le 15). According to Le 13, the woman who conceives and bears a child is unclean. This uncleanness lasts seven days if the child born is a male, but 14 days if the child is a female. However, there is a partial uncleanness of the mother that continues 40 days from the birth of a male, 80 days from the birth of a female, at the end of which period she is purified by offering a lamb and a young pigeon (or turtle-dove), or if too poor to offer a lamb she may substitute one of the birds for the lamb.

(3) Uncleanness Connected with Leprosy.

According to Le 14 and 15, the leper was regarded as under the stroke of God, and so was deemed unclean. The leper (so adjudged by the priest) must separate himself from others, with torn clothes, disheveled hair, and crying with covered lips, "Unclean! Unclean!" That is, he was regarded as a dead man, and therefore unclean and so must live secluded from others.

See, further, LEPER, LEPROSY.

(4) Uncleanness Associated with Death.

According to Le 15:24-40, anyone who touched a dead beast, whether unclean or clean, was rendered unclean. According to Nu 19:11-22, anyone touching the corpse of a human being is unclean. Likewise, everyone in the tent, or who enters the tent, where lies a dead man, is unclean seven days. Even the open vessels in the tent with a dead person are unclean seven days. Whoever, furthermore, touched a dead man’s bone or grave was unclean seven days. Purification, in all these cases of uncleanness as related to death, was secured by sprinkling the ashes of a red heifer with living water upon the unclean person, or object, on the 3rd and 7th days.

See PURIFICATION.

2. In the Apocrypha:

In Tobit 3:7-9; 6:13,14; 7:11; 8:1-3; 1 Macc 1:41-53, and in other books, we find the same laws on uncleanness recognized by the descendants of Abraham. It was regarded as abominable to sacrifice other animals (swine for instance) than those prescribed by Yahweh. There is a growing sense in Israel during this period, that all customs and all conduct of the heathen are unclean. Witness the resistance of the loyal Jews to the demands of Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 1; 2; 6; 7). The sense of ceremonial uncleanness was still a conspicuous element in the religious consciousness of the Jews in the inter-Biblical period. But the training of God in ceremonial purification and in the moral and spiritual teachings of the prophets had prepared the way for an advance in moral cleanness (both in thought and in practice).

3. In the New Testament:

By the days of Jesus the scribes and rabbis had wrought out a most cumbrous system of ceremonial uncleanness and purification. Nor did they claim that all their teachings on this subject were found in the Old Testament. See TRADITION. This is fitly illustrated in the New Testament in the washing of hands. See UNWASHEN. When the Mishna (the collection of rabbinic teachings) was produced, the largest book was devoted to the laws of purification, 30 chapters being used to describe the purification of vessels alone.

See Joh 2:1-11, and note how the Jews had six stone waterpots for purification at the wedding in Cana. See Joh 3:25 as to the controversy on purification between John's disciples and the Jews. This question of cleanness and uncleanness was a tremendous issue with every Jew. He must keep himself ceremonially clean if he would be righteous and win the approval of God.

Jesus utterly disregarded for Himself these laws of purification, though He orders the cleansed leper to return to the priest and secure his certificate of cleansing. He did not wash His hands before eating, and His disciples followed His example. Therefore, the Pharisees challenged Him to give an account of His course and that of His disciples (Mt 15:3-20 = Mr 7:6-23). Jesus then enunciated the great principle that there is no ceremonial, but only moral and spiritual, uncleanness. Not what goes into a man from hands that touch unclean things defiles the man, but the things that come out of his heart, evil thoughts, hatred, adultery, murder, etc., these defile the man.

Paul likewise regarded nothing as unclean of itself (Ro 14:14,20; Tit 1:15), yet no man should violate the scruples of his own conscience or that of his brother (and thus put a stumblingblock in his way). Love, not ceremonialism is the supreme law of the Christian. Paul, in submitting to the vow of purification in Jerusalem, set an example of this principle (Ac 21:26).

See also CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

LITERATURE.

W. R. Smith, Lectures on the Religion of the Semites (especially pp. 152-55, on taboo, and pp. 455, 456, on the uncleanness of sexual intercourse); Frazer, The Golden Bough (examples of taboo and similar laws and customs among various nations); Frazer, article "Taboo" in Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th edition; Benzinger, Hebrew Archaeology; Nowack, Hebrew Archaeology; Kellogg, commentary on "Leviticus" (Expositor's Bible); Kalisch, Leviticus; Dillmann-Ryssel, Leviticus; Schultz, Dillmann, Smend, Marti, Davidson, in their Old Testament Theologies, give useful hints on this subject; article "Casuistry" (Hebrew) in ERE, III, is valuable.

Charles B. Williams

UNCLOTHED

un-klothd'.

See CLOTHED UPON.

UNCTION

unk’-shun: The the King James Version translation of chrisma (1Joh 2:20), which the Revised Version (British and American) renders "anointing," as the King James Version renders the same word in 1Joh 2:27.

UNDEFILED

un-de-fild’:In the Old Testament tam, "perfect," presents the positive side. Hence, Ps 119:1 is translated in the Revised Version: "Blessed are they that are perfect in the way." In the New Testament amiantos, presents the negative side, "unstained" "unsullied" "without taint." Used to describe the sinlessness of Christ (Heb 7:26), to declare the marriage act free from all guilt, disgrace or shame (Heb 13:4), to contrast the heavenly inheritance with earthly possessions (1Pe 1:4).

UNDERGIRDING

un-der-gurd’-ing.

See SHIPS AND BOATS, III, 2.

UNDERNEATH

un-der-neth’ (tachath, "the bottom (as depressed)"): "Underneath are the everlasting arms" (De 33:27). In these words Moses sums up the history of Israel and gives expression to his final thought about life and time and all things visible. Underneath all phenomena and all the chances and changes of life and time there is unchanging law, everlasting principle, an all-enfolding power, an all-embracing love.

UNDERSETTER

un’-der-set-er (katheph): The word, used in 1Ki 7:30,34 of supports of the laver, means lit. "shoulder," and is so rendered in the Revised Version margin.

See LAVER.

UNDERTAKE

un-der-tak’:"To take upon one’s self," "assume responsibility," and so in Elizabethan English "be

surety." In this sense in the King James Version Isa 38:14, "O Lord, ... undertake for me" (‘arabh, the Revised Version (British and American) "be thou my surety"). Perhaps in the same sense in Sirach 29:19, although the idea is scarcely contained in the Greek verb dioko, "pursue." In the modern sense in 1 Esdras 1:28; 2 Macc 2:29; 8:10; the King James Version 2:27.

See SURE; SURETY.

UNEQUAL

un-e’-kwal: Eze 18:25,29 for lo’ thakhan, "not weighed," "illogical." "Unequally" in 2Co 6:14, in the phrase "unequally yoked," heterozugeo, is used of the yoking together of two animals of different kinds (compare the Septuagint of Le 19:19).

UNFEIGNED

un-fand’ (anupokritos, "unfeigned," "undisguised"): The Greek word occurs only in the New Testament (1Ti 1:5; 2Ti 1:5) and is designative of the moral quality of faith as "the mark of transparency and simplicity of soul—the most complete and distinct exponent of a man’s character—the natural hypothesis of a pure and good heart—a readiness to believe in goodness" (Martineau, Hours of Thought, First Series, 86 ff). Compare 2Co 6:6; 1Pe 1:22; Jas 3:17.

UNGODLY

un-god’-li (rasha‘ (Ps 1:1), "wicked," beliya‘al (2Sa 22:5), "worthless"; in the New Testament asebes (Ro 5:6), e.g. indicating that the persons so called are both irreverent and impious): Trench says that the idea of active opposition to religion is involved in the word, that it is a deliberate withholding from God of His dues of prayer and of service; a standing, so to speak, in battle array against God and His claims to respect, reverence and obedience. Those whose sins are particularly aggravating and deserving of God’s wrath are the "ungodly." And yet it is for such that Jesus Christ died (Ro 5:6).

William Evans

UNICORN

u’-ni-korn (re’em (Nu 23:22; 24:8; De 33:17; Job 39:9,10; Ps 22:21; 29:6; 92:10; Isa 34:7)): "Unicorn" occurs in the King James Version in the passages cited, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "wild-ox" (which see).

UNITY

u’-ni-ti: Ps 133:1 for (yachadh, "unitedness," and Eph 4:3,13 for henotes "oneness." Also Sirach 25:1 the

King James Version for homonoia "concord" (so the Revised Version (British and American)).

UNKNOWN GOD

un-non’,(agnostos theos): In Ac 17:23 (St. Paul’s speech in Athens) the American Standard Revised Version reads: "I found also an altar with this inscription, To AN UNKNOWN GOD. What therefore ye worship in ignorance, this I set forth unto you." the King James Version and the English Revised Version margin translate "to the Unknown God," owing to the fact that in Greek certain words, of which theos is one, may drop the article when it is to be understood. In the present case the use of the article. is probably right (compare Ac 17:24). In addition, the King James Version reads "whom" and "him" in place of "what" and "this." The difference here is due to a variation in the Greek manuscripts, most of which support the King James Version. But internal probability is against the King James Version’s reading, as it would have been very easy for a scribe to change neuters (referring to the divine power) into masculines after "God," but not vice versa. Hence, modern editors (except yon Soden’s margin) have adopted the reading in the Revised Version (British and American).

Paul in Athens, "as he beheld the city full of idols," felt that God was truly unknown there. Hence the altar with the inscription struck him as particularly significant. Some Athenians, at any rate, felt the religious inadequacy of all known deities and were appealing to the God who they felt must exist, although they knew nothing definite about Him. No better starting-point for an address could be wished. What the inscription actually meant, however, is another question. Nothing is known about it. Altars dedicated "to unknown gods" (in the plural) seem to have been fairly common (Jerome on Tit 1:12; Pausanias, i.1,4; Philaster, Vita Apoll., vi.3), and Blase (Commentary ad loc.) has even suggested that the words in Ac were originally in the plural. But this would spoil the whole point of the speech, and the absence of references to a single inscription among thousands that existed can cause no surprise. Those inscriptions in the plural seem to have been meant in the sense "to the other deities that may exist in addition to those already known," but an inscription in the sing. could not have this meaning. Perhaps a votive inscription is meant, where the worshipper did not know which god to thank for some benefit received. That a slur on all the other Athenian objects of worship was intended is, however, most improbable, but Paul could not of course be expected to know the technical meaning of such inscriptions.

See ATHENS.

Buston Scott Easton

UNLEARNED

un-lur’-ned: Ac 4:13 for agrammatos, literally "illiterate." But nothing more than "lacking technical rabbinical instruction" seems to be meant (compare Joh 7:15). 1Co 14:16,23,24 for idiotes, "private person," the Revised Version margin "he that is without gifts," correctly expresses the sense ("unbeliever" is hardly in point); also the King James Version, 2Ti 2:23; 2Pe 3:16 (the Revised Version

(British and American) "ignorant").

UNLEAVENED

un-lev’-’-nd.

See LEAVEN; PASSOVER; SACRIFICE.

UNNATURAL VICE

un-nat’-u-ral vis.

See CRIMES; PUNISHMENTS.

UNNI

un’-i (‘unni, meaning unknown): (1) One of "the twelve brethren" (so Curtis for the Revised Version (British and American) "brethren of the second degree") appointed as singers (1Ch 15:18,20).

(2) In Ne 12:9 (Kethibh ‘unno) = the Revised Version (British and American) UNNO (which see).

UNNO

un’-o (‘unno; the Septuagint omits the name, but in Codex Sinaiticus, a later hand has added Iana; the Qere of the Massoretic Text has ‘unni, as in 1Ch 15:18, whence the King James Version has "Unni"): A Levite who returned with Zerubbabel (Ne 12:9).

UNPARDONABLE SIN

un-par’-dn-a-bl.

See BLASPHEMY.

UNQUENCHABLE FIRE

un-kwench’-a-b’-l, pur asbestos): The phrase occurs in Mt 3:12 and its parallel Lu 3:17 in the words of the Baptist on the Messianic judgment: "The chaff he will burn up with unquenchable fire"; but also on the lips of Christ Himself in Mr 9:43, where the "unquenchable fire" is equated with "Gehenna" (which see). The same idea lies in 9:48, "The fire is not quenched" (ou sbennutai), and is implied in the numerous allusions to fire as the instrument of punishment and destruction in the Gospels and other

parts of the New Testament (e.g. "the Gehenna of fire," Mt 5:22 margin, etc.; "furnace of fire," Mt 13:40,42,50; "eternal fire," Mt 25:41; compare also 2Th 1:8; 2Pe 3:7; Jude 1:7; Re 19:20; 20:10,14,15; 21:8). For Old Testament analogies compare Isa 1:31; 34:10; 66:24; Jer 4:4; 7:20; 17:27; 21:12; Eze 20:47,48. The language is obviously highly metaphorical, conveying the idea of an awful and abiding judgment, but is not to be pressed as teaching a destruction in the sense of annihilation of the wicked. An unquenchable fire is not needed for a momentary act of destruction. Even in the view of Edward White, the wicked survive the period of judgment to which these terms relate.

See PUNISHMENT, EVERLASTING.

James Orr

UNTEMPERED

un-tem’-perd (taphel): Used of mortar in Eze 13:10-15; 22:28. Taphel probably refers to mortar made with clay instead of slaked lime. In the interior of Palestine and Syria walls are still commonly built of small stones or mud bricks, and then smeared over with clay mortar. The surface is rubbed smooth and is attractive in appearance. This coating prolongs the life of the wall but requires yearly attention if the wall is to stand.

Ezekiel uses the practice to typify the work of false prophets. They build up stories and make them plausible by an outward semblance to truth, while, in fact, they are flimsy, unreliable prophecies, resembling the walls described above, which can be broken down by a push or a heavy rain storm.

James A. Patch

UNTOWARD

un-to’-erd, un-tord’ (skolios): Appears only in Ac 2:40, the King James Version "Save yourselves from this untoward generation." It means "perverse," "willful," "crooked," and is so translated in Revised Version: "this crooked generation" (apo tes geneas tes skolias tautes). the King James Version headings to Isa 28 and Ho 6 have "untowardness." This now obsolete term probably derived its orgin from the idea of the heart that was not inclined toward the divine will and teaching. Hence, "not-toward," or "untoward."

UNWALLED

un-wold’.

See VILLAGE; WALL.

UNWASHEN

un-wosh’-’-n (aniptos): Occurs only twice in the New Testament, not at all in the Hebrew or Greek Old Testament (Mt 15:20 = Mr 7:2). Jesus is here denouncing the traditionalism of the scribes and Pharisees. Uncleanness, to them, was external and purification was ceremonial. Hence, the Pharisaic view that the hands became unclean (religiously, not physically), and so before meals must be cleansed (religiously) by washing, which consisted in two affusions and must extend up to the wrist, else the hand was still unclean. Jewish tradition traced this custom back to Solomon (see Shabbath 14b, end), but the first unmistakable occurrence of the custom is in the Sibylline Oracles (3:591-93), where the hands are said to be washed in connection with prayer and thanksgiving. The schools of Shammai and Hillel, though usually differing on points of tradition, agreed on the washing of hands as necessary for ceremonial purification (having reached this agreement in the early part of Jesus’ life).

See PURITY; UNCLEANNESS.

LITERATURE.

Broadus, Commentary on Matthew (15:2-20); Gould, Swete, commentaries on Mark (7:2); Edersheim, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, 8 ff; Schurer. HJP, div II, volume I, section 25 (" Scribism").

Charles B. Williams

UNWORTHLY

un-wur’-thi-li: 1Co 11:27,29 the King James Version for anaxios. In 11:29, the Revised Version (British and American), on convincing textual evidence, has omitted the word, which is a needless gloss (compare the Revised Version’s translation of the whole verse). In 11:27 the American Standard Revised Version has changed "unworthily" to "in an unworthy manner," a rather pointless alteration.

UNWRITTEN, SAYINGS

un-rit’-’-n.

See AGRAPHA.

UPHARSIN

u-far’-sin (upharsin).

See MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN.

UPHAZ

u’-faz (’uphaz): A gold-bearing region, mentioned in Jer 10:9; Da 10:5, otherwise unknown. Perhaps in both passages Ophir, which differs in one consonant only, should be read. In the second passage, instead of "gold of Uphaz," perhaps "gold and fine gold" (’uphaz) should be read. The Jerusalem Talmud states that there were seven kinds of gold, good gold, pure, precious, gold of Uphaz, purified, refined, and red gold of Parvaim (2Ch 3:6). That of Uphaz, which is so called from the place from which it comes, resembles "flashes of fire fed with pitch" (M. Schwab, The Talmud of Jerusalem, V, 207 f).

Thomas Hunter Weir

UPPER CHAMBER; UPPER ROOM

up’-er cham’-ber, (‘aliyah (2Ki 1:2), etc.; anogeon (Mr 14:15; Lu 22:12), huperoon (Ac 1:13; 9:37,39; 20:8)): In Jud 3:20 the English Revised Version renders "summer parlor" and in the margin "Hebrew: ‘Upper chamber of cooling.’" This was probably a roof-chamber. The "upper chamber" of Ahaziah in 2Ki 1:2 was evidently in the 2nd story of the building. On the "upper chambers" of the temple (1Ch 28:11; 2Ch 3:9), see TEMPLE. The "large upper room" which was the scene of the Last Supper, with that in Ac 1:13, was also plainly an upper-story chamber. That in Ac 20:8 was in the 3rd story (at Miletus, a Greek city).

See also HOUSE.

James Orr

UR

ur (’ur, "flame"; Codex Vaticanus Sthur; Codex Sinaiticus Ora): Father of Eliphal, one of David’s "mighty men," in 1Ch 11:35; in the parallel 2Sa 23:34 called "Ahasbai."

UR OF THE CHALDEES

kal’-dez (’ur kasdim; he chora (ton) Chaldaion): For more than 2,000 years efforts have been made to identify the site of this city. The writers of the Septuagint, either being unfamiliar with the site, or not considering it a city, wrote chora, "land," instead of Ur. Eupolemus, who lived about 150 BC, spoke of it as being a city of Babylonia called Camarina, which he said was called by some Ouria. Stephen (Ac 7:2,4) regarded the place as being in Mesopotamia. The Talmud, however, as well as some later Arabic writers, regarded Erech (the Septuagint Orek) as the city. The cuneiform writing of this city, Urnki, would seem to support this view, but Erech is mentioned in Genesis. Ammianus Marcellinus identified the city with the castle of Ur in the desert between Hatra and Nisibis, but this was only founded in the

time of the Persians. Owing to its nearness to Haran, and because Stephen placed it in Mesopotamia, Urfa or Oorfa, named Edessa by the Greeks, has also in modern times been identified as the city. But Seleucus is credited with having built this city.

The most generally-accepted theory at the present time is that Ur is to be identified with the modern Mugheir (or Mughayyar, "the pitchy") in Southern Babylonia, called Urumma, or Urima, and later Uru in the inscriptions. This borders on the district which in the 1st millennium BC was called Chaldea (Kaldu).

This, some hold, accords with the view of Eupolemus, because Camarina may be from the Arabic name of the moon qamar, which refers perhaps to the fact that the ancient city was dedicated to the worship of the moon-god. Another argument which has been advanced for this identification is that Haran, the city to which Terah migrated, was also a center of moon-god worship. This, however, is precarious, because Urumma or Urima in Abraham's day was a Sumerian center, and the seat of Nannar-worship, whereas Haran was Semitic, and was dedicated to Sin. Although these two deities in later centuries were identified with each other, still the argument seems to have little weight, as other deities were also prominently worshipped in those cities, particularly Haran, which fact reminds us also that the Talmud says Terah worshipped no less than 12 deities.

It should be stated that there are scholars who hold, with the Septuagint, that Ur means, not a city, but perhaps a land in which the patriarch pastured his flocks, as for instance, the land of Uri or Ura (Akkad). The designation "of the Chaldeans" was in this case intended to distinguish it from the land where they were not found.

Still another identification is the town Uru (Mar-tu) near Sippar, a place of prominence in the time of Abraham, but which was lost sight of in subsequent periods (compare Amurru, 167). This fact would account for the failure to identify the place in the late pre-Christian centuries, when Urima or Uru still flourished. Western Semites—for the name Abram is not Babylonian—lived in this city in large numbers in the age when the patriarch lived. The Babylonian contract literature from this, as well as other sites, is full of names from the western Semitic lands, Aram and Amurru. This fact makes it reasonable that the site should be found in Babylonia; but, as stated, although the arguments are by no means weighty, more scholars at the present favor Mugheir than any other site.

A. T. Clay

URBANE

ur'-ban, -ban'.

See URBANUS.

URBANUS

ur-ba’-nus (Ourbanos; the King James Version Urbane): A common slave name. Gifford says that it is found "as here, in juxtaposition with Ampliatus, in a list of imperial freedmen, on an inscription, 115 AD." He was a member of the Christian community at Rome to whom Paul sent greetings. Paul calls him "our fellow-worker in Christ" (Ro 16:9). "The ‘our’ (as opposed to ‘my,’ Ro 16:3) seems to suggest that all Christian workers had a common helper in Urbanus" (Denney).

URI

u’-ri, oo’-ri (uri (uwri in 1Ki 4:19), "fiery," unless the word be contracted for ‘uriyah, "Uriah"):

(1) Son of Hur, and father of Bezalel (Ex 31:2; 35:30; 38:22; 1Ch 2:20; 2Ch 1:5).

(2) Father of Geber, one of Solomon’s 12 provision officers (1Ki 4:19; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus, Adai).

(3) A porter who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:24; the Septuagint’s Odouth; Codex Alexandrinus Odoue; Lucian Ourias).

URIAH; URUAH

u-ri’-a, u-ri’-ja (’uriyah, in Jer 26:20 ‘uriyahu, "flame of Yahweh" or "my light is Yahweh"; the Septuagint and the New Testament Our(e)ias, with variants; the King James Version has Urijah in 2Ki 16:10-16; Ne 3:4,21; 8:4; Jer 26:20):

(1) A Hittite, who had settled in Jerusalem at the time of David and who had entered David’s service. He had become a worshipper of Yahweh (judging from the usual interpretations of his name) and had married a Hebrew wife, BATH-SHEBA (which see). David’s sin with this woman occurred while Uriah was engaged in warfare, and David had him recalled to Jerusalem in order to hide what had transpired. Uriah, however, felt himself bound by the consecration of a soldier (compare 1Sa 21:5; De 23:10 f) and refused to do violence to his religion, so that David’s ruse was in vain. (The point is missed here by speaking of Uriah’s "chivalrous determination," as in HDB, IV, 837.) David, in desperation, wrote Joab instructions that were virtually a command to have Uriah murdered, and these instructions were duly carried out (2Sa 11:2-27). The inclusion of Uriah’s name in the list of the "mighty men" in 2Sa 23:39 parallel Ch 11:41 is proof of his reputation as a soldier, and the name is found also in 2Sa 12:9,10,15; 1Ki 15:5; Mt 1:6. On the occurrence in Matthew see especially Heffern, JBL, XXXI, 69 ff (1912).

(2) A priest under Ahaz, who carried into effect the latter’s commands to introduce an Assyrian altar into the Temple and to use it for the sacrifices (2Ki 16:10-16; see ALTAR). The same Uriah appears in Isa 8:2 as one of the two "faithful witnesses" taken by Isaiah in the matter of Maher-shalal-hash-baz. This description has seemed to many to conflict with Uriah’s compliancy in obeying Ahaz, but it must

be remembered that

(a) "faithful witness" means simply "one whom the people will believe," and

(b) the articles in the sanctuary were not held as immutably sacred in the time of Ahaz as they were in later days.

The omission of Uriah's name from the list in 1Ch 6:10-14 is probably without significance, as Chronicles records only nine names from Solomon to the exile, showing that there must be many omissions. The corresponding list in Josephus, Ant, X, viii, 6, contains 18 names, including Uriah's.

(3) A son of Shemaiah, of Kiriath-jearim, and a contemporary of Jeremiah. He was a prophet, and his prophecy agreed with Jeremiah's in regards. Jehoiakim, roused to anger, arrested him, even at the trouble of a pursuit into Egypt, put him to death and desecrated his body (Jer 20-23). The story is told partly in order to show the greatness of Jeremiah's dangers, partly to bear record of the goodness of AHIKAM (which see), Jeremiah's protector.

(4) A priest, the father of MEREMOTH (which see) (Ezr 8:33; Ne 3:4,21; 1 Esdras 8:62 ("Urias," the King James Version "Iri")).

(5) One of those on Ezra's right hand reading of the Law (Ne 8:4; 1 Esdras 9:43 ("Urias")). Quite possibly identical with (4) above.

Burton Scott Easton

URIAS (1)

u-ri'-as (Oureias; Codex Vaticanus (b) Ouria; Codex Alexandrinus Ouri; the King James Version Iri):

(1) The father of Marmoth (1 Esdras 8:62) =" Uriah" of Ezr 8:33, and perhaps identical with (2).

(2) Codex Vaticanus (b) and Codex Alexandrinus, Oureias, Ourias = one of those who stood on Ezra's right hand as he read the Law (1 Esdras 9:43) =" Uriah" of Ne 8:4.

URIAS (2)

(Ourias): the King James Version; Greek form of "Uriah" (thus the Revised Version (British and American)). The husband of Bath-sheba (Mt 1:6).

URIEL (1)

u’-ri-el (’uri’-el, "flame of El (God)," or "El is my light"):

(1) A Kohathite, said in 1Ch 15:5 to be the chief of the sons of Kohath (1Ch 6:24 (Hebrew verse 9); 15:5,11). He corresponds to Zephaniah in the pedigree of Heman in 1Ch 6:33-38 (Hebrew 18-23). See Curtis, Chronicles, 130 f.

(2) A man of Gibeah, and father of Micaiah the mother of King Abijah of Judah (2Ch 13:2).

(3) The archangel (En 20:2, etc.). See next article.

URIEL (2)

(Ouriel, "fire or flame of God"‘ or "my light is God"): Called only in 2 Esdras an "angel," except 2 Esdras 4:36 where the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version rightly give "Jeremiel the archangel" for the King James Version "Uriel the archangel," but elsewhere known as one of the four chief archangels. He was the angel who instructed Ezra (2 Esdras 4:1; 5:20; 10:28). In Enoch 20:2 Uriel is the angel who is "over the world and Tartarus" (ho epi tou kosmou kai tou tartarou), and as such is the conductor to Enoch in the world below, the secrets of which he explains. Compare also (Greek) 19:1; 21:5. In the (Latin) "Life of Adam and Eve," 48 (ed. W. Meyer in Abhand. d. Bayer. Akad. der Wiss., XIV, 1878, 250), Uriel (Oriel) accompanied Michael when at God’s bidding he wrapped the bodies of Adam and Abel in three linen sheets and buried them in Paradise. In the lost "Prayer of Joseph" Uriel is the angel who wrestles and converses with Jacob and knows the secrets of heaven (as in Enoch those of Tartarus), but stands only 8th in rank, whereas in (Greek) Enoch 20:2 ff he is the 1st of the six (or seven) archangels. In Sib Or 2:229 he is entrusted with the judgment of the Titans. Compare Milton, Paradise Lost, III, 690, "regent of the sun, and held the sharpest sighted Spirit of all in heaven."

(2) "Urier" the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version margin "Jeremiel."

S. Angus

URIJAH

See URIAH, URIJAH.

URIM AND THUMMIM

u’-rim and thum’-im (ha-’urim weha-tummim (article omitted in Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:65); perhaps "light and perfection," as intensive plurals):

1. Definition:

Articles not specifically described, placed in (next to, or on (Hebrew ‘el; Septuagint epi; Samaritan-Hebrew ‘al)) the high priest’s breastplate, called the "breast-plate of decision" (English Versions of the Bible, "judgment"). (Ex 28:30; Le 8:8). Their possession was one of the greatest distinctions conferred upon the priestly family (De 33:8; Ecclesiasticus 45:10), and seems to have been connected with the function of the priests as the mouthpiece of Yahweh, as well as with the ceremonial side of the service (Ex 28:30; compare Arabic kahin, "soothsayer").

2. Use in the Old Testament:

Through their use, the nature of which is a matter of conjecture, the divine will was sought in national crises, and apparently the future foretold, guilt or innocence established, and, according to one theory, land divided (Babha’ Bathra’ 122a; Sanhedrin 16a). Thus, Joshua was to stand before Eleazar who was to inquire for him after the judgment (decision) of the Urim (Nu 27:21). It seems that this means was employed by Joshua in the matter of Achan (Jos 7:14,18) and overlooked in the matter of the Gibeonites (9:14). Though not specifically mentioned, the same means is in all probability referred to in the accounts of the Israelites consulting Yahweh after the death of Joshua in their warfare (Jud 1:1,2; 20:18,26-28). The Danites in their migration ask counsel of a priest, perhaps in a similar manner (Jud 18:5,7). It is not impossible that even the prophet Samuel was assisted by the Urim in the selection of a king (1Sa 10:20-22). During Saul’s war with the Philistines, he made inquiry of God with the aid of the priest (1Sa 14:36,37), Ahijah, the son of Ahitub, who at that time wore the ephod (1Sa 14:3). Although on two important occasions Yahweh refused to answer Saul through the Urim (1Sa 14:37; 28:6), it appears (from the Septuagint version of 1Sa 14:41; see below) that he Used the Urim and Thummim successfully in ascertaining the cause of the divine displeasure. The accusation of Doeg and the answer of the high priest (1Sa 22:10,13,15) suggest that David began to inquire of Yahweh through the priesthood, even while he was an officer of Saul. After the massacre of the priests in Nob, Abiathar fled to the camp of David (1Sa 22:20), taking with him the ephod (including apparently the Urim and Thummim, 1Sa 23:6) which David used frequently during his wanderings (1Sa 23:2-4,9-12; 30:7,8), and also after the death of Saul (2Sa 2:1; 5:19,23; 21:1). After the days of David, prophecy was in the ascendancy, and, accordingly, we find no clear record of the use of the Urim and Thummim in the days of the later kings (compare, however, Ho 3:4; Ecclesiasticus 33:3). Still, in post-exilic times we find the difficult question of the ancestral right of certain priests to eat of the most holy things reserved till there would stand up a priest with Urim and with Thummim (Ezr 2:63; Ne 7:65; 1 Esdras 5:40; Sotah 48b).

3. Older (Traditional) Views:

Though Josephus sets the date for the obsolescence of the Urim and Thummim at 200 years before his time, in the days of John Hyrcanus (Ant., III, viii, 9), the Talmud reckons the Urim and Thummim among the things lacking in the second Temple (Sotah 9 10; Yoma’ 21b; Yeru Qid. 65b). Both Josephus and the Talmud identify the Urim and Thummim with the stones of the breastplate. The former simply states that the stones shone whenever the shekhinah was present at a sacrifice or when the army

proceeded to battle.

"God declared beforehand by those twelve stones which the high priest bare on his breast, and which were inserted into his breastplate, when they should be victorious in battle; for so great a splendor shone forth from them before the army began to march, that all the people were sensible of God's being present for their assistance" (Ant., III, viii, 9).

The Talmudic explanation suggests that by the illumination of certain letters the divine will was revealed, and that in order to have a complete alphabet, in addition to the names of the tribes, the breastplate bore the names of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. and the words shibhTe yeshurun. A later scholar even suggests that the letters moved from their places to form words (Yoma' 73a, b). Characteristically enough the Talmud prescribes rules and suggestions for the consultation of the non-existing Urim and Thummim: that the one asking must be a man of public importance, that the question must pertain to the public weal; that the priest must face the shekhinah (west); that one question be asked at a time, and so forth (same place).

It is difficult to tell just how much, if anything, of a lingering tradition is reflected in the view that the Urim and Thummim and stones of the breast-plate were identical. In the absence of other ancient clues, however, it is not safe to reject even the guesses of the Jews of the second temple in favor of our own. We do not even know the meaning of the word choshen, so confidently translated "pouch" or "receptacle" by opponents of the older view, without any basis whatever. On the other hand the theory of identification was widespread. Even Philo leans toward it in his De Monarchia, although in his Vita Mosis (iii) he seems to have in mind two small symbols representing Light and Truth embroidered on the cloth of the choshen or hung round the neck of the high priest, similar to the Egyptian symbol of justice. Another very old view is that the Urim and Thummim consisted of a writing containing the Ineffable Name (Pseudo-Jonathan on Ex 28:20; compare Rashi and Nachmanides at the place).

4. Recent (Critical) Views:

The view most generally held today is that the Urim and Thummim were two sacred lots, one indicating an affirmative or favorable answer, the other a negative or unfavorable answer (Michaelis, Ewald, Wellhausen, Robertson Smith, Driver, G. F. Moore, Kennedy, Muss-Arnolt). The chief support of this view is found, not in the Massoretic Text, but in the reconstruction by Wellhausen and Driver of 1Sa 14:41 ff on the basis of the Septuagint: "If this fault be in me or in Jonathan, my son, give Urim (dos delous), and if it be in thy people Israel, give Thummim (dos hosioteta)." The following sentence clearly suggests the casting of lots, possibly lots on which the names of Saul and Jonathan were written, and "Jonathan" was taken. Efforts have been made to support the view that the Urim and Thummim themselves were sacred lots on the basis of analogous customs among other peoples (e.g. pre-Islamic Arabs (Moore in EB) andBabylonians (W. Muss-Arnolt in Jew Encyclopedia and AJSL, July, 1900)). It must be borne in mind, however, that whatever the lot-theory has to recommend it, it is inconsistent not only with the post-Biblical traditions, but also with the Biblical data. For those who are not inclined to give much weight to the passages connecting the Urim and Thummim with the high priest's apparel (Ex

28:30; Le 8:8, both "P"), there is of course no difficulty in dissociating the two, in spite of the fact that for the use of this system of divination the one thing necessary in the historical passages on which they rely seems to be the ephod. Still, if we are to think of two lots, one called and possibly marked "Urim" and the other "Thummim," it is difficult to get any meaning from the statement (1Sa 14:37; 28:6) that Yahweh did not answer Saul on certain occasions, unless indeed we surmise for the occasion the existence of a third nameless blank lot. A more serious difficulty arises from the fact that the answers ascribed to the Urim and Thummim are not always the equivalent of "yes" or "no" (compare Jud 1:2; 20:18; 1Sa 22:10; 2Sa 5:23; 21:1), even if we omit from consideration the instances where an individual is apparently pointed out from all Israel (compare the instances of the detection of Achan and the selection of Saul with that of Jonathan, above).

5. Etymology:

If we turn to etymology for assistance, we are not only on uncertain ground, but when Babylonian and other foreign words are brought in to bolster up a theory abput anything so little understood as the Urim and Thummim, we are on dangerous ground. Thus, Muss-Arnolt is ready with Babylonian words (urtu, "command," and tamitu, "oracular decision"); others suggest tme, the Egyptian image of justice; still others connect Urim with ‘arar, to curse," in order to make it an antonym of tummim, "faultlessness." It is generally admitted, however, that, as pointed in the Massoretic Text, the words mean "light" and "perfection," on the basis of which the Talmud (Yoma’ 73b) as well as most of the Greek versions translated them (delosis kai aletheia; photismoi kai teleiotetes), although Symmachus in one place (De 33:8), who is followed by the Vulgate, connects Urim with the word Torah and understands it to mean "doctrine" (teleiotes kai didache). Though loth to add to the already overburdened list of conjectures about these words, it appears to the present writer that if Urim and Thummim are antonyms, and Urim means "light," it is by no means difficult to connect Thummim with darkness, inasmuch as there is a host of Hebrew stems based on the root -tm, all indicating concealing, closing up, and even darkness (compare ...(see Job 40:13), ... and even and cognate Arabic words in BDB). This explanation would make Urim and Thummim mean "illuminated" and "dark" (compare Caster in Hastings, ERE, IV, 813), and, while fitting well with the ancient theories or traditions, would not be excluded by the recent theory of lots of opposite purport.

Nathan Isaacs

USURY

u’-zhu-ri:

1. In the Old Testament:

The Hebrew law concerning exaction of interest upon loans was very humane. Hebrews were to lend to their brethren without interest (Ex 22:25; Le 25:36 f; De 23:19 f). This, however, did not apply to a stranger (De 23:20). Two stems are used in the Old Testament, rendered in the King James Version

"usury," in the Revised Version (British and American) better rendered "interest":

(1) verb nashah (Ex 22:25; Isa 24:2; Jer 15:10), and the noun form, mashsha’ (Ne 5:7,10);

(2) a stronger and more picturesque word, nashakh, "to bite," "to vex," and so "to lend on interest" (De 23:19,20); noun form neshekh (Ex 22:25; Le 25:36 f; Ps 15:5; Pr 28:8; Eze 18:8,13,17; 22:12).

It would be easy to go from a fair rate of interest to an unfair rate, as seen in the history of the word "usury," which has come to mean an exorbitant or unlawful interest. Abuses arose during the exile. Nehemiah forced the people after the return to-give back exactions of "one hundredth," or 1 percent monthly which they took from their brethren (Ne 5:10 f; compare Eze 22:12). A good citizen of Zion is one who did not put out his money to usury (Ps 15:5). One who is guilty of this comes to disaster (Pr 28:8).

2. In the New Testament:

The Greek word is tokos, literally, "offspring," interest springing out of the principal. Money lenders were numerous among the Jews in Christ’s day, and, in the parable of the Talents, He represents the lord of the unprofitable servant as rebuking the sloth in the words, "I should have received mine own with interest" (Mt 25:27; Lu 19:23 the Revised Version (British and American)).

Edward Bagby Pollard

UTA

u’-ta (Outa): "The sons of Uta" returned with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:30); wanting in the parallel Ezr 2:45; Ne 7:48.

UTHAI

u’-thi, u’-tha-i (‘uthay, meaning uncertain):

(1) A descendant of Judah, of the clan of Perez (1Ch 9:4) =" Athaiah" of Ne 11:4.

(2) Son of Bigvai (Ezr 8:14); called "Uthi" in 1 Esdras 8:40.

UTHI

u’-thi (Codex Alexandrinus Outhi; Codex Vaticanus Outou): One of the sons of Bago (Bigvai) who returned at the head of his family with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:40) =" Uthai" of Ezr 8:14.

UTMOST SEA; UTTERMOST SEA

ut’-most, ut’-er-most.

See MEDITERRANEAN SEA.

UTTERMOST

ut’-er-most: A pleonastic compound of a comparative ("utter"; compare "outer") and a superlative ("most"), in the King James Version used interchangeably with the ordinary superlative forms "utmost" (compare Mt 12:42; Lu 11:31) and "outmost" (compare Ex 26:4,10). The Revised Version (British and American) adds still another form, "outermost," in 2Ki 7:5,8 (the King James Version "uttermost"). the Revised Version (British and American) has made a few changes to secure a more accurate translation (Jer 9:26; Joe 2:20, etc.) or to give uniformity (Ex 26:4; Mt 5:26; 12:42, etc.), but for the most part has left the King James Version undisturbed.

UZ (1)

uz (uts ‘erets uts; Os, Ox, Ausitis):

Biblical Data:

(1) In Ge 10:23 Uz is the oldest son of Aram and grandson of Shem, while in 1Ch 1:17 Uz is the son of Shem. Septuagint inserts a passage which supplies this lacking name. As the tables of the nations in Ge 10 are chiefly geographical and ethnographical, Uz seems to have been the name of a district or nation colonized by or descended from Semites of the Aramean tribe or family.

(2) The son of Nahor by Milcah, and older brother of Buz (Ge 2:21). Here the name is doubtless personal and refers to an individual who was head of a clan or tribe kindred to that of Abraham.

(3) A son of Dishan, son of Seir the Horite (Ge 36:28), and personal name of a Horite or perhaps of mixed Horite and Aramean blood.

(4) The native land and home of Job (Job 1:1), and so situated as to be in more or less proximity to the tribe of the Temanites (Job 2:11), the Shuhites (Job 2:11), the Naamathites (Job 2:11), the Buzites (Job 32:2), and open to the inroads of the Chaldeans (Job 1:17), and the Sabeans (Job 1:15 the Revised Version (British and American)), as well as exposed to the great Arabian Desert (1:19). See the next article.

(5) A kingdom of some importance somewhere in Southern Syria and not far from Judea, having a number of kings (Jer 25:20).

(6) A kingdom, doubtless the same as that of Jer 25:20 and inhabited by or in subjection to the Edomites (La 4:21), and hence not far from Edom.

James Josiah Reeve

UZ (2)

(’uts; Septuagint Ausitis; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Ausitis): The home of the patriarch Job (Job 1:1; Jer 25:20, "all the kings of the land of Uz"; La 4:21, "daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Uz"). The land of Uz was, no doubt, the pasturing-ground inhabited by one of the tribes of that name, if indeed there be more than one tribe intended. The following are the determining data occurring in the Book of Job. The country was subject to raids by Chaldeans and Sabeans (1:15,17); Job’s three friends were a Temanite, a Naamathite and a Shuhite (2:11); Elihu was a Buzite (32:2); and Job himself is called one of the children of the East (Qedhem). The Chaldeans (kasdim, descendants of Chesed, son of Nahor, Ge 22:22) inhabited Mesopotamia; a branch of the Sabeans also appears to have taken up its abode in Northern Arabia (see SHEBA). Teman (Ge 36:11) is often synonymous with Edom. The meaning of the designation amathite is unknown, but Shuah was a son of Keturah the wife of Abraham (Ge 25:2), and so connected with Nahor. Shuah is identified with Suhu, mentioned by Tiglath-pileser I as lying one day’s journey from Carchemish; and a "land of Uzza" is named by Shalmaneser II as being in the same neighborhood. Buz is a brother of Uz ("Huz," Ge 22:21) and son of Nahor. Esar-haddon, in an expedition toward the West, passed through Bazu and Hazu, no doubt the same tribes. Abraham sent his children, other than Isaac (so including Shuah), "eastward to the land of Qedhem" (Ge 25:6). These factors point to the land of Uz as lying somewhere to the Northeast of Palestine. Tradition supports such a site. Josephus says "Uz founded Trachonitis and Damascus" (Ant., I, vi, 4). Arabian tradition places the scene of Job s sufferings in the Hauran at Deir Eiyub (Job’s monastery) near Nawa. There is a spring there, which. he made to flow by striking the rock with his foot (Koran 38 41), and his tomb. The passage in the Koran is, however, also made to refer to Job’s Well.

Compare JERUSALEM.

LITERATURE.

Talmud of Jerusalem (French translation by M. Schwab, VII, 289) contains a discussion of the date of Job; Le Strange, Palestine under the Moslems, 220-23, 427, 515.

Thomas Hunter Weir

UZAI

u’-zi, u’-za-i (~’uzay>, meaning unknown): Father of Palal (Ne 3:25).

UZAL

u’-zal (’uzal): Sixth son of Joktan (Ge 10:27; 1Ch 1:21). Uzal as the name of a place perhaps occurs in Eze 27:19. the Revised Version (British and American) reads, "Vedan and Javan traded with yarn for thy wares." Here an obscure verbal form, me’uzzal, is taken to mean "something spun," "yarn." But with a very slight change we may read me’uzal =" from Uzal."

The name is identical with the Arabic ‘Auzal, the old capital of Yemen, later called San‘a’. San‘a’ is described as standing high above sea-level in a fertile land, and traversed by a river bed which in the rainy season becomes a torrent. Under the Himyarite dynasty it succeeded Zafar as the residence of the Tubba‘s. If it is the same place as the Audzara or Ausara of the classics, it is clear why Arabic geographers dwell upon its great antiquity. The most celebrated feature of the town was Ghumdan, an immense palace, the building of which tradition ascribes to Shorabbil, the 6th known king of the Himyarites. According to Ibn Khaldoun this building had four fronts in color red, white, yellow and green respectively. In the midst rose a tower of seven stories, the topmost being entirely of marble (Caussin de Perceval, Essai, II, 75). In the 7th century AD the town became the capital of the Zaidite Imams, and the palace was destroyed toward the middle of that century by order of the caliph Othman.

A. S. Fulton

UZZA; UZZAH

uz’-a, uz’-a (’uzzah (2Sa 6:6-8), otherwise ‘uzza’ meaning uncertain):

(1) One of those who accompanied the ark on its journey from Kiriath-jearim toward David’s citadel (2Sa 6:3-8, "Uzzah" = 1Ch 13:7-11, "Uzza"). From the text of 2Sa 6:3-8, as generally corrected with the help of Septuagint, it is supposed that Uzzah walked by the side of the ark while Ahio (or "his brother") went in front of it. The word which describes what happened to the oxen is variously translated; the Revised Version (British and American) has "stumbled"; others render it, "They let the oxen slip," "The oxen shook (the ark)." Uzzah, whatever it be that took place, caught hold of the ark; something else happened, and Uzzah died on the spot. If the word translated "rashness" (Revised Version margin) in 2Sa 6:7 (not "error" as English Versions of the Bible) is to be kept in the text, Uzzah would be considered guilty of too little reverence for the ark; but the words "for (his) rashness" are lacking in the Septuagint (Codex Vaticanus), while 1Ch 13:10 has "because he put forth his hand to the ark," and further no such Hebrew word as we find here is known to us. The older commentators regarded the death as provoked by non-observance of the provisions about the ark as given in the Pentateuch, but it is generally believed today that these were not known in David’s time.

What is clear is that Uzzah’s act led to an accident of some kind, and the event was regarded by David as inauspicious, so that the journey with the ark was discontinued. We know how the Old Testament writers represent events as due to divine intervention where we would perhaps discern natural causes.

(2) The garden of Uzza (2Ki 21:18,26). Manasseh the king is said (2Ki 21:18) to have been "buried in the garden of his own house, in the garden of Uzza"; and Amon (2Ki 21:26) "was buried in his sepulchre in the garden of Uzza." It has been suggested that "Uzza"—"Uzziah" (’uzziyah) = Azariah" (compare 2Ki 15:1-6). The garden of Manasseh would then be identical with that of Uzziah, by whom it was originally laid out. 2Ch 33:20 does not mention the garden.

(3) Son of Shimei, a Merarite (1Ch 6:29 (Hebrew 14)), the Revised Version (British and American) "Uzzah," the King James Version "Uzza."

(4) A descendant of Ehud, and head of a Benjamite family (1Ch 8:7, "Uzza"). Hogg, JQR, 102 ff (1893) (see Curtis, Chron., 156-59), finds a proper name "Iglaam" in 1Ch 8:6, and so reads "and Iglaam begot Uzza and Abishabar."

(5) Head of a Nethinim family that returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:49) =" Uzza" of Ne 7:51.

David Francis Roberts

UZZEN-SHEERAH

uz’-en-she’-e-ra (’uzzen she’erah; Septuagint, instead of a place-name, reads kai huioi Ozan, Seera, "and the sons of Ozan, Sheera"; the King James Version Uzzen-sherah, uzzen-she’ra): As it stands in Massoretic Text this is the name of a town built by Sheerah, daughter of Ephraim, to whom is attributed also the building of the two Beth-horons (1Ch 7:24). No satisfactory identification has been proposed. Septuagint suggests that the text may have been tampered with.

UZZI

uz’-i (’uzzi, perhaps "my strength"):

(1) A descendant of Aaron and high priest, unknown apart from these sources (1Ch 6:5,6,51 (Hebrew 5:31,32; 6:36); Ezr 7:4).

(2) An eponym of a family of Issachar (1Ch 7:2,3).

(3) Head of a Benjamite family (1Ch 7:7), or more probably of a Zebulunite family (see Curtis, Chron., 145-49).

(4) Father of Elah, a Benjamite (1Ch 9:8), perhaps the same as (5).

(5) A son of Bani and overseer of the Levitea in Jerusalem (Ne 11:22).

(6) Head of the priestly family of Jedaiah (Ne 12:19,42).

David Francis Roberts

UZZIA

u-zi’-a (‘uzziya’," my strength is Yah"; see UZZIAH): An Ashterathite and one of David’s mighty men (1Ch 11:44).

UZZIAH; (AZARIAH)

u-zi’-a, oo-zi’-a (‘uzziyah (2Ki 15:13,30; Ho 1:1; Am 1:1; Zec 14:5), ‘uzziyahu (2Ki 15:32,34; Isa 1:1; 6:1; 7:1; 2Ch 26:1 ff; 27:2); also called ‘azaryah (2Ki 14:21; 15:1,7; 1Ch 3:12), ‘azaryahu (2Ki 15:6,8); Azarias, in Kings, elsewhere Ozias; the significations of the names are similar, the former meaning "my strength is Yah"; the latter, "Yah has helped." It has been thought that the form "Uzziah" may have originated by corruption from the other. The history of the reign is given in 2Ki 15:1-8 and 2Ch 26):

1. Accession: Uzziah or Azariah, son of Amaziah, and 11th king of Judah, came to the throne at the age of 16. The length of his reign is given as 52 years. The chronological questions raised by this statement are considered below. His accession may here be provisionally dated in 783 BC. His father Amaziah had met his death by popular violence (2Ki 14:19), but Uzziah seems to have been the free and glad choice of the people (2Ch 26:1).

2. Foreign Wars:

The unpopularity of his father, owing to a great military disaster, must ever have been present to the mind of Uzziah, and early in his reign he undertook and successfully carried through an expedition against his father’s enemies of 20 years before, only extending his operations over a wider area. The Edomites, Philistines and Arabians were successively subdued (these being members of a confederacy which, in an earlier reign, had raided Jerusalem and nearly extirpated the royal family, 2Ch 21:16; 22:1); the port of Eloth, at the head of the Red Sea, was restored to Judah, and the city rebuilt (2Ki 14:22; 2Ch 26:2); the walls of certain hostile towns, Gath, Jabneh and Ashdod, were razed to the ground, and the inhabitants of Gur-baal and Maan were reduced to subjection (2Ch 26:6,7). Even the Ammonites, East of the Jordan, paid tribute to Uzziah, and "his name spread abroad even to the entrance to Egypt; for he waxed exceeding strong" (2Ch 26:8).

3. Home Defenses:

Uzziah next turned his attention to securing the defenses of his capital and country. The walls of Jerusalem were strengthened by towers built at the corner gate, at the valley gate, and at an angle in the wall (see plan of Jerusalem in the writer’s Second Temple in Jerusalem); military stations were also formed in Philistia, and in the wilderness of the Negeb, and these were supplied with the necessary

cisterns for rain storage (2Ch 26:6,10). The little realm had now an extension and prosperity to which it had been a stranger since the days of Solomon.

4. Uzziah’s Leprosy and Retirement:

These successes came so rapidly that Uzziah had hardly passed his 40th year when a great personal calamity overtook him. In the earlier part of his career Uzziah had enjoyed and profited by the counsels of Zechariah, a man "who had understanding in the vision of God" (2Ch 26:5), and during the lifetime of this godly monitor "be set himself to seek God." Now it happened to him as with his grandfather Jehoash, who, so long as his preserver Jehoiada lived, acted admirably, but, when he died, behaved like an ingrate, and killed his son (2Ki 12:2; 2Ch 24:2,22). So now that Zechariah was gone, Uzziah’s heart was lifted up in pride, and he trespassed against Yahweh. In the great kingdoms of the East, the kings had been in the habit of exercising priestly as well as royal functions. Elated with his prosperity, Uzziah determined to exercise what he may have thought was his royal prerogative in burning incense on the golden altar of the temple. Azariah the high priest, with 80 others, offered stout remonstrance; but the king was only angry, and pressed forward with a censer in his hand, to offer the incense. Ere, however, he could scatter the incense on the coals, and while yet in anger, the white spots of leprosy showed themselves upon his forehead. Smitten in conscience, and thrust forth by the priests, he hastened away, and was a leper ever after (2Ch 26:16-21).

Uzziah’s public life was now ended. In his enforced privacy, he may still have occupied himself with his cattle and agricultural operations, "for he loved husbandry" (2Ch 26:10); but his work in the government was over. Both Kings and Chronicles state in nearly identical words: "Jotham the king’s son was over the household, judging the people of the land" (2Ki 15:5; 2Ch 26:21). Works of the same kind as those undertaken by Uzziah, namely, building military stations in the hills and forests of Judah, repairing the walls of city and temple, etc., are attributed to Jotham (2Ch 27:3); the truth being that Jotham continued and completed the enterprises his father had undertaken.

5. Chronology of Reign:

The chronology of the reign of Uzziah presents peculiar difficulties, some of which, probably, cannot be satisfactorily solved. Reckoning upward from the fall of Samaria in 721 BC, the Biblical data would suggest 759 as the first year of Jotham. If, as is now generally conceded, Jotham’s regnal years are reckoned from the commencement of his regency, when his father had been stricken with leprosy, and if, as synchronisms seem to indicate, Uzziah was about 40 years of age at this time, we are brought for the year of Uzziah’s accession to 783. His death, 52 years later, would occur in 731. (On the other hand, it is known that Isaiah, whose call was in the year of Uzziah’s death, Isa 6:1, was already exercising his ministry in the reign of Jotham, Isa 1:1.) Another note of time is furnished by the statement that the earliest utterance of Amos the prophet was "two years before the earthquake" (Am 1:1). This earthquake, we are told by Zechariah, was "in the days of Uzziah, king of Judah" (Zec 14:5). Josephus likewise embodies a tradition that the earthquake occurred at the moment of the king’s entry into the temple (Ant., IX, x, 4). Indubitably the name of Uzziah was associated in the popular mind with this

earthquake. If the prophecy of Amos was uttered a year or two before Jeroboam's death, and this is placed in 759 BC, we are brought near to the date already given for Uzziah's leprosy (Jeroboam's date is put lower by others).

In 2 Kings 15 Uzziah is referred to as giving data for the accessions of the northern kings (15:8, Zechariah; 15:13, Shallum; 15:17, Menahem; 15:23, Pekahiah; 15:27, Pekah), but it is difficult to fit these synchronisms into any scheme of chronology, if taken as regnal years. Uzziah is mentioned as the father of Jotham in 2Ki 15:32,34; 2Ch 27:2, and as the grandfather of Ahaz in Isa 7:1. He was living when Isaiah began his ministry (Isa 1:1; 6:1); when Hoses prophesied (Ho 1:1); and is the king in whose reign the afore-mentioned earthquake took place (Zec 14:5). His name occurs in the royal genealogies in 1Ch 3:11 and Mt 1:8,9. The place of his entombment, owing to his having been a leper, was not in the sepulchers of the kings, but "in the garden of Uzza" (2Ki 21:26; compare 2Ch 26:23). Isaiah is stated to have written a life of Uzziah (2Ch 26:22).

W. Shaw Caldecott

UZZIEL

u-zi'-el, uz'-i-el, oo'-zi-el ('uzzi'el, "El (God) is my strength"):

(1) A "son" of Kohath (Ex 6:18,22; Le 10:4; Nu 3:19,30; 1Ch 6:2,18 (Hebrew 5:28; 6:3); 15:10; 23:12,20; 24:24), called in Le 10:4 "uncle of Aaron." The family is called Uzzielites (ha'uzzi'eli (collectively)) in Nu 3:27; 1Ch 26:23.

(2) A Simeonite captain (1Ch 4:42).

(3) Head of a Benjamite (or according to Curtis a Zebulunite) family (1Ch 7:7).

(4) A Hemanite musician (1Ch 25:4); The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus has Azarael =" Azarel," the name given in 1Ch 25:18.

See AZAREL.

(5) A Levite "son" of Jeduthun (2Ch 29:14).

(6) A goldsmith who joined in repairing the wall of Jerusalem (Ne 3:8).

(7) The reading of Septuagint (Oziel) for Jahaziel in 1Ch 23:19.

See JAHAZIEL, (3).

David Francis Roberts

VAGABOND

vag’-a-bond (nudh, "to wander"): The word is used in the curse pronounced on Cain (Ge 4:12,14). the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes in each case "wanderer," but in Ps 109:10 it retains "vagabonds." "Vagabond Jews" (perierchomai; the Revised Version (British and American) "strolling Jews") were persons who traveled about as professional exorcists (Ac 19:13).

VAHEB

va’-heb (wahebh; Zoob): The name occurs in a quotation from the book of the Wars of Yahweh in Nu 21:14. See SUPHAH. It was apparently in Amorite territory. It is not identified.

VAIL

val.

See VEIL.

VAIN

van: The adjective of "vanity," and representing the same Hebrew and Greek words as does the latter, with a few additions (chiefly kenos, "empty," and its compounds in the New Testament). And "vain" can always be replaced by its synonym "empty," often with advantage in modern English (Job 15:2; 1Co 15:14, etc.). The exception is the phrase "in vain," and even there the interchange can be made if some (understood) noun such as "ways" be added. So "to take God’s name in vain" (Ex 20:7; De 5:11) means simply to take it for an "empty" ("not good") purpose.

VAINGLORY

van-glo’-ri (kenodoxia): "Vainglory" is the translation of kenodoxia, "empty glory" or "pride," nearly akin to vanity in the modern sense (Php 2:3). Kenodoxos is "vainglorious" (Ga 5:26, "Let us not be desirous of vainglory," the Revised Version (British and American) "Let us not become vainglorious"). In 1 Joh 2:16 the Revised Version (British and American) has "the vainglory of life" (alazoneia tou biou) for "the pride of life"; compare Jas 4:16, "Ye glory in your vauntings" (alazoneia). Kenodoxia is translated "vainglory" (The Wisdom of Solomon 14:14, "For by the vain glory of men they (idols) entered into the world," the Revised Version (British and American) "vaingloriousless"); alazoneia occurs in The Wisdom of Solomon 5:8, translated "vaunting." "Pride is applicable to every object, good or bad, high or low, small or great; vanity is applicable only to small objects; pride is therefore good or bad; vanity is always bad; it is always emptiness or nothingness" (Crabb, English Synonymes).

W. L. Walker

VAIZATHA; VAJEZATHA

vi’-za-tha, va-iz’-a-tha, va-jez’-a-tha, vaj-e-za’-tha (wayzatha’): One of the sons of Haman (Es 9:9). The form has been held to be corrupt, the Hebrew letter waw (w) being exceptionally tall, and the Hebrew letter zayin (z) exceptionally short (Benfey, Die persischen Keilinschriften (1847), XVIII, 93), and points to Vahyazdata, "Given of the Best-One" (OHL, 255).

VALE, VALLEY

val, val’-i:

(1) gay’; either absolute: "from Bamoth to the valley that is in the field of Moab" (Nu 21:20); or with a proper name: "valley of Hinnom," also "valley of the son of Hinnom" (Jos 15:8); "valley of Slaughter" (Jer 7:32); "valley of Zeboim" (1Sa 13:18); "valley of Zephathah" (2Ch 14:10); "valley of Hamon-gog" (Eze 39:11); "valley of Iphtah-el" (Jos 19:14); "valley of the mountains" (Zec 14:5); "Valley of Salt" (2Sa 8:13); "valley of vision" (Isa 22:1); once (in the Revised Version (British and American)) as a place-name: "until thou comest to Gai" (the King James Version "the valley") (1Sa 17:52); also (Revised Version) "Ge-harashim" (1Ch 4:14); compare "valley of craftsmen" (margin "Ge-haharashim") (Ne 11:35).

(2) ‘emeq, ‘amoq, "to be deep"; compare Arabic ‘amuq, "to be deep"; ‘umq, "depth"; ‘Ammiq, a village in the valley of Coele-Syria; absolute: "He could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley" (Jud 1:19); often with place-names: "valley of Achor" (Jos 7:24); "valley of Aijalon" (Jos 10:12); "valley of Gibeon" (Isa 28:21); "vale of Hebron" (Ge 37:14); "valley of Jehoshaphat" (Joe 3:2); "vale of Rephaim," the King James Version "valley of the giants" (Jos 15:8); "vale of Shaveh" (Ge 14:17); "vale of Siddim" (Ge 14:3); "valley of Succoth" (Ps 60:6); compare "valley of Weeping" (the King James Version "Baca") (Ps 84:6); "valley of Beracah" (margin "Blessing") (2Ch 20:26); "valley of decision" (Joe 3:14); "vale of Elah" (margin "terebinth") (1Sa 17:2); "the King’s Vale" (Ge 14:17); but "the king’s dale" (2Sa 18:18); "Emekkeziz," the King James Version "valley of Keziz" (Jos 18:21).

(3) biq‘ah, baqa‘, "to cleave," hence, "valley," especially "broad valley" or "plain"; compare Arabic baq‘at, "wet meadow" Biqa‘, Coele-Syria; absolute: "a land of hills and valleys" (De 11:11); with place-names: "valley of Jericho" (De 34:3); "valley of Lebanon" (Jos 11:17); "valley of Megiddo" (2Ch 35:22); "valley of Mizpah" (Jos 11:8).

(4) nachal, also "river" or "stream"; absolute "Isaac’s servants digged (dug) in the valley" (Ge 26:19); with place-names: "valley (the King James Version "river") of the Arnon" (De 2:24); "valley of Eshcol" (Nu 32:9); "valley of Gerar" (Ge 26:17); "valley of Shittim" (Joe 3:18); "valley of Sorek" (Jud 16:4); "valley of Zered" (Nu 21:12).

(5) shephelah, shaphel, "to be low"; compare Arabic safal, "to be low"; the King James Version "valley" or "vale," the Revised Version (British and American) "lowland," the coast and foothills of Western Palestine

(6) aulon, "valley" (Judith 4:4; 7:3; 10:10).

(7) pharagx: "Every valley shall be filled" (Lu 3:5).

The valley gate (Ne 2:13, etc.) may have had about the location of the present Jaffa gate, if by "valley" is meant the valley of Hinnom. If the Tyropoeon is meant, it would have been near the southwestern corner of the charam area.

See JERUSALEM.

The valleys of the mountainous part of Palestine are mostly dry, rocky wadies with occasional torrents m the winter season. Those which descend to the W. widen out as they approach the plain and contain broad fields and meadows which in the winter and spring at least are fresh and green. The valley of the Jordan, the valley of Megiddo and the valley of Lebanon (i.e. Coele-Syria) contain much cultivable land: "the herds that were in the valleys" (1Ch 27:29): "They of Beth-shemesh were reaping their wheat harvest in the valley" (1Sa 6:13); "The valleys also are covered over with grain" (Ps 65:13).

See BROOK; CHAMPAIGN; LOWLAND; RIVER; SHEPHELAH.

Alfred Ely Day

VALIANT, VALIANTLY

val’-yant, val’-yant-li (chayil; ischuros): "Valiant" in the Old Testament is for the most part the translation of chayil, "power," or "might," and is applied to the courageous and to men of war ("mighty men of valor"), as in 1Sa 14:52; 31:12; 2Sa 11:16, etc.; in some passages ben chayil, "a son of might" (Jud 21:10; 1Sa 18:17; 2Sa 2:7, etc.). A few other Hebrew words (gibbor, etc.) are thus rendered. In the New Testament the word occurs once in the King James Version (Heb 11:34, "valiant in fight"; the Revised Version (British and American) "mighty in war"). "Valiantly" is the translation of the same Hebrew word (Nu 24:18; Ps 60:12, etc.); in one case in the King James Version of chazaq (1Ch 19:13, the American Standard Revised Version "play the man," the English Revised Version "men"). In some instances the Revised Version (British and American) has variations, as "man of valor" for "valiant man" (1Sa 16:18), "valiant" for "strong" (1Ch 26:7,9; Jer 48:14, etc.).

W. L. Walker

VALLEY

val’-i.

See VALE; VALLEY.

VALLEY GATE

(sha‘ar ha-gay’," Gate of the Gai"): Is placed (Ne 3:13) between the "tower of the furnaces" and the "dung gate"; from here Nehemiah (2:13) set out on his ride down the "Gai" (Hinnom) to Siloam, and, too (12:31,38), from here the Levites commenced their compass of the city in two directions. It must have been an ancient gate, for Uzziah added towers to it (2Ch 26:9). It was probably near the Southwest corner of the city and near to, if not identical with, the gate found by Bliss near (now in) the Protestant Cemetery.

See JERUSALEM, VI, 13.

E. W. G. Masterman

VALLEY OF DECISION

(’emeq he-charuts).

See JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.

VALLEY OF GIANTS

See REPHAIM, VALE OF.

VALLEY OF KEZIZ

See EMEK-KEZIZ.

VALLEY OF SLAUGHTER

See HINNOM, VALLEY OF; SLAUGHTER, VALLEY OF; TOPHETH.

VALLEY OF VISION

(ge’ chizzayon): A symbolic name generally understood to signify Jerusalem as being the home of prophetic vision (Isa 22:1,5).

VALLEY, JORDAN

See JORDAN VALLEY.

VAMPIRE

vam’-pir (alaqah): the Revised Version margin for "horseleach" (Pr 30:15) has "vampire."

See HORSELEACH.

VANIAH

va-ni’-a (wanyah, meaning unknown): A son of Bani, who had married a foreign wife (Ezr 10:36). The text is, however, doubtful. The Septuagint Codex Vaticanus has Ouiechoa; Codex Sinaiticus Ouierecho; Codex Alexandrinus Ouounia, Lucian Ouania.

VANITY, VANITIES van’-i-ti, van’-i-tiz (hebhel, ‘awen, shaw’; kenos; mataiotes): The words "vain," "vanity," "vanities" are frequent in the Bible. Their idea is almost exclusively that of "evanescence," "emptiness," including "idolatry" and "wickedness" as being not only evil but vain and empty things. They also signify falseness. The chief word translated "vanity," "vanities" is hebhel, a "breath of air, or of the mouth," often applied to idolatry (De 32:21; 1Ki 16:13; Ps 31:6; Jer 8:19, etc.); to man’s days and to man himself (Job 7:16; Ps 39:5,11, etc.); to man’s thoughts (Ps 94:11); to wealth and treasures (Pr 13:11; 21:6); to everything, in Ecclesiastes, where the word occurs frequently in various applications: "Vanity of vanities, all is vanity" (Ec 1:2; 12:8). Hebhel is also the name of Adam’s second son (Ge 4:2). ‘Awen, meaning also "breath," is likewise translated "vanity" in similar connections, but it inclines more to "iniquity" (so often rendered); it is joined with mischief and iniquity (Isa 41:29; 58:9; Zec 10:2); another frequent word is shaw’, having also the idea of "falsity, ... wickedness" (Ex 20:7; De 5:11; Ps 31:6, etc.).

"Vanity" does not often occur in the New Testament; but see VAIN, VAINGLORY. In Ac 14:15 we have mataios, "empty," translated "vanities" (of idols); mataiotes, "emptiness," "transitoriness" (Ro 8:20, "The creation was subjected to vanity," frailty, transitoriness); "emptiness," "folly" (Eph 4:17; 2Pe 2:18).

Among other changes for "vanity" the Revised Version (British and American) has "iniquity" (Job 15:35; Ps 10:7); "falsehood" (Ps 12:2; 41:6); "deceit" (Ps 144:8,11); "vapor" (Pr 21:6); "calamity" (Pr 22:8 margin "vanity"); "a breath" (Isa 57:13); "wickedly" (Isa 58:9). Conversely, for "Wherefore hast thou made all men in vain?" (Ps 89:47), "For what vanity hast thou created all the children of men!"; for "Behold, they are all vanity; their works are nothing" (Isa 41:29), "Behold, all of them, their works are vanity and nought," margin as the King James Version, with "nought" for "nothing."

W. L. Walker

VAPOR

va’-per:

(1) edh: "For he draweth up the drops of water, which distill in rain from his vapor" (Job 36:27); "There went up a mist [’edh] from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground" (Ge 2:6).

(2) nasi’," vapor," i.e. that which rises, from nasa’," to lift": "Who causeth the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth" (Ps 135:7; compare Jer 10:13; 51:16); also translated "clouds": "as clouds and wind without rain" (Pr 25:14).

(3) In Job 36:33, the King James Version has "vapour" ("concerning the vapour") for ‘alah, alah, "to go up," where the Revised Version (British and American) reads "concerning the storm that cometh up."

(4) qiTor: "fire and hail, snow and vapor" (Ps 148:8); elsewhere, "smoke": "The smoke of the land went up as the smoke of a furnace" (Ge 19:28); "I am become like a wineskin in the smoke" (Ps 119:83).

(5) atmis: "blood, and fire, and vapor of smoke" (Ac 2:19); "For ye are a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away" (Jas 4:14).

The first two of the preceding quotations are interesting as indicating the knowledge that vapor of water from the earth or sea is the source of the rain. Visible vapor, i.e. mist or fog, is much less common in Palestine than in many other countries. In the mountains, however, especially in Lebanon, mists are of frequent occurrence, appearing to those below as clouds clinging to the mountains.

Alfred Ely Day

VASHNI

vash’-ni (washni, see below; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus Sanei; Codex Alexandrinus Sani): Read in 1Ch 6:28 the King James Version (Hebrew 13) as the name of the firstborn son of Samuel. According to 1Ch 6:33 (Hebrew 18) and 1Sa 8:2, Samuel’s oldest son was Joel, and the second Abijah. The explanation of this is that in 1Ch 6:28 the word taken then as a proper name is really "and second"; so following Septuagint, Lucian, and Syriac we read (as the Revised Version (British and American)), "And the sons of Samuel: the first-born, Joel, and the second Abijah."

VASHTI

vash’-ti (washti; Astin; Old Persian "beautiful woman"): The former queen of Xerxes, whom he divorced. On the 7th day of a great feast which the king was giving to the assembled nobles of the

empire and others, he commanded the seven chamberlains who served in his presence to bring the queen into the assembly. We are told (Es 1:11) that his purpose was "to show the peoples and the princes her beauty; for she was fair to look on." The king’s command was met by Vashti with a mortifying refusal to obey. The reason which is sometimes assigned for her disobedience—that no man but the king was permitted to look upon the queen—is without foundation. Esther invites Haman on two occasions to accompany the king to a banquet at which she was present. Nor can it be said that there was any lack of recognition of Vashti’s high dignity; the seven highest officials of the palace were sent to escort her. The refusal had to be visited with a punishment severe enough to reestablish the supremacy which it threatened to overthrow. She was, accordingly, divorced and dethroned.

There is no known reference to Vashti outside of Esther. The suggestion has been made that Vashti was an inferior wife, or one of the royal concubines. There is nothing, however, to support it; and it is, besides, directly opposed to several statements in the narrative. She is always named "queen" (Es 1:9,11,12,15-18). It is only (Es 1:19) when the decree is proposed to repudiate and degrade her that she is called merely "Vashti." She also (Es 1:9) presides at the banquet for the women. It is evident, therefore, that in the palace of the women there was no higher personage than Vashti.

John Urquhart

VAT

See WINEVAT.

VAULT

volt (natsar, "to guard," "protest"): Isaiah’s charge against Israel as "a people that .... lodge in the secret places" (Isa 65:4, margin "vaults," the King James Version "monuments") probably refers to the custom of sleeping in sacred tombs or vaults of idol temples to learn the future through dreams by the method known as incubation.

See DIVINATION, 6, (ii); 7, 1; FAMILIAR; WITCHCRAFT; and Expository Times, IX, 157 ff.

VAULT OF EARTH

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 1.

VAV

vav.

See WAW.

VEDAN

ve’-dan (wedhan): A place-name occurring only in Eze 27:19, "Vedan and Javan traded with yarn for thy wares." the King James Version, taking the syllable we as the Hebrew conjunction, renders "and Da also." The text is in bad condition. Some read "Dedan," but Dedan is spoken of separately in the following verse. Assuming that Vedan is the correct reading, an identification may be conjectured with Waddan, also called al-‘Abwa‘, between Mecca and Medina. It was the object of Mohammed’s first expedition (Ibn Hisham, 415). The name contains that of the god Wadd who was worshipped chiefly by the Arab tribe Kalb.

A. S. Fulton

VEHEMENT, VEHEMENTLY

ve’-he-ment, ve’-he-ment-li (charishi; epipothesis): "Vehement" (from Latin vehere, "to carry," or ve, "out of," and mens, "mind"), carried away by the mind or force of passion, occurs twice in the Old Testament (So 8:6, the King James Version "a most vehement flame" (jealousy)) as the translation of shalhebheth-yah, "the flame of Yah," which perhaps means lightning (the Revised Version (British and American) "a very flame of Yahweh," margin "a most vehement flame, Hebrew: Yah"); and as the translation of the King James Version charishi, "silent," "still," hence "sultry" (Jon 4:8, the King James Version "a vehement east wind," the Revised Version (British and American) "sultry"). In the New Testament, "vehement desire" is (the King James Version) the translation of epipothesis, "earnest desire" (2Co 7:11, the Revised Version (British and American) "longing").

"Vehemently" is the translation of deinos, "greatly" (Lu 11:53); of ek perissou or ekperissos, "beyond measure" (Mr 14:31, "He spake exceeding vehemently"); of eutonos, "intensely" (Lu 23:10); and in the King James Version of prosrhegnumi, "to break" or "dash upon" (Lu 6:48,49, the Revised Version (British and American) "break").

W. L. Walker

VEIL (1)

val: The following words are so translated in English Versions of the Bible (sometimes the King James Version vail):

(1) miTpachath, Ru 3:15 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "mantle." As the material was strong enough to serve as a bag for a large quantity of grain the Revised Version (British and American) is certainly right; compare Isa 3:22.

(2) macweh, Ex 34:33-35. Paul in his quotation of the passage in 2Co 3:13-16 uses kalumma, following Septuagint. The covering worn by Moses to conceal the miraculous brightness of his face, although, according to Massoretic Text, he seems to have worn it only in private.

(3) macckhah, Isa 25:7; in 28:20 translated "covering." The use in 25:7 is figurative and the form of the "veil" a matter of indifference.

(4) tsammah, the Revised Version (British and American) So 4:1,3 (margin "locks" (of hair)); 6:7; Isa 47:2, the King James Version "locks." The meaning of the word is uncertain and the King James Version may very well be right. If, however, the Revised Version's translation is correct, a light ornamental veil is meant.

(5) tsa'iph, Ge 24:65; 38:14,19. A large wrap is meant, which at times was used to cover the face also. In 24:65 Rebekah conformed to the etiquette which required the veiling of brides (see MARRIAGE). In Genesis 38 one motive for Tamar's use of the veil was certainly to avoid recognition, but it seems clear from the passage that veils were used by courtesans. Why is unknown, perhaps partly to conceal their identity, perhaps partly in parody of the marriage custom.

(6) redhidh, So 5:7 (the Revised Version (British and American) "mantle," margin "veil"); Isa 3:23. A light mantle is certainly meant. In So 5:7 it is torn from the maiden in the watchmen's endeavor to detain her.

(7) parakalumma, The Wisdom of Solomon 17:3 the King James Version, the Revised Version (British and American) "curtain."

(8) Verb katakalupto, 1Co 11:6 f, with akatakalupto, "unveil" in 11:5; the King James Version has "cover" and "uncover"; kalupto, 2Co 4:3 (twice), anakalupto, 2Co 3:18; the King James Version "hid" and "open."

It will be seen that there is a certain reference to what in modern times would be termed a "veil" only in (2) above. For a possible additional reference see MUFFLER.

The use of the face veil as a regular article of dress was unknown to the Hebrew women, and if "veil" is to be understood in So 4:1, etc., it was worn as an ornament only. The modern oriental custom of veiling is due to Mohammedan influence and has not been universally adopted by Jewesses in the Orient. In New Testament times, however, among both Greeks and Romans, reputable women wore a veil in public (Plutarch Quaest. Rom. xiv) and to appear without it was an act of bravado (or worse); Tarsus, Paul's home city, was especially noted for strictness in this regard (Dio of Prusa, Tarsica prior, section symbol 48). Hence, Paul's indignant directions in 1Co 11:2-16, which have their basis in the social proprieties of the time. The bearing of these directions, however, on the compulsory use of the hat by modern women in public worship would appear to be very remote.

For the Veil of the Tabernacle and the Temple see next article.

Burton Scott Easton

VEIL (2)

(1) (parokheth; katapetasma; the King James Version vail): In Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, the veil that hung between the two holy chambers of the tabernacle is mentioned 23 times (Ex 26:31, etc.). In several places it is termed "the veil of the screen" and it is distinguished from "the screen for the door of the tabernacle" (Ex 35:12,15; 39:34,38). By the latter is meant the curtain that hung outside the holy place, i. e. at the tabernacle entrance. Ex 26:31 informs us that the veil was made of fine-twined linen, and that its colors were blue and purple and scarlet. It was embroidered with cherubim. At each removal of the tabernacle the veil was used to enwrap the ark of the testimony (Nu 4:5). From its proximity to this central object of the Hebrew ceremonial system, the veil is termed "the veil of the testimony" (Le 24:3), "the veil which is before the testimony" (Ex 27:21), etc. In Solomon's Temple the veil is mentioned but once (2Ch 3:14). It was protected by doors of olive wood (1Ki 6:31). In the later temple it is alluded to in 1 Macc 1:22. Its presence in Herod's temple is attested by the statement in each of the Synoptists that at the time of Christ's death the veil of the temple was rent from top to bottom, or in the midst (Mt 27:51; Mr 15:38; Lu 23:45; compare in Mishna, Mid. ii. 1; iv.7). This fact is the basis of the profound truth expressed by the writer to the Hebrews that Jesus, by His sacrificial death, opened for all believers a way into the holiest "through the veil, that is to say, his flesh" (Heb 10:20). See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

(2) See the preceding article and DRESS, V.

W. Shaw Caldecott

VEIN

van: Only in Job 28:1, the King James Version "a vein for the silver," or motsa'," going forth," "source." Both the King James Version "vein" and the Revised Version (British and American) "mine" are more specialized than motsa', but the Revised Version (British and American) doubtless conveys the original meaning.

VENGEANCE

ven'-jans.

See AVENGE; GOEL; RETRIBUTION; REVENGE.

VENISON

ven’-i-z’-n, ven’-z’-n: Is derived (through the French venaison) from the Latin venari, "to hunt," and means properly "the spoils of the chase." As, however, the object of the chase, paragraph excellence, was the deer, venison came to mean usually (as it invariably does in modern English) "deer’s flesh." But in English Versions of the Bible this technical force seems not to be implied, for "venison" is used only for the two Hebrew words tsayidh (Ge 25:28; 27:5), and tsedhah (Ge 27:3), and both these words (from tsudh, "to hunt") mean simply "game" of any kind.

VERDIGRIS

vur’-di-gres.

See SCUM.

VERILY, VERITY

ver’-i-ti, ver’-i-ti (’abhal, etc.; amen): "Verily," as corroborative adverb, represents various Hebrew and Greek words and particles (’abhal, "truly," in Ge 42:21, etc.; ‘akh, "only," "surely," in Ps 66:19; Isa 45:15, etc.). For the King James Version "verily thou shalt be fed" (Ps 37:3, where ‘emunah), the American Standard Revised Version has "feed on his faithfulness" and the English Revised Version "follow after faithfulness," margin in both "feed securely." The Greek amen (Hebrew ‘amen) is used very frequently in the Gospels as an emphatic confirmation of Christ’s sayings (Mt 5:18,26; 6:2; Mr 3:28, etc.), and in John’s Gospel is repeated to give additional emphasis (Joh 1:51; 3:3,5,11, The Revised Version (British and American) makes various changes, as "wholly" for "verily" (Job 19:13), "surely" (Ps 39:5; 73:13), "indeed" (Mr 9:12; Ro 2:25; Heb 3:5; 7:5), etc., and sometimes puts "verily" where the King James Version has other words, as "also" (Mt 13:23), "doubtless" (Php 3:8), etc.

Verity is the translation of ‘emeth, "truth," "stedfastness" (Ps 111:7, "The works of his hands are verity and judgment," the American Standard Revised Version "truth and justice," the English Revised Version "truth and judgment"); and of aletheia, "truth," "reality," "certainty" (1Ti 2:7), "faith and verity," the Revised Version (British and American) "faith and truth."

W. L. Walker

VERMILION

ver-mil’-yun.

See COLORS, (3).

VERSIONS

vur’-shunz.

See AMERICAN REVISED VERSION; ARABIC VERSIONS; ARMENIAN VERSIONS; COPTIC VERSIONS; ENGLISH VERSIONS; ETHIOPIC VERSIONS; LATIN VERSION, THE OLD; SEPTUAGINT; SYRIAC VERSIONS; TARGUM; TEXT AND MANUSCRIPTS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT; VULGATE.

VERSIONS, GEORGIAN, GOTHIC, SLAVONIC

jor’-ji-an, goth’-ik, sla-von’-ik:

1. The Georgian Version:

Georgia is the name given to the territory extending to the East of the Black Sea, a country that has had an independent national existence of 2,000 years but is now (under the name Grusinia) a part of the trans-Caucasian domain of Russia. The language has no affinities with any of the recognized groups, but is becoming obsolete under Russian pressure. Christianity was introduced into Georgia m the 4th century, and a national conversion followed. A well-supported tradition makes the first translation of the Bible almost contemporaneous with this conversion and refers it to Mesrop (died 441; see ARMENIAN VERSIONS), but the fact is not quite certain and the beginnings of a native version may really be as much as two centuries later. The oldest manuscript extant is a Psalter of the 7th-8th centuries, and the earliest copy of the Gospels is perhaps a century later; in all, Gregory (Textkritik, 573-75) enumerates 17 Georgian manuscripts of the New Testament, but his list is not exhaustive.

The first printed Bible was produced in the ancient alphabet in Moscow in 1743 and has never been reprinted, but other edd, perhaps only of the New Testament, were issued at least in 1816 and 1818, using the nonecclesiastical alphabet. According to Conybeare (ZNTW, XI, 161-66, 232-39 (1910)) the Georgian version was first made from the Old Syriac and then later (11th century) revised from the Greek In 1910 a new edition, based on two manuscripts dated respectively 913 and 995, was begun (Quattuor Ev. versio Georgia vetus, Petersburg). The Georgian version was used by S. C. Malan, The Gospel according to John, translated from the 11 Oldest VSS, London, 1862.

2. The Gothic Version:

Ulfilas, the Arian bishop of the West Goths and the chief agent in their conversion to Christianity, was also the first translator of the Bible into Gothic, a work for which he had even to invent an alphabet. According to tradition, his translation included the entire Bible with the exception of Kings (which he thought unadapted to the already too warlike character of his converts), but there is doubt whether his work actually included more than the New Testament. Too little of the Old Testament has survived to enable a settling of this question, nor is it possible to tell how much revision the New Testament translation has undergone since Ulfilas’ work.

A list of the six Gothic manuscripts is given in HDB, IV, 862, to which is to be added a bilingual Latin-Gothic manuscript containing portions of Luke 24, known as the Arsinoe Fragment (published in ZNTW, XI, 1-38 (1910) and separately (Giessen, 1910)). In all there have been preserved in the Old Testament Ge 5 (in part); Ps 52:2 f; Ne 5-7 (in part), and in the New Testament the Gospels and Pauline Epistles (all incomplete), with quotations from Hebrews. The best complete edition is that of Stamm-Heyne(9) (Paderborn, 1896), but as the version is of basic importance for the history of the Germanic languages there are many editions of various portions prepared for philological purposes.

The Old Testament fragments are a translation of a text very closely allied to the Lucianic Greek (see SEPTUAGINT) and are certainly not from the Hebrew New Testament undoubtedly was made from a text of the type used in Antioch (Constantinople) in the 4th century, with very slight variations, none of which are "neutral" (von Soden classes them as of the I-type). Either in making the translation or (more probably) in a subsequent revision an Old-Latin text was used, of the type of Codex Brixianus (f), and certain Old-Latin readings are well marked. For brief lists of these peculiarities see Burkitt in Journal Theological Studies, I, 129-34 (1900), or von Soden, Schriften des New Testament, I, 1469 f (1906).

3. The Slavonic Version:

It is definitely known that the first Slavonic translation of the Bible was commenced in 864 or earlier by the two brothers Cyril (died 869) and Methodius (died 885), and that the latter worked on it after the former’s death. Their work was undertaken for the benefit of the Balkan Slavs, and at first only the liturgical portions (Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Psalms) were translated, but, after the completion of this, Methodius carried the translation farther to include larger portions of the Old Testament. How much of this he accomplished is obscure, but he seems not to have finished the Old Testament entirely, while almost certainly he did not translate Revelation. Uncertain also is the exact dialect used for this work; although this dialect was the basis of the present liturgical language of the Russian church, it has undergone much transformation before arriving at its final stage. At different times the translation of the Bible was revised to conform to the changes of the language, in addition to other revisional changes, and, as a result, the manuscripts (some of which go back to the 10th century) exhibit very varying types of text that have not been satisfactorily classified.

An attempt to bring the discrepant material into order was made about 1495 by Archbishop Gennadius, but he was unable to find Slavonic manuscripts that included the entire Bible and was forced to supply the deficiencies (Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther and most of Jeremiah and the Apocrypha) by a new translation made from the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) This Bible of Gennadius was the basis of the first printed edition, made at Ostrog in 1581, although the liturgical portions had been printed earlier (Ac and Epistles first of all in 1564). The Ostrog edition followed Gennadius fairly closely, but Esther, Canticles, and Wisdom were new translations made from the Septuagint. The next revision was undertaken by order of Peter the Great and was performed by using the Greek (Old Testament and New Testament), although the resulting text was not printed until 1751. A slightly emended edition of 1756 is still the official Bible of the Russian church.

This Slavonic version is to be distinguished from the version in the true Russian language, begun first in 1517, revised or remade at various times, with an excellent modern translation first published complete in 1876. See, on the whole subject, especially Bebb in Church Quart. Rev., XLI, 203-25, 1895.

LITERATURE.

On all three versions see HDB, IV, 861-64, 1902, and the article "Bibelubersetzung" in PRE3, III (1897), with the important supplement in XXIII (1913).

Burton Scott Easton

VERY

ver'-i: As adjective (from verus, "true"), "true," "real," "actual," etc. (Ge 27:21,24, "my very son Esau"; Jos 10:27, "this very day"; Joh 7:26, "the very Christ," etc.); chiefly as adverb, "in a high degree," "extremely." As ab adverb it is commonly in the Old Testament the translation of me'odh, and in the New Testament represents, as adjective and adverb, several Greek words, as alethos, "truly" (Joh 7:26, above), autos (Joh 14:11, "the very works' sake"; Ro 13:6), sphodra (Mt 18:31, "very sorry," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding sorry"; Mr 16:4, "very great," the Revised Version (British and American) "exceeding"), huper- (in composition 1Th 5:13), etc. the Revised Version (British and American) frequently omits "very," and also substitutes other words for it, as "exceeding" (2Ch 16:8; Mt 26:7; compare above), "sore" (Zec 9:5), etc.

W. L. Walker

VESSEL

ves'-el: Is used freely in English Versions of the Bible to translate keli, the Aramaic ma'n, and skeuos, words all meaning "an implement or utensil" of any kind, when the context shows that a hollow utensil is meant. In 1Sa 21:5, however, the translation of the plural of keli by "vessels" is dubious. English Versions of the Bible evidently intended something in the nature of provision wallets, and the "holiness" of such objects finds partial parallels in Nu 19:15; Le 11:32-34, etc. But in 1Sa 21:8, in the immediate context of the verse above, keli certainly means "weapons," and this translation is quite intelligible in 21:5 also. For war among the Hebrews was a holy function, calling for extreme ceremonial purity (De 23:9-14). See the commentaries. and especially RS2, 455-56. In addition, "vessel" appears in Isa 30:14 for nebhel, "jar"; in Mt 13:48 for aggos, "vessels"; and in Sirach 21:14; Mt 25:4 for aggeion, a diminutive form of aggos. A different use is that of The Wisdom of Solomon 14:1, where "vessel" represents ploion, "a boat," while The Wisdom of Solomon 14:5,6 the King James Version has "weak vessel" for schedia, "raft" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). Vessels of all sorts and kinds and for all sorts of uses were so familiar as to make them natural illustrations for different sorts of human beings (Ho 8:8; Isa 22:24; Jer 22:28, etc.; see POTTER), and through Ac 9:15 the word "vessel" has passed into Christian theology as signifying simply a human being. But the figure of such "vessels"

as (passively) filled with different contents is not Biblical. In 1Th 4:4 "vessel" may be taken as a figure for either the man's own body or for his wife. Between these possibilities the commentaries are almost equally divided.

Burton Scott Easton

VESTMENTS

vest'-ments.

See DRESS.

VESTRY

ves'-tri (meltachah): Once, in 2Ki 10:22, as a place for vestments.

VEX, VEXATION

veks, vek-sa'-shun: "Vex," meaning originally to shake or toss in carrying, has a much more intensive meaning in Scripture than in common modern usage. It represents over a score of Hebrew and Greek words, most of them translated by this word only once, and many of them changed in the Revised Version (British and American) into other forms. Thus bahel in Ps 6:2,3,10. is in the American Standard Revised Version "troubled" (in Ps 2:5, the Revised Version margin. "trouble"); tsarar in Ne 9:27 is in the Revised Version (British and American) "distressed"; . pascho in Mt 17:15 is "suffereth grievously"; kakoo in Ac 12:1 is "afflict," etc. So "vexation only" in Isa 28:19 is in the Revised Version (British and American) "nought but terror," and there are other changes of this word (compare De 28:20, "discomfiture"; Isa 9:1, "in anguish"). On the other hand, the Revised Version (British and American) has "vex" for "distress" (De 2:9,19); "they that vex" for "the adversaries of" (Isa 11:13); "vexeth himself" for "meddleth" (Pr 26:17), etc.

W. L. Walker

VIAL

vi'-al: In modern English means "a tiny flask." The word appears in English Versions of the Bible 1Sa 10:1 and the Revised Version (British and American) 2Ki 9:1,3 (the King James Version "box") for pakh, a word found nowhere else and from a root meaning "to pour." The shape and size of the pakh are quite uncertain. In 1 Esdras 2:13; and the King James Version Re 5:8, etc., "vial" translates phiale. The phiale was a flat, shallow bowl (Latin, patera), shaped much like a saucer. Hence, the Revised Version's change to "bowl" in Revelation, a change that should have been made in 1 Esdras also.

VICE, UNNATURAL

See UNNATURAL VICE.

VICTUALS

vit’-’-lz.

See FOOD.

VILE, VILLANY

vil, vil’-an-i: The original words for "vile" and "villany" are used in about 10 different senses, e.g. despised (1Sa 15:9), despicable (Da 11:21 the King James Version), lightly esteemed (De 25:3), empty (Jud 19:24 the King James Version), foolish (Isa 32:6, the King James Version and the English Revised Version), dishonorable (Ro 1:26), filthy or dirty (Jas 2:2), humiliation (Php 3:21).

Villany occurs but twice in the King James Version (Isa 32:6; Jer 29:23), and signifies emptiness or folly (so the Revised Version (British and American)). From the foregoing meanings it will be seen that the word "vile" does not always bear the meaning which has come to be invariably given it in our present-day speech. Anything common or ordinary or humble might, in the Scriptural sense, be termed "vile." So Job 40:4, the Revised Version (British and American) "Behold, I am of small account"; also "the low estate of his handmaid" (Lu 1:48). Ordinarily, however, the idea of contemptible, despicable, is read into the word.

William Evans

VILLAGE

vil’-aj (qaphar, chawwoth, qatserim, banoth, perazoth; kome):

(1) The general term for a village, in common with Aramaic and Arabic is qaphar (So 7:11; 1Ch 27:25; kopher; 1Sa 6:18; kephir, Ne 6:2). This designation is derived from the idea of its offering "cover" or shelter. It is used in combination, and place-names of this formation became prominent in post-Biblical times, probably because the villages so named had then grown into towns. A well-known Biblical instance of such names is Capernaum.

(2) Chawwoth (always "town" in English Versions of the Bible; see HAVVOTH-JAIR) means originally a group of tents (Arabic chiwa’). These in settled life soon became more permanent dwellings, or what we understand by a village. The term, however, is applied only to the villages of Jair in the tribe of Manasseh (Nu 32:41; 1Ki 4:13).

(3) Chatserim likewise came from nomadic life. They were originally enclosures specially for cattle, alongside of which dwellings for the herdsmen and peasantry naturally grew up (see HAZAR-ADDAR; HAZOR). They were unwalled (Le 25:31) and lay around the cities (Jos 19:8).

(4) Banoth is literally "daughters." The word is applied to the dependent villages lying around the larger cities, and to which they looked as to a kind of metropolis (Nu 21:25, etc.); the Revised Version (British and American) "towns" except in Nu 32:42.

(5) Perazoth means "the open country," but it soon came to mean the villages scattered in the open (Eze 38:11; Zec 2:4; Es 9:19). Some have sought to connect the Perizzites with this word and to regard them, not as a distinct people, but as the peasant class. Attempts have also been m

ade to connect perazon in Jud 5:7,11 with the same root, and the King James Version rendered it "inhabitants of the villages." the Revised Version (British and American), on the contrary, gives it the meaning of "rulers." The versions indicate a word meaning authority, and probably the text should be emended to read rozenim, "rulers." A similar emendation is required in Hab 3:14. "Village" in the Revised Version (British and American) of the New Testament invariably represents the Greek kome, but in 2 Macc 8:6 the Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha has "village" for chora, lit. "country."

See CITY; TOWN.

W. M. Christie

VILLANY

See VILE.

VINE

vin:

1. Hebrew Words:

(1) gephen, usually the cultivated grape vine. In Nu 6:4; Jud 13:14 we have gephen ha-yayin, literally, "vine of wine," translated "grape vine" (Numbers) and "vine," margin "grape vine" (Jgs); 2Ki 4:39, gephen sadheh English Versions of the Bible "wild vine"; De 32:32, gephen cedhom, "vine of Sodom."

(2) soreq, in Isa 5:2, "choicest vine"; soreq, in Jer 2:21, "noble vine"; soreqah, in Ge 49:11, "choice vine"; compare SOREK, VALLEY OF (which see). The Hebrew is supposed to indicate dark grapes

and, according to rabbinical tradition, they were unusually sweet and almost, if not quite, stoneless.

(3) nazir, in Le 25:5,11, "undressed vine," the King James Version "vine undressed," margin "separation." This may mean an unpruned vine and be a reference to the uncut locks of a Nazirite, but it is equally probable that nazir should be batsir, "vintage."

For the blossom we have peraq (Isa 18:5), "blossom"; nitstsah, either the blossom or half-formed clusters of grapes (Ge 40:10; Isa 18:5); cemadhar, "sweet-scented blossom" (So 2:13,15; 7:12).

For grapes we have commonly: ‘enabh (a word common to all Semitic languages) (Ge 40:10; De 32:14; Isa 5:2, etc.); dam ‘anabhim, literally, "blood of grapes," i.e. wine (Ge 49:11); bocer, "the unripe grape" (Isa 18:5, "ripening grape," the King James Version "sour grape"; Job 15:33, "unripe grapes"; Jer 31:29 f; Eze 18:2, "sour grapes"); be’ushim "wild grapes" (Isa 5:2,4; see GRAPES, WILD); ‘eshkol, a "cluster" of ripe grapes (Ge 40:10; So 7:8; Hab 3:17, etc.; compare ESHCOL (which see)); qartsannim, usually supposed to be the kernels of grapes (Nu 6:4).

2. Greek and Latin:

In Greek we have ampelos, "vine" (Mt 26:29, etc.), staphule (Sirach 39:26, "blood of grapes"; Mt 7:16, "grapes," etc.), and botrus (Re 14:18), "cluster of the vine." In the Latin of 2 Esdras vinea is "vine" in 5:23 ("vineyard" in 16:30,43); botrus (9:21) and racemus (16:30) are "cluster"; acinium (9:21) and uva (16:26) are "a grape."

3. Antiquity and Importance:

Palestine appears to have been a vine-growing country from the earliest historic times. The countless wine presses found in and around centers of early civilization witness to this. It is probable that the grape was largely cultivated as a source of sugar: the juice expressed in the "wine press" was reduced by boiling to a liquid of treacle-like consistency known as "grape honey," or in Hebrew debhash (Arabic, dibs). This is doubtless the "honey" of many Old Testament references, and before the days of cane sugar was the chief source of sugar. The whole Old Testament witnesses to how greatly Palestine depended upon the vine and its products. Men rejoiced in wine also as one of God’s best gifts (Jud 9:13; Ps 104:15). But the Nazirite might eat nothing of the vine "from the kernels even to the husk" (Nu 6:4; Jud 13:14).

The land promised to the children of Israel was one of "vines and fig trees and pomegranates" (De 8:8); they inherited vineyards which they had not planted (De 6:11; Jos 24:13; Ne 9:25). Jacob’s blessing on Judah had much reference to the suitability of his special part of the land to the vine (Ge 49:11). When the leading people were carried captive the poor were left as vine dressers (2Ki 25:12; Jer 52:16), lest the whole land should lapse into uncultivated wilderness. On the promised return this humble duty was, however, to fall to the "sons of the alien" (Isa 61:5 the King James Version).

4. Its Cultivation:

The mountain regions of Judea and Samaria, often little suited to cereals, have always proved highly adapted to vine culture. The stones must first be gathered out and utilized for the construction of a protecting wall or of terraces or as the bases of towers (Isa 5:2; Mt 21:33). Every ancient vineyard had its wine press cut in a sheet of rock appearing at the surface. As a rule the vinestocks lie along the ground, many of the fruit-bearing branches falling over the terraces (compare Ge 49:22); in some districts the end of the vine-stock is raised by means of a cleft stick a foot or more above the surface; exceptionally the vine branches climb into trees, and before a dwelling-house they are sometimes supported upon poles to form a bower (compare 1Ki 4:25, etc.).

The cultivation of the vine requires constant care or the fruit will very soon degenerate. After the rains the loosely made walls require to have breaches repaired; the ground must be plowed or harrowed and cleared of weeds—contrast with this the vineyard of the sluggard (Pr 24:30-31); in the early spring the plants must be pruned by cutting off dead and fruitless branches (Le 25:3,4; Isa 5:6) which are gathered and burned (Joh 15:6). As the grapes ripen they must be watched to keep off jackals and foxes (So 2:15), and in some districts even wild boars (Ps 80:13). The watchman is stationed in one of the towers and overlooks a considerable area. When the grape season comes, the whole family of the owner frequently take their residence in a booth constructed upon one of the larger towers and remain there until the grapes are practically finished. It is a time of special happiness (compare Isa 16:10). The gleanings are left to the poor of the village or town (Le 19:10; De 24:21; Jud 8:2; Isa 17:6; 24:13; Jer 49:9; Mic 7:1). In the late summer the vineyards are a beautiful mass of green, as contrasted with the dried-up parched land around, but in the autumn the leaves are sere and yellow (Isa 34:4), and the place desolate.

5. Vine of Sodom:

The expression "vine of Sodom" (De 32:32) has been supposed, especially because of the description in Josephus (BJ, IV, viii, 4), to refer to the colocynth (Citrullus colocynthis), but it is far more probable that it means "a vine whose juices and fruits were not fresh and healthy, but tainted by the corruption of which Sodom was the type" (Driver, Commentary on Deuteronomy).

See SODOM, VINE OF.

Figurative: Every man "under his vine and under his fig-tree" (1Ki 4:25; Mic 4:4; Zec 3:10) was a sign of national peace and prosperity. To plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof implied long and settled habitation (2Ki 19:29; Ps 107:37; Isa 37:30; 65:21; Jer 31:5; Eze 28:26; Am 9:14); to plant and not eat the fruit was a misfortune (De 20:6; compare 1Co 9:7) and might be a sign of God’s displeasure (De 28:30; Ze 1:13; Am 5:11). Not to plant vines might be a sign of deliberate avoidance of permanent habitation (Jer 35:7). A successful and prolonged vintage showed God’s blessing (Le 26:5), and a fruitful wife is compared to a vine (Ps 128:3); a failure of the vine was a sign of God’s wrath (Ps 78:47; Jer 8:13; Joe 1:7); it might be a test of faith in Him (Hab 3:17). Joseph "is a fruitful bough, ... his branches run over the wall" (Ge 49:22). Israel is a vine (Isa 5:1-5) brought out of Egypt (Ps 80:8 f; Jer

2:21; 12:10; compare Eze 15:2,6; 17:6). At a later period vine leaves or grape clusters figure prominently on Jewish coins or in architecture.

Three of our Lord’s parables are connected with vineyards (Mt 20:1 ff; 21:28,33), and He has made the vine ever sacred in Christian symbolism by His teaching regarding the true vine (Joh 15).

E. W. G. Masterman

VINEGAR

vin’-e-ger (chomets; oxos): Vinegar, whose use as a condiment (Ru 2:14) needs no comment, is formed when a saccharine fluid passes through a fermentation that produces acetic acid. In the ancient world vinegar was usually made of wine, although any fruit juice can be utilized in its manufacture, and "vinegar of strong drink" (palm juice?) is mentioned in Nu 6:3. Undiluted vinegar is of course undrinkable, and to offer it to a thirsty man is mockery (Ps 69:21), but a mixture of water and vinegar makes a beverage that was very popular among the poor (Greek oxos, oxukraton, Latin posca—names applied also to diluted sour wine). It is mentioned in Nu 6:3 (forbidden to the Nazirite) and again in the Gospels in the account of the Crucifixion. The executioners had brought it in a vessel (Joh 19:29) for their own use and at first "offered" it to Christ, while keeping it out of reach (Lu 23:36). But at the end the drink was given Him on a sponge (Mr 15:36; Mt 27:48; Joh 19:29,30). In addition, the King James Version, following Textus Receptus of the New Testament, has "vinegar .... mingled with gall" in Mt 27:34, but this rests on a false reading, probably due to Ps 69:21, and the Revised Version (British and American) rightly has "wine." Vinegar, like all acids, is injurious to the teeth (Pr 10:26); and when it is combined with niter an effervescence is produced (Pr 25:20). The appropriateness of the last figure, however, is obscure, and Septuagint reads "as vinegar on a wound," causing pain.

Burton Scott Easton

VINEYARD

vin’-yard.

See VINE.

VINEYARDS, MEADOW (PLAIN) OF THE

(Jud 11:33).

See ABEL-CHERAMIM; MEADOW.

VINTAGE

vin’-taj.

See VINE.

VIOL

vi’-ol (nebhel, nebhel): the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in Isa 14:11; Am 5:23; 6:5; the King James Version alone in Isa 5:12, the Revised Version (British and American) "lute." "Viol" is derived from Latin vitella, a doublet of vitula, a "viol"; hence, French vielle, doublet of viole. The viol was a bowed instrument, the parent of the violin tribe, and is not a true equivalent for nebhel.

See MUSIC.

VIOLENCE, VIOLENT

vi’-o-lens; vi’-o-lent: Chiefly for gazal, qamac; bia, and their derivatives. Difficulty is offered only by the very obscure passage Mt 11:12 parallel Lu 16:16. Both Matthew and Luke contain the verb biazetai, but this form maybe either a middle, "presses violently," "storms," or a passive, "is forced." Matthew, in addition, contains the adjective biastai, but whether this is a term of praise, "heroic enthusiasts," or of blame, "hot-headed revolutionaries," is again a problem. Nor can it be determined whether the words "from the days of John the Baptist until now" are meant to include or exclude the work of the Baptist himself. The difference in wording in Matthew and Luke further complicates the problem, and, in consequence, scholars are widely at variance as to the proper interpretation. "The Baptist has fanned a new Messianic storm of ill-advised insurrection," "the Pharisees have shamefully used forcible suppression of God’s teachers," "the Kingdom of God comes like a storm and is received by those who have used drastic self-discipline," are instances of the differing explanations proposed.

Burton Scott Easton

VIPER

vi’-per (’eph‘eh (Job 20:16; Isa 30:6; 59:5); echidna (Mt 3:7 = Lu 3:7; Mt 12:34; 23:33; Ac 28:3)): Several vipers are found in Palestine, but it is not certain that ‘eph‘eh referred definitely to any of them.

See SERPENT.

VIRGIN BIRTH

I. DEFINITION

II. THE TEXTUAL QUESTION

III. THE HISTORICAL QUESTION

1. Statement Not Dogmatic but Vital as History

2. Its Importance to Leaders of the Early Church

3. Hypothesis of Invention Discredits the Church

IV. THE CRITICAL QUESTION

1. Basis of Virgin-Birth Statement

2. Interrelationship of Narratives

3. Sources, Origin and age of Documents

V. THE DOCTRINAL QUESTION

1. In the New Testament

2. Portrait of Jesus in Synoptic Gospels 3. In Rest of the New Testament

4. Oppositions to the Doctrine

5. Its Importance to Modern Thought

LITERATURE

I. Definition.

"Virgin-birth" is the correct and only correct designation of the birth statement contained in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. "Immaculate conception" is of course manifestly a blunder due to the confusion of one idea with another. "Supernatural or miraculous birth" will not do, because there is no intimation that the process of birth was in any way exceptional. "Supernatural or miraculous conception" is equally unsatisfactory as it involves a question-begging comparison between the birth of Christ and the exceptional births of the Sons of Promise (e.g. Isaac, John the Baptist, etc.). The only statement which is sufficiently specific is "virgin-birth," inasmuch as according to the New Testament statement Mary was at the time of this birth virgo intacta.

II. The Textual Question.

We may deal with this division of our subject very briefly, because if we are to allow any weight at all to textual evidence there is no question as to the infancy narratives, either in whole or in part. Their position is flawless and unassailable. There is a voluminous literature devoted to the discussion of the subject, but it is notably jejune even for critical writing, and much more impressive for ingenuity and dialectic skill in arguing a poor case than for anything in the way of results. We do not hesitate to refer the reader who is interested in discussions of this sort to entirely satisfactory reviews of them found elsewhere (see Machen, Princeton Review, October, 1905; January, 1906; and Orr, The Virgin Birth of Christ). We may summarize the entire discussion in the words of Johannes Weiss (Theologische Rundschau, 1903, 208, quoted by Machen, ut sup.): "There never were forms of Mt and Lu without the infancy narratives." One point only we shall consider in this connection; namely, the disputed reading of Mt 1:16. The Ferrar group of manuscripts (nos. 346, 556, 826, 828) interpose a second "begat" between the names Joseph and Jesus. It is affirmed that this reading with the variants represents an original form of the genealogy preserved in the Gospels which affirms the literal sonship of Jesus to Joseph. The first and most obvious remark to be made upon this question is, granting—what is extremely uncertain—that this reading is original, it does not prove nor begin to prove the point alleged. This is now widely conceded. For one thing, the word "begat" is used elsewhere for legal or putative fatherhood (compare Mt 1:12 and see GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST). Allen’s statement of the case indicates clearly enough that the radical use of this variation has broken down (see ICC; "Matthew," 8). This writer holds that the reading of Sam 1 ("Jacob begat Joseph. Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus, called the Messiah," Mt 1:16) is nearest the original form. By four steps, which he enumerates in order, he conceives that the original text, which was intended to convey the idea of a legal fatherhood on the part of Joseph, was modified so as to guard the statement from misinterpretation. This hypothesis is ingenious if somewhat complicated. The weak spot in the whole case (for the variation) lies in the fact that all manuscripts concur in the name of Mary and the term "virgin." It is evident, in any view of the relative standing of the various readings,

(1) that the genealogy as deposited in public or private record would read: "Jacob begat Joseph, Joseph begat Jesus,"

(2) that the person who used the genealogy in the Gospel and placed it in connection with Mt 1:18-25

(a) had Mary particularly in mind and inserted the names of women to prepare the way for the mention of Mary, all of which was a departure from usual and orderly procedure;

(b) that he used the word "begat" in the legal sense throughout (1:8,12; compare 1Ch 3:11,12,19);

(c) that he believed in the virgin-birth as evinced by the connection and the use of names of women including Mary’s.

There is therefore no basis for the idea that the genealogy, even without the strongly attested relative

clause of Mt 1:16, ever meant anything but an attestation of the virgin-birth.

III. The Historical Question.

1. Statement Not Dogmatic but Vital as History:

The twofold birth announcement of Matthew and Luke is a statement of historical or, more strictly speaking, biographical fact. The accounts, as we shall see, are very rigidly confined to the matter of fact concerned. It is not a dogma and receives very little doctrinal elaboration even in the infancy narratives themselves. It is an event, wholly real or wholly imaginary. The statement of it is wholly true or entirely false. But as a historical statement this narrative is of peculiar quality and significance.

(1) It touches upon the most delicate matters, at a place where the line between that which is most sacred and that which is most degraded in human life is closely drawn. To discredit it leaves the most intimate mystery of our Lord's earthly life under the shadow of suspicion. It is therefore a statement of the greatest personal moment in the evangelic record.

(2) It involves the secret history and public honor of a family most dear and sacred to the entire Christian body. It records the inner and outer experiences of the mother of the Lord and of His brethren, themselves honored leaders in the church.

(3) It touches upon the central mystery of the Lord's person in such a way as to involve either a very important contribution to the doctrine of the incarnation or a very serious mutilation of the truth. We may dismiss altogether the contention of many, that whether true or not the fact is of no great importance. It must be of importance. No fact in which the relationship of Jesus to His ancestors according to the flesh, to His mother, to the laws of life in the race at large, are so evidently and so deeply involved can possibly be a matter of indifference. The nature of His experience in the world, the quality and significance of His manhood, the fundamental constitution of His person, the nature and limits of the incarnation are necessarily and vitally concerned in the discussion. It is impossible to begin with the acceptance or rejection of the fact and arrive by logical processes at like convictions on any fundamental matter in the region of Christology.

2. Its Importance to Leaders of the Early Church:

All this must have been as patent to the earliest believers as to ourselves. The men who incorporated this incident into the gospel narrative could not possibly have been blind to the importance of what they were doing (compare Lu 1:3). In view of these facts it would be well for the serious student to ask himself this question: "On the hypothesis of invention, what manner of men were they who fabricated these narratives and succeeded in foisting them upon the church so early as to dominate its earliest official records and control the very making of all its creeds?" It is clear that deliberate invension is the only alternative to historical credit. We may throw out of court as altogether inadmissible the hypothesis that the church as a whole, by a naive and semi-unconscious process, came to believe these stories and to

accept them without criticism. Rumors always grow in the absence of known facts, especially where curiosity is keen. Absurd rumors multiply among the credulous. But no statement contrary to natural expectation was ever yet promulgated among people of even average intelligence without meeting the resistance of incredulity on the part of some individuals who wish to inquire, especially if means of verification are within reach. In this particular instance, the issue may be stated much more sharply. At no period reasonably to be assigned for the origin and incorporation of these documents could they have been honestly accepted by any member of the Christian community, sufficiently taught to occupy a position of authority. If the story was invented, there must have been a time when Jesus was universally accepted as the son by natural generation of Joseph and Mary. The story surely was not invented before His birth nor for some time after. The first person, therefore, who spoke contrary to the prevalent and natural belief must have had it from the family, which alone knew the truth, or else have been a wanton and lying gossip. Such a story is recognizable on the face of it as authoritative or pure invention. There is no middle ground. It could not have been recounted without being challenged for its strangeness and for its contravention of the accepted belief. It could not have been challenged without the exposure of its groundless and fraudulent character, for the simple reason that the lack of positive and authoritative certification would be its immediate and sufficient condemnation. It is not difficult to draw the portrait of the inventor of this story. He must have been lacking, not only in the sense of truthfulness, but also in the elementary instinct of delicacy, to have invaded the privacy of the most sacred home known to him and deliberately invented a narrative which included the statement that Mary had come under suspicion of wrongdoing in such a way as to shadow the life of her Son. He must also have been doctrinally lax in the extreme, as well as temperamentally presumptuous, to have risked a mutilation of the truth by an invention dealing with such essential matters.

3. Hypothesis of Invention Discredits the Church:

Moreover, this hypothesis demands that this fabrication must have met with instantaneous and universal success. It passed the scrutiny of the church at large and of its authorized teachers, and was never challenged save by a small group of heretics who disliked it on purely dogmatic grounds.

To whatever origin in the way of suggestion from without one may attribute the story—whether one may ascribe it to the influence of Old Testament prophecy, or Jewish Messianic expectations in general, or to ethnic analogies, Babylonian. Egyptian or Greek—the fact remains that the story had to be invented and published by those who ought to have known better and could easily have known better had they possessed sufficient interest in the cause of truth to have made even casual inquiries into the credentials of such an important statement offered for their acceptance. It is fairly true to say that ethnic analogies for the birth of Christ fail (see article on "Heathen Wonder-Births and the Birth of Christ," Princeton Review, January, 1908). It is also true that the rooted Sere conviction shared by the Hebrews, that family descent is to be traced through the male line only, so persistent even among the New Testament writers that both evangelists, on the face of them, trace the lineage of Joseph, would have acted as an effectual barrier against this particular legendary development. It is further true that no passage of the Old Testament, including Isa 7:14, can be adduced as convincing evidence that the story was invented under the motive of finding fulfillment for Messianic predictions (see IMMANUEL). But far more satisfactory is the elementary conviction that the founders of the Christian church and the

writers of its documents were not the kind of men to accept or circulate stories which they knew perfectly well would be used by unbelief in a malignant way to the discredit of their Master and His family. The hypothesis of invention not only leaves an ugly cloud of mystery over the birth of Jesus, but it discredits beyond repair every man who had to do with the writing and circulation of the Gospels, down to and including the man who professes to have "traced the course of all things accurately from the beginning," according to the testimony of those who were "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word" (Lu 1:2 f). It is simply impossible to save the credit, in any matter involving honesty or commonsense, of one who uses words like these and yet incorporates unauthenticated legends into the narrative to which he has thus pledged himself.

One may venture at the close of this section of the discussion to point out that everything which the inventor of this story must have been, the narrators of it are not. Both narratives exhibit a profound reverence, a chaste and gracious reserve in the presence of a holy mystery, a simplicity, dignity and self-contained nobility. of expression which are the visible marks of truth, if such there are anywhere in human writing.

IV. The Critical Question.

1. Basis of Virgin-Birth Statement:

The infancy narratives evidently stand somewhat apart from the main body of apostolic testimony. The personal contact of the disciples with Jesus, upon which their testimony primarily rests, extended from the call of the disciples, near the opening of the ministry, to the resurrection and post-resurrection appearances. It is hyper-skepticism to deny that the substance of the gospel narrative rests upon the basis of actual experience. But all four evangelists show a disposition to supplement the immediate testimony of the disciples by the use of other well-attested materials. Luke’s introductory paragraph, if it was written by an honest man, indicates that he at least was satisfied with nothing less than a careful scrutiny of original sources, namely, the testimony, written or oral, of eyewitnesses. It may reasonably be surmised that this was the general attitude of the entire group of apostles, evangelists and catechists who are responsible for the authorship and circulation of the Gospels.

But, to say nothing of the infancy narratives, for one of which Luke himself is responsible, these writers have embodied in the narrative the ministry of John the Baptist, the baptism and temptation of Jesus, all of which events happened before their fellowship with Jesus, strictly speaking, began. In particular, assuredly no disciple was an eyewitness of the temptation. None the less the narrative stands, simply because imaginative invention of such an incident in the absence of accredited facts cannot reasonably be considered. The fact that the birth narratives do not rest upon the testimony of the same eyewitnesses who stand for the ministry of Jesus does not discredit them as embodying reliable tradition, unless it can be proved that they contradict the rest of the apostolic testimony or that no reliable witness to the events in question was within reach at the time when the documents were composed. In the present instance such a contention is absurd. The very nature of the event points out the inevitable firsthand witnesses. There could be no others. In the absence of their decisive word, bald invention would be necessary. To

charge the entire church of the time (for this is what the hypothesis amounts to) as particeps criminis in its own official and documentary deception is an extreme position as unwarranted as it is cruel.

The internal harmony of the facts as recorded points in the same direction. The silence or comparative lack of emphasis with reference to the birth of Christ on the part of the other New Testament writers is to be explained partly on the basis of doctrinal viewpoint (see V, below) and partly because an ingrained sense of delicacy would naturally tend to reticence on this point, at least during the lifetime of Mary and the Lord's brethren. The following intimately corresponding facts are sufficiently significant in this connection:

(1) that the fact of Jesus' unique birth could not be proclaimed as a part of His own teaching or as the basis of His incarnate life;

(2) that He was popularly known as the son of Joseph;

(3) that the foster-fatherhood of Joseph, as embodied in the genealogy (see GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST), was the recognized basis of His relationship to the house of David. All these facts appear just as they should in the narrative.

The very fact that the genealogies, ending with the name of Joseph, and the current representations of Jesus as Joseph's son, are allowed to appear in the same documents in which the virgin-birth statements appear, together with the entirely congruous facts that the main synoptic narrative does not emphasize the event, and that neither Paul nor John nor any other New Testament writer gives it a prominent place, is indication enough that it rested, in the opinion of the entire witnessing body, on a sufficient basis of evidence and required no artificial buttressing. Internal harmonies and incidental marks of truthfulness are of the utmost importance here because in a narrative so complex and vital it would have been easy to make a misstep. Since none was made, we are constrained to believe that the single eye to truth filled the apostolic mind with light. Every item, in the infancy narratives themselves, as well as in the more strictly doctrinal statements of other New Testament books, is as we should expect, provided the birth statement be accepted as true. Internal evidence of truthfulness could not be stronger.

2. Interrelationship of Narratives:

This general conclusion is confirmed when we come to consider the relationship of the two narratives to each other. To begin with, we have two narratives, differing greatly in method of treatment, grouping of details, order and motive of narration, and general atmosphere. It is evident that we have two documents which have had quite a different history.

In two points, at any rate, what might be considered serious discrepancies are discoverable (see BIBLICAL DISCREPANCIES). These two points are:

(1) the relationship of the Massacre of the Innocents and the journey to Egypt, as related by Matthew, to

Luke’s account, which carries the holy family directly back to Nazareth from Bethlehem after the presentation in the temple;

(2) the discrepancy as to the previous residence at Nazareth (Luke) and the reason given for the return thither (Matthew).

As to (1) it is quite clear that Matthew’s account centers about an episode interpolated, so to say, into the natural order of events (see INNOCENTS, MASSACRE OF THE). It is also clear that the order of Luke’s narrative, which is in the highest degree condensed and synoptic, does not forbid the introduction of even a lengthy train of events into the midst of Lu 2:39 (compare condensation in 2:40-42,51,52). It may easily be that the lacunae in each account are due to a lack of knowledge on the part of either writer as to the point supplied by the other. Matthew may not have known that the family had resided formerly in Nazareth, and Luke may not have known that a return to Galilee as a permanent residence was not contemplated in the original plan. The difficulty here is not serious. We consider the discrepancy as it stands as of more value to the account as indicating the independence of the two accounts and the honesty of those who incorporated them into the Gospels without attempting to harmonize them, than any hypothetical harmonization however satisfactory. We introduce this caveat, however, that Matthew had an especial reason for introducing the episode connected with Herod and for explaining the residence at Nazareth during our Lord’s early years as occurring by divine authority (see Sweet, Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 218 f, for discussion of this point; and compare INNOCENTS, MASSACRE OF THE).

We are now free to consider the remarkable convergence of these two documents. The following particulars may be urged:

(1) the synchronism in the Herodian era; (2) the name "Jesus" given by divine authority before birth;

(3) Davidic kinship;

(4) the virgin-birth;

(5) the birth at Bethlehem;

(6) residence at Nazareth.

In addition we may urge the essential and peculiar harmony of descriptive expressions (see V, below) and the correspondence of the inner and outer experiences of Mary.

See MARY, II.

3. Sources, Origin and Age of Documents:

We have now reached the final and crucial point of this phase of our discussion when we take up the question as to the sources, origin and date of these narratives. Our method of approach to the general question of their credibility delivers us from the necessity of arguing in extenso theories which have been framed to account for the narrative in the absence of historical fact. We resort to the simple and convincing principle that the story could not have been honestly composed nor honestly published as derived from any source other than the persons who could have guaranteed its trustworthiness. Every indication, of which the narratives are full, of honesty and intelligence on the part of the narrators is an argument against any and all theories which presuppose a fictitious origin for the central statement. Negatively, we may with confidence assert that wide excursions into ethnic mythology and folklore have failed to produce a single authentic parallel either in fact or in form to the infancy narratives. In addition to this, the attempt to deduce the story from Messianic prophecy also fails to justify itself. In addition, there are two considerations which may justly be urged as pointing to trustworthy sources for the narrative: First, the strongly Hebraic nature of both narratives. It has often been pointed out that nowhere in the New Testament do we find documents so deeply tinged with the Hebraic spirit (see Adeney, Essays for the Times, number XI, 24 f; and Briggs, New Lights on the Life of Christ, 161 f). This statement involves both narratives and is another evidence of profound internal unity. A second important fact is that the doctrinal viewpoint is Jewish-Christian and undeveloped. The term "Holy Spirit" is used in the Old Testament sense; the Christology is undeveloped, omitting reference to Christ’s preexistence and interpreting His sonship as official and ethical rather than metaphysical. The soteriology is Jewish and Messianic, not unfolding the doctrine of the cross. All these facts point in one direction, namely, to the conclusion that these documents are early. It is impossible reasonably to suppose that such documents could have been composed in the absence of sources, or by persons devoid of the historical spirit, after the death and resurrection and ascension of Jesus had shed such light upon His person and mission as to transform both Christology and soteriology through the ideas of incarnation, atonement and the Trinity.

It is still asserted, in the face of the most convincing evidence to the contrary, that the infancy narratives are late addenda to the gospel tradition as a whole. This idea is due, primarily, to a confusion of thought between origin and publication. The latter must have been coincident with the original issue of the Gospels in their present form. The textual evidence here is convincing. On the other hand, the main body of testimony incorporated into the Gospels at the time of their publication had been in the hands of the apostles and their helpers for some years, as evidenced by the Pauline letters and the Book of acts. In all probability the sources upon which the infancy narratives rest, which had their origin and received the impress which characterizes them in the period antecedent to the public ministry of Jesus, came into the hands of the Gospel writers toward the end of the formative period at the close of which the Gospels were issued. In other words, the story of the Lord’s birth was withheld until the time was ripe for its publication. Two occasions may have served to release it: the death of Mary may have made it possible to use her private memoirs, or the rise of anti-Christian calumny may have made the publication of the true history imperative. At any rate, the narratives show every indication of being contemporary documents of the period with which they deal. This fact puts an additional burden of proof, already heavier than they can bear, upon those who would antagonize the documents. We may reasonably affirm that the narratives will bear triumphantly any fair critical test.

V. The Doctrinal Question.

1. In the New Testament:

The discussion of the doctrinal significance of the virgin-birth statement falls naturally into three parts:

(1) Its doctrinal elaboration in the New Testament;

(2) its historic function in the development of Christian doctrine;

(3) its permanent value to Christian thought.

We begin with the narratives themselves. As has just been said, they were incorporated into the Gospels at a time when the New Testament Christology had reached maturity in the Pauline and Johannine writings and the Epistle to the Hebrews. The doctrine of the incarnation was fully unfolded. It had been unequivocally asserted that in Jesus all the fullness of the Godhead was historically and personally manifested (Joh 1:14; Php 2:5-8; Col 1:18; 2:9; Heb 2:14). In contrast with these statements the infancy narratives not only, as adverted to above, exhibit on the surface a rudimentary Christology, but in several items, of profound interest and most surprising tenor, show that the birth notice was not apprehended or stated in view of the doctrine of the incarnation at all.

The detailed justification of this statement follows:

(1) Matthew (see 1:18-25) does not use the term "Son of God." The only expression implying a unique relationship to God, other than in the "of Holy Spirit" phrase, twice used, is in the word "Immanuel" quoted from Isaiah, which does not necessarily involve incarnation. At the beginning of the genealogy Jesus is introduced as the son of David, the son of Abraham.

(2) The assertion as to His conception by Holy Spirit is conditioned by three striking facts:

(a) His conception is interpreted in terms of conception by the power of Holy Spirit, not of begetting by the Father. The Old Testament expression "This day have I begotten thee," used twice, occurs in quite a different connection (Heb 1:5; 5:5).

(b) The term "Holy Spirit" is used without the article.

(c) The phrase descriptive of the being conceived is expressed in the neuter, ‘the thing conceived in her is of Holy Spirit’ (to gar en aute gennethen ek pneumatos estin hagiou).

The implication of these three facts is

(i) that the sonship of Jesus through His exceptional birth is interpreted in terms of divine power working upon humanity, not as the correlative of divine and essential fatherhood; it is the historical sonship that is in view (contrast with this the two passages in Hebrews referred to above);

(ii) the writer is speaking in the Old Testament sense of "Holy Spirit" as the forthgoing of creative power from God, not as personal hypostasis;

(iii) he is also emphasizing (in the use of the neuter) the reality of the physical birth. These three facts, all the more remarkable because they are attributed to a heavenly messenger who might be expected to speak more fully concerning the mystery, exclude the supposition that we have one historic form of the doctrine of incarnation. On the contrary, had we no other statements than those found here we should be unable logically to postulate an incarnation. Every statement made concerning Jesus, apart from the virgin-birth statement itself, might be true were He the son of Joseph and Mary.

The case is far stronger when we turn to Luke’s account, in spite of the fact that the terms "Son of the Most High" and "Son of God" ordinarily implying incarnation are used. We notice

(d) that the anarthrous use of "Holy Spirit" reappears and that a poetic parallelism defines the term (Lu 1:35), making "Holy Spirit" =" Power of the Most High";

(e) that the neuter phrase is also found here, "the holy thing which is begotten," etc. (dio kai to gennomenon hagion klethesetai);

(f) that future tenses are used in connection with His career and the titles which He bears: "He shall be (as the outcome of a process) great," and "He shall be called (as a matter of ultimate titular recognition) the Son of the Most High" (Lu 1:32); "The holy thing .... shall be called the Son of God" (Lu 1:35).

In these instances the title is connected directly with the career rather than the birth. Even the "wherefore" of Lu 1:35, in connection with the future verb, carries the power of God manifested in the holy conception forward into the entire career of Jesus rather than bases the career upon the initial miracle. These three facts taken together exclude the reference to any conception of the incarnation. The incarnation is directly and inseparably connected with Christ’s eternal sonship to the Father. The title "Son of God" includes that but does not specify it. It includes also the ethical, historical, human sonship. The term "Holy Spirit" used without the article also is a comprehensive expression covering both a work of divine power in any sphere and a work of divine grace in the personal sphere only.

These accounts are concerned with the historic fact rather than its metaphysical implications. This historic fact is interpreted in terms of a divine power in and through the human career of Jesus (which is so stated as to include an impersonal, germinal life) rather than a dogmatic definition of the Messiah’s essential nature. The omission of all reference to pre-existence is negatively conclusive on this point. The divine power manifested in His exceptional origin is thought of as extending on and including His entire career. This leads us directly to a second phase in the interpretation of Christ and compels to a

reconsideration at a new angle of the miracle of His origin.

2. Portrait of Jesus in Synoptic Gospels:

The narrators of the life and ministry of Jesus on the basis of ascertained fact and apostolic testimony were confronted with a very definite and delicate task. They had to tell with unexaggerating truthfulness the story of the human life of Jesus. Their ultimate aim was to justify the doctrine of incarnation, but they could not have been unaware that the genuine and sincere humanity of Christ was a pillar of the doctrine quite as much as His essential Deity. To portray the human experience of a being considered essentially divine was the Herculean task attempted and carried to a successful issue in the Synoptic Gospels. These writers do not conceal for a moment their conviction that they are depicting the career of the wonder-working Son of God, but they never forget that it is a career of self-limitation within the human sphere, the period of self-imposed and complete humiliation undertaken on behalf of the Father, "for us men and for our salvation." Hence, the nature and limitations of the narrative. Mark omits reference to the virgin-birth. Matthew and Luke narrate it and forthwith drop it. These facts are exactly on a paragraph. It is no more remarkable that Mark omits the story than that Matthew and Luke make so little of it. To allege either fact as a motive to doubt is to misinterpret the whole situation. By the terms of their task they could do nothing else. The Fourth Gospel and the Epistles announce that the human life of Jesus was due to the voluntary extra-temporal act of a pre-existent Divine Being, but in the synoptic narrative four passages only hint at pre-existence, and then as incidental flashes from the inner consciousness of Jesus. This omission is no more remarkable and no less so than the omissions noted above. By the terms of their task the synoptic writers could do nothing else. The fact of pre-existence could be announced only when the earthly task had been triumphantly finished (see Mr 9:9,11). During the entire period of the earthly life as such Jesus was under trial (note Mt 3:17, correctly translating the aorist; compare the remarkable words of Joh 10:17), performing a task, accomplishing a commission, achieving a victory as human son. The story of the Temptation exhibits the conditions under which Jesus performed His task. The temptations were one and all addressed to His consciousness as God’s Son. They were resisted on the sole basis of self-humiliation and dependence. The entire synoptic narrative is consistent with this representation. Jesus is consciously one in will and spirit with God, but that oneness with God is consummated and conducted in the Spirit, through faith, by prayer. They describe His entire career of holiness, wisdom and power, each unique, in the terms of the Spirit-filled, trustful, prayerful human life. Here is the vital point. They disclose the eternal Sonship (in which beyond question they believe) on its ethical, not on its metaphysical side, by prediction of His future triumph rather than by definition of His person. In such a narrative, consistently carried out, there can be no resort to the preexistent, eternal Sonship, nor to the miracle of His human origin in the story of His career under trial. In particular, the miracle, whereby His germinal connection with the race was established could not extend to the personal and spiritual life in which His victory was His own through the personal Holy Spirit. The argument from the virgin-birth to His sinlessness (see IMMACULATE CONCEPTION) was made by the church, not by the New Testament writers. The sinlessness of Christ was His own achievement in the flesh which He sacrificed through His holy will of obedience to the Father.

3. In Rest of the New Testament:

This leads us to a third phase of development in the New Testament doctrine of incarnation. In the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles it is asserted that the innermost moral significance of the earthly career of Jesus lay in the fact that it was the consistent carrying-out of an extra-temporal volition of divine mercy and love whereby He became the Revealer of God and the Saviour of men. This doctrine is based upon the story of the human career completed in the glorification which, according to the testimony, ensued upon His death and disclosed His place in the divine sphere of being. But it is also based upon the virgin-birth narrative and grounded in it. Attention has already been called to the fact that the virgin-birth is not (in the infancy narrative) connected with the metaphysical sonship of Jesus. All that is said then, doctrinally, concerning Jesus might be true were He the son of Joseph and Mary. On the contrary, what is said in John and the Epistles depends upon the virgin-birth narrative for its foundational basis. It has often been asserted that Paul and John do not refer to the virgin-birth. This statement the present writer takes to be more than doubtful, but if it is true, all the more striking is the indirect and unconscious testimony to the virgin-birth involved in their doctrinal reliance upon it. According to these writers the incarnation was due to a divine act of self-limitation whereby the divine mode of existence was exchanged for the human (Php 2:5-11 et al.). According to the infancy narrative, the birth of Jesus was due to a divine creative act whereby a human life began germinally and passed through the successive stages of growth to maturity. The synoptic narrative outside the infancy narrative supplies a third point, that the entire conscious personal career of Jesus upon earth was lived in the power of the Holy Spirit. The infancy narrative is the keystone of an arch, one half resting upon the synoptic account, the other upon the doctrinal construction of Joh and the Epistles. The virgin-birth statement by its adoption of Old Testament terminology makes room for a divine activity both in the impersonal and in the personal spheres. The doctrine of incarnation implies that as in every new human being the creative divine power manifests itself impersonally in germinal beginnings, so in the life of Christ the divine power conditions itself within the impersonal forces of germinant life with this important and suggestive difference: In the career of Jesus there issues from the sphere of germinal beginnings not a new human person created from the life-stock of the race, but the personal human life, including all human powers, of a pre-existent divine person self- conditioned and self-implanted within the human sphere. The central conscious self, the agent of His activities and the subject of His experiences in the historic sphere was the eternal Son of God. His life in the human sphere was that of a true human being in the full actuality of a human life. Hence, it follows, since ordinary generation involves necessarily (that is the intent of it) the origination of a new person not hitherto existing, that the birth of Jesus could not have been by ordinary generation. The birth of Christ through ordinary generation would have involved a quite incomprehensible miracle, namely, the presence and action of the ordinary factors in human origins with a contrary and unique result. The virgin-birth is the only key that fits the vacant space in the arch. In addition it may reasonably be urged that the relationship of human parents to each other, ordinarily a natural, necessary and sacred act, could have no part in this transaction, while the very fact that Mary’s relationship was to God alone, in an act of submission involving complete self-renunciation and solitary enclosure within the divine will, fulfils the spiritual conditions of this unique motherhood as no other imaginable experience could.

4. Oppositions to the Doctrine: Historically the virgin-birth statement performed a function commensurate with the importance ascribed to it in this discussion rather than the current depreciation of it. The doctrine of Christ was menaced in two opposite directions, which may be designated respectively by the terms "Ebionite" and "Gnostic." According to the former teaching (the word "Ebionite" being

used in a general sense only), Jesus was reduced to the human category and interpreted as a Spirit-led man or prophet, in the Old Testament meaning of the term. According to the opposite tendency, He was interpreted as divine, while His human experience was reduced to mere appearance of a temporary external union with the Logos. The virgin-birth statement resisted both these tendencies with equal effectiveness. On the one hand, it asserted with unequivocal definiteness a real humanity conditioned by true birth into an actual connection with the race. On the other hand, it asserted an exceptional birth, setting Jesus apart as one whose entrance into the world was due to a new, creative contact of God with the race. Historically, it is difficult to see how the New Testament doctrine could have escaped mutilation apart from the statement, seemingly framed with express reference to conditions arising afterward, which so wonderfully guarded it. The holy mystery of the Lord's origin became the symbol of the holier mystery of His divine nature. It thus appears in every one of the historic creeds, an assertion of fact around which the belief of the church crystallized into the faith which alone accounts for its history, a profound and immovable conviction that Jesus Christ was really incarnate Deity.

5. Its Importance to Modern Thought:

The importance for modern thinking of the virgin-birth statement is threefold:

(1) First, it involves in general the question, never more vital than at the present time, of the trustworthiness of the gospel tradition. This particular fact, i.e. the virgin-birth, has been a favorite, because apparently a vulnerable, point of attack. But the presuppositions of the attack and the method according to which it has been conducted involve a general and radical undermining of confidence in the testimony of the gospel witnesses. This process has finally met its nemesis in the Christus-myth propaganda. The virgin-birth statement can be successfully assailed on no grounds which do not involve the whole witnessing body of Christians in charges of blind credulity or willful falsification, very unjust indeed as respects their character and standing in general, but very difficult to repel in view of the results of denial at this point.

(2) The virgin-birth is important for the simple historical reason that it involves or is involved in a clear and consistent account of the Lord's birth and early years. Apart from the infancy narratives we are utterly without direct information as to His birth, ancestry or early years. Apart from these narratives we have no information as to the marriage of Joseph and Mary; we are shut up to vague inferences as to this entire period. No biographer ever leaves these points obscure if he can avoid it. It is very earnestly suggested that those who cast discredit upon the infancy story do not clearly recognize the seriousness of the situation brought about in the absence of any narrative which can be trusted as to this vital point. Calumny there is and has been from an early day. If there is nowhere an authoritative answer to the calumny, in what sort of a position is the Christian believer placed? He can assert nothing, because apart from what he has too lightly thrown away he knows nothing.

(3) Lastly, the more closely the statement as to the Lord's birth is studied, the more clearly it will be seen that it involves in a most vital and central way the entire doctrine of the incarnation. This doctrine is an interpretation of facts. Those facts stand together. In the midst of those facts, harmonizing with

them, shedding light upon them and receiving light from them, resting upon the same consentient testimony is the statement, which is thus worded in the oldest symbol of our historical faith: "Conceived by the Holy Spirit, Born of the Virgin Mary" (see APOSTLES' CREED). There is no adequate reason why the intelligent believer should feel uncertain as to this statement of our holy religion.

LITERATURE.

There is a vast and growing literature which more or less directly deals with the subject of our Lord's birth. The literature may be classified as follows:

(1) Lives of Christ;

(2) critical commentaries on Matthew and Luke;

(3) critical and historical investigations of Christian origins;

(4) monographs on the Apostles' Creed;

(5) monographs and articles on the specific subject.

For a list and analysis of discussions see Sweet, Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ, 354-57.

Louis Matthews Sweet

VIRGIN, VIRGINITY

vur'-jin; vur-jin'-i-ti:

(1) bethulah, from a root meaning "separated," is "a woman living apart," i.e. "in her father's house," and hence "a virgin." Bethulah seems to have been the technical term for "virgin," as appears from such a combination as na'arah bhethulah, "a damsel, a virgin," in De 22:23,28, etc. An apparent exception is Joe 1:8, "Lament like a virgin bethulah .... for the husband of her youth," but the word is probably due to a wish to allude to the title "virgin daughter of Zion" (the translation "a betrothed maiden" is untrue to Hebrew sentiment). and the use of "virgin" for a city (Isa 37:22, etc.; compare Isa 23:12; 47:1) probably means "unsubdued," though, as often, a title may persist after its meaning is gone (Jer 31:4). The King James Version and the English Revised Version frequently render bethulah by "maiden" or "maid" (Jud 19:24, etc.), but the American Standard Revised Version has used "virgin" throughout, despite the awkwardness of such a phrase as "young men and virgins" (Ps 148:12). For "tokens of virginity" ("proofs of chastity") see the commentary on De 22:15 ff.

(2) 'almah, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) by either "damsel" (Ps 68:25),

"maiden" (so usually, Ex 2:8, etc.), or "virgin" with margin "maiden" (So 1:3; 6:8; Isa 7:14). The word (see OHL) means simply "young woman" and only the context can give it the force "virgin." This force, however, seems required by the contrasts in So 6:8, but in 1:3 "virgin" throws the accent in the wrong place. The controversies regarding Isa 7:14 are endless, but Septuagint took ‘almah as meaning "virgin" (parthenos). But in New Testament times the Jews never interpreted the verse as a prediction of a virgin-birth—a proof that the Christian faith did not grow out of this passage. See IMMANUEL; VIRGIN BIRTH.

(3) parthenos, the usual Greek word for "virgin" (Judith 16:5, etc.; Mt 1:23, etc.). In Re 14:4 the word is masculine. In 1Co 7:25 ff the Revised Version (British and American) has explained "virgin" by writing "virgin daughter" in 7:36-38. This is almost certainly right, but "virgin companion" (see Lietzmann and J. Weiss in the place cited.) is not quite impossible.

(4) neanis, "young woman" (Sirach 20:4).

(5) Latin virgo (2 Esdras 16:33).

The Old Testament lays extreme emphasis on chastity before marriage (De 22:21), but childlessness was so great a misfortune that death before marriage was to be bewailed (Jud 11:37,38). Paul’s preference for the unmarried state (1Co 7:29 if) is based on the greater freedom for service (compare Mt 19:12), and the Greek estimate of virginity as possessing a religious quality per se is foreign to true Jewish thought (such a passage as Philo Mund. opif., section symbol 53, is due to direct Greek influence). Some have thought to find a trace of the Greek doctrine in Re 14:4. But 144,000 lst-century. Christian ascetics are out of the question, and the figure must be interpreted like that of Jas 4:4 (reversed).

Burton Scott Easton

VIRTUE

vur’-tu: This word has two quite distinct meanings in the King James Version: (1) It was formerly often used in the now obsolete sense of "manly power," "valor," "efficacy" (Latin, virtus, "manly strength" or "excellence," from vir, "man"):

"Trust in thy single virtue; for thy soldiers

All levied in thy name, have in thy name

Took their discharge."

—Shakespeare, King Lear, V, iii, 103 ff.

It was also used in the sense of a mighty work, a miracle. Thus Wycliffe translates Mt 11:20: "Thanne Jhesus bigan to saye repreef to cities in whiche ful many vertues of him weren don." So in the King James Version, Mr 5:30; Lu 6:19; 8:46, in the sense of "power," "miraculous energy or influence" (dunamis, "inherent power, residing in the nature of a thing"; contrast exousia, "power arising from external opportunity or liberty of action"). In these passages it is translated in the Revised Version (British and American) "power" (as elsewhere in the King James Version; compare Ac 3:12, etc.). (2) In its ordinary modern meaning of "moral goodness" it occurs in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) The Wisdom of Solomon 4:1; 5:13; 8:7; Php 4:8; 2Pe 1:3,5. In these passages it stands for arete, the usual classical term for "moral excellence" (originally "fitness" of any sort), used in Septuagint to translate words meaning "glory," "praiseworthiness," as in Hab 3:3; Isa 42:12; 63:7 (of God); Zec 6:13 (of the Messiah). The Septuagint sense may color the meaning of the word as applied to God in 2Pe 1:3 the Revised Version (British and American); as also in its plural use (of God) in 1Pe 2:9 (the King James Version "praises," the Revised Version (British and American) "excellencies").

The adjective "virtuous" occurs in the King James Version, the English Revised Version Ru 3:11; Pr 12:4; 31:10 (the American Standard Revised Version "worthy"), and the adverb "virtuously" in Pr 31:29 (the American Standard Revised Version "worthily"), in each case for chayil, "strength," "force" (whether of body or of mind), then in a moral sense of "worth," "virtue."

D. Miall Edwards

VISION

vizh’-un (chazon, chizzayon, mar’ah; horama, optasia): Psychologists find that man is prevailingly and persistently "eye-minded." That is, in his waking life he is likely to think, imagine and remember in terms of vision. Naturally then, his dreaming is predominantly visual; so strongly visual, we are told, that it is not rare to find dreams defined as "trains of fantastic images." Whether man was made this way in order that God might communicate with him through dreams and visions is hardly worth debating; if the records of human life, in the Bible and out of it, are to be trusted at all, there is nothing better certified than that God has communicated with man in this way (Ps 89:19; Pr 29:18; compare Am 8:11,12; Ho 12:10). If one is disposed to regard the method as suited only to primitive peoples and superstitious natures, it still remains true that the experience is one associated with lives and characters of the most saintly and exalted kind (1Sa 3:1; Jer 1:11; Eze 1:1; Da 2:19; Ac 9:10; 10:3; 16:9).

The vision may come in one’s waking moments (Da 10:7; Ac 9:7); by day (Cornelius, Ac 10:3; Peter, Ac 10:9 ff; compare Nu 24:4,16) or night (Jacob, Ge 46:2); but commonly under conditions of dreaming (Nu 12:6; Job 4:13; Da 4:9). The objects of vision, diverse and in some instances strange as they are, have usually their points of contact with experiences of the daily life. Thus Isaiah’s vision of the seraphim (Isa 6:2) was doubtless suggested by familiar figures used in the decoration of the temple at Jerusalem; Paul’s "man of Macedonia" (Ac 16:9) had its origin in some poor helot whom Paul had seen on the streets of Troas and who embodied for him the pitiful misery of the regions across the sea; and

"Jacob’s ladder" (Ge 28:12) was but a fanciful development of the terraced land which he saw sun-glorified before him as he went to sleep. Among the recurring objects of vision are natural objects—rivers, mountains, trees, animals—with which man has daily and hourly association.

The character of the revelation through vision has a double aspect in the Biblical narrative. In one aspect it proposes a revelation for immediate direction, as in the ease of Abram (Ge 15:2 and frequently); Lot (Ge 19:15); Balaam (Nu 22:22), and Peter (Ac 12:7). In another aspect it deals with the development of the Kingdom of God as conditioned by the moral ideals of the people; such are the prophetic visions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, and Micah, and the apoealypses of Daniel and John. The revelation for immediate direction has many correspondences in the life of the devout in all ages; the prophetic vision, dealing in a penetrating way with the sources of national growth and decay, has its nearest approach in the deliverances of publicists and statesmen who are persuaded that the laws of God, as expressed in self-control, truth, justice, and brotherly love, are supreme, and that the nations which disregard them are marked for ultimate and speedy extinction.

From the nature of the vision as an instrument of divine communication, the seeing of visions is naturally associated with revivals of religion (Eze 12:21-25; Joe 2:28; compare Ac 2:17), and the absence of visions with spiritual decline (Isa 29:11,12; La 2:9; Eze 7:26; Mic 3:6).

One may see visions without being visionary in the bad sense of that word. The outstanding characters to whom visions were vouchsafed in the history of Israel—Abraham, Moses, Jacob, David, Isaiah, Jesus and Paul—were all men of action as well as sentiment, and it is manifest from any fair reading of their lives that their work was helped and not hindered by this aspect of their fellowship with God. For always the vision emphasizes the play of a spiritual world; the response of a man’s spirit to the appeal of that world; and the ordering of both worlds by an "intelligent and compelling Power able to communicate Himself to man and apparently supremely interested in the welfare of man.

Charles M. Stuart

VISITATION

viz-i-ta’-shun, vis-(pequddah; episkope): In Biblical writings, the divine investigation or inspection of men’s character and deeds with a view to apportioning to them their due lot, whether of reward or of chastisement; divine dispensation of mercy or of punishment.

(1) In a general sense: "Visited after the visitation of all men" (Nu 16:29), i.e. in natural death, the usual lot of men, as opposed to a calamitous death; "She shall have fruit in the visitation of souls" (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:13 the King James Version), i.e. in the time of divine judgment. So Sirach 18:20 and perhaps 1Pe 2:12.

(2) In a good sense, of God’s care, providence and mercy: "Thy visitation (the Revised Version margin "care") hath preserved my spirit" (Job 10:12). So Lu 19:44, and, according to some, 1Pe 2:12 (see

above).

(3) Most frequently in an evil sense, of calamity or distress viewed as divine punishment: "What will ye do in the day of visitation, and in the desolation which shall come from far?" (Isa 10:3). So Jer 8:12; 10:15; 11:23; 23:12; 46:21; 48:44; 50:27; 51:18; Ho 9:7; Mic 7:4; The Wisdom of Solomon 14:11.

D. Miall Edwards

VOCATION

vo-ka’-shun.

See CALLING.

VOICE

vois.

See BATH KOL.

VOID

void: The uses of "void" in English Versions of the Bible are all modern, except for the phrase "void place" in the King James Version 1Ki 22:10 parallel 2Ch 18:9 (the Revised Version (British and American) "open"); 2 Macc 14:44 (so the King James Version and the Revised Version margin). On the Old Testament passages see OPEN PLACE. In 2 Maccabees the Greek word is keneon, which may mean either "an open place," in general, or, specifically, "the hollow between the ribs and the hip," whence the Revised Version (British and American) "his side." Moffatt in Charles’ Apocrypha translates "the open street."

VOLUME

vol’-um: This word (from Latin volvere, "roll"), twice used in the King James Version (Ps 40:7 (Hebrew meghillah); Heb 10:7), is better in English as "roll" in the Revised Version (British and American).

See ROLL.

VOLUNTARY

vol’-un-ta-ri: For the sake of variety the King James Version in Le 7:16; Eze 46:12 (bis) has rendered

nedhabhah, by "voluntary offering" instead of the usual "freewill offering" (so the Revised Version (British and American)). The words "of his own voluntary will" in Le 1:3 the King James Version are a pure gloss, properly omitted in the Revised Version (British and American), as they represent nothing in the Hebrew text. 1 Macc 2:42 has "voluntarily" as part of the translation of hekousiazo, the Revised Version (British and American) "willingly."

VOPHSI

vof'-si (wophci, meaning unknown): Father of Nahbi the Naphtalite spy (Nu 13:14); but the text is doubtful. The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus has Iabei; Codex Alexandrinus, Codex F, and Lucian Iabi.

VOW

vou (nedher; euche; 'iccar, found only in Nu 30:6,8,10 and translated horismos, by the Septuagint: A vow could be positive (nedher) and included all promises to perform certain things for, or bring certain offerings to, God, in return for certain benefits which were hoped for at His hand (Ge 28:20-22, Jacob; Le 27:2,8; Nu 30; Jud 11:30, Jephthah; 1Sa 1:11, Hannah; 2Sa 15:8, Absalom; Jon 1:16, vows of heathen); or negative ('iccar), and included promises by which a person bound himself or herself to abstain from certain things (Nu 30:3). Nowhere in the Old Testament do we find the making of vows regarded as a religious duty (De 23:22), but the fulfilling of a vow was considered as a sacred and binding duty (De 23:21-23; Jud 11:35; Ec 5:4; compare Ps 22:25; 66:13; 76:11; 116:18). A vow was as binding as an oath (see OATH) and therefore to be kept to the letter; and it was not to be lightly made (Pr 20:25). A father could veto a daughter's vow, and a husband a wife's. If a husband did not veto a wife's vow, and then caused her to break it, the sin was his and not hers (Nu 30, passim). It seems that vows were considered binding only when actually uttered (De 23:23). Persons, including one's self, animals, land and other possessions, could be vowed, but all these could be redeemed with money (see JEPHTHAH), which money was to be estimated by the priest, except in the case of a clean animal. In the case of land, houses and unclean animals a fifth part of the estimated value was to be added to make up the redemption money. In the case of land the sum was greater or smaller as the coming year of Jubilee was far off or near (Le 27, passim). Nothing which was by nature holy could be made the object of a vow, e.g. firstlings, tithes, etc. (Le 27:26,28,30); and, on the other hand, an abomination, e.g. the hire of a prostitute, could not be made the object of a vow (De 23:18). In Mal 1:14 the offering of what was of less value than what had been vowed is vigorously condemned.

In the New Testament Jesus refers to vows only to condemn the abuse of them (Mt 15:4-6; Mr 7:10-13; compare Talmud, Nedharim, and see CORBAN). In Ac 18:18 (compare Ac 21:23,24) Paul desires to show his Jewish brethren that he is willing to keep the forms of Jewish piety so long as they do not clash with his Christian conscience (compare 1Co 9:21). For the vow of the Nazirite, see NAZIRITE.

Paul Levertoff

VOYAGE AND SHIPWRECK OF PAUL

voi’-aj, ship’-rek.

See PAUL, THE APOSTLE; PHOENIX; and "Literature" to SHIPS AND BOATS.

VULGATE

vul’-gat:

I. NAME AND ITS HISTORY

1. Present Usage

2. Earlier Usage

3. Post-Hieronymic

4. Historical Importance of the Vulgate

II. ORIGIN

1. Corruption and Confusion of Old Versions

2. Heresy

3. Inevitable Separation of East and West

4. Request of Pope Damasus

III. JEROME’S TRANSLATIONS AND REVISIONS: METHOD

1. The New Testament Gospels or Whole New Testament?

2. Old Testament from the Septuagint

3. Translation of Old Testament from the Hebrew

IV. SUBSEQUENT RECENSIONS AND HISTORY OF VULGATE

1. In the Manuscripts

2. Printed Vulgate

V. MANUSCRIPTS OF VULGATE

VI. LATINITY

VII. USE OF VULGATE VERSIONS

LITERATURE

I. Name and Its History.

1. Present Usage:

The term "Vulgate" with us means but one thing—the standard authoritative Bible of the Latin or Roman church, prepared mostly by the labors of Jerome. But this is not the original use of the word and it was never so used by Jerome himself; indeed, it did not at first refer to a Latin version or translation at all. The word "Vulgate" comes from the adjective or participle vulgata which usually accompanied editio, and meant at first current or regularly used text. It was originally used as the equivalent of koine ekdosis = the Septuagint. Jerome and Augustine both use the term in this sense.

2. Earlier Usage:

Jerome (Commentary in Isa 65:20), "Hoc juxta Septuagint interpretes diximus, quorum editio toto orbe vulgata est" (and same place Isa 30:22), vulgata editio again refers to the Septuagint. Elsewhere Jerome actually gives the Greek words (of the Septuagint) as found in editione vulgata (Commentary in Osee 7 13). Augustine identifies the expression with the Septuagint (De doctr. christ., xvi. 10): "Secundum vulgatam editionem, hoc est interpretum Septuaginta." The term editio vulgata was next extended to the form in which the Septuagint was at first known to the West—the Old Latin versions (see LATIN; LATIN VERSION), although, as Westcott remarks, there does not appear to be any instance in the age of Jerome of the application of the term to the Latin version of the Old Testament without regard to its derivation from the Septuagint or to that of the New Testament, so that Jerome usually intended the Septuagint though he quoted it in Latin form. Vulgata editio, having acquired the meaning of the current or ordinarily used text of Septuagint, was once again extended to mean a corrupt or uncorrected text as opposed to the standard emended Septuagint version of Origen’s Hexapla, and in this sense is used by Jerome as synonymous with antiqua or vetus editio.

Epistle cvi.2 deserves citing in this connection: "Admoneo alia m esse editionem quam Origenes et Caesariensis Eusebius omnesque Graeciae translatores (koinen), i.e. communem appellant atque vulgatam, et a plerisque (Loukianos) nunc dicitur: aliam Septuagint interpretum quae in (Hexaplois) (i.e. of Origen) codicibus reperitur, et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa .....(koine) (communis

editio) .... vetus corrupta editio est, ea antem quae habetur in (Hexaplois) et quam nos vertimus, ipsa est quae in eruditorum libris incorrupta et immaculata Septuagint interpretum translatio reservatur." ("I recall that one is the text which Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea and all the Greek translators call the (koine), i.e. the common and current text, and is now called by most persons Lucian's (version); the other is the text of the translators of the Septuagint which is found in the codices (or books) of Origen (or the Hexapla), and has been faithfully translated by us into the Latin language .... the koine (the ordinary text) .... is the old corrupted text, but that which is found in the Hexapla, and which we are translating, is the same one which the version of the translators of the Septuagint has preserved unchanged and immaculate in the books of the scholars.")

3. Post-Hieronymic:

It was only very slowly that Jerome's version acquired this name, the phrase editio vulgata being applied to the Septuagint or the Old Latin versions of the Septuagint sometimes down to medieval times, while Jerome's translation was known as editio nostra, codices nostri, translation emendatior, or translation quam tenet Rorn ecclesia. The Tridentine Fathers were therefore guilty of an anachronism when they referred to Jerome's translation as vetus et vulgata editio. Roger Bacon was apparently the first, in the 13th century, to apply the term Vulgata in our sense (not exclusively, but also to the Septuagint), and this usage became classic through its acceptance by the Tridentine Council ("vetus et vulgata editio").

4. Historical Importance of the Vulgate:

The interest of the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) will be apparent when we reflect that this translation proved to be to the West what the Septuagint had been to the East, that it was prepared with great care by the greatest scholar whom Latin Christianity produced, that it was for hundreds of years the only Bible in universal use in Europe, that it has given to us much of our modern theological terminology as well as being the sponsor for many Greek words which have enriched our conceptions. It has also proved of primary importance as an early and excellent witness to the sacred text. Add to this that "directly or indirectly it is the real parent of all the vernacular versions of Western Europe" except the Gothic of Ulfilas. For English-speaking students it possesses peculiar interest as the source of the earlier translations made by the Venerable Bede, and portions of the Old Testament were translated in the 10th century from the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) by AElfric. Its greatest influence was exerted in the English version of Wycliffe—a literal translation from the Vulgate (1383). And Coverdale's Bible (1535) was "faithfully and truly translated out of Dutch (i.e. German of Luther) and Latin." The Rheims and Douay version was based on the Vulgate, though "diligently conferred with the Hebrew and Greek." The Vulgate exercised considerable influence upon Luther's version and through it upon our the King James Version.

II. Origin.

1. Corruption and Confusion of Old Versions:

Latin Christianity had not been without a Bible in its own language. Old Latin versions are found in North Africa as early as the middle of the 3rd century and are found in the texts of Cyprian and Tertullian. But these translations were characterized by "simplicity," "rudeness" and provincialism. There was not one standard authoritative version with any ecclesiastical recognition. Versions were rather due to "individual and successive efforts." Augustine says that anyone who got hold of a Greek manuscript and thought he knew Greek and Latin would venture on a translation. These versions originated in Africa and not from Rome, else they had been more authoritative. Besides, the first two centuries of the Ro church were rather Greek; the earliest Christian literature of Rome is Greek, its bishops bear Greek names, its earliest liturgy was Greek. When the church of Italy became Lat-speaking —probably at the end of the 3rd century—the provincialisms of the African version rendered it unfit for the more polished Romans, and so recensions were called for. Scholars now recognize a European type of Old Latin text. And Westcott thinks a North Italian recension (at least in the Gospels) was made in the 4th century. and known as the Itala (see LATIN), and which he recognizes in the Itala mentioned in Aug., De doctr. christ., xv, as "verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae"; but F.C. Burkitt (The Old Latin and the Itala, 54 ff) takes the Itala here as referring to Jerome's version. Amid such confusion and the appearance of national or provincial recensions, the Latin church became conscious of the need of a standard edition. There were almost as many types of texts as there were manuscripts: "Tot exemplaria paene quot codices," says Jerome (Preface to Gospels). Independent and unauthorized or anonymous translatitons"—especially of the New Testament—aided by the gross carelessness of scribes, made confusion worse confounded. Augustine complains of this "Latinorum interpretum infinita varietas."

2. Heresy:

In addition to the inconvenience in preaching and the liturgical variations, a greater demand for an authoritative version arose from the continual watch of the early church against heretics. Confusion of text abetted heresy, and the absence of a standard text made it harder to refute it. Besides, the Jews, with one authoritative text, laughed at the confusion of the Christian Scriptures.

3. Inevitable Separation of East and West:

The inevitable separation of East and West, both politically and ecclesiastically, and the split between Greek and Latin Christianity, rendered the existence of a standard Latin text imperative. Christianity was felt to be the religion of a book, and hence that book must be inspired and authoritative in every word—even in its order of words.

Pope Damasus determined to remedy this state of affairs, and with all the authority of the papal see commissioned Jerome to produce an authentic and standard authorized version

4. Request of Pope Damasus:

The pope's choice could not have fallen upon a more competent scholar—a man who had been

providentially gifted and prepared for the task. Jerome—his Latin name was Eusebius Hieronymus—was born at Stridon on the borders of Dalmatia about 340 AD, or a little later, of Christian parentage. He had the advantages of the best classical education and became a devoted student of the best Latin writers. In a dream he saw a vision of judgment, and on claiming to be a Christian he was rebuked: "Mentiris, Ciceronianus es, non Christianus." He began his theological studies in Gaul; but later sought the seclusion of ascetic life in the desert near Antioch. Here he studied Hebrew from a converted rabbi in order to subdue fierce passions by the difficulties of that language. About 375 or 376 began his correspondence with Damasus. In 382 he came to Rome, and became the intimate friend and adviser of Damasus.

III. Jerome's Translations and Revisions: Method.

1. The New Testament:

These fall into three main groups:

(1) revision of the New Testament;

(2) Old Testament juxta the Septuagint;

(3) Old Testament from Hebrew.

The exact date of the pope's commission is not given: it was probably in 382—the year of Jerome's arrival in Rome—or early in 383, in which year the Gospels appeared in revised form. Damasus asked simply for a revision of the Old Latin versions by the help of the Greek rather than a new version Jerome collated Greek manuscripts, and carefully compared them with the "Italian" type of Old Latin texts; where possible the Old Latin was preserved. Thus, Jerome approached the task with a conservative spirit. Still the result was a considerable departure from the Old Latin version, the changes being

(1) linguistic, removal of provincialisms and rudeness,

(2) in interpretation, e.g. supersubstantialis for epiousion, in the Lord's Prayer,

(3) the removal of interpolations,

(4) the insertion of the Eusebian Canons.

Gospels or Whole New Testament?

It is disputed whether Jerome revised the whole New Testament or only the Gospels.

Against the revision of the whole New Testament the arguments briefly are:

(1) That Augustine, writing 20 years after the appearance of the revised Gospels, speaks only of "Gospel": "Evangelium ex Graeco interpretatus est" (Epistle civ.6); but Augustine may here be speaking generally or applying "Gospel" to the whole New Testament.

(2) Jerome in his preface apparently speaks of "only four Gospels" ("quattuor tantum evangelia").

(3) The rest of the New Testament does not show the same signs of revision as the Gospels.

(4) The absence of the prefaces usual ("solita praefatione") to Jerome's revised versions.

On the other hand, to more than counterbalance these,

(1) Damasus required a revision of the whole New Testament, not only of the Gospels (Preface of Damasus).

(2) In other statements of Jerome he expressly says he revised the New Testament (not Gospel or Gospels); in Epistle cxii.20, he seems to correct Augustine's evangelium by writing: "Si me, ut dicis, in Novi Testamenti emendatione suspicis," and in Epistle lxxi.5, "I translated the New Testament according to the Greek" ("NT Graecae reddidi auctoritati"); compare also De Vir. Ill., cxxxv.

(3) Jerome quotes passages outside the Gospels where his version differed from the Old Latin VSS, e.g. Ro 12:11; 1Ti 1:15; compare Epistle xxvii.

(4) Damasus died at the end of 384—perhaps before the rest of Jerome's revision was published, and so Jerome thought no further prefaces needed.

2. Old Testament from the Septuagint:

The more likely conclusion is that Jerome revised the whole New Testament, though not all with equal care. His revision was hasty and soon became more or less confused with the Old Latin versions to which the people clung as they do to all old versions. Having probably completed the New Testament from the Greek, Jerome began immediately on the Old Testament from the Greek of the Septuagint.

(1) Roman Psalter.

He commenced with the Psalms, which he simply emended only where imperatively required (compare preface), and cursorily (circa 384). This revision is called the Ro Psalter (Psalterium Romanum), which continued in use in Rome and Italy till it was displaced under the pontificate of Plus V by the Gallican Psalter, though the Roman Psalter is still used in Peter's, Rome, and in Mark's, Milan.

(2) Galliean Psalter.

This Psalter soon became so corrupted by the Old Latin version that Jerome (circa 387) undertook a second revision at the request of Paula and Eustochium. This became known as the Gallican Psalter because of its early popularity in Gaul. It was also made from the Septuagint, but with the aid of other Greek versions. Jerome adopted in it the critical signs used by Origen—a passage enclosed between an obelus and two points being absent from the Hebrew but present in the Septuagint, that between an asterisk and two points being absent from the Septuagint but supplied from Theodotion (Preface to Psalms).

(3) Rest of the Old Testament.

About the same time Jerome published translations of other Old Testament books from the Septuagint. Job was revised very soon after the Gallican Psalter. The preface to Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticles and Chronicles is extant to show he had revised these books. Job and Psalms are the only books of this revision juxta Septuagint extant.

It is again disputed whether Jerome completed the whole Old Testament in this revision because (1) the usual prefaces are again lacking (except to the books already mentioned), and (2) in his prefaces to the revision from the Hebrew Jerome makes no reference to an earlier revision of his own; (3) the work implied was too great for the brief space possible and must have been done between 387 and 390 (or 391), for by this latter date he was already on the translation from the Hebrew. But Jerome was a phenomenal worker, as we learn that his translation of Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles from the Hebrew was made in three days. And his commentary on Ephesians was written at the rate of 1,000 lines a day.

Jerome probably completed the whole, as we infer from his own direct positive statements. He speaks of "mea in libris canonicis interpretatio" (Epistle cxii.19; see references in Westcott), and in the preface to the Books of Solomon after the Septuagint he states he did not correct Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, "desiring only to emend the canonical books" ("tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans"). Once again, he speaks of having carefully translated the Septuagint into Latin (Con Ruf., ii.24; compare Epistle lxxi).

3. Translation of Old Testament from the Hebrew:

If the postscript to Epistle cxxxiv, to Augustine is genuine, Jerome complains he had lost the most of his former labors by fraud ("pleraque enim prioris laboris fraude cuiusdam amisimus"). And Augustine requests (Epistle xcvi.34) from Jerome his versions from the Septuagint ("Nobis mittas, obsecro, interpretationem tuam de Septuagint quam te edidisse nesciebam"). Having in the course of these labors discovered the unsatisfactory condition of the Septuagint text and his friends pleading the need of a translation direct from the Hebrew, Jerome began this huge task about 390 with Samuel and Kings, which he published with the Prologus galeatus ("helmeted prologue") next the Psalms (circa 392), Job

and the Prophets (393), 1 and 2 Esdras (circa 394) (3 and 4 being omitted), Chronicles (396). Then followed a severe illness until 398, when "post longam aegrotationem" he translated Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Canticles. He then started on the Octateuch: "Octateucho quem nunc in manibus habeo" (Epistle lxxi.5), the Pentateuch being first translated in 401, Joshua, Judges, Ru and Esther soon after (xl.4: "post sanctae Paulae dormitionem"). Tobit and Judith were translated for him from Chaldee into Hebrew from which he then translated them into Latin (circa 405), and shortly before or after these he added the apocryphal additions to Daniel and Esther. Baruch he passed over. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus were not revised by him. Whether he revised Maccabees is doubtful. Thus was completed in 15 strenuous years (390-405) a work which has proved a ktema es aei (Thucydides i.22), "a possession for all time." The translation was largely undertaken at the request of friends and at no papal request. Indeed Jerome did not pretend to be working for publicity; he actually asked one friend not to show his translation.

Reception.

But human nature rarely recognizes merit in its own generation, and the spirit of conservatism rose in rebellion against beneficial innovation. Jerome was accused of slighting the Septuagint, which even in the eyes of Augustine was equally inspired with the Hebrew original. Jerome’s fiery temper and his biting tongue were not calculated to conciliate.

IV. Subsequent Recensions and History of Vulgate.

1. In the Manuscripts:

By degrees the fierce opposition died down, and even by the time of Jerome’s death men were beginning to perceive the merits of his version which Augustine used in the Gospels. Some parts of Jerome’s Vulgate (390-405 A.D.) won their way to popularity much sooner than others—the Old Latin versions died hard and not without inflicting many a wound on the Vulgate. His Psalter from the Hebrew never ousted the Gallican which still holds its place in the Vulgate. Some scholars were able to appreciate Jerome’s edition sooner than others. And it was at different dates that the different provinces and countries of the West adopted it. Pelagius used it in his commentary on the Pauline Epistles. As might be expected, the Old Latin versions retained their place longest in the place of their origin—North Africa. Britain proved the next most conservative. The old versions were never authoritatively deposed, and so Jerome’s version was compelled to win its way by its own merits. In the 5th century—especially in Gaul—it continued to grow in popularity among scholars, being adopted by Vincent of Lerins, Eucherius of Lyons, Sedulius, and Claudianus Mamertus, and Prosper of Aquitaine. In the next century its use became almost universal except in Africa, where the Old Latin was retained by Junilius and Facundus. At the close of the 6th century. Pope Gregory the Great acknowledges that the new (i.e. the Vulgate) and the old are both equally used by the Apostolic See; and thus the Vulgate was at least on equal footing with the old. In the 7th century the Old Latin retreats, but traces of it survive down into the Middle Ages, affecting and corrupting the Jerome version. Mixed texts and conflated readings arose—the familiarity of the Old Latin in lectionaries and liturgies telling on the Vulgate. The New Testament, being only a

revision and not a fresh translation, and being most in use, degenerated most.

(1) As early as the 6th century the need of an emendated Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) text was felt, and Cassidorius undertook to revise part of it. This was merely private enterprise and did little to stem the flood of corruption.

(2) About the close of the 8th century, Charlemagne commissioned an Englishman Alcuin, abbot of Martin, Tours, to produce a revised text on the basis of the best Latin manuscripts, without reference to the Greek text. Alcuin sent to York for his manuscripts and thus produced a text after British manuscripts. On Christmas Day, 801 AD, he presented the emperor with the emended text. The authority by which this text was prepared and its public use together with the class of manuscripts used did much to preserve a pure Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) text and stay interpolations: "The best manuscripts of his recension do not differ widely from the pure Hieronymian text" (Westcott).

(3) Another recension of about the same date—but a scholar's private enterprise—was produced by a Visigoth, Theodulf, bishop of Orleans. He made the Spanish family of manuscripts together with those of Southern France the basis of his text. His inscribing variant readings in the margin really helped the process of corruption. His text—though prepared at enormous labor—was far inferior to that of Alcuin and exerted little influence in face of the authoritative version of Alcuin. manuscripts were rapidly multiplied in the 9th century on the Alcuinian model by the school of Tours, but with carelessness and haste which helped to a speedy degeneration of the text. Again the confusion called for remedy.

(4) In the 11th century Lanfranc, bishop of Canterbury (1069-89), attempted correction—apparently with little success. About the middle of the 12th century, Stephen Harding of Citeaux produced a revision—extant in manuscript in Dijon public library (number 9), as did also Cardinal Nicolaus. The increased demand for Bibles in the 13th century gave opportunity for further corruption of the text—publishers and copyists being indifferent as to the character of manuscript chosen as a basis.

(5) In consequence of the fame of the University of Paris in the 13th century and the enormous activity in producing Bible manuscripts, there resulted a type of text called by Roger Bacon Exemplar Parisiense, for which he has nothing good to say.

(6) In the same century steps were taken toward a standard text and to stay corruption by the drawing up of correctoria, i.e. books in which the readings of Greek and Latin manuscripts were weighed to decide a text, the authority of Fathers cited, etc. Some of the principal correctoria are: Correctorium Parisiense known also as Senonense—one of the worst, following the Parisian type of text; Correotorium Vaticanum, the best; Correctorium Sorbonicum, in the Sorbonne; Correctorium Dominicanum.

2. Printed Vulgate:

(1) Early Editions.

Little more was done till the invention of printing, and the first products of the press were Latin Bibles. Unfortunately at first the current text was accepted without any critical labors, and so the earliest printed Vulgates only perpetuated an inferior text. Only a few from among some hundreds of early versions can be noted:

(a) the Mazarin Bible—one of the most beautiful and valuable books in the world—printed at Mainz about the middle of the 15th century (1455, Westcott) by Gutenberg, Schoffer or Fust;

(b) the first Bible published at Rome in 1471 by Sweynheym and Pannartz and reprinted in Nuremberg in 1475;

(c) 1504 a Paris edition with variant readings;

(d) an edition in Complutensian Polyglot (1514 ff) from ancient manuscripts and from the Greek;

(e) practically the first critical edition, by Robertus Stephanus (lst edition 1528, 2nd 1532, reprinted later), of interest as being practically the basis of the standard Roman Vulgate;

(f) Hentenian critical edition (Louvain, 1547).

Attempts to produce a corrected text by aid of the original were made by Erasmus in 1516, Pagninus in 1518 ff, Cardinal Cajetan, Steuchius in 1529, Clarius in 1542, etc. Even new translations were made by both Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars. This bewildering number of versions and the controversies of the 16th century called for a standard edition. The Council of Trent (1546) took up the matter and decreed that the "ipsa vetus et vulgata editio quae Iongo tot saeculorum usu in ipsa ecclesia probata" ("the same old and ordinarily used text which has been approved in the church itself by the long usage of so many centuries") should be regarded as authentic (authentica). By this they apparently meant the Jerome version, but did not state in which manuscript or printed edition it was to be found.

(2) Sixtine Edition (1590).

No further steps were taken for the present to secure a standard official Bible for the church—the private edition of John Hentenius of Louvain serving in the meanwhile until the pontificate of Sixtus V. This pope entrusted the work to a committee under Cardinal Caraffa, but he himself strenuously cooperated. Manuscripts and printed editions were examined, but the original Greek or Hebrew was to be regarded as decisive in difficulties. The result was published as the Sixtine edition of the Vulgate by the Vatican press in 1590 (see title on 1st and 2nd pages). The text resembles the Stephanus edition of 1540. A new puzzling method of verse enumeration was introduced. As one would expect, there was prefixed to the edition a Bull Aeternus ille, etc., in which the divines gave themselves credit for their painstaking labors, and the result was declared the authorized Vulgate of the Tridentine Council, "pro vera, legitima, authentica et indubitata, in omnibus publicis privatisque disputationibus ...."(" by virtue of truth, usage, authenticity and certainty, in all public and private disputes"). Errors of printing were corrected by the

pen or by pasting a slip of paper with the correction over the error. This edition was not to be reprinted for 10 years except at the Vatican, and after that any edition must be compared with the Vatican edition, so that "not even the smallest particle should be altered, added or removed" under pain of the "greater excommunication." Sixtus died the same year, and the Jesuit Bellarmine persuaded Clement VIII to recall the Sixtine edition and prepare another standard Vulgate in 1592.

(3) Clementine Edition (1592).

In the same year appeared the Clementine edition with a preface by Bellarmine asserting that Sixtus had himself determined to recall his edition on account of printers' errors (from which it was remarkably free). The pains and penalties of the Sixtine Bull were evaded by printing the book as a Sixtine edition, actually printing the name of Sixtus instead of Clement on the title-page: Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis Sixti Quinti Pont. Max. iussu recognita atque edita. The awkward system of verse enumeration of the Sixtine was dropped. The text itself was rather of the Hentenian type. No future edition was to be printed except on the exact pattern, "even to the smallest particle" of the Vatican edition. Thanks largely to the papal Bull this Clementine edition of 1592 still remains the official version of the Roman Catholic church. A second edition appeared in 1593, and a third in 1598. Roman Catholic scholars were discouraged from undertaking a new version, and Protestant scholars were, until recently, too occupied with the original texts.

Bentley's projected edition of the New Testament never appeared. Under cover of the works of Jerome a corrected text was published by Vallarsi, 1734—really the completion and revision of the edition of Martianay of 1706. Little more was done in the way of critical editions till the latter half of the 19th century.

(4) Modern Critical Editions.

In 1861 Vercellone reprinted the Clementine Vulgate (with an excellent preface), the names of Sixtus and Clement both appearing on the title-page. In 1906 an edition—Biblical Sac Vulgatae edition by Hetzenauer—was published at Oeniponte. (The majority of recent editions have been confined to the New Testament or part of it: Tischendorf, Nov. Test. Latin: textum Hieronymi .... restituit, Leipzig, 1864; Hetzenauer, Nov. Test. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) ed.: ex Vat. editions earumque correctorio critice edidit P.M.H., Oeniponte, 1899.) The Oxford Vulg, prepared by Bishop J. Wordsworth and H.J. White, of which the first part was issued in 1889, is a comprehensive work of great value. P. Corssen published the first installment of a Vulgate New Testament (Epistle ad Gal, Berlin, 1885). This is exclusive of the printed editions of several important manuscripts. Pope Plus X entrusted the preparation of a revised edition of the Vulgate to the Benedictine order—but as yet nothing has appeared.

V. Manuscripts of Vulgate.

To give a satisfactory list would be impossible within our space limits. The number is legion—estimated

at about 8,000. As yet the same order has not been called out of the chaos of Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and Old Latin manuscripts in the manner in which Westcott and Hort have reduced the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament to a system. The student may conveniently approach the subject in White's list in the 4th edition of Scrivener, A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, II 67 ff, or the longer one by Gregory in Tischendorf's New Testament Greek, 8th edition, III, 983 ff, also in Westcott's article in DB or White's in HDB; Vercellone, Variae Lectiones, 1860; Berger, Histoire de la Vulgate, 374 ff.

VI. Latinity.

Space permits only a few general remarks. The Latin of the old versions was simple, rude and vernacular, abounding in literalisms and provincialisms. In many ways, in vocabulary, diction and construction, it offended scholars. As was natural Jerome smoothed the roughness of the old versions and removed the most glaring solecisms and offensive provincialisms. His work is a masterpiece—like our the King James Version—in the harmonious blend of simple, popular, forceful language and a scholarly graceful translation. "As a monument of ancient linguistic power the translation of the Old Testament stands unrivaled and unique" (Westcott). The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has enriched our language by introducing many Greek words, "apostle," "evangel," "synagogue," "baptism," etc. It has also given us much of our theological vocabulary, "edification," "justification," "propitiation," "regeneration," "Scripture," etc. It still retains many marks of its birth in (1) Old Latin words elevated from the vernacular, (2) Africanisms: clarifico, etc., saeculum for mundus, long compound verbs like obtenebrare, etc., (3) Graecisms, like the use of the pronoun for the article, as hic mundus = ho kosmos, (4) Hebraisms, like adposuit ut apprehenderet et Petrum (Ac 12:3; see special works mentioned in "Literature").

VII. Use of Vulgate.

In the Old Testament the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is not of much importance for the criticism of the Hebrew text, because of the freedom which Jerome permitted himself in translation, and because our present Massoretic Hebrew text had by that time taken on its present form. But on the Septuagint it often throws a very useful light. In the New Testament Jerome's version ranks practically in importance with our oldest and best Greek manuscripts in establishing (in conjunction with the Old Latin VSS) the received Greek text of the 4th century, both by way of supplementing and correcting our Greek authorities. It is in the Gospels that Jerome's work is most thorough and useful. His version also supplies many a hint for the interpretation of our Greek text.

VIII. Differences between Vulgate and Our English Versions.

Apart from differences of rendering and minor points, the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) text differs from the English in the order of the books, in the amount contained in some of them, in the occasional divergence of chapter and verse enumeration. The New Testament is practically the same in the Clementine text, though the order of books varies in many manuscripts—the Catholic Epistles being

placed sometimes after Acts. In some manuscripts the Epistle to the Laodiceans is found. Most variety obtains in the Old Testament. The sequence of canonical books is the same, but the apocryphal books are interspersed among them and not placed at the end. Tobit and Judith are inserted between Nehemiah (2 Esdras) and Esther, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus between Canticles and Isaiah. Baruch follows Lamentaions, chapter 5 of which is called the "Prayer of Jeremiah the Prophet"; 1 and 2 Maccabees are placed after Malachi; 3 and 4 Esdras and Prayer of Manasses appear as an appendix after the New Testament. In Psalms the divergence is considerable, the Vulgate—like the Hebrew—counting the title as the first verse. Psalms 9; 10 of our version = Ps 9 in Vulgate, so that the Vulgate is one Psalm behind the English till Ps 114, then Psalms 114; 115 again form one Psalm = Vulgate 113. The Vulgate is now two behind. Matters are equalized by Ps 116 being divided into two in the Vulgate (= 114; 115), and 147 again = two Vulgate Psalms 146; 147. Thus, only Psalms 1-8 and 148-150 run the same. Against Jerome's advice the apocryphal parts of Daniel and Esther were accepted as integral parts of those books, the So of Three Children being inserted at Da 3:23, Susanna forming chapter 13 and Bel and the Dragon chapter 14. Ad Esther is linked on to the end of Esther. In conclusion, the present Vulgate, as Westcott remarks, is a composite of elements belonging to every period and form of the Latin version, including

(1) unrevised Old Latin (Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, 1 and 2 Maccabees and Baruch);

(2) Old Latin corrected from the Septuagint (Psalter);

(3) Jerome's free translation from the original (Job and Judith);

(4) Jerome's translation from the original (the Old Testament except the Psalter);

(5) Old Latin revised from Greek manuscripts (the Gospels);

(6) Old Latin cursorily revised (the rest of the New Testament).

LITERATURE.

This is too vast to cite, but in some of the following works sufficient bibliographies will be found: Berger, Hist de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siecles du moyen age, 1893; H. Hody, De bib. textibus originalibus, 1705; F. Kaulen, Gesch. der Vulg, 1868; Van Ess, Pragmatisch-krit. Gesch. der Vulg, 1824; E. Nestle, Urtext u. Uebersetzungen der Bibel, 1897, and Ein Jubilaum d. tat. Biblical, 1892. Two splendid articles—each by an authority—in DB (Westcott) and in HDB (White). A very readable account is in Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient manuscripts, 165 ff, and in his Handbook to the Text Crit. of the New Testament, 168 ff. For the language: Ronsch, Itala u. Vulgata, 2nd edition, 1875; A. Hartl, Sprachliche Eigentumlichkeiten d. Vulg, 1864.

S. Angus

VULTURE

vul’-tur (da’ah; Septuagint gups, and iktinos; Latin Vulturidae): Any member of a family of large birds that subsist wholly or in part on carrion. The largest vulture of Palestine was the Lammer-geier. This bird waited until smaller vultures, eagles and hawks stripped a carcass to the bone, then carried the skeleton aloft and dashed it on the rocks until the marrow could be secured. This was a favorite delicacy. This bird was fond of tortoise also, and is said to have dropped the one that struck the bald head of Aeschylus, which the bird mistook for a stone, so causing the death of the poet. Several smaller species, including "Pharaoh’s chickens," flocked all over Palestine. These were protected by a death penalty for their value as scavengers in cities. They fed on carcasses of animals that killed each other, ate putrid fish under the nests of pelican and cormorant, followed caravans across the desert, and were ready for offal thrown from animals dressed for feasting. They flocked over the altars for the entrails from sacrifice, and devoured scraps cast aside by tent-dwellers and residents of cities. They paired with affectionate courting and nested in crevices, in walls, hollow trees and on cliffs. They raised only one pair of young to the season, as the nestlings were over two months old before they took wing. The young were white at first, then black feathers enveloped them. On account of their steady diet of carrion, no one ever has been able to use their flesh for food, although some daring ornithologists have tried. For this reason the vulture was placed among the abominations and should by right have headed the lists (Le 11:18; De 14:13). The other references that used to be translated "vulture" in the King James Version, the Septuagint elaphos, Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) correctly milous) are changed to "falcon" and "kite." Isa 34:15 changes "vulture" to "kite." Job 28:7 changes "vulture" to "falcon."

Gene Stratton-Porter

WAFER

wa’-fer.

See BREAD.

WAGES

wa’-jez, wa’-jiz (chinnam, maskoreth, pe‘ullah, sakhar, sakhar; misthos, opsonion):

(1) Chinnam means "gratis," without cost or any advantage, for nought, or in vain; wages in the sense of reasonable return. Jeremiah pronounces woe upon him who "useth his neighbor’s service without wages, and giveth him not his hire" (Jer 22:13; the only place where the word is used).

(2) Maskoreth means "reward" or "wages." Laban said to Jacob: "Shouldest thou therefore serve me for nought? Tell me, what shall thy wages be?" (Ge 29:15). Jacob said, concerning Laban, speaking to Rachel and Leah: "Your father hath deceived me, and changed my wages ten times" (Ge 31:7; compare 31:41).

(3) Pe‘ullah generally means "work," "labor," "reward," "wages." The old Levitical Law was insistent on honesty in wages and on promptness in payments: "The wages of a hired servant shall not abide with thee all night until the morning" (Le 19:13).

(4) Mistakker means "earning," "hire," "reward," "wages," from root sakhar, meaning "to hire," and has in it the idea of temporary purchase: "He that earneth wages earneth wages to put it into a bag with holes" (Hag 1:6).

(5) Sakhar means "payment of contract," in the material way of salary, maintenance, fare, and so compensation, reward, price, benefit, wages—seemingly wages received after an understanding as to time, manner and amount of payment. Laban (employer) said to Jacob (employee): "Appoint me thy wages, and I will give it" (Ge 30:28); "If he said thus, The speckled shall be thy wages" (Ge 31:8); Pharaoh’s daughter said to Moses’ mother: "Take this child away, and nurse it for me, and I will give thee thy wages" (Ex 2:9); Nebuchadrezzar and his army served against Tyre, "yet had he no wages, nor his army" (Eze 29:18), and the prey of Egypt "shall be the wages for his army" (Eze 29:19); swift and sure judgment is predicted against "those that oppress the hireling in his wages, the widow, and the fatherless" (Mal 3:5).

(6) Misthos means either in a literal or figurative sense "pay for service," either primitive or beneficial, and so reward, hire, wages. In Joh 4:36 Jesus said, "He that reapeth receiveth wages, and gathereth fruit unto life eternal." 2Pe 2:15 has changed "wages" (the King James Version) to "hire," reading "who loved

the hire of wrongdoing."

(7) Opsonion, meaning primarily "rations for soldiers" (opson being the word for cooked meat) and so "pay" or stipend, provision wages. In Lu 3:14 John said to the soldiers, "Be content with your wages"; "The wages of sin is death" (Ro 6:23); Paul said: "I robbed other churches, taking wages of them" (2Co 11:8); the same word in 1Co 9:7 is translated "charges."

The Bible refers to wages actual and wages figurative. Of actual wages there are three kinds:

(1) money wages,

(2) provision (usually food) wages, and

(3) what may be called "exchange" wages, wages in kind, sometimes "human-kind," e.g. Jacob’s wages from Laban.

Often laborers and soldiers received both money and "keep" wages. The laborer in New Testament times received about 15 cents per day (the "shilling" of Mt 20:2), besides in some cases his provisions. The old Law required daily payment, honesty in dealing, also sufficient food for the laborer.

It is practically impossible to test "Bible" wages by any of theories of modern economists. In this connection, however, mere mention of the six principal theories may be of interest. Concisely put, they are:

(1) the wage-fund theory,

(2) the standard-of-living theory,

(3) the German-socialistic theory,

(4) the production theory,

(5) Henry George’s theory, and

(6) the laborer’s value theory.

The incidents in the Old Testament of Jacob and in the New Testament of Mt 20 both show that the laborer was at the caprice of the employer. Therefore, we may designate the Bible law of wages as the "employer’s theory."

William Edward Raffety

WAGON, WAGGON

wag’-un.

See CART.

WAIL, WAILING

wal, wal’-ing.

See BURIAL, III, 2; IV, 4, 5, 6.

WAIT

wat:

1. The Substantive:

The word is used in the Old Testament both as a substantive add as a verb. In the New Testament it appears as a verb only. ‘erebh, ma’arabh, mean a concealed hiding-place for purposes of sudden attack, an ambuscade.

(1) "Lie in wait": "Abimelech rose up .... from lying in wait" (Jud 9:35 the King James Version); "When they .... abide in the covert to lie in wait" (Job 38:40).

(2) "Lay wait": "They compassed him in, and laid wait for him" (Jud 16:2).

2. The Verb:

(1) sharath, "to serve," "to minister," to act in the capacity of servant or attendant: "These waited on the king" (2Ch 17:19). Used especially in this sense with regard to the ceremonial service of the host: "They shall go in to wait upon the service in the work of the tent of meeting" (Nu 8:24; compare 8:25); "The Levites wait upon their business" (2Ch 13:10 the King James Version). "Wait at" occurs in the same sense in the New Testament: "They which wait at (the Revised Version (British and American) "wait upon") the altar," etc. (1Co 9:13 the King James Version).

(2) The simple verb is used to describe the longsuffering and patience of God toward His willful people: "And therefore will Yahweh wait, that he may be gracious unto you" (Isa 30:18); "When the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah" (apekdechomai, 1Pe 3:20).

(3) The most important and frequent use of the word "wait," however, is to define the attitude of a soul God-ward. It implies the listening ear, a heart responsive to the wooing of God, a concentration of the spiritual faculties upon heavenly things, the patience of faith, "the earnest expectation of the creation" (Ro 8:19). It describes an eager anticipation and yearning for the revelation of truth and love as it is in the Father. Thus: "My soul, wait thou .... for God only" (Ps 69:5); "Our soul hath waited for Yahweh" (Ps 33:20); "Mine eyes fail while I wait for my God" (Ps 69:3); "Wait for Yahweh, and he will save thee" (Pr 20:22).

Also the New Testament thus: "Waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Ro 8:23); "For we through the Spirit by faith wait for the hope of righteousness" (Ga 5:5). From various references in the New Testament there seems to have been in the days of Jesus a sect in whose name the word "wait" played an important part. Of the aged Simeon, who met Mary and Joseph when they brought the infant Jesus to the temple, it is said that he was "waiting for (the Revised Version (British and American) "looking for") the consolation of Israel" (Lu 2:25), that is, he was looking for the fulfillment of the Messianic promise. Again, after our Lord's crucifixion, when Joseph of Arimathea begged for the body of Jesus, we are told that he was one of those that "waited for the kingdom of God" (prosdechomai, Mr 15:43 the King James Version; Lu 23:51 the King James Version). It is thought by some authorities that this implies their having belonged to the sect of the Essenes. Epiphanius associates the sect with one which he names "Gortheni," whose title is derived from a word which means "to expect."

Arthur Walwyn Evans

WALK

wok (peripatein): Aside from its frequent occurrence in the usual sense, the word "walk" is used figuratively of conduct and of spiritual states. (1) Observance of laws or customs: "Thou teachest all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs" (Ac 21:21). (2) Of the spiritual life: "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light" (1Joh 1:7); "That like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (Ro 6:4); "Walk by the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh" (Ga 5:16); "For we walk by faith, not by sight" (2Co 5:7).

Russell Benjamin Miller

WALL

wol.

See ARCHITECTURE; CITY; FORTIFICATION; HOUSE; JERUSALEM; VILLAGE.

WALLET

wol’-et, -it.

See SCRIP.

WANDERING STARS

won’-der-ing.

See ASTRONOMY.

WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL

won’-der-ingz:

I. CONDITIONS

1. The Wilderness

2. Four Separate Regions Included

3. "The Sandy Tract"

4. Description of the Arabah

5. Physical Condition of the Wilderness

6. Difficulties Regarding the Numbers of Israel and Account of Tabernacle

7. Difficulty as to Number of Wagons

8. Fauna of the Desert

9. Characteristic Names of the Districts

II. FIRST JOURNEY

1. Mode of Traveling

2. The Route: the First Camp

3. Waters of Marah

4. Camp by the Red Sea

5. The Route to Sinai

III. SECOND JOURNEY

1. The Stay at Sinai

2. Site of Kadesh-barnea

3. The Route: Hazeroth to Moseroth

4. The Camps between Hazeroth and Moseroth

IV. THE THIRTY-EIGHT YEARS

1. The History

2. The Camps Visited

V. THE FINAL JOURNEY

1. The Route

2. The Five Stations to the Border of Moab

3. From Iyim to Arnon

4. The Message to Sihon

5. From the Arnon to Shittim

6. Review

I. Conditions.

1. The Wilderness:

A consideration of the geography and natural features of the desert between Egypt and Edom, in which

the Hebrews are said to have wandered for 40 years, has a very important bearing on the question of the genuineness of the Pentateuch narrative. This wilderness forms a wedge between the Gulfs of Suez and ‘Aqabah, tapering South to the granite mountains near Sinai. It has a base 175 miles long East and West on the North, and the distance North and South is 250 miles. The area is thus over 20,000 square miles, or double the size of the Promised Land East and West of Jordan. On the North of this desert lie the plains of Gaza and Gerar, and the Neghebh or "dry region" (the south; see Nu 13:17 the Revised Version (British and American)), including the plateau and low hills round Beersheba.

2. Four Separate Regions Included:

There are four separate regions included in the area, the largest part (13,000 square miles) being a plateau which on the South rises 3,000 to 4,000 feet above the sea, and shelves gently toward the Philistine plains. It is drained into the broad Wady el-‘Arish, named from el-‘Arish ("the booth"), a station on the Mediterranean coast South of Gaza, where this valley enters the sea. In this direction several prominent mountains occur (Jebel Yeleq, Jebel Hilal, and Jebel Ikhrimm), while further East—near the site of the Western Kadesh—there is a step on the plateau culminating on the South in Jebel el-Mukhrah; but none of these ranges appears to be more than about 4,000 feet above the sea. The plateau is known as Badiet et-Tih ("the pathless waste"), and though some Arab geographers of the Middle Ages speak of it as the desert "of the wandering of the Beni Israil," they refer to the whole region as far as ‘Aqabah, and not to the plateau alone. The elevation on the South forms a very steep ascent or "wall" (see SHUR), bending round on the West and East, and rising above the shore plains near Suez and the ‘Arabah near Edom. Near the center of the plateau is the small fort of Nakhl ("the palms"), where water is found; but, as a whole, the Tih is waterless, having very few springs, the most important being those near the western Kadesh (‘Ain Kadis); for Rehoboth belongs to the region of the Neghebh rather than to the Tih. In winter, when very heavy rains occur, the valleys are often flooded suddenly by a seil, or "torrent," which is sometimes 10 feet deep for a few hours. Such a seil has been known to sweep away trees, flocks, and human beings; yet, in consequence of the hard rocky surface, the flood rushes away to the sea and soon becomes a mere rivulet. Where soft soil is found, in the valleys, grass will grow and afford pasture, but even early in spring the Arabs begin to suffer from want of water, which only remains in pits and in water holes among rocks. They have then much difficulty in watering their goats and sheep.

3. "The Sandy Tract":

Below the Tih escarpment on the South is another region called Debbet er-ramleh ("the sandy tract"), which is only 20 miles across at its widest; and to the West are the sandy plains, with limestone foothills, stretching East of the Bitter Lakes and of the Gulf of Suez. The third region consists of the granite chain (see SINAI) which rises to 8,550 feet above the sea, and some 6,000 feet above its valleys, near Jebel Musa. Parts of this region are better watered than is any part of the Tih, and the main route from Egypt to Edom has consequently always run through it.

4. Description of the Arabah:

The fourth region is that of the ‘Arabah, or broad valley (10 miles wide) between the Gulf of ‘Aqabah and the Dead Sea. It has a watershed some 700 feet high above the Gulf (South of the neighborhood of Petra); and North of this shed the water flows to the Dead Sea 1,292 feet below the Mediterranean. The total length of this valley is 120 miles, the watershed being (near the Edomite chain) about 45 miles North of ‘Aqabah. The head of the Gulf was once farther North; and, near ‘Ain Ghudian (probably Eziongeber) and ‘Ain et-Tabah (probably Jotbath), there is a mud flat which becomes a lake in winter—about 20 miles from the sea. Lower down—at ‘Ain edition Deffiyeh—there is another such flat, the head being 10 miles from ‘Aqabah. The whole region is much better watered than either of the three preceding districts, having springs at the foot of the mountains on either side; and the ‘Arabah is thus the best pastoral country within the limits described. It now supports a nomad population of about 2,000 or 3,000 souls (Chaiwatat and ‘Alawin Arabs), while the region round Sinai has some 2,000 souls (Towarah Arabs): the whole of the Tih has probably not more than 5,000 inhabitants; for the stronger tribes (‘Azazimeh and Terabin) live chiefly between Gaza and Beersheba. These Arabs have goats, sheep and camels, but cattle are only found near Beersheba. The flocks are watered daily—as in Palestine generally—and are sometimes driven 20 miles in winter to find pasture and water. The water is also brought on donkeys and camels to the camps, and carried in goatskin bags on a journey through waterless districts.

See also ARABAH.

5. Physical Condition of the Wilderness:

There is no reason to think that the conditions at the time of the Exodus differed materially from those of the present time. The Arabs have cut down a good many acacia trees for firewood in recent times, but the population is too small materially to affect the vegetation. The annual rainfall—except in years of drought—is from 10 to 20 inches, and snow falls in winter on the Tih, and whitens Sinai and the Edomite mountains for many days. The acacia, tamarisk and palm grow in the valleys. At Wady Feiran there are said to be 5,000 date palms, and they occur also in the ‘Arabah and the Edomite gorges, while the white broom (1Ki 19:5, the King James Version "juniper") grows on the Tih plateau. This Tih plateau is the bed of an ancient ocean which once surrounded the granite mountains of Sinai. It was upheaved probably in the Miocene age, long before man appeared on earth. The surface formation (Hull, Memoir on the Geology and Geography of Arabia-Petraea, etc., 1886) consists of Cretaceous limestones of the Eocene and Chalk ages, beneath which lies the Nubian sandstone of the Greensand period, which is also visible all along the route from Sinai to ‘Aqabah, and on the east side of the Dead Sea, and even at the foot of the Gilead plateau. These beds are all visible in the Tih escarpment; and North of Sinai there are yet older formations of limestone, and the "desert sandstone" of the Carboniferous period. Since the conditions of natural water-supply depend entirely on geological formation and on rainfall, neither of which can be regarded as having changed since the time of Moses, the scientific conclusion is that the desert thus described represents that of his age, This, as we shall see, affects our conclusion as to the route followed by Israel from Egypt to the ‘Arabah; for, on the direct route from Suez to Nakhl (about 70 miles), there is no water for the main part of the way, so it has to be carried on camels; while, East of Nakhl, in a distance of 80 miles, there is only one known supply in a well (Bir eth-Themed) a

few miles South of the road. This route was thus practically impassable for the Hebrews and their beasts, whereas the Sinai route was passable. Thus when Wellhausen (History of Israel and Judah, 343) speaks of Israel as going straight to Kadesh, and not making a "digression to Sinai," he seems not to have considered the topography as described by many modern travelers. For not only was the whole object of their journey first to visit the "Mount of God," but it also lay on the most practicable route to Kadesh.

6. Difficulties Regarding the Numbers of Israel and Account of Tabernacle

It is true that there are certain difficulties as regards both the numbers of Israel and the account of the tabernacle. The first of these objections has been considered elsewhere (see EXODUS). The detailed account of the tabernacle (Ex 25-28; 36-39) belongs to a part of the Pentateuch which many critical writers assign to a later date than that of the old narrative and laws (Ex 1-24). The description may seem more applicable to the semi-permanent structure that existed at Shiloh and Nob, than to the original "tent of meeting" in the desert. On the other hand, living so long in civilized Egypt, the Hebrews no doubt had among them skilled artificers like Bezalel. The Egyptians used acacia wood for furniture; and though the desert acacia does not grow to the size which would furnish planks 1 1/4 cubits broad, it may be that these were made up by joiner’s work such as the ancients were able to execute. There was plenty of gold in Egypt and Asia, but none near Sinai. It is suggested, however, that the ornaments of which the Hebrews spoiled the Egyptians were presented, like the stuffs (Ex 36:6) prepared for the curtains—just as the Arabs weave stuffs for their tents—and they might have served to spread a thin layer of gold over acacia boards, and on the acacia altar. It is more difficult to understand (on our present information) where silver enough for the bases (Ex 26:25) would be found. Copper (Ex 27:4) presents less difficulty, since there were copper mines in Wady Nucb near Serabit el Khadim. The women gave gold earrings to Aaron (Ex 32:3) for the Golden Calf, but this may have been a small object. Eusebius (in Onomasticon), referring to Dizahab, "the place of gold" (De 1:1), now Dhahab ("gold") on the west shore of the Gulf of ‘Aqabah, East of Sinai, mentions the copper mines of Punon; and thought that veins of gold might also have existed in the mountains of Edom in old times. A little gold is also found in Midian. We know that the Egyptians and Assyrians carried arks and portable altars with their armies, and a great leather tent of Queen Habasu actually exists. Thothmes III, before the Exodus, speaks of "seven tent poles covered with plates of gold from the tent of the hostile king" which he took as spoil at Megiddo. The art of engraving gems was also already ancient in the time of Moses.

See NUMBERS, BOOK OF.

7. Difficulty as to Number of Wagons:

Another difficulty is to understand how six ox wagons (Nu 7:3) sufficed to carry all the heavy planks and curtains, and vessels of the tabernacle; and though the use of ox carts, and of four-wheeled wagons also, is known to have been ancient in Asia, there are points on even the easiest route which it would seem impossible for wagons to pass, especially on the rough road through Edom and Moab. On the other hand, we know that an Egyptian Mohar did drive his chariot over the mountains in Palestine in the reign of Rameses II, though it was finally broken near Joppa.

8. Fauna of the Desert:

Whatever be thought as to these questions, there are indications in other passages of actual acquaintance with the desert fauna. Although the manna, as described (Ex 16:31), is said not to resemble the sweet gum which exudes from the twigs of the tamarisk (to which it has been compared by some), which melts in the sun, and is regarded as a delicacy by the Arabs, yet the quail (Ex 16:13; Nu 11:31) still migrate from the sea northward across the desert in spring, flying low by night. The birds noticed (Le 11; De 14) include—as Canon Tristram remarked—species found on the seashores and in the wilderness, such as the cormorant, pelican and gull; the ostrich (in the desert East of Moab); the stork, the crane and the heron which migrate from Africa to the Jordan valley. It is notable that, except the heron (Assyrian anpatu), the Hebrew names are not those used by later Assyrians. The mammals include the boar which loves the marshes, and the hyrax (the King James Version "coney") which still exists near Sinai and in the desert of Judah, with the desert hare. It is remarkable that in De (14:5), besides the ibex and the bubak, two species are added (the fallow deer, Hebrew ‘ayyal, the King James Version "hart," and the roebuck, Hebrew yachmur, Arabic yachmur, the King James Version "fallow deer") which are not desert animals. The former occurs at Tabor; the latter was found by the present writer in 1873 on Carmel, and is since known in Gilead and Lebanon. But Deuteronomy refers to conditions subsequent to the capture of Gilead and Bashan.

9. Characteristic Names of the Districts:

The various districts in the desert receive characteristic names in the account of the Exodus. Thus, Shur is the coast region under the "wall" of the Tih, and Sin (Ex 17:1; Nu 33:11) was the "glaring" desert (see SINAI) of white chalk, West of Sinai. Paran is noticed 10 times, as a desert and mountain region (De 33:2; Hab 3:3) between Sinai and Kadesh. The name seems to survive in Wady Feiran West of Sinai. It means some kind of "burrows," whether referring to mines, caves or water pits, according to the usual explanation; but in Arabic the root also means "hot," which is perhaps more likely. The term seems to be of very wide extension, and to refer to the Tih generally (Ge 21:21); for David (1Sa 25:1) in Paran was not far from Maon and Carmel South of Hebron, and the same general application (1Ki 11:18) is suggested in another passage. Finally the desert of Zin (tsin) is noticed 9 times, and very clearly lay close to Kadesh-barnea and East of Paran (Nu 13:21; 20:1; 34:3; De 32:51; Jos 15:3). The rabbis rendered it "palm" (tsin), which is appropriate to the ‘Arabah valley which still retains the old name mentioned in De 1:1. These various considerations as to the conditions to be fulfilled may serve to show that the difficulties often raised, as to the historic character of the Exodus narrative, have been much overstated; and a further study of the various journeys serves to confirm this view.

II. First Journey.

1. Mode of Traveling:

Israel left Egypt in the early part of April (after the 14th of Abib) and reached Sinai about the 14th or 19th of the 3rd month (Ex 19:1), or at the end of May. They thus took two months to accomplish a

journey of about 117 miles; but from the first camp after crossing the Red Sea to that in the plain before the Mount ten marches are mentioned, giving intervals of less than 12 miles between each camp. Thus they evidently remained in camp for at least 50 days of the time, probably at the better supplied springs, including that of the starting-point, and those at Elim and Rephidim, in order to rest their flocks. The camps were probably not all crowded round one spring, but spread over a distance of some miles. The Arabs indeed do not camp or keep their flocks close to the waters, probably in order not to defile them, but send the women with donkeys to fetch water, and drive the sheep and goats to the spring or well in the cool of the afternoon. Thus we read that Amalek "smote the hindmost" (De 25:18), which may either mean the stragglers unable to keep up when "weary," or perhaps those in the camp most in the rear.

2. The Route: the First Camp:

The route of Israel has been very carefully described by Robinson (BR, 1838, I, 60-172; II, 95-195), and his account is mainly followed in this and the next sections. We may place the first camp (see EXODUS), between the springs which supply Suez (‘Ain Nab’a and ‘Ayyun Musa), which are about 4 miles apart. The first of these is scooped out among the sand hillocks, and bubbles up in a basin some 6 ft. deep. The water is brackish, but supplies as many as 200 camel loads at once for Suez. At ‘Ayyun Musa ("the springs of Moses") there are seven springs, some being small and scooped in the sand. A few palms occur near the water (which is also brackish), and a little barley is grown, while in recent times gardens of pomegranates have been cultivated (A. E. Haynes, Man-Hunting in the Desert, 1894, 106), which, with the palms, give a grateful shade.

3. Waters of Marah:

From this base Israel marched "three days in the wilderness" of Shur, "and found no water" (Ex 15:22). They no doubt carried it with them, and may have sent back camels to fetch it. Even when they reached the waters of Marah ("the bitter") they found them undrinkable till sweetened. The site of Marah seems clearly to have been at ‘Ain Chawarah ("the white chalk spring"), named from the chalky mound beside it. This is 36 miles from ‘Ayyun Musa, giving an average daily march of 12 miles. There is no water on the route, though some might have been fetched from ‘Ain Abu Jerad in Wady Sudr, and from the small spring of Abu Suweirah near the sea. Burckhardt thought that the water was sweetened from the berries of the Gharqad shrub (which have an acid juice) on the thorny bushes near the spring. This red berry ripens, however, in June. There is no doubt, on the other hand, that the best treatment for brack water is the addition of an acid taste. The Arabs consider the waters of this spring to be the most bitter in the country near.

4. Camp by the Red Sea:

From Marah, the next march led to Elim ("the palms"), where were "twelve springs (not "wells") of water and seventy palms." The site seems clearly to have been in Wady Gharandil, where a brook is found fed by springs of better water than that of Marah. The distance is only about 6 miles, or an easy march, and palm trees exist near the waters. Israel then entered the desert of Sin, stretching from Elim to

Sinai, reaching a camp "by the Red Sea" (Nu 33:10) just a month after leaving Egypt (Ex 16:1). The probable site is near the mouth of Wady et-Taiyibeh ("the goodly valley"), which is some 10 or 12 miles from the springs of Gharandil. The foothills here project close to the coast, and North of the valley is Jebel Chammam Far'aun ("the mountain of Pharaoh's hot bath"), named from hot sulphur springs. The water in Wady et-Taiyibeh is said to be better than that of Marah, and this is the main Arab watering-place after passing Gharandil. A small pond is here described by Burckhardt at el-Murkhat, in the sandstone rock near the foot of the mountains, but the water is bitter and full of weeds, moss and mud. The site is close to a broad shore plain stretching South Here two roads diverge toward Sinai, which lies about 65 miles to the Southeast, and in this interval (Nu 33:11-15) five stations are named, giving a daily march of 13 miles. The Hebrews probably took the lower and easier road, especially as it avoided the Egyptian mines of Wady el-Maghdrah ("valley of the cave") and their station at Serabit el-Khadim ("pillars of the servant"), where—though this is not certain—there may have been a detachment of bowmen guarding the mines.

5. The Route to Sinai:

None of the five camps on this section of the route is certainly known. Dophkah apparently means "overdriving" of flocks, and Alush (according to the rabbis) "crowding," thus indicating the difficulties of the march. Rephidim ("refreshments") contrasts with these names and indicates a better camp. The site, ever since the 4th century AD, has always been shown in Wady Feiran (Eusebius, Onomasticon, under the word "Rephidim")—an oasis of date palms with a running stream. The distance from Sinai is about 18 miles, or 14 from the western end of the broad plain er-Rachah in which Israel camped in sight of Horeb; and the latter name (Ex 17:6) included the Desert of Sinai even as far West as Rephidim. Here the rod of Moses, smiting the rock, revealed to the Hebrews an abundant supply, just as they despaired of water. Here apparently they could rest in comfort for some three weeks before the final march to the plain "before the mount" (Ex 19:1,2), which they reached two months after leaving Egypt. Here Amalek —coming down probably from the mines—attacked them in the rear. Meanwhile there was ample time for the news of their journey to reach Midian, and for the family of Moses (Ex 18:1-5) to reach Sinai. On one of the low hills near Wady Feiran, Moses watched the doubtful fight and built his stone altar. A steep pass separates the oasis from the Rachah plain, and baggage camels usually round it on the North by Wady esh-Sheikh, which may have been the actual route. The Rephidim oasis has a fertile alluvial soil, and the spot was chosen by Christian hermits perhaps as early as the 3rd century AD.

III. Second Journey.

1. The Stay at Sinai:

Israel remained at Mt. Sinai for 10 months, leaving it after the Passover of the "second year" (Nu 9:1-3), and apparently soon after the feast, since, when they again witnessed the spring migration of the quail (Nu 11:31) "from the sea"—as they had done in the preceding year (Ex 16:13) farther West—they were already about 20 miles on their road, at Kibroth-hattaavah, or "the graves of lust."

2. Site of Kadesh-barnea:

(1) In order to follow their journey it is necessary to fix the site of Kadesh-barnea to which they were going, and there has been a good deal of confusion as to this city since, in 1844, John Rowlands discovered the site of the western Kadesh, at ‘Ain Qadis in the northern part of the Tih. Robinson pointed out (BR, II, 194, note 3) that this site could not possibly be right for Kadesh-barnea; and, though it was accepted by Professor Palmer, who visited the vicinity in January, 1870, and has been advocated by Henry Clay Trumbull (Kadesh-barnea, 1884), the identification makes hopeless chaos of the Old Testament topography. The site of ‘Ain Qadis is no doubt that of the Kadesh of Hagar (see SHUR), and a tradition of her presence survives among the Arabs, probably derived from one of the early hermits, since a small hermitage was found by Palmer in the vicinity (Survey of Western Palestine, Special Papers, 1881, 19). But this spring is not said to have been at the "city" of Kadesh-barnea, which is clearly placed at the southeast corner of the land of Israel (Jos 15:3), while, in the same chapter (Jos 15:23), another site called Kedesh is mentioned, with Adadah (‘Ada’deh 7 miles Southeast of Arad) and Hazor (at Jebel Chadireh); this Kedesh may very well have been at the western Kadesh.

(2) Kadesh-barnea is noticed in 10 passages of the Old Testament, and in 16 other verses is called Kadesh only. The name probably means "the holy place of the desert of wandering," and—as we shall see—the wanderings of Israel were confined to the ‘Arabah. The place is described as "a city in the uttermost .... border" of Edom (Nu 20:16), Edom being the "red land" of Mt. Seir, so called from its red sandstones, as contrasted with the white Tih limestone. It is also very clearly placed (Nu 34:3,4) South of the Dead Sea (compare Jos 15:3), while Ezekiel also (47:19) gives it as the southeastern limit of the land, opposed to Tamar (Tamrah near Gaza) as the southeastern border town. A constant tradition, among Jews and Christians alike, identifies Kadesh-barnea with Petra, and this as early as the time of Josephus, who says that Aaron died on a mountain near Petra (Ant., IV, iv, 7), and that the old name of Petra was Arekem (vii, 1). The Targum of Onkelos (on Nu 34:4) renders Kadesh-barnea by "Rekem of the G’aia" and this name—meaning "many-colored"—was due to the many-colored rocks near Petra, while the g’aia or "outcry" is probably that of Israel at Meribah-kadesh (Nu 27:14), and may have some connection with the name of the village el-Jii, at Petra, which is now called Wady Musa ("the valley of Moses") by the Arabs, who have a tradition that the gorge leading to Petra was cloven by the rod of Moses when he struck the rock at the "waters of strife" (Nu 27:14), forming the present stream which represents that of "Meribah of Kadesh." Eusebius also (in Onomasticon under the word "Barne") connects Kadesh with Petra, and this traditional site so fully answers the requirements of the journey in question that it may be accepted as one of the best-fixed points on the route, especially as the position of Hazeroth agrees with this conclusion. Hazeroth (Nu 11:35; 12:16; 33:17; De 1:1) means "enclosures," and the name survives at ‘Ain Chadrah ("spring of the enclosure") about 30 miles Northeast of Mt. Sinai on the way to the ‘Arabah. It was the 3rd camp from Sinai, the 1st being Taberah (Nu 11:3) and the 2nd Kibroth-hattaavah (Nu 11:35), giving a daily march of 10 miles.

See KADESH-BARNEA.

3. The Route: Hazeroth to Moseroth:

After passing Hazeroth (Nu 12:16; 13:3) the journey appears to have been leisurely, and Israel probably camped for some time in the best pastures of the ‘Arabah. For the spies were sent from Paran near Hazeroth to explore the route to Kadesh, and to examine the "south country" through which Israel hoped to enter Palestine (Nu 13:17,21). They explored this district (Nu 13:21; 32:8) from "the wilderness of Zin," or otherwise "from Kadesh-barnea," on the East, to Rehob—probably Rehoboth (now er-Ruheibeh)—on the West; and—having been absent 40 days (Nu 13:25)—after visiting Hebron (Nu 13:22) they returned by the direct route leading South of Arad (Tell ‘Arad) to Petra, which road is called (Nu 21:1) the "way of the spies." On their return, in the season of "first-ripe grapes" (Nu 13:20), they found Israel at Kadesh (Nu 13:26). No place North of Hebron is mentioned in the account of their explorations, and it is difficult to suppose that, in 40 days, they could have reached the Syrian city of Hamath, which is some 350 miles North of Petra, and have returned thence. The definition of Rehob (mentioned before Hebron) as being ‘on the coming to Hamath’ (Nu 13:21) is best explained as a scribe’s error, due to an indistinct manuscript, the original reading being chalatseth, and referring to the classical Elussa (now Khalasah) which lies 10 miles North of Rehoboth on the main road to Beersheba and Hebron. Israel left Sinai in the spring, after the Passover, and was near Hazeroth in the time of the quail migration. Hazeroth possesses the only perennial supply of water in the region, from its vicinity the spies set forth in August.

4. The Camps between Hazeroth and Moseroth:

Most of the sites along this route are unknown, and their position can only be gathered from the meaning of the names; but the 6th station from Hazeroth was at Mt. Shepher (Nu 33:23), and may have left its name corrupted into Tell el-‘Acfar (or ‘Asfar), the Hebrew meaning "the shining hill," and the Arabic either the same or else "the yellow." This site is 60 miles from Hazeroth, giving a daily march of 10 miles. As regards the other stations, Rithmah means "broomy," referring to the white desert broom; Rimmon-perez was a "cloven height," and Libnab a "white" chalky place; Rissah means "dewy," and Kehelathah, "gathering." From Mt. Shepher the distance to the vicinity of Mt. Hor is about 55 miles, and seven stations are named, giving an average march of 8 miles. The names are Haradah (Nu 33:24), "fearful," referring to a mountain; Makheloth, "gatherings"; Tahath—probably "below"—marking the descent into the ‘Arabah; Terah, "delay," referring to rest in the better pastures; Mithkah, "sweetness" of pasture or of water; Hashmonah, "fatness"; and Moseroth; probably meaning "the boundaries," near Mt. Hor. These names, though now lost, agree well with a journey through a rugged region of white limestone and yellow sandstone, followed by a descent into the pastoral valley of the ‘Arabah. The distances also are all probable for flocks.

IV. The Thirty-eight Years.

1. The History:

From the time of their first arrival at Kadesh-barnea, in the autumn of the 2nd year, to the day that the Hebrews crossed the brook Zered in Moab on their final march, is said to have been a period of 38 years (De 2:14), during which the first generation died out, and a strong race of desert warriors succeeded it. During this period Israel lived in the nomadic state, like modern Arabs who change camp according to

the season within well-defined limits, visiting the higher pastures in summer, and wintering in the lower lands. On their first arrival near Kadesh-barnea, they were discouraged by the report of the spies, and rebelled; but when they were ordered to turn South "by the way of the Red Sea" or Gulf of ‘Aqabah, they made an unsuccessful attempt to enter Palestine by the way of the spies (Nu 14:25-45). They were discomfited by Amalekites at Hormah ("cutting off"), which place is otherwise called Zephath (Jud 1:17). Here also they were again defeated by the king of Arad (Nu 21:1,3) in the early autumn of the 40th year of wandering. This site may well be placed at the ascent now called Nuqb es-Cufah ("the pass of Zephath"), which preserves the Hebrew name, 45 miles Northwest of Mt. Hor, on the main road from Hebron to Petra. The route is well watered, and ‘Ain Yemen is a spring at the foot of this ascent leading to the higher terrace of the Tih. Arad lies North of the road, and its Canaanite king no doubt marched South some 40 miles, to defend the top of the ascent down which the Amalekites had driven the first generation of Hebrews, who returned to the Kadesh-barnea camp.

2. The Camps Visited:

We are not left without any notice of the stations which Israel visited, and no doubt revisited annually, during the 38 years of nomadic life. We have in fact three passages which appear to define the limits of their wanderings.

(1) In the first of these (Nu 33:31-36) we find that they left Moseroth, near Mt. Hor, the site of which latter has always been shown—since the time of Josephus at least—at the remarkable mountain West of Petra, now called Jebel Haran ("Aaron’s Mountain"); thence they proceeded to the wells of the Bene-jaakan, to Hor-haggidgad, and to Jotbathah. Hor-haggidgad (or Gudgodah, De 10:7) signifies apparently the "hill of thunder," and the word is not in any way connected with the name of Wady Ghadaghid ("the valley of failing waters"), applying to a ravine West of the ‘Arabah; for the Hebrew and Arabic words have not a letter in common. The site of Jotbathah, which was in "a land of brooks of waters" (De 10:7), is, on the other hand, pretty clearly to be fixed at ‘Ain et-Tabah ("the good spring"), 28 miles North of ‘Aqabah, and about 40 along the road from Mt. Hor. This spring, near a palm grove, feeds the winter lake of et-Tabah to its West in the ‘Arabah. The next station was Abronah ("the crossing"), and if this refers to crossing the ‘Arabah to the western slopes, we are naturally brought—on the return journey—to Ezion-geber, at ‘Ain-ghudian (the usual identification), which springs from the western slopes of the Tih on the side of the lake opposite to Jotbathah. Thence the migrants gradually returned to Kadesh.

(2) The second passage (De 10:6,7). is one of many geographical notes added to the narrative of the wanderings, and gives the names in a different order—Wells of the Bene-jaakan, Moserah, Gudgodah, and Jotbathah—but this has little importance, as the camps, during 38 years, would often be at these springs.

(3) The third passage is in the preface to Deuteronomy (1:1,2), which enumerates the various places where Moses spoke to Israel at various times after leaving Sinai. These include the region East of Jordan, the wilderness, the ‘Arabah, "over against Suph," with all the district between Paran and Tophel (now Tufileh, on the southern border of Moab), as well as Laban (probably the Libnah of Nu 33:20),

Hazeroth, and Dizahab which may be Dhahab on the seashore East of Sinai. This list, with the valuable notes added showing that Kadesh-barnea was 11 days from Horeb in the direction of Mt. Seir, refers to speeches down to the last days of Moses' life. The wanderings of the 38 years do not include the march through Edom and Moab; and, though it is of course possible that they may have extended to Hazeroth and Sinai, it seems more probable that they were confined to the 'Arabah between Petra and Jotbathah. Elath (now 'Aqabah), on the eastern shore at the head of the gulfs, is not mentioned; for the raised beach South of the Lake of Jotbathah would not give pasture. In summer the camps would be on the western slopes of the valley, where grass might be found in April; and the annual migrations were thus within the limits of some 500 square miles, which is about the area now occupied by a strong tribe among Arabs.

V. The Final Journey.

1. The Route:

In the 1st month of the 40th year (Nu 20:1) Israel was at Kadesh in the desert of Zin, where Miriam was buried. They were troubled once more by want of water, till Moses smote the rock of Meribah ("strife"). They were commanded to keep peace with their relatives of Edom and Moab, whose lands were not attacked by the Hebrews till the time of Saul, and of David and his successors. They camped on the border of Kadesh, desiring to reach the main road to Moab through the city; and, when this was refused by the king of Edom, they withdrew a few miles West to Mt. Hor. Here Aaron was buried, and was mourned for 30 days (Nu 20:29), after which the 2nd attempt to reach Hebron by the main road (Nu 21:1) was also repulsed. Since, on this occasion, Israel remained "many days" in Kadesh (De 1:46) and left it less than 38 years after they first reached it in autumn, it would seem that they may have started in August, and have taken about a month to reach the brook Zered; but only five stations are noticed (Nu 21:10-12; 33:41-44) on the way. They are not said—in any passage—to have gone to Elath, but they turned "from mount Hor by the way to the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom" (Nu 21:4), or, as otherwise stated (De 2:8), they went "from the way of the Arabah" on the road which led "from Elath and from Ezion-geber"; and thus, starting on the "way to the Red Sea," they "compassed mount Seir many days," turning "northward" by the "way of the wilderness of Moab" (De 2:1,8) after passing through the coast of Edom (De 2:4).

2. The Five Stations to the Border of Moab:

If the list of five stations is complete, we may suppose that they left the 'Arabah road not many miles South of Petra, striking East by an existing road leading to Ma'an, and thus gaining the high plateau above Petra to the East, and reaching the present Chaj route. This view is confirmed by the notice of Punon as the 2nd camp, if we accept the statement of Eusebius (Onomasticon, under the word "Phinon"); for he appears to have known it as an Edomite village North of Petra, in the desert, where convicts were employed digging copper. The name, however, has not been recovered. The preceding camp at Zalmonah suggests some "gloomy" valley leading up to the Edomite plateau. North of Punon, the 3rd camp was at Oboth ("water bags"), and the 4th was at Iyim or Iye-abarim ("the ruins" or "the ruins of the crossings"), the site of which is pretty certainly at 'Aimeh, a few miles North of Tophel. The

total distance thus seems to have been about 60 miles for four marches, or 15 miles a day. Iyim was "in the border of Moab" (Nu 33:44) and in the desert facing Moab, in the East (Nu 21:11).

3. From Iyim to Arnon:

Here therefore Israel left Edom; and between Iyim and the river Arnon, in a distance of about 32 miles, only one station is mentioned, being at the valley of Zered (Nu 21:12; De 2:13,14). This has usually been placed at Wady el-Chesy ("the pebbly valley"), which flows into the Dead Sea, having its head near Iyim; but this is evidently too far South, and it is no doubt the great gorge at Kerak that is intended, having its head close to the Chaj road, halfway from Iyim to Arnon, giving a daily march of 16 miles. The traditional identification of the Arnon with Wady Mojib is rendered certain by the positions of Diban (Dhiban) and Aroer (‘Ar‘air) close by. It was the border of the Amorites, who had driven the Moabites South of this river (Nu 21:13; De 2:36), depriving them of their best lands which stretched to Heshbon. These Amorites were apparently recent intruders who, with the Hittites (see HITTITES), had invaded Damascus and Bashan from North Syria, and who no doubt had thus brought the fame of Balaam from Pethor (Nu 22:5), on the Euphrates near Carchemish.

4. The Message to Sihon:

The Hebrews were now a strong people fit for war, and Moses sent messengers from the "wilderness of Kedemoth" (De 2:26) to Sihon in Heshbon, demanding a peaceful passage through his lands, such as had been accomplished through Edom and Moab. Kedemoth ("the Eastern Lands") was evidently the desert of Moab.

It was objected, by Colenso, to the narrative of the Pentateuch that, since Israel only reached the brook Zered in autumn of the 40th year, only six months are left for the conquest of North Moab, Gilead and Bashan. But it must be remembered that the Hebrews left all their impedimenta in the "plains of Moab" (Nu 22:1) opposite Jericho at Shittim, so that the advance of their army in Gilead and Bashan was unimpeded. The Assyrians, in later times, covered in a season much longer distances than are attributed to Hebrew conquerors, and the six months leave quite enough time for the two missions sent from Moab (Nu 22:5-36) to fetch Balaam.

See NUMBERS, BOOK OF.

5. From the Arnon to Shittim:

(1) It is notable that, for the march from the Arnon to Shittim, we have two lists of stations. That which is said to have been written down by Moses himself (Nu 33:45-49) mentions only four stations in a distance of about 25 miles—namely Dibon-gad, Almon-diblathaim, Nebo and the plains of Moab, where the camps were placed at various waters from Beth-jeshimoth (Sueimeh) on the northeastern shore of the Dead Sea to Abelshittim ("the Meadow of Acacias"), now called the Ghor es-Seiseban, or "Valley of Acacias." In this area of 50 square miles there were four running streams, besides springs, and excellent

pasture for flocks. This therefore was the headquarters of the nation during the Amorite war.

(2) In the 2nd list (Nu 21:13-20) we read of a still more gradual and cautious advance in the Amorite lands, and this may represent the march of the main body following the men of war. Leaving the Arnon, they reached "a well" (Beer), probably near Dibon, this being one of those shallow water pits which the Arabs still scoop out in the valleys when the water runs below the surface. Between Arnon and Pisgah (or Nebo) no less than five stations are noticed in about 20 miles, namely Beer, Mattanah ("the gift"), Nahaliel ("the valley of God"), Bamoth (or Bamoth-Baal (Nu 22:41), "the monuments of Baal"), and Pisgah (Jebel Neba). Of these only the last is certainly known, but the central station at Nahaliel may be placed at the great gorge of the Zerqa Ma‘ain, the road from Dibon to Nebo crossing its head near Beth-meon. There was plenty of water in this vicinity. The last stage of Israel’s march thus seems to represent a program of only about 4 miles a day, covered by the more rapid advance of the fighting men; and no doubt the women, children and flocks were not allowed to proceed at all until, at least, Sihon had been driven from Heshbon (Nu 21:21-25).

6. Review:

We have thus considered every march made by the Hebrews, from Egypt to Shittim, by the light of actual knowledge of their route. We have found no case in which the stations are too far apart for the passage of their beasts, and no discrepancies between any of the accounts when carefully considered. If, as some critical writers think, the story of the spies and the list of camps said to have been written down by Moses are to be attributed to a Hebrew priest writing in Babylonia, we cannot but wonder how he came to be so accurately informed as to the topography of the wilderness, its various regions, its water-supply and its natural products. It does not seem necessary to suppose a "double source," because, in the spring of two successive years, the manna is noticed, and Israel is recorded as having eaten the quail flying (as now) by night to the Jordan valley from Africa. The march was not continuous, and plenty of time is left, by the recorded dates, for the resting of the flocks at such waters as those of Elim, Rephidim and Hazeroth. The wanderings of the 38 years represent a nomadic life in the best pastures of the region, in and near the ‘Arabah. Here the new race grew up—hardy as the Arabs of today. When they left Egypt the Pharaoh still had a firm hold on the "way of the Philistines," and the Canaanites owned his sway. But 40 years later Egypt was defeated by the Amorites, and the forces of the Pharaoh were withdrawn from Jerusalem after suffering defeat in Bashan (see Tell el-Amarna Letters, number 64, British Museum, where no less than nine known places near Ashteroth and Edrei are noticed); general chaos then resulted in Southern Palestine, when the ‘Abiri (or Hebrews) appeared from Seir, and "destroyed all the rulers" (see EXODUS). This then, was the historic opportunity for the defeat of the Amorites, and for Joshua’s conquest of the Promised Land.

C. R. Conder

WAR, MAN OF

(’ish milchamah):

"Yahweh is a man of war:

Yahweh is his name" (Ex 15:3).

In early Israel the character of Yahweh as the war-God forms a prominent feature in the conception of God (Nu 10:35; 21:14; Jos 5:13; 10:11; Jud 5:4,13,20,23,31, etc.).

See GOD, NAMES OF, III, 8; LORD OF HOSTS; and HDB, V, 635 ff.

WAR; WARFARE

wor, wor'-far (milchamah, 'anshe m., "men of war," "soldiers"; polemos, polemein, strateuesthai, stratia):

1. Religious Significance

2. Preliminaries

3. Operations of War

4. Strategy

5. Important Requisites

6. Characteristics

7. Defeat and Victory

8. Spoils and Trophies

9. Treaties of Peace

10. War in the New Testament

LITERATURE

1. Religious Significance:

From an early period of Hebrew history war had a religious significance. The Hebrews were the people of Yahweh, and they were reminded in their wars by the priest or priests who accompanied their armies

that Yahweh was with them to fight their battles (De 20:1-4). It was customary to open a campaign, or to enter an engagement, with sacrificial rites (1Sa 7:8-10; 13:9). Hence, in the Prophets, to "prepare" war is to carry out the initiatory religious rites and therefore to "sanctify" war (Jer 6:4; 22:7; 51:27,28; Mic 3:5; Joe 3:9; the Revised Version margin in each case); and Isaiah even speaks of Yahweh mustering His host and summoning to battle His "consecrated ones" (Isa 13:3), the warriors consecrated by the sacrifices offered before the war actually opened. The religious character attaching to war explains also the taboo which we find associated with it (De 20:7; 23:10; 2Sa 11:11).

2. Preliminaries:

(1) Religious Preliminaries.

It was in keeping with this that the oracle should be consulted before a campaign, or an engagement (Jud 20:18 ff; 1Sa 14:37; 23:2; 28:6; 30:8). The ark of God was believed to be possessed of special virtue in assuring victory, and, because it was identified in the eyes of the Israelites with the presence of Yahweh, it was taken into battle (1Sa 4:3). The people learned, however, by experience to put their trust in Yahweh Himself and not in any outward token of His presence. At the battle of Ebenezer the ark was taken into the fight with disastrous results to Israel (1Sa 4:4). On the other hand at the battle of Michmash, the sacred ephod at Saul’s request accompanied the Israelites into the field, and there was a great discomfiture of the Philistines (1Sa 14:18). In the later history prophets were appealed to for guidance before a campaign (1Ki 22:5; 2Ki 3:11), although fanatical members of the order sometimes gave fatal advice, as to Ahab at Ramoth-gilead, and probably to Josiah at Megiddo. Upon occasion the king addressed the host before engaging the enemy (2Ch 20:20-22, where Jehoshaphat also had singers to go before the army into battle); and Judas Maccabeus did so, with prayer to God, on various occasions (1 Macc 3:58; 4:30; 5:32).

(2) Military Preliminaries.

The call to arms was given by sound of trumpet throughout the land (Jud 3:27; 6:34; 1Sa 13:3; 2Sa 15:10; 20:1; compare Nu 10:2). It was the part of the priests to sound an alarm with the trumpets (2Ch 13:12-16; compare 1 Macc 4:40; 16:8), and the trumpets were to be blown in time of battle to keep God in remembrance of Israel that they might gain the victory. In the Prophets, we find the commencement of war described as the drawing of the sword from its sheath (Eze 21:3), and the uncovering of the shield (Isa 22:6). Graphic pictures of the mobilizing of forces, both for invasion and for defense, are found in Isa 22:6-8 and Na 3:2 and other Prophets. It was in the springtime that campaigns were usually opened, or resumed after a cessation of hostilities in winter (2Sa 11:1; 1Ki 20:22,26).

3. Operations of War:

Of the actual disposition of troops in battle there are no full accounts till the Maccabean time, but an examination of the Biblical battlefields by modern travelers with knowledge of military history has yielded valuable results in showing the position of the combatants and the progress of the fight (an

excellent example in Dr. William Miller's Least of All Lands, 85 ff, 116 ff, 150 ff, where the battles of Michmash, Elah and Gilboa are described with plans). With the Israelites the order of battle was simple. The force was drawn up, either in line, or in three divisions, a center and two wings. There was a rearguard (called in the King James Version "rereward," in the Revised Version (British and American) "rearward") to give protection on the march or to bring in stragglers (Jud 7:16; 1Sa 11:11; 2Sa 18:2; 1 Macc 5:33; compare also Nu 10:25; Jos 6:9; 1Sa 29:2; Isa 58:8). The signal for the charge and the retreat was given by sound of trumpet. There was a battle-cry to inspire courage and to impart confidence (Jud 7:20; Am 1:14, etc.). The issue of the battle depended upon the personal courage and endurance of the combatants, fighting man against man, but there were occasions when the decision was left to single combat, as at the battle of Elah between the giant Goliath and the stripling David (1Sa 17). The combat at Gibeon between the men of Benjamin, twelve in number, followers of Ish-bosheth, and twelve of the servants of David, in which each slew his man and all fell together by mutual slaughter, was the prelude to "a very sore battle" in which Abner and the men of Israel were beaten before the servants of David (2Sa 2:16).

To the minor operations of war belong the raid, such as the Philistines made into the Valley of Rephaim (1Ch 14:9), the foray, the object of which was plunder (2Sa 3:22), the foraging to secure supplies (2Sa 23:11 margin), and the movements of bands who captured defenseless inhabitants and sold them as slaves (2Ki 5:2).

4. Strategy:

Of strategical movements in war there was the ambush with liers-in-wait resorted to by Joshua at Ai (Jos 8:3); the feint, resorted to by the Israelites against the tribe of Benjamin (Jud 20:20); the flank movement, adopted by David in the Valley of Rephaim to rout the Philistines (2Sa 5:22 f); and the surprise, inflicted successfully at the Waters of Merom upon the Canaanites under Jabin by Joshua (Jos 11:1 f). Of all these the story of Judas Maccabeus, the great military leader of the Jewish nation, furnishes illustrations (1 Macc 4:5 and elsewhere).

5. Important Requisites:

Among the requisites for the proper conduct of war the most important was the camp (machaneh). Of the exact configuration of the camp of the Israelites, it is not possible to speak with certainty. The camp of Israel in the wilderness seems to have been quadrilateral, although some have supposed it to be round or triangular (Nu 2:1). The camp in the wilderness was furnished with ensigns and standards—the family ensign (’oth), and a standard (deghel) for the group of tribes occupying each of the four sides. The standard or banner (nec) is used of the signal for the mustering of troops, but standard-bearer, which occurs only once in the Bible, is a doubtful reading (Isa 10:18, where the Revised Version margin, "sick man," is rather to be followed). In time of war the camp was surrounded by a barricade, or wagon-rampart (ma‘gal), as at Elah (1Sa 17:20); and Saul lay within such a barricade in the wilderness of Ziph with his people round about him when David surprised him and carried off his spear (1Sa 26:5). Tents were used for the shelter of troops, at any rate when occupied with a siege (2Ki 7:7), although at the

siege of Rabbah we read of booths for the purpose (2Sa 11:11). Pickets were set to watch the camp, and the watch was changed three times in the course of the night (Jud 7:19; 1 Macc 12:27). It was usual to leave a guard in charge of the camp when the force went into action or went off upon a raid (1Sa 25:13; 30:10). Careful prescriptions were laid down for the preservation of the purity of the camp, "for Yahweh thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp, ... therefore shall thy camp be holy" (De 23:9-14; compare Nu 5:1-4). Garrisons (matstsabh) were placed in occupation of fortresses and strategical centers (2Ch 17:2). No doubt the caves in the hillsides and rocky fastnesses of the land, as at Michmash, would serve for their reception (1Sa 13). The garrisons, however, which are expressly mentioned, were for the most part military posts for the occupation of a subject country—Philistines in Israelite territory (1Sa 13:23; 14:1,11), and Israelites in Syrian and Edomite territory (2Sa 8:6,14).

6. Characteristics:

Among the characteristic notes of war, the tumult and the shouting were often noticed by the sacred historians (1Sa 4:6; 14:19; 2Ki 7:6). In the figurative language of the prophets the terrors and horrors and devastation of war are set forth in lurid colors. "The snorting of his horses is heard from Dan," is Jeremiah's description of an invading army, "at the sound of the neighing of his strong ones the whole land trembleth" (Jer 8:16). 'The crack of the whip and the noise of the rumbling wheel and the galloping horse, and the jolting chariot and the rearing horsemen; and the flash of the sword and the glitter of the spear, and the multitude of slain; and a mass of dead bodies and no end to the carcasses' (Na 3:2-4: J. M. P. Smith's translation in ICC). Because of the devastation of territory and the slaughter of men which it entails, the sword is named with famine and "noisome beasts" (the American Standard Revised Version has "evil beasts") and "pestilence" as one of God's "four sore judgments" (Eze 14:21, the King James Version). By a familiar figure "the sword" is often taken for all the operations of war, because it is characteristic of it to devour and to destroy (2Sa 2:26; Jer 2:30).

7. Defeat and Victory:

While the treatment of the vanquished in the wars of Israel never reached the pitch of savagery common in Assyrian warfare, there are not wanting examples of excessive severity, such as David's treatment of his Moabite prisoners (2Sa 8:2) and of the Ammonites captured at Rabbah (2Sa 12:31), and Menahem's barbarous treatment of Tiphsah (2Ki 15:16; compare Nu 31:17; Jos 6:21). That it was common for the Philistines to mutilate and abuse their prisoners is shown by Saul's determination not to fall into their hands (1Sa 31:4). On that occasion the Philistines not only stripped the slain, but cut off Saul's head and fixed his body to the wall of Bethshan (1Sa 31:9,10). It was usual to carry off prisoners and sell them as slaves (2Ki 5:2; 1 Macc 3:41). The conquerors were wont to deport the population of the subjugated country (2Ki 17:6), to carry off treasure and impose tribute (2Ki 16:8), and even to take the gods into captivity (Isa 46:1). On the other hand, the victors were hailed with acclamations and songs of rejoicing (1Sa 18:6), and victory was celebrated with public thanksgivings (Ex 15:1; Jud 5:1; 1 Macc 4:24).

The spoils of war, spoken of as booty also—armor, clothing, jewelry, money, captives and animals—falling to the victors, were divided equally between those who had taken part in the battle and those who

had been left behind in camp (Nu 31:27; Jos 22:8; 1Sa 30:24 f).

8. Spoils and Trophies:

A proportion of the spoils was reserved for the Levites, and "a tribute unto the Lord" was also levied before distribution was made of the collected booty (Nu 31:28,30). To the Lord, in the Israelite interpretation of war, the spoils truly belong, and we see this exemplified at the capture of Jericho when the silver and the gold and the vessels of brass were put into the treasury of the house of the Lord (Jos 6:24). Under the monarchy, part of the spoils fell to the king who might in turn dedicate it to the Lord or use it for the purposes of war (2Ki 14:14; 1Ch 18:7,11). The armor of the conquered was sometimes dedicated as a trophy of victory and placed in the temple of the heathen or preserved near the ark of God (1Sa 21:9; 31:9).

9. Treaties of Peace:

As the blast of the war-horn summoned to war, so it intimated the cessation of hostilities (2Sa 2:28); and as to draw the sword was the token of the entrance upon a campaign, so to return it to its sheath, or to put it up into the scabbard, was emblematic of the establishment of peace (Jer 47:6). As ambassadors were sent to summon to war (Jer 49:14), or to dissuade from war (2Ch 35:21), so ambassadors were employed to negotiate peace (Isa 33:7). Treaties of peace were made on occasion between combatants, as between Ahab and Ben-hadad II after the defeat of the latter and his fortunate escape from the hands of Ahab with his life (1Ki 20:30,31). By the appeal of Ben-hadad’s representative to Ahab’s clemency his life was spared, and in return therefor he granted to Ahab the right to have bazaars for trade in Damascus as his father had had in Samaria (1Ki 20:34). Alliances, offensive and defensive, were common, as Ahab and Jehoshaphat against Syria (1Ki 22:2), Jehoram and Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom against Moab (2Ki 3:7), and the kings of the West, including Ahab and Hadadezer of Damascus, to resist Shalmaneser II of Assyria, who routed the allies at the battle of Qarqar in 854 BC. It is among the wonderful works of Yahweh that He makes war to cease to the end of the earth, that He breaks the bow, and cuts the spear in sunder, and "burneth the chariots in the fire" (Ps 46:9). And prophetic pictures of the peace of the latter days include the breaking of "the bow and the sword and the battle out of the land" (Ho 2:18), the beating of "swords into plowshares, and .... spears into pruning-hooks" (Isa 2:4; Mic 4:3).

10. War in the New Testament:

Among the signs of the last days given by our Lord are "wars and rumors of wars" (Mt 24:6; Mr 13:7; Lu 21:9; 21:24). Jesus accepts war as part of the present world-order, and draws from it an impressive illustration of the exacting conditions of Christian discipleship (Lu 14:31). He foresees how Jerusalem is to be encompassed with armies and devoted to the bitterest extremities of war (Lu 19:41). He conceives Himself come, not to send peace on earth, but a sword (Mt 10:34); and declares that they who take the sword shall perish by the sword (Mt 26:52). The apostles trace war to the selfishness and greed of men (Jas 4:1); they see, speaking figuratively, in fleshly lusts enemies which war against the soul

(1Pe 2:11); they find in war apt figures of the spiritual struggle and divine protection and ultimate victory of the Christian (Ro 7:23; 8:37; 2Co 10:3,5; 1Ti 1:18; Heb 13:13; 1Pe 1:5), and of the triumphs of Christ Himself (2Co 2:14; Col 2:15; Eph 2:16,17). Paul made the acquaintance of the barracks, both at Jerusalem and at Caesarea (Ac 21:34,37; 23:35); and at Rome his bonds became familiar to the members of the Praetorian guard who were from time to time detailed to have him in keeping (Php 1:13). It is under the figures of battle and war that John in the Apocalypse conceives the age-long conflict between righteousness and sin, Christ and Satan, and the final triumph of the Lamb, who is King of kings, and Lord of lords (Re 16:14-16; 17:14; 19:14). For other references see ARMY, 9; PRAETORIAN GUARD; TREATY.

LITERATURE.

Benzinger, article "Kriegswesen" in Herzog, Realencyklopadie fur protestantische Theologie und Kirche (3), XI; Nowack, Hebraische Archaeologie, 72; Browne, Hebrew Antiquities, 44-47.

T. Nicol

WARD

word: "Ward" and "guard" are two different spellings of the same word, and in consequence no clear line can be drawn between them. English Versions of the Bible, however, has used "guard" only in the sense of "a special body of soldiers" (Ge 37:36, etc.), while "ward" is used, not only in this sense (Jer 37:13; contrast 39:9), but also in a variety of others. So a "ward" may mean "any body of men on special duty," as 1Ch 9:23; the King James Version 1Ch 26:16; Ne 12:24,25 (the Revised Version (British and American) "watch"), or the duty itself, as Isa 21:8; 1Ch 12:29 the King James Version (the Revised Version (British and American) "allegiance"); 1Ch 25:8; 26:12 (the Revised Version (British and American) "office," margin "ward"); Ne 12:45; 13:30 (the Revised Version (British and American) "charge"). Or "ward" may mean "guarded place," always in the phrase "put in ward." the Revised Version (British and American) has kept this phrase throughout (Ge 40:3, etc.), changing it only in Eze 19:9, where "cage" better carries out the figure of the context.

The distinction of the older English between "watch" and "ward," as applying respectively to the night and to the day seems unknown in English Versions of the Bible. Compare Isa 21:8.

The affix "-ward," denoting direction and still used in such forms as "toward," "northward," etc., had a much wider range in Biblical English. So, "to God-ward" (Ex 18:19; 2Co 3:4; 1Th 1:8); "to thee-ward" (1Sa 19:4); "to us-ward" (Ps 40:5; Eph 1:19; 2Pe 3:9 the King James Version); "to you-ward" (2Co 1:12; 13:3; Eph 3:2; 2Pe 3:9 the Revised Version (British and American)); and in Ex 37:9, the King James Version "even to the mercy seatward" (the Revised Version (British and American) "toward the mercy-seat").

Burton Scott Easton

WARES

warz (maqqachah, mekher, mimkar, kin‘ah, ma‘aseh, ‘izzabhon, keli):

(1) maqqachah, something received or purchased (Ne 10:31);

(2) mekher, "price" or "pay," value, merchandise (Ne 13:16);

(3) mimkar, a "selling," the thing sold (Ne 13:20);

(4) kin‘ah, a "package," hence, wares (Jer 10:17);

(5) ma‘aseh, "transaction," activity, property, possession, work, occupation, thing made, deed, business (Eze 27:16,18);

(6) ‘izzabhon, "selling," trade, revenue, mart, letting go for a price (Eze 27:33);

(7) keli, a "prepared" something, as an implement, tool, weapon, utensil, armor, furniture, sack, vessel, hence, wares (Jon 1:5).

In most cases the real sense is merchandise (see MERCHANDISE). "That which did not a little amuse the Merchandizers (in Vanity-Fair) was, that these Pilgrims set very light by all their Wares; they cared not so much as to look upon them" (Bunyan, The Pilgrim’s Progress).

William Edward Raffety

WARFARE

See WAR, WARFARE.

WARP

worp (shethi (Le 13:48-59)): The long threads fixed into the loom to form the basis of the web, and into which the woof is wrought from the shuttle. The warp and the woof lying at right angles to one another have in their Hebrew form (shethi we‘erebh) given to modern Jewish speech a secret expression to designate the cross.

See WEAVING.

WARS OF YAHWEH (THE LORD) BOOK OF THE

worz.

See BIBLE, IV, 1, (1), (b).

WASH; WASHING

wosh, wosh’-ing: The two usual Hebrew words for "wash" are rachats, and kabhac, the former being normally used of persons or of sacrificial animals (Ge 18:4, etc., often translated "bathe"; Le 15:5, etc.), and the latter of things (Ge 49:11, etc.), the exceptions to this distinction being few (for rachats, 1Ki 22:38 margin; for kabhac, Ps 51:2,7; Jer 2:22; 4:14). Much less common are duach (2Ch 4:6; Isa 4:4; Eze 40:38) and shataph (1Ki 22:38; Job 14:19; Eze 16:9), translated "rinse" in Le 6:28; 15:11,12. In Ne 4:23 the King James Version has "washing" and the Revised Version (British and American) "water" for mayim, but the text is hopelessly obscure (compare the Revised Version margin). In the Apocrypha and New Testament the range of terms is wider. Most common is nipto (Mt 6:17, etc.), with aponipto in Mt 27:24. Of the other terms, louo (Susanna verses 15,17; Joh 13:10, etc.), with apolouo (Ac 22:16; 1Co 6:11) and the noun loutron (Sirach 34:25b; Eph 5:26; Tit 3:5), usually has a sacral significance. On baptizo (Sirach 34:25a; Mr 7:4; Lu 11:38), with the noun baptismos (Mr 7:4 (text?); Heb 9:10), see BAPTISM. In Lu 5:2; Re 7:14; 22:14 the Revised Version (British and American) occurs pluno, while Judith 10:3 has perikluzo. Virtually, as far as meaning is concerned, all these words are interchangeable. Of the figurative uses of washing, the most common and obvious is that of cleansing from sin (Ps 51:2; Isa 1:16, etc.), but, with an entirely different figure, "to wash in" may signify "to enjoy in plenty" (Ge 49:11; Job 29:6; the meaning in So 5:12 is uncertain). Washing of the hands, in token of innocence, is found in De 21:6; Mt 27:24.

The "washing balls" of Susanna verse 17 (smegma, a very rare word) were of soap.

See SOAP.

Burton Scott Easton

WASHING OF FEET

The Old Testament references (Ge 18:4; 19:2: 24:32; 43:24; Jud 19:21; 1Sa 25:41; 2Sa 11:8; So 5:3; Ps 58:10) show that the washing of the feet was the first act on entering the tent or house after a journey. The Orientals wore only sandals, and this washing was refreshing as well as cleanly. In the case of ordinary people, the host furnished the water, and the guests washed their own feet, but in the richer houses, the washing was done by a slave. It was looked upon as the lowliest of all services (1Sa 25:41). Jesus pointedly contrasts Simon’s neglect of even giving Him water for His feet with the woman’s washing His feet with tears and wiping them with her hair (Lu 7:44). On the last evening of His life, Jesus washed the disciples’ feet (Joh 13:1-16). Their pride, heightened by the anticipations of place in

the Messianic kingdom whose crisis they immediately expected, prevented their doing this service for each other. Possibly the same pride had expressed itself on this same evening in a controversy about places at table. Jesus, conscious of His divine dignity and against Peter's protest, performed for them this lowliest service. His act of humility actually cleansed their hearts of selfish ambition, killed their pride, and taught them the lesson of love. See also The Expository Times, XI, 536 f.

Was it meant to be a perpetual ordinance? Joh 13:15, with its "as" and the present tense of the verb "do," gives it a priori probability. It has been so understood by the Mennonites and the Dunkards. Bernard of Clairvaux advocated making it a sacrament. The Pope, the Czar, and the Patriarch of Constantinople wash the feet of 12 poor men on Maundy Thursday; so did the English kings till James II, and it is still practiced in the royal palaces of Madrid, Munich and Vienna. But the objections to such an interpretation are overwhelming: (1) It is never referred to in the Synoptic Gospels, the Ac or the Epistle; 1Ti 5:10 refers only to lowly service to the saints. (2) It was first in the 4th century (compare Ambrose and Augustine) that it became the custom to wash the feet of the baptized on Maundy Thursday. (3) Ritualizing such an act of love absolutely destroys its meaning. (4) No large body of Christians has ever received it as a sacrament or an ordinance.

F. L. Anderson

According to the Belief and Practice of the Church of the Brethren

1. Practice:

Feet-washing is always practiced in connection with the Agape and the Lord's Supper. This entire service is usually called "Love Feast." These Love Feasts are always held in the evening (in conformity to the time of Jesus' Last Supper). Preparatory services on self-examination are held either at a previous service or at the opening of the Love Feast. Each church or congregation is supposed to hold one or two Love Feasts annually. No specified time of the year is set for these services. Before the supper is eaten all the communicants wash one another's feet; the brethren by themselves, and likewise the sisters by themselves.

(1) The Mode.

In earlier years the "Double Mode" was practiced, where one person would wash the feet of several persons and another would follow after and wipe them. At present the "Single Mode" is almost universal, wherein each communicant washes and wipes the feet of another. Hence, each one washes and wipes the feet of other, and in turn has this same service performed to himself.

(2) The Salutation.

Feet-washing is also accompanied with the "Holy Kiss." As soon as one has finished washing and wiping the feet of another, he takes him by the hand and greets him with the "holy kiss," usually with an

appropriate benediction as: "God bless you," or "May the Lord bless us."

2. Scriptural Basis for Feet-Washing:

There are three texts in the New Testament referring to feet-washing (Lu 7:36-50; Joh 13:1-17; 1Ti 5:10).

(1) Jesus Washing the Disciples' Feet (Joh 13:1-17).

"At supper time" (deipnou genomenou) Jesus arose, laid aside His garments (himatia =" outer garments"), girded Himself with a towel, poured water into a basin, and began to wash and wipe the feet of the disciples.

(2) Peter's Objection.

"Simon Peter .... saith unto him, Lord, dost thou wash my feet (su mou nipteis tous podas)? Jesus answered .... What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt understand hereafter. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never wash my feet." Whereupon Jesus said: "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me."

(3) Jesus Explains.

Peter now goes to the other extreme and desires complete washing. Jesus answers "He that is bathed (leloumenos, from louo, "to bathe entire body") needeth not save to wash (niptein—"to wash a part of the body") his feet." Jesus was not instituting a new symbol to take the place of baptism, to cleanse the entire person, but clearly distinguishes between the bathing (louo) of the entire body and the partial cleansing needed after the bath (baptism or immersion).

(4) The Command.

"If I then, the Lord and the Teacher, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another's feet" (Joh 13:14, kai humeis opheilete allelon niptein tous podas), "I have given you an example (sign, symbol, hupodeigma), that ye also should do as I have done to you" (Joh 13:15). "If ye know these things, happy (or "blessed" the Revised Version (British and American), makarioi) are ye if ye do them" (ean poiete auta). No language is clearer, and no command of Jesus is stronger than this. Furthermore, no symbol is accompanied with a greater promise. Note also, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me."

3. The Meaning of the Symbol:

(1) Negatively.

(a) It cannot be explained as necessity or custom, i.e. that the dust must be washed from the feet of the disciples before proceeding with the supper. It was so cold that Peter had to warm himself, and this is sufficient evidence that they wore shoes instead of sandals at this time. Furthermore, Peter did not understand the action of Jesus, hence, it could not have been customary. Most of all, Jesus was not scrupulous about keeping the customs or practices of the Jews; compare Jesus' breaking of the Jewish Sabbath (Mr 2:23-26); the Jewish fasts (Mr 2:18-22); the Jewish cleansings (Mr 7:1-20). (b) It was not customary for the host to wash the feet of the guests. Peter objected, and Jesus told him distinctly that he could not understand at the time (arti), but would afterward (meta tauta). The symbol had a deeper meaning.

(2) Positively.

(a) Feet-washing symbolizes humility and service. The apostles had been quarreling as to who would be greatest in the kingdom which they thought Jesus was about to set up (Lu 22:24-30). Most authorities agree that this quarrel took place before the supper. Peter's question. "Dost thou wash my feet?" shows clearly that his objection lay principally in this, that Jesus, the Lord and Master, should perform such humble service. But Jesus was trying all the time to teach His disciples that true greatness in His kingdom is humility and service. "I am in the midst of you as he that serveth" (Lu 22:27; compare Mt 5:5; 23:11,12). Humility and service are fundamental virtues in the Christian life. To wash the feet of another symbolizes these virtues in the same way that the Eucharist symbolizes other Christian virtues. (b) Cleansing: Jesus clearly distinguished between the first cleansing which cleanses the whole person, and the washing of a part of the body. Baptism is the new birth, which means complete cleansing. But after baptism we still commit sins, and need the partial cleansing as symbolized by feetwashing. Compare Bernard of Clairvaux: "Feet-washing is cleansing of those daily offenses which seem inevitable for those who walk in the dust of the world" (sed pedes (abluti sunt) qui aunt animae affectiones, dum in hac pulvere gradimur, ex toto mundi ease non possunt).

4. Practised by the Church of the Brethren:

Feet-washing is practiced by the Church of the Brethren for the following reasons:

(1) Jesus washed His disciples' feet and said, "I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you" (Joh 13:15).

(2) Jesus said, "Ye also ought ("are bound," opheilete) to wash one another's feet" (Joh 13:14).

(3) "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me" (Joh 13:8),

(4) "If ye know these things, blessed are ye if ye do them" (Joh 13:17).

(5) Feet-washing symbolizes humility and service, which are fundamental virtues.

(6) Feet-washing symbolizes cleansing from the sins committed after baptism.

LITERATURE.

For the Church of the Brethren: C. F. Yoder, God’s Means of Grace; R. H. Miller, The Doctrine of the Brethren Defended; tracts issued by the Brethren Publishing House, Elgin, III. For history of feet-washing, see ERE, V; New Sch-Herz Eric of Religious Knowledge, IV, 4; Smith and Cheetham, Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, articles "Baptism," "Maundy Thursday."

Daniel Webster Kurtz

WASHPOT

wosh’-pot (sir rachats, "vessel for washing"): Only Ps 60:8 = 108:9, "Moab is my washpot"; i.e. "Moab is my chattel, to betreated contemptuously," as the vessel in which the conqueror’s feet are washed.

WASP

wosp.

See HORNET.

WATCH

woch (’ashmurah, ‘ashmoreth; phulake): A division of the night. The night was originally divided into three watches (Jud 7:19), but later into four, as we find in the New Testament (Mt 14:25; Mr 6:48). We do not know the limits of the watches in the first division, but the middle watch probably began two hours before midnight and ended two hours after. The fourfold division was according to the Roman system, each of which was a fourth part of the night.

See TIME.

"Watch" is also the guard placed on watch (mishmar, Ne 4:9; koustodia, from Latin custodia, Mt 27:65,66; 28:11). It sometimes refers to the act of watching, as in 2Ki 11:6,7 (mishmereth); Lu 2:8 (phulake).

"Watch" is also used figuratively, as in Ps 141:3 for restraint: "Set a watch, O Yahweh, before my mouth" (shomrah).

See WARD.

H. Porter

WATCH-TOUR

woch’-tou-er (mitspeh (Isa 21:8; 2Ch 20:24); bachan (Isa 32:14 the Revised Version (British and American))): In Isa 2:16 the words sekhiyoth ha-chemdah have puzzled the translators. the King James Version gives "pleasant pictures," the Revised Version (British and American) "pleasant imagery," while the Revised Version margin has "pleasant watchtowers." Guthe in Kautzsch’s Bible translates Schaustucke, which practically agrees with the Revised Version (British and American).

See MIZPEH; TOWER.

WATCHER

woch’-er (Aramaic ‘ir, "wakeful one"): In Nebuchadnezzar’s dream (Da 4:13,17,23 (MT 10,14,20)) a messenger who with "a holy one" descended from heaven, they having joint authority to issue decrees. In the apocryphal literature the doctrine of the "watchers" is much elaborated. In Jubilees they are regarded as angels sent to instruct mankind in righteousness. In Enoch they sometimes appear as archangels and at other times as fallen angels. In the latter condition only we find them in the Book of Adam and Eve. The place of descent was according to Enoch 6:6 the summit of Mt. Hermon.

W. M. Christie

WATCHMAN

woch’-man (tsopheh, shomer, metsappeh, notser): Used to designate a sentinel on the city walls (2Sa 18:25; 2Ki 9:18; Ps 127:1; Isa 62:6) or on the hilltops (Jer 31:6). So 3:3; 5:7 introduces another class, "the watchmen that go about the city," and thus, it would seem, points to some system of municipal police. The distinction in meaning between the various words is clear, tsopheh having the idea of "outlooker" and notser that of "careful watcher" (being applied even to besiegers from outside: Jer 4:16, "watchers"), while shomer also embraces the idea of "defending" or "guarding." In Isa 21:6 metsappeh is to be taken generally in the sense of "watch." In Sirach 37:14 skopos, means simply "looker."

W. M. Christie

WATER

wo’-ter (mayim; hudor):

(1) The Greek philosophers believed water to be the original substance and that all things were made from it. The Koran states, "From water we have made all things." In the story of the creation (Ge 1:2)

water plays an elemental part.

(2) Because of the scarcity of water in Palestine it is especially appreciated by the people there. They love to go and sit by a stream of running water. Men long for a taste of the water of their native village (1Ch 11:17). A town or village is known throughout the country for the quality of its water, which is described by many adjectives, such as "light," "heavy," etc.

(3) The rainfall is the only source of supply of water for Palestine. The moisture is carried up from the sea in clouds and falls on the hills as rain or snow. This supplies the springs and fountains. The rivers are mostly small and have little or no water in summer. For the most part springs supply the villages, but in case this is not sufficient, cisterns are used. Most of the rain falls on the western slopes of the mountains, and most of the springs are found there. The limestone in many places does not hold the water, so wells are not very common, though there are many references to them in the Bible.

(4) Cisterns are usually on the surface of the ground and vary greatly in size. Jerusalem has always had to depend for the most part on water stored in this way, and carried to the city in aqueducts. A large number of cisterns have been found and partially explored under the temple-area itself. The water stored in the cisterns is surface water, and is a great menace to the health of the people. During the long, dry summer the water gets less and less, and becomes so stagnant and filthy that it is not fit to drink. In a few instances the cisterns or pools are sufficiently large to supply water for limited irrigation.

See CISTERN.

(5) During the summer when there is no rain, vegetation is greatly helped by the heavy dews. A considerable amount of irrigation is carried on in the country where there is sufficient water in the fountains and springs for the purpose. There was doubtless much more of it in the Roman period. Most of the fruit trees require water during the summer.

(6) Many particular wells or pools are mentioned in the Bible, as: Beersheba (Ge 21:19), Isaac’s well (Ge 24:11), Jacob’s well (Joh 4:6), Pool of Siloam (Joh 9:7), "waters of Nephtoah" (Jos 15:9).

(7) Washing with water held a considerable place in the Jewish temple-ceremony (Le 11:32; 16:4; 17:15; 22:6; Nu 19:7; Ex 30:18; 40:7). Sacrifices were washed (Ex 29:4; Le 1:9; 6:28; 14:5).

(8) The lack of water caused great suffering (Ex 15:22; De 8:15; 2Ki 3:9; Ps 63:1; Pr 9:17; Eze 4:11; La 5:4).

See also FOUNTAIN; PIT; POOL; SPRING; WELL.

Alfred H. Joy

WATER OF BITTERNESS (OR OF JEALOUSY)

See ADULTERY, (2).

WATER OF SEPARATION (OR OF UNCLEANNESS)

See DEFILEMENT; SEPARATION; UNCLEANNESS.

WATERCOURSE

wo’-ter-kors:

(1) ‘aphiq (Eze 6:3; 31:12; 32:6; 34:13; 35:8; 36:4,6), the King James Version "river," elsewhere "stream," "channel," or "brook."

(2) pelegh (Pr 21:1). "The king’s heart is in the hand of Yahweh as the watercourses," the King James Version "rivers," elsewhere "streams" or "rivers."

(3) yabhal, yibheley mayim, "watercourses" (English Versions of the Bible) (Isa 44:4); in Isa 30:25, English Versions of the Bible has "streams of water"; compare yubhal, "rivers" (Jer 17:8); yubhal, "Jubal" (Ge 4:21); ‘ubhal, "the river Ulai" (Da 8:2,3,6).

(4) te‘alah, "channel," the King James Version "watercourse" (Job 38:25); elsewhere "conduit," "the conduit of the upper pool" (2Ki 18:17; Isa 7:3; 36:2).

(5) tsinnor, "watercourse," the King James Version "gutter" (2Sa 5:8).

See BROOK; RIVER; STREAM; WATERFALL.

Alfred Ely Day

WATERFALL

wo’-ter-fol (tsinnor; only in the American Standard Revised Version (Ps 42:7)):

"Deep calleth unto deep at the

noise of thy waterfalls;

All thy waves and thy billows

are gone over me."

The King James Version and the English Revised Version have "waterspouts," the English Revised Version margin "cataracts." The etymology of the word is uncertain. It occurs also in 2Sa 5:8, translated "watercourse," the King James Version "gutter." Compare (tsanteroth), "spouts" (Zec 4:12).

WATERPOT

wo'-ter-pot (hudria; compare hudor, "water"): An earthen vessel, or jar, for carrying or holding water (in the Septuagint for kadh, "jar," or "pitcher"). It was usually carried by women upon the head, or upon the shoulder (Joh 4:28). Pots of larger size, holding eighteen or twenty gallons apiece, were used by the Jews for purposes of ceremonial purification (Joh 2:6).

WATERS

wo'-terz (mayim, plural of may, "water"; in the New Testament hudor, "water"; kindunois potamon (2Co 11:26), the King James Version "perils of waters," is in the Revised Version (British and American) "perils of rivers"): In the New Testament there is frequent reference to the water of baptism. Pilate washes his hands with water to signify his guiltlessness. Jesus tells the Samaritan woman of the living water. The Lamb shall guide the redeemed unto fountains of waters of life.

The uses of mayim are well classified in BDB, especially the figurative references, as follows: a symbol of distress, "when thou passest through the waters" (Isa 43:2); of force, "like the breach of waters" (2Sa 5:20); of that which is overwhelming, "a tempest of mighty waters overflowing" (Isa 28:2); of fear, "The hearts of the people .... became as water" (Jos 7:5); of transitoriness, "Thou shalt remember it as waters that are passed away" (Job 11:16); of refreshment, "as streams of water in a dry place" (Isa 32:2); of peace, "He leadeth me beside still waters" (Ps 23:2); of legitimate pleasures, "waters out of thine own cistern" (Pr 5:15); of illegitimate pleasures, "Stolen waters are sweet" (Pr 9:17); of that which is poured out abundantly, blood (Ps 79:3), wrath (Ho 5:10), justice (Am 5:24), groanings (Job 3:24).

Alfred Ely Day

WATERS OF MEROM

See MEROM, WATERS OF.

WATERS OF STRIFE

strif.

See MERIBAH.

WATERSPOUT

wo’-ter-spout:

(1) (tsinnor) (Ps 42:7), the American Standard Revised Version "waterfalls," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "waterspouts," the English Revised Version margin "cataracts."

(2) (tannin) (Ps 148:7), the American Standard Revised Version "sea-monsters," the King James Version and the English Revised Version "dragons," the English Revised Version margin, "sea-monsters" or "water-spouts."

"Praise Yahweh from the earth, Ye sea-monsters, and all deeps."

See DRAGON; SEA-MONSTER; WATERFALL.

Alfred Ely Day

WAVE OFFERING

wav of’-er-ing.

See SACRIFICE.

WAW

waw "w": The sixth letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia "w" (or "v"). It came also to be used for the number 6. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

WAX

waks:

(1) Noun (donagh): Used only in a simile of melting (Ps 22:14; 68:2; 97:5; Mic 1:4).

See WRITING.

(2) A now archaic verb, meaning "to grow," used freely in English Versions of the Bible as a translation of various terms in Greek and Hebrew. The past participle in the King James Version and the English Revised Version is "waxen," except in Ge 18:12. There (and throughout in the American Standard Revised Version) the form is "waxed."

WAY

wa (’orach, orcha’,’ erets, bo’, derekh, halikhah, ma‘galah, nathibh; hodos, parodos, poreia, tropos; "highway," mecillah, meclul; diexodoi ton hodon): The list just cited contains only a portion of the words translated "way" or "highway" in the King James Version. Most of them have the primary meaning of "road," "customary path," "course of travel" (Ge 3:24; Ex 23:20; Nu 20:17, etc.). By a very easy and natural figure "way" is applied to the course of human conduct, the manner of life which one lives (Ex 18:20; 32:8; Nu 22:32; 1Sa 8:3; 1Ki 13:33, etc.; Ac 14:16; 1Co 4:17; Jas 5:20). "The way of an eagle .... of a serpent .... of a ship .... and of a man" (Pr 30:19) agree in that they leave no trace behind them (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 5:10,11). In some cases the language may be such as to leave it indeterminate whether the way or course of conduct is good or bad (De 28:29; 1Sa 18:14; 2Ch 27:7; Job 13:15; Pr 3:6; 6:6; Jas 1:8), though in most cases the Bible writers attach to every act an ethical evaluation. Sometimes this way of conduct is of purely human choice, without reference to either God or good (Jud 2:19; Job 22:15; 34:21; Ps 119:9; Pr 12:15; 16:2). Such a course is evil (2Ch 7:14; Ps 1:6; 119:101,104,128; Pr 1:19, etc.) and will obtain such punishment as its lack of merit warrants (1Ki 8:32,39; 2Ch 6:23; Job 30:12; 34:11; Jer 17:10; Ezk 7:3,9; Ho 12:2). At the opposite extreme from this is the good way (Ps 1:6; Pr 8:20; 12:28; 15:10; Isa 26:7), which is that course of conduct enjoined by God and exemplified in His perfect conduct (Ge 6:12; 18:19; De 8:6; 26:17; 1Ki 2:3; Job 23:11; Ps 51:13, etc.). These two ways briefly but graphically described by the Lord (Mt 7:13,14; compare Lu 13:24) became the subject of extended catechetical instruction in the early church. See the Epistle of Barnabas, xviii, and the Didache i.1. Frequently the way in this metaphorical sense is characterized by that quality which is its outstanding feature, e.g. mention is made of the way of life (Pr 15:24; Jer 21:8; Ac 2:28); of truth (Ps 119:30; 2Pe 2:2); of peace (Isa 59:8; Lu 1:79; Ro 3:17); of justice (Pr 17:23; Da 4:37); of righteousness (Mt 21:32; 2Pe 2:21); of salvation (Ac 16:17); of lying (Ps 119:29), and of death (Jer 21:8). Frequently God’s purpose or His customary action is described as His way (Ps 103:7; Isa 26:8; Mt 22:16; Ac 13:10). Since all of God’s plans and purposes tend toward man’s salvation, His provisions to this end are frequently spoken of as His Way, and inasmuch as all of the divine plans center in Christ He is preeminently the Way (Joh 14:6). Out of this fact grew the title, "The Way," one of the earliest names applied to Christianity (Ac 9:2; 18:25,26; 19:9,23; 22:4; 24:22).

The word highway is used to denote a prominent road, such a one for example as was in ancient times maintained for royal travel and by royal authority. It is always used in the literal sense except in Pr 15:19; 16:17, where it is a course of conduct.

See also PATH, PATHWAY.

W. C. Morro

WAY, COVERED

See COVERED WAY.

WAY, LITTLE

(kibhrah, "length," "a measure"): A technical measure of distance in the Hebrew; but it must be considered undefined (Ge 35:16; 48:7 the King James Version, the English Revised Version "some way," the American Standard Revised Version "some distance"; 2Ki 5:19, the English Revised Version "some way," the American Revised Version margin "some distance"). The Hebrew term kibhrah is also found in Phoenician inscriptions as a measure of distance.

WAYFARING MAN

wa'-far-ing, The translation in Jud 19:17; 2Sa 12:4; Jer 9:2; 14:8 of (’oreach), the participle of ‘arach, "to journey." In Isa 33:8 of ‘obher ‘orach, "one passing on a path," and in Isa 35:8 of holekh derekh, "one walking on a road." "Traveler" is the meaning in all cases.

WAYMARK

wa'-mark (tsyun): In Jer 31:21, "Set thee up waymarks," explained by the parallel, "Make thee guide-posts" (the King James Version "Make thee high heaps"). A sign or guiding mark on the highway.

WEALTH, WEALTHY

welth, wel'-thi (hon, chayil, nekhacim; euporia, "to possess riches," "to be in a position of ease" (Jer 49:31)): The possession of wealth is not regarded as sinful, but, on the contrary, was looked upon as a sign of the blessing of God (Ec 5:19; 6:2). The doctrine of "blessed are the poor, and cursed are the rich" finds no countenance in the Scriptures, for Lu 6:20,24 refers to concrete conditions (disciples and persecutors; note the "ye"). God is the maker of rich and poor alike (Pr 22:2). But while it is not sinful to be rich it is very dangerous, and certainly perilous to one's salvation (Mt 19:23). Of this fact the rich young ruler is a striking example (Lu 18:22,23). It is because of the danger of losing the soul through the possession of wealth that so many exhortations are found in the Scriptures aimed especially at those who have an abundance of this world's goods (1Ti 6:17; Jas 1:10,11; 5:1, etc.). Certain parables are especially worthy of note in this same connection, e.g. the Rich Fool (Lu 12:16-21), the Rich Man and Lazarus—if such can be called a parable—(Lu 16:19-31). That it is not impossible for men of wealth to be saved, however, is apparent from the narratives, in the Gospels, of such rich men as Nicodemus, and Joseph of Arimathea (Joh 19:38,39; Mt 27:57-60), and Zaccheus (Lu 19:1-10). It may fairly be inferred from the Gospel records that James and John, who were disciples of our Lord, were men of considerable means (Mr 1:19,20; Joh 19:27).

Wealth may be the result of industry (Pr 10:4), or the result of the special blessing of God (2Ch 1:11,12). We are warned to be careful lest at any time we should say "My power and the might of my hand hath gotten me this wealth. But thou shalt remember Yahweh thy God, for it is he that giveth thee power to

get wealth" (De 8:17,18).

Those possessing wealth are liable to certain kinds of sins against which they are frequently warned, e. g., highmindedness (1Ti 6:17); oppression of the poor (Jas 2:6); selfishness (Lu 12 and 16); dishonesty (Lu 19:1-10); self-conceit (Pr 28:11); self-trust (Pr 18:11).

It is of interest to note that in the five places in the New Testament in which the word "lucre"—as applying to wealth—is used, it is prefaced by the word "filthy" (1Ti 3:3 (the King James Version), 8; Tit 1:7,11; 1Pe 5:2), and that in four of these five places it refers to the income of ministers of the gospel, as though they were particularly susceptible of being led away by the influences and power of money, and so needed special warning.

The Scriptures are not without instruction as to how we may use our wealth wisely and as well-pleasing to God. The parable of the Unjust Steward (Lu 16) exhorts us to "make .... friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness," by which is meant that we should use the wealth which God has committed to us as stewards in order that we may win friends (souls) with it for Him and His kingdom, just as the unfaithful steward used the goods with which his master had entrusted him to make friends for himself. The parable of Dives and Lazarus gives us the sad picture of a selfish rich man who had abused his trust, who had failed to make friends with his money, and who, in the other world, would have given anything just for such a friend (Lu 16:19-31).

See also RICHES.

William Evans

WEAN

wen: "To wean" in English Versions of the Bible is always the translation of (gamal), but gamal has a much wider force than merely "to wean," signifying "to deal fully with," as in Ps 13:6, etc. Hence, as applied to a child, gamal covers the whole period of nursing and care until the weaning is complete (1Ki 11:20). This period in ancient Israel extended to about 3 years, and when it was finished the child was mature enough to be entrusted to strangers (1Sa 1:24). And, as the completion of the period marked the end of the most critical stage of the child’s life, it was celebrated with a feast (Ge 21:8), a custom still observed in the Orient. The weaned child, no longer fretting for the breast and satisfied with its mother’s affection, is used in Ps 131:2 as a figure for Israel’s contentment with God’s care, despite the smallness of earthly possessions. In Isa 28:9 there is an ironical question, ‘Is God to teach you knowledge as if you were children? You should have learned His will long ago!’

Burton Scott Easton

WEAPONS

wep’-unz.

See ARMOR.

WEASEL we’-z’-l (choledh; compare Arabic khuld, "mole-rat"):

(1) Choledh is found only in Le 11:29, where it stands first in the list of eight unclean "creeping things that creep upon the earth." the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) agree in rendering choledh by "weasel," and the Septuagint has gale, "weasel" or "marten." According to Gesenius, the Vulgate, Targum, and Talmud support the same rendering. In spite of this array of authorities, it is worth while to consider the claims of the mole-rat, Spalax typhlus, Arabic khuld. This is a very common rodent, similar in appearance and habits to the mole, which does not exist in Palestine. The fact that it burrows may be considered against it, in view of the words, "that creepeth upon the earth." The term "creeping thing" is, however, very applicable to it, and the objection seems like a quibble, especially in view of the fact that there is no category of subterranean animals. See MOLE.

(2) The weasel, Mustela vulgaris, has a wide range in Asia, Europe, and North America. It is from 8 to 10 inches long, including the short tail. It is brown above and white below. In the northern part of its range, its whole fur, except the tail, is white in winter. It is active and fearless, and preys upon all sorts of small mammals, birds and insects.

See LIZARD.

Alfred Ely Day

WEATHER

weth’-er (zahabh (Job 37:22), yom (Pr 25:20), translated "day"; eudia, "clear sky," cheimon, "tempest"): In the East it is not customary to talk of the weather as in the West. There seems to be no word in the Hebrew corresponding to "weather." In Job 37:22 the King James Version translates "Fair weather comes out of the north," but the Revised Version (British and American) translates more literally, "Out of the north cometh golden splendor." "As one that taketh off a garment in cold weather (or literally, "on a cold day"), ... so is he that singeth songs to a heavy heart" (Pr 25:20).

Jesus rebukes the Pharisees for their lack of spiritual foresight when they took such interest in natural foresight. He said, "When it is evening, ye say, It will be fair weather: for the heaven is red. And in the morning, It will be foul weather to-day: for the heaven is red and lowering" (Mt 16:2,3). The general conditions of the weather in the different seasons are less variable in Palestine than in colder countries, but the precise weather for a given day is very hard to predict on account of the proximity of the mountains, the desert and the sea.

Alfred H. Joy

WEAVING

we’-ving: Although weaving was one of the most important and best developed of the crafts of Bible times, yet we have but few Biblical references to enlighten us as to the processes used in those early days. A knowledge of the technique of weaving is necessary, however, if we are to understand some of the Biblical incidents. The principle of weaving in all ages is illustrated by the process of darning. The hole to be darned is laid over with parallel threads which correspond to the "warp" (shethi) of a woven fabric. Then, by means of a darning needle which takes the place of the shuttle in the loom, other threads are interlaced back and forth at right angles to the first set of strands. This second set corresponds to the woof (‘erebh) or weft of woven cloth. The result is a web of threads across the hole. If the warp threads, instead of being attached to the edges of a fabric, are fastened to two beams which can be stretched either on a frame or on the ground, and the woof is interlaced exactly as in darning, the result will be a web of cloth. The process is then called weaving (’aragh), and the apparatus a loom. The most up-to-date loom of our modern mills differs from the above only in the devices for accelerating the process. The first of these improvements dates back some 5,000 years to the early Egyptians, who discovered what is technically known as shedding, i.e. dividing the warp into two sets of threads, every other thread being lifted so that the woof can run between, as is shown in the diagram of the Arabic loom.of considerable means (Mr 1:19,20; Joh 19:27).

The looms are still commonly used among the Bedouins. Supppose only eight threads are used for an illustration. In reality the eight strands are made by passing one continuous thread back and forth between the two poles which are held apart by stakes driven into the ground. The even strands run through loops of string attached to a rod, and from there under a beam to the pole. By placing the ends upon stones, or by suspending it on loops, the even threads are raised above the odd threads, thus forming a shed through which the weft can be passed. The separating of odds and evens is assisted by a flat board of wedge-shaped cross-section, which is turned at right angles to the odd threads. After the shuttle has been passed across, this same stick is used to beat up the weft.

The threads are removed from the stones or loops, and allowed to lie loosely on the warp; it is pulled forward toward the weaver and raised on the stones in the position previously occupied by it. The flat spreader is passed through the new shed in which the odd threads are now above and the even threads below. The weft is run through and is beaten into place with the thin edge of it. The shuttle commonly used is a straight tree branch on which the thread is loosely wound "kite-string" fashion.

The loom used by Delilah was no doubt like the one described above (Jud 16:13,14). It would have been an easy matter for her to run in Samson’s locks as strands of the weft while he lay sleeping on the ground near the loom adjacent to rod under the beam. The passage might be transposed thus: "And he said unto her, If thou weavest the seven locks of my head into the web. And she passed in his locks and beat them up with the batten (yathedh), and said unto him, The Philistines are upon thee, Samson. And he awakened out of his sleep and as he jumped up he pulled away the pins of the loom."

The counterpart of the Bedouin loom is shown on the ancient tombs at Beni Chasan (see EB, 5279, or Wilkinson, I, 317). As Dr. Kennedy points out, the artist of that ancient picture has unwittingly reversed the order of the beams. The shedding beam, of the two, should be nearer the weaver. At what period the crude shedding device described above was replaced by a double set of loops worked by pedals is unknown. Some writers believe that the Jews were acquainted with it. The "flying shuttle" of the modern loom is probably a comparatively recent invention.

The products of the Bedouin looms are coarse in texture. Such passages as Ex 35:35; Isa 19:9, and examples of ancient weaving, lead us to believe that in Bible times contemporaneous with the primitive loom were more highly developed machines, just as in the cities of Egypt and Palestine today, alongside of the crude Bedouin loom, are found the more intricate hand looms on which are produced the most delicate fabrics possible to the weaver's article. Examples of cloth comparing favorably with our best grades of muslin have been found among the Egyptian mummy wrappings.

Two other forms of looms have been used for weaving, in both of which the warp is upright. In one type the strands of the warp, singly or in bundles, are suspended from a beam and held taut by numerous small weights made of stones or pottery. Dr. Bliss found at Tel el-Chesy collections of weights, sometimes 60 or more together, individual examples of which showed marks where cords had been attached to them. These he assumed were weavers' weights (see A Mound of Many Cities). In this form the weaving was necessarily from top to bottom.

The second type of upright loom is still used in some parts of Syria, especially for weaving coarse goat's hair cloth. In this form the warp is attached to the lower beam and passes vertically upward over another beam and thence to a wall where it is gathered in a rope and tied to a peg, or it is held taut by heavy stone weights. The manipulation is much the same as in the primitive loom, except that the weft is beaten up with an iron comb. The web is wound up on the lower beam as it is woven (compare Isa 38:12).

Patterns are woven into the web

(1) by making the warp threads of different colors,

(2) by alternating colors in the weft,

(3) by a combination of (1) and (2); this produces checked work (shibbets, Ex 28:39 the Revised Version (British and American));

(4) by running special weft threads through only a portion of the warp. This requires much skill and is probably the kind of weaving referred to in Ex 26:1 ff; Eze 16:13; 27:16;

(5) when metals are to be woven, they are rolled thin, cut into narrow strips, wound in spirals about

threads of cotton or linen (compare Ex 28:5 ff; 39:3 ff). In all these kinds of weaving the Syrian weavers of today are very skillful. If a cylindrical web is referred to in Joh 19:23, then Jesus' tunic must have been woven with two sets of warp threads on an upright loom so arranged that the weft could be passed first through one shed and then around to the other side and back through the shed of the second set.

Goliath's spear was compared in thickness to that of the weaver's beam, i.e. 2 inches to 2 1/2 inches in diameter (1Sa 17:7; 2Sa 21:19; 1Ch 11:23; 20:5).

In Job 7:6, if "shuttle" is the right rendering for 'eregh, the reference is to the rapidity with which the thread of the shuttle is used up, as the second part of the verse indicates.

For a very full discussion of the terms employed see A. R. S. Kennedy in EB, IV, 5276-90.

James A. Patch

WEB

See SPIDER; WEAVING.

WEDDING

See MARRIAGE.

WEDGE, OF GOLD

wej, (lashon zahabh, literally, "tongue of gold"): A piece of gold in the form of a wedge found by Achan in the sack of Jericho. It was in one of the forms in which gold was used for money and was probably stamped or marked to indicate its weight, which was 50 shekels, i.e. one maneh, according to the Hebrew standard, or nearly two pounds troy. Its value would be 102 British pounds 10 shillings or $510.00 (in 1915). See MONEY; POUND. A wedge, or rather, oblong rectangular strip of gold, of similar weight has been found in the excavations of Gezer (Macalister, Bible Side-Lights, 121). Along with metal rings they were doubtless used as an early form of currency. In Isa 13:12 the King James Version, kethem, "pure gold" (so the Revised Version (British and American)), is translated as "golden wedge" on insufficient grounds.

H. Porter

WEEDS

wedz (cuph, "a weed" (Jon 2:5)).

See FLAG; COCKLE; RED SEA.

WEEK

wek (shebhua‘, from shebha‘, "seven"; sabbaton-ta, "from sabbath to sabbath"): The seven-day division of time common to the Hebrews and Babylonians (Ge 29:27,28; Lu 18:12). See ASTRONOMY; TIME. "Week" is used in the apocalyptic writings of Daniel for an unknown, prophetic period (Da 9:24-27). For the names of the days see ASTROLOGY, 12.

WEEKS, FEAST OF

See PENTECOST.

WEEKS, SEVENTY

See SEVENTY WEEKS.

WEEPING

wep’-ing.

See BURIAL, IV, 4, 5, 6.

WEIGHT

wat (Measure of quantity) mishqal, (mishqol (Eze 4:10), from shaqkal, "to weigh" ‘ebhen, "a stone" used for weighing in the balance): Weights were commonly of stone or bronze (or of lead, Zec 5:7,8). They were of various forms, such as the lion-shaped weights of Babylonia and Assyria, or in the form of birds and other animals. The Hebrew and Phoenician weights, when made of stone, were barrel-shaped or spindle-shaped, but in bronze they were often cubical or octagonal or with numerous faces (see illustration under WEIGHTS AND MEASURES). Hemispherical or dome-shaped stone weights have been found in Palestine (PEFS, 1902, p. 344; 1903, p. 117; 1904, p. 209).

Figurative: The phrase "without weight" (2Ki 25:16) signifies a quantity too great to be estimated. "Weight of glory" (2Co 4:17, baros) has a similar meaning, but with a spiritual reference. "Weighty," "weightier" (Mt 23:23; 2Co 10:10, barus, baruteros), signify what is important. The Greek (ogkos) (Heb 12:1), is used in the sense of burden, hindrance, as is also the Hebrew neTel (Pr 27:3).

H. Porter

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

wats me’-zhur:The system of weights and measures in use among the Hebrews was derived from Babylonia and Egypt, especially from the former. The influence of these countries upon Palestine has long been recognized, but archaeological investigations in recent years have shown that the civilization of Babylonia impressed itself upon Syria and Palestine more profoundly in early times than did that of Egypt. The evidence of this has been most clearly shown by the discovery of the Tell el-Amarna Letters, which reveal the fact that the official correspondence between the Egyptian kings and their vassals in these lands was carried on in the language of Babylonia long after its political influence had been supplanted by that of Egypt. It is natural, then, that we should look to Babylonia for the origin of such important elements of civilization as a system of weights and measures.

1. Linear Measures:

It was quite natural that men should have found a standard for linear measures in the parts of the human body, and we find the cubit, originally the length of the forearm, taken as the standard, and the span, the palm and the digit, or finger-breadth, associated with it in linear measurement. They do not seem to have employed the foot, though it is represented in the two-thirds of the cubit, which was used by the Babylonians in the manufacture of building-brick.

This system, though adequate enough for man in the earliest times, was not so for an advanced stage of civilization, such as the Babylonians reached before the days of Abraham, and we find that they had introduced a far more accurate and scientific system (see CUBIT). They seem to have employed, however, two cubits, of different lengths, one for commercial purposes and one for building. We have no undoubted examples of either, but judging by the dimensions of their square building-bricks, which are regarded as being two-thirds of a cubit on a side, we judge the latter to have been of about 19 or 20 inches. Now we learn from investigations in Egypt that a similar cubit was employed there, being of from 20.6 to 20.77 inches, and it can hardly be doubted that the Hebrews were familiar with this cubit, but that in more common use was certainly shorter. We have no certain means of determining the length of the ordinary cubit among the Hebrews, but there are two ways by which we may approximate its value. The Siloam Inscription states that the tunnel in which it was found was 1,200 cubits long. The actual length has been found to be about 1,707 feet, which would give a cubit of about 17.1 in. (see PEFS, 1902, 179). Of course the given length may be a round number, but it gives a close approximation.

Again, the Mishna states that the height of a man is 4 cubits, which we may thus regard as the average stature of a Jew in former times. By reference to Jewish tombs we find that they were of a length to give a cubit of something over 17 inches, supposing the stature to be as above, which approximates very closely to the cubit of the Siloam tunnel. The consensus of opinion at the present day inclines toward a cubit of 17.6 inches for commercial purposes and one of about 20 inches for building. This custom of having two standards is illustrated by the practice in Syria today, where the builder’s measure, or dra’, is about 2 inches longer than the commercial.

Of multiples of the cubit we have the measuring-reed of 6 long cubits, which consisted of a cubit and a hand-breadth each (Eze 40:5), or about 10 feet. Another measure was the Sabbath day's journey, which was reckoned at 2,000 cubits, or about 1,000 yards. The measuring-line was used also, but whether it had a fixed length we do not know.

See SABBATH DAY'S JOURNEY; MEASURING LINE.

In the New Testament we have the fathom (orguia), about 6 feet, and the furlong (stadion), 600 Greek feet or 606 3/4 English feet, which is somewhat less than one-eighth of a mile. The mile (milion) was 5,000 Roman feet, or 4,854 English feet, somewhat less than the English mile.

2. Measures of Capacity:

Regarding the absolute value of the measures of capacity among the Hebrews there is rather more uncertainty than there is concerning those of length and weight, since no examples of the former have come down to us; but their relative value is known. Sir Charles Warren considers them to have been derived from the measures of length by cubing the cubit and its divisions, as also in the case of weight. We learn from Eze 45:11 that the bath and ephah were equivalent, and he (Warren) estimates the capacity of these as that of 1/30 of the cubit cubed, or about 2,333.3 cubic inches, which would correspond to about 9 gallons English measure. Assuming this as the standard, we get the following tables for liquid and dry measure: Ce'ah and lethekh, in the above, occur in the Hebrew text, but only in the margin of the English. It will be noticed that the prevailing element in these tables is the duodecimal which corresponds to the sexagesimal of the Babylonian system, but it will be seen that in the case of weights there was a tendency on the part of the Hebrews to employ the decimal system, making the maneh 50 shekels instead of 60, and the talent 3,000 instead of 3,600, of the Babylonian, so here we see the same tendency in making the 'omer the tenth of the 'ephah and the 'ephah the tenth of the chomer or kor.

3. Weights:

Weights were probably based by the ancients upon grains of wheat or barley, but the Egyptians and Babylonians early adopted a more scientific method. Sir Charles Warren thinks that they took the cubes of the measures of length and ascertained how many grains of barley corresponded to the quantity of water these cubes would contain. Thus, he infers that the Egyptians fixed the weight of a cubic inch of rain water at 220 grains, and the Babylonians at 222 2/9. Taking the cubic palm at 25,928 cubic inches, the weight of that quantity of water would be 5,760 ancient grains. The talent he regards as the weight of 2/3 of a cubit cubed, which would be equal to 101,6 cubic palms, but assumes that for convenience it was taken at 100, the weight being 576,000 grains, deriving from this the maneh (1/60 of the talent) of 9,600 grains, and a shekel (1/50 of the maneh) 192 grains. But we have evidence that the Hebrew shekel differed from this and that they used different shekels at different periods. The shekel derived from Babylonia had a double standard: the light of 160 grains, or 1/3600 of the talent; and the heavy of just double this, of 320 grains. The former seems to have been used before the captivity and the latter after.

The Babylonian system was sexagesimal, i.e. 60 shekels went to the maneh and 60 manehs to the talent, but the Hebrews reckoned only 50 shekels to the maneh, as appears from Ex 38:25,26, where it is stated that the amount of silver collected from 603,550 males was 100 talents and 1,775 shekels, and, as each contributed a half-shekel, the whole amount must have been 301,775. Deducting the 1,775 shekels mentioned besides the 100 talents, we have 300,000 or 3,000 to the talent, and, as there were 60 manehs in the talent, there were 50 shekels to each maneh. When the Hebrews adopted this system we do not know, but it was in vogue at a very early date.

The shekel was divided into gerahs, 20 to a shekel (Ex 30:13). The gerah (gerah) is supposed to be some kind of seed, perhaps a bean or some such plant. The shekel of which it formed a part was probably the royal or commercial shekel of 160 grains, derived from Babylon. But the Hebrews certainly had another shekel, called the Phoenician from its being the standard of the Phoenician traders. This would be natural on account of the close connection of the two peoples ever since the days of David and Solomon, but we have certain evidence of it from the extant examples of the monetary shekels of the Jews, which are of this standard, or very nearly so, allowing some loss from abrasion. The Phoenician shekel was about 224 grains, varying somewhat in different localities, and the Jewish shekels now in existence vary from 212 to 220 grains. They were coined after the captivity (see COINS), but whether this standard was in use before we have no means of knowing.

Examples of ancient weights have been discovered in Palestine by archaeological research during recent years, among them one from Samaria, obtained by Dr. Chaplin, bearing the inscription, in Hebrew rebha‘ netseph. This is interpreted, by the help of the cognate Arabic, as meaning "quarter-half," i.e. of a shekel. The actual weight is 39.2 grains, which, allowing a slight loss, would correspond quite closely to a quarter-shekel of the light Babylonian standard of 160 grains, or the quarter of the half of the double standard. Another specimen discovered at Tell Zakariyeh weighs 154 grains, which would seem to belong to the same standard. The weights, of which illustrations are given in the table, are all in the collection of the Syrian Protestant College, at Beirut, and were obtained from Palestine and Phoenicia and are of the Phoenician standard, which was the common commercial standard of Palestine. The largest, of the spindle or barrel type, weighs 1,350 grains, or 87.46 grams, evidently intended for a 6-shekel weight, and the smaller ones of the same type are fractions of the Phoenician shekel. They were of the same standard, one a shekel and the other a two-shekel weight. They each have 12 faces, and the smaller has a lion stamped on each face save one, reminding us of the lion-weights discovered in Assyria and Babylonia. The spindle weights are of black stone, the others of bronze.

The above is the Phoenician standard. In the Babylonian the shekel would be 160 or 320 grains; the maneh 8,000 or 16,000, and the talent 480,000 or 960,000 grains, according as it was of the light or heavy standard.

H. Porter

WELL

(1) (be’er; compare Arabic bi’r, "well" or "cistern"; usually artificial: "And Isaac’s servants digged (dug) in the valley, and found there a well of springing (margin "living") water" (Ge 26:19); some times covered: "Jacob .... rolled the stone from the well’s mouth" (Ge 29:10). Be’er may also be a pit: "The vale of Siddim was full of slime pits" (Ge 14:10); "the pit of destruction" (Ps 55:23).

(2) (bor), usually "pit": "Let us slay him, and cast him into one of the pits" (Ge 37:20); may be "well": "drew water out of the well of Beth-lehem" (2Sa 23:16).

(3) (pege), usually "running water," "fount," or "source": "Doth the fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter?" (Jas 3:11); may be "well"; compare "Jacob’s well" (Joh 4:6).

(4) (phrear), usually "pit": "the pit of the abyss" (Re 9:1); but "well"; compare "Jacob’s well" (Joh 4:11,12): "Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a well" (the King James Version "pit") (Lu 14:5).

(5) (krene), "wells" (Sirach 48:17), Latin, fons, "spring" (2 Esdras 2:32).

(6) ayin), compare Arabic ‘ain "fountain," "spring": "the fountain (English Versions of the Bible) which is in Jezreel" (1Sa 29:1); "In Elim were twelve springs (the King James Version "fountains"] of water" (Nu 33:9); "She (Rebekah) went down to the fountain" (the King James Version "well") (Ge 24:16); "the jackal’s well" (the English Revised Version "the dragon’s well," the King James Version "the dragon well") (Ne 2:13).

(7) (ma‘yan), same root as (6); "the fountain (the King James Version "well") of the waters of Nephtoah" (Jos 18:15); "Passing through the valley of Weeping (the King James Version "Baca") they make it a place of springs" (the King James Version "well") (Ps 84:6); "Ye shall draw water out of the wells of salvation" (Isa 12:3).

(8) (maqor), usually figurative: "With thee is the fountain of life" (Ps 36:9); "The mouth of the righteous is a fountain (the King James Version "well") of life" (Pr 10:11); "make her (Babylon’s) fountain (the King James Version "spring") dry" (Jer 51:36); "a corrupted spring" (Pr 25:26).

(9) (mabbu‘), (nabha‘, "to flow," "spring," "bubble up"; compare Arabic (nab‘, manba‘, yanbu‘) "fountain": "or the pitcher is broken at the fountain" (Ec 12:6); "the thirsty ground springs of water" (Isa 35:7).

(10) (motsa’)," spring," (yatsa’)," to go out," "the dry land springs of water" (Isa 41:18); "a dry land into watersprings" (Ps 107:35); "the upper spring of the waters of Gihon" (2Ch 32:30).

(11) (nebhekh), root uncertain, reading doubtful; only in Job 38:16, "Hast thou entered into the springs of the sea?"

(12) (tehom), "deep," "abyss"; compare Ge 1:2; translated "springs," the King James Version "depths" (De 8:7).

(13) (gal), (galal), "to roll"; compare Gilgal (Jos 5:9); "a spring shut up" (So 4:12).

(14) (gullah), "bowl," "basin," "pool," same root: "Give me also springs of water. And he gave her the upper sprigs and the nether springs" (Jos 15:19); compare Arabic (kullat), pronounced gullat, "a marble," "a cannon-ball."

As is clear from references cited above, wells and springs were not sharply distinguished in name, though be'er, and phrear are used mainly of wells, and 'ayin, ma'yan, motsa', mabbua' and (poetically) maqor are chiefly used of fountains. The Arabic bi'r, the equivalent of the Hebrew be'er, usually denotes a cistern for rain-water, though it may be qualified as bi'r jam', "well of gathering," i.e. for rain-water, or as bi'r nab', "well of springing water." A spring or natural fountain is called in Arabic 'ain or nab' (compare Hebrew 'ayin and mabbua'). These Arabic and Hebrew words for "well" and "spring" figure largely in place-names, modern and ancient: Beer (Nu 21:16); Beer-elim (Isa 15:8), etc.; 'Ain

(a) on the northeast boundary of Palestine (Nu 34:11),

(b) in the South of Judah, perhaps = En-rimmon (Jos 15:32); Enaim (Ge 38:14); Enam (Jos 15:34), etc.

Modern Arabic names with 'ain are very numerous, e.g. 'Ainul-fashkhah, 'Ain-ul-chajleh, 'Ain-karim, etc.

See CISTERN; FOUNTAIN; PIT; POOL.

Alfred Ely Day

WELL, JACOB'S

See JACOB'S WELL.

WELLSPRING

wel'-spring (maqor): Usually "spring" or "fountain" (figuratively), translated "wellspring" only in two passages: "Understanding is a wellspring of life unto him that hath it" (Pr 16:22); "The wellspring of wisdom is as a flowing brook" (Pr 18:4). See Burroughs, Pepacton, p. 35; WELL.

WEN

Only in Le 22:22, "maimed" or "having a wen (margin "sores"), or scurvy," for (yabbal), "running,"

hence, "a suppurating sore" (compare the Revised Version margin). A "wen" is a non-inflamed indolent tumor, and so "wen" is about as far as possible from the meaning of the Hebrew.

WENCH

wench, wensh (shiphchah): The word "wench" is found only in 2Sa 17:17 the King James Version, where the Revised Version (British and American) has "maid-servant." The Hebrew word shiphchah here used is a common term for maid-servant, female slave. the King James Version used the word "wench" to convey the meaning maid-servant, which was a common use of the word at that time, but it is now practically obsolete.

WEST

(1) Usually (yam), "sea" because the Mediterranean lies to the West of Palestine; not usually in figurative expressions; but compare Ho 11:10.

(2) Often (ma‘arabh); compare Arabic (gharb), and (maghrib), "west" (maghrib-ush-shems), or simply (maghrib), "sunset."

(3) (mebho’ ha-chemesh), "entrance of the sun," (mabho’, bo’)," to come in." (Just as mizrach, is the rising of the sun, or east, so mabho’ (or ma’arabh], is the setting of the sun, or west: "From the rising of the sun (mizrach-shemesh) unto the going down (mabho) thereof" (Ps 50:1; compare 113:3; Mal 1:11).)

(4) (dusme, from duo), "to enter," "sink," "set." The Greek usage is parallel to the Hebrew just cited: "Many shall come from the east anatole, "rising") and the west" (dusme, "setting") (Mt 8:11).

The chief figurative use of the word "west" is in combination with "east" to denote great or infinite distance, as:

"As far as the east is from the west,

So far hath he removed our transgressions

from us" (Ps 103:12).

Alfred Ely Day

WHALE

hwal:

(1) ketos (Sirach 43:25 (the Revised Version (British and American) "sea-monster"); The So of Three Children verse 57 (the Revised Version (British and American) "whale"); Mt 12:40 (the Revised Version (British and American) "whale," margin "sea-monster"; the King James Version "whale" throughout)).

(2) tannin (Ge 1:21; Job 7:12), "sea-monster," the King James Version "whale."

(3) tannim (Eze 32:2), "monster," the English Revised Version "dragon" the King James Version "whale" the King James Version margin "dragon."

It will be seen from the above references that the word "whale" does not occur in the Revised Version (British and American) except in The So of Three Children verse 57 and Mt 12:40. Ketos, the original word in these passages, is, according to Liddell and Scott, used by Aristotle for "whale," Aristotle using also the adjective ketodes, "cetacean"; Homer and Herodotus used ketos for any large fish or sea-monster or for a seal. It is used in Euripides of the monster to which Andromeda was exposed. In the Hebrew, in the Book of Jonah, we find dagh or daghah, the ordinary word for "fish": "And Yahweh prepared great fish to swallow up Jonah" (Jon 1:17). Whales are found in the Mediterranean and are sometimes cast up on the shore of Palestine, but it is not likely that the ancient Greeks or Hebrews were very familiar with them, and it is by no means certain that whale is referred to, either in the original Jonah story or in the New Testament reference to it. If any particular animal is meant, it is more likely a shark. Sharks are much more familiar objects in the Mediterranean than whales, and some of them are of large size.

See FISH.

In Ge 1:21, "And God created the great seamonsters" (the King James Version, "whales"), and Job 7:12,

"Am I a sea, or a sea-monster (the King James Version "whale"),

That thou settest a watch over me?"

The Hebrew has tannin, which word occurs 14 times in the Old Testament and in the American Standard Revised Version is translated "monster," "sea-monster," or "serpent," and, exceptionally, in La 4:3, "jackals." the King James Version renders in several passages "dragon" (compare Eze 29:3 the English Revised Version).

Tannim in Eze 29:3 and 32:2 is believed to stand for tannin. the American Standard Revised Version has "monster," the English Revised Version "dragon," the King James Version "whale," the King James Version margin "dragon," in Eze 32:2, and "dragon" in 29:3. Tannim occurs in 11 other passages, where it is considered to be the plural of tan, and in the Revised Version (British and American) is translated "jackals," in the King James Version "dragons" (Job 30:29; Ps 44:19; Isa 13:22; 34:13; 35:7; 43:20; Jer 9:11; 10:22; 14:6; 49:33; 51:37). In Mal 1:3 we find the feminine plural tannoth.

See DRAGON; JACKAL.

Alfred Ely Day

WHEAT

hwet

((1) chiTTah, the specific word for wheat (Ge 30:14; Ex 34:22, etc.), with puros (Judith 3:3; Sirach 39:26);

(2) bar, or bar (Jer 23:28; Joe 2:24; Am 5:11; 8:6); in other passages translated "grain" or "corn";

(3) sitos (Mt 3:12; 13:25,29,30; Lu 3:17; 16:7; 22:31, etc.) (for other words translated occasionally "wheat" in the King James Version see CORN; FOOD)): Wheat, usually the bearded variety, is cultivated all over Palestine, though less so than barley. The great plain of the Hauran is a vast expanse of wheat fields in the spring; considerable quantities are exported via Beirut, Haifa, and Gaza. The "wheat harvest" was in olden times one of the regular divisions of the year (Ex 34:22; Jud 15:1; 1Sa 12:17); it follows the barley harvest (Ex 9:31,32), occurring in April, May or June, according to the altitude.

E. W. G. Masterman

WHEEL

hwel:

(1) ‘ophan, is the usual word (Ex 14:25, etc.). In Pr 20:26; Isa 28:27 the rollers of a threshing wagon are meant (see AGRICULTURE).

(2) galgal, "rolling thing," generally in the sense of "wheel" (Isa 5:28, etc.), but the Revised Version (British and American) in Eze 10:2,6,13 has "whirling wheels," an advantageous change. The "wheel .... broken at the cistern" in Ec 12:6 is the windlass for drawing the water, and by the figure the breakdown of the old man’s breathing apparatus is probably meant. In Ps 83:13, the King James Version has "wheel," but this translation (that of the Septuagint) is quite impossible; the Revised Version (British and American) "whirling dust" (sucked up by a miniature whirlwind) is perhaps right, but the translations proposed are end-less.

(3) gilgal, Isa 28:28, the roller of a threshing wagon.

(4) ‘obhnayim, Jer 18:3. See POTTER.

(5) pa‘am, Jud 5:28, literally, "step" (so the Revised Version margin), and the sound of horses’ hoofs is intended.

(6) trochos, Sirach 33:5; Jas 3:6 (the King James Version "course"). In the former passage, "The heart of a fool is as a cart-wheel," the changeableness of a light disposition is satirized. In James the figure is of a wheel in rotation, so that a flame starting at any point is quickly communicated to the whole. Just so an apparently insignificant sin of the tongue produces an incalculably destructive effect.

The phrase "wheel of nature" (trochos tes geneseos) is used here for "the world in progress." It is not a very natural figure and has given rise to much discussion. the King James Version accents trochos ("course") instead of trochos (" wheel"). but the language throughout is metaphorical and "course" is not a sufficiently metaphorical word. The translation "birth" for geneseos (so the Revised Version margin). i. e. "a wheel set in motion by birth." is out of the question. as the argument turns on results wider than any individual’s existence. "Wheel of nature" is certainly right. But a comparison of life to a wheel in some sense or other (chiefly that of "Fortune’s wheel") is common enough in Greek and Latin writers, and, indeed the exact combination trochos geneseos is found in at least one (Orphic) writer (full references in the commentaries of Mayor and W. Bauer). It would seem, then, that James had heard the phrase, and he used it as a striking figure, with entire indifference to any technical significance it might have. This supposition is preferable to that of an awkward translation from the Aramaic.

See COURSE.

Burton Scott Easton

WHELP

hwelp (gur, or gor; either absol. (Eze 19:2,3,5; Nab 2:12); or constr. with ‘aryeh, "lion" (Ge 49:9; De 33:22; Jer 51:38; Na 2:11); also benelabhi’, literally, "sons of a lioness," translated "the whelps of the lioness" (Job 4:11). In Job 28:8, the King James Version has "lion’s whelps" for bene shachats, which the Revised Version (British and American) renders "proud beasts," margin "sons of pride." In La 4:3 gur is used of the young of tannin the Revised Version (British and American) "jackal," the King James Version "sea-monsters," the King James Version margin "sea-calves"; it may possibly mean "wolves"; skumnos, the technical word for "lion’s whelp" (1 Macc 3:4)): These references are all figurative: "Judah is a lion’s whelp" (Ge 49:9); "Da is a lion’s whelp" (De 33:22); it is said of the Babylonians, "They shall roar together like young lions; they shall growl as lions’ whelps" (Jer 51:38); of the Assyrians, "Where is the den of the lions, and the feeding-place of the young lions, where the lion and the lioness walked, the lion’s whelp, and none made them afraid? The lion did tear in pieces enough for his whelps, and strangled for his lionesses, and filled his caves with prey, and his dens with ravin" (Na 2:11,12). In Eze 19:2-9, the princes of Israel are compared to lions’ whelps.

See DRAGON; LION.

Alfred Ely Day

WHIRLWIND

hwurl’-wind (cuphah (Pr 1:27; 10:25; Isa 5:28; 17:13; 66:15; Ho 8:7; Am 1:14; Nab 1:3), ca‘ar (Hab 3:14; Zec 7:14; Ho 13:3; Ps 58:9; Da 11:40), ce‘arah (2Ki 2:1; Job 38:1; 40:6; Isa 40:24; 41:16; Zec 9:14)): When two currents from opposite directions meet, a circular motion results called a whirlwind. On the sea this takes up small particles of water from the sea and condenses some of the moisture in the clouds above, forming a great funnel-shaped column. They are quite common off the coast of Syria. Considerable damage might be done to a small ship overtaken by them. In the desert sand is taken up in the same way, causing terrible sandstorms which are greatly dreaded by caravans. Most of the references in the Bible do not necessarily imply a circular motion, and the word "tempest" might be used in translation.

Storms usually come from the Southwest. "Out of the .... south cometh the storm" (Job 37:9); yet in Ezekiel’s vision he saw a whirlwind coming out of the north (Eze 1:4). Elijah "went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2Ki 2:11). The whirlwind indicates the power and might of Yahweh: "Yahweh hath his way in the whirlwind and in the storm" (Na 1:3); He "answered Job out of the whirlwind" (Job 38:1).

Most of the Scriptural uses are figurative; of destruction: "He will take them away with a whirlwind" (Ps 58:9; Pr 1:27; 10:25; Ho 13:3; Da 11:40; Am 1:14; Hab 3:14; Zec 7:14); of quickness: "wheels as a whirlwind" (Isa 5:28; 66:15; Jer 4:13); of the anger of God: "A whirlwind of the Lord is gone forth in fury" (Jer 23:19 the King James Version); of punishment to the wicked: "A continuing whirlwind .... shall fall .... on the wicked" (Jer 30:23 the King James Version).

Alfred H. Joy

WHITE

hwit.

See COLORS.

WHITE HORSE

See HORSE, WHITE.

WHITEWASH

hwit’wosh: the American Revised Version margin gives "whitewash" for "untempered mortar" in Eze

13:10 and 22:28. ‘Her prophets have daubed for them,’ i.e. seconded them, "with whitewash," thus giving "a slight wall" (13:10 margin) a specious appearance of strength.

See MORTAR; UNTEMPERED.

WHOLE; WHOLESOME

hol, hol’-sum: "Whole," originally "hale" (a word still in poetic use), had at first the meaning now expressed by its derivative "healthy." In this sense "whole" is fairly common (Job 5:18, etc.) in English Versions of the Bible, although much more common in the New Testament than in the Old Testament. From this meaning "healthy," the transition to the modern force. "complete," "perfect," "entire" (Ex 12:6, ere) was not unnatural, and it is in this later sense alone that the adverb "wholly" (Le 6:22, etc.) is used. "Wholesome," however, is derived from the earlier meaning of "whole." It occurs in Pr 15:4, the King James Version, the English Revised Version, "a wholesome tongue" (rapha’," heal," the Revised Version margin "the healing of the tongue," the American Standard Revised Version "a gentle tongue"), and in 1Ti 6:3, the King James Version "wholesome words" (hugiaino, "be healthy," the Revised Version margin "healthful," the Revised Version (British and American) "sound").

Burton Scott Easton

WHORE; WHOREDOM

hor, hor’-dum.

See CRIMES; HARLOT; PUNISHMENTS.

WICKEDNESS

wik’-ed-nes:

1. In the Old Testament:

The state of being wicked; a mental disregard for justice, righteousness, truth, honor, virtue; evil in thought and life; depravity; sinfulness; criminality. See SIN. Many words are rendered "wickedness." There are many synonyms for wickedness in English and also in the Hebrew. Pride and vanity lead to it: "All the proud, and all that work wickedness (rish‘ah) shall be stubble" (Mal 4:1). Akin to this is the word ‘awen, "iniquity," "vanity": "She eateth, and wipeth her mouth, and saith, I have done no wickedness" (Pr 30:20). Then we have the word hawwah, meaning "mischief," "calamity," coming from inward intent upon evil: "Lo, this is the man that made not God his strength, but trusted in the abundance of his riches, and strengthened himself in his wickedness" (Ps 52:7); zimmah, "wickedness" in thought, carnality or lust harbored: "And if a man take a wife and her mother, it is wickedness" (Le 20:14);

‘awlah, "perverseness," "Neither shall the children of wickedness afflict them any more, as at the first" (2Sa 7:10). The word for evil ra‘) is many times employed to represent wickedness: "Remember all their wickedness" (Ho 7:2). Wickedness like all forms and thoughts of wrong, kept warm in mind, seems to be a thing of growth; it begins with a thought, then a deed, then a character, and finally a destiny. Even in this life men increase in wickedness till they have lost all desire for that which is good in the sight of God and good men; the men in the vision of Isaiah seem to be in a condition beyond which the human heart cannot go: "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness" (Isa 5:20). Shades of thought are added by such words as roa‘, "evil," "badness": "Give them according to their work, and according to the wickedness of their doings" (Ps 28:4). And resha‘ or rish‘ah, also gives the common thought of wrong, wickedness. The prophets were strong in denunciations of all iniquity, perverseness, and in announcing the curse of God which would certainly follow.

2. In the New Testament:

Wickedness, malignity, evil in thought and purpose is presented by the word poneria: "But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why make ye trial of me, ye hypocrites?" (Mt 22:18). Jesus points out the origin of all wrong: "For from within, out of the heart of men, evil thoughts proceed .... wickednesses, deceit, lasciviousness .... all these evil things proceed from within, and defile the man" (Mr 7:21-23). See Imitation of Christ, xiii, 5.

David Roberts Dungan

WIDOW

wid’-o (’almanah; chera): In the Old Testament widows are considered to be under the special care of Yahweh (Ps 68:5; 146:9; Pr 15:25). Sympathetic regard for them comes to be viewed as a mark of true religion (Job 31:16; Jas 1:27). Deuteronomy is rich in counsel in their behalf (24:17, etc.).

The word is first mentioned in the New Testament in Ac 6:1: "There arose a murmuring of the Grecian Jews against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration." Paul charges that they be particularly cared for, especially those that are "widows indeed," i.e. poor, without support and old (1Ti 5:2-16). Some try to find proof in this passage of that ecclesiastical order of widows mentioned in post-apostolic writings.

See LITERATURE, SUB-APOSTOLIC; WOMAN, IV, 5.

George B. Eager

WIFE

wif.

See MARRIAGE; RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

WIFE, BROTHER'S

See MARRIAGE; RELATIONSHIPS, FAMILY.

WILD BEAST

wild best:

(1) ziz, only with sadhay, "field," in the expression, ziz sadhay, translated "wild beasts of the field" (Ps 50:11; 80:13); compare Targum to Ps 80:13, ziza'," worm" (BDB); Arabic ziz, "worm."

(2) tsiyim (Isa 13:21; 34:14; Jer 50:39).

(3) 'iyim (Isa 13:21; 34:14; Jer 50:39).

(4) chay, "living thing," often translated "wild beast" in English Versions of the Bible (1Sa 17:46, etc.).

(5) In Apocrypha (Additions to Esther 16:24, etc.) and the New Testament (Mr 1:13), therion.

(6) Ac 10:12 the King James Version; Ac 11:6, tetrapodon, the Revised Version (British and American) "four-rooted beast."

(1), (2) and (3) are of doubtful etymology, but the context makes it clear in each case that wild beasts of some sort are meant. The Targum ziza'," worm," is possible in Ps 80:13, though not probable in view of the parallel "boar": "The boar out of the wood doth ravage it, and the wild beasts of the field feed on it," i.e. on the vine (figurative) brought out of Egypt. In Ps 50:11, however, such an interpretation is out of the question. All the references from 50:8 to 50:13 are to large animals, bullocks, goats, cattle and birds. Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the Septuagint have in 80:13 "wild beast" and in 50:11 "beauty of the field" (translated)!

Tsiyim, doubtfully referred to tsiydh, "drought," occurs in prophecies of the desolation of Babylon in Isa 13:21 ("wild beasts of the desert") and Jer 50:39, of Edom in Isa 34:14, of Assyria in Isa 23:13 ("them that dwell in the wilderness"). It is associated in these passages with names of wild beasts and birds, some of them of very doubtful meaning, such as tannim, 'ochim, 'iyim, se'irim, benoth ya'anah. Wild beasts of some sort are clearly meant, though the kind can only be conjectured. The word occurs in Ps 74:14 ("the people inhabiting the wilderness") where it is possible to understand "beasts" instead of people. It occurs also in Ps 72:9 ("they that dwell in the wilderness"), where it seems necessary to understand "men." If the reading stands, it is not easy to reconcile this passage with the others.

‘Iyim occurs in Isa 13:21 and 34:14 and in Jer 50:39, three of the passages cited for tsiyim. the King James Version referring to ‘i, "island," renders "wild beasts of the islands" (Isa 13:22). the Revised Version (British and American) has "wolves," margin "howling creatures"; compare Arabic ‘anwa’," to howl," and ibn-’awa’ or wawi, "jackal."

See JACKAL.

Alfred Ely

WILD OX

(re’em): The word "unicorn" occurs in the King James Version in Nu 23:22; 24:8; De 33:17; Job 39:9,10; Ps 22:21; 29:6; 92:10; Isa 34:7 (the King James Version margin "rhinoceros"). the Revised Version (British and American) has everywhere "wild-ox" (margin "ox-antelope," Nu 23:22). The Septuagint has monokeros, "one-horned," except in Isa 34:7, where we find hoi hadroi, "the large ones," "the bulky ones." In this passage also the Septuagint has hoi krioi, "the rams," instead of English Versions of the Bible "bullocks." Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has rhinoceros in Nu 23:22; 24:8; De 33:17; Job 39:9,10; and unicornis in Ps 22:21 (21:22); 29:6 (28:6); 92:10 (91:11); Isa 34:7.

As stated in the articles on ANTELOPE and CATTLE, re’em and te’o (De 14:5; Isa 51:20) may both be the Arabian oryx (Oryx beatrix), of which the common vernacular name means "wild-ox." It may be presumed that "ox-antelope" of Nu 23:22 the Revised Version margin is meant to indicate this animal, which is swift and fierce, and has a pair of very long, sharp and nearly straight horns. The writer feels, however, that more consideration should be given to the view of Tristram (Natural History of the Bible) that re’em is the urus or aurochs, the primitive Bos taurus, which seems to be depicted in Assyrian monuments and referred to as remu (BDB). The etymology of re’em is uncertain, but the word may be from a root signifying "to rise" or "to be high." At any rate, there is no etymological warrant for the assumption that it was a one-horned creature. The Arabic raim, is used of a light-colored gazelle. The great strength and fierceness implied in most of the references suit the wild-ox better than the oryx. On the other hand, Edom (Isa 34:7) was adjacent to the present home of the oryx, while there is no reason to suppose that the wild-ox came nearer than Northern Assyria. There is possibly a reference to the long horns of the oryx in "But my horn hast thou exalted like the horn of the wild-ox" (Ps 92:10). For te’o, The Septuagint has orux, in De 14:5 (but seutlion hemiephthon, "half-boiled beet" (!) in Isa 51:20). Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) has oryx in both passages. While we admit that both re’em and te’o may be the oryx, it is perhaps best to follow the Revised Version margin, rendering re’em "wild-ox." The rendering of "antelope" (Revised Version) for te’o is defensible, but "oryx" would be better, because the oryx is the only antelope that could possibly be meant, it and the gazelle (tsebhi), already mentioned in De 14:5, being the only antelopes known to occur in Palestine and Arabia. In Isa 34:7 it seems to be implied that the re’em might be used in sacrifice.

Figurative: The wild-ox is used as a symbol of the strength of Israel: "He hath as it were the strength of the wild-ox". (Nu 23:22; 24:8). In the blessing of the children of Israel by Moses it is said of Joseph:

"And his horns are the horns of the wild-ox:

With them he shall push the peoples all of them,

even the ends of the earth" (De 33:17).

The Psalmist (Ps 29:5,6) in describing the power of Yahweh says:

"Yea, Yahweh breaketh in pieces the cedars of Lebanon.

He maketh them also to skip like a calf;

Lebanon and Sirion like a young wild-ox."

Again, in praise for Yahweh's goodness (Ps 92:10): "But my horn hast thou exalted like the horn of the wildox."

In Job 39:9-12 the subduing and training of the wild-ox are cited among the things beyond man's power and understanding.

See ANTELOPE; CATTLE.

Alfred Ely Day

WILDERNESS

wil'-der-nes.

See DESERT; JUDAEA, WILDERNESS OF; WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

WILL

See TESTAMENT.

WILL, VOLITION

vo-lish'-un ('abhah, ratson; thelo) boulomai, thelema: "Will" as noun and verb, transitive and intrans,

carries in it the idea of "wish," "purpose," "volition." "Will" is also used as an auxiliary of the future tense of other words, but the independent verb is frequent, and it is often important to distinguish between it and the mere auxiliary, especially in the New Testament.

In the Old Testament the word chiefly rendered "to will" is ‘abhah, "to breathe after," "to long for." With the exception of Job 39:9; Isa 1:19, it is accompanied by a negation, and is used of both man and God. Several other words are employed, but only sparsely. "Will" as noun is the translation chiefly of ratson, "good-will," "willfulness" (Ge 49:6), with emphasis on the voluntariness of action (Le 1:3; 19:5; 22:19,29, etc.); also of nephesh, and a few other words. In the New Testament "will" is chiefly the translation of thelo and boulomai, the difference between the two being that thelo expresses an active choice or purpose, boulomai, "passive inclination or willingness, or the inward predisposition from which the active choice proceeds" (compare Mr 15:9,12 with 15:15). "Will," noun, is thelema. With the exception of a few passages, it is used of the will of God (over all, Mt 18:14; in all things to be done, Mt 6:10; 26:42 parallel, etc.; ordering all things, Eph 1:11, etc.); human will, however, may oppose itself to the will of God (Lu 23:25; Joh 1:13; Ro 7:18; here the capacity to will is distinguished from the power to do, etc.). Boulema is properly counsel or purpose. While it is possible to oppose the will of God, His counsel or purpose cannot be frustrated (Ac 2:23; 4:28; Ro 9:19; Eph 1:11; Heb 6:17); it may, however, be resisted for a time (Lu 7:30).

In Apocrypha, for "will" we have thelema (1 Esdras 9:9 (of God); Ecclesiasticus 43:16; 1 Macc 3:60; Ecclesiasticus 8:15, "his own will"); boule (The Wisdom of Solomon 9:13, the Revised Version (British and American) "counsel); boulema (2 Macc 15:5, "wicked will," the Revised Version (British and American) "cruel purpose"); "willful" (Ecclesiasticus 30:8) is proales, the Revised Version (British and American) "headstrong"; "willing" (The Wisdom of Solomon 14:19), boulomai, the Revised Version (British and American) "wishing"; thelo (Ecclesiasticus 6:35); "wilt" (The Wisdom of Solomon 12:18), thelo, the Revised Version (British and American) "hast the will" (compare 2 Macc 7:16).

The Revised Version (British and American) has many changes, several of them of note as bringing out the distinction between the auxiliary and the independent verb. Thus, Mt 11:27, "willeth to"; Joh 7:17, "if any man willeth to do his will"; 1Ti 6:9, the American Standard Revised Version "they that are minded to be rich," the English Revised Version "desire," etc.

The words employed and passages cited show clearly that man is always regarded as a responsible being, free to will in harmony with the divine will or contrary to it. This is further shown by the various words denoting refusal. "Ye will not come to me, that ye may have life" (Joh 5:40). So with respect to temptation. We may even choose and act deliberately in opposition to the will of God. Yet God’s counsel, His will in its completeness, ever prevails, and man, in resisting it, deprives himself of the good it seeks to confer upon him.

In modern psychology the tendency is to make will primary and distinctive of personality.

W. L. Walker

WILL-WORSHIP

In Col 2:23, "a show of wisdom in will-worship," for ethelothreskia), a word found nowhere else but formed exactly like "will-worship": worship originating in the human will as opposed to the divine, arbitrary religious acts, worthless despite their difficulty of performance.

WILLOW TREE

wil’-o-tre (tsaphtsaphah): Comparison with the Arabic cafcaf, "the willow," makes it very probable that thc translation of Eze 17:5 is correct.

WILLOWS

wil’-oz (‘arabhim); itea (Le 23:40; Job 40:22; Ps 137:2; Isa 15:7; 44:4)): In all references this tree is mentioned as beside running water. They may all refer to the willow, two varieties of which, Salix fragilis and S. alba, occur commonly in Palestine, or to the closely allied Populus euphratus (also Natural Order Salicaceae), which is even more plentiful, especially on the Jordan and its tributaries. The Brook of the Willows (Isa 15:7) must have been some stream running from Moab to the Jordan or Dead Sea. Popular fancy has associated the willows of Ps 137:2 with the so-called "weeping willow" (Salix babylonica), but though this tree is found today in Palestine, it is an introduction from Japan and cannot have existed "by the waters of Babylon" at the time of the captivity.

E. W. G. Masterman

WILLOWS, THE BROOK OF THE

Evidently mentioned as the boundary of Moab (Isa 15:7) and generally identified with the brook Zered.

See BROOK; ZERED.

WIMPLE

wim’-p’l: the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes "shawls" for the King James Version "wimples" in Isa 3:22. The precise article of dress intended is unknown.

See DRESS.

WIND

wind (anemos:

1. Causes:

Unequal distribution of heat in the atmosphere causes currents of air or wind. The heated air rises and the air from around rushes in. The direction from which a current comes determines its name, as west wind coming from the West but blowing toward the East. When two currents of air of different directions meet, a spiral motion sometimes results.

See WHIRLWIND.

2. West Wind:

In Palestine the west wind is the most common. It comes from the sea and carries the moisture which condenses to form clouds, as it is turned upward by the mountains, to the cooler layers of the atmosphere. If the temperature reached is cool enough the cloud condenses and rain falls. Elijah looked toward the West for the "small cloud," and soon "the heavens grew black with clouds and wind" (1Ki 18:44 f). "When ye see a cloud rising in the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower; and so it cometh to pass" (Lu 12:54).

3. South Wind:

The south wind is frequent in Palestine. If it is slightly Southwest, it may bring rain, but if it is due South or Southeast, there is no rain. It is a warm wind bringing good weather. "When ye see a south wind blowing, ye say, There will be a scorching heat; and it cometh to pass" (Lu 12:55). In the cooler months it is a gentle, balmy wind, so that the "earth is still by reason of the south wind" (Job 37:17; compare So 4:16).

4. North Wind:

The north wind is usually a strong, continuous wind blowing down from the northern hills, and while it is cool it always "drives away rain," as correctly stated in Pr 25:23, the King James Version; yet it is a disagreeable wind, and often causes headache and fever. 5. East Wind:

The east wind or sirocco (from Arabic shark=" east") is the "scorching wind" (Jas 1:11) from the desert. It is a hot, gusty wind laden with sand and dust and occurs most frequently in May and October. The temperature in a given place often rises 15 or 20 degrees within a few hours, bringing thermometer to the highest readings of the year. It is customary for the people to close up the houses tightly to keep out the dust and heat. The heat and dryness wither all vegetation (Ge 41:6). Happily the wind seldom lasts for more than three days at a time. It is the destructive "wind of the wilderness" (Job 1:19; Jer 4:11; 13:24): "Yahweh caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night" (Ex 14:21) for the children of Israel to pass; the "rough blast in the day of the east wind" (Isa 27:8). The strength of the wind makes it dangerous for ships at sea: "With the east wind thou breakest the ships of Tarshish" (Ps

48:7). Euraquilo or Euroclydon (Ac 27:14 the King James Version), which caused Paul’s shipwreck, was an East-Northeast wind, which was especially dangerous in that region.

6. Practical Use:

The wind is directly of great use to the farmer in Palestine in winnowing the grain after it is threshed by treading out (Ps 1:4; 35:5; Isa 17:13). It was used as a sign of the weather (Ec 11:4). It was a necessity for traveling on the sea in ancient times (Ac 28:13; Jas 3:4), but too strong a wind caused shipwreck (Jon 1:4; Mt 8:24; Lu 8:23).

7. Scripture References:

The Scriptural references to wind show many illustrative and figurative uses:

(1) Power of God (1Ki 19:11; Job 27:21; 38:24; Ps 107:25; 135:7; 147:18; 148:8; Pr 30:4; Jer 10:13; Ho 4:19; Lu 8:25): "He caused the east wind to blow in the heavens; and by his power he guided the south wind" (Ps 78:26).

(2) Scattering and destruction: "A stormy wind shall rend it" (Eze 13:11; compare 5:2; 12:14; 17:21; Ho 4:19; 8:7; Jer 49:36; Mt 7:25).

(3) Uncertainty: "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine" (Eph 4:14; compare Pr 27:16; Ec 1:6; Joh 3:8; Jas 1:6).

(4) Various directions: "toward the four winds of heaven" (Da 11:4; compare 8:8; Zec 2:6; Mt 24:31; Mr 13:27).

(5) Brevity: "a wind that passeth away" (Ps 78:39; compare 1:4; 35:5; 103:16).

(6) Nothingness: "Molten images are wind" (Isa 41:29; compare Jer 5:13).

Alfred H. Joy

WINDOW

win’-do.

See HOUSE, II, 1, (9).

WINDOWS OF HEAVEN

See ASTRONOMY, sec. III, 4.

WINE-SKINS

(chemeth (Ge 21:14 margin), n’odh (Jud 4:19 "‘bottle") nebhel, nebhel (1Sa 10:3 margin), (’obh) (Job 32:19); askos (Mt 9:17; Mr 2:22; Lu 5:37; compare askoputine, Judith 10:5, the Revised Version (British and American) "leathern bottle")): These words are all used to designate skins for the containing of liquids, nebhel, however, being the most common in the case of wine. The Israelite, like the modern Arabic and Syrian, used mainly the skin of the goat and the sheep, but the skins of the ox and the camel have also been put to this purpose. The skin is removed from the animal by drawing it over the body from the neck downward, half the skin on each of the limbs being also retained. It is then tanned, the hair cut close, turned inside out, and has all the openings save one closed with cords, when it is ready for use. The reference to "a wineskin in the smoke" in Ps 119:83 is generally explained on the supposition of its being hung there for mellowing purposes, but this can scarcely be accepted, for wine is never left for any length of time in the skin on account of its imparting a disagreeable flavor to the contents. The explanation of the New Testament passages is that the new wine, still liable to continue fermenting to a small extent at least, was put into new, still expansible skins, a condition that had ceased in the older ones.

See WINE.

W. M. Christie

WINE; WINE PRESS

win, win’-pres:

I. Terms.

1. Wine:

(1) (~yayin), apparently from a non-Tsere root allied to Greek oinos, Latin vinum, etc. This is the usual word for "wine" and is found 141 times in Massoretic Text.

(2) chemer, perhaps "foaming" (De 32:14 and Massoretic Text Isa 27:2 (but see the English Revised Version margin)); Aramaic chamar (Ezr 6:9; 7:22; Da 5:1,2,4,23).

(3) tirosh. Properly this is the fresh grape juice (called also mishreh, Nu 6:3), even when still in the grape (Isa 65:8). But unfermented grape juice is a very difficult thing to keep without the aid of modern antiseptic precautions, and its preservation in the warm and not over-cleanly conditions of ancient Palestine was impossible. Consequently, tirosh came to mean wine that was not fully aged (although

with full intoxicating properties (Jud 9:13; Ho 4:11; compare Ac 11:13)) or wine when considered specifically as the product of grapes (De 12:17; 18:4, etc.). The Septuagint always (except Isa 65:8; Ho 4:11) translates by oinos and the Targums by chamar. the King James Version has "wine" 26 times, "new wine" 11 times, "sweet wine" in Mic 6:15; the Revised Version (British and American) "vintage" in Nu 18:12; Mic 6:15 (with the same change in Ne 10:37,39 the Revised Version margin; Isa 62:8 the English Revised Version margin). Otherwise the English Revised Version has left the King James Version unchanged, while the American Standard Revised Version uses "new wine" throughout.

(4) Two apparently poetic words are ‘acic (the Revised Version (British and American) "sweet wine," Isa 49:26; Am 9:13; Joe 1:5; 3:18, "juice"; So 8:2), and cobhe’ ("wine," Isa 1:22; "drink," Ho 4:18 (margin "carouse"); Na 1:10).

(5) For spiced wine three words occur: mecekh, Ps 75:8 (English Versions of the Bible "mixture"); mimcakh, Pr 23:30 ("mixed wine"); Isa 65:11 (the Revised Version (British and American) "mingled wine"); mezegh, So 7:2 (the Revised Version (British and American) "mingled wine"); compare also yayin hareqach, So 8:2 ("spiced wine").

(6) mamethaqqim, literally, "sweet," Ne 8:10.

(7) shekhar (22 times), translated "strong drink" in English Versions of the Bible. Shekhar appears to mean "intoxicating drink" of any sort and in Nu 28:7 is certainly simply "wine" (compare also its use in parallelism to "wine" in Isa 5:11,22, etc.). In certain passages (Le 10:9; Nu 6:3; 1Sa 1:15, etc.), however, it is distinguished from "wine," and the meaning is not quite certain. But it would seem to mean "drink not made from grapes." Of such only pomegranate wine is named in the Bible (So 8:2), but a variety of such preparations (made from apples, quinces, dates, barley, etc.) were known to the ancients and must have been used in Palestine also. The translation "strong drink" is unfortunate, for it suggests "distilled liquor," "brandy," which is hardly in point.

See DRINK, STRONG.

(8) In the Apocrypha and New Testament "wine" represents oinos, with certain compounds, except in Ac 2:13, where the Greek is gleukos, "sweet," English Versions of the Bible "new wine."

See also BLOOD; DRINK; FLAGON; FRUIT; HONEY.

2. Wine Press:

(1) Properly speaking, the actual wine press was called gath (Jud 6:11, etc.), and the receiving vat ("fat") yeqebh (Nu 18:27, etc.), but the names were interchangeable to some degree (Isa 16:10; Job 24:11; compare Isa 5:2, the Revised Version (British and American) text and margin) and either could be used for the whole apparatus (see GATH and compare Jud 7:25; Zec 14:10). In Isa 63:3 the Hebrew has purah, "wine trough" a word found also in Hag 2:16 where it seems to be a gloss (so, apparently, the

American Standard Revised Version).

(2) In the Apocrypha (Sirach 33:16) and in the New Testament 21:33; Re 14:19,20 (twice); 19:15) "winepress" is lenos; in Mr 12:1 hupolenion, by which only the receiving vat seems to be meant (the Revised Version (British and American) a pit for a winepress").

II. Wine-Making.

1. The Vintage:

For the care of the vine, its distribution, different varieties, etc., see VINE. The ripening of the grapes took place as early as June in the Jordan valley, but on the coast not until August, while in the hills it was delayed until September. In whatever month, however, the coming of the vintage was the signal for the villagers to leave their homes in a body and to encamp in booths erected in the vineyards, so that the work might be carried on without interruption. See TABERNACLES, FEAST OF. It was the great holiday season of the year and the joy of the vintage was proverbial (Isa 16:10; Jer 25:30; 48:33; compare Jud 9:27), and fragments of vintage songs seem to be preserved in Isa 27:2; 65:8. The grapes were gathered usually by cutting off the clusters (see SICKLE), and were carried to the press in baskets.

2. Wine Presses:

Many of the ancient wine presses remain to the present day. Ordinarily they consisted of two rectangular or circular excavations, hewn (Isa 5:2) in the solid rock to a depth of 2 or 3 feet. Where possible one was always higher than the other and they were connected by a pipe or channel. Their size, of course, varied greatly, but the upper vat was always wider and shallower than the lower and was the press proper, into which the grapes were thrown, to be crushed by the feet of the treaders (Isa 63:1-3, etc.). The juice flowed down through the pipe into the lower vat, from which it was removed into jars (Hag 2:16) or where it was allowed to remain during the first fermentation.

Many modifications of this form of the press are found. Where there was no rock close to the surface, the vats were dug in the earth and lined with stonework or cement, covered with pitch. Or the pressvat might be built up out of any material (wood was much used in Egypt), and from it the juice could be conducted into a sunken receptacle or into jars. Not infrequently a third (rarely a fourth) vat might be added between the other two, in which a partial settling and straining could take place. Wooden beams are often used either to finish the pressing or to perform the whole operation, and holes into which the ends of these beams fitted can still be seen. A square of wood attached to the beam bore down on the pile of grapes, while the free end of the beam was heavily weighted. In the simpler presses the final result was obtained by piling stones on the mass that remained after the treaders had finished their work.

3. Grading:

It is a general principle of wine-making (compare that "the less the pressure the better the product";

therefore the liquid that flowed at the beginning of the process, especially that produced by the mere weight of the grapes themselves when piled in heaps, was carefully kept separate from that which was obtained only under heavy pressure. A still lower grade was made by adding water to the final refuse the mixture to ferment. Possibly this last concoction is sometimes meant by the word "vinegar" (chomets).

4. Fermentation:

In the climate of Palestine fermentation begins almost immediately, frequently on the same day for juice pressed out in the morning, but never later than the next day. At first a slight foam appears on the surface of the liquid, and from that moment, according to Jewish tradition, it is liable to the wine-tithe (Ma‘aseroth 1 7). The action rapidly becomes more violent, and while it is in progress the liquid must be kept in jars or in a vat, for it would burst even the newest and strongest of wine-skins (Job 32:19). Within about a week this violent fermentation subsides, and the wine is transferred to other jars or strong wine-skins (Mr 2:22 and parallel’s), in which it undergoes the secondary fermentation. At the bottom of the receptacles collects the heavier matter or "lees" (shemarim, Ps 75:8 ("dregs"); Jer 48:11; Ze 1:12 in Isa 25:6 the word is used for the wine as well), from which the "wines on the lees" gather strength and flavor.

At the end of 40 days it was regarded as properly "wine" and could be offered as a drink offering (‘Edhuyyoth 6 1). The practice after this point seems to have varied, no doubt depending on the sort of wine that was being made. Certain kinds were left undisturbed to age "on their lees" and were thought to be all the better for so doing, but before they were used it was necessary to strain them very carefully. So Isa 25:6, ‘A feast of wine aged on the lees, thoroughly strained.’ But usually leaving the wine in the fermentation vessels interfered with its improvement or caused it to degenerate. So at the end of 40 days it was drawn off into other jars (for storage, 1Ch 27:27, etc.) or wine-skins (for transportation, Jos 9:4, etc.). So Jer 48:11: ‘Moab has been undisturbed from his youth, and he has rested on his lees and has not been emptied from vessel to vessel. .... Therefore his flavor remains unchanged (or "becomes insipid") and his scent is unimproved (or "lacks freshness")’; compare Ze 1:12.

5. Storage:

Jars were tightly sealed with caps covered with pitch. The very close sealing needed to preserve sparkling wines, however, was unknown to the Hebrews, and in consequence (and for other reasons) such wines were not used. Hence, in Ps 75:8, "The wine foameth," the allusion must be to very new wine whose fermentation had not yet subsided, if indeed, the translation is not wrong (the Revised Version margin "The wine is red"). The superiority of old wine to new was acknowledged by the Hebrews, in common with the rest of the world (Sirach 9:10; Lu 5:39), but in the wines of Palestine acetous fermentation, changing the wine into vinegar, was likely to occur at any time. Three years was about the longest time for which such wines could be kept, and "old wine" meant only wines that had been, stored for a year or more (Bab. Bath. 6 3).

See also CRAFTS, II, 19.

III. Use of Wine.

1. Mixed Wine:

In Old Testament times wine was drunk undiluted, and wine mixed with water was thought to be ruined (Isa 1:22). The "mixed" or "mingled wines" (see I, 1, (5), above) were prepared with aromatic herbs of various sorts and some of these compounds, used throughout the ancient world, were highly intoxicating (Isa 5:22). Wine mixed with myrrh was stupefying and an anesthetic (Mr 15:23). At a later period, however, the Greek use of diluted wines had attained such sway that the writer of 2 Maccabees speaks (15:39) of undiluted wine as "distasteful" (polemion). This dilution is so normal in the following centuries that the Mishna can take it for granted and, indeed, R. Eliezer even forbade saying the table-blessing over undiluted wine (Berakhoth 7 5). The proportion of water was large, only one-third or one-fourth of the total mixture being wine (Niddah 2 7; Pesachim 108b).

NOTE.

The wine of the Last Supper, accordingly, may be described in modern terms as a sweet, red, fermented wine, rather highly diluted. As it was no doubt the ordinary wine of commerce, there is no reason to suppose that it was particularly "pure."

2. Wine-Drinkinig:

Throughout the Old Testament, wine is regarded as a necessity of life and in no way as a mere luxury. It was a necessary part of even the simplest meal (Ge 14:18; Jud 19:19; 1Sa 16:20; Isa 55:1, etc.), was an indispensable provision for a fortress (2Ch 11:11), and was drunk by all classes and all ages, even by the very young (La 2:12; Zec 9:17). "Wine" is bracketed with "grain" as a basic staple (Ge 27:28, etc.), and the failure of the winecrop or its destruction by foreigners was a terrible calamity (De 28:30,39; Isa 62:8; 65:21; Mic 6:15; Ze 1:13, etc.). On the other hand, abundance of wine was a special token of God’s blessing (Ge 27:28; De 7:13; Am 9:14, etc.), and extraordinary abundance would be a token of the Messianic age (Am 9:13; Joe 3:18; Zec 9:17). A moderate "gladdening of the heart" through wine was not looked upon as at all reprehensible (2Sa 13:28; Es 1:10; Ps 104:15; Ec 9:7; 10:19; Zec 9:15; 10:7), and while Jud 9:13 represented a mere verbal remnant of a long-obsolete concept, yet the idea contained in the verse was not thought shocking. "Drink offerings," indeed, were of course a part of the prescribed ritual (Le 23:13, etc.; see SACRIFICE), and a store of wine was kept in the temple (tabernacle) to insure their performance (1Ch 9:29). Even in later and much more moderate times, Sirach writes the laudation of wine in 31:27, and the writer of 2 Maccabees (see above) objects as strongly to pure water as he does to pure wine. Christ adapted Himself to Jewish customs (Mt 11:19 parallel Lu 7:34; Lu 22:18), and exegetes usually suppose that the celebrated verse 1Ti 5:23 is meant as a safeguard against ascetic (Gnostic?) dualism, as well as to give medical advice.

On the temporal conditioning of the Biblical customs, the uncompromising opposition of the Bible to excess, and the non-applicability of the ancient attitude to the totally different modern conditions, see

DRUNKENNESS.

The figurative uses of wine are very numerous, but are for the most part fairly obvious. Those offering difficulty have been discussed in the course of the article. For wine in its commercial aspect see TRADE.

Burton Scott Easton

WINEBIBBER

win’-bib-er: In Pr 23:20, cobhe yauin; in Mt 11:19 = Lu 7:34, oinopotes, of habitual wine-drinkers. The accusation was falsely brought against Jesus of being "a gluttonous man and a winebibber," because, unlike John, He ate and drank with others.

WINEFAT; WINE PRESS; WINEVAT

win’-fat, win’-pres, win’-vat.

See CRAFTS, II, 19; VINE; WINE.

WINEVAT

See WINEFAT, WINEVAT.

WINGS

wingz (kanaph; pterux): Biblical references to the wings of birds are common, especially in Psalms, many of them exquisitely poetical. Often the wings of an eagle are mentioned because they are from 7 to 9 feet in sweep, of untiring flight, and have strength to carry heavy burdens: so they became the symbol of strength and endurance. Ancient monuments and obelisks are covered with the heads of bulls, lions, different animals, and men even, to which the wings of an eagle were added to symbolize strength. Sometimes the wings of a stork are used to portray strong flight, as in the vision of Zechariah: "Then lifted I up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there came forth two women, and the wind was in their wings; now they had wings like the wings of a stork; and they lifted up the ephah between earth and heaven" (5:9). The wings of a dove symbolized love. Wings in the abstract typified shelter, strength or speed, as a rule, while in some instances their use was ingenious and extremely poetical, as when Job records that the Almighty used wings to indicate migration: "And stretcheth her wings toward the south" (39:26). In Ps 17:8 there is a wonderful poetical imagery in the plea, "Hide me under the shadow of thy wings." In Ps 18:10 there is a reference to "the wings of the wind." And in 55:6 the Psalmist cries, "Oh that I had wings like a dove!" The brightness and peace of prosperous times are beautifully described in Ps 68:13, the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her pinions with pale green gold.’

The first rays of dawn are compared to "the wings of the morning" (139:9). Solomon was thinking of the swiftness of wings when he said, "For riches' certainly make themselves wings, like an eagle that flieth toward heaven" (Pr 23:5). So also was Isaiah in 40:31, "They that wait for Yahweh shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk, and not faint." In Mal 4:2 the King James Version, there is a beautiful reference, "But unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings." the Revised Version (British and American) changes "his" to "its." Wings as an emblem of love were used by Jesus in the cry, "O Jerusalem .... how often would I have gathered thy children .... as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings" (Mt 23:37).

Gene Stratton-Porter

WINK

wink (razam, literally, "to roll the eyes"): The act or habit of winking was evidently considered to be evil both in its motives and in its results. The idea of its facetiousness, prevalent in our day, is nowhere apparent in the Scriptures. It is mentioned frequently, but is always associated with sin, in the Old Testament especially in the sense of conceit, pride, and rebellion against God: "Why doth thine heart carry thee away? and what do thy eyes wink at, that thou turnest thy spirit against God" (Job 15:12,13 the King James Version). So also Ps 35:19: "Neither let them wink with the eye that hate roe without a cause." "A naughty person, a wicked man, walketh with froward mouth. He winketh with his eyes," etc. (Pr 6:12,13 the King James Version). "He that winketh with the eye causeth sorrow" (Pr 10:10). See Watkinson, Education of the Heart, "Ethics of Gesture," 194 ff.

In the New Testament the word is used to express the longsuffering patience and forgiveness of God toward erring Israel: "And the times of this ignorance God winked at" (Ac 17:30 the King James Version, hupereidon, "overlooked," and so translated in the Revised Version (British and American); compare The Wisdom of Solomon 11:23; Ecclesiasticus 30:11). The use of "winked" in this connection would in our day, of course, be considered in bad taste, if not actually irreverent, but it is an excellent example of the colloquialism of the King James Version.

Arthur Walwyn Evans

WINNOWING

win'-o-ing.

See AGRICULTURE; FAN; THRESHING.

WINTER

win’-ter (choreph, from charaph, "to inundate," "overflow"): The rainy season, also the autumn harvest season (Ge 8:22; Ps 74:17; Zec 14:8). It is also the time of cold (Jer 36:22; Am 3:15). The verb "to winter" occurs in Isa 18:6. Cethaw has the same meaning as Choreph (So 2:11). cheimon, corresponds to choreph as the rainy season, and the verb paracheimazo, signifies "to pass the winter" (Ac 27:12), the noun from which is paracheimasia (same place).

See SEASONS.

WINTER-HOUSE

(beth ha-choreph (Jer 36:22; Am 3:15)): See under SUMMER-HOUSE. The "winter-house" in Jeremiah is that of King Jehoiakim; mention is made of the fire burning in the brazier.

WISDOM

wiz’-dum:

1. Linguistic

2. History

3. Religious Basis

4. Ideals

5. Teaching of Christ

6. Remainder of the New Testament

(1) James

(2) Paul

7. Hypostasis

LITERATURE

1. Linguistic:

In the Revised Version (British and American) the noun "wisdom" and its corresponding adjective and verb ("be wise," "act wisely," etc.) represent a variety of Hebrew words: bin (binah, and in the English

Revised Version tebunah), sakhal (sekhel, sekhel), lebh (and in the English Revised Version labhabh), tushiyah (and in the English Revised Version Te‘em, ‘ormah, piqqach. None of these, however, is of very frequent occurrence and by far the most common group is the verb chakham, with the adjective chakham, and the nouns chokhmah, chokhmoth, with something over 300 occurrences in the Old Testament (of which rather more than half are in Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes). Cokhmah, accordingly, may be treated as the Hebrew equivalent for the English "wisdom," but none the less the two words do not quite correspond. For chokhmah may be used of simple technical skill (Ex 28:3; 35:25, etc.; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 14:2; Sirach 38:31; note that the English Versions of the Bible gives a false impression in such passages), of military ability (Isa 10:13), of the intelligence of the lower animals (Pr 30:24), of shrewdness applied to vicious (2Sa 13:3) or cruel (1Ki 2:9 Hebrew) ends, etc. Obviously no one English word will cover all these different uses, but the general meaning is clear enough—"the art of reaching one’s end by the use of the right means" (Smend). Predominantly the "wisdom" thought of is that which comes through experience, and the "wise man" is at his best in old age (Job 12:12; 15:10; Pr 16:31; Sirach 6:34; 8:9; 25:3-6, etc.; contrast Job 32:9; Ec 4:13; The Wisdom of Solomon 4:9; Sirach 25:2). And in religion the "wise man" is he who gives to the things of God the same acuteness that other men give to worldly affairs (Lu 16:8). He is distinguished from the prophets as not having personal inspiration, from the priestly school as not laying primary stress on the cult, and from the scribes as not devoted simply to the study of the sacred writings. But, in the word by itself, a "wise man" need not in any way be a religious man.

In the Revised Version (British and American) Apocrypha and New Testament the words "wisdom," "wise," "act wisely," etc., are always translations of phronimos, or of their cognates. For "wisdom," however, sophia is in almost every case the original word, the sole exception in the New Testament being Lu 1:17 (phronesis).

See also PRUDENCE.

2. History:

(1) In the prophetic period, indeed, "wise" generally has an irreligious connotation. Israel was fully sensible that her culture was beneath that of the surrounding nations, but thought of this as the reverse of defect. Intellectual power without moral control was the very fruit of the forbidden tree (Ge 3:5), and "wisdom" was essentially a heathen quality (Isa 10:13; 19:12; 47:10; Eze 28:3-5; Zec 9:2; specifically Edomite in Jer 49:7; Ob 1:8; contrast Baruch 3:22,23) that deserved only denunciation (Isa 5:21; 29:14; Jer 4:22; 9:23; 18:18, etc.). Certainly at this time Israel was endeavoring to acquire a culture of her own, and there is no reason to question that Solomon had given it a powerful stimulus (1Ki 4:29-34). But the times were too distracted and the moral problems too imperative to allow the more spiritually-minded any opportunity to cultivate secular learning, so that "wisdom" in Israel took on the unpleasant connotation of the quality of the shrewd court counselors, with their half-heathen advice (Isa 28:14-22, etc.). And the associations of the word with true religion are very few (De 4:6; Jer 8:8), while De 32:6; Jer 4:22; 8:9 have a satirical sound—‘what men call "wisdom" is really folly!’ So, no matter how much material may have gathered during this period (see PROVERBS), it is to the post-exilic community that we are to look for the formation of body of Wisdom literature really associated with Israel’s religion.

(2) The factors that produced it were partly the same as those that produced scribism (see SCRIBES). Life in Palestine was lived only on the sufferance of foreigners and must have been dreary in the extreme. Under the firm hand of Persia there were no political questions, and in later times the nation was too weak to play any part in the conflicts between Antioch and Alexandria. Prophecy had about disappeared, fulfillment of the Messianic hope seemed too far off to affect thought deeply, and the conditions were not yet ripe that produced the later flame of apocalyptic enthusiasm. Nor were there vital religious problems within the nation, now that the fight against idolatry had been won and the ritual reforms established. Artistic pursuits were forbidden (compare especially The Wisdom of Solomon 15:4-6), and the Jewish temperament was not of a kind that could produce a speculative philosophy (note the sharp polemic against metaphysics, etc., in Sirach 3:21-24). It was in this period, to be sure, that Jewish commercial genius began to assert itself, but there was no satisfaction in this for the more spiritually-minded (Sirach 26:29). So, on the one hand, men were thrown back on the records of the past (scribism), while on the other the problems of religion and life were studied through sharp observation of Nature and of mankind. And the recorded results of the latter method form the Wisdom literature.

(3) In this are included Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes, with certain psalms (notably Ps 19; 37; 104; 107; 147; 148); in the Apocrypha must be added Sirach and Wisdom, with part of Baruch; while of the other writings of the period parts of Philo, 4 Maccabees, and the Abikar legend belong here also. How far foreign influence was at work it is hard to say. Egypt had a Wisdom literature of her own (see EGYPT) that must have been known to some degree in Palestine, while Babylonia and Persia could" not have been entirely without effect—but no specific dependence can be shown in any of these cases. For Greece the case is clearer, and Greek influence is obvious in Wisdom, despite the particularistic smugness of the author. But there was vitality enough in Judaism to explain the whole movement without recourse to outside influences, and, in any case, it is most arbitrary and untrue to attribute all the Wisdom speculation to Greek forces (as, e.g., does Siegfried, HDB).

3. Religious Basis:

The following characteristics are typical of the group:

(1) The premises are universal. The writers draw from life wherever found, admitting that in some things Israel may learn from other nations. The Proverbs of Lemuel are referred explicitly to a non-Jewish author (Pr 31:1 the Revised Version margin), and Sirach recommends foreign travel to his students (34:10,11; 39:4). Indeed, all the princes of the earth rule through wisdom (Pr 8:16; compare Ec 9:15). And even some real knowledge of God can be obtained by all men through the study of natural phenomena (Ps 19:1; Sirach 16:29-17:14; 42:15-43:33; The Wisdom of Solomon 13:2,9; compare Ro 1:20).

(2) But some of the writers dissent here (Job 28:28; 11:7; Ec 2:11; 8:16,17; 11:5; The Wisdom of Solomon 9:13(?)). And in any case this wisdom needs God’s explicit grace for its cultivation (Sirach 51:13-22; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:7; 8:21), and when man trusts simply to his own attainments he is

bound to go wrong (Pr 3:5-7; 19:21; 21:30; 28:11; Sirach 3:24; 5:2,3; 6:2; 10:12; Baruch 3:15-28). True wisdom must center about God (Pr 15:33; 19:20 f), starting from Him (Pr 1:7; 9:10; Ps 111:10; Sirach 21:11; Job 28:28) and ending in Him (Pr 2:5); compare especially the beautiful passage Sirach 1:14-20. But the religious attitude is far from being the whole of Wisdom. The course is very difficult (Pr 2:4 f; 4:7; Sirach 4:17; 14:22,23; The Wisdom of Solomon 1:5; 17:1); continual attention must be given every department of life, and man is never done learning (Pr 9:9; Sirach 6:18; Ec 4:13).

(3) The attitude toward the written Law varies. In Ecclesiastes, Job and Proverbs it is hardly mentioned (Pr 28:7-9; 29:18 (?)). Wisdom, as a special pamphlet against idolatry, has little occasion for specific reference, but its high estimate of the Law is clear enough (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:12-15; 18:9). Sirach, especially, can find no terms high enough for the praise of the Law (especially Sirach 24; 36; compare 9:15; 21:11, etc.), and he identifies the Law with Wisdom (24:23-25) and claims the prophets as Wisdom teachers (44:3,4). Yet this perverse identification betrays the fact that Sirach's interest is not derived from a real study of the Law; the Wisdom that was so precious to him must be in the sacred books! Compare Baruch 4:1 (rather more sincere).

(4) The attitude toward the temple-worship is much the same. The rites are approved (Pr 3:9; Sirach 35:4-8; 38:11; Sirach seems to have an especial interest in the priesthood, 7:29-33; 50:5-21), but the writers clearly have no theory of sacrifice that they can utilize for practical purposes. And for sacrifice (and even prayer, Pr 28:9) as a substitute for righteousness no condemnation is too strong (Pr 7:14; 15:8; 20:25; 21:3,17; Sirach 34:18-26; 35:1-3,12; Ec (5:1).

(5) An outlook on life beyond the grave is notably absent in the Wisdom literature. Wisdom is the only exception (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1, etc.), but Greek influence in Wisdom is perfectly certain. In Job there are expressions of confidence (14:13-15; 19:25-29), but these do not determine the main argument of the book. Proverbs does not raise the question, while Ecclesiastes and Sirach categorically deny immortality (Ec 9:2-10; Sirach 14:16; 17:27,28; 30:4; note that the Revised Version (British and American) in Sirach 7:17; 48:11 is based on a glossed text; compare the Hebrew). Even the Messianic hope of the nation is in the background in Pr (2:21,22 (?)), and it is altogether absent in Job and Ecclesiastes. To Sirach (35:19; 36:11-14; 47:22) and Wisdom (3:8; 5:16-23) it is important, however, but not even these works have anything to say of a personal Messiah (Sirach 47:22 (?)).

(6) That in all the literature the individual is the center of interest need not be said. But this individualism, when combined with the weak eschatology, brought dire confusion into the doctrine of retribution (see SIN). Sirach stands squarely by the old doctrine of retribution in this life: if at no other time, a man's sins will be punished on his deathbed (1:13; 11:26). Neither Job nor Ecclesiastes, however, are content with this solution. The latter leaves the problem entirely unsolved (8:14, etc.), while the former commends it to God's unsearchable ways.

4. Ideals:

The basis of the Wisdom method may be described then as that of a "natural" religion respecting

revelation, but not making much use of it. So the ideal is a man who believes in God and who endeavors to live according to a prudence taught by observation of this world's laws, with due respect, however, to Israel's traditional observances.

(1) From many standpoints the resulting character is worthy of admiration. The man was intelligent, earnest, and hard-working (Proverbs has a particular contempt for the "sluggard"; and compare Ec 9:10). Lying and injustice are denounced on almost every page of the literature, and unceasing emphasis is laid on the necessity for benevolence (Ps 37:21; 112:5,9; Job 22:7; 31:16-20; Pr 3:27,28; 14:31; 21:13; 22:9; Ec 11:1; Sirach 4:16; 7:34,35; 29:11-13; 40:24, etc.). All of the writers feel that life is worth the living—at their most pessimistic moments the writers of Job and Ecclesiastes find attraction in the contemplation of the world. In Proverbs and Sirach the outlook is even buoyant, Sirach in especial being far from indifferent to the good things of life (30:23-25; 31:27; compare Ec 2:24 and contrast The Wisdom of Solomon 2:6-9).

(2) The faults of the Wisdom ideal are the faults of the postulates. The man is always self-conscious and self-centered. All intense enthusiasms are repressed, as likely to prove entangling (Ec 7:16,17 is the most extreme case), and the individual is always calculating (Sirach 38:17), even among his friends (Sirach 6:13; Pr 25:17) and in his family (Sirach 33:19-23). Benevolence itself is to be exercised circumspectly (Pr 6:1-5; 20:16; Sirach 12:5-7; 29:18), and Sirach, in particular, is very far from feeling an obligation to love all men (25:7; 27:24; 30:6; 50:25,26). So "right" and "wrong" become confused with "advantage" and "disadvantage." Not only is adultery wrong (Pr 2:17; Sirach 23:23), but the injured husband is a dangerous enemy (Pr 5:9-11,14; 6:34,35; Sirach 23:21). As a resuit the "moral perspective" is affected. With some of the finest moral observations in Proverbs and Sirach are combined instructions as to table manners (Pr 23:1-3; Sirach 31:12-18) and merely humorous observations (Pr 20:14), while such passages as Pr 22:22-28 and Sirach 41:17-24 contain extraordinary conglomerations of disparate motives.

(3) So hope of earthly recompense becomes a very explicit motive (Pr 3:10; 11:25, etc.; The Wisdom of Solomon 7:8-12 is the best statement on the other side). Even though riches are nothing in themselves (Pr 10:2; 11:28; 23:4,5; 28:11; Ec 5:13; Sirach 11:19; 31:5-7; all the literature denounces the unrighteous rich), yet Wisdom is to be desired as bringing not only righteousness but riches also (Pr 8:21; 11:25; 13:18; Sirach 4:15; 20:27,28; The Wisdom of Solomon 6:21). This same desire for advantage gives an unpleasant turn to many of the precepts which otherwise would touch the highest point; perhaps Pr 24:17,18 is the most extreme case: "Rejoice not when thine enemy falleth, ... lest Yahweh .... turn away his wrath from him" (!)

(4) But probably the most serious fault was that the Wisdom method tended to produce a religious aristocracy (Sirach 6:22, etc.). It was not enough that the heart and will should be right, for a long course of almost technical training was needed (the "house of instruction" in Sirach 51:23 is probably the school; compare Pr 9:4). The uninstructed or "simple" (Pr 1:22, etc.) were grouped quite simply with the "sinners"; knowledge was virtue and ignorance was vice. Doubtless Wisdom cried in the streets (Pr 1:20,21; 8:1-13; 9:1-6, almost certainly a reference to the canvassing efforts of the teachers for pupils), but only men of ability and leisure could obey the call to learn. And despite all that is said in praise of

manual labor (Pr 12:11; 24:27; 28:19; Sirach 7:15; 38:31,32,34), Sirach is merely frank when he says explicitly (38:25-34) that Wisdom cannot be for artisans (a carpenter as Messiah evidently would have been unthinkable to Sirach; Mr 6:3). Scribism was at work along the same lines of development, and the final union of the Wisdom method with the scribal produced a class who called the common people accursed (Joh 7:49).

5. Teaching of Christ:

The statement of the methods and ideals of the Wisdom school is also virtually a statement of our Lord's attitude toward it and an explanation of why much of His teaching took the form it did. As to the universality of the premises He was at one with the Wisdom writers, one great reason for the universality of the appeal of His teaching. Almost everything in the life of the time, from the lily of the field to the king on his throne, contributed its quota to His illustrations. And from the Wisdom method also the form of His teaching—the concise, antithetical saying that sticks in the memory—was derived to some degree. (Of all the sayings of Christ, perhaps Lu 14:8-10—a quotation of Pr 25:6,7—comes nearest to the pure Wisdom type.) In common with the Wisdom writers, also, is the cheerful outlook, despite the continual prospect of the Passion, and we must never forget that all morbid asceticism was entirely foreign to Him (Lu 7:34 parallel Mt 11:19). With the self-conscious, calculating product of the Wisdom method, however, He had no patience. Give freely, give as the Father giveth, without regard to self, in no way seeking a reward, is the burden of His teaching, and such a passage as Lu 6:27-38 seems to have been aimed at the head of such writers as Sirach. The attack on the religious aristocracy is too familiar to need recapitulation. Men by continual exercise of worldly prudence could make themselves as impervious to His teaching as by obstinate adherence to a scribal tradition, while His message was for all men on the sole basis of a desire for righteousness on their part. This was the true Wisdom, fully justified of her children (Lu 7:35; compare Mt 11:19), while, as touching the other "Wisdom," Christ could give thanks that God had seen fit to hide His mysteries from the wise and prudent and reveal them unto "babes" (Lu 10:21 parallel Mt 11:25).

6. Remainder of the New Testament:

(1) James

The remainder of the New Testament, despite many occurrences of the words "wise," "wisdom," etc., contains very little that is really relevant to the technical sense of the words. The one notable exception is James, which has even been classed as "Wisdom literature," and with some justice. For James has the same appeal to observation of Nature (1:11; 3:3-6,11,12; 5:7, etc.), the same observation of human life (2:2,3,15,16; 4:13, etc.), the same antithetical form, and even the same technical use of the word "wisdom" (1:5; 3:15-17). The fiery moral zeal, however, is far above that of the other Wisdom books, even above that of Job.

(2) Paul

Paul, on the other hand, belongs to an entirely different class, that of intense religious experience, seeking its premises in revelation. So the Wisdom method is foreign to him and the absence of Nature illustrations from his pages is notorious (even Ro 11:17 is an artificially constructed figure). Only one passage calls for special comment. The "wisdom" against which he inveighs in 1Co 1-3 is not Jewish but Greek-speculation in philosophy, with studied elegance in rhetoric. Still, Jewish or Greek, the moral difficulty was the same. God's message was obscured through an overvaluation of human attainments, and so Paul's use of such Old Testament passages as Isa 29:14; Job 5:13; Ps 94:11 (in 1Co 1:19; 3:19,20) is entirely lust. Against this "wisdom" Paul sets the doctrine of the Cross, something that outraged every human system but which, all the more, taught man his entire dependence on God.

Yet Paul had a "wisdom" of his own (1Co 2:6), that he taught to Christians of mature moral (not intellectual: 1Co 3:1-3) progress. Some commentators would treat this wisdom as doctrinal and find it in (say) Romans; more probably it is to be connected with the mystical experiences of the Christian whose life has become fully controlled by the Spirit (1Co 2:10-13). For religious progress is always accompanied by a higher insight that can never be described satisfactorily to persons without the same experience (1Co 2:14).

7. Hypostasis:

(1) One characteristic of the Wisdom writers that proved of immense significance for later (especially Christian) theology was a love of rhetorical personification of Wisdom (Pr 1:20-33; 8:1-9:6; Sirach 4:11-19; 6:23-31; 14:20-15:10; 24; 51:13-21; The Wisdom of Solomon 6:12-9:18; Baruch 3:29-32). Such personifications in themselves are not, of course, remarkable (compare e.g. the treatment of "love" in 1Co 13), but the studied, somewhat artificial style of the Wisdom writers carries out the personification with a curious elaboration of details: Wisdom builds her house, marries her disciple, mingles wine, etc. The most famous passage is Pr 8:22-31, however. The Wisdom that is so useful to man was created before man, before, indeed, the creation of the world. When the world was formed she was in her childhood, and while God formed the world she engaged in childish play, under His shelter and to His delight. So Pr 8:30 should be rendered, as the context makes clear that ‘mwn should be pointed ‘amun, "sheltered," and not ‘amon, "as a master-workman." And "Wisdom" is a quality of man (Pr 8:31-36), not a quality of God.

(2) Indeed, "Wisdom" is an attribute rarely predicated of God in the Old Testament (1Ki 3:28 Isa 10:13; 31:2; Jer 10:12; 51:15; compare Da 5:11), even in the Wisdom writers (Job 5:12 ff; 9:4; Ps 104:24; Pr 3:19). Partly this reticence seems to be due to a feeling that God's knowledge is hardly to be compared in kind to man's, partly to the fact that to the earlier writers "Wisdom" had a profane sound. Later works, however, have less hesitation in this regard (e.g., Sirach 42:21; Baruch 3:32, the Massoretic Text pointing and the Septuagint of Pr 8:30), so that the personifications became personifications of a quality of God. The result was one of the factors that operated to produce the doctrine of the "Word" as it appeared in the Palestinian form.

See LOGOS.

(3) In the Apocrypha, however, the most advanced step is taken in Wisdom. Wisdom is the only-begotten of God (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:22), the effulgence of eternal light (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:26; compare Heb 1:3), living with God (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:3) and sharing (?) His throne (The Wisdom of Solomon 9:4). She is the origin (or "mother") of all creatures (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:12; compare 8:6), continualiar active in penetrating (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:24), ordering (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:1), and renewing (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:27) all things, while carrying inspiration to all holy souls (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:23), especially to Israel (The Wisdom of Solomon 10:17,18). Here there is no doubt that the personification has ceased to be rhetorical and has become real. Wisdom is thought of as a heavenly being, not so distinctively personal, perhaps, as an angel, but none the less far more than a mere rhetorical term; i.e. she is a "hypostasis."

(4) Most of Wisdom's description is simply an expansion of earlier Palestinian concepts, but it is evident that other influence has been at work also and that that influence was Greek. The writer of Wisdom was touched genuinely by the Greek philosophy, and in The Wisdom of Solomon 7:24, at any rate, his "Wisdom" is the logos spermatikos of the Stoics, with more than suspicions of Greek influence elsewhere in the descriptions. This combination of Jewish and Greek thought was still further elaborated by Philo—and still further confused. For Philo endeavored to operate with the Wisdom doctrine in its Palestinian form, the Wisdom doctrine into which Wisdom had already infused some Loges doctrine, and the Logos doctrine by itself, without thoroughly understanding the discordant character of his terms. The result is one of the most obscure passages in Philo's system. Sometimes, as in DeFug. section 109, chapter xx, Wisdom is the mother of the Logos, as God is its Father (compare Cherubim, sections 49, 50, chapter xiv), while, again, the relation can be inverted almost in the same context and the Logos appears as the source of Wisdom (De Fug. section 97, chapter xviii).

See LOGOS.

(5) Philo's influence was incalculable, and Wisdom, as a heavenly power, plays an almost incredible role in the Gnostic speculations of the 2nd and 3rd centuries, the Gnostic work, Pistis Sophia, probably attaining the climax of unreality. The orthodox Fathers, however, naturally sought Wisdom within the Trinity, and Irenaeus made an identification with the Holy Spirit (iv. 20, 3). Tertullian, on the other hand, identified Wisdom with the Son (probably following earlier precedent) in Adv. Prax., 7, and this identification attained general acceptation. So Pr 8:22-30 became a locus classicus in the Christological controversies (an elaborate exposition in Athanaslus, Orat. ii. 16-22), and persisted as a dogmatic proof-text until a very modern period.

LITERATURE.

The Old Testament Theologies, particularly those of Smend, edition 2 (1899), and Bertholet (1911). For the intermediate period, GJV, III, edition 4 (1909), and Boasset, Die Religion des Judentums, edition 2 (1906). Special works: Toy, "Wisdom Literature," EB, IV (1903); Meinhold, Die Weisheit Israels (1908); Friedlander, Griechische Philosophie im Altes Testament (1904, to be used cautiously). On Philo, compare especially Drummond, Philo Judaeus, II, 201-13 (1888).

See also the articles on the various books and compare LOGOS; PHILO, JUDAEUS.

Burton Scott Easton

WISDOM LITERATURE

lit’-er-a-tur. See preceding article.

WISDOM OF GOD

(sophia): Lu 11:49 reads: "Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I will send unto them prophets and apostles; and some of them they shall kill and persecute." The patristic and many later commentators, on the basis of the parallel in Mt 23:34, took "wisdom of God" here to be a self-designation of Christ—an interpretation, however, that is obviously impossible. Somewhat similar is the view (Meyer) that treats the words as a Lukan designation of Christ, with the assumption that Luke here reintroduces Christ as the speaker in order to give solemnity to the judgment pronounced. But this is incredibly awkward and has no parallel in the Lukan use for even more solemn passages. Much simpler is the interpretation (Hofmann, B. Weiss, Plummer) that regards Christ as announcing here a decree formed by God in the past. But it is the behavior of the present generation that is in point (compare Lu 13:8,9; 20:13; altogether different is Lu 10:21). And the circumstantial wording of what follows is inappropriate for such a decree, is without parallel in Christ’s teaching, and implies rather a written source. In the Old Testament, however, no passage exists that resembles this (Pr 1:20-31 (so Godet) is quite out of the question). So many exegetes (Holtzmann, J. Weiss, Loisy, Harnack) find here a quotation from some lost source that our Lord approved and that was familiar to His hearers. This is certainly the most natural explanation. Nor can it be said to be impossible that Christ recognized genuine prophetic inspiration in some writing that was meant to have transitory value only and not to be preserved for future generations. Perhaps this bore the title "Wisdom of God" or represented "Wisdom" as speaking, as in Pr 1:22-33.

Burton Scott Easton

WISDOM OF JESUS

See SIRACH.

WISDOM OF SOLOMON, THE

I. NAME

II. CANONICITY

III. CONTENTS

1. The Wisdom Section, The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-11:14

2. The Historical Section, The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5-19:22

IV. LITERARY FORM

V. UNITY AND INTEGRITY

VI. TEACHING

1. Theology

2. Anthropology

3. Deontology

4. Hamartiology

5. Soteriology

6. Eschatology

VII. AIM

VIII. AUTHOR

IX. DATE

1. Literary

2. Historical

3. Philosophical

X. ORIGINAL LANGUAGE

XI. USE OF WISDOM BY CHRISTIAN WRITERS

XII. TEXT AND VERSIONS

1. Latin

2. Syriac

LITERATURE

I. Name.

In the Greek manuscripts (Codex Vaticanus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Sinaiticus, etc.) the book is called "The Wisdom of Solomon" Sophia Salomonos, the form of the latter word varying in the best manuscripts). In the Syriac (Peshitta) its title is "The Book of the Great Wisdom of Solomon." Solomon was among the Jews and the early Christians the patron of didactic, as David was of lyrical, and Moses of religious-legal, literature, and their names came to be associated with literary compositions with which they had nothing to do. We read in the Old Testament of the wisdom of Solomon (1Ki 3:7-14; compare Sirach 47:12-18 (14-19)), and the whole of the Book of Proverbs is called by his name, though he is at most the author of but a part. Solomon speaks in the first person in this book (The Wisdom of Solomon 6-9), as he does in Ec 1:12 ff, for that he is made the speaker until the close of The Wisdom of Solomon 9 is made certain by 7:1 ff; 9:2 ff. As long as he was thought to be the composer of this book it continued to be called "The Wisdom of Solomon" among the Jews and the early Christians.

Influenced by the Greek thought and style of the book, Jerome came to the conclusion that Solomon was not its author and he accordingly altered its title to "The Book of Wisdom" (Liber sapientiae), and it is this designation that the book bears in the Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) and the versions made from it, though in the Protestant translations (German, English, Welsh, etc.) the title "The Wisdom of Solomon" is continued, as these, follow the Greek version and not the Latin Luther’s title is The Wisdom of Solomon to Tyrants". (Die Weisheit Salamos an die Tyrannen). Epiphanius and Athanasius quote the book under the name "All-Virtuous Wisdom" (Panaretos Sophia), a title by which Proverbs and Sirach are also known in the writings of some of the Fathers.

II. Canonicity.

In the manuscripts and odd of the Greek Bible and in the Vulgate, English Versions of the Bible, etc., Wisdom follows Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, and is followed by Sirach. Some of the Fathers, believing the book to be by Solomon, thought it divinely-inspired and therefore canonical; so Hippolytus, Cyprian, Ambrose, etc. Other Fathers, though denying the Solomonian authorship of the book, yet accorded it canonical rank; so Origen, Eusebius, Augustine, etc. On the other hand there were some in the early church who refused to acknowledge the book as in any way authoritative in matters of doctrine. The Council of Trent included it with the rest of the Protestant Apocrypha (except 1 and 2 Esdras and Pr Man) in the Canon, so that the Romanist Bible includes it, but the Protestant Bible excludes it.

III. Contents.

The book is made up of two main parts so different as to suggest difference of authorship.

(1) The wisdom section (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-11:4): In this part the writer describes and commends Wisdom, warning his readers against neglecting it.

(2) The historical section (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5-19:22).

1. The Wisdom Section, The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-11:14:

(1) Righteousness:

Righteousness (i.e. Wisdom in operation) leads to immortality, unrighteousness to death (The Wisdom of Solomon 1).

(2) Contrasted Fortunes of the Wise (Righteous) and Unwise (Ungodly) (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:1-6:21).

(a) Sensual pleasures issue in death while God intended all men to live spiritually (The Wisdom of Solomon 2);

(b) the lot of the wise (righteous) is a happy one. Their sufferings are disciplinary and remedial; they shall live forever and reign hereafter over the nations (Gentiles) (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1-9);

(c) but the lot of the wicked and of their children is a miserable one; the wise (righteous) shall be happy though childless (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:10-19);

(d) virtuous childlessness secures immortality before guilty parenthood (The Wisdom of Solomon 4:1-6);

(e) though the wise (righteous) die early, yet they have rest in their death, and accomplish their life mission in the allotted time (of Enoch) (The Wisdom of Solomon 4:7-14);

(f) the ungodly (unwise) shall come to a wretched end: then they shall see and envy the prosperity of the righteous. Though they shall pass tracelessly away, the righteous shall rejoice in a life that is endless (The Wisdom of Solomon 4:15-5:23);

(g) kings ought therefore to rule according to Wisdom and thus attain to immortality (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:1-21).

(3) Wisdom.

Speaking in the name of Solomon, the writer praises Wisdom and commends it to kings ("judges"=" rulers" in The Wisdom of Solomon 6:1, is but a synonym) (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:1-11:4).

(a) All men come into the world with the same universal need of Wisdom which leads to true kingship and immortality (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:1-25);

(b) I (Solomon) sought Wisdom as the main thing and in obtaining it had along with it every good thing, including knowledge of every kind (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:1-8:21);

(c) the prayer which Solomon offered for Wisdom (The Wisdom of Solomon 9:1-18);

(d) how Wisdom defended the heroes of Hebrew history, from the first man, Adam, to the Israelites at the Red Sea and in the wilderness (The Wisdom of Solomon 10:1-11:4).

2. The Historical Section, The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5-19:22:

In this second part of the book Solomon no longer speaks in the first person (as in The Wisdom of Solomon 6-9), nor is Wisdom once mentioned or for certain referred to, though most writers see in this part the attempt of the author of The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-11:4 to exemplify in concrete instances the working of that Wisdom of which in the first part he describes the nature and issues.

(1) Contrasted treatment by God (not Wisdom) of the Israelites and their foes (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5-12). By what things their foes were punished they were benefited (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5).

(a) The Egyptians (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5-12:2): Water a boon to Israel, a bane to Egypt (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:6-14). The Egyptians punished by the animals they worshipped (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:15-20), though there was a relenting on God’s part that sinners might repent (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:21-12:2).

(b) The Canaanites (The Wisdom of Solomon 12:3-27): The abominations of the worship and the divine punishment with the lessons this last teaches.

(2) Idolatry described and condemned (The Wisdom of Solomon 13-15). These chapters form a unity in themselves, a digression from the historical survey closed with The Wisdom of Solomon 12:27 and continued in 16:1-19. The digression may of course be due to the allusion in 11:5-12 to the sins of the Egyptians and Canaanites. Kinds of idolatry:

(a) Nature-worship (fire, wind, air, water, heavenly bodies), due often to sincere desire to find out God (13:1-9);

(b) worship of idols in animal form, a much grosset sin (13:10-19);

(c) God’s indignation against all forms of idolatry (14:1-11);

(d) origin of image-worship (14:15-21); the father mourning for his deceased son makes an image of him and then worships it (14:15); rulers are often flattered and then deified (14:16 f); artists often make images so attractive as to tempt men to regard them as gods (14:18-21);

(e) immoral results of idolatry: "The worship of idols .... a beginning and cause and end of every evil" (14:27) (14:22-31);

(f) Israel was free from idolatry and in consequence enjoyed the divine favor (15:1-5);

(g) the folly of idolatry: the image man made less capable than man its maker and worshipper; the Egyptians the worst offenders (15:6-19).

(3) In five different respects the fortunes of Egypt and Israel in the past are contrasted, Nature using similar means to punish the Egyptians and to reward the Israelites (The Wisdom of Solomon 16-19:22), namely, in respect of the following:

(a) animals, quail (The Wisdom of Solomon 16:1-4) and fiery serpents (The Wisdom of Solomon 16:5-14) (The Wisdom of Solomon 16:1-14);

(b) fire and water, heat and cold (The Wisdom of Solomon 16:15-29);

(c) light and darkness (The Wisdom of Solomon 17:1-18:4);

(d) death (The Wisdom of Solomon 18:5-25);

(e) passage of the Red Sea (The Wisdom of Solomon 19:1-22).

IV. Literary Form.

There is not so much manifest poetry in this book as in Sirach, though there is large amount of genuine poetry characterized by parallelism, but not by meter in the ordinary sense of the term. In parts of the book, which must be pronounced prose, parallelism is nevertheless often found (see The Wisdom of Solomon 10:1 ff). There are far fewer epigrammatic sentences in Wisdom than in Sirach, but on the other hand there is a far greater number of other rhetorical devices, assonances (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:10; 4:2; 5:15; 7:13), alliterations (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:23; 5:12,18; 6:11; 12:15), antitheses (The Wisdom of Solomon 13:18 f), etc. See for details Speaker’s Apocrypha (Farrar), I, 404 ff.

V. Unity and Integrity.

Nearly all writers on the book believe it to be one homogeneous whole, the work of one mind. They point for proof to the fact that the whole book is a consistent whole directed against the two evils, apostasy and idolatry; that the language is from beginning to end uniform, such as one writer would be likely to employ.

For a statement of contrary views and a reply to them see the Commentary of Grimm, pp. 9-15. Until about the middle of the 18th century no doubt had been expressed as regards the unity of the book.

(1) Houbigant (Notae criticae in universos New Testament libros, 1777, 169) divided the book into two parts: The Wisdom of Solomon 1-9 written by Solomon in Hebrew, The Wisdom of Solomon 10-19 composed in Greek at a later time, perhaps by the translation into Greek of chapters 1-9. Against the Solomonian authorship see VIII, below, and against a Hebrew original see X, below. Doederlein adopted Houbigant's division of the book, denying, however, the authorship by Solomon.

(2) Eichhorn (Einleitung in das New Testament, 142 ff) divided the book also into two parts: The Wisdom of Solomon 1-11 and 11:2-19. He held that the whole was composed in Greek by two different writers or by the same writer at different times.

(3) Nachtigal (Das Buch der Welshelf, 1799) went much farther, holding that the book is nothing more than anthology, but he has had no followers in this.

(4) Bretschneider (De lib. Sap., 1804) ascribes the book to three principal authors and to a final editor.

The Wisdom of Solomon 1-6:8 was composed in Hebrew in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes (died 164 BC) by a Palestinian Jew, though it is an excerpt from a larger work; 6:9-10 is the work of an Alexandrian Jew, a contemporary of our Lord; The Wisdom of Solomon 11 was inserted by the final editor as seemingly necessary to connect parts 2 and 3; The Wisdom of Solomon 12-19 were written about the same time by a Jewish partisan of slender education and narrow sympathies.

Summary.

Perhaps, on the whole, the arguments in favor of the unity of the book outweigh those against it. But the evidence is by no means decisive. The Wisdom section (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-11:4) is a much finer bit of writing than the rest of the book, and it bears the general characteristics of the Wisdom literature. Yet even within this larger unity The Wisdom of Solomon 6-9 stand out from the rest, since only in them is Solomon made to speak in the first person (compare Ec 1:12 ff); but these four chapters agree with the rest of the Wisdom section in other respects. Within the historical section (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5-19:22) The Wisdom of Solomon 13-15 stand together as if a separate treatise on idolatry (see III, above), though if originally independent an editor has logically joined chapter 15 to

chapter 12 ; compare "for" (gar), "etc." (13:1). Indeed the book in its present form is made at least externally one, though it is not absolutely certain whether or not this external unity is due to editorial revision. Some scholars have maintained that the book as it stands is a torso (so Eichhorn, etc.). Calmer infers this from the fact that the historical sketch closes with the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan. Others say that the writer's sketch was cut short by some unforeseen event (Grotius, Eichhorn), or that the remainder of the once complete work has been lost in transmission (Heydenreich). But on the other hand it must be remembered that the writer's record is limited by his purpose, and that the history of the Egyptians supplies an admirable and adequate illustration of the wickedness and calamitous results of unfaithfulness to God and His law.

VI. Teaching.

In the treatment of this section it is assumed with some hesitation that the book is throughout the work of one man. The following is a brief statement of the teaching of this book concerning theology, anthropology, deontology, martiology, soteriology, and eschatology.

1. Theology:

Theology in the strict sense, i.e. the doctrine about God: God is incomparably powerful (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:21 f), omni-present (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:7; 12:1) and all-loving (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:24). He made the world out of formless matter (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:17, the doctrine of the Alexandrian Judaism). He did not create the world out of nothing as the Old Testament (Ge 1:1) and even Sirach teach (see SIRACH, BOOK OF, IV, 1). The author's highest conception of creation is the conversion of chaos into cosmos. It is the order and beauty of the universe that amaze the writer, not the stupendous power required to make such a universe out of nothing (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:20; 13:3). Though God is said to be just (The Wisdom of Solomon 12:15), kind (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:13; 11:17-26; 12:13-16; 15:1; 16:7), and is even addressed as Father (The Wisdom of Solomon 14:3), yet He is in a unique sense the Favorer and Protector of Israel (The Wisdom of Solomon 16:2; 18:8; 19:22); yet according to The Wisdom of Solomon 12:2-20 even the calamities He heaps up upon the foes of Israel were designed to lead them to repentance (12:2-20), though in The Wisdom of Solomon 11 f we are clearly taught that while the sufferings of the Israelites were remedial, those of their enemies were purely penal. The conception of God in Wisdom agrees on the whole with that of Alexandrian Judaism (circa 100 BC); i.e. it lays principal stress on His transcendence, His infinite aloofness from man and the material world. We have therefore in this book the beginning of the doctrine of intermediaries which issued in Philo's Powers, the media through which the Absolute One comes into definite relation with men.

(1) Spirit of the Lord.

In Wisdom as in the later books of the Old Testament (exilic and post-exilic), the expression "the Spirit of the Lord" denotes the person of God. What God does is done by the Spirit. Thus, it is His Spirit that fills and sustains the world, that observes all human actions (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:7 f), that is

present everywhere (The Wisdom of Solomon 12:1). Wisdom does not hypostatize "the Spirit of the Lord," making it an intermediary between God and His creatures, but the way is prepared for this step.

(2) Wisdom.

Much that is said of the Spirit of the Lord in this book is said of Wisdom, but much more, and there is a much closer approach to hypostatization in the case of Wisdom. At the creation of the world Wisdom was with God (compare Pr 8:22-31), sat by His throne, knew His thoughts and was His associate (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:3; 9:4,9), made all things, taught Solomon the Wisdom for which he prayed (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:22); all powerful, seeing all things (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:23), pervading all things (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:24), an effluence of the glory of the Almighty (The Wisdom of Solomon 7:25); she teaches sobriety, understanding, righteousness and courage (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:7, the four cardinal virtues of the Stoic philosophy). For detailed account of the conception of Wisdom in this book see WISDOM.

(3) The Logos.

In Philo the Logos is the intermediary power next to Deity, but in Wisdom the term keeps to the Old Testament sense, "word," that by which God addresses men. It never means more, though some hold (Gfrorer, Philo, etc., I 225 ff) that in The Wisdom of Solomon 9:1 f; 12:9; 16:12; 18:22, Logos has the technical sense which it bears in Philo; but a careful examination of the passages shows that nothing more than "word" is meant (see LOGOS). The only other superhuman beings mentioned in the book are the gods of the Gentiles which are distinctly declared to be nonentities, the product of man's folly (14:13 f), and the Devil who is, however, but once referred to as identical with the serpent of Ge 3. The book does not once speak of a Canon of Scripture or of any divine revelation to man in written form, though it often quotes from the Pentateuch and occasionally from Isaiah and Psalms, never, however, naming them. Wisdom is thus much more universalistic and in harmony with Wisdom literature than Sirach, which identifies Wisdom with the Law and the Prophets and has other distinctly Jewish features.

2. Anthropology:

In its psychology Wisdom follows the dichotomy of Platonism. Man has but two parts, soul and body (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:4; 8:19 f; 9:15), the word soul (psuche) including the reason (nous) and the spirit (pneuma). The Wisdom of Solomon 15:11 is the only passage which seems to teach the doctrine of the trichotomy of man, but in reality it does nothing of the kind, for the parallelism shows that by "soul" and "spirit" the same thing is meant. Philo teaches the same doctrine (see Drummond, Philo, etc., I, 316 ff). Man's soul is breathed into the body (15:11; compare Ge 2:7) and taken back again by God (15:8). The writer adopts the Platonic theory of the pre-existence of souls (8:20; compare 15:8,11,16), which involves the belief in a kind of predestination, for the previous doings of the soul determine the kind of body into which it enters. Solomon's soul, being good, entered an undefiled body (8:20). R. H. Charles (Eschatology, etc., 254 f) is hardly correct when he says that according to Wisdom (1:4; 9:15, etc.) matter is inherently sinful. This doctrine was definitely taught by Philo, who accepted Heraclitus'

epigram, soma sema, "The body is a tomb." So it is said (12:10; 13:1) that man is by nature evil, his wickedness being inborn. But if he sins it is his own affair, for he is free (1:16; 5:6,13). The writer borrows two words from Greek poetry and philosophy which appear to involve a negation of human freedom, namely, anake, "necessity" and dike "justice" "avenging justice". The first blinds the eyes of the ungodly (17:17), but the blindness is judicial, the result of a course of evil (see 19:1-5). The second term is used in Greek philosophy in the sense of nemesis, and it has that sense in The Wisdom of Solomon 1:8, etc. But throughout this book it is assumed that punishment for sin is deserved, since man is free. The author of Wisdom believes in a twofold division into good (wise) and bad (ungodly), and, unlike the writers of the later parts of the Old Testament, he holds it possible for a person to pass from one class into another. But does not God, according to parts of Wisdom, as of the Old Testament, appear to show undue favoritism to Israel and neglect of other people? Thus Israel is "God's Son" (18:13), His children (sons, 12:19,21; 16:10,26), His sons and daughters (9:7). They are His holy and elect ones (3:9; 4:15; and especially 10:17; 18:1,5). But the Israelites were treated as they were, not because they were Israelites, but because they were morally better than the nations around (see Drummond, op. cit., II, 207 ff).

3. Deontology:

Under the term "deontology" here, religious and ethical practice is included.

(1) As might be expected in a Wisdom book, little importance is attached to the Law of Moses and its requirements. Though historical allusions are made to the offering of sacrifices, the singing of psalms and the taking upon themselves of the obligation of the covenant of the Law (The Wisdom of Solomon 18:9); though, moreover, reference is made to the offering of incense by Aaron (The Wisdom of Solomon 18:21), and Solomon is made to utter the words "temple," "altar," "tabernacle" (The Wisdom of Solomon 9:8), yet in other respects nothing is said of the temple and its feasts, of the priesthood, of sacrifice, or of the laws of clean and unclean. Yet the duty of worshipping the one true God and Him only and the evil results of worshipping idols are strongly and constantly insisted upon, especially in the second or historical part of the book (The Wisdom of Solomon 11:5 to end).

(2) The cardinal virtues inculcated are those of the Stoic philosophy, namely, prudence (sophrosune), common-sense (phronesis), justice dikaiosune) and courage (andreia), showing that the writer was influenced by the philosophy of the Greeks.

4. Hamartiology:

As a historical fact, the writer adopts the account in Ge 3 of the entrance of sin into the world. "By the envy of the Devil, death (i.e. as the connection proves, spiritual death) entered into the world" (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:24). In The Wisdom of Solomon 14:27, however, sin is made to have its root in idolatry, meaning perhaps that all sin consists in not giving-proper heed to the one true God, and that the moral monstrosities of his time were outgrowths of idolatrous worship. The freedom of the will is taught explicitly or implicitly throughout the book (see above VI, 2).

5. Soteriology:

The book is silent as to a Messiah who shall deliver his people. It is Wisdom that saves man: "Because of her I shall have immortality" (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:13); immortality lies in kinship to Wisdom (The Wisdom of Solomon 8:17); all who give heed to the commands of Wisdom have the assurance of incorruption, and incorruption brings men near to God (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:18 f). The knowledge of God's power is the root of immortality (The Wisdom of Solomon 15:2).

6. Eschatology:

The doctrine of individual immortality is explicitly taught in this book. Man (= all men) was created for incorruption (The Wisdom of Solomon 2:23; 6:19; 12:1). The righteous have the full hope of immortality (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:4) and shall live forever (The Wisdom of Solomon 5:15). When the wicked die they have no hope (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:18), since they suffer for their sins in this present world as well as in that which is to come (The Wisdom of Solomon 3:16,18). The doctrine of a resurrection of the body is not taught. If the author accepted Philo's doctrine of the inherent sinfulness of matter (see above VI, 2), as R. H. Charles holds, he could not believe in a bodily resurrection. After death there is to be a day of decision (diagnosis, the word used in Ac 25:21; see The Wisdom of Solomon 3:18); there will be an examination (exetasis) into the counsels of the ungodly. The sins of the wicked shall be reckoned up (The Wisdom of Solomon 4:20), but the righteous man shall stand in great boldness before the face of them that afflicted him (The Wisdom of Solomon 5:1). The teaching of the book as to the future of the righteous does not seem to be consistent. According to The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1 ff, the righteous pass at death immediately into the bliss of God; but the teaching of 4:20 f is that the wicked and the righteous shall be assembled in one place to receive their sentence.

VII. Aim.

The writer's purpose appears to have been to recommend to his fellow-countrymen in Alexandria the claims of religion under the names of Wisdom, Righteousness, etc., and to warn them against falling into the idolatry of the Egyptians. In addition to glorifying Wisdom, he gives an ironical account of the rise of idolatry, and he uses strong language in pointing out the disastrous consequences in this world and the next of a life away from the true God (see above, III). The book is ostensibly addressed to rulers, but they are mentioned only in The Wisdom of Solomon 6:1-11,20-25, and the appeal of the book is to men as such. In addressing rulers the author uses a rhetorical device. It might be argued that if rulers with their superior advantages need such exhortations and warnings, how much more ordinary men!

Plumptre (Ecclesiastes, 70) and Siegfried (HDB, iV, 928) contend that the Solomon of this book is made to answer the Solomon of Ecclesiastes. But the author does not show any acquaintance with Ecclesiastes, and it is hardly likely that this last book was known at the time in Alexandria, for though composed about 200 BC, it was not put into Greek for a long time afterward. Besides, there is nothing about idolatry in Ecclesiastes. The conclusion reached in the genuine parts of this last book is a counsel of despair: "All is vanity." A reply to that book would seek to show that life is worth living for the sake

of the present and the future. The Book of Wisdom denounces idolatry in the most scathing language: how can this and the like be a polemic against Ecclesiastes?

VIII. Author.

The author was an Alexandrian Jew, well read in the Septuagint whose phrases he often uses, fairly acquainted with Greek philosophy as taught at Alexandria and also with physical science as known at the time (see The Wisdom of Solomon 7:17-20; 8:8). He was beyond all doubt a Jew, for the views he advocates are those of an enlightened but strong Judaism; his interests are even narrowly Jewish (note the fiercely anti-Gentile sentiments of The Wisdom of Solomon 11:10-13,17-23), and his style is largely tinged by the vocabulary and the phraseology of the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures. That he was an Alexandrian or at least an Egyptian Jew is equally probable. No Palestinian could have written the language of this work with its rhetorical devices (see above, IV), or have displayed the acquaintance which the book reveals with Greek philosophy as modified by Jewish-Alexandrian thought.

Other Views.

These include: (1) that Solomon is the author: see above, II. No modern scholar takes this view seriously, though singularly enough it has been revived by D. S. Margoliouth;

(2) that Zerubbabel is the author (J. M. Faber);

(3) that the author was one of the translators of the Septuagint;

(4) that the author belonged to the Therapeutae: so Gfrorer (Philo, II, 265), Dahne (Philo, II, 270); compare Jost (Geschichte des Judaismus, I, 378). This has been inferred from The Wisdom of Solomon 16:28, the Therapeutae being, it is said, a Jewish sect which, like the Zarathustrians, worshipped toward the rising sun. But we know very little about this sect, and there is no decisive evidence that it ever existed. If, however, Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, II, 17) is right in saying that Philo's Therapeutae were Christians (the earliest Christian sect of Alexandria), it is clear that no member of this sect wrote Wisdom, for the book is wholly free from Christian influence;

(5) that Ben Sira is the author (Augustine);

(6) that Apollos is the author: so Noack (Der Ursprung des Christenthums, I, 222); Plumptre (Expositor, I, 329 ff, 409 ff); see summary of grounds in Speaker's Apocrypha (Farrar), I, 413 ff; but the author must have been a Jew and he wrote too early to allow of this hypothesis;

(7) that Philo is the author: thus Jerome writes (Praef. in lib. Sol.): Nonnulli scriptorum hunt ease Judaei Philonis affirmant. This view was supported by Luther and other scholars; compare the Muratorian Fragment (in Zahn's text) in XI, below. But the teaching of this book represents an earlier stage of Alexandrian Jewish speculation than that found in Philo's works, and the allegorical method of

interpretation so rampant in the latter is almost wholly absent from Wisdom.

(8) It has been held by some (Kirschbaum, Weisse, etc.) that whoever the author was he must have been a Christian, but the whole trend and spirit of the book prove the contrary.

IX. Date.

1. Literary:

The book was probably composed about 120-100 BC. The evidence is literary, historical and philosophical. The book must have been written after the Septuagint version of the Pentateuch and Isaiah had been made, since the author has evidently used this version of both books and perhaps of the Psalms as well (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1 and Ps 31:5(6); and also The Wisdom of Solomon 15:15 f and Ps 115:4-7 (= Ps 135:15-18)). Now we know from Sirach (Prolegomena) that the Septuagint of the Pentateuch, the Prophets and of at least a portion of the Writings (Hagiographa) was completed by 132 BC, when the younger Siracide finished his translation of Sirach (see SIRACH, BOOK OF, VIII). It may therefore be inferred that Wisdom was written after 132 BC. Moreover, in The Wisdom of Solomon 4:1 the author shows an acquaintance with Sirach 16:1-4 in Greek, for the pseudo-Solomon does not seem to have known Hebrew, or he would sometimes at least have quoted from the Hebrew text. This confirms the conclusion drawn from the use of the Septuagint that this book is at least as late as, say, 130 BC, and almost certainly later. The book was composed earlier than any of the New Testament writings, or some of the latter would have been quoted or referred to. Moreover, it may be assumed that the Greek Canon was complete in the time of our Lord, and thus included Wisdom as well as the rest of the Old Testament Apocrypha. But see International Journal of Apocrypha, October, 1913, p. 77, article by the present writer. It must have taken a long time after writing for the book to gain the respect which secured its canonization. A date 100 BC agrees with all the facts.

2. Historical:

The Wisdom of Solomon 3:1; 5:1; 6:5-9 imply that at the time of writing the Jews addressed were suffering under the lash of persecution, and we have the resulting feeling of, animosity against the Egyptians, the persecuting power, expressed in 11:16-19. Now we know that the early Ptolemies treated the Jews with consideration, and Ptolemy VII (Physcon, 145-117 BC) was the first to adopt a contrary policy toward the Jews of Egypt, owing to the support they had given to Cleopatra. Josephus (Apion, II, 5) gives an account of the vengeance which this king wreaked upon the Jews of Alexandria at this time. Nevertheless, the literary manner and the restrained spirit with which these matters are referred to show that the writer is describing a state of things which belongs to the past, though to a recent past. A date about 100 BC would admirably suit the situation of the author at the time of composition.

3. Philosophical:

The teaching of the book (see above, VI) belongs to that stage in the development of Alexandrian

Judaism which existed about 100 BC. We have not in this book the allegorization characteristic of Philo (born 20 BC, died 40 AD), nor had his Logos doctrine as yet become a part of the creed of Alexandrian Jews.

X. Original Languages.

Scholars are practically agreed that the book was composed in Greek D. S. Margoliouth attempted to prove a Hebrew original (Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1890, 263-97; see reply by Freudenthal, JQR, III, 722-53), but the evidence he offers has convinced nobody.

(1) The Greek of Wisdom is free, spontaneous and idiomatic. There are a few Hebraisms, but only such as characterize Hellenistic Greek in general; Wisdom is very different in this from Sirach which abounds with Hebraisms, due no doubt to translation from a Hebrew original.

(2) The rhetorical devices so common in the Greek of the book can be due only to the original text; they could hardly occur in such profusion in a translation. In addition to those mentioned above in IV, note the Greek rhetorical figures chiasmus (The Wisdom of Solomon 1:1-4:8; 3:15) and sorites (The Wisdom of Solomon 6:7-20).

(3) The translation of Sirach into Hebrew before the discovery of the Hebrew fragments had been often attempted and found comparatively easy; but it is very difficult to put Wisdom into Hebrew because the style is so thoroughly Greek.

(4) No trace of a Hebrew original has thus far been found. What Nachmanides saw was not the original Hebrew, but a translation in Hebrew from the original text. Jerome (Praef. in lib. Sol.) says that though he had himself seen Sirach in Hebrew, a Hebrew text of Wisdom was not to be found.

XI. Use of Wisdom by Christian Writers.

It has been thought that the following parts of the New Testament have been influenced by Wisdom: Lu 2:7 (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 7:4); Lu 12:20 (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 15:8); Lu 9:31 (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 3:2); Lu 19:44 (compare The Wisdom of Solomon 3:7). The Logos doctrine of John (see Joh 1:1, etc.) has certainly a connection with the doctrine of Wisdom in Wisdom (see Gregg, Commentary, liv ff). Grafe (Theologische Abhandlungen, Freiburg in B., 1892) endeavors to prove that Paul made large use of Wisdom (see also Sanday and Headlam, Romans, 51 f, 267-69); but this has been denied; see further Dearie (Commentary, 15 ff). The book was certainly known to Clement of Rome, Tatian, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria and Hippolytus. The Muratorian Fragment states the work to have been "composed by the friends of Solomon in his honor" (ll. 69-71). Zahn (Gesch. Kan., II, 101, following a suggestion of Tregelles) prefers to read "composed by Philo in Solomon’s honor"—an easy change in the Greek (philonos for philon). Origen (Contra Celsus, v.29) calls it "the work entitled Wisdom of Solomon," so intimating doubt as to the authorship.

XII. Text and Versions.

The text in Codex Vaticanus pointed with collations in Swete's Old Testament in Greek, is on the whole the best, though both Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Ephraemi (which is incomplete) have good texts, Codex Alexandrinus being fairly trustworthy. The text is found also in fair preservation in many cursives.

1. Latin:

The Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) is identical with, but has slight variations from, the Old Latin Lagarde (Mittheilungen, 243-86) gives the Latin version of Sirach and Wisdom found in Codex Amiaut. This last is a literal rendering from the Greek.

2. Syriac:

The Syriac (Peshitta) version found in the London Polyglot and in Lagarde (Lib. Apocrypha Syr) was made immediately from the Greek, but apparently from the text in Codex Alexandrinus or in one like it.

LITERATURE.

Besides the works cited in the course of the foregoing article and the general works (commentaries, etc.) on the Apocrypha mentioned under APOCRYPHA (which see), the following are to be noted:

(1) Commentaries: Bauermeister, Commentary in Sap. Sol. libr., 1828; Grimm, Komm. uber das Buch der Weisheit, 1857, also his excellent commentary in the Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch, series 1860; J.H. Schmid, Das Buch der Welsheit: Uebersetzt und erklart, 1857; Gutberlet, Das Buch der Weisheit, 1874; W. J. Deane, The Book of Wisdom, Greek Vulgate and the King James Version with "Commentary." (1881, full and fairly scholarly); Speaker's Apocrypha (Farrar) is interesting and often helpful; Siegfried's "Introduction" and "Commentary" in Kautzsch's Die Apocrypha is slight, but also often helpful; The Wisdom of Solomon by J. A. E. Gregg (the Revised Version (British and American) with "Introduction" and "Commentary," Cambridge Bible) is brief and popular, but trustworthy; A. T. S. Goodrick, The Book of Wisdom, 1913 (admirable); S. Holmes (in the Oxford Apocrypha, with Introduction and Comm.).

(2) Of the dict. arts., that in Encyclopedia Biblica (by C. H. Toy) is perhaps the best; that in HDB (Siegfried) is fair but defective.

(3) In addition to the works by Gfrorer and Dahne discussing the philosophy of the book, the following works may be mentioned: Bruch, Weisheits-Lehre der Hebraer, 1851 (322-78); Zeller, Die Philosophic der Griechen (1881), III, part 2, 271-74, 4th edition, 272-96; Kubel, "Die ethischen Grundanschauungen der Weisheit Salomos," in Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1865, 690-722; Menzel, Der griechische

Einfluss auf Prediger und Weisheit Salomos, 1889, 39-70; Bois, Essai sur les origines de la philosophic judeo-alexandrine, 1890, 211-309, 337-412. The work by Drummond, often quoted, has been carefully done and is interestingly written (Philo Judaeus, 1888, 2 volumes; see I, 177-229).

For detailed bibliography see Schurer, GJV4, 1909, III, 508 ff; HJP, 1886, II, 3, pp. 236 f, is necessarily very defective.

T. Witton Davies

WISE MEN

wiz'-men: In addition to the uses of "wise" specified in the article WISDOM, the adjective is employed occasionally as the technical description of men who are adepts in magic, divination, etc. (e.g. in Ge 41:8; Ex 7:11; Es 1:13; Da 2:27; 5:15). Naturally, however, in the ancient world the boundary between genuine knowledge and astrology, etc., was exceedingly vague, and it was never denied that real knowledge could be gained along lines that we know to be futile. So the initiation of Moses into all the wisdom of the Egyptians (Ac 7:22) or of Daniel into all the learning of the Chaldeans (Da 1:4) met with no disapproval. These great men could be trusted to avoid the moral and religious pitfalls of such pursuits. For the ordinary Israelites, however the uncompromising prohibition of idolatry closed the door definitely to all studies of this kind. See ASTROLOGY; DIVINATION, etc. And for the Wise-men of Mt 2 see MAGI.

Burton Scott Easton

WISE, MAN

wiz.

See WISDOM.

WISH

wish: The word appears both as a substantive and as a verb in the Old Testament, having a variety of meanings: (1) The substantive, peh, means "mouth" and also "speech." In this form it occurs in Job 33:6 margin: "Behold, I am according to thy wish in God's stead." Elihu here refers to Job's expressed desire for an umpire (9:33), and one who would maintain his right with God (16:21). (2) The verb: (a) haphets, "willing," or "desirous" (Ps 40:14 the King James Version); (b) sha'-al, "to ask," "petition," "supplicate" (Job 31:30 the King James Version); (c) another variation of meaning is found in Ps 73:7 where maskith, "to imagine," is translated "wish": "They have more than heart could wish"; (d) euchomai, "to solicit," "to implore" (Ro 9:3).

Arthur Walwyn Evans

WIST, WITTY, WOT

wist, wit’-i, wot: The verb "to wit" in the King James Version is interchangeable with "to know," and is conjugated with a present "wot," and a past "wist." This inflection is derived from more complicated forms in the older English, and in post-Elizabethan times has become quite obsolete. (But compare the roots in "wisdom," "witness.") "Wit," then, is simply "knowledge," and "witty" is "having knowledge," although the noun and the adjective have become narrowly specialized in modern English (compare the similar evolution of "knowing," in its use as an adjective). Even in Elizabethan English, however, the indicative of "to wit" was becoming displaced by "know," and "wot" and "wist" together occur only 24 times in the King James Version (not at all in Apocrypha). the English Revised Version has retained all the New Testament examples, but in the Old Testament has altered about half the occurrences to "know," but has followed no discoverable rule in so doing ("wot" retained only in Jos 2:5). the American Standard Revised Version has changed to "know" throughout (Old Testament and New Testament). The infinitive "to wit" is still in use (chiefly in legal formulas) before an apposition, and the King James Version has introduced it rather frequently to clarify a construction (Jos 17:1; 1Ki 2:32, etc.), and the Revised Version (British and American) has usually retained it (omitted in Jos 17:1; 2Ch 4:12). In the other uses of this inf. (Ge 24:21; Ex 2:4) it is replaced by "to know," while the very obsolete expression in 2Co 8:1, the King James Version "We do you to wit" (i.e. "We cause you to know"; see Do), has become in the Revised Version (British and American) "We make known unto you."

The noun "wit" is found in Ps 107:27, "at their wits’ (the King James Version "wit’s") end," for chokhmah, "wisdom," "technical skill"; compare the Revised Version margin "All their wisdom is swallowed up." The meaning is "their skilled seamanship cannot cope with the danger" (the phrase is very commonly misapplied). "Wit" occurs also 1 Esdras 4:26 (dianoia, "mind"); 2 Esdras 5:9 (sensus, here "intelligence"); Sirach 31:20 (psuche, "soul," with the force of "reason").

Witty is found in the King James Version, the Revised Version margin Pr 8:12, "witty inventions" (mezimmah, "discretion" (so the Revised Version (British and American)); if "and" is not read in this verse, translate "discrete knowledge"). In Judith 11:23 occurs "witty in thy words" (agathos, "good," here probably =" thou hast spoken sound sense"). The Wisdom of Solomon 8:19 the King James Version has "a witty child," the Revised Version (British and American) "a child of parts," margin "goodly" (euphues, "well grown," "of a good disposition," "clever"). "Wittingly" occurs in Ge 48:14 (sakhal, "act intelligently").

Burton Scott Easton

WITCH; WITCHCRAFT

wich, wich’-kraft:

1. Meaning and Use of the Words

2. Biblical Usage

3. Common Elements in Witchcraft and Ancient Oriental Magic

4. Rise, Spread and Persecution of Witchcraft

LITERATURE

1. Meaning and Use of the Words:

The word "witch" seems to denote etymologically "one that knows." it is historically both masculine and feminine; indeed the Anglo-Saxon form wicca, to which the English word is to be traced, is masculine alone. "Wizard" is given as masculine for witch, but it has in reality no connection with it. Wright (English Dialect Dictionary, VII, 521) says he never heard an uneducated person speak of wizard. When this word is used by the people it denotes, he says, a person who undoes the work of a witch. Shakespeare often uses "witch" of a male (compare Cymbeline, I, 6, l. 166: "He is .... a witch"). In Wycliff's translation of Ac 8:9 Simon Magus is called "a witch" ("wicche"). Since the 13th century the word "witch" has come more and more to denote a woman who has formed a compact with the Devil or with evil spirits, by whose aid she is able to cause all sorts of injury to living beings and to things. The term "witchcraft" means in modern English the arts and practices of such women.

2. Biblical Usage:

Since the ideas we attach to "witch" and "witchcraft" were unknown in Bible times, the words have no right place in our English Bible, and this has been recognized to some extent but not completely by the Revisers of 1884. The word "witch" occurs twice in the King James Version, namely, (1) in Ex 22:18, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch (the Revised Version (British and American) "a sorceress") to live"; (2) in De 18:10, "or a witch" (the Revised Version (British and American) "or a sorcerer"). The Hebrew word is in both cases the participle of the verb (kishsheph), denoting "to practice the magical article." See MAGIC, V, 2. In the first passage, however, the feminine ending (-ah) is attached, but this ending denotes also one of a class and (on the contrary) a collection of units; see Kautzsch, Hebrew Grammar 28, section 122, s, t.

The phrase "the witch of Endor" occurs frequently in literature, and especially in common parlance, but it is not found in the English Bible. The expression has come from the heading and summary of the King James Version, both often so misleading. In 1Sa 28, where alone the character is spoken of, English Versions of the Bible translates the Hebrew ‘esheth ba‘alath ‘obh by "a woman that hath a familiar spirit." A literal rendering would be "a woman who is mistress of an ‘obh or ghost," i.e. one able to compel the departed spirit to return and to answer certain questions. This woman was therefore a necromancer, a species of diviner (see DIVINATION, IV; ENDOR, WITCH OF; FAMILIAR), and not

what the term "witch" imports.

The word "witchcraft" occurs thrice in the King James Version in 1Sa 15:23, "the sin of witchcraft" should be as in the Revised Version margin, "the sin of divination," the latter representing the Hebrew word qecem, generally translated "divination".

See DIVINATION, sec. VII, 1.

The phrase "used witchcraft" (of Manasseh, 2Ch 33:16) is properly rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) "practised sorcery," the Hebrew verb (kishsheph) being that whence the participles in Ex 22:18 and De 18:10, translated in the King James Version "witch," are derived (see above). The word translated in the King James Version "witchcraft" in Ga 5:20 (pharmakeia) is the ordinary Greek one for "sorcery," and is so rendered in the Revised Version (British and American), though it means literally the act of administering drugs and then of giving magical potions. It naturally comes then to stand for the magician’s art, as in the present passage and also in The Wisdom of Solomon 12:4; 18:13; and in the Septuagint of Isa 47:9, where it represents the Hebrew noun keshaphim, translated "sorceries"; compare the Hebrew verb kishsheph; see above.

The plural "witchcrafts" (in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American)) stands for the Hebrew noun just noticed (keshaphim) in 2Ki 9:22; Mic 5:12; Na 3:4, but in all three passages a proper rendering would be "sorceries" or "magical arts." "Witchcrafts" is inaccurate and misleading.

The verb "bewitch" occurs in Ac 8:9,11 the King James Version (of Simon Magus bewitching the people) and in Ga 3:1 ("O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you?"). In the first context the Greek verb is existemi, which is properly rendered by the Revisers "amazed"; in 3:13 the passive of the same verb is translated "he was amazed" (the King James Version "He wondered"). In Ga 3:1, the verb is baskaubaino, which is used of a blinding effect of the evil eye and has perhaps an occult reference, but it has nothing whatever to do with "witch" or "witchcraft."

3. Common Elements in Witchcraft and Ancient Oriental Magic:

Though the conceptions conveyed by the English word "witch" and its cognates were unknown to the Hebrews of Bible times, yet the fundamental thought involved in such terms was familiar enough to the ancient Hebrews and to other nations of antiquity (Babylonians, Egyptians, etc.), namely, that there exists a class of persons called by us magicians, sorcerers, etc., who have superhuman power over living creatures including man, and also over Nature and natural objects. This power is of two kinds: (1) cosmic, (2) personal. For an explanation see MAGIC, II. it is in Assyrio-Babylonian literature that we have the completest account of magical doctrine and practice. The words used in that literature for the male and female magician are ashipu and ashiptu, which correspond to the Hebrew mekhashsheph and mekhashshephah in De 18:10 and Ex 22:18 (see 2, above) and are cognate to ‘ashshaph (see Da 1:20; 2:2,10, etc.), which means a magician (the Revised Version (British and American) "enchanter"). Other

Babylonian words are kashshapu and kashshaptu, which in etymology and in sense agree with the Hebrew terms mekhashsheph and mekhashshephah mentioned above. But neither in the Babylonian or Hebrew words is there the peculiar idea of a witch, namely, one who traffics with malicious spirits for malicious ends. indeed the magician was a source of good (male and female) as conceived by the Babylonians, especially the ashipu and ashiptu, to the state and to individuals, as well as of evil, and he was often therefore in the service of the state as the guide of its policy. And the same applies to the magician as the Hebrews regarded him, though the true teachers and leaders in Israel condemned magic and divination of every sort as being radically opposed to the religion of Yahweh (De 18:10 f). Of course, if a Babylonian magician used his art to the injury of others he was punished as other criminals, and in case of the death of the victim he was executed as a murderer. It is, however, noteworthy in its bearing on "witchcraft" that the female magician or sorceress played a larger part in ancient Babylonia than her male counterpart, and the same is true of the Greeks and other ancient people. This arose perhaps from the fact that in primitive times men spent their time in fighting and hunting; the cooking of the food and the healing of the sick, wounded, etc., by magical potions and otherwise, falling to the lot of the woman who stayed at home. In the early history of the Hebrews inspired women played a greater role than in later time; compare Miriam (Ex 15:20 f; Nu 12); Deborah (Jud 5:12); Huldah (2Ki 22:14). Note also the ‘ishshah chakhamah, or "wise woman" of 2Sa 14:2 ff; 20:16.

The first two sections of the Code of Hammurabi are as follows: "1. If a man has laid a curse (kispu = keshaphim) upon (another) man and it is not justified, he that laid the curse shall be put to death. 2. If a man has put a spell upon (another) man and it is not justified, he upon whom the spell is laid shall go to the holy river; into the holy river shall he plunge. If the holy river overcome him (and he is drowned), the man who put the spell upon him shall take possession of his house. If the holy river declares him innocent and he remains unharmed the man who laid the spell shall be put to death. He that plunged into the river shall take possession of the house of him who laid the spell upon him." Not a word is said here of a female that weaves a spell, but probably the word "man" in the Babylonian is to be taken as including male and female (so Canon C. H. W. Johns in a private letter, dated December 22, 1912).

4. Rise, Spread, and Persecution of Witchcraft:

In the early and especially in the medieval church, the conception of the Devil occupied a very important place, and human beings were thought to be under his dominion until he was exorcised in baptism. It is to this belief that we owe the rise and spread of infant baptism. The unbaptized were thought to be Devil-possessed. The belief in the existence of women magicians had come down from hoary antiquity. It was but a short step to ascribe the evil those women performed to the Devil and his hosts. Then it was natural to think that the Devil would not grant such extraordinary powers without some quid pro quo; hence, the witch (or wizard) was supposed to have sold her (or his) soul to the Devil, a proceeding that would delight the heart of the great enemy of good always on the alert to hinder the salvation of men; compare the Faust legend. For the conditions believed to be imposed by the Devil upon all who would be in league with him see A. Lehmann, Aberglaube und Zauberei2 (1908), 110 ff.

This idea of a covenant with the Devil is wholly absent from the early heathen conception of magic; nor do we in the latter read of meetings at night between the magicians and the demons with whom they

dealt, such as took place on the Witches' Sabbath. The witches were believed to have sexual commerce with devils and to be capable only of inflicting evil, both thoughts alien to oriental and therefore to Biblical magic.

The history and persecution and execution of women, generally ignorant and innocent, supposed to have been guilty of witchcraft, do not fall within the scope of this article, but may be perused in innumerable works: see "Literature" below. In Europe alone, not to mention America (Salem, etc.), Sprenger says that over nine million suspected witches were put to death on the flimsiest evidence; even if this estimate be too high the actual number must have been enormous. The present writer in his booklet, The Survival of the Evangelical Faith ("Essays for the Times," 1909), gives a brief account of the defense of the reality of witch power by nearly all the Christian theologians of the 17th century and by most of those living in the early 18th century (see pp. 23 ff). See also MAGIC, and The Expositor T, IX, 157 ff.

LITERATURE.

In addition to the literature cited under articles DIVINATION and MAGIC (which see), the following worlds may be mentioned (the books on witchcraft proper are simply innumerable): Reginald Scot, The Discovery of Witchcraft (aimed at preventing the persecution of witches, 1584; republished London, 1886); reply to the last work by James I of England: Daemonologie, 1597; Casaubon, On Credulity and Incredulity .... A Treatise Proving Spirits, Witches and Supernatural Operations, 1668; Joseph Glanrill, Saducismus Triumphatus: Full and Plain Evidences concerning Witches and Apparitions (the last two books are by theologians who class with "atheists"—a vague word in those times for unbelief—all such as doubt the power of witches and deny the power of devils upon human life). For the history of witchcraft and its persecutions see howard Williams, The Superstitions of Witchcraft, 1865, and (brief but interesting and compact) Charles Mackay, Memoirs of Extraordinary Popular Delusions (2 volumes, 1851, 101-91). See also Sir W. Scott, Demonology and Witchcraft, 1830; W. R. Halliday, Greek Divination: A Study of its Methods and Principles, London, Macmillan (important); and article by the present writer in The Expositor, January, 1914, on "The Words Witch and Witchcraft in history and in Literature." For a full account of the witch craze and persecution at Salem, near Boston, U.S.A., see The Wonders of the Invisible World by Cotton Mather, D. D., with a further account by increase Mather, D. D., and compare Demon Possession by J. L. Nevins, 303-10.

T. Witton Davies

WITHERED

with'-erd (nabhel, "to fade away," "to be dried up"):

(1) Used figuratively to express leanness of soul, spiritual impotence, a low condition of spiritual life, a lack of moral nourishment: "My heart is smitten like grass, and withereth" (Ps 102:4). The contrasting figure emphasizes this idea: "All my fountains are in thee" (Ps 87:7). Also Ps 1:3, where the freshness and beauty of the righteous man's life are thus described: "And he shall be like a tree planted by the

streams of water, ... whose leaf also doth not wither." In the New Testament xeraino, "to wither," is used to carry out the same idea of moral decay, or malnutrition of soul (Mt 13:6; 21:19).

(2) "Wither" also had a physiological meaning, expressing both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament the idea of bodily impotence, especially, though not exclusively, of the limbs. Jeroboam was struck suddenly with paralysis of the arm, which is said to have "dried up" (1Ki 13:4-6); "probably due to sudden hemorrhage affecting some part of the brain, which may under certain circumstances be only temporary" (HDB, 1-vol, 599). "Their skin cleaveth to their bones; it is withered" (La 4:8).

In the New Testament (Mt 12:10; Mr 3:1; Lu 6:6) "withered hand" was probably our modern "infantile paralysis," which may leave one or more limbs shrunken and powerless without detriment to the general health.

Arthur Walwyn Evans

WITHES, WITHS, GREEN

withs, (yetharim lachim, margin "new bowstrings," the King James Version margin "new (moist) cords" (Jud 16:7); Septuagint neura hugra): The material with which Samson was bound by Delilah (Jud 16:8) was probably some moist "gut" such as was used for bowstrings. Compare metharim, "bowstrings" (Ps 21:12; yether, Job 30:11; Ps 11:2); lahim, translated "green," means "fresh," "sappy" or "moist."

WITNESS

wit'-nes (nouns ‘edh, and ‘edhah, and verb ‘anah; martus, with all derivative words and their compounds): The word "witness" is used of inanimate things, e.g. the heap of stones testifying to the covenant between Jacob and Laban (Ge 31:44-54), and the So of Moses. (De 31:19,21). The main use of the word is forensic, and from this use all other applications are naturally derived. Important legal agreements required the attestation of witnesses, as in the case of the purchase of property, or a betrothal (Ru 4:1-11, where we are told that the ancient form of attestation was by a man drawing off his shoe and giving it to his neighbor).

The Mosaic Law insisted on the absolute necessity of witnesses in all cases which came before a judge, especially in criminal cases. Not only in criminal cases, but in all cases, it was necessary to have at least two witnesses to make good an accusation against a person (De 17:6; 19:15; compare Nu 35:30; Mt 18:16; Joh 8:17; 2Co 13:1; 1Ti 5:19). According to the Talmud (Pesachim 113b), if in a case of immorality only one witness came forward to accuse anyone, it was regarded as sinful on the part of that witness. On the other hand, anyone who, being present at the adjuration (Le 5:1 the Revised Version (British and American)), refused to come forward as a witness when he had testimony to bear, was considered to have sinned (Pr 29:24). Among those not qualified to be witnesses were the near relations of the accuser or the accused, friends and enemies, gamesters, usurers, tax-gatherers, heathen, slaves,

women and those not of age (Sanhedhrin 3 3, 4; Ro’sh Ha-shanah 1 7; Babha’ Kamma’ 88a; compare Ant, IV, viii, 15). No one could be a witness who had been paid to render this service (Bekhoroth 4 6). In cases of capital punishment there was an elaborate system of warning and cautioning witnesses. Each witness had to be heard separately (Sanhedhrin 5; compare 3 5). If they contradicted one another on important points their witness was invalidated (Sanhedhrin 5).

No oath was required from witnesses. The meaning of Le 5:1 was not that witnesses had to take an oath, as some think; it describes the solemn adjuration of the judge to all those with knowledge of the case to come forward as witnesses (see OATH). When a criminal was to be put to death, the witnesses against him were to take the foremost share in bringing about his death (De 17:7; compare Ac 7:58), in order to prove their own belief in their testimony. In the case of a person condemned to be stoned, all the witnesses had to lay their hands on the head of the condemned (Le 24:14). "False witnessing" was prohibited in the Decalogue (Ex 20:16); against it the lexicon talionis was enforced, i.e. it was done to the witness as he meant to do to the accused (De 19:16-21). The Sadducees held that only when the falsely accused had been executed, the false witnesses should be put to death; the Pharisees, that false witnesses were liable to be executed the moment the death sentence had been passed on the falsely accused (Makkoth 17). In spite of prohibitions, false witnessing was a very common crime among the people (Ps 27:12; 35:11; Pr 6:19; 12:17; 14:5; 19:5; 24:28; Mt 26:60; Ac 6:13).

In Ac 22:20; Re 2:13; 17:6 the word martus, "witness", seems to be beginning to acquire the meaning of "martyr," as in the King James Version, although the Revised Version (British and American) translates "witness" in the first two passages, retaining "martyr" only in the third with "witness" in the m. For "Tabernacle of Witness" see TABERNACLE.

Paul Levertoff

WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT

This phrase arises from the words of Ro 8:16: "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God." With this may be grouped, as illustrative, 1 Joh 5:10: "he that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him." in interpreting, we may approach the former passage through the latter. To the man who "believeth on the Son of God," so as to prove him by reliance, He becomes self-evidential in experience, verifying himself to the believer as the divine response to his whole spiritual need. Thus, believed on as the Son, he awakens in the soul which he embraces the filial attitude toward God, the cry, "Abba, Father." On the other side the Spirit, both in the written Word (e.g. Joh 1:12) and in his secret converse with the believer in the life of faith, assures him of the paternal love toward him, as toward a "dear child," (Eph 5:1) of the Father of his Lord. There is thus a concurrent "witnessing." The believer’s spirit says, "Thou art my Father"; the Spirit, says to the believer’s spirit, "Thou art His child." We may compare Ro 5:5: "The love of God hath been shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Spirit."

Handley Dunelm

WITTY

See WIST, WITTY, WOT.

WIZARD

wiz’-ard.

See ASTROLOGY, 1; DIVINATION; FAMILIAR; MAGIC; WITCH, WITCHCRAFT.

WOLF

woolf

(1) ze’ebh (Ge 49:27; 11:6; 65:25; Jer 5:6; Eze 22:27; Hab 1:8; Ze 3:3; also as proper name, Zeeb, prince of Midian, Jud 7:25; 8:3; Ps 83:11); compare Arabic dhi’b, colloquial dhib, or dib;

(2) lukos (Mt 7:15; 10:16; Lu 10:3; Joh 10:12; Ac 20:29; Ecclesiasticus 13:17; compare 2 Esdras 5:18, lupus);

(3) ‘iyim, the Revised Version (British and American) "wolves" (Isa 13:22; 34:14; Jer 50:39):

While the wolf is surpassed in size by some dogs, it is the fiercest member of the dog family (Canidae), which includes among others the jackal and the fox. Dogs, wolves and jackals are closely allied and will breed together. There is no doubt that the first dogs were domesticated wolves. While there are local varieties which some consider to be distinct species, it is allowable to regard all the wolves of both North America, Europe, and Northern Asia (except the American coyote) as members of one species, Canis lupus. The wolf of Syria and Palestine is large, light colored, and does not seem to hunt in packs. Like other wolves it is nocturnal. In Palestine it is the special enemy of the sheep and goats. This fact comes out in two of the seven passages cited from the Old Testament, in all from the New Testament, and in the two from Apocrypha. In Ge 49:27 Benjamin is likened to a ravening wolf. In Eze 22:27, and in the similar Ze 3:3, the eiders of Jerusalem are compared to wolves. In Jer 5:6 it is a wolf that shall destroy the people of Jerusalem, and in Hab 1:8 the horses of the Chaldeans "are swifter than leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves." Babylon and Edom (Isa 13:22; 34:14; Jer 50:39) are to be the haunts of ‘iyim (the Revised Version (British and American) "wolves") and other wild creatures.

The name of Zeeb, prince of Midian (Jud 7:25; 8:3), has its parallel in the Arabic, Dib or Dhib, which is a common name today. Such animal names are frequently given to ward off the evil eye.

See also TOTEMISM.

Alfred Ely Day

WOMAN

woom’-an (’ishshah, "a woman" (feminine of ‘ish, "a man"]; gune, "a woman" "wife"):

I. IN THE CREATIVE PLAN

II. IN OLD TESTAMENT TIMES

1. Prominence of Women

2. Social Equality

3. Marriage Laws

4. Inheritance

5. Domestic Duties

6. Dress and Ornaments

7. Religious Devotion and Service

(1) in Idolatry and False Religion

(2) in Spiritual Religion

III. INTER-TESTAMENTAL ERA

IV. IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES

1. Mary and Elisabeth

2. Jesus and Women

3. In the Early Church

4. Official Service

5. Widows

6. Deaconesses

IV. LATER TIMES

1. Changes in Character and Condition

2. Notable Examples of Christian Womanhood

3. Woman in the 20th Century

The generic term "man" includes woman. In the narrative of the creation (Ge 1:26,27) Adam is a collective term for mankind. It may signify human being, male or female, or humanity entire. "God said, Let us make man .... and let them" (Ge 1:26), the latter word "them" defining "man" in the former clause. So in Ge 1:27, "in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them," "them" being synonymous with "him."

See also ADAM; ANTHROPOLOGY.

I. In the Creative Plan.

Whatever interpretation the latest scholarship may give to the story of woman's formation from the rib of man (Ge 2:21-24), the passage indicates, most profoundly, the inseparable unity and fellowship of her life with his. Far more than being a mere assistant, "helper" (‘ezer "help" "helper" Ge 2:18), she is man's complement, essential to the perfection of his being. Without her he is not man in the generic fullness of that term. Priority of creation may indicate headship, but not, as theologians have so uniformly affirmed, superiority. Dependence indicates difference of function, not inferiority. Human values are estimated in terms of the mental and spiritual. Man and woman are endowed for equality, and are mutually interdependent. Physical strength and prowess cannot be rated in the same category with moral courage and the capacity to endure ill-treatment, sorrow and pain; and in these latter qualities woman has always proved herself the superior. Man's historic treatment of woman, due to his conceit, ignorance or moral perversion, has taken her inferiority for granted, and has thus necessitated it by her enslavement and degradation. The narrative of the Fall (Ge 3) ascribes to woman supremacy of influence, for through her stronger personality man was led to disobedience of God's command. Her penalty for such ill-fated leadership was that her husband should "rule over" her (Ge 3:16), not because of any inherent superiority on his part, but because of her loss of prestige and power through sin. In that act she forfeited the respect and confidence which entitled her to equality of influence in family affairs. Her recovery from the curse of subjection was to come through the afflictive suffering of maternity, for, as Paul puts it, "she shall be saved (from the penalty of her transgression) through her child-bearing" (1Ti 2:15).

Sin, both in man and woman, has been universally the cause of woman's degradation. All history must

be interpreted in the light of man’s consequent mistaken estimate of her endowments, worth and rightful place. The ancient Hebrews never entirely lost the light of their original revelation, and, more than any other oriental race, held woman in high esteem, honor and affection. Christianity completed the work of her restoration to equality of opportunity and place. Wherever its teachings and spirit prevail, she is made the loved companion, confidante and adviser of her husband.

II. In Old Testament Times.

1. Prominence of Women:

Under the Hebrew system the position of woman was in marked contrast with her status in surrounding heathen nations. Her liberties were greater, her employments more varied and important, her social standing more respectful and commanding. The divine law given on Sinai (Ex 20:12) required children to honor the mother equally with the father. A similar esteem was accorded her in patriarchal times. Sarah held a position of favor and authority in Abraham’s household. Rebekah was not less influential than Isaac, and was evidently the stronger personality. The "beautiful" Rachel (Ge 29:17) won from Jacob a love that accepted her as an equal in the companionship and counsels of family life. Many Hebrew women rose to eminence and national leadership. Miriam and Deborah were each a prophetess and a poetess. The former led bands of women in triumphant song and procession, celebrating the overthrow of enemies (Ex 15:20); the latter, through her dominating personality and prophetic power, became the virtual judge of the nation and led armies to victory. Her military general, Barak, refused to advance against Sisera without her presence and commanding influence (Jud 4:8). Her ode of victory indicates the intellectual endowment and culture of her sex in that unsettled and formative era (Jud 5). No person in Israel surpassed Hannah, the mother of Samuel, in intelligence, beauty and fervor of religious devotion. Her spiritual exaltation and poetic gift found expression in one of the choicest specimens of early Hebrew lyric poetry (1Sa 2:1-10). Other women eminent as prophetesses were: Huldah, whose counsel was sought by high priest and king (2Ch 34:22; compare 2Ki 22:14); Noadiah (Ne 6:14); Anna (Lu 2:36). The power to which woman could attain in Israel is illustrated in the career of the wicked, merciless, murderous, idolatrous Jezebel, self-styled prophetess (Re 2:20). Evidence of woman’s eminence in the kingdoms of Judah and Israel is seen in the influence she exercised as queen mother (1Ki 15:13) and queen (2Ki 8:18); in the beautiful honor shown by King Solomon to his mother, Bath-sheba (1Ki 2:19); in the filial devotion of the prophet Elisha (1Ki 19:20); in the constant mention of the mother’s name in the biographies of successive kings, making it evident that she was considered the important and determining factor in the life of her royal sons. Her teaching and authority were sufficiently eminent to find recognition in the proverbs of the nation: "the law of thy mother" (Pr 1:8; 6:20) was not to be forsaken, while contempt for the same merited the curse of God (Pr 19:26; 20:20; 30:11,17).

2. Social Equality:

Additional evidence of woman’s social equality comes from the fact that men and women feasted together without restriction. Women shared in the sacred meals and great annual feasts (De 16:11,14); in

wedding festivities (Joh 2:1-3); in the fellowship of the family meal (Joh 12:3). They could appear, as Sarah did in the court of Egypt, unveiled (Ge 12:11,14). Rebekah (Ge 24:16; compare 24:65), Rachel (Ge 29:11), Hannah (1Sa 1:13) appeared in public and before suitors with uncovered faces. The secluding veil was introduced into Mohammedan and other oriental lands through the influence of the Koran. The custom was non-Jewish in origin, and the monuments make. It evident that it did not prevail, in early times, in Assyria and Egypt. Even Greece and Rome, at the time of their supreme culture, fell-far below the Hebrew conception of woman's preeminent worth. The greatest hellenic philosophers declared that it would radically disorganize the state for wives to claim equality with their husbands. Aristotle considered women inferior beings, intermediate between freemen and slaves. Socrates and Demosthenes held them in like depreciation. Plato advocated community of wives. Substantially the same views prevailed in Rome. Distinguished men, like Metullus and Care, advocated marriage only as a public duty. More honor was shown the courtesan than the wife. Chastity and modesty, the choice inheritance of Hebrew womanhood, were foreign to the Greek conception of morality, and disappeared from Rome when Greek culture and frivolity entered. The Greeks made the shameless Phryne the model of the goddess Aphrodite, and lifted their hands to public prostitutes when they prayed in their temples. Under pagan culture and heathen darkness woman was universally subject to inferior and degrading conditions. Every decline in her status in the Hebrew commonwealth was due to the incursion of foreign influence. The lapses of Hebrew morality, especially in the court of Solomon and of subsequent kings, occurred through the borrowing of idolatrous and heathen customs from surrounding nations (1Ki 11:1-8).

3. Marriage Laws:

The Bible gives no sanction to dual or plural marriages. The narrative in Ge 2:18-24 indicates that monogamy was the divine ideal for man. The moral decline of the generations antedating the Flood seems to have been due, chiefly; to the growing disregard of the sanctity of marriage. Lamech's taking of two wives (Ge 4:19) is the first recorded infraction of the divine ideal. By Noah's time polygamy had degenerated into promiscuous inter-racial marriages of the most incestuous and illicit kind (Ge 6:1-4; see SONS OF GOD). The subsequent record ascribes marital infidelity and corruption to sin, and affirms that the destruction of the race by the Flood and the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah were God's specific judgment on man's immorality. The dual marriages of the Patriarchs were due, chiefly, to the desire for children, and are not to be traced to divine consent or approval. The laws of Moses regarding chastity protected the sanctity of marriage (see MARRIAGE), and indicated a higher regard for woman than prevailed in Gentile or other Semitic races (Le 18:6-20). They sought to safeguard her from the sensual abominations prevalent among the Egyptians and Canaanites (Le 18). Kings were forbidden to "multiply wives" (De 17:17). Concubinage in Israel was an importation from heathenism.

Divorce was originally intended to protect the sanctity of wedlock by outlawing the offender and his moral offense. Its free extension to include any marital infelicity met the stern rebuke of Jesus, who declared that at the best it was a concession to human infirmity and hardness of heart, and should be granted only in case of adultery (Mt 5:32).

See DIVORCE.

Hebrew women were granted a freedom in choosing a husband not known elsewhere in the East (Ge 24:58). Jewish tradition declares that a girl over 12 1/2 years of age had the right to give herself in marriage. Vows made by a daughter, while under age, could be annulled by the father (Nu 30:3-5) or by the husband (Nu 30:6-16). Whenever civil law made a concession to the customs of surrounding nations, as in granting the father power to sell a daughter into bondage, it sought to surround her with all possible protection (De 22:16).

4. Inheritance:

The Mosaic Law prescribed that the father's estate, in case there were no sons, should pass to the daughters (Nu 27:1-8). They were not permitted, however, to alienate the family inheritance by marrying outside their own tribe (Nu 36:6-9). Such alien marriages were permissible only when the husband took the wife's family name (Ne 7:63). Unmarried daughters, not provided for in the father's will, were to be cared for by the eldest son (Ge 31:14,15). The bride's dowry, at marriage, was intended as a substitute for her share in the family estate. In rabbinical law, a century or more before Christ, it took the form of a settlement upon the wife and was considered obligatory. Provision for woman under the ancient Mosaic Law was not inferior to her status under English law regarding landed estates.

5. Domestic Duties:

Among the Hebrews, woman administered the affairs of the home with a liberty and leadership unknown to other oriental peoples. Her domestic duties were more independent, varied and honorable. She was not the slave or menial of her husband. Her outdoor occupations were congenial, healthful, extensive. She often tended the flocks (Ge 29:6; Ex 2:16); spun the wool, and made the clothing of the family (Ex 35:26; Pr 31:19; 1Sa 2:19); contributed by her weaving and needlework to its income and support (Pr 31:14,24), and to charity (Ac 9:39). Women ground the grain (Mt 24:41); prepared the meals (Ge 18:6; 2Sa 13:8; Joh 12:2); invited and received guests (Jud 4:18; 1Sa 25:18 ff; 2Ki 4:8-10); drew water for household use (1Sa 9:11; Joh 4:7), for guests and even for their camels (Ge 24:15-20). Hebrew women enjoyed a freedom that corresponds favorably with the larger liberties granted them in the Christian era.

6. Dress and Ornaments:

That women were fond of decorations and display in ancient as in modern times is clear from the reproof administered by the prophet for their haughtiness and excessive ornamentation (Isa 3:16). He bids them "remove (the) veil, strip off the train," that they may be better able to "grind meal" and attend to the other womanly duties of the home (Isa 47:2). These prophetic reproofs do not necessarily indicate general conditions, but exceptional tendencies to extravagance and excess. The ordinary dress of women was modest and simple, consisting of loose flowing robes, similar to those worn by men, and still in vogue among Orientals, chiefly the mantle, shawl and veil (Ru 3:15; Isa 3:22,23). The veil, however, was not worn for seclusion, as among the Moslems. The extensive wardrobe and jewelry of Hebrew

women is suggested by the catalogue given in Isa 3:18-24: anklets, cauls, crescents, pendants, bracelets, mufflers, headtires, ankle chains, sashes, perfume-boxes, amulets, rings, nose-jewels, festival robes, mantles, shawls, satchels, hand-mirrors, fine linen, turbans, veils. The elaborateness of this ornamentation throws light on the apostle Peter's counsel to Christian women not to make their adornment external, e.g. the braiding of the hair, the wearing of jewels of gold, the putting on of showy apparel, but rather the apparel of a meek and quiet spirit (1Pe 3:3,4).

7. Religious Devotion and Service:

The reflections cast upon woman for her leadership in the first transgression (Ge 3:6,13,16; 2Co 11:3; 1Ti 2:14) do not indicate her rightful and subsequent place in the religious life of mankind. As wife, mother, sister, she has been preeminently devout and spiritual. history records, however, sad and striking exceptions to this rule.

(1) In Idolatry and False Religion

Often woman's religious intensity found expression in idolatry and the gross cults of heathenism. That she everywhere participated freely in the religious rites and customs of her people is evident from the fact that women were often priestesses, and were often deified. The other Semitic religions had female deities corresponding to the goddesses of Greece and Rome. In the cult of Ishtar of Babylon, women were connected with the immoral rites of temple-worship. The women of heathen nations in the harem of Solomon (1Ki 11:1) turned the heart of the wise king to unaccountable folly in the worship of the Sidonian goddess Ashtoreth, and of Chemosh and Molech, in turn the "abomination" of Moab and Ammon (1Ki 11:5-8). The fatal speller Maacah morally blighted the reigns of her husband, son and grandson, until Asa the latter deposed her as queen and destroyed the obscene image of Asherah which she had set up (1Ki 15:13). As "queen mother" (gebhirah, "leader") she was equivalent to the Turkish Sultana Valide.

Baal-worship was introduced into Israel by Jezebel (1Ki 16:31,32; 18:19; 2Ki 9:22), and into Judah by her daughter Athaliah (2Ch 22:3; 24:7). The prominence of women in idolatry and in the abominations of foreign religions is indicated in the writings of the prophets (Jer 7:18; Eze 8:14). Their malign influence appeared in the sorceress and witch, condemned to death by the Mosaic Law (Ex 22:18); yet continuing through the nation's entire history. Even kings consulted them (1Sa 28:7-14). The decline and overthrow of Judah and Israel must be attributed, in large measure, to the deleterious effect of wicked, worldly, idolatrous women upon their religious life.

(2) In Spiritual Religion

The bright side of Hebrew history is an inspiring contrast to this dark picture. Prior to the Christian era no more luminous names adorn the pages of history than those of the devout and eminent Hebrew women. Jochebed, the mother of Moses, left upon him a religious impress so vital and enduring as to safeguard him through youth and early manhood from the fascinating corruptions of Pharaoh's Egyptian

court (Ex 2:1-10; Heb 11:23-26). In Ruth, the converted Moabitess, the royal ancestress of David and of Jesus, we have an unrivaled example of filial piety, moral beauty and self-sacrificing religious devotion (Ru 1:15-18). The prayers and piety of Hannah, taking effect in the spiritual power of her son Samuel, penetrated, purified and vitalized the religious life of the entire nation. Literature contains no finer tribute to the domestic virtues and spiritual qualities of woman than in the beautiful poem dedicated to his gifted mother by King Lemuel (Pr 31).

Women, as well as men, took upon themselves the self-renouncing vow of the Nazirite (Nu 6:2), and shared in offering sacrifices, as in the vow and sacrifice of Manoah's wife (Jud 13:13,14); were granted theophanies, e.g. Hagar (Ge 16:7; 21:17), Sarah (Ge 18:9,10), Manoah's wife (Jud 13:3-5,9); were even permitted to "minister" at the door of the sanctuary (Ex 38:8; 1Sa 2:22); rendered conspicuous service in national religious songs and dances (Ex 15:20; Jud 11:34; 1Sa 18:6,7); in the great choirs and choruses and processionals of the Temple (Ps 68:25; Ezr 2:65; Ne 7:67); in religious mourning (Jer 9:17-20; Mr 5:38). They shared equally with men in the great religious feasts, as is indicated by the law requiring their attendance (De 12:18).

III. Inter-Testamental Era.

The women portrayed in the apocryphal literature of the Jews reveal all the varied characteristics of their sex so conspicuous in Old Testament history: devout piety, ardent patriotism, poetic fervor, political intrigue, worldly ambition, and sometimes a strange combination of these contradictory moral qualities. Whether fictitious, or rounded on fact, or historical, these portrayals are true to the feminine life of that era.

Anna is a beautiful example of wifely devotion. By her faith and hard toil she supported her husband, Tobit, after the loss of his property and in his blindness, until sight and prosperity were both restored (Tobit 1:9; 2:1-14).

Edna, wife of Raguel of Ecbatana and mother of Sarah, made her maternal love and piety conspicuous in the blessing bestowed on Tobias on the occasion of his marriage to her daughter, who had hitherto been cursed on the night of wedlock by the death of seven successive husbands (Tobit 7; 10:12).

Sarah, innocent of their death, which had been compassed by the evil spirit Asmodeus, at last had the reward of her faith in the joys of a happy marriage (Tobit 10:10; 14:13).

Judith, a rich young widow, celebrated in Hebrew lore as the savior of her nation, was devoutly and ardently patriotic. When Nebuchadnezzar sent his general Holofernes with an army of 132,000 men to subjugate the Jews, she felt called of God to be their deliverer. Visiting holofernes, she so captivated him with her beauty and gifts that he made a banquet in her honor. While he was excessively drunk with the wine of his own bounty, she beheaded him in his tent. The Assyrians, paralyzed by the loss of their leader, easily fell a prey to the armies of Israel. Judith celebrates her triumph in a song, akin in its triumphant joy, patriotic fervor and religious zeal, to the ancient songs of Miriam and Deborah (Judith

16:1-17).

Susanna typifies the ideal of womanly virtue. The daughter of righteous parents, well instructed in the sacred Law, the wife of a rich and honorable man, Joachim by name, she was richly blessed in position and person. Exceptionally modest, devout and withal very beautiful, she attracted the notice of two elders, who were also judges, and who took occasion frequently to visit Joachim’s house. She spurned their advances and when falsely charged by them with the sin which she so successfully resisted, she escapes the judgment brought against her, by the subtle skill of Daniel. As a result, his fame and her innocence became widely known.

See SUSANNA, THE HISTORY OF.

Cleopatra, full of inherited intrigue, is influential in the counsels of kings. She married successively for political power; murdered her eldest son Seleucus, by Demetrius, and at last dies by the poison which she intended for her younger son, Antiochus VIII. Her fatal influence is a striking example of the perverted use of woman’s power (1 Macc 10:58; Josephus, Ant, XIII, iv, 1; ix, 3).

IV. In New Testament Times.

1. Mary and Elisabeth:

A new era dawned for woman with the advent of Christianity. The honor conferred upon Mary, as mother of Jesus, lifted her from her "low estate," made after generations call her blessed (Lu 1:48), and carried its benediction to the women of all subsequent times. Luke’s narrative of the tivity (Lu 1; 2) has thrown about motherhood the halo of a new sanctity, given mankind a more exalted conception of woman’s character and mission, and made the world’s literature the vehicle of the same lofty reverence and regard. The two dispensations were brought together in the persons of Elisabeth and Mary: the former the mother of John the Baptist, the last of the old order of prophets; the latter the mother of the long-expected Messiah. Both are illustrious examples of Spirit-guided and Spirit-filled womanhood. The story of Mary’s intellectual gifts, spiritual exaltation, purity and beauty of character, and her training of her divine child, has been an inestimable contribution to woman’s world-wide emancipation, and to the uplift and ennoblement of family life. To her poetic inspiration, spiritual fervor and exalted thankfulness as expectant mother of the Messiah, the church universal is indebted for its earliest and most majestic hymn, the Magnificat. In her the religious teachings, prophetic hopes, and noblest ideals of her race were epitomized. Jesus’ reverence for woman and the new respect for her begotten by his teaching were well grounded, on their human side, in the qualities of his own mother. The fact that he himself was born of woman has been cited to her praise in the ecumenical creeds of Christendom.

2. Jesus and Women:

From the first, women were responsive to his teachings and devoted to his person. The sisters of Lazarus, Mary and Martha, made their home at Bethany, his dearest earthly refuge and resting-place.

Women of all ranks in society found in him a benefactor and friend, before unknown in all the history of their sex. They accompanied him, with the Twelve, in his preaching tours from city to city, some, like Mary Magdalene, grateful because healed of their moral infirmities (Lu 8:2); others, like Joanna the wife of Chuzas, and Susanna, to minister to his needs (Lu 8:3). Even those who were ostracized by society were recognized by him, on the basis of immortal values, and restored to a womanhood of virtue and Christian devotion (Lu 7:37-50). Mothers had occasion to rejoice in his blessing their children (Mr 10:13-16); and in his raising their dead (Lu 7:12-15). Women followed him on his last journey from Galilee to Jerusalem; ministered to Him on the way to Calvary (Mt 27:55,56); witnessed his crucifixion (Lu 23:49); accompanied his body to the sepulcher (Mt 27:61; Lu 23:55); prepared spices and ointments for his burial (Lu 23:56); were first at the tomb on the morning of his resurrection (Mt 28:1; Mr 16:1; Lu 24:1; Joh 20:1); and were the first to whom the risen Lord appeared (Mt 28:9; Mr 16:9; Joh 20:14). Among those thus faithful and favored were Mary Magdalene, Mary the mother of James and Joses, Salome (Mt 27:56), Joanna and other unnamed women (Lu 24:10). Women had the honor of being the first to announce the fact of the resurrection to the chosen disciples (Lu 24:9,10,22). They, including the mother of Jesus, were among the 120 who continued in prayer in the upper room and received the Pentecostal enduement (Ac 1:14); they were among the first Christian converts (Ac 8:12); suffered equally with men in the early persecutions of the church (Ac 9:2). The Jewish enemies of the new faith sought their aid and influence in the persecutions raised against Paul and Barnabas (Ac 13:50); while women of equal rank among the Greeks became ardent and intelligent believers (Ac 17:12). The fidelity of women to Jesus during his three years' ministry, and at the cross and sepulcher, typifies their spiritual devotion in the activities and enterprises of the church of the 20th century.

3. In the Early Church:

Women were prominent, from the first, in the activities of the early church. Their faith and prayers helped to make Pentecost possible (Ac 1:14). They were eminent, as in the case of Dorcas, in charity and good deeds (Ac 9:36); foremost in prayer, like Mary the mother of John, who assembled the disciples at her home to pray for Peter's deliverance (Ac 12:12). Priscilla is equally gifted with her husband as an expounder of "the way of God," and instructor of Apollos (Ac 18:26), and as Paul's "fellow-worker in Christ" (Ro 16:3). The daughters of Philip were prophetesses (Ac 21:8,9). The first convert in Europe was a woman, Lydia of Thyatira, whose hospitality made a home for Paul and a meeting-place for the infant church (Ac 16:14). Women, as truly as men, were recipients of the charismatic gifts of Christianity. The apostolic greetings in the Epistles give them a place of honor. The church at Rome seems to have been blessed with a goodly number of gifted and consecrated women, inasmuch as Paul in the closing salutations of his Epistles sends greetings to at least eight prominent in Christian activity: Phoebe, Prisca, Mary "who bestowed much labor on you," Tryphena and Tryphosa, Persis, Julia, and the sister of Nereus (Ro 16:1,3,6,12,15). To no women did the great apostle feel himself more deeply indebted than to Lois and Eunice, grandmother and mother of Timothy, whose "faith unfeigned" and ceaseless instructions from the holy Scriptures (2Ti 1:5; 3:14,15) gave him the most "beloved child" and assistant in his ministry. Their names have been conspicuous in Christian history for maternal love, spiritual devotion and fidelity in teaching the Word of God.

See also CLAUDIA.

4. Official Service:

From the first, women held official positions of influence in the church. Phoebe (Ro 16:1) was evidently a deaconess, whom Paul terms "a servant of the church," "a helper of many" and of himself also. Those women who "labored with me in the gospel" (Php 4:3) undoubtedly participated with him in preaching. Later on, the apostle used his authority to revoke this privilege, possibly because some women had been offensively forward in "usurping authority over the man" (1Ti 2:12 the King James Version). Even though he bases his argument for woman's keeping silence in public worship on Adam's priority of creation and her priority in transgression (1Ti 2:13,14), modern scholarship unhesitatingly affirms that his prohibition was applicable only to the peculiar conditions of his own time. Her culture, grace, scholarship, ability, religious devotion and spiritual enduement make it evident that she is often as truly called of God to public address and instruction as man. It is evident in the New Testament and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers that women, through the agency of two ecclesiastical orders, were assigned official duties in the conduct and ministrations of the early church.

5. Widows:

Their existence as a distinct order is indicated in 1Ti 5:9,10, where Paul directs Timothy as to the conditions of their enrollment. No widow should be "enrolled" (katalego, "catalogued," "registered") under 60 years of age, or if more than once married. She must be "well reported of for good works"; a mother, having "brought up children"; hospitable, having "used hospitality to strangers"; Christlike in loving service, having "washed the saints' feet." Chrysostom and Tertullian make mention of this order. It bound its members to the service of God for life, and assigned them ecclesiastical duties, e.g. the superintendence of the rest of the women, and the charge of the widows and orphans supported at public expense. Dean Alford (see the Commentary in the place cited) says they "were vowed to perpetual widowhood, clad in a vestis vidualis ("widow's garments"), and ordained by the laying on of hands. This institution was abolished by the eleventh Canon of the council of Laodicea."

Other special duties, mentioned by the Church Fathers, included prayer and fasting, visiting the sick, instruction of women, preparing them for baptism, assisting in the administration of this sacrament, and taking them the communion. The spiritual nature of the office is indicated by its occupant being variously termed "the intercessor of the church"; "the keeper of the door," at public service; "the altar of God."

See WIDOW.

6. Deaconesses:

Many of these duties were transferred, by the 3rd century, to the deaconesses, an order which in recent history has been restored to its original importance and effectiveness. The women already referred to in Ro 16:1,6,12 were evidently of this order, the term diakonos, being specifically applied to Phoebe, a

deaconess of the church at Cenchrea. The women of 1Ti 3:11, who were to serve "in like manner" as the "deacons" of 3:10, presumably held this office, as also the "aged women" of Tit 2:3 (=" presbyters" (feminine), presbuterai, 1Ti 5:2). Virgins as well as widows were elected to this office, and the age of eligibility was changed from 60 to 40 by the Council of Chalcedon. The order was suppressed in the Latin church in the 6th century, and in the Greek church in the 12th. because of certain abuses that gradually became prevalent. Owing, however, to its exceptional importance and value it has been reinstated by nearly all branches of the modern church, the Methodists especially emphasizing its spiritual efficiency. Special training schools and courses in education now prepare candidates for this office. Even as early as the Puritan Reformation in England the Congregationalists recognized this order of female workers in their discipline. The spiritual value of woman's ministry in the lay and official work of the church is evidenced by her leadership in all branches of ecclesiastical and missionary enterprise. This modern estimate of her capability and place revises the entire historic conception and attitude of mankind.

See DEACONESS.

V. Later Times.

1. Changes in Character and Condition:

Tertullian mentions the modest garb worn by Christian women (De Cult. Fem. ii.11) as indicating their consciousness of their new spiritual wealth and worthiness. They no longer needed the former splendor of outward adornment, because clothed with the beauty and simplicity of Christlike character. They exchanged the temples, theaters, and festivals of paganism for the home, labored with their hands, cared for their husbands and children, graciously dispensed Christian hospitality, nourished their spiritual life in the worship, service and sacraments of the church, and in loving ministries to the sick. Their modesty and simplicity were a rebuke to and reaction from the shameless extravagances and immoralities of heathenism. That they were among the most conspicuous examples of the transforming power of Christianity is manifest from the admiration and astonishment of the pagan Libanius who exclaimed, "What women these Christians have!"

The social and legal status of woman instantly improved when Christianity gained recognition in the Empire. Her property rights as wife were established by law, and her husband made subject to accusation for marital infidelity. Her inferiority, subjection and servitude among all non-Jewish and non-Christian races, ancient and modern, are the severest possible arraignment of man's intelligence and virtue. Natural prudence should have discovered the necessity of a cultured and noble motherhood in order to a fine grade of manhood. Races that put blighting restrictions upon woman consign themselves to perpetual inferiority, impotence and final overthrow. The decline of Islam and the collapse of Turkey as a world-power are late striking illustrations of this fundamental truth.

2. Notable Examples of Christian Womanhood:

Woman's activity in the early church came to its zenith in the 4th century. The type of feminine character produced by Christianity in that era is indicated by such notable examples as Eramelia and Macrina, the mother and sister of Basil; Anthusa, Nonna, Monica, respectively the mothers of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen and Augustine. Like the mothers of Jerome and Ambrose they gave luster to the womanhood of the early Christian centuries by their accomplishments and eminent piety. As defenders of the faith women stand side by side with Ignatius and Polycarp in their capacity to face death and endure the agonies of persecution. The roll of martyrs is made luminous by the unrivaled purity, undaunted heroism, unconquerable faith of such Christian maidens as Blandina, Potamiaena, Perpetua and Felicitas, who, in their loyalty to Christ, shrank not from the most fiendish tortures invented by the diabolical cruelties and hatred of pagan Rome.

In the growing darkness of subsequent centuries women, as mothers, teachers, abbesses, kept the light of Christian faith and intelligence burning in medieval Europe. The mothers of Bernard and Peter the Venerable witness to the conserving and creative power of their devotion and faith. The apotheosis of the Virgin Mother, though a grave mistake and a perversion of Christianity by substituting her for the true object of worship, nevertheless served, in opposition to pagan culture, to make the highest type of womanhood the ideal of medieval greatness. The full glory of humanity was represented in her. She became universally dominant in religion. The best royalty of Europe was converted through her influence. Poland and Russia were added to European Christendom when their rulers accepted the faith of their Christian wives. Clotilda's conversion of Clovis made France Christian. The marriage of Bertha, another Christian princess of France, to Ethelbert introduced Roman Christianity into England, which became the established religion when Edwin, in turn, was converted through the influence of his Christian wife. The process culminated, in the 19th century, in the long, prosperous, peaceful, Christian reign of Victoria, England's noblest sovereign.

3. Woman in the 20th Century:

The opening decades of the 20th century are witnessing a movement among women that is one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of mankind. It is world-wide and spontaneous, and aims at nothing less than woman's universal education and enfranchisement. This new ideal, taking its rise in the teaching of Jesus regarding the value of the human soul, is permeating every layer of society and all races and religions. Woman's desire for development and serf-expression, and better still for service, has given birth to educational, social, eleemosynary, missionary organizations and institutions, international in scope and influence. In 75 years after Mary Lyon inaugurated the higher education of woman at Mt. Holyoke College, in 1837, 60,000 women were students in the universities and colleges of the United States; nearly 40,000 in the universities of Russia; and increasingly proportionate numbers in every higher institution of learning for women in the world; 30,000 were giving instruction in the primary and secondary schools of Japan. Even Moslem leaders confessed that the historic subjection of woman to ignorance, inferiority, and servitude was the fatal mistake of their religion and social system. The striking miracle occurred when Turkey and China opened to her the heretofore permanently closed doors of education and social opportunity.

This universal movement for woman's enlightenment and emancipation is significantly synchronous

with the world-wide extension and success of Christian missions. The freedom wherewith Christ did set us free includes her complete liberation to equality of opportunity with man. In mental endowment, in practical ability, in all the higher ministries of life and even in statecraft, she has proved herself the equal of man. Christianity always tends to place woman side by side with man in all the great achievements of education, art, literature, the humanities, social service and missions. The entire movement of modern society toward her perfect enfranchisement is the distinct and inevitable product of the teaching of Jesus. The growing desire of woman for the right of suffrage, whether mistaken or not, is the incidental outcome of this new emancipation. The initial stages of this evolutionary. process are attended by many abnormal desires, crudities of experiment and conduct, but ultimately, under the guidance of the Spirit of God and the Christian ideal, woman will intelligently adjust herself to her new opportunity and environment, recognizing every God-ordained difference of function, and every complementary and cooperative relation between the sexes. The result of this latest evolution of Christianity will not only be a new womanhood for the race but, through her enlightenment, culture and spiritual leadership, a new humanity.

Dwight M. Pratt

WONDER; WONDERFUL

wun’-der, wun’-derful: The verb "wonder" occurs only a few times in the Old Testament; "wonder" as noun is much more frequent, and is chiefly the translation of the word mopheth, a splendid or conspicuous work, a "miracle" (Ex 4:21; 11:9, etc.), often conjoined with ‘othoth, "signs" (Ex 7:3; De 6:22; 13:1,2; 34:11; Ne 9:10, etc.). Other frequent words are pala’, pele’, a "marvel," "miracle" (Ex 3:20; 15:11; Jos 3:5; Isa 9:6, margin "wonderful counselor," etc.). In the New Testament the ordinary verb is thaumazo, and the most frequent noun is teras, a "marvel," "portent," answering in its meaning to Hebrew pala’. As in the Old Testament the "wonder" is chiefly a miraculous work, so in the Gospels the feeling of wonder is chiefly drawn out by the marvelous displays of Christ’s power and wisdom (Mt 15:31; Mr 6:51; Lu 4:22, etc.).

Wonderful, that which excites or calls forth wonder, is in the Old Testament chiefly the translation of pala’ or pele’ (2Sa 1:26; Ps 40:3; Isa 28:29, etc.); in the New Testament of thaumasios (once, Mt 21:15).

For "wondered" in Lu 8:25; 11:14, the Revised Version (British and American) has "marvelled" (compare 9:43); in the Old Testament also "marvellous" frequently for "wondrous" etc. (1Ch 16:9; , Job 9:10; Ps 96:3; 105:2).

W. L. Walker

WOOD

wood.

See BOTANY; FOREST; TREES.

WOOD OF EPHRAIM

(2Sa 18:6).

See EPHRAIM, FOREST OF.

WOOF

woof (‘erebh, "mixture," "woof" (Le 13:48)).

See WARP.

WOOL

wool (tsemer; erion): Wool and flax were the fibers most used by the ancient weavers. Wool was used principally for the outside garments (Le 13:48 ff; Pr 31:13; Eze 34:3; Ho 2:5,9). Syrian wool is found on the world’s markets today, but it is not rated as first quality, partly because it is so contaminated with thorns, straw and other foreign matter which become entangled with the wool while the sheep are wandering over the barren, rocky mountain sides in search of food. Extensive pastures are almost unknown.

Two kinds of wool are sold:

(1) That obtained by shearing. This is removed from the animal as far as possible in one piece or fleece usually without previous washing. The fleeces are gathered in bales and carried to a washing-place, which is usually one of the stony river beds, with but a small stream flowing through it during the summer. The river bed is chosen because the rocks are clean and free from little sticks or straw which would cling to the washed wool. The purchaser of this washed wool submits it to a further washing with soap, ishnan (alkali plant), "soapwort", or other cleansing agent (see FULLER), and then cards it before spinning and weaving. The wool thus obtained is nearly snow white.

(2) The second supply of wool is from the tanneries where the wool is removed from the skins with slaked lime (see TANNER). This is washed in many changes of water and used for stuffing mattresses, quilts, etc., but not for weaving.

Gideon used a fleece of wool to seek an omen from God (Jud 6:37). Mesha, king of Moab, sent a large quantity of wool as a tribute to the king of Israel (2Ki 3:4). Wool was forbidden to be woven with linen (De 2:11; compare Le 19:19). Priests could not wear woolen garments (Eze 44:17). Wool dyed scarlet with the qermes was used in the blood-covenant ceremony (Heb 9:19; compare Le 14; Nu 19:6).

The whiteness of wool was used for comparison

(1) with snow (Ps 147:16);

(2) with sins forgiven (Isa 1:18);

(3) with hair (Da 7:9; Re 1:14).

James A. Patch

WORD

wurd: The commonest term in the Old Testament for "word" is dabhar (also "matter" "thing"); in the New Testament logos ("reason," "discourse," "speech"); but also frequently rhema. Rhema is a "word" in itself considered; logos is a spoken word, with reference generally to that which is in the speaker's mind. Some of the chief applications of the terms may thus be exhibited:

(1) We have the word of Yahweh (or God; see below)

(a) as the revelation to the patriarch, prophet, or inspired person (Ge 15:1; Ex 20:1; Nu 22:38, etc.);

(b) as spoken forth by the prophet (Ex 4:30; 34:1; 2Ki 7:1; Isa 1:10, etc.).

(2) The word is often a commandment, sometimes equivalent to "the Law" (Ex 32:28; Nu 20:24; De 6:6; Ps 105:8; 119:11,17; Isa 66:2, etc.).

(3) As a promise and ground of hope (Ps 119:25,28,38, etc.; 130:5, etc.).

(4) As creative, upholding, and preserving (Ps 33:6; compare Ge 1:3; Ps 147:15,18; Heb 1:3; 11:3; 2Pe 3:5,7).

(5) As personified (in Apocrypha, The Wisdom of Solomon 18:15; Ecclesiasticus 1:5, the Revised Version margin "omitted by the best authorities").

(6) As personal (Joh 1:1). Logos in Philo and Greek-Jewish philosophy meant both reason or thought and its utterance, "the whole contents of the divine world of thought resting in the Nous of God, synonymous with the inner life of God Himself and corresponding to the logos endiathetos of the human soul; on the other hand, it is the externalizing of this as revelation corresponding to the logos prophorikos in which man's thought finds expression (Schultz). Compare also the references to Creation by "the word of God" and its personifications; see LOGOS; incarnated in Jesus Christ (Joh 1:14; 1 Joh

1:1,2; Re 19:13, "His name is called, The Word of God," Ho Logos tou Theou). See PERSON OF CHRIST.

(7) Cannot be broken, endureth forever (2Ki 10:10; Ps 119:89; Isa 40:8, etc.).

(8) A designation of the gospel of Christ: sometimes simply "the word"; with Jesus "the word of the Kingdom" (Mt 13:19; Mr 2:2; Ac 4:4,29,31, etc.). In John's Gospel Jesus frequently speaks of His "word" and "works" as containing the divine revelation and requirements made through Him, which men are asked to believe in, cherish and obey (Joh 5:24; 6:63,68, etc.); "the words of God" (Joh 3:34; 8:47; 14:10; 17:8,14, etc.); His "word" (logos and rhema) is to be distinguished from lalia, speech (compare Mt 26:73; Mr 14:70), translated "saying," Joh 4:42 (4:41, "Many more believed because of his own word" (logos); 4:42, "not because of thy saying" (lalia), the Revised Version (British and American) "speaking"); in the only other occurrence of lalia in this Gospel (Joh 8:43) Jesus uses it to distinguish the outward expression from the inner meaning, "Why do ye not understand my speech?" (lalia), "Even because ye cannot hear my word" (logos).

(9) "Words" are distinguished from "power" (1Co 4:20; 1Th 1:5); are contrasted with "deed" (Mal 2:17; 1Co 4:20; 1 Joh 3:18). (10) Paul refers to "unspeakable words" (arrheta rhemata) which he heard in Paradise (2Co 12:4), and to "words (logoi) .... which the Spirit teacheth" (1Co 2:13).

For "word" the Revised Version (British and American) has "commandment" (Nu 4:45, etc.); for "words," "things" (Joh 7:9; 8:30; 9:22,40; 17:1), "sayings" (Joh 10:21; 12:47,48); for "enticing words," "persuasiveness of speech" (Col 2:4); conversely, "word" for "commandment" (Nu 24:13; 27:14; Jos 8:8, etc.), with numerous other changes.

W. L. Walker

WORK; WORKS

wurk, wurks: "To work" in the Old Testament is usually the translation of ‘asah, or of pa‘al (of the works both of God and of man), and "work" (noun) is most frequently the translation of ma‘aseh, or mela’khah; in the New Testament of energeo, ergazomai (and compound), with ergon (noun). The word "works" (erga) is a favorite designation in John for the wonderful works of Jesus (5:36; 10:38; 15:24, etc.; "miracles" to us, "works" to Him). "Works" is used by Paul and James, in a special sense, as denoting (with Paul) those legal performances by means of which men sought to be accepted of God, in contradistinction to that faith in Christ through which the sinner is justified apart from all legal works (Ro 3:27; 4:2,6, etc.; Ga 2:16; 3:2,5,10), "working through love" (Ga 5:6; 1Th 1:3), and is fruitful in all truly "good works," in which Christian believers are expected to abound (2Co 9:8; Eph 2:10; Col 1:10; 2Th 2:17, etc.). When James speaks of being justified by "works" as well as by "faith" (2:14-26), he has in view those works which show faith to be real and vital. "Dead works" avail nothing (compare Heb 9:14; 10:24). Judgment is according to "works" (Mt 16:27, the Revised Version (British and American) "deeds," margin "Greek: ‘doing’ " praxis; Ro 2:6; 1Pe 1:17, etc.), the new life being therein evidenced.

A contrast between "faith" and "good works" is never drawn in the New Testament.

See, further, JUSTIFICATION.

W. L. Walker

WORKER; WORKFELLOW; WORKMAN

wur'-der, wurk'-fel-o, wurk'-man (charash, pa'al; ergates, sunergos): "Worker" (artificer) is the translation of charash, "to cut in" (1Ki 7:14, "a worker in brass"), and of charash, "artificer," etc. (1Ch 22:15); "workers of stone," rendered "workman," "workmen" (Isa 40:20; 44:11; Jer 10:3,9, "artificer"; Ho 8:6); 'asah, "to work," is translated "workers" of iniquity (Ps 37:1, "them that work unrighteousness"); 'asah mela'khah, "to do work" (2Ki 12:14,15, "workmen," "them that did the work"; 1Ch 22:15; 2Ch 24:13, etc.; Ezr 3:9);'aneshe mela'khah, "men of work" (1Ch 25:1, "workmen," "them that did the work"); 'amel, "working," "toiling" (Jud 5:26, "put .... her right hand to the workmen's hammer"); pa'al, "to act," "do," when translated "workers," is joined with "iniquity," "workers of iniquity" (Job 31:3; 34:8,22; Ps 5:5; 6:8; 14:4, etc.; Pr 10:29; 21:15); ergates, "worker," is translated "workman" (Mt 10:10, "laborer"; 2Ti 2:15; Ac 19:25), "workers" (of iniquity) (Lu 13:27), "deceitful workers" (2Co 11:13), "evil workers" (Php 3:2); dunamis, "power," is translated "(workers of) miracles" (1Co 12:29 margin, the Revised Version (British and American) "powers"); sunergeo, "to work with" (2Co 6:1, "working together with him").

Workfellow is the translation of sunergos, "joint or fellow-worker" (Ro 16:21; Col 4:11).

Workmaster occurs in Ecclesiasticus 38:27, as the translation of architekton.

For "of ("with") cunning work" (Ex 26:1,31; 28:6,15; 36:8,35; 39:3,8), the American Standard Revised Version has "the work of the skillful workman," the English Revised Version "of the cunning workman"; instead of "I was by him as one brought up (with him)" (Pr 8:30), the Revised Version (British and American) has "I was by him as a master workman.

W. L. Walker

WORLD (GENERAL)

1. Original Words:

In the King James Version this word represents several originals, as follows: 'erets "earth"; chedhel, "the underworld"; cheledh, "lifetime," "age"; 'olam, "indefinite time," "age"; tebhel, "fertile earth"; ge, "earth"; aion, "age," "indefinite time," with frequent connotation of the contents of time, its influences and powers; oikoumene, "inhabited earth," the world of man considered in its area and distribution; last,

and most frequently, kosmos, properly "order," with the suggestion of beauty; thence the material universe, as the great example of such order; then the moral universe, the total system of intelligent creatures, perhaps sometimes including angels (1Co 4:9), but as a rule human beings only; then, in view of the fact of universal human failure, humanity in its sinful aspect, the spirit and forces of fallen humanity regarded as antagonistic to God and to good, "all around us which does not love God."

2. Remarks:

Of the above terms, some need not detain us; ‘erets, as the original to "world," occurs only thrice, chedhel, once, cheledh, twice, ‘olam, twice (including Ec 3:11), ge, once. The most important of the series, looking at frequency of occurrence, are tebhel, aion, oikoumene, kosmos. On these we briefly comment in order.

(1) Tebhel.

Tebhel, as the original to "world," occurs in 35 places, of which 15 are found in Psalms and 9 in the first half of Isaiah. By derivation it has to do with produce, fertility, but this cannot be said to come out in usage. The word actually plays nearly the same part as "globe" with us, denoting man’s material dwelling-place, as simply as possible, without moral suggestions.

(2) Aion.

We have indicated above the speciality of aion. It is a time, with the suggestion always of extension rather than limit (so that it lends itself to phrases denoting vast if not endless extension, such as "to the aions of aions," rendered "forever and ever," or "world without end"). In Heb 1:2; 11:13, it denotes the "aeons" of the creative process. In numerous places, notably in Matthew, it refers to the "dispensations" of redemption, the present "age"of grace and, in distinction, the "age" which is to succeed it—"that world, and the resurrection" (Lu 20:35). Then, in view of the moral contents of the present state of things, it freely passes into the thought of forces and influences tending against faith and holiness, e.g., "Be not fashioned according to this world" (Ro 12:2). In this connection the Evil Power is said to be "the god of this world" (2Co 4:4).

(3) Oikoumene.

The word oikoumene occasionally means the Roman empire, regarded as pre-eminently the region of settled human life. So Lu 2:1; Ac 11:28, and perhaps Re 3:10, and other apocalyptic passages. In Hebrews it is used mystically of the Empire of the Messiah (1:6; 2:5).

(4) Kosmos.

We have remarked above on kosmos, with its curious and suggestive history of meanings. It may be enough here to add that that history prepares us to find its reference varying by subtle transitions, even in

the same passage. See e.g. Joh 1:10, where "the world" appears first to denote earth and man simply as the creation of "the Word," and then mankind as sinfully alienated from their Creator. We are not surprised accordingly to read on the one hand that "God .... loved the world" (Joh 3:16), and on the other that the Christian must "not love the world" (1 Joh 2:15). The reader will find the context a sure clue in all cases, and the study will be pregnant of instruction.

Handley Dunelm

WORLD, COSMOLOGICAL

wurld, koz-mo-loj'-i-kal:

1. Terms and General Meaning

2. Hebrew Idea of the World

3. Its Extent

4. Origin of the World—Biblical and Contrasted Views

5. The Cosmogony of Genesis 1—Comparison with Babylonian and Other Cosmogonies

6. Genesis 1 and Science

LITERATURE

1. Terms and General Meaning:

The Hebrews had no proper word for "world" in its wide sense of "universe." The nearest approach to such a meaning is in the phrase "the heavens and the earth" (Ge 1:1, etc.). Even this, in a physical reference, does not convey the modern idea, for the earth is still the center with which heaven and the heavenly bodies are connected as adjuncts. It is here, however, to be remembered that to the Hebrew mind the physical world was not the whole. Beyond were the heavens where God's throne was, peopled by innumerable spiritual intelligences, whose hosts worshipped and obeyed Him (Ge 28:12; Ps 103:19-21, etc.). Their conception of the universe was thus enlarged, but the heavens, in this sense, would not be included in the "world." For "world," in its terrestrial meaning, several Hebrew words are used. The King James Version thus occasionally renders the word 'erets, "earth" (the rendering is retained in the Revised Version (British and American) in Isa 23:17; Jer 25:26; in Ps 22:27; Isa 62:11, it is changed to its proper meaning "earth"); 'olam, "age," twice rendered "world" in the King James Version (Ps 73:12; Ec 3:11), is changed in the Revised Version (British and American)—in the latter case into "eternity." The chief word for "world" in the sense of the habitable earth, the abode of man, with its fullness of

created life, is tebhel—a poetical term (1Sa 2:8; 2Sa 22:16; Job 18:18; 34:13; 37:12; Ps 9:8; 18:15, etc.) —answering to the Greek oikoumene.

In the New Testament a frequent word for "world" is aion, "age" (Mt 12:32; 13:22,39,40,49; 24:3; Mr 4:19; Lu 16:8; Ro 12:2; Heb 1:2, etc.). the Revised Version (British and American) notes in these cases "age" in margin, and sometimes changes in text into "of old" (thus the American Standard Revised Version in Lu 1:70; Ac 3:21), "ages," "times," etc., according to the sense (compare 1Co 10:11; Heb 6:5; 9:26; 2Ti 1:9; . Tit 1:2, etc.). Most generally the Greek word used is kosmos, the "ordered world" (e.g. Mt 4:8; 5:14; 26:13; Mr 8:36; Joh 1:9; 8:12; Ac 17:24; Ro 1:8,20, etc.). The wider sense of "all creation," or "universe" (see above on the Old Testament), is expressed by such phrases as panta, "all things" (Joh 1:3), pasa he ktisis, "the whole creation" (Ro 8:22).

2. Hebrew Idea of the World:

Two errors are to be avoided in framing a representation of the Hebrew conception of the world.

(1) The attempt should not be made to find in the Biblical statements precise anticipations of modern scientific discoveries. The relations of the Biblical teaching to scientific discovery are considered below. Here it is enough to say that the view taken of the world by Biblical writers is not that of modern science, but deals with the world simply as we know it—as it lies spread out to ordinary view—and things are described in popular language as they appear to sense, not as telescope, microscope, and other appliances of modern knowledge reveal their nature, laws and relations to us. The end of the narration or description is throughout religious, not theoretic.

(2) On the other hand, the error is to be avoided of forcing the language of popular, often metaphorical and poetic, description into the hard-and-fast forms of a cosmogony which it is by no means intended by the writers to yield. It is true that the Hebrews had no idea of our modern Copernican astronomy, and thought of the earth as a flat surface, surmounted by a vast expanse of heaven, in which sun, moon and stars were placed, and from whose reservoirs the rain descended. But it is an exaggeration of all this to speak, as is sometimes done, as if the Hebrews were children who thought of the sky as a solid vault (Ge 1:6-8; Job 37:18), supported on pillars (Job 26:11), and pierced with windows (Ge 7:11; Isa 24:18), through which the rains came. "The world is a solid expanse of earth, surrounded by and resting on a world-ocean, and surmounted by a rigid vault called the ‘firmament,’ above which the waters of a heavenly ocean are spread" (Skinner). The matter is carried farther when elaborate resemblances are sought between the Hebrew and Babylonian cosmogonies (see below). Such representations, though common, are misleading. Language is not to be pressed in this prosaic, unelastic way. It is forgotten that if the "firmament" or "heaven" is sometimes spoken of as a solid vault, it is at other times compared to a "curtain" stretched out (Ps 104:2; Isa 40:22), or a "scroll" that can be rolled up (Isa 34:4); if "windows" of heaven are once or twice mentioned, in many other places there is a quite clear recognition that the rain comes from the clouds in the air (Jud 5:4; Job 36:28; Ps 77:17, etc.); if the earth is sometimes spoken of as a "circle" (Isa 40:22), at other times it has "corners" and "ends" (Isa 11:12; De 33:17; Job 37:3; Ps 19:6, etc.); if sun, moon and stars are figured as if attached to the firmament—"fixed as nails,"

as one has put it—"from which they might be said to drop off" (Isa 14:12, etc.), far more frequently the sun is represented as pursuing his free, rejoicing course around the heavens (Ps 19:5,6, etc.), the moon as "walking" in brightness (Job 31:26), etc. The proper meaning of the word raqia‘ is simply "expanse" and the pellucid vault of the heavens, in which the clouds hung and through which the sun traveled, had probably for the Hebrews associations not very different from what it has to the average mind of today. The earth, itself composed of "dry land" and "seas" (Ge 1:9,10), the former with its mountains, valleys and rivers, may have been conceived of as encircled by an ocean—the circular form being naturally suggested by the outline of the horizon. A few passages convey the idea of depths within or beneath, as well as around the solid earth (Ge 7:11; De 33:13)—a thought again suggested by springs, wells, floods, and similar natural phenomena—but there is no fixity in these representations. One place in Job (26:7) has the bold idea of the earth as hung in free space—a near approach to the modern conception.

3. Its Extent:

The ideas formed of the extent of the world were naturally limited by the geographical knowledge of the Hebrews, and expanded as that knowledge increased. At no time, however, was it so limited as might be supposed. The TABLE OF NATIONS (which see) in Ge 10 shows a wide knowledge of the different peoples of the world, "after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations" (10:20,31). The outlook to the West was bounded by the Mediterranean ("great sea," Nu 31:6; Eze 47:10, etc.), with its "islands" (Ge 10:5; Isa 11:11, etc.), to Tarshish (Spain?) in the extreme West. To the North was the great empire of the Hittites (Jos 1:4; 1Ki 10:29, etc.). North and East across the desert, beyond Syria, lay the familiar region of Mesopotamia (Aram-Naharaim, Ps 60, title), with Ararat (Ge 8:4) still farther North; and, southward, in the Tigris-Euphrates valley, the ancient and powerful empires of Assyria and Babylonia (Ge 2:14; 10:10,11), with Media and Elam (Ge 10:2,22), at a later time Persia (Es 1:1), farther East To the Southeast, between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf, lay the great peninsula of Arabia, and to the West of the Red Sea, Southwest of Canaan, the mighty Egypt, Israel’s never-forgotten "land of bondage" (Ex 20:2, etc.). South of Egypt was Ethiopia. Of more distant peoples, India is first mentioned in Es 1:1; 8:9, but trade with it must have been as early as the days of Solomon. On the dim horizon are such peoples as Gomer (the Cimmerians, North of the Euxine Ge 10:2; Eze 38:6) and Magog (Ge 10:2; Eze 38:2 the Scythians (?)); probably even China is intended by "the land of Sinim" in Isa 49:12. In the apocryphal books and the New Testament the geographical area is perceptibly widened. Particularly do Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece and Italy, with their islands, cities, etc., come clearly into view. A list like that in Ac 2:9-11 of the representatives of peoples present at the day of Pentecost gives a vivid glimpse of the extent of the Jewish religious connection at this period (compare Ac 8:27 ff).

4. Origin of the World—Biblical and Contrasted Views:

From the first there has been abundant speculation in religion and philosophy as to how the world came to be—whether it was eternal, or had a commencement, and, if it began to be, how it originated. Theories were, as they are still, numberless and various. Some cosmogonies were purely mythological (Babylonian, Hesiod); some were materialistic (Democritus, Epicurus—"concourse of atoms"); some were demiurgic (Plato in Timaeus—an eternal matter formed by a demiurge); some were emanational (Gnostics—result of overflowing of fullness of divine life in "aeons"); some were dualistic (Parsism,

Manicheism—good and evil principles in conflict); some imagined endless "cycles"—alternate production and destruction (Stoics, Buddhist kalpas); many were pantheistic (Spinoza—an eternal "substance," its "attributes" necessarily determined in their "modes"; Hegel, "absolute spirit," evolving by logical necessity); some are pessimistic (Schopenhauer—the world the result of an irrational act of "will"; hence, necessarily evil), etc.

In contrast with these conflicting, and often foolish and irrational, theories, the Biblical doctrine of the origin of the world stands alone and unique. It is unique because the view of God on which it rests is unique. According to the teaching of the Bible, from its first page to its last, God is a free, personal Spirit, one, omnipotent, holy, and the world originates in a free act of His almighty will (Ge 1:1; Ps 33:9; Heb 11:3; Re 4:11, etc.), is continually upheld by His power, ruled by His providence, and is the sphere of the realization of His purpose. As against theories of the eternity of the world, accordingly, it declares that the world had a beginning (Ge 1:1); as against dualism, it declares that it is the product of one almighty will (De 4:35; Isa 45:7; 1Co 8:6, etc.); as against the supposition of an eternal matter, it declares that matter as well as form takes its origin from God (Ge 1:1; Heb 11:3); as against pantheism and all theories of necessary development, it affirms the distinction of God from His world, His transcendence over it as well as His immanence in it, and His free action in creation (Eph 4:6; Re 4:11); as against pessimism, it declares the constitution, aim and end of the world to be good (Ge 1:31; Ps 33:5; Mt 5:45, etc.). To the Old Testament doctrine of the origin of the world the New Testament adds the fuller determination that the world was created through the agency of the "Word" (Logos), or Son (Joh 1:3; Col 1:16,17; Heb 1:2,3, etc.).

5. The Cosmogony of Genesis 1—Comparison with Babylonian and Other Cosmogonies:

No stronger proof could be afforded of the truth and sublimity of the Biblical account of the origin of things than is given by the comparison of the narrative of creation in Ge 1-2:4, with the mythological cosmogonies and theogonies found in other religions. Of these the best known, up to the time of recent discoveries, were the Babylonian account of the creation preserved by Berosus, a priest of Babylon in the 3rd century BC, and the Theogony of the Greek Hesiod (9th century BC). Hesiod’s poem is a confused story of how from Chaos came forth Earth, Tartarus (Hell), Eros (Love) and Erebus (Night). Erebus gives birth to Aether (Day). Earth produces the Heaven and the Sea. Earth and Heaven, in turn, become the parents of the elder gods and the Titans. Cronus, one of these gods, begets Zeus. Zeus makes war on his father Cronus, overthrows him, and thus becomes king of the Olympian gods. The descent of these is then traced. How far this fantastic theory, commencing with Chaos, and from it generating Nature and the gods, has itself an original affinity with Babylonian conceptions, need not here be discussed. It hardly surpasses in crudeness the late shape of the Babylonian cosmogony furnished by Berosus. Here, too, Chaos—"darkness and water"—is the beginning, and therefrom are generated strange and peculiar forms, men with wings and with two faces, or with heads and horns of goats, bulls with human heads, dogs with four bodies, etc. Over this welter a woman presides, called Omorka. Belus appears, cuts the woman in twain, of one half of her makes the heavens, and of the other the earth, sets the world in order, finally makes one of the gods cut off his head, and from the blood which flowed forth, mixed with earth, forms intelligent man. That Berosus has not essentially misrepresented the older Babylonian conceptions is now made apparent through the recovery of the Babylonian story itself.

In 1875 George Smith discovered, among the tablets in the British Museum brought from the great library of the Assyrian king Assurbanipal (7th century BC), several on which was inscribed the Chaldean story of creation, and next year published his work, The Chaldean Account of Gen. The tablets, supplemented by other fragments, have since been repeatedly translated by other hands, the most complete translation being that by L. W. King in his Seven Tablets of Creation in the Babylonian and Assyrian Legends concerning the Creation of the World. The story of these tablets, still in many parts fragmentary, is now familiar (see BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA, RELIGION OF). Here, too, the origin of all things is from Chaos, the presiding deities of which are Apsu and Tiamat. The gods are next called into being. Then follows a long mythological description, occupying the first four tablets, of the war of Marduk with Tiamat, the conflict issuing in the woman being cut in two, and heaven being formed of one half and earth of the other. The 5th tablet narrates the appointing of the constellations. The 6th seems to have recorded the creation of man from the blood of Marduk. This mythological epic is supposed by many scholars to be the original of the sublime, orderly, monotheistic account of the creation which stands at the commencement of our Bible. The Babylonian story is (without proof) supposed to have become naturalized in Israel, and there purified and elevated in accordance with the higher ideas of Israel's religion. We cannot subscribe to this view, which seems to us loaded with internal and historical improbabilities. Points of resemblance are indeed alleged, as in the use of the Hebrew word tehom for "deep" (Ge 1:2), cognate with Tiamat; the separation of heaven and earth (Ge 1:6-8); the appointing of the constellations (Ge 1:14-18), etc. But in the midst of the scanty resemblances, how enormous are the contrasts, which all writers acknowledge! Gunkel, e.g., says, "Anyone who compares this ancient Babylonian myth with Ge 1, will perceive at once hardly anything else than the infinite distance between them. There the heathen gods, inflamed against each other in wild warfare, here the One, who speaks and it is done" (Israel und Babylonien, 24). One can understand how these wild polytheistic legends could arise from corruption of a purer, simpler form, but not vice versa. The idea of a "deep," or chaos, must have preceded the fanciful and elaborate creation of the woman-monster, Tiamat; the distinction of sky and earth would go before the coarse idea of the cutting of the woman in two; and so with the other features of supposed resemblance. Professor Clay has recently shown reason for challenging the whole idea of the borrowing of these myths from Babylonia, and declares that "it is unreasonable to assume that the Hebrew tehom is a modification of a Babylonian pattern ..... To say, therefore, that the origin of the Marduk-Tiamat myth is to be found in a Nippurian version, originally known as Ellil-Tiamat, is utterly without foundation" (Amurru, 50). Much more reasonably may we adopt the hypothesis of Dillmann, Kittel, Hommel, Oettli, etc., that the relation between these Babylonian legends and the Biblical narratives is one of cognateness, and not of derivation. These traditions came down from a much older source and are preserved by the Hebrews in their purer form (see the writer's POT, 402-9).

The superiority of the Ge cosmogony to those of other peoples is generally admitted, but objection to it is taken in the name of modern science. The narrative conflicts, it is said, with both modern astronomy and modern geology; with the former, in regarding the earth as the center of the universe, and with the latter in its picture of the order and stages of creation, and the time occupied in the work (for a full statement of these alleged discrepancies, see Dr. Driver's Genesis, Introduction).

6. Genesis 1 and Science:

On the general question of the harmony of the Bible with science it is important that a right standpoint be adopted. It has already been stated that it is no part of the aim of the Biblical revelation to anticipate the discoveries of 19th-century and 20th-century science. The world is taken as it is, and set in its relations to God its Creator, without consideration of what after-light science may throw on its inner constitution, laws and methods of working. As Calvin, with his usual good sense, in his commentary on Ge 1 says, "Moses wrote in the popular style, which, without instruction, all ordinary persons endowed with common sense are able to understand. .... He does not call us up to heaven; but only proposes things that lie open before our eyes." This of itself disposes of the objection drawn from astronomy, for everywhere heaven and earth are spoken of according to their natural appearances, and not in the language of modern Copernican science. To this hour we use the same language in speaking of the sun rising and setting.

The further objection that modern knowledge discredits the Biblical view by showing how small a speck the world is in the infinitude of the universe is really without force. Whatever the extent of the universe, it remains the fact that on this little planet life has effloresced into reason, and we have as yet no ground in science for believing that anywhere else it has ever done so (compare Dr. A. R. Wallace's striking book, Man's Place in the Universe). Even supposing that there are any number of inhabited worlds, this does not detract from the soul's value in this world, or from God's love in the salvation of its sinful race. The objection drawn from geology, though so much is sometimes made of it, is hardly more formidable. It does not follow that, because the Bible does not teach modern science, we are justified in saying that it contradicts it. On the contrary, it may be affirmed, so true is the standpoint of the author in this first chapter of Gen, so divine the illumination with which he is endowed, so unerring his insight into the order of Nature, that there is little in his description that even yet, with our advanced knowledge, we need to change. To quote words used elsewhere, "The dark watery waste over which the spirit broods with vivifying power, the advent of light, the formation of an atmosphere or sky capable of sustaining the clouds above it, the settling of the great outlines of the continents and seas, the clothing of the dry land with abundant vegetation, the adjustment of the earth's relation to sun and moon as the visible rulers of its day and night, the production of the great seamonsters and reptile-like creatures and birds, the peopling of the earth with four-footed beasts and cattle, last of all, the advent of man—is there so much of all this which science requires us to cancel?" (Orr, Christian View of God and the World, 421).

Even in regard to the "days"—the duration of time involved—there is no insuperable difficulty. The writer may well have intended symbolically to represent the creation as a great week of work, ending with the Creator's Sabbath rest. In view, however, of the fact that days of 24 hours do not begin to run till the appointment of the sun on the 4th day (Ge 1:14), it seems more probable that he did not intend to fix a precise length to his creation "days." This is no new speculation. Already Augustine asks, "Of what fashion these days were it is exceeding hard or altogether impossible to think, much more to speak" (De Civ. Dei, xi.6, 7); and Thomas Aquinas in the Middle Ages leaves the matter an open question. Neither does this narrative, in tracing the origin of all things to the creative word of God, conflict with anything that may be discovered by science as to the actual method of creation, e.g. in evolution. Science itself is gradually coming to see the limits within which the doctrine of evolution must be received, and, kept

within these limits, there is nothing in that doctrine which brings it into conflict with the Biblical representations (see ANTHROPOLOGY; CREATION; EVOLUTION; also the writer's works, God's Image in Man and Sin as a Problem of Today). Whatever may be said of the outward form of the narrative, one has only to look at the great ideas which the first chapter of Genesis is intended to teach to see that it conveys those great truths on the origin and ordering of things which are necessary as the basis of a true religious view of the world, no matter to what stage knowledge or science may attain. This chapter, standing at the head of the Bible, lays the foundation for all that follows in the Biblical view of the relation of God to the world, and yields the ground for our confidence that, as all things are created by God and dependent on Him, so everything in Nature and providence is at His disposal for the execution of His purposes and the care and protection of His people. The story of creation, therefore, remains to all time of the highest religious value.

LITERATURE.

See articles "Earth" in Smith's DB and in EB. The other works mentioned above may be consulted. A valuable extended discussion of the word "Firmament" may be seen in Essay V of the older work, Aids to Faith (London, Murray), 220-30.

James Orr

WORLD, END OF THE

See ESCHATOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; HEAVENS, NEW.

WORM; SCARLET-WORM

wurm, skar'-let-wurm:

(1) tola', tole'ah, tola'ath, tola'ath, from tala'; compare Arabic tala, "to stretch the neck"; usually with shani, "bright" (of Arabic sana, "a flash of lightning"), the term tola'ath shani being translated "scarlet" in English Versions of the Bible; also in the same sense the following: sheni tola'ath (Le 14:4), tola' (Isa 1:18, English Versions of the Bible "crimson"), shanim (Pr 31:21; Isa 1:18, English Versions of the Bible "scarlet"), shani (Ge 38:28; Jos 2:18; So 4:3); also kokkos, and kokkinos (Mt 27:23; Heb 9:19; Re 17:3,4; 18:12,16).

(2) rimmah, from ramam, "to putrefy" (Ex 16:20); compare Arab ramm, "to become carious" (of bone).

(3) cac (only in Isa 51:8); compare Arabic sus, "worm"; ses, "moth" (Mt 6:19).

(4) zochalim (Mic 7:17, the King James Version "worms," the Revised Version (British and American) "crawling things"), from zachal, "to crawl."

(5) skolex (Mr 9:48), skolekobrotos, "eaten of worms" (Ac 12:23).

Besides the numerous passages, mostly in Ex, referring to the tabernacle, where tola‘ath, with shani, is translated "scarlet," there are eight pasages in which it is translated "worm." These denote worms which occur in decaying organic matter or in sores (Ex 16:20; Isa 14:11; 66:24); or which are destructive to plants (De 28:39; Jon 4:7); or the word is used as a term of contempt or depreciation (Job 25:6; Ps 22:6; Isa 41:14). Rimmah is used in the same senses. It occurs with tola‘ath as a synonym in Ex 16:24; Job 25:6; Isa 14:11. In Job 25:6, English Versions of the Bible, rendering both tola‘ath and rimmah by "worm," ‘enosh and ‘adham by "man," and introducing twice "that is a," makes a painfully monotonous distich out of the concise and elegant original, in which not one word of the first part is repeated in the second. Cac (Isa 51:8), English Versions of the Bible "worm," is the larva of the clothes-moth. See MOTH. In none of the cases here considered are worms, properly so called, denoted, but various insect larvae which are commonly called "worms," e.g. "silkworm," "apple-worm," "meal-worm," etc. These larvae are principally those of Diptera or flies, Coleoptera or beetles, and Lepidoptera or butterflies and moths.

Tola‘ath shani, "scarlet," is the scarlet-worm, Cermes vermilio, a scale-insect which feeds upon the oak, and which is used for producing a red dye. It is called by the Arabs dudeh, "a worm," a word also used for various insect larvae. It is also called qirmiz, whence" crimson" and the generic name Cermes. This scarlet-worm or scale-insect is one of the family Coccidae of the order Rhynchota or Hemiptera. The female is wingless and adheres to its favorite plant by its long, sucking beak, by which it extracts the sap on which it lives. After once attaching itself it remains motionless, and when dead its body shelters the eggs which have been deposited beneath it. The males, which are smaller than the females, pass through a complete metamorphosis and develop wings. The dye is made from the dried bodies of the females. Other species yielding red dyes are Porphyrophora polonica and Coccus cacti. The last named is the Mexican cochineal insect which feeds on the cactus and which largely supplanted the others after the discovery of America. Aniline dyes have in turn to a great extent superseded these natural organic colors, which, however, continue to be unsurpassed for some purposes.

See COLORS.

Alfred Ely Day

WORMWOOD

wurm’-wood (la’anah (De 29:18; Pr 5:4; Jer 9:15; 23:15; La 3:15,19; Am 5:7; 6:12, the King James Version hemlock); apsinthos (Re 8:11)): What the Hebrew la‘anah may have been is obscure; it is clear it was a bitter substance and it is usually associated with "gall"; in the Septuagint it is variously translated, but never by apsinthos, "wormwood." Nevertheless all ancient tradition supports the English Versions of the Bible translation. The genus Artemisia (Natural Order Compositae), "wormwood," has five species of shrubs or herbs found in Palestine (Post), any one of which may furnish a bitter taste. The name is derived from the property of many species acting as anthelmintics, while other varieties are used

in the manufacture of absinthe.

E. W. G. Masterman

WORMWOOD, THE STAR

In Re 8:11, the name is figurative, given to a great star which, at the sounding of the third angel’s trumpet, fell from heaven upon the third part of the rivers and on the fountains of the waters, turning them to a bitterness of which many died. Wormwood is used of bitter calamities (of La 3:15), and may here indicate some judgment, inflicted under a noted leader, affecting chiefly the internal sources of a country’s prosperity. Older expositors, applying the earlier trumpets to the downfall of the Roman empire, saw in the star a symbol of the barbarian invasions of Attila or Genseric.

See also ASTRONOMY, sec. I, 8.

James Orr

WORSHIP

wur’-ship (Anglo-Saxon: weorthscipe, wyrthscype, "honor," from weorth, wurth, "worthy," "honorable," and scipe, "ship"):

1. Terms

2. Old Testament Worship

3. New Testament Worship

4. Public Christian Worship

LITERATURE

Honor, reverence, homage, in thought, feeling, or act, paid to men, angels, or other "spiritual" beings, and figuratively to other entities, ideas, powers or qualities, but specifically and supremely to Deity.

1. Terms:

The principal Old Testament word is shachah, "depress," "bow down," "prostrate" (Hithpael), as in Ex 4:31, "bowed their heads and worshipped"; so in 94 other places. The context determines more or less clearly whether the physical act or the volitional and emotional idea is intended. The word is applied to acts of reverence to human superiors as well as supernatural. the Revised Version (British and

American) renders it according to its physical aspect, as indicated by the context, "bowed himself down" (the King James Version "worshipped," Ge 24:52; compare 23:7; 27:29, etc.).

Other words are: caghadh, "prostrate," occurring in Isa 44:15,17,19; 46:6, but rendered (English Versions of the Bible) "fall down." In Da 2:46; 3:5,6,7,10,15,18,28, it (Aramaic ceghidh) is "worship" (English Versions of the Bible), 7 times associated with "falling down" and 5 times with "serve." ‘abhadh, "work," "labor," "serve," is rendered "worship" by English Versions of the Bible in 2Ki 10:19,21 ff: "the worshippers (servants) of Baal." In Isa 19:21 the Revised Version (British and American) has "worship with sacrifice and oblation" (the King James Version "do sacrifice"). Isa 19:23 the King James Version has "served," the Revised Version (British and American) "worship." ‘atsabh, "carve," "fabricate," "fashion," is once given "worship," i.e. "make (an object of) worship" (Jer 44:19, the American Revised Version margin "portray").

The Old Testament idea is therefore the reverential attitude of mind or body or both, combined with the more generic notions of religions adoration, obedience, service.

The principal New Testament word (59 times) is proskuneo, "kiss (the hand or the ground) toward," hence, often in the oriental fashion bowing prostrate upon the ground; accordingly, Septuagint uses it for the Hithpael of shachah (hishtachawah), "prostrate oneself." It is to render homage to men, angels, demons, the Devil, the "beast," idols, or to God. It is rendered 16 times to Jesus as a beneficent superior; at least 24 times to God or to Jesus as God. The root idea of bodily prostration is much less prominent than in the Old Testament. It is always translated "worship."

Next in frequency is sebomai, "venerate," and its various cognates, sebazomai, eusebeo, theosebes, sebasma. Its root is sebas, "fear," but this primitive meaning is completely merged into "reverence," "hold in awe": "In vain do they worship me" (Mt 15:9, etc.). latreuo, is "serve" (religiously), or "worship publicly," "perform sacred services," "offer gifts," "worship God in the observance of the rites instituted for His worship." It is translated "worship" in Ac 7:42; 24:14 the King James Version, but "serve," American Standard Revised Version: "serve the host of heaven," "serve I the God of our fathers"; but both the King James Version and the American Standard Revised Version render Php 3:3, "worship by the Spirit of God," and Heb 10:2, "the worshippers," the context in the first two being general, in the second two specific. In 2Ti 1:3 and many other cases both the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) give "serve," the meaning not being confined to worship; but compare Lu 2:37 Revised Version: "worshipping (the King James Version "served") with fastings and supplications." Ro 1:25 gives both sebazomai and latreuo in their specific meanings: "worshipped (venerated) and served (religiously,) the creature." doxa, "glory" (Lu 14:10, King James Version: "Thou shalt have worship," is a survival of an old English use, rightly discarded in the Revised Version (British and American)). threskeia (Col 2:18), "a voluntary humility and worshipping of the angels" (the American Revised Version margin "an act of reverence"), has the root idea of trembling or fear. therapeuo, "serve," "heal," "tend" (Ac 17:25, King James Version: "neither is worshipped by men’s hands"), is "served" in the Revised Version (British and American), perhaps properly, but its close connection with "temples made with hands" makes this questionable. neokoros, "temple-sweepers," "temple-keeper" (Ac 19:35), has its true meaning in the Revised Version (British and American), but

"worshipper" is needed to complete the idea, in our modern idiom.

In the Apocrypha the usage is the same as in the New Testament, the verbs used being, in the order of their frequency, proskuneo, sebomai, threskeuo, and latreuo.

The New Testament idea of worship is a combination of the reverential attitude of mind and body, the general ceremonial and religious service of God, the feeling of awe, veneration, adoration; with the outward and ceremonial aspects approaching, but not reaching, the vanishing point. The total idea of worship, however, both in the Old Testament and New Testament, must be built up, not from the words specifically so translated, but also, and chiefly, from the whole body of description of worshipful feeling and action, whether of individuals singly and privately, or of larger bodies engaged in the public services of sanctuary, tabernacle, temple, synagogue, upper room or meeting-place.

Space permits no discussion of the universality of worship in some form, ranging from superstitious fear or fetishism to the highest spiritual exercise of which man is capable; nor of the primary motive of worship, whether from a desire to placate, ingratiate, or propitiate some higher power, or to commune and share with him or it, or express instinctive or purposed devotion to him. On the face of the Bible narratives, the instinct of communion, praise, adoring gratitude would seem to be the earliest moving force (compare Ge 4:3,4, Cain, Abel; Ro 1:18-25, the primitive knowledge of God as perverted to creature-worship; Ge 8:20, Noah’s altar; and Ge 12:7, Abram’s altar). That propitiation was an early element is indicated probably by Abel’s offering from the flock, certainly by the whole system of sacrifice. Whatever its origin, worship as developed in the Old Testament is the expression of the religious instinct in penitence, prostration, adoration, and the uplift of holy joy before the Creator.

2. Old Testament Worship:

In detail, Old Testament worship was individual and private, though not necessarily secret, as with Eliezer (Ge 24:26 f), the expression of personal gratitude for the success of a mission, or with Moses (Ex 34:8), seeking God’s favor in intercessory prayer; it was sometimes, again, though private, in closest association with others, perhaps with a family significance (Ge 8:20, Noah; Ge 12:7; 22:5, Abraham: "I and the lad will go yonder; and .... worship"); it was in company with the "great congregation," perhaps partly an individual matter, but gaining blessing and force from the presence of others (Ps 42:4: "I went with the throng .... keeping holyday"); and it was, as the national spirit developed, the expression of the national devotion (1Ch 29:20: "And all the assembly .... worshipped Yahweh, and the king"). In this public national worship the truly devout Jew took his greatest delight, for in it were inextricably interwoven together, his patriotism, his sense of brotherhood, his feeling of solidarity, his personal pride and his personal piety.

The general public worship, especially as developed in the Temple services, consisted of:

(1) Sacrificial acts, either on extraordinary occasions, as at the dedication of the Temple, etc., when the blood of the offerings flowed in lavish profusion (2Ch 7:5), or in the regular morning and evening

sacrifices, or on the great annual days, like the Day of Atonement.

(2) Ceremonial acts and posture of reverence or of adoration, or symbolizing the seeking and receiving of the divine favor, as when the high priest returned from presenting incense offering in the holy place, and the people received his benediction with bowed heads, reverently standing (2Ch 7:6), or the worshippers prostrated themselves as the priests sounded the silver trumpets at the conclusion of each section of the Levites' chant.

(3) Praise by the official ministrants of the people or both together, the second probably to a very limited extent. This service of praise was either instrumental, silver "trumpets and cymbals and instruments of music," or it might be in vocal song, the chant of the Levites (very likely the congregation took part in some of the antiphonal psalms); or it might be both vocal and instrumental, as in the magnificent dedicatory service of Solomon (2Ch 5:13), when "the trumpeters and singers were as one, to make one sound to be heard in praising and thanking Yahweh." Or it might be simply spoken: "And all the people said, Amen, and praised Yahweh" (1Ch 16:36). How fully and splendidly this musical element of worship was developed among the Hebrews the Book of Ps gives witness, as well as the many notices in Chronicles (1Ch 15; 16; 25; 2Ch 5; 29; 30, etc.). It is a pity that our actual knowledge of Hebrew music should be so limited.

(4) Public prayer, such as is described in De 26, at the dedication of the Temple (2Ch 6, etc.), or like Psalms 60; 79; 80. Shorter forms, half praise, half prayer, formed a part of the service in Christ's time.

(5) The annual feasts, with their characteristic ceremonies.

See PASSOVER; TABERNACLE; etc. Places of worship are discussed under ALTAR; HIGH PLACE; SANCTUARY; TABERNACLE; TEMPLE, etc.

3. New Testament Worship:

In the New Testament we find three sorts of public worship, the temple-worship upon Old Testament lines, the synagogue-worship, and the worship which grew up in the Christian church out of the characteristic life of the new faith. The synagogue-worship, developed by and after the exile, largely substituted the book for the symbol, and thought for the sensuous or object appeal; it was also essentially popular, homelike, familiar, escaping from the exclusiveness of the priestly service. It had four principal parts:

(1) the recitation of the shema‘, composed of De 6:4-9; 11:13-21, and Nu 15:37-41, and beginning, "Hear (shema‘), O Israel: Yahweh our God is one Yahweh";

(2) prayers, possibly following some set form, perhaps repeating some psalm;

(3) the reading by male individuals of extracts from the Law and the Prophets selected by the "ruler of

the synagogue," in later years following the fixed order of a lectionary, as may have been the case when Jesus "found the place";

(4) the targum or condensed explanation in the vernacular of the Scriptures read.

It is questioned whether singing formed a part of the service, but, considering the place of music in Jewish religious life, and its subsequent large place in Christian worship, it is hard to think of it as absent from the synagogue.

4. Public Christian Worship:

Public Christian worship necessarily developed along the lines of the synagogue and not the temple, since the whole sacrificial and ceremonial system terminated for Christianity with the life and death of Jesus. The perception of this, however, was gradual, as was the break of Jewish Christians with both synagogue and temple. Jesus Himself held the temple in high honor, loved to frequent it as His Father's house, reverently observed the feasts, and exhibited the characteristic attitude of the devout but un-Pharisaic Israelite toward the temple and its worship. Yet by speaking of Himself as "greater than the temple" (Mt 12:6) and by quoting, Ho 6:6, "I desire goodness and not sacrifice," He indicated the relative subordinateness of the temple and its whole system of worship, and in His utterance to the woman of Samaria He intimated the abolition both of the whole idea of the central sanctuary and of the entire ceremonial worship: "Neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father"; "They that worship him must worship in spirit and truth" (Joh 4:21,24). His chief interest in the temple seems to have been as a "house of prayer" and an opportunity to reach and touch the people. We cannot help feeling that with all His love for the holy precincts, He must have turned with relief from the stately, formal, distant ceremonial of the temple, partly relieved though it was by the genuine religious passion of many worshippers, to the freer, more vital, closer heart-worship of the synagogue, loaded though that also was with form, tradition, ritual and error. Here He was a regular and reverent attendant and participant (Mr 1:21,39; 3:1; 6:2; Lu 6:6). Jesus did not Himself prescribe public worship for His disciples, no doubt assuming that instinct and practice, and His own spirit and example, would bring it about spontaneously, but He did seek to guard their worship from the merely outward and spectacular, and laid great emphasis on privacy and real "innerness" in it (Mt 6:1-18, etc.). Synagogue-worship was probably not abandoned with Pentecost, but private brotherhood meetings, like that in the upper chamber, and from house to house, were added. The young church could hardly have "grown in favor with the people," if it had completely withdrawn from the popular worship, either in temple or synagogue, although no attendance on the latter is ever mentioned. Possibly the Christians drew themselves together in a synagogue of their own, as did the different nationalities. The reference in James: "if there come unto your synagogue" (2:2), while not conclusive, since "synagogue" may have gained a Christian significance by this time, nevertheless, joined with the traditions concerning James's ascetic zeal and popular repute, argues against such a complete separation early. Necessarily with the development into clearness of the Christian ideas, and with the heightening persecution, together with the hard industrial struggle of life, the observance of the Jewish Sabbath in temple or synagogue, and of the Christian's Lord's Day, grew incompatible. Yet the full development of this must have been rather late in Paul's life. Compare his missionary tactics of beginning his work at the synagogue, and his

custom of observing as far as possible the Jewish feasts (Ac 20:16; 1Co 16:8). Our notions of the worship of the early church must be constructed out of the scattered notices descriptive of different stages in the history, and different churches present different phases of development. The time was clearly the Lord's Day, both by the Jewish churches (Joh 20:19,26) and by the Greek (Ac 20:7; 1Co 16:2) The daily meeting of Ac 2:46 was probably not continued, no mention occurring later.

There are no references to yearly Christian festivals, though the wide observance in the sub-apostolic period of the Jewish Passover, with references to the death and resurrection of Jesus, and of Pentecost to commemorate the gift of the Holy Spirit, argues for their early use. The place was of course at first in private houses, and the earliest form of Christian church architecture developed from this model rather than the later one of the basilica. 1 Corinthians gives rather full data for the worship in this free and enthusiastic church. It appears that there were two meetings, a public and a private. The public worship was open, informal and missionary, as well as edificatory. The unconverted, inquirers and others, were expected to be present, and were frequently converted in the meeting (1Co 14:24). It resembled much more closely, an evangelical "prayer and conference meeting" of today than our own formal church services. There is no mention of official ministrants, though the meeting seems to have been under some loose guidance. Any male member was free to take part as the Spirit might prompt, especially in the line of his particular "spiritual gift" from God, although one individual might have several, as Paul himself. Largely developed on synagogue lines, but with a freedom and spirit the latter must have greatly lacked, it was composed of:

(1) Prayer by several, each followed by the congregational "Amen."

(2) Praise, consisting of hymns composed by one or another of the brethren, or coming down from the earlier days of Christian, perhaps Jewish, history, like the Benedictus, the Magnificat, the Nunc dimittis, etc. Portions of these newer hymns seem to be imbedded here and there in the New Testament, as at Re 5:9-13: "Worthy art thou," etc. (compare Re 15:3; 11:17, etc.); also: "He who was manifested in the flesh, Justified in the spirit, Seen of angels, Preached among the nations, Believed on in the world, Received up in glory" (1Ti 3:16). Praise also might take the form of individual testimony, not in metrical form (1Co 14:16).

(3) Reading of the Scripture must have followed, according to the synagogue model. Paul presupposes an acquaintance with the Old Testament Scriptures and the facts of Jesus' life, death, resurrection. Instructions to read certain epistles in the churches indicate the same.

(4) Instruction, as in 1Co 2:7; 6:5, teaching for edification. (These passages, however, may not have this specific reference.)

(5) Prophesying, when men, believed by themselves and by the church to be specially taught by the Holy Spirit, gave utterance to His message. At Corinth these crowded on one another, so that Paul had to command them to speak one at a time.

(6) Following this, as some believe, came the "speaking with tongues," perhaps fervent and ejaculatory prayers "so rugged and disjointed that the audience for the most part could not understand" until someone interpreted. The speaking with tongues, however, comprised praise as well as prayer (1Co 14:16), and the whole subject is enshrouded in mystery. See TONGUES, GIFT OF.

(7) The meeting closed with the benediction and with the "kiss of peace."

The "private service" may have followed the other, but seems more likely to have been in the evening, the other in the morning. The disciples met in one place and ate together a meal of their own providing, the agape, or love feast, symbolizing their union and fellowship, preceded or followed by prayers (Didache x), and perhaps interspersed by hymns. Then the "Lord's Supper" itself followed, according to the directions of the apostle (1Co 11:23-28).

How far "Christian worship" was "Christian" in the sense of being directly addressed to Christ, is not easily answered. We must not read into their mental content the fully developed Christology of later centuries, but it is hard to believe that those who had before them Thomas' adoring exclamation, "My Lord and my God!" the saying of the first martyr, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit," the dictum of the great apostle, "Who, existing in the form of God," the utterances of He, "And let all the angels of God worship him," "Thy throne, O God, is forever and forever," and, later, the prologue of Jn, and the ascriptions of praise in the Apocalypse, could have failed to bow down in spirit before Jesus Christ, to make known their requests through Him, and to lift up their adoration in song to Him, as according to Pliny's witness, 112 AD, "they sing a hymn to Christ as God." The absolutely interchangeable way in which Paul, for instance, applies "Lord" in one breath to the Father, to the Old Testament Yahweh, and to Jesus Christ (Ro 10:11,13; 14:4,6,8,11,12, etc.) clearly indicates that while God the Father was, as He must be, the ultimate and principal object of worship, the heart and thought of God's New Testament people also rested with adoring love on Him who is "worthy .... to receive the power and riches and wisdom, and might, and glory, and honor and blessing." The angel of the Apocalypse would not permit the adoration of the seer (Re 22:9), but Jesus accepts the homage of Thomas, and in the Fourth Gospel declares it the duty of all to "honor the Son, even as they honor the Father" (Joh 5:23).

The classical passages for Christian worship are Joh 4:23,24, culminating in (margin): "God is spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth," and Php 3:3, "who worship by the Spirit of God." These define its inner essence, and bar out all ceremonial or deputed worship whatever, except as the former is, what the latter can never be, the genuine and vital expression of inner love and devotion. Anything that really stimulates and expresses the worshipful spirit is so far forth a legitimate aid to worship, but never a substitute for it, and is harmful if it displaces it. Much, perhaps most, stately public worship is as significant to God and man as the clack of a Thibetan prayer-mill. The texts cited also make of worship something far deeper than the human emotion or surrender of will; it is the response of God's Spirit in us to that Spirit in Him, whereby we answer "Abba, Father," deep calling unto deep. Its object is not ingratiation, which is unnecessary, nor propitiation, which has been made "once for all," nor in any way "serving" the God who 'needeth not to be worshipped with men's hands' (Ac 17:25), but it is the loving attempt to pay our unpayable debt of love, the expression of devoted hearts, "render(ing) as bullocks the offering of our lips" (Ho 14:2). For detail it is not a physical act or material offering, but an

attitude of mind: "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit"; "sacrifices of praise, with which God is well pleased"; not the service of form in an outward sanctuary, the presentation of slain animals, but the service of love in a life: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice"; not material sacrifices, but spiritual: your rational "service"; not the service about an altar of stone or wood, but about the sanctuary of human life and need; for this is true religion ("service," "worship," threskeia), "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction"; not the splendor of shining robes or the sounding music of trumpets or organs, but the worshipping glory of holy lives; in real fact, "hallowing Thy name," "and keeping oneself unspotted from the world." The public worship of God in the presence of His people is a necessity of the Christian life, but in spiritual Christianity the ceremonial and outward approaches, if it does not quite reach, the vanishing point.

LITERATURE.

BDB; Thayer's New Testament Lexicon under the word; arts; on "Praise," "Worship," "Temple," "Church," "Prayer," in HDB, DB, New Sch-Herz, DCG; Commentaries on Psalms, Chronicles, Corinthians; Weizsacker, The Apostolic Age of the Church, II; Pfleiderer, Das Urchristenthum (English translation); Leoning, Gemeindeverfassung des Urchristenthums; Edersheim, The Temple, Its Ministry and Service, as They Were at the Time of Jesus Christ, and Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah; Hort, The Christian Ecclesia; Lindsay, Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries; McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.

Philip Wendell Crannell

WORSHIP, IMAGE

See IMAGES.

WORSHIPPER

wur'-ship-er.

See TEMPLE KEEPERS; WORSHIP.

WORTHIES

wur'-thiz ('addir, "majestic," "noble" (compare Jud 5:13, Etc.)):in Na 2:5, the King James Version "He shall recount his worthies" (margin "gallants"), the English Revised Version "He remembereth his worthies," the American Standard Revised Version "He remembereth his nobles." As Massoretic Text stands, the Assyrian king hurriedly summons his commanders to repel the assault, but the passage is obscure and the text quite possibly in need of emendation.

WOT

See WIST; WITTY; WOT.

WRATH, (ANGER)

rath, roth, rath (’aph, from ‘anaph, "to snort," "to be angry"; orge, thumos, orgizomai): Designates various degrees of feeling, such as sadness (Ps 85:4), a frown or turning away of the face in grief or anger (2Ch 26:19; Jer 3:12), indignation (Ps 38:3), bitterness (Jud 18:25), fury (Es 1:12), full of anger (Ge 4:5; Joh 7:23), snorting mad (Ge 27:45; Mt 2:16).

1. Divine Wrath:

Wrath is used with reference to both God and man. When used of God it is to be understood that there is the complete absence of that caprice and unethical quality so prominent in the anger attributed to the gods of the heathen and to man. The divine wrath is to be regarded as the natural expression of the divine nature, which is absolute holiness, manifesting itself against the willful, high-handed, deliberate, inexcusable sin and iniquity of mankind. God’s wrath is always regarded in the Scripture as the just, proper, and natural expression of His holiness and righteousness which must always, under all circumstances, and at all costs be maintained. It is therefore a righteous indignation and compatible with the holy and righteous nature of God (Nu 11:1-10; De 29:27; 2Sa 6:7; Isa 5:25; 42:25; Jer 44:6; Ps 79:6). The element of love and compassion is always closely connected with God’s anger; if we rightly estimate the divine anger we must unhesitatingly pronounce it to be but the expression and measure of that love (compare Jer 10:24; Eze 23; Am 3:2).

2. Human Wrath:

Wrath, when used of man, is the exhibition of an enraged sinful nature and is therefore always inexcusable (Ge 4:5,6; 49:7; Pr 19:19; Job 5:2; Lu 4:28; 2Co 12:10; Ga 5:20; Eph 4:31; Col 3:8). It is for this reason that man is forbidden to allow anger to display itself in his life. He is not to "give place unto wrath" (Ro 12:19 margin), nor must he allow "the sun to go down upon his wrath" (Eph 4:26). He must not be angry with his brother (Mt 5:22), but seek agreement with him lest the judgment that will necessarily fall upon the wrathful be meted out to him (Mt 5:25,26). Particularly is the manifestation of an angry spirit prohibited in the training and bringing up of a family (Eph 6:4; Col 3:19). Anger, at all times, is prohibited (Nu 18:5; Ps 37:8; Ro 12:19; Ga 5:19; Eph 4:26; Jas 1:19,20).

3. Divine Wrath Consistent with Love:

Wrath or anger, as pertaining to God, is very much more prominent in the Old Testament than in the New Testament. This is to be accounted for probably because the New Testament magnifies the grace and love of God as contrasted with His wrath; at least love is more prominent than wrath in the revelation and teaching of Christ and His apostles. Nevertheless, it must not be thought that the element

of wrath, as a quality of the divine nature, is by any means overlooked in the New Testament because of the prominent place there given to love. On the contrary, the wrath of God is intensified because of the more wonderful manifestation of His grace, mercy and love in the gift of His Son Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world. God is not love only: He is also righteous; yea, "Our God is a consuming fire" (Heb 12:29); "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb 10:31). No effeminate, sentimental view of the Fatherhood of God or of His mercy and loving-kindness can exclude the manifestation of His just, righteous and holy anger against sin and the sinner because of his transgression (1Pe 1:17; Heb 10:29). One thing only can save the sinner from the outpouring of God's righteous anger against sin in the day of visitation, namely, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the divinely-appointed Redeemer of the world (Joh 3:36; Ro 1:16-18; 5:9). Nor should the sinner think that the postponement or the omission (or seeming omission) of the visitation of God's wrath against sin in the present means the total abolition of it in the future. Postponement is not abolition; indeed, the sinner, who continually rejects Jesus Christ and the salvation which God has provided in Him, is simply 'treasuring up' wrath for himself "in the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who (one day) will render to every man according to his works: .... to them that .... obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, ... wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil" (Ro 2:5-9; 2Pe 3:10; Re 6:16,17; 16:19; 19:15).

See RETRIBUTION, 5.

God's anger while slow, and not easily aroused (Ps 103:8; Isa 48:9; Jon 4:2; Na 1:3), is to be dreaded (Ps 2:12; 76:7; 90:11; Mt 10:28); is not to be provoked (Jer 7:19; 1Co 10:22); when visited, in the present life, should be borne with submission (2Sa 24:17; La 3:39,43; Mic 7:9); prayer should be earnestly made for deliverance from it (Ps 39:10; 80:4; Da 9:16; Hab 3:2); it should be the means of leading man to repentance (Isa 42:24,25; Jer 4:8).

Certain specific things are said especially to arouse God's anger: continual provocation (Nu 32:14), unbelief (Ps 78:21,22; Heb 3:18,19), impenitence (Isa 9:13,14; Ro 2:5), apostasy (Heb 10:26,27), idolatry (De 32:19,20,22; 2Ki 22:17; Jer 44:3), sin in God's people (Ps 89:30-32; Isa 47:6), and it is manifested especially against opponents of the gospel of Jesus Christ (Ps 2:2,3,5; 1Th 2:16).

4. Righteous and Unrighteous Anger:

There is a sense, however, in which anger is the duty of man; he is to "hate evil" (Ps 97:10). It is not enough that God's people should love righteousness, they must also be angry with sin (not the sinner). A man who is incapable of being angry at sin is at the same time thereby adjudged to be incapable of having a real love for righteousness. So there is a sense in which a man may be said to "be .... angry, and sin not" (Eph 4:26). Anger at the sin and unrighteousness of men, and because their sin is grievous to God, may be called a "righteous indignation." Such an indignation is attributed to Jesus when it is said that He "looked round about on them with anger, being grieved at the hardening of their heart" (Mr 3:5). When anger arises because of this condition, it is sinless, but when anger arises because of wounded or aggrieved personality or feelings, it is sinful and punishable. Anger, while very likely to become sinful,

is not really sinful in itself.

We have illustrations in the Scriptures of wrath or anger that is justifiable: Jesus (Mr 3:5), Jacob (Ge 31:36), Moses (Ex 11:8; 32:19; Le 10:16; Nu 16:15), Nehemiah (Ne 5:6; 13:17,25); of sinful anger: Cain (Ge 4:5,6), Esau (Ge 27:45), Moses (Nu 20:10,11), Balaam (Nu 22:27), Saul (1Sa 20:30), Ahab (1Ki 21:4), Naaman (2Ki 5:11), Herod (Mt 2:16), the Jews (Lu 4:28), the high priest (Ac 5:17; 7:54).

William Evans

WREST

rest: Found in the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) 3 times in the writings of Moses, namely, Ex 23:2,6; De 16:19. In all three places it refers to twisting, or turning aside, or perverting judgment or justice. In De 24:17 the Revised Version (British and American) has "wrest" where the King James Version has "pervert."

In Ps 56:5 (’atsabh); 2Pe 3:16 (strebloo), it refers to the word or words of God in the Scriptures. In the Psalms the servant of God, who speaks in God’s name, complains that the enemies "wrest," misinterpret, misapply and pervert his words. In Peter it is the ignorant and unstedfast who so pervert and misuse some of the difficult words of Paul, and they do it to their own destruction—a most earnest warning against carelessness and conscienceless indifference in interpreting Scripture.

G. H. Gerberding

WRESTLING

res’-ling (’abhaq; pale).

See GAMES, sec. II, 3, (i); JACOB; NAPHTALI.

WRINKLE

rin’-k’-l (qamaT, "to lay hold on"; rhutis, "a wrinkle"): In Job 16:8, the Revised Version (British and American) substitutes, "Thou hast laid fast hold on me" (margin "shrivelled me up") for the King James Version "Thou hast filled me with wrinkles." In Eph 5:27, Paul’s figurative reference to the church as a bride, "not having spot or wrinkle," is indicative of the perennial youth and attractiveness of the church.

WRITING, 1

rit’-ing:

I. GENERAL

1. Definition

2. Inward Writing

3. Outward Writing

II. THE SYMBOLS

1. Object Writing

2. Image Writing

3. Picture Writing

4. Mnemonic Writing

5. Phonetic Writing

III. METHODS

IV. INSTRUMENTS

V. MATERIALS

1. Clay

2. Stone

3. Lead

4. Bronze

5. Gold and Silver

6. Wood

7. Bones and Skins

8. Vellum

9. Papyrus

10. Paper

11. Ink

VI. FORMS

1. The Roll

2. The Codex

VII. WRITING

1. Writers

2. The Writing Art

VIII. HISTORY OF BIBLICAL HANDWRITING

1. Mythological Origins

2. Earliest Use

3. Biblical History

LITERATURE

I. General.

1. Definition:

Writing is the art of recording thought, and recording is the making of permanent symbols. Concept, expression and record are three states of the same work or word. Earliest mankind expressed itself by gesture or voice and recorded in memory, but at a very early stage man began to feel the need of objective aids to memory and the need of transmitting a message to a distance or of leaving such a message for the use of others when he should be away or dead. For these purposes, in the course of time, he has invented many symbols, made in various ways, out of every imaginable material. These symbols, fixed in some substance, inward or outward, are writing as distinguished from oral speech, gesture language, or other unrecording forms of expression. In the widest sense writing thus includes, not only

penmanship or chirography, but epigraphy, typography, phonography, photography, cinematography, and many other kinds of writing as well as mnemonic object writing and inward writing.

Writing has to do primarily with the symbols, but as these symbols cannot exist without being in some substance, and as they are often modified as to their form by the materials of which they are made or the instrument used in making, the history of writing has to do, not only with the signs, symbols or characters themselves, but with the material out of which they are made and the instruments and methods by which they are made.

2. Inward Writing:

The fact that memory is a real record is well known in modern psychology, which talks much of inward speech and inward writing. By inward writing is commonly meant the inward image or counterpart of visual or tangible handwriting as distinguished from the inward records of the sound of words, but the term fairly belongs to all inward word records. Of these permanent records two chief classes may be distinguished: sense records, whether the sense impression was by eye, ear, finger-tip or muscle, and motor records or images formed in the mind with reference to the motion of the hand or other organs of expression. Both sense records and meter records include the counterparts of every imaginable kind of outward handwriting.

We meet this inward writing in the Bible in the writing upon the tablets of the heart (Pr 3:3; 7:3; Jer 17:1; 2Co 3:3), which is thus not a mere figure of speech but a proper description of that effort to fix in memory which some effect by means of sound symbols and some by the sight symbols of ordinary handwriting.

It has also its interesting and important bearing on questions of inspiration and revelation where the prophet "hears" a voice (Ex 19:19; Nu 7:89; Re 19:1,2) or "sees" a vision (2Ki 6:17; Isa 6; Am 7:1-9) or even sees handwriting (Re 17:5). This handwriting not only seems "real" but is real, whether caused by external sound or vision or internal human or superhuman action.

3. Outward Writing:

Outward writing includes many kinds of symbols produced in various ways in many kinds of material. The commonest kind is alphabetical handwriting with pen and ink on paper, but alphabetic symbols are not the only symbols, the hand is not the only means of producing symbols, the pen is not the only instrument, and ink and paper are far from being the only materials.

The ordinary ways of human expression are voice and gesture. Corresponding to these there is an oral writing and a gesture writing. For the recording of vocal sounds various methods have been invented: direct carving or molding in wax or other material, or translating into light vibrations and recording these by photograph or kymograph. Both phonographic and photographic records of sounds are strictly oral writing.

The record of gestures by making pictures of them forms a large fraction of primitive picture writing (e. g. the picture of a man with weapon poised to throw) and the modern cinematography of pantomime is simply a perfected form of this primitive picture writing.

Handwriting is simply hand gesture with a mechanical device for leaving a permanent record of its motion by a trail of ink or incision. In the evolution of expression the imitation of human action tends to reduce itself to sign language, where both arms and the whole body are used, and then to more and more conventionalized hand gesture. This hand gesture, refined, condensed and adapted to mechanical conditions, and provided with pencil, chisel, or pen and ink, is handwriting. Its nature is precisely analogous to that of the self-registering thermometer or kymograph.

Nearly all the great body of existing written documents, save for the relatively few modern phonographic, kymographic and other visible speech records, is handwritten, the symbols being produced, selected, arranged, or at least pointed out, by the hand. Even the so-called phonetic writing, as usually understood, is not sound record but consists of hand-gesture symbols for sounds.

II. The Symbols.

Among the many kinds of outward signs used in writing the best known are the so-called Phoenician alphabet and its many derivatives, including the usual modern alphabets. Other well-known varieties are the wedge system of Assyria and Babylonia, the hieroglyphic systems of Egypt and Mexico, the Chinese characters, stenographic systems, the Morse code, the Braille system, the abacus, the notched stick, the knotted cord, wampum and twig bundles. These, however, by no means exhaust the list of signs which have been used for record or message purposes; e.g. colored flags for signaling, pebbles, cairns, pillars, flowers, trees, fishes, insects, animals and parts of animals, human beings, and images of all these things, have all served as record symbols in writing.

The various symbols may be grouped as objects and images, each of these classes divided again into pictorial or representative signs and mnemonic or conventional signs, mnemonic signs again divided into ideographic and phonetic, and phonetic again into verbal, syllabic (consonantal), and alphabetic. This may be represented graphically as follows:

(A) OBJECTS

(1) Pictorial

(2) Conventional (Mnemonic)

(a) Ideographic (Eye Images)

(b) Phonetic (Ear Images)

(i) Verbal

(ii) Syllabic

(iii) Consonantal

(iv) Alphabetic

(B) IMAGES

(1) Pictorial

(2) Conventional (Mnemonic)

(a) Ideographic

(b) Phonetic

(i) Verbal

(ii) Syllabic

(iii) Consonantal

(iv) Alphabetic

Objects may be whole objects (a man) or characteristic parts (human head, arm, leg) or samples (feather or piece of fur). The objects may be natural objects or artificial objects designed for another purpose (arrow), or objects designed especially to be used as writing symbols (colored flags). Images include images of all these objects and any imaginary images which may have been invented for writing purposes.

Pictorial or representative signs are distinguished from mnemonic or conventional signs by the fact that in themselves they suggest the thing meant, while the others require agreement beforehand as to what they shall mean. The fact, however, that the symbol is a picture of something does not make it pictorial or the writing picture writing. It is pictorial, not because it is a picture, but because it pictures something. The fact, e.g., that a certain symbol may be recognized as an ox does not make of this a pictograph. If it stands for or means an ox, it is a pictograph; if it stands for "divinity," it may be called an ideograph, or if it stands for the letter a it is phonetic, a phonogram.

The key to the evolution of writing symbols is to be found in a law of economy. Object writing undoubtedly came first, but man early learned that the image of an object would serve as well for record purposes and was much more convenient to handle. True picture writing followed. The same law of economy led to each of the other steps from pictorial to alphabetic, and may be traced in the history of each kind and part. Every alphabet exhibits it. The history of writing is in brief a history of shorthand. It begins with the whole object or image, passes to the characteristic part, reduces this to the fewest possible strokes which retain likeness, conventionalizes these strokes, and then, giving up all pretense of likeness to the original symbol, and frankly mnemonic, it continues the process of abbreviation until the whole ox has become the letter "a" or perhaps a single dot in some system of stenography.

Object writing is not common in the phonetic stage, but even this is found, for example, in alphabetical flags for ship signaling. The actual historical evolution of writing seems to have been object, image-picture, ideogram. phonogram, syllable, consonant, letter. All of these stages have some echoes at least in the Bible, although even the syllabic stage seems to have been already passed at the time of Moses. The Hebrew Old Testament as a whole stands for the consonantal stage and the Greek New Testament for the complete alphabetic—still the climax of handwriting, unless the evolution of mathematical symbols, which is a very elaborate evolution of ideographic handwriting, is so regarded.

Although probably not even a single sentence of the Hebrew Bible was written in ideographic, picture, or object handwriting, many documents which are used or quoted by Biblical writers were written by these methods, and all of them are repeatedly implied. In a number of cases full exegesis requires a knowledge of their nature and history. A certain number of scholars now believe that the Pentateuch was originally written in cuneiform, after the analogy of the circumstances shown by the Tell el-Amarna Letters. In this case of course there would still be traces both of the syllabic and ideographic, but theory is improbable.

1. Object Writing:

The most primitive writing was naturally pictorial object writing. When the hunter first brought home his quarry, this had in it most of the essential elements of modern handwriting. Those who remained at home read in the actual bodies the most essential record of the trip. When, further, the hunter brought back useless quarry to evidence his tale of prowess, the whole essence of handwriting was involved. This was whole-object record, but object abbreviations soon followed. Man early learned that skins represented whole animals (the determinative for "quadruped" in Egyptian is a hide), and that a reindeer’s head or antlers, or any characteristic part, served the simple purpose of record just as well as the whole object, and this method of record survives in a modern hunting-lodge. The bounty on wolves’ scalps and the expression "so many head of cattle" are similar survivals. In war, men returning hung the dead bodies of their enemies from the prows of their triumphal ships or from the walls of the city, and, in peace, from the gibbet, as object lessons. They soon learned, however, that a head would serve all practical purposes as well as a whole body, and the inhabitants of Borneo today practice their discovery. Then they discovered that a scalp was just as characteristic and more portable, and the scalp belt of the American Indian is the result. The ancient Egyptians counted the dead by "hands" carried away as trophies. Both objects and images tend thus to pass from the whole object to a characteristic part, then to

the smallest characteristic part: from the tiger's carcass or stuffed tiger to the tiger's claw or its picture. The next or mnemonic step was taken when the simplest characteristic part was exchanged for a pebble, a twig, a notched stick, a knot, or any other object or image of an object which does not in itself suggest a tiger.

The pictorial object writing had an evolution of its own and reached a certain degree of complexity in elaborate personal adornment, in sympathetic magic, the medicine bag, the prayer stick, pillars, meteoric stones, etc., for worship, collections of liturgical objects, fetishes, votive offerings, trophies, etc.

It reached a still higher order of complexity when it passed into the mnemonic stage represented by the abacus, the knotted cord, the notched stick, the wampum, etc. The knotted cord may be recognized in the earliest hieroglyphic signs, is found still among primitive people, and its most famous example is the, Peruvian quipu. It still survives in the cardinal's hat and the custom of knotting a handkerchief for mnemonic purposes. It is found in the Bible in a peculiarly clear statement in the mnemonic "fringes" of Nu 15:37-41 (compare De 22:12). The notched stick is equally old, as seen in the Australian message stick, and its best-known modern example is the tally of the British Exchequer. The abacus and the rosary are practically the lineal descendants of the pebble heap which has a concrete modern counterpart in the counting with pebbles by Italian shepherd boys. It is possible that the notched message stick has its echo in Jud 5:14 (military scribe's staff); Nu 17:1-10 (Aaron's inscribed rod), and all scepters (rods of authority) and herald's wands.

2. Image Writing:

It was a very long step in the history of handwriting from object to image, from the trophy record to the trophy image record. The nature of this step may perhaps be seen in the account of the leopard-tooth necklace of an African chief described by Frobenius. In itself this was merely a complex trophy record—the tribal record of leopards slain. When, however, the chief took for his own necklace the actual trophy which some members of the tribe had won, while the hunter made a wooden model of the tooth which served him as trophy, this facsimile tooth became an image record. This same step from object to image is most familiar in the history of votive offerings, where the model is substituted for the object, the miniature model for the model, and finally a simple written inscription takes the place of the model. It is seen again in sympathetic magic when little wax or clay images are vicariously buried or drowned, standing for the person to be injured, and taking the place of sample parts, such as the lock of hair or nail-parings, etc., which are used in like manner by still more primitive peoples.

3. Picture Writing:

It was another long step in the evolution of symbols when it occurred to man that objects worn for record could be represented by paint upon the body. The origin of written characters is often sought in the practice of tattooing, but whatever truth there may be in this must be carried back one step, for it is generally agreed and must naturally have been the fact that body painting preceded tattooing, which is a device for making the record permanent. The transition from the object trophy to the image on the skin

might easily have come from the object causing a pressure mark on the skin. There is good reason to believe that the wearing of trophies was the first use of record keeping.

It is of course not proved that body ornaments or body marks are the original of image writing or that trophies are the earliest writing, nor yet that models of trophies or votive offerings were the first step in image writing. It may be that the first images were natural objects recognized as resembling other objects. The Zuni Indians used for their chief fetishes natural rock forms. The first step may have been some slight modification of natural stone forms into greater resemblance, such as is suggested by the slightly modified sculptures of the French-Spanish caves. Or again the tracks of animals in clay may have suggested the artificial production of these tracks or other marks, and the development of pottery and pottery marks may have been the main line of evolution. The Chinese trace the origin of their symbols to bird tracks. Or again smear marks of earth or firebrand or blood may have suggested marks on stone, and the marked pebbles of the Pyrenean caves may have reference to this. Or yet again the marks on the animals in the Pyrenean caves may have been ownership marks and point back to a branding of marks or a primitive tattooing by scarification.

Whatever the exact point or motive for the image record may have been, and however the transition was made, the idea once established had an extensive development which is best illustrated by the picture writing of the American Indians, though perhaps to be found in the Bushmen drawings, petroglyphs, and picture writing the world over. It is almost historic in the Sumerian and the Egyptian, whose phonetic symbols are pictographic in origin at least and whose determinatives are true pictographs.

4. Mnemonic Writing:

The transition from pictorial to conventional or mnemonic takes place when the sign ceases to suggest the meaning directly, even after explanation. This happens in two ways: (1) when an object or image stands for something not directly related to that naturally suggested, e.g., when a stuffed fox stands for a certain man because it is his totem, or an ox’s head stands for divinity or for the sound "a," or when the picture of a goose stands for "son" in the Egyptian because the sounds of the two words are the same; (2) when by the natural process of shorthanding the object or image has been reduced beyond the point of recognition. Historically, the letter a is ox (or goat?); actually it means a certain sound.

When this unrecognizable or conventional sign is intended to suggest a visual image it is called an ideogram, when an ear picture, a phonogram. Anybody looking casually over a lot of Egyptian hieroglyphics can pick out kings’ names because of the oval line or cartouche in which they are enclosed. This cartouche is ideagraphic. On the other hand the pictures of a sun, two chicks, and a cerastes within the cartouche have nothing to do with any of these objects, but stand for the sounds kufu —who is the person commonly known as Cheops. This is phonetic. Both old Babylonian and Egyptian show signs of picture origin, but the earliest Babylonian is mainly ideographic, and both developed soon into the mixed stage of phonetic writing with determinatives.

5. Phonetic Writing:

Phonetic writing seems to have developed out of the fact that in all languages the same sound often has many different meanings. In English "goose" may mean the fowl or the tailor’s goose. In Egyptian the sound "sa" or "s", with a smooth breathing, means "goose" or "son," and the picture of a goose means either.

Whether the word-sign is an ideogram or a phonogram is a matter of psychology. Many modern readers even glimpse a word as a whole and jump to the visual image without thinking of sounds at all. To them it is an ideagram. Others, however, have to spell out the sounds, even moving their lips to correspond. To them as to the writer it is a phonogram. The same was true of the ancient picture or ideagraphic sign. The word-sign was ideagram or phonogram according to intention or to perception.

With the transition to syllabic writing, record became chiefly phonetic. The transition was made apparently by an entirely natural evolution from the practice of using the same word-sign for several different objects having the same sound, and it proceeded by the way of rebus, as shown in Mexican and Egyptian hieroglyphics.

Syllabic writing implies a symbol for every monosyllable. It was a great step therefore when it was discovered that the number of sounds was small and could be represented by individual symbols, as compound words could by syllable signs. At first only consonants were written. In the Semitic languages vowels were at first not written at all—possibly they were not even recognized, and one might use any vowel with a particular combination of consonants. However that may be, what many prefer to call consonantal writing seems to have existed for 2,000 years before the vowels were recognized and regularly introduced into the Phoenician alphabet. It is at this stage that alphabetic writing, as usually reckoned, began.

See ALPHABET.

Phonetic consonantal writing has now been in use some 5,000 years and strict alphabetic writing some 3,000 years, almost to the exclusion of other forms. The characters in use today in several hundred alphabets are probably the historical descendants, with accumulation of slight changes through environment, of characters existing from near the beginning.

Alongside the development of the historic system of symbols, there has been, still within the field of alphabetic writing for the most part, a parallel line with multitudes of shorthand and cryptographic systems. An equally great multitude of code systems are in effect phonetic words or sentences and cryptographically or otherwise used for cable or telegraph, diplomatic letters, criminal correspondence and other secret purposes.

III. Methods.

Roughly speaking, the ways of making symbols, apart from the selection of the ready-made, may be reduced to two which correspond to art in the round or in three dimensions and art in the flat or in two

dimensions. The former appeals to eye or touch, affording a contrast by elevation or depression, while the latter produces the same effect by contrasting colors on a flat surface.

Written symbols in three dimensions are produced either by cutting or by pressure. In the case of hard material superfluous matter is removed by sculpture, engraving or die cutting. In the case of plastic or malleable material, it is modeled, molded, hammered or stamped into the required form. To the first form belongs the bulk of stone inscriptions, ancient metal inscriptions, scratched graffiti, wax tablets, etc., to the later clay tablets, votive figurines, seal impressions, hammered inscriptions, minted coins, also molded inscriptions, coins and medals, etc. Several of the Hebrew and Greek words for writing imply cutting (chaqaq, charaT, charash, etc.; grapho).

Symbols in two dimensions are produced either by drawing or printing, both of which methods consist in the applying of some soft or liquid material to a material of a contrasting color or cutting from thin material and laying on. Drawing applies the material in a continuous or interrupted line of paint, charcoal, colored chalk, graphite, ink or other material. Its characteristic product is the manuscript. This laying on is implied, as some think (Blau, 151), in the commonest Hebrew word for writing (kathabh). Tattooing (De 14:1; Le 19:28, etc.), embroidery (embroidered symbolic figures, Ex 28:33,34) and weaving belong in this class (embroidered words in Palestine Talmud 20a, quoted by Blau, 165).

Printing consists in laying the contrasting color on by means of stencil or pressure, forming symbols in two dimensions at one stroke. Perhaps the most primitive form of printing is that of the pintadoes, by which the savage impresses war paint or other ceremonial forms on his face and body. Branding also belongs in this class (Ga 6:17, figuratively; 3 Macc 2:19; branding on the forehead, Code of Hammurabi, section 127; branding a slave, Code of Hammurabi, sections 226, 227).

These processes of cutting, molding, drawing and printing roughly correspond with inscriptions, coins, medals, seals, manuscripts, and printed documents—epigraphy, numismatics, sigillography, chirography, typography.

IV. Instruments.

The commonest instruments of ancient writing were the pen, brush and style. Other instruments are: the various tools for modeling, molds, stencils, dies, stamps, needles, engraving tools, compass, instruments for erasure, for the ruling of lines, vessels for ink or water, etc. Several of these are mentioned and others are implied in the Bible. The chisel which cuts and the stylus which scratches are both called stylus or simply the "iron" (the iron pen). The graving tool of Ex 32:4, the iron pen of Job 19:24, the pen of Isa 8:1, the pen of iron of Jer 17:1, and, with less reason, the pencil of Isa 44:13, are all commonly interpreted as stilus or style, but they are sometimes at least cutting rather than scratching tools. References to wooden tablets also imply the style, and references to clay tablets either the style proper or a similar instrument for pressure marks. The point of a diamond in Jer 17:1, whether it is joined with the pen of iron or not, seems to refer to the use of corundum in the engraving of precious stones. The passages which refer to blotting out (see below) or writing on papyrus (see below) or refer to an ink-

horn or ink (see respective articles) imply a pen or brush rather than style, and presumably the writing of the New Testament implied in general a reed pen. The wide house "painted with vermilion" (Jer 22:14) implies the brush, but there is no direct evidence of its use in writing in the Bible itself. The existing ostraca from Ahab's palace are, however, done with the brush. The pencil (seredh) mentioned in Isa 44:13 certainly means some instrument for shaping, but is variously translated as "line" (the King James Version), "red ochre" (Revised Version margin), and even "stilus," or "line-marking stilus" (paragraphis Aquila). The compass, often referred to in classical times, is found in Isa 44:13. The line ruler (paragraphis), referred to by Aquila (Isa 44:13), and the simple plummet as well were probably used, as in later times, for marking lines. The needle is referred to in late Hebrew and needlework in the Bible (see III, above). The ink-horn or water vessel for moistening the dry inks is implied in all papyrus or leather writing.

See INK, INK-HORN.

The Hebrew term translated "weight of lead" in Zec 5:8, and "talent of lead" is precisely equivalent to the Greek term for the circular plate of lead (kuklomolibdos) used for ruling lines, but something heavier than the ruling lead seems meant.

Erasure or blotting out is called for in Nu 5:23, and often figuratively (Ex 32:32,33; Re 3:5, etc.). If writing was on papyrus, this would call for the sponge rather than the penknife as an eraser, but the latter, which is used for erasure or for making reed pens, is referred to in Jer 36:23. For erasing waxed surfaces the blunt end of the style was used certainly as early as the New Testament times. Systematic erasure when vellum was scarce produced the palimpsest.

WRITING, 2

V. Materials.

The materials used in writing include almost every imaginable substance, mineral, vegetable, and animal: gold, silver, copper, bronze, clay, marble, granite, precious gems, leaves, bark, wooden planks, many vegetable complexes, antlers, shoulder-blades, and all sorts of bones of animals, and especially skins. The commonest are stone, clay, metal, papyrus, paper and leather, including vellum, and all of these except paper are mentioned in the Bible. Paper too must be reckoned with in textual criticism, and it was its invention which, perhaps more even than the discovery of printing with movable type, made possible the enormous multiplication of copies of the Bible in recent times.

1. Clay:

Whatever may be the fact as to the first material used for record purposes, the earliest actual records now existing in large quantities are chiefly on clay or stone, and, on the whole, clay records seem to antedate and surpass in quantity stone inscriptions for the earliest historical period. After making all allowances for differences in dating and accepting latest dates, there is an immense quantity of clay records written

before 2500 BC and still existing. About 1400 or 1500 BC the clay tablet was in common use from Crete to the extreme East and all over Palestine, everywhere, in short, but Egypt and it seems perhaps to have been the material for foreign diplomatic communications, even in Egypt. Hundreds of thousands of these tablets have been dug up, and undoubtedly millions are in existence, dug or undug. These are chiefly of Mesopotamia. The most famous of these tablets were for a long time of the later period from the library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh. See LIBRARY OF NINEVEH. Recently, however those from Tell el-Amarna in Egypt, Boghaz-keui in the Hittite country, and a few from Palestine itself vie with these in interest. Most of these tablets are written on both sides and in columns ruled in lines. They measure from an inch to a foot and a half in length and are about two-thirds as wide as they are long. Many of these tablets, the so-called "case tablets," are surrounded with another layer of clay with a docketing inscription. See TABLETS. Other clay forms are the potsherd ostraca; now being dug up in considerable quantities in Palestine Ezekiel (4:1) and perhaps Jeremiah (17:13) refer to this material.

See OSTRACA.

2. Stone:

Stones were used for record before image writing was invented—as cairns, pillars, pebbles, etc. Many of the early and primitive image records are on the walls of caves or on cliffs (Bushmen, American Indians, etc.). Sometimes these are sculptured, sometimes made by charcoal, paint, etc. The durability rather than the more extensive use of stone makes of these documents the richest source for our knowledge of ancient times. Besides natural stone objects, stone pillars, obelisks, statues, etc., stone-wall tablets, the sides of houses and other large or fixed surfaces, there are portable stone-chip ostraca and prepared tablets (tablets of stone, Ex 24:12; 31:18). These latter might be written on both sides (Ex 32:15). Job seems to refer to stone inscriptions (19:24). The famous trilingual inscription of Behistun which gave Rawlinson the key to the Assyrian was on a cliff and refers to King Darius (Rawlinson, Life, 58 ff, 142 ff). Two of the most famous of stone inscriptions are the Rosetta Stone, which gave the key to the Egyptian hieroglyphics, and the Moabite Stone (W. H. Bennett, Moabite Stone, London 1911), and both have some bearing on Jewish history. An especially interesting and suggestive stone inscription is the Annals of Thutmose III of Egypt, about 1500 BC, inscribed on the walls of the temple at Karnak. This gives a long account of campaigns in Syria and Palestine (Breasted, Ancient Records of Egypt, 163-217). The Siloam Inscription, and in general all the recently discovered inscriptions of Palestine, have their more or less important bearings on Biblical history (Lidzbarski, Handb. and Ephem.). Moses provided (De 27:2-8) for writing the Law on stone (or plaster), and Joshua executed the work (Jos 8:21,32).

Another form of record on stone is the engraving of gems, which is referred to in Ex 28:9,11,21; 39:6,14, etc., and possibly Zec 3:9.

3. Lead:

One of the commonest materials, on account of the ease of engraving, probably, is lead. Used more or

less for inscriptions proper, it is also used for diplomatic records and even literary works. It was very commonly used for charms in all nations, and is referred to in Job (19:24), where it perhaps more likely means a rock inscription filled with lead, rather than actual leaden tablets. For the text of Ps 80 on lead see Gardthausen, p. 26. Submergence curses were usually of lead, but that of Jer 51:62 seems to have been of papyrus or paper (compare W. S. Fox in American Journal of Phil., XXXIII, 1912, 303-4).

4. Bronze:

Bronze was used for several centuries BC, at least for inscribed votive offerings, for public records set up in the treasuries of the temples and for portable tablets such as the military diplomas. In the time of the Maccabees public records were engraved on such tablets and set up in the temple at Jerusalem (1 Macc 14:27). There were doubtless many such at the time when Jesus Christ taught there.

5. Gold and Silver:

Gold and silver as writing material are most commonly and characteristically used in coins and medals. References to money, mostly silver money, are numerous in the Old Testament, but these are not certainly coins with alphabetic inscriptions. In New Testament times coins were so inscribed, and in one case at least the writing upon it is referred to—"Whose is this image and superscription?" (Mt 22:20). The actual inscription and the actual form of its letters are known from extant specimens of the denarius of the period.

See MONEY.

The use of the precious metals for ordinary inscriptional purposes was, however, frequent in antiquity, and the fact that rather few such inscriptions have survived is probably due to the value of the metal for other purposes. The Hittite treaty of Khetasar or Chattusil engraved on silver and sent to the king of Egypt, has long been known from the Egyptian monuments (translation in Breasted, Ancient Records of Egypt, III, 165-74), and recently fragments of the Hittite version of this treaty have been discovered at Boghaz-keui (Winckler, MDOG, XXXV, 12 ff). This has very close relations to Biblical history, whether it was made before or after the Exodus. The famous Orphic gold tablets (Harrison, "Orphic Tablets," in Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, 573-600, 660-74) have a bearing on a comparative study of Biblical doctrine. Direct reference to engraving on gold is found in the account of the inscription on the high priest’s miter (Ex 28:36). Writing on the horns of the altar is referred to in Jer 17:1, and these horns too were of gold (Ex 30:3). Queen Helena of Adiabene is said to have presented an inscribed gold tablet to the temple at Jerusalem (Blau, 67). The golden shrines of Ptolemy V—with their inscribed golden phylacteries—are mentioned on the Rosetta Stone.

Silver, and more especially gold, have also been very extensively used for the laying on of contrasting colors, either furnishing the background or more often the material laid on. The history of chrysography is a long and full one (Gardthausen, I, 214-17; Blau, 13, 159-63). The standard copy of the Old Testament at Jerusalem, which was loaned to Alexandria, was apparently in gold letters (Josephus, Ant,

XII, ii, 10) (see SEPTUAGINT), and many of the famous Biblical manuscripts of the Middle Ages were written wholly or in part with gold, either laid on as gold leaf or dissolved and used as an ink or paint (Gardthausen, 216).

6. Wood:

Leaves of trees were early used for charms and writing. Some of the representations of writing on the Egyptian monuments show the goddess of writing inscribing the leaves of growing trees. Jewish tradition (Tosephta' Gittin 2 3-5; Mishna, Gittin 2 3, etc., quoted by Blau, 16) names many kinds of leaves on which a bill of divorcement (De 24:1,3) might or might not be written. Reference to the use of leaves is found in early Greek, Latin, and Arabic sources—and they are still used in the East.

Bark also has often been used: both liber in Latin and "book" in English, according to some, are thought to refer to the bark of the lime or beech tree, and birch bark was a common writing material among the American Indians. It is in the form of wrought wood, staves, planks or tablets however, that wood was chiefly known in historical times. These wood tablets were used in all early periods and among all nations, especially for memorandum accounts and children's exercises. Sometimes the writing was directly on the wood, and sometimes on wood coated with wax or with chalk. See TABLETS. Writing on staves is referred to in Nu 17:2. Mr 15:26 seems perhaps to imply that the "superscription" of the cross was on wood, unless Joh 19:19 contradicts this.

Woven linen as a writing substance had some fame in antiquity (libri lintei), and many other fibers which have been used for woven or embroidered writing are, broadly speaking, of wood. So too, in fact, when linen or wood is pulped and made into paper, the material is still wood. Most modern writing and printing is thus on wood. See 10, below.

7. Bones and Skins:

Diogenes Laertius (vii.174) tells that Cleanthes wrote on the shoulder-blades of oxen, but he was preceded by the cave-dwellers of the Neolithic age, who wrote on reindeer horns and bones of many kinds (Dechelette, Archeological Prehistory, 1908, 125, 220-37, et passim). Ivory has often been used and was a favorite material for tablets in classical times. The Septuagint translates "ivory work" of So 5:14 as "ivory tablets." Horns are given in late Hebrew (Tosephta', quoted by Blau, 16) as a possible material for writing. They have been used at all times and are well illustrated in modern times by the inscribed powder horns.

The hides of living animals have served for branding, and living human skin for painting, branding and tattooing extensively in all lands and all times. The literature of ceremonial painting and tattooing is very extensive, and the branding of slaves was common in many lands.

See PRINTING.

The use of skins prepared for writing on one side (leather) was early and general, dating back as far at least as the IVth Dynasty of Egypt. The Annals of Thutmose III in Palestine were written on rolls of leather. Its use was common also in Persia (Diodorus ii.32; Herodotus v.58; Strabo xv.1), and it was a natural universal material. It has been much used by modern American Indians. It was the usual material of early Hebrew books, and the official copies at least of the Old Testament books seem always to have been written on this material (Blau, 14-16), and are so, indeed, even to the present day.

8. Vellum:

Vellum is simply a fine quality of leather prepared for writing on both sides. The autographs of the New Testament were most likely written on papyrus, rather than leather or vellum, but most of the earliest codices and all, until recent discoveries, were on this material, while very few of the long list of manuscripts on which the New Testament text is founded are on any other material. This material is referred to as parchment by Paul (2Ti 4:13). Almost every kind of skin (leather or vellum) has been used for writing, including snake skin and human skin. The palimpsest is secondhand or erased vellum, written upon again.

See PARCHMENT; PARCHMENTS.

9. Papyrus:

Papyrus was not only the chief of the vegetable materials of antiquity, but it has perhaps the longest record of characteristic general use of anything except stone. The papyrus was made from a reed cultivated chiefly in Egypt, but having a variety found also in Syria, according to Theophrastus. The papyrus reed grows in the marshes and in stagnant pools; is at best about the thickness of one’s arm, and grows to the height of at most from 12 to 15 feet. It was probably a pool of these papyrus reeds ("flags") in which Moses was hidden (Ex 3:3), and the ark of bulrushes was evidently a small boat or chest made from papyrus reeds, as many of the Egyptian boats were. These boats are referred to in Isa 18:2.

Papyrus was made by slicing the reed and laying the pieces crosswise, moistening with sticky water, and pressing or pounding together. The breadth of the manufactured article varied from 5 inches, and under, to 9 1/4 in., or even to a foot or a foot and a half. The earliest Egyptian papyrus ran from 6 to 14 in. Egyptian papyri run to 80, 90 and even 135 ft. in length, but the later papyri are generally from 1 to 10 ft. long. The use of papyrus dates from before 2700 BC at latest.

Many Bible fragments important for textual criticism have been discovered in Egypt in late years. These, together with the light which other papyri throw on Hellenistic Greek and various paleographical and historical problems, make the study of papyri, which has been erected into an independent science, one of very great importance as to Biblical history and Biblical criticism (compare Mitteis u. Wilcken, Grundzuge .... d. Papyruskunde, Leipzig, 1912, 2 volumes in 4). It has been argued from Jer 36:23 that the book which the king cut up section by section and threw on the fire was papyrus. This argument is vigorously opposed by Blau (14, 15), but the fact of the use of papyrus seems to be confirmed by the tale

that the Romans wrapped the Jewish school children in their study rolls and burned them (Ta‘anith 69a, quoted by Blau, 41). Leather would have been poor burning material in either case. Certainly "papyrus" is freely used by the Septuagint translators and the word biblion is (correctly) translated by Jerome (Tobit 7:14) by charta. It is referred to in 2 Joh 1:12, "paper and ink," as the natural material for letter-writing.

See PAPYRUS, PAPYRUS.

10. Paper:

The introduction of paper was from Western Asia, possibly in the 8th century, and it began to be used in Europe commonly from the 13th century. While few Western manuscripts of any importance are on paper, many of the Eastern are. It was the invention of paper, in large measure, which made possible the immense development in the multiplication of books, since the invention of printing, and the enormous number of Bibles now in existence.

11. Ink:

Of the many materials used in order to lay one contrasting color on another, the flowing substances, paint and ink, are the most common. In general throughout antiquity the ink was dry ink and moistened when needed for writing. Quite early, however, the liquid inks were formed with the use of gall nut or acid, and many recipes and formulas used during the Middle Ages are preserved. See INK, INK-HORN. The reading of a palimpsest often depends on the kind of ink originally used and the possibility of reviving by reagents.

VI. Forms.

The best known ancient forms of written documents are the tablet or sheet, the roll, the diploma and the codex. These may be analyzed into one-face documents and many-faced documents—page documents and leaf documents. The roll, the diploma and the usual folding tablet or pleated document are forms of the one-page document, while the codex or bound book (English "volume") is the typical leaf document. The roll is the typical form of the Old Testament, the codex of the New Testament, extant manuscripts.

A book as regards its material form consists of a single limited surface suited for writing, or a succession of such surfaces. This single surface may be the face of a cliff or house wall, a broken piece of pottery, a leaf, a sheet of lead, papyrus, vellum or paper, a tablet of clay, stone or wood, a cylinder, prism, cone, pyramid, obelisk, statue or any one of the thousands of inscribed objects found among votive offerings. The typical form is the flat surface to which the term "tablet" or "sheet" is applied, and which is called "page" or "leaf" according as one or both surfaces are in mind.

These single flat leaves are characteristically quadrilateral, but may be of any shape (circular, oval, heart-shaped, etc.) or of any thickness, from the paper of an Oxford Bible or equally thin gold foil up to slabs

of stone many inches thick.

When the document to be written is long and the sheet becomes too large for convenient handling, space may be gained by writing on both sides or by making still larger and either folding or rolling, on the one hand, or breaking or cutting up into a series of smaller sheets, on the other. This folding or rolling of the large sheet survives still in folded or rolled maps and the folded or rolled documents (diplomas) of medieval and modern archives. The use of the tablet series for long works instead of one overgrown tablet was early—quite likely as early as the time of actual writing on real "leaves."

These smaller tablets or sheets were at first, it would seem, kept together. by numbering (compare Dziatzko, Ant. Buchw., 127), catchwords, tying in a bundle, or gathering in a small box (capsa). This has indeed its analogy with the mnemonic twig bundle of object writing. The Pentateuch gets its name from the five rolls in a box, jar, or basket (Blau, 65; Birt, Buchrolle, 22).

The next step in the evolution of book forms was taken when the various leaves or sheets were fastened to each other in succession, being strung, pasted or hinged together.

The stringing together is as early and primitive as the leopard-tooth trophy necklace of the African chief or the shell and tooth necklaces of quaternary Europe (Dechelette, Arch., 208-9). It was perhaps used with annual tablets in the first dynasties of Egypt and is found in oriental palm-leaf books today.

1. The Roll:

The roll consists normally of a series of one-surface sheets pasted or sewed together. Even when made into a roll before writing upon, the fiction of individual tablets was maintained in the columns (deleths, Jer 36:23 =" doors"). It was the typical book form of antiquity. It was commonly of leather, vellum, papyrus, and sometimes of linen, It might rarely be as much as 135 ft. long X 1 1/2 ft. wide for papyrus, and leather rolls might be wider still. It was the form traditionally used by the Hebrews, and was undoubtedly the form used by our Lord in the synagogue. It is still used in the synagogue. It was possibly the form in which the New Testament books also were written, but this is much more doubtful.

The roll form is rounded on the one-surface tablet, and, as a matter of fact, neither leather nor papyrus was well suited to take ink on the back; it developed from the sewing together of skins and the pasting together of sheets of papyrus. Although papyrus is found written on both sides, it is in general not the same document on the back, but the old has been destroyed and utilized as waste paper. This writing on both sides of the roll (opisthography) is referred to in Eze 2:10 (Re 5:1), where the roll is written within and without.

2. The Codex:

Wood and metal tablets, not being flexible, could not be rolled, but were hinged and became diptychs, triptychs, polyptychs. The typical method of hinging these tablets in Roman times was not the codex or

modern book form proper, where all are hinged by the same edge, but a folding form based on a series of one-surface tablets hinged successively so as to form a chain (Gardthausen, Greek Palestine, I, 129, figure 12). They were strictly folding tablets, folding like an accordion, as in some Far Eastern manuscripts of recent times. The modern hinging was used but rarely.

It is commonly said that it was this folding or hinged wooden tablet which produced the codex of the Latins and the "book" of modern Germanic races. Some, however, prefer to trace the origin to the folded document. The wood or waxed tablet was commonly used in antiquity for letters, but even more commonly the sheet of papyrus or vellum. It is quite natural to fold such a sheet once to protect the writing. Whether this was suggested by the diptych, or vice versa, the form of a modern sheet of note paper was early introduced. Either the diptych or the folded single sheet may have suggested the codex.

Whether the first codices were wood and metal or papyrus and vellum, the hinging at one edge, which is the characteristic, is closely connected with the double-face (or multiple-face) tablet. With suitable material the simplest way of providing space, if the tablet is too small, is to turn over and finish on the back. The clay tablets lend themselves readily to writing on both sides, but not to hinging. It developed, however, to a certain degree the multiple-face idea by use of prisms, pyramids, hexagonal and other cylinders, but it was early forced into the numbered series of moderate-sized tablets.

Wood and metal tablets would be hinged, but the wood tablets were too bulky and metal tablets too heavy for long works, and the ring method of joining actually led away from the book to the pleated form. Papyrus and leather, however, while they might be used (as they were used) as single tablets were thin enough to allow of a long work in a single codex. They soon developed, therefore, perhaps through the folded sheet, into the codex proper and the modern bound book. The codex, as Thompson remarks, was destined to be the recipient of Christian literature, as the papyrus roll had been the basis of the pagan literature, and there is some evidence to show that the form was, historically, actually developed for the purposes of the Christian writings, and in papyrus, while the pagan papyri continued to be in roll form. Since the invention of the codex is placed at the end of the 1st century, and the earliest codices were especially the New Testament writings, there is a certain possibility that at least the historical introduction of the codex was in the New Testament books, and that its invention comes perhaps from combining the New Testament epistles on papyrus into a volume. In the West at least the roll is, however, the prevailing form of the New Testament until the 3rd or 4th centuries (Birt, Buchrolle, passim).

VII. Writing.

1. Writers:

The chief Hebrew words for the professional "writer" are copher and shoTer, both akin to Assyrian words for "writing" and used also for kindred officers. The word copher seems closely connected with the cepher, "book," and with the idea of numbering. This official is a military, mustering or enrolling officer (Jud 5:14; 2Ch 26:11; 2Ki 25:19), a numbering or census officer for military purposes or for

taxation (Isa 33:18)—and a royal secretary (2Sa 8:17).

The shoTer appears as a herald (De 20:5,8; Jos 1:10; 3:2), as overseer of the brick-making in Egypt, and as overseer of the outward business of Israel (1Ch 26:29). He is associated with the elders (Nu 11:16; De 29:10 (Hebrew 9); 31:28; Jos 8:33; 23:2; 24:1) or with the judges (Jos 8:33; 23:2; 24:1; De 16:18).

The two terms are often, however, used together as of parallel and distinct offices (2Ch 26:11; 34:13). If any such distinction can be made, it would seem that the copher was originally the military scribe and the shoTer the civil scribe, but it is better to say that they are "evidently .... synonymous terms and could be used of any subordinate office which required ability to write" (Cheyne in EB). There seem to have been at least 70 of these officers at the time of the Exodus, and by inference many more (Nu 11:16), and 6,000 Levites alone in the time of David (1Ch 23:4) were "writers."

Another kind of professional scribe was the Tiphcar (Jer 51:27, "marshal"; Na 3:17 margin), or tablet writer, a word apparently directly borrowed from the Assyrian. This too seems to be a real synonym for both of the other words. In brief, therefore, all three terms mean scribe in the Egyptian or Assyrian sense, where the writer was an official and the official necessarily a writer.

Still another word, rendered in the Revised Version (British and American) as "magicians," is rendered in its margin as "sacred scribe" (charTom). This word being derived from the stilus recalls the close connection between the written charm and magic. None of these words in the Old Testament refers directly to the professional copyist of later times whose business was the multiplication of copies.

Sayce argues from the name Kiriath-sepher that there was a university for scribes at this place, and according to 1 Chronicles (2:55) there were Kenite families of professional scribes at Jabez.

The professional scribe, writing as an amanuensis, is represented by Baruch (Jer 36:4) and Tertius (Ro 16:22), and the calligraphist by Ezra (Ezr 7:6). In later times the scribe stood for the man of learning in general and especially for the lawyer.

It would seem that Moses expected that kings should write with their own hands (De 17:18; 31:24), and the various letters of David (2Sa 11:15), Jezebel (1Ki 21:9), the king of Aram (2Ki 5:5), Jehu (2Ki 10:2,6), Jeremiah (chapter 29), Elijah (2Ch 21:12-15), the letters of the Canaanite and Hittite princes to one another in the Tell el-Amarna Letters and Boghazeui tablets, etc., while they may sometimes have been the work of secretaries, were undoubtedly often by the author. For the prevalence of handwriting in Biblical times and places see LIBRARIES. Its prevalence in Old Testament times may be compared perhaps to the ratio of college graduates in modern life. In New Testament times the ratio was probably much greater, and it appears not only that Zacharias, the priest, and the educated Paul and Luke could write, but even the poorer apostles and the carpenter’s Son. It is assumed that all of a certain rich man’s debtors could write (Lu 16:7). This general literacy was due to the remarkable public-school system of the Jews in their synagogues, which some good Jewish scholars (Klostermann, quoted by Krauss, Talmudic Archaeology, III, 336, note 1) trace as far back as Isaiah. In Vespasian’s time it is said there

were in Jerusalem alone 480 synagogues each with its school, and the law that there must be primary schools in every city dates at latest (63-65 AD) from this time and more likely from 130 BC. The compulsory public-school law of Simeon ben Setach (circa 70 BC), although it has been labeled mythical, is nevertheless entirely credible, in view of the facts as they appear in New Testament times and in Josephus. The tale that there were in Bether, after the fall of Jerusalem had crowded full this seat of learning, "400 synagogues each with 400 teachers and 400 pupils," carries fiction on its face, but there is little doubt that there were public schools long before this in nearly every town of Palestine and compulsory education from the age of 6 or 7 (compare Krauss, III, chapter xii, "Schule," 119-239, 336-58).

2. The Writing Art:

Writing in the Hebrew as in Semitic languages in general except Ethiopic is from right to left and in Greek from left to right as in modern western usage. On the one hand, however, some Sabean inscriptions and, on the other hand, a number of early Greek inscriptions are written alternately, or boustrophedon, and suggest the transition from Semitic to western style. The earlier Greek manuscripts did not separate the words, and it is inferred from text corruptions that the earliest Hebrew writing did not. As early as the Mesha and Siloam inscriptions, the dot was used to separate words, and the vertical stroke for the end of a sentence. Vowel points were introduced somewhere from the 5th to the 8th centuries AD by the Massoretes, but are not allowed even now in the synagogue rolls. Some of the inscriptions employ the Palestinian or Tiberian system of vowel points, and others the Babylonian (above the line). Accents indicate not only stress but intonation and other relations. Very soon after Ezra’s day, and before the Septuagint translation, the matter of writing the Biblical books had become one of very great care, the stipulations and the rules for careful correction by the authorized text being very strict (Blau, 185-87). The manuscripts were written in columns (doors), and a space between columns, books, etc., was prescribed, as also the width of the column. All books were ruled. Omitted words must be interlined above. The margins were frequently used for commentaries. For size, writing on the back, etc., see above, and for the use of abbreviations, reading, punctuation, etc., see Blau, Gardthausen, Thompson, the Introductions to textual criticism and the articles on textual criticism in this Encyclopedia.

VIII. History of Biblical Handwriting.

1. Mythological Origins:

Mythologically speaking the history of handwriting dates from the beginning when the Word created the heavens. The firmament is a series of heavenly tablets, the hand writing of God, as conceived by the tablet-using Babylonians, or a scroll in the thought of prophets, the New Testament writers, and the rabbis. Whether the idea that "the heavens declare the glory of God," etc. (Ps 19:1-4), refers to this notion or not, it was one extensively developed and practiced in the science of astrology. In any event the doctrine of the Creator-Word reaches deep into the psychology of writing as a tangible record of invisible words or ideas, and this philosophizing stretches some 3,000 years or so back of the Christian

era.

For writing among the gods in the mythologies of non-Biblical religions, see BOOK; LIBRARIES.

2. Earliest Use:

When and why the very simplest kind of writing began to be used has been the subject of much conjecture. The Encyclopedia Britannica (11th edition) (XVI, 445) suggests that "the earliest use .... of inscribed or written signs was for important religious and political transactions kept by priests in temples," but the memorial pillar is older than the temple, and the economic or social record is perhaps older than the sacred, although this is less clear. Three things seem rather probable:

(1) that the first records were number records, (2) that they concerned economic matters—although it is not excluded that the occasion for first recording economic matters was religious, (3) that they were not used memorially for important transactions, but rather as utilitarian or business records.

The original mnemonic record was probably a number record. The Hebrew words for "book" and "word" both seem to mean a setting down of one thing after another, and various words in various other languages point in the same direction, as do also in a general way the nature of the primitive situation and the evidences of history. Many of the oldest records are concerned with numbers of animals. Immense quantities of very old Sumerian records are simply such lists, and the still earlier cave drawings (whether they have numbers or not) are at least drawings of animals. One use of the primitive quipu was for recording sales of different kinds of animals at market, and the twig bundle and notched records are in general either pure number records or mnemonic records with a number base. What these animal records were for is another matter. If they were records of ownership for mere tally purposes (a natural enough purpose, carrying back even to hunting trophies) the use was purely economic, but as a matter of fact the early Babylonian lists seem generally to have been temple records, and even the cave records are commonly thought to be associated with religion. The early Egyptian lists too have religious associations, and the somewhat later records are largely concerned with endowment of temples or at least temple lists of offerings—votive offerings or sacrifices. This points perhaps to a religious origin and possibly leads back to the very first felt need of records for a tithing for religious purposes. But it may equally lead to the sharing of spoils socially rather than religiously, although the history of the common meal and sacrifice shared by worshippers points to a very early religious sanction for the problem of equitable sharing of spoils, and it may have been precisely at this point and for this purpose that number record was invented. However that may be, the evidence seems to point to a number-record origin even back of the cave drawings (which are said to be chiefly of domestic rather than wild animals) at a period variously figured as from 6,000 or 8,000 years ago, more or less, to millions of years ago.

3. Biblical History:

The pseudepigraphic books of the Old Testament variously represent writing as invented and first

practiced by Yahweh, Adam, Cain, or Seth. Taking the Biblical narrative as it stands, the earliest allusion to true writing is the sign of Cain (Ge 4:15), if indeed this refers to a body mark, and particularly if it has analogy with the "mark upon the forehead" of the Book of Revelation (17:5; compare 13:16; 14:1) and the tattoo marks of ownership or tribal marks of primitive tribes, as is thought by many.

The setting of the rainbow as a permanent sign (Ge 9:12-17) for a permanent covenant is quite in line with the recognized mnemonic writing. Noah's building of an altar had the same character if it was built for a permanent memorial. More obviously akin to this primitive form of writing was, however, the dedication of a memorial altar or pillar as a memorial of a particular event in a particular place, as in Jacob's pillar (Ge 28:18,22).

For perhaps 2,000 years before Abraham, image writing had been practiced in both Babylonia and Egypt, and for more than 1,000 years a very highly developed ideographic and phonetic writing had been in use. There were millions of cuneiform documents existing in collections large and small in Babylonia when he was there, and equal quantities of hieroglyphic and hieratic papyri, leather and skin documents in Egypt when he visited it.

See BOOK; LIBRARIES; HAMMURABI, CODE OF.

Abraham himself presumably used cuneiform writing closely parallel to the writing on Hammurabi's statue. A similar script was presumably also used by his Hittite allies. In Egypt he met with the hieroglyphics on the monuments, but for business and common use the so-called hieratic cursive forms were already developed toward, if not well into, the decided changes of the middle hieratic period (circa 2030-1788 BC; compare Moller, Hierat. Palaeog., VI, 1909, 3, etc.). It is a question whether the boundary heap, which Laban "called" the heap of witness in Aramaic and Jacob by the same name in Hebrew, was inscribed or not, but, if inscribed, both faces or lines of the bilingual inscription were presumably in cuneiform characters. The cuneiform remained, probably continuously, the prevailing script of Syria and Palestine until about 1300 BC, and until, some time well before 1000, the old Semitic alphabet began to be employed.

The question of the relation of the writing in Mosaic times and in the time of the Judges to the cuneiform or the hieratic on the one side and the alphabet on the other is too much mixed up with the question of the Pentateuch to allow of much dogmatizing. Some scholars are convinced that the Pentateuch was written in cuneiform characters if not in the Babylonian language. The old Semitic-Greek, "Phoenician," alphabet was, however, probably worked out in the Palestinian region between 1400 and 1100 BC (wherever the Hebrews may have been at this time), and it remained the Hebrew writing until the introduction of the square characters.

See ALPHABET.

At the beginning of the Christian era there had been a long period of the use of Greek among the

educated, and long before the New Testament was written there was a large body of Palestinian-Greek and Egyptian-Greek literature. Latin for a time also had been used, more or less, officially, but the Aramaic, development of whose forms may be well traced from about 500 BC in the inscriptions and in the Elephantine papyri, was the prevailing popular writing. Greek remained long the language of the educated world. It was after 135 AD that R. Simeon ben Gamaliel was said to have had 500 students in Hebrew (New Hebrew) and 500 in Greek (Krauss, III, 203).

Latin, Greek, and Aramaic (New Hebrew) characters were all needed for the inscription on the cross. Hebrew had at this time certainly passed into the square form long enough ago to have had yodh pass into proverb as the smallest letter (jot) of the alphabet (Mt 5:18). Through the abundance of recent papyrus and inscriptional discoveries, it is now possible to trace the history of the varying forms of the bookhand and cursive Greek letters, and even of the Latin letters, for several centuries on either side of the year of our Lord and up to the time of the longer known manuscripts (see works of Gardthausen and Thompson). One may get in this way a good idea of how the most famous of all trilingual inscriptions may have looked as to its handwriting—how in fact it probably did look, jotted down as memorandum by Pilate, and how transcribed on the cross, assuming that Pilate wrote the Roman cursive (Thompson, facsimile 106 (AD 41), 321), and the clerks a fair epigraphic or rather for this purpose perhaps bookhand Greek (Thompson, facsimile 8 (AD 1), 123; Latin, facsimile 83 (AD 79), 276). See TITLE.

LITERATURE.

General:

Edward Clodd, Story of the Alphabet, New York, 1912 (popular); Fritz Specht, Die Schrift u. ihre Entwicklung, 3. Ausg., Berlin, 1909 (popular); I. Taylor, History of the Alphabet, London, 1899, 2 volumes, 8vo; H. Wuttke, Geschichte der Schrift, Leipzig, 1874-75 (rich and comprehensive on primitive writing); Philippe Berger, Histoire de l'ecriture dans l'antiquite, 2nd edition, Paris, 1892; Karl Paulmann, Illustrirte Geschichte der Schrift, Wien, 1880 (uncritical but comprehensive and very useful for illus.); W. M. Flinders Petrie, The Formation of the Alphabet, 1912.

Primitive:

Leo Frobenius, The Childhood of Man, Philadelphia, 1908 (casual but useful aggregation of primitive examples); Frederick Webb Hodge, ed., Handbook of American Indians North of Mexico, Washington, 1907-10, 2 volumes (dictionary form); G. Mallery, Smithsonian Inst. Reports, IV (1882-83), 3-256, X (1888-89), 1-822; M. Beuchat, Manuel d'archeologie americaine, Paris, 1912; M. H. Kingsley, Travels in West Africa, London, 1897; R. E. Dennet, At the Back of the Black Man's Mind, 1906; A. W. Howitt, Native Tribes of South-East Australia, London, 1904 (especially chapter xi); E. C. Richardson, The Beginnings of Libraries, London and Princeton, 1914.

Mediterranean:

Dechelette; Archeologie prehistorique. 1908; Arthur J. Evans, Scripta Minoa, Oxford, 1909; Angelo Mosso, The Dawn of Mediterranean Civilization, London, 1910.

Hebrew, Greek and Latin:

Frederic G. Kenyon, Our Bible and the Ancient manuscripts, 3rd edition, London, 1898; George Milligan, The New Testament Documents, 1913, Ludwig Blau, Studien zum althebraischen Buchwesen, Strassburg, 1902 (scholarly; first rank); Leopold Loew, Graphische Requisiten und Erzeugnisse bei den Juden, Leipzig, 1870-71, 2 parts; Samuel Krauss, Talmudische Archaologie, Leipzig, 1910-12, 3 volumes, III, 131-239, 300 ff (full critical notes and references); Mark Lidzbarski, Handbuch d. nordsemitischen Epigraphik, 1902-8 (also Ephemeris); Alvin Sylvester Zerbe, Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature, Cleveland, 1911 (controversial); V. Gardthausen, Griechische Palaeographie, 2nd edition, Leipzig, 1911-13, 2 volumes (remarkable for comprehensiveness, exhaustive bibliographic reference and critical scholarship); Sir Edward Maunde Thompson, An Introduction to Greek and Latin Paleography, Oxford, 1912 (expansion of his Handbook with greatly improved facsimiles, better treatment of papyri and a good working bibliography of palaeography); F. G. Kenyon, The Paleography of Greek Papyri, Oxford, 1899, 8vo; Ludwig Mitteis and Ulrich Wilcken, Grundzuge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde, Leipzig, 1912, 2 volumes in 4 (Encyclopaedia of the subject); Theodor Birt, Das antike Buchwesen, Berlin, 1882; idem, Die Buchrolle in der Kunst, Leipzig, 1907 (of first usefulness, especially in matter of illus. and refs.); E. S. Roberts, Greek Epigraphy, part I, "The Archaic Inscriptions and the Greek Alphabet," Cambridge, 1887, 8vo; Karl Dziatzko, Untersuchungen uber ausgewahlte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens, Leipzig; 1900; Ernest Christian Wilhelm Wattenbach, Das Schriftwesen im Mittelalter, Leipzig, 1896 (has an immense mass of original quotations of authorities).

Sources for Latest Literature:

W. Weinberger, "Beitrage zur Handschriftenkunde," Sitzungsber. Akad. Wien, 159, 161 (1908-9), pp. 79-195; Zentralblatt f. Bibliothekswesen, Leipzig (monthly); Hortzschansky, Bibliographie des .... Buchwesens (annual cumulation of the Zentralblatt material).

For inward writing see modern general psychologies and the books and articles in Rand’s bibliographical supplement to Baldwin’s Dictionary of Psychology. For continuation literature see the Psychological Index. For various aspects of writing consult also books on general Biblical archaeology (e.g., Nowack and Benzinger), general introductions and articles on "Alphabet," ...." Book," "Library," "Manuscripts," "Textual Criticism," and other special topics in this or other Biblical and general encyclopedias.

E. C. Richardson

XANTHICUS

zan’-thi-kus (Xanthikos): The name of a month which occurs in 2 Macc 11:30,33,38. It corresponds to Nisan (April) of the Jewish calendar.

See CALENDAR; TIME; YEAR.

XERXES

zerks’-ez: The name is an attempt to transliterate into Greek (Xerxes) the Persian Khshayarsha. The same word in unpointed Hebrew took the form ‘chshwrsh, probably pronounced ‘achshawarash, but at a later time it was wrongly vocalized so as to produce ‘achashwerosh, from whence "Ahasuerus" in English versions of the Bible comes.

Xerxes was king of Persia in 485-465 BC. The first part of his reign was marked by the famous campaign into Greece, beginning in 483. After the defeat at Salamis in 480 Xerxes himself withdrew from the expedition and it was finally discontinued in the next year. During the remainder of his reign, Xerxes seems to have spent a listless existence, absorbed in intrigues of the harem, and leaving the government to be carried on by his ministers and favorites (often slaves). He was finally murdered by his vizier and left an unenviable reputation for caprice and cruelty. For the various Biblical references see AHASUERUS.

Burton Scott Easton

YARN

yarn.

See LINEN; SPINNING; WEAVING.

YEA

ya.

1. In the Old Testament:

(’aph, "also," "moreover," "yea" (1Sa 21:5 the King James Version; 1Sa 24:11, etc.), gam, "also," "likewise," "moreover," "yea" (2Ki 2:3; 16:3, etc.], ki, "inasmuch," "certainly," "doubtless," "yea" (Ps 102:13; 105:12, etc.)): Each of these words occurs frequently, especially the first two.

2. In the New Testament:

In the New Testament we have: nai, "verily," "yea," the usual particle of affirmation (Mt 5:37; 9:28, etc.); de, "however," "on the other hand" (Lu 2:35; Ac 20:34 the King James Version, etc.); alla, "however," "but" (Lu 24:22 the King James Version; Ro 3:31 the King James Version, etc.); kai, "also," "besides," "yea" (Ac 3:16; 7:43 the King James Version, etc.). Christ forbids the employment of any affirmation stronger than the solemn repetition of the first mentioned (Mt 5:37).

Frank E. Hirsch

YEAR

yer (shanah, Aramaic shenah, "a return" (of the sun), like the Greek eniautos; yamim, "days," is also used for "year," and the Greek hemerai, corresponds to it (Jos 13:1; Lu 17,18); etos, is also employed frequently in the New Testament; for the difference between etos and eniautos, see Grimm-Thayer, under the word): The Hebrew year was solar, although the month was lunar, the adjustment being made in intercalation.

See ASTRONOMY; TIME.

YEARS, SEVENTY

See SEVENTY YEARS.

YELLOW

yel’-o.

See COLORS.

YODH

yod "y": The 10th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "y". It came also to be used for the number 10.

See JOB, and for name, etc., see ALPHABET.

YOKE

yok:

(1) The usual word is ‘ol (Ge 27:40, etc.), less commonly the (apparently later) form moTah (Isa 58:6, etc.; in Nab 1:13 moT), which the Revised Version (British and American) in Jer 27; 28 translates "bar" (a most needless and obscuring change). The Greek in Apocrypha (Sirach 28:19, etc.) and in the New Testament (Mt 11:29 f, etc.) is invariably zugos. Egyptian monuments show a yoke that consisted of a straight bar fastened to the foreheads of the cattle at the root of the horns, and such yokes were no doubt used in Palestine also; but the more usual form was one that rested on the neck (Ge 27:40, etc.). It was provided with straight "bars" (moToth in Le 26:13; Eze 34:27) projecting downward, against which the shoulders of the oxen pressed, and it was held in position by thongs or "bonds" (moceroth in Jer 2:20; 5:5; 27:2; 30:8; ‘aghuddoth in Isa 58:6, "bands"), fastened under the animals’ throats. Such yokes could of course be of any weight (1Ki 12:4), depending on the nature of the work to be done, but the use of "iron yokes" (De 28:48; Jer 28:13 f) must have been very rare, if, indeed, the phrase is anything more than a figure of speech.

What is meant by "the yoke on their jaws" in Ho 11:4 is quite obscure. Possibly a horse’s bit is meant; possibly the phrase is a condensed form for "the yoke that prevents their feeding"; possibly the text is corrupt.

See JAW.

The figurative use of "yoke" in the sense of "servitude" is intensely obvious (compare especially Jer 27, 28). Attention needs to be called only to La 3:27, where "disciplining sorrow" is meant, and to Jer 5:5, where the phrase is a figure for "the law of God." This last use became popular with the Jews at a later period and it is found, e.g. in Apocrypha Baruch 41:3; Psalter of Solomon 7:9; 17:32; Ab. iii.7, . and in this sense the phrase is employed. by Christ in Mt 11:29 f. "My yoke" here means "the service of God as

I teach it" (the common interpretation, "the sorrows that I bear," is utterly irrelevant) and the emphasis is on "my." The contrast is not between "yoke" and "no yoke," but between "my teaching" (light yoke) and "the current scribal teaching';(heavy yoke).

(2) "Yoke" in the sense of "a pair of oxen" is tsemedh (1Sa 11:7, etc.), or zeugos (Lu 14:19).

See also UNEQUAL; YOKE-FELLOW.

Burton Scott Easton

YOKE-FELLOW

yok'-fel-o (sunzugos, "yoked together"): The word is used by Greek writers of those united by any bond, such as marriage, relationship, office, labor, study or business; hence, a yoke-fellow, consort, comrade, colleague or partner.

(1) In the New Testament it occurs once only (Php 4:3): "I beseech thee also, true yoke-fellow." Most interpreters hold that Paul here addresses some particular but unnamed person, who had formerly been associated with him in the work of the gospel in Philippi. Many guesses have been made in regard to the identity of the unnamed "yoke-fellow," and these names have been suggested: Luke, Lydia, Epaphroditus, each of whom had in one way or another some connection with Philippi.

(2) Renan has suggested that yoke-fellow means Lydia (Ac 16:14,15,40), and that she had been married to Paul. But the fact that the adjective gnesios, "true," qualifying "yoke-fellow" is masculine and not feminine shows that it is not a woman but a man who is referred to. Renan's suggestion is an unworthy one, and is quite devoid of proof. It is a mere fanciful and unsupported creation of the Frenchman's brain. Renan's idea is a modification of an opinion which is as old as Clement of Alexandria, that Paul here referred to his own wife. But this conjecture is contradicted by the statement of the apostle himself, that he had not a wife (1Co 7:8; 9:5).

(3) There is still another way of interpreting "yoke-fellow," and probably it is the right one. Some expositors take the word as a proper name. Among these Westcott and Hort print "Sunzuge," in the margin. In favor of this interpretation there is much to be said, especially the fact that the word is found in the very midst of the names of other persons. The names of Euodia and Syntyche are mentioned immediately before, and that of Clement follows immediately after the true yoke-fellow. The meaning therefore is probably, "I beseech thee also, true Synzygos," i.e. I beseech thee, who art a genuine Synzygos, a colleague rightly so called, a colleague in fact as well as in name. It is obvious to compare the way in which the apostle plays upon the name Onesimus, in Phm 1:11.

John Rutherfurd

YOUNG; MEN, YOUNG WOMEN

yung, (bachur, naʻar; neanias, neaniskos): "Young man" is generally in the Old Testament the translation of bachur, from bachar, "to prove," "to choose," and of naʻar (literally, "boy," but used sometimes also of a girl). The former term denotes a young man, no longer a mere youth, but liable to military service (De 32:25; Jud 14:10; 1Sa 8:16; 2Ki 8:12, etc.). In Nu 11:28, the King James Version "Joshua .... the servant of Moses, one of his young men" (bechurim), the Revised Version (British and American) renders "one of his chosen men," margin "from his youth." Naʻar is frequently used (singular and plural) of soldiers (1Sa 14:1,6; 21:4; 25:5,8,9; 2Sa 1:5,6,15, etc.). Abraham's "young men" (neʻarim) were "trained servants," "trained men," warriors (Ge 14:24; compare 14:14 the Revised Version (British and American)). The word is often in the Old Testament translated "servant": thus in the Revised Version (British and American) for the King James Version "young man," "young men" (Ge 18:7; 2Ki 4:22; 1Ki 20:14, the Revised Version margin). In the New Testament, the ordinary words for "young man" are neanias (Ac 7:58; 20:9; 23:17,18,22) and neaniskos (Mt 19:20,22; Mr 14:51, etc.). "Young men" in Ac 5:6 is neoteroi, comparative of neos, "young," recent; the feminine of the latter word is "young women" in Tit 2:4, and neoterai is "younger women" (the Revised Version (British and American) "widows") in 1Ti 5:14. In both the Old Testament and the New Testament young men are earnestly exhorted to wisdom and sober-mindedness (Pr 1:8,9; Ec 11:9; 12:1,13,14; Tit 2:6, "discreet"; compare The Wisdom of Solomon 9:11), etc.

W. L. Walker

ZAANAIM

za-a-na’-im.

See ZAANANNIM.

ZAANAN

za’-a-nan (tsa‘anan; Sennaar): A place named by Micah in the Shephelah of Judah (1:11). In this sentence the prophet makes verbal play with the name, as if it were derived from yatsa’," to go forth": "The inhabitant (margin "inhabitress") of tsa’anan is not come forth" (yatse’ah). The place is not identical. It is probably the same as ZENAN.

ZAANANNIM; PLAIN OR OAK OF

za-a-nan’-im, elon betsa‘anayim; or betsa‘anannim Codex Vaticanus Besamiein; Codex Alexandrinus Besananim (Jos 19:33); in Jud 4:11 Codex Vaticanus translates it as pleonektounton, and Codex Alexandrinus has anapauomenon): In Jos 19:33 the King James Version reads "Allon to Zaanannim," the Revised Version (British and American) "the oak in Zaanannim," the Revised Version margin "oak (or terebinth) of Bezaanannim." In Jud 4:11 the King James Version reads "plain of Zaanaim," the Revised Version (British and American) "oak in Zaanannim." It is probable that the same place is intended in the two passages. It was a place on the southern border of the territory of Naphtali (Joshua), and near it the tent of Heber the Kenite was pitched (Judges). The absence of the article before ‘elon shows that the "be" is not the preposition before "z", but the first letter of the name, which accordingly should be read "Bezaanannim." We should naturally look for it near Adami and Nekeb. This agrees also with the indications in Judges, if the direction of Sisera’s flight suggested in MEROZ (which see) is correct. The Kadesh, then, of Jud 4:11 may be represented by the ruin Qadish on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee; and in the name Khirbet Bessum, about 3 miles Northeast of Tabor, there is perhaps an echo of Bezaanannim.

W. Ewing

ZAAVAN

za’-a-van (za‘-awan, meaning unknown): A Horite descendant of Seir (Ge 36:27; 1Ch 1:42). In 1 Chronicles, Lucian has Zauan = Samaritan z-w-‘-n i.e. Zaw‘an, from a root meaning "to tremble," "fear" (see ..., BDB). King James Version has "Zavan" in 1 Chronicles.

ZABAD

za’-bad (zabhadh, perhaps a contraction for (1) zebhadhyah, "Yahweh has given," i.e. Zebadiah; or (2) zabhdi’el, "El (God) is my gift" (HPN, 222 f); Zabed(t), with many variants):

(1) A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:36,37), son of Nathan (see NATHAN, IV).

(2) An Ephraimite, son of Tahath (1Ch 7:21).

(3) Son of Ahlai (1Ch 11:41) and one of David’s mighty men (the name is wanting in 2Sa 23:24-29).

(4) Son of Shimeath the Ammonitess (2Ch 26); he was one of the murderers of King Joash of Judah; called "Jozacar" in 2Ki 12:21 (Hebrew verse 22). Perhaps the name in Chronicles should be Zacar (zakhar),

(5) Name of three men who had married foreign wives:

(a) son of Zattu (Ezr 10:27)=" Sabathus" of 1 Esdras 9:28;

(b) son of Hashum (Ezr 10:33) =" Sabanneus" of 1 Esdras 9:33;

(c) son of Nebo (Ezr 10:43) =" Zabadeas" of 1 Esdras 9:35.

David Francis Roberts

ZABADAEANS

zab-a-de’-anz (Zabadaioi; the King James Version Zabadeans; Oesterley, in Charles, Apocrypha, I, 112, prefers, on what seems insufficient evidence, to read "Gabadeans"; Josephus (Ant., XIII, v, 10) by an obvious error has "Nabateans"): According to 1 Macc 12:31, an Arabian tribe, defeated and spoiled by Jonathan after his victory in Hamath and before he came to Damascus. There is an ez-Zebedani about 25 miles Northwest of Damascus (now a station on the railway to Beirut), on the eastern slope of the Anti-Lebanon range. This town may very well have preserved the name of the Zabadaeans, and its situation accords nicely with Jonathan’s movements in 1 Macc 12.

Burton Scott Easton

ZABADAIAS

zab-a-da’-yas. The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) ZABADEAS (which see)

ZABADEAS

zab-a-de’-as (Zabadaias; the King James Version Zabadaias): One of the sons of Nooma who put away their foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:35) =" Zabad" of Ezr 10:43.

ZABBAI

zab’-a-i, zab’-i (zabbay, meaning unknown; Zabou):

(1) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:28) =" Jozabdus" of 1 Esdras 9:29.

(2) Father of Baruch (Ne 3:20). The Qere has zakkay =" Zaccai"of Ezr 2:9; Ne 7:14.

ZABBUD

zab’-ud (zabbudh, meaning uncertain; Ezr 8:14, where Kere is zakkur and Kethibh is zabhudh =" Zabud"; 1 Esdras 8:40 has "Istalcarus"): A companion of Ezra on his journey from Babylon to Jerusalem.

ZABDEUS

zab-de’-us (Zabdaios): In 1 Esdras 9:21 =" Zebadiah" of Ezr 10:20.

ZABDI

zab’-di (zabhdi>, perhaps "(a) gift of Yahweh" or "my gift" = New Testament "Zebedee"):

(1) An ancestor of Achan (Jos 7:1,17,18). Some Septuagint manuscripts and 1Ch 2:6 have "Zimri" (zimri); "the confusion of the Hebrew letter beth (b) and the Hebrew letter mem (m) is phonetic; the confusion of the Hebrew letter daleth (d) and the Hebrew letter resh (r) is graphic" (Curtis, Chronicles, 86).

See ZIMRI, (3).

(2) A Benjamite, son of Shimei (1Ch 8:19), and possibly a descendant of Ehud (Curtis).

(3) "The Shiphmite," one of David’s officers who had charge of the wine-cellars (1Ch 27:27). The Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus has Zachrei (probably Zichri).

(4) An ancestor of Mattaniah (Ne 11:17). Luc. and 1Ch 9:15 have "Zichri."

See ZICHRI, I, 2.

David Francis Roberts

ZABDIEL

zab’-di-el (zabhdi’el, "my gift is El (God)"; Zabdiel):

(1) Father of Jashobeam (1Ch 27:2), or rather Ishbaal (Curtis, Chronicles, 290 f).

(2) An overseer of the priests (Ne 11:14).

(3) An Arabian who beheaded Alexander Balas and sent his head to Ptolemy (1 Macc 11:17).

ZABUD

za’-bud (zabhudh, "bestowed"):

(1) A son of Nathan (the prophet, probably) said in Kings to be chief minister to Solomon and also the king’s friend (1Ki 4:5; 1Ch 2:36). The American Revised Version margin has "priest" for "chief minister." Benzinger (Kurz. Hand-Commentary, 18) holds that "this expression is a marginal gloss here," while Kittel (Handkomm., 31) holds it to be genuine, though it is wanting in the Septuagint. Some suggest cokhen (see SHEBNA) for kohen. The expression "king’s friend" (compare 2Sa 15:37; 16:16) is, says Kittel, an old Canaanite title, found also in the Tell el-Amarna Letters.

(2) See ZACCUR, (4); PRIESTS AND LEVITES.

David Francis Roberts

ZABULON

zab’-u-lon (Zaboulon): Greek form of "Zebulun" of Mt 4:13,16; Re 7:8 the King James Version.

ZACCAI

zak’-a-i, zak’-i.

See ZABBAI, (2).

ZACCHAEUS

za-ke’-us (Zakchaios, from zakkay, "pure"):

(1) A publican with whom Jesus lodged during His stay in Jericho (Lu 19:1-10). He is not mentioned in the other Gospels. Being a chief publican, or overseer, among the tax-gatherers, Zaccheus had additional opportunity, by farming the taxes, of increasing that wealth for which his class was famous. Yet his mind was not entirely engrossed by material considerations, for he joined the throng which gathered to see Jesus on His entrance into the city. Of little stature, he was unable either to see over or to make his way through the press, and therefore scaled a sycomore tree. There he was singled out by Jesus, who said to him, "Zacchaeus, make haste, and come down; for to-day I must abide at thy house" (Lu 19:5). The offer thus frankly made by Jesus was accepted eagerly and gladly by Zaccheus; and the murmurings of the crowd marred the happiness of neither. How completely the new birth was accomplished in Zaccheus is testified by his vow to give half of his goods to the poor, and to make fourfold restitution where he had wrongfully exacted. The incident reveals the Christian truth that just as the publican Zaccheus was regarded by the rest of the Jews as a sinner and renegade who was unworthy to be numbered among the sons of Abraham, and was yet chosen by our Lord to be His host, so the social outcast of modern life is still a son of God, within whose heart the spirit of Christ is longing to make its abode. "For the Son of man came to seek and to save that which was lost" (Lu 19:10).

(2) An officer of Judas Maccabeus (2 Macc 10:19). (3) A Zaccheus is mentioned in the Clementine Homilies (iii.63) as having been a companion of Peter and appointed bishop of Caesarea.

(4) According to the Gospel of the Childhood, by Thomas, Zaccheus was also the name of the teacher of the boy Jesus.

C. M. Kerr

ZACCHUR

zak’-ur.

See ZACCUR.

ZACCUR

zak’-ur (zakkur, perhaps "ventriloquist" (Gray, Nu, 137)):

(1) Father of Shammua the Reubenite spy (Nu 13:4).

(2) A Simeonite (1Ch 4:26); the King James Version "Zacchur."

(3) Levites: (a) a Merarite (1Ch 24:27); (b) a "son" of Asaph (1Ch 25:2,10; Ne 12:35); (c) Ne 10:12

(Hebrew verse 13), and probably the same as in Neb 13:13, father of Hanan.

(4) A marginal reading in Ezr 8:14 for Zabbud where Kethibh is really "Zabud".

See ZABBUD.

(5) Son of Imri and one of the builders of Jerusalem (Ne 3:2).

David Francis Roberts

ZACHARIAH

zak-a-ri’-a (Zacharias; the King James Version, Zacharias):

(1) The son of Barachiah, who, Jesus says, was slain between the temple and the altar (Mt 23:35; Lu 11:51). The allusion seems to be to the murder of Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2Ch 24:20). In this case "Barachiah" would seem to be a gloss which has crept into the text through confusion with the name of the father of the prophet Zechariah, BERECHIAH (which see).

(2) See ZECHARIAH.

ZACHARIAS (1)

zak-a-ri’-as (Zacharias):

(1) One of the "rulers of the temple" at the time of Josiah’s Passover (1 Esdras 1:8) =" Zechariah" of 2Ch 35:8.

(2) One of the "holy singers" at Josiah’s Passover (1 Esdras 1:15); the name stands in place of "Heman" in 2Ch 35:15.

(3) In 1 Esdras 6:1; 7:3 = the prophet Zechariah.

(4) One of the sons of Pharos who returned with Ezra at the head of his family (1 Esdras 8:30) =" Zechariah" of Ezr 8:3, and perhaps identical with (5).

(5) One of the "men of understanding" with whom Ezra consulted when he discovered the absence of priests and Levites (1 Esdras 8:44) =" Zechariah" of Ezr 8:16, and perhaps identical with (6).

(6) Zacharias (omitted in the King James Version), who stood on Ezra’s left hand as he expounded the Law (1 Esdras 9:44) =" Zechariah" of Ne 8:4.

(7) One of the sons of Babi who went up at the head of his family with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:37) =" Zechariah" of Ezr 8:11.

(8) One of the sons of Elam who had taken foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:27) =" Zechariah" of Ezr 10:26.

(9) The father of Joseph, one of the "leaders of the people" under Judas (1 Macc 5:18,56).

(10) The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Zarains" (1 Esdras 5:8).

(11) The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Zachariah" of Mt 23:35.

S. Angus

ZACHARIAS (2)

(Zacharias): Father of John the Baptist (Lu 1:5, etc.). He was a priest of the course of ABIJAH (which see), of blameless life, who in his old age was still childless. But on one occasion when it was the turn of the course of Abijah to minister in the temple (see TEMPLE), Zacharias was chosen by lot to burn incense. While engaged in this duty he was visited by Gabriel, who announced to him that he should become the father of the precursor of the Messiah. Zacharias received the promise incredulously and was punished by being stricken mute. When, however, the child was born and Zacharias had obeyed the injunction of Gabriel by insisting on the name John, his powers of speech returned to him. According to Lu 1:67-79, Zacharias was the author of the hymn Benedictus, which describes God’s deliverance of Israel in language drawn entirely from the Old Testament, and which is unaffected by the later Christian realization that the Kingdom is also for Gentiles.

Elisabeth, his wife, was of the daughters of Aaron (Lu 1:5) and kinswoman of the Virgin (Lu 1:36; the relationship is altogether obscure). According to Lu 1:42-45, she was one of those who shared in the secret of the Annunciation. A few manuscripts in Lu 1:46 ascribe the Magnificat to her, but this seems certainly erroneous. See especially Zahn, Evangelium des Lucas, 98-101 and 745-751 (1913).

Burton Scott Easton

ZACHARY

zak’-a-ri (Latin Zacharias): the King James Version and the Revised Version (British and American) in 2 Esdras 1:40 = the prophet Zechariah.

ZACHER

za’-ker.

See ZACHER.

ZADOK

za’-dok (tsadowq, once tsadhoq (1Ki 1:26), similar to tsaddiq, and tsadduq, post-Biblical, meaning justus, "righteous"; Septuagint Sadok): Cheyne in Encyclopedia Biblica suggests that Zadok was a modification of a Gentilic name, that of the Zidkites the Negeb, who probably derived their appellation from the root ts-d-q, a secondary title of the god they worshipped. At the same time Cheyne admits that cultivated Israelites may have interpreted Zadok as meaning "just," "righteous"—a much more credible supposition.

(1) Zadok the son of Ahitub (2Sa 8:17)—not of Ahitub the ancestor of Ahimelech (1Sa 14:3) and of Abiathar, his son (1Sa 22:20).

(2) Zadok father of Jerusha, mother of Jotham, and wife of Uzziah king of Judah (2Ki 15:33; 2Ch 27:1).

(3) Zadok the son of Ahitub and father of Shallum (1Ch 6:12) or Meshullam (Ne 11:11), and the ancestor of Ezra (7:1,2).

(4) Zadok the son of Baana, a wall-builder in the time of Nehemiah (Ne 3:4), and probably one of the signatories to the covenant made by the princes, priests and Levites of Israel (Ne 10:21)—in both places his name occurring immediately after that of Meshezabel.

(5) Zodak the son of Immer, and, like the preceding, a repairer of the wall (Ne 3:29).

(6) Zodak a scribe in the time of Nehemiah (13:13). Whether this was the same as either of the two preceding cannot be determined.

The first of these filled a larger place in Old Testament history than either of the others; and to him accordingly the following paragraphs refer. They set forth the accounts given of him first in Samuel and Kings and next in Chronicles; after which they state and criticize the critical theory concerning him.

1. In Samuel and Kings:

(1) In these older sources Zodak first appears in David’s reign, after Israel and Judah were united under him, as joint occupant with Ahimelech of the high priest’s office and his name taking precedence of that of his colleague Ahimelech, the son of Abiathar (2Sa 8:17).

(2) On David’s flight from Jerusalem, occasioned by Absalom’s rebellion, Zadok and Abiathar (now the

joint high priest), accompanied by the whole body of the Levites, followed the king across the Kidron, bearing the Ark of the Covenant, which, however, they were directed to carry back to the city, taking with them their two sons, Ahimaaz the son of Zadok, and Jonathan the son of Abiathar, to act as spies upon the conduct of the rebels and send information to the king (2Sa 15:24-36; 17:15,17-21).

(3) On the death of Absalom, Zodak and Abiathar were employed by David as intermediaries between himself and the elders of Judah to consult about his return to the city, which through their assistance was successfully brought about (2Sa 19:11).

(4) When, toward the end of David's life, Adonijah the son of Haggith, and therefore the crown prince, put forward his claim to the throne of all Israel, taking counsel with Joab and Abiathar, Zodak along with Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, and Nathan the prophet, espoused the cause of Solomon, Bathsheba's son, and acting on David's instructions anointed him as king in Gihon (1Ki 1:8,26,32-45).

(5) Accordingly, when Solomon found himself established on the throne, he put Zodak in the room of Abiathar, i.e. made him sole high priest, while retaining Abiathar in the priestly office, though deposed from a position of coordinate authority with Zodak (1Ki 2:26,27,35; 4:4).

2. In Chronicles:

(1) As in the earlier sources so in these, Zodak's father was Ahitub and his son Ahimaaz—the information being added that they were all descendants from Aaron through Eleazar (1Ch 6:50-53).

(2) Among the warriors who came to Hebron to turn the kingdom of Saul to David was "Zodak, a young man mighty of valor," who was followed by 22 captains of his father house (1Ch 12:26-28).

(3) Along with Abiathar and the Levites, Zodak was directed by David to bring up the Ark from the house of Obed-edom to the tent pitched for it on Mt. Zion, when Zodak was appointed to officiate at Gibeon, while Abiathar, it is presumed, ministered in Jerusalem (1Ch 15:11; 16:39).

(4) Toward the end of David's reign Zodak and Abimelech the son of Abiathar acted as priests, Zodak as before having precedence (1Ch 18:16).

(5) To them was committed by the aged king the task of arranging the priests and Levites according to their several duties, it being intimated by the narrator that Zodak was of the sons of Eleazar, and Ahimelech (in 1Ch 18:16, named Abiathar; see above) of the sons of Ithamar (1Ch 24:3). In 1Ch 24:6 Ahimelech is called the son of Abiathar, while in 18:16, Abiathar's son is Abimelech—which suggests that the letters "b" and "h" were interchangeable in the name of Abiathar's sons.

(6) When Solomon was anointed king, Zodak was anointed (sole) priest (1Ch 29:22).

Obviously a large measure of agreement exists between the two narratives. Yet some points demand

explanation.

3. Harmony of the Accounts:

(1) The seeming discrepancy between the statements in the earlier sources, that Zodak's colleague in the high priest's office is first named Ahimelech (2Sa 8:17) and afterward Abiathar (2Sa 15:24), should occasion little perplexity. Either Ahimelech and Abiathar were one and the same person—not an unlikely supposition (see above); or, what is more probable, Abiathar was Ahimelech's son and had succeeded to his father's office.

(2) Zodak's appearance as a young soldier among the captains who brought David to Jerusalem (assuming that Zodak the soldier was Zodak the priest, which is not absolutely certain) need create no difficulty, if Zodak was not then of age to succeed his father in the priestly office. The earlier sources do not make Zodak an acting priest till after David's accession to the throne of all Israel.

(3) Neither should it prove an insoluble problem to explain how, soon after David's accession to the throne of Judah and Israel, Zodak should be found engaged along with Abiathar in bringing up the Ark to Mt. Zion, as by this time Zodak had obviously entered on the high-priestly office, either in succession to or as colleague of his father.

(4) That Zodak was left to officiate at Gibeon where the tabernacle was, while Abiathar was selected to exercise office in the capital, in no way conflicts with the earlier account and seems reasonable as a distribution of official duties. Why Zodak was sent to Gibeon, where the tabernacle was, and not kept at Jerusalem whither the Ark had been brought, he being always named before Abiathar and probably looked upon as the principal high priest, may have had its reason either in the fact that the king regarded Gibeon as the central sanctuary for national worship, the tabernacle being there (Solomon obviously did; see 2Ch 1:3), and therefore as the proper place for the principal high priest; or in the fact that Zodak was younger than Abiathar and therefore less fitted than his older colleague to be at court, as an adviser to the king.

(5) That toward the end of David's reign, not Abiathar, but his son Ahimelech (or Abimelech), should be introduced as joint high priest with Zodak will not be surprising, if Abiathar was by this time an old man, as his father was at the beginning of David's reign. That grandfather and grandson should have the same name is as likely to have been common then as it is today.

(6) That Zodak should have been appointed sole high priest on Solomon's accession (1Ch 29:22) is not inconsistent with the statement (1Ki 4:4) that under Solomon Zodak and Abiathar were priests. Abiathar might still be recognized as a priest or even as a high priest, though no longer acting as such. The act of deposition may have affected his son Ahimelech as well, and if both father and son were degraded, perhaps this was only to the extent of excluding them from the chief dignity of high priest.

4. The Higher Critical Theory:

The higher criticism holds:

(1) that the Zadok of David's reign was not really an Aaronite descended from Eleazar through Ahitub, who was not Zadok's father but Ahimelech's (Gray in EB, article "Ahitub"), but an adventurer, a soldier of fortune who had climbed up into the priest's office, though by what means is not known (Wellhausen, GJ, 145);

(2) that up till Zadok's appearance the priesthood had been in Ithamar's line, though, according to the insertion by a later writer in the text of 1Sa 2 (see 2:27 ff), in Eli's day it was predicted that it should pass from Eli's house and be given to another;

(3) that when Abiathar or Ahimelech or both were deposed and Zadok instituted sole high priest by Solomon, this fictitious prophecy was fulfilled—though in reality there was neither prophecy nor fulfillment;

(4) that during the exile Ezekiel in his sketch of the vision-temple represented the Zadokites as the only legitimate priests, while the others of the line of A were degraded to be Levites;

(5) that in order to establish the legitimacy of Zadok the writer of the Priestly Code (P) invented his Aaronic descent through Eleazar and inserted the fictitious prophecy in 1 Samuel.

5. Criticism of This Theory:

(1) This theory proceeds upon the assumption, not that the Chronicler was a post-exilic writer (which is admitted), but that he deliberately and purposely idealized and to that extent falsified the past history of his people by ascribing to them a faithful adherence to the Levitical institutions of the Priestly Code, which, according to this theory, were not then in existence—in other words by representing the religious institutions and observances of his own age as having existed in the nation from the beginning. Were this theory established by well-accredited facts, it would doubtless require to be accepted; but the chief, if not the only, support it has is derived from a previous reconstruction of the sacred text in accordance with theory it is called on to uphold.

(2) That the father of Zadok was not Ahitub, a priest of the line of Eleazar, is arrived at by declaring the text in 2Sa 8:17 to have been intentionally corrupted, presumably by a late redactor, the original form of the verse having been, according to criticism (Wellhausen, TBS, 176 f): "Abiathar the son of Ahimelech, the son of Ahitub, and Zadok were priests." But if this was the original form of the words it is not easy to explain why they should have been so completely turned round as to say the opposite, namely, that Ahimelech was the son of Abiathar, and that Ahitub was the father of Zadok., when in reality he was the father of Ahimelech. If, as Cornill admits (Einl, 116), the Chronicler worked "with good, old historical material," it is not credible that he made it say the opposite of what it meant.

(3) If Zadok was not originally a priest, but only a military adventurer, why should David have made him a priest at all? Wellhausen says (GI, 20) that when David came to the throne he "attached importance to having as priests the heirs of the old family who had served the Ark at Shiloh." But if so, he had Abiathar of the line of Ithamar at hand, and did not need to go to the army for a priest. If, however, it be urged that in making Zadok a priest he gave him an inferior rank to Abiathar, and sent him to Gibeon where the tabernacle was, why should both sources so persistently place Zadok before Abiathar?

(4) If Zadok was originally a soldier not connected with the priesthood, and only became a priest after David came to Jerusalem, why should the earlier source have omitted to record this, when no reason existed, so far as one can discover, why it should have been left out? And why should the priestly disposed Chronicler have incorporated this in his narrative when all his inclinations should have moved him to omit it, more especially when he was intending to invent (according to the critical theory) for the young warrior an Aaronite descent?

(5) That the prediction of the fall of Eli's house (1Sa 2:27-36) was inserted by a late writer to justify its supersession by the line of Zadok has no foundation except the presupposition that prediction is impossible, which fair-minded criticism cannot admit. The occurrence of the word "anointed" it is contended, presupposes the monarchy. This, however, it only predicts; and at the most, as Driver sees (Introduction, 164), cannot prove the fictitious character of the prophecy, but merely that it has been "recast by the narrator and colored by the associations with which he himself is familiar"; and even this is entirely hypothetical.

(6) Ezekiel's reference to Zadok's descendants as the only legitimate priests in the vision-temple does not prove that Zadok himself was a soldier who climbed up into the priesthood. Even if the critical interpretation of the vision-temple were correct, it in no way affects the personality of Zadok, and certainly does not disprove his original connection with the priesthood or his descent from Eleazar.

T. Whitelaw

ZAHAM

za'-ham (zaham, meaning uncertain; Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus Zalam, Codex Vaticanus Rhoollam): A son of King Rehoboam (2Ch 11:19).

ZAIN

za'-in.

See ZAYIN.

ZAIR

za’-ir (tsa‘ir; Zeior): When he invaded Edom, we are told that Joram passed over to Zair and all his chariots with him (2Ki 8:21). In the parallel passage (2Ch 21:9), "with his captains" (‘im sarayw) takes the place of "to Zair" (tsa‘irah), probably a copyist’s corruption. The place has not been identified. Some have thought that Mt. Seir is intended; others that it means the town of Zoar. Conder suggested ez-Zuweirah, Southeast of the Dead Sea. If Zoar lay in this direction, it is the way by which an invading army might enter Edom.

ZAKETAN

zar’-e-tan (tsarethan): the King James Version Jos 3:16 for ZARETHAN (which see).

ZALAPH

za’-laf (tsalaph, "caper-plant"): Father of Hanun, one of the repairers of the wall (Ne 3:30).

ZALMON

zal’-mon (tsalmon; Selmon, oros Ermon; the King James Version Salmon (Ps 68:14)):

(1) From the slopes of Mt. Zalmon, Abimelech and his followers gathered the wood with which they burned down "the stronghold of the house of El-berith," which may have been the citadel of Shechem (Jud 9:46). The mountain therefore was not far from the city; but no name resembling this has yet been recovered in Mt. Ephraim. It is just possible that in the modern Arabic name of Mt. Ebal, es-Sulemiyeh, there may be an echo of Zalmon. It is precisely to this mountain, especially to the western slopes, that one would expect Abimelech and his people to go for the purpose in view. The name occurs again in Ps 68:14, a passage of admitted difficulty. Snow in Palestine is mainly associated with Mt. Hermon, where it may be seen nearly all the year round; hence, doubtless the Greek reading "Mt. Hermon" in Judges. But snow is well known among the uplands in winter; and the Psalmist may simply have meant that the kings were scattered like snowflakes in the wind on Mt. Zalmon. We need not therefore look to Bashan or elsewhere for the mountain. The locality is fixed by the narrative in Jgs.

(2) One of David’s heroes (2Sa 23:28).

See ILAI.

W. Ewing

ZALMONAH

zal-mo’na (tsalmonah, "gloomy"): A desert camp of the Israelites, the first after Mt. Hor (Nu 33:41,42). The name "suggests some gloomy valley leading up to the Edomite plateau."

See WANDERINGS OF ISRAEL.

ZALMUNNAH

zal-mun’-a.

See ZEBAH AND ZALMUNNA.

ZAMBIS

zam’-bis: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) ZAMBRI (which see).

ZAMBRI

zam’-bri (Codex Vaticanus Zambrei, Codex Alexandrinus Zambris; the King James Version Zambis, from Aldine Zambis) :

(1) One of the sons of Ezora who put away their foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:34) =" Amariah" of Ezr 10:42.

(2) The King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Zimri" of 1 Macc 2:26.

ZAMOTH

za’-moth, za’-moth (Zamoth): The head of a family, some members of which married. foreign wives (1 Esdras 9:28) =" Zattu" of Ezr 10:27; called "Zathui" in 1 Esdras 5:12 and "Zathoes" (the King James Version "Zathoe") in 1 Esdras 8:32.

ZAMZUMMIM

zam-zum’-im (zam-zummim): A race of giants who inhabited the region East of the Jordan afterward occupied by the Ammonites who displaced them. They are identified with the Rephaim (De 2:20). They may be the same as the Zuzim mentioned in connection with the Rephaim in Ge 14:5.

See REPHAIM.

ZANOAH

za-no’-a (zanoach; Codex Vaticanus Tano; Codex Alexandrinus Zano):

(1) A town in the Judean Shephelah, grouped with Eshtaol, Zorah and Ashnah (Jos 15:34). The Jews reoccupied the place after the exile (Ne 11:30). Here it is named between Jarmuth and Adullam. The inhabitants assisted in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, repairing the valley gate (Ne 3:13). Eusebius (in Onomasticon) places it at Zanna, in the district of Eleutheropolis on the Jerusalem road. It is represented by the modern Zanu‘a, about 10 miles North of Belt Jibrin (Eleutheropolis).

(2) (Codex Vaticanus Zakanaeim; Codex Alexandrinus Zano): A place in the mountains (Jos 15:56) of which Jekuthiel was the "father" or founder (1Ch 4:18). It may be identified with Zenuta, a ruined site on a hill about 12 miles South of Hebron.

W. Ewing

ZAPHENATH-PANEAH, ZAPHNATH-PAANEAH

zaf-e’-nath-pa-ne’-a, zaf’-nath-pa-a-ne’a (tsaphenath pa‘aneach; Egyptian Zoph-ent-pa-ankh; Septuagint D, Psonthomphantch, "the one who furnishes the nourishment of life," i.e. the chief steward of the realm): The name given Joseph by the Egyptian king by whom he was promoted, probably the Hyksos king Aphophis (Ge 41:45).

See JOSEPH.

ZAPHON

za’-fon (tsaphon; Codex Vaticanus Saphan; Codex Alexandrinus Saphon): A city on the East of the Jordan in the territory of Gad (Jos 13:27). It is named again in Jud 12:1 as the place where the elders of Gilead gathered to meet with Jephthah (tsaphonah should be translated "to Zaphon," not "northward"). It must have lain well to the North of Gad. According to the Talmud Amathus represented Zaphon (Neubauer, Geog. du Talmud, 249). Here sat one of the Synedria created by Gabinius (Ant., XIV, v, 4). It was a position of great strength (B J, I, iv, 2). Eusebius, Onomasticon places it 21 Roman miles S. of Pella. This is the modern Tell ‘Amateh, on the south bank of Wady er-Rujeib, 15 miles South of Pella, and nearly 5 miles North of the Jabbok. Buhl (GAP, 259) objects to the identification that Tell ‘Amateh corresponds to the Asophon of Josephus (Ant., XIII, xii, 5). But this objection does not seem well founded.

W. Ewing

ZARA

za’-ra (Zara): the King James Version (Mt 1:3) = Greek form of ZERAH (which see).

ZARACES

zar’-a-sez: the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) ZARAKES (which see).

ZARAH

za’-ra.

See ZERAH (1).

ZARAIAS

za-ra’-yas, za-ri’-as (Zaraias):

(1) One of the leaders in the Return along with Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:8) =" Seraiah" of Ezr 2:2 and "Azariah" of Ne 7:7 = the King James Version ZACHARIAS (which see).

(2) An ancestor of Ezra in 1 Esdras 8:2 (omitted in Codex Vaticanus and Swete) =" Zerahiah" of Ezr 7:4 and apparently=" Arna" of 2 Esdras 1:2.

(3) The father of Eliaonias, the leader of the sons of Phaath Moab under Ezra (1 Esdras 8:31)=" Zerahiah" of Ezr 8:4.

(4) One of "the sons of Saphatias" who went up with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:34) =" Zebadiah" of Ezr 8:8.

ZARAKES

zar’-a-kez (Codex Alexandrinus and Fritzsche, Zarakes; Codex Vaticanus and Swete, Zarios; Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) Zaracelem; the King James Version Zaraces): Occurs in the difficult passage, 1 Esdras 1:38, as the equivalent of Jehoahaz (2Ki 23:34) and Joahaz (2Ch 36:4), the brother of Eliakim (Jehoiakim or JOAKIM (which see)). According to 1 Esdras 1:38, Joakim apparently apprehended his brother, Zarakes, and brought him up out of Egypt, whither he must have been previously taken by Necoh, whereas 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles only state that Necoh took Joahaz (Zarakes) to Egypt.

ZARDEUS

zar-de’-us (Codex Alexandrinus Zardaias; Codex Vaticanus Swete and Fritzsche, Zeralias; the King

James Version Sardeus): One of the sons of Zamoth who had married "strange wives" (1 Esdras 9:28) =" Aziza" of Ezr 10:27.

ZAREAH

za’-re-a, za-re’-a (tsor‘ah): the King James Version in Ne 11:29 for ZORAH (which see).

ZAREATHITES

za-re’a-thits.

See ZORATHITES.

ZARED

za’-red (zaredh (in pause)).

See ZERED.

ZAREPHATH

zar’-e-fath (tsarephath; Sarepta): The Sidonian town in which Elijah was entertained by a widow after he left the brook Cherith (1Ki 17:9). Obadiah refers to it as a Canaanite (probably meaning Phoenicia) town (Ob 1:20). It appears in the Greek form Sarepta in Lu 4:26 (the King James Version), and is said to be in the land of Sidon. Josephus (Ant., VIII, xiii, 2) says it was not "far from Sidon and Tyre, for it lay between them." Eusebius, Onomasticon (s.v. "Sarefta"), places it on the public road, i.e. the road along the seashore. It can be no other than the modern Sarafend, about 13 miles North of Tyre, on the spur of the mountain which divides the plain of Tyre from that of Sidon.

The site of the ancient town is marked by the ruins on the shore to the South of the modern village, about 8 miles to the South of Sidon, which extend along the shore for a mile or more. They are in two distinct groups, one on a headland to the West of a fountain called Ain el-Qantara, which is not far from the shore. Here was the ancient harbor which still affords shelter for small craft. The other group of ruins is to the South, and consists of columns, sarcophagi and marble slabs, indicating a city of considerable importance. The modern village of Sarafend was built some time after the 12th century, since at the time of the Crusades the town was still on the shore.

It is conjectured that the Syrophoenician woman mentioned in Lu 4:26 was an inhabitant of Zarephath., and it is possible that our Lord visited the place in His journey to the region as narrated in Mr 7:24-31, for it is said that he "came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee."

The place has been identified by some with Misrephoth-maim of Jos 11:8 and 13:6, but the latter passage would indicate that Misrephoth-maim was at the limit of the territory of the Sidonians, which Zarephath was not in the days of Joshua.

See MISREPHOTH-MAIM; SIDON.

Originally Sidonian, the town passed to the Tyrians after the invasian of Shalmaneser IV, 722 BC. It fell to Sennacherib 701 BC. The Wely, or shrine bearing the name of el-Khudr, the saint in whom George is blended with Elijah, stands near the shore. Probably here the Crusaders erected a chapel on what they believed to be the site of the widow’s house.

W. Ewing

ZARETHAN

zar’-e-than (tsarethan) :A city, according to Jos 3:16 (omitted, however, by the Septuagint) near Adam, which is probably to be identified with Tell Damieh at the mouth of the Jabbok. In 1Ki 4:12 it is mentioned in connefection with Bethshean and said to be "beneath Jezreel." In 1Ki 7:46, this is said to be at "the ford of Adamah," according to the reading of some, but according to the Massoretic text, "in the clay around between Succoth and Zarethan," where the bronze castings for the temple were made by Solomon’s artificers. In 2Ch 4:17, the name appears as Zeredah, which in 1Ki 11:26 is said to have been the birthplace of Jeroboam, son of Nebat. In Jud 7:22, Gibeon is said to have pursued the Midianites "as far as Bethshittah toward Zererah," which is probably a misreading for Zeredah, arising from the similarity of the Hebrew letters daleth and resh. The place has not been positively identical. From the suggestion that the name means "the great (or lofty) rock," it has without sufficient reason been supposed that it designates the conspicuous peak of Kurn Surtabheh] which projects from the mountains of Ephraim into the valley of the Jordan opposite the mouth of the Jabbok.

George Frederick Wright

ZAREZTH-SHAHAR

za’-reth-sha’-har (tsereth ha-shachar).

See ZERETH-SHAHAR.

ZARHITES

zar’-hits.

See ZERAH, (1), (4).

ZARTANAH

zar-ta’-na, zar’-ta-na (tsarethanah): the King James Version in 1Ki 4:12 for "Zarethan." The form is Zarethan with Hebrew locale.

ZARTHAN

zar’-than (tsarethan): the King James Version in 1Ki 7:46 for ZARETHAN (which see).

ZATHOES

zath’-o-ez, za-tho’-ez (Zathoes; the King James Version, Zathoe): Name of a family, part of which returned with Ezra (1 Esdras 8:32), not found in the Hebrew of Ezr 8:5; probably identical with "Zattu" of Ezr 2:8; Ne 7:13, many of which family went up with Zerubbabel, and so called also "Zathui" (1 Esdras 5:12).

See ZATTU.

ZATHUI

za-thu’-i (Zaththoui, Septuagint Codex Vaticanus Zaton): In 1 Esdras 5:12 =" Zattu" in Ezr 2:8; Ne 10:14. In 1 Esdras 9:28 the same name is "Zamoth."

ZATTHU

zat’-thu: In Ne 10:14; the Revised Version (British and American) ZATTU (which see).

ZATTU

zat’-u (zattu’, meaning unknown): Head of a large family that returned with Zerubbabel to Jerusalem from Babylon (Ezr 2:8; 10:27; Ne 7:13; 10:14 (15)). According to Ezr 10:27, some of his sons had married foreign wives, and Zattu is named in Ne 10:14 as one of the chiefs who signed Nehemiah’s covenant. Septuagint A also adds the name before that of Shecaniah in Ezr 8:5, and so we should read, "And of the sons of Zattu, Shecaniah .... "; so 1 Esdras 8:32 has Zathoes. the King James Version has "Zatthu" in Neb 10:14.

ZAVAN

za’-van.

See ZAAVAN.

ZAYIN

za’-yin "z": The 7th letter of the Hebrew alphabet; transliterated in this Encyclopedia as "z". It came also to be used for the number 7. For name, etc., see ALPHABET.

ZAZA

za’-za (zaza’, meaning unknown; the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus Ozam; Codex Alexandrinus Ozaza): A Jerahmeelite (1Ch 2:33).

ZEALOT; ZEALOTS

zel’-ut, zel’-uts: Simon, one of the apostles, was called "the Zealot" Zelotes from zeloo "to rival," "emulate," "be jealous," "admire," "desire greatly," Lu 6:15; Ac 1:13, the King James Version "Zelotes"). In Mt 10:4 and Mr 3:18 he is called "the Cananean" (so the Revised Version (British and American) correctly; not "the Canaanite," as the King James Version says, following inferior manuscripts), ho Kananaios. From the time of the Maccabees there existed among the Jews a party who professed great zeal for the observance of the "law." According to Josephus (BJ, IV, iii, 9; v, 1; VII, viii, 1) they resorted to violence and assassination in their hatred of the foreigner, being at many points similar to the Chinese Boxers. It is not improbable that the "Assassins" (see ASSASSINS) of Ac 21:38 were identical, or at least closely associated, with this body of "Zealots," to which we must conclude that Simon had belonged before he became one of the Twelve.

See, further, SIMON THE ZEALOT.

William Arthur Heidel

ZEBADIAH

zeb-a-di’-a

(1) zebhadhyaha,

(2) zebhadhyah, "Yah has bestowed";

the form (1) is the Hebrew name in (1), (a), (b), (2), below; the form (2) in the rest. Some manuscripts have Zechariah in (1), (a), (b), (3)).

Compare ZABDI; ZABDIEL:

(1) Levites:

(a) a Korahite doorkeeper of David’s reign (1Ch 26:2);

(b) one of the Levites sent by King Jehoshaphat to teach the Torah in Judah (2Ch 17:8).

(2) Son of Ishmael (2Ch 19:11); "ruler of the house of Judah in all the king’s (Jehoshaphat’s) matters," i. e. judge in civil cases, the "controversies" of 2Ch 19:8.

(3) Benjamites, perhaps descended from Ehud (see Curtis, Chron., 158 ff):

(a) In 1Ch 8:15;

(b) in 8:17, where the name may be a dittography from 8:15.

(4) A Benjamite recruit of David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:7 (Hebrew verse 8)).

(5) One of David’s army officers, son and successor of Asahel (1Ch 27:7).

(6) One of those who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem with Ezra (Ezr 8:8) =" Zaraias" of 1 Esdras 8:34.

(7) One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:20) =" Zabdeus" of 1 Esdras 9:21.

David Francis Roberts

ZEBAH AND ZALMUNNA

ze’-ba (zebhach, "victim"), zal-mun’-a (tsalmunna‘, "protection refused"): Two Midianite kings or chiefs whom Gideon slew (Jud 8:4-21; Ps 83:11 (Hebrew text, verse 12)). The name zebhach (Zebee) is very much like that of ze’ebh (Zeb, "Zeeb" in the Septuagint). Moore (Judgess, 220) says that tsalmunna‘ is probably "a genuine Midianite name"; Noldeke conjectured that it contains that of a deity (ts(a)lm), and a compound form tslmshzbh, is found in an inscription from Teima, a place East of the Midianite capital (Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum, II, cxiii f).

The narrative of Jud 8:4-21 is not to be connected with that of 8:1-3. Budde (Kurzer Hand-Comm. z. Altes Testament, XXII) would join 8:4 to 6:34; Moore (ICC) following Budde’s earlier work (1890) would connect it with a part of 7:22b, describing the direction of the flight, while Nowack (Hand-Komm.) regards the battle of 8:11 as the same as that of 7:11 if; he then takes the latter part of 8:11 to

refer to the place of the camp at night. There are many difficulties in forming a natural connection for the verses. It may be noted that in 8:18 f Gideon is not "the least in my father's house," as he represents himself to be in 6:15.

The whole section tells of a daring raid made by Gideon upon the Midianites. Some of his own kin had been slain by Midianite hordes at Ophrah (Jud 8:18 f), and, stirred by this, Gideon went in hot pursuit with 300 men (Jud 8:4). He requested provisions for his men from the people of Succoth and Penuel, but was refused this. He then went on and caught the Midianites unawares at Karkor (Jud 8:10) and captured their two chiefs. He then had his revenge on the two towns, and returned probably to his home with the two notable prisoners. These he determined to slay to avenge the death of his own kinsmen, and called upon his eldest son to perform this solemn public duty that he owed to the dead. His son, apparently only a boy, hesitated, and he did the deed himself. W. R. Smith (Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, 2nd edition, 417, note) compares with this call to Gideon's son the choice of young men or lads as sacrificers in Ex 24:5, and says that the Saracens also charged lads with the execution of their captives.

The narrative reminds one of David's romantic life in 1Sa 25; 27; 30. It is throughout a characteristic picture of the life of the early Hebrews in Palestine, for whom it was a sacred duty to avenge the dead. It affords a splendid illustration of what is meant by the spirit of Yahweh coming upon, or rather "clothing itself with" (Revised Version margin) Gideon (Jud 6:34); compare also Saul's call to action (1Sa 11:1-11), and also Jud 19 f.

David Francis Roberts

ZEBAIM

ze-be'-im.

See POCHERETH-HAZZEBAIM.

ZEBEDEE

zeb'-e-de (zibhdi, "the gift of God"; Zebedaios): The father of the apostles James and John (Mr 1:19) and a fisherman on the Sea of Galilee (Mr 1:20), the husband of Salome (Mt 27:56; compare Mr 16:1).

See JAMES; SALOME.

ZEBIDAH

ze-bi'-da, zeb'-i-da (zebhudhah, Qere, whence the King James Version "Zebudah," whereas the Kethibh is zebhidhah; the Qere means "bestowed" and is the feminine of Zabud): Daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah, and mother of King Jehoiakim of Judah (2Ki 23:36). The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus has, however,

Iella thugater Edeil ek Krouma, Codex Alexandrinus Eieldaph th. Eieddila ek Rhuma. In 2Ch 36:5 Massoretic Text lacks these names, but the Septuagint Codex Vaticanus has Zechora th. Nereiou ek Rhama; here the name of the king's mother = Hebrew zekhurah, due to a confusion of the Hebrew letter kaph (k) with the Hebrew letter beth (b), and the Hebrew letter resh (r) with the Hebrew letter daleth (d), and thus we find support for the Qere, zebhudhah ("Zebudah," in 2Ki 23:36 the King James Version). Lucian has confused the names here with those of 2Ki 24:18, and has as there, "Amital, the daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah."

David Francis Roberts

ZEBINA

ze-bi'-na (zebhina'," bought"): One of those who had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:43); the name is not in 1 Esdras 9:35, and is omitted by the Septuagint's Codex Alexandrinus in Ezra.

ZEBOIIM

ze-boi'-im (tsebhoyim; the Septuagint uniformly Sebo(e)im; the King James Version, Zeboim): One of the cities in the Vale of Siddim, destroyed with Sodom and Gomorrah. It is always mentioned next to Admah (Ge 10:19; 14:2,8; De 29:23; Ho 11:8). It is not to be confounded with Zeboim mentioned in 1Sa 13:18 and Ne 11:34. The site has not been positively identified, but must be determined by the general questions connected with the Vale of Siddim.

See SIDDIM, VALE OF.

ZEBOIM

ze-bo'-im ((1) tsebho'im; Seboeim (Ne 11:34); (2) ge ha-tsebho'im; Gai ten Samein (1Sa 13:18)):

(1) A Benjamite town mentioned as between HADID (which see) and NEBALLAT (which see), and therefore in the maritime plain near Lydda; the site is lost (Ne 11:34).

(2) The Valley of Zeboim, "the valley of hyenas," one of three companies of the Philistines left their camp at Michmash and "turned the way of the border that looketh down upon the valley of Zeboim toward the wilderness" (1Sa 13:18). There are several valleys with names derived from the hyena, so common in these parts. There is a small branch valley called Shakked dab'a, "ravine of the hyenas," North of the Wady kelt (Grove), a, Wady abu dab'a, "valley of the father of hyenas, which joins the Wady kelt from the South (Marti), and a large and well-known Wady dab'a, "valley of hyenas," which runs parallel with the Wady kelt, some 3 miles farther South, and ends at the Dead Sea. The first of these, which apparently leads to Mukhmas itself, seems the most probable. See Conder's Handbook, 241.

E. W. G. Masterman

ZEBUDAH

ze-bu’-da.

See ZEBIDAH.

ZEBUL

ze’-bul (zebhul, perhaps "exalted"; Zeboul): In Jud 9:26 ff. He is called in 9:30 sar ha-‘ir, "the ruler of the city," a phrase translated "the governor of the city" in 1Ki 22:26 = 2Ch 18:25; 2Ki 23:8; 2Ch 34:8; he was "commandant of the town" of Shechem. In Jud 9:28 he is referred to as the paqidh, "officer," or, more correctly, "deputy" of Abimelech. This verse is a little difficult, but if we read "served" for "serve ye," it becomes fairly clear in meaning. With Moore (Judges, 255 ff) we may translate it thus: "Who is Abimelech? and who is Shechem, that we should serve him (i.e. Abimelech)? Did not the son of Jerubbaal and Zebul his deputy (formerly) serve the people of Qamor (the father of Shechem)? Why then should we serve him (Abimelech)?" This is also the way Budde (Kurzer Hand-Comm. z. Altes Testament, 75) takes the verse. And further in Jud 9:29 for "and he said" many read with the Septuagint "then would I say."

The position of Zebul is here that of a deputy to Abimelech, who lived in Arumah (Jud 9:41). When Gaal came to Shechem, a newcomer with a band of men, he seized the opportunity at a vintage feast to attack Abimelech and express a desire to lead a revolt against him (Jud 9:26-29). Zebul heard these words and reported the matter to his master, vising him to make s sudden rush upon the city (Jud 9:30-33). This Abimelech does, and Gaal, on noticing the troops, tells Zebul, who turns upon him and bids him make good his bragging words. Gaal is thus forced to go out and fight Abimelech, and is defeated (Jud 9:34-40).

If this be the correct interpretation of the narrative so far, it is fairly simple and clear. Some, however, maintain that the words of Gaal about Zebul in Jud 9:28 are meant as an insult to the governor of the city; this is the view of Wellbausch (Compos., 353 f, note) and Nowack (Handkomm.; compare also his Archdologie, I, 304, 308, for the meaning of sar). Zebul is, according to them, head of the Shechemite community, and Wellhausen and Kittel (History of Hebrew, II, 85) believe him to have had something to do with the revolt of 9:23-25. For the latter view there is no proof; possibly Zebul was the head of the community of Shechem, but as he was a subject of Abimelech, who was the king or prince of Shechem, there could not be much sting in calling him the" deputy" of his master.

The questions that arise from Jud 9:41 ff need only be referred to here. Many critics have seen in 9:22-45 more than one source. Moore groups the verses thus:

(1) 9:22-23,25,42 ff as due to the Elohist (E), with 9:24 from RJE;

(2) 9:26-41 due to J. It is doubtful if the division is as clear as this.

There seem however to be parallels:

(1) The plans of Abimelech in 9:34-40 are very similar to those in 9:42 ff.

(2) Jud 9:41 b seems to give in short what we find related in 9:34-40.

(3) Septuagint in 9:31 has suggested to many that we should read there, "and he sent messengers unto Abimelech in Arumah," instead of reading "craftily." We would thus have a parallel to 9:41a.

It may be suggested therefore that if the account be double (and it is strange that Abimelech should again attack the city by almost the same methods as before, when the revolters had been already got rid of), the narratives would be in this order:

Introductory, Jud 9:23-25; then 9:26-29,30 common to both, and so possibly part of 9:31 and 32 f. Then we have two accounts of the event: (a) 9:31 (part), 34-40; (b) 9:41-45, followed by 9:46 ff.

David Francis Roberts

ZEBULONITE

zeb‘-u-lon-it.

See ZEBULUNITES.

ZEBULUN

zeb’-u-lun (zebhulun, also written zebuwlun and zebuluwn; the first form occurs only in Jud 1:30; the other two are frequent, and are used interchangeably; Zaboulon): In Ge 30:20 Leah exclaims, "God hath endowed me with a good dowry," which suggests a derivation of Zebulun from zabhadh, "to bestow," the (d) being replaced by (l). Again she says, "Now will my husband dwell with me (or "honor me"): and she called his name Zebulun"; the derivation being from zabhal, "to exalt" or "honor" (OHL, under the word).

Zebulun was the 10th son of Jacob, the 6th borne to him by Leah in Paddan-aram. Nothing is known of this patriarch’s life, save in so far as it coincides with that of his brethren. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan says that he first of the five brethren was presented to Pharaoh by Joseph, when Israel and his house arrived in Egypt (Ge 47:2). Three sons, Sered, Elon and Jahleel, were born to him in Canaan, and these became

the ancestors of the three main divisions of the tribe (Ge 46:14).

The position of the tribe of Zebulun in the wilderness was with the standard of the camp of Judah on the east side of the tabernacle (Nu 2:7). This camp moved foremost on the march (Nu 2:9). At the first census Zebulun numbered 57,400 men of war (Nu 1:30), the prince of the tribe being Eliab, son of Helon (Nu 1:9). At the second census the men of war numbered 60,500 (Nu 26:27); see, however, NUMBERS. Among the spies Zebulun was represented by Gaddiel son of Sodi (Nu 13:10). To assist in the division of the land Elizaphan son of Parnach was chosen (Nu 34:25). At Shechem Zebulun, the descendants of Leah's youngest son, stood along with Reuben, whose disgrace carried with it that of his tribe, and the descendants of the sons of the handmaids, over against the other six, who traced their descent to Rachel and Leah (De 27:13). At the second division of territory the lot of Zebulun came up third, and assigned to him a beautifully diversified stretch of country in the North. The area of his possession is in general clear enough, but it is impossible to define the boundaries exactly (Jos 19:10-16). It "marched" with Naphtali on the East and Southeast, and with Asher on the West and Northwest. The line ran northward from Mt. Tabor, keeping on the heights West of the Sea of Galilee, on to Kerr 'Anan (Hannathon). It turned westward along the base of the mountain, and reached the border of Asher, probably by the vale of 'Abilin. It then proceeded southward to the Kishon opposite Tell Kaimun (Jokneam). As the plain belonged to Issachar, the south border would skirt its northern edge, terminating again at Tabor, probably near Deburiyeh (Daberath), which belonged to Issachar (Jos 21:28).

The details given are confusing. It is to be observed that this does not bring Zebulun into touch with the sea, and so is in apparent contradiction with Ge 49:13, and also with Josephus (Ant., V, i, 22; BJ, III, iii, 1), who says the lot of Zebulun included the land which "lay as far as the Lake of Gennesareth, and that which belonged to Carmel and the sea." Perhaps, however, the limits changed from time to time. So far as the words in Ge 49:13 are concerned, Delitzsch thinks they do not necessarily imply actual contact with the sea; but only that his position should enable him to profit by maritime trade. This it certainly did; the great caravan route, via maris, passing through his territory. Thus he could "suck the treasures of the sea." See also TABOR, MOUNT. Within the boundaries thus roughly indicated were all varieties of mountain and plain, rough upland country. shady wood and fruitful valley. What is said of the territory of Naphtali applies generally to this. Olive groves and vineyards are plentiful. Good harvests are gathered on the sunny slopes, and on the rich levels of the Plain of Asochis (el-BaTTauf).

Elon the Zebulunite was the only leader given by the tribe to Israel of whom we have any record (Jud 12:11 f); but the people were brave and skillful in war, furnishing, according to the So of Deborah, "(them) that handle the marshal's staff" (Jud 5:14). The tribe sent 50,000 single-hearted warriors, capable and well equipped, to David at Hebron (1Ch 12:33). From their rich land they brought stores of provisions (1Ch 12:40). Over Zebulun in David's time was Ishmaiah, son of Obadiah (1Ch 27:19). Although they had fallen away, Hezekiah proved that many of them were capable of warm response to the appeal of religious duty and privilege (2Ch 30:10 f, 18). They are not named, but it is probable that Zebulun suffered along with Naphtali in the invasion of Tiglath-pileser (2Ki 15:29). In later days the men from these breezy uplands lent strength and enterprise to the Jewish armies. Jotapata (Tell Jifat), the scene of Josephus' heroic defense, was in Zebulun. So was Sepphoris (Seffuriyeh), which was for a time the capital of Galilee (Ant., XVIII, ii, 1; BJ, VII; III, ii, 4). Nazareth, the home of our Saviour's

boyhood, is sheltered among its lower hills.

W. Ewing

ZEBULUNITES

zeb’-u-lun-its (hazebhuloni; Zaboulon): Members of the tribe of Zebulun (Nu 26:27; Jud 12:11 f).

ZECHARIAH (1)

zek-a-ri’-a (zekharyahu, or zekharyah; the Septuagint Zacharia(s)): A very common name in the Old Testament. The form, especially the longer form, of the name would suggest for its meaning, "Yah remembers" or "Yah is renowned," and the name was doubtless understood in this sense in later times. But the analogies with ZACCUR, ZECHER, ZICHRI (which see), etc., make some original ethnic derivation probable.

(1) King of Israel, son of Jeroboam II (the King James Version "Zachariah"). See the next article.

(2) The grandfather of King Hezekiah, through Hezekiah’s mother Abi (2Ki 18:2, the King James Version "Zachariah" parallel 2Ch 29:1).

(3) A contemporary of Isaiah, taken by Isaiah as a trustworthy witness in the matter of the sign Maher-shalal-hash-baz (Isa 8:1). As his father’s name was Jeberechiah, some support seems to be offered to theories of those who would make him the author of certain portions of Zechariah.

See ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

(4) A Reubenite of the time of Israel’s captivity (1Ch 5:7).

(5) A Benjamite, living in Gideon (1Ch 9:37; called "Zecher" in 8:31). He was the brother of Kish and hence, the uncle of Saul.

(6) A Manassite of Gilead, at the time of David (1Ch 27:21).

(7) The third son of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 21:2). He was slain by Jehoram (2Ch 21:4).

(8) A "prince" who Jehoshaphat sent to "teach" in the cities of Judah (2Ch 17:7). As this "teaching" was in connection with the establishing of the Law, Zechariah was primarily a judge.

(9) A prophet who was influential in the early days of Uzziah (2Ch 26:5). He is characterized as ha-mebh in bire’oth (beyir’ath(?)) ha-elohim, which phrase is usually understood to mean that he had

instructed (Revised Version margin) the king in the fear of God. As long as he lived the king profited by his instruction and advice.

The following eight are all Levites:

(10) A doorkeeper at the time of David, who was made a singer "of the second degree" (1Ch 15:18; the text is confused). He was a player on a "psaltery" (1Ch 15:20) and took part in the thanksgiving when the Ark was brought to Jerusalem (1Ch 16:5).

(11) A son of Isshiah (1Ch 24:25).

(12) A son of Meshelemiah, a "porter of the door of the tent of meeting" at the time of David (1Ch 9:21; 26:2,14). In 1Ch 26:14 called "a discreet counselor."

(13) A son of Hosah, a Merarite, also at David's time (1Ch 26:11).

(14) The father of the prophet, JAHAZIEL (which see) (2Ch 20:14).

(15) A son of Asaph, who assisted in the purification of the Temple at the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:13).

(16) A Kohathite, who assisted in the repair of the Temple at the time of Josiah (2Ch 34:12).

(17) A son of Jonathan, an Asaphite, one of the musicians at the dedication of the wall at the time of Nehemiah (Ne 12:35).

The following are all priests:

(18) A trumpeter at the time of David (1Ch 15:24).

(19) A son of Jehoiada, at the time of Joash. He rebuked the people publicly for their apostasy, and was stoned by them, Joash consenting to their act (2Ch 24:20-22). As 2 Chronicles is the last book in the Hebrew Old Testament, Zechariah was regarded as the last of the Old Testament martyrs, and hence, is coupled with Abel (the first martyr) in Mt 23:35 parallel Lu 11:51. The words "son of Barachiah" in Matthew are due to confusing this Zechariah with the prophet.

See ZACHARIAH.

(20) One of the "rulers of the house of God" at the time of Josiah (2Ch 35:8).

(21) A son of Pashhur, 242 of whose descendants as "chiefs of fathers' houses" dwelt in Jerusalem at the time of Nehemiah (Ne 11:13).

(22) A trumpeter at the dedication of the wall at the time of Nehemiah (Ne 12:41).

(23) The prophet (Ezr 5:1; 6:14; Ne 12:16; Zec 1:1,7; 7:1,8; 1 Esdras 6:1; 7:3).

See ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

The following are all returned exiles or are mentioned only as ancestors of such:

(24) A son of Parosh (Ezr 8:3; 1 Esdras 8:30 has "Zacharias" here and elsewhere).

(25) A son of Bebai (Ezr 8:11; 1 Esdras 8:37)

(26) One of the "chief men" dispatched by Ezra to bring priests from Casiphia (Ezr 8:16; 1 Esdras 8:44). Doubtless the same as (24) or (25), above.

(27) One of the persons who stood by Ezra at the reading of the Law (Ne 8:4; 1 Esdras 9:44); almost certainly identical with (26).

(28) A son of Elam, who had taken a foreign wife (Ezr 10:26; 1 Esdras 9:27).

(29) A son of Amariah, a Judahite, the ancestor of certain persons dwelling in Jerusalem (Ne 11:4).

(30) A son of "the Shilonite," the ancestor of certain persons dwelling in Jerusalem (Ne 11:5).

Burton Scott Easton

ZECHARIAH (2)

(zekharyah, zekharydhu, "Yah has remembered" (2Ki 14:29; 15:8-12); Zacharias, the King James Version Zachariah): Son of Jeroboam II, and 14th king of Israel. He was the 4th of the line of Jehu, and reigned six months. Zechariah succeeded to a splendid inheritance, as he was king, not only of the ten tribes of Israel, but of the Syrian state of Damascus, which his father had subdued. In the unusual wealth and dignity of this position lay his peril. Also there were two dark shadows falling across his path, though both probably unseen by him. One was the promise to Jehu, as the reward of his destroying the worship of Baal in Israel, that his sons should sit on the throne of Israel to the 4th generation (2Ki 10:30; 15:12). Zechariah was Jehu’s great-great-grandson. The other was the word of Amos to the priest of Bethel: "Then said the Lord. ... I will rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword" (Am 7:8,9).

The only brief notice of Zechariah personal to himself is that he gave his support to the worship of the calves, since Jeroboam I established the religion of the state. He hardly had time, however, to identify

himself with this or any institution before he was publicly assassinated by Shallum, the son of Jabesh (he "smote him before the people"). The prophet Hosea was then alive, and there is probably allusion to this crime when, addressing Ephraim, he says: "Where is thy king, that he may save thee in all thy cities?. ... I have given thee a king in mine anger, and have taken him away in my wrath" (Ho 13:10,11; compare 1:4).

There has long been difficulty with the chronology of this period. Archbishop Ussher assumed an interregnum of 11 years between the death of Jeroboam II and Zechariah's accession. This is accepted as probable by a recent writer, who sees "at least 10 years of incessant conflict between rival claimants to the throne on Jeroboam's death" (see article "Zechariah" in HDB, IV). It seems more likely that there is error in certain of the synchronisms. The year of Zechariah's accession was probably 759 BC (some put it later), and the 6 months of his reign, with that given to Shallum, may be included in the 10 years of Menahem, who followed them (2Ki 15:17).

See CHRONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

W. Shaw Caldecott

ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF

1. The Prophet

2. His Times and Mission

3. Contents and Analysis

4. The Critical Question Involved

5. The Unity of the Book

6. Conclusion

LITERATURE

Few books of the Old Testament are as difficult of interpretation as the Book of Zechariah; no other book is as Messianic. Jewish expositors like Abarbanel and Jarchi, and Christian expositors such as Jerome, are forced to concede that they have failed "to find their hands" in the exposition of it, and that in their investigations they passed from one labyrinth to another, and from one cloud into another, until they lost themselves in trying to discover the prophet's meaning. The scope of Zechariah's vision and the profundity of his thought are almost without a parallel. In the present writer's judgment, his book is the most Messianic, the most truly apocalyptic and eschatological, of all the writings of the Old

Testament.

1. The Prophet:

Zechariah was the son of Berechiah, and the grandson of Iddo (Zec 1:1,7). The same Iddo seems to be mentioned among the priests who returned from exile under Zerubbabel and Joshua in the year 536 BC (Ne 12:4; Ezr 2:2). If so, Zechariah was a priest as well as a prophet, and presumably a young man when he began to preach. Tradition, on the contrary, declares that he was well advanced in years. He apparently survived Haggai, his contemporary (Ezr 5:1; 6:14). He was a poet as well as a prophet. Nothing is known of his end. The Targum says he died a martyr.

2. His Times and Mission:

The earliest date in his book is the 2nd year (520 BC) of the reign of Darius Hystaspis, and the latest, the 4th year of the same king's reign (Zec 1:1,7; 7:1). Though these are the only dates given in his writings, it is possible of course that he may have continued active for several additional years. Otherwise, he preached barely two years. The conditions under which he labored were similar to those in Haggai's times. Indeed, Haggai had begun to preach just two months before Zechariah was called. At that time there were upheavals and commotions in different parts of the Persian empire, especially in the Northeast Jeremiah's prophecies regarding the domination of Babylon for 70 years had been fulfilled (Jer 15:11; 29:10). The returned captives were becoming disheartened and depressed because Yahweh had not made it possible to restore Zion and rebuild the temple. The foundations of the latter had been already laid, but as yet there was no superstructure (Ezr 3:8-10; Zec 1:16). The altar of burnt offering was set up upon its old site, but as yet there were no priests worthy to officiate in the ritual of sacrifice (Ezr 3:2,3; Zec 3:3). The people had fallen into apathy, and needed to be aroused to their opportunity. Haggai had given them real initiative, for within 24 days after he began to preach the people began to work (Hag 1:1,15). It was left for Zechariah to bring the task of temple-building to completion. This Zechariah did successfully; this, indeed, was his primary mission and work.

3. Contents and Analysis:

The prophecies of Zechariah naturally fall into two parts, chapters 1-8 and 9-14, both of which begin with the present and look forward into the distant future. (1) Zechariah 1-8, consisting of three distinct messages delivered on three different occasions:

(a) Zec 1:1-6, an introduction, delivered in the 8th month of the 2nd year of Darius Hystaspis (520 BC). These words, having been spoken three months before the prophecies which follow, are obviously a general introduction. They are decidely spiritual and strike the keynote of the entire collection. In them the prophet issues one of the strongest and most intensely spiritual calls to repentance to be found in the Old Testament.

(b) Zec 1:7-6:15, a series of eight night visions, followed by a coronation scene, all delivered on the 24th

day of the 11th month of the same 2nd year of Darius (520 BC), or exactly two months after the corner stone of the temple had been laid (Hag 2:18; Zec 1:7). These visions were intended to encourage the people to rebuild God’s house. They are eight in number, and teach severally the following lessons:

(i) The vision of the horses (Zec 1:7-17), teaching God’s special care for and interest in his people: "My house shall be built" (Zec 1:16).

(ii) The four horns and four smiths (Zec 1:18-21), teaching that Israel’s foes have finally been destroyed; in fact that they have destroyed themselves. There is no longer, therefore, any opposition to building God’s house.

(iii) The man with a measuring line (Zechariah 2), teaching that God will re-people, protect and dwell in Jerusalem as soon as the sacred edifice has been built. The city itself will expand till it becomes a great metropolis without walls; Yahweh will be a wall of fire round about it.

(iv) Joshua, the high priest, clad in filthy garments, and bearing the sins both of himself and the people (Zechariah 3); but cleansed, continued and made typical of the Messiah-Branch to come.

(v) The candelabrum and the two olive trees (Zechariah 4), teaching that the visible must give place to the spiritual, and that, through "the two sons of oil," Zerubbabel the layman, and Joshua the priest (Zec 4:14), the light of God’s church will continue to burn with ever-flaming brightness. For it is "not by might" but by Yahweh’s Spirit, i.e. by divine life and animation, by divine vigor and vivacity, by divine disposition and courage, by divine executive ability and technical skill, that God’s house shall be built and supplied with spiritual life (Zec 4:6).

(vi) The flying roll (Zec 5:1-4), teaching that when the temple is built and God’s law is taught the land shall be purified from outward wickedness.

(vii) The Ephah (Zec 5:5-11); wickedness personified is borne away back to the land of Shinar, teaching that when the temple is rebuilt wickedness shall be actually removed from the land.

(viii) The four chariots (Zec 6:1-8), teaching that God’s protecting providence will be over His sanctuary, and that His people, purified from sin, shall rest secure in Him.

These eight visions are followed by a coronation scene, in which Joshua the high priest is crowned and made typical of the Messiah-Priest-King, whose name is Branch (Zec 6:9-15). (c) Zechariah 7; 8, Zechariah’s answer to the Bethel deputation concerning fasting; delivered on the 4th day of the 9th month of the 4th year of Darius (518 BC). The Jews had been accustomed to fast on the anniversaries of the following four great outstanding events in the history of their capital:

(i) when Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, in the 4th month (Jer 52:6);

(ii) when the Temple was burned in the 5th month (Jer 52:12);

(iii) when Gedaliah was murdered in the 7th month (Jer 41:2); and

(iv) when the siege of Jerusalem was begun in the 10th month (2Ki 25:1).

There are four sections to the prophet's answer divided by the slightly varying formula, "The word of Yahweh came unto me" (Zec 7:4,8; 8:1,18) and teaching:

(a) Fasting affects only yourselves; God requires obedience (Zec 7:4-7).

(b) Look at the lesson from your fathers; they forsook justice and compassion and God punished them (Zec 7:8-14).

(c) Yahweh is now waiting to return to Jerusalem to save His people in truth and holiness. In the future, instead of a curse God will send blessing, instead of evil, good (Zec 8:1-17).

(d) In fact, your fasts shall be changed into festivals, and many nations shall in that day seek Yahweh of hosts in Jerusalem (Zec 8:18-23).

(2) Zechariah 9-14, consisting of two oracles, without dates;

(a) Zechariah 9-11, an oracle of promise to the new theocracy. This section contains promises of a land in which to dwell, a return from exile, victory over a hostile world-power, temporal blessings and national strength, closing, with a parable of judgment brought on by Israel's rejection of Yahweh as their shepherd; thus Judah and Ephraim restored, united and made victorious over their enemies, are promised a land and a king (Zec 9); Israel shall be saved and strengthened (Zec 10); Israel shall be punished for rejecting the shepherding care of Yahweh (Zec 11);

(b) Zechariah 12-14, an oracle describing the victories of the new theocracy, and the coming day of Yahweh. This section is strongly eschatological, presenting three distinct apocalyptic pictures: thus how Jerusalem shall be besieged by her enemies, but saved by Yahweh (Zec 12); how a remnant of Israel purified and refined shall be saved (Zec 13); closing with a grand apocalyptic vision of judgment and redemption—the nations streaming up to Jerusalem to keep the joyous Feast of Tabernacles, and everything in that day becoming holy to Yahweh.

4. The Critical Question Involved:

There are two opposing schools of criticism in regard to the origin of Zechariah 9-14; one holds what is known as the pre-exilic hypothesis, according to which chapters 9-14 were written before the downfall of Jerusalem; more specifically, that Zechariah 9-11 and 13:7-9 spring from the 8th century BC, having been composed perhaps by Zechariah, the son of Jeberechiah mentioned in Isa 8:2; whereas Zechariah

12-14, except 13:7-9, were composed by some unknown contemporary of Jeremiah in the 7th century BC. On the other hand, there are also those who advocate a late post-Zecharian origin for chapters 9-14, somewhere about the 3rd century BC. The latter hypothesis is today the more popular. Over against these the traditional view, of course, is that Zechariah, near the close of the 6th century, wrote the entire book ascribed to him. Only chapters 9-14 are in dispute. No one doubts the genuineness of Zechariah 1-8.

The following are the main arguments of those who advocate a pre-exilic origin for these oracles:

(1) Zec 11:8, "And I cut off the three shepherds in one month." These "three shepherds" are identified with certain kings who reigned but a short time each in the Northern Kingdom; for example, Zechariah, Shallum and Menahem (2Ki 15:8-14). But the difficulty with this argument is that they were not cut off "in one month"; Menahem, on the contrary, reigned 10 years in Samaria (2Ki 15:17).

(2) Zec 12:11-14, which speaks of "a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon," is claimed to fix the date of Zechariah 12-14. Josiah fell in the valley of Megiddo (2Ki 23:29; 2Ch 35:22). But surely the mourning of Judah for Josiah might have been remembered for a century, from 609 BC till 518 BC.

(3) Zec 14:5, referring to the "earthquake" in the days of Uzziah, is another passage fastened upon to prove the preexilic origin of these prophecies. But the earthquake which is here alluded to took place at least a century and a half before the date assigned for the composition of Zechariah 14. And surely if an earthquake can be alluded to by an author 150 years after it occurs, Zechariah, who lived less than a century later, might have alluded to it also.

(4) A much stronger argument in favor of a pre-exilic origin of these prophecies is the names given to theocracy, e.g. "Ephraim" and "Jerusalem" (Zec 9:10), "Judah" and "Ephraim" (Zec 9:13), "house of Judah" and "house of Joseph" (Zec 10:6), "Judah and Israel" (Zec 11:14), implying that the kingdoms of Israel and Judah are still standing. But subsequent to the captivity the Jews ever regarded themselves as representatives of the 12 tribes, as is obvious from their offering 12 sacrifices (Ezr 6:17; 8:35). Moreover, old names such as "Israel" and "Judah" long survived (compare Jer 31:27-31; Zec 8:13).

(5) Zec 14:10, which defines the area occupied by Judah as extending "from Geba to Rimmon," which corresponds, it is alleged, with the conditions which prevailed just prior to the captivity. But it satisfies equally well the conditions after the exile in Zechariah’s own time.

(6) Again, it is argued that the national sins, the prevailing sins, idolatry, teraphim and false prophecy (Zec 10:2; 13:2-6), are those of pre-exilic times. But the same sins persisted in the post-exilic congregation (Ne 6:7-14; Mal 2:11; 3:5), and there is no special emphasis laid upon them here.

(7) Finally, it is argued that the enemies of Israel mentioned in Zechariah 9-14 are those of pre-exilic times, Assyria and Egypt (10:10,11), Syria, Phoenicia and Philistia (9:1-7). But forms of expression are

slow in changing: the name "Assyrians" occurs in La 5:6, and "Assyria" is employed instead of "Persia" in Ezr 6:22. Jeremiah prophesied against Damascus and Hamath long after their loss of independence (49:23-27). After the exile, the Philistines resisted Israel's return (Ne 4:7,8). In short all these nations were Israel's hereditary foes, and, therefore, judgments pronounced against them were always in place. Furthermore, it may be said in general that there are reasons for thinking that, in both halves of the Book of Zechariah, the exile is represented as an event of the past, and that the restoration from exile both of Ephraim and Judah, though incomplete, has already begun. This is unquestionably true of Zechariah 1-8 (1:12; 2:6-12; 6:10; 7:5; 8:7,8). The exile is treated as a fact. It is almost equally true of Zechariah 9-14 (compare 9:8,11; 10:6,8-10). Moreover, it may with justice be claimed that the alleged authors of chapters 9-14 dissociate themselves from any definitely named person or any specific event known to be pre-exilic. God alone is described as Ruler of His people. The only king mentioned is the Messiah-King (9:9,10; 14:9). The "house of David" mentioned in 12:7-12; 13:1, is never described as in possession of the throne. It is David's "house," and not any earthly ruler in it, of which the prophet speaks. Further, there are passages, indeed, in chapters 9-14 which, if pre-exilic in origin, would have been obscure and even misleading to a people confronted by the catastrophes of 722 and 586 BC. No specific enemy is alluded to. No definite army is named as approaching. Instead of Assyria, Javan is painted as the opposing enemy of theocracy (9:13), and even she is not yet raised up or even threatening. On the other hand, in Zechariah 12-14, it is not the Chaldeans under Nebuchadnezzar, but "all nations," who are described as coming up against Jerusalem (12:2,3; 14:2). Moreover, victory and not defeat is promised (9:8,14,16; 12:4,7,8). The preexilic prophets Amos, Hosea and Jeremiah held out no such hopes. These oracles, however, promise even temporal prosperity and abundance (9:17; 10:1,8,12; 12:8; 14:2,14); and they exhort the people to rejoice rather than to fear (9:9; 10:7); while in 14:16-19 all nations are represented as going up to Jerusalem to keep the Feast of Tabernacles, which was the most joyous feast of the Hebrew calendar. All this is quite the opposite of what the pre-exilic prophets (who are known to have been pre-exilic) actually prophesied. In Zec 9-14, there is sounded forth not one clear note of alarm or warning; judgment rather gives place to hope, warning to encouragement, threatening to joy and gladness, all of which is most inconsistent with the idea that these chapters are of preexilic origin. On the other hand, their are perfectly consistent with the conditions and promises of post-exilic times.

The other hypothesis remaining to be discussed is that known as the post-Zecharian. This may be said to represent the prevailing critical view at the present time. But it, like the pre-exilic hypothesis, is based upon a too literalistic and mechanical view of prophecy. Those, like Stade, Wellhausen, Kuenen, Marti, Kautzsch, Cornill, Cheyne, Driver, Kuiper, Echardt and Mitchell, who advocate this view, employ the same critical methods as those whose views we have just discussed, but arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions. Indeed, no two critics agree as to the historical circumstances which produced these oracles. Most are of the opinion, however, that these chapters were composed during the Greek period, i. e. after 333 BC. In examining the arguments urged by the representatives of this school special caution is needed in distinguishing between the grounds advanced in support of a post-exilic and those which argue a post-Zecharian date. The former we may for the most part accept, as Zechariah was himself a post-exilic prophet; the latter we must first examine. In favor of a very late or Grecian origin for Zechariah 9-14, the chief and all-important passage, and the one upon which more emphasis is placed than upon all others together, is 9:13, "For I have bent Judah for me, I have filled the bow with Ephraim; and I will stir up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and will make thee as the sword of a

mighty man." Kuiper in summing up throws the whole weight of his argument in favor of a Greek date on this verse. Wellhausen makes it decide the date of these prophecies; while Stade declares that the announcement of the "sons of Javan" is alone sufficient to prove that these prophecies are after 333 BC. Two things are especially emphasized by critics in connection with this important passage:

(1) that the sons of Javan are the world-power of the author's day, namely, the Greek-Maccabean world-power; and

(2) that they are the enemies of Zion.

But in opposition to these claims it should be observed

(1) that the sons of Javan are but one of several world-powers within the range of the prophet's horizon (Zec 9:1-7, Syria, Phoenicia, Philistia; 12:2 f; 14:2 f, all nations; and 10:10,11, Assyria and Egypt); and

(2) that the Greeks under Alexander were not the enemies of Zion, and did not fight against the Jews, but against the Persians.

Assuming the genuineness of the passage (Zec 9:13), the following considerations point to the Persian period as its probable historical background:

(a) The prophecy would be vague and meaningless if uttered after the invasion of Alexander.

(b) The passage does not describe a victory for the sons of Javan, but rather a defeat.

(c) It is introduced by an appeal to those still in exile to return, which would have been quite meaningless after Alexander's conquest.

(d) In short, Zec 9:13-17, as a whole, is not a picture of actual war, but rather an apocalyptic vision of the struggle of Israel with the world-power of the West, hence, its indefiniteness and figurative language.

Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that in Zechariah's own day the Greeks were rapidly becoming a menacing world-power. In the first 3 years (521-519 BC) of Darius' reign, 12 different revolts took place, principally in the North and East But, in 518, Darius was compelled to move westward at the head of his royal armies; Darius' visit to Egypt in 517 BC was cut short by the disturbances of the Greeks (compare Wiedemann, Gesch., 236). In the year 516 BC the Greeks of the Hellespont and Bosporus, with the island of Samos, were made to submit to Pets rule. The next year (515 BC), Darius led an expedition against the Scythians across the Danube, the failure of which encouraged the Ionians subsequently to revolt. In 500 BC the great Ionian revolt actually took place. In 499 BC Sardis, the most important stronghold for Persia in Asia Minor, was burned by the Athenians. In 490 BC Marathon was fought and Persia was conquered. In 480 BC Xerxes was defeated at Salamis. But it is unnecessary to

sketch the rise of Jayan further. Enough has been related to show that already in the reign of Darius Hystaspis—in whose reign Zechariah is known to have lived and prophesied—the sons of Greece were a rising world-power, and a threatening world-power. This is all really that is required by the passage. The sons of Jayan were but one of Israel's enemies in Zechariah's day; but they were of such importance that victory over them carried with it momentous Messianic interests. The language of chapter 9 is vague, and, in our judgment, too vague and too indefinite to have been uttered after Marathon (490 BC), or even after the burning of Sardis (500 BC); for, in that case, the author would have been influenced more by Greece and less by the movements and commotions of the nations.

Other arguments advanced by the post-Zecharian school are:

(1) Zec 14:9, "And Yahweh shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall Yahweh be one, and his name one." To Stade this passage contains a polemic against the conditions in Greek times when all gods were conceived of as only different representations of one and the same god. But, on the contrary, the post-exilic congregation was as truly a theocracy in the days of Darius Hystaspis as in the period subsequent to Alexander's conquest. The Jewish colony of the Restoration was a religious sect, not a political organization. Zechariah often pictures the close relation of Yahweh to His people (2:10-13; 8:3,13), and the author of chapters 9-14 describes similar conditions. The "yearning for a fuller theocracy," which Cheyne (Bampton Lectures, 120) discovers in Zec 9-14, is thoroughly consistent with the yearning of a struggling congregation in a land of forsaken idols shortly after the return from exile.

(2) Zec 12:2 b, interpreted to mean that "Judah also, forced by the enemy, shall be in the siege against Jerusalem," is a proof, it is alleged, that the children of the Diaspora had served as soldiers. The verse, accordingly, is said to be a description of the hostile relations which actually existed between Jerusalem and Judah in the beginning of the Maccabean struggle. The validity of these claims, however, is vitiated by a correct exegesis of the passage in hand. The text is apparently corrupt. In order to obtain a subject for "shall be," the preposition before Judah had better be stricken out, as in the Targum. The passage then translated reads, "And Judah also shall be in the siege against Jerusalem." But this is ambiguous. It may mean that Judah shall fight against Jerusalem, or it may mean that Judah, too, shall be besieged. The latter is obviously the true meaning of the passage, as Zec 12:7 indicates. For, as one nation might besiege Jerusalem (a city), so all nations, coming up are practically going to besiege Judah. The Septuagint favors this interpretation; likewise the Coptic version; and Zec 14:14. Wellhausen frankly concedes that "no characteristic of the prophecy under discussion in reality agrees with the conditions of the Maccabean time. The Maccabees were not the Jews of the lowland, and they did not join themselves with the heathen out of hatred to the city of Jerusalem, in order finally to fall treacherously upon their companions in war. There is not the slightest hint in our passage of religious persecution; that alone decides, and hence, the most important sign of Maccabean times is wanting."

(3) Zec 10:10,11, which mentions "Egypt" and "Assyria" (and which, strange to say, is also one of the strongest proofs in support of the preexilic hypothesis), is singularly enough interpreted to refer respectively to the Ptolemies of Egypt and the Seleucids of Syria. But this is quite impossible, and especially so in view of the prominence which is given to Egypt in 14:19, which points to Persian rather than Greek conditions; for then Egypt, in consequence of her perpetual efforts to throw off the Persian

yoke, was naturally brought under the observation of the Jews in Palestine, who repeatedly beheld the Persian armies passing on their way to the valley of the Nile.

(4) Still another argument advanced in favor of a late post-Zecharian date for these oracles is that from language and style: Aramaisms, scriptio plena, the preponderance of the shorter form of the personal pronoun "I," the Hebrew ending on, the frequent use of the nota accusativi, especially with suffixes, the omission of the article, the use of the infinitive absolute, and the clumsy diction and weary repetition of these prophecies are pointed to as evidence of their origin in Grecian times. But in opposition to these claims, it may be remarked in general that their force is greatly weakened by two considerations: (a) the fact that the author of Zechariah 9-14 depends so largely on older prophecies for his thoughts, and consequently more or less for his language; and (b) the fact that these prophecies are so very brief. There is no mode of reasoning so treacherous as that from language and style. (For the technical discussion of this point, see the present writer's The Prophecies of Zechariah, 54-59.)

5. The Unity of the Book:

Among the further objections made to the genuineness of Zechariah 9-14, and consequently to the unity of the book, the following are the chief:

(1) There are no "visions" in these oracles as in Zechariah 1-6. But there are none either in Zechariah 7; 8, and yet these latter are not denied to Zechariah. As a matter of fact, however, visions do actually occur in chapters 9-14, only of a historico-parabolic (11:4-17) and eschatological character (9:13-17; chapters 12; 14).

(2) There are "no dates," as in Zec 1:1,7; 7:1. But dates are seldom attached to "oracles" (Isa 13:1; 15:1; Na 1:1; Hab 1:1; Mal 1:1). There is but one instance in the entire Old Testament (Isa 14:28 margin); whereas "visions" are frequently dated.

(3) There is "no Satan." But Satan is never mentioned elsewhere in any prophetic book of the Old Testament.

(4) There is "no interpreting angel" in Zechariah 9-14. But "oracles" need no interpreting angel. On the other hand, "the Angel of Yahweh" is mentioned in both parts (3:1 ff; 12:8), a fact which is far more noteworthy.

(5) Proper names are wanting in Zechariah 9-14, e.g. Zerubbabel and Joshua. But neither do these names occur in chapters 7; 8.

(6) The sins alluded to are different, e.g. theft and false swearing in Zec 5:3,1; while in 10:2 seeking teraphim and in 13:2 ff false prophecy are named. But these sins may have existed side by side. What is far more noteworthy, in both parts the prophet declares that all these evils shall be taken away and removed out of the land (3:9; 5:9-11; 13:1,2).

(7) The Messianic pictures are different, e.g. in Zechariah 1-8 the Messiah is spoken of as Branch-Priest (3:8,9; 6:12,13); whereas in chapters 9-14, as King, (9:9,10). But in 6:13 it is expressly stated that the Branch-Priest "shall sit and rule upon his throne." Of far greater moment is the picture of the nations coming to Zion to worship Yahweh. This remarkable picture recurs in all the different sections of the book (6:12,13,15; 8:20-23; 12:6; 14:16-19).

On the other hand, the following are some of the arguments which favor the genuineness of these disputed chapters:

(1) The fundamental ideas of both parts are the same. By this we mean that the deeper we go the nearer we approach unity. As Dr. G.A. Smith argues against Graetz, who divides Hosea 1-3 from Hosea 4-14, "in both parts there are the same religious principles and the same urgent and jealous temper"; the same is equally true of Zec 1-8 and Zec 9-14. Certain similarities are especially noteworthy, e.g.

(a) an unusually deep, spiritual tone pervades the entire book. The call to a true repentance, first sounded forth in the introduction (1:1-7), is developed more and more throughout the entire 14 chapters; thus, in the sanctifying of Joshua (Zec 3:4), in the message to Zerubbabel, "not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit" (Zec 4:6), in the conditions of future blessing (Zec 6:15), in the answer to the Bethel deputation (Zec 7:5-9; 8:16); and in Zechariah 9-14, in the consecration of the remnant of the Philistines (9:7), in the blessings to Ephraim (10:12), in the baptism of grace upon Jerusalem (12:10), in the fountain for sin (13:1), in the worship of Yahweh (13:9), in the living waters going forth from Jerusalem (14:8), and in the dedication of everything as holy unto the Lord (14:20,21). The tone which tempers these prophecies is an extraordinarily deep and spiritual one throughout. And this argument cannot be set aside by rejecting wholesale certain passages as later interpolations, as is done by Mitchell (ICC, 242-44).

(b) There is a similar attitude of hope and expectation in both parts. This is especially important. For example,

(i) the return of the whole nation is a prevailing idea of happiness in both parts (Zec 2:6,10; 8:7,8; 9:12; 10:6,7).

(ii) The expectation that Jerusalem shall be inhabited (Zec 1:16,17; 2:4; 8:3,8; 12:6; 14:10,11),

(iii) and that the temple shall be built and become the center of the nation’s religious life (Zec 1:16,17; 3:7; 6:15; 7:2,3; 9:8; 14:20,21).

(iv) Messianic hope is peculiarly strong in both (Zec 3:8,9; 6:12,13; 9:9,10; 11:12,13; 12:10; 13:1,7-9).

(v) Peace and prosperity are expected (Zec 1:17; 3:10; 6:13; 8:12,19; 9:10,12-17; 10:1,7,8,10,12; 12:8; 14:11,16-19).

(vi) The idea of God’s providence as extending to the whole earth (Zec 1:14-17; 2:9,12; 4:10; 6:5; 9:1,8,14; 10:3,1,9,12; 12:2-4,8; 13:7; 14:3,9). Again,

(c) the prophet’s attitude toward Judah is the same in both parts. It is an attitude of supreme regard for Judah’s interests, making them second only to the capital (Zec 2:2,4,16; 8:19; 1:12; 8:13,15; 12:2; 14:14; 10:3; 12:4,6,7; 14:21; 9:9,13; 10:6; 11:14; 14:5). The prophet’s attitude toward the nations, the enemies of theocracy, is the same in both parts. The whole assembled world are the enemies of Israel. But though they have scattered Judah, Israel and Jerusalem (1:11), and are still coming up to besiege Jerusalem (12:2; 14:2), yet they shall be joined to the Lord in that day (2:11) and worship Yahweh like the Jews (8:20-23; 14:16-19). These are all striking instances of similarity in the fundamental ideas of the two parts of the book.

(2) There are peculiarities of thought common to both parts: e.g.

(a) the habit of dwelling on the same thought (Zec 2:1,4,5,11; 6:12,13; 8:4,5; 8:21,22; 11:8; parallel 13:3; 14:5,16,18,19);

(b) the habit of expanding one fundamental thought into a series of clauses (Zec 6:13; 9:5,7; 1:17; 3:8,9; 12:4);

(c) the habit of referring to a thought already introduced: e.g. to the "Branch" (Zec 3:8; 6:12); "eyes" (Zec 3:9; 4:10); measuring "line" (Zec 1:16; 2:5,6); choosing Jerusalem (Zec 1:17; 2:12; 3:2); removing iniquity (Zec 3:9; 5:3 ff; 13:2); measurements (Zec 5:2; 14:10); colors of horses (Zec 1:8; 6:2,6); the idea of Israel as a "flock" (Zec 9:16; 10:2; 11:4 f; 13:7); idols (Zec 10:2; 13:2); shepherds (Zec 11:3 ff; 13:7); and of "all nations" (Zec 11:10; 12:3 ff; 14:2); Mitchell in attempting to answer this argument has failed utterly to grasp the point (ICC, 243);

(d) the use made of the cardinal number "two"; thus, two olive trees (Zec 4:3); two women (Zec 5:9); two mountains (Zec 6:1); two staves (Zec 11:7); two parts (Zec 14:2,4); with which compare Zec 6:13; 9:12; 14:8;

(e) the resort in each part of the book to symbolic actions as a mode of instruction; e.g. the coronation scene in 6:9-15, and the breaking of the two staves in 11:4-14.

(3) Certain peculiarities of diction and style favor unity of authorship; e.g. the phrase "no man passed through nor returned" (Zec 7:14; 9:8) never occurs elsewhere in the Old Testament. The author’s preference for and frequent use of vocatives (Zec 2:7,10; 3:2,8; 4:7; 9:9,13; 11:1,2; 13:7); and especially the frequent alternation of the scriptio plena and the scriprio defectiva orthography in the Hebrew (compare Zec 1:2,5 with 1:4,6 and 8:14; 2:11 with 5:7; 1:11 with 7:7; 9:5 with 10:5,11; and 10:4 with 9:9).

Accordingly, we conclude,

(1) that Zechariah 9-14 are of post-exilic origin;

(2) that they are not, however, late post-exilic;

(3) that they had their origin in the period just before the completion of the temple, 516 BC, and

(4) that they were probably composed by Zechariah himself.

6. Conclusion:

This conclusion is based upon the text taken as a whole, without an arbitrary dissection of the prophecies in the interests of a false theory. Mitchell (ICC, 258-59), after eliminating numerous individual passages, arrives at the conclusion that Zechariah 9-14 were written by four different writers;

(1) Zec 9:1-10, soon after 333 BC;

(2) Zec 9:11-11:3, about 247-222 BC;

(3) Zec 11:4-17 and 13:7-9, between 217 and 204 BC; and

(4) Zec 12:1-13:6 and chapter 14, about the same time.

Tradition points to a saner and securer conclusion, that these oracles were written by Zechariah himself; which in turn is corroborated by internal evidence, as has been shown above. One wonders why these oracles, written so late in Israel's history, should have been appended by the collectors of the Canon to the genuine prophecies of Zechariah, if, as is alleged, that prophet had nothing whatever to do with them!

LITERATURE.

(1) Those Who Defend the Unity of the Book:

C. H. H. Wright, Zechariah and His Prophecies (Bampton Lectures), London, 1879; G. L. Robinson, The Prophecies of Zechariah, with Special Reference to the Origin and Date of Chapters 9-14, Leipzig Dissertation, reprinted from American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XII, 1896; W.H. Lowe, Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah, Hebrew and the Septuagint, London, 1882; O.J. Bredenkamp, Der Prophet Sach., Erklart, 1879; Marcus Dods, The Post-Exilian Prophets: Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi ("Handbook for Biblical Classes"), Edinburgh, 1879; E.B. Pusey, Minor Prophets, 1877; W. Drake, "Commentary on Zechariah" (Speaker's Commentary), 1876; T. W. Chambers, "The

Book of Zechariah" (Lange's Bible Work), 1874; A. Van Hoonacker, in Revue Biblique, 1902, 161 ff; idem, Les douze petits prophetes, 1908; Wm. Moeller, article "Zechariah" in The Illustrated Bible Dictionary, edited by W.C. Piercy, 1908.

(2) Those Who Advocate a Preexilic Origin for Zechariah 9-14:

Hitzig-Steiner, Die zwolf kleinen Propheten, 1881; Samuel Davidson, An Introduction to the Old Testament, 1862-63; W. Pressel, Commentar zu den Schriften der Propheten Haggai, Sacharja und Maleachi, 1870; C. A. Bruston, Histoire critique de la litterature prophetique des Hebreux, 1881; Samuel Sharpe, History of the Hebrew Nation, Literature and Chronology, 1882; G. von Orelll, Das Buch Ezechiel u. die zwolf kleinen Propheten, 1888; Ferd. Montet, Etude critique sur la date assignable aux six derniers chapitres de Zac, 1882; H. L. Strack, Einleitung in das Altes Testament, 1895; F. W. Farrar, Minor Prophets, in "Men of the Bible" series.

(3) Those Who Advocate a Post-Zecharian Origin for Zecharaih 9-14:

B. Stade, "Deuterozacharja, eine krit. Studie," in ZATW, 1881-82; T. K. Cheyne, "The Date of Zec 9-14," in JQR, I, 1889; C. H. Cornill, Einleitung in das Altes Testament, 1891; S. R. Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, 1910; J. Wellhausen, Die kleinen Propheten ubersetzt, 1893; N. I. Rubinkam, The Second Part of the Book of Zechariah, 1892; Karl Marti, Der Prophet Sacharja, 1892; A. F. Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the Prophets, 1892; R. Eckardt, "Der Sprachgebrauch von Zach 9-14," ZATW, 1893, 76-109; A. K. Kuiper, Zacharja 9-14; eine exegetischcritische Studie, 1894; J. W. Rothstein, Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja, 1910; G.A. Smith in Expositor's Bible, 1896-97; S. R. Driver In the New Century Bible; H. G. Mitchell, ICC, 1912.

George L. Robinson

ZECHER

ze'-ker (zakher, pausal form for zekher, "memorial"; the King James Version Zacher): In 1Ch 8:31 =" Zechariah" of 1Ch 9:37.

See ZECHARIAH, (5).

ZECHRIAS

zek-ri'-as (Codex Vaticanus (Zechrias, A and Fritzsche, Ezerias; the King James Version Ezerias): An ancestor of Ezra (1 Esdras 8:1) =" Azariah" of Ezr 7:1.

ZEDAD

ze’-dad (tsedhadhah, only found with He locale; Samaritan tseradhah; Septuagint Saradak, Sadadak, Saddak): A town or district named in Nu 34:8; Eze 47:15 as on the ideal northern boundary of Israel. The uncertainty of the reading has led to two different identifications being proposed. The form "Zerad" was accepted by yon Kasteren, and his identification was Khirbet Serada in the Merj ‘Ayun, West of the Hasbany branch of the Jordan and North of ‘Abil. This identification, however, would compel us to draw the ideal boundary along the Qasmiyeh valley and thence eastward to Hermon, and that is much too far South If with Dillmann, Wetzstein, Muehlau and others we read "Zedad," then it is clearly identical with Sadad, a village on the road between Ribleh and Qaryetain. It has been objected that Sadad is too far to the East; but here, as in the tribal boundaries also, the references are rather to the district or lands possessed than to their central town or village.

W. M. Christie

ZEDECHIAS

zed-e-ki’-as: 1 Esdras 1:46 the King James Version = the Revised Version (British and American) "Sedekias."

ZEDEKIAH (1)

zed-e-ki’-a (tsidhqiyahu, tsidhqiyah, "Yah my righteousness"; Sedekia, Sedekias):

(1) The son of Chenaanah (1Ki 22:11,24; 2Ch 18:10,23). Zedekiah was apparently the leader and spokesman of the 400 prophets attached to the court in Samaria whom Ahab summoned in response to Jehoshaphat’s request that a prophet of Yahweh should be consulted concerning the projected campaign against Ramoth-gilead. In order the better to impress his audience Zedekiah produced iron horns, and said to Ahab, "With these shalt thou push the Syrians, until they be consumed." He also endeavored to weaken the influence of Micaiah ben Imlah upon the kings by asking ironically, "Which way went the Spirit of Yahweh from me to speak unto thee?"

In Josephus (Ant., VIII, xv, 4) there is an interesting rearrangement and embellishment of the Biblical narrative. There Zedekiah is represented as arguing that since Micaiah contradicts Elijah’s prediction as to the place of Ahab’s death, he must be regarded as a false prophet. Then, smiting his opponent, he prayed that if he were in the wrong his right hand might forthwith be withered. Ahab, seeing that no harm befell the hand that had smitten Micaiah, was convinced; whereupon Zedekiah completed his triumph by the incident of the horns mentioned above.

(2) The son of Maaseiah (Jer 29:21-23). A false prophet who, in association with another, Ahab by name, prophesied among the exiles in Babylon, and foretold an early return from captivity. Jeremiah sternly denounced them, not only for their false and reckless predictions, but also for their foul and adulterous lives, and declared that their fate at the hands of Nebuchadnezzar should become proverbial in Israel.

(3) The son of Hananiah (Jer 36:12). One of the princes of Judah before whom Jeremiah’s roll was read in the 5th year of Jehoiakim.

(4) One of the officials who sealed the renewed covenant (Ne 10:1, the King James Version "Zid-kijah"). The fact that his name is coupled with Nehemiah’s suggests that he was a person of importance. But nothing further is known of him.

(5) The last king of Judah (see following article).

John A. Lees

ZEDEKIAH (2)

(tsidhqiyahu, "Yah my righteousness"; name changed from Mattaniah (mattanyah, "gift of Yah"; Sedekias):

I. SOURCES FOR HIS REGION AND TIME

1. Annalistic

2. Prophetic

II. THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAST KING OF JUDAH

1. The Situation

2. The Parvenu Temper

3. Inconsistencies

4. Character of the King

5. His Fate

6. Doom of the Nation

The last king of Judah, uncle and successor of Jehoiachin; reigned 11 years, from 597 to 586, and was carried captive to Babylon.

I. Sources for His Reign and Time.

1. Annalistic:

Neither of the accounts in 2Ki 24:18-25:7 and 2Ch 36:11-21 refers, as is the usual custom, to state annals; these ran out with the reign of Jehoiakim. The history in 2 Kings is purely scribal and historianic in tone; 2 Chronicles, especially as it goes on to the captivity, is more fervid and homiletic. Both have a common prophetic origin; and indeed Jeremiah 52, which is put as an appendix to the book of his prophecy, tells the story of the reign and subsequent events, much as does 2 Kings, but in somewhat fuller detail.

2. Prophetic:

Two prophets are watching with keen eyes the progress of this reign, both with the poignant sense that the end of the Judean state is imminent: Jeremiah in Jerusalem and Ezekiel, one of the captives in the deportation with Jehoiachin, in Babylon. Dates are supplied with the prophecies of both: Jeremiah's numbered from the beginning of the reign and not consecutive; Ezekiel's numbered from the beginning of the first captivity, and so coinciding with Jeremiah's. From these dated prophecies the principal ideas are to be formed of the real inwardness of the time and the character of the administration. The prophetic passages identifiable with this reign, counted by its years, are: Jeremiah 24, after the deportation of Jehoiachin (Jeconiah)—the inferior classes left with Zedekiah (compare Eze 11:15; 17:12-14); Jer 27-29, beginning of reign—false hopes of return of captives and futile diplomacies with neighboring nations; Jer 51:59, 4 th year—Zedekiah's visit to Babylon; Eze 4-7, 5 th year—symbolic prophecies of the coming end of Judah; Eze 8-12, 6 th year—quasi-clairvoyant view of the idolatrous corruptions in Jerusalem; Eze 17:11-21, same year—Zedekiah's treacherous intrigues with Egypt; Eze 21:18-23, 7 th year—Nebuchadnezzar casting a divination to determine his invasion of Judah; Jer 21, undated but soon after—deputation from the king to the prophet inquiring Yahweh's purpose; Jer 34:1-7, undated—the prophet's word to the king while Nebuchadnezzar's invasion is still among the cities of the land; Eze 24:1,2, 9 th year—telepathic awareness of the beginning of the siege, synchronistic with Jer 39:1-10; 2Ki 25:1-7; Jer 37; 38, undated, but soon after—prophecies connected with the temporary raising of the siege and the false faith of the ruling classes; Jer 32, 10 th year—Jeremiah's redemption of his Anathoth property in the midst of siege, and the good presage of the act; Jer 39, 11 th year—annalistic account of the breaching of the city wall and the flight and eventual fate of the king. A year and a half later Ezekiel (33:21,22) hears the news from a fugitive.

II. The Administration of the Last King of Judah.

1. The Situation:

When Nebuchadnezzar took away Jehoiachin, and with him all the men of weight and character (see under JEHOIACHIN), his object was plain: to leave a people so broken in resources and spirit that they would not be moved to rebellion (see Eze 17:14). But this measure of his effected a segmentation of the nation which the prophets immediately recognized as virtually separating out their spiritual "remnant" to

go to Babylon, while the worldly and inferior grades remained in Jerusalem. These are sharply distinguished from each other by Jeremiah in his parable of the Figs (chapter 24), published soon after the first deportation. The people that were left were probably of the same sort that Zephaniah described a few years before, those who had "settled on their lees" (1:12), a godless and inert element in religion and state. Their religious disposition is portrayed by Ezekiel in Zedekiah's 6th year, in his clairvoyant vision of the uncouth temple rites, as it were a cesspool of idolatry, maintained under the pretext that Yahweh had forsaken the land (see Eze 8). Clearly these were not of the prophetic stamp. It was over such an inferior grade of people that Zedekiah was appointed to a thankless and tragic reign.

2. The Parvenu Temper:

For a people so raw and inexperienced in administration the prophets recognized one clear duty: to keep the oath which they had given to Nebuchadnezzar (see Eze 17:14-16). But they acted like men intoxicated with new power; their accession to property and unwonted position turned their heads. Soon after the beginning of the reign we find Jeremiah giving emphatic warning both to his nation and the ambassadors of neighboring nations against a rebellious coalition (Jeremiah 27 mistakenly dated in the 4th year of Jehoiakim; compare 27:3,12); he has also an encounter with prophets who, in contradiction of his consistent message, predict the speedy restoration of Jehoiachin and the temple vessels. The king's visit to Babylon (Jer 51:59) was probably made to clear himself of complicity in treasonable plots. Their evil genius, Egypt, however, is busy with the too headstrong upstart rulers; and about the middle of the reign Zedekiah breaks his covenant with his over-lord and, relying on Egypt, embarks on rebellion. The prophetic view of this movement is, that it is a moral outrage; it is breaking a sworn word (Eze 17:15-19), and thus falsifying the truth of Yahweh.

3. Inconsistencies:

This act of rebellion against the king of Babylon was not the only despite done to "Yahweh's oath." Its immediate effect, of course, was to precipitate the invasion of the Chaldean forces, apparently from Riblah on the Orontes, where for several years Nebuchadnezzar had his headquarters. Ezekiel has a striking description of his approach, halting to determine by arrow divination whether to proceed against Judah or Ammon (21:18-23). Before laying siege to Jerusalem, however, he seems to have spent some time reducing outlying fortresses (compare Jer 34:1-7); and during the suspense of this time the king sent a deputation to Jeremiah to inquire whether Yahweh would not do "according to all his wondrous works," evidently hoping for some such miraculous deliverance as had taken place in the time of Sennacherib (Jer 21:1). The prophet gives his uniform answer, that the city must fall; advising the house of David also to "execute justice and righteousness." Setting about this counsel as if they would bribe Yahweh's favor, the king then entered into an agreement with his people to free all their Hebrew bond-slaves (Jer 34:8-10), and sent back a deputation to the prophet entreating his intercession (Jer 37:3), as if, having bribed Yahweh, they might work some kind of a charm on the divine will. Nebuchadnezzar had meanwhile invested the city; but just then the Egyptian army approached to aid Judah, and the Babylonian king raised the siege long enough to drive the Egyptians back to their own land; at which, judging that Yahweh had interfered as of old, the people caused their slaves to return to their bondage (Jer 34:11). This treachery called forth a trenchant prophecy from Jeremiah, predicting not only the

speedy return of the Chaldean army (Jer 37:6-10), but the captivity of the king and the destruction of the city (Jer 34:17-22). It was during this temporary cessation of the siege that Jeremiah, attempting to go to Anathoth to redeem his family property, was seized on the pretext of deserting to the enemy, and put in prison (Jer 37:11-15).

4. Character of the King:

During the siege, which was soon resumed, Zedekiah’s character, on its good and bad sides, was revealed through his frequent contact with the prophet Jeremiah. The latter was a prisoner most of the time; and the indignities which he suffered, and which the king heedlessly allowed, show how the prophet’s word and office had fallen in respect (compare the treatment he received, Jer 26:16-19 with 37:15; 38:6). The king, however, was not arrogant and heartless like his brother Jehoiakim; he was weak and without consistent principles; besides, he was rather helpless and timid in the hands of his headstrong officials (compare Jer 38:5,24-26). His regard for the word of prophecy was rather superstitious than religious: while the prophet’s message and counsel were uniformly consistent, he could not bring himself to follow the will of Yahweh, and seemed to think that Yahweh could somehow be persuaded to change his plans (see Jer 37:17; 38:14-16). His position was an exceedingly difficult one; but even so, he had not the firmness, the wisdom, the consistency for it.

In his siege of the city Nebuchadnezzar depended mainly on starving it into surrender; and we cannot withhold a measure of admiration for a body of defenders who, in spite of the steadily decreasing food supply and the ravages of pestilence, held the city for a year and a half.

5. His Fate:

During this time Jeremiah’s counsel was well known: the counsel of surrender, and the promise that so they could save their lives (Jer 21:9; 38:2). It was for this, indeed, that he was imprisoned, on the plea that he "weakened the hands" of the defenders; and it was due to the mercy of a foreign slave that he did not suffer death (Jer 38:7-9). At length in the 11th year of Zedekiah’s reign, just as the supply of food in the city was exhausted, the Chaldean army effected a breach in the wall, and the king of Babylon with his high officials came in and sat in the middle gate. Zedekiah and his men of war, seeing this, fled by night, taking the ill-advised route by the road to Jericho; were pursued and captured in the plains of the Jordan; and Zedekiah was brought before the king of Babylon at Riblah. After putting to death Zedekiah’s sons and the nobles of Judah before his eyes, the king of Babylon then put out the eyes of Zedekiah and carried him captive to Babylon, where, it is uncertain how long after, he died. Jeremiah had prophesied that he would die in peace and have a state mourning (Jer 34:4,5); Ezekiel’s prophecy of his doom is enigmatic: "I will bring him to Babylon to the land of the Chaldeans; yet shall he not see it, though he shall die there" (Eze 12:13).

6. Doom of the Nation:

The cruelly devised humiliation of the king was only an episode in the tragic doom of the city and

nation. Nebuchadnezzar was not minded to leave so stubborn and treacherous a fortress on his path of conquest toward Egypt. A month after the event at Riblah his deputy, Nebuzaradan, entered upon the reduction of the city: burning the temple and all the principal houses, breaking down the walls, carrying away the temple treasures still unpillaged, including the bronze work which was broken into scrap metal, and deporting the people who were left after the desperate resistance and those who had voluntarily surrendered. The religious and state officials were taken to Riblah and put to death. "So," the historian concludes, "Judah was carried away captive out of his land" (Jer 52:27). This was in 586 BC. This, however, was only the political date of the Babylonian exile, the retributive limit for those leavings of Israel who for 11 years had played an insincere game of administration and failed. The prophetic date, from which Ezekiel reckons the years of exile, and from which the prophetic eye is kept on the fortunes and character of the people who are to be redeemed, was 597 BC, when Jehoiachin's long imprisonment began and when the flower of Israel, transplanted to a foreign home, began its term of submission to the word and will of Yahweh. It was this saving element in Israel who still had a recognized king and a promised future. By both Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Zedekiah was regarded not as Yahweh's anointed but as the one whom Nebuchadnezzar "had made king" (Jer 37:1; Eze 17:16), "the king that sitteth upon the throne of David" (Jer 29:16). The real last king of Judah was Jehoiachin; Ezekiel's title for Zedekiah is "prince" (Eze 12:10).

John Franklin Genung

ZEEB

ze'-eb, zeb.

See OREB.

ZELA, ZELAH

ze'-la (tsela' (2Sa 21:14)): A city in the territory of Benjamin (Jos 18:28; the Septuagint here omits). Here was the burying-place of the family of Saul, whither the bones of the king and of Jonathan were brought for burial (2Sa 21:14; the Septuagint here reads en te pleura, translating tsela', "side"). The place is not identified. It may be the Zilu of the Tell el-Amarna Letters.

ZELEK

ze'-lek (tseleq, meaning unknown): An Ammonite, one of David's mighty men (2Sa 23:37; 1Ch 11:39).

ZELOPHEHAD

ze-lo'-fe-had (tslophchadh, meaning unknown): Head of a Manassite family who died without male issue (Nu 26:33; 27:1,7; 36:2,6,10,11; Jos 17:3; 1Ch 7:15). His daughters came to Moses and Eleazar

and successfully pleaded for a possession for themselves (Nu 27:1). This became the occasion for a law providing that in the case of a man dying without sons, the inheritance was to pass to his daughters if he had any. A further request is made (Nu 36:2) by the heads of the Gileadite houses that the women who were given this right of inheritance should be compelled to marry members of their own tribe, so that the tribe may not lose them and their property. This is granted and becomes law among the Hebrews.

Gray says (ICC on Nu 26:33) that the "daughters" of Zelophehad are towns or clans.

David Francis Roberts

ZELOTES

ze-lo’-tez (Zelotes).

See SIMON THE ZEALOT; ZEALOT.

ZELZAH

zel’-za (tseltsach; hallomenous megala): A place where Samuel told Saul he would meet two men with news that the asses were found. Its position is defined as "by Rachel’s sepulchre, in the border of Benjamin" (1Sa 10:2). It has been thought that the place of meeting was sufficiently indicated without the word betseltsach, which is translated "at Zelzah," and that this cannot therefore be a place-name. The Septuagint has "leaping mightily" or "in great haste" (Ewald) points to a different text. Whether the Greek can be so translated is also a question, as megala does not elsewhere occur as an adverb. Some corruption of the text is probable. The border of Benjamin may be roughly determined, but the tomb of Rachel is now unknown. No name like Zelzah has been recovered in the district. Smith ("Samuel," ICC, at the place) suggests that we should read "Zela" for "Zelzah" (tsela‘, for tseltsach).

W. Ewing

ZEMARAIM

zem-a-ra’-im (cemdrayim; Codex Vaticanus Sara; Codex Alexandrinus Semrim): A city in the territory of Benjamin. It is named between Betharabah and Bethel (Jos 18:22), and is probably to be sought East of the latter city. It is usual to identify it with es-Samra, a ruin about 4 miles North of Jericho. Mt. Zemaraim probably derived its name from the city, and must be sought in the neighborhood. On this height, which is said to be in Mt. Ephraim, Abijah, king of Judah, stood when making his appeal to the men of Israel under Jeroboam (2Ch 13:4). If the identification with es-Samra is correct, this hill must be in the uplands to the West, es-Samra being on the floor of the valley. Dillmann (Joshua, at the place) thinks Zemaraim cannot be so far East of Bethel, but may be found somewhere to the South of that town.

W. Ewing

ZEMARITE

zem’-a-rit (ha-tsemari; ho Samaraios): A Canaanite people named in Ge 10:18; 1Ch 1:16. The occurrence of the name between Arvadite and Hamathite gives a hint as to locality. A place called Cumur is mentioned in the Tell el-Amarna Letters along with Arvad. The name probably survives in that of Sumra, a village on the seacoast between Tripolis and Ruwad, about 1 1/2 miles North of Nahr el-Kebir. We may with some certainty identify this modern village with the site of the town from which the inhabitants were named "Zemarites."

ZEMIRAH

ze-mi’-ra (zemirah, meaning uncertain; Septuagint Codex Vaticanus Amarias; Codex Alexandrinus Zamarias; the King James Version Zemira): A descendant of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8), but more probably of Zebulun (Curtis, Chronicles, 145 ff).

ZENAN

ze’-nan.

See ZAANAN.

ZENAS

ze’-nas (Zenas (Tit 3:13); the name in full would probably be Zenodorus, literally, meaning "the gift of Zeus"):

1. A Jewish Lawyer:

Paul calls Zenas "the lawyer." The meaning of this is, that, previous to his becoming a Christian, he had been a Jewish lawyer. The lawyers were that class of Jewish teachers who were specially learned in the Mosaic Law, and who interpreted that Law, and taught it to the people.

They are met with again and again in the Gospels, where they frequently came into contact with Christ, usually in a manner hostile to Him. For example, "A certain lawyer stood up and made trial of him, saying, Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" (Lu 10:25). our Lord replied to him on his own ground, asking, "What is written in the law? how readest thou?" Regarding this class of teachers as a whole, it is recorded that "the Pharisees and lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God" (Lu 7:30). The term nomikos, "lawyer," applied to Zenas, is in the Gospels varied by nomodidakalos, "a

teacher of the law," and by grammateus, "a scribe": all three terms describe the same persons. Before his conversion to Christ, Zenas had been a lawyer, one of the recognized expounders of the Law of Moses.

A different view of Zenas' occupation is taken by Zahn (Introduction to the New Testament, II, 54), who says that in itself nomikos could denote a rabbi, quoting Ambrosiaster, "Because Zenas had been of this profession in the synagogue, Paul calls him by this name." But Zahn gives his own opinion that "since the Jewish scribe who became a Christian, by that very act separated himself from the rabbinic body, and since the retention of rabbinic methods and ways of thinking was anything but a recommendation in Paul's eyes (1Ti 1:7), Zenas is here characterized, not as legis (Mosaicae), doctor, but as juris peritus. The word denotes not an office, but usually the practical lawyer, through whose assistance e.g. a will is made, or a lawsuit carried on. Plutarch applies this name to the renowned jurist Mucius Scaevola."

The ordinary meaning seems preferable, which sees in Zenas one who previous to his conversion had been a Jewish rabbi.

2. Paul's Wishes regarding Zenas:

It is not certain where Paul was when he wrote the Epistle to Titus. But he directs Titus to come to him to Nicopolis, where he had resolved to spend the ensuing winter. And he adds the injunction that he desires him to "bring Zenas the lawyer and Apollos"—Paul's old friend from Alexandria—with him "on their journey diligently, that nothing be wanting unto them" (the King James Version). This may mean that Paul wished to have Zenas and Apollos with him at Nicopolis; but, on the other hand, it may not have this meaning. For the King James Version in translating "bring" is in error. The word signifies, as given in the Revised Version (British and American), "set forward" on their journey, that is, furnish them with all that they need for the journey. But even supposing Paul is not instructing Titus to bring Zenas and Apollos to Nicopolis—though this is perhaps what he means—yet it is most interesting to find these two friends of the apostle mentioned in this particular way, and especially at a time so near to the close of his life. Paul was unselfish as ever, solicitous that Zenas and Apollos be comfortably provided for on their intended journey. He is full of affectionate regard for them, interested in their welfare at every step; while he himself is far distant in another country, he remembers them with tender and sympathetic friendship. Doubtless the two friends reciprocated his affection.

Nothing more is known of Zenas than is contained in this passage.

John Rutherfurd

ZEND-AVESTA

zend-a-ves'-ta.

See PERSIAN RELIGION; ZOROASTRIANISM.

ZEPHANIAH

zef-a-ni’-a (tsephanyah, tsephanyahu, "Yah hath treasured"):

(1) The prophet.

See ZEPHANIAH, BOOK OF.

(2) A Levite or priest (1Ch 6:36 (Hebrew 6:21)), called in some genealogies "Uriel" (1Ch 6:24; 15:5,11).

(3) Judean father or fathers of various contemporaries of Zechariah, the prophet (Zec 6:10,14).

(4) A priest, the second in rank in the days of Jeremiah. He was a leader of the "patriotic" party which opposed Jeremiah. Nevertheless, he was sent to the prophet as a messenger of King Zedekiah when Nebuchadnezzar was about to attack the city (Jer 21:1) and at other crises (Jer 37:3; compare 29:25,29; 2Ki 25:18). That he continued to adhere to the policy of resistance against Babylonian authority is indicated by the fact that he was among the leaders of Israel taken by Nebuzaradan before the king of Babylon, and killed at Riblah (2Ki 25:18 parallel Jer 52:24).

Nathan Isaacs

ZEPHANIAH, APOCALYPSE OF

A (probably) Jewish apocryphal work of this name is mentioned in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and another list practically identical with this; a quotation from it is also preserved by Clement of Alexandria (Strom., v. 11,77). Dr. Charles thinks this indicates a Christian revision (Encyclopedia Brittanica, II, article "Apocalypse"); others suppose it to point to a Christian, rather than a Jewish, origin. See Schurer, HJP, div II, volume III, pp. 126-27, 132; GJV4, III, 367-69.

ZEPHANIAH, BOOK OF

I. THE AUTHOR

1. Name

2. Ancestry 3. Life

II. TIME

1. Date

2. Political Situation

3. Moral and Religious Conditions

III. BOOK

1. Contents

2. Integrity

IV. TEACHING

1. The Day of Yahweh

2. Universalism

3. Messianic Prophecy

LITERATURE

I. The Author.

1. Name:

The name "Zephaniah" (tsephanyah; Sophonias), which is borne by three other men mentioned in the Old Testament, means "Yah hides," or "Yah has hidden" or "treasured." "It suggests," says G. A. Smith, "the prophet’s birth in the killing time of Manasseh" (2Ki 21:16).

2. Ancestry:

The ancestry of the prophet is carried back four generations (Ze 1:1), which is unusual in the Old Testament (compare Isa 1:1; Ho 1:1); hence, it is thought, not without reason (Eiselen, Minor Prophets, 505), that the last-mentioned ancestor, Hezekiah, must have been a prominent man—indeed, no other than King Hezekiah of Judah, the contemporary of Isaiah and Micah. If Zephaniah was of royal blood, his condemnation of the royal princes (1:8) becomes of great interest. In a similar manner did Isaiah, who in all probability was of royal blood, condemn without hesitation the shortcomings and vices of the rulers and the court. An ancient tradition declares that Zephaniah was of the tribe of Simeon, which would make it impossible for him to be of royal blood; but the origin and value of this tradition are uncertain.

Zephaniah lived in Judah; that he lived in Jerusalem is made probable by the statement in 1:4, "I will cut

off .... from this place," as well as by his intimate knowledge of the topography of the city (1:10,11).

3. Life:

For how long he continued his prophetic activity we do not know, but it is not improbable that, as in the case of Amos, his public activity was short, and that, after delivering his message of judgment in connection with a great political crisis, he retired to private life, though his interest in reforms may have continued (2Ki 23:2).

II. Time.

1. Date:

The title (Ze 1:1) places the prophetic activity of Zephaniah somewhere within the reign of Josiah, that is, between 639 and 608 BC. Most scholars accept this statement as historically correct. The most important exception is E. Koenig (Einl, 252 ff), who places it in the decade following the death of Josiah. Koenig's arguments are altogether inconclusive, while all the internal evidence points toward the reign of Josiah as the period of Zephaniah's activity. Can the ministry of the prophet be more definitely located within the 31 years of Josiah? The latter's reign falls naturally into two parts, separated by the great reform of 621. Does the work of Zephaniah belong to the earlier or the later period?

The more important arguments in favor of the later period are:

(a) De 28:29,30 is quoted in Ze 1:13,15,17, in a manner which shows that the former book was well known, but according to the modern view, the Deuteronomic Code was not known until 621, because it was lost (2Ki 22:8).

(b) The "remnant of Baal" (Ze 1:4) points to a period when much of the Baal-worship had been removed, which means subsequent to 621.

(c) The condemnation of the "king's sons" (Ze 1:8) presupposes that at the time of the utterance they had reached the age of moral responsibility; this again points to the later period.

These arguments are inconclusive:

(a) The resemblances between Deuteronomy and Zephaniah are of such a general character that dependence of either passage on the other is improbable.

(b) The expression in Ze 1:4 bears an interpretation which made its use quite appropriate before 621 (Eiselen, Minor Prophets, 508).

(c) "King’s sons" may be equivalent to "royal princes," referring not to Josiah’s children at all. The last two objections lose all force if the Septuagint readings are accepted (Ze 1:4, "names of Baal"; 1:8, "house of the king").

On the other hand, there are several considerations pointing to the earlier date:

(a) The youth of the king would make it easy for the royal princes to go to the excesses condemned in Ze 1:8,9.

(b) The idolatrous practices condemned by Zephaniah (1:3-5) are precisely those abolished in 621.

(c) The temper described in Ze 1:12 is explicable before 621 and after the death of Josiah in 608, but not between 621 and 608, when religious enthusiasm was widespread.

(d) Only the earlier part of Josiah’s reign furnishes a suitable occasion for the prophecy.

Evidently at the time of its delivery an enemy was threatening the borders of Judah and of the surrounding nations. But the only foes of Judah during the latter part of the 7th century meeting all the conditions are the Scythians, who swept over Western Asia about 625 BC. At the time the prophecy was delivered their advance against Egypt seems to have been still in the future, but imminent (Ze 1:14); hence, the prophet’s activity may be placed between 630 and 625, perhaps in 626. If this date is correct, Zephaniah and Jeremiah began their ministries in the same year.

2. Political Situation:

Little can be said about the political conditions in Judah during the reign of Josiah, because the Biblical books are silent concerning them. Josiah seems to have remained loyal to his Assyrian lord to the very end, even when the latter’s prestige had begun to wane, and this loyalty cost him his life (2Ki 23:29). As already suggested, the advance of the Scythians furnished the occasion of the prophecy. Many questions concerning these Scythians remain still unanswered, but this much is clear, that they were a non-Semitic race of barbarians, which swept in great hordes over Western Asia during the 7th century BC (see SCYTHIANS). The prophet looked upon the Scythians as the executioners of the divine judgment upon his sinful countrymen and upon the surrounding nations; and he saw in the coming of the mysterious host the harbinger of the day of Yahweh.

3. Moral and Religious Conditions:

The Book of Zephaniah, the early discourses of Jeremiah, and 2Ki 21-23 furnish a vivid picture of the social, moral, and religious conditions in Judah at the time Zephaniah prophesied. Social injustice and moral corruption were widespread (3:1,3,7). Luxury and extravagance might be seen on every hand; fortunes were heaped up by oppressing the poor (1:8,9). The religious situation was equally bad. The reaction under Manasseh came near making an end of Yahweh-worship (2Ki 21). Amon followed in the

footsteps of his father, and the outlook was exceedingly dark when Josiah came to the throne. Fortunately the young king came under prophetic influence from the beginning, and soon undertook a religious reform, which reached its culmination in the 18th year of his reign. When Zephaniah preached, this reform was still in the future. The Baalim were still worshipped, and the high places were flourishing (1:4); the hosts of heaven were adored upon the housetops (1:5); a half-hearted Yahweh-worship, which in reality was idolatry, was widespread (1:5); great multitudes had turned entirely from following Yahweh (1:6). When the cruel Manasseh was allowed to sit undisturbed upon the throne for more than 50 years, many grew skeptical and questioned whether Yahweh was taking any interest in the affairs of the nation; they began to say in their hearts, "Yahweh will not do good, neither will he do evil" (1:12). Conditions could hardly be otherwise, when the religious leaders had become misleaders (3:4). The few who, amid the general corruption, remained faithful would be insufficient to avert the awful judgment upon the nation, though they themselves might be "hid in the day of Yahweh's anger" (2:3).

III. Book.

1. Contents:

The Book of Zephaniah falls naturally into two parts of unequal length. The first part (1:2-3:8) contains, almost exclusively, denunciations and threats; the second (3:9-20), a promise of salvation and glorification. The prophecy opens with the announcement of a world judgment (1:2,3), which will be particularly severe upon Judah and Jerusalem, because of idolatry (1:4-6). The ungodly nobles will suffer most, because they are the leaders in crime (1:8,9). The judgment is imminent (1:7); when it arrives there will be wailing on every hand (1:10,11). No one will escape, even the indifferent skeptics will be aroused (1:12,13). In the closing verses of chapter 1, the imminence and terribleness of the day of Yahweh are emphasized, from which there can be no escape, because Yahweh has determined to make a "terrible end of all them that dwell in the land" (1:14-18). A way of escape is offered to the meek; if they seek Yahweh, they may be "hid in the day of Yahweh" (2:1-3). Ze 2:4-15 contains threats upon 5 nations, Philistia (2:4-7), Moab and Ammon (2:8-11), Ethiopia (2:12), Assyria (2:13-15). In Ze 3:1 the prophet turns once more to Jerusalem. Leaders, both civil and religious, and people are hopelessly corrupt (3:1-4), and continue so in spite of Yahweh's many attempts to win the city back to purity (3:5-7); hence, the judgment which will involve all nations has become inevitable (3:8). A remnant of the nations and of Judah will escape and find rest and peace in Yahweh (3:9-13). The closing section (3:14-20) pictures the joy and exaltation of the redeemed daughter of Zion.

2. Integrity:

The authenticity of every verse in Zephaniah 2 and 3, and of several verses in chapter 1, has been questioned by one or more scholars, but the passages rejected or questioned with greatest persistency are 2:1-3,4-15 (especially 2:8-11); 3:9,10,14-20. The principal objection to 2:1-3 is the presence in 2:3 of the expressions "meek of the earth," and "seek meekness." It is claimed that "meek" and "meekness" as religious terms are post-exilic. There can be no question that the words occur more frequently in post-

exilic psalms and proverbs than in preexilic writings, but it cannot be proved, or even shown to be probable, that the words might not have been used in Zephaniah's day (compare Ex 10:3; Nu 12:3; Isa 2:9 ff; Mic 6:8). A second objection is seen in the difference of tone between these verses and Zephaniah 1. The latter, from beginning to end, speaks of the terrors of judgment; 2:1-3 weakens this by offering a way of escape. But surely, judgment cannot have been the last word of the prophets; in their thought, judgment always serves a disciplinary purpose. They are accustomed to offer hope to a remnant. Hence, 2:1-3 seems to form the necessary completion of chapter 1.

The objections against Zephaniah 2:4-15 as a whole are equally inconclusive. For 2:13-15, a date preceding the fall of Nineveh seems most suitable. The threat against Philistia (2:4-7) also is quite intelligible in the days of Zephaniah, for the Scythians passed right through the Philistine territory. If Ethiopia stands for Egypt, 2:12 can easily be accounted for as coming from Zephaniah, for the enemies who were going along the Mediterranean coast must inevitably reach Egypt. But if it is insisted upon that the reference is to Ethiopia proper, again no difficulty exists, for in speaking of a world judgment Zephaniah might mention Ethiopia as the representative of the far south. Against 2:8-11 the following objections are raised:

(a) Moab and Ammon were far removed from the route taken by the Scythians.

(b) The "reproaches" of 2:8,10 presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem (Eze 25:3,6,8).

(c) The attitude of the prophet toward Judah (Zech 2:9,10) is the exact opposite of that expressed in Zephaniah 1.

(d) The qinah meter, which predominates in the rest of the section, is absent from 2:8-11.

(e) Ze 2:12 is the natural continuation of 2:9.

These five arguments are by no means conclusive:

(a) The prophet is announcing a world judgment. Could this be executed by the Scythians if they confined themselves to the territory along the Mediterranean Sea?

(b) Is it true that the "reproaches" of 2:8,10 presuppose the destruction of Jerusalem?

(c) The promises in 2:7,8-10 are only to a remnant, which presupposes a judgment such as is announced in chapter 1.

(d) Have we a right to demand consistency in the use of a certain meter in oratory, and, if so, may not the apparent inconsistency be due to corruption of the text, or to a later expansion of an authentic oracle?

(e) Ze 2:8-11 can be said to interrupt the thought only if it is assumed that the prophet meant to

enumerate the nations in the order in which the Scythians naturally would reach their territory.

From Philistia they would naturally pass to Egypt. But is this assumption warranted? While the objections against the entire paragraph are inconclusive, it cannot be denied that 2:12 seems the natural continuation of 2:9, and since 2:10 and 11 differ in other respects from those preceding, suspicion of the originality of these two verses cannot be suppressed.

Ze 3:1-8 is so similar to chapter 1 that its originality cannot be seriously questioned, but 3:1-8 carry with them 3:9-13, which describe the purifying effects of the judgment announced in 3:1-8. The present text of 3:10 may be corrupt, but if properly emended there remains insufficient reason for questioning 3:10 and 11. The authenticity of 3:14-20 is more doubtful than that of any other section of Zephaniah. The buoyant tone of the passage forms a marked contrast to the somber, quiet strain of 3:11-13; the judgments upon Judah appear to be in the past; 3:18-20 seem to presuppose a scattering of the people of Judah, while the purifying judgment of 3:11-13 falls upon the people in their own land; hence, there is much justice in Davidson’s remark that "the historical situation presupposed is that of Isa 40 ff." On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that the passage is highly poetic, that it presents an ideal picture of the future, in the drawing of which imagination must have played some part, and it may be difficult to assert that the composition of this poem was entirely beyond the power of Zephaniah’s enlightened imagination. But while the bare possibility of Zephaniah’s authorship may be admitted, it is not impossible that 3:14-20 contains a "new song from God," added to the utterances of Zephaniah at a period subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem.

IV. Teaching.

The teaching of Zephaniah closely resembles that of the earlier prophetic books. Yahweh is the God of the universe, a God of righteousness and holiness, who expects of His worshippers a life in accord with His will. Israel are His chosen people, but on account of rebellion they must suffer severe punishment. Wholesale conversion seems out of the question, but a remnant may escape, to be exalted among the nations. He adds little, but attempts with much moral and spiritual fervor to impress upon his comtemporaries the fundamental truths of the religion of Yahweh. Only a few points deserve special mention.

1. The Day of Yahweh:

Earlier prophets had spoken of the day of Yahweh; Amos (5:18-20) had described it in language similar to that employed by Zephaniah; but the latter surpasses all his predecessors in the emphasis he places upon this terrible manifestation of Yahweh (see ESCHATOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT). His entire teaching centers around this day; and in the Book of Zephaniah we find the germs of the apocalyptic visions which become so common in later prophecies of an eschatological character. Concerning this day he says

(a) that it is a day of terror (1:15),

(b) it is imminent (1:14),

(c) it is a judgment for sin (1:17),

(d) it falls upon all creation (1:2,3; 2:4-15; 3:8),

(e) it is accompanied by great convulsions in Nature (1:15),

(f) a remnant of redeemed Hebrews and foreigners will escape from its terrors (Ze 2:3; 3:9-13).

2. Universalism:

The vision of the book is world-wide. The terrors of the day of Yahweh will fall upon all. In the same manner from all nations converts will be won to Yahweh (Ze 3:9,10). These will not be compelled to come to Jerusalem to worship Yahweh (Isa 2:2; Mic 4:1); they may worship Him "every one from his place" (Ze 2:11), which is a step in the direction of the utterance of Jesus in Joh 4:21.

3. Messianic Prophecy:

The Messianic King is not mentioned by Zephaniah. Though he draws a sublime picture of the glories of the Messianic age (Ze 3:14-20), there is not a word concerning the person of the Messianic King. Whatever is done is accomplished by Yahweh Himself.

LITERATURE.

Cornms. on the Minor Prophets by Ewald, Pusey, Keil, Orelli, G. A. Smith (Expositor’s Bible); Driver (New Century); Eiselen; A. B. Davidson, Commentary on Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah (Cambridge Bible); A. F. Kirkpatrick, Doctrine of the Prophets; Eiselen, Prophecy and the Prophets; F. W. Farrar, "Minor Prophets," Men of the Bible; S. R. Driver, Driver, Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament; Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible (five volumes), article "Zephaniah, Book of"; Encyclopedia Biblica, article "Zephaniah."

F. C. Eiselen

ZEPHATH

ze’-fath.

See HORMAH.

ZEPHATHAH, VALLEY OF

zef’-a-tha (ge’tsephathah; Septuagint kata borran, reading tsephoah, instead of tsephathah): This is the place where Asa met and defeated the Ethiopians under Zerah (2Ch 14:10). It is said to be at Mareshah. No name resembling this has been recovered there. Possibly, therefore, the Septuagint rendering is right, "in the ravine to the North of Mareshah." In that case the battle may have been fought in Wady el-‘Afranj.

ZEPHI; ZEPHO

ze’-fi, ze’-fo (tsephi, perhaps "gaze," or "gazing," in 1Ch 1:36; tspho, the same meaning in Ge 36:11,15): A duke of Edom. Septuagint has Sophar, which Skinner (Genesis, 431) says may be the original of Job’s kind friend. In Ge 36:43 the Septuagint has Zaphoei (= tsepho, i.e. Zepho), for Iram. Skinner holds it probable that the two names, Zepho and Iram, were in the original text, thus making the number 12 (compare Lagarde, Septuagint-Stud., II, 10, 1. 178; 37, 1. 270; Nestle, Margin., 12). Lucian has Sophar, in Ge 36:11,15; Sepphoue, in 1Ch 1:37, and Saphoin, in Ge 36:43.

David Francis Roberts

ZEPHON

ze’-fon.

See ZIPHION.

ZEPHONITES

ze’-fon-its, ze-fo’-nits (ha-tsphoni; ho Saphoni, Codex Alexandrinus omits): A family of Gadites descended from Zephon (Nu 26:15), who is called "Ziphion" in Ge 46:16.

ZER

zer, zer (tser; in Septuagint the verse (Jos 19:35) reads kai hai poleis teichereis ton Turion, which implies a Hebrew text with ha-tsurim, "Tyrians"; this must be an error): One of the fortified cities in Naphtali, named between Ziddim (ChaTTin) and Hammath (el-Chammeh, South of Tiberias). If the text is correct, it must have lain on the slopes West of the Sea of Galilee. It is not identified.

ZERAH

ze’-ra (zerach, meaning uncertain):

(1) In Ge 38:30; 46:12; Nu 26:20; Jos 7:1,18,24; 22:20; 1Ch 2:4,6; 9:6; Ne 11:24; Mt 1:3, younger twin-son of Judah and Tamar, and an ancestor of Achan. In Nu 26:20; Jos 7:17 f he is the head of the Zerahites (also 1Ch 27:11,13). the King James Version has "Zarah" in Ge 38:30; 46:12, and "Zarhites" for "Zerahites" in Numbers, Joshua and 1 Chronicles. See Curtis (Chronicles, 84 f) for identification of Ezrahite with Zerahite.

(2) Edomites:

(a) an Edomite chief (Ge 36:13,17; 1Ch 1:37);

(b) father of an Edomite king (Ge 36:33; 1Ch 1:44).

(3) Levites:

(a) 1Ch 6:21 (Hebrew verse 6);

(b) 1Ch 6:41 (Hebrew verse 26).

(4) Head of the Zerahites (Nu 26:13, the King James Version "Zarhites"; 1Ch 4:24). In Nu 26:13 =" Zohar" of Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15.

See ZOHAR, (2).

(5) Cushite king (2Ch 14:9). See the next article

David Francis Roberts

ZERAH (THE ETHIOPIAN)

(zerach ha-kushi (2Ch 14:9); Zare): A generation ago the entire story of Zerah’s conquest of Asa, coming as it did from a late source (2Ch 14:9-15), was regarded as "apocryphal": "If the incredibilities are deducted nothing at all is left" (Wellhausen, Prolegomena to the History of Israel, 207, 208); but most modern scholars, while accepting certain textual mistakes and making allowance for customary oriental hyperbole in description; accept this as an honest historical narrative, "nothing" in the Egyptian inscriptions being "inconsistent" with it (Nicol in BD; and compare Sayce, HCM, 362-64). The name "Zerah" is a "very likely corruption" of "Usarkon" (U-Serak-on), which it closely resembles (see Petrie, Egypt and Israel, 74), and most writers now identify Zerah with Usarkon II, though the Egyptian records of this particular era are deficient and some competent scholars still hold to Usarkon I (Wiedemann, Petrie, McCurdy, etc.). The publication by Naville (1891) of an inscription in which Usarkon II claims to have invaded "Lower and Upper Palestine" seemed to favor this Pharaoh as the victor over Asa; but the chronological question is difficult (Eighth Memoir of the Egyptian Exploration Fund, 51). The title

"the Cushite" (Hebrew) is hard to understand. There are several explanations possible.

(1) Wiedemann holds that this may refer to a real Ethiopian prince, who, though unrecorded in the monuments, may have been reigning at the Asa era. There is so little known from this era "that it is not beyond the bounds of probability for an Ethiopian invader to have made himself master of the Nile Valley for a time" (Geschichte von Alt-Aegypten, 155).

(2) Recently it has been the fashion to refer this term "Cushite" to some unknown ruler in South or North Arabia (Winckler, Cheyne, etc.). The term "Cushite" permits this, for although it ordinarily corresponds to ETHIOPIA (which see), yet sometimes it designates the tract of Arabia which must be passed over in order to reach Ethiopia (Jeremias, The Old Testament in the Light of Ancient East, I, 280) or perhaps a much larger district (see BD; EB; Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition; Winckler, KAT, etc.). This view, however, is forced to explain the geographical and racial terms in the narrative differently from the ordinary Biblical usage (see Cheyne, EB). Dr. W. M. Flinders Petrie points out that, according to the natural sense of the narrative, this army must have been Egyptian for

(a) after the defeat it fled toward Egypt, not eastward toward Arabia;

(b) the cities around Gerar (probably Egyptian towns on the frontier of Palestine), toward which they naturally fled when defeated, were plundered;

(c) the invaders were Cushim and Lubim (Libyans), and this could only be the case in an Egyptian army;
(d) Mareshah is a well-known town close to the Egyptian frontier (History of Egypt, III, 242-43; compare Konig, Funf neue arab. Landschaftsnamen im Altes Testament, 53-57).

(3) One of the Usarkons might be called a "Cushite" in an anticipatory sense, since in the next dynasty (XXIII) Egypt was ruled by Ethiopian kings.

Camden M. Cobern

ZERAHIAH

zer-a-hi’-a (zerachyah, "Yahweh hath risen" or "come forth"; the Septuagint has Zaraia, with variants):

(1) A priest of the line of Eleazar (1Ch 6:6,51; Ezr 7:4).

(2) A head of a family, who returned with Ezra from Babylon (Ezr 8:4).

ZERAHITES

ze’-ra-hits (ha-zarchi; Codex Vaticanus ho Zarai; Codex Alexandrinus ho Zaraei; the King James

Version Zarhites):

(1) A family of Simeonites (Nu 26:13).

(2) Descendants of Zerah, son of Judah (Nu 26:20). To this family Achan belonged (Jos 7:17), as did also two of David's captains (1Ch 27:11,13).

ZERED

ze'-red (zeredh; Codex Vaticanus Zaret; Codex Alexandrinus Zare; the King James Version, Zared (Nu 21:12)): This is the nachal or "torrent valley" given as the place where Israel encamped before they reached the Arnon (Nu 21:12). In De 2:13 f, the crossing of the brook Zered marks the end of the 38 years' desert wanderings. It has often been identified with Wady el-'Achsa, which runs up from the southeastern corner of the Dead Sea. A fatal objection to this is that the host had entered the wilderness to the East of Moab before they crossed the Zered (Nu 21:11), while Wady el-'Achsa must have formed the southern boundary of Moab. We may conclude with certainty that one of the confluents of Wady Kerak is intended, but which, it is impossible now to say.

W. Ewing

ZEREDAH; ZEREDATH; ZEREDATHA; ZERERAH; ZERERATH

zer'-e-da, zer'-e-dath, zer-e-da'-tha, zer'-e-ra, zer'-e-rath.

See ZARETHAN.

ZERESH

ze'-resh (zeresh, "gold," from the Persian; Sosara): The wife of Haman (Es 5:10,14; 6:13), the vizier of Xerxes.

ZERETH

ze'-reth (tsereth, meaning unknown): A Judahite (1Ch 4:7).

ZERETH-SHAHAR

ze'-reth-sha'-har (tsereth ha-shachar; Codex Vaticanus Sereda kai Seion, Codex Alexandrinus Sarth kai Sior): A town in the territory of Reuben, "in the mount of the valley," named with Kiriathaim and Sibmah (Jos 13:19). Perhaps in the name Chammat ec-Cara, attaching to the hot springs near Macherus, there may be some echo of the ancient name; but no identification is possible.

ZERI

ze’-ri (tseri, meaning unknown): "Son" of Jeduthun, and a temple musician (1Ch 25:3) =" Izri" of 1Ch 25:11, which should be read here.

See IZRI.

ZEROR

ze’-ror (tseror, meaning unknown; the Septuagint has Ared; Lucian has Sara): An ancestor of Kish and King Saul (1Sa 9:1).

See ZUR, (2).

ZERUAH

ze-roo’-a (tseru‘ah, perhaps "leprous"): Mother of King Jeroboam I (1Ki 11:26), the Septuagint, Codex Vaticanus and Lucian omit the name in 1Ki 11:26, but the long the Septuagint after Massoretic Text of 12:24 reads (12:24b): "And there was a man of the hill-country of Ephraim, a servant of Solomon, and his name was Jeroboam, and the name of his mother was Sareisa (Septuagint has Sareisa), a harlot."

See ZARETHAN.

ZERUBBABEL

ze-rub’-a-bel (zerubbabhel, probably a transliteration of the Babylonian name Zeru-Babili, "seed of Babylon"; Zorobabel):

1. Name:

Is commonly called the son of Shealtiel (Ezr 3:2,8; 5:2; Ne 12:1; Hag 1:1,12,14; Mt 1:12; Lu 3:27); but in 1Ch 3:19 he is called the son of Pedaiah, the brother apparently of Shealtiel (Salathiel) and the son or grandson of Jeconiah. It is probable that Shealtiel had no children and adopted Zerubbabel; or that Zerubbabel was his levirate son; or that, Shealtiel being childless, Zerubbabel succeeded to the rights of sonship as being the next of kin.

2. Family:

Whatever may have been his blood relationship to Jeconiah, the Scriptures teach that Zerubbabel was his legal successor, of the 3rd or 4th generation. According to 1Ch 3:19, he had one daughter, Shelomith, and seven sons, Meshullam, Hananiah, Hashubah, Ohel, Berechiah, Hasadiah and Jushab-hesed. In Mt

1:13 he is said to have been the father of Abiud (i.e. Abi-hud). As it is the custom in Arabia today to give a man a new name when his first son is born, so it may have been, in this case, that Meshullam was the father of Hud, and that his name was changed to Abiud as soon as his son was named Hud. In Lu 3:27, the son of Zerubbabel is called Rhesa. This is doubtless the title of the head of the captivity, the resh gelutha', and would be appropriate as a title of Meshullam in his capacity as the official representative of the captive Jews. That Zerubbabel is said in the New Testament to be the son of Shealtiel the son of Neri instead of Jeconiah may be accounted for on the supposition that Shealtiel was the legal heir or adopted son of Jeconiah, who according to Jer 36:30 was apparently to die childless.

3. Relation to Sheshbazzar:

It has been shown in the article on Sheshbazzar that he and Zerubbabel may possibly have been the same person and that the name may have been Shamash-ban (or bun)-zer-Babili-usur. It seems more probable, however, that Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah, was governor under Cyrus and that Zerubbabel was governor under Darius. The former, according to Ezr 1:8 and 5:14-16, laid the foundations, and the latter completed the building of the temple (Ezr 2:2,68; 4:2; Hag 1:14; Zec 4:9).

4. History:

All that is known certainly about Zerubbabel is found in the canonical books of Zechariah, Haggai and Ezra-Nehemiah. According to these he and Jeshua, the high priest, led up a band of captives from Babylon to Jerusalem and began rebuilding the temple in the second year of Darius Hystaspis. They first constructed the altar of burnt offerings, and afterward built a temple, usually called the Second Temple, much inferior in beauty to that of Solomon. According to Josephus and the apocryphal Book of Ezra (1 Esdras 3,4), Zerubbabel was a friend of Darius Hystaspis, having successfully competed before him in a contest whose object was to determine what was the strongest thing in the world—wine, kings, women, or truth. Zerubbabel, having demonstrated that truth was the mightiest of all, was called the king's "cousin," and was granted by him permission to go up to Jerusalem and to build the temple. Zerubbabel was also made a governor of Jerusalem, and performed also the duties of the tirshatha, an official who was probably the Persian collector of taxes.

See TIRSHATHA.

R. Dick Wilson

ZERUIAH

ze-roo-i'-a, ze-roo'-ya (tseruyah, tseruyah (2Sa 14:1; 16:10), meaning uncertain; Sarouia): In 2Sa 2:18; 17:25; 1Ch 2:16, and elsewhere where the names Joab, Abishai, occur. According to 1Ch 2:16 a sister of David and mother of Joab, Abishai and Asahel, the two former being always referred to as sons of Zeruiah. This latter fact is explained by some as pointing to a type of marriage by which the children belonged to their mother's clan (compare Abimelech, Jud 8:31; 9:1 ff); by others as being due to her

husband’s early death; and again as a proof of the mother in this case being the stronger personality. Either of the last two reasons may be the correct one, and plenty of parallels from the village names of boys today can be produced to illustrate both explanations. According to 2Sa 2:32, her husband was buried at Bethlehem. In 2Sa 17:25, "Abigal the daughter of Nahash" is said to be her sister.

See ABIGAIL.

David Francis Roberts

ZETHAM

ze’-tham (zetham, meaning unknown): A Gershonite Levite (1Ch 23:8; 26:22). In the second passage Curtis holds that "the sons of Jehieli" is a gloss; he points the Massoretic Text to read "brethren" instead of "brother," and so has "Jehiel (1Ch 26:22) and his brethren, Zetham and Joel, were over the treasures."

ZETHAN

ze’-than (zethan, perhaps "olive tree"): A Benjamite (1Ch 7:10), but Curtis holds that he is a Zebulunite (Chron., 145 ff).

ZETHAR

ze’-thar (zethar; Oppert, Esther, 25, compares Persian zaitar, "conqueror"; see BDB; Septuagint Abataza): A eunuch of Ahasuerus (Es 1:10).

ZEUS

zus (Zeus, the Revised Version margin; the Revised Version (British and American) and the King James Version Jupiter): The supreme god of Hellenic theology, "king of gods and of men." In 168 BC Antiochus Epiphanes, "who on God’s altars danced," bent upon the thorough Hellenization of Judea and Jerusalem, sent "an old man of Athens" (or "Geron an Athenian," the Revised Version margin) to pollute the sanctuary in the temple at Jerusalem and to call it by the name of Jupiter Olympius, and that at Gerizim by the name of Jupiter Xenius (2 Macc 6:1 ff). Olympius, from Mt. Olympus, the home of the gods, is the favorite epithet of Zeus, Zeus Olympius being to the Greek world what Jupiter Capitolinus was to the Roman. The same Antiochus commenced the splendid temple of Zeus Olympius, finished under Hadrian. Zeus is also frequently styled Xenius or "Protector of strangers" (Juppiter hospitalis) in classical literature. The epithet is here applied because the people of Gerizim—the Samaritans—were hospitable, probably an ironical statement of the author (compare Lu 9:52 f). Zeus is also in Ac 14:12 f the Revised Version margin for JUPITER (which see).

S. Angus

ZIA

zi’-a (zia‘, meaning uncertain): A Gadite, possibly the name of a Gadite clan (1Ch 5:13).

ZIBA

zi’-ba (tsibha’, tsibha’ (2Sa 16:4 a), meaning unknown; Seiba): A former servant or probably dependent of Saul’s house (2Sa 9:1), who was brought to David when the king inquired if there was not a member of Saul’s family that he could show kindness to (compare David’s oath to Jonathan in 1Sa 20:14 ff). Ziba tells David of Mephibosheth (Meribbaal), Jonathan’s son, who is thereupon taken to the king from Lodebar, East of the Jordan, and given Saul’s estate. Ziba is also bidden to till the land and bring in its produce, and "it shall be food for thy master’s son," according to Massoretic Text in 2Sa 9:10 b; but the Septuagint and Lucian have a better reading, "thy master’s household." Mephibosheth himself is to eat at David’s table. Ziba is to be assisted in this by his sons and servants; he had 15 sons and 20 servants (9:10).

When David has to leave Jerusalem at the time of Absalom’s revolt, Ziba (2Sa 16:1-4) takes two asses for members of the king’s household to ride on, and 200 loaves and 100 clusters of raisins as provisions for the youths. When asked where Mephibosheth is, he accuses his master of remaining behind purposely in hopes that his father’s kingdom would be restored to him. David then confers upon Ziba his master’s estate.

After Absalom’s death, David sets out to return to Jerusalem from Mahanaim, East of Jordan. Ziba with his sons and servants, as we are told in a parenthesis in 2Sa 19:17,18 a (Hebrew verses 18,19a), by means of a ferry-boat goes backward and forward over Jordan, and thus enables the king’s household to cross. But he has wrongly accused his master of treacherous lukewarmness toward David, for Mephibosheth meets the king on his return journey to Jerusalem (2Sa 19:24-30 (Hebrew verses 25-31)) with signs of grief. When he is asked why he had not joined the king at the time of the latter’s flight, he answers that Ziba deceived him, "for thy servant said to him, Saddle me (so read in 2Sa 19:26 (Hebrew text, verse 27) with Septuagint and Syriac for Massoretic Text ‘I will have saddled me’) the ass." He then accuses Ziba of falsehood, and David divides the estate between the two, although Mephibosheth is quite willing that Ziba should retain the whole of it.

David Francis Roberts

ZIBEON

zib’-e-on (tsibh‘on, "hyena"; HPN, 95; Sebegon): A Horite chief (Ge 36:2,14,20,24,29; 1Ch 1:38,40); he is called the "Hivite" in Ge 36:2 where "Horite" should be read with 36:20,29. In Ge 36:2,14 Anah is said to be "the daughter of Zibeon," whereas the Septuagint, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Syriac, and Lucian have "the son of Zibeon"; compare 1Ch 1:38,40, where also Anah is Zibeon’s son.

ZIBIA

zib’-i-a (tsibhya’, perhaps "gazelle"): A Benjamite (1Ch 8:9).

ZIBIAH

zib’-i-a (tsibhyah, probably "gazelle"): A woman of Beersheba, mother of King Jehoash (Joash) of Judah (2Ki 12:1 (Hebrew verse 2); 2Ch 24:1. Codex Alexandrinus and Codex Vaticanus have Abia).

ZICHRI

zik’-ri (zikhri, meaning uncertain):

(1) Levites:

(a) grandson of Kohath (Ex 6:21, where some the King James Version editions read wrongly, "Zithri");

(b) an Asaphite (1Ch 9:15), called "Zabdi" in Ne 11:17, where the Septuagint’s Codex Alexandrinus has Zechri = Zichri, but the Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus other names; see ZABDI, (4);

(c) a descendant of Eliezer (1Ch 26:25).

(2) Benjamites:

(a) 1Ch 8:19;

(b) 1Ch 8:23;

(c) 1Ch 8:27;

(d) Ne 11:9.

(3) Father of Eliezer, who was one of David’s tribal princes (1Ch 27:16).

(4) Father of Amasiah, "who willingly offered himself unto Yahweh" (2Ch 17:16).

(5) Father of Elishaphat, a captain in Jehoiada’s time (2Ch 23:1).

(6) "A mighty man of Ephraim," who when fighting under Pekah slew the son of Ahaz, the king of

Judah (2Ch 28:7).

(7) A priest in the days of Joiakim (Ne 12:17); the section, Ne 12:14-21, is omitted by the Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus with the exception of "of Maluchi" (12:14); Lucian has Zacharias.

David Francis Roberts

ZID-KIJAH

zid-ki'-ja.

See ZEDEKIAH, 5.

ZIDDIM

zid'-im (ha-tsiddim; Codex Vaticanus ton Turion; Codex Alexandrinus omits): A fortified city in Naphtali (Jos 19:35), probably represented by the modern Chattin, about 5 miles Northwest of Tiberias, in the opening of the gorge that breaks down seaward North of Qurun Chattin, the traditional Mount of Beatitudes.

ZIDON; ZIDONIANS

zi'-don, zi-do'-ni-anz.

See SIDON, SIDONIANS.

ZIF

zif.

See ZIV.

ZIHA

zi'-ha (tsicha', tsicha' (Ne 7:46), meaning unknown): An overseer of Nethinim (Ne 11:21) who are called (Ezr 2:43; Ne 7:46) "the children (or sons) of Ziha." The Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus and Alexandrinus omit Ne 11:20 f; the Septuagint has Sial, Lucian Siaau; in Ne 7:46; the Septuagint Codex Vaticanus Sea; Codex Alexandrinus has Oiaa; Lucian has Soulai; in Ezr 2:43 the Septuagint's Codex Vaticanus has Southia; Codex Alexandrinus has Souaa; Lucian has Souddaei.

ZIKLAG

zik’-lag (tsiqelagh, tsiqelagh (2Sa 1:1), tsiqelagh (1Ch 12:1,20); usually in the Septuagint Sekelak, or Sikelag): A town assigned (Jos 19:5; 1Ch 4:30) to Simeon, but in Jos 15:31 named, between Hornah and Madmannah, as one of the cities of the Negeb of Judah, "toward the border of Edom." It is said (1Sa 27:6) to have remained a royal city. In Ne 11:28 it is in the list of towns reinhabited by the returning children of Judah. Its chief associations are with David. Achish the Philistine king of Gath gave it to David as a residence (1Sa 27:6 f; 1Ch 12:1,20); it was raided by the Amalekites, on whom David took vengeance and so recovered his property (1Sa 30:14,26); here the messenger who came to announce Saul’s death was slain (2Sa 1:1; 4:10).

The site of this important place is not yet fixed with certainty; Conder proposed Zucheilika, a ruin 11 miles South-Southeast of Gaza, and 4 miles North of Wady es-Sheri’a, which may be the "Brook Besor" (1Sa 30:9,10,21); Rowland (1842) proposed ‘Asluj, a heap of ruins South of Beersheba and 7 miles to the East of Bered. Neither site is entirely satisfactory. See Williams, Holy City, I, 463-68; BR, II, 201, PEF, 288, Sh XX.

E. W. G. Masterman

ZILLAH

zil’-a (tsillah; Sella): One of Lamech’s wives (Ge 4:19,22,23). The name is perhaps connected with tsel, "shadow."

ZILLETHAI

zil’-e-thi, zil-e’-tha-i (tsillethay, meaning uncertain; the King James Version Zilthai):

(1) A Benjamite (1Ch 8:20).

(2) A Manassite who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:20 (Hebrew verse 21)).

ZILPAH

zil’-pa (zilpah, meaning uncertain; Zelpha): The ancestress of Gad and Asher (Ge 30:10,12; 35:26; 46:18), a slave girl of Leah’s, given her by Laban (Ge 29:24; 30:9). In Eze 48 the Zilpah tribes have the 5th division toward the South of Palestine and the 6th to the North, a slightly more favorable position than that of the Bilhah tribes.

ZILTHAI

zil’-thi, zil’-tha-i.

See ZILLETHAI.

ZIMMAH

zim’-a (zimmah, perhaps "device," "plan"): A Gershonite Levite (1Ch 6:20 (Hebrew, verse 5); also in 6:42 (Hebrew verse 27); 2Ch 29:12). See Curtis, Chronicles, 130, 134 ff.

ZIMRAN

zim’-ran (zimran, from zemer, "wild sheep" or "wild goat," the ending -an being gentilic; Skinner, Genesis, 350): Son of Abraham and Keturah (Ge 25:2; 1Ch 1:32). The various manuscripts of the Septuagint give the name in different forms, e.g. in Ge A, Zebran; Codex Sinaiticus Zemran; Codex Alexandrinus(1) Zembram; D(sil) Zombran; and Lucian Zemran; in Chronicles, Codex Vaticanus has Zembran, Codex Alexandrinus Zemran, Lucian Zemran (compare Brooke and McLean’s edition of the Septuagint for Genesis).

Hence, some have connected the name with Zabram of Ptol. vi.7,5, West of Mecca; others with the Zamareni of Pliny (Ant. vi.158) in the interior of Arabia; but according to Skinner and E. Meyer (see Gunkel, Gen3, 261) these would be too far south. Curtis (Chronicles, 72) says the name is probably to be identified with the "Zimri" of Jer 25:25. It would then be the name of a clan, with the mountain sheep or goat as its totem.

See TOTEMISM.

David Francis Roberts

ZIMRI (1)

zim’-ri (zimri, "wild sheep" or "wild goat"; in 1 Maccabees, with the King James Version, has Zambri; Codex Sinaiticus has Zambrei):

(1) A Simeonite prince (Nu 25:14; 1 Macc 2:26), slain by Phinehas, Aaron’s grandson. Nu 25:1-5 records how the Israelites, while they were at Shittim, began to consort with Moabite women and "they (i.e. the Moabite women) called the people unto the sacrifices of their gods" (25:2), i.e. as explained by 25:5 to take part in the immoral rites of the god Baal-peor. Moses is bidden to have the offenders punished. The next paragraph (25:6-9) relates how the people engage in public mourning; but while they do this Zimri brings in among his brethren a Midianitess. Phinehas sees this and goes after Zimri into the qubbah, where he slays the two together, and thus the plague is stayed (25:6-9).

The connection between these two paragraphs is difficult; Moabite women are mentioned in the first, a Midianitess in the second; the plague of Nu 25:8 f is not previously referred to, although it seems clear that the plague is the cause of the weeping in 25:6. The sequel, 25:16-18, makes the second paragraph have something to do with Baal-peor. Critics assign 25:1-5 to J-E, 25:6-18 to P.

It seems, however, that the two accounts refer to similar circumstances. This is evident if the meaning of qubbah in Nu 25:8 be as the Vulgate (Jerome's Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) renders it, lupinar, "a house of ill-repute." The difficulty is that the word only occurs here in the Old Testament, but it has that meaning in New Heb (see Gray, Nu, 385; BDB, however, translates it "a large vaulted tent." While one narrative says the women were Moabitesses and the other Midianitesses, the latter section presupposes something like the account in the former; and the point is that Zimri, at the very time that the rest of the people publicly mourned because of a plague that was due to their own dealings with foreign women, brought a Midianite woman among the people, possibly to be his wife, for he was a prince or chief, and she was the daughter of a Midianite chief. It may be urged that if this be the case, there was nothing wrong in it; but according to Hebrew ideas there was, and we only need to remember the evil influence of such marriages as those entered into by Solomon, or especially that of Ahab with Jezebel, to see at any rate a Hebrew justification for Zimri's death.

Numbers 31 describes the extermination of the Midianites at the bidding of Moses. All the males are slain by the Israelites (31:7), but the women are spared. Moses is angry at this: "Have ye saved all the women alive? Behold, these caused the children of Israel, through the counsel of Balaam, to commit trespass against Yahweh in the matter of Peor, and so the plague was among the congregation of Yahweh" (31:15 f). Here we find, although the chapter is a Midrash (see Gray, Numbers, 417 ff), that the Hebrews themselves connected the two events of Numbers 25, but in addition the name of Balaam is also introduced, as again in 31:8, where he is said to have been slain along with the kings of Midian. See further De 4:3, and Driver's note on the verse.

See BAAL-PEOR; BALAAM; PEOR.

(2) A king of Israel (1Ki 16:8-20). See special article.

(3) A Judahite "son" of Zerah (1Ch 2:6) =" Zabdi" of Jos 7:1,17 f.

See ZABDI, (1).

(4) A Benjamite, descendant of King Saul (1Ch 8:36; 9:42).

(5) In Jer 25:25, where "all the kings of Zimri" are mentioned along with those of Arabia (25:24) and Elam and the Medes. The name is as yet unidentified, although thought to be that of a people called ZIMRAN (which see) in Ge 25:2.

David Francis Roberts

ZIMRI (2)

(zimri; Septuagint Zambrei, Zambri): The 5th king of Israel, but who occupied the throne only seven days (1Ki 16:9-20). Zimri had been captain of half the chariots under Elah, and, as it seems, made use of his position to conspire against his master. The occasion for his crime was furnished by the absence of the army, which, under the direction of Omri, was engaged in the siege of the Philistine town Gibbethon. While Elah was in a drunken debauch in the house of his steward Arza, who may have been an accomplice in the plot, he was foully murdered by Zimri, who ascended the throne and put the remnant of Elah's family to death, thus fulfilling the prophecy of Jehu concerning the house of Baasha. However, the conspiracy lacked the support of the people, for word of the crime no sooner reached Gibbethon, than the army raised Omri to the throne of Israel. Omri at once hastened to Tirzah and captured the place, which as it seems offered little resistance. Zimri resolved to die as king, and accordingly set fire to the palace with his own hands, and perished in the flames that he had kindled. Thus came to an ignominious end the short reign which remained as a blot even upon the blood-stained record of the deeds of violence that ushered in the change of dynasties in the Northern Kingdom, for the foul crime was abhorred even among arch plotters. When Jehu entered Jezreel he was met with Jezebel's bitter taunt, "Is it peace, thou Zimri, thy master's murderer?" (2Ki 9:31). The historian too, in the closing formula of the reign, specially mentions "his treason that he worked."

S. K. Mosiman

ZIN zin (tsin; Sin):

(1) A town in the extreme South of Judah, on the line separating that province from Edom, named between the ascent of Akrabbim and Kadesh-barnea (Nu 34:4; Jos 15:3). It must have lain somewhere between Wady el-Fiqra (the ascent of Akrabbim?) and 'Ain Qadis (Kadesh-barnea); but the site has not been recovered.

(2) The Wilderness of Zin is the tract deriving its name from the town (Nu 34:3). It is identified with the wilderness of Kadesh in Nu 33:36; while in other places Kadesh is said to be in the wilderness of Zin (Nu 20:1; 27:14; De 32:51). We may take it that the two names refer to the same region. The spies, who set out from Kadesh-barnea, explored the land from the wilderness of Zin northward (Nu 13:21; compare 32:8). It bordered with Judah "at the uttermost part of the south" (Jos 15:1). In this wilderness Moses committed the offense which cost him his hope of entering the promised land (Nu 27:14; De 32:51). It is identical with the uplands lying to the North and Northwest of the wilderness of Paran, now occupied by the 'Azazimeh Arabs.

W. Ewing

ZINA

zi’-na.

See ZIZAH.

ZION

zi’-on (tsiyon; Sion):

1. Meaning of the Word

2. The Zion of the Jebusites

3. Zion of the Prophets

4. Zion in Later Poetical Writings and Apocrypha

5. Omission of Name by Some Writers

6. The Name "Zion" in Christian Times

LITERATURE

1. Meaning of the Word:

A name applied to Jerusalem, or to certain parts of it, at least since the time of David. Nothing certain is known of the meaning. Gesenius and others have derived it from a Hebrew root tsahah, "to be dry"; Delitzsch from tsiwwah, "to set up" and Wetzstein from tsin, "to protect." Gesenius finds a more hopeful suggestion in the Arabic equivalent cihw, the Arabic cahwat signifying "ridge of a mountain" or "citadel," which at any rate suitably applies to what we know to have been the original Zion (compare Smith, HGHL, under the word).

Considerable confusion has been caused in the past by the want of clear understanding regarding the different sites which have respectively been called "Zion" during the centuries. It will make matters clearer if we take the application of the name: in David’s time; in the early Prophets, etc.; in late poetical writings and in the Apocrypha; and in Christian times.

2. The Zion of the Jebusites:

Jerus (in the form Uru-sa-lim) is the oldest name we know for this city; it goes back at least 400 years before David. In 2Sa 5:6-9, "The king and his men went to Jerusalem against the Jebusites. .... Nevertheless David took the stronghold of Zion; the same is the city of David .... And David dwelt in the

stronghold, and called it the city of David." It is evident that Zion was the name of the citadel of the Jebusite city of Jerusalem. That this citadel and incidentally then city of Jerusalem around it were on the long ridge running South of the Temple (called the southeastern hill in the article JERUSALEM, III, (3) (which see)) is now accepted by almost all modern scholars, mainly on the following grounds:

(1) The near proximity of the site to the only known spring, now the "Virgin's Fount," once called GIHON (which see). From our knowledge of other ancient sites all over Palestine, as well as on grounds of common-sense, it is hardly possible to believe that the early inhabitants of this site with such an abundant source at their very doors could have made any other spot their headquarters.

(2) The suitability of the site for defense.—The sites suited for settlement in early Canaanite times were all, if we may judge from a number of them now known, of this nature—a rocky spur isolated on three sides by steep valleys, and, in many sites, protected at the end where they join the main mountain ridge by either a valley or a rocky spur.

(3) The size of the ridge, though very small to our modern ideas, is far more in keeping with what we know of fortified towns of that period than such an area as presented by the southwestern hill—the traditional site of Zion. Mr. Macalister found by actual excavation that the great walls of Gezer, which must have been contemporaneous with the Jebusite Jerusalem, measured approximately 4,500 feet in circumference. G. A. Smith has calculated that a line of wall carried along the known and inferred scarps around the edge of this southeastern hill would have an approximate circumference of 4,250 feet. The suitability of the site to a fortified city like Gezer, Megiddo, Soco, and other sites which have been excavated, strikes anyone familiar with these places.

(4) The archaeological remains on these hills found by Warren and Professor Guthe, and more particularly in the recent excavations of Captain Parker (see JERUSALEM), show without doubt that this was the earliest settlement in pre-Israelite times. Extensive curves and rock-cuttings, cave-dwellings and tombs, and enormous quantities of early "Amorite" (what may be popularly called "Jebusite") pottery show that the spot must have been inhabited many centuries before the time of David. The reverse is equally true; on no other part of the Jerusalem site has any quantity of such early pottery been found.

(5) The Bible evidence that Zion originally occupied this site is clear. It will be found more in detail under the heading "City of David" in the article JERUSALEM, IV, (5), but three points may be mentioned here:

(a) The Ark of the Covenant was brought up out of the city of David to the Temple (1Ki 8:1; 2Ch 5:2), and Pharaoh's daughter "came up out of the city of David unto her house which Solomon had built for her"—adjacent to the Temple (1Ki 9:24). This expression "up" could not be used of any other hill than of the lower-lying eastern ridge; to go from the southwestern hill (traditional Zion) to the Temple is to go down.

(b) Hezekiah constructed the well-known Siloam tunnel from Gihon to the Pool of Siloam. He is described (2Ch 32:30) as bringing the waters of Gihon "straight down on the west side of the city of David."

(c) Manasseh (2Ch 33:14) built "an outer wall to the city of David, on the west side of Gihon, in the valley" (i.e. nachal—the name of the Kedron valley).

3. Zion of the Prophets:

Zion, renamed the City of David, then originally was on this eastern ridge. But the name did not stay there. It would almost seem as if the name was extended to the Temple site when the ark was carried there, for in the pre-exilic Prophets the references to Zion all appear to have referred to the Temple Hill. To quote a few examples: "And Yahweh will create over the whole habitation of mount Zion, and over her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night" (Isa 4:5); "Yahweh of hosts, who dwelleth in mount Zion" (Isa 8:18); "Let us go up to Zion unto Yahweh our God" (Jer 31:6); "Yahweh will reign over them in mount Zion" (Mic 4:7). All these, and numbers more, clearly show that at that time Zion was the Temple Hill.

4. Zion in Later Poetical Writings and Apocrypha:

In many of the later writings, particularly poetical references, Zion appears to be the equivalent of Jerusalem; either in parallelism (Ps 102:21; Am 1:2; Mic 3:10,12; Zec 1:14,17; 8:3; Ze 3:16) or alone (Jer 3:14; La 5:11); even here many of the references will do equally well for the Temple Hill. The term "Daughter of zion" is applied to the captive Jews (La 4:22), but in other references to the people of Jerusalem (Isa 1:8; 52:2; Jer 4:31, etc.). When we come to the Apocrypha, in 2 Esdras there are several references in which Zion is used for the captive people of Judah (2:40; 3:2,31; 10:20,39,44), but "Mount Zion" in this and other books (e.g. 1 Macc 4:37,60; 5:54; 6:48,62, etc.) is always the Temple Hill.

5. Omission of Name by Some Writers:

It has been pointed out as a curious and unaccountable exception that in Ezekiel as well as in Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, there is no mention of Zion, except the incidental reference to David’s capture of the Jebusite fort. The references in the other Prophets and the Psalms are so copious that there must be some religious reason for this. The Chronicler (2Ch 3:1), too, alone refers to the Temple as on Mount Moriah. It is also noticeable that only in these books (2Ch 27:3; 33:14; Ne 3:26 f; 11:21) does the name "Ophel" appear as a designation of a part of the southeastern hill, which apparently might equally fitly have been termed Zion. See OPHEL. Josephus never uses the name "Zion" nor does it occur in the New Testament, except in two quotations (Heb 12:22; Re 14:1).

6. The Name "Zion" in Christian Times:

Among the earlier Christian writers who mention "Zion," Origen used it as equivalent to the Temple

Hill, but in the 4th century writers commence to localize it up the southern part of the western hill. It was a period when Biblical topography was settled in a very arbitrary manner, without any scientific or critical examination of the evidence, and this tradition once established remained, like many such traditions, undisputed until very recent years. To W. F. Birch belongs much of the credit for the promulgation of the newer views which now receive the adherence of almost every living authority on the topography of Jerusalem.

LITERATURE.

See especially chapter vi in Smith's Jerusalem; for a defense of the older view see Kuemmel, Materialien z. Topog. des alt. Jerusalem.

E. W. G. Masterman

ZIOR

zi'-or (tsi'or; Sorth, or Sior): A town in the hill country of Judah (Jos 15:54); probably Si'air, 4 1/2 miles North-Northeast of Hebron where the Mukam 'Aisa (Tomb of Esau) is now shown. It is a considerable village surrounded by cultivated land; a spring exists in the neighborhood; there are rock-cut tombs showing it is an ancient site (PEF, III, 309, Sh XXI).

ZIPH (1)

zif (ziph; Ozeib, or Ziph):

(1) A town in the hill country of Judah, mentioned along with Maon, Carmel and Jutah (Jos 15:55). It is chiefly celebrated in connection with the earlier history of David: "David .... remained in the hill-country in the wilderness of Ziph" (1Sa 23:14,15,24; 26:2); the Ziphites (1Sa 23:19; 26:1; compare Ps 54 title) sought to betray him to Saul, but David escaped. Ziph was fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:8). The name also occurs in 1Ch 2:42; 4:16. In connection with this last (compare 4:23) it is noticeable that Ziph is one of the four names occurring on the Hebrew stamped jar handles with the added la-melekh, "to the king."

The site is Tell Zif, 4 miles Southeast of Hebron, conspicuous hill 2,882 ft. above sea-level; there are cisterns and, to the East, some ruins (PEF, III, 312, 315).

(2) A town in the Negeb of Judah (Jos 15:24), site unknown.

E. W. G. Masterman

ZIPH (2)

(ziph, meaning unknown):

(1) A grandson of Caleb (1Ch 2:42); the Septuagint has Zeiph.

(2) A son of Jehallelel (1Ch 4:16). In the Septuagint's Codex Alexandrinus reads Ziphai, but Codex Vaticanus has the totally different form Ameachei.

ZIPHAH

zi'-fa (ziphah, a feminine form of "Ziph"): A Judahite, "son" of Jehallelel. The name being feminine may be a dittography of the previous Ziph (1Ch 4:16).

ZIPHIMS

zif'-imz: In title of Ps 54 the King James Version for the Revised Version (British and American) ZIPHITES (which see).

ZIPHION

zif'-i-on (tsiphyon, "gaze" (?)(BDB)): A "son" of Gad (Ge 46:16) =" Zephon" of Nu 26:15.

See ZAPHON; ZEPHONITES.

ZIPHITES

zif'-its.

See ZIPH.

ZIPHRON

zif'-ron.

See SIBRAIM.

ZIPPOR

zip'-or (tsippor; in Nu 22:4; 23:18; tsippor, "bird," "swallow" (HPN, 94)): Father of Balak, king of Moab (Nu 22:2,10,16; Jos 24:9; Jud 11:25).

ZIPPORAH

zi-po’-ra, zip’-o-ra (tsipporah; Sepphora): The Midianite wife of Moses, daughter of Jethro, also called Hobab, and probably grand-daughter of Reuel, a priest of Midian at the time Moses fled from Egypt, later succeeded at his death by Jethro, or Hobab (Ex 2:21,22; 4:25,26; 18:2-6).

Whether or not Zipporah was the "Cushite woman" (Nu 12:1) is a much-mooted question. There is little ground for anything more than speculation on the subject. The use of the words, "Cushite woman" in the mouth of Aaron and Miriam may have been merely a description of Zipporah and intended to be opprobrious, or they may have been ethnic in character and intended to denote another woman whom Moses had married, as suggested by Ewald (Gesch. des Volkes Israel, II, 252). The former view seems the more probable. The association of Midian and Cushan by Habakkuk (3:7) more than 700 years afterward may hardly be adduced to prove like close relationship between these peoples in the days of Moses.

M. G. Kyle

ZITHRI

zith’-ri.

See SITHRI.

ZIV

ziv (ziw; the King James Version Zif): The 2nd month of the old Hebrew calendar, corresponding to Iyyar of the Jewish reckoning in later times. It is mentioned in 1Ki 6:1,37.

See CALENDAR.

ZIZ, ASCENT OF

ziz (ma‘aleh ha-tsits; Hasae, Hasisa): A pass in the wilderness of Judea (2Ch 20:16) leading from Hazazon-tamar (En-gedi, 2Ch 20:2). This is generally identified with Wady Chacaca, a valley by which the ancient road from En-gedi runs toward Jerusalem. At any rate, an echo of the ancient name survives here: possibly the actual ascent was the present steep pass from En-gedi to the plateau above. See PEF, Sh XXI.

ZIZA

zi’-za (ziza’, probably a childish reduplicated abbreviation or a term of endearment (Curtis, Chron., 369, quoting Noldeke in EB, III 3294)):

(1) A Simeonite chief (1Ch 4:37).

(2) A son of King Rehoboam, his mother being a daughter or grand-daughter of Absalom (2Ch 11:20).

(3) A probable reading for ZIZAH (which see).

ZIZAH

zi’-za (zizah; see ZIZA): A Gershonite Levite (1Ch 23:11); in verse 10 the name is "Zina" (zina’), while the Septuagint and Vulgate (Jerome’s Latin Bible, 390-405 A.D.) have "Ziza" (Ziza) in both verses, and one Hebrew manuscript has ziza’ in 1Ch 23:10. We should then probably read ziza’ in both verses, i.e. "Ziza."

ZOAN

zo’-an (tso‘an; Tanis):

1. situation

2. Old Testament Notices

3. Early History

4. Hyksos Monuments

5. Hyksos Population

6. Hyksos Age

7. Description of Site

1. Situation:

The name is supposed to mean "migration" (Arabic, tsan). The site is the only one connected with the history of Israel in Egypt, before the exodus, which is certainly fixed, being identified with the present village of San at the old mouth of the Bubastic branch of the Nile, about 18 miles Southeast of Damietta. It should be remembered that the foreshore of the Delta is continually moving northward, in consequence of the deposit of the Nile mud, and that the Nile mouths are much farther North than they

were even in the time of the geographer Ptolemy. Thus in the times of Jacob, and of Moses, Zoan probably lay at the mouth of the Bubastic branch, and was a harbor, Lake Menzaleh and the lagoons near Pelusium having been subsequently formed.

2. Old Testament Notices:

The city is only once noticed in the Pentateuch (Nu 13:22), as having been built seven years after Hebron, which existed in the time of Abraham. Zoan was certainly a very ancient town, since monuments of the VIth Egyptian Dynasty have been found at the site. It has been thought that Zoar on the border of Egypt (Ge 13:10) is a clerical error for Zoan, but the Septuagint reading (Zogora) does not favor this view, and the place intended is probably the fortress Zar, or Zor, often mentioned in Egyptian texts as lying on the eastern borders of the Delta. Zoan is noticed in the Prophets (Isa 19:11,13; 30:4; Eze 30:14), and its "princes" are naturally mentioned by Isaiah, since the capital of the XXIIInd Egyptian Dynasty (about 800 to 700 BC) was at this city. In Ps 78:12,43 the "field (or pastoral plain) of Zoan" is noticed as though equivalent to the land of GOSHEN (which see).

3. Early History:

Zoan was the capital of the Hyksos rulers, or "shepherd kings," in whose time Jacob came into Egypt, and their monuments have been found at the site, which favors the conclusion that its plain was that "land of Rameses" (Ge 47:11; Ex 12:37; see RAAMSES) where the Hebrews had possessions under Joseph. It is probably the site of Avaris, which lay on the Bubastic channel according to Josephus quoting Manetho (Apion, I, xiv), and which was rebuilt by the first of the Hyksos kings, named Salatis; for Avaris is supposed (Brugsch, Geog., I, 86-90, 278-80) to represent the Egyptian name of the city Ha-uar-t, which means "the city of movement" (or "flight"), thus being equivalent to the Semitic Zoan or "migration." It appears that, from very early times, the pastoral peoples of Edom and Palestine were admitted into this region. The famous picture of the Amu, who bring their families on donkeys to Egypt, and offer the Sinaitic ibex as a present, is found at Beni Chasan in a tomb as old as the time of Usertasen II of the XIIth Dynasty, before the Hyksos age. A similar immigration of shepherds (see PITHOM) from Aduma (or Edom) is also recorded in the time of Menepthah, or more than four centuries after the expulsion of the Hyksos by the XVIIIth, or Theban, Dynasty.

4. Hyksos Monuments:

Besides the name of Pepi of the Vlth Dynasty, found by Burton at Zoan, and many texts of the XIIth Dynasty, a cartouche of Apepi (one of the Hyksos kings) was found by Mariette on the arm of a statue apparently of older origin, and a sphinx also bears the name of Khian, supposed to have been an early Hyksos ruler. The Hyksos type, with broad cheek bones and a prominent nose, unlike the features of the native Egyptians, has been regarded by Virchow and Sir W. Flower as Turanian, both at Zoan and at Bubastis; which agrees with the fact that Apepi is recorded to have worshipped no Egyptian gods, but only Set (or Sutekh), who was also adored by Syrian Mongols (see HITTITES). At Bubastis this deity is called "Set of Rameses," which may indicate the identity of Zoan with the city Rameses.

5. Hyksos Population:

In the 14th century BC the city was rebuilt by Rameses II, and was then known as Pa-Ramessu. The Hyksos rulers had held it for 500 years according to Manetho, and were expelled after 1700 BC. George the Syncellus (Chronographia, about 800 AD) believed that Apepi (or Apophis) was the Pharaoh under whom Joseph came to Egypt, but there seems to have been more than one Hyksos king of the name, the latest being a contemporary of Ra-Sekenen of the XIIIth Dynasty, shortly before 1700 BC. Manetho says that some supposed the Hyksos to be Arabs, and the population of Zoan under their rule was probably a mixture of Semitic and Mongolic races, just as in Syria and Babylonia in the same ages. According to Brugsch (Hist of Egypt, II, 233), this population was known as Men or Menti, and came from Assyria East of Ruten or Syria. This perhaps connects them with the Minyans of Matiene, who were a Mongolic race. This statement occurs in the great table of nations, on the walls of the Edfu temple.

6. Hyksos Age:

The Hyksos age corresponds chronologically with that of the 1st Dynasty of Babylon, and thus with the age of the Hebrew patriarchs Abraham and Jacob—time when the power of Babylon was supreme in Syria and Palestine. It is very natural, therefore, that, like other Semitic tribes even earlier, these patriarchs should have been well received in the Delta by the Hyksos Pharaohs, and equally natural that, when Aahmes, the founder of the XVIIIth Egyptian Dynasty, took the town of Avaris and expelled the Asiatics, he should also have oppressed the Hebrews, and that this should be intended when we read (Ex 1:8) that "there arose a new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph." The exodus, according to the Old Testament dates, occurred in the time of the XVIIIth Dynasty (see EXODUS) when Israel left Goshen. The later date advocated by some scholars, in the reign of Menepthah of the XIXth Dynasty, hardly agrees with the monumental notice of the immigration of Edomites into the Delta in his reign, which has been mentioned above; and in his time Egypt was being invaded by tribes from the North of Asia.

7. Description of Site:

Zoan, as described by G. J. Chester (Mem. Survey West Palestine, Special Papers, 1881, 92-96), is now only a small hamlet of mud huts in a sandy waste, West of the huge mounds of its ancient temple; but, besides the black granite sphinx, and other statues of the Hyksos age, a red sandstone figure of Rameses II and obelisks of granite have been excavated, one representing this king adoring the gods; while the names of Amen, Tum and Mut appear as those of the deities worshipped, in a beautiful chapel in the temple, carved in red sandstone, and belonging to the same age of prosperity in Zoan.

C. R. Conder

ZOAR

zo’-ar (tso‘ar; the Septuagint usually Segor, Zogora): The name of the city to which Lot escaped from Sodom (Ge 19:20-23,30), previously mentioned in Ge 13:10; 14:2,8, where its former name is said to have been Bela. In 19:22, its name is said to have been given because of its littleness, which also seems to have accounted for its being spared. The location of Zoar has much to do with that of the cities of the Plain or Valley of Siddim, with which it is always connected. In De 34:3, Moses is said to have viewed "the Plain of the valley of Jericho the city of palm trees, unto Zoar," while in Isa 15:5 and Jer 48:4 (where the Septuagint reads unto "Zoar," instead of "her little ones") it is said to be a city of Moab. The traditional location of the place is at the south end of the Dead Sea. Josephus says (BJ, IV, viii, 4) that the Dead Sea extended "as far as Zoar of Arabia," while in Ant, I, xi, 4, he states that the place was still called Zoar. Eusebius (Onomasticon, 261) locates the Dead Sea between Jericho and Zoar, and speaks of the remnants of the ancient fertility as still visible. Ptolemy (v. 17,5) regards it as belonging to Arabia Petrea. The Arabian geographers mention it under the name Zughar, Sughar, situated 1 degrees South of Jericho, in a hot and unhealthful valley at the end of the Dead Sea, and speak of it as an important station on the trade route between Akkabah and Jericho. The Crusaders mention "Segor" as situated in the midst of palm trees. The place has not been definitely identified by modern explorers, but from Ge 19:19-30 we infer that it was in the plain and not in the mountain. If we fix upon the south end of the Dead Sea as the Vale of Siddim, a very natural place for Zoar and one which agrees with all the traditions would be at the base of the mountains of Moab, East of Wady Ghurundel, where there is still a well-watered oasis several miles long and 2 or 3 wide, which is probably but a remnant of a fertile plain once extending out over a considerable portion of the shallow south end of the Dead Sea when, as shown elsewhere (see DEAD SEA), the water level was considerably lower than now.

Robinson would locate it on the northeast corner of el-Lisan on the borders of the river Kerak, but this was done entirely on theoretical grounds which would be met as well in the place just indicated, and which is generally fixed upon by the writers who regard the Vale of Siddim as at the south end of the Dead Sea. Conder, who vigorously maintains that the Vale of Siddim is at the north end of the Dead Sea, looks favorably upon theory of W.H. Birch that the place is represented by the present Tell Shaghur, a white rocky mound at the foot of the Moab Mountains, a mile East of Beth-haram (Tell er-Rameh), 7 miles Northeast of the mouth of the Jordan, a locality remarkable for its stone monuments and well-supplied springs, but he acknowledges that the name is more like the Christian Segor than the original Zoar.

George Frederick Wright

ZOBAH

zo’-ba (tsobhah; Souba): The name is derived by Halevy from zehobhah as referring to its supplies of "bright yellow" brass; but this word might be more appropriately used to contrast its cornfields with white Lebanon. Zobah was an Aramean kingdom of which we have the first notice in Saul’s wars (1Sa 14:47).

(1) David’s First War.

When David sought to extend his boundary to the Euphrates, he came into contact with its king Hadadezer, and a great battle was fought in which David took many prisoners. Damascus, however, came to the rescue and fresh resistance was made, but a complete rout followed and great spoil fell to the victor, as well as access to the rich copper mines of Tebah and Berothai. Toi, king of Hamath, who had suffered in war with Hadadezer, now sent his son on an embassy with greetings and gifts to David (2Sa 8:3-12; 1Ch 18:3-12). See Ps 60, title.

(2) David's Second War.

During David's Ammonite war, the enemy was strengthened by alliance with Zobah, Maacah and Beth-rehob, and Israel was attacked from both North and South at the same time. The northern confederation was defeated by Joab, but Hadadezer again gathered an army, including levies from beyond the Euphrates. These, under Shobach the captain of the host, were met by David in person at Helam, and a great slaughter ensued, Shobach himself being among the slain (2Sa 10:6-19, the King James Version "Zoba"; 1Ch 19:3-19). Rezon, son of Eliada, now broke away from Hadadezer and, getting possession of Damascus, set up a kingdom hostile to Israel (1Ki 11:23-25). Solomon seems (2Ch 8:3) to have invaded and subdued Hamath-zobah, but the text, especially Septuagint, is obscure.

(3) Geographical Position.

We can now consider the vexed question of the situation and extent of Aram-zobah. (See SYRIA, 4, (10).) In addition to the Old Testament references we have the Assyrian name lists. In these Subiti is placed between Kui and Zemar, and, where it is otherwise referred to, a position is implied between Hamath and Damascus. It would thus lie along the eastern slopes of Anti-Lebanon extending thence to the desert, and in the north it may have at times included Emesa (modern Homs) around which Noldeke would locate it. Damascus was probably a tributary state till seized by Rezon. Winckler would identify it with another Cubiti, a place in the Hauran mentioned by Assurbanipal on the Hassam Cylinder vii, lines 110-12. This latter may be the native place of Igal, one of David's "thirty" (2Sa 23:36), who is named among eastern Israelites.

The kingdom of Zobah in addition to its mineral wealth must have been rich in vineyards and fruitful fields, and its conquest must have added greatly to the wealth and power of Israel's king.

W. M. Christie

ZOBEBAH

zo-be'-ba (ha-tsobhebhah, meaning uncertain): A Judahite name with the article prefixed (1Ch 4:8); some would read "Jabez" instead as in 1Ch 4:9.

ZOHAR

zo’-har (tsochar, meaning uncertain):

(1) Father of Ephron the Hittite (Ge 23:8; 25:9).

(2) "Son" of Simeon (Ge 46:10; Ex 6:15) =" Zerah" of Nu 26:13; 1Ch 4:24.

See ZERAH, 4.

(3) In 1Ch 4:7, where the Qere is "and tsochar" for the Kethibh is yitschar, the Revised Version (British and American) "Izhar," the King James Version wrongly "Jezoar."

ZOHELETH, THE STONE OF

zo’-he-leth, (’ebhen ha-zacheleth, "serpent’s stone"): "And Adonijah slew sheep and oxen and fatlings by the stone of Zoheleth, which is beside En-rogel" (1Ki 1:9). Evidently this was a sacred stone—probably a matstsbhah such as marked a Canaanite sanctuary. A source of "living water" has always in the Semitic world been a sacred place; even today at most such places, e.g. at Bir Eyyub, the modern representative of En-rogel, there is a michrab and a platform for prayer. The stone has disappeared, but it is thought that an echo of the name survives in ez-Zechweleh, the name of a rocky outcrop in the village of Siloam. Because the name is particularly associated with an ascent taken by the woman coming from the Virgin’s Fount, to which it is adjacent, some authorities have argued that this, the Virgin’s Fount, must be En-rogel; on this see EN-ROGEL; GIHON. Against this view, as far as ez- Zechweleh is concerned, we may note:

(1) It is by no means certain that the modern Arabic name—which is used for similar rocky spots in other places—is really derived from the Hebrew;

(2) the name is now applied to quite different objects, in the Hebrew to a stone, in the Arabic to a rocky outcrop;

(3) the name is not confined to this outcrop near the Virgin’s Fount alone, but applies, according to at least some of the fellahin of Siloam, to the ridge along the whole village site; and

(4) even if all the above were disproved, names are so frequently transferred from one locality to another in Palestine that no argument can be based on a name alone.

E. W. G. Masterman

ZOHETH

zo’-heth (zocheth, meaning unknown): A Judahite (1Ch 4:20). The name after "Ben-zoheth" at the end of the verse has fallen out.

See BEN-ZOHETH.

ZOOLOGY

zo-ol’-o-ji: A systematic list of the animals of the Bible includes representatives of the principal orders of mammals, birds and reptiles, and not a few of the lower animals. For further notices of animals in the following list, see the articles referring to them:

Mammals:

PRIMATES: Ape

INSECTIVORA: Hedgehog. MOLE (which see) not found in Palestine

CHIROPTERA: Bat

CARNIVORA

(a) Felidae, Cat, Lion, Leopard

(b) Hyaenidae, Hyena

(c) Canidae, Dog (including Greyhound), Fox, Jackal, Wolf

(d) Mustelidae, Ferret, Badger, Marten (s.v. CAT)

(e) Ursidae, Bear

UNGULATA:

(a) Odd-toed: Horse, Ass, Mule, Rhinoceros

(b) Even-toed non-ruminants: Swine, Hippopotamus (Behemoth)

(c) Ruminants:

(1) Bovidae, Domestic Cattle, Wild Ox or Unicorn, Sinaitic Ibex (s.v. GOAT), Persian Wild Goat (s.v. CHAMOIS), Gazelle, Arabian Oryx (s.v. ANTELOPE), Chamois

(2) Cervidae, Roe Deer, Fallow Deer, Red Deer (s.v. DEER)

(3) Camelidae, Camel

PROBOSCIDEA: Elephant

HYRACOIDEA: Coney

SIRENIA: Dugong (s.v. BADGER)

CETACNA: Whale, Dolphin, Porpoise

RODENTIA: Mouse, Mole-Rat (s.v. MOLE), Porcupine, Hare Birds:

PASSERES: Sparrow, Swallow, Raven, Hoopoe, Night Hawk

RAPTORES: Great Owl, Little Owl, Horned Owl, Eagle, Vulture, Gier-Eagle, Osprey, Kite, Glede, Hawk, Falcon

COLUMBAE: Dove, Turtle-Dove

GALLINAE: Cock, Partridge, Quail, Peacock

GRALLATORES: Crane, Heron, Stork

STEGANOPODES: Pelican, Cormorant

RATTAE: Ostrich Reptiles:

CROCODILIA: Crocodile (Leviathan)

CHELONIA: Tortoise

OPHIDIA: Serpent, Fiery Serpent, Adder, Asp, Vipet (s.v. SERPENT)

LACERTILIA: Lizard, Great Lizard, Gecko, Chameleon, Land Crocodile, Sand Lizard (s.v. LIZARD)
Amphibians: Frog

Fishes: Fish (in general)

Mollusks: Snail, Murex (Purple)

Insects:

HYMENOPTERA: Ant, Bee, Hornet

LEPIDOPTERA: Clothes-Moth (s.v. MOTH), Silk-Worm, Worm (Larva)

SIPHONAPTERA: Flea

DIPTERA: Fly

RHYNCHOTA; Louse, Scarlet-Worm

ORTHOPTERA: Grasshopper, Locust (s.v. INSECTS)

Arachnida: Spider, Scorpion

Coelenterata: Coral

Porifera:

Sponge

Some interesting problems arise in connection with the lists of clean and unclean animals in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. The list of clean animals in De 14:4-5 is as follows:

Probably the most valuable modern work on Bible animals is Tristram's Natural History of the Bible, published in 1867 and to a great extent followed in the Revised Version (British and American) and in articles in various Biblical encyclopedias. In the table given above, the Revised Version (British and American) really differs from Tristram only in 6, 8 and 10. Hart is the male of the red deer, the ibex is a kind of wild goat, and the oryx is a kind of antelope. The first three in the table are domestic animals whose identification is not questioned. The other seven are presumably wild animals, regarding every one of which there is more or less uncertainty. 'Aqqo, dishon and zemer occur only in this passage, te'o only here and in Isa 51:20. 'Ayyal occurs 22 times, tsebhi 16 times, yachmur only twice. The problem is to find seven ruminant mammals to correspond to these names. The camel (De 14:7) is excluded as unclean. The gazelle, the Sinaitic ibex, and the Persian wild goat are common. The roe deer was fairly common in Carmel and Southern Lebanon 20 years ago, but is now nearly or quita extinct. The fallow deer exists in Mesopotamia, and Tristram says that he saw it in Galilee, though the writer is inclined to question the accuracy of the observation. The oryx is fairly common in Northwestern Arabia, approaching the limits of Edom. Here, then, are six animals, the gazelle, ibex, Persian wild goat, roe

deer, fallow deer, and oryx, whose existence in or near Palestine is undisputed.

The bubale, addax and Barbary sheep of Tristram's list are North African species which the writer believes do not range as far East as Egypt, and which he believes should therefore be excluded. In Asia Miner are found the red deer, the chamois and the Armenian wild sheep, but there is no proof that any of these ever ranged as far South as Palestine. The bison exists in the Caucasus, and the wild ox, urus or aurochs, seems to be depicted in Assyrian sculptures. The buffalo is found in Palestine, but is believed to have been introduced since Bible times. The Tartarian roe is named Cervus pygargus, and there is a South African antelope named Bubalis pygargus, but the pygarg of English Versions of the Bible has no real existence. The word means "white-rumped," and might apply to various deer and antelopes.

To complete the list of seven we are therefore driven to one of the following: the red deer, the chamois, the Armenian wild sheep, the bison and the aurochs, no one of which has a very good claim to be included; The writer considers that the roe, which has been the commonest deer of Palestine, is the ‘ayyal (compare Arabic ‘aiyil, "deer"). Tsebhi is very near to Arabic zabi, "gazelle," and, with its 16 occurrences in the Old Testament, may well be that common animal. There is reason to think that yachmur is the name of a deer, and the writer prefers to apply it to the fallow deer of Mesopotamia, as being more likely to have inhabited Palestine than the red deer of Asia Minor. There is little evidence regarding ‘aqqo, which occurs only here. The etymology is uncertain. Septuagint has tragelaphos, "goat-stag." Targum and Syriac VSS, according to BDB, have ibex. Ya‘el (Job 39:1; Ps 104:18; 1Sa 24:2), English Versions of the Bible "wild goat," is quite certainly the ibex, but it is possible that ‘aqqo may be another name for the same animal, ya‘el not occurring in this list. In BDB dishon is derived from dush, "to tread," and is considered to be a kind of wild goat. Since we have assigned ‘aqqo to the ibex, we may then assign this name to the other wild goat of the country, the Persian wild goat or pasang. Te’o is in the Revised Version (British and American) antelope and in the Septuagint orux, "oryx." This is a possible identification which suits also, Isa 51:20, and does not preclude the possibility that the re’em, the King James Version "unicorn," the Revised Version (British and American) "wild-ox," may also be the oryx. The oryx is known to the Arabs under at least three names, the most common of which, baqr el-wachsh, means "wild-ox." Under CHAMOIS, the writer suggests that zemer may be the pasang or Persian wild goat, which is figured in that article. There is little to choose in the assignment of the names, but as dishon has here been provisionally assigned to the pasang, nothing better is left for zemer than the "chamois" of English Versions of the Bible, the claims of which are referred to above.

The list of unclean animals is considered in the article on LIZARD.

Prophecies of the desolation of Babylon and Edom in Isa 13:21,22; 34:11-15 contain names of animals, some of which present apparently insuperable difficulties. See under JACKAL and SATYR. The Book of Job contains some remarkable references to animals, especially in chapters 39; 40; 41: to the wild goat, the wild ass, the wild ox, the ostrich, the horse, the hawk, the behemoth and the leviathan.

Pr 30 contains some curious allusions to natural history:

".... Things which are too wonderful for me ....

The way of an eagle in the air;

The way of a serpent upon a rock (see EAGLE; WAY);

There are four things which are little upon the earth,

But they are exceeding wise:

The ants are a people not strong,

Yet they provide their food in the summer;

The conies are but a feeble folk,

Yet they make their houses in the rocks;

The locusts have no king,

Yet go they forth all of them by bands;

The lizard taketh hold with her hands,

Yet is she in kings' palaces.

There are three things which are stately in their march,

Yea, four which are stately in going:

The lion, which is might, lest among beasts,

And turneth not away for any;

The greyhound; the he-goat also;

And the king against whom there is no rising up."

An interesting grouping is found in the prophecy in Isa 11:6-8 (compare 65:25): "And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones

shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder’s den."

The fauna of Palestine is mainly European and Asiatic, but resembles in some important points the fauna of Africa. The Syrian coney is not found elsewhere and its only near allies are the conies of Africa. The gazelle and oryx belong to the group of antelopes which is especially African. The lion and leopard range throughout Africa and Southwest Asia. The ostrich is found outside of Africa only in Arabia. Some of the smaller birds, as for instance the sun-bird, have their nearest allies in Africa. The fish of the Sea of Tiberias and the Jordan present important resemblances to African fishes. The same is true of some of the butterflies of Palestine. Allying the fauna of Palestine with that of Europe and North Asia may be noted the deer, bear, wolf, fox, hare and others. The ibex and Persian wild goat constitute links with central Asia, which is regarded as the center of distribution of the goat tribe.

The fauna of Palestine has undoubtedly changed since Bible times. Lions have disappeared, bears and leopards have become scarce, the roe deer has nearly or quite disappeared within recent years. It is doubtful whether the aurochs, the chamois and the red deer were ever found in Palestine, but if so they are entirely gone. The buffalo has been introduced and has become common in some regions. Domestic cats, common now, were perhaps not indigenous to ancient Palestine. In prehistoric times, or it may be before the advent of man, the glacial period had an influence upon the fauna of this country, traces of which still persist. On the summits of Lebanon are found two species of butterfly, Pieris callidice, found also in Siberia, and Vanessa urticae, common in Europe. When the glacial period came on, these butterflies with a host of other creatures were driven down from the North. When the cold receded northward they moved back again, except for these, and perhaps others since become extinct, which found the congenial cold in ascending the mountains where they became isolated. Syria and Palestine were never covered with a sheet of ice, but the famous cedar grove of Lebanon stands on the terminal moraine of what was once an extensive glacier.

Alfred Ely Day

ZOPHAH

zo’-fa (tsophach, meaning uncertain): An Asherite (1Ch 7:35,36).

ZOPHAI

zo’fi, zo’-fa-i (tsophay, meaning uncertain): In 1Ch 6:26 (Hebrew verse 11) = Zuph, the Qere of 1Ch 6:35 (Hebrew, verse 20), and 1Sa 1:1.

See ZUPH, (1).

ZOPHAR

zo’-far (tsphar, meaning doubtful, supposed from root meaning "to leap"; Sophar): One of the three friends of Job who, hearing of his affliction, make an appointment together to visit and comfort him. He is from the tribe of Naamah, a tribe and place otherwise unknown, for as all the other friends and Job himself are from lands outside of Palestine, it is not likely that this place was identical with Naamah in the West of Judah (Jos 15:41). He speaks but twice (Job 11; 20); by his silence the 3rd time the writer seems to intimate that with Bildad’s third speech (Job 25; see under BILDAD) the friends’ arguments are exhausted. He is the most impetuous and dogmatic of the three (compare Job 11:2,3; 20:2,3); stung to passionate response by Job’s presumption in maintaining that he is wronged and is seeking light from God. His words are in a key of intensity amounting to reckless exaggeration. He is the first to accuse Job directly of wickedness; averring indeed that his punishment is too good for him (11:6); he rebukes Job’s impious presumption in trying to find out the unsearchable secrets of God (11:7-12); and yet, like the rest of the friends, promises peace and restoration on condition of penitence and putting away iniquity (11:13-19). Even from this promise, however, he reverts to the fearful peril of the wicked (11:20); and in his 2nd speech, outdoing the others, he presses their lurid description of the wicked man’s woes to the extreme (20:5-29), and calls forth a straight contradiction from Job, who, not in wrath, but in dismay, is constrained by loyalty to truth to acknowledge things as they are. Zophar seems designed to represent the wrong-headedness of the odium theologicum.

John Franklin Genung

ZOPHIM, THE FIELD OF

zo’-fim, (sedheh tsophim; eis agrou skopian): The place on the top of Pisgah to which Balak took Balaam, whence only a part of the host of Israel could be seen (Nu 23:14). Perhaps we should simply translate "field of watchers." Conder draws attention to the name Tal‘at es-Sufa attached to an ascent leading up to the ridge of Neba from the North Here possibly is a survival of the old name. For Ramathaim-zophim see RAMAH.

ZORAH

zo’-ra (tsor‘ah; Saraa): A city on the border of Dan, between Eshtaol and Ir-shemesh (Jos 19:41); the birthplace of Samson (Jud 13:2,25); near here too he was buried (Jud 16:31); from here some Danites went to spy out the land (Jud 18:2,11). In Jos 15:33 it is, with Eshtaol, allotted to Judah, and after the captivity it was reinhabited by the "children of Judah" (Ne 11:29, the King James Version "Zareah"). It was one of the cities fortified by Rehoboam (2Ch 11:10). It is probable that it is mentioned under the name Tsarkha along with Aialuna (Aijalon; 2Ch 11:10) in the Tell el-Amarna Letters(no. 265, Petrie) as attacked by the Khabiri.

It is the modern Sur‘a, near the summit of a lofty hill on the north side of the Wady es-Surar (Vale of Sorek). The summit itself is occupied by the Mukam Nebi Samit, overhung by a lofty palm, and there are many remains of ancient tombs, cisterns, wine presses, etc., around. From here Eshu‘a (Eshtaol), ‘Ain Shems (Beth-shemesh) and Tibnah (Timnah) are all visible. See PEF, III, 158, Sh XVII.

E. W. G. Masterman

ZORATHITES

zo’-rath-its (tsor‘athi; Sarathaioi (1Ch 2:53, the King James Version "Zareathites"), Codex Vaticanus ho Arathei; Codex Alexandrinus ho Sarathi (4 2)): The inhabitants of Zorah, who are said to be descended from Kiriath-jearim families.

ZOREAH

zo’-re-a (tsor‘ah): the King James Version of Jos 15:33 for ZORAH (which see).

ZORITES

zo’-rits (tsor‘i; Codex Vaticanus ho Hesarsei; Codex Alexandrinus ho Hesaraei) :In 1Ch 2:54 for "Zorites" we should probably read ZORATHITES (which see). These formed a half of the inhabitants of MANAHATH (which see).

ZOROASTRIANISM

zo-ro-as’-tri-an-iz’-m:

I. HISTORY SOURCES

II. RELATION TO ISRAEL

1. Influence on Occident

2. Popular Judaism

3. Possible Theological Influence

4. Angelology and Demonology

5. Eschatology

6. Messiah

7. Ethics

8. Summary

LITERATURE

I. History.

Sources:

The sacred book of the Persians, the Avesta, is a work of which only a small part has survived. Tradition tells that the Avestan manuscripts have suffered one partial and two total destructions (at the hands of Turanians, Macedonians, and Mohammedans, respectively), and what remains seems to be based on a collection of passages derived from oral tradition and arranged for liturgical purposes at the time of the first Sassanians (after 226 AD). None the less, a portion (the Gathas) of the present work certainly contains material from Zoroaster himself and much of the remainder of the Avesta is pre-Christian, although some portions are later. Outside of the Avesta there is an extensive literature written in Pahlavi. Most of this in its final form belongs to the 9th Christian century, or to an even later date, but in it there is embodied much very early matter. Unfortunately criticism of these sources is as yet in a very embryonic condition. The Greek historians, especially Plutarch and Strabo, are naturally of great importance, but the chief Greek work (that of Theopompus) is lost.

For a general account of Zoroastrianism, see PERSIAN RELIGION.

II. Relation to Israel.

1. Influence on Occident:

Zoroastrianism was an active, missionary religion that has exerted a profound influence on the world’s thought, all the more because in the West (at any rate) Ahura Mazda was not at all a jealous god, and Mazdeism was always quite ready to enter into syncretism with other systems. But this syncretistic tendency makes the task of the historian very delicate. None of the three great streams that swept from Persia over the West—Mithraism, Gnosticism, and Manicheism—contained much more than a Mazdean nucleus, and the extrication of Mazdean from other (especially older Magian and Babylonian) elements is frequently impossible. Yet the motive force came from Zoroaster, and long before the Christian era "Magi" were everywhere (as early as 139 BC they were expelled from Rome; compare RAB-MAG; BRANCH). Often, doubtless, charlatans, they none the less brought teachings that effected a far-reaching modification of popular views and produced an influence on so basic a writer as Plato himself.

2. Popular Judaism:

Within the period 538-332 BC (that Cyrus was a Zoroastrian seems now established) Israel was under the rule of Mazdeans, and Mazdean influence on at least the popular conceptions was inevitable. It

appears clearly in such works as Tobit (Expository Times, XI, 257 ff), and Hystaspis (GJV, edition 4, III, 592-95), in many Talmudic passages (ZDMG, XXI, 552-91), certain customs of the Essenes, various anti-demoniac charms (see EXORCISM; SORCERY), and, perhaps, in the feast of Purim. And the stress laid on the prophetic ability of the Magi in Mt 2:1-12 is certainly not without significance. But the important question is the existence or extent of Mazdean influence on the formal Jewish religion.

3. Possible Theological Influence:

As a matter of fact, after Israel's contact with Persia the following elements, all known to Mazdeism, appear, and apparently for the first time:

(1) a formal angelology, with six (or seven) archangels at the head of the developed hierarchy;

(2) these angels not mere companions of God but His intermediaries, established (often) over special domains;

(3) in the philosophical religion, a corresponding doctrine of hypostases;

(4) as a result, a remoter conception of God;

(5) a developed demonology;

(6) the conception of a supreme head (Satan) over the powers of evil;

(7) the doctrine of immortality;

(8) rewards or punishments for the soul immediately after death;

(9) a schematic eschatology especially as regards chronological systems;

(10) a superhuman Messiah;

(11) bodily resurrection;

(12) a rationalized, legalistic conception of God's moral demands.

4. Angelology and Demonology:

In this list Mazdean influence may be taken as certain in points (1), (2), (5), (6). Of course belief in angels and (still more) in demons had always existed in Israel, and a tendency to classification is a natural product of increased culture. But the thoroughness and rapidity of the process and the general

acceptance of its principles show something more than cultural growth (compare the influence of pseudo-Dionysius on Christianity). In particular, the doctrine of patrons (angelic or demoniac) seems to find no expression in the pre-exilic religion. Nor was the incorporation into a single being, not only of phases, but of the whole power of evil, a necessary growth from the earlier religion; the contrast between 2Sa 24:1 and 1Ch 21:1 shows a sharp alteration in viewpoint. On the other hand, the dualism that Ahriman was to explain produced no effect on Israel, and God remained the Creator of all things, even of Satan. See SATAN; ANTICHRIST. (3) presents a problem that still needs proper analysis. The Zoroastrian abstractions may well have stimulated Jewish speculation. But the influence of Greek thought can certainly not be ignored, and a rationalizing process applied to the angelelegy would account for the purely Jewish growth of the concepts. (4) is bound up to some degree with the above, and presents the most unpleasant feature of the later Judaism. Sharply counter to prophetic and pre-prophetic teaching, it was modified by the still later Talmudism. Its inconsistency with the teaching of Christ needs no comment. In part, however, it may well have been due to the general "transcendentalizing" tendencies of the intermediate period.

See GOD; SALVATION.

5. Eschatology:

It is possible, similarly, to understand the advanced Jewish eschatology as an elaboration and refinement of the genuinely prophetic Day of Yahweh concepts, without postulating foreign influence. In particular, a doctrine of immortality was inevitable in Judaism, and the Jewish premises were of a sort that made a resurrection belief necessary. The presence of similar beliefs in Mazdeism may have hastened the process and helped determine the specific form, and for certain details direct borrowing is quite likely (compare the twelve periods of world-history in Apocrypha Abraham 29; Syriac Baruch 53 ff; 2 Esdras 14). But too much stress cannot be laid on details. The extant Persian apocalypses are all very late, and literary (if not religious) influence on them from Christian and Jewish sources seems inevitable (for the Bahman Yast it is certain). Nor could the effect of the Mazdean eschatology have been very thorough. Of its two most cardinal doctrines, the Chinvat Bridge is absent from Judaism, and the molten-metal ordeal is referred to only in the vaguest terms, if at all. Indeed, the very fact that certain doctrines were identified with the "heathen" may well have deterred Jewish acceptance.

See PAROUSIA; RESURRECTION.

6. Messiah:

Similarly, the Messiah, as future king, was fixed in Jewish belief, and His elevation to celestial position was an inevitable step in the general refining process. The Persian Saoshyant doctrine may well have helped, and the appearance of the Messiah "from .... the sea" in 2 Esdras 13:3 certainly recalls the Mazdean appearance from a lake. But Saoshyant is not a celestial figure. He has no existence before his final appearance (or birth) and he comes from earth, not from heaven. The Jewish Son of man—Messiah—on the other hand, is a purely celestial figure and (even in 2 Esdras 13) existed from (or before)

creation. The birth of Saoshyant from the seed of Zoroaster and that of the (non-celestial) Messiah from the seed of David have no connection whatever.

See MESSIAH; SON OF MAN.

7. Ethics:

Not much can be made of the parallel in legalism. Nearly every religion has gone through a similar legalistic state. The practical eudemonistic outlook of such works as Proverbs and Sirach (see WISDOM) doubtless have analogies in Mazdeism, and the comfortable union of religion and the good things of the present life among the Persians may well have had an effect on certain of the Jews, especially as the Persians preserved a good ethical standard. But only a part of Judaism was eudemonistic, and Mazdean and Jewish casuistry are based on entirely distinct principles.

8. Summary:

Summarizing, about the most that can be asserted for Mazdean influence is that it left its mark on the angelology and demonology and that it possibly contributed certain eschatological details. Apart from this, it may well have helped determine the development of elements already present in Israel’s faith. On the common people (especially the more superstitious) its influence was considerably greater. But there is nothing in the formal theology of Judaism that can be described as "borrowed" from Mazdean teachings.

NOTE.

There is almost certainly no reference to Mazdean dualism in Isa 45:7.

LITERATURE.

The Avesta is in SBE, IV, 23, 31, but the Gathas are best studied in L.H. Mills, The Gathas of Zarathushtra (1900); Pahlavi texts in SBE, V, 18, 24, 37, 47. The best presentation of Mazdeism is in Saussaye’s Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte, II, 162-233 (by Ed. Lehmann); compare the articles "Zoroastrianism" in Encyclopedia Biblica (Geldner and Cheyne) and HDB (J. H. Moulton, excellent); on the relation to Judaism, Stave, Uber den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judenthum (1898); Soderblom, La vie future d’apres le Mazdeisme (An. Mus. Guimet, 1901, needs checking); Boklen, Die Verwandtschaft der jud.-chr. mit der parsischen Eschatologie (1902, good material but very uncritical); L. H. Mills, Our Own Religion in Ancient Persia (1912, theory of parallel development; Mazdeism rather idealized); J. H. Moulton, Early Zoroastrianism (1913) and articles by T. K. Cheyne, The Expository Times, II, 202, 224, 248; and J. H. Moulton, The Expository Times, IX, 352. For details compare Clemen, Religionsgeschichtliche Erklarung des New Testament (1909, English translation, Primitive Christianity and Its non-Jewish Sources); Bousset, Religion des Judenthums (2nd edition, 1906); Offenbarung Johannis (1906); Hauptprobleme der Gnosis (1907, indispensable).

Burton Scott Easton

ZOROBABEL

zo-rob’-a-bel, zo-ro’-ba-bel (Zerobabel): In the King James Version; Greek form of "Zerubbabel," thus the Revised Version (British and American) (Mt 1:12,13; Lu 3:27).

ZORZELLEUS

zor-zel’-e-us (Zorzelleos, Codex Vaticanus (and Swete) Phaezeldaios; Fritzsche, Berzellaios; the King James Version Berzelus; the Revised Version margin "Phaezeldaeus"): The father of Augia, the wife of Jaddus, head of a family that "usurped the office of the priesthood" in the return under Zerubbabel (1 Esdras 5:38); "Barzillai" of Ezr 2:61; Ne 7:63.

See BARZILLAI.

ZUAR

zu’-ar, zoo’-ar (tsu‘-ar "little one"; Sogar): Father of Nethanel (Nu 1:8; 2:5; 7:18,23; 10:15), who was head of the tribe of Issachar.

ZUPH

zuf (tsuph, "honeycomb"):

(1) According to 1Sa 1:1 b; 1Ch 6:35 (Hebrew verse 20) =" Zophai" of 1Ch 6:26 (11), an ancestor of Elkanah and Samuel. But Budde and Wellhausen take it to be an adjective, and so read tsuphi, in 1Sa 1:1 b: "Tohu a Zuphite, an Ephraimite." It should probably be read also in 1:1a: "Now there was a certain man of the Ramathites, a Zuphite of the hill-country of Ephraim," as the Hebrew construction in the first part of the verse is otherwise unnatural. The Septuagint’s Codex Alexandrinus has Soup; Lucian has Souph in 1Sa 1:1 b; 1Ch 6:26 (11); Codex Vaticanus has Souphei; Codex Alexandrinus and Lucian have Souphi; 6:35 (20), Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus have Souph; Lucian has Souphi; and the Kethibh has tsiph.

(2) The Septuagint’s Codex Vaticanus and Codex Alexandrinus have Seiph; Lucian has Sipha, "the land of Zuph," a district in Benjamin, near its northern border (1Sa 9:5).

David Francis Roberts

ZUR

zur (tsur "rock"):

(1) A prince or chief (Nu 25:15; 31:8) of Midian, father of the woman slain with Zimri by Phinehas. Jos 13:21 describes him as one of the princes of Sihon, but the reference there is regarded as a gloss.

(2) An inhabitant of Gibeon (1Ch 8:30; 9:36), to be connected probably, according to Curtis, with "Zeror" of 1Sa 9:1.

ZURIEL

zu'-ri-el (tsuri'-el, "my rock is El (God)"): Prince of the house of Merari (Nu 3:35).

The word tsur, "rock," occurs also in the compound names Elizur (Nu 1:5), Zurishaddai (Nu 1:6, etc.) and Pedahzur (Nu 1:10). Gray, Numbers 6, says that a Sabean name Suri'addana is found in an inscription said to be of the 8th century BC, or somewhat carrier (Hommel, Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 320), and bartsur, in a Zinjirli inscription of the 8th century BC (Panammu Inscr., 1. 1), and that possibly the Old Testament place-name "Beth-zur" should be added (Jos 15:58; 1Ch 2:45; 2Ch 11:7; Ne 3:16).

David Francis Roberts

ZURISHADDAI

zu-ri-shad'-a-i, zu-ri-shad'-i (tsurishadday, "my rock is Shadday"): Father of Shelumiel the head of the tribe of Simeon (Nu 1:6; 2:12; 7:36,41; 10:19).

See GOD, NAMES OF, II, 8; ZURIEL.

ZUZIM

zu'-zim (zuzim; (ethne ischura, "strong nations." So Jerome in Quaest. Hebr.: genres fortes) :A people conquered by Chedorlaomer (Ge 14:5) . They dwelt in Ham, a region not otherwise known but, from the connection, inferred to be East of the Jordan. It may also be inferred that they were a race of giants. They were perhaps to be identified with the Zamzummim.